APR 28 1948

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 93—PART 11

APRIL 2, 1947, TO JUNE 12, 1947

(PAGES A1435 TO A2830)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1947

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Public Administration and Economic Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 28 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a speech entitled "Public Administration and Economic Stabilization," which was delivered on March 14, 1947, by the Honorable Edwin G. Nourse, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, before the American Society for Public Administration.

Mr. President, I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript of the address of Mr. Nourse will require 3 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, being 1 page more than the 2 pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost. The estimated cost is $213.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since August 9, when the Council of Economic Advisers was sworn in, we have been diligently engaged in seeking to get a fuller measure of the significance of the Employment Act of 1946, under which the Council was created. Our first annual report to the President made clear our realization that it had significance for the political scientist as well as the economist. In addressing the American Economic Association recently on economics in the public service, I undertook to explore somewhat further my personal views as to how the economic content of the act might best be developed. I greatly value this opportunity of discussing with you some of its public administration aspects.

Nothing could be further from my thought than to suggest that the economic problems we must face are really separated from issues of public administration or that either can be dealt with understandingly or effectively in isolation from the other. In a paper which, by a strange coincidence, was published [1] only a few weeks before my appointment to the Council, I pointed to the need of marriage—a happy and fruitful marriage—between political science and economics if we are to avail ourselves adequately of professional work in grappling with the problem of organizing a democratic people in a national program for achieving their own material well-being. My gratification at the passage of the Employment Act of 1946 and my willingness to take a part in the attempt to bring it into effective operation stems largely from my belief that this legislation represents a real and substantial step in the evolution of our politico-economic institutions. It seems to me to promise better coordination between private units of economic enterprise, large and small, and other undertakings—from local to national—which, by reason of the functions involved, need to be organized on a public or governmental basis.

I am sure that before an audience of this sort I need not belabor this point of the interrelation between our economic system and our governmental institutions. Government is inescapably integrated into the economy. This is not merely by virtue of the fact that the Government must establish the legal foundation of property rights which underlie all business life and must establish standards of business conduct and police their enforcement if we are to have a peaceful and orderly business world. Beyond this there are many activities in which government enters substantively into the business process either through its participation in the distribution of wealth or flows of income (that is, its monetary and fiscal operations) or through its participation in the productive process. This latter may be through the provision of facilities and services (postal, highway, water, and sewage, or what not), or even of physical goods such as timber, fertilizer, or electric current. Even to the most conservative, economic well-being is the major end for which the state exists. If government were denied every power except military, it would still be basically economic as to its ends, either a defensive posse to protect its domain as national resources for productive use or the private property rights of its citizens against the incursions of rival users. Or it might be an offensive posse seeking to seize economic resources or trade controls from some rival holder.

With this view, then, as to the thorough interpenetration of the economic process and the political process in modern civilization and specifically in industrial America, let us turn to consideration of the Employment Act of 1946 as the latest restatement of the intentions of the American people as to how public administration can be brought to serve more adequately the purpose of economic stabilization or sustained use of the Nation's economic resources.

THE EMPLOYMENT ACT IS ESSENTIALLY WITHIN OUR TRADITIONS

The Employment Act of 1946 is faithful both to the political traditions of our republican form of government, with its division of powers, and to our economic tradition of maximum private enterprise, with complementary use of public agencies for economic ends.

Looking first at the political side of the question, it is obvious that the act does not in any way touch our judicial system. It is focused about equally on the legislative and the executive branches of the Government. On the legislative side, it, of course, does not abrogate or restrict in any way the primacy of the Congress in the determination of policy of the devising and enactment of measures through which policy is to be carried out. The device of a joint congressional committee is nothing novel, and the methods by which this committee is to work are the same as those traditionally used by congressional committees, though larger funds have been supplied for its professional staffing and larger use of the facilities of the Library of Congress is contemplated. As to the executive branch, also, the Employment Act conforms to the fundamental traditions of our past. From George Washington down, the President has reported to the Congress on the state of the Union and made to it his recommendation of that program of legislation which he believed would best promote the national welfare. This pattern is, we hope, enriched but certainly not altered under the Employment Act. An annual economic report of the President is to be prepared with the assistance and advice of the newly created Council of Economic Advisers, and submitted to the Congress promptly at the opening of its session. This is essentially an extension of the state-of-the-Union procedure.

Traditionally also—indeed constitutionally—the President has been entrusted with the duty as Chief Executive of carrying out the measures enacted by Congress, the major parts of this work being directly administered by department heads who also sit as Cabinet officers advisory to the President. His administrative family has gradually been augmented by the establishment of a variety of agencies and establishments whose heads counsel the President in special areas and upon occasion sit with the Cabinet. Directly within the Executive Office are the Bureau of the Budget and the White House staff, who help the President's over-all planning and management functions. This traditional system of operation in the executive branch is in no way altered by the Employment Act. The Council of Economic Advisers merely augments the facilities of advice and policy formulation under the President.

Turning to the economic aspect of the Employment Act, it reaffirms and in fact makes more explicit and comprehensive than ever before the national policy of adhering to a system of predominantly private enterprise. At the same time, it also states more explicitly and comprehensively than ever before a policy of the National Government to

[1] Serfdom, Utopia, or Democratic Opportunity? Public Administration Review, vol. VI, No. 2, spring 1946, pp. 177–187.

follow such lines of positive action as the legislature may see fit to authorize under the leadership of the Chief Executive or on its own initiative, subject to his veto powers. This declaration of residual public responsibility on a foundation of private enterprise simply reaffirms as a matter of conscious policy the traditional course we have followed ever since colonial times. This is the "mixed" economy under which in Federal, State, and local matters we have been accustomed to operate. We, of course, have never had our socio-politico-economic carburetor rigidly set to any particular mixture; but neither have we ever undertaken to operate either on pure air or pure gasoline.

A century and a half ago, the infant National Government planned the disposal of its public lands; the creation of a system of highway, waterway, and railroad transportation; a scheme of international commercial relations and of internal fiscal, monetary, and banking arrangements and institutions that were expected to facilitate and stimulate the vigorous use of our labor and natural resources and to fit our business life effectively into the changing conditions of the world economy. From time to time changes in the Government plan were introduced—from the internal improvements controversy of the 1830's to the varied New Deal programs of the 1930's.

The Employment Act of 1946 is strictly in line with the spirit of 1776. It reaffirms the American practice that has been followed again and again as we have found ourselves confronted by new problems. That is, we have given the individual and the privately organized group the first chance to perform a given economic service and to reap its gains—within general codes of proper conduct. But when it became clear that private resources were insufficient or private venturesomeness too feeble or the terms of private trade incompatible with social need, we have never hesitated to invoke community organization, State activity, or Federal aid or outright operation. Sometimes—as in the carrying of the mail—the public has prejudged the case and launched a public agency without giving much opportunity for private business to show what it could do. Sometimes, on the other hand, the public has put up with poor service because of a feeling that the field should, as a matter of principle, be left to private exploitation. That view may have been propagated by special interest groups.

In a surprisingly large number of economic functions we have organized along parallel lines of private and of public activity. We have accelerated or checked the expansion of postal, highway, education, health, power, forest, and amusement services as local and temporary circumstances seemed to require. It is nonsense to say that we have had any consistent or rational policy or economic or social theory in these matters. We have been opportunists trying to get something done, and to preserve freedom of action of the citizen as well as the business enterpriser in the process of getting it done.

I strongly suspect that we shall continue these rather unsystematic practices under the Employment Act much as we have followed them for a century or more before its passage. But in conjunction with—and in a sense compensating for—this flexible and easygoing way of business life we have at length enunciated a basic policy of economic action for the Federal Government, coordinated—so far as they will permit—with State and local governments. This policy is in no way to abrogate or interfere with the embarking of the people in such private ventures as seem to them promising. Nor does it propose any logical or ideological rule or criterion for determining the line between private, publicly regulated, and governmental activity, in the economic area. The one distinctive change in this regard that the act introduces is in defining the concept of a national economic goal, attempting to gage the amount by which actual performance falls short of that goal, and declaring formal governmental responsibility for seeking every means of closing that deficiency.

Finally, besides being traditional as to the frame of government and the structure of the economy, the Employment Act of 1946 maintains the basic tradition of individual freedom of the citizen in a democratically organized society. The act neither guarantees a job to everyone nor lays upon the members of the labor force any compulsion to accept a work assignment or to abridge the choice of type, location, or duration of work. It simply undertakes to provide a regular process through which maximum opportunities for useful employment for those able, willing, and seeking to work will be created and maintained. This preservation of individual freedom applies equally to the saver, the investor, and the entrepreneur. But the act does, at least by implication, face the distinction between formal freedom and the actual restrictions of an unfavorable organizational situation. It affirms a responsibility of public administration to remove impediments to maximum production or full-employment opportunity, but without trading in the citizen's birthright of individual liberty for even the largest mess of pottage.

Thus we pass to consideration of what more adequate ends the act envisages within the tradition of long-established values. I have suggested that while basic traditions of personal liberty and freedom of enterprise have not been violated—have indeed in some ways been intensified—the act envisages in all these regards somewhat larger goals than have thus far been attained within that tradition. We shall proceed, therefore, to consider the nature of these enlargements.

SOMETHING NEW HAS BEEN ADDED

The enlarged goal of public and private administration in the economic sector may be defined briefly as fuller and better sustained use of the Nation's resources—human and material. With the passage of this act, we ceased to be content, in the ebullient spirit of youth, with bland confidence that the richness of nature's provision and the spontaneous industry and ingenuity of our people will keep up a vigorous march of economic progress and cause us to rebound promptly from any temporary periods of economic recession. The passage of this act reflected a sober realization that, in the state of technological and organizational development to which we have now advanced, it is quite possible for our economic life, once it is thrown out of adjustment, to fail to rebound with the resilience of an immigrant population pioneering a virgin land during the early decades of a technological revolution. It reflects the sobering possibility, revealed during the 30's, that even such smart people as we are could be subject to even more severe spasms of depression or the chronic invalidism of low production, under-employment, and meager purchasing power. It recognizes that if we are to hold the momentum attained under the stimulus of war and convert it into a steadily held high pace of peacetime activity, economic administration must do much by way of conscious and intelligent contriving.

It is a distinctive feature of the Employment Act that among the means it conceives to this end, it places a larger responsibility than has ever been recognized or is perhaps yet accepted upon private business administration—corporate management, union leadership, agricultural organization, and consumer behavior. Since my assigned topic is "public" administration rather than "private" administration, I may not go into this phase of the act further than to quote a few sentences from an exposition of the matter which I laid before the NAM at their recent Congress of American Industry:

"The war record of industry was a stupendous technological and engineering achievement * * * not, however, an equal economic achievement. To have carried through the bookkeeping and disbursing operations necessary even to this gigantic operation can hardly be considered a solution of the economic problems of self-sustained prosperity in a peacetime economy. * * *

"It is pretty generally agreed that in 1947 business will move into a truly, and at many spots no doubt a sharply, competitive market. That will be the testing time of business. It is up to you to show your capacity to do business in a buyers' market. Unless you can allow the full volume of productivity of our capable labor force, our ample plant, and our marvelous technology to continue unabated and can absorb within your long-time accounting, financing, and managerial system such price declines as result, you will not have shown a capacity of the competitive free enterprise system adequately to serve the Nation's needs."

Of course it would be unfair or ineffective to lay full responsibility for the attaining and maintaining of stabilized maximum employment, production, and purchasing power upon private business administration or to expect a high level of performance within the major area which it occupies unless public administration was, within its distinctive area, so conducting itself as to promote the conditions most favorable for the effective functioning of private enterprise. Since my time is so limited, all that can be said here as to the nature of this responsibility is that it is manifest in the operations of government in setting up, improving, and administering the distinctive institutions through which private business operates, and second, through the consistent and economically sophisticated handling of those substantive activities, fiscal and other, which government itself must carry on. What, precisely, this means is not anything which can be written into a single law or that the Employment Act of 1946 undertook to describe in any specific way. It is its great merit that it left details to be filled in in the subsequent process of legislative and administrative action and did not bind either the Congress or the executive agencies to any individual panacea or particular type of remedy. Instead, it enunciated its purpose in the policy clause of the Act "to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources * * * for the purpose of creating and maintaining * * * conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities * * * and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

The very fact that this measure does not authorize the use of a specific remedy, but rather establishes a process for choosing and combining either preventure or remedial measures emphasizes the responsibility which devolves upon public administration in the broadest sense, legislative and executive, Federal, State, and local, to promote the objectives of economic stabilization on a high level of efficiency. What the act does definitely provide is that, instead of the piecemeal and uncoordinated way of going at the problem, to which we have been accustomed in the past, we shall from this time forward have two foci of rationalization—one in the legislative branch and one in the executive. At each of these points it now becomes incumbent upon the individuals administratively responsible to work out the details of an integrated program through which the

purpose of the act may be most steadily and fully brought to fruition.[2]

The members of the joint committee of the Congress are proceeding with their part of the task, of developing a national economic program, and perhaps next year you will wish to invite one of their representatives to discuss with you the steps by which they are seeking to bring public administration to serve the goal of economic stabilization. In the short time which remains to me today, I shall undertake to give you a very brief sketch of the steps which the Council of Economic Advisers have taken toward discovering and occupying their place within the Executive Office of the President and of some questions which yet remain to be answered as to how our work is to be most effectively articulated with other agencies in the Government and in the economy.

ECONOMIC ADVISERS VIS-À-VIS ADMINISTRATORS IN THE ECONOMIC REALM

Since the Council of Economic Advisers is set up in the Executive Office of the President, I suppose we are technically to be classed as administrative officials. But we are possessed of no administrative authority or power to issue directives. Ours is a purely consultative and advisory role not merely as to the President individually but also, as a staff arm of the President, to a considerable number of administrative offices in the Federal Government. This advisory role extends in a way even to State and local governments, and to private business organization through our consultative arrangements. All this is covered in the act through provisions that we "assist and advise the President in tne preparation of the Economic Report" and that we "compile and submit to the President studies relating to trends and developments interfering or likely to interfere with the achievement of the policy [of the act]"; that we "appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy declared"; that we "utilize to the fullest extent possible the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as well as of private research agencies"; and that the Council "may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, as it deems advisable."

Thus we must live our life and develop our usefulness on the administrative level but in the atmosphere of ends-and-means analysis and comparative evaluation not in the atmosphere of authority. Far from being in a position to issue directives, we do not even voice our own recommendations or make a formal case in support of them. Whatever influence toward economic stabilization this agency eventually attains will not depend merely on how cordially the President welcomes the aid of professional economists in the formulation of his economic program. To attain a large measure of usefulness we must also win among the executive heads of departments, agencies, and commissions a solid respect for the professional competence of our work and for our power to grasp the complex interrelationships of a total economy (in its international setting). In our own thinking and in theirs we must build up an objective devotion to the master concept of national welfare set forth in the Employment Act. This applies likewise to the State and local administrators and the business, labor, and agricultural organizations with whom also we have working and consultative relations.

In the attempt to achieve this position of significant influence in bringing public administration in the broadest sense to promote fully the ends of economic stabilization without ourselves wielding administrative authority three general points must be recognized:

1. We must be aware of the far-reaching and deeply penetrating influence of the public administrator in promoting or impeding the stabilization of our economy on a level of high production and consumption.

2. We must give full weight to the particular requirements, difficulties, and potentialities of the locality, the industry, or even the individual organization, corporate, or union.

3. We must be able to bring to these particular interest groups a vivid sense of the solidarity of the system as a whole and the generalized program which will in the long run best promote their own prosperity. This is the most intangible part of our role but one which seems to me clearly written between if not actually in the lines of the act.

Of course the legislative process must be invoked from time to time to modify our institutions in the interest of a better stabilized economy. Likewise the legislature must act in regular course to levy taxes and direct revenues into particular channels of disbursement which, for better or worse, affect the stability of the economy. It might seem from a cursory reading of the Employment Act that the work of the Council of Economic Advisers is focused primarily, if not exclusively, upon this legislative function. More careful consideration, however, will, I believe, considerably alter this emphasis and give large or even correlative importance to our relationships with the administrative process.

I suspect that in the long run the value of our counsel must derive in large measure from the wisdom of administrative officers—Federal, State, and local—and a large part of whatever influence this agency may have toward promoting the stability of the economy must derive from what it can do toward helping these administrative officers to get a broader vision and more accurate understanding of the relation of their actions to the stability of the economy as a whole. Day in and day out in every part of the Nation, these public administrators are making decisions and taking actions by which the broad policies and the particularized mandates of formal law become the substance of our economic life. They put flesh and blood upon the bones of a legislative act and are themselves the brain and spirit through which that body acts.

Hence I think it would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of the informal but vital relationships which need to be built up between the Council of Economic Advisers and its staff and this great corps of administrative officers. This defines one of the principal matters to which the Council must give its attention—a field whose surface we have as yet only scratched. In cultivating this field we bespeak your studious and friendly cooperation. Time permits me to speak only briefly of three general aspects of this problem: (1) Our relationships with Federal administrators; (2) our relationships with public administration in the State and local area; (3) relations with administrative officers of private organizations mainly limited, of necessity, to national agencies.

Under the provisions of the law, we are a small synthesizing agency close to the Presidential apex of the Federal executive establishment. The factual and much of the interpretative material much we must attempt to synthesize into a consistent and sharply focused national program is drawn from the staff work of scores of agencies scattered through most if not all of the Federal departments and independent boards and commissions. Our staff mingles freely with these staffs on the plane of professional cooperation, giving us the broadest and most intimate view possible of the functioning of the economy in its almost infinite complexity. As our interpretation of these materials converges upon broad questions of national policy, it is incumbent upon the Council as such to establish consultative contact with the administrative heads of these agencies at the policy level.

It is important to us to make sure that we have not, in attempting to grasp the over-all picture, failed to give proper weight to the distinctive needs and operative difficulties of the functional interest groups of which the economy consists—labor, finance, management, agriculture, consumers, and whatnot. At the same time it is incumbent upon us to challenge the thinking of the top administrators in each of these areas as to whether they have become unduly influenced by the special interests of their clientele and have subordinated the highest productivity and stability of the economy as a whole to the promotion of that particular interest. It will probably occur to you at once that this kind of informal influence toward harmonizing the thinking of interrelated agencies of the Federal Government is very much in line with President Truman's frequently indicated desire to have all parts of the executive branch working together smoothly as a team pursuing the common goal of national unity.

Turning now to the State and local area, the growth of big Government at Washington in recent years has made it easy for many people to get a false perspective as to where the true springs of our economic life are located. In fact, the statutes of the States and even the ordinances of our cities provide a substantial part of the institutional framework upon which our business system rests or through which it operates. State and local revenues and expenditures ordinarily run at a level something like 40 percent of Federal. And their public works in normal times run twice as large as those of the Federal Government. Obviously no systematic study of just how the economy as a whole functions and no program for its better stabilization can be adequate which does not give searching consideration to the State and local phases.

We must seek a harmonizing of the thinking and action of State and local administrations into a coherent and consistent pattern of stabilizing the Nation's economic activity. It must not, in ignorance or selfishness, be pulling off in all sorts of mutually defeating directions. These State and local administrators' knowledge of local conditions and limitations must be brought in to enrich the over-all pattern of policy and program.

But from the other side too, we must be concerned that the broad general picture be seen in the proper perspective, and that the general purpose is disseminated into the thinking of all these administrators. If a process of truly stabilizing adjustments is to be effectuated, every administrative ruling and personal act must be directed toward a consistent purpose, comprehensive as to the whole economy. To cite a single example, State administration cannot safely erect trade barriers or devise siphons of capital at the expense of neighbor States. Nor can municipalities safely construct economic walls around themselves after the physical pattern of the Middle Ages.

---

[2] Since the cost of the war from which we have just emerged put the problem of debt reduction and budget balancing much to the fore, it is worth observing that piecemeal legislation and lack of a consistent and usefully integrated national program is one of the greatest sources of waste and inefficiency in government. From the other side of the picture a well-considered program for sustaining maximum employment and production is the surest way of maintaining the ability of the economy to bear such tax burden as is needed for carrying the debt and performing the necessary national services.

Finally, what has been said as to public administrators must be said of private administrative officials of business, labor, agriculture, and other organizations of an economic character outside the Government. The council has been giving particular consideration to the problem of building up consultative relations with these quasipublic administrators to the end that we may gain the sharpest insight possible into the true needs and difficulties of private enterprise and at the same time quicken their realization of the complementary relationship of public enterprise if even their own objectives are to be realized in the long run and to the fullest extent possible. We believe that this two-way avenue of communication will, over the years, help to promote a better understanding of the most effective role of Government in economic life and better meshing of governmental with private agencies.

In conclusion, then, may I urge all public administrators and students of public administration to study the interarticulated political and economic philosophy of the Employment Act of 1946. A quarter of a century ago we began to develop machinery for a coordinated financial program for the Federal Government through the Bureau of the Budget. Belatedly we have now launched a parallel agency to aid in developing national economic policy on a similarly comprehensive basis. Deep study and careful experimentation will be needed if we are to develop democratic but efficient means for interlacing public and private machinery to achieve such stabilization of our economy as an intelligent and well-intentioned people should be capable of achieving.

May I invite you as specialists in public administration to propose or to respond to such consultative or operating relations as may best bring the professional training and business experience of America to bear on the perennial and widely ramifying adjustments through which alone our complex industrial economy may be kept running at a rate approximating its potential productive efficiency.

Industrial Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a message from Hon. Robert F. Bradford, Governor of Massachusetts, to the Senate and House of Representatives of Massachusetts on March 18 with reference to a report filed with him by the Massachusetts labor-management committee. The message is as follows:

In my inaugural message I informed you that I had asked nine leaders in the field of industrial relations to recommend to me such changes in our existing laws as they believed to be most helpful to narrow the area and limit the damaging effects of industrial disputes. I took this step because I am convinced that the road to progress in this field lies through labor-management understanding, rather than by Government intervention.

I am herewith submitting the report of that committee.

It is a unanimous report. In my judgment it is a remarkable contribution to the cause of industrial peace and prosperity. It is so comprehensive in character and so forward-looking in its recommendations that I have no hesitation in incorporating its entire content in this message as a program for your consideration.

The report is divided into several parts. Each part deals with a different phase of the entire problem. The committee recommends:

1. Specific proposals to make collective bargaining more effective, and to set up a new and stronger service of conciliation and arbitration.

2. A procedure to prevent labor stoppages which jeopardize public health and public safety.

3. Amendments to bring into balance the State Labor Relations Act.

4. Definite machinery to solve the vexatious questions raised by the closed shop and jurisdictional disputes and other disputes between unions.

The final section deals with the question of financial reports from trade unions. This question was settled last November through a law adopted by the people of the Commonwealth. This law should not be changed until it has been given a full opportunity for trial. The committee's report does not propose to change the law. It does recommend definitions and clarifications which will implement its administration and carry out its intent.

To my knowledge this is the first time in industrial history that so comprehensive a subject has been so conscientiously studied to an ultimate, unanimous agreement by representatives of every group affected. Molded by you into legislation, this Massachusetts plan can become a modern Magna Carta for labor and industry.

This committee was appointed by Governor Bradford on January 2 to study pending legislation and to make recommendations. As Governor Bradford stated in his message, this was a unanimous report. The fact of that unanimity is most significant in view of the fact that the public, labor, and management were represented equally by outstanding leaders in those fields.

On the committee were: Sumner Schlichter, Harvard University, chairman; Rev. Thomas E. Shortell, of Worcester, Holy Cross College; Douglas V. Brown, of Brookline, Institute of Technology; Anthony J. DeAndrade, of Boston, vice president of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants of North America, AFL; Jack Hurvich, president of Greater Boston Industrial Union Council, CIO; Harold D. Ulrich, of Melrose, general chairman of the B. & M. system board of adjustment, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks; James Wall, of North Adams, president of Wall-Streeter Shoe Co.; Seabury Stanton, of South Dartmouth, president of the Hathaway Manufacturing Co.; Clarence G. McDavitt, of Newton, retired vice president of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Mathews on "Group Libel"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Review of Literature published an editorial on a suggested new form of legal action called group libel, which was intended as a remedy for various groups and classes who had been libeled as such.

Several hundred persons were sent a prepublished copy of the editorial and were asked for their comments. From these replies were selected letters from Bernard M. Baruch, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Judge Learned Hand, Senator Joseph H. Ball, Hon. Bernard L. Shientag, Senator Elbert D. Thomas, and my colleague from New Jersey, Judge Mathews.

The subject itself and the letter from my colleague are so interesting I feel that all the Members of this House should have an opportunity to read that letter.

The letter as published in the Saturday Review of March 15, 1947, follows:

SIR: The problem you are trying to solve is an important and difficult one. Your suggested solution, although somewhat original, is basically the same as the solutions offered for all our problems—more laws and additional legal remedies.

Almost every progressive and liberal doctrine is based upon further governmental restrictions of liberty because of social and economic conditions which we ourselves have created by our own man-made system of civilization. Which, as Lewis Carroll might say, makes everything "complexer and complexer." And the further mixed up we got the louder are the cheers for the passage of legislation which gets us further mixed.

Within the last year and a half I have startled audiences (sometimes composed largely of members of what we call minority groups) by telling them there are no such things as rights of minorities. I ask them to examine the Constitution of the United States and tell me if anywhere in that document they find mention of any such things.

What they will find is just what was intended to be there—rights of individuals. I plead with them to stop talking in terms of minorities and minority groups. I ask them to talk and think in terms of individual American citizens. If any actual right is violated, it is the right of an American citizen, not the right of a member of a minority, even though it may have been violated by someone who may do so just because the one whose right has been violated belongs to a minority group. I have told them that they have confused the reason for the violation with the right violated, and that by their very reference to themselves as minority or special groups or classes, by this very segregation of themselves they are only making more and more acute and bitter the consciousness of something which the Constitution did its very best to eliminate. Instead of quenching the fire, they are adding fuel.

And now you suggest that we go further and recognize by legislation not only the legitimate existence of classes, groups, and sets but afford them some kind of legalistic remedy eo nomine. And by that one further step we will add to class consciousness, whether it be because of birth, religion, or economic status or whatnot. And out of the legal fights that will ensue still further class antagnoisms and hatreds will grow.

What about us Congressmen? Is there a group or a minority in the United States that has been more libeled and maligned than Congress, as such? What do you propose we do about that?

Before I came to Congress I did quite a little writing. During the days of the New Deal I wrote some articles and one book, the book about 4 or 5 years ago. No magazine editor wanted them. I only offered the book to one or two publishers, but they were so patently frightened by both the title and the content it was almost funny. The title was

"The Hypocrisy of Democracy." The content was in essence a defense of the Constitution. But liberalism was popular, democracy was our idol. And now we are wondering what happened to us.

You are engaged in the very profession which can do the most good in solving this problem—the education of the American public to true fundamentals. Yet you propose legislation of a novel and, to my mind at least, dangerous type. May I refer you to Conwell's Acres of Diamonds?

You are the best protectors of liberty. I know that a magazine is run to make money and not as a crusade. But unless editors begin to risk something for liberty just as men have suffered and died for it, do not think that it will be saved by fascinating formulas such as your editorial suggests.

FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

American Legion Air-Power Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, because of the vital significance of the American Legion air-power program to our national security, I take this opportunity to call it to the attention of my fellow Members of Congress.

On the prime importance of American air power to our security, may I call your attention to a recent statement by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who better than any other person can appraise the potency of air power. In a recent speech he said:

> The War Department believes that the Air Force occupies a dominant position in war. We believe the Air Force represents the only immediate weapon available for retaliatory action if we are attacked. We must at all times have an air force—and a decent air force—in being.

I heartily endorse the following statement from a Legion pamphlet outlining that program:

THE AMERICAN LEGION PROGRAM ON ADEQUATE AIR POWER FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

The American Legion has always been a forthright spokesman on the great value of air power to our national security. Had the American Legion's prewar recommendations on military and naval aviation been followed by the country and the Congress, our Nation would not have entered World War II as a dangerously weak, fifth-rate air power. The record of American foresight in matters of national defense is far worse than the public realizes. It is an unfortunate byproduct of our habit of winning wars. Once final victory is achieved, America is quick to forget the terrible cost in lives and money of its initial unpreparedness, and the fact that it risked losing either or both of the World Wars because of its short-sighted peacetime attitude on adequate national security.

The American Legion is firmly convinced that the urgent lesson of the recent war was the advent of air power as the greatest striking force in the world. Our great military leaders, as well as those of our recent enemies, have testified that air power was the greatest single factor in defeating the Axis. In our blackest hours, American air power staved off defeat in the Battle of Midway and at Guadalcanal. It went on to turn the grim tide in the Pacific war. In Europe, air power smashed the Luftwaffe and strangled the Axis war machine. Everywhere, it spearheaded Allied offensives to final victory. From its puny beginnings in 1939, American air power grew to be the largest and most powerful in the world. However, America must remember that when the war ended, the Germans were years ahead of us in the newest phases of aerial warfare—jet planes and rockets. Had the Nazis a little more time to further develop and mass produce their jet planes and long-range rocket bombs, we might be still fighting to win the Second World War.

Jet planes and rockets have outmoded America's aerial weapons of the recent war, yet jets and rockets are only the forerunners of revolutionary new developments in aeronautics. To keep its world leadership of the air, America must invest heavily in new aeronautical research and development, for we are just beginning to probe into supersonic speeds The high price of such aviation research and the cost of an adequate air force are America's surest guaranty of national security and world peace.

Should there be a next war, it is obvious that the United States will be the first target of any aggressor. Any future enemy will strike through the air with lightning suddenness and in great force. Unlike the last two wars, there will be no sea or land barriers to protect us. Today and tomorrow America has only its air frontiers, like that over the Polar region. Either America can defend its air frontiers instantly and successfully and then strike back in kind within a few hours, or it will lose the war. If our country fails to act on these facts, we are again trifling with our own freedom and openly inviting attack and disaster.

The American Legion believes that our country must always retain its world leadership of the air as the foremost factor in national security and world peace. To that end, the American Legion has launched an educational air-power program built around the slogan "Air power is peace power." The basic themes of this program are:

1. Leadership in air power is the first essential of our national security.
2. American leadership in the air is essential to the fulfillment of our international obligations.
3. Strong American air power guarantees the maintenance of world peace.

Predicated on the knowledge that world leadership in air power is the key to our national security, the American Legion community air-power program is based on these six basic precepts which constitute adequate American air power:

1. PUBLIC AIR-MINDEDNESS

A complete public understanding of the singular importance of air power to our national security and to world peace is the vital requirement for American leadership in the air age. We must learn quickly that air power has uprooted our traditional civilization and ways of life; that it has made private flying a commonplace thing; that it has made America completely and logically vulnerable to air attack by wiping out our traditional barriers and changed lines of defense. Remembering the terrible cost of its past complacency, America must act now on the obvious fact that the nation which commands the air commands its own fate.

2. AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH

An intensive program of aeronautical research and development is a basic, urgent requirement for American leadership. This country now stands on the brink of the greatest technical revolution in the history of aviation. Before us are the unsolved mysteries of atomic energy, electronics, jet propulsion, and supersonics. Because of these advances in science and aeronautics, this Nation's World War II combat planes are now outmoded. More importantly, America's aviation research and testing facilities are becoming obsolete. Unless our country wants to stand still on the threshold of this air age, we must have extensive research programs and adequate testing facilities.

3. INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS

The air battles of World War II were as much contests between Allied and Axis industries as they were between armed forces. For this reason, our future national security depends equally upon both military and industrial preparedness. Industrial preparedness must be carefully planned and ready in advance to meet any emergency. We must insure a maximum production of superior aerial weapons in a minimum of time. The high operational mobility of our Air Forces must always be matched by a like industrial mobility. Alert industrial preparedness can save us not only thousands of lives but billions of dollars.

4. AIR TRANSPORTATION

A sound and growing air transportation system, competent to assume its role in the movement and communications of any future war, is of vital importance to American air power. The Nation's commercial air transport system must provide the thousands of planes required as an adequate reservoir by the Air Forces in the time of war emergency. Our scarcity demands that we develop and maintain an adequate air transport system at a high level of efficiency. This is most essential because global air transportation has now wiped out the natural barriers which have protected men for centuries. American commerce and its armies of the future must move easily and swiftly to any part of the world because nations have shrunk to neighborhoods.

5. ALERT AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

As World War II proved, a strong aircraft industry is the bulwark of an adequate Air Force, and, consequently, of our national security. Essential American leadership in the air must be guaranteed by the constant developemnt of new and improved equipment by an alert aircraft industry which is capable of rapid expansion to meet any emergency. After world peace is a concrete reality, the full scope of American inventive genius and methods of production must be sustained by a rock-bottom minimum of 3,000 military planes a year. This volume of production is required to maintain the reservoir of engineering, tooling, and production skills which are indispensable for rapid expansion.

6. STRONG AIR FORCES

In this age of lightning warfare and increasingly terrible weapons, America has no defense or no security unless they are spearheaded by strong, permanent air forces which have superior equipment and adequately trained personnel. These air forces-in-being must be instantly ready to defend our air approaches and strike down any aggression at its source in a matter of hours. To support these active air forces, America must also maintain a much larger, properly equipped, intelligently staffed and adequately trained Air Reserve Force which is ready at all times for immediate combat.

Mr. Speaker, to launch this community educational air-power program, the American Legion held its first National Aeronautics Conference in Indianapolis March 20–22, during which time I had the pleasure of addressing delegates from 47 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Canada on a phase of this vital program.

This first National Aeronautics Conference of the American Legion received wide recognition in the press and over the radio throughout the United States.

Witness the following editorials from the New York Times, the Indianapolis News, and the Indianapolis Star:

[From the New York Times of March 24, 1947]

AMERICAN AIR POWER

Some plain if unpalatable facts were placed before the American Legion's National Aeronautics Conference in Indianapolis by Gen. George C. Kenney, Senator Brewster of Maine, and Major General Echols, who performed so great a service during the war in assuring the flow of our matériel.

Senator BREWSTER submitted evidence to show that we are rapidly becoming, by contrast with our position of dominant power during the war, the world's third-ranking air power, with Britain and Russia leading us. General Kenney argued that so-called push-button warfare, with its radio-controlled, long-range, pilotless aircraft and rockets with atomic warheads, is a long, tough and exceedingly expensive road. General Echols revealed that the production of American military aircraft has fallen far below the safety level set by the Presidential Air Coordinating Committee. He called for the maintenance of an American air force in being at a level sufficient to discharge our obligations in connection with the maintenance of peace. He called also for establishment of a Congressional air policy board to examine and coordinate all the elements, including military aircraft, commercial air development and a healthy, expandable aviation industry, which go to make up our first line of defense.

These messages to the Legion were not the words of warmongers, but of men who realize that weakness, especially in the air, is no harbinger of peace.

[From the Indianapolis Star of March 22, 1947]

KEEP OUR AERIAL ARM STRONG

Safeguard America's freedom and the world's little peoples with a mighty air force. Such is the earnest plea of ranking military authorities attending the American Legion's National Aeronautics Conference here. These disciples of preparedness are not alarmists. They are not warmongers. They are defense experts who know the odds of future scientific war.

The distinguished group included Gen. George C. Kenney, commander of the Strategic Air Force; Maj. Gen. William E. Kepner, head of the AAF's tactical training division; and others prominent in development of military and civil aviation.

These defense authorities are not fearful of early war. They fear only dangerous public complacency. If America maintains an aerial armada alerted to immediate action and in step with the latest advances in aeronautic engineering, its security should be assured.

Essence of future preparedness is time. Protection of the oceans has vanished. The era of push-button warfare is not distant. A few hours may hold the balance between victory and annihilation.

Tacticians warn how rocket ships and guided missiles have revolutionized the future's strategy. For generations the Arctic has been little more than an empty waste of eternal ice. Now it is the short route for air attack from Europe and Asia.

Those are the grim facts of national defense. Every citizen must pay more for the insurance of aerial might. The American Legion has rendered a notable service in arranging this first national conference. Its success should assure the continuity of this fervent appeal, ringing out from the heart of the Nation.

[From the Indianapolis News of March 22, 1947]

CLIPPING THE EAGLE

A 2-year United States power dive from first to third rating in world military aviation strength is a matter of rightful concern to delegates and speakers at the American Legion's National Aeronautics Conference in its 3-day Indianapolis sessions. Representatives from all the 48 States, Alaska, and Hawaii have been hearing a succession of warnings on letting down a Nation's air guard from such speakers as Maj. Gen. W. E. Kepner, Senator Owen Brewster, of Maine, Rear Adm. J. J. Clark, Col. Eddie Rickenbacker, and Gen. George C. Kenney.

In line with these warnings is a statement issued by the Army Air Forces in Washington detailing, among other facts, that the AAF now is left with a fleet of only 500 aircraft which are not considered obsolete out of a total assortment of some 16,000 planes in varying stages of antiquity. And even though it has been virtually taken apart by the massive postwar shrinkage demobilization program, the American sky defense faces even further shrinkage in the congressional clamor for budget and tax reduction, Army officers feel that the personnel cut to one-tenth of wartime strength is even more serious than the lack of modern aircraft. And the research jet bombers and fighters may have to fizzle out like a Roman candle, if requested funds are not provided.

The Legion's conference is timely. The world still is far from the stage when Americans again can abandon the maxim "to maintain the peace, we must be strong."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the principal addresses delivered to this first National Aeronautics Conference by Senator Owen Brewster, of Maine, on Soviet Air Power; Gen. George C. Kenney, commanding general, Strategic Air Force, Army Air Forces, on Push-Button Warfare and the Polar Concept; Robert Ramspeck, executive vice president, Air Transport Association of America and for 14 years a Member of this Congress, on Air Transport Equals Mobility Unlimited; John F. Victory, executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics on Scientific Research the Foundation of Air Power; Rear Adm. J. J. Clark, USN, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for Air, on Naval Aviation and National Security; Maj. Gen. William E. Kepner, commanding general, Technical Training Division, Army Air Forces, Scott Field, Ill., on Air Power Supremacy and Security; Maj. Gen. Oliver P. Echols, AAF, retired, president, Aircraft Industries Association of America, on Air Power, the Aircraft Industry, and the American Legion; and my own address, Air Power and Preparedness—Security.

Tax Bill Coddles the Rich and Soaks the Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in my 30-minute speech on March 26 on one of the most drastic gag rules ever presented to this House, the rule made in order the consideration of a tax bill which coddled the vested interests, the economic royalists, the war profiteers and the black marketeers who accumulated $26,000,000,000—billions, not millions—during the awful war years, and who will be relieved by the bill from paying taxes to the tune of nearly $3,500,000,000.

During the 8-hour debate on the bill my Republican friends tried with their usual ingenuity and resourcefulness to mislead the people, particularly that 96 percent of the people who will benefit least from the bill, into the belief that this measure will inure to their benefit, will provide new incentives to business, and provide employment.

They stressed the alleged and fictitious savings to people who receive relatively low incomes.

The bill passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress was actually a Republican bill, forced through by a solid Republican bloc, aided, unfortunately, by a few votes from reactionaries on our side.

The proponents of the bill now before the Congress failed to provide a comparison with the Revenue Act of 1939, passed by a Congress with a heavy Democratic majority inspired by President Roosevelt.

The fact is that now, when the war is over, the common people are paying a heavier tax bill than they did before the war.

Here is a table I have myself arranged to show the true comparison between the fair and equitable tax bill of 1939, based on the accepted principle of ability to pay, which shows the real comparison between the present bill and the 1939 act. This new bill coddles the rich and socks the poor.

Original table prepared to show that under the 1939 Democratic Revenue Act individuals earning up to $2,500 paid no tax even during the war years

MARRIED COUPLE, NO DEPENDENTS

Income	December 1939 tax bill	1945 tax bill	Tax bill under Knutson bill as amended	Saving
$1,200	0	$38	$27	$9
$1,500	0	95	67	28
$2,000	0	190	133	57
$2,500	0	285	228	57
$10,000	$415	2,185	1,748	437
$25,000	2,489	9,082	7,266	1,816
$50,000	8,869	24,795	19,836	4,959
$100,000	22,469	63,128	50,502	12,623
$500,000	304,144	407,465	342,074	65,391

I inserted several tables in my speech but I feel the above table and figures are easier to understand, and taking all the figures into consideration the facts are that 4 percent of the taxpayers will receive nearly $2,000,000,000 more reduction in their income taxes than 96 percent of the taxpayers. The efforts of the Republicans to relieve the American taxpayer are amazing and their misrepresentations will not stick.

I remember, and you remember, last summer when the industrial czars, the business magnates, the lords of trade and press, told us and the American people that if price control was abolished the black market would disappear and there would be a free flow of commodities to the American dinner tables at low prices.

And what are the facts?

Since price ceilings were removed, the legal prices of meat and vegetables and

dairy products are equal to or above the black-market prices during the war.

The cost of living has shot up nearly 60 percent since the election, while incomes stood still or went backward.

Housewives, many of them, were misled by the NAM propaganda.

Now they know better.

When they go to the market they know now that the so-called meat shortage of last summer was really a strike by big packers.

Mr. Speaker, from now on I feel that the American consumers, wage earners, and people with small incomes will not believe in the promises of the Republicans and will not be led astray again. It is a fact that they are now turning to the Democratic Party, which must and will safeguard the interests of the underprivileged and the common man.

I opposed the tax-reduction bill because it was an unfair bill and not that I did not want the taxes of persons of low incomes reduced. We should also try to balance the budget and then start to pay off our bonded indebtedness in the interest of the Government bondholders. If we will not start doing it now—when the annual income is $175,000,000,000 and when business is making good profits and accumulating surpluses and wealth—when will we start?

Constructive Proposals on American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Constructive Proposals," published in the Progressive of March 31, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS

There has been so much understandable commotion over the Truman administration's demand for an aggressive American foreign policy that little attention has been paid to three constructive proposals advanced during the past week which would far more effectively advance the cause of peace than would the shipment of money and munitions to bankrupt monarchies.

The three proposals, made on separate occasions by different persons, manage to add up, nevertheless, to a pattern or program of democratic action on at least three vital subjects which are being ignored by the diplomats in their haggling over boundaries, reparations, and spheres of influence.

Tucked away in the acres of newsprint devoted to the "Greek crisis," "the Truman doctrine," and the Moscow Conference were these striking, and grossly underplayed, recommendations for affirmative action in world affairs:

1. GENERAL MAC ARTHUR'S PLAN FOR JAPAN

In his first formal press conference since the end of the war, General MacArthur gave the United Nations a badly needed shot in the arm when he announced that the time had come to write a peace with Japan and place that country under UN control immediately. MacArthur's achievement in Japan is almost without parallel in history, and it is all the more striking when compared with the tragic mess the Big Four have made of Germany. The fact that he is convinced that Japan has progressed to the point where the UN can take over shows how much more than a soldier MacArthur is. Coming as it did, when the UN had been dealt a body blow by President Truman, the MacArthur statement was hailed by UN officials and delegates as a blood transfusion which might make a healthy youngster of a stricken infant—if the MacArthur proposal isn't pigeonholed.

2. THE TYDINGS DEMAND FOR DISARMAMENT

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, who has a distinguished record of fighting for worldwide abandonment of conscription, delivered a major foreign policy address in the Senate calling for immediate, total disarmament by all nations and the adoption of a new policy of placing full reliance on a "newly sinewed" United Nations. In its present form, he said all too accurately, the UN is "nothing more or less than a glorified debating society."

TYDINGS called for an end of straddling, an end of concentrating disarmament talk on the atomic bomb alone. "What we must control is not the atomic bomb," he said, "not the scientists who make it, but the ability to make war. In short, we must control ourselves, and the people of all other nations must do likewise.

"The time has come to confront the naked truth. The time has come for us to make the great decision which will mean the survival or the end of civilization. The time has come to make the United Nations the living, potent, decisive factor in the affairs of men and nations which 51 nations have pledged their sacred word that it shall be."

3. A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

A single sentence resolution was introduced in both houses of Congress—in the Senate by Senators FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and in the House by Representative Boggs, of Louisiana—providing:

"That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

The aim of the resolution, said Senator FULBRIGHT, is to provide a "positive solution to an important source of trouble in the world." It is appropriate, he added, for the United States to propose this solution to some of Europe's problems "for the same reasons that we are called upon to spend billions of dollars in Germany, in Greece, in Turkey, and to lend billions in other lands. If there is ever to be peace, or ever to be an end to the expenditure of these vast sums in foreign lands, I believe a federation of European states is one of the essential conditions."

Here are three constructive planks in an American foreign policy which make a great deal of sense—far more long-range sense than the patchwork of negation currently being pushed in Washington. Of course, the diplomats and the brass hats will sneer them off as visionary and unrealistic—the State Department, for instance, has already dismissed the MacArthur proposal as premature and impractical—but we have tried the realism of practical men for a long time now, and enduring peace seems as remote as it ever was in our time.

A program of action based on attainable ideals and fired by a crusading idealism will go far toward breaking down world-wide cynicism and frustration, and embark us on a course of democratic peacemaking that we can be proud to proclaim and sell to the other peoples of the earth.

The School-Lunch Program—Investment in Nation's Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a few remarks about the school-lunch bill. This bill to continue the school-lunch program had my support when it was before the House in the last Congress. And I am just as strong for it now as I ever was. I know of no project more necessary to the health and vigor of the children of our Nation. Proper nourishment is the first requirement in building strong bodies.

The strength and security of our Nation depends upon a robust and intelligent manhood. The urgent need for physically fit men and women was demonstrated in the last war. Forty percent of young Americans were rejected for military service because of physical defects. The causes of rejection for the most part were from malnutrition. What can be more important to our future welfare than adopting a remedy for this defect? Growing children need nourishing food to develop into alert citizens.

We are liberal in appropriations to many causes that pertain to conservation of our natural resources, to agriculture, and others too numerous to mention. Is it extravagant or wasteful to safeguard the health and well-being of our children?

The health of 5,000,000 school children benefits from nutritious lunches now furnished at their schools through Federal, State and local cooperation. The pupils in rural schools particularly have been helped by these lunches. They have meant the difference between physical well-being and malnutrition to them.

The school-lunch program would have come to an end within this week without this deficiency appropriation to carry it through the next 3 months. We have talked and preached economy this entire session. But I do not agree that it is economy to risk impairing the health of the school-age child by denying him sufficient and proper food. The House is to be commended in continuing this program for the welfare of men and women of the future. I am delighted this bill has passed and I hope the Senate approves it before the schools are out of funds.

Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats, the Communists and fellow travelers are resisting any cut in the

President Truman budget. The smear campaign against those who seek to eliminate waste and extravagance in government is on in full swing. It is refreshing to find that some publications are aware of the drive now being made to discredit those who believe in economy in government.

The Wall Street Journal is to be commended for its editorial exposure of the organized campaign against cuts in expenditures. Under leave to extend I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 2, 1947:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK

FIGHTING ECONOMY

Mr. Royster reports to this newspaper from Washington that Congress is finding its budget pruning an arduous task. That was bound to be the case under the best of circumstances. The apparent lack of cooperation in the executive departments certainly increases the difficulties.

Appropriation bills are framed by subcommittees of the House Appropriations Committee. These subcommittees spend many hours questioning the various departmental heads, and anyone who has eve read a transcript of these sessions will be impressed by the knowledge and diligence that many of the committee members display.

Departmental heads do not like these sessions and those who have indulged in loose fiscal practices like them least of all. It is common knowledge that in many departments considerable effort is devoted to bamboozling the subcommittee, and in certain cases those who are to testify are carefully rehearsed.

The department heads have all year to prepare and defend their requests for money. The Congressmen must frame an appropriation bill after some days of consideration. Obviously the department heads have an advantage unless they know, as was the case in the Coolidge administration, that resistance to economy will be followed by punishment.

The present atmosphere in Washington is certainly very much different. It is hard to remember a time when resistance to budget cuts has been more open and more bold. Deliberate and undisguised propaganda, some of it not very frank, has been put under way in an attempt to bring pressure on Congress. Certainly members of the Cabinet and the White House know this and there is no protest on record.

Anyone who watches the news from Washington will have difficulty in escaping the impression that there is a more or less organized campaign against cuts in expenditure. Against those who are trying to save there has been something like a smear campaign attempting to picture the proponents of economy and tax reduction as a rather shoddy lot of demagogues.

A year ago when OPA was trying to have its life prolonged something very like this took place. There was a rather steady stream of abuse of those who wanted to modify the OPA act. Various groups throughout the country were inspired to deluge Congress with demands for continuance of price control. Apparently the sponsors of this propaganda at least convinced themselves and they also succeeded in convincing President Truman. The result was a stunning defeat of the majority party in the November elections.

People who remain long in the Washington atmosphere can reach some queer conclusions and in light of the record it would not be surprising if some people had adopted the theory that cutting expenses and reducing taxes will be unpopular. Perhaps the Democratic leadership has not identified itself with that theory; we hope not. Nevertheless, the case could be made much clearer than it is. Both for the good of the country and for his own future, Mr. Truman might find occasion to make his position more clear.

Statement by Labor-Management Advisory Committee on Appropriations for the Conciliation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued on March 27, 1947, by the labor and management members of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee of the United States Conciliation Service. For the information of the Senate, Messrs. Ahearn, Ruthenburg, and Skinner are industry members; while Messrs. Fenton, Golden, Shishkin, and Strachan are labor members.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MARCH 27, 1947.

The members of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee of the United States Conciliation Service have discussed the action of the House of Representatives with respect to appropriations for the Conciliation Service. If the Senate concurs, certain key positions in the Conciliation Service will be eliminated.

Everyone agrees that a strong conciliation and mediation service is essential if the peaceful settlement of labor disputes is to be encouraged and sound labor-management relations fostered.

Congress is now considering a number of proposals for strengthening and expanding the Conciliation Service. Until Congress has made its decision, the present Conciliation Service has an important job to perform. The disorganization of the Service, before Congress has decided basic policy matters, would be unfortunate at this critical time.

Our committee has the responsibility for making recommendations to the Secretary of Labor or to the Director of the Conciliation Service with respect to the policies, procedures, organization, and the development of adequate standards and qualifications for the personnel of the Service. We believe that substantial progress has been made in the past 12 months and that Mr. Edgar Warren, as Director of the Service, has conscientiously discharged the duties of his office.

We have no doubt that the Service, under Mr. Warren's leadership, has sought to represent the public interest in the peaceful settlement of labor disputes, and we are of the opinion that all who have been associated with Mr. Warren regard him as a loyal and patriotic American.

V. P. AHEARN.
FRANK P. FENTON.
CLINTON S. GOLDEN.
LOUIS RUTHENBURG.
BORIS SHISHKIN.
CLARENCE O. SKINNER.
ALAN STRACHAN.

The Postal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by me before the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service, on April 1, 1947:

Mr. Chairman, before we begin the deliberations of this morning, I request recognition to make a brief statement for the record of these hearings on your bill, H. R. 2408.

Exactly 100 years ago this month, on March 3, 1847, another Congress enacted into law a bill authorizing the Postmaster General to issue postage stamps as evidence of prepayment of the fees for transportation and delivery of mail matter. That bill, as a revenue measure, originated in one of our predecessor committees, and may fairly be said to be the beginning of our modern postal service.

The first adhesive, or stamp, authorized by that legislation, was sold in New York City on July 1, 1847, the first day of the new fiscal year.

We are, therefore, the centennial committee of the Congress for the inauguration in America of the postage stamp.

It is intensely interesting to note that from the beginning of the postal service under the Constitution, in 1789, to the date of the first postage stamp, 1847, postal receipts practically balanced expenditures. The total postal receipts for these 63 years were $113,748,998, while the expenditures were $111,790,393. The total net surplus for the 63 years was $1,958,605. I complete this fiscal picture with the fact that in 1850, the average American spent 20 cents a year for postage. In the bill before us, this is exactly the price the post office today proposes for a single special-delivery stamp for one first-class letter.

Today, as the Centennial Committee of Congress for the Postage Stamp, we are observing the one-hundredth anniversary by trying to find ways and means to correct the greatest deficit in the history of our postal service, estimated at $352,000,000, a total approximately equal to the entire revenues of the Post Office Department in 1917 at the time of our entry into World War I.

We are here trying to enact legislation to meet as much as possible of this deficit, beginning July 1, 1947, the centennial date of our first postage stamp. I hope that we will succeed in this effort, and that the bill before us in its final form will be our great contribution to the proper observance of the centennial.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fol-

lowing editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of February 22, 1947:

DISPLACED PERSONS AND THE UNITED STATES

What shall the United States do about the displaced persons of Europe?

That question was discussed for 2 hours at the annual meeting of the International Institute of Milwaukee County by a panel of interested and unusually informed persons. The conclusion was that the United States should, during the next 4 years, permit entry of 100,000 displaced persons annually, entirely outside of present quotas but in theory out of the unused accumulations of the war years. There is a letter on this page today on the same subject.

We believe the speakers at the institute meeting arrived at a sensible and generally acceptable solution of a difficult problem.

There are now about 1,000,000 individuals in the displaced-persons camps in Europe. Some permanent plan must be made for them. It is right that the United States should assume leadership in effectuating a plan. The American share has been set at 400,000 persons, which is not so high as to constitute an assimilation problem for us but which is high enough to encourage other receiving countries to do their full share.

Our problem is to accept our responsibility with the greatest benefit to ourselves and with the least damage to the quota system of immigration, to which we have now been committed for about 25 years. Since many countries will not completely use their quotas in the next few years, it is likely that we shall not exceed the permitted total of 150,000 immigrants in any one of the next 4 years, even though we allow 100,000 displaced persons to come in annually, regardless of current quotas.

There is, therefore, a minimum of danger to the quota system itself, which should be preserved, and no possibility of an excess of immigration beyond our power to assimilate. Since all the usual tests of fitness will be applied, there is little likelihood that the wrong kind of immigrants will be admitted.

Our country is now suffering from a shortage of doctors, nurses, farm laborers, garment workers, and a hundred and one other professional and trades people. There are many such people among the displaced persons. Since most of those who will finally come have relatives here and all must have guarantors, they will make little demand on housing, and the jobs they will seek are the jobs which are crying for takers at this time. They should be no great problem, therefore, either socially or economically.

From the standpoint of the displaced persons themselves and from the standpoint of helping to get Europe back on its feet, the problem is so urgent that Congress should lose no time in passing the legislation necessary to permit America to do its part. The quicker a start is made in opening up this country to limited reception of these people the surer it will be that we get the cream of those seeking a new settlement and a new life. The longer we delay the harder it will be to bring over here the kind of people who will be assets to us.

Collectivism Versus Freedom of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of an article by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. It appeared in the American Bar Association Journal in March under the title of "Collectivism's Rising Tide." Senator O'MAHONEY correctly points out that the growth of collectivism in this country and the world is a challenge to freedom of peoples. He presents facts on which he places his opinions. He does not prescribe the cure but asks the people "to think on these things." It is time that we follow Senator O'MAHONEY's advice. The article is as follows:

The Eightieth Congress is not yet 1 month old, but there have already been introduced in the two Houses 30 bills increasing the powers of the Government at Washington. These measures have been sponsored by members of both political parties, and are defended by their authors as absolutely essential in the public interest.

One of these bills, introduced by a Republican Representative, would establish the Office of Power Administration. Another, introduced by a Democratic Representative, would establish a Water Pollution Advisory Board in the Federal Public Health Service. A Republican Senator introduced a bill to create a new Department of Peace. A Democratic Senator introduced a bill to establish a Federal Transportation Authority as an independent agency.

Some of these bills deal with matters that are clearly national in scope. Others deal with matters that are purely local. All of them, if enacted, would make big Government bigger. This is taking place within 3 months of a national election at which the people of the country, in unmistakable terms, let it be known that they wanted, not more Government, but less.

What is the explanation of this steady drift toward central government, and what are we going to do about it? These questions must be answered by the people of the United States if we are to preserve the system which we so automatically call the American way of life.

The American lawyer, with a great tradition of public service behind him, has an opportunity now to do for the people of the United States and the world what was done for the people in 1787 by the lawyers who made up the majority of the convention which drew the Federal Constitution. Of the 55 delegates who attended that immortal session, 34 were lawyers. Ten of them had been judges, and they all went to Philadelphia not to serve the interests of groups or classes, or even geographical sections. They went there in the interests of all.

When these men drew the preamble of the Federal Constitution, they were not thinking in terms of special groups or of class government. They were thinking in terms of the people as a whole. They were thinking of justice for people. They were thinking of "domestic tranquillity," of common defense, and of the general welfare. They sought to build a government that would, in their language, "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity." They were thinking, therefore, of individuals. They were thinking of the men and women and children who at that time constituted, and who in all the days to come would continue to constitute, the people of this great Nation.

If we who are the lawyers of this generation, following in the footsteps of these, our great predecessors, are to preserve the ideal of Government they cherished, we shall have to begin by rededicating ourselves to the great cause in which they served; namely, the cause of freedom for people. And our first task will be to determine why it has come about in our generation that the principles of popular government have been giving way steadily to the principles of authoritarianism.

I know of no nobler task to which the modern lawyer can dedicate himself than this. The rising tide of collectivism threatens to engulf the whole world. It will engulf us here if we do not understand the cause and go immediately about the task of applying the remedy.

A CHALLENGE TO THE MODERN LAWYER

Centralism in government has markedly increased in our time, not alone in the totalitarian states, but in countries like Great Britain and this, where people are still loyal to the principle of popular sovereignty. It was a British lawyer who several years ago wrote a great book on the development of administrative law under the title "The New Despotism." He used the word "despotism" because he recognized that government bureaus tend to develop arbitrary powers. The same theme was adopted here by a great American lawyer, who was also a member of the House of Representatives, in a volume which he called the Wonderland of Bureaucracy. Both of these books were written long before the New Deal, a fact which I casually mention in order that it may be clear that the development of centralism in the United States is not to be charged against any particular party or individual. Administrative bureaus in Government, more of which are being suggested even now by Members of the Eightieth Congress, like national labor unions, are the result of the appearance of national and international business corporations. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the modern business corporation is the most significant single social institution of our time.

Public comprehension of the nature of the modern corporation has been slowly taking form. As long ago as 1929, President Herbert Hoover established a special research committee on social trends. The chairman of that committee was the distinguished economist, Dr. Wesley C. Mitchell, under whose editorship a report was published during the closing year of President Hoover's administration.

One of the most significant chapters of this work was written by Dr. Charles E. Merriam, who compared the economic power of certain corporations with the economic power of States and cities, as measured by their revenues and the number of their employees.

This chapter showed that in 1930 New York City, which enjoyed the largest gross revenues of any political organization in the country except the Federal Government, actually had smaller gross annual receipts than the Pennsylvania Railroad System, General Motors, the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., or the United States Steel Corp.

In 1942 the State of New York had reached a higher rank in terms of revenue than the city of New York by about $6,000,000 ($720,306,000 for the State as against $714,653,000 for the city). Yet it was still outranked by corporate giants. The modern industrial corporation has become so great that it can match resources even with governments.

CREATURES OF MAN AND CREATURES OF GOD

To think of such organizations as though they were individuals is a fundamental error out of which stems much of the confusion that makes our age so turbulent. Although the modern industrial organization is actually more like a government than it is like an individual, we treat it as though it were an individual. We think of it as having the privileges and rights of an individual, whereas every lawyer knows that a corporation is a creature of man, while man is a creature of God. No corporation can come into existence save by the permission of some government. But man makes the government which makes the corporation.

Failure to comprehend this distinction and to provide the rule of order by which the modern economic state shall be made, as the political state was made by our Federal Constitution, a servant of the people, has led directly to the appearance of totalitarianism.

When the business and political leaders of Europe failed to solve this, the greatest question of our time, and the people of Europe were unable to support themselves because they no longer had control of the economic instrumentalities by which the modern world lives, they turned to central government for relief. They listened to the false preaching of Lenin, Mussolini, and Hitler, and gave to the political state arbitrary power over themselves as well as over the economic system, with the appalling results that were written in the blood of 34,000,000 people from 1939 to 1945.

Some of us act now as though World War II were like last year's Army-Navy football game, a contest that is over and done with. We seem to cherish the fond hope that we can revert to some vague normalcy and go on about the business of living without coming to grips with the underlying cause of the modern crisis. This cause is the fact that we no longer are living in a world of individuals, but in a world of organizations, and that there can be no solution of our problem until we find a rule by which these economic organizations, whatever they are—corporations, trade associations, labor unions, organizations of consumers, pressure groups of every kind—may live together in understanding and mutual helpfulness for the benefit of all the people.

One of our mistakes has been the effort to proceed by way of punishing abuses instead of encouraging the obvious good that proceeds from modern industrial organization. There are abuses to be sure. There are corporate abuses and labor union abuses. Racketeers in their time have sought to use both types of organization for narrow and selfish personal ends rather than for the public good. But despite these blotches upon the body of modern economic organization, no one can doubt that both the corporation and the labor union have been productive of definite social benefit. The modern world would be impossible without them.

TODAY'S NEED—A NEW RULE OF ORDER

It would be just as great an error to try to destroy the labor union as it would be to try to destroy the corporation. We cannot go back to the time when our economic life was the product of the capital and labor of a few men under a system whereby the worker could talk personally with his employer, and both could move on to new geographic frontiers when dissatisfied with the conditions they were enduring. The frontiers of this generation are in the field of technology and science, the great blessings of which cannot possibly be developed for mankind except through economic organization. It follows, therefore, that we have no alternative but to write a rule of responsibility for the new social institution which is the mark of our time, the organization, corporate or otherwise, by which groups of men act together. If we believe, as the lawyers who wrote the Federal Constitution believed, that the people are the source of all authority that may be exercised over them, then we cannot possibly be willing to endure a condition by which a handful obtain the power to wield these modern agencies, and the masses are compelled to endure whatever conditions may be imposed upon them.

BIG BUSINESS, BIG LABOR, BIG GOVERNMENT

We must open our eyes to the fact that the large corporation, the national labor union, and the Government administrative bureau are all aspects of the same development. The large corporation was necessary because otherwise mankind could not use the great instruments invented by genius and discovered by science. The national labor union was necessary because otherwise the workers, who could no longer negotiate with the owners of the enterprises for which they labored, would have been unable to safeguard their just interests. The Government administrative bureau was necessary because, as the new economic organizations spread beyond local boundaries, crossing mountains and rivers, and spanning the whole country, it was no longer possible for local governing authority to regulate them in the public interest.

Thus, the powers of the city and the State have been steadily diminishing, while the power of the central government has been steadily expanding. As it expands, collectivism spreads from the economic sphere to the political sphere. We see it all around us. We see political collectivism stretching out to embrace all Europe. We see socialism taking over the government of England. We see great industrial enterprises taken over by the Government of Great Britain. We know that of all the great nations of the world only the United States still adheres to a belief in the capitalistic system. If it is to survive, then it follows that we in the United States must make it survive. That, I think, is the task of the lawyer—the lawyer whose function has always been to make as well as to interpret the rule of social order. The lawyer fills our legislatures and our Congress, just as he filled the Constitutional Convention, and if the modern lawyer believes as his predecessor believed—that the people are the sovereign masters—then he will undertake now to help save the capitalist economy by helping to write the rule under which the managers of all modern economic organizations are made responsible to the people.

This rule can only be written by the Congress of the United States, which in the Federal Constitution was given explicit power to regulate all commerce among the States and with foreign nations in the interests of the whole people for whom that Constitution was written.

Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of March 30, 1947:

CHARGE RAILS CONTRIBUTE TO CAR SHORTAGE

Delays by the railroads in handling cars in switching yards and terminals, routing loads to factory sidings, and picking up cars ready for shipment are major factors in the boxcar shortage, Midwest shippers charged yesterday.

These complaints about railroad service came from several dozen sharply critical and plain-spoken agricultural and industrial shippers who attended a meeting of the executive and railroad committees of the Midwest Shippers Advisory Board in the Palmer House.

IMPROVEMENT IS PLEDGED

Speaking for the railroads, J. J. Mahoney, superintendent of transportation for the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad, admitted serious shortcomings in railroad service, but promised substantial improvement in the next 3 or 4 weeks.

He said unfavorable weather, employee absenteeism, and government priorities on grain shipments for export had disrupted freight distribution. He pledged the carriers to immediate aid in moving millions of bushels of wet or high moisture corn in Illinois and Iowa before the grain deteriorates.

Lawrence Farlow, secretary of the Farm Grain Dealers' Association, and other spokesmen for country grain elevator interests warned that 50,000,0000 bushels of wet corn in Illinois must be hauled to buyers and processors in a "matter of days" if severe losses from spoilage are to be avoided.

FAR BELOW REQUIREMENTS

The elevator operators said they were getting only fractions of the number of cars required and were turning to trucks for transportation. One operator said he needed 20 cars a week and was getting two. Another said that in a recent period he received 100 cars, against 300 in previous years. Others said they were getting only 5 to 7 percent of the cars required and told how loaded cars were left in switch yards 10 days to 2 weeks.

J. C. Justesen, Mosinee Paper Mills Co., said car delays had caused a 7-day shut-down in the company's plant and that one car that was traced required 30 days to travel from Tomahawk, Wis., to Harvey.

"The railroads are not short of cars," he said. "They are just short of what it takes to keep the cars moving around."

Mentally Ill Veterans Are Entitled to Better Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a grave injustice is being inflicted on many veterans of the last war who served honorably in the armed forces in the defense of this country. These men, in many cases suffering from break-down or delayed reaction, have become mentally ill after leaving the service from the effects of the rigors of battle, extended periods of actual combat, and all the horrors of war which they have experienced. Now, because the Veterans' Administration has ruled that they are not entitled to hospitalization, these veterans are faced with commitment to State institutions for the insane with the resultant stigma which must follow them through life and bar them from many jobs, including civil-service employment with the 10-percent credit due to all veterans.

Such a situation cannot be tolerated, and must not be allowed to continue. Our veterans are entitled to proper medical care, if they are now ill from the effects of their war service, regardless of the date when their illness became apparent or whether they suffer from disease, physical injury, or mental derangement.

In many cases the mental illness of our veterans is only temporary, and I

believe it is our duty to provide adequate veterans' facilities for the proper care and treatment of these men so they can be restored to health. Our veterans are entitled to this consideration in gratitude for their unselfish devotion to duty during their service for this Nation.

I also believe provision should be made to insure that a complete case history should be submitted for the consideration of any court where a sanity hearing is held for a veteran. This report should include a full statement of the veteran's war record, as well as his service medical record and a report of any treatment from a Veterans' Administration facility.

In Los Angeles County a number of veterans, refused admittance to the veterans' hospitals, have been placed in State institutions—hospitals already overcrowded and with inadequate facilities for the care of these men. The following resolution has been adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors urging the Congress to act to provide adequate care for these unfortunate veterans. I believe it is up to us to act now, and urge the Members of the House to give serious consideration to this problem.

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Tuesday, March 18, 1947.

The board met in regular session. Present: Supervisors Raymond V. Darby, chairman presiding; Leonard J. Roach; John Anson Ford; and Roger W. Jessup; and J. F. Moroney, clerk, by Ray E. Lee, deputy clerk. Absent: Supervisor William A. Smith.

IN RE CARE AND TREATMENT OF MENTALLY ILL VETERANS: RESOLUTION PETITIONING VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION AND CONGRESS TO PROVIDE IMMEDIATE ADEQUATE FACILITIES

On motion of Supervisor Ford, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be and the same is hereby adopted:

"Whereas on February 27, 1947, a ruling came down from the Veterans' Facility at Sawtelle to the effect that effective immediately it would be impossible to commit any veteran to any veterans' facility unless it were first shown that said veteran's mental illness was service-connected; and

"Whereas in the county of Los Angeles there are many veterans, both residents as well as transients, who are mentally ill, who are unable to be placed in a veterans' facility and are sent to State hospitals for the insane; and

"Whereas under the law of the State of California, as set forth in the welfare and institutions code of said State in regard to mentally ill persons, the court must make a finding that veterans in this category are mentally ill or insane, and the veteran who is committed to a State hospital for these reasons is not only thereafter barred and precluded from becoming a civil service employee entitled to a 10-percent credit due to the fact that he is a veteran, but his whole future is jeopardized because of commitment to a State hospital for mental treatment; and

"Whereas because of inadequate facilities (obvious to every citizen who reads the newspapers and current periodicals), it is at this time impossible in a state hospital to give the proper treatment and care so deserved by our veterans: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles go on record as petitioning the Veterans Administration at Washington, together with the Congress of the United States, that every possible step be taken to provide immediate adequate Federal Government facilities for the care and treatment of all mentally ill veterans."

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on March 18, 1947, and is entered in the minutes of said board.

[SEAL] J. F. MORONEY,
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and ex officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Said County.

How Not To Retire the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in June 1944, our boys were storming the beaches of Normandy.

In that same month, the Treasury opened its Fifth War Loan. Of fifteen and five-tenths billions in marketable securities, it offered only three billions which matured in a longer period than 10 years.

In late November and December of that same year, when it was touch and go in the Ardennes Forest of Belgium, the Treasury offered in its Sixth War Loan, seventeen and two-tenths billions in marketable securities. Only three and five-tenths billions were consigned for repayment in a period longer than 10 years.

With Germany down and Japan ready for conquest, the Treasury sold the mighty Seventh War Loan of May 1945, nineteen and seven-tenths billions in marketable securities, of which five and three-tenths billions could not be paid for 14 years and eight billions could not be paid for 22 years.

Thus with half a war already won, was born the Truman doctrine of dumping the debt on the next generation.

But this doctrine reached its finest flower after the war was completely ended and wartime expenditures had sharply dropped. Two months after the Japanese surrender in Tokyo Bay, the United States Treasury borrowed money in the Victory loan by selling $19,000,000,000 in marketable securities. Of this amount, less than four billions can be retired within 14 years, and eleven and seven-tenths billions must wait 22 years for payment, if not 27.

This is a record unrivaled even in the depths of war or depression; the New Deal and World War II loans never included much more than 50-percent long-term debt as opposed to short-term. It remained for an administration priding itself on debt reduction to reduce debt by financing out of a clear sky a loan of which three-fourths must wait 14 or 22 years for repayment.

For whom was the Victory loan a victory?

The Hand Bill To Restore Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a statement concerning my bill, H. R. 71, which appeared in the New Jersey Education Association Reporter, and I likewise insert a resolution favoring this bill passed by the Retired Men's Association of the Fire Department of the City of New York.

This bill has met with universal favor with all affected groups.

HAND INTRODUCES PENSION EXEMPTION BILL RIGHT AWAY

The first session of Congress was only a few hours old when Representative T. MILLET HAND, of Cape May City, introduced a bill to cut the income tax on teachers, and others, receiving pensions from Government units. The bill was listed as H. R. 71.

It provides that all amounts up to $2,000 per annum as annuities, pensions, or retirement benefits for past services as an employee of the Government of the United States, as an employee of any State, or political subdivision thereof, shall be excluded from gross income and shall be exempt from taxation" under the income-tax law.

This is a slightly more generous provision than the teachers have been asking. They requested an exemption on retirement pay up to $1,440. This, coupled with the normal exemption of $500, would give a total exemption of $1,940. This figure was backed by the NEA because it is the amount exempted under the Railroad Retirement Act.

RESOLUTION BY RETIRED MEN'S ASSOCIATION, FIRE DEPARTMENT, NEW YORK CITY

Whereas the sustained increase in the cost of living has seriously threatened the physical well-being and economic stability of thousands of citizens whose means of support is from fixed income paid to them by various public retirement systems; and

Whereas such retired employees, by reason of advanced age, are particularly subject to illness, frequently requiring medical or surgical treatment in addition to their normal living expenses; and

Whereas public employees have received increase and bonuses in income to offset the increased cost of living, while retired public employees have had and will receive no income adjustment of any kind to assist them to meet the ever-increasing raise in the cost of living; and

Whereas prior to the enactment of the Public Salary Act of January 1, 1939, pensions and annuities were exempt from Federal income tax; and

Whereas Government agencies contribute annually for pensions, i. e., to assure that employees will be able to retire when they become incapable through age or disability for efficient performance of their duties, their Government units make similar contributions in proportion to their pay rolls; Federal income tax neutralizes these contributions, as 23 percent annually more or less of the contributions toward the pensions is deflected from support of the aged pensioner to support the Federal Government; and

Whereas exemption from income taxation is the only form of relief that can be given to retired public employees to help them to

maintain the purchasing power of the pension they earned by long years in the public service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully requested to enact appropriate legislation to exempt from Federal income taxation, all pensions and annuities up to $2,000 per annum, received by any retired employee from any public retirement system of the United States, any State or any political subdivision thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That we support Hon. T. MILLET HAND'S bill H. R. 71 and use every effort by this association and other organization to bring about its final enactment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to all members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the United States Senate and to each Member of Congress in which members reside.

Income Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor of this bill. It does not represent my idea of a perfect income-tax reduction measure, but in a body of 435 Members such as the House of Representatives, it is rare indeed that the individual Congressman has an opportunity to vote for something of which he approves in its entirety.

This bill is designed to relieve the individual tax payer from a substantial portion of the heavy tax burden which he carried courageously and patriotically during the war years. It is intended to provide well-deserved relief to those millions of persons of fixed incomes who suffer from shortages, high cost of living and inflation. It provides for special relief for the aged, the retired, and the infirm. Finally, it provides substantial additional relief for more than 30,000,000 people.

This bill recognizes that the people of small incomes are having a hard time. It recognizes this by providing that 61 percent of this reduction shall go to persons receiving net incomes of $5,000 a year or less. Of this amount, 71 percent goes to individuals of incomes less than $3,000 a year.

I believe that this bill will furnish incentives for business expansion and for the creation of new businesses by our millions of returned veterans. It will stimulate our national economy, create new wealth, provide a higher standard of living through increased production, and furnish an increase in gainful employment.

It provides for greater relief for the so-called little fellow than the Democrat tax reduction bill passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress. These millions of people will under this bill be able to save something from their earnings and obtain increased comfort and enjoyment for themselves and their families.

We achieved industrial and military predominance and the highest standard of living in the world because of the vitality and flexibility of our free competitive incentive private property system. This bill will do much to increase our productive effort. It will also give new hope to those unhappy people who are slaving in totalitarian countries, new hope and renewed faith in a solvent, prosperous, and vigorous America.

The Rise of Senator Thye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn., on March 31, 1947:

THE RISE OF THYE

A new farm-group leader is rising in the United States Senate. His rise, though unassuming and thus in keeping with the recency of his election to that body, is nevertheless clear. And, looking backward, people may someday see his quiet emergence, into this role just now as historically important, because it coincides with the beginning of the postwar agricultural era, whose acute problems this man has shown the capacity to understand.

The new farm-group leader is EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota. Of course, in a formal or titular sense, leadership in any phase of Senate activity is established only after an extended time, many years perhaps, of hard work. So there may be for a while no widespread recognition of the rise of THYE in his field.

All the same, the mark of farm-group leadership already is on him, and this should steadily become more evident as he goes more deeply and actively into the complex postwar farm problems. Several reasons for this conclusion are now plain.

First was the penetrating and courageous character of THYE'S first farm speech as a Senator in Minnesota at Albert Lea, Saturday afternoon. That address demonstrated that THYE is keenly alive to the deflationary perils which are inherent in the present price inflation. It demonstrated that he perceives the urgency of adopting new permanent farm legislation before a collapse comes, rather than following the former congressional course of delaying action until after the arrival of disaster. It showed that THYE is ready with a practicable plan, that of his proposed joint congressional committee, to get the ground work done in time. And the address also proved that THYE will not go along with but will fight against proposals to cut valuable existing farm programs, such as the REA and school-lunch program, to pieces on grounds of economy. These are the marks of leadership.

The next sign of THYE'S rise in the farm group grows out of his background. He is a "dirt farmer," one of very few real farm operators in the Senate. He has had practical experience in a marketing cooperative. And he has dealt repeatedly with the public side of the farm question as Governor of this State. Also, there is not in him any antilabor bitterness that could handicap good farm leadership.

Finally, THYE'S chance grows out of the situation in the Senate itself. An older generation of Senate farm leaders is passing. "Cotton Ed" Smith and John Bankhead are dead. George Norris is gone. The venerable ARTHUR CAPPER, now chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, is asking and receiving help from younger hands. And there is abundant young blood at hand, with about 15 new Republicans and 3 new Democrats from farm States in the Senate. The farm group undoubtedly will play an expanding role. A new leader is sure to arise. Very few will have the qualifications and the patience for the job, and THYE seemingly has both.

So Senator THYE'S rise to a leading place in the Senate farm group has begun. How far he can go will be important in this State and to this region, as well as to THYE himself. He has a good chance to make a large contribution to the welfare of American agriculture and through it to the national welfare in the years to come.

Conciliation and Arbitration Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include excerpts from the report of the Massachusetts Labor-Management Committee, recently filed with Gov. Robert F. Bradford, of Massachusetts. These excerpts deal with the problem of the improvement of the Conciliation and Arbitration Services. I have included the excerpts so that they may be available in connection with House Resolutions 17, 34, 68, 75, and 76, five identical bills filed by Representatives AUCHINCLOSS, CASE of New Jersey, HALE, HERTER, and myself, which propose somewhat similar improvements in the Conciliation and Arbitration Services of the Federal Government. The excerpts are as follows:

The improvement of industrial relations must be accomplished in the main by the parties themselves with such assistance as the Government may be able to give. That is why the committee has devoted a substantial part of its report to a discussion of what employers and unions can do to improve the effectiveness of the bargaining process.

If labor and management are entrusted with the principal responsibility of making collective bargaining work more effectively, they are entitled to the best possible conciliation service. Consequently, the committee attaches great importance to its suggestions for a conciliation service. It believes that the adoption of these suggestions would give the employers and the labor organizations of the Commonwealth an unprecedented opportunity to provide themselves with an efficient and impartial conciliation service. No industrial community has ever gone as far as the committee recommends in placing the responsibility for developing conciliation in the hands of employers and labor organizations. The committee believes, however, that this is where the responsibility should be. The committee also recommends a procedure by which the employers and labor organizations of the Commonwealth

can provide themselves with a competent and impartial arbitration service.

* * * * *

III. A NEW AND STRONGER CONCILIATION SERVICE WHICH GIVES NEW OPPORTUNITIES AND NEW RESPONSIBILITIES TO EMPLOYEES AND TRADE-UNIONS, AND A NEW ARBITRATION SERVICE OF ASSURED COMPETENCE AND IMPARTIALITY

The committee has pointed out that the responsibility for industrial relations in the Commonwealth should rest with employers and employees through their organizations. Their best opportunity to exercise this responsibility is in their dealings with one another. The employers and trade unions, however, should have an instrument to help them maintain good industrial relations when unassisted negotiations fail. That instrument should be the conciliation service. In addition, the Commonwealth should have an arbitration service of assured competence and impartiality.

The employers and the employees of the Commonwealth have the greatest interest in an efficient and fair conciliation service and in a competent and impartial arbitration service. Consequently, it is fitting and proper that the two groups through their respective organizations be given the opportunity to develop the kind of conciliation service and the kind of arbitration service which meet their needs. Such an opportunity has never been given employers and trade-unions either in Massachusetts or anywhere else in the world. The proposal of the committee, therefore, marks an important step forward (1) in imposing on employers and employees the responsibility for developing good industrial relations, and (2) in giving them powerful instruments with which to meet that responsibility.

Specifically, the committee proposes the following steps:

1. The conciliation service shall be an independent agency within the department of labor and industries.

2. The conciliation service shall be under the administration of a director of conciliation who shall be responsible for appointing conciliators, and who shall, in general, be directly responsible for the satisfactory administration of the service.

3. The director shall be assisted in the administration of the service by the advice and counsel of a joint labor-management committee which shall consist of four representatives of management and four representatives of labor. The four representatives of management shall be appointed by the governor from a list of not less than eight nominees submitted by the Associated Industries of Massachusetts. The representatives of labor shall be appointed by the governor from a list of not less than four nominees submitted by the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor, and not less than four nominees submitted by the Massachusetts State Industrial Union Council. Two of the labor representatives shall be selected from the nominations of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor, and two from the nominations of the Massachusetts State Industrial Council. The governor shall be authorized to request the nominating organizations for additional nominations, but no appointments to the joint labor-management advisory committee shall be made except from persons nominated by the designated employer and labor organizations. The members of the committtee shall serve without compensation. They shall be appointed for an indefinite period subject to the continuing approval of the nominating organization. If a member of the advisory committee fails to attend two successive quarterly meetings, his place shall become vacant, and the director shall notify the governor and the nominating organization.

4. The director shall be a person of established reputation and proven experience in industrial relations. He shall be appointed by the Governor from nominations submitted by the joint labor-management advisory committee. The Governor shall be authorized to request additional nominations from the committee, but the director shall be selected from nominations submitted by the committee.

5. The term of the director shall be for 5 years, and his salary shall be $9,000 a year. The labor-management advisory committee may at any time, by unanimous vote, recommend to the Governor that the director be dismissed from his position, and the Governor shall be bound by such unanimous recommendation.

6. There shall be not less than four full-time conciliators appointed by the director of conciliation, with the advice and consent of the joint labor-management advisory committee. Each conciliator shall receive a salary of $8,000 a year. He may, however, be removed for cause by the director of conciliation; with the advice and consent of the joint labor-management advisory committee. As many additional conciliators shall be appointed as may be necessary. With the approval of the joint labor-management advisory committee, the director may appoint special conciliators on a per diem basis of compensation in the event that the services of the full-time conciliators are not available, or in special cases where the desirability of such appointments is clearly indicated.

7. The joint labor-management advisory committee shall meet quarterly, and at such other times as the director may deem necessary or advisable, or at the joint request of one member of management and one member of labor. The committee shall receive quarterly reports from the director on the operation of the service.

8. The conciliation service shall maintain a panel of arbitrators. No person shall be included in such panel unless he has received the unanimous approval of the joint labor-management advisory committee. The full-time conciliators of the service shall not be eligible for inclusion in the panel.

Your committee believes that the steps which have been proposed will result in conciliation service of the highest possible quality. The ultimate responsibility will rest with the organizations of employers and employees within the Commonwealth. We believe that they will faithfully carry out their obligations. We expect that their nominations for membership on the joint labor-management advisory committee will be made with care, and that the persons appointed from the lists of nominees will be regular in their attendance at meetings of the committee and conscientious in the performance of their duties.

The unanimous approval of the joint labor-management advisory committee would be the surest guarantee of the integrity and competence of the arbitrators included in the panel. Arbitrators would be available on a per diem basis to the parties to disputes arising within the Commonwealth. Compensation for their services and expenses would be paid by the parties. The existence of such a panel of arbitrators should provide substantial encouragement to the disputes to submit their disputes to peaceful adjudication rather than to resort to the use of economic force.

If the above proposals are adopted, your committee is confident that the conciliation service can and will constitute an invaluable implementation of industrial peace within the Commonwealth. We visualize the conciliation service not as an agency to be called upon only as a last resort when other procedures have failed but as a more positive agency, continually striving to avoid "last resorts." We visualize it as a fire-prevention agency, and not merely as a body whose function is to put out fires once they have occurred. The service must exert a persistent influence in persuading employers and labor organizations to settle their differences by peaceful methods. It will naturally try to promote the use of voluntary arbitration as a substitute for interruptions of work. It will make every effort to persuade the parties to potential disputes to enter into voluntary agreements for the submission of future differences over contract terms to arbitration. Such agreements—to be distinguished from agreements on substantive terms of employment—might well run for periods of 3 to 5 years or more. It will be a particular duty of the service to use its best efforts to bring about such agreements in those segments of industry where stoppages of work might have serious repercussions on public health or public safety.

McCormack, the Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include herein a well-deserved compliment that warrants the attention of every Member of the Congress. All of us heartily concur with the sentiments expressed by the editorial writer of the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., under date of March 31, 1947.

M'CORMACK THE LEADER

One of the prime requisites of a great political leader is the faculty of sensing impending danger to the government to which said leader gives his allegiance.

In view of the recent declarations by our great national leader, President Harry S. Truman, and the FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover, as to the dangers that atheistic communism pose toward the American way of life, it is interesting to review some of the statements made by the then House majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, on the floor of the National House of Representatives as far back as Wednesday, March 6, 1946.

At that time MCCORMACK's plea was like a voice in the wilderness crying out against potential dangers. Said he then: "Russia is going out of its way openly to attack religion in an effort to divide the religions of the Western World." This was a most significant statement.

Congressman MCCORMACK followed it up with another that went like this: "One thing seems certain—the United States cannot and should not, for its own best interests, as well as for future peace, continue what appears to be a policy of appeasement of Soviet Russia and its imposition of communistic control upon other countries of the world. Appeasement of Hitler contributed to bringing about World War II. Appeasement of Russia will contribute to the defeat of international cooperation necessary for permanent peace." Those were strong words from a strong man.

More than 10 months after Leader MCCORMACK's prophetic speech, Pope Pius XII, on Saturday, January 18, 1947, addressed a group of American pilgrims in the following language:

"Denial of men's civil and religious rights has not abated. Nor is it surprising. But it is tragic. It could be depressing, the thought that the heroic deaths of hundreds of thousands of the Nation's brave and promising youth should have left so little peace and justice and charity in its wake.

"But one dare not be discouraged. Leaders will not be wanting, they are not wanting, men of sterling character, not self-seeking

but genuinely devoted to the physical and social betterment of all classes, who in the light of Christian principles will gladly and effectively recognize what was so luminously clear to him, whom you are pleased to call the 'Father of Your Country,' that religion and morality are the indispensable support of political prosperity and that morality will not be maintained without religion.

"We pray daily that God may give these leaders the patient courage of their convictions and the strength to guide civilization back to its safe moorings. We bless you and your loved ones at home, and we express the hope that you may see the truth and speak it unafraid."

Truly may it be said that JOHN W. MCCORMACK looms larger than ever in our American pattern of life. Like a true leader, he blazes the way. May God, in His infinite wisdom, spare him and his devoted wife many, many more years of public life so that America and the world may have the benefit of the inspired leadership of the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

Opposes Present Ratification of Italian Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and for the information of any constituents who are interested, I am inserting a copy of my letter of March 28, 1947, laying certain criticisms of the proposed peace treaty with Italy before the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and I am appending the prompt and cordial reply of Senator VANDENBERG:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am deeply concerned with the proposed treaty of peace with Italy—so much so that I feel impelled to intrude my concern on your attention.

I have examined with care a number of memoranda on this subject, including a pamphlet entitled "What's Wrong With the Proposed Treaty of Peace With Italy," by A. A. Berle, Jr., a former Assistant Secretary of State. This document was sent me by the Committee for a Just Peace With Italy, Inc., and it seemed to me to be worthy of consideration.

Senator, there are a great many citizens of my district of Italian extraction. I am personally acquainted with many hundreds of them. They are first-class citizens whose opinions and feelings are entitled to respect. They tell me they are deeply troubled with many of the items in the proposed Italian treaty.

On March 24, 1947, nine important associations joined together in a letter to me, which reads as follows:

"DEAR SIR: The undersigned constitute the heads of all the Italo-American organizations in this area who have united, in this instance, in order to interpose a very strong objection to the proposed attempt to ratify the existing peace treaty for Italy.

"We feel that the ratification of the proposed peace treaty will cause a definite threat to world peace. We also want our Representatives to know that we feel very deeply for the present sad plight of the Italian Nation and urge you to use all your resources in fighting for a more equitable peace. The reasons are many and we therefore are enclosing a copy of an article by that famous journalist Mr. Vincent Sheean who voices, in eloquent manner, our sentiments on this most crucial situation.

"The thousands of persons represented by the undersigned are anxiously waiting for favorable action from you.

"With kindest regards,

"Very truly yours,

"Carl Valore, Columbus Association; Vincent Speciale, Italian Social Center; Biagio Bartolomei, Sons of Italy; Frank DeFeo, Independent Order Sons Italy; Joseph Borzellino, Circolo Delia; James Daniels, San Nicola di Bari; Nick Fazio, Naso Capo D'orlando; Anthony Ciolorito, Figli Di Sicilia, Frank Silvagni, Holy Name Society."

On the same day that I received this letter, I read accounts and saw pictures of the mass evacuation of Italians from the principal naval base, Pola, which is being given to the Yugoslavs. We are all familiar with the situation at Trieste. I should be greatly surprised if there is not trouble on the Adriatic. Trouble always follows the arbitrary separation of people from their homes and their own groups.

I appreciate the difficulties confronting your committee in the Senate. Italy, of course, cannot be rewarded as a former enemy country, but the historic friendship of the Italian people to us should be weighed in all considerations affecting them, and there likewise should be considered the interests of our own citizens bound by ties of deep affection to Italy.

It is wholly the province of the Senate to consider these matters, but may I presume to suggest that the proposed treaty be scrutinized in every particular with care and also with sympathy? The rapid development of events in Europe may shortly indicate an entirely different approach to this problem. It should not be ratified now.

Sincerely.

T. MILLET HAND.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
March 29, 1947.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAND: This will reply to your letter of March 28. I can fully understand your concern and anxiety about the pending Italian peace treaty. I can understand the sentiments of your Italian-American constituents. You may be very sure that the whole situation is also unsatisfactory to me. But we confront a condition and not a theory. Unless we are to have separate peace treaties (which could easily lead to complete chaos for Italy and everybody else) we must have a multilateral treaty which requires agreement with our war allies including the Soviet Union and its satellites. After participating myself in 9 months of these negotiations, I am forced to say that the pending treaty is the best that can be obtained at the present time or in the foreseeable future.

The treaty represents many concessions obtained for Italy by the Government of the United States. For example, the burden of reparations is only a minor fraction of the total reparations originally demanded. (Of course, no reparations come to us at all.) Another example is the fact that we wanted Trieste and most of the peninsula to remain Italian. When this became impossible we established the "free state" as the only alternative to delivering these areas to Yugoslavia. I think the present Italian Government will testify that the United States made every effort to protect the legitimate rights of the new Italy; and that in many aspects we succeeded. We are still conducting conversations with the Italian Government as to additional helpfulness on our part if and when the treaty is executed.

The practical question which we now confront is whether the new Italian democracy is better off with or without this treaty (because no other treaty is possible for some time to come). I cannot escape the conviction that Italy is better off with the treaty than without it. Otherwise I would anticipate multiplying friction with her neighbors and a progressive instability which would make successful rehabilitation very difficult. The choice unfortunately is the lesser of two evils.

Until all of these pending treaties are ratified there can be no withdrawal of foreign troops from either Italy or the Balkans; and until this happens there can be no real autonomy. If we must tear up the only agreements that have thus far been made to liquidate the war, I fear we would drift back into worse confusion and chaos. I do not see how Italy could hope to profit from such a trend. It is easy to criticize the Italian treaty. I frankly do so myself, but to do better is a different story and a doubtful one. Meanwhile our Italian-American friends must judicially weigh all the factors involved and temper their understandable emotions with realistic prudence. Their own American Government is the friend of Italy as demonstrated not only by its conduct at the Peace Conference but also by postwar contributions which already exceed $1,000,000,000.

With warm personal regards and best wishes.

Cordially and faithfully,

A. H. VANDENBERG.

Interruptions to Production Jeopardizing Public Health or Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include excerpts from the report of the Massachusetts Labor-Management Committee, recently filed with Gov. Robert F. Bradford, of Massachusetts. These excerpts deal with the problem of interruptions to production which jeopardize the public health or the public safety, a problem with which House Resolutions 17, 34, 68, 75, and 76 deal:

The committee has given long and careful attention to the problem of interruptions to production which jeopardize the public health or the public safety. When negotiations fail to resolve differences, the committee believes that both parties should submit their differences to arbitration. The procedures which the committee suggests are designed to encourage arbitration where negotiations fail. The committee must take cognizance of the possibility that arbitration will be rejected and that a strike or lockout will jeopardize the public health or the public safety. Consequently the government

should have effective instruments for protecting the public health and public safety in these circumstances. The committee believes that its recommendations, if adopted, would provide the Government with such instruments.

IV. THE PROBLEM OF STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS WHICH JEOPARDIZE PUBLIC HEALTH AND PUBLIC SAFETY

The great interdependence of the modern economy means that the health and the safety of the community are immediately jeopardized by interruption to the production of certain types of goods and services. Some goods and services on which the community is most immediately dependent are provided by the Government. Examples are police protection, fire protection, water supply, and the services provided by public institutions, such as institutions for the aged, the feeble-minded, the insane, the handicapped, and prisons and hospitals, and the activities of many Government departments which are essential to the day-to-day enforcement of laws.

Private industry and private institutions provide services which are almost as essential as those provided by the Government. Examples are hospital service, electric light and power, and gas. The community is less immediately dependent upon deliveries of food or fuel, but an interruption of these services would soon jeopardize public health and public safety. One can easily understand what a calamity would be caused by a strike or lock-out of nurses in a hospital or by a strike or lock-out in an electric light and power plant in a large city in midwinter. Thousands of homes would be cold because oil burners do not run without electricity. Many factories and stores which depend for their operation upon electricity would close. Elevators would not run and, unless transportation systems had their own source of power, streetcars and subways would not operate. A shut-down in the production of gas would deprive many homes of heat and many more homes of cooking facilities. The resumption of service would involve many hazards.

An interruption of other important types of service, such as street railway and bus transportation or telephone service, would disrupt production and cause inconvenience and economic loss far beyond strikes or lock-outs in most other industries. Nevertheless, they would not jeopardize the public health and public safety.

It is obviously important that the Government have clearly defined authority and well-planned policies to protect the community against interruptions to production which would gravely imperil the public health or the public safety. The following principles are useful guides in formulating procedures and policies for protecting the community against strikes or lock-outs which gravely imperil the public health and the public safety.

1. The right of employees or employers to interrupt the production of goods and services which are immediately required for the public health and public safety is a more qualified right than the right of employees and employers to interrupt the production of less immediately essential goods and services. People upon whose work the public health and safety immediately depend may have on paper the right to strike, but an extensive use of the right to strike would result in its being taken away from them. In other words, the right to strike is in effect a right which they possess only so long as they do not use it.

2. Public officials are entitled to have their duty and authority to protect the public health and public safety clearly defined, and they are entitled to be provided with effective instruments. It is neither fair nor wise to compel public officials to rely upon makeshift instruments of doubtful legality.

3. If arbitration through an impartial board is available to the parties, and if one or both of the parties refuse arbitration, the paramount issue in the dispute becomes, not the differences between the parties over contract terms, but the merits of the reasons of one party or both for insisting upon jeopardizing the public health and public safety rather than submitting the case to arbitration.

The committee believes that the long-term arbitration agreements proposed in section III of this report can be developed to give the Commonwealth complete protection, or nearly complete protection, against strikes or lock-outs which might imperil the public health or public safety. One of the responsibilities of the new type of conciliation service recommended by the committee is to induce employers and unions to make long-term arbitration agreements in all industries where an interruption to production would seriously injure the community. The committee, however, must take account of the possibility that there may be a few situations in essential industries where the parties are unwilling to negotiate a long-term arbitration agreement. Effective protection of the interests of the community requires that there be ways of providing for these cases. The committee suggests the following arrangements:

If the director of conciliation believes that a dispute is likely to produce an interruption of service which would gravely threaten the public health or the public safety, and if conciliation has been refused or has failed to produce an agreement, and if arbitration has been refused, the director shall inform the Governor and recommend that the Governor declare an emergency. The Governor may in his discretion act on the recommendation of the director of conciliation.

If the Governor declares an emergency, the committee recommends that two procedures be specifically authorized which the Governor in his discretion may employ:

(a) Require the party or parties refusing arbitration to show cause for this action. This hearing shall be conducted before a specially appointed moderator selected by the governor. The moderator shall be a person skilled in industrial relations and with an established reputation for impartiality. In the event that the governor orders a show-cause hearing, the parties may be required, if necessary, to maintain the status quo for 15 days. The show-cause hearing shall be strictly limited to a review of the reasons for the refusal of arbitration, not a review of the merits of the unsettled issues between the parties. It shall be the duty of the moderator to endeavor to work out a form of arbitration which is mutually acceptable to the parties. If the show-cause hearing fails to produce an agreement to arbitrate, the moderator shall make public his findings.

(b) Invite the parties to submit their case to a special emergency board of arbitration appointed by the director of conciliation from the standing panel of arbitrators. The emergency board shall conduct its hearings and make its report within a period of 30 days unless a longer time is mutually agreed upon. During the hearings before the emergency board and for 30 days after its report has been made public, the parties shall be bound to maintain the status quo, with respect to the matters in dispute, except as they may make changes by mutual agreement. The emergency board, in determining the effective date of its award, shall consider any evidence on the responsibility of either party for prolonging the procedure or rejecting arbitration.

The committee is aware of the possibility that the availability of emergency boards may discourage the parties from settling their differences by negotiation or voluntary arbitration. It has attempted to guard against this danger.

If one party or both reject the recommendations of the emergency board, a strike or lock-out may occur which imperils the public health or the public safety. In that event it is important that the Governor have adequate and specific authority for dealing with the situation. Broad powers are conferred on the Governor by section 9H of chapter 23 of the general laws, and by the Commonwealth Defense Act of 1917, which is referred to in section 9H of chapter 23. Section 9H of chapter 23 of the general laws reads as follows:

"Whenever the Governor shall determine that an emergency exists in respect to food or fuel, or any other common necessary of life, including the providing of shelter, or any two or more of such necessaries of life, he may, with the approval of the council, by a writing signed by him, designate the adjutant general, the commissioner of labor and industries, and the commissioner of public safety to act as an emergency commission, and thereupon the commission shall have, with respect to the necessary or necessaries of life as to which the emergency exists, all the powers and authority granted by the Commonwealth Defense Act of 1917, being chapter 342 of the General Acts of 1917, to persons designated or appointed by the Governor under section 12 of said chapter 342 and the Governor may revoke such written authority at any time. During such an emergency the Governor, with the approval of the council, may make and promulgate rules and regulations, effective forthwith, for the carrying out of the purposes of this section and for the performance by the Commonwealth and the cities and towns thereof of any function affecting food or fuel or any other common necessary of life, including the providing of shelter, authorized under article XLVII of the amendments to the constitution. Violation of any such rule or regulation shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or by both. The provisions of said chapter 342 are hereby made operative to such extent as the provisions of this section may from time to time require."

The Commonwealth Defense Act of 1917 contains the following sections which bear on the Governor's authority to deal with emergencies in respect to "any common necessaries of life."

"SEC. 6. Whenever the Governor shall believe it necessary or expedient for the purpose of better securing the public safety or the defense or welfare of the Commonwealth, he may, with the approval of the council, take possession: (a) Of any land or buildings, machinery or equipment. (b) Of any horses, vehicles, motor vehicles, airplanes, ships, boats, or any other means of conveyance, rolling stock of steam or electric railroads or of street railways. (c) Of any cattle, poultry, and any provisions for man or beast, and any fuel, gasoline, or other means of propulsion which may be necessary or convenient for the use of the military or naval forces of the Commonwealth or of the United States, or for the better protection or welfare of the Commonwealth or its inhabitants. He may use and employ all property so taken possession of for the service of the Commonwealth or of the United States, for such times and in such manner as he shall deem for the interests of the Commonwealth or its inhabitants, and may in particular, when in his opinion the public exigency so requires, sell or distribute gratuitously to or among any or all of the inhabitants of the Commonwealth anything taken under clause (c) of this section, and may fix minimum and maximum prices therefor. He shall, with the approval of the council, award reasonable compensation to the owners of any property of which he may take possession under the provisions of this section and for its use, and for any injury thereto or destruction thereof caused by such use."

"SEC. 23. Whenever the governor, with the advice and consent of the council, shall determine that an emergency has arisen in regard to the cost, supply, production, or distribution of food or other necessaries of life in this Commonwealth, he may ascertain the amount of food, or other necessaries of life within the Commonwealth; the amount of land and labor available for the production of food; the means of producing within or of obtaining without the Commonwealth food or other necessaries of life as the situation demands; and the facilities for the distribution of the same, and may publish any data obtained relating to the cost or supply of such food or other necessaries, and the means of producing or of obtaining or distributing the same. In making the said investigation he may compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents, and may examine the books and papers of individuals, firms, associations, and corporations producing or dealing in food or other necessaries of life, and he may compel the cooperation of all officers, boards, commissions, and departments of the Commonwealth having information that may assist him in making the said investigation."

These statutes provide the Governor with broad powers. These powers are especially useful if the interruption of essential services is caused by the recalcitrance of management The powers granted to the Governor by these statutes are presumably also adequate to deal with strike situations.

The committee does not believe that the seizure of plants is a desirable way of dealing with disputes between labor and management, and calls attention to the fact that seizure does not settle differences over the terms of employment. In the case of public seizure of a plant, the committee recommends that the Governor shall continue to maintain existing wages and working conditions unless he puts into effect the wages and conditions of employment recommended by the emergency board. In the event that an emergency board has not been appointed in the dispute, the committee recommends that the Governor maintain existing wages and working conditions unless he asks the Director of Conciliation to appoint a special board from the panel of arbitrators to determine wages and working conditions under public operation.

The committee believes that the procedures outlined will make emergencies exceedingly rare, and that they will permit any emergencies which arise to be handled with due consideration to all of the interests involved.

Resolution Adopted by the Supreme Council of Polish American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission granted me by the House, I include the following resolution adopted by the Supreme Council of the Polish American Congress at its second annual meeting held at the Statler Hotel here in Washington on the 13th and 14th days of February, 1947. This resolution was presented to Hon. Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State on March 18, 1947 by Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress, Inc.:

More than 2 years have elapsed since the war has ended, and yet world hope for genuine peace and security is still far from reality—mainly because of the obstruction of Soviet Russia.

Victory of the Allies has meant only that the brown fascism of defeated Nazi Germany has been supplanted by the red fascism of Communist Russia, which is equally oppressive and rapacious. In the interlude of the 2 years Soviet Russia—encouraged by the unpardonable policy of appeasement of the democratic nations—has grabbed many lands, subjugated millions of peoples and looted their capital.

This policy of appeasement indulged by the United States with the evident tragic consequences is politically wrong and without realistic justification. For much of Russia's industry and agriculture has been ruined by her erstwhile Nazi accomplice and to regain offensive war power Russia would need billions of American dollars and at least 5 years for industrial reconstruction.

The evil, however, with which Soviet imperialism has beset the World had its origin in the now infamous Yalta Conference, where for temporary political expediency democratic principles were compromised, solemn pledges broken and whole nations bartered away into bondage of Communist Russia.

The most ignominious barter of the Big Three at the Yalta Conference was the delivery of democratic, Christian Poland to communistic, anti-Christian Russia. In shameful disregard for the valor and unbounded sacrifice of the Polish people spent in the course of the common struggle, it was decreed at Yalta that their country be partitioned, their institutions debased and their government disavowed in preference to Russian installed puppet regime. This settlement of the Polish question, however, only challenges the wisdom and the good faith of world statesmanship and threatens at once any plan for durable peace and security.

In recent weeks, Soviet Russia, having apparently fully exploited the Yalta compromises and being aware of her present internal and economic weakness, has begun to make desperate efforts to bring about world disarmament, especially that of America. First through legal means and then through her network of espionage, Russia is trying desperately to learn the secret of the atom bomb. In this respect American pacifists and misguided liberals unwittingly and the Communist fifth column deliberately are aiding the Russian objective by clamoring for disarmament and the disclosure of the secret of the atom bomb.

In view of these ominous facts and in an effort to help realize international peace and security, the Supreme Council of the Polish American Congress, representing over six million Americans of Polish descent, voices these declarations:

1. To prevent any further blackmail of the democracies by Soviet Russia, the Supreme Council of the Polish American Congress calls upon the United States and Great Britain to revoke at once the Yalta deal with all of its evil compromises concerning not only Europe but Asia and the Pacific.

The flagrant violation of Russia's pledge to allow "free and unfettered elections in Poland" presents these two signatories with extraordinary legal and equitable basis for such an immediate revocation of the deal. Reconsideration of all the issues compromised at Yalta would at once create a new world situation in which not imperialistic Russia but the United States and the other democratic nations would of righteous necessity assume the dominant role. With the revocation of the Yalta pact the great wrongs inflicted upon Poland and the other defenseless countries could be redressed and thereby the Bolshevik designs for world domination effectively thwarted.

2. Common decency and sound statesmanship demand the reestablishment of a truly strong, integral, and independent Poland with a democratic government. The so-called Polish elections of last January, rigged up in an atmosphere of Russian coercion, terror, and brutality were a grotesque fraud.

The long-awaited "free and unfettered elections" in Poland can be secured only if Russia will withdraw its armies and its secret police from that country and the elections are conducted under the surveillance of an international commission free from any coercion.

3. Recognizing the fact that the territory ceded to Poland in the west has always been historically and economically an integral part of Poland, except for the time it was seized and held by force by Germany, the Supreme Council uncompromisingly is opposed to any revision of these western or so-called Oder-Niesse boundaries of Poland. Moreover, this land is but small compensation for the unparalleled devastation and loss of life and property which the German war-machine inflicted upon Poland.

4. The surviving members of the Polish armed forces, who fought so gallantly for the cause of the United Nations and the Polish political refugees, whose only transgression has been to want freedom and democracy, have today become outcasts of the "four freedoms", barred from their homeland and left destitute throughout the globe. Cannot now the democratic nations in gratitude offer them haven?

(a) In order that the United States might in good conscience assume its responsibility to admit a fair share of these displaced persons—we earnestly appeal to Congress to enact the necessary legislative changes, permitting:

(1) "recapturing" past unused quotas.

(2) utilization of current unfilled quotas.

(3) mortgaging or borrowing ahead of future quotas not yet due.

In the interim the Supreme Council appeals to all people of charitable heart to bring immediate relief to these unfortunates and to their brethren in Poland, who face starvation and ruin.

5. To assure the security of this country and to enable it to conduct a virile and positive foreign policy with the view of establishing world peace, the Supreme Council:

(a) Calls for the maintenance of full military strength of the United States;

(b) Supports the policy of retaining the secret of the atom bomb and of its continued improvement and production under the surveillance of the military;

(c) Approves universal military training to assure this country's state of preparedness;

(d) Opposes any disarmament sought by Russia at the expense of the democracies and calculated only to serve communistic imperialism;

(e) Supports the American claim to the Pacific island bases.

To these ends the Supreme Council of the Polish American Congress dedicates its will and efforts in the sincere hope that it will thus in some measure help the United States discharge its international responsibility with dignity and efficacy and redeem its promises to its faithful allies.

For the Supreme Council of the Polish American Congress:

CHARLES ROZMAREK, *Chairman.*

JOHN A. STANEK, *Secretary.*

MARCH 1947.

The Italian Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the present Italian peace treaty proposes that Italy's interests and future should be sacrificed to totalitarianism in a vain effort to find a basis for lasting peace. Events have now proved that this is not the way it will be found. As conclusive evidence that this is the case, the Greek crisis has already revolutionized our outlook and foreign policy.

These views have been expressed by the Committee for a Just Peace with Italy, Inc., which is composed of our leading American citizens of Italian birth or extraction. This substantial committee very properly insists that the Senate must take the foregoing statement into consideration in taking action on the Italian peace treaty, that Italy should remain, with Greece and Turkey, in the democratic orbit of influence, and that the treaty should definitely be rejected and a new treaty negotiated. The committee further urges that in the meantime, the Senate declare the war with Italy at an end.

Under the permission granted by the House, I include in my remarks the following analysis of the Italian peace treaty by Mr. A. A. Berle, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of State, in charge of Italian affairs.

My friends on this committee take the position that although Mr. Berle's analysis only recommends that we withhold ratification at this time; the reasons he gives for his position may well favor outright rejection of the treaty. His analysis reads as follows:

A REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF COMMON CAUSE, INC., BY A. A. BERLE, JR.

Your committee has been kind enough to ask my views on the proposed treaty of peace with Italy. You are, as I understand it, particularly interested in whether the peace treaty accords with the pledges made to the Italian people prior to the collapse of Mussolini and to the principles for which the United States fought during World War II.

My suggestion, for reasons hereafter stated, is this:

The wisest course would be to urge the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate to study and conduct hearings on this treaty; but that it should recommend to the Senate that ratification of this treaty be withheld for the time being and until the other treaties embodying the European settlement, particularly those with Austria and Germany, are negotiated and are placed before the Senate and the American people. When this shall have happened the Senate and American public opinion will be able to form a judgment as to whether all the treaties should be ratified.

This suggestion must not be considered as even remotely implying a course of American isolationism like that adopted after World War I. The United States is now locked by circumstances and history into the European situation. She could not isolate herself if she wished. Whatever settlement is reached with respect to Italy or the rest of Europe, the United States is one of the powers which will be held to primary responsibility. This, in itself, requires great caution in approaching the Italian treaty. If the result is bad, a repercussion will be a movement against its makers, including the United States. It may be added that, in view of American participation in the United Nations, the United States Government is in a position to deal separately with peace treaties, while maintaining all of her responsibilities and interests in the European scene.

The governments of the Soviet Union, Great Britain, the United States, and China, together with the allied and associated powers, have committed themselves to signing the treaty of peace with Italy.

So far as the United States is concerned, all parties understand that her signature is subject to ratification by the Senate of the United States. The problem now presented is whether or not your organization and other American citizens should urge on the Senate (1) ratification of the treaty; (2) refusal of ratification; or (3) to withhold ratification at this time. I think the third course should be followed.

I

At present, neither the Senate nor the American public can judge whether this treaty effects a settlement of the Italian problem.

Secretary Byrnes and his colleagues, through the long negotiations of 1945 and 1946 which led to drafting the proposed treaty, readily grasped the central problem. It was not the problem of Italy. It was the wide gulf between the Soviet Union and the group of nations under her control, and the practically unanimous opinion of the other nations of the world. The negotiations, in fact, were only secondarily negotiations for a treaty of peace with Italy. They were really attempts to reach a modus vivendi between the Eastern and the Western Powers. The basis was the situation created by military occupations of territory set up when Germany collapsed, and when the principal allied armies met in central Europe. Certain demarcation lines were agreed on, theoretically for convenience of military administration. They were not intended to be the basis for settlement of final relations between the Allied Powers. Yet they powerfully influenced the relationships which are set up by the draft treaty. Treaties based on battlefield conditions, temporary occupations, and disturbances following a huge war, are rarely enduring.

Both Secretary Byrnes and President Truman recognized this with commendable frankness. They state that the treaty is unsatisfactory in some respects but is the best obtainable under the circumstances. In blunt fact, the terms of the present treaty satisfy no one.

Nevertheless, the negotiation of the five treaties represents a great service to the American people rendered by Secretary Byrnes, Senators Vandenberg and Connally, and their colleagues. But this service was not the solution of the Italian problem. It was the crucial, though temporary, checking of imperialist movements which endeavored to use postwar confusion to seize territorial and political advantage in all directions. Secretary Byrnes was able to bring this in some degree to a halt. He deserves the highest commendation. This was the real result of the first five peace treaties.

Time may show that the result obtained is the only result politically possible, and that acceptance is dictated by circumstances. But in view of the rapid changes in the European scene, we have the right to hope that with the passage of time a less passionate atmosphere will be created; and that solutions may become possible which more nearly accord with the underlying desires of the populations of the countries.

So long as the Italian treaty is unratified, there is a possibility of a more satisfactory and sound agreement either by negotiation between Italy and Yugoslavia (which has been suggested already) or by clarification of the European situation, or both. Either possibility might be foreclosed if the treaty were ratified now.

The first reason for delaying ratification is that the treaty as it stands is not satisfactory; that it is not, in fact, a treaty of peace with Italy at all; and that more time may permit repairing some of the injustices of the treaty.

II

The Government of the United States made a single pledge to the Italian people prior to the landing of troops in Italy. This pledge was that United States would assure the preservation of the essential nationhood of Italy. This pledge was, properly, read against the background of the Atlantic Charter and the repeated declarations of war aims.

Unless, therefore, Italy as a great nation can live, maintain herself, and resume the position in Europe to which her attainments entitle her, the pledge has been broken. The provisions of the proposed treaty may not inevitably infringe on this pledge; but they do not guarantee that it will be carried out. Unless other elements appear which are not now visible, the result of the treaty might conceivably be to create a situation in which the people of Italy are as helpless as are apparently the people of Poland. The United States is already struggling with a situation in Poland arising out of a breach of the understanding arrived at on which the Polish people relied. Clearly we cannot afford the creation of another situation in which a people believes that it has been betrayed. The comments that follow are therefore addressed to various phases of the maintenance of the "essential nationhood" of Italy.

On the political and territorial side, the draft treaty with Italy is in the nature of a blank check. Its real significance can only be filled in by other settlements not yet made.

Besides making certain minor changes in favor of France on the French border, this treaty deprives Italy of Venezia Giulia, sets up an artificial Free Territory of Trieste guaranteed by the United Nations with a clearly artificial boundary; substantially disarms Italy on land and sea; and requires the demolition within one year of any defenses which Italy may have on the new frontier. Thereafter, she is to be perpetually undefended.

Under certain circumstances, these provisions might be livable. But this depends on settlements not yet made. Thus:

The Italian arrangement will mean one thing if a free, friendly, independent state of Austria emerges. It will mean something else if a Russian or other Great Power army remains in Austria, or dominates Austrian life.

The treaty will mean one thing if the Italian colonies in Africa, ceded to the United Nations, become real internationalized areas moving toward a free and friendly life. It will mean quite another if sole trusteeship of these colonies, notably Tripolitania, cause them to become, in substance, colonies of a nationalist European empire. The Soviet Union has already requested that she be named the sole trustee for Tripolitania. At an earlier period, Great Britain apparently also had hopes of becoming sole administrator.

The treaty will mean one thing if general disarmament is finally worked out so that

the entire Yugoslav frontier, and the Yugoslav side of the Adriatic, becomes a peaceful, nonmilitary strip of territory. It will mean quite another thing if actually the entire Dalmatian and east Adriatic coast remains, as now, a heavily armed military frontier. At present Albania, in agreement with Marshal Tito, is creating (and perhaps has already completed) a powerful air base and a powerful naval base near Tirana and Valona respectively. These command the Strait of Ostranto. Taken together with the military dispositions north of Trieste, and other Balkan arrangements, they really turn the Adriatic into a lake dominated by Marshal Tito. Meanwhile, there is open conflict on the frontier between Yugoslavia and Albania on the one hand and Greece on the other. The peace of the Mediterranean, and with it of Europe, under this treaty, would be substantially placed in the hands of Marshal Tito. His government has not as yet given evidence that it is entitled to guard the peace of a great part of the world.

It is possible to imagine settlements effecting general disarmament which might make the arrangements of this treaty moderately safe, despite its harsh language. Such settlements have not been made, or even outlined. The claims of the various parties do not yet foreshadow that they will be easy to attain.

The only certainty resulting from immediate ratification of this treaty would be that Italy would be disarmed, that American and British troops would be withdrawn; that a disarmed Italy and Adriatic would be left facing Yugoslavia with an army estimated at 600,000 men, maintained at war strength, and backed by a militarist government which has proclaimed its desire to seize more Italian territory, and dominate or, if possible, annex the proposed Free Territory of Trieste; and to strengthen its position in the Adriatic and the Balkans by every possible means, including use of force short of war.

As a result we have neither balance obtained by mutual good-will of peoples, nor balance obtained by equivalent force; nor stabilization obtained through complete and friendly understanding of the great powers. Under the present circumstances, the Italian peace might easily become, not a peace settlement, but a diplomatic stepping stone to further disturbance.

It follows that the wise and prudent course, in the point of view of the United States (and, I think, of the rest of Europe) would be to delay ratification of this treaty until we know with reasonable clearness, what else is going to happen.

III

On the economic side, the proposed treaty leaves room for few illusions. It is not, in fact, seriously defended, except as a settlement of expediency.

The Italian people are to pay reparations; this they cannot do unless other nations, particularly the United States, are generous to them with gifts and loans. Since the treaty takes from Italy part of her current production, and much of her raw material, especially coal, she will be less able to pay in future than at present. In substance, the United States must thus pay the reparations bill of Italy, or accept responsibility for a long period of Italian misery, or even of a possible collapse in which the entire Italian people will suffer.

The United States is, of course, able to pay Italy's reparations bill. If this solution is the only one possible, it might be better to accept rather than add to the already huge total of misery in this area. Yet, by no possible reasoning, can the situation be described as satisfactory.

The total of reparations amount to $365,000,000, of which the Soviet Union gets $100,000,000; Yugoslavia, $125,000,000; Greece, $105,000,000; Ethiopia, $25,000,000; Albania, $5,000,000. The amounts, like most reparation figures, are arbitrary—which is natural. Relatively, the Greek claim should be superior to any other; but Greece has not even a membership on the commission of the four Ambassadors which is to administer the settlement. Payment is to be made from various sources, but notably from Italian current industrial production including mining. The Soviet Union proposes to take her reparations in part by furnishing raw materials to Italy, and taking back the finished product, thus securing in effect a mortgage on Italian labor.

One could go into detail. For instance, in the Soviet settlement, Italy will continue to pay until the excess of the value of finished products over the value of raw materials sent her by Russia adds up to the reparation figure. Control of these "values" apparently rests in the hands of the four ambassadors. By manipulating these values, reparations could be extended indefinitely. We might take the cynical view that this is a matter for Italians. But, when it is realized that Italy must live on imports, and must pay with her exports for the necessities she must import, such manipulations might extend, indefinitely, claims on American generosity to salvage for the Italian people a bearable standard of living. This is merely one illustration of some of the possibilities which this treaty contains.

It is, of course, possible to conceive a turn of affairs in which the financial and economic provisions contained in part VI of the treaty could be worked out. In dealing with the Italian reparation figures and economic clauses, the negotiators avoided the fantastic figures which attended negotiations of reparations with Germany at the time of the Treaty of Versailles. For their relative restraint, they deserve commendation. Yet the reality is none the less unpleasant. The Italian people have not now sufficient current production to take care of their current needs. They have been living partly on American supplies, sent through UNRRA, or paid through American loans, or by the personal sacrifices of thousands of Americans who buy food and clothing from their own resources, and send it to their Italian friends. The reparations clauses will perpetuate this situation for a considerable period of time.

In certain cases—notably that of Greece—there is a clear obligation on Italians to do what they can for the Greek people. In Greece also American economic assistance has come close to being the difference between life and death for many people. It is possible, of course, to channel a part of our assistance to Greece, for example, by way of Italy; a portion being diverted, through the reparations route, to Greece. But it might be plain common sense for us, in that case, to lend assistance to Italy by diminishing reparations and increasing our direct assistance to Greece—since we seem to be the ultimate source from which reparations might come.

The history of Europe after World War I taught us that postwar economic situations can be transitory. Despite a bleak outlook at the moment, some economists feel that the upsurge of production, once war conditions have been eliminated, can be great. The picture, particularly in respect to food and textiles, may well undergo a marked change within the next year or two. Again the logic of the situation suggests waiting until we see more clearly what the outline of postwar European economics will be.

IV

The plan creating the Free Territory of Trieste and its territorial statute government deserve a word. The facts have been widely publicized, and little detailed examination is needed here.

Trieste is an Italian city. Its outskirts and hinterlands are Yugoslav. There has been, and is now, a state of suppressed war between the two nationalities. The main economic significance of Trieste is as a port, not only for Italy, and for Yugoslavia, but also for trade from Hungary, Yugoslavia, Austria, and northern points. We cannot yet know whether that trade will be allowed to flow freely; or whether a series of closed economic arrangements will channel this trade for political purposes through unnatural routes. It has been reported that the Free Territory of Trieste, guaranteed by the United Nations, and with a fine geographical position to serve the commerce of central Europe and the Mediterranean, is considering granting concession for a hotel and gambling casino as a means of financing at low level its public services. Perhaps nothing could better illustrate the irony of the proposed arrangement as conditions now stand.

Geographically, the situation is acknowledged to be tenuous in the extreme. The city is dependent for communication with Italy on a strip not much more than a couple of miles wide; and on the least adequate of the railroads which serve the city and port. The water supply, the electric-light plants, and other of the plants serving the city lie outside the free territory. Workmen employed in the free territory live in the suburbs outside and are at the mercy of the authorities who could decline to permit passage across the border, either to enter or to leave. The negotiators, realizing this artificial condition, concluded agreements by which the Government of Yugoslavia undertakes to safeguard the essential necessities of the situation. Anyone familiar with agreements of this sort knows that, even without technical violation, life under such conditions can be made unbearable for human beings. Agreements of this kind can be short-lived and rest primarily on good will. At present, only the presence of Allied force in Trieste prevents violent conflict between Yugoslavs and Italians.

Were the relations between Italians and Yugoslavs like the relations which exist, say, between the United States and Canada, an arrangement of this kind would be possible. The common sense and goodwill of individual citizens and local authorities would then find ways and means of making the arrangement work. Americans immediately think of the easy relationships which prevail, let us say, along the Canadian border where we freely interchange jobs, entry, electric power, and where hundreds of men pass from Canada to the American side for work or recreation with no inconvenience. The ultimate hope in this singularly explosive region is that Yugoslavs and Italians (who left to themselves, get on very well together) will eventually take charge and eliminate the nationalist politicians who have made life unbearable for both sides. But it would be unreal to say that this situation prevails now. Until it does, the Free Territory of Trieste is merely a weaker and more impractical version of the Danzig settlement which failed so signally after World War I.

There are indications that time, tolerance, and good sense will eventually produce better relationships on this border. Then, conceivably, the fragile arrangement of Trieste may work. As of the moment, it must be recognized for what it is: An unsatisfactory compromise resulting from an attempt to move the line of Yugoslav domination by force across the head of the Adriatic for the purpose of adding to nationalist domination of that part of the Mediterranean area.

Again it follows that, before ratifying, further light is needed on the ultimate relationship of the parties immediately involved—Yugoslavia and Italy; and, behind that, of the relations which are to prevail between that sector of Europe which is Russian-dominated, and the rest of the world. That is not and cannot be spelled out in the Italian treaty alone, but must await the fitting together of the totality of peace treaties. Therefore,

logic directs they be considered together as a whole rather than piecemeal.

V

Even in peace treaties, I suppose, decent attention ought to be paid to the amount of misery they create. One effect of this treaty will be the immediate migration of a great number of Italian citizens from territory to be turned over to Yugoslavia. They will, in fact, become homeless refugees in Italy. This is not what the treaty says. It is the result of a condition of affairs by which many thousands of Italians will not risk remaining in Yugoslav territory, where there exists a period of revolutionary terror, and where political revenge is being carried out with extreme ruthlessness. The number of added displaced persons can only be estimated; Venezia Giulia sources insist it will produce 40,000 from that area alone. In any event, the number will be substantial. And there is thus added another item to the black page of individual misery which so-called peace making in Europe has already caused. This condition also may be ameliorated by time. There is, in my judgment, no reasonable doubt that, as of the present, the human results of the proposed new border will be bitter indeed.

This memorandum does not undertake to discuss the proposed disposition of the Italian colonies in Africa, nor of the cession of the Dodecanese Islands to Greece. The theory of the treaty is that the Italian colonies in Africa will be disposed of by the Governments of the Soviet Union, Great Britain, United States, and France; if agreement is not reached, the matter is to be submitted to the United Nations. Most Americans prefer submission to the United Nations, rather than continuation of a condition putting a premium on territorial grabbing. The cession of the Dodecanese Islands to Greece seems acceptable; responsible Italian statesmen agree that these islands, which are Greek, should be restored to Greece. In neither case would any interest be prejudiced if the treaty were not ratified now, though direct delivery of the Dodecanese to Greece might be arranged even in advance of ratification.

There remains the single question: Is not an immediate settlement, however bad, better than continuing conditions where there is not peace at all? This is, in effect, the principal argument for immediate ratification. It is not sufficient. In the absence of a just European settlement, or of the clarification of relations between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers, or both, there is no reason to believe that this treaty, even if ratified, would constitute a settlement at all.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, I suggest to your committee that they consider recommending to the appropriate authorities, including the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, that this treaty be received and studied but that its ratification be delayed until the outline of the European settlement shall be agreed upon.

Lincoln Day Speech of Hon. Charles A. Plumley, of Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under consent heretofore granted, I am inserting as an extension of remarks a verbatim stenographic report of a speech I made at the Lincoln Day celebration at Fresno, Calif., on February 11, 1947:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I take no exception in being introduced by the chairman as a Member of Congress from Maine—with this exception: Maine slipped once; Vermont never has.

This has been a hectic week for you; but what do you think of me? Being called only last Sunday and told that I was to make three—and now they tell me four—speeches out in California. There was only one thing for me to do—that was to accept the invitation.

I am no stranger in this part of the country. That was one reason I came out here on such short notice, to see again your wonderful valley and the Sierras. I love no other mountains more, unless it be the Green Mountains of Vermont.

Last night, having ridden from 2:30 p. m., Washington time, I arrived over the airport at Los Angeles at 1 a. m. I was going to say 4 a. m., but that was Washington time. You can figure it out better than I, but it was half-past 4 or 5 back home when I got into the airfield; then it took me an hour and forty-five minutes to get to the hotel; so that I hadn't had much sleep when somebody from this town, and then somebody from Long Beach, called me and said it was time to get up. I called up Mrs. Plumley to let her know I had a fine trip—I did not tell her anything about the landing because once before she waited 2 hours and 35 minutes for me to get out of a California fog—wasn't the first fog I was ever in either.

I did think it was kind of adding insult to injury today when the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce gave me a dinner and had an undertaker there. I got his number, so that if I ever feel as I did last night in the fog over California I can call him up.

None of you listeners can be more surprised to hear me than I am to be here to talk to you. None of you can regret more than I do that Senator HICKENLOOPER found it impossible to be here. It is a difficult and a thankless job to undertake to pinch hit for so eloquent an orator and so great a statesman as the Senator from Iowa. However, while I appreciate your disappointment in not having Senator HICKENLOOPER with you, and his in being unable to come, I am glad to be here to renew old friendships and to make new ones.

The Republican National Committee was insistent that you should not be disappointed, so they told me—which was an indirect compliment calculated to induce me to substitute for the Senator. The compliment was not justified, as you will soon learn, but it worked; so I am here.

I am going to make you a real old-fashioned Vermont-Republican, Jeffersonian-Democrat speech. If you don't like it you can leave any time.

I come as a Vermonter across the continent to emphasize the fact Kipling so well stated:

"There is neither east nor west, border nor
breed nor birth,
When two strong men stand face to face,
tho' they come from the ends of the
earth."

So stands the Republican Party today, solidified East and West, honest-to-God, Jeffersonian Republicans—Republicans survived, I say modestly, by reason of the attitude taken by that so small group known as Vermont Republicans.

I promised not to omit to say to you that I was embarrassed, during the third attempt of Franklin D. Roosevelt to be elected, by the fact that my State of Vermont voted Jefferson a sword and invited him to run again. I have had difficulty in dodging that issue.

We meet today to observe the anniversary of the birth of that uncommon commoner, 100-percent American, great emancipator, savior of the Nation; a type whom nature wills to plan but once in all a peoples' years—Abraham Lincoln.

So many people have so well said of Lincoln those things which all of us would be proud to put in words, that little remains to be said or can be said which has not already been spoken. Poets, authors, statesmen, all have vied with one another in an attempt to do justice to the memory of the man and his achievements. One poet has said:

"Some opulent force of genius, soul, and
race,
Some deep life current from far centuries
Flowed to his mind and lighted his sad eyes,
And gave his name, among great names, high
place.

"Unschooled scholar! How did you learn
The wisdom a lifetime may not earn?
Unsainted martyr! Higher than a saint!
You were a man, with a man's constraint,
In the world, of the world was your lot;
With it and for it the fight you fought
And never till time is itself forgot
And the heart of man is a pulseless clot
Shall the blood flow slow, when we think the
thought
Of Lincoln."

True it is that a strange light shone from his sad grey eyes; all the magic of morning, noon, and night, all the mystery of dark forests and starry skies were in them; a strange divinity shone from his face, carved with lines of worry and suffering, cut deep with care and love for mankind, a boundless love, fathomless as the sea, illimitable as space. No monarch ever had greater power than he; none ever employed it so tenderly, so benevolently, so graciously. No power of pardon except that of providence was ever exercised so mercifully, so divinely. No other human being dried so many tears, stopped so many heartaches, revived so many hopes. Don't think me sacrilegious when I say: "He was a man of sorrows, acquainted with grief. He was bruised for our iniquities; he was wounded for our transgressions, and the weight of our Government was upon him. He saved others; himself he could not save."

Shepherd of the people, that old name that the best rulers ever craved, he fed us with counsel when we were in doubt, with inspiration when we sometimes faltered, with caution when we would be rash; with calm, clear, trustful cheerfulness through many an hour when our hearts were dark. His rugged, honest, steadfast perseverance and staunch Americanism still stand as examples and objectives which the nations and all of us as individuals may well try to emulate.

Unwavering in his loyalty to the fundamentals of American government, his genuine respect for the Constitution and his great concern for the destiny of the Republic ended only with his death.

"So they buried Lincoln! Strange and vain.
Hast any creature thought of Lincoln hid
In any vault 'neath coffin lid?
In all the years since that wild spring of
pain?
It is false—he never in grave hath lain.
You could not bury him, although you
slid
Upon his clay the Cheops pyramid,
Or heaped it with the Rocky Mountain chain.
If so, man's memories not a monument be,
None shalt thou have."

A redeemed and reunited Republic is Abraham Lincoln's monument.

We Vermonters still believe in the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of Vermont, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights. We still insist among other things that Congress shall

make no law abridging freedom of speech; that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; and that the powers not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution itself are reserved to the respective states or to the people. We believe that the Constitution is still the supreme law of the land and that no plea of emergency may ever suspend its provisions in any particular, at any time, anywhere.

I want to say to you women that it is about time you recognized your responsibility. It is about time that you realized as the owners of five-eighths of all the property, real, personal, and mixed, in the United States of America today, as joint depositors in savings banks, or as beneficiaries of life insurance policies, and in a hundred other ways beneficiaries—yours is the money to control and yours to save, and if the old man will not go out to vote, take your sister and go along and both vote.

With the people of Indiana (whose general assembly has adopted a concurrent resolution to this effect) we Vermonters know we were fooled for quite a spell by the magician's trick to make us believe that a dollar taxed out of our pocket and sent to Washington would be bigger or twice as big when it came back. Of all the foolish asinine things ever perpetrated on a nonsuspecting public. The idea of taking a dollar out of your left pocket and putting it behind your back and putting it in the pocket of the Federal Government and then putting it in your right pocket with partial payment of some obligation which your State has incurred.

Well, we are through with that kind of program. We certainly are. We propose to bring government back home to the States and to restore the American Republic, and the 48 States which now comprise it, to the foundation built for it by our fathers. We know that a republican form of government has over a long period of years, made greater material progress, produced higher standards of living, inspired superior love of peace, tolerance, and goodwill than has been achieved in any other period in any other nation on earth.

We Vermonters vote with that party which stands for the sanctity of the home and church, for the constitutional right of free speech, of free criticism of Government, for independence in thought, work and play, worship and prayer; individual license to plant and sow and harvest without dictation by any brain trust or any bureaucrat.

I don't know and I don't care whether I overstep my time. I came out here to make a speech and I am going to do it while I am at it. I want to tell you this: You Californians, if you don't want to have the State of California produce the next President of the United States, you had better be darned careful. There are millions of voters, from Maine and Vermont westward, looking this way, who think you have one of the strongest candidates today that the Republican Party has to offer. I am not out here to run your politics, but I notice he is smart enough to be up in Washington. I saw his picture today in the paper. He is getting around in Washington. There are two or three others who would like to have the lightning strike them. This man Warren knows his way around.

Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide in the strife of truth or falsehood for the good or evil side. That hour has struck for t' e Republican Party. If we do not make good our promise to balance the budget, reduce taxes—up or down or across the board or any other way—at least 20 percent, cut a million off the payroll and to do about 49 other things that have got to be done in order to save this Government—it cannot all be done in 2 years, but if we don't make some progress at it right away, we will not be entitled to be running this Government.

Now, we Vermonters believe in being good neighbors. We have lived peacefully along an unfortified boundary line running between ourselves and our Canadian neighbors so long that there is nothing new or wonderful to us about this good neighbor idea. Why shouldn't we be good neighbors? We always have been. Moreover, Vermonters are ready to fight to establish and to continue and to maintain that status, but we hate paternalism, and we insist that this is our Government and that it does not own or control us; nor can it define or classify us as serfs or menials.

The story the ages tells us is that no method of procedure has ever been devised by which liberty can be divorced from local self-government; no plan of centralization has ever been adopted which did not ultimately result in bureaucracy, tyranny, inflexibility, reaction, and decline.

Of course we are for real reciprocity. If you've got some potatoes that you want to swap for butter—if you've got something that I haven't, or I have something that you haven't, that's a fair trade; that's reciprocity.

But when Argentina or Uruguay and one or two other countries are burning up tons of corn which they would like to get up here to sell in a market to compete with western farmers and to make it impossible for you to sell your corn, that's not reciprocity. I'm not for it.

Vermont Republicans have registered, undismayed and in no uncertain terms, their repudiation, disapproval, and contempt of those whose tactics and programs would undermine and eventually destroy our representative form of government.

Now, let's see—just before I left JOE MARTIN, our Speaker, said, "Tell those folks on the west coast this Congress is dedicated to the task of getting the Government out of the people's hair; returning to constitutional government; drastically reducing the cost of government, reducing taxes; starting on the long trail of debt reduction; bringing about better relations between labor and industry; and establishing peace at home and abroad." That's your Speaker who says that.

Now, what did the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations say? He said: "Tell 'em, Charlie, that the President's budget message calls for expenditures of $37,500,000,000. It means the carrying of 2,100,000 people on the pay rolls—there are now 2,300,000 people on the pay roll. We do not need over 1,300,000 on the pay roll in any event, and we should be able to reduce the Government's expenses next year by at least $5,000,000,000. The salvation of American liberty depends upon balancing the budget, reducing taxes to the point where there will be some incentive for people to go out and produce. This is the way to raise America's standard of living."

Now, this Nation, which the Civil War was fought to preserve, will have ceased to be when the legislative powers are surrendered to executives who are but too willing to accept them; when the judiciary strives to find reasons for upholding laws enacted at the behest of noisy minorities; when the plain language of Federal and State Constitutions is given new and strange meanings in order to meet assumed emergencies; when debasement of the currency is adopted as a sound financial policy; when the sovereignty of the individual States is disregarded and local self-government becomes an obsolete phrase; when individual initiative is discouraged, the lessons of experience cast aside; when personal liberty, in great measure, becomes a thing of the past. All these things are involved in, will be the ultimate end and result of, and are a part of the policy and program which the New Deal party endorses and pledges itself to support blindly like an automaton or a robot.

Now, you cannot pick up a paper today in which there is not an intimation made by somebody, representing the New Deal element in Congress, to the effect that it is going to be impossible for the Republicans to carry out their policy.

No such crisis as now exists has confronted this country since the date Abraham Lincoln declared that our Nation could not endure half slave and half free. The battle has just begun.

The Republican Party has made mistakes—yes; and it is big enough to admit them, subsequently to correct them. It has maintained a record for achievement and accomplishment which will not permit it to lie down. The Republican Party has always been the party of action, of progress and achievement, since the day of its founding, and every time the so-called Democratic Party has been in power it has messed up the Government to the extent that eventually the people of the country have waked up and hollered like the very devil for the Republicans to get back and take over. They have done it now. They put the responsibility squarely on us, and it is ours to assume. If we do not do it—just too bad for the country and for us because we will never again get the opportunity. We are going to do it. We are going to keep our promise. We are going to pay off our pledges just as fast as we can.

On November 5, 1946, the people of the United States had their first opportunity in years to vote in a national election with their minds unburdened by the repressive consideration that our country was engaged in war, or threatened by war. I know thousands of good Republicans voted the Democratic ticket because we were at war, and that was the only reason they did it; but since the war is over, look at the vote we had. And we will have one three times as big in 1948—in California!

The issues in the election were clearly drawn. No one can deny that an overwhelming majority of the people of the United States have said that:

Our national house must be put in order.

Government controls must be ended so that private enterprise may be free to produce in abundance, and at reasonable prices, the goods the country needs.

National policy and action affecting labor relations must be reformed to the end that protection of the welfare of the people as a whole will be a consideration superior to the special interests of either employers or labor organizations.

Don't worry about the Wagner Act—it's going to be amended, so it will be fair to both sides. We are not going to start out with a lot of punitive legislation—that's the wishful thinking on the part of those who want to make you think that we don't know any better than to do that, but we do. We think we know pretty well what we are trying to do, and we are not going to let them tell us when to do it or how to do it. When we get our program ready we will announce it and you will back it.

The people of the United States demand that an end be put to the confusion, indecision, lack of direction in national affairs, to the continuing attempts to impose on the country the wishes of small but powerful minorities, and the unwarranted Government restraints on individual freedom.

You would be surprised to see the scarcity of the old type of lobbyist since January 1.

They aren't there any more—those boys that came into your office and said, "Now, you sign right here on the dotted line if you want to come back to the Congress." I am not bragging, because, as a Vermont Republican, I fear neither God, man, nor the devil. I don't think it took any courage for me to show them the door. I'm telling you it is pretty embarrassing for some folks. It will be a major aim of the Republican program to restore and safeguard the political, economic, and social freedom of the individual.

The powers of Government should be embodied in laws enacted by elected legislators. We've got more men hanging around Congress—and more in those bureaus than there are in Congress—who couldn't be elected fence builders in Fresno, and never have been elected to any office—here's a gentleman who can tell you something about it—he's been down there trying to do business. They don't know enough to—well, I won't say what I think about it.

We're going to stop calling names, as you've noticed here tonight. We're going to say what we are going to do. We are just going to thank God that we've got a chance to do it, and clean out that rotten mess there in Washington. We'll do it.

The Government cannot legislate prejudice out of existence. You think that over. That's something you cannot legislate out of existence, either prejudice or intolerance. How many years have we been trying to install the Christian religion by legislation? No, by its own direct dealings and by use of its influence the Federal Government can and must set the country a high example of impartiality, tolerance, and good will, and so must the States.

This is not a matter which Government can deal with directly successfully. The sound approach to the problem is through the process of education. And another thing, you watch your school books and see what is in them. Have somebody who is fair-minded let your children know that there have been improvements, and that there has been progress, but kick out of your schools this phoney stuff based on theories that are as dead as the bullrushes around little Moses. How? You've got to begin right here at home—mother, you had better look at the book, read through that history. One of the most insidious places where they undertake to put the wrong ideas into the minds of the younger children is in their English text-books. They write a theory with a little story and it is as communistic as anything that ever Foster wrote. It's there, all over this country, in the schools.

The expense of Government must be cut to the bone. There should be a surplus of receipts over expenditures to be used to reduce the Federal debt and reduce an overhanging threat of inflation, and before we know how much we can cut we've got to know how much we are going to get. You can't start out to build a house unless you know where you are going to get the money, and you cannot undertake to reduce the amount that you first thought to expend until you know that you are going to have more than you are going to spend.

I think it's Saturday that the Legislative Budget Committee—that's what I've got to be back to Washington for—is to bring in an estimate as to the amount of revenue which can be produced. When we know how much revenue we are going to have, then we'll know how much we can apply on our national indebtedness. We'll know how far we can cut the budget. We'll know how many things we can do. But until we know we're not going to tell anybody about it.

Expenses, I say, must be cut to the bone. Taxation of individuals and business firms should be decreased in proportion to the reduced expenses of the Federal Government. When we don't need this money for Federal expenditure you'll have it to use in the State, and you'll run your own business and say how much you'll tax yourself, in the State, in the town. A thorough overhauling of the Federal tax system ought to be undertaken at the earliest possible moment in order to gear the system to its sole rightful purpose—the raising of the revenue required for economical, pay-as-you-go operation of an efficient Government.

The basic labor law—the so-called Wagner law—was enacted to minimize labor disputes by legalizing the right of collective bargaining on matters affecting hours, wages and conditions of work. Now the truth is, on the theory that the economic power of labor unions was inferior to that of employers, the law was made deliberately one-sided. Benefits of the law are available only to labor unions; penalties of the law apply only to employers. The law discriminates not only against employers—you hear very little about this—but also against the rank and file of American working men and working women, because while they are legally protected against coercion, discrimination, and interference on the part of their employer, they have no such similar protection against coercion, discrimination, or interference from the unions or from John Lewis or anybody like him. That's why that law has got to be amended—to protect the ordinary working man and working woman.

I had a petition sent me within 2 weeks signed by 400 members of labor unions in the northern counties of my State asking me to see to it that the Wagner law was amended. Now you folks, active as you are in politics, know that it took an awful lot of courage to sign that petition on the dotted line and send it down to me—possibly for me to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; but they are sick and tired and fed up on being ordered around; they are going to take care of it if we don't; and if we don't, then they are always going to vote the Democratic ticket, and I don't know as I blame them.

Today it is the unanimous wish of the people of the United States for a permanent condition of peace and good will among the nations of the earth. If possible, the wish is now more sincere and ardent than ever before. The world of today has been so shrunk by science that when war breaks out anywhere it tends to engulf nations everywhere. Twice within one generation wars that originated between other nations have involved the United States. Under these conditions it is clearly in the interest of the people of the United States to encourage and promote all reasonable proposals and programs that will lead to maintenance of permanent peace. That's easy to say, but very, very difficult of accomplishment.

The United States should contribute unreserved support toward the building of a truly effective international organization. The United States—and I weigh well my words—I am a graduate of a military institution, was president of one for 14 years, my two boys are graduates—so I say, the United States should make a standing offer to take steps equal to those of other strong military powers to limit its war-making potential. In the meantime, however, while the international situation remains unclarified as it is, and until the disposition of other nations is revealed and they put all their cards on the table in front of an iron curtain, the United States must continue to assure itself of maximum military preparedness.

Republicans will undertake all possible measures not only to preserve peace, but to promote actively cooperative and friendly relationships, with all other nations to achieve and to cherish a just and lasting peace in order that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Russia in the Postwar World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by Paul Hutchinson, which appeared in the Christian Century of March 5, 1947, and which appears to be an important contribution to the current discussion on our foreign policy:

RUSSIA IN THE POSTWAR WORLD

HONOLULU, February 14.—After 8 months of travel, I have come to earth here for a few weeks. Stretched on the Waikiki sands, looking across the sun-splashed blue of the Pacific (I insert this for the benefit of my snowbound colleagues in Chicago), I am trying to use these days to sort out and reflect on the impressions of a journey that has taken me all but around the globe. It has been an experience conducive to meditation. While I was in Japan the PRO (press relations officer) at headquarters told an Army gathering that I was the first correspondent to complete a round-the-world assignment since the end of the war. Whether that is true, I have no means of knowing. But I do know that I have been enabled to see many of the present tension spots at first hand, and the temptation to try to summarize some of the conclusions to which I have been driven is irresistible. This I intend to do—Waikiki languor permitting—in five concluding letters.

Two questions fill the minds of the thoughtful throughout Europe and Asia: What is the United States going to do? What is Russia going to do? Politically, and to a large extent economically and socially, the postwar outlook reduces largely to the answers given those questions. The policies of other states, and developments within them, of course, enter into the total picture. But everything revolves about America and the Soviet Union—their relations with each other and their intentions with regard to foreign and domestic affairs. There is, therefore, no other place in which to start considering the prospects for peace than with the part to be played by these two nations, the two true great powers that emerged from the war. And I might as well begin with Russia.

One of the facts gradually impressed on a person who wanders about this jittery world is the omnipresence of the Russian question. From Sweden through Germany and Italy and on to the eastern end of the Mediterranean, the oil lands of the Middle East, India, China, and occupied Japan, national leaders everywhere are trying to compute the Russian factor and are shaping their policies in the light of their conclusions. Let trouble break out anywhere—as for example in the agrarian revolts in the Philippines or the resort to terrorism in Palestine—and the question invariably arises, "How much of this can be traced to Russia?" The Russians may protest that this is unjustified, that it is bad faith, warmongering, the deliberate fabrication and spreading of baseless suspicion. But it is also a fact.

On the other hand, the Russians keep themselves on edge with constant fear of what the rest of us are up to, and especially of the United States. Is this country forming a combination of nations, through the United Nations or otherwise, to thwart the policies and ambitions of the Soviet Union? Do we consider her a carrier of infection, and

are we trying to arrange to quarantine her? That may sound ridiculous to Americans. But it is what the Russians suspect, and the suspicion enters deeply into their actions. That, too, is a fact.

I

Lasting peace (and all I mean by that is a peace that is more than another armed truce covering one or two decades) therefore seems to depend largely on the ability of Americans and Russians to reach a degree of understanding sufficient to take the edge off their mutual suspicions and to permit friendly—or at least not belligerent—working relations. I am aware that some Americans minimize the importance of this by interpreting a recent "unstiffening" of the Russian attitude as evidence that Moscow has been sufficiently cowed by American firmness to retreat from its former aggressiveness. Others, especially in the higher levels of our Army and Navy, are convinced that Russia is so exhausted that the Soviet general staff will not permit a major crisis to develop, no matter what line we may follow. I would not count too heavily on either hypothesis. Unless there is a meeting of minds between American and Russian leaders, I expect that the present precarious peace will constantly be subjected to attrition.

For Americans, therefore, the question of the hour is: What is Russia trying to do? I return from this trip convinced that, in the large, her policy can be summarized under five points:

1. To play for time, in order to complete her domestic recovery and to arm herself with atomic and biological weapons.

2. To complete her seizure or domination over what the geopoliticans—following Mackinder and Haushofer—have defined as the controlling "Heartland" of the "World Island."

3. As a means to this end, to eliminate Great Britain as a rival for dominant position in Europe and Asia.

4. As a means to this end, to attempt to keep the United States from throwing its gigantic strength to the support of Great Britain.

5. To foster, by every means short of war, the continuation of confusion everywhere outside the Russian sphere, relying on the drift toward chaos to favor the growth of national Communist parties which may be expected, on attaining power, to gear their foreign policies in with those of the Communist homeland.

II

Each point in this program is important, but I wish to direct attention especially to the middle three. Here will be the real battlefield during the Moscow Conference; out of these three policies will arise the detailed issues which conceivably might divide the world into two armed and arming camps. And any reader who will work out for himself what these issues are likely to be will then be able to decide for himself whether an "inevitable" war is involved. To me, there does not appear to be anything especially enigmatic or mysterious—Mr. Churchill to the contrary—about this Russian program. Yet the three vital points, which I have numbered 2, 3, and 4, have not yet sufficiently been taken into account by American thinking, unless they are what Mr. Lippmann had in mind when, on his return from Europe last spring, he summarized Russian policy as an effort to secure Germany as an ally for a coming war with Britain.

I am astonished that so little attention is paid to the relation of geopolitical ideas to the policies of the Kremlin. However deep their loyalty to the ideological tenets of Leninist communism, the men who control Russian policy pride themselves on their realism. That, essentially, was the issue on which Stalin drove out Trotsky. As realists, they see themselves in a world of power politics, where the survival and triumph of the Communist revolution depends, in their view, on their ability to play the power-politics game as well as, or better than, any other power or combination of powers. Geopolitics provides the blueprints for this game. And geopolitics says that he who controls the heartland rules the world island, while he who controls the world island rules the world.

Now, anyone can discover what the geopolitician means by the "heartland" by looking at the maps in the "bible" of this school of thought, the lectures delivered by Sir Halford J. Mackinder, Oxford professor of geography, before the Royal Institute in 1919, and published in the United States by Henry Holt & Co. under the title "Democratic Ideals and Reality." There can be seen what Hitler, insofar as he came under the influence of Mackinder's disciple, Haushofer, was trying to take. But far more important, there can be seen how close the Soviet Union now is to control over the heartland, and how comparatively small is the fringe area which it still must absorb or dominate in order to fulfill the geopolitical conditions for supremacy over Europe, Asia, and most of Africa.

The process of absorbing this fringe area constitutes the present program of Soviet expansionism. It is succeeding beyond anything even remotely accomplished by Hitler, partly as a military result of the war and partly as a result of the internal crumbling of rotten governments. But the process cannot be completed until Great Britain is pushed out of the domination she has exercised in many parts of Europe and Asia. Again, consult Mackinder's maps and you will see what the tension points are bound to be. This brings us to points 3 and 4 in the basic Russian policy.

Great Britain, the Soviet leaders know, today is just as strong in world politics as the United States says it shall be, and not a whit stronger. (This is not a diplomatic way of describing the present international situation, but we are now concerned with the realities, and the more starkly we see them and state them, the less fuzziness will there be in our minds as we try to deal with them.) Left to deal with Britain alone, Russia has no doubts about the outcome of her struggle for first place in Eurasia. The question which obsesses her leaders, therefore, is whether the United States means to stay out of this struggle. And Molotov at his worst is accordingly not to be regarded as picking a fight with the United States; what Molotov is trying to do is to make the consequences of active American intervention seem so costly that Washington will hesitate before making sweeping commitments to British support.

III

This is a dangerous game, but it is in the familiar tradition of Realpolitik. The American people, who so far have tended to consider everything connected with Russia in terms of almost unrestrained emotion, pro or con, need to learn to look at this policy coolly and to see it for what it is. It is power politics, played with great determination and greater resources than any single European government has been able to command since 1914. There should be nothing obscure about this. The obscurity, such as there is, seems to me to be on our side of the line. For this geopolitical drive from the Kremlin requires, if it is to be intelligently dealt with, that the United States shall make up its mind how far it intends to go in backing up Great Britain and, to a lesser extent, the present government of China. That is the immediate problem with which Russian policy confronts us, and that is the problem we don't want to face.

Perhaps I am simplifying this question of Russian policy too much in my desire to get it out of the category of the enigmatic and the mysterious. For while Russian policy at present is an adventure in power politics, it is not solely that. The Communist revolution is still a reality. The world still teems with hundreds of millions of wretched, desperate poor to whom the Communist promise is as dazzling as any Christian apocalypse. However grim the conditions within the USSR, however uninviting the fate of the individual in the Soviet police state, however much the preoccupations of power politics may have subordinated the socialist zeal of the members of the Politburo, there is still plenty of dynamism in the Communist faith. In a Europe and an Asia which have all but lost every other dynamic faith, this is a fact with which to reckon.

Most of the peoples of the western democracies fear this Communist revolutionary fervor. In the light of the record, they have ample reason to do so. Where Red rule has been established, personal freedom has nearly vanished. Contrary to Marxist doctrine, the development has not been toward the withering away of the power of the state but toward the most ruthless and complete concentration of power in the hands of the state that modern history has known. A simple test by which to understand what is at stake for the democracies is to list the changes that would take place in the U. S. S. R. and its satellite states if the American Bill of Rights should go into effect there.

But if this means that Americans have cause to oppose the expansion of Communist power over democratic regions, it still leaves for decision the question as to how this opposition is to be maintained. Is it to be by a countering resort to power politics—the quarantine method with its final appeal, if necessary, to war? I think we must conclude from recent utterances by the Pope that the Roman Catholic Church holds the answer is yes. By that I do not mean that the Roman Church wants such a war or is working to bring on such a war. The Vatican is well aware of the devastation such a war would involve, and of the critical condition in which the church, along with all the other institutions of a shattered society, would find itself at its close. But the Roman Church feels itself in so exposed a position now that it fears further advances of communism would reduce it, at least in Europe, to a church in chains or in the catacombs. Therefore it believes that, if it finally proves that the Russian drive to complete control over the Heartland cannot be stopped in any other way, it is the moral duty of the western powers—which, in the final analysis, means the United States—to stop it by force.

IV

There are many outside the Roman Church, or any church, who believe the same thing. Influential figures in the United States, in Britain and Canada, in all the countries of western Europe, as well as in China, hold this view. By no means all of them are social reactionaries or even conservatives. What, if not this, was the meaning of President Van Dusen's declaration, in a recent article in Life, that if communism overruns China the United States will have to fight Russia? And at what point, I cannot help wondering, would the Emil Brunner to whom I listened at Cambridge last August draw the line of moral duty beyond which western Christians should not go toward the use of force in opposing any further Communist advance?

I am returning from this journey of exploration more than ever afraid of the threat to human freedom implicit in the totalitarianism of the Communist state. But I am by no means persuaded that freedom can be defended against that danger by war. For one thing I do not believe that any freedom would survive another world war—the first atomic war—no matter for what purposes, or under what slogans, it was fought. Neither do I believe that guns or atom bombs or germ-scattering rockets can long suppress the desperate longing of the exploited poor for an easing of their lot and an opening

of the door of opportunity to their children. And so far as the Christian church is concerned, if it ever allows itself to bless a holy war against Communist advance it is going to find itself speedily entangled with a deplorable crew of allies who will stigmatize it indelibly as a tool of reaction and a complacent partner in exploitation. Precisely that can be seen happening on a restricted scale in Spain today.

I trust that nothing I am writing will be interpreted to mean that I dismiss the problem of dealing with Russia lightly. Some of my leftist friends believe that I regard it as more serious than it is. Because of the astuteness with which the men in the Kremlin are playing their game, and because of the fertile fields which misgovernment and terrible poverty offer their propaganda at so many spots on the Eurasian map, I think that we are going to have a bad time—a very bad time—in our dealings with Russia. Our difficulties are going to be increased by the fact that there is no effective way by which we can reach the Russian people with assurances of our pacific intent. No way, that is, while the Russian newspaper and radio system remains as it now is, short of complete submission to whatever policies the men of the Politburo may support.

Yet difficult as this prospect is, there is no reason to grow panicky. If we will but keep constantly clear in our minds what communism essentially is, we should be able to chart a construction course of our own. Communism is a dynamic revolutionary force promising heaven on earth to the masses. As such, it is a beacon of hope to the hordes of the exploited. But it is also being tested in the laboratory of human experience. In the long run, it cannot avoid the results of that test. For the time being, however, if we believe that human welfare requires that communism shall not continue to expand its power indefinitely, we must prepare to prove that our social and political system can provide more comfort, more security, more opportunity, more liberty, and more satisfaction than any other.

If we can do that, the prospect of a Communist wave engulfing our democratic world will gradually fade away. If we can do that, even an atomically armed Soviet state will hesitate to force a showdown with the rest of the world genuinely devoted to the democratic cause. But if we cannot do that, all our arms and all our techniques will never save us from the rejection which history will visit upon us. For "History," as Auden says, "to the defeated may say alas, but cannot help or pardon."

PAUL HUTCHINSON.

Appropriations for the Customs Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I addressed to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], chairman of one of the subcommittees of the Senate Appropriations Committee, regarding the reduction of the Customs Bureau as contemplated in a bill recently passed by the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 2, 1947.

Hon. GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am sure that your subcommittee has by now had the opportunity to determine the essential facts regarding reduction of the Customs Bureau as contemplated in the bill passed by the House. Having the facts, I am also sure that your subcommittee and, I trust, the full committee will recognize the false economy inherent in a drastic reduction of the customs patrol.

It appears incredible to me that responsible committees of the Congress could possibly favor stripping our borders and coastal areas of the force necessary to prevent a wave of lawlessness, gangsterism, and smuggling. Since it is economy the Congress appears to be concerned about, it strikes me that openly inviting smuggling, aside from the moral and legal factors, is the ultimate in false economy. I am sure the revenues we can expect by effective prevention of smuggling far exceed the cost of maintaining an adequate antismuggling patrol.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

The Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter relative to the housing situation, addressed to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, by Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and R. J. Thomas, chairman of the CIO Housing and Community Development Committee, and vice president of the United Automobile Workers, CIO.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 19, 1947.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: It is a matter of sincere regret that we are unable personally to give you the views of the Congress of Industrial Organizations on housing legislation. Word of the hearings reached us too recently to enable us to attend your hearings. We are writing to assure you that our organization is deeply concerned with the extreme gravity of the housing situation and to urge speedy enactment of comprehensive housing legislation.

The housing shortage today is a national disaster. Crowding and doubling up have grown worse during the past year. The worst sufferers are those who have had to seek new dwellings, notably war workers and veterans. Their plight is even more desperate than a year ago and the strongest measures are needed to cope with the situation.

The CIO pledges its support to the National Housing Commission Act, which is similar in most respects to the bill that passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote last year. The CIO urges your committee however, to add the following necessary provisions in order to reflect the increased need and soaring prices: (1) to include the Douglas-Taylor bill as an amendment to S. 866 in order to fill part of the gap which high construction costs have created between public housing and private housing; (2) to provide 100 percent insurance of loans for private rental projects and mutual or cooperative projects, at interest of 3 percent, and advance loans of 1 percent to assist cooperative groups to get started; (3) to invest the administrator of housing activities with directive powers, on the ground that a strong, central agency will act economically and effectively; (4) to establish a technical director for housing with authority to use funds, previously appropriated for housing, to finance the pioneer developmental and experimental work on factory-built housing in order to reduce costs; and (5) to provide that development funds and 100-percent loans be available to new producers of factory-built housing in order to speed up the modernization of the building industry.

These improvements in S. 866, we are confident, will contribute decisively to reducing housing costs and will hasten fulfillment of the national goal of a decent home for every family in a suitable environment.

We again urge prompt and courageous action to solve the Nation's foremost social and economic problem.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
R. J. THOMAS,
Chairman, CIO Housing and Community Development Committee; Vice President, United Automobile Workers, CIO.

Industry-Wide Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Scranton Times, a fearless, independent, Pulitzer prize-winning newspaper published in Scranton, Pa., on a subject of great current interest—the matter of industry-wide bargaining.

I commend this editorial especially to the attention of members of the Senate Labor Committee. For background purposes, perhaps I should point out that the Scranton Times is beholden to no group, party, or class, and is entitled to be heard with respect.

Incidentally, I might point out that the great anthracite-mining industry, centered almost entirely in my State, is really free enterprise—enlightened free enterprise—in that the operators of these mines were able to sit down with the representatives of their employees and reach agreement on a wage and working contract without the need for Government intervention, seizure, or operation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

So far as the House Labor Committee is concerned it appears now that demands for an end of industry-wide bargaining, heard during the open hearings, will not be approved or attempted. It is felt no workable alternative has been brought forth. Most of the industrialists making the demand to ban industry-wide bargaining appeared to be prompted chiefly by a desire to weaken unions. The strongest demand has come from the southern coal operators, whose record in the part for collective bargaining, it is conceded, has been none too good.

It is noticeable that there has been no demand for such a ban from the anthracite region, where industry-wide bargaining has been the practice since 1900, when John Mitchell came into the region to lead the first strike of hard-coal workers. Industry-wide bargaining in the anthracite region was given official as well as public sanction by the award of the Roosevelt Anthracite Mine Strike Commission back in 1902. That award covered the region and has largely been the basis of all awards since.

It is worthy of mention, although it doesn't prove anything much, that even Representative NIXON, who said he conducted a personal survey in Scranton regarding union and labor sentiment, made no mention of opposition to industry-wide bargaining. Mr. NIXON said the workers, merchants, lawyers, etc., whom he interviewed here were surprisingly frank in their criticism of leaders and need for certain types of regulatory legislation. If that be so their silence regarding industry-wide bargaining may be construed as approval of the practice so long in vogue.

Banning of industry-wide bargaining would, as we understand it, force the union to negotiate separately with companies, like the Glen Alden, Lehigh Valley, Reading, or individual operators. Instead of one general agreement covering the industry there would be a hundred or more. That could easily create a disturbing if not chaotic condition.

The situation in the bituminous industry is somewhat different from the fact soft coal is mined in regions hundreds of miles apart where mining conditions may vary. The anthracite region is confined to a comparatively small area in Pennsylvania. In our opinion industry-wide bargaining, as long practiced, is desirable for the anthracite industry.

Nomination of David E. Lilienthal—Supplemental Notes by Senator McKellar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, in making my address on the Lilienthal nomination I did not confine myself strictly to the notes I had prepared. There were certain other matters not included in the address, and in order to give a complete history, I ask unanimous consent to have the notes published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the notes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, in the more than 30 years' service I have had in the United States Senate, the Lilienthal case is the most remarkable case of confirmation that has been before this body. I served during a small portion of Mr. Taft's term as President, the entire terms of President Wilson, and during the part of a term of Mr. Harding, and the nearly two terms of Mr. Coolidge, the one term of Mr. Hoover, and three and a portion terms of Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and during this term of Mr. Truman.

During that entire time so far as I can recall, I have opposed three nominations. One was Mr. Aubrey Williams, who was shown to be a near Communist, and he was defeated by an overwhelming vote of 52 to 36, on March 23, 1945. Remember that the charges against Mr. Williams was that he was a Communist or near Communist. I have looked over the list of those voting in that case and there are 40 who voted against him who are still in the Senate. They are as follows: BALL, BREWSTER, BRIDGES, BROOKS, BUCK, BUSHFIELD, BYRD, CAPEHART, CAPPER, CONNALLY, CORDON, DONNELL, EASTLAND, FERGUSON, FULBRIGHT, GEORGE, GURNEY, HAWKES, HICKENLOOPER, MCCARRAN, MCCLELLAN, MCKELLAR, MILLIKIN, MOORE, O'DANIEL, OVERTON, REED, REVERCOMB, ROBERTSON of Wyoming, RUSSELL, SALTONSTALL, SMITH, STEWART, TAFT, TYDINGS, VANDENBERG, WHERRY, WHITE, WILEY, and WILSON.

The evidence against Mr. Williams was not half as strong as the evidence against Mr. Lilienthal. It wasn't shown, as it is in this case against Lilienthal, that Mr. Williams was ever guilty of downright dishonesty; that he was ever guilty of serving utility corporations while serving as an officer to regulate in part those very same corporations. It was never shown that Mr. Williams turned out everybody that he thought was inimical to him or that he had gathered around him the great number of dishonest persons and a great number of Communists that Mr. Lilienthal had gathered around him in the TVA, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

THIS CASE

What I have to say about this case I am going to divide into five general parts:

The first subject of discussion will be the career of Mr. Lilienthal up to the time of his appointment to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

This will include his so-called practice of law in Chicago and will include the remarkable story of his research work for the railroads and other public utilities from 1926 to 1932. It was while engaged in this work that Gov. Phil La Follette employed him as commissioner of public service in Wisconsin.

The Wisconsin law forbade him engaging in any other work, but he kept his work in Chicago for 18 months and 15 days and drew income both from the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin and the Commerce Clearing House in Chicago. It was a dishonest and corrupt transaction and the Wisconsin law declared that his commissionership was vacated by his engaging in other work. The fact that he engaged in work directly contrary to what he was doing in Wisconsin made it the more dishonorable and the more dishonest.

In the second place I am going to discuss Mr. Lilienthal's career in the Tennessee Valley Authority from the time of his appointment early in 1933 until he rooted out Dr. A. E. Morgan, the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors, and had himself made Chairman of the Authority. This was in 1938. This phase of the case against Lilienthal is undisputed.

Dr. Morgan testified on two different occasions before the committee. Lilienthal was present and afterward testified concerning another matter, but never mentioned Dr. Morgan or his testimony, which leaves Dr. Morgan's testimony as to the dishonesty and corruption of Mr. Lilienthal completely undenied.

In the third place I am going to discuss Mr. Lilienthal and his career of communism in the TVA. This will include his whole leftist and Communist course in dealing with the affairs of the Authority.

In the fourth place we will show the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars in his trying to establish cooperatives in Tennessee. This will include his running of the Authority for himself, his violation of national general laws and his legislating for the Authority.

In the fifth place, we will discuss his character witnesses and his character in general.

MR. LILIENTHAL

Mr. Lilienthal was born in Morton, Ill., July 8, 1899, of parents who had been born in what is now Czechoslovakia, which is now under Russian domination.

Some newspapers seem to think it was cruel for me to ask where Mr. Lilienthal's parents were born. There was no intent to be cruel. It was not their fault that they were born in what is now a Russian-controlled country. The remarkably cruel thing about this story is that Mr. Lilienthal claimed not to have known where his parents were born and had to have it looked up. Upon my second request several days afterward to know if he had found out where his father and mother were born, he said they were born in Pressburg, Czechoslovakia. Think of it for a moment, Senators. We are asked to confirm a man to what may be the most important office on earth who does not even know where his parents were born and had to look up their records.

Not only that but we are asked to confirm a first-generation American. Our Army discriminates against first-generation Americans and, as I am informed, has uniformly done so heretofore. And here we are discriminating in favor of first-generation Americans whose parents came from what is now Czechoslovakia, always nearby Russia and now dominated by Russia. I do not know whether or not Mr. Lilienthal's parents were ever naturalized citizens of the United States. Apparently he was not asked this question by me or any member of the committee.

Mr. Lilienthal graduated from DePauw University in Indiana. He then went to the Harvard Law School and graduated. He then went to Chicago for the purpose of practicing law. For a short time he was in the office of Mr. Donald Richberg.

He admits that he worked for railroads and other utilities from 1926 to 1931. He claims that in 1931 he went to Madison, Wis., to become public utilities commissioner for Wisconsin. He testified that at that time he had no unfinished lawsuits. The claim that he was a practicing lawyer seems to be utterly without foundation.

In 1926 he entered into a contract with the Commerce Clearing House, Inc., at $20,000 per year to make research and get all decisions and publications favorable to the railroads and other public utilities including power utilities and this work he continued until August 1932, and perhaps later. Remarkable to state, Senators, in his biography in Who's Who for 1944-1945 he shows the following: "Editor, Public Utilities and Carriers Service, 1926-31." In the 1946, or next year edition of Who's Who he very carefully omits from his biography "editor, Public Utilities and Carriers Service." Why did he omit it? Not only that—he testified for days and never mentioned having worked for the Public Utilities and Carriers Service. He never said a word about that to the commit-

tee; he gave all of his other service but never a word about editing Public Utilities and Carriers Service. He deliberately held back that information from the committee that he had worked for the Public Utilities and Carriers Service. It was his principal source of income. How did we find that out? By Mr. Lilienthal's truthfulness in answering questions asked him? Not at all, but by a very remarkable piece of evidence.

MRS. LEITZELL'S TESTIMONY

On February 19, 1947, Mrs. Meads Duncan Leitzell, 1520 North La Salle Street, Chicago, came before the committee and was sworn by Chairman HICKENLOOPER. I had never seen or heard of her before. I did not have the slightest idea what she was going to testify.

She said she was born in St. Louis, Mo., and moved to Chicago in 1928. She held a position as stenographer with the Commerce Clearing House in the Continental-Illinois Bank Building. She testified that at that time Lilienthal was employed by the Commerce Clearing House as editor of Public Utilities and Carriers Service. His office was in the same building as the Commerce Clearing House at first. She soon became his secretary and also employed with her were two others, Harry Booth and Joseph Swidler.

She also testified that she received $24 a week, that Mr. Booth received $28 a week, and that Mr. Swidler, now the general counsel of the TVA, received $17.50 a week, and that Mr. Lilienthal received $20,000 a year. (Record, p. 588 and following.)

She said that the Public Utilities and Carriers Service was a legal publication service dealing with court decisions and legislative bills of interest to utilities and carriers. Mr. Lilienthal paid Mr. Booth, herself, and Mr. Swidler by check. She testified that on February 19. For some remarkable reason which has never been explained or attempted to be explained by Mr. Lilienthal or anyone else, the next morning the amount of the salaries that Mrs. Leitzell testified that she, Mr. Booth, and Mr. Swidler received was omitted from the record.

Later on when I went before the committee, I called to its attention the fact that this evidence was left out and told the committee that I had heard the witness testify to these various amounts. I asked unanimous consent that it be inserted into the record. The committee allowed it to go in—page 782:

"Senator MCKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to put into the record, the testimony from pages 666 to 671 of the House committee hearings, the hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1939–40, volume 1033. Also I seek to correct the record. The other day when a lady was put on the stand by the name of Mrs. Leitzell, certain testimony was given by her. I had never seen her before, and I did not know that she was to go on the stand. I judged when she first started that she was a character witness for Mr. Lilienthal. I just assumed that.

"But she turned out to be a very different kind of a witness, and I have no objection to it. Quite the contrary; I was glad that her evidence was taken.

"But there were several statements that were omitted and the questions, too.

"One was that she stated, as I recall, that she was working for Mr. Lilienthal in her private capacity for the utilities company at a salary of $24 a week, and that a Mr. Booth was working for Mr. Lilienthal in that same capacity in Chicago, for $28 a week, and that a Mr. Swidler, Joseph Swidler, was working for the same concern at $17.50 per week. And as I recall, the chairman asked her if that was the same Swidler that there was so much talk about lately.

"Now, that is my recollection of it. And if the chairman and the committee recollect it as I do, then I would like to have the record corrected to that effect. I tried to get the information from Mrs. Leitzell and did not do it. I want to be perfectly frank about it. I tried to do that when I found it was omitted.

"If not, I would like to have the privilege of introducing testimony of those who were here—some of those who were here—to correct the record in that way.

"The CHAIRMAN. Unless there is some refutation of the statement as to those salaries and the statement made by the Senator, I believe we can let the record stand as the Senator stated it. If there is some contradiction of that, we will correct the record upon testimony."

Mr. Lilienthal was present when Mrs. Leitzell testified and naturally his face was very red and his eyes were down.

I had two witnesses ready to testify that they heard her testimony on the subject. Mr. Lilienthal was present that morning but made no statement about it. The chairman of the committee recollected the matter as I did and asked if there was an objection to putting these salaries back into the record, and there being no objection, the salaries were put back into the record.

"The CHAIRMAN. I said the suggestion was made that the point of your testimony would be that Mr. Lilienthal was receiving pay, or income, or compensation for his services in connection with the Commerce Clearing House activities while he was a member of the Wisconsin State Utilities Commission.

"Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes; as I say here in my statement he did receive checks from the Commerce Clearing House during that time, and I was paid by him. You see, he went to the commission in 1931, and I was still working for him through the summer of 1932.

"The CHAIRMAN. Oh, I see. Now, as I recall it, a question was raised that as an employee of the Wisconsin State body there he was prohibited under the Wisconsin law and the obligations of his job from accepting compensation from other employment any place else. Did you know anything about that?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. I didn't at the time. I know now that that is true.

"The CHAIRMAN. I see. And how long did this compensation from the clearing house continue, so far as you know?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. So far as I know, as long as I worked there. Whether it continued later I do not know.

"The CHAIRMAN. Your employment ended prior to your vacation in the summer of 1933? Is that correct?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes; that is right." (Record, pp. 590–591.)

"Their office was at 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago. After moving into the 1 North La Salle Street office, I continued to act as Mr. Lilienthal's secretary. In that capacity, I prepared manuscripts for the Public Utilities and Carriers' Service. * * * Mr. Lilienthal often wrote his notes and material in shorthand. I could read and transcribe his shorthand notes. I handled his check book, preparing checks for payment of myself, Booth, and Swidler, and for office expenses, such as telephone bills and rent.

"I checked his monthly bank statements against the stubs in his checkbook, which was kept in the office.

"Early in 1931 Mr. Lilienthal was appointed to the Wisconsin commission and went to Madison.

"He continued to maintain his office at 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago. He continued to pay the office rent. He continued to pay Mr. Booth and Mr. Swidler.

"He handled these checks in one of two ways—either he would come into the office and sign the checks or I would mail them to him in Wisconsin for signature.

"After his appointment to the Wisconsin commission, Mr. Lilienthal told me to tell anybody who asked for him that the office was no longer his. I followed his instructions.

"I continued to work for Mr. Lilienthal under these conditions through and beyond the summer of 1932." (Record, p. 590 and following.)

Of course, it will be remembered that Mr. Lilienthal went to Wisconsin as a member of the public-service commission on February 12, 1931.

And again:

"Senator CONNALLY. No; after he went to Madison or before he went to Madison. What was he supposed to do?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. He was the editor of it.

"Senator CONNALLY. Editor of a magazine?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. It was not a magazine, sir.

"Senator CONNALLY. What was it?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. It was a service for attorneys, utilities, and carriers. That was the name of it: Public Utilities and Carriers' Service. It was gotten out in loose-leaf form and sent at different times, after court decisions.

"Senator CONNALLY. To keep them advised as to the status of the affairs of the utilities and the railroads? Is that right?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. More court decisions dealing with utilities and the carriers.

* * * * *

"Senator CONNALLY. Well, you say he continued to receive a salary for it?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. He did.

"Senator CONNALLY. And he continued to pay you for the work on this stuff?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes, sir.

"Senator CONNALLY. Was there any difference in his conduct of the business after he went to Wisconsin, as compared to what he did before?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. Well, surely he was not as active after he went to Wisconsin.

"Senator CONNALLY. Because he was not there all the time?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. Because he was not there.

"Senator CONNALLY. But was there any change in the nature of the work that he was doing?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. The work was the same, as far as the office went.

"Senator CONNALLY. All right." (Record, p. 592.)

And again:

"Senator MCKELLAR. Did he just occasionally come down to your office?

"Mrs. LEITZELL. Yes, sir. That is right." (Record, p. 592.)

Now the Code of Wisconsin provides:

"No commissioner [meaning Public Service Commissioner] shall be pecuniarily interested in any railroad, public utility, or motor carrier, and if any such commissioner shall voluntarily become interested, his office ipso facto shall become vacant."

And again:

"No commissioner shall hold any other office or position of profit or pursue any other business or vocation or serve on or under any committee of any political party, but shall devote his entire time to the duties of his office." (Record, p. 806.)

Immediately I examined into the facts concerning this remarkable testimony. I first found that in 1944 and 1945 edition of Who's Who that Lilienthal put in his biography that he was "Editor, Public Utilities and Carriers' Service, 1926–31."

I looked in the new year's edition, 1946–47, and found that he left out that he was "Editor, Public Utilities and Carriers' Service 1926–31." (Record, p. 636.)

I learned from the secretary of state of Wisconsin that his salary as public-service commissioner was $5,000 a year and that he served as such public-service commissioner until June 30, 1933.

I also learned from the Commerce Clearing House, Inc., that at the same time in violation of the law that he was paid between the dates of February 12, 1931, and August 27, 1932, 1 year, 6 months, and 15 days, the sum of $17,574.

In Wisconsin he took the oath of office:

"Each commissioner shall take and file the official oath and shall in addition thereto swear or affirm that he is not pecuniarily interested in any railroad, and that he holds no other office of profit, nor any position under any political committee or party."

What a record.

MRS. LEITZELL'S EVIDENCE AND LILIENTHAL

Mrs. Leitzell testified on February 19. Lilienthal was present as before stated. I had never seen her until she took the stand and I never saw her after she got off the stand; but evidently Lilienthal saw her, because the next morning there was left out of the record her statements about her own pay and that of Mr. Booth and that of Mr. Swidler and that evidence was put back by unanimous consent as shown on page 782 of the record. I telegraphed Mrs. Leitzell to know why it was left out and her reply was she had not left it out but, of course, the committee had heard it just as I had heard it and just as the audience had heard it. We could not have gotten those figures unless she had so testified and it was put back. Then Lilienthal in some way undertook to doctor the record by referring to a statement in the Appendix 935, marked "Exhibit 17." Of course, this short memorandum from Joseph Volpe, Jr., who signs himself deputy general counsel, of the Atomic Energy Commission has no evidential value at all because he merely says he checked the matter with the stenographer and with others who were present when Mrs. Leitzell testified and that she did not so testify. That was directly contrary to what the committee remembered about it and what I could have shown by witnesses and offered to show by witnesses if it had not been for the committee's action in correcting the record. That is just another one of Lilienthal's slick tricks. The memorandum was put in on page 35 more than 2 weeks after the testimony and after the record had already been corrected by the committee and without any knowledge whatsoever on my part until I read it in the so-called record. You will see these figures are not denied at all on page 935. Of course, they came from Mrs. Leitzell and it was another one of Lilienthal's slick tricks to get Mrs. Leitzell to leave them out. She had been his private secretary and even after she had come here at the request of somebody or on her own initiative and given the facts Lilienthal testified that she was of high character. He never undertook to show by her in any way that her figures were not right or that her statements were not right.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Now, by the way, your former secretary, Mrs. Leitzell, is a woman of fine character?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. I certainly saw nothing to the contrary when she was in my office" (p. 812).

He later said that Mrs. Leitzell was in error in thinking he told her to keep the Chicago employment secret but I have no doubt that was just merely his bad recollection (p. 813). Pages 814, 815, 816, 817 show that Lilienthal was absolutely wrong in his recollection.

As I stated before (record, p. 782), I had asked and received the unanimous consent of the committee to insert the amount of the salaries which were paid to Mrs. Leitzell, Mr. Booth, and Mr. Swidler by Mr. Lilienthal. This pretended denial, on page 935 of the record, is just an attempt to muddle the record. It is a reflection on the committee. The chairman remembered the matter, just as I and several others remembered it, and it will be remembered also that Mrs. Leitzell was not my witness at all.

This is the slick kind of work that Lilienthal has been engaged in all of his life. It is just another evidence of his slickness—not of his ability but of his slickness and his dishonesty.

He got salaries at the same time both from the utilities and from the State of Wisconsin. In this connection he tried to get Governor La Follette to come down and testify, but Governor La Follette didn't do it. He sent a telegram which is in the record (p. 783). I quote:

"Hon. BOURKE HICKENLOOPER,
"United States Senate,
"Washington, D. C.:

"I note the imputation that David Lilienthal was underhandedly serving private interests while on Wisconsin Public Service Commission. When offered the appointment he was active in his profession and naturally had to wind up his affairs. He fully and completely disclosed his affairs and subsequently filed in the Governor's office a copy of the contract which his affairs were wound up. His record as commissioner was outstanding, voted public service, and wholly honorable.

"PHILIP F. LA FOLLETTE."

In other words, I judge from the telegram from Governor La Follette that he refused to come down here when he was as nearby as Pennsylvania; that what he meant was that he didn't catch up with Mr. Lilienthal when he was working for the State of Wisconsin, but, of course, Governor La Follette is too intelligent a man not to know that all of Lilienthal's work was nullified by the Supreme Court and that he did nothing for the State of Wisconsin.

It will be seen that Lilienthal, contrary to the law of Wisconsin, which would prevent him from doing so, conducted his work for the Commerce Clearing House at the same time he was employed by the State of Wisconsin as one of a commission to control the utilities. In other words, he was on both sides of the case. He was for the corporations and against them. He was for the State and against it. And this is the kind of man that some of you Senators are going to vote for. How in the name of heaven you can vote for that kind of man, I cannot understand.

Under the arrangement begun in 1926 he was to get $20,000 a year and was to pay the expenses, which amounted to four or five thousand dollars, and under the new arrangement he was to get about $14,000 a year from the utilities and $5,000 a year from the State of Wisconsin as a public-service commissioner.

Is that the kind of man that you want as the head of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Nor does his double-dealing stop in his young days. Just look at this record where he, or somebody for him, left out part of the testimony (record, p. 782):

Exhibit No. 17
(Record, p. 935)

"UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,
"Washington, D. C., February 28, 1947.

"To: Mr. Fred B. Rhodes, Jr., executive director, Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

"From: Mr. Joseph Volpe, Jr., deputy general counsel.

"Subject: Senator MCKELLAR's suggestion for correction of record with reference to testimony by Mrs. Leitzell.

"On Wednesday, February 26, Senator MCKELLAR asked the committee to correct the record to show that Mrs. Leitzell gave testimony on the salaries paid to her, Mr. Swidler, and Mr. Booth. I have checked this matter with the stenographer and others who were present when Mrs. Leitzell testified, and as well against my own notes. I am certain that Mrs. Leitzell's only reference to compensation was with respect to the amount paid Mr. Lilienthal. This appears on page 1409 of the transcript. We ask that the figures furnished by Senator MCKELLAR be stricken from the record."

Mr. Volpe did not go on the stand. I never heard of him until I got hold of the record today. I have made an investigation, however, about Mr. Volpe. He was appointed deputy general counsel for the Atomic Energy Commission by Mr. Lilienthal at a salary of $9,000 a year. I quote from Senator BRICKER's statement, based on FBI records: "Joseph Volpe, Lilienthal appointee as deputy general counsel * * * has a brother who is a Communist Party member, and delayed informing the Commission of the radical records of two other appointees."

Lilienthal waited 2 weeks, namely, March 3, 1947, after the case was closed. The committee felt he ought to make some explanation of that testimony and sent for him, and here was his answer. He read a letter from Commerce Clearing House, Inc., signed by William Kixmiller, president, and accepted by David E. Lilienthal. This was a week prior to his going to work for the State of Wisconsin as railroad and public utility commissioner.

COMMERCE CLEARING HOUSE, INC.,
February 5, 1931.

DEAR MR. LILIENTHAL: Following your report to me yesterday that you would like to accept the position of member of the Wisconsin Railroad Commission, provided your appointment is confirmed, I am glad to inform you that we should be willing to give you a leave of absence for a year, with an option to renew the absence the second year.

It is understood that you will render no personal services for us during this period and will receive no compensation from us. The editorial work heretofore performed by you and carried on in your office by assistants under your direction is to be continued by them during your absence, pursuant to this arrangement.

Your present weekly check from us of $385 will be reduced initially to $240 per week. This check will be drawn directly to you to avoid unnecessary bookkeeping, and is to reimburse you for liabilities (such as rent, salaries, etc.) heretofore assumed by you primarily to carry on your work. In addition to such reimbursement, these weekly checks drawn to you during your absence will include a margin above reimbursement as part payment for your past services, particularly in the training of assistants to carry on this editorial work. We estimate this sum to be $2,000 per year, though it may be less. Your right to the reimbursement of payments above provided for is not and will not be in any way affected by the extent to which we market the service.

COMMERCE CLEARING HOUSE, INC.,
WM. KIXMILLER, *President.*

Accepted:
DAVID E. LILIENTHAL (p. 808).

Lilienthal would never have put this letter in unless the committee had sent for him and had him explain it and is there any explanation about it? It is precisely what I claimed and what Mrs. Leitzell said it was, that he worked for this Commerce Clearing House, Inc., which was a utility company organization, for 18 months and 15 days after he was appointed by Governor La Follette as commissioner of Wisconsin utilities in violation of the Wisconsin statute, and he undertook to make some kind of explanation on page 809. There is not a particle of doubt about his being employed both by the utility companies and against the utility companies in Wisconsin.

No man ought to be appointed to any Federal office or confirmed to any Federal office who would violate the Wisconsin law as he did; who would violate his oath of office; deliberately swear to a falsehood, and he knew it to be a falsehood when he took the oath; who would violate every propriety of honesty and fair dealing in the world and work for and against the utilities. If he would violate the law when he was 30 years of age, if he would disregard all the proprieties of honest dealing when he was 30 years of age, if he would try to cover up his acts when he was 30 years of age, if he

would falsely swear when he was 30 years of age, he would do it when he was 47 or 48. It was another one of his slick tricks.

Lilienthal seems to be a genius for advertising himself. When he got that place in Wisconsin he at once got very popular in politics and in advertising himself in politics. His first act and his most famous act in Wisconsin was to cut down the telephone rates. He was going to save the people of Wisconsin millions of dollars in telephone rates. It created quite a furor. He was with the people. He was aiding the people, and the gullible newspapers were singing his praises all over the State. He got the Commission to lower the rates and the companies fought the order. They had to put up a lot of money. At one time I think the record shows they had $5,000,000 deposited in escrow in order to pay back the savings to the people in the event the telephone company lost the case, but the Supreme Court of Wisconsin finally held that the reduction in rates ordered by Lilienthal was illegal and Lilienthal never saved the people of Wisconsin a nickel.

While Lilienthal was doing this research work for the utility companies in Chicago he claimed to be practicing law. He especially claimed his practice of law in his biographies he gave, but inadvertently he himself testified that he had no practice in Chicago.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Now, Mr. Lilienthal, what lawsuits did you have unfinished when you went to the Wisconsin commission in 1931?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. My best recollection is that there were no lawsuits in which I was counsel or party at that time" (p. 830).

He was only a lawyer when he came to advertising himself. Evidently, however, his Communist tendencies, his leftist weaknesses, got him appointed on the Tennessee Valley Authority.

DR. A. E. MORGAN

Dr. A. E. Morgan had been president of Antioch College in Ohio. He was Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority for more than 5 years. He knew Mr. Lilienthal intimately as Lilienthal was appointed soon after Dr. Morgan was. Dr. Morgan appeared in answer to a subpena from the committee and among other things testified as follows:

"Senator MCKELLAR. From your knowledge of how Mr. Lilienthal conducted himself in the TVA while you were there, do you think that he would be a proper man or a safe man to put in as head of what may be probably the most important organization ever attempted by man?

"Dr. MORGAN. No" (p. 352).

He then gave his reasons.

As early as 1940, Dr. A. E. Morgan stated of Mr. Lilienthal, "The difficulty I found in dealing with Mr. Lilienthal—the difficulties were of two kinds: One arose out of his personal desire to be irresponsibly in power." What a true prophet Dr. Morgan was at that time.

We now have this selfsame man Lilienthal actually seeking the most powerful place on earth without the slightest aptitude for holding such a position. We find a man who believes in the government of men and not of laws. He has been seeking power from the time he left Harvard. He is seeking power now, and he says of this power, "Those who control energy control people." (Progressive Farmer, October 1945.) He no doubt feels that if he is given this power he will control the world.

If Mr. Lilienthal is an honest man and has been an honest man, who would be his best witnesses? Someone who knew him as a young man. No such witness has appeared.

Then the men he was employed by—men of the Commerce Clearing House—who paid him a handsome salary to work for the power companies. None appeared.

Then came his appointment to the TVA. His associates there should be his witnesses if he were an honest man. We heard one of those associates, Dr. A. E. Morgan, and Dr. Morgan denounces him as one of the crookedest crooks he had ever known, after his testimony is boiled down. Does his associate, whom he seems absolutely to control, Dr. H. A. Morgan, appear? Not at all. He never utters a word, though he has always voted with him. What can the agreement between those two be?

And who are the rest?

James P. Pope, a former Senator in this body. Does he appear for him? Not a word. He made speeches for him down in Tennessee, but not a word has he said on the witness stand.

Who are the next? His various attorneys down there. Have we had a word from one of these? Not a word. Mr. James Lawrence Fly was one of his attorneys. He does not come forward to stand up for his chief. Mr. W. C. Fitts, of Birmingham, also former general counsel of the TVA. Does he appear? Not at all. Joseph C. Swidler, present general counsel, whom he raised from a $1,020 salary to a $12,000 salary per year. Does he appear? And Herbert S. Marks, one of the celebrated foursome in the TVA, known as Herb Marks, Joe Swidler, Mel Siegel, and Dave Lilienthal. Among themselves it was "Herb, Joe, Mel, and Dave." Not one of them appeared. Mel does not appear. Joe does not appear. Herb does not appear. What has become of these men when Dave is in so much trouble? It is true that Mel was a well-known Communist. It is true that Joe never got a license to practice in the Federal courts, where nearly all the litigation of the TVA is, until last July, when he had already been general counsel of the TVA for 2 years, but that would seem to make him come forward the quicker, but never a line of testimony from Joe.

Mr. Lilienthal says he is not in politics. Therefore, he ought to be able to get Democrats and Republicans alike for him. Whom did he get? Did he get former Governor McAlister, or former Governor Cooper, or Governor McCord, of Tennessee, to come and testify for him? He and his subordinates were constantly before the Tennessee Legislature asking for various things and the passage of various laws. Did any of the legislature come forward? None at all. Congressman JENNINGS and Congressman GORE and Congressman KEFAUVER and Congressman PRIEST, all of whom testified for Clapp, did not testify for Lilienthal. Clapp got two Senators from Alabama and maybe one or two Congressmen from Alabama, but none of them testified for Lilienthal. They may have heard of his working both for the power companies and the State of Wisconsin as public-utilities commissioner at one and the same time? Did he get any businessmen in Knoxville? Did he get any businessmen in Chattanooga? Did he get any businessmen in Nashville? Did he get any businessmen from any part of the State? Did he get any farmers from Tennessee? They were all conspicuous by their absence. Did he get the head of the farm organizations of which Mr. O'Neal is the president? He got a telegram from O'Neal that means absolutely nothing. Did he get any lawyers for him? Did he get any doctors for him? Did he get any churchmen for him? Yes, he got two priests who were off-shoots of the Catholic Church, but were not orthodox Roman Catholics.

TESTIMONY OF DR. A. E. MORGAN

The nominee Lilienthal has taken strange positions throughout this hearing. One of the strangest of his many strange positions is his failure to in any way in the world to mention the testimony of Dr. A. E. Morgan. He treats it just as though it were not given at all, and yet Dr. Morgan served with him from May 1933 to 1938, on the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and during that time, Dr. Morgan was chairman of the Board. Dr. Morgan said:

"The difficulty that I found in dealing with Mr. Lilienthal—the difficulties—were of two kinds. One arose out of his personal desire to be irresponsible in power. I think I could have gotten along, so far as that was concerned. But I was known to the world as Chairman of the TVA, and representations were made to the public by the TVA as the TVA, which I considered to be, to use a short word, 'dishonest'" (p. 802).

"And so far as the friction due to his personal ambitions was concerned, I might have gotten along with that, but there came times when it was impossible for me to be quiet while the TVA was making representations, and making me a part of those representations; and therefore I came to a point where I could no longer be quiet under these circumstances.

"There are those two kinds of difficulties I had, and I would like to keep them separate. One made my work very difficult. The other put an obligation on me that I couldn't avoid. Those are somewhat separable" (pp. 802–803).

I want the Senate to understand that Mrs. Meads Duncan Leitzell was not the only one in this record to declare Mr. Lilienthal a liar. Dr. Morgan, like Mrs. Leitzell, not only declared him a liar but furnished the proof when he said:

"I think it was in the latter part of 1936 that Mr. Lilienthal presented to myself and H. A. Morgan, and some others, H. A. Morgan being the third member of the Board, a letter he had written to Mr. Willkie. This letter started out: 'Confirming our recent conversation,' and then went on to say that, 'You do not agree to cooperate with us except on the basis that you have a monopoly of power distribution in all the vast area of the four States in which you operate.'

"From memory I can't quote the letter exactly, but this is the substance of it: That the only condition under which you will cooperate is that we do not compete with you in the great areas in the four States in which you operate, and you insist on maintaining a monopoly in that area."

And then Dr. Morgan continued:

"And he asked, on the basis of the conversation with Mr. Willkie, which was confirmed in that letter to Mr. Willkie, that the relationships of the TVA and the Commonwealth & Southern be canceled; that this exchange of power and agreement not to raid each other's territory, etc., be canceled.

"I took this position: That this was a very momentous action to take. By that time Mr. Lilienthal's word had become not to be final to me. I had had no contact with Mr. Willkie, or practically no contact, since May 1933. * * *

"* * * When Mr. Lilienthal asked the Board to discontinue the relationships, I said I thought that was a big step to take, and before it was taken I would like to have the whole Board with Mr. Willkie, so we could all hear him directly on that point" (p. 805).

The meeting took place.

"At the time of the meeting, Mr. Willkie told me that after sending that letter Mr. Lilienthal called him by telephone and told him that letter was a mistake and there was no meeting necessary. But Mr. Willkie told me that he had suspicions also, and he insisted on coming to the meeting.

"At that meeting I asked Mr. Willkie if this letter represented his views. He said it did not at all represent his views, and he told me that the conversation supposedly confirmed in that letter had never taken place" (p. 806).

Dr. Morgan further states:

"I might say that when Mr. Lilienthal handed us this letter saying, 'This is to confirm our conversation,' he told me that he sent copies to the President and to Senator La Follette and others saying, 'This confirms our conversation,' so that anybody receiving that letter would assume of course that it

was valid, because it was written to a man confirming a conversation.

"Mr. Willkie told me no such conversation took place, and that that did not represent his attitude in the least" (p. 806).

Dr. Morgan then quotes Mr. Willkie as saying:

"The Commonwealth & Southern will sell to the TVA its whole system, or the system in any State, or any part of any system in any State. It will sell part of it now, and part of it later. The fact that some is bought now doesn't prevent other parts being bought later" (p. 807)

Thus here were two other men, both Dr. A. E. Morgan and Mr. Wendell Willkie, testifying that Lilienthal is a common liar. Lilienthal's double-dealing and dishonesty is shown by the following statement of Dr. Morgan:

"I saw a letter written out of Mr. Lilienthal's office to, I think. Bessemer, Ala., to this effect:

" 'We are estopped from pushing the extension of power while this agreement with the Commonwealth & Southern is on, but we can accomplish the same purpose in another way. If you will write us and ask us for questions and ask us for help, we can't refuse those requests. And so long as the initiative comes from you, then we can get the same results without formally violating that agreement' (pp. 810–811).

"Later on in an investigation there was no such letter found in the files (p. 811).

"Another evidence of Lilienthal's double-dealing and dishonesty. And further, a Mr. Pierce had charge of the files and Mr. Pierce stated to Dr. Morgan, 'my material was there, but H. A. Morgan's communications and Lilienthal's communications were just not there. They weren't in the files when they were called for. They just didn't exist in the files' " (p. 812).

Lilienthal claims that he was never in politics. Notwithstanding that it was shown that he very actively engaged in politics when he was enjoying a place under Gov. Phil La Follette and another one under the utility companies at the same time. Dr. Morgan said this:

"The TVA Act provided that no political appointments should be made; that if any were made the Director involved should be dismissed.

"Mr. Lilienthal undertook to make such apointments. The head of our personnel department and his assistant undertook to refuse to make such appointments. They undertook, I think honestly and sincerely, to uphold the law.

"Various subterfuges were used by Mr. Lilienthal to secure such appointments.

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, will you differentiate and explain what you mean by 'patronage appointments,' just so we can get it straight? Do you mean appointments without regard to merit or particular qualifications for the job?

"Dr. MORGAN. I mean appointments that would not be made on the basis of merit; that were made because of political considerations. * * * Now, with respect to some of these things—those things are not done by record generally—I knew personally of some of them. In one case, there is a definite record. Mr. Floyd Reeves, who was then in charge of our personnel department, came in to me one day with a long communication written by his assistant, Mr. Clapp, who has recently been general manager. Mr. Reeves said, 'These political appointments have got to stop, or I am going to leave the TVA.'

"I asked him for evidence of it. He gave me a long letter written by Mr. Clapp, outlining case after case of political appointments."

Why, Lilienthal swore before the Appropriations Committee that I had never asked him for any appointment or patronage of any kind. Yet during all of these hearings he has been trying to show that the reason I was against him was because he had refused me patronage. This is nothing but a filthy falsehood, made by a double-dealing, dishonest, corrupt, falsifying individual, whose record is a disgrace to the public service and yet it is sought to appoint him to probably the most powerful office in the world. Here was Lilienthal's philosophy as stated by Dr. Morgan:

"The CHAIRMAN. Do I conclude from your testimony that you indicate that Mr. Lilienthal supported these political-pressure appointments without regard to merit, on occasions?

"Dr. MORGAN. Yes. But I would say this: That there was a certain maxim that I never heard him repeat, but it was carried out: Whatever will bring approval, do yourself; whatever may bring disapproval, do through another" (p. 818).

A better estimate of Lilienthal's actions could not be stated.

Dr. Morgan then testifies to a letter that he got from Mr. Arnold Kruckman, a TVA employee in the Washington office.

The letter said this: "Congressmen and Senators are displeased with you because you will not give them patronage appointments. Mr. Lilienthal is on good terms with them. They have decided to work through him and not through you. And as an arrangement, Senator Bachman's secretary is going to be taken to be Mr. Lilienthal's secretary, and the Congressmen will work through Mr. Robinson as Mr. Lilienthal's secretary, and you will have no contact with Congressmen. It will be Mr. Robinson as Mr. Lilienthal's secretary.

"That is the way contacts will be made in the future. And part of Mr. Robinson's job will be to discredit you" (pp. 829 and 830).

And this is the record of a purist on patronage.

Another characteristic of Mr. Lilienthal was stated by Dr. Morgan:

"I found that there were people very much interested in developing an independent source of aluminum. Will Mayo, who is Henry Ford's chief engineer, was one, and I think there was a Reynolds Co. that was interested, and I proposed the making of a study of the low-grade bauxites of Alabama.

"Mr. Lilienthal absolutely vetoed that. He said, 'The Aluminum Co. is too big and too powerful. We must not disturb them in any way' " (pp. 838 and 839).

And again:

"We had had a contract with the Aluminum Co., at very low rates, and I felt that this was a further reduction of price to the Aluminum Co. We were going to spend about a million dollars, not openly going to the Aluminum Co., but strengthening the line by going many miles around to them" (p. 839).

This was another evidence of Lilienthal's duplicity and slickness. Lilienthal was always on the side of the Aluminum Co. (pp. 841–842).

His lobbying at the Capitol is shown on page 842. He told Dr. Morgan that he would support a proposed amendment to the TVA Act to give the TVA the power to integrate the various power elements of the system, when as a matter of fact he had been here in Washington urging that the legislation not be passed (pp. 841–845).

I asked Dr. Morgan this question:

"From your knowledge of how Mr. Lilienthal conducted himself in the TVA while you were there, do you think that he would be a proper man or a safe man to put in as head of what may be probably the most important organization ever attempted by man?

"Dr. MORGAN. No" (pp. 857–858).

And again:

"Senator MCKELLAR. Well, let me ask you this: If you were a Senator here, knowing Mr. Lilienthal as you do, would you vote for his confirmation?

"Dr. MORGAN. No" (p. 858).

THE BERRY CASE

Dr. Morgan then testified about the Berry case:

"Dr. MORGAN. Mr. Berry acquired a considerable amount of mineral rights on lands that were to be condemned for the Clinch River Reservoir, the Norris Reservoir. He claimed very substantial damages on those.

"Senator MCKELLAR. More than a million dollars, was it not?

"Dr. MORGAN. I think so. I felt that those claims were improper. And I felt that there was a constant sort of sidestepping, not a facing of them directly but a side-stepping, something the same as what I had seen in the Aluminum Co. case. I had kept still in one case, and it seems to me that unless something were brought out in the open, I believed that was going to slip by, and he would just get what he asked for, or part of it, by default. So I testified against him in that matter" (pp. 859 and 860).

Berry, after he found out the TVA was going to condemn the land, had bought up the mineral claims on the lands that were to be condemned. And then he claimed more than a million dollars on account of it. Lilienthal wanted to pay him $25,000 or more. It was a dishonest and corrupt transaction.

DR. A. E. MORGAN'S TESTIMONY

Dr. A. E. Morgan, the man who built the dams, the chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority from the beginning until Lilienthal pushed him out early in 1938. (P. 329 of the hearings.)

Dr. Morgan was the engineer who built the dams. Without his engineering ability no such work would have ever been done. Lilienthal knew nothing about engineering. He was a soldier of fortune. He had been educated as a lawyer but had never practiced actually. But Dr. A. E. Morgan had been an engineer all of his life and had been president of Antioch College in Ohio. He was strong-minded, self-willed, splendidly educated, a great engineer, a wonderful worker, and with the money that the Congress afforded him, he built the TVA dams. He built the organization of engineers under him.

In his testimony he said that Lilienthal had not been there 2 weeks after his appointment before he began to formulate plans to root him out after the dams were built. His first step in the rooting-out process was for Lilienthal to make friends with Dr. H. A. Morgan, who took practically no interest in the dams and probably held the place only to draw the salary. (That is the only reason I ever knew for his having been on the Authority.) Lilienthal also began to make arrangements with the aluminum company, a very powerful institution nearby, and from that time on until he rooted Dr. A. E. Morgan out he was constantly in some kind of scheme or undertaking to belittle or injure Dr. A. E. Morgan. All of this will be found in Dr. Morgan's testimony on pages 344 and following of the hearings.

Lilienthal was constantly running up to President Roosevelt telling him big stories about what he was doing and just as big stories about what Dr. Morgan was not doing (p. 356).

Dr. A. E. Morgan testified beginning on February 11. Lilienthal was there. All of his men under him were there. He heard all of Dr. Morgan's testimony. He even appeared on the stand after Dr. Morgan had testified, but he never remotely mentioned Dr. Morgan's testimony. Dr Morgan said things about Lilienthal that should forever disqualify him from holding any office under our Government or any other respectable Government.

He charged him with (p. 356):

"Inaccurate and misrepresentative reports to the President, the Congress, and the public.

"Mismanagement of the power program.

"Lack of candor in statements to Congress and the public concerning the power program.

"Improper and misleading accounting, reporting, and publicity in reference to the 'Yardstick' program."

Page 357:

"Collusion, conspiracy, and mismanagement in administration.

"Subservience to political and other special interests.

"Carrying on public relations so as to create definitely misleading impressions, with such skill and strategy that charges of direct and open falsehood was evident.

* * * * *

"If there were but occasional instances these could be dismissed * * * as lapses * * * unless there is understanding of this habit of * * * half truths, misrepresentations, and near falsehoods.

"* * * Lilienthal's lying claims to President Roosevelt * * * making out that his management had doubled the sale of electric power, when only a slight over-all average increase above pre-TVA sales could be shown

"* * * Lilienthal's lies when stating TVA power started from scratch."

And again:

"Trickery by Lilienthal's using revenue figures, which ignore the heavy capital cost of the installations."

Morgan here quotes the President's words: "There could be no more serious breach of their fiduciary duty than making willfully false reports"—and proves Lilienthal had been doing just that (p. 358).

"I have stated (such misrepresentations of Lilienthal) are not casual or incidental. They are habitual. Have stated they are made to the President and the Congress and the public."

Again:

"This is the Hamilton case—and none of the Insull men are accused or charged or suspected in any way. Lilienthal made detailed charges on this which enabled Chairman to make clear in detail the smears Lilienthal planted on him in public."

And again:

"On only one occasion in the entire life of TVA did Lilienthal or H. A. Morgan ever support Chairman Morgan in a divided vote. Dr. H. A. Morgan invariably voted with Lilienthal on power matters and Lilienthal invariably voted with Morgan on his fertilizer projects" (p. 359).

And again:

"I would like to just mention this thing that I came up against. At the time of Mr. Lilienthal's appointment for the second term, the President asked me to talk about it. I went to him. I told him I didn't approve of Mr. Lilienthal's reappointment. He agreed with me; said that he had come to the same impression himself, independently" (p. 360).

And again:

"Mr. Lilienthal * * * getting himself appointed sole negotiator, carried on confidential negotiations with Aluminum Co., for the sale of power * * * resulted in selling to Aluminum Co. almost one-third of the total power capacity then available. He used as his personal and confidential secretary the former personal and confidential secretary of the southern manager of the Aluminum Co." (p. 361).

Again:

"Since the first few weeks of the existence of TVA Mr. Lilienthal * * * has maintained a steady campaign of propaganda to discredit me * * * (he) has endeavored to create suspicion in the minds both of people in and out of TVA and Members of Congress that the Chairman was in secret collusion with the utility interests" (p. 361).

Again:

"This behavior of the other two directors of determining far-reaching and fundamental Board policies without informing the Chairman or reporting to the Board, has been so general that it will be dealt with in detail in another memorandum after access to records is available."

And again:

"Thus, Mr. Lilienthal maintained an attitude of antagonism and bitterness in the public mind, not by telling the truth * * * but by deliberate deception of the public."

Again:

"Chairman Morgan insisted on meetings with Wendell Willkie before final negotiations with Commonwealth & Southern Corp., and Lilienthal agreed by privately advising Willkie not to meet the Chairman.

"To make deliberately false statements [by Lilienthal] in such a letter and send copies to other persons without the knowledge of the person to whom the letter was [supposedly] addressed * * * would be discreditable strategy.

"In plain language Mr. Lilienthal * * * saying that I the Chairman of the TVA Board proposed to give some corporation a monopoly of TVA power * * * a violation of the act and my oath * * * I never considered or made any such proposal."

And again:

"Year after year Commonwealth & Southern Corp. showed its willingness to sell parts of its properties to TVA. Year after year Mr. Lilienthal had confused that issue in the public mind. (When there is no way out for Mr. Lilienthal he frequently excuses all as terminology)" (p. 362).

And again:

"The letter to Mr. Willkie [confirming understandings] with copies sent to the President and the news release of February 2, 1937, are not isolated falsifications. They are part of a program of misrepresentations running through the life of TVA.

"Thus it is not any single act of misrepresentation and deceit from which the TVA suffers but a conflicting habit of misrepresentation which is greatly in conflict with public interest."

And again:

"Then the No. 5 charge of collusion, conspiracy, and mismanagement in administration * * * that is one of the major difficulties * * * [also] there has been a disregard for the intent of Congress and a misrepresentation in reporting to Congress, to the appropriation committees."

And again:

"Describes how Lilienthal denies efforts to take electric business away from private companies * * * and yet does that very thing very systematically and thoroughly * * * misleading Congress and getting around the law" (p. 363).

"This case clearly shows the hypocrisy and insincerity of Mr. Lilienthal's methods * * * The difference between Mr. Lilienthal's statement and mine is striking."

And again:

"Here we find Mr. Lilienthal taking liberties for himself while he would deny a far more modest position to the Chairman * * * The thing he accuses me of doing is what he has done himself. That is the kind of moral conduct—

"That kind of attitude, with which, when you have to work with it, makes a clean-cut job very difficult."

And again:

"Cites long memo on allocation of costs. Quotes the President holding same ideas as chairman and also Manly, Chairman of Federal Power Commission—all opposed to Lilienthal's plan * * * shows Lilienthal's lies" (p. 365).

And again:

"The Berry case—detailed—showing how Chairman dismissed the whole thing for lack of bona fides, while Lilienthal contracted to adjudicate its equities, thus admitting values, and only Chairman's stout resistance prevented the robbery of millions of dollars" (p. 365).

This evidence is not contradicted in this record. If it had been untrue it could have been contradicted by Dr. H. A. Morgan; it could have been contradicted by Lilienthal himself. It might have been contradicted by the General Counsel. It could have been contradicted but he did not see fit to undertake to testify about it himself or to have anybody else testify about it. His various attorneys or solicitors could have testified; any number of others could have testified to the truth or untruth of the matter but not a line of testimony. I am sorry all the Senators could not have been present and could have looked Lilienthal in the face while Dr. Morgan was testifying. His head was hung down and his face was exceedingly red but he never mentioned Dr. Morgan or his evidence. Of course, he knew that every word that Dr. Morgan had said about him was true. He has been a slick one all of his life. He was "slick" in Chicago and Wisconsin and he has been "slick" all of the time he was with the TVA. In his failure in even attempting to disprove Dr. Morgan's statement he reminds me of the story of two Negro men I knew when I was a boy. Both of them were great friends of mine—Frank Mills and Sam Youngblood. They were brothers-in-law and had bought little homes on the same side of the hill not over a hundred yards apart. They had a fence between them. Frank was very scary. Sam was a brave man and a good fighter. Sam wanted to whip Frank for some "slick" conduct on Frank's part but he could not get Frank to come out of his house. So one morning Sam undertook to force Frank to come out. He began to tear down the line fence between Sam's house and Frank's house. He tore several panels off the fence but Frank would not come out. He then went around to the back yard and got his cows and steers and turned them in on Frank's corn, and the corn was fine corn, too. When he did that, Frank came to the door and yelled out at the top of his voice, "Ah, Sam, damn you Sam, I see you Sam, but I ain't going down there." Then, turning to his wife, who was Sam's sister, he said: "Sarah, Sam's steers are in my corn, but I ain't going down there." And he shut the door and let the steers eat the corn. That is Mr. Lilienthal's position about Dr. Morgan's testimony. He would not go in that "field." Every opportunity was given him to show he was not what Dr. Morgan said he was—a schemer, a falsifier, an untruthful man, a straight-out liar, ever scheming to get something for himself—but Mr. Lilienthal did not get in the field of Dr. Morgan's truthfulness.

LILIENTHAL AND COMMUNISM

Mr. President, I do not know whether Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist or not. He testified he was not, but after hearing Lilienthal testify before the Appropriations Committee innumerable times, after hearing him testify in this case, after learning all that I have about his history and record, I am frank to say I would not believe him on oath. I have never charged that he was a member of the Communist Party, but he is so slick, so double-dealing, so double-appearing, ever trying to agree with the opinions of anyone whom he wants to curry favor with, he might well be a member of that party. I believe one of the tenets of the party is for its members to deny being a member when charged with being a member. From all I have read that he wrote and from all the testimony I have heard him recite on this subject, I believe his every sympathy, his every real sentiment, his every real inclination, his every belief in government or the lack of government is communistic.

Since he has been with the TVA, that organization has become a nest of Communists, and there can be no doubt but what he has fostered communism or has closed his eyes to communism and that he was at heart delighted to see communism flourish in the TVA as well as everywhere else.

I have never heard of his denouncing communism in any manner, shape, or form in his speeches or in any of his writings.

He was a public sponsor of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in 1940. He made a speech at the convention. There was not anything in the speech of any consequence, but his merely making a speech at the convention shows his interest in the Communist Party, for everybody knows now, and most people knew then, that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was a well-known Communist-front organization. It was one of the most active Communist-front organizations in the country and everybody knows about it and Lilienthal was a sponsor for it. And however dense he may claim to be, even Lilienthal has sense enough to know it was a Communist-front organization.

On Wednesday, September 6, 1939, Earl R. Browder general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, appeared at a public hearing before the Dies committee in Washington, D. C., and during his testimony Mr. Browder stated (p. 4482 of vol. 7 of the published hearings of the Dies committee), that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was a "transmission belt formerly known as United Front Organization of the Communist Party" along with various other organizations which Mr. Browder specified by name (p. 4483 of this record) including the National Lawyers Guild.

He not only signed the call for the Southern Conference for Human Welfare convention but he had Clapp and Pope sign it.

Not only was he a working member and a sponsor for the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in 1940 but also he had been for years a member of the National Lawyers Guild of the CIO which is another Communist-controlled outfit from which Judge Nathan R. Margold, then Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, former Assistant Secretary of State Adolph Berle and Justice Ferdinand Pecora of the New York Supreme Court resigned, and in resigning Mr. Berle had this to say:

"The National Lawyers Guild was formed in the hope that expression might be given to the liberal sentiment in the American bar.

"It is now obvious that the present management of the Guild is not prepared to take any stand which conflicts with the Communist Party line. Under these circumstances, and in company, I think, with most progressive lawyers, I have no further interest in it." (Washington Times-Herald, June 5, 1940.)

So far as the record shows Lilienthal is still a member of the National Lawyers Guild, unless he has resigned recently.

[From the New York Times of June 6, 1940]

"BERLE DROPS OUT OF LAWYERS GUILD—SAYS GROUP IS NOT PREPARED TO TAKE STAND CONFLICTING WITH RED PARTY LINE—ORGANIZATION DEFENDED—VICE PRESIDENT HOLDS CHARGE BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE IS UNJUSTIFIED

"WASHINGTON, June 5.—A. A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, has resigned from the National Lawyers Guild and from the District of Columbia chapter of the Guild because, he said, the Guild 'is not prepared to take any stand which conflicts with the Communist party line.'

"The resignation was submitted on June 3 to John Gutknecht, president of the National Lawyers Guild, of the Hotel Roosevelt, New York, and Merle D. Vincent, president of the District of Columbia chapter. Mr. Berle in his letter said:

" 'I hereby resign from the National Lawyers Guild and also from the District of Columbia chapter, resignation to take effect at once.

" 'The National Lawyers Guild was formed in the hope that expression might be given to the liberal sentiment in the American bar.

" 'It is now obvious that the present management of the guild is not prepared to take any stand which conflicts with the Communist Party line. Under these circumstances, and in company, I think, with most progressive American lawyers, I have no further interest in it.'

"JACKSON ALSO OUT

"WASHINGTON, June 5.—The resignation of A. A. Berle, Jr., from the National Lawyers Guild followed those of Attorney General Robert H. Jackson and Nathan Margold, solicitor of the Interior Department.

"Robert Kenney, recently elected president of the guild, said that Mr. Berle apparently had been prompted by a 'misapprehension' He added that the guild was 'essentially a professional, not a pressure, organization,' and asked that the organization be not condemned because of the actions of a small minority.

"SEES CHANGE UNJUSTIFIED

"Referring to Mr. Berle's resignation and his reason for doing so, Osmond K. Fraenkel, vice president of the National Lawyers Guild and president of its New York chapter, said yesterday:

" 'I know of no action of the guild which justifies any such statement. The guild has consistently adhered to the principles formulated when it was founded, to which Mr. Berle subscribed, and has championed democracy and all aspects of civil liberties.

" 'The guild has placed itself on record as opposed to dictatorships and aggression. Certainly the action of the national executive board of the guild, taken last December, in denouncing the Soviet invasion of Finland shows that there is no substance to Mr. Berle's position.

" 'The convention just held also recognized that the United States must be safeguarded in every possible way against invasion or aggression.' "

[From the New York Times of February 23, 1939]

"RED ISSUE SPLITS LAWYERS GUILD—PECORA LEADS ATTACK ON RADICALS—THREAT OF MASS RESIGNATIONS BACKS JUSTICE'S PLEA TO CURB COMMUNIST ELEMENT—GROUP BLOCKS CENSURE OF ISMS

"A threatened serious breach in the ranks of the National Lawyers Guild, which has a membership of 3,400 lawyers and judges representing nearly every State in the Union, was reported from Chicago yesterday. The rift was said to have developed on Lincoln's Birthday at the start of the 4-day convention of the guild in that city, in an unexpected speech against radicalism by the retiring president, Supreme Court Justice Ferdinand Pecora, of New York. Justice Pecora's term was for 1 year.

"As a result, it was said, a considerable part of the membership banded on the Sunday before the close of the convention to take open steps to end the charged Communist control, evidenced particularly, it was contended further by the protestants, in the control of the chapters in New York and Washington.

"It also was revealed that at a closed meeting of the executive committee of the guild earlier that night the attack on the Communist element was resumed with a cross-fire of accusations and recriminations. This followed the presentation of a resolution, it was said, along the lines of Justice Pecora's speech, blasting communism, nazism, fascism, 'and any other ism challenging American principles.'

"When a stand was taken by a majority of the executive committee against including Communists in the resolution, it was reported last night, those leading the antiradical fight abruptly left the meeting. They immediately held a conference, it was said, at which all agreed that unless the guild openly went on record against 'isms' of all kinds, the sponsors of the antiradical movement collectively would resign from membership.

"Despite the heated speeches in the executive committee meeting, according to the reports, the accusations of radical control in the guild were kept secret until late yesterday afternoon, when it developed that some of those at the head of the antiradical movement in Chicago had begun making arrangements for another meeting in this city within the next few weeks.

"Efforts to obtain from Justice Pecora a confirmation of the rift met with no success. It was learned that when Justice Pecora reached his home at 50 Riverside Drive from Chicago on the Monday after the executive committee meeting he immediately went to bed with a serious attack of influenza he had acquired during the guild convention. When his physician was called in, nurses were ordered to remain at the bedside.

"It was said at his home, however, that although he was still in bed, with only members of his family being permitted to visit him, it was possible that he would be able to return to court in about 10 days.

"The report from Chicago had it that Justice Pecora had announced his intention to lead a general resignation of members of the league if 'the Communists are not driven out of control,' but confirmation of this also was unobtainable.

"It was understood, however, that when he is sufficiently recovered, Justice Pecora will hold a conference with others in the guild opposed to the so-called controlling radical influence, with a view to formulating plans to carry out their aims."

From almost the beginning of the TVA there was a cell of Communists in the TVA practically all the time he was there. It is still there. Lilienthal could not have been in charge for more than 14 years and not know it. He did not have a great many witnesses in this recent hearing but two of his principal witnesses, Mr. Henry C. Hart and Mr. John M. Frantz, were both Communists. Hart was a self-admitted Communist and all the proof showed that Frantz was definitely one. When the Communist fight got hot in the TVA several years ago and it was being investigated by a House committee, Hart got out and went into the Army, and Frantz got out and was transferred to one and then another agency of the Government here in Washington, and is now getting more than $8,000 a year. David Stone Martin, another well-known Communist, left at the same time and came to Washington. He was in several Government agencies here. Lilienthal got him taken care of. While Communist activities were so powerful down in Knoxville, these and other Communists boasted that prior to their being run out they got rid of red-blooded, full-fledged, 100-percent Americans, James L. Smith and L. B. Bolt, Jr., both natives of Tennessee.

The Smith case is typical of the Communist control in the TVA under Lilienthal. Smith came in at a salary of $1,020 a year and he was promoted eight times, and then Lilienthal's Communists got after him. The self-admitted Communist, Mr. Hart, got up a petition in Mr. Smith's office to have him investigated and tried. Mr. Clapp was the head of that particular division and he agreed to have Smith prosecuted and tried and appointed Arthur S. Jandrey, a proved Communist, to try him. He appointed another proved Communist, Melvin Siegel, to prosecute him and the evidence shows he was allowed a whole month of official time to prepare the case, and still another Communist, Louis F. Krainock, was appointed to defend him. What chance had poor Smith with false charges brought against him and with a packed Communist court to try him? Clapp would not let Smith select someone to represent him from outside, but he gave Smith a Communist file clerk to defend him who was not even an attorney. Therefore, Smith received no defense. Smith had come

in at a small salary and was then getting $3,500 a year when outrageous fraud was practiced on him, out of which he was moved out of the TVA. Not only was Clapp privy to it, but, of course, Lilienthal knew all about it. Why did they put Smith out? Simply because he was a red-blooded American and these and their employers were Communists or Communist sympathizers.

These faked, trumped-up, dishonest and corruptly dishonest charges against Smith were not brought by Lilienthal himself. Of course, they were not brought by H. A. Morgan or by former Senator Pope, the other two Commissioners. They were not brought by Mr. Clapp, the General Manager at the time. They were not brought by John Franklin Pierce, Mr. Smith's immediate supervisor, or by any other official of the TVA but they were brought by some young clerks, all Communists, who were way down the list in salaries. These clerks were getting less than $2,000 a year. Smith's salary at that time was $3,500, he had been promoted eight times and had even been promoted on January 1, 1939 before he was dismissed on January 31, 1939. My recollection is that Lilienthal said he did not know anything about this Smith case or the Bolt case. If he did not know anything about it he did not have sense enough or information enough to be the head of the TVA. My own judgment is it was just another one of his slick tricks. I think he knew about it and that he gave them free rein. These charges were brought by these young Communists against Smith not as Communists, of course not. They were brought in the name of the UFW (CIO union), and the charges were so flimsy and ridiculous that even a good moot court lawyer could have successfully defended Smith. That was why the Communists were so insistent that Smith be denied outside counsel.

L. B. BOLT, JR.

The Bolt case was just as bad. L. B. Bolt was another 100-percent American. He had no time for Communist fallacies and falsehoods and double-dealing and dishonesty and corruption. It was about this time that communism was flourishing in the TVA. Mr. Bolt was put on the stand by me, and he testified as follows:

"Mr. BOLT. Now, in 1937, in the TVA legal department, of which I was a member, the situation was as follows: John M. Frantz was an avowed Communist. I knew John personally, and I can state that he was a fanatical type. I asked him on one occasion if he really believed in it enough that he would give his life, and he replied very seriously that he couldn't think of a more glorious death than to lead some worker revolution.

"Senator MCMAHON. Did you report that to your superior officer?

"Mr. BOLT. I think the explanation will come out, Senator."

Now, next to this group was Joseph C. Swidler, the present general counsel, Herbert S. Marks, recently appointed general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission and Melvin Siegel. (Incidentally, Mr. Siegel is now an employee of the Atomic Energy Commission.)

"The CHAIRMAN. When you say 'next to this group,' what do you mean by the term?

"Mr. BOLT. I think I can clarify it. They never acknowledged openly or avowedly that they were Communists.

"Now, here is a factual situation: These three men in particular set themselves up as consultants and advisers to the known and avowed Communists within TVA. In other words, there was no effort to hide the activity whatsoever within the organization.

"Senator JOHNSON. Was that role of consultant official, or is that your term?

"Mr. BOLT. That is my term. In other words, they were always conferring; the known Communists from other departments were always coming up to the legal department and going into these conferences with these three men, Swidler, Marks, and Siegel.

"Now, their positive activity was this: They had a TVA union that was an AFL affiliate, and there was a small group of known Communists within the organization that sought to overturn the existing union and make it a CIO affiliate.

"Now, Joseph C. Swidler, Herbert S. Marks, and Melvin Siegel were actively propagandizing other members of the TVA legal department, particularly with reference to joining this CIO-affiliated union. The process they employed was this: I was extremely busy at the time, but they first sent this John Frantz around to try to convert you to communism and then insist that you join this CIO or support the CIO union" (p. 231).

* * * * *

"Senator KNOWLAND. Now, was one of them the head man in the legal department?

"Mr. BOLT. No; the general counsel of the legal department at that time was James Lawrence Fly. The solicitor, as I recall, was William C. Fitts, Jr.

* * * * *

"Senator MCMAHON. I think he is an adviser to Mr. Owen D. Young, that well-known Communist.

"Mr. BOLT. And his disciples were Gordon R. Clapp, Arthur S. Jandrey—and there were some others in the personnel department.

"Now, these three men, Swidler, Marks, and Siegel, were very close friends of David Lilienthal. They knew each other as Joe, Herb, Mel, and Dave, and they did nothing, in other words, without ascertaining how the wind blew from upstairs, and they made no secret of the fact—

"Senator MCKELLAR. What do you mean by 'upstairs'?

"Mr. BOLT. That was Lilienthal.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Lilienthal was 'upstairs'?

"Mr. BOLT. That is right. They made no secret of the fact. They threw their weight around to a considerable extent; in other words, just had the threat on their lips, if you don't do such and such, 'I will tell Dave.'

"And on one occasion I heard Marks pull: 'If you don't do such and such, I will tell Dave, and Dave will tell Felix, and Felix will tell Sam, and Sam will tell the Skipper.'

"Senator MCKELLAR. What did he mean by that?

"Mr. BOLT. Well, 'Dave' meant David Lilienthal, 'Felix' meant Felix Frankfurter, 'Sam' meant Sam Rosenman, and 'the Skipper' meant President Roosevelt" (p. 233).

Again Mr. Bolt: "Now, we get down, then, to some actual cases, and records exist. There was a man in the employ of TVA by the name of Bernard 'Buck' Borah. He was an avowed Communist. He spent most of his time out propagandizing and organizing on TVA time. His supervisor was T. Levron Howard.

"Now, the supervisor attempted to mark on his record either 'unsatisfactory' or to dismiss him, but, in any event, an issue was raised and Borah resisted. He was actively defended by Joseph C. Swidler, Herbert S. Marks, and Melvin Siegel." (Record, p. 234.)

Incidentally, Joseph Swidler is the so-called general counsel of the TVA. Herbert Marks and Melvin Siegel are now employed by Lilienthal on the Atomic Energy Commission, where he has not yet been confirmed.

And again I quote Mr. Bolt: "Now, there is another case, that of Henry C. Hart. He was an avowed Communist. From the record of the Dies committee and admitted testimony, I don't think there is any question about it, and the TVA officials, including Gordon R. Clapp and Mr. Lilienthal, either knew it or should have known it. But he was defeated; and no later than 2 weeks ago this man was eulogized on at least two different occasions before a Senate committee by Gordon R. Clapp.

"Senator MCKELLAR. What was done with Hart?

"Mr. BOLT. He was retained.

"Senator MCKELLAR. And promoted?

"Mr. BOLT. And promoted." (Record, pp. 234–235.)

Mr. Clapp testified that when Hart gets through with his education at the expense of the Government and comes back to the TVA, he will be reemployed. (Record, p. 235.)

John F. Pierce was also terminated because he was not a Communist. (Record, p. 235.)

Charges were brought against Joseph C. Swidler, the present counsel.

Mr. Bolt testified: "George P. Gant, who was director of personnel under Aubrey Williams, who has now been elevated to be general manager of TVA, heard the proceeding and admitted conferring many times in private with Swidler as to what should be done. And the whole effect—I can prove it by the record—was that Swidler was permitted to decide his own case. At the same time that was going on, Mr. Lilienthal was in Grand Rapids, Mich, making a speech, which most of the newspapers in the country published, as to what a wonderful merit system TVA had. I can produce the record." (Record, p. 237.)

Bolt testified there were 30 charges against Swidler, charging him with illegal actions, violations of policy matters, personal politics. (Record, p. 237.)

Bolt named Henry C. Hart, Bernard "Buck" Borah, John M. Frantz, Muriel S. Williams, Joseph C. Swidler, Herbert S. Marks, and Melvin Seigel and in discussing these several well-known Communists, he said: "And I think the conclusion is almost inescapable that Mr. Lilienthal condoned such activity, if not encouraged it." (Record, p. 238.)

Mr. Bolt said the following: "I want to give the names of those that were testified as having attended Communist meetings: John M. Frantz, Dr. Barry Casper, Dorothy Remine Frantz, Mabel Abercrombie, Bernard Borah, Howard Fazier, Harry F. Alber, Henry C. Hart, Jr., Milton Mandel, David Stone Martin, Ruth S. Martin, Harry T. Miller, Richard T. Mosher, Burton Zion, Rudolf Bertram, Bertha Klenova, Joseph Herman Daves, Kenneth Malcom, Kenneth Cameron, Donald Wheatcraft, Edward Glasek, and Kathleen R. Eakin." (Record, p. 240.)

There were 42 in this one list, and here are more: Mrs. Elizabeth Winston Todd, Frank D. Alexander, Nelson Travis Barr, R. O. Niehoff, F. Woods Beckman, Louis F. Krainock, Bernard Frank, Harry C. Bauer, V. V. Paul, Lucille Thornburgh, Muriel Borah, Katherine Frohmer and her husband, Burton J. Zion, Arthur S. Jandrey, E. B. Schultz, Elizabeth Allen, Roland Wank, Forrest Allen, and Hugh Urban. In all, 42. (Record, p. 240.)

Again, Mr. Bolt testified: "Now, when this news broke, that James L. Smith had been framed by the Communists—and it was in both newspapers—no effort was made on the part of the management of TVA to make restitution to James L. Smith. No apology was ever offered. They still say, and they say today, in other words, that they are satisfied with the Smith record. That record is before the other committee. They are perfectly willing, on the other hand, to take the word of an avowed Communist which they are now doing in the case of Henry C. Hart." (Record, p. 241.)

Again:

"Senator MCMAHON. Now, as for this John Frantz that said to you in 1935 that he was an avowed Communist and he would like nothing better than to die leading a revolt against the Government. He said that to you, did he?

"Mr. BOLT. Yes; that is right. He was fanatical. His eyes would light up when he would talk about it." (Record, p. 242.)

Now, Lilienthal brought both John M. Frantz and Henry C. Hart before the committee. Both of them were avowed Communists and both of them were interrogated

by those on both sides of this controversy, and from their cross-examinations it looked as if both of them were as guilty as it was possible for men to be.

In this connection, an interesting thing happened. When Hart came down here from Wisconsin, where he is attending school at Government expense, he went to the home of Frantz and put up there. Here is the testimony:

"Senator MCKELLAR. Have you seen Mr. Lilienthal since you have been here today?

"Mr. HART. Yes, sir; I saw him this morning.

"Senator MCKELLAR. When did you get here?

"Mr. HART. I got here on Monday evening, sir.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Monday morning. What hotel did you go to?

"Mr. HART. I did not go to a hotel, sir.

"Senator MCKELLAR. You have not been putting up at a hotel?

"Mr. HART. No, sir.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Where are you putting up?

"Mr. HART. I would rather not answer that, if it is not relevant, sir.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Well, it is very relevant to this hearing.

"Mr. HART. I will be glad to answer if the chairman will direct me, Senator.

"Senator MCKELLAR. I hope the chairman will direct him, because it is a part of the story."

The chairman so directed, and Mr. Hart testified as follows:

"I am staying with John Frantz in Arlington, Va."

This was the other Communist who appeared and testified after Hart got through.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Have you seen Mr. Lilienthal? I believe you stated you had. Where did you see him and under what circumstances?

"Mr. HART. Well, I saw him sitting in the Senate Chamber this morning, sir.

"Senator MCKELLAR. That is the only time you have seen him?

"Mr. HART. And then at noon recess he came up and shook my hand.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Now, whom else have you seen from the TVA?

"Mr. HART. That is all, sir.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Have you conferred with anybody about this matter since you got here?

"Mr. HART. Yes, sir. When I first reached town I phoned the TVA representative, Miss Marguerite Owen, and asked her two questions. One was who had testified in the Atomic Energy Committee to date, and the second was whether I would be permitted to see the record on the Smith hearings in the TVA offices.

"Senator MCKELLAR. And did she furnish it to you?

"Mr. HART. No, sir.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Who furnished them to you?

"Mr. HART. Nobody, sir. I did not read them.

"Senator MCKELLAR. So what you had to say about Mr. Smith was about reading what he had to say in the hearings?

"Mr. HART. No; the purpose of my inquiry was whether I should familiarize myself with the record in order to prepare myself to answer questions. I have not done so.

"Senator MCKELLAR. So you have been testifying about Mr. Smith this afternoon without familiarizing yourself with what he had testified to, have you not?

"Mr. HART. That is correct, sir. What I have testified this afternoon is based upon the knowledge that I recollect all employees got in February of 1939, at the time that his hearing was summarized in an announcement to the employees.

"Senator MCKELLAR. What did they get? You said 'what all employees got.' Was it a summary of the case.

"Mr. HART. I already said, sir, in the United Federal workers employees' paper——

"Senator MCKELLAR. So you made up your mind as to Mr. Smith's testimony, what you saw in the employees' paper of the TVA?

"Mr. HART. Yes, sir.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Have you got that with you?

"Mr. HART. No, sir.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Where is it?

"Mr. HART. I do not know, sir.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Where did you examine it?

"Mr. HART. I examined it when it was distributed.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Oh, you have not examined it since?

"Mr. HART. No, sir.

"Senator MCKELLAR. So the young lady at the TVA here, Miss Owen, did not show that to you?

"Mr. HART. No, sir."

The foregoing shows the nature of Mr. Hart's testimony. It was false in substance and in fact. It will be seen from other parts of his own testimony that he saw Miss Marguerite Owens and stayed with John M. Frantz, and he saw and talked with Mr. Lilienthal.

THE RATHER CELEBRATED ROBERT F. HALL COMMUNIST LETTER WRITTEN BY HART

At this point I want to read this letter:

POST OFFICE BOX 1604,
Knoxville, Tenn., January 31, 1939.

Mr. ROBERT F. HALL,
Secretary, Communist Party,
District No. 17, Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR COMRADE ROB: We have had signal success in our latest undertaking to purge the TVA of a reactionary-burgeois supervisor who stood in our way and prevented the expansion of the party control of the employees' organization. He was antilabor and his point of view was so repugnant to our ideals that we determined to get rid of him, as further argument seemed definitely hopeless.

We must explain that under the employee relationship policy of the TVA, we were confronted with certain definite obstacles. We presume, of course, that the oral reports to you from Comrade Laurent Frantz have covered this in detail.

The move was accomplished through the party fraction on the files-shop committee of the Knoxville Lodge of the UFW, it now having been 2 years since we were overwhelmingly victorious in throwing the AFGE bodily into the UFW in a clever maneuver in 1937, the details of which we assume you heard from Comrades Ted Wellman and Kenneth Malcolm at the time it occurred.

Comrade John Frantz was selected to bring the charges and was aided magnificently by Comrades Cameron, Miller, Urban, and another comrade whose name will not be mentioned here because of the high position he occupies, but you doubtless know of whom we speak. I, myself, did some work on the matter, but the credit goes to those named above and below.

The skunk, who was the object of our efforts, was James L. Smith, Chief of the Central Files. We took unusual precautions to insure that once we brought the charges, that we could make them stick, all along the line and this, of course, involved considerable ground work.

But Comrade Abercrombie, of the Norris branch, and Chairman Borah, of the Knoxville TVA branch, did a wonderful job of persuasion and were especially diligent and at the same time properly secretive, so as to accomplish the desired end, without disclosing the ultimate and basic objective, to all of whom they had to contact, in order to insure that Smith would receive only a cool reception and no encouragement in his fight against our charges.

Many meetings and conferences had to be held and it was also necessary to consult with Comrades Wellman and Crouch several times on matters of strategy and policy.

In the end we were successful, because today, the 31st, Gordon Clapp, director of personnel, signed a previously prepared finding that Smith must be and is removed as head of the Central Files. Smith is now expected to resign since he has made only a very feeble attempt to defend himself. It is, of course, highly gratifying to know that the party here is just beginning to realize the strength of organization and we should be able to expand the party and obtain additional recruits on the fine showing we have made in the Smith case.

All the comrades in the TVA and Norris branches send you and Comrade Taylor our best regards and wishes for future success.

HENRY C. HART,
Assistant Chairman.

P. S.—We received your urgent request regarding distribution of extra bundles of the Daily Worker in the TVA offices and this matter will receive immediate attention. The best means of distribution which we have employed so far, is to put the DW in another paper and deliver it with a nod to the member.

Concerning this letter about which so much has been said, the facts are very simple. Senators will notice that the letter is dated January 31, 1939. Hart admits that he was a Communist up until January 1939. The proof is that he was active as a Communist in the TVA up until April 1939, which is in this record undenied, as shown by the testimony of Mrs. Roxie Paris, who was also a Communist and who joined the Communist Party for the avowed purpose of exposing them. On page 700 of the record she tells about a Communist meeting in Knoxville at which Mr. Hart was present, as shown by the following:

"Senator MCKELLAR. Now, was Mr. Hart at that meeting? He was present when you gave that out?

"Mrs. PARIS. Yes; he was present. He gave it out. He gave it out on my telephone.

"Senator MCKELLAR. He gave it out over the telephone, and it was published? And that was on April 27?

"Mrs. PARIS. That was on Thursday, yes; I guess it was the 27th.

"Senator MCKELLAR. April 27, 1939?

"Mrs. PARIS. That is right.

"Senator MCKELLAR. And if Mr. Hart says he had left the Communist Party in January 1939, he is just mistaken about it?

"Mrs. PARIS. He is mistaken, or crazy, one; I don't know which.

"Senator MCKELLAR. I want to ask you if you got any other papers from Mr. Hart.

"Mrs. PARIS. I got a Daily Worker there that has a report in it about Lasser that he brought over for me to read" (p. 700, record).

Now the letter above referred to from Henry C. Hart has had a remarkable history. It was written January 31, 1939, as will be seen from examining it. That was the day James L. Smith was ordered removed as head of the Central Files of the TVA by Gordon R. Clapp, personnel manager. It will be recalled that Arthur Jandrey was assistant director of personnel and he heard the charges against Smith and also that Melvin Seigel of the legal department prosecuted Smith, assisted by this same John M. Frantz and Hugh Urban. They ganged up on this man Smith and they also appointed him a counsel, Louis Krainock, who was not a lawyer, but likewise a Communist as heretofore shown. It has already been shown beyond dispute that Hart was a Communist as late as April 1939. It has never been shown by Hart, or anyone else, that he ever resigned; he just claims to have quit the Communist Party. Now, that letter, remarkable to state, was written on the very day that the Communists got rid of the 100-percent American, James L. Smith. It was a grand event in the TVA Communist cell's history. The letter was written and mailed from Knoxville the day Smith was ordered removed, January 31, 1939. The letter was mailed from the private post-office box belonging to Mrs. Pauline

Crumley, a TVA employee, who said she and her roomate had the only keys to the box. All these facts were evidently in the mind of Henry Hart. Who knew more about Smith's conviction than anyone else? Of course it was his real prosecutor, Henry C. Hart. Who knew that Rob Hall was head of the Communist Party down in Birmingham? Of course he was the friend and fellow Communist, Rob Hall. It had to be somebody who knew the facts and Henry Hart more than any one person on God's earth knew the facts. He had gotten up the petition against Smith; he had prosecuted Smith; and had taken an active part until the order was issued removing Smith from the rolls of the TVA. Henry Hart in his testimony before the committee admitted that he had sent reports to Ted Wellman, State secretary of the Communist Party in Tennessee. How natural was it for him to send a report also to the district secretary, Mr. Hall. I quote from the hearings:

"Senator HAWKES. Will you tell us, and I think you want to be sincere, will you be good enough to tell us what you actually did as a member of the Communist Party, because I have been sitting here for a half hour and I still do not know.

"Mr. HART. I read the Daily Worker, paid my dues, and made regular reports to Wellman."

Now Wellman was the State secretary of the Communist Party. No one knew that better than Hart, because Wellman solicited Hart to join the party. In the foregoing letter to Hall, Hart said: "The move was accomplished through the party fraction on the files shop committee of the Knoxville lodge of the UFW, it now having been 2 years since we were overwhelmingly victorious in throwing the AFGE bodily into the UFW in a clever maneuver in 1937, the details of which we assume you heard from Comrades Ted Wellman and Kenneth Malcolm at the time it occurred."

So that Hart's own evidence shows that he was the only one in the TVA cell of Communists who had all this information, for he had been a Communist since 1937.

The letter itself was not published for about 3 years. It was published in the Knoxville Journal on June 27, 1943. Mr. Hart, Mr. Lilienthal, Mr. Clapp, were all in Knoxville and all read it. There can be no doubt that Mr. Hall knew about it. He is now right here in Washington but he was not put on the stand It was not denied by Hart, or Lilienthal, or Hall, or Clapp. Nobody answered it. On July 25, about a month later, it was again published under a Washington dateline, in the Knoxville News Sentinel. Still no one connected with the TVA or the Communist Party denied it. Nobody denied it even though Mr. Clapp and Mr. Hart had gotten together and prepared an affidavit and called it a forgery That answer was prepared on July 10, 1943, 15 or 16 days after the Knoxville Journal published it and about 15 days before the Knoxville News Sentinel published it. It had already been prepared when the News Sentinel published the letter and the details about it coming from Washington.

They never published the affidavit until Clapp got in hot water before the Committee on Public Works and then the old discarded affidavit that they did not have the nerve to publish when it was prepared, although both papers had published the letter, was brought forth. And it was not offered until it had been publicly announced that the Dies committee did not have either one of the photostatic copies of the letter that the affidavit was first offered in the other committee and Henry Hart was brought here to testify concerning it.

It was soon found that the affidavit could not stand the test and they then brought Communist Hart from his school in Wisconsin to add his testimony concerning it. He virtually admitted everything that was in it as shown by the record. Even now there is not a real fact in the letter that is disputed. No one else but a Communist could have written it, and he had to be an educated Communist to have written as good a letter.

Further about this letter, it was developed in the hearing that the Knoxville News Sentinel, a tremendously pro-Lilienthal paper, evidently having talked with Lilienthal and Clapp and Hart, sent a special representative to Washington to find out if the letter were correct—Daniel Kidney—to investigate and advise whether the Dies committee had such a letter in their files. Here is what Mr. Kidney telegraphed, on July 26, 1943, to his newspaper, the Knoxville News Sentinel, from Washington: "That the Dies committee did find 55 Communist Party members in the investigation in the TVA area was verified today by Robert Stripling, chief of the Dies staff. 'We did not make the names public, but certainly expected TVA to see that Communists were purged from its staff,' Mr. Stripling said. Instead the committee files contain a letter from Henry C. Hart, Jr., TVA personnel employee, claiming that the Communists were instrumental in getting James L. Smith, native Knoxvillian, fired from TVA." And thereupon the News Sentinel did publish the Hart letter in its entirety in bold-faced type and it had never been denied until this time.

If that photostatic copy of the letter had not been in the Dies committee files at that time when Daniel Kidney was sent to examine into this matter, he would have exposed the whole matter as a colossal fraud and so would have his paper, which is on the side of Lilienthal, but they verified the letter and thereupon published the letter.

THE LETTER ITSELF

Now let's take the letter itself. Remember that the real prosecutor of Smith was Hart. And he had been prosecuting him for at least 5 weeks. Remember that Hart was a graduate of Vanderbilt University. And look at the language of the letter in the first paragraph where he calls Smith "a reactionary burgeois supervisor." Remember that he was one of the young employees holding a place not paying over $2,000 a year in the TVA and that Smith was a long-time employee of the TVA who was getting $3,500 a year.

And then note in the third paragraph his close association with Ted Wellman and Kenneth Malcolm, which is in accord with the facts. In the fourth paragraph, note that Comrade John Frantz and Comrades Cameron, Miller, Urban were all members of the prosecuting party. And his statement about how much work he had done on the Smith case, and that was in accord with the facts. Then note what he said in the fifth paragraph, "We took unusual precautions to insure that once we brought the charges, that we could make them stick, all along the line and this, of course, involved considerable ground work."

And then note his reference in the seventh paragraph to Comrades Abercrombie and Borah, and in other paragraphs to Comrades Wellman and Crouch, and to Gordon Clapp and how intimately he spoke of these, and it is easily seen that nobody but Hart could have written the letter in the face of his own testimony, much less the testimony of all the others.

Another fact that I want to call out especially is shown in the fourth paragraph of the Hart letter: "* * * and another comrade whose name will not be mentioned here because of the high position he occupies, but you doubtless know of whom we speak."

There can be no doubt that this man was Lilienthal himself.

It will be remembered that the Communists were talking about the time would soon come and the revolution would soon take place and the Communists would reign supreme in the United States.

Lieutenant Detective Osborne, of the Birmingham Police Department, who made a splendid witness in the case, testified fully and freely and truly how the photostatic copy was obtained in Birmingham and Mr. Barker testified in like manner how the photostat copy was left with Mr. Dies, the chairman of the committee.

On page 395 of the record is to be found the testimony of Lieutenant Detective Osborne. He testified that on the day before Investigator Barker got to Birmingham, he had arrested Mr. Laurent Frantz, brother of John M. Frantz, in the headquarters of the Communist Party in Birmingham. At that time Communist Hall had his office in Birmingham and Frantz was found in Hall's office.

Hall disappeared before the detective got to the office with the deputy United States marshal to serve a subpena on them for the Dies committee. (Record, p. 396.)

"Senator MCKELLAR. Will you tell whom you found at the offices of the Communist Party in the Clarke Building?

"Mr. OSBORNE. At 2 p. m. April 9, 1940.

"Senator MCKELLAR. April 9, 1940?

"Mr. OSBORNE. Yes, sir.

"I returned to detective headquarters on my assignment at that time. I was in charge of the un-Americanism activity detail, Birmingham Police Department. On reaching my office, Chief E. L. Holland called me into his office and introduced me to a deputy marshal by the name of Ellis whom he said had a subpena for Robert F. Hall for the Dies committee and asked would I accompany Mr. Ellis over to the headquarters and effect the arrest or serve the subpena. Mr. Ellis and myself went to the headquarters, 235 Clarke Building, Birmingham, and the door was shut. I knocked several times. In response, a young man came to the door and when I made myself known to him he slammed the door in my face, I catching it with my foot to block the shut. I went inside and I asked for Robert F. Hall, and he said that he was not there, he did not know him, or had not seen him. I asked him was he employed at that office, he said he was not, that he was just doing some personal work on the typewriter. I asked him his name and he refused to give it to me. I searched him in the capacity of a city officer and I found in his possession some mail for Robert F. Hall and also a key to the office. He would not talk. I took him over to the police headquarters and questioned him, and about 4 or 5 o'clock on the same date, while I was questioning this subject, whom I found to be Laurent Frantz, Mr. Barker come in and introduced himself to me as being an investigator for the Dies committee." (Record, p. 397.)

"Senator MCKELLAR. You had already arrested Mr. Frantz?

"Mr. OSBORNE. Yes, sir. Mr. Frantz was arrested before Mr. Barker got over. Mr. Barker arrived at 4:05. I said, 'Well, I guess I have got one of these "Commies" here if you want to check on him.' He showed his credentials to Frantz and Frantz would not talk to him, so I finally put him in jail, and after getting the key off of him, Mr. Barker and myself went back over to the Communist headquarters late that afternoon and that night and looked around at certain documents, taking about 35 or 40 different documents, letters, from different parties, to have them photostated. This particular letter, which impressed me so at that time was for the fact that I had handled Hall, arrested Hall, also Frantz, Taylor, and was looking for Crouch.

"What struck my attention at that time was the fact of the Daily Worker being inserted inside of another paper to be distributed on the TVA property.

"Senator MCKELLAR. How was that? I did not get that.

"Mr. OSBORNE. I said what struck my attention was also the postscript of the letter where it says their method of distributing the Daily Worker would be to insert it in another newspaper and give it out to the TVA

project. I said, 'It looks like your TVA is infested down there, Barker.' He said, 'I do not know. We are checking on it up there.' So about 10 a. m. on the 10th Mr. Barker and myself went to the Electric Blue Printing Co., which at that time was located at 108½ North Twenty-first Street, to have the documents that we had photostated. We remained there with the gentleman who made them and after it was made he turned it over to me. Mr. Barker and I then went back to the hotel and read them over, then I turned them over to Mr. Barker. I did not keep a copy of any of them. Neither did the man who made the prints." (Record, pp. 397-398.)

Lieutenant Detective Osborne read into the record an affidavit from the Electric Blueprinting Co. stating that photostatic copies of the letter were made as Mr. Osborne had testified. (Record, p. 398.)

On February 17, Mr. Barker testified as to what he did with these letters, including the one written by Mr. Hart. Mr. Barker on pages 454 and 455 and 456 positively identified the letter.

"Senator McKELLAR. What did you do with the original of that letter?

"Mr. BARKER. Detective Osborne and I returned all of the original material to room 235 in the Clark Building, the Communist Party headquarters, and put it back where we had found it.

"Senator McKELLAR. What did you do with the photostats after you got here?

"Mr. BARKER. I delivered all that material to Congressman Martin Dies in his office in the New House Office Building.

"Senator McMAHON. Getting back to when you spoke to Mr. Dies about your material that you found down in Birmingham, did you call his attention to this particular letter?

"Mr. BARKER. Oh, yes; very definitely, and I am coming to that.

"Senator McMAHON. You considered this an important discovery?

"Mr. BARKER. I considered it an important piece of evidence because it showed Communist activities in the Tennessee Valley, if the letter was to be believed on its face.

"Senator McMAHON. You discussed that with Mr. Dies?

"Mr. BARKER. Oh, yes.

"Senator McMAHON. He read it?

"Mr. BARKER. He read it.

"Senator KNOWLAND. The photostat or the copy?

"Mr. BARKER. The photostat copy of the letter.

"Senator McKELLAR. I want to ask you if the letter that the chairman of the committee has just shown you as coming from Henry C. Hart, Jr., to an address to Robert F. Hall, secretary of the Communist Party, Post Office Box 1871, Birmingham, Ala., is that a true copy of the original that you found in that Communist office down there?

"Mr. BARKER. It appears to be. My best recollection is that it is." (Record, pp. 456 and 457.)

And again:

"Senator McKELLAR. In your judgment, and from your knowledge of the facts, is that an exact copy of the letter that you and Mr. OSBORNE found in the Communist headquarters at Birmingham?

"Mr. BARKER. Yes, sir." (Record, p. 460.)

The two photostatic copies of the Hart letter were left with the chairman of the Dies committee by Mr. Barker as they should have been. They were thrown out by Mr. Lilienthal or Mr. Hart or one of their Communist friends.

We are not responsible for it. There isn't a particle of doubt about that letter being written by the witness, Mr. Hart, because when he was brought here to testify, he testified with his head down for the most part and made one of the poorest witnesses that ever came before any committee. I don't believe there is a doubt in the mind of anybody who heard or knows the facts that he wrote that letter.

If there ever was any doubt about this letter, Senator JOHNSON of Colorado removed that doubt in the testimony of another excited, slow-witted, ridiculous Communist witness by the name of Kenneth Cameron.

On page 725 of the record Senator JOHNSON asked him this question: "Did you do anything officially, or anything in any way, to show that the letter was in error at the time it was called to your attention? Or did you wait until you found out that the Hart signature was no longer in existence before you raised any objection to the contents of the letter?

"Mr. CAMERON. I did not raise any objection, public objection to the contents of the letter; no, sir."

That shows just what happened about this letter. They did not publish an affidavit of denial of the letter, until they knew Hall had destroyed the letter itself and they had gotten somebody in the Dies committee to destroy the two photostatic copies.

That tells the whole story about this letter.

JACK COMER

Another witness against Mr. Lilienthal was Jack Comer. Mr. Comer went with the TVA in 1933 and remained until 1941. He resigned at that time and began to practice law. He had gone to night law school before that. He testified that Henry C. Hart was a proud and boastful Communist; and that John Frantz was an "avowed" Communist during his days at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, and he preached communism to everyone while at the TVA"; and that he was thrown in jail in Knoxville several times for inciting riots. (Record, p. 356 of the Clapp hearing.)

He testified that those in charge of TVA constantly discriminated in favor of Communist unions. He, himself, was president of TVA's white-collar A. F. of L. union. The CIO Communist union took his records and bank accounts.

"Comer went into the justice of peace court of the late Squire J. Mack Moulden to replevin the records and was confronted by a battery of top TVA legal talent, Joe C. Swidler, now general counsel; Herbert Marks, (now a lawyer on the Atomic Energy Commission under Lilienthal); Melvin Siegal (now a lawyer on the Atomic Energy Commission under Lilienthal), and Richard T. Mosher."

These lawyers said the records were not to be found, but Comer obtained them. (Record, p. 357 of Clapp hearings; p. 359.)

He testified that Communists were preferred in this organization all during his testimony. He testified as follows concerning a visit of a Japanese delegation to the TVA about 1 or 2 years before they got into the war:

"I refer to the time when the TVA conducted a tour of its projects for a Japanese Commission. Not only were the Japs shown and flown all over the Tennessee Valley at Government expense, but any other visitors with foreign accents were shown the same courtesies." (Record, p. 361, Clapp hearings.)

Mr. Comer further states:

"It seems as though all you had to do to be shown the TVA is to be a foreigner." (Record, p. 361, Clapp hearings.)

Mr. Comer further stated:

"Last summer I was taking flying lessons out at the airport and the TVA has its own plane out there and on one occasion they came in from a flight over the Authority and two of the people I could not even understand their foreign accent. Any time you want to get a free trip over the TVA you have to have a foreign accent." (Record, p. 361, Clapp hearings.)

And again he further stated:

"These Japs visited TVA shortly before Pearl Harbor. If this is the type of security Lilienthal is going to use for the atomic bomb, we may find ourselves blasted to eternity by communistic Russian replicas of them." (Record, p. 361, Clapp hearings.)

All through Mr. Comer's testimony he shows how the communists were preferred by those in authority in the TVA over Americans.

"Senator McKELLAR. I believe you said that they were all either tinged or colored with communism?

"Mr. COMER. That is right.

"Senator McKELLAR. Among those did you include Mr. Marks and Swidler and Siegel?

"Mr COMER I do.

"Senator McKELLAR. Do you include Mr. Clapp and Mr. Lilienthal?

"Mr. COMER. I do." (Record, p. 368, Clapp hearings.)

Mr. Comer got his own legal education, became a lawyer and businessman and has made a great success in it as his testimony shows. He was for a long time the head of one of the labor unions and his every sympathy is with organized labor. He is a very fine man.

Mr. Comer was a straight-from-the-shoulder witness. Anyone on earth could tell that he was honest and fearless in giving his testimony.

How the members of the committee failed to accept it I do not know.

Likewise Mrs. Roxie J. Parris was a fearless, uncontrolled, out-spoken, honest witness. What she knew, she knew. And this Senate can take her testimony and Mr. Smith's testimony, Mr. Bolt's testimony and Mr. Comer's testimony with the absolute conviction that they were telling the truth, and that cannot be said for Mr. Lilienthal anywhere along the line.

Nobody heard Mr. O. C. Osborne, lieutenant of detectives at Birmingham, Ala., testify who did not know instinctively that he was telling the truth and the Senate can implicitly believe anything he said. Even Chairman HICKENLOOPER complimented the truthfulness of Lieutenant Osborne. (Record, p. 408.)

LILIENTHAL'S WITNESSES

Lilienthal's case is remarkable in the way of witnesses. It is remarkable because of the witnesses he did not put on the stand—witnesses who were compelled to have known the facts about the TVA. He put none of these on. Then it is remarkable as I shall hereafter explain because of the witnesses he did put on in his own behalf. We will take those he did not put on first.

1. He had been serving with Dr. H. A. Morgan, a member of the TVA from its beginning—now about 14 or 15 years—but he did not put Dr. Morgan on as a character witness or as a witness familiar with all the facts of the TVA and who could refute charges of communism in the TVA.

2. Again, he did not put on Dr. A. E. Morgan and he did not undertake to refute any of Dr. A. E. Morgan's statements. I put Dr. A. E. Morgan on the stand.

3. He did not put his associate, Senator James P. Pope, a former Member of this body, now a long-time member of the TVA, and who ought to have had some knowledge about it on the stand. He is conspicuous by his absence, and he certainly would know something about communism there or the lack of communism in the TVA, but he did not put him on.

4. Then there was his first general counsel an secretary of the corporation, Mr. James L. Fly, who must have known about there being communism in the TVA. He is not now with the TVA or the Government at all, and is practicing law in New York. Surely he could have put Mr. Fly on if it had been to his interest to do so.

5. His next general counsel was W. C. Fitts, successor to Mr. Fly, and who is a very excellent lawyer, and I doubt not that he is a very fine man. I knew his father, who was practicing law in Tuscaloosa, Ala., when I was a student at the university fifty-odd years ago, and surely Mr. Fitts knew about communism

in the TVA. Mr. Fitts is now a law partner on Mr. Fly in New York.

6. Joseph C. Swidler, the present general counsel. Mr. Swidler, it is true, started out in life with Mr. Lilienthal as a clerk at $71.75 a month when Mr. Lilienthal was working for the Commerce Clearing House, a utility-controlled corporation in Chicago which was working for the various utilities, and it was at the same time that Mr. Lilienthal was also working as a member of the railroad and utilities commission in the State of Wisconsin. So, surely, Mr. Swidler knew something about it. It is true that Mr. Swidler was never admitted to the Federal court until last July, and it is true that the testimony here shows that Mr Swidler was a Communist, but surely Mr Lilienthal would not object to a man being a witness because he happened to be a Communist. Lilienthal not only surrounded himself with Communists in TVA, but he is now busily engaged in surrounding himself with Communists like Marks, Ramey, Volpe, Siegel, and Niehoff, all of whom he has with him at the present moment on the Atomic Energy Commission.

7. There is another man who was associated with him in the TVA for a long, long time. His name was J. A. Krug, and he was Chief Engineer for awhile. Mr. Krug is now Secretary of the Interior. What possible reason could he have had for not calling Mr. Krug to testify for lack of communism in the TVA if there was a lack of communism there? Who could have made a better or stronger witness than Mr. Krug, and yet Mr. Krug was not invited by Mr. Lilienthal to testify in this case, and his testimony does not appear. I am informed it has not been a week ago that Secretary Krug made a radio speech and admitted there were Communists in the TVA.

8. Dr. Floyd Reeves is another man who was associated with him in the TVA for several years. Dr. A. E. Morgan, whose testimony is absolutely uncontradicted, although Lilienthal personally heard every word of it, testified that Lilienthal kicked Dr. Reeves out because he complained of Lilienthal's political appointments. Think a moment, Senators, the idea of Lilienthal, with all he has had to say about his lack of politics, getting into a controversy with Dr. Reeves about political appointments. And yet that is just exactly what happened, and he did not produce him, although Dr. Reeves is now working for the present Governor of the State of New York.

9. Here was Mr. Clapp whom he had appointed to succeed him and he did not dare to put Mr. Clapp on the stand and Clapp did not dare to put Mr. Lilienthal on the stand. Their affairs had been conducted in such a dishonest and corrupt way that neither one of them would testify for the other.

10. Not only that, the next four witnesses who did not appear for Lilienthal who it seems should have appeared for him were four Congressmen. Congressman ALBERT GORE, Congressman PERCY PRIEST, Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER and Congressman JOHN JENNINGS. They all testified for Mr. Clapp but they did not testify for Mr. Lilienthal.

11. Take the two Senators from Alabama—Senator LISTER HILL and Senator JOHN SPARKMAN. They both testified for Mr. Clapp but neither one of them testified for Lilienthal.

What caused the trouble? Why? How? What is the answer?

12. During Lilienthal's stay in Tennessee we have had four governors—Govs. Hill McAlister, Gordon Browning, Prentice Cooper, and Jim McCord. Not a one of them appeared, and no governor from any of the adjoining States appeared.

13. Not only that but as everybody familiar with politics knows, East Tennessee has Republican officials in some of the counties and Democrat officials in some of the counties, and not a single solitary official was called upon to testify for Mr. Lilienthal.

14. Since Mr. Lilienthal has been the chairman of the TVA probably no other corporation in Tennessee has been more active with the Legislature of that State than has the TVA and yet not a single member of the legislature was called here to testify as to the good character of Mr. Lilienthal.

15. And look at our judges. Probably a third of the judges in the State are in that part of Tennessee and not a single judge was called upon to testify to the good character of Lilienthal and yet Mr. Lilienthal had been down there for 14 or 15 years.

16. Nor did the mayor of Knoxville, nor the mayor of Chattanooga, nor any other mayor in the State or any official in the State testify for him or any of their predecessors in office.

17. Not a Protestant minister of the gospel came here to testify for him except two adherents of an offshoot of the Roman Catholic Church but they were not orthodox Catholics and were not priests of the Catholic Church. There are not any finer people on earth than the regular Catholic organization in Tennessee.

18. There were no rabbis brought here who testified for him. I doubt if he knows a rabbi.

19. Finally, not a college president in any of the States in which the TVA operates was called for any purpose by Lilienthal. Not even his old friend, Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina to whom both Clapp and Lilienthal referred in their testimony.

No former associate of Lilienthal in any business or in any profession anywhere in the United States was called as a witness by Mr. Lilienthal. Not even Gov. Phil La Follette who appointed him head of the public service commission in Wisconsin; and not even Ed A. O'Neal of the American Farm Bureau Federation who was supposed to be connected with him to the extent of giving certain farmers selected by O'Neal and Lilienthal about $2,000,000 of Government money per year without any authority whatsoever to give such money to this selected few, testified for him.

I want also to call the attention of the Senators to the fact that according to this testimony the closest friends that Lilienthal had down here were Herbert S. Marks, Joseph C. Swidler, Melvin H. Siegel, who together with Lilienthal were known in the TVA as the "four horsemen," the most intimate of friends, and all three of them were here in the committee room during the hearings, but not a one of them was called to testify for Lilienthal.

The very fact, Mr. President, that no disinterested man who was known outside his own precinct in Tennessee was called by Mr. Lilienthal to uphold his management of the TVA during the 14 or 15 years he has lived down there is in itself such a condemnation of him that this body ought not to confirm him.

MR. LILIENTHAL'S CHARACTER WITNESSES

1. John M. Hancock, industrial banker; partner of Lehman Bros., National Surety Corp., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Florsheim Shoe Co.; A. Stein & Co., S. H. Kress & Co., American Export Lines, Inc.; associate with B. M. Baruch in rubber survey. (Record, p. 75.)

"Mr. HANCOCK. As to Mr. Lilienthal, we have had very little work closely together. I have known of his work. I know only the general reputation he has had as administrator, and I cannot speak as to that generally, but only as to the field in which I have had occasion to contact him." (Record, p. 77.)

That was since the Lilienthal report was presented.

The Lilienthal report recommended all uranium ore should be owned by Lilienthal's organization and Mr. Hancock was not in accord with that. (Record, p. 77.)

2. Bernard M. Baruch, character witness, also differed with Lilienthal. (Record, p. 100.)

He thought Groves had not gotten his just deserts. (Record, p. 106.)

He implied that Lilienthal had undermined Groves. He was astounded that General Groves and General Farrell and others who had brought about the discovery of atomic energy were left out. (Record, p. 106–107.)

He (Baruch) gave General Groves the highest praise. (Record, p. 107).

He thought well of the Acheson-Lilienthal report but thought it ought to have been held up. (Record, p. 108).

He damned him with faint praise. (Record, p. 108 and following.)

This character witness really ruined Lilienthal, and I quote as follows:

"Senator MCKELLAR. Knowing that you are not a Communist, do you think we ought to select for this Commission a man who in his organization at home has had in the last 10 years somewhere between 40 and 55 Communists, and whose department had defended all Communists in his set-up down at the TVA? Do you think that at this time, with the world in the shape that it is in now, with the United States having the questions confronting it that it has now, do you think it is the time to appoint those friendly to the communistic cause?

"Mr. BARUCH. But I do not know to whom you refer.

"Senator MCKELLAR. I am talking of Mr. Lilienthal.

"Mr. BARUCH. I would not say that he was friendly to the Communist cause, Senator, from what I have seen of him.

"Senator MCKELLAR. But if you knew that from 30 to 40 or 55 Communists have been employed by him?

"Mr. BARUCH. And he knew it?

"Senator MCKELLAR. And he knew it. Men who were confessed Communists, men who joined the Communist Party while working for him, and admitted that they did. Would you think it would be a wise appointment at this time in our history, with the differences between us and Russia as they are—do you think it is a wise time to appoint such a man to office?

"Mr. BARUCH. I would not appoint a Communist to office at any time.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Shake hands. You are a great man. I have always had the greatest respect for you, and now I have more than ever. You would not appoint a Communist at any time. That is all." (Record, pp. 108–109.)

As a character witness, Mr. Baruch certainly did not do Mr. Lilienthal any good.

3. James Bryant Conant, president, Harvard University.

Dr. Conant was another witness who, while testifying to another's character (being called to testify about Mr. Wilson), made some interesting statements:

"Senator MCKELLAR. You would not be in favor of the confirmation of anyone about whom you had doubt as to what he felt more interested in Russian communism than he did in the American Constitution and Government, would you?

"Dr. CONANT. No.

"Senator MCKELLAR. I did not get that.

"Dr. CONANT I say 'no.'

"Senator MCKELLAR. I was confident you would say that.

"If you were a Senator, would you vote for the confirmation of any man to this particular office at this particular time, when the world is topsy-turvy in a way, and when there is so much feeling as between the Russian Government and the American Government and the American people and the Russian people—you would not think for a moment of confirming anyone about whom there was any doubt as to his Russian proclivities, would you?

"Dr. CONANT. I should certainly not want to confirm anyone, if I were a Senator, about whose loyalty I had any doubt.

"Senator MCKELLAR. America first; that is true, is it not?

"Dr. CONANT. The question is of his loyalty, isn't it?

"Senator MCKELLAR. Well, suppose he had surrounded himself with a large number of Communists, and promoted in his establishment only those who had Russian proclivities, Communist proclivities; would you feel like supporting a man of that kind?

"Dr. CONANT. When you speak of Communist proclivities, of course you refer to members of the Communist Party?

"Senator MCKELLAR. Yes, sir; one who had members of the Communist Party in his organization.

"Dr. CONANT. Oh, now, they might be there without his knowing it, sir?

"Senator MCKELLAR. Well, do you think they could, without his knowing it, exist there for 15 years, some of them joining the Communist Party while he was in charge? Do you think it is possible?

"Dr. CONANT. I don't know. I couldn't tell you.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Well, if you had any doubts about it, you would not vote for such a man, would you?

"Dr. CONANT. If I had any doubts about his loyalty, I certainly wouldn't.

"Senator MCKELLAR. That is all" (p. 116).

Dr. Conant had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Lilienthal for a short time, but quite intimately, in connection with the preparation of the so-called Acheson-Lilienthal report on atomic energy (p. 117).

Dr. Conant spoke very highly of General Groves and thought Groves still had a part in the matter (p. 118).

4. Dr. Vannevar Bush, president, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Bush testified to the good character of Mr. Carroll L. Wilson (pp. 179–180).

Dr. Bush also testified for Mr. Lilienthal (pp. 183–184). He had known him about 15 years.

5. Mr. Joe Starnes, former Congressman, Guntersville, Ala.

Mr. Starnes had known Mr. Lilienthal from 1935 while Mr. Starnes was a Member of the House. He stated that in his judgment Lilienthal was a man of impeccable character and was an able administrator (pp. 186–187).

Mr. Starnes was one of the examiners who went down and spent 1 day at Chattanooga, I believe. Their hearing was executive. The only three they had any evidence about were Henry C. Hart, Muriel Spear, Borah Williams, and David Stone Martin. Also Henry Thornton and Francis J. Martin.

Mr. Starnes stated before this committee that they had found these three employees to be admitted members at one time or the other of the Communist Party and they felt that the responsibility for further action was on his shoulders. (That is, Mr. Clapp's.) (P. 189.)

The witness said he had only made a verbal report on Communists down there, but handed them a printed report and he identified it (pp. 192–193).

In his report Mr. Starnes contradicted himself by saying the following:

"Numerous witnesses who have appeared before our committee have given testimony indicating that the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign-Born is a Communist-dominated front" (p. 193).

The witness also further stated: 'This chart makes clear the important fact that the Union for Democratic Action is composed chiefly of individuals who have been a significant part of the interlocking directorate of the Communist movement in the United States. As the leaders of the Union for Democratic Action would probably put it, this chart contains the evidence of their political conduct before Pearl Harbor" (p. 193).

Mr. Starnes also testified about the Conference for Human Welfare and other communistic organizations (p. 193).

Lilienthal and Clapp were both sponsors for the Communist organization which met at Chattanooga in 1940.

Testimony of Mr. Starnes:

"Senator MCKELLAR. Now, I want to read you from this report concerning the ideological background of the Communist attack:

"From the evidence which this report sets forth in later sections, it will be clear that the spearhead of the attack upon Congress as an institution stems from a group of men who have had long training and experience in the ideology of Karl Marx. It is pertinent, therefore, to draw attention to the official declarations of the Marxist movement which deals with the subject of the legislative or parliamentary branch of government.

"The theses and statutes of the Third (Communist) International, a document accepted as the basis of the program of the Communist Party of America, contains the following statement:

" 'Therefore, the deep hatred against all parliaments in the revolutionary proletariat is perfectly justified.'

"The same official document includes the following:

" 'Communism repudiates parliamentarism as the form of the future; its aim is to destroy parliamentarism.'

"It is true that Communists engage in political campaigns for the ostensible purpose of electing their friends and members to legislative bodies, but the official view of the Communist International on this matter is set forth in the following language:

" 'The Communist Party enters such institutions, not for the purpose of organization work but in order to blow up the whole bourgeois machinery and the parliament itself from within.'

"Communist literature is filled with declarations concerning parliamentary institutions similar to the foregoing citations. Further examples would be mere repetition. The Communist position sums up to the following: Discredit parliamentary institutions in every way possible, penetrate them for destructive purposes wherever possible, and wait for the emergency when they may be destroyed altogether.

"The current campaign against Congress, engineered by the Union for Democratic Action and its agents such as Lewis Corey, fits perfectly into the Marxist pattern reflected in the foregoing quotations.

"Now, the question I want to ask you is: Did it make no difference to you, as chairman of this committee, when you found, upon examination in Birmingham—and your agents seem to have found more, but just take these seven—seven Communists down there? Did you not think it was worth looking into?

"Mr. STARNES. Why Senator, of course; we were looking into it at the time.

"Senator MCKELLAR. You were looking into it. Well now, do you yourself remember examining in part Mrs. Muriel S. Williams?

"Mr. STARNES. Oh, yes.

"Senator MCKELLAR. You took part in that examination, did you not? Mr. Barker conducted it in your presence. You were the only Congressman there, were you not?

"Mr. STARNES. That is correct.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Mr. Clapp testified she was the only Communist dismissed.

"Mr. STARNES. Mr. Martin, he testified, resigned from the Authority.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Listen to this:

" 'The testimony of Mrs. Muriel S. Williams, of the TVA, whom Mr. Clapp testified was the only Communist dismissed by the TVA as result of the Dies committee investigation testified before the Dies Committee in Washington on July 26, 1940, admitting that she was a Communist and named the following persons as having attended meetings with her.'

"Now, I want to give you the names of the persons that she saw at Communist meetings as given me by Mr. Robert Barker, and I will read them to you (Dies committee hearings, July 26, 1940, pp. 1268, 1269, 1271, and 1277):

" 'John M. Frantz, Dr. Barry Casper, Dorothy Remine Frantz, Mabel Abercrombie, Bernard Borah, Howard Frazier, Harry F. Alber, Henry C. Hart, Jr., Milton Mandel, David Stone Martin, Ruth S. Martin, Harry T. Miller, Richard T. Mosher, Burton Zion, Rudolf Bertram, Bertha Klenova, Joseph Herman Daves, Kenneth Malcom, Kenneth Cameron, Donald Wheatcraft, Edward Glasek, Kathleen R. Eakin.'

"And you heard her testify to those names?

"Mr. STARNES. Oh, yes; I conducted the investigations, Senator" (p. 195).

6. Dr. Karl Taylor Compton, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Dr. Compton came to testify as a character witness for Mr. Wilson (p. 211).

He had this to say of Mr. Lilienthal:

"Mr. Lilienthal, I came to know slightly during the operation of the Science Advisory Board, back in 1933 and '34. I was very much impressed with his ability and energy, his efficiency. I didn't know enough about that organization and its problems to have any opinion other than that which I have stated.

"As far as I knew the situation, my opinion of Mr. Lilienthal was entirely favorable. And for a short time before his appointment as chairman of this Atomic Energy Commission, I have heard a good deal of discussion of Mr. Lilienthal. As you probably know, every little group of people interested in this thing over the country was busy selecting its own commission, and I saw a lot of those amateur selections, and Mr. Lilienthal was some place on every list that I saw.

"I have been very much impressed with the policies for the operation of this commission, as I have heard them briefly outlined on one occasion by Mr. Lilienthal.

"Senator MCKELLAR. Was Mr. Lilienthal one of the scientists who had to do with the discovery of atomic energy?

"Dr. COMPTON. No, sir (p. 221).

"Senator MCKELLAR. Did Mr. Lilienthal know anything about it?

"Dr. COMPTON. That, I don't know. I know there was a lot of work going on down in your territory, and Mr. Lilienthal knew something of it, but I don't know how much" (p. 222).

So, it is perfectly clear that Dr. Compton did not know much, if anything, about Mr. Lilienthal.

7. Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State.

Mr. Acheson was called, but testified as to the good character of Mr. Marks and not of Lilienthal (pp. 276 to 284).

He had known Mr. Lilienthal only since the organization of the board of consultants last March (p. 284).

Mr. Acheson didn't know of the secret of the atomic bomb being imparted to other countries up to the present time. He thought certain parts of it had been imparted to Great Britain and Canada (p. 290).

He approved the Lilienthal report in the way it was published (p. 291).

8. John Lord O'Brian, counselor at law, Washington, D. C.

Mr. O'Brian testified as to the character of Marks (p. 310).

He also testified in behalf of Mr. Wilson (p. 315).

9. Col. Walker L. Ciser, chief engineer of power plants, Detroit Edison Co., Grosse Pointe, Mich.

Colonel Cisler testified in favor of Mr. Marks (p. 317).

Attorney Henry H. Fowler was a witness against Mr. Bolt, but a very weak one (p. 321).

10. Secretary Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War.

Secretary Patterson was a character witness for Mr. Lilienthal.

"Secretary PATTERSON. Mr. Lilienthal, I should say, I have known about 5 years. My contacts with him haven't been in connection with the prosecution of the war, but occurred when I was Under Secretary of War and he was head of the TVA; they were all of them business contacts" (p. 323).

Secretary Patterson also was asked about the plan proposed by Mr. Lilienthal for the establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission and its powers and duties. He said he read it at the time but didn't have it present in his mind at that time (p. 325).

He said that the atomic-energy secret had not been imparted to other nations (p. 326).

He said he was in favor of international control of atomic energy (p. 327).

His testimony, of course, concerning Mr. Lilienthal amounted to very little.

11. Dr. John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College.

Dr. Dickey testified about the good character of Mr. Marks (p. 366).

As to Mr. Lilienthal, he said: "And I have just simply shaken hands with Mr. Lilienthal" (p. 367).

12. Chester I. Barnard, president, New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., Newark, N. J.

Mr. Barnard had known Mr. Lilienthal only since September 1945, about a year and a half. This was entirely in connection with the atomic-energy matter (p. 418).

He did not agree with Lilienthal at all about the atomic bomb (p. 419).

Mr. Barnard stated that Mr. Lilienthal said to him with the utmost vehemence: "If it requires a totalitarian regime to control atomic energy and the atomic bomb, I hope one drops on me and my family. I do not want to live, and I want no descendants of mine to live, n a totalitarian society (p. 419).

"Senator McKELLAR. You are a businessman?

"Mr. BARNARD. Yes, sir.

"Senator McKELLAR. And you have been in business a long time occupying a very prominent place?

"Mr. BARNARD. All my life.

"Senator McKELLAR. All your life. I want to ask you how you regard our Government. Do you not think the American Government is a very honest, upright Government?

"Mr. BARNARD. I would have to have a lot of definition, Senator McKellar, to answer that question.

"Senator McKELLAR. You do not think much of the American Government, then?

"Mr. BARNARD. Yes.

"Senator McKELLAR. I want to know how much you think of it.

"Mr. BARNARD. I think enough of it to have spent a lot of time here.

"Senator McKELLAR. I know, but that is a very general statement, Mr. Barnard, and we want to get something specific. Do you not believe in the splendid way in which your Government was founded? Do you not believe in the Constitution of the United States and the laws passed by the Congress and by the various States? Do you not like the American system of Government?

"Mr BARNARD. I do.

"Senator McKELLAR. I would think a man in your position would not hesitate to say that w had a good government. Do you know of any government anywhere else that is any better?

"Mr. BARNARD. No; I do not.

"Senator McKELLAR. Well, I am glad to hear it, because you rather gave me a wrong idea about it, and I am glad to hear you say that you think well of our Government.

"I want to be perfectly frank with you and tell you that I have that same notion about it. When it comes down to a test, all good Americans are and should be believers in the American Government.

"Now, the American Government now has the secret of the bomb, has it not?

"Mr. BARNARD. I do not know how secret it is.

"Senator McKELLAR. You do not know how secret it is?

"Mr. BARNARD. No, sir.

"Senator McKELLAR. Do you know anything about the bomb itself? Do you know what it is made from?

"Mr BARNARD. I know all about it.

"Senator McKELLAR. Have you got the formula?

"Mr. BARNARD. No, thank God; I have not.

"Senator McKELLAR. If you knew the formula by which this bomb was made; that is what I asked you.

"Mr. BARNARD. I know how the bomb is made, Senator. I could not describe the quantities, and so forth.

"Senator McKELLAR. You know it took the world a good long while to build this bomb, do you not?

"Mr. BARNARD. I think it was a pretty short time.

"Senator McKELLAR. I want to ask you this: You know from history that men of every age in the last 2,000 years or more have been trying to do what we call split the atom. Do you not know that from history?

"Mr. BARNARD. They had hopes of it.

"Senator McKELLAR. Alexander the Great had Macedonian scientists 2,300 years ago, trying to work out how to split the atom. You know that from history, do you not?

"Mr. BARNARD. Yes, sir.

"Senator McKELLAR. You know that a Latin poet wrote an ode to the atom, do you not?

"Mr. BARNARD. I do not remember that, sir.

"Senator McKELLAR. Well, it is a little too far from your personal memory, but I was speaking about history. I recall having studied in college this particular Latin author, and I remember that particular incident. And every age since that time, scientists have tried to bring that about.

"Now, the United States has accomplished it, and at a very big cost, too. Even those who want to make it appear to be as little as possible, admitted that it took $2,600,000,000, and many people say that it cost the Government five or six billions.

"Now, why, if that secret is still in our hands, as it has been testified before this committee and before the other committee, that that secret is still in the hands of the United States Government, should we give it away?

"Have you got any lack of confidence in your own Government to think that we will make war with the bomb on other people? Why do you want to give it to other nations who had very little to do with discovering that atomic bomb?

"Mr. BARNARD. You are asking me a question, and I am going to answer it, and there will be two or three parts to the answer.

"I want to give it in return for the nearest thing I can get to a guaranty that it will not be used in warfare. That is No. 1.

"2. I want to set up the arrangements, because I do not think it can be kept secret. It is not secret to the United States Government alone. We had three partners in this game, the Canadians and the British being in it with us.

"Professor Chadwick, who met with our committee, was here a great deal of the time. He is one of the leading atomic physicists in the world, and the man who discovered neutrons in 1932.

"It is not a United States secret, and a great deal of misunderstanding comes from assuming that it is.

"In addition to that, there are just too many people in this country who know these secrets, Senator, and there was just too much information gotten out of Canada for me, and I do not want anybody to be misled as to the dangers.

"Senator McKELLAR. Notwithstanding what you have heard about me, I think you will give me credit for not being offensive, and I do not want to be offensive. But how long have you known about this secret that you say is now in the hands of everybody?

"Mr. BARNARD. I did not say it was in the hands of everybody.

"Senator McKELLAR. Well, you said it was well known.

"Mr. BARNARD. I said we had three partners, three governmental partners in this, and a great many scientists have been involved in it.

"Senator McKELLAR. And you say that the people who have the secret now are Great Britain and Canada, as well as the United States?

"Mr. BARNARD. Yes" (pp. 423 to 425).

Mr. Barnard testified a long time and said exceedingly little. It is a matter of great astonishment to me that a man who talks like this is the president of a great institution like the Bell Telephone Co.

13. Rev. Thomas E. O'Connell, past president of the Catholic Committee of the South, also testified (p. 441 and following).

14. Bishop E. H. Hughes, 691 Rollingwood Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

Bishop Hughes was at one time president of Depauw University, but his presidency terminated 12 years before Lilienthal received his diploma in 1920, but he is still a trustee of the university (p. 516).

He said he had met Lilienthal repeatedly; knew him back in 1928 in Chicago.

15. Charles A. Thomas, vice president in charge of research and development, Monsanto Chemical Co., 1700 Second Street, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. Thomas had known Mr. Lilienthal since early January a year ago (p. 594).

Mr. Thomas helped prepare the Lilienthal-Acheson report. He thought Mr. Lilienthal "quite a catalyst." He explained that this was getting people to work with each other (p. 594).

He did not give as an illustration Mr. Lilienthal's disagreement with Dr. A. E. Morgan.

He thought the United States was short on uranium and thorium and said: "We get all of Russia's uranium under such a scheme, put in the international authority. In other words, all of the uranium and thorium of the world would be put under this authority, and the first step is that we would have a survey of geologists going into Russia and finding out continuously what their deposits of uranium are" (p. 598).

Mr. Thomas spoke in favor of the proposal to give the secret to other nations, especially Russia. But he knew nothing about Mr. Lilienthal.

16. Barrett C. Shelton, publisher, Decatur Daily News, Decatur, Ala.

Mr. Shelton was very much for Mr. Lilienthal (p. 609).

He knew nothing about when the dams were built, except the first one was built at nearby Muscle Shoals.

17. Mr. Robert Bishop, Guntersville, Ala.

Mr. Bishop said he had had a lot of dealings with the TVA and they had always been fair with him (p. 613).

If his testimony was of any value to anyone, the other side can have it.

He said the TVA was a good thing, and that I agree with, if it were properly run by honest people.

18. Mr. Louis A. Eckl, editor, Florence Times, Florence, Ala.

Mr. Ecky testified for Mr. Lilienthal.

He had seen Mr. Lilienthal occasionally when he came to Florence (p. 619).

19. Mr. H. E. Monroe, president, Chamber of Commerce, Huntsville, Ala., and head of the Business Equipment Co., Huntsville.

He wanted to concur in what the other gentlemen had to say. He had only met Mr.

Lilienthal on several occasions. He had talked with him on several occasions (p. 622).

20. Mr. Thomas McCroskey, Knoxville, Tenn., farmer.

Mr. McCroskey thought Mr. Lilienthal was eminently qualified for the job. He had never been to Mr. Lilienthal's home although he lived quite close to him. He had had business relations with the TVA, of course (p. 623).

WITNESSES THAT DID APPEAR

What is the value of these witnesses?

1. Mr. John M. Hancock's evidence was of no value whatsoever to Mr. Lilienthal.

2. Nor can Mr. Bernard M. Baruch's testimony be considered of any value. He damned Lilienthal with faint praise, and differed with him very much.

3. The next witness, Dr. Conant, president of Harvard University, said if he had a doubt about Lilienthal's loyalty he would not vote for him. Well, there are a thousand doubts about his loyalty shown in this record.

4. I was not present when Dr. Vannevar Bush testified for Mr. Lilienthal and he was the only man who had known him for any length of time. The best that can be said for Dr. Bush is that he is a good "claimer" for anything or anybody in whom he is interested. Primarily he seems to have been testifying for Carroll L. Wilson but he did endorse Mr. Lilienthal. (Record, p. 183.)

5. Mr. Starnes had known Mr. Lilienthal for some time, but Mr. Starnes held hearings only 1 day in Chattanooga and his memory concerning them was very, very bad. Mr. Starnes is a nice man but he seems to be one of the Lilienthal crowd.

6. Dr. Karl Taylor Compton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, came as a witness for Dr. Compton, but he was asked about Mr. Lilienthal and he said that he knew him very slightly back in 1933 and 1934, and his testimony was of no value.

7. Dean Acheson was called to testify to the good character of David S. Marks and not for Lilienthal. He had only known Lilienthal since last March.

8. John Lord O'Brian was not called for Lilienthal but for Marks and he also testified for Wilson.

9. Col. Walker L. Cisler, chief engineer of power plants, Detroit Edison Co., testified for Mr. Marks and not for Lilienthal.

10. Secretary Patterson had known Lilienthal only during the last 5 years and had only known him officially.

11. Dr. John S. Dickey, president of Dartmouth College, testified to the good character of Mr. Marks and Mr. Lilienthal, he said, "And I have just simply shaken hands with Mr. Lilienthal."

12. Chester I. Barnard, president, New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., had known Lilienthal only since last September a year ago, about a year and a half.

13. Rev. Thomas E. O'Connell, past president of the Catholic Committee of the South, an offshoot of the Catholic Church testified but his testimony was of no value.

14. Bishop E. H. Hughes, of Chevy Chase, Md., was at one time president of Depauw University but his presidency terminated 12 years before Lilienthal was there and he knew very little about him.

15. Charles A. Thomas, Research Developer of Monsanto Chemical Co. That company had large business relations with Mr. Lilienthal.

16. Barrett C. Shelton, publisher, Decatur Daily News, Decatur, Ala.: He knew nothing about where the dams were built and his evidence was not of any particular value.

17. The same is true of Mr. Robert Bishop who had had dealings with the TVA and said it had always been fair with him.

18. Mr. Louis A. Eckl, editor of the Florence (Ala.) Times testified that he had seen Mr. Lilienthal occasionally when he came to Florence.

19. Mr. H. E. Monroe, president, Chamber of Commerce, Huntsville, Ala.: He just concurred with what the gentlemen who preceeded him had to say.

20. Mr. Thomas McCroskey put himself down as a farmer from Knoxville, Tenn. Mr. McCroskey had had business relations with Mr. Lilienthal and they were satisfactory.

The character evidence for Lilienthal practically amounted to nothing.

LILIENTHAL FOR LILIENTHAL

The proof in this record shows that since Mr. Lilienthal's graduation from law school that his one purpose in life has been to get the most benefits possible for Mr. Lilienthal. I will take this up under several headings:

1. He went into Mr. Donald Richberg's office in 1923, according to his biography, and immediately took away from Mr. Richberg his great law practice or claims credit for it. Of course, we all know that this statement is wholly incorrect. We know this claim of Mr. Lilienthal's is utterly without foundation. He probably saw Mr. Richberg collect some fees and he might have run an errand or two about it but Mr. Richberg nor any one connected with his firm does not testify, for his own biography states:

"From 1923 to 1926 the young lawyer was associated in the practice of law with Donald R. Richberg of Chicago and he participated in important cases involving the rights of labor."

2. "Practicing law alone after 1926 in his own right he became special counsel for the city of Chicago in the famous telephone rate controversy which ultimately resulted in the United States Supreme Court's ordering a refund of $20,000,000 overcharge to telephone subscribers."

He does not say how much money he got from the city of Chicago as special counsel in this case or what he did or whether he did anything. Lilienthal for Lilienthal!

3. In his laudatory biography he next says:

"From 1926 to 1931 he also edited the Public Utilities and Carriers Service for Chicago's Commerce Clearing House. Most of the customers of his legal service were members of the power trust or their attorneys, and the service gave them up-to-date digests of legislative and court decisions affecting their operations."

This is the celebrated situation that Mrs. Leitzell testified about. Of course, Mr. Lilienthal's date is wrong. Quoting further from his biography:

"Lilienthal's knowledge of the utilities led Governor La Follette to ask him to become a member of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission in 1931 In this capacity Lilienthal reorganized the commission and revised the public-utilities statutes of Wisconsin in such a way that they became the model for half a dozen other States"

What are the facts about these statements in Mr. Lilienthal's record? The facts all came out in the testimony of Mrs. Meads Duncan Leitzell, of Chicago, before the Senate committee on February 19, 1947 (vol. 16, pp. 1398-1409), heretofore discussed.

Mrs. Leitzell was not my witness. She was put on the stand by the committee. I had never heard anything about these facts concerning which she testified. I never saw or heard of her before. I was never more surprised than to hear her story. To my mind her testimony already discussed condemns Lilienthal and shows that he is wholly unfitted to hold any office of public trust, much less this office which may be the greatest office in the world.

LA FOLLETTE'S TELEGRAM

Now, Governor La Follette's telegram, put in the record by Mr. Lilienthal, states that it came to his knowledge that Mr. Lilienthal had canceled his contract and was winding up his business, and a copy of his canceled contract was filed with the State of Wisconsin while Mr. Lilienthal was commissioner but the copy of the contract cannot be found in the State's possession. Governor La Follette said it was locked up in a safe. I suppose the better to keep it secret, but the witness, Mrs. Leitzell, contradicts this. She testified thusly:

"After his appointment to the Wisconsin commission Mr. Lilienthal told me to tell anybody who asked for him that the office was no longer his. I followed the instructions." (Record, p. 590).

In addition to that, Mr. Lilienthtal admits he kept the secret in the publication of his biography in 1944-45 Who's Who when he put this in at that time:

"Contributor to local magazines; editor public utilities and carrier service 1926-1931."

Of course, we all know that Who's Who publishes only the statements of a man as he gives them.

In the next edition of Who's Who, 1946-48, evidently fearing that something might come out about this remarkable double-rating employee for the utilities and against them, he left that statement out, thus verifying what Mrs. Leitzell testified. Lilienthal for Lilienthal. Note well. Note especially well. He not only took other business in violation of the law but he was working for and against the same companies nearly all the time he was utility commissioner of Wisconsin. He got much more from the companies themselves than he did from his office under Governor La Follette. He served two masters and for a long time got by with it.

But Governor La Follette suggests that he gave him permission to violate the law. Well, of course, everybody knows that Governor La Follette had no more right to give a man permission to violate the law than the man himself had to violate it without permission. The truth is, Senators, that this is a transaction that is dishonest, corrupt, and unfits a man who would engage in such a practice for the holding of this or any other office under the Government of the United States. Lilienthal for Lilienthal.

(4) Lilienthal was appointed a member of the Tennessee Valley Authority by President Roosevelt in the Spring of 1933. Dr. A. E. Morgan, whose testimony is undenied, tells of his manipulations down there.

Lilienthal was still working for Lilienthal. He made an agreement with Dr. H. A. Morgan to act with him instead of acting with the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Dr. A. E. Morgan, and from 1933 to 1941 he was continuously after Dr. A. E. Morgan. He bootlicked and honeyfugled President Roosevelt until he got the President to believe in him and finally got Dr. A. E. Morgan out and got himself appointed Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority. A more contemptible, a more dishonest, or a more corrupt course of conduct can hardly be imagined. Lilienthal for Lilienthal.

5. Dr. A. E. Morgan had planned all the dams or practically all of them. He had a fine engineering force. Lilienthal knew no more about engineering than a cat, but he saw what an opportunity it was for him to get money, and it was not long before he was getting it. He had one of his general counsel who did not know the law to give an opinion that he did not have to pay the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority into the Treasury of the United States, but he had a right to withhold them and do with them just as he pleased. Senators, as the older ones of you know, I got every dollar of the money from the Congress to build these twenty-odd dams in Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky. I got the dams by the hardest kind of a fight over the wishes of the House of Representatives and by only one majority in the Senate committee. When the appropriation bills came on I got the money, and

it takes money to build dams. When I learned that Mr. Lilienthal declined to pay his receipts into the Treasury of the United States I was never more astounded in my life. I did not believe it was the law then, and I do not believe it is the law now. It was just a dishonest and corrupt way that Lilienthal took and pursued in reference to the moneys coming into the TVA's till. He had flattered President Roosevelt to the extent that President Roosevelt agreed with him, and there I found myself in the attitude of a man who had worked night and day, faithfully and long, ever since I had been in Congress, to get the money to build these dams. I had succeeded. I knew they would be of the greatest value to Tennessee and to the country and would be a source of large income to the Government. When Lilienthal took this position of not paying the receipts into the Treasury I thereupon began to move in every way I could to pass a bill requiring the TVA to pay its receipts into the Treasury of the United States, like all other governmental institutions.

I got the bill passed in the Senate, but the House defeated it, and it did not become the law—and Lilienthal still claims that he is not required by law to pay his receipts into the Treasury of the United States. What his receipts are no Member of Congress knows. No member of the Government knows. I doubt if Mr. Lilienthal himself knows. He spends this money just as he pleases. Lilienthal for Lilienthal.

6. He has repealed the national civil-service law, the national retirement law, the national rivers and harbors and flood-control law, the general accounting and various other laws, and he placed the TVA over all and above all in that territory, and ever since the dams began to bring in income he has used that income as he saw fit. I here quote from what Mr. Lindsay Warren says about it (p. 4, hearings on H. R. 4961, June 18, 1941):

"We say the audit they rely on is merely in addition to the audit under the Budget and Accounting Act. Now, what kind of audit is this, that they say is all we can make and all that they will permit us to make: Well, it is nothing more than what is known as a commercial audit. Under that they can go ahead, if they please, and make every kind of illegal expenditure on the face of the earth, and there is nothing that we can do about it but report it. The horse is then out of the stable."

So that Mr. Lilienthal is the sole beneficiary of the financial value of this property of the United States. He spends it on any vagaries that he wishes. Lilienthal for Lilienthal.

7. A part of these expenditures he uses almost wholly for himself. He says he allots $150,000 to about 15 employees known as his publicity force. This publicity force he uses as he pleases. He gets all the favorable comments in the papers. He publishes what he pleases. He keeps out of the papers what he desires. It is noticeable that the most of the papers are for him. They are for him right or wrong. They do not investigate as to whether his publicity force is telling the truth or not. They go ahead and publish it. There is nothing like having unlimited use of Government money. He has one big $60,000 airplane which he uses as his private plane, as well as numerous other perquisites. He has an income of $35,000,000 a year. Of course, much of this he loses in his various vagaries. The records shows that he does not know whether he is making money or not. The Government has nearly $800,000,000 invested in those dams. No taxes are paid to the Federal Government. He sells fertilizers. He gives away over $2,000,000 a year to certain farmers who have the political ear of Mr. Lilienthal. It is very nice for those farmers to have a gentleman like Mr. Lilienthal so generous with the Government's money, but if benefits go out to the farmers they should go out equally to all. It is an infamous shame that a few selected farmers should get all the benefits of the Government's fertilizers free of charge. It is dishonest; it is unwise, and it is corrupt. That is one of Mr. Lilienthal's ways of handling the income of this great institution as he pleases and not as the Government pleases. Lilienthal for Lilienthal.

8. He says he is not in politics. A greater untruth was never told, probably. It is just as great an untruth as that uttered by him when he said recently that "he had done his damndest" to keep from being appointed to this position. That statement is as false as hades itself.

When his time came up for reappointment 2 or 3 years ago, let's see who got him reappointed: He was appointed with the endorsements of Henry A. Wallace, Sidney Hillman, who was then living, Walter White, and Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt, and perhaps others. I have been told that these same people, with the exception of Mr. Hillman, endorsed him this last time, although he said he had no endorsements at all to President Truman. I might remark here that President Truman never asked either one of the two Tennessee Senators for their endorsements of either Mr. Lilienthal as head of the Atomic Energy Commission or Mr. Clapp as head of the TVA. Our endorsements for residents of our State seem not to have been desired. We knew nothing about it until we saw these appointments in the papers. Lilinethal for Lilienthal.

9. Judging by the past financial transactions of Mr. Lilienthal, what may we expect if he is appointed to this position? His leading principle of Government often quoted is as follows:

"Our Government and every government is and must be a Government of men and not of laws."

In a recent publication in the Progressive Farmer of October 1945, when he was an active candidate for this position using the TVA's $60,000 airplane making speeches all over the country about something he knew nothing in the world about and probably never thought of until Hiroshima, he had much to say about this discovery and the people controlling it. I quote from him—bear this in mind:

"Those who control energy control people." Are we going to put this great discovery and this great power in the hands of a man who believes that "those who control energy control people?" Lilienthal for Lilienthal.

10. Of course, we all know the possibilities of this power to be put in the hands of a man who requires anyone in his way to get out like he did with Phil La Follette; like he did Dr. A. E. Morgan; and like he has but recently done with General Groves. Whoever gets in his way must get out. Lilienthal for Lilienthal.

He can be dishonest, as an individual, if he wants to but he must bear the burdens of being dishonest. He took a chance to attempt to regulate the power companies for the State of Wisconsin and at the same time receive pay from the power companies which it was his sworn duty to regulate. He can take a chance to be dishonest if he wants to. He can take a chance to get rid of anyone who is in his way. Are we going to confirm a man of this kind to this high and important office? It may probably be the greatest office ever created. He violated a law to collect two salaries. He might be dishonest again. Lilienthal for Lilienthal.

11. What are his qualifications? He is not an engineer—never has been one. He never heard of atomic power until the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. He saw that there might be better pickings than there were in the Wisconsin Utilities Commission; better pickings than there were in the utilities companies themselves; better pickings than those he found in the TVA, and he immediately set out to get the new place without regard to his lack of information concerning the new power. The world has been trying to discover this power for more than 2,000 years; and yet in less than 2 years after it was discovered Lilienthal was trying to leave his former favorable financial pickings and go into this new effort to make money. Who knows what he might do? He took the power companies' money and he took Wisconsin money both dishonestly. He served two masters. He took Dr. A. E. Morgan's place dishonestly. He undertook to take General Groves' place without any knowledge of the subject at all. If he did sell out his public duty to the power companies at about $1,100 a month who can say he would not sell out to those interests the various secrets controlling atomic energy? Lilienthal for Lilienthal.

He yielded to the temptation of making money and obtaining greater publicity in Wisconsin. Who can say he will not yield to a greater temptation in the large field?

On pages 3 and 4 of the record Lilienthal testified about his express qualifications but deliberately held back the information from the committee that he had worked for the Commerce Clearing House, his principal source of income. He told of his law practice and association with Donald Richberg and various magazines, but failed to mention his connection with the Commerce Clearing House.

On pages 33 and 34 he testified that he did not believe the military should sit in on meetings of the Commission and did not approve of the Atomic Energy Committee sitting in on the Commission meetings. In other words, he wanted it to be a one-man job, as his previous places had been.

LILIENTHAL'S RECORD IN TVA

On his record in TVA Lilienthal should not be confirmed to membership on the Atomic Energy Commission.

1. There are a number of reasons. The first is that ever since he has been Chairman of the Authority he has violated the laws of the United States (a) in disregarding the general civil-service laws; (b) in disregarding the general retirement laws in dealing with his employees; (c) in disregarding navigation and flood-control laws of the United States; (d) in disregarding the general-accounting laws of the United States and not having his accounts examined. The Congress does not know, the President does not know, and the people of the country do not know whether Mr. Lilienthal has used the enormous receipts from the TVA honestly and wisely or not, because he does not account for them except in such reports as he sees fit to make.

2. We have invested in the TVA about $800,000,000. Although we have a great income from these dams, amply able to pay a reasonable interest on this money, not a cent of it has been paid on this investment.

Further than that, not a cent of taxes is paid to the United States Government. This allows him to sell power to the private power companies and to the big corporations cheaper than they can produce power for themselves; but it does not lessen the price of power to the people. This Body passed a law several years ago requiring him to pay his money into the Treasury of the United States. By lobbying in the House Lilienthal got the measure defeated there. If he has been conducting his business honestly and fairly to the people he would not take these positions. Nobody knows whether he has conducted the TVA honestly or dishonestly. In my judgment, you Senators who vote for this man are going to feel tremendously humiliated whenever the affairs of the TVA under Lilienthal are investigated. We have never had an investigation of them

and as long as he controls them, and he will continue to control them if Clapp is made chairman of the Authority, it will be dishonestly run. No man who honestly handles the money of other people ever objects to being investigated or ever objects to furnishing the proof of the correctness of his books.

Senators, the best part of my legislative life was spent in obtaining these dams. It was through my efforts that every dollar of the money that went into these dams was obtained. But I say to you very solemnly that if I had known that after we had gotten the dams built we were going to turn it over to be used by Lilienthal as his private property, not accounting to the Congress, not accounting to the people for the returns coming from these dams, I say to you I never would have tried in the slightest way to have obtained these dams.

FIVE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS

I wonder do you Senators realize what this confirmation of Lilienthal means? Do you realize what it is going to cost the United States to have Lilienthal run this atom bomb operation for awhile until he can give the secret away to other nations? Do you know that Lilienthal has already recommended a $500,000,000 appropriation for the atom bomb this year? Two hundred and fifty millions of dollars cash and two hundred and fifty millions authorization—$500,000,000 in all the first year? What a modest little cost to give away the greatest discovery ever made by man. Five hundred millions for the first year. That is just a half billion, and what is a half billion dollars to the United States? It is such a teeny, weeny bit. And giving it away will make all the nations look to us for more. And what a delightful thing it will be to have other nations look to us for more, and getting more money from us.

Who are the Senators who know what is going to be done with this $500,000,000 thus put in the hands of Lilienthal? You have not been told and probably will not be told; but why need we bother with that when we have Lilienthal who has so recklessly spent the income from the TVA to look after it. If we give them five hundred million the first year, who can say the amount will not be greater the next year?

Suppose it takes Lilienthal 10 years to give it away. That is $5,000,000,000. But what is $5,000,000,000 to this ountry? We only owe about two hundred and sixty billion now, and we probably will not pay over two billion on this debt this year.

COMMUNISM IN GREECE AND TURKEY

The President has sent us a message asking for some $400,000,000 and the use of our Army and Navy and perhaps Air Corps to stop communism in Greece and Turkey. A few hundred millions has also been recommended by former President Hoover for Austria. And we will have to give money to China and probably to Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, and perhaps even India. Where are we going to stop? Iraq and Iran will no doubt be asking for several hundred millions; Arabia several hundred millions; and Palestine—of course that is a more difficult subject. Great Britain wants to continue to control Palestine and it may cost several hundred millions of dollars, and why should not we spend this money.

GREECE AND TURKEY

But let us confine ourselves for the present to the money required for preventing communism in Greece and Turkey. I am against communism anywhere and at any time, but why should we stop communism in Greece and Turkey and not do anything to stop it in America? We are taking the side of communism when we appoint this communistic commission. Mr. Lilienthal has been in charge of the TVA for some 8 or 10 years and during all that time communism has flourished down there.

He had 20 witnesses, including himself, to testify for him in this hearing. Three of them were well-known Communists—Kenneth Cameron, Jr., former TVA employee, a well-known Communist; John Marshall Frantz, a former TVA employee and a well-known Communist; and Henry C. Hart, a former TVA employee and a well-known Communist. The only testimony that he got from any of the officials or employees of the TVA was from these three well-known Communists. And yet he claims not to be a Communist.

ONLY A START

But the five hundred millions that Lilienthal asked for is only a start. I suppose it is a grave secret as to how he is going to spend it. Already he is going to take over all the private industries down there, according to the telegrams and letters from Mr. W. E. Badgett which were put in the record.

PREPARATION FAR IN ADVANCE

A great Commission with David E. Lilienthal as its Chairman, and asking the first year for only $500,000,000. Why, the idea is unthinkable. Just think of a great man like "Dave," who did not know where his own father and mother were born—just think of a great man like "Dave" not having but $500,000,000 to spend in a whole year. Why, he had thirty-five million at the TVA, and after giving him this high office, just to give him five hundred million a year—it is almost sacreligious to think about.

GEMS (?) FROM LILIENTHAL'S TESTIMONY

"Our Government and every government is and must be a government of men and not of laws." If that is not a definition of communism, then a definition cannot be made.

And again he says:

"Any forms of government, therefore, and any other institutions, which make men means rather than ends in themselves, which exalt the state or any other institutions above the importance of men, which place arbitrary power to this conception; and there I am deeply opposed to them."

1. His attitude toward General Groves

"Senator VANDENBERG. Has your Commission ever consulted with General Groves since the Commission was organized?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. Yes; that was one of the very first things we did, and all during this period we have had the benefit of a good many consultations with General Groves and some of his associates on a great variety of matters. And Colonel Nichols, his deputy, has been of invaluable service to the Commission, as well.

"Senator VANDENBERG. You did consult with General Groves? Your answer was "Yes"?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. Yes. On many occasions; yes, sir. And on many subjects.

"Senator KNOWLAND. Was that individually, or did the Commission call General Groves in?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. It was chiefly between the Commission and General Groves, although I perhaps did see the general at times in addition to that.

"Senator JOHNSON. Was that since December 31 at midnight, or prior to December 31 at midnight?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. Most of the consultations were prior to that. I am not sure whether there have been consultations with General Groves since the transfer or not.

"Senator JOHNSON. You haven't had any since December 31 at midnight with General Groves, have you?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. I don't recall that there have been any; I think perhaps not." (Record, p. 11.)

This shows that on December 31 at midnight General Groves was thrown out and Lilienthal took over, and there has been no communication since; and from our experience with this man down in Tennessee, if the Army or the Navy think they are going to have anything to do with Lilienthal's show, they are mistaken, that is all, Secretary Patterson to the contrary notwithstanding.

2. The Military Liaison Committee

"Senator MILLIKIN. Are they in attendance at all sessions of the Commission?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. No; and we do not contemplate that.

"Senator MILLIKIN. Why not?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. I think there is a distinction between these two things. One is the responsibility which the Commissioners have, and the other is the responsibility of liaison with the Military Liaison Committee. There will be many joint sessions, and there will be a great deal of interchange of information. But it would be very difficult for the Commission to feel free to discuss many matters except within a Commission meeting.

"Senator MILLIKIN What would be the difficulty of that? I mean, how can the Military Liaison Committee know what is going on, unless they are actively participating in the discussions with the Commission as the Commission does its business?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. I have difficulty in conceiving of that, Senator. But it would be comparable to the joint committee of the Congress, which has also a continuing responsibility, not simply by which they review matters, but by concurrent consideration of the problems before the Commission. There will be nothing withheld from the Military Liaison Committee.

"Senator MILLIKIN. But you are putting that as a matter within your own judgment and discretion as to what should be put out to the Military Liaison Committee." (Record, p. 13.)

As times goes on, if Lilienthal should be confirmed, everything will be under his direction and control.

Again:

"Senator MILLIKIN. * * * I do not mean that they shall vote, but I mean that they shall be present whenever the Commission is meeting. Are we in agreement or disagreement on that?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. No; we are in disagreement on that, I am afraid, Senator. I think that would become very unwieldy." (Record, p. 14.)

Of course, the Military Liaison Committee, the Congress, or anyone else will not have anything to do with the matter if it is turned over to Lilienthal.

Later on Lilienthal gave assurances that there would be no trouble on that score, and evidently Senators MILLIKIN and VANDENBERG accepted these assurances from Lilienthal; but it will be found after Lilienthal takes charge that nobody else will have anything to do with it.

3. His selection of the majority of the Board

"Senator MILLIKIN. * * * Did you recommend any of the other members of the Commission?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. Yes.

"Senator MILLIKIN. Who were they?

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. Well, I am proud to state the facts, but I am not sure of the propriety of doing so.

"Senator MILLIKIN. I do not ask the question in terms of disparagement. I just want the facts.

"Mr. LILIENTHAL. Dr. Bacher and Mr. Waymack." (Record, p. 30.)

He is doing in this just exactly what he did with poor Dr. H. A. Morgan in the TVA. I do not know that he recommended Dr. Morgan but as soon as he got in the Authority he made deals with Dr. H. A. Morgan and from that time on even to the present time Dr. H. A. Morgan is Lilienthal's man and is still known as Lilienthal's man. He votes

whichever way Lilienthal tells him to vote. Of course, he draws his own salary.

Lilienthal had much to say about security. I doubt if he is an expert on security except that there is no question about his being an expert on Lilienthal's security in Government places.

4. Lilienthal a Red in Wisconsin

I here quote the testimony of Judge Asa K. Owen of Price County, Wis., as shown in a letter dated January 27, 1947:

"I hear, over the radio, that you oppose the confirmation of the President's appointment of David Lilienthal to head the Atomic Energy Commission, or whatever it is called. I believe that you are absolutely sound on this. When we had him here in Wisconsin, I, for one, became convinced of his 'red' leanings. I never, never met him, and never had any dealings with him, but so frequently read of his views expressed in the State press, that I was convinced that he was unsound and unsafe. It was a relief to me when he was called to Washington, figuring we were well rid of him in this State and not expecting that he would assume any prominence nationally. I think if you will take the trouble to have your investigators come to Wisconsin and look back through the press, during the years of his State service, you will find plenty." (Record, p. 81.)

I was examining Mr. Lilienthal and he did not repudiate this statement.

He alone recommended Gordon Clapp.

LILIENTHAL'S REAL IDEAS ABOUT GOVERNMENT

Not long after Mr. Lilienthal got to Tennessee as Director in the TVA he began to give his real views about government in a very remarkable way.

He went about securing from the State of Tennessee a certificate of incorporation of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., and here is what he proposed that this corporation should do:

"A. To promote, organize, establish, manage, finance, coordinate, and assist in any way whatsoever in the development of cooperative enterprises in the Tennessee Valley and contiguous areas; to hold and administer funds received from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and other Government agencies for the cooperative enterprises to be fostered by this corporation; to set up, manage, develop, and finance a chain of cooperative enterprises throughout the above areas through the organization of subsidiary or related corporations whose ultimate members or shareholders will be the individuals engaged in the particular activity, agricultural, manufacturing, marketing, or otherwise, which the particular subsidiary or related corporation will control and operate, and which subsidiary or related corporations will ultimately organize their own central control and form an organization which will take over the assets and liabilities of this corporation; to receive and administer gifts or grants of money or property of any kind whatsoever.

"B. To produce, raise, manufacture, buy, sell, deal in, and to engage in, conduct, and carry on the business of producing, raising, manufacturing, buying, selling, and dealing in farm products, livestock, goods, wares, and merchandise of every class and description necessary or useful for the operations of the corporation.

"C. To lend or advance money to, extend financial assistance to, accept bills of exchange, endorse the notes and guarantee the obligations of, individuals, firms, corporations, and/or others with or without collateral security of any kind whatsoever and to buy, discount, sell, rediscount, and otherwise deal in, notes, warehouse receipts, pledges, bills of lading, freight receipts, open accounts, trust receipts, mortgages, and other similar evidences of debt or to loan money and to take notes, open accounts and other similar evidences of debt as collateral security therefor.

"D. To borrow money, and to make and issue notes, bonds, debentures, obligations, and evidences of indebtedness of all kinds, whether secured by mortgage, pledge, or otherwise, without limit as to amount, and to secure the same by mortgage, pledge, or otherwise; and generally to make and perform agreements and contracts of every kind and description.

"E. To improve, manage, develop, sell, assign, transfer, lease, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise dispose of or turn to account or deal with all or any part of the property of the Corporation and from time to time to vary any investment or employment of capital of the Corporation.

"F. To apply for, obtain, register, purchase, lease, or otherwise to acquire and to hold, own, use, develop, operate, and introduce, and to sell, assign, grant licenses or territorial rights in respect to, or otherwise to turn to account or dispose of, any copyrights, trade-marks, trade names, brands, labels, patent rights, letters patent of the United States or of any other country or government, inventions, improvements, and processes, whether used in connection with or secured under letters patent or otherwise.

"G. To the same extent as natural persons might or could do, to purchase or otherwise acquire, and to hold, own, maintain, work, develop, sell, lease, exchange, hire, convey, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of and deal in lands and leaseholds, and any interest, estate, and rights in real property, and any personal or mixed property, and any franchises, rights, licenses, or privileges necessary, convenient, or appropriate for any of the purposes herein expressed.

"H. To acquire by purchase, subscription, or otherwise, and to hold for investment or otherwise and to use, sell, assign, transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise deal with or dispose of stocks, bonds, or any other obligations or securities of any corporation or corporations; to merge, or consolidate with any corporation in such manner as may be permitted by law; to aid in any manner any corporation whose stocks, bonds, or other obligations are held or in any manner guaranteed by the Corporation or in which the Corporation is in any way interested; and to do any other acts or things for the preservation, protection, improvement, or enhancement of the value of any such stocks, bonds, or other obligations, or to do any acts or things designed for any such purpose; and while owner of any such stocks, bonds, or other obligations to exercise all the rights, powers, and privileges of ownership thereof, and to exercise any and all voting powers thereof; to guarantee the payment of dividends upon any stocks, or the principal or interest or both, of any bonds or other obligations and the performance of any contracts.

"I. To do all and everything necessary, suitable, and proper for the accomplishment of any of the purposes or the attainment of any of the objects or the furtherance of any of the powers herein set forth, either alone or in association with other corporations, firms, or individuals, and to do every other act or acts, thing or things incidental or appurtenant to or growing out of or connected with the aforesaid business or powers or any part or parts thereof, provided the same be not inconsistent with the laws under which the Corporation is organized.

"J. The business or purpose of the corporation is from time to time to do any one or more of the acts and things hereinabove set forth and it shall have power to conduct and carry on its said business, or any part thereof, and to have one or more offices, and to exercise any or all of its corporate powers and rights, in the State of Tennessee, and in the various other States, Territories, colonies, and dependencies of the United States, in the District of Columbia, and in all or any foreign countries.

"K. The enumeration herein of the objects and purposes of this corporation shall be construed as powers as well as objects and purposes and shall not be deemed to exclude by inference any powers, objects, or purposes which this corporation is empowered to exercise, whether expressly by force of the laws of the State of Tennessee now or hereinafter in effect or impliedly by the reasonable construction of said laws.

"4. The maximum number of shares of stock which the corporation is authorized to have outstanding at any time is 100, all of which shall be without nominal or par value.

"This corporation is formed to receive a grant from the Federal Emergency Relief Corporation for use in financing cooperative enterprises in the Tennessee Valley area. The stock of the corporation is to be subscribed for by the incorporators and is to be issued and held in the name of the United States of America. All the rights and privileges of stockholders whatsoever, including voting rights, are to be exercised on behalf of the United States by the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, acting severally, or by such person or persons as the said directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall appoint as their agent or agents to the same extent as if they were the actual owners thereof. Each director of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall have the proportionate number of votes that the number of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority bears to the number of shares standing in the name of the United States of America.

"5. The minimum amount of capital with which the corporation will commence business is $1,000.

"6. The name and place of residence of each of the incorporators is as follows: Arthur E. Morgan, Knoxville, Tenn.; Harcourt A. Morgan, Knoxville, Tenn.; David E. Lilienthal, Knoxville, Tenn.

"7. The corporation is to have perpetual existence.

"8. The private property of the stockholders shall not be subject to the payment of corporate debts to any extent whatever.

"9. The following provisions are inserted for the management of the business and the conduct of the affairs of the corporation:

"A. The number of directors of the corporation shall be three and directors need not be stockholders of the corporation. Election of directors need not be by ballot.

"B. The directors shall have the power, without the assent or vote of the stockholders, to make and alter bylaws of the corporation; to fix and vary the amount to be reserved as working capital; to authorize and cause to be executed mortgages and liens upon all the property of the corporation, or any part thereof; to determine the use and disposition of any surplus or net profits over and above the capital stock paid in, and in their discretion the directors may use and apply any such surplus or accumulated profits in purchasing or acquiring the bonds or other obligations or shares of capital stock of the corporation to such extent and in such manner and upon such terms as the directors shall deem expedient; but shares of such capital stock so purchased or acquired may be resold unless such shares shall have been retired for the purpose of decreasing the corporation's capital stock as provided by law.

"C. The directors shall have the power, with the consent in writing of the holders of the voting stock issued and outstanding, or upon the affirmative vote of the holders of the stock issued and outstanding having voting power, to sell, lease, or exchange all of its property and assets, including its good will and its corporate franchises, upon such terms and conditions as the board of directors deem expedient and for the best interests of the corporation.

"D. In addition to the powers and authorities hereinbefore or by statute expressly conferred upon them, the directors are hereby empowered to exercise all such powers and do all such acts and things as may be exercised or done by the corporation; subject, nevertheless, to the provisions of the statutes of Tennessee, of this certificate, and of any bylaws from time to time made by the stockholders; provided, however, that no bylaws so made shall invalidate any prior act of the directors which would have been valid if such bylaw had not been made.

"We, the undersigned, apply to the State of Tennessee, by virtue of the laws of the land, for a charter of incorporation for the purposes declared in the foregoing instrument.

"Witness our hands this the 23d day of January 1934.

"ARTHUR E. MORGAN.
"HARCOURT A. MORGAN.
"DAVID E. LILIENTHAL."

I cannot better close this speech than by referring again to Lilienthal's book, TVA—Democracy on the March. It will be recalled that I asked him if he was a Democrat and he said "No." How in the name of heavens can a man talk about democracy on the march when he is not a Democrat? I want to read first the endorsement by that Republican-born, Democrat-for-office-holding, and communistically inclined distinguished gentleman, former Vice President Henry A. Wallace:

"Of all the books which I have read during the past 12 months, Lilienthal's on the TVA is to me the most exciting. It is exciting because it describes the new democracy in terms as real as a juicy steak. Curiously enough, there is nothing in this book to offend 9 out of 10 businessmen. Lilienthal makes the TVA live as an example of how a Government-inspired project vastly increases the amount of free enterprise and prolongs it far into the future. The TVA not only enlarges the opportunity for free enterprise, but it is a model for decentralization, for true economic democracy, with the people participating in the decisions which affect their daily bread."

Next I want to quote what Charles A. Beard has to say:

"TVA—Democracy on the March is a book of living lines, historical and prophetic, on a great American experiment in the creative use of science and natural resources in the civilization of a vast region, written by David Lilienthal, who, in virtue of his public services in the Tennessee Valley Administration, has won a place for himself among the first citizens of the Republic."

The best thing that can be said for Mr. Beard is that he is a New Deal historian, a follower of former Vice President Wallace—at least he follows him as an endorser on democracy that is not democracy and was not written by a Democrat.

The next endorser is Stewart Chase:

"The book has a long-range importance and will be read by students all over the world for years to come. The TVA is one social invention where we clearly lead the world, and the Russians, the Chinese, Scandinavian, Indians and others are well aware of it. I met some of their representatives in the Valley who are studying the project at first hand. I know that the book will help them as well as ourselves to see the pattern of an exciting new method of public operation."

It is said of Mr. Chase, I do not know him and never read any of his articles, but it is said of him that he is a magazine writer and an uplifter and a "do-gooder" and frequently talks about matters that he does not know too much about. But I must say of Mr. Chase from his certificate that he seems to be more interested in the Russians and Chinese than he is in 100 percent Americanism.

The next endorser of Mr. Lilienthal's celebrated book on democracy when he is not a Democrat is Louis Bromfield. He says:

"This is an exciting book, to cheer any reader discouraged by the portents of the past 25 years. It is the record of a truly great achievement still in the process of healthy development."

Mr. Bromfield, I am told, is a farmer. I imagine he is the kind of a farmer that Mr. Lilienthal is a writer. Farming seems to be a hobby of his like writing a book is a hobby of Lilienthal's.

Lilienthal's next endorser is Floyd W. Reeves, who says:

"This book is a vivid and concrete account of decentralized grass-roots administration of government illustrated by the 10 years' experience of the TVA's many-sided activities and programs. But, unlike anything I have ever read, it is told in a way that should make this otherwise abstract issue understandable to many, many people.

"I know you are deeply interested in the importance of bringing the functions of government close to the people—on the farms, in the small towns, and in the cities. This book tells just how that can be and is being done through the work and democratic methods of the only regional Federal agency in the country. It describes by actual illustrations how the people of the Tennessee Valley have made the job of developing and using their resources—land, forests, minerals, and water—their own job. The story of the Tennessee Valley, as I know it from my own experience and observations, is the only substantial story of real democracy in the administration of a resource development program. Fortunately, it is now going to be told."

My recollection is that he was one of the first and foremost in getting communism started in TVA. He speaks of TVA's many-sided activities. I think its most decided activities under the Lilienthal rule has been the activities of Communism down there.

I got the money from the Congress, as everybody knows, who is informed about it, and it was Dr. A. E. Morgan who built the dams and Lilienthal seems to have looked after what he considered the personal advantages coming to Lilienthal in the matter just as he looked after Lilienthal in the Wisconsin and Illinois double service—when he got some $17,000 plus from the corporations while holding the office of regulating the corporations in Madison.

Next, comes G. Bromley Oxnam, put down here as "Methodist bishop, Boston area," known throughout the country as the "Red Bishop":

"This is more than government for the people; it is government by the people. Faith comes alive in works and a new spirit is born. I can think of no more significant service at this moment to the democratic way of life than to have the clergy and the church members of the Nation read this volume."

Well, of course, with Mr. Wallace recommending him first and Bishop Oxnam recommending him last he is a pretty well recommended Russian enthusiast. If he had not been an enthusiast for the Russian government, whether he belongs to the Communist Party or not, he would not have had the endorsement of the former red Vice President and the present "Red Bishop." I have been advised that the Lilienthals have entertained Bishop Oxnam, the "Red Bishop" at their home in Norris, which the Government pays for incidentally.

Is the American Press Free and Responsible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have from time to time pointed to the dangers to free enterprise arising, not from organized labor, but from organized monopoly—the ever-increasing concentration of economic power in an ever-decreasing number of companies and individuals, through trusts, monopolies, trade agreements, and international cartels.

Naturally, I have not been alone in calling the attention of the Nation to these dangers.

I have here an editorial from the Chicago Times, a fearless and independent newspaper owned and published in Chicago, which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave, for the information of the Members and of the country at large. It follows:

I. FREE AND RESPONSIBLE

Three years ago the Luce publications (Time, Life, Fortune) appropriated $200,000, and Encyclopedia Britannica put up $15,000 more, to finance an independent and high-powered investigation into America's information agencies.

By that we mean the press, motion pictures, radio and book and magazine publishers.

The commission created under this grant was headed by Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago. Its other members were: Zechariah Chafee, Jr., professor of law, Harvard; John M. Clark, professor of economics, Columbia; John Dickinson, professor of law, Pennsylvania; William E. Hocking, professor of philosophy, emeritus, Harvard; Harold D. Lasswell, professor of law, Yale; Archibald MacLeish, former Assistant Secretary of State; Charles E. Merriam, professor of political science, emeritus, Chicago; Reinhold Niebuhr, professor of ethics and philosophy of religion, Union Theological; Robert Redfield, professor of anthropology, Chicago; Beardsley Ruml, Chairman, Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Arthur M. Schlesinger, professor of history, Harvard; and George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College.

We impose this list of distinguished names upon our readers simply to show the caliber of this body. It was, we might add, completely free from any Luce or Britannica influence. We also invite attention to the fact that with the exception of Beardsley Ruml and Archibald MacLeish, the commission consisted entirely of educators of the top strata.

The investigators found considerable fault with the Nation's disseminators of information. They found rich monopoly in great degree. They found inaccurate and inadequate reporting of the facts. They found distortion and misrepresentation. They found that there is a wide difference between present conditions and those which moved Jefferson so eloquently to plead the cause of a free press.

Their findings are published in a book released last deek by the University of Chicago Press called A Free and Responsible

Press. A reprint of this appears also in the current edition of Fortune magazine.

A good many of the findings of the commission are factual and indisputable. For example:

From 1909 to 1947, the number of daily newspapers in the United States has declined from 2,600 to 1,750.

There are now only 117 cities in the Nation in which there is more than one newspaper. That means that 92 percent of the communities in the country have only one newspaper.

In 1910 there were more than 16,000 weekly newspapers in the Nation. Today there are fewer than 10,000.

Nearly a third of American radio stations are owned or controlled by newspapers. In 100 cities both the single local newspaper and the local radio station are under single ownership.

Nearly all daily newspapers in the Nation obtain their national and international news from one or more of only three press associations—Associated Press, United Press or International News Service.

There are four major radio networks—National, Mutual, Columbia, and American—which provide a majority of our radio information.

There are eight major motion picture companies which almost completely dominate both the production and distribution of Hollywood's products.

This concentration of mass-communication power, the commission points out, is alarming.

A "czar" in any of these fields would possess enormous powers. He might sway the minds of millions of persons.

There is where the "responsible" comes into the title of the report of this commission.

On that we will have more to say in future editorials.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 3, 1947:

CRITERION FOR RENT CONTROL

The necessity for continuing rent control while there is an acute shortage of houses has seemed to us self-evident. Without control extraordinary demand is certain to bring soaring rents and create a desperate situation for families who cannot pay them. High rents, in turn, will bring demands for still higher wages and prices, giving a lusty twirl to an inflationary spiral. We recognize that controls work hardship on some owners. We know that when New York City, for example, puts the major burden of a billion-dollar budget on real estate, that action increases pressure against rent ceilings. Nevertheless, weighing landlords' hardships against the hardships that uncontrolled rent rises will bring to millions, the case for control is clear.

President Truman in a formal message this week recommends a year's extension of present controls as a measure of protection for American families. Congress, meantime, is trying to find a middle road. The Senate Banking Committee would extend control over existing rental housing through next February, put enforcement in the hands of the Housing Expediter and provide for local advisory boards to consider rent adjustments or decontrols on a regional basis. The House Banking Committee, however, on Tuesday gave tentative approval to a 10-percent across-the-board rent rise. The House measure would, like the Senate proposal, lift controls on new housing. It would also remove all priorities on building materials and abolish the office of Housing Expediter, thus wiping out what remains of the veterans' housing program undertaken last year.

This proposal goes too fast and too far. We trust that when the committee returns to the problem after the Easter recess it will consider the more moderate Senate proposal. The flexible machinery that measure provides for adjustments to meet local conditions seems to us preferable to a flat percentage increase. Exempting new housing may be justified as an incentive to construction. What is required of rent-control extension is to prevent multiple hardship and avert an inflationary spiral for however many months may still be required to moderate an extraordinary demand for shelter.

Triple-A Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the various Triple-A organizations in my district are doing a wonderful piece of work. They deserve the gratitude of the American people, and especially of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include the following reports from my district:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, FIELD SERVICE BRANCH,
Yellville, Ark., March 25, 1947.

Mr. J. W. TRIMBLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRIMBLE: Since we wrote you a few weeks ago in the interest of the soil-conservation program, administered by the Field Service Branch of the PMA, we have learned that a proposal has been made recently by a congressional Committee on Agriculture, to reduce by $100,000,000 the already committed $300,000,000 for soil conservation payments to farmers. As no doubt you know the 1947 commitment has been tentatively approved and the entire 1947 program has been announced. Therefore we again feel that we are speaking for all the farmers of Marion County and the Third Congressional District in soliciting your support in using your influence in opposing this proposed reduction in funds to farmers in 1947.

In our recent letter we called your attention to the President's budget recommendations in which he asked that $100,000,000 be cut from the 1948 appropriations to assist farmers in carrying out needed conservation practices. We are of the opinion that neither the President nor the gentlemen of the congressional committee would have made their respective recommendations had they had all the information on this matter. We are convinced that the President did not have all the facts in the matter when he said that 60 percent of the soil conservation payments went to one-eighth of the Nation's farmers. He probably was not aware of the fact that this small percentage of farmers control more than 60 percent of the Nation's farm land and that the tenants are the chief beneficiaries on these farms. Records show that cotton production for example has been doubled, as a result of the landlord having carried out needed conservation practices. Consequently the tenants and share croppers incomes has been increased accordingly. Farm people are not the only ones who are benefited by our farm program. Increased production benefits all the people from every walk of life both economically and from a health standpoint.

Neither do we agree with those who say that a majority of farmers will carry out soil conservation practices without financial assistance from the Treasury. Now, when farmers are considered prosperous, the great majority of them do not have the necessary funds to buy fertilizer and seed and to hire the equipment needed for constructing stock ponds and terraces, etc. Naturally then we must conclude that conditions will get worse in normal times or in periods of depression. We are of the opinion that if the soil conservation payments were stopped that participation in carrying out conservation practices would drop to approximately 10 percent of what it is now.

Then there is the national problem of flood control about which a majority of all the people are concerned. It is a proven fact that water held on the fields and meadows will be prevented from moving down into the streams and thereby relieve the flood conditions in the rich valley lands to an enormous extent.

We again want to express our appreciation for your past efforts on behalf of the farmers of Marion County and your congressional district and we are convinced that your influence in the future will be directed in the interests of our national farm program.

M. C. CAMPBELL,
W. H. DOSHIER,
GUY MCCRACKEN,
Marion County PMA, Field Service Branch, Conservation Committee.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, FIELD SERVICE BRANCH,
Clinton, Ark., March 24, 1947.

Hon. J. W. TRIMBLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is inspiring indeed to know that you are using your energy to retain the appropriations for the Production and Marketing Administration program, which we all know is so necessary for the general welfare of our people.

We feel that the Government is only exercising its just duty in paying a part of the cost of maintaining the soil and restoring the necessary elements that make for a healthier people in our Nation. When a farmer pays a part of the cost of the material and furnishes all the labor he is contributing all that he can afford and all that he should contribute to the general welfare.

We are very much disturbed over the President's message, in which he recommended $100,000,000 reduction in the Production and Marketing Administration appropriations. We feel that he has been grossly misinformed. Too, we understand that the Committee on Appropriations has supported the President's recommendation. It is unfortunate that the President and the Committee on Appropriations are so unfamiliar with the good that has been done.

We know that you gentlemen who are working for the program need a lot of information that you can pass on to the other

Congressmen in order to keep the appropriations we now have. Therefore, we are enclosing, herewith, a tabulation of the 1946 practices of Van Buren County as well as a copy of an address by Fred J. Sievers, director of the Massachusetts Experiment Station, Amherst, Mass., to members of the National Agricultural Limestone Association at the annual convention January 15 and 16, 1947, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C. This material will perhaps be of use to you in convincing other Congressmen of the need of the Production and Marketing Administration program.

The county committee has recently compiled some information showing that every dollar spent for conservation practices will give to the county and Nation $7 in value.

We certainly appreciate your efforts thus far and your and your staff's efforts in supplying us with materials. Any other materials that we can make available to you we will be glad to do so.

Yours very truly,

A. B. O'NEAL,
Chairman, Van Buren County PMA.
D. M. BAKER,
Vice Chairman.
RAY RATEN,
Member.

Summary of conservation practice data under the 1946 agricultural conservation program (source 46–SR–54)

County: Van Buren. State: Arkansas

SECTION I

Name of practice (1)	Practice designation (2)	Payment unit (3)	Extent (4)	Number of farms carrying out practice (5)	Estimated acres (6)	Payment rate (7)	Value column (4)×(7) (8)
Application of phosphate, 20 percent	1-a	Pounds	140,400	38		$0.0066	$926.40
Application of phosphate, 20 percent (CMS)	1-a X	do	809,625	267		.0066	5,343.52
Application of phosphate, 19 percent	1-b	do				.0064	
Application of phosphate, 19 percent (CMS)	1-b X	do				.0064	
Application of phosphate, 18 percent	1-c	do	6,000	2		.0062	37.20
Total phosphate			956,025	295	2,391		6,307.12
Application of 60 percent potash (or equivalent)	2	Pounds				.013	
Application of ground limestone	3	Tons	1,177	46		3.40	4,001.80
Application of ground limestone (CMS)	3 X	do	60	2		3.40	204.00
Total limestone			1,237	46	212		4,205.80
Ryegrass seeded fall 1945 on cropland or orchard	4	Pounds	2,460	17		.07	172.20
Ryegrass seeded fall 1945 on cropland or orchard (CMS)	4 X	do	20,500	128		.07	1,435.00
Total ryegrass			22,960	137	1,148		1,607.20
Lespedeza seeded spring 1946 not harvested for hay	5	Acres	2,827	319		1.50	4,240.50
Preparation of land for irrigation	6	do				1.00	
Small grains seeded in fall 1945	7	do	416	62		1.50	624.00
Summer legumes or nonlegumes left or turned under	8	do	662	242		1.50	993.00
Seeding hairy vetch	9-a	Pounds	1,270	10		.14	177.80
Seeding hairy vetch (CMS)	9-a X	do				.14	
Seeding Hungarian vetch	9-b	do				.068	
Seeding Hungarian vetch (CMS)	9-b X	do				.068	
Seeding Willamette vetch	9-c	do	100	1		.076	7.60
Seeding Willamette vetch (CMS)	9-c X	do	4,000	27		.076	304.00
Seeding common vetch	9-d	do	200	1		.076	15.20
Seeding common vetch (CMS)	9-d X	do				.076	
Seeding Austrian winter peas	9-e	do	5,355	31		.05	267.75
Seeding Austrian winter pea (CMS)	9-e X	do	21,875	104		.05	1,093.75
Seeding crimson clover (clean)	9-f	do	142	2		.16	22.75
Seeding crimson clover (clean) (CMS)	9-f X	do				.16	
Seeding bur-clover (in bur)	9-g	do				.08	
Seeding singletary or rough peas	9-h	do				.08	
Seeding singletary or rough peas (CMS)	9-h X	do				.08	
Total winter legumes, seeded, fall 1946			2,942	152	1,098		1,888.85
Sodding Bermuda	10	Acres	210	68		6.00	1,260.00
Seeding Bermuda grass	11-a	Pounds				.60	
Seeding carpet grass	11-b	do				.25	
Seeding Dallis grass	11-c	do				.25	
Seeding bluegrass	11-d	do				.25	
Seeding orchard grass	11-e	do				.30	
Seeding redtop	11-f	do	603	13		.15	90.45
Seeding timothy	11-g	do	258	6		.07	18.06
Seeding ryegrass	11-h	do				.07	
Seeding ryegrass (CMS)	11-h X	do				.07	
Seeding Reed canary grass (improved)	11-i	do				.45	
Seeding white Dutch clover	11-j	do	164	8		.60	98.40
Seeding hop clover	11-k	do				.50	
Seeding Kobe lespedeza	11-l	do	212	2		.15	31.80
Seeding Korean lespedeza	11-m	do	1,462	10		.08	116.96
Seeding common lespedeza	11-n	do				.20	
Seeding Tennessee 76 lespedeza	11-o	do				.20	
Seeding black medic	11-p	do				.25	
Seeding Ladino clover	11-q	do				.60	
Seeding Persian clover	11-r	do				.60	
Seeding bur-clover (in bur)	11-s	do				.07	
Seeding sweetclover (yellow)	11-t	do				.09	
Seeding sweetclover (white)	11-u	do				.12	
Seeding alsike clover	11-v	do				.25	
Seeding red clover	11-w	do				.25	
Seeding crimson clover	11-x	do	5	1		.15	.75
Seeding crimson clover (CMS)	11-x X	do				.15	
Total seeding approved pasture mixtures			2,704	17	180		356.42
Establishing vegetative waterways	12	Acres	.5	1		20.00	10.00
Contour-ridging pasture land	13	Feet				.0015	
Producing and harvesting legume and grass seed	14	Acres				3.50	
Construction of terraces and outlets	15	Feet	156,631	34		.01	1,566.31
Construction of terraces and outlets (CMS)	15 X	do				.01	
Total construction of terraces and outlets			156,631	34	297		1,566.31
Construction of a stock pond	16	Cubic yards	104,254	90		.12	12,510.48
Construction of a stock pond (CMS)	16 X	do				.12	
Total stock ponds			104,254	[1] 90	[1] 90		12,510.48

[1] Total number constructed.

Summary of conservation practice data under the 1946 agricultural conservation program (source 46-SR-54)—Continued

Name of practice	Practice designation	Payment unit	Extent	Number of farms carrying out practice	Estimated acres	Payment rate	Value column (4)×(7)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Construction or enlargement of drainage ditches	17-a (1)	Feet				$0.009	
Do	17-a (2)	do				.0175	
Do	17-a (3)	do				.03	
Do	17-b	Cubic yards				.08	
Total construction or enlargement of drainage ditches							
Contour farming intertilled row crops	18	Acres	6,322	384		.60	$3,793.20
Development of springs and seeps	19	Cubic feet	316	6	[1] 6	.50	158.00
Mowing pastures, 1 mowing	20-a	Acres	829	94		.50	414.50
Mowing pastures, 2 or more mowings	20-b	do	930	94		1.00	930.00
Total mowing pastures			1,759	188			1,344.50
Total value of all practices carried out							40,865.38
Total value of all "X" practices carried out							8,380.27

[1] Total number constructed.

SECTION II. FARM AND CROPLAND PARTICIPATION

Item	Number of farms	Cropland
	A	B
1. Total	2,077	102,236.4 acres.
2. Participating farms	831	53,292.5 acres.
3. Percent participation, (2)÷(1)	40 percent	52 percent.

SECTION III. LIME AND PHOSPHATE MATERIALS

Estimated percent of the following materials applied under the 1946 program to—

	Pasture	Hay crops	Cultivated crops	Winter legumes
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
(a) Liming materials	75	20	5	
(b) Phosphate materials	60	25		15
(c) Potash				

SECTION IV. SIGNATURES

Approved: HOOD S. LOUGH, *County Administrative Officer.*
Date: March 22, 1947.

Living Costs Continue To Skyrocket—Price of Bread Will Rise to 15 Cents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when and where will it end?

Warnings went unheeded in the heat of the drive to abolish price controls—and the Nation's wage earners are now paying the excessive bill.

The following article from the Granite City (Ill.) Press-Record tells of the increase in the cost of bread:

PRICE OF BREAD TO BE INCREASED FROM 12 TO 15 CENTS IN THIS AREA

General increases in the price of bread are expected to occur within the next few days and of the two local bakeries which bake bread, one boosted the price from 12 cents to 15 cents today. The other is waiting for the St. Louis bakers to raise prices.

Bread prices in this area are the lowest in the United States at present, one of the bakers said, and 15-cent loaves are now being sold in most of the remaining sections of the country.

Reason for the price increase is due to the boost in the wholesale prices of shortening, flour, and other ingredients. Prices of other bakery goods will also be increased, the bakers said.

For the past few days bakers in the St. Louis area have been discussing whether to increase the price on the present loaf by 3 cents or reduce its size and increase the price 1 cent. Whatever the outcome of the discussion, the price of bread will be increased.

Retirement Benefits for FBI Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "In the National Interest," published in the Fall River Herald News, of Fall River, Mass., in the issue of March 27, 1947. The editorial strongly endorses the bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and myself, providing retirement benefits for the personnel of the FBI.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

The great Federal Bureau of Investigation, during the tenure of J. Edgar Hoover as Director, has risen to a high place in the esteem of the American people. This admiration has been earned by unusual and constant devotion of skill and courage to the protection of every man, woman, and child from outrage by kidnapers, vicious criminals, and enemy saboteurs.

Mere chance has not contributed to the remarkable record of achievement that has elevated the FBI to eminence as the outstanding protective organization of the world of all time. Only the utilization of the highest degree of intelligence and the exercise of extraordinary valor by an expertly trained personnel have produced such success.

To begin with, the Bureau accepts as candidates for appointment as agents only those with special talents. Then they are subjected to rigorous mental and physical tests and training. To win membership they indeed have to exhibit great worth. When they are enrolled in the service, they constantly must conform to a high standard of conduct and must persevere in the assignments entrusted to them to maintain their standing and to advance.

It is to be expected that men who are so well developed in loyal and skilled service will draw the attention of business and industry. Many of them are offered attractive positions with no hazards and much greater

financial return. Many agents have resigned to accept places of responsibility that command salaries from 5 to 10 times those of the most experienced FBI agents. This presents a problem to the Bureau, for it desires to retain in the service of the people those who have become so valuable. In the absence of higher salaries, some other form of security may lead many of them to refuse glittering offers.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, have made a proposal that has substantial merit and would serve the best interests of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and of the country. The Senators suggest, through a bill they have filed in the Senate, that pensions shall become available to FBI agents when they shall have reached the age of 50, if they shall have served at least 20 years in the Bureau. It is a good suggestion. If it is adopted, FBI men will be less tempted to end their public careers and to seek more remunerative occupations elsewhere. They will feel that in giving their best years to an intensive effort to protect all Americans they also will be building some security for themselves and for their families.

The cost of such an arrangement would be inconsequential in comparison with the public good that would result. The expense of searching for capable recruits and of training them would be reduced because there would be fewer vacancies. Since the average age of FBI agents is 32, there could be no rush of applications for retirement. Thus, at little cost, the personnel of the investigating staff would become more stabilized and there could result an easier maintenance of the wonderful efficiency of the Bureau. Surely, the bill of Senators BRIDGES and LANGER will meet with enthusiastic approval in both branches of our National Legislature.

Comparative Industrial Military Potential of Different Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Comparative Industrial Military Potential of Different Countries," prepared by Mr. Leifur Magnusson, assistant director of the Department of Research, Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Because of the general interest in the article and because of its timeliness, I make this request.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARATIVE INDUSTRIAL MILITARY POTENTIAL OF DIFFERENT COUNTRIES [1]

(By Leifur Magnusson, Assistant Director, Department of Research, Industrial College of the Armed Forces)

INTRODUCTION

The economic potential of a country is determined by its natural resources, industrial facilities (capital equipment) and the health, skill and living standards of its inhabitants. A country greatly endowed in these respects can rapidly convert peacetime production into wartime production when an emergency arises. (This statement is made without consideration, but not without fear, of the atomic bomb.) Capital equipment and industrial workers are deployed from the civilian economy to the munitions factories and the military front. Young persons, over-age persons, and women—the unpaid workers of peacetime—take over the production lines while the males of military age, as well as women, it turns out, man the fighting lines. The state of the arts or technological development of the time, the structure of the economy, its management and organization, all combine to determine the efficiency with which these factors of strength are exploited.

It follows that, in order to measure the relative economic (war economic) position of countries, their relative strength in natural resources, productive capacity, and various human elements must be ascertained. The problem is one in the measurement of economic magnitudes, not of abstract elements of time and political conditions. The purpose of this paper, individually and in no way officially, is to make such a comparison of economic strength of the powers as they stood at the beginning of the Second World War. No acccunt has been taken of actual military strength as shown by sizes of the military establishments of the countries, their armies, navies and air forces, or their general expenditures for these services.

It may be noted in passing that in 1922 the International Labor Office called attention to the possibility of constructing an index similar in some respects to the one presented below. Inasmuch as the constitution of the ILO requires that the countries of chief industrial importance "shall have permanent representation on the governing body of the ILO," the statisticians of that organization worked on a device of this general nature.

FACTORS OF ECONOMIC POTENTIAL

The nine factors used in the construction of the series of index numbers here presented for different countries to determine their economic potential comprise (1) population, (2) the number of wage earners and employees in mining and industry, (3) the output of work (horsepower-hours), (4) food production in terms of calories, (5) gross weight of merchant tonnage, (6) length of railway mileage, (7) the value of industrial production, (8) the value of international trade, and (9) the national income. The figures are for prewar years of maximum attainment on the assumption that any height formerly reached can again be achieved.

The population year chosen was 1940, and earlier or later censuses, in a few instances, were adjusted to that year by use of the indicated ratio of growth shown for previous censuses of the country.

The number of wage earners and salaried employees in mining and industry was taken as one indication of the industrialization of the countries. The year 1940 was selected as the base. It would have been desirable to include employees in other branches of activity, had it not been for the fact that the comparability of the data became more questionable for the other economic classifications.

Another factor, the value of industrial production as a whole, however, gives a more inclusive statement of the industrialization of the countries and therefore supplements, if it does not supplant, the figure for number of employees. The data regarding industrial production are provided by the reports of the economic statisticians of the League of Nations Secretariat. The production of 24 countries, constituting in 1925 to 1929 90 percent of the world's industrial output, is given. The remaining 10 percent can then easily be distributed among the remaining countries. Statistics collected by the International Institute of Agriculture supply the necessary information on which to make value estimates of foodstuffs produced. The value of minerals was calculated from the quantities and international prices reported by the League economists. It is obvious that a great many averages and assumptions have been resorted to in arriving at such a general statement of the value of the productive output of the countries. But since the same assumptions are applied to all the data, the errors tend to counterbalance one another. Moreover, in the final outcome, the differences between the countries are generally so wide that errors in the basic data will not materially alter the final rank of the countries.

The volume of work output (horsepower-hours) is also an indication of industrialization of a country. This figure gives the horsepower equivalent of the four recognized sources of work or energy—coal, crude oil, water power and human labor. The inclusion of human labor gives undue weight to the countries of large population and minimizes the development of mechanical power in a country. In the final index, therefore, only the energy equivalents of coal, petroleum and water have been converted and utilized. The estimates are based on the consumption, and not the production of the materials involved. The use of the consumption figure as the basis of military potential tends to minimize the strength of great coal and petroleum exporting countries. Except in the case of Canada, no great amount of water-power energy is exported. On the other hand, to ascribe to the great petroleum exporters, Venezuela, Iran and Iraq, a military strength proportionate to such exporting capacity is to be quite unrealistic, since those countries have no facilities to turn that power into industrial strength for the support of military efforts. The actual consumption power of the different countries, therefore, measures their true capacity of utilization or ability to turn their power energy into either industrial or military channels.

Food production is expressed in caloric values of the volume of food produced annually. There are other important nutritional values, but the calorie is the only common denominator. Production, rather than consumption, has been chosen since it is the measure of the self-sufficiency of a country, an important element in military strength. When an emergency arises, the excess of labor in agriculture can readily be turned into industrial production.

The statistics of merchant tonnage and railway mileage, next to population, are the most accurate, as well as most familiar, for purposes of international comparison. Ton-mile capacity might indeed be a better yardstick than mileage, but the figures for such carrying capacity are not so generally given as for length of miles. Here the weakness of the index lies in the lack of data as respects other means of transportation.

National income is the most valuable and authoritative indication of the relative economic strength of the powers. The data are available, however, for only a few countries. Income statistics are recent additions to knowledge and not yet highly refined or perfected. The values here used are in American dollars.

USE OF INDEX NUMBERS

The method of comparison rests on the use of index numbers. The population of the countries, for example, is compared. If 100 is given to the country with the largest population, other countries are ranked in order below it. If China with 400,000,000 or more inhabitants is represented by 100, Canada with 10,000,000 is 2.5 percent thereof, which is the same as saying it has an index of 2.5. If Great Britain had 20,000,000 gross tons of shipping before the war at the height

[1] Partial reprint from Social Science (Menasha, Wis.), October 1946.

of its shipping preeminence and America had 17,000,000, they stand to each other in the relation of 100 to 85. If America had 237,000 miles of railways at its service and Norway 2,370, the countries are in a ratio of 100 to 1 with respect to railway-mileage potential.

It is necessary to use index numbers since population, production, railway, mileage, and income are unlike magnitudes and cannot be combined. They must be reduced to abstract numbers that can be added arithmetically. The reduction of the absolute magnitudes of population, income, etc., to index numbers also has the advantage of showing more clearly the range of differences between the countries as respects each characteristic of economic potential. The final step in the process is the addition of the various indexes and the arrangement of the countries in the order of size of the indexes. The population index is basic. Addition of the other measures, that is, relative numbers of industrial strength, is a kind of weighting of the population index or relative.

The indexes are based upon the actual magnitudes of economic potential. No attempt has been made to indicate the relative efficiency of the countries in the application of their available potential. Per capita or other ratios of comparison have not been taken into account in ranking the countries as respects their possible military strength. The indexes of relative efficiency, expressed in per capita or other rate, would be highly important in the determination of the level of welfare in different countries.

* * * * *

IMPORTANCE OF THE FACTORS OF ECONOMIC POTENTIAL

* * * * *

The question of weighting the factors included in these indexes requires an observation. In a certain sense, adding the indexes of specific power output, value of industrial production, transportation facilities, and others to that of population is a real weighting of the population strength of a country. In other words, it is assumed that the number and quality of population is equally important for all countries and counts for as much in one country as another. Capacity to do work is a universally valuable component of war potential. National income and value of industrial production are similarly useful symbols of economic importance for every country. Only one of the nine factors presents a possible question of relative importance as an element in war potential. The volume of international trade may conceivably represent actual economic weakness since it points to a certain lack of that self-sufficiency which is the basis of the military economy. In the case of Russia, essentially landlocked and without a fleet, a large dependence on imports would mean weakness. For Great Britain, with the largest merchant tonnage and a fleet second only to that of America, it spells strength. In quite another way, also, the international trade factor emphasizes the real political character of the war potential.

"Weighted" relative prewar military industrial power of 25 specified countries

Country	Population		Population "weighted" by—													
			Industrial strength		Transportation facilities		International trade		National income		All factors		All factors except national income			
													Amount		Relative	
	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)		(7)		(8)	
United States	4	29.2	1	329.2	1	217.7	2	109.3	1	129.2	1	697.8	1	597.8		100.0
China	1	100.0	5	144.0	3	107.5	3	106.6					6	158.1		26.4
India	2	84.9	4	182.9	4	103.8	4	102.4					5	219.3		36.7
Russia	3	38.7	2	198.2	5	67.7	6	46.3	2	97.9	4	294.0	4	234.8		39.3
Japan	5	16.1	8	73.2	7	51.1	8	41.0	6	23.0	6	140.0	8	133.1		22.3
Germany	6	15.4	3	188.2	6	52.5	5	71.3	3	56.1	3	321.9	3	281.2		47.0
Great Britain	7	10.6	6	121.3	2	119.1	1	110.6	4	47.3	2	366.5	2	329.8		55.2
Italy	8	9.8	9	62.1	9	31.8	9	25.8					9	100.1		16.7
France	9	9.3	7	90.2	8	38.6	7	42.4	5	24.9	5	168.2	7	152.6		25.5
Brazil	10	9.1	11	33.7	12	20.6	14	17.5					11	53.6		9.0
Poland	11	7.8	10	35.1	18	14.3	17	13.6					13	47.4		7.9
Spain	12	5.8	12	32.6	14	16.2	20	9.6					15	46.8		7.8
Yugoslavia	13	3.5	22	11.4	20	8.1	22	6.8					23	19.3		3.2
Czechoslovakia	14	3.4	14	27.7	21	7.0	18	13.4					19	41.3		6.9
Argentina	15	2.9	16	19.2	16	15.1	13	18.3					16	46.8		7.8
Canada	16	2.5	13	30.2	10	27.6	10	25.0	7	7.8	7	83.1	10	77.8		13.0
Union of South Africa	17	2.3	23	9.3	19	8.5	19	10.8					21	24.0		4.0
Hungary	18	2.1	21	11.5	23	4.6	23	6.0					24	17.9		3.0
Netherlands	19	2.0	19	15.7	13	18.0	12	20.5	8	6.2	8	54.7	12	50.2		8.4
Belgium	20	1.9	15	21.3	22	5.4	11	24.0					14	46.9		7.8
Australia	21	1.6	18	16.0	15	15.5	15	15.2	9	5.3	9	47.1	17	43.5		7.3
Peru	22	1.6	25	5.6	25	3.0	24	3.5					25	8.9		1.5
Austria	23	1.5	20	15.0	24	3.7	22	6.8					22	22.5		3.8
Sweden	24	1.4	17	16.7	17	14.5	16	14.5	10	4.5	10	46.0	18	42.9		7.2
Norway	25	.6	24	6.5	11	26.2	21	7.1	11	1.7	11	39.7	20	38.6		6.5

The question of military strength ultimately finds its answer in the alliances made and preserved among the countries. Any measurement of economic war potential, as here attempted, is bound to be subject to extraneous and shifting political forces. The measurement of the economic potential of the separate countries, however, has a value in showing what combinations of political power might eventuate in a world of dynamic change.

RESULTS OF THE TABULATIONS

The preeminent position of America is the outstanding result shown by the various indexes of economic potential. In five out of nine factors used in the compilation of the final indexes America is first. Only as respects population, food production—which is a function of population—shipping tonnage, and value of international trade was America excelled by any country. The consequence is that in combining the separate indexes into a general index, or any combination of indexes, America leads all the rest.

British potential was a little over one-half that of the United States, Germany's less than one-half, and Russia's less than two-fifths.

It need scarcely be added that the present indexes can only confirm what is probably common knowledge. All they purport to do is to give a concrete statistical answer to the question as to what was the relative standing of the powers of the world as respects their economic war potential at the beginning of the conflict.

TABLE I.—*Prewar position of countries named with respect to designated factors of military industrial power*

Country	Population (thousands)	Number of wage earners and employees (thousands)	Energy from coal, petroleum, water in horsepower hours daily (millions)	Value of industrial production (millions)	Gross merchant tonnage (millions)	Railway mileage (actual)	Food production in calories (billions)	Value of international trade (millions)	National income (millions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
United States	131,400	17,000	1,603	$45,500	17,406	236,842	157,138	$3,799	$71,000
China	450,000	4,000	59	7,700	473	12,000	360,000	312	
India	382,000	13,300	54	7,500	248	41,076	300,000	828	
Russia	174,000	12,500	320	30,000	1,316	52,700	205,200	363	42,050
Japan	72,500	6,550	89	5,900	5,630	15,186	45,230	1,183	4,870
Germany	69,300	16,660	583	17,500	4,493	33,878	68,870	2,651	28,875
Great Britain	47,900	10,890	353	11,200	19,672	20,080	17,530	4,743	26,025
Italy	43,700	5,590	81	6,500	3,446	10,551	37,620	757	

TABLE I.—*Prewar position of countries named with respect to designated factors of military industrial power*—Continued

Country	Population (thousands) (1)	Number of wage earners and employees (thousands) (2)	Energy from coal, petroleum, water in horsepower hours daily (millions) (3)	Value of industrial production (millions) (4)	Gross merchant tonnage (millions) (5)	Railway mileage (actual) (6)	Food production in calories (billions) (7)	Value of international trade (millions) (8)	National income (millions) (9)
France	42,000	7,930	169	$10,800	3,557	26,464	42,660	$1,571	$11,065
Brazil	40,900	3,200	16	2,200	488	21,255	38,760	401	
Poland	35,000	2,770	50	3,600	122	14,020		177	
Spain	26,000	3,350	23	2,600	1,178	10,340	26,430	182	
Yugoslavia	15,700	780	12	1,200	411	5,999		156	
Czechoslovakia	15,200	2,780	45	2,300		8,262		473	
Argentina	13,100	1,560	15	2,800	313	25,204	25,120	732	
Canada	11,400	1,300	170	4,300	1,395	42,727	26,160	1,069	3,770
Union of South Africa	10,300	200	29	1,800	60	13,915		404	
Hungary	9,300	1,020	18	970		5,732		186	
Netherlands	8,800	1,360	28	1,800	2,973	2,106		877	2,990
Belgium	8,400	1,970	52	2,100	431	3,007		1,051	
Australia	7,200	1,060	35	2,800	470	27,179	18,310	646	2,600
Peru	7,000	470	3	370	41	2,810		89	
Austria	7,000	1,690	19	1,100		5,000		250	
Sweden	6,300	1,400	40	2,100	1,716	10,373	7,010	621	2,200
Norway	2,900	340	34	800	4,835	2,379	1,580	311	750

TABLE II.—*Relative prewar position of 25 countries based on indicated factors of military industrial power*

Country	Population (1)	Industrialization: Number of wage earners and employees (2)	Industrialization: Energy from coal, petroleum and water (3)	Industrialization: Value of industrial production (4)	Industrialization: Total (5)	Transportation: Gross merchant tonnage (6)	Transportation: Railway mileage (7)	Transportation: Total (8)	Food production in calories (9)	International trade (10)	Value of national income (11)
United States	4 29.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	1 300.0	88.5	100.0	1 188.5	43.6	2 80.1	1 100.0
China	1 100.0	23.5	3.6	16.9	9 44.0	2.4	5.1	17 7.5	100.0	18 6.6	
India	2 84.9	78.2	3.3	16.5	5 98.0	1.6	17.3	10 18.9	83.3	9 17.5	
Russia	3 38.7	73.5	20.0	66.0	3 159.5	6.7	22.3	6 29.0	57.9	16 7.6	2 59.2
Japan	5 16.1	38.5	5.6	13.0	7 57.1	28.6	6.4	4 35.0	12.6	5 24.9	6 6.9
Germany	6 15.4	98.0	36.3	38.5	2 172.8	22.8	14.3	3 37.1	19.1	3 55.9	3 40.7
Great Britain	7 10.6	64.1	22.0	24.6	4 110.7	100.0	8.5	2 108.5	4.9	1 100.0	4 36.7
Italy	8 9.8	32.9	5.1	14.3	8 52.3	17.5	4.5	9 22.0	10.4	10 16.0	
France	9 9.3	46.6	10.6	23.7	6 80.9	18.1	11.2	5 29.3	11.8	4 33.1	5 15.6
Brazil	10 9.1	18.8	1.0	4.8	13 24.6	2.5	9.0	15 11.5	10.8	15 8.4	
Poland	11 7.8	16.3	3.1	7.9	11 27.3	.6	5.9	18 6.5		20 5.8	
Spain	12 5.8	19.7	1.4	5.7	12 26.8	6.0	4.4	16 10.4	7.3	23 3.8	
Yugoslavia	13 3.5	4.6	.7	2.6	22 7.9	2.1	2.5	20 4.6		24 3.3	
Czechoslovakia	14 3.4	16.4	2.8	5.1	14 24.3	.1	3.5	21 3.6		17 10.0	
Argentina	15 2.9	9.2	.9	6.2	16 16.3	1.6	10.6	14 12.2	7.0	11 15.4	
Canada	16 2.5	7.6	10.6	9.5	10 27.7	7.1	18.0	8 25.1	7.3	6 22.5	7 5.3
Union of South Africa	17 2.3	1.2	1.8	4.0	23 7.0	.3	5.9	19 6.2		14 8.5	
Hungary	18 2.1	6.0	1.1	2.3	21 9.4	.1	2.4	23 2.5		22 3.9	
Netherlands	19 2.0	8.0	1.7	4.0	19 13.7	15.1	.9	11 16.0		8 18.5	8 4.2
Belgium	20 1.9	11.6	3.2	4.6	15 19.4	2.2	1.3	22 3.5		7 22.1	
Australia	21 1.6	6.2	2.2	6.2	18 14.6	2.4	11.5	12 13.9	5.1	12 13.6	9 3.7
Peru	22 1.6	2.8	.2	1.0	25 4.0	.2	1.2	25 1.4		25 1.9	
Austria	23 1.5	9.9	1.2	2.4	20 13.5	.1	2.1	24 2.2		20 5.3	
Sweden	24 1.4	8.2	2.5	4.6	17 15.3	8.7	4.4	13 13.1	1.9	13 13.1	10 3.1
Norway	25 .6	2.0	2.1	1.8	24 5.9	24.6	1.0	7 25.6	.4	19 6.5	11 1.1

Some of the Iron in That Curtain Is Stamped "Made in America"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News directs attention to an article by Mr. Leland Stowe in the Liberty magazine. The statement is an interesting comment on communism and its operation in eastern Europe. The editorial follows:

ANTI-RED REVOLT?

"The Soviet Union is not nearly strong enough to choose isolation and try to go alone behind her iron curtain," writes Leland Stowe in the current issue of Liberty magazine, out tomorrow.

Just back from a 5-month tour of central and eastern Europe, Mr. Stowe declares in his Liberty article entitled "What Iron, Whose Curtain?" that much of the iron curtain is fabricated with cotton and gauze and that some of the iron in that curtain is stamped "made in America."

Mr. Stowe observes that the two main Russian programs in Hungary and Rumania are working against each other to the disadvantage of the Reds. Their economic program to drain as much national wealth out of the occupied zones as quickly as possible has thwarted their political program of furthering Marxism.

"The majority of Hungarians and Rumanians remain strongly opposed, predominantly aloof or hostile toward the Soviet system * * * because they feel for the most part that Soviet actions are radically reducing their country's wealth and diminishing its chances of recovery."

Correspondent Stowe predicts that since Communist prestige has suffered a terrible blow during this winter internal political pressures will increase, and there will be dramatic and violent developments. The Soviets must soon withdraw their occupation forces, leaving a weakened minority group of local Reds in doubtful control of the governments.

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of April 3, 1947:

NETS OF 2,900 FIRMS UP 28 PERCENT DURING YEAR

The National City Bank of New York reported yesterday in its April letter that 2,900 leading corporations showed combined net income after taxes in 1946 of $6,700,000,000, compared with $5,200,000,000 in 1945, a 28 percent increase.

The corporations had a combined capital and surplus of $70,800,000,000, making the average return 9.5 percent, compared with a net worth of $68,000,000,000 and a return of 7.7 percent in 1945, the bank noted.

"The year will go down in the records as one of the best from the standpoint of earnings of a majority of American companies," the bank reported.

Pronounced gains over 1945 were found by the bank in "most of the manufacturing industries" and "especially in wholesaling and retailing and the service industries," including amusements, hotels, and restaurants, which "benefited generously from the high national income and liberal spending."

Sales of 1,155 manufacturing companies showed gross income of $53,400,000,000 with net income of $3,200,000,000, an average net margin of 6 cents per dollar of sales, compared with 3.9 cents in 1945.

Sales of 145 retail and wholesale companies totaled $12,400,000,000, an increase of 31 percent over 1945 and an all-time high. The average margin was 4.5 cents per dollar of sales, against 2.7 cents in 1945.

Worried Wool Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal, printed under date of April 3, entitled "Worried Wool Men."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORRIED WOOL MEN—BOSTON FLEECE DEALERS TREMBLE ON UNITED STATES THREAT TO CONTINUE MONOPOLY—SAY GOVERNMENT SUPPORT OF 1946 "SUPER PRICE" WOULD PUT THEM OUT OF BUSINESS—FLOOD OF IMPORTS DWINDLING

(By John O'Riley)

BOSTON.—The specter of Government wool monopoly is sending shudders up and down Summer Street.

The Bostonians, who censure more books and eat more fish cakes for breakfast than any other people in America, also handle more wool. And their Summer Street is to fleece what Wall Street is to money and San Antonio to hot tamales.

Summer Streeters are a venerable lot. And they do a big job. It's getting wool from the back of sheep to the Nation's seventh largest industry—woolen textile manufacturing. Buying wool from ranchers, they clean it, sort it, and distribute it to mills. They've done the job for over a century. Now they fear they may be headed straight for the ranks of the unemployed.

Their displacer: The United States Government.

EAGLE ON THE ROOST

Four years ago the Government, in the heat of war, started buying the total domestic production of wool. It's bought it all ever since. Private merchants, thus crowded out, haven't yet felt the shock too much. They've earned their "board and keep" by handling the huge imports of foreign wool pouring into the country since 1940.

The wool-consumption boom, however, has passed its peak. The import flood dwindles. The private merchants wing homeward to their normal roost of domestic wool merchandising. But the roost is occupied. The United States eagle is still there. He acts as if he may stay.

Evidence of his intent: The Senate Agriculture Committee this week approved a bill to require the Agriculture Department to support the price of wool paid producers during 1947 and 1948 at no lower than the Government support level of 1946. And that support level was about 42 cents a pound.

"FOR US: LIQUIDATION"

Government support of wool at the 1946 superprice of 42 cents, declare the wool merchants, will simply mean Government taking over the entire United States production—as in the past 4 years. With woolen textiles already at the saturation point and mills sharply cutting production, the merchants emphasize that they can't possibly buy wool at 42 cents and sell it to cloth makers without drowning themselves in red ink.

"For us," says a typical Summer Streeter, "the 42-cent support plan just about means liquidation."

Summer Streeters sympathize with western sheep ranchers who want protection from cheap foreign wool. Some of them, as buyers, spend so much of their lives in the West that they call you "podner" and wear Texas-brimmed hats even in Boston. They think wool could be supported at 90 percent of parity (prices giving growers 1909–14 buying power). But they gag at the 2-year 42-cent guarantee.

PROSPERITY BY DICTATE

And the price history of wool bears them out. In prewar 1939 the average price paid growers for wool was just over 22 cents per pound. During the intervening years between the two World Wars the yearly average price was 26 cents.

"For the Government to say," reflects one old-time wool dealer, "that the price of wool, come hell or high water, has got to stay at nearly double the normal peacetime level for the next 2 years is sort of like saying we are going to have perpetual prosperity by legislative dictate. You might call it sort of taking the 'aw of supply and demand by the horns."

And, the wool merchants emphasize, setting a support price at a fixed level (1946 level) is quite a different thing from tying it to parity. Parity prices change from month to month; they fall when prices of manufactured products fall.

GOLD-PLATED PRICE GUARANTY

The present parity price for wool is 41.9 cents a pound. Thus the Government support price of about 42 cents is about 100 percent of parity. But a year ago the parity price was 32.9 cents. Should the prices of manufactured products drop to last year's level, 42-cent wool would be 127 percent of parity.

Summer Street's question: Why should wool be singled out for such a gold-plated price guarantee when Congress has promised to support other basic farm commodities at only 90 percent of parity?

In the face of a prospective indefinite perpetuation of the Government wool monopoly, private wool merchants can cite eloquent figures in support of their claim that the sheep ranchers got fair prices for their product when it was bought and distributed to the textile industry by private business.

THE RECORD IS GOOD

During the two between-wars decades from 1921 to 1940, prices paid to wool producers averaged more than 96 percent of parity. In seven of these years the price was above 115 percent of parity. But prices paid for six basic farm commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts—averaged only 77 percent of parity in the 1921–40 period.

Labeling Government buying and distribution of wool "a merchandising plan that doesn't merchandise," wool merchants call attention to the great mountain of wool which the Agriculture Department has bought and piled away unsold during the Nation's greatest wool-consuming spree on record. This wool mountain at the start of this year totaled 480 million pounds—nearly a full year's needs at the prewar consumption rate.

While the Government held onto its fleece, textile mills gobbled up well over 3 pounds of foreign wool for every pound of the home-grown product last year. In prewar years, 3 of every 4 pounds of wool consumed by United States mills came from American sheep.

The argument of sheep-State Senators that sheep ranchers can't operate profitably without the aid of such a Government buying program brings a wry smile to the face of the Summer Streeter. And he admits that however the ranchers might do "without it," some of them have certainly done all right "with it."

One Bostonian who spends most of his time in the West puts it this way:

"The biggest sheep town in the country is San Angelo, Tex. The four banks there had $12,000,000 deposits at the end of 1940. And at the end of 1946 they had $43,000,000. I reckon they didn't make that selling hay, podner."

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 3 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Philip Murray, president of the CIO, and R. J. Thomas, chairman of the CIO housing committee, addressed to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], dealing with the housing problem.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: It is a matter of sincere regret that we are unable personally to give you the views of the Congress of Industrial Organizations on housing legislation. Word of the hearings reached us too recently to enable us to attend your hearings. We are writing to assure you that our organization is deeply concerned with the extreme gravity of the housing situation and to urge speedy enactment of comprehensive housing legislation.

The housing shortage today is a national disaster. Crowding and doubling up have grown worse during the past year. The worst sufferers are those who have had to seek new dwellings, notably war workers and veterans. Their plight is even more desperate than a year ago and the strongest measures are needed to cope with the situation.

The CIO pledges its support to the National Housing Commission Act, which is similar in most respects to the bill that passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote last year. The CIO urges your committee, however, to add the following necessary provisions in order to reflect the increased need and soaring prices: (1) to include the

Douglas-Taylor bill as an amendment to S. 866 in order to fill part of the gap which high construction costs have created between public housing and private housing; (2) to provide 100 percent insurance of loans for private rental projects and mutual or cooperative projects, at interest of 3 percent, and advance loans of 1 percent to assist cooperative groups to get started; (3) to invest the Administrator of housing activities with directive powers, on the ground that a strong, central agency will act economically and effectively; (4) to establish a technical director for housing with authority to use funds, previously appropriated for housing, to finance the pioneer developmental and experimental work on factory-built housing in order to reduce costs; and (5) to provide that development funds and 100 percent loans be available to new producers of factory-built housing in order to speed up the modernization of the building industry.

These improvements in S. 866, we are confident, will contribute decisively to reducing housing costs and will hasten the fulfillment of the national goal of a decent home for every family in a suitable environment.

We again urge prompt and courageous action to solve the Nation's foremost social and economic problem.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, CIO.
R. J. THOMAS,
Chairman, CIO Housing Committee.

The Greatest Robbery in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to quote the following article, printed in the Palm Beach Times on Thursday, March 27, 1947, written by Mr. E. F. Hutton, of Westbury, Long Island, N. Y.:

I OFFER THE "GREATEST ROBBERY IN THE WORLD"

Joseph Pulitzer stated: "Our Republic and its press will rise or fall together."

The press is the guardian of free speech and liberty.

You of the press of the United States of America should review your purpose and your reason for existence. You are, "we, the people" in action every day. It is your task to protect by every means the Constitution and the Bill of Rights of this country—by pitiless publicity—by logic.

We, the people, pay out our pennies, nickels, dimes, quarters, and 50-cent pieces for daily papers and weekly magazines.

You are patronized every day by the commercial, industrial, and service institutions of America. We, the people, pay you to carry messages for us.

We, the people, and our business system—those who advertise—keep you going and pay your bills.

Yes—"The Republic and its press will rise or fall together." Without advertisers, you, the press, must be subsidized. Only Government can subsidize you. That means that we, the people, are subsidized too. There would remain only Government. Who wants that?

Communists can make news. Of course, you should print that news. But rapists, thieves, and murderers also make news. The maker of the news is just as important as the news.

When Joe Doaks states that our Constitution is a dud, the reader merely laughs. But if Joe Doaks is a leader of a group, the reader does not laugh. He reads and wonders. I agree that the statement of Joe Doaks as a group leader is news, but I insist that the identity of Joe Doaks, his associations, and his purposes are equally news. Print the whole story. Do not leave half impressions. That is your sacred duty.

Someone has said, "There are three sides to every story: your side, my side, and the truth." When individuals or groups assault our system it should follow that our system has given to our people more of life's good things than is enjoyed by people of any other Nation on earth.

Keep your eyes on the state of our money. Get down to cases as to why our money is worth less than it used to be. Explain money. Explain how the Government has cut itself in as a partner of every working man and woman of the United States of America—and a partner in every free and private enterprise—which means legalized stealing from those who work and sweat and try to save something for their old age. Tell the people how by thrift and savings they have become the owners of the free enterprise system in this country. Tell them we all have a stake in the business that is the United States of America. Tell them why we have so few idle people here—because we have fewer idle dollars. Hold up to scrutiny the ideologists who want to change this system of ours in order to grab it and own it—and the people.

You, the press of America, are as important as our Congress because you form public opinion—and one's judgment is no better than his information.

Tell them that no real American has been opposed to the rights of man, the rights of minorities, the rights of those who save their money and place it in the business enterprise of our country or the rights of labor. These rights are clearly stated under the Constitution and its amendments. You, the press, should use those rights in exposing those who would change them into special privileges under the guise of doing good for the majority. The press of our country should have once or twice a week a well written editorial—a down to earth statement on the front page of the paper in defense of liberty as you are the enlightened trustees and guardians of the rights of mankind. Progress is a change of attitude. Bring well stated editorials to your front pages and write them so that the people can understand.

Expose the totalitarians—collectivists—those who always exercise the Bill of Rights because under it they have free speech to discredit the American system. They want those rights vested in them to take over. Do you imagine they would ever give them back?

You should be telling us that business doesn't grab a dollar for itself everytime it pays out a dollar in wages. You should be telling us that business distributes seven to eight dollars in wages for every dollar it pays to those whose money is in the business. You are experts in publicity. You can reduce the facts to the least denominator and state them clearly, quickly, and effectively. Keep us informed as to not just what the law gives, but also that which the law takes away from us. You are the trustees of liberty.

This, actually, is your big job today.

The press can save America. "Our Republic and its press will rise or fall together." You don't run a single comic strip, no matter how wild and fantastic it is, that is as wild and fantastic as the plans and the dreams of the plotters who want to take this country over. There is nothing comic about the way they are planning it. There is nothing comic in it for you or for us. If they accomplish their purposes you will not be a newspaper. One hundred and forty millions of people will then be in a closed shop—a Government closed shop. Then you and we, the people, will be but slaves.

Start selling your own, and our, country to us, the people, and make it worth 100 cents on the dollar. Citizenship in the United States of America is the most envied privilege in the world today. Tell us it is because we, the United States of America, have been the most successful in developing popular government, common wealth, and real freedom and liberty. Tell this kind of news to us, the people, who are, with our pennies, nickels, and dimes, supporting the press. Tell it to the advertisers and encourage them to speak of the romance of American business. Americans want to hear it. Dig for the facts. Expose useless spending. Expose the real meaning of Government ownership. Expose the whittling away of our charter of liberty. Expose monopolistic despotism, whether in Government, business, or labor. Expose representative government when it fails to uphold, defend, and protect constitutional liberties.

We, the people, with our pennies, nickels, and dimes, who help support the press, want you to encourage the enterprise system, which built this country from 13 weak Colonies into the No. 1 world power.

If robberies are sensational news, if murder is the meat of newsprint, what could be more worthy of publicity than exposing the looting of liberty and the murder of freedom? I offer the theft of freedom as "The greatest robbery in the world." You should help prevent it.

Your success in this effort will justify the faith of our founding fathers. Your failure may mark the collapse of the last citadel of a free people anywhere on this globe.

E. F. HUTTON.
WESTBURY, LONG ISLAND.

Bring "Mac" Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 25 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 38 requesting the President in the name of the American people to invite General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur, United States Commander in Chief, Far East, to return to the United States for a period of at least 30 days. It is desired that during General MacArthur's visit home he may have the opportunity to address a joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives to give his views on matters affecting the security of the United States.

It is hoped that favorable consideration will be given my proposal, since it is apparent from the approval of the idea in many newspaper editorials that General MacArthur's return will be welcomed by an overwhelming majority of the American people.

The following editorial in the April 1 issue of the Washington Times-Herald is

evidence of the sentiment in the hearts of the American people regarding General MacArthur's stature as a military genius and a great American.

The editorial is as follows:

BRING "MAC" BACK

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, has offered a resolution that both House and Senate join in asking President Truman to bring Gen. Douglas MacArthur home for at least 30 days to address Congress on national security from here on.

We heartily agree with all that and hope the proposition is carried through right away.

MacArthur is one of the proven great men of our time. Not only has he proved his brains and wisdom but he has also had the most unusual and valuable range of experience of any American public figure.

Just consider briefly his record of recent years. In 1935 he retired from the United States Army after a brilliant career climaxed as chief of staff. He then went to the Philippines to help the islanders prepare for their independence, then scheduled for 1946.

The Filipinos had never had an army nor anything that could be called a national system of government or policy. MacArthur began to build for them from the ground up.

He had barely reached the halfway stage when the Japs struck. The story from there on is so well known we won't even outline it. The big fact is that MacArthur went on from war to another tremendous assignment of organization and redirecting of a whole people—this time the Japanese.

His success is a miracle of our chaotic and disorganized times.

A word from MacArthur to America right now could be a tonic beyond all others. Not to mention the fact that we'd all like to look at a real, sure-enough hero again and pay him the tribute he deserves while he's around to enjoy it.

Statement of Pressed Metal Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. S. Morrison, executive vice president of the Morrison Steel Products, Inc., of Buffalo, N. Y., together with a statement from the Pressed Metal Institute, of Cleveland, Ohio. This bottleneck in the scrap-steel industry, like in many other industries, can be straightened out if it is recognized and some action taken to alleviate the condition, and thus release the material for the small industries. In my opinion the statement of the Pressed Metal Institute contains a great deal of merit, and in the belief that this might be of interest to others, I am glad to have an opportunity to include it in the RECORD. The letter and statement are as follows:

MORRISON STEEL PRODUCTS, INC.,
Buffalo, N. Y., March 27, 1947.

The Honorable JOHN C. BUTLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will undoubtedly be interested in an analysis of the information contained in the attached copy of Bulletin No. 793, issued by the Pressed Metal Institute.

To an economy-minded Congress, it appears very clear that there is an extremely large potential to be gained from an active follow-up of the plan suggested therein. Assuming that 10,000,000 tons of scrap steel are available (every indication points to the fact that this figure is readily available) and assuming further that the $10 per ton figure is equitable, it may be readily computed that a gross income of $100,000,000 is available to be applied against the needed expenditures currently being considered for foreign application.

A review of the domestic scrap situation shows that the established price of $19 per gross ton which was obtained during the war years, has now doubled on current quotations. This situation is extremely unhealthy for the entire economy and will undoubtedly have a serious effect on the possibilities of reducing the present high level of steel prices. It would appear that an adaptation of the plan would therefore have manifold benefits and should be activated. Your interest in furthering that purpose will undoubtedly carry the full support of the American people.

Yours very truly,

S. MORRISON,
Executive Vice President.

LET US GET SOMETHING TANGIBLE IN EXCHANGE FOR OUR EXPANDING LARGESS

To the Pressed Metal Industry:

President Truman appeared before a joint meeting of both Houses of Congress seeking $400,000,000 to underwrite some incomplete commitments of the sagging British Government in Greece and Turkey.

The fact that Henry Agard Wallace is opposed to Mr. Truman's position should be significant.

It is to be doubted if anyone in the administrative branch of the Government, and few in Congress, actually know in detail how extensive are our shipments of fuel, food, and other materials on the cuff to both our impoverished allies and our beaten foes around the world, but it is tremendous, and is engaging huge fleets of ships.

As a stamping manufacturer you are concerned about our dwindling scrap stock pile, why, if we are to continue bolstering up a decadent monarchy in Greece and a questionable republic in Turkey in addition to the other commitments around the world, don't we get something tangible in return for this ever-widening largess of ours aside from the hypocritical thanks of the recipients?

Suggest to your representatives in Congress, the majority of whom are now leaning on those Bender brooms in dazed immobility, that the mighty fleet of ships now carrying huge quantities of things we could well use here to every quarter of the globe, that these bottoms bring back something more essential than Scotch whisky from England, Irish whisky from Ireland, champagne from France.

It is no secret to you that the scrap market here is urgently in need of replenishment. Now, in the days when Mr. Roosevelt was President and Mr. Cordell Hull was Secretary of State, we generously shipped scrap to Japan practically up to Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. Some of that scrap should come back to us from Japan. There should be, in Europe, great accumulations of metal scrap and the needy in these areas could be successfully put to work accumulating scrap and thus, in part, earning the donations we so generously provide.

Our occupational forces around the world might very profitably enlarge their far from onerous occupational activities by supervising the collection of, and even transporting, the scrap to appropriate dockage where the incoming bottoms might pick it up for a return trip.

Certainly with our present huge bureaucracy and the armed forces combined there is ample manpower to get this alien scrap rolling. Ten million tons of scrap would depreciate the stocks of our gallant allies of but a small portion of the existing scrap metal abroad. If this metal could be brought to America, sold by the Government at $10 a ton to those mills who had agreed to provide long terms and secondly to reduce their prices, it would not take more than a few token shipments of such alien scrap to break the present indefensible scrap market.

You remember that in the Grant administration President Grant had the fortitude to sell Treasury gold and break the gold combine. Some such action is indicated in the steel industry

Henry Ford, Jr., has already met the situation by reducing his prices, Fowler McCormick, chairman of the board of International Harvester Co., has also cut the prices of tractors, trucks and farm machinery with the explanation that he had decided to give the benefit of high earnings to customers rather than stockholders or employees because the time is here to recognize customers as an integral part of business. He said, "Our present wage-price-profit mechanism is out of date. All industry finds itself in the same situation. We have done something for our stockholders—we have done plenty for our employees. Now we must try to be equitable in our treatment of the third group—our customers."

Write your views on the subject to your representative in both Houses of Congress and encourage them to do something constructive promptly.

Faithfully yours,

PRESSED METAL INSTITUTE,
TOM J. SMITH, Jr.,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. Vandenberg's Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of April 1, 1947:

MR. VANDENBERG'S PROPOSAL

Up to now, on all issues of consequence, the overwhelming majority of the Security Council and the General Assembly has seen eye to eye with the United States. There is every reason to assume, moreover, that this majority favors our projected aid to Greece and Turkey. Given a United Nations vote on the subject at this time, the result would be almost certain. The sole dissenters would be a relatively tiny minority made up of Russia, Poland, and one or two other Soviet satellites.

Accordingly, if adopted, Senator VANDENBERG's proposal to subject our Greco-Turkish program to a majority veto of the United Nations would involve virtually no present risk of our being voted down. At first glance, therefore, the proposal may seem to be little more than an empty gesture. But actually, in its implications, it is far more than that. It represents a concrete move by the chairman of our Senate Foreign Relations Committee to make clear that the United States

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

is prepared—in both principle and practice—to be governed in this matter by the overriding sentiment of the world. In effect, what Mr. VANDENBERG suggests would commit us in advance to yield to any future decision the UN may make regarding our aid to Greece and Turkey.

There may be some question about whether Mr. VANDENBERG's proposal could be reconciled with the terms of the UN Charter. On its face, however, with technicalities to one side, it seems to be designed mainly to emphasize to the world that the United States attachés the greatest importance to the ultimate authority of the United Nations—so much so, in fact, that we stand ready to surrender the veto power we could conceivably use in some future dispute over our role in Greece and Turkey. That role, under the suggested amendment, would be subject to the majority will of either the Security Council or the General Assembly—an arrangement that would shatter loose charges accusing us of unwarranted unilateral action and imperialism.

In principle and aim at least, Mr. VANDENBERG's idea thus appears sound and pertinent enough to be embodied in the proposed Greco-Turkish legislation, which the President had hoped would be enacted by now. The legislation is urgently needed. Also needed is a clear understanding everywhere that it is not meant to undermine the United Nations but to meet an emergency beyond the UN's present capabilities. The amendment offered by Senator VANDENBERG, who is, incidentally, a firm supporter of the President's program, seems admirably suited to that end.

Armenia and the Turkish Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as we proceed to the consideration of the proposal of the President of the United States of an American Turkish loan, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a letter which was recently dispatched to the President of the United States by the Armenian National Council of America, a letter in which the consummation of the loan is vigorously protested. The communication is well worthy of the careful and painstaking consideration of the membership of the Congress and the people of the country.

Mr. Speaker, the communication to which I have referred is the following:

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

In the name of the millions of our Armenian brethren who were massacred by the Turks, in the name of justice, and in the interests of world peace, the Armenian National Council of America protests the proposed loan to Turkey.

Turkish rule is neither democratic nor representative. Turkey practices a domestic policy of decimation and deportation of the national minorities within its borders.

Underwriting the Turkish Government, therefore, would imply American endorsement of tyranny and despotism, contrary to our American traditions and would tend to lower our prestige in the eyes of humanity.

Any support of Turkey, whether military or financial or moral; any alliance with Turkey, whatever its guise or form, might serve to give the world a push down the road to World War III.

In World War I, Turkey was on the side of Germany. In World War II, Turkey pursued a policy of crafty neutrality, by means of which she battened on the allies and Germany, in turn, by offering her services and goods to the highest bidder.

The Armenian people, on the other hand, served the allies unselfishly, devotedly, and to the utmost of their capacities. Almost 2,000,000 Armenians sacrificed their lives in defense of the Allied cause in both World Wars.

In recognition of the Armenian contribution towards an Allied victory in World War I, the Allies promised to restore the Armenian homeland.

This promise was solemnized by the Treaty of Sevres in 1920, which Turkey signed, and, in accordance with treaty terms, President Wilson was designated to define the boundaries of the new nation.

President Wilson's arbitral award was made public in December of 1920 but it was never honored. The Treaty of Sevres was torn up by the Turks, as being a worthless scrap of paper.

Today, 27 years after the sacred promise of the Treaty of Sevres, the major portions of the Armenian homeland are under the iron boot of Turkey, and the Armenian is still a homeless wanderer over the earth.

Therefore, to the end that justice, so long delayed, be done to the Armenian people; to the end that American traditions of justice and freedom for all be maintained; to the end that the world be freed from the fear of another war; the Armenian National Council of America urges the complete rejection of the proposed loan to Turkey.

Respectfully,
ARMENIAN NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
MARK J. SHAHINIAN, *Chairman,*
MARTIC T. MARTENTZ, *Vice Chairman,*
SETH SHAHEN, *Secretary,*
MESROB BAJAKIAN, *Treasurer.*

Labor Conditions in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago an American delegation of workers returned from Argentina. These delegates made a study of labor conditions in Argentina. Their report to the press of America was not a favorable one.

It is curious to compare the report of this labor delegation to the press of the United States with the report made by the president of the delegation, Arnold Zander, to the Argentinian Government. I wish to place in the RECORD at this time a photostat copy of a statement signed by Arnold Zander on February 7, 1947, just before the delegation left Argentina. Here is the signed statement by the president of the delegation:

Please tell President Peron that the North American Workers Delegation deeply appreciates the opportunity he afforded us to come to Argentina to meet this great people. It is an unusual idea to which President Peron gave expression when he thought of inviting representatives of the organized workers of America to visit the workers of Argentina. Such unusual and constructive ideas should be commended by everyone and we feel that because of the opportunity afforded us lasting contacts have been developed which will improve the understanding and friendship between the people of our two countries. Another exceptional device which we have been told will be employed is the assignment of labor attachés to the Argentine embassies in the various countries of the world and we look forward to receiving and collaborating with those who are coming to the United States.

We have been given every opportunity to see Argentina and to visit with the workers as well as with the syndicates and public officials. Our contacts have been constructive. We have learned a great deal and hope that we have been able to contribute at least a little to the understanding of Argentinians, of their problems and our mutual aspirations. We believe firmly in the need for solidarity of working people everywhere and it is inconceivable that a proper program of collaboration of the working people of the Western Hemisphere could be put in motion without including both the working people of the United States and Argentina.

We are satisfied that our visit here will have lasting benefits. It is for this reason we send to President Peron our thanks. We also express our gratitude to those with whom we have worked and assisted us and made our visit as constructive and enjoyable as it has been.

We were privileged to see the mountains and lakes, the Pampas and some of the villages of Argentina. We are impressed by the grandeur of the country and of the tremendous opportunities that are in Argentina for developing full and free living. We are sure the aspirations of the people of Argentina are like our own and we look forward to cooperating with the people of your country in realizing our mutual aspirations.

On leaving Argentina our hearts go out to our new friends and to all of the people of this great land with whom we now feel acquainted.

It would be impossible for me to enumerate fully or to mention by name all those who have been specially kind, cooperative, and helpful during our visit. On the other hand I would like President Peron to know that we have been well provided for and expertly conducted. To begin with our trip to Argentina was most pleasant and special commendation should be given to the crew of our plane and to those who made all the arrangements along the way. I must mention my experience in riding to and from Mar del Plata with members of the Argentine Delegation who contributed greatly to my understanding of Argentina and the labor situation. Our visit to the Labor Court was constructive and helpful. We learned a great deal about procedures employed there and we were able to compare them with our own.

Every member of our delegation has expressed the hope that he may return to Argentina to enjoy the beauties of the country and to become better acquainted with those we have been privileged to meet and with many others from whom we know we could get more of the spirit of the country. We want to develop the closest possible friendship with Argentina and are happy to have heard the same wish expressed by many of your people.

In conclusion I might refer to the remarks about Argentina recently made by Mr. Felix Knight in the sense that the people of Argentina are pushing forward toward a fuller life. Those with whom we have met and worked are aiding them in this endeavor. We extend every good wish to the officers and agents of the government who are giving support and aid toward this end.

ARNOLD S. ZANDER.

FEBRUARY 8, 1947.

Mr. Speaker, this report to the Argentine Government does not square with the report given to the press of America. It is easy to see the hand of that muddling jughead, Spruille Braden, in the report given the press of America. As long as Spruille Braden has anything to say, nothing good will ever be said about Argentina in America.

Members of Congress should read the statement given in Argentina and signed by the President of the delegation. Then compare this statement with the report given by this same group to the press of the United States.

It is easy to reach a conclusion. The report in Argentina was an honest report. The report in the United States was doctored up to fit in with Spruille Braden's smear Argentina policy. It is time this Congress took a hand and forced the dismissal of the muddling jughead who has set Latin-American relations back 50 years.

Statement of Fact Refuted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, through the director of its national legislative committee, has refuted a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which said that "all outstanding religious and veterans' organizations have recommended favorable action" on the proposal of President Truman in his message of January 6, 1947, for legislation regarding displaced persons in Europe, by means of a letter under date of April 2 from Col. John Thomas Taylor, the director, to Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH, who made the statement.

I do not think anyone can dispute the fact that the American Legion is an outstanding veterans' organization.

The text of Colonel Taylor's letter is as follows:

APRIL 2, 1947.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: In an extension of your remarks on displaced persons in Europe, appearing on page A1407 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 1, 1947, the following statement appears:

"President Truman, in his message of January 6, 1947, urged legislation to relieve the unfortunate suffering of these people, but, so far, no action has been taken, notwithstanding that all outstanding religious and veterans' organizations have recommended favorable action. Besides these organizations, many outstanding gentlemen who have studied the existing conditions in the displaced-persons camps all strongly urge and recommend that we permit a fair share of these unfortunate people, as provided in my bill (H. R. 464), be admitted."

The American Legion, a veterans' organization of more than 3,600,000 members and an Auxiliary of nearly 1,000,000 members, has never urged favorable action on any proposed legislation to relax immigration quotas or to assign any unused quotas for the use of displaced persons or anyone else. On the contrary, the American Legion, by mandates adopted by our national conventions, is not only unalterably opposed to liberalizing immigration quotas but advocates further restrictions, including the barring of all immigration into the United States until such time as (1) unemployment shall be less than 1,000,000; (2) all veterans shall have been afforded the opportunity of gainful employment; and (3) all members of imported foreign-labor battalions, refugees, war prisoners, and those who have been given temporary sanctuary shall have been returned to the lands of their origin, which should be accomplished without delay.

In view of the foregoing, your statement as to veterans' organizations could not possibly apply to the American Legion.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

Reply to Mr. Forrestal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed to the gentleman from California, the Honorable RICHARD J. WELCH, in which the Honorable James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, took occasion to deny personal responsibility for the failure of certain petitions from Guam and Samoa to reach the Congress of the United States. I am hereby introducing a copy of that letter into the RECORD for reference at this time. As may be noted, Mr. Forrestal states that a petition for citizenship and an organic act contained in Joint Resolution 1 of the Eighth Guam Congress, dated January 4, 1947, is in the possession of his naval subordinates and gives assurances that it will now reach the Congress. He also acknowledges the adoption by the General Fono of American Samoa in November of 1946 of a resolution requesting American citizenship and an organic act and gives assurances that that resolution will also reach the Congress.

The Secretary of the Navy is an honorable gentleman, and I hereby publicly absolve him of personal knowledge of the existence of the petitions to which I referred and I withdraw my statement that he deliberately withheld them from the Congress. Since Mr. Forrestal now has knowledge of the existence of the petitions to which I referred and since has made public his assurance that the petitions will come to the Congress, I am completely satisfied in that respect. Mr. Forrestal is an honorable man and I am sure he will keep his word. Gentlemen, I accept his word.

In thus retracting my charge that Mr. Forrestal has deliberately withheld these petitions from Congress, I want to make it plain, however, that I am not withdrawing from the position I have taken in calling for an end to naval autocracy in Guam and American Samoa. I stand fully and publicly committed to the proposition that there must be civil governments for civil populations under the American flag in time of peace. To that end I call upon Mr. Forrestal—and I call on the head of the administration which he represents—to put an end to the undemocratic and un-American forms of government which exist in Guam and American Samoa by executive fiat.

I feel somewhat like the little boy who surprised himself by actually hitting his teacher with the pea he had aimed in her direction—"Goodness, that was such a little pea. Why did she jump so high?" What is it that has aroused the gold braid department of our Government and has prompted the Secretary of the Navy to have this letter placed in the RECORD of the Congress? What is it that has brought out the Navy lobby and has aroused the wrath of the administration? Was it my statement that Mr. Forrestal has withheld a petition from the Congress of the United States? Gentlemen, I do not think so. The thing that brought out the hatchetmen is the Poulson bill, H. R. 2753. Gentlemen, that bill, which is in reality nothing more than a proposed organic act for Guam proposes a complete reformation of the naval government of Guam which has existed for almost 50 years under the jurisdiction and control of various Secretaries of the Navy. The rub is, that by providing for a new form of government my bill in reality points out the evils of the existing form of government in Guam. That is the real reason why a Secretary of the Navy finds it necessary to reply to me and enter into controversy with me—a lowly little Republican Congressman from California.

The Poulson bill, H. R. 2753, is designed to give the people of Guam many basic liberties and rights which they have never enjoyed under the United States naval government of Guam. My organic act for Guam extends to the people of Guam by act of Congress the following rights and basic liberties:

Representation in the United States Congress—section 13.

A civilian governor appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the United States Senate—section 14.

Participation by the people of Guam in the choice of local government officials who perform the functions of local government and judges of their local courts—section 17.

Universal suffrage with voting qualifications as prescribed by the Guam Congress—section 10.

A share in the Federal grants of funds for vocational education—section 26a; soil conservation—section 26b; school lunches—section 4.

Extension to Guam of the facilities of the United States Public Health Service with respect to hospital construction—section 26c—and the programs of the Federal Security Agency, the United States Office of Education, the United States Civil Service Commission, and so forth.

Lawmaking on local affairs by the Guam Congress—sections 6 through 9.

Pay for members of the Guam Congress—section 7c.

Elimination of the Governor's power of absolute veto—section 9a.

Establishment of the jurisdiction of the Federal courts over cases arising in Guam with the right of appeal through the Federal courts to the Supreme Court of the United States—section 21.

Extension of all of the civil liberty guarantees of the Constitution—section 4.

Political equality for the people of Guam under the American system.

The end of discriminatory labor laws and regulations—section 4

Freedom from naval control over local affairs not directly concerned with island and national defense—sections 31 and 32.

Removal of the requirement that Guamanians have the permission of the United States Navy before they can leave or return to the island of Guam.

American citizenship for the people of Guam—section 3.

Social equality and the end of segregation and discrimination—section 4.

A free economy in which the people of Guam will have control over the issuance of business licenses and permits and the issuance of price and trade regulations—section 6.

The establishment of private commercial banking facilities in lieu of the United States naval owned and operated Bank of Guam—section 5a.

Elimination of the Governor's power to prescribe local customs duties and the integration of Guam into the United States customs and tariff system—sections 28 and 29.

The end of taxation without representation through the extension of the power of local taxation to the people of Guam through the Guam Congress—section 28b.

Extension to the Guam Congress of the power to create and establish local courts to replace those now existing by order of the naval governor—section 19.

Extension of the right of trial by jury—section 21c.

There it is. There are just 23 of the liberties and rights which the people of Guam should have but which on the whole they do not have under naval government. One might almost say, gentlemen, that those 23 points amount to 23 counts in an indictment.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 1, 1947.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Yesterday Congressman NORRIS POULSON, of California, charged that I had deliberately withheld from the Congress knowledge of a petition addressed to the Congress of the United States by the Eighth Guam Congress, requesting full citizenship and the enactment of an organic act for the government of the island.

I understand that such a petition was adopted by the Guam Congress on January 4, 1947, but the Guam Congress took no further action to implement this resolution nor did it forward any copies thereof to the Governor of Guam or to me. Late in February, the Governor of Guam directed the Attorney General to request action on the part of the Guam Congress in order that the resolutions might be forwarded. Copies of the resolution were prepared by the Attorney General and, at his request, signed by the presiding officers of the Congress. I understand that they were not delivered to the Governor of Guam for forwarding until March 15. They have not yet reached this department and I do not have, and never have had this petition.

Congressman POULSON also referred to an enactment of the 1945 General Fono of all the leading chiefs of American Samoa, petitioning the Congress of the United States for an organic act for government of American Samoa. It is inferred that I likewise withheld this from the Congress. In April of 1945, an assembly of Samoans adopted a resolution requesting citizenship, and transmitted it to the Governor of American Samoa, who forwarded the papers to Washington. These resolutions were submitted to the Fono of Samoa at its annual meeting in November of 1945, but no action on an organic act was taken by the Fono because the members themselves were not prepared to submit a proposed act.

In November of 1946 the matter was again introduced in the Fono and a resolution adopted requesting citizenship and an organic act. The records of the proceedings of the Fono were transmitted to the Hopkins committee, which had been appointed by me to study and make recommendations concerning the governments of Guam and American Samoa. This Hopkins committee returned to Washington from its visits to Guam and American Samoa on Friday, March 28. The resolution of the Samoan Fono, I understand, is embodied in the report of the Hopkins committee which has not yet been submitted to me but which should reach my desk sometime this week.

Be assured that I have not deliberately withheld either of these matters from the Congress of the United States and that immediately upon their receipt I shall transmit them expeditiously.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Housing and Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Chat Patterson, national legislative representative of the American Veterans' Committee.

This statement sets forth the testimony of Mr. Patterson had he been given the opportunity to appear before the House Banking and Currency Committee. It is a well-considered statement and should command the respect and attention of every Member who is seriously concerned with the problems of the veteran.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee to present the views of the American Veterans Committee (AVC) on H. R. 2549. The AVC as a World War II veterans' organization with members in almost 1,000 chapters from coast to coast is deeply interested in the retention of present rent and housing controls because we believe any curtailment in these controls would drastically affect all veterans and their families as well as the majority of citizens in obtaining or retaining adequate housing.

Veterans, as well as others, have been hard hit by the inflation in the cost of such basic items as food and clothing. We believe that the present high cost of living indicates that controls over such basic items were taken off too soon. But the feeling has been that the removal of controls would stimulate the placing of supplies of food and clothing on the market. Buyers, it has been argued, would have some margin of protection in refusing to buy when prices went too high. This can work to a limited extent since consumers can delay purchases of clothing and can eliminate luxury items from their food purchases. But we insist that a similar philosophy cannot justify the removal of rent controls. You can't produce in a matter of months the millions of homes and rental units which are urgently needed. The housing shortage can only be regarded as an acute situation which will remain of emergency proportions for at least another year.

There has been recently a wave of astounding statements to the effect that there really is no housing shortage. To the person who is satisfactorily housed this may be encouraging news. But it is difficult to persuade the person who has spent the last 6 months vainly seeking a place to live that this assertion is anything more than brazen propaganda.

The Bureau of the Census announced on March 18, 1947, the results of a veterans' housing survey which it made between July 1946 and September 1946. The surveys were made in 70 selected cities and reveal some of the facts about the veteran's housing desires and his income which must be taken into account in considering any housing legislation. I sincerely hope that every member of this committee will have occasion to study this survey as it pertains to his own particular area.

The survey concretely presents the housing problem when it shows that from 30 to 40 percent of married veterans are living in rented rooms or doubled up with in-laws. In Los Angeles County, Calif., for example, fully 50 percent of the married veterans in that area are without desirable living quarters. In the New York City area some 44 percent of the married veterans fall into this category. For the New Orleans area in Louisiana, the Detroit area in Michigan, and the Philadelphia area of Pennsylvania the figures are respectively 32, 51, and 43 percent.

The survey also vividly demonstrates that veterans cannot afford either the rental or purchase cost of new housing. The median weekly income of veterans is shown to be between $40 and $50. In the majority of cases they cannot afford to pay more than $40 a month rent, and they cannot afford housing costing over $6,000.

These figures present in the cold language of statistics the crushing problem which is facing the veteran. Even under the Wyatt program new housing often costs $80 a month in rentals and $10,000 in purchase price. These figures, as we now know, are rapidly becoming minimums. The Wall Street Journal reported in a survey printed February 17, 1947, that over-all building costs are up 86 percent over 1939 and have reached an all-time peak. Builders are curtailing their program up to 90 to 95 percent because of the current record high costs, according to the same source.

I am sure there is not a member of this committee who does not want to alleviate the desperate and critical situation described above. I am also certain that you gentlemen want to do everything in your power to hold down the present soaring costs. Do you not agree that the first consideration in discussing current housing legislation should be: "Will this legislation create more housing units at a lower price?"

The first and most obvious way of avoiding an immediate crisis in the field of rental housing is to continue present rent controls without change. We know that a marked majority of the American people feel that rent controls should be retained. The National Opinion Research Center in a poll made last spring reported that 85 percent of the people thought it would be necessary to continue rent controls during the next year. Fifty-two percent of this group wanted rent control continued beyond June, 1947.

Even more significant is the poll released in December, 1946, by Dr. George Gallup which reported that 64 percent of United States voters thought their present rents were about right. Only 11 percent said their rents were too low and 24 percent felt that the rents were too high.

The chairman of this committee has issued several encouraging statements indicating the necessity for continuing rent controls. If such a necessity exists then why not pass a simple bill extending the existing rent provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act? H. R. 2549, as it pertains to rent controls is confusing and may well prove unworkable and ineffective.

The bill makes no provision for enforcement of rent control other than court action. And if the average veteran can't even pay the present rent costs then how can he afford court action? Also with the present scarcity of average rental units it is unlikely that a tenant will haul his landlord into court.

It is my understanding that for the past 5 years the Government's rent-control laws have provided a means for questioning the validity of certain maximum rents. If we want to continue effective rent control then let's use the machinery and methods which have controlled rents so far. This is no time to change horses in the middle of the swelling stream of inflation. Rent controls also should be continued as is for at least another year—until June 1948.

It is necessary to emphasize that during the present housing crisis no accommodations which are currently being used as rental units should be exempted from rent controls. We all know that transient hotels and motor courts are at present serving as permanent accommodations for tremendous numbers of homeless veterans and other citizens. These accommodations should be kept under rent control during the present emergency and not exempted as is provided in section 202 (c) (1).

In regard to title I of H. R. 2549, AVC believes that in the face of the continuing housing emergency all controls which aid in the construction of housing at minimum price levels must be retained. We feel that the following controls fall into this category:

1. The construction order limiting nonessential construction: It is generally well known that there just are not enough building materials to go around. Until there are, it makes sense to most veterans that homes of the kind they can afford should not be sacrificed for night clubs or a smaller number of luxury type dwellings. It is for this reason that we believe it is essential to continue the order which limits nonessential construction. Without that order, all sorts of unnecessary construction would spring up which would drain building materials away from new homes for veterans. This is especially true since persons engaging in commercial and luxury types of construction are generally in a better position to pay higher prices for building materials than veterans and other people constructing homes for veterans. Until there is a better supply of building materials there must be a limitation on nonessential construction.

2. Allocation of a few basic raw materials: For similar reasons, the allocation of a few basic raw materials to producers of critical building products must be continued. Allocation of this type appears to have been an important reason for the increases in the production of these building products during the past year. Of course, it is very important that this increased production be maintained.

3. Special assistance to building materials producers in securing bottleneck equipment and machinery: Continuation of the authority to render spot assistance to building material producers in securing bottleneck equipment and machinery should also continue. We understand that this has permitted production to continue in many cases where it otherwise would have been stopped or curtailed because of break-downs or shortages.

4. One thousand five hundred square foot limitation, one completed bathroom limitation, and year-round occupancy limitation: Of special importance to veterans is the requirement that houses must have a floor area of not more than 1,500 square feet and use no more bathroom fixtures than are necessary for one bathroom. This means that scarce materials will be available for more houses, and that more of the houses built will be the kind veterans can afford. The requirement that houses be built for year-round occupancy means that veterans houses will be built in place of beach houses and the like.

5. Rent ceilings on new construction: I cannot overemphasize the importance of continuing rent ceilings on new houses. While the present $80 average rental ceiling is within the reach of some veterans, it is unfortunately beyond the means of many others. The removal of these ceilings would result in exorbitant rents and therefore far less rental housing which veterans can afford. This would be disastrous at this time when it is so hard for veterans to find homes.

We do not believe that removal of rent control would result in any substantial number of existing houses being brought on the market for veterans. We believe stories to this effect are mostly propaganda for removal of rent control.

We feel that the rents approved by FHA on new houses are not a deterrent to the construction of new houses which veterans can afford. In approving these rentals FHA considers all of the present high construction cost and permits rents which allow a reasonable return on the builders' investment. I understand that in fixing these rents, a 7-percent allowance for vacancies is made, which is certainly more than adequate under present conditions.

6. Veterans' preference: We are happy to note that the bill before this committee would not abolish veterans' preference. However, it is our considered opinion that such preferences would be meaningless to a large extent if the bill is enacted into law. It would be small consolation to veterans to have preference in the rental or purchase of dwellings that they cannot afford to rent or buy.

7. Sales prices and rent ceilings on HH priority constructed houses: We feel that sales prices and rent ceilings on HH priority constructed houses should be continued. The priorities assistance which the Government extended to builders in the interest of providing homes for veterans, was based upon the agreement of the builders to abide by these ceilings. We believe that the abandonment of these ceilings would serve to disappoint the reasonable expectations of veterans.

8. Guaranteed markets: We see no reason why the Government should not continue to assume part of the risks involved in getting the production of prefabricated homes started. Veterans are particularly interested in these houses being built because they are less expensive than most others.

The American Veterans Committee, therefore respectfully urges that rent control be extended with adequate enforcement provisions and that existing housing controls be retained.

United States of Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and newspaper articles:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 26, 1947.*
Hon. HALE BOGGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOGGS: Any American who has traveled in Europe in peacetime has been dismayed and distressed by the division of that Continent into a number of small states—each with separate passport regulations, separate tariffs, and separate regulations of all kinds, calculated to interfere with the happiness and prosperity of its people. Divided, these people have fallen time and time again as a result of national jealousies and wars. Although I have no longer an active connection with the New Orleans Item, I was delighted to read in a recent issue a powerful editorial putting forward the idea of a United States of Western Europe, and I was further gratified to see you take the initiative in the House in introducing for its consideration a resolution on this subject. I understand that Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, has introduced a similar resolution in the Senate.

To my mind there are a thousand good reasons favoring the formation of a United States of Western Europe, and none against it. Switzerland is the classic example of a nation able to peacefully govern Europeans of different languages and nationalities. The United States contains in its citizenship millions of European immigrants and descendants of immigrants from all European nations, and these people can tell their European nationals the benefit which comes here from a government of united states. It is of undoubted value to our own prosperity and safety that the civilized nations of western Europe should be free, united, and prosperous.

You and Senator FULBRIGHT are identified with a cause of immense importance. Others, like myself, who believe in it, want to wish you Godspeed and to help in its promotion in every way possible.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. THOMSON.

[From the Washington Daily News]

EUROPE'S UNITY

(By William Philip Simms)

WASHINGTON, March 24.—"That the Congress hereby favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations," was the text of a resolution introduced yesterday in the House by Representative HALE BOGGS (Democrat, Louisiana).

Shorter by 26 words than the 46-word Fulbright resolution of 1943 favoring a United Nations, the Boggs proposal is certain to stir considerable debate on both sides of the Atlantic. Most people will be for it, outside the Soviet bloc at any rate, but Moscow and its satellites will see in it just another plot of "encirclement."

A United States of Europe long has been the hope and dream of some of the foremost statesmen of the Old World and the New.

All agree that European peace never can be truly stabilized as long as it remains Balkanized as at present. Nor can the European

standard of living ever reach a permanently high level unless and until some sort of customs union permits a freer exchange of commodities.

Mr. Boggs holds that the Moscow Conference, our aid to Greece and Turkey, and similar steps are in the right direction, but that these are not enough.

"Europe must be reconstituted," he says, "and reconstituted as a unit if the world is to have peace."

Many agree with Mr. Boggs. Just before he left for Moscow, John Foster Dulles said the Big Four would deal with Germany, but Germany was the central problem of Europe and Europe was the world's worst fire hazard. After each past conflagration, the structure has been rebuilt substantially as before.

"Statesmanship," Mr. Dulles went on to say, "can do better than go on repeating that folly." Last September, in Zurich, Winston Churchill said "we must build a kind of United States of Europe."

Here as elsewhere, Soviet Russia is blocking the way. She wants no combinations anywhere that are not controlled from Moscow. She strongly favors a federalized Balkans with a Tito in every capital, but opposes a friendship treaty between France and Britain. Austria, Italy, and Hungary would be incalculably better off for an economic understanding, but Russia will not allow it.

Finland and her Scandinavian neighbors, especially Sweden, could make life more worthwhile for all concerned, but Moscow has put thumbs down on an Entente. Britain, France, and the Low Countries have toyed with a similar idea only to be accused of attempting to form a bloc against Russia.

If Russia were merely seeking peace and prosperity for herself and Europe, nothing could advance the cause more than a federalization of western Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

If she aims to pick off the smaller European countries, one by one, and add them to her string of satellites, federalization might interfere with her plans.

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 12, 1947]

FOR A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

If I were Secretary of State Marshall addressing the Peace Conference at Moscow I would say:

"Gentlemen, I must speak in absolute frankness to you. Twice in one generation my country has been obliged to sacrifice its manhood and spend its treasure in efforts to prevent conflagrations from spreading to my homeland that were started on this Continent. Not only have these conflagrations been of stupendous cost to my people during the actual hostilities, but the financing and aid which we gave in the First World War caused such dislocations in our economy that it took us nearly two decades to recover.

"The Second World War cost us well over $200,000,000,000 in addition to the lives sacrificed and we are not yet in a position to evaluate the economic damage that has resulted.

"I am therefore venturing what I believe to be the basic causes of these conflagrations and suggest remedies.

"First. The geography and natural resources of continental Europe are such that only a United States of Europe, with no trade or tariff barriers, can produce and sustain an economy of plenty.

"Second. The dismissal of the idea that socialism, be it of the type as expounded by Karl Marx, Lenin, Hitler, Mussolini, Quisling, or Attlee, can offer you a solution to your political or economic troubles.

"I will now elaborate on the preceding suggestions using my country as an example which will show the similarity of the United States of America geography and the proposed United States of Europe.

"I shall also try to outline the ideology or economy that prevails in my country and try to correct certain false impressions that have been propagandized.

"Geography: The British Isles compare to my country's New England States, both industrially and physically; France and Germany to our Midwest; Russia to our States like Texas, Nebraska, and Missouri.

"Ideology or economy: The term 'capitalistic' is misapplied in describing the economy of the United States. 'Capitalism' such as has prevailed in Europe has been a very negligible factor in the prosperity of the American people. The term 'American industrialism' is more appropriate. This is typified by the fact that:

"1. There are millions of individual stockholders in American corporations;

"2. The American economy is based on the production of large quantities of the necessities and comforts of life produced at a price that nearly all the people can pay. This is exemplified by slogans commonly used by manufacturers, such as 'More and Better Things for More People (General Motors), 'Better Things for Better Living Through Chemistry' (du Pont).

"3. The millions of American farmers are prosperous and self-sustaining in contrast to the former large landowners of Europe and resultant peasant class.

"4. There is a vast prosperous middle class of shopkeepers and professional men and women.

"5. The men and women who work in our industries have the highest standard of living in the world.

"Gentlemen, I should like to have you visit the United States of America again and make both a study and examination of our Government, institutions, and industry. I sincerely believe that once you follow the pattern we have set, my Government will make available to you the necessary financial assistance and guidance.

"Such matters as wars and atomic bombs will then cease to be subjects of importance for our generation and the generations to come."

EDWARD I. BLEE.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of March 29, 1947]

SUGGESTIONS FOR FORMING A EUROPEAN FEDERATION ARE STUDIED AGAIN

(By Robert L. Riggs)

WASHINGTON.—The proposal that the United States take action to help Greece and Turkey maintain their independence has caused three Members of Congress to give new impetus to another proposal which is at least 400 years old. The older proposal is that there be formed a United States of Europe.

To forward the idea of uniting the numerous states of Europe into one federation two Senators and a Member of the House have introduced a resolution which, if adopted, would make it part of the foreign policy of this Nation to favor creation of a United States of Europe.

The two Senators are WILLIAM J. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah. The Representative is HALE BOGGS, 33-year-old war veteran of New Orleans. The three Democrats say they don't propose that this country impose upon Europe the idea of federation—in fact, it couldn't do so if it wanted to do it. The resolution is intended, they say, merely to let those Europeans interested in the idea know that it has the sympathetic interest of the people here.

Here is the complete text of the 19-word resolution: "Resolved, the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations."

Although the legislators don't expect the United States of America to take positive action to bring about the European federation, there are two things they would expect this country to do to help it along if it ever got to the organization stage. The first would be to guarantee the emerging federation from military interference by Russia. The second would be to give it financial assistance to generate economic strength.

UNDER WHOSE DOMINATION?

The Russian angle is a new twist to the Federation idea which was toyed with as long ago as the seventeenth century. Russia, of course, has her own ideas about what should be done to unify Europe, namely, that it come under the sway of Communist governments owing their loyalty to Moscow. If the United States is going into the business of stopping the spread of totalitarian governments, as proposed in the Greek-Turk assistance program, the supporters of the Federation plan contend their idea presents the best way to do so.

The way to prevent the spread of communism, they say, is to bring about a peaceful, prosperous Europe. This cannot happen, they argue, so long as every little language has a nation of its own; so long as national boundaries create economic barriers within so small an area. Already, they point out, Russia controls Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Bessarabia, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. Democracy and free enterprise will not survive in the rest of Europe, they say, unless its economic problems are solved. We would face a similar situation in this country, they say, if, in order to ship crude oil from Texas to New York, it were necessary to pay tariff fees and effect international currency exchange across several boundaries.

THE IDEA IS PRACTICAL

As an illustration that a United States of Europe could succeed, they point to the Swiss federation of 25 independent cantons, with 4 separate languages, and with vast differences in race, religion, and culture. Despite these differences, they say, Switzerland has been welded into a federation with a common economic, foreign, and military policy.

As long ago as the seventeenth century Henry the Fourth, of France, was advocating a "great design" of federated states. This country was just over its birth pangs when George Washington wrote to Lafayette: "One day, taking its pattern from the United States, there will be founded the United States of Europe."

Victor Hugo supported the idea. Aristide Briand, of France, worked for it between two world wars. Winston Churchill, Clement Attlee, Jan Smuts, and John Foster Dulles are among its present-day advocates.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 21, 1947]

CONGRESSIONAL MEMBERS URGE FEDERATED EUROPE

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON, March 21.—Members of Congress today joined the company of Winston Churchill, Walter Lippmann, Jan Christiaan Smuts, et al., in proposing a "United States of Europe."

The Fulbright-Thomas-Boggs resolution, urging that a federated Europe become a cardinal objective of United States foreign policy, reveals a new tack which congressional and Capital thinking is taking as it contemplates the vast burdens the Nation is proposing to assume as leader and rehabilitator of the nontotalitarian world.

To its advocates, the proposal for a United States of Europe looms as nothing less than an objective which would permit this Nation to coordinate and channel its diverse foreign lending and spending policies toward the setting up of a powerful and

economically healthy state in the cradle of western civilization.

And this state would be stalwart enough to transform the big two into the big three, establishing a new checkmate to Communist and Russian efforts to dominate Europe.

NOT EXACTLY NEW

Democratic Senators J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and ELBERT THOMAS, of Utah, two of the most scholarly Members of the Upper House, and Democratic Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, the three sponsors of the resolution introduced this noon, concede that their idea is not exactly new.

They know, furthermore, that Soviet Russia has denounced the proposal each and every time it has been previously advanced, and that the Communist Parties in France, Italy, and elsewhere could be expected to campaign strenuously against the inclusion of their countries in the contemplated federation.

But, to advocates here, the plan assumes new urgency at a moment in history when President Truman has announced an American intention to bolster nontotalitarian regimes wherever situated against encroachment, and when it is proposed to spend $400,000,000 to shore up nations on Russia's Middle East periphery—and more money, undoubtedly, elsewhere—with the United States already having expended some $20,000,000,000 in the restoration and stabilization of the postwar world.

Senator FULBRIGHT declared that the American people have had enough of wars which for centuries "have been generated by the conflicts that inhere in the fragmented sovereignties of Europe."

Mr. BOGGS observed that the rehabilitation of Europe cannot be done with American dollars and relief alone, nor is "the negative policy of opposing Russia and international Communism, as vital as that is, enough. The peoples of western Europe must be enabled to help themselves."

UNITED STATES BACKING

The resolution does not mean that the United States would seek to "impose" federation upon Europe. Rather would it have the United States give encouragement and support to the European forces working for it.

The proposal, it is agreed here, is of tremendous scope, although the precise definition of "European federation" is not clear in the Fulbright-Thomas-Boggs resolution.

To many advocates, the federation would of necessity include Germany and its Ruhr, the economic heart of western Europe. It would embrace Belgium and the Netherlands, France, and Italy. Conceivably it could include the Scandinavian bloc. Possibly it should be an "open end" federation, prepared to admit Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and other nations now within the Soviet orbit, when they are able and willing.

As for the inclusion of Britain, many Britons feel that with the empire shrunken, London no longer can play a balance-of-power role but must cast its lot with western Europe.

The sponsors of the resolution would encourage the formation of the federation "within the framework of the United Nations."

European sponsors see the federation as preventing western Europe from becoming a battleground between the United States and Russia. Conversely, should the United States and Russia compose their differences, they see the federation preventing western Europe from being reduced to impotence between two giants.

In the United States the "world government" people like Clarence K. Streit are urging a "union of all the democracies around the Atlantic Ocean in a great union of the free."

Those most immediately concerned, in Congress and out, see in the federation a blueprint and formula under which the United States could bend its rehabilitation and loans not merely to restore Germany and Greece, bolster Turkey, or fend off communism in Italy, but to work toward a general European settlement and reestablishment.

World Phonetic Alphabet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted and signed by all the members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation endorsing a world phonetic alphabet prepared by the Honorable Robert L. Owen. I personally commend this great achievement to the Congress and the country. So often, even in this enlightened age, language is a barrier between man and man, which precludes the kind of understanding necessary to a peaceful world. Senator Owen, by his Global Alphabet Guide Book, has given mankind the opportunity to remove this obstacle for all time to come.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Honorable Robert L. Owen, one of Oklahoma's first and most distinguished United States Senators, did, between the years 1907 and 1925, honor our State and Nation with courageous, constructive, and enduring service in the upper Chamber of our National Congress; and

Whereas with a firm and determined resolution to strike at the roots of ignorance and illiteracy and the consequent corollaries of international misunderstanding, strife, and war, this distinguished son of Oklahoma did voluntarily retire from his seat in the United States Senate to foster a global alphabet, thereby opening the door to a world language as one of the main avenues to world brotherhood; and

Whereas after more than a quarter of a century of devoted attention to this ideal, which involved a tremendous expenditure of personal effort and personal funds on his part, Senator Owen has produced a global alphabet which by reason of its completeness, its simplicity, and its perfection constitutes one of the greatest contributions of all time to the science of language; and

Whereas Senator Owen has demonstrated that with this alphabet any language in the world can be taught within a very short period of time and all languages of the world can be reduced to writing either by hand or machine at speeds far in excess of those accomplished with any other existing alphabet; and

Whereas on March 26, 1947, in an inspiring address delivered to the Oklahoma Congressional delegation, a copy of which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A1290, Senator Owen explained the possibilities of his global alphabet as a basis for the use of English as a world language and as a potentially powerful instrument in shaping the destiny of the United Nations Organization and the future of mankind; and

Whereas the Oklahoma congressional delegation is convinced of the tremendous importance to our own Nation and to the world of the handiwork of this great Oklahoman: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the world phonetic alphabet set forth in the Global Alphabet Guide Book by the Honorable Robert L. Owen should be adopted as an auxiliary alphabet for purposes of instruction in all languages.

GEORGE B. SCHWABE, Member of Congress, First District; WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Member of Congress, Second District; CARL ALBERT, Member of Congress, Third District; GLEN D. JOHNSON, Member of Congress, Fourth District; MIKE MONRONEY, Member of Congress, Fifth District; TOBY MORRIS, Member of Congress, Sixth District; PRESTON E. PEDEN, Member of Congress, Seventh District; ROSS RIZLEY, Member of Congress, Eighth District.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased also to insert herewith the following statement by the Honorable Robert L. Owen entitled "What the Global Alphabet Is Not":

The global alphabet is not a language. It does not interfere with any language. It does not interfere with any alphabet. It is of importance to understand what the global alphabet is not. This alphabet does not interfere with any languages in the world, but leaves them as they are.

It does not propose to change the methods of spelling as they now exist, but would leave them alone. This alphabet does not change the spelling in any book in any library in the world. It does not propose to simplify spelling as currently used.

The global alphabet does not interfere in the slightest degree with the linotype nor the monotype machines as they exist.

What it does do is to interpret sounds of the voice with an alphabet that cannot be misunderstood.

It is an auxiliary, a phonetic key, to all languages.

The Hawaiians would need only 12 global letters to write their language; the Moros, 16; the Hebrews, 23; the Spanish, Portuguese, and Italians would only need 30 letters; the Russians only 33. The letters could be written with a pen at more than twice the speed used with the existing phonetic alphabets, and could be written with the global typewriter twice as fast.

Old-Age Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under existing law one who is receiving the benefits of old-age insurance is deprived of his monthly stipend in any month when he earns $15 or more. Although I agree that there should be some restriction in the law, it does not seem to me reasonable or fair, at least with the cost of living what it is today, to deny an older person his insurance payments simply because he has earned this almost insignificant amount.

Furthermore, because of the difficulty which a person has in getting back on the rolls to receive the benefit of this

insurance, I find that two things are happening: One, people over 65 who have the desire, ambition, and ability to supplement their meager income by working part time, are refraining from doing so; and, two, in some cases they are earning more than $15 a month but because they feel the law is unfair are not revealing that fact to the Government agency charged with the administration of this law.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill which would permit a person over 65 to earn up to $40 a month without being deprived of insurance benefits. It is my hope and my firm belief, based upon the study I have made of the question, that this will not cost the Government anything substantially more than the amount it is now paying out for this insurance. What it will do, is to give these older people some greater latitude in supplementing their insurance income from outside sources. This desire on their part to continue their contribution to the economy of our country should not, in my opinion, be discouraged as is happening under the present law.

This amendment will only result, as I see it, in improving the standard of living for these older people who have worked hard all their lives, paid into this insurance fund, and now want to taper off gradually from their hard working days without giving up entirely.

OPA Employees Expect Increased Salaries Under New Rent-Control Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, we have heard so much recently about doing away with this or that bureau and the transferring of the personnel to some new bureau, and in some instances with perhaps increased salaries.

The sugar rationing has been transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture and current rumor has it that the OPA Sugar Control Division will likely take charge of the program under its new set-up.

Now it is being suggested that the OPA rent-control personnel be transferred to the Office of Temporary Controls with an increase in salaries.

It does not seem to do any good to get rid of a bureau if it is to operate under a new name and with increased salaries and with the same personnel. That simply does not make sense. It does not fool the people as much as some of the New Dealers imagine. This has been done in many instances and it looks as if it is now becoming a fixed policy.

I am just in receipt of a letter from a man in Tulsa, Okla., who owns a few small apartments. He explains that one of the OPA employees, in the rent control division, recently tried to tell him how he could circumvent the regulations and collect more rents than he was permitted to collect. The evening of the same day, the OPA employee appeared at one of my constituent's apartments and was investigating with an idea of trying to ascertain if my constituent was charging more rent than his permit allowed.

But the worst part of it all is that this OPA employee, being a stranger to my constituent, who met my constituent on the bus by mere accident, told the apartment owner that if the proposed transfer of the rent-control division was made to the new bureau, it would simply mean that "they will have to take us over to run the thing for them, and we will probably get better salaries than we now get."

The letter, which is dated March 28, 1947, follows:

Some time ago I wrote you a letter with regard to the OPA business, and since that time I have made up my income-tax report on my apartment showing a good-sized loss to us, something over $200, as I remember it, on a five-apartment affair, and that after having spent last fall $700 sanding the floors and papering and painting.

Well, anyway, they won't leave me alone, and on my way to work the other morning I got on the bus and sat right across from a nice looking fellow who, from his clothes, would appear to be "doing good," and I spoke to him, then went across to sit down with him, and asked if he was with the Frates bunch yet, and he said "OPA." "Well," I said, "you won't be long, will you?" He said, "Hell, if they put in this new department it will mean just this: They will have to take us over to run the thing for them, and we will probably get better salaries than we now get." I told him of my loss on my income report, and he asked me why we didn't charge more, and I said, "Not me, I'm not going to get the OPA after me in court." "Well," he said, "you don't have to give receipts, etc." I got this thing off my mind all day but on arrival back at what we call home, the tenant in apartment two, who has been there but a short time, answered the doorbell, and there was apparently the same party waiting to see her, and he asked if she had been charged more than our regular rate for the apartment and some other questions, and then he left. Why go to Russia to live?

Soviet and New Deal Bridgeheads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an editorial which appeared on the front page of the Chicago Sunday Tribune on March 30, 1947:

SOVIET AND NEW DEAL BRIDGEHEADS

Since Mr. Truman discovered a Communist menace in Greece, his short-range vision has noticeably improved. He and the rest of the New Dealers now suddenly profess to have learned that there are Communists crawling around in their administration.

Mr. Truman has therefore decreed that "reds" be fired from the bureaucracy. Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach has called upon Congress to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States. The Supreme Court, getting in step, has approved dismissal of Communist sympathizers from Government posts.

This flurry of New Deal activity would be more convincing if the administration's illumination did not follow so far in the wake of general awareness that Communists had become a formidable force in the Government, in labor unions, in the schools, in the press, films, and radio, and among foreign-language groups. None of this is new. It was to be discovered at almost any time after the advent of the New Deal if anyone in the executive branch had been interested.

Indeed, the complete information was in the possession of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, long before he was permitted to testify publicly to his knowledge a few days ago. Mr. Hoover and his staff over the years had compiled detailed reports about Communist infiltration. Time after time they tried to break through the iron curtain which the administration imposed upon them.

Mr. Roosevelt's patronage was carried to the length of granting Earl Browder, then head of the Communist Party, a Presidential pardon from a Federal prison sentence, ostensibly in the interests of national unity. Browder was liberated in time to organize the Communist forces for Roosevelt in the 1944 campaign. Later on he boasted, "Our own policies and work contributed essentially to the victory of November 7."

Not until Hoover was called before the new House Committee on Un-American Activities, now organized under Republican control, was he able to obtain an official audience.

He then described the Communist Party as dedicated to the overthrow of the United States Government. "The Communists," he said, "have been, still are, and always will be a menace to freedom, to democratic ideals, to the worship of God, and to America's way of life."

Readers of the Tribune know that this is so true as to be obvious. We have said the same thing repeatedly. It is the only honest estimate that could ever be given of communism.

In view of this history, Mr. Truman's talk of preventing communism in Greece and his belated uproar over Communists at home must be regarded as diversionary tactics. The New Dealers have their own subversive conspiracy against America. At times they have been quite willing to employ Communists to advance it, but they are capable themselves of carrying it on. By now dumping the Communists from the New Deal droshky, they hope to divert notice from the fact that they are headed the same way as the Communists.

All this talk of stopping communism in Greece is a delicate falsehood. It is plain from the testimony of Paul Porter, the late OPA commissar, now blossomed out as an expert on Greece, that Truman intends to establish the New Deal variant of American communism in Greece, manned by his own nominees, directed by himself, but financed by the people's money, in order to keep his subversive organization together in the hope of bringing it back to this country afterwards.

"Trust the President," says Porter, clamorously denying that Congress should have any power to review what is done by Truman's agents in Greece if Congress should authorize the venture. But it is impossible to trust him when all of the facts show that the New Dealers, utterly undeterred by their November defeat, are carrying on their subversive activities on all fronts and even seeking a refuge abroad where their experiments and techniques may be improved with practice.

Deficiency Appropriation Bill H. R. 2849 as Affecting the Veterans' Administration Program and the School-Lunch Program in an Interview With Mr. Robert J. Coar, Director of Radio at the Capitol, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON C. JONES
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 1, 1947

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interview given by me by a transcription at 11 a. m. on Tuesday, April 1, in Washington, D. C., and broadcast over a number of stations in North Carolina through the capitol at Raleigh, N. C., at 9 p. m. on the same day:

INTERVIEWER. Congressman JONES, are there any provisions of House bill 2849 making available funds to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, with which you fundamentally disagree?

Congressman JONES. There are two provisions with which I violently disagree.

INTERVIEWER. What are these provisions?

Congressman JONES. First, the radical cutting of $550,000,000 from the Veterans' Administration program. I am especially interested in this because as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House I am familiar with the over-all program of this splendid agency—the Veterans' Administration. A cut of this size and character would be ruinous to the program. This $550,000,000 cut represents a cut of $200,000,000 from the allowance for pensions and compensation benefits and a cut of $350,000,000 from the allowance for readjustment benefits, including many of the benefits under the GI bill of rights—on-the-job training, schooling, unemployment pay, loans for veterans' housing, business loans, farm loans, and reemployment rights. This further disturbs General Bradley in his very stupendous job of carrying out the over-all plan of the Veterans' Administration.

In my opinion, the Government is very fortunate to have a soldier of this type and a man of this character to administer this important agency at the present time. The Government is already under obligation to him for his splendid military service and patriotic contribution to this country and it is a great sacrifice to him to administer this comprehensive program of the Veterans' Administration. There has been some intimation that General Bradley might resign and this cut is one of the best ways to encourage this—that is, by withdrawing from him certain funds necessary to carry forward the program of the Veterans' Administration. I hope that the House will restore this $550,000,000 to the veterans' program before the bill is finally passed in the House.

The second provision with which I disagree is that which removes any allowance for the continuation of the school-lunch program at the very time when it was expected to be a permanent set-up and a great advancement in promoting not only the education but the health of the children of our Nation. It is a disappointment to everyone concerned in this splendid program because it was expected that the program would be expanded rather than abandoned.

We have not time to enumerate the many advantages of the school-lunch program or the benefit that the children of the Nation derived from the program. These are demonstrated by the expansion and growing popularity of the program.

The declaration of the policy contained in the act of the Seventy-ninth Congress is as follows: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress as a measure of national security to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural products and other food, by assisting the States through grants in aid and other means in providing an adequate supply of food and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance and operation and expansion of nonprofit school-lunch programs." In initiating, supporting, and maintaining the national school-lunch program, the Government of the United States has rendered invaluable aid to the cause of public education and to public health in all of the States of the Union and it seems a tragedy to cut it out when it probably is just entering upon a period of its greatest use to public education.

The very able and progressive Superintendent of Public Instruction in North Carolina, Dr. Clyde Erwin, has urged me and the other members of the North Carolina delegation in Congress to support the program and to urgently request the Appropriations Committee of the House not to desert this important needed legislation which contributes so immeasurably to the health and education of the children of the United States. I sincerely hope that when this deficiency bill is finally adopted, the item for the school-lunch program will be restored by amendment so that the school leaders throughout the United States may further develop the school-lunch program which means so much to the education and health of the youth of our Nation.

Union Members Under Compulsion To Write Objections to Their Senators and Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent to the members of local No. 90, an Iowa local of the teamsters' union, by its executive board:

THE VOICE OF LABOR MUST BE HEARD!

JANUARY 23, 1947.

DEAR MEMBER OF LOCAL UNION No. 90: A Nation-wide letter-writing program has been recommended by the American Federation of Labor, and organized labor must act promptly and effectively if the gains of the last century are to be preserved.

This means we are talking about our future bread and butter.

The new Congress will take up the notorious Case antilabor bill and possibly other of the many such bills that were introduced in the House of Representatives in the first few hours of the opening session of Congress.

The officers of local union No. 90 heartily recommend that you adhere to the recommendation of the American Federation of Labor and that each member write in his own way a letter to the Representatives of Congress in his district, to vote against any antilabor legislation that may come before the Congress, and to stand by labor, to make sure that those who represent us follow our orders, so we can earn our living as is our constitutional right.

In order that this program be a success, each one of you must write letters to your representatives in the House and Senate immediately. Make your letters brief, in your own handwriting, and demand a reply in such a way that you personally will know he received your letter; and further, state that you will be watching the report of his voting on bills in the public press with a great deal of interest.

Your local union in regular meeting has acted on a program to see who of its members writes as above recommended. We know the good members will write without further communication from this office.

It is recommended that you give your letters to your steward or bring them to the union office and have your name checked off our list as one who has complied. We will gladly pay postage and mail these letters directly from the union office.

It is also recommended that those members who do not follow through with the above program be called in before the executive board of local union No. 90 to explain why they did not comply with the above recommendation. You will save time by writing a short letter that takes only a few minutes, rather than make an appearance before the executive board to explain why you did not do so.

For your information, the following are the representatives in your district, including their Washington addresses:

Senator GEORGE A. WILSON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Representative PAUL CUNNINGHAM, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Hoping you will give this matter as serious attention as the officers of your union are doing, we remain.

Fraternally yours,
LOCAL UNION No. 90,
Executive Board.

Housing and Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Lloyd F. Oleson, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

The national commander of the DAV has written in such clear and concise terms that no intelligent person can possibly misunderstand the importance of the subject discussed. I am pleased, therefore, to introduce this letter into the RECORD in the hope that other Members will receive the benefit of this most excellent statement.

MARCH 20, 1947.

The Honorable JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Relative to the necessity for continued control or further relaxation of Government housing controls, the Disabled

American Veterans is motivated primarily by the pressing needs of service handicapped veterans, and other veterans, for decent housing.

It is apparent that open limited conditions would preclude scores of thousands of service disabled veterans, and other veterans, from procuring suitable housing, either on a purchase or a rental basis.

Because of several critical material shortages, it appears imperative to continue several of the more important housing controls until after emergency conditions shall have been surmounted.

The Disabled American Veterans, therefore, concurs with the position of the housing expediter, Mr. Frank R. Creedon, in believing that it will continue to be necessary for the Government to maintain at least the controls indicated as follows:

1. Nonresidential construction should be rigidly restricted so as to prevent needed housing materials from being diverted into nonresidential constructions not urgently needed for the economy of our country.

2. Critical basic raw materials, needed in housing construction, should be allocated by the Government for acquisition by manufacturers according to their relative needs and the needs of the processed materials for housing-construction purposes.

3. Building-material producers should be extended assistance in procuring machinery and equipment needed to process raw materials into needed housing-construction materials.

4. In view of the very critical limited supply of bathroom fixtures, such bathroom fixtures should be so allocated as to permit the completion of only one bathroom in each new house, until the supply shall more nearly meet the demand.

5. Because of the very limited volume of housing materials, the size of new houses should continue to be limited, until such supply becomes sufficient to meet the demand, to 1,500 square feet per housing unit.

6. Seasonal houses should be prohibited until such time as a sufficient number of year-round-occupancy houses shall first have been constructed.

7. Rent ceilings on new housing units should continue to be controlled on a fair investment return basis until the supply has more nearly caught up with the demand for housing units.

8. Preference priority should be extended to service-disabled war veterans, and then to other war veterans, in that order as to rentals of all new housing units and as to the sale of all new housing units.

9. Ceilings on the sales prices and rentals on all HH priority-constructed houses, and other houses and housing units should continue to be maintained, with better arrangements for veteran and public inspection of such ceilings of sales prices and rentals.

Government controls as to materials for, construction of, and sale and rental of housing units should continue to be maintained only until the supply has begun to approximate the demand. Indefinitely continued controls by Government as to materials for, construction of, and sales and rentals of housing units is definitely not desirable, but complete removal of such controls too soon might well prove to be disastrous. The early relaxation of such controls immediately after VJ-day has probably been largely responsible, and too long delayed resumption of needed controls has probably considerably delayed the time for the complete relaxation of all such controls, beyond the time that would have been necessary had they not originally been relaxed too much too soon.

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD F. OLESON,
National Commander.

Example of Pressure-Group Activity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I think the following correspondence is very significant. I believe it shows conclusively that much of the pressure which is being placed on this Congress and its Members in opposition to appropriation reductions which have been and are being made in order to eliminate overstaffing, waste, and inefficiency in governmental agencies is not only insincere but fraudulent, if not actually dishonest.

The other day I received a mimeographed letter bearing the name and address of one of my constituents. That letter read as follows:

MARCH 26, 1947.

DEAR SIR: As a citizen I feel that the House of Representatives has failed to safeguard the best interests of the public by failing to provide adequate funds to finance the customs service—the one bulwark we possess against low-priced foreign-trade encroachments, illicit narcotics, and unbridled smuggling.

I feel that an increase in the budget for personnel would be money well spent in the public interest.

Respectfully yours.

Even though this letter was mimeographed and evidently an indication of the efforts of a pressure group to discourage the working of this Congress toward reestablishing economy in Government, I sent the following reply:

MARCH 28, 1947.

DEAR MR. ———: I have just received your message of March 26, saying that as a citizen you feel that the House of Representatives has failed to safeguard the best interests of the public by failing to provide adequate funds to finance the customs service.

It is quite true that the customs service is a bulwark against foreign trade encroachments and smuggling.

I believe you will find that it is true that the House of Representatives, in reducing the appropriation to which you refer, did not have as its purpose the reduction of the efficiency of the customs' officials. I am sure that it was the intent of the Congress in reducing this particular appropriation (as it will be when other appropriations are reduced) to eliminate waste in Government operation, to create greater efficiency in the various departments and agencies, and to reduce the cost of Government so that tax rates and the Federal debt may be decreased. It is to be hoped that a proper allocation of the appropriations may be made to the various departments to produce these desirable results.

Sincerely.

To my considerable surprise, I then received the letter which is quoted below:

MARCH 31, 1947.

Thank you for the enclosed letter. I am favorably impressed by your direct stand upon this issue, which by the way is of no particular personal interest to me. It probably should be, but inasmuch as I was away on vacation and was trying to lose contact with work for a few days, I failed to read about the proposed bill and certainly did not request any action. I am sure that someone used my name to bolster a pressure group's campaign for funds for continuing certain obsolescent jobs. In view of the above facts, I feel that you should be informed that probably a large portion of your mail is padded for selfish interests.

Just to complete the record, Congressman, you may be certain that when I have something to say to my Congressman, I'll say it directly, on my stationery, or in person if sufficiently urgent, and I'll not bother to sign petitions, form letters or circulars. That day will probably come, for I have been known to "speak out" before this. In the meantime, keep up the good Republican work. I like it.

By way of relieving the overburdened secretaries in your office, I do not feel that this letter requires an answer.

Sincerely.

I reiterate that this series of correspondence is of great significance. This is so not only because it discloses the unethical activities of a pressure group but because it further emphasizes the fact that our fair-minded citizens are giving whole-hearted support to the economy steps being taken by the Congress.

What Kind of Business Is This?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of positive information which has caused me to wonder if the New Dealers are up to the old tricks which they played in the thirties. We all know of many instances where payments were made out of the Federal Treasury in the form of checks issued and distributed rathe. indiscriminately, without rhyme or reason. I personally saw many checks issued to farmers and landowners during the thirties where no application for the same was ever made by the farmer or landowner, and where he did not know the purpose for which the check was issued to him. Many of these made voluntary statements publicly to that effect. It was a subject of much radio and newspaper comment at the time.

The information which I have just received is to the effect that an income-tax return was filed on or shortly before March 15, 1947, in which the taxpayer used Form W–2. The taxpayer is on the Government pay roll and a substantial withholding tax was withheld. A check was drawn and issued on the Treasury of the United States and mailed from one of its disbursing offices for the full amount of the withheld tax. The check was received by the taxpayer April 1, 1947, about 2 weeks after the return was filed. The check had endorsed on the bottom left-hand corner "1946 tax refund."

This taxpayer made no application for a refund. What kind of business is this?

Perhaps the House Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of the appropriations for the Treasury Department wrought better than it knew. It reported its bill appropriating $800,000,000 less under the item "Refunding internal revenue collections," than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, which is the left hand of the President and appointed by the President. It is conceivable that if public funds are to be thus distributed, the full additional $800,000,000 approved by the Bureau of the Budget might be needed to distribute public funds to people who never asked for them, to refund their entire 1946 income tax, which had already been withheld by the Government, or substantial portions thereof.

The least that can be said, and the most charitable view that can be taken of this is that it was a colossal blunder resulting from dire incompetency. Yet the howl has gone up from a lot of the bureaucrats in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, that their forces have been too drastically reduced for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947. But remember that the force that handled this item was appropriated for by the Seventy-ninth Congress and is being paid out of funds over which the present Congress has no jurisdiction.

The New Dealers in the House have complained that we should not have passed the bill cutting the appropriation for refund of taxes collected by $800,000,000. If this monkey business, or incompetency, is general, I am delighted that the Republican House of Representatives in Congress was wise enough to effect such a substantial savings for the taxpayers. If the practice is general, the entire force handling such matters, and those responsible for such procedure should be removed from the pay rolls of the Government. Perhaps it is fair to say that at least more competent help should be employed.

Who can imagine Treasury Department officials, employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, being so careless that they will indiscriminately, or otherwise, issue "1946 tax refund" checks to the taxpayers for the full amount of money that has been withheld by the Government from the monthly salary of the Government employees, without application therefor? Just what kind of business is this?

The Bureaucrats Always Will Kick at Cutting Costs and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a timely editorial from the pen of Mr. Robert W. Boyer, managing editor of the Altoona Tribune, and which appeared in the March 28 issue.

The editorial is as follows:

THE BUREAUCRATS ALWAYS WILL KICK AT CUTTING COSTS AND TAXES

This opinion of ours might be quite wrong, but we feel justified in expressing our doubts of the efforts from Government officials to convince the Congress that vital functions of Government are going to be lost by reducing expenditures, and, of course, taxes.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has been most concerned about efforts to reduce Government spending, and taxes.

The latest furor of this kind comes from the customs office, under the Treasury Department, which announced that it was laying off border patrolmen and antismuggling port agents because of a lack of funds from Congress.

W. R. Johnson, customs commissioner, said beginning today, the Bureau will be compelled to lay off 210 men in the Canadian border patrol service, and 1,200 waterfront patrol officers in 22 ports. Not enough funds, says Mr. Johnson.

He said the work could be resumed, and the men could have their jobs back if Congress restores a $3,500,000 reduction in Customs Bureau funds.

Said Chairman TABER of the House committee, "The facts are that this service was given $3,500,000 more than it had for the current fiscal year. It sought $6,500,000. It can hire at least 400 more employees than it has now and yet it is announcing large reductions in force with the deliberate object of deceiving the people."

Mr. TABER said he believed officials are trying to pressure the Senate into restoring cuts voted by the House.

We are inclined to believe there is enough substance in Mr. TABER's suspicions to merit close examination by the Senate before it grants the funds asked by the various bureaus.

What bureaucrat ever would stand still for a reduction of funds?

In 1940 the Treasury Department budget was $2,125,092,033. In 1948 the estimated expenditures are $9,141,861,717. Has the increased cost of living raised Treasury salaries that much?

It is a peculiar thing that as soon as the House Appropriations Committee started to cut expenses in the Government the cry at once went up that we should be endangering our security. Fingers were pointed at the Army and Navy, and, strangely enough, with all the multitude of offices that could cut expenses, page after page of them in the Government Directory, the Army, Navy, and Air Force seem to be getting it heaviest. Now comes the customs service, with its border and port patrols, another appeal to the people from the security angle.

What the people want to know, as they clamor for reduced burden of Federal taxes, is why Government costs have risen so steadily, with no increase in the proportion of services?

The appropriation for independent offices has more than doubled since 1940. The Department of Commerce wants over three times as much. The Department of Labor has gone up from $18,570,698 in 1940 to $106,242,917 in 1948. Even the Post Office Department has gone from $45,953,822 to $356,679,250, and it is the only one with even a claim to partial self-support.

Every Congressman who inquires in his home district will find his constituents want to know more than ever before where their tax dollars are going, they want to know because they haven't bothered too much for years, and suddenly they are awake to the fact that every year, Government costs are going right up.

They are becoming alarmed, and rightfully so. There are calls from the Government for economic balance. Mr. Truman calls for lower prices. Mr. Snyder cries out about inflation, yet none seem to think that the Government, the greatest spender in all the world, sets the pace for inflation by its careless use of the people's dollars, and the tremendous burden of taxes it expects them to labor along under.

The people who are paying the bill want to know. Why, they ask, does the Interior Department need $292,019,818 more than it needed in 1940?

It is the same story all through the Government—rising expenditures. How then do Mr. Truman and Mr. Snyder expect lower prices, steadier wages, increased production, and leveling off of the inflationary spiral?

The House and Senate have a clear duty to slash expenditures and costs ruthlessly, and then let the various bureau officials account to the people for loss of necessary services, if there are any to be lost.

The Proposed Turkish Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as I am quite sure that the membership would be interested in the views of Mr. Arshag Mahdesian, for many years the editor of the highly influential New Armenia, upon the recent proposal of the President of the United States of an American-Turkish loan, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter which this distinguished author and commentator wrote to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate.

As Mr. Mahdesian is one of the greatest living experts on Near East problems, that which he has to say on the subject has a timely importance which none who know him would question.

Mr. Speaker, the document to which I have just referred is the following:

MARCH 14, 1947.

To the Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Obviously Mr. Winston Churchill, who during the World War I saved the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire by withdrawing the British warships from the Dardanelles just as the Turks were ready to capitulate, has succeeded in beguiling the Truman administration into underwriting the bankrupt philo-Turk policy, which Great Britain has been pursuing since the nineteenth century.

In the World War I, Turkey was the ally of the Central Powers and she perpetrated such atrocities on the Armenians and the Greeks as to arouse world-wide indignation. President Woodrow Wilson called the Turks "Apaches," and former President Theodore Roosevelt, damning the Turks vehemently, criticized President Wilson for not declaring war against Turkey. He said, as quoted in the New York Times, December 8, 1921, as follows:

"He has stood by without a single throb of his cold heart, without the least quickening of his tepid pulse, while the Turk inflicted on the Armenian and the Syrian Christians wrongs which would have blasted the memory

of Attila, and he has claimed credit for his neutral indifference to their sufferings."

William Howard Taft, Charles Evans Hughes, Elihu Root, Henry Cabot Lodge, William Borah, William Jennings Bryan, Nicholas Murray Butler, Charles W. Eliot, Bishop William T. Manning, Stephen S. Wise, and many other prominent Americans excoriated the Turkish Government for its barbarities.

In an eloquent speech, which Senator Lodge delivered in the Senate, on December 7, 1917, he said:

"My feeling for Turkey goes much further than the practical question. The Ottoman Turks have been in Europe since the fifteenth century. In the days of their success they were a scourge to Europe and Christendom. In the long centuries of their decay they have been the pest and the curse of Europe, the source of innumerable wars, the executioners in countless massacres. There is not one word to be said in defense of the Turks as governors or rulers. When they came into the region that is now called the Balkans they found there large and prosperous cities, built up during the early Middle Ages on the ruins of the Roman civilization. They found a fertile and cultivated country. The cities which they captured sank into deserted villages. Wherever they have trodden trade, industry, commerce, the arts, and civilization have withered away. They have preyed upon the jealousies and controversy of the other nations of Europe, and in this way have sustained themselves at Constantinople. They have been the cause of many wars. The massacres of which they have been guilty, which stretch back to the day of their arrival and which have been worse than during the entire nineteenth century, almost surpass belief and imagination."

Senator William E. Borah, who also was advocating the declaration of war against Turkey—branded by him as "the persecutor of Christians, the foe of civilization, the incarnation of massacres, and the enemy of every principle of humanity"—wrote to me, after the speech of Senator Lodge, as follows:

"I had intended to speak upon it but Senator Lodge spoke upon the subject and his views were so thoroughly in harmony with mine and so much better expressed that I did not assume to discuss the matter further. I should have been glad, in fact I presume it is not improper for me to say that I urged very earnestly in the Foreign Relations Committee a declaration of war against Turkey. I heard the reasons why the declaration of war was not to be made, but more of them seemed controlling to me while there were overwhelming and what seemed unanswerable reasons for declaring war against this nation, or I would hardly call it a nation, rather, this conglomerate mass of incarnate fiends."

Former President William Howard Taft, later Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, in an article contributed to my magazine in 1918, defined Turkism or Ottomanism as follows:

"Ottomanism represents the very antithesis of Americanism. Eastern diplomacy is outwardly bland and exuberant. It is secretly adamant and utterly indifferent to performance. It is opportunist. It says one thing and does another, or leaves its promise unfulfilled, and all with equal equanimity. Those who practice it are like those mentioned by Macbeth: 'That palter with us in a double sense; that keep the word of promise to our ear, and break it to our hope.' Its rule is to evade, revoke, and delay at all costs, promise the best and do the worst."

Chief Justice Taft's definition of Ottomanism—shall we say his verdict against Turkey?—still retains its incontrovertible force.

It is not only the prominent Americans and Europeans who have anathemized the Turks. After World War I, Sultan Ibn-Saud, King of the Wahabis, declared:

"The Turks, from time immemorial until the present, have been a race of cruel barbarians. Many subject nations under Turkish rule were persecuted to extirpation. The Turk has no civilization. He creates nothing, for he is too lazy to work. His only trade is to levy tribute, and to live, like a parasite, on the production of his subjects. Whenever the Turk is obliged to eat his bread in the sweat of his brow he becomes a beast of prey and devours the people that have fed him. It is a disgrace that the Turkish domination was not destroyed at the end of the World War. Instead, the European powers, animated by selfishness, greed, and chicanery, gave a new lease of life to the Turkish barbarians. Under the leadership of a few half-civilized atheists, the Turks are today a worse menace than they were formerly."

During World War II Turkey assisted Germany with her false neutrality. European and American diplomats assert that if Turkey had sided with the Allies, even at the end of 1943, the military collapse of Germany would have been hastened. Without Turkish chromium Germany could not continue her high-grade-steel industry.

The Turkish press was proud of the assistance Turkey rendered to Germany. Anatolu wrote, on May 7, 1944: "We have demonstrated our friendship for the Germans all through this war, and have done so in their moment of greatest need;" and Son Posta avowed unabashed, on April 22, 1944: "We shall remain friends of Germany to the last."

Even after the Teheran Conference, Turkey, ignoring her treaty of alliance with Great Britain and material assistance she had received from England and the United States, maintained her neutrality on puerile pretexts. Winston Churchill, while addressing the House of Commons in 1944, remarked bitterly: "The hopes we cherished of Turkey boldly entering the war in February or March or of at least according us the necessary bases for air action—these hopes have faded."

After Turkey's belated formal rupture of diplomatic relations with Germany, it took 6 months before the Turkish Government could resolve to declare a psuedo-war on Germany.

How often must the United States Government be deceived by the wily Turk? The Arab used to pray: "O Allah! If a person fools me for the first time, please punish him; if he fools me for the second time, please punish me."

Respectfully yours,

ARSHAG MAHDESIAN.

FRESNO, CALIF.

Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, Czechoslovakia, byproduct of the First World War, was supposed to be a democracy, patterned after Switzerland or the United States. The Czechs and the Slovaks, at long last, were to realize the dreams of generations, the right to govern themselves as free men and be masters of their own destinies in a common political state on the basis of equality.

Thomas G. Masaryk, one of the founders and the first president of the Czechoslovak Republic, promised the Slovaks that they would have their own parliament, courts, and schools, and the official language of Slovakia would be Slovak. The Pittsburgh Pact of May 30, 1918, written and signed by Masaryk, contained these promises and was in fact the basis of Slovak cooperation with the Czechs during World War I.

Neither Masaryk nor his successor, Dr. Edward Benes, kept that promise and the Slovaks did not realize their ancient dream of being masters of their own household within the framework of Czechoslovakia. The Slovaks clamored for recognition and demanded the realization of their inherent, God-given rights to their own national existence. Masaryk and Benes, however, did not heed their pleas. They told the world that, as far as they were concerned, there was no Slovak Nation and the Slovak language was but a dialect of the Czech tongue.

Twenty years of the Republic were not enough to teach the centralistic regimes of Prague the lesson of old Austria-Hungary. They insisted on becoming a bad copy of it. Czechoslovak propaganda continuously promoted the fictitious ideology of an ethnically unified Czechoslovak Nation. The Slovaks, however, were determined to fight for their rights. They refused to be but a Czech colony exploited at will by the centralistic and imperialistic regimes of Prague.

1938 AND MUNICH

Came Munich, Dr. Benes' complete capitulation to Hitler, and the collapse of Czechoslovakia. Dr. Edward Benes and the promoters of the Czechoslovak Nation ideology excoriated and cursed the western democracies for deserting them. Shortly thereafter, Dr. Edward Benes resigned from the highest position of trust, the Presidency, and abandoned Czechoslovakia to the tender mercies of the Nazi beasts of Berlin. Not only the Slovaks, but even the Czechs still remember that.

It is well to note that Dr. Edward Benes knew well at that time that Hitler would take over the whole of Czechoslovakia, the Czech and Moravian armament plants and ammunition dumps. Why did he not order them destroyed or render them useless? We know today that Hitler's war machine used these plants effectively against the United Nations. Of course, we are supposed to forget that for Dr. Benes' benefit.

INDEPENDENT SLOVAKIA

In 1939 Hitler took over Bohemia and Moravia, declared these territories "protectorates" of the German Reich, and the Slovaks declared their independence. It is well to note here that Dr. Joseph Tiso, president of the Slovak Republic, was not responsible for the independence proclamation. After his conference with Hitler in March 1939, Tiso returned home to report to the Slovak Parliament. It was only after a lengthy deliberation that the Slovak Parliament decided that under the given circumstances there was nothing else for it to do but declare the independence of Slovakia. And that it did on March 14, 1939.

Slovakia was recognized as an independent state by some 29 countries, including the Vatican, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia. No country at that time protested against the independence of

Slovakia. Neither did Dr. Edward Benes himself.

Events moved at a terrific pace. Hitler's Nazi hordes struck at Poland, partitioned it with Soviet Russia, conquered demoralized France, swept through the whole of Europe, and finally struck at their partner in aggression and conquest, Russia. It took just about everything that Russia and the United Nations had and about 4 years to annihilate Hitler's war machine and liberate the nations of Europe.

BACK IN THE SADDLE AGAIN

In the meantime Dr. Edward Benes was not idle either. He had himself and his political entourage recognized as the Czechoslovak government-in-exile by London, Washington, and Moscow. Dr. Benes also discovered that he was still President of Czechoslovakia, but that his term was up in 1942. So to make things legal and constitutional, he had the people he named as ministers and members of the provisional Czechoslovak Government in London reelect him President of Czechoslovakia.

According to Dr. Benes and his propaganda machine, everything contrary to the pre-Munich constitution and order of Czechoslovakia was illegal and, therefore, null and void. The old boundaries were to be restored, independent Slovakia forgotten, and Carpatho-Russia—Ruthenia—was indeed still a part of Czechoslovakia, Dr. Benes said. Well, that Czechoslovak constitution has been mutilated and violated so badly by the very people that swore to uphold it that it is hardly recognizable today. As Al Smith would say, "Let's look at the record."

Dr. Benes donated Carpatho-Russia to the USSR; he has issued decrees and signed treaties without regard to any constitution or the will of the people of so-called Czechoslovakia. All prewar political parties, except the Communist Party, were outlawed, and the new parties that were formed were established only with the sanction of Dr. Benes and his Government. The Government controls not only all political parties, but also the whole press and radio. Shades of democracy and the Czechoslovak Constitution.

The national and people's courts are functioning full time: sentencing, dispossessing, and disfranchising thousands of citizens arbitrarily on the charges of collaboration, fascism, nazism, and being antistate and enemies of the people. And the people of Czechoslovakia, especially Slovakia, are weary of all this. They want to know how they stand so that they might get down to the pressing business of reconstructing their respective countries. They insist that Dr. Edward Benes and his political adventurers must quit using the victory of the United Nations to liquidate all political opposition under the guise of administering justice and serving the cause of the people.

HOW DOES BENES GET AWAY WITH IT?

No one has yet explained how Dr. Edward Benes ever got away with what he did. He capitulated to Hitler, handed over the industrial assets of Czechoslovakia to the Nazi war machine, and deserted his country in its most critical hour. During the war he wormed his way into favor with the Great Powers and now is riding roughshod over everybody and everything that stands in his way politically.

The people of Slovakia ask: Why didn't Benes stay with us? What would he have done under the given circumstances, if he were in Tiso's place? Did we not suffer enough under the Nazis and the "liberation" armies? Why can't we be free like other nations are? Why can't we have an independent Slovakia if we so will it?

In the light of the events that have transpired from 1939 to 1945, the justifiability and legality for the existence of Czechoslovakia, it seems to me, may be questioned seriously. Czechoslovakia in fact was done for with Benes' capitulation—in Munich, and she ceased to exist completely as a sovereign state after March 14, 1939. There was no Czechoslovakia for 6 years. Those are facts.

THE SLOVAKS DO NOT WANT BENES AND HIS BRAND OF DEMOCRACY

We are told that Czechoslovakia has been reborn, reestablished, in fact that legally it never ceased to exist. Dr. Edward Benes has said so, and he is backed up by the United Nations. But the vast majority of Slovaks still believe that they have a moral and legal right to their own national existence, to their own state, and to their own government, anything that Dr. Benes and his political followers might say to the contrary notwithstanding.

I have it from several very reliable sources that the prevailing majority of Slovaks do not want Benes and his brand of Czechoslovak democracy. Dr. Edward Benes and Czechoslovakia have outlived their usefulness. The Slovaks have been glutted with Czechoslovak this and Czechoslovak that for twenty long years, and what has happened since the return of Dr. Benes and Czechoslovakia only further confirms the fear of most Slovaks that Benes and his Czechoslovakia mean a continued "Calvary" for the Slovak Nation.

The Slovaks have had their fill of Dr. Benes and Czechoslovakian democracy. They tell us that if they were free today to choose between Dr. Tiso and Dr. Benes they would choose Dr. Joseph Tiso; if they were free to choose between the independent Slovakia under Tiso and the present people's democracy under Benes they would choose the former. They protest being ruled by a foreigner.

But the Slovaks are not free to voice themselves. Any citizen voicing himself for a free Slovakia is ipso facto a Nazi, a Fascist, a collaborator, an enemy of the state and the people, and subject to prosecution. And that means persecution. Fear and terror, concentration camps and tyranny are breaking the Slovaks physically and morally.

BENES WARNS: UNCLE JOE WILL FENCE YOU IN

On February 16, 1947, Dr. Edward Benes warned the Slovaks that if Slovakia ever again broke with the Czechs, she would become a part of Russia. He said among other things:

"Today all plans concerning some central European federation are finished. * * * The Czechoslovak state could not endure another crisis, for after a further crisis there would be no Czechoslovak Republic. After such a further crisis Slovakia would not be an independent state in any case, but would become probably part of Russia. * * * I look, above all, at the preparation of the constitution and add only that an independent Slovakia in the future would not be acceptable to Czechs under any circumstances. The Czechs, having on one side 70,000,000 Germans, must have Russia as a neighbor. They could not, consequently, acccept an independent Slovakia. That is a vital problem for the existence of the Czechs as a nation and a state and it also is the lesson of Munich." (New York Times, February 17, 1947.)

Dr. Benes evidently is not concerned with what is acceptable and vitally important to the Slovaks. He may be determined that the Slovaks never again shall be strong enough politically or economically to cause any trouble to the Czech nation, but the Slovaks are even more determined to survive. The Slovaks have withstood Magyarization and they are determined to withstand Czechization and communism as well. They proved it in the May 1946 parliamentary elections. The Communist Party polled some 40 percent of the total Czech vote in Bohemia and Moravia, therefore, more than any single Czech party, but it was soundly trounced in Slovakia, where the Democratic Party polled some 62 percent of the total vote cast. But Dr. Benes ought to explain how the Czechs would lose Russia as a neighbor if Slovakia became a part of Russia.

Transferring hundreds of thousands of Slovaks to the Sudetenland, Bohemia and Moravia, may be expedient for Dr. Benes and the Czech people today, but it may boomerang later on. The Slovaks insist that the best possible solution of the whole Czechoslovak question rests on a free Czech state and a free Slovak state. The interests of both nations can be served best only by such a solution. The Slovaks must first have their own state, as must the Czechs, before any political alliances, such as Czechoslovakia, can be established on the basis of equals with equals. No other solution will fully satisfy the Slovak people or justify the lofty aims and ideals of the United Nations. The Slovaks too have a right to freedom.

I suggest a free Czech state and a free Slovak state first, then let the people of the respective countries decide freely whether they want another Czechoslovakia or not.

WHY IS TISO BEING TRIED?

Benes and his lackeys prepared for the trial of Tiso long before the war was concluded. They had plenty of time on their hands to invent the charges that would convict him. They contrived a total of 113 charges, the two main charges being: First, that he broke up the Czechoslovak Republic; and, second, that he collaborated with the Germans.

Let us look a little deeper into these accusations and ponder over them. In the first place the Czechoslovak Republic was broken up in Munich, where the British and the French had the main say. They maimed the Republic to such an extent that it was quite helpless to defend itself.

In October 1938 autonomy was attained for Slovakia by all the political

parties. At that time Hacha was in the President's chair. Since that time Czechoslovakia was always written with a hyphen, and Hacha personally attended the first session of the Slovak Parliament.

However, the Czechs doubted that the Slovaks were governing themselves and wanted to abolish their autonomy in March 1939. They sent the army to Slovakia so that they could be in power in Slovakia again. This angered the Slovaks and led to rioting. It was then that Hitler told Tiso that if Slovakia does not secede from Bohemia, he will subdivide it.

The fact of the matter is that the Slovaks would have been satisfied with autonomy within the framework of a joint republic, but when they received such an ultimatum, the Slovak Parliament approved separation. Can Tiso be held responsible for that? That happened in time of peace and not a single country in the world protested against it. Not even Benes himself.

Now let us look at this so-called collaboration. If by collaboration we mean that negotiations were carried on and agreements were made with Hitler, then such collaborationists were even the British and the French. Did they not negotiate the Munich pact? The Soviet Union also negotiated and made agreements with Hitler. And that was the main reason why the war came about. It is altogether questionable whether Hitler would have dared to attack Poland, if he had not become friendly with Stalin.

Those are the reasons why it seems strange to us that Tiso is being tried. Benes should be on the bench of the accused because he capitulated to Munich. And on the same bench should be Stalin himself, because he too collaborated with Hitler and partitioned Poland with him.

These important facts are somehow forgotten today. Why? To distract attention from themselves, the greatest transgressors are placing the blame on others and are trying them to conceal their own dirty deals. How long will the world tolerate such injustices?

DR. TISO TO BE SHOT—ALEXANDER MACH TO HANG; DRAGNET OUT FOR DR. DURCANSKY

We received an authentic report from Slovakia that Dr. Tiso's trial will be concluded, and the former President of Slovakia will be hanged.

Alexander Mach will be hung. Dr. Durcansky is being sought over the whole world and there is a large reward for his head, for his capture dead or alive.

At first it was reported that Tiso would be pardoned by Benes, but now Benes is determined that he be sentenced to death, because, as a result of Tiso's trial, he has been labeled the world over as a servant of Moscow. After a conference with the Communists Benes made up his mind that Tiso be executed. Dr. Lettrich visited Benes in regards to Tiso too and told him how American Slovaks felt about Tiso; they are 95 percent for him. But Benes convinced Lettrich that Tiso must be executed, and it was decided there and then that he be hanged.

This report comes from an altogether reliable source and is wet with tears.

Our Sacred Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address delivered by Rembert Gilman Smith, of Tulsa, Okla., and Denver, Colo., before the Denver Chamber of Commerce, March 28, 1947, which contains some very excellent food for thought, as well as conclusions pertaining to our Constitution and the American way of life:

OUR SACRED HERITAGE

(By Rembert Gilman Smith, Tulsa and Denver)

Gladstone declared, "The Constitution of the United States is the greatest charter for the freedom of man ever struck off in a stated time by the mind and purpose of man." The proof of this has been the unequaled material and moral prosperity of our people, since it was adopted in 1787. It was not and is not now perfect, but the great principles which it formulated are of abiding value, and the preservation of them is a sacred duty of every generation of American citizens.

It has dangerous foes, at home and abroad, who plan, plot, and work to destroy it.

Benjamin Franklin said, when it was completed, "We have now written a great charter for the preservation of human welfare; the question now and in the future will be, 'Can we keep it?' "

Abraham Lincoln, both saint and seer, said, "We will nobly save or basely lose the last, best hope of earth."

Since 1932 it has suffered the assaults of ignorant, stupid, or selfish men, so that it now is badly wounded and imperatively needs healing and defense.

The enterprisers of the New Deal and their followers are responsible for its present distress.

The so-called relief, under the New Deal, has lowered the spirit of our people. It has relieved the worthy poor of their pride; the unworthy poor of incentives for industry; the families, fraternal orders, and churches of their duties to care for their needy members; the frugal and industrious of their savings by heavy taxes; the politicians of political insecurity. They think they can safely rely on the votes of the millions to whom they have passed out doles and jobs.

Paternalism is a plague worse for the souls of the people than pellagra for their bodies. The great Grover Cleveland said, "It is not the duty of the Government to support the people, but the duty of the people to support the Government." Under the New Deal, the self-respect and dignity of our people have suffered as never before. Should they die, how unspeakable the tragedy. The New Deal is the new degeneration.

Ordinary beggars occasionally reform and go to work. New Deal beggars will never do so. They will form an inverted aristocracy; their coat of alms will be a well-worn tin cup, indelibly inscribed on it, in words of brass, the legend:

"MEND-I-CAN'T"

Their willingness to work will be exhausted when they vote for the New Deal demagogs, described by Harry Hopkins as "their friends." The demagogs are far more to be blamed than are the destitute.

The New Deal has done much to intensify class consciousness, and to create suspicion and hatred between the classes. This has caused dangerous disunity, from which we had been free.

What can you and I do to heal the wounds in the body of the Constitution of 1787?

Let me suggest the following answers:

1. We can keep informed about governmental affairs, city, State, and national. Both Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson believed that an educated and informed citizenry is necessary for the preservation of our Government. Voluntary ignorance of governmental affairs is nothing other than negative treason.

2. We can keep in touch with our elected servants, from the President to the sheriff, from the Senator to the city councilman. They need our help, and they deserve our continual scrutiny of their acts. It is dangerous to leave everything to them. Aristotle said "Democracies will die unless citizens continually distrust their elected leaders." This was not cynicism but realism. John Wesley, the great founder of Methodism directed the lay officers of his societies to tell the preachers what they thought wrong in them. You can tell the officers of Government, high or low, what you think wrong in them.

They are not your masters, but your servants. If you vote for them and let them alone, they will likely lessen your freedoms and increase your taxes, until you will go to jail, or to the poorhouse. There are few greater perils now than that from the insatiable appetites of politicians for the earnings of the people, which they take from them by exorbitant and cruel taxes.

3. You can urge the members of your family, your associates in business, and your friends to the discharge of their duties to the Government.

4. You can call meetings in your community, like those of the Town Hall of the early days, for the discussion of governmental problems.

5. You can pray daily to the God of our fathers, whose help alone made possible the Constitution of 1787, to save this Republic from the dangers of these times.

If we will do these things, we will preserve the heritage of political freedom and material welfare which our fathers handed down to us and transmit it to our posterity.

MARCH 28, 1947.

Uniform Marriage and Divorce Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent radio program given over Station WQQW, of Washington, D. C., on the subject of uniform marriage and divorce legislation, such as could be considered by the Congress, after adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 28, which was introduced by me and which is now in the hands of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. HOTTON. Senator CAPPER, won't you explain, first of all, why you feel there is a need for a uniform marriage and divorce law?

Senator CAPPER. Before I answer that question, Mrs. Hotton, I would like to tell you and the radio audience that I am quite interested and pleased to have a part in your program over this new station, which is endeavoring to formulate its programs in keeping with some of the principles set forth in the now-famous Blue Book put out by the Federal Communications Commission.

Now, back to your question. I think perhaps the best way to explain the need for uniform marriage and divorce legislation is to cite some statistics:

The Nation was properly shocked last September when the Federal Security Agency released provisional figures on marriages and divorces in 1945. Frankly speaking, the figures are startling. The Federal Security Agency recorded these provisional statistics: One million six hundred and eighteen thousand three hundred and thirty-three marriages and 502,000 divorces in 1945. In other words, for every three couples that marched to the altar, one wedding ended in the divorce courts.

Look at the figures for this year. The Census Bureau estimates that in 1947 there will be nearly 40 percent as many divorces as there are marriages. Are we going to allow this problem to wreck our homes, the very core of civilization and human progress? I am convinced it is one of the greatest dangers confronting the American people today—and we must do something about it.

Mrs. HOTTON. Well, Senator CAPPER, when you propose a uniform marriage and divorce law, you imply that our existing State laws are different. How are they different?

Senator CAPPER. It would not be quite correct to say there are as many different laws on marriage and divorce as there are States in the Union, but the divergence is extreme. Most of the State legislatures, however, have been or still are in session, and changes are currently taking place in many of these States. I believe it is still true, though, to say that Nevada and Florida are commonly referred to as "States where divorce is extremely easy." South Carolina recognizes hardly any grounds for divorce action, but I learned that at least one body of their State legislature has adopted a bill which would recognize two or three grounds for divorce action.

Similar variation exists as concerns requirements for marriage. In some States a few days' notice is required, and in other places various kinds of physical examinations are necessary, while in still other States in the Union "quicky" marriages are quite in order under the law of that commonwealth.

I feel that our fundamental institution of the family is seriously threatened by our 49 different and conflicting laws on the subject of marriage and divorce.

A man and woman living together in a community may be law-abiding citizens in that community; their children are legitimate and entitled to the rights of legitimate children in that community.

But if they move even a few miles and cross a State line into another community, the man may become—in law—a bigamist, the woman an adulteress, and the children have neither the right to bear their father's name nor to inherit their parents' property.

Whenever society is compelled in equity to ignore or flout statutory law, there you have engendered a disrespect for law that leads toward break-down of law and order.

Society today in the United States, attempting to live under 49 different and conflicting codes on marriage and divorce, can only make the best of an impossible situation by ignoring the laws. That is bad for society; bad for the individual.

Mrs. HOTTON. What solutions are there which might remedy this situation?

Senator CAPPER. Under our Constitution there are two ways to remedy this situation. We can strive to persuade the 48 State legislatures and the Congress (for the District of Columbia) to enact uniform laws on marriage and divorce and property rights relating to the married and divorced status; or we can amend the Constitution to permit Congress to enact national laws on these subjects.

The first course is just plainly impossible of accomplishment.

I am aware of the objections raised against Federal statutes governing marriage and divorce. They are real. They are serious.

But the danger to our social structure from the threatened destruction of the family in the United States seems to me just as serious, just as real, and in my judgment even more certain.

I have recently introduced a resolution in the Senate which reads as follows:

"The Congress shall have the power to make laws, which shall be uniform throughout the United States, on marriage and divorce, the legitimation of children, and the care and custody of children affected by annulment of marriage or by divorce."

Mrs. HOTTON. If this resolution you have introduced is accepted then what is your proposal?

Senator CAPPER. Believing as I do that major changes in our national program should come by amendments to the Constitution, and not by simple enactment of law, I am pressing for the adoption of the resolution which I have just read, so that the Congress would then have authority to legislate on the subject. As you, of course, know, any constitutional amendment requires the vote of two-thirds of the Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States.

If, and when, this constitutional amendment is adopted, I have introduced a bill known in the present Congress as S. 198 which could be used as a basis for legislative consideration. Some of the points mentioned for marriage requirements are:

1. Minimum age of 18 years for men and 16 years for women.
2. A notice of 2 weeks.
3. Certain mental and physical requirements.
4. No proxy marriages.

The following grounds for divorce would be recognized:

1. Adultery.
2. Cruel and inhuman treatment.
3. Abandonment or failure to provide for 1 year or more.
4. Habitual drunkenness.
5. Incurable insanity.
6. Conviction of an infamous crime.

The provisions of this bill would, of course, be subject to debate and amendment.

Mrs. HOTTON. Is such an amendment to our Constitution something new, or does similar legislation exist in other countries?

Senator CAPPER. I am not prepared to give a full and complete answer to that question. In passing, however, I would like to cite you to a statement made by Justice Frankfurter in commenting on the Williams case, back in the October term of 1942. The Justice said:

"The Parliament of Canada has exclusive legislative authority to deal with marriage and divorce. Similarly, the Australia Constitution empowers the Commonwealth Parliament to make laws with respect to marriage and divorce. The Constitution of the United States, however, reserves authority over marriage and divorce to each of the 48 States. Now, that is our starting point. In a country like ours where each State has the constitutional power to translate into law its own notions of policy concerning the family institution, and where citizens pass freely from one State to another, tangled marital situations, like the one immediately before us, inevitably arise."

Mrs. HOTTON. What has happened to your resolution at this time? What action is being taken?

Senator CAPPER. My resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 28, is currently in the hands of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

During World War II it was understood that no action on constitutional amendments would be taken until most of our veterans returned to their homes. The time has now come for such action, and I firmly believe this matter should be given prompt consideration and—I trust—early approval.

Mrs. HOTTON. Have you had any indication of interest in your proposal? Are women's groups actively supporting it?

Senator CAPPER. Yes; several national organizations have, from time to time, declared themselves favorable to the principle, but the recent war period, as I said before, has prevented their giving attention to any specific proposal on the subject. I do, however, find in my mail a widespread and deep-seated interest among individuals throughout the land in something of this nature. After careful study of the problem over a number of years, it is my conclusion that uniform Federal regulation of marriage and divorce laws through a constitutional amendment such as I have introduced is absolutely necessary to correct the situation.

Keeping in mind our responsibility of preserving the institution of the home, I take this opportunity to urge you individually and as members of various groups to which you no doubt belong, to actively press for congressional consideration of the proposal and support my resolution.

Antics of a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the leading editorial of the Washington Times-Herald of April 4 is timely and interesting, and I submit it herewith. I recommend the reading of this to all of the Members of Congress.

It follows:

ANTICS OF A PRESIDENT

Some interesting recent incidents on the life of President Harry S. Truman:

On February 26, 1947, ex-Governor George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania, wrote Mr. Truman that he, Earle, had resigned as head of the American Anti-Communist Association. Earle did this only because the association wanted to take a political stand on the nomination of David E. Lilienthal as head of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Earle himself remained a fierce and vocal foe of both American and Russian communism.

On February 28 President Truman wrote Mr. Earle the following letter:

"DEAR GOVERNOR: I appreciate very much your note of February 26, and I am very happy to be informed of your decision with regard to the American Anti-Communist Association.

"People are very much wrought up about the Communist 'bugaboo,' but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe so far as communism is concerned—we have too many sane people. Our Government is made for the welfare of the people, and I don't believe there will come a time when anyone will really want to overturn it.

"HARRY TRUMAN."

On March 12 Mr. Truman appeared before Congress and asked for loans totaling $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey. These nations, he said, were menaced by totalitarianism—meaning Russian communism, though the President did not use that term—and—

"Should we fail to aid Greece and Turkey in this fateful hour, the effect will be far-reaching to the west as well as to the east."

On March 22 Mr. Truman issued an Executive order that Communists and Communist sympathizers be thoroughly and swiftly screened out of Government jobs. The explanation given was that "the presence within the Government service of any disloyal and subversive person constitutes a threat to our democratic processes."

To cap all this hocus-pocus, there is the fact that Mr. Truman staged his sensational secret conference with congressional leaders, in which he outlined the Communist menace to Greece and Turkey, just 24 hours before he dictated the Earle letter saying he saw no Communist menace in the United States.

And there we have a picture of a President of the United States cutting some very fancy didoes indeed.

One day he whispers to congressional leaders that Russia is breathing down the necks of our Greek and Turkish friends; the next, he commits to paper his feeling that communism is no threat in this country.

BLOWING HOT, BLOWING COLD

A couple of weeks later, he sounds a $400,000,000 fire alarm against Russia. Ten days after that, he finds Communists in Government jobs to be a menace to that same Government, and orders them booted out of those jobs as fast as loyalty examining boards can run them down.

What's the answer? Or is there an answer?

Did Mr. Truman stir up the Greek-Turkish excitement because he believed those countries were in danger; or because he thought it was politically smart to cut loose on the Reds everywhere? Was the Red-purge order issued out of sincere conviction, or out of political expediency? Does the last man who gets to Mr. Truman sell him the bill of goods; or does Mr. Truman have a yearning to be everybody's sweetheart all the time?

Here's another consideration: It is notorious that the New Dealers a year ago were playing ball with the Reds all over the map of the United States, and that Mr. Truman was doing nothing to stop that game. What guarantee have we that Mr. Truman, if allowed to continue in office after next year, won't take to playing ball with the Reds again, whenever he thinks it politically smart to do so?

If Mr. Truman can explain this episode in his career, and make the explanation sound convincing, it will be the neatest trick of this or any other week.

Government Purchase of Office Buildings

REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES]. He discussed a matter with which I have long been familiar. I have not had an opportunity to read his bill as yet, but, as I say, I do know about that situation. This is, I think, the largest office building in Kansas City, in the heart of the downtown business area. For a number of years there has been very great congestion down in that area. There is not an office to be rented in Kansas City anywhere within range of the business district. When it was learned a few months ago that the Federal Government had bought that building and was preparing to oust many hundreds of the best firms and business and professional men in Kansas City, it created consternation all over the city. It meant not only that the tenants of that particular building are doing business under conditions of the greatest uncertainty, but it means that every other business firm and every professional man in Kansas City in the business district does not know where he is going to land because of the great scramble for office space that has been created. There are many things I would like to say in connection with this situation. Unfortunately, I have only 1 minute allotted to me at this time. However, I expect to discuss this problem further when Mr. REEVES' bill reaches the floor of the House.

Your Land and Mine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit the following copy of a broadcast entitled "Your Land and Mine" by Henry J. Taylor, which was given on March 14, 1947:

President Truman proposes that America spend $400,000,000 to stop the Communists in Greece and Turkey. I've been to both Greece and Turkey and have seen Communists operate there at first hand. Therefore I have some idea about what President Truman is warning us against.

But if America has that much at stake in stopping Communists over there, how about stopping the Communists right here in the United States? If we're going to throw them out of Greece and Turkey, how about throwing them out of America—out of our schools, our labor unions, our universities, and out of our own Government?

How often we see troubles elsewhere while we are blind to the same troubles here at home. Communists are exactly as much of a threat to America inside America as they are to America in Greece, Turkey, and elsewhere. Surely that should be plain.

If we haven't sense enough or courage enough to throw them out of America, you may be sure we cannot succeed in throwing them out of Greece.

COMMUNISTS HAVE NO PLACE HERE

It's like running up and down the block with a broom, cleaning your neighbors' houses while you set a bad example by leaving your own home full of dirt—rats in the basement, termites in the floor, snakes around the place distributing poison—soiling your own home all the while.

When St. Patrick drove the snakes out of Ireland, the snakes probably protested and there must have been a lot of hissing going on. What we need to do now is to drive the snakes out of America and let them hiss. We should not pay any attention to the hissing.

Foreign agents plotting our downfall have no place in this country. Their operations, reaching into the American labor movement, American unions, schools, colleges, newspapers, radio, and the American Government itself—high in the ranks of American planners—produce a poison we should not be called upon to absorb at home while we try to stamp out the same kind of thing abroad.

COMMUNISM AN ECONOMIC FAILURE

Communism, my friends, is a moral question as well as an economic question and a question of national defense. Let's spell it out on those grounds. Let's try to be simple and to the point.

The economic failure of communism is well known. Even Communists and their innocent, bewildered fellow travelers among us admit that communism only comes where people are in despair or where the Red Army stands on the border—that's why a technique of confusion and despair such as strikes or any kind of demoralization is valuable to Communists everywhere.

So, instead, let's look at the morals involved and ask any school teacher or college professor, youth leader, writer, or anyone how he can apologize for communism and still remain a good American citizen. It cannot be done. Let's be fair, but let's call a spade a spade and a snake a snake.

COMMUNISM A MORAL FAILURE

For numerous innocent people in our land, especially in our schools, don't seem to understand the damage they do to themselves and to our great country in being hazy about the moral side of communism.

The underlying evil in the Communist philosophy, by which Communists try to undermine a life based on private property and free enterprise and individual merit, is its rejection of man's free will in discriminating between right and wrong, good and evil.

Evil, then, imply, is not personal but social; not a matter of you or me but of the social order. If you or I do anything wrong, it's not our fault. The fault lies in the fact that we live in a democracy.

Evil is blamed on a system or institution, never on a person. Evil is explained away in terms of physical environment. In short, Communists suggest that evil is physical and organizational and political, not moral.

Thus, according to the Communist philosophy, capitalism is falsely blamed for the ills of mankind. Democracy as we know it is blamed for the evils of the world. That's why the Communist ideology is utterly impersonal.

Stripped of its trappings, the principle is simply the principle of the ambitious tyrant and the ruling political class who have hit on a political racket. Summed up, the principle is this—no heaven, no hell—no hell, no evil—no evil, no judge—no judge, no God.

THE SYSTEM EVERYTHING—MAN NOTHING

Man, devoid of free will, is not responsible. Only a system is responsible. Agitate for the system, lie for the system, die for the system. That is why communism's respect for human life is so low. That is why Russian concentration camps, secret police, and terrorism are not shocking to the Communists and fellow travelers in our country.

The system over there means everything—the individual man or woman means nothing.

Much of this false philosophy has crept into our schools today and into the American labor movement too. The idea that a system of organization means so much and the individual man so little.

WE UNDERESTIMATE THE ENEMY

Further, as FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover has said, we sadly underestimate the degree and methods by which we are attacked by an actual Communist fifth column operating in our country, just as it is operating in Tur-

key, in Greece, and in so many places elsewhere.

Wrote the FBI chief in a recent issue of the American magazine, and I quote him:

"The disloyalty to America of American Communists is no longer a matter of conjecture. The Communist seeks to infiltrate the ranks of labor for the purpose of using labor for the revolutionary purposes of the Communist Party.

"A Communist, steeped in stealth, trickery, and deceit, cannot long survive the truth.

"The healing rays of public opinion," concludes Mr. Hoover, "focused on communism will have the same curative effects that X-rays have upon cancerous growths, if applied in time."

THEY ARE BORING FROM WITHIN

Yes, kind friends, when once we realize that the Communists in our midst are enemies of the United States, we will then make some progress toward understanding their significance in America as well as we understand their significance in Greece and Turey. Like typhus germs in a community, it isn't the great number of germs that's important—it's what each germ does that counts.

According to the British Empire Communist Congress meeting in London in March, there are at present 12,500,000 Communists operating in 57 countries outside Russia. This means, my friends, that there are two Communist Party members operating outside Russia for every party member inside Russia, that country having 6,000,000 members at home.

It is their basic purpose to see that there shall be no strong country in the world outside the U. S. S. R. It is their intention to see that the United States shall be unable to defend itself in a pinch. The strategy of "boring from within" is, of course, as old as history.

Through giant coast-to-coast interlocking union combines into which they attempt to bore, and through the device of industry-wide bargaining to which they have attached themselves, Communist fifth-column members cast their eyes on the possibility of a general strike in our country, just as they do in England and France, India, everywhere.

And, remember, so far have we gone down the road of lopsided legislation that a general strike is not only possible in America today, but it would be legal. I'm not predicting such a strike, but that is the fact.

THEY WISH TO BREAK OUR CONFIDENCE

With all this, they wish to break our confidence in American ways of doing things, American institutions, American competitive enterprise, the determination of plain, progressive folks and good companies to stand on their own feet and get ahead.

Defeatism about our individual future under American conditions is distributed systematically along with other poisons.

As working people we have our problems. I know that as well as the next man. Life is hard for most of us in one way or another. But knowing the value of our life in America, regardless of our individual lot, and comparing it with any place else in the world, it simply is not safe for us to take what we have for granted.

Great effort and great vigilance are needed to keep this country free and strong. If European-minded experimenters among us prefer communism or socialism, let them operate elsewhere. There is plenty of room for them in Russia. If they like it there so much; if they like treating people as guinea pigs; and if they are interested in agitating for a political caste system, lying for it, dying for it, let them swing their weight around in Russia. That's where their thoughts belong.

It is in this respect that many innocent people who really think they are liberals become badly confused.

They cannot see that communism, and even socialism, in practice means tyranny; means less and less freedom, and less and less of the good things of life for ordinary people.

OUR NATION WILL BE WHAT WE ARE

They overlook the moral degradation in communism entirely. No heaven, no hell—no evil, no judge—no judge, no God. The fact remains that the "big brain" attitude toward ordinary people is essentially a guinea-pig attitude, regardless of good intentions. This attitude regards people as specimens to be told what to do and what not to do.

The Government through excessive taxation is to spend the working people's money for them through Government bureaus instead of leaving more for working people to spend for themselves. People are to be dealt with in half truths on the theory that plain folks are too dumb to understand the whole truth and act wisely on it.

The fact is that our country is no better than the individual people in it. In the long run, our Nation will be precisely what we are—strong if we are individually strong, weak if we are weak, productive if we are productive, stagnant if we are lazy and idle. President Truman has defined world conditions. Our home conditions we can see for ourselves.

The place which Communists and fellow-travelers have in our domestic difficulties has been made crystal-clear by J. Edgar Hoover. So what are we waiting for? Why doesn't the State Department, Congress, and the whole Government turn J. Edgar Hoover lose to rid us of these snakes? He'd make the best St. Patrick I can think of.

STAMP OUT COMMUNISM HERE

Home conditions and world affairs are just too dangerous to allow Communists any longer to attack us here with their poison and their plans. The Communist Party should be ruled off the election ballot in every State in America.

Communists on whom the FBI has a file should be forced to register as alien agents. No Communist should be eligible for office in any American organization, school, university, or in any capacity whatever in the United States Government.

While we interest ourselves in Greece and Turkey, if our own Government doesn't protect us against these same planning and plotting people here at home, who will? America's future must remain in truly American hands. American school minds must learn American lessons, not Russian lessons, or even British lessons.

America must remain free and open to the individual, open and available to people on the way up—young Americans coming forward on the sunny side of life in the greatest country on the face of the earth.

The coming generation must be free to walk in this green pasture without being bitten by snakes or caught in political coils. The Communist attack on the free world, the things President Truman says we must stamp out elsewhere, we must stamp out here in your land and mine.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, soon the Congress will be confronted with the question of the President's recommendation of the loan to Greece and Turkey. This proposed loan can hardly be viewed in the same light as the loan to Great Britain. Rather it is an effort to stop the forward march of the Communist Party headed by Marshal Stalin into the southern part of Europe to gain control of the Mediterranean Sea.

One of the interesting things about this proposed loan is that many of the sympathizers in this country who were for the loan to Britain, in many instances now are against any proposed loan to Greece and Turkey. There are a great many people in the United States who would become very indignant if you intimated they possessed communistic tendencies. Still they are against doing anything to stop the forward movement of communism in any part of Europe, and they are very prone to talk about civil liberties in the United States.

I should not suggest for a moment that these people are Communists. I am interested in their idea of liberalism to which they tie their kites. It might be interesting to see what might happen to some of these people, if and when the Stalin Communists move in.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of April 7 entitled "If I was the Politburo":

"IF I WAS THE POLITBURO"

We have a friend, who shall be nameless here, and who comes up now and then with a notion which we find interesting in a grisly, spine-wrinkling sort of way.

The other day, for instance, sitting in a restaurant after lunch with a cigar jitterbugging in his mouth and ashes falling like snowflakes on his vest this friend of ours held forth approximately as follows:

"You know, I got to thinking what I would do if I was the Politburo, and Russia had moved in and conquered the United States.

"The Politburo, of course, is those 14 guys in Moscow who kick the Russian bear around and he has to pretend he likes it.

"Well, I was thinking, suppose I was the Politburo, and suppose us Russians had come over the top of the world with a flock of bombers, followed up by a flock of air-borne infantry, and had caught Uncle Sam in a bigger and better Pearl Harbor, because he hadn't had sense enough to keep his guard up and smack down us Russians' fifth column of Communists and fellow travelers in America, or because he'd spread himself too thin combatting communism in other countries.

"Anyway, say us Russians are now sitting pretty in control of this whole ex-great and ex-glorious ex-nation, and say I'm the Politburo. What do I do first?

"Well, everywhere else that I've gone—Poland, Baltic states, and all—I've begun by killing off a lot of people. Only I don't call it killing. I put it more refined-like. My name for it is liquidating 'em for the good of the great new classless society which I'm setting up.

"Of course, the real reason I liquidate 'em is that I'm afraid of 'em, but naturally I can't admit that out loud."

Our friend paused to gulp a drink of water, then went on:

"Now, who would I be most afraid of? The President, Congress, governors, legislatures, mayors? I don't think so. After all, most of those guys are politicians, and once I'd liquidate a few of them with plenty of fanfare the rest would probably go to work for me.

"Nope—I think the first two bunches of Americans I'd get after in a big, wholesale way would be nobody but the American Communists themselves, and those of their fellow

travelers who had been sincere believers in communism and actively disloyal to Uncle Sam. Yep; first off, I'd liquidate a big piece of my own former fifth column.

"LIQUIDATION PRIORITIES

"You see, these local Reds, and the fellow travelers who really hope to blast our Government down some day, are mostly natural-born soreheads, haters of everybody in authority, or they got that way early in childhood's unhappy days. So, no sooner am I—the Politburo—in authority in this country than most of them take to hating me, just because I'm the new boss.

"So I'd get on their trail first. I'd have at least half of the United States Communist Party members murdered in cold blood, just to show the other half that the Communist Party all along had meant what it said about absolute obedience to its ruling clique. And any fellow travelers who tried to exercise their old traditional American freedom by arguing with me about anything—anything at all—why, I'd mow 'em down with machine guns.

"Next, I think I'd turn on the big shots in the labor unions, and bump them off without even any mock trials like they have in Russia. Likewise, all the really active, sincere guys in the unions' rank and file.

"These babies, you see, have been telling the workingman for generations now that he's entitled to a living wage and then some, and decent working conditions and all. Not with me in charge he isn't. His job in my Communist set-up is to work like a slave, live off the leavings, let my little Communist master class take all the gravy, and never question my wisdom.

"Then, I'd knock off a lot of clergymen of all the churches, and several thousand outstanding teachers and professors, and maybe 90 percent of all the newspaper and magazine and radio and movie people I could catch. All these rascals, you see, are forever putting ideas into people's heads—helping 'em think—and if there's one thing a Communist government can't stand for it's a bunch of the slaves running around thinking. Got to make robots of 'em all, or after a while they'll make blood sausage meat of you.

"It would be quite a massacre," our friend wound up with a sardonic grin; "but I bet if I was the Politburo and handled things that way, it would be one long, weary time before the American people wriggled out of my trap."

Profit Records of 2,900 Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the House to the story incorporated herein from the New York Times of April 6, relative to the profit showing by most of the leading corporations of the Nation.

The news item from the New York Times is as follows:

REPORTS OF 2,900 CORPORATIONS SHOW EARNINGS MORE THAN DOUBLED IN SOME CASES IN 1946

Annual reports of 2,900 leading corporations showed that 1946 earnings in many lines more than doubled the previous year's net, according to a tabulation appearing in the April letter of the National City Bank issued last week. The profits of the entire trade group were all over the 100 percent level, the compilation showed. In commenting on the table, which is presented below, the bank letter said:

"Analysis of the sales figures where given shows that the high earnings were in most cases the result of greatly expanded volume of business, rather than of abnormally wide profit margins, which for most groups were actually below the average of active prewar years.

"Moreover, in considering gains in net income compared with 1945, allowance should be made for reduction in taxes, including elimination of excess profits tax, which in many cases more than offset a decline in operating earnings. The fact that 1945 statements of many companies included heavy charge-offs of war plants and facilities, which did not recur in 1946, also contributed in boosting the comparative net earnings.

"Need for discrimination in drawing conclusions about earnings is further emphasized by the fact that approximately one-fourth of the manufacturing corporations so far reporting—including some of the largest and most successful in the country—experienced lower earnings than in 1945.

"This reflected cancellation of war contracts, strikes, reconversion difficulties, shortages of materials, increased costs and unprofitable Office of Price Administration ceilings, most of these factors applying chiefly to companies in the heavy industries and to operations during the early part of the year.

"Other outstanding exceptions to the upward trend were railroads and air transport companies."

Net income of leading corporations for the years 1945 and 1946

[Net income is shown as reported—after depreciation, interest, taxes, and other charges and reserves, but before dividends. Net worth includes book value of outstanding preferred and common stock and surplus account at beginning of each year]

Number of companies	Industrial groups	Net income after taxes		Percent change [1]	Percent return on net worth	
		1945	1946		1945	1946
23	Baking	$29,093,000	$60,872,000		10.2	21.8
16	Dairy products	38,989,000	65,454,000	+67.9	12.0	18.9
17	Meat packing	34,825,000	70,461,000		5.4	10.8
26	Sugar	28,015,000	39,154,000	+39.8	7.0	9.5
59	Other food products	110,453,000	182,712,000	+65.4	11.5	18.1
16	Soft drinks	36,661,000	39,111,000	+6.7	19.4	19.5
34	Brewing	22,587,000	39,632,000	+75.5	14.5	23.4
12	Distilling	65,362,000	164,001,000		19.7	41.1
23	Tobacco products	76,634,000	100,690,000	+31.4	9.4	11.4
46	Cotton goods	28,760,000	102,896,000		7.8	27.1
13	Silk and rayon	14,280,000	42,419,000		9.5	24.5
7	Woolen goods	11,986,000	30,328,000		10.3	25.2
20	Hosiery, knitted goods	7,990,000	21,779,000		11.1	28.2
41	Other textile products	36,113,000	83,828,000		9.5	20.8
31	Clothing and apparel	14,000,000	35,430,000		9.8	23.3
9	Leather tanning	3,623,000	5,030,000	+38.8	8.8	10.8
21	Shoes, leather products	17,262,000	26,757,000	+55.0	8.2	12.7
27	Tires, rubber products	66,152,000	126,759,000		10.7	20.6
24	Lumber	20,165,000	43,764,000		6.8	14.1
14	Furniture, wood products	6,316,000	11,915,000	+88.6	6.5	10.8
70	Pulp and paper products	61,254,000	140,163,000		6.5	14.4
28	Printing and publishing	17,467,000	31,478,000	+80.2	10.4	17.9
59	Chemical products	216,701,000	321,830,000	+48.5	10.2	14.7
26	Drugs, soap, etc	74,312,000	121,963,000	+64.1	15.5	23.6
17	Paint and varnish	20,675,000	36,682,000	+77.4	8.2	13.8
40	Petroleum products	596,662,000	760,592,000	+27.5	8.8	10.7
23	Cement	4,634,000	17,186,000		2.6	9.7
11	Glass products	33,513,000	52,136,000	+55.6	10.2	14.8
37	Other stone, clay products	29,047,000	61,819,000		6.8	13.4
51	Iron and steel	183,531,000	273,336,000	+48.9	5.1	7.5
12	Agricultural implements	54,671,000	45,520,000	−16.7	7.1	5.7
64	Building, heating, plumbing equipment	42,359,000	62,051,000	+46.5	8.5	11.4
71	Electrical equipment and radio	149,958,000	114,547,000	−23.6	12.4	8.9
55	Hardware and tools	40,155,000	56,239,000	+40.1	10.3	14.0
39	Household equipment	16,927,000	32,618,000	+92.7	10.6	18.4
135	Machinery	91,240,000	106,237,000	+16.4	10.1	11.3
24	Office equipment	33,052,000	58,173,000	+76.0	11.3	18.9
26	Nonferrous metals	110,710,000	136,685,000	+23.5	5.8	7.1
72	Other metal products	58,760,000	61,902,000	+5.3	9.7	9.5
22	Autos and trucks	246,743,000	128,754,000	−47.8	14.0	6.9
57	Auto equipment	51,940,000	38,041,000	−26.8	13.1	8.9
23	Railway equipment	36,158,000	42,081,000	+16.4	8.2	9.3
26	Aircraft and parts	83,339,000	4,182,000	−95.0	22.2	.9
5	Shipbuilding	11,775,000	10,175,000	−13.6	21.0	17.4
39	Miscellaneous manufacturing	62,180,000	73,973,000	+19.0	13.0	14.4
1,511	Total manufacturing	2,997,938,000	4,091,355,000	+36.5	9.3	12.1
23	Coal mining	[2] 23,858,000	[2] 35,892,000	+50.4	4.2	7.5
28	Metal mining	[2] 24,952,000	[2] 27,087,000	+8.6	6.2	6.6
44	Oil and gas	[2] 31,012,000	[2] 36,504,000	+17.7	11.3	12.6
11	Other mining, quarrying	15,774,000	[2] 23,652,000	+49.9	14.1	20.4
106	Total mining, quarrying	[2] 95,596,000	[2] 123,135,000	+28.8	7.1	9.5
19	Chain stores—food	20,898,000	45,446,000		8.9	18.6
53	Chain stores—other	97,520,000	197,344,000		12.0	23.0
37	Department stores	55,020,000	111,465,000		11.2	20.8
6	Mail order	61,105,000	159,517,000		10.2	25.6
55	Miscellaneous and wholesale	40,704,000	82,891,000		10.3	20.2
170	Total trade	275,247,000	596,663,000		10.9	22.3
133	Class I railroads	446,762,000	288,534,000	−35.4	3.6	2.3
33	Traction and bus	23,772,000	35,692,000	+50.1	5.2	7.5
10	Shipping	10,471,000	24,014,000		6.9	15.3
12	Air transport	11,755,000	[3] 879,000		14.0	
45	Miscellaneous transportation	26,189,000	18,412,000	+29.7	6.7	4.5
233	Total transportation	518,949,000	365,773,000	−29.5	3.9	2.6
188	Electric power, gas, etc [3]	443,137,000	558,291,000	+26.0	6.8	8.9
50	Telephone and telegraph [3]	198,013,000	216,711,000	+9.4	6.5	6.9
238	Total public utilities	641,150,000	775,002,000	+20.9	6.7	8.2

Footnotes at end of table.

Net income of leading corporations for the years 1945 and 1946—Continued

Number of companies	Industrial groups	Net income after taxes		Percent change [2]	Percent return on net worth	
		1945	1946		1945	1946
15	Amusements	$64,473,000	$122,582,000	+90.1	12.6	22.4
39	Restaurant and hotel	9,953,000	13,784,000	+38.5	11.0	15.4
25	Other business services	14,176,000	17,250,000	+21.7	12.0	13.9
16	Construction	4,101,000	6,733,000	+64.2	6.3	10.0
95	Total service and construction	92,703,000	160,349,000	+73.0	11.8	19.4
241	Commercial banks [4]	363,562,000	375,692,000	+3.3	8.9	8.5
77	Fire and casualty insurance [4]	89,854,000	24,263,000	−73.0	6.8	1.6
144	Investment companies [4]	128,172,000	149,407,000	+16.6	6.1	6.0
55	Sales finance companies	31,158,000	28,028,000	−10.0	6.2	5.5
88	Real estate companies	6,432,000	11,070,000	+72.1	5.4	9.0
605	Total finance	619,178,000	588,460,000	−5.0	7.6	6.5
2,958	Grand total	5,240,761,000	6,700,737,000	+27.9	7.7	9.5

[1] Increases or decreases of over 100 percent not computed.
[2] Before depletion charges in some cases.
[3] Due to the large proportion of capital investment in the form of funded debt, rate of return on total property investment would be lower than that shown on net worth only.
[4] Figures represent in most cases operating earnings only, and do not include profits or losses on investments.
[5] Deficit.

Mocking Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post, Monday, April 7, 1947:

MOCKING STRIKE

Nobody has been really deceived by the transparent subterfuge by which Mr. Lewis has sought to camouflage his defiance of the antistrike order upheld by the Supreme Court. The clause in the Lewis-Krug contract permitting the UMW to designate memorial periods was never intended to cover a 6-day suspension of work throughout the coal fields. It differed in no respect from a strike. If the losses resulting from this mocking strike should be followed by another indefinite period of idleness on the specious ground that only two coal mines have been properly certificated as safe, any public condonation of Mr. Lewis' mourning strike there may have been will, we feel sure, give place to indignant condemnation of his latest move.

Of course, it remains to be seen whether Mr. Lewis' request that the coal mines, with two exceptions, be closed until they have passed Federal inspection will be interpreted by his followers as a command to prolong the present strike. If so, the Government's only recourse will be an appeal to the courts for another injunction. Referring to the call for a 6-day memorial period, we said that John L. Lewis had "gone as far as he possibly could toward thumbing his nose at the administration and the Supreme Court without incurring the additional fine of $2,800,000 which the Court had prescribed in case of another UMW strike against the Government while the injunction granted last November remains in effect." But it appears we were wrong. We failed to do justice to Mr. Lewis' unexcelled ingenuity in evading legal restraints by distorted interpretations of law and arbitrary definitions of the terms of his contract with the Government. We also failed to make adequate allowance for the implacability of his determination to get even with his arch enemy, Secretary Krug.

As Captain Collisson has pointed out, it is necessary to follow the rule of reason in determining whether mines are sufficiently safe to permit of their reopening. The procedure suggested by Mr. Lewis is obviously designed to achieve by indirection the mine shutdown that he has been prevented from decreeing openly as the result of the Supreme Court decision. If he is not stopped, the Government will be forced to admit its impotence to deal with organized minorities that threaten to paralyze the Nation's industry to gain their ends. That way lies political disintegration, and this is more to be feared than the economic losses that would result from a prolonged suspension of coal mining.

Missouri Legislature Endorses H. R. 1759

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 1759, to eliminate the discriminatory application of the Federal income tax laws against citizens of the 39 noncommunity-property States, which I introduced in the House on February 6, 1947, has received widespread support and approval throughout the country. Many Members of the House have expressed their concurrence with the proposal, and I am satisfied that the bill will pass the House by a large majority when it is brought to the floor. Thus far I have heard of no opposition to the measure.

The legislature of my home State, Missouri, has adopted a resolution memorializing the Congress that H. R. 1759, or equivalent legislation, be enacted. Under leave heretofore granted I include in my remarks the text of the resolution:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Whereas an inequality exists between citizens and residents of the several States of the United States, in that residents of nine States having community property laws are privileged to divide incomes between husband and wife for income tax purposes, thereby reducing the income taxes required to be paid by said residents, which privilege is being denied to the residents of 39 States not having community property laws; and

"Whereas by reason of the premises legal privileges are enjoyed by a minority of the citizens of the United States of America, solely determined by residence, which are not permitted to all the citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas it is within the power of the Congress of the United States of America to correct such inequality by adopting suitable and appropriate legislation therefor: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, in its sixty-fourth regular session assembled, respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States of America that H. R. 1759, introduced by Representative REEVES, of Missouri, or any other suitable and appropriate legislation be enacted permitting division of income between husband and wife for income tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be dispatched to the United States Senators and Congressmen from Missouri."

I hereby certify that the above senate concurrent resolution was adopted by the Missouri Senate on March 4, 1947, and concurred in by the Missouri House of Representatives on March 28, 1947.

[SEAL] ROY D. MILLER,
Secretary of the Senate, State of Missouri.

Golden Gate Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the California Legislature, fifty-seventh general session:

Assembly Joint Resolution 33

Assembly joint resolution relative to accepting amendments to permits from the Government of the United States for the construction of approach roads and toll-collection areas over certain rights-of-way leading to the Golden Gate Bridge, and relating to the retrocession by the Congress of the United States of jurisdiction over said rights-of-way as relocated and said toll areas, bridge ends, and bridge

Whereas on February 13, 1931, the Secretary of War, pursuant to the authority vested in him by the laws of the United States, granted to the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District certain rights-of-way upon which are located the approach roads, toll areas, and bridge ends of the Golden Gate Bridge; and

Whereas the said grant has been accepted by the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, and also by the Legislature of the State of California; and

Whereas it has become advisable to use additional land for widening of the north entrance to the toll plaza located on the Presidio of San Francisco Military Reservation; and

Whereas on the 15th day of August 1946, and the 6th day of March 1947, the Secretary of War did grant to the Golden Gate Bridge

and Highway District amended permits granting the use of said additional land as set forth in red on the map attached to and made a part of said amended permits of August 15, 1946, and March 6, 1947; and

Whereas it was provided in said amended permits that the amendments should not become effective and the original permit shall remain unchanged thereby unless and until the State of California shall have, with respect to such amendments, taken the same similar action which it was required to take with respect to the original permit and which is set forth in paragraph 11 and subparagraphs 11a, 11b, and 11c of that instrument as a condition precedent to the taking effect thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That said amendments, dated August 15, 1946, and March 6, 1947, to said permit, dated February 13, 1931, granted by the Secretary of War to the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, be and the same hereby are, together with each, all, every, and singular, the terms, conditions, limitations, reservations, and requirements therein contained, accepted by and on behalf of the State of California; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of California does hereby make application to Congress for a retrocession of jurisdiction over the rights-of-way as relocated and amended by said amended permits of August 15, 1946, and March 6, 1947; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of California will, in case such retrocession of jurisdiction is granted by Congress, accept such retrocession of jurisdiction, and will assume the responsibility for managing, controlling, policing, and regulating traffic thereon, all subject to the following limitations and to such other limitations as Congress may prescribe;

(a) That nothing in said permits contained shall be construed to give to the State of California or any of its agents, authority at any time to regulate traffic of military personnel or vehicles upon the said bridge or roads. All traffic upon said roads and upon said bridge shall be free from any tolls, charges, or any form of obstruction by State or other agencies, against military and naval personnel and their dependents, civilians of the Army and Navy traveling on Government business under military authority, and Government traffic.

(b) That whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of War or his authorized representatives any emergency exists which justifies it, he may assume exclusive control and management of said bridge and roads and may then in his discretion prohibit, limit or regulate traffic thereon.

(c) That nothing in said permits contained shall be construed to confer upon the State courts the right to try persons subject to military law for crimes or offenses committed on said roads, or upon said bridge within the boundaries of the respective military reservations involved, but the courts of the United States or military tribunals as now or hereafter provided by law, shall retain exclusive jurisdiction to try such persons for such offenses; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of California does hereby agree to make the additional right-of-way granted by said amended permits of August 15, 1946, and March 6, 1947, a part of the system of public highways of the State; and be it further

Resolved, That by the acceptance of such amended permits the State of California expressly agrees that the additional land covered thereby shall be used for road or highway purposes only in relation to the approaches to the Golden Gate Bridge and that no structure will be erected thereon that will interfere with the use of the combined Army-Navy signal station located on the top of the traverse at the left of Emplacement No. 3, and that the use of such land for the widening of the bridge roadway or approach will not interfere with the use of the War Department rooms in Emplacement No. 3 or the access by means of tunnel to same or the extension of said tunnel which may be necessary in relation to the new limits of the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district right-of-way; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of War, to each House of Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.

Nazi Party Membership Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago before the House, I called attention to the fact that there were several hundred known Nazi Party members in Turkey, and I asked what does the State Department intend to do in regard to known Nazis in Turkey as a condition for the loan which that dictatorial Government has requested from the American taxpayers. I mentioned also that the Turks have hundreds of millions of dollars of concealed Nazi assets and $75,000,000 of looted Nazi gold. My remarks seemed to have disturbed some of the Members of the House. I wish to suggest for those who are interested that they consult the 800-page document submitted to the Senate Military Affairs Committee by the War Department of the United States this last December, which lists the Nazi Party membership of people throughout the world—lists which were found in Berlin itself by United States military officers. This list gives the party number, the membership numbers of the persons, the date they entered the Nazi Party, the date of birth and birthplace, the last recorded address and occupation. The Nazis were nothing if not thorough. We now have a list from Berlin itself of the Nazi Party members resident throughout the war in Turkey. Here is the list of Nazi Party members resident in Turkey:

Nazi Party membership records

TURKEY

Membership No.	Name	Date entered	Birth date	Birthplace	Last address recorded	Occupation
8182263	Ahlhorn, Wiltrudis	Oct. 1, 1940	Mar. 29, 1917	Elsfleth	Istanbul	Foreign-language clerk.
7055168	Allardt, Helmut Dr.	Aug. 1, 1939	Mar. 20, 1907	Königsberg	Ankara	Legation secretary.
7024337	Angelides, Alexander	Mar. 1, 1939	May 3, 1916	Istanbul	Istanbul, Batariastr. 15	Clerk.
7070689	Aulehla, Rudolf	Apr. 1, 1939	Nov. 17, 1892	Vorkloster	Istanbul	Textile technician.
3805620	Ballhause, Friedrich	July 1, 1936	Dec. 7, 1905	Hamburg	do	Merchant.
3282187	Bammes, Fritz	May 1, 1933	Sept. 9, 1905	München	Bursa, Ismet Pasa cadd 23	Teacher (language).
2018565	Barth, Erwin	do	Feb. 14, 1911	Darmstadt	Istanbul	Practitioner.
8225814	Barth, Theodor Dr.	May 1, 1941	Nov. 6, 1896	Vöcklabruck	Istanbul, Ayaspasa Mete Cad	Bank director.
1121627	Barth, Walter	May 1, 1932	Dec. 7, 1909	Wiesbaden	Istanbul, Turkish-German Orient Bank	Bank clerk.
2873477	Bartsch, Käthe	Oct. 1, 1934	Nov. 29, 1883	Brieg	Ankara	Stenotypist.
3744797	Bauer, Charlotte	Aug. 1, 1936	Feb. 5, 1907	Leipzig	Istanbul	Clerk.
3744807	Bauer, Fridolin	do	Apr. 3, 1901	Hannover	Ankara, Posta eaddesi 53 Kp 6	Special teacher.
2746579	Bauer, Margarethe	Oct. 1, 1934	May 29, 1890	Toppeo Krs. Schwiebus	Ankara	Stenotypist.
7421480	Bauer, Minna	Feb. 1, 1940	May 9, 1904	Hannover	Ankara 53	Housewife.
3391311	Baumann, Wilhelm	Nov. 1, 1933	Aug. 24, 1903	Neustadt	Istanbul, Sakeci Palast	Clerk.
3498921	Beck, Walter	Nov. 1, 1935	Oct. 26, 1906	Kassel	Istanbul	Merchant.
3722587	Becker, August	May 1, 1936	Apr. 17, 1905	Wiesdorf	Ankara, Jenischehir-Amrag cad 6	Architect.
1273128	Beerwarth, Klara	Jan. 22, 1940	May 19, 1900	Eberswalde	Istanbul-Beyoglu, Cihangir Mahallesi Somuncuoglu Sokak 12 Sihhat App. Kapi 7.	Clerk.
8719534	Beitlich, Franz	July 1, 1941	May 2, 1899	Ober-Preschkau	Istanbul, Beyoglu, Serdar ekrem sok 82	Commercial agent.
7025374	Benedikt, Arthur	Apr. 1, 1939	June 27, 1906	Graslitz	Ankara Terna cadd 24	Construction technician.
7024811	Bergemann, Heinz-Otto	Mar. 1, 1939	June 13, 1918	Baden-Baden	Istanbul, Gümüzsnyn cadde-si 55	None.
56791	Bethke, Martin	Feb. 19, 1927	June 5, 1907	Berlin	Ankara	Reporter for the Angriff.
8664644	Binder, Erwin	Nov. 1, 1941	Feb. 23, 1902	Wels	Konya Matra muduluga	Graduate engineer.
4457046	Bittel, Kurt	Oct. 1, 1937	July 5, 1907	Heidenheim	Istanbul, Faksim Sira Selvi 127	Archaeologist.
Warning	Bitzer, Heinrich		Dec. 1, 1918	München	Istanbul, Galata 1009 BP	None.
217639	Bitzheimer, Fritz	Mar. 1, 1930	July 15, 1905	Dahle	Giresun/Black Sea	Merchant.
3401078	Blum, Egon	Mar. 1, 1934	Nov. 20, 1898	Wien	Ankara	Engineer.
2547851	Bödefeld, Theodor, Dr. Ing.	May 1, 1933	Jan. 9, 1898	Emsdetten	Istanbul Gümüssuya	Professor.
9009928	Boscheinen, Anna	July 1, 1941	Nov. 30, 1890	Kronstadt	Istanbul-Cihangir Oba sok 1/2	Housewife.
1704584	Boscheinen, August	July 1, 1933	May 8, 1883	Düsseldorf	Istanbul Beyoglu Brussasoka Nr. 25	Electrician.
8142229	Bott, Richard, Dr.	July 1, 1940	Apr. 25, 1902	Frankfurt/M	Istanbul-Galata, Jeni Jol 20	Assistant secondary school teacher.
3280934	Brandt, Ludwig	May 1, 1933	May 11, 1890	Spremberg	Ankara, German Embassy	Assistant Administrator.
7025410	Braun, Heinz	Apr. 1, 1939	Sept. 23, 1920	Bamberg	Istanbul, Birahauc sokak 18	None.
3709602	Brell, Walter	Feb. 1, 1936	Nov. 5, 1900	Freiburg	Istanbul, Cichangir Cihan Palas 3	Editor.
7685517	Buchert, Paul	July 1, 1940	Dec. 29, 1914	Berlin	Istanbul	Clerk.
2718880	Buchholz, Erwin	Oct. 1, 1934	Mar. 3, 1912	Charlottenburg	Istanbul "Deutsche Bank und Diskonto Gesellschaft" (German bank).	Bank official.

Nazi Party membership records—Continued

TURKEY—continued

Membership No.	Name	Date entered	Birth date	Birthplace	Last address recorded	Occupation
3514107	Caesar, Wilhelm	Apr. 30, 1936	Jan. 27, 1904	Bremen	Istanbul	Graduate engineer.
4009187	Damerau, Viktor	Aug. 1, 1937	June 12, 1887	Saloník	Ankara	Consulate secretary.
6991935	Danielsen, Paul Peter	Nov. 1, 1938	Oct. 3, 1890	Flensburg	Istanbul-Ayas Pasa	Merchant.
3499474	Deuker, Hendrik	Mar. 1, 1936	Dec. 4, 1904	Düsseldorf	Istanbul	Sports teacher.
3733557	Diemke, Willy, Dr	Aug. 1, 1936	Nov. 19, 1911	Königsberg	Ankara	Archaeologist.
8225832	Duplitzer, Alex	May 1, 1941	Apr. 21, 1921	Istanbul	Istanbul Cihangir cos	Draftsman.
7024338	Duplitzer, Johann	Mar. 1, 1939	Aug. 17, 1882	Varna	Istanbul kum sok 6 Jazici sok 36	Clerk.
3454461	Ehrngruber, Richard	May 1, 1934	Dec. 10, 1906	Oberndorf	Istanbul, Beyoglu Aynali Ces me Keklitt sokak	Store clerk.
5016979	Eimer, Richard	May 1, 1937	Apr. 28, 1912	München	Ankara	Assistant administrator (municipal).
1480989	Eiselein, Rudolf	Apr. 1, 1933	Feb. 5, 1904	Lubburgas	Istanbul	Clerk.
1704194	Engelmann, Hermann Dr. von.	July 1, 1933	May 22, 1888	Stettin	Istanbul, Mis Sokak 9 Boite postal 2023	Newspaper correspondent.
8929751	Feiland, Isolde	May 1, 1942	July 26, 1920	München	Istanbul, Galata Yazici Vikisrya ap 56	Housewife.
8127500	Feiland, Rolf	Oct. 1, 1940	Apr. 10, 1913	Kiel	Istanbul	Export merchant.
6078713	Feustel, Gerda	June 1, 1938	Jan. 13, 1914	Rüdersdorf	do	None.
3400771	Feustel, Hans Walter	Mar. 1, 1934	Feb. 18, 1902	Dresden	Istanbul, Galata Kuto Han	Expediter.
9280860	Fischer, Herbert	Nov. 1, 1942	Jan. 7, 1905	Chemnitz	Istanbul Jeni Kapi Ka.-Bo.-Kücük-Langa-Caddesi 16.	Master weaver.
2292227	Friebel, Herbert	May 1, 1933	Apr. 8, 1914	Danzig	Istanbul	Bank official.
6305250	Friede, Viktor	May 1, 1938	June 20, 1904	Dtsch. Feistritz	Ankara, Jenisehir Selanik cadd. 44	Graduate engineer.
7024255	Friedl, Karl	Mar. 1, 1939	Sept. 12, 1917	Littau	Istanbul, Sira selvi 54	Butcher.
7025400	Friedl, Leopold	Apr. 1, 1939	Nov. 10, 1913	Wien	do	Do.
3226558	Fritz, Ekkehard	July 30, 1938	Nov. 14, 1914	Berlin	Istanbul	None.
3400772	Fromm, Kurt	Mar. 1, 1934	Mar. 24, 1902	Leipzig	Istanbul, Hoyryc sokak 6	Furrier.
2998291	Froreich, Gunther von	June 12, 1936	June 9, 1910	Brühl	Istanbu', "Dtsch. Levante Linie"	Clerk.
2718837	Gallitzdorfer, Eugen Josef	Oct. 1, 1934	May 29, 1896	Irfersgrün	Istanbul, Büyük Resit Pasa Caddesi Labli 13 Kat	Master workman.
3658020	Gallus, August	June 1, 1935	Feb. 17, 1896	Passau	Istanbul, Polonya-Sokak 27	Clerk.
8128351	Ganglberger, Otto	Feb. 1, 1941	May 22, 1895	Wien	Istanbul, Beyoglu Posta Sokak 20	Technician.
2871107	Gediga, Friedrich	Oct. 1, 1934	Aug. 23, 1889	Dittersbach	Istanbul, German general consulate	Caretaker.
5505812	Georg, Carl Oskar Ritter von.	Feb. 1, (?)	Aug. 19, 1913	Kiel	Istanbul	Bank clerk.
1479830	Giebner, Andreas	Apr. 1, 1933	Feb. 5, 1889	Tulcea/Rumänien	Istanbul/Constantinople/Galata Sakule Oten sokayi 5/4.	Merchant.
1704893	Giebner, Gerhard	July 1, 1933	Apr. 8, 1910	Istanbul	Izmir	None.
5943482	Giebner, Ingeborg	May 1, 1938	Dec. 16, 1913	Köln	Izmir-Burova	Housewife.
3401081	Giebner, Julius	Mar. 1, 1934	Apr. 15, 1887	None given	Istanbul, Pangalti Elmada Turna sokag 14	Master joiner.
1587885	Gittinger, August	May 1, 1933	June 8, 1901	Stuttgart	Ankara	Chief gardener.
8410153	Globig-Weissenbach, Friedrich.	Aug. 1, 1941	Aug. 3, 1911	Dresden	Ankara, Cihau Palas Hotel	Editor.
7332378	Goebel, Rudolf	Feb. 1, 1934	Oct. 24, 1906	Essen	Ankara, Posta Kutusu 109	Engineer.
671627	Goltermann, Heinrich	Oct. 1, 1931	Sept. 13, 1910	Engerode	Ankara Bira, Gazi fabrikagi	Volunteer.
3667153	Groha, Hubert	May 1, 1935	Nov. 19, 1913	Mährıng	Istanbul-Galata, Posta Kutusu 1157	None.
466931	Guckes, Alfred Dr	May 25, 1935	Feb. 28, 1901	Sulzbach i/Th	Istanbul	Merchant.
1631072	Haase, Bernhard	May 1, 1933	Oct. 31, 1901	Horn	Ankara	Consulate secretary.
2811183	Haensel, August	do	July 7, 1902	Lübeck	do	Airplane pilot.
1789254	Häuser, Heddy	July 1, 1933	Apr. 23, 1903	Frankfurt	do	Crafts worker.
4122082	Hagedorn, Else	May 1, 1937	Apr. 21, 1891	Verl	Istanbul/German Secondary school	Teacher.
8288426	Harscher, Friedrich von	Jan 1, 1941	July 5, 1896	Darnstadt	Ankara	Master piano builder.
1960149	Hartsch, *Karl* Johannes	May 1, 1933	Sept. 2, 1905	Döbeln	Istanbul	Teacher.
1234401	Haug, Erwin	Aug. 1, 1932	Oct. 4, 1904	Stuttgart	do	Master workman.
2884646	Hausmann Kurt	May 1, 1933	Apr. 16, 1897	Palermo	Istanbul "Deutsche Bank" (German Bank)	Director.
4456822	Heidt, Johann	Oct. 1, 1937	June 19, 1912	Griesheim	Istanbul	Bank clerk.
9139999	Heimer, Martin	Aug. 1, 1942	Jan. 18, 1901	Niederschlema	Istanbul, Ayazpasa 2	Master grinder.
7218310	Heinisch, Otto	Oct. 1, 1939	Jan. 25, 1893	Brünn	Istanbul	Captain, retired.
8410167	Hendricks, Hugo	Aug. 1, 1941	Dec. 12, 1903	Recklinghausen	Ankara i/Fa. Hohtif AG	Construction engineer.
7025401	Herok, Fred	Apr. 1, 1939	June 14, 1903	Bielitz	Istanbul-Taksim, Talimhar Topcu cadd 2	Merchant.
3733319	Herlan, Friedrich	Aug. 1, 1936	Mar. 27, 1908	Basel	Istanbul	Teacher.
1480467	Heuser, Edith	Mar. 1, 1933	July 31, 1898	Insterburg	Istanbul-Galata/German Secondary school	Housewife.
8693964	Heuser, Fritz	Jan. 1, 1940	Oct. 15, 1889	Dortmund	Istanbul-Galata German school 43 Jeni sokak	Teacher.
8128352	Hlouschek, Alois	Feb. 1, 1941	June 10, 1893	Krakau	Istanbul Istiklal Cadd	Hatmaker.
6991937	Höhne, Heinz	Nov. 1, 1938	July 6, 1911	Pirna	Istanbul	Teacher.
8410171	Holz, Liselotte	Aug. 1, 1941	Mar. 31, 1913	Stuttgart	Ankara German consulate	Correspondent.
3773553	Hommes, Adolf	Jan. 1, 1937	July 28, 1908	Darmstadt	Istanbul	Secondary-school teacher.
3401487	Honorat, Heinz	Feb. 1, 1934	Jan. 20, 1876	Istanbul	Istanbul Yesickoy	Bank official.
3722883	Jäger, Robert	May 1, 1936	Aug. 29, 1909	Basel	Istasion Codden 15 Ankara	Servant.
3401083	Jäggle, Erich	Mar. 1, 1934	May 16, 1912	Stuttgart	Izmir	Store clerk.
4139169	Jahns, Helmut	May 1, 1937	May 19, 1902	Gebhardshagen	Istanbul-Galata Yeniyol 20	Secondary-school teacher.
1156667	Jansen, Hanns, Ernst Dr	May 1, 1932	June 20, 1904	Soest	Istanbul	Editor.
2637431	Jenke, Albert	May 1, 1933	Mar. 29, 1888	Athen	Istanbul-Findikli Exelsior Werke	Engineer.
8735058	Jenke, Ingeborg	Feb. 1, 1942	Aug. 19, 1896	Kassel	Ankara German Embassy	None.
1736901	Kalis, Paul Werner	May 1, 1933	Feb. 24, 1904	Hamburg	Istanbul	Book dealer.
5393199	Kappert, Erich Helmut	May 1, 1937	June 30, 1910	Eningen	Istanbul-Galata, Aleman Lissxi, Jeni-Yol 20	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
3400758	Keilhau, Alexander	Mar. 1, 1934	June 22, 1889	Istanbul	Istanbul, Beyoglu 101	Merchant.
3401494	Keilhau, Fred	Feb. 1, 1934	Mar. 26, 1902	do	Istanbul, Beyoglu Hynali Cesme, Ince Kaz 39	Do.
6668321	Kirchhelle, Else	May 1, 1937	Nov. 19, 1911	Oberkatz	Istanbul Aleman Lisesi	Sport teacher.
584270	Klein, Günther	July 1, 1931	Mar. 19, 1913	Ihmert	Ankara	Student.
3401497	Klein, Walther	Feb. 1, 1934	Jan. 21, 1912	Istanbul	Istanbul, Beyoglu, Osmanye Lübeci-hendek, Gulhan sok.	Merchant.
3400757	Kleiner, Marie Luise	Mar. 1, 1934	May 2, 1906	Istanbul	Istanbul, Beyoglu Jaczici Sokogi	Clerk.
3454464	Knaus, Franz	May 1, 1934	Nov. 11, 1903	Stuttgart	Istanbul Pera Jeneseri sokak 25/I	Electroassembler.
3400759	Knecht, Robert	Mar. 1, 1934	Mar. 6, 1907	Pforzheim	Istanbul, Parmak kastu Pembe Cikmaz	Merchant.
7987514	Knoll, Herbert	Apr. 1, 1940	May 9, 1909	Wels	Ankara, Anafartaler cad Rehber Apart 6	Architect.
3402198	Kober, Herbert	Feb. 1, 1934	Jan. 1, 1904	Dönkritz	Ankara, Hygiene Ministerium	Master mechanic.
1588856	Koch, August	Apr. 1, 1933	Mar. 8, 1895	Danzig	Istanbul	Servant.
3401499	Koch, Wilhelm	Feb. 1, 1934	Jan. 14, 1903	Istanbul	Istanbul, Taksim Schit Muhtar bey Cad 66	Merchant.
3402026	Köhle, Heinrich	do	Dec. 26, 1905	do	Istanbul, Kumbaraci Vokusu Feri Appt. 119/5	Do.
4679176	Köhler, Hans	Nov. 1, 1937	Apr. 18, 1907	Pössnek	Istanbul Alman Nektebi	Teacher.
3281476	Köster, August	May 1, 1933	Mar. 20, 1907	Verden a. d. Aller	Ankara, German Embassy	Merchant.
7421482	Kolbe, Franz	Feb. 1, 1940	Dec. 18, 1912	Dresden	Malatia	Engineer.
8128511	Koller, Anton	Mar. 1, 1941	Dec. 2, 1907	Wien	Ankara Jenisehir Düzenli Sokak 6	Furnace assembler.
752156	Komischke, Heinrich	Dec. 1, 1931	Feb. 6, 1911	Hannover	Istanbul, German general consulate	Student.
7054091	Krausse, Friedrich	June 1, 1939	Mar. 6, 1901	Neumark	Istanbul, Beyoglu, Yazici Sokak	Bank official.
6193372	Kristinus, Heinrich, Dr	May 1, 1938	Oct. 10, 1904	Reichstadt	Istanbul, Kadiköy Mühürdar Cadderi 133	Professor.
6095900	Kroecker, Hans	Aug. 1, 1938	Apr. 30, 1907	Istanbul	Istanbul	Merchant.
3401243	Kröger, Kristian	Mar. 1, 1934	Feb. 5, 1903	Altona	Ankara	Engineer.
2871755	Krull, Erich	Oct. 1, 1934	Oct. 27, 1895	Ballenstedt	Istanbul	Consulate secretary.
1273238	Kühn, Rudolf	Sept. 1, 1932	July 8, 1906	Saalfeld	Istanbul, P. O. Box 2029, Cihangir Hayat App. 2	Merchant.
7942054	Kummer, Heinrich	Jan. 1, 1940	Mar. 26, 1888	Waldenburg	Ankara, German Embassy	Valet.
790645	Lange, Herbert	Feb. 1, 1932	Oct. 24, 1906	Chemnitz	Istanbul, Asmali Mescit 9/2	Master workman.
3391269	Lebküehner, Otto	Oct. 1, 1933	Mar. 2, 1906	Schweinfurt	Ankara, Hotel Exelsior	Graduate engineer.
4789603	Leichert, Paul	Dec. 1, 1937	Sept. 15, 1914	Berlin	Istanbul-Beyoglu/Cihangir 1 Kar Su Caddesi Nenopulo Apartmani.	Clerk.

Nazi Party membership records—Continued

TURKEY—continued

Membership No.	Name	Date entered	Birth date	Birthplace	Last address recorded	Occupation
7332384	Leitner, Karl Josef	Dec. 1, 1939	Oct. 8, 1907	Waltendorf	Istanbul	Mechanic.
Warning	Leitner, Robert		Apr. 12, 1906	None given	do	
2561182	Leitzke, Walter	Aug. 1, 1935	Sept. 12, 1896	Oschatz	do	Consulate employee.
9558601	Lemm, Helmut	Oct. 1, 1941	Jan. 31, 1907	Berlin	Istanbul-Cihangir	Merchant.
3453606	Liebertz, Wilhelm	May 1, 1934	Mar. 18, 1896	Orsoy/Rhein	Istanbul, Sisli Halaskar Gazi cadden No. 279	Do.
3400761	Liebl, Jakob	Mar. 1, 1934	Dec. 3, 1905	München	Istanbul-Pera Tarlabasi Ficici Sokak 5	Do.
3401695	Liebmann, Herbert	Feb. 1, 1934	Sept. 4, 1903	Görlitz	Istanbul	Teacher.
2755035	Liebmann, Margarethe	Oct. 1, 1934	Aug. 9, 1902	Jerusalem	do	Housewife.
3771582	Liebsch, Joseph	Dec. 1, 1936	Nov. 1, 1903	Eskischehir Türkei	Ankara	Office clerk.
3391314	Lilly, Johann Friedrich	Oct. 1, 1933	June 12, 1908	Stettin	Istanbul, Deutsche Bank (German Bank)	Bank official.
2482463	Linke, Wolf	May 1, 1933	Oct. 17, 1909	Haltern	Istanbul	Junior barrister.
8226583	Linow, Hans	Feb. 1, 1941	July 1, 1918	Berlin	Ankara German Embassy	Office clerk.
9140013	Lippold, Hans-Georg	Aug. 1, 1942	Nov. 19, 1901	do	Istanbul, Coskunstr. 17	Factory manager.
3453592	Lochner, Heinrich Nikolaus	May 1, 1934	Jan. 4, 1888	Izmir	Izmir c/o S. D. Diamantides P O B. 116	Do.
2365237	Looss, Adolf Kurt	May 1, 1933	Sept. 15, 1906	Einsiedel	Istanbul	Machinist.
3744949	Louis, Herbert	Aug. 1, 1936	Mar. 12, 1900	Berlin	Ankara Yemischir. Abac Sokagi 24	Professor.
3401089	Massmann, Wilhelm	Mar. 1, 1934	Apr. 7, 1907	Mülheim/Ruhr	Istanbul-Galata, Cinili Rihtim Jan II/Kat 15	Merchant.
7054090	Medlitsch, Friedrich	June 1, 1939	Feb. 28, 1906	Engerau	Istanbul Findikli Meclisi Mebusan caddesi 11/2	Factory manager.
5943790	Meinel, Fritz	May 1, 1938	June 17, 1885	Neustadt	Istanbul, Zeytinburnu	Textile expert.
6915801	Meissner, Heinrich	Sept. 1, 1942	Dec. 20, 1924	Stuttgart	Istanbul-Galata Jasici sok Dogan ap. 49	None.
3400778	Menge, Harald	Mar. 1, 1934	Feb. 10, 1901	Sondershausen	Ankara	Clerk.
6991936	Meyer, Ewald	Nov. 1, 1938	Nov. 5, 1910	Istanbul	Istanbul, Yazedji sokak 56	Commercial agent.
3752030	Missir, Emil	May 1, 1935	Jan. 30, 1894	Vachy auf Samos Griechenland.	Izmir/Alsancak Birinci Kosdon 330	Merchant.
3744808	Möller, Clemens, Dr	Aug. 1, 1936	Dec. 21, 1906	Singen	Ankara, Yeni-Sehir	Assistant secondary school teacher.
1454646	Moyzisch, Jutta	Feb. 10, 1933	Apr. 18, 1907	Wien	Ankara	Housewife.
1307980	Moyzisch, Ludwig	Nov. 11, 1932	Aug. 26, 1905	do	do	Official.
951783	Müller, Carl August	Apr. 1, 1932	Dec. 4, 1881	Asperg	Istanbul (P. O. Box 1090)	Merchant.
4457053	Müller, Hans	Oct. 1, 1937	June 16, 1913	Hamburg	Istanbul, Talimane Recep Posa Cadd 25/6	Forwarder.
3604791	Münchow, Bruno	Mar. 1, 1935	Nov. 13, 1891	Anklam	Izmir	Government office secretary.
7050484	Naumann, Rudolf, Dr. ing	May 1, 1939	July 18, 1910	Fichtenau	Tarabya (Taraklija?) Ahi Celebi 43	Graduate engineer.
3400784	Nöthig, Jacob	Mar. 1, 1934	July 11, 1883	Istanbul	Istanbul-Begöglu Uaici	Supervisor.
3391317	Oberle, Emil	Nov. 1, 1933	Nov. 16, 1889	Karlsruhe	Istanbul "Deutsche Bank und Diskonto-Ges."	Bank director.
1639358	Objartel, Waldemar	Apr. 1, 1933	Apr. 23, 1903	Berlin Lichterfelde	Istanbul	Chief bank clerk.
719460	Oehring, Walter	Dec. 1, 1931	Feb. 1, 1897	Schkeuditz, Pr	Istanbul, Caddesi 391 Istiklal	Furrier.
3391304	Ortt, Martin	Oct. 1, 1933	Jan. 20, 1901	Fürth	Istanbul	Engineer.
7053831	Ottweiler, Ottwilm	May 1, 1937	Apr. 7, 1911	Herne	do	Assistant secondary school teacher.
5518306	Otzen, Otto F. P	Apr. 1, 1938	Nov. 28, 1902	Schleswig	do	Pharmacist.
6438679	Patek, Viktor	Nov. 1, 1938	Nov. 17, 1909	Lundenburg	Ankara	Electro assembler.
8128277	Peters, Richard Dr	Feb. 1, 1941	July 24, 1897	Hannover	Ankara Sokak 7	Editor.
3401091	Peters, Trude	Mar. 1, 1934	Oct. 6, 1906	Teschen	Istanbul-Beyoglu Zambok 15	None.
2443436	Pfennig, Erich	May 1, 1933	May 4, 1894	Dresden	Istanbul	Chief clerk.
8128431	Posemann, Charlotte	Feb. 1, 1941	July 2, 1915	Berlin	Ankara, Mesrutiyc Cadd 15	None.
6300?8	Posemann, Konrad	Sept. 1, 1931	Dec. 15, 1909	do	Ankara, P. K. 156	Clerk.
3282137	Prange, Irmgard	May 1, 1933	Jan. 10, 1910	Libau/Kurl	Ankara/German Embassy	Housewife.
5505479	Prietsch, Rudolph	Jan. 1, 1938	Aug. 27, 1895	Grimma	Istanbul-Pangalti Ehmdagi Caddesi 39	Commercial agent.
8127525	Raidl, Rudolf	Oct. 1, 1940	Apr. 13, 1905	München	Istanbul-Cihangir, Özogul sokak Nr. 16	Clerk.
3391321	Reck, Albert	Oct. 1, 1933	Apr. 11, 1891	Istanbul	Istanbul-Beyoglu, Tom Tom Sokage 9	Merchant.
7332446	Reinhardt, Ilse	Dec. 1, 1939	Dec. 5, 1909	Witten/Ruhr	Istanbul	Stenotypist.
2867733	Richter, Franz	Oct. 1, 1934	Nov. 22, 1902	Istanbul	do	Office clerk.
4770235	Richter, Helmut	May 1, 1937	Apr. 28, 1911	Leipzig	do	Teacher.
3038990	Rickertsen, Georg	May 1, 1933	June 26, 1887	Flensburg	Giresun	Merchant.
6997100	Riedel, Otto	Dec. 1, 1938	July 14, 1906	Klosterneuburg	Samsun, Sinema gecedi	Branch manager.
2275679	Riegner, Hans Ernst	May 1, 1933	Oct. 14, 1900	Berlin	Ankara	Attaché.
8410217	Riesch, Karla	Aug. 1, 1941	Jan. 30, 1912	Travemünde	Ankara, Anadolu Ajansi	Housewife.
3473632	Riesch, Walter	Mar. 1, 1936	Aug. 1, 1906	Berlin-Schöneberg	do	Telegraph engineer.
1484080	Rieser, Rudolf	Apr. 1, 1933	July 27, 1899	Oberaudorf	Istanbul, Sisane Karakel Ipk ciknans Walamanga Ap 6.	Merchant.
3142220	Risch, Kurt	May 1, 1933	Nov. 4, 1934	Wilferdingen	Ankara	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
3453568	Roggenbuck Siegfried Aug., Dr.	May 1, 1934	Dec. 1, 189?	Berlin-Steglitz	Izmir "Deutsche Orientbank"	Bank director.
2847921	Romberg, Gustav	Oct. 1, 1934	Oct. 27, 1887	München-Gladbach	Istanbul	Engineer.
5505833	Rothfritz, Herbert	Feb. 1, 1938	Dec. 6, 1907	Neunkirchen	Istanbul, Alman mektebi Jeni Jel 20	Teacher.
8151097	Rothfritz, Hildegard	July 1, 1940	Feb. 23, 1917	Hamburg	Istanbul Abdulhak Hamidcaddesi 76 Cilli apartman 9	Store manager.
5041159	Ruff, Tilde	May 1, 1937	July 28, 1912	Dillingen	Istanbul	Posta clerk.
4237216	Runge, Willy	do	June 25, 1904	Junknischken	Ankara	Cabinetmaker.
2454913	Rupf, Herbert	May 1, 1933	July 15, 1912	Dresden	Istanbul	Student agriculture.
7547561	Saad, Jasma	Mar. 1, 1940	June 2, 1898	Jatla	do	Clerk.
4456910	Schaefer, Eduard, Dr	Oct. 1, 1937	June 4, 1903	Roenigsaggwld	Istanbul I, Olcak Dam Johnoer 6	Director of publishing company.
8929687	Schettler, Renate	May 1, 1942	Apr. 17, 1912	Hamburg	Ankara, Züven Sokak 22	Secretary.
3400776	Scheuermann, Gretel	Mar. 1, 1934	May 3, 1907	Istanbul	Istanbul, Beyoglu, Jacici Sokag 40 Botton Han	None.
8128471	Scheuermann, Ludwig	July 1, 1940	Nov. 8, 1895	Augsburg	Istanbul-Galata, Alman, Lisesi Yeni Yo 120	Secondary-school director.
4706185	Schiller, Gertrude	May 1, 1937	Dec. 10, 1910	Frankfurt	Ankara	Teacher.
7332376	Schillfried und Rattonitz, Charlotte von.	Dec. 1, 1939	Oct. 9, 1906	Berlin	Ankara, Karanfil 15a	Housewife.
6390874	Schimitschek, Gertrud, Dr	May 1, 1938	May 5, 1903	Wien	Istanbul	Do.
4690867	Schmelzer, Martha	May 1, 1937	Mar. 19, 1910	Cohnar	do	Nazi Party education officer.
8225914	Schmitz, Paul	May 1, 1941	Dec. 12, 1903	Frankfurt	Ankara	Editor.
6430560	Schneider, Franz	Dec. 1, 1938	Aug. 16, 1894	Troppau	do	Leader in German work service.
4679174	Schneider, Hubert	Nov. 1, 1937	Apr. 3, 1901	Gernrode	Eskisehir, Cumhuriget Mahalesi 16	Graduate farmer.
3721620	Schönfeld, Hans	May 1, 1936	June 21, 1903	Oschersleben	Istanbul	Postal official.
2566121	Schwarz, Helmut	May 1, 1933	Dec. 20, 1895	Karlsruhe	Istanbul, Posta Kutusu Ga	First lieutenant retired.
2594888	Schweinitz, Dr. von Hans Ulrich.	do	May 9, 1908	Sitzmannsdorf	Alexandrette lata 1341	Vice consul.
8410243	Sega, Johann	Aug. 1, 1941	Apr. 4, 1889	Marienhof	Istanbul German Embassy	Steward.
8929667	Seibt, Walter	May 1, 1942	Nov. 15, 1901	Weigsdorf	Istanbul, Sisli Harzimsah sokak 24	Business manager.
163931	Seiler, Julius	Nov. 1, 1929	Nov. 14, 1902	Schillings-fürst	Ankara	Merchant.
3398021	Sodemann, Richard	Jan. 1, 1934	Nov. 8, 1890	Stralsund	do	Master mechanic.
1117377	Sperling, Rudolf	June 1, 1932	Nov. 13, 1905	Gut Rosenthal Ukraine	Istanbul-Erenköy, Tasmektep sokak 9	Student.
6985722	Staschen, Christoph	May 1, 1937	Oct. 24, 1903	Osternburg	Ankara	Merchant.
8226633	Staudinger, Richard	Mar. 1, 1941	Oct. 3, 1901	München	Alman-sefareti	Truck driver.
4297424	Stegner, Hellmuth	May 1, 1937	Feb. 27, 1912	Oelsnitz	Istanbul	Teacher.
3810754	Stengele, Heinrich	Mar. 1, 1937	July 17, 1899	Sepplingen	Ankara, Leblebier Mahallesi acia sok	Electro assembler.
6983152	Stetter, Rudolph Dr	Sept. 1, 1938	Nov. 28, 1890	Burgau	Ankara Yenisehir	University professor.
7685711	Steuerwald, Karl	July 1, 1940	July 2, 1905	Strassburg	Ankara Oagatay Sokagi 15	Professor.
3398023	Stiebner, Gerhard	Jan. 1, 1934	Feb. 13, 1909	Dresden	Ankara, Camcaricade Ap. 5	Technician.

Nazi Party membership records—Continued

TURKEY—continued

Membership No.	Name	Date entered	Birth date	Birthplace	Last address recorded	Occupation
2593616	Stille, Wilhelm	May 1, 1933	Jan. 3, 1905	Berlin-Wilmersdorf	Istanbul	Court assessor.
6087422	Stippler, Heinrich	July 1, 1938	Nov. 30, 1906	Hamburg	Istanbul Tüfekci Salih sok 19 Fernyaga	Engraver.
1588276	Stockmann, Alfred	May 1, 1933	May 5, 1888	Erfurt	Istanbul, Ainale Cesme Emin Cami sokak 53/55	Clerk.
8462233	Stolz, Karl Dr	Oct. 1, 1940	Dec. 27, 1903	Wien	Istanbul	Secondary school teacher.
3401461	Sudrow, Walter	Feb. 1, 1934	Mar. 11, 1895	Stuttgart	Istanbul, Jazici Sokak	Bank official.
3391316	Thamm, Hermann	Oct. 1, 1933	Jan. 30, 1909	Istanbul	Istanbul, Harbiye 58 Junus Sok 40	Clerk.
5505477	Thieme, Kurt	Jan. 1, 1938	Aug. 16, 1891	Naumburg	Istanbul-Beyoglu Imansokag 17	Assembler.
1554651	Trost, Heinrich	July 8, 1935	Apr. 27, 1893	Harzgerode	Istanbul	Consulate secretary.
5854845	Trüb, Friedrich	Aug. 1, 1937	Dec. 13, 1898	Eskischir (Kl. Asien)	do	Engineer merchant.
7685380	Ugé, Friedel	July 1, 1940	Mar. 6, 1892	Darmstadt	Taxim Lamartin 25	Head nurse.
4678993	Uhlenkotte, Elfriede	Nov. 1, 1937	Nov. 7, 1912	do	Istanbul	Housewife.
1584587	Uhlenkotte, Wilhelm	May 1, 1933	Aug. 5, 1910	Dortmund	do	Clerk.
474787	Uhlitzsch, Carl Heinz	Mar. 1, 1931	Mar. 4, 1913	Wurzen	do	Student.
8128510	Ulrich, Ralph	Mar. 1, 1941	June 15, 1907	London	do	Clerk.
3555929	Ulshöfer, Ilse	June 30, 1936	June 12, 1904	Erfurt	do	Housewife.
2370251	Vogel, Oskar	May 1, 1933	Feb. 17, 1905	Istanbul	Istanbul, German Bank	Bank official.
7024442	Walther, Gebhardt von	Mar. 1, 1939	Dec. 19, 1902	Düsseldorf	Ankara	Consul.
3400791	Weber, Johannes	Mar. 1, 1934	Jan. 5, 1890	Grossheringen	Istanbul	Merchant.
7702180	Weber, Marianne	Sept. 1, 1940	Nov. 29, 1921	Tübingen	do	None.
3401465	Weidemann, Hans Dr. rer pol.	Feb. 1, 1934	Oct. 28, 1900	Berlin	do	Agent with power of attorney.
7421481	Weissbach, Erich	Feb. 1, 1940	June 12, 1903	Markranstädt	Wittgendorf 54	Assembler.
3684938	Weisser, Erich	Aug. 1, 1935	May 17, 1906	Leipzig	Izmir	Clerk.
3400764	Weisshäupl, Ernst Rudolf	Mar. 1, 1934	Oct. 7, 1903	Wien	Galata, Mumhane Eskisarap iskele sokak Kuco-Han.	Merchant.
3401466	Wendler, Gerhard	May 6, 1938	Mar. 7, 1903	Lommatzsch	Istanbul	Teacher.
4288668	Wendler, Ruth	May 1, 1937	Mar. 22, 1910	Wilmsdorf	do	Housewife.
3453604	Wex, Willi	May 1, 1934	Nov. 27, 1897	Linden b/Tölz	Izmir, Karsiyaka Haci Selik Sok 4	Gardener.
7025376	Widmann, Herbert	Apr. 1, 1939	May 3, 1905	Istanbul	Istanbul, Agaspasa Tülin Apart 1	Merchant.
4456821	Wienholdt, Adalbert	Oct. 1, 1937	Mar. 26, 1902	do	Instanbul, Dohnabahce 9	Clerk.
1704050	Wienholdt, Wilhelm	July 1, 1933	Nov. 1, 1904	do	Istanbul	Do.
1411032	Wiesner, Elsa	Dec. 1, 1932	May 16, 1894	Küstrin	do	Children's nurse.
5681620	Wilms, Herbert	May 1, 1937	Jan. 5, 1910	Rheydt	Ankara	Applicant for official's position.
2849288	Windels, Ulrich	May 1, 1933	Oct. 30, 1887	Berlin	do	Merchant.
4037866	Winkelkötter, Hans	May 1, 1937	July 14, 1908	Bremen	Nisantas, Vale Konags, Cadt Lorch 99	Do.
2985862	Winkelmann, Horst	May 1, 1933	Apr. 9, 1914	Leipzig	Istanbul	Secondary school graduate.
4524586	Winter, Albert	May 1, 1937	Sept. 2, 1886	Pasewalk	Ankara	Kiln master.
5699871	Wirth, Max	do	Sept. 9, 1912	Stuttgart	Istanbul	Mechanic.
3591242	Wussow, Fritz	Dec. 1, 1934	May 12, 1901	Neustettin	Trabzon	Consulate secretary.
3401468	Zecker, Heinrich	Feb. 1, 1934	Oct. 13, 1901	Berlin	Istanbul-Galata Aben Munih Han 6 Kat No. 1	Engineer merchant.

TURKEY—SUPPLEMENTARY LIST NO. 1

[NOTE.—Italics are corrections to the main list]

3401473	Ballmann, Alfred	Feb. 1, 1934	July 21, 1901	Berlin	Istanbul	Merchant.
Warning						
3453682	Barfuss, Alfred	May 1, 1934	Dec. 24, 1910	Alexandrien	Istanbul-Beyoglu/Kumbaraci-Camei Sokak 22	Commercial official.
4009126	Barthel, Paul	Aug. 1, 1937	July 24, 1889	Reichenbach	Istanbul	Business manager.
3744807	Bauer, Fridolin				*Ankara, Posto caddesi 53 Kp 6*	
8664644	Binder, Erwin				*Korva Natra muduluga*	
4457046	Bittel, Kurt				*Itanbul Faksim Sira Selvi 125*	
6096161	Boscheinen, Wolfgang	Aug. 1, 1938	Apr. 21, 1917	Bursa	Istanbul	Clerk.
2171160	Bossert, Hellmuth	May 1, 1933	Sept. 11, 1889	Landau	do	Doctor of philosophy.
7025410	Braun, Heinz				*Istanbul, Birahane, Sokak 18*	
1736860	Brittinger, Fritz	June 1, 1933	Apr. 20, 1893	Ludwigshafen	Istanbul, Kabatas Pasa Konak 46	Assembler.
3401476	Buehner, Hans	Feb. 1, 1934	Jan. 13, 1900	Saalfelden	Istanbul, Ainufri Sokak 7	Master mechanic.
1273149	Bunz, Friedrich	Sept. 1, 1932	July 1, 1899	Stuttgart	Istanbul-Beyoglu, Zekke cadde si 585-87	Merchant.
3454460	Bunz, Otto	May 1, 1934	Mar. 14, 1910	do	Istanbul-Beyoglu, Sakiz agac 5 solkun Sokak 1	Do.
427503	Christen, Diedrich	Jan. 1, 1931	Feb. 24, 1888	Hamburg	Istanbul	Do.
1273157	Coulouthres, Harry	Sept. 1, 1932	July 17, 1900	Konstantinopel	Pera, Kumbaradji, Sokak 46 Kulutres afarteman 46.	Do.
3401079	Curdt, Wilhelm	Mar. 1, 1934	July 6, 1906	Istanbul	Istanbul, Pera	Do.
6991935	Danielsen, Paul Peter				*Istanbul, Avaz Pasa*	
3401477	Deutinger, Sepp	Feb. 1, 1934	May 25, 1900	Saalfelden	Istanbul, Felek Sokak 2 appart 9	Assembler.
1117498	Dorner, Erich	June 1, 1932	Feb. 28, 1909	Kollnau	Istanbul, Rua Chokule Pasaj Jalk 35	Store clerk.
3401479	Dümig, Erwin	Feb. 1, 1934	Dec. 4, 1910	Kirchheim	Istanbul, Bogaz Kessen 86	Pastry cook.
8225832	Duplitzer, Alex				*Istanbul, Cihangir coskum Sok 6*	
3454461	Ehrngruber, Richard				*Istanbul-Beyoglu 28 Avnali "Ces" me, Keklik Sokak*	
3261763	Eschig, Edgar	May 1, 1933	July 12, 1894	Hamburg	Istanbul	Buyer.
3402655	Falke, Friedrich	Feb. 1, 1934	July 7, 1871	Schwarzholz	Ankara, Yünok zirsat Enstitusi	University professor.
3401480	Fallmer, Otto	do	Oct. 15, 1898	Marxdorf	Istanbul Beyasit Sokak 3/I	Foreman (building trades).
8929751	Feiland, Isolde				*Istanbul, Galta Vezici Viktorya ap 56*	
4456822	Heidt, Johann			*Griesheim/Main*	*Istanbul, Deutsche Bank*	
3401486	Heine, Hans	Feb. 1, 1934	Aug. 15, 1898	Reims	Istanbul, posta Sokak 38	Graduate engineer.
3401487	*Heinz, Honorat*				*Istanbul Yesickoy Istasyon Caddesi 15*	
8411067	Hendricks, Hugo				*Ankara Adana i/Fa. Hohtif AG*	
7025401	Herok, Fred				*Istanbul Taksim, Talimhane Topcu cadd 2*	
3401488	Herrmann, Josef	Feb. 1, 1934	July 31, 1897	Hasselbach	Pendik	Bricklayer.
3391320	Hertel, Max	Nov. 1, 1933	June 4, 1880	Glauchau	Istanbul, Asmali Meseit	Innkeeper.
1737676	Heymann, Gisela	May 1, 1933	Jan. 13, 1896	Neukirchen	Istanbul, Beyoglu Bursa Sokak 17	None.
1737506	Heymann, Oskar	do	Nov. 2, 1875	Wien	do	Architect.
Applicant.	Hitzigrath, Kurth	Oct. 7, 1942	June 18, 1885	Bad Oeynhausen	Istanbul Schischli, Kodeman Caddesistr. 140/III	Factory representative.
8128352	Hlouschek, Alois				*Istanbul, Istiklal Cadd, 180*	
3453685	Häfi, Hugo	May 1, 1934	June 16, 1878	Regensburg	Istanbul-Erenkoy, Köskü Gesaryan	Colonel, retired.
Warning	Hofmeier, Karl	Oct. 1, 1934	Jan. 26, 1912	Wien	Taskasap, Hayrettin pape Sok 35	Student.
2752569						
1754767	Hülsmann, Otto	Apr. 1, 1933	June 3, 1906	Hannover	Ankara Maden Tetkik ve Arana Custitus	Graduate engineer.
3401083	Jäggle, Erich			*Bad Cannstatt*	*Izmir, Deutsche Or. Bank*	Bank employee.
1736901	Kalis, Erich, Werner, Paul				*Istanbul-Beyoglu, Istiklal Caddesi*	
3391308	Kapp, Andreas	Nov. 1, 1933	Nov. 26, 1899	Konstantinopel	Istanbul-Galata	Book dealer.
199074	Leitner, Robert					
3092392	Pfferkorn, Gertrud	May 1, 1933	May 17, 1910	Freiburg	Istanbul Beyoglu Agas Pasa Fresco	Wet nurse.
3401447	Pfeifer, Emil	Feb. 1, 1934	Feb. 16, 1903	Istanbul	Istanbul, Pangalti Cadidige Sokak 162	Merchant.
2725680	Pritzkat, Hermann	Oct. 1, 1934	Apr. 22, 1903	Rudstannen	Istanbul Timarciscohag 5	Electro engineer.
3038990	Rickertsen, Georg				*Giroson*	
6997100	Riedel, Otto				*Samsun, Sinema gecedi 2*	
1484080	Rieser, Rudolf				*Istanbul, Sisane Karakol Ipek Cikmos Waldmange ap 46.*	

Nazi Party membership records—Continued

TURKEY—SUPPLEMENTARY LIST NO. 1—continued

Membership No.	Name	Date entered	Birth date	Birthplace	Last address recorded	Occupation
1737060	Rohde, Werner	May 1, 1933	Sept. 10, 1873	Kuhren	Gut Hasirka Istazyon Gokeehr	Estate manager.
5505833	Rothfritz, Herbert	------	------	*Neuenkirchen*	*Istanbul, Jeni Jol 20 Deutsche Schule (German School).*	
8151097	Rothfritz, Hildegard	------	------	------	------	*Camp commander (German R. A. D.).*
3401453	Ruff, Ernst Dr	Feb. 1, 1934	Sept. 4, 1897	Nekarsulm	Istanbul, Sultan Haman	Merchant.
5041159	Ruff, Tilde	------	------	------	*Istanbul-Salata, Dt. Orientbank*	*Stenotypist.*
4237216	Runge, Willy	------	------	*Jucknischken*	*Ankara, is klar caddesi*	*Special teacher.*
1588743	Schleip, Arthur	May 1, 1933	May 14, 1890	Reichenbach	Istanbul Beyoglu Balkon-Sokak 7	Construction foreman.
4679174	Schneider, Hubert	------	------	------	*Istanbul*	
3709175	Schönig, Emil	Apr. 1, 1936	Jan. 21, 1907	Frankfurt	Istanbul Tekke Celdesi 85	Innkeeper.
1588789	Scholz, Erich	May 1, 1933	Dec. 16, 1900	Bockelsdorf	Istanbul Abdullah Sokak 2	Printer.
3398363	Schultz, Erich	Jan. 1, 1934	Sept. 25, 1881	Riga	Ankara	Merchant.
3445399	Schultz-Jena, Irmgard	Apr. 1, 1934	Aug. 19, 1909	Jena	Istanbul	Wet nurse.
8410243	Sega, Johann	------	------	------	------	*Caretaker.*

TURKEY—SUPPLEMENTARY LIST NO. 2

[NOTES.—Italics are corrections to the main list or supplementary list No. 1. (M) after the name indicates that the name is in the NSDAP general card file, and (2) indicates it is among the applications for membership]

3726566	Albrecht, Karl (2)	Feb. 20, 1934	Sept. 10, 1874	Istanbul/Türkei	Izmir, German Consulate	Administrative assistant.
4009478	Dainas, Kurt (2)	June 12, 1937	June 29, 1896	Tessendorf	Ankara, Gazi Enstitüsü	Sports teacher.
3752033	Damke, Paul (2)	Mar. 1, 1935	Oct. 13, 1882	Schwiebus/Neumark	Izmir, Alsancak, Ilkbahar 34	Carpenter foreman.
3744722	Engesser, Walter (2)	Apr. 26, 1936	Mar. 6, 1905	Furtwangen im bad. Schwarzwald.	Trabzon, Almanya Konsoloslugu	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
3401491	Höcke, Ludgar (2)	Jan. 4, 1934	Apr. 24, 1909	Coesfeld/Westf	Istanbul, I. inci Vakif Han 43	Mechanic.
3918390	Horn, Valentin (2) Dr. phil	Feb. 23, 1937	Apr. 2, 1901	Steinbach/Westerw	Ankara-Yenisehir, Atatürk Bulvar	Professor.
3744742	Hurr, Emil (2) Dr. ing	Feb. 1, 1935	Apr. 4, 1899	Helenendorf	Istanbul, Posta Kuturu 2019	Chemist.
3733579	Jensen, Lorenz (2)	Feb. 24, 1934	Sept. 11, 1883	Beken Distr. Apenrade	Trabzon, German Consulate	Chancelor.
3936288	Jensen, Margarete (2)	Dec. 15, 1936	Jan. 5, 1888	Rendsburg	----do----	Housewife.
3401086	Keller, Karl (M)	Mar. 1, 1934	Apr. 16, 1900	Worms	Kozlu, Kosnur is, T. A. S	Electrician.
3401405	Kern, Paul (M)	Feb. 1, 1934	May 19, 1874	Mainz	Kanya, Gazi Meydan 15	Graduate engineer.
2719511	Kilb, Josef (M)	Oct. 1, 1934	May 5, 1906	Oberursel	Istanbul, Guletibi Ojami Sogak Bereket, Sade 3	Assembler.
17086 1479802	Knop, Alfred (M)	Feb. 1, 1933	Sept. 20, 1893	Bärwalde	Ankara, Zirat Enstitüsü	Landscape architect.
3453605	Kolczawa, Josef (M)	May 1, 1934	Jan. 4, 1887	Wien	Istanbul, Tarla Basi Peskirü 3	Woodworker.
3453588	Korn, Anton *Rudolf* (M)	----do----	June 13, 1914	Izmir	Izmir-Kemer-Kathane Cad. 133	Bank clerk.
3402197	Korsten, Wilhelm (M)	Feb. 1, 1934	Apr. 10, 1905	Odenkirchen	Ankara, Agence Anatolie	Engineer.
3722880	Kramer, Johannes (2)	Feb. 27, 1936	Nov. 3, 1905	Neuenkirchen/Oldbg	Ankara, Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü	Physicist.
3453589	Krug, Adam (M)	May 1, 1934	June 24, 1895	Mannheim	Izmir-Cherefettin Bey Sok	Contractor.
1484207	Krug, Hans (M)	Apr. 1, 1933	Aug. 1, 1899	Nürnberg	Istanbul, Beyoglu Asmali	Graduate merchant.
7025073	Kuckenbuch, Herbert (M)	Apr. 1, 1939	July 20, 1890	Aussig	Ankara-Demirki Bahee	College instructor.
1588533	Lachs, Otto (M)	May 1, 1933	July 30, 1906	Sarayoro	Istanbul, Beyoglu Zambaksokak 15	Journalist.
3402654	Lang, Heinrich (M)	Feb. 1, 1934	Nov. 16, 1902	Wien	Ankara, Electr. Werk "Telgas"	Technician.
1736795	Langer, Ernst (M)	Mar. 1, 1933	Feb. 5, 1886	Innsbruck	Istanbul, Beyoglu Targumansokak 14	Technician bookkeeper.
1484038	Laschenzky, Christian (M)	May 1, 1933	Nov. 5, 1885	Salzburg	Istanbul, Pera Billurtschu 14 Sokak	Music teacher.
3401088	Levermann, Johann Heinrich *Albert* (M).	Mar. 1, 1934	Feb. 11, 1889	Hamburg	Ankara	Machinist.
3752031	March, Wilhelm (2)	Mar. 1, 1935	Feb. 15, 1880	Izmir/Türkei	Izmir, Göztepe-Tramway 888	Foreman.
3722881	Richter, Dr. Friedrich (2)	Feb. 21, 1936	Dec. 25, 1906	Pagenkopf/Pom	Ankara, German Embassy	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
5505604	Rübsamen, Hans Heinrich (M).	Jan. 1, 1938	May 23, 1915	Frankfurt/Main	Istanbul, Beyoglu 29, Jazicisokak jeni jol 29	Clerk.
3744978	Saucken, Dr. Hans von (2)	Feb. 20, 1934	Nov. 1, 1893	Königsberg/Pr	Istanbul, German Gen. Consulate	German vice consul.
50405	Schäffner, Karl (M)	May 1, 1933	Feb. 13, 1886	Krems/Donau	Istanbul-Peva, Cihsa apir Defterda	Retired major.
3936289	Schede. Dr. phil. Martin (2)	May 14, 1937	Oct. 20, 1883	Madgeburg	Istanbul	Director of Archaeological Institute of the German Reich.
3805621	Schön Adolf (2)	Dec. 1, 1934	July 11, 1884	Kreuznach	Istanbul-Cihangir, Cihangir Sok. 22	Master workman.
3709175	Schönig, Emil (M)	------	------	*Frankfurt/Main*	------	
3282185	Steiner, Ernst (M)	July 1, 1933	Jan. 3, 1903	Leoben-Steiermark	Istanbul-Beyoglu, Hayriye Caddesi 26	Surveyor and engineer.
3453602	Steiner, Dr. Paul (M)	May 1, 1934	Sept. 18, 1905	Gelsenkirchen	Usack-Seka Fabrikasi	Entomologist.
3454475	Steller, Anna (M)	----do----	May 18, 1892	Burg/Magdeburg	Istanbul-Beyoglu Venechitt-Sokag 41	Directress.
7025075	Thielmann, Emil (M)	Apr. 1, 1939	Nov. 3, 1903	Untergrüne	Ankara, Yiz sokak 13	Engineer.
3744787	Urbach, Kurt (2)	Feb. 28, 1935	June 19, 1906	Berlin	Izmir, P. K. 42	Bank official.
3402188	Uiberreiter, Dr. Sieglinde (M).	Feb. 1, 1934	May 4, 1907	Zell a. See	Ankara, Jenisekir, Ada Kale sok. 18	Teacher.
1484285	Valenta, Johann (M)	Apr. 1, 1933	June 24, 1902	Urfra	Niselsantasch Djabistr. Pera 25	Elevator assembler.
3400428	Vennekamp, Karl (M)	Mar. 1, 1934	Dec. 28, 1907	Duisburg	Istanbul, Posto 47	Merchant.
1704648	Verstl, Georg (M)	July 1, 1936	Sept. 3, 1883	Frankfurt/Main	Istanbul, Ayas Palas Ralas App. 14	Chief engineer.
3454473	Weber, Ambros (M)	May 1, 1934	Oct. 7, 1893	Ebenfurth	Istanbul-Beyoglu, Sofigali Sok. 10	Cook.
733893	Weckelmann, Friedrich (M).	Dec. 1, 1931	Sept 16, 1881	Wattenscheid	Istanbul	Retired factory director.
3750009	Wiefling, Frieda (2)	Oct. 15, 1935	Sept. 25, 1886	Berlin	Istanbul-Snadiye Gulsen 8	
3401467	Wilkesmann, Wilhelm (M).	Feb. 1, 1934	May 20, 1879	Schwelm/Westf	Istanbul, Mohkeme alti 80	Foreman.
3400765	Zimmer, Dr. *Maximillian* Karl (M).	Mar. 1, 1934	Mar. 1, 1872	Weinheim	Amasya	Farmer.
3401098	Zimmermann, Wilhelm (M).	----do----	Apr. 28, 1884	Schwarzensee	Istanbul, Cihangir Susam-Sokagi 56/58	Retired naval lieutenant.
3744723	Wilmsdorff, Else von (2)	May 19, 1936	Nov. 5, 1888	Berlin	Ankara, German Embassy	Housewife.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Members of the House will note that a number of these Nazi Party members are merchants, teachers, engineers, bank officials, and professors. These people, so far as is known, are still in Turkey.

For other Members of the House who are interested particularly in Greece, I wish to submit also for the RECORD the list of Nazi Party members who lived throughout the war in Greece. Again, the full data—name, occupation, birthplace, last recorded address, and so forth—is included. There are approximately 300 known Nazi Party members in Greece:

Nazi Party membership records—Continued

GREECE

Membership No.	Name	Date entered	Birth date	Birthplace	Last address recorded	Occupation
1322479	Achenbach, Alfred	Sept. 1, 1932	Feb. 3, 1885	Oberschelden	Athens	Mine foreman (retired).
3610165	Angersbach, Heinrich	Apr. 1, 1935	Nov. 19, 1901	Köln/Rh	Kavalla	School principal.
3776441	Bailloni, Albert	Mar. 1, 1937	May 21, 1905	Dillweissenstein	Athens, Marnistr. 5	Merchant.
5969549	Balfans, Christa	May 1, 1937	Dec. 23, 1914	Gudenhagen	Athens	Governess.
3686409	Boltzer, Emil, Dr	Aug. 1, 1935	Mar. 1, 1906	Nürnberg	Athens, Odos Patriarchou Joakim 7	Junior barrister.
4031193	Bauer, Elizabeth	May 1, 1937	Aug. 11, 1902	Schönau	Salonika	Teacher.
7017258	Bauer, Josef Franz	Feb. 1, 1939	Mar. 3, 1907	Tigring	Athens	Office clerk.
3733358	Beer, Rosa	Aug. 1, 1936	Dec. 29, 1890	München	Athens, Isakaloff 19	Teacher (language).
595289	Benkert, Ingrid	Sept. 16, 1936	May 8, 1894	Homberg	Athens, Wilionistr. 5	None.
7024815	Betram, Otto	Mar. 1, 1939	Nov. 2, 1903	Frankfurt	Athens, Dodokanisos 11	Clerk.
3453289	Bickel, Max	May 1, 1934	Feb. 27, 1896	Tengen	Athens	Merchant.
3454992	Block, Paul	June 1, 1934	Oct. 10, 1897	Danzig	Athens, Stadionstr. 11	Electro technician.
3936447	Blohm, Ernst	June 1, 1937	Oct. 12, 1897	Lübeck	Athens, Stadion 5	Merchant.
1546100	Bohnenberger, Hermann	May 1, 1933	Sept. 2, 1902	Büchenbronn	Athens, Kornarou 8	Setter (jewel).
3280723	Born, *Kar* Otto	Jan. 22, 1940	Aug. 13, 1906	Hannover	Athens, "Deutsche Lufthansa"	Clerk.
1574217	Boxheimer, Hans	May 1, 1933	July 10, 1904	Frei Weinheim	Salonika, Porto Lago	Merchant.
3398314	Broichhausen, Josef	Jan. 1, 1934	Jan. 7, 1914	Beuel	Athens, Achamon 152	Merchant.
826049	Buchner-Baucevich, Hektor	Aug. 1, 1933	Nov. 25, 1903	Xanthi	Salonika	Merchant.
7421394	Busch, Alexis	Aug. 1, 1939	Feb. 13, 1904	Reval	Thessalonike, Vasilissis Olgas 52	Tobacco expert.
2382742	Christoph, Georg	May 1, 1933	May 20, 1896	Bautzen	Athens	Secretary.
3453676	Cleve, Kurt von	May 1, 1934	July 24, 1891	Rathenow	Athens, Psychiko	Clerk.
3397940	Coutoumas, Egon	Jan. 1, 1934	Apr. 1, 1897	Karlsruhe	Athens, Stadion 11	Merchant.
7055151	Danzer, Karl	Aug. 1, 1939	Oct. 12, 1878	Neuhofen	Larissa dos Dimitras	Master miller.
3710064	Degener, Albert Dr	May 1, 1936	Mar. 29, 1899	Bernburg	Athens	Syndic.
6926900	Dick, Fritz	June 1, 1936	Oct. 18, 1906	Zweibrücken	do	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
952059	Dziobeck, Ernst	Mar. 1, 1932	Feb. 2, 1895	Molga	Athens, Stadionstr. 11	Engineer.
4190931	Elser, *Karl* Adolf	May 1, 1937	Nov. 30, 1913	Stuttgart	Athens	Clerk.
7024814	Emrich, Wilhelm	Mar. 1, 1939	July 14, 1886	Cassel	do	Commercial agent.
7011458	Engelmann, Erika	May 1, 1937	July 14, 1914	Ciron	Athens, Südostropa AG	"Untergauführer" (Nazi Party).
1547715	Estlinbaum, Hugo	May 1, 1933	Feb. 22, 1907	Matarie	Athens	Tool maker.
3454693	Fehlisch, Arthur	June 1, 1934	June 19, 1902	Görlitz	Salonika/Odos Eratous 3	Merchant, mechanic.
1729813	Feiler, Karl	July 1, 1933	Dec. 17, 1890	Mensheim/Wttbg	Salonika, Athenosstr. 13	Electro assembler.
1730334	Feussner, Paul	June 1, 1933	Feb. 18, 1890	Witterda-Erfurt	Salonika, Pitakou 4	Technician.
7024348	Fikus, Franz	Mar. 1, 1939	Jan. 28, 1906	Solingen	Thessalonike Meg. Alexandronst 5	Merchant.
766581	Fischer, Helmut	Dec. 1, 1931	Dec. 4, 1910	Dresden	Salonika, Dikitircou 9	Clerk.
5879669	Flath, Heinz	May 1, 1937	Nov. 2, 1915	do	Salonika	Merchant.
3454998	Frege, Kurt	June 1, 1934	Aug. 31, 1898	Greiz i/V	Patras, Agh. Dionisiou	Do.
6990801	Frege, Maria Louise	Oct. 1, 1938	Mar. 1, 1895	Metz	Patras Agiou Dionysiou 43	Housewife.
3946873	Frische, Gustav	July 1, 1937	Mar. 21, 1901	Barntrup	Volos, Odos Jaulkou 183	Engineer.
5505811	Fritzsche, Gertrud	Feb. 1, 1938	Nov. 2, 1887	Dresden	Athens/Psychiko odos Glasemion	Teacher.
3609997	Fromm, Hugo	Apr. 1, 1935	Jan. 28, 1885	Zeitz	Athens	Merchant.
7024349	Glanzer, Egydius	Mar. 1, 1939	Sept. 1, 1884	Thomatal	Thessalonike Odos 26	Brewer.
7421397	Goecker, Fred	Feb. 1, 1940	May 28, 1904	Delitsch	Athens (Georgiou Stavrou 6)	Commercial agent.
8735119	Graevenitz, Kurt-Fritz von	Feb. 1, 1942	Aug. 31, 1898	Dorf Kreuth/Ober-Bayern.	Athens, German Ministry	Counsellor of Legation.
4659678	Greulich, Helmut Dr	May 1, 1937	Oct. 24, 1906	Posen	Athens	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
5509679	Grimm, Rudolf	Sept. 1, 1937	Aug. 28, 1919	Stulhow	Athens/ Deutsch. wiss. Inst. Odos Rhigillis 20a	Student.
7819060	Gross, Friedrich	Jan. 1, 1940	Mar. 27, 1906	Altmünsterol	Athens, German school	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
2548695	Gründel, Edgar	Aug. 1, 1935	Aug. 17, 1913	Hamburg	Candia-Crete	Clerk.
3453628	Grundmand, Kimon	May 1, 1934	Aug. 6, 1891	Athens	Athens, Phidias 1	Reichs Government employee.
7055147	Güdner, Antonie	Aug. 1, 1939	June 21, 1883	Keipzig	Athens Agion Nehelion 56	Governess.
4931792	Haack, Hans Dr	May 1, 1937	Aug. 11, 1891	Treptow	Athens	Secondary-school teacher.
7055152	Hager, Anna	Aug. 1, 1939	July 1, 1915	München	Thessalonike Odes Polonias 3	Stenotypist.
7024350	Haesele, Kurt Werner	Mar. 1, 1939	Jan. 27, 1902	Wien	Athens	Language instructor.
1026047	Hammer, Carl	Apr. 1, 1932	Feb. 14, 1909	München	Athens, Nikikara 14	Merchant.
1326352	Harms, Siegfried	Dec. 1, 1932	May 8, 1907	Lübeck	Athens	Do.
7685474	Heindl, Franz	July 1, 1940	Nov. 19, 1901	Wien	Nia Smyrna b. Athens	Engineer.
6078870	Heine, Erich	June 1, 1938	Jan. 9, 1903	Leipzig	Athens, Intercontinentale 1	Merchant.
5092605	Heinrich, Else	May 1, 1937	Sept. 19, 1909	Skarlin	Athens	Teacher.
5284898	Heinrich, Kurt	do	May 22, 1907	Potsdam	do	Graduate merchant.
3280921	Heitmann, *Hans*, Edgar	June 1, 1933	June 27, 1885	Hamburg	Salonika, Strasse Meg. Alexandros No. 1	Ship broker.
2669908	Heitmann, Julie	Oct. 1, 1935	Dec. 6, 1890	do	Salonika	Teacher.
3454692	Helm, Rudolf Dr	June 1, 1934	Aug. 23, 1902	Lübeck	Salonika, Konstantinon Melenikon 92	German Instructor.
1730420	Helmer, Eduard	June 1, 1933	Mar. 1, 1898	Liebotschan	Salonika, rue 26 Oktobre	Master brewer.
7055148	Helmer, Marie	Aug. 1, 1939	Nov. 13, 1898	Saaz	Thessalonike	None.
7009699	Herms, Karl	Sept. 1, 1938	Sept. 7, 1920	Schwedt	Cavalla b/Fa. Jürgen-W. Fahl	Do.
1730123	Hempel, Karl Bernhard	June 1, 1933	Nov. 18, 1893	Salonika	Salonika, Kawakia 11	Clerk.
5518182	Hering, Louis Johannes	Apr. 1, 1938	Apr. 25, 1879	Oberhohndorf	Athens, Stadion 45	Merchant.
3454984	Heyer, Helene	June 1, 1934	July 12, 1905	Staffelstein	Athens, Odos Nikis 25	Wet nurse.
6990799	Hieke, Karl	Oct. 1, 1938	Dec. 27, 1895	Wien	Athens, Odysseus, Androutsou 4	Master brewer.
7451299	Hille, Bernhard	Feb. 1, 1940	Mar. 18, 1913	Dortmund	Athens, Foreign Office	Propaganda section.
3453633	Hintze, Sophie	May 1, 1934	Apr. 29, 1875	Essen	Athens, Arachovis 45	Teacher.
7220042	Höfflinghaus, Hans	Oct. 1, 1938	Mar. 25, 1875	Lünen	Athens, Valtetzionstr. 4	Merchant.
7050644	Jäck, Alfred	May 1, 1939	Jan. 17, 1902	Pforzheim	Athens, Karitzistr. 6/4	Mechanic.
3398301	Jaeschke, Kurt	Jan. 1, 1934	Oct. 8, 1902	Labiau	Athens, Leof. Singrou	Merchant.
8128078	Jedermann, Rudolf	Dec. 1, 1940	June 2, 1882	Istanbul	Athens, Eressustr. 18	Cashier.
3722493	Junghans, Marga	May 1, 1936	Mar. 25, 1905	Wuppertal-Barmen	Athens	Private teacher.
3454981	Kaatzach, Felix *Walter*	June 1, 1934	Feb. 14, 1902	Leipzig	Athens, Ellispaston No. 55	Graphic artist.
7025315	Kaemmereit, Ludwig	Apr. 1, 1939	Oct. 1, 1889	Hamburg	Candia Odostesoff (Insel Crete)	Clerk.
1734734	Kaier, Dr. Eugen	May 1, 1933	Sept. 7, 1906	Schapbach	Salonika	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
7558480	Kamysek, Karl	Mar. 1, 1940	Nov. 23, 1902	Ohlau	Athens, "Luftgaukommando"	Administrative clerk.
1729539	Karamitsou, Dr. Theodor	June 1, 1933	Aug. 10, 1880	Serres	Salonika Leoforos Nikis 55	Physician.
3733408	Kaspar, Dr. Hermann	Aug. 1, 1936	Mar. 30, 1906	Blumenau	Athens, Arachovisstr. 11	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
8127425	Kasper, Hermann	Oct. 1, 1940	June 13, 1887	Huchenfeld	Athens, Arachovis 11	Office clerk.
3710114	Kaufmann, Margarethe	May 1, 1936	Sept. 9, 1907	Limburg (Lahn)	Salonika, Odos Sporadon 4	None.
3455002	Keller, Georg	June 1, 1934	Aug. 27, 1914	Boudja b/Payrne	Patras, Bourlomius	Clerk.
4371404	Kessler, K. *Richard*	May 1, 1937	Dec. 2, 1901	Schlüchtern	Athens (i. Fa. Athanil AG.)	Do.
7111942	Kirchner, Edmund Iwan	Sept. 1, 1939	Jan. 6, 1900	Komotau	Athens, Odos Hikou 4	Editor.
6899937	Kirchner, Erika	Apr. 1, 1939	Nov. 15, 1912	Grazz	Athens	Housewife.
2479398	Kissing, Dr. Walter	May 1, 1933	Jan. 21, 1898	Barmen	do	Engineer.
1547726	Klaiber, Emil	do	May 16, 1889	Schwenningen	Salonika, Perichevs 2	Merchant.
5518142	do	Apr. 1, 1938	Aug. 19, 1916	do	Thessalonike	Clerk.
3402181	Klaiber, Maria	Feb. 1, 1934	Jan. 15, 1895	do	Salonika, Perikleosstr. 2	Housewife.
1489988	Kloebe, Friedrich Karl	Apr. 1, 1933	June 11, 1904	Saarbrücken	Athens, Fidion 5	Engineer.
3398295	Klob, Martin	Jan. 1, 1934	June 21, 1883	Amberg	Athens, St. Irene Platz 3	Merchant.
3243616	Köberle, Hans	May 1, 1933	Aug. 29, 1914	Esslingen	Athens	Technician.
3280197	Kögler, Fr. Wilh	July 1, 1933	Dec. 1, 1888	Belgern	Athens "Deutsche Lufthansa"	Master workman.
3695474	Koellreutter, Herbert	Feb. 1, 1936	July 23, 1914	Freiburg i. Br	Athens, Odos Sima 25	None.

Nazi Party membership records—Continued

GREECE—continued

Membership No.	Name	Date entered	Birth date	Birthplace	Last address recorded	Occupation
6990800	Krell, Alexander	Oct. 1, 1938	Feb. 14, 1884	Cilli	Athens, Od. Omiron 16	Innkeeper.
7024342	Krell, Anna	Mar. 1, 1939	June 10, 1890	U. Markersdorf	Athens, Odos Omiron 16	Do.
3710115	Krüger, Else	May 1, 1936	Dec. 24, 1899	Wiesbaden	Salonika, Odos Sporadon 4	None.
3391273	Krüger, Erich	Oct. 1, 1933	Jan. 7, 1882	Walsleben	do	Engineer.
5518141	do	Apr. 1, 1938	Dec. 15, 1893	Weissenfels	Candia Creta	Language instructor.
3733361	Kübler, Dr. Karl	Aug. 1, 1936	July 4, 1897	Simmersfeld	Athens, Phidiaxstr. 1	Doctor of philosophy.
7685473	Kull, Dr. Herbert	July 1, 1940	Mar. 14, 1909	Graudenz	Athens, Sokratousstr. 28	Pharmacist.
1547852	Kunz, Eugen	May 1, 1933	May 27, 1915	Athens	Athens, Theseusstr. 9	Student.
3733362	Kunz, Lorenz	Aug. 1, 1936	Aug. 13, 1910	do	Athens, Odos Thisseos 9	Clerk.
7202828	Kunze, Karl	Jan. 1, 1940	Sept. 28, 1889	Schönefeld	Salonika, Leoharis Georgi 16	Master printer.
2701390	Lau, Werner	May 1, 1933	July 19, 1908	Altona	Athens, Odos arachoris 11	Assessor (court).
6009188	Lauerer, Eva	Jan. 1, 1938	Aug. 24, 1909	Mühldorf	Salonika	Teacher.
7685762	Lauter, Friedrich	July 1, 1940	Feb. 6, 1912	Ansbach	Athens, Sinastr. 66	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
270972	Lehner, Ludwig	May 1, 1933	Feb. 5, 1899	München	Athens	Merchant.
7457686	Leiner, Arthur	Mar. 1, 1940	Oct. 6, 1885	Schöntal	Salonika, Tsimiski 49	Official.
3526069	Lessny Krafft, Helmut	July 3, 1938	Dec. 17, 1905	Heinrichau	Athens	Clerk.
3401293	Leyh, Fritz	Mar. 1, 1934	Jan. 25, 1895	Cannstatt	Athens, Odos Akamantos	Factory manager.
4456824	Löhr, Ernst	Oct. 1, 1937	June 4, 1910	Biebrich	Athens, Sokratesstr. 28/I	Merchant.
2896059	Lüder, Wolfgang	May 1, 1933	Dec. 31, 1905	Dresden	Athens, German school	Assistant secondary school teacher.
7421393	Magel, Johann	Feb. 1, 1940	July 28, 1893	Eisenzicken	Volos, Athinastr. 78	Bricklayer.
3280917	Marcks, Auguste	July 1, 1933	Apr. 11, 1889	Oldenburg	Salonika, König Georg No. 74	Teacher.
7055145	Merkel, Rolf	Aug. 1, 1939	June 11, 1901	Freiburg	Athens (Psychiko Krinon 12)	Agent.
3401297	Merkle, Emil	Mar. 1, 1934	Feb. 28, 1907	Pforzheim	Athens, Kornarou 6	Setter (jewel).
3946876	Meyer, Dr. Kurt	July 1, 1937	May 9, 1909	Leipzig	Athens, Odos Asklipion 3	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
5612422	Meysen, Eugen	May 1, 1937	Jan. 11, 1906	Heidelberg	Athens, German school	Assessor (court).
133314	Meysen, Trudel	June 1, 1929	Apr. 24, 1905	do	do	None.
1413339	Möller, Otto	Apr. 1, 1933	June 17, 1893	Berlin	Athens, Stadion 11	Merchant.
1490856	Mohr, Aloys	do	June 26, 1898	Dortmund-Hörde	Athens, Odos Peta 12	Airfield manager, "D. L. H."
4455916	Moseke, Maria	May 1, 1937	Feb. 18, 1905	Höxter	Athens, German school	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
7055149	Müller, Friedrich	Aug. 1, 1939	Jan. 9, 1895	Salonika	Thessalonika Nermion 26	Machinist.
8336451	Müller, Hans	Oct. 1, 1940	Dec. 16, 1902	Wippra	Grube Kirka b. Dede-Agatsch	Graduate mining engineer.
3455001	Müller, Karl Georg	June 1, 1934	Feb. 7, 1859	Heidelberg	Patros, Odos Villenam	Merchant.
8358535	Müller, Otto	June 1, 1941	Apr. 24, 1906	Wien	Athens	Editor.
1732009	Müller, Rudolf Erich	Apr. 1, 1933	Oct. 1, 1911	Sofia	Thessalonike	Clerk.
1574743	Naumann, Johann Georg	do	June 24, 1902	Zwönitz	Athens-Kalithea	Master workman.
8742443	Meumann, Margarete	Oct. 1, 1941	June 30, 1903	Berlin	Athens, German Embassy	Reichsbank clerk.
4746530	Nitschke, Dr. Otfried	May 1, 1937	Oct. 14, 1912	Hirschberg	Piraeus	Student.
5518149	Nolte, Helene	Apr. 1, 1938	May 18, 1913	Wuppertal	Athens, Joulinnoustr. 36	Nursery teacher.
2200916	Oechler, Dr. Erich	May 1, 1933	July 17, 1908	Darmstadt	Athens	Pharmacist.
3936346	Pache, Emmy	June 1, 1937	Oct. 5, 1883	Merzdorf	Athens/Psychiko	Housewife.
6990823	Palm, Richard	Oct. 1, 1938	Nov. 29, 1886	Wien	Patras Iteai	Farmer.
860183	Paulmichl, Alfons	Mar. 1, 1932	Mar. 15, 1904	Kisslegg	Athens, Leof Singrou 41	Mechanic.
860116	Paulmichl, Rudolf	do	May 30, 1907	do	do	Do.
3710116	Paulus, Marie	May 1, 1936	Aug. 10, 1895	Athens	Salonika, German Consulate	None.
6077708	Pfann, Roland	Sept. 1, 1937	June 30, 1903	Nürnberg	No address given	Merchant.
3398287	Pommerencke, Fritz	Jan. 1, 1934	Aug. 23, 1907	Heidenheim	Athens, Hippo Kratous 23	Book dealer.
7048768	Ponweiser, Ludwig	Apr. 1, 1939	Aug. 14, 1898	Pittena	Athens	Construction foreman.
4056149	Quistorf, Hermann jun	May 1, 1937	Oct. 22, 1909	Hamburg	Patras/AG. Nikolau 36	Language instructor.
1490932	Raidel, Gottfried W	Apr. 1, 1933	Aug. 17, 1904	Lechnitz/Siebenb	Athens, Hymetos 24/2	Machine builder.
6087486	Rauchheld, Hans	July 1, 1938	Aug. 28, 1900	Oldenburg	Patras	Paper technician.
7018425	Reseck, Gertrud	Sept. 1, 1938	Apr. 17, 1918	Kuschlau	Athens, Junkerswerke	Clerk.
3397939	Riechof, Helmut	Jan. 1, 1934	Feb. 26, 1908	Lübeck	Athens, Achäou 10	Do.
3936449	Riedl, Dr. Georg	June 1, 1937	Feb 14, 1895	Patoas	Athens, Akademiestr. 78	Director.
332632	Riehle, Friedr. Wilh	Dec. 1, 1931	Jan. 11, 1908	Neuwied	Athens, Philotheis 17	Clerk.
3733364	Rietz, Max	Aug. 1, 1936	Jan. 24, 1882	Berlin	Athens, Konstantinopoleos 327	Printer.
2655266	Roed, Hans	Oct. 1, 1935	May 3, 1906	Hamburg	Athens	Electro engineer.
3453631	Roefer, Burghard	May 1, 1934	July 6, 1912	Emden	Athens, Panepistiou 6	Clerk.
8127585	Rölke, Max	Oct. 1, 1940	Jan. 29, 1909	Bautzen	Athens	Workshop foreman.
3477507	Rösner, Curt	Jan. 1, 1936	Feb. 5, 1888	Berlin	Athens, Palaon Phaliron Najadan 20	Editor.
3454994	Rohrer, Alfred	June 1, 1934	July 21, 1898	Athens	Athens, Petzovon 3	Merchant.
3391267	Rohrer, Willy		Sept. 21, 1903	do	Salonika, Chalkidikis 38	None.
5518280	Romain, Alfred	Apr. 1, 1938	Mar. 22, 1917	Kassel	Athens, Alt Phaleron Odos Musen 20	Student.
3397934	Romain, Lili	Jan. 1, 1934	Nov. 26, 1888	do	Athens, Arachovis 9	Housewife.
8225903	Romain, Marianne	May 1, 1941	Feb. 20, 1920	Jena-Taur	Athens, Arachovis 11	None.
3453630	Rospert, Robert	May 1, 1934	Aug. 22, 1903	Salonika	Thessalonike	Auto machinist.
2020070	Roth, Gustav	May 1, 1933	Apr. 6, 1912	Mainz-Kastel	do	Assistant secondary school teacher.
1942398	Rudolph, Walter	do	Feb. 16, 1908	Kohlfurt	Athens	Do.
1729444	Ruggiero, Felix	June 1, 1933	Apr. 20, 1903	Salonika	Athens, Stadion 11	Dental technician.
3398462	Ruggiero, Robert	Jan. 1, 1934	Feb. 22, 1901	do	Salonika, Perikleous 1	Secretary.
3398296	Sasse, Dr. Friedrich Wilhelm.	do	Jan. 21, 1892	Röhlingen	Athens, Panuthos 47	Graduate farmer.
5558230	Sauer, Albin	May 1, 1937	July 22, 1912	Augsburg	Thessalonike/P. O. B. 225	Assistant secondary school teacher.
3766039	Sauer, Dorothee	Dec. 1, 1936	Apr. 4, 1909	Kiel	Thessalonike	Teacher.
7989133	Sauerstein, Karl	Oct. 1, 1940	Oct. 27, 1895	Abertham	Athens b/Bevollm. d. Reiches	Master workman.
3401065	Sauerwald, Wilhelm	Mar. 1, 1934	Nov. 9, 1889	Waltersdorf	Naousa-Macedonia	Electrician.
2386727	Schäfer, Ernst	May 1, 1933	June 30, 1902	Trankebar/Indien	Athens	Theology licentiate.
2781738	Schäfer, Rudolf	do	Apr. 2, 1912	Werder	do	Electrician.
3453627	Schalies, Adolf	May 1, 1934	July 20, 1910	Berlin	Athens, Stadion 11	Assembler.
3046738	Schaller, Artur	May 1, 1933	Mar. 5, 1899	Seifersdorf	Athens	Police sergeant.
2582093	Schartau, Otto	do	Oct. 5, 1910	Posen	Athens, Leophoros Vasilissis Sophias 2 German Ministry.	Student.
8128077	Schauff, Karl	Dec. 1, 1940	Sept. 5, 1903	Barmen	Athens	Business manager.
1104971	Schellenberg, Walter H	Oct. 21, 1938	Mar. 13, 1894	Wiesbaden	do	Merchant.
3398297	Schlagdenhaufen, Gustav Martin.	Jan. 1, 1934	Dec. 4, 1892	Strassburg	Athens, Philitios 11	Do.
3762628	Schmidt, Adalbert	Dec. 1, 1936	June 8, 1905	Frankfurt a/M	Athens, Derwinion 41	Newspaper secretary.
3488014	Schmidt, Heinrich	June 19, 1942	Nov. 3, 1911	Hamborn	Athens	None.
3398312	Schmitt, Adam	Jan. 1, 1934	Feb. 15, 1893	Bamberg	Athens, Asklipiou 64	Storekeeper's assistant.
7024343	Schrader, Anna	Mar. 1, 1939	Sept. 15, 1870	Athens	Athens, Notara 38a	Teacher.
5505759	Schreck, Anneliese	Feb. 1, 1938	Aug. 2, 1910	Pfullendorf	Athens	Assistant secondary school teacher.
3918256	Schröter, Werner	May 1, 1937	Apr. 25, 1904	Berlin	Athens, Rue Thessalonikis	Engineer.
8739622	Schulisch, Artur	July 1, 1941	Jan. 24, 1889	Forst	Athens, Nea Llossion Platia	Technician.
7685541	Schumann, Martha	July 1, 1940	May 20, 1908	Dresden	Athens, Marnistr. 37	Correspondent.
6153614	Schwager, Dr. Helmut	May 1, 1937	Apr. 3, 1905	Leipzig	Corfu	Language instructor.
5518147	Schwarz, Erich	Apr. 1, 1938	Feb. 7, 1892	Berlin	Athens	Chief engineer.
7055146	Schwarz, Paula	Aug. 1, 1939	Sept. 24, 1909	Aachen	Athens (Psychiko Odos Narkisso 7)	Housewife.
7024344	Schweder, Ludwig	Mar. 1, 1939	Apr. 10, 1885	Brünn	Athens, Nea Sunyrni 159/12	Chemist.

Nazi Party membership records—Continued

GREECE—continued

Membership No.	Name	Date entered	Birth date	Birthplace	Last address recorded	Occupation
5505842	Schweitzer, Richard	Feb. 1, 1938	Sept. 18, 1903	Bärwalde	Athens, Odos Stadion 11	Engineer.
5333268	Schwörbel, Herbert	May 1, 1937	Nov. 11, 1911	Thessalonike	Athens	Editor.
3733412	Sgraja, Martha	Aug. 1, 1936	Aug. 21, 1895	Athens	Athens (Akademiestr. 29)	Governess.
7077351	Siebert, Ernst	Sept. 1, 1939	June 5, 1903	Brandenburg	Athens, Aristippou 2	Printer.
4053532	Siegmund, Reinhard	May 1, 1937	Sept. 21, 1906	Harburg-Wbg	Athens German school	Assistant secondary school teacher.
406184	Sorg, Ina	Jan. 1, 1931	Jan. 31, 1887	Pforsheim	Velos German Consulate	Private teacher.
3280505	Spietschka, Georg	June 1, 1933	Jan. 20, 1890	Neugarten	Piraeus, Metazastr. 23/I	Shipbuilding engineer.
1814173	Starke, Heinz Hugo	May 1, 1933	May 26, 1901	Lübeck	Athens, Amerkis 4	Representative (business).
7262046	Stekl, Anna Maria	Nov. 1, 1939	Nov. 14, 1906	Dubrovnik	Athens, Feldpost-Nr. 00886 A. O	Children's nur
6796699	Stelzig, Dr. Ernst	Nov. 1, 1938	Apr. 30, 1910	Oberaltstadt	Salonika	Professor.
7148545	Steven, Helga	Sept. 1, 1939	Aug. 15, 1920	Neustadt/Aisch	Athens	None.
1170348	Stickel, Oskar Erwin	July 1, 1932	Oct. 30, 1888	Chemnitz/Sa	Athens-Cavalla, Justinianou 8	Merchant.
4820128	Strasser, Dr. Robert	May 1, 1937	July 13, 1913	Stuttgart	Athens German school	Assistant secondary school teacher.
3285733	Struensee, Karl Aug. von	Oct. 1, 1933	Aug. 26, 1906	Stettin	Athens "Lufthansa"	Assistant airfield manager.
7025336	Stützel, Willy	Apr. 1, 1939	Sept. 8, 1900	Nürnberg	Athens, Miltiadonstr. 5	Agent.
2402324	Susseroth, Alice	May 1, 1933	Oct. 12, 1905	Asensburg	Athens, Rue Phidias	Housewife.
7112191	Susserott, Hans	Sept. 1, 1933	June 15, 1911	Allenstein/Ostpr	Olympia, "Deutsch. Grabungshaus"	Archeologist.
5518535	Thoss, Albert	Mar. 1, 1938	Dec. 21, 1884	Leipzig	Corfu	Lithographer.
6314466	Trofer, Willibald	May 1, 1938	Feb. 6, 1908	Quarb	Patras, Paper factory Egl	Rolling-machine operator.
4463658	Tschira, Arnold	May 1, 1937	Oct. 17, 1910	Freiburg Br	Athens, Phidiasstr. 2	Assistant.
6087411	Urff, Franziska	July 1, 1938	Jan. 31, 1903	Brünn	Athens (Evias 74)	Teacher.
7112184	Viezeus, Axel	Sept. 1, 1933	Mar. 24, 1897	Berlin-Charlottenburg	Athens, Dim-Kallifrona 76	Clerk.
3280920	Vock, Ernst	July 1, 1933	Oct. 5, 1888	Salonika	Salonika, Aristotelous 2	Agent.
4794520	Vonderlage, Bernard, doctor of philosophy.	May 1, 1937	Aug. 19, 1896	Hamburg	Thessalonike, German school	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
7025380	Vorauer, Ferdiand	Apr. 1, 1939	Dec. 17, 1903	Graz	Athens, Kyr. Lonkareos	Merchant.
3454975	Wagner, Hermann	June 1, 1934	Feb. 26, 1895	Stuttgart	Athens, Oesidion 1	Photographer.
4456825	Walther, Heinrich	Oct. 1, 1937	Apr. 17, 1892	Valparaiso	Athens, Kleomenosstr. 3	Commissioner.
9290285	Warwarovsky, Anton	Jan. 1, 1941	Feb. 21, 1909	Wien	Athens, Reichsbahnfunkstelle	Electrotechnician.
7077350	Wawra, Alma	Sept. 1, 1939	Sept. 1, 1900	Lauterwasser	Athens, Leofores Alexandras 17	Governess.
1275598	Wawretzko, Günther	Oct. 1, 1932	Oct. 21, 1903	Berlin-Charlottenburg	Athens	Consultate secretary.
3222565	Weber, Berta	May 1, 1933	Aug. 13, 1901	Alt Nuifra	Athens, Piräusstr. 1 Dt. Archaeolog. Inst	Home economics teacher.
7024345	Weber, Heinrich	Mar. 1, 1939	Apr. 15, 1909	Frankenhausen	Athens	Architect.
7024355	Winkler, Rudolf	do	May 16, 1889	Frankfurt/M	Volos, Odos Constanta 2	Master miller.
3454995	Wirsching, Philipp	June 1, 1934	Mar. 6, 1896	do	Athens, Vorreon 15a	Merchant.
5530067	Wolf, Hans Götz	May 1, 1937	June 12, 1913	Neu Zetysch	Athens (Arachobistr. 11)	Teacher.
3398304	Wrede, Dr. Walther	Jan. 1, 1934	June 5, 1893	Marburg	Athens, Phidiasstr. 1	Secretary.
3454982	Zahn, Angela	June 1, 1934	Dec. 19, 1904	Calamata	Athens, Philoteis 17	Clerk.
5759901	Zeller, Eberhard, doctor of medicine.	May 1, 1937	Sept. 3, 1909	Stuttgart	Athens-D. W. I. Rigillis 29	Physician.

GREECE—SUPPLEMENTARY LIST NO. 1

[NOTE.—Italics are corrections to the main list]

3936347	Bärwald, Dorothea	June 1, 1937	Dec. 18, 1914	Berlin	Athens, Psychiko	Maid.
3686409	Baltzer, Emil Dr.					*Director (Siemens AG).*
7024815	Bertram, Otto			*Frankfurt/M*	*Athens, Propylaeon 36*	*Merchant.*
3454992	Block, Paul				*Athens, Chr. Smyrnis 23*	
3282140	Böttcher, Rudolf	June 1, 1933	Oct. 2, 1901	Erfurt	Athens, Patissia, AG. Louis 75	Electrician.
1546100	Bohnenberger, Hermann			*Bückenbroun*	*Athens, Kornarou 7*	
2738087	Burse, Winfried	Oct. 1, 1934	May 21, 1905	Berlin	Athens	Merchant.
3398303	Camphausen, Wilhelm	Apr. 30, 1936	May 11, 1902	Rheydt	Athens, Sokrateus 28	Do.
3398294	Dyckhoff, Hans	Jan. 1, 1934	Oct. 7, 1891	Paderborn	Alt-Phaleron/37 Terpsichoris	Do.
952059	Dziobek, Ernst			*Malga*		
1411559	Eggelin, Hans	Apr. 1, 1933	July 31, 1895	Braunschweig	Alt-Phaleron, Odos Protus 22	Graduate engineer.
1077293	Eggenhofer, Sepp	June 1, 1932	Oct. 21, 1902	Planegg	Athens, Asklipiou 3	Dentist.
3401290	Ehrlich, Rudolf	Mar. 1, 1934	Apr. 29, 1897	Tarnowitz	Athens, Tennisklub Athens	Sports teacher.
1729813	Feiler, Karl			*Mewsheim/Wttbg*		
5092605	Heinrich, Else				*Athens, Panepistemion 17*	*Housewife.*
1730420	Helmer, Eduard			*Liebotschau*	*Salonika, Brauerei Fix*	
7055148	Helmer, Marie					*Housewife.*
3454984	Heyer, Helene				*Athens, Stadion 11*	*Nurse.*
858587	Heyer, Karl	Apr. 1, 1932	Mar. 8, 1902	Elbing/Westpr	Athens, Stadion 11	Cable assembler.
1730970	Hoenicke, Walter	June 1, 1933	Mar. 21, 1905	Anbonne	Salonika, Metropolstr. 79	Merchant.
3398288	Huch, Ilse	Jan. 1, 1934	Dec. 23, 1897	Braunschweig	Patras, c/o E. B. Manegold Dimitropoulos	Governess.
2822131	Idel, Hans (M, I)	Feb. 21, 1942	Oct. 30, 1913	Konigsberg	Athens	Plumber.
1729953	Iffland, Johannes	July 1, 1933	Nov. 20, 1902	Erbach	Salonika, Harilaos Odos Marathonos	Teacher.
3733360	Just, Otto	Aug. 1, 1936	Oct. 1, 1906	Duisburg	Balton 14, Ampelokipaus/Athens	Master machinist.
3454981	Kastzsch, Filix *Walter*				*Athens, Ellisponton 55*	
7050632	Pirmann, Franz	May 1, 1939	Jan. 26, 1894	Klagenfurt	Tppokratus 92	Gunmaker.
3391267	Rohner, Willy	Oct. 1, 1933				*Farmer.*
1729133	Ruggiere, Hubert	June 1, 1933	Dec. 4, 1897	Salonika	Salonika, Perikleostr. 1	Dentist.
3398297	Schlagdenhaufen Gust. Martin.				*Athens, Charitosstr. 27*	
3762628	Schmidt, Adalbert				*Athens, Nikitara 14*	
1275150	Schmidt, Eugen	Oct. 1, 1932	Nov. 18, 1896	Brünn	Castella a/Puräus	Engineer.
3398312	Schmitt, Adam					*Merchant.*
2985551	Schmude, Erika	May 1, 1933	Mar. 8, 1899	Bromberg	Athens, Pangrate Ifigratus	Medical technician (assistant).
1115292	Schrage, Georg	Mar. 1, 1932	Mar. 22, 1899	Nordenham	Athens, Alitsis 13	Merchant.
5505759	Schreck, Anneliese				*Athens, Odos Aradiowis 11*	
7025335	Schwab, Franz	Apr. 1, 1939	Mar. 9, 1911	Domsdorf	Athens, Petralona, Ktissifontos 4a	Machinist.
5518147	Schwarz, Erich				*Athens, Stadion 11*	

GREECE—SUPPLEMENTARY LIST NO. 2

[NOTE.—Italics are corrections to the main list or supplementary list No. 1. (M) after the name indicates that the name is in the NSDAP general card file, (2) indicates it is among the applications for membership]

1730426	Arnold, Walter (M)	July 1, 1933	Jan. 5, 1894	Kändler	Salonika (Thessalonike), Agnoston Stratiotou 14	Master butcher.
3744806	Behrens, Wilhelm (2)	June 6, 1936	July 3, 1895	Soest/Westf	Piräus, Etairia-Lysas naton	Engineer.
4009475	Brettschneider, Lotte (2)	Feb. 21, 1937	Mar. 10, 1909	Solingen-Ohligs	Salonika, Odos-Logotheton 5	Housewife.
3946872	Eisenreich, Josefine (2)	May 1, 1937	Apr. 6, 1891	Bad Aibling	Athens, Arachovis 11	Teacher.
3752043	Flachowsky, Johannes (2)	Sept. 1, 1936	Apr. 15, 1897	Gera/Thür	Athens 8, Polemi 23	Weaving technician.
3771619	Groos, Ursula (2)	Nov. 3, 1936	Sept. 18, 1902	Trier	Athens, Arachovis 11	Assistant secondary-school teacher.

Nazi Party membership records—Continued

GREECE—SUPPLEMENTARY LIST NO. 2—continued

Membership No.	Name	Date entered	Birth date	Birth place	Last address recorded	Occupation
3771620	Hauff, Elisabeth von (2)	Nov. 11, 1936	Mar. 26, 1901	Heilbronn	Athens, Arachovis 11	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
3766039	Heers, Dorothee (2)	Oct. 7, 1936	Apr. 4, 1909	Kiel	Salonika, Analypseos 14b	Teacher.
3936448	Helgenberger, Konrad (2)	Jan. 27, 1937	Dec. 7, 1900	Eberswalde	Palaion Faliron, Amfitritis 23	Graduate farmer.
3946874	Hess, Fritz (2)	May 9, 1937	July 10, 1905	Cunersdorf	Athens, Karneadou 26	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
1730075	Hoenicke, Walter (M)					
3454986	Hüger, Leopold (M)	June 1, 1934	Nov. 9, 1902	Wien	Athens, Aristidonstr. 1	Merchant.
3733359	Just, Hermann (2)	Dec. 1, 1934	Sept. 2, 1909	Hamburg	Ktima Traclones, Chlyvada	Installer.
7024351	Ketzel, Karl Alfred (M)	Mar. 1, 1939	Feb. 10, 1887	Dresden	Volos, Odos Glavanis	Master machinist.
3397946	Kindermann, Carl, Dr. (M)	Jan. 1, 1934	Mar. 9, 1896	Heidelberg	Athens, Odos Sina 66	Pastor.
790490	Kloebe, Helene (M)	Jan. 1, 1932	July 23, 1882	Minden	Athens, Odos Pheidon 5	None.
3455000	Knorpp, Karl (M)	June 1, 1934	Nov. 15, 1894	Nd. Kausungen	Patrai, Papierfabrik EGL	Paper maker.
1413193	Köhler, Arthur (M)	Mar. 1, 1933	Sept. 5, 1896	Goidinowe Krs. Militsch	Athens, Agamemnonstr. 2a Kalithea (Peronia)	Toolmaker.
1332396	Köppler, Willy (M)	Oct. 1, 1932	Aug. 12, 1887	Mannheim	Athens, Alkamenus 36	Merchant.
1275315	Konstantin, Syris (M)	....do....	Dec. 31, 1909	Alt-Schalkowitz	Kalitthea, Platia 9	Wheelwright.
7685733	Korbacher, Friedrich (M)	July 1, 1940	Apr. 1, 1898	Hannau	Salonika (Thessalonike) Kosmopolit	Technician.
3454993	Krais, Wolfgang (2)	Mar. 27, 1934	June 7, 1912	Stuttgart	Athens-Konkaki, Agh, Nicolaus 44	Medical candidate.
3752028	Kropf, Wilhelm (2)	Jan. 10, 1936	June 25, 1910	Tresben/Molde	Patrai, Paper factory E. G. Ladopoulos	Engineer.
3773812	Krüger, Richard Georg (2)	June 6, 1934	Feb. 7, 1860	Tarnowitz/O. Schl	Kanea, Insel Kreta	Merchant and consul.
3752048	Kruschwitz, Max (2)	Dec. 29, 1934	Apr. 15, 1880	Teichdorf/Thür	Trikkala, Thessalien	Electro technician and business manager.
3397943	Lazar, Paul Franz (M)	Jan. 1, 1934	Nov. 29, 1901	Konstantinopel	Athens, Kiflesia Profilis-Ilias	Merchant.
3397945	Lex, Franz (M)	....do....	Oct. 26, 1898	Graz	Athens-Odos-Hektoros 3/Parodos Tenedon 47	Private official.
3397935	Leyh, Carl (M)	....do....	Aug. 18, 1897	Bad Cannstatt	Patrai, Odos Spyr, Basilarou	Engineer.
3402745	Leyh, Emilie (M)	Feb. 1, 1934	May 17, 1898	....do....	Patrai, Odos Spyr. Basiliatou	Housewife.
3946875	Lucken, Hans (2)	May 17, 1937	Sept. 5, 1904	Bardewisch/Oldenburg	Athens, Acropole Palace Hotel or Frankfurt/M., Bleich-Str. 40.	Graduate engineer.
3733409	Nordmann, Claus (2)	Apr. 5, 1936	Dec. 1, 1908	Kronprinzen-koog	Athens Odos Arachovis 11	Assistant secondary school teacher.
3733411	Rauscher, Christian (2)	Apr. 22, 1936	Jan. 3, 1894	Nürnberg	Korfu	Lithographer.
3733363	Rehhäusser, Tilde (2)	Mar. 4, 1936	Aug. 2, 1904	Ludwigshafen/Rh	Athens, Bysariond 6	Youth leader.
3936449	Riedl, Georg J. (2)			*Patrai*		
4009477	Rottke, Martin (2)	June 3, 1937	Feb. 8, 1910	Berlin-Charlottenburg	Thessalonike, German school, Vassilissis Olga 70	Assistant secondary school teacher.
2985551	Schmude, Erika (M)			*Rosenberg*		
3733365	Schug, Gottfried (2)	Nov. 28, 1934	May 12, 1901	Chemnitz	Athens-Kalithea, Odos Iracleus 142	Textile chemist.
3733410	Simons, Henny (2)	Apr. 23, 1936	May 30, 1894	Elberfeld	Athens, Daphnomili 14	Teacher.
3391140	Strässer, Heinrich (M)		Nov. 18, 1884	Barmen	Athens	Guild master.
1547827	Strecker, Karl (M)	May 1, 1933	Sept. 7, 1891	Reutlingen	Athens, Henokratous 33	None.
3733368	Thoni, Heinrich (2)	Mar. 29, 1936	Oct. 30, 1898	Augsburg	Piräus, Thrakis-Kontras	Textile technician.
3776442	Thüsing, Clemens (2)	Dec. 2, 1936	Dec. 16, 1899	Braunschweig	Neu-Phaleron, Kifissou 4	Graduate engineer.
3398308	Venzlaff, Willy (M)	Jan. 1, 1934	June 25, 1904	Berlin	Athens, Alt-Phaleron, Alkyonis 25	Merchant.
3744805	Wagner, Hans (2)	May 28, 1936	Dec. 31, 1897	Konja Koprulu	Athens, Tal-Phaleron, Hotel Carlton	Journalist.
7025314	Wahl, Franz (M)	Apr. 1, 1939	Apr. 20, 1880	Istanbul	Athens, Odos Stournara 19	Merchant.
3454694	Weindel, Thilo (M)	June 1, 1934	Jan. 5, 1906	Konstantinopel	Salonika (Thessalonike) Platea Kalipoleon 9, Harilau.	Electrotechnician.
3733413	Wende, Hans Martin (2)	May 1, 1936	May 7, 1905	Wohlau/Schles	Athens, Sarandapichu 5	Assistant secondary-school teacher.
3402744	Werner, Max Erich (M)	Feb. 1, 1934	Jan. 7, 1896	Leipzig	Athens-Pangrati, Sini, Bgrones, Tetragonon B. 21	Printer.
4009476	Wetzel, Paul (2)	June 3, 1937	Sept. 22, 1902	Stollberg/Erzgeb	Salonika, Egnatias 124	Master workman.
7024347	Wittmann, Eduard (M)	Mar. 1, 1939	Mar. 4, 1909	Klein-Zell	Patrai, Otomoliostr	Machine operator.
3401291	Wolferts, Helmuth (M)	Mar. 1, 1934	Apr. 28, 1914	Kappel	Athens, Leoforos Alexandras 18	Student of philosophy.
1413098	Zahn, Thekla (M)	Mar. 1, 1933	Sept. 7, 1894	Stühlingen	Athens, Odos Frinichou 8	Housekeeper.
7077349	Zettl, Leopold Paul (2)	Apr. 28, 1939	Oct. 26, 1909	Wien	Piräus, Dropetsona	Engineer.

Mr. Speaker, what does our State Department propose about the known Nazi Party members in Greece and Turkey? What does our State Department know about the present relationships between these Nazis and the present Turkish and Greek Governments? Does our State Department know whether or not any of these men are deliberately stirring up trouble in those countries? Do they know whether or not the great Communist "bugaboo," to use President Truman's word in his letter to Mr. Earle of 2 weeks ago, is being propagated by these Nazi Party members in the accepted Hitler manner? What, Mr. Speaker, are these Nazis doing in Turkey and Greece today? The American people want to know.

I include an item from the Washington Post of April 3 as a part of my remarks:

TRUMAN CALLS REDS IN UNITED STATES JUST "BUGABOO"

PHILADELPHIA, April 2.—George H. Earle, former Minister to Bulgaria and Austria, revealed tonight that President Truman wrote him that communism was a "bugaboo" just 2 weeks before the Chief Executive launched his Greco-Turkish aid program to block Russian infiltrations.

The letter was dated February 28.

Mr. Truman's letter was a reply to one Earle had written to the President informing him that he had decided to resign as head of the American Anti-Communist Association.

The President's letter said:

"I appreciate very much your note of February 26 and I am very happy to be informed of your decision with regard to the American Anti-Communist Association.

"People are very much wrought up about the Communist 'bugaboo,' but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe as far as communism is concerned—we have too many sane people.

"Our Government is made for the welfare of the people and I don't believe there will ever come a time when anyone will really want to overturn it."

Mr. Speaker, sometimes the American people think that our officials in Washington are busy and sometimes I think the American people are right—particularly in regard to the State Department.

Truman's Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there is no mystery behind President Truman's magnificent handling of the most difficult job in the world—the Presidency of the United States. His courage, his common sense, and his ability to solve problems as they arise is becoming well known to the American people. His greatest asset is just being himself—a man of the people, interested in the people, and working always in their behalf. There is no doubt in my mind that he is growing with his responsibilities. As a people we should be proud that we have such a man as Harry Truman to head our Government in these troublous and difficult times.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I insert in the RECORD with unanimous consent, an article from the United States News of March 21, 1947, and the Washington Post of April 7, 1947. These articles indicate not only that the American people are soundly behind the President but also that the standards which he has set indicate a sense of responsibility to his office and that the test which he has faced, he has met and successfully overcome. The straightforwardness, the statesmanship, and the honesty of his approach to our problems are factors which have endeared him to the American people and which will cause our esteem for him to rise still more in the perilous days ahead.

[From the United States News]

THE UPSWING FOR MR. TRUMAN—FORCES BEHIND HIS COMEBACK FROM 32 PERCENT POPULARITY TO 51—ASSURANCE IN MEETING CRISIS—SHIFT FROM PERSONAL ADVISERS TO A CABINET GOVERNMENT

The Nation's greatest mystery lies behind the question: What is happening to Presi-

dent Truman? Old doubts and uncertainties are disappearing. The President is moving with assurance and aplomb into all sorts of grave problems. He is assuming a role of positive leadership. And his popularity is rising steadily.

In spite of an election which gave Congress to the Republicans, Mr. Truman is growing in stature. Many Republicans are praising the frankness with which he put the Greek and Turkish problem before Congress. His relations with Congress often are friendly and cooperative; they lack bitterness even on party matters. And, as a mark of congressional esteem, Mr. Truman is being excepted from the proposed ban against third terms.

A new Truman is emerging, a man entirely different from the fumbling and inept person who was depicted in the campaign speeches of 1946. Watching him in action now, the Democrats are picking up new courage and the Republicans are deciding that he will be no pushover in the next Presidential campaign.

In the disputes of last summer and under the campaign battering of autumn, Mr. Truman's popularity shrank to a point at which only 32 percent of the voters approved of the way he was running the Presidency. Since then, he has climbed steadily, as the chart on page 16 indicates.

Most of his gains have been made since the Republican Congress took over. Between the low point of October and the time Congress convened in January, Mr. Truman picked up only three points on the Gallup polls. He gained 13 more points in January for approval of the job he was doing, and, by March, had brought 51 percent of the voters to the point of saying they would vote for a Democrat for President if the election were held then. For Presidential-election purposes, the strength of Mr. Truman is indistinguishable from that of his party.

During the period in which his popularity was rising Mr. Truman was engaged in a series of works of prime importance. He slugged it out with John L. Lewis, made a bid for cooperation with the Republican Congress, got rid of some of his advisers, discarded most of the war controls, presented a budget which Republicans are finding hard to cut, and chose General of the Army George C. Marshall to be Secretary of State.

Behind this rise in popular esteem lies a story of a changing approach to national problems. Mr. Truman fell heir to a governmental method created to fit the working habits of his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt. It did not fit Mr. Truman. That system has been discarded. A new one is taking its place.

Mr. Roosevelt had developed a highly personalized form of government. He had, from the days of the first brain trust in the 1932 campaign, a group of intimate advisers that often stood closer to him than any Cabinet officer. Numerous jealousies and disputes arose from this operation. Some of them overlapped into the Truman administration. Mr. Truman found that he could not work that way.

A Cabinet Government is being installed to fit Mr. Truman's manner of working. Unofficial advisers play nothing like as important a part in his operations as do members of his Cabinet. His personal inclinations lead him toward a regularity of procedure into which this method fits.

Before the President called in Republicans and the leaders of his own party in Congress for a talk about the Greek and Turkish situation, he held a full-dress Cabinet meeting at which every phase of the problem was thrashed out Methods of handling it were thoroughly discussed. The main course of action was agreed upon at this meeting.

With his course decided, the President began his negotiations with Congress. After discussions with congressional leaders, he took the problem to Capitol Hill in a personal speech to a joint session.

With some variations this is the typical Truman approach to a big problem. This does not mean that Mr. Truman does not consult with experts outside his Cabinet. He does. He collects all the information he can and then makes his decision. His closest friends say that no one person or group of persons can be said to make up Mr. Truman's mind for him.

Full authority is given to each Cabinet officer to deal with the problems inside his own bailiwick. The relationship between Mr. Truman and the Cabinet resembles that between the head of a big corporation and its department chiefs.

When a problem overspreads one department, or affects the policy of the entire Government, it is thrashed out at a full-dress Cabinet meeting, and often the decision of the Cabinet becomes the course the President follows. This is what happened when the meat controls were thrown off last autumn, when the decision was made to fight it out with John L. Lewis, and again in the Greek-Turkish crisis.

Two points of view are represented in the Cabinet: One is nonpartisan and nonpolitical. The other is that of experienced politicians. The Cabinet members are finding that the President gives the greatest weight to purely nonpolitical opinions.

The nonpolitical group includes Secretaries Marshall; Averell Harriman, of Commerce; James V. Forrestal, of Navy; Julius A. Krug, of Interior; and Robert P. Patterson, War. All are experienced in public service and none has a political background.

Secretary John W. Snyder, of Treasury, falls into the same general grouping, but his long and close friendship with the President somewhat sets him apart from the others. His political ambitions are chiefly for the President.

Four members of the Cabinet have a strong Democratic Party background. They are Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan, Attorney General Tom C. Clark, and Secretaries Clinton P. Anderson, of Agriculture, and Lewis B. Schwellenbach, of Labor.

Time and again, however, when questions of what would be the political thing to do are raised, the President tells his advisers that he is not interested in what is the right thing to do politically. Cabinet officers insist that he is putting emphasis solely upon what is the right thing to do as a matter of principle.

Teamwork, thus, is developing in the Cabinet. Close friends of the President say that the Cabinet's members are pulling together as a harmonious group and that the alterations Mr. Truman has made in its membership since he took over have removed the dissenting elements.

One by one, the men who drew criticism upon Mr. Truman have disappeared from the White House group. The two fireballs of the Roosevelt administration, Henry A. Wallace and Harold Ickes, went out of the Cabinet. James K. Vardaman, Jr., and George Allen no longer attract attention. They are busy with other jobs that keep them away from the White House scene.

When the President first took over, and throughout the early days of his administration, his advisers were divided into two groups. One wanted to keep some part of the war controls for a peacetime economy. The other wanted to get rid of them. Mr. Truman never varied from his intention to get rid of them as soon as he could. But there was turmoil inside the administration until, one by one, the dissenters were eased off the stage.

The Truman secret lies in this changed atmosphere. Some argue that Mr. Truman is turning to the right. Polls show a shift in the source of his strength. Where Mr. Roosevelt was strongest among the youngest voters, Mr. Truman is strongest among the oldest group. And where Mr. Roosevelt rated highest with manual workers, Mr. Truman gets most support from farmers.

But the opinion is growing among Democrats that, by insisting upon playing no politics at all, Mr. Truman is playing the smartest kind of politics. They think the national mood is one of cooperation for the common welfare. And therein may lie the secret of the new Truman.

[From the Washington Post of April 7, 1947]

TRUMAN'S STANDARD

The recovery of Mr. Truman's standing from the depths of last October is one of the phenomena of our times. To what is it due? There are those who say that Mr. Truman has merely profited from the fractious divisions in the Republican Party. It is said he is simply the beneficiary of public condemnation of his influential left wing. The explanation in our opinion is not so simple. Mr. Truman has made his remarkable headway, in the people's estimation by his own contribution. He took the defeat of his party last November in a spirit of sportsmanship that won instant recognition. His head was bloody, but quite unbowed. He demonstrated a quality that could be revealed only by adversity. Some men thrive on adversity, and Mr. Truman proved he is one of them. He refused to stop being the people's President simply because the country had elected a Republican Congress. Those who swore there would be no vetoes during the Republican tenure—and how many there were?—quickly realized their mistake. Saturday night he showed his mettle when he virtually served notice to the GOP that he would veto any of the tax relief plans at present under discussion on Capitol Hill.

It is this sense of responsibility to his office that has marked his conduct of affairs since November. The tests have come fast and furiously. John L. Lewis provided the first issue when he staged his holdup of the Nation. The people, accustomed to see Mr. Lewis pull the strings of government, rejoiced when the President wrested them out of Mr. Lewis' hands, and returned them to the people. The struggle, alas, is not yet over, but in this affair the President scored a victory for our democracy against the "mobocracy" that the miners' leader was trying to install in its place. Not a single issue has he ducked, and some issues he has anticipated; as, for instance, when he headed off the witch hunt for Communists in administrative offices that sadistic Congressmen were itching to lead. Evidently his organization is on a par with his inspiration. No longer is he the victim of the hunches of office-hunting cronies. Everything he does nowadays—whether in appointments or in affairs—betrays, on the whole, good staff work.

The problem of soaring prices is the latest domestic issue to engage his constant attention. In the Jefferson Day speech Mr. Truman dealt with it. What he said on a subject that concerns everybody individually and collectively was to the point. In our system of free enterprise, price decisions are individual—at least personal. There are those who would saddle do-nothingness about prices on the workings of some mysterious and impersonal "system." The President cut through this kind of abracadabra with a plain reminder to the price makers that in their hands rests the fate of our economic system. Theirs is "the responsibility of playing fair, of not going whole hog for profits." They wanted decontrol. Now let us see them use their freedom, not abuse it. In hammering away at high prices the President is showing a timely leadership which testifies to his concept of his position as the President of all the people.

The straightforwardness and statesmanship of his approach to our domestic problems is matched in the President's attitude to world problems. The Truman doctrine summed up our duty no less than our policy. To aggressors abroad he is opposing precisely the same treatment that he meted out to John L. Lewis at home. The doctrine, far from being novel and irresponsible, is in the grand American tradition. It was appropriate that in a Jefferson Day speech the President should attest to the roots of his own doctrine in American history. He saw the doctrine as a logical extension of the Monroe Doctrine, now the Chapultepec doctrine, which bands the American nations together against any aggression in this continent. In the words that Mr. Truman quoted, Thomas Jefferson, even in those nursling days of the Republic, came close to advocating global application of the Monroe Doctrine. Madison, with amazing prescience, would have so applied it. Latane's history of American foreign policy says that "Monroe, it appears, was strongly inclined to act on Madison's suggestion, but his Cabinet took a different view of the situation." Thus Mr. Truman has simply realized the pioneer and nascent ideas of the founding fathers. Who, in the light of Mr. Truman's quotations, would say that the founding fathers would not have done as he has done, even before he did it?

It is his great good fortune and the country's that the President has in Senator VANDENBERG a man who shares his sense of American destiny. To be sure, they belong to different parties. But both of them, while playing the great political game which will be run off in 1948, will, we believe, play it within the limits marked by a primary concern for our national security. These are times for greatness. Polybius contrasted the splendid heights to which the people of Athens rose when they had to face a war with the waste of their strength in internal quarrels when no such stimulus offered. If this is not to be said of modern America, it will be due in greatest part to Truman and VANDENBERG.

Irish Contribution to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, at a meeting in Boston in January His Excellency Richard J. Cushing, archbishop of Boston, delivered an address on the Irish contribution to America, which interested and inspired all those who heard it. It contains so many well thought out views, is so full of originality, force, and high principle, that I feel sure it will be read with interest and benefit by the Members of Congress, who will be inspired, as I was, by its idealism and its vision. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the address will make two and one-third pages of the RECORD, and that the cost of printing will be $167.67.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to address this important meeting. It is the fiftieth anniversary dinner of the American Irish Historical Society and it is also the charter meeting of the Massachusetts branch of that same illustrious organization. The double observance provides an appropriate opportunity for the Society to honor a distinguished Irish-American Bostonian, Mr. P. A. O'Connell.

Sentimental considerations apart, there are important reasons why the Irish contribution to America should be constantly recalled, especially here in Boston. Every racial group has made its contribution to the established greatness of America and to the potential harmony of united humanity. We are entitled to recall with pride the contributions of our own racial families only in proportion as we are prepared to acknowledge the contributions made by other races than our own. Any prejudiced preoccupation with the excellence of our people to the exclusion of the just recognition due others would be a blemish on our own greatness; it would be ungenerous and uninformed.

The eventual historians of America's greatness will find it impossible to decide which peoples made the greatest contribution to the building of America and the formation of her spirit. It would be impossible to discuss the foundations of American greatness without reference to the early and continuing influence on our national spirit of Spanish chivalry, of French vision, of English practical genius, of German integrity and of Dutch sobriety. Each of these has made itself felt in the formation of America and all of these are blended in the unique character of the American spirit. Other nations came here later than the sons and daughters of Spain, France, England, Germany, Holland, and the others, yet again it would be impossible to understand the epic of America without reference to the contribution to American greatness that they also have made. Surely the American character would be very different from what it now is were it not for the piety and industry of the Polish people, the Lithuanians, the Russians, and the other peoples of the Christian East. America needed and has been grateful for the spiritual and physical energies released into the life stream of our history by the Mediterranean peoples of Greece, Italy, Portugal and the Nordic peoples of Scandinavia and Denmark. Our land has been made better because of the contributions of Latin Americans, African Negroes, the Jew and the Oriental, and all other Americans have been profoundly influenced by the presence within our shores of these and other great racial and cultural groups. In the very diversity of our racial strains and in the harmony of their blend lies the secret of America's greatness.

From this fact it follows that either of two possible alternatives would be unfortunate. It would be unfortunte continually to isolate one racial strain from all the others and persistently to dwell upon its characteristics, whether good or bad. At the same time, it would be unfortunate to accept the "melting pot" theory of American life and to suppose that the individual characteristics of the races which comprise America have been lost by their indiscriminate fusion into a completely neutral and homogeneous American character. America is not a "melting pot"; the races which have come here have gladly blended in the harmonious whole that is America their several characteristics but they have not on that account entirely lost them. It is the glory and the strength of America that she enjoys the united loyalty of the members of many racial families. It is no less her glory and her strength that she permits racial and cultural differences to survive in those who are legitimately attached to these traditions. As distinguished from all Fascist national unities and all Communist classless societies, America has never pretended nor attempted to be a monolithic society. America is a land where the things which make for personality, for variety, for individual values have always been encouraged. America seeks in her national life a more perfect union, but she expects this to be a union of people and forces worth uniting and she knows that in personal worth differences matter. In the house of America, as in that of heaven, there are many mansions.

For these reasons we who belong to the Irish racial and cultural tradition, gladly paying tribute to the genius and the heritage of other traditions among our neighbors, make no apology for occasional meetings of this kind to recall at once the things that make us different and the things that as a people we have tried to contribute to the life we hold in common with our fellow Americans.

The contribution of Ireland to the rest of the world has been essentially spiritual. Her friends and her enemies alike have dealt too much on the supposed predilection of her sons for political, military, and commercial careers. The Irish have attained a great preeminence in these fields, not merely here in America but elsewhere throughout the world. The names of Irishmen are among the most illustrious in the political history of the Western Hemisphere, North and South America alike. The military prowess of Irish names is written in the history of these lands and also in the history of France, of Hungary, and of England herself. The commercial genius of the Irish people has brought them distinction in the fields equally far flung.

Here in America these gifts of the Irish people have made their contribution to our national greatness particularly prominent. Nearly half of the Presidents of the United States were of Celtic blood, and the Irish were the foremost in the American struggle for liberty. Custis, the adopted son of Washington, wrote: "The aid we received from Irish Catholics in the struggle for independence was essential to our ultimate success. In the war of independence Ireland furnished one hundred men for every single man furnished by any other foreign nation; let America bear eternal gratitude to Irishmen."

President Theodore Roosevelt paid tribute to the Irish influence in America when he said:

"In every walk of life men of Irish blood have stood and now stand preeminent as statesmen and soldiers, on the bench, at the bar, and in business. They have done their full share toward the artistic and literary development of the country."

Ireland is proud of the part her sons have taken in building up the greatest democracy on earth, but she is prouder still of the fact that this devotion to the city of man has always been inspired among Irishmen by fidelity to the Kingdom of God. A great Yankee, Dr. Orestes Brownson, called the Irish and their descendants by all odds and under every point of view the purest, the best, and the most trustworthy of the American people. The Irish may well feel that Dr. Brownson's tribute was excessively generous, but its essential point is true. The political, military, and business ability of the Irish people, their worldly success, is not the most accurate gage by which to measure either their greatness or the greatness of their contribution to American life. The triumph of the Irish, when they are faithful to the highest traditions of their own people, has always consisted in this: While making their way in the world, while displaying such rare patriotic energy, they have vivified all by their faith, and measured all success by the light of faith. Maguire shows this very clearly in his book Irish in America, where he observes:

"What Ireland has done for the American church every bishop and priest can tell.

Throughout the vast extent of the Union, there is scarcely a church, a college, an academy, a school, a religious or charitable institution, an asylum, a hospital, or a refuge, in which the piety, the learning, the zeal, the self-sacrifice of the Irish, of the priest or the professor, of the sisters of every order and congregation, are not to be traced. There is scarcely an ecclesiastical seminary for English-speaking students in which the great majority of those now preparing for the service of the sanctuary do not belong, if not by birth, at least by blood, to that historic land to which the grateful church of past ages accorded the proud title—'Insula Sanctorum'!"

Forty years ago an American writer could say:

"This vast continent affords a most striking proof of what religion means to the Irish people. Count the colleges, schools, academies, hospitals, and asylums of charity that have sprung up as if by magic all over the land, and tell me is there anything that speaks more eloquently to the heart than the faith that inspired such unselfish devotion. Religion as a name is useless; it is only precious for what it enables us to be and to do. It is religion that has made the Irish people what they are. It has made them just toward others, lovers of order and progress, firm in the support of just authority, and courageous in resistance to lawless tyranny. No state can thrive without such virtuous citizens, and no country can be hopelessly lost that has the happiness of possessing them."

This will always be the secret of Ireland's essential contribution to the life and the greatness of America. It might be feared that a people so deeply religious might, precisely because of their religious attachments, be slow in assimilating themselves to the broader, more general patterns of the community life. Yet no less competent an interpreter of the American scene than President William H. Taft found it possible to say:

"There has been an easy amalgamation of the Irish with our American life. They have added much to the composite American, made from various European stocks. They have softened the American wit. They have added to American tenderness. They have increased the spirit of good fellowship, added to our social graces, increased our poetical imagination, made us more optimistic, and added to our sunny philosophy. Socialism and anarchy have found no lodgment among Irishmen. They believe in institutions of modern society. They believe in upholding our National and our State Governments. They are not full of diatribes against the existing order. They struggle for equality of opportunity, and recognize the value of liberty ordered by law. They are not seeking to invent a new society and turn the present one topsy-turvy. They are cooperating with the good fortune, the prosperity, and the happiness that is possible under our Government. They are grateful for all this, they value it, and they will fight to preserve it."

I have often thought that these words of President Taft were touched with prophecy. The institutions of modern society were never so much in jeopardy as they now are. Our National and State Governments were never so cynically criticized and so unsparingly challenged. Equality of opportunity is now a matter of legislation rather than something which is taken for granted; this means that its reality is in doubt or under attack. American traditions, the American way of life itself, certainly its Christian roots need men who, like the Irish according to President Taft, are grateful for these, value them with passionate devotion, and will fight to preserve them.

In this connection I recall another prophetic word uttered with regard to the Irish people. Nearly 300 years ago a papal nuncio sent to Ireland by the Pope wrote back to Rome these words: "Ireland may yet become an outwork of the faith to Europe and its herald to America." Ladies and gentlemen, you are living in days which have seen this prophecy on the verge of fulfillment. Ireland has become an outwork of the faith to Europe, has been and is its herald to America. The Irish people, wherever they may be, are the champions of Christianity in a world menaced by Asiatic communism; they are foremost among those who, in the Old World and the New, are unswervingly committed to the traditions of humanism, Western civilization, and Christianity which once gave origin, meaning, and purpose to our Democracy and which can once again guarantee Democracy's survival.

But if Ireland has been so great a force in America and in the world she has been no less powerful an influence in our immediate area of interest and loyalty. Despite the efforts of the unfriendly to discredit the Irish contribution to our local history, the consoling fact is that Ireland in Boston has no reason to be ashamed. For one thing, we were not as latecomers here in Boston as our critics like to pretend. Those who sometimes suggest that Boston was a land of promise until the Irish came forget or never knew that the Irish were here from the beginning. Later the brain and the brawn of tens of thousands of Irish immigrants were to play a major part in the development of the commerce and the industries which brought power and prestige to Massachusetts and to all New England. But here in Boston the Irish gave our city many of the principal firsts in its history. Honoring as we do this evening a merchant and philanthropist, it is appropriate to recall that the first Bostonian to open a store in our city was an Irishman, John Cogan. Mr. Cogan opened his establishment at the corner of State and Washington Streets and at its opening he became Boston's first merchant. He came here directly from Ireland a very few years after the Massachusetts Bay Colony got under way and from the very beginning he made his presence felt. The Englishmen in the colony deeply respected him; together with Governor Winthrop, Mr. Ballingham, and Mr. Coddington he planned the original city. He was a member of the first board of selectmen elected in Boston; he was a charter member of the Ancients and Honorables; he served Governor Winthrop as an adviser on agricultural matters; his home, near the corner of Beacon and Tremont Streets, was a center of the social life of the time. Mr. Cogan's store prospered; he became an extremely wealthy man, owning mills in Charlestown and Malden and purchasing great landholdings in what is now Woburn. At his death, having no place else to which to will it, John Cogan left his money to Harvard College. He was the first Boston merchant of prosperity and prestige, the first of a long line of Irishmen in the business life of this city, a line of which Mr. O'Connell, our distinguished guest this evening, is a contemporary and a worthy representative.

The records of early Boston reveal another merchant of Irish birth and Boston success in the person of Mr. David Kelly who appears among the principal landowners of the area in 1679. A generation or so later there arrived in Boston an Irish merchant named Joseph St. Lawrence. By this time Boston had begun to require that gentlemen planning to establish in business here show capital in amount sufficient to guarantee their solvency. Mr. St. Lawrence was able to produce 50 pounds sterling, and the then equivalent of the Better Business Bureau was duly impressed. Some of the Irish obviously arrived here with money on their persons.

The shipbuilding industry in these parts originated with an Irishman from Galway, one Capt. Thomas Hawkins. Hawkins was building boats in the Bay Colony before the end of the seventeenth century. At about this same time another Irishman was probably the local pioneer in the meat business. His name was Florence McCarthy and he established a slaughterhouse somewhere around 1686. He died a wealthy man and left to his two sons, Thaddeus and Thomas, the means to set themselves up in other and more pretentious business.

William Freeland, another Irishman, was one of Boston's first cabinetmakers; he set up his business in the city in the latter part of 1730 and appears to have prospered. The first paper-manufacturing plant in this part of the world was built in 1728; an Irishman was its first superintendent, Jeremiah Smith, and two Irishmen were prominent in its development, Hugh McLean and James Boies. The latter became an influential figure in the Revolution and rendered Washington material aid at the time of the siege of Boston. The chocolate industry in America began here in Boston and its founder was an Irishman by the name of John Hannon. He opened his chocolate mill in 1764; its site was on the banks of the Neponset River at Dorchester Lower Mills where the chocolate industry has flourished ever since.

To start his venture, John Hannon borrowed from another Irishman here in the city, the James Boies to whom I have already referred. In that same neighborhood the piano-making industry began in this country and again an Irishman was identified with it. Benjamin Crehore, who lived in Milton, manufactured pianos there as early as 1800. Peter Pelham, another Irishman, was the first conspicuous cultivator of the fine arts in New England. He was a painter and a teacher of art; he married the widow of Richard Copley, herself an Irishwoman from Limerick, and thus he became the stepfather of John Singleton Copley, the celebrated artist, whose name is recalled by Copley Square and by other place names in Boston. John Singleton Copley took his middle name from his mother's Irish family; his Irish stepfather taught him painting and engraving.

The Boston records of the eighteenth century reveal Irishmen well established here in a variety of posts. Several coppersmiths of Irish birth were then at work here in Boston; at least one roofer and slater was taking town of Boston contracts in 1768 when John McLean charged us $82 for repairs done by him on Faneuil Hall. The most popular inn hereabouts in the middle 1700's was kept by Thomas Lawlor, and Patrick Conner ran a fine boarding house in the same period at 53 Marlboro Street. The Irish responded with great good will to the call to arms for the American Revolution and the Charitable Irish Society of the times suspended all its meetings until the war was over and the British were driven forth. I need not tell you that the fire department was in the early days well staffed by men with such good Irish names as those which appear on the same rosters to this day—Mortimer, Barry, Collins, Healy, Hay, Kelly, Kenney, McLaughlin, Murphy, Mulligan, O'Connell, Riley, and Shannon. We never lost our hold on the fire department.

In the last century Irish influence grew steadily. Irish names like those of John Boyle O'Reilly and James Jeffrey Roche took their places among the wielders of the pen in literary and journalistic Boston. Patrick A. Collins brought the Irish genius for political leadership to the running of municipal affairs. Philanthropy found Irishmen still in the fore: Andrew Carney, founder of the Carney Hospital, an Irishman, was one of the originators of the Safety Fund Bank which eventually became the First National Bank of Boston. He was also identified with the origins of the John Hancock Insurance Co., and since his day every big Boston bank and business house has managed to find one or two Irishmen somewhere among all the Irish-Americans of our city to hold a place or two on the boards and directorates of the Boston banking establishments. Since

the early days we have grown by the hundreds of thousands, but we still live under a quota so far as the banks' directorates are concerned. Sometime the quota seems to have been set in 1630 and never revised.

But despite the exclusions and the petty persecutions which the Irish have encountered ever since their numbers began to swell, it still remains true that there is not one industry, profession, trade, or business in Boston which does not bear witness to the influence of the Irish, old and young, and which is not indebted to the Irish for the vitality and the vision which have given them their growth here. All this makes the more unfortunate an observation sometimes heard in criticism which should be a challenge to an organization such as your own, bringing together as it does so many leaders in every walk of life. I am not personally sure of how justified this criticism is, but I have heard it so often now that I cannot ignore it and I feel bound to pass it on to you. I have heard it offered as one of the explanations of the departure from this region of many ambitious young Irish-Americans who are determined to seek their fortunes and who no longer believe that they are to be found here at home in Boston. I have heard it offered as one of the reasons for the unhealthy flocking of young Irish-Americans into civil service and into the machinery of party politics. For what it is worth, I pass it on to you, confident that among your number are many men who can discover whether or not it is true and, if it is true, can do something about it.

I am told by young men that many of our established Irish-American business and professional men of the older generation are not too anxious to bring younger Irish-Americans into their respective walks of life. I hear stories of an indifference on their part to the natural ambition of younger men to gain a foothold in the professions or the pursuits where they themselves have found prosperity. I sometimes hear these complaints together with contrasts to the "family feeling" that exists between the older and the younger generations of other racial and national groups within the business houses, the professions, and the trades. I have even heard it said that in some of the professions—some of the professions calling for the longest and the most exact training—our young men find themselves blocked and bypassed by the very men from whom they would reasonably expect patronage and encouragement; in these professions, it would seem, some of our successful men proceed on the nervous principle of oriental despots; permit none of the young men of the tribe to work too near the throne.

I cannot believe that any of our business or professional men so fear the competition of their younger brethren that they will not gladly and generously give them place, as they come along as graduates from our schools and colleges. I cannot believe that any of our successful men are so forgetful of the road they themselves traveled that they would not be willing even to make sacrifices in order to help the younger men "arrive" in the professional and business world without the necessity of leaving home and entering into unequal competition with strangers in strange places. If there is—or has been—any tendency of that kind, I know it is sufficient to mention it thus publicly in order to start the thinking and the action that will end it. No Irishman, mindful of the story of his own people in these parts, could possibly be guilty of refusing every aid and encouragement within his power to those who seek to establish themselves among their own people and in their own city as prosperous and useful citizens.

So, charter members of the Irish Historical Society, you have a great work to do. On the national level you must continue to foster the study of the Irish contribution to American life, that you may encourage its continuance and yourselves perpetuate it. Here, locally, you must make those who will come after you proud of what you have done and grateful for the opportunities that you have opened up to them. May God prosper all your plans. God bless you all.

Checks and Balances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a text of an article which was published in the April 5, 1947, edition of the Christian Science Monitor. The subject of the article is our American system of checks and balances, our land's greatest contribution to the progress of mankind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHECKS AND BALANCES—OPPOSING FORCES HELD VITAL TO CHECK INDIVIDUAL OR BUSINESS MONOPOLY

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

"Do you know the greatest contribution America can make now or has ever made to mankind?" asked a foreign observer.

"No," said an American friend.

"Well, it is your concept of checks and balances. It is this concept which makes you the strongest, freest, most prosperous nation on earth. Teach that concept to the world. Have the world learn it, too, by your example, by your applying your own concept more and more, instead of abusing it yourself, and you will have struck the greatest possible blow for mankind's progress."

The foreign observer was right, I believe. Checks and balances is, of course, the concept that no power—economic, political, social, or any other form—should exist as a monopoly, but, rather, that there must be limits upon it through other power.

This concept is by far the leading factor needed today by the nations of the earth, struggling from the disastrous effects of war and, in many places, from the long-time chains of bondage. It is also needed by Americans, because we need to learn and relearn that monopoly in business or in labor or in any other sphere is the antithesis to checks and balances. At every hand, there are indications of constant trends toward monopoly in human relations; these trends must be halted.

In America, in contrast with the situation in many other lands, we have not one church but many churches, not one political party but two major parties and many minor ones, not one all-powerful branch of Government but three separate, independent, and coequal branches—legislative, executive, and judicial; not one state-controlled newspaper network but many independent newspapers and chains of newspapers.

Each of these institutions exercises some check or balance on the other. If any one of these institutions became a monopoly, it might tend to grow despotic.

Power, even in the hands of human "angels," corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely. That is true whether absolute power is in the hands of a dictator president or a dictator businessman or a dictator labor leader or a dictator press baron. Checks and balances must universally obtain. There must be not sterile uniformity but productive variety everywhere.

The foundation of our whole checks and balances system is, of course, the United States Constitution. In writing this wondrous document, the founding fathers remembered their experiences with foreign tyranny. They devised, therefore, our tripartite government—with no one branch so supreme that it could bend the other branches completely to its will nor, most important, so supreme that it could make the people its slave.

Congress, for example, was empowered to pass the laws of the land, but the President was empowered to veto them, if he were so inclined; in turn, the Congress could override the veto; the Supreme Court could then defeat Congress' will by declaring the law unconstitutional, and then Congress could begin the process of enacting a constitutional amendment which could nullify the Supreme Court's decision.

Thus, each step in this process serves as a check and balance against the arbitrary use of power.

Our own Congress is an illustration of checks and balances. We have not one chamber, but two chambers, and within both the Senate and the House no two Members are alike from the standpoint of geographical background, or racial or religious or economic or political or social or vocational background. Every man is an individualist, every man serves to contribute some varied approach to the legislative whole. That is why Congress can do its job better than Hitler's puppet Reichstag.

Each new discovery of astronomy, chemistry, of physics, of biology proves that ours is a universe of checks and balances.

A sense of humor can ably balance anyone's tending to moodiness or despondency. Our daily activities—work and play and sleep—thrive on a successful equilibrium, with the individual neither working nor playing nor sleeping to excess. "Everything in moderation, nothing in excess," said the Greeks, and they were right. Excesses do not lead to successes.

In every successful human relation there are checks and balances. A husband and wife may have opposing and varied qualities, for example, habits of spending and economy, which mutually balance. Friends of different temperaments, business partners with different aptitudes—each of these relationships symbolizes this principle. Let them be monopoly created, let some form of power, however good at the outset, develop completely unchecked, and trouble looms ahead.

It may seem like a long way from success in the life of the individual to success in the life of the Nation, but they are guided by the same universal factors.

Developing checks and balances in the body politics of the nations of earth is important. It is up to America and the American people to show the way with its checks and balances. Let us combat monopolistic power however it exists and supplant it with the concept that is America's greatest contribution to mankind.

Atomic Energy Commission—Nomination of David E. Lilienthal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

The following vouchers were omitted from the RECORD of April 1 (p. 3040):

H-63273-/15 39-24394/

Standard Form No. 1034—Rev. Form approved by Comptroller General, U. S. June 6, 1927 (Gen. Reg. No. 51, Supp. No. 7)

PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL D.O. Ven. No. .....

Ba. Ven. No. 2403 OCT 11 38

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE PREAUDIT
Certified for payment in the sum of $.....
Comptroller General of the United States
By.....

U.S. Tennessee Valley Authority
(Department, bureau, or establishment)

Voucher prepared at Knoxville, Tennessee 10-11-38 WFP
(Give place and date)

THE UNITED STATES, Dr.,

To JOHN LORD O'BRIAN
c/o Harvard Club (Payee)

Address New York City, N. Y.

Payee's Account No. .....

PAID BY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY OCT - 1938 U. S. CASHIER
(For use of Paying Office)

No. and Date of Order	Date of Delivery or Service	Articles or Services (Enter description, item number of contract or general supply schedule, and other information deemed necessary) Terms Net % Discount Cash ..... days	Quantity	UNIT PRICE Cost	UNIT PRICE Per	AMOUNT Dollars	AMOUNT Cts.
		Brought forward from continuation sheet(s)					
	Fiscal year 1938	Per invoice attached				25,000	00
					Total	25,000	00

Shipped from ..... to ..... Weight ..... Government B/L No. TV .....

I certify that the above bill is correct and just; that payment therefor has not been received; and that except as otherwise noted all of the articles, materials, and supplies furnished under purchase order No. ..... if unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies, have been mined or produced in the United States, and if manufactured articles, materials, and supplies, they have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States, and that state or local sales taxes are not included in the amounts billed.

(Sign original only)

*Payee As Per Certified Invoice Attached
(This certificate not required when a like certificate is made by payee on attached bill or bills)

Per ..... Title .....

(Payee must NOT use this space)

Differences		
Account verified; correct for	25,000	00

(Signature or initials) [illegible]

Contract No. TV -16876 Date ..... Req. No. ..... Date ..... Invoice Rec'd 10-11-38

Pursuant to authority vested in me, I certify that the above articles were received in good condition, after due inspection, acceptance, and delivery prior to payment as required by law, or the services were performed as stated; that they were procured under the contract numbered above or the unnumbered contract attached hereto, or that they were procured without written contract, in open market, and with or without advertising, under the circumstances stated in No. ..... of "Method of or Absence of Advertising" shown on reverse hereof, and were necessary for the public service; and that the prices charged are just and reasonable and in accordance with the agreement.

†Approved for $ 25,000.00

(Sign original only)

†[illegible]

For General Auditor

Title For Chief, Voucher Section

ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION (for completion by Administrative Office)

Appropriation, limitation, or project symbol	Appropriation title	Limit'n or Proj't Amount	Appropriation Amount
6490110	Tennessee Valley Authority Fund 1939		For Approved Amount

Allotment symbol	Amount	Encumbrance liquidated	COST ACCOUNT Symbol	COST ACCOUNT Amount	OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE Symbol	OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE Amount

Paid by { Check No. 977572 dated 10-18, 19.... for $ 25,000.00 on Treasurer of the United States in favor of payee named above.
Cash, $..... on ....., 19....., * Payee .....

(Sign original only)

* When a voucher is signed or receipted in the name of a company or corporation, the name of the person writing the company or corporate name, as well as the capacity in which he signs, must appear. For example: "John Doe Company, per John Smith, Secretary", or "Treasurer", as the case may be.
† If the ability to certify and authority to approve are combined in one person, one signature only is necessary, otherwise the approving officer will sign in the blank space below "Approved for $.....", and over his official title.

Per .....

Title .....

Hill

1-2(a)

METHOD OF OR ABSENCE OF ADVERTISING

(Sec. 3709 of the Revised Statutes)

1. After advertising in newspapers.

2. (a) After advertising by circular letters sent to ..... dealers.

(b) And by notices posted in public places.

(If notices were not posted in addition to advertising by circular letters sent to dealers, explanation of such omission must be made. The notation on the certificate on the face of the voucher must be "2(a)(b)" or "2(a)", depending on whether or not notices were posted.)

3. Without advertising, under an exigency of the service which existed prior to the order and would not admit of the delay incident to advertising.

4. Without advertising in accordance with .....

5. Without advertising, it being impracticable to secure competition because of .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

(Here state in detail the nature of the exigency or circumstances under which the securing of competition was impracticable under 3 and 4)

NOTE.—The above form "Method of or Absence of Advertising" is to be used when purchases are made or services secured under proper authority without written agreement in any form. In case of a written agreement (formal contract, proposal, and acceptance, or less formal agreement) Standard Form No. 1036—Revised should be used for abstracting the method of or absence of advertising and award of contract. (See General Regulations No. 51, Supplement No. 6, General Accounting Office, Aug. 20, 1930.)

H 43809 38- 0145

Standard Form No. 1034
Form approved by Comptroller General U. S. June 18, 1928 (Revised August, 1930)

Public Voucher for Purchases, and Services other than Personal

D. O. Voucher No. 6602 JUN 30 37

Knoxville, Tennessee. 6-25-37 Chh
(Voucher prepared) (Give place and date)

PAID BY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY
JUL 1937
By J. E. WOLFE
ACTING TREASURER
(For use of Paying Office)

U. S. Tennessee Valley Authority
(Department, Bureau, or Establishment)

Appropriation: 6480110 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND 1937

THE UNITED STATES, Dr., To.. John Lord O'Brian
(Payee)

Address Buffalo, N. Y. Payee's Acct. No.

Payee must NOT use this space

Contract No. TV-16876 Date Req. No. Date
Activity For

Expenditure Symbol	No. and Date of Order	Date of Delivery or Service	ARTICLES OR SERVICES (Enter description, Item Number of Contract or General Supply Schedule, and other information deemed necessary)	QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE Cost	UNIT PRICE Per	AMOUNT Dollars	AMOUNT Cts.	NOTATIONS Payee must NOT use this column
		6-37	Terms net % Discount Cash ... days Service as per invoice Vendor's 6-23-37				25,000	00	

RECEIVED JUN 30 1937 TVA

(This certificate not required when a like certificate is made by payee on attached bill or bills)

Sign original only

I certify that the above bill is correct and just, and that payment therefor has NOT been received.

TOTAL 25,000 00 W.

*Payee As per certified invoice attached. Per Title

(Additional statements by Department, Bureau, or Establishment, if deemed necessary)

(Accounting Classification)

(Payee must NOT use this space)

Differences:

Account verified; correct for $ 25,000 00

(Signature or initials)

I certify that the above articles were received in good condition, after due inspection, acceptance, and delivery prior to payment as required by law, or the services performed as stated; that they were procured under the contract numbered above or the unnumbered contract attached hereto, or that they were procured without written contract, in open market, and with or without advertising, under the circumstances stated in No. ..... of "Method of or Absence of Advertising" shown on reverse hereof, and were necessary for the public service; and that the prices charged are just and reasonable and in accordance with the agreement.

†Approved for $25,000.00

(Sign original only)

†Asst. Auditor of Disbursements

†Title Chief Voucher Clerk

Paid by Check No. 85699 dated JUL 1 1937 for $25,000.00 on Treasurer of the United States in favor of payee named above.

Cash, $ ....., on 05-211 *Payee

(Sign original only)

Per

Title 1-4 (5)

* When a voucher is signed or receipted in the name of a company or corporation, the name of the person writing the company or corporate name, as well as the capacity in which he signs, must appear. For example: "John Doe Company, per John Smith, Secretary," or "Treasurer," as the case may be.

† If the ability to certify and authority to approve are combined in one person, one signature only is necessary; otherwise the approving officer will sign in the blank space below "Approved for $....," and over his official title.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 10—1751

METHOD OF OR ABSENCE OF ADVERTISING

(Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes)

1. After advertising in newspapers.
2. (a) After advertising by circular letters sent to _____ dealers.
   (b) And by notices posted in public places.

(If notices were not posted in addition to advertising by circular letters sent to dealers, explanation of such omission must be made. The notation on the certificate on the face of the voucher must be "2 (a) (b)" or "2 (a)," depending on whether or not notices were posted.)

3. Without advertising, under an exigency of the service which existed prior to the order and would not admit of the delay incident to advertising.
4. Without advertising in accordance with _____
5. Without advertising, it being impracticable to secure competition because of _____

_____

_____

(Here state circumstances under which the securing of competition was impracticable)

NOTE.—The above form "Method of or Absence of Advertising" is to be used when purchases are made or services secured under proper authority without written agreement in any form. In case of a written agreement (formal contract, proposal and acceptance, or less formal agreement) Standard Form No. 1036 (Revised) should be used for abstracting the method of or absence of advertising and award of contract. (See General Regulations No. 51, Supplement No. 6, General Accounting Office, August 20, 1930.) 10—1751

Crisis in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Crisis in Foreign Policy," delivered by me over the National Broadcasting Co. network on Friday night, April 4, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The world that emerged from this last war—hungry, impoverished, and devastated—was sustained by one great hope, the hope that the victory won at the cost of so much blood and heartache would be followed by a lasting peace.

Just about 2 years ago that hope gave promise of fulfilment. We can all remember the feeling of optimism that swept the world when the United Nations came into being, thanks to the inspiration and guidance of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Reason and justice would replace force and violence as the wartime allies learned to live together and strengthen their friendship in our one world. Here was Roosevelt's great American foreign policy for world peace and democracy, an American policy around which all the peace-loving peoples of the world could rally.

Now we have before us a proposal which, in the name of aid to Greece and Turkey, would turn us away from that policy of peace and democracy, a proposal which would take us back to the world of power struggles where might makes right, where every nation is a law unto itself, and where military force is the only international language.

Before we take that precedent-shattering step, let us look closely at just what that proposal provides.

We are asked to appropriate a sum of $400,000,000 of which only one-fourth will be used to supply relief to the Greek people. $150,000,000 goes to supply and train the Turkish Army. $150,000,000 goes to supply and train the Greek Army. In other words, $300,000,000 goes for arms, $100,000,000 for bread. And the entire program is to be administered by the United States alone, without so much as a by-your-leave to the United Nations.

Let me say right now that I feel that no people are more entitled to American aid and support than the gallant people of Greece. But obviously relief for the Greek people is not the real issue raised by the administration proposal. If it were the bulk of the money requested should go to the Greek people instead of going to strengthen the Government and military cliques. If it were the United States would have adopted the proposal of former Mayor LaGuardia. You recall that last fall LaGuardia as head of UNRRA proposed the continuation of international relief through the United Nations, with the United States paying only 70 percent instead of all the cost. But our representatives in the United Nations fought and defeated that proposal. Yes, if relief for the Greek people were the real issue the proposal would have my wholehearted support and the support of the always generous American people.

The real issue tonight is whether we shall continue to support the United Nations or whether we shall play the lone wolf in a game of imperialist-power politics. I am opposed to that, and the American people, as the Gallup poll shows, share that opposition. The real issue is whether we should furnish military aid to the Greek monarchy and the Fascist government of Turkey—two tyrant governments as ruthless and arbitrary as any in the world. I am opposed to that, and the American people, as the Gallup poll shows, overwhelmingly share that opposition. And the American people will not be satisfied by the Vandenberg amendment which merely permits the United Nations to come into the picture but does nothing to assure that the United Nations will do so.

We know that the Greek monarchy was virtually forced on the people in a sham election. That election was held on a day when the Greek Prime Minister Sophoulis warned that "conditions do not exist for a free election." Thousands of the prodemocratic leaders had just been assassinated or exiled or were held in jail without trial and on trumped-up charges. Their only offense was that, true to the traditions of ancient Greece, they loved freedom and hated tyranny. Armed bands of terrorists working with the royalist police roamed the countryside beating and intimidating the opponents of the King. True, when the actual voting took place under the eyes of American observers, there was little violence or fraud. Why should there have been? Violence and fraud had already done their work in the preceding weeks.

What is this Greek monarchy which American taxpayers are asked to prop up? King Paul, like his late brother George, does not have one drop of Greek blood in his veins. His family name is Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Glucksburg. He comes from one of Central Europe's perennial royal families which made a business of farming out rulers for the Balkan countries—which presumably were too benighted to govern themselves. His family was foisted on the Greek people in one of the characteristic intrigues of nineteenth century diplomacy.

It is tragic indeed that we, who established our government by overthrowing the tyranny of kings, should now be engaged in the business of propping up tottering thrones throughout the world.

But we are told that this monarchy with all its admitted faults—its incompetence, its corruption, its brutality—must be supported to stem the tide of communism that flows in from across the borders. I do not know how many of the Greek guerrillas are Communists and how many are just plain citizens who hate corruption and love freedom. But this I do know. For every Greek Communist who has been converted by Russian propaganda, a hundred Greek Communists and insurgents have been made by the Fascist brutality and corruption of the present Greek Government and the intervention of foreigners who keep it in power.

It is the grim fact, attested by dozens of American witnesses, that the insurgents in the Greek mountains dare not lay down their arms for they will be butchered in cold blood, as were their comrades who tried it. It is a grim fact, attested by the official report just issued by the Food and Agriculture Mission of the United Nations, that the Greek ruling clique is supported by taxes drawn from the poor, while the rich are permitted to shirk their fair share of responsibility. Listen to the words of that report: "In every part of the country, the great majority of farmers are poverty-stricken and destitute. City factory workers or public employees are not in much better shape. At the same time that this widespread poverty exists, the stores are full of all kinds of goods at high prices, and the restaurants are thronged with well-dressed people, enjoying the good food and wine, who live very comfortably despite the poverty all around them."

Let us be clear about this. American military aid to Greece is not a crusade to aid democracy, for there is no democracy in the Greek Government.

And surely we are not crusading for democracy in supporting the Turkish Army. For the Turkish police state and its persecution of those who read the wrong books, hold the wrong ideas, and vote the wrong way, will only be strengthened by our aid. And Turkey has absolutely no relief needs. Not a

single bomb dropped on Turkey during the war. Instead Turkey enjoyed one long, uninterrupted war boom. It sold supplies to Germany and to the Allies with a vast indifference to anything but the profits. Both sides paid Turkey and paid very well.

It becomes unmistakably clear that the objective is not so much food for the Greek people as oil for the American monopolies—the oil that lies in the great underground reservoirs in the lands just east of Greece and Turkey. And the objective is not a fair allocation of those oil resources, worked out by mutual consultation of the interested countries, as required by the Atlantic Charter, but all the oil that the power of our arms and money can command. This then is not a relief plan, it is an oil-grab plan.

And it is unmistakably clear that another objective is a new American imperialism. It is a step in the direction of the grandiose scheme for a Pax Americana based not upon moral leadership, but upon dollars and atom bombs.

I submit that America's goal should not be the domination of a resentful world. We should have more worthy ambitions than to become receiver in bankruptcy of the British Empire.

And it is unmistakably clear finally that the result will be not to set a stop light against Communist expansion, but only to give a green light to the discredited and corrupt reactionaries throughout the world. What praise we earned in the controlled press of Franco for our support to the Greek monarchy! What an inspiration for Peron in Argentina to see us take the side of Fascist Turkey! What new determination has gripped the feudal warlords in the Chinese Government! But what despair and disillusion have already struck the hearts of the oppressed and downtrodden!

My friends, that is not America's historic mission. America's mission is not to govern the world, but to teach the world that men can g. ern themselves.

In our country we can see how the administration plan has won the support of those who always opposed our entry into the United Nations; of those who fear the noble ends for which we said the war was fought—liberty, equality, brotherhood; of those who would perpetuate the rotten status quo in the Balkans and the Middle East; of those who hate Russia so pathologically that they cannot make an honest effort to reach agreement with her.

Now, I do not want to minimize the difficulties of settling our differences with Russia. Those differences are real and complicated—like some of our differences with Britain or France—but they are soluble. Roosevelt solved many of them. And I believe we can solve more of them by a real effort to sit down and sweat it out with Russia. That's what we do about our conflicts with Britain. Why, then, should we sound the war alarms when differences develop with Russia? Why should our newspaper write scare headlines about every minor difference with Russia—differences of the sort that would rate small articles on page 20 if another country were involved?

But we are told that further consultation is futile; that the United Nations is too weak to handle the problems of Greece and Turkey. Then our duty must be to strengthen it. And we know that we cannot strengthen an arm except through exercising it, using it. We remember that the League of Nations was destroyed by those who refused to use it to stop Mussolin and Hitler, claiming the League was too weak. Again, we are told the United Nations is still untested. But the United Nations faced two great tests more than a year ago—the complaints that Soviet troops were on Iran's soil in violation of treaty and the complaint that the British and French troops were in the Levantine. And the United Nations, without deploying a single soldier, without firing a single shot, met those tests. By mobilizing the opinion of the countries of the world, by invoking the conscience of mankind, the United Nations secured the withdrawal of the foreign troops.

The United Nations has had its baptism of fire. The United Nations has been tested and found strong. Let us not withdraw our crucial support. Let not the country which did the most to build the United Nations become the country that did the most to crumble it.

Senator PEPPER and I have introduced an alternative resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 93—to deal with this great problem. We believe it meets the needs of the Greek people and at same time it conforms to the faith and aspirations of the American people. Briefly, our resolution would (1) appropriate funds for relief and rebuilding of Greece; (2) provide for the administration of that relief by the United Nations; (3) request the General Assembly of the United Nations to institute a full-scale investigation with a view to resolving not only the Greek crisis but the underlying Middle East problems—Palestine, the Dardanelles, and Middle East oil. I should like to point out that our bill provides for immediate assistance to the Greek people through a stopgap advance of $100,000,000 by the RFC. It does not delay this assistance until after the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly. The UN could use the trained personnel of UNRRA who are still in the field to distribute this relief.

Our resolution is equally important for the things which it does not do: It does not provide any funds for military intervention in Turkey; it does not provide for the sending of American military forces into Greece; it does not provide for unilateral action by the United States nor for bypassing the United Nations.

A momentous decision lies ahead of us. Upon it hangs the future of the great idea of permanent peace through international organization. Let us not abandon that great hope so soon after its birth; let us not condemn it without a trial; let us not sacrifice it on the altar of power politics.

The Forces Patterning Tomorrow's Economic Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it can be said with emphasis that Anglo-Saxon liberty has been fought out on the battlefield of taxation, and that fight is in progress right now. What Congress does during the months to come with the problem of taxation will determine whether individual liberty and private enterprise can be preserved.

Taxation should not be a subject of partisan politics, and those who reduce it to the level of demagogery are trifling with the security of our Republic.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article by Bradford B. Smith which appeared in the February issue of Dun's Review:

THE FORCES PATTERNING TOMORROW'S ECONOMIC LIFE

(By Bradford B. Smith, economist, United States Steel Corp.)

Among students of economic affairs for whose wisdom and insight I have respect I find a considerable amount of agreement on certain things. They agree, for example, on the presence of a backlog of demand for durable goods—a backlog resulting from wartime curtailment of peacetime production and from the presence of an overabundance of money, due, in turn, to long continued inflationary monetary policies. They agree on the presence of increased productive capacity. They agree, also, that strikes and continuation into peacetime of wartime controls, particularly price control, have definitely interfered with production of the most wanted goods.

But they observe, also, that prices and wages have been playing leap-frog up the ladder of inflation and that we have thus been in some phase of an inflationary boom. Finally, they agree that inflationary boom must sooner or later be followed by some sort of depression, depending upon the promptness with which corrective action is taken. This is established by sound economic reasoning and verified by historical record. Inflationary boom can be likened to the pleasant excitement of sailing through the air when you jump off the roof. Depression is the thud when you hit the ground. But it is the jump, not the ground, that causes the concussion. The ground is harmless if you will only keep your feet on it.

So much for the current situation. Beyond that point prospects are dimmer, but the problems are bigger. What puzzles the thoughtful and worries the conscientious is what is going to happen when the bloom is off the boom and f-ar of depression becomes rampant. At the root of the problem is the question of whether the American system of voluntary markets and individual freedom is going to b- replaced by one or another form of statism such as has been sweeping across the world. If we should arrive at the onset of serious depression, it will be after having been habituated for more than a decade to a step-by-step, but everincreasing, assumption by government of paternalistic authority.

In the light of our habituation to this long evolution of coercive intervention into how much of what is to be produced and how much who is to get—or not get—for producing it, is it not probable, should depression come, for the evolution to be speeded rather than retarded—that is, for pressure to be exerted upon the Government then in power to start large-scale public works, try to support prices and wages, step up spending, increase incentive-destroying taxation, multiply bureaucracy anew, and compound its regulatory restrictions?

Perhaps the kind of country which would result from such measures is the kind that some people think they would prefer to one in which production is free of direct or delegated government coercion. That is a judgment which each man must make for himself as a matter of philosophical conviction or moral faith. But it is an economist's job to point out, as best he can, the economic consequences of adhering to each attitude so that judgment between they may be as broadly based and intelligent as possible.

The fundamentally conflicting attitudes at the very root of the matter are as follows: You either believe in a framework of law in which your neighbor is entitled to the possession of his property and the fruits of his productive exertions, to consume or to dispose of as he sees fit in voluntary exchange for the fruits of others' efforts; or else you believe that you have a right through the government to take from your neighbor what

he produces without his consent because you or somebody else needs it or wants it, or because he produces more than you do. In one case the warrant for having something is working to produce it or its equivalent. In the other, the warrant for having something is wanting it, plus the power to take it.

VOLUNTARY SOCIETY

The first concept is expressed in the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." It is the one upon which the American system of voluntary markets and free individuals was founded. The other concept lies at the roots of the collectivistic societies and their recent war making. Let us take the first concept and explore the body of its meaning, its corollaries, and economic consequences.

If exchanges of goods and services are voluntary, then he who would sell is free to choose among all buyers, and he who would buy is free to choose among all sellers. No seller can command the buyers; no buyer can command the sellers. Voluntary markets are necessarily competitive markets. They are also the only known way of achieving fair prices. It is unfair to compel a seller to take less than competing buyers are voluntarily willing to pay. Similarly, it is unfair to compel a buyer to pay more than competing sellers are voluntarily willing to accept.

Since none in a voluntary society can secure what others produce without their consent, then fear of not having compels each man to produce for himself. The voluntary society provides the maximum possible stimulus to each individual's productive capacity without undermining a similar stimulus to other individuals. Break that principle—as collectivistic societies do—so that some can take without paying for it what others produce, and individuals tend to be diverted from the pursuit of individual productivity to the competitive practice of getting something for nothing with the aid of the state—that is, from exploitation of natural resources and processes to despoliation of each other.

Note next that in the voluntary society human exertion is constantly guided into the most efficient production of the most wanted goods. That means maximum human happiness in a material sense in terms of the very wanting to have and not wanting to work with which we are born. As the Nation's wants shift from horse and buggy to Detroit-made automobiles, for example, the production of automobiles is automatically encouraged while buggy sales disappear. It becomes more profitable to produce automobiles than buggies; horsepower than horses.

Under voluntary markets, production is thus continuously guided into the hands of the most efficient, and people are continuously guided into pursuits in which they find the greatest rewards, while total effort is continuously apportioned to producing the most wanted goods in terms of their cost. It is a beautiful and awe-inspiring piece of three-way, automatic, miracle-producing machinery.

Price and production regulations prevent that machinery from performing its vital functions. Of this there has recently been spectacular illustration. When buyers are prevented from paying what they are willing to pay then the incentive to produce what is most wanted is denied expression. Production is kept out of balance with true demands. At the present time, moreover, the price fixers have nothing substantial to go on except the wartime or the prewar prices. But the wartime pattern of production, and the prices to evoke it, represent an unwanted, rather than the now-wanted pattern. The prewar pattern is irrelevant by reason of the wartime wrenching of the economy which has intervened.

COERCIVE WARTIME POWERS

The exercise in peacetime of wartime powers must thus inevtiably hamper and prevent rather than aid and encourage the great economic readjustments called for by return to peace. Their exercise must inevitably degenerate into a bureaucratic taking from some for the supposed benefit of others, instead of taking from all to win the war for everybody. Such wartime powers, untied from the win-the-war purpose, become the politician's paradise—of whatever party—for power means patronage. But, to pursue the metaphor to the end, they simultaneously constitute the Nation's economic perdition. Eliminating coercive emergency powers once the emergency is over should assume the character of a religious habit if a people desires to be prosperous and free. All can regard with gratification the widening perception and official recognition of this truth.

Strict adherence to the conviction that each is individually entitled to the fruits of his exertion and to their voluntary exchange is the very essence of individual freedom. You just cannot have one without the other in any meaningful sense. Abolish one and you have abolished the other. How, for example, can you compel anyone to do or not to do anything, in the last analysis, unless, aside from physically injuring or confining him, you have power to deprive him of something against his will? Is there not a saying to the effect that control a man's bread and he is your slave?

In this connection a frequent, but fallacious, contention is that you can refuse to buy a man's goods or services, and so exert so-called economic coercion upon him. But such refusal to buy is practicing, not rejecting, the voluntary society. In fact, to suppose otherwise is to deny its voluntary nature. Remember, instead, that each who would sell is free to choose among all buyers. Attempted coercion through nonbuying thus becomes the buyer's own voluntary self-denial, while the attempted coercion merely diverts rather than prevents the sale. No competing producer—or seller for that matter—can exert coercion in voluntary markets.

It is simple economics rooted in human nature, as I have attempted to show, that voluntary markets mean the maximum of production, justice, progress, and freedom. There is only one entity which can destroy those markets. It is government. In other times and places it always has. The coercive or collectivistic, rather than the voluntary, society is the typical one in history. It is the one toward which all others tend to revert.

There are many roads by which we have been traveling toward controlled economy and the omnipotent state. In some respects the broadest are the least perceived. I tag them with the names, "taxation," "money," "monopoly," and "regulation." I have already dealt with regulation as exemplified in price control.

Take taxation. He who would adhere to the voluntary exchange of goods and services must answer this question: How can each man have what he produces, or its equivalent, if something must be taken from him to support the Government? The answer to that question was discovered and written into the Constitution by our forefathers; it was forgotten and written out of the Constitution by their descendants. Our forefathers understood it so well they even had a slogan. It was, "No taxation without representation." But how many people today grasp the full body of meaning for which that phrase stood? It meant, of course, that taxes were to be determined by the voluntary consent of taxpayers expressed through their elected representatives—and that is what taxation must always mean in a voluntary society if such a society is to endure.

But that raised another technical question with which statisticians, but not too many others, are thoroughly familiar. It is the question of the representativeness of the sample selected. In this case the question was how to assure that elected representatives do, in fact, constitute a truly representative sample of taxpayers. Our forefathers found the answer to that also, and wrote it into the Constitution.

UNEQUAL TAX BURDENS

The principle can be simply stated: In a society of free men, taxation must always equally burden the members of the electorate. In voting taxes, the representative must know that he distresses those of the majority which elected him as much as those in the minority opposing him.

Break that principle, as we did in the fourteenth amendment, which gave majorities in Congress unlimited power to despoil minorities, and see what the economic results must inevitably be. At times great pressure will be brought to bear upon the legislature relatively to concentrate taxes upon the more productive minority to the supposed relief of the majority. This was feared by Madison when the Constitution was written, and it was prophesied by Lord Macaulay in 1857. It has now happened.

The levying of taxes on minorities by those elected by majorities has certain ominous moral aspects which are very important. But I am now seeking, instead, to point out the cold economic consequences to American productivity. Those economic consequences are almost shockingly simple and direct. They may be cast, for example, in terms of the creation of productive jobs.

Think as one will, but there is no other way in which a self-sustaining productive job can come into existence except for someone, in the hope of profit, to save and invest his money in providing the tools of production. But if the majority decides to tax away large amounts of that hoped-for profit either directly or by progressive taxation of individual income, then the incentive and ability to save and invest in the job-creating tools of production is diminished. The creation of new jobs fails to keep pace with the release of workers from existing jobs as efficiency increases and with the normal additions to the working force. So chronic unemployment as in the thirties is obviously invited.

The second economic consequence is to injure the mechanism for adjusting production to the changing patterns of demand. Consider, for example, how shifting production from buggies to automobiles would have been hampered if the profit in producing automobiles had been taken in taxes for subsidizing, in effect, the lesser profits or losses of buggy makers. The inducements and the pressures to make production conform to demand would have been diminished. Maladjustment would have remained, and that, again, means less production. In short, by traveling one hidden road to collectivism, we seemingly must next set our feet upon another broad but even more hidden road, and so double the speed of our progress without knowing where we are going. That brings me to the matter of money.

The economics of money is obscure to most people. That is one reason for believing that political manipulation of the money supply is the most deceptive and devastating of all the means for transforming the highly productive voluntary society into the sterile authoritarian state, while at the same time it is the most popular and seemingly plausible means for preserving private enterprise by supposedly stabilizing over-all production. That only makes it the more dangerous.

There are certain things we must understand. The stuff we use to pay bills—that is, money—consists, first, of the coins and printed currency we carry in our pockets; and secondly, of bank deposits subject to check, the deposits being about four-fifths of the total. Most of us can only get this money by

ourselves concurrently selling something, whether it be our property or our labor. If that were always true for everybody, there would be no problem. No one could go into markets and purchase something out of them except by having equivalently contributed something to them. The money one had, as a command over other peoples' products, would match one's own products made available to others. The money claims against goods would match the goods to be claimed. Money would truly be then a stable medium of exchange.

THE NATURE OF INFLATION

But our money isn't that way. It can be printed instead of earned. The first step is for the Government to print bonds—promises to pay. The next step is to take those bonds to the commercial banks. There these Government promises to pay in the future are swapped for the bank's promise to pay on demand—that is, for a bank deposit. That is what a bank deposit is: It is the bank's liability to pay in gold if called upon to do so. Since everyone expects that the bank would pay if called upon and allowed by law to do so, these liabilities or deposits are themselves used as money. We transfer them to each other by writing checks in exchange for the goods and services we get from each other.

The significant thing is that simply by making entries in their books banks can create deposits for use as money. The process is the monetary equivalent of the paper money printing press, and in fact it actually starts with a printing press—the one which prints the Government's promises to pay some time in the future. This is something that people must understand because the process has been employed to multiply the supply of money sixfold since 1933, and three times since 1939, while the right of people themselves to police the inflation by converting their money into gold has been denied them.

The new money to spend in markets is obtained without concurrently contributing goods or services to the markets. The balance between money going to market and goods going to market is thus destroyed. The extra money competing for goods bids prices up. That is inflation, and that is the only possible way it can occur. Then the inflation becomes the excuse for jumping over onto another road to statism—the road of price control, rationing, allocation, production directives, priorities, and so on, all of which directly destroy the voluntary market, and undermine the maximum production of the most wanted goods it otherwise promotes. Just to close the spiral for an instant at this point, it may be noted that the resulting unemployment in turn becomes the excuse for printing and spending more money, while the increased spending and rising debt become the excuse for increasing incentive-destroying taxes. The spiral becomes self-stimulating.

The fact that printing money adds money to markets but not goods to match it means that the money is more of a tax receipt for goods taken away than it is a command over goods to be had. Subsequent spenders of the money find this out in two ways: By price control and rationing they find themselves with money left over which they can't spend to buy what they want. Money you can't spend is relatively worthless. Or in the absence of those controls, the prices go up and each dollar buys less. There is no reliable way that printed money, once issued, can ever be redeemed in goods equivalent to those taken when it was issued. Printing of money is not the creation of purchasing power. It is, instead, the cruelest and most deceptive form of taxation with the longest lasting evil aftermaths. The burden always falls most heavily upon those with pensions, bequests, or otherwise fixed income, and often least able to bear the burden.

There is one final, truly vicious aspect of printing press money that should be noted. When the money enters the market, the market responds. It shifts capital, manpower, and materials toward greater production of the particular goods taken. The market does not know the demand is false. The demand is not the expression of competitive expenditure by those whose income derives from producing for each other what they want most in exchange. The demand is, instead, the result of someone getting something for nothing without having to measure his getting with giving of goods competitively acceptable in markets.

Production is diverted to synthetic demand instead of being governed by exchange for equivalent values. In short, the boom financed by inflating the money is the relative wastage of scarce manpower, capital, and resources. In wartime, this is readily apparent: Printed money is exchanged for goods which are then destroyed under compulsion. In peacetime, the process is similar though less readily apparent.

But buying with printed money must eventually end. It ends either when check deposit expansion reaches the limit under the gold standard, if we have a gold standard, or when the Federal Reserve Board otherwise decides to call a halt, or eventually when so much money is printed that it becomes substantially unacceptable as a medium of exchange. When it ends, the maladjustment between production and demand is exposed. Unwanted production accumulates in inventories, liquidation sets in, and spirals of recession are inaugurated. That is why bust follows boom.

The starting of a boom by printing-press techniques is the guaranty of the bust to follow. We had a taste of that in the we-planned-it-that-way boom of 1936 and the bust in 1937. We shall, I fear, have bigger and better examples in the days to come unless more people learn that Government monkeying with money is playing with dynamite which on explosion can extinguish the voluntary society.

MONOPOLY

I come now to the monopoly road to statism. There is one type of monopoly that is currently a serious threat—it is labor monopoly. The laborer is not a commodity, but the service he renders cannot escape economic law. That means quite simply that if the service is made artificially costly, then, just like anything else, customers will buy less of it than otherwise. Labor, like anything else, can price itself out of its market, if given monopoly status. It has achieved monopoly status. In actual practice this means that in determining the price paid for labor—the wage rate—many employers are permitted to deal with but one entity, subjected to neither individual nor group competition.

This is monopoly obscured but monopoly price control nonetheless. It is tantamount to saying to each person that the price they must pay for bread from whomever purchased is nevertheless to be set by one baker, no other being permitted to offer a lesser price in the hope of getting their business. It is the exercise of great power, and like all power it tends to feed upon itself and to be abused to the injury of the innocent.

The same is true in labor. The only and everlasting protection of the worker's independence and economic freedom is the presence of competing buyers for his service, that is, competing employers, just as competing sellers are his protection when he spends his wage as a buyer. As workers form monopoly groups against particular employers, they may be shutting off each employer from other sources of supply to the monopoly group's own seeming benefit; but by that very act they are also shutting off other workers from access to these employers. Thus, step-by-step, the workers are shutting each other out and so losing the very roots of their independence. They become the prisoners of the monopolies they create.

As labor monopolies employ their coercive power to obtain above-market-price wages, then some of the workers are priced out of jobs and find themselves with nowhere to go—except to charity. They are shut out from other employment by reason either of the same overpricing elsewhere that is responsible for their own disemployment, or by the presence of seniority and other rules designed to protect these monopolies against worker competition. Such monopolies operate most brutally against competition of the nonworking with those working. They tend to create unemployment and render it chronic.

WAGE COST RIGIDITY

With this understood, the nature of monopoly as one of the great roads to statism becomes readily apparent. Thus when recession comes these monopolies will certainly strive with all their power to maintain existing wages. Wage cost is at least three-quarters of all costs. This cost rigidity will hamper and hinder the realinement of employment and production to meet the changing pattern of demand as the war-born shortages are made good. It will act as a destroyer of the profit incentive to create new jobs. It means that we may have to take our licking in pronounced and prolonged unemployment instead of in swift-moving, flexible price, profit, and wage adjustments that will keep most people working most of the time. That, in turn, permits those who wish to do so, however untruthfully, to scream out that private enterprise has failed, and that Government must step in—with multiplied bureaucracy and a bigger printing press, together with their unlimited capacity to perpetuate, rather than cure, maladjustments in production, employment, prices, and costs.

THE WHY OF IT

Often I have asked myself why some people who profess to believe in individual freedom and voluntary markets, nevertheless often subscribe to measures which mean statism. I think a good deal of the reason is just plain, good-hearted thoughtlessness which takes the form of let's give the other fellow a break, not realizing that this is the giving of power to undermine free institutions. I think some more of the reason is just untrammeled strife for personal or group power without regard to the cost to the community. Still more of it is ignorance of the inconsistency and danger involved. And there may be some who, knowing better, have not the courage to act and speak on their convictions.

Perhaps underlying all of these is something inherent itself in the marvelous mechanism of production and distribution which has arisen from the practice of individual freedom in America. I refer to the extreme division of labor, the high degree of productive specialization, the singleness of each person's source of income, and the ever-widening area covered by his expenditures. I think that this has resulted in tremendous bias in economic perception and political judgment.

For example, ask anyone which he would prefer, a 10-percent raise in salary, or a 10-percent decrease in living cost. He will usually choose the first, figuring if he can get his single-source income up, he can somehow manipulate his multipurpose expenditures to come out with a net advantage. He is deeply concerned about changes in his income; but changes of much greater proportions in items of his expenditure often fail even to get over the threshold of his perception. Yet accumulations of such unnoticed changes can mount up to far greater consequence than changes in the single item on the other side of the book to which he is

so perceptively allergic. And so it is for the economy as a whole: Our economy operates under a double-entry system. For any advantage here, there is a cost there. But the trouble is that the costs can be widely dispersed in time and space and so go unperceived and untotaled in balancing the books for net gain or loss; whereas the advantages can be appealingly single and apparent.

Let's look next at another consequence of high-level, specialized production. Let's look right into the heart of the family where children grow up. More and more of these children fail to see their fathers at work. The father goes away in the morning to come back at night. Children are kept out of contact with the competitive struggle where the rule is that the warrant for having something is working. Instead, they are confined to the equality phases of family life. When the candy is passed everyone takes one apiece. If the children need something, the parents provide it within their ability to pay for it—not because the children have earned it. We are a rich Nation because of our specialization in productive occupation. So we keep our children at home and in school, longer and longer. The academically proficient often go on to college and to graduate work and then become teachers in jobs financed by the State or by charity.

For many of them their whole experience in formative years drives home the theory that the warrant for having something is needing it or wanting it to the extent of somebody else's ability to pay for it. They have had no real contact, as in farm life, with working as the warrant for having. Is it any wonder that many of them should, in all sincerity, think and teach the children that we ought all to be one great big family under a benign, paternal Government, clothed with authority to redistribute production according to need and with responsibility for keeping everyone happy?

THE PRINCIPLE OF IT

To the cynical these considerations mean that we should fold our hands and accept with resignation the departure of individual freedom from earth. I am not ready to do that. Instead, I remember being spanked as a child for having swiped a piece of chalk from the schoolroom. I realize now that no one cared particularly about the chalk and no one was greatly inconvenienced by its removal—except myself. It was the principle of the thing that was at stake. The stealing of the chalk represented a small leak in the dike of moral conviction behind which we live. And leaks must be quickly plugged lest they become torrents.

So it is also with the principles of a free society. I think that there is some chance that apathy toward small leaks in the dike can be overcome before they become torrents by identifying them as violations of those principles that should be regarded as something sacred—principles derived from having countered all the costs, however dispersed—principles derived from having read and learned the lessons of history—principles that in their derivation cover not only economic well-being, but also individual rights and moral convictions. Then I hope the small leak, instead of going neglected, will automatically bring to bear upon itself the corrective force of accepted principle—just as such a corrective force came rather disconcertingly to bear on the chalk stealer's anatomy.

FIVE SUGGESTED PRINCIPLES

Such principles, and adherence in word and deed to them, have to come out of each man's own conscience. So it is with some diffidence that I suggest a few principles:

1. Government is the superior instrument to coerce. The economic purpose of government in a free America must, therefore, always be exclusively and solely to employ its superior compulsion to prevent fraud, predation, coercion, and monopoly abuse among those governed.

2. To that end, determination of the kind and amount of whatever nonharmful goods are to be produced, where, when, by whom, and at what price or wage, must ever be left to the voluntary and competitive decisions of those concerned. For government to dictate in these matters is for government itself to engage in the very coercion or monopoly abuse which it is government's function to prevent. For the same reason, government itself should never engage in or subsidize production for competitive sale.

3. It is the function of government to keep honest the Nation's money. This means it should not in peacetime tolerate, or itself ever practice, the alternate expansion and contraction of the money supply.

4. Taxation by representation means that taxation must equally burden the members of the electorate. It means that government should grant no tax-offsetting gifts or subsidies. It means government should not seek to lay tax burdens on minority groups which majorities escape.

5. My final principle is not really a principle—it is merely a personal definition of what freedom means in America. To me it means not only that no man must physically injure another or take property from him, without his consent; but also and most especially it means that not even government must do these things except to punish those who do them to others.

Freedom is definable only as the absence of coercion between men. It is obtainable when government's superior power to coerce is employed to cancel out coercion between men. The ever-present and awful temptation of government is to employ or delegate its coercive power beyond that point for seemingly benevolent purposes. But government can give nothing to some without taking something from others. But taking without paying replaces freedom with despoliation and invites the predatory to entrench themselves in the enjoyment of the spoils. That is where serfdom to the state begins. That is where it has begun in America. That is where it must be stopped if America is to remain productive and free.

Role of America as World Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, about a week ago the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace held its annual convention here in Washington. This outstanding organization, of which 14 other national organizations are members, represents about 10,000,000 American women. The convention was a notable one, and one of its outstanding features was an able address by Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, in which she discussed with clarity and eloquence America's new role as a world leader. I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It's hard to be an American these days. We used to think the lot of the American was easy and fortunate. We looked out on the world in the mood of the pharisee, thanking God we were not as the rest of men, and taking considerable credit to ourselves for our immunity from the ills that beset poorer, more troubled, or more backward nations. This feeling reached its peak in the late war when a whole generation of young Americans went abroad and came home blessing the luck that made them citizens of "God's country."

Now we know that being an American is not easy. It's a back-breaking, brain-wracking job. It imposes terrible choices—terrible compulsions, rather, for we are pursued by a destiny we cannot escape.

Just now we are making decisions we cannot retract. The question at issue is not Greece. It is not a $400,000,000 relief program. It is not what kind of government Greece has, or Turkey has, and whether we can improve it by directing how and for what our money shall be spent. It is not a question of making the world safe for democracy, although anyone who compares President Truman's message to Congress with the speech of Woodrow Wilson as we entered the First World War must be struck with the similarity of the arguments.

All these questions come into the debate, but only as they bear on the new position of the United States in the world. We are weighing our awful responsibility as a, as the, great power, the great democracy and the founder of the United Nations. There is nothing else to talk about today because this issue overrides all others. No matter on what terms we go into Greece, we are taking a fateful step on a new course. We are, indeed, adopting a doctrine of intervention which staggers the internationalist who thought our whole international duty was to participate in a collective-security system.

The crisis that hangs over our heads isn't a Greek crisis. It's an American crisis. In the confusion and agony of judging between risks, of balancing one obligation against another, of seeing ourselves for the first time as making the historic motions instead of seconding them, we have at last grown up. I don't recall another instance, in our history or in the history of any other country, where a whole people were consciously deciding policy.

We are not balking at taking over a task Britain failed in even before she gave it up for lack of means to carry on. Britain has already spent more in Greece than we are asked to give. The United States, itself, through UNRRA and direct grants, has spent nearly twice as much as the sum proposed now. All this economic aid has not availed to save the situation.

My own hope is that Britain will stay with us in Greece until the United Nations relieves us both. But this is not what troubles us most. It is characteristic of Americans to believe that we can succeed where the other fellow fails. We don't want to prop up the ruins of empire or governments in bankruptcy, but our reluctance is not due to an inferiority complex. No; the reason the President's message shocked us is that it suddenly showed us exactly where we stand, with nothing between us and whatever danger there is. Wherever the front line is, there are we, exposed and responsible.

It's hard to be an American, and it's hard for an American to take over world leadership. Throughout the war we kept repeating that the struggle for peace would be more difficult than the military battle, but we did not really believe it. Since the fighting ceased we have preened ourselves on having learned from experience. In proof of our final conversion from isolationism to internationalism we took the lead in sponsoring and organizing the United Nations. We outdid every other nation in supporting it. We gave it a home. We have treated it more

or less as an American institution, and that's what it looks like, don't forget, from Europe, Asia, or South America. We told ourselves and everybody else that we meant to base our policy on it.

This was and is our firm intention. It is our first and over-all commitment to ourselves and the world. If the United Nations cannot be built up to take the place of national armies; if an international mind cannot be slowly shaped out of the clash and conflict of national minds; if on this little, brittle globe, in its envelope of danger-infested air, a sense of community cannot be developed out of the knowledge that no man is safe unless all men are safe, then there is no sense in anything and no hope of peace or human progress. Certainly there is no work for the Women's Action Committee.

No American is pessimistic enough to accept the alternative to the United Nations, which is chaos, war, or death. No American dare accept it, and neither, I should judge, does Russia, for of all the member states, the United States and the Soviet Union should be the most concerned to strengthen it. Small nations might possibly take shelter behind the great, especially if the world is divided into two rival constellations. But the solar bodies have no shield. If there is war, they will bear the brunt and cost of it. Both would be immeasurably weakened and one irretrievably defeated.

This country cannot afford to assume international obligations except in some sort of association with the United Nations. This is important for the United States and even more important for the United Nations, because the world organization can never achieve authority to take over all international obligations, as eventually it must if it is to fulfill its mission, unless it draws authority from powers that are at present stronger than itself. It can only be strong, in other words, as it is made strong by its members.

It can be argued that it is more desirable for this Government to strengthen the United Nations than to strengthen Greece. In the long-range view that is beyond question, and all of us would be opposed to strengthening Greece at the expense of the United Nations.

But I do not think that is the choice we face. The choice is between shrugging off or shouldering our responsibility as a great democratic power. Certainly it would be easier to turn the question over to the United Nations. Some of those who protest againt bypassing the United Nations really want to bypass the question itself. They want an alibi for inaction, an excuse to do nothing.

Nothing is the one thing we cannot do. We are caught in a tremolo passage in the grand concerto of history, a movement of transition in which old institutions are in process, we hope, of giving place to new. But the movement is as slow and painful to listen to as the practice hour of a child who keeps on playing the first bars of an étude over and over. The United Nations can be invoked, as it should be; it can be associated in action, as it should be; but it does not yet command the funds, the means, the speed, and above all, the unity, to enable it to act in an emergency.

And that means that it isn't enough for us to belong to the United Nations. The Greek issue is a turning point precisely because it shows how easily the United Nations, just because it is still young and weak, can become a way of escape—the new refuge of the isolationist, or the refuge of the new isolationist.

The American dilemma is that we stand as the leader of the democratic forces of the world, and also as the chief architect of an international structure in which opposing systems, democratic, totalitarian, and their in-between variants, are supposed to work together. This opposition is the chief source of weakness in the United Nations; if you doubt it, look at the line-ups and the votes and observe how easy it is for the democracies on one side and the Soviet group on the other to reach agreement among themselves.

The first question is: What is the duty of the United States as a democracy? To my mind our paramount obligation is to work for a free world, for one world without freedom would be just one big prison. Surely we have to work to enlarge or at least to prevent the progressive narrowing of the area of freedom. To the extent of our power we have to see that as many countries as we can reach, and we can reach Greece and Turkey, are left free to choose their own form of government.

The next question is: What do we mean by democracy? Three Americans have lately offered resounding definitions—the President in enunciating a new policy to support free people to resist attempted subjugation; Secretary Marshall in laying down Jeffersonian doctrine before his colleagues at the Moscow Conference; David Lilienthal in reminding Congress of the fundamental principles of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Despite their different application, the definitions echced, they prove that Americans have no doubt of the meaning they attach to a word that others use to express something entirely different. But the important thing about these credos is that the speakers felt impelled to make them. No longer can we take for granted, as we did for a long time, that the world accepts our definitions, or believes we have the best form of government. We cannot take for granted that anyone else will take a stand for the democratic system unless we do.

Here, I think, we reach the point of decision. We live in a hungry world, a world of want and fear, a world of lost homes, lost values, lost souls. We Americans inhabit a kind of plateau of our own, above the poverty and gloom in which our allies and our former enemies share a common misery. The upper level isn't very safe in these circumstances and I need not tell you that we aren't greatly loved by the people down below.

We are in danger, moreover, of being left alone on our plateau with the freedoms we consider essential to our national existence. When I was in Europe this winter what worried me more than the physical suffering was the sagging spirit of the democracies. People have to have a minimum ration of bread and work and hope before they begin to care for freedom, and even those who do care are getting tired. Almost everywhere democratic parties are under attack by a Communist minority that never tires and brings to the political battle the discipline and elan of a well-trained army.

The danger is democratic defeatism, the discouragement of Democrats, the feeling that the democratic system is somehow obsolete and that the cards are stacked against it in a world too bankrupt to maintain economic freedoms. The many-sided pressures to give up the fight for individual freedom and national independence are almost irresistible. You may be sure that if the leading democracy does not take a stand for democracy, this defeatism will deepen and spread. And that spells disaster for us. Strong as it is, our system cannot function, politically or economically, in splendid isolation, and it may well be isolated unless we help democratic government to survive, not only where it is directly threatened, as in Greece, but where it is weakening, as in France.

If we agree that the United States cannot let democracy wither in the world, the third question is: What is our duty to the United Nations? I see no way out of the American dilemma except to seize both horns at once. We have to use our power to the utmost to support the United Nations and democracy at the same time. It's a job for both hands—and this is one case where the right hand must always see what the left hand doeth—and a job for both lobes of the brain, for so far in the world affairs we have used all our powers more effectively than our brain power. Senator Austin clarified the question when he said yesterday that it is by combining national and international action of both immediate and long-range character and aimed both at the security and economic aspects of the problem that the members of the United Nations can advance the cause of collective security.

We have to play the dual role and we have to play it spectacularly so that no man anywhere can doubt that we believe as ardently in an organized world community, limiting national sovereignty by international law, as we believe in defending and extending human freedom. Surely there is no contradiction there. The more free governments and free men we have the more quickly the United Nations will develop into the bulwark of freedom and justice it must be if it is to become the bulwark of peace. We are trying to create a security system, but at the same time we are creating the world order which that system has to maintain, and if the order is not sound, if it fails to satisfy the conscience and aspirations of mankind, all the ivory towers on the East River cannot make the system endure.

I know no other way to strike out for the long and rocky road to peace except to take the risks and follow the direction we believe will lead to peace. There is risk in any positive policy. My guess is that the President made a major issue of the Greek crisis to warn the Soviet leaders that they were running into the danger of war. Whether the alarm signal will cause them to stop, look, and listen is somebody else's guess. I believe it will buck up democratic forces in Europe and silence doubts as to whether we are going to stay in the war and the world to the end.

But to prevent those doubts from turning into fears that America comes as "protectors" have come before, as imperialists, it is important to carry out simultaneously a whole complex of other international policies, such as making room for displaced persons, supplying materials and opening markets for the projects of other countries, renewing and extending reciprocal trade agreements, insisting on a German settlement that will give hope and the means of self-support to Germany and speed the economic revival of Europe. Helping Greece and Turkey as strategic points of defense puts our motives under suspicion unless this help is part of a great program of general reconstruction.

All Europe is more or less under the same pressure and shaken by the same fears we act to allay in the eastern Mediterranean. Now that we have started being bold, why not be bold in a big way and set in motion a master plan for the resurrection of Europe? Not alone, of course, not as Santa Claus, but as a great country with faith in the future and audacity enough to invest our substance in building it. If we do not gamble greatly on the human race, who shall save it? If we do not gamble greatly on the human race, how shall we be saved?

We are too much afraid. We are too much afraid of communism. It is troublesome as an instrument of Russian expansion, but as a doctrine and way of life it takes only among the impoverished, the dispossessed and the frustrated. Remember that not a nation in the world outside of Russia has ever cast a majority vote for this system.

We are too much afraid of Russia. Russia is the biggest and most undeveloped of empires. Victory has weakened it as it has weakened every victor except the United States. The iron curtain is not opaque enough to hide the signs of its postwar crisis.

Russia is not ready to fight, has no will to fight and will back down before any threat of a first-class scrap.

We are too much afraid of war. We are in a period of profound struggle—a contest of ideas, of incompatible systems, of clashing worlds that have never met before, of words that don't mean the same thing and clocks that don't tell the same time. If we once convinced ourselves that this is the only kind of war we're going to fight for years to come, we'd take it in our stride and buckle down to the works of peace.

We are too much afraid of the cost of peace. We don't realize that if wars can be made by words, as Germany taught us, then peace can be made by words, thoughts, processes of education. When I looked at the rubble of Berlin, I shivered at the power of words. For surely that ruin is less the work of bombs than of the bombardment of words that pulverized the reason and moral sense of a people before it pulverized their cities. I saw then that the atom bomb will not destroy us unless we first destroy ourselves. And when I looked at the Germans, the living ghosts in that awful limbo, I saw that you can never kill your enemy. At the end of all wars you can only live with him. Our problem is to find the way, and surely for Americans, who are part of all the enemies they have fought, that isn't an insoluble problem.

Our problem is to get through to people, to find words that mean the same things in all languages. Peace is one of the words nobody mistakes. But how say it loud enough, so that the Russian people can hear us, for example? The power of the uncommunicated word is nil. Communication is about the most difficult of all our problems. Yet this country has the power to make itself heard and felt. No American dare underestimate that power, for we alone, at this particular moment of history, have the strength, the energy, and the means to swing the balance of the world.

No one else has the power to make peace. And there, members of the Women's Action Committee, is where we come in. To sum up what I have been trying to say, I think Americans have no choice but to fight for a civilization that guarantees individual liberty under the reign of law. There can be no peace unless the human being feels secure in his inalienable right to life and liberty. There can be no peace without the economic policies this organization sponsors. The way to peace is by opening doors—to trade, to people, to communication, to the spread of truth and light, which is the function of UNESCO, and of compassion and justice, which is the function of humanity.

Don't let's mark down or limit our aims. If we need a whole world, we need whole men and women to make it, men and women to whom nothing human is alien, and to whom no man-made problem seems beyond the capacity of man to solve. And don't let's underestimate our power as citizens. It was never so clear as now that public opinion makes policy in this country, and never so clear that this country makes policy for the world.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, Member of Congress from California, and I have jointly introduced a bill to provide housing for veterans. The bill is known as S. 701 and H. R. 1750. In a statement made before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on Thursday, March 20, Mrs. DOUGLAS very ably described the great need for the speedy construction of veterans' housing and the method which our bill provides for its solution. Her statement was so cogent a presentation of the problem that I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I urgently request my colleagues to give it close attention.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Representative DOUGLAS. Housing today, gentlemen, is not a problem, it is a crisis—a crisis which must be realistically met if we are to protect the American home, the foundation of our democracy.

Congress cannot sit idly by and permit millions of families to live in tents, garages, stores, cabins, trailers, hotel rooms, or shamefully doubled up in one-family dwellings without inviting social disorder.

This committee has before it a comprehensive housing bill which is designed to meet this crisis on a permanent, long-term basis. I heartily support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and commend its authors. It is long overdue.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is designed to provide low-rent public housing for the low-income groups and moderate rental private housing for the middle-income groups, and to extend financial assistance to communities for the clearance of slums for redevelopment.

Despite the magnificence of this bill, we must face one hard, cold fact—that building costs today have been caught in an inflationary spiral.

The most tragic and helpless victim of this spiral is the veteran, for whom I am pleading today.

Despite all the incentives and encouragement which this bill gives to private enterprise by reducing substantially the cost and risk of financing private building, nevertheless the present inflated level of construction costs will make it next to impossible over the next 2 years to build any volume of reasonably decent homes for rent which will be within the reach of the average veteran.

Even with the additional aids which would be provided by the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, few if any homes can be built at present costs to rent between $30 and $50 a month, and it is in this range the average veteran finds himself. A survey of veterans' housing needs, conducted last summer by the Bureau of the Census, showed that 36 percent of the veterans requiring rental housing can only afford rents in the $30 to $50 range on the basis of their current earnings.

In other words, most of the veterans are caught between the limitations in the public-housing portion of this bill which in effect would restrict occupancy of public housing to families of not over $2,000 income even in the largest metropolitan areas, and the inflationary costs under which private enterprise must operate today.

You have been presented and will be presented with the general housing needs of this country, in support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and they are very great.

I want to present you specifically with the plight of the veteran.

Let me quote from the testimony of the chairman of the veterans' advisory committee of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles before a joint legislative committee of the California Legislature held in Los Angeles, February 24, 1947. This advisory committee is made up of all veterans' organizations in the State, and just prior to its report to this legislative committee had completed a comprehensive survey of veterans' needs in Los Angeles.

"It is this committee which actually contacts the veteran and his family who need housing. And from those personal contacts the committee has formulated its opinions and ideas regarding the immediate need for action.

"Interviewing about 100 veterans a day, these committeemen hear the pleading stories of young Americans beating a path to this public agency for help. Here is where the story of desperation is revealed.

"In the privacy of a small office the veteran, in most cases accompanied by his wife, and in many interviews small children tag along, unfolds his pitiful story of postwar housing. It is not uncommon to learn of 12 people of mixed sexes sleeping in one bedroom. Nor is it uncommon to hear of parents occupying one bed with an adult son and daughter. Newspaper reports of young American veterans and their families living in chicken coops and rabbit hutches are not exaggerated one iota.

"It is ironically fortunate for public morals that newspapermen are not present at these daily interviews.

"The majority of veterans applying for housing assistance at the local public housing offices have made tiresome search for rental accommodations long before calling upon the agency for help. The failure of private enterprise to provide adequate rental units within the price range of the average veteran family will force more of these veterans to appeal for shelter to Government agencies.

"More than 59 percent of the veterans who have applied for public housing have incomes of less than $40 weekly. Incomes in some of the families surveyed are often supplemented by other employable persons in the group.

"The hard, cold facts are simple to understand. Limited incomes, lack of adequate rental opportunities at prices these veterans can afford to pay are creating tremendous hardship. Hundreds of veteran families have been forced to crowd in with relatives and friends. The health authorities have expressed much concern in the matter. Disease is on the upgrade. Juvenile delinquency and adult uneasiness because of housing problems are now fomenting added social disorders. Separated families in this area are increasing; divorces are more frequently mentioned among our young veteran families as a means to an end of family responsibility."

This is the condition in which we find our veterans in one important community in the United States. Multiply it hundreds of times and you have the condition of veterans in the Nation.

According to figures supplied by the Veterans' Administration and the National Housing Agency based on Bureau of Census statistics, we find that in the Nation more than half the veterans are married, and that 30 percent of those married veterans are living abnormally, as the veterans I just described are living in California—namely, in trailers, tourist cabins, rented rooms, in stores, or doubled up with parents in single unit dwellings—or, even worse, housing conditions are actually forcing husbands and wives to live separately.

Again, according to the survey made by the Bureau of Census in the summer of 1946 for the National Housing Agency, the average income of the married veteran in the United States needing rental housing was $47 a week.

According to this same survey, 14 percent of the married veterans requiring rental

housing must pay less than $30 a month, and 56 percent can only afford to pay rents between $30 to $50 a month.

Private enterprise cannot produce and is not producing new housing at the rents needed to serve veterans and their families in these lower-income ranges.

The number of permits issued by Federal Housing Agency for construction of new houses from December 24, 1946, through March 7, 1947, was 130,615.

Of those, 16,615 were for rental housing.

Of the 16,615 for rent in the entire country, only 3,403 were to rent for less than $50 per month.

Our young men gave up their homes to defend this Nation. They have returned and find themselves homeless, caught in the worst housing emergency in the history of this country.

Surely our defenders have a right, now, to settle down peacefully and establish their own families.

Surely it is the direct responsibility of Congress to act in this matter.

Senator TAYLOR and I have introduced a bill to provide houses for veterans. Our bill is no substitute for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which fills a critical long-term need.

It has nothing to do with the urgency of continuing rent controls. The deficiency appropriation to finish uncompleted units of veterans' temporary emergency housing is still vital.

We must continue to recognize that it is more important for people to have roofs over their heads than for night clubs, race tracks, and show places to be built. We, therefore, must continue a rigid limitation on nonresidential construction.

Allocations and materials controls should be continued and vigorously enforced with respect to any materials still in short supply.

All of these essential measures are supplementary to the need for basic housing legislation such as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. However, even with the enactment of this Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, under present high levels of construction costs, you will have a no-man's land in housing for the family that must rent between $30 to $50 a month, and it is this no-man's land which creates an emergency for the veteran which our bill is designed to meet.

This committee must decide whether it is the responsibility of Government to provide decent homes for its defenders in those fields in which private enterprise cannot make such provisions. It it does so decide, then it must recognize the emergency with which the veteran is confronted.

In brief, what our bill does is to authorize the Federal Government to make loans of up to a total of $1,000,000,000 to local public housing agencies at a 2½-percent interest rate and for terms extending up to 60 years.

To bridge the gap between the $30 to $50 rents we are seeking and the costs of operation and debt service due to inflated construction costs, the Federal Government would make annual contributions up to 2 percent of the project's development cost. This would mean that with a building program of $1,000,000,000 worth of veterans' housing, there will be a maximum annual cost of the Government of $2,000,000. This cost cannot continue over a longer period than 10 years. If we relieve our acute housing shortage quickly the contributions may be needed for only a few years.

Here is what the bill would do:

1. It would provide housing of a permanent nature, immediately, for a large number of veterans requiring moderate-rental housing—which is the largest group of veterans.

2. It would be applicable only where the President and the locality involved finds that an acute shortage of housing exists which cannot be provided in sufficient quantities by private enterprise.

3. It would confine its benefits to servicemen, veterans and their families, and the families of deceased persons who served in the armed forces.

4. It would be restricted to rental housing.

5. It would use the existing instrumentalities of public housing agencies which, over the past few years, have demonstrated, by their competence, experience, and talent, their capacity to undertake such a program.

6. Because of the low interest rate on the loans and the long amortization period, it would make necessary only small annual contributions to achieve the moderate rents desired.

7. It calls for the utilization of the Federal agency which is accustomed and experienced in this type of Federal aid to localities and therefore one which is geared in personnel and techniques to move immediately.

8. When the President determines that the acute shortage of housing no longer exists, it would require that local public housing agencies dispose of any housing project constructed under this bill at its fair market value.

There is a very definite precedent for such an approach. In the months prior to the declaration of war on December 7, 1941, a large number of permanent well-constructed housing projects were developed and constructed to rent at economic values, with a specific provision in the law that these projects shall be disposed of as soon after the emergency as possible. The Government is now in the process of disposing of these projects to tenants and to private operators; the same thing would be done with the program herein outlined.

It will be charged that this is notihng more than public housing going into a field which was never contemplated, and which if continued as a basic policy of Government would result in Government-owned housing for a tremendous segment of our society. There would be merit to such criticism if it were to become a basic policy. Therefore, our bill is based on the philosophy that this is an emergency and that Government control and ownership will cease when the emergency is over.

It is the direct responsibility of Congress to provide decent housing for our young men who gave up their homes to defend this Nation and who have now returned to this country, and are seeking, fruitlessly, to find new homes where they can begin their familiy life.

There are millions of these veterans today who are homeless, gentlemen.

A Mississippi Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Mississippi Statesman," which appeared in the April 1947 issue of the Southern Agriculturist.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MISSISSIPPI STATESMAN

One of the hardest working statesmen on the current American scene who is rendering conspicuous service to the South and to the Nation as a whole is Congressman WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi.

Born in Moss Point, Miss., educated at Millsaps College in Jackson, 1910–14, in World War I as a private in the United States Army, promoted to regimental sergeant major before his discharge—this young Mississippian began his career as a school teacher in 1914.

In 1917, Mr. COLMER was admitted to the Mississippi Bar. From 1921 to 1927 he served as county attorney for Jackson County, from 1928 to 1933 as district attorney for the second district, and since then has represented the Sixth Mississippi District as one of the most able and conscientious Members of Congress.

While a member of the all-important House Rules Committee and a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission, Congressman COLMER'S most distinguished service has been rendered in recent years as chairman of the Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning.

In the latter capacity, Congressman COLMER has submitted 11 comprehensive reports to the Congress dealing with basic economic problems growing out of the war.

The following summary of Congressman COLMER'S latest recommendations to the Congress, as chairman of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning and calling for congressional inquiries by appropriate committees, is typical of the sound approach and thoroughgoing way in which he and his committee are functioning:

1. A review of the financial aspects of our occupation policy in order to substitute productive and self-supporting economies in exenemy countries for the present method of supporting them with American money while they in turn are being drained by Russia and France.

2. Specific assistance to the western occupied zones of Germany and Austria, and direct relief to Italy and Greece.

3. The making available of loans to our occupation authorities through the Export-Import Bank rather than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in order to start the flow of raw materials necessary for industrial production in these countries. This involves a limited further capitalization of the Export-Import Bank for political loans made necessary before the effective operation of the International Bank and Fund. This further capitalization should be authorized only after a review of the existing loans, and the withdrawal of credits to countries which have violated the agreements that formed the basis of the loans.

4. A further inquiry into the remaining restrictions on the movement of businessmen; and into the methods by which freedom of access into foreign countries of United States information agencies, including books, magazines, papers, movies, and reporters, can be facilitated.

5. A specific study of safeguarding the trade recommendations with respect to the abuse of state trading practices, particularly by the state monopolies of nations who are not members either of the Bank, the Fund, or of the International Trade Organization.

6. A study of the desirability and effectiveness of the elimination of the export of American technical know-how and of finished products which could be useful in the development of atomic weapons under the provisions of the McMahon bill on the control of atomic energy. Security considerations may call for broadening such controls over experts to prevent building of other armaments.

7. The holding up of further settlements of lend-lease until inquiries as to the fulfillment of the conditions of the lend-lease agreement have been made and until the safeguarding of access to strategic materials and equal trading operations for the United States have been obtained.

8. A study of the nature of the employment of gold reserves by countries which are not members of the International Bank and Fund which may prejudice the operation of gold as a medium of international exchange for multilateral trading.

Congressman COLMER'S work in all these vital inquiries and studies cannot fail to show that the South, and the State of Mississippi in particular, is being represented today in the National Government by a leadership of the most able and diligent kind. In COLMER the citizens of the Magnolia State have a spokesman whose importance, evidenced daily in the Nation's Capital, bids fair to become as memorable in future years as that of such distinguished Mississippians as Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar, Jefferson Davis, and Sergeant Smith Prentiss.

Let's Practice What We Preach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received from Mr. C. T. Thompson, of the Thompson-Hayward Chemical Co., Kansas City, Mo., a copy of a circular which is being distributed by that company on the subject of Government economy. It is entitled "Let's Practice What We Preach."

This circular points out in a very telling manner that the only way we can reduce taxes and expenditures is by reducing the activities of the Government. While the truths contained in this circular are self-evident, they cannot too often be repeated and emphasized.

LET'S PRACTICE WHAT WE PREACH!

There is almost a universal demand for a decrease in National Government expenditure.

The same demand exists for decreased taxes by business and individuals.

Yet what causes Congress to delay action so definitely promised before elections?

Why? Why? Why?

Because—

Farmers don't want subsidies and crop guaranties discontinued.

States want hand-outs for road construction.

Cities want donations to expand airport facilities.

Veterans want expenditures which are growing by leaps and bounds.

Localities want Federal aid for school lunches.

Federal agencies refuse to reduce their specialized activities and enlist favored blocs to scream at the prospect of being cut.

We could continue, but you get the point.

What further do we see?

Every State, every city, engaged in a mad competitive rush to expand.

Citizens all demanding more services, which cost money to create and more taxes to maintain.

Never were so many bond issues being proposed by every metropolitan city for new projects at a time when money will buy less tangible results.

Educational agencies all out raising funds to expand for an emergency condition again with highest costs for accomplishment.

So it goes.

How can taxes be reduced unless we exercise some self-restraint, self-denial, and self-discipline.

(A) As citizens, we must resolve—

1. To vote against additional bonds in our own communities when it is not sound to do so.

2. To be willing to forego many improvements.

3. To be hardy enough to stand some inconveniences and discomforts if our pocketbooks are not able to pay the price of the bill to eliminate them.

(B) As communities—

1. To stop looking to Federal aids for donations and help.

2. To only undertake projects the community can properly pay for.

3. To be willing to expand on a realistic and orderly basis.

4. To stop starry-eyed competition with other communities and be content with doing the best we can with what we have.

(C) As States—

1. To eliminate duplication of Federal programs such as veterans' bonuses, and paternalistic programs.

2. To restore to their local communities their local responsibilities.

We can't have our pie and eat it too. The New Dealers have proved this to us in our debt load.

Lower taxes can only come with less expenditures.

Let's practice what we preach.

Individual Income-Tax Reduction, H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that H. R. 1 has passed the House of Representatives, its provisions are of interest to all individual taxpayers. The bill as it passed the House is a tax-reduction bill for the benefit of those who pay individual income taxes. It does not apply to corporations.

What changes may be made in H. R. 1 before it becomes a law are problematical, but I am inserting tables taken from the Ways and Means Committee report on H. R. 1, which will show the effect of H. R. 1 on individual income taxpayers.

What each individual income taxpayer will wish to know is how H. R. 1 will affect him if the bill becomes law in its present form. The purpose of each table and the person or persons to whom the tables apply is clearly stated at the top of each table.

Individual income taxpayers, whether single or married, who have attained the age of 65 or over, will be especially interested in tables 4, 5, and 6.

TABLE VI-A.—*Comparison of individual income tax under present law and H. R. 1, as reported*

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax		Amount of reduction in tax, H. R. 1 (as reported)	Percent tax reduction, H. R. 1 (as reported)	Effective rates	
	Present law	H. R. 1 as reported			Present law	H. R. 1 as reported
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
$500						
$600	$19.00	$13.30	$5.70	30.00	3.17	2.22
$700	38.00	26.60	11.40	30.00	5.43	3.80
$750	47.50	33.25	14.25	30.00	6.33	4.43
$800	57.00	39.90	17.10	30.00	7.12	4.99
$900	76.00	53.20	22.80	30.00	8.44	5.91
$1,000	95.00	66.50	28.50	30.00	9.50	6.65
$1,200	133.00	93.10	39.90	30.00	11.08	7.76
$1,500	190.00	133.00	57.00	30.00	12.67	8.87
$1,600	209.00	153.00	56.00	26.79	13.06	9.56
$1,700	228.00	173.00	55.00	24.12	13.41	10.18
$1,800	247.00	193.00	54.00	21.86	13.72	10.72
$1,900	266.00	212.80	53.20	20.00	14.00	11.20
$2,000	285.00	228.00	57.00	20.00	14.25	11.40
$2,500	380.00	304.00	76.00	20.00	15.20	12.16
$3,000	484.50	387.60	96.90	20.00	16.15	12.92
$4,000	693.50	554.80	138.70	20.00	17.34	13.87
$5,000	921.50	737.20	184.30	20.00	18.43	14.74
$6,000	1,168.50	934.80	233.70	20.00	19.47	15.58
$7,000	1,434.50	1,147.60	286.90	20.00	20.49	16.39
$8,000	1,719.50	1,375.60	343.90	20.00	21.49	17.20
$9,000	2,023.50	1,618.80	404.70	20.00	22.48	17.99
$10,000	2,346.50	1,877.20	469.30	20.00	23.47	18.77
$11,000	2,688.50	2,150.80	537.70	20.00	24.44	19.55
$12,000	3,049.50	2,439.60	609.90	20.00	25.41	20.33
$13,000	3,434.25	2,747.40	686.85	20.00	26.42	21.13
$14,000	3,842.75	3,074.20	768.55	20.00	27.45	21.96
$15,000	4,270.25	3,416.20	854.05	20.00	28.47	22.77
$20,000	6,645.25	5,316.20	1,329.05	20.00	33.23	26.58
$25,000	9,362.25	7,489.80	1,872.45	20.00	37.45	29.96
$30,000	12,264.50	9,811.60	2,452.90	20.00	40.88	32.71
$40,000	18,425.25	14,740.20	3,685.05	20.00	46.06	36.85
$50,000	25,137.00	20,109.60	5,027.40	20.00	50.27	40.22
$60,000	32,247.75	25,798.20	6,449.55	20.00	53.75	43.00
$70,000	39,643.50	31,714.80	7,928.70	20.00	56.63	45.31
$80,000	47,324.25	37,859.40	9,464.85	20.00	59.16	47.32
$90,000	55,290.00	44,232.00	11,058.00	20.00	61.43	49.15
$100,000	63,540.75	50,832.60	12,708.15	20.00	63.54	50.83
$150,000	105,806.25	84,645.00	21,161.25	20.00	70.54	56.43
$200,000	148,551.50	118,841.20	29,710.30	20.00	74.28	59.42
$250,000	191,771.75	153,417.40	38,354.35	20.00	76.71	61.37
$300,000	234,996.75	187,997.40	46,999.35	20.00	78.33	62.67
$400,000	321,446.75	265,110.25	56,336.50	17.53	80.36	66.28
$500,000	407,896.75	342,460.25	65,436.50	16.04	81.58	68.49
$750,000	624,021.75	535,835.25	88,186.50	14.13	83.20	71.44
$1,000,000	840,146.75	729,210.25	110,936.50	13.20	84.01	72.92
$2,000,000	1,704,646.75	1,502,710.25	201,936.50	11.85	85.23	75.14
$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	3,823,210.25	451,789.75	10.57	85.50	76.46

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE VI–B.—*Comparison between individual income tax under present law and H. R. 1, as reported*

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax		Amount of reduction in tax, H. R. 1, as reported	Percent tax reduction, H. R. 1, as reported	Effective rates	
	Present law	H. R. 1, as reported			Present law	H. R. 1, as reported
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
$1,000						
$1,200	$38.00	$26.60	$11.40	30.00	3.17	2.22
$1,500	95.00	66.50	28.50	30.00	6.33	4.43
$1,800	152.00	106.40	45.60	30.00	8.44	5.91
$2,000	190.00	133.00	57.00	30.00	9.50	6.65
$2,100	209.00	153.00	56.00	26.79	9.95	7.29
$2,200	228.00	173.00	55.00	24.12	10.36	7.86
$2,300	247.00	193.00	54.00	21.86	10.74	8.39
$2,400	266.00	212.80	53.20	20.00	11.08	8.87
$2,500	285.00	228.00	57.00	20.00	11.40	9.12
$3,000	380.00	304.00	76.00	20.00	12.67	10.13
$4,000	589.00	471.20	117.80	20.00	14.72	11.78
$5,000	798.00	638.40	159.60	20.00	15.96	12.77
$6,000	1,045.00	836.00	209.00	20.00	17.42	13.93
$7,000	1,292.00	1,033.60	258.40	20.00	18.46	14.77
$8,000	1,577.00	1,261.60	315.40	20.00	19.71	15.77
$9,000	1,862.00	1,489.60	372.40	20.00	20.69	16.55
$10,000	2,185.00	1,748.00	437.00	20.00	21.85	17.48
$11,000	2,508.00	2,006.40	501.60	20.00	22.80	18.24
$12,000	2,869.00	2,295.20	573.80	20.00	23.91	19.13
$13,000	3,230.00	2,584.00	646.00	20.00	24.85	19.88
$14,000	3,638.50	2,910.80	727.70	20.00	25.99	20.79
$15,000	4,047.00	3,237.60	809.40	20.00	26.98	21.58
$20,000	6,393.50	5,114.80	1,278.70	20.00	31.97	25.57
$25,000	9,082.00	7,265.60	1,816.40	20.00	36.33	29.06
$30,000	11,970.00	9,576.00	2,394.00	20.00	39.90	31.92
$40,000	18,097.50	14,478.00	3,619.50	20.00	45.24	36.20
$50,000	24,795.00	19,836.00	4,959.00	20.00	49.59	39.67
$60,000	31,891.50	25,513.20	6,378.30	20.00	53.15	42.52
$70,000	39,273.00	31,418.40	7,854.60	20.00	56.10	44.88
$80,000	46,939.50	37,551.60	9,387.90	20.00	58.67	46.94
$90,000	54,891.00	43,912.80	10,978.20	20.00	60.99	48.79
$100,000	63,127.50	50,502.00	12,625.50	20.00	63.13	50.50
$150,000	105,383.50	84,306.80	21,076.70	20.00	70.26	56.20
$200,000	148,124.00	118,499.20	29,624.80	20.00	74.06	59.25
$250,000	191,339.50	153,071.60	38,267.90	20.00	76.54	61.23
$300,000	234,564.50	187,651.60	46,912.90	20.00	78.19	62.55
$400,000	321,014.50	264,723.50	56,291.00	17.54	80.25	66.18
$500,000	407,464.50	342,073.50	65,391.00	16.05	81.49	68.41
$750,000	623,589.50	535,448.50	88,141.00	14.13	83.15	71.39
$1,000,000	839,714.50	728,823.50	110,891.00	13.21	83.97	72.88
$2,000,000	1,704,214.50	1,502,323.50	201,891.00	11.85	85.21	75.12
$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	3,822,823.50	452,176.50	10.58	85.50	76.46

TABLE VI–C.—*Comparison of individual income tax under present law and H. R. 1, as reported*

MARRIED PERSON—2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax		Amount of reduction in tax, H. R. 1 (as reported)	Percent tax reduction, H. R. 1 (as reported)	Effective rates	
	Present law	H. R. 1 (as reported)			Present law	H. R. 1 (as reported)
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
$2,000						
$2,500	$95.00	$66.50	$28.50	30.00	3.80	2.66
$3,000	190.00	133.00	57.00	30.00	6.33	4.43
$3,100	209.00	153.00	56.00	26.79	6.74	4.94
$3,200	228.00	173.00	55.00	24.12	7.13	5.41
$3,300	247.00	193.00	54.00	21.86	7.48	5.85
$3,400	266.00	212.80	53.20	20.00	7.82	6.26
$3,500	285.00	228.00	57.00	20.00	8.14	6.51
$4,000	380.00	304.00	76.00	20.00	9.50	7.60
$5,000	589.00	471.20	117.80	20.00	11.78	9.42
$6,000	798.00	638.40	159.60	20.00	13.30	10.64
$7,000	1,045.00	836.00	209.00	20.00	14.93	11.94
$8,000	1,292.00	1,033.60	258.40	20.00	16.15	12.92
$9,000	1,577.00	1,261.60	315.40	20.00	17.52	14.02
$10,000	1,862.00	1,489.60	372.40	20.00	18.62	14.90
$11,000	2,185.00	1,748.00	437.00	20.00	19.86	15.89
$12,000	2,508.00	2,006.40	501.60	20.00	20.90	16.72
$13,000	2,869.00	2,295.20	573.80	20.00	22.07	17.66
$14,000	3,230.00	2,584.00	646.00	20.00	23.07	18.46
$15,000	3,638.50	2,910.80	727.70	20.00	24.26	19.41
$20,000	5,890.00	4,712.00	1,178.00	20.00	29.45	23.56
$25,000	8,521.50	6,817.20	1,704.30	20.00	34.09	27.27
$30,000	11,381.00	9,104.80	2,276.20	20.00	37.94	30.35
$40,000	17,442.00	13,953.60	3,488.40	20.00	43.60	34.88
$50,000	24,111.00	19,288.80	4,822.20	20.00	48.22	38.58
$60,000	31,179.00	24,943.20	6,235.80	20.00	51.96	41.57
$70,000	38,532.00	30,825.60	7,706.40	20.00	55.05	44.04
$80,000	46,170.00	36,936.00	9,234.00	20.00	57.71	46.17
$90,000	54,093.00	43,274.40	10,818.60	20.00	60.10	48.08
$100,000	62,301.00	49,840.80	12,460.20	20.00	62.30	49.84
$150,000	104,538.00	83,630.40	20,907.60	20.00	69.69	55.75
$200,000	147,269.00	117,815.20	29,453.80	20.00	73.63	58.91
$250,000	190,475.00	152,380.00	38,095.00	20.00	76.19	60.95
$300,000	233,700.00	186,960.00	46,740.00	20.00	77.90	62.32
$400,000	320,150.00	263,950.00	56,200.00	17.55	80.04	65.99
$500,000	406,600.00	341,300.00	65,300.00	16.06	81.32	68.26
$750,000	622,725.00	534,675.00	88,050.00	14.14	83.03	71.29
$1,000,000	838,850.00	728,050.00	110,800.00	13.21	83.88	72.81
$2,000,000	1,703,350.00	1,501,550.00	201,800.00	11.85	85.17	75.08
$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	3,822,050.00	452,950.00	10.60	85.50	76.44

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE VII–A.—*Comparison between individual income tax under present law and under H. R. 1 for taxpayers 65 years of age and over* [1]

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax		Reduction in present tax under H. R. 1
	Present law	H. R. 1	
$500			
$600	$19.00		$19.00
$700	38.00		38.00
$750	47.50		47.50
$800	57.00		57.00
$900	76.00		76.00
$1,000	95.00		95.00
$1,200	133.00	$26.60	106.40
$1,500	190.00	66.50	123.50
$1,800	247.00	106.40	140.60
$2,000	285.00	133.00	152.00
$2,500	380.00	228.00	152.00
$3,000	484.50	304.00	180.50
$4,000	693.50	471.20	222.30
$5,000	921.50	638.40	283.10
$6,000	1,168.50	836.00	332.50
$7,000	1,434.50	1,033.60	400.90
$8,000	1,719.50	1,621.60	457.90
$9,000	2,023.50	1,489.60	533.90
$10,000	2,346.50	1,748.00	598.50
$11,000	2,688.50	2,006.40	682.10
$12,000	3,049.50	2,295.20	754.30
$13,000	3,434.25	2,584.00	850.25
$14,000	3,842.75	2,910.80	931.95
$15,000	4,270.25	3,237.60	1,032.65
$20,000	6,645.25	5,114.80	1,530.45
$25,000	9,362.25	7,265.60	2,096.65
$30,000	12,264.50	9,576.00	2,688.50
$40,000	18,425.25	14,478.00	3,947.25
$50,000	25,137.00	19,836.00	5,301.00
$60,000	32,247.25	25,513.20	6,734.05
$70,000	39,643.50	31,418.40	8,225.10
$80,000	47,324.25	37,551.60	9,772.65
$90,000	55,290.00	43,912.80	11,377.20
$100,000	63,540.75	50,502.00	13,038.75
$150,000	105,806.25	84,306.80	21,499.45
$200,000	148,551.50	118,499.20	30,052.30
$250,000	191,771.75	153,071.60	38,700.15
$300,000	234,996.75	187,651.60	47,345.15
$400,000	321,446.75	264,723.50	56,723.25
$500,000	407,896.75	342,073.50	65,823.25
$750,000	624,021.75	535,448.50	88,573.25
$1,000,000	840,146.75	728,823.50	111,323.25
$2,000,000	1,704,646.75	1,502,323.50	202,323.25
$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	3,822,823.50	452,176.50

[1] The greatest reduction in tax dollars due to the $500 exemption is $385.75. This is on an income of $5,000,000.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE VII–B.—*Comparison between individual income tax under present law and under H. R. 1 for taxpayers 65 years of age and over* [1]

MARRIED COUPLE BOTH WITH INCOME OVER $500—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax		Reduction in present tax under H. R. 1
	Present law	H. R. 1	
$500			
$600			
$700			
$750			
$800			
$900			
$1,000			
$1,200	$38.00		$38.00
$1,500	95.00		95.00
$1,800	152.00		152.00
$2,000	190.00		190.00
$2,500	285.00	$66.50	218.50
$3,000	380.00	133.00	247.00
$4,000	589.00	304.00	285.00
$5,000	798.00	471.20	326.80
$6,000	1,045.00	638.40	406.60
$7,000	1,292.00	836.00	456.00
$8,000	1,577.00	1,033.60	543.40
$9,000	1,862.00	1,261.60	600.40
$10,000	2,185.00	1,489.60	695.40
$11,000	2,508.00	1,748.00	760.00
$12,000	2,869.00	2,006.40	862.60
$13,000	3,230.00	2,295.20	934.80
$14,000	3,638.50	2,584.00	1,054.50
$15,000	4,047.00	2,910.80	1,136.20
$20,000	6,393.50	4,712.00	1,681.50
$25,000	9,082.00	6,817.20	2,264.80
$30,000	11,970.00	9,104.80	2,865.20
$40,000	18,097.50	13,953.60	4,143.90
$50,000	24,795.00	19,288.80	5,506.20

[1] The greatest reduction in tax dollars due to the $500 exemption is $773.50. This is on an income of $5,000,000.

TABLE VII–B.—*Comparison between individual income tax under present law and under H. R. 1 for taxpayers 65 years of age and over*—Continued

MARRIED COUPLE BOTH WITH INCOME OVER $500—NO DEPENDENTS—continued

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax		Reduction in present tax under H. R. 1
	Present law	H. R. 1	
$60,000	$31,891.50	$24,943.20	$6,948.30
$70,000	39,273.00	30,825.60	8,447.40
$80,000	46,939.50	36,936.00	10,003.50
$90,000	54,891.00	43,274.40	11,616.60
$100,000	63,127.50	49,840.80	13,286.70
$150,000	105,383.50	83,630.40	21,753.10
$200,000	148,124.00	117,815.20	30,308.80
$250,000	191,339.50	152,380.00	38,959.50
$300,000	234,564.50	186,960.00	47,604.50
$400,000	321,014.50	263,950.00	57,064.50
$500,000	407,464.50	341,300.00	66,164.50
$750,000	623,589.50	534,675.00	88,914.50
$1,000,000	839,714.50	728,050.00	111,664.50
$2,000,000	1,704,214.50	1,501,550.00	202,664.50
$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	3,822,050.00	452,950.00

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE VII.—*Comparison between individual income tax under present law and under H. R. 1 for taxpayers 65 years of age and over*[1]

MARRIED COUPLE BOTH WITH INCOME OVER $500—2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax		Reduction in present tax under H. R. 1
	Present law	H. R. 1	
$500			
$600			
$700			
$750			
$800			
$900			
$1,000			
$1,200			
$1,500			
$1,800			
$2,000			
$2,500	$95.00		$95.00
$3,000	190.00		190.00
$4,000	380.00	$133.00	247.00
$5,000	589.00	304.00	285.00
$6,000	798.00	471.20	326.80
$7,000	1,045.00	638.40	406.60
$8,000	1,292.00	836.00	456.00
$9,000	1,577.00	1,033.60	543.40
$10,000	1,862.00	1,261.60	600.40
$11,000	2,185.00	1,489.60	695.40
$12,000	2,508.00	1,748.00	760.00
$13,000	2,869.00	2,006.40	862.60

[1] The greatest reduction in tax dollars due to the $500 exemption is $773.50. This is on an income of $5,000,000.

TABLE VII.—*Comparison between individual income tax under present law and under H. R. 1 for taxpayers 65 years of age and over*—Continued

MARRIED COUPLE BOTH WITH INCOME OVER $500—2 DEPENDENTS—continued

Net income before personal exemption	Amount of tax		Reduction in present tax under H. R. 1
	Present law	H. R. 1	
$14,000	$3,230.00	$2,295.20	$934.80
$15,000	3,638.50	2,584.00	1,054.50
$20,000	5,890.00	4,332.00	1,558.00
$25,000	8,521.50	6,368.80	2,152.70
$30,000	11,381.00	8,633.60	2,747.40
$40,000	17,442.00	13,459.60	3,982.40
$50,000	24,111.00	18,741.60	5,369.40
$60,000	31,179.00	24,373.20	6,805.80
$70,000	38,532.00	30,232.80	8,299.20
$80,000	46,170.00	36,320.40	9,849.60
$90,000	54,093.00	42,636.00	11,457.00
$100,000	62,301.00	49,179.60	13,121.40
$150,000	104,538.00	82,954.00	21,584.00
$200,000	147,269.00	117,131.20	30,137.80
$250,000	190,475.00	151,688.40	38,786.60
$300,000	233,700.00	186,268.40	47,431.60
$400,000	320,150.00	263,176.50	56,973.50
$500,000	406,600.00	340,526.50	66,073.50
$750,000	622,725.00	533,901.50	88,823.50
$1,000,000	838,850.00	727,276.50	111,573.50
$2,000,000	1,703,350.00	1,500,776.50	202,573.50
$5,000,000	4,275,000.00	3,821,276.50	453,723.50

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE VIII.—*Comparison between the estimated individual income-tax liability under present law and H. R. 1, calendar year 1947 (with assumed income payments of $165,000,000,000)*

[Money amounts are expressed in millions]

Net income class (in thousands)	Taxable returns		Net income		Tax liability under [1]				Decrease in tax over present law					
					Present law		H. R. 1		Amount			Percent		
	Number	Percentage distribution	Amount	Percentage distribution	Amount	Percentage distribution	Amount	Percentage distribution	Simple distribution	Cumulated from smallest income class	Cumulated from highest income class	Simple distribution	Cumulated from smallest income group	Cumulated from highest income group
$0 to $1	6,563,742	14.1	$5,087	4.5	$343	2.0	$240	1.8	$103	$103	$3,696	2.8	2.8	100.0
$1 to $2	18,032,560	38.6	26,982	23.6	2,579	15.3	1,805	13.7	774	877	3,593	20.9	23.7	97.2
$2 to $3	12,696,257	27.2	31,441	27.5	3,163	18.8	2,445	18.6	718	1,595	2,819	19.4	43.1	76.3
$3 to $4	6,731,566	12.3	19,574	17.1	2,238	13.3	1,791	13.6	447	2,042	2,101	12.1	55.2	56.9
$4 to $5	1,703,235	3.8	7,926	6.9	1,066	6.3	853	6.5	213	2,255	1,654	5.8	61.0	44.8
Total under $5	44,817,360	96.0	91,010	79.6	9,390	55.7	7,135	54.2	2,255			61.0		
$5 to $10	1,213,469	2.6	8,100	7.1	1,393	8.3	1,114	8.5	279	2,534	1,441	7.5	68.5	39.0
$10 to $25	506,953	1.1	7,500	6.6	2,030	12.0	1,628	12.4	402	2,936	1,162	10.9	79.4	31.5
$25 to $50	102,103	.2	3,450	3.0	1,446	8.6	1,162	8.8	284	3,220	760	7.7	87.1	20.6
$50 to $100	34,896	.1	2,419	2.1	1,321	7.8	1,065	8.1	256	3,476	476	6.9	94.0	12.9
$100 to $300	8,096	[2]	1,250	1.1	850	5.0	690	5.2	160	3,636	220	4.3	98.3	6.0
$300 to $500	555	[2]	208	.2	157	.9	129	1.0	28	3,664	60	.8	99.1	1.7
$500 to $1,000	287	[2]	195	.2	144	.9	125	.9	19	3,683	32	.5	96.6	.9
$1,000 and over	80	[2]	161	.1	126	.7	113	.9	13	3,696	13	.4	100.0	.4
Total over $5	1,866,439	4.0	23,283	20.4	7,467	44.3	6,026	45.8	1,441			39.0		
Grand total	46,683,799	100.0	114,293	100.0	16,857	100.0	13,161	100.0	[3] 3,696			100.0		

[1] Normal tax surtax and alternative tax on capital gains.
[2] Less than 0.05 percent.
[3] In addition to this loss of $3,696 million there is a loss of $140 million due to the $500 exemption for persons 65 years of age and over. The total loss under H. R. 1 therefore is estimated at $3,836 million. Insufficient data on persons now enjoying certain tax exclusions make it impossible to estimate this loss, although it is believed to be small.

NOTE.—Figures do not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

High Taxes Versus Incentive and Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the adverse effect of present high taxes upon our national economy is overlooked by those in the lower income-tax groups who stand to profit most from the creation of new pay rolls and the general expansion of free enterprise.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following article by Henry Hazlitt in Newsweek under date of April 7, 1947:

HIGH TAXES VERSUS INCENTIVE AND REVENUE

(By Henry Hazlitt)

In a recent Gallup poll the question was asked: "About how much do you think a married man with two children who earns $50,000 a year now pays in Federal income taxes?" The typical answer was $9,000. The actual tax on such a net income, however, is around $24,000. It would be instructive to learn how many people know that a $300,000 net income shrinks to $66,000 after taxes and a $1,000,000 income to $161,000.

In its March letter the National City Bank publishes some illuminating income-tax tables. One of these shows how much is actually left at various income levels for the taxpayer himself out of every extra dollar he earns. The figures are for a married man

with two children and legal deductions of 10 percent of his gross income:

Gross income:	*Taxpayer keeps out of each additional dollar*
$2,000	$1.00
$4,000	.81
$8,000	.75
$16,000	.59
$32,000	.41
$64,000	.29
$128,000	.15½
$350,000	.13½

When the Gallup poll asked people how much they thought a man who earns $50,000 a year ought to pay in income taxes, the median average answer was $7,500. This is only about a third of what such a man actually does pay. The taxpayer is allowed to keep less than half of everything he earns above $22,000. The question of fairness, however, is one on which it seems impossible to get agreement. No matter how much is taken from the big incomes, some people cannot see why those who earn more than they do should be allowed to retain any amount higher than they themselves can earn.

It seems more profitable from a pragmatic standpoint, therefore, to consider not so much the fairness of the tax structure as its practical effects on the economy. One obvious effect (considering the present corporate as well as personal income-tax structure) is to soak up the principal sources of capital funds. The funds that the present tax structure takes are precisely those that would have gone principally into investment—that is, into improved machines and new factories to provide the increased labor productivity which is the only permanent and continuous means of increasing wages.

An even more important effect of taking so much of the taxpayer's earnings is to diminish or remove the incentives to bringing such earnings into existence in the first place. This means not merely a loss to the taxpayer who does not trouble to earn the money. It means a loss to the wealth of the whole Nation. It means a loss even to the Treasury itself. Another table compiled by the National City Bank, based on reports of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, strikingly illustrates this result. (The dollar figures stand for millions of dollars.)

[Millions of dollars]

	1926–28 average	1942
National income	$77,000	$122,000
Incomes over $300,000:		
Total amount	$1,669	$376
Taxes paid	$281	$292
Top tax rate applicable (percent)	25	88
Number of returns	2,276	654

Let's see what this means. During the same period that the total national income increased 58 percent total incomes over $300,000 fell 77 percent. If each individual's income had risen by the same percentage, total incomes over $300,000 would have risen by a much greater percentage, for all incomes previously above $190,000 would now be counted among the incomes over $300,000. Yet even if the aggregate of such incomes had risen no more than proportionately to the whole national income, the total would have reached $2,637,000,000—7 times greater than it actually was—and if this income had been taxed at the same schedule as in 1926–28, with a top tax rate of only 25 percent, the yield to the Treasury would have been about $444,000,000.

It would have been, in other words, about 50 percent greater than the actual yield from the greatly reduced incomes taxed at a top rate of 88 percent, for there can be little doubt that overwhelmingly the most important reason for the contraction of incomes over $300,000 in 1942 compared with 1926–28 was precisely the increase in the top personal income-tax rate from 25 to 88 percent. In other words, there can be little doubt that a sharp reduction in the top tax rates prevailing today would eventually greatly increase rather than reduce revenues.

Power Needs of the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Paul J. Raver, Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, in Seattle, Wash., on February 26, 1947, containing some very interesting and I think important observations on the power problem of the Northwest.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The last time I appeared before you, I believe, was in December of 1940, a little more than 6 years ago.

On that day I announced the appointment of Frank Ward as manager of the Bonneville Power Administration for the Puget Sound territory, with offices here in Seattle.

Since that time there have been a number of changes. One of them is the departure of Mr. Ward from the position which he has so ably filled, to become superintendent of Tacoma City Light. We are distressed at losing Mr. Ward's services, but we are partly comforted by the knowledge that he is not going very far away.

It is my hope to fill his position, and in fact, to keep the standard of all Bonneville staff appointments at a level which will inspire the confidence of the Northwest region and the Nation as a whole. There is no substitute for competence.

Since 1940 there have been many changes in the Northwest's power picture.

In 1940 we had power to sell and prospects for still more power.

Now that situation has been completely changed. We have very little property to sell now—most of it is already sold—and prospects of having still less power to sell in the immediate future.

Six or eight years ago these facts would not have been very distressing because at that time the meaning of Bonneville and Grand Coulee was scarcely more than a beautiful theory.

Some people said that cheap power in large quantities produced by these dams would bring a tremendous industrial development to the Pacific Northwest.

Other people said that this was a lot of hogwash—that the power could not be sold, that the river would not "pay out", and that industry was interested principally in market and transportation factors.

Because the theory was in dispute 6 or 8 years ago, a lack of power supply at that time would have meant relatively little to us. We would not have known what we were missing.

But the war period, and particularly the postwar period of the past year and a half, have changed all that. The connection between cheap power and industrial development is no longer a matter of theory out here.

It is a proved fact.

Thus, some of us do know now what we will miss if we do not keep the power supply up ahead of the demand and always available.

Those of us who have had an opportunity to realize this, owe it to the region and the Nation to spell the story out again and again and again.

Let me refresh your minds on it briefly once more.

No region, no nation can progress in this technological age without an adequate supply of energy. This energy may be in the form of coal, oil, gas, or hydroelectric power, or a combination of these energy sources. That area within a nation which contains a supply of any one or more than one of these resources will, other things being equal, be the area that has the greatest industrial and related economic development. It will also be the area supporting the largest segment of the population.

Regions without one or more of these energy bases must import their energy by pipe line, steamship, truck, or rail transportation and add the costs of such transportation to the cost of production of its goods and services or remain an undeveloped hinterland.

One of the most dramatic illustrations of the importance of an energy base, not only to a region but to an entire nation, was given a few weeks ago when John L. Lewis called out his miners and the industrial economy of the entire Nation was gradually but certainly grinding to a complete halt.

During the past 8 years the Northwest has had a demonstration of what an adequate and cheap supply of energy can mean to its economic development. This demonstration came first in the tremendous productive output of war plants in this region based on an adequate supply of hydroelectric energy. The demonstration has been even more dramatic since the war—when the surplus supply of energy which briefly existed upon the cessation of hostilities and the shut-down of the great war producing plants was absorbed almost overnight by resurgence on a peacetime basis of one of the greatest expansion movements in the use of electrical energy that has ever occurred anywhere.

It should be pointed out, however, and emphasized in every way that we can emphasize it in order to bring it home to the people, not only in industry but on the farms and in the homes of the Northwest, that this rapid development of industry and the rapid expansion of the uses of electricity on the farm and in the home is going to come to a stop unless new supplies of the Northwest's energy base are quickly developed—just as surely as if a John L. Lewis of the power industry had called a strike on further development of the river.

Tte Northwest does not have coal in industrial quantity. It does not have oil. It does not have natural gas. All of these energy resources must be imported. It does have hydroelectric power still to be developed. It is apparent that the Northwest is in no position to compete with regions that have adequate supplies of coal, oil, and gas as the bases for their whole economic development, unless there is always available in the Northwest an adequate supply of hydroelectric power already developed and ready for use.

Certainly, whenever any expansion in industry comes in the industrial East, more coal can be mined because the mines are there, or more gas can be piped in because

the gas is going to waste in fields where it exists today, or more oil can be pumped—but in the Northwest more hydroelectric power cannot be pumped into industry until new dams have been constructed.

Consequently, the only way that the Northwest can keep abreast of its own expansion potentialities is for the Northwest to maintain its own energy supply which means that it must always be ahead of the demand for energy by having the supply available ahead of the demand. Otherwise the Northwest will lose much of its potential industrial development to other sections and areas of the Nation where the energy bases is expansible almost overnight because of the character of the material which is used to supply that energy base.

Here it takes 5 years to build a new dam. We should always have a new dam in reserve in which new generators can be installed at any time the demand for expansion of our energy base makes itself apparent. Such new dams on the Columbia River can be built and should be built to extend navigation and flood control and to provide water for irrigation. These other purposes provide the basic justification for the Federal Government to step in and make the development in the first instance. Power is and should continue to be a byproduct of these other multiple purposes—and power will pay the way.

In the Northwest since hydroelectric power is the only cheap energy base which can be made available to the region, that factor should be used to emphasize the feasibility of the other multiple purposes for which the dams are fundamentally built.

Until the people of the Northwest come to a full realization of this basic approach to their own expansion and development, it goes without saying that the rest of the country cannot be made to realize the importance of the program to the Nation as a whole.

Chambers of commerce, leaders of industry, as well as leaders of farm groups and smaller consumer groups need a better appreciation of the financial stake which they as businessmen have in the continuation on a fairly large scale of the construction of multiple-purpose dams on the Columbia River and its tributaries.

Industries are investing millions of dollars of private capital here in the Northwest, on the assumption that a cheap energy supply will be available as a continuing resource of this region. They are becoming conscious of the need for continued expansion of this base.

At a recent meeting of the Bonneville Regional Advisory Council, for instance, we had as a guest, Mr. E. H. Vicary, of the Crown Zellerbach Co. Mr. Vicary is undoubtedly known to a number of you here. I am not at liberty to quote Mr. Vicary's statement in its entirety, but I can say that he made it quite clear that his firm is very much in the market for power, especially in the Port Angeles area. Mr. Vicary declared that the need for his company was so urgent that they would take emergency steps to develop their own capacity if need be, but he concluded his statement with these words: "Isn't it a shame to spend money for fuel oil when you have water going down the streams? In the long pull it seems to me the generating and transmission facilities you are talking about are the best bet we can think of nationally."

The utility industry, comprising publicly owned agencies, large and small, and the five major privately owned operating companies, have, of course, seen this picture most clearly.

At a series of meetings in Tacoma in January, members of the Northwest Power Pool, including the Seattle and Tacoma city systems, Puget Sound Power and Light and others, reached agreement on the region's power needs for the next 6 years.

Let me read you their statement:

"It is recognized that provision for future supplies of electric power adequate to maintain continued industrial, agricultural, and utility development in the Pacific Northwest depends upon the construction of multiple-purpose projects on the Columbia River and its tributaries. The Federal Government, by numerous acts of Congress, has assumed responsibility for the construction of these multiple-purpose projects.

"The assumption of this utility responsibility by the Federal Government has caused investors and management of both publicly and privately owned industrial and power distribution enterprise in the States of Oregon and Washington to plan their investments and developmental programs in the belief that this Federal policy will continue.

"Recognizing that the existing generating capacity in the Northwest is now fully utilized and that the maintenance of an adequate power supply is of extreme importance, the undersigned privately and publicly owned utilities, after conferring with representatives of the Federal agencies concerned, have given careful consideration, first, to the power requirements by year through 1953; and, second, to the requirements for the construction of additional backbone transmission circuits needed to bring power supplies from Federal projects to the region's load centers.

"As a result of these extended deliberations, and detailed load studies, it is determined and agreed that new Federal generating capacity in the amount of 318,000 kilowatts, over and above the 745,000 kilowatts of generating units now on order, will be required between now and November 1, 1949, to meet the present critical power supply problem; and 1,565,000 kilowatts will be required by November 1, 1953, as set forth in detail in the attached memorandum. To meet these requirements it is urged that the necessary appropriations be made available as rapidly as possible to the Corps of Engineers and to the Bureau of Reclamation.

"Inasmuch as these Federal generating plants are located a considerable distance from the region's load centers and inasmuch as present transmission facilities of the Bonneville Power Administration are already approaching conditions of full load, it is agreed as essential that appropriations for backbone transmission facilities be made available to the Bonneville Power Administration on an annual and continuing basis adequate to provide a means for the delivery of power to load centers."

The facts of power needs cited in this statement of policy have the agreement of the Northwest Public Power Association, representing most of the PUD's, cooperatives, and municipal facilities, which reviewed them in Portland on February 4 and passed its own statement of policy. There are, of course, marked differences of opinion between utilities as to specific facilities needed; but there is no difference of opinion on the over-all amount of generating capacity needed, or on the need for the continued extension of the basic transmission grid.

I think these figures on needed supply are of basic significance to every businessman in Seattle.

They are significant because they show that the current program is not sufficient to keep up this region's energy base.

To be effective it is not enough to meet current demand. We must have power on the shelves ready for market or the market will not materialize.

This power inventory will not be built up unless the leadership of the region is aggressive in making its needs known.

We cannot stock our power inventory without capital or credit.

It is my personal view that the kind of capital and credit we must have can be obtained only from a bank of the largest size. I think there is only one bank big enough. That is the United States Treasury. In this case, as with any other enterprise, the bankers (in this case, the Congress) "have to be shown." It is up to you, as the stockholders and the directors of the Pacific Northwest, to prove your point and to get the money. You can quote Interior and BPA as your technical advisers and your managing engineers, but it is you who will have to actually do the borrowing.

I know you can show plenty of security for the money, and ample revenues for pay out.

There has been some question as to whether Northwest power and industrial development is not too dependent upon an industry with an uncertain future out here—the aluminum industry.

All the evidence points to permanence—if power supplies are developed. The testimony of big producers and fabricators; and, in fact, the economics of the industry itself, point to an expanded, permanent operation—if power supplies continue available at competitive prices.

On December 31, Mr. R. S. Reynolds, president of the Reynolds Metal Co., of Richmond, Va., wrote me a letter. Almost the first sentence in that letter mentioned his plans for expansion of his business, and then said: "I am wondering if the rumors are true that we can't get any more power from the Bonneville Power Administration." Unfortunately, at the moment, the rumors are true.

No industry remains static. It either grows or it slips. This is especially true of the aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest. It must grow until it is an integrated operation from the production of raw material to the production of fabricated goods. Unless Mr. Reynolds and others can expand, the splendid start of a great new industrial development will die aborning.

All this goes to show that the Northwest can't wait even 1 year on the possibility of some other source of energy. Our need is now and immediately foreseeable. We must have all the power we can scrape together prior to 1953 to meet actual deficiencies. This requires money for the Army and Reclamation Bureau projects, and money for transmission to bring the output of those projects to load centers.

I want to close with this observation. The program I am talking about is not a program involving a gift from Uncle Samuel. I am talking about a self-liquidating, financially feasible program from every point of view.

I should like to point out to you that as of June 30, 1946, the date of our last annual audit by Arthur Andersen & Co., of Chicago, the Federal Government had invested in the Pacific Northwest, in Bonneville Dam, in Grand Coulee Dam, and in the Bonneville Power Administration approximately $275,000,000 in ower facilities. As of that same date we had collected in gross revenues approximately $84,000,000. We had spent out of that $84,000,000 approximately $26,000,000 for operation and maintenance of the power facilities in the 3 projects. We had set aside approximately $26,000,000 in interest on that investment. We had set aside approximately $14,000,000 in depreciation on that investment and had left over in the neighborhood of $16,000,000 in net surplus.

It is, in fact, the greatest of its kind in the entire country. Upon it the Nation as well as the region can depend for the production of new taxable wealth and the creation of new opportunities for new people coming to the region to make a livelihood. It is a program to undergird and expand the free enterprise system—to expand opportunities for the exercise of individual initiative and of private capital. For the private capital system anywhere depends for its success on

three factors: (1) An assured energy base; (2) an expandable energy base; (3) a cheap energy base. These three factors are present in those sections of our country where the greatest industrial expansion has taken place—in Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and the industrial east where coal is an assured, expandable and cheap energy base; in California and Texas where the energy base is gas and oil. But in the great Northwest the energy base which is inexhaustible must be harnessed before 't is available and it must be harnessed in advance of the demand for energy if progress is to be assured.

Distribution: The Key to Agricultural Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including excerpts from the talk made by Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., at a meeting of the Firestone champion farmers in Washington, D. C., on February 13 last.

I thoroughly agree with the emphasis which Mr. Firestone places on marketing and distribution as a key to agricultural progress, and hope that all Members of Congress interested in agriculture will take the opportunity to read what Mr. Firestone has said:

During World War II and in the immediately following postwar period, the farmers of America literally saved a large part of the world from mass starvation. Although they were severely handicapped by shortages of manpower, machinery, and materials, they nevertheless succeeded in breaking all previous records in the production of food and other vital materials. They proved beyond a shadow of doubt that this country could turn out far more farm products than it did in normal prewar years. And I am sure that with ample help, plenty of machinery, and unlimited supplies of materials, even those amazing production records could be broken.

Basically, it is not overproduction, but underconsumption which bars agricultural progress. In other words, the real bottleneck lies in distribution. There is a real need, somewhere in the world, for everything you can produce, and more. The problem is to get your products to those who need them.

In this respect, the problem of agriculture is the same as that which industry faces. The productive capacity of both has been substantially increased as the result of the wartime emergency and, if we are not to slip backward, we must find outlets for all that we can produce and enough more to justify future expansion.

Markets must be broadened by making more products available to more people. To accomplish this, a close and careful study must be made of methods of distribution, eliminating all needless expenses and spending more time on effective marketing efforts. We must do everything we can to maintain the high living standards of our country, because we cannot sell the output of our farms and our factories unless people have purchasing power. These are steps which we can take right now. But the real hope of ultimately solving the problems of our economy lies in the youth of our country.

But the time has come when training farm youth in the science of production is not enough. The farm boys and girls of tomorrow must also be trained in the science of distribution.

We have learned that lesson the hard way in industry. For many years, after the beginning of the machine age, we concentrated on attaining greater efficiency, economy, quality, and quantity in our production. Not enough attention was paid to distribution, because it was not then a serious problem and few could foresee the day when we could not consume all that we could produce. But now, it is a different story. Industry is, at last, beginning to recognize the urgent need for concentrated attention on the problem of attaining greater efficiency, economy, quality, and quantity in our system of distribution.

One the principal difficulties is a severe shortage of men trained in the science of distribution. Comparatively few institutions of learning have comprehensive courses of study aimed at graduating a student qualified to enter into distribution as a vocation. A young man today has the choice of hundreds of schools which grant degrees in chemical, electrical, mechanical, and civil engineering and many other subjects which will fit him to become skilled in various phases of manufacturing.

But if he intends to follow distribution as a vocation, he must acquire most of his training after he leaves college, by working in one or more of the marketing organizations now established or in the market research division of some industrial concern. Only after years of on-the-job experience can he qualify as an expert in this field.

Consequently, if we are to progress in the years to come, we must begin at the grass roots by fostering and encouraging young men and women to consider the science of distribution as their life work and by persuading colleges and universities to offer regular courses of study which will eventually result in the granting of degrees in distribution.

Echoes From Cornfield Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Echoes From Cornfield Conference," from the Washington (Ind.) Herald of March 27, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECHOES FROM CORNFIELD CONFERENCE

On the occasion of his famous Cornfield Conference, August 27, 1938, HOMER E. CAPEHART, in his first political address, used these words:

"I am sick and tired of hearing businessmen and men of other groups condemn the New Deal and then do absolutely nothing about it.

"I am a farmer and a businessman. I cannot stand by idly and see this Nation of ours, that has blessed you and me and millions of others with vast opportunity, ruled by a man whose false leadership, if not changed, will bring it to destruction.

"We are not a Communist country, nor a Fascist country, nor a Nazi country. We are still a Nation of free people who believe in an Almighty God and the right of every man to follow his own ability to opportunity's end.

"We cannot live under two systems of government—the American system and the New Deal experiment."

Since that hot August day in 1938, Mr. (now Senator) CAPEHART has made hundreds of speeches in which he has flayed communism in all its forms. During the last campaign he set the keynote of the campaign by declaring that the basic issue was a contest between two ideologies of government—the ideology of free men, free government, and free enterprise and the ideology of regimented men and dictatorships.

Last week Senator CAPEHART called attention again to those words that he used at the Cornfield Conference and reminded his audience of how far we have traveled on the pathway of Communist ideology—so far that we are now engaged in a major operation to purge our roster of Government employees of Communists—so far that we now are poised on the edge of a world conflict to stop the spread of philosophies of government that we have nurtured and encouraged for the past 15 years.

It was Roosevelt's reversal of United States policy by recognizing the Government of Soviet Russia in 1933 that started Stalin on his quest to world power. It was the New Deal coddling of Communists in this country and the Roosevelt coddling of Stalin throughout the period of the war that put Russia in a position to threaten the peace of the world today.

Had there been more Capeharts and more people who followed his advice, even as late as 1938, the situation would have been much different the past several years and it would be much different today.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I fail to recall a legislative proposal that has caused me as much concern as has President Truman's announced policy of providing relief and military aid to Greece and Turkey.

Since listening to President Truman's message to the joint session of the Senate and House on March 12 I have tried to read every article on the subject that has come to my attention.

I am inserting as part of my remarks today an article written by William L. Shirer which appeared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Throughout the war years I have read many thought-provoking articles written by Mr. Shirer. His story as it appeared in the press of yesterday should be read by every citizen who is striving to make the correct decision.

"TRUMAN DOCTRINE" CALLED A STEP TOWARD WAR—AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY SEEN HIGHLY UNLIKELY TO INDUCE RUSSIANS TO QUIT EUROPE WITHOUT CONFLICT THAT WOULD DESTROY CIVILIZATION

(By William L. Shirer)

If, as everyone in Washington now seems to agree, President Truman's proposal for aid

to Greece and Turkey is essentially a military matter whose purpose, in Walter Lippmann's words, "is to exert American military power upon the Soviet power," then, obviously, further discussion about saving nonexistent "democracies" in Turkey and Greece has become a waste of time and the "Truman Doctrine" has to be judged solely on its military merits.

Perhaps a reporter, being a civilian, has no business venturing into the military field. But since many of his brethren have, this one, with due apologies, would like to offer his 2 cents' worth. My only excuse—and it's pretty flimsy—is that on many a dreary night in Berlin I had nothing better to do than to delve into such authorities as Luderdorf and Clausewitz on the general subject of the relationship between politics and war, that last winter in Germany I had the opportunity of studying the full texts of the operation plans of the Wehrmacht for each phase of the recent war, and that, like many another American reporter, I was fascinated and horrified by the realization that the most perfect plans of the military fraternity go awry as soon as they are put to the terrible test of battle and the unpredictable uncertainties of world politics.

No general staff ever planned more expertly, more meticulously, than the German. When you study its ingenious plans you can see how sure its members must have been that their military calculations could not help but succeed. And yet in the end their greatest calculation—to risk war itself—was so ghastly a mistake that their country was destroyed as a result of it.

Obviously our own high command has not got to that point yet—of risking war with Russia. But if the newspaper accounts about the correctness of our decision to exert American military power against Russia in Turkey and Greece have any basis whatsoever, then we have certainly taken a first step. And the American people ought to know why—and what the risk, so far as it can be calculated, is.

"Diplomacy and strategy, political commitments, and military power are inseparable," as Edward Mead Earle pointed out in his excellent book, Makers of Modern Strategy. "The very existence of a nation depends upon its concept of the national interest and the means by which the national interest is promoted; therefore, it is imperative that its citizens understand the fundamentals of strategy."

The German experience, it seems to me, has a lesson for us. As expert as the German soldiers were at their trade, there was always one thing, it seemed to me, that they lacked in their calculations—they had no political sense. They failed to comprehend the dictum of their own greatest modern strategist, Clausewitz, that "war is politics continued by other means."

Specifically, the German generals could never see the world picture. In the fateful August days of 1939 they would not stop to make a fundamental calculation as to the chances of the two great neutral states, Russia and the United States, coming into the war against them. We know from the secret German archives that Hitler, in his various harangues to the high command, brushed aside the subject as of no importance. Even on the eve of the German declaration of war against us, Hitler assured everyone that American troops could never land on the European Continent.

In the early months of the war I asked the late Goering if America's potential airplane production did not enter into his calculations. He laughed the question off as a joke. It was plain he had never faced that prospect.

Now that we have decided to throw in American military power against the Soviet Union, our statesmen and high command, it seems to me, could profit from the German lesson by getting very straight in their own minds the consequences of politics by diplomacy being suddenly replaced with politics by war. Professor Earle emphasizes that Lenin, like Engels, had "read, annotated, and pondered Clausewitz" and that, speaking of the latter's "famous dictum" that "war is politics continued by other means," Lenin once exclaimed, "The Marxists have always considered this axiom as the theoretical foundation for the meaning of every war."

MOVE TO CONTRACT RUSSIA

We are now told by certain writers who presumably reflect the thinking of our military men that our new strategic plan is designed not only to check Soviet expansion but to contract it—in fact, to put us into a position where we can talk the Russians into withdrawing their military power from Europe. It is argued that by strengthening the armies of Greece and Turkey we can achieve this tremendous goal.

But certainly this is highly doubtful. In their present unreasonable mood the Russians are not likely to be talked into withdrawing from Europe. If that is so, they can only be forced to do so by American military power. The question is: Have we the power at such a distant point from our shores and so close to Russia's frontiers?

The Turkish Army could probably hold out longer than did the Poles in 1939. But is it as good as the former German Army? The Greek Army, held at bay for 2 years by a few thousand bedraggled guerrillas, could hardly stand up, say, to a combined Yugoslav-Bulgarian force strengthened by Russian unit which could be made quickly available.

The only Army we have in Europe is a small contingent in Germany. It is a police force, not a combatant Army of any strength. Indeed, seasoned European journalists express the fear that, if the Soviet Union desired to, it could probably occupy the entire continent within a few weeks and thus deprive us of even the possibility of air bases. Also Europe, including Great Britain, is exhausted by war. Its peoples, especially on the continent, would hardly spring to arms, even if they had them, to join in a war against Russia, however, much they may detest the Soviet dictatorship and love us.

MILITARY PRESSURE ABSURD

From a purely military point of view, since that appears to be the issue, it would seem as absurd for us to try to exert successful military pressure, however just our cause, against the Soviet Union on or near its borders as it would be for Russia to use its military power against us from below the Rio Grande. Even a puzzled civilian could predict the results in both cases with deadly certainty.

And if war comes between the world's two greatest powers, as it will certainly come if either side starts using its military power against the other, then, regardless of who wins, our civilization, such as it is, will perish. On that, at least, there can be no disagreement.

Need for Occupation Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter under the heading "Need for occupation forces," published in the New York Times of March 13, 1947.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED FOR OCCUPATIONAL FORCES—PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS AFFECTING OUR PERSONNEL IN GERMANY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Last September I returned from Germany, where I was attached as attorney to the War Crimes Branch, United States Army, and had the privilege of taking an active part in various war-crime trials, especially the so-called Malmedy trial, conducted at Dachau, to punish the killers of American soldiers taken prisoners in the Battle of the Bulge. During my stay over there I had ample opportunity to observe our occupation forces at work and to notice that most of our Military Government offices which I saw were adequately manned, but that none of them was overstaffed.

Since that time conditions have radically changed. True, the total of American wives and children surpasses the total strength of our constabulary, but I doubt that this fact will enchance our military and administrative efficiency. The Seventh and Third Armies have been deactivated. The constabulary, upon which the Military Government counts to suppress any resistance movements, is without its tanks; our Air Forces are without bombers.

General Clay was compelled to announce several radical personnel cuts, resulting in 30 to 40 percent reduction of MG's personnel by July 1, 1947, doing away with practically all of the liaison detachments in the smaller places of the Landkreise and cutting the strength of various administrative departments to the bone—not even to mention the complete lack of personnel for one of the most important tasks, denazification, the handling of which we should have reserved for ourselves.

Moreover, although all these reductions were instituted on the basis of a greatly reduced tentative budget for 1947, the present economy drive in Congress threatens even this budget with further very substantial cuts, which well might make occupation a meaningless gesture and a hollow shell. Already AMG is compelled to cancel running contracts with civilian employees. All personnel with a rating below CAF-8 and P-3, who have their families over there, cannot, pursuant to a notice recently appearing n Stars and Stripes, expect a renewal of their contracts.

RESULT OF CUT

What will happen if the intended six-billion cut, or even the liberal four-and-one-half-billion cut, should become law is only too obvious. While I was still over there, many of the Germans in all walks of life expressed their doubts about the seriousness of our intention to stay and sweat it out in Germany.

But what is our alternative? To turn over the occupation of our zone to the French or the English, who, although they on their small war-ravaged and impoverished island certainly do not have the financial resources of this country, now have substantially more troops (300,000) under arms in Germany than we have? Or to continue to occupy Germany with totally inadequate and insufficient forces?

When will we ever learn that power is the only language all of the other countries understand? There cannot be the slightest doubt in anybody's mind that by indiscriminately cutting down our occupation forces (as will be the inevitable result of the intended budget reductions) we will not only lose face in the eyes of the German people, who would certainly be the first ones to avail themselves of our weakness, but will also lose the much-needed bargaining power in AMG's dealings with the other occupying governments.

From all I have seen, the military government and its military and administrative personnel have done an excellent job. Undoubtedly, mistakes and errors have been made; undoubtedly, people were occasionally placed in positions for which they were not fit and in which they exercised faulty judgment; undoubtedly, a small minority placed good living and personal gains above their tasks. But, on the whole, the military government's personnel are efficient, honest, and capable, deeply devoted to their duties; they measure up fully to the forces of any of the other occupying powers, and do not deserve to be let down now by economy measures, however well intended they may be, which would cripple this efficiency beyond repair.

Congress, before cutting the budgets of the War and Navy Departments, should listen to the warning voices of men like Secretaries Marshall, Patterson, and Forrestal, and Generals Eisenhower, MacArthur, McNarney, and Clay, who are certainly no New Dealers, and whose personalities and backgrounds should vouch for the absence of any bias or personal interest.

WARNINGS OF LEADERS

The Secretaries of the War and Navy Departments are civilians themselves. Generals Marshall and Eisenhower are professional military men, who have time and time again in the past placed the interest of the Nation above the gains or interest of any particular group or class. In General Clay we are happy to possess a man who combines, to an otherwise rarely attained degree, the top qualifications of a soldier with the qualifications of a civilian administrator and diplomat. Their warning voices should not be heard in vain.

And it is more than a coincidence that there seem to be not many supporters of the budget cuts among the Republican Members of Congress who have actually been over there, be it as a fighting man, like Senator LODGE, or as an observer, like Senator MORSE. These men know what is at stake.

A substantial cut in income taxes would, no doubt, be welcomed by everybody, but I think much too highly of the patriotism and intelligence of the average American to believe that they would also welcome such cut if it can be achieved only by wielding an ax in a dark room, by the relinquishment of our international obligations, and by paying a price which might not fall due for another 10 or 20 years, but which we one day would have to pay.

We did have money enough to bring dozens of witnesses from everywhere to Washington to testify in the 6 weeks' fight against Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation. Concededly, the amounts needed for the efficient occupation of Germany and Japan are bigger. But bigger things are also at stake, and for those bigger things we ought to, and must, have the money, even if it means a tax reduction of less than 20 percent, or no tax reduction at all.

The Second World War is not yet ended. Hostilities have merely ceased.

HERBERT J. STRONG.

NEW YORK, *March 8, 1947.*

Press Freedom Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the La Crosse Tribune:

PRESS FREEDOM REPORT

Freedom of the American press is in danger, according to the Commission on the Freedom of the Press. The group does not see an immediate danger, but it cites a potential peril if present set-ups and practices continue.

This conclusion is the result of 4 years of study by 13 scholars, headed by President Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago. Their study also included radio, movies, books, and magazines.

But since when did radio and movies become "press"?

The Commission found the chief perils to press freedom in such things as the "big business" aspects of newspaper ownership; too much sensationalism and too little public responsibility; news distortion through pressure, personal interests, or emphasis on "firstness"; and lack of "mutual criticism."

If freedom of the press is in danger, most newspapers will certainly want to know where the danger lies. And certainly they will be grateful for intelligent outside criticism in their own and the public's interest.

Direct or implied criticism is a vital newspaper function. Members of the profession will scarcely overlook its value as it applies to them and their product.

But there is some doubt as to whether this criticism is as valuable as it is interesting. The doubt arises from the fact that the Commission has made its report so generalized that it runs the risk of distortion and overemphasis.

Perhaps many of its criticisms are true in individual cases. But we don't think they add up to an entirely accurate conclusion. For one thing, the report tends to make big business synonymous with evil.

It is true that newspaper ownership is in fewer hands today than 30 years ago. The same thing is true of railroads and automobile manufacturing. But it does not hold that the railroads and auto industry serve the public less well as a result.

There are limitations imposed on newcomers in the publishing field—some good and necessary, some not. The latter are being eliminated gradually by internal and external action.

But with all of them removed, there might not be a great increase in the number of papers. There are varying degrees of competence in newspaper publishing, as in other fields. Lack of public acceptance and consequent failure cannot be eliminated.

As for "sensationalism," that's a loose and tricky word. Many sensational exposures by newspapers have advanced justice and the public welfare.

Furthermore, the normal is not always news. Millions of John Joneses may live uprightly, perform valuable duties, be kind to the wife and kids, and go to bed early. But people aren't going to buy newspapers to read about them.

The Commission advocates mutual criticism and repeal of the "unwritten law," whereby newspapers ignore one another's errors, misrepresentations, and lies.

Well, we don't think they do ignore them. If one newspaper reports the truth where another errs or lies, the shortcomings are not being ignored.

Errors and misrepresentations are not always malicious. Would it help, when they occur, for a rival paper to come forth with an editorial saying, "The editor of the Morning Bugle is a liar," or "Our contemporary, the Evening Breeze, is staffed by fat-headed executives and lousy reporters"?

Newspapers used to do that, back in Horace Greeley's time. They don't today, for the same reason that other professions don't. Constant mutual criticism would cast doubt on the good faith of the critics, and undermine public confidence in an honorable calling made up in the great majority of honorable men.

The newspaper profession is by no means perfect. It has its share of publishers and editors of low taste and low standards. But we think they are the exception.

Perhaps the Commission missed a bet by not taking a tip from journalistic practice and putting a finger on specific evils.

If it had named names, cited cases, and said, "Such things are an affront to the public and a neglect of duty," any dangers to press freedom might be averted more readily.

Should We Not Be Cautious in Moving Into Greece?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, following is a statement expressing what my views have been all the while. As what I regard as truth has come to light, it seems apparent that there is no hope of adjusting the Greek situation without requiring a representative government in Greece, something not now obtaining.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article:

GREEK SEES NATION FACING LONG DISUNITY

ATHENS, March 30.—Greece's elder statesman predicted gloomily tonight a fierce division, for at least a generation, among the unhappy people here, and the possibility of dictatorship by the royalist government.

White-thatched, 89-year-old Thanistocles Sophoulis, former premier and leader of the Liberal Party, who is as leftist as a Maine farmer, asserted that even should the government offensive exterminate the guerrillas, "it will affect the relatives and sympathizers in hundreds of thousands. There will continue to be reprisals. Greece will be divided at least a generation."

Sophoulis, whose party is recognized as the center bloc in Parliament, charged that the record of the Populist Party (Royalists) has been predicated on the thesis "crush everyone who is not with the party."

He believes the Government misinterpreted President Truman's speech, which he thought was an "idealistic United States means of aiding the country on the verge of collapse."

Since President Truman condemned excesses of the extremists, Mr. Sophoulis observed, a government truly cognizant of its responsibilities would have resigned.

Mr. Sophoulis felt during the interlude that "the majority of the men in the mountains are not active Communists, but persons who fled for security." Nevertheless, he maintained they must, for future realistic purposes, be considered potential Communists.

Asserting the present Government policy was "the best recruiting agent for the guerrillas," Mr. Sophoulis proposed a democratic government be restored provisionally, give guaranties of personal liberty to the guerrillas who lay down their arms, and "in 4 or 5 months Greece would be able to proceed with free elections."

Send MacArthur to Reich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel:

SEND MAC ARTHUR TO REICH

During the war Douglas MacArthur was accused of playing to the gallery. Everything he did, said his critics, was carefully planned for its dramatic effect. They were fond of pointing out that at the Japanese surrender ceremonies, in which General MacArthur made his famous speech placing man's entire hope of survival on a spiritual entity, nothing was overlooked that would contribute the histrionic touch.

Since the war ended, other generals have returned home and received their acclaim. MacArthur remained on the job, accepting, with everlasting credit to himself and his country, the herculean task of guiding a conquered nation through its postwar tribulations. Was it in character for a parade-hungry actor to refuse a trip home where many think he would have been accorded the biggest ovation of any war hero in all time?

Douglas MacArthur has adhered to the simple formula that there was a job to be done.

Even his sourest critics today agree his guidance of the Japanese people in disarming and adopting a democratic constitution is phenomenal.

More importantly, the Japanese people think he has done a good job, too. Their appreciation of a man in whom they feared vindictiveness but who, as Time so aptly puts it, "touched the deep chords of the Japanese soul," rose to new heights following MacArthur's anonuncement that Japan was ready for a peace treaty.

When the Supreme Commander lunched publicly with Tokyo correspondents, the Japanese were astounded that, unlike their own generals (before surrender), MacArthur had no men with guns standing guard for blocks around.

Nor did the general, as the cooks expected, send someone around to taste the food to be sure no sulking Jap had poisoned it.

How unlike a showman concerned only for his personal safety.

General MacArthur has warned that delays in signing a treaty with Japan may impair her already weakened economy. This invitation to disaster can be averted if the country is declared at peace so that trading with other countries may resume.

If Premier Yoshida's words are reliable, the Japanese are ready for a treaty but not for an American withdrawal. MacArthur sees the post treaty job of steering and protection as a function for UN.

Beyond assurances that the Japanese can get back on their economic feet, one positive danger could result in premature withdrawal of United States forces. It is the same hammer and sickle menace here as in Turkey and Greece, and in every spot on the globe where democratic processes have not entrenched themselves against communism.

The fact remains that General MacArthur is on the last lap of an assignment requiring his presence.

In our opinion, his presence is more urgently required to take over rehabilitation of the Reich than to remain much longer in the Orient.

What better qualification for a tough job is available than successful experience in a comparable assignment?

No American, Britisher, or Russian has demonstrated the leadership required to reconstruct the Reich. A new high in maladministration has now hit Germany in the form of hunger strikes.

It will be said, of course, that MacArthur knows only the oriental mind, that he is unfamiliar with European problems. Is it forgotten that he fought in World War I with the Rainbow Division in Champagne-Marne and Aisne-Marne defensives and the St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne offensives? That he was with the Army of Occupation in Germany in 1918 and 1919?

Let General MacArthur be named to direct the rehabilitation in all of Germany. Russia will object, but Britain and the United States can point out that it will be in the mutual interest of the three powers to get Germany's industries going, her farms producing and other commerce resumed as quickly as possible.

MacArthur's appointment to coincide with the proposed unification of Germany by July 1 of this year would be a long step toward bringing a real peace to Europe.

Let's send MacArthur to Germany.

Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma memorializing Congress to continue the Rural Electrification Administration and to provide funds for loans to rural electrification cooperatives. The memorial reads as follows:

Whereas Congress is now in session and is considering the amount of funds, if any, to appropriate for continuance of the rural-electrification program; and

Whereas the record of rural-electric cooperatives is one of outstanding service and achievement and is a wholly self-liquidating enterprise with several million dollars paid back in advance of schedule; and

Whereas Oklahoma is in great need of the continuance and extension of the REA program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein)—

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact such legislation as shall continue rural-electric cooperatives in operation and to enable them to extend service to all additional rural communities in the United States as is practicable on a self-liquidating basis.

SEC. 2. That the speaker of the house of representatives be and he is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the chairman of the Appropriation Committee of said United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Oklahoma delegation to Congress.

The Value of Military Training—The Necessity for Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, since this is Army Day, it occurred to me it might be appropriate to put into the RECORD the speech I made last Thursday to the Joint Assembly of the Vermont Legislature, covering the matter of the value of military training and the necessity for universal military training.

Under permission heretofore granted, I extend my remarks by including the address referred to above.

THE VALUE OF MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the invitation to address the joint assembly. Fortunately, the Easter recess of Congress makes it possible for me to accept and to be here.

As a graduate, trustee, and sometime president of the oldest military collegiate institution in this country, namely, Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., I have observed the exemplifications and accomplishments for which this military collegiate training is responsible. I know whereof I speak when I say that the lessons it teaches are invaluable. It impresses upon the student mind the axiom that "no man is fitted to command who has not first learned to obey." He learns to meet emergencies, to be prepared for the unexpected, and to assume responsibility as the opportunity and occasion therefor are presented. I doubt if any course of study or training can show better ideas, ideals, or educational theories, or any that in practical results better fit those who are taught—citizen, soldier, or sailor—for either private or public career; hence I am going to address you upon the subject of universal military training.

A CITIZEN SOLDIERY

In common with Capt. Alden Partridge, who founded Norwich University, and with the people of the State of Vermont who have faithfully supported it since 1819, I believe that a citizen soldiery is essential to the maintenance of free government, and that every citizen should be trained to discharge his duties as such in times of peace, as well as those of war.

A short 2 years ago in March, the most superbly trained and equipped army in history was smashing down the last feeble guard of a beaten and bloody Wehrmacht, while in the Pacific our war-hardened task forces were knocking at the inner ramparts of Japan.

Two months later the shattered remnants of Hitler's once invincible war machine laid their arms in unconditional surrender and the spotlight of war swung its merciless glare toward the land of the rising sun. At this same moment began the dissolution of the most effective citizen fighting force ever assembled upon the face of the earth. A dissolution whose initial leisurely pace and orderliness were so accelerated by the capitulation of Japan that the awful energy released above Hiroshima and Nagasaki seemed somehow to have transmitted itself into the race to demobilize. "Bring the boys home" and "Stop the draft" were slogans of the day. The war was over, and we had won.

Well, we brought the boys home—12,000,000 of them. We stopped the draft. On the last

day of last month the Selective Training and Service Act really expired. From that day forward our ability to raise and train armies and navies will rest solely on the success of the recruiting efforts of our armed forces.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY

We face today the heavy responsibility of bringing peace to a war-torn world. The unsettled conditions which make this problem so difficult of solution are familiar to us all. They present a real challenge to our generation, one which we cannot ignore nor fail to meet. The course which we chart during the coming months will determine whether the world is to march forward into an era of lasting peace or merely snatch a fitful breather before plunging headlong into another war.

The framework for peace is, in the main, being designed by two great nations—our own and Russia. The struggle for its design goes on apace. Anxious eyes follow every move of these principal contenders, seeking to determine the shape of the final outcome. The attitude and statements of our representatives to the United Nations and to the peace conferences are being analyzed in the light of the actions we are taking here at home. Will the critical years ahead find us "speaking softly and carrying a big stick," or vocally strong though physically weak? Make no mistake, we are in a power game and will continue to be in a power game from here on out. The degree of power we must retain is relative to that retained by others. It must not be varied to suit the demands of wishful thinking, malicious sabotage, or emotional obfuscation.

PROMPT ACTION ESSENTIAL

We need to act promptly, in the interest of international peace, to attune our military policy to the requirements of our foreign policy. We should move without further delay to strengthen our hand at the peace table by placing on our statute books a universal military training law.

Our reservoir of trained manpower is slowly and inexorably trickling away. The lessons of past wars, the sure knowledge of the shape of future wars—and we are not yet in position to ignore their threat—combine to urge us not to let this continue. I shudder to think of this great Nation being subjected to the blitz tactics of a future aggressor without having turned a wheel to train its citizens against such an eventuality. Our coming generations are entitled to more foresighted planning than this. Yes; we can take it. England took it. A nation of 130,000,000 people cannot be wiped off the earth nor conquered in a day. But why risk being drawn into a prize fight committed to conditioning yourself between rounds? Better far to be in shape when the opening gong sounds.

TRAIN IN PEACETIME

Yet we will not be in shape unless we train in peacetime. There will be no time to train when war comes. And not only must we be prepared to meet the shock of its initial impact, we must be capable of absorbing this shock and of instantly mobilizing a counterblow of such swiftness and power as to quickly transfer the battle grounds to the lands of the aggressor. How, then, can we move now toward this capability?

Our concept of national defense envisions in peacetime a small, professionally efficient Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force, a strong National Guard and a large Organized Reserve. Provided these forces are properly balanced and capable of warding off initial attacks for a time sufficient to mobilize and train an army af citizen soldiers such as we raised in this past war, no nation on earth will ever stand against us. But these forces cannot be balanced, cannot be trained as in the past, after hostilities have started and before the enemy can reduce our outer bastions. Time and space factors have changed with the development of new weapons of war. There are no outer bastions capable of holding an enemy at bay. This forces us to reestimate our military potential in the light of these developments. It forces us to conclude that we must gear up our mobilization capabilities in point of time. Experience proves that this cannot be done at the expense of training. Therefore, we must do a part of our training in advance. Therefore, we must train in peacetime. But why you may ask, can't the peacetime training of our National Guard and our Organized Reserve be stepped up to meet these new demands?

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE

I have served as an officer both in the National Guard and in the Reserve. I have a high regard for these civilian components but I know their capabilities and limitations as instruments for military training. One hundred hours of armory training plus 100 hours of summer-camp training do not permit a yearly schedule of sufficient training value to prepare men, even basically, for modern war. The cost and scarcity of modern training aids and newly developed weapons do not permit us to supply each armory and camp with such necessary equipment. Even could this be done, demands upon the time and interests of our civilian soldiers which would be necessary to carry on the required training would prove impossible to meet. The National Guard and active units of the Organized Reserve can contribute spirit and organization—they can weld trained men into a team but they cannot impart the necessary individual training to prepare a soldier for combat. Could these civilian components but recruit their strength from a pool of trained individuals they would, indeed, be prepared to carry out their intended mission as first line of defense troops. Herein we find the way to gear up our mobilization in point of time. Herein lies the true function of universal military training—it is the cornerstone of our national security.

Again I repeat, we need a system of universal military training in the interests of international peace. We need a system of universal military training in the interests of national security. Let us move to provide it.

PROPER MILITARY DISCIPLINE

I insist that the due cultivation of proper military discipline among the great mass of the people, and a general diffusion of military information, always have been, are now, and always will be indispensably necessary for the preservation of this Government.

The road to universal peace is a tortuous path which leads down the dark future through long generations, involving the Christianization of the world—an end devoutly to be sought, eventually to be obtained—but obviously ages hence.

IDEALISM VERSUS REALITY

The sober realization of a people who fail to allow their idealism to divorce them from stark reality and a clear conception of the foibles and idiosyncracies of human nature impresses the fact upon them that just so long as racial hatred and discrimination, economic rivalry between nations for world markets, and arrogant nationalism remain, disarmament and a pacific world cannot be.

To be an American citizen in this, so wonderful an age, is the greatest blessing any man or woman may enjoy. To have and play a part in the shaping of history is the greatest opportunity with which any man or woman of any day or generation can be confronted. The best educated citizen is the one who respects the rights of others, recognizes that properly constituted authorities are entitled to be obeyed, and realizes the responsibilities attaching to the rights and duties of his citizenship. A man educated to understand, to accomplish, and to command is the type of citizen such training develops.

With every rational and conscientious person the world over I join in the wish and the hope that there may never be another war, but a commonsense, unemotional survey of the existing world condition compels all of us to acknowledge that there is no assurance that such hopes may soon be realized, nor that our wishes may speedily come true.

The fight between good and evil has just begun. Old as the beginning of things, yet young as tomorrow when it is born, the struggle between these two opposing forces must go on forever, through all history, to the end. Those who believe in the eventful triumph of the right must still march and fight and fall, recruited from the flower of mankind, cheered only by their own hope of humanity, strong only in their confidence in their cause.

In the final analysis education is the bulwark against all things destructive of American institutions.

THE EDUCATION OF YOUTH

"All who have meditated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced," said Aristotle, "that the fate of empires depends on the education of youth."

Everyone who measures up to the full stature of his citizenship should be trained to discharge in full, not in part, his obligations of citizenship as well in times of war as in times of peace. Military training as an incident to the education of American youth should be encouraged, continued, and extended as an incident to the academic, scholastic, and physical preparation of a 100-percent-American citizenship for today and tomorrow in order "to insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty" to themselves and their posterity.

Statement of Policy of Public and Private Power Users

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from the Chamber of Commerce of Pasco, Wash., expressing the concurrence of that chamber in the statement of policy of the so-called Tacoma Power Conference on January 22, 1947.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
PASCO, WASH., *March 25, 1947.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Pasco Chamber of Commerce wishes you to know that it has endorsed the statement of policy as agreed upon at the conference in Tacoma, January 22, 1947, of public and private power users. The chamber members realize the great importance of adequate and low-cost power to the industrial future of the Northwest and wish you to know that they appreciate the efforts you are making to preserve this natural advantage given us by our great river

system. And they will be happy for you to make any use of this endorsement you may find possible.

Yours very truly,

HILL WILLIAMS, *Executive Secretary,*
Pasco Chamber of Commerce.

United States Lacks Resources To Save Entire World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following column from the World-Herald, Omaha, Nebr., March 30, 1947:

UNITED STATES LACKS RESOURCES TO SAVE ENTIRE WORLD

(By Louis Bromfield)

The more rapidly crises develop around the world the clear it becomes that we have had no foreign policy in the past and that we have none now.

The Greek crisis, seen from the proper prospective, is no more than an incident in a world filled with similar disasters. It may lead not only to confusion but to disaster for us, as well as for the peoples of the Balkans and the Near East.

There is no reason whatever to suppose that by pouring money into Greece or Turkey we shall solve their respective problems or stave off the spread of Russian aggression and expansion.

President Truman in his sensational speech (and it was one of the most sensational ever made by an American President) politely referred again and again to the "spread of communism." All the world, including Soviet Russia, knows that he meant the "expansion and aggression of Russian ambitions."

It has long since become clear that communism is merely a tool, a modern political method by which the small group of men in control of Russia are seeking to expand their power. The circumstances and the methods being used are almost indistinguishable from those of the Nazi government of Germany.

WE CANNOT BUY GOOD WILL

The error in the proposal of President Truman and his advisers to aid Greece has at least two facets:

1. The old American error based upon the belief that you can buy anything you want including good will with money.

2. That the whole program will be successful without the use and backing of strong armed force.

The writer has spent a great deal of his life in Europe. He knows its nations and peoples a great deal better than do most newspaper correspondents. He is prepared to state that you do not and cannot buy good will with money alone.

Actually the fact is that much of the American food and machinery sent into Poland, Yugoslavia and the other Balkan States under UNRRA was used by selective distribution to create ill will toward capitalistic America and good will for communism and Soviet Russia.

Also he is convinced that we have not enough money, raw materials, or machinery to rehabilitate the whole of the world. If we attempt to do so, we shall only bleed ourselves white and reduce our natural real wealth and living standards to the level of the more desperate European nations.

The citadel of western civilization has moved across the Atlantic from Europe to America. A superficial, unwise, head-long policy of trying to buy off or rehabilitate the whole world could easily crack the walls of this last citadel.

I doubt President Truman or the State Department is prepared to ask for troops and ships to back up the proposed Greek and Turkish policy. I am certain the American people are not prepared or willing to grant such a request.

The proposals made so hastily following the trigger decision of Great Britain to pull out of Greece seem to be superficial, hasty, and almost hysterical.

Intervention in Greece is not simply a single incident, quickly and decisively closed. Of necessity, it institutes a policy of intervention which, to be effective, must be extended around the whole circumference of the globe, in China, in India, in Korea, in Germany, in the Near East.

We cannot go halfway without wasting the money, material, and lives involved in any hastily prepared program.

The question is whether we are prepared for the colossal, probably insoluble problem posed for the moment in Greece alone.

The fact is that in the long run the world is on the crest of a colossal surge of history and that even the superhuman efforts of the greatest and richest nation in the world cannot stem or alter its course.

Two great nations are involved, Soviet Russia and the United States, for Great Britain or the other western empire states do not count any longer unless they achieve some strong form of federated union.

In the wake of such a wave, history moves rapidly, and time becomes the most important element. Already countless Americans have transferred their enmity from Nazi Germany to Communist Russia.

No accidental, hit-and-miss plans of intervention hastily prepared and ill-contrived are of any use. Unless we are prepared to back the millions of dollars to be poured into Turkey and Greece with military force, the whole amount plus some lives is certain to be lost.

GREAT FORCES AT WORK

The shape of the world is being determined not by what we want or what Soviet Russia wants but by much greater forces of economics, of ideologies, of weariness and despair, of famine, of death and rebirth.

Both Russia and this Nation are faced by challenges.

If these are met and solved, preferably by common action, our civilization will survive; if they are not we are headed for another dark age. Even the atomic bomb is only incidental to the process.

The decisions which will determine the future of the world lie with Russia and the United States. All the rest merely clutters up the scene and serves to complicate and cripple the actions of these great powers and cause enmity between them. This fact lies at the root of the futility of the United Nations.

The Greek issue has clarified one thing—that when cause for action arises, history in these times cannot wait upon a United Nations cluttered by flotsam and jetsam left behind in the great wave of history upon which Soviet Russia and the United States are riding.

The decisions in the end, as history will show, happily or tragically, can be made only by these two nations.

It would be well for all the world if they got together on a friendly basis and worked out what is to be done with that same stricken, decaying world. The rest is weakness and sentimentality and essentially tragic nonsense which can only prolong the agony.

Court Should Not Recharge as General Offsets Payments Made on Specific Accounts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted in the House, I am placing in the RECORD two letters which I have written to Ralph H. Case, of Washington, D. C., who became attorney for the Sioux Indian Tribe many years ago and is well posted on Indian legislation. These letters deal with the effect of the Indian Claims Commission Act upon certain claims of the Sioux Tribe.

Below, I place the first of these letters, and in a separate insertion, I am placing the second letter, together with the reply of the attorney for the Sioux:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 2, 1947.

RALPH H. CASE,
Attorney, Southern Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MAJOR CASE: I wish to congratulate you upon your success in your new motion to the Supreme Court to send back to the Court of Claims for further proceedings certain claims which were pending at the time the Indian Claims Commission bill was passed by the Congress.

I have read with interest your 4-page motion. It seems to me that you presented unanswerable logic in pointing out that the original jurisdictional act was amended for new claims then pending in the Court of Claims or the Supreme Court with respect to the deduction of offsets, even though the claims themselves could not be transferred to the new Commission.

Necessarily, then, the Supreme Court held rightly, I think, in saying that the Sioux claims which were then pending should be further considered by the Court of Claims in the light of the amendment to the Jurisdictional Act with respect to offsets.

If my memory is correct, this will apply to the so-called case No. 11 covering the land opening of '89, in which there was a finding of $3,500,000, and the trust-fund cases Nos. 18 to 24, involving Standing Rock, Cheyenne River, Rosebud, and Crow Creek Reservations, with a finding of $2,500,000 but both of which were destroyed by the Court of Claims allowing offsets of approximately $8,000,000.

I feel sure that reexamination of the offsets will show that some of them were expenditures for educational, health, and possibly some of the other purposes which are forbidden by the new rule on offsets set forth in section 2 of the Claims Commission bill.

As I recall, a large part of the offsets were charges against the tribal moneys for so-called Sioux benefits paid to individual members of the tribe. I have always thought that was not fair because the tribal money belonged to all members of the tribe while the Sioux benefit payments went only to certain members. In addition, I am sure that examination of the individual programs submitted for the use of Sioux benefit money will reveal that much of the Sioux benefit money has been expended for educational and health purposes, including clothing re-

quired so that the recipient could go to school.

It will be appreciated if you can write me a letter confirming my understanding of the meaning of the grant of your motion by the Supreme Court and setting forth the ways in which I or the people in my office can assist you in gathering evidence to throw out the illegal offsets which the Court of Claims set up which are now clearly illegal.

Incidentally, are there any other claims pending which are entitled to reconsideration under the same rule in the above-mentioned matters?

With appreciation for the good work you have done in this matter and my best wishes for 1947, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative, Second District of South Dakota.

Reduction of the Personal Income Tax Will Stimulate Incentive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, reduction of the personal income tax will provide more risk capital for new business ventures and hence create more opportunities for employment. It will also leave a greater volume of purchasing power in the hands of consumers and hence stimulate demand and production. With increased production and business expansion a reduction in tax rates may result in little, if any, reduction of the total amount of taxes collected. It is well known to students of taxation that there is a point beyond which increased tax rates fail to produce increased revenues.

Not only are present taxes so high as to have reached the point of diminishing returns, but they are so high as to be confiscatory. They are leading toward nationalization of industry. Such high taxes will also tend to produce a deflationary gap, which may lead to a depression.

Reduction of personal income taxes following World War I helped to produce initiative. Taxes which drastically limit use of income not only limit funds available for investment but also remove incentive.

A reduction in personal income tax rates can be effected without further deficit financing provided governmental expenses are reduced. Now that large wartime costs are largely eliminated, such cuts can and should be made.

If income taxes are reduced by increasing exemptions for those at the lowest income level, a burden will be removed from those least able to pay, especially white-collar workers such as teachers, and persons with fixed incomes, such as those living on pensions or annuities. These groups are now caught between the rising cost of living and the inelasticity of their incomes. Decreased taxes for the low-income groups will amount to a pay increase for American workers. Such an automatic increase in take-home pay should help to alleviate industrial unrest.

If taxes are reduced by a given number of percentage points for each of the present tax brackets, relief would be provided on the same basis for all; undue reduction of tax revenues would be avoided, and great numbers of taxpayers would continue to have a stake in fiscal policy. Taxation of low and middle incomes is necessary if revenues are not to be too greatly diminished.

If taxes are reduced through a flat percentage decrease for all taxpayers, the disproportionate share of wartime taxes paid by large incomes will be reduced and brought more nearly into balance.

Whichever method is adopted, a decrease in personal income taxes is clearly in order in the interests of the health of the national economy.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on March 29, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, this week I received notice of my appointment together with Mayor Lounsbery and Justice Gold and others to honorary membership on the Binghamton Committee of American Relief for Italy. It goes without saying I deem it a privilege to lend such support as I can to this worthy cause.

As a matter of fact, our attitude toward relief for Italy has been strained too long. The war has been over nearly 2 years. Thousands of young American men of Italian parentage have returned from the front to Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott, have gone back to their former jobs or gained new ones and are giving to our locality and our country the finest citizenship that can be found.

These young American-Italians joined wholeheartedly with all other Americans in the fight against fascism which gripped the country of their fathers for 2 decades. They helped rid the Italian people of their heavy yoke.

No war-torn country is more prostrate than Italy is today. Her people are in poverty. They certainly deserve the friendly consideration from a nation which has so large a percentage of citizens originating from Italian climes.

For the sake of petty politics, a few irresponsibles are trying to put the heat on me for the lack of adequate housing for veterans. It's the old game of making somebody the goat for a lot of mistakes and blunders in the whole housing fiasco.

Those who are blaming me and firing personal insults at me either are ignorant of my record or just don't know the score. Are they so ignorant they don't know I voted for every dollar spent thus far on veterans' housing in Binghamton?

Are they so dumb they don't realize the administration in Washington is still in the saddle?

Don't they know these attacks are being hurled at me to take the heat off a lot of others who are the ones responsible for inaction while I have been striving with might and main to help the people back home?

No; they can't pin their failure to get our veterans homes on me. They can't stretch a lie quite that far although they have told a good many in the past few years.

Fortunately you people know my record and you don't need cheap demagogs to lie about it to you.

Your thousands of letters of gratitude and thanks for help I have been able to give to our veterans and their families are in my files for inspection to any "doubting Thomas." They pour into my office daily, so there is, always a fresh supply.

I expect to defend that record over this program tonight and every Saturday night as long as I am attacked by enemies of the veteran.

I expect to continue to propose measures which benefit the veteran in spite of the below-the-belt personal and vicious attacks made on me by those same enemies of the veteran.

I will continue to fight for the veteran regardless of how much my right to do so is challenged by the enemies of the people whether they raise their voices in Binghamton or anywhere else.

I will continue to fight against hypocrites who pose as friends of the veteran yet who try to block every move I make to assist the veteran.

No; they cannot hang the blame for no veterans housing on me when they have done absolutely nothing themselves to help the veteran get a home.

They would smear my efforts, but would not deign to do anything themselves.

Your letters thanking me, dear friends, are all I need to throw back the enemies of the veteran for an awful loss. They cannot win that way.

No, boys, the responsibility is yours. I voted for the veterans' housing bill and helped get it through Congress. Now your job is to carry out the law as Congress intended it and stop smearing me for something you're to blame for.

Get busy, boys, time's a-flying! Use your knives to cut the Government red tape instead of putting them into my back. I'll cooperate with anybody who sincerely wants to help.

Thank you.

Sugar Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEAR MR. RAMEY: I thought I'd sit down and blow off some steam. Listen to this: My husband works for the NYC Railroad. A while ago he handed me a sugar stamp, good for 1 pound, and told me to buy him some the first chance I got.

I put it away in my purse, or pocketbook, whatever you want to call it, right next to a stamp of my own, good for 5 pounds (No. 52, since expired).

I had to leave the room for a few minutes the next day. When I came back I see that our two kids have everything turned inside out from the handbag, and tore and ate up half the contents. I'm only glad that it was a couple of days before pay day, and that I didn't have any bills in it, just change. I looked, but no stamps were in sight.

I wrote the ration board in Cleveland, for new ones.

They sent me a form to fill out. I fill it, send it back.

Two weeks lapse, and I get a letter saying, "So sorry, we can't replace stamps that have been torn loose."

I write back telling them that the stamp good for 1 pounds is supposed to be loose, my husband gets them that way (two such stamps, one he already spent). When the conductor receives stamps for use on the caboose, he divides them among himself and the two brakemen, and as far as my stamp No. 52 was concerned, I could have used that for 5 pounds easy. I could just have made believe that I was tearing it out of my book, if I happened to know that the grocer was a stickler for form. It came from my books, and I can't help it if the books are so old they're falling apart. It was still my 5 pounds sitting on a grocery shelf somewhere.

Well, I get another letter from them, and this time they want to know my husband's caboose number. (No mention of my stamp.)

So I sit down and write down his caboose number, in preparation of sending it to them, and at the same time the thought flashes through my mind that for all the money I spent on stamps, writing to them, it would have paid for the sugar. I get mad, and add a footnote to the caboose number, I'm sending, which reads, "If I don't get results this time, I'll take it up with someone who has jurisdiction over the rationing board." That did it, I guess. I haven't heard from them since, and it's been way over 2 months. Some fun. No sugar, no justice.

It just goes to show you, I've borrowed sugar from my friends to tide me over, and am going to have a picnic paying it back.

Mrs. VIRGINIA MEYER.

TOLEDO, OHIO.

Shall the Teamsters Union Be Allowed To Rule the Dairy Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting an address made by Mr. Fred Brenckman before a special convention of the Pennsylvania State Grange at Lock Haven, Pa., April 3, 1947:

SHALL THE TEAMSTERS UNION BE ALLOWED TO RULE THE DAIRY INDUSTRY?

The teamsters union, which is one of the most arrogant and ruthless labor organizations in the United States, has given notice of its intentions to organize all milk haulers on the Pacific coast, together with any other independent groups of employees in connection with the dairy industry that are thrown into competition with members of the teamsters union. Judging from the actions of this union in various parts of the country, it may be taken for granted that this is to be a Nation-wide drive.

The weapon upon which the union depends to enforce compliance with its demands is the secondary boycott. In plain language, under this plan unionized plants would refuse to receive the farmer's milk unless it were hauled by union drivers, or drivers receiving union pay and working under union conditions.

UNION RULE OR RUIN

One large concern operating in the California area has been definitely told by the spokesmen of the union that, regardless of the opinion of the attorney general of the State to the contrary, they demand from the company a contract which will guarantee to the milk hauler a rate which the union claims to be necessary to the proper maintenance, repair, and replacement of all equipment used, plus a wage scale, vacations with pay, and a closed-shop requirement which is the equivalent to that now enjoyed by union employees engaged in the trucking business.

The union is also insisting on a guarantee of hours and of income which will make certain that independent haulers receive from the employer an amount equivalent to the weekly take-home pay of the average union employee.

To grant these demands would, of course, have a decided effect on the price of milk. The public would have to pay more, and as consumer resistance would develop, the farmer would have to take less for his product.

Moreover, in many parts of the country the farmer himself pays for the hauling, and much of the hauling is done by farmer patrons who own trucks and gather and haul the milk of their neighbors in certain areas.

The union has definitely stated that it will draw up a model form of contract which all independent haulers will be asked to sign. If this should be met by a refusal, the union plans to call out on strike all its plant employees at any particular point to force the employer to make such an agreement.

Last year the teamsters union tried these same tactics in the Kansas City area, limiting their operations to only one or two points, so as not to shut off the entire milk supply of the city and thereby causing a popular uprising.

Thereupon, the farmers and milk haulers secured an injunction in the courts. When the case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the State, the action of the lower court was sustained. It was held that the teamsters union violated a State law which forbids conspiracies of this kind.

Appearing as a witness before the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare recently, Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, gave many illustrations of intolerable abuses of which the members of the teamsters union have been guilty in their determination to organize and control the dairy industry.

THE WALKER-GORDON FARM

One of these was the case of the Walker-Gordon farm at Plainsboro, N. J. The employees of this concern were really engaged in agricultural pursuits, and they did not want to join the union. The company's production of 23,000 quarts of certified milk a day was hauled and distributed by union drivers. But in order to force 36 people employed in the bottling establishment to join the union the teamsters union declared all the milk produced on the place "hot cargo," with the result that the milk, which was used for feeding babies and invalids under the prescription of physicians, could not be delivered. Before the company surrendered to the demands of the union it lost $20,000.

Last year in Detroit the teamsters union tried to compel grocers, shopkeepers, and their employees to join the union or pay tribute to it under penalty of getting no supplies. This bold attempt at wholesale brigandage was halted by the courts, and it is possible that criminal prosecutions may grow out of it.

Farmers join with all the other groups who stand for common decency and fair play in demanding that Congress enact legislation at this session that will restore the rule of law and order in this country, giving the rank and file of the people the protection which they have a right to expect at the hands of the Government.

A Correspondence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a correspondence between the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and myself dealing with the general subject of communism. I call the particular attention of the Members to the dates of the first eight letters in the series:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1946.

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: This letter is written for the purpose of obtaining your permission to discuss with agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation the activities of Communist agents and the problems incident to the growth of communism in this country. I also request your authorization to review the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in connection with their study of the problem of Communist activities.

I appreciate that this authorization should be limited to only such information as can be divulged by the Bureau without jeopardizing current and future investigations by the Bureau.

I have already been in touch with Mr. E. A. Tamm of the Bureau, who advises me that they have information which they are willing to release to me and which can be released without in any way interfering with their work.

I sincerely trust that this request will receive your favorable consideration. I earnestly ask that you honor this request at the earliest date.

Yours truly,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have your recent letter in which you request permission to discuss with agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation the activities of Communist agents and the problems resulting from the growth of communism in this country. You have also requested authorization to review certain records of the Bureau relating to Communist activities.

I have discussed this matter with Mr. Hoover, Director of the Bureau, and, after very careful consideration, we have concluded

that we cannot accede to your request. The Department and Bureau have always maintained the steadfast policy that the files of the Bureau should be maintained in a confidential status.

I regret very much that I am unable to comply with your request. However, if in the future you feel that I can be of help to you, please do not hesitate to call on me.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

———— ————,

Attorney General.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1946.

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: I have received your letter of February 27, 1946, denying my request to discuss with agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation the activities of Communist agents in this country and to review certain records of the Bureau.

May I emphasize and call your attention to the fact that my request is only for such information as will in no way jeopardize the current and future work of the Bureau in this field. It is my understanding that the Bureau is doing an exceptional job in connection with its investigation of Communist activities. I would under no circumstances want to interfere or handicap them in the work they are doing.

I would be remiss in my duty, however, as a representative if I did not point out to you certain deep convictions that I have with regard to Communist activities and the work of the Bureau in this regard.

It certainly must be well known to you that the growth of Communism in this country has reached such proportions that it now constitutes a definite threat to our Republic. This threat is not imaginary. It is real. It is known to exist by every investigator. This in itself constitutes a problem that our Government must face. A more serious problem, however, arises out of the fact that the people of this country have not been given the facts of the situation.

I am convinced that when the people of this country are given the facts on this or any other matter the problem will soon be solved and eliminated. By withholding the facts from the people the problem will become aggravated.

The basis of my plea to you, Mr. Attorney General, is not that I be given the facts but that the people of the United States be given the facts. I am not concerned with the question of how they get the facts. I am concerned with when they get the facts. I trust that our Government will not again be responsible for giving the people too few facts too late.

I am reliably informed that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has the facts and that the facts can be divulged without jeopardizing the future investigation and work of the Bureau. It is within your power alone to make these facts available to the people or to withhold them. I trust that you will choose the former course of action and reconsider your letter of February 27.

There can be no real value in hiring a fireman to stand by and watch a fire. His job should be to put it out. How then can you justify the investigation of communistic activities if the results of the investigation are to be suppressed?

May I renew the request contained in my letter of February 14. I trust that you will reconsider the position you have taken in this matter and that I might have your favorable reply at an early date.

Yours truly,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 5, 1946.

Hon. J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: I am enclosing copies of my letters of February 14 and March 1 to the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Attorney General, and a copy of his letter to me of February 27. As you will note, the purpose of my letters to the Attorney General is to obtain authority to discuss with agents of your Bureau the activities of Communist agents in this country and to review certain records of the Bureau. In view of the fact that the Attorney General advises that he cannot accede to my request and that you share his views, I believe it advisable to address you on the subject and solicit your assistance.

There are two points that I want to make very clear. In the first place, it is my desire to obtain only such information as will in no way jeopardize the current and future work of the Bureau in investigating Communist activities. Secondly, if it is deemed inadvisable to release such information to me, it is my desire that at least the facts as found by your investigations be immediately brought to the attention of the public generally.

For a considerable length of time I have become more and more impressed with a conviction that Communist activities in this country have reached such proportions that they constitute a very real threat to our republican form of government and that people generally are not acquainted with the gravity of this situation or the extent of these activities. I fear that, by the time the people generally are aware of what is taking place, it will be too late to take corrective steps. My problem and the purpose of this letter is to inquire as to how you feel the people of this country can be apprised of the methods used by Communists and the extent of their activities in undermining our form of government. I cannot believe that it is your personal conviction that the findings of your investigations on this subject should be buried and withheld from the American people. I believe you must admit that this is exactly what is being done today.

I must assure you that I have the highest regard for your Bureau and the very exceptional work that it has done under your direction. I feel that it is the outstanding agency of the Federal Government, both from the point of view of its accomplishments and its efficient operation. I trust that it will continue to hold the well-deserved respect of the American people, which it now has. I cannot help but feel, however, that, if important facts which I am certain the Bureau has with regard to Communist activities are withheld, this situation will reflect adversely upon the work of the Bureau.

I would appreciate your giving consideration to the question of how the public can be best advised of the current Communist activities in this country. I would be very pleased to receive your sentiments and suggestions on this subject.

Yours truly,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington 25, D. C., March 13, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Mr. Nichols has advised me in detail regarding his conversation with you on Tuesday, and I was glad that you understood our position in this whole matter. In turn, I can understand your situation and interest, and I do appreciate your desire to be of assistance.

In accordance with your conversation with Mr. Nichols, I am enclosing copies of a few of my addresses wherein I have dealt with this subject matter.

With best wishes and kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, March 19, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This has reference to your March 1 letter and to our subsequent telephone conversation regarding activities of Communist agents in this country. I understand you have since talked with J. Edgar Hoover and I am assuming from this that the matter has been taken care of to your satisfaction.

Kind personal regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

———— ————,

Attorney General.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1946.

Hon. J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: I wish to thank you for your letter and the copies of your speeches in which you refer to the activities of Communist agents in this country.

I appreciated the opportunity of being able to discuss this problem with your assistant, Mr. Nichols.

I have summarized my present position on this matter in a letter to the Attorney General. A copy of that letter is enclosed for your information.

Yours truly,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1946.

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: I refer to our previous correspondence and telephone conversation regarding activities of Communist agents in this country.

As a result of my conversation with you and with Mr. Nichols, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I have been influenced to hold this matter in abeyance. I do this in view of your assurance that you will take all steps necessary for the proper security of our country and our form of government and your further assurance that all facts coming to your attention and the attention of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which can be revealed without jeopardizing such security will be presented to the people at the earliest possible time.

Yours truly,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1947.

Hon. J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: May I express my sincerest congratulations on your statement made before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on March 26, 1947. I have written Mr. Tom C. Clark a letter outlining my reactions to your testimony, and, in

view of our correspondence on the same subject last March, I am enclosing a copy.

Yours very truly,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1947.

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: I refer to our correspondence of last February and March on the subject of communism.

You will undoubtedly recall my concern at that time over the threat to our Republic posed by the growth and success of the Communist movement. I sought your permission to interview various FBI agents and review certain Bureau records to ascertain for myself the true facts concerning the activities and operational program of the Communist Party. It was my hope that I could somehow help bring those facts to the attention of the American people. I felt that, while the people had been subject to much misinformation, it was only too apparent that they were being starved for lack of authoritative information.

It was for this reason that I made my unusual request. You will further recall that you were unable to grant me the desired permission because of departmental policy. I wrote to you again on March 1, saying:

"This threat is not imaginary. It is real. It is known to every investigator. This in itself constitutes a problem that our Government must face. A more serious problem, however, arises out of the fact that the people of this country have not been given the facts of the situation.

"I am convinced that, when the people of this country are given the facts on this or any other matter, the problem will soon be solved and eliminated. By withholding the facts from the people, the problem will become aggravated.

"The basis of my plea to you, Mr. Attorney General, is not that I be given the facts, but that the people of the United States be given the facts. I am not concerned with the question of how they get the facts. I am concerned with when they get the facts. I trust that our Government will not again be responsible for giving the people too few facts too late."

You will recall, finally, that I was persuaded to hold the whole matter in abeyance, after a telephone conversation with you and an interview with Mr. Nichols, assistant to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I did so expressing my sincere desire that all facts coming to your attention and to the attention of the FBI which could be revealed without jeopardizing our national security would be presented to the people at the earliest possible time.

This letter is prompted by the recent statement made by Mr. Hoover before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

To me, Mr. Hoover's statement filled a long-felt need. It expressed clearly, forcefully, and what is most important, authoritatively, the real nature of what he so aptly termed "the diabolical machinations of sinister figures engaged in un-American activities," I wish to commend your department for rendering a significant public service. I am sending my personal congratulations and a copy of this letter to Mr. Hoover, with whom I also had correspondence last year.

To my knowledge this is the first time that an official statement outlining the facts concerning the program and operational plan of the Communist Party has ever been issued. Its value, coming from a person with authority and authentic knowledge of the problem, cannot be overemphasized.

It was a satisfying pleasure, too, to learn that Mr. Hoover had emphasized the obvious remedy. I heartily agree with his concluding statement:

"Victory will be assured once Communists are identified and exposed, because the public will take the first step in quarantining them so that they can do no harm."

My only criticism is one that has probably suggested itself to you already. I feel that much valuable time has been lost in not making these facts available to the American public at an earlier date. However, I have no desire to cry over spilt milk. I am now confident that your Department and its affiliated Bureau are wholly conscious of the importance of keeping the public informed by the release of reliable information to which only you can lend credence.

Again, let me express my satisfaction. It is my fervent hope that this policy will be continued and that as new facts concerning the Communist Party, its program, its method of operation, and the identity of its members are brought to light, you will swiftly bring them to the attention of the American people

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

The United Nations Is Kicked Out the Window and the President of the United States Is To Take Personal Charge

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, after reading the newspaper reports of the speeches at the Jefferson Day dinner, Saturday night, it is reasonable to conclude that the administration has decided that they thrive better under a war mania, and it becomes apparent that they will go to any extreme to prevent the Republican Party from doing the job the voters gave us to do last November. It appears now that in the new proposal, the United Nations is kicked out the window and the President of the United States is to take personal charge.

The following is a news item from the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C.:

UNITED STATES INTERVENTION REGARDED AS TRUMAN PLATFORM FOR 1948—DEMOCRATS ADMIT PURPOSE OF BILL TO AID GREECE AND TURKEY IS POLITICAL

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

Democratic as well as Republican leaders yesterday were interpreting the President's Saturday night speech as Mr. Truman's announcement of his candidacy to succeed himself next year on the platform of American intervention for the protection of free peoples wherever menaced by aggression.

Viewed as particularly significant were passages in the speech suggesting that the Truman doctrine is a global extension of the Monroe Doctrine, despite the fact that while Monroe interdicted intervention in this hemisphere he renounced American involvement in European affairs.

USING MONROE'S MANTLE

In these passages, as the politicians construed them, Mr. Truman appeared to visualize himself seeking election next year wearing the mantle of Monroe with the blessing of Jefferson. As visualized by others, he appeared to be setting forth to civilize the world with the atom bomb in one hand and the Bill of Rights in the other.

The President defined the Truman doctrine as "aiding those peoples whose freedoms are endangered by foreign pressures." Then, launching the Truman candidacy of this platform, Gael Sullivan, acting Democratic national chairman, proclaimed that "the triumph of President Truman in the cause of peace and human welfare will be the triumph of the Democratic Party in the days ahead."

CALLED SAFE GAMBLE

From the viewpoint of the practical politicians, the Democratic strategy is a gamble but a safe one. If the Truman plan to check Russian expansion is successful, the Democrats would expect to win the election hands down with the President as their candidate. If it should get us into war or near war with Russia the plea would be not to swap horses while crossing the river, which was successful in 1940 and 1944.

Many Republicans were of the opinion expressed by Senator KEM (Republican), of Missouri, who commented:

"Is the President attempting to make political capital of the Nation's foreign policy? He appears to be a student of the crisis technique of his predecessor."

POLITICAL AIMS ADMITTED

One of the most significant developments as the Truman Greco-Turkish program goes before the Senate this week is the admission from the Democratic side that its purpose is political and is dictated by the principles of military strategy. Senator GEORGE (Democrat), of Georgia, second ranking Democratic member of the Foreign Relations Committee, said that tactical reasons are involved, inasmuch as Turkey is the key to the Middle East.

He voiced the view of Secretary Marshall, who had advanced military considerations in persuading the President to intervene in Greece and Turkey.

The British stand to benefit prodigiously from Mr. Truman's policy. The United States virtually would take over the protection of the British oil concessions in Iran and the Middle East, including the British oil concessions in Iran and Iraq. It would hold the northern front against Russian aggression. The famous life line of the Empire, running through the Suez Canal to the Far East, would be shortened, but it would be guarded by American might.

Adulterated Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

TOLEDO, OHIO, *March 25, 1947.*

The Honorable HOMER A. RAMEY,
Representative, Ninth District of Ohio, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Knowing you are always interested in the folks back home, felt you might like to hear about a universal gripe. To illus-

trate my point, I have enclosed a sample of what is purported to be "coffee." Believe me, any resemblance to coffee is strictly coincidental.

After making a purchase of a pound of coffee in the bean last night, I examined the contents just prior to placing it into our grinder at home. For a while I was sorely tempted to send this to an examiner for the Pure Food Act but on second thought, knew a publicity blast from your office would get quicker action. Like other citizens, we don't mind paying higher prices for coffee, but when this doubling in price is coupled with the sale of such a wretched, adulterated, foul smelling, product as per sample, I believe our patience is exhausted.

You know, from vast experience, that Mr. Average Citizen will stand for quite a lot; taxes, rationing, restrictions, and so forth. Therefore I sincerely believe you will be remembered best for your stay in Washington, if you could secure once again, a "good cup of coffee." Bolstered by the return of such nectar, we could face conditions with renewed vigor.

Respectfully yours,

CALVIN LIEBERMAN.

What's Wrong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter by Dr. Norman Sweet which appeared in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel of March 29, 1947:

WHAT'S WRONG?

To the EDITOR:

A linoleum merchant asked me: "What's wrong with the world?" While he laid my linoleum, I began by asking, "What is wrong with anything?" I answered myself by saying: "A thing is wrong between two or more people because they cannot agree upon what is right." And now we come to the enigmatical question of the ages: "What is right?"

I'm starting this like one of Socrates' observations of human life. What is right to one may naturally be wrong to another if one secures a better advantage in any particular.

What seems right to a child of five not understanding (due to not having had experience) from the parent's lengthy experience that is wrong, is further complicated by the parents trying to talk in adult language to the child.

The child becomes more confused, and feels resentment at being forced to do the right thing it has not yet learned is right. It does the wrong thing, in defiance, believing it is right.

The parent was right but handled it in the wrong way.

So with UN, Russia and America in particular. We talk to Russia in our over 160 years of freedom of living, while Russia has been under Czarish and communistic rule for centuries.

Russia is suspicious of us and we're suspicious of her. Therefore, suspicion (doubt and fear) must be the first element to be removed before any progress on any subject can be even discussed.

Now, our forms of government, natures, anthropological development have been widely different. Human relations can only be established by each understanding the other's natures, and talk, policies, and programs should be built upon this basis.

It will take many years—and it should—to reach a final understanding. But let us approach the matter in a suggestive (psychological) not a critical manner (political) and show Russia we do not want one iota of territory, except for possible protection from attack, but she can say the same thing to us—that she wants equal protection from attack and wants territory for the selfsame reason.

Both are right to themselves, but wrong to the other. Now, what we need in the UN is an educational program on war as a destructive agency between nations, not particularly concentrated upon the two largest (America and Russia) nations.

The atomic-bomb secret held exclusively by America is our greatest handicap to effect this objective, and naturally we're going to control its secret until control of its manufacturing use all over the world is obtained and sustained.

Russia feels this as a "sword of Damocles" over her head. If Russia, in lieu of America, had atomic control, she would do just what we are doing.

Therefore, what's wrong with the world? Nothing. It's what's wrong with the human beings in the world. We're full of fear and are selfish, and education is the only process that can remove both, and we (all of us) are poor students. We must get down to first principles—live and let live. No exceptions.

NORMAN SWEET.

FORT WAYNE.

Classroom Courses for On-the-Job-Training Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include a petition from numerous World War veterans from my congressional district. The petition speaks for itself.

We the undersigned, being veterans of World War No. 2, and residents of Alfalfa County, Oreg., hereby respectfully ask and request the Veterans' Administration and the United States Congress to omit and waive the requirement that veterans who are on-the-job-training be required to take classroom applied training courses in this area; for the reason that the subjects offered are not pertinent to the training. The schooling requires a man who is tired from working all day to go to school at night, 4 hours per week, and the expense to the veteran of traveling to and from schools is prohibitive in many cases.

Clarence L. Roberson, Wayne A. Ford, Robert V. Goldsmith, Al S. Pantel, Comer L. Jenlink, Jess E. Tatro, Alvin J. Schiffner, William Edward Kerr, Roy Lee Gibson, Ralph John Hutson, William J. Boston, William J. Smith, Maurice M. Frank, Bill B. Bowles, Ray E. Davidson, Howard F. Leslie, John A. Steele, Richard L. Bright Jack C. McDaniel, Bill B. Young, Roy S. Williamson, William F. Kinney, Charles E. Brewer, Raymond C. Hutson, Maynard Cramer, Robert E. Wilson, Harry E. Smith.

Prospects for Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have three addresses which I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The first is an address entitled "Prospects for Industrial Peace," delivered by Edwin E. Witte, chairman, department of economics, University of Wisconsin, to the Milwaukee County League of Women Voters, at Milwaukee, Wis., on February 7, 1947; the second, an address entitled "Labor Management Problems in 1948," delivered by Mr. Witte at the meeting of the Business and Professional Men's Group of Cincinnati, on March 21, 1947; and the third, a companion address entitled "Government Control of Industrial Relations," recently delivered by William M. Leiserson, of Johns Hopkins University, in Los Angeles, Calif. The three addresses—two by Mr. Witte, and the third by Mr. Leiserson—are of great importance to Members of the Senate as we begin to approach the whole problem of labor legislation. I think these two men, recognized as great experts in this field, have put down in black and white a few cautions which the Senate might well afford to heed.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have the address entitled "Prospects for Industrial Peace" delivered by Mr. Witte, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am advised by the Public Printer that Mr. Witte's address will make approximately two and a quarter pages of the RECORD, which is one-fourth of a page in excess of the two pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost. The cost is estimated to be $159.75.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSPECTS FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE

(Address of Edwin E. Witte to the Milwaukee County League of Women Voters, at Milwaukee, February 7, 1947)

In discussing the prospects for industrial peace, I will deal both with the outlook in the months immediately ahead and with the factors, as I see them, upon which will depend the prospects for improvement of labor-management relations in the longer run.

As everyone knows, the United States had experienced an extraordinary amount of labor trouble since VJ-day. In 1946, this country had 4,700 strikes, which caused a loss, as estimated by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, of 113,000,000 man-days. The 4,700 strikes were not the largest number of strikes in any year. In 1944, we had 5,000 work stoppages. But in that year, all of the strikes caused a loss of but 8,000,000 man-days. During the entire year, in more than 3½ years, work stoppages caused a loss of 36,000,000 man-days—only one-third the strike loss of the single year 1946.

The strike record of 1946 was the worst in all our history, although this was not the year of the largest number of strikes. But

the strikes of this last year involved large number of workers and lasted a long time. Above 75 percent of the total lost time in 1946 was accounted for by the 29 strikes each of which involved above 10,000 men. In the war period there were less than a dozen strikes involving such numbers of workers and the average duration of strikes was only a few days, contrasted with 24 days in 1946. While during the entire war there was not even one strike which was authorized by an A. F. of L. or CIO union, nearly all the work stoppages since VJ-day have been authorized strikes. They have occurred after the expiration of the union contract and have concerned demands for wage increases. Union security has been far less of an issue in strikes than before the war and none of the major strikes have involved jurisdictional disputes.

Bad as has been our strike record since VJ-day, it is important that it be seen in its proper perspective. Man-days lost through strikes as reported by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics take account only of time lost by workers on strike and by other workers rendered idle in the same plant by reason of a strike although they themselves are not on strikes. The totals given omit from consideration working time lost in other plants by reason of shortage of materials attributable to a strike. Even so, it is worth noting that the 113,000,000 man-days lost in 1946 through strikes were less than half of the man-days lost through industrial accidents in this last year as estimated by the National Safety Council. They amounted to less than 1.5 percent of all working time in nonagricultural employment.

Even more significant is the fact that more than 10 times as many union agreements were concluded in 1946 without strikes as there were strikes. In 1946 there were at least 50,000 situations in which agreements were arrived at between management and unions without any interruption of work. It is the exceptional which makes the news and it is fortunate that in this country strikes attract little attention. In many great industries there have been no or but very few strikes since VJ-day. This holds true for such great industries as building construction, textiles, men's and women's clothing, hosiery, shoes, rubber, and many more. Most of the bad strikes since VJ-day have occurred in industries and plants in which the unions gained recognition only shortly before the outbreak of the war—that is in industries and plants which had but a very limited experience with collective bargaining when the war brought with it an end, for the time being, to normal collective bargaining.

It is not surprising that in these industries labor and management experienced difficulties in arriving at agreements through collective bargaining when after VJ-day they were again on their own. There are many reasons why the end of hostilities was followed by a great increase in strike losses.

First among these must be cited the natural reaction against wartime restrictions. The world over, there have been many serious strikes since the war ended. In proportion to its industrial population, Australia has had a worse record than the United States, and Canada certainly not a better one. In the United States the year 1919 was the worst year for strikes until 1946.

Governmental controls kept both wages and prices during the war below what they otherwise would have been. Both labor and management were restive under these Government-imposed restrictions. Both sides clamored for restoration of free collective bargaining.

Responding to their demand, the Government almost at once after VJ-day started to withdraw its controls. The War Labor Board took no new disputes and before long terminated its work. Wage controls were largely abandoned, but price control remained.

The result was that in major mass-production industries, which had but very limited experience with collective bargaining before the war, the serious strikes previously noted developed. As I see it, there is little value in trying to assess blame for these strikes. The old adage, "It takes two to make a quarrel," pretty generally is also applicable to labor disputes. For the labor troubles of the recent past no one is entirely blameless.

Fearful of loss of take home pay, labor made demands for greatly increased wage rates. While privately conceding the need for some increases, management generally was very slow in making increases. One reason was uncertainty about the possibility of recouping the increased wage costs through price increases. As Business Week, the McGraw-Hill publication of wide circulation among businessmen, pointed out, a few months ago, in its analysis of post VJ-day strikes, there was a price aspect as well as a wage aspect in all or substantially all of the great strikes which developed. In not one major strike were wage increases made until management had been assured of corresponding price increases. Retention of price controls, while wages were free from control except where price increases were sought hindered arriving at compromise settlements and in many cases led directly to strikes.

Both labor and management professed faith in collective bargaining. But to many in the ranks of labor, collective bargaining meant: "Give us what we want, or else." To many managements, free collective bargaining meant being able finally to say "No" to union demands without possibility of review by any one. Among the union men in several of our major mass production industries there was an almost irresistible strike fever and a widespread belief that management would give in after a short strike, as it had so often given in after wildcat strikes during the war. Many managements, similarly, believed that it was a good time for a show-down, while needed materials were still so very short in supply. Not a major cause of strikes, as I see it, but clearly a factor enabling managements to hold out longer once strikes were begun was the reconversion tax credit provision of the Federal income tax law. Companies which paid large amounts in taxes during the wartime could recompute their taxes for the war years and get refunds if they sustained losses in the reconversion period. This provision, in some cases operated much like the payment of strike benefits from the Federal Treasury to companies involved in great strikes enabling them to show substantial profits after taxes despite operating losses

Plus these factors affecting labor and management tending toward industrial strife, an uncertain governmental policy increased tensions and often delayed settlements. The undue publicity given strikes and the tendency of nearly everybody in the public to adopt a highly partisan attitude, usually without much, if any, knowledge of the facts, clearly did not help matters.

The recital of the reasons why the post VJ-day period was one of many large strikes could be further prolonged. What really matters in relation to the prospects for industrial peace is that many of the causes which produced such great strike losses are, fortunately, no longer operative.

There is much evidence that the workers are fed up with strikes. The fact that even now average take home pay in manufacturing industries is below the maximum of the wartime while the cost of living has risen very greatly is, of course, a source of discontent. So are the high food costs and the large, although spotty, profits of manufacturing corporations, which are greatly exaggerated in the accounts believed by the workers. But there appears to be among union men an attitude of, Stop, Look, and Listen. It is realized that labor gained but little through the first round wage increases while immensely damaging its cause with public opinion. Very certainly the responsible labor leaders of the country do not want further great strikes if they can prevent them. Even in the CIO vigorous efforts are now being made to curb left-wing elements, whose party line is again class warfare. The bitter A. F. of L. rivalry, which of itself was an important cause of postwar labor troubles, is apparently becoming less intense. Union treasuries, never as large as popularly supposed, are now very low. The state of public opinion is such that labor will be blamed for further serious labor troubles. In that event legislation which at the least will be annoying and insulting to the unions if not seriously damaging is certain to be enacted. For these and still other reasons the dominant union sentiment at this time is one of trying to avoid strikes and to arrive at compromises of disagreements with management.

There are factors in the present situation also which make management anxious for industrial peace. Government controls are off and price adjustment can now freely be made. No longer can the Government be blamed for strife which may develop. We are back to free enterprise and management has a direct interest in making it work. Shortages of materials have either disappeared or are in the process of doing so and in many lines there is a reason to believe that loss of production through strikes will mean a permanent loss of business which can never be recovered. In the industries in which great strikes are most likely, the war tax credits by now have been pretty well exhausted. While the position of the unions has been weakened, their membership is still very near the peak. Neither management nor the unions proved a pushover in the postwar period, as many extreme partisans on the respective sides had expected. In a sellers' market such as now prevails for labor, the unions' position is intrinsically very strong if strikes develop and that whether Congress is pro- or anti-labor.

Happily the factors enumerated already have resulted in marked improvement in the strike situation. It is not generally known but a fact that the trend in strike losses has been downward ever since February a year ago and that since June strike losses have been at a much lower level than in the first 5 months of the year. The man-days lost through strikes increased practically every month for the first 6 months following VJ-day. They reached a peak of 23,000,000 man-days lost in February 1946. This represented nearly 4 percent of total work time and was the worst month for strikes in all our history. Strike losses remained at unprecedented heights for four more months, although considerably less than in February. After the settlement of the first coal and the railroad strike, late in May and early in June, respectively, strike losses decreased sharply. The only nation-wide strikes since then have been the maritime strikes of September-October and John L. Lewis' second coal strike in November, which was of short duration but did more to prejudice the public against the unions than probably anything else. Even in the high months of this period, September and November, the man-days lost through strikes totalled only 5,000,000, contrasted with above 10,000,000 in each of the first 5 months of 1946 and 23,000,000 in the peak month of February a year ago. In all of the other months beginning with June, strike losses have not been so very alarming. Since settlement of the last coal strike, almost the only major strikes in the country have been the two which so long have plagued Wisconsin. For January 1947, no report is yet available, but it is a certainty that this was the lowest month in strike losses since VJ-day and not much, if at all, above the average prewar Januaries. For the country

as a whole strike losses ever since June have been only a small fraction of 1 percent of work time.

It is no exaggeration to say that settlement of disputes through collective bargaining is now the pattern, rather than disagreement resulting in strikes. For some months industry has been confronted with second-round wage demands, comparable to the first-round demands following VJ-day. But this time compromises are being worked out around the conference table. Such settlements have been arrived at not only in industries which have had little trouble since VJ-day, like construction, textiles, clothing, hosiery, and rubber, but also in some industries which experienced serious strikes in the first round of wage increases, like meat packing, lumber, and oil. These settlements represent collective bargaining at its best. They do not provide for the same flat-rate increases throughout all industry, on the model of the 18½-cents-per-hour increase which became pretty much a universal pattern after settlement on the basis of the steel strike. As they are adapted to the peculiar situation in each industry and even the special circumstances of a particular company, they are basically much sounder than the first-round increases. And, generally, they have not led to immediate price increases.

As recently as a month ago, predictions about the prospects for industrial peace in 1947 were very gloomy. Now they have become rosy, indeed. I also am optimistic, but direct attention to the fact that the new contracts in a least three of our major industries remain to be written. In steel, in many respects the most crucial of all industries, the old contract has been extended to April to permit longer negotiations and the same thing has been done in relation to the Chrysler contract. Other union agreements in major automobile plants do not expire until that time, and April 1 is also the normal new contract date in coal. There is no ground for alarm in the fact that this year's contracts have still to be negotiated in these three critical industries, which have accounted for the largest part of the strike loss since VJ-day.

Extension of the time for negotiations, in fact, is most hopeful. But the fact must not be lost sight of that no agreements have been reached to date in these critical industries and in all of them, it now appears, matters will come to a head in April. While the prospects for new agreements without strikes seem good, there is still the possibility that the spring may bring simultaneous strikes in a large segment of all American industry. Whether settlement or strikes will be the outcome, it seems to me, will depend upon whether both parties in these troubled industries display the same statesmanship which has kept many other industries at peace since VJ-day.

The will to peace and an earnest desire to find a basis for adjustment, I believe, also holds the clue to the longer time prospects for industrial peace. I have no faith in any political solution of labor relations problems. Industrial peace cannot be brought about by law. Legislation such as is now before Congress will put Government into the labor relations picture more than it ever has been before, at least in peacetime. In the end it cannot but result in further governmental restrictions upon both labor and management. The route to industrial peace does not lie in further legal restrictions and increased governmental intervention. Just as the Employment Peace Act has not brought industrial peace to Wisconsin, so similar legislation by Congress will not assure industrial peace to the Nation. It may well have precisely the opposite effect, reversing the present trend toward fewer strikes and reduced strike losses.

The long time prospects for industrial peace depend upon managements and unions learning how to live together peacefully. That this is not an easy matter, the difficulties experienced in many instances clearly indicate.

There is an old French saying: "When the other fellow acts unreasonably, look inward." This saying is a sound rule in relation to labor difficulties. But the inward look must not be one of self-righteousness. Rather, it needs to be one, as suggested in a recent speech by Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros. Co., of "humility" and of "realization." Said Mr. Luckman, "there is no hope that either side will bring to the bargaining table those qualities of sanity, moderation, and tolerance which are indispensable for the survival of democracy in industry."

Besides such an inward look of humility, there is need for improvement in labor relations, a sympathetic understanding of the problems of the other fellow. There is today and has long been a wide gap between the thinking of labor and management. Unfortunately, we even lack appreciation of the fact that there is such a pronounced difference in basic patterns of thought. Many managements do not understand unions and all too often do not even try to understand them. On the part of the many unions and their leaders there is very inadequate appreciation of the problems facing management and all too often indifference as to how union policies may affect the survival of a company or industry.

It is false, as asserted by the Communists, that the interests of labor and capital are completely antagonistic and irreconcilable. It is also false, as often stated by management partisans, that the interest of the workers, the stockholders, and management are in all respects identical. Labor and management have common interest in everything that pertains to production. But their interests are not identical on questions concerning the distribution of the joint product. Quarrels over the distribution of production are as old as is production itself. These quarrels will not be adjusted solely by preaching identity of interests. But neither is their hope of peace in class warfare or its constant preachment.

It is in frank recognition both of common and divergent interests that there lies hope for reconciliation. Prof. E. Wight Bakke, director of the labor-management center of Yale University, sees the principle of mutual survival as the key to the development of satisfactory relations between managements and unions. Unions will be militant and unreasonable so long as they believe that the employers are seeking to undermine them. Managements will fight unions to the death so long as they believe that the unions are seeking to overthrow the system of free enterprise which has made our economy the strongest ever developed.

Managements need to get over their longing for the good old days when there were no unions. There is little if any prospect that unions will soon disappear from the American scene. Unions in this country are now more than 100 years old. They have survived all of the ups and downs of the business cycle, all political changes, and all shifts in public attitudes. When managements seek to destroy unions they are certain to bring to the top the rabble rousers and the most extreme elements among the union men. Giving status and security to the union is not a guaranty of no further labor trouble but a sine qua non in getting along with the union.

On the part of labor a first essential is to convince management and the public that the unions are not revolutionary and do not seek to destroy the American way of life. Unions cannot expect management to deal other than in a spirit of hostility with them, so long as their leaders and their publications are constantly villifying managements and stirring up grievances and magnifying them. The prosperity of the workers is dependent upon the prosperity of the company, even though large profits are not a certain guaranty of high wages. And the rights of workers as human beings, democracy in the shop, can be attained and safeguarded without destroying the rights of management and its ability to successfully conduct the enterprise.

Both labor and management need to cease taking the advice of the extremists in their ranks. It just does not make sense to follow the leadership of industrialists who have made a mess of their labor relations and to reject the advice of other industrialists who get along well with unions. On the part of unions it is high time that they realize that responsibility goes with power. Unions must recognize that they have grown up and act accordingly. On the part of both labor and management there must be, not merely free, but genuine, collective bargaining—an attitude of tolerance and understanding, earnest desire to make collective bargaining work, a willingness to explore possibilities for adjustment with an open mind and to make accommodations enabling the other fellow to live and function in accordance with the basic concepts of our American democracy and of our American system of free enterprise.

While expressing my views on what labor and management can do to improve labor relations, I do not want to overlook the responsibility of those of us who are neutrals. We have talked a lot about the rights of the public, but very little about the duties of the public. But in our legal system, every right carries with it a corresponding duty and that applies to the public as well as to the parties directly involved in labor controversies.

A first duty of all neutrals is to be truly neutral. That is impossible if we form judgments on insufficient information and align ourselves with one party or the other, as we are prone to do. It is only when we are certain of all the facts that we can have an intelligent opinion or in any manner contribute to the settlement of a controversy. Generally, neutrals not in official position can do but little directly toward settling labor disputes. But informed public opinion is a very potent force and can contribute a great deal toward improved labor relations.

The Government, as the representative of the entire public, has important responsibilities in the development of improved labor relations. It is its responsibility to establish minimum standards for the protection of the weak and the unorganized. In all the discussion of new labor legislation the fact that much of our legislation for the protection of the children in industry and of the lowest paid and weakest of the adult has become meaningless, has been entirely overlooked. Government can also make an important contribution to better collective bargaining by making available to the parties the latest relevant data. It can do much for the peaceful settlement of labor disputes through making impartial mediation and voluntary arbitration service available to parties whenever they may want their assistance. In strikes the Government has the responsibility of preserving law and order. Industrial disputes cannot be allowed to become actual warfare and it is up to the responsible executive authorities to enforce the criminal law even during strikes. In great emergencies the Government must go beyond such measures, and through the exercise of all its powers and with the support of public opinion somehow, and in any manner that it can do so, end strikes which threaten to stop our entire economic system, as President Truman did in the railroad strike of last June and the coal strike in November. But I would reserve such coercive intervention by Government to

great emergencies and would not dull its effectiveness by too frequent use. Disraeli's maxim, "Never expose the impotence of democratic government," applies with peculiar force to labor disputes.

While the Government and the public generally have responsibilities for the preservation of industrial peace, the primary responsibility rests upon labor and management. We will have self-government in industry only if they mutually solve their problems. That they can do so has been happily demonstrated in many industries. It is to be hoped that similar progress will be made in those other industries which have been mainly responsible for the great strike losses since VJ-day. The downward trend of strikes and the progress made recently in the development of genuine collective bargaining afford hope that the corner has been turned and that in these troubled industries also the situation will continue to improve.

Labor-Management Problems in 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the second address which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD is entitled "Labor-Management Problems in 1947," and was delivered by Mr. Edwin E. Witte, chairman, department of economics, University of Wisconsin, at the meeting of the Business and Professional Men's Group of Cincinnati, on March 21, 1947.

Mr. President, an estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that it will cost $248.50 to print this address delivered by Mr. Witte.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS IN 1947

(Address of Edwin E. Witte, chairman, department of economics, University of Wisconsin)

In discussing the labor-management problems in 1947, it is logical to begin with a review of past developments.

I will say little about the period before 1935 when Congress enacted the National Labor Relations Act, popularly known as the Wagner Act. Unionism was then over 100 years old in this country. It had survived all of the ups and downs of the business cycle, all political changes, and all climates of public opinion. It was firmly established in many industries, but was almost completely excluded from the mass-production industries.

Both unionism and collective bargaining had long been of undoubted legality. While there had been a few early cases in which labor unions were held to be illegal, it had long been firmly established that combinations of workingmen to increase their wages, shorten hours of labor, or improve working conditions, are lawful. There never had been even one case in which a combination for these purposes had been held to violate the antitrust laws, regardless of the size of the union or the percentage of the employees in a given industry included within its membership. Union agreements were of unquestioned legality, including agreements for the closed shop—and without the limitation specified in the Wagner Act that closed-shop agreement must be made with a union representing a majority of the employees.

As early as 1918 in the Declaration Principles to Govern Labor Relations during World War I, it was declared to be the policy of the United States to accord workers the rights of self-organization and collective bargaining, free from all interference by employers. This statement came from the War Labor Board of that day, of which the then ex-President and later Chief Justice William Howard Taft was co-chairman. This principle was first written into statute law in the Railway Labor Act of 1926, approved by President Coolidge. It also was included in the Norris-La Guardia Act of 1932 and in the Bankruptcy Act of 1933, both of which were approved by President Hoover. It was reaffirmed in section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act of the early days of the Roosevelt administration.

This same provision is the central section of the Wagner Act. This law differs from the earlier legislation to safeguard the right of workers to form labor organizations and engage in collective bargaining only in that it implements this statement of the rights of workers by a short list of unfair labor practices of employers. The most important of these unfair labor practices are discrimination against workers for union membership or activities, the establishment or maintenance of company dominated unions, and refusal to bargain collectively when a majority of the employees have designated a collective bargaining representative. Commission of an unfair labor practice—by an employer does not constitute a crime nor does it subject him to suit at law. But it does make him liable to proceedings before the National Labor Relations Board and, if found guilty of unfair labor practices to an order directing him to desist from these practices and to make whole, as nearly as can be, the persons injured by his unlawful conduct. But it is only after such an order has been confirmed by a circuit court of appeals that the employer is subject to any penalty for disregard of the Board's order.

The National Labor Relations Act became law in July 1935 but it did not really become operative until April 1937, when the Supreme Court unanimously held its provisions to be constitutional. In another case decided at the same time a majority of the Court held that the act applied not only to what had theretofore been considered interstate commerce, but to all industries, other than agriculture, in which interruption by a labor dispute would in a substantial manner interfere with interstate commerce. These decisions were rendered by the Supreme Court before a single appointee of President Roosevelt sat on that Court.

These decisions upholding the Wagner Act and giving it the broadest possible scope were followed immediately by the greatest wave of union organization we have ever known in this country. Since 1937, union membership has increased from less than 5,000,000 to nearly 15,000,000. The great mass production industries were largely organized at this time. In these industries, however, there was but a short experience with collective bargaining when the war came and interrupted normal developments.

During this period, while union membership and union agreements multiplied, the unions lost favor with public opinion. For this, their own conduct was largely to blame, although by no means all unions were responsible. This was the time of the sit-down strikes and of the attainment of control by Communists in a fairly large number of CIO international unions and of more local unions. In the intense organizational drives of the rival federations into which the labor movement had been split, public interests were disregarded and public opinion flouted.

Labor paid dearly for this mistake. Labor excesses were an important factor in bringing on the conservative wing in American politics which has been very pronounced since 1938. One of its major consequences has been the enactment in many States, beginning in 1939, of a new type of labor legislation, restrictive of labor unions and their activities in labor disputes. At the same time there has been an all but complete cessation of new labor legislation of the protective type, which until recently was the only legislation to which the term "labor legislation" was applied. The restrictive laws in the States have been very little enforced. In no State other than Wisconsin was there up to last summer even a single case in which a union has been proceeded against for unfair labor practices. In Wisconsin there have been many cases against labor unions under its Employment Peace Act, but even there many of the provisions which were designed to hit unions have in practice turned out to be additional restrictions upon employers. All actions premised upon illegal closed-shop agreements have been against employers. This has been true also of the great majority of cases in which a breach of a union agreement has been charged. State experience indicates that labor legislation of the restrictive type is more of an insult than an injury to organized labor. But just as the employers resented having the Wagner Act forced upon them, so the union workers have felt aggrieved by the restrictive State laws. These laws may to some degree have checked the spread of union organization but, unfortunately, they have not brought labor peace. In nearly every State which has a restrictive labor law the governors in their messages of this year have dealt upon the need for further restrictions, while most of the governors in States without such laws reported that their States had been relatively free from labor troubles.

Since the period, from 1937 to 1941, of the greatest spread of unionism and of union excesses which turned public opinion against the unions, we have been through the trying but glorious days of World War II and the disturbing experience since VJ-day.

During World War II this country had relatively little labor trouble. In the nearly 4 years of our participation in the war our direct strike losses totaled only 36,000,000 man-days—considerably less than one-half of 1 percent of working time in industrial employments. This was not only a much smaller strike loss than in the prewar years, but, relative to our number of workers, the smallest wartime strike loss in any English-speaking country. Many strikes occurred in the United States during the war years. In 1944 there were more strikes than in any other year, including even 1946. But with few exceptions, these were wildcat strikes, involving few men, and, typically, they were settled within a few days. Not a single strike occurred during the war which was authorized by an international union then affiliated with either the AFL or the CIO. Independent unions had a somewhat less good record, but only the coal strikes resulted in any serious interference with war production.

Contrary to a widespread impression now prevailing, strikes were not prohibited by any law during the war. Nor did we have compulsory arbitration, as this term is usually understood. The National War Labor Board was vested with authority to decide issues in disputes which management and labor did not themselves settle. But its decisions were merely advisory, with plant seizure as the only possible method of enforcement when the Board's orders were not voluntarily accepted. Plant seizures were resorted to in but few cases and sometimes failed to bring about compliance. But the great majority of the Board's decisions were accepted in good faith by both sides, although they often did not like them.

In 21,000 labor-disputes cases decided by the War Labor Board there was defiance by unions in less than 50 cases and by employers in less than 300 cases, the great majority of the latter after VJ-day. More important was the fact that even in wartime the great majority of employers and unions settled their own difficulties without resort to the Government. As was to be expected from the fact that collective bargaining was so new in these industries, this was less true in the mass-production industries than in most other industries.

The strike record during wartime, which was on the whole very good, was not due to any legislation or the great wisdom of the National War Labor Board. It is to be attributed to the no-strike pledge, and its faithful observance by the great majority of union leaders and managements. The no-strike pledge was a very informal promise of the labor leaders to avoid strikes while the war was in progress and a corollary promise of both management and labor to abide by decisions of the War Labor Board on issues which the parties were unable to settle. The no-strike pledge was not kept 100 percent on either side. It was, however, observed remarkably well on both sides. Typically, labor felt aggrieved because the Board refused to allow as large wage increases as it felt entitled to and as it could have gotten but for the existence of wage controls. On the other side, many managements felt aggrieved because the Board often settled disputes over demands for the closed shop by directing union maintenance of membership during the life of the contract. With few exceptions both sides abided by the Board's decisions. Thanks to the patriotism displayed by them, we got through the trying war period with a minimum of interruption of war production through strikes.

Wartime restraints, however, were productive of much discontent and produced many frictions, which were an important factor in bringing on the serious strikes which plagued this country during the first 10 months following VJ-day. Almost as soon as the shooting stopped and at the insistence of both labor and management, the Government returned responsibility for the settlement of labor disputes to the parties directly involved. After August 18, 1945, the War Labor Board merely cleaned up its old cases and it went out of existence on December 31, 1945. Wage control was withdrawn except where price increases were sought simultaneously. Labor and management were strictly on their own and, it was hoped, that they would settle their differences through collective bargaining.

In many industries they did so, without strikes. But in the mass-production industries as well as other establishments where unionism was new very serious strikes developed. From VJ-day through February 1946, strike losses increased every month. In February they were at a peak of 23,000,000 man-days—nearly 4 percent of working time and three times as great a loss as in the entire year of 1944, the worst year we have ever had for number of strikes. Since February a year ago the trend of strike losses has been downward. It remained very high for three more months. Since early June 1946 the total of the strike losses has not been so very alarming. Since then we have had only two Nation-wide strikes, the maritime strikes of September and October and the second coal strike of John L. Lewis in November. Only in 2 months of this period was the strike loss as great as 5,000,000 man-days, contrasted with above 10,000,000 in each of the first 5 months of 1946. During the last 3 months, strike losses have been less than in normal prewar years.

Considering the entire year of 1946, the strike record was by far the worst of any year. Direct strike losses totaled 113,000,000 man-days—three times the combined total of the four war years. There were fewer strikes in this year than in 1945 or several earlier years. But the strikes of 1946 involved more workers and lasted longer. Twenty-nine strikes each of which involved more than 10,000 workers accounted for above 75 percent of the strike loss. These were nearly all in the mass-production industries, plus the coal and maritime strikes. In nearly all of the post-VJ-day strikes demands for wage increases were the primary issue. Union security figured as an issue (even as a minor one) in less than 5 percent of all the strikes, compared with above 50 percent in the prewar years. Of the 4,700 strikes in 1946, only 19 are recorded as jurisdictional strikes. In very few of them was there even a claim of contract violation. The serious strikes of the postwar period have developed after contracts expired and have concerned disagreements over wage rates.

Each side insists that the other was to blame for these strikes. Very probably, the old adage that it takes two to make a quarrel is closer to the truth in most cases than to exclusively blame either. A small number of strikes may have been due to Communists within the unions, as the party line changed when Russia was no longer in danger. A much more potent cause was the belief of many workers that wages had been kept down unduly during the war and that profits were so high that very substantial increases could easily be granted. Even more important in this connection was the steady upward climb in the cost of living. On part of management there was an understandable, but unfortunate hesitancy to promptly grant reasonable wage increases that were clearly called for. There was also a feeling that the time was opportune for a show-down with the unions, to regain management rights lost during the war. Both sides had asked for the restoration of free-collective bargaining. But to many union leaders that meant, "Give us what we want, or else." And to many managements it meant the right to say "No," without possibility of review by anyone. This may have been free collective bargaining, but clearly was not genuine collective bargaining.

Responsibility for the strikes after VJ-day must be shared by the Government and the public. The Government's policies were uncertain and frequently changed. We had no less than three radically differing wage policies in the first 6 months following the close of the war. Largely dropping wage controls while retaining price controls was most illogical. The press, by giving undue publicity to strikes, tended to produce a situation in which we always seemed to be in a crisis. As was said at the time by a keen observer: "We could make some progress toward better labor relations, if somebody was not always saying that we are in a crisis, alarming the public, and magnifying differences." Public opinion, because hysterical, uninformed, and partisan, was a far less effective force for industrial peace than it could and ought to have been.

There is little in the record of the postwar labor troubles of which any one can be proud. But no good can be served in harping upon past shortcomings. With all of the bad strikes we had in 1946, it was nevertheless the year of the greatest peacetime production we have ever known. The 113,000,000 man-days lost through strikes in this worst year represented only 1½ percent of all working time and less than half of the loss estimated by the National Safety Council as the cost of industrial accidents in this year. The 4,700 strikes during 1936 are to be compared with a total of above 50,000 union agreements in effect in the United States. There were 10 agreements reached without strikes for every strike. Many important industries have had few, if any, strikes since VJ-day. Among them are building construction, textiles, men's and women's clothing, rubber, paper, and shoes. The postwar strikes occurred mainly in industries in which collective bargaining was new when the war came and in which there was but little collective bargaining during the war. That serious trouble developed in these industries might almost be said to have been natural.

The best part of the postwar period is that the trend of strikes has been downward now for more than a year. During the last 3 months strikes have been at a low point. However faulty the Government's handling of this problem may have been in the first period following VJ-day, it has become much more sure and consistent in the most recent period. The Government's course of action in the railroad strike of last spring and the coal strike of last fall could scarcely have been improved upon for vigor and effectiveness. These potentially most serious strikes were settled without any real damage to our economy and without any yielding to the strikers. But the principal credit for the greatly improved strike picture belongs to the managements and to the unions which have worked out compromise settlements without strikes of the troublesome second-round wage increase demands.

When these demands were first presented they seemed likely to produce another wave of strikes comparable to that which followed the presentation of the first round wage increase demands. But in industry after industry compromises have been worked out, representing settlements, without strikes, which are eminently reasonable and fair to both sides. Through this process, it has been possible to make adjustments to the peculiar situation presented in particular plants, avoiding the unfairness of the 18½ cents per hour increase, across the board and in all plants, which finally became the pattern of the first round wage increases.

Unfortunately, not all industries to date have worked out such reasonable compromise settlements. In the great mass production industries of rubber, automobiles, and steel there is still a serious possibility of bad strikes ere many months. The same holds true for the railroads, the telephone industry, and, as always, coal. When in the steel industry, on expiration of the contract in January, it was extended by mutual agreement until the end of April, to allow further time for negotiations, this was generally regarded as an assurance that there will be no steel strike this year. Similar action in relation to the Chrysler contract was viewed as an indication that there will be no automobile strike. To date, however, no compromises have been agreed to in either the steel or automobile industries and the rubber workers are due to go on strike within a few days against the four major rubber companies, unless there is a last-minute settlement. Such last-minute settlements are exceedingly common in labor disputes and the situation is by no means hopeless. The fact that these are the industries in which occurred the greatest of the strikes after VJ-day, however, is not reassuring. Similarly, it must be deemed a cause of concern that to date the employers in steel and automobiles are reported not to have made any counter wage offers. If settlements are effected in the critical industries mentioned, 1947 may well prove one of the best years we have ever had. But the danger of bad strikes in these industries is still very real.

What Congress does or does not do will have very little influence upon the chances of avoiding this danger. The long-time effects of many of the proposals now under consideration in the Congress are debatable. I have opinions about them but do not claim to have the answers. That some changes in the present legislation may have value in the development of improved labor relations I readily concede. To make the obligations of

the National Labor Relations Act two-sided, instead of one-sided, is clearly desirable. So is the writing into the law of the employers' freedom of speech which is guaranteed by the Constitution. Opposition of the unions to requirements to insure the honest handling of union funds and of democratic procedures within unions, I have long regarded as short-sighted and most unwise. Jurisdictional disputes are so unfair to employers that I favor experimentation with governmental machinery for their settlement. If the power of seizure in labor disputes which threaten our entire economy can be safeguarded so as to prevent the serious threat to the continuance of our system of free enterprise which such power carries with it, authority to that effect may appropriately be given the President. Like everybody else who has spoken on the subject, I favor strengthening of the Conciliation Service and believe that, instead of the reduced appropriations proposed by the House committee, appropriations for this purpose should be increased. There is still other additional legislation which has some promise of being helpful.

My general view, however, is that satisfactory labor relations cannot be developed by law. I do not see the solution of our labor difficulties in politics and have no faith in increased governmental restrictions and authority in this field. Some new legislation may be helpful to get employers over the feeling which is now so widespread that they are the underdogs and that the law is unfair to them. There is danger, however, that this feeling may be shifted to the workers, with the inevitable consequence that there will be a drive ere long for further restrictions upon management, which will reach fruition on the next swing of the political pendulum. Even as now proposed, many of the restrictions intended to operate against unions are likely to prove further restrictions upon the freedom of action of managements. The final net result of reliance upon legislation to solve labor problems may well be, as Cyrus Ching, of the United States Rubber Co., has often warned, that both labor and management will be bound hand and foot and that the Government will dictate all aspects of labor relations, which is pretty much the same thing as the end of our system of free enterprise. When strikes threaten to stop our entire economy the Government needs must act. In such emergencies, the Government must act to end these strikes by all means within its power. But I would heed the maxim of Disraeli, "Never expose the impotence of democratic government." I would reserve governmental intervention, going beyond mediation and voluntary arbitration, to real emergencies and not dull the effectiveness of what the Government needs must do in crises by too frequent use.

Good tests of sound new legislation at this time seem to me to be these: Clearly every change in the present law which puts labor in a less favorable position than it was before the Wagner Act was enacted needs to be most carefully scrutinized and generally should be avoided. It is manifestly unfair to impose restrictions upon labor unions which do not apply to corporations, which represents combinations of capital intrinsically much the same as labor organizations. Further shifts of authority from the States to the National Government should be reviewed with suspicion. That is why I have said nothing about Federal legislation against acts of violence and such clearly unlawful conduct as mass picketing. Such conduct is unlawful in every State and I believe that we can get effective law enforcement only if public opinion insists upon local and State officials doing their sworn duty, to impartially and vigorously enforce the law during labor disputes, as well as at other times.

But all this represents something of a departure from the principal subject I am discussing, the prospects for industrial peace in 1947. Whatever may be the long time effects of what Congress may do by way of additional labor relations legislation, it is quite clear that it can have only indirect effects upon the disputes which may result in strikes within the next few months. It is very doubtful whether Congress will act by the time any of these disputes reach the critical stage. Even more important is the fact that the legislation Congress is likely to pass is concerned with issues and matters other than those involved in the pending disputes. The issues in these disputes center around wage demands, not the closed shop, industry-wide bargaining, jurisdictional disputes, or the unionization of foremen. Prohibiting the closed shop in the industries in which it now exists, in most of which there have been few strikes, will not lessen the danger of strikes in the near future in the rubber, steel, automobile, and telephone industries in which the closed shop is almost unknown. Similarly, the demand for the prohibition of industry-wide bargaining comes not from industries which are now bargaining on that basis but from industries which have never had industry-wide bargaining and in which it is not now a major issue.

Conversely, I also do not believe that what Congress may do by way of additional labor relations legislation will have the effect of bringing on another strike wave, as some of the opponents of this legislation are predicting. Should the downward trend of strikes be reversed after Congress acts, it is inevitable that the proponents and supporters of the legislation will be charged with this result. But even in that event, the true causes of the strikes are likely to be much more deep-seated than any legislation that Congress may pass.

Major strikes ere long in the industries in which there was so much trouble last year, it seems to me, will be avoided only if labor and management in these industries arrive at compromise settlements, particularly upon the central issue of wages. Neither labor nor management is a push-over in these industries, and neither is it at all likely to yield its present position completely. Even if compulsory arbitration were instituted, the final determination is almost certain to be a compromise. The real question is whether such a compromise can be worked out by the parties or must be dictated by Government. This presents a test for collective bargaining—whether collective bargaining can be made to work in these industries in which it is still very new.

Making collective bargaining work in such a way that it will preserve industrial peace is not any easy matter. As the bad experience in some industries, notably coal, in which there long has been collective bargaining, illustrates, collective bargaining is not a guarantee against strikes. But world experience, I believe, has demonstrated that the best hope for industrial peace lies in agreement between labor and management.

Collective bargaining involves more than negotiation or even the conclusion of union agreements. It involves the parties learning to live together and making adjustments to their mutual advantage. This is something that the Government cannot do for them—something which law, at the most, can encourage but of itself never accomplish.

Developing genuine collective bargaining in industries in which it has not heretofore prevailed is not an easy matter. Management, unaccustomed to dealing with unions, will be alarmed about encroachments upon management rights. Union leaders who have thought and talked of management as if it had horns will find it difficult to reverse themselves.

Outsiders can only make suggestions which labor and management, earnestly seeking to get along with each other, may find helpful. One such suggestion is the old French saying: "When the other fellow acts unreasonably, look inward." But the inward look must be more than a look of self-righteousness. Rather it needs to be, as Charles Luckman has said, a look of "humility" without which "there is no hope that either side will bring to the bargaining table those qualities of sanity, moderation, and tolerance which are indispensable for the survival of democracy in industry."

Besides such an inward look of humility, there is needed for improvement in labor relations a sympathetic understanding of the problems of the other fellow. There is today and has long been a wide gap between the thinking of labor and management. Unfortunately, we even lack appreciation of the fact that there is such a pronounced difference in basic patterns of thought. Many managements do not understand unions and all too often do not try to understand them. On the part of the many unions and their leaders there is very inadequate appreciation of the problems facing management and all too often indifference as to how union policies may affect the survival of a company or industry.

It is false, as asserted by the Communists, that the interests of labor and capital are completely antagonistic and irreconcilable. It is also false, as often stated by management partisans, that the interests of the workers, the stockholders, and management are in all respects identical. Labor and management have common interests in everything that pertains to production. But their interests are not identical on questions concerning the distribution of the joint product. Quarrels over the distribution of production are as old as is production itself. These quarrels will not be adjusted solely by preaching identity of interests. But neither is their hope of peace in class warfare or its constant preachment.

It is frank recognition both of common and divergent interests that there lies hope for reconciliation. Prof. E. Wight Bakke, director of the Labor-Management Center of Yale University, sees the principle of mutual survival as the key to the development of satisfactory relations between managements and unions. Unions will be militant and unreasonable so long as they believe that the employers are seeking to undermine them. Managements will fight unions to the death so long as they believe that the unions are seeking to overthrow the system of free enterprise which has made our economy the strongest ever developed.

Managements need to get over their longing for the good old days when there were no unions. When managements seek to destroy unions they are certain to bring to the top the rabble rousers and the most extreme elements among the union men. Giving status and security to the union is not a guaranty of no further labor trouble but a sine qua non in getting along with unions.

On the part of labor, a first essential is to convince management and the public that the unions are not revolutionary and do not seek to destroy the American way of life. Unions cannot expect management to deal other than in a spirit of hostility with them, so long as their leaders and their publications are constantly vilifying management and stirring up grievances and magnifying them. The prosperity of the workers is dependent upon the prosperity of the company, even though large profits are not a certain guaranty of high wages. And the rights of workers as human beings, democracy in the shop, can be attained and safeguarded without destroying the rights of management and its ability to successfully conduct the enterprise.

Both labor and management need to cease taking the advice of the extremists in their ranks. It just does not make sense to follow the leadership of industrialists who have made a mess of their labor relations and to reject the advice of other industrialists who

get along well with unions. On the part of unions, it is high time that they realize that responsibility goes with power. Unions must recognize that they have grown up and act accordingly. On the part of both labor and management, there must be, not merely free, but genuine, collective bargaining—an attitude of tolerance and understanding, an earnest desire to make collective bargaining work, a willingness to explore possibilities for adjustment with an open mind and to make accommodations enabling the other fellow to live and function in accordance with the basic concepts of our American democracy and of our American system of free enterprise.

While expressing my views on what labor and management can do to improve labor relations, I do not want to overlook the responsibility of those of us who are neutrals. We have talked a lot about the rights of the public, but very little about the duties of the public. But in our legal system, every right carries with it a corresponding duty and that applies to the public as well as to the parties directly involved in labor controversies.

A first duty of all neutrals is to be truly neutral. That is impossible if we form judgments on insufficient information and aline ourselves with one party or the other, as we are prone to do. It is only when we are certain of all the facts that we can have an intelligent opinion or in any manner contribute to the settlement of a controversy. Generally, neutrals not in official positions can do but little directly toward settling labor disputes. But informed public opinion is a very potent force and can contribute a great deal toward improved labor relations.

The Government, as the representatives of the entire public, has important responsibilities in the development of improved labor relations. It is its responsibility to establish minimum standards for the protection of the weak and the unorganized. In all the discussion of new labor legislation, the fact that much of our legislation for the protection of the children in industry and of the lowest paid and weakest of our adults has become meaningless, has been entirely overlooked. Protecting the employer against unreasonable portal-to-portal pay suits is a legitimate amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act, but clearly the present standard of 40 cents per hour in employments in interstate commerce also needs to be changed.

Government can make an important contribution to the improvement of collective bargaining by making available to the parties the latest relevant date. It can do much toward the peaceful settlement of labor disputes by way of impartial mediation and arbitration—and I note here that the Advisory Labor-Management Committee has extended deserved praise for recent improvements in the organization and functioning of the United States Conciliation Service. The Government also has the responsibility for maintaining law and order in strikes, which in our governmental system is an executive duty and primarily a State function. When great emergencies arise the Government, as I have suggested, must go beyond such measures and, through the exercise of all its powers and with the support of public opinion, end strikes which are really a serious menace to our entire economy.

This program assigns a very important role to Government in relation to labor disputes. But it leaves the major responsibility, where it should be, upon labor and management. Governmental determination of labor relations problems represents a departure from our American ideal of self-government in industry. In some situations it is necessary, but all of us, I feel sure, much prefer adjustment through the democratic processes of collective bargaining.

Collective bargaining has worked reasonably well in many industries even during the early months of the postwar period, when there were so many great strikes. It did not function in other industries, but in most of these industries there had been little experience with the institution. We cannot be sure that these industries will be able to make collective bargaining work in the public interest as it has in so many other industries. But I see no cause for despair. I believe that if left alone, labor and management in these industries will be able to solve their own problems, with the minimum of governmental intervention we all desire.

Government Control of Industrial Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the third address which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD is entitled "Government Control of Industrial Relations," and was recently delivered at Los Angeles, Calif., by William M. Leiserson, of Johns Hopkins University.

Mr. President, it is estimated, according to the Government Printing Office, that the address delivered by Mr. Leiserson will cost $319.50, as it will take approximately 4½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

(By William M. Leiserson, Johns Hopkins University)

I

The great obstacle to orderly development of public policy with respect to industrial relations is the tendency of each generation to consider its labor problems unique. There is a general impression, for example, that active government participation in labor relations began with the New Deal laws protecting union organization and encouraging collective bargaining. And the more ardent New Dealers have been inclined to think labor history began in 1933. As a matter of fact, labor relations have been controlled by law and government in this country since the beginning of our history. Nevertheless recurring periods of labor turmoil and widespread strikes continue to succeed each other over the years, and each generation repeats the cry for something that will really solve the labor problem.

Our concern being the relations of free workers and free employers, I propose to begin the discussion with a text from the prophet of free, private enterprise, Adam Smith. I read from book I, chapter VIII of The Wealth of Nations:

"We rarely hear * * * of the combinations of masters, though frequently of those of workmen. But whoever imagines, upon this account, that masters rarely combine, is as ignorant of the world as of the subject. Masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform combination, not to raise the wages of labor. * * * To violate this combination is everywhere a most unpopular action, and a sort of reproach to a master among his neighbors and equals. * * * Masters too sometimes enter into particular combinations to sink the wages of labor. * * *

"Such combinations, however, are frequently resisted by a contrary defensive combination of the workmen; who sometimes too, without any provocation of this kind, combine of their own accord to raise the price of their labor. Their usual pretenses are sometimes the high price of provisions; sometimes the great profit which their masters make by their work. But whether their combinations be offensive or defensive, they are always abundantly heard of. In order to bring the point to a speedy decision, they have always recourse to the loudest clamor, and sometimes to the most shocking violence and outrage. They are desperate, and act * * * (to) * * * frighten their masters into an immediate compliance with their demands.

"The masters upon these occasions are just as clamorous upon the other side and never cease to call aloud for the assistance of the civil magistrate, and the rigorous execution of those laws which have been enacted with so much severity against combinations of * * * laborers and journeymen."

Apparently people were fighting the same devils when the good book was published in 1776 that we are fighting today. Though writing in England Smith described as well the labor relations that prevailed in the United States and the role the Government has played in them down to recent times. Today many employers think the situation has been reversed. The law, they say, especially the National Labor Relations Act, bears with greatest severity on them rather than on the laborers; and the magistrates' hands have been tied by the Norris-LaGuardia Act. But they still do not cease to call aloud for the assistance of the Government, only now their clamorous cries are directed to the Congress rather than to the magistrates.

Like Adam Smith, however, we must not be misled by the clamor of those who have been masters. The picture is not as dark as they paint it. No employer has gone to jail for violating the Labor Relations Act, but workers are still going to jail for their "unfair labor practices"—for disorderly conduct in connection with strikes, for mass picketing, as well as for the violence they resort to in desperate efforts to bring their disputes to a speedy decision.

To understand what really has happened to our industrial relations in recent years, we need to look back at least a hundred years. During the first quarter of the nineteenth century property qualifications for voting were abolished and manhood suffrage established in most of our States. This fact probably has more to do with our present labor troubles than most of the other causes we ascribe them to. It brought relaxation of the laws against combinations of working people, and soon led to legalizing of unions and of the right to strike. Certainly public control of industrial relations today is primarily conditioned by the fact that labor has votes, and has learned how to use them.

Legalizing unions and strikes was helpful to wage earners, but largely ineffective in safeguarding their interests, so long as employers had the equal right to destroy their unions, to refuse to deal with them, to discharge or discriminate against employees for talking unionism. It was the votes of workers, aided by the support of the general public which sympathized with their cause, that changed this condition by laws designed to equalize their rights and bargaining strength with those of industrial managements.

But like most remedies for social life, this remedy has created new problems equally serious. Although many workers and unions are still weak in relation to their employers, some unions have so grown in power that they are in a position to dictate terms of employment, and they have demonstrated their ability to shut down whole industries

like coal and steel, transportation and other public services.

There has been a natural reaction of anti-labor public feeling which finds expression in Congress and State legislatures in a flood of bills to restrict and regulate the activities and practices of union organizations, and to abolish some of their privileges. The unions want no labor relations legislation at all. Although they strongly advocate and prepare programs for general social legislation, in respect to their own activities, they take a completely laissez faire position. They want to be let alone.

Some legislation directed against unions is bound to be passed. The negative attitude of organized labor has made this inevitable. But little effort is being made to study the experience with the laws that have been passed, and with the policies of the Labor Relations Board, the War Labor Board, and other Government agencies, to find out what measures were helpful and constructively directed toward peace and amity in labor relations and which tended in the opposite direction. A brief examination of what we have been doing about our labor relations in the last decade or so will make plain, I think, why failure to study this experience is likely to result in legislation that defeats its own purposes.

II

When Congress adopted the Labor Relations Act in 1935, it laid the foundation for a national labor policy that was at once a wage policy and a policy of governing labor relations. It chose to avoid Government setting of rates of pay and other details of employment contracts. It sought instead to equalize bargaining power between industrial managements and their labor forces, and leave them free to agree on terms by the process of collective bargaining. Congress recognized that individual bargaining meant, in effect, management dictation of terms of employment. By eliminating employers' unfair labor practices, it tried to establish what the law refers to as actual liberty of contract, and thus avoid also dictation by Government officials. Wages and working rules would be determined by collective agreement and mutual consent.

That the act has been eminently successful in accomplishing its immediate objectives is obvious. The bargaining power of workers has been enormously increased by encouraging and protecting union organization, and all the major industries now recognize and deal with unions. But the collective-bargaining policy was adopted not because freedom to organize and equality in negotiating labor contracts were regarded as ends in themselves. The underlying idea was that the public interest in industrial peace and justice in labor relations would be furthered by such a policy. This is made plain by section 1 of the act, which recites that the practice of collective bargaining is necessary for the following, among other reasons: (1) To remove certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest; (2) to stabilize competitive wage rates and working conditions; (3) to secure friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, and working conditions.

But what happened to these larger purposes? Apparently the policy in this respect worked to ends opposite of those intended. Certainly work stoppages did not become less frequent, and the attitudes of management and labor less bitter and more friendly. Perhaps the explanation is that no provision was made for dealing with the problems that would arise when collective bargaining ends in disagreement. The law compels bargaining, but not agreement. Its requirements are satisfied when the Labor Relations Board succeeds in joining managers and workers in a vow to bargain collectively. Was the assumption that they would live happily ever after?

The Labor Relations Act does not deal with the subject matter of collective bargaining—wages, hours, working conditions. Because the Government provided no adequate machinery and policies for securing peaceful and friendly adjustment of disagreements about these vital matters, industrial strife was stimulated. When the national-defense program got under way, a rash of strikes broke out over the country about just such problems. A Labor Division was hurriedly set up in the Office of Production Management to deal with them, which duplicated the meager facilities of the United States Conciliation Service. Both proved ineffective, and a third agency was hastily created, the National Defense Mediation Board. This Board soon found itself making decisions, in the form of recommendations, which fixed wages and granted maintenance of membership, among other conditions. If the recommendations were not accepted by either party, the Government took over the industry. Thus, voluntary mediation ended up in a form of compulsory arbitration, and John Lewis' coal miners wrecked this when the Board decided against a closed shop in certain mines.

Then came the war; and it will be recalled that the War Labor program did not start out to be a compulsory program with the Government fixing details of the labor bargain. The pledge not to strike or lockout made with the War Labor Board was established by agreement of representatives of labor and industry. This voluntary method, after the manner of collective bargaining, was proposed and accepted as a substitute for compulsory legislation passed by the House of Representatives and pending in the Senate toward the end of 1941.

By 1943, however, Congress had given the War Labor Board the power and the duty to provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective-bargaining agreements) governing the relations of the parties to labor disputes. Directive orders supplanted collective bargaining as the method of adjusting labor relations and fixing terms of employment. To be sure, some compulsion was necessary under war conditions, but it was not foreseen and planned. We drifted into it while struggling to maintain voluntary methods.

The Smith-Connally Act, which formalized this compulsory policy, also provided for a so-called cooling-off period, for Government-conducted strike votes, for plants to be taken over by the Government, for prohibition of strikes in such plants, and for other restrictions. But despite this law, if not because of it, labor strife increased, and mines or factories operated by the Government have been shut down by strikes just like privately managed enterprises.

After the war ended the Government wanted to get out of the business of dictating terms of labor contracts. An Executive order authorized free bargaining about wages, provided no price increases would result from such action. But by that time collective bargaining had become a lost art, and the Government itself did not know the part it has to play in it. As a result we had the great national strikes last year with lost working time breaking all records. And we ended up by Government fact-finding boards setting the pattern of wage increases after all.

So our legislative and administrative methods of controlling labor relations have gotten us much that we didn't want, and what we wanted most we didn't get.

III

There are many who think that when powerful and well-financed national labor organizations are pitted against great employing corporations, the inevitable result is either industrial war on a grand scale or collusion against the consuming public; and however reluctant the Government may be to dictate terms and conditions of employment to both management and workers, public necessity and public opinion will force it to do so? This view is expressed in the current demands for labor courts, and other devices for outlawing or restricting strikes and subjecting labor controversies to compulsory arbitration of some kind.

But this was substantially what we had during the war period. Yet 1944 saw the greatest number of strikes on record up to that year. Both individual and collective bargaining were all but done away with and terms of employment were fixed by Government flat. Free managements and free labor unions could not be maintained under this policy, and because most employers and unions have learned the lesson, they are joined in opposition to such a program. Public exasperation with their inability to settle controversies peacefully may force some kind of compulsory arbitration; but the experience of other countries as well as our own makes plain that only a police state can make this system work.

There is much popular support, also, for the view that unions have built up powerful labor monopolies which need to be made subject to antitrust laws as monopolistic business combinations are. Coal operators, we are told, cannot combine to choke off our supply of coal until they get the price they want; but, mine workers can combine to stop production until they get the wage they want. The owners of an electric-light company are obligated by law to give continuous service, even though losing money, but employees of such a company, through a union, are allowed to shut that service down and plunge a whole community into darkness and danger. Such actions by labor unions are permitted, so the argument goes, because they have been given a special license to violate the law against monopolies. Labor should be brought within the law.

But not only labor unions, farmers' organizations, too, are exempted from antitrust laws. Unquestionably unions are combinations to restrict competition among workers, to raise and standardize wages and working conditions through whole industries; and farmers organize to standardize products and raise prices. In fact the Government lends money to combinations of farmers to help them withhold their products until they can get the prices they want. These Government policies with respect to labor and agriculture were established by law to deal with economic and social evils brought on by competition among farmers and workers, just as the antitrust laws were directed against the evils of business monopolies. To say they are special licenses to violate the law and to compel wage earners (or farmers) to compete and underbid each other is to ignore history and the progress that has been made since the combination laws of Adam Smith's days.

Closely related to the fear of union monopoly is the fear of industry-wide bargaining. To prohibit such bargaining is one of the main demands employers are pressing on Congress. But the very purpose of union organization is to standardize wages and working conditions so that employers will earn their profits by good management, and not by paying less for labor than their competitors. That is why any bona fide union, even though it gets started locally, soon spreads out and strives to organize the whole trade or industry. Economic forces have pressed our unions to become the national organizations that most of them are. A law prohibiting formal labor contracting on an industry basis can only result in unions insisting on the same terms from each separate employer. This is the current actual practice, and the unions usually have their way; which means of course that the terms agreed upon in the first plant or two set the stand-

ards for the whole industry. But because employers are reluctant to organize nationally for labor bargaining, strikes multiply to force all competing employers to adopt the same standards.

So far as this reluctance is due to fear of antitrust laws, it seems to have little basis in fact. All industries have their national trade associations for dealing with trade problems, but most of them shun labor problems. These organizations have frequently come into conflict with the Sherman Act. But I know of no employers' association that has ever been prosecuted as a monopoly, if it confined itself to dealing with labor—defined by law as not an article of commerce. The lack of employers' organizations for labor bargaining is a distinct weakness in our industrial relations.

To be sure there are dangers to the public in possible Nation-wide strikes, or collusion against consumers between industry-wide organizations of employers and workers. The purpose of public control of industrial relations is to provide safeguards against just such dangers. But if we are to have unions at all, they will be national unions, and in industries whose markets are Nation-wide they will bargain nationally. It seems as futile to try to stop this as to compel employers to sell only to local customers.

Public opinion generally, despite its condemnation of union abuses and reckless use of the strike weapon, still feels that freedom of workers to combine in labor unions for bargaining purposes is somehow connected with the maintenance of democratic political institutions and with free private enterprise. Even those who favor the strongest antiunion laws are careful to provide in their bills for "full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing." No better proof of this public feeling is needed than the policy of the western Allies in defeated Italy, Germany, and Japan. Among the first steps taken to build democracy in the former Nazi and Fascist countries was to proclaim freedom for workers to form and join unions. Revival of suppressed free labor movements has been stimulated and organization of new self-governing unions encouraged. Apparently those who framed the policy felt that democracy could not be built in those countries without union organizations like those that thrive under free governments. And it is to be noted that this policy has brought no public opposition in the United States.

Plainly the tumultuous labor relations we have experienced since the Wagner Act was passed, and the failure of Government efforts to reduce industrial strife, have not changed the minds of most of our people as to the soundness of the policy of protecting labor's right to organize and encouraging the practice of collective bargaining.

IV

The foregoing indicates, I think, that any constructive program for controlling labor relations must be predicated on continuation of the collective-bargaining policy Congress adopted with the Wagner Act. Yet the problems which have aroused the public to the need of more Government control have grown out of this policy. What then is needed in the way of additional controls and improvements to make the policy work to the public ends stated in the act itself: Reduction of industrial strife and unrest, stabilization of wage rates and working conditions, and friendly adjustment of industrial disputes?

In trying to perfect the policy we must understand the limitations of the tools we use—Government control. There is a common misconception that the Government is all powerful. If it passes a law, say to forbid certain kinds of strikes or some customary management or union practice, and the law has teeth in it, it is thought that the prohibited practices will really disappear, except for a violation here and there for which those responsible can be punished. Then there is the notion that if the Government or the public does control, the results are necessarily fair and good and in the public interest.

But relations between teachers and public schools are completely controlled by public authorities. They license teachers and they frown on unions among them. Strikes to force changes in salary scales fixed by legislatures or boards of education are obviously illegal. Nevertheless beginning in Norwalk, Conn., last summer, a wave of such unlawful strikes has shut down schools in many cities throughout the country. In Buffalo, at least, even the principals, who are part of the management of the schools, joined the strikers. There is much opinion that the public, or the taxpayers, have not done right by the teachers, and usually the strikers have triumphed over the authorities rather than suffered punishment for their unlawful revolts. Who will say that Government control of teacher relations has been in the public interest during the period of high price of provisions, as Adam Smith put it. And who is in a position to say that the illegal strikes, picketing, and closing of schools have not contributed as much as the Government controls to improving teacher relations and meeting the public responsibility for educating the young.

Government control may have just as bad effects as lack of control. And the Government alone cannot fairly and effectively control industrial relations any more than it can maintain law, order, and justice generally without the aid of self-governing organizations or institutions like the family, the church, professional societies, trade associations, better business bureaus, etc., and the codes and traditions they develop. Private governments, the political scientists call them, and industrial managements and labor unions are such private governments. When these enter into collective-bargaining agreements they set up joint industrial governments which institutionalize labor relationships with codes, traditions, and norms of conduct that are the basic elements of social control. Despite temporary breakdowns when strikes occur, such industrial governments are maintaining law, order, and justice in industry today to an extent that the public government alone could never achieve.

Just as international law has been slowly developing over the years through conferences, agreements, decisions, and precedents, so industrial law has been developing through similar collective-bargaining customs and practices; through union agreements, and decisions, and precedents made in administering and interpreting them. If we would have effective public control, the Government must build its program on this industrial law, and on the methods by which it is made and developed. What happens when this necessity is disregarded is well illustrated by the public furor over the billion dollar portal-to-portal suits. These, by the way, though following the course of law in the courts, seem to be regarded as greater threats to the economy of the Nation than the strikes that unions carry on.

The National Labor Relations Act has freed the forces that make for union organization and collective bargaining, and thereby it has contributed greatly to the private industrial law making through which Government control is made practical and effective. Its basic provisions must therefore be retained, and Government policy grounded in them. But the act has also developed some abuses which obstruct rather than promote agreement between labor and management. It is folly, therefore, to hold that no changes in it are necessary. But if the collective-bargaining policy is to achieve its purposes, any amendments made must strengthen such bargaining, not weaken it.

To strengthen the policy, an amendment is needed that will require unions to bargain collectively, as well as employers. On the assumption that unions exist primarily for bargaining purposes—which is true enough—the obligation was imposed only on employers. But this stimulated a take-it-or-leave-it attitude on the part of not a few unions, and the omission needs to be corrected.

Similarily the act does not make it an unfair labor practice for a union to discriminate against employers who form or join employers' associations. Neither does it encourage organization among employers as it does among working people. There is no good reason why the act should not treat management and labor alike in these respects, and an amendment to this effect would strengthen the bargaining policy. To make sure of such equal treatment, some countries define labor unions as organizations either of employers or workers for collective-bargaining purposes. As our unions have grown in membership and power, some of them have tipped the scales with more bargaining strength than the employers. This tends to make the unions headstrong, conciliation and mutual agreement more difficult. The policy, however, is predicated on equal bargaining power. Many proposed amendments would weaken unions as a means of equalization. This would be a backward step. It would lessen responsibility, and stimulate warfare rather than industrial law makng. The constructive way is to encourage employers to organize to match the strength of the unions.

Another change in the act is necessary to prevent interference by a minority with the functioning of a union chosen by a majority to act as collective bargaining representative. Some unions have called strikes to compel employers to deal with them after they had lost elections which resulted in another union being certified as the legal representative. This is contrary to the policy of the act, and should be made an unfair labor practice. A closely related problem is the practice of a few unions to boycott products made by members of another union which has been legally designated bargaining agent. This too can be met by defining the practice as unfair under the act. There is reason to believe, also, that a more precise definition of bargaining units would also be helpful.

These are examples of the types of amendment that we must always be prepared to adopt in order to strengthen the collective-bargaining policy of the law. By the same token we must be ever watchful to reject amendments that are constantly being offered that would have the contrary effect. For example there are proposals for taking away rights of employees, unions and their officers under the act, if they misbehave in certain ways. But it would be as absurd to say that the management of a corporation or its officers shall not be allowed to act for the owners because they have committed some unfair labor practice, as to prohibit a union or its officers to represent or bargain for the employees. Certainly bargaining and adjustment of disputes would not be furthered by such legislation. Proposals of this kind would disorder, not control industrial relations.

I have mentioned the futility of trying to stop the growth of industry-wide bargaining. A safeguard against its abuse has already been provided by the Supreme Court in its decision that if unions conspire with employers to fix prices or monopolize articles of commerce they are as guilty as the employers, and subject to the same penalties. Protection against dangers that might grow out of legitimate bargaining on an industry basis can be provided by the administrative and judicial agencies which conciliate, mediate, arbitrate, and otherwise direct the process

of collective bargaining, and which I shall presently describe.

But the public interest is furthered by the wider bargaining because it provides a sounder base for industrial government. It extends the area of law and peace over a whole industry, just as the king's law and peace were extended over a whole nation to supplant the petty rule and warring of feudal lords. It provides administrative and judicial procedures for settling and deciding controversies in accordance with law. The collective agreement is the constitution of this government, and the customs, precedents, and decisions constitute the body of common industrial law. Periodical conferences of representatives of management and labor provide new laws.

On a small scale such governments exist also in the plant or plants of a single employer. But the smaller the scale, the less stable the governments; and the traditions of common interest in the industry of both management and labor are slower to grow. Also the small-scale governments can rarely afford a permanent independent judiciary in the form of an umpire, impartial chairman, or adjustment board. This institution grows only under industry-wide governments, or where a great employing corporation operates many plants covering large sections of the country.

In this connection a realistic program of Government control would correct a weakness in the judicial system of the private industrial governments, and at the same time provide a means for embodying the private industrial law into public law. Contrary to the practice in other countries where compacts between managements and unions are treated as gentlemen's agreements, in the United States they are legal contracts enforcible in the courts. The common complaints about violations of union contracts make plain that ordinary courts are not equipped to administer justice under industrial laws. On the other hand the judicial processes developed under union agreements are still in rudimentary form. The judges are still in the circuit-riding stage—temporary itinerant referees, arbitrators, umpires.

Nothing illustrates better the need of an organized system of industrial adjudication than the dispute between John Lewis and Secretary of the Interior Krug which brought on the recent coal strike. The question about which they differed was whether the agreement between the union and Mr. Krug could or could not be canceled before the mines were returned to private ownership. This obviously was justiciable under the terms of the contract. But when the case got to the courts, the issues were about injunctions, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and about a lot of other things in which lawyers are learned. Punitive remedies for violations of agreements can help little because in the course of their working relationships management and employees are unwittingly violating agreements almost every day. The need is for an independent judiciary to apply and interpret the industrial law developed under the customs and practices of collective-bargaining agreements.

This does not require an elaborate system of labor courts established by the Government. An act of Congress is needed, however, requiring every union contract to include a provision that all grievances arising under it, and all disputes about its meaning shall be settled by arbitration if they cannot be adjusted by mutual consent. Then if they fail or are unable to set up their own arbitration system, there should be made available an industrial arbitration tribunal to which either party may refer cases for final and binding decisions. This is not compulsory arbitration in the ordinary sense of the term. It would merely substitute an effective industrial judicial system for deciding disputes arising under labor agreements in place of the regular courts which theoretically are already empowered to decide such issues. Public opinion both among unions and management favors such adjudication of disputes under agreements. The Government would merely extend their own custom and practice, and make certain that the judicial system works to prevent work stoppages.

v

But when agreements expire or are to be revised, or new agreements are to be made, the differences are not justiciable. These controversies have been causing our greatest industrial wars, since the Labor Relations Act has made strikes for union recognition unnecessary. True, most disputes of this kind are settled peacefully by collective bargaining, nevertheless it is the disagreements about making or changing contracts that bring on the great strikes and labor crises, and pose the most difficult problems of public control.

In international affairs we have learned that wars cannot be prevented unless we organize for peace, and establish orderly methods and procedures for consultation, investigation, conciliations, mutual adjustment and voluntary arbitration. But we have not yet learned that we need similar machinery, organized methods and established procedures to prevent industrial governments from breaking down when the contracts which set them up expire in the legal sense of the term. Instead we have been content with haphazard Government intervention by the United States Conciliation Service, or by so-called fact-finding boards, as often after the wars are on as before they have begun. Actually the contracts do not really terminate. For the seniority, pension, promotion, transfer, and work-assignment rules provided in the agreements are permanent rights that continue in effect until changed by mutual consent. There is no hiatus in reality between agreements. And this is the most powerful factor that collective bargaining provides for maintaining industrial peace.

The Labor Relations Act compels bargaining. Why should not conciliations or mediation also be compelled? The principle is the same. As already indicated much of the criticism of this law is more justly ascribed to the lack of adequate mediation machinery. Whenever a critical labor situation, as during the defense and war periods, or during the wage and price strikes of last year, new boards are created, and these usually drift into compulsory arbitration because methods, procedures, and traditions of mediation have not become established.

For the very reason that a program of Government control based on collective bargaining cannot compel agreement, it must compel mediation and organize an adequate administration of it. Once this is done the absurdity of laws requiring so-called cooling-off periods and Government-conducted strike votes will become evident. Mediation machinery, if properly designed and operated, settles disputes, not strikes. There is an important distinction between the two; and the measure of the effectiveness of this method of control is the number of strikes it prevents, not the number it settles; for the strike itself is a method of settlement—the war method.

If therefore, strike notices have to be filed at any time before the whole process of mediation is completed, and this sets the time for the expected cooling to begin, the effect is to heat rather than cool tempers during the periods of collective bargaining or conciliation when cool heads are most needed. This is what actually happened under the Smith-Connally Act, and disagreements and strikes were thus stimulated.

What is needed is a mediation period after bargaining has ended without an agreement. But this requires that the Government must be ever ready with an established organization and procedures, and expert mediators trained in the methods by which differences between management and labor are adjusted to the satisfaction of both. If the Government is prepared to meet its responsibilities in these respects, both parties customarily agree to maintain the status quo until all mediation proceedings have been completed. Here again is an industrial custom which needs to be embodied into public law. Government mediation must require, therefore, that while a dispute is in process, management shall not change the conditions out of which it arose, and workers or unions shall not attempt to force a change. Because the Government has failed to do this, the propaganda slogan "no contract, no work" has become popular and caused many unnecessary strikes.

Whether the mediation organization is headed by a board or a single administrator is immaterial. The important thing is that managements and unions, and the Government too, shall have obligations, duties to perform in connection with mediatory efforts to settle disputes before they break out in strikes. In addition to maintaining status quo while cases are in process, there are other responsibilities that must be imposed on the parties to disputes, if mediation is to be effective in preventing strikes. The negative requirement of the Wagner Act that they shall not refuse to bargain collectively needs to be translated into positive specific duties.

There must be the duty to exert every effort to make and maintain collective labor agreements; to give adequate notice in writing of proposed changes in agreements; to arrange joint conferences promptly for negoiating the changes or new proposals; to exert every effort to settle all disputes, whatever their nature, in such conferences between authorized representatives of employers and employees; the duty to refer all unsettled disputes to the appropriate Government agency for mediation or other assistance. Some of these are commonly stipulated in union agreements with employers, but those referring to obligations to the Government are not common. I propose that they should be prescribed by law.

We hear frequently that what mediation machinery we have needs to be strengthened. But this can only mean jobs for more mediators unless responsibilities like these are met by both management and workers in connection with the Government's conciliatory efforts. But legal penalties will be of little help in enforcing them. What is most needed are habits of law and order in settling labor controversies, and these can best be established by orderly procedures provided by a mediation agency with appropriate methods for handling different kinds of disputes, and then pressing and exercising the parties in meeting their obligations in connection with the mediation process. Unions say they want to use the strike only as a last resort. But this is not possible without Government mediation measures of the kind suggested.

Other measures such as voluntary arbitration and what is called fact finding need to be integrated into the mediation system. They are really a part of it, and they have been much less effective than they might be, because they have been haphazardly used, and their places and functions in the system have been ignored. Fact finding, for example, is a useful emergency procedure when all mediation efforts have been exhausted and voluntary arbitration cannot be secured. But if a board really found and published all the facts, the effect would be to defeat the purpose of securing a peaceful settlement. People would draw different conclusions from the facts, and much of the public might conclude that the board's recommendations were wrong. This emergency procedure, therefore, requires that the dispute shall be arbitrated, with the decision put in the form

of a recommendation. If such decisions are well publicized, and are not frequently made so that public attention can be centered on them, then pressure of public opinion is mobilized to secure acceptance of the recommendation, provided the men who made it are well known and respected for their impartiality.

There is no assurance, of course, that partisan and political pressures will not prevent the maintenance of an adequate mediation organization to avoid strikes by settling disputes. But here again industry-wide and other large-scale bargaining have valuable contributions to make. Wherever such bargaining has existed for a long time, and permanent arbitrators adjudicate disputes arising out of the agreements, it is customary to invite these industrial judges to assist as mediators in negotiating new or revised agreements. They know the problems of the industry, and both parties have confidence in them if they have functioned well as arbitrators. Sometimes the adjudication functions are entrusted to an adjustment board representing labor and management in the industry as a whole, with or without a neutral umpire.

Here are the elements of a complete mediation system within Nation-wide industries. Instead of discouraging bargaining machinery of this kind, Government policy would serve public interests better if it encouraged them, as it does farmers, processors and distributors to organize cooperatives. Such industrial home-rule arrangements, I think, hold the greatest promise for effective maintenance of labor peace. If industries, or groups of industries were helped to develop their own mediation systems, with the kind of impartial conciliators they would jointly select, then the Government's mediators and arbitrators would have to be men of equal caliber and experience. They could neither influence nor help the top men in the industrial set-up if they were not; and both management and labor would have a direct interest in seeing to it that Government mediators are top-notch men.

VI

This completes the improvements that seem to me to be immediately necessary to make Government control based on a collective-bargaining policy work more effectively to safeguard public interests. The compulsions in the proposed amendments to the Labor Relations Act, the obligatory mediation, and the adjudication of disputes about interpretation of agreements, are nominal, not punitive, and are based on the customs and rules developed through the collective-bargaining process.

I offer no suggestions for regulating unions by law, not because they must be kept free of all Government regulation, but because we do not know enough about their internal affairs at present, to devise effective regulations that will not do more harm than good. The Smith-Connally Act provided that every strike ballot shall have printed on it the question: "Do you wish to authorize this interruption of war production?" The assumption was apparently that union officials wanted strikes and if the Government took a secret ballot on this question, the workers would mostly vote "no." But what most of them did was to vote "yes." The attempts to outlaw closed shops, without providing for the needs they meet, have proved futile in the States, and a Federal act is not likely to fare any better. I see no objection to requiring unions to register, and file financial reports, constitutions, etc.; or to requiring that partisan political contributions shall be voluntary. This has been tried, but the laws have not changed labor relations for the better.

Our courts have been regulating unions for very many years. They hear and decide numerous cases in which members of local unions complain of violations of union constitutions or bylaws, arbitrary expulsion from membership, and autocratic practices by union officials. But whether a statute will accomplish any more than the court decisions have done, we do not know. If, however, such legislation is to be adopted to improve labor relations, we would have to regulate the internal affairs of management as well as unions. For the same kind of autocratic practices occur within the management hierarchies, as within union organizations. Both are responsible for bad labor relations. Until we can be reasonably certain of the effects of regulatory legislation, it would be better not to try it.

I conclude, therefore, with suggesting that the predominantly voluntary methods outlined above offer the best course of action for perfecting Government control of industrial relations founded on a collective-bargaining policy. To those who think that laws with teeth in them can improve human relations like those between workers and managers, this will be unsatisfactory. The only answer I can give is that in democratic countries, strong laws providing for compulsory settlements and restrictions on strikes have proved less effective in maintaining peace and amity in labor relations, than the apparently weak voluntary, conciliatory methods.

The Cartel System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Cartel System," delivered by Edward H. Levi, of the University of Chicago Law School, before the Chicago Chapter of the New Council of American Business, on March 13, 1947, in the city of Chicago.

Mr. President, the Government Printing Office informs me that the address delivered by Mr. Levi will take about 3½ pages of the RECORD and will cost $248.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CARTEL SYSTEM

(By Edward H. Levi, University of Chicago Law School)

During the war years the cartel system, the system of restrictive control of business through private international arrangements, became a topic of popular conversation. This was largely due to the revelations of the Department of Justice and of various Senate committees, among them, the Truman Kilgore, and Bone committees. The revelations indicated that American production had been drastically limited, if not prevented, through cartel arrangements; that divisions of territory harmful to American interests had been effected, and that cartels generally had been used by the German Government as instruments of war in peacetime. Cartels were used by the Germans to support espionage groups and to obtain vital information concerning weapons of warfare produced in other countries, including the United States. More than that, cartels were used as a most effective weapon to weaken industry throughout Europe at the expense of the expanding and ever more dominant German monopolies. The spheres of influence explicitly given to Germany through private cartel treaties anticipated the Hitler march through Europe. Because the cartel system was carried to its perfection by Nazi Germany we came to think of cartels as one of the avenues leading to authoritarian government and as enemies of democracy.

But we forget quickly. Cartels were operating prior to the First World War and they were then German-dominated. Through the control over American patents and supposedly American firms Germany prior to the First World War almost succeeded in crippling the industrial military potential of this country. The president of the Bayer Co., Dr. Hugo Schweitzer, was complimented on his work of industrial sabotage prior to our entrance in the First World War, and was told by his German superiors that his accomplishments could be compared to the work of an army leader who had succeeded "in destroying 3 railroads of 40 cars containing 4,500,000 pounds of explosives."

After the last war President Wilson warned of our need to build an American chemical industry. He stated that the German chemical industry "was and may well be again a thoroughly knit monopoly, capable of exercising a competition of a peculiarly insidious and dangerous kind." The Federal Trade Commission in 1924 boasted that through its power to issue licenses on seized patents it had destroyed the German monopoly. We forgot quickly then. We not only helped to rebuild German industry but we willingly entered into restrictive arrangements with the successors of the firms that had previously tried to dominate us. We permitted German firms which had been seized in this country to go back to German-dominated cartel ownership. We entered into private territorial arrangements which kept American firms out of foreign markets. We entered into patent licensing agreements which gave German firms control over American production.

And we permitted Germany, which we regarded as weak and feeble, to evade the terms of the Versailles Treaty through the use of cartel agreements and cartel-controlled companies. For example, under the terms of the Versailles Treaty the German firm of Carl Zeiss was not permitted to manufacture military optical instruments. In 1921 Carl Zeiss created a manufacturing subsidiary in Holland which it controlled, and using this as a dodge, continued its military business. The Zeiss firm explained some years later in a letter to Bausch & Lomb that it had done this "because it had at no time the intention to allow our business and knowledge of the military business to rest." It was this same firm of Carl Zeiss that entered into restrictive arrangements with the American firm of Bausch & Lomb under which "the American firm could not sell military instruments directly or indirectly to countries outside of the United States until Carl Zeiss agreed" and under which the American company was required "to set up a special department which would handle research and development of military instruments," with the Germany company being given the right to veto and to participate in the selection of the head of this department.

One of the mainstays of Germany's armament program was the firm of Friedrick Krupp. "As a part of the Treaty of Versailles, this firm was required to destroy its machinery and implements of war. In order to evade the treaty, Krupp transferred its patents, its licenses, and its secret processes of manufacture to a Swedish armament manufacturer, Bofors, in exchange for a block of that company's stock. While the Inter-Allied Commission was supervising German disarmament, Krupp continued with its manufacture of new types of heavy artilleries, tanks, antiaircraft, gas masks,

bombs, and other war matériel" through its cartel companion, Bofors, and also through Spanish interests in a similar way.

It is not true that some Allied officials did not know what was happening in the period between the two wars. The British representative of the Inter-Allied Commission supervising German disarmament stated in a public lecture in 1923:

"We in this country flatter ourselves that the war ended on January 10, 1920; a future generation may yet describe the period in which we are living as an armistice during which the war was continued by other methods than rifle and howitzer, only to be resumed in all its carnal horrors after the lapse of a few ambiguous years."

We knew that while Germany was prohibited from manufacturing munitions by the peace treaties the German I. G. Farbenindustrie firms were making and importing military explosives as early as 1925 and, in addition, had entered into arrangements controlling the production of explosives throughout the world. A representative of the United States State Department told a meeting of arms manufacturers in 1925, when Germany was regarded as hopelessly weak, that:

"Notwithstanding the fact that it was known that Germany was exporting arms and munitions, it was not possible from a diplomatic standpoint to mention Germany or any of the Central Powers in this connecnection, since they were supposed to abide by the treaties which put an end to the World War."

The period between 1920–33 was a period of successive plans to give financial aid to Germany. It was necessary to help Germany because the economic futur. of Europe was said to be dependent on a strong Germany. This period was also the time when Germany regained her control over the international industrial order through a series of sweeping cartel arrangements. Some of these arrangements were worked out in conferences in New York in 1929. The Department of Justice was informed of these conferences by an anonymous post card but apparently decided to do nothing about them. And nothing was done about the agreements either until war had broken out in Europe. The American people were then surprised to discover what had been going on.

One agreement worked out in 1929 was the arrangement between the I. G. Farbenindustrie and the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. The agreement was termed by the parties to be a "full marriage." The agreement was reported in the New York Times soon after it was made. But the American public did not realize that the agreement was no less than a world-covering division of territory and allocation of business arrangement under which, as a Standard Oil official reported, "The assumption is that the I. G. are going to stay out of the oil business and we are going to stay out of the chemical business insofar as that has no bearing on the oil business." Nor did the American public realize until the revelations of the Department of Justice and the Senate committees as late as 1942 that the effect of this arrangement had been to give to I. G. Farbenindustrie control over strategic patents covering the processes for making synthetic rubber in this country. The early failure to provide an adequate stock pile of natural rubber and to encourage the development of a synthetic-rubber program in this country must be placed on the United States Government. But the assumption of the United States Government was in part that free and competitive enterprise would bring to this country such synthetic-rubber developments as were then possible. Neither the Government of the United States nor the industry of this country realized that I. G. Farbenindustrie had a veto right over the American development. Or to quote a Standard Oil official again, that "the thing that is really holding us up, however, is not the lack of a plan * * * but the inability of our partners (meaning thereby I. G. Farben) to obtain permission of their government to proceed with the development in the United States."

Conferences were held in 1929 also between officals of I. G. Farben and the Aluminum Co. of America. The result of these conferences was an agreement finally concluded in 1931 under which the two companies pooled their patents covering processes for the manufacture of magnesium in the Magnesium Development Corp. But the American public did not realize that by the terms of the agreement I. G. Farben was given the right to limit the American production of magnesium. The agreement read in part as follows: "The holders of the I. G. shares * * * shall have the right to limit the increases in production capacity of every such producing company after the initial contemplated production capacity shall have been reached. The initial contemplated production capacity shall in no case be more than 4,000 tons per annum." Magnesium was important during the last war. This country's inadequate magnesium capacity was not due solely or even mainly to this agreement. But the agreement was certainly no help.

As a matter of fact the outstanding quality of the cartel agreements worked out by the German concerns in the period between the wars is that they were all part of a plan. To say this is not to say that they were a part of a master plan of the German nation to dominate the industrial world. But it is to say that German industry was sufficiently centralized and monopolized so that what appeared to be separate agreements to individual American firms were in reality part of a large program to allocate world territories and production as to all important industrial items. When the du Pont Co. for example concluded a patent and licensing agreement with the British Imperial Chemicals company, this agreement was really a tripartite agreement between du Pont, Imperial Chemicals, and I. G. Farben. Memoranda found in the I. G. files in Germany since the war show that the I. G. officials at least believed that they conferred regularly although informally with du Pont officials on the carrying out of cartel arrangements all over the world. This may have appeared to be only an individual business arrangement to du Pont, but to I. G. Farben it was one of a number of key agreements—each agreement giving to German industry a protected place and securing for it the power to limit production outside of Germany. Almost every important war item—beryllium, plastics, military optical instruments, synthetic nitrogen, pharmaceuticals, electrical and radio equipment, aircraft component parts—were covered by these individual treaties.

Not only was production outside of Germany limited where the control of patents could be used for that purpose but areas of great importance to the United States were systematically reserved for German industry. One key to all cartel arrangements made by German industry with American firms was that the Latin-American market in some measure was to be reserved for Germany. This was accomplished during a time when the American public thought we had a good-neighbor program as part of a general policy to develop closer relations with Latin America. The Sterling Products Co., for example, the successor of a firm seized by the American Alien Property Custodian during the first World War, had an arrangement under which its sales in Latin America had to be handled by the agents of the German Bayer firm. Typical of the arrangements was the one concluded between the Rohm and Haas firm of Philadelphia and the Rohm and Haas Co. of Darmstadt, Germany. To understand what the arrangement was one need only read a letter from the German firm to its American partner on December 22, 1939. It begins: "The arrangements which we have with your firm about synthetic tanning limits the markets where you are free to sell your synthetic tannings to the United States of America and Canada, whereas we supply the rest of the world." The letter goes on to say that most of the South American markets, "Can at present not be supplied by us regularly and in order to allow our friends in those markets to maintain their position we should very much appreciate if you could supply them." The response to this letter reads in part, "Of course we shall be glad to follow your wishes in every detail * * * I wish to assure you that no matter who is doing the shipping we shall revert to the status quo ante as soon as normal conditions have been restored."

What the restoration of the status quo ante may mean for American business if it should ever be restored is set forth quite clearly in a letter from the Rohm & Haas Co. to Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, then Coordinator, Council of National Defense. The letter reads:

"Shortly after the start of the war, the German house asked whether we might be willing to sell, during the war, to some of the firms with whom they had been dealing. We gave our consent. It is obvious that it would not be worth while for us to go to any great expense to develop the South American trade, since there is a good chance that our right to sell in South America may be cut off when the war ends."

Today it undoubtedly does not appear that there is much of a chance of this taking place, but may I remind you that Rohm & Haas, of Philadelphia, which in 1939 was selling in Latin America only by the grace and request of a German firm and which previously had been barred from that market was seized by the American Alien Property Custodian during the First World War. The purpose of the seizure was to free American industry from foreign restrictions. That which seems unlikely now also seemed unlikely after the First World War.

As a matter of fact it should be pointed out that the American Alien Property Custodian seized during the First World War the property in this country of the German Bayer firm. The Alien Property Custodian sold the properties to the Sterling Products Co. It in turn sold the dyestuff plant, business, and patents to the Grasselli Chemical Co. By 1923, the Grasselli Chemical Co. had already entered into negotiations with the German Bayer Co. for the formation of a new company to be jointly owned and to be known as the Grasselli Dyestuff Co. A series of arrangements followed concerning the Grasselli Dyestuff Co. between the American and German interests. The heart of these arrangements was that the German interests would not manufacture dyestuffs in the United States, its territories or Canada save through the Grasselli Dyestuff Co. and that the Grasselli Dyestuff Co. would confine its manufacture and sale of said products in the United States of America, its territories, and Canada.

The successor to the Grasselli Dyestuff Co. is General Aniline and Film, and its sale in Latin America prior to our entry into the war were by permission of I. G. Farben because the Latin-American market was by this arrangement allocated to Germany. I. G. Farben used General Aniline and Film as a depository of patents taken out in this country with the purpose of blocking American developments outside of the I. G. Farben agreements. As the war approached, I. G. Farben made a hurried arrangement with Standard Oil of New Jersey in an attempt to work out what a Standard official called "complete plans for a modus vivendi which would operate through the term of the war, whether or not the United States came in." As a part of the complete plans, thousands of patents were thrown into General Aniline

and Film. The American Alien Property Custodian has seized General Aniline and Film but these patents are still being enforced to stop the development by other American companies of the processes covered by these patents, and General Aniline and Film has not abrogated the contracts which prohibit it from selling outside the United States and Canada.

I do not believe that the main purpose of these arrangements was to provide a vehicle for the German Government through which it could support espionage groups and obtain vital information concerning weapons of warfare produced in other countries, including the United States. Certainly American firms which entered into these arrangements had no such idea. Yet it was perhaps inevitable that these arrangements should have been used for these purposes. In any event the German Government made use of cartel outlets as centers of propaganda and centers of espionage, particularly in Latin America where the German outlets, protected against competition for so many years, were in many cases sufficiently strong to be able to survive the blockade and to operate in the Argentine. But the Germans made use of cartel agreements with American firms in order to send groups of experts through American plants as late as 1939. And they constantly made use of patent licensing agreements in order to obtain precise information not available to the American public as to American capacity.

The arrangement between Carl Zeiss and Bausch & Lomb, for example, required the transmission to the German firm of minute reports. Carl Zeiss in a letter of March 24, 1939, for example, made this demand on Bausch & Lomb, "it is absolutely necessary, and that is why we ask you for it, that you supply us * * * with a precise statement of those patents of ours which you use in your manufacturing processes, designating at the same time those instruments in whose manufacture these patents are used, also indicating the turn-over you have had in these instruments during the last two business years, and the volume of orders which you have at present on hand for such instruments." It is only fair to state that Bausch & Lomb did not comply with this request. "Instead of the detailed reports which had formerly been sent, Bausch & Lomb" sent "a statement of the aggregate amount of sales of instruments covered by Zeiss patents in 1937 and in 1938, designating the patents. They stated they had orders for future delivery of instruments covered by Zeiss patents totaling approximately $1,000,000" and they sent "the patent numbers."

International patent exchange agreements, of course, pose a difficult problem if cartel arrangements are to be used for the purpose of espionage. The Japanese Government attempted to use patent exchange agreements for the purpose of obtaining information on propellers being tested by the American Navy. And according to the files of the Universal Oil Products Co., "During the period August 21, 1939, up to the end of December 1939, 32 technical representatives of various Japanese concerns were here. * * * During that period the entire U. O. P. organization cooperated fully with them on their problem, which was mainly production of aviation fuel." This comment is added to the Universal Oil Products interoffice memorandum, "It is our belief that the information given to the Japanese representatives was as complete, if not more complete, than any information given on these processes which we have supplied to anyone." It has been pointed out that much of the information supplied pursuant to cartel arrangements and patent exchange agreements was of no importance even though thought important by Germany and Japan. That is no doubt true. It is also true that we do not know all of the information which was supplied. A habit of exclusive communication was established by years of cartel arrangements.

Perhaps it is more significant to note that it was the deliberate policy of German firms to gain the acquiescence of French, Belgium, and Dutch concerns to restrictive agreements under which a fine would have to be paid if either party exceeded production by an agreed amount. The German firms then proceeded to pay their fines and to build up their productive capacity. With increased capacity they could then threaten the rest of Europe with a trade war and gain thereby a revision of cartel arrangements more favorable to them, and more unfavorable to the rest of Europe. A representative of the Belgian steel mills complained, "We resent just as much as you do to see our mills subjected to the German dictatorship." But he pointed out that "should the steel cartel break up the prices of all steel commodities would dwindle down very fast." France tried to liberate its dyestuff industry from Germany control during the First World War. It placed the seized firms in the hands of the French Kuhlmann Co. But it was not long before the French Kuhlmann Co. was again tied to German industry and prohibited from manufacturing the dyestuffs which were more closely related to important wartime capacity. Of course, this policy reached its climax during the occupation of Europe. The German Government followed a systematic policy of building up German industry at the expense of the occupied areas. This should be remembered when it is suggested that German industry be restored.

I feel somewhat embarrassed in parading before you these old stories of German cartels. The stories are old. The only stories that can be told, however, are the ones that have been made public in that they are a part of the public record of cases or in the available files of Senate committees. It is not proper to make use of confidential Department of Justice information. I am embarrassed also because I think the emphasis of these stories is somewhat wrong, as I shall point out later, and because there is no particular point in muckraking. Yet the very fact that these stories are old has some significance because I believe we have already forgotten them. There is an uncomfortable analogy between the present time and the period after the First World War. More than that, during World War II a variety of constructive steps were suggested in this country to help take care of the cartel problem. Most of these steps have not been taken.

Senator O'MAHONEY introduced a bill to require the compulsory registration of private restrictive international agreements and international patent agreements. No action has ever been taken on this bill. As a result of the revelations of the Truman, Bone, and Kilgore hearings, various patent reform measures were proposed and introduced. No action has been taken on any of these. The proud boast of the Alien Property Custodian during this war, and indeed he had explicit and public instructions from President Roosevelt, was that the seized firms during this war were to be used for the benefit of the American public as a whole in accordance with high American policy. But as a matter of fact these concerns have been operated as though they were preferred private businesses, holding on desperately to their illegal patent monopolies, and in some cases not even daring to formally abrogate agreements which prohibit them from selling abroad.

There is a high mockery in all this. The American Cyanamid Co. wanted to cooperate with the Mexican Government in setting up a monopoly of the chemical industry in Mexico. The Alien Property Custodian opposed this and so did the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice opposed it because it wished to have no monopoly set up by an American company which would have closed sales avenues for other American firms, and also because it thought it dangerous to have an American firm establish a monopoly in a necessity in any foreign country. The Alien Property Custodian opposed it because he said he could use the seized firms, which were really departments of the American Government, as a means of helping industry in Latin America and as a means of opening up trade for American firms generally. Because of this argument President Roosevelt stopped the American Cyanamid deal. But to what avail? We have not developed trade with Latin America through the seized firms acting for all American industry. The seized firms have been operating as private companies in some instance making use of the German agents in Latin America as their own agents, and, as is the case with General Aniline and Film still subject to old restrictive arrangements.

Of course, these old restrictive arrangements are not now effective. But this is to be remembered. Most of them, informal or otherwise, were supposed to be resumed after the termination of the war. There is no mechanism for making these agreements public because no public registration act has been passed or is even being considered in the Congress. And the drive to make restrictive arrangements centering around patent agreements will continue, because our patent law has not been reformed. The Department of Justice knows very well that restrictive arrangements were being negotiated even while the war was on. It knows that now is the period to stop the resumption of these arrangements. But the anticartel program of the Department of Justice seems to have fallen to pieces. In this respect we are reliving the days after the First World War.

There are two differences. We have a somewhat halting program to make German industry competitive. The program is a halting one not only because of the division of Germany and the inability to get agreement on the carrying out of such a program but also because among the American representatives are those who quite sincerely believe that a strong Germany is more important than a decartelized one. And it is natural that some of these men should hold to these views because their activities in American industry included the consummation of restrictive cartel arrangements. It was to be expected that the German industrialists have taken advantage of this. They knew that we would insist upon some kind of a rearrangement of German business. They even had a plan ready for the rearrangement of I. G. Farbenindustrie. And they have come forward today to maintain that the maintenance of the German chemical industry is of the utmost importance for the rest of the world. They urge, and I am quoting from a document prepared by an I. G. Farben official: "It should not prove difficult by means of controls through Allied control personnel and by cooperation with available, highly qualified German experts, who after the terrible experiences of the last decade, are ready to cooperate in this task from inner conviction, to see to it that another rebirth of bellicose tendencies is nipped in the bud or that preparations to start undesirable operations are rendered impossible." And there are many who are willing to believe that the second difference is that we are attempting to establish within the framework of the UN an international trade office which will have as one of its objects the outlawing of restrictive arrangements. But we have not taken the domestic steps to implement such a program, and the program is fraught with danger in any event because it also provides for the setting up of international commodity agreements, which can be private cartel arrangements in a thin disguise.

The cartel problem is not the most important problem in the world today, but it is important. We probably are getting the

kind of anticartel policy we deserve. The policy is weak and ineffective. I think we forget that there is a great deal of sympathy for cartels in this country. As a matter of fact, sympathy for German cartels was for a long time traditional in this country. Mr. Samuel Untermyer testified before the Interstate Commerce Committee in 1912 as follows: "We have a great deal to learn from the experience of foreign countries. With all due respect to our President, I think we are children in the science of government. I have seen something of the operation of the German cartels. I have been brought into professional relations with one aspect of that situation, and it is far ahead of our chaotic haphazard system." And Mr. Gilbert Montague, a New York lawyer, delivered himself of the following in 1918: "In Germany there is no prohibitory legislation on the subject of trusts. No official has received letters of marque to harass at will the high seas of commerce and flaunt in every channel of business the terrors of antitrust statutes." He said: "The advantage which German industry derives from legislative tolerance and official good will toward industrial combinatior must inspire the envy of American businessmen." During the Hoover administration no action was taken to prevent known cartel arrangements because it was not deemed desirable to disturb enterprise during a difficult period. And there is something a little bit unhealthy in the way the cartel problem of necessity has been approached during the last war.

The cartel problem is not a German problem. German cartels are not popular today because Germany has been or is an enemy. If in describing the effects of international cartels we weigh heavily the use of espionage and the effects of restrictive arrangements imposed by foreign firms whose country became our enemy, then we are apt to pass over the fact that the objection to cartels applies equally when the arrangement is consummated with a British firm as well as with a German. The emphasis on Germany is dangerous. Our views toward Germany will change. They have already changed. It must be made clear that taking the German out of the cartel or the bad German will not make the cartel good.

The emphasis upon the effect of these agreements on wartime production has its ludicrous side. The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey quite naturally began a publicity campaign after a decent interval to remove from the public mouth the taste of its I. G. Farben agreements. A part of this campaign was intended to show that whatever the arrangements that were made, this country got more out of Germany because of them, than I. G. Farben got for Germany. And they told a very convincing story. So convincing in fact that the Nazi government, which of course had access to the articles and advertisements became quite angry at I. G. Farben for having been so duped and demanded an explanation. Thereupon I. G. Farben in Germany, as Standard Oil had done in the United States, prepared a well-documented report showing that Germany had done all the gaining by these restrictive arrangements, and that Standard Oil was not telling the truth. A sound anticartel policy cannot be based on the theory that one party gains and the other loses by the agreement and that an agreement is to be judged by whether one's own national gained. Such a view would be an invitation to the United States Government to behave the way the German Government did. It would mean that the only lesson we had learned from German cartels was that we should behave as effectively as the Germans did.

Indeed, it sometimes appears that that is the only lesson we have learned.

Cartel arrangements in the long run are bad for people everywhere. In the short run they are misleading. In the short run a cartel is urged to solve the problem of so-called overproduction or of an uneconomic allocation of resources. By restricting production or momentarily removing competition, a cartel may disguise the fact that economic resources are misallocated or are going to waste. A cartel solves nothing. It does not force a shift in resources. In the long run it encourages the misuse of economic resources.

But a cartel arrangement does more. A cartel cannot operate where there is free access to the market. By artificially stabilizing prices, a cartel, if it were not founded on coercion or monopoly, would only result in new enterprises entering the field. The basic requirement for any international cartel is therefore coercion and monopoly at home. The most frightening thing about the number of cartel arrangements to which American firms were parties is that each one of these arrangements signifies that the American participant had achieved such domination over the domestic market that it could exercise monopoly power and coercion at home. A German firm would have found it valueless to have entered into a cartel arrangement with an American concern to keep it out of Latin America, if other American firms could have gone in to fill the gap. Such agreements were only made when the American firm either had no real competitors or could police and coerce them.

The problem of cartels in the last analysis is therefore a problem of monopoly at home. If a German firm and Germany were to blame for restricting French production of dyestuffs, then the French Kuhlmann firm and the French Government were equally to blame. And if American firms entered into arrangements to restrict American production, they and the United States Government were also to blame.

The reason for making these arrangements is clear. The reason was to make money. It was thought that more money could be made if prices were stabilized. An official of an important American electrical company explained to a newcomer, "Now to deal with your dissatisfaction with our inferior position in the export market. It is perfectly true that we are second largest lamp manufacturer in the world (probably joint second with the German Osram Co.) but we only have a participation, outside of the United States and Canada, of approximately 1.2 percent of the Licensed Lamp Manufacturers' business, which is probably about 0.8 percent of the world business outside of the United States and Canada. I agree this is definitely lousy." But then he went on to explain that the restriction had been imposed upon them through a patent agreement and that in addition if they did not adhere to the restriction then foreign companies would come into the American market. The restriction in other words was the result of monopoly power and adherence to it was given because of the desire to have monopoly benefits.

It is silly to expect a monopoly to act as though it were competitive. Monopolies will make restrictive arrangements with other monopolies. They will police their own dominions and they will keep independent enterprise out if they can.

The shape of American industry today is alarmingly monopolistic. The standard pattern of control over a manufacturing industry is to have domination in the hands of two, three, or four companies. American industry got that way through two great merger movements, each of which ended in a depression. We are now in a third great merger movement. The impulse toward greater concentration is strong indeed. If American industry assumes this form then we must expect cartel arrangements. Business is of course international. We would not want American business not to exchange know-how and technology with foreign firms. But a simple exchange agreement between two firms competitive in their home markets inevitably becomes a cartel arrangement when it is between two monopolies.

The world today is a world in which the free and competitive enterprise system is losing out. This is not strange. Competition has never really been tried. It is not true that competition cannot be enforced. It is much more correct to say that competition cannot exist if a country is not willing to enforce it. That was the case in Great Britain where the cooperation between the monopoly firms such as Imperial Chemical Industries and the British Government had to reach a point where the chemical industry even under a conservative government was only one step from socialization. A monopoly which thinks it can survive as a monopoly is the modern world without government control and regulation is living in a fool's paradise indeed.

We have not tried a free and competitive enterprise system in this country. We have achieved a rather precarious mixed economy. But it is an economy sufficiently monopolized to promote inflation during the upswing of the business cycle and to make recovery difficult on the downswing. And we have an economy which invites the formation of international cartels.

It is possible that we cannot have a free and competitive enterprise economy. It is possible that we cannot do away with cartels. It is certain that we cannot do away with cartels unless we are willing to take effective steps to do so. It is possible to chart what these steps must be. They are:

1. We must reform our present patent law. We should not put companies in the position where they will make more money if they misuse patents as part of more general restrictive arrangements. Patents which are misused ought to be forfeited. This suggestion was made as long ago as 1912 by Louis Brandeis. It has always been opposed by the patent bar.

2. We ought to enact a statute which will require the public registration of private international agreements which contain restrictive arrangements or which provide for the continual exchange of patents or trademarks. The filing of these agreements should not confer any immunity from the antitrust laws. The filing of these arrangements, however, would make it possible for the American public to know where the business of their country stands and what are the barriers to true competition.

3. We ought to insist upon vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws. The monopoly pattern of American industry today exists in violation of those laws. The cartel arrangements which were formed in the period between the wars were consummated in violation of the antitrust laws. The only alternative to enforcement of the antitrust laws, if we are not going to abandon the objective of a free and competitive society, is a drastic revision of our corporation laws, either through combined State or Federal action in such a way as to limit the size of corporations.

Finally, we are entitled to a report on the progress or lack of it which has been made in the readjustment of German enterprise. We are entitled to know whether effective steps have been taken during the formative period to strengthen industry outside of Germany and to put German industry itself on a basis where, to quote President Wilson after the First World War, it will not be again "a thoroughly knit monopoly" capable of activities "of a peculiarly insidious and dangerous kind."

World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, on February 21, 1947, a number of organizations which had been working separately toward the goal of world government met in a joint convention, and formed a new organization, the United World Federalists. The new organization will coordinate the activities of proponents of world government, and will work toward the creation of a world republic with limited powers adequate to insure peace.

One of the great speeches made at the Asheville conference was the notable address by Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina. Because I think its stirring message will have value for all of us, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMON DEDICATION OF AMERICAN BROTHERHOOD WEEK AND THE ORGANIZATION FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT

(By Frank P. Graham, president, University of North Carolina)

This is the eve of Washington's birthday. We pause in honor of the memory of the man who became the rock of the revolution upon whom broke defeat, intrigue, and despair. In winter's gaunt retreat his dauntless faith held on as he fathered the birth of a nation, a venturing hope for freeing the earth in time.

This is Brotherhood Week in America, sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. These are World Federation Days in Asheville. The two movements coincide in time and purpose, the one emphasizing the value of the freedom of differences and the other emphasizing the necessity of the security of unity.

America, settled by peoples of many regions, races, colors, cultures, and creeds, should lead the way in helping to make the world safe not only for majorities, but also safe for minorities, not only safe for democracy, but also safe for differences. The haven for heretics in the day of its weakness should not, in the days of its power, become the stronghold of bigots. The world has given America the vigor and variety of its differences. America should protect and enrich its differences for the sake of America and the world. The freedom of honest differences is necessary to a free personality and a free world. True freedom of self-expression leads neither to self-exploitation nor to self-deterioration, but to a self-realization of the whole personality for the good life in human brotherhood.

In the cause of freedom of religion, freedom of assembly and organization in churches, parliaments, corporations, agricultural cooperative societies, and labor unions, freedom of the press, and freedom of all honest differences, spiritual heroism shines out all along the way of the human pilgrimage. The cross and the stake reveal, and the synagogue and the church carry on, the unconquerable aspiration of the human spirit for a freer and better world. Idealism does not cringe before force. Repression is the way of frightened power. Freedom is the way of enlightened faith. History teaches beyond the denial of bigotry or the sneer of cynicism that the answer to a difference of opinion is not denunciation, is not the smear of a great public servant such as David Lilienthal; the answer to idealism is not a concentration camp; and the answer to error is not terror, but the cleansing power of light and liberty under the law. Without sacrifice of loyalties or convictions but with mutual respect for differences we meet on the common ground of our great religious communions.

The Jewish people who gave us the highest conception of the one God, the sovereignty of the moral law and the greatest book, the greatest life, and one of the greatest cultures in all history, speak to us today through their old and new prophets in the deep moral tones of personal goodness and social justice. The Catholics represent to us the unity of mankind and a universal sympathy for human beings everywhere in need of mercy and compassion. They bear the cross far and near with its call to sacrifice and heroism in the sharing and giving of life. The Protestants stand for the individual, his intellectual freedom and his spiritual autonomy. Without mediation of bishop or king, but as individuals in the congregation in direct communion with their Lord, they made over their churches and their states in the name of the people and under the authority of God. For them all, there still speaks the Carpenter's Son, at once Jew, Catholic, Protestant, Son of man and Son of God, who shared all that He had with all mankind. After 2,000 years we crucify mankind and crucify Him with our religious bigotry and persecution, racial hatreds, wars, and motives of greed for ourselves. Today, as sincere Jews, Christians, and human beings, without divisions in His spirit, as we stumble along on our human pilgrimage, may we ever press forward together in the eternal adventure toward the kingdom of God.

As barriers across our pilgrimage toward human brotherhood in a world government are now dangerous lags in our democracy. Science and democracy and the great human freedoms for which the war was won make dangerous lags out of the idea of the innate superiority of a master class, whether it be the nobility, the middle class, or the proletariat; a master race, whether it be German or Japanese or Anglo-Saxon; and a master state, whether it be German or Japanese, British, Russian, or American. The leadership or dominance of any group or race or nation based on special privileges, monopolies, tyranny, and force rather than on the freedom and equal opportunity of all people regardless of race, color, creed, or party is a frustration of the American dream and is a denial of the Hebraic-Christian hope.

Before human society could rise to the opportunities of the first scientific revolution and the mighty industrial revolution which came out of it, we find ourselves in the midst of the second scientific revolution—with its pure theories and ideas of radioactivity and nuclear physics—and the great atomic revolution, which came out of it, in the momentous transition of our times. In capturing the energy of the atom, the pure scientists, in the universities, the men and women of ideas, have captured nothing less than the power of the universe, loaded with the hopes or the doom of mankind.

The transitions of history impelled by the compass and later by the steam engine were processes of slow centuries and gradual adjustments. Social drift and slow adjustments did not then, on such a scale as now, mean swift and wide social tragedy and involve mayhap the survival of the human species on this earth. The possession of the earth might return to a species which has not learned to make mechanisms beyond its control.

Human society with an atomic bomb in its bosom cannot lag in adjustment to its explosive power. Mankind, with his swift scientific inventions and his slow social adjustments, has, with much economic progress and much human misery, muddled through to this fateful hour. Confronted with the atomic bomb, men and the nations through cooperation now are to master this modern mechanical civilization or be destroyed in its unregulated self-destruction.

The one world needs an international authority in line with the Baruch-Acheson-Lilienthal report for inspection and control of the sources and manufacture of atomic power; a world court with jurisdiction over the crimes of individuals against the United Nations subject to the guarantees of an international bill of rights; an international police force responsible not to separate nations but to the United Nations; and the shifting of legislative power from the Security Council to the Assembly of all the United Nations, weighted for representation of the peoples of the world.

The atomic bomb in the hands of the absolute state is the greatest threat which has come to man. With regard to the other dangerous lags, we have the freedom to struggle for freedom and hope for a better day. With the lag of the idea of the absolute national state in an atomic age, we may have no world in which to struggle or hope or even to live. The one world truly begins at home, but without the one world we may have no home in which to begin. The one world should advance with the merger of the World Federalists, Americans United for World Government, the Massachusetts Committee for World Federation, the Georgia World Citizens' Committee, the Student Federalists, and the World Republic.

We meet in the historic city of Asheville whose high ground is a rugged stronghold for world federation. We meet in the historic State of North Carolina from whose eastern shores Woodrow Wilson as a boy looked out wistfully upon the waters of the world and from whose capital Josephus Daniels went forth to fight valiantly for the League of Nations of Woodrow Wilson and for the good-neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt. In this State already have merged on a State basis under the leadership of Levering, Albright, Brandis, Phillips, Bishopric, Merritt, Ramsey, Smith, Shoemaker, and Humber, Americans United for World Government, World Federalists, and the Student Federalists. In this program of federation we envisage not the United Nations against world government, or world government against or around the United Nations, but the United Nations for world government, and world government through the United Nations.

It is now imperative that all groups, all races, and all nations, whatever be their differences, make their first concern the strengthening of world government through the United Nations for the international control and the humane use of atomic power. The great international economic framework thrown around the earth by the commercial and industrial revolutions and the international political framework now being thrown around the earth, organized to include in time all the nations of the earth, require the acceptance of an idea of the intellectual and spiritual fellowship of all men and all nations reaching around the earth in our one world. Above the idea of the economic interpretation of history we need the spiritual interpretation of life. An idea, old as 2,000 years and as young as the hopes of men, the idea of the fatherhood of God

and the brotherhood of man, rejected these centuries as impracticable and impossible, has become in the atomic age the most necessary and practical, the greatest idea of them all.

Just as surely as the Italian and Iberian Peninsulas were the fifteenth and sixteenth century home of the commercial revolution and just as surely as Britain was the eighteenth and nineteenth century home of the industrial revolution, so America is the midtwentieth century home of the atomic revolution. Through the ideas of scientists from many lands, the loyalty of workers from many States, American Presidential daring, American technology, military organization, and business enterprise, the United States is the home of the atomic bomb, catastrophic for war or regenerative for the peace of mankind.

As the home of the atomic bomb, America has a great moral responsibility. America, for the sake of her own soul, must take the lead in putting the atomic bomb under the control and ban of world government. America must, with the wise safeguards of an international authority under the United Nations, share the knowledge and use of atomic power and with all peoples, for research and humane causes, for full production, and fair distribution within the nations, and for justice and peace among the nations.

Standing where cross the high road and the low road of human destiny, America, with her ideas, her mechanisms, and her universities, let us pray, will not fail mankind in this tragic hour, but will rise to the responsibility of her power and the opportunity of her greatness to give fresh hope to the stricken, hungry, and fearful peoples of the earth as sons of God in a federal government of all nations in one world neighborhood of human brotherhood, we pray God, in our time.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Federal Aid for Education, which I delivered at Teachers College, Columbia University, on April 7, 1947, under the sponsorship of Phi Delta Kappa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal aid for education needs no defense before a group of this kind. I am not going to spend my time attempting to show you that the necessity is with us, that the time has come in our constitutional and Federal development, that aid on a Nationwide basis is essential in guaranteeing an equal opportunity for the fundamentals of ordinary education to all of the people of America. This has already been aired well over the radio and has been given full publicity in our press, and statistics are easily available.

There are one or two branches of educational thought in the Nation which reflect some sort of fear about the Federal Government getting too close to education in the States and in the communities. This fear to the thoughtful has been completely allayed because no person in approaching the question of Federal aid would attempt to overcome what has been one of the basic ideas of American Government, the local control of education.

American education based upon the great public-school system recognizes the place for the home, the church, and private organizations in our educational set-up. The endowed schools are too well established and are functioning too successfully for the benefit of America ever to attempt to do anything but to aid them in a better functioning of their contributions to American life. The church schools have found their place in the American system and are contributing to the evolution and development of their own objectives, as well as to the growth and development of American democracy. The home, too, through such agencies as the parent-teacher associations, and as a result of the thoroughly democratic manner in which teachers in our public schools are trained and selected, is contributing its share to the proper growth and development of our Nation. The great problem—which is a fundamental problem of a democracy—is that of preserving the individual that he might attain the maximum of potential enlargement; always in theory and practice stressing the importance of maintaining the concept of the individual that the welfare of the citizen shall be the reason for government; and at the same time developing the community so that it will exert the influence of society upon the individual and thus temper him, that his aims and activities shall be bent toward social helpfulness. Education's task is to serve the leaven that will preserve the individual, yet mold him to a thoughtfulness of his place as one of many others, an individual with a social conscience. This is democracy's mission.

Was there ever a time for a greater need? Pay attention to world trends and see if those ideals and those ideas which have made us a Nation stand in danger. As a reader of history I count the American experiment definitely worth while. This land is one where many peoples and cultures mingle and from the contributions of all receive an enhanced appreciation of each. As one who has been made by America—who is a product, or should I say, a victim, of our American public-school system—I count this land blessed and its ideals and ideas worthy of preservation. And in the preservation of those ideas and ideals I count our schools the greatest contributor. Can government ever have a greater function than that of its own preservation? Education is the path democracy treads. Propaganda is the way of the dictator and dictatorships. And there is a vast difference. Shall the people learn the truth and be free to express it, discover it, expand it, and use it, or shall they be given just what is for their good? Thoughtful American citizens demand the first. He who would destroy democracy in America will picture the second as attractive. Equality of early educational opportunity offers democracy's greatest chance.

Conditions are not perfect, but ideals controlling and governing education in America are more widely and universally accepted today than they ever were before. In fact, educators are in reality a unit when it comes to these things: All recognize the place for the home, the place for the church, the place for the endowed private institution, and the place for the public school in our educational scheme. There is in reality no conflict. The great American Government settled once and for all that it was possible even in the individual for many loyalties to exist without producing an inconsistency. Thus, all contribute to the building of our Nation. American citizenship has become so complex that we no longer divide our all into those things which are to be rendered unto Caesar and to those which are to be rendered unto God. American citizenship has now evolved to the place that even in our constitutional system itself the complexity of the citizen is recognized, for in the Fourteenth Amendment we laid down the principle that persons born in the United States, and under its jurisdiction, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. There are, you see, at least two political loyalties in each of us and there is no conflict. With the adoption of that principle of citizenship came a tremendous significance to our constitutional scheme and new America had its beginning with that theory.

We fought our Civil War because men could not see that a person had a dual loyalty. For the first 75 years of our national development, concepts in regard to sovereignty controlled the thinking of all of our statesmen. The Constitution itself was a symbol of sovereignty and so were the constitutions of every individual State, and therein came the clash. "Sovereignty is indivisible," said Webster. "Sovereignty is surely indivisible," said Calhoun. "Sovereignty must therefore rest in the nation," said Webster. "Sovereignty must therefore rest in the state," said Calhoun. And then we fought.

A better light dawned and wiser heads, after the shedding of our brothers' blood, realized that we were fighting over a principle that need not be, and we learned that our Federal system could be preserved through the creation of a dual citizenship without loss to either State or Nation, but with benefit to them both.

Since I do not have to convert you to the necessity for Federal aid for education, probably I can, with advantage to all, trace our constitutional development and thereby emphasize not only the need but even justify in our constitutional scheme the desirability of a step which we will be taking when Federal aid becomes an accomplished fact. This seems necessary to do because the thoughtless among the critics of Federal aid for education assert that Federal aid is contrary to our States rights theory—that Federal aid means Federal control. And some even go so far as to call the whole idea unconstitutional.

Various thinkers approach our constitutional development in different ways. I like to do it in this way: The Constitution came into being that moment that various men throughout our Thirteen Colonies recognized the fact that there were some things which were of common concern to all of the Colonies. It was that thought which made us a Nation. In April of 1775 we had Lexington and Concord; in May we had the meeting of the Second Continental Congress; in June we had Bunker Hill; in July we had Washington taking command of the Army of the United States at Cambridge. Those four steps are history. Their significance is the thing which I would stress now. Lexington and Concord were Massachusetts incidents. The meeting of the Second Continental Congress was a reaffirmation of the fact on the part of the leaders in all of the Colonies that there were elements in the various local conflicts that were of common concern. Bunker Hill was, therefore, the first fight after the discovery of this concept. By that fight the de facto Government of the United States came into existence, and Washington the following month ratified that concept in accepting the command of the Army of the United States. The Declaration of Independence in the following July turned the de facto United States Government into a de jure Government, and

the American Nation was born. As the Nation grew, written descriptions of these fundamental concepts were created by the preparation of the Articles of Confederation and our Constitution. This gave us a Federal system creating one out of many but based upon the theory that each State should take care of its local affairs, but the Nation should take care of those affairs which were of common concern to all. And our Federal system based upon this simple concept actually existed before our Constitution and was the mother of it, not its child as so many seemed to think. Today this distinction is not essential because both mother and child are fused in the dim past.

But in the beginning a national citizenship was not thought of. The Constitution remained a symbol of sovereignty, thought of more or less as a static affair. Then it evolved into a living organism, much as a result of changing concepts in the world and as a result of judicial review and Marshall's great reasoning in expounding the doctrines of a Constitution that was established to endure through the ages. Then came the Civil War, and with it came the concept of a dual citizenship. And today no longer is the Constitution a mere symbol of sovereignty; no longer is our Constitution a mere embodiment of a living organism; but today it has become in very deed the companion of the American people in the accomplishment of their objectives. Thus it is not only the word and the letter of the law, but it is its living spirit.

Now let us turn to the growth of some of our national educational habits as they have evolved in relation to our constitutional development. Federal aid for education is not new. That which has been done has in no sense harmed the local control or marred our Constitution's spirit and that which is about to be done must in no sense harm the local control or mar our Constitution's choicest principles.

It was in Buchanan's administration, I believe, that the first bill to create the land-grant colleges was introduced. You all know how our country had grown politically and economically, how the movement to the West carried the ideals of the American educational system, but not the facilities for its preservation. My own State and territory reflect the theory very well, for the second act of our territorial legislature created the university which became one of the first to be established west of the Mississippi and one of the earliest to inaugurate the coeducational system.

You will remember that after the bill creating the land-grant colleges passed Congress President Buchanan vetoed the bill on the score that there was no provision in the Constitution of the United States for Federal aid for education. But with the coming of Lincoln, and with the necessities growing out of or incident to the Civil War, Lincoln found a sanction in our Constitution and signed the bill and our land-grant institutions became a fact. Probably this act of Lincoln's has meant more to the growth and development of American democracy than any other single act. When one realizes what has been accomplished in research alone by the great institutions which have evolved from this simple act of Lincoln's, sanctioned undoubtedly as an act consistent with the national defense provision of the Constitution, one realizes its importance not only to our country but to the whole world. Yet if we had remained strict constructionists in constitutional theory, if we had conceived our Constitution as a mere symbol of sovereignty, and the division of rights merely between the State and the Nation, we could not have taken this great step. But on analysis we see that what was taking place was merely the same as that which took place when our Nation came into existence. Lincoln discovered one more thing which had been conceived of as being merely of local concern actually to have been something of national concern. Pause long enough and consider, if you will, the retarded growth of our country had Lincoln persisted in maintaining Buchanan's Constitutional outlook!

That also is the story of the building of our railroads. That also is the story of the evolution of Federal relief and Federal aid for the distressed. We must remember that during the extremely hard times of Cleveland's administration, when the farms throughout the Mississippi Valley were left so dry and desolate that even seed crops were not preserved, a bill was introduced into Congress to provide for Federal aid to farmers, but Cleveland vetoed that bill as a strict constructionist on the theory that the Government of the United States was set up to be supported by the people and not to support the people of the United States. But with the growth of the need for relief and the development of the cooperative activities between the State and the Nation has come, of course, the necessary change. Yet who today would call Buchanan or Cleveland illogical? Constitutional development is not a matter always of logic; there come times when it is a matter of necessity.

It is in keeping with the necessities of the times that we turn to Federal aid for education. It is in keeping with this evolving theory of cooperation between the State and the Nation that we today justify that aid. It is in keeping with the growth and development and the meaning of American citizenship and the relation of that citizenship to the theory that education is basic in American democracy that we extend now the cooperative spirit and justify Federal aid on the score that all persons born in the United States shall have an equal opportunity in the attainment of the fundamentals of education

A society based upon a well-trained citizenry is still America's best dream. It should be the world's dream. There can be no peace until there is some contentment, until living standards are such that men and women can produce not only enough to live on, but a surplus to keep that living bigger, better, and more complete.

I believe that for the first time that a nation has attempted to express itself with thankfulness to those who have served it well, by offering educational advantages to the individuals who have come out of that service, placed the philosophy of education where it should be put. The soldier education bill is not a bill primarily for the benefit of the soldier boys and girls. It is for the benefit of the Nation and the American people. Realizing what happened to France and what happened to England as a result of the last war, we recognized the loss of a whole generation of leadership and the American Government was determined that a generation of leadership should not be lost to us as a result of this war. The soldier education act is based upon that theory. Build us a better nation is its slogan. No one knows that better than I do because I, myself, wrote that theory into the bill.

American democracy, resting upon the theory of a trained citizenry, a citizenry growing into more complex activities as time goes on, conscious of the worth of that American democracy both to itself and to the world, marches on with the growth and development of our Constitution. Thus, Federal aid, viewed as a cooperative activity—cooperative on the part of the State and the Nation; cooperative on the part of the State, the Nation, and the citizen; cooperative in the development of our constitutional scheme in harmony with Marshall's great notion that the Constitution was set up to endure through the ages, and in harmony, too, with our present day enlightened concept of that Constitution as the companion of the people in the accomplishment of their objectives. I repeat, Federal aid for education viewed in this sense finds its place and keeps its place in the development of American democracy. We may go even further, it is a base upon which that democracy rests. Both reason and purpose underlie American democracy, both reason and purpose will preserve it, but it is only through the medium of trained minds and trained persons that reason and purpose and therefore democracy can be maintained.

For the past 20 years attempts have been made to get Congress to authorize Federal aid for education. Fifteen bills calling for Federal aid to assist the States in financing elementary and secondary schools have been introduced in the Eightieth Congress, 4 in the Senate and 11 in the House.

On July 3, 1946, the Senate passed, by a vote of 48 to 18, S. 1850, of which I was one of the sponsors. This bill provided for the establishment of a National Science Foundation. The Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned without passing this bill.

In his message to Congress last year, President Truman stressed the importance of such legislation. Such congressional action has been urged by spokesmen for government, education, labor, clergy, agriculture, medicine, and science. Studies by subcommittees of the Military Affairs Committee and the Commerce Committee have proved beyond doubt that a program of Federal aid is imperative. I believe it is necessary to the public health, the public welfare, to scientific education, and to the Nation's defense. Research in the natural sciences, largely dependent upon universities, has been made possible by traditional private endowments and State appropriations. The evidence is that heavy taxes have removed private funds and that State appropriations cannot meet the need.

These are the factors behind the growing sentiment for Federal support of science. We have worked diligently to avert any possibility of affecting the freedom of science through Federal control of science. The proposals would nurture the flowering of basic knowledge, not constrict it.

On March 26, 1947, a compromise was worked out between my bill, S. 525, which is the same as S. 1850, and S. 526, introduced by Senator SMITH for himself, Mr. CORDON, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. FULBRIGHT, which provides for a bill to create a National Science Foundation bearing a title, "A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes."

Quoting further from the committee report of March 26, "The committee finds that Federal support of scientific research, including provision for scholarships and fellowships for study in science, is essential to the preservation of the national health, prosperity, and security of the Nation and to the full development of our scientific resources.

"The recommendations of this committee for the creation of a National Science Foundation are substantiated by the testimony of over 150 witnesses heard in both Houses of Congress during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. The testimony of these outstanding scientists, educators, public officials, and representatives of labor, industry, and the clergy is, but with one exception, unanimous as to the need for a National Science Foundation."

The bills authorizing Federal aid to assist the States in financing elementary and secondary schools which in all probability will receive the closest attention in the Senate

hearings are S. 472 and S. 199. S. 472 is a bipartisan-sponsored bill introduced by Senator TAFT, for himself and Senators SMITH, COOPER, TOBEY, THOMAS of Utah, HILL, ELLENDER, and CHAVEZ. This bill authorizes grants in aid to the States for public schools only. S. 199 was introduced by Senator AIKEN of Vermont who is chairman of the Senate subcommittee. S. 199 proposes Federal aid for both public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools.

S. 472 in its provisions is the same as S. 181, which Senator HILL and I introduced in the 79th Congress and which was favorably reported to the Senate by the Committee on Education and Labor, June 13, 1946. Eleven of the thirteen members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to which S. 472 is referred, were members of the committee that reported S. 181. S. 472, first, absolutely prohibits Federal control of education; second, authorizes Federal funds in direct proportion to need and effort and in indirect proportion of the financial ability of the States to support schools; third, establishes a minimum foundation school opportunity in the Nation through public and elementary and public secondary schools; fourth, protects the educational welfare of minority racial groups, and fifth, limits the use of Federal funds to such schools as the States make eligible for State support.

The 1945 hearings on S. 181 developed very little opposition to Federal aid to public schools. Considerable opposition was evidenced toward Federal assistance to private and parochial schools.

Support for S. 472 is headed by the National Education Association, joined by such national organizations as The American Legion, The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, The General Federation of Women's Clubs, The Association of Childhood Education, and the American Association of University Women.

Labor Department Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to Senator KNOWLAND, of California, and also a statement by Mr. Whitney:

MARCH 28, 1947.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have never believed that Congress would deliberately sacrifice human life and promote industrial chaos. Yet those are the tragedies implicit in the proposed cut in the appropriation for the Department of Labor.

I do not see how the Labor Department can possibly provide even the barest minimum of the desired services if this totally unjustified cut of 40 percent in its appropriation, made by the House, is passed by the Senate. The Labor Department will exist in name only.

The Division of Labor Standards will go by the boards and with it the unceasing check needed to prevent unnecessary industrial accidents. Recently here in Cleveland a 15-year-old boy employed in a factory as a spray painter was hospitalized for 14 weeks and permanently disabled when the paint caught fire. He became literally a human torch.

The United States moved to bring charges against the company involved. This did not help the burned boy, but it did help to check similar accidents in the future. Yet, elimination of the Division of Labor Standards, as directed by the House, will invite the repetition of this abuse of human labor.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics will also be badly crippled. The findings of this Bureau are used by millions of people yearly. They are absolutely essential to any approach toward determining causes of industrial accidents, studying and eliminating friction in labor-management relations, determining fair wages where they are tied to the cost of living, accurately determining the number of unemployed, checking on the progress of housing through construction statistics, and other equally vital areas of our activity as a people. Yet, all of these will be discontinued or seriously curtailed if the House action is sustained.

If the Congress were deliberately to set out to promote industrial chaos, it could not choose a more effective route than insuring that the statistical raw material for planning are destroyed.

This blow at industrial progress is underlined by cutting by one-fourth the funds for the Conciliation Service. This just does not make sense; at a time when both labor and management are placing increasing faith in Federal efforts at mediating or conciliating industrial disputes, the ability of this vital agency to function is crippled.

In respect to the slashing of funds for the United States Employment Service, I do not understand how this agency is to be expected to guarantee that the money turned over to the States for their employment programs will be administered in accordance with Federal standards.

In turning employment services back to the States, Congress promised that Federal money would be used in accordance with Federal standards. The House voted the full sum for the State employment services which the Budget Bureau requested—some $71,728,000—while reducing by almost 80 percent the funds of the Federal agency charged with seeing that these $72,000,000 are wisely spent.

It almost seems as if the House desired to turn over to the States Federal money which they can use as a slush fund without adequate check by the United States Government.

Similarly, with the Veterans' Employment Service. How can this agency be expected to service the needs of jobless veterans when its funds have been slashed by 34 percent? Its work of uncovering job opportunities for veterans would virtually halt.

It would also seem that the House is not altogether in sympathy with enforcing the current low minimum wage of 40 cents an hour. In utter disregard of the imperative need to employ sufficient inspectors to see that this standard is enforced, the House would slash the appropriation for the Wage and Hour Division by 25 percent.

I have always believed in economy. But the House action is not economy. It is a fantastic, stumbling chase after an elusive will-o'-the-wisp. Its reckless disregard of the needs of the great body of labor, management, veterans, women, and children for assistance through the tested and proved services of the Labor Department will cost the country heavily in the months ahead.

I urge the Senate to insist on the full restoration to the Department of the amount recommended by the President's Budget Bureau.

Respectfully yours,

A. F. WHITNEY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN PROTESTS SLASH IN LABOR DEPARTMENT FUNDS—PRESIDENT A. F. WHITNEY OF THE BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN SAYS CONGRESS CHASING WILL-O'-THE-WISP

What happens when an economy-minded Congress applies the ax to essential Government services?

A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, has supplied the answer in asking the Senate to restore to the Labor Department the 40-percent slash in its funds for the next fiscal year voted by the House last week.

Said Whitney, "I believe in economy. But the House action was not economy. It was a fantastic, stumbling chase after an elusive will-o'-the-wisp. Its reckless disregard of the needs of the great body of labor, management, veterans, and even women and children for assistance through the tested and proved services of the Labor Department will cost the country heavily in the months ahead."

In a letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee, Whitney protested vigorously against eliminating or crippling a number of agencies of the Labor Department, including the Division of Labor Standards, Wage and Hour Division, Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Conciliation Service, and the United States Employment Service, the latter including the Veterans' Employment Service.

Whitney warned that the House action to eliminate the Division of Labor Standards would invite repetition on a Nation-wide scale of the recent Cleveland disaster in which a 15-year-old boy employed as a paint sprayer became a human torch when the paint caught fire. The Division of Labor Standards is currently charged both with preventing abuse of labor of young people and training safety inspectors.

Appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Statistics was slashed 60 percent by the House. "This Bureau," said Whitney, "furnishes the statistical raw materials for planning to determine causes of industrial accidents, establish good relations between labor and management, wage analysis, job opportunities, productivity, technological developments, employment statistics, and construction statistics."

Construction statistics are particularly important because they offer a check on the progress of the Nation's housing program.

Most heavily hit by the House action is the United State Employment Service whose funds were slashed approximately 80 percent. The USES—the Federal office—is charged with certain specific responsibilities which if not supplied by the Federal offices to all State services will have to be duplicated by each of the 48 States, and insuring that Federal funds granted to State employment services are administered in accordance with Federal standards as laid down by the Wagner-Peyser Act, passed in 1933. In direct contrast to its treatment of cutting 77 percent of the Federal end of the Federal-State system, the House voted to give the States the full amount recommended by the Budget Bureau, $71,728,000.

Pointing to the weakened ability of the USES to enforce Federal standards, Whitney raised the question of whether the States were about to receive a Federal slush fund which, for lack of Federal supervision, could be mishandled by State political leaders.

On behalf of the veterans, Whitney objected to reducing the already inadequate job-placement work set up for them. This is currently carried on through the USES by the Veterans' Employment Service, whose funds were slashed 35 percent.

Whitney accused the House of being out of sympathy with enforcing the current low minimum wage of 40 cents per hour, since the Wage and Hour Division, which provides Federal inspectors to insure compliance with the minimum-wage laws was slashed 25 percent.

A cut of 25 percent in funds for the United States Conciliation Service also drew Whitney's fire. "This just does not make sense," he said. "At a time when both labor and management are placing increasing faith in Federal efforts at mediating or conciliating industrial disputes, the ability of this vital agency to function is crippled."

The Triumph of President Truman in the Cause of Peace and Human Welfare Will Be the Triumph of the Democratic Party in the Days Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening the Democratic Party fittingly and triumphantly paid tribute to the immortal Thomas Jefferson, author of American democracy and founder of the Democratic Party.

There were many splendid speeches; and among the most inspiring I place that made here in Washington by the Honorable Gael Sullivan, who hails from my own State of Illinois and my own city of Chicago, vice chairman and executive director of the Democratic National Committee; young, dynamic, and a progressive leader of great ability and promise.

Mr. Sullivan's speech so favorably impressed me that, under leave to extend my remarks, I now embody it in the RECORD for the inspiration and encouragement to sincere men and women of our Nation. It follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, and fellow Democrats, in these precious hours we commemorate the birth of our political faith—and the beginning of new and greater tasks to be worthy of that faith. The principles of Thomas Jefferson are the articles of our political faith—but the vibrancy of those principles must be matched by the vitality of our performance.

We answer tonight a new call to organize our party for victory in 1948. We join ranks again in answer to a new reveille against reaction. The reveille for free men and free women who want to work out a peace, and make that peace work.

The Jefferson faith that dedicated our party to human rights—that places the first priority on human welfare—knows that the fight to sustain the dignity of the individual and the sanctity of the family unit is never-ending.

Greed and intolerance are the twin tyrannies that never take any time off.

HUMAN BUDGET OUT OF BALANCE

Our kind of political faith is one of constant redemption. It can turn defeat into victory, it can change indifference into confidence, it can blot out fear and replace it with courage, it can revive hope where only doubts have been. Without that fire of faith our labors would be stalled at the start.

The problems we face have no soft solutions; the Democratic Party offers no easy escape for those who want to make the fight for victory from the side lines. As long as this Nation still spends $13 to control crime for every dollar it spends for education the human budget is far from balanced.

As long as one young man out of every three was rejected during the war for physical and mental defects we still know that the struggle to make the Nation's health our first wealth is far from won.

As long as two citizens out of every three failed to vote—as they did in the last congressional election—we must prepare to organize and educate more and more of our people to express their will at the ballot stations of freedom.

THREE GREAT DEMOCRATS LINKED

Wherever free men and women band together in this Nation to oppose business monopoly or racial intolerance they gather in the spirit of Thomas Jefferson, the Jefferson who knew that the well-informed citizen was the right-acting citizen, the Jefferson who proclaimed this principle of our political faith. "Our freedom depends on the freedom of the press and that liberty cannot be limited without being lost."

Wherever our citizens rally to safeguard the interests of the human family, whether they would liberate the prisoners of our slums or the economic cast-offs of our factories and farms, the justice of their cause comes from Franklin D. Roosevelt when his heart spoke these words: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

Wherever our citizens unite to plan and work out the techniques of abundance, they share the moral stamina and broad-gage vision of President Truman when he says: "More and more we are learning, and in no small measure through the medium of the press, how closely our democracy is under observation. When we fail to live together in peace, the failure touches not us as Americans alone, but the cause of democracy itself. That we must never forget."

TRUMAN WAY IS THE HUMAN WAY

Millions of Americans cherish that same thought in their hearts tonight. Millions of our people who know that police states begin and end with concentration camps want more Truman and less tyranny.

Millions of those Americans say with one voice, "President Truman has kept faith with our principles and our party. The Truman way is the human way."

Tonight we marshal the loyalties and energies for our fight. Behind us we have the records of those leaders who helped to push forever outward our frontiers of the mind. We have the inspiration of the Jeffersons, the Jacksons, the Wilsons, and the Roosevelts, who believed that low incomes for the many and high profits for the few don't mix in a thriving democracy.

In front of us today we have a leader, tested and triumphant. He is prepared to meet the challenge of abundance in our atomic age, confident because of the people's confidence in his program, eager to see and do the right because his hopes have an abiding kinship with the people's hopes.

Therein lies our strength to fight, and therein lies our will to win.

The triumph of President Truman in the cause of peace and human welfare will be the triumph of the Democratic Party in the days ahead.

Electoral-Vote Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, a number of us hope shortly to secure hearings before the Judiciary Committee on several resolutions proposing to abolish that archaic, dangerous, and undemocratic institution known as the electoral college.

One of the greatest newspapers in the United States, the Dallas Morning News, carried an editorial in its April 5 issue supporting our plan to abolish the electoral college and to divide the electoral vote on the basis of the popular vote. I commend the substance of this editorial to your serious consideration. It follows:

ELECTORAL-VOTE PLAN

There is being advocated by Representative ED GOSSETT, of Wichita Falls, and other Congressmen a constitutional amendment to make the electoral vote of each State proportional to the split in the popular vote. In the last Presidential election, for example, New York's entire 47 electoral votes went to the Democratic Party because it won over the Republicans by a vote of 3,304,238 to 2,987,647 at the polls. Mr. GOSSETT's plan would have divided the electoral vote, 25 to the Democrats and 22 to the Republicans.

On behalf of the plan Mr. GOSSETT advances the very sound argument that the present system makes both political parties the victims of organized pressure groups in the pivotal States. "If you will examine the platforms of both political parties," he says, "you will find that they are designed to catch the votes of these organized minorities. * * * These said minorities are neither fish nor fowl. They are simply up for sale to the highest bidder. Their prices are exceedingly high in terms of public welfare."

It may be asked, Why not adopt an outright popular vote? To this Mr. GOSSETT cites the fact that such a system would throw the voting machinery into Federal control and deprive States of their right to fix voting ages and other standards. Georgia, for example, permits 18-year-olds to vote. Under a popular vote system, either Georgia would be deprived of this right in presidential elections, or it would be forced on other States.

It will be argued by the opponents of the plan—by both those wishing to adhere to the present system and those wishing to adopt the outright popular vote—that Mr. GOSSETT's plan is one best calculated to release the South from its present disadvantage because of the bidding of political parties for the pressure-group vote in the pivotal States and, at the same time, preserve for the South its privilege of maintaining the poll tax provision. There would be truth in that argument. The reply to this is that the Southern States are on sound constitutional grounds, and on sound governmental theory, in wishing to maintain the sovereignty of the States in the matter of suffrage. On the other hand, the present provision for electoral college voting is a gone-to-seed attempt to apply an

original provision which was a many-sided compromise, lacking in any distinct principle.

Mr. GOSSETT's plan for abolishing the electoral college without abolishing the electoral vote and providing that the latter be cast in proportion to popular vote seems in reappraisal a sound middle course for preserving State sovereignty, on the one hand, and, on the other, giving the southern and western States relief from the present political advantage of the pressure groups in the pivotal States.

What Does Labor Really Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a significant contribution to the thinking on labor relations is contained in an article by Hon. J. D. Zellerbach, vice chairman, governing body, International Labor Organization, appearing in the current issue of the American Magazine. Mr. Zellerbach presents the view of an enlightened employer and places heavy reliance on free collective bargaining between management and labor unhampered by repressive labor legislation or the guardianship of employers and employees by the Government. Though I do not agree with Mr. Zellerbach on profit sharing with employees which I favor, I find myself in agreement with so many other points in his article and believe that it will be of such real value to have in the RECORD the salutary point of view of an enlightened employer with personal experience in bargaining with unions, that I am submitting it for the Appendix. It follows:

WHAT DOES LABOR REALLY WANT?

(By J. D. Zellerbach, vice chairman, governing body, International Labor Organization)

One day in Montreal, during a session of the International Labor Organization, I made a casual reference to our American faith in a system of industrial labor relations founded on freedom and mutual fairness. Instantly I was challenged by a delegate from an authoritarian nation—not Russia, by the way. How could I justify praise for our system, he demanded, when, that very day, world headlines were black with news of disastrous strikes in vital American industries?

"We have none of that foolishness in our country," he said proudly.

I asked him to explain his country's system.

"Just as you Americans are suffering from labor conflicts," he said, "so our people suffered after the revolution. Our leaders, realizing something had to be done, called in experts and developed a plan. This plan was given the Army to enforce. Under the plan, industry is told what it may and may not produce, and workers are told what they may and may not do. We have no more strikes, no lock-outs, no arguments. We have the perfect system for industrial peace."

Is that what we want in America? Is that what we are headed toward?

Heaven forbid. But at the same time we certainly do not want a continuance of the disastrous labor conflicts which marked 1946.

Between us and some authoritarian system of domination and restriction stands one factor which can save the day; the intangible but very real thing we call good labor relations. Whatever happens eventually in this country will be dependent largely upon how intelligently and faithfully each one of us, manager and worker alike, administers our responsibility to get along harmoniously with our fellows.

Perhaps your instinct is to say, "Oh, that isn't for me to worry about. Let the big fellows settle it." Unfortunately, it isn't that simple, for good labor relations begin with the individual and directly affect the intimate lives of almost every human being on earth. They affect our pocketbooks and our peace of mind. They are important to those who work, whether in management or labor, because they directly affect our personal welfare, our bread and butter, and the immediate welfare of our families. They are important to those whose income is derived from investments.

They are important to our purchasing power, being responsible to a great degree for high prices or reasonable prices. They are important to our communities, which prosper or hunger with us. They are important to our Nation, causing good times or bad times. They are important to the world, for our affairs have become so interwoven that a strike in St. Louis, United States of America, can cause a famine in Prague, Czechoslovakia. Most of all, perhaps, they are important to America's position among world powers.

One evening in Paris I had dinner with a group of French families. The dining room was bitterly cold; there was no fuel. Throughout devastated Europe, families, down to the smallest child, were scrabbling desperately in the rubble for anything that would make a fire. Yet the newspapers and radio were crackling with word of an impending strike in America which would close down the coal mines and cripple countless other industries.

"How can such a thing be?" one of the French women asked me, wonderingly. "What is wrong with the American system that such a frightful thing could occur in a land where everyone is rich and happy?"

Well, of course, everyone in the United States is neither rich nor happy—except by postwar European standards. But the lady's question touched off a general and extremely serious discussion about different systems of government.

Here were people typical of others all over the world. people whose established ways of life had been ripped apart by the fury of war and who were groping for something, anything, with a reasonable assurance of stability. Before them are two great examples of systems, two ideologies, both calling themselves democracy, both claiming to be the best way of life for the people as a whole. One is the so-called democracy of authoritarianism, under which every function of living is regulated and dominated by a government plan. The other is the democracy we know, the democracy of free people and free enterprise, the American system. Which should they choose?

Whether we like it or not, we are objects of curiosity today in an international goldfish bowl. People everywhere are watching us, studying us, evaluating our system against the other system which calls itself democracy. Our actions, our relations with one another here at home, may throw the balance of sentiment in favor of our system or against it. Thus, how we get along with one another under our system may determine the destiny of many people in many lands and, in the long view, the future of the world. For, more than any other one thing, the great bulk of people all over the world today want a system that will guarantee peace, not only peace among nations, but peace among individuals.

So all this focuses down to the one factor which, properly administered, can bring about industrial peace and give us contentment here at home and a good face before the world—the factor called labor relations. How are we going to attain good labor relations? What's the answer?

Good labor relations are the sum of living and working honestly together for a common cause, our personal welfare. They are the joint responsibility of management and labor, as groups and as individuals. They cannot be written into a union contract, and they most certainly cannot be created by legislation under a system of free enterprise.

The term itself has come into common usage only since 1934. Prior to the National Labor Relations Act, most employers and employees mutually lived labor relations without thinking or talking much about them, and those relations were good or bad depending upon the natures of the individuals involved.

My father was always puzzled when people mentioned labor relations. He didn't know what that meant. It never occurred to him that relations with his workmen could be a problem; they were simply a part of his everyday life. Now the system has changed, but the basic principle is as sound as ever.

The system changed principally, I think, because factories grew so large it was no longer humanly possible for the executive head to know each of his men by name, or for the men to feel free to carry their personal problems to him. So now we have negotiation between groups. This is presumed to be an impersonal system, but it is not impersonal and cannot be impersonal, for the agreements arrived at and the administration of those agreements cannot possibly be stronger than the integrity, the good faith, of the individuals who have to work them out. Human nature is still the keystone by which the entire structure must stand or fall.

Good labor relations are not necessarily created by high wages. When a strike occurs, the first impulse of most people is to say, "I suppose they want more money, or shorter hours." Sometimes, although with increasing rarity, these are the focal points of the dispute. But 9 times out of 10 they are not the underlying causes of dissatisfaction. They are the surface rash rather than the disease itself. Some of the bitterest relations exist in the highest-paid industries.

A good many polls are taken by impartial observers from time to time to determine what workers really want. I think it will surprise you, as it surprised me, to learn that these, in the order given, are the factors which workers listed as most important to themselves:

1. Definite understanding of what is expected of me in my job.
2. Fair and understanding supervision.
3. Assurance that my job will be permanent as long as I do my work satisfactorily.
4. Assurance that I will get advancement if I am qualified when better jobs open up.
5. Assurance that I will be paid as much as conditions permit.

Wages, then, are less important to most workers than understanding, fair treatment, security, and expectation of promotion. Hours of work are even less important than wages. It would be a genius, indeed, who could write those intangibles into a contract or into a law. They explain why labor disputes did not end with enactment of wages-and-hours legislation.

Wages will always be important and must always be adjusted to meet changing conditions. There is no such thing as a stable wage pattern. In that connection, we have heard some talk about a guaranteed annual wage, but the phrase has too many different meanings to be talked about loosely. To some it means the guaranty of so many dollars for a year ahead, whether the employer can sell the product of the workers' time or whether he can't, at a fair price or at any price. In

this sense, all thinking men must agree that it is an entertaining but impractical dream. A prominent union official summed it up recently when he said, "Its basic guaranty by an employer is a fallacy. No employer can guarantee his own solvency."

A good deal of the dissention over wages is rooted in a rather general belief that owners and managers of a business net as much as 60 cents on every dollar of gross sales. That, of course, is a far cry from truth. According to Government reports, the average profit per dollar of sales in American business in 1944 was 3.9 cents; in 1945 it was 3.8 cents. These were so-called good years. The public impression of exorbitant profits probably stems largely from the belief of many businessmen that it is unwise to let employees become familiar with the company's financial status. This policy inevitably breeds distrust, murderous to good labor relations.

Frankness, on the other hand, tends to create a realization among workers that they have a responsibility to keep alive and healthy the goose that lays the golden pay checks. We have no financial secrets from employees in our business. Some of my friends in industry feared the worst when we began to make the company's financial reports available to every workman in the mills and candidly discussed such touchy subjects as the relation of wages to the cost of living. They objected to the idea of mentioning millions of dollars in reserves or distributed to stockholders. "You'll make the men dissatisfied," they argued.

I disagreed with this point of view. "They'll be proud to work for a company that can show financial stability," I said. "It makes for a sense of security." That's how it has worked out. Today every mill hand can know about the company's finances and its plans.

There is an increasing tendency toward this candor in other industries, and it is a promising sign. When factories were smaller every employee understood that the "old man" had to be kept solvent so jobs could continue, and that principle is still basically sound. Nowadays it may be necessary to interpret sometimes involved financial statements, but generally it is well worth while.

Just as management has a responsibility to pay adequate wages, so labor must realize that management has an equal responsibility to pay an adequate return to investors. If the higher cost of living is justification for increased wages, it is also justification for increased profits to pay stockholders and build up reserves. A dollar is worth no more in a dividend check than it is in a pay check.

Today many factory properties are carried on the books at a fraction—one-fourth to one-third—of the amount it would cost to replace them, and this is true of raw materials, machinery, tools, and equipment. Consequently, if a company's future is not to be imperiled, its reserves must be higher to provide replacements at today's high prices, so that jobs may continue. Everyone can understand this, but it is a point too often overlooked in labor negotiations.

In striving to attain the intangible thing we call good labor relations, some well-intentioned employers, particularly during the war years, when we had many unusual employees, leaned so far toward humanitarianism that they developed what is sometimes called the Jehovah complex. These are the employers who showered their workers with baby bonuses, furniture, free rent, and motorcars.

The story is told of one such industrialist who was showing a friend through the model residential district he had built rent-free for his employees. The visitor commented that each home had a petunia garden. The employer explained, "Certainly, I like petunias." Unhappily, not all his employees shared this passion; some of them probably disliked petunias intensely, but had to tolerate them to humor the boss. When the revolt came—because eventually the employer had to refuse a request for still more free things—he saw the recipients of his benevolence throw rocks through the windows of his model factory.

No, labor doesn't want paternalism. Grown men and women don't want to be babied by philanthropists. Most American workers want what they can earn, and they are perfectly willing to do an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. In their private lives they want the free right of self-expression.

Another fairly common wartime device was profit sharing. We heard a good deal about those industrial utopias where every worker was a part owner in the company. The plan seemed to work pretty well while the war was raging and the Government guaranteed both costs and profits. In a few instances it is still working fairly well. In most instances, however, it fell to pieces when profits decreased or disappeared in the face of postwar free competition. One of the great Midwestern concerns which was held up as a model of the profit-sharing system has now been forced to reorganize and return to orthodox methods.

Experience has proved that in times of no profit, the very times when the company desperately needed the utmost degree of effort and cooperation from its employees, the system fell apart. Employees, certainly, should be given a normal opportunity to purchase stock in the employing company, but sound and enduring interest cannot be created by handing them stock gratuitously, perhaps because an individual seldom cherishes anything he gets for nothing.

The most stupid tactic in labor relations is a show of force, whether on the part of management or of labor. Good relations never were established and never can be established by a lock-out or a walk-out. No human being can deal effectively or reasonably or, with a good will, carry out agreements arrived at when there is a gun on the table. Good relations can be established only when problems are approached with reasonableness, frankness, fairness, honesty, objectivity, and a determination on each side to live up to agreements in spirit as well as in letter. Even such a seemingly small thing as the surroundings for a negotiation meeting are important.

At one time, in our industry, we considered our labor negotiations to be a company matter. We found a wider feeling of confidence and broader unity could be created by dealing on a regional industry-wide basis. Now we hold negotiation meetings in a large hall. Each local union and each employer sends its delegates. Negotiation committees for each side are chosen and carry on their discussions before the entire group. A verbatim stenographic report is kept. It is a matter of firm policy that each company is represented by its executive head or a responsible official empowered to make binding decisions then and there. The latter point is vital.

It is astounding, sometimes, to find that some employers feel no sense of personal responsibility for labor negotiations. Not all, fortunately, are so thoughtless as the wartime factory head who wired one of our universities: "Please rush an industrial-relations plan for a concern employing 1,500 people," or another who engaged a labor-relations expert and told him, "From now on this is your worry. Don't bother me with it. If we have any more labor trouble, you're fired."

No one aspect of modern industry is more directly important to the executive head of a company than labor relations. No one would hire a treasurer, a production manager, and a sales manager and tell them, "Go ahead and run your jobs and don't bother me." That business would go to pot in a hurry. No, top management should devote at least as much time and effort to labor relations as to financing, production, and sales—more, as a matter of fact, because it is a newer and less well patterned phase of modern business, and because it is a phase which touches every activity of business.

The employer must realize that labor is people—human beings. Workers cannot be treated impersonally, like so many lumps of coal or bolts of cloth or numbers on a chart. Labor is not a commodity, and an understanding of that fact is the key to harmony between labor and management—the same key which unlocks all human relations. It is forged of frankness, fairness, and honesty. These are factors which cannot be written into labor contracts or enforced by legislation.

All these things are particularly important this year. Today we are facing a grave crisis in industrial relations, a crisis that can have tremendous influence upon our pocketbooks and our entire scheme of living. Thirteen years ago we saw corrective legislation enacted in Washington, prompted at least in part by some pretty indefensible practices on the part of management in some industries. The tenor of this legislation was not only prolabor but antibusiness.

History teaches us that when one group in America becomes too powerful for the general welfare, public opinion is aroused against it and we get corrective legislation. In some cases these laws are emotional and go to extremes. This spring, in Washington, we are facing legislation to correct certain practices on the part of labor. Many of us in management believe such legislation must be moderate and constructive, not emotional or resentful. Equilibrium can no more be gained by a violent push to the right than it was achieved by the extreme push to the left.

It is equally indisputable that most of the past efforts to curb abuses by legislation have proved to be destructive rather than constructive, have led to persecutions rather than to progress. We have just been through a period of persecution of business; we want no persecution of labor. Industrial leadership has gone on record for measures which will cure labor abuses, but without curtailing the power of organized labor to promote and protect the legitimate interests of its members. Organized management is united for patience and justice.

At one time or another in recent years, nearly every American has had a twinge of regret for the good old days. Yet those of us who remember the good old days clearly realize only too well that they were not so good after all. Most of the social-security systems set up in fairly recent years are sound. No thinking employer would dispense with them if he could. Many employers, on the contrary, complain that they do not go far enough, and in many industries retirement and benefit plans have been instituted to supplement them. All these things are manifestations of progressive thinking about labor relations. All of them are based upon a human desire for fair play as the only key to real teamwork.

Top management must realize, as many industrialists already realize, that if industrial leaders neglect their responsibility, if they fail to establish relations which will assure peace and good will, other types of leaders with other objectives will inevitably rise, and the result conceivably could be chaotic. Thus the matter of good labor relations, for management and labor alike, becomes much more personal than altruistic; it becomes a matter of intelligent self-interest, a struggle to retain for all of us the gains already made, and to add to them.

The good old days are not coming back. But by working together in humanness and understanding we can create in America, perhaps this year, good new days which will be far better.

America Must Protect Herself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 7, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following article by Ira E. Bennett which appears in the April number of the National Republic:

AMERICA MUST PROTECT HERSELF
(By Ira E. Bennett)

Events inevitably will demonstrate that President Truman made a mistake when he overstepped the bounds of national self-interest in demanding virtual abandonment of tariff protection.

As world production is restored, Americans determined to protect national defense, including economic defense, cannot but part company with Mr. Truman. The century-old policy of tariff protection is declared by him to be obsolete. But it will be found anything but obsolete when all nations begin to produce again. Champions of protective tariff, including industry and labor, will rally to the colors.

It is unfortunate that a breach must occur among the ranks of Americans, because the attempt of "one worlders" to break down tariff protection will have a tendency to chill the warm desire of the people to do everything reasonable to help the crippled world.

The people have just shown that they will not tolerate further sacrifice of their liberties and interests at the behest of spendthrift enthusiasts who have tried to introduce a new system of government in this country.

The bureaucrats in control of the reciprocal trade agreement program may run to the end of the rope that Congress improvidently gave them. They are to negotiate a fancy world trade agreement at Geneva (unhappy site of many international failures) and they hope to hammer down the tariff rates that protect American industry and labor, all in the name of peace and world happiness.

Protectionists hold that President Truman's speech at Waco audaciously declaring war on American economic protection, will prove in the end to have marked the turning point of the brief period of cooperation between Republicans and Democrats in foreign policy.

Protectionists who have been as generous as other Americans in contributing to world relief are indignant when the President brands them as "isolationists"—that is, Americans who have no sympathy whatever with the woes of other peoples. But under whatever names they may be called, the supporters of the American protective-tariff system intend to remain Americans. They believe that unless the United States is kept sound and wholesome in her economy it is idle to suggest that she can help other nations.

Mr. Truman followed the example of others who have misrepresented the Smoot-Hawley tariff law. He denounced it as one of the major causes of the depression beginning in 1929, a year before it was enacted. It may be impossible to find an impartial critic among Americans, but a visitor from Venus might ask, "If the Smoot-Hawley tariff is so abominable, why did not the New Deal repeal it?"

The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act is still in effect. Why did not Mr. Truman, when a Senator, introduce a bill to repeal it? Why does he now attack it, when he is under oath to execute it?

The answer volunteered by protectionists is that the New Dealers lacked the courage to revise the tariff. They did not dare go up against the workers whose bread and butter in normal times depend upon national defense against foreign pauperism. The New Deal contented itself with abusing the law and inventing ways to destroy labor's protection while pretending to obey the law.

The "reciprocal" trade agreement system insinuated into law by the New Deal is a pious fraud, well known to be such by many of its advocates. It is a fraud that is supported by many well-meaning citizens who do not know its real character. It is intended to bring about free trade as a substitute for protection to American industry and labor. This true intent is disguised under the word "reciprocal."

So far as history shows, every citizen is in favor of true tariff reciprocity. Protectionists have supported it and now favor it. What they oppose is not reciprocity in tariff concessions, but betrayals of protection to American industry and labor in the name of reciprocity.

No one knows the identity of the genius who invented the scheme of siphoning away tariff protection by pretending to promote genuine reciprocity in trade agreements. This inventor, whoever he was, took pains to conceal himself. But he had inspired disciples like Cordell Hull and Henry A. Wallace, who made little or no concealment of their opposition to protection for American labor. Mr. Hull was somewhat cautious, but Mr. Wallace made no secret of his willingness to sacrifice American industry employing many workers. His plea was that any American industry that was not efficient should be slaughtered, to make way for imports from abroad, furnished by industries that were efficient. He contended that the German toy industry, for example, was more efficient than the corresponding American industry, and that, therefore, a tariff rate protecting the American industry should be scrapped. Under Wallace's plan, any American industry unable to compete with a foreign concern paying coolie wages should be killed off. Mr. Truman in his Waco speech adopted the Wallace philosophy.

The inherent fraud in the reciprocal trade agreements, according to protectionists, lies in the fact that when the United States makes an agreement with a certain foreign country, covering certain concessions in tariff rates, it immediately bestows the same concessions to all other countries under the most-favored-nation clause of general treaties. Thus, when the United States gave a concession to a European country on a certain item, it gave the same concession to Japan.

This generalization of tariff concessions is anything but reciprocal. It is not intended to be reciprocal. Its aim and effect are to tear down rates that protect American producers who employ American workers. The net result, so far as it goes, is to open the gates of the United States to any concern that furnishes cheap goods made by coolies, peons, enslaved war prisoners, or other underpaid workers. Logically carried out, the reciprocal-trade agreements would reduce American workers to the wage standards of Japan.

Under the acid test of actual trial, the so-called excessively high duties of the Smoot-Hawley tariff were not high enough to protect American workers against ruinous coolie-labor competition from Japan. Until the late war stopped the business, Japanese goods flooded the American market in spite of the alleged high duties. Several American industries were crippled by this unfair competition, and a few of them perished. If the war had not intervened, public opinion would have demanded higher duties against cheap Japanese goods.

In his Waco manifesto President Truman waved the flag of war-terror. His argument was that trade rivalries breed hatred and encourage war, and that the United States must therefore make sacrifices in the economic field for the sake of promoting world peace. Americans must not be content with paying billions in taxes to be spent for foreign relief. They must also agree to remove the economic shield that protects the American worker against the direct competition of foreign low-wage labor.

Those who take a stalwart stand for protection at home for the sake of keeping America great and strong, with well-paid labor, wholly disagree with Mr. Truman and are preparing to fight him to a finish. Their reasoning runs like this:

There never was and never will be entire accord among nations on trade matters. It is natural that they should be rivals in trade. It is not a rivalry that breeds war. Germany did not make war for trade reasons, nor did Japan. Trade rivalry is merely a self-reliant urge to provide for a nation's defense. A tariff system is like a gate in a nation's walled defenses. Through the gate trade may pass, but always subject to the will of the gatekeepers. If the gate be left unguarded, enemy goods, like real human enemies, will swarm in. Free trade means the tearing down of one of the gates of national defense. What avails the nation's will of defense if one of its gates is left open?

The same gate that bars entry of a flood of cheap goods also bars the entry of swarms of coolies, peons, moujiks, Communists, and other dregs of war. Those who stand for tariff protection are equally opposed to subjecting American workers to unrestricted immigration of aliens.

It is suggested, also, that the United States alone should not make all the concessions in promoting trade among the nations. One of the strongest barriers against unimpeded flow of goods is the system of cartels sponsored and even directed by foreign governments. Indeed, trade is now a government monopoly in many countries, including Great Britain. Yet this fact is not a breeder of war.

Britain borrowed money from the United States and was thereby enabled to buy goods from Argentina. Argentina had a fine balance in her favor. Then Britain tried to induce or compel Argentina to spend this balance (American dollars) in Great Britain. This demand was in flagrant violation of Britain's pledge when she borrowed money from the United States that she would not use the money in any way to discriminate against the United States.

Did this breed war? Not at all. The United States merely called Britain sharply to account and reminded her of her pledge. Britain replied, 'So sorry," and the incident ended, with the United States a little disappointed, but far from indulging in such thoughts of war as Mr. Truman conjured up at Waco.

Hard-pressed countries will resort to many devices to build up trade. Real barriers, such as lack of credit, lack of ships, etc., can be removed without destroying every nation's right to regulate its own commerce. It is not necessary to destroy American high wages and big production in order to promote world trade. Protectionists point to the vastness of the American market, which is still under control of Americans. Within that market the people enjoy a high standard of living and can greatly assist other countries that are in need.

World trade under existing conditions is a glittering generality. American exports will not be greatly expanded under any proposals pending at Geneva, because certain foreign governments are expecting to be supported by the United States by means of money loans, food relief, etc. Why should

they make any concessions to the United States, when they are already obtaining American help free of charge?

A few American industries, such as motion pictures and automobiles, are eager to break down the tariff system that protects other American industries. Is it desirable that American workers should be unprotected against undue and ruinous foreign competition in order to promote the foreign sale of American movies and automobiles? Workers in both of those industries receive high wages, thanks to the system that develops the world's greatest market and holds it for the benefit of Americans. Protectionists hold that to throw away the home market for the sake of trying to win more foreign trade is worse than folly. They say it is taking the way of national bankruptcy and economic suicide, in view of the universal urge by destitute foreign countries to break into the rich pastures where Americans enjoy special advantages conferred by a protective tariff system as a part of the national defense.

Architectural Competition for Design for Federal Memorial to Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, because of the public interest, and in the hope that many a worthy contestant will learn of this great undertaking, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times March 30, 1947, announcing an architectural competition, offering $125,000 in prizes to obtain a design for a $30,000,000 Federal memorial to Thomas Jefferson and the pioneers of the western expansion of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL TO HAIL JEFFERSON, WEST—ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITION WITH PRIZES OF $125,000 MARK PLANS AT ST. LOUIS

ST. LOUIS, March 29.—An architectural competition offering $125,000 in prizes to obtain a design for a $30,000,000 Federal memorial to Thomas Jefferson and the pioneers of the western expansion of the United States was announced here today.

The competition is sponsored by the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Association, a national group of interested citizens, who raised the prize moneys by private subscription.

Site of the memorial is a plot of 80 acres already cleared in the downtown center of the St. Louis river front, an area historic as the funnel of early migration to the West.

The competition is open to architects, construction engineers, and students in both fields. Landscape architects, painters, sculptors, and laymen are invited to take part in the contest by associating themselves with an architect.

COMPETITION TO COVER A YEAR

The competition will be held in two stages and will require about a year to complete. At the end of the first stage next September, five finalists will be named to compete in the second stage. Each of these will receive $10,000.

The author or authors of the final winning design will receive a prize of $40,000 and be recommended to the Department of the Interior for employment in executing the design. A second prize of $20,000 and a third of $10,000, together with two honorarium awards of $2,500, will be made.

It is intended that the memorial area be developed as a place of resort, inspiration, relaxation, and instruction for visitors from all of the world.

Application to enter the contest may be made to George Howe, Old Courthouse, 415 Market Street, St. Louis 2, who is directing the competition as professional adviser to the association. A fellow of the American Institute of Architects, Mr. Howe has made it clear to the sponsors of the contest that collegiate Gothic and collegiate Georgian buildings are not his idea of a memorial.

LOUISIANA PURCHASE RECALLED

The site of the memorial contains the place at which the United States in 1804 took formal possession of western territory acquired from France by the Louisiana Purchase. The area is directly associated with the start of the expedition of Lewis and Clark as well as those of Pike and Fremont. The Santa Fe, Oregon, and California Trails also began here.

Within the memorial area were situated the first theater, the first Episcopal and Unitarian churches, the first post office and the first music publishing establishment west of the Mississippi.

"The purpose of the memorial for which a design is sought in this competition," Mr. Howe said, "is not only to commemorate the past, but also, and especially, to keep alive in the present and in the future the daring and untrammeled spirit that inspired Thomas Jefferson and his aides to offer men of all nations new opportunities under democracy by consummating the Louisiana Purchase."

Nomination of David E. Lilienthal To Be Chairman of Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has been much discussion recently relative to the Lilienthal nomination. I have at last had an opportunity to go through the record of the hearings, and I have prepared a statement on the subject of the nomination which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The statement sets forth my reasons for opposing the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY IN OPPOSITION TO CONFIRMATION OF DAVID LILIENTHAL

Mr. President, I believe that the nomination before us may be the most important single nomination I have yet been called upon to consider during my 8 years in the Senate or that any of my colleagues has voted upon during this period.

I am not a member of the Joint Atomic Investigating Committee, nor have I, unfortunately, because of the pressure of other legislative business, had an opportunity to read through the full transcript of its intensive hearings on this nomination. I have, however, consulted as many sources as I could within the limited time that has been available to me on this subject.

I have approached this subject with an open mind and have not sought to confirm or reject any preconceived notions about this nomination.

ADVICE AND CONSENT FEATURE

I have weighed very carefully "the advice and consent" power of the Senate in connection with Executive nominations in addition to the other relevant factors that must be considered. All of the factors I have reviewed with one paramount question in mind, "Will my consent to this nomination serve the public interest?" At stake is not only the reputation and standing of one man, but the very security of our Nation.

Never before did the full meaning of "advice and consent" impress itself so forcefully upon me. This is no ordinary case where the President gets his man. This is a case where we ask, "Have all of us gotten the right man?" After all, we in the Senate are but servants of the Nation, and it is our obligation to get right men, and make no mistake.

I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to the fact that in section 2 of the Atomic Energy Act, Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, which relates to the establishment of the Commission itself, the Act specifically emphasizes the "advice and consent" of the Senate.

Let us bear in mind, too, that the Atomic Energy Commission is a congressional creature, created by congressional action, to meet congressional requirements.

In other words, it is apparent that the responsibility of Congress with specific reference to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission goes far beyond the normal responsibility which Congress has with reference to appointments which fall more peculiarly within the province of the Chief Executive's family.

UNIQUENESS OF THIS POSITION

It has been stated that the action of the Senate is confined to simply affirming or rejecting the President's nomination. I do not so interpret the significant words "advice and consent" in this case, where the situation presents the issue whether or not a certain man whom the President nominates should be confirmed for this powerful position.

Where the man is a member of his official family is one case. Where it is a question of confirming a man for a judicial position which involves whether he has sufficient qualifications and is of judicial temperament and believes in the American way, this is another situation. But where you have the responsibility, such as we have here, which would place at the head of a new political and economic creature—the Atomic Energy Commission—a creature such as has never before in the history of the world been created, then the responsibility of "advice and consent" is a matter that is of the greatest consideration.

CORESPONSIBILITY OF SENATE AND PRESIDENT

We must remember that the appointment to this position is a coresponsibility of the Executive and the Senate. The President nominates. It is only when the Senate has confirmed, that the appointment is consumated.

The situation which we are facing as Senators is, therefore, something new and virtually unprecedented. I don't think that at least my responsibility has been adequately met if I should find that the nominee has merely some limited qualifications

for the job. This job, because of its importance, calls for the highest degree of judgment on the part of the advising and consenting power in evaluating the nominee.

LEGAL BACKGROUND OF ADVICE AND CONSENT

Mr. President, I hesitate to go into great detail on the subject of advice and consent. But I do believe that a brief statement as to the constitutional and historical background of this matter is called for in connection with this unprecedented nomination.

Therefore, before I list the various reasons why I have taken my position in opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal for this post, I should like to submit to my colleagues a brief historical review on "advice and consent." In so doing I hope to straighten out what I believe to be some misconceptions which have been previously voiced in the Senate.

THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE

Article II, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution of the United States, provides that the President "shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for and which shall be established by law."

This provision was not in the first draft of the Constitution which proposed to give all of the appointing powers, insofar as was not otherwise provided for in the Constitution, exclusively to the President. The same draft, however, gave to the Senate the power to appoint ambassadors and judges of the Supreme Court. The advice and consent of the Senate, and the appointment by the President of ambassadors, ministers, consuls, and judges, was afterwards reported by a committee as an amendment, and was unanimously adopted. (Story, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, fifth ed., vol. II, pp. 351–352.)

This mode of appointment to office seems entitled to peculiar commendation. It is definitely preferable to selection by the President alone, without any check, or by the more cumbersome concurrence of both Houses of Congress, or by the electorate.

The grant of this power to the Senate was strongly opposed by John Adams who engaged in a friendly correspondence with Roger Sherman on this point. In reply to Adams' objections that this power would lessen the responsibility of the President, focus attention of the country on the Senate in executive matters, excite ambition in the Senate, and involve the Senate in strictly partisan matters, Mr. Sherman replied:

"It appears to me that the Senate is the most important branch in the Government, for the aid and support of the executive, for securing the rights of the individual States, the Government of the United States, and the liberties of the people.

"The Executive is not to execute its own will, but the will of the legislature declared by the laws, and the Senate, being a branch of the legislature, will be disposed to accomplish that end; and advise to such appointments as will be most likely to effect it; from their knowledge of the people of the several States they can give the best information (as to) who are qualified for office. And they will, as you justly observe, in some degree lessen his responsibility, yet will he not have as much remaining as he can well support? And may not their advice enable him to make such judicious appointments as to render responsibility less necessary? No person can deserve censure when he acts honestly according to his best discretion." (Pitkin, A Political and Civil History of the United States, 1828, vol. 2, pp. 285–291.)

Alexander Hamilton discussed with care this provision of the Constitution in the Federalist (No. 76). In reply to the question, "To what purpose then require the cooperation of the Senate?" he stated:

"I answer that the necessity of their concurrence would have a powerful, though, in general, a silent operation. It would be an excellent check upon a spirit of favoritism in the President, and would tend greatly to prevent the appointment of unfit characters from State prejudice, from family connection, from personal attachment, or from a view to popularity. In addition to this, it would be an efficacious source of stability in the administration."

In discussing the reason for not placing the exclusive power of appointment in the President, Story points out that such power assuredly would be abused except in the hands of a President of great firmness, integrity, and public spirit. He concludes that the requirement of consent of the Senate was a wise precaution.

Under article II, section 2, clause 2, the President is to nominate, and thereby he has the sole power to make the selection for the office; but his nomination cannot confer office, unless approved by the Senate. (See *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1803), 1 Cranch. 137, and *U. S.* v. *LeBaron* (1857), 19 How. 73.) His responsibility and the Senate's is complete and distinct. He can never be compelled to yield to the Senate's attempt to obtain appointment of a man unfit for office. On the other hand, the Senate may withhold its advice and consent from any candidate who, in its judgment, does not possess due qualifications for office. The consciousness of this check will make the President more circumspect and deliberate in his nominations for office. He will feel that, in case of a disagreement of opinion with the Senate, his principal vindication must depend upon the exceptional character of his nomination. And in the case of a rejection, the most that can be said is, that he had not his first choice. He will still have a wide range of selection; and his responsibility to present another candidate, entirely qualified for office, will be complete and unquestionable (Story, p. 354).

It is not to be expected that the Senate will ordinarily fail to consent to the appointment of a suitable person for office for there will be a responsibility to public opinion for this failure, which will overcome all common private wishes. The greater danger probably lies in a tendency to yield to the wishes of the President rather than to interpose to prevent an unsuitable choice.

All of the foregoing should be especially considered in view of the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

I should like to list now the various factors that I have evaluated and that I am sure my colleagues have evaluated.

Of course, my fellow Senators have undoubtedly seen the poll in the newspapers indicating that this nomination will be confirmed, based upon present vote commitments. This does not for one moment relieve those of us who have not committed our votes to report on our weighing of the pertinent factors in this decision.

What then are the factors?

BASIC QUALIFICATIONS

1. The most important factor is, of course, the basic qualifications of Mr. Lilienthal for the post—technical, administrative, judicial. Rarely have qualifications so diverse been necessary in a nominee for the adequate handling of so vast an enterprise. Pertinent to this question are considerations of the nominee's temperament, his ability to handle people, handle money, handle vital secrets, to cooperate with authorities at all levels of government—national and international.

In this connection, we may note a second factor—the gearing of the nominee's qualifications into his duties.

NATURE OF DUTIES

2. It is obvious to all that the position of Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission is one of the most powerful and critical positions in this Nation today. Yes, in the world in this new atomic age.

Mr. President, on reading Public Law 585 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, "An act for the development and control of atomic energy," we note the unprecedented powers of the five-member Atomic Energy Commission, of which Mr. Lilienthal would be Chairman. The Chairman would have under him the General Manager and Divisions of Research, of Production, of Engineering, and of Military Application. The Commission itself will exercise its powers for the continued research into the vast, unexplored fields of nuclear processes, atomic energy, fissionable and radioactive materials.

The Commission will be the exclusive owner of all facilities for the production of fissionable material other than certain facilities specified in the act. It will have title to all fissionable materials in the United States. It alone will issue licenses for any person to manufacture, produce, or export any equipment or device utilizing fissionable material or atomic energy. It will engage in the production of atomic bombs, atomic-bomb parts, and other military weapons utilizing fissionable materials.

It will own all facilities, equipment, and materials heretofore utilized in Government atomic research. It will handle the dissemination of restricted data on atomic energy in such a manner as to insure the common defense and security. With the consent of the agency concerned, it will utilize or employ the services of the personnel of any Government agency or any State or local government or voluntary or uncompensated personnel to perform such functions as the Commission may deem advisable.

It will determine compensation for any property or interest therein taken or requisitioned pursuant to the act. It will have the power to make application to the appropriate court for enjoining any acts or practices which it regards as constituting a violation of the Atomic Energy Act.

These and many more provisions indicate the unparalleled scope of the chairman's and the Commission's powers.

JUDGMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

3. Ordinarily, I would give very substantial weight to the judgment of any Senate committee which has considered a matter such as this as extensively as has the Atomic Investigating Committee. Its 8-to-1 vote on behalf of the nominee is a matter which must be given due respect by all Members of the Senate. Nevertheless, I do not regard the committee's judgment as final and as automatically binding upon me in this particular case because of the tremendous importance of the new and vital issues involved, and the necessity for each Senator weighing the whole matter in accordance with his own conscience. I repeat, the Senate is a fundamental part of the appointing power. The President nominates, our duty is to advise and consent, and advice and consent never meant so much before.

OBJECTION OF FELLOW SENATOR

4. I do not believe that the objection raised so strongly by my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee, to the effect that the nominee is personally obnoxious to him, is determinative. Certainly this objection has vitality, but on the basis of the available precedents which I have personally had compiled in a Senate Judiciary Committee print, I believe that the objection of obnoxiousness has no determining effect when the nominee is to fill an office which is not exclusively within the objector's jurisdiction.

VIEWS OF PEOPLE

5. Another factor to be considered is the judgment of the American people. One phase of that judgment is expressed in mail from the folks back home. But, unfortunately, a vast proportion of this mail has been of an inspired character with individuals submitting to the Senators, not thoughts which they have arrived at after individual judgment based on evidence, but canned thoughts that they have been directed to present by one pressure group or another. These inspired communications, therefore, must, unfortunately, be considerably discounted.

NOMINEE'S PHILOSOPHY

6. Another and vital factor is the fundamental political philosophy of the nominee. I refer to the philosophy which will characterize his judgment on a multitude of economic, political, and social problems which he will face—a philosophy which will undoubtedly bring him to appoint men with a similar philosophy—men of subordinate position under his jurisdiction; a philosophy that will come to be regarded in large measure by our own people and the peoples of the world as constituting "the American position" and "the American philosophy" (on atomic energy) in this critical age.

Those are some of the factors which I have sought to bear in mind, judging them on their own merits and character and then together into a complex whole.

Hearsay evidence, rumors and gossip, attempts to smear the nominee, or to paint him as an angel, must all be discounted.

MY CONCLUSION

After weighing all of the above factors in the public interest, it is my judgment that the paramount welfare of the American people requires that I cast my vote in opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

MY REASONS FOR OPPOSING THE CONFIRMATION OF DAVID LILIENTHAL

The following are my reasons for opposing the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal:

1. Lack of public confidence in him

Mr. Lilienthal definitely does not enjoy the respect and confidence of the overwhelming proportion of the American people. Yet the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission must enjoy such almost unanimous respect and confidence as the people had, for example, in Mr. Baruch, if the Chairman is to serve effectively in promoting world peace and an expanding industrial economy in our country. But in the case of Mr. Lilienthal, we see at every hand nothing but bitterness, division of opinion, and dissension, regarding his nomination—qualities which cannot help but destroy his effectiveness if he were confirmed.

2. His dissension-creating quality

It is apparent that Mr. Lilienthal himself is in part responsible for much of the ill feeling against him. However capable an administrator he may be, the position of Chairman of the Commission requires more than ability as an administrator; it requires the ability to harmonize conflicting interests, to bring men together rather than to further separate them. Mr. Lilienthal has in the past, according to all impartial observers, needlessly created enemies and obstacles through his high-handed, czaristic treatment.

This quality in him could not help but split the country wide open on countless atomic issues in the future. Already the Nation is severely split over his nomination. There must be unity on this matter rather than division. Surely, in this land of one hundred and forty millions, there are capable men who could fill this post and do not have the cloud of suspicion and distrust over them that Mr. Lilienthal has.

3. He is not an indispensable man

Proponents of Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation have indicated that catastrophe will ensue unless Mr. Lilienthal is confirmed. I cannot believe that anything of the sort will occur. On the contrary, I believe that Mr. Lilienthal can very well be dispensed with and that he should be replaced by a man of Mr. Baruch's caliber, who enjoys the unlimited confidence and respect of the American people and who could be a scientist and engineer. There is grave doubt in the minds of the American people that a man can fill this job simply because he has demonstrated administrative qualities in TVA without being a scientist and an engineer.

Mr. Lilienthal is but one in a long line of New Deal prodigies of whom it has been stated that they and they alone can perform given jobs. I cannot go along with that view. No man is indispensable for any particular job, even though he has been in charge of a vast New Deal superstate like TVA.

4. Socialistic philosophy

Mr. Lilienthal is hardly an unequivocal believer in our system of private enterprise. This is evidenced by his socialistic-public-ownership position on TVA and related projects. While there are certain features of the Atomic Energy Act which provide for public ownership, nevertheless it is the purpose of the Congress that there can be maximum atomic development along the lines of private enterprise consistent with our national security and economic health.

In the declaration of policy of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States that subject at all times to the paramount objective of assuring the common defense and security—

"The development and utilization of atomic energy shall, insofar as practicable, be directed toward improving the public welfare, increasing the standard of living, strengthening free competition in private enterprise, and promoting world peace."

The question now before Congress is whether or not Mr. Lilienthal has the kind of a philosophy which will enable him to "strengthen free competition in private enterprise." The question before Congress is whether or not Mr. Lilienthal's background, experience and philosophy, are such as to enable him to do a more effective job than anyone else in promoting world peace insofar as it is tied up with atomic energy.

I submit that there is nothing in the record which demonstrates that the nominee's experience renders him a particularly able proponent of strengthening free competition in private enterprise. I submit, likewise, that the record discloses at least a reasonable doubt with respect to establishing Mr. Lilienthal's qualifications as the man best able to promote world peace.

Opposition to Private Research

Following the declaration of policy in the Atomic Energy Act is a statement outlining the purpose of the act, and the purpose of the act, among other things, is to "foster private research and development to encourage maximum scientific progress."

I submit, Mr. President, that there is nothing in the record which particularly demonstrates the adherence of this nominee to a philosophy of private enterprise or private research, and it is, in fact, conceivable on the basis of the record that his predilection for government enterprise and government initiative might conceivably lead him to place an emphasis on government research to the possible detriment of the private research specifically mentioned in the act.

In the organization provisions of the act it is apparent that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission should be peculiarly well qualified as an administrator to work with the military liaison committee, and to direct research, and to direct the protection of fissionable materials, and to direct the utilization, both private and military, of atomic energy. It is moreover apparent that the Chairman of the Commission must be a man keenly conscious of the implications inherent in any international arrangements which might be concluded with reference to atomic energy.

With respect to patents and inventions, it is crystal-clear that the Chairman of the Commission must be a man whose concern with the public welfare is integrated with his concern for the maintenance of a system which adequately protects the interests of American free enterprise.

Confirmation Means Impetus to Collectivism

I do not believe that we can entrust Mr. Lilienthal with the responsibility of encouraging private initiative. On the contrary, I believe that in confirming him we will be giving immeasurable impetus to forces of collectivism in our country and throughout the world. In confirming Mr. Lilienthal we are also in effect establishing the policy for appointments of collectivist-minded individuals all the way down the line who will serve under him. This must not occur; from the topmost level down to the bottom the Atomic Energy Commission should be staffed by men who believe in the private-enterprise system basically.

5. His lack of resistance to communism

The charge of communism has been leveled against Mr. Lilienthal, but I am not stating that Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist or is a sympathizer of communism. I am, however, stating that his record displays little, if any, evidence of resistance to communism. Yet we need to build up in America a resistance movement against communism consisting of individuals who are so devoted to our constitutional system and to our free enterprise system that they will not be susceptible to the wiles of communism, but will combat it with all the force at their command at every turn of the road. We know that countless folks in our land have been impacted and poisoned by the virus of Communists, and that they would not give resistance to the sabotaging of our free way of life.

6. Lack of bipartisanship in his appointment

As a result of the November election, the President should have given this very important nomination to a man who enjoyed the respect and confidence of both political parties, and who had been endorsed by both parties prior to submittal to the Senate. Instead, as in almost all of his appointments since November, the President has unfortunately selected a man who in no way represents the feelings of the American Republican electorate. I am not concerned about Mr. Lilienthal's party label, whatever it may be. I am concerned with the fact that he doesn't represent the views of the vast proportion of the electorate.

It is with these reasons in mind—the reasons of the public interest—that I will cast my vote in opposition to his confirmation.

We Must Conquer Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a statement

which I gave to the newspapers a few days ago entitled "We Must Conquer Fear."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The newspapers and the radio are filled with direful prophecies of gloom and the American people are led to believe that the whole future is so dark that it is unfathomable and there is not even a ray of hope. I do not discount the troubled condition of the world and the many problems with which we are confronted in America, and yet I am reminded that we have had similar experiences before and somehow our country and the world have survived. I have confidence to believe that we will survive again and after a few years, when adjustments have been made, our economic situation fully reconverted and our international affairs organized upon a stable basis, with the United Nations organization prepared and equipped to deal with world problems, and functioning in the sphere of world affairs, with both authority to settle difficulty and power to enforce its decrees, we shall marvel that our spirits were so low and our apprehensions of fear so dominant.

America today needs above other things to conquer fear. The late President Roosevelt never said a truer thing than that fear itself was the one thing which we had most to fear. That is definitely true today in our domestic and international affairs. There may not be a wide distinction between courage and fear, but there is enough difference to make victory possible. A great minister said that the difference was that "courage was fear after it had said its prayers." Anyway, my thought is that if we review the present condition and look the facts straight in the face there is no occasion for gloom to settle over the domestic front, and those who are predicting a depression are doing more to create it than any of the facts of our present situation.

A depression arises from the reduced purchasing power of the people, from the inability of the farm and factory to sell their products at a profit, from the slackening of business resulting in unemployment, so that vast numbers of people are out of a job, and hence without means of support. None of these elements are present today, and yet the effort is continuous to create in the public mind fear of what is going to happen tomorrow. The attitude of fear and distrust becomes at once the most disturbing elements and not the facts of business, industry, agriculture, or labor.

The total earning power of the people of the United States for the year 1946 exceeded $168,000,000,000. The earnings for 1947 will approximate and may exceed that sum. In the deep-depression year the total earnings amounted to only $44,000,000,000. As long as the earnings continue high there is a sound market for everything produced on the farm and by industry and full employment for labor at reasonable wages.

In the four depression years of 1929 to 1933, there were over 5,000 bank failures in the United States and the banks had no money to lend for business expansion or new industries or agricultural improvements to create jobs for the American people. There has not been a single bank failure in the United States during the past 3 years and the bank had on deposit the vast sum of $166,000,000,000 the first of the year.

The people of the United States now own over $260,000,000,000 of Government bonds and the interest is paid semi-annually and an installment paid on the bonds each year which will provide a constantly increasing reservoir of funds for purchasing goods, making investments, building new homes and otherwise contributing to the general maintenance of prosperity, in our country.

The first of this year there was in force $158,000,000,000 of life insurance on the lives of the people of the United States, larger by $39,000,000,000 than it was even 6 years ago. A tremendous sum is paid to beneficiaries each year in death benefits, endowments or annuities, all of which adds to the available cash in the hands of the people to meet the demands of living and investments.

As a basis for predicting a depression following this war is the statement that we have had depressions following the other wars, and that since this was the greatest war of all time, we ought to have the greatest depression in our history. There is no justification for such a conclusion. Conditions are entirely different. The figures already cited demonstrate that. Another factor which enters into the whole situation has not been considered, which is that every State in the Union now has millions of dollars in its social security fund for the very purpose of tiding us over any period of slackening employment. The workers when unemployed will receive weekly payments from this accumulated fund which will aid in making ther self-sustaining even during a period of unemployment. When you add to this the old-age assistance, retirement and insurance benefits, you have another backlog of support against a serious depression.

I have gone into these matters in some detail because I think it is vitally important that we look ahead with confidence and hope, based upon the actual facts of our economic condition, rather than taking counsel of our fears and helping to create an atmosphere and attitude favorable to the development of a depression.

As an indication of the disposition to engage in gloomy predictions and dire prophecies of ruin, I need only quote a few in past years. These relate both to the condition of our own country and to the whole international situation. William Wilberforce said in 1790: "I dare not marry; the future is so dark." William Pitt in 1800: "There is scarcely anything around us but ruin and despair." Benjamin Disraeli in 1850: "In industry, commerce, and agriculture, there is no hope." In 1837 the Detroit Free Press: "All is darkness and despair. As a Nation we are at the bottom of the hill." In 1837 the Philadelphia Gazette: "Nothing in this country is safe, solvent, or reliable." And as late as 1907 the Wall Street Journal said: "The old ship of state is sinking." Many more quotations could be given to similar effect. However, it remained for Harper's Weekly, under date of October 10, 1857, to paint this picture:

"It is a gloomy moment in history. Not for many years—not in the lifetime of most men who read this paper—has there been so much grave and deep apprehension; never has the future seemed so incalculable as at this time. In France the political caldron seethes and bubbles with uncertainty; Russia hangs as usual, like a cloud, dark and silent, upon the horizon of Europe; while all the energies, resources, and influences of the British Empire are sorely tried and are yet to be tried more sorely, in coping with the vast and deadly Indian insurrection and with the disturbed relations in China. It is a solemn moment and no man can feel an indifference—which, happily, no man pretends to feel—in the final issue of these dark and disastrous events. Of our own troubles in the United States, no man can see the end."

How like so many speeches, editorials, and radio comments today. But 90 years have intervened since that was written and America today is the greatest and most powerful Nation in the world, and we have in this country 140,000,000 people who are in better financial condition and have more of the material benefits and comforts of life and with a higher standard of living than at any other period of our history.

We are going forward in our efforts to bring to the world the realization of its age-old dream of universal peace, and if we will cease talking war, and desist from trying to create a depression, we shall have a good chance of achieving our great goals of prosperity and peace at home and abroad.

I plead for that courage that will conquer fear.

Popular Election of President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials on the subject of popular election of President.

There being no objection, the two editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fall River (Mass.) Herald-News of March 24, 1947]

ELECTING A PRESIDENT

The controversy over a change in the Federal Constitution that would abolish the electoral college and provide for the election of a President and Vice President by direct popular vote is being revived. Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, is the sponsor of a resolution in Congress that calls for the change. The present procedure in elections, whereby votes are cast for members of the electoral body, rather than directly for the candidates for the high offices, has been so frequently explained that it is generally understood. Also understood is the possibility that, through State unit voting in the electoral college, candidates who have actually received a minority of the popular vote may be declared elected over others who have shown greater strength at the polls.

It is pointed out in support of the change that such a situation has already arisen in three instances in the history of the country and is likely to arise in any sharply contested election. In such an outcome, it is argued, the rule of the majority, as a fundamental principle in a democracy, is defeated. The intent of the framers of the Constitution in approving the electoral college was to give the sparsely settled States a better representation in the election of the President in relation to the political strength of the big centers of population. Previous attempts to introduce a change have ended in debate. The new movement to bring it about will test the present trend of popular sentiment regarding it.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette of March 26, 1947]

POPULAR VOTE FOR PRESIDENT

News that Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE has reintroduced in Washington a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to do away with the electoral college and provide for election of President and Vice President by popular vote brings up all the old arguments against the present, outdated system.

Briefly, LODGE doesn't like "the obsolete electoral college" that "makes possible the election of a man as President who has not received a majority or plurality of the popular vote." He introduced his measure in Congress back in 1941, was called into the service, and now is stumping for it again.

We think a poll of the American people would reveal that a large percentage of them are all but unaware their direct votes don't

elect the President, that if they were acquainted in detail with the present system they would favor the Lodge proposal.

The general and typically American impatience with the Georgia electoral system, that gave the late Gene Talmadge victory over an opponent who collected some 16,000 more popular votes, suggests what the attitude might be.

Indeed, what LODGE dislikes has happened more than once in United States history. Lincoln was chosen President in 1860 with 1,866,452 votes, while his opponents polled 2,815,617. Hayes and Benjamin Harrison did not receive even a popular plurality, standing lower in the scale than their principal rivals.

Historians have written for decades that the electoral college system has never been what it was intended to be by its originators, a council of the country's ablest men, exercising an independent choice of a Chief Executive.

With the rise of political parties and machines the dignified system envisioned by the original planners has gone out the window. In fact, some critics of the present system term the electors mere dummies who vote for the candidate of their party for President, the candidate nominated by a party caucus or convention, wholly outside constitutional provisions.

Opponents of the popular-vote method claim anything but the electoral college system would be too slow, too cumbersome for the United States, that the total popular vote may take months to count. But present-day communications, it seems to us, rule out any such delay. In many countries outside the United States the popular vote is tabulated in a matter of days with less efficient machinery than we possess. A count of all but negligible segments of the popular vote is sometimes necessary even under the present system.

Now that LODGE has brought the measure up again, it should be given wide publicity, placed before the voters so they can judge for themselves which system they want. Pure democracy exists nowhere in the world, is not possible among more than a handful of people, but in a country that lives by the closest thing to true democracy in the world today, the popular vote would seem to be a prerequisite to conscientious government.

War or Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will It Be War or Peace?" published in the Camden (N. J.) News of March 13, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL IT BE WAR OR PEACE?

(By Al Rose)

Will events in Europe lead to war or peace? At Moscow a most important conference is being held by foreign ministers of the four great powers in the world. In Washington President Truman has just asked Congress for $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey. In China there is civil war. There is unrest in many areas. History is repeating itself and there are many similarities between present events and those leading up to World Wars I and II. Whether you want to believe it or not, the United States is facing its mos critical period in all its history. That includes the perilous days immediately after the Jap sneak attack on Pearl Harbor when few Americans realized how badly we were hurt. Now after the war is over and all the facts have been published, Americans now realize that we had no Pacific Fleet and little defense the first few months after that attack. But we rallied quickly.

Today most Americans are more interested in getting a new automobile or more sugar than in world affairs. The News wants to wake you up about the dangerous situation and the nearness we are to war again. Forget a little about your personal pleasures and wants and think about your country and its future. Without a safe Nation, all the autos, all the sugar, and all the worldly goods won't help you much. It will be too late then. Americans always are too prone to wait until the fight starts to get worked up. This time let us stop the fight before it starts. How? That is the problem. Start thinking about the President's plea. Greece today is the Manchuria before World War II. Turkey is almost as bad as the Ethiopian situation, and China today is the Spain of pre-World War II days.

Whether you like it or not, Russia is crowding the United States hard. The Reds are playing their cards close to the vest, and they have a huge standing army, lots of tanks, and the world's largest air force. That armed force is trained to the minute. The Soviet has not demobilized. It has armed men stationed all over its domain and on borders ready to spring into action, be it Greece or China or Turkey.

America must give aid to Greece and Turkey now. But we must have some strings attached to it. We must not be the tail to the British kite any longer. The British Empire is no more. Great Britain is great in name only. It is bankrupt and has become a second-rate power. World War II was the finishing blow to this once mighty Nation. Whenever a country as haughty and as proud as Britain comes to the United States or any other nation begging, you know it must be in dire straits. It has done that. The British have informed this Government that it cannot meet its financial commitments any more. It is broke. It took a lot of courage for the British to do that. We do not admire everything the British do. They have gotten under our skin a lot, but one thing we do know, the British have saved our hides many times by playing world policeman and patrolling the sea lanes. Now the British are done. They cannot protect us any more. It is either the United States or the Russians. We are the only two great powers left. France is a weakling. China is beset by civil strife. We have no other allies save the staunch South American friends, but they look to us and they have no large armies or navies. Therefore, it is the United States on one hand against a Russian-controlled Europe and China, unless we step in now and try to save the pieces.

Secretary Marshall is the best man for the job now but he can't bluff forever. The Reds know the condition of our armed forces. He can stall and he can talk tough but he must have something to back him up.

We must step into Greece and aid that gallant nation to save itself from the Reds and also the old imperialistic British plan. We must help the Turks stave off the Red thrust at the Dardanelles and our vital oil pipe lines. Oil is the key to all wars and also the key to peace.

Camden and Ouachita County people, the News asks you to start thinking about this problem. Then do a lot of praying about it. Ask God for divine help and guidance. Pray for this country now. Our leaders need help and need it badly. Write your Congressmen and Senators and let them know you are thinking about this crisis. If we go into Greece and help Turkey, we are in there for keeps. It may stop a war. It may not. But we can't sit back and let the Russians gobble up everything, for that means war most certainly and then it will be the United States alone against most of Europe and Asia.

Think this over and do not let the myth of peace blind you to the cruel facts that are staring us in the face.

Will it be war or peace?

Implications of Grecian-Turkish Loan Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from Statewide, Idaho's illustrated news weekly, on the subject of the proposal for military involvement in Greece and Turkey.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE—IT'S MONOTONOUS

Congress received its toughest postwar problem last week—perhaps one of the toughest in American history—when President Truman proposed a half-billion-dollar grant to arm Greek and Turkish troops for the purpose of blocking Communist expansion in the Mediterranean.

The amount of money involved, although a large sum, is in no way as important as whether approval of the Truman proposal would speed the United States down the road to World War III. All signs indicate that it would.

The proposal, which amounts to establishment of an American army of mercenaries in Greece and Turkey, is certainly not a gesture for continued peace. It would not stop Russian expansion. Rather, it would goad it on to greater efforts. The reaction of Russians to the idea can be judged by what ours would be if Russia were to spend a half billion dollars building Communist armies in Canada and Mexico.

At the same time, Truman's proposal works at cross purposes to our Nation's avowed support of the United Nations organization. If the security of Turkey and Greece is being threatened by Russia, now is the time to test the strength and machinery of UN. That was the purpose for which it was established. If our country turns to the old system of secret diplomacy, which is the basis of the Truman proposal, and rejects the UN as a vehicle for peace, then we are guilty of scuttling that organization in its infancy, just as we were guilty of killing the League of Nations at birth.

The President's request for funds for Greek and Turkish armies is an open declaration that the United States believes that the UN won't work. And it certainly won't unless member countries have faith and a desire to see the objectives accomplished. Congress should reject the proposal and urge the President to take the matter before the United Nations organization.

Robert E. Lee, the American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Fred P. Myers, commander in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, in Statuary Hall of the United States Capitol, upon the occasion of the celebration of the one-hundred-and-fortieth anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee. The celebration was held under the auspices of the United Daughters of the Confederacy on January 18, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is interesting, fitting, and inspiring to us of the Southland, and especially to us of Virginia, to meet each year in this place, at different times, to honor the memory of the two great American patriots whose statues are placed in this Hall of Fame by the proud State which gave them birth. Each in his day led his State in a war for independence—one for our common country, the other for a particular part of that country. Both are honored of all men for the rectitude of their purpose and for their heroic struggle in striving for its accomplishment. One achieved victory; the other suffered defeat, but both now stand in the Hall of Fame of the National Capitol as the first citizens of their native State, and foremost among the Nation's great.

Thus Robert E. Lee and George Washington stood on the same ground at different times, both were faced by the same alternative, and both followed the same difficult course in different circumstances.

First, they had substantially the same background of culture and held similar views of their vested rights.

Second, both reluctantly broke sacred ties in obedience to a stern sense of duty.

Third, both did the brave and daring thing in manfully espousing a cause for the right as they saw it in the face of superior might.

Fourth, both stood on the bold assertion of their ancient and sacred rights for the principle of local self-government in local affairs as a part of their common heritage.

Fifth, both contributed to the understanding and stability of the constitutional system under which each lived.

Sixth, both brought world-wide renown to American arms and character to American soldiery.

No man is glorified and memorialized for the mere unmitigated fact of being a fighter. But we honor a soldier when he is more than a soldier and exhibits those heroic and self-sacrificing qualities that appeal to the best in human nature in manfully contending for a cause in which he is willing to die. For no man is fit for leadership in any cause unless he is willing to die in that cause.

From his ancestry, Lee rather naturally drifted to the profession of arms, although in his later years in a letter to General Ewell, he seemed almost to regret it. His traditions of soldiery were those of knighthood and chivalry, and to them he brought the stern righteousness of the Puritan and the militant spirit of the Ironsides of Cromwell.

As a cadet at West Point Lee unconsciously and unintentionally gravitated into a position of leadership with the highest admiration and respect of his fellow cadets. Col. John Macomb, of the United States Army, said that when he entered West Point in 1828 he found Lee the prominent figure of the cadet corps of that time. Like Washington in his day, he was spontaneously chosen to settle disputes between his fellows. Although the practice was then rife, the cadets did not attempt to haze Lee. He graduated second in his class without a single demerit.

In recognition of his promise as a soldier and his character as a man, Gen. Winfield Scott appointed Lee as Chief of Engineers on his staff. That confidence was more than justified by Lee's distinguished service in the Mexican War, in which his insight made possible the two victories that insured the success of the major objective of the campaign against the capital of the enemy country. Later when the darkening clouds of war were settling over our land, and the approaching crisis called for the most momentous decisions, General Scott was so well impressed with Lee that he influenced President Lincoln to offer him the chief command of the National Army. He said: "Col. Robert E. Lee is the greatest soldier now living, and if he ever gets the opportunity, he will prove himself the great captain of history." Another time he said that Lee's services were "worth millions a day to any government." When the offer of appointment by President Lincoln was rejected by Lee and his resignation seemed imminent, General Scott passionately cried, "For God's sake don't resign, Lee." The calm but resolute reply was, "I am compelled to; I cannot consult my feelings in this matter." Much as Lee dreaded and regretted the apparent necessity for secession, he did what he considered his highest duty, followed the allegiance to the highest sovereignty in his native State in the almost universally recognized right of secession. According to John Drinkwater, it was no longer a matter of wisdom. The die was cast and the time had come for action regardless of consequences. His rightful duty was his only consideration.

Although Lee had said: "I can anticipate no greater calamity for the country than the dissolution of the Union * * * still a Union that can be maintained only with swords and bayonets, and in which strife and civil war are to take the place of brotherly love and kindness, has no charms for me. If the Union is dissolved and the Government dispersed, I shall return to my native State and share the miseries of my people and, save in defense, will draw my sword no more." Upon accepting appointment to command of the Virginia forces, he said: "I would much have preferred had your choice fallen upon an abler man. Trusting in Almighty God, and approving conscience, and the aid of my fellow citizens, I devote myself to the service of my native State, in whose defense alone will I ever draw my sword."

Lee fought not as an aggressor against the Union, but in defense of his native State and her confederates of like belief on behalf of what he considered their sovereign rights to determine for themselves their ultimate allegiance, and to be protected in that position. He did not believe in the system of slavery, and that was not the cause for which he fought; he did believe in the ultimate and sovereign right of self-determination of the State. That was the right which he sought to defend. He opposed secession, not on the question of right, but of expediency, and regretted the apparent necessity for its exercise. But as a soldier, and a loyal citizen to what he believed his highest sovereignty, he subordinated himself and his fortune to the majority of his fellow citizens, in the conviction that only those who can first obey, can be trusted with leadership or command.

The record of General Lee is too well known to be here recounted, for it has become a proud chapter in American character and American arms. He far exceeded the opinion of General Scott. Maj. Gen. Sir Frederick Barton Maurice, Director of Military Operations, Imperial General Staff, professor of military studies in the University of London, and author of "Robert E. Lee, the Soldier," and other works said: "As a general, Lee's chief characteristics were his rapid grasp of the possibilities of a military situation, his skillful use of interior lines of communication, capacity for guessing what was in the minds of his opponents, and for his understanding of their weaknesses. Few commanders have excelled him in the power of arousing devotion in his men. * * * Beyond and above all this, Lee's great contribution to the art of war was his understanding of the part field defenses could play in aiding maneuver. In this he was years ahead of his time, and it was not until the beginning of the twentieth century that his methods were fully understood and applied in the military world. His high character, his moral courage, his noble nature, and his mastery of the art of war, make Robert E. Lee a notable figure in the pages of history."

The campaigns of Lee and those conceived and directed by him, as the Valley campaign and others, have been the objects of intensive and profitable study for many years on both sides of the Atlantic.

But Lee in defeat was even more impressive than Lee in victory. It is in misfortune that the character of the truly great and upright man appears most impressive in bold relief against the somber background of the situation in which he is placed, and when all else fails, he stands in undisturbed calm upon his integrity and his character. That was his last impregnable fortress.

Surrounded by the tattered remnants of that proud array with which he had dealt the Union Army many a crushing blow, amid the devastation of his native State, in the shadow of defeat and the despair of what many then called a lost cause, the character of Lee stood out in lonely grandeur and with a dignity that only the great and noble could maintain. Without bitterness, in humility of spirit, with a name more glorious in misfortune, and with an unimpaired faith in the ultimate rightness of things, he accepted the verdict of the sword and devoted his interests and energies to the arduous work of recovery, reconstruction, and peace. As president of a then small college which he made famous and upon which he left the indelible stamp of his character, and to which posterity has added his immortal name, he became a beacon of hope and an inspiration to the youth of his land to call their faces from the sad beauty and departing visions of the afterglow of the sunken Confederacy to the hopeful dawn of a new South of proud and sacred memories.

Lee courageously chose to abide by the results of the war and refused to desert his State in her deep distress. Although urged by many, both North and South to do so, he refused to apply for a pardon from the Federal Government while threats of prosecution were pending, and died technically a paroled prisoner of war. He resolved to face what he may as a man who had followed the guidance of an approving conscience and a clear sense of duty, regardless of consequences. By invitation, he appeared before a committee of Congress and, in response to questions, expressed the opinion that the results of the war were accepted in good faith by the southern people, and that he knew of nothing to the contrary.

Lee's attitude of resignation to the inevitable and his calm acceptance of defeat is in the following words expressed to a chaplain at Washington and Lee University: "Yes, it is all very sad, and might be a cause of self-reproach, but we are conscious that we have humbly tried to do our duty. We may, therefore, with calm satisfaction trust in God and leave results to Him."

To Matthew F. Maury, Lee wrote: "As long as virtue was dominant in the Republic, so long was the happiness of the people secure. I cannot despair of it yet. I look forward to better days, and trust that time and experience, the great teachers of men, under the guidance of an ever-merciful God, may save us from destruction, and restore to us the bright hopes and prospects of the past. The thought of abandoning the country and all that must be lost in it is abhorrent to my feelings, and I prefer to struggle for its restoration and share its fate, rather than give all as lost. * * * I still look with delight upon the mountains of my native State. Virginia has need for all of her sons, and can ill afford to spare you." In similar vein he wrote to General Beauregard, as follows: "I am glad to see no indication in your letter of an intention to leave the country. I think the South requires the aid of her sons now more than at any period of her history. As you ask my purpose, I will state that I have no thought of abandoning her unless compelled to do so."

Lee brought character to soldiery and dignified its profession with his magnanimous example. We honor him as a soldier, but more as a gentleman, who could fight without being embittered by war. Throughout the tragic days of war and the vindictive times of the reconstruction period, he remained the unshaken Christian, uncontaminated by the ugly spirit of the time. He referred to his opponents as enemies only in a military sense, and usually as "those people." It is, perhaps, fortunate that Lee was a soldier, for he demonstrated what manner of man a soldier can and should be even in the grim business of his profession. As the mountain peak appears in the sunlight of heaven above the tempests and mists of the valley below, so the magnanimous character of Robert E. Lee towers far above the turbulent hysteria of the unhappy days of his later life. That character alone did much to disarm hostility toward the South during that time which a northern historian recently referred to as "the crime of reconstruction."

The attitude and the influence of Lee in those troublous times of reconstruction appears in a reply to an overzealous minister of the Gospel in a bitter denunciation of their late enemies. Lee said: "Doctor, there is a good book which I read and you preach from, which says, 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you' * * * I have fought against the people of the North because I believed they were seeking to wrest from the South dearest rights. But I have never cherished toward them bitter or vindictive feelings, and I have never seen the day when I did not pray for them." In his letter conditionally accepting the presidency of Washington College, now Washington and Lee University, Lee said: "I think it the duty of every citizen, in the present condition of the country, to do all in his power to aid the restoration of peace and harmony, and in no way to oppose the policy of the State or General Government directed to that object. It is particularly incumbent upon those charged with the instruction of the young to set them an example of submission to authority." To the then former Governor Letcher he wrote: "The interests of the State are therefore the same as those of the United States * * * All should unite in honest efforts to obliterate the effects of war and to restore the blessings of peace."

In announcing the acceptance of General Lee as president of (then) Washington College, the minutes of the board of trustees of September 1, 1865, contains the following paragraph: "In dedicating his future life to the holy work of educating the youth of his country, General Lee presents a new and interesting phase of his grand and heroic character—a character than which no more perfect model exists among living men. 'Tis a solid fabric and will well support the laurels that adorn it.' Let the young men of the country, North as well as South, be wise, and profit not less by his precepts than by his great example."

The Americanism and the good citizenship of General Lee stand out in shining emphasis amid the turmoil of his day. To the bitter comments of a southern lady on the troublous times, he replied: "Madam, don't bring up your sons to detest the United States Government. Recollect that we form one country now. Abandon all those local animosities and make your sons Americans." When there developed a widespread and persistent sentiment to elect him Governor of Virginia, General Lee said in a letter to his chief sponsor: "I believe it (election) would be used by the dominant party to excite hostility toward the State, and to injure the people in the eyes of the country; and I therefore cannot consent to become the instrument of bringing distress upon those whose prosperity and happiness are so dear to me. If my disfranchisement and privation of civil rights would secure to the citizens of the State the enjoyment of civil liberty and equal rights under the Constitution, I would gladly accept their deprivation in their stead." In another letter to Senator Cabell on the same subject, he said: "I believe my election would be injurious to Virginia, and I cannot therefore consent to become a candidate."

The magnanimous private character of General Lee in all his contacts as a commander, as president of a college, and as a man can be understood by the secret code that was only after his death found among his private papers. It is as follows: "The forbearing use of power is not only a touchstone, but the manner in which an individual enjoys certain advantages over others is a test of a true gentleman. The power which the strong have over the weak, the employer over the employed, the educated over the unlettered, the experienced over the confiding, even the clever over the silly—the forbearing or inoffensive use of all this power or authority, or a total abstinence from it when the case admits it, will show the gentleman in a plain light. The gentleman does not needlessly and unnecessarily remind an offender of a wrong he may have committed against him. He can not only forgive, he can forget; he strives for that nobleness of self and mildness of character which imparts sufficient strength to let the past be but the past. A true man of honor feels humbled himself when he cannot help humbling others."

So far as one person can understand the religion of another, it appears that the religion of Robert E. Lee was that of a gentleman rather than that of theology. Although in his early life he was under the Christian influence of a sainted mother and Bishop Meade, he revolted from some of the sometimes violent and intolerant expressions of the church of his day, and did not present himself for confirmation until he had reached the age of 45 years. He loved the influence and the service of his church and carried with him the Book of Common Prayer as a constant companion and a sacred treasure. He was a Christian gentleman, not by virtue of a creed, but by the spirit of good will, brotherly love and a just consideration of others. His was the soul of kindness as the first impulse of a kind heart. Courtesy and his courtly manners were not matters of mere form, but the natural expression of his attitude toward others, and his dignity was an expression of his self-mastery and self-respect. His momentous decisions were the expression of a stern sense of duty which he defined as the sublimest word in our language. His was the natural religion of a good man with profound faith in a good God. That faith in the constant guidance of God in human affairs, and in His law of the ultimate rightness of things, helps us to understand his secret of calmness unspoiled by victory and unbroken by defeat. In victory, he gave the glory to God; in defeat, he accepted the result as the inscrutable will of the same God. Thus as a storm-lashed ship on an angry sea, the character of Lee went grandly on in unshaken faith and humble dignity. He would say with Shakespeare, "There is a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we may."

It is therefore natural that Lee's favorite hymn was How Firm a Foundation, ending with the words:

"When through fiery trials thy pathway shall lie,
My grace, all-sufficient, shall be thy supply;
The flame shall not hurt thee; I only design
Thy dross to consume and thy gold to refine."

General Lee was even before his death regarded with honor and admiration by his enemies. General Grant and his staff came in eager to see and admire their great and respected foeman. Upon his return to Richmond from Appomattox, the Federal soldiers always made way for him and paid him a soldier's honor when he passed.

Upon the occasion of the death of General Lee, a leading New York paper said editorially, in part: "We have long ceased to look upon him as the Confederate leader, but have claimed him as one of ourselves; have cherished and felt proud of his military genius as belonging to us; have recorded his triumphs as our own; have extolled his virtues as reflecting upon us. Robert E. Lee was an American, and the great Nation that gave him birth would today be unworthy of such a son, if she regarded him lightly. * * * In him all that was pure and lofty in mind and purpose found lodgment. Dignified without presumption, affable without familiarity, he unified all those charms of manner which made him the idol of his friends and of his soldiers, and won for him the respect and admiration of the world. Even as in the days of his triumph, glory did not intoxicate him, so, when the dark clouds swept over him, adversity did not depress. From the hour that he surrendered his sword at Appomattox to the fatal autumn morning, he passed among men, noble in his quiet, simple dignity, displaying neither bitterness nor regret over the irrevocable past. He conquered us by the grand manner in which he sustained himself, even as he dazzled us by his genius, when the tramp of his soldiers resounded through the valleys of Virginia.

"For such a man we are all in tears and sorrow today. Standing beside his grave, men of the South and men of the North can mourn with all the bitterness of 4 years of warfare erased by this common bereavement. May this unity of grief—this unselfish manifestation over the loss of the Bayard of America—in the season of dead leaves and withered branches which this death ushers in, bloom and blossom, like the distant coming spring, into flowers of heartier accord."

Today we honor ourselves, our southland, and our common country in thus honoring the memory of this great and good man, this matchless leader and faithful comrade of our fathers, for in his character are combined the chivalrous instincts and courtly manners of a gentleman, the stern sense of righteous duty and self-sacrificing courage of a hero. Robert E. Lee is today more than an object of southern veneration and pride; he is a great American, a man whose life is an inspiration and whose memory is a benediction.

Back to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Back to the United Nations, delivered by Hon. Henry A. Wallace, editor of the New Republic, at Madison Square Garden, New York City, March 31, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are here tonight because we want peace.

We are here tonight because we mean to have peace.

We are here tonight to state that the Truman doctrine endangers peace.

We are here tonight to assert that peace requires Americans to reject that doctrine and reaffirm their faith in a strong United Nations.

Our soldiers did not win one war to fight another. Our workers and farmers toiled for freedom not for fear. Our dead did not bequeath to their children a legacy of death.

The world is hungry. The world cries out, not for American tanks and guns to destroy more lives and leave more hunger, but for American plows and food to fulfill the promise of peace.

The world is afraid. The world cries out, not for an American crusade in the name of hatred and fear of communism, but for a world crusade in the name of the brotherhood of man.

All of America's history was consecrated to that ideal. It was tested and proved in a great civil war. Twice in this generation Americans have fought for a free humanity. Today we come to a turning in freedom's road. Today America is in danger of turning aside.

In the name of crisis the President asks America to help the governments of Greece and Turkey.

In the name of crisis America is asked to ignore the world tribunal of the United Nations and take upon herself the role of prosecutor, judge, jury—and sheriff—what a role!

In the name of crisis facts are withheld, time is denied, hysteria is whipped up. The Congress is asked to rush through a momentous decision as if great armies were already on the march. I hear no armies marching. I hear a world crying out for peace.

Once a President of the United States faced the dissolution of the Union itself—a real crisis. "My countrymen one and all," said Abraham Lincoln, "think calmly and well upon this whole subject. If there be an object to hurry any of you in hot haste to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it."

We too must think calmly and well upon this whole subject.

Nineteen days ago the President of the United States told the Congress that the people of Greece were hungry and needed our help. Was this news to the President? Or to the Department of State which advises him? Every responsible member of the Government has known since the war ended that Greece lay in ruins and that famine was at the throat of her people. Every responsible member of the Government and every Member of Congress knows today the hunger, poverty, the devastation which rides over Poland, Italy, Yugoslavia, the Ukraine, and White Russia. Seventy percent of the livestock of Poland has been destroyed. The children of Italy and Yugoslavia wear rags for clothes. Millions of the people of central Europe have no shoes to wear. Ten million people in the Ukraine are homeless. Do these facts constitute a crisis? Or is a man's belly empty only when his mind is full—full of approved thoughts?

The welfare of all peoples is our concern. Famine anywhere endangers plenty everywhere. Progress anywhere helps progress everywhere. Action to help the world must help America. But not the action the President proposes. The needs of a desperate people are being exploited, just as the generosity of the Americans is being exploited—for other ends. The truth is that the President and his Republican backers are less concerned with the need of the Greek people for food than with the need of the American Navy for oil. The plan to contain communism is second to that need. For every glamorous admiral who boasts, it is "Nobody's damn business where we go," there are 10 drab but practical procurement officers to add, "and we'll get there with Middle East oil."

America is rich in oil but thinks she needs more for the greatest navy and air force in the world. When Britain competes for these resources, we settle our differences as friends. When Russia, competes for them we sound a fire alarm and thank God for the atom bomb. Why? Great nations including Russia and America struggled for oil long before there were Communists in the Kremlin. Poverty, which causes communism, will be ended not by beating drums of hatred, but by world planning. I shall not blame America alone for present tensions, and I shall criticize Russia when I think Russia is wrong. But I do assert that a great part of our conflict with Russia is the normal conflict between two strong and sovereign nations and can be solved in normal ways. When some Americans assert that it is hopeless to seek an agreement with Russia on the Balkans and the Middle East, I answer, "How do we know?" A program for United Nations development in the Balkans and Middle East has not been tried.

As for Russia's possible use of the veto, we can no more justify a position to bypass the United Nations on that ground than a private citizen can justify a decision to take the law in his own hands because he fears he may not have a fair trial in the court established to determine his rights. If we took the matter to the United Nations and the Russians exercised their veto, the moral burden would be on them. When we act independently outside the framework of the United Nations, the moral burden is upon us.

It is sheer nonsense to assert that we have sought solutions through cooperation. America and Britain have divided the oil of the Middle East as though we were the conquerors and lord protectors of the realm. At Yalta we solemnly agreed that Turkey's grip on the Dardanelles would be loosened by mutual consultation after victory. At Potsdam we reaffirmed that agreement. Not one step has been taken in 18 months of peace.

In the long and bitter winter of 1947, the world agency which could have saved lives and prevented misery was killed. Almost all of the United Nations except America and Britain supported Fiorello LaGuardia's plan to save UNRRA. The defeat of that plan was a world tragedy.

Through months of inaction the Congress strangled the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. The President countersigned its death warrant. Now we are told that America must act alone in Greece and Turkey because there isn't time to create a United Nations agency for relief and rehabilitation. In the Assembly of the United Nations, Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY said that nothing could be done to free the Spanish people because the United Nations had no right to interfere in the internal affairs of any nation. By what right do these same Americans justify unilateral interference in the affairs of Greece and Turkey?

The administration and its Republican supporters argue that we must intervene alone in Greece because the United Nations is too weak to act. I have not forgotten the appeasement of Hitler. I remember that every betrayal of world solidarity against Hitler by Daladier and Chamberlain was made in the name of the weakness of the League of Nations. Let us not betray the future. Let the world not destroy the United Nations as it once destroyed the League.

If the United Nations is weak, who makes it weak? What is the United Nations but the nations who belong to it? What have they done to make it strong? Today the budget of the United Nations is $6,000,000 less than the budget of the New York City Sanitation Department.

And who was it who insisted on keeping the budget of the United Nations $6,000,000 lower than the amount spent to keep the streets of New York City clean? The Soviet Government certainly wished to keep the budget low. Speaking in the name of a stingy-minded Republican Congress, Senator VANDENBERG cried, Amen!

In December Senator VANDENBERG was willing to spend only $11,000,000 for the United Nations. Today he is ready to spend untold millions to prop up anti-Soviet regimes.

There is but one hope for world peace—the United Nations. The Greek problem is a world problem and must be settled by the United Nations. If there is a Turkish problem, it, too, is the concern of all members of the United Nations. That is the spirit in which the Charter was signed.

We ask that the United Nations undertake a new program for relief of all peace-loving peoples in lands that have been devastated by war and today are in need. We ask that American funds be made available for this purpose.

We ask that the United Nations establish regional commissions for the reconstruction of Europe, the Middle East, and other areas as part of an over-all plan. To provide funds for reconstruction is the purpose of the World Bank. If the present Governors of the Bank are unwilling to act, then the Bank should be given Governors who will act. Adequate funds should be made available to support the Bank.

We ask that the United Nations face the problem of security not piecemeal but on a world-wide basis. This means the internationalization of the Dardanelles, the Suez Canal, and the Panama Canal. It means world disarmament and world control of atomic energy. It means real assurance against aggression and also adequate provision for peaceful change.

Let us do for the United Nations what needs to be done to carry out these tasks.

If the United Nations is untested, let us test it.

If the United Nations lacks support, let us support it.

If the United Nations is weak, let us strengthen it.

No one pretends that the United Nations will meet all needs and solve all problems overnight.

Patience and toil will not give us the millennium, but they will help to make a more decent world than we have ever known.

If we reject this course, the United Nations will crumble and man's hope will perish. Sooner or later Truman's program of unconditional aid to anti-Soviet governments will unite the world against America and divide America against herself.

The Truman program must turn the world against America. At our command freedom, in whose name Americans have died, will become a catchword for reaction. Once we grant unconditional loans to the undemocratic Governments of Greece and Turkey, then, in the name of freedom, every Fascist dictator will know that he has credit in our bank. Today it is the Governments of Greece and Turkey. Tomorrow it may be Perón and Chiang Kai-shek. Our banks will give dollars; our arsenals will give weapons. When that is not enough our people will be asked to give their sons.

The Truman program must turn Americans against each other. It will threaten everything in America that is worth fighting for. Intolerance is aroused. Suspicion is engendered. Men of the highest integrity in public life are besmirched. The President's Executive order creates a master index of public servants. From the janitor in the village post office to the Cabinet member, they are to be sifted and tested and watched and appraised. Their past and present, the tattle and prattle of their neighbors, are all to be recorded. But more Americans than these are in danger of persecution.

Intolerance has an insatiable appetite. Whom will its inquisition condemn if this drive continues? Every American who reads the wrong books; every American who thinks the wrong thoughts; every American who means liberty when he says liberty; every American who stands up for civil rights; every American who speaks out for one world; every American who believed in Willkie; every American who supported Roosevelt. Only they who say "Shibboleth" shall pass by the gate.

Hatred and violence abroad, hatred and fear at home will be the fruits of the Truman doctrine. A strong United Nations can bring peace. Which do we choose—for America must choose. The world waits for the American people.

Where are the millions who supported Roosevelt's ideals? Where are the inheritors of our great tradition? In weariness and confusion many Americans have abandoned political action. Now they must return. Their country needs them. Americans of all parties, all faiths, all creeds must now speak out in one great voice for peace and freedom.

America is our country. Because we love America, because we want America to be free and at peace in a world free and at peace, we say:

No imperialist adventures. Support the United Nations.

Millions to feed the hungry. Not one cent to arm tyranny.

Down with intolerance and bigotry. Back to the faith of our fathers.

No Outside Interference Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members of the House that I am inserting an editorial from the Orlando Star of Saturday, April 5, in regard to the legislative contest between Maj. James G. Horrell and Alexander Akerman, Jr., for the seat of representative from Orange County. This editorial expresses practically my position on the matter. I was well aware of the fact that Mr. Akerman, according to the law, was entitled to the seat. On the other hand I do not approve of the deceptive campaign which he waged.

In the statement which I made to the House previously advising Mr. Carroll Reece to mind his own business I stated that the Florida Legislature would handle this in the proper manner. They have now done so.

The editorial follows:

NO OUTSIDE INTERFERENCE NEEDED

If Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, wants to get James G. Horrell seated in the coming Florida Legislature, he should stick his nose into the situation and go to bat for Alex Akerman, Jr. If we know our Florida legislators they don't like to be told by someone up North how to run things down in Florida. That is one of the reasons Georgia elected the late Eugene Talmadge as Governor.

We have said before and we still feel we are correct, that Akerman and Tyn Cobb were elected to represent Orange County. The majority vote indicated that.

Horrell has a point in the contention that many voters thought they were voting for Cobb and Akerman in one group and Horrell and Leland Chubb in another. However, we do not believe a sufficient number of voters misunderstood it to have elected Horrell instead of Akerman.

The analogy which Reece makes that if Congress operated on the basis that the Florida Legislature is asked to operate by Horrell in ruling out Akerman, there would be Democrats in Congress, is silly. There was no misunderstanding when electors went to the polls to vote for Congressmen. There were but two names to ballot on. In the Orange County race there were four, two Democrats and two Republicans. We know for a fact some thought the group division, as it operated in the Democratic primary, held for the general election.

However, as we said before, we do not believe a sufficient number of voters thought that way to have given Horrell a majority.

We believe a majority of the voters voting in the State representative race voted for Cobb and Akerman because they wanted them to represent this county in the legislature. But if outside pressure is brought, in an attempt to support Akerman, there is no telling what the reaction may be.

The legislators might exercise their prerogative and seat Horrell.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 9 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Before It's Too Late," on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey, from the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune of March 16, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE

Has President Truman decided on intervention with American money, materials, and at least indirect military force to "stop" Russia in the Near East, or is he playing a gigantic game of bluff with us—our lives and our destinies—at stake?

Because the American people do not as yet know the exact answer to that question, because the President has not chosen to tell us how far we are going, they are seriously disturbed by the implications of Mr. Truman's historic pronouncement of a new foreign policy. They know that what he asks is a larger gamble than merely who shall govern Greece and Turkey. They understand it is not enough for the President to say that his purpose is to halt a world march of communism, because stopping communism in Greece or Turkey will not of itself remove communism from this world, and certainly it cannot remove the economic cancers which fester communism.

And they know, also, that if the course indicated by the President's address is followed to its logical conclusion the result will be to divide the world into two hostile camps and set the stage for another war. Mr. Truman was vague—perhaps by studied intent—as to this. But, by implication and effect, he all but declared war upon Soviet Russia. He could not go all the way because, fortunately, this still is a democracy and, under our system, only the Congress, the elected representatives of the people, can declare war. But a President can lead the Nation to the brink.

Is it any wonder that throughout the Nation the people are seriously disturbed by the grave potentialities of this departure in national policy?

President Truman justified his requested intervention in Greece in terms of maintaining free institutions, national integrity, representative government, the individual liberties so dear to a democracy. Those are precious words and those are precious things, but is it not true that the civil war in Greece is concerned about many other things beside abstract principles?

Modern Greece began a proud fight for independence some 50 years after America won its own. With the same pride she gained the 1911 constitution, voted in democracy—the Hellenic Republic of 1924—and chafed under the dictatorship of Mextaxas after his spineless sponsor, King George, had sacrificed the people's constitution and his own character to fascism in 1936. A lasting light, that pride flamed up again 4 years later when fierce Greek soldiers halted the Italian armies inching eastward from Albania. And they resisted to the bitter end when the Nazis came to pull Mussolini's chestnuts from the fire and to drive the British from Athens, the Greek islands, and Crete.

That fight was carried on, not by the forces of the present Government, but by the patriot guerrillas of Greece, scattered cores of resistance under the banner of EAM—the national liberation front. But when the British returned they put down this liberal EAM party by force of arms and by the same force restored a discredited king to office. This Government lacking the necessary support in its own country and confronted by armed revolution now asks that foreign bayonets prop it up. Mr. Truman proposes we provide the bayonets.

It is incredibly naive, as well as dangerous, to view this civil war in Greece as merely a struggle between democracy and totalitarianism. It is a product of forces which American intervention cannot control. If we choose sides and intervene it will mean only one thing—the United States will be fighting an undeclared war against Greek patriots. That is a shocking fact and many of us may not yet be ready to admit it.

If we do this in Greece, where are we going to stop? Would it not be as logical to intervene against the antidemocratic forces in, say, France, Spain, China, and Argentina? Are our armies going to march over the world putting down all popular aspirations for change? If so, then we are storing

up immense trouble for ourselves and probably strengthening the very forces we are opposing. In every age it has been true that a government able to maintain itself only by foreign help was building its house on sand. Do we learn nothing from history?

It is very easy to damn the Russians. They have been damned and double-damned ever since the Bolsheviks came into power, because they offered a deadly threat to the institutions of capitalism and other cherished conceptions of our society. The list of American fears about Russia is well known, and the provocation on her side has been great. Her dynamic expansion, whether for defense in depth or future aggression or whatnot, her gratuitous vetoes in UN, her cool reception of America's plan to control atomic weapons, her disregard of civil liberties and "iron curtain" of censorship have heightened mistrust and suspicion.

Russia's estimate of the kind of treatment she can expect from the democracies, on the other side of the picture, is bound to be based on her experience with them in the past. After the First World War they denied her a seat at the peace table, gave away much of her territory, quarantined her radical new ideology by encircling Russia with buffer states and applied an economic blockade which resulted in the terrible Russian famine of 1920–21. The Soviet Government was not recognized by Great Britain and France until 1924, by the United States until 1933. Russia was not admitted to the League of Nations until 1934 and was expelled in 1939 for aggression against Finland. The league had taken no such action against Germany for the Austrian Anschluss, against Japan for invading China, or against Italy for aggression against Ethiopia.

There are enough openly dangerous areas of Soviet-American misunderstanding without pretending that our position in Greece is more righteous and tenable than it actually is. Relations with Russia are difficult enough and they are not being made less difficult by Mr. Truman. This does not mean that the United States must approve communism, and appeasement of Russia would be intolerable. But going out of our way to intimidate and threaten the Soviet Union is unfair to American public opinion and perhaps perilous to the future safety of the world.

Bureaucratic Propaganda Against Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of April 7, 1947, entitled "Pay-Roll Propaganda":

PAY-ROLL PROPAGANDA — "I'M ESSENTIAL" CLAMOR LIFTED BY BUREAUCRATS AS CONGRESS SWINGS AX—LABOR STATISTICIANS POLL PUBLIC; CUSTOMS BUREAU OVERDOES "FIRING" SHOW—TRUMAN BACKS AGENCY HEADS

(By Vermont Royster)

WASHINGTON.—Eager congressional budget-cutters have stirred up a bee's nest of stinging bureaucrats.

Aroused department and agency heads, confronted with the first real economy drive in two decades, are buzzing into action to protect their hives from the ax. Joining forces, they've swarmed into an all-out campaign to stop Congress from what they charge is a "decimating" of the Federal Government's pay rolls.

Even President Truman is lending a hand. The Chief Executive has told his agency heads to fight for the full appropriations called for in the administration's budget. He's promised that he will throw his full weight behind the official recommendations.

ORDERED TO BATTLE

The Cabinet has been told that the President considers his proposed budget expenditures for 1948 as "rock bottom," and all bureaus have been ordered to battle it through. Those already cut by the House are to carry the fight to the Senate's Appropriations Committee and, if necessary, to the public.

They've done just that. Congress-wise bureau chieftains are striking back at the legislators' weakest point, their constituents. Congressmen rash enough to vote for the budget cuts are finding that the heat's on.

To dramatize their fight, many Government agencies are threatening wholesale firings, particularly in the home districts of unfriendly legislators. Others are circularizing interested pressure groups with warnings that their own pet projects may have to be discontinued. The hue and cry has been raised that services "essential to the public welfare"—control of smuggling and narcotics, lighthouses and air-line aids, public health—will have to be curtailed.

The hard-pressed bureaus are doubling direct pressure on Congress, too. Every agency of any size had its own budget liaison man, and today they're working overtime buttonholing every Senator or Representative on the Appropriations Committees. GOP Congressmen say they haven't had so much attention from Government officials in 15 years.

THINNING OUT A BEEHIVE

The campaign has already met with some success. The Senate's Appropriations Committee is expected to restore some earlier cuts made by the House. Thinning out a beehive has proved to be a prickly task.

The cause of all this hullabaloo is the hefty slice of economy which the House carved off the administration's budget in its first two appropriation bills for 1948. These bills covered the Treasury, Post Office, and Labor Departments and several independent offices including the Federal Security Agency.

The over-all savings achieved by the House were not great—there were too many fixed commitments—but nearly every Government office was sent away with from 10 to 45 percent less than it requested for salaries and general operating expenses.

Until these bills slipped through the House without a murmur, few of the bureau-keepers, grown cynical with the years, took the economy drive seriously. Now they do.

CUTS THAT ROCKED THEM

It was cuts like these that rocked them: One hundred thousand dollars lopped off the budget requested for the Treasury's personnel office; $2,000,000 off the Bureau of Accounts; $340,000 from the Bureau of Federal Supply; $35,000,000 from the Coast Guard; $61,000,000 from the Federal Security Agency; and $4,000,000 from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Almost every office covered by these bills was rolled back. However little the dent made in the total over-all budget, to the offices concerned it was a blitz, as devastating and as unexpected as Pearl Harbor.

And that was only the beginning. Intelligence reports from within the House committee have it that the other departments are to be cut from 20 to 40 percent below Mr. Truman's budget.

These hard-hit agencies are fighting back, and in the battle they are using every trick in the book.

For instance: Before the ink was dry on the first House appropriation bill—and even before the Senate had considered it—Customs Commissioner W. R. Johnson sent notices to his field offices to fire upward of 1,500 customs inspectors and assistants, all but wiping out the border and port patrols. Not surprisingly, this raised considerable furor, particularly in the border and large coastal cities.

PUZZLER FOR COMMITTEEMEN

Mr. Johnson claimed this was necessary because of the $6,000,000 cut in his budget below the President's request. But the House committeemen were a bit puzzled. For while the $47,000,000 given the Customs Bureau was a sharp cut-back from Mr. Truman's budget request, it was still as much as the Bureau got this year.

Subsequently, in fact, Mr. Johnson backtracked. The first news stories, he told a curious Senate committee, were misleading. At most, not more than 800 employees of the Bureau will have to be dropped; the others would be rehired. About 400 customs inspectors were more or less fired one day and then rehired a few days later after the furor died down.

To Chairman TABER and his House colleagues, this Customs Bureau maneuver had all the earmarks of a propaganda campaign. Mr. TABER is still trying to find out why it was necessary to fire so many persons so precipitously.

Crepe hangs over other personnel offices, too. At the Revenue Bureau, Commissioner John Nunan, Jr., threatens even heavier firings if the House budget cuts go through. Mr. Nunan says some 7,000 "T" men—the eagle-eyes who check income-tax returns for fraud—will have to be dropped. He's now busily bombarding the Senate committee with claims that these "T" men bring in $20 for every dollar they're paid.

Still other Government agencies are going to their customers to drum up support for their record-breaking appropriation requests.

Ewan Clague, head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for example, has undertaken a sort of Gallup poll in an effort to show Congress how much his bureau's work is appreciated and demanded by the public.

A circular mailed out to all regular users of the BLS data warns that due to the threatened 60-percent cut in the Bureau's funds it will be necessary "to drop immediately a major portion of the basic services" of the Bureau. Mr. Clague justifies the circular by saying that he wants to cut down, the services with the "least loss" to the public.

The circular provides several places for the customers to emphasize their need for the BLS data. The Bureau, which is quite expert at tabulating figures, plans to present Congress with an imposing statistical barrage on its popularity with the public. The cost of this survey will come out of the 1947, not the 1948, budget.

IRRITATION ON THE HILL

This bit of direct mail advertising has caused considerable irritation on Capitol Hill. It's true enough, of course, that the BLS was cut $4,000,000 below the Administration's budget request and even below this year's appropriation. What angers the Congressmen is that the circular leaves out a very important part of the story.

In 1938 the BLS was getting along nicely on $784,000 annually and providing such "basic services" as its consumer and wholesale indexes. During the war its functions were expanded until by 1947 it was getting a $5,500,000 appropriation. All the House was trying to do was level off some of these wartime jobs.

The final version of the House bill gave the bureau $2,300,000, or still nearly three times its 1938 budget. So Mr. Taber can't understand why it must drop a "major portion" of its "basic services."

And so it goes. The downtown offices are working like busy little bees to convince Congress and the public that they are being

butchered, while the economy bloc argues that all they are doing is cutting the agencies back to prewar size.

GOP leaders in the House concede that their appropriations will mean personnel layoffs; that, they say, was the purpose. But they fiercely deny that the threatened wholesale firings will be necessary, or that any "essential services" need be eliminated.

Loans to Foreign Countries by Reconstruction Finance Corporation

REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I asked the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to furnish me with information with respect to loans which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had made to foreign countries. The information seems to be of such general interest that I am including in connection with my remarks a letter which I received on April 2 from Mr. Henderson, the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The letter gives the information in detail and is as follows:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, April 2, 1947.

Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WOLCOTT: In response to your recent request we are submitting the following information relative to RFC loans and advances to foreign governments:

NATIONAL DEFENSE LOANS AND ADVANCES

Great Britain: Pursuant to section 5d (4) of the Reconstructoin Finance Corporation Act, as amended, the RFC on July 21, 1941, authorized a loan of $425,000,000 to the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. This loan was made with the approval of the President for the purpose of achieving for Great Britain the maximum dollar exchange in the United States. $390,000,000 of this loan was disbursed and as of March 26 of this year, $181,233,912 had been repaid.

Russia: On September 12, 1941, Defense Supplies Corporation, a subsidiary of the RFC, created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, entered into an agreement with Amtorg Trading Corp., a United States corporation owned by Russian interests, under which Defense Supplies Corporation made an advance of $49,741,692 to Amtorg against the purchase price of $100,000,000 worth of strategic and critical materials, including manganese, chrome, asbestos, and platinum. The strategic and critical materials have since been received and disposed of.

Philippines: This corporation entered into an agreement on August 26, 1946, with the National Abaca and Other Fibers Corp., an agency of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, for the purchase of abaca fiber during the period August 8, 1946, to June 30, 1947. Under the terms of this agreement the RFC agreed to advance $2,000,000 against the purchase price. A portion of the abaca covered by the agreement was delivered and the balance of the advance was repaid by agreement of February 3, 1947.

Brazil: In order to increase the procurement of natural rubber in Brazil by making credit available to those engaged in such procurement, the Banco de Credito da Borracha was established in Brazil in 1942. Forty percent of the stock was purchased with funds supplied by RFC in the amount of $3,000,000 under section 5d (3). Substantially all of the remainder of the stock was purchased by the Brazilian Government. The State Department is presently negotiating for the sale of RFC-held stock to Brazilian interests.

Newfoundland: An advance of $5,628,614 for equipment, facilities, and supplies for the Newfoundland Railway was approved under section 5d (3) on July 14, 1941. This was reduced on November 21, 1941, to $2,100,000. The funds were employed to improve, extend, and rehabilitate the Newfoundland Railway, as requested by the President upon advice of the Permanent Joint Board of Defense that the military requirements of the United States and Canada required such action. The Army did the actual construction and RFC accepted installment notes of the Newfoundland Railway, which, under the agreement, may be exchanged for Newfoundland Government bonds. The railway is owned by the Newfoundland Government; $606,357 has been repaid, leaving outstanding $1,493,643.

Canada: On June 9, 1942, the President approved a $10,000,000 advance to War Supplies Limited, an agency of the Canadian Government, in order to finance the production of copper, lead, and zinc. Pursuant thereto, $1,265,872 was advanced by Metals Reserve Corporation, a subsidy of the RFC, which was subsequently repaid in full.

Ecuador: On September 30, 1941, the RFC authorized not to exceed $150,000 (made available from the President's emergency fund) to the Government of Ecuador. This was later reduced to $124,628. The purpose of this action was to permit that Government to gain control of airlines in which Germany had an interest.

Bolivia: On August 27, 1941, the RFC authorized $300,000 (made available from the President's emergency fund) to Lloyd-Aero Boliviana, a company owned by the Bolivian Government, in order to enable that Government to gain control of airlines in which Germany had an interest. This amount was subsequently paid in full.

Netherlands Indies Government: On September 13, 1946, the RFC authorized an advance of $12,000,000 to the Netherlands Indies Government against the purchase price of natural rubber, the amount of the advance to be used for the purchase of textiles and certain other commodities in the United States. The period during which the Netherlands Indies Government could call on this advance expired without any calls being made.

In each instance where an advance is referred to above, such advance was made under authority either of section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, or under the fifth paragraph of section 5d, and in each instance the approval of the President is required and was obtained.

LOANS UNDER SECTION 201 (C) OF THE EMERGENCY RELIEF AND CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1932, AS AMENDED, WHICH AUTHORIZES LOANS FOR THE PURPOSE OF FINANCING SALES OF AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES IN FOREIGN MARKETS

Russia: On July 18, 1933, the RFC authorized a loan to Cotton Exporters Finance Corp., of New York, in the amount of $1,500,000, and an additional loan of $1,300,000 was authorized 1 week later. These loans were secured by notes of the Amtorg Trading Corp., which, in turn, were indorsed by the State Bank of USSR. All of these amounts were disbursed, except $77,098, and have subsequently been repaid. Loans involving Amtorg Trading Corp. in amounts of $51,247 and $29,295 were authorized on July 21, 1933, and August 14, 1933, respectively, and disbursed. These likewise have been repaid in full.

China: On July 10, 1933, the RFC authorized a loan of $50,000,000 to the National Government of the Republic of China. This authorization was reduced on February 16, 1934, from $50,000,000 to $20,000,000, of which $17,105,386 was disbursed. Payments by China to RFC reduced this amount to $13,537,389 and the outstanding notes held by the RFC for this balance were sold on April 8, 1936, to the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Norway: The RFC on January 12, 1940, authorized a loan of $10,000,000 to the Kingdom of Norway. None of this loan was ever used and the entire amount was subsequently canceled.

POSTWAR PHILIPPINE LOAN

On November 13, 1946, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 656, Seventy-ninth Congress, the RFC, after consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, authorized a loan of $25,000,000 to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines.

With kind personal regards,
Sincerely,
CHARLES B. HENDERSON.

Bugs in the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George S. Denson, president of Harding College:

BUGS IN THE BUDGET

Did you know that income of the Federal Government for the next fiscal year will be 9 times, maybe 10 times, what it was in the boom period of 1929? It will be at least seven times the receipts the Federal Government had in 1939. Weak nation it would be, indeed, that could not balance a peacetime budget with the receipt side of the ledger at enormous peacetime highs.

Just to balance the budget during boom times, however, is not enough. We must retire and reduce taxes. Looking at another angle, the Federal Government wants to spend more than four times as much as it did in any year of the thirties, when deficit spending was in the habit-forming stage. Has it now become fashionable for our Government to spend all it can get? Have we forgotten that the more we spend the more we shall have to tax?

If we cannot, under favorable conditions of high employment and prosperous trade, get hold of ourselves long enough to retire our national debt and cut our taxes, at what future time do we expect to do so? Is our budgeting so out of hand that Congress cannot gain control over it? Or is the public thus unmindful of the trouble we're in for under a tax load required by the spending of $37,500,000,000 annually?

Both the President and the Congress have given evidence of honest desire to keep the expenditure side of the budget down. But the pressures that are applied from every direction call for spending more money. As a people, we shall have to exert great moral fortitude at this time if we expect an about-face in a spending philosophy grown almost traditional. We need not complain to the Government for being spendthrift, if at home

we insist upon being spendthirsty about our pet projects. Economy begins first at home.

Although the war has been over nearly 2 years, your Government wishes to spend more in the next fiscal year alone than was spent during the whole of World War I. Of course, this is a dangerous era, and no one wants to hamstring our national defenses. The whole Nation wants the occupation program to succeed. But more efficiency and the least possible waste of manpower and money should be the order of the day.

As late as November the War and Navy Departments were still employing more than a million civilians. Spending in every department, military or nonmilitary, should be studied carefully. Everyone knows it is easier to keep on spending Government money than to retrench. This is just as true of the national defense. Despite warnings of what may happen, Congress will do well to examine these expenditures.

Soviet Russia is not likely to be changed in her course by the outcome of our budget. Fact that Russia's whole national income is very little more than our proposed national budget ought to embarrass nobody but Russia. And the fact that Russia plans to spend more than our country for military services ought to be embarrassing, in these times of peace, to Russia. However, large expenditures for the sake of national defense may be necessary until the peace is secure. But we need not conclude that the habit of heavy spending is to be our full and complete offering to the dove of peace.

Trimming down expenses is not an easy task for Congress. Snail's progress will be made unless the people make themselves heard. A big and wasteful budget now, carrying with it a tax penalty upon the enterprise of our people, could do much to start us downhill toward the kind of economy Russia has. Most Americans, I believe, would rather be allowed to spend their own money than have the Government spend it for them.

Activity of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the Washington Times-Herald of April 8, 1947:

HOT HOUSE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Both House and Senate get down to business this week, presumably refreshed by a few days' visit with the voters over the Easter holidays and with renewed ideas of what people want of the Government in these times.

The word from those few checked so far is that the House is still hotter than the Senate in its campaign to rid the country of the New Deal and that for the rest of this session it will continue stepping on the Senate's corns until that august organization get into the spirit of action.

A check-over of House and Senate attitudes on the points of the 1946 Republican campaign promises makes interesting news and clearly shows which branch of Congress is closer to the sentiment of the country. Here are the main items:

1. GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The Republicans promised "a substantial cut" in Federal expenditures. The House was first to act on this, and adopted the more strict attitude on both over-all budget cuts and on the reduction of individual departments as reviewed.

The executive departments are definitely running to the Senate for rescue.

The Senate has learned, via the mail from home, that rescue is wanted more by the taxpayers for themselves than for the monster bureaucracy built up in the past 16 years.

2. TAX CUTS

These were certainly pledged in 1946 and the House has already delivered. The Senate is still working on its own version of the House's personal income tax-reduction formula and yesterday Senator TAFT of Ohio, chairman of the Republican policy committee, promised again that this session of Congress will see both taxes and budget cuts.

But the fact remains that it is the Senate which is dragging its foot and the House which has already acted firmly on taxes as on budget.

3. LABOR LAWS

The Republicans were definitely pledged in 1946 to develop a more sensible relationship between unions and industry. The Congress has already passed one bill to that end and the House is headed right now to pass another but is only waiting on the Senate to get a little nearer ready before doing so.

The bill already passed is the one to make sense out of the so-called portal-to-portal racket that had piled up roughly $5,000,000,000 in suits against industry before the Truman administration waked up and through the Department of Justice began to show some sense of responsibility in the matter.

But the House unlike the Senate, did not wait on Truman. It acted. Senate and Executive followed.

The House has also completed its work on the general labor program designed to build a fairer balance between management and unions.

The only reason the House has not reported out and passed its labor bill is plain consideration for the Senate where the going is much rougher, mainly because of Republican timidity about last fall's plain mandate.

Maybe the telephone strike and John L. Lewis, semistrike in coal will clear that up. At any rate, the betting is that the general labor law program will all go through before the end of this month and that Truman will not veto it.

4. PRESIDENTIAL TENURE

The Republicans promised last year to give the country a chance to prevent any more third- and fourth-term Presidential menaces if it wants, and that one has certainly gone through, all right.

A proposed constitutional amendment is now before the State legislatures and has already been passed by several.

No amendment has ever moved so rapidly with the possible exception of the one to repeal prohibition.

5. COMMUNISTS

The Republicans asked for and plainly got a mandate against communism in Government last year. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has done an excellent and aggressive job so far and has smoked out the Executive to the point that Mr. Truman has ordered another loyalty board to go to work, supplementing already existing and useless ones, and Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach has asked for the outright outlawing of the Communist Party as a whole.

But note that it is the House that has done the heavy work. In the Senate there is nothing aggressive showing anywhere.

Senator TAFT coined a very descriptive phrase when he said that Atomic Commission Chairman David E. Lilienthal is "soft" on communism. He could well apply the same to a good many of his colleagues, Republican as well as Democratic.

But look for still more aggressive anticommunism from the whole House. There, Democrats as well as Republicans, are responding to general public demand.

6. THE WAR

It was definitely a part of the Republican mandate of last year to study the story of World War II and find out just who did what, how, and why. That is a monumental project, necessarily slow moving on the surface.

However, it is fair to report that the special Senate committee on the war has been digging for big ones and will crack several sensational stories before the end of this term.

The appointment of ex-Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Montana Democrat, to look into the oil leases in Arabia made under Government direction, is just a sample. This project involves many millions of dollars already spent and many more to come, not to mention its diplomatic and military aspects, past and future.

Teams of investigators for the Senate committee are also deep into the papers of the War Production Board, Lend-Lease, inside the State Department, in England, France, and elsewhere.

The things they have already turned up promise that both branches of Congress will be hotter than firecrackers before June.

The war investigating committee is the one outfit best calculated to whip the Senate's thyroid back up to the point necessary for it to keep pace with the House and the general mind of the country toward the New Deal.

In any case, the House itself is still plenty hot, feels good about the snap and speed and precision with which it has reorganized and put through its program to date.

It can be expected to move even faster from here on in. The country still wants an accounting of the New Deal.

Why No Tax Reduction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brookville (Pa.) American:

WHY THEY DON'T WANT TAX REDUCTION

One of the most amazing if not the most impressive sights in these days is the amount of crocodile tears of the administration, including the New Dealers, who are not, shed when it comes to the question of debt reduction and tax reduction.

These tears would seem more impressive were it not for the New Deal record during the past 14 years. The left wingers are now, for the first time, showing great concern at the size of the national debt and stating that debt reduction ought to be put ahead of tax reduction. Their concern is really touching.

For a dozen years they praised the policy of debt increase. They declared that the size of the national debt was not important. President Roosevelt himself said it didn't matter much because we owed the debt to ourselves. Some of the more fanatic New Dealers told us that a big Federal debt was actually a good thing.

Now, apparently, they no longer think it is a good thing, even if we owe the money to

ourselves, and they say that it ought to be reduced before there is any tax reduction.

Of course, the fact is that they really don't care any more now about debt reduction than they did in the palmy days of the New Deal. What they really want is to keep taxes at their present level so there will be more money to put the Government into competition with private industry and to promote the crackpot socialist schemes which the New Dealers are constantly planning and suggesting. If it is to further their program, such lack of thrift wouldn't bother them in the least. That is why they are for the swollen $37,500,000,000 budget requested by President Truman, and it is why talk of tax reduction, soon has them frothing at the mouth.

Aside from the objections of the left-wing boondoggiers to tax reduction, there are a number of shrewd Democratic politicians who don't want tax reduction either. Their main objection is that tax reduction by a Republican Congress now—over the opposition of President Truman—might help the Republicans in the 1948 Presidential campaign.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on April 5, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, in behalf of the committee which is raising funds to build a memorial home for Disabled American Veterans in Broome County, I have been asked to urge your friendly consideration.

I scarcely need to point out to you that money donated to the cause of veterans wounded and maimed for life is most worth while. I therefore commend the local DAV's fund-raising drive to you all.

The trouble started last week when some of the powers that be began to worry about their failure to take care of the veterans who couldn't find homes in our section.

"We're in for a lot of criticism," they whispered, "unless we house these veterans, and we aren't doing a very good job at that. We've got to lay the blame on somebody else or we'll really be in for it.

"We'll single out Congressman HALL and blame him. Some newspapers are always glad to make HALL the goat whenever there's some blame. He won't be able to get out of that one.

"We can make the public think Congressman HALL hasn't lifted a finger to help the veterans get homes. Oh, yes; it's true HALL has been in Congress and voted for all veteran housing bills and has done a lot for veterans but we'll make the people forget that.

"We'll play the Hitler game on HALL. We'll tell lies about him so big and smear him so often the public will believe us. Then they won't put the blame for our mistakes on us, they will hold HALL responsible."

So the plotters gloated over their bright scheme. They dreamed of the public getting mad at the wrong person and thought they saw HALL's face getting red.

But they had one serious setback. Not all the newspapers fell for their game. Only one local paper printed their attacks the way they thought would damage HALL the most.

So the plot to hang the blame for no vet housing in Binghamton on Congressman HALL has failed and he's ready for their future attempts to blame him. Only next time I have some nice little plans myself to put the heat on the proper seat.

It hasn't been pleasant, dear friends, when I'm in Washington, attending to the job you chose me to do, and too busy to defend myself, to read of the attacks and plots made on me by cheap demagogs who don't know the score themselves.

If these babies want to continue to annoy me, if they want to keep playing with dynamite, they're going to take the consequences. They'll have only themselves to blame for what happens.

But let me give you the one reason why the plans of the smear-bund to hang the blame on me for their mistakes in vet housing went wrong and failed to work.

They thought both Binghamton newspapers would fall for their dirty plot. As it turned out, the evening paper did not. And I myself learned something from their failure.

I learned that regardless of what little love some local men of integrity may have for me, some will not join with cutthroats to get rid of me.

Some will not join forces with gangsters to rub me out.

Some will not get in bed with second-story men to get even with me.

They may not care for me as their Congressman, but they prefer me to the inferior, pasty face, stupid opposition that they have seen stooge for others lately.

Some may not be thoroughly sold on me but they could never stomach the pitiful demonstrations of HALL-baiting so recently in progress.

Being intelligent men, they like to see constructive and cooperative steps taken in the interest of our community and our area. Therefore, I can't believe they approve of the policy which has recently been popular with a few stuffed shirts, the policy of visiting Washington and deliberately by-passing your Congressman and appealing to bigger shots. Of course, from my standpoint, it may be a good thing. They can't blame me when they come back home empty-handed as they usually do.

Those who do condescend to call on their Congressman get results. Witness a recent excursion a group of community leaders made to the Capitol. I have on record letters from their spokesmen thanking me and assuring me that they considered my help to them during their visit was the secret of the success of their whole trip. Many others have written me likewise. Yes, when they come to my office, they get results.

Thank you.

Push-Button Warfare and the Polar Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. George C. Kenney, commanding general, Strategic Air Forces, AAF, before the First National Aeronautics Conference, the American Legion, March 20, 1947:

Push-button warfare, which we hear a lot about these days, has captured the imagination of the American public. The last generation devoured the pages of Jules Verne's Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea. Today, all ages from 10 to 100 read Buck Rogers. It is a good thing to keep our minds interested and stimulated, for mankind is burning the midnight oil these days all over the world trying to discover new methods of destroying himself or how to counter such means if an enemy employs them.

As long as we keep thinking, studying, developing, and producing, we are on safe ground, but if we lull ourselves to sleep by saying that we either have the answers on hand, or have them right around the corner, we will invite disaster. The road to push-button warfare with its radio controlled long range pilotless aircraft and rockets with atomic warheads, is long, tough, and exceedingly expensive. If we are forced into a war within the next 20 years the probability is that we will still see our pilots flying airplanes which shoot down enemy airplanes in air combat and piloted airplanes which carry bombs to destroy enemy targets.

From what we know right now, if we want to develop a guided missile with a 5,000-mile range the following facts stare us in the face. In the first place, that missile is no hand grenade in size. It is a missile which destroys itself on impact. That means dollars and plenty of them. It will take years to produce the first one for test. During that period the cost of research and development by all the agencies concerned, will be tremendous. In other words, by the time we get the first article, someone will have spent billions on it. If this test article is successful and we want to go into production from the point on, it is much cheaper. To set up for the first production article will only cost a mere seven million and after that, we can have them for the modest sum of $270,000 apiece.

Unfortunately, after we get a lot of these weapons there are still some serious problems. The control by radio becomes increasingly difficult and complicated for every mile of increased range. Five-thousand-mile control today really looks somewhat fantastic. Another thing to think about is the introduction of man-made static to interfere with guiding such missiles by radio. No matter how much we would like to have it in a hurry, in the light of what we see ahead of us today, push-button warfare is not right around the corner.

Of course, foremost in our minds when we speak of new developments is the atomic bomb. This weapon bids fair through its terrific power and its terrible radiological effects to change considerably methods and effects of warfare. It may place in the hands of him who uses it effectively first a decisive advantage. It may, through too widespread use in war, affect the very character of the human race. The atomic bomb of today has a destructive power of more than 20,000 tons of TNT. The B-29's during the war against Japan dropped a total of 150,000 tons of bombs. The power of just one bombardment airplane has become something appalling when you consider that it would take thousands of B-29's carrying full loads of the old TNT bomb to equal the wallop that took out Hiroshima when first the atomic bomb was dropped.

You have all seen the pictures of the underwater Bikini test where one of the old-type atomic bombs was exploded. That column of water that was pushed over a mile up into the air, was half a mile in diameter. Imagine that bomb exploding in Times Square and picking up a section of Manhattan Island a half mile in diameter, throwing it a mile high and then having the pieces

rain down over an area 3 or 4 miles from Times Square. In that half-mile-diameter circle are about 100,000 people. It is inconceivable that any of them could survive. By the time we move out 3 miles from the point of the explosion we are across the Hudson into Jersey City and Hoboken, across the East River into Brooklyn, and most of Manhattan Island has been subjected to a rain of radioactive debris that once was a section of New York City. We can really speculate on the effects of a bomb dropping in the Hudson or the East River and deluging this whole area with radioactive water and steam.

This is no theoretical dream. This picture is real. You cannot get rid of it by simply closing your eyes or by neglecting to adopt the measures essential for self-protection and the maintenance of our national self-respect.

You may hear someone say, "Oh, here is another warmonger trying to scare us into building up a big military establishment."

In this case I'm working for you. My job is to defend this country. I'm supposed to be an expert at it. To do my job, I have to assess all factors involved and make recommendations accordingly. If I see bad weather ahead, it is my duty to warn the people I'm working for.

I sometimes wonder what these people really want. Do they want the truth, the warning of possibilities ahead of them even if it does scare them a little, or would they prefer to close their eyes and ears and go back to sleep until another Pearl Harbor wakes them up?

Now I'm not preaching war. I don't want even to see another war. No one in his right mind could want another war. But, looking around the world today, I believe that failure adequately to prepare for the possibility of war would constitute national criminal negligence.

You may ask who is the next possible aggressor. I don't know his name or his nationality, but he probably lives in Europe or in Asia. There is where three-quarters of the people of the world live, and when you get into a war it is a war against people. There is where the attack will come from, and we are No. 1 priority on the list of objectives which the next Hitler will hand to his boss gunmen

World War I and World War II taught the aggressors that if allowed even a comparatively short breathing space, the industrial power of the United States would produce the machines that would defeat them. In other words, if the United States can be knocked out, world domination is assured to the victor. A would-be Hitler of the future will not forget that lesson. For us to forget it would also constitute national criminal negligence.

As part of the planning and preparation for the proper national defense, we must visualize the probable assault and then try to determine the defense against it and the counteraction. The counteraction or retaliation is the only way of gaining the decision over the self-constituted opponent and punishing him for his crime against international law and his violation of all rules of peace and common decency.

This brings us to what we have come to call the polar concept. It simply means that invading aircraft will fly the shortest route to the target. Our former immunity, guaranteed us by two friendly oceans and a powerful Navy is no more. The threat today is from the long-range airplane. The direction for us to look is no longer east or west but north. If you examine a globe you will find that an airplane coming from any take-off point along the north coast of Europe or Asia to attack our large centers of industry and population will fly over the North Polar Basin. Prior to a few years ago range and weather made it unnecessary to worry about this frontier. The modern airplane capable of operations under all conditions of weather and possessed of ranges already at the 10,000-mile mark has changed our whole concept. That is why we are so interested nowadays in cold-weather operations.

Having completed a magnificent job that is a tribute to Navy planning and to the courage, skill, and resourcefulness of the personnel under his command, Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd is on his way home from Antarctica. This, the greatest expedition of its kind in history, will, I believe, prove to be of historic significance.

Let me quote from an interview with Admiral Byrd dated March 3, 1947:

"I voice a strong warning to my fellow Americans when I say that we can no longer crawl into cocoons and believe that distance guarantees us safety; that oceans and poles will be our ever-protecting no man's land.

"It is no scare phrase, but a bitter reality to state that conflict, should it ever come again, will lash at our Nation over one or both poles.

"We must be alert and vigilant along the icy borders which are nature's last frontiers of defense against human invasion."

Admiral Byrd continued: "I can realize perhaps better than any other man what the machine onslaught against the poles foreshadows, for I have seen startling comparisons in action."

"Since speed and progress seem to recognize no horizons, we must accelerate our thinking, our planning, our actions and our own horizons. We must do it now for we are at an important crossroads in both military science and world survival.

"Delay could well prove disastrous."

If we get into trouble again, the attack will probably come over the shortest air routes from the European-Asiatic land mass, across the North Polar Basin. It will be directed against our centers of industry and population. Following this ruthless assault may come the airborne troops to seize key points of the country before we recover from the shock of seeing every major city north of the San Francisco-St. Louis-Washington line wiped out by a comparatively few loads of atomic bombs, superexplosives, superincendiaries, or whatever means of mass destruction happens to be in vogue at the time. The objective of the enemy will be to knock out our industry and with it our capability of producing the machinery and the weapons with which to carry on resistance and at the same time to inflict such a stunning casualty list upon the Nation that it breaks the national willingness to endure further losses and thereby forces capitulation.

You will hear people say "Oh, we've heard this story before. No war has ever been won quickly like that in spite of the dire predictions every time some new weapon was invented." Of course Poland only lasted 17 days, Holland 4 days, Belgium 18 days, Norway a couple of weeks, and Denmark a few hours, as the price of inadequate preparedness, but what people fail to take into consideration is that where formerly it took days and a terrific effort to kill a few thousand people, now one airplane in a single attack can wipe out a city and kill a hundred thousand people.

Now for the defense against an assault such as I have pictured. Only an air force has the capability of doing anything in the initial stages of such an attack. An adequate warning service, coupled with fighter defenses intercepting the hostile aircraft as far away from their targets as possible and shooting down a sufficiently high percentage of them to prevent a repetition of attacks which eventually might bring us to our knees, is one must item for our national defense. But to stop our enemy from continuing his assault, we must be prepared to carry the war to him, to smash his air establishments, the factories that make his aircraft and their bombs, the sources of his fuel supply—in short, his capacity to make war. Accordingly the long-range striking force composed of long-range heavy load-carrying bombers, and long-range fighters to protect them, is another must item and the most important of all, as it furnishes the best guaranty that the transpolar assault will be stopped, that the battle for the air will be won, and that the final phase, the actual invasion and occupation of the enemy country by our surface forces, can get under way.

To carry out our mission of protection, like any police force, the Air Forces must be adequate, efficient, and properly organized. Air analysis of public opinion indicates that to the people of the United States an air force second to none is required for our national defense. The maintenance of that force costs money, lots of it. If we really want national defense we will foot the bill. If we lose interest in national defense, we will not.

Whatever else we do to preserve this country and its ideals we must not neglect our technical research and development. We don't want to, and we can't afford to, win our wars by mass spending of blood. We want to win them at a minimum cost in human lives by using our brains and the machines conceived by those brains. If we stop thinking, stop inventing, and stop developing and allow ourselves to pit manpower against manpower, we will be playing a losing game. We are only 140,000,000 in a world of 2,000,000,000. We must guard against obsolescence in both our thinking and our equipment. As fast as our weapons, our tactics, our methods, become obsolete, we must scrap them ruthlessly. National defense is national insurance. The cost of national defense is—and will continue—to strain the national pocketbook. We can afford only modern thinking, modern organization, modern weapons.

Regardless of disparity in manpower resources, if we remain ahead in technical development and win the air war, we need not fear defeat if we should again be forced into conflict.

Air power is truly peace power.

Moral Defeat at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, William Henry Chamberlin, in a recent article, has termed the Yalta agreement our greatest diplomatic failure. It would seem that Mr. Chamberlin has correctly called the turn on one of the great crimes committed by this country against European nations involved in the war; particularly Poland which has suffered most. We can never live down the crime that was committed at Yalta. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this very challenging article by Mr. Chamberlin:

OUR GREATEST DIPLOMATIC FAILURE—DETAILS OF YALTA AGREEMENT REVEAL IT AS A MOST IMMORAL, UNNECESSARY VIOLATION OF ATLANTIC CHARTER

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

At long last we possess what purports to be the full text of the Yalta Agreement, signed by Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill on February 11, 1945. Its details had been doled out piecemeal in rather understandably shamefaced fashion over a period of more than 2 years. Soviet Foreign Minister Molo-

tov seems to have given the impetus to full publication when he cited the Yalta Agreement about reparations to bolster up his talking position at the Moscow Conference.

Measured against the developments of the last 2 years, against the dreary chaos in Central Europe, the immense totalitarian expansion in eastern Europe, the alarming situation which confronts us in the Near East, Yalta may fairly and soberly be described as the most disastrous defeat in the diplomatic history of the United States. It was immoral because many of its provisions repudiated the Atlantic Charter and those principles of liberty and humanity to which this Government has always professed devotion.

It was stupid, because it traded vital considerations of American national interest and security for what have proved to be worthless Soviet I O U's. And, no matter what its apologists, whose voices have been growing feebler with the passing time, may say, it was completely unnecessary.

The Yalta document fairly drips with unctuous and offensive hypocrisy. There are repeated genuflections before the Atlantic Charter. The signatories reaffirm their faith in its principles. Yet the two principal territorial decisions of Yalta were crude violations of the Atlantic Charter.

THE CASES OF POLAND AND CHINA

Over 40 percent of the area of prewar Poland was transferred to Russia without any provision for consultation of the will of the people affected. At the same time Poland was assured substantial accessions of territory in the north and west, i. e., the right to annex an unspecified amount of territory that is ethnically overwhelmingly German. Neither of these transfers, by any process of sophistry, could be reconciled with the Atlantic Charter principle: "No territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

Only less immoral than this arbitrary drawing of new frontiers in eastern Europe, to an accompaniment of brutal mass expulsion of many millions of people, Poles from eastern Poland, Germans from the German eastern provinces, was the treatment of China. There was no Chinese representative at Yalta.

Yet, in a frantic effort to buy Soviet intervention in the war against Japan, which was superfluous and detrimental when it actually occurred, Roosevelt and Churchill signed away China's economic rights in its richest industrial province, Manchuria. It was agreed that Russia should have a naval base at Port Arthur, at the southern tip of Manchuria, preeminent interests in Dairen, Manchuria's largest port, and joint operation rights for the entire Manchurian railway system.

When a strong country, whether it be Japan or Russia, acquires sweeping strategic and economic concessions in the territory of a weak country like China the stage is set for trouble and aggression. The Russians subsequently turned Manchuria into an empty shell, industrially, by looting much the greatest part of its industrial equipment and machinery.

EXCESSIVE GERMAN REPARATIONS DEMANDED

Equally objectionable was the agreement about reparations, which may be considered the primary cause of many of our relief headaches in Germany today. It was provided that Germany should be stripped of capital goods, that there should be use of German labor (a thin camouflage for the introduction of human slavery) and that there should also be annual deliveries of goods from current production for a period to be fixed. A figure of $20,000,000,000 was suggested, of which half should go to the Soviet Union.

How a country that was being thoroughly wrecked by air bombing and that was to be stripped both of its capital goods and of its able-bodied manpower could produce a sufficient surplus to warrant a figure of $20,000,000,000 worth of reparations was not explained. Stupidity went hand in hand with profound and cynical immorality in decisions which violated basic American ideals, wrecked the economies of great areas, sanctioned the restoration of slavery, and profusely sowed seeds of hate and possible future wars both in eastern Europe and in the Far East.

American national interest was certainly not served by selling out China in Manchuria, by giving a green light for the expansion of Soviet totalitarianism in eastern Europe. We would be in a far stronger political and moral position today if we had never thrown over our friend Mihailovich for our enemy Tito, in Yugoslavia, if we had not accepted with little question the Moscow carpetbag regime in Poland.

It may be noted that the little fig leaves of decency in the Yalta agreement have been made a laughing stock by persistent Soviet bad faith. The promises of free and unfettered elections in Poland, of enabling liberated peoples to create democratic institutions of their own choice have a hollow and bitter sound, in view of what has happened in Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and many other countries.

NO NEED TO APPEASE STALIN

The last stand of the apologists for Yalta is the alleged necessity of appeasing Stalin at the time when it was signed. If we hadn't signed on the dotted line, so the argument runs, the Soviet dictator might have quit the war in a huff, and where would we have been then? This overlooks the important point that Stalin was far more politically and militarily dependent on us than we were on him. The destruction of any element of check or balance on Soviet expansion in Europe and Asia was far more a Soviet interest than a rationally conceived American or British interest.

Yalta was a disgrace, and a needless disgrace. It was concluded stealthily, without any consultation with the American people or their representatives. Undoing its disastrous consequences will be one of our main foreign policy chores for a long time to come. It is an ironical reflection that many of the political fruits of victory were sacrificed on the altar of appeasement at Yalta—just 3 months before the collapse of Germany and 6 months before the fall of Japan.

Jefferson Day Address of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star:

A PRESIDENT SPEAKS

The annual Jefferson Day dinner of the Democratic Party is strictly a political affair. But President Truman's address to the party faithful Saturday night was not a political speech.

It was a message which carried an impression of maturity and earnestness, an expression from a man who spoke, not as the leader of a political party, but as the President of a great people who are reluctantly beginning to realize that they have been pushed to the center of the world stage at a decisive moment in history.

One might say, without any intent to give offense, that here is a man who has found himself. Throughout his first year and a half in the White House, Mr. Truman functioned in the shadow of his illustrious predecessor. He labored, too, under the handicap of a domestic political climate that was unfavorable to his party. In this atmosphere he made mistakes, many of them. But once the verdict of November had been returned, a verdict which wiped out the Democratic majorities in both the House and the Senate, a change came over Mr. Truman. He stopped trying to be a President with nothing more to offer than a devotion to the policies of the man who had held office before him. Instead, he became a President with a program of his own, and on November 11, 1946, he stated it in these words: "To do in all cases, from day to day, without regard to narrow political considerations, what seems to me to be best for the welfare of all our people."

The record will show that he has adhered to this guiding principle. And to the consternation of his political opponents, the record will show also that there has been a favorable public response to this quality of leadership.

There have been certain byproducts of Mr. Truman's leadership which are to be paradoxical in character. Thus, for example, we find the President on Saturday night warning against false economy, and urging the wisdom of maintaining a high tax structure during this period of prosperity in order to reduce the national debt. That would seem to be sound doctrine. Yet a few Republicans—including some who were outraged when an earlier Democratic administration suggested that we need not worry about the debt because we owed it to ourselves—profess to believe that the President's words were the counsel of a partisan politician.

Fortunately, the hollowness of these complaints is self-evident. No one should be deceived. In this critical time, when our own future is so tightly interwoven with the future of a stricken world, we are fortunate to have a President who has set for himself the high purpose of doing in all cases what seems to be best for the welfare of all of us. What the future will bring is, of course, uncertain. But as long as Mr. Truman keeps his sights trained on that objective he deserves the support of his fellow Americans.

Why the Communist Party in America Should Be Restrained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, last night at the invitation of the American Broadcasting Co., I spoke over its Nation-wide network on the reasons why it has become imperative that America, officially, and Americans, individually, take some effective steps to curb the rising tide of communism in this Republic. Under leave granted me by the House, I am inserting my radio address in the RECORD at this point. I might add that the

Eugene Dennis mentioned in my broadcast is the same Denis, with many aliases, who was this morning cited for contempt of Congress by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and whose record also reveals that he has obtained passports fraudulently in this country by use of fictitious names. The record presented to our committee this morning also shows that he falsified the date of his birth to avoid military service when registering under the Selective Service Act.

WHY THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN AMERICA SHOULD BE RESTRAINED—RADIO ADDRESS OF HON. KARL E. MUNDT, REPUBLICAN, SOUTH DAKOTA, RANKING REPUBLICAN MEMBER OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

(This address was broadcast over the American Broadcasting Co.'s network at 10:15 eastern standard time, Tuesday evening, April 8, in reply to an address over the same facilities the previous night by Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party. Mr. Dennis spoke in opposition to restraints being placed on the Communist Party in America.)

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. Last night over this network, many of you heard a man, now calling himself Eugene Dennis, speaking in defense of the Communist Party. It was quite natural that this fellow called Dennis should speak as an apologist for the Communist Party because he is the general secretary of the Communist Party in America.

Therefore, it is important that we not only analyze the party line of the Communists enunciated by Dennis last night but that we also call before this microphone a witness who can tell us with authority something of the background and reliability of Mr. Dennis.

I think we all agree that there is no better authority on either crime or communism in the United States than J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of America's famed Federal Bureau of Investigation. Testifying under oath before our House Committee on Un-American Activities on March 26—less than 2 weeks ago—Mr. Hoover was asked whether he believed Mr. Dennis had good reason to refuse to give the committee his real name. Mr. Hoover said: "That is true. He is known as Francis Eugene Waldron; alias Francis Xavier Waldron, Jr., alias Paul Eugene Walsh, and alias Gene Milton. Those are the names we have discovered up to date about that gentleman."

Dennis admitted on this network last night that he had changed his name, but he said, "What of it? So did Mark Twain." Ah, friends, but what a difference. Mark Twain changed his name only once and stayed by it—he did not change it half a dozen times and for twice that many reasons.

So much for the nature of the Communist spokesman who addressed you as a paid agent of the party over this network last night. Now let us examine the true nature of the Communist organization for which he was pleading and against which he urged you not to establish any restraints, restrictions, or controls.

COMMUNISTS ARE RED BUNDISTS

Just as the German-American Bund was the American agent of a foreign government, so, too, the Communist Party in this country serves as the American agent of a foreign power. Just as individual bundists placed their first loyalty not to America and its free institutions and Christian concepts of freedom, but to a foreign ideology, so, too, the individual Communist in this country dedicates his first loyalty to a foreign cause. It is for this reason that J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, recommends the use of the phrase Red Fascists to describe the American Communists, since the analogy between them and the Bundists is so closely interwoven. When all Americans come to think of Communists in this country as Red bundists, and when we all come to recognize their activities as the subversive operations of foreign agents, we shall be well on the road to constructing effective curbs against their diabolical plots to undermine our churches, our freedoms, and our Government.

Contrariwise, so long as millions of Americans fail to recognize the Communists for what they actually are in this country, we are in the vulnerable position of a fire department which would harbor arsonists on its staff and place gasoline in its fire extinguishers. Communism in America has attained a size and wormed its way into such places of influence and importance that it has become imperative that it be stripped of its thin mask of respectability and exposed to full view, naked and undisguised, as the un-American virus which it actually is.

Here is what the highly objective New York Times recently said editorially about the Communist Party, I quote: "The Communist Party is not a political party but a conspiracy which uses democratic methods to kill off democracy—and which resorts to bullets whenever the ballots go against it."

Good friends, literally millions of darkened homes in Poland, in Finland, in the former Baltic Republics, in Hungary, in Yugoslavia, in Bulgaria, in Greece and in many other countries bear mute but mighty testimony to the accuracy of that New York Times editorial.

This Red conspiracy to establish a world-wide dictatorship by the Soviet has its cell of Red Bundists—Red Fascists—Communists agents—call them what you will, in every country in the world. America is no exception. Before our congressional committee 2 weeks ago J. Edgar Hoover called attention to this startling fact, and I quote you the exact words of the Director of our Federal Bureau of Investigation. Hoover said: "The size of the Communist Party is relatively unimportant because of the enthusiasm and ironclad discipline under which it operates. In 1917 when the Communists overthrew the Russian Government there was 1 Communist for every 2,277 persons in Russia. In the United States today there is 1 Communist for every 1,814 persons in this country."

FOREIGN DOMINATION OF AMERICAN COMMUNISTS

Is further proof needed as to the acute threat of communism to our free institutions and our Christian concepts in America? Fellow citizens, on May 28, 1942, Attorney General Francis Biddle found officially that the Communist Party from the time of its inception in 1919 believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States. William C. Bullitt, our former Ambassador to Russia, told the House Committee on Un-American Activities the same thing 2 weeks ago and provided proof for his statements. Louis Budenz, former editor of the Communist Daily Worker, has admitted that as editor of the paper published in New York he had his editorial policy directed from Moscow. The Los Angeles Times, great newspaper of the west coast, and editorially a week ago, "The Communist Party isn't a party at all as we Americans understand it—it is a conspiracy run from abroad." Said the St. Louis Globe-Democrat a few days ago, "The Communist Party is a fifth column engaged in a huge conspiracy against the United States."

Even the man calling himself Dennis, America's No. 2 Communist, who spoke over this network last night urging Americans to keep the bars down and the way free for Communists to attack our way of life has said, "We are and shall continue to be an American working class political organization guided by the science of Marxism-Leninism." And what, my friends, is the science of Marxism-Leninism? That has been made abundantly clear in the Russian Mein Kampf as written by Lenin and rewritten by Stalin-Marxism-Leninism tells us on its own printed pages that its goal is Soviet world-wide domination.

It is against this conspiracy and this program that the Communists now plead with you not to establish any restrictions or restraints. The whimpering cry of the Communists pleading to be unrestrained in their efforts to destroy America is like proposing to a farmer that the best way to raise good crops is to ignore the weeds growing in his fields. Like many other Americans, however, I contend that every reasonable and legal step which can effectively be taken against communism in America in this critical hour should be undertaken without delay. The hour is already very late. The time for action has most abundantly and emphatically arrived.

COMMUNISM GREATEST ORGANIZED ENEMY OF THE CHURCH

Ladies and gentlemen, communism is the greatest organized enemy which the church of God and the cause of freedom has had in all our history. Last night, Dennis, the Communist, urged over this radio that you support his campaign to keep the bars down and the way free for Communists to attack our way of life. He brazenly told you, "Of course it is true that on occasion we Communists have agreed with the Soviet foreign policy and disagreed with American policy." What he did not tell you, however, is this. Without exception, American Communists have always agreed with the Moscow policy and they have consistently supported it against America. Neither Mr. Dennis nor any other Communist can show you a single instance where American Communists have sided with America in our disputes against Russia on any important item in our whole agenda of discussions and disputes.

SHOULD COMMUNISM BE OUTLAWED?

What should we do to restrict the activities of these Red Fascists? Here, in part, are some of the answers which Congress has in mind. In my opinion, the time has not come when we can get the most desirable results by outlawing the Communist Party by national legislation. There are several reasons for this, but two of them are the following: (1) Both the FBI and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as well as other opponents of communism, are still securing highly valuable clues on Communist techniques and operatives through the device of reversing the fifth-column technique and infiltrating their meetings and their conference rooms with patriotic Americans who bring back reports on the plots which the Communists are formulating. In this way even that small portion of Communist activity which remains above ground in this country aids our security officers to protect America. (2) A second reason why outlawing the Communist Party by national legislation might not be desirable just now is that freedom-loving people all over the world are watching America and as we demonstrate our ability to root out enemies of freedom while at the same time extending our constitutional guaranties of freedom even to those who would sabotage the Constitution, we develop and sustain a reputation abroad which might otherwise be diminished. And, of course, in the final analysis the mere outlawing of the Communist Party would not in itself be an effective antidote to this un-American poison.

SIX EFFECTIVE RESTRAINTS ON COMMUNISM

What should we do to restrain the activities of these Red Fascists. There are a number of practical and effective restraints which can and should be applied to Communists in America without delay and without apology. Let me list a few of these possibili-

ties: (1) Since American Communists follow a party line laid down in a foreign capital, they serve as agents of a foreign government and they should be compelled to register as such. Failure to do so should be punished by severe penalties. (2) Communists should be summarily dismissed from all appointive offices which they now hold in National, State, or city Governments. Communists and their fellow travelers and sympathizers should not be permitted to draw pay from the taxpayers of a system of government which they are sworn to undermine and overthrow. (3) Passport privileges should be denied to American Communists. This Government should do nothing to facilitate the travel of un-American agents who use these travel permits to confer abroad with fellow Communists who also seek to undermine freedom in America. (4) All alien Communists should be immediately deported. (5) Labor organizations which select Communists as officials should be denied their rights under Federal labor legislation. (6) Fingerprinting should be made mandatory on all passport applications and on all incoming visas so the Communist racket in fraudulent passports and black-market immigration can be exposed and eliminated.

The six foregoing suggestions for restraining Communist growth and activity in America do not infringe upon the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. They are practical, effective steps in the job of self-preservation for Americans who want to protect this Republic from Godless communism and Red fascism.

However, the fight against communism in America cannot be won by the Government alone. Today's critical conditions require that private citizens everywhere, both individually and collectively, take active steps to drive communism from their communities. This is not a fight which can be won by faint-hearted warriors. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot cannot defeat Red fascism. You who join in this crusade against the enemies of Christianity and country will be called Red baiters, Hitlerite, anti-Semitic, and Fascists. Anybody who opposes communism anywhere is smeared with these brands since this is a basic tactic of the Communist party line laid down in Moscow. But if you love America, and if you want to have a part in this great battle against the forces of Red fascism, there is a job for you to do in your community.

Each citizen can help in this crusade. Through your church, your service club, your veterans' organization—individually or collectively—you can help restrain and repel the vicious march of communism. Have you examined the textbooks used in your local schools and colleges? Is there Communist literature in your school of public libraries? Are Communist cooperators, sympathizers, or agents slyly peddling their slimy propaganda in your community? Have your schools, your club, your church, your professional or labor organizations, and that national organization with its high-sounding title and its announced action program of noble objectives which you have been invited to join and to support with your money, have they purged themselves and their advisory committees of all who promote or protect the Communist party line?

THERE'S A JOB FOR EVERY CITIZEN TO DO

The one thing Communists most fear in this country is an American public aroused against them. That is why they are so quick to try to smear all of us who speak out to expose their treachery and their tricks. Now, before it is too late, each of you can help mobilize a public opinion which will outlaw communism in the minds of all decent citizens without requiring a single law or regulation.

IF YOU LOVE AMERICA YOU CAN HELP SAVE IT

Our American Communists work their damage in many devious ways. Some are in labor unions, some in Government jobs. Some become teachers—others are found in almost every walk of life. They are aided in their wicked work by many fellow travelers and front organizations; some are willing cohorts; others unwitting dupes. Several lame-duck radio commentators and newspaper columnists—hang-overs from the days when communism was considered respectable in Washington—still follow the Communist party line. Some defend communism openly—others disguise their motives by simply attacking those who attack communism. Some movie studios in Hollywood still harbor Communists. However, this is still America and there is something that you can do about that. You don't have to sit still and be propagandized on the screen, over the air, and through the press. You can organize community boycotts against pictures featuring stars who are Communists or scenes which are anti-American. You can write your radio station or your editor protesting against the comments of speakers or writers who defend communism and denounce those who are trying to drive it from America. It is your home and your church that the Communists attack—you have a right and a duty to take part in the battle to destroy the influence of those who defend and support the Communists.

If you are really serious about your desire to help restrain the Godless teachings of communism in America there is one thing more which you can do—right now—tonight. You can send a dollar bill to the United States Chamber of Commerce here in Washington and order the two new documentary booklets recently published, showing just how communism is tightening its hold upon the jugular vein of American life. After reading these booklets, you can place them in your school and public libraries. You can also ask your Congressman to send you free copies of official congressional reports showing how the Communist Party in America is in fact the agent of a foreign government. Or send 50 cents to the Government Printing Office in Washington and get the official report of the Congressional Library called Communism in Action.

Unless you are ready to run up the white flag of surrender to the red flag of atheistic communism, there is work enough for each of you to do in arousing America to this crusade against communism so that freedom can prevail here in this most important bastion of its existence. To be forewarned is to be forearmed. Let us unite in creating sufficient restraints to protect our American way of life against communism here at home so that we can be strong enough to protect America against the world threat of communism which now menaces us so directly from abroad. To do less is to surrender to the forces of evil and to do violence to the traditions which have made America great.

Forest Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert a letter from Mr. Paul H. Gerrard, forest supervisor, Ozark National Forest, Ark., written in answer to my request for information regarding the work of the Forest Service in that area.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE, OZARK NATIONAL FOREST,
Russellville, Ark., March 28, 1947.

Hon. J. W. TRIMBLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Some time ago I sent you a letter giving information covering receipts and total expenditures of the Ozark National Forest for the last fiscal year. I am now taking the opportunity of transmitting you a copy of a report by the Chief of the Forest Service. This report deals in a general way with the entire field of work covered by the Forest Service and most specifically with the timber situation in the United States. It also outlines a plan for the building up of an abundance of timber for the future.

The big job, in my opinion, is that of getting forest management practices in more general use among the small timberland owners. Some 1,649,000 small timberland owners with less than 5,000 acres each own 122,000,000 acres out of the total of 183,000,000 acres of forest land in the South. Only about 2 percent of this group of owners are now following good management practices. Likewise, this is a group which has little fire protection. The larger timberland owners (5,000 acres or more) are doing a better job of protecting their land from fire and following good cutting practices. Therefore, the big job is educating, demonstrating good practices, and assisting these small owners in the ways of good forestry. Forest land of this group can be made to produce nearly three times the volume over that of the present time.

There are 338,000,000,000 board feet in saw-timber-size trees in the South consisting of 194,000,000,000 feet in softwood and 144,000,000,000 in hardwood. Our saw-timber volume during the past 10 years has been reduced 30,000,000,000 board feet, or 8.2 percent. By species it is equivalent to 9.1 percent for pine and 7.4 percent for hardwoods. The 1944 annual cut exceeded the net growth in sawlog-size timber by 24.9 percent. The quality of sawlog-size trees is gradually deteriorating and the volume of the average sawlog tree has fallen from one-third to one-half in the past 10 years. If the 1944 drain and cutting practices continue for 20 years the stock of sawlog-size timber in the South would be reduced 35 percent. The total volume, as expressed in cubic feet and including trees of all sizes, has been maintained during the past 10 years. For trees 5 inches in diameter and larger, it nearly equals current drain. This indicates that the demand for pulpwood, plastic, fuelwood, etc., can be maintained. We must, however, improve our practices if we expect to continue to provide the production of larger sizes of timber for lumber, speciality products and for our growing pulpwood industry.

During the fiscal year 1946, 11,687,000 acres out of a total of 18,348,000 acres of State and private forest land in Arkansas were provided with organized protection involving total expenditure of $314,166 of which $156,900 was provided by Clarke-McNary funds. Of the area under protection in 1945, only 17,631 acres, or fifteen one-hundredths percent were damaged by fires, while other State and private land not under protection suffered a loss of 1.69 percent. The increased appropriation provided by the recent State legislature will be of material assistance in expanding fire protection in general throughout the State.

The Arkansas Division of Forestry and Parks produced and distributed 878,500

seedlings to landowners within the State in 1946. This activity was carried on with Forest Service cooperation through the Clarke-McNary and the Norris-Doxey Farm Forestry Act.

The Cooperating Farm Forestry Act enabled the Forest Service to share the cost with the Arkansas Extension Service for the employment of one farm forester. This man furnished on-the-ground technical advice on the proper handling of small woodland to 48 owners and assisted in the proper marking of 537,000 board feet of forest products. Here again, a recent action of the State legislature will make it possible for the division of forestry and parks to provide this type of service at a cost basis to the large owners and without charge to the smaller landowners.

I might also mention that through our cooperative agreement with the game and fish commission, they have trapped over 600 deer from the Sylamore ranger district for stocking refuges in various parts of the State.

This is a rather lengthy letter, but I did want to give you a few highlights regarding forest conditions here in the South and the cooperative activities of the Forest Service in the State. If you should have need for more detailed information in regard to the above, I will be very glad to furnish it.

Very truly yours,

PAUL H. GERRARD,
Forest Supervisor.

Terms of Office of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Ninety-third Legislature of Maine:

Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

Whereas the Eightieth Congress of the United States of America, at the first session begun and held at the city of Washington on Friday, the 3d day of January 1947, by a constitutional two-thirds vote in both Houses adopted a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of the President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

"'SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'."

Therefore be it

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Maine hereby ratifies and adopts this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved, That the secretarcy of the State of Maine notify the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of this action of the legislature by forwarding to each of them a certified copy of this resolution.

In senate chamber, March 31, 1947.

Sent down for concurrence, read, and adopted.

CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
Secretary.

House of representatives: Read and adopted March 31, 1947. In concurrence.

HARVEY R. PEASE,
Clerk.

Air Transport Equals Mobility Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Robert Ramspeck, executive vice president, Air Transport Association of America, before the American Legion National Aeronautics Conference, Indianapolis, Ind., March 20, 1947:

Among all the worthy objectives of the American Legion, I can conceive none with a more purposeful meaning for the Nation than the advocacy and sponsorship of this campaign. It is completely courageous, but nevertheless in character with the motives of this powerful and influential organization that, at a time when its membership is still recovering from the awfulness of war, the Legion rises among us to point out how the United States must, for its own security and well-being, maintain its supremacy in the air.

The war ended on a note of frightfulness. The atomic bombing of Japan unleashed an era of incalculable power, whether for good or for bad. The fact that its first manifestation was destructive is perhaps a grim warning to the world. And the further fact that aviation was the means of loosing this terrible weapon points up the theme of this conference—that the United States must maintain its supremacy in the air and develop its aviation muscles still more, on the basis that our resources in the air are perhaps the best antitoxin against the germs of war.

I do not pose as a military expert. Even in the field of commercial aviation I am a comparative newcomer. Yet I have observed enough since becoming affiliated with the scheduled airlines of the United States to obtain the definite conviction that civil aviation is the great backlog of military security. Perhaps that statement puts me in the role of an armchair general. So be it. For no less an authority than General Eisenhower is credited with the statement that there are only two professions in which the amateur excels the professional—military strategy is one. The other is not generally discussed in public.

I'll go ahead with my role as an armchair general.

Though I got no closer to combat than the Nation's Capitol I share what I believe to be the feeling of most of you. Legionnaires that war is a silly way to settle international differences. Nevertheless, I am not a pacifist nor an appeaser. Nor do I think any of you in this audience feel that America will work out her destiny by laying down her big stick and saying to whosoever attacks these United States, "Come on, boys, take what you want." America wasn't built that way, and we will not survive that way.

In reading the history of the last war, one is constantly impressed with mobility as a source of military strength and combat power. Perhaps that phrase is just a more elegant way of saying what General Nathan Forrest is reputed to have said many years ago, that the secret of victory is to "Git thar fustest with the mostest." The truth of that dictum, so far as I can tell, has been inviolate from the Civil War to the surrender of Japan. Whether our future line of defense is against rockets, pilotless aircraft or atom bombs, the fighting forces having the greatest mobility will have the greatest tactical advantage, either for offense or defense.

I do not mean to be an alarmist. Yet who knows whether 1947 will be labeled by future historians as a postwar or a prewar year? All of us hope that threat of aggression will be removed in the coming months and years and a peaceable means found to settle international differences. But a casual return to history will show us that the end of aggression, devoutly hoped for after 1918, did not materialize. Neither has the threat been yet obliterated. If preparedness is the best antidote for the poison that breeds world cataclysms, let's look a little at the role of civil and military aviation in the past, to learn what may be expected of it in the future.

It was clear to almost everyone at the end of World War I that the airplane had grown out of the role of a weapon. Its potentialities changed the entire method of warfare. Henceforth, any planners for defense or aggression would have to look to the skies as well as to land and sea surfaces. And I believe I am safe in saying that despite the air power which Germany built up in the years between the two wars, created on the technical efficiency of the Germanic military mind and the evil genius of Hermann Goering, the Allied planning and production for air warfare was much better, once it got started. I will not say, of course, that either England was prepared in the air in 1939, or America in 1940–41, for the struggle that came. But the determination of the Royal Air Force was sufficient to hold off the immense power of the Luftwaffe in adequate degree until the immense resources of America could come to Britain's aid. If German air power, calculatingly strengthened in the 1930's, had been strong enough to lay waste Britain's defenses, who can say today what the course of the war might have been, and how much of the world today would be under Axis domination?

In the march of aviation, some of us are prone to forget how young the science of aeronautics really is. Most of you know that the Wright brothers conducted the first experiments that led to flight in heavier-than-air machines. But how many of you remember that it was in 1903 that aviation was born? Aviation is only in its forties.

And the most rapid part of aviation's march was since the outbreak of World War I, spurred, of course, by military necessity, but bolstered by the developments of civil aviation in the years between.

When we declared war on Germany in 1917, there were 52 officers, about 1,100 enlisted men, and about 200 civilian employees, including mechanics, in the Aviation Section of the Signal Corps. Up to that time the Army had trained 139 men to fly, of whom 25 or so were really qualified pilots.

We had no appreciable civilian flying activity in the United States before 1917. We had no air lines upon whose experiences and facilities we could draw to make up for our deficiencies in aviation. We had no civil pilots, no civil airports, no civil aerological services, private or public—in short, no great reservoir of civilian aviation resources which we now know to be the backlog of civilian defense.

Let's skip to the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939. On the day the Germans invaded Poland, Col Edgar S. Gorrell, first president of the Air Transport Association and one of the most dynamic men ever to be connected with aviation, was on a fishing trip in Ontario. The association had been instructed to locate him, if anything untoward occurred in the international situation. A survey plane of the province was sent out and finally located the party in a fishing boat. The plane landed alongside, picked up the colonel. Within an hour he was on an air liner and he arrived the same day at his office in Chicago. He called his personal friend, Gen. George Marshall and said, "General, the air lines are ready." It was as simple as that.

But what had the air lines to offer the Nation on that day in September 1939?

The very first action of the Air Transport Association, after it was formed in January 1936, was to urge the War Department to let the association formulate, with the Department, a plan for the mobilization and utilization of the scheduled air lines in wartime. The permission granted, the association worked during the year with the Army Air Corps and the Army War College to make a plan for using our civil aviation resources for war. The plan was revised from time to time, according to conditions, and checked every 2 weeks or so. The German invasion of Poland was a dress rehearsal of the plan, although no mobilization took place. When it was needed, however, it was ready. Indeed, it had been tested to some degree, for the air lines, through the association, had collaborated with the Ferrying Command of the Air Corps for development of worldwide air transport facilities. A secret mobilization plan was drawn up by the air lines which enabled them to undertake important special missions for the War Department. The Ferrying Command not only enlisted the air lines in the actual ferrying of aircraft to Alaska, Africa, India, and other foreign countries but also utilized air-line facilities for the establishment of weather, meteorological and maintenance services for development of foreign routes. Routes were surveyed and regular services overseas begun, forming the framework for the more important operations that came later in the war.

On the day that Pearl Harbor was attacked, the response of the air lines was immediate and dramatic. Minutes after the news was flashed, our air lines, already on military reserve under ATA's mobilization plan, flew to the colors. Air-line planes were ordered by radio to land at the nearest fields and await orders. Several liners discharged their passengers at the nearest airport, lingered only long enough to take aboard military personnel or war cargoes and then took off again for unrevealed destinations, many of them only dots on the map, places the pilots probably never heard of before.

Pan American Airways converted their Clipper planes to war service within 24 hours after Pearl Harbor. Their world-wide operations went on in the Atlantic, Pacific, Latin America, Africa, and the Orient. Flight operations over the Atlantic soon doubled. Their Pacific operations were continued and through China National Airways the provisional capital at Chungking was linked with Calcutta. The trunk operation between Seattle and Fairbanks, Alaska, was increased to daily schedule. Pan American went on to construct airport facilities, establish war transportation and ferrying services, replace Axis air lines in South America, train 1,850 navigators, and transport a great number of Government personnel and their supplies.

A typical instance of the value of the association's plan—and an illustration of the mobility offered by air transportation—took place the next Sunday after Pearl Harbor. In the middle of the morning, the War Department called the association to ask for an immediate secret movement of special troops. They were to go to Brazil, where it was feared an attack was coming. Within a few minutes Colonel Gorrell was in Army headquarters to receive orders for the movement. ATA's plan went into operation.

Within 5 minutes the required planes were notified to land at the nearest airport, passengers were discharged, airplanes refueled, reserviced, and equipped with fresh crews, supplies, spare parts, maps, and mechanics. Nonessential equipment was stripped. The planes were flown to the appropriate Army posts even before the troops were ready to board them. The troops were flown to the Nation's boundaries and then on to their then secret destination, all done according to the principles laid down in the plan the association had suggested and helped to formulate years before.

The logbooks of the air lines are in laconic language. But let me tell you what happened when Dutch Harbor, that cold spot on the Alaskan chain of islands pointing toward Siberia, was threatened.

The Japs had taken Attu and Kiska, and were on the verge of assaulting Dutch Harbor, the most western bastion of American defense of the North American Continent. To lose Dutch Harbor meant a Jap foothold on our continent. At 6 o'clock on Saturday afternoon, June 13, 1942, a call went through from Washington to the headquarters of 11 air lines, ordering every available transport plane to Edmonton, Alberta, to rush men and material to Alaska to stop the gap.

Flight superintendents radioed orders to all ships from coast to coast to alter their courses, drop their passengers at the nearest airport, disregard designated destinations and head north. Crews had to borrow pocket money from corner grocery stores and forget they had no clean shirts.

Quickly assembled at Edmonton, the Minute Man fleet began shuttling vitally important ammunition, medicine, food, machinery, guns, and personnel to bolster the Dutch Harbor base. These flights of thousands of miles were over uncharted terrain, with mountain ranges periodically forcing flights to 23,000 feet for safety. The concerted efforts of the air lines made Dutch Harbor strong enough to thwart the proposed Jap invasion, and who can say that the course of the war was not changed by the mobility afforded our armed forces by the instant availability of air transport?

The whole framework of the scheduled air lines went into war in December, 1941. Western Airlines' planes were requisitioned to fly ammunition to the west coast, where it was feared that enemy action might come. United Airlines maintained its cross-country services for the transportation of Members of Congress, high Government and civilian persons, and military personnel going to their posts. The cabins and cargo pits were filled with cargo and materials. They flew charter trips everywhere and added second and third sections of regular trips. The immense amount of emergency materials which restored Pearl Harbor to power went over the 6,300-mile coast-to-coast and Pacific coast systems of the line.

Continental Air Lines was ordered to make ready 49 B-17's for combat. Chicago and Southern began its program to modify its planes for combat within a week after we were attacked. Delta Air Lines also began a modification program and to create a military-transport division for Army cargo.

Northwest Airlines established the northern region routes, destined to be one of the most colorful aviation actions of the war. Across the country, Northeast Airlines made a survey flight from Presque Isle, Maine, over Labrador and to Gander, Newfoundland, to determine the practicability of regular transport flight to these points.

Early in 1942 Transcontinental & Western Air made survey flights preparatory to establishing a trans-Atlantic service. Near the end of February a TWA plan left Washington for Cairo, Egypt, carrying Army personnel, and thereby began the service for that division of the Air Forces which was to become the Air Transport Command.

The next month Eastern Air Lines, which had been flying heavy priority cargoes down the east coast to Florida and from the Midwest to the Gulf, began operations with the Air Transport Command, operating in the Miami, Caribbean, North and South American zones. Braniff Airways came into service with the ATC, its facilities aiding materially in setting up the Texas-Canal Zone area of operations.

Immediately after the declaration of war, Pennsylvania-Central Airlines sent two-thirds of its fleet of Capitaliners to the Army. Dozens of their crack crews became members of the Air Forces. In March 1942 PCA signed a contract to operate the first domestic scheduled military cargo service to be conducted by an air carrier in the United States. TACA Airways continued their operations between North and South America, meanwhile performing valuable work in detecting and locating enemy submarines in the Caribbean.

Thus, the air lines of the United States were ready when the time came, to leap in and do their part. Literally overnight they prepared to fly the Himalayas instead of the Rockies, the Sahara instead of Death Valley, the Greenland ice cap instead of the Great Lakes. Every center of population and production in the Nation became linked by air with the rest of the world. In areas where men had never flown before they navigated routes across ice fields, ocean spaces, and desert wastes. Immediately any city in the world became within 60 hours of any airport in the United States.

Within 6 months after Pearl Harbor the scheduled air lines of the United States had sold or leased to the Government 193 planes, more than half their total of 359. More than one-third of their personnel, including top executives and pilots, joined the armed forces, and the air lines faced a continuance of their domestic operations with as great handicap, but with as much determination, as any industry in the Nation.

The trained pilots, mechanics, dispatchers, and executives of the scheduled air lines who volunteered in the armed services, or were drafted for special assignments, were the seed corn from which grew the personnel of the Air Transport Command. Without the skill and experience of these persons, and the splendid example they set, these vital organizations could not have attained their efficiency so rapidly nor maintained it so magnificently. Pilots who flew 100 hours a month in their domestic air-line jobs

frequently doubled their flying time in military service, and many times ground personnel worked round the clock to support their comrades in the air.

The air lines expanded their foreign operations in war service on approximately this pattern:

United and Consolidated on long routes in the Pacific; Northwest and Western to Alaska; American and Transcontinental & Western across the North Atlantic; Northeast to Greenland; Pan American pioneered in the Central Atlantic, Pacific, and Alaska; Eastern across the Caribbean to South America; and American Export to South America, Africa, and Europe; and Pan American-Grace and Braniff to South America.

Other air lines sharing in domestic service directly for the military forces included:

All American, Braniff, Chicago & Southern, Colonial, Continental, Delta, Hawaiian, Inland, Mid-Continent, National and Pennsylvania-Central. In fact all scheduled air lines had a part in the war effort.

Even though they were handicapped by loss of personnel and planes and strained to the utmost by their separate operations for the Air Transport Command and the Navy Air Transport Service, the air lines steadily struggled to meet the demands of their own traffic which had reached an all-time peak in 1941. The flights were dominated by the carriage of passengers, cargo, and air mail on war business, with priority seats accounting for well over 50 percent of the traffic. The planes were flying almost fully loaded. The prewar normal load factor was about 50 percent occupation of the available space. Before the war ended it was over 90 percent. At the same time ingenuity and speed-ups in maintenance made it possible for planes to be in the air up to 12 hours daily, compared to the usual 7 to 9 before the war.

This talk is not intended as a paean of praise. I would rather that it be a pattern. There has been time since the end of the war to appraise the air lines' contribution to victory as a basis for planning the future of civil aviation in its two prime functions of peacetime air transport and bolstering our security.

The United States has never lost a war. But let us not permit a state of complacency to set in, with its inevitable poison to our defense organisms. Should we permit this, a strong aggressor nation could wreak damage on this country comparable to what might have happened had the Japanese been able to bomb the three big aircraft manufacturing plants on the west coast. It requires only an ordinary imagination to envision how that would have hampered our progress in the war, and little more is required to sustain the thought that if war comes to us again, the first effort of the enemy will be to bomb our production centers relentlessly, as we did in Germany and Japan.

We began World War I with a huge deficiency in air transport capacity. In 1941, the number of transport aircraft available to the military services and civil aviation combined was less than 500. The military transport program began with less than 200 aircraft drafted from the air lines, and we were well into the second year of the war before aircraft production became adequate.

We overcame our obstacles in aircraft production and operations, but it is almost certain we shall not have a similar opportunity to accomplish the same production miracle again, the miracle that let the Allies have some 10,000 aircraft in operation at the end of the war, with most of them, of course, in American hands.

It seems sensible that the United States should have a reserve of at least half that number as a simple addition to our security. If the Nation agrees that this is a logical way to support our common defense, then, in the name of all that spells security, let us find a way to build our air fleet to those proportions, keep it modern and usable and our aviation talents and resources at a high level.

It's a huge job we have before us. The technical, financial, and operating poblems of the scheduled air lines are staggering even for peacetime operation. The problems multiply as we consider the relation of our peacetime fleet to national defense. If it is decided that four to five thousand planes are needed, how shall we maintain them? By their operation on the air lines? Or in idle reserve? Or by Government subsidy? Or by some other means?

We're striking at the root of the problem. We have history to support the need for a correlated system of civil-military air power. We have the ability to produce and maintain such a system. This is as good a place as any to place the problem on a national sounding board, and I present it to you for further dissemination and study. You'll find the air lines ready and willing to cooperate. And let us keep before us always the thought that if another emergency strikes at us we must have air power to survive and win, and that air transport is an essential element of air power, for it is mobility unlimited.

Veterans' Administration's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of Wednesday, April 9, 1947:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(By Tyrrell Krum)

Yesterday, we presented the opening remarks of General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, made to the House Appropriations Committee recently in surveying the VA's program for handling veterans' affairs.

We also gave you the results, in part, of a lengthy private talk we had with the general alone in his office in the Veterans' Administration in which we went over with him all the various manifold difficulties encountered in getting the VA's operation into high gear. And we want to express again our admiration for the job the general is doing.

In attempting to stave off wholesale cuts in VA's annual funds, General Bradley declared in no uncertain terms that if widespread reductions are to be effected, I frankly do not see how they can be accomplished except at the expense of service.

We take up from that point of the general's analysis of the titanic operations of the VA in administering the affairs of millions of veterans and members of their families.

General Bradley continued:

"Where operating costs are reduced to the point that services suffer, we must ask ourselves if this is not false economy. The benefits provided veterans under the Readjustment Act (GI bill of rights) were devised to speed their return to healthy civilian lives. If we slow down the process of readjustment by timid dollar-minded administration of the law, the eventual cost of that delay may far outweigh our savings.

"Delayed readjustment might result in lifelong demands by veterans for priority claims on the national budget."

At this point, we want to make the comment. How right the general is in the observation just made above. Nothing could do more harm to the affairs of the millions of men and women who won our wars than to let them gain the impression they are being given the run-around.

To continue General Bradley's message:

"The fixed charges of veterans' benefits result first from the laws enacted by Congress, second from the war, which determined the number of men entitled to these benefits. As a result of wars in which we have engaged the United States last month (March) had more than 18,300,000 veterans eligible for one or more veterans' benefits.

"In the enactment of veterans' legislation, Congress established the measure of our obligation to these men. In other words, Congress has obligated the American people for the eventual cost of such authorized benefits as 18,000,000 veterans may choose to claim. What the eventual cost may be, no one can—with certainty—say.

"This is particularly true of the readjustment benefits such as education and training, unemployment allowances, and loan guaranties available to more than 14,400,000 veterans of World War II.

"Certainly the cost of this program has been influenced from year to year by the rate of demobilization. Eventually its overall cost will be affected by the turn of our economy. If job opportunities are plentiful in a period of expanding prosperity, the demands for these benefits will be considerably less than they might be in a period of recession.

"Such other factors as availability of schools for instruction and the availability of homes for purchase will determine to some degree the eventual cost of this program. And the broadening of benefits by amendment to the law directly affects the number of veterans who may ultimately apply for them.

"Under the pressure of public opinion, the armed services greatly accelerated the rate of demobilization during the winter of 1945–46. They maintained that rapid pace through the spring and summer, so that by the start of our fiscal year 1947 a total of 12,807,000 veterans had already been discharged from service.

"The estimate on which our 1947 budget was based anticipated that not until June 30, 1947, would we reach a total of 14,000,000 veterans of World War II. As it turned out, we passed that mark early in December 1946.

"This rapid and unprecedented speed-up meant vast increases in the number of veterans applying for benefits of the Readjustment Act. At the same time, it burdened us with additional hundreds of thousands of claims for disability compensation.

"It multiplied our peacetime insurance holders.

"And it threw an early and expensive load on our veterans' hospitals."

With these preliminary remarks out of the way, General Bradley gets down to the basic fundamentals behind all veterans rights and benefits, which we'll cite for you in his own direct quotes in this same space tomorrow.

Communism in Hollywood, From Testimony of Hon. Eric Johnston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I exhibited to this House a petition signed by thousands of the best

people in California urging the Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate the Communist plot centered in Hollywood and the west coast area.

Similar appeals have been coming in from that day to this.

Several days ago, Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, with headquarters in Hollywood, Calif., appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities and did about the most masterful job of side-stepping the issue to which I have ever listened. I cross-examined Mr. Johnston on this subject of Communists' activities in the moving-picture industry; and for the information of the House and the country, under the permission granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting that portion of Mr. Johnston's testimony carrying my cross-examination and his answers to my questions. In order to show the background of the issue involved in these questions, I am beginning with the question asked Mr. Johnston by Representative VAIL, of Illinois:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. VAIL.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Johnston, you mentioned a moment ago, in the course of testimony, that you thought that the Federal Bureau of Investigation should make recommendations to the proper authorities with respect to the necessary legislation to properly stem the tide of communism. You are aware, of course, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation essentially is a policing organization and has no power or authority to suggest legislation?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. VAIL, I said that either the FBI or the Department of Justice.

Mr. VAIL. But you included the FBI?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes; should make recommendations if they haven't sufficient power.

Mr. VAIL. Testimony before this committee in the last few days has indicated that there are several prominent figures in the moving-picture industry, prominent actors in particular, who support communistic activities. I have in mind in particular the names that have been mentioned, March, Robinson, and Sinatra, and Cagney. In your opinion, are those individuals concerned with the progress of communism in this country?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have no knowledge to that effect.

Mr. RANKIN. What was that question?

Mr. VAIL. The question concerned the moving-picture actors or actresses who were interested in the promotion of communism in this country; and Mr. Johnston has stated that he knows nothing of such activities.

If those activities became known to you, Mr. Johnston, would you recommend the elimination of those individuals from the moving-picture industry as you have recommended the elimination from union organizations and Government service?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If they hold offices in the unions or in their guilds, yes, I think they should be prohibited by law from doing so if they are Communists and/or proven to be Communists by trial, as we do in the United States. Then, it seems to me, they should be published. The very fact that they are published to the world as Communists is sufficient to eliminate them, in my opinion.

Mr. VAIL. You are aware of the fact that this committee has before it the problem of considering legislation to outlaw communism. You have taken a definite position, as I understand it, against legislation toward that end?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, I have, but I don't think it is important. The important thing is, are the Communists conspirators? If they are, they should be exposed and prosecuted. The important thing isn't whether Communists believe in collectivism as a political belief. The important thing is, in a land of free speech and a democracy, as to whether they are carrying on conspiratorial activities. If they are, they should be prosecuted and exposed and prevented by law from holding key positions in associations or unions, or of cooperatives, or of management.

Mr. VAIL. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. RANKIN.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Johnston, you say that where Communists conspire to overthrow this Government they should be prosecuted?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Right.

Mr. RANKIN. Are you aware of the fact that communism is a conspiracy against this Government?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe that it is; but if it is proven to be so I think they should be prosecuted.

Mr. RANKIN. Have you any doubt?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I personally have not. In our country we do things by law.

Mr. RANKIN. One of the most dangerous influences they can get their hands on is the moving-picture industry. You said a while ago that, as I understood, you would not fire one or prevent them from participating in the movie industry if you knew they were Communists.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would prevent them from holding offices.

Mr. RANKIN. That is not the thing. The man who makes the picture, to poison the minds of children of this country, through the moving-picture industry, is just as dangerous as the man who plants dynamite under a defense plant in time of war, and it is your duty, it is the duty of every patriotic American, to drive from every position they possibly can those enemies of our country who are conspiring to undermine and destroy it. Unless that is done you are going to have some very drastic legislation with reference to the moving-picture industry from the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think they should be exposed; should be prevented from holding office. I think their very exposition would eliminate them. But I don't think, Mr. RANKIN, we are ready for concentration camps yet in America. Men have to earn a living. I think this: If they are doing things which are conspiring or treasonable, they should be prosecuted and dealt with as real criminals.

Mr. RANKIN. Yet you say you would not prevent them, try to prevent them, from making pictures or working in the moving-picture industry, even though you knew they were Communists?

Mr. JOHNSTON. A man who works in the moving-picture industry, unless he directs the plot, or cuts the film, hasn't very much to do with Communist propaganda in the films. Mr. RANKIN, before you came in I said that unquestionably, in my opinion, there were Communists in Hollywood, but that they had not had an effect upon the American films, because we are hated in every land in the world in which communism holds sway.

Mr. RANKIN. Who is hated?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The American motion-picture industry. We are forbidden in most of the countries behind the iron curtain; we are forbidden and fought by Communist Parties in every land in the world.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Johnston, they don't have to hold office even in a labor union to be effective, but unless your outfit, the moving-picture industry, is willing to purge those subversive influences, it is going to have to be done by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. RANKIN, we are doing everything in our power to do that legally. We cannot discharge a man from a union because he says he is a Communist.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. Let's see whether you can or not. You mean you can't discharge a man working in your enterprise when you know he has joined a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is different. If that is proven he is in a conspiracy and should be prosecuted by the Department of Justice.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what communism is. It is dedicated to the destruction of this Government. It is dedicated to the destruction of the American way of life and to every business enterprise in America.

Mr. JOHNSTON. All I say to you is, Mr. RANKIN, prove that he is a Communist; if he is engaged in conspiracy he should be prosecuted.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, but listen: I am surprised at your attitude. I think you are going to have to revise your position and join us in this crusade to save America from its enemies within our gates. And you can't wink at them in the moving-picture industry.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We are not winking at them in the motion-picture industry, Mr. RANKIN.

Mr. RANKIN. And continue to enjoy the confidence of the American people.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We are not doing that.

Mr. RANKIN. Today we are in a deadly conflict with oriental communism and western civilization. Someone yesterday, or the day before—2 days ago—described Stalin as the Genghis Khan of the twentieth century. I thought that that was putting it rather bluntly. But we are today in deadly conflict between those two ideologies and there can be no compromise.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. RANKIN——

Mr. RANKIN. In this country.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I hope you you are not impugning in any way the American activities of the motion-picture employers in Hollywood.

Mr. RANKIN. I am, some of them, I will say.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I want to tell you right now there is no group of more American people in the country than are those in Hollywood. I want to tell you some of the things they are doing, just for information——

Mr. RANKIN. I know some of the things they are doing, and I know some of the things they are doing that probably you don't know, and I can tell you now, you need a house cleaning, need it very badly, and I think you are the man to start it.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. RANKIN.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Johnston, you say that you would prohibit Communists from holding office——

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, Mr. RANKIN.

Mr. RANKIN. In Federal, State, or county or municipality?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. You would also prohibit them from holding offices in labor unions?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. You would also prohibit them from becoming instructors in our educational institutions, I presume?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If those are deemed of importance, yes. If those are deemed key positions—and in my opinion they would be.

Mr. RANKIN. Don't you think it is a key position when a man has the training of the youth of the country?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If they are teaching conspiratorial or revolutionary ideas, overthrow of the Government by force, in schools, of course they should be removed.

Mr. RANKIN. Would you want to send your children to a school teacher that you knew was in favor and committed to the overthrow of this Government?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Why, of course not.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. Now, then, don't you think that actors who put on plays should also be, who are Communists, should also be banned?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If you are performing conspiratorial activities, yes. Mr. RANKIN, the difficulty is in labeling everyone who doesn't agree with you a Communist—or agree with me—and that is one of the problems. Many of these people have different points of view.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Johnston, you are so busy with your executive duties that I am afraid you don't read some of these films between the lines, read between the lines, but a great many of the people——

Mr. JOHNSTON. I not only read between the lines, but I get under the sheets, too, Mr. RANKIN.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, then, I want to ask you about your script writers. Do you permit these fellows to write script, the Communists, to write script for your pictures?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If the scripts that are written are in any way communistic, I have almost complete confidence that the employers would not permit such a script to be used.

Mr. RANKIN. Would you risk having a man write a script or a picture to be shown to the millions of children of this country that you knew was a Communist?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If he was using anything communistic in it?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Please bear in mind that after a script is written it is reviewed by a good many people. It is read. It is reviewed by top executives. After it is photographed it is again reviewed and cut.

Mr. RANKIN. And still you can read between the lines in some instances. So I am asking you if you would, if you knew that a man or a woman was a Communist, if you would permit him to write the scripts for the picture shows that you were sending out over the country for the children of this Nation?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If a man is a known Communist, of course, he should not be. I told you a moment ago, as an employer in Hollywood—if we have a contract with a man there is no way by which we can cancel that contract, just because he is a member of the Communist Party, unless he engages in treasonable activity.

Mr. RANKIN. The mere fact that he is a member of the Communist Party, committed to the overthrow of this Government, should justify you in canceling the contract. They threw one great American off the radio there, Cecil DeMille, because he wouldn't contribute to a campaign that he considered corrupt, to which he was opposed. Now, I am going to ask one more question, and then I will close. I note you say that you attended one of these banquets where they had 62 courses and 32 wines. As a matter of fact, that was for the top-flight commissars?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Of course.

Mr. RANKIN. You were eating with the commissars. The millions of people who are held in slavery and subjugation in Russia never got into one of those banquets—even with two courses and one wine, did they?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I don't think I was allowed even to see them very much.

Mr. RANKIN. No. If they have their way the same condition will prevail in this country. One of the most potent influences that they could get their hands on—and the reason I am saying this, I have been abused so much that I have become immune to it—but I can tell you now there is a great deal, a rising tide of criticism of the moving-picture industry from this standpoint, and the reason I am saying this to you -and I will say, Mr. Johnston, I have known you for a long time, you were head of the Chamber of Commerce, I believe?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I was; yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. And I don't want to see the moving-picture industry crippled or discredited, but I think that unless you get busy and clean house and fumigate it——

Mr. JOHNSTON. How would you suggest we do it, Mr. RANKIN?

Mr. RANKIN. I suggest that you get as busy as the FBI does. And I am not sure that you couldn't get the assistance of the FBI. And everyone whose loyalty was questioned I would certainly get them out of the moving-picture industry.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. RANKIN——

Mr. RANKIN. Just as I would get them off of the pay roll of the colleges of the country, just as I would get them off the Federal pay roll, the State pay roll, the county pay roll, and the municipal pay roll. A man who doesn't believe in this form of government, and who is out to destroy or join the conspiracy to destroy it, that man has no right to participate in those activities that control public sentiment or shape the public mind.

* * * * *

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. RANKIN, as I said before, if there is a conspiracy to destroy our Government by force, of course, it should be prosecuted and prohibited.

Mr. RANKIN. It is a conspiracy to destroy it by any method by which it can be destroyed. That has been brought out so forcibly here by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and others who are familiar with the situation that I don't see how any American can question it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not question Mr. Hoover. I have the greatest confidence in him, Mr. RANKIN.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. RANKIN.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Johnston——

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. This hearing is being held on a couple of bills, one of which I introduced to outlaw the Communist conspiracy. There have been a great many who testified who have dwelt on trying to outlaw a political party. Don't you think some law should be passed to punish the participation in a conspiracy against the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Well, Mr. RANKIN, I thought there were laws in existence now which would punish treason, conspiracy against the United States—our alien and sedition laws.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not sure they do.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If they do not, strengthen them. You are an expert on legislation. I am not.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank you for the compliment, but I am not sure that I could qualify.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Couldn't the Department of Justice tell you whether they are strong enough?

Mr. RANKIN. What I am driving at, and I think what you are driving at, and all other patriotic Americans are, is, putting a stop to these attempts to undermine and destroy this Government, the American way of life.

Now, they keep harping on the capitalistic system. Just offhand you would think they were talking about a few millionaires, but they are talking about everyone who owns a home or who owns a farm or a factory or a store or a shop or a filling station. In other words, it is to destroy the entire economic system of this country. So don't you think some law, if the law is not sufficient now—and if it hasn't been enforced—don't you think we ought to strengthen that law to prohibit and to punish anyone who joins in such a conspiracy here in the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. RANKIN, I am not an expert on law or legislation, and, as I said, I think you are. If the laws need to be strengthened, and if the Department of Justice does not have sufficient law to prosecute people who are now committing acts of sedition or treason against our country, then the law should be strengthened, unquestionably. In a free country, such as ours, people can change the form of government by constitutional methods. I do not believe in communism, I do not believe in anything which it stands for, I am unalterably opposed to it; but I also do believe, with the late Oliver Wendell Holmes, that freedom is the right to express the thoughts that are repugnant to ourselves if they want to express them. When you talk about treason, or overthrowing the Government by force, then something should be done about it.

Mr. RANKIN. Treason consists in levying war on the United States, or aiding or abetting an enemy in time of war. That is roughly the definition of treason in this country. Now the Communist conspiracy is a conspiracy to destroy this country. Wouldn't you call that a treasonable conspiracy? If it isn't considered treason under the law, don't you think it should?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe it is, but I think it should be prosecuted under the law. If the law isn't ample, the law should be extended so that it is ample.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I am driving at.

* * * * *

Mr. RANKIN. If we passed a law, if Congress passed a law along the lines I suggested, that would enable you to get rid of them, wouldn't it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. We will try to help you.

The Lilienthal Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, first as an American and second as a Member of Congress, I am fully aware and the American people should become fully aware of the propaganda and pressure to which Members of the Senate have been subjected relative to the campaign by so-called liberals, Communist tools, and innocent affiliates to force the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal to the Atomic Commission.

Americans should become fully aware that the appointment of David Lilienthal was the result of a well-planned program, and that the gentleman, himself, while holding a Government position, unceasingly and actively campaigned for this position. This is corroborated by no less a person than Harold "Honest" Ickes. I feel that careful consideration should be given to the remarks of William C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to Soviet Russia, when he stated that in his opinion Russia did not have all the necessary data to develop and manufacture the atomic bomb, and he concluded that if the Senate did have such knowledge, the people of these United States would have been so informed in a forceful manner.

I wish to stress the fact that at this moment in our Nation's history, we cannot afford to gamble on the loyalty or innocence of any individual or group of individuals. It is our opinion that if the slightest suspicion is cast on any person who is to be placed in a position where instruments of defense, either intentionally or through ignorance, fall into the hands of an alien power, that person should not be given one moment's consideration. We also feel that if the person himself is a true patriot, he would resign without hesitation.

A review of the background of the present Presidential appointee fails to reveal that he is a master mind. His greatest

claim to this position appears to be the years he has spent with the TVA. I am of the opinion that the job performed by Mr. Lilienthal in no way proves great ability. He has not been placed in a position where he has been compelled to meet competition. His financial backer has been the Treasury of the United States. All of the red tape with which similar utilities are daily confronted never existed for him. TVA has never been faced with a tax problem and if a few additional million at the end of the year was needed the powers that approved this social experiment helped to secure the money without too much effort.

It is my opinion that under the circumstances there are in this country several hundred thousand young men who would have done a better job than Mr. Lilienthal. His business life has been protected from the hardships and worries which daily confront the executive who is responsible to stockholders, and who despite red tape, competition, and other obstacles is expected to produce a profit at the end of the year. If Mr. Lilienthal had been in private industry he would not at the end of the year be able to show a profit, but reported that the business will be short two million this year, one million next year, and so on indefinitely, he would not be employed long. No, Senators, there is not actually any convincing proof that Lilienthal is a tried and unusually able executive.

Before reaching a decision to take a public stand on the appointment of David E. Lilienthal I made a systematic examination of the organizations and publications which have been propagandizing in behalf of the gentleman and for his appointment to the Atomic Commission. On a recent date some 21 organizations came out openly for Mr. Lilienthal. Among this group we find the National League of Women Voters. Now this organization, headed by Anna Lord Strauss, has consistently advocated and lobbied to retain as a part of our bureaucracy such agencies as OPA.

This organization among other things publishes a paper called Action. In May 1946, Vera Nicholes Dean wrote an article for this paper under the title "Is Russia Alone to Blame." In this article the popular Vera Dean has this to say:

> Since VJ-day our—United States—economic withdrawal, our naked materialism as exemplified by our attitude toward the feeding of starving peoples, our political vacillations, and above all, our moral negativism have done more to keep the world in a turmoil than Russia's actions.

Just exactly where Vera Dean has been in the past year it is most difficult to say. She probably never heard of UNRRA and if she has is not aware that 72 percent of the funds expended by this organization came out of the taxpayers in the 48 States of these United States. It is possible that she never heard of the $4,500,000,000 loaned to Great Britain, she may not have heard of the recent loan to Italy, or of the extensive credits to Greece and the pan-Slavic states. It is possible that she is in the dark in respect to the commodities which have been extended Tito, under very liberal conditions, which in turn have been used to finance communism in that nation and the death of five of our finest young soldiers. She appears to be ignorant of the wholesale looting of food and the stripping of machinery in Soviet-occupied countries. This nation which she attempts to glorify in a subtle manner, looted from Rumania alone 1,700,000 horses. We wonder if this lady fully realizes what this item alone means to the people of Rumania, where the horse is the prime factor in producing food. Our Nation has presently been made aware of the effectiveness of such looting.

Another organization which appeared on this endorsement list was the Federal Council of Churches for Christ in America. Now several days after this appeared a small item was carried in one of the leading daily papers which denied they had taken such a position. In our opinion the United States Senate should learn how the name of such an organization can be used in such a loose manner. It must be remembered that this organization claims to represent some 25,000,000 Protestants in this Nation. It might be well to learn by what authority this endorsement was issued, apparently without consulting the responsible executives in that organization.

With one or two exceptions each of the organizations which endorsed Mr. Lilienthal could be exposed for what they really are. We wonder if the innocents in these front groups fully realize what the ultimate consequence of their unthinking endorsements might lead to. These persons are the Chamberlains of the day—people who desire to appease. It is likewise very strange to us that many of these people, who now insist that we must get along with this totalitarian giant, were the chief propagandists against the Chamberlain appeasement policies. They held that America could not exist in a world in which one-half was under the domination of German totalitarianism, but now seem to think we can live in a world, now more than half dominated by Russian totalitarianism. Even the slow thinkers of our day are beginning to realize that Hitler's methods and objectives were a part and parcel of the Soviet Communist system. According to our late President, Stalin and the Government of the U. S. S. R. are just as vicious a state as Hitler's Nazi government.

The idealists in America who have conducted such an aggressive campaign to have Mr. Lilienthal confirmed, have little regard for the safety of our Nation as a nation. They have time and again indicated their preference for a one-world government regardless of what the results might be to our people and country. It is therefore only reasonable to conclude that they feel they have in Mr. Lilienthal a man who is innocent enough to bend to their will and desires. They seem to forget that we are living in a practical world and that one of the most capable and shrewdest realistic thinkers of our day is the man who heads the Kremlin. A Communist preaches idealism to all such innocents, but not since the day of Karl Marx have they ever been known to practice it. A Communist lives in a practical world and functions accordingly.

One of the leading publications promoting the Lilienthal appointment is the confused organ known under the title of the New Republic.

It is perfectly possible that Mr. Lilienthal is merely repaid a debt of gratitude, when on an early occasion he endorsed this publication with these words:

> The New Republic stands out in American journalism because it understands that unity and agreement, however much desired are frail and illusory unless forged out of the realities of modern life. The New Republic is admirably qualified for this essential role of vigorous, independent interpreter of complex facts.

Directly above this statement and picture of Mr. Lilienthal is a similar endorsement and picture of Orson Welles, who has been active in no less than 14 Communist-front organizations in the United States. On one occasion one of the leading members of the Communist movement in America, and now reformed, stated:

> Orson Welles is used by the Communist movement to the limit, but he is too unreliable to be accepted as a full-fledged member.

In this same document the New Republic stresses the fact that among most scintillating contributors to the publication are Bruce Bliven, George Soule, Max Lerner, Malcolm Cowley, and Michael Straight. To many persons this means little, but if one desires to learn how communistic these four persons might be all they need to do is to examine the public records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and they will find that George Soule, is mentioned on 43 occasions, which related to his extensive Communist-front activity. Using the same index then look up Mr. Malcolm Cowley, there you find he is mentioned some 54 times and his Red-front activities exposed. Then using the same index look for the name of Max Lerner; he is spoken of on no less than 50 occasions and his Communist-front-activity exposed in detail. The fourth person referred to is Bruce Bliven; he is mentioned in this same index no less than 25 times, and his Red activities are brought to light. The background of Michael Straight and his indicated sympathies place him in about the same category as the other four.

Directly underneath these advertised contributors is the phrase: "And many others."

We do not pretend to know exactly what they mean by this additional remark, but we can inform you that among others who were given space in the publication to espouse and glorify the Russian Communists was none other than Earl Browder.

In the same pamphlet in which Mr. Lilienthal's picture and endorsement appeared is a picture of and an endorsement by Harold J. Laski.

At this point it might be interesting to review Mr. Laski's opinion on atomic energy, as stressed by him in December of 1945, when speaking before the Nation Associates as a guest of Freda

Kirchway and her Socialist-minded friends. Mr. Laski on this occasion stated:

> Free enterprise and market economy mean war. Socialism and planned economy mean peace. All attempts to find a compromise are a satanic illusion.
>
> It is clear to any honest observer that a society dominated by businessmen could not be trusted to create the mental climate in which the development of atomic energy would be confined within the framework of peace. They would not give the common people the education because they fear its outcome.

We are interested in knowing if Mr. Lilienthal shares this same opinion, inasmuch as he shares the same page.

Today this publication is now, theoretically at least, headed by Henry Wallace, who has been loud in his endorsement of Mr. Lilienthal.

We regret to mention that while some Members of the United States Senate might at this time be confused as to the direction to take, to these I say, the Browders, Laskis, Soules, Blivens, and Wallaces are not. They hope to change our Government in part or in whole and have a definite program laid out to reach this goal. It makes little difference to them who they will use to reach their objectives.

This publication, according to the House campaign hearings, sold to the CIO its congressional list.

I feel that if Mr. Lilienthal holds this publication in such high regard and not only loans his picture, but his signature and endorsement in a pamphlet gotten up to sell the magazine, he must endorse Mr. Welles, George Soule, Harold Laski, Michael Straight, Max Lerner, Malcolm Cowley, Bruce Bliven, and the policy which gives to Earl Browder, space in the publication to glorify the Communist movement.

The Constitutional Education League of New York City, recently called upon Henry Wallace to register as a foreign agent, when he assumed editorship of the New Republic. They charged that the owner resided in London, England. It might be interesting to learn if the red-wing labor group which now controls Great Britain, and of which Harold Laski was secretary have more than a casual interest in the Lilienthal appointment.

One leading newspaper which devoted considerable space in defending the appointment of Lilienthal, has on several occasions carried ads telling of activities and meetings of the Communist Party. The executive secretary of one branch of the Communist Party was for a period of time employed by this paper in the accounting department. He informs that according to the books of the specific branch of the Communist Party they were not asked to pay for the ads. In fact he said, "We did not have that kind of money in the treasury."

Still another publication carried headlines that the FBI issued a statement exonerating Mr. Lilienthal of any Communist activity. We have been informed that no such statement was issued.

One motion picture house carried ads in Washington, D. C., papers to the effect that they were showing a picture which had to do with Mr. Lilienthal, using these words, "Lilienthal confirmed." Only those who are acquainted with the Communist propaganda technique fully realize what such a distortion means. This method is commonly used to make the people believe that a highly controversial issue has been settled, and in this way discourage the opposition, which is led to believe the fight is lost. This of course, could have been an innocent error, but it is difficult for any person or group who understands the methods used by fellow travelers and Red propagandists to accept this explanation.

With one or two exceptions every Red sheet in America has carried on a direct or subtle campaign to have this gentleman confirmed.

In addition to close association with so-called liberals and twentieth century progressives, Mr. Lilienthal has at least on one occasion loaned his name to the leading Communist front in the South. This organization is known as the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. This front was established by a direct contribution of $2,000 from the Communist Party, and was established through the efforts of Robert F. Hall, a leading member of the Communist movement today, Paul Crouch, Ted Wellman and Joseph Gelders, the same names which appear time and time again in connection with the Communist cell in TVA.

Earl Browder, definitely identified the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a front organization, describing it as a transmission belt for Red propaganda. James W. Ford, a candidate for Vice President on the Communist Party ticket, spoke of this front and the Southern Negro Youth Conference in these terms:

> The Communists through their pioneering work in the South may justly claim to have laid the foundation for great social movements." (Communist, September 1938, p. 826.)

On March 29, 1944, the Special House Committee on Un-American Activities, cited this organization as a Communist front. Senators, we wish to remind you that this was the finding of a committee composed of Members of the United States Congress, and not by some unofficial prejudice group. It appears that Mr. Lilienthal saw reason to ignore those findings. They were made public and have been printed over and over again, yet we heard no denials or repudiation of this Communist front by the presently appointed applicant for the post of Chairman of our Atomic Commission. If the man is sincere, we feel that we are within our rights as citizens of the United States to know just how he feels about this organization today. It is our opinion that any normal person and true patriot would loudly denounce such a group when the facts are brought to his attention. For some reason he appears to have reserved his decision. His testimony on the stand indicates that conveniently his knowledge of communism and its relationship with so-called progressives and pink liberals is limited.

You must realize, Senators, not only is the security of America at stake, but the security of the true freedom-loving people of the world, many of whom at this moment are being ground under the heal of a ruthless despot, and forced to accept a form of government which aims to destroy their individual liberties. The Members of the present Congress may one day be called to account by the patriots of the United States because they failed to consider the facts which have been herein set forth.

Testimony has shown that during the time Mr. Lilienthal served at TVA some of his closest associates and fellow employees had better than casual relations with leading Communists and Communist fronts.

For some reason officials of our Nation fail to comprehend the true purpose of the Communist front and do not realize that these fronts and their sponsors—innocent or otherwise—are as much a fifth column today as the German-American Bund. Despite the extensive testimony and written word of Browder, William Z. Foster, Lenin, Stalin, and many others, they cannot bring themselves to believe that the objectives of the Communist and the sympathetic fellow traveler is to destroy the capitalistic form of government, no matter where it exists. The chief purpose of these fronts have been, and are now, to carry on a plan of organized dissension—to carry the word of Marx and Lenin to the people and to conform strictly to the foreign policy of their fatherland—Soviet Russia.

Employed at TVA under Mr. Lilienthal was John Marshall Frantz, who was on the advisory board of the North American Committee to aid Spanish democracy. This front is cited no less than four times in the Red Book of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

> 1. Received money raised by the Communist Party of Massachusetts. (Massachusetts, House Committee on Un-American Activities, report 1938, p. 562.)
>
> 2. International Workers Order (which is cited by the House committee and other official Government agencies no less than 13 times in the "Red book," published by the House Committee on Un-American Activities), contributed funds to the described Spanish front.
>
> 3. Cited as under Communist control, influence, and collaboration with the Communist Party by the Committee for Cultural Freedom, Prof. John Dewey, chairman, April 1942.
>
> 4. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944; January 3, 1940.

Among the membership of the advisory board of this organization there were on its board 20 people, and of that 20, 12 were TVA employees and 3 were relatives of TVA employees, making 15 of a membership of 20 either employed by the Authority or relatives of TVA employees.

One of the most intimate associates of Mr. Lilienthal at TVA and during the development of the Atomic Commission is Mr. Herbert Marks. He was identified under oath on July 6, 1940, by Mrs. Muriel S. Williams, a former member of the Communist Party as a person who attended pro-Communist meetings. Mr. Marks likewise has been identified as a member of the National Lawyers Guild. This organization is cited no less than

three times in the Red Book, published by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

1. The late Frank P. Walsh, Comptroller, Joseph D. K. Golderick, Judge Ferdinand Pecora, Hon. Adolph Berle, Nathan Margold, then solicitor to the Department of Interior, and others resigned from the National Lawyers Guild on the ground that it is Communist dominated. (New York City Council Committee investigating municipal civil-service commission, pt. II, p. 55.)

2. Cited as a Communist front. (California Committee on Un-American Activities, report 1943, p. 39.) A. A. Berle, Jr., then Assistant Secretary of State in his letter of resignation dated June 5, 1940, stated that the leadership is not prepared "to take any stand which conflicts with the Communist Party line."

3. Cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944 (pp. 147-149).

Despite these disclosures we have failed to learn that Herbert Marks ever resigned or repudiated this organization. We have brought to the attention of officials, that without fail, you can usually find in every Government Bureau members of this organization who are placed in highly strategic positions and in this way have a heavy hand in the activity of the respective Agency or Bureau.

Selected by the Atomic Commission, 3 days after it had been set up, to head the General Advisory Committee of Scientists, was one of the leading innocents of our day, Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer. In 1940 he joined a Communist front committee which defended New York City public school teachers charged with Communist activities. He also was a member of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, one of the most notorious Red fronts in the United States. This organization is cited three times in the Red Book, published by and publicly distributed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. To date, so far as is known, the good doctor has failed to repudiate the front or its Communist members.

During the recent hearing David Lilienthal failed to produce any evidence that he ever took one single step to repudiate the people employed under him and their Communist front organization associations. The issue at the moment is not whether Lilienthal is himself a Communist. If he was negligent in routing Communists out of TVA, he himself was so gullible that he joined a major Communist front—he ought not to hold a position of public trust, for there are many Americans who neither are negligent or gullible, and who can be trusted to their very last breath to defend and protect the best interests of the United States.

In addition to his association with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Mr. Lilienthal has likewise been accused of being an alumnus of the League for Industrial Democracy. Examination of the early development of this organization reveals that the Fabian Society of London—a creation of Frederick Engels, who was a protege and brother of Karl Marx—established some years ago the London School of Economics, whose purpose was "to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future socialist state." Later an American branch was organized under the name of Intercollegiate Socialist Society, whose object was to promote "an intelligent interest in socialism among college men and women." After World War I the word "Socialists" fell into disrepute and Marxist planners and the brother Socialists popularized—with the aid of some of our leading political figures—their system with the word "democracy," hence the name of the organization was changed to the League for Industrial Democracy. Its purpose declared was and reported still to be the creation of "a new social order based on production for use and not profit."

This organization has been infested by Socialists and Communists since its inception. One of the leading functionaries in this organization is Paul Blanchard who in 1943 entered the foreign-service branch of one of our Government agencies. He was one of the leading voices of this front, and when addressing strikers in Utica, N. Y., said:

I am sometimes ashamed that I am an American. Yes, I am Red and pretty Red * * * The things that happened in Russia are bound to happen in America. * * * The working class must have power. They cannot get that power unless they take it from somebody else. We must honestly try to abolish the superstition of Patriotism. I am an American only by accident of birth.

This same gentleman, and we use the word loosely, in his book on Social Planning and a Socialist Program, said:

The Socialists propose to supplant the competitive planning of Capitalism with a highly centralized planned economy. Our aim is frankly international and not narrowly patriotic. Daughters of the American Revolution, please take notice. If we gain control of the American Government, we would probably begin with a complete revision of the National Government system. We would do one of two things. We would write an Amendment to the Constitution giving the Federal Government the right to regulate all private business and to enter into any business which it deemed proper, or we would abolish the Constitution altogether.

On April 15, 1932, Blanchard told the Academy of Arts and Sciences in Philadelphia:

Having once captured the Government and shelved the Supreme Court, we Socialists would nationalize as many large industries as we could chew. We would do it peacefully, if possible, and would do it otherwise if necessary.

I could continue hour after hour on these associations of Mr. Lilienthal's and the invisible support he has received in his race for nomination to the Atomic Commission. However, at this point I wish to remind you Senators that atomic power is not only a military weapon but an instrument of our future economy. It might, therefore, be well to learn how many of Mr. Blanchard's policies as set forth above are also the policies of Mr. Lilienthal. The person who sits in the driver's seat of this Atomic Commission might find it within his power to quietly aid the program proposed by the League of Industrial Democracy, and in this way help to retain in our Government the Communist and Socialist program which the people repudiated at the election polls in 1946. It is our opinion that people do expect their duly elected legislators to place in responsible positions trusted patriots who can be depended upon under any circumstances regardless of their political affiliation.

I do not feel that the United States Senate has fully investigated the Wallace-Baruch-Acheson interests in respect to this nomination. It appears that one or more of these gentlemen were given to talking out of both sides of their mouth. The part played by these three in the development of this Commission should be explored to the last period. We have plenty of time at the moment, but when atomic energy is dropped on the metropolis of New York City, Washington, D. C., and other congested areas there will be no time to ascertain who was innocent or who was negligent for the damage will have been done.

David Lilienthal at the moment is asserting himself as the man to be trusted with this power. And, yet, his friends, who were yelling a year ago for us to give the knowledge of the atomic bomb to Russia, are the same people who are today yelling to rush his appointment. Such a rush by the Senate would be foolhardy and criminal recklessness.

As a last word of caution, I wish to bring to your attention the concluding words of the Acheson-Lilienthal report, in respect to the development of their proposed method of handling atomic energy:

When the plan is in full operation there will no longer be secrets about atomic energy.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, with spring and the desire for more and better agricultural products, there is increased interest in the soil-conservation program. In one Maine county, Waldo, with a total acreage of 470,162, half of which are in farms, there are approximately 2,600 operating farm units, and on January 1, 23 percent had applied for or received assistance from the district.

From my own county of Somerset, Obed Millett, chairman, Somerset County Agricultural Conservation Committee, Skowhegan, Maine, writes:

SKOWHEGAN, MAINE, *March 21, 1947.*
Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: The Somerset County Agricultural Conservation Committee feel obliged to make known to you some of the results accomplished in Somerset County during the past 10 years of agricultural conservation program work. The program has had very nearly unanimous support from all the active full-time farmers in the county during the past several years, has been entirely voluntary on the farmers' part, and

administered by local and county committeemen on a strictly nonpartisan basis.

From a small beginning in 1936 of less than a thousand tons of limestone and a few thousand dollars in practice payments designed to improve and protect the soils of the county, the practices have increased, until 1946 shows nearly 7,000 tons of limestone spread and other conservation practices carried out which returned assistance payments, including limestone to farmers, of nearly $100,000. Of the several practices available to farmers under the program the farmer paid 30 percent of the cost of materials, the program paying 70 percent. Farmers are hearing of a drastic reduction or possible elimination of funds to continue the agricultural-conservation program on grounds that practices are being supported by Government funds that would be carried out by farmers at their own expense, and that it is the farmers' problem to maintain soil fertility and not the Government's.

The committee wish to point out that even under a well-organized program that less than one-half the limestone needed to maintain soil efficiency is being used, that only about one-third of the superphosphate is being used that should be to balance farm produced fertilizing materials, and many of the program practices that should be carried on to a much greater extent than at present are hardly being used at all.

The committee also feel that although the farmers have a large stake in the future of the farm soils, consumers have a greater stake and consumers interests can only be maintained and protected through a Government program.

Plans have been made to strike from the program any and all practices that may be considered as not absolutely necessary to a peacetime program, but there will undoubtedly be grave and costly consequences to any future program that does not take into account the heavy burdens placed on our farm soils during the past few years as well as the farmers probable inability to do even a small part of the necessary rebuilding at their own cost.

If the Somerset County Agricultural Committee can furnish you with information or affidavits that may help you in decisions regarding the future of funds to continue this program so vital to soil fertility please feel free to call on us at any time.

Yours very truly,

OBED MILLETT,
Chairman, Somerset C. A. C. A.

In referring to the soil conservation program, a Maine columnist, May Craig, writes:

There are farmers who think only of how much they can get out of the soil, just as there are owners of forests who think only of cutting as much as they can and move on. Just as there are manufacturers who want to get as much work as they can out of human beings, at as cheap a price as possible; and labor that wants the highest wage for the least work.

But most of us commit these sins out of ignorance or thoughtlessness. Farmers close to the land learn to love it and care for it. They think of the future not only of their own income but the future generations of consumers who will look to the land for food. They see erosion and the ruin it perpetrates on beautiful, fertile land. They know about the dust bowls of the prairies where we ripped the sod off and let the topsoil, which it took centuries to build, blow away. They know that land must be fed, that we cannot take crops off it year after year and put nothing back, lest we come too soon to the time when nothing can be taken out any more.

It is within our generation that we have come to the realization of the national, general, public interest in preserving our soil. Taxpayers have a general idea that they are paying a lot of money for the Department of Agriculture for conservation. They have a dim idea that this is for the benefit of the farmer and they don't like the word subsidy. But more of us are coming to realize that the spendthrift young United States is growing up; that our resources are not boundless; that our soil must not be robbed; that what we put into proper soil conservation, as into flood control, is for the benefit of all of us.

The Hour of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address which I delivered before a Republican rally in Waukesha, Wis., on March 28, 1947:

We are in the aftermath of the greatest and costliest war that mankind has ever known. Like evil ghosts, the effects of that colossal conflict stalk the council chambers of every nation in the world. Their cold breath blows and leaves its mark on the economic, social, and political life of every country on the face of the globe.

Man's faith in man is wavering; moral concepts are tottering, and nations which once were great now watch themselves crumble and decay. The world seethes with poverty, revolt, and undeclared conflict. The world is deliriously feverish from the shock of the wounds inflicted upon it during the past 8 years.

This is a bleak picture, but nothing can be gained by closing our eyes to the stark reality of the awesome scene.

There are only two great powers in the world today: One is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, dedicated to the religion of communism and to the suppression of individual rights and liberties. The other is the United States of America—a democratic republic—dedicated to the preservation of the inherent rights of the individual man.

We, the people of that United States of America, face our greatest challenge, for we are the last example of a government of the people. The hope of all men in whom the spark of liberty still glows rests in a strong United States—an America that will shine in the future, as it has in the past, as a beacon for the suppressed and the desolate. It is the one nation that stands out in this world in ruins with the potential to give courage and direction to the suffering.

Will it meet the challenge? Will it meet the needs of this hour of decision? There can be only one answer: It must and it will; for if it fails, individual liberty and freedom will become concepts without reality, Christianity will give way to godlessness, and our priceless heritage of the Bill of Rights will disappear into the oblivion of autocratic totalitarianism.

But, tonight, I sound this warning: We can meet this historic challenge only if we retain those qualities of strength and virility which have made us great.

The United States of America—with a sound government responsive to the will of the people, with a productive economy, and with an industrious, prosperous, and happy people—is our answer to the challenge which has been flung at us by the impartial hand of history.

Of what value is our economic or military aid to nations fighting for their freedom, to Greece or to Korea; of what value is our own military might; yes, of what value is our atomic bomb and our supersonic aircraft, if we are weak and soft and corrupt within our own borders? Let there be no mistake about it. If our Government succumbs to confusion, if the dictates of pressure groups take precedence over the welfare of the country as a whole, if our economy is stifled by the cost of huge and extravagant Government and by industrial warfare, and if our people are torn by class hatreds, suspicions, and jealousies, we will fail—and fail miserably—to meet the challenge of the year 1947.

I would be frank with you. There is a long, hard road over which we must travel if we are to strengthen ourselves to meet the grave responsibilities which are ours. Let there be no doubt about it, we face a terrific job right here at home if we are to provide for the world the shining example of a free and liberty-loving democratic republic at work.

Our Federal Government is swollen and expanded beyond the point of human reason; our national debt is $260,000,000,000. The annual cost of our Government approximates one-fifth of our national income. There is an almost unbearable tax load on our people and on our economy. Industrial strife menaces us like a dark cloud on the horizon. Our political and our social institutions are under attack by infiltrating Communists and fellow travelers. We must recognize in a hurry that these are the things which make us weak and disunited. These are the ills which sap our strength and these are the ills for which we must find the remedies.

Yes; these are days of decision—decisions of such magnitude that they are terrifying when we understand their implications. They are decisions that nevertheless must be made, and will be made, for even in failing to make them, we face the gravest of consequences.

It is going to require men of great courage, ability, and integrity to look these problems squarely in the eye. * * *

Let us look at a few of these problems in some detail, but indulge me for a moment to talk "politics." It seems good to get back on a political platform once more, and I'm sure you won't mind if I take advantage of it—just this once. This is one of the things that you and I are fighting for—the free give-and-take of unfettered political expression. It is an integral part of a strong and free America.

So, I say more power to those who disagree with me. I say more power to those newspapers, columnists, radio commentators, and cartoonists, whose wishes have become father to their thoughts and who are trying hard to make the people believe that the Republican majority in Congress is foundering without a program, sinking from want of leadership and dying from lack of energy, drive, and initiative. I say more power to them, because that is their right and their privilege. I know that they are going to say, "More power to you, too, John Byrnes," when I stand up here and fling their insinuations right back in their collective faces.

These men who have been weaned on the New Deal just don't understand.

They can't understand a political party which has thrown away the scepter of one-man rule and the rubber stamp of a "ja" Legislature. They can't understand a Congress whose leadership comes from the rank and file of its membership, with a free and undictated policy arrived at by free men whose only "boss" is the American people. Even before seats of the Eightieth Congress had been warmed they rent the air with their cries of "failure," "indecision," and "muddling." Oh, how they pray that their wish shall become the parent of reality. How sad will be their disappointment as the demo-

cratic process triumphs over government by fiat.

What are the facts concerning the accomplishments of the Republican majority during its 2½ months of existence?

First, the Republicans completely reorganized the legislative branch of the Government. This was necessary under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress and adopted as the rules of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. The deadwood of 48 House committees and 33 Senate committees had to be cleared away. Nineteen House committees and 15 Senate committees—brand new and streamlined for action—had to be organized, filled, and set into action. Now staffs and experts had to be found, qualified and hired. And, on top of this, the new majority had to take over the administration and direction of a Congress which had for 14 long years been controlled by the Democratic Party. These two colossal jobs had to be accomplished before one piece of legislation could reach the floor. And, none of it could be done before the first meeting of Congress on January 3.

Yet, 3 weeks after the opening of the session, these wishful thinkers, these fishers in the slough of despair, were pointing their grimy fingers and hollering like gleeful school boys, "See, what did we tell you? They're sitting on their haunches. They ain't done a thing."

The fact is that the Eightieth Congress was hard at work, under an intelligent leadership, seeking the democratic solution to our national problems.

With the Congress organized, the new committees began their job of sifting and winnowing the proposed legislation, seeking the facts and weighing the evidence before sending any legislation to the floor. Those hearings and deliberations took time, of course. Much slower, I'll readily admit, than the legislative process of the New Deal—when the bills rolled off of the mimeograph machines of the executive branch and slid noiselessly into the hopper for the imprint of the rubber stamp.

Here the cartoonist dipped in his inkwell and the radio commentator sprayed his throat. The former inked out a sleeping elephant; the latter screamed, "Delay." This was all new to them. They'd forgotten how a democratic republic operates under the Constitution of the United States.

The fact is that the Eightieth Congress was hard at work, under an intelligent leadership, seeking the democratic solution to our national problems.

During the hearings, differences of opinion among the Republican Members developed—not over the long-range objective, but over methods and means. These differences were brought out into the open, so they wouldn't fester under the dark light of secrecy.

"Heresy," our little friends shouted and wrote and drew. "Rebellion in the ranks. Undisciplined mob. Whoever heard of such a thing?" Fourteen years under the thumb had caused them to forget that honest men have honest differences which they air openly and honestly before setting their course.

The fact is that the Eightieth Congress, under an intelligent leadership, was democratically settling its minor differences in the open, and its majority was united in its objective of bringing sanity to our National Government. Its differences were compromised in the American way, not by threats, reprisals, and political purges.

Mark me well, those who have been persuaded by these men:

The Republican majority in Congress is mindful of the gravity of the hour.

Its course is well charted.

It will keep faith with the American people—the people who have expressed their confidence in democratic leadership during these days of trial and trouble.

It will meet the challenge of the postwar era.

That is our answer to those who wish us ill.

Our program has begun.

Our program is no secret. It is not unveiled with fanfare nor released with the precise timing of the stage manager the better to play upon the emotions and prejudices of the people. It is there for all to see. It is simply this:

A sound, solvent, and progressive United States, strong within, fearless in its might, and ready and willing to meet the challenge of this momentous hour.

The Republican program envisages a sound and solvent America.

There is probably no single internal problem more pressing or of more importance than putting our financial house in order.

We are laboring under the largest public debt in the history of any nation. Two hundred and sixty billion dollars—over 50 times the full assessed value of all of the taxable property in Wisconsin—a debt that is one and one-half times our total national income. This is the inheritance of the Republican Party.

The annual carrying charge on this debt is in excess of the annual average cost of Government prior to 1934. This is the inheritance of the Republican Party.

In 1932 the annual cost of operating the Government was $4,000,000,000. After 14 years of the more abundant life, the annual cost of the Federal Government had run up to $37,000,000,000. This is the inheritance of the Republican Party.

When the New Deal took over in 1932, there were 578,000 civilian Federal employees. Excluding the War and Navy Departments, there were on January 1 of this year 1,277,000 civilian employees on the Federal pay roll—four times the population of the entire Second Congressional District. They are an inheritance of the Republican Party.

Our Federal tax burden this year will be 22 times the tax burden in 1932. This is an inheritance of the Republican Party.

These legacies constitute the first challenge of the Republican Party. We are meeting that challenge, hour by hour and day by day.

The huge cost of Federal Government is being reduced. The President's so-called "tight" budget will be cut by between five and six billion dollars. This is in the face of an opposition that cries belatedly for economy, yet loudly wails that it can't be done.

The teeming thousands of pay roll hangers-on in the labyrinth departments of the executive branch are receiving their notices. The distributors and receivers of political patronage have their crying towels out and their tears are filling the Potomac, but the cuts are being made. This is being accomplished with no help whatsoever from the executive branch of the Government.

The budget will be balanced. Not only will the budget for 1948 be balanced but the unbalanced budget for 1947 inherited from the Democrats will also be balanced. The first balanced budget in 16 long years. How the pressure groups moan. How their congressional supporters cry when their pet projects are being eliminated. Oh, how the propaganda machines turn the sob stories. Yet, in the face of this opposition, the Republican majority is slashing at the ensnarled budget requests of the lush departments. Over a billion dollars has been eliminated already in the two appropriation bills that have been passed. Almost $700,000,000 have been rescinded from previous appropriations made by the Democratic Congress.

Debt retirement will begin. By cutting expenses to the bone and by encouraging business to maintain a high level of activity, we expect a surplus of from eight to nine billion dollars. A large share of this will go toward making payments on the national debt.

The terrific burden resting on the shoulders of the American taxpayer will be reduced. Already a bill has passed the House of Representatives which will reduce the individual income-tax load by from 30 to 10 percent. This has been done in the face of an opposition that said, "You can't do it."

This process of returning sanity to our fiscal affairs will continue. It requires a high degree of political courage. I have the highest respect for the members of the Appropriations Committee who are doing such a momentous, and, at times, thankless job. We in Wisconsin can well be proud of our member on that committee, Congressman KEEFE, of Oshkosh.

Thus, the Republican Party is moving toward a sound and solvent America. It is working as fast as is consistent with good business practice. It takes time to clean out the trash that has accumulated for 14 years in the Nation's Capital.

The Republican Party is working, too, toward a unified, productive America. It recognizes that industrial peace must be established through fair and reasonable legislation that will protect the American public from indiscriminate warfare. It has taken the lead in the fight against the infiltration of the Communists and the fellow travelers, and it will not rest until they are eliminated from those places where they can do so much harm.

This will be our answer to the challenge of the hour. A strong, solvent, unified, productive, and progressive America, well equipped to stand up and face the world and say, "This is democracy. Here is your choice. Come with us."

Army Day Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of April 7, 1947:

ARMY DAY OUTLOOK

Army Day, 1947, should be more than an occasion for reflecting upon past glories of our Army. It is an appropriate day to take stock of our present not-so-mighty armed might and of the prospect for building it up to proper strength.

This year Army Day comes only a few days after expiration of the draft. From now on the Army—admittedly taking a chance—will have to depend entirely on voluntary enlistments to achieve its peacetime goal of 1,070,000 Regulars. To reach this goal and to maintain this standing Army at scheduled strength will require, for an indefinite period, the enrollment of 30,000 men every month. This is about 10,000 more a month than the present rate.

We have never before faced so tremendous, so challenging a recruiting job. The raising of a volunteer peacetime Army of more than a million Regulars is without precedent. Yet the job must be done if we are to carry out our world-wide responsibilities—now and later. Today's Army is scarcely one to justify boasting. It contains relatively few combat veterans in the rank and file. Most of our troops abroad are handicapped by insufficient training and experience. Our military organization at home is largely a cadre affair.

Some units which exist on paper consist only of a token group of officers and men.

The world situation is such as to make many persons wonder if it was prudent to take a chance in the building of this new Army. While it remained on the statute books, selective service provided an effective support to lean upon in the event of failure of voluntary recruiting. Now that it is gone, along with the stimulus which it provided to enlistments, there is no recourse but to make the volunteer system work. No recourse, that is, unless we are to reenact a selective service law in peacetime—which is an unlikely eventuality.

Every citizen, therefore, should feel it his duty to share with the War Department the critical responsibility of raising America's postwar Army of volunteers in the shortest time possible. General Eisenhower and his officers cannot do it alone. They will need the understanding, cooperation, and active help of all the public if next Army Day is to be an occasion for real celebration.

Rich Man's Bill or Poor Man's Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1 is the Republican tax reduction bill recently passed by the House. It reduces the Nation's individual income tax bill by $3,840,000,000. It provides:

A cut of 30 percent in taxes for an estimated 25,000,000 taxpayers including:

Single persons earning up to $1,667.

Married persons earning up to $2,222.

Married persons with 2 dependent's earning up to $3,333.

A cut of 30 to 20 percent in taxes for an estimated 6,000,000 taxpayers including:

Single persons earning up to $2,100.

Married persons earning up to $2,650.

Married persons with 2 dependents earning up to $3,750.

A cut of 20 percent in taxes for an estimated 15,000,000 taxpayers, not included in above, but earning less than $302,396.

An additional $500 exemption for persons over 65, eliminating an estimated 1,400,000 taxpayers from the rolls.

It maintains the present graduated tax scale. Under this bill, a married man with no other dependents, at different income levels, would pay the following amount for income taxes out of every dollar he earns:

	Cents
$1,100	None
2,200	6.6
2,750	9.1
5,500	12.7
11,000	17.4
16,500	21.6
27,500	29.1
55,000	39.7
110,000	50.5
1,100,000	72.9

Under present law, 44,817,360 taxpayers earning under $5,000 pay 56 percent of the income taxes. Under H. R. 1, they will pay 54 percent.

Under present law, 1,866,439 taxpayers earning over $5,000 pay 44 percent of the income taxes. Under H. R. 1, they will pay 46 percent.

It is evident that a large share of the tax relief proposed under H. R. 1 will be afforded to the lower-income groups. However, H. R. 1 is neither a poor man's bill nor a rich man's bill. It was designed to distribute the tax reduction equitably among all groups since the burden of all taxpayers was substantially increased during the war. It is, in my opinion, just and fair legislation.

Stop Communism Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Mr. Charles V. Stansell, associate editor of the Kansas City Star, was in Washington for a close-up study of the national and international situations. In an article in the Star he points out that only prompt and decisive action by the United States can stop the spreading domination of Europe by communism. Under leave heretofore granted I include the text of Mr. Stansell's article in my remarks:

HALT REDS NOW—OPPORTUNITY RIPE FOR BLOCKING THEM WITHOUT VIOLENCE, CHARLES V. STANSELL SAYS—MAY BE LAST CHANCE—AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY VITAL TO PREVENT SURGE TO SOUTH

WASHINGTON, March 26.—The time for a peaceable halt to Russian expansion is now.

If the American program to bolster Greece against Communist domination is not put through in the next few weeks the opportunity may be forever lost.

Turkey would go next, the coveted Russian control of the Dardanelles would be nearer and Soviet influence in the Mediterranean area and the Middle East would have been given a powerful forward push.

UNITED STATES AS BULWARK

UNRRA is leaving Greece at the end of this month and the British are pulling out at the same time. Without the proposed assistance from America, the situation would be left wide open for the Communist guerrilla forces to take over, and for the opening wedge for the spread of Soviet power throughout a wide area. Thus encouraged, Russia would proceed with its still broader program of expansion.

These are the immediate and tremendous stakes involved in the new American foreign policy. They point to the urgent need of prompt action which can save the day for peace and American prestige. If this step is taken at once it will head off the demand for much broader action later that might have far more serious consequences.

Such are the conclusions of the best informed circles on the administration proposal for $400,000,000 in aid to Greece and Turkey, with only the semblance of military assistance but with close State Department supervision over use of the money.

GIVEN TOP PRIORITY

This program is being given absolutely top priority in White House, diplomatic, executive department, and congressional discussion today. The answers to these pertinent questions have been pretty clearly developed:

"Are we starting a crusade against communism and Russian expansion around the globe to head off the Soviet ambition to become world power No. 1?"

No. We are moving to prevent the necessity of that sort of thing later. It's the seasoned conclusion that if we act decisively on a small scale now then much more costly procedure can be avoided and aid to other countries, such as China and Korea, can be held within controllable limits. There is an evident desire to avoid the fixing of a dead line for congressional approval but the fact is recognized that delay would be extremely hazardous.

COULD DELAY CRISIS

While no decision from Congress can be expected within a week or so, it is felt that evidence of a favorable decision would hold off the crisis for the time being. The absence of it would strengthen the will of the Communist elements in Greece and the expansion program of Russia generally.

"Do we propose to send troops into Greece and Turkey?"

Not troops, but only small military missions to work with the Greek and Turkish Armies. No definite figures are given, but the personnel of these missions could be counted by the score or even on one's fingers. We do have considerable military supplies in Italy which could promptly be moved over into Greece, if necessary, but this is not on the present schedule. There is the definite aim of avoiding any show of military power on our part, although we do have a sizable naval force in the Mediterranean.

The thought of provoking war, however, is positively in the background. For all practical purposes it's being dismissed by administration spokesmen and comes up only in the questioning by congressional committees.

"What of Russia in connection with this aid program?"

The Soviet reaction to date has been considerably milder than expected. Insiders here believe that Russia positively does not want war and that its economy is too weak to stand it, that its attitude has been more of a bluff than anything else and that if we call it decisively the Soviet will gradually back away.

LOOK FOR OPEN DOORS

A high official who has spent years in Moscow puts it this way: The Russians have pushed at a good many doors. If they found half an opening they rushed in. But if the doors didn't yield the Russians pulled back and turned somewhere else. They need only to be shown now that we mean business. They are not in position to go to war. They are engaged in a great internal struggle to rebuild. They will have a hard time doing that without our assistance, and they know it. Their economic resources simply cannot be pitted against ours. They know that.

The Negro Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday April 9, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a letter written to the Memphis Commercial Appeal and printed therein of

date of Sunday, April 6, 1947, which clearly states the stand of most southerners with reference to racial problems:

NEGRO SHOULD EARN RIGHTS

To the COMMERCIAL APPEAL:

Race relationship is the No. 1 problem of the Nation and the South is at least the laboratory for the working of a solution. There is being put forth the idea that race must be ignored and entire equality embraced, or, there is race hate. Many of us southern folks are so provincial that we don't accept the Negro as an equal, but by no measure can we be said to hate him. Any movement that supports the proposition that the white man is better qualified or entitled by race accomplishment to control public affairs is branded a hate organization.

We don't believe or recognize that the Negro race in three generations from slavery has progressed to where he is competent to take over.

Under the favorable conditions that we have created for him, he should make considerable progress in the next 10 to 15 generations. The Negro's right to protection by the courts in his property and life is denied nowhere in the South.

He is encouraged to better himself economically, physically, and culturally, but these things cannot be forced on any people, but must be slowly and patiently sought.

The FEPC'ers would force the employment of Negroes in industry and business whether they are competent or wanted. Likewise, a Negro business could be forced to employ whites whether wanted or not. This race interest could be just another effort to control American life and to annoy the South. Nothing more dangerous to liberty and the American way of life has yet been conceived by the fanatics.

Our Negroes must do something and be something to earn their place in our Nation. America has done far more for the Negro than the Negro has done for America.

A PLAIN CITIZEN.

DEVALLS BLUFF, ARK.

Your National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, since this is Army Week, it is a peculiarly appropriate time to turn our thoughts to the question of our national defense. In so doing we must also remember to be eternally vigilant in the weeks and months to come, to see to it that, after the music of the band has died in the distance and the shouting of this occasion is over, there is no relaxation in thought or deed in our maintenance at all times of a sound but not wasteful defense program, planned with care, and keyed to modern military and naval thinking and development.

Continually hoping and praying as we must for an effective, enforceable, and sincere agreement for international disarmament, let us not meanwhile so lose our perspective that we allow our Nation to be endangered.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which was delivered last Saturday, April 5, at an Army Day ceremony in Rochester, N. Y., by our able and distinguished colleague, the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York:

Mr. Chairman, my comrades in arms, Mayor Dicker, President Shumway, chamber members, and guests, it is a genuine pleasure for me to return home today and to share with you a part in your annual celebration of Army Day. I am grateful to you, not only for the loyal support so many of you rendered last fall which has resulted in this privilege which is now mine to serve my country in time of peace, but also for this opportunity which you have afforded me to bring back to you a message, and voice some of the views and convictions I entertain on the subject of your and my national defense.

I am happy, as I know the citizens of Rochester are, that our city has been honored as the location of the headquarters of several combat units of air and ground forces, whose commanding officers have been presented to you here today. These Reserve and National Guard units will prove important factors both in the life of this community and also in the plan now being formulated throughout the country for the organization of the qualified citizenry for the continuing task of maintaining a readiness, both actual and psychological, to meet any emergency which may arise. Those of us who know personally the commanders of these units realize how fortunate we all are in the selections which have been made.

The first question we must ask ourselves in any discussion of national defense is: Against whom is it necessary to defend our Nation? The answer is: Any potential enemy either outside or within this country. We can concede at the outset that to create and maintain this defense would be easier under a dictatorship where all opposition could be crushed instantly under the heel of one man or clique, and anyone who stood in the path of their designs could be liquidated or brushed aside. But we simply don't do things that way. That system is anathematized, and properly so, by freedom-loving Americans. Let us never depart from that fundamental principle. In peacetime, in our laudable desire to strengthen our country and in our eternal vigilance, necessary as that is, to ensure that no enemy, foreign or domestic, is placed in position to deal a mortal blow at the vitals of our body politic, let us not at any time or under any provocation induced by the pressures of the moment, forget that we are operating and, with God's help, will continue to operate within the framework of a democracy, a system of government which permits freedom of expression and of debate, which exalts the dignity of the human soul, which nurtures tolerance, and which abhors extremist tactics.

Guided, therefore, by these lofty ideals, let us also not fail to be realistic. We must face facts. We must develop a true appreciation of the role of world leadership which we have either assumed or inherited. We must realize that in this fast condensing world of the airplane, the radio and the cyclotron, we can no longer consider the Atlantic seaboard as our first line of defense. We must understand, too, that guns and bullets, torpedoes and atomic bombs and diabolical disease germs are not the only weapons of modern warfare, that the most insidious of them all and perhaps the most destructive, is subversion. We must remember that bloodless overthrow from the foundation, if it can be accomplished, as it has in some countries, is the most effective instrument known to man to accomplish the imposition of the will and ideologies of one nation upon another.

Our second great question is: What shall be the nature of our defense? Obviously the economy of our country cannot permit the maintenance of a standing army and navy of the size or with the equipment appropriate to a period of great national emergency.

True, we must make provision, just so long as all the other great nations do the same, for an adequate standing force to form the core, or nucleus, for the great body of defenders of our Nation if defense again becomes necessary.

I am most sympathetic with the attitude of those who urge international disarmament. It would be an unmixed blessing if all nations could be brought to the realization of the utter futility of settling their differences by the sword, but the trouble is that we must realistically face the fact that this millenium has not arrived. May God speed the day when it does arrive.

Until that time, however, I conceive it to be the duty of the Congress of the United States, the guardian in peacetime of this Nation's safety, to insure that our national security be not imperiled and that we maintain a sufficient strength in arms and men and alertness and advanced awareness in scientific research that we may not furnish an open invitation to attack by possible aggressor nations.

Every informed person knows of the important role played by the Reserve Corps and the National Guard in our national defense. I am happy to be able to advise you that it is my distinct impression from talks I have had just this week in preparation for this address with members of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with War Department matters that they are acutely conscious of the contributions, both actual and potential, of the citizen soldiers who comprise these units. If the scourge of war should ever again afflict our Nation, the methods of waging it in all probability will differ from those we knew in World War II, even more than those in turn were so often unrecognizable to our comrades of the First World War. We cannot fairly expect next time that the continental United States will be spared the awful ravages and holocaust of the conflict. The lightning flash of aggressive concentrated attack on key installations will be the medium whereby an adroit enemy will seek to submerge us and prevent us from ever getting the wheels turning and democratic machinery functioning to fight an all-out war, which, I guess, the nations of the world now realize is the only kind of language this country knows, when challenged.

For this reason, then, it is particularly important, not only that we work ardently and pray unceasingly for peace, but also, so long as naked aggression stalks the globe and other countries continue their militaristic preparations, that we maintain on our soil a body of men who passionately desire peace but who also love and are ready to defend their country and give them at least the bare minimum in men and machines to do that job. These alert groups, disciplined and trained, even though as yet inadequately, would be towers of strength in the face of sudden attack.

The impact upon a disorganized and naturally terrified citizenry of their courageous calm, born of their devotion to duty and nurtured by discipline, is incalculable. Therefore, it seems to me the work you men are doing in organizing these units is so very important.

Nor must we forget that wars are not fought with men alone, nor solely with the weapons and tactics of former wars. It is truer today than ever before that one of our principal concerns in planning and spending for national defense should be with research, experimentation, and collaboration between Government and industry in the design and development of new weapons. The overriding importance of this field of endeavor should not be minimized.

Another absolute essential, as I view it, in the organization of our national defense

is the unification of the armed services. My only reservation regarding the legislation which is now pending and the subject of hearings before the appropriate congressional committees, is that it does not go far enough. If there is one lesson the last war taught us, it is the necessity for a unified command, not alone in the field, but also at the top level. We have one national defense problem: We have so many dollars, so many men, and so many materials which we can devote to national defense without pinching ourselves elsewhere. Common sense demands that those dollars, men, and materials be distributed over the entire defense program in accordance with a single master plan, in order that there be no unnecessary duplications and shortages.

In the past, hearings on War and Navy Department budgets were held before two congressional subcommittees, each of which was ignorant of what the other was doing. Moreover, it was repeatedly stated at those hearings that the Army estimates were prepared without knowledge of the Navy estimates, and vice versa.

It is true that some slight integration of the two budgets may have taken place when they were considered by the Bureau of the Budget and by the full Appropriations Committee. But even so, it is no exaggeration to say that in both the legislative and executive departments of the Federal Government the problem of national defense was viewed, for budgetary purposes, not as a single problem but as two separate problems.

There is no justification for continuing to prepare our defense program in this fashion. To do so is to invite both danger and waste. Until defense planning is conducted by the services jointly, until some means has been devised whereby conflicts and duplications between the two are automatically resolved before legislation is enacted and appropriations made, until we know that differences in treatment and seeming duplications are due to planning and not to chance and lack of planning, not until that time can we be sure that we are getting full value for our defense dollars. I hope action on this matter will be taken promptly.

Finally, there is another element of national defense transcending in importance the welding of our potential fighting men into a single team, or even the maintenance at all times of an adequate force, properly trained and equipped, both on active duty and in reserve. This element is basic and fundamental. Without it all else is a hollow shell, destined to collapse under the first strain engendered either by armed conflict with another nation or organized and insidious attack from within. This essential element is a sound economy.

Reasonable men may fairly and sincerely differ as to the best method to accomplish the objective of creating and maintaining an economic system capable of sustaining and protecting us, and either assisting to ward off or successfully carrying us through another catastrophic national emergency. But no one, it seems to me, can reasonably deny the urgent necessity for the existence of such an economy. Time does not permit of any detailed discussion of this big subject, but I say to you, with all the earnestness at my command, that the spending and taxing policies of our Government over recent years cannot continue if this Nation is to remain strong. Furthermore, unless we do maintain domestic strength, we cannot take the position in the world which is both our birthright and our obligation.

We must find a way and find it now to reduce drastically governmental expenditures, balance the budget, begin payments on our huge national debt and grant some relief to our over-burdened and harassed people in all walks of life from the mounting burdens of taxation. The line of demarcation must be drawn between the activities of the Government which are desirable and those which are essential. Fine furniture and elegant drapes add much to the looks and comfort of the home, yet these things are entirely out of place unless there is something in the pantry and unless the kitchen larder is stocked with the essentials of life. This principle of sane budgetary housekeeping must be applied to our Government before it is too late.

It has been a real privilege to me to come here today and set forth some of my views on these great problems. As your chosen representative, I bespeak most earnestly at this season of the year, and in the months to come, your prayers for a just and enduring peace and your continued interest and effort to maintain the internal strength of this Nation we love at a point where we can retain our position of world leadership for the ultimate good, not only of our own people, but as well our brothers across the seas. To that twofold objective, humbly beseeching divine guidance in this hour, so critical for our Nation, let us dedicate ourselves without stint and without reserve.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent has been granted for the insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of a letter addressed to the editor of the New York Times and published in that paper on April 6, 1947. This letter, written by my father, Frederic R. Coudert, gives his views on the important problem now facing us as to whether the Congress should favorably respond to President Truman's request that aid be extended to Greece and Turkey.

OUR NATIONAL SECURITY VIEWED AS BASIS OF PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR AID TO MIDDLE EAST

(The writer of the following letter is a lawyer, and was formerly president of the American Society of International Law. He is the author of Certainty and Justice and of numerous articles on law and international relations.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the extended discussion that has arisen over President Truman's address to Congress regarding aid to Greece and Turkey, there has been a babel of voices. Would it not be well in attempting to view the matter objectively to look at the historic background to determine the dominant motive in requesting Congress to extend aid to both of these countries in order to prevent Communist inroads and annexations?

Many feel that the President's request was made because of the fear held by a large number of Americans that democracy, meaning thereby representative government based upon free elections and all respect in those lands for the rights of man, might be destroyed. Critics argue that extending aid to these countries would lead ultimately to an ideologic crusade all over the world and that we are no more justified in crusading for our principles of government than are the Communists in attempting to undermine our own system with a similar end in view.

I incline to believe that neither view of the problem accurately describes the situation and that we may be involved in an unreal controversy.

OBJECTIVE OF PRESIDENT

The primary objective of the President was the security and safety of the United States and this, I think, is the problem to which we must address our minds. If the Communist doctrine and its proponents were alone involved, we might hesitate to believe that their propaganda, unless it involves the use of national military force, would be of supreme danger to the people of the United States. All sane men would recoil from any such religious wars as afflicted Europe in the sixteenth century.

Most of the governments of the world have not been, and are not now, democratic. While many of them may have been so in form, we realize that in fact they have been and many still are of a despotic or totalitarian character. The immature democracies have ever tended to result in dictatorship by a man or a group, and this has been true from the classic days of Greece down through the centuries.

If it happened that Greece or Turkey, or any other nation, on its own initiative wished to establish a Communist or other form of government—socialistic, aristocratic, or otherwise—we could not and probably would not, object. This would be equally true of Great Britain which, since Waterloo, has lived amicably enough in a world ruled by every form of government.

Why was it that, notwithstanding all this, Great Britain through generations has always been ready to use force to prevent the dominance of the European Continent by any great power? Why was the British Fleet mobilized in 1878 to prevent Russia from overwhelming Turkey and taking the Dardanelles, and thus becoming a Mediterranean and Atlantic power? Russia was then under the czardom which, although an absolute government, was not one attempting to use propaganda as a means to subvert other governments. Yet, Great Britain felt that its own security was fundamentally involved.

THREAT TO BRITISH SECURITY

Why do we find British troops, funds, and British influence in Greece at the present time? Is it not precisely for the very same reason, not merely to save an anti-Communist or democratic government there (if the Greek Government be deemed such), but primarily because Great Britain is convinced that her fundamental security is affected and that she had to continue to oppose Russian extension, whether through Communist methods or otherwise, to the Mediterranean.

England got along well enough with the Czars' government, absolute as it was, save when it threatened the English idea of their own security; in technical, diplomatic language, "the balance of power." I realize the unpopularity of the term at the present time, but I think the refusal calmly to analyze the situation, which the phrase was intended somewhat awkwardly to denote, has led to obscure and misdirected thinking.

The policy originated in the desire of the people of the British Isles to protect themselves against dominance by any one nation of continental Europe by playing off one power against another; it was the natural dictate of the national will for independence and security. In itself it did not necessarily possess those evil connotations so often applied to it. As was stated by Vattel in the middle of the eighteenth century:

"England has the honor to hold in her hands the balance of power, and she is careful to keep it in equilibrium. This had been the instinct of British statesmen since the time of William III, and their avowed policy ever since; and the insular position of England, unassailable herself, and aiming at no conquest on the Continent, has enabled her to play with success the part of the Puis-

sance mediatrice of Europe—to quote Montesquieu's phrase. It was this policy, aiming, of course, primarily at the security of Great Britain and her Empire, which inspired Pitt and his successors in their implacable struggle against French imperialism and the efforts of the British Government to reestablish a just equilibrium in Europe after the downfall of Napoleon." (The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy, vol. 2, p. 3.)

A nation frequently does and necessarily must seek its own security from foreign aggression and dominance, through availing itself of this so-called balance of power, or perhaps we should say balancing of power. The present problem must be to transfer the preponderance of power to the nations intent upon maintaining peace and the reign of law. Power politics, so called, is an inevitable concomitant of international relationships. The United Nations, if it is to succeed, must possess this preponderance of power.

NATIONAL SAFETY INVOLVED

But it will be said, Why should we shape our policy merely to follow in the steps of Great Britain? Should we not have our own policy, and look to our own safety? I agree wholly that this should be the dominant criterion, and that our policy should not be and is not a consequence of any Anglomania or any other emotional cause but that our policy is and must be a matter of American national safety. Until we can reach such a result through the United Nations, we must do so with our own power, aided by others who also desire peace through law.

Russia on the Atlantic, much more populous than the United States, with modern aviation, navies, etc., could be quite as much of a menace to the United States as was Czarist Russia to England in 1877 and 1878. Under modern conditions, Russia on the Atlantic would be nearer to us than she was to England in 1878, when she threatened to take Turkey into camp.

There is now the added feature that the Soviets of today are impelled by their aggressive and quasi-religious doctrines of a militant communism, sustained by many "fifth columnists" in our own land as well as in the other nations. Communism has become a potent means to aid in a national expansion movement of long duration. The fanaticism of ideologic belief added to nationalist ambition thus render the Russia of today far more dangerous as a possible opponent than the Russia of the Czars, whose government, even though despotic, was far less efficient and dynamic.

Why, then, has there been misunderstanding and perhaps camouflage regarding our dominant and real reason for drawing the line of Communist advances in Europe—in Greece and in Turkey? Perhaps some of this camouflage was due in part to the natural desire to avoid directly confronting Russia with a challenge, but more still, I think, to the discredit into which the term "power politics" has fallen. Power politics has in the end always existed among the nations, whether in the days of Alexander of Macedon, the Roman Empire, or the days of the glory of Spain under Philip II, or of France under Louis XIV or Napoleon.

POWER OF ENFORCEMENT NECESSARY

Power politics may well be abhorrent to the moralist and the idealist, but it works with the certainty of a biologic law, and it is more than a dangerous illusion to ignore that working; to trust to international law, whether found in treaty or otherwise, where there is no power of enforcement is sheer folly. The United Nations cannot work unless the great powers enforce that law; if they do, it would merely prove another very complete instance of power politics making law.

We cannot have peace while we are living in fear and dread of war, and while such fear dominates our policies. Fear is the worst of all counselors. If we now insist upon stopping aggression along the Mediterranean, carried on through communistic affiliations, we can, I think, assure our safety for some time to come while we strive meanwhile to strengthen the United Nations, so that right may be sure of the necessary sustaining might.

I realize that modern science has annihilated distance; that a policy that might have been wise for England in the past may not apply to America today; but it certainly has not been proved that a power dominant in Europe and in Asia, and, in addition, holding the Atlantic and Mediterranean lines, would not be a menace to the security of the United States. Our only foreign policy in the past—the Monroe Doctrine—was based wholly on our power to maintain it. We are thus confronted with something more than an ideological conflict, and our policy, as enunciated by the President and agreed to by leading members of the dominant party in Congress, is thus based not upon prejudice or a fanatical devotion to our own political system but upon fundamental considerations of national security. That security today is the mainstay of any survival of the community of independent nations under international law.

FREDERIC R. COUDERT.

NEW YORK, *March 27, 1947.*

Safety Regulations in Coal Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND COAL MINERS HAVE LOST LIVES SINCE 1900

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if Congress will act quickly I am confident that it will give to the Federal Government full authority to enforce safety regulations for our Nation's coal mines, authority which was denied by a previous Congress when it considered a Federal mine-inspection measure back in 1941.

With one very important exception—power of enforcement—Congress passed a fine bill then. Let us now complete the work, this time closing our ears to the States' rights bugaboo—fine weapon for the opponents' lobbyists—and put real teeth into the Federal law.

I am sincerely hopeful that the special Senate investigating committee, as a result of their findings at Centralia, will make strong recommendations to the Congress. Then, with quick action, the proper course will be followed.

But if we delay, how quickly will the Centralia disaster be forgotten. The names of 111 coal miners will have been added to the long list of those who have made the supreme sacrifice in a vital American industry without fully awakening a Nation to its full responsibility. The old system has failed to protect our miners through the years. Strict Federal regulations with enforcement powers are necessary to solve the problem.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Monday, April 7, 1947, reviewing the record of casualities in the coal industry in the United States since 1900.

In the face of these alarming figures, how can Congress fail to act immediately?

The article follows:

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND COAL MINER HAVE LOST LIVES SINCE 1900; RECORD IN UNITED STATES WORST OF MAJOR PRODUCING NATIONS—CHIEF RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONDITION SEEMS TO BE WEAKNESS IN ENFORCEMENT OF SAFETY BY STATES—FEDERAL LAWS LACK TEETH TO COMPEL COMPLIANCE

(By Malcolm Hobbs)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—The deaths of 111 coal miners in the Centralia (Ill.) mine disaster has refocused public attention on one of the world's most hazardous occupations. How risky life is for coal miners is shown by the fact that some 250,000 of them have lost their lives below ground since 1900. Seventeen million more have been injured seriously. The world death rate in coal mines is running at about 5,000 a year; injuries total 400,000 yearly.

The most recent figures, compiled by the International Labor Office just before the war, show the risk to American coal miners is greater than in any of the other major coal-producing countries. United States Government officials admit that the same ratios undoubtedly exist today.

The United States, in the last year in which comparative data is available, 1935, led five other leading coal-producing countries in fatal accidents in coal mines. The other countries are Belgium, France, Great Britain, Poland, and Germany. Figures for the Soviet Union are unavailable. Two other less important producing countries—Canada and Japan—were the only ones with higher death rates than the United States.

COMPARATIVE DEATH RATES

Here are the comparative death rates of the 6 major coal countries, per 1000 year-long shifts by the miners: United States, 4.24; Belgium, 1.92; France, 1.27; Great Britain, 1.49; Poland, 3.03; Germany, 1.82.

In nonfatal accidents, the United States shows up a little better. France has the worst record in this category, with the United States next in line. No figures are available for Belgium. Here are the nonfatal accident rates: United States, 318.9; France, 560.2; Great Britain, 237.2; Poland, 249.7; Germany, 187.1.

The death rate in coal mining in the United States is about seven times as high as for American industry generally. Only Poland exceeds this proportion with a ratio of 10 to 1. Great Britain's rate is 2½ times as great as in the rest of British industry, while the German rate is three times greater. No figures exist for Belgium and France.

All in all, Great Britain's safety record is outstanding. Great Britain is the only country employing more workers in coal mining than the United States.

BACKWARD IN ENFORCEMENT

Accident and death rates bear witness that coal mining is dangerous work anywhere in the world. Why is the record of the United States in this field so notably bad? The logical reason would seem to be in the type and extent of safety regulations, plus the amount of power delegated to enforce them. A study of our system of safety regulations compared to those in other countries indicates that we are backward not so much in the regulations as in the enforcement of them.

Ever since the Federal Bureau of Mines was established in 1910, the Government has had a hand in mine safety, but it has been a

restricted hand because of States' rights. The Federal Government has a safety code for the coal mines and a system of inspections, but it has virtually no enforcement power to back it up. The Government can only make recommendations; it is up to the States to enforce safety regulations.

Unfortunately, State enforcement has shown itself vulnerable to political pressure and inefficiency. The Centralia mine is a good example of this. There were more broken regulations at No. 5 mine than there were those which had been complied with. The State of Illinois had sufficient safety regulations, but very little enforcement.

In European governments, where centralization is the rule, the problem is naturally simplified. Regulations are more uniform and the full power of the government is behind enforcement of regulations.

In Belgium, for example, full responsibility is placed in a district commissioner who must take all steps to see that regulations are carried out at once, and for this purpose may make use of the police and the gendarmerie.

In France, enforcement power is vested in a director general of mines. Local prefects can order mine owners to correct breaches of regulation, and mine labor has a voice in demanding these corrections.

Prewar Germany had regulations which provided that in the event of offenses, mine authorities are empowered to close the mine.

Great Britain has been steadily adding to its safety-control measures since 1911. Today "where the divisional inspector, or a majority of the workmen employed in any mine is of opinion that the general regulations applying to the mine ought to be supplemented" the demands are brought to the attention of the Secretary of State for approval.

RUSSIAN REGULATIONS

In the Soviet Union much of the authority for enforcement of safety regulations is vested in the individual worker. No workman is allowed in the mines unless he passes a medical examination for fitness. Inspectors for each mine are required to close all underground workings where danger threatens. Russia is the only country which specifically prohibits intoxicated workers from entering a mine or bringing alcoholic beverages into a mine. There are no figures available here on death and accident rates in Russian mines which would indicate the effectiveness of its regulations.

Polish regulations established in 1930 set up district mining offices with full power to enforce safety regulations if mining operators refuse to comply. Orders of mine closures can be appealed by management, but the order stays in effect during the appeal. Regulations provide for constant inspection.

Our State safety regulations—notably those of Pennsylvania, Illinois, and New Mexico—are considered to be as good if not better than those in effect in Europe. Evident laxness of State enforcement has resulted in our unfavorable rate of deaths and accidents in coal mines.

When the Federal Government took over the mines from the coal operators in 1946, agreement was reached with the United Mine Workers that Federal safety codes would be established. This would have been an opening wedge to eventual Federal enforcement. Progress in establishing these codes has not been rapid, however, probably because of the uncertainty about the mines being returned to the operators.

The present congressional investigation of the Centralia mine tragedy may result in more stringent Federal legislation with enforcement powers, but it is expected that the old bugaboo of States' rights will be raised to block such a move.

Loopholes in Loyalty Plan—Ban on Reds in Government Is Forward Step But Does Not Guarantee Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting as a part of my remarks, an article by Rex Collier, one of our leading columnists. This article recently appeared in the Washington Evening Star and pretty well describes the President's program for ridding the Government pay roll of Communists and other subversive elements.

I have heretofore called attention to weaknesses in the President's order. Among other things, I called attention to a particular weakness whereby the order of the President provides in substance that the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation be consulted. This order does not give the FBI any authority to do more than report to a department head whether the individual has an FBI record. There are, of course, hundreds of thousands of Government employees who do not have records in the FBI. This for the reason that there has been no occasion for making any investigation concerning them.

I agree that the President's order is really a forward step. My criticism is that it does not step far enough.

The article read as follows:

LOOPHOLES IN LOYALTY PLAN—BAN ON REDS IN GOVERNMENT IS FORWARD STEP BUT DOES NOT GUARANTEE SECURITY

(By Rex Collier)

Although President Truman's program for ridding the Government pay roll of Communists and other subversive elements is a bold move in the right direction, there are serious loopholes in the plan. They are loopholes which should be plugged if the movement to root out all potentially disloyal Federal employees is to meet with any reasonable degree of success.

In the first place, the Executive order setting up the new loyalty program draws a distinction between applicants for Government employment and employees already in the service. In the case of applicants, an investigation is compulsory. The language of the order is explicit in that respect. In the case of employees already on the rolls, however, the wording of the order is so ambiguous as to leave the way open for indifferent compliance or evasions that could circumvent the intent of the order altogether.

APPLICANT SCREENING SPECIFIED

For example, Part I of the order states unequivocally that there "shall be a loyalty investigation of every person entering the civilian employment of any department or agency of the executive branch of the Government." Moreover, the same section specifies the type of investigation that shall be conducted. It must cover "all available pertinent sources of information," including the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Civil Service Commission, Army and Navy Intelligence, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, State and local police records, former places of employment, educational institutions attended, etc. If these records produce any "derogatory information with respect to loyalty of an applicant," a full field investigation must be made by the Civil Service Commission.

Given sufficient funds and adequate personnel, the Civil Service Commission can do a highly effective job of exposing and turning back any applicant whose loyalty to the United States is a matter of serious doubt.

DISCRETIONARY ENFORCEMENT

Compare the positive phraseology pertaining to applicants with this directive regarding investigation of employees already inside the Government gates: "The head of each department and agency in the executive branch of the Government shall be personally responsible for an effective program to assure that disloyal civilian officers or employees are not retained in employment in his department or agency." Furthermore, the head of the department or agency is given the responsibility of "prescribing and supervising the loyalty determination procedures of his department or agency, in accordance with the provisions of this order, which shall be considered as providing minimum requirements."

By thus placing on department heads the responsibility for investigating their own employees and of establishing procedures, the order could be interpreted by some administrators as leaving matters pretty much to their own discretion. It is no secret that some departmental officials, including some personnel officers, have evidenced in the past a complete lack of sympathy with respect to loyalty inquiries. This apathetic, if not antagonistic attitude, may account for the fact that during the past year, when the departments were supposed to take over the investigative job relinquished by the Civil Service Commission for lack of funds, no effort whatever was made by some personnel officers to carry out their new responsibilities.

COMMUNISTS IGNORE OATHS

The President's Loyalty Commission, of which A. Devitt Vanech, special assistant to the attorney general, was chairman and Civil Service Commissioner Harry B. Mitchell a member, found that most of the agencies have been content to accept the oath of office taken by the employee as prima facie evidence of his loyalty. Yet Canada learned that Communists and fellow travelers have no qualms about violating oaths of allegiance when occasion requires.

Another weakness in the new plan for checking on employees already in the civil service is the failure to provide for anything more thorough than a "name check" by the FBI. Director J. Edgar Hoover has made it clear that such a check is far from conclusive. The fact that the FBI may have little or no evidence in its files against a particular employee does not mean that the FBI is willing to guarantee the loyalty of that person. Under the order the FBI has no authority to do more than report to a department head whether the employee has a record at the FBI.

Even if the FBI should report that the employee has a bad record, it is still discretionary with the department head as to whether action under the loyalty order should be initiated. And, as Mr. Hoover told the House Committee on Un-American Activities recently, there have been instances in the past when such discretion operated to permit a Communist to remain in office.

FINDING A SOLUTION

While these defects in the loyalty program are known to be worrying some of the officials concerned with safeguarding the security of the Government, no one pretends as yet to have a complete solution for what is admittedly a tough problem. The FBI, largest

of Federal investigative agencies, has neither funds nor facilities to undertake the huge task of conducting a "full field investigation" of every Government worker. Even the limited screening provided in the Executive order will entail large additional appropriations and the hiring of many new employees by the Civil Service Commission.

A compromise arrangement that would immensely strengthen the proposed program, with little extra expense, would be to direct the Civil Service Commission to supervise and periodically check on the administration of the loyalty order within the various departments. If the Commission found that some agency was not doing an effective job the dereliction should be reported to the President. Such pressure from higher up might have a salutary effect on indifferent or reluctant administrative officers.

Communist-Front Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Journal of April 7, 1947:

MAKE THE NAMES PUBLIC

At the direction of the President, Attorney General Tom Clark is preparing a list of Communist-front organizations in the United States, and some officials of the Department of Justice think there will be some 300 of them if local, State, and national groups are included. The information on which the list is being prepared is obtained through the FBI and the Criminal Division of the Justice Department, but the Attorney General says he has not yet decided whether it shall be given to the public or kept secret.

By all means there should be full publicity, according to our view—and for two reasons: First, in order that citizens may not be inveigled into joining some front organization masquerading under a high-sounding title; second, for the protection of organizations that have no connection, direct or indirect, with subversive activities. This second reason is based on the generally accepted belief that it is unfair to throw a cloak of anonymity about one member of a group charged with an offense and by this method cast suspicion upon all having membership therein. Only the sorriest of scandal sheets will print a news item about a certain lawyer, or a certain minister, or a certain newspaperman who has been caught in sin.

By the same token, then, Mr. Clark should see that his plain duty is to give the names of every outfit in this country known to entertain communistic ideas or to have sympathy for communism. Of course, the Attorney General cannot afford to do any guesswork, or take anything for granted; when he names an organization as one guilty of acting as a Communist front, he must be prepared to furnish proof, always remembering that membership in the Communist Party is not a crime. Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach recently suggested that it should be placed under the ban, but he has not been able to muster support for such legislation in this democratic land; that kind of law would be exactly on a level with the Russian system which permits just one political group to name candidates for office. But the American people should know the identity of every organization which actually seeks the overthrow of our form of government—they should be placed on guard against all such. The plain fact is that no communistic organization can last long in a land where it is subjected to pitiless publicity. Let them have just that.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a very thoughtful letter which I have received from a constituent of mine, Mr. W. Whittington Cadle, of Olympia, Wash. Mr. Cadle is a longtime resident of that area and has been a very active leader in community affairs, taking great interest in matters of a patriotic nature and those of general benefit to the people.

The letter follows:

OLYMPIA, WASH., *April 7, 1947.*

Hon. FRED NORMAN,
Congressman, Third District, State of Washington, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORMAN: I have been following what is being done, or left undone, regarding communism, both nationally and in this State. It seems to me that lack of definite action against communism is due very largely to the fact that there is no clearly established definition of communism, as it is being practiced here and abroad. I also believe that it is folly to try to combat communism abroad and let it run practically rampant here in the State of Washington and in the United States. I am herewith, therefore, submitting for your consideration a definition of communism as I know it.

"A DEFINITION OF COMMUNISM

"Communism, as practiced, is the materialization of a political ideology which justifies deception, trickery, subversion, and other questionable methods for the gaining of control of a majority by the use of any means available; primarily, in a democratic country and its labor organizations, through the infiltration of its leading advocates into political and economic organizations until they gain control of key positions therein, and then maintain that ascendancy through physical force, even, if necessary.

"Such practices, being diametrically contrary to the ideals and principles upon which a democracy is founded, hence communism, once defined, is an enemy of democratic government, and as such can, and should be, declared dangerous and inimical to the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness principle on which this Nation was founded. Therefore its advocacy should not be advocated anywhere within the domain of the United States of America; and those who advocate it should be declared enemies of the State, traitors to the Government of the United States, and should be criminally prosecuted accordingly."

Sincerely, your constituent.

W. WHITTINGTON CADLE.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, since the House will not be in session on Saturday, April 12, the second anniversary of the passing of the greatest American of his age, the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, I have obtained consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and accordingly insert therein remarks which originally I had intended for delivery on the floor.

On April 12, 1945, while the Nation still bled from the wounds of the war yet raging in its victorious final months in Europe and Asia, the sudden passing of President Roosevelt was as severe a shock as we had ever sustained.

But it was not loss to America alone; his sure hand had steadied the entire world.

I say this with measured thought.

This Nation knows now that it was only after another generation of the world's manhood had been sacrificed to world aggression that the judgment of another great American, Woodrow Wilson, in matters of transcendent world importance had been vindicated. But not even the magnitude of President Wilson's work was so determinative and so complicated as that of President Roosevelt's. Mr. Roosevelt exhibited a grandeur in action and a stature of personality as great as any that history provides. The immensity of the arena in which he spoke and fought reduces the classic figures of Rome and Greece to the relatively inconsequential stature of actors in a drama of minor scope.

CIVILIZED WORLD MOURNED PASSING

The whole civilized world mourned the passing of this great humanitarian and colossal world figure, the most powerful personality of his generation, representing the most powerful Nation on earth.

THE "FOUR FREEDOMS"

This was the great patriot with never-dimmed faith in our Nation and with never-dimmed faith in the idea of democracy.

He believed, and made his belief real by his actions, in peace and freedom and justice for all nations. His enunciation of the "four freedoms" was no political gesture—it was the sincere and forceful expression of his inmost creed. Above all things, he longed and worked for the time when there could be that most fundamental of all freedoms—freedom from fear; for where fear is, there cannot be freedom.

Let us hope and pray that he has not given his life in vain. The world has not forgotten that dream, nor that dreamer. Realization of his dream for peace and freedom to all the world was denied him in his lifetime; we must pray and work for its attainment now in his memory.

His passing was especially grievous because the forces of the Allied Nations were rapidly bringing to an end, as he himself realized, the greatest evil that ever plagued the world; and henceforth we were not to have the benefit of his great ability, his courage, his industry, his faith, and his fidelity to his destiny to bring about the actual accomplishment of a just and lasting peace, which was his most-cherished dream, and to lead mankind through reconversion and recovery from the awful waste of war.

Men and women everywhere, of all beliefs and faiths, as never before in the history of the world, mourned for him, and continue to mourn his death; and I feel they join with us today in paying homage to his memory, and in ascribing high praise to his unsullied record of unparalleled accomplishment for all the people of America and of the world.

INSPIRING LEADERSHIP BROUGHT VICTORY

His singularly gifted and inspiring leadership brought us to the threshold of victory; but, victor in his war for peace, he himself became war's victim. We witnessed his valiant efforts to prevent war, his crushing burdens and sorrows in war, his aspirations, his prayers, and his works to conquer war, and did what we could to buttress those efforts.

This great patriot has taken his place among the gallant and illustrious dead who have made our Nation consecrate, and it is our part, the living, to preserve this Nation in fulfillment of our sacred debt to all our martyred dead. May we be equal to the demand in every hour of our danger or need.

FRIENDSHIP OF LONG STANDING

It was my good fortune, Mr. Speaker, to have known this great man from 1913, when he became Assistant Secretary of the Navy, to the time of his lamented passing. I learned early in our acquaintance to know and to admire his tact, the breadth of his human understanding, and the winning personality which opened all hearts to him. I followed closely his remarkable and able career in the Navy under a great Secretary, my friend, Josephus Daniels, who shared my interest. Consequently, at the Democratic National Convention of 1920 it was natural that I should urge and advocate his nomination for Vice President.

NOMINATED THE "HAPPY WARRIOR"

Then in August, 1921, he was struck down with a physical ailment that would have crushed any man of ordinary clay; but he would not admit that anything could stop him. His will to recover, to conquer the weakness of his body, was a thing of iron. Only 3 years later, in 1924, hale enough to attend the Democratic National Convention, I heard him nominate Alfred E. Smith as a candidate for the Presidency with a speech in which he first described his old friend as "The Happy Warrior."

From 1928 to 1932 he was preparing, as Governor of New York, for the greater work that was ahead. In 1930, after the great show of confidence in him by the people of his State, I wired him the very evening of his overwhelming victory that his reelection made him automatically a Democratic candidate for President of the United States, and the next President.

AIDED IN NOMINATION

On the occasion of my visit to Albany in January 1932, at his invitation notwithstanding the unfair attacks made on him because of his physical affliction I found him full of vigor, and in spite of the opposition of some of the Illinois leaders, I pledged him my support. From that day on I became active in his behalf. It was my good fortune to meet Col. Louis Howe and Jim Farley, who were actively in charge of his preconvention campaign for the nomination, and in conjunction with them I can justly lay claim to have aided in bringing about Governor Roosevelt's nomination as the Democratic candidate for President at the Chicago convention in June 1932.

It was my privilege to meet with Governor Roosevelt from time to time during the campaign. At his personal request, I was placed in direct charge of the publicity activities among all foreign-language groups. Inspired by the magnetic appeal of his golden voice, and by his firm grasp of the needs of the world, thousands of us worked incessantly and successfully for his election.

After his election, I had the honor of seeing President Roosevelt frequently in the White House to discuss legislation and more general matters; I found him, Mr. Speaker, to be a most resourceful and well-informed statesman whose grasp of detail, as well as of the broad outlines of great plans, always amazed us.

"ALL WE HAVE TO FEAR IS FEAR"

When President Roosevelt was inaugurated, the country was in its worst crisis since the War Between the States. Business had collapsed. Banks were closed in 38 States, and in the remaining 10 States their operations were limited. There was a run on gold. Some communities were reduced to using scrip. Prices of farm staples were at or near an all-time low. The chant of the auctioneer was heard in the countryside as farm mortgages were foreclosed. Nearly 18,000,000 were without jobs; but few were without fear.

Fear was everywhere.

Into this panic came this great leader and builder, fearless and courageous, with humanitarian understanding, with his fresh voice of confidence. In his inaugural address he proclaimed: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." It seemed as if the fog of fear evaporated before our eyes, and in the famous "hundred days" Congress carried out in laws the policies and recommendations made by President Roosevelt.

Banks, plants, and business reopened. We went off the gold standard. Roosevelt fed the hungry, clothed the ill-clad, sheltered the homeless, and brought strength and hope and confidence to all. All over the Nation men and women went back to work, as the President set up the Public Works Administration, National Industrial Recovery Administration, Work Projects Administration, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and many others too numerous to mention.

FDR RECOGNIZED THREAT OF HITLER TO AMERICA

Two months before Mr. Roosevelt, consecrated to the American way of life and to the democratic way of political action, came into office in America Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany and began to impose his new order of reaction and violence and hate, first upon Germany and then upon all Europe, "and tomorrow the world." From the time Hitler first made plain his mission of conquest and destruction, Mr. Roosevelt denounced and opposed him, recognizing the deep and deadly conflict between Hitlerism and Americanism. Yet for his courage in 1937 in calling attention to these, the appeasers, the isolationists, and the lethargic assailed and attacked him and called him dictator and warmonger, because he recognized the dangers to democratic institutions and warned us of them.

At home reform followed reform as the Roosevelt program was made effective. The Agricultural Adjustment Act was born. Prohibition was repealed. The Securities and Exchange Commission was created. Home Owners' Loan Corporation financed distressed mortgages. The Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration took form. The Tennessee Valley Authority arose as an arm of the pepole. The Social Security and Wagner Labor Relations Acts were passed.

Soon the President was the object of bitter attacks, many from the very men and businesses he had saved from utter oblivion, but he held steadfast to his humanitarian policies, helping the helpless, remembering the forgotten man.

NOBODY WANTED HIM BUT THE PEOPLE

In common with the people of 46 States, I continued to support him and he was reelected in 1936 overwhelmingly. Nobody wanted him but the people.

I need not further recite the accomplishments of this monumental genius. They are a part of imperishable history, and everybody everywhere knows them by heart.

Early in 1940 I was among the first to insist that President Roosevelt must be a candidate for a third term; that he owed it to himself to consolidate and make permanent his victories over reaction; and that he owed it to his country, as war moved toward America with paralyzing velocity.

I can say with all truth and sincerity that originally the President was fearful of breaking past precedents, and he was won over only with difficulty.

Again, in 1944, I was among the first to urge persistently that his country needed him, and that not only his country but the whole world needed his sure leadership, his vast knowledge and grasp. I begged him to carry on and bring the people to victory against their enemies and to a just and lasting peace for a sorely troubled world. I may say that it required greater persistence from his friends and admirers, with the interest of victory in peace and peace in victory at heart, before he yielded to our entreaties and the world's need of him. I recollect vividly the moment I stated to him that the world needed his sagacity, his resourcefulness, and his acumen, and recalled to him the tribulations of Woodrow Wilson and of our world after the previous war, and said the world would not be denied.

ROOSEVELT DID NOT WISH FOURTH TERM

He told me that, even though he were no longer President, he felt he would be accorded a place at the peace table. I then earnestly pointed out to him that, though there was no doubt his advice and counsel would be sought, he would not have that influence and power and authority which would be his as President.

Death struck him down before he could know the full fruits of his victory; but surely all that we do here is imbued with his spirit and his will.

On many complicated legislative questions President Roosevelt displayed not only supreme knowledge and understanding and courage, but patience and diplomacy seldom matched, and a political acumen possessed by very few.

HIS DEVOTION TO THE UNDERPRIVILEGED WAS MAINTAINED TO VERY LAST

Correctly to appraise Franklin D. Roosevelt's amazing character, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to bear in mind his tremendous preoccupation with the underprivileged, the oppressed—with those who live with fear.

On the very day of his death, while triumphant Allied armies stormed through Normandy and our own American forces bore closer to the Japanese mainland, I received from one of the President's secretaries, Mr. Jonathan Daniels, what I believe to have been his very last legislative message.

That message had nothing to do with the vast and urgent problems of the war in Europe or in Asia; it was not a message of death and destruction for our enemies, but a message of hope and promise for our own people.

Mr. Daniels brought to me on the very day of the President's death Franklin Roosevelt's urgent hope that I should do everything in my power to bring about favorable action on the rule for the consideration of the bill for a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. President Roosevelt genuinely believed in Jefferson's principles, that there should be equal rights and benefits for all, special privileges for none.

PRESIDENT'S LAST MESSAGE TREASURED

Mr. Daniels delivered his message to me at 3 o'clock of that tragic day. Mr. Daniels told me that the President had been improving and was planning on an outing that afternoon and that he wanted to see me on his return to Washington. Afterward, when I learned that at that time he already had been taken away, I collapsed.

I have treasured that last mandate, and I have tried to make it effective. It was our great President's last message, and shows that to the very end his thoughts were with the people.

This truly authentic Great labored long, painstakingly and untiringly in the interest of humanity, with a singleness of purpose and in a spirit of self-denial and self-devotion genuinely heroic. Moderate in his views, unbending in his principles, charitable in his judgments, he was a ripe scholar, well versed in philosophy and the principles of sound government and sociology and economics, an inspired writer, a clever and magnetic conversationalist, a fair-minded and honorable opponent in controversy. He fell fighting in the breach; fell when not far beyond the noonday of his life, feeling that while he had accomplished something he had left much more undone.

ROOSEVELT WAS A STATESMAN IN THE BROADEST AND TRUEST MEANING OF THE TERM

His unflagging energy and intellectual versatility were the marvel of the world. He had explored the highways and byways of governmental knowledge, and the confusing labyrinth of parliamentary procedure was a plain and simple path to him. His keen eye discovered the slightest defect in the substance and form of every proposal presented for his consideration. Fearlessly he turned the light of constructive criticism on every suggested plan, whether its author was friend or foe. His one and only purpose was to promote safe and sane legislation, and to prevent the enactment of ill-considered and loosely drawn laws.

He was a statesman in the broadest and truest meaning of the term.

He was free of all affectation, sincere and genuine throughout. He followed always the path of duty outlined by a conscience that was ever responsive to the noblest and most patriotic impulses of true manhood.

"AS GOD GAVE HIM TO SEE THE RIGHT"

One of the outstanding traits of his sterling character was his fine sense of justice and fairness. Unerring in his judgment of the capabilities of his fellow workers, he was always ready and willing to give credit where credit was due. None so quickly as he encouraged the worthy and deserving, and none so mercilessly exposed shame and pretense. A complete master of the art of timing, he disdained the cowardice of temporizing when the time for action had come.

In the honesty of his soul he could not conceal his contempt for the man who would sacrifice principle for expediency. Pressing forward in the fight, as God gave him to see the right, he unhesitatingly took a firm and determined stand on every great question of public policy, regardless of the effect on his own political fortunes. With full confidence in his own integrity of purpose, undisturbed by criticism or abuse, he was content to look for vindication to the impartial judgment of the future.

ROOSEVELT WILL STAND AS BENEFACTOR OF HIS AGE

And so, when passions and prejudices have subsided, when clashing aspirations and conflicting attitudes have become more tempered; when, as he believed, society would have adjusted itself to the new order in which human rights transcend the rights of property; when the historian in a noon-clear atmosphere writes of our present era; then, Mr. Speaker, Franklin D. Roosevelt, able, conscientious, far-seeing statesman, doer of big things, humanitarian, will stand as one of the benefactors, not only of his age, but of all time.

I have always maintained, and I know that history will bear me out, that he possessed in his one great personality the attributes which made Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson great Americans, great Democrats, and great men.

I shall, to my dying day, be thankful to the Almighty for the privilege that has been mine to work and cooperate, first with Wilson, and then with an even greater American, patriot, humanitarian, and champion of justice, freedom, and humanity, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Soviet Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address by Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine, to the American Legion First National Aeronautics Conference, Indianapolis, Ind., March 21, 1947:

SOVIET AIR POWER

Many world air routes may soon run through the Arctic in peace or war.

Establishment of four weather stations in the Arctic this past year brought a charge from the Soviet that this was a hostile and aggressive act aimed at Russia.

Sometimes one can infer the intentions of others from their suspicions.

In this light it is interesting to realize that in the last decade Russia has established over 100 weather stations in the Arctic with far more adequate lay-out than any on our side of the North Pole.

No one in America had hitherto considered these Russian weather stations (some with four planes as part of their equipment) as hostile and aggressive.

Russia has made crystal clear in official declarations, her intentions of becoming the world's greatest power. For example, on August 18 an official Russian document—the Communist Agitator's Notebook—declared:

"The aviation of the Soviet Union cannot lag behind that of other countries. On the contrary, in the interests of peace and the security of our people and of other peace-loving nations, Soviet airplanes must fly higher, farther, and faster than those of other countries * * * we must have the most powerful air force in the world."

William Courtney emphatically declares that Russia has captured scientific leadership in the field of rocket propulsion by taking the great majority of the captured German scientists and technicians back to her own country to perfect the projects they had already under way in Germany. Sweden has good reason to believe that Russia is preeminent in the field of rocket design.

The Moscow radio indicates that the Russian budget for national defense is some $4,000,000,000 greater than our own. Clearly, a large proportion of that budget is being spent on air power, because Russia does not have a large navy. A recent United Press dispatch of the week of February 24 estimated that 58 percent of the Russian military budget would go to the air force.

Bearing in mind the reported size of the Russian budget and the fact that a large proportion is being expended on the air arm, it is interesting to note that our Army Air Forces' appropriation accounts for less than one-third of the President's national defense budget (allowing for the AAF share of War Department costs as well as the AAF's own appropriation).

The appropriation for the Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics is only 15 percent of the total appropriation for the Navy.

In some circles it is still popular to underestimate Russian air power, but on this score it might be well to remember that Russian production of combat aircraft during the three peak years exceeded that of any other nation except the United States. Her production of combat aircraft, according to Russian data, was almost double that of Great Britain or of Nazi Germany.

BRITISH AND AMERICAN AIR POWER

Great Britain is reducing her Navy by 60 percent and is apparently depending in the future to a large extent on the American Navy for sea power. Meanwhile, Britain is concentrating on the development of air power.

There is strong indication that Great Britain is far ahead of us in the promising field of jet propulsion. Britain has captured the speed record and openly boasts that if we develop a plane that can recapture the record she has two or three more that can set the record even further ahead. Our own manufacturers testify that Britain is at least 2 years ahead of us in jet propulsion, and our military leaders are not prepared to challenge this claim.

In the commercial air-line field, Great Britain has already announced orders for super air liners to be jet propelled and for super air liners to be propelled by gas turbine-propeller propulsion. Those planes are already nearing the construction stage. There are no orders for similar air liners in this country.

Even more striking than the above facts is the news that the Royal Air Force is a larger Air Force than the AAF. The new budget for the RAF for the 1947–48 fiscal year provides that the strength of the British air arms shall be reduced from 760,000 officers and men in the current year to 370,000 officers and men in the coming year. The President's budget for 1948 proposed a 55-group force for the AAF. This 55-group force would average from 320,000 to 350,000 officers and men, or appreciably less than the RAF's force for the 1947–48 fiscal year.

In this connection, it is particularly alarming to know that the administration has stated that the major impact of any reduction in the President's budget effected by Congress will fall almost exclusively on the AAF. The Secretary of War has even stated that the reductions contemplated by Congress will force a reduction from the 55-group force to a 35-group force. A 35-group force would provide for some 250,000 officers and men, which is one-third smaller than the RAF's strength for 1947–48.

In view of the world-wide recognition that air power is absolutely vital to our security and the recognition by most of our military leaders that any aggressor likely to attack this country would carry out his attack through the air, the question may well be raised as to whether or not the major impact of necessary economies should fall upon air power.

A realistic appraisal of the possibilities of future warfare may point to an entirely different conclusion.

We cannot afford to remain the world's third ranking air power.

COMMERCIAL AIR LINES

Commercial air lines under the American flag at home and abroad are an absolute essential of air power.

Plane production in recent months has been at 2 percent of the war peak.

Military requirements cannot possibly maintain the aircraft industry at a level absolutely essential as a reserve in the event of any emergency.

Nor can military flying possibly supply the familiarization with world weather and topography and landing fields that will be a prime essential in any future conflict.

The State Department is reluctant to permit even one flight of B–29's around the world.

Britain is fully alert to this situation and is planning to dominate the commercial air routes of the world.

Yet twice in our generation it has been demonstrated that Britain is no longer equal to keeping the peace of the world.

America must realize how rapidly our air power would decline if American overseas commercial operations should dwindle. Yet that is a serious prospect under present policies and conditions.

Britain with her associates in air development in Holland and the Scandinavian countries and Australia is forging steadily ahead in the commercial field with unlimited and carefully coordinated government support.

Meanwhile American companies are struggling with each other and with a complicated and confusing set-up to secure the landing privileges to maintain American preeminence in air transport overseas.

The lessons of the American merchant marine in recent decades do not seem to be borne in mind as America repeats in the air the tragic policies that reduced American shipping to a point where it was carrying only about 10 percent of American foreign trade and less than 15 percent of American travel across the North Atlantic.

Private Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon address by Dr. Walter R. Courtenay, of the First Presybyterian Church, of Nashville, Tenn.:

PRIVATE PROPERTY

"Thou shalt not steal." Exodus 20: 15

One of the surest signs of the weakening of our democratic, free competitive system is to be found in much that is being written and spoken concerning private property.

Private property is the cornerstone of our way of life. It is a symbol of sacredness to all who love American democracy. It is the heart of our free-enterprise system, the foundation of all our liberties. It is the north star which drew men from all the nations of the earth to this Nation, quickening their hopes and aspirations, sharpening their wits, enriching their experience, assuring them that here in this land of the free and the home of the brave they would cease to be poor and underprivileged, abused and forgotten, that here they could be men, men with new minds, new souls, new horizons, new vocations, aye, the owners of property.

No nation in all history has ever known such an influx of immigrants. Americ was deluged with people seeking new tomorrows. They did not come to us in order to forget. They came to gain. Their main objective was to live in a free land and be owners. Here poor men could find lucrative employment, some becoming landowners and home owners, others becoming well to do, some becoming very wealthy. Here the forgotten could become the noted, for in America, the land of new paths and high goals, a man could climb as high as he desired.

I speak of these matters today because the time has come when every American had better do some fundamental thinking about private property and the trends of today, but let no one think that I am speaking for the comfort of the comfortable or the pacifying of the rich. Today, as every Sunday, I speak to all men, because all men need God and need to know the truth which God has given.

I presume that most people in America would gladly grant the authority and value of the Ten Commandments. They are still fundamental, and we cannot build a better world without them. Then permit me to observe that in these Commandments, which stress for us the sanctity of God, the sanctity of worship, the sanctity of the Sabbath, the sanctity of life, and the sanctity of marriage, also emphasizes the sanctity of private property, or, as Dr. Elton Trueblood has phrased it, "the dignity of property." The decalog which says I must love God and love my fellow man also says that I must respect the property rights of others. I must not steal.

Therefore, as a Christian and an American, permit me to affirm my faith in the sanctity of private property.

1

I believe in private property because I believe that our American way of life is superior to that of communism, which is our only rival in the world today. I believe in our democratic free-enterprise system because of what communism stands for and does.

1. Communism is based on a policy of expediency, intrigue, murder, and larceny. Their program is a program of revolution and robbery. They willingly break every divine commandment in order to achieve the overthrow of the economic and governmental systems of other nations. Strangely enough, although they create their new state by means of murder and larceny, as soon as their state is organized they immediately write into their laws the words, "Thou shalt not murder"; "Thou shalt not steal." It is wrong for a Communist to kill a Communist. It is wrong for a Communist to steal from a Communist, but it is not wrong for a Communist to kill a capitalist and steal his possessions. A man can be an honest Communist but he cannot be an honest man.

2. Communism can only be brought into being through armed force and can only be maintained by the power of secret police, the threat of prison, and the firing squad. Communists promise equality in the new state, but what equality does one find in communistic hands? Even if it were humanly possible to create equality, by what means could a government maintain it? Any nation that is created through murder and larceny and maintained by secret police and fear is not in the same class with countries like our own.

3. Communism boasts that its way of life is superior to ours. Is this true? Are Communists better fed, better clothed, better housed, better treated? Are they better educated and more privileged? Dare they criticize their leaders or find fault with the governmental program? Are communistic lands cleaner, more sanitary, and freer from graft? Are the people of Communist lands more moral and nobler?

As I have read the reports on Russia over the last decade I find no such evidences. I find that they have borrowed almost all their technical information from us. I find that they have looked to us for their industrial and transportation development. Their "know-how," like the materials that enabled them to beat back the Germans, is labeled "Made in the U. S. A." The advances Russia has made are directly traceable to our own tremendous progress under the free enterprise, private-property system. I cannot conceive of any American believing that citizenship in Russia is superior to citizenship in these United States. We have all they possess, and tower above them as the mountains do the plains.

4. The Communist states cannot be superior to us, for they face the same problem

that troubles us, namely, human nature. If we, with a better system, with a higher code of morals, and with virile Christianity cannot solve the human equation, how can Russia?

It is my opinion that communism is a decayed form of society, and whereas Americans express their social advancement in terms of private property, the Communist must do so in terms of promotions in the party, which, in turn, must be achieved by means of intrigue, "politicing," bootlicking, and self-seeking.

I have long noticed that those who take socialism and communism seriously are either theorists who live as capitalists while they dream of socialism, or are crackpots, frustrated egoists, and downright scoundrels who feel that by overturning society they will improve their own positions. These "isms" are breeders of envy, covetousness, and greed to a degree never attained within a democratic system such as ours.

5. Communism, like nazism, will be vigorous and united only as long as it is feeding on the properties of others. When the parasite comes to the place where it can no longer feed on the host, it must feed on itself and die. If the nations of the world were communistic today and Russia had no democracies outside her borders to make the scapegoat of her own wickedness, there would be world-wide revolution within 5 years and the boasted harmony and superiority of the communistic state would blow up like an ammu-

[illegible]

6. Communism hates conservatives, and therefore hates the business and professional and agricultural people of America. Why do they hate conservatives? Is it not because conservatives are those who are owners, people who have a stake in the country, people who are not willingly going to throw away their properties and positions? Only a fool or a crazy man or a sincere Christian is going to throw away his possessions and substitute totalitarianism for free democracy, and I find very few sincere Christians in the Communist ranks.

What is conservatism after all but the stability of a people. What is stability but two-thirds conservatism. Can any person be creative and dependable apart from such stability?

What American, be he employer or employee, banker or baker, factory owner or farmer, professional man or priest, miner or minister, wants to be robbed of all he has, spied on for the rest of his life, browbeaten and threatened every day he lives, and with nothing to hand down to his children except a black tomorrow filled with the horror of a nightmare?

No, my friends; communism has not the way to build a better world, a world filled with happier, healthier people, a people noted for noble character.

Our own system is far from perfect. We all admit that, but if we, with all we have, are unable to control the raw material of human nature, what chance has communism of doing so?

II

I believe in private property and the American system because I believe ownership builds better people.

I believe that the possessive pronouns are important. I believe that a man is more a man when he owns property and controls it than when he does not. I believe that ownership is the power of democracy, the very life-blood of the state. That is why the demagogue consistently appeals to those who are not owners.

I believe that ownership makes man more creative, more industrious, more stable. I have not forgotten that in the first year of the Plymouth Colony the ground was parcelled out by families with the understanding that whatever was grown belonged to the colony as a whole. It was not a fruitful plan, so much so, that in the second year the plan was changed, and while the families gardened the same amount of soil they were told that whatever they raised belonged to them. That year the crops were 10 times greater.

I believe that ownership also makes one fellow-conscious. One learns a great deal about himself in taking care of other people. If the state takes care of all, the individual loses much of that which makes a man human. In meeting the needs of loved ones and friends and customers and citizens one learns the significance of good government and constructive economy. If governments had to go out and earn the money they use, or borrow it on their own, they would do a better job in spending it. They would better understand the meeting of needs in a sensible manner. Government spending is never conservative.

I believe that ownership builds better citizens. When a man builds he not only increases his material possessions, he somehow increases his inner possession. He is a bigger man spiritually. How often I have heard men who served as officers in Army and Navy during the last war say that the bravest men, the men who stayed on the job longer when the going was tough, came from those American homes where parents worked and saved and shared and voted. The picture of the citizen who leans on a shovel is a picture of what happens when government makes the

[illegible]

I believe that men will work harder for material rewards than they will for vague social ideals. Men do all right when they are assured of faithful compensation for faithful work. America, the greatest democracy in world history, the Nation with the highest standard of living, the Nation which has done more to lift mankind nearer security and enlightenment than any other nation, was built, not on the communistic pattern, but on the pattern of private property.

III

I believe in private property, its sanctity and dignity, because I believe God does.

This is most certainly the teaching of the Old Testament as a whole. The eighth commandment of the Decalog, with the expression of the basic idea in chapters 21 and 22 in Exodus clearly state God's approval of the sanctity of private property.

Let no one believe that the commandment was given for the safeguarding of the rich and powerful. Actually it was the poor man's welfare God had in mind. One sees it clearly as Elijah stands before the king and denounces him for stealing Naboth's vineyard.

"Thou shalt not steal" applies to all men, and is God's way of saying that what a man has honestly earned is his and has a sanctity recognized by the very laws of Heaven. As Dr. Trueblood has said, "Stealing is evil because ownership is good."

Not only does the Old Testament teach the sanctity of private property but it emphasizes the responsibilities of the owners of private property. Property must represent services rendered to society. If a man can work and does not work he has no right to the security of society or the necessities of life. The Bible makes no place for the loafer or the idle, wasteful rich. God means for men to work, to save, to share, and to live righteous lives.

God believes a man should be justly rewarded for services rendered and that what a man earns should be wisely used.

The owner, according to Scripture, is a trustee. What he owns is:

(1) Derived from God and from others;

(2) Is limited by the brevity and insecurity of life;

(3) And is dependent on the owner's wisdom in acting as a trustee.

God holds us all responsible for the wise use of what we call our own.

According to the ancient tribal laws of the Jews every man had a place of dignity within the tribe. As long as he obeyed the laws of the tribe and did his part for the welfare of self and society he had full claim on all the tribe possessed and stood for, but when he disobeyed or did not work, he could be turned into the desert where every man's hand would be turned against him.

It is doubtless this ancient day and custom which explains why there are no words in Hebrew for alms and beggar. Charity in Hebrew means "right doings." To help another who had tried and failed was merely doing what was right, and hence no man who had honestly tried and failed could be a beggar. Every man knew that failure was not a disgrace and did not blemish a man's standing in society. Only those who did not try, like the one-talent man in Christ's parable, was hopeless—and he was not worthy of any sympathy at all.

To the ancient Jew the privilege of increasing one's possessions was a sure indication of God's favor, and the Jew raised his hands to God in thanksgiving and opened his hand and heart in generosity toward all who had tried and failed.

Whenever the owners acquired wealth by ways and means unapproved by God or stored up wealth merely to have more or forgot the needs of men less fortunate or the safety of the nation as a whole, God always sent His prophets to remind men that they were responsible to Him for the wise use of possessions. The owner must do right toward God and toward his fellow men.

How we need prophets in America today! So much of our charity is foolishness and morally wrong. We feed people who will not work and clothe and shelter people who have no loyalty to God or America. We pledge security to the man who would destroy us if he could—and we think we are doing right. I wonder what Amos would say about our day? He would condemn many whose sole interest in life is to have more. Certainly he would strike out against all who exploit and oppress. But would he not also condemn our policies of soft-headed charity and immoral social legislation?

Every man owes something to society and he who can but does not serve for the total good as well as his own has no claim on society be he rich or poor.

Roger Babson has well said, "The body was made for use, and to use it properly is to cooperate with God in the grand purpose of the world's salvation."

Many who will agree that the Old Testament teaches the sanctity of private property will not agree when I say that the New Testament teaches the same. They will remind me that Jesus said, "Lay not up for yourselves treasure on earth," and His words to the rich young ruler, "Go, sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor," and to the disciples, "Sell what you have and give alms." But may I point out that in the first instance Jesus was talking to men who were to walk up and down the earth as evangelists. They would have no time for treasures on earth. In the second instance Jesus did not imply that the young ruler had no right to call his property his own or to keep it or sell it. In the third instance He indicated that the disciples owned something which was their's and could be sold.

I believe Jesus believed in the sanctity of property as His Father, God, did. And so did Paul. Neither Jesus nor Paul nor any of the apostles said it was wrong to possess, they merely said that in possessing we must not be unmindful of the claim of God and of our fellow men.

As I read my Bible I am conscious that in the mind of God trusteeship and possession are inseparable, but a man has every right,

nay, a moral responsibility, to work, to save, to share, and to serve. What he has honestly acquired is his.

I am glad I am not rich. I am happy I am not poor. I am thankful I have enough for each day's need, a little over for the happy times and the shaded times, and something to share in God's service and in the service of my less fortunate neighbors. I am content!

The Bible stands before me to remind me that I must work. The Bible stands before me to teach me that I must seek to accumulate, for only by so doing can I relieve my fellow men of caring for my needs, and only by accumulating can I help others less fortunate. The Bible says I must not live and strive to accumulate merely to have more than others—I must not hoard! The Bible says it is a sin when I can increase my possessions and my power to help others and do not do so! The Bible clearly states I have a right to own and that no man has a right to take from me that which is legitimately mine.

With all its faults, our system of private property is nearer to God's social plan for humanity than any other system and I regret that many ministers and Christian leaders do not believe so! Those who say that we should not give our support to any one system above another are being most unrealistic and unbiblical. It would not be difficult to demonstrate that Christianity can express itself more openly and constructively through our system than it ever can through communism. He who will not uphold our democracy and work for its improvement by democratic methods is not a true lover of Christianity and men.

The safety of our religion, our homes, our property, our very lives, depends on our ability to retain and improve our democracy.

IV

Today is January 19, and in this area of Am-rica that means the birthday of our favorite southerner—Robert E. Lee.

It is not amiss, therefore, for me to point out that the main reason why Lee refused command of the Federal forces and cast his lot with the South was because he, as a Christian and an American, believed in the sanctity of private property.

Lee did not believe in slavery. Lee had liberated his own slaves before the War Between the States thundered across our land. But Lee knew that millions of dollars had been invested in slaves and that no government and no group of States had any right to cause men to lose that investment without due process of law and just compensation. To wage a war to destroy that investment was in Lee's mind, and in the mind of most southerners, immoral. It was not that the South intended to unduly prolong slavery, for the records show that the South was rapidly moving in the direction of emancipation. The South fought, not so much in defense of slavery, in fact, not at all for slavery as such, but for the sanctity of private property. The war of the sixties was the South's affirmation that property is sacred and no man or government has a right to destroy it without due process of law.

I believe the words "mine" and "thine" are sacred words, and I pray God that they may ever be in America, and that each of us will so use the rights of private property in this generation that all generations may possess the open Bible and the blessings of democracy.

I want this church, all churches, and our own denomination in particular to say to all men in all parts of the world today, "Property, under the laws of God, is sacred."

"Thou shalt not steal." Let all men hear. Let all men obey.

Reasons for Aid to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 10 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the pending proposal to extend assistance to Greece, written by William Philip Simms, and recently published in the Pittsburgh Press.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IT MEANS

(By William Philip Simms)

WASHINGTON.—The President sat in his White House study. Probably never before had he been so grim. Said he:

"Not since Jamestown and Plymouth Rock has our American civilization been in such danger as now.

"Frankly and definitely, there is danger ahead—danger against which we must prepare. But we well know that we cannot escape danger, or the fear of it, by crawling into bed and pulling the covers over our heads.

"Let us not blind ourselves to the undeniable fact that the evil forces which have crushed and undermined and corrupted others are already within our own gates. Their secret emissaries are active in our own and neighboring countries.

"No man can tame a tiger into a kitten by stroking it. There can be no appeasement with ruthlessness.

"I make the direct statement to the American people that there is far less chance of the United States getting into war, if we do all we can now to support the nations defending themselves against attack * * * than if we acquiesce in their defeat.

"RISK IN ANY COURSE

"We must admit there is risk in any course we may take. But I deeply believe that the great majority of our people agree that the course that I advocate involves the least risk now and the greatest hope for world peace in the future.

"Democracy's fight against world conquest is being greatly aided, and must be more greatly aided, by * * * the United States.

"We must be the great arsenal of democracy. For us this is an emergency as great as war itself."

It was not President Truman talking. It was Franklin D. Roosevelt. The occasion was his fireside chat of December 29, 1940, a year before Pearl Harbor.

President Truman just as well could use those exact words today. Ruthless totalitarian power again is expanding in Europe and Asia and using the same fifth column tactics within our own gates and neighboring countries.

SOME DON'T GRASP DOCTRINES

Indeed President Truman's message to Congress last week, in many respects, greatly resembled that Roosevelt pronouncement. He warned that "the national security of this country" is involved, and he proposed aid to democracies wherever threatened by totalitarian aggression.

Like President Roosevelt, he called on America to make herself the arsenal of democracy in order that "we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion." Such, at least, were the clear implications.

Many in Congress failed to comprehend the Roosevelt meaning back in 1940. Some, though fewer, do not seem to grasp the full import of the Truman doctrine now. Some can't discern the forest for the trees.

Incredibly enough, they seem to think that Mr. Truman is trying to force King George II upon the unwilling Greeks, while others insist that we should make them adopt a government of the kind we Americans like. Both of which miss the mark by a mile.

The Truman doctrine is simply the Atlantic Charter principle that peoples everywhere should have the right to live under a government of their own choosing, whether of the right, left or middle, monarchy or republican.

A New Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

BRIEF OF JOHN C. WILLIAMSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON MARCH 14, 1947, PROPOSING AN AVERAGING PLAN AS AN ALTERNATIVE METHOD OF DETERMINING SURTAX

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the National Legislative Committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars, has had under consideration since the forty-seventh national encampment several resolutions the objectives of which were to encourage small business, the flow of venture capital, and at the same time to provide some measure of tax relief to veterans during the postwar years of readjustment to civilian life.

Several of these resolutions have been transformed into legislation which is now pending before various committees of the Congress.

At the same time the national legislative committee has devoted considerable study to a tax plan which, although it does not provide for tax relief in the form of straight tax reduction or exemption, does remove certain inequities in the present tax structure and at the same time is designed to encourage new business venture with a resultant higher level of employment. The VFW plan will also provide some tax relief to veterans and nonveterans alike whose incomes during the war years and for some years hence will be subject to considerable fluctuation.

Briefly the plan is an alternative method of determining surtax and will parallel the present section in the Internal Revenue Code on surtax rates. It is a 5-year moving-average plan which compares what a taxpayer would have paid in surtax had his total income received during the current and four preceding years been received in equal yearly amounts with what he had actually paid in surtaxes during the four preceding years. The difference is what the taxpayer owes for the current year.

Following is the plan as incorporated in the proposed bill:

In lieu of the surtax imposed by section 12 (b) (1), Internal Revenue Code, an indi-

vidual may elect, for each taxable year, to compute the surtax or surtax refund in the following manner:

(1) To the surtax net income for the current taxable year he will add the surtax net income, if any, reported by him in each of the four preceding taxable years. If for any of the four preceding taxable years, the tax was computed under the tax table, the taxpayer adjusts the figure shown as adjusted gross income to reflect the surtax net income by taking the standard deduction of 10 percent and the surtax credits.

(2) Add the surtax net income of the earliest year, not to exceed the fourth year preceding the current taxable year, to the surtax net income of the current year. To this sum add the surtax net incomes of the intervening years regardless of whether a return was filed in any of these years.

(3) Average the above to obtain an average surtax net income.

(4) Compute the surtax for each year on the average found in 3, above.

(5) Compare this total average surtax with the surtaxes actually paid. If he actually paid more surtaxes than the total of the average surtaxes obtained in 4, above, he is entitled to a refund of the difference; and if he actually paid in the four preceding taxable years less surtax than that obtained in 4, above, his surtax for the current year will be the difference.

It is apparent from the above that this averaging plan would benefit all veterans who are presently earning their first moderate income since induction in the armed services. It would also benefit those veterans who may not earn their first appreciable income until some years after their readjustment period. It would stimulate increased investment in risk enterprises; thereby increasing employment; and, of course, it would provide a more equitable means of surtax determination for those individuals whose incomes are continually subject to wide fluctuation.

The only distinction between veterans and other taxpayers would be a technical amendment to permit veterans to average income over any of the 5-year period in which they were on active duty even though no returns were filed for the years while in service. For example, a veteran in the Army in 1943 could average his 1947 income over 1943, 1944, 1945, 1966, and 1947. A civilian who filed his first return in 1945 could average his 1947 income, under the proposed law, only over 1945, 1946, and 1947.

Joint returns, themselves, would present no particular problem under the proposed law but provision would have to be made for segregating income when taxpayers change from filing a joint return to filing single returns as is now done in the case of capital loss carry-overs.

Attached to this brief is a draft of the bill which would amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide a 5-year moving average plan for the computation of individual income tax.

Also attached are two tables, A and B, which set forth comparisons of present surtax with surtax based upon average surtax net income.

Also enclosed is an article by Douglas Larsen which appeared in the New York World-Telegram on March 22, 1947. This appeared also in the Washington Daily News and other newspapers covered by the Newspaper Enterprise Association.

[Excerpt from The Finance and Tax Program for Small Business, by J. C. Dockeray, Finance and Tax Division, Office of Small Business, Department of Commerce. (Original article in February 1947 issue, pp. 10–14, Domestic Commerce—U. S. Department of Commerce publication)]

All business, both large and small, must grow in order to enjoy a healthy economic life. Economic survival is related to ability to grow and to adapt to the ever-changing environment. Most business grows in part from within through the retention of earnings but due to its financial situation small business must grow principally from within. Outside capital has not been available on favorable terms or in adequate amounts. For this reason high-tax rates limit the ability of small concerns to expand.

The net earnings of small business fluctuate more widely than do those of big business. This leads to the payments of larger amounts of taxes over a period of years by small business than would be true if its earnings were more stable. This situation is especially serious for unincorporated enterprises that pay taxes under the highly progressive personal income-tax rates. Since small business is typically unincorporated, it faces a real problem in this particular. A satisfactory method of averaging income subject to taxation over a number of years must be developed if businesses with fluctuating characteristics are to be taxed comparably with businesses having stable income.

The article below appeared in the New York World Telegram, issue of March 22, 1947:

FIVE-YEAR TAX PLAN CONSIDERED—"AVERAGE" METHOD OFFERED IN CONGRESS BY VFW

(By Douglas Larsen)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—Many Congressmen are enthusiastic about a new method of computing income taxes which is designed for the benefit of veterans, small businesses, and others whose incomes vary greatly from year to year.

The plan has been offered by the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which presented it to the Ways and Means Committee. Legislators who have studied it say that it might become the GOP's No. 1 tax program.

For want of a better name it is referred to as an "averaging plan." It would permit any taxpayer, if he chose, to base his tax payment on his average income over a 5-year period, instead of forcing him to pay each year on what he earned that year.

The proposal can be illustrated like this:

Jones served a year in the Army and had no taxable income to report. His first year in civvies he started a little business; his net income was $2,500 and his income tax $510. The next year business improved; he took out $5,000 net, and his tax is $1,100. The third year as a civilian brought him $7,500 net, on which he must pay $1,810. And on the fourth year's $10,000—the business now being established and prospering—he must shell out $2,640.

During these 5 years he has earned a total of $25,000 net and has paid a total of $6,060 in income tax.

Under the VFW's "averaging plan" he would average the 5 years' net income at $5,000 a year, on which the tax would be $1,100 a year. This would total $5,500 and save him $560 over the period.

Another example would be an author, who spent 2 years in service and then 2 years writing a book. During these 4 years he has no taxable income and pays no tax. During the fifth year he completes and sells the book, it is published, and makes a hit, and he takes in $25,000 net.

The present law permits him to consider the 2 years of writing and distribute his income over that period. But the proposed law would take account also of the 2 years in the Army and let him split his $25,000 five ways, paying $5,500 in all.

The privilege of spreading income like this is restricted now to a few cases, such as authors, artists, inventors, who work for some time and then reap their reward all at once.

It does not apply, as the proposed law would, to baseball players, movie and stage actors, and others who work every year, are paid at once, but have great variations in income from year to year.

As suggested, the plan would provide a "moving average." That is, the taxpayer each year could average in the last 4 years if that would reduce his tax, however he may have filed the previous year. Or, if he chose, he could ignore the average and consider only his current income.

If the taxpayer's income should drop materially, by averaging in the last 4 years, he could get a refund.

John C. Williamson, a VFW spokesman, who presented the plan to the Ways and Means Committee, explained its purpose like this:

"Veterans, as a group, will experience wide fluctuations in their incomes for the next few years of readjustment. The present income-tax system is designed for persons whose income is fairly steady from year to year. This averaging plan will make it possible for persons to balance lean years with good years.'

A recent poll of leading tax experts revealed that 86 percent favor some system of averaging yearly earnings. But previously suggested plans have been rejected for one reason or other.

Author of the VFW's plan is Richard A. Mullens, tax attorney and former Army captain, who served in the Pacific in World War II He is special tax consultant to the VFW's national legislative committee. He has worked on his plan for some years.

TABLE A.—*Comparison of present surtax with surtax based upon average surtax net income*

	Earnings of sample taxpayer over 10-year period	Surtax computed under present system at 1945 rate	Cumulative surtax paid under present system	Average surtax net income as computed under averaging plan	Surtax computed under averaging plan at 1945 rate	Cumulative surtax paid under averaging plan
1944	$1,600	$320	$320	$1,600.00	$320	$320
1945	1,600	320	640	1,600.00	320	640
1946	500	100	740	1,233.33	100	740
1947	3,000	620	1,360	1,675.00	600	1,340
1948	3,000	620	1,980	1,940.00	600	1,940
1949	7,000	1,660	3,640	3,020.00	1,502	3,442
1950	6,000	1,360	5,000	3,900.00	1,288	4,730
1951	4,000	840	5,840	4,600.00	840	5,570
1952	8,000	1,960	7,800	5,600.00	1,960	7,530
1953	6,000	1,360	9,160	6,200.00	1,360	8,890

Total surtax paid under present system..... $9,160
Total surtax paid under averaging plan..... 8,890

NOTE.—Major in Army until 1946. Started own business.

TABLE B.—*Comparison of present surtax with surtax based upon average surtax net income*

	Earnings of sample taxpayer over 10-year period	Surtax computed under present system at 1945 rate	Cumulative surtax paid under present system	Average surtax net income as computed under averaging plan	Surtax computed under averaging plan at 1945 rate	Cumulative surtax paid under averaging plan
1944	0	0	0	0	0	0
1945	0	0	0	0	0	0
1946	0	0	0	0	0	0
1947	$1,500	$300	$300	$375	$300	$300
1948	8,000	1,960	2,260	1,900	1,600	1,900
1949	8,000	1,960	4,220	3,500	1,750	3,650
1950	6,000	1,360	5,580	4,700	1,360	5,010
1951	10,000	2,640	8,220	6,700	1,840	6,850
1952	15,000	4,730	12,950	9,400	4,730	11,580
1953	5,000	1,100	14,050	8,800	1,100	12,600

Total surtax paid under present system..... $14,050
Total surtax paid under averaging plan..... 12,600

President Monroe's Message in 1823 Erected Standards for Our National Defense Which Now Apply to the Mediterranean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it is not because Russia is communistic, but rather because her communism is aggressive, that we concern ourselves with the problems of her neighborhood, meaning Greece and Turkey. We cannot decide for the Russian people what form of government they shall have. Our foreign policy has never been based upon interventions to influence the people of other nations to prefer our system. We would not be abandoning this policy to intervene in the Mediterranean in the present difficulties. The problem is simple enough if we regard the lessons of history concerning aggressions. Even under the old methods of transportation and warfare, we found our national interests involved in European aggressions. The contagions spread more rapidly than ever under modern conditions, and Athens is less distant from Washington than some cities of South America embraced within the area covered by the Monroe Doctrine.

President Monroe's famous message of 1823 contemplated the same type of potential aggressions we are witnessing today. What logic would there be in committing our resources to the defense of the Western Hemisphere to preserve our freedom but to neglect a defense of the Northern Hemisphere for the same purpose? Greece is very much involved in the strategic areas of our Northern Hemisphere and for that reason the Truman doctrine logically grows out of our traditional policy. It would be inaccurate obviously to regard the two doctrines as one but basically they have the same purpose, that of defending our own Nation and its free Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote the following pertinent passages from the address of President Monroe which constitute his famous doctrine:

A strong hope has been long entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest, and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. It is believed that the whole civilized world takes a deep interest in their welfare. Although no power has declared in their favor, yet none, according to our information, has taken part against them. Their cause and their name have protected them from dangers, which might, ere this, have overwhelmed any other people. The ordinary calculations of interest, and of acquisition, with a view to aggrandizement, which mingle so much in the transactions of nations, seem to have had no effect in regard to them. From the facts which have come to our knowledge, there is good cause to believe that their enemy has lost forever all dominion over them; that Greece will become again an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank, is the object of our most ardent wishes.

It was stated at the commencement of the last session, that a great effort was then making in Spain and Portugal, to improve the condition of the people of those countries, and that it appeared to be conducted with extraordinary moderation. It need scarcely be remarked, that the result has been, so far, very different from what was then anticipated. Of events in that quarter of the globe, with which we have so much intercourse, and from which we derive our origin, we have always been anxious and interested spectators. The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly, in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellowmen on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded, or seriously menaced, that we resent injuries, or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere, we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different, in this respect, from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole Nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare, that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power, we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But, with the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration, and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling, in any other manner, their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. In the war between these new governments and Spain, we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered, and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur, which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change, on the part of the United States, indispensable to their security.

Mr. Speaker, these words of President Monroe give force and meaning to the recent editorial comment of Roscoe Drummond in the Christian Science Monitor:

It is altogether useful that there is a wide agreement on what the Government's aid-to-free-peoples policy really means. The difference is that the evils which its opponents—mostly the extreme prewar isolationists—attribute to the policy are, in the judgment of its supporters, its real virtues.

Its opponents say they are against aid to Greece and Turkey because it means carrying the Monroe Doctrine to the Mediterranean, because it is equivalent to peacetime lend-lease.

Its supporters are for aid to Greece and Turkey because they believe the Monroe Doctrine must be carried to the Mediterranean—to the frontier of free peoples; because they believe that unless freedom is defended where it is at stake a chain of events will be set in motion which will make its defense nearer home vastly more costly, vastly more perilous.

The Monroe Doctrine in the Western Hemisphere has not operated as an instrument of aggression nor as an instrument of imperialism. It has been utilized by a free people to help secure freedom.

The Truman-Monroe Doctrine embodies the same fundamental to accomplish the same purpose. It is a modern fulfillment of traditional American policy carried out on a scale which the times demand.

From Nebraska to the Nation: Arbor Day

REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 9, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, from March through May, throughout the United States, thousands of Americans of all ages will plant millions of trees and shrubs on Arbor Day. The fact that there is no uniform date set apart nationally for this observance is, of course, due to variation in climate among the several States. Any other State might have given this enduring symbol of the limitless blessings of nature conferred upon our beloved country, to the American people. But it was Nebraska—and Nebraskans—who gave our Republic Arbor Day. The wisdom, the forethought, the patriotism, and the confidence in country which brought Arbor Day into existence makes me proud that I am a Nebraskan and that I serve the people of Nebraska.

Arbor Day was no accident. It was not the creation of men or events in a particular historical era. It was not established to meet a passing need only to be retained on the statute books without significance or meaning after that need had vanished into time. At its very birth in Nebraska, Arbor Day was steeped in tradition. Arbor Day, after originating in Nebraska on April 10, 1872, has gone on to play an important role in Nebraska agricultural progress during every season of each succeeding year. In this respect, Arbor Day adheres closely to the pattern of another great American holiday—July 4, Independence Day.

The great names of the War for Independence are familiar to all of us—Washington, Greene, Francis Marion, Mad Anthony Wayne, Jefferson, John and Samuel Adams, Benjamin Franklin. But, the true heroes, the men who never enjoyed the freedom for which they fought, lie in forgotten graves from Lexington to Valley Forge, from King's Mountain to Yorktown. These unremembered ones made liberty possible and gave real meaning to Independence Day. Other Americans whose names will never be found in any of our history books kept the message of the Liberty Bell alive down through the decades until this very day.

I have spoken of the Fourth of July because it is similar to Arbor Day—because it is built on the broad base of the

small man's faith in freedom as his work-worn hands reach up in prayer to God.

The history of tree planting in Nebraska goes back beyond written record. Archeologists tell us that a group of early farmers who lived in almost all of the river valleys of Nebraska, except in the shadow of the eastern Missouri River bluffs had learned the secret of planting trees to protect their crops from the elements.

Manuel Lisa, who came upriver from St. Louis in 1807 to trade in furs, landed on Nebraska soil near the present site of Omaha. On his rafts he brought cattle, hogs, poultry, squash, lima beans, potatoes, and turnips. He also brought small trees. He planted for himself. Yet, he had brought more than he needed for his own use and he gave of his bounty freely to the Indians who greeted him upon his arrival. Not only did he give to the Indians. He told them how to plant these new crops, how to care for them, and how to plant trees.

Other planters followed Manuel Lisa, the unknown "Johnny Appleseeds" of the Midwest. So widespread had become the lore of planting trees that when, in 1832, eastern Nebraska was visited by the distinguished American artist, George Catlin, he—Catlin—could describe what once had been a treeless prairie as "everywhere covered with beautiful green turf and with occasional patches and clusters of trees."

From Michigan, Indiana, Kentucky, and Missouri settlers poured into Nebraska. To some finding a home in Nebraska was an accident. A broken prairie-schooner wheel; an Indian attack; the loss of a team of horses; a family could go no farther. They built sod houses, traded with the friendly Indians, collected wild plants, and—somehow—existed through the winter, fully intending to go on in the spring. But instead they learned to love the land and stayed on to prosper. More purposeful settlers, intent on building permanent homes in the new country, brought plants and tree sets with them. Some of these far-bought trees flourished; more died. Still such was the spirit of the undaunted pioneer that he and his family kept on fighting to make a garden out of a wilderness.

During the 1840's and the 1850's friends gave friends tree sets as presents on birthdays and holidays. Tree trading became almost as common as horse trading on the Nebraska frontier. Trees and the products of trees occupied a place of honor at the first Territorial fair in 1859. Under the Homestead Act of 1862, inducements were held out to tree planters. A claim could be proved more quickly if there was evidence of a grove or the planting of trees along section or boundary lines.

In the spring of 1868, a Nebraska pioneer, Dr. George L. Miller, in writing of another pioneer, said:

> He is constantly sticking the cuttings or roots of fruit or forest trees into the ground. When he is not doing this, in the proper season, he is using a pair of shears ingeniously fastened on a long pole and operated with a string, in trimming the limbs of the tall trees, which his own hand planted, that have grown out of his reach. One of these, the king of cottonwoods, which arose from a few inches of a limb of one of those trees * * * is about 12 years of age. It stands 40 feet in its subterranean stockings, and measures at the butt 60 inches in circumference. But his fruit growing is the great thing. He already raises peaches for market and his apples will be counted this fall by hundreds of bushels.

It is no wonder that the Nebraska State Horticultural Society was organized in 1869. Interest in the planting of fruit trees as well as the planting of shelter trees was at high pitch. J. Sterling Morton, who was to become the third United States Secretary of Agriculture; Nebraska City orchardist, J. H. Masters; Editor Robert W. Furnas; and Chief Justice Oliver P. Mason were among the society's 23 charter members.

To J. Sterling Morton goes the honor of giving Arbor Day its name. As a member of the State board of agriculture, he offered the following resolution on January 4, 1872:

> *Resolved*, That Wednesday, the 10th day of April 1872, be, and the same is hereby, especially set apart and consecrated for tree planting in the State of Nebraska, and the State board of agriculture hereby names it Arbor Day; and to urge upon the people of the State the vital importance of tree planting hereby offer a special premium of $100 to the agricultural society of that county in Nebraska which shall, upon that day, plant properly the largest number of trees; and a farm library of $25 worth of books to that person who, on that day, shall plant properly, in Nebraska, the greatest number of trees.

That resolution was unanimously adopted.

As the immediate result of that first of all Arbor Days, over one million trees were planted. Nor was this a false start. It is a matter of record that approximately 350,000,000 trees and vines were set out in Nebraska during the 12 years following that first Arbor Day. Today, Nebraska observes Arbor Day on the second Wednesday in April and this—Arbor Day, 1947—is the diamond-jubilee observance, the seventy-fifth anniversary of the first Arbor Day.

In the 1930's we talked a lot and listened to a lot of talk about shelter belts. In advocating this boon to the farmer, many considered it something new—a practical movement to enrich the soil, to protect the crops, and to beautify the land. Actually, it represented a return to one of the basic agricultural principles which had helped to make Nebraska great in farm production. The early Indian farmer of the Republican River people, Manuel Lisa, J. Sterling Morton—all contributed to it. But, as in all great gifts to mankind, it was the "small man," the forgotten, the unknown, who dared fire and flood, blizzard and brutality, to mold disaster into destiny. In its noblest sense, Arbor Day is Nebraska's enduring monument to the "little man."

Some years ago, I planted a white pine on the Capitol grounds. That tree had been sent to me by Sterling Morton, Jr. from the Morton arboretum in Illinois. I hoped that this tree might eventually take the place of that one which had been planted by the late Secretary of Agriculture and which had been removed to make way for the expanding department. I think Mr. Morton must have understood the meaning of my act for I was thinking of his words while I turned the earth:

> The cultivation of flowers and trees is the cultivation of the good, the beautiful, and the ennobling in man, and, for one, I wish to see this culture become universal in the State.

Arbor Day 1947 has a message to the community, the State, the Republic, and the world. Through Arbor Day, Nebraska's unknown planters down through the years, speak, saying, "To destroy is evil. To cause to grow is good. Yesterday's planting is the harvest of tomorrow."

The Lilienthal Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 10 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Confirm Lilienthal," which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press of April 4.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFIRM LILIENTHAL

David Lilienthal's opponents have done their worst and have been outvoted. It is not likely that on any other test they can show greater strength than on the Senate's 52 to 38 rejection yesterday of the motion to send the nomination back for further committee investigation.

So the Senate should get along with the business now, promptly confirm Mr. Lilienthal and the other nominees for the Atomic Energy Commission.

It should do that to enable the Commission to work unmolested in the development of atomic energy, keep ahead of the rest of the world and thus advance our national security. And to enable the Senate itself to devote its attention to controversies of more substance.

Disposal of War Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of an editorial by Drew Pearson of recent date, and my answer to a letter from a good friend of mine, Mr. George B. Neff of Avoca, it being the only letter I have received from my district concerning the Pearson editorial. I feel that in fairness to all this explanation must be made of the issue to the American people.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register and Tribune of March 25, 1947]

HOUSING

The fur is flying backstage over another fast housing deal in big real estate lobbyists

have put over in Congress—and on the veterans.

The deal involves a resolution, adopted behind closed doors of the House Banking and Currency Committee and by an Appropriations subcommittee whereby surplus war housing can be sold only for cash.

Innocent on its face, this means a big advantage for the big real-estate operators, who can afford to put up spot cash for the multiple-unit surplus-housing projects.

Since most of the projects are big ones, ranging from 100 up to 3,000 units in size, veteran-purchaser groups cannot compete on a cash basis with the big real-estate syndicates. The latter would be in a position not only to put up the money, but, because of the limited cash bidding on such large transactions, could force down sales prices.

The deal was put over by Chairman JESSE WOLCOTT, of Michigan, of the Banking and Currency Committee, and Chairman BEN JENSEN, of Iowa of the Government Corporations Subcommittee.

APRIL 8, 1947.

Mr. GEORGE B. NEFF,
Walnut, Iowa.

DEAR GEORGE: The Drew Pearson attack on Congressman WOLCOTT and myself is just another example of the unfair tactics used by certain radical groups here in a well-planned program to discredit Congressmen who will not go along with Government ownership and control of everything.

Here are the true facts about the war housing issue. The Federal Public Housing Administrator asked us to give them the green light to dispose of war housing under a plan they have cooked up whereby mutual ownership corporations would be formed by the present occupants in these war housing projects. Most of these tenants are nonveterans. The present occupants under that plan would then have first priority to buy the house they now occupy, whether they are veterans or not. They are to pay 10 percent in cash and pay the balance over a 45-year period. Thus keeping the Government in business and in virtual control of the property for the life of the contract.

Our committees unanimously opposed that plan for very good and definite reasons. In the disposal of all surplus property the Congress has said in the laws now on the statutes that veterans should have priority over nonveterans to purchase surplus property, but the FPHA officials contend it is not proper, fair, nor feasible to give veterans priority in this instance. To this contention neither my colleagues nor I can agree at all, and we so informed the FPHA.

I contend, as do most of the members of the committees, that veterans should have the privilege of a 60-day period to purchase the houses direct from the Government, so long as the bid price is at least 75 percent of the appraised value of the property. Certainly, the veteran who served his country for the comparable small pay in relation to those who worked in defense plants, should have this advantage. And I am certain that is the wish of the American people too.

Also, we have substantial information that in most of the cities in which these housing projects are located, if given an opportunity the cities would purchase these projects in toto at a responsible price and dispose of the units at a reasonable price to veterans on such terms as are satisfactory to the interest of the individual veteran. All recognized veterans' organization representatives to whom I have talked are in full agreement with the position taken by us.

The private lending institutions in the respective areas where these projects are located are ready and anxious to furnish the needed capital to the veterans, either by a direct loan or by FHA loans, which ever are agreed upon between the veteran and the lending institution, whether the purchases are made direct from the Government or city.

Mr. Dillon Myer, Director of FPHA, assured us at a duly called joint meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee, headed by Congressman Wolcott, and the Subcommittee on Government Corporations, House Appropriations Committee, of which I am chairman, that he would abide by our decision, because the law now in effect for the disposal of these war housing projects was not too plain. Therefore, he did not want to dispose of them until we had looked into the matter. So, after due consideration of our joint committee, we unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"It is the sense of this joint committee that sales of permanent war housing units by the Federal Public Housing Authority be limited to such transactions as will return all proceeds of the sales in cash to the general fund of the Treasury of the United States at the time of the consummation of the sales."

We hoped that the effect of this resolution would be to hold the disposal program in abeyance until the Banking and Currency Committee could have hearings, and then write a bill which would be in plain understandable language and be a sound practical disposal plan, and one that would give justice to the veterans. The committee will start hearings within the next 10 days and we hope to have the bill made law within the next 60 days, if possible.

With kindest good wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

The Final Product Is What Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times:

THE FINAL PRODUCT IS WHAT COUNTS

(By Kyle Palmer)

When Republican majorities were returned to the United States Senate and to the national House of Representatives in 1946 there was general agreement among Democrats and Republicans alike that the GOP not only would retain control of the Congress, but would coast gayly into the White House in 1948.

Last November Republican jubilation was at its zenith and Democratic despair hit a nadir.

Political wiseacres could furnish scores of reasons and cite innumerable precedents in history to bulwark their arguments; Republicans couldn't lose; Democrats couldn't win.

SHAKY ELEPHANT?

An era had come to a close; the old cycle of political change had been restored.

But now, from all we hear, both the jubilation and the despair were a bit premature; the elephant is a trifle shaky on his legs, we're told, and the donkey's ears are perking up.

The same group of experts that proved by chapter and verse that "any Republican will win" are hard at work demonstrating the likelihood of GOP losses in Congress 2 years hence, along with the probable retention of President Truman at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mainly they describe "Republican failure" or "vacillation" as the cause for this somewhat precipitate reversal of form.

REVOLVING PROPHETS

Given another set of circumstances or conditions 3 months hence they'll solemnly do a double reverse and establish, to their own satisfaction, at least, that their original premise was correct.

Political likelihoods are not subject to such volatile judgments, nor are political realities so responsive to superficial influences; victory or defeat for Republican and Democrat in 1948 can be swayed by events and conditions yet to occur, but the weights and balances continue to favor the election of a Republican Congress and President at the next general election.

Chicago's heavy Democratic majority for the first politically respectable mayor the Kelly machine has put forward in many years may be a straw in the April wind—but Chicago is a windy city and the breezes there are variable.

NATIONAL TRENDS

Where national political trends are concerned, about the only change that has occurred since last November is represented in a growing realization that the Republicans face a fight instead of a frolic during the months ahead.

The Republican Party as represented by Members of the Senate and House has been in control of Congress just a little more than 3 months. New and old GOP legislators were barely seated before the Democratic propagandists began their chant of failure.

President Truman invited cooperation, and at the same time he and every other Democratic leader identified with the administration's political fate and future turned to the job of making the Republicans look foolish and frustrated.

What chiefly is the complaint against Republican Senators and Representatives at this time—less than 90 legislative days after they assumed office?

That they predicted much and have produced little? That they have not fulfilled promises to curb labor-union excesses and are not likely to do so? That taxes have not been reduced? That the housing shortage remains? That they fight too much among themselves?

Substance can be found in some of the critical generalizations, particularly as they apply to lack of harmony, or unity, or party discipline, or whatever you prefer to call current difficulties encountered by those seeking to have the Republicans work as a group.

MORE QUARTERBACKS

True it is that there have been more quarterbacks than linemen on the GOP team. Teamwork takes time and is a matter of training, association, and understanding.

After nearly 16 years of consistent Republican defeats and denial of authority and responsibility, the odd circumstance is not that the Republicans find it difficult to work as a unit, but that they can find opportunities to work together at all.

A Nation too long accustomed to the autocratic rule of Roosevelt and to the imposition of one man's will on a party in power has not learned to appreciate the value and the ultimate welfare and security of independent thinking by men who, in general, have identical objectives in view.

PRESIDENTIAL HOPES

If you look carefully at these GOP quarrels, contradictions, contrarieties, and discrepancies, you will discover more controversy as to methods than applies to policies and convictions.

Again, there is truth in the charge that too many Republicans are interested in their personal chances to become President. That

is a legitimate criticism, but since when have Democrat and Republican differed in that human respect?

While FDR was alive he succeeded in keeping all party rivals safely relegated to the status of political pygmies. Mr. Truman was one of them, and he was elected for the Vice-Presidency as an insurance policy. The selection was made by shrewd and cynical men who expected to benefit from that policy.

Mr. Truman is now a candidate to succeed himself because it would represent political suicide by his backers to desert him now. He was their best bet when the ailing Roosevelt was renominated; he continues to be their best bet. He is a smart politician and, now that his surprise and, no doubt, genuine humility under the sudden impact of the Presidency show signs of wearing off, he will be a good campaigner.

CAMPAIGNING TRUMAN

He is campaigning right now.

However, the final GOP legislative product rather than the preliminary models will be the determining factor in Republican success or defeat in 1948.

Collectively the new and old Republican Senators and Representatives went into office as the joint custodians of the Nation's hope for better things and as the exponents of a national protest against many New Dealers and many New Deal policies.

Some aspects of the New Deal were falling apart from age, decay, and structural faults, but in the main the professional and bureaucratic political machine which Mr. Truman took over was soundly and securely intrenched.

NOT IN MONTHS

With all the will in the world, the new Republican-controlled Congress cannot in the space of a few months untangle a web that has been so many, many years aweaving.

By far the great majority of Republicans elected to the Eightieth Congress are able. Each in his own way may interpret his mission or his party's mission according to individual or even sectional approach, but in the main—and after much inescapable trial and error—something in the nature of a cohesive legislative policy is sure to emerge.

Count on Mr. Truman and friends to do all possible to make the Republican effort appear small and trivial. Look to the White House for an endless succession of inspired pronouncements for the benefit of "the little man," who, by the way, swings the biggest influence at the ballot box.

THEY ARE WORKING

But don't lose sight of the fact that Republicans are really working, that most of them not only realize the political expediency of getting results, but also comprehend the vital need for accomplishing objectives which the people will recognize as substantial.

Neither Governor Dewey, of New York, nor Senator TAFT, of Ohio—regardless of any rivalry for the Presidency—can afford to allow personal differences or political interests interfere with basic party responsibility for sound legislation. The same rule applies generally.

Each may maneuver for advantage and may encourage individual followers to skirmish for position, but none can overlook the danger to himself that lies in a Republican legislative fiasco.

DEFEAT FACTORS

There have been occasions in the political history of the United States when an election was lost by those who could only lose because of their own mistakes and inadequacy.

There are numberless factors contributing to such a condition: overconfidence, straddling, over-ambition, cynicism, surrender to expediency, venal politics, compromising associations.

The approaching national election has every appearance of falling into such a category.

Democrats may fight with all of the energy and enterprise at their command, but the outcome of the battle depends upon Republican competency and integrity. These—or their deficiency—will be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the voter considerably in advance of day of decision.

Truman Avoids Domestic Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Truman, in his Jefferson Day dinner speech, announced his candidacy for reelection and in so doing avoided reference to highly important domestic problems. He was content to emphasize the danger inherent in the present international crisis. It was purely a political speech, for which devoted brethren paid $100 per plate. The President might well have stated the issues confronting this country and advised what he intends to do about them. As yet he has failed to recommend any constructive legislation to meet these current issues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith a timely article by that eminent political writer, Mr. Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Evening Star on Tuesday, April 8, 1947:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

President Truman's candidacy for reelection in 1948 had a second launching at the Jefferson Day dinner here Saturday night. Mr. Truman said nothing about being a candidate in his address. It remained for House Minority Leader RAYBURN, Gael Sullivan, executive director of the Democratic National Committee, and others to proclaim again that the Democratic Party had its choice for the Presidential office. The declarations for Mr. Truman, however, were merely supplementary to the casting of Mr. Truman's hat in the ring months ago by Postmaster General Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in a speech delivered in New York.

It has been obvious almost since Mr. Truman took over the Presidential office after the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt he would be the Democratic nominee for President next year. A President is always a candidate for renomination—and he has to be—except when he is completing a second term in the White House. In the case of Mr. Roosevelt, he was a candidate at the end of both a second and a third term.

The Democrats today proclaim their chances of winning next year's national election are bright. They have been encouraged by a favorable Truman press, by a Gallup poll, and by a mayoralty election in Democratic Chicago.

However, when the Presidential campaign shapes up in 1948 there are a number of questions the Democrats will have to answer satisfactorily if they are to win. The Republicans won the congressional elections last year because the people were sick of Democratic fumbling in labor relations, were sick of Democratic high taxes and huge expenditures, and were sick of bureaucratic control of their affairs. They took over majority control of both the Senate and House on these issues.

What have the Democrats done since that election to remove these causes of irritation? Outside of the elimination of various wartime controls—and they have not all been eliminated—the Democratic administration has done nothing. Instead of helping the Republican majority in Congress with labor legislation, with still further cuts in the Federal budget, and with tax reduction, the administration registered, in one way or another, its opposition. Now, how is that attitude going to make a hit with the American voters?

Furthermore, the President before very long is going to be compelled to go on record on some of these vital issues. The Republican Congress is going to send him tax reduction and labor bills. If he vetoes them—and there was an indication in the Jefferson Day address he would veto a proposed tax reduction at this time, although he said nothing whatever about labor legislation—it will be in direct opposition to the expressed wish of the voters in the 1946 election.

There has been much talk about improved relations since the elections. If there has been an improvement it is largely due to the fact that the new Congress was known to favor amendments to the labor laws. And now threat of new Nation-wide labor troubles is not helping the administration—the telephone strike, the threatened telegraph strike and the coal mine work stoppage.

The Truman Jefferson Day address, delivered on a political occasion when funds were being raised for the Democratic National Committee, must be considered a political address. Noticeable about it was the fact that the field of foreign policy was placed first. What the President had to say about domestic issues—tax reduction and reduction of Federal expenditures—was in the nature of excuses why the administration could not go along with them.

Foreign policy has been kept out of partisan politics successfully since the close of the war—largely through the efforts of the Republicans under the leadership of Chairman VANDENBERG of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It was Senator VANDENBERG who stiffened the backbone of the Truman administration in its dealings with Soviet Russia, and the policy today is as much Senator VANDENBERG'S as anyone else's. It does not appear likely, under these circumstances, that the foreign policy will become an issue in the Presidential election. However, it is within the bounds of possibility that the Democratic campaign next year will be to run Mr. Truman against Joseph Stalin, rather than against his Republican opponent.

Inflationary Dangers of Rising Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on the domestic front, certainly one of the major problems is the rising cost of living. It was with considerable interest that I read of the action of the President in calling his Cabinet together to consider what steps might be taken to halt this

trend. But it was a disappointing letdown to receive the announcement from the President's spokesman after that meeting that no plans of action were laid down at all.

Apparently it was not recognized or discussed in this Cabinet meeting, that one of the principal inflationary trends is the continued excessive governmental spending. The administration still resists emphatically, and even violently, any efforts to reduce expenditures, particularly those having to do with employment of staff.

Our Democratic friends oppose relief to the overburdened and harassed taxpayers in the form of a reduction in taxes and an increase in the take-home pay, ostensibly because the spreading of such relief to the extent of $5,000,000,000 among the people of this country, thus increasing their purchasing power, will accentuate an inflationary trend. They lose sight of, or at least do not mention, the fact that this increase in the workingman's take-home pay is likely to have a very salutary effect in reducing the extent of demands for increased wages which, as we all know, are a part of the inflationary spiral. They would prefer, instead of giving this $5,000,000,000 to the people to spend, to have the Government spend $6,000,000,000 more than this House believes is necessary to perform the essential functions of government. I believe the people will back us up in our insistence that they, not the Government, have this money to spend.

A clear-thinking constituent of mine, Mr. A. E. Piesner, who runs the New York Bakery at 385 Joseph Avenue, Rochester, N. Y., has sent me a letter addressed to the President by the National Bakers Supply House Association, a part of which, under leave granted, I include in these remarks:

MARCH 28, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: From an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, dated Wednesday, March 26, we understand you have appealed to manufacturers, such as ourselves, for lower prices; moreover hoping that we as businessmen would see the handwriting on the wall—the inflationary dangers of rising prices.

In the first place, Mr. President, we are completely in accord with this view. We believe in lower prices and have tried valiantly to keep them down. We are with you, to a man, on this point; moreover we not only see the inflationary danger of rising costs, we feel it, every minute, every hour of the day.

But may we ask you a question? We are for the most part agricultural processors—producers of food from agricultural products, and as such manufacturers and processors, businessmen too. What, if anything, is the Government doing to keep prices down, either in the way of reducing the cost of government—and taxes have a very considerable bearing on prices—or in trying honestly and realistically to stabilize our markets? No, we don't want control, but we do want some degree of realistic, positive action from our Government. There are too many press conferences, too much talk, Mr. President, and too little action.

You were once a small businessman, and I am sure in operating that business if you didn't keep your selling price to the public in line with what you were paying for your merchandise, and your other costs of doing business, you had an unprofitable operation.

Your Secretary of Agriculture has talked at length in many sections of the country concerning the wild and speculative grain market today, and has advanced many reasons, blaming everyone but himself and his coworkers in his own Department. Actually, Mr. President, the Government has the wheat market cornered, and every move of administrative officials influences the options. There isn't a thinking businessman, and for that matter a thinking farmer who will not tell you the advance in grain prices has been absolutely without justification.

Considering figures from the Department of Agriculture, wheat certainly was not worth 85 cents per bushel more on March 17 than on February 1, and there certainly is no reason why on Thursday, March 20, this price should be 30 cents less than on Monday, March 17. Ten-cent fluctuations in the price of wheat, in both directions, mean an entirely false set of values. Who in this world, with this sort of stuff going on, can say what the real value of a bag of flour is, or the price of a loaf of bread?

We have other problems, too, but I am speaking of the one that bothers us most—the lack of support and cooperation from those whom we have charged with the responsibility of operating our Government.

We think honestly that you can blame no one else but your administration for the deplorable condition which has not only brought wheat prices to the very highest point in 30 years, but likewise increased the cost of living substantially because of the increased price of flour—all types—and finally baked foods, including bread. Other food processors are similarly affected. Today, I understand, the American housewife is paying about 42 cents out of every dollar of income for food. Flour has advanced from $4.70 per hundredweight in October 1946 to $7.20 per hundredweight today, March 28. In sympathy with wheat we now have corn at its highest price in 28 years. Corn sirup from $4.20 per hundredweight in October 1946 to $5.15 per hundredweight today, March 28. Dextrose has advanced; sugar has advanced from $7.95 in October 1946 to $8.76 today, March 28. Shortening has advanced from $18.75 per hundredweight in October 1946 to $43 per hundredweight today. Again, Mr. President, farm products: Cottonseed, soya. Egg yolk advanced from $1.02 per pound, Mr. President, in October 1946 to $1.20 per pound today, March 28. Your Department of Agriculture continues to support the many bad principles involved here.

Now, we are not letter writers, we are not complainers, we are just plain, honest business people, trying to do our part to keep America straight and strong. All of us for the most part, as I have said, are agricultural processors, and we should like to have you, or Secretary Anderson, tell us how we, using all of those products as our basic ingredients, can keep prices down, and how in turn our customers, the bakers of America, when forced to pay our higher prices and the prices of other processors, can keep from charging the consumer more. I don't think you can, but we stand ready to listen.

We realize what a terrific and tremendous job you have, and while we agree with your thoughts, as well as your wishes, as expressed in your statement to the press on Wednesday, we don't know that we can do anything for you. We think it looks pretty much as if we are headed fast for hell in a hand basket, and we are not pessimists, in fact if we were we would not have remained in business through 70 years. Generally speaking, everybody in this country is for making the most for himself, both money and otherwise. Even personal prejudices, face saving, political expediency, is costing the people of this country a lot of money. Is it not up to the farmer, the businessman, the laborer, and all of us, as Americans, to realize our position and get on the band wagon? We think so. We are prejudiced; we are silly; we are the laughingstock of the world; we are the shackled Gulliver that the elder statesman Baruch described in Time magazine a month or so ago. We are trying to help everybody in the world, but we cannot help ourselves.

I think you would get a tremendous kick out of an article appearing in Reader's Digest this month—The Land of Plenty. It tells the story—your story and our story, and we as one little group of manufacturers wish with all our hearts that you had read it before you made your statement to the press Wednesday.

To us, just a small group of plain, ordinary businessmen, as I say, trying hard to do our best every day—and we don't think that business is without its faults—we are not trying to leave that impression, nor do we want other people to have the reverse of that impression—it appears that what we are doing is killing the goose to get the golden eggs. We will wake up without the goose, and, of course, the eggs. We will wake up without America.

Please do not pass this letter along to the Secretary of Agriculture with the request that we get an answer. We are simply talking to you as our President. Let the actions of the Secretary of Agriculture, or the actions of others in your administration, be our answer. We don't want any mimeograph replies * * * we are in no mood to receive them.

I might add, because of the wide publicity given your statement, and for the effect that it had on our customers, and in turn on their customers—the American housewives—that this letter is being released to our trade press, and other periodicals.

We, Mr. President, like you, are for lower prices, but we are going to have to get a little better support and a little more action on the realistic side from the banks of the Potomac if we are to do the job that you would like us to do.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL BAKERS' SUPPLY HOUSE ASSOCIATION.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Hartford (Conn.) Courier of March 22, 1947:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Hawaii's 47-year battle to be granted statehood has at least progressed to the stage of a favorable report to the House of Representatives. By 4th of July this year or next year the flag of the Union of "Indestructible States" may have 49 stars, the new one for our first overwater State. If Congress should approve the measure, President Truman would unquestionably sign it. He advocated statehood for Hawaii in his annual message to Congress.

Time has weakened most of the arguments formerly invoked against statehood for a territory 2,200 miles from the mainland. To

our west coast Hawaii is nearer geographically, and in the matter of communication, than was California to the Nation's Capital when it was admitted as a State. Moreover, the residents of Hawaii of Caucasian blood have been increasing so that now they represent 35 percent of the population of 500,000. And more importantly, residents of Japanese extraction have been declining in number. By percentage they are fewer than the Caucasians.

The case for Hawaii as a State, excluding consideration of foreign policy and our interest in the Pacific, is a strong one. Its economy is far sounder than that of many of our own States. Furthermore, it is not plagued by lamentable racial issues to the extent that is our South. It has proved its capacity to conduct its own affairs through an orderly government chosen by its electorate although always subject in major matters to congressional review. Moreover, Hawaiians have justly complained that with no voice in levying the taxes they pay to the United States Treasury, they have been in a position strongly paralleling that of the American colonies to Great Britain. From their experience, and with no credit to us, they could repeat: "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

There are even larger considerations in this issue. The granting of statehood to Hawaii, it is said, will bind this strategic base more closely to the Union and intensify the loyalty of the American citizens in Hawaii. Favorable congressional action will serve notice anew on the world that we intend to stay in the Central and Western Pacific despite our relinquishment of control over the Philippines. In the first analysis, if we do not intend to admit Hawaii to statehood, we should offer it its freedom and proceed to negotiate for military bases as we have in the Philippines. For a territory of this character, sound as it is governmentally and economically, to remain a Territory contains too strong a suggestion of an outdated policy of subjugation.

President Truman's Present Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Frank R. Kent:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—PRESIDENT TRUMAN TURNS TABLES ON THOSE WHO SNEERED AT "POOR LITTLE MAN"

(By Frank R. Kent)

It there has been a swifter change in the history of American politics than that evidenced by President Truman's situation now as contrasted with his situation 4 months ago, it would be interesting to know what and when and where. The change, in fact, has been so sudden and so complete as to be practically ridiculous.

Last December, for example, Mr. Truman was at so low an ebb that Democrats and near Democrats in every section were figuratively throwing stones at him. A Senator of his own party—Mr. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, who must feel particularly silly when he thinks his windy utterances over, was solemnly—and very loudly—calling upon him to resign for the good of the party and in the interests of the Nation. This absurd suggestion was echoed and endorsed in several quarters and with varying degrees of enthusiasm. It became the fashion to write disparagingly of Mr. Truman and to speak of him with contempt.

The country was full of his detractors and he had extremely few defenders. In particular, he was assailed by the professional liberals and the left-wing journalists and politicians of the Roosevelt regime. These sneeringly referred to him as that "poor little man," and with extraordinary unanimity agreed that he had made a dreadful botch of his job and ought to remove himself. In other words, they swept the "poor little man" up in a corner and struck a match to him. Actually, it was one of the most wholehearted efforts to politically bury a President while still in the White House that has ever been made—and quite the most unsuccessful.

TABLES COMPLETELY TURNED

That Mr. Truman should survive this fervent attempt on his political life, participated in not only by the Republicans but by a considerable number of slap-happy Democrats of the Fulbright type, to say nothing of the radical Roosevelt groups, was remarkable, indeed. However, not only to survive but so completely to turn the tables on both his Democratic critics and his Republican foes as in 4 months' time to have the first rushing up on the roof to cheer him and compel the latter hurriedly to drop their attitude of derisive disdain and openly recognize him as a formidable 1948 contender for the Presidency, absolutely certain to be the Democratic nominee—that is in the nature of a real political miracle.

And, yet, that was the situation before the Jefferson Day dinner here on Saturday night, when Democrats of all factions and degrees gathered in their annual celebration of the birthday of the party's founder. It was attested by all the latest polls, by editorial comment all over the country, by the posture of the politicians, and the reports of objective observers of both parties. But it was very greatly emphasized at the Jefferson Day dinner by the ovation accorded Mr. Truman when he rose to speak and by the really fine address which he then delivered. No one possibly could read that speech and believe for a moment it came from a beaten or a discouraged man. There was not in it so much as a trace of defeatism or dismay.

SERENE AND CONFIDENT

On the contrary, it unmistakably conveyed the impression of a serene and confident man, who fully appreciates the gravity of the great problems with which he has to deal, but does not for one moment shrink from them, nor is he appalled by the heavy responsibility they lay upon him. Though he addressed a strictly partisan gathering on a strictly party occasion, his was anything but a partisan speech. His reiteration and amplification of his foreign policy was clear, firm, and carried conviction. He dealt with domestic affairs with admirable restraint and common sense. His one mistake was in repeating some of the cheap claptrap with which the Republican cuts in appropriations, particularly those in Coast Guard and customs funds, have been met.

But, take it as a whole, the speech was clear, calm, adequate, and straightforward. It is not exaggeration to say that it has increased the Truman prestige. The 1948 election is still 19 months away. Mr. Truman's popularity may sink as swiftly as it has risen. Before the end of summer he will have had to take some positions and make some decisions that may affect very greatly his political prospects. Whether he blocks or approves the Republican effort to protect the public against the abuses of the power-drunk labor bosses is one of them.

Or, regardless of anything he says or does, world events may shift the whole political scenery. This is an uncertain and critical period in history and no one can see very far into the future. However, odds are no longer being offered, as they were 4 months ago, that any Republican can beat Mr. Truman next year, and those who contend that the Republican 1948 nomination is equivalent to election are nothing like as numerous, and no one at all is going about sneering at Mr. Truman as that "poor little man."

Time To Write Better Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press on the subject Time To Write Better Tax Bill.

The Pittsburgh Press is one of the most influential papers in western Pennsylvania and is owned by the Scripps-Howard chain. It is heartening to know that the editorial policy of a paper of such importance notes the haste with which the tax bill was written and the inadequate preparation which went into it. No further comments are needed, as the editorial speaks for itself.

TIME TO WRITE BETTER TAX BILL

The tax reduction bill was steam rollered through the House. That will not happen in the Senate.

The Senators say they will take their time. They should. Take time, first, to cut down on Government spending. They'll know better then how much revenue can be spared. So far, the much-advertised economizing by Congress has been little more than loud talk.

Good use could be made of the time by opening Federal tax laws to general study and revision. There's no valid reason for limiting consideration to the House's 30, 20, and 10 percentage cuts on personal income taxes. There are other things wrong with the tax structure besides the high rates on personal incomes.

Some of the excises are also too high. There are inequalities of taxation as applied to different types of incomes, and to incomes of the same amount.

The hurry-hurry pressure for the House's "quickie" bill can be set aside by eliminating the retroact've feature of the tax cut. It doesn't make sense to burden next year's budget with a promise to rebate taxes already paid. Not when the payments have been made in a period that has been generally prosperous, and especially not when the public debt is as large as it is. Better that the surplus revenues be used to slash that debt.

People are doing business, and doing pretty well, on the basis of plans long since made, plans which took into account the present tax rates. They have filed returns on this year's anticipated incomes, and are paying the taxes. The Senate, in our opinion, would do well to let the present rates stand for this year. And start on legislation to make next year's tax burdens lighter and fairer.

An Absolute No!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of the Christian Century:

AN ABSOLUTE NO!

Congress should reply with an absolute "No!" to President Truman's request for $400,000,000 to be used in bolstering with American arms and personnel the military strength of Greece and Turkey against Russia. Mr. Truman has taken the road that leads to war. He solemnly confessed that he was fully aware of the broader implications of the course on which he asks this Nation to embark. The tone of his address to Congress was portentous. It was punctuated by such words as "the gravity of the situation," "in this fateful hour," and "the security of this Nation is involved."

Moreover, he conceded that the aid now asked for Greece and Turkey may be insufficient, in which event the President frankly announced that he would return to Congress for more funds and further authority. This ominous warning served notice that he stands ready to send armed forces for another purpose than merely to suppress terrorists in Greece. The Nation is thus confronted by its President with the sharply defined imminence of World War III. Mr. Truman recognized that his proposal embodies a policy of defiance and threat toward Russia and is willing to stake American lives on its outcome.

The worst feature of his address was his attempt to justify his proposed course by invoking the principles of the United Nations in its support. Read these quotations, then rub your eyes and read them again: "We shall not realize our objectives (in the United Nations) unless we (i. e., the United States) are willing to help free peoples * * * against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes." "We (i. e., the United States) cannot allow changes in the status quo in violation of the Charter of the United Nations." In the action now proposed "the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

I

How could the President of the United States make so obviously false a claim? The course, outlined by him, is in reality a repudiation of the fundamental principle of the Charter of the United Nations. That organization was created for no less a purpose than to preclude just such unilateral action by a single nation as Mr. Truman now asks the United States to take. Its Charter cannot be invoked as sanction for a single-handed intervention in the situation which now obtains in Greece and Turkey. When the President pleads for our independent assumption of the responsibility that belongs alone to the United Nations, he cannot conceal the fact that he regards its principles as not binding on the United States. His tribute to these principles cannot be accepted as sincere. His reasoning in support of the proposed action thus constitutes nothing less than a torpedoing of the United Nations. It will be so regarded by all the world.

Who would have thought that in less than 2 years after its Charter had been adopted, and after its organization had taken form and begun to function, the United Nations would be repudiated in principle as well as in fact by the very power which had fostered it and by the President who had acclaimed it as alone holding the promise of world peace? Mr. Truman's excuse for bypassing the United Nations is lame and implausible. He says: "We considered how the United Nations might assist in this crisis, but the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action, and the United Nations * * * [is] not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required."

II

This is incredible. The Security Council of the United Nations is in continuous session only 200 miles from the White House. The full Assembly can be brought into special session as quickly as Congress can adjust itself to the handling of the crisis. Moreover, the issue would be defined in much simpler terms for the United Nations than for the American Congress. It falls clearly within the purview of that organization, whose fundamental purpose is "to maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace * * * and to bring about * * * adjustment or settlement of * * * situations which might lead to a breach of the peace." The situation in Greece and Turkey as described by President Truman perfectly matches the purpose of the United Nations as defined by the opening words of the Charter.

The President now asks the United States to take the law into its own hands. In total disregard of our solemn pledges to maintain international peace by collective action he proposes to meet the speculative threat of Russian aggression by an overt threat of American military power. And he piously puts forward this unilateral action of ours as a realization of the objectives of the United Nations. This is sheer hypocrisy, be it ever so unconscious. Still more amazing is it that men like Senator VANDENBERG and others who helped form the United Nations and paid eloquent tribute to it as the hope of the world, should now be the foremost champions of this proposal to betray it.

The assertion of the President that the United Nations is incapable of dealing with this situation is simply not true. The Assembly is empowered to consider it and to recommend to the Security Council a course of action. The fact that the United Nations has no military forces at its command and no such funds as Mr. Truman now asks Congress to appropriate is no reason at all for disregarding its jurisdiction. Nor need the veto power of the Soviet Union in the Security Council inhibit action. The interpretation of the veto which gives an aggressor nation or one threatening aggression or one believed to constitute a threat to world peace the power to estop action by the Security Council reduces the whole idea of a United Nations to either a monstrous or a childish absurdity. The present case affords an ideal occasion to expose that absurdity.

How could these alleged hindrances to United Nations action in the present situation be overcome? The problem would not be difficult. The Assembly—representing 54 nations—could recommend action. The Security Council could register the necessity of action despite the probable (but not certain) veto of the Soviet Union. For funds, an assessment of a reasonable amount could be levied upon the member nations which the United States would supplement to make up the $400,00,000 the President now asks this Government alone to appropriate. Armed forces not yet having been provided to the United Nations, the United States (or any other country) could be appointed to carry out the collective mandate with respect to Greece and Turkey with whatever military and civilian forces the task would require. If this were done, the entire adventure, even though the burden of its execution was borne by the United States, would wear a wholly different face from that displayed by the single-handed operation proposed by Mr. Truman.

The threat to world peace admittedly existing in the Greco-Turkish situation would thus be recognized as a world problem to be handled by the world organization created for precisely this purpose. The operation would not be an American operation, but a United Nations operation, with the United States action under the authority and with the backing of the world community. The sharp edge of suspicion with which American political and economic policy is regarded all over the world would be dulled if not allayed by this procedure. The United Nations would be invested with the dignity and respect which it can never possess until it has demonstrated its ability to take decisive action in concrete cases. The present crisis provides that organization with its first opportunity to prove its worth.

The irresponsible unilateral seizure of its most essential function by the United States can result in nothing less than a scuttling of the United Nations. This is the way in which the old League of Nations was rendered impotent. American public opinion has heaped scorn upon the European powers for similar treatment of the now defunct league. This country invites the same judgment upon itself if it takes the Greco-Turkish situation into its own hands.

III

Why did not the Truman administration adopt this obvious course? Why has it taken the ball away from the world organization and run wildly out of bounds in utter disregard of the team play which it called at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco? Plainly, Mr. Truman has something else in mind than world peace. He cannot conceal it under the sentimental verbiage about America's love for little nations seeking to maintain democratic institutions and their national integrity. Such sentiments Americans do indeed hold, even though they are under no illusions concerning their applicability to Greece or Turkey. But the President is under an illusion, once cherished but long since worn out, when he refers to the free peoples of the world who look to us for support in maintaining their freedom. The truth is that they do not look to us; they look to the United Nations. They fear us. We think their fears are groundless. But they are very real to them.

The smaller countries, save only those whose governments are the puppets of some imperial power, have unanimously put their hopes in the United Nations. One reason is that they hope the United Nations will protect them against the great powers, including the United States. It is hard for us to swallow this bitter fact. These nations are disturbed at the prospect of the United States extending its power by independent measures outside the functioning of the world organization. To be sure, Greece and Turkey, prompted by Great Britain, have asked us to come over and help them. But even they, desperate as they are, would infinitely prefer that our help came through the United Nations than unilaterally. They prefer it because such intervention would not only promise greater immediate security but would preclude the possibility of imperial domination.

Mr. Truman's excitement over this crisis is not rooted in pure altruism. It reflects the militaristic ideology that has become ascendant in his administration, which is now dominated by military-minded statesmen headed by himself and his new Secretary of State. This mentality has little use for the United Nations. It feels its own power. It feels the great power of the United States. And its policies do not rise above the level

of power. It says in effect: "We can clean that situation up; let us, then, hasten to do it." The long-time consequences of such policies it does not see or, if it sees them, is willing that the world shall be dominated by a single power so long as that power is in their hands. They see Great Britain bankrupt, its empire disintegrating, the Mediterranean unpoliced, and they want to take the broken fragments of that empire—Greece, Turkey, Egypt, and the whole Near East with its multibillion investments in oil—under the wing of the United States.

A pax Americana would thus succeed to the pax Britannica. This military-minded statesmanship does not see that by usurping Great Britain's imperial position we would take over also the permanent liabilities which have brought her empire to ruin, and this without the assets which for two centuries have filled the coffers of the ruling country. Chief among the liabilities will be the sacrifice of the moral position in world esteem which has been our proud possession for more than a century. We shall win an imperial position and hold it only at the cost of being feared and hated by the rest of the world.

All this we could avoid by acting through the United Nations. We should then have the world on our side, not alone in the present crisis, but in the future more terrible crisis which may be irrepressible. That final atomic war, if it should come, would probably annihilate civilization in both Russia and the United States. But our maximum chance of avoiding it is not to invite it as we do by single-handedly challenging Russia now.

Our foreign policy must be taken out of the framework of imperialism in which the militaristic mentality of our statesmen are projecting it. The American people are not ready to cast their traditions and ideals on the scrap heap. They want to help the stricken peoples of the world, but they do not want to dominate them. They are willing to give millions for humanitarian relief, millions—yes, and billions if necessary—for the support of the United Nations in the discharge of its world mission against every threat of war, but not $1 for empire.

Naval Aviation and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Rear Adm. J. J. Clark, United States Navy, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for Air, at first national aeronautics conference of American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind., March 20, 1947:

Today, almost 2 years after the termination of the greatest war in history, we find the world far from the peace which we envisaged at the war's end. On every side we see the festering sores of incipient war. The greatest empire the world has ever known is slowly disintegrating and in the wake of this disintegration are problems which are the concern of the entire world. There are, also, ideologies abroad which are directly opposed to this Nation's concept of freedom, liberty, and democracy.

This Nation emerged from the recent war as the most powerful country on the face of the earth, and as such we have certain responsibilities which we must shoulder. The most important among them is the responsibility of insuring the peace which was bought at such a terrific sacrifice. It is not sufficient for us to say, "We did it twice and we can do it again," for on those two occasions our allies gave us the much-needed time interval to get our industrial potential into high gear in the production of munitions of war.

Today we must face the facts—there will be no time interval the next time. Modern warfare travels with the speed of sound and we must be ready for it whenever and wherever it may arise. This means that we must have a well-balanced fighting force trained and equipped, and provided with the best that our research and development program can develop. In the meantime we must utilize the proven tools of the last war until such time as they can be replaced by better ones. Naval aviation, in planning for its part in maintaining the national security, intends to do exactly that.

Air power is a vast subject and means different things to different people. To the Navy it means air-sea power as exemplified by our carrier task forces during the war in the Pacific. It means, too, our long-range seaplanes and landplanes employed in long-range naval reconnaissance, search, and antisubmarine operations.

As a matter of fact, air-sea power is the descriptive term for present-day naval operations. The Navy employs aircraft in teamwork with its surface and subsurface vessels. Naval planes and submarines work together to destroy the enemy's fleet and other seagoing forces. Naval planes and destroyers team together to destroy the enemy's submarines. Carrier planes go in and maintain control of the air in a given overseas locality, keeping the war in the other fellow's back yard instead of our own. In landing operations carrier planes provide one of the most successful techniques ever employed, namely, air support of ground forces. Besides all this activity, naval patrol planes perform their multiple missions of search, patrol, reconnaissance, convoy, transport, and antisubmarine warfare.

The principles of naval warfare have not changed, but means for carrying them out have been radically altered. Naval aircraft can carry all types of bombs and guided missiles many miles beyond the range of the big guns and accomplish the same, if not greater, destruction because these weapons are not committed to their objective when they leave the ship, but are only committed when the pilot releases them at the target.

None of us can predict what the future holds in the field of development. It may be that antiaircraft defense some day will progress to the point where the piloted aircraft is outmoded. Split-second fire control, proximity fuses, long-range radar, guided missiles, etc., may reach the point where we will have to turn to other means for carrying on naval warfare. Perhaps a submarine aircraft carrier loaded with guided missiles and pilotless aircraft, as well as conventional planes, will become one of our major weapons. But all that is in the future.

The Navy must maintain ready at hand the necessary means for upholding national policy. It must organize this strength so the penalties for becoming involved in a war with us are obvious to any would-be aggressor.

Unless we employ our armed forces on such broad objectives as these, we are jeopardizing our national security and inviting war. We do not have to turn to the pages of history very far to find the results of disarmament, appeasement, isolationism, and impractical idealism. They have failed so many times that it should be a matter of principle to ignore totally any suggestion that this Nation subscribe to them. The United Nations organization has made one significant step in preventing war, and that is by the realization that war cannot be outlawed by a vague resolution, but it can be prevented by a visible and ready military power, equipped to stifle the aggressor who challenges the peace of the world. It has taken two bloody wars for us to realize this concept of the relations between nations. Let us hope that the lesson has been well learned.

We must maintain our proven weapons and techniques. We must develop new weapons and techniques and we must plan the direct application of this and all our military power so as to realize the most efficient use of all our armed forces.

As you all know, the United States Fleet is at present built around the aircraft carrier. Presently we have 12 large carriers in commission, including the CVB's *Midway* and *F. D. Roosevelt*, the two largest carriers afloat. In addition, we have a comparable number of escort carriers to provide air support of ground troops and antisubmarine warfare aircraft. These carriers provide our seaborne mobile striking force in wartime. Their peacetime function will, of course, be that of training for the wartime mission. Also, we are maintaining a ready Naval Air Reserve throughout the country at their wartime proficiency, absorbing new techniques in order that they may be in a high state of readiness to man the reserve carriers.

The strategic disposal of our mobile carrier force should discourage any attack, but should it come, a carrier fleet will be in a position to intercept and nullify it, since they are capable of going anywhere in the maritime world. Once this attack is repulsed, this mobile striking force could proceed to the enemy's homeland and proceed with the same successful treatment which our Japanese adversaries have so good reason to remember.

The use of this mobile striking force does not in any way mean that we shall not be dependent upon our land bases. There are bases throughout the Atlantic and the Pacific that are vital to the protection of the continent as well as our possessions. These bases are necessary to the support of our striking forces even as they were in World War II. These strategic land bases provide the wherewithal to make the mobile tactical force a hard-hitting effective fighting unit, since they carry out the vital task of providing necessary logistic support.

Even though land-based air be supported at these bases, there are still areas outside the reach of these land planes, which fall to the carrier task forces to cover. We are all in agreement that no two wars have ever followed the same pattern. I see no reason, therefore, to believe that any future war will follow the strategic geography of World War II. Taking this into consideration, together with the possible loss of some of our bases and the technical limitation of the range of land-based air, it is factual that carrier aviation will be the only weapon, which can be effectively brought to bear in certain areas.

Though this carrier aviation will be our most potent weapon, we must still depend on our long-range patrol planes for reconnaissance with the fleet, patrol of large ocean areas, antisubmarine warfare, and air-sea rescue operations. As to whether these planes are sea or land planes is dependent upon the circumstances under which they are to operate.

Another vital cog in our air-sea power is marine aviation, which provides tactical air support for amphibious operations. Such operations without proper air support are likely to be doomed to failure. Their success is directly proportional to the efficiency of their close air support.

To sustain the air-sea power organization, we have now 6,130 operating aircraft. Of this number, 3,526 are first-line combat planes, while the remaining 2,604 are used for training, transport, research, development, experimental work, and for support of air activities ashore. Another 1,933 planes

are assigned to the Naval and Marine Corps Air Reserve for use in our Nation-wide air-reserve program. Of the 3,526 combat planes in the fleet, over half of them are carrier aircraft.

I know that you are interested in the planes the Navy is now using and what planes it plans to use in the future. Aboard our carriers today, our fighter complements consist of the combat-proven Corsairs and Hellcat planes plus the twin-engined Tigercat and the speedy Bearcat. For our dive bombers, we are presently employing the improved Helldiver while the missions of the torpedo planes are being carried out by the well-known Avenger.

The Navy has, of course, endeavored to keep pace with the march of science with particular reference to jet aircraft and turbo-jet aircraft. Squadrons are already operating with the Ryan Fireball aircraft which is a fighter with a reciprocating engine forward and a jet engine aft. The McDonnell Phantom, which has already been service-tested, flies at a speed in excess of 500 miles per hour, yet can be slowed down for landings on board a carrier, a fact which was proven in recent tests. In addition to the Phantom, an Army jet aircraft, the P-80, has been modified and successfully landed aboard a carrier. We have two new carrier planes which combine the functions of dive bombing, torpedoing, and gun and rocket firing. One, the Martin Mauler, mounting an engine of over 3,000 horsepower, has a maximum combat radius from a carrier of 700 miles. This plane, designed for operation from the Midway class carrier, has as its prototype the Douglas Skyrider which operates from the usual type carrier. Both planes are single-seaters with maneuverability and rate-of-climb characteristics heretofore found only in fighter aircraft. As dive bombers, they perform in accordance with that old Navy theory that only the shots that hit count.

Our development, however, has not been restricted to carrier type aircraft exclusively. I believe you are all familiar with the recent record distance flight of the *Truculent Turtle* from Perth, Australia, to Columbus, Ohio. This plane, the Lockheed Neptune or P2V, is a twin-engined landplane especially designed for long range reconnaissance and antisubmarine warfare. It is the result of all the lessons we learned during the war about how to combat the submarine menace as well as how to protect our overwater shipping. The Neptune unescorted will perform these missions and be able to defend itself against hostile attack. Also the Neptune can operate from small unprepared fields, a characteristic vital to the success of its assigned missions.

These are planes which we already have. We have others in the design and test stage which will keep abreast of our research and development of newest and specialized weapons. The performance of our present jet aircraft and the excellent prospects for gas turbines as power plants for carrier planes have encouraged the most advanced research into all types of jets and turbines. Our research, of course is proceeding in the field of winged guided missiles of which we have the Lark, Loon, Bumble Bee, and the Gorgon, besides the Bat, which no doubt you have all seen in the newspapers and news reels.

In closing, I should like to leave with you this one thought. In order to maintain the peace we must be ready for war. Twice we have been involved in wars not of our own making and each time we were unprepared. Let us not be a party to such a grievous mistake again. You veterans of World War I remember the white crosses at Chateau-Thierry, Belleau Wood, The Marne and Soissons, and you veterans of World War II remember the white crosses from Africa to Normandy and from Guadalcanal to Okinawa. Each and every one of those crosses mark the final resting place of one of our comrades who died in the belief that the peace for which he fought would be everlasting. We failed after World War I by scrapping the biggest Navy the world had ever seen. Let us not fail this time.

News From Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the New York Times of April 7. It will be noted that I have introduced a bill to accomplish the very thing this editorial points out and I reiterate that we should practice in this country the democracy that we are attempting to preach abroad.

NEWS FROM GUAM

A report of the Eighth Guam Congress, recently come to hand, offers convincing evidence of the ability of the people of that island to deal with public affairs in an orderly and competent manner. A joint session of the House of Council and the House of Assembly debated several controversial measures having to do with the rebuilding of Agana, including the allotment of land and the zoning for business and light industry. One by one the disputed points were disposed of by reasonable compromise. A proposed petition to the Navy Governor of Guam requesting the setting aside of 10 percent of tax collections to provide scholarships in the United States for Guamanians choosing professional studies, such as medicine and law, was carried over for further consideration when some members found flaws in the petition as worded. A communication was received from Navy Governor, Rear Adm. C. A. Pownall, acceding to their request that all ordinances for governance of the island be presented to them for their comment before promulgation. There was no discussion, although the qualifications by Admiral Pownall that in certain circumstances this might not be possible must have been somewhat galling.

On Guam more than 20,000 people have lived under the United States flag for almost half a century. They are still second-class citizens, with only an advisory voice in their affairs, ruled by laws that are what the Navy governor or the Navy Department says they are. Navy government of Guam has been, on the whole, benign, contrary to some exaggerated reports. Most Navy governors have been conscientious men. Some of them, such as Admiral Pownall, have been deeply interested in the welfare of the Guamanians. But it still has been government without the consent of the governed, taxation without representation, and a violation of fundamental democratic principles.

The Guamanians have been governed largely for the benefit of the United States, in order to make the most efficient use of Guam as a forward military base. That is the situation today. The military comes first in everything. Guam is now one of our most important naval bases in the Pacific. It is all the more important that the United States should practice there the democracy it preaches. Congress would do well to grant citizenship to the Guamanians and give to the Eighth Congress of Guam the right of local self-government to which the Guamanians are entitled and for which we believe they would prove their competence.

Equitable Extension of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, extension of social security has been recommended by the Social Security Board and by a special report submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee. A coordinated, national system should be substituted for the present patchwork. The Social Security Act is in need of extensive revision. The system should be extended to provide more adequate coverage for those already included in its scope; to include large numbers of people not now covered; and to provide protection against hazards not now included. Living costs have risen materially since the passage of the act in 1935. This means that allotments that were adequate at that time are no longer sufficient. Increases in certain categories of benefits authorized under 1946 amendments to the act are of a temporary nature. Most of them will continue only through 1947 unless further action is taken. Minimum weekly unemployment insurance benefits are too small, and old-age assistance is still inadequate in many States.

Twenty million persons in the United States are currently excluded from old-age insurance. Workers in small firms, Federal employees, maritime and agricultural-processing workers are excluded from unemployment-insurance. Moreover because of the constant shifting of people between covered and uncovered employment, and migration from one State to another, many gaps and much undue delay occurs. A Nation-wide coordinated system would eliminate much of this, as well as the great variations in payments made by different States.

Types of coverage not now furnished under the act include: Temporary and permanent disability under the old-age insurance system; Federal aid to the handicapped, or to pay the medical expenses of needy persons; a broad health program. The self-employed could not practicably be insured against unemployment or temporary disability but could receive the other coverages.

Extension of social security will help to maintain purchasing power in the hands of consumers and hence will help to prevent another depression. This is particularly true in view of the increasing industrialization and urbanization of the Nation, since industrial workers are directly dependent on jobs for income. Even with full employment, hazards of sickness, death, and unemployment will occur and these can best be met through group action which spreads the burden of these risks over the population as a whole and which spreads income over periods of nonearning. Reserves of the old age insurance system, accumulated by the Federal Government, amounted to $7,000,000 in 1946, thus forming an ample

base for expansion. Social security provides a maximum of security with a minimum of cost. In the postwar period technological unemployment is likely to continue; indeed it appears to be accelerating. Increased security on the part of people in the lower income brackets will make for national stability, less labor unrest, less demand for extreme economic measures. This will safeguard free enterprise. It will also minimize resistance on the part of the workers to technological change.

Social security does not destroy individual initiative, but instead provides a minimum base of protection on which the worker can build through his own efforts. If the system is based on the past earnings of an individual, it will be sufficiently flexible, since it will reflect differences in wage rates in different parts of the country It should be extended to cover all our people, both for the sake of national prosperity and also because it is inequitable that some groups of workers should be protected while others are not. A high level of national income and buying power, all of which would be fostered by such a program, would mean that the added expenses of an expanded program could be more easily met, and in a sense the program could be said to pay for itself in improved national health and productivity.

Income Tax Status of Married Persons in Non-Community-Property States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Ways and Means has under consideration H. R. 1759, a bill granting to married persons living in non-community-property States who file joint returns the same income-tax treatment as if they lived in community-property States. I submit herewith House Joint Resolution 11 of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, which urges that steps be taken to relieve Illinois and other States of a tax burden which is considered discriminatory:

House Joint Resolution 11

Whereas under our present Federal income-tax laws there exists an area wherein the personal income-tax burden exhibits a gross inequality; and

Whereas this gross inequality of personal income-tax burden is based on the fact that some of our States by law have adopted a so-called community of interest in property as between husband and wife, giving each spouse a half interest in income of the other; and

Whereas this community of property interest permits the husband and wife in the community-property States to file separate Federal income-tax returns showing a division of the income between them and thereby to make lower income-tax rates applicable; and

Whereas in all other States, including Illinois, which do not recognize such community interest in property, the husband and wife are not permitted to divide a spouse's income and a single income-tax return accordingly results in higher tax rates being applicable; and

Whereas such provision in the Federal income-tax law discriminates against taxpayers in States which have not adopted a community-property law to the extent of approximately $1,000,000,000 annually; and

Whereas this inequality and discrimination have resulted in recommendations for remedial legislation by the American Bar Association, tax administrators, and others: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That to allow such discrimination and inequality to continue to exist is undemocratic, discriminatory, burdensome, and contrary to the very essence of a tax system which purports to place a fair and equal tax burden on all citizens of the United States, regardless of the State wherein they may reside; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States now assembled be urged to take such steps as may be necessary to remedy this unfair and discriminatory tax burden which is unjustly placed on the citizens of the States of Illinois and that full and favorable consideration be given to proposals allowing division of income for tax purposes between husband and wife in all States of the Union; and, be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, February 18, 1947.
HUGH GREEN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk, House of Representatives.
Concurred in by the senate, March 12, 1947.
HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of March 23, 1947:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA

The House Public Lands Committee has recommended approval of the grant of Statehood to Hawaii and will take up the issue on Alaska next month. Arguments pro and con and conditions relating to both Territories are similar. Both have been under the American flag for more than a half century; both have voted in favor of statehood; both are noncontiguous to continental United States; both are of the utmost importance in global military and economic strategy; both can assume statehood's financial burdens; both have substantial elements in the population of non-Caucasian descent; both are meshed to the progress of the Pacific coast; both meet the requirements for statehood.

Arguments against their admission were weakened during the war. Before Pearl Harbor and on that fatal day it was feared that the larger percentage of those of oriental extraction in the islands was a menace to security. But Hawaii came through the crucial test of war in the Pacific with honor and glory. A committee of the House is on record that from Pearl Harbor onward, not one act of sabotage was committed in the islands. The people of both Territories were injured by Japanese aggression, both fought and in the highest degree earned the right to be Americans.

Their physical separation from the other 48 States is of small consequence in this age of airplane and radio. In 1850 when California was admitted, the nearest State was 750 weary horseback miles away.

California will gain advantages by their admission. Their four Senators and the number of their Representatives may be expected to support in sectional measures the congressional delegations from the 11 Western States. As their economy develops it will bring increased movement of tonnage through the ports of Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Alaska's population in 1940 was 72,000. At present it probably is 90,000. Minnesota and Nevada had less than 7,000 residents when admitted. The Territory's known resources are immense. As established industry, she mines coal, gold, copper, and tin. There are potential oil fields. Agriculture is a major project. Fur, timber, and fisheries yield in the millions annually. These industries have been developed with totally inadequate internal transportation and at the sluggish pace concomitant with Federal landownership.

If Alaska is erected into a State the Federal Government will give her a dowry of land and it may be expected that the State government will encourage widespread development in a fashion the Federal Government does not do. At present, Alaska is exploited without full consideration of the Territory's benefit. Only $1,000,000 remains in Alaska of the annual $60,000,000 yield of her fisheries. A substantial number of Alaskans anticipate that Statehood will cause an increase in taxation. This is true, but the cost should be more than offset by the enlargement of revenue following economic development.

Hawaii's population exceeds 500,000. Her numbers and wealth are greater than those of any other Territory except Oklahoma's were upon admission. Hawaii's great crops are sugar, pineapples, and coffee, and as evidence of her wealth, in 1945 the Territory paid $173,000,000 into the Federal Treasury, a sum larger than the contribution of some States. This amount was considerably more than Hawaiian expenditures, aside from the military budget. In the 5 years before World War II, Hawaii imported more goods from the United States than any nation excepting the United Kingdom, Canada, France, Japan, and Germany.

The evidence is against the statement that those of Japanese descent will vote in a bloc. While those of Japanese blood represented 32 percent of the population in 1940, the Territorial legislature has never contained more than 20 percent of Nisei's.

By votes of 2 to 1, both Territories have asked for statehood. Our public men have made the world conscious of the American principle of self-determination. Here is a good place to make application of the principle.

It's Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, every hindrance possible to the development of old industries and the expansion of new industries is being used by Government bureaucracy through its controls and regulations. The present resistance to cutting expenditures is reflected in the publicity emanating from Washington. The citizens of this Nation know that unless the expenditures of Government are cut to the bone and the tax level of industries reduced the free enterprise system will bog down, instead of expanding as it should at this time.

The most cursory examination will indicate the appalling duplication of time, money and personnel which now exists in the Federal Government.

SPRAWLING FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A recent survey shows difficulty of applying wise economy to the Federal budget. No less than 93 agencies, operating under 17 Government establishments, lend Government funds. Insurance is provided through another 22 agencies operating within 16 different departments. Labor questions are handled by 27 agencies in 14 different establishments; business problems by 64 agencies scattered through 32 different establishments; acquisition of land by 34 agencies; wildlife preservation by 16; home and community planning by 12; forestry by 14; materials and construction by 10; social welfare by 28. Statistics are gathered and published by 65 different agencies. In 1932 there were 521 agencies ranked as bureaus or their equivalent; today, 1,141. President's 1948 budget asks more than $8,800,000,000 for independent offices of Federal Government—$5,500,000,000 more than they spent in 1940.

Why should the taxpayers be called upon to carry such a load as this? Does it make sense? The people of this country know that it does not, and they want relief from this burden.

The new scheme to protect the jobs of the New Deal is to create relief organizations to operate in foreign countries to which displaced employees may be transferred if and when the ax falls on a bureaucratic pay roll on the home front.

I commend to my colleagues' attention in both branches of Congress an article by Frank C. Waldrop which appeared in the Times-Herald under date of April 10, 1947:

IT'S YOUR MONEY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The Treasury, you will maybe be glad to know, has made a slight $6,000,000,000 mistake with your money and mine. Repeat, the Treasury is in error by $6,000,000,000 on taxes.

Details of this staggering news were disclosed yesterday by John W. Hanes, chairman of the board of the Tax Foundation of New York City.

Mr. Hanes qualifies as a money expert in banking, business, and government. What's more, lest it be suggested that he is a partisan needler of the Truman administration in turning up this—repeat—$6,000,000,000 error—it ought to be borne in mind that he was brought into Government by none other than the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and served the New Deal as a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary of the Treasury.

He quit the New Deal of his own will and under his own steam when he concluded there was no chance of bringing any order out of the Roosevelt program of Government finance, but he remains a respected and authoritative expert on government and money and has been called numerous times by committees of Congress to help clarify our tax problems.

His disclosures of yesterday were made in a letter to Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Republican, of Colorado, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, minority senior member.

Some high points:

1. Last January, President Truman forecast that Federal revenues would be $2,300,000,000 less than Federal expenditures for the current fiscal year ending June 30.

2. But the facts of actual cash revenues to the Treasury now show that on June 30, there will be a surplus of revenues over expenditures of between $3,000,000,000 and $4,000,000,000.

In other words, Mr. Truman was off, in round figures, $6,000,000,000.

Is that important? Mildly so because taxes are planned and levied on the basis of estimated Government income and expenses.

Government income, just to underscore the point, comes from only one source, and that is the pockets of the people. It comes from the tax collections out of your money and mine.

The Federal Government is collecting in this current fiscal year $6,000,000,000 more of your money and mine than Treasury figure sharks had thought, or said, it would.

Why? The Treasury has some answering to do on that one, but for one part of the answer Mr. Hanes gives a view that Socialists, Communists, and all other people can spend some profitable time considering. It is that the capitalistic system in the United States is running ahead of the Government's understanding of it.

Our system that has built this Nation to its present point out of 150 years' hard work is bigger and better than its adversaries could realize. The Socialists and the Communists have had to come to us to finance, equip, feed, and win the last two World Wars.

And after the wars they have had to come to us for food, money, brains, and direction for a fresh start.

A pretty good system. But it can be destroyed. We could be defeated in war—a trick nobody has yet turned; we could be corrupted from within.

Mr. Hanes yesterday discussed that second prospect. It is contained in the simple facts that everybody knows.

The individual citizen's place in the community can and inevitably will be corrupted when he doesn't know his income, is reckless with his outgo, and kids himself about the state of his bank balance. Just so with the Nation.

If the Federal Government goes on sucking money out of the people's pockets at the present tax rate, keeps on spending anywhere near the present rate, and keeps on piling up the public debt, the end result is obviously ruin.

Our American capitalistic business system is clicking right now in handsome style. So now is the time to get our balance sheets in order. Mr. Hanes' financial prescription:

1. Fire at least a million of the 2,300,000 Federal employees, now.

2. Reduce Federal taxes, now.

3. Reduce the Federal debt, now.

As to the first point, he spoke as an experienced governmental administrator and held that governmental essential services could be preserved and even improved, by cutting Government personnel. Washington knows what he means and knows he is right.

As to the second and third, Mr. Hanes said that the present tax rate and level of business operations indicate the Treasury will have a surplus of $11,000,000,000 by June 20, 1948, if the Federal budget now being authorized in Congress is cut by six billions as ordered by the House of Representatives.

If the lesser Senate cut is put through there is still a surplus in sight for 1948 of $9,500,000,000.

The Government has no business taking that much more money out of our pockets than it needs for an orderly program of debt reduction and essential service.

It has no moral right to it as a matter of common honesty, and as a matter of national safety to the capitalistic system it must leave money alone that it does not prove it needs.

Why does the Federal Government still try to grab off more of the people's money than it can justify a claim to?

Well, habit is a powerful boss. Since 1933, the Federal Government has been grabbing more and more money every year in taxes and spending more and more and more in appropriations.

It just has the habit and it can't and won't quit until the owners of the money make it quit. The owners of the money are the American taxpayers.

The agency that has the power to act for the owners of the money is Congress. With all good will to Mr. Truman, he is a President caught in the works of an executive branch that has had nearly a whole generation of unbridled power over other people's money.

The job of breaking that power lies with Congress. These next few months will tell whether Congress has the will and the brains to break that power. Mr. Hanes said yesterday:

"It will take every ounce of political courage and wisdom for Congress to go through with this tax and debt reduction program.

"You can be sure that with 2,300,000 Federal employees propagandizing for their appropriations, the pressure will be enormous.

"But our hope of financial security and our individual personal ability to pay our bills, meet our tax payments and have a prosperous business economy depend on it. Federal taxes and debts must come down. The Treasury figures show it can be done—but only if we want it done."

Immigration Visas of European Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have received from time to time protests relative to the type and physical condition of the refugees who are being admitted to the United States from Europe. For the benefit of others who may be disturbed at the reports they receive concerning this situation, I herewith include, under leave to revise and

extend my remarks, a letter I wrote to the Secretary of State and the reply thereto, just received, from the Visa Division:

MARCH 12, 1947.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am in receipt of reports from reliable persons, recently in Bremerhaven, who have observed the operations at the seventeenth port where, I understand, most of the refugees embark for shipment to the United States. They advise me that these shipments are designed to take up the unused portion of the immigration quotas of various European countries. Certain details in these reports I find highly disturbing.

It is stated that only a small proportion of these refugees will be capable of supporting themselves in the United States; that a large number of them are in such bad physical condition that they have to be carried on shipboard on stretchers; that, despite a policy of giving priority to children, many shipments contain more persons over 65 years of age than those of under 10; that the sanitary condition and standards of these people, as a whole, are distressingly low; that, of the some 12,000 refugees shipped up to the middle of last month, 90 percent were Jewish.

I would appreciate very much your comments as to the accuracy of the reports I have received. I would also like to know if there has been any waiver or modification of our normal requirements and physical standards, for admission with respect to emigrants who pass through Bremerhaven. Is there no priority being shown children? Is there a special priority for members of the Jewish faith? What is the total number of these refugees that it is contemplated will be admitted to the United States this year?

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD T. MILLER.

APRIL 2, 1947.

The Honorable EDWARD T. MILLER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MILLER: I have your letter of March 12, 1947, requesting certain information in regard to refugees who are coming to the United States from Germany.

In implementing the displaced-persons visa program which was instituted in pursuance of the President's directive of December 22, 1945, American consular officers are governed in the issuance of immigration visas by the existing laws and regulations, including the so-called public-charges provisions of the laws and quota limitations.

As required by law, quota nationality is determined by country of birth. The only exceptions are for children accompanying their parents, who take the nationality of such parents, and wives accompanying their alien husbands, who may, under certain conditions, take the nationality of their husbands. No unused quotas are being utilized for displaced persons who are not by nationality (country of birth) chargeable to such quotas.

All applicants are examined physically. Visas are not issued to persons found to be afflicted with a dangerous or contagious disease or tuberculosis, which are mandatory grounds for exclusion. In the event an applicant is physically defective otherwise, that circumstance is taken into consideration in determining whether his assurances of support, as shown by evidence presented to the consular officer, are adequate. As you are probably aware, the President's directive of December 22, 1945, provides for the issuance by American welfare organizations of corporate affidavits of support approved by the Attorney General.

In the issuance of visas under the President's directive, consular officers have given priority to orphaned children. Moreover, every effort is made by consular officers to provide for a nondiscriminatory distribution of visas among displaced persons of the various faiths and creeds. Owing to the slowness with which some of the non-Jewish welfare organizations developed their program of issuing corporate affidavits of support as compared with Jewish welfare agencies and in consequence of the limited number of corporate affidavits made available by some of these non-Jewish agencies, the distribution of visas by faiths has been inevitably affected. Another factor which has led to the predominance of Jewish displaced persons among the immigrants coming to the United States under the terms of the President's directive has been the circumstance that, for obvious reasons, the majority of the persons qualifying under the German quota have been Jewish prosecutees. The status under the Nazi regime of many of the displaced persons of German ethnic origin has, of course, affected their screening and this in turn has also had some bearing upon the distribution of visas.

The issuance of immigration visas to displaced persons under the President's directive commenced on March 31, 1946, and the number of such visas issued through January 31, 1947, has, according to consular reports, been as follows with respect to faith and creeds:

Catholics	2,173
Jewish	9,627
Protestants	1,969
Others	705
Total	14,474

Records regarding the actual entry of aliens into the United States are kept by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice. Consequently, I am not able to furnish statistics regarding the arrival into this country of displaced persons to whom visas have been issued, but I hope that the foregoing information will meet your requirements.

Sincerely yours,

G. J. HAERING,
Chief, Visa Division,
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

Scientific Research, the Foundation of Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by John F. Victory, executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, at the National Aeronautics Conference of the American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind., March 20, 1947:

It was with keen appreciation of the potential significance of this meeting that I accepted the invitation of your national commander to speak here today. As executive secretary of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, familiarly known as the NACA, it has been my privilege to participate in many significant events which have marked milestones in aeronautical progress through the past 32 years.

It is encouraging to know that the American Legion is planning to take special cognizance at this time of the increasing importance of American air power in promoting the security of America.

To you Legionnaires who were "over there" on Armistice Day, 1918, and to all Legionnaires who served in any capacity in the struggle to "make the world safe for democracy" and who thought they had won "the war to end wars," it is particularly disappointing to see history repeating itself. Why does history repeat? Because human nature does not change. Men forget; and each generation seemingly must learn in the bitter school of experience. The causes that have led to wars in the past still abound. So, unless our generation, including the veterans of both World Wars, does something positive and effective to change the course of history, World War II will have been but another armistice. The President's recent message to the Congress on foreign policy points up the seriousness of the situation.

The United Nations is the present great hope of the world. Before the United Nations comes of age, however, and develops a restrictive influence on aggressive warfare, you are gathered here to do something positive and effective to get our country out of the groove, so to speak, that leads from one war to another. You are to deal with the efficacy of air power as a means of preserving peace; and it is my privilege to discuss the foundation of air power—scientific research.

By the outbreak of World War I in 1914, the Government, practically the only customer of a then-meager aircraft industry, had purchased less than 100 airplanes. Aeronautics was still a new science about which the world knew but little, and America, the birthplace of aviation, even less than some European countries which had sensed more acutely the potential military significance of the airplane and had forged ahead in aeronautical research and development.

It was during the first session of the Congress following the outbreak of that war that the National Advisory Committe for Aeronautics was established to "supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution." The NACA was also authorized by law to direct and conduct research and experiment in aeronuatics in such laboratories as might be placed under its direction. The vision of that Congress in 1915 was tempered, however, with a fine regard for economy in appropriating the taxpayers' money, for the NACA was started with the significantly cautious appropriation of "$5,000 a year for 5 years, or so much thereof as may be necessary." It was never clear whether the phrase "so much thereof as may be necessary" related to the $5,000 or to the 5 years.

By the end of World War I the NACA had one research laboratory building and one wind tunnel in operation on the Army's Langley Field, Va. It had, however, brought the then-existing aircraft industry together for the first time in 1916; and in 1917 had formulated the first aircraft-procurement program, effected the establishment of the Aircraft Production Board, brought about the cross-license agreement, which gave peace to a patent-troubled industry, and led the industry to organize so that it could advance its own interests and secure the necessary capital to expand in order to meet war needs.

Before the shouting and celebration on Armistice Day, 1918, were over, the Government had canceled, by telegraph, all contracts for aircraft production. The war to end wars had been won. Civil and commercial aviation

were virtually nonexistent; the military significance of aircraft had not been demonstrated; and maintenance of an aircraft industry was no concern of the Government at that time. It was most fortunate for American aviation and the country, however, that the Congress continued to support scientific research.

While the NACA was laying the foundations for the new science and designing and developing novel research facilities and techniques, it also found time and had the vision to urge the inauguration of the air-mail service in 1918, and, when its continuance was challenged, to advocate its support as providing at least an experimental demonstration of the possibilities of civil and commercial aviation. The NACA was also a prime mover in urging, for 7 years, legislation culminating in the enactment of the Air Commerce Act in 1926 for the encouragement and regulation of civil and commercial aviation. After that the NACA left such matters to other agencies and concentrated on its own prescribed function of scientific research. Emphasis was devoted to improving the efficiency and safety of aircraft, which made possible new achievements from time to time in their speed, range, altitude, and general utility.

Today the NACA consists of 15 members appointed by the President, and includes the heads of the Army Air Forces, Naval aviation, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Bureau of Standards, Weather Bureau, and Smithsonian Institution; and scientists or aeronautical authorities from the aircraft industry and from private life, all serving as such without compensation. The committee elects annually its chairman and vice chairman. Assisting the main committee are 6 major and 20 subordinate committees, comprising more than 300 leaders in science and engineering, who also serve without pay. Through this form of organization the talent of America is marshaled in the formulation of research programs. These programs, upon approval by the main committee, are executed by a paid director of aeronautical research. The committee has three major research stations—one on the Army's Langley Field, Va.; one on the Navy's Moffett Field, Calif.; and one on the Cleveland Municipal Airport, having an aggregate plant value of about $85,000,000 and an operating staff of about 6,000 employees.

Even with all its staff and facilities, the NACA does not design or build airplanes or engines. Its function is not competitive with that of industry.

Some examples of NACA contributions up to the time of Hitler's ascendancy include the NACA cowling in 1928, which added 15 percent to the speed of single-engined airplanes; the optimum location of engine nacelles in wings, and filleting at the juncture of the wing and fuselage, in 1930. These two principles justified, for the first time, the use of retractible landing gear. The introduction of those three principles into use at one time had a revolutionary effect upon aircraft performance, military strategy and tactics, and upon commercial aviation. Two years later the committee demonstrated to the aircraft industry the advantages of the now-widely-used tricycle landing gear.

It was generally conceded by 1932 that America led the world in the technical development of aircraft for both military and commercial purposes. Then came Hitler whose dreams of world conquest were based largely on gaining supremacy in the air. The air program was entrusted to Goering, who started not by rushing into production the types of aircraft German industry then knew how to build, but rather by expanding Germany's research facilities until, by the time of the pact of Munich in 1938, they were five times as extensive as America's. Hitler was not bluffing. He had stolen a march on the peace-loving nations. The world faced the stark reality that World War I had been fought in vain, and that the job had to be done all over again and on a much larger scale.

In the meantime, the NACA, by scientific investigations had accumulated a considerable backlog of research data awaiting application by industry, including, for example, such laboratory contributions as low-drag wings, high-speed propellers, new devices for stability and control, improved systems for cowling and cooling engines at high speeds, advances in knowledge of structural design, prevention of ice formation by use of heat, and many others. This reserve of scientific data was quickly drained by the military services and the aircraft industry, and applied in the design and development by industry of America's aircraft, which, type for type, were equal to or superior to those of any other nation.

I prefer to leave to others the interpretation of the military significance of superior performance of aircraft in warfare; but whatever it amounted to in the winning of World War II will be small in proportion to its significance in any future war.

During the late war the NACA took a calculated risk in suspending long-range basic research in favor of making our aircraft immediately more effective than the enemy's. This amounted to sacrifice of the future to the present, but it was of great value in the decisive struggle for control of the air.

Aeronautical science stands today on the threshold of a new era, made possible by the advent of new forms of propulsion. The airplane in its present form is no longer a sound basis for future planning for the national defense. The achievement of really high-speed flight is within the grasp of any nation willing to make the effort. The possibilities offer a challenge to scientific research, to the aircraft industry, and to the military services. We all have accepted the challenge and are working together as an air-power-development team. Our success will not only have profound influence upon military science and upon the progress of civilization, but will also be vital to the security of America, to say the least.

Out of the late war came the astonishingly simple, lightweight, and powerful jet propulsion engine, providing the answer to the sharp drop in propeller efficiency which occurs above 500 miles per hour.

With jet engines, airplanes now fly faster than 600 miles per hour, and continued scientific research and development, both here and abroad, will increase and multiply this speed. But man has not yet flown as fast as the speed of sound, which varies from about 660 miles per hour in the cold temperatures at 40,000 feet to about 760 miles per hour in summer temperatures at sea level.

To achieve the speed of sound is not a simple problem, for as it is approached the airplane wing meets the same difficulty that the propeller tip experiences—compressibility, with its accompanying great increase in drag and loss of lift. This phenomenon occurs when the airflow over any portion of the airplane reaches the speed of sound. Its pressure impulses, which move in all directions at that speed, cannot move ahead fast enough to prepare the way for the passage of the airplane, so that these pressure impulses build up into shock waves, which cause a tremendous increase in drag or resistance.

It appears certain that really high-speed flight is going to require extremely thin wings, perhaps of such radical form as diamond or double-wedge shapes, circular arcs, or other unconventional sections, and swept back, so that in plan form the airplane may resemble an arrow.

To fly above the speed of sound, or at supersonic speed, an airplane or missile must pass through the transonic speed range, in which air flows over some portions of the airplane at speeds lower than the speed of sound, and, at the same time, over other portions at speeds higher than the speed of sound. This mixture of subsonic and supersonic airflow occurs between 600 and 800 miles per hour and presents enormous difficulties of stability, control, lift, structural strength, and power required.

As shock waves form, airflow conditions change sharply and perhaps with greater force than a pilot can apply. It now appears that airplanes will fly normally either at speeds below 600 miles per hour or above 800 miles per hour, at least until more scientific data become available that may permit steady flight in the transonic region.

Combustion problems are acute. When you reflect on how easy it is to blow out a match you can appreciate the problem of maintaining a flame in a jet engine that may take air in and eject it at a thousand or two thousand miles per hour.

As an indication of the remarkable progress that has been made in aircraft propulsion, it may be noted that the average weight per horsepower of aircraft engines complete with oil, radiator, water, and so forth, was, during World War I, about 5½ pounds. By World War II improvements had reduced the average weight per horsepower to 1½ pounds. There is now under investigation at the Cleveland laboratory of the NACA a ram-jet engine about 20 inches in diameter, weighing about 400 pounds, and, except for the means of controlling the fuel supply, having not a single moving part. When an airplane can be designed to fly safely at 1,500 miles per hour with that engine, it will be delivering a thrust equivalent to 20,000 horsepower, or an average of one-fiftieth of a pound per horsepower. This is a striking indication of the possibilities of the new era in aeronautical science that is just dawning.

The world's first high-speed flight research airplane is the Bell XS-1. This airplane represents a cooperative effort between the Army Air Forces, the Bell Aircraft Co., and the NACA. It was built for the NACA under Army contract. It is not a service airplane, merely a research vehicle. It is carried by a B-29 bomber and released at the highest attainable altitude. Then by the use of rocket propulsion and ingenious recording instruments, new and extremely valuable data are obtained in level flights of about 2 minutes' duration in and perhaps through the transonic speed regime. The objective is to investigate all of the aerodynamic phenomena encountered in high-speed flight, including the very important problems of stability and control, aerodynamic efficiency, and structural loads.

Structural problems have grown enormously more complex as the theoretical strength of the usual aircraft materials is approached. New alloys with improved strength characteristics are required. The thin wings necessary on high-speed aircraft will severely limit the room in which adequate internal structural strength can be developed. The structure of the high-speed airplane of the future must be enormously stronger, yet lighter, and of small dimensions.

Another structural problem looming in the high-speed future is posed by the heating action of air friction against the wing and the fuselage. Even at present speeds, the problem of skin friction heating has become significant. For example, the cabin of the Lockheed P-80 Shooting Star heats up about 50° F. higher than the outside air at a speed of 550 miles per hour. At the speed of sound the temperature rise would be about 100°. At twice the speed of sound the rise would be about 400°. To solve this problem inves-

tigations of cabin refrigeration, involving extremely lightweight and compact units, are in progress.

For guided missiles research, there is a Pilotless Aircraft Research Division of the Langley Laboratory of the NACA. There guided research missiles, powered by rockets, are used as vehicles for conducting supersonic research. Great accuracy and extremely high speed are essential if guided missiles are to be effective in war. Not only must stability and control be dependable, but target-seeking devices, which "home" missiles on sources of light, heat, or metal, must be foolproof in their operation.

Such problems illustrate the necessity for continued emphasis upon scientific aeronautical research. Without such basic research data, industry cannot proceed on a sound basis with the design and construction of high-speed aircraft and guided missiles; nor can the Army and Navy evolve tactical, or even strategic, plans for supersonic warfare, with assurance of practicability.

Time does not permit an attempt to list many of the scientific problems which face us today in aeronautics. But it is essential that we consider the promptness with which we integrate an air power development policy within the national-defense structure.

The first consideration of such a policy is that there should continue in time of peace that smooth and effective cooperation that existed during the war, beween the members of the air power development team, the NACA, the aircraft industry, and the armed services. We still have that cooperation.

The second consideration of an air power development policy is a clear statement of the responsibilities of each member of the team. We are in possession of that ingredient also. I refer specifically to the statement of a National Aeronautical Research Policy, dated March 21, 1946, copies of which I have made available to the secretary for distribution. That document was developed and approved by the Army Air Forces, naval aviation, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Aircraft Industries Association, and the NACA. In effect, that policy is the blueprint for the Nation's continued aeronautical progress, based as it is upon a record of fact and past accomplishments.

The National Aeronautical Research Policy was prepared at the request of the Congressional Postwar Policy Committee. It is gratifying that, after months of careful consideration, agreement was reached by all concerned and that the underlying factors in the differentiation of functions between the NACA, the industry, and the military services are so fundamentally sound. That policy provides in substance:

(a) That scientific research in aeronautics is the province of the NACA;

(b) That the application of the results of scientific research in the design and development of aircraft and equipment, both civil and military, is the function of the aircraft industry, assisted as may be necessary by contracts for experimental articles placed in a manner to stimulate competition for quality;

(c) That the evaluation of military aircraft and equipment developed by the industry, and the exploration of possible military applications of research results, are functions of the military services.

The policy further provides that expedition of the practical use in civil aeronautics of newly developed aircraft and equipment, insofar as Government assistance may be necessary, is the function of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The policy provides that scientific research in aeronautics is the function of the NACA not only because the law so provides, but also because: First, by its very nature, scientific research in aeronautics is necessarily a function of Government because of the long-range considerations that must influence research programs on matters so vital to national security, and because the cost of adequate wind-tunnel and research facilities is too great to be borne by private industry; secondly, when conducted by the NACA, with the Army, Navy, Civil Aeronautics Administration, industry, and others having a voice through membership on technical subcommittees, all concerned benefit alike, unnecessary overlapping and duplication of effort are avoided, and economy and efficiency are promoted; thirdly, because an independent organization devoted exclusively to research can attract to Government service, without compensation, the highest level of scientific leadership, and can serve impartially the best interests of aviation and of the Nation, uninfluenced by procurement or production problems; and, fourthly, because experience has shown that the value of the airplane for national defense and for commerce has directly followed the evolution of an advancing technology based largely on long-range scientific research, planned to anticipate the growing research needs of aviation.

The policy contemplates parallel attack by several independent research teams when necessary, such duplicating efforts, however, to be coordinated through the technical subcommittees of the NACA.

In the case of industry our recent war experience has proved that a sound and healthy aircraft industry is essential to national security, and that it must be competitive in order to develop initiative and technical competence, and provide the stimulation of imagination, the incentive of profit through production contracts, and company pride in achievement. Competition in the application of fundamental scientific data to the design of aircraft and interpretation in terms of their performance, economy, and safety, should provide America with the best possible aircraft.

The Army and Navy requirements for aircraft performance will, of course, always be in advance of the best the industry can produce. Each branch of the service will test and evaluate new aircraft for tactical use through its qualified personnel and diversified facilities. Evaluation can be made in accordance with the military requirements which govern the use of the equipment. Obviously, with a number of types from which to choose, the armed forces will, of course, weed out the inferior and encourage the superior.

The basic factors of research, development, and evaluation are already well developed in America. The blueprint for action in the form of a National Aeronautical Research Policy has been drawn and approved. Only one further step remains—to obtain a widespread and intelligent appreciation of the facts. The American Legion, representing patriotic America at its best, can be effective in crystallizing public thinking on these problems which affect so fundamentally our future security.

With technological developments revolutionizing air warfare, scientific research in aeronautics is an essential element of the price of survival, for no natural law has as yet been found that places a limit upon the power, the speed, or the size of aircraft; or of guided missles, or upon the vast potentialities of atomic energy. We dare not run the risk that optimism or complacency suggests We know too well the disappointments and disastrous consequences that often follow when we try to win with the second-best hand in a poker game. We simply cannot afford to gamble with our national existence. That is the stake, gentlemen. Right now it is wrapped up in the tremendous significance of scientific research as the foundation of air power.

After Us the Deluge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by C. N. Woods, formerly regional forester, United States Forest Service:

AFTER US THE DELUGE?

(By C. N. Woods, formerly regional forester, U. S. Forest Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture)

The conservation of the natural renewable resources (soil, vegetation, game) of the public lands of the West and the welfare of the people are seriously threatened by certain livestock owners, members of powerful livestock organizations. (I make no blanket indictment of stockmen. Many of them are conservation-minded and cooperative.)

These men are intent on having legislation enacted by the Congress to transfer to the stockmen now using these lands title to 130,000,000 acres of public domain lands administered by the Department of the Interior under the Taylor Grazing Act, and the nontimbered lands in the national forests, or all lands therein that have more value for grazing livestock than for the production of timber.

My discussion largely concerns national forest lands, because the resources of these are so susceptible to irreparable damage and because they have so great a public interest. These lands are at high altitude and get the maximum precipitation. They are the most subject to run-off of flood proportions. Most of the 130,000,000 acres of the public domain lands are at lower elevations, their slopes not nearly so steep. They are not subject to so much damage, have less public interest. These are the foothill and desert lands.

It should be stressed that these stockmen do not concede the right of anyone to buy these lands except those who at present graze livestock on them; sportsmen, timber users, recreationists, water users who depend on the lands for their water, none of these are to have an option to buy the lands, however long or important their use of them or however great the hazard from overuse by livestock.

Stockmen would also extend their use of Federal lands by entering the national parks with their herds. How long would they expect to graze in these before claiming the exclusive right to buy the national parks? Would they expect to buy the national park lands at a nominal price, as they do the public domain, considering no values whatever except forage values?

There have been many floods, the past half century, of greater severity on the average than those that had occurred previously in the history of the West. In Utah, for example, among many others, there were the Willard, the Farmington, and Mount Pleasant floods within the past three decades, the last-named occurring in 1946. The two former were within 50 miles of Salt Lake City. They extended down to the main Utah north and south highway and blocked it with mud and boulders. They took six lives and caused over a million dollars' damage to private property. The mud-rock flows ruined some valuable lands in the valley. Geologists tell us these were the biggest floods coming from these drainages in the thousands of years since Lake Bonneville receded. They say

this with assurance because the boulders carried so far exceeded in size any that were ever transported by these streams previously.

A number of these floods originated on overgrazed, privately owned lands in the mountains. Much private land is still being overgrazed by livestock and is deteriorating. Even now, negotiations are under way for the purchase by public and private interests of lands on the Ogden River watershed. The land is overgrazed by livestock, depleted, and is eroding fast and there is a threat to private property in the valley. If the deals go through, grazing use will be reduced and the land will be protected from further abuse. Some stockmen do not seem to realize that the steep slopes cannot be grazed heavily year after year without depletion of vegetation and accelerated erosion resulting.

Nearly all Utah's principal cities are at the mouths of canyons where immense loss can result from floods. Much loss has already occurred. This is not a drop in the bucket, however, to what will occur if grazing use is allowed to run wild on these great watersheds.

The Government has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in Utah for the protection of private property from floods. It has spent and is spending much money to purchase land to stop overgrazing of livestock. Private citizens and organizations are purchasing land and donating it to the Government for protection.

But even the United States can do relatively little to repair the damage done by these floods. It is impossible to fill all the gullies and to replace the soil lost by sheet erosion. Only nature can repair the great damage done to land since man appeared on the scene. Nature will need immense periods of time at the best, but even nature cannot repair the damage if man continues at his pace of the last century, for he has been tearing down much faster than nature can build up.

Overuse of the ranges. Millions of acres of damaged desert range; eroded, gullied, denuded mountain slopes that once blossomed as the rose; mountain meadows, once verdant and lovely, now gullied, with lowered water table, dried out, succulent grasses largely replaced with unpalatable weeds and shrubs; some lands in the valleys, once of much value, now covered with mud-rock flows, unsightly, ruined; canals and reservoirs damaged by excessive erosion.

But the spoilers seem to be unrepentant. Their plans, if they materialize, will cause much greater destruction. Do these men have no sense of public responsibility? Have they no desire to leave these great renewable resources of watershed, soil, plants, and game with which a bounteous Providence has so magnificently endowed us in as good condition as man received them?

But let us go back 45 years. That was the turning point. The forces of conservation began mustering their strength. The dangers of natural-resource exploitation began to be clearly recognized. The national-forest system was established for the protection of timber and the regulation of stream flow. The Secretary of Agriculture, James Wilson, established the policy of coordinated multiple use in his mandate that the national forests should be managed for the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run.

Immediately there began the gigantic struggle which is reaching its climax today. The forces of conservation have been spearheaded by the Forest Service.

In Utah the national forests contain nearly 8,000,000 acres of Federal lands, which are owned and managed in trust for the whole people. These include the principal mountain ranges of the State and consist largely of steep slopes. In these national forests most of the streams have their sources. They are the most important of the public lands because of their great value as watersheds. Utah's people are dependent on these for the big part of their water used for domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes. Much reduction of use of livestock has been made for protection of these watersheds and it has generally been made against the protests of stockmen. They have claimed that reduction has been unnecessary, that the range has not been suffering from overuse. Since the time that deer have become abundant in places, they have blamed the deer for overusing the range and have asked for more reduction of deer.

The Forest Service recognized the partial justice of this complaint against deer and became quite active 6 or 7 years ago in a campaign to reduce deer herds in Utah for the benefit of the browse on their winter ranges. In a few years, 88,700 doe deer, in addition to many thousands of bucks, had been removed. At the time this campaign was started, stockmen were notified that livestock use must also definitely be reduced to the permanent carrying capacity of the range. Reductions were to be completed by the beginning of the grazing season of 1946, at the latest. They were urged not to delay reductions any longer than was absolutely necessary, since ranges continue to deteriorate as long as they are overused. Besides, other interests than stockmen were suffering seriously from range and watershed abuse.

Many stockmen in the intermountain region made reductions in use and did not wait until 1946. Very few objections were heard to the policy until 1946 approached. Then the leaders of the Utah State livestock associations asked that reductions be postponed for 3 years to give stockmen time to have investigations made. They already had been given much time.

The Forest Service has studied these ranges for four decades. Among its personnel are geologists, soils experts, botanists, agronomists, ecologists, and practical stockmen. They are in unanimous agreement that there is much range on these national forests still overused and deteriorating. These conclusions are backed up by much range research which has been done on these lands during the past 20 or 30 years.

The Forest Service is not making blanket reductions. On many allotments it does not propose to make reductions. As a citizen I appealed in 1945 to the presidents of the two Utah State livestock associations, asking them not to fight the principle of reduction in use of the range, but to consider range allotments individually and to protest only if the Forest Service should ask for reductions of use on allotments which the associations did not believe needed relief. The issue would then be clear and an investigation could be had. The associations did not reply to my letters.

Much land in the national forests of Utah has more value for grazing than for the production of timber. By far its greatest value, however, and the principal reason for its having been included in national forests is for the protection of the watersheds. Based on the facts of history, we could not depend on stockmen giving these great watersheds ample protection if they acquired title to them.

I speak from experience and from first-hand information. For more than four decades I rode the ranges of Wyoming, Nevada, Idaho, and Utah as a stockman or in the Forest Service in positions from ranger to regional forester. I have been a friend to stockmen. While regional forester I worked to get them greater permanency in the use of their national forest allotments. Thereby I hoped to interest them more in taking proper care of the ranges and watersheds. With greater stability of use they could afford to manage their ranges so as to perpetuate the forage and retain the soil. They have been given this greater permanency, as far as consistent with the perpetuation of soil and forage. Without proper protection of these, use could never be stabilized.

I have been insistent that they properly manage the ranges, that they make the necessary adjustments in use and get down to carrying capacity where overstocked. A vocal and powerful minority protests the reasonable requests the Forest Service rightly makes. This minority is unwilling to make the needed adjustments in use, although assurance is given by the Forest Service that if the range improves so that it can properly stand more use, then more use will again be allowed the present users.

This struggle, as I have indicated, is reaching its culmination. The reply to the Forest Service proposal to reduce grazing use to what the land will stand is that "Congress investigate the Forest Service;" that "The land be turned over to the Department of the Interior for management until final disposal;" that "Forest Service appropriations be reduced;" that "land in the National Forests more valuable for grazing than for timber production be sold to the stockmen" for a very nominal consideration to be determined largely by themselves.

Livestock interests would intimidate and wreck the Forest Service because it has the courage to actively work for perpetuation of these great natural resources; because it is insistent that due regard be paid to the interests of the general public; because it demands that damage due to overuse of the ranges cease; because it is following the basic mandate given it by Congress.

The press relates that a committee of Congress has recently asked the Secretary of Agriculture to postpone any reductions in grazing use until further investigation can be made. Further delay in making adjustments in range use, which are known to be needed, is positively unwarranted. There already has been too much delay. The longer the delay, the greater the deterioration; the greater the deterioration, the lower the carrying capacity and the greater the reduction of use eventually necessary. The greater the depletion of forage, the more erosion; the more erosion, the less vegetation can be grown; and so, a vicious circle.

Fish and wildlife resources, among the greatest of our public land values, are being destroyed. Great damage has been done to fish life in many streams by erosion, accelerated through overuse of mountain slopes. Removal of supervision of the Forest Service can be expected to make matters much worse.

If deer are to survive in healthy herds, they must be furnished with ample winter range. Deer in large numbers have never been successfully fed over protracted periods. Should the livestock man deplete the winter ranges, he can move his stock or bring feed to them. The deer cannot be removed to feed nor, as has been said, can they be adequately nourished artificially.

We are gullible indeed if we believe these public lands can be passed to private ownership without great harm resulting to fish and game. I refer to upland birds as well as to big game. Depletion of vegetation and disturbances by livestock during the nesting season make it difficult for upland birds.

Stockmen who use the National Forests for grazing are but a small minority of all the people with interests in these Federal properties. Many of the stockmen themselves who do not have range on the National Forests have other vital interests in them. There are the recreationists and the sportsmen; the users of water for irrigation and domestic purposes and in industry. Also there are many whose property would suffer damage from floods.

The interests of this big majority must be well protected. A long-suffering public should not be content with the present conditions and certainly it should be highly

alarmed with stockmen's plainly announced plans. The people should awake, rise up, and assert themselves. They should demand that no brake be put on the Forest Service in its efforts to effect a prompt remedy.

OGDEN, UTAH, *February 26, 1947.*

United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Miami Herald:

KEEP THE MARINES

The existence of the United States Marine Corps is threatened. The vagueness of the proposed bill to merge the armed services permits the President, if he wishes, to abolish the Marine Corps by Executive order.

The best argument for preservation of the Marine Corps is found in the brilliant record of that branch of service from 1789 to the present. The Marines have established and maintained a tradition of being first where the going is toughest. Their brilliant exploits at Tarawa and Iwo Jima are but the most recent additions to the glory record.

They were amphibious troops long before anyone thought of the name. They were "Commandos" in name and deed a century ago. They have been the shock troops and "suicide troops" in every war America has fought since the Revolution. They've carried out every order from quelling insurrections in Central America to planting the flag on Mount Suribachi.

The merger of the armed forces should be accompanied without destroying this important seagoing army of top-grade fighting men. Before Congress passes the merger bill it should guarantee preservation of this proud force, a most valuable asset in the atomic age of specialization in warfare.

Contributions of Veterinary Medicine to Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I wish to present the following article by Brig. Gen. R. A. Kelser, United States Army, retired, who was formerly the Director, Veterinary Division, Surgeon General's Office during the period of May 3, 1938, to January 10, 1946. This article originally was submitted for publication in the Merck report on January 30, 1946.

The article follows:

Veterinary activities, undoubtedly, are ordinarily thought of by the public as service restricted largely to the professional care and treatment of sick and injured animals. It is quite understandable, therefore, that with the Army horse and mule replaced to a large extent by machines, there are many who do not realize that the veterinarian still has an important place in a modern army. Veterinary science, like medical science, is considerably broader than that phase of it which has to do with the treatment and care of the sick and injured. Among other things, it includes preventive medicine and various phases of sanitary science of great importance to the military establishment, particularly in time of war.

VETERINARY SERVICE WITH ANIMALS

In building up our Army to meet the tremendous task and responsibilities with which it was confronted in World War II, it was very properly mechanized to the fullest extent consistent with operational efficiency and the opportunity to gain superiority. Mechanization, however, did not entirely eliminate the need for animals. They were employed in limited numbers in the Army of the United States and to a considerably greater extent by the armies of some of the other countries involved in the world conflict. Nazi Germany, with all her "blitz" tactics and emphasis on mechanized warfare, utilized several hundred thousands of horses and mules, even in the early days of the war when her armies were rapidly overrunning the countries which she invaded. In Tunisia, Sicily, Italy, India, Burma, China, and in some of the Pacific islands, we and our allies found the horse and mule valuable supplements to the motor.

World War II also brought the war dog into prominence. Thousands of these faithful beasts were recruited for service with the armed forces of the United States. Anyone who knows anything about dogs will readily recognize the value of the service such animals are capable of rendering.

The Army Veterinary Corps, thus, did have the responsibility of providing a professional service for the care and treatment of sick and injured military animals, although the number involved was not very large. For such animals as the Army did employ, provisions were made whereby they received the very best in the way of professional care and treatment when sick or injured. Further, in connection with its animal service the value and importance of the Veterinary Corps' activities were not limited to benefit of the animal recipients. Protection and benefit to man resulted in many instances, and a number of highly important scientific accomplishments and contributions came out of the work and investigations of the Veterinary Corps with animal diseases.

Equine encephalomyelitis, the most serious of all horse and mule diseases in the United States and various other countries, has been of special importance, not only because of its prevalence and mortality in animals, but also because it is transmissible to man with very serious results. The Army Veterinary Corps has contributed richly to the knowledge of this disease, its transmission, control, and prevention. It was an officer of the Veterinary Corps who first discovered the ability of mosquitoes to transmit the malady, a finding of great importance from the standpoint of control and prevention of the disease in both animals and man. The discovery also led to the subsequent uncovering of evidence that St. Louis encephalitis in man is undoubtedly mosquito-borne. The extent to which encephalomyelitis has occurred among animals in the United States is apparent from the figures for the year 1938. In that year over 185,000 cases were reported, with large losses. Beginning in 1939 all Army horses and mules have annually been immunized against encephalomyelitis with vaccine prepared by the Army Veterinary School at the Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C. No Army animal thus immunized has contracted encephalomyelitis since the inauguration of the vaccination program.

Glanders, formerly a notorious scourge of the equine component of armies the world over, and transmissible to man, was nonexistent among military animals in the United States during the war, and of no important significance in our foreign theaters, thanks to mallein and serological tests, and preventive measures instituted by the Veterinary Corps. Anthrax, likewise of importance in both lower animals and man, became no problem even though it was necessary to send military animals into localities where the disease was especially prevalent. Vaccination and sanitary procedures prescribed and carried out by the Veterinary Corps were highly effective in the prevention of the disease among Army animals.

Early in the emergency the Veterinary Corps immunized all horses and mules against tetanus through the administration of toxoid. As a result no cases of tetanus developed among animals in the United States Army. Another very important accomplishment was the prevention of rabies among our war dogs. With dogs recruited from all sections of the United States and rabies prevalent in numerous localities from which the animals came, and further, with the disease occurring in epizootic proportions in several areas where dogs were being assembled and trained, there was plenty of chance for the infection to be introduced among the war dogs. Early recognizing the possibilities and danger, the Veterinary Corps adopted the policy of vaccinating all dogs upon receipt at war-dog reception and training centers, prior to their release from the prescribed quarantine period the animals were required to go through. The results were very significant in that not a single case of rabies occurred among the several thousands of dogs recruited and utilized by our armed forces during the war.

Research investigations conducted by the Veterinary Corps with equine influenza, periodic ophthalmia, canine filariasis and leptospirosis, equine trypanosomiasis, and other animal diseases, have yielded valuable results. Especially noteworthy are the results obtained in the studies of periodic ophthalmia, the cause of more blindness among horses than all other causes combined. Research studies of this disease, carried out at the Veterinary Research Laboratory, Front Royal Remount Depot, Front Royal, Va., have indicated that riboflavin deficiency is involved in the etiology of the disease and that the malady may be prevented by supplementing the usual ration with small amounts of riboflavin.

INSPECTION OF MEATS AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

While the requirement for veterinary service for animals was limited in proportion to the relatively small number of animals in the Army, a different situation existed with respect to the Veterinary Corps' functions and responsibilities in the inspection of food for military personnel. The requirements for this type of veterinary service were in direct ratio to the size of our Army in terms of manpower. It followed, therefore, that a large part of the duties performed by the Veterinary Corps in World War II was in connection with the inspection of meats, meat-food, and dairy products procured for the subsistence of troops.

The primary purpose of the Veterinary Corps' food inspection is the protection of the health of troops by determining that meats, meat-food, and dairy products are sound, wholesome, and suitable for human consumption. The inspection for this purpose is not limited to that made at time of purchase, but also while the foodstuffs are in storage, when moved, and when issued for the use of troops. Further, at the time of purchase or offer for delivery to the Army the inspection is extended to determine whether or not the food items meet specifications and contract requirements as to type and quality.

As everyone knows, during the recent war our troops were widely distributed throughout the world. In many places climatic and

other conditions under which perishable food items had to be received, stored, moved, and handled, were exceedingly severe. It was therefore, most important, in order to protect the health of our soldiers and insure their efficiency, that every safeguard possible be placed around their food supply. The most important classes of food from a nutritional standpoint are meats, meat-food, and dairy products. They are likewise the most vulnerable to contamination and spoilage, producing serious outbreaks of disease if consumed following such damage. The Veterinary Corps, thus, had a very great responsibility in insuring the wholesomeness, safety, and quality of the food supply for the Military Establishment.

With shipping space very critical, and cold-storage facilities nonexistent or inadequate, it was necessary that many of our overseas forces utilize to the fullest extent possible supplies of perishable food items which were, or could be made available locally. In line with this policy, the Veterinary Corps supervised or operated in various overseas localities, slaughter houses, poultry plants, dairies, ice-cream plants, and dairy and hog farms. These installations proved of great value in supplementing field rations with wholesome fresh meats and dairy products, thereby contributing greatly to morale. In places like Australia and New Zealand, where meats, meat-foods and dairy products were supplied our forces, principally on a reverse lend-lease basis, the Army Veterinary Corps supplemented the local veterinary inspection service.

Another valuable contribution of the Veterinary Corps concerned the fresh milk supply of the Army. Early in the emergency it was decided to make every effort to retain fresh milk as a regular ration item for soldiers undergoing training in this country. The huge demands for canned and powdered milk for overseas use, lend-lease commitments, and our civilian population, in addition to the fresh milk requirements, put the Nation's milk supply in a very critical category. It was essential, therefore, that steps be taken to promote and maintain the greatest possible production of milk and at the same time make adequate provisions to insure the wholesomeness and safety of that going to our troops. The effectiveness and proficiency with which this task was accomplished are attested by the fact that throughout the war period, soldiers in training in the camps, posts, and stations in this country received an average of a little better than one-half pint of fresh milk per man per day, requiring at the peak approximately 65,000,000 pounds of milk per month, and with it all no serious outbreak of milk-borne disease occurred.

The Veterinary Corps made many outstanding contributions in the development and improvement of special methods and procedures for the production of various types of foods to meet the exigencies of the war. These included such foods as desiccated eggs, powdered, reconstituted, and frozen milk, war hams and bacon, and various canned products.

Meat, meat-food and dairy products constitute approximately 38 percent of the soldier's ration and cost about 60 percent of the money allowance. The size of the job the Veterinary Corps had in inspecting these foods for wholesomeness and quality is indicated by the fact that when the war ended the Corps was inspecting every day over thirty million pounds of meats and dairy products.

Throughout the war the closest liaison and cooperation existed between the Veterinary Corps, War Food Administration, Department of Agriculture, and Food and Drug Administration, with respect to veterinary inspection of meats and meat products. Further, under an arrangement between the War Food Administrator and the Secretary of War, the Army Veterinary Corps provided basic veterinary inspection at a number of slaughtering plants which ordinarily would have been furnished such inspection by the War Food Administration.

VALUE OF VETERINARY SERVICE TO OTHER COUNTRIES

A more indirect but very valuable contribution which the Veterinary Corps made during the war effort was that which resulted from the benefits of its service to the people in the countries in which elements of the corps were located. For example, when the United States established its base in Iceland, conditions under which fresh milk and certain other foods were produced and handled gave rise to grave doubt as to the wholesomeness and safety of the local supply for our troops. Veterinary Corps officers were able to introduce many reforms and improvements, making local available supplies suitable and safe for our use. The marked value of these improvements was so apparent to the local people that additional help was sought from the Veterinary Corps in connection with diseases, problems, and conditions pertaining to their livestock, dairy, and fish industries. This help was gladly given and, as officially reported by the commanding general of our base, was an important factor in cementing firm relations between our military forces and the Icelandic people. Analogous occurrences and situation characterized Veterinary Corps service in various other countries, with China an exceptionally outstanding example.

When the submarine menace off our Atlantic coast was at its height and our supply line to the Panama Canal Zone placed in jeopardy, great impetus was given to the construction work on the Pan-American Highway. In connection therewith increased concern was felt over the possibility of introducing exotic diseases of man and lower animals into the various countries traversed by the highway and eventually into the United States. With a view to obtaining information for use in preventing spread of disease by way of the highway, the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau was designated by the interested countries to conduct a thorough survey. The Secretary of War was requested to assign representatives from the Veterinary Corps to perform that part of the survey concerned with animal diseases. This was approved and there was made perhaps the most complete survey of animal diseases in Central American countries through which the Pan-American Highway will pass.

United States Army veterinary officers have also been assigned to missions in Peru and the Republic of Panama to assist the governments of those countries in matters pertaining to military and civil veterinary service.

IMPORTANCE OF CONTRIBUTIONS BY CIVILIAN VETERINARIANS

I desire to especially emphasize the highly important part the civilian component of the veterinary profession played in World War II. To begin with, it was necessary to call approximately one-sixth of the Nation's veterinarians to active duty with the Veterinary Corps to enable it to perform its military mission. Thus, the small Regular Army component of 126 officers and about 600 enlisted technicians was expanded to about 2,200 veterinary officers and over 5,000 enlisted men. This country's vast livestock industry, important as it is to our food supply in peacetime, was a most vital necessity during the war period. To preserve and protect it from the ravages of disease was the responsibility of the American veterinary profession and in this the civilian component carried the bulk of the load. How very well it did the job is now a matter of history. Had it failed, the result would have been catastrophic.

FUTURE VALUE OF VETERINARY CONTRIBUTIONS

The future value to the United States of the accomplishments and contributions of American veterinary medicine in World War II will be considerable. There has been developed much important information of great value in the treatment, control, and prevention of a number of animal diseases, some of which occur in man.

Veterinary inspection of meats, meat-food and dairy products, conducted under severe conditions in many parts of the world have resulted in the development of ways and means for the special preparation and handling of many ordinarily perishable foodstuffs to withstand unfavorable conditions. Much of this will have a postwar application.

Observation of American veterinary science in action in various parts of the world has markedly and favorably impressed the people of many lands, thereby increasing their respect for American scientific standing and achievements. Further, the help rendered by the Veterinary Corps to the people of a number of countries in connection with the improvement of their livestock and dairy industries and the control of animal diseases, has been an important factor in promoting excellent relations of lasting value. On the other hand, our veterinarians have profited by the opportunity for observation and experience in many parts of the world. They have returned with first-hand knowledge concerning many diseases and conditions we, fortunately, have been able to keep out of this country. As a result they are better prepared to promptly recognize and deal with these exotic diseases should any of them, unfortunately, reach our shores.

As recently announced by the War Department, the United States, during the war, was alive to the possibility of attempts by the enemy to introduce disease in man and animals in this country. In preparing a defense against this possibility, personnel of the Army Veterinary Corps contributed extensively and with very valuable results. A number of the findings and accomplishments resulting from this work will have great postwar value.

American veterinary medicine served well and contributed much to victory in World War II and in so doing improved its knowledge and expanded its standing in both this country and abroad.

Natural-Gas Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, John L. Lewis has found ways to make good every threat to close the coal mines at will. No one, of course, would object to a mourning period for those who so unfortunately were the victims of the mine tragedy, and certainly if it is necessary to close all the mines in order to make working conditions safe, we say amen. However, it is high time that we in Congress began to find out how and why John L. Lewis can always bring our proud country to its knees.

When the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the injunction proceedings against the head of the mine workers, the country thought government by law had again prevailed.

However, the original date set for a coal strike prior to the lengthy legal proceedings—April 1—found the mines

closed. The majority are still closed. The supply of coal flowing from the mines is far below normal.

This situation focuses new attention on another, involving restrictions on the free flow and use of natural gas. In this instance a Federal agency, the Federal Power Commission, is guilty of arbitrary action. Our fuel uncertainties, with national inconvenience and heavy economic losses, will continue as long as the coal monopoly is upheld by restrictions on natural gas.

Limitations on development of natural gas, with tremendous implications for the oil industry, are due to efforts by the Federal Power Commission to extend its regulatory control beyond authority granted by Congress. Administrative and judicial legislation has replaced the intent of the Natural Gas Act of 1938. It must be clarified and redefined. The House Committee on Interstate Commerce will begin hearings Monday, April 14, on amendments to the Natural Gas Act. They are designed to remove the confusion threatening to undermine the natural-gas industry and deny to millions of people a superior and reasonable-cost fuel for domestic and industrial purposes.

If the restrictive policies now being applied to natural gas, obviously to protect the coal industry, had prevailed in the past, the railroads would have been halted to protect the stagecoach, electricity would have been banned to aid the candlemakers, and radio would have been curbed to help the phonograph industry. Yet today, in the face of frequent disruption of coal supplies, the policies of the Federal Power Commission are denying adequate supplies of natural gas to consumers through authority usurped in defiance of Congress.

Is it too much to ask that the American consumer be allowed to have a dependable supply of fuel which is not subject to the whims and caprices of a labor tyrant? If allowed to pursue its social theories to their indicated conclusion, the Federal Power Commission will make its contribution to the power of John L. Lewis by denying the consumers access to the large and steadily growing known supply of natural gas.

The unwarranted authority assumed by the FPC and the "clouds over the oil and gas industry" in the form of judicial decrees, have had effects on natural gas as follows:

First. Widespread distribution of natural gas is being retarded through uncertainties over future regulation, bureaucratic quibbling over proper elements of operating cost, and lengthy delays in action on development applications.

Second. Ignoring statistics on the tremendous reserves of natural gas and scientific progress toward new fuels—such as gas from coal—the Federal Power Commission is undertaking to decide for the American people how, where, and when they will use a particular type of fuel. Individual choice is giving way to bureaucratic decision as to what is best for the people.

Third. In a time of world strife, large industries are denied the use of a more desirable fuel, not affected by rail difficulties and coal strikes, and forced to be dependent upon coal and the whims of those in control of mining. Such action is a direct threat to national security.

Fourth. Applications for service expansion, estimated at a total of $500,000,000, are now before the FPC, but the execution of these vast programs will largely hinge on whether producing companies are permitted by law to operate with reasonable security, avoid waste, and plan orderly development in advance of consumer demand.

It has always been the purpose of Congress to encourage new industries in the public industry. In the case of the natural-gas industry, this was done through legislation giving the Federal Power Commission control over interstate movement of natural gas. The industry supported this legislation. Control over production and gathering of natural gas and distribution after the interstate movement was left to the States, in accordance with their settled constitutional right to regulate their internal affairs.

However, characteristic of Federal agencies in recent years, the FPC began to assume authority not granted by Congress. The natural-gas industry soon found itself in a jungle of uncertainties, delayed decisions, and undefined policies. In brief, the industry is being strangled by red tape of a particularly adhesive variety.

The purpose of amendments to the Natural Gas Act of 1938, sponsored by Members of the Senate and three Members of the House, is to clarify the policies and to define and limit the procedures of the FPC in its control of the natural-gas industry. What is now uncertain regulation by men will be replaced with specific direction by law. It is my earnest hope that Members of the House will participate in the hearings before the House Interstate Commerce Committee, beginning on Monday, and will support the amendments to clarify the Natural Gas Act.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of August 9, 1947. This expression from one of the great newspapers of the Nation and one of the most influential in Ohio, in strong and resolute manner, answers affirmatively the important question confronting us as to whether Congress should approve President Truman's recommended aid to Greece and Turkey.

NOW IS THE TIME

The time has come for a showdown with expansionist, Communist Russia. The Plain Dealer urges Congress, therefore, to approve President Truman's request for $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey.

We support this somberly and after much soul searching, realizing it may lead to further commitments of money elsewhere—yes, and men, too. But the honor of the United States, the destiny of this Nation as a protector of free peoples and one which will not be pushed around, leaves us no alternative. God helping us once again, we must face reality in a world still troubled.

We do not delude ourselves that the United States will by this one move save democracy in Greece, where there is little, or in Turkey, where there is none. Democracy will come later. We believe it better to state this plainly now, without hyprocrisy. Our citizens will understand and respond more readily if we drop all false pretense.

Frankly, we recommend it on military grounds, for our own long-range protection against the menace of communism, the Red fascism, which has already gone quite far enough. The other free peoples will support our action.

This is the place to have the showdown—at the Dardanelles, in the eastern Mediterranean, where Communist stooge states do not yet exist, where no Russian troops are living off the already impoverished land. This is the time to throw a block at Russia, to call her bluff, in a spot where military advantages are obvious. We are already committed in Germany and Austria. Should we falter in the Balkans, we might as well abandon all Europe.

The people of the United States must quit deceiving themselves about Russia and what her pushing and porkiness mean. We have been struggling with our ex-ally diplomatically ever sinve VE-day. Russia has never fooled herself about what our opposition signifies. We should quit fooling ourselves.

The Russians know that American aid to Greece and Turkey, to shore up the faltering British, is an attempt to beat them to the punch. They have known all along the meaning of our protests against the rigged elections in Poland and Bulgaria, the shooting down of our planes in Yugoslavia, the faked-up revolution in Iran, the industrial stripping of eastern Germany, the cheapening and nullification of the high purpose of UN by constant haggling, the subsidizing of Communists and fellow travelers everywhere. Why continue to softsoap ourselves that these are peaceful tactics?

We heartily wish the Russians would come to their senses and stop trying to inflict communism on the world. But there is no sign they will. They have swallowed up Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia. They have the noose around Finland, Poland, and Yugoslavia. Their Gestapo dominates Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Hungary. They are proselyting in Germany and Austria, promoting a Communist government in France and egging on an ultraleftist minority in England to upset our friend Bevin.

In the United States they have bored from within so successfully, because the New Deal welcomed their support, that they have captured control of a large percentage of CIO unions and plunged that organization into a bitter, internal strife, which the anti-Communists must win, if they ever expect to advance their legitimate union aims. They have become so bold of late that they even defy the authority of Congress to subpena them; they tell freely of forging passports, which in our simple innocence we always thought was sufficient reason to go to jail.

We know from their own lips and writings that the creed of communism justifies lying, fraud, suppression of civil liberties—even kidnaping and murder if necessary—to advance the holy cause. It denies and debases the dignity of the individual, grinds it in the dust. It annihilates ambition, thwarts success. It is an evil, noisome menace, an accursed religion, whose believers are fanatical missionaries. It is a police state with

concentration camps, where the elite rule and live well, and the people share the poverty. Call it what you will—communism, state socialism, Red fascism, Stalinism—it's the same foul pestilence, the antithesis of everything American. We detest it thoroughly and so do all who love liberty.

We reject completely the Caspar Milquetoast philosophy that it is possible to crawl into our own shell, let Europe go hang, hope that communism will bite off more than it can chew. We reject the Henry Wallace asininity which forgives and excuses all aggression. We dismiss as puerile fantasy the lovely dream that if Stalin dies, some wondrous, beneficent statesman (name yet unknown) will take over and shed sweetness and light in all directions. We know different. The Politburo will still rule. Siberia will still cool off independent thinkers.

We learned once before, to our regret that we cannot appease tyrants with delusions of grandeur. In 1939 and before the menaces were Hitler and Hirohito. In the years it took us to get wise, the same fatuous arguments for appeasement and delay were advanced by timid liberals. You can't compromise with an aggressive police state.

We might as well out with it and face the ultimate possibility—war with Russia—for hundreds talk about it daily. It's a grim thought, and we hope it will not come. But we are convinced of this—there is less chance of war by blocking off Russia now than in lying down and hoping for a miracle.

In looking for an out, alarmed wishful thinkers predict that a policy of opposing evangelical communism will bankrupt us, prevent a reduction in taxes, commit us ultimately with troops, bring more demands for aid. We recognize that more demands for aid may come from countries in Europe, and are prepared to deal with them on their own merits. We don't underwrite in advance pouring money into every rat hole in Asia. This will not be necessary if we act swiftly and resolutely in Europe.

Of this we are sure—if communism should ever dominate our world, these woes would seem as insignificant as a hangnail to a man with appendicitis, kidney stones, and meningitis. We never know to what heights we can rise when we must.

We live in a dangerous age, a century of great and violent change, an era of hard politicians and revolutionary prophets.

Alas, there is no turning back to the status quo, the life of ease.

We cannot dream in our ivory tower of the higher life, full of philosophy and art, comfort and security, where no young man will ever need again to face danger in the uniform of his country.

As the richest, most productive Nation, the only really strong one, we have been forced to grow up, assume greater responsibilities in this shrinking world. And they are great, for dream though we may of a world government and peace on earth, dog still eats dog and force counts most.

If the Russians do not shift course, we must certainly restore the draft. Taxes will remain high. The debt will not come down. Airplane factories and shipyards must again come to life. Atomic bombs will still be produced. Like it or not, this is the inevitable sequence of preparedness and protection.

We Americans seek no territory to annex, no world to conquer. But we live in a world constantly made smaller through airplanes and radio, a world where a fanatical nationalistic religion is on the march. We have just fought and won a war (though it was far from our shores and we suffered little) to crush one such pestilence—Nazi fascism. We must beware of the dangers of Red fascism while there is still time. Wishing never yet stopped a war, but nipping aggressors when they are weak sometimes has.

So let's set our jaw and turn our face into the tempest. Help friendly nations while they are still alive. Cease this stupid business of pouring food and money into Russian stooge states, where Titos rule and everyone votes yes. Let our own administrators handle the funds in friendly nations, and show the local governments how to improve themselves and use the money best.

Let's notify the United Nations and invite it to help as Senator VANDENBERG suggests, but not expect it really to do anything. How can it, with the continuous Russian veto? Some day it may be strong enough, but not now.

Perhaps this strong action will cool Russia off. Let's hope so, but keep our fingers crossed. Hitler would have cooled off, had he been stopped at the Rhineland when he first began his aggressions. Ten years later, after he had swallowed his victims one by one, it was too late without a world war.

Let's get on with it resolutely, realistically. Our people are unafraid of anything on earth, once they know the facts and the danger. The facts about expansionist communism, like the facts on cancer, are just now beginning to dawn on them.

Appropriations for the Department of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me today before the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the Labor Department appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am sure by now that the members of this subcommittee are convinced that the amputation of functions of the Labor Department proposed by the House Appropriations Committee and agreed to by the House in H. R. 2700 was a flagrant instance of false economy and of irresponsibility. This committee has heard many of the experts from the Labor Department testify on the exact nature of the functions they supervise and also has the advantage of some very intelligent appraisals of the situation made here and on the floor of the Senate by such Senators as Mr. MORSE and Mr. SPARKMAN.

In my appearance here I do not want to go back over all the arguments which have been made, pro and con, because I am sure this committee is attempting to make a fair-minded approach to the situation, and therefore, is acquainting itself with those arguments so that further repetition would be unnecessary. However, I do want to make clear, in case there is any doubt in the minds of any members of the subcommittee, that the functions of the Labor Department which would be curtailed or eliminated should H. R. 2700 become law in its present form—I am sure it will not—are of vital importance to the State of Pennsylvania and as such are important to the Nation and, in fact, to the world, for Pennsylvania and its industrial capacity together compose one of the major factors toward the rebuilding of a world in ruins and, through that rebuilding, the achievement of real and enduring peace.

That sounds like a very extravagant statement, I know. But it is not extravagant. In their own way, each State contributes much toward that goal, but it is Pennsylvania on which we and much of the world now depend for steel and coal and glass and firebrick, the best grade of petroleum, textiles, and an unlimited variety of major industrial needs. Therefore, any action of the Congress which has as its effect the disruption or the hampering or the delay of full production in Pennsylvania is a serious matter.

That is why I am so concerned about this bill as passed by the House. Practically every function of the Labor Department which would be curtailed or eliminated is an important function in my State.

Briefly, taking up some of the items in the bill, I would like to mention the significance of these cuts to my State.

THE WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

A cut here of $1,147,100, under budget estimates is a cut of more than 20 percent. Now, as far as Pennsylvania workers are concerned, this would not on the surface appear to be too serious a matter because there are few establishments in Pennsylvania where wages are lower than, or even as low as 40 cents an hour. So there would therefore appear to be not much need for wage and hour inspections. But the picture is misleading.

Although employment is booming in most parts of Pennsylvania, there are areas of the State which are rapidly falling into the category of "distressed area" and where unscrupulous employers might attempt to recruit workers at starvation wages if they thought the Federal Government was powerless to enforce the Wages and Hours Act. As a matter of fact, even today in our present high-wage economy, wage-hour inspectors, making a limited number of inspections, are still finding violations. If the number of inspectors in the State is cut from 61 to about 46, as would be required should this appropriation reduction stand, the inspectors would not nearly be able to keep up with new enterprises started in the State, let alone get around to many employers whose operations have never been inspected. It is possible these 46 inspectors would not only have to cover Pennsylvania, but adjoining States as well. Lack of sufficient inspectors is an open invitation to violations of a law which today is a woefully inadequate law, but is the only law we have on the subject.

Just the other day, after the House had seriously cut back the customs service appropriation, and that service had to grant emergency furloughs or hand outright dismissals to the major portion of its force, smugglers recognized an immediate invitation to lawlessness. It was no surprise to me, therefore, to see an Associated Press dispatch reporting the murder of a customs patrol inspector by a smuggler in Arizona, almost immediately after the service was crippled by the false economy drive of the House. Here we have a case of murder which I think can be attributed directly to the House Appropriation Committee's action. I do not look for any murders as a result of emasculating of Wage and Hour Division enforcement, but I do fear that the invitation to smuggling represented by the false economy of the House bill for the Treasury Department would be duplicated to some extent in this bill as an invitation, not to smuggling, but to chiseling on our wage earners in some areas of Pennsylvania where there is a labor surplus and in any other areas which may be hit by periods of unemployment. There is a more important aspect of the problem from the standpoint of my State and it is this:

Pennsylvania, being generally a high wage State, continually faces the prospect of unfair competition from other States where wages have a tendency to sink to substandard levels. The textile industry in Pennsyl-

vania especially, is continually beset by ruthless competition from fly-by-night and runaway shops in other States where unscrupulous employers take advantage of the labor surplus to beat down wages and living conditions to deplorable levels. As low as it is, this 40-cent minimum wage which the Wage and Hour Division is to enforce is of substantial protection to Pennsylvania.

I don't want to cast aspersions on any other State, but I think it worth noting that the textile State of South Carolina in the fiscal year 1946 reflected a rate of minimum wage violations of 29 percent of all inspected establishments. This compares with a rate of less than 8 percent in Pennsylvania, and the rate in Pennsylvania was as high as it was only, I am sure, because the limited number of inspectors sought out those establishments which they thought most likely to be in violation.

I am sure that no representative of the State of South Carolina would approve of a crippling of the Division charged with enforcing minimum wage regulations because South Carolina, I am sure, has no desire to encourage wage chiseling at the expense of its citizens. In a case like this not only do South Carolinians suffer from low wages, but Pennsylvania industries and workers suffer because their product must face unfair competition.

I would like to remind the members of this committee that when the portal-to-portal bill was before the Senate, I attempted to amend it to provide for a 60-cent minimum wage. Senator TAFT succeeded in having that amendment tabled after he declared that the Senate Labor Committee, of which he is chairman, intends to bring out some comprehensive amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act with the intent of strengthening that act and raising standards. A bill to do just that was passed by the Senate last year, indicating that if the Senate Labor Committee acts in the manner Senator TAFT promised it would, it is very likely the Senate will approve a bill calling for a minimum wage of at least 60 cents—the figure we approved last year—and no doubt even higher than 60 cents.

Senator MORSE announced on the Senate floor that he voted to table my amendment for a 60-cent minimum because he thought it was not high enough. I agree it is not high enough. I hope he and other members of the majority party will approve a bill calling for a higher figure. But in the meantime, unfortunately, the minimum wage is still only 40 cents.

I mention all this because I think it is apparent we are going to have a higher minimum adopted soon—and I trust it is soon—and that the duties of the Wage and Hour Division will be increased as a result. If these inspectors found 325 violations of minimum wage standards in the 1946 fiscal year in a high-wage State like Pennsylvania it is obvious that a 60-cent minimum wage or a 70-cent minimum wage or a 75-cent minimum wage might be violated more frequently than the 40-cent minimum wage was violated in those cases where discovery of the violations was made. And if 29 percent of all establishments inspected in South Carolina in that year showed violations of a 40-cent minimum wage, what can we look for in the way of violations if the wage is raised and if there are insufficient inspectors to detect violations?

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

I want to make some brief observations on this item which was cut by the House by about $500,000. This committee knows of the tremendously important functions of the Solicitor's Office, including advisory opinions on the Wages and Hours Act, the making of predeterminations of prevailing wage rates as required by four statutes relating to public construction, and so on.

There is not a single function of the Solicitor's Office that could be eliminated because they are all provided for by law. The effect of a half-million-dollar cut—nearly a 50-percent cut—as provided by the House would mean not the elimination of any unnecessary functions but merely the delay of necessary ones. Mr. Chairman, I don't think I have to emphasize the importance of speed on the part of Government agencies in dealing with the explosive issues of labor-management relations, particularly where wage rates are involved.

The most dramatic single instance where speed on the part of this office of the Labor Department was necessary occurred recently in Pittsburgh during that paralyzing power strike which brought mighty Pittsburgh to its knees. This strike was not halted even when the courts issued an injunction against it and jailed the president of the independent union which called the strike. The strike was halted, however, suddenly and dramatically, after several weeks, when the Solicitor's Office of the Labor Department was asked to give a ruling on a legal question which up to then had stalemated any settlement. The question revolved around the application of wage-stabilization regulations to any wage increase which might be arrived at should the issues of the strike be submitted to arbitration. It was a very complex legal question. The Solicitor's Office was asked for such an opinion immediately. The very next day this dragging strike which had prostrated the great city of Pittsburgh was ended and it was ended because the Solicitor's Office, working at top speed, prepared an opinion which convinced the union involved it could safely submit the dispute to arbitration.

Mr. Chairman, if the Solicitor's Office had been so understaffed as this bill in its present form would make it, it could not have acted so promptly. I venture to say that every day that that strike continued because of delay in the Solicitor's Office in providing an opinion on the legal question involved, would have cost Pittsburgh perhaps as much as the entire budget estimate for an adequate staff for this office next year. The Solicitor's Office needs were estimated by the Budget Bureau at $1,251,000. The half million dollars which the House proposed to save out of this item is small change compared to the savings which accrued to the people and to the industries as a result of prompt termination of that strike.

I will have a little more to say later about how this power dispute in Pittsburgh was finally settled, partly as a result of the prompt and efficient and reliable work of another agency of the Labor Department, the Bureau of Labor Statistics. But at this point I want to complete my statement on the Office of the Solicitor.

One of the jobs of this office is, as I said, to make predeterminations of prevailing wages required under four statutes relating to public construction: The Davis-Bacon Act, the National Housing Act, the Federal Airport Aid Act, and the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. The Solicitor's Office must determine the currently prevailing wage rate in the locality—usually the county involved—for each class of laborer or mechanic to be employed on a particular project. Individual rates are established in that way for carpenters, bricklayers, painters, plasterers, and every other craft to be employed on the project. These prevailing wage rates, once established, become statutory minimum wages and must be included in the advertised specifications for the project and in any contracts let for the construction work.

This is not a function which can be even partially eliminated. It is mandatory by law, and it must be done before any of the contracting agencies can go ahead with their work. It affects all kinds of public construction—vitally needed veterans' housing, educational facilities and hospitals, airports, public buildings, and many other things. The volume of construction in my own State affected by these laws is considerable.

From the beginning of January to the middle of March of this year alone, there were 112 requests to the Department of Labor from various agencies for predeterminations of wage rates for construction to be performed in Pennsylvania. One of these was for a veterans' hospital to be constructed at Wilkes-Barre, whose estimated cost is over $17,000,000. An $11,000,000-construction project is planned in Lebanon.

The National Housing Agency is putting up low-rent apartment houses in Philadelphia and elsewhere.

Veterans' educational facilities, each at an estimated cost of anywhere from $21,000 to close to $350,000 are being constructed in many places in Pennsylvania, including Chester, Huntington, Elizabethtown, Slippery Rock, Loretto, and the State college in Centre County.

War Department projects at Cumberland and New Cumberland, planned for the near future, have a combined estimated value of $374,740.

Municipal airports at Westmorland, Hazleton, Beaver, Somerset, Eagles Mere, Emlenton, Franklin, Waynesburg, to mention only a few, are planned by the Civil Aeronautics Administration under the Federal Airport Act.

The Public Buildings Administration has requested a predetermination for repairs to the United States Mint in Philadelphia.

Every one of the requests for predeterminations that comes into the Labor Department must be answered by the Office of the Solicitor. A reduction in the budget of the national office will simply mean that the answers will be delayed until an inadequate staff can get to them, and the practical result in Pennsylvania will be that millions of dollars worth of construction work will be held up.

Homeless veterans in my State will not be satisfied in their demand for decent shelter with the explanation that their needs cannot be met because Congress failed to appropriate adequately for the Solicitor's Office in the Labor Department.

Building trade-unions and construction contractors will regard it as very false economy indeed if by failure to appropriate an adequate sum we cause unemployment or hold up their businesses. I need hardly say that the cost to my State, directly and indirectly, of such false economy may even exceed the entire amount requested for the Office of the Solicitor.

Another function of the Solicitor's Office which will become increasingly important as a result of proposed legislation is that of giving advisory opinions on the application of the wage-and-hour laws. The portal-to-portal bill would make of such opinions official rulings which could be cited by an employer as his defense under good faith for a violation of the law resulting from his following such an opinion. Should that law be enacted it is obvious that the Solicitor's Office will have to be extremely exact and careful in its opinions, and this means more work for the agency rather than less. I do not mean to say that the Office is not now extremely exact and careful in its rulings, but it seems obvious to me that the added responsibility thrust upon that agency under the bill would increase the burden of its work.

DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS

Here the House has gone hog-wild. It has eliminated the agency. It is thus presumably saving the Government $718,700. I do not have readily available much detail on what this means in safety and health work in Pennsylvania—I am sure it is substantial—but in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor in an article by Josephine

Ripley, published April 4, I read the following:

"In Rhode Island alone, last year, the Division (of Labor Standards) at the State's request stepped in to help reduce industrial accidents by 14 percent over the year before, thus saving labor and industry an estimated $3,500,000—a sum far greater than the $800,000 required for the Division's work."

Of course, if the Congress is going to adopt the position at this late date that industrial health and safety are not important, then there is nothing I can say to assure the continuation of this important function of the Labor Department. But, if the Congress is going to give up this work, I think the labor committee of the Senate should bring out a bill to eliminate the Division of Labor Standards and not let the House Appropriation Committee, which is not noted for its understanding of industrial problems, make the decision for us on so far-reaching a matter.

THE CONCILIATION SERVICE

The action of the House in this case was so ridiculous I doubt if I have to say much at all on this item for I am sure the Committee recognizes the importance of this Service in maintaining industrial peace.

I note that Senator TAFT in his proposed labor bill provides for substantially increased functions and responsibilities for the Conciliation Service, whether it be under the Labor Department or an independent agency. We are preparing to vote on the funds for this agency for the next fiscal year. Are we to make a deep slash here, decapitate the agency, in fact, and then turn around and give it much to do and find we have to vote it a deficiency appropriation? The $500,000 which would be saved under the House bill might result in the loss of millions of dollars to industry and labor in Pennsylvania alone, as a result of even one strike resulting from a lack of sufficient Conciliation Service personnel.

In my own city of Philadelphia, the Conciliation Service formed the Philadelphia Assembly in which employers and labor representatives meet with the branch director at the Philadelphia office to discuss general and specific problems of labor-management relations. Gentlemen, did you know that largely as a result of this work, the city of Philadelphia now has the best labor record of any city in the United States?

Mr. Chairman, a record like that does not just happen.

Just selecting at random some of the cases in which the Conciliation Service was involved in Pennsylvania recently, I might cite the instance in January when the Service brought about an eleventh-hour settlement of a dispute involving 36 foundry companies in the Philadelphia area, and the International Molders and Foundry Workers Union. This would have involved 2,000 employees directly, and indirectly thousands more and the economy of the State. Is a service like that worth a half million dollars to the whole country when this was just one individual dispute it settled.

A strike involving 15,000 workers of the American Viscose Corp. was averted by this same Service only recently in Pennsylvania. Last October the Conciliation Service settled without a strike, a dispute between the Radio Corp. of America and 2,000 electrical workers at Lancaster. Is it any wonder I do not want to see a guillotine used on this agency decapitating its head and its directing leadership?

THE BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

I have two letters here I would like to read before I say anything myself. One is from the head of the Department of Economics at Carnegie Institute of Technology and the other is from the sales manager of the S. Morgan Smith Co. at York, Pa., to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a copy of which was sent to me. In both cases I asked for their permission to make public their communications, and they were happy to oblige. The letters are as follows:

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 3, 1947.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: It has come to my attention, through the press and through acquaintances in Washington, that the House of Representatives has recently voted to reduce the appropriation of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor by about 60 percent from the fiscal 1947 level in the budget for fiscal 1948. I should like to urge that you do not support this drastic reduction. While it may well be appropriate to reduce the governmental expenditures at this time, surely a cut of this magnitude in the Bureau of Labor Statistics appropriation will do harm far out of proportion to the relatively small volume of funds which is saved.

In particular I should like to emphasize the great value for the schools, for business research, and for intelligent planning at the governmental level of the sort of statistical data currently being collected and analyzed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. These figures are of a careful, nonpartisan, scientific nature. They provide an objective factual basis for the making of intelligent economic decisions on a wide range of questions, such as price policies of individual firms, establishment of wage rates, man-hour productivity in different industries, etc. If the 60 percent cut is approved by the Senate, nearly everything except purely routine operations on a few series will have to be given up. The valuable series now obtained and published regularly by the Bureau have been built up over a long period of years. It would be a very serious backward step and loss to the academic and business communities for these years of progress to be reversed.

I urge, therefore, that you vote to moderate substantially this cut in the Bureau of Labor Statistics appropriation.

Very truly yours,

G. L. BACH,
Head, Department of Economics.

APRIL 5, 1947.

We were, indeed, very much alarmed the other day when we read in a New York newspaper that Congress was intending to cut the Bureau of Labor Statistics appropriation about 60 percent. Most of the durable goods industry is dependent upon your statistics for use as indices in price adjustment clauses contained in pending contracts. If these statistics have to be discontinued for lack of funds, the industry will be in a pitiable condition. A lot of companies holding long-time contracts will just about be wrecked. We have some contracts extending back to 1942 which were held up and then resumed after the war. The United States engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and TVA advise us that they cannot accept statistics for use as indices unless they are compiled by a Government agency. Outside of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, we do not know of any Government agency that is set up to compile such statistics.

Undoubtedly other industries who have been relying on the Bureau's statistics of commodities, labor, etc., will be seriously affected. If Congress votes to cut down the Bureau's appropriation, it should indicate clearly what services should be pared down or eliminated and thus make sure that an economic crisis will not result.

We certainly appreciate your past help and the obliging manner in which you have tried to aid various industries.

Very truly yours,

D. J. MCCORMACK,
Sales Manager,
S. Morgan Smith Co., York, Pa.

One conspicuous example of the value of this Bureau is its occupational wage-rate survey providing wage rates for individual occupations in all major industries in localities of 100,000 population or more. These surveys would be eliminated under the House bill, and only national averages would be available, thus depriving employers, unions, mediators, and arbitrators of authoritative information which very frequently aids in the settlement of disputes and the negotiation of wage contracts at the local level. Let me cite one case:

I mentioned the power strike in Pittsburgh. The strike was ended but not settled by a ruling from the Solicitor's office. The strike was settled by arbitration. The arbitrators in this case kept the Bureau of Labor Statistics busy for about an entire month answering requests for pertinent wage information needed in the settlement of this case. Pittsburghers who went through the power strike would say it was a peculiar type of economy which would make it impossible for the Bureau of Labor Statistics to have provided the information which helped substantially in removing the threat of a repetition of that costly strike. Yet if the proposed budget cuts go through, this type of information will cease to be available, not only in Pittsburgh but in Philadelphia, Reading, Erie, and the Allentown-Bethlehem area.

Cost-of-living indexes prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics showing changes in consumer prices would be eliminated on a monthly basis in this bill, in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, and would be available only on a quarterly basis. In this period of changing prices—I trust they will be changing downward substantially—it is vitally important not only to Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, but to the whole State and to the Nation, to know what is really happening to prices, and this is the agency of the Government charged with finding out.

I can understand why some Members of the Congress desire these statistics eliminated entirely, because they show all too graphically what has happened to our economy since this Congress ruthlessly murdered price control by passing an unworkable bill last year. BLS has shown the fallacy of the arguments advanced in the Congress that without price control there would be a short period of rising prices and then a readjustment and everybody would have plenty at prices he could afford and everyone would be happy. Rather than assuming blame for the error of judgment and the wrong predictions made at that time, some Congressmen apparently want to eliminate BLS cost-of-living studies so that they would not be confronted every month with the figures showing how wrong they were last summer. That is hardly a valid reason for doing away with the studies which chart the lifeline of our economy.

Housing statistics gathered monthly on new construction in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, York, and Lancaster would be discontinued under this bill. These studies constitute the only available information showing the progress of housing for veterans and for the public generally, and are widely used by the building industries and the real estate industry. Similarly, BLS now makes rent surveys twice a year in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Scranton. These surveys would be reduced to once a year. Yet if Congress allows rents to rise, these surveys would be necessary at least four times a year, as the President has requested.

I am sure it is unnecessary for me to document all of the activities of BLS which are already known to this committee, and, I assume, appreciated.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. Chairman, throughout my statement I have been repeating the word "amazed" in

discussing some of the cuts made by the House. None is as amazing as the cut for USES. Here the House committee and the House voted $71,728,000—every cent which was requested—for the various State employment services which the Federal Government is subsidizing 100 percent. For the central office, the home office, headquarters, the nerve center of this far-flung program, the committee and the House allow $900,000, and cut $3,000,000 from the budget estimate. That would make of the home office, of the national headquarters a bookkeeping office and nothing more, a paymaster.

We are turning loose here $71,000,000 for the States to do with largely as they like, with no supervision, no control, no direction. Gentlemen, is that what the House means by good business in government? Would any of our large chain business organizations think of putting every State manager on his own, with no supervision or control from the home office? Would any large chain business organization, any great corporation operating in every State, think it good business to let each State manager devise his own policies, set his own program completely independent of any national policy? Would it consider withholding from its State manager the information and discoveries made elsewhere which would help him in promoting the business in his own State?

Of course not.

Yet, here, we would have a $71,000,000 Nation-wide business—a big business—departmentalized by States in such a manner that no one State would know what the next State was doing, that none of us in the Congress would know what any of them were doing with this tremendous amount of money we are providing in a blank check. I this be economy, then I don't think we in the Senate want any part of it—not this kind of economy.

In Pennsylvania, the USES provides a working link with all other States in the Nation, many with similar employment-area problems, to improve the standards of operations for those in Pennsylvania who need jobs and for those employers in Pennsylvania who need skills not available in our own State, but procurable through the national clearing house of USES which is now serving more than 200 Pennsylvania employers.

Among some of these firms who enjoy a service which would not be available if this bill were left unchanged are some of the most important in Pennsylvania, not only in the industrial field, but in research and education. To name a few:

Publicker Industries, Sharp & Dohme, Atlantic Refining Co., American Gear Manufacturing Co., Mellon Institute, Rust Engineering, Altoona Pipe & Steel, Aviation Corp., Armstrong Cork Co., Hercules Powder Co., Piper Aircraft, Pittsburgh Steel, Commercial Solvents, Sharples Chemical Co., Baldwin Locomotive, Carnegie Institute, Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia, Corning Glass Co., and Talon, Inc.

The type of employees they seek through the National Clearing House of the USES is usually a type difficult to find, men technically trained in unusual specialties. I have not had an opportunity to investigate many specific cases in which USES has been of significant help in its recruitment of technical specialists for Pennsylvania firms, but I do know of several instances where this help has been of vital importance. USES is presently recruiting geologists, petroleum engineers, and geophysicists for one large corporation in Pennsylvania, and recently obtained several scarce specialists for another firm.

Now, we in Pennsylvania have many fine technical schools whose graduates cannot always find jobs in their specialties in our own State, but who are just the thing industries in other States may be looking for. To get them jobs, are we to depend on each State's sending out to the other 47 a list of all job opportunities of a highly technical nature and receiving in turn similar lists from each of the other 47 States in order to do all by itself what this National Clearing House of USES is doing from one central agency? In other words, are we expecting each of the 48 States to build up an agency of its own which would be as efficient as the one central agency we now have? Gentlemen, that would be bureaucracy compounded.

This is not only true in connection with the recruitment of technical personnel but applies to all sorts of job opportunities. There are parts of Pennsylvania where there are labor surpluses and where job seekers sometime are required to find openings in other States. Similarly, there are these same labor surplus areas in other States where are found skills needed in Pennsylvania. The object is to fit the man to the job and the job to the man and if we are going to "balkanize" our employment service, as Senator MORSE recently said, this appropriation bill would "balkanize" our entire economy, we are certainly stretching economy to a point where it may break our economy.

The committee has heard at great length about the various functions of USES and nearly all of the important ones are important to Pennsylvania for the simple reason that Pennsylvania is such an important industrial State. I do not want to take the time to repeat all of this information, but I would like to cite a few examples of what this agency means to our State.

The personnel manager of a garment factory in Hazleton, Pa., recently found his employee turn-over was running as high as 58 percent. Testing programs developed by USES were put to work in this plant, and, as a result, the veterans who were hired under the on-the-job-training program—those who were tested and found suitable—have stayed at work and turn-over has been reduced to 2 percent. At the request of a textile manufacturer in Wilkes-Barre it studied plant operations and developed two types of tests for quiller operators and weavers. These tests were so successful they are being adopted elsewhere. In a rubber company in Erie techniques of testing developed by USES reversed a high turn-over rate to such an extent that during the first 30 days after installation of the program, there was not a single resignation. There have been many such cases and I don't want to take the time to cite them all.

One of the things the 77-percent cut in USES funds would mean to Pennsylvania is the elimination of regional offices. Eleven of the 12 regional offices would probably be abandoned. That would undoubtedly mean the end of the Philadelphia office, since it is so close to Washington. Pennsylvania employers who have had the experience of having to run to Washington for a decision every time a problem comes up will not, I am sure, find conditions improved in the employment field by the elimination of the Philadelphia office.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat what I have said many times on the floor of the Senate in recent weeks. If the Congress is determined to do away with basic features in our Government—and the Labor Department represents one of the most basic departments of all—then, I submit, the Congress must have the courage to enact legislation specifically aimed at eliminating those things the majority of the Congress believe should be eliminated and do it openly and above board and not in a back-door fashion through the thoroughly dishonest method of starving out functions and agencies by means of appropriation bills.

The chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. BRIDGES, said to me during the debate on the legislative budget that one of the reasons the joint committee could not give a break-down on how cuts could be made was that this would be prejudging the work of the Appropriations Committees. Mr. Chairman, I submit that in these appropriation bills the House Appropriations Committee is attempting, all by itself, to reorganize the executive branch of Government, and I don't think that is its function, and I am sure that this committee and the Senate will not tolerate it.

Newsprint and Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Col. Robert R. McCormick, the distinguished editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, before the committee which is investigating the newsprint shortage. The statement was made by him on March 17, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentleman of the subcommittee on newsprint shortage, there has been so much confused testimony before your committee on the subject of paper that I take the liberty of sending you a short résumé of the history of paper and printing of newspaper publishing.

Paper and printing came, as they had to, together. One would have been worthless without the other. They increased the possibility of acquiring knowledge from the very few to the many. It was not until the rotary paper machine and the rotary press were invented that knowledge became possible to the many.

It was when the ground-wood process was developed—as I have been informed by Warren Curtis, Sr.—and modern paper mills were designed by Warren Curtis, Jr., and George F. Hardy, and linotypes and printing presses of modern design were installed in specially designed newspaper buildings, that knowledge became possible for everyone.

When the new mills were put into operation near the forest and near the paper market, such as ours that we built at Thorold, Ontario, in 1912, hoping to free ourselves from the vagaries of the paper market, the cost of paper declined so rapidly (at one time it was down to $20 a ton) that competing newspapers progressively reduced the price of daily papers to 1 cent and Sunday papers to 5 cents, making their information available to everyone.

This led to a tremendous demand for newspapers which, as I have said before, could only be put out by means of newly designed and invented newspaper machinery. Large circulations in turn made advertising increasingly profitable to advertisers which again made possible still lower circulation rates.

At the beginning of the present era, pulpwood was readily available. It could be bought from pulpwood dealers as other materials are bought from drummers. As the years have gone by, the nearby pulpwood has been cut off. The remaining wood has receded farther and farther from the mills, and the mills going after it have receded

farther and farther from the market, involving higher and higher freight rates. Wood is no longer found along existing railways or highways or easily driven rivers. To obtain wood today, logging operations have to be carried on with road building and river improvement carried out in many places on a scale comparable to the Panama Canal.

I believe the first great logging operation was performed by the Ontario Paper Co. some 25 years ago, but this was an operation to conserve wood that had been killed by fire.

The price of wood at Thorold, after freight had been paid on it, fluctuated from as low as $9 a cord to the present price of $36 a cord. All of the other costs of paper mounted until now I do not know whether the mills of average economy can be supported at the present price of $84 a ton.

To meet these and other increasing costs, newspaper prices and advertising rates have been constantly raised. The daily papers are mostly back to 5 cents, with the Sunday papers at 10, 12, and 15 cents, but the papers are vast improvements over the ones that sold for those prices a half century or more ago.

Not the least of these improvements has been the printing of halftones, which was born into the newspaper world in my time. Whether the improvement in paper made this possible or whether this made improved paper necessary, I do not know.

Another great improvement is in color printing. That was introduced about a half a century ago but badly. It could be used only for grotesque comics. Improved presses now permit fine art work. The curator of the Chicago Art Institute has told me that some of our rotogravure reproductions of great paintings are better than the originals.

With the recession of the spruce forests, other materials must be found. We are grinding 10 percent of poplar at Thorold today, but vastly larger quantities of other raw materials must be found.

We may find them chemically. Our alcohol plant was founded as a war service. Its economic condition in the peacetime world has not been established, but we also make yeast, and we make a substance which vastly improves cement. It is not beyond the grounds of possibility that the sugars and lignins of wood, from being waste, will become the main products, the fibers the by-products. If this happens, we will have an economy in paper making and a better sheet of paper.

This brings to mind other raw materials than wood. Sugar mills reverse the pulpwood process. When the sugar has been squeezed out of the sugarcane by calenders such as we use, the cane becomes a waste material. It becomes a paper-making raw material with no cost. There is a pilot plant in Mexico experimenting with this now.

The passing of the horse has all but destroyed the market for straw at the very time that the agricultural machinery companies have perfected a hay baler with which one man can do the work that formerly required 10. Straw is an old raw material for paper making and in this new economy may come back again into its own.

Geographically sugarcane paper would reach our southern newspapers with minimum freight rates, and straw paper may well compete in the interior with paper made in Labrador, Hudson Bay, or Alaska, not to say Europe.

Strange things will be said to you about newspapers. The strangest one is that what it takes to start a newspaper in these days is a lot of money. The only publisher who started a successful newspaper in the last 50 years who had lots of money was Hearst. He also had great newspaper ability. Adolph Ochs came to New York from Chattanooga, Tenn., with practically nothing and made the great New York Times. Victor Lawson took the Chicago Daily News for failure to pay its rent. Pulitzer started in St. Louis with nothing and came to New York without much more. He died leaving his newspaper enormously rich and successful, but his successors did not have the know-how and brought it to ruin in a few years.

The New York News went to press modestly on the presses of the New York Mail. Within a year it moved into a small building on Park Place and only after its success had been established did it take a 20-year lease on a larger building, and even there used some second-hand equipment. When its success was assured and its circulation becoming a factor in the paper market, we enlarged our paper mill to supply it and eventually built a paper mill for it.

Successful newspapers are started in a small way. Their mistakes are small mistakes. It is only when they have become successful and the demand for them great that they need large buildings, extensive press capacities, and complicated organization. Large newspapers have all the problems of small newspapers and others, too.

That money can make a newspaper can be disproved by the experience of Frank Munsey, Mrs. Thackrey, Marshall Field and David Stern.

A newspaper has to stand on its own feet. It cannot be supported even with the full power of the Federal Government. A decision of the Supreme Court given at the instigation of the executive was utterly impotent to bring success to an improperly edited newspaper. On the other hand, no amount of outside attack can harm it. For some years now, our newspapers have been subject to boycotts, to the bitter propaganda of the British Foreign Office, conducted throughout the entire press of the British Empire and such publications as it controls in this country. We have been barked at by every living magazine jackal. We have been maligned by every writer that could be suborned for pay, and in consequence of all this, we have the two most successful newspapers in the world.

The paper seeks its readers by its appearance, which is the quality of the paper, plus the style of the type, plus the attractiveness of pictures. It sells them by presenting interesting reading matter called news.

Nobody has ever been able to define news. An unusual happening is news, but this meeting is news without being unusual. It is news because it is an important happening. If you look through the roto sections, you will find that beauty is news, humor is news, child and dog pictures are news, catastrophes are news. Daily happenings of people who have made themselves interesting, whether in politics or music, or what is known as society, are news.

Most news makes itself, but the writing of it almost inevitably requires the exercise of description. How speedy was the pitcher? Did the jockey ride magnificently? How loudly was the speaker applauded?

It is alleged by those who would destroy the newspapers that this necessity is exercised to the detriment of the reader. Utter nonsense. Many people know the facts as well as the writers. Indeed the writers get many of their facts at second hand. If the facts are not correctly reported, the writer and his publication soon discredit themselves.

How are selections of news made and how are assignments given out? They are made by men with a natural aptitude for editing and assignment. These men pass from beginners to editors by demonstrated ability, by the general reputations they have acquired. If men who demonstrate their lack of qualifications are retained, their publication becomes unacceptable to the readers, who leave it and it dies. The men who can make the best blend of art, humor, and news will make the best newspaper and it will be recognized as such.

This cannot be done by law, by a journalistic OPA, by a college student, or by any group of pinko professors living off the money other men have made. Such things may attempt to destroy newspapers but I do not think they can even do that.

A particularly American provision in the Constitution is that providing for free speech and a free press. While the language would appear to be all inclusive, we find that this freedom has never been extended to the stage or the moving picture. It is nullified in periodicals by the large subsidies they receive from the Post Office Department. Everything said over the radio is said under the threat that the radio license will not be renewed.

Freedom of the press, therefore, is actually freedom of the newspaper press, and this has been exercised under trumped-up prosecutions and widespread conspiracies to discredit newspapers of independent habit, but the press of the United States has remained substantially free in great contrast to the press of the British Empire, which in many matters is directed by the Government.

Its consistency and reliability may be accounted for by the fact that to continue to exist, it has to retain constantly the confidence of its readers. Sensational falsehoods may pick up readers but not retain them. Conversely, an author or book publisher may hope to make such a killing in one book as not to need to write or publish another.

America's Ten Legal Commandments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "America's Ten Legal Commandments," prepared by Mr. Albert Brick, an able attorney of Washington, D. C., for the April 1947 issue of the Public Service magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S TEN LEGAL COMMANDMENTS

(By Albert Brick [1])

Out of our experience in the last decade and a half, the American people might well have learned 10 great truths in relation to the law. These might be called her ten legal commandments. They are not necessarily new truths; indeed, some are as old as the recorded history of a free people. Yet, they speak with new strength, new dignity, new meaning, to an America starting out on a bold, new path after her victory in the Second World War. These truths go to the very heart of America's system of private enterprise and of her constitutional Republic. They differentiate free America from Collectivist nations, America ruled by law from lands ruled by dictatorial men.

What are these ten legal commandments?

1. POWER MUST EXIST IN LAW AND MUST BE LIMITED BY LAW

"Where the law ends, tyranny begins," said William Pitt in 1770. We have seen that when power in government exists merely because of the capricious will of one man or a group of men and where it is uncontrolled,

[1] Albert Brick is a member of the bar of the District of Columbia and President of the Florida State Society for the District of Columbia.

it tends to oppress. "Absolute power," says the Actonium dictum, "makes for absolute corruption." Limited power, power which is checked and balanced, makes for purity in government, for fiscal sanity and political health.

2. LAW MUST HAVE THE RESPECT OF THE PEOPLE

It is folly for a government to pass a law which is not held in high esteem by the overwhelming mass of the populace. One wit has remarked, "A law will fail when too many people believe that it must be enforced rather than observed." If the only way that it can be respected is through compulsion and enforcement, it will require police power, and where it requires police power, evasion of it will be attempted. The strongest law is the law in which the people most strongly believe.

3. LAW MUST BE AS MODERN AS THE NEEDS OF THE TIMES

W. S. Gilbert said, "The law is the true embodiment of everything that's excellent."

But, in time, even excellent laws may become obsolete and must be changed. This does not mean that they must be changed precipitously; on the contrary, they must be changed only after careful deliberation.

Law, too, must be a dynamic instrument for the future. Said one observer, "law should be an alliance of foresight and insight against short sight." But, the only thing that is changeless in the world is still change itself. Sydney Smith said, "When I hear a man talk of an unalterable law, I know that I am listening to an unalterable fool."

4. THE FORMULATION OF THE LAW MUST BE A CAREFUL, DELIBERATE PROCESS

Aristotle said that the law is reason free from passion. Where laws are enacted or amended with rash haste, passion, and the fever of the times may militate against their effectiveness and righteousness. This does not mean that legislatures must go at turtle pace, but rather that each proposed legislative item should be given the consideration which is its just due.

5. EXCESS LAW CAN HARM AS MUCH AS INSUFFICIENT LAW

"Quantity production tends to cheapen everything, including the law." "The more laws, the less justice," goes an old Proverb. "The more corrupt the state, the more numerous the laws," said Tacitus. Congress or any State legislature can do no greater harm than by wildly enacting a stack of laws for which there is no need nor justification.

6. THE PRACTITIONERS OF THE LAW DESERVE THE RESPECT OF THE PEOPLE

It is commonplace to jibe at the legal profession. "What would the devil say if he sat down between two lawyers?" asks the old gag. "Virtue in the middle!" Also, "A lawyer, like a wagon wheel, must be well greased." These jibes, though they may be justified for an insignificant minority of those who shame the legal profession by wearing its garb, are completely inapplicable and unjustified for the overwhelming mass of the practitioners of the law who respect the rights and privileges of their profession. To place the bar in disrepute is to place a grave handicap on the order of the Nation.

7. THE OCCUPANTS OF THE BENCH DESERVE THE HIGHEST RESPECT OF THE PEOPLE

Bugs Baer used to say that some politicians act as if they want "the best judges that money can buy." Yet, we know that where judges are for sale, either to foreign ideologies or to corrupt groups, the power of the law and the merit of the law are corrupted. The Good Book says, "Judge not according to the appearance but judge righteous judgment." The voice of the judge should be the voice of the law speaking and should be so recognized by the people.

8. LAW MUST BE EQUAL TO ALL—TO HIGH AND TO LOW

In some circles of Government, there has developed a feeling that "the powers that be" are immune to the law and can break the law. Lawmakers must not be lawbreakers. "Be you ever so high, the law is still above you," an old saying goes.

"The voice of nations, and the course of things,
Allow that laws are superior to kings."

9. THE SELF-RELIANCE OF THE PEOPLE IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN THEIR RELIANCE ON LAW FOR ECONOMIC GOOD

Theodore Roosevelt said, "It is difficult to make our material condition better by the best laws, but it is easy enough to ruin it by bad laws." Law is no panacea for the economic problems of the Nation; these must still be solved in the grass roots by the diligent efforts of an enlightened, courageous populace.

10. A LAW-ABIDING PEOPLE IS A HAPPY PEOPLE

There is no greater serenity nor peace of mind than that which comes to a free people which respects the law and because it respects the law, gladly observes it. In such a condition, the prosperity of a people, and the morale of a people can reach superb new levels.

These, then, are 10 legal commandments which America might follow toward the goal of a greater and ever sounder Nation.

United States of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States of Europe," which was written by me and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 6, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE—SENATOR FULBRIGHT ARGUES THAT SUCH A FEDERATION AMONG NATIONS NOT DOMINATED BY COMMUNISM WOULD BE EFFECTIVE STEP TOWARD CONTAINING RUSSIA, BRINGING PEACE, AND REVIVING THE CONTINENT

(By J. W. FULBRIGHT, United States Senator from Arkansas)

On March 21 Senator THOMAS of Utah and I introduced a concurrent resolution providing that the "Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations." On the same day a similar resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman BOGGS of Louisiana.

This is not a new idea. For centuries the leading thinkers and statesmen of the world have, from time to time, urged the creation of a federated Europe as the best method of bringing peace and prosperity to that unhappy region and as one of the essential conditions for a peaceful world.

We know that both world wars grew out of the conflicts which are inherent in the fragmented sovereignties of Europe. We should know that so long as this senseless conglomeration of separate political and economic entities exists there is little hope for the peace and prosperity of the world. We also know that the most propitious time to move forward is just after society has been disturbed by some great upheaval, leaving it in an unstable and fluid state. Europe is in that condition today, and the time is ripe for a change. It is our job to see that the change is forward, to a system of freedom and self-government, rather than backward, to slavery and tyranny.

NATIONS SHOULD DRAW UP A TENTATIVE CONSTITUTION

No one can tell at this time how this proposal will be received by the European countries. The practical thing to do would be for representatives of these countries to meet and draw up a tentative constitution for the consideration of their own people and the world. Only by formulating a specific proposal dealing with all the matters involved in a federal union can the ideas of the people crystallize and arrive at a reasonable judgment. If the Congress should adopt now Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, I think it would give impetus to the calling of such a constitutional convention.

It is, of course, certain that many people will dismiss the proposal as naive and utopian, but we should remember that all proposals that promise any significant improvement in human affairs have always been branded utopian. The United States of America was, in the beginning, branded utopian, and its failure predicted by those who, if they were here today, would look with derision upon this proposal.

For several centuries, under the Roman Empire, Europe was united. Later Charles the Great, in the ninth century, united all of Europe from Spain to the Elbe River under a single power. Europe has always been a cultural entity, and in the great days of the Renaissance national lines were not closely drawn. Culture was not French, or German, or Spanish, it was European. Since prehistoric days the inhabitants of Europe have belonged to the same white race whose branches are to be found in northern Africa and western Asia. They possessed a common primitive civilization going back to the neolithic age and the philologists tell us that, with one exception, all their languages are derived from a common mother tongue. Their political organizations and customs developed along similar lines and throughout their history were distinguishable from the servility which characterized oriental despotism.

Western Europe, exclusive of Russia, consists of a well-integrated economy and a land mass of approximately 2,000,000 square miles, with 300,000,000 inhabitants. Physically, racially, and culturally there is no insuperable obstacle to a reasonable federation of these peoples.

There are very special reasons why the people of the United States should consider at this time the re-creation of the unity which, in ancient days enabled the Europeans to live in relative peace and happiness. Already we have made, or are committed to make, enormous loans to the nations of Europe. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars feeding the people of Germany and the devastated countries. We are faced in the immediate future with the further obligation of supporting Greece and Turkey at great cost. But overshadowing all these obligations is the supreme interest that we have in creating a peaceful world. The primary reason for these loans and grants is the creation of a stable and orderly world in which we may live in peace, and yet we should know that money alone will not achieve our objective.

This proposal for a United States of Europe is not an idealistic dream to bring relief to the suffering people of Europe. Americans can be, if they are of a mind to be, sound, practical businessmen. As President Truman said recently, we have already invested

$341,000,000,000 in preventing tyranny from enveloping the world. In addition, we are committed to spending $600,000,000 annually to support Germany, many billions of loans to other European nations, and in the immediate future we probably shall undertake the support of Greece and Turkey. As practical people we may well ask ourselves, how do we finally work out from under these obligations?

There is no simple all-inclusive answer to this question, but one of the essential conditions to any solution is the re-establishment of industry and commerce within the framework of a stable political system. In the Near East and in Europe a prerequisite to the revival of trade and industry is a United States of Europe. Without a prosperous Europe to consume the produce of the Near East and other countries, and without the production of Europe's industry, I can see little hope for a revival of commerce on a substantial scale.

In Moscow at present, the representatives of the great powers are trying to find a solution to the problem of what to do with Germany. They are confronted with a dilemma. On the one hand all of Europe and the Near East is in need of the goods which Germany could produce. Without that production, the rehabilitation of those areas will be slow indeed. But, on the other hand, the great powers fear that if the industrial capacity of Germany is turned loose to produce at a maximum, for a third time, a militant Germany will emerge to attack the world.

Herbert Hoover in his recent report to the President effectively presented the case against the present policy in Germany. Under this so-called level-of-industry policy the industrial capacity of Germany is arbitrarily reduced. For example, with a capacity of 19,000,000 tons of steel she can produce 6,000,000 tons and the production of basic chemicals such as nitrogen, which can be used for fertilizer, is reduced to 40 per cent of prewar production.

Although we in the United States are short of these same articles we are forced to send to Germany huge supplies at the cost of the American taxpayer. In addition, the other countries of Europe are desperately in need of these articles and are unable to purchase them anywhere.

This inability to get fertilizer for food production and steel for reconstruction of worn-out factories is prolonging the chaotic conditions in Europe which is, I believe, one of the principal causes for the spread of communism. In desperation the people bargain away their freedom for a promise of food and employment. They do not know the promise is false, but they do know their hunger and idleness are real.

In the Near East we see another facet of the same problem. If we undertake the support of Greece and Turkey, how and when can we stop the lavish outpouring of our resources? We are not likely to stop it until those countries are self-supporting economically, which, in turn, will give them political stability. Before the war Turkey sold one-half, and Greece one-third, of her exports to Germany. Without the restoration of that market, it is improbable that either country can prosper and thereby relieve us of our burden.

FEDERATED EUROPE A WAY OUT OF DILEMMA

The way out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves is the creation of a United States of Europe. There are 14 states which are not yet dominated by the Communists. These states have a population of nearly 300,000,000 persons. If Germany should be reorganized as a federation of states, as she was before Bismarck, and these states then merged into a United States of Europe with 300,000,000 people, there would be little danger of a revival of German militarism and slight chance of her dominating the federation.

With the federalization of Europe would come freedom of commerce, the free movement of persons, a common currency, and efficient transportation. The result would be a rising standard of living and a lowering of the political rivalries and economic tensions which generate war.

If we grant that a United States of Europe is the answer to our dilemma we may then ask ourselves what are the prospects for its creation? It is to be expected that Russia will as usual oppose it. Such a federation would not threaten Russia, but it would, with the return of decent living conditions, put an end to the spread of communism in Europe. Russia's opposition, exerted through her influence on the Communist parties, especially in France, is the greatest obstacle to the achievement of federation. But even in France the Communists control less than 30 percent of the votes, and, therefore, with strong leadership in the democratic parties of France, she could take the lead in promoting the union. Although France is torn by internal dissension, I cannot believe that she is through as a great nation or that she will not develop again statesmen of the caliber of Jaurés or Briand, who advocated so eloquently the creation of a United States of Europe. If France should take the lead and is supported by this country and England, I think a federation could be created in spite of the possible opposition of Russia.

Russia has since the days of Tehran worked overtime the theme of her fear of aggression and concern for her own security.

But during the intervening years we have seen that by a combination of the Red army and the infiltration of her secret police she has acquired the domination of many smaller nations with more than 60 millions of people. She has professed a faith in the United Nations, but her actions in and out of that organization belie that profession. Her expansion already is so great that she threatens the power to survive of all other independent nations, except our own. If the United Nations is to have a chance to succeed as a voluntary union of peoples, it is imperative that, pending the realization of its objective, the existing power relationships among the great nations be preserved. This country cannot tolerate the expansion of Russia to the point where she controls, directly or indirectly, all the resources and manpower of Europe, Asia, and Africa. If that should come about no longer would there be an opportunity for a voluntary association of nations. The issue would certainly be decided by war. In seeking to maintain the integrity of Europe by federation, we would not threaten Russia's security, but we would make a substantial contribution to the ultimate success of the United Nations and incidentally assist Russia to develop the self-restraint which is so patently lacking in her present philosophy of government.

In any case, I think it has now become clear to us that Russia does not intend, if she can help it, to permit the rehabilitation of any European country, except under the aegis of the Communist party. I do not think she will go to war in the near future to enforce this policy, but she is prepared to bring the full force of her economic and propaganda power to bear on the issue.

Unless we are willing to write off Europe as a friend and supporter of democratic principles, it behooves us to use our economic power, and our talents of persuasion, to induce Europeans to create a free and democratic federation of states. Under such a union the world may again see a renaissance of culture, of freedom and of spiritual power which once before led the world out of the tyranny of the Dark Ages.

Socialism in France and England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful and timely address delivered in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 21, 1947, by Col. Robert R. McCormick.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As far back as I can remember, France was considered the most conservative of all countries. It was thought that her revolutions were past; the royalist and imperial parties merely historic organizations; the republic so strong that it could permit the use of titles as names, conferring no political or economic privileges; the land under the Code Napoleon widely held; most business small and remaining in the family from generation to generation; France was the leading nation in art, and was high in science. Her industries were in the luxury trades. She pioneered the high priced automobile to be run on the military roads, and after the Wrights invented the airplane, France developed it as an expensive sport. Although the people were freed, almost nothing was done by them in such things as plumbing, electrity, and household gadgets to improve their living conditions. They kept their earnings in cash or government bonds which became worthless with inflation.

Defeated in all of her grandiose conquests, France had learned to be self-supporting and was carrying on an unprofitable colonial policy of military conquest at high cost, as it was explained to me, to regain her military self-respect.

One thing we did not know was that her bureaucracy remained through all revolutions, continued to grow in size and to enjoy privileges over citizens not existent in America or England, privileges called the "administrative law." It was so harsh with dissidents that only men of revolutionary determination dared dissent.

I was in France in 1915 as a correspondent and as a soldier in 1917 and 1918. I billeted in French houses and served with French troops. If confirmation of the French reputation for solidity and conservatism had been needed, I would have furnished it.

We started a newspaper for the Army in 1917. We continued it for 10 years after the war, during every one of which I spent considerable time in France. Year by year I could see the growing degeneration of the French people. Wartime rent controls were continued, demoralizing tenants and preventing new building. The enormous bureaucracy was not liquidated. France continued conscription and a large army when it was not needed, and which had become obsolete and mutinous when it was needed. The victorious generals of 1918 were perniciously active to retain their war rank. Communism grew to the point where workmen would not produce weapons to be used against Hitler, then allied with Stalin.

Rescued by American arms, France has confiscated almost all wealth-producing properties, is operating them badly or not at all. The country is completely bankrupt

financially and morally, with no gleam of hope for recovery.

England, on the contrary, was, as Lord Curzon put it, a proud empire. Her wars of conquest had all been successful except our Revolutionary War. As much by diplomacy as by battle, she subdued her rivals—Spain, Holland, France, Russia, and Germany.

Britannia ruled the waves. Under this protection, beginning in the reign of Elizabeth, there came a great outpouring of chartered companies and other organizations for trade and conquest. Some of them developed into colonies, of which only the American colonies achieved independence. The India company, as we know, acquired a substantial part of India. Cecil Rhodes brought on the South African war and the conquest of South Africa. Other companies obtained extraterritoriality in China and in Turkey.

The industrial revolution begun in England gave that country a head start. The presence of coal, iron, and tin on the islands in close proximity furnished natural advantages, in trading with countries strong enough to resist aggression but backward in commerce and industry.

During the life of the Long Parliament and the Cromwell dictatorship, merchants controlled the government and greatly expanded British trade. When the Stuarts returned to power and afterward when the aristocracy took over under William and Mary, trade was again given every consideration to keep the middle class contented. With complete command of the sea, other nations could only trade by British sufferance and with some coercion were required to patronize British banks and British insurance. Britain could import and export whatever she wanted to.

The principle that competition is the life of trade did not find its way into British jurisprudence. No laws preventing restraint of trade or preventing railroad rebates were enacted. Special privilege and monopolies were a definite part of government policy. In consequence the nation became immensely rich with the riches in few hands.

In 1873, Joseph Medill, writing from England, said:

"Nothwithstanding the enormous, unprecedented riches of Great Britain, the distribution of the wealth is fearfully far from general or equal. There are now 1,000,000 poorhouse paupers in England, whose condition is depicted by Dickens. They literally enough constitute the 'undercrust' of English society. The 'upper-crust' number, perhaps, a hundred thousand families, or half as many persons as the paupers. One-third of these are born nobles, and own all the land; the other two-thirds were generally born rich, and own most of the residue of the property, in the form of buildings, improvements, ships, and railroads, stocks and bonds, goods and chattels, moneys and credits of all kinds. Between those extremes of absolute destitution and over-gorged affluence come the great toiling millions, who produced all the wealth and development. They live, as a whole, comfortably; but they have little or no accumulations, but, while self-supporting, subsist from hand to mouth as artisans, or on the product of each year's crops as farmers. They own no land, and few have a house they can call their own. They are all tenants, and the greater part laborers, depending on their weekly wages for means of existence. The tenant farmers number 500,000 families, who, by almost starving a million of hirelings, manage to pay their enormous rents and save a little money. Thus Great Britain is a land of extremes in everything. The British nation are the most industrious, frugal, enterprising, sagacious, pugnacious people on the face of the earth. They have the richest men in the world, and the largest number of paupers, and the greatest percent of landless persons."

It was the laws of primogeniture and entail that kept property in few hands.

As protection to themselves, the aristocrats allowed a few successful and rich people from the middle class to be elevated to lower grades of the nobility, up which their decendants could climb through the generations. Thus it became the objective of businessmen to seek success, in order to obtain titles and then retire from active business. As success was never an end in itself, there was little incentive to continue the improvement of an institution. Sons did not take pride in carrying on and enlarging the businesses of their fathers and grandfathers as with us. It was enough for the ennobled owner to ride along on the old momentum and avoid competition by the cartel system and by keeping wages at a minimum.

Life, with the court, the royal enclosure, fox hunting, polo, $1,500 hand-made shotguns for the exclusive use of landowners, was organized for the rich. Commissions in army and navy and livings in the church were confined to the ruling class.

Neglected and ignored, condemned to belong to the lower classes, the workmen became sullen. They refused to accept labor-saving machinery and produced less per man than any other workmen in the world. So strongly established was British control of world trade, however, that it prevailed until the blow of war set it on the road to ruin.

The adoption of free trade in 1853 deprived the treasury of much revenue. The owners of the distilleries and breweries, now in the aristocracy, were able to prevent substantial excise taxes. The system of income taxes was devised to maintain the Government. It operated to destroy the Empire.

Imperialism, the doctrine that wars were fought to make money for the insiders, was widely held in the early years of this century. When the English found themselves at war in 1914, because of a secret treaty, many of them thought that it was an imperial war. They failed to enlist, they went on strikes. As one means to conciliate public opinion heavy corporation and income taxes were imposed. So heavy were they and so small was the output of English labor that England, the great trading and manufacturing country, could no longer compete in the world markets. Foreign investments made in previous years were sold to finance the war so that that form of income disappeared. While the war did not come to the island in appreciable extent, considerable wealth in shipping was lost. Drained of capital by these losses, which could not be made good because of overtaxation, the British could not replace obsolete equipment or start any new industries. In 1932 the cartel system, the German and Italian forerunners of fascism, was adopted. Under this system each industry undertook to regulate the quality, quantity, and price of the output of each of its members. In the case of the E. B. B. W. Vale Steel Co., that company borrowed money from the Bank of England to build a steel mill on the American pattern. The bank named the competitors of the bank to a majority of the places on the board and they held down the output of the only modern steel factory in England.

The aristocratic system had run its course. A revolutionary election put in the present Socialist government, which is confiscating all property. An interesting side light on this Government is that half of its members are from the aristocracy. The aristocracy cannot demean themselves by entering private trade, but they may operate business conducted by the Government without loss of face, but they don't know how to. The character of the government is illustrated by the following:

A farmer named George Milton Odlum owned a model farm in Wiltshire, stocked with an exceptional herd of Friesian cattle. From the outbreak of the war in 1939 Odlum was bedeviled by Government regulations, promulgated by the Ministry of Agriculture under R. S. Hudson and applied by the county war agricultural committee. By April 1942 when he had been forced by the committee to part with three-quarters of his herd, Odlum was thoroughly discouraged. At this time, opportunely, a buyer for the farm turned up.

This was none other than Hudson, the minister of agriculture. Odlum named his price for the farm (about $240,000) and Hudson closed the deal with him. On that very same day, a member of the local war agricultural committee directed Odlum to restock his farm with cattle. He was instructed to buy enough to fill his No. 1 shed which would hold 100 cows. Odlum protested the inconsistency of being forced to sell his quality herd and then being directed to restock mongrel cows which might be diseased. Apparently, however, he complied before Hudson took over the farm 3 months later.

Odlum at no time had recourse under the law. His life was made miserable by the application of the ministry's orders by Hudson's local bureaucrats. In addition, the local committee had power to seize his farm if charges of inefficiency could be proved to the satisfaction of the minister—Hudson himself. He was muscled out of his farm by a cabinet officer coveting that particular farm of all the farms in England.

The scandal finally reached the courts through an action brought by Odlum for libel against one of Hudson's agents. By the time the case was heard, Hudson had been in possession of the farm for 4 years and the libel itself was 3 years old. The hearing developed the facts as to discriminatory treatment against Odlum and preferential treatment accorded Hudson by the minister's own appointed bureaucrats. Justice Atkinson, who rendered judgment for Odlum, expressed amazement when it emerged during the hearing that the ministry of agriculture had undertaken to indemnify the defendant agent of the ministry.

"Why the country should be made to pay the damages," he said, "I do not know."

How terrifying is the government is shown by the fact that the London newspapers did not cover the trial, except for brief stories about the judgment.

The country is bankrupt and only subsisting on American charity.

Having traced the course of France and England into socialism, tending to communism, let us see whether the same movement under way in the United States can be arrested. I hope so.

America began departing from European ways with the colonial settlements. People left Europe to get away from Europe. This movement was greatly accelerated by the Restoration. While in England the Restoration put a graded society in charge, with its doctrines of privilege and exploitation, which, as we have seen, was only ended by the recent political revolution; in America the Puritan movement continued to grow. Excesses in this country have been excesses of puritanism, not of aristocracy.

Virginia, the most British of the Colonies, developed the republican theory to a greater extent than any of the other colonies and led all the others in the revolution and separation. The rights of man were adopted as the principles of the country. The privilege of the established church was abolished. Belief in a certain form of government was no longer prescribed by religion. Entails and primogeniture were done away with. Property was divided every generation either by will or relationship. Every man was given an equal chance in life.

During the colonial period, when enterprise was held down, development was all in

the political field. With the coming of freedom, economic improvements began almost instantly. What kinds of improvements were they? Improvements not for the few, but for the many. First came the cotton gin, removing the toil of making cotton. Then the reaper, saving the men and women on the farm from the back-breaking toil of harvesting. The steel plow opened up the prairies to ownership.

The railroads were conceived to benefit the seaboard cities and, of course, to earn profits, but they brought the farmers' products to the market and immigrants to the land. They supplanted the immigrants' wagons and the stage coach. We who accept them as a matter of course should read Mark Twain's panageric over this marvelous invention less than a century ago. Plumbing, almost unknown abroad, is almost universal here. The stove, converted into the furnace, has broken the back of winter for everyone. The telephone is an apparent luxury. A hundred million phone calls a day attest its wide use.

Petroleum was developed to put a lamp on every table, and when the lamp gave way to the superior electric-light bulb, petroleum remained to drive the automobiles, and what automobiles! Not Rolls Royces, Mercedes, Panhards, at great price, but Fords, Plymouths, and Pontiacs, reached by the purse of almost everyone. They brought in concrete roads for everyone to enjoy, not for cannon to pound over.

With small beginnings, the producers of these popular articles had to amass capital to enable them to meet the demand for their product. It is well known that Henry Ford began with subscriptions of $28,000. The last time I was here in 1933 Harry Chandler told me how he and a number of other forward-looking Los Angeles men endorsed Donold Douglas' note for $10,000 each to start his modest factory. The next day I went to the factory and saw the first DC2 under construction. These examples are typical of all the industrial developments that have created our civilization. Very few men produced them all. In addition to the leaders I have mentioned, you easily think of Edison and Westinghouse, and of Wright, but do you know of Igor Sikorski? You may not know who Roebling was. You have never heard of Curtis, who made newsprint possible. Do you remember Selden, inventor of the automobile, or Hughes, of the electric stove? Pullman, who did so much to make Chicago and modern travel, is only remembered for the obstinacy he developed in old age. Supply all the names you can think of. How many are there? The men who created our industrial civilization, our American way of life, are numbered in the hundreds—not even the thousands. They could do it because they had been freed from aristocratic suppression and had not run into demagogic suppression.

The accumulations necessary to production inevitably made their possessors rich, many times richer than the bulk of the people, and made them a cause for envy, upon which demagogs like the Roosevelts and Huey Longs played for their political gain. Slogans were invented to outcry reason. Taxation according to ability to pay developed into confiscation. Share the wealth turned out to be share the poverty.

All advance, as I have said, is the creation of few men, inspired in their respective fields. All the rest benefit from their genius. The car builder benefits me far more than I him. Years ago I used to make frequent trips to Buffalo and put up at its poor hotels. One day I found that a first-class Statler hotel had been erected. The last thing in the world I would care to do would be to collect a string of hotels, but I am more the beneficiary of the man who does than he is.

Now we have come to the point where there cannot be any more such men, there cannot be any more Ford factories or Douglas airplane works or Statler hotels. From now on the men who have ideas for the betterment of human life will not be able to put them into force, for they will not be allowed to accumulate the money necessary to production. There will be no new industries. There will be no new instruments.

Inevitably existing ones will gradually die off with nothing to take their place. That is the road down which we are traveling. How fast I am not prepared to say.

Both the French and English civilizations went to pieces in about 30 years. Yet without the causes which brought about their decline we may proceed just as fast to our doom—or not necessarily so. The evils which were so apparent in them have not existed here. If men of vision will have the courage to explain and expound, we may get a change in the tax laws which, in the present state of public ignorance, Congressmen are not courageous enough to write.

Isn't this modern and progressive community the place to start such education?

The Lilienthal Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 11 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Lilienthal Debate Ends," from the Philadelphia Inquirer of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LILIENTHAL DEBATE ENDS

After many weeks of stormy debate, the Senate's confirmation of David E. Lilienthal as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission came as an anticlimax.

The Senators had talked themselves out on the issue. And for all practical purposes decision had been reached a week earlier when Senator BRICKER'S motion to return the nominations to committee indefinitely was rejected by a 14-vote margin.

The opposition to Lilienthal, headed by the aged feudist from Tennessee, Senator MCKELLAR, was distinguished by its ineptness as much as by its bitterness. It failed to produce one sound reason why the appointment should be overturned.

It is true that President Truman could have made a much less controversial choice for this important post. Because of grudges held against Lilienthal since his TVA days, opposition to his confirmation was certain.

Once the nomination was made, however, Lilienthal was entitled to confirmation unless his incompetence or unworthiness for the job was demonstrated. But the only things brought against him were irrelevancies.

Now that he and his associates on the Commission can go ahead with their duties after weeks of precious time lost in the Senate, they should be given every possible support. Development of atomic energy has taken on such an importance to this country as to baffle the imagination. We cannot afford to see it hampered by petty political sniping.

Need for Aviation Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an address delivered by our distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE]. Although it embraces some points on which I have not yet completed my study so as to take a final position, it bespeaks such sincerity and loftiness of motive that I feel we can all profit by a reading of the able gentleman's remarks, which follow:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE AT THE CONNECTICUT AIR POWER CONFERENCE IN BUSHNELL MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM, HARTFORD, CONN., APRIL 13, 1947

Members of the American Legion, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am glad to be with you here tonight in the great capital city of Hartford. I am honored to be on the same platform with such distinguished speakers. I regard it as a rare privilege to be asked to participate in the activities of the Connecticut Air Power Conference.

Our gathering here tonight demonstrates our deep and abiding interest in air power. But it has another more sinister, more ominous meaning. It means that we are worried. We are worried because our aviation which played a decisive part in the winning of World War II is now but a tattered remnant of its former self. We are worried because we know that aviation is constantly growing and changing and that, therefore, we should be exerting constantly greater efforts to perfect the great flying machines which we already have and to create new types of aircraft. We are worried because less than 2 years after the end of the war, our military aviation is falling behind not only that of Russia but also that of Britain.

The eminent aviation experts on this platform are far more competent than I to discuss the present predicament in which American military, naval, and industrial aviation finds itself. I do not intend to talk about the technical details of aviation. I shall deal with it rather in terms of our foreign relations. But I cannot refrain from saying that the rapid, not to say headlong, deterioration of our air power is a cause for serious concern. It is time that we brought this vital element in our national defense in line with our international commitments. Our air power must be a reflection of the turbulent crisis in which we are called upon to play a leading part.

Let us briefly examine some of the basic factors in the air picture as it exists today in America.

First, it is essential that we have an alert and intensive program of research and development. At the end of World War II we were, I am reliably informed, five to ten years behind the Germans in many categories of air power. This was particularly true with respect to jet propulsion, advanced air dynamics, and the development of guided missiles. In air armament and aerial torpedoes even the Japanese were ahead of America and the Japanese received their knowledge from the Germans. Today we are even further behind than at the close of the war. Russia captured from Germany many valuable installations, the invaluable supersonic wind tunnels and most of the other research and laboratory equipment. In addition, the Russians captured German records and German scientists. I am in-

formed that these German scientists are treated with the greatest hospitality and care by the Russians. If the Russians, whose standard of living ranks twenty-sixth in the world and who are suffering from the devastation of war, can afford an extended program of research and development surely we with the highest standard of living in the world, we who have suffered no devastation, can afford to do far more than we are doing in this field. In any event, I conceive it to be a matter of imperative necessity.

Secondly, it is vital that we have a readily expansible aviation industry. You have been told by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air about the Air Coordinating Committee's recommendations. The minimum yearly production which would enable the aviation industry to expand to war mobilization needs was fixed at 3,400 planes weighing 37,000,000 air frame pounds. As a matter of fact, this was the minimum estimate for a peaceful partially disarmed world. According to General Echols, former Assistant Chief of Air Staff, Matériel, and Services, a total of 1,330 military planes and 467 transports were produced in 1946. This "was worse than in peacetime 1939" when we built 2,500 aircraft. He said: "If something isn't done about the situation, and quickly, we are going to be right back to the point we reached after World War I when we had only three manufacturers in the business." He goes on to estimate that we are now turning out approximately 400 engines a month, half of which are produced by a single company. He points out also that most of our heavy aircraft industry is operating in the red and that if this continues there is great danger that little will be left of its productive capacity. Our skilled aviation workers will be dispersed and we shall lose the nucleus of industrial organization and expansion which we built up during the war. This is a matter which concerns the military, labor, and industry. Most of all, it concerns the American people.

I am not suggesting that, now that the war is over, we should maintain fifty or one hundred thousand planes. Indeed, if other nations are ahead of us merely in quantity there is perhaps not too much to complain about. We know that planes become obsolete very quickly. But it is vital that we should achieve predominance in the quality of our planes and in the ability to convert rapidly and readily to the production of new aircraft of every kind.

The gravity of this situation can hardly be overestimated. I feel sure that when it is exposed to the pitiless rays of publicity it will come as a shock to most Americans. Yet it is but a symptom of our reluctance to recognize the world crisis in the light of its grim actualities. Day by day almost imperceptibly, we are sliding back into our prewar condition. Now, of course, there is no reason for us to devote such a large part of our national effort to the maintenance of armed forces as we did during the war. It is important that many expenses of Government be curtailed, that payments be made on the national debt in order to diminish inflationary pressure, and that people be granted some relief from burdensome income taxes. This is important not only as a stimulus to expanding production but as an aid to morale. We must cut down taxes on ambition—curbs on incentives—which place a premium on idleness rather than on productive work, which encourage reliance on government rather than self-reliance. The income-tax reduction bill, already passed by the House, attempts to do this also by providing substantial additional relief for 30,000,000 people in the low-income group.

But it would be suicidal folly for us to pretend that because World War II is over, we are not living in a period of conflict. We know better than that and we shall ignore the relentless realities of this troubled planet at our peril.

It seems unjust that we who have so recently emerged from a titanic struggle should so soon again be compelled to face these inexorable facts. In spite of the blessings with which we are surrounded in our beloved America, we are a tragic generation. The countless felicities which abound in our land make it hard for us to turn our faces toward the bitter hatreds, the rivalries, the despair and cynicism, and the tangled web of human relations of a prostrate and ravaged Europe. We have won two world wars but we have not yet gained a pattern of international relations which enables us to deal in words rather than in power. Until this has come to pass, it is essential that we think in terms of our national self-interest not only for the preservation of America but because a vigorous America is the best hope of the world. In 1778 Thomas Paine said, "The cause of America is, in large measure, the cause of all mankind." This is as wonderfully true today as it was then. Accordingly, while it behooves us to continue our efforts to achieve peace through the medium of the United Nations, in the creation of which our country took the lead, it is urgent that we understand that the United Nations is at this point in its development powerless to deal with many of the more critical and explosive issues which beset this tired world.

It is in this light that we should regard the proposed aid to Greece and Turkey. If we had confronted the United Nations with this problem, we would have asked it to do a thing for which it has neither the resources nor the power. This might have well ruined the United Nations before it had a chance to gather strength.

The proposed aid to Greece and Turkey is not a relief measure. It is a strategical measure which may be regarded as directed toward the accomplishment of the following principal objectives:

1. To protect Greece and Turkey, at their request, from coercive foreign pressures and thus allow them to evolve under their own impetus toward a more abundant life.

2. The safeguarding of our own national interest and national security by our efforts to contain the totalitarian forces which, in spite of the war's end, are still very much on the march.

3. The maintenance of world peace, not by the policy of abject appeasement, which failed so woefully at Munich in 1938, but by a policy predicated on the thought of Abraham Lincoln that we should be at once "compromising and stern." Compromising in order to reach a modus vivendi and stern in our efforts to safeguard the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which were agreed to by us and our allies.

4. To act in defense of the United Nations Charter by giving effect to the policies set forth in its preamble until the United Nations shall have gained sufficient cohesive strength to act on its own.

There can be no doubt in the mind of a dispassionate observer that the United States has no intention of embarking on a course of world conquest. We want to conquer war. But we still feel that the slogan "peace at any price" is as obsolete as the horse-drawn street car. Americans have never been the self-indulgent pleasure-loving pacifists they were thought to be by our enemies in World War II. We gave these traducers of our national character the lie on every battlefield of the world. There are things worse than war and one of those things is abject surrender to the forces of darkness, despotism and reaction, which as always in the past, constitute a threat to the forces of light and freedom and brotherhood on which our great Nation was founded. Yes; there are things worse than war, horrible though war is. Surely we are not so tired that we are ready to deliver ourselves and our friends into slavery. Surely having fought through World War II, at a tragic cost in human lives and a gigantic cost in National treasure, we are not now prepared to sit on the side lines while the beacon light of freedom flickers and dies. Certainly we, the inheritors of the great traditions which launched America on her dynamic adventure, will not foreclose a free future for our children by a loss of faith at this perilous time. Surely we realize that a passion for peace will not protect us from war. Our readiness to fight for our faith will be a greater deterrent of war than our willingness to surrender now what we fought the war to preserve.

This is indeed a sickening time for us who have so recently emerged from the tragedy and devastation of war. But it is also a challenge. It is a challenge to accept the leadership, which is being thrust into our hands as a result of the determining part we played in the war. It is a challenge to bring our moral force in line with our industrial power. It is a challenge to every man and woman in America to discharge their peacetime responsibilities as citizens in order that we shall not at some future date be called upon to perform our relentless duty in another more formidable war. World War I and II were caused, in large part, by German miscalculation as to what America might do. Let there be no miscalculation now. Let it be resoundingly clear that there are certain principles from which we will not depart; that there are certain ideals which we regard as more precious than life; that we believe mightily in our own faith and in the timelessness of the great truths on which our country was founded.

During the recent war an old poem was, from time to time, revived as Americans went off to battle:

"Though reason chafe and love repine,
There came a voice without reply,
'Tis man's perdition to be safe,
When for the truth he ought to die."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is vital, nay it is urgent, that we who survive live according to these truths, in order that future generations of Americans shall not perish in an atomic apocalypse born of our own weakness. If we here in this blessed land can give a vigorous demonstration that we believe deeply in the dignity of the individual, that we are as alert to assume our obligations as we are to exercise our rights, and that we value freedom more than security then I say to you, our light will shine forth for all the world to see. Then we shall have achieved the only real, the only worthy security which man can achieve, the security which comes from the knowledge that our strength, a strength based on a dynamic faith and buttressed by massive power will be exercised in the cause of peace and freedom.

Congress Slow? That's Good!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following timely article appearing in the April 23 issue of Pathfinder magazine, written by Wheeler McMillen, able and well-respected editorial director of that excellent publication:

CONGRESS SLOW? THAT'S GOOD!

"He has the slows," President Lincoln once said of General McClellan. People are making the same complaint about Congress.

"You fellows were elected to change things. We sent you down there to economize, cut taxes, fix up the labor laws, and straighten the country out. For nearly 3 months you have been talking. How about some 'acts'?"

In language more or less polite than that, citizens are repeating the complaint. The first 3 months have, in fact, seen few major laws enacted.

The "slowness" of Congress is good rather than bad. The country ought to congratulate Congress upon taking its time.

True, the problems are great and many are urgent. They require, because they are great and urgent, the ablest solutions man can devise.

Thorough study by individual Members, exhaustive inquiry and discussion in committees, and ample debate on the House and Senate floors are essential to wise lawmaking. Minds that clash have to find their way to agreement. The effect of every word of law has to be weighed.

Otherwise the country will get hasty legislation. It may be recalled that 17 acts hurriedly passed in 1933-36 were carried to the Supreme Court. Fourteen of these were declared unconstitutional. One was that masterpiece of hurry-up, the NRA. Presented on May 18, it was reported to the House May 23 and enacted May 26.

This Eightieth Congress faced several time-using hurdles on the opening day. The Reorganization Act imposed numerous changes in set-up and procedure. It took time to work those out. A new majority, long out of power, had to organize and prepare for work. The Bilbo episode delayed the Senate.

Impatient citizens do not always allow for the fact that the Congress majority holds views that the President, on partisan lines, may choose to oppose. While a technical majority prevails, and may pass a bill, the President can exercise his veto. Then two-thirds must vote to support the bill or it is lost.

For that reason alone the Republican majority seeks to bring forth legislation sound enough and fair enough to attract support from Democrats in the event of a veto. Otherwise, even on such vital matters as tax, economy, and labor measures the Nation might get none of the changes the election called for.

Also, fortunately, this country supports no dictatorships, not even by a majority. Several million Americans did not vote for a change. The representation of minorities is no less important in the American system than is the rule by majority.

Senator ED THYE, of Minnesota, has reminded critics of the new Congress that building a house appears to be a slow and disorderly procedure. The materials have to be assembled, the basement dug, and foundations laid. At that point the owner who looks at his crowded and littered property wonders what sort of mess he has on his hands. Eventually things begin to take shape. But it may be quite a while before the lawn can be seeded.

So, says Mr. THYE, the materials and plans now being assembled on the legislative lot will in proper time become an orderly structure. His comparison is a good one.

What Americans want we usually think we want right now. Nevertheless we would rather have a competent, high-quality job done than a quick and careless one.

Decisions made by this Congress will, in some cases, affect history for generations. Most of them are too important to too many people to be made hastily.

Let Congress take its time. Let the Members debate each issue fully. Enough human errors will be made at best.

And even if every law passed proves to be the top of perfection, society will have a few ills left that Government cannot cure.

Letter to Hon. Wright Patman, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter which pays a fine tribute to Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, our colleague from Texas. The letter was written to Representative PATMAN by Hon. Carl Estes, a leading Texas publisher, of Longview, Tex.

The letter follows:

DALLAS, TEX., *April 11, 1947.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress from Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WRIGHT: You have for years done more for the people in your district than any other man in the Congress of the United States I have ever known—either Democrat or Republican.

For years you have done far more than anyone I know for both veterans of World Wars I and II.

Ever since you left the pine-clad red hills of our beloved east Texas over there around Hughes Springs and went to the marble Halls of Congress, you have constantly been the watchman in the tower for all east Texas—never passing up an opportunity to help us all—rich and poor, white and colored union or nonunion, New Dealers and antis (like me).

Your latest successful fight against the big United States Steel Trust, in which you will make possible more jobs for the people of east Texas, more pay rolls for our merchants, and more development of another of our great natural resources—iron ore—deserves the everlasting gratitude of every living soul in not only east Texas but the entire State as well, and I just wanted to write you and tell you how grateful to you I am for your Lone Star steel battle.

You have done the most remarkable job of any man in Congress in our generation. I have seen you spend your own money and even the time after normal working hours in this fight, just as you fought for housing for the veterans of the entire Nation. Truly Texas and the Nation are grateful and appreciative of what you are doing for all of us.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to my own Congressman, the Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH, with a request that he have same printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

CARL L. ESTES,
President, Estes Publications.

Our National Prosperity Is Dependent on Our Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman CARL ANDERSEN, inserted a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in regard to the apparent drive to bring about lower prices for commodities. In this statement he pointed out that for 25 years we have had approximately $7 of national income for each $1 of gross farm income.

A man from my State, Carl H. Wilken, a common-sense economic analyst for the Raw Materials National Council of Sioux City, Iowa, has carried on 10 years of research work in connection with this factual relationship. Ever since I have been a Member of Congress he has been calling the attention of congressional committees to its importance.

In 1944, the Country Gentleman, after a thorough check of Mr. Wilken's analysis, published an article in their December issue of that year entitled "The Key to Prosperity." I have checked this relationship of farm income and national income. It makes sense to me, and I feel that Mr. Wilken has performed a great service for the American people if we will but act on his suggestions.

In my opinion, we as Members of Congress have been negligent, in not using it as a yardstick for legislation. The ratio has never been refuted by any economist or anyone else and has remained unchanged in periods of prosperity, depression, war, and even in spite of legislation has been passed and made law.

It makes a science of our economy instead of a lot of confused theories. The need of such a yardstick is apparent from the underestimation of our national income by our Government experts in 1946 of approximately $25,000,000,000. This error, for example, resulted in approximately $5,000,000,000 more of revenue for the Treasury than they expected.

These same experts are now sending out propaganda that prices must come down. They are flirting with disaster for the Nation. The ratio, I have mentioned proves that a drop of 10 percent in our price level for agricultural products sets the stage for a 10-percent loss in national income. With $260,000,000,000 of national debt and a minimum Federal expense load of at least $30,000,000,000 annually, we need to have what they term as high farm prices if we are to survive as a Nation.

A few short years ago, in 1940, we had a national income of approximately $77,000,000,000 or only twice that of the fiscal year 1948 budget the President has asked for. At that time we had a national deficit and 8,000,000 unemployed because there was not enough income created by our farm production. Now when we have for the first time a balanced budget, these theorists want to reduce prices and destroy the income for national solvency.

We have made that error in the past. The cry "we must come back to normalcy" in 1920 precipitated the depression that closed many of our banks and forced many individuals into bankruptcy. In 1929 the world was forced into another era of low prices for farm products. This brought on the socialized planned

economy here and the growth of similar ideologies all over the world.

At the present time the world is threatened with communism. The cure for communism is prosperity and there is no other. The formula of $1 of gross farm income which creates $7 of national income is the yardstick which Mr. Wilken has uncovered in his research work and given to us for guidance.

In the period 1930–41 the United States had farm prices at a level which forced agriculture to lose a total of $67,500,000,000. The seven times turn of farm income forced the Nation to suffer a loss of $473,000,000,000 in 12 years of peacetime economy. By permitting farm prices to drop back to 1940 levels the period which the Department of Agriculture usually discusses could mean an annual loss in national income up to $90,000,000,000. It would mean disaster. The Republican Party must not and will not let it happen regardless of pressure from any source.

I have had Mr. Wilken tabulate the expenditures for food, clothing, housing, and household operation the necessary items of living costs. The figures cover the period 1929–45 and they prove to my mind the complete accuracy of the 1–7 formula. As farm prices increase the per capita income increases and the cost of living does not increase, on the basis of per capita income created. As farm prices drop the percentage spent from the national income for the four necessary items—food, clothing, housing, and household operation—increases and as prices go higher the percentage spent for costs of living decreases. For example in 1932 the year of low farm prices the American public had to spend 85 percent of its income for the items I have mentioned while in 1942 with the same price level as in 1929 they spent only 49.2 percent.

This may all seem like a paradox and it is just the reverse of much of the economic thinking. To prove it let us apply common sense. Our Nation today has full employment and we have now the greatest per capita consumption of food and clothing in the history of the Nation. Given the opportunity and a continuance of our present prices we will build more new homes, more new cars, and so forth, in the next 10 years than any period in the history of the United States. Yes, we will even have the income to help other nations less fortunate. But should this cry for lower prices result in a loss of income, then we can again soon head into another depression with its unemployment and economic chaos.

I feel that it is time for us to throw off this confusion and develop a program under which we can assure our producers in the mine, in the factory, and on the farm that they will receive a stable and lasting price for their production and that we intend to do away with any and all war powers which give any department of Government the power to bring about price levels which mean poverty to our people. The free movement of trade at a proper price level must be maintained so that production will create prosperity.

Year	Expenditures for food	National income	Percent of national income
	Billions	*Billions*	
1929	$19.0	$83.3	22.8
1930	18.5	68.8	26.9
1931	15.4	54.4	27.7
1932	12.1	39.9	30.3
1933	11.4	42.3	27.0
1934	12.5	49.4	25.3
1935	13.9	55.7	24.9
1936	15.2	64.9	23.4
1937	16.2	71.5	22.5
1938	15.1	64.2	23.3
1939	15.3	70.8	21.5
1940	16.5	77.8	21.2
1941	19.0	95.6	19.8
1942	23.8	121.5	19.5
1943	27.6	147.9	18.8
1944	30.4	160.7	18.8
1945	31.8	161.0	19.7

Year	Expenditures for clothing and shoes	National income	Percent of national income
	Billions	*Billions*	
1929	$11.1	$83.3	13.3
1930	9.7	68.8	14.0
1931	8.3	54.4	15.2
1932	6.2	39.9	15.5
1933	5.6	42.3	13.2
1934	6.6	49.4	13.4
1935	7.2	55.7	12.9
1936	7.7	64.9	11.8
1937	7.9	71.5	11.0
1938	7.8	64.2	12.1
1939	8.3	70.8	11.7
1940	8.8	77.8	11.3
1941	10.3	95.6	10.7
1942	12.5	121.5	10.3
1943	14.7	147.8	9.9
1944	16.1	160.7	10.0

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce. Figures for 1945 and 1946 not available.

Year	Expenditures for housing	National income	Percent of national income
	Billions	*Billions*	
1929	$11.2	$83.3	13.4
1930	10.8	68.8	15.7
1931	10.1	54.4	18.5
1932	8.8	39.9	22.0
1933	7.7	42.3	15.8
1934	7.4	49.4	14.9
1935	7.5	55.7	13.4
1936	7.8	64.9	12.0
1937	8.3	71.5	11.6
1938	8.6	64.2	13.3
1939	8.8	70.8	12.4
1940	9.1	77.8	11.7
1941	9.6	95.6	10.0
1942	10.1	121.5	8.3

Year	Expenditures for household operations	National income	Percent of national income
	Billions	*Billions*	
1929	$11.0	$83.3	13.2
1930	9.9	68.8	14.3
1931	8.7	54.4	16.0
1932	6.9	39.9	17.2
1933	6.7	42.3	15.8
1934	7.5	49.4	15.1
1935	8.0	55.7	14.3
1936	9.0	64.9	13.8
1937	9.6	71.5	13.4
1938	9.0	64.2	14.0
1939	9.7	70.2	13.7
1940	10.6	77.8	13.6
1941	12.3	95.6	12.8
1942	13.2	121.5	10.8

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce. Figures for 1943–46 not available.

President Asks for Another Round of Wage Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 25, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. President Harry S. Truman's remarks to reporters about the current high price level were interpreted generally by observers in Washington as a rather flagrant invitation for labor union leaders to seek another round of wage increases.

More thoughtful labor leaders have been holding the line against the demagoguery of a few radical labor union men who wanted to press for much higher increases this year. Now, the President has played into the hands of the radical element. Any wave of strikes, thus, can be traced to the White House itself.

Mr. Truman, like his immediate predecessor as President, seems to have developed a very convenient memory. His economic advisers are not ignorant men, but they, too, seem to overlook the same fact as they call on business and industry to lower prices and subtly blame the Republicans for helping keep up the high prices.

Certain fundamental facts of fiscal life may as well be faced by the American people. Thus facts, deliberately overlooked by Democratic propagandists generally, are:

First. This Nation has the largest public debt of any nation in the world. This debt is 10 times as high as the debt following World War I. It is the Democratic legacy to the people—and it alone would assure high prices for years to come.

Second. Government expenditures, because of administration pressure, remain higher than ever in history. Despite the cuts that will be made by Republicans—over the vehement opposition of all New Dealers—Government expenditures will remain from two to three times higher than in the prewar period.

Third. The Democratic administration has embarked on a policy of feeding overseas panhandlers who pretend to be against communism. Under Secretary of State Will Clayton frankly admits that the Greek gift is an extension of lend-lease, but note that the same administration which now wants to turn lend-lease against Russia spent billions on lend-lease for Russia.

Fourth. American industry admittedly has been making higher-than-normal profits, but if all the profits of industry were eliminated, there would not be more than a 10-percent cut in prices—almost insignificant in view of the actual rise in prices since 1939. And the same labor leaders to whom President Truman threw out his invitation to disaster by OK'ing their strikes in advance are the very men who have made the present high prices inevitable. They do not

really want lower prices—they merely want a bigger slice of the national income pie. Generally, they want to get it from the public, for they realize that management's part of the pie in the long run, is generally not too high.

Fifth. President Truman, as he hints that industry and the Republicans are to blame for high prices, forgets that it was he, himself, who last June vetoed the only workable OPA bill that could be gotten through Congress. By his veto, he made inevitable the OPA holiday and the confusion that followed. This confusion and price tangle caused the demise of OPA.

If the people only will remember a few facts of recent history as they pay the highest prices in history for goods, they can correctly place the blame for their troubles. If they listen to the half-truths of demagogs, they will become further confused and will acquiesce in other policies that inevitably will but compound their sorrows.

The Republican program for meeting inflation is a sound one. It has stood the test of time. It is to cut Federal expenses, to keep our overseas spending to a minimum, to encourage industry to produce, to keep the heavy hand of Government out of business and to keep both labor and business out of Government. If the people support that program, there is still hope. If they do not, we are long gone down the road to perpetual chaos and fiscal insolvency, with all the heartaches and disillusionment such a policy has brought to other peoples in other climes in other days.

Let us face the facts—and let us be brave enough to recognize that only by back-breaking toil can America be saved.

We Need More Rural Electrification Lines, More Poles, More Wires, More Switches To Avail Ourselves of the Great Quantities of Cheap Power Now at Hand and Transmit This Low Cost Energy to Every Farmer in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, there is probably no bill that comes before Congress which so completely cuts across party lines and receives greater support from Members on both sides of the aisle than does the annual appropriation for rural electrification.

In my long service in this House I know of no bill to which my colleagues—without regard to sectionalism or political differences—give a greater measure of thought, time, effort, and study than they annually bestow upon the matter of financing of rural electric lines.

This interest which gave rise to the original passage of the Rural Electrification Act, has continued to find support for every beneficent thought that any Member could bring to bear in extending the great benefits of cheap electric power to all citizens on farms in rural America.

Every last man in this House is proud of the little part he played in fostering and effectuating the purpose of the act. The membership as a whole are constantly and zealously on guard to see that the administration of upward of the $1,000,000,000 they placed at the disposal of the Rural Electrification Administrator are ever and always judiciously handled. It is altogether fitting and proper that they continue to give it this scrutiny inasmuch as this House has constituted in the REA, one of the greatest single industries in our Nation—an industry fostered and annually refueled with funds appropriated from the Federal Treasury itself.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. Maury A. McWilliams, president of the Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc. Mr. McWilliams is also president of the State Wide Alabama Rural Electric Co-ops as well as a director in the National Association of Electric Cooperatives.

The Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., as well as other electric cooperatives, is not a rural-electrification cooperative, which we in this House ordinarily understand such an association to be. It is rather a sort of parent organization or a kind of a super co-op. It is engaged in generating and brokering operations in buying and selling electric power to a number of regular rural electrification distribution cooperatives.

It was originally organized in our State to take over what we in this body remember as the old Hopson power interests or the Alabama Water Service Co. You will recall that the old holding company was compelled to sell these holdings under an order from the Securities and Exchange Commission and the death-penalty clause.

As you also remember, there was some criticism at that time not alone as to the price paid but as to the economic soundness, as well as the wisdom of acquiring these old properties, some 3 or 4 years back. I am advised, however, that despite the uphill pull of maintaining them in operation that under the leadership of Mr. Maury A. McWilliams, the properties are still operating and that the board itself is doing a comparably fine job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was most happy to receive a letter from Mr. McWilliams, and I will, with your permission at this point, introduce into the RECORD both Mr. McWilliams' letter to me and my response:

ALABAMA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Andalusia, Ala., March 14, 1947.
Congressman FRANK BOYKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOYKIN: Appreciate your going along with us fellows on our expansion Alabama Electric Cooperative, I remember you telling me that you were for REA 100 percent.

We in REA in Alabama—and there are nearly 100,000 now—appreciate your help, and know that you will continue to support us.

Trank you, Mr. Frank.

MAURY A. MCWILLIAMS,
President.

P. S.—As president, State-wide, Alabama director in national association, it is a pleasure to tell the REA consumers who our friends and ENEMIES are.

MAURY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1947.
Mr. MAURY A. MCWILLIAMS,
President, Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc., Andalusia, Ala.

DEAR MR. MCWILLIAMS: I exceedingly regret not having had a visit with you on the occasion of your recent trip to Washington. Upon learning of your being on Capitol Hill, I endeavored to contact you at the offices of several of the Alabama Members, but was not successful in reaching you.

I was particularly interested in discussing with you, as president of the State-wide Alabama Rural Cooperative Association, several items in the annual report of the Rural Electrification Administrator, Mr. Wickard, to the Congress for the fiscal year 1946. This report came to me just prior to your arrival in Washington and its perusal and disclosures distressed me no end.

Primarily I would have liked to have discussed that part of Mr. Wickard's 1946 report which discloses the very low percentage of the farms in Alabama as compared with other States that now enjoy the benefits of the Rural Electrification Act over which I personally labored so long and hard to implement with a large annual appropriation of funds.

As you stated in your letter, "I am 100 percent for the REA." I have always been for REA—lock, stock, and barrel." I have gone overboard for maximum appropriations by Congress in obtaining every last dollar I could get for lighting up the farms in Alabama.

All during my long years of service in this House I fought side by side with our dearly beloved and revered Senator John Bankhead to bring the benefits of the magic of white power to every farm home in our State. The records will support the fact that I succeeded in getting the first project for Rural Electrification started both in Clark and Washington Counties. There my brother, R. M. Boykin, and I have REA lights and power in the houses on our farm at McIntosh, Ala., where we operate one of the largest diversified farms in our county.

I have always voted for every project brought up on the floor of the House by REA. I supported every appropriation for TVA * * *. You can be well assured that I will ever and always continue not alone to work in and with the Committee on Appropriations but to vote for every appropriation for Rural Electrification that will henceforth be brought out on the floor.

It is a matter of public record that there are only two other States in the country in which there is a greater power supply available than there is in Alabama. We in Alabama have the great Tennessee Valley Authority power available on the north; the Gulf Power Co. out of Florida sends its transmission lines across our boundaries at Flomaton, Florala, and south of Samson. These are supplemented by the tremendous line mileage of the Alabama Power Co., with its veritable grid work of high-tension lines criss-crossing our State. Altogether they give rise to the fact that there are more Alabama cotton and peanut planters, hog raisers, and dairy farmers now producing crops in the very shadows of high-tension power lines than in any State in the Union.

Secondarily, I wanted to discuss the cost of power purchased from public utility interests throughout the United States which is disclosed in table 5 of the Rural Electrification Administrator's 1946 report to Congress.

Inasmuch as that table in the report did not include the rates charged by the Alabama Power Co. to the REA co-op borrowers, I contacted Mr. W. W. Arnett in the Administrator's office in order that I might learn at first hand what the local public utility was charging the good farmers of Alabama and their farm cooperatives for the power furnished them.

What follows is table 5 abstracted from the report to Congress of Mr. Wickard, the Administrator, with the Alabama Power Co. rates inserted therein:

TABLE 5.—*Rates per kilowatt-hour offered by principal power suppliers contacted by REA*

Supplier	Old average rate per kilowatt-hour (cents)	New average rate per kilowatt-hour (cents)	Number of borrower co-ops served
Empire District Electric Co.	0.95	0.77	5
Kansas Gas & Electric Co.	1.14	.85	6
Mississippi Power Co.	.95	.80	5
Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	.85	.68	6
Southwestern Public Service Co.	.82	.72	10
West Texas Utilities Co.	1.05	.80	11
Alabama Power Co.	.80	.70	11

It will thus be seen from the report furnished to the Congress of the United States by the Rural Electrification Administrator Mr. Wickard, that the Alabama Power Co. is today furnishing power to the cooperatives of Alabama at rates comparable to and in most instances lower than most of the principal power suppliers contracted by the REA throughout the whole Nation.

In discussing the reduction in rates which have been effected, the Administrator reported to the Congress:

"Its search for cheaper wholesale power rates not long ago led the Powell Valley Electric Cooperative in Virginia to contract with Tennessee Valley Authority for power to serve four southwestern Virginia counties. TVA power will cost the co-op 7.5 mills a kilowatt-hour, a reduction of 26 percent below the price it has been paying. TVA's rate to this borrower is in sharp contrast to the rate of 10.6 mills a kilowatt-hour, the average wholesale price paid by all Virginia cooperatives to power companies in a recent year."

I have official information that Mr. R. E. McDonnell (Burns and McDonnell) of the engineering firm for your co-op, under date of March 8 advised your Alabama power cooperative in part as follows:

"It is apparent to anyone interested that as regards the cost of energy to the Alabama Electric Cooperative there is but a slight advantage resting with generated power."

Washington REA has advised that the average southern Alabama farmer uses approximately 65 to 80 kilowatt-hours per month.

They further advise that your co-op can purchase this power at a wholesale rate of seven-tenths of 1 cent per kilowatt-hour. It would, therefore, follow that your co-op could purchase enough electrical energy to furnish the average farm home 80 kilowatts of power for 56 cents per month—less than 2 cents per day.

I would be most interested to have you advise me with respect to just how many millions more would be required to rehabilitate existing pole lines, wires, hydroelectric and Diesel generating units, as well as to build the proposed steam-generating plant at Gannt.

Assuming that your generating co-op could generate this power as much as 10 percent less than you can now purchase it, is it not a fact that this savings would be so small that it would not enable the distributing co-ops to reduce the farmer's power bill by as little as 6 cents a month?

Be assured that my every business experience, acquired over the years, would make me shy away from in any manner "endorsing notes for millions" of dollars if the chance—and I mean chance—of getting a return was not a whole lot better than that one. If I played that loose and fast—I would have gone broke years ago!

Now, Maury, let's be honest and square, one with the other! We both in the past may have had our gripes about public-utilities rates, but you can't get away from the truth as it is revealed in the report of the Rural Electrification Administrator, Mr. Wickard, to Congress for 1946.

This report shows that not alone does your co-op and all the other distributing co-ops in Alabama enjoy cheap wholesale power rates from the local utilities (as is made evident in table 5), but that the co-op consumers of Alabama also obtain cheap retail power rates, as are shown by the billings disclosed in table 7 of that report.

Please note also the fact that the Alabama Power Co.'s rate to the Alabama electric co-ops are even lower than the rate of 7.5 mills or 0.75 cents per kilowatt which the TVA charges to the Rural Electrification co-ops in southern Virginia, as is shown by the Administrator's report.

Viewed in the light of simple business principles, it is because of these facts with respect to transmission coupled with the great abundance of cheap power available to our farmers and other rural consumers that I have never been able to reconcile myself as to the wisdom of acquiring "the old Hopson properties," which I recall was the Alabama Water Service Co.

Neither have I ever felt that it was economically sound nor good business practice for a small farm cooperative group to burden themselves with a great financial debt—haul coal 150 miles to 200 miles on a railroad to operate another small steam generating plant—in an endeavor to make power in competition with the gigantic hydroelectric properties of the TVA nor even with such an enormous steam generating plant as is now sitting right on top of the tremendous deposits of coal which underlie the turbines sending their electrical energy to the four points of the compass across the high-tension lines from Gorgas, Ala.

With respect to the report to Congress of the Rural Electrification Administrator, I am handing you herewith some pertinent data extracted from table 6, headed "REA loans and results accomplished by their expenditure, by States, June 30, 1946."

I am also sending comparable data extracted from the Administrator's report, table 7, "Consumption of electrical energy by borrowers and revenues by borrowers, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1946."

May I point out that in table 7 the total of $25,159,649 allocated to our State it at the same time clearly shows up the fact that with all that money there are only three other States in the United States where a smaller percentage of farms are now electrified than in our own State of Alabama? Certainly it cannot be said it is or was because of the want of funds.

The report further discloses that with $11,570,294 advanced by the Federal Government to Alabama cooperatives, only 48,855 farmers and other consumers have so far been connected.

Table 7 as taken from the Administrator's report to Congress recites a total operating revenue of $2,381,716 derived from the sale of 104,530,000 kilowatt-hours billed to the Alabama consumers. A further analysis of that table discloses the fact that of the total of 104,530,000 kilowatt-hours billed by the cooperatives, more than 87,000,000 were purchased from public utilities and—that with this purchased power—there were only three States in the Union which enjoyed cheaper billed rates than we do in Alabama.

No man in all of Alabama is more God-fearing, honorable, upright, and respected—than is Bob Goode—who farms about 30 miles north of my brother and myself.

We have never had a more distinguished farm leader—nor one who has done more for the farmers in our State than has Bob Goode. He is a constituent of mine and one I am happy to say enjoys my fullest confidence and respect.

I have discussed rural electrification for hour upon hour with Bob Goode and Bob tells me:

"Frank, we have already got oodles and oodles of cheap power in Alabama. It is not power we need. What we do need is more farmers' distribution co-ops, not generating co-ops.

"Frank, let us take the money available to us in Alabama and put up more poles and more lines and get electricity in every farm home in the State.

"There is $13,000,000 more available now—more than has been advanced. If we would spend this money judiciously, we would in the coming year put cheap electric light and power into nearly 50,000 more farm homes in our State."

It is quite impossible for me to understand why it is with this enormous amount of cheap power available that Alabama is now so low in the roll call of States extending the benefits of rural electrification to its farmers and other rural consumers.

Moreover I am sorry to note that, whereas nearly 250 new industries were established in our State last year—all of which can avail themselves of cheap power—that the Administrator's report stated there was but one new rural co-op established in the northern part of the State.

I am not unmindful of the task you and your board have in operating the old Hopson hydro and Diesel plants and the fact that you might need new poles and larger line wires. If you need any help in obtaining funds to rebuild these things, you can rest assured that I will take off my coat and go to work to help you get them. You just say the word.

As for me personally, I am convinced that what we in Alabama need is not more power plants but that we do need more rural electrification lines, more rural co-ops, more poles, more wires, more switches, and more of everything necessary to distribute the great quantities of cheap electric power now available, and get this energy to every farmer in the State of Alabama. Let's use our money wisely to that end.

With every best wish,

Sincerely yours,

FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress.

What follows are the tables taken from the 1946 annual report of the Rural Electrification Administrator to Congress:

TABLE 6.—*REA loans and results accomplished by their expenditure, by States, June 30, 1946*

States	Borrowers: Energized	Borrowers: Not in operation [1]	Total allocations [2]	Funds advanced [3]	Miles energized	Consumers connected	Percentage total farms electrified June 30, 1946
Alabama	23	3	$25,159,649	$11,570,294	11,473	48,855	34.1
Arizona	3	4	1,984,000	1,268,020	640	2,439	71.5
Arkansas	18	2	21,421,000	12,906,069	11,574	40,659	30.8
California	4	2	2,414,500	1,995,103	1,607	4,697	96.2
Colorado	19	2	16,044,551	10,114,419	7,941	24,210	62.4
Connect cut	0	0	0	0	0	0	89.9
Delaware	1	0	1,376,000	1,102,310	1,047	3,468	72.1
Florida	15	2	11,359,000	5,653,698	4,662	16,837	47.3
Georgia	42	4	36,975,402	19,032,319	22,632	89,015	41.7
Idaho	9	0	5,995,750	3,817,405	3,243	7,880	88.4
Illinois	28	0	32,792,803	23,980,420	22,401	66,379	64.5
Indiana	44	3	30,230,564	22,336,100	23,500	85,025	83.9
Iowa	53	2	44,647,098	33,022,212	32,557	79,693	74.2
Kansas	23	10	23,663,851	11,074,012	10,527	22,366	36.1
Kentucky	25	1	26,618,855	14,268,254	14,828	61,400	32.1
Louisiana	15	2	17,270,000	12,742,757	8,677	30,740	36.8
Maine	4	0	1,012,500	672,132	477	1,905	56.9
Maryland	2	0	5,018,500	2,926,662	2,079	9,101	71.4
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	90.0
Michigan	13	0	17,514,500	14,136,518	10,082	37,726	94.3
Minnesota	50	1	48,525,301	32,291,605	34,741	80,998	55.7
Mississippi	23	1	26,622,953	14,724,220	16,491	65,668	24.8
Missouri	39	5	44,233,325	30,379,178	24,951	85,821	38.5
Montana	16	5	11,984,598	5,070,866	3,795	11,803	37.6
Nebraska	23	9	24,522,663	14,440,106	13,331	28,961	37.3
Nevada	1	1	296,000	240,383	121	518	57.6
New Hampshire	1	0	1,794,000	1,580,903	1,427	3,304	83.8
New Jersey	2	0	668,500	559,062	437	1,780	98.5
New Mexico	8	2	4,781,500	2,846,229	1,641	6,011	34.6
New York	6	1	4,548,618	3,737,029	2,773	9,540	84.2
North Carolina	33	6	32,000,352	18,875,713	13,605	54,910	43.8
North Dakota	8	15	17,054,972	5,924,777	3,673	7,570	10.4
Ohio	28	0	28,663,201	22,542,635	20,265	72,728	90.3
Oklahoma	23	4	24,581,506	16,686,206	17,277	42,191	29.0
Oregon	12	3	8,539,584	5,411,407	3,281	11,461	88.9
Pennsylvania	13	0	14,817,200	12,064,572	10,593	38,015	74.8
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	87.4
South Carolina	23	5	16,539,269	10,309,268	11,690	41,622	44.7
South Dakota	7	14	10,930,154	3,253,034	2,556	5,355	13.5
Tennessee	30	0	25,686,608	16,046,238	14,162	104,633	30.3
Texas	74	23	67,319,074	44,486,111	48,479	128,505	43.1
Utah	5	1	1,702,000	1,323,407	879	2,896	81.9
Vermont	3	0	1,905,000	1,619,724	1,210	3,262	75.1
Virginia	16	4	18,123,356	12,944,966	10,302	34,126	41.9
Washington	21	0	11,996,611	7,395,216	6,471	15,819	87.0
West Virginia	2	0	802,000	736,241	560	1,976	37.1
Wisconsin	32	1	40,462,822	22,650,018	17,465	49,371	76.7
Wyoming	13	2	5,723,000	3,119,070	2,546	6,446	52.1
Alaska	2	0	488,000	429,324	116	879	----------
Virgin Islands	1	0	275,000	273,572	52	493	----------
United States	856	140	817,086,990	514,819,844	474,837	1,549,057	52.9

[1] Includes 36 borrowers with refrigeration loans only.
[2] Includes allocation from 1947 appropriation.
[3] Includes $200,000 repayments to RFC as adjustment on 1942 note.

TABLE 7.—*Consumption of electrical energy by borrowers and revenues of borrowers, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1946*

State	Kilowatt-hours billed	Operating revenue	Cents per kilowatt	Low U. S. cost position
	Thousands			
Alabama	104,530	$2,381,716	2.28	4
Arizona	9,609	268,621	2.80	8
Arkansas	24,066	1,370,039	5.70	42
California	15,347	399,293	2.60	5
Colorado	41,065	1,745,006	4.25	19
Connecticut	0	0	----------	----------
Delaware	4,535	220,628	4.87	36
Florida	18,388	799,120	4.38	26
Georgia	89,192	3,377,479	3.79	15
Idaho	11,098	482,280	4.35	24
Illinois	83,395	3,979,192	4.77	33
Indiana	98,167	4,422,809	4.50	27
Iowa	143,641	5,446,247	3.79	16
Kansas	26,240	1,282,067	4.88	37
Kentucky	58,457	2,646,360	4.52	28
Louisiana	81,810	1,634,681	2.00	2
Maine	1,178	76,414	6.48	47
Maryland	14,010	606,340	4.32	22
Massachusetts	0	0	----------	----------
Michigan	44,175	1,852,275	4.18	18
Minnesota	134,800	5,846,958	4.33	23
Mississippi	70,627	2,538,147	3.59	13
Missouri	126,501	4,350,812	3.44	12
Montana	13,477	621,488	4.61	29
Nebraska	49,460	1,871,137	3.78	14
Nevada	3,024	64,469	2.13	3
New Hampshire	2,237	138,401	6.18	45

TABLE 7.—*Consumption of electrical energy by borrowers and revenues of borrowers, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1946*—Continued

State	Kilowatt-hours billed	Operating revenue	Cents per kilowatt	Low U. S. cost position
	Thousands			
New Jersey	2,393	$98,689	4.13	17
New Mexico	17,689	472,816	2.67	7
New York	3,606	185,123	5.13	39
North Carolina	40,155	1,946,802	4.85	35
North Dakota	21,167	677,154	3.20	11
Ohio	94,464	4,019,859	4.27	20
Oklahoma	35,560	2,031,398	5.72	43
Oregon	21,162	648,404	3.07	10
Pennsylvania	39,858	1,886,579	4.72	31
Rhode Island	0	0	----------	----------
South Carolina	31,660	1,476,731	4.65	30
South Dakota	6,469	339,383	5.25	41
Tennessee	235,936	4,541,049	1.93	1
Texas	134,920	5,872,118	4.36	25
Utah	1,761	105,290	5.97	44
Vermont	3,856	190,114	4.92	38
Virginia	37,595	1,606,208	4.28	21
Washington	40,166	1,060,259	2.64	6
West Virginia	1,326	68,375	5.17	40
Wisconsin	135,126	4,059,282	3.00	9
Wyoming	8,905	426,919	4.78	34
Alaska	1,827	114,684	6.27	41
Virgin Islands	520	24,671	4.75	32
United States	2,185,150	80,275,086	3.68	----------

North Dakota for Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, the North Dakota House of Representatives unanimously passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, memorializing Congress to pass the equal rights amendment to the Constitution, and submit same to the several States for their approval and adoption. This amendment will put women on an equality with men.

The action taken by the North Dakota Legislature was due to the work and enthusiasm of a North Dakota woman, Mrs. Alfred Zuger. Mrs. Zuger is chairman of the North Dakota Branch of the National Woman's Party. She is also State chairman of legislation of the North Dakota Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, and of the North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs.

State Senator Carl E. Day, chairman of the judiciary committee, was the able sponsor of the measure in the State senate. Miss Haaugland, a State representative, sponsored the measure in the State house of representatives. Governor Aandahl, Attorney General Johnson, Secretary of State Hall, State Auditor Mrs. Baker, State Insurance Commissioner Krueger, State Treasurer Swenson, and Commissioner of Agriculture and Labor Dahl all endorsed and favored the resolution. In addition, many organizations of men and women in the State not only favored but actively worked for the passage of this resolution.

I am proud to say that North Dakota is the second State to take this action, preceded only by the State Legislature of New York, which, on March 24, 1945, memorialized Congress to pass the equal-rights amendment resolution and refer it to the States for ratification.

At present, women have different rights and privileges in different States. In some States they virtually have all the rights that men have. In others, they do not. I do not believe that women should be discriminated against in any State. I do not believe it is proper to permit any State to discriminate between the rights of men and women. By the very nature of things women are the equal of men and they should be treated as equal in the eyes of the law in every State.

In view of the spontaneous demand that the equal-rights amendment to our Constitution be referred to the States, it is not surprising that there should be some opposition, that there should be suggestions of delay and study. Such study is simply a waste of time. We know that there are discriminations in some States and that there should be none. We also know that in every en-

deavor woman has shown herself the equal of man. Why continue this discrimination? We also know that the rights of men and women is a matter that concerns the Nation as a whole. It is not a State issue.

On this subject a well-known economist, Dr. Miriam Oatman, has the following to say:

POSITION OF THE NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY REGARDING THE COMMISSION ON LAWS AFFECTING WOMEN

(By Dr. Miriam Oatman, secretary of the National Woman's Party)

I. We are always in favor of knowing the facts about anything. We are not in favor of duplicating work that has been done already, or of spending public money unnecessarily. The facts about the legal situation of women, up to the year 1945, have been brought together in several different studies.

In 1929 the National Woman's Party made a State-by-State survey of laws as they affect women. In 1932 the General Federation of Women's Clubs made a similar survey. In 1936 the Inter-American Commission of Women made a complete study of the subject which was published as a United States Senate document. In 1938 the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor completed a similar study, which also is a Government document and has since been brought up to 1945.

II. If, despite these considerations, Congress should decide to establish a Commission to study the laws affecting women and to make recommendations, that Commission should be as broadly representative as possible and should not be confined to members of one political party or representatives of one social outlook. The National Woman's Party should be represented, also the business and professional women, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and other important groups.

III. The appointment of such a Commission should not be accepted by us, nor should we permit it to be represented, as a substitute for the equal-rights amendment, or as an excuse to delay the passage of that amendment. Our demand for equal status is based upon the underlying foundations of democratic principle; hence, we cannot accept any substitute or brook any delay.

On the practical side, we cannot afford to await the report of such a Commission: (1) Since no finding would be new in view of the facts already before us; (2) since the recommendations might be adverse to our cause; and (3) since even recommendations embodying our viewpoint would have no mandatory effect. They might be useful in showing—once more—advisable changes in other laws; but the States would be free to ignore them. Our amendment, once made a part of the Federal Constitution, could not be ignored by the States.

IV. The passage of the bill in question is in no sense a fulfillment of the platform pledges by which both the Republican and the Democratic Parties committed themselves to working for equal rights. We insist upon the early fulfillment of those pledges.

The North Dakota resolution follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, endorsing equal rights for women

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein):

Whereas the women of America have shared equally with men in the hardships and sacrifices incident to the building of this Nation; and

Whereas they have shared equally in the pain and distress which have been involved in the maintenance of the American Republic and the ideals of free government against the aggression of tyrants and have participated, and are today participating, in the battles precipitated by the enemies of freedom; and

Whereas this Nation was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," and such declaration has no actual or implied limitations on equality before the law by reason of sex; and

Whereas the rights of women before the law are much abridged in many States, and this legal discrimination on the basis of sex constitutes an intolerable burden upon thousands of women who are solely dependent upon their own efforts for their livelihood, and is a source of irritation to many thousands of others who recognize in this discrimination a flat contradiction of the American principle of equality, wholly out of accord with the status of American women, which they have reached by their achievements in other field of human endeavor; and

Whereas there are today 985,000 more women than men in this country and women have served this country in time of war as well as peace, equally well with men in every field of work: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the senate and house legislature pass the following resolution and the amendment, as follows:

"EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have the power within the respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification"; be it further

Resolved (if house and senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States (who has also endorsed this amendment), the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of North Dakota.

That the foregoing resolution is sponsored by Mrs. Alfred Zuger, State chairman, legislation, North Dakota Federation of Business and Professional Women's Club, and director and State chairman of legislation, North Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs, and State chairman, legislation, North Dakota Branch of National Woman's Party.

The following State officials have endorsed the foregoing resolution: Gov. Fred G. Aandahl; Attorney General Nels G. Johnson; Secretary of State Thomas Hall; State Auditor Berta E. Baker; State Insurance Commissioner Otto Krueger; State Treasurer H. W. Swenson; Commissioner of Agriculture and Labor Math Dahl.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, previously obtained, I wish to include herewith a copy of an article from the New York Times of date April 11, 1947, in connection with the celebration held in New York for Army Week, and which article includes a statement by Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, United States Army, in connection with universal military training.

The article is as follows:

DUTY OF UNITED STATES HELD TO REMAIN STRONG—GENERAL HODGES AT ARMY WEEK MEETING SAYS UNIVERSAL TRAINING IS NECESSARY

Trained armed services are a concomitant of the United States world position of responsibility, Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, commanding the First Army, declared yesterday.

General Hodges, speaking at an Army Week observance, said that while there now exists a large reservoir of trained men both in and out of service on whom the country can call in any swift emergency, the backlog of battle-tested soldiers will have diminished to the danger point a few years hence.

Addressing a noontime gathering of several thousand persons from the steps of the Subtreasury Building, Wall and Nassau Streets, General Hodges asserted that national security is now dependent upon the adoption of a universal military-training program.

Maj. Gen. Charles B. Stone, deputy commander and chief of staff of the Air Defense Command, sounded the same warning at the ceremony, which was held under the auspices of the Military Order of the World Wars.

Other speakers at the ceremony, in which American Legion, Army, Navy, and Marine color guards participated, as did the Fort Jay band, were Rear Adm. Joel H. Bunkley, commander of the New York Chapter of the Military Order; Rear Adm. Reginald R. Belknap, former commander in chief of the order and chairman of this year's Army Day parade committee, and Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid, commander of the Eastern Sea Frontier.

At a Governors Island ceremony earlier Admiral Kinkaid received from General Hodges the Army's Distinguished Service Medal, the citation hailing Admiral Kinkaid's service in the southwest and western Pacific.

Today, as part of the week-long Army observance proclaimed by President Truman, Governors Island will hold open house between 1 and 5 p. m. Ferries will leave the Battery at 15-minute intervals and half-hour tours of the installations will be conducted.

Who Said Prices Would Fall?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from PM of April 13, 1947, by Fiorello H. LaGuardia:

WHO SAID PRICES WOULD FALL?

(By Fiorello H. LaGuardia)

Where are the wise guys who removed price control? Where are the big-mouths who shouted, "Remove controls and prices will go down"?

Just as was predicted by sound, sane, patriotic men and women a year ago, the cost of living has gone up and not down since the removal of price control. Inflation is creeping up. Yes; and people in Washington are commencing to worry. Too bad that their concern comes a little late.

On February 10, 1946, on this page, I said:

"Inflation is recognized by high prices for everything and requires more dollars to buy anything. The cost of living increases faster than wages or earnings. The only thing that is cheap is the dollar."

That was the time for the Treasury Department to get busy. Then it was that Congress ignored the interest of the American family and legislated for high profits and profiteering. There was the opportunity President Truman missed.

On April 28, 1946, in my weekly PM article, I pointed out that a combination of politically minded Republicans and cotton-minded Democrats in the House of Representatives were bent on killing all price control. Powerful, resourceful lobbies were at work. I called attention to the control that the profiteers, racketeers, inflationeers, politicianeers, and speculateers had taken on Congress. It was tough on every American family and the good old United States of America. I warned then that the way things were going, every family pantry would be pilfered and the wardrobe would be bare of clothes.

President Truman properly vetoed the first bill. Then Congress dragged the debate on until the very last minute and sent another bill to the President. This he signed. The dire results, the consequences, are now before us. The worst is yet to come.

On June 16, 1946, I cited the figures that OPA and the various agencies of Government had presented to Congress. It was no secret. The total increase in staple items of food and clothes, such as meat, milk, poultry, dairy products, and textiles, wools, rayons, and cotton goods, will cost the consumers, in the year following decontrol of prices, an estimated total of $5,720,000,000. Where will all this money come from? The average family hasn't got it to spend. It will, therefore, come from the table, from the comfort of millions of American men, women, and children.

THE VICIOUS CIRCLE IS CONTINUING

In my article of June 30, 1946, as the dirty work of decontrol was setting in, I estimated that the cost of food for a family of four, with a $3,000 income, would increase $250 a year; of clothing, $100 a year.

The vicious circle of increased cost of living, increased wages, is continuing. Unless proper economic adjustments are made, the spiral is going to end in inflation and be followed by a depression. This must be avoided. On July 7, 1946, I wrote:

"The fact is ignored that in this age there cannot be prosperity in our country unless 130,000,000 people are prosperous.

"A country of a small wealthy class and big land owners, with a suffering, exploited, helpless population, cannot survive today. It does not deserve to survive.

"We have learned that the prosperity of our country depends upon the purchasing power of the people. Purchasing power is created only by work coupled with decent wages, fair salaries enabling a high standard of living. If, every time an adjustment is made in increased wages, prices are jumped, then purchasing power is not increased and the relative position of the masses of workers, employees, and small businessman with industry remains the same. There is no net gain.

"We have talked so much about higher standards of living and purchasing power. Everyone agrees. There, though, it has stopped.

"There is but one place from which this differential necessary to an increased purchasing power and higher standard of living can be taken, and that is from profits.

"If the same standard of profits of the past is maintained, then the same relative positions continue. There will not be increased production. There will be the same large gaps between economic groups, dire poverty, semipoverty, moderate income classes with one wealthy class at the top."

PURPOSE OF A PROGRESSIVE INCOME TAX

That is not the American way. That is not the American system. That will not protect free enterprise. That is plutocracy at its worst. That is what must be avoided.

Big business, industry, and, yes, finance, must remember that the very purpose of a progressive income tax is to pass on in wages to producers and workers a better share of the profits. Yet there is a stubborn resistance to that. Good common sense would dictate that the distribution of the profits in a more equitable manner with those who help create them is the one salvation of our country and our present system.

Labor, too, has a responsibility. Labor must work harder, produce more. Now is not the time for feather-bedding, nonproductive fringe payments. Production is what is needed.

I repeated the admonition in my article of December 15, 1946:

"Business and industry must recognize that increased wages with increased prices, keeping the same relative ratio of wages and cost of living which existed prior to 1933, is simply impossible.

"We must reach a point where increased wages will provide a higher and better standard of living and security to all wage earners and salaried people. * * * The differential must necessarily come from profits. That means that what was a reasonable expectation on a dollar investment before 1933 cannot be expected today. It does mean, by greater production, fair profits can be made. No one denies under our economy that profit is a legitimate and important factor."

The Easter parade is over. Yes; there were many, many pretty bonnets on Fifth Avenue. For every pretty bonnet on the Avenue, there were a thousand housewives throughout the land who could not manage to buy a new pair of shoes for each of the kids in the family. The price of clothes has gone up so high, along with food and household furnishings, that it can be said, as was predicted a year ago, that not only the lower income group but the $3,000, the $4,000 family just cannot make both ends meet.

Congress has recognized the increased cost of living. Members of the House and Senate could not get along with $10,000 a year. That is quite true. They allowed themselves $2,500 pay raise, plus another $2,500 cost-of-living bonus in the form of tax-free expense accounts. I say "cost-of-living bonus" because it was not a salary; it isn't taxable; it is just $2,500 additional to meet the additional cost of living in Washington, D. C. I think the Members of Congress were entitled to that. They should be in a position to understand the plight of the average American family. They must know by this time that if prices continue to increase, with corresponding increases in salaries and wages, then inflation just cannot be avoided.

The administration naturally is panicky. They have every right to be. It is a panicky situation. It requires action. Mere talk won't do it; mere appeals won't do it. Why, the profiteers are laughing at the President and Congress. They are making theirs—at least, they think they are. They are, for the moment. They have no vision. Many of the smaller ones will go under if inflation sets in.

The American people, particularly the mothers and housewives, cannot be distracted from thinking of the present economic situation of the country by sending sharpened bayonets to Greece.

Last Wednesday the President called a Cabinet meeting. Fine. The White House said it was "like a session of a graduate class in economics." Well, perhaps that was a little too much. What was needed, judging from past performance, was a session in elementary economics. Too bad this economic education did not take place earlier so that the might of the administration could have been impressed on Congress before all the damage was done. I note everyone went to lunch after the "seminar." They did not eat statistics. Neither can the housewife feed her family with statistics.

HOW TO GET FIRST-HAND INFORMATION

If the President of the United States would have a conference with Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Jones, Mrs. O'Grady, Mrs. Olson, Mrs. Epstein, and Mrs. Esposito, who are struggling to keep families together on a weekly pay envelope, he could obtain first-hand information on the high cost of living. He might also get information on present rents and some help to avoid another catastrophe and more disaster to the American family. He might learn how much mothers worry about the cost of brother's shoes and sister's dress. He might learn of the many denials of the American family and how necessities of yesterday are luxuries today—in the richest land on earth

Incidentally, while we are talking about experts, it was noted that the President's economic advisers, appointed to prepare plans for a full employment policy of our country, attended the economic seminar with the Cabinet. What the American people want to know is what happened to the full-employment policy. There is no plan to absorb unemployment in the event of a depression. Here is a place where experts could really display their talents. There is little hope to be found in the report to the President prepared by these same experts.

It is also noted that nothing has been said in the guise of economy to abolish their jobs, and nothing will be said as long as they continue to submit innocuous reports and indulge in academic discussions.

There is another lesson in store. We criticize and are opposed to other forms of economy. People are getting tired of shifting from one party to another. The way to prove that our economy is the better is to make it work. We must demonstrate by a better, a fuller, a happier life that our system is the best. It can be done. It should be done. It must be done.

American industry and business and finance and labor can do it. If they do not, the Government will have to step in. There is no time to lose. Action! Action! Action!

So, again I say: Wake up Washington, before it is too late.

The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of its investigation of un-American propaganda in the United States.

This report shows that the Communist Party is an agent of a foreign power

and that it is dedicated to the destruction of this Government and all other free governments throughout the world.

If every patriotic American could read this document and realize what communism is doing to try to destroy our form of government, our American way of life, in fact, our Christian civilization throughout the world, they would rise up as one man and drive this infamous influence from American soil.

The matter referred to follows:

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES AS AN AGENT OF A FOREIGN POWER

(Report of Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess., H. Rept. No. 209)

PREFACE

It is the unanimous opinion of this committee that the Communist Party of the United States is in fact the agent of a foreign government.

It is important that the Government and the people recognize this fact.

If the Communist Party is to be properly dealt with, it is essential that the legislation of Congress and the thinking of the people be predicated upon this fundamental fact. The purpose of this report is to straighten the thinking of the American people and the Government concerning the Communist Party and to dispel the idea that it is a domestic political party, or that it is a minority group operating within the democratic framework of our Constitution. This report is a documented refutation of this misconception.

Below will be found a tabulation which appeared in the New York Times on March 16, 1947, on the number of Communists throughout the world, according to countries. This tabulation was presented at the recent British Communist Party Congress held in London, February 23, 1947. Mr. William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, attended, along with the delegates from 30 countries. It was in effect a meeting of the Communist International and was so interpreted by the leading correspondents throughout the world. We must recognize that in dealing with communism we are dealing with a world-wide revolutionary movement which is being directed by a foreign government, whether it be the Communist Party of the United States, Chile, Mexico, Finland, or whatever country.

The committee, therefore, is issuing this report as exhibit A to establish the true character of the enemy within our gates.

How the Communists estimate their strength

At a recent Communist conference in London, a chart showing the Advance of Communism was displayed, giving the Communists' own estimate of their strength. The total world membership claimed was 18,592,300. According to the chart, "All parties in this list base themselves on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin." This is the listing that appeared on the chart:

Country and party	Members	M. P.'s
AMERICA		
Argentina: Communist	30,000	
Brazil: Communist	130,000	17
Canada: Labor-Progressives	23,000	
Chile: Communist	50,000	20
Columbia: Democrat Socialist	10,000	2
Costa Rica: Vanguardia Populist	20,000	6
Cuba: Popular Socialist	152,000	12
Ecuador: Communist	2,500	
Haiti: Popular Socialist	500	1
Martinique: Communist		2
Mexico: Communist	25,000	
Nicaragua: Partido Socialista	500	
Panama: Partido del Pueblo	500	
Paraguay: Communist	8,000	
Peru: Communist	35,000	5
Puerto Rico: Communist	1,200	
United States: Communist	74,000	
Uruguay: Communist	15,000	5
Santo Domingo: Popular Socialist	2,000	
Venezuela: Communist	20,000	2
ASIA		
Burma: Communist	4,000	
Ceylon: Communist		
China: Communist	2,000,000	
Cyprus: Akel	4,000	
India: Communist	53,700	
Indonesia: Communist		
Japan: Communist	6,000	5
Korea: Communist	50,000	
Lebanon: Communist	15,000	
Malaya: Communist	10,000	
Palestine: Communist	1,400	
Philippines: Communist		
Siam: Communist		
Syria: Communist	8,000	
AUSTRALASIA		
Australia: Communist	25,000	1
New Zealand: Communist	2,000	
EUROPE		
USSR: Communist	6,000,000	
Albania: Communist		
Austria: Communist	150,000	4
Belgium: Communist	100,000	23
Britain: Communist	43,000	2
Bulgaria: Workers' Party	450,000	278
Czechoslovakia: Communist	1,000,000	115
Denmark: Communist	60,000	18
Finland: Communist	28,000	41
France: Communist	1,300,000	
Germany (Soviet): Social Unity	1,576,300	
Germany (Western): Communist	350,000	
Greece: Communist	400,000	
Hungary: Communist	650,000	70
Iceland: United Socialist	1,000	10
Ireland (North): Communist	500	
Italy: Communist	2,200,000	108
Luxemburg: Communist	5,000	
Netherlands: Communist	50,000	15
Norway: Communist	33,000	11
Poland: Workers' Party	600,000	
Portugal: Communist		
Rumania: Communist	500,000	68
Slovakia: Communist	250,000	
Spain: Communist		
Sweden: Communist	46,000	
Switzerland: Parti du Travail	21,000	1
AFRICA		
Algeria: Communist		
Eritrea: Communist	200	
Morocco: Communist		
South Africa: Communist		
Tunisia: Communist		

New York Times, Mar. 16, 1947, p. E5.

INTRODUCTION

It is the object of this report to establish from documentary sources the fact that from its inception in September 1919 to the present day the Communist movement of the United States may be properly characterized as—

1. An organization operating under centralized discipline subordinated to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the single and ruling party of that country.

2. A section of a World Communist Party, controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

3. An organization whose basic aim, whether open or concealed, is the abolition of our present economic system and democratic form of government and the establishment of a Soviet dictatorship in its place.

4. An organization resorting to deception, evasion, illegal methods, violence, and civil war, methods implicit in its revolutionary purpose.

When the Communist organization was an insignificant sect relying for its chief inspiration and support upon the comparatively weak Soviet Government of 15 or 20 years ago it was felt that its activities could be safely ignored, that the free play of our democratic process would ultimately cushion and vitiate its efforts. In 1947, however, we find this totalitarian bridgehead firmly entrenched in the labor movement, the Government, political parties, the press, radio and films, the schools and colleges, the churches and social organizations. Its influence is far out of proportion to its membership, due to its discipline, its control of strategic posts in mass organizations, and its ties with the Soviet Government, which today enjoys unprecedented standing as a world power. In recent times the Soviet Government has repeatedly demonstrated its ability to transform hitherto insignificant Communist minorities into ruling parties (Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania). Even in countries not under direct Soviet military occupation, the former Communist minority is making an open bid for power (Belgium, Italy, France, Denmark, China). In view of the expansionist attitude of the Soviet Government clearly demonstrated in its recent history, these countries furnish us with an instructive social laboratory.

Our own country is far from immune to the operations of the subversive and aggressive Communist movement. In the light of our own highly integrated and sensitive society, it is well within the bounds of practical possibility, that if the present potentialities of the American Communist movement were fully mobilized for a supreme subversive effort, if these potentialities were given substantial aid from a strong foreign power, they could seriously dislocate our economic and social life and even the effectiveness of our armed forces.

An elementary regard for our sovereignty as a Nation and the interests of national security, require as a minimum that the nature of the Communist movement be fully analyzed and understood.

I. ORIGIN AND BACKGROUND

The Communist Party of the United States is a section of the international Communist movement founded by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin during the First World War. His motives in launching this organization may be roughly classified as twofold in character:

1. Offensive: He sought to destroy the capitalist system and the governments under which it operates in order to absorb the nations of the world within the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

2. Defensive: He sought to safeguard the interest of the then weak Soviet Government, by diverting hostile nations through the promotion of internal disorder.

The Communist movement today remains essentially devoted to these mutually complementary aims.

Lenin held that the First International, founded by Karl Marx (1864–1872) "laid the foundation of the international organization of the workers in order to prepare for their revolutionary onslaught on capital." He believed that the Second or Socialist International (1889–1914) was too moderate, reformistic, and patriotic. As early as November 1, 1914, he already envisaged a split in the Second International and the formation of a Third or Communist International. With the outbreak of World War I, he attacked the democratic Socialists for their support of national defense in an imperialist war, and for their refusal to support a revolution against one's own government. The group which he led met at Zimmerwald, Switzerland, in September 1915 and became known as the Zimmerwald Left. On April 24, 1917, the Russian Social Democratic Party adopted Lenin's proposal to change its name to the Russian Communist Party as more suitable to its revolutionary aims. The Russian Revolution of November 7, 1917, hastened the growth of Communist parties throughout the world.

The flames of proletarian revolution that spread throughout Europe after World War I

gave every evidence of Moscow stimulation and support. Then, as now, there was no publicly acknowledged Communist International.

As far back as 1917 a bureau of international revoluntary propaganda was formed which was officially attached to the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs of the Provisional Workmen's and Peasants' Government of the Russian Republic. Karl Radek conducted this bureau with the assistance of a number of war prisoners. It published three papers: Die Fackel, afterward called Völkerfriede (German, Nemzetkesi Szocializta (Hungarian), and Iainte (Rumanian), which were distributed in the trenches. John Reed, one of the founders of the American Communist movement, worked for Die Fackel.

On December 13, 1917, the Soviet of Peoples Commissars issued the following ordinance assigning 2,000,000 rubles for the needs of the revolutionary internationalist movement:

"Taking into consideration that Soviet authority stands on the ground of the principles of international solidarity of the proletariat and the brotherhood of the toilers of all countries, that the struggle against war and imperialism, only on an international scale, can lead to complete victory, the Soviet of Peoples Commissars considers it necessary to come forth with all aid, including financial aid, to the assistance of the left, international wing of the workers' movement of all countries, entirely regardless whether these countries are at war with Russia, or in an alliance, or whether they retain their neutrality.

"With these aims the Soviet of Peoples Commissars ordains: The assigning of 2,000,000 rubles for the needs of the revolutionary internationalist movement, at the disposition of the foreign representatives of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs.

"President of the Soviet of Peoples Commissars VI, Oulianoff (Lenin); People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs L. Trotsky; Manager of Affairs of the Soviet of People's Commissar VI, Bonch-Bruevich; Secretary of the Soviet, N. Gorbounov.

"(Gazette of the Provisional Workers and Peasants Government, December 13, 1917.)"

Two outstanding points should be noted in connection with this declaration: (1) From the outset the machinery of international Communist propaganda was initiated and supported by the Soviet Government as auxiliary to the activities of its section on foreign affairs; (2) such activity was directed at all nations, regardless of treaty status. An understanding of the nature of the international Communist movement requires a full appreciation of these two fundamental principles on which it was founded, principles whose validity cannot be legitimately challenged today.

On November 3, 1918, the Communist Party of Austria was formed. Returning war prisoners actively propagandized in Russia played a leading part in the movement in Austria and Hungary. On December 23, 1918, the Russian Government formally recognized the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Soviet Republics and offered them "all necessary aid and support."

By November 8 practically the entire German Fleet had fallen into the hands of revolutionary sailors, who, in cooperation with workmen's and soldiers' councils on shore, had gained control of Kiel, Wilhelmshaven, Heligoland, Borkum, and Cuxhaven. Berlin found itself in the throes of a general strike on November 10, 1918. Dr. Oskar Cohn, former counselor for the Russian Embassy, admitted the receipt of Russian funds on November 5, 1918, from Adolph Joffe, the Bolshevik Ambassador at Berlin, to further this movement (Current History, May 1919, p. 227).

On February 2, 1919, riots broke out in Glasgow, and widespread strikes occurred in London and Liverpool. On February 22, 1919, a revolt broke out in Budapest against the Hungarian People's Republic. It was led by Bela Kun, former Russian war prisoner and later a member of the executive committee of the Communist International. On March 5 a Soviet Government was proclaimed in Bavaria.

Added proof of Soviet propaganda activities abroad may be found in the radio statement of George Chicherin, Commissar of Foreign Affairs, dated February 4, 1919, to the Allies, in which he declared the Russian Soviet Government's "readiness, if necessary, to include in the general agreement with the Entente Powers a pledge of noninterference in their internal affairs." It is to be found in the message sent by Maxim Litvinoff to President Wilson on March 5, 1919, in which he offered in behalf of the Soviet Government to cease propaganda if the Entente would enter into peace negotiations.

Louis Fischer, long a pro-Soviet observer, with access to original Soviet sources, has described Soviet activity in the Balkans as follows:

"The Bolsheviks planned both moves. Airplanes flew regularly from Hungary to the Ukraine, bringing leaders or reports and taking back suggestions, Soviet legal codes as models, and post. A Bolshevik offensive would establish direct geographical contact with Bela Kun, bring Bessarabia back to Russia, perhaps inspire a revolution in Rumania. (Soviets in World Affairs, p. 195.)"

Lenin's gratification at the widespread revolutionary developments throughout Europe was expressed in a speech before the all-Russian central executive committee, on October 22, 1918, published in the Berner Tagwacht:

"We never before stood so near to the international proletarian revolution as at present: * * * Of course, you know that the revolution has broken out in Bulgaria and that the Bulgarian soldiers are organizing councils, or soviets, after the Russian model. Now comes the news that similar soviets are now in process of being organized also in Serbia. * * * In Austria, too, the revolution of the workers and peasants is knocking at the door everywhere. * * * The German revolution is already a fact. * * * So far as Italy is concerned, the revolutionary sentiment of the proletariat of that country is evident to us. * * * Its (Independent Socialist Labor Party of England) sympathies for us are constantly on the increase. The Socialist labor parties of Scotland have even come out openly for the Bolsheviki. * * * Our allies are millions and millions of proletarians in all the countries of the world."

The estimates of allied statemen corroborated the gravity of the European situation. In his official summary to the Council of Ten, meeting in Paris on January 21, 1919, M. Georges Clemenceau declared:

"Bolshevism was spreading. It had invaded the Baltic provinces and Poland, and that very morning they had received very bad news regarding its spread in Budapest and Vienna. Italy, also, was in danger. The danger was probably greater there than in France. If Bolshevism, after spreading in Germany, were to traverse Austria and Hungary and so reach Italy, Europe would be faced with a great danger."

On the other hand, starvation faced millions in Russia exhausted by the havoc of war and revolution. Premier Clemenceau sought the economic isolation of bolshevism in Russia with a view to provoking its fall. On December 13, 1918, he presented a plan to the Allies intended to interdict to the Bolsheviks access to the Ukraine regions, the Caucasus, and western Siberia, which are economically necessary to them for their endurance.

The encirclement of Russia is described by Louis Fischer in the following terms:

"On the west, Russia was cut off from the outside world by the Baltic buffers, the Germans, the British Fleet, and by Poland; on the north by British, French, American, Italian, and Serbian troops; on the south, by the French in the Ukraine, Denikin in the Kuban, and the British in Caucasia and Transcaspia; on the east, finally by the Japanese and their faithful atamans in eastern Siberia, and by the Czechs and Kolchak in western Siberia (Soviets in World Affairs, p. 155)."

Chicherin pressed desperately for peace. To Rakovsky he wrote on March 13, 1919:

"If we do not reach an understanding, the policy of blockade will be pressed with vigor. They (the Allies) will send tanks, etc., to Denikin, Kolchak, Petlura, Paderewski, etc."

Lenin wrote:

"We are in a beleaguered fortress, so long as no other international Socialist revolution comes to our assistance (A Letter to American Workingmen, Moscow, August 20, 1918)."

He sought to gain a breathing spell.

In this setting the central committee of the Russian Communist Party addressed a proclamation signed by Lenin and Trotzky and a few revolutionary Socialists and Communists then resident in Moscow, to revolutionary elements throughout the world to take part in the First Congress of the Communist International to which specific left-wing Communist and revolutionary Socialist groups were invited from various countries (Izvestia, January 24, 1919). The call was broadcasted throughout the world by George Chicherin, Soviet Commissar of Foreign Affairs.

The first Congress of the Communist International took place on March 2, 1919, in Moscow. Incorporated into its very fiber was the following principle which later became number 14 of the famous 21 points governing admission to the Communist International, adopted by the Second Congress, July 17 to August 7, 1920:

Each party desirous of affiliating with the Communist International should be obliged to render every possible assistance to the Soviet Republics in their struggle against all counterrevolutionary forces. The Communist parties should carry you a precise and definite propaganda to induce the workers to refuse to transport any kind of military equipment intended for fighting against the Soviet Republics, and should also by legal or illegal means carry on a propaganda among the troops sent against the workers' republics, etc.

II. THEORY

Communist theory is based upon the teachings of Karl Marx, founder of the First International; Friedrich Engels, his closest associate; Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, founder of the Third or Communist International and first Premier of the Soviet Government; and Joseph Stalin, his successor. From the time of its foundation in 1919 to the present, the American Communist movement has pledged its loyalty to these teachings, as have the Communist Parties of all countries. These teachings are embodied in the Program of the Communist International adopted in July-August 1928 as a uniform and common program for all sections of the Communist International and never repudiated.

The Communist Party member is thoroughly indoctrinated with the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, through the Communist press, pamphlets, books, meetings and schools. The purpose of this indoctrination is manifold.

It serves to mold a uniform, Communist consciousness, thus setting this totalitarian sect definitely apart from all democratically minded Americans. It is the authoritative frame of reference for all Communists.

The Communist movement is primarily a combative organization dedicated to the struggle against those whom it looks upon as

class enemies. It, therefore, operates on strict military lines. Indoctrination serves this army, as it does any other, as a cohesive factor. Its professed idealistic aims tend to glorify the movement and build up the morale of its followers.

Communist theory exalts and perpetuates the authority of its leaders, for it claims to present a body of unassailable scientific principles of which the Communist leader is the sole authorized spokesman and interpreter. Any deviation from the principles of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, as most recently interpreted by the leader, is subject to severe penalties all the way from censure and expulsion to physical liquidation.

Contrary to the belief which Communist leaders seek to inculcate among rank-and-file members and followers, that Communist theory is an immutable body of scientific principles, it is subject to the most flexible interpretation solely by the leader as it suits his particular purposes at any time. Thus Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism furnished the justification for support of collective security against the Fascist aggressors prior to the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact, denunciation of World War II as "imperialist" during the life of this pact, and support of the Allied Nations after Hitler attacked the Soviet Union on June 21, 1941. In moments of frankness, Communists have given revealing evidence of this theoretical jugglery. Speaking in criticism of the line of Earl Browder, which had just been officially repudiated, Gilbert Green, member of the National Board of the Communist Party of the United States, confessed that "unable to make the line fit the theory, I began to reshape the theory to fit the line" (Political Affairs, July 1945, p. 591). Margaret Cowl, a charter member of the American Communist organization, explained that the Browder line had been imposed by selecting "from the Marxian-Leninist classics excerpts out of their content to justify Comrade Browder's revisionist policies" (Daily Worker, July 18, 1945, p. 7). No matter what tortuous turns the party line may take, the suitable quotations from Marx-Lenin and Stalin will always be found to justify the change.

But for the rank and file the sanctity of the Marxian theory remains inviolable. As Lenin put it:

"The Marxian doctrine is omnipotent, because it is true. It is complete and harmonious, and provides men with an integral world conception * * * (The Teachings of Karl Marx by V. I. Lenin, Little Lenin Library, England, 1942, p. 7.)"

Without attempting an exhaustive analysis of Communist theory, we shall try to present a few of its basic tenets, which determine the Communist attitude toward democracy and its institutions.

For nearly a century, from Karl Marx to Joseph Stalin and William Z. Foster, Communists have assailed the evils of the capitalist system and have prophesied its collapse. Their propaganda and activity is therefore based upon a consuming hatred of the system of free enterprise or capitalism as "naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation" (Karl Marx) regardless of the fact that this system has produced for Americans the highest standard of living and freedom in the world today.

Capitalism

The following citations are typical of the Communist attitude toward capitalism:

"Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolize all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation * * * The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated." (Karl Marx, Capital, vol. I, Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation, published in 1867.)

"The history of capitalism has entirely confirmed the Marxian theory concerning the laws of development of capitalist society and the contradiction of this development which inevitably lead to the downfall of the whole capitalist system." (Program of the Communist International, adopted September 1, 1928.)

Democracy

From this conception of the nature of capitalism flows the Communist interpretation of the modern state, of American democracy.

"The burgeoisie (capitalists) has at last, since the establishment of modern industry and of the world market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative state, exclusive sway. The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole burgeoisie." (Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx and Frederich Engels, 1848.)

In his authoritative work, The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, published in 1894, Friedrich Engels developed this thought further. He declared that "the modern representative state is the instrument of the exploitation of wage-labor by capital." The state, he added, makes use of a public force, to accomplish its purpose. This public force "consists not merely of armed men, but of material appendages, prisons, and repressive institutions of all kinds." Lenin endorsed this conception in his basic work, The State and the Revolution and claimed that "A standing army and police are the chief instruments of state power."

A hostile attitude toward the American Government based upon this theory, is fundamental with every Communist whether he is in the Federal service, in the armed forces, or in civil life. It holds precedence over all oaths of allegiance to America no matter how solemnly sworn, and over all professions of national unity and patriotism. It is summarized by William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, when he wrote in 1932, "the Communist Party makes it clear to the workers that the capitalist democracy is a sham" (Toward Soviet America, p. 255). On January 20, 1944, he reiterated, "A postwar Roosevelt administration would continue to be as it is now, an imperialist government" (published in Political Affairs, July 1945, p. 645).

Soviet fatherland

Prior to the establishment of the Soviet Union, Karl Marx held that the workingmen have no country (Communist manifesto). After the Russian Revolution, Communists have maintained that the Soviet Union is the only fatherland to which they owe allegiance. In other words, this means that each individual Communist owes prior and superior loyalty to the Soviet government, regardless of his oath of citizenship or other sworn statements to the contrary. The note of Soviet loyalty pervades all Communist literature.

The following excerpt from the proceedings of the fourth world congress of the Communist International held November 5 to December 5, 1922, is merely typical:

"In view of the fact that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is the only fatherland of the international proletariat, the principal bulwark of its achievements, and the most important factor for its international emancipation, the international proletariat must, on its part, facilitiate the success of the work of socialist construction in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and defend her against the attacks of the capitalist powers by all the means in its power."

It was in this spirit that Earl Browder read to 2,000 applicants for Communist Party membership in the New York district in 1935, the following solemn pledge:

"I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism."

Class struggle

The Communist looks upon society as sharply divided into two mutually antagonistic classes—the capitalist class (bourgeoisie) and the working class (proletariat). In this he follows the teachings of Karl Marx as laid down in the Communist Manifesto:

"Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature: It has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other—bourgeoisie and proletariat."

At all times the Communist considers himself as an active participant in this class struggle. He identifies himself with the proletariat and its class interests, although a large proportion, if not the greater part, of the members and especially of the leaders of the Communist Party of the United States, are intellectuals and professionals. Marx, Lenin, and Stalin belong to the class of intellectuals not workers. The Communist is contemptuous toward the American Federation of Labor, which includes over eight million workers, because of its overwhelming hostility toward the Communists and what they stand for. Similarly he is hostile toward all workers who refuse to subordinate themselves to the Communist Party line.

The Communist includes within the category of the hated ruling class not only the capitalist class but all those who, in his opinion, do its bidding, i. e., business executives, foremen, and government executives. He accepts their orders only under sufferance hoping for the speedy arrival of the day of revolutionary deliverance from "capitalist slavery." The outlook of the Communist Party member on this question is succinctly expressed by Karl Marx in the Communist Manifesto:

"Manifesto: As privates of the industrial army they are placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of officers and sergeants. Not only are they slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois state; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the over looker, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself."

Revolution

According to Communist theory, the incessant clashes between the working class and the capitalists increase in their proportions until they reach a climax—the revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist system by the workers. In the Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx, the picture is drawn as follows:

"The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also other previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property. * * * In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, ranging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie 'lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.'"

The central target of the Communist, marked for destruction, is the so-called "capitalist state." While this primary aim is veiled in modern Communist literature, it remains a basic precept of Communist theory. In a

letter to his friend Kugelman, dated April 12, 1871, Karl Marx stated that the task of the proletarian revolution is "No longer, as before, to transfer the bureaucratic and military machinery from one hand to another, but to smash it.

Commenting on this statement, Lenin added:

"Today, both in England and in America, the 'preliminary conditions for every real people's revolution is the smashing, the destruction of the ready-made state machine.'" (Selected Works, vol. II, p. 37.)

"In other words," says Stalin in his Foundations of Leninism, "the law of violent proletarian revolution, the law of the smashing of the bourgeois state machine as a preliminary condition for such a revolution, is an inevitable law of the revolutionary movement in the imperialist countries of the world." (Leninism, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1942, p. 35.)

Dictatorship of the proletariat

In place of democracy, the Communist propose to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat which Lenin has defined as "the rule—unrestricted by law and based on force—of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie (The State and Revolution).

"'The dictatorship of the proletariat,' in the opinion of Joseph Stalin, 'cannot arise as the result of the peaceful development of bourgeois society and of bourgeois democracy; it can arise only as the result of the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, the bourgeois army, the bourgeois bureaucratic machine, the bourgeois police. * * * The new form of organization of the proletariat is the Soviets'" (Leninism, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1942, pp. 33, 34).

According to Lenin's promise this dictatorship was to be "a state that is democratic in a new way—for the proletarians and the propertyless in general, and dictatorial in a new way—against the bourgeoisie" (Lenin, Selected Works, vol. VII, p. 34). It was to be a "proletarian democracy, the democracy of the exploited majority, based upon the restriction of the rights of the exploiting minority and directed against this minority" (Stalin). It was to be a democracy of the poor against the rich. Reporting for the Communist Political Association at its convention on May 20–23, 1944, Robert Minor approved this theory declaring that, "There is nothing more thoroughly proven by history than the correctness of the Marxian doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat." Stalin has explained the real meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat as it functions in the Soviet Union as follows:

"No important political or organizational problem is ever decided by our soviets and other mass organizations without directives from our party. In this sense we may say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is substantially the dictatorship of the party, as the force which effectively guides it." (Quoted by Edgar Snow, in Pattern of Soviet Power, p. 164.)

For the evidence as to what the dictatorship of the proletariat has meant in terms of actual experience, we shall have to go to those fully familiar with it, men who are wholly sympathetic to the cause of labor and freedom.

"I am quite clear as to the difference in purpose between the dictatorship of Soviet Russia and those of the Fascist countries. But the methods employed are largely the same. All have their secret police, and employ arbitrary arrest and imprisonment. What is the difference in that respect between the Russian OGPU, the Gestapo of Germany, and the Ovra of Italy? They are all endowed with wide powers of arrest and imprisonment. Russia, too, has suppressed all political opposition. Liberty of speech, freedom of the press are denied to all but the Communist Party." (Walter Citrine, general secretary of the British Trade Union Congress, president of the International Federation of Trade Unions, from his book, I Search for Truth in Russia.)

"There are classes in the U. S. S. R.; a privileged class and an exploited class, a ruling class and a ruled class. Between the two there is a wide difference in the standard of living. * * * There is no private ownership in the U. S. S. R. There is only State ownership. * * * A small number enjoy this State property. The greater number of people support it, produce, respect, and are separated from it by a huge police apparatus of repression." (M. Yvon, worker, foreman, factory director, and member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, who spent 11 years in that country and wrote What Has Become of the Russian Revolution, from which the above is quoted.)

"The Soviet state * * * has not suppressed the professional police. It has not assimilated the courts in direct jurisdiction by the masses. It has not done away with social hierarchy in production. It has not lessened the total subjection of the local community to the power of the state * * *. It shows a tendency toward the development of a more specialized apparatus of repression than before * * *. In reality, the Soviet state continues to be, as the state of the past, a government apparatus resting in the hands of a minority. (Of another minority, of course.) Little by little, the 'power of the Soviets' is being replaced with the power of a certain party * * *. The 'Soviet regime' becomes the means of bringing into power and maintaining in power a revolutionary minority which claims to defend the interests of a majority."

(J. Martov, Socialist theoretician, member of the Russian Social-Democratic Party, who died in 1923. The above is quoted from his pamphlet, "The State and the Socialist Revolution.")

"But the Soviet trade unions are both formally and actually an organic part of the state machinery, a branch of the Soviet Government and the ruling dictatorial Communist Party. * * * The policy of these unions has been determined by the Communist Party, i. e., by the Government, and the members of the executive committees have been appointed by the same agency, not by the membership. Since there are no free elections of any kind in Soviet Russia and the people have no guaranties of personal liberty and no freedom of expression or of association, the Russian trade unions cannot be regarded as free organizations of workers. They are organs of the state, a department of the Government." (William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, in the New Leader, August 4, 1945, p. 1.)

In other words, the Communists propose to substitute for the democratic, capitalist system under which ownership and control of industry is diffused among millions of individuals, a system under which industry, banks, newspapers, railroads, radio networks, films, and the government itself, are all controlled by a one-party dictatorship of the Communists. Under the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, which is actually the rule of a small group at the head of the Communist Party led by an all-powerful dictator, the great mass of the people would be deprived of those freedoms which we have learned to enjoy as naturally as the air we breathe, namely, the right to take a new job; the right to work or not to work; the right to own and operate an automobile; the right to travel freely from place to place without police passport; the right to have a private telephone without interference; the right to criticize freely public officials and remove them, if necessary; the right to hear and read opposing opinions on the radio and in the press; the right to vote an opposition ticket; the right to a fair trial under a system of law emphasizing the innocence of the accused unless proven guilty; freedom from personal surveillance by janitors and other agents in the employ of the police; freedom of speech, press, and assembly; freedom of worship; freedom of research.

The theoretical principles which we outlined constitute the fundamentals of what is known as Marxism-Leninism to which the Communist Party of the United States pledged "adherence" at its last convention on July 26–28, 1945. Its present allegiance to these doctrines is further assured by William Z. Foster in his statement in the Worker of August 5, 1945, page 10:

"Our Communist parties will do well to pattern after the lives of our greatest leaders * * * Marx, the greatest Socialist theoretician, was simultaneously the active, practical leader of the First International. Lenin, the great theoretician of imperialism, also led in the tremendous work of building the Russian Communist Party and of carrying through the Russian revolution, and Stalin, the best Marxist of our times * * *. Our party with such great leaders as its guides, must become a party of active mass organization as well as one of propaganda and agitation."

It should be clear that these principles are neither scientific nor calculated to further the well-being of the broad masses of the people, but that they constitute, in fact, a program which seeks to exploit every problem confronting our present democratic society in order to destroy that society and establish in its place a Communist dictatorship.

III. STAGES IN THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

On September 18, 1945, the Communist Party of the United States celebrated its twenty-sixth anniversary at Madison Square Garden in New York City. Despite the varied forms the American Communist movement has taken since its inception in September 1919, the Madison Square Garden meeting has furnished a concrete expression of the unbroken continuity of the movement in both organization and principle.

The Communist Party of America held its first convention from September 1–7, 1919, at the headquarters of the Russian Federation of the Socialist Party in Chicago. The call for the meeting was published in the (Russian) Nory Mir on July 7, 1919, and in the Revolutionary Age of August 23, 1919, both being left-wing Socialist organs. It called upon all those who favored an "international alliance of the Socialist movement of the United States only with the Communist groups of other countries" to answer "the clarion call of the Third International."

On the day the convention opened, Gregory Zinoviev, president of the executive committee of the Communist International, issued an appeal from Moscow to "all those who are for the Soviets and the proletarian dictatorship * * * to unite as soon as possible and form a unified Communist Party."

The temper of the Chicago meeting was well described in his official report by I. E. Ferguson, who was elected to its executive council. He declared:

"For one thing the fact that the federation delegates were largely Slavic emphasized the close union between the organization of the Communist Party here and the parent organization which came into being in Moscow in March of this year—the Communist International. It was the Russian expression of Marxism which predominated this convention, the Marxism of Lenin, and the party traditions of the Bolsheviki."

Zinoviev's appeal urging all American Communists to "unite" went unheeded. A large group of English-speaking delegates headed by Benjamin Gitlow and John Reed, resented the predominance of Russian-speaking elements at the convention and decided to split away. They held their own convention, almost simultaneously, in Chicago and formed the Communist Labor

Party. Both groups were represented as the Second Congress of the Communist International held in the summer of 1920.

Veterans of these two conventions more than a quarter of a century ago, hold key positions in the Communist Party of the United States today. Alexander Bittelman, member of the program committee of the Communist Party of America convention, is today a member of the national board of the Communist Party of the United States, and editor of its official Yiddish organ, the Morning Freiheit. Alfred Wagenknecht, elected executive secretary of the Communist Labor Party, is presently vice president of the Illinois-Indiana district and a member of the review commission of the Communist Party of the United States. Charles Krumbein, another CLP delegate was, until his death in February 1947, national treasurer. Earl Browder and Ella Reeve Bloor, who is now a national board member, were charter members of the Communist Labor Party.

Typical of the close relationship between the budding Communist movement and the Soviet Government was the fact that Dr. Julius Hammer, later a Soviet concessionaire, financed the Communist Labor Party, as well as the establishment of the Soviet "Embassy" under Ludwig C. A. K. Martens in 1919. Gregory Weinstein, editor of the Novy Mir and the (Communist) Class Struggle, became chancellor of the "Embassy." (I Confess by Benjamin Gitlow, pp. 28 and 59.)

On January 12, 1920, Zinoviev addressed a note to both Communist groups calling for "an immediate joint convention" to unite them to "seize power and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat." His letter was based upon the "reports of comrades who have arrived from America." It was clear that failure to comply would have meant nonrecognition by the Communist International. Thereupon a special convention of the United Communist Party was held secretly in May 1921, which constituted itself as the "American section of the Communist International." The raids conducted by Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer had driven the party underground. All delegates assumed aliases. Israel Amter, alias Ford, was elected as an alternate member of the central executive committee. He is today a member of the National Board of the Communist Party of the United States.

The Communist International was, however, unwilling to allow the American Communists to limit themselves to illegal activity. The Third Congress of the Communist International held in Moscow in June–July 1921 therefore issued the following directive to its American affiliate:

"The Communist International draws the attention of the Communist Party of America (united) to the fact that the illegal organization must not only form the ground for the collection and crystallization of active Communist forces, but that it is their duty to try all ways and means to get out of their illegalized condition out into the open, among the wide masses, that it is their duty to find the means and form to unite these masses politically through public activity into the struggle against American capitalism." (Communist, August 1921.)

Conformance with this edict was immediate. The next issue of the Communist, official organ of the Communist Party of America, carried an article under the alias of Roger B. Nelson, entitled "The Party at the Crossroads," from which we quote in part:

"Our central executive committee, conscious of its duties and the pressing needs of the Communist International and the party, has laid the foundation for unifying and centralizing the open, legal activities of the party * * *. In doing this we are simply accepting the tactics adopted by the Third Congress of the Comintern." (Communist, September 1921.)

In pursuance of the Comintern mandate, the party established the American Labor Alliance, as its open, legal expression. This was reported to the secret convention of the Communist Party of America held at Bridgman, Mich., on August 17–21, 1921, by Jay Lovestone, alias Wheat, its executive secretary. Instructions from the Third International were personally transmitted by Max Bedacht, alias Marshall, American delegate to its third congress. He is now general secretary of the International Workers Order, a wealthy Communist fraternal organization.

This form was not considered satisfactory by the Communist International and hence it was decided to establish the Workers Party of America. A convention was called for this purpose in New York City on December 23–26, 1921. At its second convention held in December 1922, in New York City, the Workers Party of America adopted a program presented by Charles E. Ruthenberg, member of the central executive committee of the Communist Party of America under the alias of Damon. This convention elected him as executive secretary, a position to be held until March 2, 1927, the date of his death.

Both the Communist Party of America and the Workers Party of America sent delegates to the fourth congress of the Communist International held in Moscow, November 7–December 3, 1922. The two organizations were eventually merged into the Workers (Communist) Party of America at a convention held August 21–30, 1925.

At the sixth convention in New York City on March 1–10, 1928, the party assumed the name of the Communist Party of the United States, which was continued until the convention of May 20–22, 1944, at which time the organization transformed itself into the Communist Political Association. During this period the party formally disaffiliated itself from the Communist International on November 16, 1940, for the specific purpose of removing itself from the terms of the so-called Voorhis Act, requiring the registration of foreign agents. The Communist International was itself formally dissolved on May 22, 1943, thus removing from the field of Russian relations with her wartime allies a source of considerable irritation.

These formal severances of international ties did not remove the American Communists from foreign influence and direction. At a convention held on July 26–28, 1945, and in response to a letter of criticism from Jacques Duclos, secretary of the Communist Party of France and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International, the Communist Party of the United States was reconstituted and Earl Browder was replaced by William Z. Foster as its official leader.

As late as May 20–23, 1944, Robert Minor in his official report to the founding convention of the Communist Political Association emphasized the historical ties of his organization with the Communist Party of America, the Communist Labor Party, and the Communist International, when he spoke of "the history of the Communist Party" which "came to life in Chicago in September 1919 and which now passes on its heritage to the Communist Political Association." He added:

"It is doubly important to emphasize that the American Communist Party found a priceless and indispensable source of strength, clarity of principle—and the courage and assurance that can come only from the international outlook and soundness of theory—in its contact with its brother Communist Parties of all countries through the Communist International."

Chronology of conventions

September 1–7, 1919: Communist Party of America.

September 1–7, 1919: Communist Labor Party of America.

May 1921: United Communist Party of America.

December 23–26, 1921: Workers Party of America.

August 17–21, 1922: Communist Party of America.

December 1922: Workers Party of America.

December 23, 1923, to January 1, 1924: Workers Party of America.

August 21–30, 1925: Workers (Communist) Party of America.

October 1927: Workers (Communist) Party of America.

March 1–10, 1929: Workers (Communist) Party of America.

March 31–April 4, 1930: Communist Party of the United States.

April 2–8, 1934: Communist Party of the United States.

June 24–28, 1936: Communist Party of the United States.

May 27–31, 1938: Communist Party of the United States.

May 30 to June 2, 1940: Communist Party of the United States.

May 20–22, 1944: Communist Political Association.

July 26–28, 1945: Communist Party of the United States.

IV. RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

From its birth in 1917 the international Communist movement, including the Communist Party of the United States, has been merely a foreign extension of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which, according to article 126 of the Soviet Constitution published in 1941, "is the leading core of all organizations of the working people, both public and state" (p. 36). The Communist movement has maintained this character since the Russian Revolution on November 7, 1917, before the Communist International was founded in March 1919, during its existence, and after its formal dissolution in May 1943. On the basis of evidence at hand, we are forced to assume that the Communist International still exists and is still functioning, only in a more covert form. A proper estimate of this movement must be based upon an appreciation of its unbroken historical continuity, regardless of outward tactical changes.

Pro-Communist spokesmen have labored arduously to convince the American people that each Communist Party is an independent entity by itself, rooted in its own native soil and history and free from foreign domination of any sort. The May 1938 constitution of the Communist Party of the United States declared, for example:

"The Communist Party of the United States of America is a working class political party carrying forward the traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Jackson, and Lincoln, and of the Declaration of Independence."

Despite these assurances there is ample evidence to the contrary. Walter G. Krivitsky, former Chief of the Soviet Military Intelligence for western Europe, testified on October 11, 1939, before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. He died mysteriously in a Washington hotel in February 1941. He stated under oath before the special committee:

"The Communist International is not an organization of autonomous parties. The Communist Parties are nothing more than branch offices of the Russian Communist Party. The Communist International that operates in Moscow is nothing more than an administrative body which transmits the decrees reached by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Soviet Russia."

Russian party model

William Z. Foster, who is now chairman of the National Board of the Communist Party of the United States, has long recognized the hegemony of the Russian Communist Party over the movement of which he is a part. In his work, Toward Soviet America, he said:

"The Communist Party of the United States * * * is the American section of the Communist International * * *. The Communist International is a disciplined world party * * *. Its leading party, by virtue of its great revolutionary experience, is the Russian Communist Party" (pp. 258, 259).

So strongly was this view entrenched that we find the Russian Communist Party referred to repeatedly throughout official Communist literature as the model party to be studied and imitated. In the Daily Worker of March 5, 1939, for example, we find a reprint of the following cabled editorial from the Moscow Pravda:

"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union always was and always will be a model, an example for the Communist Parties of all countries."

The Party Organizer, official internal organ of the Communist Party of the United States, intended for the enlightenment of party members only, has carried the following sample articles from time to time:

Outline for Class in Organization on Lines of Russian Model. (December 1927, p. 10.)

How a Unit of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Works. (February 1931, p. 25.)

How the American Party Modeled Its Constitution on the Russian Party. (May 1931, p. 1.)

Bolshevik Organizational Principles From an Outline Used by the Soviet Party Schools (March 1931, p. 27; April 1931, p. 28.)

Reporting on the meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States held on December 3–5, 1938, which dealt with the publication of the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist of January 1939 announced:

"It will be the task and duty of the membership and organizations of the Communist Party in the coming months to organize and carry through the distribution of the minimum of 100,000 copies of this book" (p. 3).

The party urged followers to acquire it, to have it, to study it.

According to a speech delivered on February 24, 1941, by Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, "close to 200,000 copies of that book were sold."

At the Tenth Convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A., the following leaders of the Russian Communist Party were elected to the honorary presidium: Stalin, Dimitroff, Manuilsky, and Kuusinen (Daily Worker, May 28, 1938, pp. 1, 5). Appropriately the emblem of the Russian Communist Party, the American Communist Party, and the Communist parties throughout the world has always been the hammer and sickle.

Russian dominance

From the outset the Russian Communist Party actively manipulated the affairs of the Communist International and those of each individual, affiliated party. Angelica Balabanoff, appointed first secretary of the Communist International by the Central Committee of the Russian Party, has described how the delegates to its first congress were chosen:

"Most of the 35 delegates and 15 guests had been hand picked by the Russian Central Committee from so-called Communist parties in those smaller nations which had formerly comprised the Russian Empire, such as Estonia, Latvia, Ukraine, and Finland." (My Life as a Rebel by Angelica Balabanoff, p. 213.)

Although ostensibly representing the Italian party, she was considered a member of the Russian Communist Party by virtue of her residence in that country, and hence subject to its discipline. All Communists, regardless of nationality, residing in the Soviet Union, enjoy a similar status, including American Communists assigned to Moscow and such present-day luminaries as Togliatti (Ercoli) of Italy, Rakosi of Hungary, Fischer of Austria, Thorez of France, Pauker of Rumania, and Dimitroff of Bulgaria.

Angelica Balabanoff has described the operations of Russian Communist Party rule in Comintern matters.

"It was the secret party committee, not the Comintern Executive, that * * * issued statements in my name" (p. 224). "A leader or agent would be summoned to Moscow and ordered to have certain resolutions passed in his own party. * * * Moscow named all leaders" (p. 270). "I was now considered a member of the Russian party, whose delegates were elected by the Russian Central Committee" (p. 272).

So much was the Communist International the creature of the Russian Communist Party that it was made the subject of a report submitted at each convention of that party. At the ninth congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Karl Radek explained in his official report:

"The III International is the child of the Russian Communist Party. It was created here, in the Kremlin, on the initiative of the Communist Party of Russia. The executive committee of the III International is in our hands." (Izvestia, April 3, 1920.)

This estimate is corroborated by the testimony of Benjamin Gitlow, one of the founders of the American Communist movement, Communist candidate for Vice President in 1924 and 1928, and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International:

"Whereas the American party * * * had to carry our decisions of the Communist International explicitly, the Russian party was given a privileged position. The Russian party was permitted not only to review all decisions of the Communist International, but, if necessary, to take it up in its political committee and to change those decisions * * * and that decision becomes binding upon the parties of the Communist International.

"Another important fact to bear in mind is that * * * the rules governing the Communist International provide that whenever a party sends representatives to the Communist International, or delegates to the congresses of the Communist International, those delegates cannot be instructed * * * but they must go to the Communist International uninstructed. The only party that has the right to instruct its delegates to the Communist International and to make those instructions binding on the delegates is the Russian Communist Party. * * * In other words, they have built the Communist International organization in such a way that the Russians under no circumstances can lose control of the Communist International." (Hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, September 8, 1939—vol. VII, p. 4583.)

The Communist Party of the United States is so much an organic part of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that it has invariably reflected the factional struggles for power within its Soviet parent body. In 1926, for example, Zinoviev and Trotsky united in a left-opposition movement against Joseph Stalin. The Political Committee of the Workers (Communist) Party of America adopted a resolution on October 29, 1926, which expressed its support of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the struggle against the opposition led by Comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev. As the struggle intensified, James P. Cannon and Martin Ahern, both members of the American party's central executive committee, were expelled as Trotskyites on October 27, 1928, together with their followers. Later the Russian party was torn by a struggle against the Right Bukharinites, with the result that Jay Lovestone, executive secretary of the Workers (Communist) Party was expelled on July 8, 1929, because of his suspected sympathies with Bukharin. In his speech delivered before the American commission of the executive committee of the Communist International on May 6, 1929, Stalin described in some detail the race between the American Communist factions for Moscow's favor, as follows:

"I take such a simple fact as the speculation on the divergencies in the CPSU practiced by both the majority as well as the minority leaders. You know that the one as well as the other section of the Communist Party of America in vying with each other, overtaking each other as if at the races, strenuously try to speculate on the existing and nonexisting differences in the CPSU."

A study of the proceedings of the various congresses of the Communist International shows that the proceedings were completely dominated by members of the Russian Communist Party, subject to the discipline of the party's central committee. Those who were not Russians by birth were members of the Russian party by virtue of their residence in the Soviet Union. Some were political exiles from Fascist countries. The first three chairmen of the Communist International were members of the political bureau of the Russian Communist Party: Zinoviev, Bukharin, and Molotov, the latter being simultaneously the Soviet Premier. The last chairman was George Dimitrov, who was released from Soviet citizenship and his duties as a deputy to the Supreme Soviet on August 22, 1945, to participate in the Bulgarian elections.

At Comintern congresses, representatives of the Russian Communist party presented the main reports, resolutions, and manifestos. The manifesto of the first congress held in 1919 was drafted by Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Rakovsky, and Platten, a Swiss refugee, in Moscow. At the second congress in 1920 the chief reporters were Zinoviev, Lenin, Bukharin, and Radek. The third congress in 1921 heard reports from Zinoviev, Lenin, Radek, and Hintchouk. The chief speakers at the fourth congress in 1922 were Zinoviev, Radek, Trotsky, and Lenin. The following members of the Russian Communist party presented the main reports at the fifth congress in 1924: Zinoviev, Kalinin, Varga (Hungarian), Bukharin, Rykov, and Manuilsky. Reporters at the sixth congress in 1928 were Bukharin, Kuusinen, Varga, Stutschka, and Manuilsky. The seventh congress in 1935 heard the reports of Pieck (German), Dimitrov, Ercoli (Italian), and Manuilsky, all acting under the discipline of the Communst party of the Soviet Union.

Instructions from Moscow

The guiding hand of the leaders of the Russian Communist party is to be seen not only in Comintern matters in general but also in questions dealing specifically with the activities of the American Communist Party. The following are cited by way of example:

1. Communication dated January 12, 1920, signed by Zinoviev, calling for an "immediate joint convention" to unite the Communist party of America and the Communist Labor Party.

2. Referring to the United States, Zinoviev declared at the third congress of the Communist International: "the task of the Communists consists in agitating among the masses to develop the maximum of organizational work, to ruthlessly unmask the opportunists and centrists, to wrest the masses away from them, to destroy illusions, which were brought by social traitors." (Report of meetings held in Moscow, June 22–July 12, 1921, p. 45.)

3. At the fourth congress of the Communist International, Zinoviev reported that the affairs of the American party were discussed five times in the executive committee and nine times in its presidium. He added:

"We were able to send a delegate to America, who remained for some time. The

greatest difficulty with which the American movement has been confronted was the problem of combining together legal and illegal work." (Abridged report of meetings held at Petrograd and Moscow, Nov. 7–Dec. 3, 1922, pp. 9, 11, 25.)

4. In his report to the fifth congress, Zinoviev made the following reference to the affairs of the American Party:

"We must also combat some digressions to the right in the American movement; these digressions made their appearance in connection with the Third Party, the La Follette party." (Abridged Report of Meetings held at Moscow, June 17 to July 8, 1924, p. 16.)

5. The Thesis of Zinoviev presented to a plenary session of the Executive Committee of the Communist International in 1925 contained a section dealing with the Workers Party of America and pointed out that it was necessary "to fuse the national sections of the party into a real united party." (The Party Organization published by the Workers (Communist) Party of America, ch. II.)

6. Speaking at the Sixth Congress of the Comintern on July 19, 1928, Bukharin outlined the duties of the American Communist Party, as follows:

"Events like the United States incursion in Nicaragua have not been sufficiently counteracted, particularly by the American Party."

7. Joseph Stalin presented a statement before the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on May 14, 1929 which presented in detail the tasks of the American Party, including The International Red Day Campaign, The Trade Union Unity Convention to be held in Cleveland on August 31, The Gastonia Campaign, Work Among the Miners, The Developing Activities of the All-America Anti-Imperialist League, and the "liquidation of all factions * * * in the Communist Party of America." His proposals on May 6, 1929 before the American Commission of the Communist International called for "An Open Letter * * * in the name of the ECCI (Executive Committee of the Communist International) to the members of the Communist Party of America", demanding that "The Secretariat of the CEC (Central Executive Committee) of the American Party be altered, and the "recall" of Jay Lovestone, then secretary of the American party. (Original documents presented by Jay Lovestone before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. XI, pp. 7112 to 7124.)

George Dimitrov was similarly explicit in his instructions to the American party at the Seventh Congress in 1935, when he called for the creation of a "mass people's front in America * * * in opposition to the parties of the trusts and the banks, and likewise to growing fascisms. * * * Our comrades in the United States acted rightly in taking the initiative for the creation of such a party." (Abridged Stenographic Report of the VII Congress of the Communist International, p. 151.)

Parallel policies

From about 1935 leaders of the Russian Communist Party have refrained from issuing open instructions to the American Communist Party. A number of simultaneous historical factors offer an explanation of this new procedure. First is the growing threat of Fascist Germany and Stalin's desire to placate public opinion in the democracies. Second is the probable use of instructions by short wave and cable. Third is the fact that pronouncements by leading spokesmen of the international Communist movement in such internationally circulated Communist publications as International Press Correspondence, World News and Views, Communist International, War and the Working Class, New Times, as well as the official Soviet press, served in the nature of instructions to a thoroughly disciplined world party. Indisputable evidence of Russian direction of the international Communist movement, including that of the United States, lies in the unswerving parallelism of policy between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the party in the United States, both before and after 1935.

1. Against the League of Nations: (a) In December 1927, at the Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Stalin spoke against the League of Nations and charged that all the talk about it "only resulted in fooling the masses, in new outbursts of armament, and in fresh exacerbation of impending conflicts." Russia was not in the League.

(b) William Z. Foster, present leader of the Communist Party, United States of America, voiced a similar opinion in his book, Toward Soviet America (1932), when he declared:

"The League of Nations is not a peace-striving institution * * * it is a grouping of imperialist bandits intent only upon their own schemes of mass exploitation and war making" (p. 42).

2. For the League of Nations: (a) In an interview with Walter Duranty published in the New York Times of December 25, 1933, Stalin declared that "it is not impossible that we should support the League of Nations in spite of its colossal defects." Russia joined the League in September 1934.

(b) The resolution of the central committee of the Communist Party, United States of America, published in the Daily Worker of July 3, 1937, stated that "it is necessary to explain that the present League is not quite the same as it was some years ago, that the present League can and must be used for the cause of peace and democracy."

The November 1934 issue of the Communist official monthly organ of the CPUSA said:

"The outstanding event in the present international situation is the entry of the U. S. S. R. into the League of Nations" (p. 1059).

3. For collective security: (a) Maxim Litvinov, representing the Soviet Union before the Council of the League of Nations meeting in London on March 17, 1936, urged "the collective organization of security" against the Fascist aggressor nations.

(b) The central committee of the Communist Party, United States of America, in its resolution published in the Daily Worker of July 3, 1937, called for "the creation of a united front of democratic states against the Fascist aggressors."

4. For the Soviet-German pact, against imperialist war: (a) The Soviet-German nonaggression pact was signed by Joseph Stalin on August 23, 1939. V. M. Molotov, Soviet People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, terms World War II "the new foreign adventures of the imperialist powers." (Daily Worker, November 7, 1939.)

(b) On August 26, 1939, Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America, broadcasting over the NBC network, declared that "The Soviet-German agreement is thus the best current example of the way to peace." Browder called the war "a family quarrel of rival imperialisms." (Daily Worker, November 6, 1939.)

5. Support of the war against the Fascist powers: (a) Germany attacked the Soviet Union on June 21, 1941. On July 3, Joseph Stalin broadcast an appeal in which he said:

"In this war of liberation we shall not be alone. In this great war we shall have true allies in the peoples of Europe and America."

(b) The official statement of the Communist Party, U. S. A., issued on June 22, 1941, demanded that the American people:

"Support the U. S. S. R. in its fight against Nazi war." (Communist, July 1941, p. 579.)

6. In defense of American capitalism: (a) On November 6, 1941, following Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin declared:

"But in England and the U. S. A. there are elementary democratic liberties, there are trade-unions * * *, there are labor parties, there is a parliament, whereas the Hitler regime abolished all these institutions in Germany * * *. It is enough to compare these two series of facts to understand * * * the full falseness of the German-Fascist chatter about an Anglo-American plutocratic regime."

(b) In a speech delivered at Bridgeport, Conn., Earl Browder went even further in his support of capitalism when he said:

"We must be prepared to give the hand of cooperation and fellowship to everyone who fights for the realization of this coalition. If J. P. Morgan supports this coalition and goes down the line for it, I as a Communist am prepared to clasp his hand on that and join with him to realize it." (Communist, January 1944, p. 8.)

7. Attack on American capitalism: (a) With the end of the war the Soviet press has shown evidence of hostility toward American capitalism, of which the following are typical:

"The impending danger of mass unemployment is indicative of the profound contradictions that are inherent in America's economics." (M. Rubinstein, New Times, July 1, 1945, p. 19.)

"A choice has to be made. Either with the trusts and large banks, which are in the hands of traitors, or with the people." (Andre Marty, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France, Trud, July 3, 1945.)

(b) The draft resolution of the National Board of the Communist Political Association presented to its convention on July 26–28, 1945, was similarly hostile to American capital:

"American capital supported the war against Nazi Germany, not because of hatred of fascism or a desire to liberate suffering Europe from the heel of Nazi despotism, but because it recognized in Hitler Germany a dangerous imperialist rival * * *. They are trying to organize a new cordon sanitaire against the Soviet Union * * *. On the home front the big trusts and monopolies are blocking the development of a satisfactory program to meet the human needs of reconversion with its accompanying economic dislocations and severe unemployment." (Political Affairs, July 1945, pp. 579, 580, 581.)

8. Causes of Soviet victory: (a) The Moscow Bolshevik of July 4, 1945, stated that an important immediate task of propagandists and agitators is to explain fully and clearly the causes of the Soviet Union's victory. Propagandists and agitators must show the causes of victory are the strength of the socialist system, the might of the Red Army, and the leadership in military and state affairs of Generalissimo Stalin.

(b) Robert Thompson, member of the secretariat of the Communist Party of the United States, has written an article entitled "The Red Army's Contributions to Victory," in Political Affairs, of June 1945, in which he says in part:

"The Soviet high command, guided by the military and political genius of Marshal Stalin, opposed the strategy and tactics of Hitler's total war and blitzkrieg with the strategy and tactics of a people's war backed by the unique economic, military, moral, and political resources of the socialist country" (p. 488).

9. The following articles are reprinted in Political Affairs, official American Communist monthly organ, from the War and the Working Class, which is now known as New Times, a semimonthly magazine published in Moscow. Its purpose is obviously to guide the policy of Communist parties throughout the world. The reprinting of these articles

denotes not only their acceptance by the American Communist Party, but also that they are to serve as official directives for the guidance of party members.

Title	Author	Date of publications War and Working Classes or New Times	Political Affairs
France and the San Francisco Conference	N. Nilolayev	No. 6, Feb. 15, 1945	May 1945.
Democracy	A. Sokolov	No. 8, Apr. 15, 1945	June 1945.
International Cartels and Their Agents	V. Linetsky	No. 7, Apr. 1, 1945	August 1945.
Poland After Liberation	K. Rudnitsky	No. 8, Apr. 15, 1945	Do.
Trade Unions and the State	K. Omelchenko	do	Do.

Alex Bittelman, a member of the present National Board of the Communist Party, U. S. A., and one of the founders of the movement in this country, has epitomized the role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in his authoritative pamphlet entitled, "Milestones in the History of the Communist Party":

"The Communist International and its model party—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—headed by Comrade Stalin, gave us the guidance that helped the American Communists to find the way to the masses and to the position of vanguard. (p. 8) * * * The leading role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the Comintern needs neither explanation nor apology. A party that has opened up the epoch of the world revolution, and that is successfully building a classless society on one-sixth of the earth, is cheerfully recognized and followed as the leading party of the World Communist movement" (p. 71).

V. HOW THE WORLD COMMUNIST PARTY IS CONTROLLED

Lenin, the founder and chief theoretician of the Communist movement, had no faith in the efficacy of the democratic process. In frequent polemics on party organization, he was most caustic in his contempt for those who believed in following "like a tail" the spontaneity of the masses, branding such tactics as "Khvostism," after the Russian word, "khvost," meaning "tail." He advocated rather a political organization that would concentrate "all secret functions in the hands of as small a number of professional revolutionists as possible."

We have already shown how the leadership of the international Communist movement was concentrated from the outset in the hands of a small group at the head of the Russian Communist Party. In the early stages of the Communist International, however, when the movement was comparatively weak, there was some pretense of democratic methods. As the Soviet Union and the Communist Parties grew in strength, these pseudo-democratic forms were discarded and the dictatorship of the Russian Communist leaders of the international Communist movement became even more complete and absolute. Thus the first six Congresses of the Comintern were held at comparatively frequent intervals in 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1924, and 1928. Delegates from affiliated parties attended these congresses and participated in the discussions of proposals presented by the controlling Russian Communist group. The seventh congress was held in 1935, after a lapse of 7 years. From 1935 to 1943, when the dissolution of the Comintern was announced by Joseph Stalin, no congress was held. At the present time it would seem that Communist Parties have no right to participate in the formulation of decisions affecting their movement, which emanate from Moscow. Thus, the dissolution of the Comintern serves a dual purpose. (1) It removes the basis for the charge of Moscow interference in the internal affairs of nations and lends color to the claim that the various Communist movements are spontaneous and indigenous. (2) It gives the Russian Communist leaders a justification for the abolition of international congresses or other media of international participation in the formulation of the world Communist policy, and thus makes for increased concentration of control in their hands.

Having had no previous experience with a centralized world party of this new type, Americans find it difficult to grasp its essential character. We are prone to judge the Communist Party in terms of other American political parties which are bound by no international ties but are inherently devoted to this country, which are loose in their discipline and tolerate wide differences of opinion, parties which serve as vehicles for the aspirations and demands of multifarious American groups and are wholly indigenous. While publicly encouraging the illusion that their party answers this description, the Communists are fully aware of the falsity of this belief. Speaking at the thirteenth plenum of the executive committee of the Comintern in December 1933, Ossip Piatnitsky, veteran leader of the Russian Communist Party and head of the organization department of the Communist International, declared that—

"The Communist International is united by the executive committee of the Comintern into a single, world, centralized party."

This conception was fully accepted by American Communists. Earl Browder has referred to the Communist Party of the United States as "a party of an entirely new type, never before seen in America, a party of the type first created by Lenin in the Russian Bolshevik Party, and now being brought into existence in every capitalist country, under the leadership of the world party of communism, the Communist International." (Modern Thinker, March 1934.)

The basis of the organization of the international Communist movement as a world Communist Party was envisaged at the time of its foundation as necessitated by "conditions of acute civil warfare," which called for the highest degree of centralization under the aegis of the executive committee of the Communist International. The subordination of the various national Communist Parties to the central control of Moscow was justified in the program of the Communist International on the ground that such parties must subordinate "the temporary, partial, group, and national interests of the proletariat to its lasting, general, international interests." In the final analysis, the interpretation of what constitutes the "lasting, general, international interests" of the proletariat was left to the Russian-dominated executive committee of the Communist International in Moscow. As the "only fatherland of the international proletariat, the principal bulwark of its achievements and the most important factor for its international emancipation," it follows that the interests of the Soviet Union must be paramount over all other interests, whether they be those of the workers in a particular industry or the interests of a nation as a whole.

From 1919 to approximately 1935, the Communist International has repeatedly published detailed statutes governing its affiliated parties. The discontinuance of the publication of these statutes coincides with the adoption by the 1935 Congress of the Comintern of its "Trojan Horse" policy when the Soviet Union began to seek the support of the democracies against the rising threat of Nazi aggression, when the Communists began to minimize and deny their revolutionary aims, and when they proclaimed their devotion of democracy. It is a reflection of the fact that Russian leadership of the Comintern had reached a pinnacle of unchallenged authority over a period of 16 years, an authority based not upon publicized statute books but upon the compulsory power of its farflung apparatus. These statutes have received their binding force through long Communist usage and unreserved acceptance. They have neither lapsed nor have they been publicly rescinded. The practices of the Communist Party of the United States at the present time are fully in line with these statutes and give ample evidence of their continued potency.

To preserve an appearance of democracy the constitution of the Comintern sought to create the impression that its world congress is its supreme authority. Since such congresses have been held every few years or not at all, it has been manifestly impossible for them to handle the everyday affairs of the International. Hence its constitution provided that "The leading body of the Communist International in the period between congresses is the executive committee, which gives instruction to all the sections of the Communist International and controls their activity" (par. 12). This body usually included representatives of the leading Communist Parties. That body is, however, required to meet "not less than once every 6 months" (par. 23). The executive committee therefore "elects a presidium responsible to the ECCI, which acts as the permanent body carrying out all the business of the ECCI in the interval between the meetings of the latter" (par. 19). To carry the centralization still further the presidium elects a political secretariat "which is empowered to make decisions." Joseph Zack, formerly a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party, United States of America, stationed in Moscow from 1927 to 1930, has described the actual functioning of the International, before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on September 30, 1939, as follows:

"The ones that control the actual organizational machinery of the Communist International are the so-called small commission, a body of three individuals, and those three individuals (Piatnitzky, Manuilsky, Kuusinen) are all Russians and members of the Russian Communist Party. * * * Stalin has a battery of private secretaries whose function is to watch the foreign situation—China, the Americas, Germany, France, England—and who report to him personally * * * and through them and through * * * these three members of the commission, he commands and controls absolutely everything."

This small commission is in a position to issue orders to at least 65 Communist Parties throughout the world—orders which "must be promptly carried out."

The seat of the Comintern has always been in Moscow, which has given the Russian Communist Party physical control of its apparatus. Mr. Zack has testified that this apparatus consisted of "about four or five hundred employees, and all these employees are paid out of the Russian Treasury."

Statutes

On July 23–August 7, 1920, at the Second Congress of the Communist International, the following statute was adopted with the approval of the American Communist delegates who were present:

"All the parties and organizations comprising the Communist International bear the name of the Communist Party of the given country (section of the Communist International)."

Since that time the American section has been known as either the Communist Party of America, the Workers (Communist) Party of America, or the Communist Party of the United States (section of the Communist In-

ternational) until the party's alleged disaffiliation from the Communist International on November 16, 1940. It will also be remembered that after assuming the name of the Communist Political Association on May 20–23, 1944, for strategic reasons, the party resumed the name of the Communist Party of the United States on July 26–28, 1945, as prescribed by the original statutes. The compulsory adoption of this name emphasizes the subordination of all Communist Parties to their recognized Communist center in Moscow. This is accentuated by the fact that but one Communist Party is officially recognized in any given country, a situation which still prevails after the dissolution of the Comintern.

The Communist International has formulated model statutes (Musterstatut) for all Communist Parties which have been imposed upon these parties oftentimes despite considerable internal resistance. In the report of the organization department of the executive committee of the Communist International between the fifth and sixth world congresses, progress along this line is noted as follows:

"Beginning in the second half of 1925, immediately after the first international organizing conference, the revision of the statutes of the Communist parties in accordance with the requirements of the model statutes was taken in hand under the guidance of the organizing department."

In 1935 the Workers Library Publishers published a Manual on Organization for Communist party members, by J. Peters, which is prefaced by the following introductory note by Jack Stachel, now a member of the national board of the party:

"Much of the material was of late available, as for example, the famous and thoroughgoing resolutions and decisions on the question of organization adopted by the second organizational concerence of the Communist international."

In 1925 a directive from the Communist International brought about the reorganization of the Workers Party of America on a shop nuclei basis. This form of organization, which the Comintern constitution has called the basic unit of the Communist Party organization (par. 4) which had been abandoned for some time in the United States, has been revived at the convention in July 1945.

The statutes also provide for strict supervision of the American party's program. Point 15 of the Conditions of Admission to the Communist International provide that—"the program of each party belonging to the Communist International should be confirmed by the next congress of the Communist International or its executive committee."

The constitution of the Communist International has even prescribed the exact form of membership requirement for its affiliated parties, namely:

"Membership in the Communist Party and in the Communist International is open to all those who accept the program and rules of the respective Communist Party and of the Communist International, who join one of the basic units of the party, actively work in it, abide by all the decisions of the party and of the Communist International, and regularly pay party dues."

Article 3, section 1 of the constitution of the Workers (Communist) Party, dealing with membership, which is typical, repeats this formula almost word for word:

"Every person who accepts the program and statutes of the Communist International and of the Workers (Communist) Party, who becomes a member of a basic suborganization of the party, who is active in this organization, who subordinates himself to all the decisions of the comintern and of the party, and regularly pays his membership dues may be a member of the party."

It should be noted here that each individual member must subordinate himself to the decisions of the Communist International, whose constitution provides that such decisions "must be unreservedly carried out even if a part of the party membership or of the local party organizations are in disagreement with it" (par. 5). The executive committee of the Comintern is in fact empowered" to annul or amend decisions of party congresses and of central committees of parties and also to make decisions which are obligatory for them" (pars. 13 and 14).

Recent developments in the Communist Party of the United States in 1945, 2 years after the announced dissolution of the comintern, offer a striking illustration of the enforcement of these provisions. Jacques Duclos, secretary of the Communist Party of France, and a member of executive committee of the "defunct" Communist International, wrote a letter which appeared in Les Cahiers du Communisme, of April 1945, official theoretical organ of the Communist Party of France, in which he attacked Earl Browder, then president of the Communist Political Association, for revision of Marxism, for promulgating "the concept of a long-term class peace," and for the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States, which had been approved at a convention held in New York City on May 20–23, 1944. It should be noted at this point that the comintern constitution provides that all relations between its various national sections are subject to the control of the executive committee of the Communist International (pars. 31, 32). They cannot deal with each other as free, autonomous parties. It is significant also that the Communist Party of France officially endorsed Browder's policy in its official organ-in-exile, France Nouvelle of May 1944, indicating that this position had received official international approval at the time. It is therefore difficult to avoid the conclusion that Duclos was selected as a convenient mouthpiece of the submerged executive committee of the Communist International exercising its right to annul or amend decisions of party congresses."

In accordance with the rule laid down in No. 18 of the original 21 points or conditions of admission to the Communist International, it is provided that "all the leading organs of the press of every party are bound to publish all the most important documents of the executive committee of the Communist International." True to this practice, by means of which the Comintern can go over the heads of national party leaders, the Worker of May 27, 1945, section 3, pages 1 and 3, carried a full translation of the Duclos letter severely criticizing the Communist Political Association and its president. In accepting these strictures, Browder expressed his welcome of the initiative of Jacques Duclos in utilizing this channel of international discussion. A resolution approving Duclos' position was adopted by the emergency national convention held on July 26 to 28, 1945, with Browder's single opposition vote. He later pledged his full support of the resolution.

An exact parallel is to be found in the address by the executive committee of the Communist International to all members of the Communist Party of the United States, attacking Jay Lovestone, then executive secretary of the CPUSA, for failing to recognize the crisis of capitalism, and the "necessity of accentuating the struggle against reformism," and removing him "from work in the American Communist Party" (Daily Worker, May 20, 1929, p. 3). A few days later his expulsion was announced by the executive committee of the Comintern and the central executive committee of the American party, this being but one of numerous expulsions of leaders of national parties by the executive committee of the Comintern in line with section III, paragraph 15, of its constitution, providing that "the ECCI has the right to expel from the Communist International, entire sections, groups, and individual members who violate the program and constitution of the Communist International or the decisions of the world congress or of the ECCI."

The extent of Moscow control of the American Communist Party is indicated by the fact that conventions "can be convened only with the consent of the ECCI." (Constitution of the Communist International, par. 34.) Illustrating this procedure the Daily Worker of October 15, 1924, announced among the decisions of Workers' Party central executive committee that "the CEC authorized a request to the Communist International for permission to hold an annual convention of the Workers' Party some time during the month of January." It should be noted at this point that it required a letter from Jacques Duclos, member of the executive committee of the Comintern, to provoke an emergency convention of the American party on July 26–28, 1945.

The constitution of the Comintern has provided a number of safeguards to insure its complete control over affiliated parties. The executive committee of the Communist International is empowered to send its own representatives to member parties who speak in its name.

"Such representatives receive their instructions from the ECCI or from its presidium, and are responsible to them for their activities. Representatives of the ECCI have the right to participate in meetings of the central party bodies as well as the local organizations of the sections to which they are sent * * *. They may * * * speak in opposition to the central committee of the given section, at congresses, and conferences of that section, if the line of the central committee in question diverges from the instructions of the ECCI. Representatives of the ECCI are especially obliged to supervise the carrying out of the decisions of the world congresses and the executive committee of the Communist International" (par. 22).

Communist International representatives

The application of this decision is demonstrated by a significant list of Comintern representatives who have operated in this country under false passports and various aliases. Although these representatives varied in nationality, it must be remembered that they all represented the Communist world party centered in Moscow.

G. Valetski (Valetsky), a Pole, who attended the secret convention at Bridgman, Mich., on August 17–21, 1922, member of the Russian Communist Party.

Josef Pogany, alias John Schwartz, alias John Pepper, alias John Swift, former commander in the Hungarian Red Army in 1919, exile to the Soviet Union, attended the secret convention at Bridgman, Mich., on August 17–21, 1922, elected a member of the Central executive committee of the Workers Party of America at its convention on December 23, 1923, to January 1, 1924, disciplined and recalled by the Comintern in July 1929.

Boris Reinstein, a former member of the American Socialist Labor Party, by whom he was repudiated, present at the first congress of the Communist International and the secret convention of the Communist Party of America at Bridgman, Mich., on August 17–21, 1922.

S. Gussev, alias P. Green, also known as Drabkin, chairman of the Parity Commission of the Workers Party Convention on August 21–30, 1925; general in the Red Army; member of the Control Commission of the Russian Communist Party.

Y. Sirola, alias Miller, representative to the United States in 1926–27; former chairman of the Finnish Communist Party, and one of the founders of the Communist International.

Arthur Ewert, alias Braun, alias Brown, alias Berger, Comintern representative to the United States in 1927, sent to Brazil and arrested in December 1935; former member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Germany.

Harry Pollitt, Comintern representative to the convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A., held March 1–10, 1929; secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain.

Philipp Dengel, Comintern representative to the convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A., held March 1–10, 1929; member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Germany.

B. Mikhailov, alias George Williams, Comintern representative to the Communist Party, U. S. A., in 1929, 1930; member of the Anglo-American Commission of the Communist International; prominent member of the Russian Communist Party.

Gerhart Eisler, alias Hans Berger, writer of articles in the American Communist press pertaining to Communist policy in Germany from 1931–32 and from 1940–45; former editor of Under the Banner of Marxism, official theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Austria; former Comintern representative in the Caribbean area.

Benjamin Gitlow, former member of the executive committee of the Communist International, former member of the political committee of the Communist Party, U. S. A., and at one time its candidate for Vice President of the United States, has described the powers of these plenipotentiaries in his testimony before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, from which we quote:

"A representative of the Communist International to the United States during his stay in the United States was the boss of the party. * * * He automatically became a member of all the leading committees of the party in the United States and participated in its deliberations and enjoyed a vote on matters that were voted upon. * * * All he had to do was to impose his power and mandate as a C. I. representative, and then his view would prevail. Generally American Communists never would take a position in opposition to the representatives of the Communist International" (hearings, vol. 7, p. 4590).

According to paragraph 22 of the Comintern constitution, its executive committee also had "the right to send instructors to the various sections of the Communist International," whose "powers and duties * * * are determined by the ECCI to whom the instructors are responsible." These instructors supervised special phases of Communist activity in the United States. We cite a number out of many more who have visited these shores:

Carl E. Johnson, alias Scott, also known as Jensen or Jenson, a former member of the Lettish Communist Club of Boston who left the United States in 1919 and became a member of the Russian Communist Party. He came to the United States in 1921–22 to supervise Communist trade-union activity as the official representative of the Red International of Labor Unions with headquarters in Moscow.

——— Petersen represented the Communist International in 1925–26 in dealing with Communist activity among the Swedes in the United States, active in editing the Swedish Communist paper, Ny Tid.

——— Marcus, alias M. Jenks, Comintern instructor on organization matters in the United States in 1928, wrote a pamphlet for the American party entitled, "The Party Nucleus."

F. Marini, also known as Maurio Alpi, alias Fred Brown, attended the tenth convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A., in May 1938 as secretary of its commission on organization, press, and literature and chairman of its commission on national groups, writer for the Communist; originally from Trieste from where he went to Russia; active in the United States for about 10 years.

William Rust, Young Communist International representative to the Young Communist League of the United States in 1927 approximately; member of the British Communist Party and Young Communist League.

Willi Muenzenberg, visited the United States in 1934; former Communist deputy to the Reichstag in 1933; international head of the Workers International Relief, a Communist relief organization.

Louis Gibarti, also known as Dobos, in the United States intermittently after 1934 as representative of the Workers International Relief; an ex-officer in the Red Army of Hungary under Bela Kun.

Raissa Irene Browder, wife of Earl Browder, collaborator in writing his standard Communist works for at least 16 years; delegate to the tenth convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A., May 27–31, 1938; identified as an agent of the Soviet Intelligence Service before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (vol. XI, p. 7026).

Raymond Guyot, leader of the Young Communist International delegation at the World Youth Congress at Vassar, 1938, general secretary of the Young Communist International, and member of the political bureau of the Communist Party of France.

Reports to the Communist International

According to the Guiding Rules for the Construction and Organization of Communist Parties adopted by the Third Congress of the Communist International in 1921, "The party must hand in its quarterly report to the leading body of the Communist International," as well as the minutes of its central committee (constitution, par. 29). In addition, "Special reports must be made on the work of special committees of the party" (Guiding Rules, pars. 17, 18). The extent and detail of these reports is illustrated by the following items included in a report of the executive committee of the Communist International between the Fifth and Sixth World Congresses, published in July 1928: General economic and political situation in the United States, inner situation in the Workers (Communist Party), campaign against the war danger, "Hands off China" campaign against American intervention in Nicaragua "in which for the first time in American labor history the marines were appealed to on the necessity to fight against their own government," work of the All-American Anti-Imperialist League, the Labor Party movement, the Sacco-Vanzetti campaign, the campaign for the protection of the foreign born, the work of the Anti-Fascist Alliance of North America, the Unemployed Councils, the Trade Union Educational League, the anthracite-coal strike, the Passaic textile strike, the furriers' strike, the cloakmakers' strike, the bituminous-coal strike, the Colorado miners' strike, the Haverhill shoe workers' strike, party schools, the party press, work in the cooperatives, work among the farmers, the International Labor Defense, the Workers International Relief, the Workers' Sports Federation, the American Negro Labor Congress, anti-American agitation in the Philippines and in Hawaii, work among women, the Young Workers' League, number of members and units of the Workers (Communist) Party. No congressional committee in the United States was ever able to secure so detailed a report of the activities of the American Communists.

As late as April 1945 Jacques Duclos, member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, published in the Cahiers Du Communisme, theoretical organ of the Communist Party of France, the following detailed information regarding the American Communist Political Association: A study of various speeches by Earl Browder, a comment on William Z. Foster's unpublished letter of criticism of Browder's position, a comment on the unpublished speech of Samuel Darcy, study of the organization's membership figures. Since it has not been the Comintern practice for one party to report its internal affairs and difficulties to another but rather to the Executive Committee of the Communist International, one is forced to the conclusion that Duclos' familiarity with these matters was the result of information received through official international Communist headquarters in Moscow, for whom he was acting as spokesman.

These reports are thoroughly discussed by various committees of the Comintern. They are subjected to intensive criticism on the basis of which instructions are sent to the party concerned, "(a) through correspondence; (b) through instructors; (c) through workers from the Department." (Report of the organization Department of the ECCI 5th—6th Cong. p. 32.) At the Fourth Congress in 1922, for example, Zinoviev reported that the American Communist Party had been discussed five times by its Executive Committee and nine times by its Presidium, such matters being referred to it, as a rule by the American Commission of the Comintern. Between 1924 and 1928 the Information Department of the Comintern received 38 reports and 14 communications from the American Communist Party. Prior to its Sixth Congress the Report of the Executive Committee declared:

"Since the Fifth Congress the inner-Party situation has been dealt with in special American commissions in the Fifth, Sixth, and Eighth Enlarged ECCI sessions."

Speaking of its work in general, the ECCI report adds:

"During the period covered by the report a large number of general and individual letters have been sent to the Parties, instructions have been given in conversation with Party representatives, criticisms of factory newspapers of the various countries have been published, etc."

In the Communist International of October 15, 1933, there appeared a detailed analysis and criticism of 2 months' issues of the Daily Worker, published in the course of checking up the carrying out of the tasks put before the Communist Party of the United States of America by the executive committee of the Communist International. The article was entitled "Review of the Daily Worker, U. S. A. (June and July)."

The recent detailed criticism of the American party by Jacques Duclos may be properly considered as a criticism by the international executive committee. Appended to this volume will be found a long list of directives issued by the executive committee of the Comintern to the American party in conformance with this procedure.

For those who cherish the illusion that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has voluntarily liquidated this world-wide apparatus built up in the course of 26 years of laborious effort and struggle, for those who retain even a vestige of doubt regarding the maintenance of this network, let us add these memorable words from Stalin's oration at Lenin's funeral. They were reprinted in the New York Times of August 19, 1945, without the slightest protest from Soviet sources:

"In leaving us Comrade Lenin ordered us to strengthen and expand the union of the republics. We swear to thee, Comrade Lenin, to honor thy command. * * * In leaving us, Comrade Lenin enjoined us to be faithful to the Communist International. We swear to thee, Comrade Lenin, that we shall dedicate our lives to the enlargement

and the reinforcement of the union of the workers of the world, the Communist International."

VI. THE AMERICAN SECTION OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communist Party of the United States has functioned at all times and throughout all its forms as an integral part of the Moscow-controlled world-wide Communist apparatus, submitting unreservedly to its decisions, placing its resources and individual members at the full disposal of the Soviet Government or the Comintern for assignment to duty in any part of the globe, and receiving in return certain special, branch-office privileges.

American Communist literature abounds in declarations of complete subservience to the Communist International and its decisions, from which a few examples are cited. In 1929 the Comintern forwarded an address to the United States calling for the repudiation of the leaders of the American party elected at a convention held in March 1929. The Daily Worker of June 1, 1929, page 1, has described the reaction to this document:

"The address of the Comintern to the American party members was received 14 days ago. The political committee immediately, by unanimous vote, accepted, endorsed, and pledged to carry it into effect and fight against any opposition to it, open or concealed. The address was published in the Daily Worker of May 20, the first issue after receipt of the document. * * * By mail and telegraph a constant stream of messages has poured into the party office, from district organizers, district bureaus, language bureaus, and newspaper staffs, and from leading workers, all accepting, endorsing, and pledging to struggle for the line of the address and against all opposition to it."

In an article entitled "Milestones of Comintern Leadership," by Alex Bittelman, now a member of the national board of the Community Party, United States of America, we find the following acknowledgment by an official representative of that party, of the role played by the Comintern in the affairs of the American party:

"A unified and single Communist Party was materialized in the United States in shorter time, less painfully and wastefully, than would have been the case without the advice and assistance of the Comintern * * * Once more the American Communists consulted with the Communist International. That was in 1921–22. And correct advice came, as it was bound to, and with its help, Workers' Party was organized. * * * What was it that proved especially helpful for the American Communist in the Comintern advice on legal and illegal work? It was the world and Russian experience of bolshevism. * * * It was the Comintern advice and guidance that helped American Communists to turn full face to the building of a left wing in the reformist unions beginning with 1920; it was the advice of the Comintern that helped formulate a correct solution to one of the basic problems of the American proletariat—the organization of the unorganized into trade-unions; it was advice of the Comintern on independent leadership of the economic struggles by the revolutionary elements that helped formulate strike policies and tactics. * * * Once more came the outside influence of the Comintern; and what did it say? It said that the struggle against discrimination and for Negro rights is a revolutionary struggle for the national liberation of the Negroes, that we must fight for complete Negro equality, and that in the Black Belt the full realization of this demand requires the fight for the national self-determination of the Negroes including the right of separation from the United States and the organization of an independent state. * * * The Comintern undertook to prepare the proletarian vanguard, the Communist Party, and through it the whole working class for effective struggle against unemployment." (Communist, March 1934.)

On a number of occasions, Earl Browder, as the executive head of the Communist Party of the United States, has expressed his complete acceptance of Comintern decisions. At its eighth convention on April 2–8, 1934, he stated in his official report:

"The task of our party today, the tasks of this convention, have been clearly and systematically set forth in the documents before us for adoption, especially the theses and decisions of the thirteenth plenum of the executive committee of the Communist International. * * * My report has been for the purpose of further elaborating these fundamental directives and discussing some of our central problems concretely in the light of these directives." (Communism in the United States, by Earl Browder, p. 78.)

Even when such decisions involved severest criticism, Mr. Browder's submission to the Comintern was never in doubt. Criticized for certain errors on the question of America's relation toward Japan, he declared in his report to the sixteenth plenum of the central committee of the Communist Party, United States of America, on January 28, 1933:

"With regard to my own errors in this question, I must admit an additional weakness in not yet having written the extended article on this whole question that was suggested in the letter of the Comintern." (Communists, March 1933, p. 237.)

In the same spirit he received the critical letter of Jacques Duclos, which served to remove Browder from the leadership of the American party, with the statement that—

"We can only welcome the initiative of Jacques Duclos." (Worker, May 27, 1945, sec. 3, p. 1.)

In his authoritative Manual on Organization, J. Peters has laid down the principle which guides the American party in its attitude toward the Comintern, as follows:

"We do not question the political correctness of the decisions, resolutions, etc., of the executive committee of CI" (p. 27).

American delegates to Moscow

Since 1917 there has been an endless pilgrimage of American Communists to Moscow, including delegates to Comintern congresses and plenums of the ECCI between congresses, direct representatives of the American Communist Party, workers in special departments, students, information specialists, trade-union delegations, tourists, representatives of Communist-front organizations, couriers, and secret agents. For the most part these individuals traveled under aliases and false passports. Thus, Moscow came to be known in inner party circles as Mecca. The conspiritorial nature of the Communist movement precludes the possibility of presenting anything but a partial list of these to indicate the pattern.

The following representatives of the American Communist movement were delegates to the various congresses of the Communist International in Moscow:

First Congress, March 1–6, 1919: John Reed; Boris Reinstein, alias Davidson; S. K. Rutgers.

Second Congress, July 23–August 7, 1920: Louis C. Fraina (Communist Party of America); Alexander Stocklitsky (Communist Party of America); John Reed (Communist Labor Party); John N. Jorgis (Communist Labor Party); Alexander Bilan (Communist Labor Party); Edward I. Lindgren, alias Flynn (Communist Party of America). Member of the executive committee of the Communist International, John Reed.

Third Congress, June 22–July 12, 1921: Robert Minor, alias Ballester; Max Bedacht, alias Marshall; Bill Haywood for the Industrial Workers of the World; Nicholas Hourwich, alias Andrews; Oscar Tywerousky, alias Baldwin; Ella Reeve Bloor; Jack Crosby. Member of the executive committee of the Communist International, Baldwin.

Fourth Congress, November 7–December 3, 1922: L. E. Katterfeld, alias Carr; Max Bedacht, alias Marshall; ——— ———, alias Pullman; T. R. Sullivan; Arne Swabeck, alias Lansing; Otto Huiswood, alias J. Billings; Claude McKay; ——— Kucher; Alexander Trachtenberg (Workers Party of America); Max Bedacht (Workers Party of America); ——— ———, alias James Cartwright (Workers Party of America). Member of the executive committee of the Communist International, Carr, James P. Cannon. Substitute, Charles E. Ruthenberg, alias Damon.

Fifth Congress, June 17–July 8, 1924: William F. Dunne; Israel Amter; ——— Jackson; Joseph Pogany, alias John Pepper.

Sixth Congress, July 25–Sept. 1, 1928: Lovett Fort-Whiteman; William W. Weinstone; James P. Cannon; James W. Ford; John Pepper; Otto Hall, alias Jones; Harry M. Wicks; Alex Bittelman; Benjamin Gitlow; Earl Browder, alias Dixon; Samuel Darcy; Bertram D. Wolfe; William Z. Foster; Jay Lovestone; Manuel Gomez; William F. Dunne. Member of the executive committee of the Communist International—William Z. Foster, Jay Lovestone (expelled); candidates, Benjamin Gitlow, Otto Huiswood; later Robert Minor, alias Randolph. Gitlow was later expelled.

Seventh Congress, July 25–August 21, 1935: Earl Browder, William Z. Foster, Gilbert Green, James W. Ford, Robert Minor, Samuel Darcy. Members of the executive committee of the Communist International—William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, Gilbert Green; candidate, James W. Ford.

Testifying under oath before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Earl Browder enumerated his trips to Moscow as follows:

"My first visit was in 1921. * * * My next visit in 1926. * * * I believe I have visited there almost at least once a year since then. My last visit was in 1938. * * * Since 1930 I visited there because of my position as general secretary of the party, and a desire to confer with Communists in the Soviet Union and other countries." (Hearing, vol. 7, p. 4324.)

William Z. Foster, present leader of the Communist Party, United States of America, testified before the same committee on September 29, 1939, that he had visited the Soviet Union on official Communist business at least 10 times in 1921, 1923 or 1924, 1926, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1934, 1935, and 1937.

Between congresses of the Comintern, the American Communist Party maintained official representatives in Moscow. Among those listed by Benjamin Gitlow, former member of the executive committee of the Comintern, are the following: Israel Amter, Max Bedacht, Robert Minor, Louis J. Engdahl, Earl Browder, Harrison George, H. M. Wicks, William W. Weinstone, and others. (Hearings, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. 7, p. 4590.)

Among those called to Moscow in 1929 to discuss the factional situation in the American party were: William Z. Foster, Alex Bittelman, Max Bedacht, William W. Weinstone, Jay Lovestone, Benjamin Gitlow, William Miller, Tom Myerscough, William White, Edward Welsh, Bertram D. Wolfe, and Alex Noral.

In his autobiographical work, Proletarian Journey, Fred E. Beal, former Communist strike leader, tells of meeting the following members of the central executive committee of the American Communist Party in Moscow during the 1930's: William F. Dunne, Clarence Hathaway, and William W. Weinstone; also John Little, representing the

American Young Communist League; and Michael Gold, Daily Worker columnist.

Andrew Smith, another former member of the American Communist Party, wrote the story of his adventures in the Soviet Union in a book entitled, "I Was a Soviet Worker," in which he told of conferring with John J. Ballam, J. Peters, and Andrew Overgaard, a trade-union specialist, and all representatives of the American party in Moscow. Smith's credientials were signed by J. Peters and reproduced in his book.

American agents of Moscow

As a part of a disciplined world party, members of the American Communist Party are subject to assignment to Moscow or any other part of the world under the orders of the Comintern. It would require an omnipotent intelligence service to list all of these agents and their many varied activities. We can only list some by way of example:

Earl Browder, head of the Pan-Pacific Secretariat, with headquarters in Hankow, China, in 1927; editor of its official organ, the Pan-Pacific Worker; works published in the Soviet Union.

Philip Aronberg, assistant to Browder in China.

Harry M. Wicks, representative to Germany and Latin America (1926).

William F. Dunne, representative to France and Germany.

Joseph Zack, representative to Latin America, especially Venezuela (1932).

Jack Johnstone, representative to India and deported by the British Government (1928).

Harrison George, representative to Montevideo (1926).

Charles Krumbein, representative to Great Britain (1930).

Robert Minor and Earl Browder, acting in behalf of the national committee of the American Communist Party in Spain in 1936–39. Andre Marty, member of the executive committee of the Comintern, was the head of an international secretariat in general charge of operations. Other Comintern representatives in Spain were Generals Emil Kleber, Lukacz, Krieger, Cole Dumont, and Vladimir Copic. Earl Browder has estimated that at least 2,000 members of the American Communist Party were members of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade in Spain at the time. Minor officials of the American party in Spain were John Gates, member of the New York State Committee; William Lawrence, organizational secretary of New York State; Joe Dallet, section organizer in Youngstown, Ohio; Saul Wellman, member of the New York State Committee of the Young Communist League; Steve Nelson, member of the national committee; and Joseph North, editor of the New Masses. (For an extensive list of members of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, organized by the Communist Party of the United States, see Committee on Un-American Activities, Appendix IX, pp. 274–291.)

Leonard Emil Mins, American Communist research analyst for the Office of Strategic Services, later suspended. Editor for the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute in Moscow prior to 1936.

Nicholas Dozenberg, business manager of the Voice of Labor, official organ of the Workers Party of America, 1920–23; business manager of the Worker, official organ of the Workers Party of America and manager of the Workers Publishing Society, 1923–27; agent of the Soviet Military Intelligence, 1927–39.

Schachno Epstein, editor of the Morning Freiheit, official Yiddish organ of the Communist Party of the United States; secretary of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee in Moscow in 1944; editor of the Emes, Yiddish organ in the Soviet Union, until his decease in 1945.

Williana Burroughs, Communist candidate for Lieutenant Governor of New York State in 1934; English-language announcer for the Anglo-American department of the Moscow radio for nearly 10 years, until October 1945.

Within the year 1934 the following American Communists contributed articles to the International Press Correspondence (Inprecorr), official weekly press organ of the Communist International: Hy Kravif, A. G. Bosse, alias for Alfred J. Brooks, Jack Hardy, alias for Dale Zysman, Earl Reeve, Esther Lowell, Sascha Small, Howard Lindsay, Charles D. Fletcher, Grace Hutchins, Al Steele, M. Morris, Joseph North, I. Amter, A. A. Heller, Robert Julien Kenton, Edwin Seaver, Anna Damon, Louis Coleman, P. Francis, A. B. Magil, Alan Calmer, H. Puro, Samuel Weinman, Rose Crane, Leo Thompson, Simon W. Gerson, Vern Smith, Rose Baron, William L. Patterson, Isidor Schneider, P. Lapinsky, Paul Novick, Harry Dawson, Peter Dorn, Paul Levin.

A. G. Bosse, alias for Alfred J. Brooks, a public-school teacher of the New York public schools, a member of the Communist Party, U. S. A., had absented himself from his position from 1929 to 1932 to serve as a "referent" or information specialist for the Communist International in Moscow. (Report of the Subcommittee of the Joint Legislative Committee To Investigate Procedures and Methods of Allocating State Moneys for Public School Purposes and Subversive Activities, pp. 314–317.)

Joseph Kowalski, editor of the Communist paper, Glos Lodowy; in charge of a Soviet penitentiary between 1920 and 1923, after his deportation from the United States in 1920; now active in the United States. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, vol. 2, p. 1310.)

Anna Louise Strong, writer for the following Communist magazines in the United States: Liberator, New Masses, Soviet Russia Today, Labor Herald, Workers Monthly, Sunday Worker; editor of the Moscow Daily News.

Speaking of some of the founders of the American Communist Party, Jay Lovestone, its former executive secretary, stated that some of them "are now holding the highest posts in the Communist party of the Soviet Union, in the Russian trade unions, and in the Soviet Government" (pages from Party History by J. Lovestone).

An American Communist, whether he be a member of a trade-union or other organization or employed in private industry or by the Government, is merely a cog in this vast international apparatus.

Among those who received special revolutionary training at the Marx-Lenin Institute and other schools in Moscow were the following leaders of the American Communist Party: Carl Reeve, Charles Krumbein, Joseph Zack, William Odell Nowell, Beatrice Siskind, Clarence Hathaway, Morris Childs, also known as Chilofsky and as Summers, Harry M. Wicks, Marcel Scherer, Otto Hall, Lovett Fort-Whiteman, who in turn sent 10 young Negro students to Moscow, and many others. Mr. Nowell, who has since repudiated the Communist Party, testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as to the character of this training.

He testified that he had been a student at the Lenin University from September 1931 to December 1932; that his traveling expenses from Detroit were paid by the central committee of the American Communist Party; that his living expenses in Moscow were defrayed by the Communist International and the Soviet Government; that there were approximately 30 other American students at the university at the time. Among the subjects he studied were strike strategy, military science, secret service, codes, Communist strategy, street fighting, civil warfare, organization, tactics and methods of the Red army, and sabotage, (Hearings, vol. 11, pp. 7020–7026). A conservative estimate would show at least several hundred such highly trained operatives in the United States at the present time.

Indicative of the reverent attitude of American Communists toward Moscow is the fact that the remains of such leading American Communists as John Reed and Charles E. Ruthenberg are buried at the wall of the Kremlin in that city. When William Z. Foster suffered a serious heart ailment between 1932 and 1936, he went to the Soviet Union for treatment.

Press propaganda

The report of the agitation and propaganda department (Agitprop) of the Comintern, issued between the fifth and sixth congresses, indicated extensive aid to the press of the Communist Parties throughout the world. This report says that—

"The supply of the party press with useful material, which was one of the first and foremost through the "Imprecorr," proved to be the best way of influencing it" (p. 42).

Scattered throughout the American Communist press of this period are reprints of Inprecorr or International Press Correspondence material. Inprecorr was succeeded by World News and Views, later by the War and the Working Classes, and most recently by New Times. Reprints from these two Moscow organs have appeared in the Communist, later known as Political Affairs, on the following dates: March 1944, April 1944, May 1944, July 1944, August 1944, December 1944, June 1945, and October 1945.

The Agitprop also "supported the steps taken for the organization of a telegraph agency which, since March 1927, has been supplying firstly, the biggest Communist newspapers of the capitalist countries * * * and which has now extended its work and is transmitting news between European countries."

Official sources show that in the middle of 1945, Moscow supplied the following publications and news agencies in the United States with such cabled and radio news, the customary practice being that such material is sent prepaid:

Name and address	Number of words
Allied Labor News, 1133 Broadway, New York City	3,500
Azember, 320 East 79th St., New York City	600
Bratsky Vestnik, 3146 South 16th St., Omaha, Nebr	800
California Labor Herald, 150 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco	400
Glas Narodna, 216 West 18th St., New York City	1,700
Glas Ludowy, 5856 Chenester St., Detroit	6,000
Giviagda Poparna, Stevanapoint, Wis	100
Intercontinent News, 1133 Broadway, New York City	19,000
Karpatska Rus, 556 Yonkers Ave., Yonkers, N. Y	3,500
Lraper, 40 East 12th St., New York City	1,800
Ludovy Dennik, 1916 East St., Pittsburgh	1,000
Magyar Jovo, 413 East 14th St., New York City	1,500
Narodni Glasnik, 1916 East St., Pittsburgh	600
Narodna Volya, 5856 Chenester St., Detroit	100
Nasz Swiah, 5003 Gramme Ave., Detroit	1,400
New Masses, 104 East 9th St., New York City	7,000
New York Listy, 435 East 86th St., New York City	1,400
Nova Doba, 1448 West 18th St., Chicago	600
Pravada, 1916 East St., Pittsburgh	900
Russky, Golos, 130 East 16th St., New York City	2,100
Slobodna Rech, 1916 East St., Pittsburgh	1,400
Sovposol, Washington, D. C	5,200
Sovruday, New York City	3,500
Svornost, 2520 South Pulaski Rd., Chicago	800
Trade Union Service, 220 Fifth Ave., New York City	1,200
Ukranian Daily News, 85 East 4th St., New York City	3,500
Yugoslav Herald, 223 Valencia St., San Francisco	2,500
Yugoslavenski, Obzav National Ave., Milwaukee	700
Pravada, 1732 Brandywine St., Philadelphia	1,400

An examination of the contents and ownership of these publications will disclose their Communist character and control at the time this study was made.

Correspondents from all parts of the world feed material into the Daily Worker and the Worker and constitute a part of the vast international Communist information network, the following being a partial list: Nicholas Bogdanov, Tokyo; Juan Balahap, Philippine Islands; Ruy Faco, Rio de Janeiro; Kostas Karayorghis, Athens; Rupert Lockwood, Sydney; Ivor Montagu, John Ireland, William Rust, London; Sean Nolan, Ireland; Paul Rosas, Indonesia; David Raymond, Allied Labor News; Ionel Stejuru, Rumania; Owen Roche, Mexico City; Susumu Ikano, Yenan; Stanley Ryerson in Toronto; J. B. S. Haldane in London; Derek Kartun, Paris; Florimonds Bonte in Algiers; Humberto Lillo Bernales in Santiago; Rodolfo Ghioldi in Montevideo; Alvaro Sanclements, Venezuela; John Gibbons in Moscow; P. C. Joshi in Bombay; Anival Escalante in Habana, and many others, indicating that the Communist Party, U. S. A., is now as it has always been an integral part of a World Communist Party.

International holidays

The Communist International laid down directives for holidays to be celebrated by the American Communist Party and campaigns to be carried out. The report from the fifth to the sixth congress stated that—

"Since the beginning of 1927, the following campaigns have been carried out with the support of the agitation subdepartment: Lenin Week, 1927; the anniversary of the February Revolution; May Day, 1927; the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution; Lenin Week, 1928; the tenth anniversary of the Red Army; campaigns against white terror and the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti" (p. 40).

The May Day manifestoes of the Communist International giving the agitation slogans for the given period were published over a period of years in the following issues of the Daily Worker: May 1, 1930; April 28, 1931; April 30, 1932; April 30, 1933; April 27, 1935; May 1, 1936; May 1, 1937; April 30, 1938; May 1, 1940.

The Comintern report issued between the fifth and the sixth congresses called attention to the fact that "the British, Czech, and American Parties have also held central schools which were supported by the propaganda subdepartment of the ECCI by the drawing up of syllabuses on various subjects in the sphere of Leninism, and by instructions on organization and method" (p. 45).

So much did the Soviet Union consider American Communists as their own that quite a number fled to the Soviet Union or received shelter there after having been convicted for the violation of the laws of the United States. In his biographical work entitled "Proletarian Journey" Fred E. Beal describes how he and six others convicted in the famous Gastonia case jumped bail and fled to the Soviet Union to be warmly received by the MOPR, Russian section of the International Labor Defense, and later assigned to posts under the Soviet Government. Other fugitives from American justice who received a Soviet welcome were Harry Eisman, William D. Haywood, Louis Bebritz, and many others.

It is clear from the foregoing that the American Communists Party not only accepted instructions from international Communist headquarters in Moscow but willingly and wittingly acted in every sense as the American agent of its Soviet principal an obligation which in turn devolved upon every single member of the American party.

VII. LIST OF TYPICAL DIRECTIVES FROM MOSCOW AFFECTING THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Letter to American Workingmen by N. Lenin dated August 20, 1918. (Report of the Joint Legislative Committee of the State of New York Investigating Seditious Activities. Revolutionary Radicalism, pt. I, vol. 1, p. 657.)

Call for a Third International Congress at Moscow (January 1919) and proposed platform. (ROSTA Russian Telegraph Agency, February 24, 1919. Recognition of Russia (1924, p. 228).)

A New Letter to the Workers of Europe and America by N. Lenin, dated January 21, 1919. (Report of the Joint Legislative Committee of the State of New York Investigating Seditious Activities. Revolution Radicalism, pt. 1, vol. 1, p. 668.)

"Manifesto of the Communist International to the Proletarians of the World." (The Communist International No. 1, May 1, 1919. Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 337.)

Letters of Zinoviev to the Central Committee of the American Communist Party and American Communist Labor Party, dated January 12, 1920. (Report of the Joint Legislative Committee of the State of New York Investigating Seditious Activities. Revolutionary Radicalism, pt. 1, vol. 2, p. 1902.)

Letter from Zinoviev, President of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, calling upon the proletariat of every country to celebrate the third anniversary of the Bolshevist Revolution in Russia (1920). (Fish committee, pt. II, vol. No. 3, p. 97. Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 3, p. 97.)

Theses and resolutions adopted at third world congress of the Communist International, June 22–July 12, 1921, re organization of Communist International, trying to find best method of organizing and standardizing propaganda throughout the various sections. (Contemporary Publishing Association, New York City, 1921. Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 3, p. 36.)

Third Congress of the Comintern, June–July 1921, instructions to the Communist Party of America to form an open political body which could operate legally. (The Communist, August 1921. Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 3, p. 206.)

The Comintern, in conformity with its instructions to the Communist Party of America to organize a legal political party, transmitted a program for guidance to the Communist Party, entitled "Concerning the Next Tasks of the C. P. of A. (A Thesis by the Executive Committee of Communist International) Main Aspects of Strategy" (About August 1921). (Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 256.)

Max Bedacht reports carrying instructions from the Comintern to organize a legal political party and made plans to change the various units of the American Labor Alliance into units of a political party to be known as the Workers' Party of America. (Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 255.)

Instructions from Comintern to the minority faction, with the demand that the minority rejoin the Communist Party of America, led by the so-called majority which had organized the Workers Party of America in obedience to instructions received from Moscow. (Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 260.)

Appeal to the minority membership by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of America section of the Communist International, urging them to return to the ranks of the Communist Party of America, section of the Communist International. (The Communist (April 1922, p. 3). Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 3, p. 615.)

"Decisions of E. C. C. I." Special bulletin on party situation, issued by the central executive committee of the Communist Party, dated New York, May 1922. Comintern rendered another decision under date of March 11, 1922, in which the executive committee of the Comintern reaffirmed its decision of November 21 and January 24. (Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 260.)

Executive committee of the Comintern issued a call for the fourth congress of the Communist International held in Moscow, November 7, 1922. (Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 309.)

Cablegram addressed to C. E. Ruthenburg, signed by Zinoviev, sent on behalf of Third International, informing secretary of Workers Party that the fraternal delegates of Workers Party were received by fourth congress of the Third International and then proceeds to answer a cable sent by Ruthenberg requesting the opinion of the Third International as to the agitation being carried on within the Workers Party of America by the Jewish Federation. (Worker, December 16, 1922, p. 1, cols. 1 and 2. Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreigr Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 1935, p. 304.)

Cablegram from Zinoviev, head of the Communist International, to C. E. Ruthenberg, executive secretary of the Workers Party of America, condemning frivolous breach of discipline against central committee of Workers Party. (The Worker, December 16, 1922, p. 1. Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, app. I, p. 402.)

Comments of J. Louis Engdahl, official of the Workers Party, on the second national convention of the Workers Party and referring to instructions received from the Comintern at Moscow. (The Worker, January 6, 1923. Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 508.)

Statement of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the American question. (The Worker, New York, February 24, 1923, p. 5. Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, appendix I, p. 404.)

Cablegram from Comintern to the Workers Party, urging unity against persecution of political prisoners. (The Worker, March 17, 1923. Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 509.)

Letter from Executive Committee of Comintern, demanding the Proletarian Party of America to join forces with the Workers Party. (The Worker, April 7, 1923. Recognition of Russia, p. 510. Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 510.)

Zinoviev instructions addressed to the Workers Party of America re the work of the Workers Party of America (August 1923). (Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 376.)

Appeal to the Communist International to the workers of all countries on the third anniversary of the Treaty of Versailles. (The Worker, August 5, 1923. Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 512.)

Cablegram from Zinoviev, head of the Communist International, to C. E. Ruthenberg, executive secretary of the Workers Party of

America, on the establishment of the Worker, New York. (Worker, September 8, 1923, p. 1; Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, appendix I, p. 396.)

Cablegram from Zinoviev, Moscow, to Ruthenberg: "Know no more important task American workers than establishment militant daily. This should be rallying point for concentration all forces present time. Only after foundation daily will Comintern consider we have real mass party America." (The Worker, September 8, 1923; Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 2, p. 513.)

Zinoviev lauds Workers Party. (The Worker, September 15, 1923; Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 2, p. 513.)

Greetings from the executive committee of the Communist International to the Workers' Party of America (third convention), and stating they have every confidence that the party will line up the workers of America with the revolutionary workers of the world in the struggle against capitalism and for the establishment of a workers and farmers government (December 7, 1923). (Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 3, p. 485.)

Text of instructions given by Zinoviev, president of the Communist International and president of the Petrograd Soviet, to the Workers Party of America, commenting on its work and giving instructions for more intensive revolutionary work in the party (1923). (Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 3, p. 73.)

Article entitled "To the Communist Party from the Executive Committee of Comintern" sets forth instructions which the Communist Party received from the Comintern re the activity of the Workers Party of America as the legal branch of the Communist Party. (Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 282.)

Letter from Moscow, dated December 31, 1923, directing the Workers Party to give their attention particularly to the forming of groups in the shops and to the making of every effort to penetrate the labor unions. (Recognition of Russia. Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, pt. 2, 1924, p. 435.)

The Executive Committee of the Communist International reports that Comrade Cook has been ordered to return home with full instructions from the Communist International re the various problems confronting the American Party. (Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 3, p. 38.)

Statement in which the Communist International endorses the Workers Party of America. (Daily Worker, May 16, 1924, p. 1. Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, appendix I, p. 415.)

Speech by Zinoviev, June 1924, at the Fifth World Congress of the Communist International, stating that the executive committee (of the Communist International) has implicit trust in the American Central Committee and that both groups must merge and work together without fractionation. (Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 1, vol. 1, p. 50.)

Letter from organization committee of the Communist International dealing with the beginnings of discussion of shop nuclei in the Workers (Communist) Party. (Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 3, p. 158.)

Reorganization of the Communist Parties upon the Basis of Factory Nuclei (by Mickievicz-Kapsukas). The chief political work must go through factory nuclei, organize all Communist of a particular factory without distinction of nationality, etc. (International Press Correspondence, vol. 2, No. 9, Jan. 29, 1925. Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 3, p. 158.)

Report of Comrade Lozovsky entitled "The Struggle for Unity of the World Trade-Union Movement" giving instructions for the United States. (Moscow Pravda, No. 77, April 4, 1925. Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, part 1, vol. 1, p. 90.)

Letter of the Communist International and the Red International of Trade Unions, addressed to the central executive committee of the Workers Party of America, dated April 30, 1925, stressing the following points:

1. Strikes and wage movements.
2. Class collaboration.
3. Organization of the unorganized.
4. Amalgamation.
5. Canadian autonomy.
6. The shop committee movement.
7. The work among the Negroes.
8. Connections with the workers of the colonies.
9. International trade union unity. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4689 ff.)

Decision made by the Commun.st International on the American question. (Daily Worker, May 20, 1925. Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4645 ff.)

Letter from Communist International to the central committee of the Workers (Communist) Party of America on the reorganization of the party. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4610.)

Letter addressed jointly by the executive committee of the Communist International and the executive committee of the Red International of Labor Unions to the Worker (Communist) Party with instructions to be carried out by the Workers (Communist) Party, which instructions were embodied in resolutions passed by the fourth convention of the Workers (Communist) Party held in Chicago, August 21, 1925. (Daily Worker, August 15, 1925. Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 1, vol. 1, p. 49.)

Letter addressed jointly by the executive committee of the Communist International and executive committee of the Red International to the Workers (Communist) Party, containing instructions to the Trade-Union Educational League (contained in the resolutions of 1924). (Daily Worker, Aug. 15, 1925. Subheading "Trade union work." Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 1, vol. 1, p. 58 ff.)

Instructions from Comintern to American Party reorganization of a delegation of trade unionists to visit the Soviet Union. About September 1925. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4699.)

A letter from the Communist International to the Workers (Communist) Party of America dealing with the reorganization of the Workers (Communist) Party, contained in a pamphlet entitled "The Party Organization" by Jay Lovestone and C. E. Ruthenberg. (The Party Organization, published by the Workers Party of America (approx. 1925). Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, appendix I, p. 295.)

Cable signed by Kruse, Moscow, dated October 3, 1926. "Last clause of contract must be acted on immediately. Contract makers say both businesses must go New York and they expect you to act immediately on last clause, after which other business can be accomplished amicably without stockholders' meeting." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4599.)

Cable from Moscow, dated October 3, 1926, to Ruthenberg, secretary, WOPAT, Chicago, Ill., re question of moving the central committee of the party from Chicago to New York. "If unanimity in this question cannot be reached, then the decision in this question should be left to the next party convention." Signed, Kuusinen. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4599.)

Cable from Moscow, signed "Hunky," dated October 4, 1926, "Decision provides full possibilities if energetically handled. Transfer paper at once with three prominent editors. First steps necessary immediately and will lead to accomplish transfer to New York. Cable information quick." (Special Committeee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4600.)

Cable from Moscow, signed "Hunky" dated October 11, 1926. "Your failure to answer on moving causes serious embarassment. If you fail to act promptly it can be due only to misunderstanding of attitude here. Universal opinion here for New York with arguments even stronger than yours. Any immediate transfer of paper and stuff can lead to further steps." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4600.)

Cable sent by the Communist International to the American Party, October 13, 1926, for the presidium of the executive committee of the Communist International, signed by the secretary of the Communist International re the question of removing the national headquarters from Chicago to New York and of removing the Daily Worker from Chicago to New York. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, pp. 4596, 4597.)

Report summing up the work, errors, and tasks of the respective Communist parties including the American Communist Party. (Seventh enlarged executive committee of the Communist International. (Meeting November 22–December 16, 1926.) (Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 1, vol. 1, pp. 56, 57.)

Theses on International situation and tasks of the Communist International—principal summary of the work, errors, and tasks of the respective Communist parties. (International Press Correspondence (Vienna) vol. 7, No. 11, February 3, 1927, pp. 217, 222, 223.) (Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 3, p. 186.)

Resolution of the presidium of the executive committee of the Communist International on the American question, July 1, 1927, calling attention to the objective difficulties and weaknesses of the Workers Party of America. (Communist International between the fifth and sixth world congresses (1924–1928), p. 336.)

Resolution on American Question.

1. Struggle against Imperialism and the War Danger.
2. Development of the Revolutionary Labor Movement in America.
3. Trade-Union Work.
4. The Inner Party Situation.

Final text endorsed by presidium of executive committee, Communist International, July 1, 1927. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4635 ff.)

Dealings with the factional part situation on the Workers (Communist) Party. Cablegram from the presidium of the executive committee of the Communist International to the national office of the Workers (Communist) Party. (Party Press publication of cablegram, July 7, 1927.) (Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 1, vol. 1, p. 57.)

Cable received by Max Bedacht, acting secretary of the Workers (Communists) Party, from the presidium of the executive committee of the Communist International. (Daily Workers, New York, July 12, 1927.) (Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 1, vol. 1, p. 58.)

Cable from Moscow signed by Cannon, Foster, and Weinstone, July 30, 1927, who were in Moscow discussing American affairs with

the Communist International. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4597.)

Declaration of the political committee on the American Question; resolution adopted by the presidium of the executive committee of the Communist International. (Daily Worker, August 3, 1927, p. 3.) (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4633.)

Letter from the organization department of the executives of the Communist International instructing the American party as to publishing factory papers in the various plants and factories in the United States. (Party Organizer, December 1927.) (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4610.)

Cable sent in 1927 by the Communist International to the American party re "Declaration of the Communist International on the factional situation in the Workers (Communist) Party." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4598.)

Cable sent in 1927 by the Communist International to the American party asking that the following be published: "Our cable of July 7 did not aim at all to support the hegemony of one group in the Workers Party but the merging of all groups. * * * According to the agreement, the opposition shall also have the right to express and defend in a nonfactional, comradely way its opinions in all meetings of the party units." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4598.)

Cable from Moscow sent in 1927 to the American party: "ECCI considers such methods struggle as opposition group uses in statement impermissible factional, such expressions styling majority of Polcom "petty bourgeois intellectuals" as "clique leadership" are opposed resolution of ECCI and agreement of American comrades serving only to poison party life. ECCI most decisively opposes these faction methods. On other hand, ECCI declares against any disciplinary measures against opposition." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4598.)

Cable sent in 1927 by the Communist International to the American party: "Presidium ECCI considers that in view of the urgent necessity for party to conduct as great a fight as possible against intervention and counter-revolutionary war of American imperialists in China and Nicaragua, and also difficult position of the party arising out of the attacks of the Government and trade-union bureaucracy, the presidium cannot accept proposal for delegates to come to Moscow. * * * Dispute re party convention will be decided upon receipt of respective written statements." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, pp. 4598, 4599.)

The last (February 1928) meeting of the CE adopted a unanimous thesis on the general situation of the party, stating that while there are lingering remnants of old fractional groupings, it must be recorded that: "Great headway has been made by the party in consolidating its forces and unifying its ranks on the basis of the resolutions of the last party convention." (Decision on the Workers (Communist) Party of America.) (Communist International between the fifth and sixth world congresses, p. 338.)

Report on the situation in all sections of the World Communist Party, including the Workers (Communist) Party of America. (Communist International, July 1928, pp. 333-351.) (Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 1, vol. 1, p. 32.)

Statement of the CI on the American Party, volume 8, No. 83, Inprecorr, page 1576, indicating the tasks of the party. (Sixth world congress, November 1928.)

Provision for the calling of a convention of the American Communist Party to decide the question of leadership. (Communist International between the fifth and sixth world congresses, p. 337.)

"At the fifth enlarged executive the main question at issue was the continuation of the Labor Party campaign which the then majority of the CEC of the American Party had decided to discard."

"Our slogan itself should now be revised insofar that we no longer agitate for a Farmer-Labor Party, but only for a Labor Party, since in the changed conditions the premises for the formation of a joint party of workers and small farmers are lacking." (Communist International between the fifth and sixth world congresses, pp. 336, 337.)

"The sixth enlarged plenum of the ECCI very emphatically declared that the Comintern demands the complete and unreserved cessation of fractional struggle."

"The opposition groups must cease their fractional methods. They must endeavor by their attitude to facilitate unity with the majority of the political party before and and at the party convention." (Decision regarding the American Communist Party) Communist International between the fifth and sixth world congresses (pp. 336-337).

Open letter dated Moscow, February 1, 1929, from the executive committee of the Communist International to the convention of the Workers (Communist) Party of America. (Daily Worker, Mar. 4, 1929.)

Cablegram from the presidium of the executive committee of the Communist International to the central committee of the party re information received from the political bureau of the new central committee of the Communist Party of the United States of America concerning some attempts to resume factional struggles after the convention by a part of the minority dissatisfied with the results of the convention. (Daily Worker, Mar. 27, 1929.)

Address by the executive committee of the Communist International to all members of the Communist Party of the United States. (Daily Worker, May 20, 1929, p. 3.) (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, appendix I, p. 898.)

Reports of speeches by Stalin, Kuusinen and Molotov on the American question, submitted in evidence by Jay Lovestone at a hearing before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. (Stenographic reports on the American question before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Dec. 2, 1939, pp. 7111-7133.) (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, appendix I, p. 875.)

Cablegram from the Young Communist International to the Communist Youth League of the United States of America, and motions adopted by the Communist Youth League. (Daily Worker, May 23, 1929, p. 1.) (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, appendix I, p. 925.)

Decision on May 17, 1929, of the Political Secretariat of the Communist International to remove Lovestone from membership in the political bureau of the central committee of the American party. (Daily Worker, June 12, 1929.)

The Significance of the Comintern Address. (Communist, June 1929, pp. 291-302.)

Cable from the Young Communist International to the Young Communist League of the United States and the statement of national executive, Young Communist League-USA pm Suspension of Rubenstein and Silvis from NEC Buro. (Daily Worker, July 11, 1929, pp. 1, 2.) (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1930, appendix I, p. 919.)

Plans for Red Day in Moscow, including friendly discussions, with representatives of the foreign Communist Parties, the representatives of the MOPR (International Labor Defense) taking part. (Pravda, Moscow (July 14, 1929).) (Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 2, vol. 3, p. 28.)

Decision of the tenth plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the appeal of Lovestone, former executive secretary of the Workers (Communist) Party of America. (Daily Worker, July 29, 1929, p. 3.) (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, appendix I, p. 925.)

The Polit-Secretariat of the ECCI issues instructions to the Workers (Communist) Party of America on the election campaign at its session on September 7, 1928. (The Daily Worker, vol. V, No. 233, October 2, 1929, appendix 10, p. 117.)

The Struggle for the Bolshevisation of the Communist Party of the United States, by I. Mingulin (Moscow), Imprecorr, volume 9, No. 28, dealing with the interference of the Communist International in the American party. 1929.

In May 1929 the American Commission of the Third International had a meeting at Moscow and Stalin addressed the American section, saying that the revolutionary crisis of the Communist Party has not arrived as yet in the United States. * * * American Communist Party must be ready to meet the crisis, fully armed to take over the direction of the future class war in the United States. (Communist International, March 20, 1930.) (Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, 1930, pt. 1, vol. 1, p. 16.)

Cable from Ruthenberg, Engdahl, Lovestone, Bedacht dealing with the thesis dated April 13, 1930, enclosing minutes of meetings of the Polburo with instructions to return as soon as read. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 7, p. 4617.)

Directives of the Politsecretariat of the ECCI to the Communist Party of the United States of America, relative to the decisions of the Twelfth Plenum of the CPUSA, dealing Comintern Documents, the Communist, May 1931, volume X, No. 5, pages 402-408. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, appendix I, p. 490.)

Directives of the Politsecretariat of the ECCI to the Communist Party of the United States of America, relative to the decisions of the Twelfth Plenum of the CPUSA, dealing with unemployment, the trade-unions, the party leadership, the party press, the 7-hour day, the Negro question, etc. (Communist, May 1931, pp. 402-408.)

Criticism of June-July 1933 issues of the Daily Worker by the Communist International. (Communist International, October 15, 1933.) (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1940, vol. 37, pp. 4407 ff.)

Message received from presidium of executive committee of the Communist International on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Daily Worker, January 6, 1934. (Daily Worker, January 6, 1934.)

From the "main extract referring to the United States from the report by George Dimitroff on The United Front Against War and Fascism, at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in Moscow—calls for the creation of a party which will be neither Socialist nor Communist. But it must be an anti-Fascist party and must not be an anti-Communist party." (Daily Worker, December 9, 1935.)

Article by George Dimitroff, chairman of Communist International, entitled "The War and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries." (Daily Worker, November 4, 1939.)

Manifesto of the Communist International. (Sunday Worker, November 5, 1939.)

October 1939: Manifesto of the executive committee of the Communist International and an article by Dimitroff, secretary of the Communist International entitled "The War

and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries." (Both dealt with the imperialist nature of World War II and the responsibility of France and England in prolonging the war and the aid rendered them by the United States.)

December 1939: Anglo-American contradictions in the second imperialist war. By Varga, noted economist of the Communist International.

May 1940: "The Struggle Against the Imperialist War" by Dimitroff, secretary of the Communist International.

June 1943: Dissolution of Communist International approved by its sections. Last issue of the organ the Communist International announced that the parent organization had assisted its sections in establishing their own press organs.

June 8, 1943: Announcement made of establishment of new magazine in Moscow, the War and the Working Classes, issued by the Soviet Trade Unions. Editorial stated that publication affords wide Soviet public circles an opportunity to express their opinion on all vital questions of the international life and foreign policy of the states engaged in the war and of the states occupying a neutral position. Later called New Times and published in five languages, including English, this Soviet organ has become recognized as the successor to the Communist International and its authoritative articles accepted as dogma by all functioning Communist Parties, including that in the United States.

VIII. CORROBORATIVE TESTIMONY

The following excerpts from the testimony of Louis F. Budenz, former managing editor of the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A., and member of the party's national committee, corroborates to date the charges made in this report to the effect that this organization is not a bona fide American political party, but that it is in actual fact an agency subversient in every sense of the term to the ruling party of the Soviet Government, the Communist Party of the Union, which operates through its affiliates in 67 countries as a World Communist Party. We cite first from his testimony of November 22, 1946:

"We must understand then before we get to the meat of the matter that we are dealing with a conspiracy to establish Soviet dictatorship throughout the world. This conspiracy resorts normally to illegal methods. This conspiracy requires the utmost servility on the part of the so-called Communist leaders in various countries throughout the world. It makes puppets of this leadership, as shown in the case of William Z. Foster or Earl Browder.

* * * * *

"Never throughout its history has the Communist Party found one defect of any kind in any leader of the Soviet Union who was endorsed by the Kremlin. You can search the Daily Worker or any other Communist publication from beginning to end for 25 years and you will find that always the Soviet leadership is 100-percent perfect in those pages—they have Godlike qualities that prevent any flaw being found in them. Secondly, this movement follows Moscow in every detail. Examination of the official Communist press will confirm this—that the policies desired by the Kremlin are followed out servilely by this organization and its leadership. That stamps it immediately as something set off from the rest of America, as a quisling organization as much under the heel of the Kremlin, or at the behest of the Kremlin, as the Nazi bund was the agent of Hitler's Germany.

"Mr. Dennis came to me again when acting as political committee representative to the Daily Worker.

* * * * *

"Dennis said to me that I might occasionally receive instructions and communcations from this Hans Berger. Dennis told me further that Berger was strictly underground, and that he was known by Dennis as a responsible comrade who had been in China and Spain and many other places, 'including the United States, as you may know.'

"These were his words, as stated specifically: 'That Berger had functioned previously in China, Spain, and here in America, as you may know.' Dennis then said that Berger was 'equivalent to a representative of the Communist International, and that I was to consider him as such.' To advise me fully, Dennis added that Berger's real name was Gerhart Eisler, and that he functioned, or was to function, among the 'German comrades here' as such (p. 12).

* * * * *

"The main point is that there was this representative of the Communist International in the office, and his name was Edwards; I saw him in action in 1935 and 1936—right along. Then there was Brown, whose real name was Alpi, supposedly an Italian, and many others.

* * * * *

"And, as a matter of fact, I found that there were various rings in this conspiratorial apparatus, and different sections, one of which is the Soviet police system here and another the Communist International apparatus.

"Then there is also the use of certain members of the party who normally are in public life, the use of them illegally and secretly, sending them to Latin America, and to Canada, and other places secretly. And, as a matter of fact, sometimes a person who has been a district organizer will suddenly come to you and say that he is going to Mexico or to some other place and by the questions he asks you know he is on a secret mission (p. 14).

* * * * *

"Returning to Berger specifically: I did receive from time to time notes sent by him when Dennis was away. These stressed in particular that the second front in Europe was important, and hammered at the importance of talking about the Soviet Union to the American people. Those were some of the notes I recall. There were others, of course, from Berger and from others (p. 15).

* * * * *

"But the notes from Berger particularly emphasized the necessity of bringing to the American people the alleged democratic character of the Soviet Union, and the language he used was very emphatic. In addition, once in a while he expressed his opinion very definitely, through the political representative of the political committee, who brought instructions from Berger to the Daily Worker. When the question came up of the United States being the Soviet Union's chief foe, as a result of the Duclos article, Berger-Eisler gave what was almost a decision * * * (p. 16).

"Now, I want to call the attention of this committee to the fact that I have copies of the Communist here in my possession which show the leading position of Gerhart Eisler as Hans Berger. These articles prove his high rank, for they are on vital subjects in the theoretical organ of the Communist Party. These articles range from a signed article by him in November 1942 on Twenty-five Years of Soviet Power—published along with articles by Earl Browder, general secretary of the party, and V. J. Jerome, editor of the Communist—over to a number of very important contributions on foreign policy. They are written by a man of authority, it's clear. Among them, significantly, is an article on the dissolution of the Communist International * * * (p. 20).

"Now, I want to get here to the dissolution of the Communist International and the article on it by Berger-Eisler in the Communist. This is the issue, by the way, the discussion of which I happened to be in on in part, and I know how this issue was framed. It is very interesting. Mr. Berger's name does not appear on the cover, but whose name does appear is Dmitri Z. Manuilsky. * * *

"This issue we were discussing was the one that discussed the Communist International, and the question was how it should be discussed. And it was agreed that Mr. Berger should write this piece which he did write, in order to show to our comrades that internationalism still lives—'internationalism still lives' was the phrase used—even with the dissolution of the Communist International. And in order to drive that home, it was decided to put in a prominent article by Dmitri Manuilsky on The Glorious Victories of the Red Army because every trained Communist knows that Dmitri Manuilsky represents leadership of the Communist International even to this day. That was the understanding which prompted his open threat to the United Nations recently of the power of the Communist Parties throughout the world. That is the speech that is putting every party on its toes and was the signal from the Communist International. Manuilsky should know all about these matters for every trained Communist knows he roughly runs every Communist Party through the continued international channels of communication. Even when George Dimitrov was leader, Foster told me—and he was guilty of a pun about it—that Dimitrov may be the head but Dmitri is the heart of the Communist International. That is a fact; Manuilsky represents what now is the equivalent of the Communist International and let us understand this" (p. 23).

Statehood for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, everybody wants to get into the act—as the famous comedian, Jimmy Durante, might say it—or Senator Claghorn, the radio statesman, might put it thusly, everybody wants to get into the Union, the Union of States, that is.

Last August, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I visited the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and a few weeks later, in September, as a representative of our Government designated by the Secretary of the Interior, I attended the inauguration in San Juan of the first native-born Puerto Rican to be appointed Governor of his homeland since the United States took over the island in 1898.

My visits to the last of the possessions of our Government holding territorial status were not for the purpose of making a study of the question of statehood for these three Territories but I quickly discovered that a Member of Congress cannot avoid a discussion of this topic once he comes in contact with the leaders of the political life in these possessions.

I found that Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico have one thing in common—a burning desire for statehood. It was a

subject that featured every conversation committee members had with local government officials and with leading local citizens from the moment our airplane landed to the take-off several days later. While we had not gone to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico to talk about statehood—such being within the province of members of other committees in Congress—we found it a matter of necessity to become greatly interested in the question before we took leave of those places.

And our experiences have not been unlike those of numerous other Members of Congress and high Government officials who in recent months have found occasion to visit our Territories. Most of these people have come back to Washington with almost as much enthusiasm for the granting of statehood to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico as the natives themselves hold.

ALASKA A STRATEGIC POINT

While our Military Affairs Committee group was visiting in Alaska, Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug was also there and upon his return to the States his recommendations were strongly in favor of statehood for that great Northwest section to which some refer as the back door to the United States. It could just as well be called the front door. Our Military Affairs Committee was greatly interested in Alaska from a wartime strategic point of view but the citizens up there also made certain that we were oriented in their plans for eventual statehood.

Within the past 3 weeks Secretary Krug has returned from a trip to Hawaii. He must have been briefed by the same leaders in that romantic island territory as were the members of our committee, because when he stepped from his plane in Washington his first statement was to the effect that Hawaii was entitled to statehood. I was with Secretary Krug in Puerto Rico last September, and I am confident the arguments the natives advanced in favor of statehood impressed the Secretary, whose Department has the duty of administering for our territories and possessions.

Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico might have little chance to realize their dream of statehood if the Department of Interior were not favorably disposed. The winning of support of Secretary Krug, therefore, is very helpful. But it by no means grants statehood. Only Congress can do that.

In recent years the number of bills which have been dropped into the hopper in the House of Representatives calling for statehood for our territories have been ever increasing. This may be due greatly to the fact that Members of both the House and Senate in increasing numbers have been visiting our territorial possessions on various committee assignments, mostly to do with the war effort—and lately studying postwar problems that our remaining frontiers pose.

AIR TRAVEL SHORTENS DISTANCE

If statehood ever comes to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, much credit must go to air travel—and particularly to the air transport services of the Army and Navy, which made it so convenient for Members of Congress on official missions to get to these outposts.

Of course, in our visits we found some local people opposed to statehood, but such opposition was rare indeed in comparison to the almost general clamor among the natives to become an actual part of the United States with full State rights—and principally with the right to elect their own governors.

There is a bill in the House of Representatives now asking that Alaskans be permitted to elect their own Governor. They would like to have that right pending consideration of their request for statehood. Puerto Ricans have been bitter in their resentment over appointed Governors. They are pleased with the selection of Jesús T. Piñero, native-born and very popular among the people, as their new Governor but they would have liked it a lot better had they been permitted to elect him themselves. They are frank in stating they hope he will be the last appointed Governor.

Twelve separate bills have been introduced in the Eightieth Congress to provide statehood for Hawaii. There have been several asking statehood for Alaska, but only one, so far, for Puerto Rico. And there is a resolution offered by Representative B. W. GEARHART, Republican, of California, providing for the issuance of a letter of invitation to the Government and people of Iceland to become a State in the Union of the United States of America. There is hardly any likelihood, however, that the latter suggestion will be seriously considered.

Statehood for the present Territories means not only that their citizens will enjoy the privilege of electing their own Governors in the future but it will mean an automatic increase in the size of the Congress of the United States. First of all each new State would be entitled to two Members in the Senate of the United States. Alaska would be entitled to one Member of the House of Representatives and Puerto Rico and Hawaii, under legislation proposed, would be given two Members of the House.

REPRESENTATION WITHOUT VOTE

Of course, the Territories now have representatives in Congress, but they are more or less just good-will ambassadors. Each Territory sends a single Delegate to Washington. The Delegate can attend sessions of the House of Representatives and meetings of House committees. He may introduce legislation and he has the privilege of the floor—meaning he can speak in the interest of the people he represents—but he cannot vote.

This brings us to the realization that there is a difference in the degree of American citizenship which the residents in the Territories hold to that which we as residents of States enjoy. They feel that they are not complete Americans. They cannot vote for President. They have no voting representation in Congress. They are subject to all Federal tax laws, yet have no voice in their making. They often re-echo the old colonists' cry of "taxation without representation" when they speak on this subject.

They fail to share in many Federal acts which confer monetary benefits to States.

They begin to feel that they are Americans, yet they are not Americans.

Those who lead in the fight for statehood point out that when they were organized under Territorial status it was an implied promise that eventually they would be accepted into the Union as a State. They point to the fact that this promise has been carried out in the case of all other sections that first held Territorial status. The last Territory admitted to the Union as a State was Arizona on February 14, 1912.

So it has not been too long ago when Congress met a somewhat similar problem and decided in favor of statehood for the petitioning territory. Just a few days more than a month before the admission of Arizona, Congress on January 6, 1912, had accepted New Mexico as a State. Oklahoma had been admitted on November 16, 1907. All within the memory of most of our citizens of today.

SEPARATION FROM MAINLAND AN OBSTACLE

Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma found their road to statehood a comparatively smooth one, however, because their boundaries were contiguous with other State boundaries. Chief obstacle to statehood for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico lies in the fact they are far removed countries, separated from the Union by thousands of miles, and in the case of Hawaii and Puerto Rico all overseas.

Because definite steps are now being taken to consider the proposal of admitting Hawaii to the Union in the form of open public hearings before the Public Lands Committee of the House on the numerous bills introduced in Congress asking statehood for the islands we may soon expect some public reaction. After completion of the hearings the committee unanimously approved legislation to grant statehood to Hawaii.

Nicholas Murray Butler, famed educator, president emeritus of Columbia University, has already publicly expressed emphatic objection to statehood for the three Territories.

Said Dr. Butler in a letter to Secretary of the Interior Krug:

> Under no circumstances should Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or any other outlying island or territory be admitted as a State in our Federal Union. To do so, in my judgment, would mark the beginning of the end for the United States as we have known it and as it has become so familiar and so useful to the world. Our country now consists of a sound and compact area, bounded by Canada, by Mexico, and by the two oceans. To add outlying territory hundreds or thousands of miles away, with what certainly must be different interests from ours and very different background, might easily mark, as I said, the beginning of the end.
>
> Think of what would happen—

Dr. Butler continued—

> were the vote of one Senator from Alaska or Hawaii or Puerto Rico to defeat the ratification of an important treaty affecting the policy and good order of the world. It is

unthinkable that we should allow any such possibility.

WHOSE VOTE WOULD BE DECISIVE?

Anyone disagreeing with Dr. Butler could point out that in a Senate made up of two representatives from each State there would necessarily have to be a good many other Senators with the same view as the Alaskan, Hawaiian, or Puerto Rican Senator to make any one man's vote the deciding one. For instance, if a decision of world significance were to be made in the Senate by a vote of 46 to 45 who could say whether the junior Senator from Hawaii or the junior Senator from Rhode Island had cast the deciding vote if they had both answered in the affirmative. Or who could blame the senior Senator from Alaska for the defeat of a measure considered to be important for the national interest any more than he could blame the senior Senator from Ohio if they both had cast a negative vote.

Former Speaker of the House of Representatives SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, now minority leader, says the question concerning the matter of statehood for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico "goes to the fundamentals."

"And the question we have to answer," says RAYBURN, "is whether we are going to begin making States out of possessions that are not contiguous to the United States of America."

The former Speaker concedes it is a question that we will have to meet one day and, he suggests, "we had better put our best thinking on it."

Many of the leading daily newspapers throughout the Nation, and a great many of our leading national figures seem to be doing much thinking on the subject these days. An analysis of their trend of thought would seem to favor admission of the Territories. Few share the views of Dr. Butler.

HAWAII MAY BE FIRST

In the race for statehood, Hawaii is far in front. As a matter of fact, the plea of the islanders has reached the stage of most serious consideration. The Committee on Public Lands having completed its public hearing on the petition of Hawaii and having recommended to the House approval of one of the many bills to grant statehood puts the matter squarely before Congress and calls for a disposition of the question one way or the other in the near future. Once favorably considered by the committee, it passes from the stage of mere discussion and becomes a problem to be solved by the vote of Congress. However, not all bills approved in committee become law, so Hawaii's fight is far from being won.

The movement for statehood seems far stronger in Hawaii than in Alaska and Puerto Rico. At least, the movement is farther advanced and the groups interested seem better organized. They come to Congress quoting the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, as an advocate for statehood for Hawaii.

"I urge that the Congress promptly accede to the wishes of the people of Hawaii that the Territory be admitted to statehood in our Union," President Truman pleaded in behalf of the cause.

Before the war the people of the Territory of Hawaii voted 2 to 1 in favor of statehood, and in 1941 a Gallup poll showed opinion of the people in the States approximately the same. In March of 1946 Dr. Gallup again polled the mainlanders, and this time they were 3 to 1 for admitting Hawaii as a State.

Incidentally the 1946 Gallup poll showed that the average American—except those who have had military service in the Pacific—does not know a whole lot about the islands.

The Territory of Hawaii consists of a group of eight islands and numerous islets in the Pacific Ocean, situated a little more than 2,000 nautical miles west of the North American Continent. The total land area is 6,438 square miles, an area slightly larger than the combined area of Connecticut and Rhode Island.

The population of the Territory was estimated at 502,122 in 1945, exclusive of military and naval personnel. The capital of the Territory is Honolulu, situated on the island of Oahu. It is a completely modern city with a population estimated in 1945 to be 261,033. The racial origin of this population, in addition to the native Hawaiians and the Caucasians from the mainland, is Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Filipino, and Portuguese. About one-third are Caucasian, one-third Japanese, and the remainder mostly Hawaiians, part Hawaiians, Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans, with a sprinkling of Puerto Ricans and others.

NO SABOTAGE IN HAWAII

Some regarded the fact that Hawaii was one-third Japanese in population as a barrier to favorable consideration for statehood but the facts are the best argument against creating an obstacle on this line. The Federal Bureau of Investigation found not a single act of sabotage or fifth-column activity committed in Hawaii before, during, or after the attack on Pearl Harbor. The islanders proudly boast that the record of their people on the war and home front was unexcelled in performance, loyalty and cooperation.

The citizens' statehood committee point out in their arguments for statehood that Americanization, racial equality, and democratic ideals are far advanced in Hawaii. There is less racial friction and discrimination in Hawaii than in many mainland areas, they say. The different racial groups live together with a minimum of friction and no racial clashes

The outbreak of World War II, as far as active United States participation was concerned, at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, threw more light upon the loyalty and patriotism of the Hawaiian population than the many preceding years since the Republic of Hawaii was annexed as an American Territory on September 9, 1897. The war began with an enemy attack on Hawaii and the Territory remained the only major part of the Nation to be subjected to direct attack.

NISEI TROOPS FOUGHT WITH HONOR

Hawaiians were tested by the fire of battle and the trials of war both at home and abroad. The islands furnished their quota under selective service, but by voluntary enlistment it raised a battalion of infantry among those of Japanese descent which finished the war with an outstanding record and was one of, if not the most, decorated units of the American Army.

Citizens of every race and every color served in all the services and in war work of every kind and description.

"The roll of Hawaii's honored dead throughout the world is proof positive of the loyalty of Hawaii's sons," Hon. Ingram M. Stainback, Governor of Hawaii, asserted in a plea for statehood. "Their patriotism is not measured by the color of their skin."

So much for the patriotism of the Hawaiians—and there will be no Member of Congress who will oppose statehood on such an argument. Opposition to admission of the Territory into the family of States is almost certain to be based on the question whether we are going to make States out of possessions that are not contiguous to the present 48 States—the fundamental question to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has already drawn the attention of the House of Representatives.

Anticipating this as the main obstacle to statehood, the islanders have not evaded the question, and in all their arguments for admission seek to answer it in a manner which they believe should influence Congress in their favor.

Governor Stainback covers the question thusly:

With modern means of transportation and communication, Hawaii's geographic position is no deterrent to statehood. We are closer to Washington today than Boston was at the time of the formation of the Union, and certainly much closer than Texas, California, or other western territories were at the time of their admission as States.

The people of Hawaii are as well informed on national affairs and in as close touch with their fellow citizens as if the Territory were a contiguous area. For example, our papers receive the service of all leading news-gathering agencies, carry the articles of most nationally known columnists, and two well-known news weeklies appear on the stands in Hawaii the same day as on the mainland.

TWELVE HOURS FROM MAINLAND

So we found it last summer when we visited the islands. Twelve hours after we took off from San Francisco we landed in Honolulu. If I travel from East St. Louis to Washington by railroad, it takes me 21 hours. The interests of the people were as Governor Stainback says. We hardly set our bags down in the Moana Hotel before we were besieged by a local committee made up of veterans of World War II, who wanted to discuss with us problems that were identical with the problems we were confronted with by committees that waited on us in our home districts.

By any economic yardstick, the citizens' committee claims, Hawaii deserves statehood. It has a self-sustaining economy and valuable resources. Hawaii's 1940 exports totaled $102,145,130 and imports $127,539,539. It had a prewar visi-

tors' industry of $20,000,000. In 1945 value of real and personal property in Hawaii exceeded that of several States and totaled more than that of any other Territory at time of admission to statehood.

The islands have an experienced and intelligent electorate. In the 1944 general election 85 percent of the registered voters exercised their right of franchise. They have a functioning, orderly government. The Territory has passed through a long period of tutelage and probation, and the islanders feel they have proved their capacity to conduct their affairs as an American commonwealth. Further, they believe admission of Hawaii to statehood would benefit the United States by binding this modern civilian community and strategic military base more closely to the Union, and would intensify pride of the American citizens of Hawaii in being Americans.

Hawaiians also like to point to the fact that the Territory has consistently paid into the United States Treasury a considerably larger amount than the Federal Government, exclusive of military expenditures, has spent upon the Territory. In 1945 Hawaii paid into the Federal Treasury $173,999,227.

ALASKANS EAGER FOR STATEHOOD

We were flying over Alaska about 6 hours out of Great Falls, Mont., traveling in an Army C–54 about 9,000 feet above the roughest stretches of the Alcan Highway when our plane was struck by lightning—an uncomfortable experience, despite the fact that aviation experts say they have never known of a case where lightning had caused a fatal crash. I mention the lightning incident here to cite it as a possible omen—or perhaps a warning directed to a representative group from Congress that lightning might strike at any time in that vast northland.

Alaskans are eager for statehood. Events since Pearl Harbor have increased their efforts to attain admission to the Union. Before Pearl Harbor, Alaska was only a stepchild for whom the parent Nation did very little. By the handful of real Alaskans who gained our ear during a reception at the mayor's home in Fairbanks we were told that the average American considered Alaska as a place to go in quest of quick wealth, and if attained the opportunists would leave the country immediately. Alaskans are disturbed by the get-rich-quickers who take all they can from this frontier country with no thought of giving anything in return to Alaska. Alaskans believe statehood would help to correct this situation and then, they say, you would see real development of the country so that it would be a tremendous asset to the Union.

The Alaskans have no hesitancy in citing their strategic military location as one of their strongest arguments for admission as a State. They assert that the development of Alaska is of "utmost importance from a military standpoint," and they insist that statehood will accelerate that development. Recently the commanding general of the Alaskan Department stated that military defense of Alaska could not be effective unless there is a growth in civilian population and civilian industry.

Statehood would aid materially in bringing that about—

Says the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate from Alaska—

because Alaska would then receive automatically the grants in aid and appropriations which go to the States on an allotment basis instead of having to plead, hat in hand, for every Federal dollar.

STATEHOOD WILL BRING DEVELOPMENT

Alaska has many of the same arguments for statehood that have been advanced for Hawaii, namely: First, once a Territory has been formally organized it is assurance statehood is the next political step; second, served its tutelage; third, Alaskans are loyal, law-abiding American citizens; fourth, Alaskans have voted 2 to 1 in favor of statehood.

But the Alaskans stress more strongly than does the Hawaiians that statehood will result in development of their country—and naturally so, because the Hawaiians favored by better climatic conditions have an area almost fully developed at the present time. That the self-government which statehood will bring to Alaska will permit of real development of the vast potentialities of this northern land in fact seems to be the chief argument why it should be brought into the family of States.

If the average American knows little about the islands of Hawaii, he knows even less about Alaska. It is an amazing country.

Alaska was purchased from Czarist Russia in 1867 and there have been some hints of recent date that the Soviet Government does not consider the Czar had the right to sell a possession of the Russian people.

Because of its distance from the United States and the lack of transportation facilities other than air and water, Alaska may be considered an island from the viewpoint of military operations. The wartime Alcan Highway provides the only existing through land communication with the United States, and will require considerable improvement as well as extensive continuing maintenance if it is ever to be used as a supply route.

ONE-FIFTH THE SIZE OF UNITED STATES

The eastern boundary of Alaska is north of a point two-thirds of the way from San Francisco to Hawaii, while the Alaskan Peninsula is north of the Hawaiian Islands. Adak is north of Midway, and Attu is north of Wake Island and New Zealand. Point Barrow is farther north than any other point in North America except the tip of Boothia Peninsula in north-central Canada. On the other hand, Adak is in the same latitude as northern Newfoundland, northern Great Britain, or southeastern Sweden.

The land area of Alaska is about one-fifth the size of the continental United States, but because it is comprised of numerous widely scattered islands it occupies a relatively larger area of the earth's surface. The distance from Juneau to Attu is approximately the same as that from Savannah, Ga., to Los Angeles, and from Juneau to Point Barrow is about as far as from Fort Worth to Duluth.

Alaskans hasten to explain that despite this wide area, they are actually closer to the mainland in terms of travel time than Washington was to Philadelphia in an earlier day. And they further hold that although a population of approximately 80,000 is scattered very thinly over this vast Territory, that this should not be held against their chances for statehood because Alaska today has more people than six out of the last nine Territories admitted to statehood.

Contrary to the prevailing idea held by most Americans who have never been to the far north, Alaska is not entirely a land of ice and snow, and severe subzero cold. True, these conditions exist in the real Arctic or extremely cold climate found north of the Alaskan mountain range in the valley of the Yukon and north to the Arctic. In this section temperatures range from 60 below to 90 above with a temperature range of 150 degrees.

IN LOVE WITH CLIMATE

But there are two other distinct climatic regions. There is a moderately cold area found south of the Alaskan Range and in the Alaskan Peninsula, where the temperatures range from 20 below to 70 above. Then out on the Aleutians chain the temperature ranges from 25 above to 65 above, but the mild temperatures hardly make up for extremely high winds—williwaws—recorded up to 110 miles per hour, and almost constant fog.

Juneau, Anchorage, and the towns south of the Alaska Range, therefore attract most settlers. And like the former Belleville, Ill., man, Michael J. Haas, who went to Juneau about 12 years ago on a temporary job and decided to make it his home, the majority fall in love with the climate and the country.

"It is the greatest place on earth," Haas told me, "and if we could just get statehood you would see rapid development of all the great resources of Alaska."

Air transportation is the lifeblood of Alaska. At the present all other forms of transportation are limited. But with the attaining of statehood, Alaskans look for self-government to lead to the construction of highways and railroads which are so vital to future development.

TRANSPORTATION IS BIGGEST PROBLEM

In all of Alaska the only highways of importance are the Glenn-Richardson Highway connecting Anchorage with Fairbanks and the Alcan Highway running from Fairbanks southeast to Edmonton. The only railroads are the Alaska Railroad running from Seward to Fairbanks, and the Whitepass & Yukon running from Skagway to Whitehorse. Water transportation is limited to the summer season because Arctic ice in the winter extends south around the Alaskan Peninsula through Anchorage and leaves Seward and Whittier, the only year-round ice-free ports serving the mainland of Alaska. For many parts of Alaska no means of transportation are available except the dog team and the airplane.

For the security of the United States, Alaskans argue, this vast Territory should be given status as a State and permitted immediately to develop itself. They say that they can develop the back door to America within a short time to a point where that back door can be quickly shut against attack from the outside. At the time of Pearl Harbor the back door was wide open and we can recall America's frantic efforts to close it to prevent the Japs from getting a foothold on the American Continent.

FEEL THEMSELVES PART OF UNITED STATES

One thing visitors to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska quickly learn is that residents in these three Territories do not like to hear anyone say, "I am going to the United States." If you must make the trip be certain you inform a Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, or an Alaskan that you are "going over to the mainland."

A leading citizen of Puerto Rico promptly took one of our committee members to task on this point.

When someone in Ponce plans to visit San Juan, it would sound stupid if he said, "I am going to Puerto Rico," the native explained. If someone in New York wishes to visit California, it would appear as ignorance if he says: "I am going to the United States." The first one would naturally say: "I am going to San Juan," and the second: "I am going to California." Both of them are in the United States.

In Puerto Rico they let you know that it is absolutely wrong and misleading to say: "I am going to the United States." It is wrong, they say, because all we are doing is to go from one place in the United States to another place within the same Nation.

"To say otherwise," according to Mr. Julius L. Pietrantoni, of Ponce, P. R., "would constitute an act of denying, a foolish denial of our own sacred rights and a showing of ignorance with respect to our powerful condition of American citizens."

In other words, the Puerto Ricans feel pretty strongly about their American citizenship. Like the Hawaiians and the Alaskans they would like to have it more all-embracing—a status only statehood can bring.

SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTY PERSONS PER SQUARE MILE

The island of Puerto Rico is approximately 95 by 35 miles or about 3,400 square miles. It has a population of 2,100,000, more than double what it had at the beginning of the century, and this large and increasing population has to live on what is mainly an agricultural economy. In no place in the world can 630 persons per square mile subsist, except at very low levels, on an agricultural economy. It is for this basic reason that the Federal Government has been called upon to give increasing aid to Puerto Rico.

The political leaders of the island recognize the economic difficulties of their people. The present Legislature of Puerto Rico is trying to deal with the economic problem along the following lines: Puerto Rico must increase its production, through improved agriculture and, mainly, through industrialization, fast enough to take up the chronic lag of unemployment; and still faster to keep up with the rapidly increasing population; and still faster looking toward a time in which the fair-minded Federal aid provided shall cease to be essential to its survival.

As in none other of our possessions, the government has found it a necessity to participate completely in the economic development of the island. The Industrial Development Co., a public corporation, helps private investors to establish new industries, or establishes them itself, as a guide, example, and stimulus to private investors.

The Agricultural Development Co. develops new crops as a guide, example, and stimulus to farmers in developing a more diversified agriculture yield.

The Development Bank, which has the approval of private banks of the island—some of the managers of which serve on the Development Bank's board—has been established to make long-term investment loans that the private banks of Puerto Rico do not extend.

SYSTEM ESTABLISHED TO MEET NEED

These institutions, Puerto Ricans point out, have not been established because of an abstract theory, but to meet the pressing specific needs of Puerto Rico. While they realize the socialistic nature of their economic program, they insist that it was the only way through which encouragement could be given to private investment to go into new fields. It required government pioneering to stimulate private enterprise. By 1960, through their program, Puerto Ricans hope to be self-supporting—and even before that time they hope to be self-governed.

Hon. Luis Muñoz Marín, President of the Senate of Puerto Rico, recently wrote me to this effect:

As to my personal opinion, (on statehood), I believe Puerto Ricans would feel honored if Puerto Rico were admitted as a state of the Union, although I have serious doubts as to whether our present economy would be able to sustain the heavy financial drain that Federal taxes would imply. For instance, although we have more than tripled our educational budget during the last 6 years still we have about 40 percent of our children without a chance to go to school; although we have almost tripled our health budget in the same period, and reduced general mortality from 18 per 1,000 to 13 per 1,000, making substantial inroads into tuberculosis, malaria, diarrhea and enteritis, we still have a high figure of mortality from these diseases with the exception of malaria.

Although we are developing agricultural and industrial production to meet the needs of a growing population that should have a higher standard of living, we are still far from the goal that we must set ourselves in order that 3,000,000 Puerto Ricans (expected figure) may support themselves adequately by 1960. And if we had to pay federal taxes now, that would mean that about $40,000,000 a year would leave the economy. If we are having a hard time without that drain, it can be imagined how the problems would be aggravated if we had to do without such an amount.

DIVIDED OPINION IN PUERTO RICO

That is my honest personal opinion, not given in the name of the voters, because of the aforementioned pledge (Marín had prefaced his remarks by informing me that the majority party, Popular Democrat, of which he is chairman, has a pledge before the people of not interpreting their votes cast in favor of the party as votes either for or against statehood, independence or any other form of political status) but only as a result of my own thinking and observation.

I feel confident, however, that were it not for the very tough difficulties pointed out many thousands of Puerto Ricans would be working hard for statehood the same as the Hawaiians, who do not face the same economic reality.

From Mr. Marín's clear statement it is evident that while there is a movement for statehood in Puerto Rico there is not solidarity on the question—and this we found to be true on our visit to the island. As a matter of fact, opinion in Puerto Rico is divided among those who favor independence, in a spirit of friendship with the United States similar to that under which Philippine independence has been established, those who favor statehood, and those who favor full local self-government based on rights and not on special favor.

Marín urges his people to be cautious in their course. While the Puerto Rican people are asking for a chance to vote freely on their own future, Marín wants to be certain that they will be properly advised when they vote on what economic relationship they can expect with the United States, with a view of making themselves fully self-supporting, under the different forms of political status upon which they may be asked to consider in a referendum.

IMPATIENT FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT

One thing, however, the Puerto Ricans hold to be beyond question and that is that no community, and especially no American community, should be longer deprived of full local self-government.

In the same area where lies Puerto Rico there is another island possession of the United States—the Virgin Islands. Last week a congressional committee returned from a visit to that tropical American paradise after giving assurance to the island Governor that they would recommend to the Congress that a resident commissioner of the Virgin Islands be authorized to sit in the House.

In far away Guam, more than 23,000 residents, most of whom have located there since the war, are seeking legislation to protect their rights as American citizens and to allow them to set up local government, courts, and so forth, in keeping with such rights.

These are the territorial and island possession problems the United States will soon be called upon to solve—the people in these distant places who believe themselves to be Americans seem to be growing more and more insistent that their citizenship be strengthened.

Communism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States wisely or-

dered some time ago that Communists be driven from the ranks of government. I am deeply concerned as I view this trend of communistic influence in the United States whether or not the great rank and file of American people are thoroughly informed as to just how far-reaching this movement is. It is regrettable indeed that they have invaded so many fields of our American life. The former Senator La Follette contributed a strong editorial some months ago in his Progressive magazine under the heading of "Liberals beware." The Communist element in America has grabbed the word "liberalism" and they are carrying the torch for everything that they call liberal, when in many instances it is like communism itself—the most reactionary of all forms of human existence.

I ask that every Member of Congress read carefully the following statement, which I shall ask unanimous consent to include herewith. This statement was published under the authorization and signed by the Michigan State Committee of the Communist Party, Carl Winter, chairman, 902 Lawyers Building, Detroit, Mich. I ask that you read this document and you will observe the general conduct of Communists in America.

In reading the document, the heading of which is "You face a clear and present danger" one would be led to believe that the Communists are the great sponsors of human rights in America; that they, by their newly conceived philosophies, have produced a better situation than the Bill of Rights. Their constant reference to democracy, and their constant reference to liberal action and thought is sheer hypocrisy. No man who knows the general plan of the Communist Party in Russia and the methods they are pursuing throughout the world can ever agree that they symbolize to any degree, or stand for the word liberalism, as we know it.

The regrettable thing about it all is that such vast numbers of people, including all too often labor groups and others in America, are led astray by this communistic buncombe. The Communists in this document take the position that they are the first line of defense of liberty in this iniquious battle of capitalistic groups and Fascists to subjugate the common people to an unholy existence.

It calls for clear thinking on the part of a lot of American people. I have no disposition to suggest that we should legislate the Communist Party out of existence, but I do suggest that we legislate to deal most vigorously with them when we find them engaged in any activity contrary to the American system, and the President's order to rid the Government of Communists should be fulfilled at the earliest possible date. Here I include the document distributed in the city of Flint, Mich., in the automobile factories on April 1, 1947:

YOU FACE A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

President Truman has called upon Congress and the American people to underwrite the purchase of two reactionary governments abroad—the totalitarian dictatorship of Turkey and the Fascist Monarchy of Greece. He has asked Congress to appropriate $400,000,000, military and governmental personnel as a down payment in this deal. And for what purpose are we to send money and men to Greece and Turkey? We are being asked to subscribe to an adventure in empire building. We are being asked to go out in support of two reactionary and hated governments which have promised American big business the unhampered right to exploit and rob the people of Greece and Turkey of their labor and their natural resources.

Fascist regimes which have sold the national interest of their countries to American imperialists to provide them with a base of operations from which to dominate, rob and plunder the markets of the whole of Europe and Africa, of the Middle and Far East. Aid to the Greek and Turkish Fascist rulers in power is a knife in the backs of the suffering, hungry and democracy-loving peoples of these countries.

President Truman's arrogant insistence upon disregarding the United Nations in this matter exposes the greedy and selfish presence of Wall Street imperialists behind this move. It constitutes a foul blow struck at big three unity within the United Nations—the sole instrument for achieving a lasting peace.

This Truman doctrine of sending American money and troops to the defense of reactionary governments, now everywhere under attack by their own people, threatens the peace of the world and makes of America a hated and feared champion of the remnants of Fascism and enemy of the struggling democracies around the world.

As former Vice President Henry Wallace said in reply to President Truman's appeal for aid to Greece and Turkey:

"That policy of imperialism proved to be so bankrupt that Britain can no longer maintain it. Now President Truman proposes we take over Britain's hopeless task. The world is hungry and insecure, and the people of all lands demand change. American loans for military purposes won't stop them. President Truman cannot prevent change in the world any more than he can prevent the tide from coming in or the sun from setting. But once America stands for opposition to change we are lost. America will become the most hated nation in the world."

A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

Why are the most reactionary men of the trusts using the weapon of Fascism—against the American labor movement?

Why does big business want to deny Americans the right to be Communists?

So it can deny organized workers the right to bargain collectively as they see fit.

So as to prevent trade unions from exercising their right to strike or defend labor's interests through independent political action.

So as to prevent justice-loving Americans from aiding the Negro people in their struggle for their constitutional rights.

So it can silence all progressives and anti-Fascists who speak against reaction's program of unrestrained profiteering, economic disaster and world domination.

Like Hitler and Mussolini, the architects of an American form of Fascism center their attacks first upon the Communists. They know that we are the front-line fighters for the people's welfare and liberties, for a just and lasting peace.

The National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce know that if they can outlaw the Communist Party—every progressive organization can be undermined, and every decent individual who resists the attack of the trusts on the trade unions and the Bill of Rights, can be hunted as a hidden Communist.

Democracy is an underground movement today in Spain, in Greece, in Turkey. Is the American spirit of liberty and justice for all to be driven underground in these United States?

Since the former Roosevelt supporter, Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach, has given aid and comfort to the most reactionary Republicans like Congressman HARTLEY and the poll-tax Democrats like RANKIN—The danger has become more clear and present.

The Red witch-hunt of Governor Kim Sigler and his administration in Lansing, is a part of this brazen assault upon our popular liberties and living standards. State senator Matthew Callahan's little Dies committee is busy slandering civic and labor leaders, intimidating our youth and our teachers, smearing the organizations of the people under the pretext of exposing the Communists.

Governor Sigler is trying to destroy academic freedom in the schools and the political rights of labor with the club of anti-communism. Governor Sigler has replied to every demand of the people for the enactment of State laws to extend democracy and for meeting the housing, health, and job security needs of the citizens by shouting, "Red plot!"

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY WORTH TO YOU?

Such openly Fascist organizations as the Gerald L. K. Smith rabble, the Columbians, and the Ku Klux Klan will be encouraged to new depths of violence against the lives and liberties of us all.

We are certain that the American people will fight back. They learned much in the war against Hitler. They do not love American democracy less for having defended it in battle against fascism.

Already dozens of Americans have spoken out against this outrageous proposal to outlaw the Communists. Among them are Senators like PEPPER, THOMAS, TAYLOR; Congressmen like POWELL and MARCANTONIO; Republicans like council members Genevieve Earle and Stanley Isaacs; writers like Vincent Sheean and Dashiel Hammett. Others will speak out.

The Communist Party knows that this fight in defense of liberty can be won by the American people. But only if the people are given the truth and stirred to action.

We are, therefore, undertaking to break through the iron curtain of a press and radio controlled by the NAM and the chamber of commerce and to reach the people with the truth.

We intend to place advertisements in many of the country's newspapers.

We shall bring this message to the people through the radio.

We must organize meetings, tour speakers, get out pamphlets and leaflets.

But even to begin doing this we need a minimum of $250,000. And we need it in the next 25 days. We count on you, the members and friends of our party.

We count on the support of all non-Communists who know that this attack is aimed at depriving every American anti-Fascist and liberty-loving citizen of the protection pledged him in the Bill of Rights and the Constitution.

We have set up a special committee to direct the campaign to raise this fund. Its cochairmen are Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., and Peter V. Cacchione, and its treasurer, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. Other members are Ben Gold and John Gates.

We know that you will respond generously to this appeal. We urge that you also respond promptly. Time is of the essence. We have a big job to do—fast.

Send funds to Philip Schatz, treasurer, 902 Lawyers Building, Detroit 26, Mich.

ACT IMMEDIATELY

The people must rally to defeat the "one at a time" strategy of American reaction and fascism. They would outlaw the Communist Party today in order to silence the Roosevelt Democrats and Willkie Republicans tomorrow in order to kill the forces of labor and the progressive forces of the people who are striving to establish their political independence of the dictatorship of big business and the trusts.

The fight of Communist workers for the legal existence of their party is every man's fight for political freedom and the Bill of Rights. The Communists now man the first line of defense of American democracy against the attacks of the Fascist enemy within.

Write or wire your Congressman to vote against any and all proposed legislation that would restrict the rights of labor or the legality of the Communist Party.

Write or wire Governor Kim Sigler and your State senator to oppose and defeat any bill which would deny the right of all labor and people's political parties to a place on the ballot. (People's pressure has already defeated one such bill, House bill 151.)

Demand the abolition of the inquisitorial Callahan committee.

Voice your opposition to this underhanded steal of your basic democratic right of freedom of political choice in letters to the editors of your local newspapers.

Get your local union, club, church, or social organization to take similar action now while there is yet time to safeguard our cherished liberties.

Send a generous contribution today to the Communist Party, 902 Lawyers Building, Detroit 26, Mich.

Give liberally toward raising the $250,000 fund needed immediately to defend the Bill of Rights.

It's either all out in defense of our cherished freedom now against the attack of reaction, or it's all over for democracy here in our America.

MICHIGAN STATE COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST PARTY,
CARL WINTER, *Chairman.*
DETROIT, MICH.

Amadeo Obici

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MITCHELL JENKINS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tonight at 8 o'clock, on the National Broadcasting Co.'s program, Cavalcade of America, there will be presented the story of Amadeo Obici, the president and founder of the Planters Peanut Co., whose home office is in the city of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in my district.

It is the story of the rise of a penniless young Italian immigrant from poverty and obscurity to the control and direction of a vast corporation whose operations extend over the whole of the United States. It is a story of courage and imagination, the kind of story with which our national history is replete. In miniature, this is the story of America itself, for it exemplifies those qualities which have made America great.

To the people of my district in Pennsylvania the story is not new, for we have watched its unfolding as the years have passed by. We have seen the expansion of Mr. Obici's interests from year to year and have recognized those qualities in him which have made that possible. To us it seems but fitting and proper that they should receive recognition on a larger scale.

As it will appear on tonight's program, that story is as follows:

Amadeo Obici, one of Wyoming Valley's principal citizens, arrived in America from Italy in 1889 and went to northeastern Pennsylvania, where a kind stationmaster at a dreary railroad station introduced him to the American delicacy, peanuts.

Sometime later, Amadeo's uncle moved to Wilkes-Barre and here young Obici's Americanization really began. There young Obici got a job as a clean-up boy in the grocery store of John Hance, working extra hard in order to return to his uncle the money given to him for his passage to this country from his native Italy, and in order to save sufficient funds to bring the rest of his family over here: His mother, his brother, and his two sisters.

Soon Obici decided to go into business for himself, not with a store but with a peanut stand because he figured that peanuts, unlike fruit, did not spoil and would be more profitable and less troublesome. During the day, Amadeo had his peanut stand outside Hance's store; in the evenings he took his stand outside the opera and the prize fights. In between times Amadeo read Shakespeare in order to perfect his knowledge of the English language.

One night, outside the prize fight, Amadeo encountered competition from an Italian girl, Louise Musante, whose brother was one of the fight contestants. When they discovered, to their mutual joy, that they were both from the same city in Italy—Oderzo—they married, and the first thing they did was buy a horse and wagon from which to sell their roasted peanuts.

Obici's next step was to rent a second floor in an empty building and begin roasting peanuts on a larger scale so that they could sell them to storekeepers. Obici bought a new wagon and had printed on it: "The Peanut Specialist." He also fulfilled his dream and brought his family over from Italy. Soon enough his family was working with him in his business, roasting and salting peanuts.

He also acquired a business partner, Mario Peruzzi, who married Elizabeth Obici, Amadeo's sister. The firm then took the name of Planters' Peanut Co., getting the name from the peanut planters in Virginia.

Orders began pouring in for Planters' products. They enlarged their building. They made a profit. The firm enlarged. They built their own peanut-cleaning plant in Virginia, where they shelled and cleaned the peanuts they got direct from the growers. Finally, they expanded their plant so that it made its own bags and boxes and tins as well as cleaned and salted the peanuts.

After the plant in Suffolk was completed they built another in San Francisco. Today Planters' Peanut Co. is the biggest, having gone from the time when Obici sold 20 bags a day to the present when it sells 100,000,000 pounds a year. Obici is no longer the peanut specialist; he is the peanut king.

Obici believes that his story exemplifies the freedom of opportunity in America.

Aid to Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose another editorial by Mr. John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Chicago Daily News, of Saturday, April 12, 1947. I, for one, am not ready to vote for the perilous Truman plan. We know no more now than we did when the President made his speech before this House. We are asked to step in alone on a plan that the most ardent proponents indicate may lead to war. They admit that the President's proposal may not even be a solution. Some Members are going along because they do not care to oppose the President. If the President is opposed on this measure, it will not be the first time that a Congress has disagreed and disapproved a Presidential action. If the President is committed to this program, he has done so without recognizing the legislative branch of the Government.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS READY TO VOTE FOR PERILOUS TRUMAN PLAN

Now that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has voted 13 to 0 for the President's $400,000,000 gift to Greece and Turkey, the administration's stop-Russia program will be approved by Congress with only token opposition.

Senator VANDENBERG's amendments, which obligate the President to withdraw American aid to these two countries if either the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations, by majority vote so determine, have placated the Peppers and lulled the public conscience.

Actually, the amendments are meaningless because they are in conflict with established United Nations rules and procedures. The veto power, for instance, cannot be set aside by congressional action whenever it suits our purpose so to do.

The Vandenberg amendments attempt to do by subterfuge what the administration fears never could be accomplished within the United Nations because of Russia's veto power. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, is far more realistic in urging reorganization of the United Nations if "such action is necessary to permit it to function."

Russia has been justly blamed for her obstructive tactics within the UN, but it is well to remember that the United States is also smugly relying upon the veto power to protect our interests in case Russia, Great Britain, France, and China ever decide to graze in the same pasture.

Need we add that stranger things have happened?

REASONS FOR OPPOSITION

We have opposed the revolutionary Truman doctrine as it has been called by his glorifiers because it:

1. Destroys the original and fundamental concept of the United Nations.
2. Commits the United States to the role of world policeman.
3. Stems from the idea that you can buy good will and fight communism with dollars.
4. Misleads the American people into believing that this is another glorious triumph for democracy.
5. Issues an open invitation to war.

THE CAUSE IS LOST

It is now apparent that our fight has been lost. In a few days, the Congress of the United States will vote $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey, which will be small change in comparison to the billions that must follow.

For the Truman doctrine, if sincerely conceived, cannot stop with our intervention in Greece and Turkey. To be effective, it must be carried to China, Korea, India, and the Near East.

World Report, a well-documented publication on global affairs, reveals in its current issue that implementation of the Truman doctrine will mean "United States financing of other countries at the rate of $7,000,000,000 a year for the next 3 years if Washington follows through on the new policy as set for Greece and Turkey. That policy is designed to preserve the economic and political integrity of many nations, prevent the spread of communism and restore stability throughout the world."

To get the full import of our new foreign policy, read that last sentence once again.

It means that we shall spend $21,000,000,000 in the next 3 years in public loans and grants to England, Germany, Italy, Austria, Greece, Turkey, China, Japan, the Philippines, Korea, and other countries.

It means that little, if any, of the money will ever be recovered.

It means that we are headed on the road to bankruptcy, for, as Louis Bromfield said in a recent article: "We have not enough money, raw materials, or machinery to rehabilitate the whole of the world. If we attempt to do so, we shall only bleed ourselves white and reduce our natural real wealth and living standards to the level of the more desperate European nations."

It means that, as in two previous world wars, the youth of America will once again be sacrificed in vain.

FADED IDEALS

Critics of our opposition to the Truman doctrine point out that the United Nations is simply an adventure in sentimental futility. "The way to stop Russia," they say, "is to get tough now."

How different from the idealistic spirit in which the people of the United States embraced the United Nations as the means of preserving world peace.

Can they excuse President Truman's failure to consult the United Nations when Great Britain, in hysterical haste, decided to pull out of Greece?

Can they forget that article 1 of the UN Charter states that the purposes of the United Nations are "to maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

If such an excellent statement of principle is now adjudged by the United States Government to be meaningless, less than 2 years after it was signed by 51 nations, what rightful claim can we make to the moral leadership of the world?

BETTER USE FOR BILLIONS

Employment of a new foreign policy designed solely for the purpose of containing Russia will have tragic results because it discards practical idealism for mailed-fist power politics which have been responsible for the scourge of war throughout the centuries.

If Russia is flexing her muscles for world conquest, we might better spend some of the billions we are shipping abroad on the largest and technologically best developed air force that can be assembled.

The retaliatory striking power of such an air armada probably would cause the Russians to do some reflective thinking before emulating the late unlamented Mr. Hitler.

Since virtually everyone concedes that the next war, if it comes, will be fought with atomic weapons and rockets, perhaps some apologist for the Truman program will now step forward and explain how the expenditure of $400,000,000 in Greece and Turkey will contain Russia when she has learned how to manufacture atomic bombs and decides to use them on us?

Or shouldn't I have asked that one?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Can an Economic Depression Be Avoided?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine of April 13, 1947:

CAN AN ECONOMIC DEPRESSION BE AVOIDED?

Whether the American economy is moving soundly forward or is headed toward another 1929 is a matter of much discussion. There are some who feel that the inflationary process has reached a point of imminent danger; there are others who maintain that no serious dislocation is in sight.

Therefore five of the Nation's leading economists were asked to give their answers to the question: Can a depression be avoided?

The economists are: Sumner H. Slichter, Lamont University professor, Harvard University; Alvin H. Hansen, littauer professor of political economy, Harvard; Ludwig von Mises, visiting professor, Graduate School of Business Administration, New York University; Alan H. Temple, vice president of the National City Bank of New York; and John D. Black, professor of economics, Harvard.

In their answers there is a certain measure of agreement; they see dangers in the present situation but are generally optimistic. They agree that the situation should be watched and that precautions should be taken; they disagree, however, as to just what those precautions should be.

Among the factors making for danger these are cited: (1) The recent sharp rise in living costs, with only a moderate rise in per capita income; (2) disparity in price levels, with farm produce relative higher than manufactured goods; (3) high profit margins; (4) swollen inventories; (5) the great expansion of the Nation's money supply; (6) possible resumption of New Deal fiscal policies; (7) failure to develop full and effective machinery to prevent a slight recession from becoming a collapse.

On the optimistic side of the ledger these are cited: (1) A general awareness among Government, business, labor, and the public that dangers exist; (2) a continuing enormous demand for goods; (3) the basic strength and resilience of the economy; (4) the will to balance the Federal budget; (5) moves by a few large producers to reduce prices; (6) the beginnings that have been made in Washington toward planning for a stable economy.

Here are the views of the five economists:

"PRICES MUST COME DOWN

"(By Sumner H. Slichter, Lamont University professor, Harvard)

"The most dangerous aspect of the business situation is the rapid rise in wholesale prices. Today the general level of wholesale prices is up 6 percent since the end of January. Farm prices have risen over 10 percent. Any tendency to bid up prices rapidly is bound sooner or later to come to an end. Certainly prices cannot be expected to rise indefinitely at the rate of 2 percent a month. The present price level is especially unstable because the supply of finished goods is still abnormally low relative to incomes.

"There are several reasons for this. Part of the output of industry has been going into inventories, exports have been abnormally high in relation to imports, and the productive processes of industry are not yet fully in balance—the intermediate processes have been operating at a higher rate than the final processes.

"As supplies rise relative to incomes, prices may be expected to turn down. Many people fear that the correction in prices will be large and sharp, that it will induce widespread postponement of commitments and that it will produce large-scale unemployment. Any early readjustment in business is likely, in my judgment, to be mild and to affect prices far more than production or unemployment. One reason for this belief is that the prices which are most badly out of line are mainly agricultural prices. These prices could fall substantially without producing a large-scale postponement of business commitments. Indeed, a drop in the price of food would help sustain the demand for a large proportion of manufactured products.

"Another reason for expecting that any correction in business will be mild is that the demand for consumer durable goods, industrial equipment, and construction is unprecedented. The country has about 2,000,000 fewer automobiles than at the time of Pearl Harbor—although population has increased by about 6,000,000 since that time. Never has the average age of cars in use been so high. It is safe to predict that every automobile which can be built will be made in 1947.

"The need for industrial equipment is urgent and the demand will be little affected by momentary disturbances in the business situation. The country has fewer freight cars today than it had on VJ-day. Electric light and power companies are desperately short of generating equipment. Output of freight cars and electric generators during 1947 will be limited only by physical conditions. This holds true for many other kinds of equipment.

"Especially pressing is the demand for construction of all sorts. Consider housing, for example. More than one-fourth of the 6,000,000 married veterans discharged since June 1945 are living doubled up with their families, and an additional 5 percent are living in rented rooms. The increase in the number of families, which was 700,000 in 1946, will be substantially greater in 1947. In 1946 construction was limited by the supplies of materials, but at the end of the year the output of building materials was 60 percent above 1946. Construction costs are high and uncertain and only the most urgent work will be done. Nevertheless, the volume of construction this year will be determined more by physical conditions than economic conditions.

"With a large and insistent demand for durable consumer goods, industrial equipment, and construction, readjustments in prices are likely to have little unfavorable effect upon the general level of production and employment. The earlier that readjustments in the price level occur, the better for the community as a whole. It would be far preferable to have readjustments in prices this year than in 1948, when part of the most urgent demand for durable consumer goods, industrial equipment, and construction will have been met.

"Four principal steps would be useful in making business less susceptible to recession:

"1. Encourage a skeptical and cautious attitude toward prices. One of the most favorable elements in the present business

situation is the general lack of confidence in the level of prices.

"2. Discourage the expansion of credit, particularly credit used to finance the accumulation of inventories, speculation in land, or the purchase of durable consumer goods. If there were ever a time, for example, when the use of credit in buying automobiles should be discouraged, that time is the present.

"3. Reduce the Federal debt held by the commercial banks and encourage the purchase of war savings bonds by individuals.

"4. Avoid lasting increases in construction costs, particularly substantial increases of wages in building construction. Sooner or later the stability of business will depend upon the maintenance of a high level of construction. When that time arrives, the most urgent demand for construction will have been satisfied. A high rate of construction will then depend upon the ability of the construction industry to offer houses and other structures at attractive prices. Once wages in the construction industry go up, it is very difficult to get them down. Hence, now is the time to move cautiously in raising construction wages.

"In the last few weeks several important price reductions have been announced by large manufacturers. These announcements are to be welcomed, despite the fact that they do not apply to the goods which have risen most in price. These reductions have a symbolic value. They remind people that sooner or later there will be price adjustments and thus they help discourage the development of an inflationary psychology. More such announcements would be helpful."

"A PROGRAM IS NEEDED

"(By Alvin H. Hansen, Littauer professor of political economy, Harvard)

"The question we are asked to discuss is not, I take it, whether or not we could develop a program (political difficulties assumed away) which would effectively prevent or check a depression; the question is rather: Are we now in the United States prepared to stop the next depression?

"The answer is, I believe, a qualified "no." If a slump should cumulate with the speed and force of that which hit us in 1929–32 or 1937–38, we have neither the program nor the machinery necessary to check it effectively. Timing and flexibility are essential to a successful and effective compensatory cycle policy.

"We should distinguish at once between structural and cyclical adjustment programs. To make our society function well, structural adjustments are essential, involving labor-management relations, wage-price-productivity relations, tax structure, social security and agricultural programs, enforcement of antitrust laws, etc. All these are important. But they will not prevent depressions. In addition to all these, it is also necessary to develop an effective and quick-acting antidepression program. This we have not done, and there is little evidence that we have as yet any serious intention to do so.

"But we have made a little progress. We are somewhat better prepared to cope with a slump now than we were in 1929 or 1937. We are far more aware of the importance of acting before a slump has gathered sufficient momentum to produce a deep impression. While far from general agreement, there is nevertheless much greater support now for vigorous and quick action. The President voiced this in his recent economic report to the Congress when (referring to the maladjustments and unfavorable possibilites which could cause a recession in 1947) he said: 'The Government will watch this situation and be prepared for action if needed.'

"That declaration is heartening and the President is not altogether whistling in the dark. Within limits he can act. But his power to act is far from adequate. Effective timing and adequate scope for quick, flexible adjustment of public expenditures is not possible without a long-range minimum program of public construction; from such a minimum base it would be possible to expand outlays rapidly to meet emergency needs and thus provide a part of the needed compensatory action.

"Quick timing is also required with respect to tax change, for example, the first-bracket income-tax rate. Until the President is empowered to act quickly (a) by congressional authorization to step up outlays already approved in terms of a long-run expenditure program, and (b) by congressional authorization to vary, say, the first-bracket personal income-tax rate, he is, in fact, not equipped to deal with a fast-moving recession in business activity. Long-range plans and machinery for flexible adjustment are the two things most lacking currently to meet effectively a head-on recession.

"We do have now, in some measure, an automatic compensatory mechanism. With respect to unemployment insurance, payroll taxes exceed benefit payments in boom years, while payments exceed taxes in deep depressions. Our steeply progressive income-tax structure raises tax yields in boom years and reduces tax collections in depression. This helps, but it is not enough.

"Finally, I fully agree with the President's statement (economic report) that we shall not again permit so drastic a collapse in income and employment as started in 1929. We have, I think, discarded sufficient prejudices and obsolete dogmas to prevent that. We shall, I believe, act soon enough to prevent another such disaster. But the action will be tardy, ineffective, and wasteful. We have neither the long-range programs nor the machinery for an effective anticyclical policy."

"WE MUST CONTROL CREDIT

"(By Ludwig von Mises, visiting professor, Graduate School of Business Administration, New York University)

"The recurrence of economic depressions is not a phenomenon inherent in the unhampered operation of the market economy. Neither is it, as the Marxians contend, an offshoot of contradictions allegedly present in the capitalist mode of production.

"The emergence of a depression is the necessary outcome of endeavors to expand credit in order to lower the rate of interest, to make prices and wage rates rise and to finance Government expenditure. Credit expansion temporarily engenders an artificial prosperity. But such a boom cannot last. It must invariably lead to a slump, and the depression is the more disastrous the further credit expansion goes in the preceding period. There is but one means to avert depressions, namely, to abstain from credit expansion.

"It is a sad fact that the country's money supply, consisting of currency outside the banks and demand deposits subject to check, has more than tripled since the beginning of the war. But the significance of these figures must not be overrated. They must be weighed against the Nation's whole potential of production. The American economic system has such an enormous buoyance and recuperative power that it was able to stand even this tremendous shock. Private enterprise and initiative, although deliberately sabotaged by Government and union policies, have given proof of their adaptability and efficiency.

"Business has succeeded by and large in compensating for the worst effects of those policies. There is no reason to assume that the recession will go farther than it has already gone in some branches and that those branches in which production is continuing at a high level will be affected by a serious decline.

"The danger does not arise from what has already happened but from the havoc which a resumption of the New Deal's financial methods could create. And here we are confronted with the comforting fact that the trend of the Nation's financial and economic policy has been reversed. The vicious doctrines of unbalanced budgets, reckless Government spending and borrowing from the commercial banks no longer appeal to public opinion.

"People realize that strikes hurt the interests of the wage earners even more than those of the other strata of society. The workers are beginning to comprehend that technological improvement, the necessary condition of raising their wages and standard of living, requires the accumulation of additional capital and that taxes preventing the formation of new capital amount to the most pernicious antilabor policy.

"Recent events in Great Britain and France and the spread of realistic information about the lot of the masses in Soviet Russia and its satellites are at last depreciating the prestige of all-round planning. The Americans are on the way toward a better appreciation of the achievements of economic freedom, the ultimate foundation of all other freedoms.

"As the international situation makes huge expenditures indispensable, it may be rather difficult for Congress to balance the Federal budget. But if this is done and if no new armed conflict arises, there will be no depression."

"RESTRAINT IS NEEDED

"(By Alan H. Temple, vice president, National City Bank, New York)

"As long as booms occur, reactions will follow. Whether the reaction from the present boom takes the form of a minor recession, a major recession, or a depression will depend largely upon the extent to which the weaknesses created during the boom are recognized and the readiness with which people move to correct them.

"Like every other inflation in history, the present spiral is creating maladjustments which in time will bring it to a halt. The chief of these maladjustments is the widened spread between prices of various goods and services. If all prices and all incomes rose together, purchasing power would be maintained at the higher-price level. But all prices and all incomes do not move together. They rise unevenly, and people whose incomes lag lose buying power.

"In recent months living costs have had an extreme rise, against a modest increase in per capita incomes. This leaves city people especially with less purchasing power for non-cost-of-living items. A second case where prices are out-running purchasing power is in the cost of building, which menaces the outlook for both housing and industrial construction despite the tremendous latent demand.

"Apart from unbalanced price and income relationships, booms bring business mistakes and miscalculations, such as overexpansion of plant and inventory and extremes of speculation and debt-making.

"To state the chief weaknesses is to suggest the nature of the corrections wanted. A better alignment all around, among prices in relation to each other and between prices and incomes, is needed. While wage and price increases are desirable in exceptional cases, the only practical hope of regaining balance and stability is through a drop in prices that are too high—the sooner the better. Proposals for industrial wage increases are defective on two counts:

"1. Factory wages and prices even now are high relative to the compensation of most

other groups of the population, and new increases would widen existing disparities;

"2. The prices that are relatively higher than manufactured goods consist mainly of certain farm products. Authorities agree that in due time farm prices will drop. If wage rates should be raised to increase the buying power of factory workers for farm products, the time will soon come when manufactured goods prices will be high relative to farm incomes.

"Exorbitant profits contribute to instability equally with exorbitant wages. In the industries the need is to improve efficiency of output, reduce unit costs of products, and pass the saving along not in higher wages or higher profits exclusively but also in lower prices in which everyone can share.

"Policies of management and labor should emphasize lower costs of production, lower prices, and the long-run interest in balance and stability. Economy in government and tax cuts are needed, both to increase disposable incomes and to encourage investment and enterprise. Obviously, industrial peace is necessary. Given these requisites, other conditions are highly favorable, including enormous unsatisfied needs for goods here and abroad, and the financial strength and liquidity of the economy.

"The answer to the question asked by the Times therefore is a conditional one. A depression can be avoided, but not through panaceas or white rabbits. Only restraint rather than excesses, and devotion to the general welfare rather than to special interests, will ease our way from the inflationary road to a sounder course.

"There is a maxim that 'hard times make hard work.' Some people are amending this to read that 'only hard times make hard work.' It is within our power to prove that, on the contrary, 'hard work averts hard times.'"

"GOVERNMENT MUST ACT

"(By John D. Black, professor of economics, Harvard)

"At this late date, some measure of a business recession can scarcely be avoided. Or at least the means by which it could have been done are no longer practically available. Present levels of prices are higher than can be sustained with currently earned incomes plus remaining reserves of savings, and buying consumer durables on credit needs in most lines to slacken rather than to expand. The price recessions resulting from this situation, if history repeats itself, will overreach, because customers will not respond to the declining prices promptly enough. This will cause some unemployment, and further reduction of buying power. What is most important in the situation is taking vigorous steps now to check the recession in its early stages and prevent continued spiraling downward.

"The measures required for this include such as the following:

"1. The prompt lowering of prices in manufactured lines to levels that will be sustained by the purchasing power normally to be expected. This is particularly important for prices of basic materials like steel. (The International Harvester Co. has just moved in this direction. Whether far enough, I do not know. With lower steel prices, it could move further.)

"2. Uninterrupted operation of all plants, so that they can supply one another with needed materials and parts, and output per worker can be increased, and costs brought to reasonable levels below the reduced prices required if they are not already there.

"3. A prompt raising of wages in plants, if, or as soon as, output per worker produces costs that are reasonably under the lower prices to be announced.

"4. Adoption by firms of programs and policies aimed at moderate but more certain levels of profits, and dividing more readily their increases in earnings with consumers in lower prices and with employees in higher wages.

"5. Prompt conversion of the present high profits in most merchandising to reduced margins and lower consumer prices. If this is not done promptly, they will soon be absorbed in uneconomical duplication of facilities and wasteful services.

"These measures will, of course, be dubbed by many as utopian or as a counsel of perfection. Nevertheless, in large measure only to the extent that these measures are taken in the next decade or two will we avoid either (1) serious business recession at some periods, or (2) supplementary measures by government. At most, such measures will be carried through only partly in the near future.

"Hence some supplementary measures by government will be required at critical periods such as in the next year. These had better take the form of setting up a detailed manpower budget to discover exactly where unemployment and reduced incomes are likely to appear; collaborating with industry and trade in providing public works if industry and trade will not collaborate enough. Housing will be the most important and most difficult field in which to work out such arrangements. Additional supplementary food distribution may be needed to maintain agricultural income."

Problems Confronting the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio interview reported yesterday over Station WINS, New York City, and Station WLW, Cincinnati, regarding some of the problems which have faced and will face the Eightieth Congress:

QUESTIONER. Congressman, what do you think are the high spots in the accomplishments of Congress up to this point?

Representative KEATING. Well, I'm delighted that you asked that question, because I think there are a lot of people who are not fully aware of what has been done to date. Although legislation is necessarily, and probably fortunately, a deliberate process, which requires subcommittee and committee action after a bill has been introduced, sometimes with extensive hearings before the matter is in shape to be brought to the floor of the House for action, the public generally may not realize the extent and importance of the legislation which has actually passed the House already.

The House has passed 112 bills dealing with all kinds of subjects. Outstanding among these are measures to effect the following results:

1. To reduce governmental expenditures by cutting $6,000,000,000 from the budget submitted to us by the President.

2. To increase the take-home pay of the overburdened and harassed taxpayers of this country by reducing their income taxes by percentages ranging from 30 percent in the lowest income brackets to 10½ percent in the highest brackets.

3. To curb the portal-to-portal pay-suit racket by outlawing illegitimate claims, while retaining intact those legitimate claims which are based on an agreement between the parties or the established custom in the plant.

4. To submit to the various States for ratification, if they so elect, a constitutional amendment to limit Presidential tenure of office.

5. To extend the control of sugar temporarily and provide for orderly decontrol.

6. To make a frontal attack on communism in this country by citing for contempt the defiant Gerhard Eisler, who has assumed the unenviable position of perhaps the No. 1 Communist and to provide for thorough investigation of communism, fascism, and all other subversive ideologies throughout the country in industry, labor unions, and above all, in governmental service.

These are some of the more important things which the House has already done, and time does not permit me to go into more details.

QUESTIONER. Let's look at this tax bill, Congressman. I believe you were one of the first in Congress to suggest a greater break for those in the low-income backet—legislation to give them a greater tax reduction. What is your opinion, then, of the bill which recently passed the House and is now before the Senate for action?

Representative KEATING. Well, I supported this bill, even though it did not go as far as mine in the principle of a graduated tax reduction. The way I looked at it is that legislation is a give-and-take matter and that all the knowledge in the world is not reposed in the mind of any one man, least of all in mine. The position of 31,000,000 taxpayers was improved by the raise from 20 to 30 percent in the reduction which they would enjoy under this bill. That represents two-thirds of all the taxpayers in the country.

Just because this bill did not approach the tax-reduction problem in precisely the manner I might have wished, did not seem to me sufficient reason to deny the deserving and hard-pressed taxpayers any relief at all. Therefore, I concluded I was serving the best interests of the greatest number by voting for the bill.

QUESTIONER. Many—here in Washington—are still debating the question of tax reduction against debt reduction. Would you give us your views on that problem.

Representative KEATING. The way I look at it is that we can do both. When the President submitted his $37,500,000,000 budget he still left a leeway of $1,500,000,000 between prospective income and outgo. If we cut the budget $6,000,000,000 as the House has voted, that gives you $7,500,000,000. If $4,000,000,000 of this is used for tax reduction, it leaves $3,500,000,000 to apply on the national debt, plus the substantial surplus which the President now tells us will result for fiscal 1947. That sounds to me like a pretty substantial reduction.

QUESTIONER. Let's clear up a little confusion on this question, too. Where does a tax-reduction bill now stand—on the legislative road? And what—in your opinion, Congressman, will be the outcome?

Representative KEATING. The Senate, it is true, has not yet acted on this important matter, but I am perfectly convinced that they will pass a tax-reduction bill before we adjourn. Just what form that will take, it is, of course, impossible, and in fact would be quite presumptuous for me to predict, but I am sure if it differs from the bill we have passed, the conferees will iron the matter out and come up with some mutually agreeable legislation.

QUESTIONER. Now, Congressman, tell us what's on the fire in the immediate future.

Representative KEATING. Well, next week we take up a labor bill. Then, I understand, a rent-control bill. I guess perhaps those are the most controversial issues on the calendar at the moment.

QUESTIONER. What about this labor bill you mention?

Representative KEATING. I am not on the Labor Committee, so that I do not yet have the comprehensive and detailed knowledge about this bill which I want, and expect to have, before I vote. I intend to study it over this next week-end and also to read carefully the committee report and much of the testimony which was taken in the extensive hearings held by this committee. There is no doubt in my mind that the American people, including the working men and women and, perhaps above all, union members, are looking to this Congress to enact labor legislation which will furnish more adequate protection to the public from the results of labor-management conflicts, and greater protection to union members from the acts and policies of unscrupulous and dictatorial leaders without, at the same time, being punitive in character so as to destroy or weaken the labor-union movement generally, or strike a blow at those union leaders who are striving to represent their members sincerely and conscientiously.

Probably if 435 Congressmen sat down to write a labor bill you would have 435 different answers. It is my hope and my confident expectation that the bill which finally emerges from debate will be one which will merit and receive the overwhelming support of Congressmen of both parties who recognize the need for some corrective and constructive legislation along these lines.

QUESTIONER. This problem of rent control is one of the issues which must be decided within the next few weeks. Right now there is a little confusion; I wonder would you tell us what is the position of rent control at this time?

Representative KEATING. As I understand it, the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which handles this legislation, has completed its public hearings and has held three executive sessions, which are to be continued next week in an effort to arrive at a definite recommendation for submission to the House.

The corresponding Senate committee has reported out a bill providing for the temporary continuation of rent control until February 29, 1948, transferring this control to the Housing Expediter, and providing for the creation of local advisory boards in the various communities to pass on maximum rents and housing accommodations, and to assist in the administration of the law.

QUESTIONER. Now, getting closer to home on the rent-control problem, what is your attitude on it? And, especially on the question of an increase?

Representative KEATING. Here again, like the labor question, one always wants to get all the information and data he can, arising from the hearings and the detailed knowledge of the committee members, but my inclination at the moment is to feel that the housing shortage is still so great in this country that it presents something of a national emergency justifying and, in fact, requiring the continuance of some form of control for the time being.

I don't like the interference of Government with our everyday life, but I realize that this principle must yield at times to the exigencies of the occasion. I would be fearful of the results if we were to remove controls completely at the present moment. When it comes to the question of an increase, although I am open-minded to be convinced otherwise, I have thought that it was preferable to deal with each case on its merits rather than to attempt to apply any over-all increase.

I know specifically of cases where landlords, in my opinion, are entitled to substantial increases, but I know of other cases where they have refused to keep the properties in repair or do anything at all for their tenants, and where, in my judgment, they are not entitled to any increase.

For that reason, I have thought that to apply an across-the-board increase which they talk about, might result in the creation of at least as many inequities as it would cure.

QUESTIONER. Mr. KEATING, I suppose a question close to your interest as a veteran of the past war is this proposed unification of the Armed Services. Would you give us your position on that?

Representative KEATING. My experience in the Army convinced me of the absolute necessity for better coordination of effort between the three arms of the service. I am a staunch advocate of unification. My only criticism at the moment about the pending bill is that it does not go far enough, but I believe it is undoubtedly a step in the right direction. It probably will be improved in detail as the result of discussion and hearings, as usually happens in the legislative process, but certainly the principle involved I strongly favor.

QUESTIONER. Some critics of unification, Congressman KEATING, insist that one man in charge of the combined services would come into too much authority and power. Do you share that view?

Representative KEATING. No, I do not. That power is now vested in the President as Commander in Chief, but the difficulty is that, with the many crucially important matters engaging his attention, he naturally is not able to give our national defense the time and study which it deserves and which one charged with no other responsibilites would be able to give it.

There is another point about that—under this proposed bill, if the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force disagrees with the Secretary of National Defense on any important issue, he has the right to take his report or recommendation direct to the President, after first informing the Secretary of National Defense that he has done so. I think that completely answers any such charge as you mention.

QUESTIONER. Many Navy veterans—both in and out of service—fear that the Navy will be relegated to the background under this proposed merger. What do you think about that?

Representative KEATING. I really don't feel there is any just ground for such apprehension. The same might just as well be said about the Army and Air Force. If, for instance, the civilian Secretary of National Defense who was appointed happened to be an ex-Navy man it might be argued that the Army or the Air Force would be scuttled, but I am satisfied that anyone named to such a position of great responsibility would recognize fully the contribution which all the armed services have made and must continue to make.

QUESTIONER. One final question, Congressman KEATING. What's the outlook for appropriations for the Army and Navy? There are some fears that the economy-minded Congress will slice too deeply into the military budget. Do you have any reports on that situation?

Representative KEATING. The detailed appropriation bill for the Army and Navy has not yet been presented to us, but I have been told it is likely to be coming along in a matter of 2 or 3 weeks. My guess is that it will provide appropriations somewhat lower than the figures set forth in the President's budget. I have no doubt that there are points at which economies can be effected. I am sure, however, that Congress will not adopt a military and naval budget which is so drastically cut that national security becomes imperiled or essential operations of the services are curtailed to the point of ineffectiveness.

You must remember that almost half of the Members of Congress are veterans of World War I or II, or both. I am most sympathetic with the attitude of those who urge international disarmament. It would be an unmixed blessing if all nations could be brought to the realization of the utter futility of settling their differences by the sword, but the trouble is that we must realistically face the fact that this millenium has not arrived. May God speed the day when it does arrive. Until that time, however, I conceive it to be the duty of the Congress of the United States, the guardian in peacetime of this Nation's safety, to insure that our national security be not imperiled and that we maintain a sufficient strength in arms and men and alertness and advanced awareness in scientific research that we may not furnish an open invitation to attack by possible aggressor nations.

Government Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit an editorial from the Courier Freeman of Wednesday, April 9, 1947. The publisher of this paper is the Honorable Bertrand H. Snell, of Potsdam, N. Y., the distinguished former minority leader of the House of Representatives. The editorial reflects his sound judgment and long experience in fighting needless Government expense. It is refreshing to find men of his caliber realizing what the present Republican majority in this House is up against in trying to cut down the expensive, overgrown Government bureaus established by the New Deal.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

There is considerable discussion at present over what Congress is trying to do in decreasing Government expenditures and bringing them back nearer to a peacetime normal level. The regular Federal activities in all lines increased enormously during the war. People expected that, but they did not expect these extraordinary activities and expenses would become fixed charges for all time—years after the war was over.

It is just beyond the comprehension of the average citizen why it is necessary to have nearly as many men on the Government pay roll in peacetime as it was when we were fighting a global war with around 12,000,000 men under arms.

If there was one mandate from the last general election, it was that it wanted decreased Government expenditures and less waste of the taxpayers' money. As far as we are able to learn there is not a single group, or man, in Congress that wants to decrease the efficiency of any needed Federal activity. What they do want is a careful going over of every Federal bureau and a weeding out of the useless and nonproductive employees and to put it on a reasonably sound business basis.

The House Appropriations Committee tried to honestly carry out the wishes of the people. Increases that could not be justified were pared, and activities no longer needed in peacetime were dropped. Only a short time ago President Truman himself told the Federal bureau chiefs that they must begin at once to decrease expenditures, yet at present he is putting the full force of the Executive back of the bureaus in demanding the full amount of his budget estimates. The result is that nearly every bureau chief in Washington, and his satellites, are spending all their time and the people's money in spreading propaganda to the people advising them that such and such a service will be destroyed by

any decreased appropriation, and the ultimate result will be a great financial loss to the Government. This propaganda went to each section of the country where there was a special service that was of importance to the welfare of its people. We had it up here and naturally our people were aroused. The word came from Washington before they really knew what was in the House bill, and even before consideration in the Senate, that practically the entire border patrol and customs service would be wiped out and our whole northern border left entirely open. Of course, everyone knows that the customs service is one of the very important branches of the Government, and must be maintained. Bureau chiefs well knew this, and knew this was an easy way to arouse the people against cuts in appropriations.

To emphasize this Commissioner Johnson at once sent out notices to his field offices to fire upward of 1,500 customs inspectors and assistants, all but wiping out the border and port controls. No wonder the people along this northern border were up in arms, and rightly so. As a matter of fact, we are informed that the most of the men that were fired were rehired the next day or will be very soon.

Later Mr. Johnson told the Senate committee that no more than 800 in the entire service would be dropped. And if he says that now, probably not one of the really essential men will eventually be taken from the pay roll. Congress just wants him to weed out the men who are not essential to the service, and if he is not willing to do that and work to save the taxpayers' money, we should have a new Commissioner.

There never was a bureau chief who did not want more and more money, and want to extend his bureau's activities. But when he finds out that he cannot get all he asks for, be will generally go ahead and do the job with what Congress gives him.

Just a word about the House appropriation for the whole customs service; of course, no one yet knows what the Senate will do, but today the bill carries almost exactly the amount that was appropriated for this service last year. No complaint was made about the service last year, and yet the Bureau has enough money and sufficient clerical force to propagandize the whole country for additional funds to save the destruction of the customs service. It is just plain bunk. Besides it is strictly against the law for a department to use money appropriated for a special service for another service that has no appropriation. Certainly there is no appropriation of Federal funds for propaganda against the acts of Congress.

Furthermore, if we are correctly informed, the border patrol itself has about three million more than last year.

We believe Congress is trying its level best to carry out the mandate of the 1946 election, and give the country decreased Government expenditures. Therefore Congress deserves the united supoprt of all thoughtful citizens who are truly interested in honest Federal economy.

Senator H. Byrd Has Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following editorial taken from the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) Daily News which is published in my home town and one of the leading papers in south Florida, this editorial being written by Gov. R. H. Gore, the owner and publisher of the paper:

SENATOR H. BYRD HAS ANSWER

It has been obvious for some time that there is something rotten—not in Denmark—in the Greco-Turkish political football, which has been kicked from Europe to the United States.

Apparently, the problem is too hot for the United Nations to handle, therefore, as usual, we are supposed to pick-up the $400,000,000 "ball" and run with it—that is what our present national leadership would like for us to do without asking too many questions.

And as, per usual, these one-worlders run into perfect tackling on the part of the gentleman from Virginia, Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, who would have been President of the United States today had it not been that these same one-worlders sold the American public back in 1944 that we shouldn't change horses in midstream if we hoped to win the peace as well as the war.

After 19 months of this so-called peace, we ask you what have we won? Nothing!

It's a shame that we haven't more intelligent leadership of the HARRY BYRD caliber in our National Capital today. When the one-worlders, without thought of security or economy, threaten to toss the American dollar across the Atlantic we always hear from Senator BYRD, the watchdog of the American Treasury.

This time the Virginia Senator is in there fighting to prevent our leaders from going off half-cocked and wrecking the United Nations set-up before affording that group the opportunity of trying to solve the Greco-Turkish crisis.

We agree with the Senator that if the United Nations is not capable of handling the situation by demanding an immediate show-down on the issue with Russia, then it's time to scrap the present UN and reorganize even if it should mean the withdrawal of the Soviets from around the world peace table.

As it stands today, it appears our national leaders have very little faith in the strength of the United Nations to stop aggressors, else why would we take the initiative in what appears to be the beginning of world war III?

Neck Deep in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herewith an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of April 7, 1947:

NECK DEEP IN POLITICS?

This congressional session has entered its fourth month with its accomplishments still painfully few. The Republicans in control have had ample time to prove their capacity. At the session's start they promised prompt obedience to the mandates given them by American voters in the November election. Remedial labor legislation was the first and clearest of these; here the need of celeritous action was obvious and it has been emphasized by developments since the session opened.

Three months later the country still waits for the promised labor enactments. The Republican majority still talks of doing something about it, but the prospect of definite enactment grows hazier. Not even the immediate threat of a Nation-wide tie-up of telephone communication—an essential public utility—stirred them to action.

Some weeks ago the crisis in Greece forced President Truman to seek prompt congressional action to enable this country to meet its obligation to peace and world-wide democracy. The Nation's response was strongly favorable. Eminent Republicans in and out of Congress supported the appeal, but a Republican Congress still stays its haste and makes delays.

Inaction likewise leaves the Nation's postwar defense program undefined and uncertain, though the need for its adoption grows more urgent by the minute by reason of sinister developments abroad and the expiration of the draft.

The vital questions of Federal revenues and expenditures go unanswered by enactments, too, despite need for their settlement. Republicans still are divided among themselves on these issues and the method of dealing with them.

In brief it appears that too many Republicans in Congress are thinking primarily of next year's political campaign—trying to decide whether labor legislation, the grant of emergency aid to Greece, the adoption of a n tional defense program—would help or hurt their own and their party's election chances. While they debate and hesitate and vacillate and mark time, Congress gets little or nothing done.

Meanwhile unofficial canvasses and surveys agree that President Truman's political stock is rising and his personal popularity growing the country over. Republican politicians in and out of Congress should be able to trace that result to its cause: The ineptitudes and delays of the Congress which apparently is forgetful of the national mandates to which it pledged prompt obedience—and neck deep in the kind of politics which usually obstructs and sometimes betrays the public interest.

Are the New Rent-Control Bills a Step Toward Socialized Housing or Worse?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from one of my constituents. So far as I know this man does not own any rental property whatever. At most he does not own more than one or two smaller houses which are rental property. There are many people thinking along the same lines that my constituent has written me. They are wondering and asking the question, "Are the new rent-control bills a step toward socialized housing or worse?" For that reason I am quoting his letter in its entirety as follows:

It seems very obvious that the authors of the proposed rent-control legislation are not serious in their claims of protecting the veteran from so-called greedy landlords.

As I understand the proposed bill all new construction and conversions would be decontrolled from rent control except that veterans would have a priority on the rental of these units. That such property as had been previously rented would remain under rent control thereby freezing the present tenant

in at the low rate. Most of these tenants are of long standing and nonveterans. The veteran is still frozen out due to the fact housing was never rationed but only the rate controlled which allowed these present to buy and hoard more housing than they would normally consume and it is still in hoard. The veteran is still frozen out but he has a priority on the new units which will rent for twice the price of the controlled ones.

Now, it seems to me that if the authors of this bill were serious, they would have at least provided the veteran with a priority on the controlled housing instead of the noncontrolled housing.

I can only come to one conclusion and that is, that either the authors of the bill are incapable of their job, or it is a move toward socialized housing or worse. I am thoroughly convinced the proper thing to do is to decontrol all housing before further damage is done.

Resolutions From the Iowa General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include House Concurrent Resolution 14, Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 23 of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

"House Concurrent Resolution 14

"Whereas the use of alcoholic beverages is rapidly increasing in Iowa; and

"Whereas the habit-forming practice of the use of alcoholic beverages in many cases results in lowered physical and mental efficiency, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, increased crime, and general disregard for law and order, all detrimental to the general public welfare; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of Iowa does recognize the inherent right and duty of government to protect and safeguard the general public welfare of its people by all proper means; and

"Whereas the above habit-forming practice is constantly being stimulated and encouraged by the use of advertising and propaganda, much of which comes from out of the State and which has for its purpose financial profit rather than the general public interest and welfare; and

"Whereas there has been introduced in Congress a bill by Senator ARTHUR CAPPER known as S. 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, which bill is now in the hands of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of Maine, is the chairman: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Iowa hereby urges its Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence and support in behalf of S. 265 to the end that the general welfare of the people, and especially the youth of Iowa, and the United States, be safeguarded and protected.

"Furthermore, that a copy of said Resolution be sent to the United States Senators from Iowa and the United States Representatives from Iowa, to the Honorable WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., Senator from Maine, and to the Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER, Senator from Kansas."

I hereby certify that the foregoing House Concurrent Resolution 14 was duly adopted by the Fifty-second General Assembly of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, Iowa., this 9th day of April 1947.

A. G. GUSTAFSON,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 22

"Whereas the Internal Revenue Code of the United States, as construed and administered by the Internal Revenue Bureau, permits married residents of eight States to split their income for income-tax purposes because of the existence of the community-property concept in such States; and

"Whereas married residents in all other States are not so permitted to split their income; and

"Whereas the use of this legal fiction or rule of law, known as the community-property law, results in discrimination against the married residents of Iowa and all other similar non-community-property States, and requires such residents to bear an unjust proportion of the Federal tax burden; and

"Whereas, in connection with the adoption of the Revenue Act of 1947, the Congress of the United States is now considering various proposals to eliminate this unjust and unfair discrimination; and

"Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of this general assembly and of the people of Iowa that the Internal Revenue Code of the United States should be amended so as to permit a husband and wife residing in non-community-property States, including Iowa, to split their income for income-tax purposes upon the same basis as is employed in community-property States, irrespective of the sources of the income: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Fifty-second General Assembly of the State of Iowa respectfully represents to the Congress of the United States that it is the opinion of the people of Iowa, as well as the opinion of this assembly, that the Internal Revenue Code of the United States should be revised and amended so as to permit a husband and wife, residents of Iowa or of any of the other non-community-property States, to split their income, and thereby eliminate the unfair and unjust discrimination now existing in favor of the married residents of States having the community-property concept;

"That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are requested to exert their efforts to secure such a revision of the Internal Revenue Code;

"That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to so revise the Internal Revenue Code of the United States;

"That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress.

"JAY C. COLBURN."

We, Kenneth A. Evans, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa, and W. J. Scarborough, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-second General Assembly of Iowa.

KENNETH A. EVANS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
W. J. SCARBOROUGH,
Secretary of the Senate.

I, Rollo H. Bergeson, secretary of state of the State of Iowa, hereby certify that a copy of this resolution has been forwarded to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representatives of Congress.

[SEAL] ROLLO H. BERGESON,
Secretary of State.

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 23

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress a plan calling for the unification of the armed forces of the United States; and

"Whereas the said plan in one form does not make adequate specific provision for the recognition of the United States Marine Corps as a distinct unit of the armed forces of the United States; and

"Whereas the Marine Corps has established itself over a period of more than a century as one of the greatest fighting organizations in the world and should be continued in its traditional status; and

"Whereas the security of the United States requires the continuation of a unit versed through experience and training in the art of amphibious warfare; and

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps has, since its organization in 1775, distinguished itself as the greatest and best versed amphibious force in the world: Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (the house of representatives concurring):

"1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized and urged to take immediate favorable action toward specifically establishing the United States Marine Corps and making adequate provision for its continuation in any plan for unification of the armed forces of the United States.

"2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Iowa Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"GEORGE FAUL.
"JOHN P. BERG.
"CARL A. BURKMAN."

We, Kenneth A. Evans, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa, and W. J. Scarborough, secretary of the senate, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of the Fifty-second General Assembly of Iowa.

KENNETH A. EVANS,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
W. J. SCARBOROUGH,
Secretary of the Senate.

I, W. J. Scarborough, secretary of the senate, further certify that a copy of this resolution has been forwarded to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, the Honorable Arthur H. Vandenberg, President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Iowa Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

[SEAL] W. J. SCARBOROUGH,
Secretary of the Senate.

The Hatchet Men Are Out Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Marine Bulletin of Albany, N. Y., dated April 1947:

THE HATCHET MEN ARE OUT AGAIN

Last year the hatchet men of the War Department had their axes poised to destroy the Marine Corps. Their efforts were forestalled by a fighting speech delivered by General Vandegrift and the all-out fight by the Marine Corps League. Now they are out again; this time armed with what purports to be an agreement between the Army and the Navy on a plan to merge the armed forces. The fact that elements within the two larger services have reached some form of agreement we are forced to accept, but nowhere—nowhere in all of the maze of press reports emanating from Washington is there any evidence that the Marine Corps has participated in any agreement—or that it has even been consulted.

This gave us our first inkling that all might not be well, and a quick examination of the merger bill which developed from the alleged agreement made it apparent at once that our suspicions were justified. The very same ills and pitfalls that characterized the merger "gold brick" of 1946 are all back again seeking legislative blessing in 1947. Just as the 1946 effort that failed, the new bill calls for one powerful Cabinet member to take the place of the two we now have and need, as well as a great all-powerful General Staff on Hitler's German pattern to control all of the armed might of the country. And the Marine Corps? The Marine Corps is scarcely mentioned—given only such slight and humiliating recognition as could adequately be met by one marine standing guard over one coal pile in one navy yard. For all the merger bill is concerned the Corps can be legally destroyed, eradicated in everything but name, by a simple stroke of the pen.

And such action is by no means improbable if the merger bill is passed. For as soon as they can get legislative sanction the War Department hatchetmen intend to wipe out the Fleet Marine Force, destroy completely the useful character of that highly trained specialist organization that led the victorious march across the Pacific.

This is no hasty or ill-advised flight of imagination; they have announced their intent to do so both publicly and privately, and, if challenged, they will not deny it now. And these same Pentagon patriots intend to try to replace the Fleet Marine Force with Army units—Army units working under a War Department that couldn't even spell "amphibious" until that same Fleet Marine Force taught them the meaning of the word in 1941.

All of these apprehensions for the safety and perpetuity of the corps may seem groundless to the casual reader of the maze of carefully planned War Department propaganda on the merger subject, for it would seem at the outset that the Marines' traditional amphibious function is clearly set down in the "agreement." But on second glance it becomes obvious that the apparent security is no security at all, since it is proposed that the Marine Corps' mission be expressed not as a part of the law but as a simple Executive order—an Executive order that can be changed overnight. For the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force this procedure may be acceptable, since their existence is adequately protected in the proposed law itself, but not so for the Marine Corps. The Marines alone are not legally taken care of, and if this ambitious design for power receives the sanction of Congress, the disciples of militarism in the Pentagon will lose no time in taking full advantage of that fact. Before the people have time to protest the proud Marine Corps that has stood as the country's primary force in readiness since 1776 will be weakened, maimed, and destroyed. And the War Department hatchetmen will have the law on their side while they do it.

But this brutal injustice doesn't have to happen. Marines have come promptly and willingly to the aid of their country in its every hour of need. And it behooves every loyal marine to do his traditional part in this crisis too—bending every effort to alert the people that they stand in imminent danger of falling victim to a militaristic Frankenstein on the Nazi pattern—and losing their most valuable armed force in the bargain.

In short this is what the Marine Corps League believes, in the interest of the United States and the United States Marine Corps:

1. The present merger bill is unsatisfactory and dangerous because:

a. It cuts down the amount of civilian control over the military forces.

b. It authorizes the establishment of a powerful politico military national general staff.

c. It permits the summary destruction of all that is valuable in the Marine Corps.

2. No law relating to the armed services is suitable unless it prescribes what each one shall do. In the case of the Marine Corps it should clearly provide for a vigorous Fleet Marine Force with its included air arm—as the element of the armed forces primarily responsible for development of landing force tactics and equipment.

These thoughts are not selfish conclusions born of ignorance or hypocrisy. They are the common sense convictions that every loyal American will hold once he is made aware of the truth. But to make him aware—that is your job.

Hon. D. Emmert Brumbaugh, of Pennsylvania, Acquires New Laurels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when I resigned my seat in Congress to enter naval service during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the voters of the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania elected Hon. D. Emmert Brumbaugh as my successor by an overwhelming majority.

That the confidence of the voters was not misplaced is evidenced by the fact that Representative Brumbaugh gave honorable service during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress and was reelected to the Seventy-ninth Congress by an imposing majority.

During Representative Brumbaugh's service in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses his genial disposition and fine personality won him many friends among his colleagues, the great majority of whom are still serving in Congress.

It is pleasing to Emmert Brumbaugh's large circle of admiring friends to learn that Gov. James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania, recognizing his many sterling qualities and his successful business experience of over 36 years in the field of banking, appointed him secretary of banking for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The appointment has met with Statewide approval with many newspapers lauding the Governor for his choice of such an outstanding citizen for one of the most important positions in his cabinet.

The avalanche of congratulatory messages from persons in all walks of life is not only indicative of the popularity of the new secretary of banking of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania but reveals the respect and esteem in which he is held by those privileged to have made his acquaintance.

Those of us who know Emmert Brumbaugh intimately are proud of his achievements, which are an added guaranty that he can be depended upon to give a good account of his stewardship in his new position in public life.

The following article, by John R. Deitrick, appeared in many Pennsylvania newspapers and is a brief sketch of the new secretary of banking of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It is a tribute to the high qualities of citizenship that have been characteristic of D. Emmert Brumbaugh and which have aided him immeasurably during an honorable and busy career that reflects to a marked degree inherent qualities of honesty, courage, and sincerity of purpose.

The article is as follows:

NEW SECRETARY OF BANKING IS MAN OF MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(By John R. Deitrick)

HARRISBURG, February 17.—D. Emmert Brumbaugh, Pennsylvania's new secretary of banking, has some definite ideas on banks and banking and well he might—he's been in the business for 36 years.

But in spite of his long experience, Brumbaugh, at 53, is still one of the younger members of Governor Duff's cabinet.

Brumbaugh, a stocky man with a thatch of brown hair, a pleasant smile and a boundless energy, has been climbing from one accomplishment to another all his life.

Born on a farm near Martinsburg, W. Va., he advanced successively from bank clerk to bank president and then to United States Representative and now to secretary of banking for the Commonwealth.

A serviceman during World War I with overseas service, Brumbaugh says he is definitely interested in aiding the former GI's of World War II.

The banking department is backing a bill which will permit State banks to grant broader loan privileges to the Commonwealth's veterans.

The new banking secretary won't commit himself to a trend in the pending movement in the legislature to make Saturday closing of banks during the summer months and optional the rest of the year.

Smiling and shaking his head, he said easily, "We'll take no part in that matter. It is an issue for the banks themselves and related groups to decide."

Commenting in general on the banking situation in the Commonwealth, Brumbaugh expressed the view that "We should keep our banking conditions such as to be prepared for all emergencies."

"We're in an easy period now," he added, "but the individual banks should keep their assest invested in such a manner that funds will be immediately convertible in case of depression."

Asked if he meant by the remark that a depression was imminent, he replied:

"I am not alarmed about a depression in the near future; naturally we'll have a recession."

Noting the current wave of inflated prices, Brumbaugh said he believes "a price reduction is necessary if we are to maintain mass production."

Brumbaugh brings to his post a background heavily studded with banking and financial experience. Aside from serving as president of the bank at his home at Claysburg, Blair County, he has served on several State banking committees and during his term as Representative to Congress served on the Banking and Currency Committee.

He was elected to Congress in 1943 in a special election and was returned again in 1944 for a full 2-year term. He was not a candidate in the 1946 elections.

Brumbaugh is married and the father of four children—two sons and twin daughters.

Gentlemen of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pike County Republican, of Pittsfield, Ill.:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS

"As far as the eye can reach, a vast expanse of level land, clothed with tall prairie grass, seemingly as fertile as the most fertile lands in America, a great empire that some day may help feed a nation. Out here in the West they call these great bottom prairies 'God's Acres,' and well they may be. They are beautiful to behold and some day the rising tide of immigration will sweep to this fertile valley and pitch its habitations therein. Some day the ingenuity of man will here build an empire."

So wrote Maj. Charles J. Sellon, Pittsfield editor, 1859, in Historic Notes, quoting an early-day traveler in western Illinois.

The empire which the early-day traveler envisioned came to pass. It is the great Sny Valley, whose fate today is in the lap of the Congress of the United States.

The ingenuity of man turned this fertile miasma-breeding lowland into an empire of homes, schools, and churches. This empire embraces 110,000 rich acres. This empire is slowly drowning, due to a changed water table. Already 22,000 of these fertile acres have been lost to agriculture by the changed water level.

The change in water level is attributed by valley inhabitants to new dams in the Mississippi River incident to Government's deep navigation channel project. Because of the risen water level seep water is interfering with valley farming and causing huge losses.

The great crops that carpet this valley in the maturing season are more wonderful to behold than the tall prairie grass that clothed it of old. Last year the valley produced its greatest crops of corn and soy beans. Then, after the crops were matured, floods and seep water invaded the crop lands. Grounds were softened. Farm machines mired. They could not harvest the crops. All winter the farmers sought to save their record crops, taking advantage of short periods when the ground was frozen sufficiently to hold up the machines. Huge losses resulted from the delayed harvest.

The Sny Valley is a drowning valley, As we write this editorial the Sny Valley is going under water. This doubtless would not be happening were the plans of the Army engineers now in effect. For the fifth season in succession there is flood threat to the farmers of the Sny Valley. The Army Engineers' report estimates the average annual flood damage in the valley at $450,200. The engineers find that their proposed improvement for which appropriation is lacking would reduce the frequency of flood damage to about once in 50 years instead of the present average intervals of about 2 years.

Congress can save this drowning valley. Former editorials in this newspaper have put the facts before the Congress. Congress has the official report of a thorough investigation of the situation by the War Department engineers, showing how desperate is the plight of this western Illinois agricultural empire, and how it can be saved. The findings of the engineers were approved by the Seventy-ninth Congress, which included the proposed Sny improvement in the flood control bill, H. R. 6597, on July 24, 1946 (Public Law No. 526, 79th Cong.). President Truman signed this bill. The proposed improvement had the approval of Gov. Dwight Green and the Army engineers in Illinois.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurred generally with the plans of the reporting engineers, who found the estimated cost of the proposed improvement to be economically justified.

Engineers of the War Department advise that they are ready to proceed with the proposed improvement as soon as money for the work is made available.

All that stands in the way of saving this drowning empire is an appropriation, which is within the discretion of this Eightieth Congress and which the Army engineers find to be economically justified.

The Pike County (Ill.) Republican is published and circulates on the 742 square miles of the Sny watershed, with its population of 22,780 persons. It sits where it can see what is happening to this great food-producing empire, dotted with its fine farmsteads and happy homes.

Millions of dollars have been expended locally to build this empire since the first levee construction work began back in 1870. The United States has spent more than $1,000,000. Local interests have spent approximately $3,733,000—report of Chief of Engineers Gen. R. A. Wheeler to the Secretary of War, April 17, 1946.

Are these large costs—local and Government—to be lost for want of an appropriation to save the investment?

For this Sny Valley is today a drowning valley. It is drowning as it reaches out for this engineering plan to save it and which only the necessary appropriation by the Congress can bring within its reach.

We urge this appropriation in the name of economy—human and material. Is it not economy to save a present investment that is grievously distressed rather than start or increase some other investment in a project not so desperately put to it for survival?

We submit the facts. We submit the economy of the situation. Great material and human values are at stake.

Gentlemen of the Congress, we plead the record.

(NOTE.—This is the third in a series of three editorials designed to acquaint Congress with factual issues involved in the Sny Basin proposal.)

Railroad Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, once again we are witnessing a wave of railroad accidents. Many of these disasters can and should be avoided. I have called the attention of the House on many occasions to the dangerous operation of our railroad systems. In this connection, I desire to include in the RECORD an editorial taken from the April 11, issue of the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch. The editorial follows:

RECKLESS RAILROADING

An inexcusable act of negligence caused the deaths of 24 persons and the injury of 138 in the wreck of the Pennsylvania Railroad's Red Arrow near Altoona, Pa., February 18. This accident has been followed by an epidemic of railroad wrecks totaling seven in as many days. The Interstate Commerce Commission finds that the train was speeding at more than 65 miles an hour downgrade and round a curve where the speed limit was 30 to 35 miles an hour. Only 2 miles ahead, furthermore, was another curve round which the speed limit was 19 miles an hour.

Was it the negligence of the two engineers (one of whom is dead) or of the policy-making officials of the company? Did the engineers, running an hour late, feel that they must make up the time, regardless of speed limits, to avoid the company's displeasure? Or did they simply not know, as the surviving engineer says, that they were exceeding the speed limit? Neither of the two locomotives was equipped with a speedometer, which is a plain case of negligence on the part of the company. If an engineer is to be held responsible for staying within the speed limit, he has got to have the instrument that will tell him the speed at which he is going.

Whatever the reason for it, the amount of fast and reckless railroading, and its toll in lives, are shocking. In the past 5 years alone, 97 persons have lost their lives and 586 have been injured in accidents involving excessive speed.

There was the wreck of the Southern Pacific's Challenger November 8, 1944, near Colfax, Calif. It was traveling at excessive speed, more than 55 miles an hour, round a curve where the speed limit was 35 miles an hour. The resulting wreck killed 9 and injured 206.

On July 3, 1944, an Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe train which, the ICC found later, was running at high speed, wrecked near Maine, Ariz., killing 4 and injuring 126. Barely a month later, on the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, near Shelbina, Mo., a train going 50 miles an hour failed to reduce its speed to the 10-mile-an-hour limit as it entered a siding, and derailed, killing 1 and injuring 8.

The accident at the Etzel Avenue grade crossing of the Wabash Railroad in St. Louis on January 23, 1944, was another horror story of excessive speed. The passenger train that was in collision with a Public Service Co. bus was running 30 miles an hour, although the speed limit was 10. Fifteen persons were killed and 8 were injured.

The wreck of the Burlington's Exposition Flyer and Advance Flyer in Naperville, Ill., in April of last year involved a number of causes, of which the speed of the two trains was, under the circumstances, one of the least defensible.

Here were two trains traveling, one behind the other on a single track, at a speed of 85 miles an hour, yet spaced only 3 minutes apart. If the first train should stop unexpectedly, the second train would have only 3 minutes to come to a standstill, and at that speed it takes a mile or a mile and a half to bring a train to a stop. It did stop unexpectedly, and the second train plowed into it, killing 44 and injuring more than 100.

The painful fact is that the railroads are trying to compete in twentieth century speed, but with nineteenth century equipment for doing so safely. Such railroads as want to continue to operate without speedometers, without two-way radio, without automatic train control, and other modern safety safe-

guards for modern speeds, should resign themselves to jogging along at the leisurely pace to which their equipment entitles them. If they want to compete with the air lines in speed, they should be required to equip themselves with the devices that will make high speed safe. In addition, speed limits should be rigorously enforced, regardless of schedules, for no amount of safety equipment can make recklessness safe.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, Saturday marked the second anniversary of the passing of one of the greatest Democrats in the history of our Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herewith the text of a memorial address which I made in the Raymond Mississippi Baptist Church on April 15, 1945, 3 days after the passing of Franklin D. Roosevelt:

Franklin Delano Roosevelt is dead; he has crossed the river, and rests in the shade of the trees. The Commander in Chief has joined his men, who, as he did, gave their lives that we might live.

Four times President of the United States, Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, international statesman, humanitarian, Christian gentleman, and devout father and husband—Franklin Roosevelt overcame seemingly insurmountable physical and psychological handicaps to become the most adored and revered man of his day, and the most signally honored man in the turbulent history of his native land.

The story of Franklin D. Roosevelt does not find a parallel in the phenomenal rise of Abraham Lincoln—or even of Roosevelt's successor, President Truman. On the contrary, President Roosevelt was brought into the world in the lap of luxury—he never knew a material want—and the friends and associates of his youth were those, who as he, were far removed from the poverty, hunger, and privation with which every nation and people are ever conscious and beset. But he grew—as did our Saviour—in wisdom as in stature, and the rich and wealthy background of his early days only seemed to enhance and deepen his sympathy for his less fortunate brothers.

As a young man he suffered the ravages of deadly paralysis—the crippler that fears no man but makes visitations on the homes of the rich as well as the poor. This was to leave a mark on the physical being of Franklin Roosevelt that he was to carry to the grave. At this point in his life, Franklin D. Roosevelt made a decision that was to play a leading role in shaping the future of the entire world. He could have lived comfortably in the pleasant security of his Hyde Park home, but he chose rather to serve his people, and to devote his life to their welfare and to the struggle for a better world.

In 1933, after more than two decades of honorable public service to his people in various capacities, he became the thirty-first President of the United States. Into his unfaltering hands were placed the reins of a ship of state sorely obsessed of chaos and depression and internal strife and starvation. But his mighty hands were capable, and with the divine help of a gracious and merciful God, our President led this Nation out of depression and want into plenty. It was then that he carved his first niche into the hall of eternal fame.

But when he had completed this task, and was preparing himself for his return to the quiet and peace of private life, another obstacle even greater and more ominous suddenly appeared, which was to compel a weary Franklin D. Roosevelt to remain at the helm; his people demanded that he continue to lead them—for he had now become a living symbol of unity among men.

And now, as did Moses of old, he has led his children to within sight of the Promised Land; and, like Moses, he has been denied entrance, but his spirit shall be watching from its place in the ethereal land of God as his followers march on to the victory that he was to share. And his spirit shall be free.

But Franklin D. Roosevelt left more than victory in this war. By his unerring hands was molded the greatest singleness of purpose and action ever achieved in any nation. He sympathized with the weak and the poor, and he supplanted oppression with tolerance and understanding. Publicly, through the medium of radio, he led his people in humble and reverent prayers for the well-being of a stricken humanity. It was he who proved to us that we had nothing to fear but fear itself.

Heartfelt grief at the loss of Franklin D. Roosevelt is not confined to the mere bounds of his own country—but its scope is international—for he was the shining symbol of freedom, liberty, and hope to countless millions of war-ravaged souls throughout the entire world.

Just as every other human, he had enemies. But his enemies were political—not personal, and even his political enemies join his personal and political friends in mourning his untimely passing.

What mistakes he might have made in the discharge of his duties were the natural result of human weaknesses and the human inability to foresee the inevitable; not as a result of any diversion of the man from his conscience, for sincerity, the love of righteousness, and the love of God was the basis in which he found root for his every move.

Gone is the exuberant smile of F. D. R.; gone his fighting and determined chin, and the familiar comforting voice that stilled the aches in the hearts of millions. These characteristics, which are already a part of world history, will be seen and heard no more. But they shall live among us forever, and shall present themselves in our memories as a ray of hope to give light to our darkest hours. Franklin D. Roosevelt was a great man in every construction of the word, and his memory is an inspiration, for indeed, he left footprints on the sands of time:

"Footprints, that perhaps another,
Sailing o'er life's solemn main,
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
Seeing, shall take heart again."
—*Longfellow: A Psalm of Life.*

Roosevelt was not indispensable; but he was irreplaceable. Long after his body has returned to its original dust, and we, who knew him and loved him have joined him in the Great Beyond, he shall live—for he is an immortal, and has joined their exclusive company.

Thus cracks a noble heart. We shall not see his like on earth again. The soil has claimed its own.

To the people at home, Franklin D. Roosevelt was President; to the soldiers at home and on far-flung battlefronts, he was Commander in Chief. To me he has been both President and Commander in Chief, and:

"Tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
The Flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crossed the Bar."
—*Tennyson: Crossing the Bar.*

General Bradley and the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS
(By Tyrrell Krum)

There's no denying that of all the postwar governmental activities the most difficult has been the job performed by Gen. Omar N. Bradley in bringing the Veterans' Administration from a small obscure peacetime agency to the biggest single business activity in this Nation today.

The moment the guns of war stopped sounding and the men began marching home, most wartime Government bureaus—in theory at least—began cutting back the tremendous load of pay rollers built up during the stress of wartime conditions.

Take for instance—War Manpower Commission, War Production Board, Office of Price Control, Office of War Information, Office of Censorship, Federal Housing Agency to name but a few. And, of course, there was the Army and Navy.

Even the War Assets Corporation, which was set up to dispose of some $30,000,000,000 worth of goods, materials, and real estate left over from the war, was a diminishing operation in the final analysis, although for months it hit the jackpot in placing men and women aboard its pay rolls.

But the Veterans' Administration was entirely different. Just as the Government pay rolls of the Nation invariably swell during a depression in which employment tapers off elsewhere, so is it only natural that the Veterans' Administration should thrive in a period of postwar readjustment.

However, it was not until General Bradley assumed command of the Veterans' Administration in August 1945, at the specific urgings of President Truman, that any progress was made in setting up a postwar operation despite the fact that the entire Second World War, in which some 16,000,000 men and women served, had been fought and won.

The finest exposition of the difficulties experienced by the Veterans' Administration in gearing itself for all-out handling of benefits for veterans costing in excess of one-fifth of the national budget, was given by General Bradley himself, in his official report to the Congress which we discussed at length last week and which will be continued for a few days more.

The famous fighting man of the European liberation said:

"Whenever we have been confronted by tremendous increases in the number of veterans seeking benefits, we have also been faced with the need for enlargement of our operating staff. During periods of acute emergency we have often been forced into overtime work.

"And to accommodate the vast new business that has crowded us throughout the country, we had no alternative but to establish branch offices and to open additional regional, subregional, and contact offices wherever they were most desperately needed."

There you have the general's own estimate of the acute problem which faced him when he took over in 1945 to begin the task of decentralizing the VA from a tight control

here in Washington to hundreds of "hometown" sites where "they were most desperately needed."

But the job was not without its obstacles, as General Bradley pointed out:

"Rentals for many of these new offices reflect the expensive condition of today's crowded real estate market. The materials and labor required for essential alterations were costly and considerably higher than comparable expenditures 2 years ago. The millions of dollars worth of supplies needed in our hospitals went up in price from day to day.

"During our period of reorganization and decentralization, we suffered from an understandably low rate of worker production. Many of our employes were engaged in the actual processes of reorganization. Others were busy devising up-to-date procedures. The great majority of our workers were new and therefore untrained in their tasks.

"Because most of them have been on the job for 6 months or more, their rate of production should markedly increase. And we should actually be able to accomplish more with fewer people."

In fact, as the general pointed out, steps were taken in February to "freeze" personnel on VA rolls at the then existing levels. The General also ordered his deputies throughout the country to suspend promotions, to eliminate all but critical travel and to curtail as far as possible the use of fee-basis medical examination and treatment.

This order, the general explained, had the effect of arresting our expansion and may be relaxed later on to permit hiring to replace separations. But General Bradley was firm in his declaration:

"It will compel managers to scrutinize their operations and reduce costs to the rock-bottom minimums required for good service."

General Bradley then pointed out, in actual figures, the tremendous strides taken by the Veterans' Administration in handling veterans' problems before and after the war. He pointed out:

"In 1939 the ratio of employees to veterans was one employee to each 106 veterans. It now stands at one to each 82 veterans. In themselves, however, these figures do not tell the story. They do not take into account the fact that today we are handling more than twice as many separate benefits.

"They do not take into account the fact that as we move farther away from the war our need for services will diminish.

"In 1939 there was no education and training under the Readjustment Act, there was no program for loan guarantees, there were no readjustment allowances, no cars for amputees.

"And in 1939 the great bulk of claims for veterans of World War I had long ago been adjudicated. In contrast to this, we adjudicated a total of 607,000 compensation claims during the first 7 months of this fiscal year. And we provided a grand total of 6,850,000 out-patient treatments and examinations."

We'll continue General Bradley's interesting and enlightening documentation of his administration of veteran affairs tomorrow.

Floodwaters Rising in Sny Valley—Thousands of Acres Are Under Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing on the first page of the Pike County Republican, Pittsfield, Ill., of April 9, 1947:

Heavy rains and thunderstorms Friday night sent west Pike creeks out of their banks, sent the Sny out of bounds, and put fear of a repetition of former floods into the hearts of west-bottom farmers.

The Mississippi River yesterday was cresting at approximately 19 feet at Hannibal and 18 feet at Louisiana. These readings are about 5 feet above flood stage. The points named are opposite the great Sny Valley, which Saturday and Sunday was threatened with inundation.

Hadley and McCraney Creeks were dumping big floods into the Sny Valley Friday night and Saturday morning. United States Route 36 near Kinderhook was under water. Supervisor Roy Orr, of Cincinnati Township, told the Republican Saturday forenoon that the water was coming out over the Sny lowlands, and it looked like the valley was going to be drowned out again.

In a trip to the Sny bottoms Sunday forenoon we observed a large area of farmland under water. The water was spreading out through breaks in the Sny levees that had not been repaired since the disastrous flood of last August. Out from New Canton one could see expanses of water almost everywhere.

In the vicinity of the old "Hump" bridge out in the Sny bottoms, the flood seemed to be rising rather rapidly.

The creeks heading on the Pike County uplands had run down following cessation of the rains, but the Sny was rising and pouring out onto farmlands through the broken levees. A high river was backing up the Sny.

Farmers in the valley had been hoping for plow weather to prepare for planting. No ground had yet been plowed and no oats had yet been seeded in the bottoms.

Joe McFarland, of New Canton, manager of the Loyd Hardware Store here, told the Republican Monday morning that lots of water could be seen looking out across the Sny bottoms west of New Canton.

The Best Years of Our Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in the past Hollywood and the motion-picture industry has come in for its share of comment and criticism on the floor of this House. So I think it very fitting that when a film deserves special commendation for good citizenship it should also be made a matter of record in Congress. I am speaking of Samuel Goldwyn's production, The Best Years of Our Lives, which was recently honored with nine academy awards.

This film deals so honestly and so uncompromisingly with the problems we are all facing today, especially those of the returning servicemen, that I think it should be required seeing for every American.

It has already received singular acclaim from many public officials, the press, the veterans' organizations, and our military leaders. I would like to take this opportunity to add the congratulations of a Member of this House for a job well done.

Those of you who have seen the picture know that it is the story of three Americans who come home from the war to meet—and solve in their own different ways—the perplexing problems of rehabilitation to civilian life. One of these men is a banker, one is a soda fountain attendant, and the third—played on the screen by Harold Russell—is a boy who has lost both hands in the war.

Russell's performance in the picture is itself one of the most inspiring sights I have ever seen, and will certainly give courage and hope to the thousands of other veterans who were maimed in the war. If for no other reason than this, The Best Years of Our Lives deserves a niche in our national archives.

But it is also a testament, in film, to the spirit and strength of the American people and, as such, will serve to represent us faithfully and well overseas. Like many other citizens, I have in the past occasionally regretted the false picture of our country that has been presented abroad by our Hollywood films. In London where the picture is now playing, the press has already commented repeatedly that it brings to the English people a new understanding of us Americans, our problems, and our spirit. So there is all the more reason for rejoicing now that at least we can send across the seas a film in which every American can take such honest pride. The Best Years of Our Lives is a credit to the United States, and it is the consensus of opinion of all those who have seen it that it will do more to promote understanding and good will toward this country than any film we have ever exported.

What Has the Eightieth Congress Accomplished?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. MEADE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on April 11, 1947:

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

Ladies and gentlemen, a few days ago I was asked this question, "What has the Eightieth Congress accomplished?" In order to answer that question, I think I should take you back to January 3, the day on which the Eightieth Congress convened.

Immediately after the House was organized by the Republican majority, the first act of the Eightieth Congress was to adopt the rules promulgated by the Seventy-ninth Congress under the Congressional Reorganization Act. These rules provided for the streamlining of congressional committees and procedure. The 43 committees on the House side were consolidated into 19 efficient, up-

to-the-minute committees, staffed with experts to handle the legislation before them. Then came the difficult job of assigning the Members of the new Congress to the various committees. After 3 weeks of wrangling, this was finally completed and to all intents and purposes Congress was ready to go to work, but laws are not written in a day and most of this important job is done in the committees. Some of them have been working day and night to get legislation before the House for a vote. This is not an easy job at best, and certainly the absence of any legislative program on the part of the Republican majority at the beginning of the session did not help the situation any. Shaping their campaign promises into an intelligent legislative program, in view of the dissension in their own ranks, has delayed the legislative program in the House from day to day and from week to week.

Up to April 1 Congress had been in session 12 weeks, out of which the House had been in session 47 days and the Senate 43 days, covering 202 hours in the Senate and 163½ hours in the House. Four thousand four hundred and ninety-three pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were covered with the debate and the speeches in the RECORD, but in all of that time just 30 bills were enacted into law. Many of these were inconsequential amendments to existing laws, which required very little time before the committees and little or no debate in the House. They were bills such as:

Providing for compensation for certain employees of the House and Senate under the Reorganization Act.

Relating to the payment of salaries to certain Senate employees.

To amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940.

To continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947.

For the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in cattle.

Extending the time in which the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission shall make its report to Congress.

One hundred and sixty-four bills have been passed by the House and 106 by the Senate out of a total of 1,081 bills introduced in the Senate and 3,014 in the House, and the only ones of any real importance to which the Republicans may point with pride aside from those enumerated are the following:

1. Liquidation of the OPA and Temporary Controls Administration, which has passed the House only.

2. Federal aid in recruiting farm labor, passed by the House only.

3. Bill limiting portal-to-portal suits, now in conference between the House and Senate.

4. The legislative budget, slicing $6,000,000,000 from the President's budget, also in conference.

5. Copper tariff suspension, passed by the House only.

6. The 20- to 30-percent income-tax reduction, passed by the House only.

7. The Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, passed by the House only.

That, ladies and gentlemen, gives you an idea of the snail's pace with which we are passing the legislative program in the Congress, and at that rate we should be able to adjourn the present session of Congress about December 24, 1947, although the legislative reorganization bill calls for adjournment not later than July 31, 1947.

After 9 weeks of hearings before the House Committee on Education and Labor, an omnibus labor bill has finally been prepared and will be reported to the House within the next day or so. Some of its provisions are:

1. Outlaws strikes affecting public health, safety, or welfare. Permits the Attorney General to obtain court orders to head off or stop them, with the injunctions remaining in force indefinitely if the court sees fit.

2. Forbids strikes of a general nature unless the majority of the employees in a collective-bargaining group vote to reject the final terms offered by the employer.

3. Outlaws the closed shop.

4. Outlaws industry-wide bargaining.

5. Outlaws secondary boycotts in which employees refuse to handle products and supplies for some other than their employer. Outlaws jurisdictional strikes—usually caused by disputes between two unions over the right to do a certain job, with the employer not a party of the dispute.

6. Forbids mass picketing and use of violence in picketing.

7. Guarantees free speech of the employer.

8. Bans all political contributions by a union.

9. Permits any union to be sued for violation of a contract.

10. Takes the Conciliation Service away from the Department of Labor and makes it an independent Government agency.

11. Lists unfair labor practices by unions as well as employers.

The Senate bill differs materially from the House bill and is generally regarded as much less drastic.

And so now after almost 14 weeks of the Eightieth Congress has passed, the Republicans have finally gotten a labor bill ready for House action.

What, may I ask, has become of the promises made by the Republican Party last fall? I am particularly reminded of a speech made by the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., the new Republican Speaker of the House, on last election night in which he said:

"We Republicans intend to work for a real increase in the income of everybody by encouraging more production and lower prices without impairing wages or working conditions." I grant that is a big order, but what has Mr. MARTIN's party leadership done to fulfill that promise? We are today paying the highest prices of history for the necessities of life, the high-sounding speeches of Senators TAFT and WHERRY to the contrary notwithstanding. The New York Tribune, a Republican newspaper, has pleaded with the Republicans to stop and ask themselves just what the party proposes to do with its new power? Senator WAYNE MORSE, another Republican, continues to charge that the Republican Party is dominated by big business. * * * Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, has been generous in his condemnation of the Old Guard * * * he has repeatedly reminded them that they received no mandate from the people last November to exempt the railroads from the antitrust laws; to turn atomic energy over to greedy exploitation of private business; to cut taxes for the rich and soak the poor under the Knutson plan; to take milk away from hungry children by destroying the school-lunch program; to destroy labor's fundamental rights; to cripple or weaken public power developments; to create a further artificial scarcity of food in order to maintain exorbitant prices; or to wreck the soil-building and conservation programs. The continual wrangling between Republican Senators VANDENBERG and TAFT, between Senator BALL and Presidential candidate Harold Stassen, does not make for the smooth-running organization which the Republicans held themselves out to be in the last election. Maybe we expect too much of them, but surely we have a right to expect more than we have received out of 14 weeks of the legislative bungling and delay such as we have witnessed in the Eightieth Congress.

Doubtless the Republicans are asking themselves why a recent Gallup poll has shown President Truman's stock has gone up from 35 percent in January to 60 percent today in public opinion. There must be a reason for that increase in popularity and certainly the showing made by the Republican-dominated Congress has not improved the Republican side of the survey.

Mr. TABER, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is bragging that his committee is cutting almost every appropriation bill at least 20 percent. That is hardly a record of which to be proud. Everyone knows that the governmental agencies expected substantial cuts in their appropriations and padded their estimates to take care of at least that much of a cut * * * leaving them where they might have been had not the Republicans made such a point of cutting the appropriations to the bone. It seems particularly appropriate at this point to call to your attention the 40-percent cut in the Department of Labor appropriation bill, the cut almost in half of the amount recommended for the National Labor Relations Board created by the Wagner Act to protect labor's right of collective bargaining. The wholesale economies in this particular appropriation bill are astounding, especially when we realize that the Department of Labor as a separate department was a brainchild of the Republican Party, having been created during the Taft Administration. Prior to that we had the Department of Commerce and Labor but apparently the Republicans thought labor in this country was of sufficient importance to merit the creation of an independent department with a Secretary of Labor in the Cabinet.

Also, in their zeal for economy, the Republicans have struck out of the bill the appropriation for industrial safety and sanitation service on the theory that this is a matter for the States to handle. Another victim of the Republican ax-wielding is the United States Employment Service. Under the curtailed appropriations for Labor, the programs for veterans and physically handicapped persons must be substantially curtailed; 12 USES field offices will have to be closed.

I am in favor of governmental economy and heaven knows there is plenty of room for it, but I want that economy program to be based upon the sound recommendations of a committee such as the Byrd Committee on Nonessential Governmental Expenditures and not on the whim of the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee in an effort to make good on some Republican campaign promise.

With half of the first session of the Eightieth Congress over, are we unreasonable in expecting some comprehensive legislative program in the House? Are we to continue to waste time with little or no important legislation on the calendar ready for action in the House—with the House in session only a part of the time and then, in the final weeks of the session, be called upon to pass the program recommended by the majority without sufficient time for debate in the House—as was done on the Knutson tax bill? Laws governing the lives of 140,000,000 people are important matters and should not be jammed through Congress in a few hours of debate in the House. The country has a right to expect that legislation shall be given due consideration and that a handful of leaders in the House shall not be allowed to write the legislation, report it to the House with insufficient consideration by the committee and then steam-roller it through the House by a majority vote without sufficient time in the House for careful consideration and debate.

This is not a campaign speech. Were the Democrats in control of the House today and the absence of a legislative program so flagrant, I would criticize my own party just as strongly. We are not in Congress to play politics, we are elected by the people to pass legislation and I think it is high time we got about the job of doing so.

Kirsten Flagstad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Kirsten Flagstad is a Norwegian soprano especially skilled in Wagnerian roles. Among those competent to judge such things, Flagstad is currently the greatest of all such singers, being possessed of voice and dramatic capacity suitable for this particular form of art.

Richard Wagner was not only a composer, poet, and dramatist, he was an intense nationalist, deeply influenced by those who insisted upon the leadership in European culture of Teutonic concepts of life.

His operas revived the spirit of Teutonic tradition, and although written before Hitler was born, influenced the whole Nordic trend in Europe of which Hitlerism was a manifestation. Of all who composed for opera, Wagner alone represents not only a musical essay, but also a political and philosophic movement.

A person devoted to Wagnerian roles is likely to be influenced by Wagnerian philosophy, for whereas it is possible to sing lieder written by composers from Schubert to Irving Berlin without the need for profound study of motive and mood, it is not possible to be devoted to Wagner without being affected by him.

Lauritz Melchior will be given as an example of the error of my statement, for he, unlike Kirsten Flagstad, remained impervious to Germanic blandishments in spite of his competence as a Wagnerian tenor.

The answer to that is that some are affected one way and some another, but nobody can be in association with Wagner, alive or dead, without being influenced or repelled by him. To many, Wagner is the greatest of all composers of opera.

So when war came Kirsten Flagstad was in the dilemma of association and she chose to return to Norway via Germany. In Norway her husband was apparently one of the quisling group of pro-Nazi businessmen and was eventually indicted for it.

The war is now some two years gone. Hitler is dead and Germany has become the ward of the United States, which is laboring for her survival as a nation at the Moscow conference.

It is not probable that Kirsten Flagstad understands the economics and politics of the current American policy better than she did of the Roosevelt policy and the Morgenthau plan. Musicians are notoriously one-tracked personalities, devoted to their specialty

Nevertheless, each human being is responsible for his own choice and Kirsten Flagstad is responsible for hers. But does such responsibility justify a lifelong, venomous, vindictive persecution by private individuals bent on receiving their pound of flesh? Actually that is what is happening.

A camarilla of private persecutors, ignoring the legal fact that the Norwegian Government provided her with a passport to come to this country and that the Government of the United States permitted her to enter and to live here, devote themselves to vilification, attack, and boycott.

They arrogate to themselves a routine function of government.

Most of those who engage in this campaign of hate call themselves liberals. They ask for tolerance. They demand the right of difference of opinion. They ask for justice for themselves but reject it for others.

They denounce as persecution every manifestation of dislike for and discrimination against themselves, but insist upon their right to dislike anyone and to discriminate against anyone.

They protest persecution and boycott, but they persecute and boycott. They are totally without pity, mercy, charity, or understanding of human vagaries. They make hate their standard and brazen it before the world.

So they try to spoil Flagstad's concerts by frightening audiences away. They create the impression that they will send rowdies to her concerts who will embarrass the audiences. They live in a frenzy of sadism, tortured lest approving listeners applaud Flagstad's Isolde, because they oppose what they assume is her politics.

Of course they will fail. As long as Flagstad's voice holds, those who thrill to the music of Wagner will want to hear her in Die Walkuere or in Lohengrin or in The Ring.

It is possible to enjoy the art of Jo Davidson, for instance, while despising his politics, just as it is possible to listen to Prokofieff without remembering that he is a Communist. Art is a gift from God unspoiled by the political stupidities of its angels.

Successful Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this Chamber is now considering certain legislation affecting the entire field of labor-management relations, it is my desire to call the attention of the House membership to a program long in successful operation in an important industry in my home community of Paris, Ill. So successful has the program been that it has won the favorable attention of national commentators. In that connection, under permission previously obtained, I desire to include in the RECORD the text of an article carried recently in the Paris (Ill.) Daily Beacon-News and other daily newspapers from coast to coast serviced by the United Press. Author of the article is Frederick C. Othman, Washington columnist for the United Press.

The article discusses a plan in operation in the plant of the U. O. Colson Co., one of the world's largest makers of calendars, lithographing art, and advertising specialties. I should like to observe in passing that the program has worked to the great advantage of the employees, who regard themselves as coworkers, as well as to the advantage of the company management and the community.

As an indication of successful growth it might be noted that the company, within the past week, formally opened to public view a plant addition more than doubling its former floor space.

Because of its unique nature the company has properly been considered one of the most unusual industrial organizations in America, and was so designated by the famous radio star, Kate Smith, who used it as an excellent example of the American way of life in one of her regular national broadcasts.

The article, entitled "Paradise in Paris, Ill.," as it appeared in the press, follows:

J. P. Gramling, assistant sales manager of the U. O. Colson Co., says he has noticed that everybody mentioned in my pieces lately has been sore at somebody else.

Why not, he asks, break the monotony with a story about some folks who aren't mad at anyone? He means the 400 employees of the Colson Co. in Paris, Ill.

The happy ones in the Paris paradise manufacture fans and fly swatters for advertising purposes in the summer and a line of calendars with pretty pictures on same for year-round use. These include the usual babies, puppies, snowstorms, and bathing girls.

There are no labor problems in Paris, says Gramling, because of a few strictly enforced rules around the plant. No worker is allowed to have a baby, for instance, unless he accepts a war bond from the company to help out with junior's education.

All hands must take 2-week vacations. The company prefers that they have their rest at Twin Lakes Park, because here it maintains cottages furnished completely (dishes and calendars included) for their free use. With the cottages go 35 free boats for fishing purposes. The fellow who catches the biggest fish of the season must accept a prize.

Most of the 400 fortunate ones drive to work in their own autos. The company maintains a parking lot with the name of each motorist on his private stall. His windshield is washed daily in summer; the ice is removed in winter. If one of his tires goes flat while he's at work, he must not protest if the company has it repaired gratis.

Anybody who thinks up a good idea to improve the calendar business is forced to accept a free auto. Any worker who tries to work all the time is nudged gently toward one of several recreation rooms. These are equipped with pianos, soda pop, candy, books, magazines, and easy chairs.

If an employee wants to build a house, the company insists on advancing half the down payment. If he needs a new refrigerator, furnace, or sofa, the boss demands the right to lend him the full price without interest. Anyone getting married must accept a wedding gift.

Nobody has to go to the company's parties, but it insists on tossing them regularly. It also insists on paying half the workers' insurance premiums and slipping them a share of the profits annually.

"We think it pays," says Gramling. "If more concerns would try it, there might be a better understanding between management and labor."

That does it. Breaks the monotony. Tomorrow, back to the battling lawgivers.

Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter received on April 9, 1947, from P.

Roy Brammell, dean of the school of education at the University of Connecticut, concerning educational measures now pending before the Congress.

The letter reads as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT,
Storrs, Conn., April 7, 1947.

The Honorable ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE,
Representative from Connecticut,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I believe that conditions concerning education in this country have been made clear enough during the last few months to convince an overwhelming majority of American people that public education must be better supported. I believe the people are looking to their representatives in State and Federal legislatures to speak and vote in those bodies in favor of providing money adequate to assure every boy and girl in the Nation a decent educational opportunity. Certainly we are all aware of a few fundamentals. First, educated citizens schooled and skilled in responsibilities of citizenship are basic to our way of life. Second, our sense of justice will not permit that accident of place of birth determine for a child his educational opportunity. Third, the wealth concentrated in certain cities and States is basically not their own. It arises from many sources and often from distant points. The simple example of Connecticut's importation of high-school children from Florida to work in the tobacco fields is a case in point. Fourth, it is good economics to up-grade the education of our people. The educational up-grading of backward sections of our Nation will raise the standard of living and increase the demand for goods produced in the more forward sections.

I urge your endorsement and support of S. 472 and its equivalent in the House of Representatives. I urge that you strive for its passage without delay knowing that back home your constituents have come to realize that because of its importance to the Nation, public education should receive first claim on public funds.

Yours sincerely,

P. ROY BRAMMELL,
Dean, School of Education.

World Federation of Trade Unions Hostile to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have addressed the House in an effort to expose the machinations of the World Federation of Trade Unions—an international Communist organization.

I am placing in the RECORD today the correspondence between Secretary of War Patterson and Mr. Matthew Woll, an able leader of the American Federation of Labor.

It is of more than passing interest that Mr. Woll, whose knowledge and experience in labor matters is beyond question, corroborates to the fullest extent my opinion of the WFTU as a Communist instrument hostile and dangerous to the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the correspondence above referred to:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 25, 1947.

Mr. MATTHEW WOLL,
Chairman, International Labor Relations Committee, American Federation of Labor, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WOLL: I have your telegram of March 13, 1947, in which you protest on behalf of the American Federation of Labor the decision authorizing a visit of the World Federation of Trade Unions mission to Japan and Korea.

In this connection, all aspects of the problem were considered, including the international character of the WFTU and the undesirable position our Government would be placed in as a result of international criticism and criticism within the United States should the request be refused.

Inasmuch as the mission had already toured Europe, it was considered unwise to refuse the group the privileges of studying the problems in Japan and Korea which might be related to any complete consideration of world problems. Further, all the members of the WFTU mission are representatives of governments which have representation on the Far Eastern Commission, the international organization which formulates policy for the occupation of Japan, and the WFTU has been recognized by the United Nations.

This trip had been proposed to General MacArthur at an earlier date and he had agreed to the trip. Accordingly, at that time an invitation in good faith was extended to the WFTU. Subsequently, General MacArthur decided against the trip, but the commitment to the WFTU had already been made.

I assure you that this action was taken in the best interest of the War Department and of the United States Government and that very careful consideration was given to all the facts that were available prior to the time General MacArthur's objection to such a trip was overruled.

Since this mission is small in size and the length of its stay short in duration, as well as the fact that it will be investigatory in nature and under the direct control of General MacArthur while in the occupied areas, any undue influence on Japanese trade unions is most unlikely. The printing in the Japanese press of the text of your telegram with a view to offsetting such a situation, is therefore, not considered necessary.

However, I am forwarding a copy of it to General MacArthur in order that he may be advised of your views.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

COPY OF LETTER TO SECRETARY OF WAR PATTERSON BY MATTHEW WOLL, CHAIRMAN, INTERNATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS DEPARTMENT, A. F. OF L.

APRIL 2, 1947.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I herewith acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 25 in reply to my telegram of March 13.

Your letter has failed to answer any of the objections raised by the A. F. of L. against the WFTU mission to Japan. Nor have you given any valid reason for overruling General MacArthur, who is on the scene and who has dealt with Japanese problems in an admirable manner—conducive to the best interests of the American people, the development of democracy in Japan, and the cause of lasting world peace.

It is entirely incomprehensible to us why our War Department should hasten to grant special privileges to the WFTU which has continuously waged an unwarranted campaign against the United States and has assiduously spread every calumny emanating from the Kremlin against our Nation's domestic and foreign policies. Your decision is all the more indefensible in view of the fact that your Department has done nothing to assure the right of an A. F. of L. delegation to visit the French zone in Germany last November when these rights were denied them by the same WFTU. The size of the WFTU mission and the length of its stay, upon which you lay so much stress, Mr. Secretary, are matters of small consequence. It is its obnoxious antidemocratic and anti-American spirit and purpose that are decisive and which you entirely overlook.

You further state that all members of the WFTU mission are representatives of governments which have representatives on the Far Eastern Commission. The WFTU is not an intergovernmental organization. It claims to be an international labor organization. According to your statement, the American member of the WFTU delegation is a representative of the United States Government. We deny that this is so. Who chooses him? The A. F. of L., which has at least twice as many members as the American affiliate of the WFTU, was never consulted about this. We cannot believe that any subdivision of our Government would lend such authority as you indicate to the Saillant mission to Japan. Surely, Mr. Secretary, you do not base your conclusion on the fact that the WFTU has been recognized by the United Nations. The A. F. of L. has exactly the same status and recognition in the United Nations as does the WFTU.

We must register our most vigorous protest against your arbitrary decision that the publication of the A. F. of L. position as distinct from that of the WFTU is not considered necessary. We wonder why you object to the Japanese workers being given the opportunity of learning both positions—the position of the free trade unionist A. F. of L. as well as the platform of the Communist-dominated WFTU. Your refusal to permit even the publication of an A. F. of L. cable in the Japanese press at the very moment that you permit and facilitate the visit of a WFTU delegation to Japan strikes us as distinctly unfair to the dominant trade union organization of American labor.

Sincerely yours,

MATTHEW WOLL.

Make Drastic Cuts and Eliminate Unreal Idealistic Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, who has been operating an independent business of his own for many years, has just written me his views on what the public is expecting of this Congress. I am quoting his letter in order that my colleagues and the public may know how some real American independent businessmen in my section are thinking, and what they are expecting of Congress.

I am pleased to quote the letter in its entirety, as follows:

As you no doubt are aware, the Nation this morning is faced with a Nation-wide telephone strike and a Nation-wide coal strike

in addition to all the minor strikes, one of which affects bus transportation in the nine-State area surrounding Tulsa.

Don't you feel that it is time for Congress to quit haggling over details and to do something about this continuous industrial turmoil? I think you will agree that the present majority in Congress is the result of the dissatisfaction of the folks back home with just that sort of thing. Furthermore, I feel that it is time to quit haggling about the budget and drastically trim the appropriations for the tremendous number of governmental bureaus and departments that have grown up during the war. If we are honest with ourselves, we can readily see that this Nation is broke and what sensible business would do in an effort to correct such a situation would be to make drastic cuts and eliminate unreal idealistic service. I do not know whether you folks in Washington are aware of the temperament and restlessness of the sensible people in this Nation with reference to all these things and whether you are aware of the fact that they are looking to you for action.

The root of all of these evils is just plain communism and as long as these folks are fed by the Government we are going to have to put up with this situation and they will eventually take over. All the demands which bring about these Nation-wide strikes are without any foundation and are fantastic and ridiculous and something has to be done to put the settlement of these matters back in the hands of the people who pay the pay rolls and not left in the hands of Government conciliators who do not have to pay the bill and who do not have to operate their business under the idealistic conditions that these settlements bring about. Believe me, I am telling you that the sensible people, and that includes a lot of the labor-union members, are looking to you folks to do something about it.

"Meddle in Greece? No!" Declared Randolph, of Virginia, More Than 100 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in 1824 the House of Representatives discussed a resolution to appoint an American Commissioner to Greece. Greece was then fighting against Turkey for independence. The resolution was considered as a friendly gesture to the Greeks. But the Congress of that day was not easily maneuvered into foreign entanglements of any kind. The resolution was not passed.

The resolution read as follows:

Resolved, That provision ought to be made by law for defraying the expense incident to the appointment of an Agent or Commissioner to Greece whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such appropriation.

The congressional debate centered around the fact that this would be at least de facto recognition of a Greek Government, would bring war with Turkey, and would be, in fact, a declaration of war. The Greek-Turkish War was not finally settled for 6 years after this date. In 1827 Britain with funds and troops entered the fray.

JOHN RANDOLPH'S PLEA

The following selection is from John Randolph's speech in opposition on January 24, 1824:

It is with serious concern and alarm that I have heard doctrines broached in this debate fraught with consequences more disastrous to the best interests of this people than any that I have ever heard advanced during the five and 20 years since I have been honored with a seat on this floor.

They imply, to my apprehension, a total and fundamental change of the policy pursued by this Government from the foundation of the Republic to the present day. Are we, sir, to go on a crusade in another hemisphere for the propagation of two objects as dear and delightful to my heart as to that of any gentleman in this or any other assembly—liberty and religion?

And in the name of these holy words, by this powerful spell, is this Nation to be conjured and beguiled out of the highway of heaven—out of its present comparatively happy state into all the disastrous conflicts arising from the policy of European powers, with all the consequences which flow from them? Liberty and religion, sir—things that are yet dear, in spite of all the mischief that has been perpetrated in their name. I believe that nothing similar to this proposition is to be found in modern history, unless in the famous decree of the French National Assembly which brought combined Europe against them with its united strength, and after repeated struggles finally effected the downfall of the French power. * * *

Sir, I am afraid that along with some most excellent attributes and qualities—the love of liberty, jury trials, the writ of habeas corpus, and all the blessings of free government we have derived from our Anglo-Saxon ancestors—we have got not a little of their John Bull, or rather John Bulldog, spirit, their readiness to fight for anybody and on any occasion.

Sir, England has been for centuries the gamecock of Europe. It is impossible to specify the wars in which she has been engaged for contrary purposes, and she will with great pleasure see us take off her shoulders the labor of preserving the balance of power. We find her fighting, now for the Queen of Hungary, then for her inveterate foe, the King of Prussia; now at war for the restoration of the Bourbons, and now on the eve of war with them, for the liberties of Spain.

These lines on the subject were never more applicable than they have now become:

"Now Europe's balanced; neither side prevails,
For nothing's left in either of the scales."

If we pursue the same policy, we must travel the same road and endure the same burdens under which England now groans. But, glorious as such a design might be, a President of the United States would, in my apprehension, occupy a prouder place in history who when he retires from office can say to the people who elected him, "I leave you without a debt," than if he had fought as many pitched battles as Caesar or achieved as many naval victories as Nelson.

And what, sir, is debt? In an individual it is slavery. It is slavery of the worst sort, surpassing that of the West India islands, for it enslaves the mind as well as it enslaves the body; and the creature who can be abject enough to incur and submit to it receives, in that condition of his being, perhaps an adequate punishment. Of course, I speak of debt with the exception of unavoidable misfortune. I speak of debt caused by mismanagement, by unwarrantable generosity, by being generous before being just. I am aware that this sentiment was ridiculed by Sheridan, whose lamentable end was the best commentary upon its truth.

No, sir. Let us abandon these projects, let us say to those 7,000,000 Greeks, "We defended ourselves; we were but 3,000,000 against a power in comparison with which the Turk is but a lamb. Go and do thou likewise." And so with the governments of South America.

If, after having achieved their independence, they have not valor enough to maintain it, I would not commit the safety and independence of this country in such a cause. I will in both these pursue the same line of conduct which I have ever pursued from the day I took a seat in this House, in 1799, from which, without boasting, I can challenge any gentleman to fix upon me any colorable change of departure.

Let us adhere to the policy laid down by the second as well as the first founder of our Republic, by him who was the Camillus as well as the Romulus of the infant state—to the policy of peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none—for to entangling alliances we must come if you once embark in such a policy as this.

And, with all my British predilections, I suspect I shall, whenever that question shall present itself, resist as strongly an alliance with Great Britain as with other powers. We are sent here to attend to the preservation of the peace of this country, and not to be ready on all occasions to go to war whenever anything like what in common parlance is termed a turn-up takes place in Europe.

Excerpt from a letter by the Secretary of State, John Q. Adams, to the Congress. The letter was read into the debate on January 20, 1824:

The United States could give assistance to the Greeks only by the application of some portion of their public force, or of their public revenue, in their favor, and it would constitute them in a state of war with the Ottoman Porte, and perhaps with the Barbary Powers. To make this disposal either of force or of treasure, you are aware, is, by our Constitution, not within the competency of the Executive.

The Great Game of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the able columnist, Frank R. Kent, has not been deceived by the vicious and malicious lies that have been spawned by the New Deal and their fellow travelers ever since they were repudiated by the patriotic citizens of our country in November 1946.

I am inserting, under leave to extend my remarks, the following article by Frank R. Kent, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 11, 1947:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—GOP CONGRESS LEADERS CHAGRINED BY MISCALCULATION ON PRESS SUPPORT

(By Frank R. Kent)

The thing that more than any other has surprised as well as chagrined Republican leaders since they took over control of Congress is the extremely bad press that has attended their efforts to formulate a pro-

gram. They did expect something better, which shows that they made a basic miscalculation as to the general publicity situation.

For example, they had the not unnatural feeling that the voters, long restrained by the war, having, in the last election, belatedly turned against the New Deal policies, the press (also the radio) generally would commend and support the Republican effort to go in the other direction—by correcting the lopsided labor situation; by slashing governmental expenses, reducing waste and taxes. They had every right to that expectation. When it turned out to be largely unfounded, it came with something of a shock to complacent Republicans who felt thay had a clear mandate from the people.

So they had. They were entirely right about that. Their mistake was in totally underestimating the hold which, in 14 years of concentration, the left-wing elements, which constituted and attached themselves to the New Deal, had acquired on the channels of communication. This is one of the phenomena of the period. It is made more interesting, so far as the press is concerned, because it was obtained almost simultaneously with a campaign of denunciation. The New Deal CIO allies, for example, were enabled regularly to get extraordinary newspaper space day after day for their repetitious, verbose, and wholly synthetic statements in the very newspapers which they consistently accused of suppressing the news.

TURNED OUT ALL WRONG

Apparently the Republican idea was that when the New Dealers were repudiated at the polls, automatically their propaganda facilities would disappear and their publicity effectiveness be curtailed. But that notion turned out all wrong. There are today more New Deal left-wingers astride the channels of communication than before. The polls were hardly closed before there was a rush toward the press, the magazines, and the radio. Some of them have become publishers, some assistants to the publishers, some are editorial writers, quite a few have become columnists, and several are radio commentators. The ease with which they have penetrated into those fields can be accounted for in several ways but it is none the less remarkable.

The net of all this is that the left-wing spokesmen today are more articulate than before the election. When they lined up and let go at the Republicans soon after Congress convened it was something of a shock to the latter and they have been under pretty hot attack ever since. This is not to say that the Republicans have not done things for which they should be criticized. It would be amazing if they had not. It is to say that they are nothing like as black as they are being painted and that a good deal of the criticism is the same old left-wing, labor, New Deal misrepresentation and propaganda—largely by the same people.

At the moment their fire is concentrated on the Republican effort to reduce appropriations. It is normal, of course, to hear the bureaucrats squeal when their estimates are cut. But the present squealing goes far beyond the ordinary. It appears not only well organized but to have a professional touch. A really violent blast has accompanied the two appropriation bills thus far acted upon by the House—the Treasury and labor-security bills. A similar blast is obviously planned for every such bill as it comes up.

BASIS OF CURRENT ATTACK

The current attack is based on stories which insist that because of Republican "meat-ax surgery" various dreadful things are about to happen. We are told that the Secret Service is being undermined so as to flood the country with counterfeiters; that the Wagner Act is being scuttled through reduction in appropriations; that the Republicans are going to return the children to sweatshop conditions by denying the Children's Department proper funds; that the customs service is being forced to lay off men, thus throwing our ports open to smugglers; that Republican stinginess is going to permit tax evaders to go free.

Investigation proves there is scarcely a trace of truth in any of these stories. Yet they continue to be circulated. Telegrams pour in to Senators protesting the dismissal of customs employees, but the fact, as brought out by Representative WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, that customs asked for $6,500,000 more than it got last year; that it was given $3,165,000 more and that its appropriation provides for 400 additional employees—those facts get little, if any, attention. Neither is the fact publicized that the 8,000 revenue agents costing $30,000,000 a year, whose lopping off has been so vehemently denounced, were the not wholly occupied agents that ex-Secretary Henry Morgenthau excitedly added a couple of years ago in the 1944 agitation about tax dodgers.

These are the sort of things that induce Chairman TABER, of the House Appropriations Committee, to charge that "an insidious campaign of deceit and falsehood is being conducted to the effect that we are scuttling essential public services." Apparently the Republicans, while shocked and sore, are not going to weaken. They take comfort in the obvious fact that their record will be judged after they have made it and not by what is said about it before they have had their chance.

United States Resources Insufficient To Save the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Louis Bromfield has written a timely article calling attention to the fact that as we consider the so-called Greek crisis we should bear in mind the physical resources with which we are endowed as a nation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this article by Mr. Bromfield:

TO SAVE ENTIRE WORLD UNITED STATES LACKS RESOURCES

(By Louis Bromfield)

The more rapidly crises develop around the world, clearer it becomes that we have had no foreign policy in the past and that we have none now. The Greek crises, seen from the proper prospective, is no more than an incident in a world filled with similar disasters, but it may lead not only to confusion but to disaster for us, as well as for the peoples of the Balkans and the Near East.

There is no reason whatever to suppose that by pouring money into Greece or Turkey we shall solve their respective problems or stave off the spread of Russian aggression and expansion.

President Truman in his sensational speech—and it was one of the most sensational ever made by an American President—politely referred again and again to the spread of communism. All the world, including Soviet Russia, knows that he meant the expansion and aggression of Russian ambitions.

COMMUNISM IS TOOL

It has long since become clear that communism is merely a tool, a modern political method by which the small group of men in control of Russia are seeking to expand their power. The circumstances and the methods being used are almost indistinguishable from those of the Nazi government of Germany.

The error in the proposal of President Truman and his advisers to aid Greece has at least two facets. First, the old American error based upon the belief that you can buy anything you want, including good will, with money. Second, the whole program will be successful without the use and backing of strong armed force.

The writer has spent a great deal of his life in Europe. He knows its nations and peoples a great deal better than most newspaper correspondents, and he is prepared to state that you do not and cannot buy good will with money alone. Actually the fact is that much of the American food and machinery sent into Poland, Yugoslavia, and the other Balkan states under UNRRA was used by selective distribution to create ill will toward capitalistic America and good will for communism and Soviet Russia.

THREAT OF NATION

Also he is convinced that we have not enough money, raw materials, or machinery to rehabilitate the whole of the world and that, if we attempt to do so, we shall only bleed ourselves white and reduce our natural real wealth and living standards to the level of the more desperate European nations.

The citadel of western civilization has moved across the Atlantic from Europe to America. A superficial, unwise, headlong policy of trying to buy off or rehabilitate the whole world could easily crack the walls of this last citadel.

I doubt President Truman or the State Department is prepared to ask for troops and ships to back up the proposed Greek and Turkish policy, and I am certain the American people are not prepared or willing to grant such a request. The proposals made so hastily following the trigger decision of Great Britain to pull out of Greece seem to be superficial, hasty, and almost hysterical.

MORE THAN INCIDENT

Intervention in Greece is not simply a single incident, quickly and decisively closed. Of necessity it institutes a policy of intervention which, to be effective, must be extended around the whole circumference of the globe—in China, in India, in Korea, in Germany, in the Near East.

We cannot go half way without wasting the money, material, and lives involved in any hastily prepared program. The question is whether we are prepared for the colossal, probably insoluble, problem posed for the moment in Greece alone.

The fact is that in the long run the world is on the crest of a colossal surge of history and that even the superhuman efforts of the greatest and richest nation in the world cannot stem or alter its course. Two great nations are involved—Soviet Russia and the United States—for Great Britain or the other western empire states do not count any longer unless they achieve some strong form of federated union.

In the wake of such a wave history moves rapidly and time becomes the most important element. Already countless Americans have transferred their enmity directly from Nazi Germany to Communist Russia.

NEED MORE THAN HIT-MISS

No accidental, hit-and-miss plans of intervention hastily prepared and ill-contrived are of any use. Unless we are prepared to back the millions of dollars to be poured into Turkey and Greece with military force, the whole amount plus some lives is certain to be lost.

The shape of the world is being determined not by what we want or by what Soviet

Russia wants but by much greater forces of economics, of ideologies, of weariness and despair, of famine, of death and rebirth. Both Russia and this Nation are faced by challenges.

If these are met and solved, preferably by common action, our civilization will survive; if they are not, we are headed for another dark age. Even the atomic bomb is only incidental to the process.

The decisions which will determine the future of the world lie with Russia and the United States. All the rest merely clutters up the scene and serves to complicate and cripple the actions of these great powers and cause enmity between them. This fact lies at the root of the futility of the United Nations.

The Greek issue has clarified one thing, that when cause for action arises, history in these times cannot wait upon a UN cluttered by flotsam and jetsam left behind in the great wave of history upon which Soviet Russia and the United States are riding. The decisions in the end, as history will show, happily or tragically, can be made only by these two nations.

It would be well for all the world if they got together on a friendly basis and worked out what is to be done with that same stricken, decaying world. The rest is weakness and sentimentality and essentially tragic nonsense which can only prolong the agony.

Federal Judge Rules OPA Is Dead in Rent Suit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it has always been a serious question in my mind whether or not the President now has or has had all of the power that the incumbents of that office have assumed for the past 14 years, when it comes to issuing some of their Executive orders and directives. It has been indulged in to such an extent that in my humble opinion at least the practice is in danger of resulting in rule by men, rather than by law.

I have just received through the mails a newspaper clipping containing a United Press report of an instance where Federal Judge Claude McColloch in January held that he was not bound to follow the rental provisions of the Price Control Act. The newspaper account follows:

JUDGE RULES OPA IS DEAD IN RENT SUIT

PORTLAND, OREG., January 25.—Federal Judge Claude McColloch Saturday announced that his court "will not longer deem itself bound to follow the rental provisions of the Price Control Act."

McColloch's decision, in a case wherein a tenant sued a landlord for requiring the tenant to buy furniture, stated that, "The courts should not be expected longer to uphold the fiction that a war is being conducted, when, in fact, there is no war.

"The Congress and the State legislatures have it in their power to deal with the Nation's rental problems on the present facts, and this court will not longer deem itself bound to follow the rental provisions of the Price Control Act, enacted in 1942, when sought to be enforced by one not named or authorized in the act," the judge wrote in a memorandum on the OPA's suit against a landlord.

McColloch contended that the President did not have authority to set up the new agency, Office of Temporary Controls, and appoint Maj. Gen. Philip Fleming as the head of it.

His statement, "by one not named or authorized in the (war powers)" referred to Fleming.

Labor Should Live Within the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Donald R. Richberg as published in the Reader's Digest of March 1947, with additional material by the author:

LABOR SHOULD LIVE WITHIN THE LAW

(By Donald R. Richberg)

I met a man walking down Main Street, brandishing a large battle-ax. I said to him: "What are you going to do with that dreadful weapon?"

He said: "I am going to engage in collective bargaining; and, believe me, I'm going to collect."

"But," I said, "you surely wouldn't actually swing that ax on anybody, would you?"

"Not," he said, "if the other fellow pays me what is coming to me. But I can threaten him and do anything I want to do to him with this ax; because"—get it!—"he's an employer and this is a labor dispute."

Now what is that battle-ax? It is not a physical weapon at all, but an economic weapon—the crushing power of monopoly. It is the power—through concerted control of the labor supply—to stop the production and distribution of the necessities of life until the labor monopolists are paid their price: a price which, over and over again, is more pay for less work and more authority with less responsibility.

Why do we permit labor to have such power? We deny it to business. Sixty years ago we decided that no private-business monopoly control over our American economic life would be tolerated. This decision is expressed in two doctrines of law.

1. If a monopoly of a necessity of life is desirable or inevitable, as, for example, a telephone or a telegraph, or a water- or an electric-power, or a railroad monopoly, then it must be regulated by the authorities to protect the public welfare. This doctrine was written into the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887, when Government regulation of railroad rates, services and profits began. It has since been extended over other public utilities.

2. Side by side with public regulation of public utilities, we have developed a program of preventing or destroying all other monopolies. The Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 prohibited all contracts, combinations and conspiracies in restraint of trade and all attempts to monopolize any part of interstate commerce. This enactment has been supported and expanded by many statutes and decisions which Federal and State legislators and judges have been writing ever since, outlawing any form of unregulated private monopoly.

Our national policy is perfectly clear. A private monopoly must be regulated or destroyed. How then does it happen that labor monopolies are not regulated and not destroyed? How does it happen that although coal operators cannot combine to choke off our supply of coal till they get the price they want, mine workers can combine to stop production till they get the wage they want? How does it happen that the owners of an electric-light company are obligated by law to give continuous service, even though losing money, but that the employees of such a company, through a union, are allowed to shut that service down and plunge a whole community into darkness and danger?

Are not such actions by unions exactly what was—and is—forbidden by the Sherman Antitrust Act? Of course they are. Why, then, are they permitted? Let us thoroughly learn the answer: Labor unions have been given a special license to violate the law.

This was first accomplished by the Clayton Act in 1914. That law expressly laid down the plausible but extraordinarily wrong doctrine that the antitrust laws should not be enforced against labor organizations when lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof. (Businessmen are not allowed to carry out their legitimate objects by creating and operating a monopoly!) But subsequent laws and court decisions have extended this special privilege for labor until there is practically no conspiracy by organized labor to operate monopolies that is not officially stamped as lawful and legitimate.

The time has come when we should review and revise the wholesale exemption of labor unions from the rules of law that govern and control all the rest of us.

Let us divide our problem into five parts. First, consider the internal organization of unions. By law every union should be obligated to have stated elections and conventions for the free and democratic adoption of constitutions and operating procedures. Those procedures should require the rendering of financial reports and a full opportunity for the members to criticize the officers and to regulate their activities, without being punished—as now happens all too often—by suspension or expulsion from the union. Such requirements cannot be honestly described as putting any strait-jacket on unions. Their purpose is only to free union members from the despotic control of labor bosses.

Parallel to that purpose all workers should be set free by law to join or not to join a union, as they please. Union discipline today includes a strict regulation of a member's economic life as a wage earner and frequently of his political life as a citizen. No American should be forced to adopt his economic philosophy or his political program at the dictation of a union. A closed shop or a union shop, compelling all workers to be members of a union, enables the union—by means of suspension or expulsion of a member for any or no cause—to compel the employer to fire that member from his job. This is arbitrary coercion, both of the employer and of the unwilling member. This is monopoly in one of its most extreme and hateful forms.

The closed-shop or union-shop contract is already outlawed on our railroads by the Railway Labor Act. It should be outlawed in all our industries.

To sum up the first part of our problem, which deals with the internal management and membership of unions: The management should be democratic and the members should be free men.

The second part of our problem is to determine how far collective bargaining can

be extended under one organization without becoming an instrument of monopoly.

It should be evident that industry-wide bargaining creates a monopoly control of industry. Collective-bargaining agreements between all the employers of an industry on the one hand and a union of all the industry's workers on the other are plain conspiracies in restraint of trade. Standardized wages and working conditions throughout an industry are monopoly wages, resulting in monopoly prices and monopoly-controlled production. The overcharging and exploitation of all the industry's customers are inevitable. Competition, the guardian of fair prices, is as quickly destroyed by labor dictation of wages and production as by business dictation of prices and production.

Large numbers of the customers of most industries are themselves union members. When wages and prices are raised by industry-wide collective-bargaining agreements the members of one union are simply trying to exploit the members of other unions. For organized labor itself such agreements are largely negative and self-defeating. But they are positively detrimental to the country at large and destructive of our economic institutions and ideals.

We believe in a free competitive economy. Industry-wide collective-bargaining agreements represent the beginning of a controlled economy regulated by an industrial or political dictatorship. First, all the employers and all the employees in an industry agree on wages, irrespective of local conditions and irrespective of the circumstances of individual firms. The next step is logical and has followed in many instances. Brought together for wage purposes and delivered from competition as to wage costs, the employers will naturally try to deliver themselves from other competitive restraints and so move on toward monopolistic prices fixed by concerted action.

This development has happened on a great scale in Europe, including Great Britain. It means a controlled economy in private hands. And what happens next? The public is outraged by private monopoly, and it demands the nationalization of the industries concerned. In other words, industry-wide collective-bargaining agreements lead toward private monopolistic tyranny; and private monopolistic tyranny leads toward public totalitarian tyranny. If we want to keep economic freedom in America, we must stop the spread of industry-wide collective-bargaining agreements before they make a socialized, planned economy inevitable. One way to do this would be by an amendment to the present National Labor Relations Act.

The fundamental bargaining unit authorized by law should be an organization of the employees of one employer. This local labor union and the employer should have full power to make a mutually satisfactory contract, free from any control by any national union or employer association.

But local unions and employers in a single producing or distributing region—such as a metropolitan area—should be permitted to form a regional federation—this is, a voluntary association of independent, self-governing units—to work out regional agreements, provided that these are not made the instrument of standardized wages and working conditions.

The object of the law should be, first, to prevent any monopolistic fixing of wages, production, or prices, and, second, to preserve the freedom of contract of employees and their employer. The benefits of the statistical services of a national association of workers or businessmen can be preserved, but such an association should be legally prevented from dictating uniform policies and programs to labor or management throughout an industry and from thus depriving the public of the protections of competitions within an industry.

For the protection of both public and private interests in a free economy, a Federal law should be enacted that would make industry-wide bargaining illegal and make all contracts and combinations of labor or management that substantially restrict competition preventable and punishable under the antitrust laws.

We come now to the third part of our problem: strikes.

Some strikes are of national concern. The way to prevent them is to make them unnecessary and unjustifiable by establishing a legal machinery for the peaceful settlement of labor disputes and by making it the legal duty of employers and employees to attempt in good faith to settle disagreements peacefully. The administration of such a law should be given to a new Federal Industrial Relations Board. In a dispute of real public importance, the Board should be authorized to appoint a special Commission of Inquiry to investigate the facts and make recommendations for a just settlement.

It should be one duty of the Commission to ascertain the effect upon the public of a stoppage of production. If it finds that no great public hardship would result, then the parties to the dispute should be left free to accept or reject the Commission's recommendations. But if a stoppage would deprive the public of a necessity of life and imperil the public health and safety, further Government action would be necessary. Upon the President's approval of the Commission's report, its recommendations should become a legal settlement of the dispute, effective for 1 year.

If the employer declined to accept this settlement, the Government would appoint a temporary receiver for the properties in order to keep them operating. The legal obligations of a public utility are well established. It must continue to operate, regardless of losses to the owners, the stockholders. The legal obligations of other businesses upon which public health and safety depend should extend at least to the requirement that they shall not be shut down because of disagreements between employers and employees.

These principles should be as binding on employees as on employers. Accordingly, the new terms of employment should be submitted to a vote of all the employees. If they vote to accept them, they will go on working and their union will continue to represent them. If they vote to reject them, each worker will be free to quit his employment as an individual. But any strike by the union, or other concerted action to prevent the continued operation of the plant, would be a violation of law. If the welfare of the community depends on keeping a business in operation, any concerted effort to stop it is plainly a conspiracy against the people which should be prevented and punished.

This means that the union as a body, or the workers quitting employment permanently, cannot be permitted to exercise the privileges or exemptions conferred by the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and other laws which give special protections to organized labor. It is through such laws that our labor movement has gained its present strength. Deprive a union and its members of the shelter of such laws and they will become again subject to the competitive forces that are destructive of monopoly power—that power so viciously exerted in strikes against the public welfare.

The courts should be set free again to enjoin conspiracies against the people and their government. The employer should be set free to hire new workers to replace the workers who have individually quit their employment. This does not mean condemning any individual to involuntary servitude. All it means is that, when urgent public need demands the cooperation of all good citizens, labor unions and their members shall not enjoy a special exemption from legal obligations enforced against all others. Stripped of special privileges, opposing a public opinion united in support of an impartial judgment backed by the President, no union would be able to carry on a successful strike against the production of public necessities.

The fourth part of our problem is picketing.

What would we think if all the manufacturers of a given commodity should gather themselves into a union and throw long lines of massed pickets around the places of business of their customers and refuse to allow anybody to enter or leave until those customers consented to buy that given commodity at a given price? We do not allow violence to set prices. We must stop allowing violence to set wages.

Since VJ-day thousands of picket lines in America have engaged in violence with no effective rebuke and repression. This violence is sometimes by individuals using fists or weapons. It is sometimes by groups of strikers so thickly massed that noncombatants are unable to exercise their clear legal right to enter the struck plant. Our States must police the picket lines into lawfulness and orderliness. If they do not, they will eventually lose some of their proper authority and we shall see our picket lines policed by agents of Federal administrators and of the Federal courts. Somehow, by somebody, the picket lines in America must be made law abiding.

The fifth part of our problem concerns the contract between the union and the employer. Contracts among employers in restraint of trade are unlawful. Yet, many contracts between employers and unions, containing provisions flagrantly in restraint of trade, are tolerated. An instance is the familiar provision through which local employers and local unions agree that they will not handle materials brought in from other localities.

All management-union contracts substantially affecting interstate commerce should be open to public inspection. They should be scrutinized by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. If they violate our antimonopoly laws, the Department of Justice should be as much obliged to proceed against them as it is now obliged to proceed against monopolistic conspiracies of managements. Unions should not be allowed to do, and unions and managements together should not be allowed to do, what managements by themselves cannot lawfully do.

These suggestions cannot rightfully be regarded as antilabor. They are only applications to labor of the traditional and current American proposition that we shall have no favored class and no class-government.

Little by little, in the course of several generations, we have taught railroads and electric-light and power companies and insurance companies and banks and stock exchanges and many other types of business enterprise that they cannot rule or ruin our economic life to enhance their own profits. The measures we took against them they called antibusiness. We nevertheless took those measures; and those enterprises are still in prosperous existence.

We must take corresponding measures against abuses of power by unions; and, when we have taken them, our unions, also, will still flourish. They have a great part to play in American life, and they will play it—but within the framework of public law.

It took legislation in Washington to persuade capital that it was not bigger than the Capitol. It will take legislation in Washington to persuade labor that no trade-union is bigger than the American Union.

Restore Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, from hearings of the House Committee on Education and Labor I am forced to conclude that Old Man Competition is badly battered, rather weak, and just about a wreck. Although he is the primary reliance of the individualistic system of the United States of America he is groggy because of the pincers strategy of the New Dealers.

On the one hand, we had the kitchen Cabinet and the President building the top of a labor government at the White House. On the other, we had the pressure of war for use in forcing centralization in Washington. These two prongs of the pincers certainly did pinch. They pinched us into the highest pyramid of hocus pocus ever built on the idea of statism.

Mr. Speaker, the United States was far up the road toward a Mussolini corporate state when the voters yanked the rug from under the feet of the New Dealers last November. Collective bargaining at the White House had taken us a long way away from what the American people want, what made us great, and what is implicit in the Bill of Rights. And what you should remember is that it built up a bureaucracy of special privilege that likes what they have squeezed out of the American people. They like their position. They have been made unresponsible by law and especially by maladministration. So you are getting numerous and loud squawks that are just the same as the country has heard before.

Once in a while some person or group accumulates too much power. They convince themselves that "I am the law" and that they can ignore the public interest. When that happens we just have to chop them down to the right size. If we let any group wax too fat on monopoly power they become as strong as the Government. When any one group gets as much power as the Government it is the Government. So, Mr. Speaker, the work of the House Committee on Labor and Education must now serve to reestablish a balance between the primary forces in American life and to do so in harmony with the principles which made the Nation great. And when one says that he means we must restore competition.

Mr. Speaker, there just is no substitute for competition. Why? Because we do not grow men big enough or ideas big enough to operate a system that will sustain and maintain 140,000,000 people otherwise. It must be a self-balancing and checking system that is sparked by competition. There is no substitute for competition. There is no alternative to competition. Anything and everything we have tried either as a substitute or alternative has ultimately turned out to reduce our freedom or deprive us of it by putting the heel of some bureaucrat, board, or commission on our neck.

To have competition suppressed in the guise of regulating something or other has happened time after time. But recently we supplemented the political bureaucrats with labor bureaucrats. Our masters are now chiefly in the House of Labor. They are ably supported and assisted by political bureaucrats. So poor Old Man Competition is as anemic as the Old Harry. He suffers from all kinds of deficiencies—beef, iron, vitamins, enzymes—not to mention solid food. Mr. Speaker, we not only have the political bureaucrats suppressing, undermining, and destroying competition, but they now conspire with the top dogs of the great labor combines built up from the White House. So it will take all the king's horses and all the king's men to put Old Man Competition together again.

Now let us look at what has happened from the standpoint of those of us on the receiving end—those who get the heel on our neck because of this combining of political and labor bureaucrats to sabotage Old Man Competition. About every way we turn we find we can take it or leave it. Things are nicely frozen. Prices have gone up. Prices are still going up.

Mr. Speaker, we recently had to swallow a few hundred thousand words designed to kid us into the notion that costs have little or nothing to do with prices. Just hold prices down and put up costs. It is a neat trick—if you can do it. But it somehow seems to have something to do with supply. We cannot get things. We cannot get enough. And if we can get them we do not find Old Man Competition around to help us with the price. Moreover, if we detect any signs of his presence he seems but a shadow of his former self. Looks like a case of low blood pressure at least. So we have prices going up, supply not going up, costs going up, and Old Man Competition going crazy or on vacation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the largest single item of costs generally must be wages and salaries. Everything shakes down to work as the creative or productive factor. So we have manual work, brain work, and the work of tools to be marketed. Is the work of over 57,000,000 persons employed in the United States to be sold at a flat price—a price arbitrarily decreed by a few labor barons who conspire with a few political bureaucrats to hand out a ukase that the price is so much—take it or leave it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this question of competition does not stop with the price of things we buy as consumers, or with the supply. It reaches down into wages and how much workers earn. It may be an unpopular idea in some places but it still is true that to earn we have to have a job and do some work. We cannot eliminate competition even in fixing wages and expect to be better off. In the first place, a combination to fix wages is a combination to fix prices. When this is done in the name of any other kind of organization except labor, it is considered in restraint of trade and therefore unlawful. When it is done in the name of labor it is now quite all right, but Old Man Competition has not heard about that. He has not read the statutes, apparently. Not even the revised statutes. So the arbitrary fiating of wages by industry-wide, union-wide, or too-wide bargaining sets up extraordinary pressures to eliminate jobs, to restrict working time, to reduce weekly and annual earnings and to put the whole employee-employer relation on an armed truce basis.

Now one thing I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, is that we cannot get along without competition even to set wages. Allowing competition to operate serves to adjust supply to demand and vice versa. If competition can operate, those periodic cycles of adjustment called depression, recession, or whatever you please, should not be as deep or last so long.

Life is a continuous process of adjustment. We cannot nail everything down either by collective bargaining or by law. The American idea is to keep opportunity open. That is where Old Man Competition gets in his work. If he has half a chance he will keep opportunity open. Just get the road blocks, bottlenecks, and iron curtains out of the way.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of collective bargaining has been carried much too far. It has been used to build up monopoly power and thereby to eliminate competition as a regulating and balancing factor in American life. It has pushed us so far that we are now on the threshold of great domestic cartels. Cartels such as those which played a leading role in the decline and fall of the British Empire, of Germany, of France, and many other nations.

Now I hope you will not think that the labor barons are the only ones who would like to continue the present sweet set-up with competition behind the eight ball. There are many employers who join them in that desire. You will hear them yelling that this or that is too drastic, too severe, goes too far, and is just too awful. But remember when that chorus wells up, that what is behind it is the same desire to get Old Man Competition off their back, that most human beings fall heir to now and then. Once you put together a nice monopoly position and get Old Man Competition well shackled, you really hate to give it up.

Mr. Speaker, the issue presented by labor legislation is not just correction of excesses perpetrated in the name of labor. It is the restoration of competition in American life after 15 years of partially covered up efforts by the New Dealers who have tried to get rid of it.

Military Government: Administration of Occupied Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday April 14, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Journal of the American Bar Association:

MILITARY GOVERNMENT: ADMINISTRATION OF OCCUPIED TERRITORY

(By Eberhard P. Deutsch, of the Louisiana bar)

(The picture and pattern of military government in Germany and Austria (American zone) have changed somewhat, but Colonel Deutsch depicts its legal phases. Before entering military service in August of 1942, he was the head of a law firm in New Orleans. He is a veteran of both World Wars. Assigned overseas in May of 1943, he served in combat with the Forth-fifth Division during the Sicilian invasion, and also with the Eighty-second Airbone Division at the time of the Normandy landings. He has been awarded the Bronze Star and Purple Heart medals, and holds a Presidential Distinguished Unit Citation. He has performed general administrative and legal duties in civil affairs and military government in and following combat, in various countries of Europe, and acted as principal legal adviser to Gen. Mark W. Clark in the quadri-partite military administration of Austria. He received his law degree from the University of Tulane in 1925, and holds the honorary degree of doctor of jurisprudence from the University of Messina, Italy, conferred on him in 1943.)

Little has as yet appeared in legal literature, though much is unquestionably destined to be written, on military government. This function of command has in the past been merely incidental to other phases of military conquest. In World War II, however, recognition was at last given by the War Department to the military importance of the maintenance of order in, and immediate reconstruction of, occupied enemy territory, in the close wake of tactical units.

This recognition was evidenced by the creation, in the European theater, of a fifth general staff section, G–5, at each tactical command down to and including corps; with a new special (military government) staff section at divisions. Military government representation was even accorded at the regimental level. In each instance this staff was an integral part of the combat unit involved; for military necessity is always the primary underlying principle for the conduct of military government.

It should be noted at the outset that the following discussion relates principally to military government, which deals with the administration of occupied enemy territory (e. g., Germany, Austria), as distinguished from civil affairs which refers to friendly of liberated countries (e. g., France, Belgium).

It is impossible, within the limited scope of such an article as the present one, even to outline the various functions within the broad scope of military government. They range literally from the cabbages to kings of Alice-in-Wonderland fame. "The object of civil affairs control through military government," says the Manual,[1] "is to assist military operations, to further national policies, and to fulfill the obligation of the occupying forces under international law."

Suffice it to indicate that among the most important functions of military government are those performed by legal staffs. These legal functions form the subject of the present discussion.

FUNCTIONS OF MILITARY GOVERNMENT

Military government does not itself ordinarily carry on governmental functions. It directs such functions by an indigenous government which it finds or sets up in occupied territory. It is carried out, however, by operational teams or detachments, called carpet personnel, as part of the forces of the commander of the tactical unit of the area involved, guided and supervised in turn for that commander, by his G–5 or military government staff. At Army levels and above, each such staff, and each detachment except the smallest, contains legal officers.

It may be well to recall at this point, that the law of occupied enemy territory, in the words of the Duke of Wellington[2] "is neither more nor less than the will of the general who commands" the occupying army. This is subject, of course, to the limitations imposed by modern international agreements,[3] as well as by the control exercised over the military commander by his own government.

To all practical intents and purposes, however, the commander of the occupying forces embodies, within his official military person, the constitution, as well as the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the government of the territory occupied by his forces.

IMPORTANCE OF THE LEGAL PHASES

The importance of the legal phases of military government should at once become apparent from the brief outline given above. The broad scope of the work of military government legal officers may, for present purposes, conveniently be divided into the following categories: (1) legislation; (2) reestablishment of a national ministry of justice; (3) reorganization of indigenous courts; (4) reorganization of bar and notaries; (5) establishment, operation, and supervision of military government courts; (6) advice and opinions.

LEGISLATION IN OCCUPIED TERRITORY

Legislation in the occupied territory consists of enactments of the military government, and such legislation of the indigenous government as is not suspended by the occupational commander, or as he requires or permits to be enacted by that government and its subdivisions or agencies.

Military government enactments vary in form, and cover a wide range of subjects. They include proclamations issued in the name of, and signed by, the theater commander, announcing the fact of occupation, the establishment of military government and instructing the civilian population as to their status and conduct in general.

Next, there are ordinances or laws, usually issued simply by order of military government, on many fundamental subjects, such as crimes and offenses, suspension of certain local legislation, currency and foreign exchange, frontier control, censorship and communications, and so on.

Finally, there are notices or directions, covering limited areas or addressed to specific classes of persons, establishing curfew, regulating circulation of persons or vehicles, requiring the surrender of weapons, etc.

Each such enactment, by its very nature as a legalistic document, is drafted, revised, or at least required to be approved, by legal officers. And so, too, legal officers must render assistance in the suspension of such indigenous laws of the occupied country as may affect the security of the occupying forces, or are contrary to their avowed war aims. In the latter category, by way of example, in Germany, were those laws providing wide executive and judicial latitude to protect the so-called sound instincts of the people.

LEGISLATION DURING AND AFTER COMBAT

During combat the drafting of military government legislation and the supervision of the enactment and suspension of indigenous legislation were performed by the legal officers of each commander for his own zone of operations. In the case of Allied commanders the work was frequently done jointly by legal officers of both British and United States forces.

Following the cessation of hostilities and the establishment of quadripartite military government, new systems were devised. The Allied Councils of both Germany and Austria consist of the commanders in chief of the four occupying powers. Each council has a legal directorate composed of the chiefs of the four legal divisions.

The legal functions of the military government of each country as a whole are accordingly performed by a quadripartite legal directorate composed of United States, French, Soviet, and British officials. In Germany no central government has been established. Accordingly national legislation in that country, other than the indigenous legislation existing at the time of occupation, and permitted to remain in force, consists of enactments prepared by the quadripartite legal directorate and issued by the Allied Control Council. Indigenous local legislation is issued or suspended under the unilateral supervision of the legal officers of the zone command.

MILITARY LEGISLATION IN AUSTRIA

In Austria a national government was set up at once with the approval of the occupational authorities, followed a few months later by national elections, and the establishment of a central government, duly recognized by the governments of the occupying powers, but subject to continuing supervision and control by the Allied Council.

Accordingly, no military government legislation as such has been issued for application throughout the whole of Austria. Instead, the national legislative process has been carried on, at first by cabinet decree, and thereafter by parliamentary enactment. But this legislation has been permitted to be promulgated and put into effect only after affirmative approval by the Allied Council.

All Austrian legislation has therefore been submitted, following enactment, to the quadripartite legal directorate. This directorate has recommended to the Allied Council approval, amendment, or disapproval, of Austrian national legislation; and directions of the Council to the Austrian Government have been issued accordingly.[4]

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE UNDER OCCUPATION

Reestablishment of a National Ministry of Justice is obviously a vast task. In Germany, as stated above, no national government exists as yet, and there is accordingly no such ministry. In Austria it was established at an early date, and it functions under the supervision of the quadripartite legal directorate, with unilateral supervision of its functions within each zone of occupation.

The task has consisted primarily of purging the ministry of its Nazi personnel, and substituting officials whose political records, and whose standing and ability, permit their forming parts of the important executive

[1] United States Army and Navy Manual of Military Government and Civil Affairs, TM 27–5, OPNAV 50 E–3, sec. 4, p. 3.

[2] Hansard's Debates, 3d. Ser., cxv, 881.

[3] See, for example, Hague Convention No. IV and Annex (Hague Regulations) of October 18, 1907, respecting the laws and customs of war on land, 36 Stat. at L. 2277 and 2295.

[4] The action of the Council and legal directorate were at first required to be unanimous, and ultimate disagreements were rare. More recently, a new control agreement provided in effect that, in the absence of unanimous approval, legislation (other than constitutional provisions) was to become effective, on a presumption of approval, 31 days after submission to the Council. Strangely enough, disagreements have since become more frequent.

machinery to control and guide a national administration of justice without danger, from that source at least, of a recurrence of totalitarian upheaval. At the end of the first year of occupation, the ministry had reached approximately one-third of its normal strength, based on standards existing prior to the annexation of Austria by Germany in March 1938.

INDIGENOUS COURTS UNDER MILITARY GOVERNMENT

The indigenous courts of a strictly political nature in occupied enemy territory, such as the German Sonderand Volksgerichte, have been abolished. All other indigenous courts were suspended pending reorganization, purging of personnel and functions, and reestablishment on sound bases.

When reestablished and permitted to reopen, priority was given to certain classes of litigation. Criminal cases take precedence over civil matters. First among criminal cases come those instituted since the occupation. Among civil cases, priority is required to be given to cases involving domestic relations.

The courts of the occupied country are prohibited from exercising jurisdiction over cases involving members of the armed forces or nationals of the countries of the occupying powers, cases arising under any law suspended by military government, money demands against the indigenous government or any agency thereof, and other categories of litigation specifically enumerated in military government legislation on that subject.

FUNCTIONS OF THE INDIGENOUS COURTS

If the foregoing outline of the status of indigenous courts in occupied enemy territory does not suffice to show the extensive supervisory duties and responsibilities of military government legal officers in that regard, one needs glance only briefly at the sweeping powers exercised by such officers over those courts. Among those powers are the following: (1) To dismiss or suspend any judge, prosecutor, or court official; (2) to attend the hearing of any case, even in closed session, and to have unrestricted access to all files and records; (3) to review all decisions of all trial and appellate courts, and to nullify, suspend, reverse, or modify to any extent any finding of any such court; (4) to transfer any case or class of cases to the jurisdiction of military government courts; and (5) to supervise and control the administration and budgets of all such courts.

Supervision and control of the indigenous courts was originally performed unilaterally, by legal officers in each zone. Control has gradually been relinquished to the National Ministry of Justice, with supervision continuing zonally, on a unilateral basis.

In addition, complete control over the bar and notaries [5] is vested in the military government, exercised locally through its legal officers. No person is permitted to practice as lawyer or notary (nor as judge or prosecutor) without the consent of the military government, and until having taken an oath in the following form (United States zone):

"I swear that I will at all times apply and administer the law without fear or favor, and with justice and equity to all persons of whatever creed, race, or political opinion they may be; that I will obey the law in spirit as well as in letter, and that I will constantly endeavor to establish equal justice under the law for all persons." [6]

[5] Notaries in continental Europe, as the Louisiana colleagues of the author will understand, occupy a quasi-judicial position of great importance in the commercial and professional life of their communities.

[6] This is the oath prescribed for use in Austria. That being used in Germany, while not identical, is of substantially similar tenor.

The military government is empowered specifically, "to disbar from practice any lawyer or notary." And because these officials were, under the Nazi regime, formed into Nazi-controlled organizations, the latter were dissolved, and new local regional and national voluntary associations have been formed under the supervision of legal officers of the military government.

MILITARY COURTS OF OCCUPYING FORCES

The law-enforcement machinery of the occupying forces, beyond direct military sanctions, consists of a system of military government courts. These are established by decree in the form of law or ordinance. Their proceedings are governed by promulgated rules of procedure, and these are supplemented by a guide to procedure prepared to assist officers conducting such tribunals.

These courts have jurisdiction over violations of the laws and usages of war, of military government enactments and of laws of the occupied country itself. As to persons, they have jurisdiction as to all except members of the allied forces, prisoners of war and diplomatic agents.

The occupational commander may provide for such types of courts, and give them such jurisdiction, as he deems advisable. In the United States, French, and British zones of the European theater, there are three kinds of these courts, summary, intermediate, and general. Summary courts are composed of one officer and may impose fines up to $1,000 or imprisonment up to 1 year. Intermediate courts are composed of one or more officers, and may fine up to $10,000 or imprison up to 10 years. General courts are composed of three or more officers, and may impose any punishment including death.[7]

ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS OF MILITARY GOVERNMENT COURTS

In addition to the foregoing powers, all military government courts may enter orders prohibiting an accused from entering or leaving a designated area, or ordering him to enter or leave it; for the forfeiture, restitution, or disposal of property, premises, or businesses; impounding money or other objects; requiring and forfeiting bail; punishing for contempt; and they have all "such other powers as may be necessary and appropriate for the due administration of justice."

Summary courts act as committing magistrates. They may themselves try cases, or refer them for trial to such higher court as, under the circumstances disclosed, seems to have adequate punishing power in the event of a finding of guilty. Or, the appointing authority may refer a case directly to an intermediate or general court for trial.

Courts may be appointed by commanders of certain units, with the appointing power largely decentralized in nonoperational areas. Courts are composed of Allied officers,[8] but prosecutors and defense counsel may be of any rank, or even civilians. There is no right of appeal, but decisions are subject to review, and the reviewing authority may set aside a finding of guilty; affirm, suspend, reduce, commute, or modify any sentence; order a new trial; and "make such other order as may be appropriate," except that the reviewing authority may not set aside a finding of not guilty.

At first, in Sicily and Italy, it was attempted to follow largely Anglo-Saxon procedure, in order to implant the germ of that wholesome system on the Continent. This was found, however, to be insufficiently effective for use against enemy subjects, who took advantage of its seeming technicalities, relays, and presumptions in favor of the accused. A quick, decisive process was found necessary to meet the paramount demands of military necessity, and a summary continental system has now been adopted in the European theater.

The court has studied the record of the case before it is brought on for trial. It commences by stating to the accused a résumé of the case to be presented against him, and by interrogating him with regard thereto; it then proceeds with proof of only such matters as are controverted.

The only real rule of evidence in military government courts is that of relevancy. Hearsay, by way of example, is expressly admissible, but is to be given only such weight as circumstances justify. Evidence of bad character is admissible only after the accused has put his own character in issue. Neither husband, nor wife, nor parent, nor child may be compelled to testify against the other, and the privileges of attorney and client, and priest and confessor, are recognized.

Military-government courts may adopt a flexible procedure for the trial of juvenile offenders "based on the accepted practices of local juvenile courts" and those of England and the United States.

Finally, it is provided in the Rules of Procedure:

"The proceedings shall not be invalidated, nor any findings nor the sentence disapproved, for any error or omission, technical or otherwise, occurring in such proceedings, unless in the opinion of the reviewing authority, after an examination of the entire record, it shall appear that the error or omission has resulted in injustice to the accused."

Military-government legal officers are responsible for the establishment, staffing, operation, and supervision of military-government courts. They prepare cases, prosecute them, sit as members of such courts, act as defense counsel in the most serious cases, and prepare recommendation for the reviewing and confirming authorities.

LEGAL ADVICE TO MILITARY GOVERNMENT

Of course, legal officers are chargeable with responsibility, in the last analysis, for all legal phases of military government. Legal questions are involved, directly or indirectly, in practically every detail of military-government activity. These questions vary from such relative trivialities as to whether an Allied officer need return the salute of a prisoner of war, to such vast problems as the legality, under international law, of the Moscow Declaration of November 1, 1943, providing for separation of Austria from Germany and her re-creation as a free and independent nation.[9]

One of the most interesting of such questions involved the title to captured or abandoned enemy property. The point has frequently arisen. The French, for example, contended that any such property of French origin must be considered to revert to French ownership, regardless of the means by which the enemy had acquired it, or the nationality of the capturing forces.

A somewhat similar question, one involving extensive repercussions in any number of directions, has more recently arisen in the

[7] Death sentences must be confirmed by the commander of the occupying forces or by such officer as he may designate.

[8] Demobilization following cessation of hostilities has gradually necessitated the use of civilians as members of military government courts.

[9] See for instance, "A Study of the Legality of the Annexation of Austria by Germany under International Law and Austrian Constitutional Law, and the Policy of the United States Toward Anexation," by Herbert Wright, professor of international law, the Catholic University of America. The study was reprinted as H. Doc. No. 477, 78 Cong., 2d sess., 1944. A similar study by Prof. Hans Velsen, of the department of political science of the University of California, at Berkeley, reaches diametrically opposite conclusions.

Soviet zone of Austria. Under the Potsdam declaration, Russia was permitted to apply to its reparations claims, German property found in eastern Austria. It has treated as German, property which the Germans had confiscated, frequently from Allied interests, following annexation of Austria to Germany.

COMPLICATED QUESTIONS AS TO PROPERTY

Following capture by United States forces of an extensive cache of fine wines in the German arsenal at Cherbourg, a contention was made in behalf of another nation, that all such captures become property of the Allies, to be divided among them as determined on diplomatic or other high levels. The point arose again, with various claims by various governments, on all conceivable grounds, being asserted to all or parts of a vast hoard of gold captured by United States troops in a German salt mine.

The disentanglement of Austrian from German economic interests, attendant on the reestablishment of Austria as an independent nation, raises legal questions of corporate reorganization and finance, as nice as any ever discussed in the lawbooks.

The solution of problems of restitution of property and property rights, wrongfully taken or transferred during the Nazi regime, frequently under color of law, will unquestionably ultimately result in the establishment of new principles of equity jurisprudence.

Similar examples of literally fascinating legal questions arising in the course of military government, both before and after combat, might be multiplied indefinitely. Many of them, of course, cannot be settled with the writing of mere legal opinions.

Some require diplomatic negotiations, and even international conventions. Legal personnel must play the leading roles in such presentations. On the character of their performance, the success of military government operations and, to a great measure, of the future ability of the nations of the world to live among each other in peace, may largely depend.

Army Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the ceremonies observing Army Day in the city of Roanoke, Va., on April 7, 1947:

It is consonant with the fundamental concepts of a nation dedicated to the cause of peace, it is consistent with our cherished traditions, it is in furtherance of constructive service to our sacred and inescapable responsibilities to our own enlightened self interest, as well as our moral and spiritual obligation to build and secure the future peace of the world, that we, on this occasion, celebrate Army Day.

It is with pride in their fortitude, tribute to their valor, praise for their genius, gratitude for their accomplishments, appreciation of their sacrificial service on the field of battle, that, in humility and reverence, we thank divine providence for, as we salute, the armies of America, the valiant soldiers of democracy, the preservers of the Republic, the guardians of the present, and the defenders of the future.

May a grateful people ever proclaim, with the fervor of undiluted patriotism and sincerity of abiding devotion to the ideals of the founding fathers, that the soldiers of democracy will ever deserve to be "First in war; first in peace and first in the hearts of their countrymen."

Like his gallant brother in arms of the Navy and Marine Corps, the American soldier is the symbol of our traditions, the shield of our hope for survival in a grasping and contracted world whose existence is rendered indescribably precarious by the unfathomed potentialities of atomic mass destruction.

Our Army has written many glorious chapters in the Nation's history. Travail and suffering, sweat, blood, and tears have beset the hard road of its accomplishments. It has triumphed over the forces of nature and it has triumphed over the forces of evil. It sprang from the loins of a free people, ennobled and inspired by the cause of liberty and justice which it served. It found no worthy foe in the regimented robots of the beastial dictators and their enslaving tyranny which it so signally crushed.

Its story of magnificence and achievement has been written in every corner of the globe.

It has indelibly inscribed its heroic record not only in the affections of the American people, but of peoples of other lands who cherish liberty and justice, and whose faith in the dawn of a new era had all but been shattered on the racks and pillories of mental and physical anguish born of the hideous ideologies which have sought, and continue to seek, the destruction of the citadel of democracy.

Let us never forget those who fell or fail to hold high and sacred the immeasurable price of their sacrifice.

No eulogy, no epitaph, no monument, however beautiful and imposing, can do more than remind us of their valor and devotion.

In service to our country in the discharge of her obligations at home and abroad, let us resolve that the hallowed dead shall not have died in vain. May we never forget the bitter tears, the broken homes, the mangled bodies, the aching hearts, and the shattered hopes.

We are not, thank God, a Nation of warriors. Impartial history records that we have never engaged in a war of aggression. We have never sought nor do we now seek anything of any nation anywhere in the world which we do not freely accord to every other nation everywhere in the world.

Ours has never been a spirit of international selfishness or national aggrandizement. We seek no new territory, nor do we seek to inject our philosophy of government into the systems of other nations against the free and untrammeled will of any people. Ours has never been nor is it now a policy of imperialism. We have never sought to sabotage the economy and internal security of a friendly nation by fomenting strife, dissension and disruption among its nationals, nor have we ever, in violation of the common amenities of international honor and decency, maintained an elaborate espionage system within the borders of an ally and endeavored to breed an army of desperate traitors among her citizenry. We have never sought, through the cowardly and treacherous process of insidious infiltration, to pollute and contaminate the ideological concepts of any people, thereby to sap the vitality, undermine and overthrow the structure of any government. To the shame and degrading guilt of Soviet Russia, we are constantly, through Kremlin collusion, being subjected to all of this and more. The patience of the American people is long suffering but that virtue has its limitations. We crave peace but we crave it with honor.

No nation which will, with candor, honesty, and intelligence, analyze the recorded history of American social evolution and policy, or the demonstrated motives and purposes enunciated by America today, can find any basis to justify, either to its own people or to the world, any semblance of reason or fact, express or implied, upon which to predicate false and pernicious propaganda ascribing any ulterior motive in policy or purpose.

The world knows—even Red Russia knows—that it is the intense and relentless desire of our people and their Government to bask in the sunlight of a sane and durable peace, whose beneficent rays of hope, and freedom from fear of totalitarian aggression, will illumine the darkest corners of the earth and embrace the entire world.

The world knows—even Red Russia knows—that in view of the ominous clouds of threatening disaster which loom on the international horizon, the locked secrets of atomic energy, and with them the very life of civilization itself, are safe only in the keeping of the strong hands and moral conscience of America.

"I know not what course others may take, but as for me," I will never agree to surrender to any nation, or combination of nations, the secret of atomic energy, until a practical, sound, safe, and enforceable system of control has been established and adopted.

I mean a system of control buttressed by rigid sanctions for its threatened violation and sanctions which cannot be thwarted or defeated by the veto power of any nation.

Let us keep America strong so that she may speak forthrightly and with unwavering decision in the councils of the world. May hers not be the voice of appeasement symbolizing the umbrella of Munich but the clear and positive voice of democracy backed by the will, the determination, and the unquestioned power of her righteous might, to the end that the blighting scourge, the unspeakable horror, and the devastating carnage of global conflict shall never again drench the world with innocent blood.

Together, a united people, we shall face the future with faith and courage. Our energy and our talents we must dedicate to strengthening and perfecting the processes of democracy.

Let us see to it that the virtue, the power, the force, the efficacy, the moral, and spiritual attributes, and the very content of democracy itself gains and holds mastery over the minds of men. We must make it work and demonstrate that its essence is overwhelmingly superior to communism or any other antithetical force or ideology.

I loathe communism with a vehemence circumscribed only by anathema, but I am convinced that it cannot be dissolved by legislative fiat any more than democracy or religion can be legislated out of existence.

Any form of tyranny over the minds of men is as dangerous as it is despicable.

We must avoid the hysterical and tempting urge to outlaw the Communist Party and thereby drive it under cover. Such a course would bolster it with a complex of martyrdom and tend to furnish fuel for its insidious and abominable flames. We must keep it in the open so that we can know who, where, and what, and bring to bear upon it and its disciples the merciless light of uncompromising publicity.

We must see to it that neither communism, democracy, nor any other ideology, religion, or philosophy is by force fostered upon any nation anywhere in the world.

The untrammeled and unfettered inherent right of self-determination, under conditions of uncoerced freedom of choice, must obtain everywhere in the world. For such is the creed and such is the essence of democracy—the last best hope for the future peace of the world.

Greco-Turkish Loan Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of yesterday, April 14, on President Truman's Greco-Turkish loan proposal. I have spoken on this proposal before the House and I have supplied constructive reading material on this subject. Nothing that I have heard or read so far has changed my position. We can best serve the world by conserving our strength in order to use direct methods rather than backing into a situation which Great Britain admits to be untenable.

The editorial follows:

HABIT-FORMING LOANS

A number of the Senators who spoke on Mr. Truman's Greco-Turkish loan proposal seemed to feel that they had been shanghaied into supporting it, even though they doubted its wisdom. Some of them said they would go along this time, but insisted they were not establishing a precedent for future outpourings of American billions.

When the reluctant Senators say, "Thus far, but no farther," they are either fooling themselves or trying to fool their constituents. If the Truman-Vandenberg policy makes sense at all, it makes sense only as a declaration that we are willing to spend unlimited American billions and risk war to stop Russian aggression anywhere in the world.

Next time it will be harder, not easier, to refuse. If, as Mr. VANDENBERG pretends, the Nation's prestige will be destroyed by refusing to grant Mr. Truman's request now, it will be destroyed even more surely by turning him down the next time he wants to give a half billion dollars away or send a military mission to bolster a weak government. Or at least, so Senator VANDENBERG will assert, citing the present instance as precedent.

Mr. Truman is bluffing, and bluffing on a poor hand, for Greece and Turkey can never be made strong and self-reliant as against a Russian threat. If he wants to bluff, why doesn't he use his ace, the atomic bomb? An ultimatum to Stalin to get out of the countries he has taken by force or trickery, and to liquidate the minority governments that Russian bayonets have established, might not work, but it obviously would have a better chance of working than the present program. The overpowering objection to this course is one that Mr. Truman and Senator VANDENBERG are debarred from offering. That is that if it did not work, we would have a war. Their program also gives Stalin the excuse to make war whenever he pleases, and at a time that suits him, not us.

We do not believe that a war with Russia is necessary. It is true that our political ideal of individual freedom and the Communist political ideal of slavery to the state are in conflict. But Americans oppose communism not only because they find its methods repugnant, but also on the ground that it won't work.

If the Communist idea won't work, we have only one thing to fear from it. That is the activity of its adherents in this country, who are trying to keep our system of free enterprise from working by internal sabotage. In his new crusade against communism, Mr. Truman is strangely tender toward the only Communists who can hurt us, those within his own governmental family. His overadvertised purge of them actually was a gag order against disclosing official Government papers. This might keep some fellow traveler from betraying a military secret to Russia. It would be equally useful, however, in preventing an honest Government employee from exposing one of Chairman Hannegan's Missouri burglars.

If communism won't work in Russia—and all the evidence is that it hasn't—it won't work in Europe. Stalin may seize that continent, but his methods, if we are right in our judgment, won't enable him to make Europe a military threat to America. If we aren't right and communism will work while our system won't, we can't change that by war. We might as well go down to New York Harbor and welcome the commissars.

It may be suggested that this policy of letting Stalin do his worst, in the belief that he can't harm us, will be rough on the western Europeans whom he would surely try to subjugate. If so, it is up to them to get together and defend themselves. Individually they are weak. Collectively they are stronger than Russia.

There is only one certain thing about the Russian problem. That is that if we persuade the governments of western Europe that we are at their service on call, they will do nothing to help themselves, but will weaken us by incessant demands for more loans. If by refusing the Greek loan we tell them now that they are on their own, they may do something to save their skins. The formation of a European federation for mutual protection against Communist aggression would be wholesome, but no such arrangement is to be expected as long as the nations are satisfied that America's wealth and fighting power are to be had for the asking.

"Bring 'Mac' Back"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since introducing House Concurrent Resolution 38 on March 25, requesting the President in the name of the American people to invite General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur, United States commander in chief, Far East, to return to the United States for a period of at least 30 days, the chorus of voices chanting "Bring 'Mac' back" has reached mountainous proportions.

Newspapers, through their editorial columns, have widely acclaimed the idea, which includes the invitation to General MacArthur to address a joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives and to make Nation-wide radio addresses embodying his views on many vital issues of concern to the American people because of their effect on the national security of the United States.

I have received a letter from Louis E. Starr, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, endorsing the objectives of House Concurrent Resolution 38.

I am pleased to have Commander Starr's views, and for the information of my colleagues, his letter of April 2 reads as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1947.

The Honorable JAMES VAN ZANDT,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT: I have noted with interest and satisfaction the resolution which you introduced into the Congress to bring General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to the United States for a period of some 30 days.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is deeply concerned with a number of the problems which confront the American people. I am convinced that it would be most helpful if General MacArthur were to address the Congress and the American people. We need his views on national security, our position in the Orient, the unification of the services, universal military training, the handling of the atomic energy, and other subjects related to our national well-being.

You doubtless recall that Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, father of Douglas MacArthur, was one of the founders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Our organization which has now grown to a strength of between two and three million combat veterans, most of whom served overseas, would welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to this great American leader. I trust your resolution will bring about this most valuable visit.

Very sincerely yours,
LOUIS E. STARR,
Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a revised copy of the bills which I have previously introduced looking toward the enactment of an organic law for the government of the citizens of Guam.

In that connection, I submit herewith a copy of Joint Resolution 1, adopted January 4, 1947, by the Eighth Guam Congress. A careful reading of this resolution should remind all of us of our obligations to the people of Guam. Further than that, it will, I hope, prompt us to give early attention to the pending resolutions on Guam.

The Guamanian resolution follows:

Joint Resolution 1, Eighth Guam Congress

Whereas the United States of America acquired the Island of Guam as a result of the Spanish-American War under the terms of the treaty signed at Paris on December 10, 1898; and

Whereas article IX, paragraph 2, of the said treaty provides that the Congress of the United States of America shall determine the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories thereby ceded

by Spain to the United States of America; and

Whereas the United States of America has created a tradition for its respect and adherence to the sanctity of treaties, said tradition having been consistently maintained upon numerous occasions, including that of determination by the Congress of the United States of the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands, the other territories ceded with the Island of Guam by Spain to the United States of America under the terms of the said Treaty signed at Paris on December 10, 1898; and

Whereas the people of Guam have consistently proven their love for and loyalty to the United States of America during times of peace and throughout the horrors of a terrible war wherein faith in God and country upheld the said love for and loyalty to the United States by a helpless people; and

Whereas the people of Guam, owing permanent allegiance to the United States, have always aspired to be recognized as citizens of their own and beloved Nation, the United States of America, and having honorably served said Nation in war and peace; and

Whereas in the service to God and country, to which the people of Guam have uncomplainingly contributed their all, many families have been honored by having a member or members thereof becoming unsung hero or heroes, having made the supreme sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this joint resolution be adopted by the Eighth Guam Congress, in joint session, for presentation to the Congress of the United States of America for appropriate action in the determination of the civil rights and political status of the citizens of Guam to the effect that a law be passed by the said Congress of the United States granting full citizenship of the United States to the aforesaid citizens of Guam, together with the enactment of an organic law for the government thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That one copy of this joint resolution, signed by the Honorable B. J. Bordallo, Chairman of the House of Council, and the Honorable E. T. Calvo, Chairman of the House of Assembly, be forwarded by the way of the Honorable Governor of Guam and other official channels to the Eightieth Congress of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That one copy each of this joint resolution be furnished the Civil Administrator, Naval Government of Guam; the Honorable Governor of Guam; the Honorable Secretary of the Navy; the Honorable Secretary of State; the Honorable Secretary of War; the Honorable Secretary of Interior; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Honorable Speaker, United States House of Representatives; the Honorable President, United States Senate; the honorable chairman and members, Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, United States Senate; the honorable chairman and members, Insular Affairs Committee, United States House of Representatives; and any other person deemed to be friendly to Guam and people.

Done at Agana, Guam, this 4th day of January 1947.

Councilman J. Guerrero, Chairman; Councilman F. B. Leon Guerrero, Secretary; Councilman V. C. Reyes, Member; Councilman S. A. Sanchez, Member; Assemblyman F. T. Flores, Member; Assemblyman F. D. Perez, Member; Assemblyman F. Carbullido, Member; Assemblyman A. S. N. Duenas, Member.

Unanimously adopted by the Eighth Guam Congress in joint session January 4, 1947.

B. J. BORDALLO,
Chairman, House of Council.
E. T. CALVO,
Chairman, House of Assembly.

Margarine and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 15 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Margarine and the Farmer," written by Mrs. Corrie T. Plyler, of Columbia, S. C., and published in the South Carolina Farmer, the official organ of the South Carolina Farm Bureau.

Mrs. Plyler is secretary to the Honorable J. Roy Jones, commissioner of agriculture for the State of South Carolina. She has long been active in several womens' clubs and devotes a great amount of her time to public service. She has made an exhaustive study of the question of prohibitive taxes on the manufacture and sale of margarine as a substitute for butter.

There is at present pending before the House a bill which would eliminate the Federal taxes on oleomargarine. Furthermore, I propose to offer an amendment to the first revenue bill which comes before the Senate to effect the repeal of such taxes.

I commend this article by Mrs. Plyler to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARGARINE AND THE FARMER

(By Corrie T. Plyler, Columbia, S. C.)

The contribution which the oil farmer makes to the Nation's economy has become markedly manifest during the late war. All our vast resources of oil-bearing crops were insufficient to meet the demand at home and the desperate needs of nations abroad. When it is remembered that to these fats and oils were added the immense resources of the dairy industry, and still we were unable to satisfy the clamor for energy-giving fats, it does not require figures to show how tremendously important are both these groups of farmers to the well-being and security of the Nation.

To many farming districts of the North Central States dairying means a livelihood. To the farmlands of the Middle West soybean farming has rapidly become in the last 10 years a principal source of income. In the South it is cottonseed which represents a large part of the farmers' income. The cotton crop is no infant in American agriculture, but not so many years ago the cottonseed was piling up in towering heaps of waste or floating down our rivers to the sea. We have made remarkable strides in discovering the potentialities of this once despised portion of the cotton plant and putting it to use. No Southern farmer has to be told the many varied uses of cottonseed—in feed for cattle, in upholstery, absorbent cotton and gauze, in motion-picture film, paint, cellophane, and in food products.

Foods are produced mainly from the oil which is extracted from the seed. From 1932 to 1938 the amount of cottonseed oil used in shortening increased from 834,000,000 pounds to over 1,000,000,000 pounds but decreased in 1941 to about 889,000,000 pounds; then, under war allocations it decreased in 1945 to about 487,000,000 pounds. The amount of cottonseed oil used in margarine rose from just over 15,000,000 pounds in 1932 to nearly 254,000,000 pounds in 1945, representing 50.9 percent of all fats and oils used in margarine in that year. In addition, in 1945 there were used in margarine 10,214,911 pounds of peanut oil, also an important product of the South, to say nothing of 105,001,070 pounds of milk. From 1933 onward the amount of foreign oils used in margarine steadily declined until in 1943 no foreign oils were used, and since that date margarine has been wholly a domestic product.

Next to shortening, margarine provides by far the largest market outlet for cottonseed oil and could provide a much larger market were it not for the burdensome restrictions imposed on the distribution and sale of margarine. During periods when the buying power of the public is reduced—and it must be remembered that the present level of the national income is abnormally high—the consumption of fats will undoubtedly decrease to some extent; but if the sale of margarine were not curtailed by taxes, the consumption of fats as a group would not decline nearly as much. The advantage of retaining this large outlet in margarine for cottonseed oil at a time when there would be a strong tendency for oil prices to decline is self-evident.

There is no longer any doubt that margarine is a nutritious, wholesome, and pure food product. The prejudice of earlier years is crumbling like the walls of a building with no foundation; for the best scientific knowledge has shown that there is absolutely no basis in fact for such prejudice. We could quote from many authorities, but perhaps the best brief statement comes from the National Research Council, whose thoroughness and integrity cannot be suspected:

"The present available scientific evidence indicates that when fortified margarine is used in place of butter as a source of fat in a mixed diet, no nutritional differences can be observed."

It is part of the glory of this Nation that it has learned to make, entirely from the produce of American farms, and at low cost to the consumer, food products such as margarine which can augment our food supply, never yet entirely adequate. Many consumers have never been able to afford butter; margarine provides for them a low-cost, nutritious item for their diets. During the war—and it is conceivable that such a situation of shortages might occur again without the impetus of a war—we needed all the butter and margarine that we could get. The combined supply was not enough. During this period many new consumers of margarine came into being, and just as many wondered why they had questioned the value of the product these many years. A large proportion of these new consumers will continue to use margarine as a highly desirable food. If we put it on a price basis, we have never been without a fat shortage, since many who were not buying butter because of its high cost, were not able to buy margarine because of the tax restrictions.

Margarine is the only pure food which has been singled out by the United States Government and State governments for special taxes. South Carolina, or any of the Cotton South, does not tax margarine. But certain other States impose taxes from 5 to 15 cents a pound on the sale of margarine, as well as license fees for manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of the product, from $1 to $1,000 a year. The Federal margarine law imposes a tax of one-fourth cent a pound on the white product, 10 cents a pound on the yellow product, license fees of $600 a year for manufacturers, $480 a year for wholesale distributors of the yellow margarine, $200 a year for distributors of the white margarine, $48 a year for retailers of the yellow margarine,

and $6 a year for retailers of white margarine. In addition, there are many nuisance requirements, such as posting of signs in restaurants, special labeling, prohibition in State institutions, etc.

Most of these laws have been enacted for the avowed purpose of preventing fraud or of protecting the dairy industry. On both scores they are superfluous: the Federal food, drug, and cosmetic law, to say nothing of comparable laws in most of the States, strictly controls the ingredients and labeling of the product, while the Federal margarine regulations rigidly control its sale. As for protection of the dairy industry, it has been demonstrated time and again that any such benefit is fictitious; there is sufficient room for both butter and margarine in the American market basket.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the underlying reason for the continuance of such antiquated legislation is not to prevent fraud but to penalize one group of American producers for the supposed benefit of another group of American producers. The dairy farmer and the cotton-oil farmer can advantageously exist side by side, the product of each supplementing that of the other, just as do exist, for example, the coal producer and the fuel-oil producer, the metal industry and the plastics industry. The American Farm Bureau Federation stands for a fair balance between the great economic groups in our Nation—agriculture, labor, and industry. If agriculture desires equality of opportunity with other industries, it must not deny a fair balance to the various elements within agriculture itself. As Mr. W. R. Ogg, director of the Washington office of the federation, recently told the convention of the South Carolina Farm Bureau: "We cannot afford to let any group obtain a position of monopolistic advantage over other groups in our economy."

South Carolina farmers will never divorce their interest from that of the consumer; and in asking for fair play for their farm products which go into the manufacture of margarine, they are at the same time sustaining the freedom of choice, which belongs to the public, in selecting foods for their table.

Break With Communist Russia

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is useless to try to promote peace throughout the world with a soup-kitchen diplomacy.

President Truman has asked us for an appropriation of $400,000,000, to be followed up with American arms, to check the spread of communism through Greece and Turkey into the Near East.

I agree with the President as to the evils of communism. It is the most dangerous movement that has ever threatened the civilization of mankind.

Communist Russia has violated every promise made when we recognized her 15 years ago. The Russian Government is not a system of government, if you please. It is a system of slavery, crime, persecution, duplicity, and oppression. It is attempting to extend its vicious system all over the world, and especially throughout the United States.

Today millions of dollars are being spent for just such advertisements as you see in the Washington Post this morning, to undermine and destroy this Government. Today, while we have the atomic bomb, while America is standing out as the leading Nation of the earth, and the last hope of the Christian way of life, let us say to them that these international crimes must be stopped, this undermining of our civilization, these attempts to overthrow this government and destroy the American way of life must come to an end.

I believe it would be only a matter of time until the decent people of Russia would rise up and overthrow the regime under which they now suffer, and establish a government in which we could have confidence.

Today no sensible man would believe a word a Communist says, and anything they would sign would not be worth the paper it was written on. Shall we "piddle" along until they grow stronger and get our secrets of the atomic bomb and until we are so weakened that we will not have the power that we have today?

In the name of America, in the name of our Christian civilization, in the name of the western way of life, I say we should break relations with Communist Russia today.

When the Honorable William C. Bullitt, our former Ambassador to Russia, appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities a few days ago, he said that if Russia had the atomic bomb and we did not have it, she would have dropped it on us before now.

I quote from the record:

Mr. BONNER. What do you think Russia would do with the atomic bomb?

Mr. BULLITT. If she had it and we did not, it would already have been dropped on the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. If she had and we didn't?

Mr. BULLITT. If she had it and we didn't.

Mr. BONNER. Your testimony frightens me. I am glad to have heard you, and I think you have told the American people something—if the newspapers would carry it—that would open up their eyes and maybe make them realize what a dangerous threat we have now before us, notwithstanding all that certain papers say about this committee and those who are interested in the preservation of this country.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to know something about the way the people in Russia are treated, read the following questions and answers copied from these hearings. I cannot imagine anything more horrible than the facts developed by this testimony:

Mr. RANKIN. A statement was made before this committee that there was no more democracy in a Communist country than there was in the penitentiary of the State of New Jersey or Mississippi or Texas. Is that statement correct?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I wouldn't put it in that form. The fact is that there is no democracy of any kind without political democracy.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, the masses are the slaves of the state or the commissars?

Mr. BULLITT. That is correct. Completely the slaves of the state; and furthermore, the doctrine which is taught is the doctrine of the omnipotence of the state—that a man is good insofar as he serves the state; a man is bad insofar as he doesn't serve the state.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, were you in Moscow in the late thirties?

Mr. BULLITT. I was in Moscow, Ambassador in Moscow, from the autumn of 1933 until the autumn of 1936.

Mr. RANKIN. Did you see a large streamer across the gates of Moscow with this inscription on it: "Religion Is the Opiate of the People"?

Mr. BULLITT. That streamer I saw in Moscow in 1919, and in 1932, when I was there, but it is my impression that it had been removed in 1933. I am not certain of that, but that is my impression.

Mr. RANKIN. I give you my impression. My recollection is that former President Hoover went to Moscow in 1936; is that about right?

Mr. BULLITT. I don't know. He wasn't there when I was there.

Mr. RANKIN. He made a radio speech when he returned to America, and told about seeing that streamer.

Mr. BULLITT. That is a statement which you may find all through Moscow and Leningrad, and the country, "Religion Is the Opiate of the People."

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, communism is atheistic?

Mr. BULLITT. Completely.

Mr. RANKIN. Completely?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. They believe in outlawing all religion?

Mr. BULLITT. You have to qualify that now to this extent: they have an ideal, which is the state. It is a form of state worship. They did their utmost to destroy Christianity in Russia; they conducted campaign after campaign against Christianity in Russia. When the last war, the war of 1939, came on, they found that they needed the support of a lot of religious people. Therefore, they stopped the persecution of the church in violent form; they permitted more churches to open, and they took the other course, which was of getting the leaders of the Orthodox church under their thumb, so that today they control the Orthodox church as one of the apparatuses by which they control the peoples of the Soviet Union. But they do permit it to function.

Mr. RANKIN. Also they propose to take over all property, all land, all factories, all methods of production and distribution; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, when the revolution came there they took everything over.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, a man cannot own his home or land in Russia?

Mr. BULLITT. That is true, basically; but now they allow, for example, the peasants on the collective farm, they allow a peasant to get the product of an acre or a half acre that he has back of his place where he lives.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, they permit him to have what we call a garden in the South?

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. But the land that he tills, to make his living, is owned by the Russian Government?

Mr. BULLITT. Owned by the state.

Mr. RANKIN. And it is dominated by commissars?

Mr. BULLITT. Completely.

Mr. RANKIN. And instead of imposing the usual amount of rental, as we impose, a certain percentage of the crop, they demand that they deliver a certain amount of production, do they not?

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. In 1933, I think it was, they had a crop failure in the Ukraine. Do you remember that?

Mr. BULLITT. I do; very well.

Mr. RANKIN. And the people of the Ukraine are among the best people in Russia?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And they went down and took everything away from them and starved five or six million of the best people in Russia to death, in their own homes; that is correct, isn't it?

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Congressman, it was, in one way, even worse than that. They set the grain quotas higher than the total grain crop.

They then took the entire grain crop, but because there wasn't more, to come up to quota, the man was a criminal, and, therefore, he was treated as a criminal, in addition to being starved, and his wife and children as well.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BULLITT. They managed to dispose, by systematically organized starvation, they managed to dispose of some three to five million Ukrainians.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, the people in the Ukraine are the white people of Russia, the Nordics, are they not?

Mr. BULLITT. No; that you can't say. The Ukrainians are an extremely fine people. Russians are a very fine people. Both the Russians and the Ukrainians are extremely Nordic.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, what I mean by that is that these people were Nordic people; they were not orientals?

Mr. BULLITT. Certainly not.

Mr. RANKIN. The people in the Ukraine are among the best people in Europe.

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Yet they went in there and took everything they made and starved, you say, five or six million of them to death?

Mr. BULLIT Three to five million.

Mr. RANKIN. Men, women, and children starved to death, eating, in their frantic misery, the bodies of their own children, of their own families; that is correct, isn't it?

Mr. BULLITT. I am extremely sorry to say that I actually have two photographs of a father and mother and the skeleton of the child they had eaten, which were taken down there in the Ukraine.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is what I am trying to bring out.

Mr. BULLITT. I still have two photographs of that. There is nothing more horrible.

Mr. RANKIN. You spoke a while ago of there being 10,000,000 people in concentration camps.

Mr. BULLITT. I should say, at least.

Mr. RANKIN. You said that they were infinitely worse off than the slaves were in the Southern States.

Mr. BULLITT. What I said was this, sir: That there were more slaves today in the Soviet Union than there ever were at the height of slavery, not merely in the Southern States but in the world.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. Well, in the Southern States I don't think it ever got higher than 4,000,000, and never were the slaves in the Southern States treated as brutally as the people are now treated in those concentration camps in Russia.

Mr. BULLITT. I think——

Mr. RANKIN. According to the information we get.

Now, you spoke a while ago about outlawing the Communist Party. The bill before us simply proposes to prevent men from being elected to office on the Communist ticket, to put a stop to the sending of Communist literature through the mail, and to put a stop to certain professors teaching communism in the schools and colleges of this country. Is there anything wrong in preventing those encroachments?

Mr. BULLITT. Personally, I think the more people in the United States know about communism the better.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but——

On the question of slavery in Russia, I quote again from the hearings:

Mr. MCDOWELL. Mr. Ambassador, for the first time, I think, in the Nation's history, America is becoming, rapidly becoming, acutely conscious of the Communist situation here and around the world.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MCDOWELL. I feel that all of the eyes of America are on this hearing today. Most certainly those things that you have said today are going to have a profound effect upon the people of America. I have attended many Communist meetings—not as a member. One of the frequent occurrences at the meetings was a comparison between living here in America and in Russia. The comparison, of course, was bad, so far as America was concerned. Would you care to make any observations on the things that occur in Russia?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, of course, statements of that kind are so fantastically distorted that it is very difficult to answer them.

In the first place, life in Russia is lived under the constant fear of the knock of the secret police on the door in the middle of the night. No man when he goes to bed, and no woman, knows that in the middle of the night the secret police aren't going to arrive—and then comes disappearance. Then comes either death in a cellar with a shot in the neck or deportation to one of the forced labor camps. We do not know exactly how many men and women are in those forced labor camps today, but there is extremely reliable testimony that there are more than 10,000,000 human slaves today in those forced labor camps working under the NKVD in the Soviet Union at this time.

It is worse than at the worst moment of Negro slavery. There were never so many slaves as there are today in the Soviet Union actually working in slavery.

As a further evidence of the slavery and cruelty to which the Russian people are subjected, I am inserting at this point an article entitled "The Truth About Soviet Russia's 14,000,000 Slaves," by Max Eastman, which was published in the April issue of the Reader's Digest.

It reads as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT SOVIET RUSSIA'S 14,000,000 SLAVES

One of the most stupendous and shocking events of modern times is the revival of human slavery in Soviet Russia. Hitler attempted this on the ancient Roman plan, enslaving aliens or supposedly inferior races. Stalin, however, who does not believe in racial inequality, has enslaved his own fellow citizens, as well as people from other nations, on a scale not seen before in all history.

There are today at least 14,000,000[1] slaves in the forced-labor empire of the Soviet Union. They live in corrals surrounded by stockades topped with barbed wire, watched day and night by riflemen in turrets with powerful searchlights and packs of dogs to pursue runaways. They do the heaviest, roughest, most grueling labor: mining; lumbering; forest clearing; constructing roads, railroads, canals, airdromes, and factories.

Their labor power is cheap, constant, controllable, "indifferent" to climate. They can be transported in freight cars in unresisting droves like cattle, and can be used up without worry over capital invested. For these Soviet slaves cost nothing to their owner, the MVD[2], whose agents simply pick them up on the street or drag them out of their beds at night. The labor of the 14,000,000 slaves is an essential factor in the economy of the "first socialist state." When the number runs low the MVD has been known to issue to each of its local branches a quota of so-called new offenders to be arrested.

This slave system makes a mock of the pretense that totalitarian ownership has solved unemployment. There are more permanently enslaved workers in the Soviet Union than there were temporarily unemployed workers in the United States in the most desperate year of the depression. In some of the camps the slaves live in conditions worse than those endured by men of the Stone Age. Here, for example, is part of the testimony of one Polish prisoner, who had formerly been a judge:

"Half-naked, barefooted, half-alive, we arrived in the icy and deserted tundra where there was but a stick with a board nailed to it bearing the words: 'Camp Point No. 228.' We ate rye flour mixed with water, uncooked. At night we slept in dugouts, lying close to each other for warmth, on wet branches spread on the mud.

"At 4 a. m. the timekeeper would strike a steel saw with an ax, sounding reveille. No one had to dress, for no one had undressed. Just get up and eat the second part of the flour received the night before. At 5 o'clock came the second signal: 'Get out to work.' Slowly one after another, the terribly dirty creatures in tatters crawled out of their mudholes, shivering with cold to begin the day's labors. The stench was unbearable.

"Sometimes a man stayed where he was, claiming he was sick. If the doctor's assistant, after feeling the man's pulse, decided that the prisoner was lying, the unfortunate was beaten and kicked out.

"Many died each night in the camp, and orderlies would tear the clothes off the bodies and then drag them to the 'morgue,' a primitive barn made of sticks and branches where piles of corpses lay."

From another slave's testimony: "We lived in tents without floors. When we returned from work at night, chilled and soaked to the bone, we sank up to our knees in mud inside the tents. We lay in all our clothing, in a sort of feverish sleep, and succeeded by morning in drying out a portion of it before the guards with their dogs came to drive us out to another day's work. When one of us died in the night, we concealed the body beneath the bunks as long as we could endure the stench, so as to receive the dead man's ration of bread."

These examples are from the "death camps" of Russia's Far East and North. Many similar descriptions of existence in them could be cited from the mass of evidence available. A report on life in an average camp, by a distinguished Polish woman now in the United States, is corroborated in detail by written testimony from hundreds of other former inmates.

The slaves sleep in long wooden barracks on rows of shelves as wide as a man is long. The prisoners go in head first and lie side by side on the bare boards, close-packed, with their feet toward the aisle. They have no mattresses, bedclothes, or blankets. They sleep in the same rags they work in. The slaves are infested with lice and bedbugs, and run over by rats. They have no water to wash in, and are permitted but one bath a month out of a single pail of hot water. There is one stove in each barrack, which warms those in a radius of 5 or 6 yards; the rest must depend upon animal heat.

At 4:40 a. m. the slaves are roused by armed guards. If they loiter they are dragged off the shelves with blows. They take a small wooden bowl and spoon (which are never washed) to a cauldron and receive a ladleful of weak soup[3] and a chunk of black bread. After that breakfast they are lined up,

[1] Kiril M. Alexeiev agrees with this figure. Victor Kravchenko, author of I Chose Freedom, stated that when he was a Moscow official the estimate was 20,000,000. Colonel Cazalet, a British Member of Parliament who accompanied Polish Premier Sikorski on a trip through the camps, reported that a Russian general said to him: "I don't know why you complain so bitterly about the Poles. There are 20,000,000 of our own people living under the same conditions."

[2] MVD, meaning "Ministry of Interior Affairs," is the new name for the State Police (formerly the NKVD and before that the GPU).

[3] For 1 month the soup is made of fish, with the heads and eyes floating in it. Another month it is of oats, unhusked as the horse eats them. Another month, of the dregs of soybeans after the oil has been removed. Another month it is cabbage and water.

counted, and marched to labor in groups of about 25, marshaled by guards with rifles. Every morning before they start marching to work a guard announces: "I warn you, one step to the left or the right, and I will shoot without further warning." The guards do shoot, and the slave who strays or stumbles is left dead beside the road.

The prisoners work 10 to 12 consecutive hours, receiving at noon two heaping tablespoonfuls of kasha (mush). At night they are lined up and counted again, the guard makes the same announcement, and they march back. Their evening meal is another ladle of soup and two more tablespoonfuls of mush. They then crawl onto their shelves for the night.

This is their life, provided they have fulfilled what is set as the norm of productive labor. If they fail to fulfill the norm, their infinitesimal rations are reduced still further. Those who refuse to work—and fulfilling less than 30 percent of the norm is counted as a refusal—are locked in the isolator—a guardhouse with solitary confinement cells. For repeated refusals the usual penalty is death.

"Nevertheless," says another report, "there are many refusers, especially in winter. The usual type is a totally exhausted man who has become indifferent to everything. He has but one wish—to lie quietly on his bunk so as to feel as little as possible the gradual ebbing of energy and life. In camp jargon this is called dying away."

Each group of camps has a hospital—a building exactly like the others and with the same hard shelves to lie on. But there is a little extra food, each patient has a blanket, and some hospitals are transformed into a kind of paradise by the presence of a devoted doctor, who is usually also a slave. He is limited by lack of supplies and by rules designed to kill rather than cure his patients. For example, a "quota of sickness" will be established, and those who fall sick in excess of the quota must be turned away.

The most heart-rending thing in the Nazis' slave trade was the breaking up of families. In thousands of cases, however, the Germans did keep prisoners in family groups. But in Russia it is a general rule, even in mass deportation, that husbands and wives shall be torn apart and scattered beyond the possibility of communicating with each other. The same rule is often applied to parents and children.

The degree of cruelty fluctuates at different times and places, but similar regulations prevail everywhere in the camps. For the principal purpose of the whole institution is to punish and exterminate, with incidental profit, the enemies of the dictatorship. There is a constant dread of kindly feelings creeping in, and every guard knows that if he does not live up to the Soviet standard of cruelty he is in danger of being condemned to slavery himself.

On what basis are Soviet citizens chosen for this doom of slavery? They are people who obstruct, oppose, criticize, or are suspected of secretly disliking the totalitarian Communist regime.

The most privileged among them, strangely enough, are those who obstruct through moral delinquency—criminals such as thieves, burglars, murderers. The least privileged are those who simply oppose the regime because of moral, religious, or political conviction; these are called "enemies of the people." Actual criminals constitute only about 15 percent of the inmates. The rest may be divided into seven groups:

1. Bytoviks. This is a new Soviet word for the crime of "degeneration" from the Socialist "way of life." It includes what we call "malfeasance in office." Since, under state ownership, even the man who sells lemonade at a soft-drink stand is in office, there is an inexhaustible source of recruits for the slave camps. For instance:

A woman cook on a collective farm forgot to salt the dinner. She was prosecuted for "failure to perform official duties."

A man sent to town by a collective farm to sell rye sold it at 23 rubles instead of 26 or 27. He was arrested for poor salesmanship.

2. Kulaks. These are the enterprising and successful farmers—peasants who had honestly acquired a little more land and cattle than their neighbors, and believed in their right to keep them. This is the largest group of slaves—and, because of their husky frames and habits of hard labor, the most valuable. They were deported by millions (whole villages were deported) when the peasants were driven into the collective farms in the early thirties. As the kulaks die off their ranks are filled by those members of collective farms who, in spite of police and propaganda, go right on hankering for farms of their own.

3. Industrial workers condemned for lack of discipline or obstructing discipline—a heavy crime in the Soviet code, which includes repeated absenteeism or tardiness; or, worst of all, protesting against hours, wages, or conditions of labor.

4. Workers and Communists from foreign countries, lured to Russia by the promise of a millennium. Having come as pilgrims to the fatherland of international socialism, many remain as convicts in a country which regards all foreigners with suspicion. Also, Russians who have been abroad and are considered contaminated by the bourgeois culture of the western world and those who maintain relations with foreign visitors.

For example, a girl named Aniechka attended a ball where she won the prize offered for the best waltz. The wife of the Italian consul was present, congratulated the winner, and talked pleasantly with her for 2 or 3 minutes. The next day the girl was arrested and sent to forced labor.

5. Recalcitrant priests, people sentenced to hard labor for their religious beliefs, and intellectuals condemned for their opinions.

6. Several million citizens of Poland, Bulgaria, and other satellite states. These have formed a new category of slaves since the war ended. They are selected and treated the same as the Russian slaves.

7. Repatriated Russian prisoners of war. It is a rule in the Soviet army that no individual soldier shall surrender; he must die fighting. Therefore, all liberated Soviet army soldiers are brought before a commission which decides whether they are innocent. Hordes of them have been shipped into the slave camps; many have wounds testifying how well they fought for their country. It is this doom of slavery hanging over them that has caused thousands of Russian soldiers to resist with violence the proposal to send them home to their native land.

Legally, any commitment to the camps is for a limited period of time, but the MVD knows no law. Its sentences can be extended, just as they can be imposed by administrative order, and they usually are. It is estimated that only 5 percent of those who have been condemned to the camps are ever released.

Why this monstrous practice has been almost unnoticed in the world press is a mystery. In 1930 the Treasury Department of the United States put an embargo on Soviet pulpwood and matches as products of forced labor. But Molotov—who had just been appointed Premier—quieted the rumors with a prodigious lie:

"Many an unemployed worker of the capitalist countries will envy the living and working conditions of the prisoners in our northern regions." The embargo was lifted by the State Department. Any rumors escaping since then have been scotched by fellow travelers, who still maintain that the camps are little more than pleasant summer homes for Boy Scouts.

Henry Wallace, on his visit to Russia and Siberia in 1944, apparently failed to see a single one of what Wendell Willkie called the usual concentration camps. Wallace had his picture taken in happy company with Ivan Nikishov, the brutal head of Dalstroi, the hugest and most dreaded group of death camps in Siberia. Here, in a territory several times the size of France wholly ruled by the MVD, slaves are dying by the thousand in the frenzied effort of the Soviet Union to surpass other nations in the production of gold. In the title of his picture Wallace calls this captain of human extermination a big industrial boss.

Such ineptitudes would be impossible were it not for the deceptive way in which slavery got started in the Soviet Union. It crept in under the glamour of a utopian ideal. Criminals, Lenin taught, are not enemies but victims of society—of capitalist society. Under socialism, he proclaimed, they need only be reeducated through labor, and crime would disappear from the world.

A genuinely humanitarian penal reform was initiated in Russia, and traces of it endured until 1928 when the gigantic effort of the 5-year plan extinguished all ideals except that of getting work done. The benign notion of reeducating convicts then disappeared in the frantic search for brute labor power. All that remains today of Lenin's ideal is the privileged position of actual criminals in the slave camps.

The MVD and the Ministry of Justice have insisted again and again that class enemies be treated more severely than nonpolitical criminals. Semion Firin, a high MVD official, announced, "We say to you common criminals: we do not consider you as enemies because in your midst there are no sons of landowners and manufacturers."

There are thousands of children in these camps, for the decree of 1935 extending the full penalties of the criminal law to minors above the age of 12 has never been revoked. Babies are born, too, in this empire of starvation. Sexual intercourse is forbidden to the slaves, but many women resort to it coldbloodedly in the hope that pregnancy will get them a breathing spell and an extra ration. In the seventh or eighth month they are removed to a special maternity camp, where for a year they have lighter labor. At the end of the year the baby is removed to be brought up (the mother never knows where) by the state.

In adopting the institution of slavery, Soviet leaders had to solve a difficult economic problem. In 1932–33 the average wage of hired labor in the Soviet Union was 1,496 rubbles a year, and the cost of upkeep per prisoner in the slave camps was estimated at 500 rubles. This seems a big saving, but is not enough, under normal conditions, to compensate for the well-known inefficiency of slave labor.

Soviet Marxists, well aware of this difficulty, have solved it under socialism in a way that capitalist society could not even attempt. They compel interest in the work by keeping the mass of the slaves hungry and by rationing food to them in proportion to the work they do. Those who cannot or will not work enough to cover their subsistence—the weak, the sick, the refusers—are fed so little that they die before their subsistence cost has become a serious item.

Another eyewitness report says: "Nobody who has not studied the records of life in these hells can come within miles of understanding to what abysses of moral stupor and animal need a human being is reduced by all this. Everything which is capable of sustaining individual and human dignity is remorselessly ground out of existence. All privacy, decency, and gentleness are liquidated. The animalizing effect of prolonged hunger and the accompanying stupefying of mental and moral powers is always at work. The human being within the carcass dies progressively; and a suffering, stupefied animal takes its place."

It is to hide these facts that the iron curtain was pulled down. It will stay down so long as there are eyes of freemen left to see

what monstrous thing has befallen mankind in the name of socialism.

Mr. Speaker, how any man can read this testimony and then refer to Russia, or any other communistic country, as a democracy is more than I can understand.

If President Truman will break relations with Soviet Russia and refuse to recognize that horrible regime until freedom and liberty and justice have been restored throughout the now communistic-dominated areas of this world, the people will rally to his support, and America will take her place as the great leader in the onward march of our Christian civilization.

This is the time to act. The hour for decision has arrived.

Justice for the Italians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the April 1947 issue of the magazine Trade With Italy:

JUSTICE FOR THE ITALIANS

(By Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York)

Speaking at a dinner in his honor in New York last January 13, His Excellency Alcide de Gasperi, Prime Minister of Italy, concluded his remarks as follows: "I * * * tell you that Italy has the utmost faith in your collaboration, in your understanding of Italy. Italy's interests are similar to the interests of the American world. I ask you to have faith in us. Do not think that our country will lose its bearings, even though hesitations and oscillations prevail at present. Our country is aware of the grave situation it faces, but it also feels the responsibility of saving its people, and also of saving democracy in Italy, which is more than national responsibility. It is the responsibility of a country which feels it is a part of humanity and knows that tomorrow no innovation will take place in the world without the collaboration of a people like the Italian, and knows it will be capable of contributing to this new world order with all its strength and with all the tradition of its radiant civilization." This is a very eloquent statement and one which undoubtedly touched the hearts of many Americans.

However, in Paris, on February 10, 1947, the Italian Government reluctantly signed a peace treaty with the Allies whereby she lost Trieste and the area around it; ceded part of Venezia Giulia to Yugoslavia; transferred land in the Tenda Briga regions to France; agreed to return the Dodecanese Islands to Greece; yielded control of her African possessions, including all her special rights in Ethiopia; submitted to cutting her navy to the bone; will reduce her army to 135,000 and limit the police to 65,000; practically abolished her air forces; agreed to remove or destroy her frontier fortifications; agreed to pay $100,000,000 indemnity to Russia. Furthermore, Italy had to accept economic and financial terms which took into account her late entry into the war on the Allied side and which were written by and for major victorious powers.

To say that these provisions are, in many ways, Draconian, may be considered to be an understatement by the Italians. To the Italians, it seems that very little has been left to them.

Sad to relate, treaties are the inevitable aftermath of every conflict and history is replete with evidence that they do more to keep open the old wounds and prevent the healing of new sores than any other procedure that man has so far devised. The victors, abandoning the dictates of logic and justice, impose their will on the vanquished. In the superheated atmosphere which such conferences usually generate, many important factors are overlooked or laid aside. Neither Italy's problems nor the problems facing the world have been solved by the Italian peace treaty—on the contrary, they are aggravated.

We constantly refer to the fact that two world wars were fought within the life span of one generation and unhesitatingly recognize that such strife has caused deep disturbances which have induced profound and fundamental changes in the economic, social, cultural, and psychological relationships of nation with nation, man with man. Through treaties of peace, we solemnly reassure each other that we will create a salubrious climate, as it were, wherein peace and prosperity for all may flourish and endure. Yet in this particular instance, we Americans failed in our responsibility toward Italy. We failed to recall that the cordial friendship existing between Americans and Italians has had a long and solid history. Until the arrival of the Fascist regime under Mussolini, Italy and America enjoyed the fullest exchange of cultural and commercial relations in amity and accord. We failed to remember the constant stream of immigrants from Italy to our shores, enriching our endurance and vitality, becoming loyal and devoted citizens, respecting our traditions and institutions. Italians in Italy and in America shared our dream and completely subscribed to the American principles of freedom and democracy. Italians in Italy proved their devotion to these ideals when, upon the express invitation of the United States, they overthrew Mussolini and his cohorts who had, against the deep-seated, well-known sentiments of the Italian people, entered into a despised alliance with Hitler and his hangmen. In 1943 Italy declared war on Germany and set up a democratic form of government. That important fact is much too easily forgotten.

She threw herself into the military struggle on behalf of the Allies with commendable zeal. Italian regular troops in the liberated areas and the patriots in the German occupied territory wrote page after page of military heroism. Thousands of Italian workers assisted our armed forces in the distribution and transportation of supplies. The army of Partisans daily risked their lives, proving itself one of the most effective resistance movements in Europe. They saved countless American lives. They were the torch bearers of Italian freedom. Resistance in Italy during the German occupation was practiced by all classes of the population, peasants, farmers, industrial workers, intellectuals, and priests. There were industrialists in the north who paid their workers to go on anti-Fascist strikes or commit acts of sabotage, and two great commercial banks financed the resistance. When the underground movements emerged after liberation, the emphasis shifted from resistance to administration, from disciplined unity among men of good will to partisanship and politics. The anti-Fascist leaders in whom formerly quickness of decision and fearlessness were the chief requisites now had to prove that they could bring food to starving people and do thousands of other tasks for which there was little material available.

Millions of loyal Americans of Italian lineage made every sacrifice on our home front, contributed hundreds of thousands of men and women to the armed forces of the United States, fought and died on the battlefields of the world for the American ideals of freedom, tolerance, and equality.

But, above and beyond her participation in the military effort, Italy's claim to equitable treatment is based on humanitarian grounds. Friends of Italian democracy everywhere realize that the Italian people were duped and inveigled into participation in one of the great crimes of history. Released from the thrall of Fascist propaganda, Italians view the invasions of Ethiopia, Albania, and France in a true, clear light and bewail the black marks on their proud escutcheon. But Italy has paid dearly for such violence in the desolation and death which was subsequently visited upon her and has proved to the world that she is fully contrite and anxious and willing to redeem herself.

The treaty foisted upon Italy is not, in all respects, what former Secretary of State Byrnes would have liked to bring back. Indeed, it is not the treaty that the Americans, the British, and the French would have made with Italy. It is a treaty forced upon all by Russia. Yugoslavia had no moral claim to Trieste, yet Russia fought like a demon to get Trieste for the Yugoslavs. It was only due to the insistence of the other three powers that a compromise was effected and Trieste was internationalized. Russia was so adamant that, were not this compromise agreed upon, there would have been no treaty. It was a case of bending—rather than breaking. Furthermore, the Americans felt that if a treaty could be made with Italy, the way would be cleared for similar treaties with other Balkan countries and finally a treaty with Austria. The result would be that Russia would withdraw from southeastern Europe. We now know how vain were those hopes. Russia remains in southeastern Europe and seeks to extend her sphere of influence by political infiltration and otherwise through Greece and Turkey and even beyond. President Truman, in his speech to the assembled Members of both Houses of Congress on March 12, 1947, rightfully promulgated a new Monroe Doctrine for the Mediterranean Basin. He said, in effect, to Russia, "Thus far shall you go—and no further." His pronouncements received the plaudits not only of our Nation but of the nations of the Western World.

One can say, without fear of contradiction, that the Italian peace treaty does not conform to the Atlantic Charter, disregards Italy's status as a cobelligerent, and neglects the promises repeatedly made by the Allies before the Italian surrender. The Italians are of the opinion that practically all their requests of an economic nature have been rejected. It is emphasized that the peace treaty imposes upon Italy a financial burden of more than $13,000,000,000, not including reparations payable to any country except Russia or the value of the territories to be ceded.

The Italians have been deeply resentful of the fact that demand is made of them that they give up all but a small number of war vessels to their former allies, considering that such a proviso treats their navy as war booty.

Let us not forget that nations of the Western World ardently desire to keep Italy democratic. One of the most effective ways to assist the spread of communism is to keep a people hungry. Empty stomachs make desperate minds. We must supply Italy with at least her minimum needs of grain and cereals. If Italy's national economy is not made more self-sustaining, she will undoubtedly turn more and more to the left. While Italy has not been recognized as a full-fledged cobelligerent as was Greece, nevertheless the reasons for our aid to Greece and Turkey run parallel with the need to aid Italy.

Every effort must be made to revive and stimulate trade between the United States

and Italy. We need each other. The Fascist regime did everything in its power to destroy this commercial relationship. Plans are afoot to eliminate discriminatory trade barriers and the coming conference at Geneva will set-up the International Trade Organization, the results of which should be of great benefit to Italy as well as the United States. Italy has much to sell us and we have much to sell in return. She can buy our capital and consumer goods with the dollars she secures through the sale of her olive oils and wines. No stone should be left unturned to build a great bridge of trade between our two countries. We might well set-up a trade commission to which both countries might send delegates, initiating steps to develop trade. In this connection, Italy should be permitted, even at the expense of amending the treaty, to rebuild her merchant marine.

But, above all, every effort should be made to admit Italy as a member of the United Nations. Such world-wide recognition of her national sovereignty would certainly bolster the morale of her people and the prestige and distinction thus bestowed would do much to assist her people in their progress toward a glorious future.

Radio Address, Station WMEX, Boston, Mass., Thursday, April 3, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered on Station WMEX, Boston, Mass., Thursday, April 3, 1947:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, your business, and that of every adult living between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in that great country stretching from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, is the Government of the United States.

All of us are partners in that enterprise, sharing its gains and its obligations.

Today, many of our people are thinking only of what they can get from the Government, forgetful of what they must give to it in terms of alert and intelligent citizenship.

This Government of ours is what we make it. It is idle to complain about its doings, unless we carry over our criticism into positive action. Public opinion is the dynamic spirit of a democracy. It must be ever vigilant in the expression of its will, so that we may have better laws for a better country.

The United States is the only free country on earth.

You and I are concerned about the spread of communism throughout the world, and the challenge it hurls at our way of life. That is the danger from without, and I do not propose to minimize it. But tonight I want to speak to you about the danger from within.

Slowly but surely it is extending its influence over every phase of your life, during your hours of work and your hours of relaxation.

Ever since the days of Abraham Lincoln our leaders have warned us of this encroaching evil, but even at this late day the people are not aroused to their peril. It is stealing upon us so softly that we are not aware of its coming. It does not employ the naked force of firing squads or concentration camps or any of the outward measures of tyranny. Nevertheless, day by day, we are becoming more helpless before its increasing power.

Why do so many Americans feel a vague uneasiness about the future? We have emerged victorious from a war which threatened our national security. More people have jobs today than ever before. The standard of living is certain to improve, as measured by the comforts of life and the extension of educational and cultural opportunities to more and more of our people. With the tremendous backlog of needs which must be met industry and labor should be looking forward to new production records. And there is more money in circulation with which to buy the things which are produced. In the light of these facts we should be confident, but we are not.

What is it, then, that we fear?

I say that it is the growing concentration of economic power in the hands of a few. Before this trend the average man feels dependent, and helpless, and unhappy. For a new form of tyranny is bearing down upon him.

All of our tragic experience of the last 20 years may be traced to the growth of arbitrary power. In facing this fact let us realize that totalitarianism comes in many forms and disguises. Oftentimes one monopoly has been fighting another monopoly, and we have been led to believe that one is virtuous and the other is vicious. We have been blind to the danger that, in this contest of the giants, if only one monopoly comes out on top, then all will be enslaved.

Fascism came first. Next there was nazism. And now communism. The threat of two of them has been eliminated. The last one poses a threat and the answer to that is still locked in the not-too-distant future.

In these terms, we have seen the danger of uncontrolled bigness. Meanwhile, the growth of the irresponsible power has been going on here at home. The temporary collapse of monopoly, in 1929, largely as a result of its own excesses, brought suffering to tens of millions of Americans. It was then that we began to realize that our ability to work and our willingness to work were not enough. The opportunity to work had passed out of our hands and into the control of a small number of men. Economically, we were at their mercy. They milked the Nation and then told us to go hang. The depression which followed should have taught us that we must be unremitting in our efforts to see that this does not happen again. For the war just ended was caused in part by the sins of monopoly in America.

This must not happen again. Neither we nor the world can pay again for such folly.

In an effort to combat this, we have seen two other forms of monopoly develop in America, one in Government and the other in labor.

We in New England have been fortunate in escaping industrial strife. Our labor leaders have been responsible men who have not given in to the lust for power. They have truly recognized that through organization they can win bargaining rights for the workers they represent.

This has not been so in other sections of the Nation. Not long ago, we witnessed the sorry spectacle of one labor leader who tried to browbeat the Government and put himself above the sovereign interests of the people. For some time the issue remained in doubt, and while it did we suffered from an artificial shortage of fuel and light and the electric power that we must have to meet the everyday needs of life.

The menace of monopoly has also reared its head in Government. The vast growth of bureaucratic agencies, with department heads issuing directives which have the force of law, though not passed upon and established as law by the representatives of the people, is an extension of personal power which must be curbed.

But while we take necessary steps to regulate these two monopolies, we must not overlook the essential fact that the dominant force in America today is ownership and control over the means of production. Big business is absorbing little business and is building up private economic states with far more power over your lives than you realize.

Sometimes, a leader of big business squarely faces the issue. In 1925 the board chairman of one of our largest motorcar manufacturers said, and I quote: "Sometimes I am almost forced to the conclusion that our company is so large, its inertia so great, that it is impossible for us to be real leaders."

At that time, the assets of this company amounted to a mere $700,000,000. At the end of 1943, they had climbed to over $2,000,000,000.

In 1941, this corporation's car and truck sales amounted to 45 percent of the total United States motor-vehicle industry. More than 300,000 people were directly attached to the pay roll. These, in turn, influenced the jobs of millions of others. When you add this company's army of stockholders and those dependent upon this organization for purchases and products, you realize that it is an economic state bigger than most political States of the Union.

This is but one example of the trend toward concentrated power. There are many others. The danger to you is in the fact that with size, come controls, the political and social controls that strangle liberty.

Out of $175,000,000,000 worth of contract awards made by the Government between June 1940 and September 1944, $107,000,000,000, or 67 percent, went to only 100 of the more than 18,000 corporations receiving such awards.

In 1941 the Temporary National Economic Committee warned us that, and I quote: "It is quite conceivable that the democracies might obtain a military victory over the aggressors only to find themselves under the domination of economic authority far more concentrated and influential than that which existed prior to the war."

Since 1940, 1,800 independent manufacturing and mining concerns have been swallowed up by big business. One of the reasons why we have big Government and big Labor, is the effort being made to regulate this colossus for the public good.

Even now, I regret to say, there are a few industrialists who are itching to get their fingers on the control of atomic energy, for that would give them the last and supreme monopoly.

Back in 1917, President Wilson believed that criminal laws had to be enacted to prevent the existence of trusts and monopolies. "What we must really fear," he said, "is the combination of combinations which are becoming so powerful as to be entirely out of the bounds of human conception * * * and entirely beyond the power of democratic controls."

It was at Grand Coulee Dam on October 2, 1937, that President Roosevelt hit the nail on the head when he said, and I quote: "In place of the independent businessman, we have the managing clerk of the chain store who cannot even make a credit sale, and a superintendent has taken the place of the factory owner. Big business has found it to its advantage to rotate even these men, so that no one of them is left in the community long enough to get his roots established or to really become a part of the life about him. Thus, big business has devoured its own young, destroyed its own defense. The small businessman has been crushed, merged, consolidated, or otherwise retired. Local independence and responsibility has been sacrificed to balance sheet values."

In this year of 1947, President Truman in his message to Congress pointed out that fewer men now control more economic power, so that whole industries are dominated by one or a few large organizations which can restrict production and thus reduce employment and purchasing power.

Faced with these facts and solemn warnings, what are we, the public, going to do in order to protect ourselves from the dangers of this super-government?

Far back in 1914, the Congress passed the Clayton Act, designed to curb monopolies. This could be done, it was thought, by prohibiting one corporation from purchasing the capital stock of another. Since then, however, corporations have by-passed the plain intent of the act by purchasing the physical assets of their competitors, instead of the capital stock.

This loophole must be plugged to hold monopolies in check.

Hearings are now being held by the House Judiciary Committee on H. R. 515, sponsored by Congressman KEFAUVER, of Tennessee. The purpose of this bill is to stop the alarming increase in mergers and acquisitions.

The forces of monopoly are out to kill this proposed legislation, but you, the public, are yet to be heard from, demanding that it be made law.

The rapid growth of private supergovernment in industry must be halted before it leads, as it surely will, to political supergovernment and all the evils of tyranny.

The civil liberties which we now enjoy, will disappear if free enterprise is smothered. And by free enterprise I do not mean the special privilege of corporate giants to seize complete control of our economy. Instead, I give it the American interpretation, which means the chance for you, the average citizen, to start up in business on your own, or to have the opportunity of a job.

Monopoly or freedom—which is going to prevail?

The issue depends on you.

Rev. Geoffrey C. Stone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me by the House today to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is my privilege to include the following address made by Rev. Geoffrey C. Stone, C. SS. R., of Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church, Brooklyn, who served with great distinction overseas during the late war as a chaplain in the United States Army, at the annual communion breakfast of the Shipbuilding Branch of the Supreme Anchor Club, held at the Columbus Club, Brooklyn, on Sunday morning, April 13, 1947:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the Shipbuilding Anchor Club, when my good friend, Joe Martino, chairman of the speakers' committee, asked me to address you on the occasion of your annual communion breakfast, I accepted gladly, for I have always found it a pleasure to talk to a group of Catholic men. My words this morning will lay stress upon both your manliness and your Catholicism.

As Catholic men, there are three things that are of the utmost importance to you in this life—your home, your country, and your religion. This trinity of interests fundamentally underlies every other thought or concern, even though, as fundamentals, they may seem pushed into the background of daily affairs.

Home: Most of you are family men. The rest hope sooner or later to become such. Your status is that of a very important vocation in life—to some quite evident, to others dimly recognized, by still others altogether too often neglected or completely ignored. Your daily labor is both arduous and hazardous, but it's man's work, and there is something not only exhilarating but elevating in a tough task attempted and a successful job achieved. There's nothing ignoble about hard work. It takes plenty of stamina, endurance, perseverance, vigor, energy, with a combination of brain and brawn, to put through the job. Pride in achievement is some reward, but not sufficient to override the natural desire for comfort and ease. One must eat; one must clothe oneself; one must have a place to rest one's weary bones. Man likewise has the innate urge to reproduce his kind, to take pride in the "chip off the old block"—or the many chips—to provide some few tokens of love for the life's companion who is his helpmate in the glorious task of rearing children as children of God and heirs to the Kingdom of Heaven. That's what keeps most of you going day after day, year after year—the necessity of providing to the best of your ability for the loved ones at home. Without that incentive, you would soon falter, grow discouraged, and quit. Those of you who are activated by love of wife and kids, and are concerned with the nobleness of your vocation under God, are vitally interested in the present well-being, and the future development of those choice souls which God has entrusted to your care. Anything that will benefit them now, and afterward in adult age, is a matter of importance; anything that is of detriment to them now, or which may harm them in future, is to be combated with all the ardor and earnestness that love for kids and hope for their happiness can demand. Many a man dies happily, despite a life of constant toil, in the assurance that he has fulfilled the obligations of his vocation in leaving children well reared, decent living, God-loving, and a joy in his old age. He has a right to expect the reward of an eternal happiness.

Now, at the present time particularly and fanatically, there is a powerful surge of blatant materialism, which seeks to break asunder the bonds of love and religion cementing family life. A philosophy of life, at great variance to the stated views of the God who created us, would stage man in the role of barnyard rooster, with his prolific progeny gobbled up by an omnipotent state, for indoctrination in diabolical dogma and devilish theories, and eventual freedom—good God—as slave laborers in concentration camps. The pattern set by the Mother of God as the virtuous model of Christian womanhood, the imitation of which has ennobled a man's wife and a child's mother to a status worthy of veneration and greatest respect—that pattern would give way to the very dubious dignity of a highly productive hen or a prize sow. Love, pure, decent, honorable love, descends to the slimy depths of an abominable, dishonorable lust. Home, family life, give way to the stalls of a brooding farm.

Men, your kids face just such intolerable degradation, unless you do something about it. Your own flesh and blood, the little boys and girls who were this very morning nourished by the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ; that cute little trick who causes you to swell with pride as he serves at the altar of God; that sweet little image of her mother who kissed you good-by before you came here this morning; that tiny tyke in the crib who squeezes your heart with its tiny hands; those precious charges are destined for abject misery and perversion if you ignore the inroads of materialism which would supplant the religion which makes them so dear to you and has made you devote your life's energy to them.

COUNTRY

The conduct of the shipbuilding men during the war needs little comment. The glorious record of achievement in the face of tremendous odds is very well known, and highly appreciated. Your patriotism is beyond reproach; it stands shoulder to shoulder with every trade, and with every GI on every combat front. We were as one in considering our country as God's country, for He favored us beyond our fondest and most ardent prayer. We are far from blind to the faults and blunderings of our leaders; we recognize the need of many improvements in our political set-up; we clearly see the necessity for a better and more equable distribution of material wealth, a greater reward for the product of our brains and brawn; we know that our beloved country is far from perfect in many respects, but it is still our beloved country, it is still far superior to any other of the past or the present, and it will still be ours to run as we please, to condemn as we desire, to praise as we think fit—only as long as we fight manfully to keep it our country, and God's country, and not the plaything of any foreign demagogue who would usurp the place of God.

Our country guarantees right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It guarantees us freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from fear, and is trying to free us from all material want. We have a right to be born and to live as liberty-loving and liberty-living citizens. We have access to an education to fit us for this life's burdens and eternity's reward. Our home is our castle, and no man dare violate its sacred precincts. We can strive to make it a paradise on earth, and in so striving find comfort in arduous labor that otherwise would be too onerous. All this they want to take away from us, promising us in its stead a nebulous heaven that is farcical when viewed by the pattern they have provided elsewhere. We love our country despite its faults, but we should love it enough to be ready to do something—anything—to preserve it from the danger that threatens it.

RELIGION

Without religion there is no meaning to life. The Creator of our existence tells us what it's all about, in unmistakable terms. Assured of His existence, we are assured of the truth of His words. Calvary proves His love for us; history proves His provident care for His children. The nobility of our soul as the image and likeness of the eternal God ennobles our bodies that otherwise would be but magnificent animals. With understanding of the eternal home as the goal of our existence, we are enabled to suffer the many difficulties of this life, with patience, in the eventual relief we expect to receive from the sweet yoke and light burden placed upon us here, that we may not seek an earthly heaven, but look beyond to the future. "We have not here a permanent dwelling place, but we seek that which is beyond." Evil and sin must be punished by the justice of God. This may be a vale of tears, where we eke out our existence in the sweat of our brow, but we know that the comparatively little we are called upon to suffer here is but a trivial punishment compared with what we richly deserve. Then, too, that reward offered us is a powerful inducement to a worthy life.

Now, along comes the preaching of a new religion, which offers release from all the dictates of a God. It denies the existence of a God, it derides the notion of a soul, it scorns credence in a hereafter. We are but animals owing our existence to a superstate, thoroughly and absolutely dependent upon it for our slightest need, destined to serve it slavishly for the whole span of our existence, and to end that existence on a dung heap. There will be no country to cherish, no home or loved ones to enhearten us, no future life to encourage and strengthen us. Just a pitiful endurance, as long as we are the profitable slaves of a self-established superman called Joe.

Today there is much talk of war, but the next war will not be between nations. It

will be between the adherents of Christ and those of anti-Christ, between the votaries of good and those of evil, between those who look to heaven for guidance and those who follow the behest of Moscow. I cannot bring myself to believe that all the Russian people have been contaminated by the vicious teaching of the Kremlin, though millions have been slaughtered for their refusal. No more can I imagine a total lack of decency in Poland, or Czechoslovakia or Yugoslavia, or the other benighted countries in the control of communism. But there is control, and there is a diabolical power pushing constantly for more and more power—to extend its tentacles about the entire earth. Neither can I imagine how an American could wish to exchange the rights and liberties here enjoyed for the slavery offered the fellow travelers, but I know it is so—though I cannot understand it. That the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man should be scrapped so as to accept the unclehood of Stalin is beyond my mental concept. Uncle Sammy may have his bad moments, but he's not a bad uncle by and large. Uncle Joe looms large as anti-Christ, and Simon Legree, and No. 1 man among the devil's advocates. That there should be freemen who wish to become slaves is impossible—though it is so. That there should be Americans who prefer communistic domination is just as impossible—yet just as much a fact. That there should be those who call themselves Christians and yet worship at the shrine of Joe Stalin is still an impossibility—but we have them all about us. For years the Catholic Church was almost alone in warning us of the danger—like a voice crying in the wilderness. Her words fell upon deaf ears, for only religion—only religion—was at stake. When we awoke to the threat to our country's safety, the cry became more articulate. Must it be that our home and family be desecrated and dissolved before we are fully aware of what is going on in our midst?

Just what are we going to do about it? As long as we picture the next war as an engagement between a backward and besodden country on the other side of the world, and our own modern and progressive America with its atom bombs stocked away, just so long will we stifle a yawn and turn over for another nap. But if we once realize that a fanatical fifth column is already at work amongst us, with fellow travelers seeking control in every organization and club, every office and business, every society and union, and are found even in high and powerful places, then it is time for us to wake up and become aroused from our lethargy. We can fight and conquer, subdue and annihilate this monster in our midst, by first of all recognizing its presence wherever it raises its ugly head; by calling attention to its presence that others may be warned and protected; by avoiding contamination from its poisonous breath; by staying beyond its clammy and filthy touch; by arming ourselves against the treason of its proferred rewards by a renewed love for our country; against the atheism of its doctrine by renewed faith in Almighty God and acknowledgment of His providence; against the viciousness of its lust by remembrance of the loved ones at home.

Do not permit yourselves to be enticed to the chopping block by a few kernels of corn thrown to you. Fight for your rights as freemen, but not at the cost of your liberty. Use the brains that God gave you, and figure out the meaning of every move—don't be as sheep led to the slaughter. Above all, live as Catholic men should live, so that the example of your lives may be a powerful deterrent to those who wish to imagine that Christianity is dead, and a powerful incentive in leading the doubting to a study of your way of life, in the hope that they may see that God still reigns in the heavens and lives in the hearts of men.

Doing All Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that more and more of the newspapers throughout the country are coming to the realization that this Republican Congress is doing a good job. They are expressing the confidence that we will do, in a large measure, what the public expects of us. I submit, for your consideration, an editorial from the Times-Record, Spencer, W. Va., one of the great weekly newspapers of this country, edited by Mr. Norman Laughlin, wherein he directs attention to the tremendous handicap under which we have been laboring, and agrees that the Congress is doing all right.

The editorial follows:

DOING ALL RIGHT

There has been considerable complaining in the press that the Republican Congress has not acted on tax reductions, new labor laws, etc. Most of this comes from the Democratic Members themselves, and from the Democratic press. For our money, we feel that the Congress is conducting themselves in the proper manner, by giving careful study to the matters that they will act upon.

The new Congress took office in January, the Republicans in control for the first time since 1933. Since that time America has never witnessed the equal of class legislation, and hundreds of laws enacted for the sole purpose of getting votes regardless of how they affected the bulk of the taxpayers.

Now, Democrats are clamoring for speed, haste, and what have you? And President Truman, who has not been one of the howlers, has nevertheless created at least two grave emergencies which have put Congress back considerably with their regular work. Of course, there is nothing to prevent him from creating more emergencies, a means successfully used by his predecessor to attempt to arouse public opinion to his side of a question.

The Republican Congress will cut taxes, and they will put the budget in the black—but this is not going to be an easy task. They have President Truman, the administration Democrats, the Army and Navy, and the "pork barrel" politicians against them—but even against these odds, it can be accomplished providing the President doesn't recommend loans to nations across the waters faster than Congress can trim his inflated budget.

Labor legislation will be enacted—or better yet, kill off some now on the books, like the Wagner Act. But this must be done with caution, certainly this cannot be done after a few days' hearing before a committee. Give them an opportunity to do what they feel is best for all Americans, not just a few powerful labor outfits.

The Times-Record has faith in the present Congress. And so do the vast majority of the people. We do not feel that the mess that it inherited can be straightened out in 90 days—it will more probably take 90 years—but this Congress will start the ball rolling, you can be sure of that, and you can likewise be sure that it will be rolling in the right direction.

A Decisive Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Boston Post. It is interesting because it calls attention of management to the shortcomings in the pending labor bill, H. R. 3020.

The editorial follows:

A DECISIVE WEEK

A decisive week for industrial peace and harmony in the United States will open next Tuesday, when the Fair Labor Standards Act, setting forth changes in the Federal wage-hour law, will be reported out of the House committee in Congress.

In its present form, as it is about to be reported out of committee, it provides for setting up a labor-management relations board of three, with no more than two from a major party, to act in a judicial capacity over all labor-management disputes, and provides for an administrator paid $12,000 a year who would serve as investigator and prosecutor of violations.

It also provides for a conciliation service outside of the Department of Labor to serve under the executive branch of the Government as an independent agency.

The inherent weakness of this kind of a set-up to administer fair labor-management practices and to curb excesses of both management and labor is the virtual impossibility of finding men capable of wielding such enormous power, or of securing from either management or labor four men who would have the support, approval or respect of both management and labor.

This would be a quadrumvirate with unprecedented power over both management and labor, if, indeed, an administrator could be found willing to take the kind of a brutal beating which will surely be meted out by the opposed factions, for the sum of $12,000 a year.

Both management and labor would do well to scrutinize the Fair Labor Standards Act, and make certain before final enactment that this product of the high temper of the times does not conceal the seeds of a greater disunity.

While there are provisions in the bill in its present form to halt industry-wide bargaining, the safeguards against the use of a multitude of minor local strikes are too intangible to be of any real service to the Nation.

The Congress must consider that a key union or a key local can wield as much power in bringing an industry to a stop as an industry-wide union. In the textile industry, for example, a strike of loom fixers can bring a whole plant to a stop.

To take militant action against a whole industry, labor leaders need have control only of the key operation without which an industry cannot run. Such a key operation pulls the switch on all the rest.

Similarly, management might take a closer look at some of the clauses in the proposed act which appear to be most favorable to the cause of management. There is a provision that management's last offer to employees shall be printed on a secret strike ballot to determine whether the employees reject the offer and prefer to strike. It does

not require any intensive cerebration to detect the peril in that. What both management and labor want and will approve is a formula for reaching a fair and equitable understanding long before a dispute reaches the stage of a strike vote. For, if a strike is imminent, very few employees are going to stop to read the fine print on their secret ballots.

If the Fair Labor Standards Act is only an attempt on the part of the majority party in the Congress to demonstrate a desire to put an end to management-labor warfare, with the foreknowledge that President Truman would exercise his veto, it is dangerous and mischievous. If it is seriously proposed as a means of ending management-labor struggles it falls far short of being constructive legislation.

Concurrent Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

Concurrent resolution calling upon New Jersey's representatives in the National Congress and the Legislatures of the sister States and all good citizens to restore the American Republic and the forty-eight States to the foundations built by our fathers

PREAMBLE

New Jersey needs no guardian and intends to have none. We Garden Staters, like the people of our sister States, were fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight in its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as Federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the forty-eight States.

So we propose henceforward to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles and paternalism. We are no one's stepchild. We have grown up. We serve notice that we will resist Washington, D. C., adopting us.

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the senate concurring):

1. We respectfully petition and urge New Jersey's Congressmen and Senators to vote to fetch our county court house and city halls back from Pennsylvania avenue. We want government to come home.

2. *Resolved, further,* That we call upon the legislatures of our sister States and on good citizens everywhere who believe in the basic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson to join with us and we with them to restore the American Republic and our forty-eight States to the foundations built by our fathers.

Address by Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, Before Pan American Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on April 14 the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] addressed the Pan American Union. I ask that this very forceful speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to join this morning with the representatives of 21 American Republics in commemorating the founding of the greatest continental community of nations which has ever blessed the peace and progress of the world.

I am deeply grateful to the "good neighbors" who form this international fraternity for the privilege of speaking upon this significant occasion which symbolizes our common bonds, our common hopes, our common aspirations, our common heritage, and our mutual good will.

Just so long as we keep our Western World in tune, we shall here preserve the healthiest and most useful regional society of sovereign peoples on this earth.

Looking back to its creation on April 14, 1890, the Pan American Union is 57 years young today. But looking back to the heroic Simon Bolivar and his first Congress of American States in 1826, the roots of our Union stem back nearly a century and a quarter. Those were rugged, pioneering times. Indeed, such were their uncertainties that our own United States delegates to that initial gathering in Panama were unable to participate. One died and the other was a week late. But a glorious idea was born in that first hopeful adventure. The acorn is an oak today.

In those early intervenig years there were numerous significant conferences which market steady progress toward hemispheric peace and solidarity. But it was a particularly important and prophetic day when the present Pan American Union was formally created in 1890; and every succeeding anniversary, from that hour to this, has confronted us with new incentives and new needs to keep our 21 Republics inseverably linked in the friendly unity which is our mutual protection and our incalculably precious benediction. Any threat to this unity betrays the welfare of every one of these 21 sovereign Republics. I am proud to confidently say that this is the firm sentiment of the people of the United States.

Two years ago this month we all went to San Francisco to help build the United Nations in order to knit the peace-loving peoples of the world in one common bond of peace-living fellowship, to serve human rights and fundamental freedoms. It was a tremendous event in the evolution of international morality. But there came a dubious moment when it looked as though the larger, untried project was to swallow up our regional institutions and end their lives for keeps. I shall never forget the thrilling and tenacious zeal with which the American Republics—all of them—sprang to the defense of our pan-American ideal. They were ready to look forward to the larger vision of a coordinated world; but they declined to turn their backs upon the blessed record of a united hemisphere. They were ready to embrace the new fraternity, but not at the expense of abandoning the old. The vitality of pan-Americanism will never have a greater demonstration of affectionate devotion than in those critical days when San Francisco was deadlocked on this problem.

It was my honor and responsibility to serve as chairman of the subcommittee which struggled for many long days and nights to find an acceptable formula which could preserve the overriding authority of the United Nations and yet leave the cooperation of pan-America unimpaired. I joined wholeheartedly with my friends in the other 20 American Republics—as did the solid, sympathetic delegation from the United States—in unyielding insistance upon a satisfactory answer to this challenge. When we finally succeeded with our task, the glad rejoicing was unrestrained. I shall never forget that historic night when each Republic, in turn, spoke from its heart in deepest satisfaction that the problem had been solved. Such relationships are beyond price in the affairs of humankind.

In my opinion it is possible that there might never have been a San Francisco Charter if we had not been able to agree upon chapter VIII on "Regional Arrangements." Equally, in my opinion, the United Nations is infinitely stronger as a result of this regional recognition that the cooperative unity of the Americas shall persist in all its mutual good wills.

None of us would for an instant subtract from the supreme mandate of the United Nations in respect to international peace and security. All of us will seek to build it from strength to strength so that it may grow in functions and facilities. None of us will withhold our willing and unequivocal allegiance to the Security Council and the General Assembly, the Town Meeting of the World, within the framework of the Charter. It was not in conflict with this indispensable objective that we insisted also upon our continuing and historic right to cooperate as friendly neighbors on continents peculiarly set apart and self-contained. On the contrary, the United Nations Charter wisely acknowledges that these two great, basic objectives are not incompatible. Indeed, it expressly enjoins our 21 Republics to maintain our New World unity and to use it to strengthen independent freedom for each and all through regional solidarity and peace. The more successfully we maintain these ties the less burdensome will be the tasks which the United Nations will confront.

To that blessed objective, we, the 21 sovereign Republics of the Western Hemisphere, once more pledge our hearts and hands on Pan-American Day, 1947; and I dare to assert that none among us does so with greater fidelity or stronger faith than the United States.

If and when there are any unfortunate lapses in our close and friendly relationships, it is a necessity of the first magnitude that such situations shall be swiftly and equitably cured; and this is the common concern of all of us because all of us are equals in both the responsibilities and the privileges of this great heritage.

I want to underscore that point. Pan-Americanism is a partnership affair. It must always operate as a partnership affair. More and more, in the last decade, we have been spelling this out at our various conferences. I go back to Buenos Aires in 1936 where, while emphasizing the inadmissability of intervention in the affairs of any Pan-American country, we pledged intimate and mutual consultations (1) if the peace of the American Republics is menaced; (2) in the event of

war or a virtual state of war between American States; (3) in the event of international war outside America which might threaten the American Republics. At Lima in 1938 we improved the procedure of consultation and extended it to economic, cultural, and other aspects of continental solidarity. At Panama in 1939 we called for consultations in case of any geographical region of America subject to the jurisdiction of any non-American state should be obliged to change its sovereignty and there should result therefrom a danger to the security of the American Continent. At Habana in 1940 we improved the process of consultation—again calling for reciprocal assistance and cooperation for the defense of the nations of the Americas. At Rio de Janeiro in 1942 we reaffirmed our solidarity; took note of World War II; recommended the breaking of diplomatic relations with Japan, Germany, and Italy; and called for consultations prior to the reestablishment of these relations in order that this action may have a solidarity character. We also called for consultations in the event of inter-American violations of agreements or treaties. At Mexico City in 1945, we said:

"In case acts of aggression occur or there are reasons to believe that an aggression is being prepared by any other state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, the states signatory to this act will consult among themselves in order to agree upon the measures it may be advisable to take."

Cooperation is the keynote of the Americas. Consultation, not dictation, is the indispensable means to this end. Partnership is the genius of this relationship. Consultation is its lifeblood. The Ninth International Conference of American States will meet in Bogotá in December to further strengthen this inter-American system and to put our consultations on even firmer foundations. The problems of the postwar world call upon all of us to draw even closer together in our consultations for the sake of our mutual, intelligent self-interest. The Bogotá Conference should be the most important, the most constructive, the most fruitful we have ever held. It should more effectively integrate our consultation system. Furthermore, the Rio conference, originally scheduled for October 1945, should soon implement the Act of Chapultepec and give the inter-American system its permanent status as an integral part of the United Nations peace machinery.

I believe so deeply in this partnership concept of our pan-American relationships and in the process of consultation respecting our interlocking problems that I think it would be wise if our regular International Conferences of American States were held oftener than once in 5 years, and if the regular meetings of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs were annual events. We must not drift apart. Too much is at stake in this restless and uncertain world. We cannot consult and confer too often in the conservation of our heritage.

Then I take the liberty of adding another suggestion on this auspicious day when we again exchange our pan-American fidelities. I express the wish that the time may soon come when our continental fellowship will be geographically and spiritually complete through the association with us, on some appropriate basis, of the great and splendid Dominion of Canada. This is not a new idea. At the Inter-American Conference in Mexico City in 1945, our resolutions expressed the "wish that collaboration of Canada with the pan-American system shall become ever closer." Nor is that all. When the pan-American building here in Washington was erected in 1910, the room for the Governing Board and the great council table were built with a prophetic eye to that happy day when Canada should be among those present. A twenty-second chair was made. It has been empty long enough. Nor is that all. Around the inner courtyard of this Pan American Union building are the coats of arms of the countries which here make common cause for peace and progress in this hemisphere—and the coat of arms of Canada is already there with all the rest. By every rule of righteousness she is eligible to this association. By every rule of reason we should wish her here. I would welcome the final and total New World unity which will be nobly dramatized when the twenty-second chair is filled and our continental brotherhood is complete from the Arctic Circle to Cape Horn.

One thing more I should like to say. During the past year the Pan American Union suffered the sad and untimely loss of its Director General, Dr. L. S. Rowe. For a quarter century he gave his skilled and devoted service to the "clearing house of inter-American good will." With tireless zeal he labored for our common cause. He never failed a rendezvous with duty. He was inter-America's first friend. His successor as Director General of the Pan American Union is a distinguished Latin-American for the first time in 57 years. I should like to say, in behalf of my country, that we think it is a particularly happy augury that this is so. In no more significant fashion could it be demonstrated that pan-America belongs to all of us alike. May I add that it is a matter of great personal satisfaction to me to welcome the able and brilliant Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, former President of Colombia, to Washington to fill this important post. I came to know him intimately at the San Francisco Conference. He was one of the sturdy leaders in working out the Charter's recognition of regional arrangements. He powerfully demonstrated his firm loyalty to this inter-American fraternity of which he now becomes the directing head. Young in years but ripe in wisdom and experience, I know our "oak" will thrive under his husbandry.

And now I conclude as I began. In the name of the United States and pursuant to the proclamation of the President, I greet our sister Republics upon this significant day which has been set aside for special recognition by 21 New World governments in honor of the greatest and most fruitful continental community of nations the world has ever known. We greet you with friendship and affection. With unadulterated allegiance to the United Nations may we pursue its mandate to us to carry on in faithful loyalty to the historic attachments and consultations and cooperations which have made the Pan American Union one of the greatest beneficial institutions of all time.

We Should Not Cut Loans by Farmers Home Administration to Veterans Who Want to Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am becoming increasingly disturbed about the lack of funds in the Farmers Home Administration for loans to veterans who want to farm.

Here is one agency that in my judgment has accomplished much for veterans and their families. In my files right now I have more than a hundred letters from veterans pleading for more funds for the Farmers Home Administration. These veterans today are unable to get the advantage of a loan that was given to civilians while they were out bleeding and dying for their country.

The situation is desperate. Where are our promises to those veterans? The funds for the Farmers Home Administration are depleted.

In honesty and business the record of the Farmers Home Administration is beyond criticism. Just look at their record in my district. Here it is:

County	(1) Applications received, loans made, and amount loaned, July 1, 1946 to Feb. 1, 1947			(2) Applications received, loans made, and amount loaned, July 1, 1945 to Feb. 1, 1946			(3) Estimated applications and funds needed, Feb. 1 to June 30, 1947		(4) Veteran loans made and amount loaned to Feb. 1, 1947		(5) Estimated veteran loans and amount, Feb. 1 to June 30, 1947		(6) Number of families receiving loans since start and to Feb. 1, 1947, and amount		(7) Repaid	(8) Amount repaid, principal and interest	(9) Farm ownership loans and amount advanced		(10) Farm ownership loans paid up
Ashland, Iron, and Bayfield	64	42	$50,023	32	19	$24,775	40	$100,000	28	$47,160	15	$35,000	1,910	$498,328	734	$447,146	36	$701,300	13
Burnett	44	29	59,120	36	10	10,980	40	50,000	16	26,250	25	30,000	1,337	640,471	290	463,788	34	104,041	11
Douglas	30	18	15,790	19	10	6,560	21	61,500	17	32,785	5	32,500	925	371,446	452	323,373	26	61,007	10
Lincoln	73	37	40,435	41	28	18,480	25	80,000	21	47,340	18	65,000	1,263	594,526	494	497,956	51	96,810	17
Oneida and Vilas	3	2	1,100	13	7	7,100	30	60,000	7	6,578	10	45,000	710	172,243	346	162,633	10	18,860	3
Polk	89	54	116,830	51	31	35,595	79	123,180	66	149,823	37	50,000	1,612	1,010,920	674	819,662	26	113,295	11
Price	36	53	22,216	25	21	8,146	60	35,000	19	12,948	45	26,250	1,172	538,314	627	344,654	71	131,620	26
Rusk	55	35	27,970	31	34	31,450	68	122,000	30	52,867	35	78,000	755	727,950	414	573,570	66	135,995	19
Sawyer	45	31	33,865	32	30	30,820	45	24,000	35	52,460	15	15,000	741	460,186	325	302,681	27	57,420	6
Taylor	65	59	24,785	61	54	37,270	68	71,000	30	60,250	28	40,000	1,432	1,208,137	814	796,202	141	262,276	37
Washburn	50	25	29,510	30	18	18,625	35	50,000	17	30,235	19	30,000	1,255	521,655	374	445,290	40	74,230	10
Total	554	385	421,644	370	262	229,801	511	776,680	286	518,696	252	446,750	13,112	6,744,176	5,544	5,206,955	528	1,756,854	163

We freely give billions to every foreigner who brings a suitcase to Washington. We do not even have the guts to ask them to pay the interest or the principal back. We just give, give, and give.

But when it comes to advancing money for legitimate loans with interest to our veterans we skimp and save.

Economy, yes. But it is foolish and blind economy to refuse to advance money to Farmers Home Administration for farm loans to veterans. Let us act now to provide funds to this agency. The veterans have a right to expect this. To refuse them would prove us unworthy of their confidence.

Election of President by Popular Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Majority Rule," published in the Woonsocket (R. I.) Call of April 1, 1947, and an editorial entitled "Why Not?" published in the Worcester (Mass.) Labor News of April 4, 1947. These editorials deal with the amendment which I have proposed for the election of the President by direct popular vote.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Woonsocket (R. I.) Call of April 1, 1947]

MAJORITY RULE

If Senator LODGE of Massachusetts has his way, the United States will never again have a President who represents a minority of the voters, as has happened three times in history. He proposes abolition of the electoral college in favor of electing the President by popular vote.

This would appear to be a constitutional change that has long been neglected. The dangers imminent in the electoral college system are well known and, in fact, we have escaped them only because of the apparent high character of the men who have been its victims.

Most noted of all examples, perhaps, is the historic Hayes-Tilden contest of 1876. In this election Rutherford B. Hayes was declared elected by a margin of only one electoral vote, although he received 250,000 fewer popular votes than did Samuel J. Tilden. And in 1876 the voting population of the United States was far less than it is today.

As Senator LODGE points out in his argument against the electoral college, the Nation could well have been embroiled in a civil uprising had Tilden taken a belligerent attitude at losing the election. The fact that a majority of the citizens approved him indicated the support he could have called upon.

"The passions and hatreds that a bitter elective struggle engenders could well lead to violent and bloody conditions under such circumstances," the Bay State Senator contends.

He also points to the election of William Henry Harrison in 1888, even though Harrison's popular vote was only 5,444,337 compared to Grover Cleveland's 5,540,050. Earlier, in 1824, Andrew Jackson secured a popular plurality of 50,000 votes over John Quincy Adams, although Adams was chosen President when the election was decided by the House of Representatives.

If the United States is to continue under the policy of the majority rule, the proposal of Senator LODGE for popular Presidential elections should be adopted, even though such adoption may take years under our present method of amending the Constitution.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Labor News of April 4, 1947]

WHY NOT?

HENRY CABOT LODGE recently introduced an amendment to that controversial President-tenure bill. It calls for direct election of President by votes of the people, doing away with the electoral college. Now, that's a piece of up-to-date legislation, and though the question has been brought up in Congress a number of times, there never was a time when it was so apropos as now. Granted, the people vote for presidential candidates, and those votes have to be counted, but when the will of the people can be submerged and their decision nullified something is decidedly wrong. This, Senator LODGE aims at correcting, yet how far he will get at this session of Congress remains to be seen.

While he is about it, and while the question of tenure has not been wholly settled, he might add to his thought that limiting the tenure of Senators and Representatives would be keeping step with the general trend. We have a sample of a man being too long in Washington when Senator MCKELLAR opposes the confirmation of David Lilienthal for personal reasons * * * admittedly loss of patronage. That sort of thing is what belittles the National Legislature, so get them all down to a stated term in office, then back to private life. They then won't be so dependent on how the people back home feel over their actions.

Jefferson Day Address by Gael Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Jefferson Day address delivered by the Honorable Gael Sullivan, vice chairman and executive director of the Democratic National Committee, at Providence, R. I., April 13, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and friends, tonight the first hundred days of a Republican Congress have ended.

One hundred days have passed and only one major piece of legislation has been passed by the Republican Congress.

That's the box score of the Republican bungle band—100 days, 1 major enactment for the welfare of the people.

In those 100 days the Nation's Government has been throttled by a tyranny of inaction.

One hundred days of political puttering, 100 days of legislative paralysis, 100 days of back-fence bickering by men who were asked to lead a forward march to peace and plenty.

And instead, they answered a roll call of retreat, the retreat to a Harding normalcy, the retreat to a normalcy that meant profits for the few and poverty for the many.

What happened to the promise of lower prices?

The housewife's dollar bill today will buy less than a half-dollar could before the war.

She has been waiting for 100 days for an answer, while her pocketbook gets thinner and her market basket gets smaller.

What happened to the promise of housing for the veterans?

They have been waiting 100 days for the answer.

Their housing dollar today will buy what 35 cents would have bought in 1939.

What happened to the four-ply promise of the GOP to balance the budget, continue essential Government services, reduce the debt, and cut income taxes by 20 to 30 percent?

The people have been waiting a hundred days for the magic Republican formula, and now they have the answer.

The people know the difference now between the stump speeches of last October and the statesmanship that is required today—but the Republican Party doesn't.

The people know that a surplus of promises can never offset a deficit in performance—but the Republican Party doesn't.

The people know that a $20 saving in taxes and a $200 increase in the cost of living does not add up to a solvent America.

The people do not want to pay that kind of price for what they know will lead to a Republican recession.

The Republican cry is "Cut taxes and unloose incentive."

Release incentive for whom? For those in the higher brackets who have their financial cake and thousands of profit dollars, or for those in the lower brackets who have only the financial crumbs and a few orphan dollars?

That is why the whole Nation has taken notice of the finger pointing of Republican Senator HARLAN BUSHFIELD, of South Dakota, at his own party with these words:

"We have failed in everything we have promised to do for the voters."

Another Republican speaks his mind, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, dismayed by the old guard leadership, accuses certain Republican congressional leaders of fostering an economic patch-quilt program, based on a false boom for a few years and then a terrific bust.

Still another Republican, Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, is fearful that the Eightieth Congress will revert to the isolationism of the past and give the country back to Wall Street.

He warned his own party that the voters "gave no mandate in the last election to destroy labor, to take milk away from school children, to turn over development of atomic energy to ruthless and greedy men, anxious to control all the sources of power in the United States and the whole world, to create artificial scarcity of food in order that high prices might be artificially maintained while millions of people go hungry in America."

That is why the first hundred days of the Republican control of Congress has brought a Nation-wide slough-off in support for the party whose hands are 10 thumbs, whose eyes are looking down, and whose feet are stumbling backward into the future.

In those same hundred days, the people have heard another voice—and they have seen another vision.

They have seen a man—to quote his own words—who would "do in all cases, from day to day, without regard to narrow political considerations, what seems to me best for the welfare of all our poeple. Our search for that welfare must always be based upon a progressive concept of government."

They have seen a man who knows what to do about safeguarding the Nation's health.

They have seen a man who wants to keep us strong in our whole economic body, in our whole social body, and in our individual bodies.

They have seen a man who understands the process of working out a peace and making that peace work.

They have seen a man who would stem the threat of totalitarian aggression wherever it creates a partnership with hunger and human misery.

President Truman has been the source of their comfort and conviction in these trying days, and President Truman has become the symbol of their deliverance from the Republican bungle bund.

His patience and wisdom, his courage and practical vision have their seed and their sustenance in the principles of Thomas Jefferson.

The Truman faith is today's expression of the Jefferson faith.

Thomas Jefferson was the first to set forth the Democratic faith for all Americans.

"We of the United States," he said, "are constitutionally and conscientiously democrats."

By "democrats" Jefferson did not mean party members.

He meant members of a whole society who acknowledge they are created free and equal. He meant a people endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

He meant a people ruled by a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

Jefferson further set forth his conviction in these words:

"The mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately by the grace of God."

There was no room in Thomas Jefferson's democracy for that "favored few," whether their power derived from a claim to other men's worldly goods or a claim to other men's souls.

And for that same privileged few there is no room in our democracy today.

Americans have never had a monopoly on the longing to be free—or the insistence on being free.

In today's world, that longing and that insistence have spread among many peoples.

It is being expressed in struggle, and when frustrated, in fury and revolt.

Where the struggle is won, peace comes to the people and peace grows in the world.

Where it is lost, the rebellion and the fury of deprived peoples live on in plague-spots that also undermine the well-being and peace of the world.

That fury, that insurgence, can be dangerous.

They invite the very chaos on which enslavement feeds.

And, when, in this age of sudden and sweeping destruction, there is chaos anywhere, there is danger everywhere.

When the moral laws of mankind are shrugged off in one place—the criminal indifference that flows from it can infect all places.

If freedom is international, so are the forces that threaten it, and so is its defense.

In winning the peace, they do not serve who only stand and wait.

They do serve who hold the peace of the world inviolable by any aggressor, for any cause.

They do serve who act before initial aggression is allowed to grow into the threat of war.

They serve who meet the despair and the aimless fury of frustrated peoples by holding out to them the solid assurance of help and who lend them a hand on the hard road to self-support.

Two years ago, at almost this very hour, we hoped to hear the voice of Franklin D. Roosevelt. On the day before our gathering, the voice of Roosevelt was stilled forever.

But the words that came from his heart for that occasion remain in our own hearts.

And today, while the task of building the peace is yet to be completed, those words come back to you and me:

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today.

"Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

Today from the fires of our faith—one resolve "burns with the hard, gemlike flame."

That resolve is—

War must not be.

War need not be.

And war shall not be.

The United Nations must build, must live, must stand forever as the great liberator of all peoples from the fear of war.

Nobody in a society of free men misunderstands that.

And no difficulty, no problem, great though it may be, is beyond solution while this knowledge is in the minds and hearts of men.

In this time of world crisis each citizen must ask himself, not "How can I be safe?"—but "How can I serve?"

Many times we have proclaimed our Bill of Rights.

Not often enough have we proclaimed the duties that are inherent in those rights.

I ask you to join with me tonight in a simple statement of our responsibilities to achieve world peace.

We citizens of America and fellow men of all peoples acknowledge our faith in God and our duty to our country.

It is our duty to take part as largely as we can in shaping the democratic destiny of our country and of the community of peoples which is mankind.

This we can do, this we shall do, in the ways open to a free people at peace with the world.

It is our duty to deserve those rights which are ours through heritage.

Our liberty does not come down to us as an unearned blessing.

Neither can we keep it so, but must earn it continuously with each generation, else it will be lost.

It is our duty to deserve the right to vote.

This we do by intelligently exercising that right at every election so that democracy will not perish by default.

It is our duty to support a world organization with the strength to stop wars.

This is a duty to our own country no less than to our fellow man of all countries.

It is our duty to seek the honest interchange of goods and ideas with peoples of other nations.

In so doing, we shall help all peoples to security and well-being.

It is our duty to achieve an economy that secures the bounty of the good life for the farmer on his land, the worker in his job, the businessman in his enterprise.

Our duty is not in adding more to those with much, but in providing enough for those with too little.

It is our duty to help keep our press and pulpits and classrooms free.

In the dissemination of information and religion and education the opinions of minorities must enjoy the same equality and right of utterance as majorities.

We believe that in the technique of abundance lie the promise of well-being.

It is our duty to seek the development and control of those techniques of progress so that the fullest benefits may be realized by the fullest number and that peace and plenty may live in our country and in the world. President Truman knows that responsibility is the great developer—just as love of freedom is the great incentive.

He wants the rewards of citizenship to be guaranteed to the lowliest, but he demands, as Jefferson did, that the duty of being worthy is a never-ending debt to be paid for by an all-weather loyalty and an ungrudging tolerance toward our fellow man.

Racial or religious bigotry can blight even the strongest democracy.

We have much to preserve, much to improve, and much to pioneer if we want the world's peace to last.

The burdens that confronted Jefferson in his time were no less staggering than those that Truman must meet in our time.

And that is where we, the Democratic Party organization, can be of service.

We can prevent Republican buck passing for Republican failures—by keeping ourselves and our fellow Americans informed.

We can prevent it by working hard in our local communities to keep our neighbors interested in what goes on in their Government, interested enough not only to read about it and talk about it, but when the time comes, to vote about it.

In the last election, two citizens out of every three failed to vote.

I repeat that: Two citizens out of three failed to report at the ballot stations of democracy in the last election.

This cannot—must not—hapuen again.

Our kind of democracy won't have the third chance.

Our first task will be to see to it that 60,000,000 Americans are registered to vote in November 1948.

Our next will be to see to it that they do vote in November 1948.

That is the way and the only way to stop the Republicans from leading us back to the normalcy of economic stagnation and social scrap heaps.

That is the way and the only way for millions of Americans to give proper expression to their ever-growing conviction that the Truman way is the human way.

President Truman and Henry Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 15 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman and Wallace," published in the Washington Evening Star of today, and also an editorial entitled "No Cause for Hysteria," published in the Washington Post of today. I hope all Senators will read both editorials.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 15, 1947]

TRUMAN AND WALLACE

It is a question whether there is much that the President can do, or ought to do, about Henry Wallace's extraordinary tirades in Britain. To do anything of a striking nature might have the effect of making Mr. Wallace appear to non-Americans to be more important than he really is, or it might have the effect of seeming to dignify the man's offensiveness toward his own Government.

Of course, the President might take back what he said the other day when he told a news conference that he had no desire to read Mr. Wallace out of the Democratic Party. But would it be wise to stage a spectacular political excommunication? Might not such an event be embroidered upon abroad—notably in Russia—as evidence of Mr. Wallace's significance or of our Government's unwillingness to let prominent Americans speak out in opposition?

After all, last September President Truman repudiated Mr. Wallace about as completely as any man could be repudiated. As Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Wallace was then doing his best to undermine Secretary of State Byrnes—who was at the Paris Conference of Foreign Ministers—by attacking American foreign policy for allegedly being too tough toward Russia. Mr. Truman finally resolved this by firing Mr. Wallace from the Cabinet and retiring him to private life.

Today, as a private citizen, Mr. Wallace seems to be well within his legal rights in saying the things he has been saying in Britain. Apart from sounding more like Ilya Ehrenburg than an American, his offense is that he has been showing a vast amount of irresponsibility and a shocking degree of impropriety. Capitalizing on the high honors once accorded him by his country, he has been grossly misrepresenting the motives of our Government, wittingly or unwittingly, through distortion and otherwise, painting a lurid picture abroad of the United States officially bent on a course of ruthless imperialism.

Under our laws, this sort of thing is permissible not less for Mr. Wallace than for others equally thick-skinned, reckless or lacking in good taste. The President may find that his wisest course is to allow Mr. Wallace to run down, like a clock that somebody decided not to wind again. Actually, as far as the overwhelming majority of the American people are concerned, Mr. Wallace has been pretty effectively repudiating himself. As for an answer to what he has been saying, resounding congressional support of our foreign policy will be answer enough.

[From the Washington Post of April 15, 1947]

NO CAUSE FOR HYSTERIA

We hope that President Truman will give no heed to the excited demands that he launch a campaign against his former Secretary of Commerce, Henry Wallace. Undoubtedly that is what Mr. Wallace is angling for. He would like to dignify his cheap assault upon the bipartisan foreign policy that is taking shape in Washington by crossing swords with the President. Numerous Republicans on Capitol Hill would also be delighted to see such an open fight between the Democratic President and a former stalwart in the Democratic Party. But the effect would be a useless dissipation of energy and a diversion of interest from the real issue before Congress and the country.

Effective replies to Mr. Wallace have already come from hundreds of different sources. The consensus seems to be that he has made himself foolish by misrepresenting the policy of his own country in speeches delivered in other lands. This loss of stature is a peculiarly fitting penalty for indiscretion in the exercise of the right of freedom of speech. For any man with political ambitions it is a devastating blow. But, aside from this fact, the suggestions now being made that Mr. Wallace's passport should be revoked and that he should be investigated by the House Un-American Activities Committee are so utterly out of keeping with our way of life as to be ridiculous. Democracy is not to be redeemed by abandoning its principles.

The best answer that Congress can give to Mr. Wallace is a resounding bipartisan vote in favor of the President's program of aiding Greece and Turkey to maintain their independence. The idea that Mr. Wallace's petulant and muddled speeches must be answered from the White House before Republican Senators will support what they regard as a sound and essential international policy is only a political aberration that cannot stand the test of analysis. The only sound reason for supporting the Truman doctrine is that it is right—that it offers a positive and feasible method by which democracy can protect itself against expanding totalitarianism. All the epithets and wisecracks that Mr. Wallace can utter will not change this fact. So long as he can play upon the novelty of bombarding the foreign policy of his country from a foreign shore doubtless he will have some listeners, but it will be the vote of Congress that will be heard in Athens, Ankara, Moscow, and every other capital in the world. Congress thus has it wholly within its power to muffle Mr. Wallace's sensationalism by the unperturbed and dignified methods of democracy.

Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks that have been made at various public meetings in England the past 2 weeks by the former Vice President of the United States, Henry Wallace, it appears to me that Mr. Wallace is attempting to influence the foreign policy, not only of the United States but of England and particularly of Russia.

May I quote you from section 5 of the Criminal Code of the United States, entitled "Criminal Correspondence With Foreign Governments; Redress of Private Injuries Excepted":

Every citizen of the United States, whether actually resident or abiding within the same, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or in any foreign country, who, without the permission or authority of the Government, directly or indirectly, commences or carries on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with an intent to influence the measure or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States; and every person, being a citizen of or resident within the United States or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, and not duly authorized, who counsels, advises, or assists in any such correspondence with such intent, shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not more than 3 years; but nothing in this section shall be construed to abridge the right of a citizen to apply, himself or his agent, to any foreign government or the agents thereof for redress of any injury which he may have sustained from such government or any of its agents or subjects. (Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 321, sec. 5, 35 Stat. 1088; Apr. 22, 1932, ch. 126, 47 Stat. 132.)

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer]

TRUMAN SHOULD REPUDIATE WALLACE

Senator VANDENBERG, in declaring that it is a shocking thing when an American citizen goes abroad to organize the world against his own Government, expresses the wrath of millions of outraged Americans against Henry A. Wallace.

Wallace, loud-mouthed No. 1 propagandist for Communist Russia in America, is in England busily engaged in belittling his own country, deriding its foreign policy and yelling for a Roosevelt New Deal for the world, presumably at America's expense.

He is haranguing British throngs with his denunciation of President Truman's plan to aid Greece and Turkey in stemming the red tide of communism. He is assailing—of all things—America's imperialism. He is saying that we are too selfish and laggard to lead the world to peace and that such a task is Britain's. He is pooh-poohing our part in World War II and charging that all we want now is normalcy. And the British, true to tradition, are lapping up this hog-wash.

What, in the name of American heroism and sacrifice, is Henry Wallace trying to do?

Is he striving deliberately to hasten a showdown between this country and the Soviet Union?

Is he seeking to stir enmity against the United States throughout the world?

Is he trying, by giving aid and comfort to the Moscow Politburo, to rally American Communists to direct action against the Government of the United States?

Wallace's disservice to his country was bad enough last fall when, at a critical moment in international relationships, he opposed a policy of firmness with Russia, starting an administration row which led to his belated removal from the post of Secretary of Commerce.

But his disservice is vastly worse, when, as a nominal private citizen, he lets out his anti-American, pro-Communist bleats in Britain and holds his Government up to world scorn.

For, however logically it may be contended that here at home Wallace is a political pipsqueak with no following but Communists, fellow travelers, and other crackpots, the fact remains that abroad he speaks not without a measure of authority.

Hand-picked stooge of Franklin D. Roosevelt, he is a former Vice President of the United States. He is a former Secretary of Commerce and Secretary of Agriculture. He continues to be a raucous exponent of big government and world WPA policies.

He is a man who not only typifies the Roosevelt "Raw Deal" to perfection but who missed being Mr. Roosevelt's successor in the White House only by a fluke—and who still wants to be President.

So it's perhaps understandable that the words of this blatherskite carry weight with the British, who trust America scarcely more than they trust Russia and who are using their sly old technique to prop up their sagging Empire by whatever means comes to hand. Wallace's slams at America, to judge from the enthusiastic crowds, is music to British ears.

But granting Wallace's right to free speech, there is a limit beyond which, in view of his past official position in this country, he has no moral right to go when abroad. He has already exceeded that limit and unquestionably has caused serious damage to America and its efforts for peace. It is time for the United States Government to show up the un-American activities of this touring editor whose proper editorial berth is in the office of Moscow's America-baiting Pravda.

Since this New Dealer has shown repeatedly that he has neither the good taste nor the good judgment to speak with discretion, President Truman owes it to the Nation to repudiate him publicly and vigorously so that the whole world may know, once and for all, that Henry Wallace's voice isn't the voice of America.

The Challenge of a Whirling World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech I made last evening before the Ohio Society of New York City in which I discussed the challenge that the spread of communism presents to the United States:

This Nation is now grappling with the question of what should be the world role of the United States. The most momentous debate perhaps of our entire history is now in progress. It is being carried on wherever Americans live; in cities, villages, and on lonely farms and ranches. Every kind and condition of man is taking part in it. The fact of the debate, the manner in which it is being carried on, and the Nation-wide participation in it, is, as nearly as we can arrive at it, pure democracy. The people, through the time-honored American process of talking out things, are arriving at their own conclusions. Whatever they may decide, the result must affect Americans and the world for a long time to come.

Nothing is simple in a world as infinitely complicated as the world in which we live. Yet the issue before the people is relatively simple. It is: Should the United States oppose the expansion of communism? And, if it is decided that it should oppose it, how are we to go about it?

There is little in our temperament, training, or experience which fits us to deal with so novel a question. If it be true that there is nothing new under the sun, the situation that presently confronts us vis-à-vis the spread of communism, is certainly new under the American sun. We have never, for that matter, completely made up our minds as to what should be our role in the world. We have indeed adhered, roughly, to two principles only in our international relations. One is the Monroe Doctrine, through which we have insisted for more than a century that other nations refrain from attempting to dominate any nation of the Western Hemisphere. The other is—whether or not we admit it—that no one country, or group of countries, shall dominate the world. Twice within a generation we have fought in world wars and turned the scale against the would-be conquerors, because of our adherence to that principle. Yet our foreign policy—or our lack of it—has often been characterized by indecision, vacillation, and a lack of foresight phenomenal in a people who like to think of themselves as hard-headed.

It must be remembered, moreover, that by our very existence we exert a gigantic influence upon the world, as though we were the moon affecting the pull of the global tides. Such is our strength and influence, that we affect other nations almost as much by doing nothing as by doing a great deal. There is no fact upon earth which quite overshadows the minds of men as much as the fact of the United States. I do not say this out of a false pride, or a stupid chauvinism. We are great enough as a people, I hope, to have a proper humility, and wise enough to realize that while we owe much of what we are to ourselves, we also owe much of it to great good fortune. Consequently, I stress our power and influence in the councils of nations, not boastfully, but because it bears directly upon the great debate in which the people and their congressional representatives are now engaged.

Tonight we are the only truly powerful people on the face of the earth. We are the sole people who emerged from the war stronger than we were before. Only about 6 percent of the world's population lives within our borders. But we lead all other nations incomparably in horsepower, the key to production as production is the key in many ways to power and influence. We lead all other nations in agricultural production. We are the only people who have both a giant agriculture and a giant industry, while both are capable of almost endless expansion. We are the world's largest importers and exporters of both manufactured goods and raw materials. Our management is competent; our labor skilled; our techniques of production are unsurpassed. It follows, therefore, that since we loom over a battered and disorganized world like a colossus, whatever we may do, or fail to do, is of transcendent importance to men wherever they live.

In the struggle for the world that is now in progress, we are not without friends. Certainly the English-speaking nations of the earth are with us, from the home islands of Great Britain, to our neighbor Canada, to the other end of the earth in Australia and New Zealand. Similarly, western and northern Europe are our friends, and the extent to which that friendship may decline will depend more upon our default than their dereliction. Eastern Europe, hidden behind the iron curtain, is far from being natively hostile to us, but at the moment it is impotent and voiceless. Elsewhere in the world, we enjoy a large fund of good will. It springs from many factors. One is that we long ago abandoned imperialism. In the Philippines, we were the first nation to give a subject people their freedom, and this is not lost upon men. The other factor is that through our politico-economic system, we have managed to make men free and at the same time provide the world's highest standard of living. This, too, is not lost upon men.

Our influence in the world flows, then, not only from our material strength which is unmatched, but also from our spiritual attitudes. Most men do not fear us. They do not fear what we may do, but rather what we may refrain from doing.

Fate has so ordained it that there are only two titans left upon earth: the Soviet Union and ourselves. It would be criminally stupid to underrate our rival. The Soviet industrial and military potential is perhaps greater than our own. Russia's 9,000,000 square miles of territory and her 200,000,000 people—to say nothing of the land area and population of her satellites—constitute a staggering potential. Three times the size of the continental United States, with 60,000,000 more people than we have, and possessing gigantic stores of raw materials, the Soviet Union may ultimately become the earth's strongest power. But at this time she is weaker than we are.

At the outbreak of this war Russia was roughly where we were in the 1850's. She had a vast, undeveloped continent to develop. But, unlike ourselves, she had always been withdrawn from the world; aloof, secretive, dreaming, and—industrially backward. We had been in the mainsteam of nineteenth-century progress. She had stayed out of it. We went through many transitional industrial processes here. Russia attempted in one jump to go, not from the oxcart to the automobile, but from the oxcart to the airplane. We imported millions of foreigners to build America. They remained as loyal American citizens. Russia imported foreign technicans to help her. Then when their jobs were done they left the country. Nor is this all. Postwar investigations by our forces in Germany clearly show that it is nonsense to say that a dictatorship is more efficient than a democracy, because in a dictatorship everybody does what he is told to do and nobody talks back to the boss. The fact is that in a dictatorship men became robots. They do not dare to think. They are fearful of making a suggestion that might be useful. They do only what they are told to do, for the man who does more may lose his head or his meal ticket. Democratic freedom and democratic initiative are far superior in turning out goods, or fighting, to any dictatorship that men have ever devised.

Let us, however, grant for the purposes of our discussion, that Russia has had greater economic progress between the wars than we had expected. What then?

Russia's losses in the war were upon a colossal scale. Losses of houses, factories, bridges, railroads, dams, and electric power developments upon which she had so heavily relied. Russia's internal problems must be very heavy. And do not forget this. Her leaders must make good the promises upon which her revolution was predicated. It was promised to the Russian people nearly 30 years ago that if they would pull in their belts, work hard, and suffer privations for perhaps a generation, they would then come into a superior standard of living. The people did pull in their belts. They did suffer privations. But Russia's preparations for war must have lowered her already low standard of living. The war itself had a catastrophic effect upon her. That is why she has looted Manchuria and much of eastern Europe of everything she could lay her hands upon. And because her standard of prewar living was so low, Russian soldiers, coming into Europe at a time when it was destitute, stared bug-eyed at what they took to be the luxury of paradise.

Russia must spend the next 25 years restoring Russia if she makes good her word to her people. Even in such a land, the dictators must fear that the people will not forever wait upon them to make good their promises. I do not, then, think it an exaggeration to say that many of her actions during the past 2 or 3 years—actions which appear inexplicable to us—are dictated, not by strength, but by weakness. If, therefore, it is sound policy for us to oppose Communist expansion in the world, it is common sense to oppose it not when Russia—the homeland and heartland of communism—is strong, but when she is weak.

We do not deny that the Russians, or any other people, have the right to choose their own form of government; rather do we affirm it. We got on with Czarist Russia for more than a century although its absolutist principles were abhorrent to us, and we get on today with numerous governments that are—to put it politely—something less than democratic. If the Russians kept their communism to themselves; if they did not seek to impose it upon others by force, revolution, and boring from within, we could live in the same world with them, if somewhat uneasily. But if Russia is to use communism as a weapon for conquering the world, we must eventually come into conflict with her. As I have said before, we have fought in two wars within a generation to prevent any one country or group of countries, from dominating the earth. I have no doubt that we would do it again if unhappily the need should arise.

What are the prospects of preventing such a war? I think they are good. But they are good only if we carefully note the facts of human existence and act within the criteria that they impose.

We shall not triumph by merely denouncing communism. No physician denounces typhoid fever. Medical science finds what causes it; seeks to prevent it; and, if it strikes, tries to cure it. Denunciations of communism are childlike exercises in petulance, and must bring smiles to the faces of the hard-boiled men who rule Russia. So, too, if communism has any validity as a politico-economic concept, if it appeals to some men

in terms of idealism however mistaken we may think it, we cannot dispose of it by jailing some of its adherents. We can effectively combat it only by opposing to it our own democratic politico-economic ideas, and our own democratic idealisms. You and I believe that our system has more to offer men than communism has to offer them. And I think you would join me in saying that if we could carry our system, wholly or partially, to the peoples of the earth, they would aline themselves with us rather than with the Communists.

We must, however, act in terms of positive creation, instead of negative repression. You will recall how the early Christians were thrown to the lions and were scourged with whips. Yet Christianity spread despite the might of Rome, despite the killings and scourgings. It spread because its appeals to the minds and souls of men were greater than the appeals of paganism.

Remember, too, that for long centuries the ordinary man has been asking a larger share of the world's goods and services than he ever had before. It is a yearning that has never been entirely quiescent. It is a movement that we cannot, and should not, attempt to repress. Here in the United States, more than elsewhere, it has found its fullest expression. But over large areas of the earth, the movement has been stultified by ignorance, lack of techniques for industrial and agricultural production, or the blind greed of blind rulers. Wherever this condition exists, wherever men go naked and hungry, wherever they are hopeless of the future, communism makes inroads. If a man's life is an oscillation between sleep and hunger, if he is a slave in all but name, if his short days upon earth are but a journeying from one misery to another, there is no point in preaching to him the beauties of democracy. You cannot fry the Bill of Rights. You cannot keep warm under the Constitution on a cold night. Such indeed are the agonies of hunger, and the imperatives of self-preservation, that we know why many a European woman, during the war, starving herself or the mother of starving children, sold herself for a chocolate bar. Certainly in these terms, communism makes its greatest appeal to the hungry, the dispossessed, the bereft of hope; and these are as the sands of the sea today.

Yet bear this carefully in mind. The question is not whether communism is more capable than democracy of fulfilling the material and spiritual needs of men. It is not. The point is that communism comes in as a receivership when democracy is without vision; when, that is to say, it is moribund or bankrupt. Men embrace communism more out of desperation than out of conviction. They embrace it because at least it offers them hope of a better way of life than they have; as the only alternative when there is no other alternative.

I said before that the world does not fear us. Even the Russians do not, in my opinion, fear us militarily even though we have the atomic bomb. They believe that we will not use it unless we are first attacked. They would fear us only if we should adopt the one policy that they know to be effective as an antidote against their communistic expansions. That policy is one of counter-revolution.

By this I mean something relatively simple. The Russians know that hunger is revolutionary. They also know that bread is counter-revolutionary. It is not only a more humane weapon than guns, and a more rational weapon than repressions. It is also infinitely more effective. Bread, in long-run terms, is the only effective antidote to communism. Then add to bread the right to earn it in freedom, to eat in liberty, and communism will disappear like snow before the warm sun. Is there anything we can do to see that men get bread and enjoy it in freedom?

I think there is. The question is not whether we can do it, but whether we must do it. I believe that we must, because it is the only reasonable alternative to the building up of a situation that will ultimately result in a catastrophic war. During the last war we did not arm according to our resources, but according to our needs. We did not say that we could afford so many dollars for airplanes, and then build as many as we could get for that sum. We asked the armed forces to tell us how many airplanes they wanted. Then we found the money necessary to build them.

So now, faced with a crisis of appalling dimensions, we must consider not what we can do, but what we ought to do, what we must do. If communism continues to expand, if it should engulf country after country, the balance of power would eventually become so great against us that we could do one of two things. We could become part of the system. Or we could fight. I believe that we would fight. Obviously, the results would be catastrophic to us as well as to others. But we still have time to oppose the expansion of communism. We have the strength. The Russians, in all that counts, are presently weak. Their greatest strength lies neither in what they are nor what they do. It lies in what we do not do.

I suggest, therefore, that, after exhaustive studies have been made, the United States should announce a plan of financial assistance to the nations of the world upon a scale comparable to the needs. I need hardly add that I do not propose that this country should become a lady bountiful boarding-house keeper, ringing a bell and saying to everyone, "Come and get it." Prospective borrowers would have to demonstrate their needs beyond a shadow of a doubt, and borrow upon a budgetary plan according to conditions that we lay down and which they must live up to. I say budgetary plan because it must contemplate a period of 25 to 50 years for its completion. The tasks to be accomplished would take that much time, while we could finance it only in terms of decades rather than years. If, moreover, under such a proceeding, a borrowing nation did not abide by its promises, we could stop lending in the second year or the fifth year, and so we would retain a large measure of control over the way in which the money was being used.

There are many conditions to attach to such loans, but three are all important. These are:

1. The money must be used to develop projects that will enable the people to take care of themselves. For example, many areas in the world—especially in the Middle East—can raise their agricultural level only through irrigation. This means the building of dams, reservoirs, and similar works. We must stop supplying wheat to the starving, and supply them with the means of growing wheat.

2. Benefits flowing from our loans must accrue to the whole people of a nation, and not go largely into the hands of local grafters whether politicians or industrialists. This might imply direct American supervision of the spending of the money; or cutting off the annual installments when we were convinced that the money is being misused.

3. Borrowing countries must pay, so far as possible, for what they get in the form of exports, and the balance to be expressed in the form of a long-term loan without interest.

Two things are clear. We all know that modern technology in both industry and agriculture is fully capable of raising the standard of living of the people of the world to a higher scale than they have ever known. This does not necessarily mean that it can be raised to the American level. But most men would think themselves living in luxury if they were raised to the level of our very poorest people. We all know, too, that the ordinary man has long been demanding, will continue to demand, and rightfully does demand, a larger share of the world's goods and services than he ever had before. It follows, therefore, that if we do not show the world the way to a better life, the world will follow those who, if they do not lead the way, will promise to lead the way. Here in our country, thousands of Negroes are leaving the South for the North. My southern friends think they are foolish because, they say, Negroes will not be better off in the North than they are in the South. Such an argument, so far as the fact of Negro emigration is concerned, is irrelevant. Negroes will continue to go north so long as they think they will be better off there than in the South.

The plan I propose is designed to accomplish two objects. The one is the prevention of war. The other, directly flowing out of its operation, is the prevention of a perhaps catastrophic depression in this country. If that should befall us, most of the world would go down with us. This is the one great eventuality upon which the Soviet Union is counting. They hold that it is inevitable under our capitalist system. And—let us not blink the fact—they are joined in their prognostications of a great American depression, although for different reasons, by many British and American economists. But if we could set much of the backward world in industrial motion, if we could raise the standard of living of the more than 1,000,000,000 people of the earth who live at poverty levels, we should never have an economic depression, here or elsewhere.

The cost of such a plan will be high. Perhaps you will say that we cannot afford it. But what could cost us as much as a war; a war that would kill millions of Americans and destroy the whole structure of western civilization? How much would the parents and wives of our war dead give to have them back alive? What would now you and I pay if we could be assured that there would never again be war? Certainly I make no assurance whatsoever that the plan I have proposed will guarantee us against war. The most that men can do is to assess the world in which we live and proceed as reasonably as we know how to prevent the greatest of all human catastrophes. Surely if we should go to war tomorrow, no one would say that we could not afford it. We pay whatever war demands in lives and treasure as the price of our liberty. Everything on earth has its price. It may be that in the "heaven" of men's dreams one can eat his cake and have it too. But here below every single blessing must be paid for, sometimes doubly. It follows, then, that if we want a peaceful, orderly world, we wust pay the price. As against war, what price, in money terms, are we willing to pay?

And is that all that will be demanded of us? Most certainly, material riches alone will not suffice. Indeed, they could be our downfall unless purposefully applied by a meaningful people.

We may refuse to accept our destiny, but ultimately we cannot evade it. The situation we face is unparalleled. So must be our acts to meet it. We are not the darlings of history. History has no darlings. Geography has lost its concealing magic. The fates have not exempted us from the universal ordinance that life is in reality a hard road, dark and filled with tragedy.

It is our present lot to live in a time of the crashing of empires, the breaking of nations. Very well—what manner of men and women are we? Have we the courage to strip ourselves of all sham and littleness, and face up to the cold and all too tragic fact that upon our character and our capacity rests the future of our civilization? As against war, what price, in terms of discipline and sacrifice, are we willing to pay? As individuals and as a Nation, the moment of Destiny is upon us. We must either live greatly, or die meanly. Ours is the Choice.

Peace or War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank V. Severne, editor of the Watkins Express of Watkins Glen, N. Y., entitled "Peace or War":

PEACE OR WAR

On March 12, President Truman delivered an address before a joint seession of Congress for an appropriation of $400,000,000 to preserve and secure the territorial integrity and sovereign rights of Greece and Turkey. "I believe," he said, "that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

The English Magna Carta, our own Declaration of Independence, the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine, and now the pronouncement of a globe-encircling foreign policy mark the forward sweep across the centuries of human progress and the federation of the world. One hundred and seventy-five years ago, 3,000,000 people, stretched for a thousand miles along the Atlantic shore from Maine to Florida, were confronted with the same problem and asked the same question: Does it mean peace or war? And Lexington was the answer.

A small group of men assembled in Philadelphia, by a divided vote, adopted the Declaration of Independence and pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their most sacred honor to the cause of freedom.

The question before the American people today is far greater than that which confronted the Thirteen Colonies. It is worldwide and fraught with incalculable possibilities. No one who has followed the trend of events since the end of the last war can misunderstand or misinterpret the diplomatic manipulation of European affairs.

In the darkest hour of the American Revolution, Benjamin Franklin was sent to France for help. Without that help there could have been no Yorktown and no United States of America.

Greece and Turkey, in their hour of distress and danger, have appealed to us for help. If we fail, their liberties as a free people are at an end, and our own peace and security at home and abroad will become the object of a growing and perpetual menace. The freedom we prize for ourselves must not be denied to others, and the American people turn with pride and confidence to their lawmakers at Washington, without regard to party, for approval of the President's request.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

ALLEGHENY COUNTY COMMITTEE
ON DISPLACED PERSONS,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 11, 1947.

The Honorable JOHN McDOWELL,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. McDOWELL: May we respectfully submit the following resolution taken by the Allegheny County Committee on Displaced Persons on March 31, 1947:

"Whereas there remain in Europe today 850,000 people—men, women, and children—who cannot be returned to their original places of residence, and, 2 years after the war are still residing in detention camps because they have no place to go;

"Whereas the people of the United States have a responsibility to those people of other nations who because of the war are without a place to live;

"Whereas the heritage of our Nation and of our own local Pittsburgh community comes from the contributions made by peoples of many nations and many faiths;

"Whereas we have faith and confidence that these people who are without a place, share our community of interests, and will contribute to our society if we give them an opportunity: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, who have come together in an association known as the Allegheny County Committee on Displaced Persons, go on record in favor of permissive legislation of an emergency nature, so that a fair share of those people of Europe who are without a place to go may be granted an opportunity to enter the United States; and further, that copies of this statement be sent to the President of the United States and to those Members of the Congress of the United States who represent the people of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County."

Irish Achievement In U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Irish World, Saturday, March 29, 1947.

IRISH ACHIEVEMENT IN U. S. A.

As the colorful battalions from colleges and high schools, from military and civic organizations, from Irish counties of all Ireland, from cultural, fraternal, educational, political, social and state societies marched up Fifth Avenue on March 17, 1947, we heard citizens exclaim in wonder their joy and pride and give expression to their pent-up emotions in hearty calls of "Splendid," "The best ever," "Once more a great parade," "They seem to grow bigger and better," and "A wonderful day for the race." Our own idea was approaching the philosophical in that we thought only a democracy could produce such a parade. Only a democracy would select a nonmilitary man for national and international honors. Then our mind turned back over the past, over a bridge of history and the grand roll unfolded.

Among the founders of the Republic there were of Irish birth and blood: Charles Carroll, Charles Thomson, secretary to our First or Continental Congress; John Rutledge who is the real father of our Federal Constitution; he was practically the founder of South Carolina as Carroll was of Maryland. There were Nixon, Lyons, and Lynch. When we speak of free speech today we must not forget the man who defied the Federalists and forced the repeal of the sedition laws was a native of Ireland. Lyons was the man that forged the weapons which Jefferson translated into laws and ended forever the discrimination against foreign-born citizens. There were Generals Sullivan, Conway, and others who served our armies. There were Barry, McDonough and hundreds of men who made our Navy. There were Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson. Democracy owes as much to Jackson as it does to any other man this country produced or brought to the top in the fires and furnaces of revolution and war.

In New York, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire the basis of religious liberty was established by the Irish. People who protest today against discrimination do not know what they owe to the early Irish of this Republic for their social freedom. Twelve signers of the Declaration of Independence and 11 of the leading generals of the Revolutionary War were Irish by birth or descent.

But the social and political work performed by the Irish-Americans of New York from Charles O'Connor down to the Civil War is a second brilliant chapter.

When the Union was seriously endangered and our country's life as a separate, independent, and self-sustaining Republic was challenged during the Civil War one of the great coordinating forces, one of the stanchest upholders of the Union and President Lincoln was the Irish. There were approximately 350,000 native-born Irishmen in the northern armies during the Civil War. The names of the generals and high commanders of Irish extraction and of Irish birth would fill an entire page of this paper. We need but mention Phil Sheridan and Thomas F. Meagher as samples of the glorious list to remind our readers of the debt to the Irish.

The two world wars are too close to us to be reminding our readers that the noble procession was kept up. A list of the Kellys, the O'Briens, the Sullivans, the Bradys, the Murphys, the Bradleys, the Delaneys, and Delahauntys, McAuliffes, Kennys, O'Donnells and Callaghans, with all the rest of the Macs and O's not forgetting the Devereux, the Lynchs, Dorans, Duffys, and Andersons, and all the unmistakable Irish soldiers and seamen who contributed to the glory of our country and who did so much to preserve its power and security as well as contributing to our country's leadership in the world would fill several volumes.

No doubt accompanying the men and women and the young students up the line of march were the spirits of the illustrious dead. Echoing were the voices of humanity from the four corners of the earth saying. "Sing, parade, march—march on. The world owes it to the Irish."

Managing Our Own Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., which appeared on April 10, 1947:

MANAGING OUR OWN ECONOMY

Announcement in today's Bergen Evening Record of an average 20-percent reduction

on three distinguished stores' inventory of clothing extends into this territory a most astonishing and reassuring economic phenomenon. The dollars-and-cents facts of this merchants' rebellion against their own high prices are significant enough to us who consume. The reasoning which led to it is of even more importance.

For, like the reasoning which compelled the International Harvester Co., the Ford Motor Co., the Frigidaire division of General Motors Corp., and Emerson Radio to order drastic reductions in retail prices, the reasoning of Law, Inc., at the other end of the supply pipe line assumes a solemn responsibility of every one to this economic system of ours which is the basis of this political system of ours.

For the first time business acknowledges, even eloquently demonstrates, that if the free economy is to avoid catatrophic oscillation between boom and bust its participants must freely take a hand in preserving its equilibrium. "We accept our share of the responsibility," says the Law, Inc., announcement, "and thus earn the right to remind even more emphatically our fellow businessmen—as well as industry and labor—of the dire results (here as well as abroad) of waiting until a slackening in demand brings about a forced adjustment. Then production will be slowed down, employment will be even more drastically curtailed, and our national economy will be seriously crippled."

It goes without saying that if the general present trend is continued a crucial and increasing number of potential consumers will be priced out of the retail market; goods will back up on the shelves and in the pipe lines; lay-offs will start in the production industries; the consumer potential will still further contract; and we shall be on the sickening downward spiral which last time ended in the convulsion of the thirties. Let there be no mistake about it: If the United States economy collapses again it will be forever, as far as we now living are concerned. The administration which next becomes our trustee in bankruptcy will plan and regiment on a scale which will make the New Deal's bureaucracies seem by comparison the wildest dreams of a McKinley capitalist.

The alternative to this is what the laws, like Mr. Straus and Henry Ford II and Fowler McCormick now propose: That freemen take their planning, their pricing, their profits, their procedures, and their whole discipline back into their own hands. Their purpose is neither so visionary nor so improbable as might at first appear. By bringing back into the market consumers unable to buy at yesterday's prices they will accelerate turnover enough to maintain stable profits. And by providing yardsticks against which all prices can be measured they will force down less responsible merchants' prices; they will create between true value and the price tag a vacuum in which the profiteer cannot breathe.

Obviously, this is a challenge to industry, to labor, and to the consumer. How these partners in the common enterprise respond to the urgent challenge of the patent economic facts may be not only a test of freedom but to a degree the measure of whether we merit freedom.

Stop the Spending Spree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the people throughout the length and breadth of this Nation are extremely anxious that the wild and lavish spending of the taxpayers' money be curtailed. Of course, there is one way the Congress can curtail the spending of the people's money, and that one way is to materially reduce the appropriations of money to the many and various agencies of our Government.

I am very certain that many of the people desire that this spending spree be stopped at once. There are many potent reasons why that cannot be done, and I desire to present those reasons so the country and the people will know just what our situation is in that particular. Many of us desire that this spending be stopped at once—and I am one of those who so aspire; that wish is concurred in by millions of our people, because the taxes have been high and they have so continued for a long time. All classes of the people have struggled with the problem of paying their taxes. Those working for wages or salaries have found their pay checks in a smaller amount than anticipated because the withholding tax has been deducted therefrom. The common people, regardless of their occupation, have suffered the weight of the heavy hand of the taxing officials and this act alone has caused many of them to desist from employing help, making repairs, and engaging in needed and necessary remodeling and other pursuits. This fact alone has taken away the power of purchase and the power of employment. Their surplus has been absorbed in taxation.

Mr. Speaker, what is the cause of high taxes? Every American can answer that question, because when we spend we must tax. There is but one method of raising money for our Government, and that is by and through the method of taxation provided by law. The Government has no money except that which is raised by taxation, and that money comes from the people. We are the paymasters, and we are the only paymasters in that instance. The people pay the taxes to support our Government. And if and when excessive sums and amounts are recklessly spent by our Government, or by the boards, bureaus, and agencies thereof, and by the departments of our Government, that fact alone makes it necessary that the taxes be increased. Remember, when money is spent and spent foolishly the burden of paying rests upon the people, upon the taxpayers. Many people want and demand that certain public improvements or public services be extended, or inaugurated, and in many instances some of the people want and demand larger appropriations of money for certain purposes, but when that request, or demand, is made it is well that they remember that the money which will be so used must be raised from the people themselves by and through the method of taxation.

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year of our Government begins on July 1 of each year, and it runs up to and until June 30 of the following year. The departments of our Government, and the boards, bureaus and agencies thereof, are still operating under the appropriations made prior to July 1, 1946, and these appropriations were available from July 1, 1946, until June 30, 1947. The appropriations which are now being reduced for the various departments of Government for the fiscal year commencing on July 1, 1947, and ending on July 1, 1948, will not become effective until after July 1, 1947. Therefore, the many and various departments, boards, bureaus and agencies of our Government are still operating under the appropriations made before July 1, 1946, at the time the President, and his party, were in full control of both houses of Congress. Therefore, the spending which is now witnessed and which we will continue to witness until June 30, 1947, is the handiwork of the President and his majority in the Congress. The country and the people should know that fact, and they should remember it well—because they have been the spenders in our country for needless things.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that the appointees, who now hold their places in every department, board, bureau and agency of our Government will realize the sad plight of the people—the taxpayers—who pay the debts which they contract; the people pay the debts created by the large and unusual personnel employed in every place in our Government; they pay the debt created by every proposed gift, under the guise and pretense of a loan, made to foreign countries; the people—they pay, and pay, and pay. Yet, those in command—those in charge of our Government—fail to give one moment's thought or consideration to the struggle of the people to raise the money with which to pay the taxes imposed for the purpose of paying the debt created or the obligation made by them. Therefore, it is my hope that some thought will be exercised in behalf of the people who pay—the taxpayers. The spending must be cut, and the people must have relief—and this I urge.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Washington News of date April 1, 1947, which is as follows:

CUT SPENDING FIRST

Anyone who undertakes to dispute with John W. Hanes on taxation should do so with utmost humility. No other man in the country brings to the problem greater knowledge, intelligence, and sincerity than the former Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Hanes this week made the cheering announcement that the Government would end the current fiscal year, June 30, with a surplus of $3,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000. And he estimated that, with present taxes and high business volume, the end of the next fiscal year, June 30, 1948, would show an accumulated surplus of $9,500,000,000 if Congress cuts the President's budget by $4,500,000,000 as the Senate has recommended, or a surplus of $11,000,000,000 if the cut is to the tune of $6,000,000,000, as the House has resolved.

Mr. Hanes uses the figures to fortify his argument that it is possible to cut taxes and reduce the public debt at the same time.

We do not dispute Mr. Hanes' figures, nor his argument that taxes are too high for peacetime economic health of the country and must be reduced soon if America is to continue to prosper. But we would like further proof in regard to his most dubious assumption—namely, that the Republicans controlling Congress are really going to economize on the scale they promised. To date

there is little to justify that hope. Appropriation bills already in the congressional mill scarcely threaten a dent in the President's budget. And commitments are running high, wide, and handsome.

As typical of how Republicans, no less than Democrats, respond to spending pressures, take the case of the $12,000,000 subsidy for importing and shifting farm labor, which Congress has just continued. That subsidy was started as a food-for-wartime measure, but it is being continued into the third year of peace because the boys who own the beet-sugar ranches and vegetable farms want it continued, and they apparently have the votes to get what they want.

Or take the wool subsidy voted this week by the Senate. It is estimated that will cost the taxpayers $75,000,000. This program, designed to maintain an above-market price for wool at a time when Government warehouses bulge with surplus wool as never before, will force all taxpayers, as consumers, to continue paying too-high prices for clothes made of that wool. It doesn't make sense, but apparently it makes votes among the wool people.

In terms of billions, these Treasury raids of millions are small, but they are symptomatic. And the millions quickly add up to billions. What happens, then, to the rosy promise of surpluses?

We still want to see spending cuts ahead of tax cuts.

Governor Dewey and the Ban on Public Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune this past Sunday, April 13.

Mr. Sullivan hits the nail on the head in stating that the labor problem is in the public mind. My hat goes off to the legislation passed in New York State and approved by Governor Dewey which bans strikes by employees of the Government.

Today debate will start on H. R. 3020, the bill which the whole Nation has been so patiently waiting for. In going through the provisions in this bill, I believe the committee will be praised for their untiring efforts by every sound-thinking citizen in our country. H. R. 3020 should definitely correct the injustices that the rank and file of labor has been forced to accept. The bill prescribes the rights of an individual member of a labor organization and protects him in the exercise of those rights. It outlaws sympathy and jurisdictional strikes. It outlaws picketing of a place of business where the proprietor is not involved in a labor dispute with his employees, which action has recently caused considerable trouble in my own district. It makes labor organizations equally responsible with employers for contract violations. The bill also stops industry-wide bargaining which, in the past, has paralyzed our economy and imperiled the health and safety of our people. There are many other provisions in the bill which are most commendable and which, I believe, will go a long way toward bringing peaceful relationship between employer and employee.

My great hope now is that the upper House will approve of a similar bill, and that our President can report to the country along the lines of the report given by Governor Dewey when he stated that the labor legislation recently passed in New York State was the result of "fruitful partnership."

STATES BAN ON PUBLIC STRIKES CALLED ASSET TO DEWEY FOR 1948—MARK SULLIVAN DECLARES LABOR PROBLEM IS IN THE PUBLIC MIND, AND BECAUSE OF THE NEW LAW THE GOVERNOR IS NOW OUTSTANDING IN THIS FIELD

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, April 12.—Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, as a possibility for the Republican Presidential nomination, by quick and vigorous action on a new condition confronting him and his State and the country, has got for himself a secure and valuable asset.

There had arisen during recent years a new, extreme and dangerous use of power by labor unions and leaders—strikes by employees of Government. Such strikes had been considered so unthinkable that there was no law dealing with them in New York or in the Federal Government. That they called for legislation was obvious. Mr. Dewey acted, and by acting acquired to the public eye the distinction that goes with being the first.

There had been in New York City three threats of strikes which would have shut down the city-owned subway. It was these that moved Governor Dewey, though there had been minor strikes in other public services in other cities in the State. After two Republican members of the New York Legislature had prepared measures to make such strikes illegal there arose in Buffalo a strike of school teachers. Because this resulted in a shut-down of the schools in one of the country's largest cities it attracted Nation-wide public attention to the whole problem of strikes by Government employees. Taking account of the Buffalo strike, the proposed legislation was made stronger. Enactment of it, calling Governor Dewey to the attention of the country, gave him the asset he now has.

PROVISIONS OF THE LAW

The law as enacted makes a strike against the Government punishable by the discharge of the strikers. If the striker should be reinstated, the law provides that he cannot benefit from striking. He would be barred for 3 years from getting any increase in salary and his civil-service advantages would be otherwise curtailed.

The principle underlying this law was stated clearly by Governor Dewey: "The very right of private employees to strike depends on the protection of constitutional government under law. Every liberty enjoyed in this Nation exists because it is protected by government which functions uninterruptedly. Paralysis of government is anarchy, and in anarchy liberties become useless."

In another connection Governor Dewey stated another ancient principle of government. He initiated a measure aimed to provide larger salaries for teachers and otherwise improve education. But he insisted that the expense be met not out of the treasury but by local governments. To make this possible he initiated a measure giving larger taxing powers to local governments. And in signing this bill, he proclaimed a principle which he repeated on other occasions:

"Unless local governments are capable in large part of supporting themselves, we will rapidly degenerate to a centralized government, with the loss of freedom and careful scrutiny by the people which would inevitably follow. * * * Without close correlation between the spending of public money and the responsibility for collecting through taxes, local responsibility for government will degenerate rapidly and we shall have an all-powerful centralized government. * * * It is a fundamental truth that where a unit of government spends tax moneys which it does not raise irresponsibility and waste are inevitable."

PRINCIPLE APPLIED TO UNITED STATES

Then Governor Dewey applied the principle not merely to local governments and States but to the Federal Government, and not merely to taxation but to every form of legislation. His words might have been written by Thomas Jefferson:

"The strength of a free people is to be found in the alertness of its citizenry and their ability to watch and control the affairs of their government. Every power that can be left at home close to the people should remain where they can watch it and supervise it. * * * In this State and Nation we believe that the best government is that which is close to the people and under their constant scrutiny and control."

Governor Dewey's success in bringing about legislation which received applause was due in part to his leadership of the State legislature. He alluded to this as a "fruitful partnership." The ability of a governor or other party leader to get cooperation from his party is itself an asset, and this, too, weighs in Governor Dewey's behalf as a Presidential possibility.

The most conspicuous of the assets Governor Dewey has acquired is the legislation making strikes by government employees illegal. The labor problem is in the public mind, and in this field Governor Dewey is now outstanding. Public interest in the labor problem will soon turn to Congress when that body begins work on a comprehensive program of labor legislation. It is possible that some Republican in Congress, Senator TAFT or another, may acquire the kind of eminence in which Mr. Dewey is now most conspicuous.

The Party of Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial from the Zanesville (Ohio) Times-Recorder dated April 11, 1947:

PARTY OF PERFORMANCE

The Republican Party, placed in control of Congress last November, has found it necessary to tread warily in the intervening months and this caution has resulted in much undeserved criticism.

Appropriately enough, the majority of the critics are those aligned with the opposition party, the discredited "tax and spend" group, the New Dealers, who with their wild-eyed theories and impractical philosophies were repudiated at the polls.

Republican Congressmen took office with a promise to bring the national expenses within income, to eliminate all unnecessary Federal bureaus and agencies, to wrest powers from a greedy bureaucracy, returning them to their rightful owners, the local governments. They pledged themselves to halt usurpation of legislative power by the executive branch,

to bring an end to debasement of the currency, to reestablish personal freedom, to remove penalties on individual enterprise—in short to restore the American Republic to the foundations laid for it by our forefathers.

This, obviously, is an ambitious program, its successful performance requiring the utmost in calm, considered judgment, demanding the highest degree of patriotic statesmanship. Yet, from every surviving group of New Dealers, backed by a skill in propaganda acquired in years of fooling the people, comes loud disapprobation of Republican lethargy; criticism based on the fact that in a few months the present Congress has not been able to remedy all the mistakes, rectify all the errors, restore all the ruins that have resulted from more than a decade of blundering, stumbling incompetence.

The present situation is not new. Every time the Democratic Party has been given power the people have found it necessary to recall the Republicans to clean up the mess.

We are confident the Grand Old Party will meet every responsibility, fulfill every obligation, and any delay must be laid not to unwillingness nor inability, but to almost insuperable difficulties and the need for extreme caution.

A glance at the record of the Republican Party is convincing proof of its ability to perform as well as promise.

The Labor Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune for Monday, April 14, entitled "The Labor Bills":

THE LABOR BILLS

If the two big omnibus labor bills now coming before Congress were actually the "first real step toward the development of fascism in the United States," as Mr. Philip Murray told an impassioned rally of his Congress of Industrial Organizations chieftains in Washington yesterday, then history would have to lay the responsibility very largely upon union leadership of the kind which Mr. Murray and his CIO have so often exemplified.

Shrieks of fascism now, grotesque in themselves, cannot conceal the fact that these bills were incubated in the huge, paralyzing strikes and threats of strikes of a year ago; they were nurtured in the peremptory refusal of the heads of the great industrial unions to admit any public responsibilty commensurate with the power they were obviously wielding over the public's life; a democratic mandate for some effective corrective action was clearly returned in the elections last fall, and, with a serious economic, political, and social problem thus plainly posed, the union chieftains have had little or nothing to contribute toward an answer save more threats.

Union dictation invited the mandate. It has forced several demonstrations since that the hand of ordered government is by no means powerless to act Mr. Lewis has pretty clearly shown us that while you cannot dig coal with bayonets the courts can set enforceable limits to the irresponsibility of the big union managements. State enactments of varying degrees of severity, like the Condon-Wadlin Act here, the Indiana and Virginia laws which averted telephone strikes in those States or the New Jersey enactments, which the telephone workers are now challenging, have offered tests, the results of which are certainly not yet clear but which are suggestive experiments in the democratic regulation of this area of our life so vital to democratic survival.

For the CIO now to shout "fascism," "damnable conspiracy," "complete crippling of labor," and so on, perhaps testified to the power behind the measures now being considered, but it neither repeals the history out of which they have grown nor helps toward the serious criticism of the bills themselves. They are open to criticism. A number of the lesser provisions of the House bill are of dubious justice or practicability, while two major proposals—the banning of closed-shop contracts and of industry-wide bargaining—rely on the method of flat prohibition rather than on the more flexible and more workable method of regulating the abuses arising under these practices.

The Senate bill is not yet complete. Less extreme than the House bill, it may carry further modification when it is reported out. Senator IVES has been working hard for limitations in the interest of both workability and equity. He would, for example, defer the very involved question of industry-wide bargaining for further study; and, in urging that the right to apply for injunctions against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts should be confined to the Labor Board rather than given to employers, he draws a distinction important to the basic aim—which is not to "crush labor" but to establish a reasonable balance of rights and obligations between the parties to the industrial struggle.

That is what the Nation has demanded. Senator IVES, however, will not get much help from the CIO or other union leaders as long as they confine themselves to doing a tribal war dance about fascism. The bills are not ideal; but it is essential that they be got on the floor and subjected to real analysis. In such a process the only recipe for fascism is for any party to take a merely blind and stubborn view of the basic problems, economic as well as social, which have been forced upon us.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of President Truman's address on the Franklin D. Roosevelt memorial broadcast, as recorded in the New York Times of April 13, 1947:

My fellow countrymen, 1 year ago today I stood in silence beside a newly built tomb in the rose garden at Hyde Park. The tomb is a simple memorial of pure white marble. The inscription on it tells only that the man whose body lies there was born in 1882 and that he died in 1945.

But there is another and greater memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt which tells a fuller story. That story has been told to me a thousand times. I have seen it in the eyes and I have heard it in the words and I have read it in the hearts of men and women all over the country. It has come to me from those whom I have met in my travels, on trains, on ships, and in the air; even in foreign countries. It is the natural human response of people everywhere to something in the character and personality of Franklin Roosevelt. It is a response to his understanding and his sympathy for suffering—an understanding and a sympathy that were deep and sincere because they were born of a tragic personal experience.

That experience made Franklin Roosevelt peculiarly sensitive not only to the sorrows and the sufferings of others but also to their most cherished hopes and aspirations.

More impressive than marble monolith or anything printed on paper or carved in stone is the unending pilgrimage to that sheltered grave behind a high hemlock hedge above the Hudson. In the 12 months just passed, half a million persons have stood where I stood a year ago today.

Time will confirm Franklin Roosevelt's outstanding place in history. It is not for me or for any of his contemporaries to attempt to measure his great stature or to estimate the impact of his words and his deeds upon the days of his years. Today, as I think back to my visit to his grave a year ago, it is uppermost in my mind that he was a great humanitarian—that he brought hope and courage to despairing hearts when fear was destroying the faith of the people—and that through the most terrible war in history he remained the symbol of fortitude, justice, and humanity.

Franklin Roosevelt rests in a spot he held dearest—his home. He died fighting for what he loved most—his country, its homes, its institutions, its people, sharing their stubborn belief in freedom under a just God, in whose almighty beneficence rests the hope of the world this day.

His home and his grave are in the Nation's keeping. Let us bow together in a moment of silent tribute to his memory.

Indiana's Public Utility Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel:

REPUBLICAN ACHIEVEMENT

It is not by accident that Indiana's telephone workers remained on the job while 340,000 telephone employees elsewhere in the Nation were on strike.

According to the Associated Press, both union and company officials credit Indiana's new public-utility arbitration law with averting a walk-out in this State.

The Republican leadership in the 1947 general assembly will have earned the gratitude of all Hoosiers if the arbitration law survives this and future tests. Indiana is one of few States whose public-utility labor laws seem to have been adequately equipped with teeth to make them stick.

At any rate, James Orr, vice president of the Indiana Telephone Workers Local No. 1, said that in his opinion it was the law which averted the strike. More significantly Indiana members of the telephone workers' union have been forbidden by national headquarters to walk out.

An official opinion of the Attorney General given to Governor Gates is that the law applies in the present dispute. As a result, instead of a stoppage that is paralyzing most

of the Nation's communications system, Indiana telephone service continues uninterrupted, while contract negotiations between the company and the unions are in process.

According to the law, if collective bargaining (of or similar to the kind provided for by the National Labor Relations Act) fails, conciliators and boards of arbitration appointed by the Governor would attempt to effect a settlement.

Thereafter the State's arbitration and conciliation agencies would present their findings relative to wages, working conditions and/or whatever other matters may be in dispute.

Their decision may pacify both parties. But if either or both are still dissatisfied, an appeal may be carried to the circuit court of the county in which the dispute occurs. Upon review of the evidence, this court would make a decision which, if the law is observed, becomes final.

What happens if public utility workers walk off their jobs in event of their failure to bargain with management, thus by-passing the arbitration machinery?

There are two restraints making this unlikely. First, doing so makes them willful violators of the law. Violation of the anti-strike law carries maximum penalties of $2,000 in fines and a 6-month jail sentence. Second, if their case is equitable they stand to gain more by Government arbitration than they would from a long strike in which they would face the wrath of public indignation and loss of wages.

In the last recourse by law—that of an appeal to a circuit court—there may be the most serious weakness of the measure. It assumes an unwarranted capacity in a civil court to settle a problem calling for the special skills of a labor conciliator which many such judges lack.

Here would have been an ideal opportunity for establishment of a State labor court on the pattern of that advocated by Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan.

Nevertheless, the law appears to have real strength. It is so written as to make it highly desirable for both company and workers to settle their differences. Once the controversy goes beyond collective bargaining, either side stands to lose; and neither can tell who would end up the loser. The law encourages them to keep their chips on their own table.

Indiana has gained Nation-wide distinction because of this act. It should encourage the next legislature to carry the same principle into legislation affecting disputes in other types of industries. It promises to pave the way to similar laws in other States.

Henry Wallace's Speeches in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. Henry Wallace, who is touring in Europe, made some very strong and very disagreeable statements. It is possible that the gentleman violated some of our criminal statutes, by so doing. If he *did* violate any penal statute, he should be compelled to answer for that violation. However, all of us realize that he has directly injured the cause of peace in the world—and his untimely and very undiplomatic utterances have, without doubt, materially injured our relations in some country or countries in Europe. It is a sad commentary for us to behold a man who has held high public office, and who, undoubtedly, now aspires to some higher place, to "speak out of turn", as Wallace has done, and he says he will continue talking in the future. There is one way to stop him—and if he continues to injure our Nation, as he has undoubtedly already done, he should be stopped—and he should be stopped at once.

A very enlightening editorial appeared in the Indianapolis Star, recently, upon this subject. Under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks, I include that editorial, which is as follows:

WALLACE SPEAKS OUT OF TURN

Henry A. Wallace might say anything in Madison Square Garden and not greatly disturb the people of America. The situation is different when he makes sweeping assertions at a press conference in London. His friends in this country may applaud what he says at home, and others will consider the source and not worry. Europeans are likely to weigh his words in the scales of his having been Vice President, and take them too seriously.

Henry, for example, told the European newspapermen he felt a sense of urgency in watching these two giant powers, America and Russia, getting ready for a death struggle. How will that sound when it is relayed to Moscow? And what will the Soviet bosses not do with that as an argument to the peasantry back in the hinterland? There it is, a plain admission from a former Vice-President of the United States that we are getting ready for a death struggle with Russia.

Secretary Marshall's patience and patriotic endeavor to bring about a better understanding with Stalin and Molotov are being hamstrung by the garrulous Wallace. The former Vice-President is not so dumb that he does not realize how ill-advised are his remarks. He cannot be excused by the remark that he is well meaning. If he were well meaning he would not embarrass his own Government in the present emergency.

Requesting the National Congress To Pass Legislation for the Immediate Cash Payment of GI Terminal Leave Pay Heretofore Issued in Nontransferable Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution which was adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly, this year:

S. 279—H. 357

(Concurrent resolution by Mr. Cantwell requesting the National Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal leave pay heretofore issued in nontransferable bonds)

In the senate:
Introduced March 11, 1947.
Considered March 12, 1947; adopted.
Sent to house by order of the senate.

WM. BRANSWELL,
Assistant Clerk.

In the house:
Introduced March 13, 1947; veterans affairs.
Considered March 27, 1947; favorable.
Considered April 1, 1947; adopted.
A true copy.

JAMES H. FOWLES,
Clerk of South Carolina Senate.

Concurrent resolution requesting the National Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal-leave pay heretofore issued in nontransferable bonds

Whereas the National Congress of the United States of America by legislation duly passed, issued to enlisted men of World War II terminal pay nontransferable bonds for their services as rendered; and

Whereas these veterans in the United States could more acceptably use such pay in the readjustment period in so many ways; and

Whereas there is now pending in the National Congress a number of bills to make immediate cash payment of these terminal-pay bonds to the veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring). That the General Assembly of South Carolina hereby requests the National Congress of the United States to give as early attention as is practicable to the payment of the terminal-pay bonds heretofore issued to veterans of World War II; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of the National Congress from South Carolina urging immediate attention and assistance with this pending legislation: be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution also be sent to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the legislative committee of the American Legion and to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, all in Washington, D. C.

Americanism Or?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an essay written by one of my constituents, Roger Brucker, of Shelby, Ohio, who is one of the winners of the essay contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio.

I congratulate Mr. Brucker on being one of the winners and upon his achievement, and I respectfully urge the membership of the House of Representatives to read this essay, "Americanism Or?"

I also compliment the American Legion of Ohio for sponsoring such a worthwhile program and for bringing these winners as their guests to the greatest capital of the world.

The essay follows:

AMERICANISM OR?

(By Roger Brucker)

"Atom bomb levels Hiroshima." The atom bomb was not the only thing that went boom that day. In the minds of a good many Americans this started a chain reaction of thoughts—thoughts of future wars far more horrible than any yet dreamed of. Scientists began hinting of even deadlier things to come. Hand in hand with the thoughts of

war came those of peace, a peace which would insure fair and equal rights for the people of the world. How can the people of the world govern themselves and also keep peace?

For countless centuries, down through the pages of history, man has sought the perfect government. The Romans were on the road to this goal with their semidemocratic form of government, but greedy men seized power and the Roman Empire disintegrated. All this, however, did not take place within a short period of time. The Roman Empire lasted more than three times as long as our Nation has.

In 1787 a group of men attempted a difficult task. It is difficult to get 13 people to agree on matters pertaining to their rights. It is harder yet to get Thirteen Colonies to agree on the same question. The Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia to unite these Colonies into a strong Nation—a Nation which today is the strongest in the world. These men studied the Roman and every other government to profit by their mistakes. With these experiences they drew up the Constitution and set in motion the wheels of a more perfect government than any yet devised. The freedom we have today must be attributed to the foresight of these men.

The spirit of Americanism was born in the people of the Colonies long before the drawing up of the Constitution. This spirit grew as America grew. Today many organizations are based around this spirit. The increase in the number of qualified persons voting is a good example of Americanism in operation.

Truly, Americanism is a good thing, but is it the greatest height to which democracy can rise? I cannot believe this to be true. I believe that democracy, in order to be really effective, must work on a larger scale. Let us consider it working on a scale called worldism. I feel that this is the ultimate goal of democracy.

Until the theory that nationalism is the primary concern of the people of a country is antiquated, we shall never have a true democracy or even peace. A new way of thinking must be developed now. A way that will make men realize that all men have equal rights and that no one is more important than any other. Just as in the early days of our country States were reluctant to give up petty advantages, nations, too, will not be willing to give up certain of their advantages. When the Thirteen Colonies agreed to the plan for a United States, they found that the gains realized from the Union far outstripped the losses. The people benefit when their welfare and happiness is put foremost. The uniting of the States was a give-and-take proposition the same as life is a give-and-take proposition.

By this we may conclude that Americanism is not an end in itself but merely a means to an end. One can easily see by comparison that Americanism is the most promising start yet known on the road to worldism. Americanism is the foundation to lasting peace. Worldism through peace, peace through democracy, and democracy through Americanism.

United States of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper articles:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 2, 1947]

UNITED EUROPE SOON?

(By William Philip Simms)

There will be a United States of Europe within 2 years, Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, founder of the pan-Europe movement predicted today. The only doubt, he said, is whether it would be a union of democracies or a union of soviets.

Count Coudenhove-Kalergi is head of the Research Center for European Federation at New York University. He came to Washington to discuss related problems with officials here. He predicted to the writer that a united Europe soon will be official United States policy.

The Boggs-Fulbright resolution declaring that the Congress hereby favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations, Count Coudenhove-Kalergi observed, is the inevitable corollary of the Truman doctrine.

That doctrine, he said, has brought things to a head. Before its enunciation, European statesmen overwhelmingly favored a United States of Europe but many of them feared to work openly to bring it about.

Now things will be different. The little countries will not be so afraid of the Soviet Union. With American backing, they will go ahead. Next August, a customs union is schedule to go into effect among the Netherlands, Luxemburg, and Belgium. That will be the beginning. Others will follow and the movement will grow like a snowball. The United States of Europe will not spring up overnight. It will develop economically and politically along natural lines until, at last, there it will be.

While in Europe last summer Count Coudenhove-Kalergi polled 3,913 members of European parliaments, asking whether they favored a European federation within the UN framework. All members of freely elected parliaments were polled. Of 624 who have replied, all but 12 answered "Yes."

A Congress of European members of parliament will meet in Geneva next summer. Some 185 are expected. A European charter will be drafted with practical recommendations for economic and political integration. This will be done in line with article 52 of the UN Charter which provides for regional pacts and agencies.

The Communists are the principal holdouts. Moscow is bitterly hostile. She is suspicious of even the slightest collaboration on the part of any two of the western powers, however small. It is far easier for Russia to seize control of small European states, one by one, than to dominate all of them in a bloc. As long as the Kremlin dictatorship can call the tune, a united Europe will be difficult—unless the Kremlin can unite the Continent under the hammer and sickle.

But a forthright stand on the part of the American people behind the Truman Doctrine might lead Russia to see that her own best long-term interests lie in the direction of a peaceful, prosperous, united Europe. It is chiefly on this that proponents of a united Europe are pinning their hopes.

"Europe's future depends on America," observed Count Coudenhove-Kalergi. "But," he added, "America's destiny also is linked to the fate of Europe."

[From the Washington Post of April 8, 1947]

EUROPEAN UNION

The prospect of failure at Moscow to achieve any meeting of Russo-western minds on the German future puts the onus upon this country to leave Europe in no uncertainty about our American policy. All the conditions are favorable for the achievement of a western agreement over Germany. British and Americans have already come to a working arrangement in the amalgamation of their zones in Germany. The French, to be sure, are still absent from it. But the French would enter our system in Germany tomorrow if we were to apply their common sense to the problem of the Ruhr. An international regime in the Ruhr would make the French our copartners. And it would bring about a solution of the non-Ruhr problem of Germany by sheer attraction.

The Ruhr is so vital to all Europe, indeed, that its internationalization would make visible the community of Europe. Now the political manifestation of community is federation—a way out for Europe to which many of its public men have been converted as the answer to chaos and communism. The philosopher Lecky says that "the success of any opinion depends much less upon the force of arguments, or upon the ability of its advocates, than upon the predisposition of society to receive it." In our opinion there is now a predisposition in Europe for federation. It has acquired momentum in Britain and France from their economic difficulties. The Monnet plan in France, it is recognized, cannot succeed except in a larger context of population and resources. So Monnet's visit to London resulted in an organized exploration of the Blum bid for a Franco-British tie. Under the pressure of events more and more leaders in Britain are losing the duality of mind which persuaded Mr. Churchill at Zurich to advocate union for continental Europe and freedom of action for Britain. But the most significant step seems to have been made in the low countries. Dutch-Belgian negotiations looking to the setting up of a customs union have been successful. What has been the most formidable hurdle has been fear of Russian opposition; no country and no people in Europe are free from it. Yet that fear would be removed in an instant by American backing and financing of federation, and must be.

It is the logic of the Truman doctrine no less than the logic of failure in Moscow to demonstrate this backing on Secretary Marshall's return. The doctrine is profreedom. But it would lead to our national bankruptcy if we were to limit its application to nations only as their independence comes under the shadow of extinguishment. We cannot wait to bail nations out, nor have we the money to do it. The moral of the Truman policy is that we shall prevent these emergencies. This can be done by throwing all our energies into the task of making as much as possible of Europe into a going concern—first by political encouragement of federation and then by an American survey on the spot, coupled with consultations with the European commission, of what reconstruction will require. The alternative is chaos, a Russian-subjugated Europe, or a Europe located like an Old Man of the Sea on America's back.

A verbal investment in such a program is already before Congress sponsored by Senator FULBRIGHT and Representative BOGGS. Their 28-word resolution says that "the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations." Passage of this resolution would have an electric effect upon Europe if it were pushed and followed up by the State Department. It has already been given enough lip service to warrant action. Last year President Truman, in an interview with George Creel, applauded a United States of Europe. And Secretary Marshall came close to endorsement in Moscow when he said "We are not in favor of a Europe divided against itself," as it would be, in Senator FULBRIGHT'S words, as a congeries of fragmented sovereignties. The Secretary's negative requires to be completed with a positive, for an impasse in Moscow would leave a dangerous diplomatic void in Europe and accentuate fear in Europe of being squeezed between Russia and America.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 7, 1947]

THE TIME IS FAVORABLE

Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, in an eloquent article in the Post-Dispatch yesterday, called on America to look beyond patchwork accommodations in the international field and strive for a solution which will relieve us of the economic and military burdens of a disorganized Europe.

In the next 15 months the United States is expected to spend $7,000,000,000 on its international commitments, some $700,000,000 going to the support of our defeated enemy, Germany. As a practical people, Senator FULBRIGHT says, "we may well ask ourselves, how do we finally work out from under these obligations?" Then he answers his own question:

"In the Near East and in Europe a prerequisite to the revival of trade and industry is a United States of Europe. * * * With the federalization of Europe would come freedom of commerce, the free movement of persons, a common currency and efficient transportation. The result would be a rising standard of living and a lowering of the political rivalries and economic tensions generating war."

Senator FULBRIGHT points out that Europe desperately needs, for its rehabilitation, the full production of German industry. But because Europe is not organized in such a way as to protect itself from a possible revival of German militarism, it is planned to let Germany manufacture less than a third of its prewar production of steel, less than half of its rated capacity of fertilizer, and other goods in proportion.

Senator FULBRIGHT would have Germany broken up into the separate states which composed the Reich and then organize these with other continental countries into a European federation. So divided, the Germans could not dominate a European federation.

The Senator takes it for granted, of course, that European federation would have to be achieved over Russian opposition. He thinks it should be clear to us by now that Russia does not intend, if she can help it, to permit the rehabilitation of any European country, except under the aegis of the Communist party. It is up to the Western powers to see that Europe is rehabilitated, instead, under democratic auspices. He would have the United States extend encouragement for the calling of a constitutional convention to unite at least western Europe.

He admits the great complexity of the problem but adds: "The most propitious time to move forward is just after society has been disturbed by some great upheaval leaving it in an unstable and fluid state."

The western powers would do well to commit this statement to memory. The men in the Kremlin know it and it is their guiding principle at the moment. If the Western powers forget it, they do so at their peril.

[From the Washington Daily News of April 2, 1947]

AN ALL-OUT PEACE OFFENSIVE

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, has introduced a resolution favoring a United Democratic States of Europe—excluding Russia and her satellites. Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, Arkansas, urges a federation to include all European states.

Winston Churchill and many other statesmen view some form of federation as the only hope for Europe's peace and recovery. But the road is blocked by Russia's attitude that any action toward European unity is an effort to form an anti-Soviet bloc.

Yet, if Europe is to survive, the continental nations and Britain must learn to live and work together.

The Truman doctrine of protecting independent states against foreign aggression is sound, as far as it goes. But it is a defensive position against war. It will not, of itself, relieve sick and faltering Europe from unbearable burdens of armaments and fear. A broad, dynamic peace offensive is essential to save Europe and the world from economic chaos and disintegration.

The United States can do much to open the way for an era of good will and cooperation. We are the world's banker—the only great power that is solvent and able to give substantial aid to other nations.

That position entitles us to demand that Europe put her house in order, and live at peace as we do among our Western Hemisphere neighbors.

The Truman doctrine can be made a positive, winning program by our announcing that we will support nations which are willing to cooperate with one another, and withhold all aid from those which are disturbing the peace or contributing to economic stagnation. We are, in fact, backing into such a position now when we deny grain to Yugoslavia.

But what is needed is a dramatic pronouncement that will command world attention and respect. This is where the project of a united Europe comes in.

Europe's highly integrated economy will not respond to piecemeal treatment which remedies fingers and toes but overlooks lungs and heart. Rehabilitation, to succeed, must be on a continent basis. We should insist that an economic council of Europe be formed to draft a general recovery plan.

Not all nations would join at once in such a program. But, given firm support, the movement's strength would be cumulative.

With the world divided by ideological conflict, many peoples are on the fence, wondering which way to jump. The choice between a system backed by our productive capacity and genius and Russia's tottering, low-standard economy would seem inevitable—once we demonstrated that we meant business.

Russia? When Moscow becomes convinced that not enough war loot and reparations exist in devastated Germany to meet the demands of Russia's hungry people, the Soviets may see that their salvation lies in working with peace-loving nations in a common reconstruction program.

Relief? Some will be necessary, for a time. But the bulk of our money should be invested in self-liquidating enterprises, helping only those who are willing to help themselves. If economic unity brings a United States of Europe, well and good. But the first essential in Europe is for people to get back to work.

Palestine

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a coincidence, after finishing the newly published book, Behind the Silken Curtain, by Bartley C. Crum, I picked up the Washington Times-Herald this morning and read the leading editorial which I recommend to all of the Members of the House. Regardless of how you feel about the Palestine situation, I think you should read this book. It contains some charges which I feel should be answered instead of being evaded. We, the strongest country in the world, should have a State Department upon which we can rely to deal forthrightly with all matters. The President of the United States, at least, should know what is going on in his own State Department.

UN TAKES UP PALESTINE

United Nations Secretary General Trygve Lie must be given credit for at least one thing, we think; namely, that he moved with strikingly un-UN-like speed in the matter of Palestine.

British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin last February threw up his hands, admitted that direct Jewish-Arab negotiations in London had broken down, and signified Britain's willingness to submit the whole Palestine question to the UN.

This was done formally on April 2. Mr. Lie cabled notices to the 55 member nations of the General Assembly that he would like that body to begin consideration of Palestine on April 28. Approvals came in from the necessary majority—29 nations—and lo and behold, the debate is now set to start April 28 at the General Assembly's old stamping ground in Flushing Meadow, New York City.

This is phenomenal speed for the UN to show, and is rather as if Mr. Lie had turned suddenly from an elephant into a reindeer or gazelle.

Of course, the General Assembly won't be able to do anything definite about Palestine, like changing it from a British mandate to a UN trustee territory or a state split three ways among the Arabs, British and Jews.

The Assembly is only a sort of high-toned debating society. The real UN powerhouse, such as it is, is the Security Council, with its big five permanent members and six other rotating members.

However, an international debating society can at least debate—meaning it can let everybody concerned with the problem under discussion get up and speak his mind. That a lot of mind-speaking will be done and a lot of time consumed in this debate is a lead-pipe cinch.

Palestine is one of the most explosive issues in the world today. Primarily, the question is whether the Jews are ever to get the national homeland they want, in the most logical of all places in the map of the world. Mixed up with that primary question, though, are all sorts of secondary ones, having to do with Britain's strategic position in the Middle East, Russian ambitions to break the backbone of that British position, the desire of several nations including our own for easy access to Middle East oil, and so on.

It is conceivable that the General Assembly debate on Palestine may build up public opinion throughout the world to force a final and reasonably satisfactory settlement of the entire Holy Land issue. That would be a large feather in the cap of the UN.

At the least, it seems certain that many people will know more about Palestine at the end of this discussion than they know now.

We're hoping especially for the airing of a sensational charge going around about some dealings of our own State Department with regard to Palestine.

This charge is made in a recently published book: Behind the Silken Curtain, by Bartley C. Crum; Simon and Schuster, New York, 1947, 298 pages, $3. Mr. Crum was a United States member of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine.

CRUM VERSUS ACHESON

We quote from pages 36 and 37 of the Crum book:

"I was given * * * a résumé of the State Department secret file on Palestine, the existence of which apparently not even President Truman had known. According to this

file, since September 15, 1938, each time a promise was made to American Jewry regarding Palestine, the State Department promptly sent messages to the Arab rulers discounting it and reassuring them, in effect, that regardless of what was promised publicly to the Jews, nothing would be done to change the situation in Palestine. This file confirmed the charge of double-dealing that had been hurled at both the United States and Great Britain."

Crum further says that Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson denied a charge by Crum that State Department subordinates had sabotaged the Truman Palestine policy; and that Acheson, challenged to make the abovementioned secret file public, had not done so.

The Crum book goes into some most interesting detail on this subject of State Department playing both ends against the middle. Crum's story, on the surface at least, has a well documented and responsible ring to it.

We move that this particular charge be placed on the program of the General Assembly's Palestine debate, well up toward the top, and that the whole truth about it be dug out and broadcast to the world.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MITCHELL JENKINS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Pennslyvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by A. A. Berle, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of State, at the fourth convention of American Federation of International Institutes, St. Moritz, New York, N. Y., March 28, 1947:

Exclusion of displaced persons from any permanent home is the blackest page in postwar history.

Callous Nazi cruelty and, I am sorry to add, inhuman Allied policy has made some millions of innocent people into permanent prisoners behind barbed wire—or wanderers on the face of the earth. The Italian treaty we are asked to ratify displaces even more; since its signature nearly 30,000 poured into Italy.

Many hundreds of thousands we may never hear of again. These we cannot reach; for them we can only hope.

But we can do something about the 900,000 or so who are in western Europe. More than that, we are jointly responsible. As they die, we share the guilt.

And I say with all conviction that history takes its toll for guilt of this kind. These pools of misery we call concentration camps or DP camps scattered throughout Europe are weights thrown into the scales of international affairs. They breed fear, despair, and hatred. If they are unrelieved, they lead in time to violence, anarchy, and war. Having spent much of my life in international affairs, I have seen whole nations pay in blood and tears for guilt of this kind.

All Allied nations should be working to clear up this problem. But even if others fail, the United States Congress can act. I am here today to ask that you and all of your friends join in urging that Congress do something now.

The 900,000 displaced peoples in western Europe include refugees of all races. Twenty percent are Jews; the rest are Christians. They are Italian and Polish and Lithuanians and Catholics. They are Protestants from Finland and Latvia. They are Greek Catholics from Yugoslavia and Greece. They are new migrants from Venezia-Giulia on the Yugoslav border.

These men, women, and children are not going home. They cannot. Some would be killed if they went. Others have been forcibly driven out by the occupying nations. You may say that Europe ought to take care of its own. No doubt; but Europe will not, and the United States apparently is unable to change that situation. Devoted Americans—I am proud to mention my friend, Eddie Warburg—have pounded in every government without success. It comes to this: If the United States does nothing, practically nothing will be done.

But we, who absorbed the European refugees after the massacres of Kishinev, and when the Armenians were being forced out of Turkey, and in many other cases can take, and must take, a substantial number of these people.

We can do it by proper handling of our immigration laws. These laws permit the immigration into the United States of 154,000 quota immigrants annually. This was authorized by the Congress more than 20 years ago.

But in fact during the war years immigration substantially stopped. We did not take in 154,000 people a year, because they could not leave. So that in fact immigration was suspended in large part since 1939. Actually, since 1930 less than 600,000 immigrants reached the United States on immigration visas.

Because of this, a former Commissioner of Immigration, Earl G. Harrison, is now proposing legislation which would permit 400,000 displaced persons to enter the United States, in adidtion to the immigration permitted under the quota law. These immigration visas should be available to displaced persons only.

The Congress can do this without changing the immigration policy to which they are committed. The United States can do this without absorbing more immigration than was estimated when it passed the present law. The public can demand this in the name of common decency. You can influence a fair share of public opinion.

Nobody need say: "There is nothing I can do about displaced persons." There is a thing that can be done. Gov. Herbert Lehman has been urging action along these lines. So has Charles Taft. Fiorello LaGuardia has asked for it, so has Jim Farley. They are entitled to some help.

And, while you are at it, throw your weight against the diplomacy that wants to push populations out of one country for the benefit of another.

That policy was adopted in the evil days of the Hitler-Stalin pact. One of the first results of that pact was the displacing of great numbers as a result of the partition of Poland and the rearrangement of frontiers in eastern Europe. Both sides displaced thousands of homes. I have never discovered how some Allied governments were willing to accept this cynical and hideous idea. The brutal fact is that displaced persons are not all victims of Nazi cruelty. Some of them are victims of Allied mistakes.

Behind barbed wire or in sodden barracks there are men and women and 150,000 children whose lives are as important in the sight of heaven and civilization as your life or mine. They have been hounded through the tragedy of exile and hunger to the greater tragedy of hopeless despair. This country has in its hands the keys to those camps and has not yet seen fit to open their gates.

In the name of God, how long?

Air Power Supremacy and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Maj. Gen. William E. Kepner, commanding general, Technical Training Division, AAF, Scott Field, Ill., before the Air Power Is Peace Power dinner, First National Aeronautics Conference of the American Legion Thursday evening, March 20, 1947, at the United States Naval Armory, Indianapolis, Ind.:

Down through the ages the security of any nation has depended on its ability and determination to provide the necessary means. This has been followed by the tactics necessary to overcome the opposition. The supremacy of equipment and manpower has been a beacon light to those leaders who held responsibility.

Supremacy is a condition of fact upon each successful termination of conflict. In a struggle of attrition, it happens at a majority of local conflicts. The combining of these miscellaneous supremacies of action produces national supremacy, whether it be industrialism, statesmanship, or war. I hold it to be a law of nature that nothing stands still—you either go ahead or you go backward. Hence we must struggle to go ahead.

Fortunately, in both World Wars I and II the industrial supremacy of North America, and in particular the United States of America, was an established fact. Happily, its ability to survive a destructive attack such as Europe or Japan endured was never seriously challenged.

Our statesmanship saw us through war. It is now confronted with going ahead in organizing the peace and preventing another war. It is a very great task. Progress can only be evident when success is assured. May God grant them supremacy.

However, we must deal in capabilities, and I do hold that a proper security of our present industrial supremacy demands air-power supremacy if we are going to maintain security and peace.

At least two, and possibly three, other populated centers of the world have the capabilities to produce developments that we must keep abreast of in order to maintain our Nation's supremacy.

In World War II our air strategy in Europe seems to have been, first, slowing down growth of the German Air Force, by bombing attacks that stopped him from increasing in strength; second, by a bleeding-to-death process of the whole German Air Force structure that eventually gained air supremacy for the Allies Then the air-war decision was in our favor, and no longer seriously contested. In this, we used a team of bombers, fighters, and logistics, where each depended on the other two to gain and maintain supremacy.

Logistics was an endless chain of moving supplies, equipment, and personnel. One end was the source in the United States of America, supported by 140,000,000 people who made it possible. The discharge end in Europe and Africa. The carrier space (the ocean and the airways between), protected by both sea and air escort defense. Factories and depots supplied bombers and fighters.

Bombers attacked strategic targets, i. e., war munitions, tank factories, airplane factories, transportation, oil and electric facilities, submarine bases, enemy docks, and fleet bases. These attacks definitely helped the fighters to survive, also the flow of logistics to all.

The fighters escorted bombers to the limit of endurance. This endurance increased through logistic planning until they went all the way. They also attacked transportation and German air force logistic installations. The guiding principle being to attack and destroy or by every conceivable means, to heckle and confuse to the end, that we might gain air supremacy and by the use of all air power prevent the German air force from maintaining air supremacy.

It was a problem of logistics, a race of production headed by the President, statesmen and industrial organizations of people at home in the strategy of providing the means. The air combat strategy headed by General Arnold directing the flow to General Spaatz in Europe and General Kenny in the Pacific.

It was also a race against time. The Eighth Air Force (one of 16 air forces), on its first mission in 1942, led by General Eaker without American fighter escort, consisted of 12 bombers. In December 1944, the Eighth Air Force under General Doolittle put 2,000 bombers, escorted by about 1,000 fighter escorts, on a mission. Air supremacy was in sight but not yet an established fact.

It became a fact on the conclusion of the air battles of Berlin, in March of 1945. The German Air Force air supremacy was broken, the body bleeding to death, and his development going backward.

It is needless to say this was accomplished not by the Eighth Air Force alone, but by all the Allied air forces in the European theater of operations. It was made possible through the understanding support and appreciation of the Supreme Commander in Chief, General Eisenhower, backed by the Supreme Allied War Council and Joint War Chiefs of Staff.

We demonstrated, among many things, that courage and aggressiveness in air warfare cannot be stopped, except by destruction at the base, or in the air. It is a matter of record that in no single case did an attack turn back because of opposition.

Nor were these principles or actions peculiar to one air force. They were equally true of United States air power everywhere, regardless of war theater or the color of the uniform.

How did we grow up to air supremacy in the face of the unquestioned German Air Force supremacy? The answer is, they (the German Air Force) committed several serious errors in strategy and tactics. My personal opinion is that the following is pertinent:

1. They did not go after the English fighters in the Battle of Britain, thus they failed to soften up the air ahead of their bombers.

2. They did not attack and annihilate our fighters and thus prevent effective escort of American bombers, particularly when they frequently outnumbered us locally by four or five to one, in the beginning.

3. They went to a fighter defense over Germany instead of providing for strategic attacks on our English bases or in the vicinity, when we were assembling or returning.

4. They failed to use flexible plans that would enable their combat leaders (in the air) to take advantage of combat intelligence on the spot.

5. They dealt with air war in a tempo and psychology of their own past successes, when there had been a different enemy and equipment in the air. They were too inflexible to meet surprise either in tactics or strength. This severely restricted all local German Air Force air commanders' initiative.

Whether these observations of mine were decisive factors, may be open to question. But it is a fact they did not maintain air supremacy; they eventually went backward.

Much is being said about the next war being a push-button affair. Well, it may be, but that depends on when it happens and what development goes on between now and then. If it happens tomorrow, there won't be too many buttons ready. And any potential enemy knows that as well as we do. I trust such an enemy does not exist, but if he does exist, I hope he is at least no smarter than we are along the lines of science and technology.

Our security depends on an ability to go through a transition phase between the methods available today and those of a future push-button era, if and when it arrives.

All future wars will probably be planned on the blitz pattern. It certainly is far more satisfactory to the winner if a war can be won quickly. For in another war of any duration, even the winner is going to receive some severe body blows that are costly.

If a war comes tomorrow, we shall have to use what we have today. Our present machines manned with currently trained personnel, will have to suffice, at least in the beginning.

While industry will tool up on advanced design, it will take time. The only time won will be through our reserve forces that we can use immediately, if we are the object of initial attacks.

Does anyone doubt that these planes will be our present active bombers and jet machines? If war occurred immediately, we would not be too far behind in development compared to the rest of the world. What a more distant date would involve, I cannot predict.

However, as for training and organization, it has been said by others that we are not in nearly as good shape as we were at the end of World War II, due to rapid demobilization. That condition can only be corrected by strenuous all-out effort on the part of everyone. Again, it is a question of time. On this point we need to squarely face the plain truth. Churchill proved that a democratic nation would face it, when he promised only blood, sweat, and tears with a real hope of victory in the end.

If we must face a complete push-button war in the unknown future, it takes time for development as it took time in World War II. We get time only through surviving an attack or preventing one. Let's hope it is prevented.

Atomic energy and the atom bomb is but a point on the threshold of science. It adds tremendous capacity to air power. What would have seemed fantastic destruction 5 years ago, is today a reality. Apply speeds and ranges demonstrated this past year and the desirability of holding air supremacy rises up as a grimly necessary objective at once. Security of our industrial productivity is mandatory and we dare not relax until we are sure there will be no more war.

The examples of destruction by air power at Hiroshima and Nagasaki are proof enough of the destructive force of one air weapon. The Bikini test fully vindicated the forecast of the scientists. I need not repeat here the results. Some of you saw them, as I did when I was privileged to be Vice Admiral Blandy's deputy commander for Army and Navy aviation on those tests. An array of vessels of some sixty-odd were located in the lagoon of Bikini Atoll, and on these vessels, which in themselves were instruments, were placed some 10,000 instruments that would measure the effect of the bomb. Knowing that there was always some dispersion at the point of impact of bombs, the vessels were arrayed, spread out so that the mission would be accomplished; i. e., graded damages—maximum to minimum.

I have a profound respect for the atom bomb. I would say only in general terms that the bomb lived up to all expectations and to the forecast of the scientists as to what its destructive force would be, that it was equivalent to the explosion of 20,000 tons of TNT.

Probably the next question to arise is, What targets could one conceivably use it on? These are: Targets of concentration, and they include transportation centers, communication centers, critical industrial areas, and, of course, concentrated arrays of surface vessels, concentrated invasion forces, and closely allied to this, concentrated defense forces where invasion forces might desire to land, miscellaneous targets that will inevitably appear, due to the enemies' tactics, either in defense or offense.

The Bikini tests also proved the utility of the multi-engined as well as the single-engined drone in actual operation. Also, a practical use of television. The strategy and tactics possible with drones is a long step forward and is a present reality. It does point to considerable development in elaborate control, complex observation requirements, and combat intelligence. This development in turn requires a high degree of training in commanders' staffs and operating personnel. For, be assured we still need highly trained men and brains to guarantee success if, or when, a "push button" war becomes a complete reality in the future. Even now, the special training requirement is becoming evident. It always pays to make operations as foolproof as possible. This is not a new theory.

For example, throughout the European air war each mission was given a dry run as a theoretical combat exercise each night before we put out the order. We had officers to theoretically use the estimated German Air Force on one side, while our operations officer would use our fighter force on the proposed order. If the German Air Force side of the exercise won, we immediately made a new plan that could stand up. Then that proved solution went out as an order. It often paid big dividends.

The cost of air supremacy in peacetime is high. But if we have it, the other fellow is not going to succeed in the air war provided we remember the lessons learned from the German Air Force, World War II, even granting he is foolish enough to attack. Anyway, compared to the cost of equipment in the air from the Eighth Air Force alone on one mission—estimated $480,000,000—it all makes sense.

Then, again, if it saves lives, who can evaluate the cost?

General Eisenhower said: "He who would have security must bear its burden."

Finally, great as the atom bomb is, it alone does not justify completely disarming. We will still need an Army to fight on land, police, and organize. As long as there is commerce on the sea, we still need a navy. We most certainly need air power to establish and maintain air supremacy and prevent the other fellow from gaining supremacy.

I do not subscribe to the idea there is no defense against attack. There is. But we must deal in generalities. There are three, possibly four, general defense measures to be considered:

1. To prevent attacks before they occur which means if the enemy is already at war with us, to attack him at his bases and in such a manner that he is thus not able to make an attack.

2. So array our own dispositions that they offer no suitable targets for him to attack. This is extremely difficult in a highly industrial country like our own for it means that we should go to extreme dispersion and with certain critical installations greatly isolated.

3. Maintain an ability to retaliate in the event the enemy is so foolish as to attack. This means, of course, that his attack would be effective only to a limited degree and that once he has attacked, we must be so

situated as to retain enough equipment of our own to retaliate in a fashion that would make him pay.

4. To provide suitable shelters and protected areas.

The final answer is to be eternally vigilant in our world-wide intelligence system, exercise the best of judgment, educate all of our people to such an extent that they keep their balance, and the Nation as such remains in equilibrium, prepared to maintain itself in the face of all aggression. I am a firm believer that ignorance breeds worry and worry breeds fear. From this, misunderstanding and inefficiency will inevitably be the results. By removing ignorance we correct the whole matter. For that reason those in authority must be perfectly honest with the mass of the people who after all are definitely concerned with their own personal welfare and in the last analysis, they make up a democratic nation.

We should keep internationally alert, for this insures peace. It is as important to win a peace as it is to win a war. Winning the peace produces lasting benefits, for with world peace, there would be no war. In an atomic age, total war (if not completely disastrous) is so expensive to civilization that we just cannot afford one. We won't have a war if every nation is honest, considerate, and unselfish to a reasonable degree. As I have stated before, atomic energy is one of the great discoveries. It has been said that atomic energy at present is at about the same stage in usefulness to civilization as was electricity when Benjamin Franklin slid his key down the kite string. If this be true, we cannot afford to neglect the benefits of atomic energy and must approach the problem intelligently as we did with electricity. We can do this if development and utilization be directed toward improving the public welfare, increasing the standard of living, strengthening free competition in private enterprise, and promoting world peace.

Remember brainpower and manpower are a nation's security and survival power.

Finally, the next war should be won before it starts or it may be disastrous to both the loser and perhaps the winner.

How Can "Truman Doctrine" Defend United States Against Atom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Akron Beacon-Journal as an extension of my remarks, written by John S. Knight, president and editor of that newspaper:

HOW CAN "TRUMAN DOCTRINE" DEFEND UNITED STATES AGAINST ATOM?

Now that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has voted 13 to 0 for the President's $400,000,000 gift to Greece and Turkey, the administration's Stop Russia program will be approved by Congress with only token opposition.

Senator VANDENBERG's amendments which obligate the President to withdraw American aid to these two countries if either the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations, by majority vote, so determine, have placated the Peppers and lulled the public conscience.

Actually, the amendments are meaningless because they are in conflict with established United Nations rules and procedures. The veto power, for instance, cannot be set aside by congressional action whenever it suits our purpose so to do.

The Vandenberg amendments attempt to do by subterfuge what the administration fears never could be accomplished within the United Nations because of Russia's veto power.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, is far more realistic in urging reorganization of the United Nations if such action is necessary to permit it to function.

Russia has been justly blamed for her obstructive tactics within the UN but it is well to remember that the United States is also smugly relying upon the veto power to protect our interests in case Russia, Great Britain, France, and China ever decide to graze in the same pasture.

Need we add that stranger things have happened.

We have opposed the revolutionary Truman doctrine as it has been called by his glorifiers because it:

1. Destroys the original and fundamental concept of the United Nations.

2. Commits the United States to the role of world policeman.

3. Stems from the idea that you can buy good will and fight communism with dollars.

4. Misleads the American people into believing that this is another glorious triumph for democracy.

5. Issues an open invitation to war. It is now apparent that our fight has been lost. In a few days the Congress of the United States will vote $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey, which will be small change in comparison to the billions that must follow.

For the Truman doctrine, if sincerely conceived, cannot stop with our intervention in Greece and Turkey. To be effective, it must be carried to China, Korea, India, and the Near East.

World Report, a well-documented publication on global affairs, reveals in its current issue that implementation of the Truman doctrine will mean "United States financing of other countries at the rate of $7,000,000,000 a year for the next 3 years, if Washington follows through on the new policy as set for Greece and Turkey. That policy is designed to preserve the economic and political ntegrity of many nations, prevent the spread of communism, and restore stability throughout the world."

To get the full import of our new foreign policy, read that last sentence once again.

It means that we shall spend twenty-one billions in the next 3 years in public loans and grants to England, Germany, Italy, Austria, Greece, Turkey, China, Japan, the Philippines, Korea, and other countries.

It means that litle, if any, of the money will ever be recovered.

It means that we are headed on the road to bankruptcy, for, as Louis Bromfield said in a recent article, "We have not enough money, raw materials, or machinery to rehabilitate the whole of the world. If we attempt to do so we shall only bleed ourselves white and reduce our natural real wealth and living standards to the level of the more desperate European nations."

It means, that as in two previous World Wars, the youth of America will once again be sacrificed in vain.

Critics of our opposition to the Truman doctrine point out that the United Nations is simply an adventure in sentimental futility. "The way to stop Russia," they say, "is to get tough now."

How different from the idealistic spirit in which the people of the United States embraced the United Nations as the means of preserving world peace.

Can they excuse President Truman's failure to consult the United Nations when Great Britain, in hysterical haste, decided to pull out of Greece?

Can they forget that article 1 of the UN Charter states that the purposes of the United Nations are:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

If such an excellent statement of principle is now adjudged to be meaningless by the United States Government less than 2 years after it was signed by 51 nations, what rightful claim can we make to the moral leadership of the world?

Employment of a new foreign policy designed solely for the purpose of "containing" Russia will have tragic results because it discards practical idealism for mailed fist power politics which have been responsible for the scourge of war throughout the centuries.

If Russia is flexing her muscles for world conquest, we might better spend some of the billions we are shipping abroad on the largest and technologically best developed air force that can be assembled.

The retaliatory striking power of such an air armada probably would cause the Russians to do some reflective thinking before emulating the late, unlamented Mr. Hitler.

Since virtually everyone concedes that the next war, if it comes, will be fought with atomic weapons and rockets, perhaps some apologist for the Truman program will now step forward and explain how the expenditure of $400,000,000 in Greece and Turkey will "contain" Russia when she has learned how to manufacture atomic bombs and decides to use them on us?

Or should I not have asked that one?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Air Power, the Aircraft Industry, and the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Maj. Gen. Oliver P. Echols, president, Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., before the first American Legion National Aeronautics Conference, March 22, 1947:

It is a real pleasure to be here with you this morning to represent our country's aircraft manufacturing industry in this very important conference. The American Legion has had an enviable record on the critical issues of national security. Throughout the many years preceding World War II when most Americans were blind to developments abroad, the Legion was sounding clarion-clear-warnings. It is because of this remarkable record of unswerving devotion to adequate national preparedness that the aircraft manufacturing industry is so deeply gratified that you are embarking upon an air-power program.

You have heard the other speakers describe the latest developments in air power, its significance in the warfare of today and tomorrow, and of some of the critical problems that now confront us. Yesterday at Wright Field you were given a picture of some of the remarkable scientific problems

that must be solved and some of the instruments that must be perfected if this country is to retain its leadership in the air. It is our hope that these sessions have given you the information you need to carry the story about the air-power problem to your own communities. The manufacturing industry is convinced that the Legion can be the most potent force for overcoming the problems that face us and for insuring that America retains its air power. Accordingly, we are deeply appreciative of your willingness to undertake this program, and we heartily congratulate you on your foresight and patriotism in so doing.

My assignment here today is to discuss with you the role of the aircraft manufacturing industry in air power, its record in fulfilling that role in the last war, and its own immediate problems which contribute to the critical situation in which we find American air power today.

THE ROLE OF INDUSTRY

I believe that several of the speakers who have preceded me have emphasized to you that air power consists of far more than the air-striking forces of the Army and Navy. All leading students of air power, both here and abroad, now stress the fact that air power consists of the air forces, industry-equipped to produce the most modern instruments of warfare and vehicles for transportation, a commercial air transportation system capable of fulfilling its role in the logistics of the wars of the future, and an air-minded citizenry.

I believe that it is generally recognized that without a manufacturing industry capable of producing the most recent weapons and capable of immediate expansion in an emergency, there can be no air power worthy of the name.

It is perhaps important to make clear to you the exact role of the manufacturing industry in modern air power. In this country the commercial aircraft manufacturing industry is charged with the task of design and development of new aircraft—and that phrase includes flying missiles—as well as the production of the aircraft in the quantities required. This is a fact that is not as widely understood by the public as it should be. Our Federal Government maintains huge laboratory facilities, those operated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, to carry on pure research in the science of aeronautics.

The armed services also must maintain the facilities such as you saw at Wright Field yesterday and such as the Navy has at Philadelphia and Patuxent, to carry on the exhaustive evaluation testing of new equipment and to develop the specifications for military aircraft. It is important to bear in mind that these Government institutions do not design and develop aircraft. I repeat—the design and development of aircraft, as well as the production, is the assignment of the aircraft-manufacturing industry. This repetition is essential if the public is to comprehend the importance of the survival of a healthy nucleus of the aircraft industry.

As a measure of what was accomplished in this role of design, it is interesting to recall that the industry developed 425 separate models of 155 distinct types of aircraft during the war period. Each model incorporated an improvement in combat power or operating performance over its immediate predecessor.

THE INDUSTRY'S RECORD

The record of the aircraft industry during World War II has been praised widely and frequently. Perhaps one of the most authoritative appraisals of that record is contained in the aircraft report of the Senate's Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. This is the Truman-Mead-Brewster committee which exhaustively investigated aircraft production throughout World War II.

The aircraft report of this committee states, "We may be justly proud of our war record of mass production of aircraft. The 300,000 airplanes produced exceeded by a wide margin the most optimistic expectations."

The committee further pointed out that—

"This production record is an even greater accomplishment if we consider that it was done at a time when aircraft production was a continuously expanding business with all the intricate and seemingly unsurmountable problems of such unprecedented growth."

Let us recall the figures showing the expansion undertaken by the industry. Production during the 1930's had fallen to a pitifully low level. Even in 1939, with Hitler on the march, our output consisted of some 2,500 military and transport aircraft. From that low level we were forced to expand until output reached 96,000 in 1944.

There is another aspect of the industry's wartime record that deserves special emphasis. The aircraft manufacturing industry carried out this remarkable growth and produced the aircraft necessary to win the war on a record-breaking low rate of profit. The industry's rate of profit on sales in the peacetime year of 1939 was 10.3 percent. From that level the rate of profits dropped sharply and continuously until it reached 1 percent on all sales in 1944. In 1945 the rate of profit was 1.6 percent.

Official reports from the Securities and Exchange Commission and the authoritative statistics compiled every year by the National City Bank of New York reveal that the aircraft industry had the lowest rate of profits on sales of any important industry producing war material. This record of having the lowest rate of profits on sales was maintained throughout the war years.

THE PROBLEMS WE FACE

Unfortunately, it appears that the production record has been too quickly forgotten and that the costly lessons learned in that era are to be ignored. Let us look at what has happened since VJ-day.

The aircraft industry, which produced the weapons to win the war, is disintegrating. From a production peak of 9,000 planes per month, output has tobogganed to a mere dribble of a few dozens a month.

Total output of military aircraft in 1946 was 1,330 planes. An additional 467 two- and four-engine transports were produced, making a total of 1,797 planes having some potential military use produced in 1946. Thus our output in 1946 fell below the production level of 1939.

More important, production in 1946 was well below the rate which the Air Coordinating Committee, the official group designated by the President to recommend policies on air power, has recommended as the minimum yearly production for national safety. The Air Coordinating Committee has stated that at least 3,000 military airplanes should be produced each year, even—and I quote—"after maintenance of world peace is well assured and a substantial degree of disarmament has taken place."

This same Committee stated that if the need was for "a substantial striking force ready at all times to cooperate in the maintenance of world peace," that a minimum annual production of 5,780 planes was essential. Obviously, 1,330 is a far cry from 3,000, not to mention 5,780.

In allowing production to fall far below the safety medium, we are apparently repeating the disastrous and costly record following World War I. During World War I the then new airplane was hastily placed into production, and 18 manufacturers were engaged in the industry at the end of that war. Output had increased from only around 150 planes a year to 14,000 by 1918.

Following World War I output fell back to a trifling level, and by 1926 all but three of the 18 companies were out of business.

Today, following the repetition of the drastic curtailment in production, we find that 7 of the 11 largest airframe manufacturers operated at a loss in 1946. Among the smaller manufacturers, also, losses were the rule last year. Four of these smaller companies have been forced to undergo financial reorganization in Federal receivership actions.

This year and early next year the military aircraft industry will be engaged in producing several hundred new high-speed airliners, in addition to the small military volume that remains. However, when those airline orders are completed and delivered, no replacement market is in sight. These new airliners will approximately double the number of seats available on the nation's airlines, and the higher speeds of which they are capable will further enlarge capacity. From this it should be apparent that the military aircraft industry will be entirely dependent for actual survival upon orders for new equipment needed to maintain a modern and effective air force such as the armed services require.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

The program

That is the situation with regard to the aircraft industry. Other branches of aviation likewise have their difficulties, as you have heard. Many of the airlines are operating at a loss and are desperately seeking ways to finance new equipment and the facilities for all-weather flying. These and other problems, together with our own, have convinced the aircraft industry that the time has come to undertake a comprehensive audit of our air policy. It is not enough to have this survey made by an administrative agency. The policy must be determined and incorporated into law by the Congress. We believe that such a comprehensive survey and the reestablishment of a basic air policy will not only safeguard the national security, but it will place aviation on a basis that will within a few years enable it to become one of the Nation's important industries, providing steadily expanding employment for thousands of enterprising young Americans.

In summary, preservation of our air-power leadership attained so dearly in World War I seems to me to require the following:

1. Maintenance of a modern air force in being at a level sufficient to discharge our world obligations in connection with the maintenance of peace;

2. Establishment of a 5-year production program on a consistent basis at levels suggested by the Air Coordinating Committee so that American air power will be backed at all times with a productive nucleus capable of rapid expansion in any emergency;

3. Provision of an organization and policies in research that will insure tecnnological leadership in the air for this Nation;

4. Adoption of policies with regard to commercial aviation that will preserve an air-transport system required for logistics of the wars of the future;

5. Mobilization planning on a level necessary to keep pace with changes in military weapons and in the art of production;

6. Establishment of an air-policy board or committee that will review our progress annually and report to the Congress on the status of the air-power program.

With such policies, we could feel secure. We could also feel confident of a progress that would insure the future of our commercial aviation and provide thousands of new jobs for enterprising young men.

Certainly it is a program in the national interest, and one that I hope each of you will want to support wholeheartedly. With your support in explaining the need for this program in each of the States and communities where the Legion's air-power program will soon be in operation, we can look more

confidently into the future. If the public comprehends the exact status of its air power and is informed of the remedies, then we can expect action. That job of taking the story to the public is one the Legion can do more effectively than any organization with which I am familiar.

In conclusion, let me assure you that the industry is fully alive to our own responsibility in this activity. If we can be of help to you, call on us and it will be forthcoming, if the assistance is within our means and ability.

Antilabor Features of H. R. 3020

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a letter sent to Republican Members of Congress by Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president, the American Watch Workers' Union, exposing in vigorous language the antilabor features of H. R. 3020:

APRIL 14, 1947

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The omnibus bill which the House Labor Committee has prepared is, and will be, the kiss of death to the Republican Party unless the clear-thinking Members of Congress who belong to the Republican Party take the initiative and eliminate from this bill the hymn of hate which is written into it.

There are two groups in American life that must be isolated and identified by the American people if there is to be industrial peace. These two groups are the reactionary group in management who would turn the pages of history back and again make labor the slave of the master, and the illusionary revolutionists in the labor movement who preach the doctrine of greed and teach those that have not to plunder those that have. Both of these groups are bad for America.

The intelligent leadership in the Republican Party should immediately exert their influence within the Republican Party and its Members of Congress if they desire to save it. There is no hope for the workingmen and women of America in the Republican Party if this omnibus bill is what its leaders represent. In 1948 it will be impossible for any person to support the Republican Party who is interested in social welfare if the omnibus bill is passed by Congress, even though it is vetoed by President Truman. The kiss of death will have been firmly implanted on the Republican Party making it the party of reaction and antilabor forces through the passage of this bill.

The American people in 1946 voted for labor reform, but they did not vote to put a strait-jacket on legitimate objectives of the working men and women of the United States. If the Republican Party is ever again to win the rank and file of the working people of our country it must refuse to represent either the illusionary revolutionists of labor or the reactionary forces in management; it must represent the public interest. In swinging the pendulum back it must not swing that pendulum back to the extreme right. The place for that pendulum is on dead center.

The answer to industrial peace in America is human understanding between labor and management. No legislation, including the omnibus bill, can bring that about. Labor and management must educate themselves and be made to realize that they must work together for more productivity at lower unit costs, with that productivity sold to the American consumer at much lower prices than they are paying today.

The omnibus bill gives to the members of unions a bill of rights, it establishes union democracy by law, but then takes away the benefits of such a bill of rights by outlawing the closed shop and limiting the union shop. There can never be industrial peace over a long period of time in any company without the union shop or a union security clause. The outlawing of the closed shop is playing into the hands of the reactionary groups who hate and would destroy labor unions. Outlawing the closed shop would bring chaos and industrial discord to the printing trades industry where collective bargaining has existed on a community level for well over a century. It would break down the skills and apprenticeship standards of the trades in the printing industry. There are many other industries where industrial peace has reigned for many years that would be similarly affected. It should not be the intention of the Republican Congress to destroy existing peaceful relations between employers and employees which have existed over a long period of time. The passage of legislation which would outlaw the closed shop would accomplish just that.

Intelligent management and intelligence labor leadership has always been able to negotiate the issue of closed shop, union shop, or maintenance of membership, satisfactorily to both sides. The closed union evil has been corrected in the bill under section 8 (b) which specifies unfair labor practices for unions. If all clauses which refer to the outlawing of the closed shop and regulations concerning the union shop were eliminated from this bill it would take much of the poison out of it. The clause which submits the union shop to ratification of the members of the bargaining unit should remain in the bill.

The House Labor Committee in their anxiety to curtail John L. Lewis, has dealt a death blow to every legitimate union in America, in the section which has to do with industry-wide collective bargaining. This committee should not be allowed to destroy the relationship between international unions and their affiliated local unions as the omnibus bill would do. No international officer could assist a local union in negotiating its contracts under this bill. No international union could even advise its affiliated local unions on economic problems under this bill. This bill would make every international union an impotent organization. It would also eliminate sound leadership from assisting in bringing labor-management cooperation. This section should be rewritten so as to eliminate industry-wide collective bargaining but at the same time allow an international union to aid and assist local unions in collective bargaining on a local or community level.

A very bad feature of the omnibus bill is that it prevents the negotiation of pension plans, group insurance benefits, hospitalization benefits which make it mandatory for all employees to participate, even though the union has nothing whatsoever to do with the administration of the plan, such as plans which are put into effect by insurance companies by private industry. This section which prohibits this is section 8 (c) (3) and section 2 (11), starting on line 14 of page 9 and ending on line 4 of page 10 which specifies what may be bargained for. Under this section, paid holidays could not be negotiated for.

Another clause which is extremely dangerous is section 8 (d) (3), which would allow an employer to maintain an employee representation plan. In effect, this would recreate the company-union problem, which should be illegal under any circumstances. A company union never properly represents its membership. A company union is not an independent union.

The omnibus bill, in section 10 (h), beginning on line 3, page 43, to line 11, would allow the courts to nullify the Norris-LaGuardia Act in ordinary labor disputes, as this section would authorize the courts to use broad judgments in the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes. The courts would be permitted to have a heyday in the issuance of injunctions in labor disputes which would destroy the legitimate objectives of working men and women when they are organized. It would bring us back to the days of mob violence, tear gas, and other scenes which were brought out in the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee report which were so frequent prior to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The omnibus bill correctly limits mob action by members of unions. It should not allow it again by employers through the use of injunctive processes.

Analysis of the entire bill is now being made and will be submitted to you in detail form. For you as a Republican Congressman to endorse this bill without realizing its contents would indeed be a miscarriage of justice.

In fairness to the Republican Party you should demand a postponement of consideration of this bill by the Republican caucus until such time as you have a chance to see an analysis of this bill by all interested groups. The steam-rolling tactics sometimes used to put a bill through should not prevail in this case if a stigma is to be prevented on the name of the Republican Party.

Thanking you for consideration of this memo, I remain,

Cordially yours,

WALTER W. CENERAZZO,
National President,
American Watch Workers Union.

Analyzing the bill starting on page 1, and taking up each section which is objectionable:

Title 1, amendment of National Labor Relations Act: Section 1, O. K. Section 2, subsections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, are O. K. as to meaning. Section 2, subsection 11 (B) (iii) does not call for enough conferences; there should be at least eight conferences of at least 4 hours duration within the 30-day period.

Section 2 11 (g) would cause every union to have a strike vote before collective bargaining really commenced. This section should be broken down into two questions. (1) Shall the employer's last offer of settlement of the current negotiations be accepted or rejected? (2) And then if the employees vote rejection they should be allowed to vote whether they desire to continue negotiations or whether they desire to strike? The way this clause is presently written all an employer would have to do is to have his timing right and he could force a strike at any time by presenting ridiculous counterproposals to the union. Lines 14 on page 9 to line 4 on page 10 I have described before although it would appear that good faith on either side was not essential in order to comply with this law.

On page 11, lines 7 to 10, would prohibit the organization of office employees of insurance companies and many other industries that handle matter of a confidential nature.

On page 12, line 19, subsection 16, would prohibit a national union from paying strike benefits in any strike regardless of how well justified a strike may be. It also would prevent moral or economic assistance in any way by an international union to an affiliated local union. There are many international unions which have employees of competing employers organized, and which have responsible union leadership and who do assist in bringing about industrial peace and labor-management cooperation. Also the only way in which an employer who

refuses to be fair can be made to be fair and collectively bargain in good faith is through the threat of a strike or an actual strike supported by an intelligent international union. This section as written destroys the relationship between the international union and the local union in such industries as the glass industry where the international union and the employers have had industrial peace for so many years. While this clause prohibits the industry-wide strike it also prohibits any international union from servicing its members of affiliated unions.

On page 13, line 20, subsection (e), while it sounds reasonable and fair would also prohibit a union from bargaining on the use of imported parts from a foreign country with much less labor cost.

As for the creation of a Labor-Management Relations Board, starting on line 6, page 14, and continuing through to page 19, line 2, is a matter of opinion and patronage, and one which I do not believe will seriously make much difference whether it is the present National Relations Labor Board or the way it is established under this bill.

Under section 8, unfair labor practices, starting on page 19, line 20, there are several clauses which are extremely unsound. Subsection (c) (i), on line 12, through line 20, would appear to curtail the union shop and would definitely cause industrial discord in any plant now having a check-off. Regardless of how anyone feels on the check-off, to allow any employee to drop out of the union at any time is simply asking for trouble in a plant between employees.

On line 20, page 20, subsection 2 (C) (ii), again would prohibit pension funds, death benefits, and homes of any kind.

On line 20, page 20, subsection 2 (C) (ii) would prohibit joint charitable trust funds in which the union and management both would have trustees. It also would prevent an employer from contributing to a pension trust where the union has representation; also employees benefit plans where the union has representation. Many of these trusts and funds are of a cooperative nature and a part of sound industrial relations. To prohibit them by law would take away from employees of industry many benefits.

Line 18, page 21, through line 22, is too broad and sweeping and would be subject to many misinterpretations, and is another one of the many clauses which would limit union security contained in this bill.

Line 1, page 22, through line 7, is also another one of these similar clauses, as would line 24, on page 22, through line 4, on page 4, again prohibiting maintenance of membership or union security.

Page 23, lines 5 and 6, is one of the worst clauses in this bill. It reads: "To compel any member to agree to contribute to, or participate in, any insurance or other benefit plan." This would kill the benefit features of many international unions, and in the printing trades particularly would destroy the Union Printers' Home of the International Typographical Union, the upkeep of which is paid for by the members of that union and is compulsory as a condition of membership. This home was founded and donated by two employers over 50 years ago and has been maintained by the membership through that period and has over 500 residents at present. In addition, it would kill the pension plan and death fund of the same union, as well as those of other printing-trade unions. What right has Congress to abolish historical institutions and benefit plans which thousands of persons have received constructive benefits from and which the membership of an international union has voted for in honest referendums?

Lines 7 and 8, on page 23, is an unreasonable clause, as it gives unlimited right for any member to resign from a labor organization at any time and still remain an employee. If a person receives the benefits from a collective-bargaining agreement and is a member of the union, he should be obliged to remain for the duration of the agreement at least. This clause as it is written would raise havoc in any plant where the employer wanted to break up the union.

Line 10, page 24, through 13, is another clause which is aimed at union security.

Line 20, page 24, through line 5, on page 25, should also include national unions; if we are to have union democracy, let's have it for international unions as well.

Line 11, page 25, should also provide that unions could submit financial reports monthly or quarterly if they desired to submit reports oftener than annually.

Page 26, lines 3 to 9, would permit company unions as was stated before. Under no circumstances should this be allowed.

Section 4, lines 10 through 19, page 26, makes State laws supersede Federal laws on union security. It is another clause which assists antilabor advocates.

Line 15, on page 27, limits the employer from discharging employees on discipline by the union to the nonpayment of dues. This is an inconsistency with subsection 6, on page 23, line 19 through page 24, line 9, which specifies other offenses all of which are bad and a person should be expelled out of a union for this. Line 15, on page 27, however, would allow these persons to continue to work even though they had committed and been proven guilty of such offenses as described in the other section.

Line 22, on page 27, allows groups of employees to present grievances to their employer without intervention by the bargaining representative if a settlement is not inconsistent with the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement in effect. This would cause tremendous unrest in a plant that does not have a union shop. It also would allow favoritism by the employer in the settlement of grievances. It should be eliminated.

On lines 11 and 19, page 28, the percentage should be raised from 30 to 50 percent, so as to be sure that the representatives do represent a majority in the unit and that those challenging that representation also represent a majority. This would stop minority groups from creating industrial discord through organization campaigns utilizing Government agencies as a means to their ends.

Lines 12 and 14, should be defined as to what an interested party is and if it means a union the union should have at least 30 percent applications to intervene.

Page 30, line 11 through line 2, on page 31, would completely smash the present relationship between the national unions and local unions which are affiliated. It is entirely wrong to stop a union from advising its affiliates. The same arguments which were described against the monopolistic strike section apply here.

Line 6 on page 31, would wreck many industrial unions and could be utilized by an employer who wanted to play skilled workers against unskilled and vice versa.

Section 4 starting on line 16, page 31, through page 32, line 2, seems to allow a great latitude of conduct for both unions and employers. And to allow them to use examples of international unions in industries not even related to their own as a means to use unfair tactics.

Section 5, line 3 through 14 on page 32, seems to allow for a union which is not even on the ballot to participate in a certification election, also it deliberately delays the run-off for 60 days which could be utilized to weaken the union.

Section 8, line 8 through 15 on page 33, seems to allow a union to partition for certification during the life of an agreement between another union and an employer. This is presently forbidden by NLRB procedure and to allow such a practice would tear asunder industrial relations in every plant where the union is unable to obtain what the employees during negotiations and where another union claims it could accomplish the objectives.

Section (g), page 33, line 16 through page 35, line 11, should be rewritten to eliminate any reference to economic action on the union-ship issue and should simply provide for secret ballot ratification of the union contract including all of its clauses, as it is presently written, it would if an employer desired, tie up a signing of a contract indefinitely.

Again, on line 11 through 16, on page 38, is one of those trick sentences which would give to an employer the right to take such action as he desires, provided he can justify it as something that a national union once did. Two wrongs don't make a right.

On page 43, lines 3 to 11 refer to the Norris-LaGuardia Act which were described previously in the original memo. This clause is a very dangerous one to industrial peace.

Lines 6 through 19, on page 47, it would appear would limit mass picket lines and other actions which we would deem un-American and should be eliminated; however, lines 60 to 13 could easily be used to obtain an injunction on the slightest flare-up.

Line 2 on page 48 refers to monopolistic strikes and should be made more clear by further interpretation.

Line 19 on page 49 through line 2 on page 49 would start a lawyers' field-day in suing unions. Another clause could be written which would require adherence to union contracts which would not be so punitive as this clause.

Lines 3 to 8, on page 49, again attack the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Lines 17 to 19, on page 49, while giving an individual the right to refuse to work, automatically implies that when a group of employees do it, or two or more employees quit work, it is concerted action.

The rest of the bill has to do with abolishing of the National Relations Board, conciliation of labor disputes in industries affecting commerce. This is a matter of judgment, opinion and patronage and should be decided by each Congressman's personal use. However, section (f) starting on line 9 to 17 on page 52 should be clarified so that it would not mean recertification of every union now having a collective bargaining between them.

On strikes impairing public health and safety there are several sections which would appear to give an employer a chance to disrupt a union such as lines 23 on page 59 through lines 5 on page 60, which would allow employees after a decision has been given to decide who their bargaining representatives should be instead of determining bargaining representative prior to such action.

On page 62, under title of Equal Responsibility and Liability, section 302 (a), would appear to allow the courts to use wide latitude in determining amounts in judgments against unions and could well bankrupt unions into inactivity and impotency.

Page 63, Reports of Labor Organizations to Members and page 64, Restrictions on Political Contributions, I agree with in their entirety.

There are other clauses in this bill which would help straighten out labor relations but they are of no value as long as this material which is being criticized remains in the bill.

It is imperative that Members of Congress understand the contents and implications of this omnibus bill before voting upon it. Mistakes cannot be rectified after a vote is cast on this measure. The steamrolling tactics of having this bill voted before Members of Congress can analyze the effects of it are wrong. A steamroller whether it is run by Republicans or Democrats is wrong. It would appear that this bill is going to be jammed through on Wednesday or Thursday

and is going to be made a party measure. To do so is political suicide for many Members of Congress who come from industrial districts for it will put ammunition into the hands of those who have always been hostile to Republicans and Republican policies and there will be no labor leader worthy of the name who will dare to lift his voice in assistance of Republican candidates for Congress if this bill passes as presently written.

This analysis has been prepared in a friendly spirit with the hope that there are enough courageous Republican Congressmen who have a desire to keep that pendulum on dead center and have no desire to serve the extreme left or the extreme right and who want the public interest served. There are probably many other persons who can analyze this problem and assist Members of Congress in their decision but as time is short I am taking the privilege of submitting this analysis to you trusting that you will receive it in the spirit in which it is offered, a plea by a responsible union leader who practices the doctrine of labor-management cooperation; who represents the union which practices union democracy and who realizes the effects of what would happen to the Republican Party if this omnibus bill is passed. Thanking you for your consideration of this analysis, I remain

Cordially yours,

WALTER W. CENERAZZO,
National President,
American Watch Workers' Union.

BOSTON, MASS.

Turkey's Financial Status Compared With Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, is it true that civil liberties do not exist in Turkey? Why did the New York Times correspondent have his license to file cables taken away from him in the last 2 weeks? Is it true that the Turkish Government owns all of the industry in Turkey? Is it true that the Turkish Government persecutes Christian and Jewish minorities in Turkey? Is it true that the present dictatorship is completely arbitrary in its actions? Mr. Speaker, these are questions that need answering.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Congress, difficult as it may be, would like to compare the financial status of the present dictatorship with our financial status. After all, we have been asked to vote $100,000,000 for Turkey as a first installment on a military alliance, and it might be a good idea to take a look and see whether we can afford this kind of military alliance, and whether there is any quid pro quo. Also, if we are to guarantee Turkey continued armed control of the Dardanelles, would it not be smart to find out whether the Turks can afford to take care of themselves?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a national debt of $260,000,000,000. We pay annual interest of 6 or 7 percent on that debt. The American taxpayer voted for the Republican Congress in the belief that we could reduce taxes, effectuate savings in the Federal Government, and at the same time, begin to retire the national debt.

When we look through the so-called secret documents which the State Department presented to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and subsequently released to a selected 10 newspaper men, we discover that the Turkish foreign debt is approximately 268,000,000 lira. The bulk of this foreign debt, according to our State Department is owed to Great Britain. It seems that the British have had a military alliance with the Turkish Government for a very long time—unfortunately, the Turkish Government refused to honor it during the last war—they violated it—but the British, despite the violation of agreement by the Turks, have continued to lend their money so that today, the bulk of this 268,000,000 lira is owed to Great Britain. The annual burden of service charges, including the retirement of principal, is said by our State Department to be 17,000,000 lira, about 25 percent of which is payable in gold or foreign exchange. Holdings of the Central Bank of Turkey are 201,900,000 lira. In order that the annual payment on the Turkish foreign debt, including the payment on principal, amounts to 17,000,000 lira, of which one-fourth and roughly 4,500,000 lira is payable in gold or foreign exchange. In brief, the Turks with their present foreign exchange holdings could pay for 40 or 50 years on their present indebtedness without any difficulty.

For the past 10 years, the Turkish Government has steadily increased its exports over its imports—indeed during the war, their exports increased 80 or 90 percent over their imports; they did business with the Nazis; they permitted us to buy chrome at three or four times the market price; they made money in the past 10 years—lots of it. So much, Mr. Speaker, that their foreign exchange holdings went up from 5,700,000 lira in 1938 to 201,000,000 lira in 1946. These people have been making a killing. They have been rolling in clover. In fact, they seem to be getting a little fat, while the American taxpayer has been sweating it out. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, what our State Department says about Turkey's present economic position, and permit me to quote from the famous secret documents:

> Turkey's principal difficulty is that of meeting the economic and financial burden of maintaining a large standing army. This expense costs the Turkish Government not far from one-half of its annual revenues and requires foreign exchange exceeding that available from current income.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the House should note that our State Department itself says that the Turkish Government is in an excellent financial position, but that the armament expense of the Turkish Government requires foreign exchange exceeding that which is available from current income.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, our State Department asks us to go into debt to arm the Turkish Government. Our State Department would rather that we go into debt than that Turkey should go into debt. Note that Turkey's position is excellent but that because her army takes almost one-half of their annual revenues, they need foreign exchange—a little more foreign exchange than what is available from their current income. Mr. Speaker, what is current income? That is a very interesting phrase, Mr. Speaker—that "current income." What is current income? Do you suppose that the American taxpayer is interested in current income? I understand that there was an election in America last fall and that there was considerable discussion of current income. I suggest that there are at least 140,000,000 people in America who are interested in current income. So we must tell the American taxpayer that his current income has to be reduced so that the current income of the Turkish Government can be increased. We put our hands into the family budget of 60,000,000 American families. We take and we give to a dictatorial Fascist Turkish Government. Oh, yes, their financial position is excellent. In fact, it is better than ours. Their national debt is tiny. They settle their lend-lease account in cash. They profiteered during the war. They still have hundreds of millions of dollars in Nazi assets and $75,000,000 of looted Nazi gold, but they want us to pay for their army with our current income. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that one Congressman after he had read these famous secret documents, suggested that we should seek a loan from Turkey. That is not so funny, Mr. Speaker, when we begin to look carefully at what the Truman doctrine implies. I would suggest to the House that nobody knows where this policy ends. Nobody knows what it will cost. I suggest now that this policy become known as the Truman bankruptcy policy for America. If the policy is executed, it will mean bankruptcy. It does mean inflation now. It pours out billions of goods in service. It increases our taxes. It pushes prices up—it prohibits us from paying on our national debt. Mr. Speaker, with all my heart, I hope that before the House acts, it will examine with the greatest care exactly what this policy means in financial terms. We have had enough financial megalomania—enough of wasteful spending.

American Policy in the Middle East, Including Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the American Federation of Polish Jews, Chicago, Ill., April 13, 1947:

> The confusions and fears of our times demand a frankness of discussion. There are far too many silences.
>
> One silence I have reference to is the deliberate omission of any mention of Palestine

by President Truman in his now famous aid-to-Greece statement. We are moving into the Mediterranean. That much, at least, is obvious. Mr. Truman asked for $400,000,000 plus military and civilian personnel for Greece and Turkey to, he said, "insure peaceful development of nations free from coercion." Even the most naive of political spectators cannot dissociate Palestine from the Middle East. Equally patent is the fact that Palestine is a country not "free from coercion." We can reach no other conclusion but that the omission of Palestine from Mr. Truman's presentation was deliberate and calculated.

I am quite sure that in their discussions Secretary of State Marshall and Foreign Minister Bevin are talking about the Palestine situation. If we are to be intimately concerned about the peace in and the stability of the Middle East, certainly we cannot afford to ignore the explosive situation in Palestine. Of course, in the instance of Greece, compulsion comes from the east and in the instance of the Holy Land the oppression comes from the west. May I ask, "Do we measure evil by who fosters it?" If the United States speaks of favoring Greece and Turkey to save it from disintegration and speaks of it in terms of a presumably composite picture of the Middle East, then the United States cannot brush Palestine aside, nor, indeed, any of the other portions of the Middle East. As has been said, "if it is not all, it is nothing." I say categorically there can be no peace in any part of the Middle East, including Greece and Turkey, unless there is peace in Palestine. There can be no piece-meal peace. If we are to make the Middle East safe for democracy, then in the name of logic and common sense, let us not forget our geography.

Or are there other things we are remembering? Things like oil, for instance? The American oil company known as the Arabian-American Oil Co., which is jointly owned by Standard Oil of California and the Texas Corp., has arranged a $250,000,000 scheme to develop the Saudi-Arabian petroleum output and to build a 30-inch, 1,050-mile-long trans-Arabian pipe line from the Persian Gulf to the eastern Mediterranean. Those are the future plans. In the recent past, from 1944 to 1947, the Arabian-American Oil Co. made a profit of sixty to seventy million dollars on its sales of Near East oil to our Navy. Actually, therefore, American taxpayers paid the company's original investment of $27,500,000 plus another $43,000,000, the cost of its new refinery, and, furthermore, American taxpayers paid an $18,000,000 subsidy which the oil company presented to King Ibn Saud. Nice work—if you can get it.

Thus, on one hand the American taxpayer supports feudalism in one part of the Middle East and then again is asked to support democracy in the lands of Greece and Turkey. Let's pursue this thought a bit further: Britain has withdrawn from Greece because she can no longer afford to maintain military establishments therein. The United States feels called upon to step in with its money and personnel. Britain, however, has already spent $400,000,000 on the maintenance of 100,000 troops in Palestine "for the sake," as Winston Churchill put it, "of a senseless, squalid war against the Jews." Are we not then being used in a financial sense to help Britain liquidate the Jewish national homeland? Do we not help Britain maintain her police state in Palestine?

It is not denied that Greece is sorely in need of our help in reconstruction. But what is true of Greece is true of the Middle East as a whole. You will not cure by binding some wounds and allowing other wounds on the same body to fester. Palestine is another sector of the same zone. It is the task of the statesman to see the picture, and see it whole.

Let's turn for a moment and view the British in Palestine. For 8 years now Britain has ruled Palestine without supervision since the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations ceased to function. Indeed the shameful and shocking record of Britain's administration of its mandate over Palestine is not the common knowledge it should be. In Palestine we are concerned with living people whose pattern of political life had been set by international covenant and then upset by the tenacious, unrelenting grip of the appointed trustee.

One would be led to believe by the behavior of Britain that Palestine is her own vassal state to be dealt with without regard to the obligations and responsibilities she has assumed with the granting to her by the League of Nations the mandate over Palestine.

In the settlement following World War I, the issues were clearly cut and clearly met. The Allies promised independence to the Arabs in certain former provinces of the Turkish Empire, which empire up to that time was in complete domination of the Arabian world, and Palestine was set aside as a country for the Jewish national home. Palestine was specifically exempt for the purposes set forth by the Balfour Declaration, "to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish homeland." This was definitely agreed to by King Emir Feisal, representative of the Arab people at the Peace Conference.

The promises to the Arab peoples have been kept scrupulously. Even Transjordan, once part of the Palestine mandate, was thrown in for good measure. But the solemn pledge of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine was breached again and again by the power entrusted with its fulfillment. Seven independent Arab States exist today, five of whom have representation on the United Nations and other international councils. Their area extends over 1,000,000 square miles. Of all class A mandates established by the League of Nations—Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Transjordan, and Palestine—a class A mandate being one that is directed toward self-government, only Palestine's independence is unfulfilled. This tiny bit of land of 10,000 square miles is now the scene of frustration and tugging interests, where human and moral values struggle with the demands of power politics, oil, military defenses, and the British cry of external security.

In 1939 the British promulgated the Palestine white paper, which drastically restricted land purchases by the Jews of Palestine soil and limited immigration of Jews into the Holy Land. After a total of 75,000 entrees was reached, further immigration was to be dependent upon Arab consent.

The reasoning behind this infamous maneuver was quite obvious. Then, as now, the Arab leaders used threats and blackmail to throw their support and their oil to the highest bidder. It was relatively simple for the British to seize this pretext of Arab opposition and turn it to her own uses. "We are helpless," the British told the world. "We cannot do otherwise but to stay in Palestine to maintain law and order."

Meanwhile, 6,000,000 Jews perished under Hitler's rule. No place would accept them and the gates of Palestine were sealed by British perfidy. Boatloads of escaping Jews sank off the shores of Palestine while the British colonial administration followed the policy of the British Foreign Office. Thus, the land which by international covenant signed by 52 nations of the League of Nations and subsequently by the United States by separate treaty, was to be a national homeland for the Jews was opened to everybody but the Jews. And at a time, too, when every civilized country professed its horror at the tragedy that had befallen the defenseless Jews.

The peace brought with it, for a while, the beginning of new hopes for the little countries and for minority peoples. The Labor government came into power in Great Britain as standard bearers for a new liberalism in Europe. The Jews in Palestine and the Jews who had witnessed the massacre of their kin, but who had themselves survived, reviewed the record of the Labor Party and its stated—and restated—policy on Palestine, and were jubilant. Surely, now, deliverance was at hand.

In 1940, the Labor Party Conference declared, "that in order to remove the root cause of Jewish suffering and to insure the existence and free development of the Jewish people, international assistance should be given for the continued growth of the Jewish national home in Palestine by immigration and settlement." The London Conference of 1942 reaffirmed "Its determination that in the new international order after the war, Jews shall enjoy civil, religious and economic equality with all other citizens, and that international assistance shall be given to promote by immigration and settlement the Jewish national home in Palestine." The Labor Party Conference of 1942 and 1943 stated in its resolution "that victory must insure for the Jews full civil, political, economic equality and their national rights. It reaffirms the traditional policy of the British Labor Party in favor of building Palestine as the Jewish national home." In 1944, the Palestine problem formed a special chapter in the document known as the international postwar settlement proposed by the national executive and introduced by the present Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee. It received 8 months deliberations by the party. It must be kept in mind, too, that at the time the 1944 Palestine policy was adopted the Labor Party was not in opposition, but a full responsible partner in the coalition government. The Labor Party, in other words, was in a position to know, and did know, all the pertinent facts. I read a part of the Palestine chapter as written by the Labor Party in 1944. "But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe."

In 1945 the national executive of the Labor Party published this resolution: "The Committee reaffirms the policy accepted by the annual conference in December 1944 on Palestine. It therefore calls upon the British Government to remove the present unjustifiable barriers on immigration and to announce without delay proposals for the future of Palestine in which it has the full sympathy and support of the American and Russian Governments."

And, finally, I'd like to quote a few sentences from Mr. Arthur Creech Jones who is presently Colonial Secretary. "This" he stated in 1939, "is not a conflict between the Jews and Arabs, but it is largely a conflict between the new order which the Jews stand for in Palestine and the old crumbling feudal system for which a few rich Arab landlords stand. That difficulty of conflict between the new and the old order has been exploited by Fascist Imperialism; it has been exploited by those who hate the very principles for which the Jewish democracy stands; and it has been exploited largely because in that crumbling feudal order one saw spreading in the Middle East a new democratic faith which would ultimately undermine the foundations of the older system. The Jews are asked to end their experiment because our own Government is unable to carry through those equitable principles of good govern-

ment which they have declared for in the Balfour Declaration. Those of us who have seen the great achievements of the Jews on the spot * * * feel it would be a great betrayal for that experiment to be brought to an end." So much for the Colonial Secretary who was so verbally brave when he was without authority to act.

Those are the words of the Labor Party on record. But the words of record are far, far removed from the deeds of record. But no sooner had the Labor Party come into power than there came a complete reversal of attitude, policy, and direction. Jews who after months and months of the long, long trek following the beacon of Palestine found not the dignity, not the hope of beginning life anew, but the barbed wire of concentration camps on the island of Cyprus. Illegal searches and seizures on the part of the British colonial administration became the order of the day. Imprisonments without trial withdrawal of the right of peaceful assembly, daily curfews became part of the routine of Palestine life. Martial law was imposed and the economic life of Palestine was disrupted. Adding injury to injury and heaping insult on insult, only some 2 weeks back the British Palestine Government announced it will require the Jewish community to pay for the damage of at least one million dollars caused by fires at Haifa. This damage was sabotage and was ascribed to terrorists. The British action was equivalent to visiting punishment upon the innocent. Responsible Jews in and out of Palestine deplore terrorism. I condemn it. Jews themselves have been hurt and killed by the unlawful action of members of the Stern and Irgun gangs. Certainly, the entire Jewish community should not be made to pay for the crimes of a few desperadoes. Attlee and Bevin fail to realize that the deliberate default of their solemn pledge to open the gates of Palestine to refugees has caused despair, creates terrorism. But why hold innocent people as hostages and make them pay blood money?

It has been well put in one newspaper editorial, "The historian may reflect that if one-tenth of the energy, persistence, expenditure and military might invested in the preservation of the notorious white paper were devoted to the fulfillment of the mandate the problem would be at rest."

It is little wonder, therefore, that the bitterness and frustration in Palestine reached the breaking point. The Jews who had redeemed the soil of Palestine, made of it a center of science and cultivation in the Middle East, Jews who died of disease in clearing the marshes and planting the life-sustaining trees, Jews who had contributed more than their alloted share to the allied war effort were all forgotten. It is little wonder that they asked, "Why?"

The English proposed and the United States acceded to an Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. That Committee recommended the immediate admission of 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine. The Eisenhower report and the Harrison report, both undertaken at the request of President Truman, revealed the dire need of the displaced Jew for Palestine. But again there followed delay. It would seem that the British by every possible device sought to postpone any equitable solution. Twice they offered what they knew would be unacceptable federalization plans for Palestine, but turned down the proposal of a carefully worked out, reasonable plan for partition offered by the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

Now, the British in transparent insincerity offer submission of the Palestine problem to the General Assembly of the United Nations. In the interim period until recommendations are made by the Assembly, Britain will maintain her control over and her vicious practices in Palestine. Until such time she considers the situation "static or frozen." They say, too, that they can reject any recommendations made by the United Nations because they point out the General Assembly can only make recommendations and no final decisions. Is Britain telling the world that if she likes the recommendations she'll accept them; if she doesn't she'll reject them? Such an attitude necessarily makes any action by the General Assembly a farce. Is it again another British dodge and stall for time? Is there yet to be another investigation followed by discarded recommendations? How sordid a business this is, this playing about with broken lives and desperate hearts.

We must at this point ask ourselves: Shall the United States, which since 1922 has reaffirmed its policy of favoring the establishment of the national Jewish homeland in Palestine, permit the United Nations to serve the purpose of British imperialist interests in the Middle East? Cannot the United States at least demand that Britain give some evidence of its good faith? Keep in mind that the United States has openly and continuously reiterated this policy, not only by separate treaty with Great Britain, but through congressional resolutions and declared Executive proclamations by various Presidents of these United States, beginning with President Wilson and following through to President Truman. It has been repeated in the political platforms of the two major political parties and has been the subject of numerous congressional debates.

Now the opportunity presents itself concretely to the United States Government to stand by its Palestine policy when it arises before the United Nations. By its great moral strength, by the force of its present leadership in world affairs, the United States can prevent in this instance the development of another farcical ending. By direct interest and guidance, the United States can throw its great weight on the side of the equities, sustained as it is by the existence of recognized international documents and international and national commitments. It is up to the United States to avert the tragedy that must follow in the wake of British political machinations to continue her control in Palestine without regard to corresponding responsibilities.

And again, if the approach in the United Nations is to be a sincere one, then direct representation to the Jews of Palestine, through the Jewish Agency, must be allowed. The Arabs, as I have previously stated, already have such representation. Britain has her own vote and those of the Dominions. The Jews of Palestine, who constitute over a third of the population of Palestine and who have specific and special international status as conferred upon them by the League of Nations mandate have no such representation. Most certainly, the contention cannot be made that they are not interested parties.

I believe, too, that if the United Nations is to act as a court of equity, then Britain must come into that court with clean hands. To do so, Britain must open the gates and abrogate at once the Palestine white paper of 1939 which was and is in direct contravention to the purposes of the mandate of the League of Nations. The Mandates Commission of the League of Nations declared at the outset that in so promulgating this white paper, the British were acting unilaterally in breaching an international covenant, and, therefore, rested on no legal foundation. The British must cease to pervert the purposes of the mandate. Otherwise, she brings with her submission of the Palestine issue to the United Nations the evidence of her betrayal of a trust and stands self-condemned by her own record of complete misadministration of the mandate which in good faith was placed into her hands.

The question is still open. Will the United States permit Great Britain to use the instrument of the United Nations, fashioned we hope, to secure our peace, as a cloak to hide her ill-becoming practices in Palestine? To permit Britain to do so would weaken tragically the basic structure of the United Nations. Or will the United States stand firmly and independently behind its own declared policy on Palestine?

What cruel, perverse trick of fate is this that the destiny of a people should be subject to the whim and blunted vision of a man like Bevin? Had he a shred of compassion or even the faintest trace of graciousness in his make-up, he would at least keep quiet and not dance verbally about like the bull in the china shop. The folly and inhumanity of Britain's conduct in Palestine is tragic enough without Mr. Bevin throwing his weight around. Not since he has been in office has Mr. Bevin uttered one statement that was statesmanlike or conveyed a sense of his grasp of the Palestine situation.

His skin is safe; he has enough to eat and drink; he lives in security within his own country. He cannot comprehend the plight of those who do without; there is too much fat around his soul for so compassionate a thought to penetrate. His offensiveness, his boorishness would be of little matter were it not the clearest kind of signal for the continued British policy of brutality and repression in Palestine.

Let us not be mistaken about this. The submission of our cause to the United Nations, even if Britain were acting with sincerity, does not necessarily mean a recommendation in favor of justice and the equities. We must remember that in the General Assembly there will be considerable teamwork between the Arabs and the Latin-American bloc. That was discernible at the last meeting of the General Assembly despite the protests of the United States. Twenty of the countries south of the Rio Grande joined with five Arab countries to obtain the election of their candidates to the Security, Economic, Social, and Trusteeship Councils. Although their numbers fall short of a majority, the combination must be reckoned with. They can practically nullify any conclusion reached by the General Assembly, if they so desire.

Again, we don't know what the attitude of Russia will be but we do know this. Whatever the Russian attitude is, it will be shared by Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, and White Russia and Albania. In the past, the Soviet Union has shown little sympathy with the aims of Zionism.

We shall meet with many unknown factors. What will the final vote of India be? Will she concern herself with the reaction of Indian Moslems or will she consider first the importance of the development of the Middle East that is spelled out by a Jewish national home in Palestine. How will the little countries react?

We know then that we cannot sit idly by and await inertly the outcome in a special session of the General Assembly, if one be called, or the conclusions reached by the General Assembly today. We know we must warily watch the British maneuvering. Many of the countries who will participate know nothing of the actual facts of, in and about Palestine. It must also be remembered that much of the anti-Semetic propaganda of the Hitler machine penetrated deep into the conscience of occupied countries. Remember Jews have no voice on an international level. Who speaks for them? Judging from the past—no one. I hope the American people at least will pay heed and insist that honor and decency prevail.

Punitive Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate as part of my remarks a timely editorial on punitive labor legislation in this morning's Washington Post. Every Member of Congress should read this editorial and the debates in Committee of the Whole held today on H. R. 3020, known as the Hartley bill:

PUNITIVE LABOR LAW

Hostile reaction to the New Jersey antistrike law provides evidence—if any is needed—that punitive legislation will not insure peace on the labor front. For New Jersey telephone workers, although ordered to return to their jobs on pain of excessive fines or jail sentences—following State seizure of company properties—have remained on strike. Moreover, a million unionist sympathizers are preparing to stage a 1-day work stoppage as a protest against the law.

Legislators should have learned from experience that repressive laws cannot be effectively enforced unless supported by public opinion. The American people seem disposed to uphold legislation that will eclipse the power of labor unions to impose intolerable hardships upon the public through work stoppages. But we do not believe they will countenance punitive legislation of the kind passed by the State of New Jersey, aimed at local suppression of strikes by coercion of individual strikers, especially if those strikes do not involve any major threat to the general welfare.

Furthermore, the haste with which New Jersey's Legislature acted to put teeth into a nonpunitive existing law banning utility strikes during a cooling-off period tends to discredit its action. Particularistic legislation aimed at suppression of a strike already in progress is naturally resented as an invidious attack on the group immediately affected. Legislation passed in the midst of a crisis when tempers are heated and judgment biased is almost certain to be defective. It appears that the New Jersey Legislature will have good reason to repent of its precipitancy.

Care of the Blind in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at this time I wish to present a statement made by O. E. Day, chief of the State Council for the Blind, Department of Welfare of Pennsylvania, and also a statement by Miss O'Hara, former Secretary of Welfare of Pennsylvania, which relates to the care of the blind. I think it most appropriate to present the statements at this time because so many of the lower levels of government are looking to the national level for assistance. I think a reading of the statements will prove very illuminating and show what can be done at the State level. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statements by Mr. Day and Miss O'Hara.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O. E. DAY, CHIEF, STATE COUNCIL FOR THE BLIND, DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE, SAYS:

DID YOU KNOW?

The 1943 General Assembly, in addition to appropriating funds necessary to carry out the general objectives of the State Council for the Blind, Department of Welfare, for the 1943-45 biennium, granted $90,000 for remedial eye care, restoration and prevention fees; $69,700 for the initiation of a home-teaching program for the adult blind; and set aside in the State treasury a $20,000 employment revolving fund for the purpose of establishing blind persons in business?

The 1945 General Assembly granted an appropriation of $288,700 to cover the activities of the council in the general fields of home teaching, remedial eye care, and the prevention of blindness?

In addition, an appropriation of $100,000 was designated for expanded rehabilitation service to adult blind Pennsylvanians. Immediately following the enactment of the new legislation, the Secretary of Welfare, who is the executive officer of the State Council for the Blind, requested a complete reorganization of the council. The major steps of the reorganization, designed to improve efficiency and to gear the council to assume increased responsibilities, were effected by July 26, 1945.

The State Council for the Blind is now divided into three distinct sections: Rehabilitation, home teaching, and remedial eye care and prevention of blindness. Each section is under the direct supervision of one person who is responsible to the chief, not only for the efficient operation of his section, but for the coordination of the services of his section with the activities of other two sections.

The guiding philosophy of the State Council for the Blind is to marshal all the existing splendid forces in our commonwealth for the purpose of presenting greater opportunities for the visually handicapped.

The State Council for the Blind, Department of Welfare, Education Building, Harrisburg, extends a vocational rehabilitation service to the capable blind of our commonwealth.

WOULD YOU LIKE TO KNOW?

Who is eligible for our service? Any man or woman residing in Pennsylvania, who has reached his sixteenth birthday, and who has a permanent employment handicap by reason of greater than a 30-percent loss of visual functioning (usually determined by visual acuity of 20/60 or less in the better eye with best correction).

What services were given by the rehabilitation section last year?

During the last year the rehabilitation section provided a total gross income of $211,435 to 152 different industrially blind residents of the commonwealth. This income was created at an over-all cost of approximately $33,000. The service cost included professional and stenographic salaries, traveling expenses, and office supplies. The average yearly income of the persons placed in employment was $1,391. The average monthly income, $115.91. This average monthly income exceeded the ceiling of the pension by $15.91. It cost the commonwealth an average of $217 per client to serve the above number in employment. This section was able to provide $1 of income for the above-mentioned number of clients at a cost of 15.6 cents.

The industrial unit of the rehabilitation section placed or maintained in employment 84 persons during the year ending May 31, 1946. The average monthly income of these persons was $114. Average yearly income, $1,368. The business unit of the rehabilitation section placed or maintained in employment 50 persons with an average monthly income of $175. An average yearly income of $2,100.

The sheltered-employment unit of the Rehabilitation Section placed or maintained in and created employment for 18 persons, who average a yearly income of $179. Average monthly income, $15.

The services extended to the 152 blind persons consisted of counseling, training, and employment placement. These services were rendered without the benefits of Act 75-A or Public Law 113.

What services were rendered to the blind last year by the home teaching section?

The approximate cost for the operation of the home teaching section for the year ending May 31, 1946, was $39,103. The number of teachers averaged 13, with an average of 50 students per teacher. However, in addition to the actual students taught, more than three times that number of blind persons were given services during the same period. A total of 2,185 blind persons were visited, making a per capita cost of $17.89 for the 12 months. The total number of calls made was 9,886 at the cost of $3.95 per call, based upon the total cost of the program as shown above. The services given were instruction in embossed type, writing, typing, crafts, personal adjustment, leisure-time activities, together with an understanding of the local resources for the blind and interpretation of problems of the blind to families and communities.

How were the blind and visually handicapped benefited last year through the Remedial eye care and prevention of blindness section?

During the last year eye care was given to or supplemental work was performed for 5,181 persons, resulting in the expending of $58,689.86 for such services as examinations, glasses, refractions, repair of glasses, surgery, treatment transportation, and prosthesis. Of the 5,181 persons served, 2,066 persons were out-patients who received clinical services. A total of 5,181 visually handicapped persons were served, making a per capita cost of $11.13 for the 12 months.

To summarize: During the year ending May 31, 1946, the gross expenditure of the council was approximately $130,792.86 and we served 7,518 visually handicapped and blind Pennsylvanians, resulting in an average per capita cost of $17.39 for services rendered.

During last year 150 blind Pennsylvanians enjoyed restored useful vision as a direct result of the council's services.

During last year the council rendered financial aid to six Pennsylvania eye clinics for services extended to visually handicapped and blind clients of the council.

During the last year, in cooperation with the State department of public instruction, two sight-saving classes were started making a total of 29 classes.

During last year, through cooperation with the 67 county offices of the department of public assistance, talking book machine service was rendered to 2,164 blind Pennsylvanians.

The records of the State Council for the Blind reveal that 16 blind Pennsylvanians were established in business enterprises through non-interest-bearing loans amounting to $16,200 from the State revolving fund.

Under Pennsylvania law, Pennsylvania visually handicapped and blind persons enjoy more improved conditions than do the blind of any other State in the Nation.

REMARKS BY S. M. R. O'HARA TO THE PENNSYLVANIA FEDERATION OF THE BLIND ON MARCH 20, 1947, AT HARRISBURG, PA.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, when your representative asked me if I would ac-

cept honorary membership in the Pennsylvania Federation of the Blind, I was happy to reply that I would accept and was honored, indeed, by the invitation and such evidence of your friendship. Tonight, with pleasure, I formally accept honorary membership. I am profoundly moved by your action.

I am moved by your action because I have given little to the blind of Pennsylvania but the blind of Pennsylvania have given much to me by the example of your courage, by your wise choice of a positive way of life and an equally wise rejection of the folly of defeatism.

In the discipline for living taught to me by loving parents and wise mentors, there is a fundamental precept for acceptable conduct. That precept is that there is only one unforgivable sin, and that sin is despair.

Now if ever I have known a group of men and women who give living exemplification of the fruits of rejecting despair, or what is diluted despair: defeatism—that group is the blind of Pennsylvania.

You are living examples of the same firm and consistent courage that carried the early settlers of our Nation through encircling forests, across broad rivers, over steep mountain ranges from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

By your example, you are teaching not only the blind and the visually handicapped to surmount their physical barriers, but also you are teaching the sighted to break through the accepted boundaries of the five senses of hearing, smelling, feeling, tasting, and seeing.

You are teaching the sighted that not only may each sense be raised to an unknown *n*th degree but you are adding evidence to the existence of an extrasensory perception with which both sighted and visually handicapped may make contact with the world about us.

Again I am honored by inclusion in your membership because I respect your political and social judgment.

In your political and social philosophy as a group, you have chosen not to capitalize the generous sympathy of your fellow citizens, but have chosen the knightly way of training for your tasks, asking of your fellow citizens only the opportunity to enter the tournament of living on a fair field with a fair economic and social handicap.

Others have told you the details of the program and the achievements of the Department of Welfare through the State Council for the Blind. These achievements have been attained with your understanding assistance and that of other citizens, who are not only benevolent but also intelligent.

The current issue of We, the Blind presents a readable story of the work in Pennsylvania for the blind by the blind.

One of these stories is captioned: "Build it yourself." It thrills me and fills me with faith in the capacity of brave men and women to surmount physical handicaps.

I well remember the staff meeting in the Department of Welfare when the assignment was made to the State Council for the Blind to plan and man the department's exhibit in the 1947 State farm show.

Thousands must have left that farm show with a better understanding of what Pennsylvania's blind are doing to help themselves with a little help from her citizens.

The Department of Welfare was happy to coordinate their efforts to make that contact with the substantial farm groups of this State.

The people must know what you are doing. The people must believe as we in the department of welfare knew that the program of the State Council for the Blind is dynamic, constructive, and offers a profitable investment to the taxpayers of Pennsylvania in her visually handicapped.

In the same issue of We, the Blind, Mr. Day has analyzed the dollars-and-cents investment in service for the blind and the return on that investment. You will be amazed. That is political engineering; that is human engineering equal to the best mankind can create in the way of roads and buildings and education, and a small return indeed to many in your group who have incurred their handicap in the military service in our behalf.

I wish I could name the men and women, name by name, who have helped to build the program of prevention of blindness, remedial eye care, home teaching, and social and industrial rehabilitation in Pennsylvania.

To one and all let us say thank you, and to one and all may I add: The blind continue to need the understanding cooperation of the intelligent citizen who is also the sympathetic interpreter. They need it to protect them from the ill-considered benevolence that leads to parasitic groups, and they need it to support them in the knightly way of self-training, self-discipline, and social and industrial life on a fair field.

You have honored me with an expression of your confidence in my work as a public official for the blind.

I shall cherish this plaque always as a beautiful and tangible momento of our work together for the blind of Pennsylvania and the blind everywhere.

Report on American Youth for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, first session:

REPORT ON AMERICAN YOUTH FOR DEMOCRACY

(Investigation of un-American propaganda activities in the United States by the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess., under Public Law 601)

American Youth for Democracy: Temporary address, 13 Astor Place, room 612, New York 3, N. Y., Algonquin 4-4646.

Cochairmen: Robert Thompson, Naomi Ellison; executive secretary, Carol Ross; vice chairmen: Winifred Norman, John Gallo; secretary-treasurer: W. Robert McCarthy.

OCTOBER 1943.

American Youth for Democracy: National office, 150 Nassau Street, room 412, New York 7, N. Y.

Naomi Ellison, chairman; Carl Ross, national executive secretary; Henry Cooperstock; Terry Grabel; Winifred Norman; John Gallo, vice chairmen; Vivian Levin; Leo Rifkin; Philip Schatz.

New York State office: Corp. David Livingston, chairman; Lillian Gates, executive secretary; Bob McCarthy; Beryl Michaelson, Jimmy Schlecker, Nettie Selling; Everett G. Thomas; Leon Wofsy.

DECEMBER 1945.

A shrewd observer once remarked that "France lost the war not in Flanders but in the schoolrooms." No serious-minded person can deny that America is confronted today with a possible threat to its security as critical as any in its history. The fact that forces hostile to American democracy and seeking its destruction are penetrating our schools and colleges in an effort to subvert the great body of American students is, therefore, a matter of major national concern.

The specter of communism stalks our college campuses masked under the cloak of the American Youth for Democracy. This organization, which claims 60 chapters in colleges in 14 States and a total membership of 16,194, is neither American nor democratic in its origin or purposes. Manipulated by shrewd and specially trained organizers operating in a narrow circle behind the scenes, it endeavors to exploit to the advantage of a foreign power the idealism, the inexperience, and the craving to join, which is so characteristic of our college youth. Behind a veil of a multitude of high-sounding slogans, one is conscious of a determined effort to disaffect our youth and to turn them against religion, the American home, against the college authorities, and against the American Government itself. It is, indeed, a training school in lawlessness. Its methods are underhanded and devious, in line with the Trojan-horse policy initiated at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. These methods have been graphically described by the Canadian Royal Commission in its recent report on espionage activities. The tragedy is that this movement has been able to corrupt some of our young people for its subversive designs. As Rev. John Courtney Murray, S. J., has said in an informed article entitled "Operation University," in America for April 13, 1946:

"There is no doubt that Moscow understands the power of youth. It is consciously enlisting the aid of youth in furthering its own purposes, whose sinister character is ably concealed beneath the aura of idealism that youth finds so seductive."

With amazing guile the youthful representatives of the American Youth for Democracy resort to numerous devices in order to deny and conceal the Communist character of the organization. Section 1, article II, describes the AYD as a "character-building organization dedicated to the education of youth in the spirit of democracy and freedom, as set forth in its program."

Writing in PM of March 10, 1947, in behalf of the New York State AYD, Leon Wofsy assured its readers that "we have no skeletons in our closets. There are no grounds for any 'exposure' whatsoever. AYD is an independent organization of, by, and for young people."

Repeatedly AYD representatives have denied Communist Party domination or relation to the Communist Party. What are the facts?

ORIGIN

On October 15, 1943, a special convention of the Young Communist League was held at Manhattan Center at Thirty-fourth Street and Eighth Avenue in New York City. At this convention the Young Communist League officially transformed itself into the American Youth for Democracy. Addressing this convention, Earl Browder, then general secretary of the Communist Party, USA, called "for a broader unity among the young people's organizations, to reach out and to dissolve old and outlived barriers which have kept apart too many youth organizations."

Prior to this convention, Max Weiss, president of the Young Communist League, had published a proposal in the Communist of September 1943, "a magazine of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism," which has been the theoretical organ of the Communist Party for about 20 years, "to change the program and name of the YCL and to broaden its leadership in order to help create a new, united anti-Fascist youth organization."

The intent of this maneuver was frankly disclosed by Mr. Weiss in the same article, in the following remark:

"It is certainly true that the changes will help blunt certain weapons used by defeatists and reactionaries who pointed to the

name of the organization as 'evidence' that the YCL was the 'youth section' of the Communist Party."

In other words, this was one of a long chain of alleged disassociations and changes of name executed by the Communist parties throughout the world and their auxiliaries, to disarm and confuse the outside world. The Communist Party, USA, for example, decided to "cancel and dissolve its organizational affiliation to the Communist International" on November 16, 1940, in order to evade the provisions of the Voorhis Act. Similarly the Communist International was "dissolved" on May 30, 1943. Numerous Communist publications and front organizations changed their names. The Young Communist League was simply carrying out another phase of the Communist's policy of organized deception.

Mr. Weiss added that "all Communists will naturally hope that thousands of youth who will join the new organization will also later join the Communist Party."

Again indicating the kinship of the AYD and the Communist Party, he insisted that the new organization "must militantly champion the principle of full citizenship of the Communist Party in the democratic life of the country."

The convention dissolved itself promptly at 5:40 p. m. on October 16, 1943, and empowered Max Weiss, Frank Cestare, and Claudia Jones to "conduct all necessary steps to wind up the affairs of the Young Communist League within 30 days from date."

On October 17 these same delegates met at Mecca Temple in New York City in a special constitutional convention to form the American Youth for Democracy.

INTERLOCKING PERSONNEL

The new Trojan-horse strategy provides for the broadest possible network of enticement and the narrowest concentration of control in strictly Communist hands. The following interlocking table of officers of the American Youth for Democracy, the Communist Party, and the Young Communist League shows the close identity of the inner core of the AYD and the Young Communist League.

Name	American Youth for Democracy	Young Communist League
Pauline Annone	State and regional organizations—western Pennsylvania (letterhead, Oct. 17, 1943).	Member, National War Service Council (Meet the Young Communist League, p. 27).
Warren Brown	Vice chairman, Buffalo (AYD Builder, January 1944)	Registered member, Communist Party, Los Angeles County, Calif., November 1938.
Fay Caller (also Fay Caller Vedro).	Member, national board (AYD letterhead, Oct. 17, 1943)	Administrative secretary, New York State (Daily Worker, Mar. 2, 1942, pp. 1, 4).
Frank Cestare	Founder, convention, Oct. 15, 1943	National administrative secretary (Young Communist Weekly Review, Apr. 7, 1942, p. 6).
Leo Cooper	Managing editor, Spotlight, official organ (April 1944, p. 2)	Managing editor, Weekly Review, official organ (Mar. 30, 1943, p. 10).
Margaret Delehanty	New York State leader	Signer of statement in defense of Mrs. Earl Browder (Daily Worker, Dec. 23, 1943, p. 1).
Jack Epstein	State and regional organizations—Connecticut (letterhead, Oct. 17, 1943).	Member, War Service Council (Meet the Young Communist League, p. 27).
Francis Franklin	Contributor, Spotlight, official organ, April 1944, p. 24	Member; member, managing board, Champion, official organ (Special Committee on Un-American Activities hearings, vol. 9, p. 5605).
John Gallo	Member, national board (letterhead, Oct. 17, 1943)	Attended a banquet of the Young Communist League at 12th and Taylor Sts., Detroit, on July 13, 1940. Signer of statement, National Free Browder Congress (Daily Worker, Mar. 16, 1942, p. 2).
Claudia Jones	do	Educational secretary, New York State (Daily Worker, Oct. 4, 1940, p. 4); chairman, New York State (Daily Worker, May 2, 1940, p. 5).
John Hudson Jones	Member, city council, chairman, Harlem Youth Center (AYD Builder, January 1944).	Contributor (Worker, Dec. 20, 1942, p. 12, section).
Adeline Kohl	State and regional organizations, Michigan (letterhead, Oct. 17, 1943).	Acting State secretary, Michigan; speaker at Lenin memorial meeting and rally for victory, Jan. 18, 1942, Detroit. Member, executive committee, New York County (Young Communist League Yearbook, 1937, p. 55).
David Livingston	Acting president (letterhead, Nov. 11, 1943)	Chairman of convention credentials committee (Washington Times-Herald, Jan. 25, 1946).
Daisy Lolich	State and regional organizations, Ohio (letterhead, Oct. 17, 1943)	Secretary, Ohio; speaker, Communist Party (Daily Worker, Feb. 3, 1942, p. 5).
Bill Mardo	Contributor, Spotlight, official organ (January 1944)	Sportswriter (Daily Worker, Nov. 29, 1943, p. 3).
Robert McCarthy	Secretary-treasurer (Daily Worker, Oct. 18, 1943)	Signer, petition to free Earl Browder (Daily Worker, May 2, 1941, p. 2).
Carl Ross	Executive secretary (Daily Worker, Oct. 18, 1943)	Executive secretary (Daily Worker, May 22, 1937, p. 8).
Lillian Ross	Acting secretary (letterhead, Nov. 11, 1943)	Divisional secretary, Communist Party (Sunday Worker, Oct. 13, 1940, p. 3).
Phillip Schatz	Organizational director (AYD Builder, January 1944)	New York State educational director (Daily Worker, Apr. 25, 1938, p. 4).
Herbert Signer	Executive secretary (Daily Worker, June 17, 1946)	Mid-West secretary.
Marcella Sloane	Member, city council, New York State student secretary (Builder, January 1944).	Secretary, college division.
Celeste Strack	State and regional organizations, California (letterhead, Oct. 17, 1943).	Organizer, Los Angeles (Sunday Worker, Feb. 1, 1942, p. 5).
Everett Thomas	Listed on letterhead (Nov. 11, 1943)	Field officer; speaker, Communist Party rally, New York City, Mar. 7, 1946 (Daily Worker, Mar. 8, 1946).
Robert Thompson	Member, national board (letterhead, Oct. 17, 1943)	Member, national secretariat, Communist Party (Worker, July 28, 1946, sec. 3, p. 4).
Max Weiss	Founder	President (Dust Off Your Dreams, the Story of the American Youth for Democracy, p. 14).
Selma Weiss	State and regional organizations, Maryland Washington, D. C. (letterhead, Oct. 17, 1943).	Secretary, Washington, D. C. (Daily Worker, Nov. 4, 1942, p. 3).
James West	State and regional organizations, New Jersey (letterhead, Oct. 17, 1943).	Executive secretary, Northwest convention (Daily Worker, Oct. 5, 1940, p. 5).
Leon Wofsy	President, New York State (PM, Mar. 10, 1947, p. 21) (Daily Worker, Dec. 17, 1942, p. 12).	President, Marxist Cultural Society, City College of New York; editor of the CCNY Communist publication of Marxist Cultural Society (Interim Report and Conclusions of the New York City Subcommittee Relative to Subversive Activity Among Students in the Public High Schools and Colleges of the City of New York, Dec. 1, 1941, p. 102).

The high-handed tactics of the Young Communists at the October 17, 1943, convention were described in detail by Pfc. Richard A. Holman, 1944, in a subsequent issue of the Cornell Bulletin, as follows:

"Of the 314 'representatives' of youth at the YCL (now AYD) convention, 242 came from Young Communist League chapters. The remainder were largely from front groups and controlled unions. * * * Of the 100 members of the AYD executive committee, these 'representatives' chose 80 out of a slate of 80 presented to them. * * * The only additional nomination from the floor was thrown out by the chairman."

This account is particularly interesting in the light of Communist emphasis upon the issue of civil liberties, whenever an AYD chapter is under fire.

PROGRAM AND CONSTITUTION

Despite its professions of independence from the Communist Party, the AYD has aped its parent organization closely in its program and constitution.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1938)

The Communist Party of the United States of America is a working-class political party, carrying forward today the traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Jackson, and Lincoln and of the Declaration of Independence (p. 5).

AMERICAN YOUTH FOR DEMOCRACY — PROGRAM ADOPTED OCTOBER 17, 1943

These ideals, embodied in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights. * * * We are inspired in our devotion to these great ideals by the example of such great patriots as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Samuel Adams, Tom Paine, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and Frederick Douglass.

Article III. Membership

SECTION 1. Any person 21 years of age or more, regardless of race, color, national origin, sex, or religious belief, who is a citizen of the United States * * * shall be eligible for membership (p. 7).

Article IV. Initiation and dues

SEC. 4. Fifty percent of the initiation fee shall be sent to the national committee and 50 percent shall remain with the State organization (p. 9).

Article III. Membership rights and obligations

SECTION 1. All young people, regardless of color, national origin, religious belief, or political party affiliation who accept the program of the American Youth for Democracy may join.

SEC. 2. The yearly membership fee to the American Youth for Democracy shall be $1; 50 cents for high school students. Fifty percent shall go to the national council and 50 percent to the State or regional office.

Article VIII. National organization

SECTION 1. The supreme authority in the Communist Party of the United States of America is the national convention. Regular national conventions shall be held every 2 years.

SEC. 6. The national committee is the highest authority of the party between national conventions.

SEC. 7. The national committee elects from among its members a political committee. * * * The political committee is charged with the responsibility of carrying out the decisions and the work of the national committee between its full sessions (p. 17).

Article VI. National convention

SECTION 1. The national convention shall be the highest policy-making body of the American Youth for Democracy.

SEC. 2. The national convention shall be convened at least 2 years.

Article VIII. National council

SECTION 1. The national council shall be the highest policy-making body of the organization between national conventions.

SEC. 5. The national council shall elect from its members a national executive board. Between meetings of the national council the board shall transact the business of the national council.

This highly centralized structure is copied bodily from the structure of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, UNITED STATES

Article VI. Rights and duties of members

SECTION 1. The Communist Party * * * * opposes with all its power any clique, group, circle, faction, or party which conspires or acts to subvert, undermine, weaken, or overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy whereby the majority of the American people have obtained power to determine their own destiny in any degree (p. 10).

AMERICAN YOUTH FOR DEMOCRACY — PROGRAM ADOPTED OCTOBER 17, 1943

We will expose and combat the activities of all enemies of the welfare of the Nation and its youth, the agents of defeatism and fascism, who work within the labor, progressive, and youth movements.

These face-saving formulas were obviously adopted to counteract the growing conviction that the Communist Party and the American Youth for Democracy are part of an international conspiracy seeking to undermine and destroy democractic countries throughout the world in the interests of Soviet aggrandizement. They are signs of a guilty conscience. There are enough weasel words attached to provide plenty of loopholes for an attack upon our Government on allegedly imperialistic and reactionary grounds. Gullible liberals will, no doubt, fall victim to this trap.

COMMUNIST LOYALTY

The Communist Party, the Young Communist League, and the AYD have never on a single occasion deviated from the main line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, despite their professions of loyalty to our founding fathers. AYD's complete adherence to the line of the Communists remains the acid test of the foreign loyalty which dominates all its activities.

Prior to 1935 the Young Communist League supported the Oxford oath, under which it was pledged not to support its own country in any war in which it may become involved, regardless of the nature of the war and its causes. This was the period during which the Soviet Union feared attack from capitalist nations. The chief Communist-front organization at this time was the American League Against War and Fascism, with a program of open treason against our armed forces.

Here is a sample of the line of the Young Communists at the time taken from a manifesto published by the Young Communist League in 1934:

"Youth of America: Service notice on the bosses' government that you are through serving as cannon fodder * * * We must turn our guns on our real enemies—not the workers of other countries—but our own bosses in this country. Fight for a Soviet U. S. A."

With the outbreak of the war in Spain and Soviet support of the Loyalist cause, it was deemed expedient to repudiate the Oxford oath. Gil Green, general secretary of the Young Communist League, found no hesitation in reversing himself at its eighth national convention, when he declared:

"If we in this country face the same conditions as the young people of Spain, we would not hesitate for 1 second in defending democracy against fascism to the last drop of our blood." [1]

Hostility toward the United States moderated after the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935, when the Soviet Union was seeking to establish a united front with the democracies against the Fascist aggressors. Gil Green, general secretary of the Young Communist League, who had been a delegate to the Comintern Congress, voiced this reversal in these terms:

"American youth realize that they live in the wealthiest country in the world * * * [the anti-Fascist youth forces] have recognized the natural love of youth for the land of their birth." [2]

As soon as the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed, the Young Communist League was quick to change its position on the question of war. A leaflet distributed on the streets of New York by the Young Communist League attacked President Roosevelt and sounded the cry:

"Not a man, not a cent, not a gun for imperialist war preparations. Every increase in the armed forces of the United States is but a step toward preparing this country for entry into the European war. * * * The armed forces must not be expanded. American youth must not be militarized. * * * Support the peace policies of the Soviet Union."

The Young Communist League published a deluge of pamphlets along the same line, and its members participated in the Youth Congress delegation which booed President Roosevelt on the White House lawn.

The AYD was born during the period of World War II, when Russia was already an ally. The AYD was active in securing blood donors, selling war bonds, running canteens, and furthering the March of Dimes. The national board of the AYD affirmed its support of the "timely proposal of Secretary of Navy Knox, for a system of postwar universal obligatory training for youth," adding that "this world-wide war has taught us that we can never again allow a generation of youth to exist who are not fully equipped to defend this country with arms in hand." [3]

The October 17, 1943, program of the AYD was most extreme in its expressions of patriotism. It declared:

"All of us stand ready to lay down our lives in defense of our Nation, our people, and our democratic heritage.

"We pledge allegiance to our country and to the cause of liberty and justice for all. * * * It is a just war to destroy fascism. It is a people's war for national liberation.

"We will resolutely combat the treacherous conspiracies of the Fascists, defeatists, and their fifth column."

The international Communist line changed after the end of the war, and the AYD subserviently followed the pattern set down for it. Its emphatic views on universal military training were forgotten in its startling reversal on this question. We quote:

"American Century is a fancy way of disguising the most aggressive kind of American imperialism, out to conquer the world, economically, then politically. Is that fascism? It's exactly what Hitler tried, only he called it Lebensraum and German destiny. * * *

It's in the light of this that we understood President Truman's call for universal military training. * * * Well, our foreign policy is headed away from cooperation with other nations for peace. It's aimed at world imperialist expansion. That's why President Truman looks for a giant-size army. * * *

"So we're opposed to universal military training because it means a large army to be used for antidemocratic purposes of our army in China. * * * It means setting up the big stick for a big-stick policy." [4]

While there has never been a syllable of criticism of the Soviet Union in AYD literature, its attack on the United States embraces every phase of American life from foreign policy to the labor movement and the universities. The AYD pamphlet further declares:

"Me—the hero—I haven't even got a place to live. * * * I pick up a newspaper and read where there are people—some of them in high places with a lot of power—throwing out their chests and telling the world how tough they are * * * how we've got the biggest Army and the biggest everything it takes to fight another war. * * *

"It stopped being funny when our Government began to play around with Fascists in other parts of the world. With the Mikado in Japan, with cartel big shots in eastern Europe, and with the reactionary Kuomintang in China." [5]

The pamphlet also describes the activities of the Chicago senior division of the AYD, which paraded through the Loop with placards and leaflets, calling for the withdrawal of "our boys" from China and the "speedy demobilization of the veteran men and women in the armed forces."

During the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations, the Philadelphia AYD organized a picket line outside the Argentine consulate and sent the State Department a "hot telegram" protesting against his policy to Argentine.[5]

Speaking at the World Youth Conference held in London in November 1945, Tom Neill, of the United Electrical Radio, and Machine Workers Union (CIO) and an AYD supporter, declared:

"We submit that sole ownership by the United States of the 'secret' of the atomic bomb can only serve to create and intensify

[1] Make Your Dreams Come True, Workers Library Publishers, June 1937; Report to the Eighth National Convention of the Young Communist League, U. S. A., May 2, 1937, p. 43.

[2] Young Communists and Unity of the Youth, by Gil Green, Youth Publishers, New York, October 1935, p. 4.

[3] Daily Worker, February 21, 1944, p. 3.

[4] Dust Off Your Dreams, The Story of American Youth for Democracy, New York, December 1945, p. 19.

[5] Ibid., pp. 4, 15, 18, 19.

an armament race. If this policy is permitted to develop, it will undermine relations between the United States, Great Britain, and the USSR, as well as France, China, and all nations."[6]

The renewed militancy of AYD members in the labor movement and in college circles is an expression of present line of the Communist Party and the American Youth for Democracy.

It is difficult to understand how AYD's professed devotion to the ideals of Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Paine, Jackson, and Lincoln can be blithely so reconciled with actual devotion to the wishes of Josef Stalin as shown by these changes.

RELATIONS TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The close relationship between the Communist Party and the American Youth for Democracy, though continuously disavowed by the AYD in non-Communist circles, is openly admitted and described in detail by Max Weiss, its leading founder, in the Communist press. Speaking of the "relationship of the party to AYD."

Mr. Weiss, in his report to the national committee of the Communist Party, affirms that "toward the end of November (1946) the national board (of the Communist Party), in consultation with the youth commission of the party, formulated a memorandum."

The policy of appointing a youth commission of the Communist Party to handle all important matters of its auxiliary youth organization is standard practice, according to the statutes of the Communist International. It means that the AYD is neither autonomous nor independent and that its national executive board is simply a mouthpiece for the youth commission of the Communist Party.

Mr. Weiss, in his official report, demanded that "the entire Communist Party and its leadership develop systematic Communist Party work and Marxist education among the youth and give party guidance and direction to young Communists active among the youth."

In other words, the AYD has admittedly the benefit of the advice of its more experienced conspirators in the Communist Party.

Quoting the memorandum that was drawn by the party, Mr. Weiss explicitly declared:

"Today the most important and effective channels for organizing and promoting effective action of the advanced anti-Fascist youth is the American Youth for Democracy. It would be the crassest mistake to minimize the importance of the organization or to fail to give it effective assistance."

Displaying a frank and authoritarian right to interfere in the affairs of the AYD, the national board of the Communist Party declared itself "opposed to the proposition that the Young Communist League shall be reconstructed." The national board was clear in its perspectives, which are outlined as follows:

"One, that the party will become a party with mass influence among the youth, with masses of youth joining the party; * * * and, secondly, the party will help develop the AYD as a mass, advanced anti-Fascist youth organization in which the Communists play a leading role."[7]

There could be no more forthright avowal of the party's overshadowing interest in the American Youth for Democracy.

As late as March 10, 1947, the AYD officially defended the position of the Communist Party, USA, in a statement appearing in PM, on page 21, and signed by Leon Wofsy, New York State AYD president, from which we quote:

"We subscribed without reservation to the full and equal citizenship of Communists with all democrats. * * * We judge Communists as we judge others in our organization, on the basis of merit. * * * The Communists who are among those elected to leadership in the AYD are there because the membership feels that they have proven their worth."

It is interesting to note in passing that the former headquarters of the AYD at 13 Astor Place, New York City, were located in the same building with a number of other Communist-controlled organizations: L'Unita del Popolo, Italian Communist paper; Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; State, County, and Municipal Workers; School for Democracy; Camp Arcadia, AYD camp; Friends of the Campus; Tom Mooney Hall; Progressive Forum; Teachers' Union, Local 555, which was expelled from the American Federation of Teachers, AFL, for Communist activities.

A typical issue of the Daily Worker, official Communist Party organ, for March 15, 1947, contains the following notices of AYD functions: Penny party of AYD Village Young Adult Club; Brooklyn College AYD's March social; Dance-a-round, American Folksay Group, AYD; Hunter College AYD entertainment; smorgasbord and square dancing, American Folksay Group, AYD, Brooklyn. The various names used are illustrative of the guises under which the AYD appears.

Gracing various AYD entertainments, meetings, and campaigns, or contributing to its magazine, Spotlight, is the usual list of sponsors which are invariably found supporting the Communist Party and its front organizations, including such names as Paul Robeson, Benjamin J. Davis, Jr. (a Communist Party leader), Rev. William H. Melish, Rev. Jack R. McMichael, Ferdinand Smith, William J. Schieffelin, Norman Corwin, Howard Fast, Harry F. Ward, Edward G. Robinson, Col. Evans F. Carlson, Zero Mostel (an AYD member), Martley C. Crum, John T. McManus, Donald Henderson, Joseph E. Davies, and Lt. Comdr. Charles S. Seely, United States Navy (retired).

To some extent conservative groups and even the Government itself has been responsible for lending prestige to the AYD and its leaders and for misleading the public as to the subversive character if this organization.

At the AYD convention of October 1943, "Whitey" Goodfriend spoke as a delegate, praising the Soviet Union and demanding the opening of an immediate second front. His remarks were echoed by a chant taken up by the audience to the words of Open Up a Second Front Now. Goodfriend had been selected by the OWI during the war as the "typical American youth."

VETERANS

With the admission of over 1,000,000 veterans to our colleges, the Communists have displayed an increased and understandable interest in the campus. John Williamson, a member of the secretariat, the highest political body in the Communist Party, USA, has expressed this interest in the official Communist magazine, Political Affairs, of March 1946, on page 238, as follows:

"The Communist Party should particularly attract the militant youth—especially the veteran."

Writing in the same magazine for February 1947, pages 132, 133, and 134, Marvin Shaw, former student secretary of the Young Communist League, emphasizes this point and indicates the direction of current Communist agitation among these veterans. Calling attention to the presence of 1,080,000 veterans in our colleges, he insists that these veterans "know that another economic crisis will not allow them" to use their technical skill and academic training. This is merely an insidious method of inciting dissatisfaction with the Government's veteran program, which is considered the most generous in the world. Indicating the Communist line of agitation on foreign policy, he declares: "Veterans also expressed concern over the ways and means of preserving peace." This, again, is another invitation to provoke veteran dissatisfaction with American foreign policy.

The potential danger involved can best be appreciated when it is remembered that the Communists first initiated the veterans' bonus march in 1932, which later escaped their control. The current Communist press is replete with accounts of veterans' marches on State capitols and city halls. The Worker of March 2, 1947, carries an account of a teen-age youth march on Albany. The Worker of the same date speaks of a midnight special of student veterans leaving for Washington, D. C. The Daily Worker of March 8, 1947, page 4, speaks of the Seattle continuation committee of the veterans' bonus march which cooperated with the Communist Party of Washington in a march on Olympia, the State capital. David Livingston, AYD leader, should be remembered as one of the leaders of the GI demonstrations in Hawaii. Other Young Communist Leaguers led similar mutinous demonstrations in other parts of the world.

RELATIONS TO THE LABOR MOVEMENT

AYD claims a strong kinship with labor. Its program declares:

"We regard labor as the most consistently democratic force in our country's life, the most progressive social force in modern society. We draw on its strength and experience. * * * We call on it to champion even more boldly the cause of youth. We, in our turn, place our organization at the service of the labor movement. * * * And we appeal to the working youth to join American Youth for Democracy."

Despite these ardent overtures, it is to the credit of the young people in the labor movement that the AYD has made a very slight impression in labor organizations. The AYD has, therefore, been compelled to rely upon Communist-controlled unions for any support they may have been able to secure.

Communists who are members of unions have been instructed to try to secure official recognition of the AYD from the organization's executive committee or from the organization itself. Once that is obtained the way is paved for financial donations, pro-AYD articles in the union press, appeals for AYD members, sports and dramatic activities under AYD auspices, distribution of the Spotlight, sending AYD propaganda to young members, and the public endorsement of AYD by leading union officials. Among its leading trade-union representatives are David Livingston, of the retail and wholesale clerks union; John Gallo, of the Ford Local 600, UAW; and Bob McCarthy, of the shipbuilders, all of the CIO.

ORGANIZATION

It might be well at this point to analyze the composition of the founding convention of the AYD held in October 1943, since it furnished a good cross section of the membership of the organization as a whole. It is estimated that there were 332 regular delegates and 150 guests and observers representing 156 Young Communist League clubs coming from 18 States, including the District of Columbia. The ages of these delegates ran as follows: Under 14—3; 14 to 17—45; 18 to 20—79; 21 to 25—130; over 25—65.

According to the Spotlight of June 22, 1944, the following is the membership distribution of the AYD at that time. Although these figures, undoubtedly vary somewhat at the present time, the table does give an idea of the geographical spread and density of the

[6] American Youth at the United Nations of Youth, World Youth Conference, 1945, p. 7.

[7] Daily Worker, April 3, 1946, pp. 11, 14.

organization in various parts of the United States:

New York	8,300
California	1,394
Michigan	1,370
New Jersey	860
Illinois-Indiana	1,250
Wisconsin	146
Maryland-Washington, D. C	534
Massachusetts	480
Eastern Pennsylvania	641
Western Pennsylvania	97
Missouri	116
Connecticut	245
Washington-Oregon	240
Ohio	450
Minnesota	66
Colorado	5

Those who would be inclined to minimize the significance of this comparatively small figure should realize that for the most part each of these young people has received concentrated training in organization methods and propaganda at the hands of the Communist Party and that they are actually the dangerous ferment in an amorphous and highly impressionable student body.

The AYD has held a number of regional conferences in various parts of the country, which are organized by regional or State councils, of which the following are typical: November 23, 1943, at the Tuller Hotel in Detroit; December 19, 1943, at the Hotel McAlpin in New York City; January 7, 1944, at the Wisconsin Hotel, Milwaukee; January 9, 1944, at the Central YMCA in Chicago; and March 15, 1946, at the National Maritime Union Hall in Philadelphia.

SWEETHEARTS OF SERVICEMEN

A division of the AYD born during the last war is the organization known as the Sweethearts of Servicemen. Its maiden effort was a delegation of 75 young women who arrived in Washington to petition Congress "to give their soldier boy friends and husbands the chance to vote in the 1944 Presidential elections." The delegation was featured in the Daily Worker of December 14, 1934, on page 1. It included such active AYD figures as Pauline Jacobs; Pauline Anoni, of Pittsburgh, "boy friend of Corp. David Grant," who in private life was the organizational secretary of the Communist Party of western Pennsylvania; and Naomi Ellison, cochairman of the AYD and the wife of Victor Ellison, Communist candidate for commissioner in Pierce County, Wash., in the election of November 1942. The next day the Daily Worker published an editorial in honor of the delegation.

FRIENDS OF THE CAMPUS

Initiated in 1945 in order to mobilize "moral and financial support" behind the AYD, Friends of the Campus is headed by a group of individuals closely identified with Communist causes. Included in this list is Donald Henderson, honorary president, who has been previously cited by this committee as "a publicly avowed card-holding member" of the Communist Party "for more than 10 years"; Honorary Chairman Jack MacMichael and Vivian Liebman, leaders of the American Youth Congress, which booed President Roosevelt on the White House lawn; Joseph Starobin, columnist for the Daily Worker; and Bob Burke, former member of the Young Communist League, who was expelled from Columbia University in December 1940.

WORLD FEDERATION OF DEMOCRATIC YOUTH

Naive students who become involved in the AYD are blissfully unaware that they have automatically become entangled in a network with far-reaching international commitments, over which they have no control. The AYD is affiliated with the World Federation of Democratic Youth, which was founded in London in November 1945 by delegates from over 50 nations. This organization now has its headquarters in Paris, which has become the extramural center of the subrosa Communist International and its auxiliary organizations, such as the Women's International Democratic Federation and the World Federation of Trade-Unions.

The delegation to the January 1945 World Youth Conference, which laid claim to representing approximately 2,000,000 organized youth (a fantastic figure), included among its 20 delegates the following: Esther Cooper, of the Southern Negro Youth Congress; Frances Damon, of the American Youth for a Free World; Alice Horton, of the United States Student Assembly; Mollie Lieber, of the American Youth for Democracy; Elizabeth McCandless, of the Los Angeles Youth Council; Thomas Neill, of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (CIO); and Doris Senk, of the American Youth for a Free World. The following Americans were elected as officers: Elsa Graves, industrial council, YWCA, as vice chairman; Frances Damon, as treasurer; and the following were chosen as council members: Naomi Chertoff, of the Junior Hadassah; Esther Cooper, Frances Damon, Elsa Graves, Russell Jones, of the National Intercollegiate Christian Council; and Thomas Neill.[8]

From the outset the World Federation of Democratic Youth demonstrated that it was far more interested in serving as a pressure group in behalf of Soviet foreign policy than it was in the specific problems of international youth. It immediately concerned itself with the question of Franco Spain, condemnation of the reactionary Greek Government, and support for Marshal Tito. No single word of criticism of the Soviet Union was tolerated. Delegations were organized to visit Russia; and Mollie Lieber, the AYD representative, has since toured the United States to speak in glowing terms of her experiences. Her first report was delivered on April 5, 1946, at the Hotel Diplomat in New York City before a session of the New York State AYD.

The World Federation of Democratic Youth brought into being the International Union of Students, which held a meeting in Prague on August 17-31, 1946. The administration and direction of this project was entrusted to a 17-man executive committee, of whom 12 were known Communists. In all of these international youth conferences the Soviet Union controlled a two-thirds majority, consisting of a solid bloc of the Soviet delegates, those from the Soviet-controlled states in eastern Europe, plus a disproportionate number of Communists and fellow travelers from other countries.[9]

So strong was the Communist domination at the London conference that it aroused the deepest concern of the English bishops, notably the present Cardinal Griffin.[10]

An example of the marked anti-American bias of the World Federation of Democratic Youth was a resolution to call on the then Secretary of State Byrnes in Paris to condemn the "lynch atrocities and the rising tide of Fascist terror which are being perpetrated against the Negro people in Georgia, Mississippi, and the southern part of the United States."

The action was taken on a motion by Mrs. Dorothy Burnham, educational director of the Southern Negro Youth Congress, a Communist-controlled front organization.

METHODS

No study of the American Youth for Democracy would be complete without a detailed analysis of the devious methods employed by the Communists in their operations among our young people—methods which bear all the earmarks of systematic training and shrewd direction from professional international conspirators. These methods should receive the most careful study in the various universities, so that students may be fully equipped to meet the Communist wiles in a truly American fashion. In this connection we shall rely on the testimony presented to our committee by former members of the Young Communist League. These methods, which are still actively in force, indicate the essentially conspiratorial nature of the Communist movement among the youth and its corruptive influence.

Members at large: Those active in strategic positions where a Communist label would be disadvantageous are affiliated as members at large so that they do not have to meet with any unit or branch of the party and can, therefore, work in front organizations and church groups and not be known as members of the organization. Among such members at large have been Kenneth Goff, alias John Keats, former member of the national committee of the Young Communist League, and Edward Strong, a member of a special branch, and head of the Southern Negro Youth Congress, which the Young Communist League surreptitiously controlled.

Concealment of membership records: The interim report and conclusion of the New York City Subcommittee Relative to Subversive Activity Among Students in Public High Schools and Colleges of the City of New York found on December 1, 1941, after hearing many witnesses, that the following methods were used in recruitment for the Young Communist League:

"Students were permitted to join under fictitious names; that the student's name would not be entered in any records, since all records pertaining to each student were kept by key numbers instead of names; that the YCL would not send any mail to her home; and that all notices to attend meetings and all instructions would be communicated by word of mouth" (p. 45).

Secret mail: Letters of instruction from the national office of the Communist Party or the American Youth for Democracy are often coded or sent by special courier for return after having been read.

Communist caucuses and party consultation: The Communist group in each youth organization holds a preliminary caucus on all major matters of policy or on the election of officers. All key matters are taken up with the local Communist Party leaders in advance. All important posts in any Communist-controlled youth organization are filled either by Communists or their trusted adherents. Enlarging upon the methods used by the Young Communists at Brooklyn and City College, the subcommittee studying the New York City public schools and colleges explained that this group was able to exercise a degree of influence utterly disproportionate to its numerical strength by obtaining a monopoly of positions of undergraduate leadership as the result of "an elaborate system of conniving, masquerading, interlocking directorates, agitation, and propaganda."

Penetrating religious groups: Those who deal with Communist youth organizations are frequently deceived by the number of religious organizations apparently represented. Religious groups are notoriously naive and easy prey for the young Communist power politicians. Every young Communist is instructed as a first step to join a mass organization such as a "Y" or a church, a trade-union, or a student group. With religious groups the Communist strategy is to speak in terms of Christian principles but actually to exploit them to

---

[8] Report of United States Delegation to the World Youth Conference, London, November 1945, 144 Bleecker Street, New York City.

[9] World Students' Congress at Prague, by Martin M. McLaughlin, in America, December 14, 1946, pp. 291, 292.

[10] "Operation" University, by John Courtney Murray, in America, April 13, 1946, p. 28.

establish contact and use them for Communist propaganda, often with considerable success. Out of a total of 52 members of the national council of the American Youth Congress, 22 have been identified as Communists. This list is given here for the purpose of indicating the technique employed whereby they appear not as Communists but as the representatives of religious and other respectable groups:

William Hinckley, Christ Episcopal Church, Missouri.

Irma Garner, South Side Settlement House.

Howard W. Lederer, Ninety-second Street YMHA, New York City.

Elizabeth Scott, St. James Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Rose Terlin, student secretary, student division, YWCA.

Rose Troiano, national industrial council, YWCA.

Hazel Lehman, Youth Forum and Commonwealth Federation, Washington.

Robert Clemmons, Epworth League, Cleveland, Ohio.

William Dorsey, City-wide Young People's Forum, Baltimore.

Bert J. Duzykowski, Central Committee of Polish Youth, Milwaukee.

Kenneth Goff, Wisconsin Townsend Clubs.

Florence V. MacDonald, Wisconsin Young People's Conference.

Harold Peterson, Minnesota Junior Farmer-Labor Association, Minneapolis.

In some States the young Communists have even penetrated the Young Democrats.

Attitude toward religion and ethics: In view of the penetration of religious groups by these connivers, it is well to note at this point, Lenin's instructions to young Communists on ethics, morality, and religion, instructions which are basic regardless of all deceptive maneuvers to the contrary. These words furnish a standard whereby one may judge the nature of the inner corruption resulting from membership in the ranks of the Communists. We quote:

"But is there such a thing as Communist ethics? Is there such a thing as Communist morality? In the sense that it is preached by the bourgeoisie who declared that ethics were God's commandments, we, of course, say that we do not believe in God and that we know perfectly well that the clergy, the landlords, and the bourgeoisie spoke in the name of God in order to pursue their own exploiters' interests.

"In what sense do we repudiate ethics and morality? * * * We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. * * * For us, morality is subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat." [11]

Assignments and training: It must be realized that we are dealing here not with any spontaneous or indigenous movement but one which is carefully cultivated and directed from outside. Thus young Communists will suddenly appear out of nowhere as a result of a disciplined assignment from central headquarters. They have been trained to be professional revolutionists and ignore home, scholastic, or fraternal ties in submission to orders. Speaking before the National Resident Board of the Young Communist League on April 9, 1933, Henry Winston declared in this connection:

"There is a great need for the training of people in the South. We should send someone down there for a couple of months to conduct classes, study groups, etc., to train and educate the youth commissions of the party on how to work and develop a mass movement."

A letter from the YCL national office to its members dated December 14, 1937, demonstrates how specifically detailed such instruction and training is:

"In order that all district organizers and the league as a whole can provide leadership to the broad youth movement that is developing, they become specialists on youth problems * * *. We are listing here a number of sources of youth research material and a number of publications with which every district organizer should be familiar."

According to the YCL national board minutes of November 6, 1937, arrangements were made with the Visual Education Press for the publication of charts and lectures for the use of YCL branches.

Defiance of college rules.—The New York City subcommittee studying subversive activity among students in the public high schools and colleges of New York City received in evidence a document presented by a group of YCL students to a committee of professors headed by the dean of the City College. The document is a manifestation of an attitude toward the college authorities which those dealing with the AYD, successor to the YCL, would do well to remember. We quote:

"The rules and regulations of the City College which we are asked to obey and which are put before us are necessary levers for the functioning of an institution. They are in reality rules and regulations calculated to prevent struggle on the part of the student body against the forces of society which the college represents. We as Communists therefore regard it as our duty to struggle against these forces in society and, of course, incidentally, against the rules which these forces in society have adopted. * * * We who are Communists point out, in conclusion, that we do not fear repressive measures on the part of the faculty and the administration of the college."

Grievances: The same committee pointed out the tendency of this group to seize upon every grievance, whether real or imaginary, in order to identify the college authorities with the bosses, or the boss-controlled government, and the student with the oppressed and exploited workers of the world, thus instilling in the minds of the students a contempt for democratic processes and the recognized forms of social and political change in a democracy.

Student strikes: From 1935 to 1939 the high schools and colleges of the country were afflicted with an epidemic of Communist-staged peace strikes. The New York Board of Superintendents reported in 1936 that "although some of the pupils who absented themselves last year did so from a sincere belief in the cause of peace, yet some pupils participated for other reasons and some pupils threatened their classmates with violence if they did not join with them in the peace strike."

Teacher cooperation: The aforementioned committee found numerous examples of teacher and student cooperation in Communist projects. In many instances young Communist groups were assisted by faculty advisers.

Tactics of harassment. The committee has described tactics employed by the Communist-dominated American Student Union chapter against Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College, which are worthy of note. We quote in part:

"His home telephone rang into the small hours of the morning, telegrams were received announcing deaths; student pickets wearing gas masks paraded in front of his home, frightening his small children."

CHARACTERIZATIONS OF THE AMERICAN YOUTH FOR DEMOCRACY

Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College, New York:

"Announces the denial of a charter to the American Youth for Democracy 'because both students and instructors feel that it is not a bona fide group. * * * Communism has appeared in the last few years in one camouflage after another, and now it comes in the guise of a youth organization concerned with democracy, in which it was never interested'" (New York Times, March 26, 1944, p. 44).

Dr. Harry Noble Wright, president of the City College of New York:

"Speaking of the American Youth for Democracy, he warned liberals 'to guard against those who, under the pretense of working with us, so conduct themselves as to destroy the sincere and open functioning of our institutions'" (New York Times, March 26, 1944, p. 44).

Prof. John J. Theobald, chairman of the faculty committee of the City College of New York:

"That the AYD was sponsored and initiated by the Young Communist League, which was then disbanded in favor of the new organization; that former members of the Young Communist League have been active organizers of the local AYD initiated at the college; that the strategic position of national executive secretary of AYD is held by the former New York State chairman of the Young Communist League; and that there is printed evidence in the September 1943 issue of the Communist that members of the Communist Party harbor the hope that 'thousands of youth who will join the new organization will also later join the Communist Party, and that many will become leaders of the Communist Party'" (New York Times, January 6, 1944, p. 25).

John P. Lewis, editor of PM, March 6, 1947, page 21:

"On October 17, 1943, in Mecca Temple, New York City, 400 delegates of the Young Communist League—official organization of the Communist Party—met to dissolve that organization and to begin the formation of a new one that would 'broaden the base of leadership' and take in 'non-Communist youth.' * * * Temporary officers named at the dissolution meeting of the Young Communist League to preside over the formation of the new organization were elected to permanent offices in the AYD, dispelling any possibility of doubt as to the paternity of the latter organization. * * * Information available to PM (clippings from city newspapers and many political publications of all shades of opinion) does not indicate that the AYD has ever taken any action to repudiate either its Communist parentage or the Communist Party's assumption of prerogatives in its development as an 'organization in which the Communists play a leading role.'"

Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation:

"In our own country and in our own time, we have seen another youth movement arise. It still flourishes. I refer to that high-sounding, idealistic title, 'American Youth for Democracy,' which conceals the evils and the corruption of American communism. This name is but a new one for the former Young Communist League. It reflects all the sinister purposes of the Communist Party of the United States. It employs the same techniques and has the same objectives, namely, the conversion of our haven of liberty and freedom to worship as we choose to a godless, totalitarian state where the adversaries of democracy can do as they please" (Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A1225).

Robert L. Stearns, president of the University of Colorado:

"I have just received the report of the special committee which was appointed last month to investigate and report on student organizations having a political aspect and in particular the organization known as the American Youth for Democracy.

"This report is fair, thorough, and judicial. * * * It concludes, in part, as follows: 'It is our opinion that the organization known as the American Youth for Democ-

[11] Lenin Speaks to the Youth, published by International Publishers, 1936, second printing, 1937, pp. 13 et seq.

racy, which has headquarters at 150 Nassau Street, New York City, and which has a chapter on the campus of the University of Colorado, is in its underlying purpose what is known as a Communist front, and therefore a front for some other and undisclosed ideology which is in fact illiberal and contrary to our system of government'" (statement issued subsequent to special committee report of March 15, 1947).

CONCLUSION

Some colleges and universities have taken steps to ban the operations of American Youth for Democracy on their campuses. Other institutions have taken other methods to outlaw or curtail this thoroughly un-American and communistically controlled organization.

Each college or university will know the best course of action to follow in its local situation to restrict the vicious influences which the AYD exercises on any campus where it operates. Your committee recommends the following steps as being among the most effective methods for dealing with this problem:

1. The committee calls upon the Governors or legislatures of the various States as well as the administrative heads of the various colleges and universities to thoroughly expose the Communist connections of the American Youth for Democracy as well as the inimical objectives of the Communist Party in America.

2. The Communist Party should be exposed as an organization which is completely and uniformly subservient to the interests of the Soviet Union just as the German-American Bund was subservient to the interest of Nazi Germany. Members of the AYD should therefore be looked upon as young bundists whose basic loyalty is not to the United States but to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

3. The AYD should not be given the honorable status of a bona fide student organization. Its members on each campus should be made publicly known and registered as such. Parents, fellow students, and faculty members should be provided with these membership lists together with a candid explanation of the true nature of the organization and its affiliation with Soviet-dominated communism in America. Student advisers should seek to dissuade students from affiliating with this blatantly un-American outfit.

4. Wherever there are overt acts of violation of either college or civil authority or obscenities committed against the American flag by the AYD or its members, such acts should be dealt with sternly in accordance with the law.

APPENDIX

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND YOUTH

The Communist International in its franker days has made explicitly clear its aims and its methods in reaching the youth of the so-called capitalist countries. We cite, for example, the following authoritative resolution from the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International adopted on August 29, 1928:

"39. The growth of the importance of the youth in industry, due to capitalist rationalization, and the growing danger of war makes it more than ever necessary to intensify work among the youth.

"The congress instructs the Young Communist International to examine the question of the tactics and the methods of work of the Young Communist International, with a view to embracing larger sections of the working youth, to adopting more varied methods of recruiting, to securing more lively and active response to their economic, educational, and theoretical requirements, while at the same time preserving the militant features of the Young Communist Leagues." [12]

Commenting in a complimentary vein upon the achievements of the Young Communist League in capturing the American Youth Congress, O. Kuusinen, former secretary of the Communist International, spoke as follows before the same World Congress:

"Third, the American young comrades have also learned to overcome their former inflexibility in tactics and to apply elastic tactics * * *.

"Fourth, the comrades of the Young Communist League of the United States have learned that it is essential to enter the big youth organizations led by the bourgeoisie. And not only that, they have also learned how to work in these organizations. * * * in the course of not quite a year the Young Communist League in the United States has succeeded in creating 175 fractions in these mass organizations * * * [applause] * * *.

"How can we speak at all of preparing the working classes to fight war in the event of its outbreak, if we do not work in these bourgeois mass youth organizations? * * *

"The mass of the young members will be caught by surprise and will be dragged into the war by deceit, if they are not prepared beforehand for all this by their connections with the Communists * * *. The doors of our youth organizations must be thrown wide open! * * *

"Above all, it is absolutely essential that the Communist Parties should give the youth movement constant and solicitous aid, much more effective aid and leadership than hitherto * * *.

"We want to attack our class enemies in the rear, when they start the war against the Soviet Union. But how can we do so if the majority of the toiling youth follow not us, but, for instance, the Catholic priests or the liberal chameleons?

"We often repeat the slogan of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war against the bourgeoisie * * *. We need a broad revolutionary youth movement at least 10 times as broad as our parties, and a united youth front hundreds of times broader still * * *.

"Long live the glorious Soviet fatherland.

"Long live the great leader of the world proletariat—Stalin." [13]

Stripped of its Communist jargon, there is outlined in the above citation a complete blueprint of the tactics and policies of the young Communists operating in the American Youth for Democracy: (1) The necessity for the employment of "elastic tactics"; (2) the need for penetrating YMCA's, YWCA's, religious organizations, and various other "big youth organizations of the bourgeoisie"; (3) the policy of maintaining Communist cells or fractions in these organizations; (4) the support of organizations like the AYD by the Communist Party; (5) the subordination of all youth activities to the primary strategy of attacking alleged enemies of the "glorious Soviet fatherland" in the rear and "transforming the imperialist war into civil war." It must be recalled that the Communists are quick to classify as an imperialist warmonger any individual or nation which opposes its aspirations for world conquest, the most recent example being furnished during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact and the picketing of the White House. Today the Soviet-Communist propaganda apparatus is again using these terms against the United States.

[12] Communism and the International Situation, Thesis on the International Situation and the Tasks of the Communist International, adopted at the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, 1928; Workers Library Publishers, 35 East One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street, New York, January 1929, p. 30.

[13] Youth and Fascism, by O. Kuusinen, Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1935, pp. 17, 18, 20, 29.

Mr. Vandenberg's Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 16 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able editorial from the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., commending the address by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on aid to Greece and Turkey.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. VANDENBERG'S ROLE

In his eloquent speech on American aid to Greece and Turkey, Senator VANDENBERG has done more than show that the President's proposed program is both sound and necessary. In a personal sense—and of course without seeking to do so—he has demonstrated once again his statesmanlike stature. Before the war he was numbered among the isolationists. During the war, undergoing a profound intellectual conversion, he came to see the world, and his country's relation to it, in an entirely fresh light. With admirable forthrightness, refusing to be bound by any narrow consistency, he lost no time in making clear that he had moved forward—far forward—to new ground. Today no one in the United States speaks with greater force or intelligence on our towering responsibilities in the family of nations.

Mr. VANDENBERG'S role within recent years has been truly remarkable. He played a key part in the founding of the United Nations at San Francisco. While his party was in the minority in the Senate, his counsel loomed large in the deliberations of the Big Four Foreign Ministers. As the Republican member of former Secretary Byrnes' senatorial advisory team, no man did as much as he to make our foreign policy genuinely bipartisan—a contribution of major historical importance. When last November's elections changed the control of Congress and raised him to the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee, he decided that his new responsibilities would not permit him to continue his direct participation in diplomatic meetings abroad. Events have since shown that this was a wise decision. His presence has been needed in the Senate; it is needed now when international issues press from every side and demand the kind of vision and statesmanship he has displayed.

The United States is fortunate in having this man at the head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His position on aid to Greece and Turkey is typical of his capacity to give enlightened leadership in matters that are at once complex and fateful not only for our own country but for the

world as well. His role in this sense is of crucial importance, bearing as it does, in a significant measure, on the shape and durability of the next peace. It is a happy thing that he has proved himself amply equipped to play it.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 16 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] concerning labor legislation being considered.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congress' vociferous labor wrecking crew appears determined to wipe out, in one major sweep, many of the rights of labor achieved only after a long, hard struggle.

This wrecking crew may have the votes to wipe out labor's gains. But, if it does achieve this undemocratic goal, it will awaken one day in the not too distant future to learn that industrial peace cannot be assured by the passage of laws that create new barriers between labor and management, or by laws that place labor in an unfair bargaining position.

Our system of free enterprise can survive only if our Government protects the rights of both labor and management. Both are composed of human beings, and both make errors.

Those who blindly scream that labor is responsible for all industrial strife fail to consider the rights of the worker who is struggling to achieve something that even resembles a balance between wages and the cost of living.

It is an undisputable fact that organized labor has raised the standard of living in our great land. It has not been an easy battle. Oftentimes the workingman has been forced to strike to achieve even meager concessions even though in many cases his wages are not high enough to afford a decent standard of living.

Apparently, the wrecking crew is not interested in these facts. It is operating under the blind, unrealistic theory that industrial peace can be achieved only if organized labor is subservient to industry.

Short-sighted men in other nations and of this Nation in the past also have followed such a course, and their countries lived to regret their actions.

In an effort to speed action on their program of punitive labor legislation, these Congressmen are saying that they are saving labor from itself. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Past history proves that blind reaction will bring down the house of industry as well as that of labor. It is regrettable that some Members of Congress have not profited by the mistakes of others in this respect.

Jefferson's Authorship of Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 16 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to publish in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Julian P. Boyd, librarian of Princeton University, who heads a committee engaged in the publishing of a complete edition of the letters and writings of Thomas Jefferson. This important work originated in the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission, an agency created by the Congress. The work is being carried on by a group of scholars and will be published shortly by the Princeton University Press, under a subvention from the New York Times Co.

In the letter Mr. Boyd calls my attention to the fact that those working on the compilation have discovered in the Jefferson papers in the Library of Congress a fragment of the earliest known text of the Declaration of Independence. Mr. Boyd says in his letter:

The fragment consists of only a few lines, but these are sufficient to prove beyond all doubt that they belong to an authentic composition draft. More than this, they prove with equal finality that Jefferson's famous rough draft, which is one of the great possessions of the Library of Congress * * * was originally a fair copy, transcribed from the text of which the fragment (just discovered) was a part. Finally, the discovery of this fragment should put an end to efforts made in the nineteenth century and even at present to prove that Jefferson did not write the Declaration.

This brief quotation indicates the importance of the discovery, and I am, therefore, asking that the entire letter from Mr. Boyd, going into more detail, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, N. J., April 8, 1947.

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Following our conversation, I should like to give you a few details about our recent discovery in the Jefferson Papers in the Library of Congress of a fragment of the earliest known text of the Declaration of Independence. I am glad to do this because, as you doubtless know, our plan to publish through the Princeton University Press, under a subvention from the New York Times Co., a complete edition of the letters and writings of Jefferson in about 50 volumes, originated in the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission, an agency created by the Congress. To that Commission and to various other officials and agencies of the Government, particularly to Dr. Luther H. Evans and his colleagues at the Library of Congress, this enterprise is deeply indebted. We have now assembled photoduplications of some 48,000 letters and documents of Thomas Jefferson and we hope to begin publishing in the near future. Obviously, this considerable progress could not have been made if we had not received such cordial support from the Library of Congress and other agencies of the Government.

This considerable mass of Jefferson documentation, assembled from several hundred sources in this country and abroad, contains many letters and documents throwing fresh light upon the life of Thomas Jefferson and the history of his times. One of these that we have discovered is a small fragment of the text of the Declaration of Independence in Jefferson's handwriting. This fragment had escaped the attention of historians owing to the fact that it now appears upside down on the draft of a resolution which Jefferson intended to present to Congress on the matter of General Sullivan's request to resign his military commission in 1776. The few lines of this fragment belong to that part of the Declaration which criticized the British people for their acquiescence in ministerial measures, a passage which Congress wisely and almost completely eliminated from the final text of the great document. The fragment consists of only a few lines, but these are sufficient to prove beyond all doubt that they belonged to an authentic composition draft. More than this, they prove with equal finality that Jefferson's famous "rough draft," which is one of the great possessions of the Library of Congress and which I regard as the most interesting document in American history, was originally a fair copy, transcribed from the text of which the fragment was a part. Finally, the discovery of this fragment should forever put an end to efforts made in the nineteenth century and even at present to prove that Jefferson did not write the Declaration. No serious historian has ever had any doubt about Jefferson's authorship of the Declaration of Independence, but the absence of any text earlier than the rough draft has caused some investigators, more zealous than critical, to assume that there was a different authorship. When the Library of Congress published in 1943 a brochure describing the evolution of the text of the Declaration, this brochure advanced the hypothesis that the rough draft was originally a fair copy of some earlier text. The discovery of the fragment confirms this hypothesis.

The first announcement of this discovery will be set forth in an article in the New York Times magazine on Jefferson's birthday, April 13. In that article I made the following statement: "Even Jefferson could not dash off such a noble text in a moment of inspired zeal for his country. The history of the evolution of the Declaration of Independence is a history of painful composition, of hesitation over the right choice of words, of deletions, and of additions. In this the Committee of Five and finally the Congress had a hand and, both as politics and as literature, the Declaration was a better document after they had made their heavy excisions, painful though they were to the sensitive author."

Again let me say how greatly I value your deep interest in the effort we are making to assemble a complete and dependable edition of Jefferson's writings. Let me add also how greatly we value the splendid cooperation of the Library of Congress, of the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission, of the National Archives, of the Director of the United States Mint, and of other officials and agencies of the Government.

With warm regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

JULIAN P. BOYD,
Librarian of Princeton University.

The Newsprint Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. WILSON
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 16 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Freedom Depends on Paper," from the Red Oak (Iowa) Express.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM DEPENDS ON PAPER

One of the most stringent shortages—and it seems much worse than during the war—is paper, and particularly newsprint. And believe it or not, American freedom depends on an adequate supply of newsprint. If any party—say the Communists—could close up all the newspapers, it might not take long to change our form of government. The people must get the facts to defend their rights. It's just another angle of the freedom of the press.

While the situation is not yet that serious, it is extremely acute. This newspaper, for instance, has been unable to obtain any extra supply of newsprint. The Express would like to provide more news space, take care of more subscribers, and improve its publication, but until more paper is available, we have to do the best we can.

As a general thing, the smaller papers have been the hardest hit. Many of the large dailies own their own mills. Even so, the Philadelphia Bulletin, largest evening paper in America, went virtually adless for a week. Business in Philadelphia suffered; so did the subscribers, for ads are really business news, and can point the way to savings for all classes of buyers.

The shortage seems to be due to a number of reasons. First, there is the tremendous demand, with some of the paper entering the black market at high prices that all cannot afford to pay. Second, a lot of mills have been gobbled up by big publishers who proceed to hog the output that formerly went in part to others. Third, there has been a shortage of freight cars, with the result that many mills have not been able to get shipments out of their plants.

Part of the trouble may be temporary, but the loss of buying capacity by smaller purchasers, through the action of the big fellows who bought up mills, is permanent, unless something is done about it. One only has to look at the last several issues of the Saturday Evening Post and Life magazine, the largest in months, to know where some of the paper is going. One paper company for instance, which is owned by one of the largest magazine publishers, has consolidated about 43 firms, with the idea of providing for the needs of the magazine. When a paper company goes out of the public field, where are its customers to go, since other firms already have more orders than they can fill.

Time magazine, in a recent issue, virtually admits the charge, saying:

"Last week the committee (Senate Small Business Committee) called in 50 big publishers, asked about sharing a little of what newsprint makers call the 'currency of civilization.' The guests just stared at the ceiling. But when the impatient Senator WHERRY threatened legislation to restore newsprint controls, the publishers promised to see what they could do. Local associations, they hoped, would see to it that no daily or weekly had to suspend."

And except for the fact that big-business New York Times lent the Communist Daily Worker some paper, that sheet would have had to fold up temporarily. A nice gesture from the Times at that, but not one that will solve the problem permanently.

Something has to be done about print paper, to see that the smaller papers get a fair supply—all papers, for that matter. No matter how small a newspaper may be, it takes about so much paper to publish. Not many of the little fellows can exist unless there is revenue from advertising of sufficient volume, because the rates per page are so much less. It costs just as much to set a page in a small paper as a larger one; the amount of copy is about the same.

But thoughtful publishers will oppose rationing. To make it work, there must be price control, and the first thing that happens when profit leaves is that the mills curtail production, same as anyone else would do. We want to get away from all forms of rationing.

There is a better way out. That is to require the mills, bought up by large publishers, to continue to supply the usual quota to their old customers until new installations take up the slack, or demand recedes. One might argue that to do so would be to confiscate the property of large publishers who bought these plants for their own use. Not at all. The owners of the plants would make a profit on all sales made, but they might have to wait until additional capacity could be provided at their own mills before they could hog all the paper. Really, if too many mills are devoted to a few publications, it amounts to a combination in restraint of trade.

At that, the big fellows should remember that real freedom grows at the grass roots. If the smaller papers cannot succeed, it won't b long until some smart bureaucrat will figure how to get control of the big boys. The smaller fellows are in the majority; the thousands of members of the National Editorial Association, for instance, can probably pack a bigger wallop votewise than the big boys. It's a thought, anyway.

And we respectfully suggest that Mr. WHERRY and his committee check up and see that something is done about the shortage other than staring at the ceiling.

The Agricultural Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following article by Sumner R. Parker, State director, Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture. This article, which appeared in a recent issue of Farm Bureau in Massachusetts, sets forth in a conservative and forceful way what 10,000 farmers in Massachusetts do with the money which the Congress appropriates for the agricultural conservation program.

THE AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

(By Sumner R. Parker, State director, production and marketing administration)

Maintenance of soil fertility has been a major objective of the agricultural conservation program in Massachusetts since it was first authorized in 1936. Approximately 10,000 farmers have continuously participated in this program.

In 1946 they used 74,000 tons of lime. Only a part of the cost of this was furnished by the program. The farmers paid for the rest of it as they do on all of the practices that are encouraged. This is more than double the amount of lime that was previously used in the State, and is still much less than is needed.

SUPERPHOSPHATE WAS SCARCE

Superphosphate was scarce in 1946, and less than half as much was used as farmers wanted. Seven thousand seven hundred tons were supplied under the program, when 18,000 tons was the estimated amount that would be used if it were available. Superphosphate is the principal source of phosphorus that builds bones in animals and humans. If the soil is low in phosphorus, so are the crops and livestock that live on the soil. Calcium from lime and phosphorus from superphosphate have been proven many times to be healthful to the population that lives on the products of the soil.

Two thousand five hundred tons of potash were used by farmers in 1946. Without potash, clover, alfalfa, and other legumes failed to grow. These nitrogen producing plants manufacture from the soil and air foods that are essential to livestock, and increased yields of forage from the land.

COVER CROPS ENCOURAGED

The program encourages the use of cover crops by paying a part of the cost of the seed. Thirty-five thousand acres are seeded annually after the main crop has been removed. These cover crops are the green fields of rye that are observed in the month of November scattered all over the special crop area of the State. Formerly less than 10,000 acres of land were covered over the winter with this soil-retaining crop. Many more acres could be benefited by the use of this practice.

Only recently has attention been given to the better control of water on the slopes of our tilled fields. We call this washing. Much of it is very slow. Recently erosion control practices have been added to the program of agricultural conservation. These are performed under the supervision of the engineers of the Soil Conservation Service who assist farmers in laying out diversions to carry off the water, and ditches to drain the land. The soil building program aids in this by reimbursing the farmers for a part of the cost in connection with erosion control.

The mulching of orchards and vegetable lands is a practice that has been growing over the last few years, and is highly recommended by all fruit growers and vegetable men. To encourage this practice, a small payment has been made for the mulch that is placed under the trees or is applied to the vegetable land to prevent the evaporation of moisture and to add humus to the soil. Fifty-five hundred tons of mulch are applied annually throughout the State. While the payment is only a small part of the cost, yet frequently it makes the difference between the application of the material and the neglect of the land.

FARMER ADMINISTRATION

The agricultural conservation program is administered by State committeemen, county committeemen, and community committeemen—men who participate in the program and are chosen by other participants to administer the program in their field. For this reason many special services that have been necessary in the last few years have been administered by the committeemen of the agricultural conservation program. They are now, of course, a part of the Production and Marketing Administration, and just a mention of some of these special services will call to mind problems and trials that farmers have lived through in the last few years.

SPECIAL SERVICES

Last spring and summer, for instance, feeds were scarce and high. Protein meals were particularly short, and it was necessary to ration them. With the assistance of a feed advisory committee, composed of all sections of the grain trade, assisted by the Extension Service and other State and Federal organizations, protein meals were rationed to all Massachusetts feed dealers and mixers. When other feeds became scarce, special supplies were allocated to this region and again ordered shipped to dealers in the State where the supplies were shortest. The additional sources of feed were not adequate to meet the need, but through the efforts of the State and county offices, the feed committees, and the dealers, 193 carloads were handled.

Price support for potatoes in the summer and fall of 1946 was another duty that was assigned to this same group. Under the price-support program that was pledged by Congress to producers of potatoes, the Department of Agriculture was bound to find a market at the support price for the potatoes that the farmers produced. This was done by buying 280 cars of potatoes during the early part of the season. Later, after the potatoes were dug and placed in storage, 340 more cars were handled, and permanent storage loans were made on an additional 800 cars. During this period no potatoes were wasted. No farmers were refused the opportunity to deliver their potatoes. No potatoes were piled in the fields. In all, 669 carloads were bought, and of these 87 cars went to welfare institutions and school lunch and 582 cars went to dairy farmers for livestock feed.

In the early part of 1946 a part of the price of milk that consumers did not pay was paid by a subsidy directly to dairy farmers. This was handled by the county offices of the agricultural conservation program. They made payments to 5,700 dairy farmers, three times during the first half of the year covering the periods as follows: The last 3 months in 1945, the first 3 months in 1946, and the second 3 months in 1946.

These special services are now largely completed, and we hope that the occasion for them will not soon return.

A PERMANENT PROGRAM FOR SOIL BUILDING

The permanent program of soil building, however, is one in which the general public is vitally interested. Very little progress was made in maintaining the soil fertility of the country until Federal assistance was given to the program. True, good farmers everywhere have practiced soil building, but the continued downward trend of crop yields and fertility was not halted until a national program of soil building was put into effect.

William Crowell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Shore Breeze, Shore High School, Euclid, Ohio:

WILLIAM CROWELL, ONE OF THE STATE WINNERS IN LEGION ESSAY CONTEST, AWARDED 7-DAY TRIP TO WASHINGTON, D. C.; ESSAY WAS ONE OF THREE BEST IN STATE

William R. Crowell, 16-year-old sophomore, was one of the most surprised people in the assembly sponsored by the American Legion, Monday. Breathlessly he accepted the medal, as Mr. W. L. Deweise, chairman of youth activity in Ohio, informed him that he was a State winner in the essay contest. Still a little flustered, he read his essay, titled "Americanism or ?". Beaming, he took a seat of honor on the stage.

Although this is not his first attempt, it is the first time he has won anything for his writing. Fame came to him once before, however, when he won second place in a county speaking contest. All publicity is not pleasing Bill found out when a newspaper carried a story headlined, "Euclid girl wins contest."

William will get, along with 11 other State winners, a free 7-day trip to Washington, D. C. There were three winners in each high school grade.

The other winners were announced by Mr. Hinch. Winners for the twelfth grade were Joe Mayer and Janet Schulmeister, Bob Steele and Carol Wilson, for the eleventh grade; Bill Crowell and Lois Webb, for the tenth grade; ninth grade winners were Jim Verbsky and Ruth Thomas. Bob Steele and Carol Wilson were the winners for the school.

Dr. Loos introduced Mr. Joseph Gorg, vice commander of the Euclid Post, No. 343, and Mr. Victor Johnson, district commander of the Ninth District of the State of Ohio. Mr. Johnson then introduced Mr. W. L. Deweise, who gave a talk on Boys' State before presenting Bill with his medal. The representatives of Boys' State and Girls' State are Bob Steele and Aldona Thomas. Roger Wach was the representative last year for the Boys' State.

AMERICANISM OR?

(By William Crowell)

Americanism, to me, is synonymous with the most beautiful word in our language—freedom.

Its alternatives—communism, fascism, and socialism—are among the ugliest, because they all entail the deprivation of the precious freedoms which make being an American the rarest privilege in the world.

Freedom to complete my education in a land where there are no restrictions on the dissemination of knowledge, and where freedom of thought and discussion is encouraged.

Freedom to choose my life work; to seek useful employment wherever I choose.

Freedom of opportunity to advance in my chosen field, limited only to my own ability to improve myself and to progress.

Freedom to travel the length and breadth of my country as a free man, and to found a home for myself and my family wherever we elect to live under the protection of the Stars and Stripes.

Freedom to worship, to read, to write, to speak, and to think according to the dictates of my conscience through all the years of my life.

Freedom to choose, in free elections, those who make the laws under which I must live, and to remove them from office by the ballot if they prove false to their trust.

By toil, blood, and unselfish sacrifice, my forefathers developed and secured these freedoms, making this country great, powerful, and prosperous, with the highest living standards in all the world.

I know that the price I must pay for the full enjoyment of these freedoms is constant vigilance against the encroachment of alien "isms"; that only by working, and, if need be, by fighting, to preserve these freedoms will I earn the right to the privileges that go with the American way of life.

I know that if ever I and others of my generation grow careless or indifferent to our duty to make Americanism work, these sacred freedoms will be lost and the light of liberty will dim and die.

I know that today there are forces at work in this country seeking to supplant Americanism with these alien "isms" which, if permitted to prevail, will destroy the free America in which I wish to live and die.

We have only to compare the socialistic way of life as it exists today in Russia and other lands with what Americanism has to offer to reach the conclusion that we who live in this blessed Nation have many freedoms for which to thank our God.

In countries where these alien "isms" rule there is no freedom such as we in America enjoy, regardless of class, race, creed, or color. In the blighted lands where communism and fascism prevail the state is supreme and the individual counts for naught. The American ideal holds the individual to be supreme, the state his servant.

I ask only the right to live, work, play, pray, and die a free American, proud to pass on intact to those who follow me the sacred heritage of freedom which my fathers entrusted to my keeping.

National Policy Committee Survey of Opinion on Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement issued by the National Policy Committee following a meeting at Princeton, N. J., on April 12:

The American people have a "yes, but—" attitude toward pending Federal labor legislation, according to a statement released today by a panel of the National Policy Committee reviewing a Nation-wide series of meetings on labor-management relations held under the auspices of that committee since December.

This panel has been meeting here at the Institute for Advanced Study during the last 2 days, and has considered reports of 17 meetings held in 11 different cities, from Boston to Portland, Oreg., and from Minneapolis to Memphis. All meetings were off-the-record sessions, permitting frank interchange on the part of the 243 participants. Among those taking part were 55 from management, 54 from labor, more than 20 each from education, law, government, press, and radio. Others represented agriculture, the church, and citizens' organizations.

"Legislation is not the final answer," says the review panel of 15. "Industrial peace will grow only as management and labor both recognize their responsibilities to the public and develop better trained representatives for day to day plant relations as the basis for workable contract negotiations. They can't pass the buck to Government and expect to avoid the controls that neither management nor labor seems to wish."

Reviewing the discussions in these 11 widely scattered localities, the panel found it significant that there was broad acceptance in principle, of labor's right to organize, to bargain collectively, to strike. There were, however, immediate exceptions to these principles at the point of application. It was agreed that labor has the right to organize, but should this include the right to force men to join a union? On the other hand, should a nonunion man "free-wheel" on what the union does for its members? It was agreed that labor has the right to bargain collectively, but should this include a closed, as contrasted with a union, shop? It was agreed that labor has the right to strike, but members from all sides took a sober view of the effect nationally of the misuse of labor's highly concentrated power. Concern for sustained production was repeatedly emphasized. On the other hand, there was substantial opinion that if that right is denied in cases clearly affecting pub-

lic health, welfare, and safety, the denial must be sincerely balanced by workable equivalents.

Concern was repeated that labor and management both tend to bypass the public interest. At the same time, it was said that if the public wishes to intervene as a balancing factor in labor-management disputes, issues must be better understood and governmental machinery equipped with skilled specialists to operate it.

The Nation-wide series of meetings which this panel reviewed was an attempt on the part of a private organization to provide local occasions at which representatives of the contending factors could meet for discussion of issues free from the pressures of specific negotiations. The National Policy Committee has its headquarters in Washington. Its chairman is David Winton, of Minneapolis. Funds for these discussions were provided by the Scaife Foundation of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Frank Aydelotte, president of the Institute for Advanced Study, met with the group at dinner on Saturday night. The review panel of 16, chaired by William H. Baldwin, of New York City, included a number of members who had participated in the regional meetings. Among those present were Winfield Riefler, of Princeton; H. K. Thatcher, of Little Rock, Ark., secretary of the National Association of State Commissioners; secretaries and directors of agriculture, Bradley Morison, editor of the Minneapolis Times; Sam Sponseller, of Cleveland, regional director, CIO; J. Lawrence, of SKF Industries, Philadelphia; Marion Lyndon, public relations counsel, of Boston; and Bernard Noble, of Portland, Oreg.

Contrast Between Democracy and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 16 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the March-April issue of Labor's Monthly Survey, a publication issued by the American Federation of Labor, occurs a very concise and striking article which in parallel columns contrasts the way of life of democracy with the way of life of communism. It is noteworthy not only because it is well expressed, but also because it is sponsored by one of our great labor organizations.

In the same issue there appear two tables, one of which contrasts what one gets for work under a free-enterprise system as compared with the communistic system. The other table contrasts the high living standard which is produced by free enterprise and free labor in the United States as compared with conditions elsewhere.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary of the differing ways of life, the table regarding free enterprise and communism, and the table showing the high living standard produced in the United States, may all three be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO WAYS OF LIFE—A CONTRAST

DEMOCRACY	COMMUNISM (OR RUSSIAN "DEMOCRACY")
Everyone has basic rights and freedoms guaranteed.	No one has guaranteed rights. Everyone is subservient to 14 Politbureau dictators.
Freedom of the person	
No arrest without warrant; no arbitrary seizure of persons or property or search of homes. Trial by jury guaranteed.	Arbitrary arrests; imprisonment without trial; secret police seize anyone, search any home; everyone watched by spies.
Other freedoms	
Free press and radio, free speech.	State-controlled press and radio, persons criticizing Government imprisoned.
Freedom to seek truth, in schools, universities.	State tells everyone what to believe, though often untrue.
Religious freedom.	Church dominated by state.

TWO WAYS OF LIFE—A CONTRAST—Continued

DEMOCRACY	COMMUNISM (OR RUSSIAN "DEMOCRACY")
Representative government	
Government by laws enacted by chosen representatives of the people.	Government by decrees of dictators, without consent of the people.
Free elections, candidates nominated in primary elections or conventions of parties.	One-party "elections," candidates chosen by Communist Party officials.
Economic freedom	
Anyone is free to start any kind of business.	State controls all business. No private enterprise.
Anyone may own a home, farm, or business.	State owns housing facilities, farms, businesses.
Worker is free to choose job and change job.	State dictates job, freezes worker in job.
Collective bargaining, union contracts.	Wages and conditions dictated by bureaucrats.
Result	
High living standards.	Miserable living standards.

Free enterprise (U. S. A.) and communism (U. S. S. R.)

WHAT YOU GET FOR YOUR WORK

To buy—	United States (hours worked)	Russia (hours worked)
Daily food	3	9
Cotton stockings	1	24
Cotton shirt	3	320
Woolen gloves	2	100
Alarm clock	4	160
Bottle of beer	[1] 10	8
Lady's coat	75	1,000
Wrist watch	30	1,600
Galoshes	3	160
Toothbrush	[1] 15	4

[1] Minutes.

Source: Courtesy of New York Journal American. This chart appeared in their issue of Jan. 3, 1947, p. 20. The figures are for 1946. Average wage, United States of America—$1 per hour; average wage, U. S. S. R.—25 cents per hour. Wages and prices in U. S. S. R. reported by George Moorad and John Strohm after recent trips to Russia. A few U. S. S. R. prices: Wrist watch, $400 to $700; coat for worker's wife, $250; cotton shirt, $80 to $100; bottle of beer, $2.

Free enterprise and free labor in USA produce highest living standard

	Population	Land area (square miles)	Railroad mileage	Telegraph-wire mileage	Telephones (in use)	Automobiles (in use)	Radios (in use)	Electricity (capacity installed, percent)	Oil (production, percent)	War expenditures, per capita	Percentage of manufactured production	Daily newspapers
World	2,170,000,000	57,510,000	788,672	5,567,000	51,500,000	41,300,000	125,000,000	100.0	100.0	Estimated, $1,154 billions.	100.0	[1] 3,000
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Persons*	*Persons*	*Persons*					
United States	7.0	6.0	30.0	40.0	1 for 5	1 for 4	1 for 3	46.2	61.0	$2,431 since June 30, 1941.	32.2	1,749
Russia	8.8	14.0	6.2	11.0	1 for 188	1 for 252	1 for 45	[1] 5.0	6.0	$622 since June 1, 1940	18.5	28
Great Britain	2.2	.17	3.0	4.3	1 for 156	1 for 22	1 for 5	6.0	1.7	$2,351, since Mar. 31, 1940.	9.2	150
France	1.8	.34	5.0	5.0	1 for 27	1 for 18	1 for 9	2.1	.7	$613, since June 1, 1940.	4.5	85
Sweden	.3	.31	1.3	.1	1 for 6	1 for 29	1 for 5	1.8	.15	Not available	1.3	135
Italy	2.1	.2	1.4	4.8	1 for 72	1 for 93	1 for 43	1.8	.03	do	2.7	16

[1] Estimated.

Source: Courtesy of the New York Journal-American; the above chart appeared in their issue of Jan. 3, 1947, p. 20. The figures are from Government agencies and trade associations, 1937-46.

End of Wasteful Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, in the face of all the propaganda and untrue statements being circulated by some commentators and newswriters, I think the following article by David Lawrence, published by the Long Beach Press-Telegram, Long Beach, Calif., is so outstanding in its truthfulness and in clearness that it deserves to be made a part of our national records. I am, therefore, inserting it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that its circulation will be greatly increased thereby:

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSMEN VOTE END TO 14 YEARS OF WASTEFUL SPENDING

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—When the House of Representatives passes a tax-reduction bill by virtually a two-thirds vote, it may be taken for granted that the measure represents a preponderant public sentiment.

The best indicator of this is the fact that 40 Democrats, out of the 173 who voted, cast their ballots for the bill along with 233 Republicans. Considering that only 3 Republicans voted against the bill, out of 236 voting, it is evident that the Republican majority is not only cohesive but it can command support on the Democratic side, too.

For several weeks there has been a smear campaign waged against the Republican Congress. It has been argued that tax reduction would unbalance the budget and bring other dire consequences. The truth is the Democratic party is badly split. One group is politically sagacious and is envious because the Republican Party has been given the opportunity to gain prestige through tax reduction. The other group, of course, wants to keep on spending indefinitely.

The spenders in the Democratic membership in Congress are still the more numerous inside the minority party and one wonders what would have happened if the Democrats had regained control of the House in last November's elections.

If the Democrats were in control today, the economy-minded would have been outvoted by the spenders and it is questionable whether any such vote for tax reduction could have been mustered even with Republican help.

Without a promise of tax reduction, the Nation today would be in the midst of runaway inflation and economic chaos. The New Dealers have been denouncing the Republican Congress, and the left-wingers have been assiduously cultivating the impression that the Republican Congress has been bungling its job. The truth is that delays were encountered because the entire congressional structure has been reorganized pursuant to legislation passed last year, and no Congress in history has had to face the reorganization of committees and the rearrangements of procedures which have been imposed on the present Congress by statute.

Notwithstanding these time-consuming steps, the Republican majority in the House has given an example of resoluteness in passing—within 90 days of the day the session began—a tax bill which not merely fulfills the promises made to the people in the autumn elections but dramatically reverses the tide of spending which, if not blocked, would have bankrupted the Nation.

The trouble about the tax-bill controversy is that the bureaucrats in the administration have been concealing the truth. First, they put figures in the Budget estimates which were plainly padded. Not only were receipts underestimated but the expenditures were placed much higher than they should be. Then the President took the ridiculous position of opposing tax reduction—a blunder in politics if ever there was one.

The Republicans refused to be swayed by the smear campaign and put through a tax bill. It will be revised in the Senate, but the final bill is not likely to be vetoed unless Mr. Truman wants to commit political suicide in 1948.

The fact is the American people are tired of spendthrift government and now want economy and an end to spending. The consequence of the House action will be felt throughout the whole economic system. It is a breath of fresh air after nearly 14 years of wasteful spending by the New Deal.

Lindbergh Urges United States World Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Charles A. Lindbergh from the New York Times of April 14, 1947:

LINDBERGH URGES UNITED STATES WORLD ROLE—FORMALLY DROPS ISOLATIONISM FOR ACTIVE HELP TO ALL IN PERIL FROM AGGRESSION—TEXT OF STATEMENT

(The statement follows:)

Seven years ago, I toured this country pleading for a consistent American policy toward Europe. At home and abroad, I had been advocating that England, France, and America build their strength but refrain from war while Nazi Germany and Communist Russia fought out their totalitarian ideas. I believed that our withdrawal from Europe after the First World War had committed us to a policy of neutrality, and that American intervention in a Second World War would leave European nations prostrate and destroyed without gaining the ideals that we fought for.

Those of us who opposed intervention were unsuccessful. Our country went to war and we went with it. With Americans of all viewpoints, we worked, fought, and many died in the cause of victory. From a military standpoint, that victory has been achieved decisively. But we emerge from war with western civilization greatly weakened in a world full of famine, hatred, and despair. We have destroyed Nazi Germany only to find that in doing so we have strengthened Communist Russia, behind whose "iron curtain" lies a record of bloodshed and oppression never equaled.

I believe we could have prevented the war in western Europe and that it has resulted in one of the greatest of human tragedies. But it will do little good to argue the wisdom of the past. The action we have taken cannot be changed, and it forms the foundation upon which we must unite to build a better future.

STRESSES CONSISTENCY

Today, I plead again for a consistent American policy toward Europe. It would be disastrous for us to continue wavering back and forth between intervention and withdrawal. We made our decision when we entered the war. Our honor demands, our security depends, on carrying through what we have started. We must help to rebuild western civilization. We must reestablish and protect the ideals we believe in. This will require our extending financial assistance. It may require the use of military force. But no necessary cost is too high for the accomplishment of these objectives.

The welfare of other nations has always been of great importance to us; but, in years past, we Americans could live securely behind our own defenses regardless of conditions abroad. Even with the aircraft and high explosives of World War II, transoceanic bombing against a strong power was impracticable. The cost was out of proportion to the damage that could be done. Now, in a rocket-atomic age, the welfare of other nations is more than important, it is vital to us. No earthly distance is adequate defense against the latest weapons of science. Our security now depends on preventing the assembly of modern weapons by an aggressive power. It depends on the cooperation of peoples who believe in the freedom and dignity of man and in a way of life that is basically similar to our own. Wherever these peoples need help, we must assist them. There is no better way, probably there is no other way to attain security, peace and the progress of our civilization.

Pending Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post has a timely editorial entitled "Overdoing It" which I incorporate as part of my remarks. I ask each Member of Congress to read the same.

OVERDOING IT

Chairman ALLEN, of the Rules Committee, indulged in no exaggeration when he said in the opening debate on the House labor bill that this undoubtedly is one of the most far-reaching and important bills that any Member of this Congress will be asked to vote on. The bill outlines a new national policy governing the relations between management and labor, and the relations of both to Government. To say that it is sweeping in its terms is an understatement. We can get nearer to the truth by saying that it is a vast and complex network of ideas—many of them undigested ideas—dumped into an omnibus bill without much regard for what the net effect upon our economy may be.

We think the bill contains numerous constructive provisions. For example, it would recognize unfair labor practices on the part of unions as well as employers. It is an attempt to democratize unionism, to correct such evils as mass picketing, jurisdictional strikes, and strikes that imperil the national welfare. The trouble is that in many instances it invokes crude and repressive remedies. It is not a carefully devised effort to redress the balance between industry and

labor; on the contrary, it is a sharp swing of the pendulum in the direction of unreasonable restraints on organized labor. It is not surprising that the long delay in correcting the defects of the old system should produce this sort of a reaction. But this explanation of why the bill has taken the shape it has still does not make it intelligent legislation.

No doubt the bill will be vehemently assailed because it would abolish the NLRB and set up in its place a Labor-Management Relations Board. But this may prove to be one of its happier aspects. The main idea behind the proposed change is to separate the prosecuting and judging functions of the NLRB. The task of investigating alleged unfair labor practices, of preparing complaints and carrying on all the executive work under the act would be assigned to an Administrator. The Board would become a truly quasi-judicial body for the hearing and deciding of cases taken before it. With unions and their officials certain to be hailed before the board on charges of unfair practices, this effort to secure greater objectivity in its decisions might reasonably be welcomed by labor.

But the House Committee on Education and Labor was not content to give the Board a more judicious character or even to rewrite the Wagner Act. It has provided for a system of judicial review that might tie up most of the vital business of the Board in the courts for rehearing. The bill also sweeps on to take many labor problems out of the hands of the Board and Administrator and lodge them in the courts by restoring use of the injunction to cope with certain forms of picketing, illegal boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and so forth.

Especially unsound, in our opinion, is the provision which would authorize the President to secure an injunction to halt any strike which he believed to threaten curtailment of essential public services. We have often emphasized the necessity of providing some means of dealing with union tyrants, such as John L. Lewis, who are willing to paralyze our entire economy for the sake of gaining their ends. But in all conscience, free use of the injunction in public-utility walk-outs is not the answer. Let the Government take over an industry essential to the public health, safety, and welfare, if necessary, while a dispute is being settled. But certainly the Government should not intervene by means of an injunction and then rely upon the crude machinery that would be created by the House bill to bring about a fair settlement.

Nor is this all. The bill would abolish the closed shop (although authorizing some forms of the union shop), outlaw industry-wide collective bargaining, create a new conciliation service outside of the Labor Department and set up a rather crude system for balloting among employees before strikes may be called. It is too much of an undigested lump. We doubt that many members of the committee are familiar with its details. Certainly the rank and file of House Members are not. And the great American public is almost completely ignorant of what Congress is trying to do.

This is not the way to secure sound legislation. It is not even good politics. At the very least, it seems to us, the bill should be broken down into three sections—one modifying the Wagner Act and the other two dealing with the conciliation service and emergency handling of utility strikes affecting the national interest. Only by this means do we see any chance of the country understanding what its legislative arm is doing. If the steamroller which seems to be going into action in the House disregards this widespread demand, the chief burden of legislating in this field will fall upon the Senate, where evidence of a more responsible attitude is apparent. Failure of the Senate to heed current warning signals would doubtless result in a veto, and the whole mess would be in the lap of Congress once more. The time to avert such a calamity is now while it is still possible to strip this legislation to reasonable proportions.

Oversupporting Wool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald of Friday, April 11, 1947:

OVERSUPPORTING WOOL

By April 15 the Secretary of Agriculture proposed to have the Government out of the wool business, unless Congress directed otherwise. Now the Senate has directed otherwise, and if the House follows suit, the United States will be well launched on a vast and very expensive program of peacetime agricultural support by Government purchase and selling.

The Government has been buying the domestic wool clip at around 41.6 cents a pound. Forbidden to sell at less than parity price, currently 42 cents, it has been unable to meet the lower price of foreign wools, even after a 34-cent tariff. So the stock of domestic wool is up around 480,000,000 pounds; the Boston wool trade has had its domestic business practically cut off except as handlers for the Government's CCC, and the American taxpayers have been footing the bill, already $39,000,000.

That is a bad program to continue. It is damaging to a business that employs 3,000 people here in Massachusetts. It is heavily subsidizing inefficiency in American wool production. It is preserving long after the war a program of artificial price support that will keep this country out of free world markets and stifle healthy international trade. It is costing us—particularly us in the industrial region—a pretty penny in taxes.

But the farm bloc will not let go. It even came to Congress with a plan to increase its take. The support price was to be the higher of either the 1946 support level or 90 percent of the comparable price, an elaborate new formula which is widely superseding straight parity because it is higher. In the case of wool, 90 percent of comparable would be 46.9 cents, as of April 1.

This scheme to advance the Government's purchase price by 5.3 cents was opposed even by the Department of Agriculture, and it was dropped from the bill on the Senate floor. But the Senate also killed the substitute bill of SALTONSTALL and LODGE, which would have set support at 90 percent of parity, or 37.7 cents as of April 1 a figure within competitive range of foreign wool. The final Senate version retains the 41.6 figure for two more years, which means 2 more years in which the Government will take over the business that belongs down on Summer Street.

But there is more to it than that. The wool bloc has dipped its fingers into our pockets. Wyoming, for instance, will receive $2,500,000 (Department of Agriculture estimate), but it will cost the State only $30,000 in Federal taxes. Texas will get $8,000,000 and pay $850,000. Who does help pay the cost? You guessed it, we in Massachusetts, the same people who lose the wool business that goes to the Government.

Having seen the raid that can be made by the wool growers, producers of other commodities are going to demand—and in the present temper of the Senate, at least, are going to get—similar subsidies. Where the end will be, no one can guess; but the Senate's adoption of the wool support bill is disturbingly like an attack on our whole economy. It sets a costly precedent for a Senate which talks so loudly of saving the taxpayers' money.

Triple A Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a report from the Production and Marketing Administration of Searcy County, in my district. This report shows what an excellent piece of work this agency is doing. It also indicates the necessity for a continuation of the appropriations:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Marshall, Ark., April 1, 1947.

Hon. JAMES W. TRIMBLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRIMBLE: We believe the enclosed Summary of Conservation Practices Data Under the 1946 Agricultural Conservation Program carried out in Searcy County in 1946, will be of interest to you.

This summary gives the extent of the various conservation practices in which the Government invested $34,572.12, plus approximately $15,000 of the farmers' cash, plus $15,000 farmers' labor equals $64,572.12, total cost of getting this conservation done. This is only a small percent of the value in conservation to the national welfare. For instance, if the 580,500 pounds of phosphate in which the Government invested $3,830.84 used at the rate of 300 pounds per acre would cover 1,935 acres, assume this was all used on lespedeza meadow, and the production of hay was increased a ton per acre times 1,935 acres equals 1,935 tons of hay. One thousand nine hundred and thirty-five tons of hay at $20 per ton equals $38,700, or a return of 10 times the Government investment of $3,830.84. Phosphate shows results for 3 years or more. If the average increase for the 3 years is figured at $30,000 worth of lespedeza hay, the return on the Government investment for the national welfare is $90,000, or 23 for 1.

Yours sincerely,

RALPH HUDSPETH,
C. HOWARD TREECE,
County Committee.

Summary of conservation practice data under the 1946 agricultural conservation program

County: Searcy. State: Arkansas. [Source 46-SR-54]

SECTION I.

Name of practice (1)	Practice designation (2)	Payment unit (3)	Extent (4)	Number of farms carrying out practice (5)	Estimated acres (6)	Payment rate (7)	Value (columns 4X7) (8)
Application of phosphate 20 percent	1-a	Pounds	$52,900	20		$0.0066	$349.14
Application of phosphate 20 percent (CMS)	1-a X	do	525,300	240		.0066	3,466.98
Application of phosphate 19 percent	1-b	do				.0064	
Application of phosphate 19 percent (CMS)	1-b X	do	2,300	2		.0064	14.72
Application of phosphate 18 percent	1-c	do				.0062	
Total phosphate			580,500	253	1,935		3,830.84
Application of 60 percent potash (or equivalent)	2	Pounds				.013	
Application of ground limestone	3	Tons	451	18		3.40	1,533.40
Application of ground limestone (CMS)	3 X	do	621	35		3.40	2,111.40
Total limestone			1,072	41	550		3,644.80
Ryegrass seeded fall 1945 on cropland or orchard	4	Pounds	1,925	18		.07	134.75
Ryegrass seeded fall 1945 on cropland or orchard (CMS)	4 X	do	40,200	116		.07	2,814.00
Total ryegrass			42,125	130	2,148		2,948.75
Lespedeza seeded spring 1946 not harvested for hay	5	Acres	3,512	334		1.50	5,268.00
Preparation of land for irrigation	6	do				1.00	
Small grains seeded in fall 1945	7	do	63.0	8		1.50	94.50
Summer legumes or nonlegumes left or turned under	8	do	314.0	83		1.50	471.00
Seeding hairy vetch	9-a	Pounds	180	2		.14	25.20
Seeding hairy vetch (CMS)	9-a X	do				.14	
Seeding Hungarian vetch	9-b	do				.068	
Seeding Hungarian vetch (CMS)	9-b X	do				.068	
Seeding Willamette vetch	9-c	do				.076	
Seeding Willamette vetch (CMS)	9-c X	do				.076	
Seeding common vetch	9-d	do				.076	
Seeding common vetch (CMS)	9-d X	do				.076	
Seeding Austrian winter peas	9-e	do				.05	
Seeding Austrian winter peas (CMS)	9-e X	do				.05	
Seeding crimson clover (clean)	9-f	do				.16	
Seeding crimson clover (clean) (CMS)	9-f X	do				.16	
Seeding bur-clover (in bur)	9-g	do				.08	
Seeding singletary or rough peas	9-h	do				.08	
Seeding singletary or rough peas (CMS)	9-h X	do				.08	
Total winter legumes seeded fall 1946			180	2	6		25.20
Sodding Bermuda	10	Acres	57.0	20		6.00	342.00
Seeding Bermuda grass	11-a	Pounds	379	10		.60	227.40
Seeding carpet grass	11-b	do				.25	
Seeding Dallis grass	11-c	do				.25	
Seeding bluegrass	11-d	do	976	26		.25	244.00
Seeding orchard grass	11-e	do	2,808	42		.30	842.40
Seeding redtop	11-f	do	669	12		.15	100.35
Seeding timothy	11-g	do	1,736	35		.07	121.52
Seeding ryegrass	11-h	do	790	4		.07	55.30
Seeding ryegrass (CMS)	11-h X	do	300	1		.07	21.00
Seeding reed canary grass (improved)	11-i	do	3	1		.45	1.35
Seeding white Dutch clover	11-j	do	23	2		.60	13.80
Seeding hop clover	11-k	do	29	2		.50	14.50
Seeding Kobe lespedeza	11-l	do				.15	
Seeding Korean lespedeza	11-m	do	9,693	56		.08	775.44
Seeding common lespedeza	11-n	do				.20	
Seeding Tennessee 76 lespedeza	11-o	do				.20	
Seeding black medic	11-p	do				.25	
Seeding Ladino clover	11-q	do				.60	
Seeding Persian clover	11-r	do				.60	
Seeding bur-clover (in bur)	11-s	do				.07	
Seeding sweetclover (yellow)	11-t	do	430	2		.09	38.70
Seeding sweetclover (white)	11-u	do	71	2		.12	8.52
Seeding Alsike clover	11-v	do	60	2		.25	15.00
Seeding red clover	11-w	do	1,768	33		.25	442.00
Seeding crimson clover	11-x	do				.15	
Seeding crimson clover (CMS)	11-x X	do				.15	
Total seeding approved pasture mixtures			19,735	93	988		2,921.28
Establishing vegetative waterways	12	Acres				20.00	
Contour ridging pasture land	13	Feet	8,400	1	2	.0015	12.60
Producing and harvesting legume and grass seed	14	Acres	28	4		3.50	98.00
Construction of terraces and outlets	15	Feet	24,565	11		.01	245.65
Construction of terraces and outlets (CMS)	15 X	do	8,401	4		.01	84.01
Total construction and terraces and outlets			32,966	14	26		329.66
Construction of a stockpond	16	Cubic yards	96,060	97		.12	11,527.20
Construction of a stockpond (CMS)	16 X	do	4,460	19		.12	535.20
Total stockponds			100,520	98	[1] 109		12,062.40
Construction or enlargement of drainage ditches	17-a (1)	Feet				.009	
Do	17-a (2)	do				.0175	
Do	17-a (3)	do				.03	
Do	17-b	Cubic yards				.08	
Total construction or enlargement of drainage ditches							
Contour farming intertilled row crops	18	Acres	52	6		.60	31.20
Development of springs and seeps	19	Cubic feet	448	11	[1] 14	.50	224.00
Mowing pastures:							
1 mowing	20-a	Acres	1,994	163		.50	997.00
2 or more mowings	20-b	do	1,692	74		1.00	1,692.00
Total mowing pastures			3,686	217			2,689.00
Total value of all practices carried out							34,993.23
Total value of all X practices carried out							9,047.31

[1] Total number constructed.

SEC. II. Farm and cropland participation:

Item		Number of farms A	Cropland B
1. Total	acres	1,745	61,513
2. Participating farms	do	699	33,274
3. Percent participation, (2)÷(1)		40	54

SEC. III. Lime and phosphate materials: Estimated percent of the following materials applied under the 1946 program to:

	Pasture	Hay crops	Cultivated crops	Winter legumes
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
(a) Liming materials	90	10	-------	-------
(b) Phosphate materials	65	35	-------	-------
(c) Potash	-------	-------	-------	-------

SEC. IV. Signature.

Approved:

TROY H. BUCHANAN,
County Administrative Officer.

March 24, 1947.

Friend of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Daily News:

FRIEND OF LABOR

Mrs. MARY NORTON, Democratic Member of Congress from New Jersey, has enlivened the labor-legislation debate by resigning from the House Labor Committee.

Her reason: "I have no respect for the present chairman."

The present chairman, a Republican from Mrs. NORTON'S State, is Representative FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

It may be that the tough labor bill for which Mr. HARTLEY and a majority of his committee are seeking a big vote in the House is, in some respects, too tough. Anyway, Mrs. NORTON is entitled to her opinion of Mr. HARTLEY, who by this time probably is used to being called an enemy of labor.

But the chairman of the House Labor Committee, through many years while the Democrats controlled Congress, was the same Mrs. NORTON, who considers herself a great friend of labor.

In those years no proposal, however mild, for safeguarding the use of organized labor's power and correcting the many abuses that had grown out of the Wagner Act's lopsidedness, could get even as much as a fair hearing from the House Labor Committee.

Mrs. NORTON and other Democrats operated both House and Senate Labor Committees on the theory that friendship for labor consisted in doing their level best to kill every measure to which the big union leaders and lobbyists had the slightest objection.

Time after time during those years we warned that this policy of blocking moderate corrective labor legislation would, inevitably, build up public pressure for legislation likely to prove immoderate and punitive.

It gives us no pleasure that there seems an opportunity to say, "We told you so." But we do believe that labor's cause has had, among its indulgent friends, more really dangerous enemies than Mr. HARTLEY.

Pan-American Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this week, in the celebration of Pan-American Week, the United States joins the 21 Western Hemisphere Republics in paying tribute to the spirit of cooperation which has united our two continents for generations.

This observance has become one of the most significant anniversaries in the world today. It is the only day which is dedicated to the reaffirmation of unity in international relationships and cooperation, a movement which has quite signficantly spread into the hinterlands of the two continents.

Technically speaking, the celebration of pan-American solidarity dates back to the founding of the Pan American Union in 1890, but actually the idea has been manifested by great leaders of all generations. In 1826, when Simon Bolivar, the great South American liberator, called a meeting of the South American countries, this was the real beginning of pan-Americanism, as expressed by the sister republics themselves. Prior to this, in 1823, President Monroe issued the famous Monroe Doctrine which cemented the solidarity of the Americas. The period between the promulgation of this historic doctrine and the Act of Chapultepec of 1945 is a story of increasing achievements in the fostering of hemispheric solidarity between our continents, greatly influenced by the efforts of our late President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull. It was chiefly through the efforts of these two great statesmen that the good-neighbor policy was established, and which now stands as the greatest single move toward better relations between our countries.

The foundation for this solidarity has been made. It now becomes our duty and privilege to keep this spirit alive, and to maintain the close bond that now exists among our people. I believe that such a policy can be a lasting contribution to the preservation of peace, not only among ourselves, but among the other nations of the world. The strength of pan-Americanism should help to strengthen the United Nations. As our delegate to the United Nations stated recently, "The world security for which the United Nations is striving rests on the oaken beam of Western Hemisphere solidarity."

So, it is for us to implement and make pan-Americanism a working thing.

Representing a section of the United States that has become a gateway for the Americas, and which has pioneered in the development of the cultural, commercial, and spirtual bonds with our neighbors to the south of us, I would like to point out the steps that have been taken in New Orleans toward the acceptance of the tremendous challenge that lies before us in the fulfillment of true hemispheric cooperation in the troubled world of today.

New Orleans, since the very early days of its history, has ranked as one of the greatest ports of the world, and has always been closely bound to the Latin-American nations, through its geographic position, its climate, its tempo, its temperament, and its traditions. As the natural outlet to the sea, goods flowed through the mouth of the mighty Mississippi River to our southern neighbors, but most of the traffic was lethargic, and no real effort was made to encourage the Latins in the use of this magnificent port, and no conscious attempt was made to know our traders better, other than through the inherent ties which already existed. What had to be imported was imported. Further developments and idea-exchanges were by-passed. No move to encourage trade and travel between the two continents was made.

Suddenly with World War II, came the biggest shipping boom the Crescent port had ever experienced, and New Orleans business leaders decided that they would make an all-out effort to maintain the terrific port business that had developed during the war and build up trade with Latin America.

Now, through the combined efforts of the business, civic, educational, and financial leaders of the city, New Orleans has set about to recapture the flow of people and goods through its port which has served as an example for dozens of other cities who are already establishing similar programs. In order to encourage the trade and travel of the Latin-American neighbors through its city gates, New Orleans leaders have taken into consideration the fact that a good neighbor is an understanding one, and they have set about making it possible for visitors to the city to leave our shores with a much better understanding of the people of the United States, and we in turn have learned to know our neighbors with a renewed appreciation. Here is how it works:

When a Latin-American importer, businessman, traveler, or government official enters New Orleans, he is at once informed of the unique institution of International House. This is a magnificent, modernistic 10-story structure, located in the heart of the business district, where the visitor is ushered into its main lobby, received and registered. From then on, his visit is made more pleasant by such

conveniences as an international restaurant, where he may obtain any type food he desires, use of private offices, and a World Trade Reference Library, the only one of its kind in existence. A bilingual secretary will take his dictation in his native tongue, appointments with leading businessmen are made for him, trade information is obtained, conferences arranged, and his time devoted to business matters is practically cut in half.

Examples of the unusual services that International House's expert staff have performed in the few years of its existence have already circled the globe. Today this civic, nonprofit institution has well-established friends all over the world who continue to make use of the services of the World Trade Development Department wherever they are, as this department is constantly establishing the necessary contacts for businessmen all over the world.

Already similar International Houses are being planned in a dozen or more far-flung cities throughout the world. Nelson Rockefeller, who led the inauguration ceremonies of this unique organization in 1944, said:

> In International House we see the good-neighbor policy in action. For that policy would be a sterile thing if it were not the avowed and cherished ideal of the people of this country as well as the people of all the other Americas.

So successful was this initial attempt in the furthering of good will between the Americas, that New Orleans has embarked on a second project, which is soon to be completed. In November of 1946 I was privileged to lay the cornerstone for an International Trade Mart, which will house the products of all nations under one roof, affording the Latin American buyer as well as the seller an opportunity to view and place orders for goods of every possible variety in a centralized exhibit spot. Enhanced by the congenial atmosphere of the presence of people who speak his own language, trade experts, and sales representatives to offer whatever information he desires, the visitor from Latin America will now have a much better opportunity to conduct his business here with ease.

The city has recently opened its new Moisant International Airport, with direct flights to many Latin-American cities. It has established a Department of International Relations, and opened a new foreign trade zone, to facilitate transshipment of goods, and is continually on the alert for new ways to make it easier for the Latin American businessman to transact his business with the United States, and most important of all, to know us better.

I wish there could be an International House in every port of our great country. What better investment could be made by a municipality and by our country than to insure a bond of friendship and mutual good will with our sister republics to the south? A true manifestation of pan-Americanism among our peoples can make a lasting contribution to the establishment of permanent peace throughout the world. May we continue to work for its fulfillment.

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the people of the West are greatly affected by reports emanating from Washington to the effect that budget cuts will be made in those departments of Government that are charged with the preservation of our natural resources and the further development of our western lands.

The Republican Governor of California, the Honorable Earl Warren, appreciates the seriousness of this situation as is demonstrated by his recent visit to Washington to personally appear before the Subcommittee of the Interior Department of the House Appropriations Committee urging an appropriation beyond that recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the immediate completion of the Central Valley project, including publicly owned transmission lines and a standby steam-power plant.

Under date of March 24 the Governor addressed a letter, a copy of which I include with these remarks, in which he pointed out the necessity of further safeguarding the natural resources of the West, particularly the great forests so important to our national economy. In his letter he points out that the development of the Central Valley project ties in so closely with the protection of our national resources that a material reduction in the appropriation would be detrimental to the welfare of the West.

I want to urge Congress to weigh carefully all of the factors concerned before materially reducing appropriations for fire and pest control, for flood control, and for reclamation and irrigation. I urge them to read Governor Warren's letter made a part of these remarks.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Sacramento, March 24, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE B. MILLER,
Member of the Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been following congressional action in regard to budget matters with a great deal of interest, particularly as the recommendations affect cooperative State and Federal programs dealing with our natural resources of water, power, timber, and range. As California is the heaviest lumber-using State and one of the largest lumber-producing States, I am concerned about any program that will seriously impair our cooperative programs and reduce the effectiveness of forests and watershed management and protection by the United States Forest Service. This whole program ties in so closely to the Central Valley project and our agricultural and industrial life, that I feel any material reduction in appropriations affecting the management and protection of our wild lands will be extremely detrimental to California's welfare.

California has initiated regulatory measures for timber harvesting and range improvement and has effectively increased participation in insect and disease control measures in cooperation with Federal agencies and private industry. No matter how effective are our regulatory programs, if we fail to give adequate protection to those resources from fire, insects, and disease, our efforts will have gone for naught because that protection is fundamental to the growing of a continuous crop of forest products.

Our department of natural resources advises me that the Forest Service is having to materially reduce its trained protection force for the coming season because of budget limitations. This is particularly serious, in view of a greatly increased population and a 50-percent deficiency in precipitation to date.

I am advised by the department that at the present time there is no enabling legislation wherein the Federal Government can adequately cooperate with the States and private industry in effectively controlling tree-killing insects and diseases, but that S. 597 and H. R. 1974 are intended to correct this situation. The department reports that during the past 15 years California's loss from insects alone has been in excess of 10,000,000,000 board feet of pine timber—enough to run all of our pine sawmills for that period.

Because of the seriousness of the situation, I urge that you support legislative programs with necessary appropriations which will assure continuity in the protection and management of our wild-land resources.

Sincerely,

EARL WARREN, *Governor.*

Prayer of an Unknown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a prayer which was taken from The City Without Walls:

PRAYER OF AN UNKNOWN

(This prayer of an unknown person before the time of Christ was recorded in a collection of noble early sayings compiled and written down by Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, about 325 A. D.)

May I be no man's enemy, and may I be the friend of that which is eternal and abides.

May I never quarrel with those nearest to me; and if I do, may I be reconciled quickly.

May I never devise evil against any man; if any devise evil against me, may I escape uninjured and without the need of hurting him.

May I love, seek, and attain only that which is good.

May I wish for all men's happiness and envy none. May I never rejoice in the ill fortune of one who has wronged me. When I have said or done what is wrong, may I never wait for the rebuke of others, but always rebuke myself until I make amends.

May I win no victory that harms either me or my opponent.

May I reconcile friends who are wroth with one another.

May I, to the extent of my power, give all needful help to my friends and to all who are in want.

May I never fail a friend in danger.

May I be able by gentle and healing words, when visiting those in grief, to soften their pain.

May I respect myself.

May I always keep tame that which rages within me.

May I accustom myself to be gentle, and never angry with people because of circumstances.

May I never discuss who is wicked and what wicked things he has done, but know good men and follow in their footsteps.

Workers Must Be Protected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the workers of this country must be protected against the hazards of employment. The safety laws have resulted from the bitter school of experience and these laws for the protection of our workers should be carried out. I am including a timely editorial by Spencer Canary, editor of the Bowling Green (Ohio) Sentinel-Tribune, covering mine disasters.

CURB MINE DISASTER

The more one reflects on the mine disaster at Centralia, Ill., and the more he learns about seemingly unnecessary hazards, the more deeply one feels the necessity of the Federal Government passing a law with teeth in it that will protect coal miners and all others engaged in dangerous mining.

The Federal law now provides for safety inspections that may be suggested to the States; but, until the Government took over the mines last November to prevent a strike causing national economic chaos, it did not have the power to enforce safety regulations; and it will not have the power after June 30, when the mines must be returned to the owners, unless a new law is passed.

The miner's boss, John L. Lewis, muffed a golden opportunity to focus public opinion on the safety question when the mines were taken over by the Government. That was more important to the miners than was Lewis' strike called against the Government on the ground that the latter was paying the miners' welfare fund the 10 cents a ton after instead of before the coal was washed.

The Government, too, has been derelict in not insisting on safety measures, such as Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug is now taking by closing 518 mines which produce 26 percent of the Nation's bituminous coal. Evidently Mr. Krug's inspectors did discover a lot of hazards and ordered them removed; but, although Mr. Krug said that neither the preliminary nor final report (on inspections) at Centralia found imminent danger which would have called into play emergency procedure under the mine safety code, he declared that the final inspection March 17-20 showed 55 items of noncompliance with the Federal safety code, including 52 repeat offenses, and also that reports of the operating manager on correction of deficiencies had been misleading.

Harry Nierman, assistant superintendent of the Centralia Coal Co., told a Senate investigating committee that rock dusting of the mine the week-end preceding the explosion had been postponed for a week because of mechanical failure of the dusting machine; and coal dust has in the past been often given as the cause of explosions. Why not await for repair of the machine instead of sending men into the mine—an action that resulted in death?

Of course, the inclination of workers to take chances despite regulations will always be a source of accidents. Everyone knows that in factory or farm carelessness causes a lot of accidents. Autoists and pedestrians take chances—and sometimes die as a result, as 40,000 a year and a million injuries attest. Even in homes a multitude occur.

In the Centralia mine disaster that snuffed out the lives of 111 men, there may have been carelessness, for it is suggested that an electrical flash or a rock falling into an open box of dynamite caps might have caused the deadly explosion.

But the hazards of mining are such that not only fines but prison sentences should be imposed on those who do not obey safety regulations.

Marquis Childs, the columnist, says that, during the past 46 years, 71,000 recorded mine fatalities, or an average of 129 deaths a month have occurred; and that at present the average fatality a month is 85. Surely the Nation cannot permit this to go on unheeded. Is life in America so cheap?

One thinks of the charge of the Light Brigade at Balaklava.

"Onward to death rode the 600."
"Someone had blundered."

"Lame Duck" Prosecution by OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in February I introduced a bill that would prohibit the OPA from continuing unjustified "lame duck" prosecution of thousands of business people throughout the United States. I proposed to relieve the people from this persecution, based on border-line interpretation of regulations and orders no longer in effect.

Several other Members of Congress have introduced bills that would have the same purpose and objective. Many additional Members of Congress have called and talked with me about the progress that has been made and expressed a very great interest in some action being taken immediately.

In January the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who has also been very active and especially interested in this problem, had incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Honorable William E. Remy, Deputy Administrator for Enforcement of OPA, which explained the situation at that time and the policy being pursued, as well as listing the pending cases as of October 31, 1946. At that time there were 28,131 cases pending.

On December 23, 1946, an enforcement petition was granted in all treble-damage claims involving decontrolled commodities in which the single amount of the overcharge is less than $200, all such cases to be dismissed forthwith. This action reduced the backlog of cases to 17,652 as of December 31, 1946. The backlog of cases was further reduced to 15,449 as of January 31, 1947.

On March 1, 1947, there were 1,991 pending investigation, 4,589 pending disposition, and 6,495 cases pending litigation, or a total of 13,075 cases.

The most serious type of cases are the so-called treble-damage cases, of which there were 4,873 pending as of March 1, 1947. Treble damages claimed in these cases amount to $41,773,000.

A few days after I had introduced H. R. 2100, the Administrator of OPA called me and discussed the entire situation and the problem with which they were faced. Several conferences with other Members of Congress and discussions have been had with representatives of OPA and the Office of Temporary Controls. An effort has been made to determine a policy that would eliminate a great number of the small cases which are by far the greatest majority of the number and a small percentage of the dollars involved.

After much discussion and reviewing the record, it was a considered judgment of most of us that if all such cases involving decontrolled commodities in which the single amount of overcharge was less than $3,000 were dismissed that the greatest injustices would be immediately eliminated. Before this conclusion was reached we obtained a complete breakdown as to what would be the effect. We found there were 1,872 or 42 percent of the cases pending involve something like $36,000,000 or 85 percent of the total claims in dollars. In other words, if a policy of a cut-back of all such cases were issued, 3,000 cases would be immediately disposed of and only approximately $5,000,000 involved.

We submit, Mr. Speaker, that such action on behalf of the agencies would be thoroughly justified. If they want to show good faith in an effort to dispose of these little insignificant, technical, and borderline cases, and grant this relief to small business people who are having a hard time protecting themselves, this in our opinion would be the most equitable approach to it. Many of us have been led to believe that some such action would be taken and that in addition the larger cases would be reviewed with a view of prosecuting those who really engaged in large black-market operation and endangered the economy of this Nation proceeded against.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, there is anyone in this House who wishes to see willful and flagrant violations where they benefited by thousands and thousands of dollars at the expense of the public extended a general amnesty.

In these large cases the Government stands generally to be successful where there is a willful and flagrant violation. In these small cases, the recovery is going to be extremely small. The juries and the courts throughout the country are not going to convict them. Then by proceeding with such cases the Government is only spending money with little hope, if any, of return, to say nothing of the justice or injustices involved.

Some in the agency now claim there is some doubt that they have the authority to issue such a policy. Such a doubt was raised when the $200 cut-back order was issued and the same authority exists on the larger cut-back figure as existed when that action was taken. It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that there are still some in these agencies who wish to extend their authority and jurisdiction just as far as they can, notwithstanding the action of the President last November and the Congress at various times since.

I think this is a matter to which the Congress should give immediately its attention. I know there has been some discussion among the members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency as well as other Members of the

House. It is a matter, I believe, that could be more appropriately handled by administrative action but since that action has been held up I urge that the Congress give consideration at an early date.

In order that the House of Representatives may have the general information, I ask to include in my remarks information and tables provided by the Office of Price Administration, together with general sanction policies: Case No. 6, enforcement exception granted—C–2; No. 7, enforcement exception granted—C–3; case No. 14, enforcement exception regarding motor vehicle regulation; enforcement exception case No. 16; and enforcement exception cases Nos. 17, 18, and 19. There are other exceptions, Mr. Speaker, being granted but this gives you an idea, not only as to the procedure in reference to these cases but the tremendous difficulty anyone charged with such violation has in trying to find out just what his status is. A small businessman has little chance of defending himself and should be given relief.

FEBRUARY 26, 1947.

MEMORANDUM

To: William B. Remy, Deputy Commissioner for Enforcement.

From: Miriam Ziony, analyst.

Subject: Reduction in review and disposition work load on decontrolled commodities from October 31, 1946, to January 31, 1947.

Comparison of schedule A, Review and Disposition, backlog figures for October 31, 1946 (revised), and January 31, 1947, shows by the beginning of February a marked decrease in pending load as follows:[1] 45.1 percent drop in total number of backlog cases, from 28,131 to 15,449 cases; 47 percent drop in cases under investigation, from 4,607 to 2,443 cases; 50.7 percent drop in cases awaiting disposition, from 12,395 to 6,106 cases; 36.7 percent drop in cases pending in court, from 10,788 to 6,823 cases.

All types of cases pending in court showed a decrease during this period and suspension orders pending also dropped considerably by the end of January. The only increase indicated was in determination proceedings pending on meat subsidy withholding cases, which rose from 8 cases in October to 13 cases as of the end of January.

Changes in backlog on decontrolled commodities by type of case pending were:

SCHEDULE A.—*Review and disposition—backlog on decontrolled commodities, Jan. 31, 1947*

	Total	Meat	Other decontrolled foods	Apparel	Textiles and leather	Industrial materials	Automotives, fuel, and services	Durable goods
Cases under investigation	2,443	221	307	279	90	482	865	199
Awaiting disposition	6,106	1,201	1,152	769	219	1,010	1,304	451
Cases pending in court	6,823	1,285	1,342	564	225	1,173	1,737	497
Federal, criminal	593	143	92	11	23	56	258	10
Local, criminal	48	11	19			1	13	4
License suspension	147	76	35	2		2	27	5
Administrator's own treble-damage claims [1]	2,643	349	560	267	162	783	243	279
Administrator's consumer treble-damage claims [2]	2,047	240	394	95	7	137	1,030	144
Injunctions	1,314	452	238	186	33	190	161	54
Contempt action	31	14	4	3		4	5	1
Suspension orders	64	62	2					
Determination proceedings (subsidy withholding)	13	13						
Total	15,449	2,782	2,803	1,612	534	2,665	3,906	1,147

[1] On commodities sold for resale or for use in the course of trade or business.
[2] On commodities sold to consumers.

Dollar bracket	Number of cases	Percentage of cases	Treble-damage claims	Percentage of claims
Cases over $10,000	716	15	$21,480,000	51
Cases over $5,000	1,385	26	31,530,000	75
Cases over $3,000	1,872	42	35,913,000	85
Cases over $2,000	2,215	46	37,971,000	90
Cases over $1,000	2,878	56	39,960,000	95
Cases over $500	3,614	75	41,018,000	98
Cases over $200	4,873	100	41,773,000	100

PROBABLE WORKLOAD AS OF JULY 1, 1947

When we consider the clean-up job on the 8,200 cases to be closed out, plus the fact that few cases can actually reach trial prior to June 30, plus the office turmoil which successive reduction-in-force procedures produce, plus a few and slightly increasing but time-consuming suits against the Government to enjoin the OPA or to recover subsidies, it does not appear reasonable to assume a sharp reduction of the 4,873 cases prior to June 30, 1947.

EXHIBIT A.—*Review and Disposition Division—pending treble-damage cases on decontrolled commodities, by commodity and dollar amounts of single damages, Mar. 1, 1947—national total*

	National total	$200 to $500	$500 to $1,000	$1,000 to $2,000	$2,000 to $3,000	$3,000 to $5,000	$5,000 to $10,000	Over $10,000
National total	4,873	1,259	736	663	343	487	669	716
Meat	412	52	59	68	28	41	90	74
Other foods	770	152	119	129	56	69	128	117
Apparel	492	60	52	51	36	53	123	117
Textiles and leather	143	8	16	19	14	15	30	41
Industrial materials, Lumber	1,115	226	161	152	98	135	162	181
Autos, fuel and services	1,465	642	274	192	80	101	77	99
Durable goods	476	119	55	52	31	73	59	87

CHAPTER 9–15. GENERAL-SANCTION POLICIES

Sec. 9–1501. Application of sanctions to violations and granting enforcement exceptions

Sec. 9–1502. Notification of formal action

Sec. 9–1501. Application of sanctions to violations and granting enforcement exceptions.

.01. Scope: The procedure stated in this section shall apply to all cases handled in the enforcement division.

A. This procedure shall not apply to cases being handled by the area rent offices (see secs. 9–6601 and 9–6602).

B. This procedure does apply to cases stated in paragraph A when such cases have reached the enforcement division by referral.

.02. Application of sanction.

A. General: No case which discloses a violation shall be closed without the application of a formal sanction, e. g., criminal, license suspension, contempt, treble damage (suit or settlement), injunction or administrative suspension, except as stated in .02B, 1, 2, 3, and 4. The determination concerning the appropriate formal sanction shall be based on outstanding instructions. Civil cases involving overcharges shall include a claim for treble damages. License-warning notices are not formal sanctions, but in accordance with outstanding instructions. they shall be issued in conjunction with formal sanctions wherever ultimately a license-suspension suit would be appropriate in the event of further violation.

B. Exceptions: There shall be no deviation from this procedure except where:

1. The violation is clearly trivial and inconsequential. Such case may be closed with an appropriate admonitory letter. A violation is considered trivial only where the overcharge is extremely small and the nature of the violation is very minor in terms of price-control objects to be accomplished by the regulation.

2. No formal sanction is available under law.

3. The investigation has not been substantially completed but does reveal some violation, where the field has been placed in the "B" category.

4. An enforcement exception is granted by the deputy commissioner for enforcement. There may be cases where compelling equitable features suggest that formal sanction be withheld or withdrawn, in whole or in part. It is impossible to leave such decisions to the determination of each office. Experience has shown that a serious lack of uniformity results and often the full implications of such a decision are not evident to the members of one office.

.03 Procedure for securing an official enforcement exception.

A. The regional enforcement executive, on his own motion or upon request from the regional administrator or regional section chief may submit to the deputy commissioner for enforcement a request for consideration of the issuance of an enforcement exception in any case. The request shall be accompanied by:

1. A memorandum setting forth the entire facts of the case with a recommendation of the type of exception, and a proposed statement of a rule to cover similar cases.

2. An investigation report or a copy.

3. If the regional enforcement executive is requested to submit such a memorandum by any of the other officials named above, he shall submit such memorandum with a notation of his views.

B. Before transmitting the request for consideration of the issuance of an enforcement exception, the regional enforcement

[1] Revision made in all categories on other decontrolled foods on the basis of smaller revised percentage estimates for sugar cases which had to be subtracted out of total October figures reported on Field Form No. 4 for all foods except meat but including sugar; also previous low estimates on other food cases under investigation and cases awaiting disposition have been changed to the actual figures indicated in Field Form No. 4 for November as pending as of the end of October. Prior to November, sugar cases were not listed separately in Field Form 4 but were included in the totals on other foods. Original October estimates on sugar cases were too high. Total revised backlog on decontrolled commodities as of October 31, 1946, includes 3,427 more cases than in original tabulation, with a corresponding decrease in total backlog for sugar as of October 31, 1946.

executive shall submit the matter to the regional administrator so that the latter may join in the request, or express his opinion thereon, or submit additional facts as he thinks significant to a consideration of the request.

C. The decision with respect to each case considered under this section is published as appendixes 9-1501A through L.

.04 The deputy commissioner for enforcement reserves the right, on his own motion, to grant an enforcement exception in any appropriate case after consultation with the regional enforcement executive in the region where the specific case is pending.

.05 Procedure subsequent to granting of enforcement exception. If an enforcement exception is granted by the deputy commissioner for enforcement, either upon request or upon his own motion, a statement of the rule covering the enforcement exception will be issued to all enforcement attorneys for future application in similar cases. Enforcement attorneys are instructed to apply all outstanding enforcement exceptions to cases which, in whole or in part, fall within the rule stated in the exception.

A. Any case upon which an enforcement exception has been issued, and all similar cases falling within the same rule, shall show within the file that the disposition, in whole or in part, has been governed by the specific enforcement exception.

B. The rules stated in enforcement exception shall govern all cases falling within the rules, irrespective of whether or not formal sanction has already been instituted, but shall not apply to completed sanction cases.

C. There are certain types of situations which will not alone be considered sufficient for the granting of an enforcement exception:

1. Where the defendant claims that his violation was committed subsequent to an interpretation not given in accordance with procedural regulation No. 1.

2. Where the defendant after violation applies for and receives a price adjustment.

3. Where the defendant claims that he had to charge a higher price because the ceiling price was too low for him, or for the industry.

4. Where the defendant claims that he charged over the ceiling because he was required to purchase over the ceiling.

CASE NO. 6. ENFORCEMENT EXCEPTION GRANTED—C-2

Facts: A retailer entered into a contract with a manufacturer for the delivery to the retailer of 5,000 cultivators in monthly installments, order prepaid. The retailer properly priced the cultivators under GMPR. When the retailer had received approximately half the delivery, the manufacturer received an order from OPA under MPR 188 fixing his ceiling price and requiring a tagging of a retail price announced in the order. The order was duly filed and published in the Federal Register. The retail price fixed in the order was lower than the GMPR price at which the retailer was selling. Although the manufacturer thereafter continued to make deliveries to the retailer under the contract, the retailer had no direct knowledge of the order. When the retailer was first informed of the order, he discontinued the sales at the GMPR price.

Decision: Enforcement exception granted as to all such sales already made by the retailer or any other seller similarly situated.

Basis: Enforcement exception C-1 would have applied automatically to this case, except for the fact that here the retailer's ceiling price was not based on fixed or percentage mark-up over supplier's price, not exceeding supplier's ceiling price. But the underlying reason is substantially the same. The retailer was engaging in a course of legal conduct until, by the act of the agency on application of the manufacturer, the retailer's price became illegal. While it is true that publication in the Federal Register constitutes constructive notice to all, there is nothing to prevent the agency from adopting a policy which does recognize the fairness of withholding sanction under proper circumstances. There was nothing to cause the retailer to inquire whether the manufacturer had applied for any price, or whether one had been ordered, or whether the order affected the retail level. In cases such as these, it is unreasonable to expect the retailer to watch the Federal Register scrupulously because of the mere possibility of publication of an order that might directly affect him.

The same considerations would also apply to some sellers other than retailers who could find themselves in the same position.

As in enforcement exception C-1, the exception does not apply to merchandise remaining unsold after the seller has been told or has otherwise learned of the change in legal price. The undelivered merchandise must be repriced.

Rule: Where any seller has been selling at or less than the ceiling price, and where the supplier has applied for a price which the agency orders and duly publishes in the Federal Register, and where the order also fixes a price for the seller which is less than he has been charging, and where the seller does not know and has no reason to make further inquiry to determine that such application was made by the supplier or acted upon by the agency, enforcement exception granted as to all such sales by seller insofar as seller's price was legal but for the order. On all merchandise remaining unsold seller must reprice in accordance with order.

Coverage: All regulations in all commodity fields at all applicable industry levels.

Washington, D. C., March 29, 1946.

GEORGE MONCHARSH,
Deputy Administrator for Enforcement.

CASE NO. 7. ENFORCEMENT EXCEPTION GRANTED—C-3

Facts: On November 9, President Truman announced that ceiling prices on all commodities except rent and sugar and a few minor commodities were lifted. The October 31, 1946, statistical reports show that there were 2,707 Administrator's claims and 2,211 Administrator's consumer claims pending in court, 11,002 cases completed investigations awaiting disposition, and 4,184 cases under investigation. Our personnel has been substantially cut except for rent, sugar, and sales-control enforcement. A number of the courts have been reluctant to go forward with cases involving small amounts of overcharge.

Decision: The enforcement exception is granted.

Basis: This decision is necessary in order that we may reduce the work load of our staff and to relieve it of the less significant cases. Also, by making this decision we are eliminating the number of small cases from the court dockets thus enabling our attorneys to proceed with the more significant cases.

Rule: All treble damage claims involving decontrolled commodities in which the single amount of the overcharge is less than $200 shall be dismissed forthwith. This is applicable both to pending litigation and to cases pending disposition. A case should not be dropped where the evidence presently in the file establishes single damages of less than $200, and the file indicates that by further investigation made in accordance with Review and Disposition Directives 4 and 5 single damages in excess of $200 will be developed.

Coverage: All regulations in all commodity fields at all industry levels where the commodities are now decontrolled.

Washington, D. C., December 23, 1946.

WILLIAM E. REMY,
Deputy Administrator for Enforcement.

CASE NO. 14. ENFORCEMENT EXCEPTION GRANTED

Facts: The used-motor-vehicle regulation, RMPR 341, MPR 540, and MPR 569, provided dollar-and-cents prices for used vehicles. These prices, called "as is" or base prices, were the maximum which any person selling a vehicle could charge. A person regularly engaged in the business of selling used vehicles could charge the warranty price which is $100, or 25 percent, more than the "as is" price, if he applied for and obtained written authorization from the district office to sell as a dealer, as that term is defined in the regulations. Before issuing the authorization the district office price division generally verified that the applicant had a place for the display and sale of used vehicles, and facilities for the repair and reconditioning necessary to put and keep vehicles in good operating condition.

Situation A: A truck concern applied for authorization and pending issuance of such authorization sold a truck at the warranty price. The authorization was never issued, and enforcement instituted a treble damage action based upon the difference between the "as is" and the warranty price. The district office price division has advised the enforcement division that the seller had the facilities necessary to qualify as a dealer and that the authorization was not issued because the application had apparently been misplaced in the district office.

Situation B: A seller has been engaged in the business of selling used cars and trucks. He applied for and received authorization as a used-car dealer. Subsequent investigation disclosed that he had sold trucks at the warranty price although not specifically authorized as a truck dealer. The overcharge is the difference between the "as is" and warranty prices. The subject has facilities adequate for the repair and reconditioning of used cars and trucks.

Situation C: A seller regularly engaged in the business of selling used vehicles sold such vehicles at the warranty price although he never applied for nor received written authorization to sell as a "dealer." The overcharge is the difference between the "as is" and the warranty prices. Subject has always maintained facilities for the repair and reconditioning of vehicles, has given purchasers the written warranty required by the regulations, and has performed the services necessary to meet the terms of the warranty.

Decision: Enforcement exception is granted.

Basis: In a going price control program it is absolutely necessary to hold the seller to the price he was entitled to receive at the time the sale was made even though he could have received authorization to charge the higher price had he properly applied for such authorization. However, after a commodity has been decontrolled the reasons for holding the seller to the lower price no longer exists if he can satisfactorily prove that he could have qualified for the authorization which would permit the higher price to be charged.

Rule: Where a seller of used motor vehicles establishes to the satisfaction of the Chief of the Regional Review and Disposition Section, the Regional Enforcement Executive and the Regional Administrator that he would clearly have been entitled to an authorization as a dealer if he had made application therefor or having made such application if the same had been properly acted upon, any case based upon sales at not more than the price he would have been entitled to charge as a dealer shall be dismissed.

Coverage: RMPR 341, MPR 540 and MPR 569.

Washington, D. C., February 21, 1947.

WILLIAM E. REMY,
Deputy Commissioner for Enforcement.

ENFORCEMENT EXCEPTION CASE NO. 16

Facts: No request for an enforcement exception has been made in this case. However, the Deputy Commissioner on his own motion has considered an exception.

No court action has been taken. However, an investigation has been made and

an action would be filed in accordance with agency policy and procedures if no exception is granted.

The claim is against A. C. Wells et al, d/b/a J. W. Wells Lumber Co., Menominee, Mich., hereinafter referred to as the company.

The company operates a hardwood floor mill in the Upper Peninsula in Michigan, the producing area of hardwood lumber. It purchased hardwood lumber and hardwood logs and made them into hardwood flooring which they sold primarily at ceiling prices established for mill sellers of hardwood flooring by MPR 432. The company screened the best hardwood lumber amounting to about 10 percent of all the hardwood lumber it purchased, dried this lumber and resold it, as lumber, in carload quantities. Also it had been selling hardwood flooring in small quantities near its mill at what it called retail prices. Sometime in August 1945 James A. MacDonald, price specialist in the lumber unit in the Escanaba district office, called upon A. C. Wells at the company's place of business. It appears that the company had been selling all of its lumber at the ceiling price for mill sellers as provided for in MPR 223, and all of its hardwood flooring, including a small lot of so-called retail sales at the mill ceiling price established by MPR 432. The company requested an interpretation of MPR 467 and MPR 215 from the Escanaba district office inquiring as to whether or not it could take the mark-ups provided in those regulations (MPR 215 provides a mark-up for retail sellers of hardwood flooring out of a distribution yard stop; MPR 467 provides for mark-ups of mill prices on sales of hardwood lumber by distribution yards). Because of the wording of the applicable regulations, it was not unreasonable for the seller in good faith to request an interpretation as to whether or not he was entitled to those mark-ups. Mr. MacDonald told the company orally that based upon the regulation and upon the operation being performed by the company and its past performance prior to the war that it was qualified to use the mark-ups contained in MPR 467 and MPR 215. The company requested that this interpretation be given to them in writing. On August 13, 1945, the Escanaba district office wrote the company authorizing it to take such mark-ups. The letter was signed by James A. MacDonald, Price Specialist, Industrial Commodities.

There was no price attorney in the Escanaba office in August 1945. Mr. MacDonald states that he orally discussed this with the regional price attorney in Cleveland and the regional price specialist in Cleveland. This discussion was made after August 13, 1945. The price specialist was orally told that the interpretation set forth in the August 13, 1945, letter was correct.

On September 1, 1945, the company raised its prices in accordance with the interpretation set forth in the August 13, 1945, letter. In August 1946 the company was investigated by enforcement. It was then determined that the interpretation set forth in the August 13 letter was erroneous. The overcharges from September 1, 1945, through August 1, 1946, totaled $12,840.

Decision: Exception granted.

Basis: Enforcement exception case No. 4 denies an exception where an oral authorization was made by the Office of Price Administration in violation of procedural regulation No. 1. That decision is reaffirmed.

The provisions of procedural regulation No. 1 are sound and are necessary for the administration of any Government activity. The 1946 amendments to the Emergency Price Control Act recognized this principle in that Congress provided that no action could be maintained if the violation arose because the person selling the commodity acted upon and in accordance with the written advice and instructions of the Administrator or any regional administrator or district director of the Office of Price Administration.

The issuance of written interpretations by unauthorized employees of the Office of Price Administration is a violation of internal instructions and can be held to a minimum by proper supervision and corrective measures taken against persons violating such instructions. A serious question arises as to what enforcement action should be taken against a member of an industry who, in good faith, applies to the Office of Price Administration for an interpretation, receives a written interpretation from a person with apparent authority, and relies upon this interpretation to the end that he, by doing so, is in violation of an Office of Price Administration regulation.

Where no element of fraud and collusion are present and the enforcement attorney is satisfied that there was need for the interpretation and a price specialist, although unauthorized, issues one, which was in good faith relied upon, no prosecution should be had against the person receiving such interpretation if it develops that such interpretation is erroneous.

Rule: Where a person applies to an office of the Office of Price Administration for an interpretation of a regulation and receives an interpretation in writing from a person in that office who has been designated as the price specialist for the commodity or commodities involved in the interpretation, and the person applying for the interpretation has no actual knowledge of the fact that such price specialist does not have authority to issue the interpretation, enforcement exception is granted the person receiving the interpretation, with respect to those violations which occurred solely as the result of such interpretation, provided that all the following conditions are met:

1. The person applying for the interpretation correctly stated all relevant facts.

2. The matters contained in the written interpretation were a proper subject for interpretation.

3. The applicable regulation or regulations did not state a rule clearly contrary to such interpretation.

4. There was no element of fraud or collusion on the part of or between the price specialist and the person seeking the interpretation.

5. That the person applied for and relied upon the interpretation in good faith.

WILLIAM E. REMY,
Deputy Commissioner for Enforcement.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 20, 1947.*

ENFORCEMENT EXCEPTION CASE NO. 17

Facts: Section 5 (e) of 2d RMPR 19 with respect to certain shipments of southern pine lumber invoiced as containing in excess of designated percentages of certain grades, established the No. 2 common price as the applicable maximum price for lumber invoiced as No. 1 common and higher grades, if any such shipment did not bear the grademark of a qualified inspection agency or was not accompanied by a certificate of inspection by a proper inspection agency. Some producers of southern pine lumber who were not members of a qualified inspection agency, and for that reason were unable to comply with the grade-marking provision of the section, made shipments which were invoiced as containing quantities of the higher grades in excess of those set forth in the section and such shipments were not accompanied by a certificate of inspection by a recognized inspection agency. However, these producers had in their employ inspectors capable of properly grading southern pine lumber in accordance with the recognized rules of the industry. These shipments were actually graded by such graders in accordance with industry rules and practices and the invoices for these shipments accurately reflected the quantities and grades of lumber determined by the graders.

Decision: Enforcement exception is granted.

Basis: Section 5 (e) was incorporated in the regulation to combat widespread violation by upgrading of lumber. A study of southern pine grade distribution for the year 1941 was made by the Southern Pine War Committee, an industry organization. This study disclosed that the normal log out-turn of No. 1 common and higher grades in the production of southern pine lumber varies in different geographic areas from a low of 5 percent to a high of 30 percent. The results of this study were taken into consideration in establishing the various percentages set forth in the section. In the early part of 1946, because of an aggravated general violative condition existing in the lumber industry, our lumber enforcement activity was considerably increased. One of the most prevalent forms of violation in southern pine lumber was upgrading. Because of the extensive upgrading practices and the fact that the Government had only limited facilities available for detecting such upgrading, the agency placed heavy reliance on section 5 (e) and took extensive enforcement action based upon violations of that section. Since decontrol the considerations expressed generally in Enforcement Exception No. 10, and particularly as illustrated by parts A, B, D, and G, apply with equal validity to the considerations disclosed by the above facts. However, since none of the situations stated in Enforcement Exception No. 10 is applicable to this express situation, it is necessary to issue a separate enforcement exception to cover violations of 5 (e) of 2d RMPR 19.

Rule: Any case where the claim for treble damages is based upon violations of section 5 (e) of 2d RMPR 19 shall be dismissed if all of the following conditions are met:

1. The shipments involved in the case were actually graded by employees of the shipper qualified to and capable of properly grading southern pine lumber in accordance with the recognized rules of the industry.

2. The invoices for such shipments accurately reflected the quantities and grades of lumber as determined by such grading and there was no upgrading of any of the lumber involved in any such shipments.

The term "upgrading" as used in this exception means any misrepresentation or misdescription as to the grade or quantity of any item of lumber where such misdescription resulted in a higher price than the applicable legal ceiling.

This exception is expressly limited to violations of section 5 (e) of 2d RMPR 19.

WILLIAM E. REMY,
Deputy Commissioner for Enforcement.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 13, 1947.*

ENFORCEMENT EXCEPTION CASE NO. 18

Facts: Enforcement Exception No. C-3 (case No. 7), issued December 23, 1946, provided: "All treble-damage claims involving decontroled commodities in which the single amount of the overcharge is less than $200 shall be dismissed forthwith."

The question has been raised as to whether that exception applies, or should be extended, to cover installment payment settlement agreements (not reduced to judgment) where the balance remaining unpaid on December 23, 1946, was less than $200. Two situations are presented, one where the settlement was originally in excess of a sum of $200 and was reduced by partial payments to less than $200, the other where the original settlement was for a sum less than $200.

Decision: Enforcement exception granted as to both situations.

Basis: The same considerations which led to the adoption of Enforcement Exception No. C-3 are here applicable. From the point

of view of the work load involved in processing those cases where the balance remaining unpaid on December 23, 1946, was less than $200 it is immaterial whether the original settlement was for more or less than $200. However, with respect to installment-payment settlement, where the balance due on December 23, 1946, was more than $200 and installment-payment settlements entered into after that date, where the total amount of the settlement exceeds $200, the agency must undertake the work load involved, both in effecting the initial settlement and in collecting the full amount of the settlement even though eventually the final installment or installments may be less than $200.

Rule: Any case in which (i) a settlement had been effected and payment was to be made by installments, and (ii) the claim had not been reduced to judgment, and (iii) the amount remaining unpaid on December 23, 1946, was less than $200, shall be closed and no further proceedings taken to effect collection of the balance due under the installment-payment settlement.

Coverage: All regulations in all commodity fields at all industry levels where the commodities are now decontrolled.

WILLIAM E. REMY,
Deputy Commissioner for Enforcement.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 27, 1947.*

ENFORCEMENT EXCEPTION CASE NO. 19

Facts: MPR 420, effective July 12, 1943, established a higher price for manufacturers of custom heels produced in Brooklyn, N. Y., and Rochester, N. Y., than it did for other types of heels. The statement of considerations recited that the higher price was limited to manufacturers in Rochester and Brooklyn, N. Y., because available information indicated that the volume of such heels produced outside of those two cities was negligible. A producer of custom heels in Massachusetts charged and collected the ceiling price applicable to heels produced in Brooklyn and Rochester, N. Y., and filed a protest to the regulation. Pending decision on the protest, he was granted an adjustable pricing order. An enforcement action is pending against him for treble damages arising out of his taking the higher price prior to the issuance of the adjustable pricing order. On November 8, 1946, amendment 8 to MPR 420 was issued. That amendment removed the geographical limitation and established the higher price for manufacturers of custom finished hardwood heels, irrespective of where produced. The statement of considerations for that amendment recited that information obtained since the time the original regulation was issued disclosed that a large quantity of custom-finished hardwood heels was produced in areas outside of Brooklyn and Rochester, N. Y., and that the prices originally established in the regulation "caused hardships" to manufacturers of custom heels outside of those two cities. The enforcement department has been advised by the Court Review, Research and Opinion Division that, in their opinion, the protest must be granted. The Court Review, Research and Opinion Division has further represented to the Enforcement Department that, in their opinion, it would be more expeditious to handle this matter on the basis of an enforcement exception than by granting the protest; in either event the result, insofar as the seller is concerned, would be the same, namely, the extinguishment of our treble-damage claim.

Decision: Enforcement exception granted.

Basis: Since it appears from the oral representations and written memoranda of the Court Review, Research, and Opinion Division that the Administrator does not have a legal claim against the seller for treble damages arising out of sales of custom-finished hardwood heels at prices not in excess of those authorized under amendment 8, the only question is whether this case should be disposed of by enforcement, exception, or favorable action on the pending protest. We accede to the views expressed by the Court Review, Research, and Opinion Division that it would be more expeditious to dispose of this case by enforcement exception than by granting the protest. It also appears probable that there are other provisions of regulations to which the same principle might hereafter be extended. It is therefore desirable to state a general rule to cover not only this situation, but others of like character which may arise in the future, but, in order to prevent unwarranted extension of the rule, to limit its coverage to specific provisions of specific regulations named in this exception or added to it by subsequent order of the Deputy Commissioner for enforcement.

Rule: Where the Court Review, Research, and Opinion Division advises the Deputy Commissioner for Enforcement in writing that a provision of a regulation or order is invalid, and it is the opinion of the Enforcement Department that it is preferable to dispose of cases arising out of violations of the invalid provision by enforcement exception rather than to grant the protest, an enforcement exception is granted as to all actions based upon such provisions of such regulations as may be specified in this exception or may hereafter be added to it by order of the Deputy Commissioner for Enforcement.

Coverage: This exception is limited to the following regulations and orders:

(1) Section — of MPR 420, prior to amendment 8, to the extent that said amendment 8 is to be considered as having retroactive effect to the effective date of the regulation and no enforcement action is to be instituted or maintained against a seller of custom finished hardwood heels when the only violation charged consisted of selling at prices which would have been legal had the provisions of amendment 8 been in effect from the effective date of the regulation.

(2) Section 16 of Second Revised MPR 215, prior to amendment 20 (April 23, 1946) to the extent that said amendment 20 is to be considered as having retroactive effect to the effective date of original MPR 215 and no enforcement action is to be instituted or maintained against a mill or concentration yard when the only violation consisted of selling at retail through distribution yard facilities in the manner and under circumstances that would have been legal had the provision of amendment 20 been in effect from the effective date of the regulation.

WILLIAM E. REMY,
Deputy Commissioner for Enforcement.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 3, 1947.*

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration has done more than any other single governmental agency to bring the comforts of the present day to the American farm home. We should not cease to work for its continuation until every farm home in America has all the electricity it needs and at rates it can afford to pay. Rural electrification in America did not come about overnight. Only after long years of hard fighting in the Congress by such men as Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, Congressman Sam Rayburn, of Texas, Congressman John Rankin, of Mississippi, and others, was it made a national program.

Among the pioneer workers for rural electrification in my State was Clyde T. Ellis, former Member of Congress from the district which I am now honored to represent. He served for years in the Arkansas State Legislature and sponsored the first rural-electrification law for Arkansas. While in the Congress he was an active, aggressive fighter for rural electrification. He is now the executive director of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. There are scores of other men in this House today who deserve much credit for the success of this program. To say that rural electrification is making good would be a trite expression. None of the Members of this House who have rural electrification in their districts can doubt the benefits of it.

From press reports, I gather that there is some opposition to the program and perhaps a movement is on foot to trim the budget recommendation for the Rural Electrification Administration. I hope these reports are unfounded. The funds appropriated for the Rural Electrification Administration to lend to the co-ops throughout the country come back to the Treasury of the United States with interest. The co-ops have a fine record for repayment of their loans, while at the same time extending their own services. In very few instances has a co-op defaulted, and in most instances they pay up even ahead of time. So it is false argument to say that the Government cannot afford the funds. Progress in a community helps everybody in it, including the Government, and history shows that progress follows electricity, especially cheap electricity.

Some argue that the co-ops should be abolished or the loans cut for the reason that they pay no taxes. The Carroll Rural Electrification Cooperative has its headquarters in my home town, Berryville, Ark. The other day I wrote to my friend and neighbor, J. E. Simpson, attorney for that co-op, and asked him to give me a statement of the taxes paid by that cooperative. I have his reply and I quote the following from his letter to me dated March 24, 1947:

In accordance with your request of March 21, 1947, I have examined the records of the office of the Carroll Electric Cooperative Corp., a rural electric cooperative, serving 5,000 members with approximately 1,620 miles of rural lines in eight counties in northwest Arkansas and southwest Missouri.

The monthly operating reports show payments of taxes for the last 6 months of 1946 and the first 2 months of 1947, as follows:

July	$478.30
August	528.92
September	483.09
October	592.20
November	613.94
December	602.75
January	493.95
February	507.20

The tax records of the cooperative show the comparative payments as follows:

	1945	1946	5-year average
Ad valorem tax	$4,581.69	$4,878.47	$4,024.95
Membership tax	339.44	339.44	317.86
Pay-roll tax	864.24	763.54	618.61
Membership 2-percent sales tax		3,840.00	
Total	5,785.37	9,821.55	4,961.42

I only check the records of sales tax paid by the members for the year of 1946. This record agrees with the receipts received from the different collection agencies and shows that the cooperative and its members, by reason of the service of the cooperative, paid $9,821.55 in taxes for the year of 1946.

Have You Had Enough?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a news item which appeared in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat of Monday, April 14, 1947:

ONE BAKERY RAISES PRICE

The long-promised increase in bread prices started this morning as the General Baking Co., manufacturers of Bond bread, ordered a 3-cent-per-loaf increase. Other bakers in St. Louis, East St. Louis, and Belleville are expected to fall into line within the next few days.

Carl Ruffing, vice president and manager of Feickert's Bakery, Inc., largest local producer, said that no plans had been made, but that if the increase became general, bakeries in Belleville would be obligated to follow suit. He did not anticipate any immediate increase in the price of sweet-dough products, most of which were affected by an increase following the lifting of price controls last fall.

Retail dealers in Belleville were notified by drivers of the General Baking Co. this morning that the retail price of the 1-pound loaf had been increased from 12 to 15 cents per loaf, and the 20-ounce loaf from 15 to 18 cents per loaf.

House Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very interesting article by James Marlow that appeared in the Lynn Item, Lynn, Mass., as follows:

PROPOSED MEASURE A MAZE OF WORDS—63-PAGE EXPLANATION OF 68-PAGE BILL INDICATES A LACK OF CLEAR UNDERSTANDING IN THE PROGRAM

(By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON, April 15.—This is written to point out the importance of the labor bill which the House starts to debate today.

It is the most far-reaching bill—in the sense of the restrictions it would place on unions ever considered by Congress.

It would make profound changes in the Wagner Act, the law covering relations between employers, workers, and unions.

The House expects to vote on this bill Friday. Later the Senate will vote on its own bill.

Both Houses then will agree on a compromise bill which President Truman may veto. Congress may pass it into law over his veto.

This House bill was designed by the House Labor Committee, where the Republican members, in a majority, and several Democrats, approved it.

But six Democrats on the committee not only voted against letting this bill out but denounced it as dangerous and damaging.

The bill is 68 pages long. With this bill the majority on the committee produced a 63-page explanation of what it means.

The committee minority in turn wrote a 49-page explanation, which was a criticism and denunciation.

Since only a handful of House Members are on the committee, the full House, when it votes, will have to depend upon the committee members for a lot of guidance on what each section of the bill means.

There are so many things in this bill that, if it becomes law, it probably will be years before the full significance of all its details can be known. And for this reason:

The National Labor Relations Board, which administers the present Wagner Act, is still interpreting its meaning, although the act was passed 12 years ago.

A new board will be set up to interpret the new act, if the House bill becomes law. So it undoubtedly would have to go through the same process of interpretation.

In order to understand the bill and have some sureness of what he was going to write, this writer first took the bill to one of the chief attorneys of the CIO.

After three painful hours of examination—which still was only pretty sketchy—the writer and the attorney had covered only 27 of the 68 pages in the bill.

The CIO attorney gave his own interpretation of what he thought this word or that section of the bill meant.

Then, to get the other side, the writer conferred with one of the most important Republican members of the Labor Committee, one of the men who helped put the bill together.

On some points he said he thought the CIO attorney had given the right interpretation, but on other points the committee member said he wasn't sure of the answer.

So here, before the bill reached the floor for debate, sources of argument and varying interpretations had arisen.

But it would do so much, and the bill is so complex, that not one and probably not three or more stories could tell it in unmistakable language, even if both sides agreed on what each provision means.

The committee members themselves take extreme views of what it would do. The majority of the committee said, in part, in its explanation:

"The committee believes that the enactment of the bill will have the effect of bringing widespread industrial strife to an end."

But the minority members, after voting against the bill, said in their explanation that the bill's proposals are:

"Deliberately designed to wreck the living standards of the American people. * * * It turns the clock of history back at least a century and a half."

Pending Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, April 15, 1947:

THE RIGHT IDEA

Mr. Philip Murray unburdened himself of an important aphorism Sunday. The occasion was an all-day meeting of 250 leaders of his Congress of Industrial Organizations, before which he worked himself up into a lather on the subject of the pending labor legislation in the House and Senate. The Communist issue had been injected into the meeting, causing an angry digression from the subject in hand. Whereupon Murray intervened with the remark that "too often men's tongues will wag whilst their brains stand still." The application to Mr. Murray himself is too apt to be ignored.

A number of the provisions in the House bill seem to us to err on the drastic side, however justified they may appear in the light of organized labor's frequent disregard of the public's health and safety in the last 14 months. The Senate bill promises to be of a milder nature, though stiff enough, depending somewhat on the influence of Senator IVES, who is reputed to hold the balance of power in the committee. We are hoping his influence will be fairly decisive, since as a moderate leaning to neither extreme and as a lawmaker long trained in labor legislation at Albany, he understands the practical side of the problem.

Basically, the Senator prefers regulation to prohibition as a remedy for labor's abuses, the exception being the ban on the closed shop. He seems to be satisfied that the tyranny over the individual worker exercised by this institution warrants its eradication. On the other hand, he objects to some features of the proposed restrictions in the Senate measure on the union shop, which makes union membership a condition not of getting a job but (after a brief interval) of keeping it. The distinction, though on the right side, seems a little too slight, perhaps. There are in effect today approximately 50,000 labor agreements covering 15,000,000 workers and 73 percent of these agreements, affecting nearly half of these workers, call for some form of the closed shop, more often the union shop. To bear down too heavily on both therefore might well disrupt the whole structure of the country's labor relations.

As for industry-wide bargaining, Mr. IVES would neither prohibit nor restrict it until Congress has learned much more about its workings than it knows today. In England and Sweden, where industry-wide bargaining has become traditional, it has contributed markedly to industrial stability. Again the practical goal should be proper regulation.

He opposes a flat ban against secondary boycotts, certain jurisdictional strikes, strikes

in violation of contract provisions and strikes to force an employer to bargain with a union. He has said these should be declared unfair labor practices and handled by the National Labor Relations Board which, instead of private employers, should have the power to seek injunctions against these practices. Why isn't this a wise detour, avoiding, as it would, the bad blood of a direct legal conflict between management and men?

Of course, any curb on the present license of organized labor will bring down on the heads of those who suggest it, including Senator IVES, the anathemas of gentlemen whose tongues wag while their brains stand still. But the Senator, above most of our lawmakers, seems to us to have the right idea.

The New Soo Power Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert at this point a very timely editorial from the April 11 issue of the Evening News of Sault Ste. Marie.

The War Department is presently preparing to commence construction of the 14,000-kilowatt plant in the late spring and giving every consideration to the extension of a long-time lease to the Michigan Northern Power Co. for a reasonable proportion of the excess water from the Soo Rapids so this company can definitely stay in operation for years to come.

The editorial follows:

FOURTEEN THOUSAND OR FORTY-FOUR THOUSAND

For the person devoted to the Sault it is hard to understand arguments that the Michigan Northern Co. plant and canal should be junked and that the Government should spend taxpayers' money to put up a huge new power plant in the Rapids.

These facts stand out and are unassailable. Let's take them in order.

A 44,000-kilowatt plant would replace the Michigan Northern; the Michigan Northern Power Co. would be scrapped, Sault would lose a third or more of its taxes, and if power costs were high the Union Carbide division would close up.

If the Carbide and Michigan Northern suspended operations, some 700 workers and families would be looking for jobs, be added to the unemployed list which is already high.

Lake Superior discharges only so much water and no more. Unfortunately the water cannot be sent back over the Rapids to be used again. The maximum power from the Rapids will be developed when the new 14,000-kilowatt plant is in operation together with the Michigan Northern.

Thus an argument for the 44,000-kilowatt plant is an argument to knock the props from under the Michigan Northern and the Union Carbide. When the city and chamber of commerce join in fighting the 44,000-kilowatt plant they are fighting for the jobs of the 700 men and for their families; they are fighting for the welfare of every one of us because 700 jobs mean so much to the Sault; they are fighting needless spending of Government money to put out of business a firm that pays a big share of Sault's taxes; they are fighting against the economic sin of destroying an operating organization merely that it might be replaced by a Government organization, a process comparable to depression-day process of killing off little pigs and plowing cotton under; they are fighting a flight of industry from the Sault. If the city and chamber of commerce did not take the course they are taking, they would be betraying the interests of the city and of all of us.

Thus arguments that the Government should build a 44,000-kilowatt plant in the Rapids would be understandable from a person, say in Detroit. It will be remembered that the first one to boom the 44,000-kilowatt plant was a TVA proponent who wanted to ship our power to Detroit for use as a club over Detroit Edison. He didn't care what happened to the Sault. Once the 44,000-kilowatt plant is built (if ever) and the power assigned to Detroit or elsewhere nothing in the world will bring it back and the Sault will be sitting high and dry, minus its carbide plant.

We have no assurance that any new industry will come here if the Carbide goes. Right now we have a block of 2,000 kilowatts at the city's disposal for new industry and there has been no rush of industry to the Sault. When the 14,000-kilowatt plant is built, there will be power available for new industry, and power available to Newberry, the REA, and St. Ignace. George Baldwin, president of the Edison-Sault, himself said so.

Moreover, the 14,000-kilowatt plant is only a starter. When the Michigan Northern plant wears out, we can add other units to the Government plant. That will be the time to fight for a 44,000-kilowatt plant.

Meanwhile any talk of a taxpayer-money utility merely to junk the Michigan Northern plant to satisfy somebody's grudge is sheer madness. It should arouse resentment in every one of us as a cold-blooded stab at the very heart of Sault Ste. Marie's economic stability.

H. R. 3020 Is Not Antilabor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, these remarks are directed primarily to those millions of men and women who comprise the rank and file of organized labor. Those individuals who have really become the forgotten men and women in the so-called labor movement. Those individuals whose only prerogative in many instances consists in paying dues and being ordered to work or not to work at the whim and fancy of some power-hungry self-seeking individual who terms himself a labor leader.

Over 2,000 of these individual dues-paying union workers have written me appealing for protection and their right to work under conditions which they choose without any coercion, restraint, or interference from any source. This bill, if enacted into law, will do just that for them.

The legislation now before us will prove very unpopular to some of those unscrupulous labor racketeers who have been exploiting and opposing the humble worker expressing any individuality or personal initiative.

Mr. Speaker, if you will pardon a personal remark, I would like to state that I feel qualified from personal experience to address these remarks to those loyal and patriotic men and women who comprise the vast majority of our trade unions. At the age of 8 I started selling newspapers in my home town in Ohio. From here I advanced to assistant janitor of the public schools.

During the summers I worked as a common laborer in the cement and carpenter construction industry at $1.25 per day. I have driven a 5-ton truck from morning until night at $2.50 per day. I have walked 2 miles to work and 2 miles back and packed a bucket in order to wheel brick at 10 cents per hour. I walked 1 mile to work and 1 mile back, to work beside the hot blast furnaces in the steel mills at $60 per month. I have worked in the oil fields, the rubber factories, and the flour mills with top wages $2 per day.

I walked from town to town, and house to house, over parts of Wisconsin and Illinois, taking orders for a portrait company on a straight commission basis. I mopped floors, tended furnaces, and waited table for my board and room in an effort to get a college education. I have pitched hay, shocked wheat, and mowed briars from morning until night for one meal and 50 cents per day.

In other words, I feel that I have worked just as long hours and sweat just as much for just as small a wage as any of those to whom these remarks are now being addressed. When I see men and women at their jobs I can appreciate all the physical vicissitudes which are plaguing them because I also have been there. When I see the farmer in the harvest field I know just how many running briars are digging at his ankles, how many sweat-bees are nipping at him and how much chaff and dust is going down the back of his neck or into his eyes and ears.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not bragging because I have worked my way up through the ranks, but neither am I complaining. I would not for the world want to see the young men and women of today return to the long hours and some of the working conditions under which I have labored for most pitiful wages. However, neither would I want some so-called leader of an organization to tell me that I could not work if I wanted to work and circumstances made it necessary that I did work, unless I paid tribute to him.

I believe in most organizations. I believe in the organization of churches, of schools, of labor, of farmers, of the business and professional men and women. In fact, I believe in any organization which has as its ultimate objective the creating of a better society for its members and for mankind in general.

I believe in the organization of the United States as we have known and loved it for the past 171 years. I believe in it because I feel that it has done the greatest good for the greatest number of people of any government that has or will exist.

As previously stated, I feel qualified to speak particularly to those folks in the Eleventh Congressional District of Ohio because I have known quite a few of them personally for over 25 years and some of them their entire lives. I have sat in church and in lodge with many of them. I have hunted and fished and played with them. I have done dental work for scores of them. I have talked with them concerning their families and their personal troubles. I have heard many of them express themselves against those in our country who were not loyal to its fundamental principles and have heard them say, "Those folks should be shot or deported."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I know them for what they really are in their hearts. All of them are Americans. Most of them are family men and women. Most of them are honest and most of them are asking for one thing, and one thing only, and that is a decent job with a decent living wage and an opportunity to live a decent, normal life, with some hope of security when they reach the sunset of life.

Knowing these things to be true, I asked for membership on the Labor Committee, feeling that I might somehow be instrumental in helping these folks attain their objectives without ruining our entire American economy. Personally, I feel that the bill now before us is the greatest piece of proposed legislation to dignify the individual worker that has ever been presented to the United States Congress.

The workers in my district know, or should know, that there is a group in America who are attempting to gain control of both them and their organization. If these forces should gain control, they would wipe out all organizations—even the churches. They would be regimented into classes and they and their children's children would work for the state and not for themselves and their families. They would be herded into groups and sent to work any place and at any job wherein they best could serve the interest of their masters. The first step toward accomplishing this objective is to deny the individual the right of free speech and a secret ballot. This legislation for the first time in history establishes democratic processes of government in labor unions.

As we have set forth in our report on this bill, the necessity for legislation is admitted by all fair-minded individuals.

This legislation, if enacted into law, will give to the working men and women a new Bill of Rights. It will add dignity and stature to their position as well as establish peaceful, harmonious relations between them and their employers. This is as it should be in America where class hatred, bigotry, and intolerance have no place.

I would have welcomed a bill of rights of this nature when I was employed in the various capacities as above described, and I am confident that when the honest, patriotic American working men and women learn the real intent and purpose of this proposed legislation and read the 18 rights accorded them under its provisions, as set forth below, that they will join me in saying that a new day has dawned both for the working men and women of America and also for a long-suffering public, who are so dependent upon them for service. This bill provides among other things that the worker shall have:

First. The right to join with his fellow workers to select as their bargaining agent the union that they want, not the union that is forced upon them.

Second. The right to get a job without joining any union.

Third. The right to vote by secret ballot in a fair and free election on whether his employer and a union can make him join the union to keep his job.

Fourth. The right to require the union that is his bargaining agent to represent him without discriminating against him in any way or for any reason, even if he is not a member of the union.

Fifth. The right with his fellow employees to make demands of their own and to bargain about them through the leaders of their own local union without dictation by national and international officers and representatives and without regard to the demands of other employees upon other employers.

Sixth. The right to keep on working and getting his pay in spite of sympathy strikes, jurisdictional disputes, illegal boycotts, and other disputes that do not involve him and his union or his employer.

Seventh. The right to know what he is striking about before he is called out on strike, and to vote by secret ballot in a free and fair election on whether to strike or not after he has been told what his employer has offered him.

Eighth. The right to express his opinion concerning union policies, union officers and candidates for union office, and to make and file charges against his employer, the union, or union officers, without suffering any penalty or discrimination.

Ninth. The right to vote by secret ballot, without fear, in free and fair elections on any matter of union policy—how much dues he shall pay, what assessments the union can make him pay, what the union can spend the money for.

Tenth. The right to vote by secret ballot in free and fair elections for his own choice of union officers.

Eleventh. The right to know how much money his union has, how much it pays its officers, and how much of the union's money the officers use for their expenses.

Twelfth. The right to refuse to pay the union for any kind of insurance that he does not want.

Thirteenth. The right to stay a member of a union, without being suspended or expelled, except for first, not paying dues; second, disclosing confidential information of the union; third, violating the union's contract; fourth, being a Communist or fellow traveler; fifth, being convicted of a felony, that is, of a serious crime; sixth, engaging in disreputable conduct that reflects on the union.

Fourteenth. The right to be free of threats to his family for doing things in connection with union matters that an employer or a union does not like.

Fifteenth. The right to settle his own grievances with his employer.

Sixteenth. The right, without fear of reprisal, to support any candidate for public office that he chooses and to decide for himself whether or not his money will be spent for political purposes.

Seventeenth. The right to go to and from his work without being threatened or molested.

Eighteenth. The right to have a fair hearing, before an impartial board, without cost to himself, whenever he believes that any employer or any union is depriving him of these rights.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the workers of America will be told by high pressure national and international officers—whose job depends on selling them a phony bill of goods that he is indispensable to their welfare—that this is an antilabor bill. They will tell them that this legislation is a stab in the back of labor. They will tell them that this bill, if enacted into law, will set labor back to the days of the sweatshop. Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to suggest to the workers when they hear these accusations made, that they again read the 18 advantages granted them in this bill and judge for themselves whether this is antilabor or just good plain pro-American doctrine.

I believe and am convinced that honest, loyal, patriotic Americans will agree that the enactment of this bill will have the effect of bringing widespread industrial strife to an end and that employers and employees will once again go forward as a team united to achieve for their mutual benefit and for the welfare of the Nation the highest standard of living yet known in the history of the world.

Rev. Dr. Joseph Francis Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I herewith insert the prayer offered by the Reverend Dr. Joseph Francis Thorning in the House Chamber on April 14, 1947. Dr. Thorning is the associate editor of "The Americas" and "World Affairs" and is rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md.

Dr. Thorning has traveled extensively in Central America where he has lectured at a number of universities. In this country Dr. Thorning is urging that the United States Congress make it unmistakably clear that every Marxist totalitarian be regarded and registered as a foreign agent exactly on a par with any Nazi-Fascist totalitarian. It happens that Dr. Thorning's parish at Carrollton Manor is the original home of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, one of the Maryland signers of the Declaration of Independence. I feel justly proud that a man of Dr. Thorning's background and teachings is occupying this historic estate.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Almighty Father, look down with favor upon the Speaker of this House and all the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Remembering the devoted cooperation of the other American Republics and Canada in an hour of trial we beg the help of Thy grace on Pan-American Day for constancy in the cause of Western Hemisphere solidarity.

Bestow Thy benediction, dear Saviour, upon all peoples who honor their obligations as good neighbors. Instruct their minds and guide their hearts in the courses of true friendship. Inspire the children of the Americas with the love of truth, justice, and freedom. Grant that they may fit the values of inter-American friendship into the framework of world order.

This we ask through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Overdoing It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present herewith an analysis of the Hartley bill, H. R. 3020, which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post:

OVERDOING IT

Chairman ALLEN of the Rules Committee indulged in no exaggeration when he said in the opening debate on the House labor bill that "this undoubtedly is one of the most far-reaching and important bills that any Member of this Congress will be asked to vote on." The bill outlines a new national policy governing the relations between management and labor and the relations of both to Government. To say that it is sweeping in its terms is an understatement. We can get nearer to the truth by saying that it is a vast and complex network of ideas—many of them undigested ideas—dumped into an omnibus bill without much regard for what the net effect upon our economy may be.

We think the bill contains numerous constructive provisions. For example, it would recognize unfair labor practices on the part of unions as well as employers. It is an attempt to democratize unionism, to correct such evils as mass picketing, jurisdictional strikes, and strikes that imperil the national welfare. The trouble is that in many instances it invokes crude and repressive remedies. It is not a carefully devised effort to redress the balance between industry and labor; on the contrary, it is a sharp swing of the pendulum in the direction of unreasonable restraints on organized labor. It is not surprising that the long delay in correcting the defects of the old system should produce this sort of a reaction. But this explanation of why the bill has taken the shape it has still does not make it intelligent legislation.

No doubt the bill will be vehemently assailed because it would abolish the NLRB and set up in its place a Labor-Management Relations Board. But this may prove to be one of its happier aspects. The main idea behind the proposed change is to separate the prosecuting and judging functions of the NLRB. The task of investigating alleged unfair labor practices, of preparing complaints and carrying on all the executive work under the act would be assigned to an administrator. The Board would become a truly quasi-judicial body for the hearing and deciding of cases taken before it. With unions and their officials certain to be haled before the Board on charges of unfair practices, this effort to secure greater objectivity in its decisions might, reasonably, be welcomed by labor.

But the House Committee on Education and Labor was not content to give the Board a more judicious character or even to rewrite the Wagner Act. It has provided for a system of judicial review that might tie up most of the vital business of the Board in the courts for rehearing. The bill also sweeps on to take many labor problems out of the hands of the Board and Administrator and lodge them in the courts by restoring use of the injunction to cope with certain forms of picketing, illegal boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and so forth.

Especially unsound, in our opinion, is the provision which would authorize the President to secure an injunction to halt any strike which he believed to threaten curtailment of essential public services. We have often emphasized the necessity of providing some means of dealing with union tyrants, such as John L. Lewis, who are willing to paralyze our entire economy for the sake of gaining their ends. But in all conscience, free use of the injunction in public utility walkouts is not the answer. Let the Government take over an industry essential to the public health, safety, and welfare if necessary, while a dispute is being settled. But certainly the Government should not intervene by means of an injunction and then rely upon the crude machinery that would be created by the House bill to bring about a fair settlement.

Nor is this all. The bill would abolish the closed shop (although authorizing some forms of the union shop), outlaw industry-wide collective bargaining, create a new conciliation service outside of the Labor Department, and set up a rather crude system for balloting among employees before strikes could be called. It is too much of an undigested lump. We doubt that many members of the committee are familiar with its details. Certainly the rank and file of House Members are not. And the great American public is almost completely ignorant of what Congress is trying to do.

This is the way to secure sound legislation. It is not even good politics. At the very least, it seems to us, the bill should be broken down into three sections—one modifying the Wagner Act, and the other two dealing with the conciliation service and emergency handling of utility strikes affecting the national interest. Only by this means do we see any chance of the country understanding what its legislative arm is doing. If the steamroller which seems to be going into action in the House disregards this widespread demand, the chief burden of legislating in this field will fall upon the Senate, where evidence of a more responsible attitude is apparent. Failure of the Senate to heed current warning signals would doubtless result in a veto, and the whole mess would be in the lap of Congress once more. The time to avert such a calamity is now while it is still possible to strip this legislation to reasonable proportions.

University of Delaware Observes Army Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered on April 10, 1947, at the University of Delaware by Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, retired, on the occasion of the university's observance of Army Week. General Reybold, I may say, is a graduate of the University of Delaware and for several years prior to his retirement in 1946 was Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers, climaxing a long and distinguished career of service in the United States Army. I would like to add also that General Reybold was the first nongraduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point to be appointed Chief of the Corps of Engineers.

The audience which had the pleasure of hearing General Reybold was comprised of a very large portion of the student body of the University of Delaware. Significant in this connection is the fact that approximately 75 percent of the entire male enrollment at the university is comprised of veterans of World War II.

For those who may not have previously realized it I wish to point out that the University of Delaware is one of the oldest institutions of higher learning in the Nation, having had its inception as an academy in 1743. It has grown and developed along with our Nation, and its graduates have made great contributions to the development of our way of life and have answered the call to arms in every war from and including the American Revolution.

The clear and concise manner in which General Reybold, one of our country's outstanding citizens and soldiers, has presented the picture of today's need for a recognition of the requirements of national security makes his address, which follows most interesting and thought provoking:

Many of you here today have had active service in our armed forces, and I feel sure that those of you who do fall in that category are glad to get out of uniform, take up where you left off in your educational program, and otherwise resume your normal way of life. Since I spent 4 years on this campus and have recently removed my uniform, I would say we have much in common. To be with you on this occasion is a pleasure, and I am honored to be on your university-hour program.

This being Army Week, I have chosen to say something about our national security, and by this I mean the security of our country and of our way of life—security against all disturbing elements. Our armed forces exist for this very purpose, and in my judgment they must be maintained as never before. I believe the next war, if one should come along, will be quick and an "all out" affair. We are a peaceful Nation but must be prepared to strike back and strike hard at the fellow who chooses to start something. The sneak attack by the Japs at Pearl Harbor will have been but a drop in the bucket as compared to what could and probably would take place in another major war, and we don't care to be on the receiving end. We were miserably prepared at the start of each of the last two wars, and had we not been able to mobilize behind vast ocean fronts and distant battle lines held by our allies, we might have been badly hurt. As it was, not a single hostile shot reached the shores of this country. Will we be so fortunate the next time? Personally, I have grave doubts. The airplane has certainly "washed up" our protective ocean fronts, and the first shots could very readily be fired the next time right into our own front yards.

In World War II we witnessed the development of radar, electronic devices, the proximity fuse, pilotless aircraft, and the beginning of warfare with guided missiles and atom bombs. The future will bring forth further scientific developments, and if we wish to remain abreast of things, or better still, be a step ahead of the other fellow, we must establish on a permanent basis the best research and development organization we can possibly get together. It seems that modern war has no respect for property or humanity. When better weapons of war are developed, let the United States be the first to do so and then be sure to lock up the prescriptions.

It was our money, our industries, our shipping, and our manpower that put the finishing touches of victory to the last two wars, and our enemies know it. With the United States out of the way in any future world conflict, a strong aggressor nation would probably have free sailing around the rest of the globe. Our European enemies overlooked that consideration in the last two wars and paid the penalty. They estimated us to be weak, and we were weak. Then was the time for them to strike, but they failed to do so. I fear they will not make the same mistake three times. If our armed forces become weak again we are inviting attack. If we remain strong, all aggressors will think twice before striking. In other words, and as stated by others over the radio and in the press, a strong America is a peaceful America.

When we attempt to discuss matters relating to our national defense, it is well to have in mind an understanding and an appreciation of what we have in this country of ours as against that of other countries. The things some nations would like to grab off. Think of our natural resources, our vast agricultural and mineral lands, our industrial capacity and the know-how of our management and labor, our magnificent transportation and communication facilities—in brief, our great national wealth. Think of our freedom from dictation, our liberties in speech and religion, our daily way of doing and saying things, our American way of life; all fought for and established by our forefathers. It is for these precious things that we must have now and in the future a strong national defense. Let us be determined that no aggressor nation or group of nations shall ever get a foothold in this country and tell us what we will do or not do. We had enough of that in our pre-Revolutionary days. And let us begin right now to clean up certain subversive elements who are attempting to bore from within our governmental structure. The President has started the ball rolling by an Executive order and Congress is beginning to take serious notice of these and other underground activities in the country. The FBI is on the trail of the offenders, and that to me means real business. We must all join hands and kick these disturbing and disloyal elements out of our midst.

Let us take a look at the world structure as of today. While Germany is no longer a threat as a military power, she must be watched over carefully and nursed into a sense of decency not only for her own people but for her neighbors and for the world. That means occupational troops for some time to come. The British Empire has been considerably weakened and will probably never be as strong as before the recent war. England, the very heart of the Empire, is a target for mass destruction from Continental Europe. However, it would make a great difference in our capacity to wage war whether England be with us or against us. I suggest she remain with us in the future as in the past. France is relatively weak from a military point of view and seems to have lack of unity among her own people. Prior to the last war she rotted rapidly through fifth-column activities and has not yet recovered. Italy can be written off completely and does not know where to go or what to do. Japan, like Germany, is out as an immediate threat, but she is important in world trade. China is torn by internal trouble and may be counted out from a military viewpoint. However, if taken over and led by a strong and resourceful nation, her manpower and natural resources might become important factors in any war. So, that leaves the United States and Russia, the two great military powers of the day.

We are all hopeful that the United Nations set-up will some day become a potent instrument of peace in world affairs, but as yet it is nothing more than a newly born child. Russia seems to be hard to get along with at every turn of the road, and the United States seems to be doing everything from dollars to doughnuts to establish peace and freedom throughout the world. In order to carry out our thoughts in the matter we cannot permit our Army, Navy, and Air Force to fall back to prewar levels or anywhere near such levels. We are in the international ring of freedom no matter whether we like it or not. We can stay in that ring only as long as we have the will power to do so and the physical strength to stand up and fight for our democratic principles of government and for those weaker nations who wish to follow in our footsteps of liberty and freedom. This business of the big fellows knocking down the peaceful little fellows who are free and love it should be stopped before it becomes a disease and penetrates this hemisphere.

Until the United Nations organization is in full force and effect and until this world has leveled off into peaceful and neighborly understandings, we the people of the United States had better watch our step and see that an adequate defense is provided. And don't forget that the best defense is the ability to assume at any and all times a strong and prompt offense. Of course, we are all for cutting the cost of Government, for reducing taxes, for paying off our national debt and for balancing our budget—but let us not at this critical time go so far in reducing our annual appropriations as to weaken further our armed forces.

Modern wars are total wars and they involve not only the military forces, but the entire civil life of communities and nations. The civilian elements of our country would be harder hit than our field forces if an enemy should reach our shores. We would then need unity of effort on the part of every man, woman, and child in the country. Why wait—let's begin now and try to be realistic. Just think of what an atomic bomb or a group of guided missiles would do to New York City or any other large center. The very thought leads us to the conclusion that we must have well-trained troops available to send into such centers of population and also have trained and disciplined civilians in every community for the purpose of restoring order out of chaos. With universal military training we would have in each community trained and disciplined civilians.

What has happened to our armed forces since VJ-day? We had during the war about 12,000,000 men under arms. I understand we now have about 1,750,000, including our naval forces. The Army is down to about 1,200,000, which represents a reduction of some 90 percent. So when pacifists and fifth columnists begin to talk about disarmament, just remember that we have already done a large piece of disarming. I am informed that the Russians have cut their ground forces by about 67 percent and air forces only about 33 percent. We should always estimate the capabilities of other countries rather than probabilities. One of the things about the last war was that our people did not estimate properly what the Japanese could do. They gave too much consideration to what the Japs would probably do, rather than what they were capable of doing. On the other hand, it would seem that the Japs made a very careful estimate of what it would take to defeat the British and the United States in the Far East, and then did it with only 13 divisions in addition to their naval and air forces.

I am told that an airplane with a range of 5,000 miles could take off from Siberia and cover all the United States, not just the industrial centers. Same thing from Iceland, Greenland, and the near end of Norway. I mention these facts as an indication that we are under the guns of those who might not like us and who might choose to occupy and jump off from these places. In the Pacific there is no doubt that we should extend our front well beyond Pearl Harbor and stay put. Nobody knows how long we will have to occupy Germany, Japan, and Korea. So when you add up all these things, plus our present diplomatic dealings, we should listen attentively to the estimated requirements of the State, War, and Navy Departments and back them up, especially during this transitional period from war to peace.

Dr. Carlson, president of the University of Delaware, has told you this is Army Week and the purpose thereof. Let us therefore be more specific about the Army. Nobody knows better than the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff what size Army we should have. They have set a figure of 1,070,000 men as of July 1947. Counting National Guard and Reserve units, they have set an M-day force ready for action of 1,750,000 men. Until things settle down throughout the world I do not think we should tamper with these figures, either directly or indirectly. The country has many outlying tasks yet to perform. The War Department has recently released the following statement on the subject:

"Today the national interest admits of no theory in acknowledging specific obligations. Broken down into basic tasks of the armed forces, they include:

"(a) Occupation of Germany, Japan, and Korea.

"(b) Provision of forces committed for use by the United Nations.

"(c) Exercise of United States foreign policy abroad.

"(d) Assistance of Western Hemisphere nations in mutual defense.

"(e) Development of an adequate intelligence organization.

"(f) Maintenance of supremacy in research and development."

Since the performance of these tasks is to solidify military victory and establish the opportunity to work out world peace, the necessity of maintaining a respectable military posture cannot be overstressed. General Eisenhower has signified the principle thus:

"The strength we need is that required to meet the solemn commitments our country has made throughout the world and a sufficient framework of organizations behind them to secure us in peaceful activity and to give confidence to those who seek to emulate. Not a man or a gun should be maintained for aggressive purposes—but every American and every friend of America in the world has the right to know that they can count on us for a full share in upholding the democratic ideal."

A matter of real concern is whether the War Department can secure through voluntary enlistments the manpower to fulfill its stated requirements. There are indications it cannot. The selective service law is, as you know, no longer in force. The veterans from the last war are still available but in diminishing numbers. In a few years they

may be counted out. In order to establish and maintain a force of trained men, especially for the National Guard and Reserve Units, we should, in my judgment, enter into a system of universal military training at the earliest practicable date. The War Department has such a plan and has presented its views to Congress. I can assure you it is a good plan. It would be helpful if all good citizens, mothers and fathers alike, would urge upon Congress the adoption of such a plan of training for the youth of the country.

Let me say in passing that universal military training is not universal military service. It's not conscription as practiced by European powers. The entire Army of the United States, including the Regular Army, National Guard, and Organized Reserves, normally will be made up wholly of volunteers in time of peace. Generally speaking, under the War Department plan, our young men 18 years of age would be inducted for training only; they would not be members of the Military Establishment or available for combat or any other operational requirements during the period of training; they would not be subject to court martial or provisions of the Articles of War, but would be governed by a special code of conduct which would be established and guided by the recommendations of a civilian advisory board. In addition to military training, athletic, religious, educational, and recreational programs would be provided to improve the mental, physical, and moral fiber of the youth undergoing the training. I venture to say that, once the system be established, the graduates themselves would be the strongest supporters. Aside from other things, let us ask ourselves this question: Is it not a sound and democratic principle that each physically and mentally fit male citizen and alien residing in the United States owes an obligation to this country to undergo training which will fit him for military service in an emergency? If the answer is "yes," why not do something about it.

I am reminded at this point that we have an ROTC unit here at the University of Delaware, and I hope it grows bigger and better as the years roll on. In my opinion, no system of peacetime training in the country paid bigger dividends in the last war, and I urge upon every male student to take advantage of the opportunity.

Let us now turn our minds back to the broader subject of national security and quote another recent release of the War Department.

"Creation of the atomic bomb, guided missiles, long-range aircraft and other scientific devices revises the security concept, accentuates its relationship to every segment of our population. No longer can it be delegated, even in peacetime, solely to the armed forces. The unprecedented integration of civilian and military effort when the country's life was at stake proved beyond all question the existence of a partnership which must continue uninterrupted in peace. The military half of the mission is discharged with arms; the other half includes responsibilities of peace to be met by soldier and civilian in terms of foresightful citizenship which recognizes the nature of military strength and what that strength implies for future peace and welfare, not only of the United States, but of the world. In point are the words of General Marshall:

"'I think we have got to compress theories with realities. We will have to bear in mind the inevitable human reactions of the postwar aversion to military matters and the taxpayers' passion to reduce military expenditures. We will have to take the nations of the world as they are, the prejudices and passions of the people as they exist, and with those considerations, develop a method so that we can have a free America in a peaceful world.

"'The men and women of the United States Army are citizens of a democracy. They, like their Government, are servants of the people. Were it otherwise, the concept of democracy, as we know it, would surely perish. In seven major wars its rank and file stood as a true composite of any American community. In the aftermath of those wars its members went back to civil life to enjoy the same privileges and carry out the same duties as any other citizen.

"'Yet today's peacetime Military Establishment is unique among armies of history. Primarily, it is of a free people and is constituted of the largest force of volunteer soldiers ever to serve under one flag. Traditionally, it fulfills a mission prescribed by the public under a constitutional delegation of power to the Congress—a literal chain of command that remains unaltered after more than 160 years' practice.

"'In previous years proclamation of Army Day symbolized the Nation's acclaim to soldiers of all our wars—a rededication to the ideals they served well. The innovation of Army Week serves to focalize attention on the interdependence of all groups to national security and national welfare. Public familiarity with military problems is as essential to good citizenship as the knowledge of public schools or public finance. Thus, the problem of security becomes as much the concern of every man, woman, and child in this country as it is to the armed forces which attempt to provide it'."

Triple A Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a report from the Producing and Marketing Administration of Washington County, in my district. This report shows what an excellent piece of work this agency is doing. It also indicates the necessity for a continuation of the appropriations:

CONSERVATION—HOW MUCH AND WHO?

Is it the farmer's responsibility to keep our soils productive, or is it the responsibility of the consuming public to assist?

Through the exploitation of agriculture we have built up a great nation. Agriculture is our most important natural resource. Some of our other natural resources are not particularly important. It costs about as much to mine or develop nonimportant resources as you get in return for them. Of course, some have made fortunes but hundreds have lost everything, so it balances up. This is not true with agriculture. Agriculture has paid a tremendous return.

Before the agricultural conservation program in 1936 people did not comprehend what was happening to the soils of this country. Those who have served for long periods in the fields of agriculture education had the idea that, if we developed an agricultural program that was formulated well enough to bring to the attention of the farmer what was necessary from the standpoint of conserving the fertility of the soil, that was all that was required. His personal interest and pride would do the rest. But it didn't work out that way. It wasn't because he didn't understand that it failed. The answer was that he couldn't. The tremendous financial drain that had been made upon agriculture through its contribution to the development of other industries made such a program impossible.

Our National Government began to realize the futility of depending upon the farmer for maintaining the productiveness of our soils when it required all his energy to make a living. We were losing the productiveness of our land, our greatest natural asset.

In short, farmers could no longer justify the expense of anything more than what was necessary for eking out a subsistence for themselves and family, and anything beyond that had to go by the board. It was during this period that the Government came to a realization that this fundamental national resource was being rapidly abused to a point where it was a liability, and that if it were to be preserved for posterity, the Government and public needed to make their responsibility in this respect evident.

It was under these conditions that the Agricultural Conservation Program was inaugurated, a plan to assist the farmer in doing many things that was generally known to be necessary but which he could no longer justify because of lack of money.

When the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was first being considered, we had a dust storm in New England that had its origin in the Great Plains. When concern was expressed regarding this matter, there was an attitude in evidence that this was the concern of those who live in those areas and not the Government's affair or the general public's. The facts were, that those who were supposed to take the responsibility for controlling this condition had already left the farms, but their soil was still blowing. When the soil erodes from wind or rain, the farmer alone can't stop it. He has to have cooperation. It is not solely the farmer's responsibility to keep the soil productive. This is everyone's responsibility as a consuming public, as the public depends on America's soil for the high standard of living of which we are so proud. If it becomes necessary for the farmer to move off the farm because of soil depletion, it is very evident somebody else must take over. If constructive methods are to be inaugurated for the purpose of protecting our soil from exploitation, the public might better use the farmer's energies for that purpose while he is still able to continue his operations than to wait until he is forced to leave the farm to make a living.

The consuming public should cooperate with the farmer by bearing part of the cost of maintaining the fertility of the soil, and not depend upon him for the entire responsibility. We will never keep our lands on a highly productive basis if we depend on farmers to do it alone.

Now, after several years of operation under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, many of the original practices that were deemed necessary but now considered unessential have been eliminated, and the program has been strengthened to the point where everyone who is in close touch with the program is fully convinced of its necessity and fundamental soundness. We are still in danger, because the general public and many of our national leaders consider the support of this program an unnecessary use of public funds. This, in the face of what has been accomplished, seems little short of tragic. Right-thinking people owe it to themselves to become better informed regarding the objectives of the AAA soil and water conservation program.

Soil and water conservation practices carried out under the 1946 agricultural conservation program in Washington County

[Participating farms, extent and value of soil-building practices carried out by practices in connection with the AAA program in 1946]

Practices	Number of participating farms	Extent	Government assistance
Phosphate	661	[1] 4,187,013	$27,632.29
60-percent potash	98	[1] 46,211	600.74
Limestone	106	[2] 2,278.83	5,468.19
Ryegrass	711	[1] 219,179	15,332.03
Lespedeza—not harvested for hay	1,145	[3] 18,615.0	27,922.50
Small grains seeded fall 1945	148	[3] 1,431.1	2,146.65
Summer legumes left or turned	159	[3] 784.3	1,176.45
Winter legumes	223	[1] 55,026	7,739.40
Seeding approved pasture mixtures	213	[1] 57,819	9,231.23
Vegetative waterways established	9	[3] 10.31	204.20
Contour ridging pasture land	2	[4] 8,100	12.15
Harvesting grass and legume seed	163	[3] 1,535.6	5,374.60
Terraces constructed	12	[4] 29,199	291.99
Stock ponds constructed	148	[5] 164.868	19,784.16
Construction of drainage ditches	4	[4] 4,000	101.10
Do	4	[5] 2,693	215.44
Mowing pastures to control weeds	1,002	[3] 18,900.0	14,461.50

[1] Pounds.
[2] Tons.
[3] Acres.
[4] Feet.
[5] Cubic yards.

Total assistance for the above practices in 1946, $129,122.84.

Number of farms in county, 5,047; cropland, 206,698.

Participating farms, 2,047; cropland, 121,559.

Percent participation, 41; percent cropland, 59.

Let us determine the return per dollar invested in some practices for Washington County, and then decide how the funds allocated to our county can be invested to bring the Government the best return, over a period of years, on the money invested.

Application of phosphate, 66 cents per hundredweight: Government assistance of $27,634.28 plus $25,122.08 of the farmer's cash plus $17,585.68 of farmers labor equals $70,342.04 which will purchase and place in the soil 4,187,013 pounds of 20-percent phosphate; 4,187,013 pounds used at the rate of 250 pounds per acre will cover 16,750 acres.

Lespedeza hay production was increased by 1 ton per acre times 16,750 acres equals 16,750 tons of hay; 16,750 tons of hay at $20 per ton equals $335,000, or a return of 17 times the Government's investment of $27,634.28 the first year.

Phosphate shows results for 3 years or more. If the average increase for 3 years is figured at $200,000 worth of lespedeza hay, the return on the Government's investment for the national welfare is $600,000 or 22 for 1.

Ground limestone, average $2.40 per ton.

Government assistance of $5,469.19 plus $2,506.71 of farmers' cash equals $7,975.90, total investment in purchasing, hauling, spreading and working in 2,279 tons of lime on 1,139 acres.

Results to be expected: Missouri Experiment Station Circular No. 218 indicates that lime applied with phosphate to lespedeza showed an increase of 700 pounds of hay over lespedeza to which only phosphate was applied. The number of pounds of protein in the hay produced on untreated plots was 192.6 pounds per acre. On plots receiving phosphate alone 216.1 pounds per acre. On plots receiving phosphate and lime 336.3 pounds of protein per acre. Apparently the calcium functioned in moving phosphorus into the plant. The plots receiving phosphate and lime showed an increase of 144.6 pounds of protein over untreated plots. This is equivalent to 352 pounds of 41 percent cottonseed meal.

If meal is $3.50 per hundredweight, the increase is worth $12.32 per acre; $10.32 of the increase can be credited to the lime; 1,139 acres times $10.32 equals $11,754.45 return on the investment per year. If we figure that the application is effective only 8 years we show a total return on the $5,469.19 investment of $94,035.30 or over 17 to 1.

Establishing cover winter legumes, $3.37 per acre: Government assistance of $7,749.40 plus $3,874.70 of farmer's cash plus $3,874.70 of farmer's labor equals $15,498.80, which will purchase seed and inoculation, haul the seed home, prepare the land, and plant the seed on 2,300 acres.

A crop of hairy vetch, for instance, adds from 5 to 10 tons of organic matter and 90 pounds of nitrogen per acre, according to Arkansas Experiment Station reports. A pound of commercial nitrogen costs retail from 10 to 16 cents, depending upon the type of nitrogen fertilizer used. If we use an approximate average of 13 cents, 90 pounds at 13 cents equals $11.70, would approximate the value of the nitrogen in a crop of vetch. The value of the organic matter is not so easily figured, but certainly a conservative estimate would be 50 cents per ton or $3.50 per acre. Nitrogen $11.70 plus organic matter $3.50 equals $15.20 per acre; 2,300 acres times $15.20 equals $34,960 return for 1 year. The experiment station report indicates that a crop of hairy vetch turned under at the proper time provides enough nitrogen and organic matter to carry two or three succeeding cultivated crops, so we may figure 2½ times $34,960 or $87,400 return on the Government's investment of $7,749.40 or 11 to 1.

Construction of stock ponds, 12 cents per cubic yard: Government investment of $19,784.16 plus $9,892.08 for farmers' cash plus $9,892.08 farmers' materials and labor equals $39,568.72 which will construct 155 stock ponds averaging 1,064 cubic yards of dirt moved per pond.

Results: In Washington County there are 206,698 acres of cropland to be found on 5,047 farms or 41 acres per farm on an average. It may also be assumed that on these farms an additional 50 acres of land will be found which can provide grazing for 10 head of cattle or about 1 cow to 5 acres. This land is not being used for anything because the timber is scrubby and scattering, stock water is not available so no pasture improvements are made. This type of land should be developed perhaps as pasture and timberland, but some sort of current income must be in sight before such development will be made.

An investment of $127.64 by the Government matched by an equal amount of cash and labor by the farmer in constructing a stock pond for adequate water would result in an added production and income from 10 head of cattle at least. If we figure this income at $20 per year per cow we have a $200 added income per farm on 636 farms or one-fourth of the farms in Washington County, $12,720. This return should continue over an indefinate period. If we figure 30 years we show a total return of $381,600 on a $19,784.16 investment or 19 to 1.

It should also be remembered that if the water supply had not been made available this land would probably have gone into cultivation and much of the soil lost. In most cases the stock pond will bring about proper land utilization instead of exploitation.

WALTER D. RAMEY,
Chairman, Washington County Committee, PMA Field Service Branch.
LINCOLN E. MAUPIN,
Vice Chairman, Washington County Committee, PMA Field Service Branch.
ROE D. STOKENBURY,
Member, Washington County Committee, PMA Field Service Branch.

Can Science Remain Free?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESTON E. PEDEN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following address by Rev. A. Powell Davies of the Unitarian Church, Washington, D. C.:

CAN SCIENCE REMAIN FREE?

Harvard University has recently completed one of the most astonishing and intricate pieces of mechanism ever contrived by man. It is a giant calculating machine, capable of solving in a matter of minutes complicated mathematical problems which might otherwise take weeks and months to carry to a conclusion. It works—does this calculating machine—4 hours a day for Harvard University, the remaining hours for the United States Navy. It can calculate the path of a rocket in the stratosphere, taking into account air resistance, wind pressure, the pull of gravity, and the effect of the earth's rotation. It can include the influence of even more subtle factors which are not as yet disclosed. In addition, it can deal with multiple double-jointed equations, of the kind mathematicians sometime have to solve by the thousand when employed in such matters as discovering more about the inner workings of an atom. It will be seen, therefore, that though it is only a machine, it is a very remarkable machine, and moreover, useful.

But to advance its usefulness it so happens that people like Prof. Norbert Wiener, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, are almost indispensable. He is one of the few people on the face of the earth who know what such a machine is all about. For that reason, he was asked to make an address on the subject. During the war he had participated in research aimed at the development of rocket bombs and controlled missiles, so he also knew the military uses of such an astonishing mechanism.

And Dr. Wiener refused to speak. He is all through, he says, with helping to develop new weapons. He rebels against the use to which science is being put. "I do not expect," he writes in an explanation of his stand, "to publish any future work of mine which may do damage in the hands of irresponsible militarists * * *. To provide scientific information is not necessarily innocent act, and may entail the gravest consequences. The practical use," he concludes, "of guided missiles can only be to kill foreign civilians indiscriminately, and it furnishes no protection whatever to civilians in this country."

This, then, was the significance of his refusal; he is the first of the top-level scientists openly to rebel. There will be others. Not a doubt of it. And what is the reason? The reason is that science has become, even to scientists, too dangerous to be left unregulated. Unless it can be socially controlled—one of the most difficult things ever contemplated since the beginning of history—science will be the means by which civilization will be totally destroyed. Professor Wiener, recognizing this, refuses to lend himself to such disastrous possibilities, and decides the issue presented by his practical judgment, in the full light of his moral responsibility.

Other scientists have taken for the time being a somewhat less drastic stand. Some of them have gone about the country, from platform to platform, warning people of the peril that is darkening the future. They

have tried to influence politics. They have forsaken their ivory towers for the unaccustomed adventure of public life. They have succeeded in reinforcing popular approval for some new and important agencies that science has made necessary—such as the provision for civilian control of atomic energy within the United States and the United States sponsored International Atomic Development Authority contemplated as the basis of United Nations world control.

But their success, though remarkable, has not caught up with the problem. The development of weapons has been going on at a much faster rate than the development of international control. It was predictable therefore, that faced with the unavailability of larger solutions, some of the scientists would follow the promptings of individual conscience and rebel. They have apparently begun to do so.

Such individual rebellions are certainly not without usefulness if they emphasize the problem we are not solving—or even beginning to solve. But beyond that they will do no good. Individual scientists, by withholding their labors or concealing their discoveries, can never know whether they are hastening a disaster or postponing it. They cannot know because they are unable to tell what other work is going on, perhaps in other countries, or whether in the end their own contribution would make disaster more likely or less. Too many factors are involved, not all of which are visible to individual scientists. Moreover, it is certain that if enough scientists refused to cooperate with the government of their country, or with the armed services, an attempt would be made to coerce them.

Last spring, when I was Chairman of the Emergency Conference on Civilian Control of Atomic Energy, I saw very plainly at times the resentment of politicians that scientists were so elusively difficult to control. "Why aren't the scientists more patriotic?" the legislators—some of them—would ask. By which they meant, "Why don't the scientists do what the politicians decide?" This is not a matter to be taken lightly.

What I am driving at, however, is that a revolt of individual scientists is not a solution, and that it is very doubtful that an organized revolt would do much better. It has to be understood, too, that nobody is going to give the scientists the right to do as they please, even though their intellectual status is above the average. Some way has to be found of regulating science—if there is ever again to be security—that represents the entire population. And the extraordinary fact—quite incomprehensible to anyone who has absorbed the significance of what has happened in the last few years—is that nothing is yet being done to find a means for the social regulation of science. Nothing, that is, on a scale proportionate to the problem.

Let me make a little clearer what our actual situation is. We have not yet got the international control of atomic energy. Whether we shall succeed in getting it very soon is still in doubt. Even if we do, it is only the beginning of what is necessary. Science has not arrived at a stopping point. There is as much possibility of discovery in the future as there was in the past. But today, as one atomic physicist lamented to me only a few months ago, you cannot even give a bright graduate student a piece of research to do without fearing that he may stumble upon something that in one way or another has dangerous potentialities.

The American plan for the international control of atomic energy is a brilliant solution—but a limited one. How limited it is, is well known to those who developed it. It represents only a beginning.

Moreover, atomic energy and indeed the whole area of applied physics is only one part of the problem. At present, it is the easiest part to keep watch over—not easy, not by a long, long way, but nevertheless, the easiest. What shall we say of little laboratories, here, there, or anywhere, in which deadly bacteria can be developed? Already we can use bacteria to destroy crops—the basic food supply of an entire nation—leaving the people to starve. Atomic vaporization might be more merciful. Further possibilities lie ahead. Is it conceivable that we shall leave laboratory research uncontrolled? If we do, it is certain that sooner or later, either by accident or by design, some fearful disease will wipe out the lives of millions. Yet, this is something that could come out of the laboratory of a small hospital, or of a drug manufacturer, or even of a private researcher.

When we recognize the implications of the point to which modern science has advanced and then remember that it is still advancing, most of the things with which the congresses and parliaments of the world are at present concerned pale into insignificance. The really commanding requirement of the period immediately before us is to work out, nationally and internationally, the means of regulating science in all its departments so that its dangers will be limited and its benefits insured. Even the benefits we could afford to postpone for a season—most of them. But the dangers are immediate.

In the sense in which the word was applied in the past, it is impossible for science to continue to be free. It is impossible for it to remain morally irresponsible. That is a very hard recognition to make, particularly if, like myself, you are devoted to the methods and purposes of science. It sounds like a new kind of heresy. But the test of a scientific mind is whether it can accept the realities of a situation, even if they are unwelcome. The realities of our present situation are indeed unwelcome. It may be generations—if we manage to avoid still worse things—before these realities seem entirely friendly to mankind. But there they are: Realities.

If science is not controlled by considered and deliberate purpose; controlled in such a way as to provide optimum freedom of the kind most necessary for scientific work; if science is not regulated on a public-welfare basis, openly and candidly with all the people knowing what is being done, then let me state the alternative. When the situation becomes critical enough, there will be panic and science will be regulated by tyranny, perhaps in the first place by the military. This has nearly happened already in the case of atomic energy. The McMahon bill was only passed after a long struggle and against formidable opposition. It may not remain undisturbed. I am not criticizing the military in saying this: if nobody else protects the public, the military will doubtless do its best to fill the blank. But where would this end? Would it be likely to prevent war—and the consequent complete disaster?

There ought to be, immediately, both national and international commissions, composed partly of scientists and partly of able, public-spirited citizens who are not scientists, whose assignment would be to work out continuously for as long a period as may be necessary the detailed arrangements by which scientific research and all its applications can be regulated. This, without doubt, is the most important item on the world's agenda. Without the regulation of science, right through from research to technological application, the destruction of civilization is sooner or later inevitable. If the regulation is military and despotic, destruction is just as probable as if there were no regulation at all. By regulation, therefore, we mean civilian control, openly responsible to all the people and moving as rapidly as possible toward the universal.

I say that this is the most important item on the world's agenda. If it is not so regarded, and rather soon, science is on its way to anarchy in the first place, and final domination for destructive purposes immediately afterward.

Dr. Harlow Shapley, one of the greatest of living astronomers, begins a recent article by saying that civilization has few friends. (Harvard Alumni Bulletin, January 1947.) "Nobody cares aggressively about its continuance," he says. "It is accepted casually, like the air we breathe and the rhythm of the heart. But can we longer leave it safely to chance?" he asks. "Civilization needs friends * * * needs planning and thoughtful action," or before long, he concludes, there will be no civilization left to befriend.

One wonders how it could be put, so vividly that people would be shocked into recognition of realities. Perhaps it could be put in a sort of parable. Suppose we opened our newspapers some morning and read this headline: "Ocean liner on fire: life aboard goes on as usual." Suppose beneath it were the following story: "The famous luxury liner *Western Civilization*, radioed last night that a fierce fire had broken out below decks which may result in the ship becoming a total wreck. All aboard, however, though naturally a little alarmed, are taking the situation very calmly. No unusual measures are contemplated such as might extinguish the fire or place it reliably under control. All meals are being served as usual, the customary sweepstakes on the daily mileage of the ship are very popular, and the crew has been ordered to polish the bright-work and put on a new coat of paint on the funnels.

"When the owners were telephoned in New York early this morning they said they fully expected that the fire would make no difference to the usual profits and that they were above all opposed to any kind of new regulation or governmental interference. The maritime union, when informed of the emergency, said that the strike which had been called for the near future would not in any circumstances be postponed. When a reporter asked Congressman Typical, chairman of the Committee on Committees-as-Usual, whether he wished to make a comment, the celebrated Congressman from the Third District of Everywhere impatiently replied that if we would all put our hands to the plow and our shoulder to the wheel and stop rocking the boat, we would have nothing to fear. 'The way to fight fire,' he concluded, 'is with fire.'"

Suppose we found such a story in the morning newspaper. It is incredible, you say. We never could. Yet, we are doing something even more incredible every day. We are permitting the affairs of the Nation to go on, not to mention those of mankind at large, almost as though nothing exceptional had happened in the last few years.

How does it come to pass that nothing is being done about the most urgent problem of the present age? I ask, with Dr. Shapley. Where are the friends of civilization?

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which attempts to solve the serious crisis that exists in my State and many others in the field of education. This is a companion bill to S. 472, introduced by the senior Senator

from Ohio and seven other Senators. The bill has two general purposes: First, to guarantee a certain minimum educational program in public elementary and secondary schools and, second, to reduce the inequalities of educational opportunity between the several States.

There is much discussion and debate throughout the land and here in the Halls of Congress on the question of one world. However, on the question of one nation, there is no disagreement whatsoever. We are one Nation, dedicated to a program of equal opportunity for all citizens. To accomplish this program, we must afford to the children of America equal opportunity in the field of education.

In Kentucky, we now face a serious crisis. We, in Kentucky, spend a larger percentage of our per capita income on education than do our neighboring States, Ohio and Indiana. Yet Ohio and Indiana, because of far greater per capita income are able to spend twice as much per child per year. This is causing a very serious teacher problem in Kentucky and other low-income States. My bill corrects this inequality through Federal aid to the low-income States. Under its terms, the States are obligated to meet certain financial requirements in order to qualify for Federal aid. The bill does not permit the States to rescind any funds now being spent for education. Federal aid is a supplement to the present State programs. Furthermore, this bill completely safeguards State control of the educational system. Its passage will permit higher salaries for teachers and greater educational opportunity for the children of the low-income States.

My bill will be referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor. After 3 months of untiring efforts on the part of the members of that committee, a bill was yesterday brought to the floor dealing with the complicated problems in the field of labor. It is my hope that the committee can now turn its efforts to equally important problems in the field of education. In Kentucky and other low-income States, we are face to face with a grave and serious crisis.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Wisconsin Manufacturers Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered on Tuesday, April 15, before the Wisconsin Manufacturers Association in Milwaukee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How Congress Is Meeting Its Challenges

Mr. Chairman, friends of the Wisconsin Manufacturers Association, at the outset, I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity to address this distinguished assemblage—this assemblage of builders, sustainers. It is like a homecoming to me after the strenuous life of Washington.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION

Yes, I am grateful to the manufacturers of Wisconsin for the privilege of addressing you. My sense of appreciation, too, is deep and thorough for the loyalty and support that I have received from the people in Wisconsin as expressed in person and by letters. That, as you realize, is the real compensation which a public official receives. In a very real spirit of humility, I can only say that I shall strive constantly to merit that continued confidence.

(a) I am particularly grateful to folks in the State who have written me endorsing policies which I have established as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The response was most gratifying, for example, after the Judiciary Committee initiated the practice of screening all judicial nominations through the State bar associations. So, too, there was generous endorsement after I urged that FBI confidential reports be made on judicial nominations in an effort to insure the highest possible caliber of judicial appointees.

(b) I am grateful also for the appreciation shown in the mail for my efforts in endeavoring to reestablish the Great Lakes package freight. The problem of freight rates for our area is another problem which will require increasing scrutiny. Increasing coastal competition renders imperative a thorough study of the entire midwestern freight-rate problem.

(c) I am grateful also for the letters that have come from members of your group in the past few weeks with reference to efforts in Washington to secure a centennial coin commemorating the admission of our State into the Union next year. Your own Joe Heil has spearheaded this effort because, like most good businessmen, he believes that it should be possible to finance a State-wide celebration of this character on a business-like basis. Your group is, of course, peculiarly a part of any observance of a century of achievement in Wisconsin, and consequently has a very proper interest in the centennial.

(d) I am grateful also for the fine efforts that the manufacturers of this State have put forth not only throughout the war effort, but especially in getting postwar production and in getting veterans back on the job despite many pressing problems.

(e) I want to express my gratitude also for the support which the folks back home here have given to the congressional efforts to eliminate the grave economic menace of the $6,000,000,000 flood tide of so-called portal-to-portal pay suits.

(f) I am grateful for the support back home of congressional efforts to limit Presidential tenure.

Yes; there is much for which I am deeply grateful to you.

OUR APPROACH TONIGHT

In preparing my remarks, I have sought to place myself in your position and to bring to you information that I believe Wisconsin industrialists are interested in securing.

My information cannot be complete. In a sense it will be only cursory and some of it conjectural because it involves evaluating the future and because all of your legislative programs are concerned with human elements—men with different political views, different social outlooks, different education, different religious, economic, geographic backgrounds, and with different emotional reactions. All of this means that in our democratic system, it is impossible to foretell the outcome of legislation with any degree of certainty.

In seeking to penetrate our tomorrows, it is well for us to simplify our thinking, cast out fear and doubt, so that we can make an honest, objective appraisal, free from bias or prejudice or bigotry.

Part I. The challenging world of 1947

While we have been living in a period of tremendous change and challenge (and this is always the case after the world has gone on a war jag), this particular period is more dynamic than ever. Because of human invention and ingenuity, the world has been contracted, time and space eliminated, and we find ourselves neighbors to every other nation.

Businessmen in Wisconsin are interested in the foreign situation. The reason is apparent to us all. In one generation wars in Europe have precipitated us into two world conflicts. This foreign situation calls particularly for calm evaluation of the known factors. What are these factors? They are:

(a) America is sound at the core, with no depletion of her basic strength except in some of her vital materials.

(b) The United Nations organization is struggling for expression and vitality.

(c) A great hope abides in the common people of earth that not only the international peace mechanism may be perfected, but that the will of the nations will become dynamic to effectuate world peace.

(d) There are but two big powers on earth—America and Russia—with all nations still battered by the shock of war.

United States-Russian Conflict

(e) America is in opposition to Russian policy in Germany, in Greece, Turkey, and Korea, in fact, everywhere in the world, due, in turn, to three conditions:

1. A broad difference in political, religious, and economic ideology. Russia minimizing the individual and maximizing the state; America struggling to maintain and perfect the democratic way of life.

2. Russia not only desiring to extend her ideological influence, but to extend her territorial borders.

3. America awakening now to the need of seeing that natural resources, such as oil and minerals, will remain in sufficient supply.

Because of the contracted nature of the earth, our conflict (ordinarily called peaceful) requires to a certain degree the same weapons that we used in South America during the war. Our investment in dollars there kept Hitler out of South America. Our investment and our definite stand, we hope, will stop the Russian Bear from taking over all of Europe and the Near East.

Challenge to America

This is a quick analysis of our foreign policy. This much is certain. Somewhere up ahead, the world is still confronting a global Armageddon. The character and the extent of that Armageddon will to a large degree be determined by the kind of thinking and the kind of leadership which America brings to the immediate crucial problems in the field of foreign policy.

Part II. Our domestic policy

Now, what about our policies here at home? I do not propose this evening to attempt an analysis of the political situation. I do, however, believe that it is desirable to make a few comments on the sentiment throughout the country—because, of course, that sentiment very properly influences Congress.

Rise of Executive Popularity

It seems to be very evident at the present time that the Chief Executive and the administration, according to the latest polls, are gaining in strength. I hope that I will never become so partisan that I cannot join with all right-thinking Americans in being grateful for every evidence of increasing con-

fidence in Government—be it executive, legislative, or judicial.

Unfortunately, it is also apparent, however, that at the present time there is a definite decline in the confidence of some people in Congress.

I believe this is extremely unfortunate, for several reasons:

(A) In our system of government it is absolutely imperative for Congress to retain its legitimate stature and strength as the voice of the people.

(B) A dwindling respect for Congress is usually accompanied by an aggrandizement of Executive power.

Now, just what is the basis for criticism of Congress at the present time—and how valid is this basis?

Smear Propaganda Against GOP Leaders

(a) First of all, I believe some folks back home have been sold a false bill of goods by certain New Deal newspaper scribes. These few newsmen have supped so long at the New Deal table in Washington that their outlook and objectivity have been stunted. Accordingly, the New Deal columnists have attempted to smear the Eightieth Republican Congress.

Their efforts echo the unfair charges made by a few of my Democratic colleagues to the effect that every one of the 51 Republican Senators is an active Presidential or vice-presidential candidate, interested only in the outcome of 1948. I say there is no justification for that charge.

To be sure, there are numerous men in the Senate of outstanding caliber, but not one of them, I believe, wants to or will sacrifice the team success of the Eightieth Congress in order to realize personal ambitions. This is as it should be.

Congress must work as a team insofar as possible. There is no time for idle speculation about 1948. That is the sentiment of the Republican leadership in Congress, New Deal newsmen to the contrary.

I want to make it absolutely clear that I have the highest respect for the American press as a whole and for the able corps of Washington correspondents generally. But there are some among them, I regret, who have been infected with New Deal views.

Small GOP Margin of Power

(b) Next, let us observe that Republican control of the Congress is not as unchallenged as it is assumed to be. The margin of GOP strength is small in the Senate; 51 Republicans to 45 Democrats. In the House, there is a larger margin, 246 Republicans to 188 Democrats and 1 American Labor Party.

Let us remember, too, that not only is the GOP margin, particularly in the Senate, not numerically strong, but it has been out of power for 14 years. This is not an excuse for Republican "errors" or alleged slowness. It is simply a statement of fact. As I will point out, no apology is needed for the Republican record to date.

Let us remember that the seven Congresses preceding the Eightieth Congress, beginning with the Seventy-third Congress in 1933, were all Congresses where legislative speed was a relatively simple matter because there was an effective, well-organized, articulate majority. That tremendous legislative machine which began in the Seventy-third Congress steamrollered on almost without an interruption until 1937 when the court-packing bill came up and was defeated.

Then, for the first time, the machine slowed down, and in 1937, 1938, and into a part of 1939, the Seventy-fifth and Seventy-sixth Congresses started a return to orderly legislation as differentiated from the hurried "must" or "crisis" legislation which began in the Seventy-third Congress. In 1939, World War II forced a return to a more rapid legislative program. Basically, the last 14 years have been an era of speedy legislation, when Congress ran a $20,000,000,000 debt up to $260,000,000,000.

Reported Dissension in Congress

(c) Some of the public appears to be getting fed up with what looks like bickering and wrangling and dissension in Congress—yes, in the Republican Congress.

This criticism I do not feel is a valid one. I do feel that there is a certain amount of regrettable lost motion, a certain amount of emotional high tension which is unwarranted and unnecessary and thoroughly undesirable. It is not, however, a major legislative stumbling block. In many respects it is, in fact evidence of independent thinking.

I hold no brief for an intemperate individual legislative approach, but it cannot be denied that out of the crossfire of many personalities and many backgrounds and many approaches, there usually emerges a kind of legislation which to a large degree is representative of the best in American thinking.

Here again it is imperative for us to bear in mind that in the kind of a government we know and love, there is no dictator or legislative "boss." There isn't any one man on the Republican side of the aisle, for example, who can stifle vigorous and forthright opinions even from his own party members—and that is perhaps as it should be.

Reported Lack of Accomplishments

(d) It appears that the folks back home feel that Congress is not getting the job done quickly enough.

There is a limited amount of truth in this. Folks back home want to see an end to war controls, want to see adequate labor legislation, want to see bureaucracy slashed, want to see taxes cut, and want to see business back firmly on its feet. All of these things haven't been accomplished and so to that extent it is true. On the other hand, let us consider these significant facts:

Substantial Achievements

1. In the first 30 days of this session of the Eightieth Congress, this Congress accomplished the first major political policy revision in a decade and one-half—and that was a stupendous job.

2. In the first 30 days of this Congress, Congress accomplished the first major procedural and mechanical revision of its machinery in 150 years. This was a stupendous job as every industrialist knows who has ever attempted to reconvert or retool his plant in a period of 30 days.

In other words, these two jobs had to be done before any legislative program could be effectively undertaken.

3. Congress has passed legislation which would, if finally enacted into law, eliminate the tremendous economic threat inherent in the so-called portal-to-portal pay suits. I am happy to report that it was the Senate Judiciary Committee which wrote the legislation along with its companion committee in the House.

4. The Congress passed the first decontrol act of 1947 which seeks to delimit and define war time and emergency controls. I am proud to report that here again, this bill emerged from the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

5. The Congress has also passed a resolution which would limit Presidential tenure for the future. This resolution likewise originated in the Judiciary Committee. Already, this constitutional amendment has been ratified in several States including our own. When it is ratified, we hope that never again will we be confronted by a 14-year reign with some results so damaging that they cannot be repaired except after a long period of time.

Labor Reform

6. At the present time far-reaching, consequential labor legislation—long overdue—is emerging from the congressional committees for consideration by Congress.

Through this legislation, I trust that we will be adequately curbing the racketeer element of labor. The labor bill will be passed, not with the idea of jeopardizing the rights of the public or of labor or of management, but of preserving them. As you know, I am not a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which has gone thoroughly into this subject. But I recognize, as do the committee members, that on vital matters such as this, it is well to remember the old German proverb "Eile Mit Weile"—make haste slowly.

In this matter, as in all others, the public interest is paramount.

Tax and Budget Reduction

7. We have made substantial progress along the line of income-tax reduction. This progress has been delayed somewhat by the unsettled foreign conditions.

But I believe that tax reduction can be effectuated while making adequate payments on our staggering debt. The additional consumer and corporation income for spending, resulting from tax reduction, should help antidote those malicious influences that would like to plunge us into a depression.

8. Progress, as you know, has also been made along the line of budget reduction from the President's $37,500,000,000 figure.

We are cutting appropriations for certain Government departments which have ballooned in size during the New Deal administration. There may be someone hurt, but it is the only way that the thing can be done because there is a disease in Washington known as "political fungus." The legislative branch is going ahead to eradicate the fungus without injuring the tree itself.

Exposure of Reds

9. Thanks to Republican pressure, the executive branch is at last getting under way to purge Communists from the agencies through an Executive loyalty order, a mere 14 years overdue. Simultaneously, Red subversive is being pitilessly exposed in congressional committees.

I need hardly tell you gentlemen of the terrific damage that the disciplined Red minority can do in unions and elsewhere. Fortunately, we in America are becoming more realistic in relation to curbing the termite process of borers from within. That doesn't mean that we are going to limit freedom of the press and of speech.

It does mean, however, that we are conscious of the value of possessing American citizenship. Throughout the world, everywhere beyond our borders, the inhabitants of other countries wish that they were citizens of this great Nation. Countless numbers would seek homes here. Yet there are those within America who would destroy this thing we call American freedom, the American way of life.

We say, therefore, that if there are those in this Nation who are so dissatisfied with our form of government, that they owe allegiance to another government, and yet claim to be citizens of this great country, let us remove the right of citizenship from them and let them go to this other government. That is where they belong.

World Trade

10. Speaking of the foreign picture, hearings have been held in committee on our future world-trade program and on the international trade organization.

We must, of course, proceed slowly and carefully so that we do not damage the greatest market in the world for you producers. I refer to America. That does not mean that we are going to build needlessly high tariff barriers. As you know, there is too much "baloney" talk about that subject; too many generalities.

For months now the dollar value of United States exports has been, roughly, twice that of her imports. If the present trend continues, the United States, at the end of each

year, will have built up a total credit of over $7,000,000,000. Foreign countries cannot continue to run into debt at such a rate, and it is true that the United States cannot afford to lose the export trade. Therefore, there must be an honest effort made to reverse the present trend. Travel by our citizens in foreign countries would help, and, of course, contributions that we are making also tend to balance the situation. Our difficulties today are infinitely greater than after the First World War. Then, we looked toward an era of peace and plenty. Now, because of the Russian situation, we know not what we look at.

We expect a national income of $160,000,000,000. Yet, bear in mind that our total exports last year, including goods purchased with the money we furnished, didn't go over $10,000,000,000. We thus see that we must be sure that we don't kill the goose—our own market—that lays the golden egg in looking for the much smaller eggs of the distant geese.

America is in world affairs up to her ears, and I think to stay. We have taken trusteeship of the isles of the Pacific. We are helping the democratic nations of Europe with our loans and with our food and with our clothing.

We are the blessed nation of earth, and in a sense we are giving, giving, giving, and probably we are reaping from that great law, "it is more blessed to give than receive," the benefits that we do have—peace, our industries and homes intact.

But in this giving process now, we have to become still more realistic. Was it not Paul who said, "If any provide not for his own—is worse than the infidel." The time has come now that our gifts must be disassociated from our business enterprises. Those who handle our money in the International Bank and in the Export-Import Bank must not indulge in giving too much because giving weakens the receiver as well as the giver.

We must see that there is a quid pro quo when we do business. Now I believe that this idea is becoming more and more apparent in Congress and in Washington.

OVER-ALL OUTLOOK FOR CONGRESS

I have briefly reviewed 10 phases of congressional achievements. All of these actions have been taken thus far with a view toward making a stronger, safer, sounder America in this threatening atomic age—an America with modern military defense, economic and political defense.

I submit that while there may be ample reason for us to be concerned with what appears to be undue delay—the record of the Eightieth Congress thus far has by no stretch of the imagination been a bad record. There is every evidence that before the Eightieth Congress adjourns, it will have made good on its promises, so good that the Eightieth Congress will be considered as one of the most outstanding Congresses in American history—provided certain obstructionist tactics in the Congress by a small handful of men can be curbed.

Part III. What America needs

What does America need now, gentlemen? I submit she needs these things:

1. All-out production that will meet head-on the challenge of inflation. Production of the character of which I speak will cut costs and make prices more equitable.

2. Management-labor harmony: That is a job for all of us, not simply management and labor, but the public, which has such a great stake in the same.

3. Pro-American program on the labor front: Under this program, neither labor nor management, nor any other segment, will be made a privileged segment, with rights superior to those of any other segment. I have said many times that this job should be the job primarily of labor and management themselves. Each segment should police its own house and see that the racketeers—those who want to play the game only according to their own rules and not according to the rules of their country—that the racketeers are done away with.

We have seen that charges of racketeering have been applied of late to those in labor, but we cannot forget that in the past and even in the present, vicious greed exemplified through a few men, sometimes creates racketeers in management and capital. Monopoly, except in cases where the Government gives sanction thereto, may become racketeering in its function. We don't want a racketeering labor monopoly or any other type of monopoly.

4. A return to principles which made America great—work, thrift, and faith in God and man. To accomplish this, the drift to statism must be reversed.

5. Utilization of our inventive genius: We must see to it that the profit motive is maintained. It is an incentive for the expression of the American genius. Because this Second World War has drained us of so much of our strategic materials, it is necessary that the genius of men get into action and by the utilization of this genius and perhaps through the new atomic energy, we may bring about the dream of the alchemist. In fact, we are doing that right now in our alloys and our plastics, in our creation of new materials.

These are some of America's basic needs today as I see them.

Part IV. Conclusion

Wisconsin's Achievements

Gentlemen, in conclusion, may I say that we in our land have been singularly blessed, and we in Wisconsin have been particularly blessed. We can recall that in the opening days of the 1930's, the shock of the depression was cushioned here in Milwaukee by the variety of our industries. We can recall that in 1930, Milwaukee was still producing at the rate of $1,200 annually for each of its 578,000 residents, a higher rate than in any other American city. Throughout the Nation, it became known that Milwaukee was an island of prosperity in a national sea of depression, although ultimately, Milwaukee, too, was inundated.

I can think of few places in all America which afford as graphic an illustration of American achievement, American initiative, and American industry as Wisconsin.

In the span of a single century we in Wisconsin and here in Milwaukee have seen mighty industries grow from small, humble beginnings. We have seen them thrive on the solid, old-fashioned virtues of thrift and diligence. We have seen them grow to greatness, because this was a land where economic opportunity was never denied to industrious men who sought to build and to achieve.

Basically, gentlemen, all of the problems which confront our land can perhaps be reduced to this single fact: Our every effort must be dedicated to preserving the framework within which such achievement is possible.

If we can preserve a vigorous, growing economy, if we can provide an economic climate favorable to the growth of industry and business, if we can preserve the great American freedoms, the great American values, then we may be confident that labor and management, and what is more important than either—the general public—can continue to build. Yes, it can then build so virile and so vital a democracy here at home that our example and our influence can serve as a powerful force in establishing world order out of international chaos.

Congress, I am sure, will meet its challenges, as will all America.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following letter setting forth a series of recommendations made by the board of directors of the Charleston (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce, concerning labor legislation:

CHARLESTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Charleston, W. Va., April 3, 1947.

Hon. E. G. ROHRBOUGH,
Member of Congress,
Third West Virginia District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROHRBOUGH: Congress will shortly be called upon to consider new legislation, or amendments to existing legislation, dealing with employer-employee relations.

The board of directors of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce considers it appropriate that West Virginia representatives in Congress should have some expression on this subject from the organization representing business and industry of the great Kanawha Valley, an area which includes more than one-eighth of West Virginia's population and from one-fifth to one-sixth of all its business, industry, and employment.

These viewpoints have not been formulated in a punitive attitude toward organized labor. On the contrary, the board members believe that no labor organization, whose members have affiliated with it freely and voluntarily, and who control their union and its policies through democratic processes, has anything to fear from the legislative changes recommended here.

The board of directors of the Charleston chamber recommends the following seven legislative steps which it believes to constitute a sound governmental program designed to maintain a proper balance in employer-employee relationships:

1. PROHIBITION, BY LAW, OF THE CLOSED-SHOP CONTRACT

The closed-shop contract was devised and formerly used by labor leaders as a bargaining instrument with which to win, hold, and strengthen the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively. They wrested this concession from employers at a time when the right to organize and bargain collectively was not established by law.

Today the Wagner Act has established this right at law for every industrial employee in commerce. The law likewise protects this right against the caprice of an employer.

In consequence, what necessity or justification is there for a continuation of the closed shop by contract? It affords the employee no protection from his employer that is not now provided by law.

Instead, it gives the union a protection against the desire of an employee not to join, or to withdraw after he has joined—an unintended benefit to which the union is not entitled, now that it is fully sheltered and protected in its existence by law.

Why should Government permit a labor organization, or any other organization, to maintain its membership through a monopoly over employment? Why should not every union, now that its existence is fully protected by law, be required to maintain its membership on its merits as an organization?

Why should any union be permitted, by a closed shop contract, to exercise monopolistic control over the employment in any establishment when a mere majority of the employees are, by law, sufficient to win exclusive bargaining rights for that union?

To ask all these questions is to answer them.

Abolition of the closed-shop contract does not necessarily mean the end of the union shop. If all employees, attracted by the accomplishments, benefits, and opportunities of union membership, voluntarily join the union, a closed shop naturally follows.

But it is not one closed by contract. This latter is a vastly different status under which an employer is unable to employ the most competent person if he is not a union member, and, more importantly, no person may obtain employment unless he joins the union.

All the abuses of monopoly are inherent in a closed shop contract. It is violative of that individual freedom of action which every American citizen likes to think he possesses and which even the Wagner Act is supposed to guarantee. The protected right to join a union carries with it, by implication (and should carry with it by specific wording), the equal right and privilege to refrain from so doing without prejudice to employment opportunities. The closed shop contract makes this impossible.

Now that Congress has fully protected, by law, the existence of labor organizations, it is equally as obligated to protect the opportunity of every American citizen to be gainfully employed where and as his abilities qualify him for such employment.

This is fundamental. Yet the closed shop contract sharply curtails this opportunity for our citizens unless they will subject themselves to the monopoly over employment which government permits unions to impose. Discriminations against employees on account of race and color are fostered and protected under the closed shop contract. Prohibition, by law, of the closed shop contract would do more to establish free employment opportunities for all our citizens than all the FEPC bills and other devices so far proposed.

2. PROHIBITION, BY LAW, OF SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

This practice is so repugnant to fair play and is so universally criticized by press and public as to require no comment here. It penalizes innocent employers and workers and is another illustration of the extent to which labor leaders, insensitive of their responsibilities to the cause of labor, and to the public generally, will abuse a monopolistic control of the labor supply if permitted to do so. The secondary boycott can be, and has, in fact, been used to obstruct and to stop the free flow of commerce between the States.

3. A BROADER DEFINITION OF THE TERM "LABOR DISPUTE" IN THE NORRIS-LA GUARDIA ACT, SO AS NOT TO PREVENT THE USE OF INJUNCTIVE RELIEF IN ANY GIVEN SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH ARE NOT STRICTLY A PART OF ANY LABOR DISPUTE

This refers to instances of secondary boycott where employers and their services have been innocently victimized and persecuted because of labor disputes in which neither they nor their employees are directly involved.

There have been instances here, in the Kanawha Valley, in which organized labor has attempted, through its unions, to prevent goods and services from being handled by common and contract carriers to persons in business whose employees either were not organized at all or were not organized in a manner agreeable to the union attempting to impose such a penalty. This is an intolerable invasion of private rights and a bold subordination of the public interest. These injured in this manner are entitled to every possible form of relief under the law.

4. AMENDMENT OF THE WAGNER ACT SO AS TO DEFINE UNFAIR PRACTICES BY EMPLOYEES IN THE SAME MANNER AS THOSE BY EMPLOYERS ARE NOW DEFINED, AND TO IMPOSE UPON EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS LIABILITY FOR THEIR ACTS AND UPON THEIR CONTRACTS, IN THE SAME MANNER AND TO THE SAME DEGREE, IN EVERY RESPECT, THAT THE LAW NOW IMPOSES THESE RESPONSIBILITIES UPON AN EMPLOYER

The fairness of this advocacy need no argument to support it nor any citation of abuses over the past decade to prove its need. This statutory deficiency has been a primary source of injustice to employers throughout a decade of legislative and administrative unbalance in the governmental treatment of employer-employee relations.

5. PROHIBITION, BY LAW, OF THE ORGANIZATION OF SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES

It is the unanimous viewpoint of our board members that the attempt to organize supervisory employees, in the same manner and for the same purposes that other employees may be organized, violates a fundamental tenet of a successful business and industrial operation. Supervisory employees must, if they are to do their jobs efficiently and properly, be a part of management, and therefore cannot be a part of employees' organizations.

6. PROHIBITION, BY LAW, OF THE RIGHT TO STRIKE IN ALL EMPLOYMENT WHERE THE PUBLIC INTEREST IS OVERWHELMINGLY PARAMOUNT

This would include governmental and all those public utilities and services upon which the health and safety of the public depend.

7. PROHIBITION, BY LAW, OF INDUSTRY-WIDE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Wide variation in the cost of the same industrial and commercial processes over the national area, or even any substantial part of it, obviously causes an industry-wide labor contract, with its uniform wage scales and other terms affecting production costs, to penalize unfairly and severely many employers and the communities in which their industries are located.

Jefferson Day Address of Gov. Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of April 12, 1947, more than a thousand Democrats of the Tenth Congressional District of Missouri—southeast Missouri—met at Sikeston, Mo., to do honor to the founder of our party, Thomas Jefferson. The dinner was attended by many distinguished Democrats from out State, including practically all of our State officials. Gov. Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, was the guest speaker on this occasion and delivered a splendid address on the life and philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.

Under leave granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks a copy of the address delivered by Governor Kerr, which is as follows:

Good friends and fellow Democrats of the great State of Missouri, it is a pleasure to visit a State whose people have contributed so much to the development of their own area, and to the Nation.

I am happy to be in the State where my father was born and grew to manhood.

I am happy to be in the State that has produced so many distinguished men and women.

I am happy to be in the State that has given my country and the world our most distinguished leader, President Harry S. Truman.

I am proud to be with you on this Jefferson Day occasion. As we think of its significance we are reminded of the last words of the great John Adams when he said, "Jefferson still lives."

In these words Adams found comfort, and through them he expressed undying hope as his immortal spirit released itself from the exhausted physical body that could no longer continue the unequal struggle to contain that spirit.

Even as the words were spoken the physical Jefferson was dead, but the spiritual Jefferson was vitally and tremendously alive.

"Thomas Jefferson still lives" was spoken as a present fact. The words still live as a prophetic truth and a truthful prophecy.

There were many personalities in one in the tall master of Monticello, sage, philosopher, architect, inventor, scientist, and statesman. For each of these he is justly famous. But his inviolate claim to immortality and the affection of all mankind springs from the fact that he, more than any other, symbolized, vitalized, and declared the precept and spirit of equality, liberty, and justice.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In these vivid phrases are contained a glowing picture of all men's hopes: Before Jefferson was, while he lived, today, tomorrow, and for all time.

"All men are created equal."

As much as Jefferson loved Virginia, and no man ever held a greater love for the soil from which he grew, he did not limit this concept to Virginians.

As much as he loved his own race, these words were not spoken of it nor of any limited portion of humanity. They were spoken of all men.

To better understand the impact of these words we must remember that when they were spoken by Jefferson there was not a nation of free people on the earth. He was then a British subject without full rights either of individual citizenship, or representation in the Government that exercised dominion over his person and his property.

Without being completely free himself, he was owner and master of others who were his slaves and he did not even have the power to give them that portion of freedom which he enjoyed.

He knew that human happiness and human freedom could not exist until humanity recognized and honored the eternal principle that "all men are created equal."

And yet, his declaration was so revolutionary that it was nearly 87 years afterward before Lincoln issued the proclamation emancipating native-born Americans from the bondage of slavery.

His declaration was so revolutionary that today, 171 years later, it is still in advance of the basic laws of any nation on the earth, including our own.

It is so revolutionary that at this good hour it is nearly as much a declaration of our

purposes yet to be achieved as a history of our accomplishments or a description of our status.

Thomas Jefferson still lives.

He developed a crusade for democracy into a reality of human rights. He caused human rights to ripen into human privileges.

We recognize that the struggle for equality among men started in the earliest dawn of the history of the human race, but we realize that it was the brilliant flashing mind, the burning words, and the flaming personality of Jefferson that gave the struggle its greatest impetus, and that is today its greatest inspiration.

He was inspired by a vision which he used as a light for the people's feet and a guide for their progress.

Nature knows no other force as powerful as the undying hope in the human heart for equality of opportunity and privilege.

By what he said and did Thomas Jefferson gave that hope the greatest encouragement it had ever known.

He feared and fought the centralization of power over human beings, whether that power emanated from government, wealth, or monopoly. He knew the danger was caused by the "power," regardless of the source from which it sprung, or the agency that wielded it.

He knew that citizens and wealth alike must be protected against excessive restriction by, and encroachment from, government. He was just as certain that government must be protected against the encroachment and power of wealth or of the citizen or group of citizens who possess it.

He declared the necessity of security for many freedoms—"freedom of religion, freedom of press, freedom from monopoly, freedom from unlawful imprisonment, and freedom from a permanent military."

He knew that monopoly is just as deadly an enemy of the people as tyranny, and that economic bondage is as intolerable as physical slavery.

He knew there could be no liberty without equality, nor equality without liberty, nor abiding peace without either.

But the United States of America is what it is because of the truth of his declaration and the declaration is truly proven by what America is.

We are of all nations, races, and creeds. We have been the melting pot of the world. It is here that the east and west have met. Here are the peasants from the Balkans; the happy, singing people of Bavaria; the dark-eyed Latins from Italy and Spain and southern France; the clear blue-eyed Anglo-Saxons; the rosy-cheeked and smiling-eyed people from Erin; the highlanders and the lowlanders from the hills and dales of Scotland; the tall Scandinavian; the powerful Cossack from the Steppes of Russia. They have come from around the world; from our neighboring lands across the Rio Grande and below the Isthmus; the black man from the Congo and the Sudan; the meditative and thoughtful orientals; the stalwart men from the north. The red man was here for thousands of years before Leif Ericson came, and is still a component part of our people. And all of us are a part of each other, and each of us is a part of the strongest, and certainly to us, the most blessed nation on the earth.

Each citizen has his own hopes, aims, ideals, and ambitions. Each has his individual personality, liberty, and freedom. But the greatest privilege and the greatest security of each is in the collective strength and power of all.

As I think of the United States, I am reminded of your great mountain forests. Many kinds and sizes of trees are there. Each has its own individual body and in the forest stands apart from all others. But deep-bedded in the soil the roots of all are mingled together, at the same time drawing sustenance from the earth and from the cohesive elements which hold them together, while above all, the boughs and leaves are mingled in a symphony of shades and colors, partaking of, sustained by, and reflecting the elements and the glory of the sun.

Americans—all Americans—strengthened individually in the rich soil of equality, and the sunshine of liberty and freedom, have united their vigor and power into one mighty continuing thunderbolt of strength for the security and safety of all.

We have not achieved perfection—far from it—but we have come a long way. The progress we have made is a warm and shining light in a world of cold shadows and fearsome darkness.

In the years past we have seen the Republican Party earn the right to be known as the Do-Nothing Party. They did nothing in the late twenties to stop the wild speculation that increased and expanded until it exploded into the economic collapse of 1929.

They did nothing about poverty and depression that followed inevitably in the wake of that explosion.

They did nothing in the danger-ridden days before Pearl Harbor to prepare our Nation against war.

They did nothing after the war to prevent inflation or hold in check the rising tide of excess cost of living to the average man and woman.

They did nothing to help make it possible to secure adequate housing by our veterans and for the rank and file of our people.

In the general campaign last year the Republican leaders made so many promises to provide so many benefits at so little cost to so many people that the voters elected a Republican majority in both Houses of the National Congress.

They have now been in session nearly 3½ months. Where is their performance?

Now, I would not say that they have done entirely nothing—that would be unfair. They had not been in session more than 2½ months until they had driven through both Houses and sent to the President a bill to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam.

In the general election last fall the Republican leaders and a coalition of special interests convinced enough people that price control should have been abandoned sooner, to make the difference between a Republican and a Democratic victory in the November election.

They told the people that the elimination of price controls, after a short period for adjustment, would bring about prices below OPA levels. Republican leaders and manufacturers told the people that controls reduced production and created shortages. "Get rid of these restrictions," they said, "and rising production would soon bring prices down to a reasonable level."

"Give us a free market," they shouted, "and increased production and competition will check all rising price spirals."

The cold record of events from that time until now has proven conclusively that these Republican leaders either did not know anything about what they were saying or did not care, or worse.

The cost of living has steadily mounted for the past 10 months. Today, the general prive level stands at the highest peak we have ever known. Of course, the Republican Congress, now in session nearly 3½ months, is just as aware of these facts as you and I, but they have done nothing to correct them.

I know the American housewife—all of them—are thrilled and encouraged and comforted by the fact that the Republican Congress has changed the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam, but I doubt if this knowledge can offset the 50-percent increase in the family budget for food.

I am sure that the GI's and their families, who cannot find a place to live at any price, are deeply gratified that the Republican Congress has changed the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam.

But I sincerely doubt if those who voted for Republican Congressmen and Senators last November will soon, if ever, repeat their blunder.

The Republicans have been weighed on the scales and have been found wanting. Their old men live in the shadows of the past; their young men live in the shadows of their old men. They spend too little time thinking of the victory they won last November and its resulting responsibilities. They spend too much time thinking of the victory they hope to win a year from next November.

I say the people have given too much responsibility to men of too little realization of what their obligations are. They remind me of the story of the all-woman jury I once heard. For the first time in the history of a Federal court in a western State, an all-woman jury had been selected. They listened attentively to the trial of the case, the instructions from the judge, and the argument of counsel. They retired to consider their verdict.

As evening came on, they were called before the judge, who inquired if a verdict had been found. When they answered "No," he excused them until the following morning. At that time they returned and remained in the jury room throughout the day. Again that evening they reported: "No verdict." Again they were excused and returned the following morning. Late in the afternoon of the third day the judge called them in. "Have you reached a verdict?" he asked. "No," they replied. "Did you understand the evidence?" he asked. "Oh, yes. Quite well," they said. "Were my instructions clear?" he asked. "Yes. They were quite complete and simple," they told him. "It is not too complicated a case," the judge remarked. "When do you suppose you can bring in a verdict?" The women looked at each other. Finally, one turned to the judge and said: "Your Honor, we have not yet had time to consider the verdict." The judge, quite surprised but still courtcous, asked: "Would you mind telling me what you have been doing?" "Oh, yes. I will be glad to," the lady replied. "You see, we have been trying to elect a foreman."

There are so many candidates for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1948 that they will have to call their national convention at least a week ahead of the regular time in order to eliminate enough of the Presidential candidates to where there won't be more than one to each of the 48 States.

If they only knew how little difference it makes who their nominee is, they might not call it, for you and I know that the next President of the United States will be none other than Missouri's most distinguished son, Harry S. Truman.

Many Republican leaders do not know how much ground they have lost since last November, but some of them do. A few weeks ago the Republican national chairman, Carroll Reece, attempted to eliminate any thinking or planning by the rank and file of his party's membership in Congress by declaring: "Team play is the first essential of success."

Republican Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, lashed back at him by declaring: "It is Reece's fallacious contention that unless a Republican Member of Congress follows the Republican leadership he does not engage in team play. A more brazen demand for reactionary control of the Republican Party has not been suggested by a Republican spokesman for many years."

MORSE declared that "the group of Republicans for whom Carroll Reece serves as chore boy do not represent the views of rank-and-file Republicans."

"It is Reece and the machine politicians for whom he speaks," MORSE continued, "who would have us vote a tax program that would

sell the national defense program short, that would sell the value of the American dollar short, that would sell our international obligations short, and that would sell a sound Republican program short."

Reece and the party machine, MORSE added, would "take us back to the depression-causing policies of the Republican Party of the 1920's."

About a month ago Senator HARLAND J. BUSHFIELD, Republican, of South Dakota, frankly admitted: "We (the Republicans in Congress) have failed in everything which we promised the voters." Maybe Senator BUSHFIELD did not know that his Republican colleagues in the Congress had finally succeeded in driving through legislation to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam.

The day has passed when the voters of the most powerful, the largest, and the greatest Nation on the earth can safely trust the future destiny of that Nation to a political leadership or party whose only record and only program is "do nothing."

The time has passed when the voters of this Republic can entrust its future to men who either fail or refuse to do anything other than play partisan politics with the fundamental girders upon which the security, the prosperity, and safety and future of the Nation rests.

I think the facts clearly demonstrate that the Republican leadership is playing partisan politics with reference to the control of atomic energy. I think their action clearly demonstrates that they would jeopardize the peace of the world and the very existence of this Nation by either permitting the control of atomic energy to become vested in the hands of a few private citizens, or that they could actually place it there.

Atomic energy, if properly handled, will lead the world into its greatest era of peace and progress. If unintelligently handled, or mishandled, it could lead to the destruction of the world.

The Republican leadership has played partisan politics with the Nation's security. They actually sought to reduce appropriations to the armed forces to a point that would have crippled the Nation's military power at a time when this Nation, and this Nation alone, can maintain its own security and lead the free people of the world into a lasting and abiding peace.

Their No. 1 bill (H. R. 1) seeks to bring about a reduction of taxes on the basis of 20 percent across the board. This would mean that tax relief would be given to the smaller taxpayer in the terms of pennies, while many who have the largest incomes would be given relief in the terms of tens of thousands of dollars.

American business last year, after all taxes were paid, earned more than two and one-half times as much net profit as in any other peacetime year in our history. Their net earnings thus far this year are at a still higher level.

The great national debt we owe was in the main incurred to pay the cost of winning the most terrible of all wars. The time to reduce our debt is when we are prosperous—and certainly, we have never been more prosperous than we are today. Yet Republican leaders in the national Congress would reduce taxes instead of reducing the national debt.

The Democratic Party, however, cannot go forward on the basis of the failures of the Republican Party. We must go forward on the basis of our record, and the program we have for the people. We are proud, and we are grateful for the record we have made.

We have been the party of progress.

We have been the party of production.

We have been the party of preparedness.

We have been the party of prosperity.

We have been the party of peace.

We must be all of these to and for all of the people of this Nation—today and tomorrow.

We are in the most important era our Nation has ever known. We stand at the crossroads of destiny—our own destiny with reference to progress, preparedness, production, prosperity, and peace. The people want to plan and build as individuals and as a Nation. They want political leadership that is dedicated to planning and to building.

The Democratic Party offers such leadership. We have never been satisfied either by re-telling what has been done or agreeing merely to hold what has been gained.

What the people want and what we must provide are daring architects for the future. They want a program that will make tomorrow better than today—that represents the vision of those who believe in going forward. They want a plan conceived in courage and dedicated to progress.

Therein is our best opportunity and our greatest challenge. We must have the vision and the daring and the courage of youth with the wisdom that comes from long and successful experience, and with all of the strength arising from the concept of going forward to the uttermost reaches of human capacity.

I know we have served the welfare of the Nation. I know that we have made strong the foundation and the girders of the only nation that today can lead us and the world into a lasting peace.

I am not a pessimist as to the future. I cannot agree with those who say that civilization is having its last chance, because I have too much faith in the Providence, in the God who made us, and I have too much faith in the integrity, the aggressiveness, and courage of 140,000,000 people to believe that we are on the threshold of civilization's last opportunity.

But I do know this—that we face what could be the gravest dangers our Nation has ever known.

And I believe that the Democratic Party of this Nation, under the leadership of one of the most courageous and enlightened men we have ever had in the White House, Harry S. Truman, has the responsibility of fighting the good fight, the valiant fight, for the future security of this Nation and the peace of the world.

One time the Master, with His disciples, had fed and talked to the multitude throughout the day, and as the evening came on the multitude left and only He and the disciples remained. He turned to them and said: "Will ye not also go away?" And old Peter, the impetuous, said: "Master, if we leave Thee, to whom shall we go?"

I say to you: If America cannot provide leadership in this day and hour, in this crucial time in the history of the world; I say and ask you, if the free peoples of this world wishing to improve their individual position, their opportunities, and their security cannot look to the United States of America for leadership to build and keep an era of peace, "to whom shall they go?"

And if the rank and file of Americans cannot look to the Democratic Party in this Nation for that leadership, to whom shall they go?

We have the opportunity to do anything that we dare to do. We have the privilege of accomplishing what we are willing to plan and dedicate ourselves in service to achieve. We have the inherent wisdom in the rank and file in this party to know the truth with reference to our position in the hearts and minds of the American people. We have the courage to meet the challenge of that knowledge.

We know that our cause is just. We know that our purpose is right. We know the cold test of time has proven in performance the purposes and the achievements of this party.

Therefore it is up to us, united with intelligence, with daring, with wisdom, with vision and unfaltering courage to give the people a program of greater progress and continued prosperity and peace. A program that will maintain the security of the individual citizen in the ranks of the people, and our Nation in the ranks of the nations of the earth.

And you, the fine Democrats of Missouri, with all the others throughout the land, can breathe the breath of progress and breathe the breath of strength and daring and courage into an ever stronger Democratic Party.

Give us your vision. Give us your dedication to the accomplishment of the purposes of this great party, and you will have fulfilled the destiny of free men and women.

I congratulate you upon the work you have done and upon your determination to see to it that the people of America may have tomorrow as they had yesterday, the benefit of the leadership—the benefit of the help—the benefit of the program of the party of Jefferson, the party of Jackson, the party of Wilson, the party of Roosevelt, and the party of Truman.

Pending Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Hon. EDWARD MARTIN, United States Senator from Pennsylvania, to a delegation of 100 representatives of Pennsylvania CIO unions in the Senate reception room, Thursday, April 17, 1947. The meeting was at the request of the CIO group to present their views on pending labor legislation and to seek Senator MARTIN'S support:

I appreciate very much this opportunity to meet with you representatives of the CIO. This meeting is so important that I have written out what I want to say.

I cannot tell you in detail how I shall vote on the various provisions of the new labor bills, but I do want you to know where I stand on certain principles because my vote in the Senate will be guided by those principles.

First, these are the things I am for:

Your right to organize.

Your right to bargain collectively.

Your right to strike—because a strike is free speech in action—unless the greater right, the health and safety of the people, is endangered.

While, as I have said, I recognize labor's right to strike to obtain relief from grievances, I am opposed to jurisdictional strikes, to sit-down strikes, and secondary boycotts.

I maintain that the obligation to live up to their contracts should rest equally upon labor organizations as it does upon management.

I believe the American workingman should be protected in his right to work freely at the job of his choice.

I believe the union member should have the right of secret ballot, without coercion from any source, when voting in elections or to decide other matters affecting his welfare.

I believe that the success of our whole national economy is dependent upon the friendly cooperation of labor, management, and agriculture. Government must be the impartial friend of each group. It must not favor one above the other. It must not favor one faction of labor, management, or agriculture above the others. If the pendulum swings too far to one side—then the Government must do as it has done many times in the past—step in to restore the balance.

The argument of the CIO to Congress appears to be: Let the Government keep out. We are satisfied with things as they are. That is because you have special advantages today.

When big business monopolies threatened to push little business into oblivion and disregarded the interest of the public, Congress passed antitrust legislation. Labor cheered for that. It wanted Congress to get into it. When management grabbed every advantage and pushed labor around, Congress stepped in with laws to protect the workingman. Labor had no objection to the Government's intervention at that time. You will remember how labor descended upon Washington to demand votes for those bills just as, today, it comes to Washington in droves to demand votes against any change in the existing law. But today the pendulum has swung too far in the other direction. Some union leaders are pushing the individual workers around, taking advantage of every quirk and twist in the laws that Congress passed to help workers. Some unions are backing business into a corner and jeopardizing its very existence. Congress certainly never intended that.

As CIO representatives you have talked to me frankly and I am talking just as frankly to you.

The Republican candidates last November were elected by overwhelming majorities. In a heavily industrialized State like Pennsylvania, Republican candidates could not have received those great majorities without the vote of hundreds of thousands of our fine workers in organized labor. This was an indication that the rank and file of labor wanted an end to industrial strife and expects this Congress to enact fair and just laws which will bring this about.

I have always opposed racketeers, whether they be in labor organizations, business or in government. In the 1946 campaign, one of the main issues was racketeering and communism in labor—yes, and I mean the Political Action Committee of the CIO. I want to repeat here to you what I said all over Pennsylvania during the campaign: "Get rid of your Communists and your racketeers. If you don't the Government is going to do it for you."

Just how strong the new labor laws will finally be depends upon how well labor cleans up its own houses. The CIO has not made too much progress to date. Some moves by your leaders toward sweeping out the reds and the racketeers have been almost entirely a gesture—nothing more.

Finally, I believe that there is no more important domestic issue today than the maintenance of industrial peace. I hope that more leaders of labor and business will learn to preach the doctrine of fair play and goodwill instead of hate and distrust. Organized labor, as a whole, has shown little disposition to meet these issues with fairness and in a spirit of cooperation. But you're not alone in that. Neither has management. On both sides there has been selfishness and ruthless disregard for the common good—the good of that great third party to every dispute—the general public. Each side has wanted everything for itself and nothing for the other fellow.

Since you have failed to get together under existing laws, resulting in great loss to all concerned, I believe it is the responsibility of Government, as the impartial friend of labor and management, to step in and referee this thing for the good of all of the people.

I want it understood that I am going to vote for new labor legislation. I will not support legislation intended to punish labor—that is not justice. I want laws which will correct the glaring bad spots that have developed under the National Labor Relations Act. I will vote for legislation which I believe will correct these and other abuses and will move the pendulum back toward dead center where the rights of all are protected and industrial peace maintained.

Aid to Our Senior Citizens Is a Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the American people are known throughout the world for their generosity and their willingness to lend a helping hand to the unfortunate and needy in every foreign land. Funds were appropriated to answer the distress calls from war-torn Europe and Asia. Supplies poured from America to bring food and clothing to sufferers abroad. But here in America we are not always so ready to come to the aid of our own who are deserving and in need.

In the United States we have failed to provide adequate measure of security for our senior citizens, in spite of the efforts of many Members of Congress and the introduction of bills which would grant a modest pension to these men and women who have contributed years of valuable service to the communities in which they live and to the Nation, and who have now reached an age when they can no longer find employment and are unable to earn the money necessary to supply food, shelter, and clothing.

It is the first duty of the Government to alleviate the suffering of its own citizens. Many of our senior citizens do not want charity, but they were not covered by the benefits of the Social Security Act during their productive years, and were unable to lay aside a sufficient sum to care for themselves in their declining years. Many who are faced with the choice of begging for help from relatives already overburdened in this day of high living costs and high taxes or with the humiliating search for charity prefer to face slow starvation from undernourishment and live in substandard rooming houses until failing health brings their pitiable condition to the attention of the local civil authorities.

Why do we tolerate this situation in the United States? Why have we not acted to provide uniform protection for our senior citizens? Some of the States have recognized the need of these people and have provided some old-age benefits, but for the most part these are inadequate in the face of the high cost of living.

Our senior citizens have earned the right to retire from their labor and to be assured of an income adequate to supply their modest needs. Such a pension would not be a gift of charity, but a retirement pay awarded by the Nation to senior citizens who have produced for the Nation and have contributed taxes for the maintenance of the Government over a long period of years.

H. R. 16 has been introduced in this Congress. I believe this bill presents a reasonable and practical plan to provide an annuity for our senior citizens. I am a member of the Steering Committee for H. R. 16, and I urge every Member of the House to study its provisions.

This bill will guarantee security to every American citizen when he reaches the age of 60, and I believe H. R. 16 should be brought before the House and passed during this session of Congress.

San Francisco Chamber Opposes Cut in Army-Navy Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce has adopted a resolution strongly protesting against any reduction in the present budget for military and naval expenditures. The following is the letter which I have received from the president of the organization:

SAN FRANCISCO JUNIOR
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
San Francisco, Calif., April 8, 1947.

The Honorable FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HAVENNER: The Military and Naval Affairs Committee and the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce in regular session Wednesday, April 2, 1947, went on record as opposing any proposed congressional action which will reduce the President's budget as related to military and naval expenditures during the coming fiscal year.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. KING,
President.

Dr. Francis E. Townsend on Free Enterprise Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, a number of the Members of the House, including myself, have for many years supported the legislation sponsored by Dr. Francis E. Townsend and his organization, commonly referred to as the Townsend plan. I feel it was the purpose of my colleagues, and am sure it was my purpose, in supporting such legislation, to work for adequate, uniform old-age pensions. During the recent years, however, I have been more and more distressed by the inclusion of additional features in this so-called Townsend plan legislation. I

have also noted, and with considerable misgiving, that the Townsend National Weekly, a newspaper published by Dr. Francis E. Townsend, has changed from what I had considered an advocate of national old-age pensions, until now it seems to be, generally, as indicated on its masthead, America's leading liberal newspaper. Whether it is a leading newspaper is, I should say, questionable. That it is liberal, in the sense of being radical or left wing, is beyond question.

In the issue dated February 15, 1947, of this so-called leading liberal newspaper, and on pages 6 and 7, there is an editorial entitled "Free Enterprise versus Communism" by Dr. Francis E. Townsend. This editorial speaks perhaps more clearly than anything that I can say the real purposes or views of its author on this subject. Without taking the time and space to quote the entire editorial, I believe the following direct quotes will tell the full story. I feel they will be of considerable interest to my colleagues who have worked with me during the years in behalf of Townsend plan legislation. They will also be of special interest to all true Americans who have followed Dr. Townsend, thinking that they were supporting national uniform pensions. Excerpts from the editorial, which are direct quotes, follow:

ABOUT COMMUNISM

There is this to be said for a communistic system, a dictatorial system under a benevolent and all wise manager would probably be the most nearly efficient of any conceivable system. A ruler who loved humanity and who determined to do everything possible for the betterment and advancement of his people could, without doubt, do more for a people than they could ever do for themselves. Too many people under any governmental system are too much like "dumb, driven cattle" to know what is best for them.

ABOUT FREE ENTERPRISE

The free enterprise system as it exists today cannot last, for it is rapidly strangling itself to death for want of a market; so there is little use of our advocating its spread to the rest of the world. Free enterprise means freedom to exploit—freedom to rob legally. It is as un-American as anything that ever came out of Europe; and far indeed from the conception of a government as envisioned by those who gave us our Constitution. Can free enterprise be made to work? No. The enterprise of exploitation must be restricted and restriction is the very antithesis of freedom. Free enterprise must be replaced by a system of cooperation in which all will benefit as possible and avoid a total collapse of inproportionately from the activities of all. * * * The profit system as we have known it is near its end. Profit, in the near future, will mean profit for all, not aggrandizement of the few at the expense of the many.

Then let us make the transition as quickly dustry and a condition of chaos. The first step? National insurance for all citizens, à la the Townsend plan.

So, Dr. Townsend would have us make the transition as quickly as possible. From what, and to what, would this change be made? Obviously from our present form of government to the benevolent dictatorship which he states would be very efficient, and able to do so much more for the people than they can possibly do for themselves. Does the doctor not know that the benevolent dictatorship is merely a short stop on the road to absolutism, to tyranny? We are to believe that the good people in the Townsend Clubs of America agree with the doctor? I do not believe they do. Are those of my colleagues who have worked for old-age pensions à la the Townsend plan aware that now we are committed to be working instead for national insurance for all, as the medium by which this transition from the republic to dictatorship is to be accomplished? The purpose of this message, Mr. Speaker, is to assure the Congress, and the people of America, that I, for one, am not in sympathy with this proposition.

I still maintain that our form of government has proven itself by and large to be the best ever achieved by the mind of man. I submit that there is none on the earth, in my opinion, that will equal it. I am proud to defend and support it against any enemy without or within the country, and I find it difficult to express my contempt for any citizen who would even propose that we surrender it for any other form. I trust that there are many who share my views, and I pray God that there are few who disagree.

The British Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, Great Britain's Labor government has discovered that there is no escape from or substitute for sound fiscal policy. Despite any commitments which it may have made to the people of Great Britain, it has discovered that economy is spelled the same in any language and that sound fiscal policy is indispensable to survival.

It is of more than passing interest that this week the Labor government presented its budget for the fiscal year 1948 to the House of Commons. It is an expenditure budget and obviously relates only to Britain's sterling position and not directly to her problem of shortage of exchange.

Based on reports by Reuters Agency, the budget calls for an expenditure of £3,181,000,000 and represents a cut of £729,000,000 below 1947, or an average reduction of 19 percent.

Oddly enough, the greatest reduction is found, not in civil functions but in the military budget. Britain's military needs have been reduced from £1,653,000,000 in 1947 to £899,000,000 in 1948. This is a reduction of £754,000,000, or about 46 percent.

It is expected that Britain's budget will not only be balanced in fiscal year 1948 but will, in fact, show a surplus of about $1,000,000,000.

If equivalent percentages were applied to the President's budget for fiscal 1948, it would show a reduction in excess of $10,000,000,000. Congress has by comparison, therefore, been quite conservative in its proposal to reduce expenditures below the President's 1948 budget.

Newly Found Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial which appeared in the Fort Wayne, Ind., News-Sentinel on Monday, April 14, 1947:

NEWLY FOUND COURAGE

The current flurry of activity which may culminate in the passage of restrictive labor legislation recalls that Congress has headed into such problems many times in the past, but never before with much success.

It has always steamed and sputtered when industrial disputes were threatened or continuing, always docile when the trouble subsided.

In June 1941, when the Nation was feverishly strengthening its military resources, a strike tied up a California aircraft factory. Thereupon the Senate voted for the Connally proposal to have the Government take over strike-bound defense plants, and by the overwhelming vote of 67 to 7. In the following months, when the legislation came before the House, there was no strike crisis; the House rejected the Connally proposal in two decisive votes, 220 to 149, and 255 to 114.

In October and November 1941, strikes shut down the captive coal mines. Thereupon the House passed, by the wide margin of 252 to 136, the drastic Smith antistrike bill. The measure not only required a 30-day postponement of projected strikes and a ballot vote on them, but also banned any change in open- or closed-shop status during the defense emergency, jurisdictional or sympathetic strikes, secondary boycotts, mass picketing, and criminals, Bundists, or Communists as union officials. Trade-unions were to register and disclose their finances and membership. When the bill came before the Senate, Japan had struck at Pearl Harbor and the administration was in the process of demanding a no-strike pledge from the unions. The Senate took no action on the Smith bill or any other antistrike measures.

Agitation for antistrike legislation died down during 1942, since very few serious strikes broke out. In the spring of 1943, however, three separate strikes were called in the coal fields, and John L. Lewis defied the War Labor Board. The Senate repassed the Connally bill by 63 to 16.

The House found the Senate's bill too mild, and proceeded to substitute, by a vote of 231 to 141, the Smith bill of 1941, with some of its more drastic provisions removed. The House added a ban on political contributions by trade unions to political parties. In the conference, more of the House bill's provisions were deleted, and the compromise Smith-Connally bill was passed by 219 to 129 in the House, and 55 to 22 in the Senate.

In the long run, it was a hodgepodge bill which proved to be almost wholly ineffective, as a great many close observers had predicted it would be.

After its passage, President Roosevelt vetoed it, claiming that he agreed with many of its provisions, but arguing that the 30-day strike notice and the strike balloting would encourage rather than discourage strikes. The bill was passed at once over his veto, receiving relatively more support from Republicans than Democrats.

The persistent timidity of the Congress where legislation to control the unions is concerned, has been a source of mystery. To some considerable extent, it has been due to

the loud-mouthed threats of the CIO-PAC, which claimed that it could deliver the labor vote in a bloc to defeat any Senator or Representative who even so much as dreamed of regulatory legislation. That myth has been repeatedly exploded—a fact which may now partially explain the Congress' new-found courage.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I am flying home to attend the funeral of my dearest and closest personal friend, I find that I will not be on the floor when H. R. 3020 comes before the House for general debate. The bonds of friendship that bind men together in life seem to tighten when death comes. To absent myself from his funeral would sever in death a friendship of many years' standing. I cannot bring myself to do that.

Although I will not be here when H. R. 3020 comes up for debate, I feel it my duty to record my views on that measure as it now stands. To that end I am having the following remarks placed in the RECORD:

Gentlemen, I do not like the bill in its present form. I do not subscribe to the view of Philip Murray, president of the CIO, that the bill is "the first step toward fascism in the United States." On the other hand, I do not regard the bill as it now stands as a forthright and enlightened expression of our faith in the American system of free enterprise.

In our search for means of correcting the malpractices and excesses which have come to light during the recent years of postwar readjustment, let us be careful that we do not reduce organized labor to a position of impotence. Many of us agree that the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, which sought to guarantee labor's right to bargain collectively, and other legislation of the thirties may be unduly favorable to labor. While some of us agree that the National Labor Relations Board created by that act to deal with unfair labor practices by employers has been unduly weighted in favor of labor, it does not follow that we have lost faith in collective bargaining nor that we have come to the conclusion that labor no longer needs protection from unfair labor practices. Neither does it follow that we want to see the powers and functions of the Board so overweighted in the name of reform as to throw the balance past center and into the hands of management or Government.

If, in the sound judgment of the legal talent of this Congress, the National Labor Relations Board as presently constituted lacks the judicial attributes essential to fair enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act, I want to be among the first to suggest that it be properly and reasonably reformed. Similarly, if the legal talent of this Congress sincerely believes that union members are not adequately provided with either the means or the form for securing redress for the violation of their rights by union leaders, I want to be the first to urge that that situation also be remedied. Some of us who have had no formal training in the law have serious doubts that the remedy lies in creating another administrative board to do essentially the same kind of a job under this new legislation as was performed by its predecessor under the National Labor Relations Act. As a matter of general principle, we feel that the functions of law enforcement and the adjudication of disputes should be relegated to duly constituted courts of law and not placed in special boards which can be made susceptible to the will of a strong executive or powerful forces of industry and labor. Our views in this respect are further influenced by our conviction that achievement of the American people's desire for good and efficient government lies not in the creation of more boards and offices but in the abolition of unnecessary functions and the efficient functioning of those that remain.

I am one of those who believe in the basic principles of the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932, which forbids antilabor injunctions by the courts in private industrial disputes, but I do feel that in application this act has been greatly abused and I agree that we must do something to avoid the effects of strikes which endanger the public health, welfare, and safety and the proper functioning of the institutions of government. There is considerable merit, therefore, in the proposal to authorize the President to seek, and the courts to issue, injunctions in such strikes. It is important, however, that this power be used sparingly and that it be predicated solely on the public interest.

I doubt the wisdom of compulsory arbitration since we have found through experience that because Government arbiters are either prolabor or promanagement, neither management nor labor have found this to be a satisfactory method of concluding their controversies. Furthermore, because it depends on Government intervention or control, there is always the danger that it might become political in nature. I feel, however, that we should have some type of new arbitration service of assured competence and impartiality to exert a continuing influence to persuade employers and employees to settle their differences by peaceful methods, through voluntary arbitration as a substitute for interruptions of work. I think we should go slowly in curtailing industry-wide collective bargaining. In our anxiety to strike at certain overbearing and dictatorial labor leaders, we should not cripple or possibly destroy one of the fundamental rights of labor which often benefits management more than it does labor. The following few lines, quoted from a letter I have just received from a friend in the general contracting business, point out this feature of the bill insofar as it bears on construction work:

"There is some talk of forbidding area and group labor contracts. This matter should be carefully considered insofar as it deals with construction work. As you know, our master labor agreement in southern California is between the six basic trades and the San Diego chapter and the southern California chapter of the AGC and the Building Contractors' Association and it covers all of southern California. If such an agreement is made illegal a chaotic condition would prevail. If each contractor has to come to terms with each individual union local (I deal with from 20 to 80 locals each year), we employers will have to accept whatever the unions offer us."

We should go very slowly and very cautiously in the matter of company unions. Labor organizations which are subservient to management and which are employer-dominated lose their effectiveness as unions. Collective bargaining between management and management-dominated unions would be a farce.

Bossism and the dictatorial control of unions by power-drunk individuals and by groups and factions which use labor organizations in furtherance of their personal ambitions for political and economic power must be brought to an end. So-called labor leaders with size 12 ambitions and a size 5 sense of public responsibility must be made to realize that labor unions are not instruments of personal ambition. Labor dictators and bosses, like their counterparts in other walks of life, must be brought to heel. They must be made truly accountable to the will of the membership of their unions and to the public interest. They must become the servants of the unions, not their masters.

To these ends I favor those parts of section 8 of the bill which propose to democratize union elections and administrative procedures by designating certain union practices as unfair. To my mind there can be no argument with the proposition that it is an unfair labor practice when union leadership prescribes unreasonable or discriminatory financial demands on the membership. Any organization, whether it be a labor union or a trade association, which denies its members the right to freely express their views, either within or without the organiaztion, on any subject matter without being subjected to disciplinary action and which conducts its affairs in a manner that is not in conformity with the free will of a majority of the members is undemocratic and un-American.

I have no dispute with the proposition that initiation fees, dues, and assessments should be reasonable and uniform and in accordance with the will of the membership. I agree that taxes or assessments should not be levied by unions on the right of a man to work or to conduct his business free from interference. I agree that members should have the right to resign their membership at will and that they should not be subject to suspension or expulsion without an opportunity to be heard. I agree that members should be free from reprisal for failure to support issues or candidates for office. I agree that there should be secret ballots and open counting of ballots on questions of union policy and union action and that unions should not spy on their membership, intimidate their families or injure the person or property of members of their families. I agree that unions should report to the membership on the financial affairs of the union.

I am opposed, however, to section 8 (c) (3), which makes it an unfair labor practice for unions to require their membership to contribute to, or to participate in, union insurance and benefit plans. I also feel that it is not an unfair labor practice to require union members who have been ousted from their unions for cause to give up the jobs which they procured as union members.

The compulsory check-off system is of long standing and in my opinion is a proper subject of labor-management contract. The inclusion of the compulsory check-off in the list of unfair labor practices set out in this so-called labor reform measure is not based on legitimate complaint or on evidence of widespread abuse. In this respect it stands out as evidence of a desire to inconvenience unions and lay obstacles in the way of union existence.

I am of the opinion that if there are shortcomings in our present system which permit either unions or management to escape liability for violation of collective-bargaining contracts, remedial action should be taken without delay. I have no sympathy with mass picketing and slow-down and sit-down strike techniques. I am opposed to featherbedding practices. I would like to see an end of sympathy strikes and jurisdictional strikes. It would have been to the eternal credit of labor if the unions themselves could have abandoned these practices, but since they have not done so I feel that the time for legislative action is here.

I feel that breaches of the peace and strike violence in general should be handled by local authorities in local courts under local laws and ordinances. If these have failed and

local authorities can no longer maintain law and order on the local scene, we have indeed fallen i- to unhappy times.

Reasonable modification of the closed shop principle may be in order but it should not take the form of an absolute ban of the closed shop. Modification of the principle should not be of such nature nor of such severity as to reduce unions to impotence as instruments for collective bargaining. It is not consistent with a real desire to modify the principle of the closed shop to deprive unions of the power to discipline their members for cause or to deny them effective means for eliminating disloyal and anti-union elements from their membership. I believe that the union shop might be acceptable as a worthy substitute to the closed shop.

My position as an opponent to communism is consistent and of long standing. Communism should be exposed and uprooted from our society. We should seek it out with equal vigor no matter whether it be found among government employees, in labor unions, in trade associations, or in front organizations of intellectuals and professional people. I consider it folly, however, to hope to legislate it out of existence. If it exists in American labor unions to the extent that the exponents of this measure would have us believe, I suggest we have an honest-to-goodness investigation by which we may seek out and eliminate from our society those who seek its destruction. I do not think it proper that this body, by legislative enactment, point an accusing finger at labor unions or any other organization of Americans unless it has before it absolute and conclusive evidence based on first-hand information. If such information is at hand, it should be made available without delay to the leadership of such organizations and to proper police authorities for appropriate action under existing law.

I do not consider my election to this body as a mandate from the people of my district for the repeal of the great social and economic reforms which we have achieved. I feel that my constituents wanted an end of emergencies in government and a return to normalcy. I feel that they had lost patience with government controls and regulations and that they were anxious to do for themselves in an atmosphere of freedom. I feel that above all the people of my district who elected me to this body were utterly and completely fed up with industrial chaos, high taxes, deficit financing and extravagant government spending. They did not send me here to emasculate the social legislation which has given our people a degree of social and economic security totally unknown to man in all the ages of his existence.

In conclusion, I wish to state for the record that I doubt the wisdom of any measure which seeks to accomplish widespread reforms in our social, political, and economic systems by the "omnibus" technique. Invariably there are some sections of such bills worthy of treatment as separate bills. As a rule, there are other sections which are of doubtful merit and which should not ride through as parasites clinging to worthier legislation. Admittedly the bill has some good features which we might well enact into law. Those features I support. The bill also contains some features which are stringent and unduly repressive on labor and therefore contrary to the national interest. Those features I must oppose. Since I cannot both favor and oppose the same bill at the same time, there is no choice left to me—I must come out against the bill in its present form. But I should like to emphasize what we want, what we need, what we must strive to effect is a good labor bill—a bill that is predisposed neither to labor nor management—a bill that the President cannot afford to veto—or should he choose to do so—a bill that will be passed over his veto. The present bill could never be passed since we could not secure from the Senate necessary votes to override a Presidential veto. The welfare of the country is paramount to any political maneuvering over the labor-management bill. The public is not interested in political football, but in obtaining the passage of a bill that will remedy existing defects in labor-management relations. After all, as long as the vast majority of people are in favor of certain changes in our labor laws, let's proceed to accomplish those rather than take the chance of getting no bill at all and thereby allowing existing evils to continue.

I feel confident, however, that the labor bill which will come out of conference between the House and Senate will have remedied most of the evils of the present bill and will be one which we can all support.

Creating a Department of Peace Within the Framework of the National Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following essay by Kenneth R. Kurtz, of the Weston (W. Va.) High School. The title of this essay is "Creating a Department of Peace Within the Framework of the National Government":

Peace is an elusive word. Generations upon generations have sought in vain to define this word; generations upon generations have tried in vain to secure the blessings of permanent peace. We of the present generation will also have a chance to secure a universal and workable peace among all nations.

It is up to the United States, as one of the great states of the world, to do everything possible to secure peace. We Americans must be in the forefront of the universal peace movements, and indeed many of us are. As Oswaldo Aranha, the former Foreign Minister of Brazil, said of this country recently, "The people who disintegrated the atom have now the mission of integrating humanity."

Let us then, with every weapon at our disposal, begin the crusade to bring downtrodden and oppressed people everywhere the sweet and noble blessings of world-wide peace.

In each generation of our great land, ideas have been pushed forth along the line of universal peace. William Ladd, of New Hampshire, in 1828 was perhaps one of the first in this land to advocate a world security organization. He founded the American Peace Society, anticipating by nearly 100 years Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations. Mr. Ladd urged then the formation of a congress of the nations and a world court. Each following generation has pushed this great ideal further. In 1918 and after, the idea of the League of Nations was pondered in men's minds. To my mind, the League failed because we Americans did not support and encourage it. In 1945, the United Nations actually came into being. America and Americans have so far seen fit to heartily support this organization. Let us pray that they will continue to do so.

Perhaps, however, the United Nations plan fails in one respect. The actual contact with this agency is only through diplomats and Government officials. But peace is the problem of every man, woman, and child on this entire globe, not alone those high in official circles. Therefore, what is now needed is some organization or agency that will bring the problems of peace into every American household and eventually, we hope, into every family in every land.

Mr. R. M. Davis' suggested Department of Peace seems to be one of the best methods of accomplishing this aim. As I understand it, this department, to be formed within the framework of our National Government and to be headed by a secretary of Cabinet rank, would have a threefold purpose. A, to formulate and publicize educational programs to promote better understanding between nations; B, to encourage interchange of ideas and persons between the United States and other lands; and C, to assist educational, civic, and religious organizations in formulating programs dealing with international relations, international cooperation, and the problems of peace.

The world is now at peace—at least we are laboring under that delusion. But there will never be any peace as long as peons in Mexico are paid subexistence wages or editors are executed in Poland for printing a denunciation of a government in which they do not believe. True, we have just won a gigantic struggle, but we have failed in the respect that there are countless problems all over the globe that we have not solved and which threaten the security of each and every one of us. As Norman Corwin has stated: "Peace has a mind of its own, and doesn't follow victory around."

We must therefore earnestly and wholeheartedly support some practical means of aiding the dove of peace in building her nest in war-torn and war-weary continents. Mr. Davis' practical proposal offers an excellent way of doing this. We must find some way of preserving peace. The alternative is total destruction.

This is by far the most important, the most gigantic, and the most back-breaking task that humanity has ever attempted to undertake. Again quoting Mr. Corwin: "To win is great; to learn from winning, greater; but to put the lessons learned from winning hard to work, that is the neatest trick of all."

The Department of Peace, as one of the executive departments of our Government, could be of inestimable value in furthering the cause of peace. Education, I insist, is the noblest and greatest force in the universe. This department's main duty would be the education of citizens to the blessings of peace, the prosperity of peace, the absolute necessity of peace.

"In vain we build the world, unless the builder grows," states Edwin Markham. It is high time the builder grew in stature and wisdom. Through the peace department our people would be educated for peace; they would see that the only salvation of humanity is to learn to live at peace.

Another activity of this agency would be the encouragement of interchanging ideas and individuals between this and other nations. Thus, the best ideas of one nation would be known to other nations. They could then adapt ideas to suit their own, individual needs. With all nations desperately trying to secure peace, some excellent suggestions are bound to come forward. Therefore, it is essential that some agency be set up to see that all good and workable suggestions are passed along to nations who can use them.

Thus, scientific, educational, and many other achievements would not be selfishly kept by one nation for its own advancement but would be available to all for the advancement of mankind.

But ideas are not the only commodity that this department would help interchange between nations. Individuals, too, would be interchanged—not only as gestures of good will, but for very practical reasons. For example, a nation which has a specialist in a certain disease could be sent to aid another country that is threatened by such a plague. Not only is good will increased between the two governments then, but a practical service has been rendered.

Not alone, however, should scientific and educational leaders be interchanged but common people, workers seeking advanced technical training which is best secured in another land, housewives, farmers, school children, and the like should also be interchanged. It has been aptly put: "Nations do not fight other nations they know well." Let the housewife of Duluth meet the mother of Paris, let the farmer of Melbourne know the mechanic of Warsaw, introduce the doctor of Hong Kong to the lawyer of Cairo—and international relations between their respective lands will be immeasurably improved. This would b a very worth-while service which the Department of Peace could support.

As this agency will come in direct contact with the public in fulfilling its third principal duty, the general public will begin to think and act for peace. If this department really helps civic clubs, educational organizations, and religious agencies in formulating peace programs and discussions on international problems vital to all, the Man in the Street will soon become acutely aware of the pressing problems of peace.

Long ago Virgil said, "The noblest motive is the public good." In fulfilling this third part of the Peace Department's platform the weight of public opinion could be brought to bear on vital issues of peace and the public interest would be aroused. Thus, the public good, which includes many items, would become the driving motive of Mr. Davis' planned department.

With the fulfillment of the three duties of the Department of Peace the following will have been accomplished:

A. The problems of peace will no longer be considered merely as concerning high government officials but the common man will think of these problems as vitally concerning him, as indeed they do.

B. The leaders of various fields will meet their counterparts in other lands and exchange their views and opinions, thus helping to form the basis for the settlement of vexing problems.

C. Figures and statistics would be made available to all to aid in the program of peace.

D. Educational programs for peace would be drawn up and available to all needing them;

E. Experts in various fields could be interchanged with nations needing technical assistance;

F. Support and belief in the United Nations would be increased among peoples in all walks of life;

G. The department could aid the United Nations in the setting up of international conferences and, if every nation sets up such a department, the United Nations could work directly with this department on world peace problems; and

H. The cause of democratic governments would be supported, thus helping many souls, wearily oppressed today by totalitarian governments, secure liberty, justice, and equality.

Mr. Davis is a visionary; his proposal for the creation of a peace department and his support of this contest show that. He is carrying out the old Biblical maxim: "Where there is no vision, the people perish." This department would clear the eyes of many people on peace issues and raise the sights of the human race toward the noble goal of peace.

By giving our unqualified support to this proposal and by doing everything in our power to further the idea (and ideal) of world peace we would be carrying out that famous tenet of Abraham Lincoln when he said: "With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Address by Hon. W. Lee O'Daniel, of Texas, Before Rotary Club of Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered before the Rotary Club in Detroit, Mich., yesterday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLIND STAGGERS IN WASHINGTON

Having been brought up on a large ranch, I learned as a boy many things from dumb animals which enable me to better understand the activities of some public officials in Washington. I have never been able to forget the funny antics of Old Bill, our faithful old plow horse, as he carelessly stumbled all over the barnyard one day, knocking down fences and trying to enter the barn where there was no door. Old Bill had blind staggers. He meant well, but had lost all sense of perspective. So, I caution you gentlemen to be tolerant when you hear of some unbelieveable things happening in Washington. Blind staggers is a terrible affliction. It comes on suddenly and the victim has no knowledge that he has done anything strange. Sometimes they recover—but seldom. Some cases have lasted about 14 years. Many new cases have developed since last November 5.

The health officers have been trying to find out what has brought on the blind staggers epidemic. They have discovered some kind of flower growing inside the iron fence around the White House. It seems that this special flower has an attractive fragrance which causes many people to want to climb over the fence and dwell within. The flower blooms every 4 years.

But seriously speaking, there was a time when I think we would all agree that we had in this Nation the greatest Government on the face of the earth. Through a system of free enterprise we built in America a nation where the average man enjoyed the highest standard of living in the world. Now we have a very low standard of living. There was a time when we looked into show windows and saw the things we wanted, but could not get them because we did not have enough money. Today we look into the show windows and, although we have plenty of money in our pockets and see the things we want, we cannot get them because the merchants have samples only, and nothing for delivery because manufacturers cannot operate their factories under New Deal communistic regimentation. The net result in both cases is identical—a lowered standard of living.

We built a nation where we could say with pride that the rights of the individual were sacred and that we had a Government in Washington committed to the maintenance of free enterprise, freedom of thought, and freedom of religion. We had reached the stage in this Nation where we believed we were secure in these freedoms. But I believe you will agree with me that these conditions have during the past 13 or 14 years all been changed. We no longer have in this Nation the original type of free private enterprise which transformed America from a wilderness to the greatest Nation on earth. What we have is simply a degree of freedom such as is permitted to us under the rule of the bureaucrats whose power has been established to reign over us.

A great industrial genius and world benefactor has just passed away here in your city. I am proud to have personally known Mr. Ford and to have been his guest at Dearborn. He typified the spirit of free private enterprise. His rise from lowly mechanic to the world's greatest industrialist demonstrated the unlimited possibilities that once existed in America. These possibilities no longer exist in America. They are gone. The next potential Henry Ford in overalls who comes along with a brilliant idea will forget what his idea was before his application to start manufacturing a new product runs the gauntlet of red tape in Washington and some bureaucrat sends him the usual disapproval notice. Or if he does get permission to start a new business, the bulk of his profits must be sent to Washington to maintain the bureaucrats, and his small share could not be pyramided into a very large industry during an ordinary lifetime.

I am convinced that the great rank and file of the American people are dissatisfied with the kind of government dished out to us during recent years. They endured this Government during the period of the depression on the theory which had been popularized, that the only way we could get out of the depression was by turning the job over to the Government to solve our problems for us. It was in this state of mind and under this condition that we were finally fenagled into entering World War II and the people of this country endured bureaucratic rule and governmental regimentation because they were told, and many believed, that this centralization of power was essential to the success of the war effort.

When the war was over about 2 years ago, the people expected these war controls to be lifted. The people expected they would be given an opportunity to again live as free-born American citizens, to meet and to solve their own problems and to actually direct and operate their own Government. But the Reds, the Communists, who had infested Washington for the past 15 years, had other ideas. It was their belief that the end of the war did not mean the end of governmental control and regimentation, but rather that it meant a change in the type of control and regimentation. There were a few of us in the Capitol who did all we could to do away with the war controls immediately and turn the country back to the people; however, we did not have enough votes to get the job done. The OPA, the XYZ, and all the other alphabetical agencies were maintained in power and operated at full blast. Now, if you recall, we had an election on the 5th of November 1946. During the campaign the leadership of the Republican Party, that is, the politicians, correctly sensed what the people wanted. They went to the people with a promise that if the Republican Party was returned to power, there would be a general housecleaning in Washington; they would get rid of these surplus boards and bureaus that plagued the people. They promised they would immediately proceed to give the people throughout this Nation a reduction in taxes, and most important of all, they promised that they would dethrone and re-

move from power these labor racketeers who for years have dominated the Government in Washington under the leadership of the Democratic politicians.

The Republican politicians were wise when they pitched their campaign on this basis. They correctly interpreted the desires and wishes of the great rank and file of the American people. The result was a landslide, the like of which this country had never before seen. It was a spontaneous, Nation-wide response of the American people to return to power in the political affairs of this Nation the party that expressed a belief in the principles of democratic government. I am frank to tell you that while I have always been a Democrat and a Jeffersonian Democrat, not a New Deal Democrat, I was greatly elated over the results of the election. It meant more to me to see the people of this Nation rise up and demand that true democratic government be reestablished than it did to me to see the Democratic Party returned to power because I, along with other Democrats, realized that the Democratic Party, as such, has long since departed from the principles upon which this party was established and it had grown to the point where it was the agent of the privileged few to oppress the many. And may I add here that there are also quite a few New Dealers who are wearing the Republican badge.

Now as I talk to you today, after having seen the Republican Party with their substantial majority in both Houses of Congress perform, I am disappointed with the results. Instead of giving this country real, honest-to-God labor legislation designed to protect the great rank and file of our people, we have seen the leadership of the Republican Party begin to pussyfoot, to hedge, and to dodge. This is not true of all of them, but it is true of many of them. Instead of this Congress proceeding immediately to give this Nation tax relief which had been promised and to which the Nation is justly entitled, we have seen the Republicans engage in a lot of technical discussion. We have seen them do a lot of hair-splitting, hedging, and dodging. We have seen a lot of shadow boxing between the politicians at the head of the Republican Party who are looking to the election in 1948 and the leadership of the Democratic Party who are also looking to the election in 1948, both apparently believing that they can still fool the American people.

Well, now, folks, I believe as firmly as I believe anything that the American people—if you will excuse the expression—are simply fed up on political promises that don't last after the election has been won. I think the American people are completely saturated with the doctrine that has been preached by these social uplifters who spend 90 percent of their time thinking about how they can produce some kind of legislation to take property away from the thrifty and pass it along to the thriftless, and, unless I miss my guess, the leadership of the Republican Party is today making a fatal mistake.

Let me talk to you about a few things which to my mind are very obvious. You know we held a great debate down there in Congress and the wheel horses of the Republican Party, that is, the most courageous of them, even went so far as to demand that the Federal budget be cut from thirty-seven billion to thirty-one billion dollars. Now, of course, the debate did not go on long before the compromisers started to work and then this six-billion-budget cut became a four-and-a-half-billion demand.

I tell you frankly that I believe either a four-and-a-half or a six-billion-dollar cut in the budget is so small that it is a reflection on the intelligence of the American people. During the days when the New Deal had brought into Washington all of the experts on how to spend money, during the time when they had their pipe lines running out from the Federal Treasury in every direction, the best they were ever able to do was to think up means by which they could spend in round figures only $9,000,000,000. And here we are today kidding ourselves and trying to kid the American people into believing that we are for economy in government when we advocate cutting the Federal budget only to $31,000,000,000. I tell you they have lost all perspective of money values; call it blind staggers, or anything you will.

It is true that we have to add to our normal spending now $5,000,000,000 to finance the public debt. It is true that we probably need $9,000,000,000 annually more than we spend to maintain our armed forces. It is true we must have probably $5,000,000,000 to care for our returning soldiers, but with all this, there is still no reason on earth why the Federal budget for the coming fiscal year could not be cut to $25,000,000,000 and then further reduced to twenty billions during the next year. Of course, you can't do this and maintain the whole army of politicians that we now have on the patronage pay rolls in Washington, D. C., and throughout the Nation. If there is any real economy in government it means we must retire these bureaucrats and their hirelings from loafing on Government pay and permit them to go back home and get an honest job producing something. It means that some Senators and some Representatives and some other folks in public life must give up some of their patronage pay rolls. I believe the citizens of this Nation voted last November to stop the New Deal gravy train. But the Republicans in Congress are acting like they think the people voted to only change the engineers and conductors who operate the New Deal gravy train.

When I first entered the United States Senate back in 1941, I submitted a series of labor bills designed to correct the then existing labor situation throughout this Nation. As governor of Texas, I sponsored and succeeded in getting enacted, a bill which became known as the "O'Daniel antiviolence strike law." It simply made it a felony for anybody during a labor dispute to use force or violence, or the threat of force or violence. After its enactment, we succeeded, under its terms, in promoting some labor leaders to cotton pickers on our State farms at Huntsville. After that, we did not have much labor trouble in Texas. I brought that bill with me to Washington in August 1941, and introduced it in the Senate. It has been hidden under the rug in some committee room ever since. I recommended then that both by statutory enactment and constitutional amendment that we guarantee in America the right to work and that we abolish the closed shop.

I have also spoken before some State legislatures on my "freedom to work" bill and have made many radio broadcasts about it. I am very proud to report that my State of Texas has just passed the "freedom to work" bill and a few other States have also passed it. But it has not yet been passed in Washington. I recommended that the Congress pass legislation that would modify the wage and hour law in a manner which would have made impossible these high-jacking portal-to-portal suits which the Nation faced in 1946. I recommended that legislation be enacted which would make labor unions responsible under our antitrust laws, the same as all other citizens. I recommended that the Constitution of the United States be amended so as to limit the term of the President of the United States and to limit the terms of Members of the House of Representatives and of Members of the United States Senate. We finally succeeded in submitting to the States a proposed constitutional amendment that will limit the tenure of office of the President, and I hope it will be ratified and made effective. And at that time I warned the Congress of the United States that unless they moved promptly to curb the power which by legislation they had placed in the hands of these labor racketeers, that unless they amended the Wagner labor law and passed these other measures to which I have referred, this country was headed for the greatest crisis it had ever faced within the field of labor relations.

But, my friends, both the leadership of the Republican Party and the leadership of the Democratic Party had their eyes fixed exclusively on the election board, each jockeying for position, each bidding for a place which would assure them the support of the labor racketeers, the Reds, and the Communists in the next election. The result was that my bills never got out of committee.

I am glad of one thing, however, and that is, the record speaks for itself. It was not necessary for me to wait until the war effort was tied up with strikes to see they were coming; it was not necessary for me to wait until the war was over and these labor racketeers commenced to exert the power which they had built up to strangle and throttle the industries throughout this Nation, for me to know that that condition was inevitable. I am gratified, however, that even though they were late in their conversion, it has been my privilege to live to see many of the leaders in both the Democratic Party and in the Republican Party come around to a realization of the fact that something has to be done and something is being done, even though enough has not yet been accomplished. Now, in light of all that has taken place up to the present time, and in light of the fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that I did accurately forecast what was ahead of us within the field of labor relations, I wish to make another prediction and that prediction is: The American people are not going to be satisfied until the right of the great rank and file of the people to rule this Nation is reestablished.

I think the great mass of our people would prefer to use either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party as the agency to accomplish this reformation, but unless we break the stranglehold on both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party of these pussyfooters and dodgers who are always afraid they will make some labor leaders mad, who are always afraid they might incur the displeasure of some would-be liberal who gets most of his information by long-distance telephone from Moscow, I predict the people will create a new party that will furnish the leadership; they will create a party which will bring under control all of these "isms" and selfish groups and that will reestablish a government for the great rank and file of all our citizens.

I will tell you something else that the people are going to do. They are going to put some party into power who will have enough vision and foresight to operate this Government on an annual budget of not more than sixteen to eighteen billion dollars a year. The people of this Nation are not going to be willing to spend the last of their days in abject servitude in order that they may pay high taxes for the benefit of the bureaucrats who want to operate a gravy train for their patronage-seeking henchmen.

In this Nation, the voting Republicans are about equal in numbers to the voting Democrats. The professional politicians in both parties realize this and they also know that either party, in order to win the election, must have the votes of the various small radical groups. Therefore, the leaders in both parties are continually catering to the radical minority groups of "reds," Communists, Socialists, labor-leader racketeers, and others. These politicians are sure of getting the votes of the regulars in their own respective parties, so they do not have to cater to those

honest, conservative voters, but they do have to do the things the radicals want or lose their votes. There is not a great deal of difference between the rank and file of Democrats and Republicans in this Nation as far as sound American governmental philosophy is concerned. Therefore, if the good, honest, conservative voting citizens in both the Democratic Party and in the Republican Party would only get together and consolidate their voting strength under a new party, this Nation, almost overnight, would swing back to the right, and serious crises facing us both at home and abroad would vanish as the morning dew before the hot rays of the rising sun. If that is not done, there remains little hope of our Nation surviving as a government of free and independent people.

There is another great question, and that is the question of foreign affairs, which is on the minds of all our people at this time. I doubt the propriety of my discussing that question here today, but I do want to say this: I am as strong as any man in the world can be for the maintenance of an Army and a Navy adequate to protect this country and to do our part to guarantee the peace of the world. Yes; I am in favor of stopping the expansion of the Communists in their drive to overrun Europe, but, listen, I am in favor of something more than that; I am even in favor of stopping the drive of the Communists to overrun this country; I am even in favor of running them out of Washington—now.

And, while on this subject of communism, let me call your attention to the fact that it is not necessary to have Communists in Congress to enact communistic laws. We have some of the most communistic laws in this country that were ever dreamed of by the most devoted Communists who ever lived in any other country, but they were passed by Democrats and Republicans. So, while we are running Communists out of our governmental bureaus, I advocate that we repeal all communistic legislation which has been placed on our statute books during the last 14 years. I can assure you, however, that this will never be done, regardless of whether you have a Republican or a Democratic majority in Congress. Both parties dare not repeal these communistic laws because they would make the various radical minority groups mad and they could not get themselves reelected.

No one has battled any harder than I have throughout my whole public life to do what I could within the field of social security and to promote the social welfare of the great rank and file of our people. I am as firmly committed to this idea now as I ever was, but here is one thought I wish to leave with you:

"One of the best ways on earth to promote the social welfare of the average man, one of the best ways on earth to promote the long-time financial security of the average citizen is for the Government to take the hand of Government out of the taxpayers' pockets. Taxpayers of this Nation will buy lots of social security for themselves if we will just simply stop robbing them of everything they make."

I would not be candid with you people here today if I did not tell you frankly that I am very much concerned about the future of this Nation. In making that statement, what I mean to say is, I am concerned and I have a deep fear that we are headed down the road that will ultimately lead to complete Government ownership and control of all lines of business in this country. And of course, Government control of the business affairs of this Nation, the centralization of the whole economic life of this country in the hands of the Government, inevitably means the end of all personal liberty. It means the end of all personal rights. It means the establishment finally of the corporate state as advocated by Mussolini or the Communist rule being carried out in Russia, or the rule of state socialism which was brought to power by Adolph Hitler.

The reason I am concerned about these things the reason I am fearful that they will come to America is based primarily on the fact that we have in this country so many citizens who seem to believe that we can still retain our personal liberty, that we can still retain our rights to own and control property, and at the same time continue to go deeper and deeper into a government controlled economy. I would not be the least bit fearful if I thought the only method by which this country would adopt communism and socialism would be by the voters going to the polls and voting the Communist or Socialist ticket straight. I do not believe the people of America would ever do that. Communism always crawls in under the tent. The reason I am fearful about conditions which face this Nation today is that we have in this country many sincere, honest people who do not want communism, who do not want socialism, but who actually, in fact, are doing everything it is possible for them to do to bring it about. They are, in my judgment, acting ignorantly and innocently.

The great banner under which this country is today being destroyed and the one that has the most popular appeal is that under which we go forth to battle every day to extract more and more money from the taxpaying public in order that these "do-gooders" may do something more to promote the welfare of the people. Under the guise of having the Government assume the obligation of taking care of the people, instead of having the people assume the obligation of taking care of the Government, we are, day by day, creating a situation in this country where the very volume of taxes is becoming so great that sooner or later the weight of this tax burden will absolutely destroy free enterprise in this Nation.

As an example, let me tell you that in the great State of Texas, large as it is, containing the almost limitless natural resources that it does, and with the most thrifty and hardest working people on earth, our share of the national public debt, based on our per capita share of the national income, is $10,000,000,000, while the total assessed valuation of all real and personal property in Texas as reported to our comptroller for this year is only $5,000,000,000.

Now, my friends, I am not concerned especially as to whether or not the leadership of this country intends to destroy free enterprise; what I am concerned about is, Will they, by the result of what they are undertaking, actually destroy it? In other words, what you are concerned about and what I am concerned about is, Will free enterprise be destroyed? If it is destroyed by people who do not intend to do it, but who do do it, the result is exactly the same.

When businessmen themselves begin to accept the philosophy that you can by a system of public taxation of the thrifty provide lifetime security for the thriftless, not only in America but throughout the whole wide world, I say to you that it is time for us to stop, look, and listen. The Federal Government in this Nation has for so long taken such a heavy toll in the form of taxes from our citizens that I feel we have become numbed to the dangers inherent in this process.

I am absolutely astounded when I find able men in Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, men who have for many years been regarded as sound conservatives, allowing themselves to be drawn into academic discussions about whether the budget for the future operation of this Government should be set up on a basis of thirty-two or thirty-three billion or whether the proper figure is thirty-seven billion. My friends, that to my mind is just like two great medical experts standing at the bedside of a patient trying to decide whether they should give him one or two teaspoonsful of strychnine.

Now, there is another thing I am concerned about. We have some businessmen in this country who seem to still believe that the Federal Government by some means may be allowed to continue to take in the form of taxation approximately one-third of the income of all our people and still we may have democratic government in this country. So far as I am concerned, I think the time is here now when the people of this Nation should rise up and demand that the Federal Government proceed immediately, now in 1947, to cut its operating expenses down to a reasonable basis.

My friends, there is nothing complicated about what this country needs. I tell you frankly if we would cut the Federal budget to twenty-five billion this year and proceed to cut it to twenty billion the next year, and at least to eighteen billion the following year; if we would cut income taxes at least in half; if we would pass labor legislation that would make the labor unions responsible under our antitrust laws the same as other citizens; if we would pass legislation to stop these industry-wide labor contracts; if we would have throughout this Nation strict enforcement of our antitrust laws, thereby maintaining competition in business and through abolition of the industry-wide labor contracts, secure competition in labor; if we would repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act which bars our citizens from the court house to settle their labor disputes; if we would either repeal or substantially amend the Wagner labor law; if we would write into the Constitution of the United States a guaranty to protect the right of our citizens to work irrespective of membership or nonmembership in labor organizations; if we would amend the Constitution of the United States so as to limit the term of the President of the United States to 1 term of 6 years and to place similar limitations on the terms of Senators and Representatives; if we would write into this same constitutional amendment a prohibition against allowing Senators and Representatives to accept Presidential appointments until they have been out of office at least 5 years; then we would reestablish democratic government in America.

These are all fundamental things; they are not radical; they are constructive. They are all things that Congress ought to be able to do in 2 weeks' time. The trouble is we do not have the desire or the intention on the part of Congress to do them.

What would be the net effect of doing these things? I will tell you what it would be, it would simply be to return the control of the Government to the people. It would be to destroy the rule of the bureaucrats. It would be to junk now and for all time that philosophy which has become popular in this country, which says it is a badge of honor and statesmanship for any citizen to be broke and on the Government pay roll and it is a dishonor for any businessman to be successful, to meet his obligatons and to expand his business.

If we want to get rid of the Reds, if we want to reestablish democracy, I want to tell you frankly you are going to have to put folks down at Washington who want to see it happen. You have got to fill the National Capitol with people who look to the future of America and who in doing so look over and beyond the next Presidential election.

Address by Hon. Irving M. Ives, of New York, Before the Economic Club of New York

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered last night before the Economic Club of New York by our distinguished colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was with real appreciation that I accepted the privilege of appearing on your program tonight. After my very interesting and pleasant experience with your distinguished president, I am not surprised to know that the Economic Club of New York is so successful. I congratulate both you and him upon the happy circumstance which may have brought about the fortunate relationship existing among you.

At the time I received your invitation to speak, I intended to talk on subjects of a governmental nature and dealing with fundamentally economic matters. I intended to speak on our tax structure in this country, not alone as it pertains to the Federal layer of government, but to all the lower layers, and to consider the interrelationship existing among these layers where problems of taxation are concerned. I feel very strongly that one of these days—and the sooner the better—this matter of taxation must be adjusted on a more equitable basis from the standpoint of the over-all burden upon the people of our country. Otherwise the lower layers of government may find themselves in a condition where they will become incapable of raising revenues or where, if they do raise revenues, they will be in effect confiscating the property of the private citizen.

Circumstances in the meantime have arisen which have caused me to change my plans in the selection of a subject for this evening. These circumstances are not the proposal now before the Congress to provide aid to Greece and Turkey. I might well devote these remarks to a consideration of that subject, but it has now been so thoroughly explored since it was unexpectedly thrust into our midst early in March that there is little I could add to the information and comment which have already been made concerning it.

Let it suffice that it seems to me that with the provisions safeguarding the integrity of the United Nations and protecting our own country, which have been offered by way of the Vandenberg amendments to the legislation now before us, the plan should be approved by the Congress and should become operative. I feel very strongly that both the world and ourselves stand to lose much more if we refuse to provide the aid which has been proposed and to accept the new role in world affairs which the British situation requires of us.

It seems to me that in resolving this question it is our own self-interest which is of first concern to us and to the world and which should receive our first consideration. I believe that what is best for us as a nation in the long run will prove best for the world. On the basis of the analysis submitted by Senator VANDENBERG and our State Department, it would appear that our greatest hope for avoiding future conflict and for preserving the peace of the world lies in our acceptance of this new responsibility. The alternative course would seem to lead inevitably to disaster for us and to the annihilation of freedom in the world. More or less along these lines the Congress appears now to be thinking and more or less along these lines it is probable that the Congress finally will act.

Tonight, however, I shall speak principally of a matter which is of immediate transcendant domestic importance and which is now squarely before the Congress. I refer to legislation dealing with labor relations.

All of you are acquainted with the conditions which have arisen during the past decade in connection with the relationship between labor and management. Most of you are aware of the circumstances which preceded the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act—circumstances which in themselves produced the National Labor Relations Act. You are aware of the chief purpose inherent in the enactment of this legislation which was to bring about equality of bargaining power between management and labor.

However, as so frequently happens in America and wherever free government exists in the world, in moving out of one unbalanced condition we move into another unbalanced condition. So it has been with the National Labor Relations Act. Whereas formerly the preponderance of power rested with management, as a result of the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act and through its administration, this preponderance has now come to rest with labor. Neither of these conditions is desirable and either of them leads to certain industrial strife. Of such is the story of labor relations in the more recent history of the United States.

All of you are familiar with the abuses which have arisen under our present statutes affecting labor relations, particularly as these statutes deal with collective bargaining. Most of you undoubtedly are acquainted with the real causes of these abuses. These causes may be divided into three main categories.

The first of these categories covers conditions now prevalent where the so-called "closed shop" is concerned. Immediately we are faced here with questions as to whether employees should be obliged to belong to organizations against their will in order to obtain work and whether employers should be obliged to hire only employees who are members of labor organizations. These restrictions would appear to violate basic American principles. The situation becomes aggravated further when in many instances the majority of employees themselves seem to have little or nothing to say about their status with respect to the "closed shop." In the light of these conditions there would appear to be no justification whatever for any institution known as the "closed shop."

However, in this instance we are confronted with more than a single set of principles. We are faced also with a compelling condition. The closed shop is an ancient institution in labor organization in the United States. It was first established almost a hundred years ago—generations before the New Deal or anything like modern labor legislation was even dreamed of. In asserting its right to the closed shop, labor has insisted—and not without real provocation—that those who are to benefit from the efforts and activities of a labor organization should belong to and support that organization and accept their full measure of responsibility, not only for the conduct of its affairs, but for the cost of its operation. Moreover, many employers who have dealt with their employees through the medium of a closed-shop contract have come to prefer this kind of arrangement and object to abandoning it. In other words, as an institution which in wide areas of industry is fundamental in the relationship between labor and management, the closed shop in the United States has attained an historical position where its banning by law would be an extremely dubious procedure.

On the other hand, abuses which have arisen where the closed shop exists can and should be eliminated. On this point there should be no difference of opinion among all who seek to help produce a satisfactory relationship between workers and employers. In seeking to prevent these abuses, men of good will differ only in the method by which they would remove them.

Again, in the matter of jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, including the obnoxious practice of cross-picketing, which has sometimes been so evident in New York City, there is a strong feeling among all people, even among the labor organizations themselves, that these unhappy conditions should be corrected. Furthermore, inasmuch as labor itself thus far has shown no will to clean its own house, there has been a growing sentiment that this particular job must be done through the process of government. Here again the only difference among those seeking to prevent jurisdictional strife and other unwarranted conditions pertaining to it concerns the question of the method to be used by which to bring about corrective measures.

So also, in resolving the problem of industry-wide bargaining, concerning the undesirable quality of which there is general agreement among most people, it becomes a question of plan or method in applying corrective measures. Here we have a situation where the chief objections fall largely into two categories—one of which pertains to the spread of monopoly through industry-wide bargaining, the other of which is a sequel of the first and concerns that condition of serious strife in a whole industry resulting in national economic paralysis.

All of the legislation now before the Congress which deals with the undesirable conditions I have cited is intended to correct them. In the exercise of corrective measures, however, extreme caution should be taken to make sure that results which follow are not to be worse than the conditions which they are intended to cure. In our efforts to give to management additional prerogatives which would aid in establishing a balanced relationship with labor, we should be sure that the rights of labor are protected and preserved. It seems to me that here we are faced with a task not of taking from anyone, but of adding to someone.

For example, in the matter of the closed shop I am convinced that every employer should be granted the right to say whom he shall or shall not employ. Furthermore, I am equally convinced that no closed shop contractual relationship should be consummated unless a majority of all employees are in favor of it. Provision to guarantee these standards should be basic in any legislation which may be enacted. Even further safeguards may be required and if these can be imposed without incurring consequences as undesirable as the conditions to be corrected, they also should be incorporated in the legislation. The situation here is one involving collective bargaining and would seem obviously to entail amendment to the National Labor Relations Act.

Jurisdictional strikes and other controversies involving primarily the matter of representation in collective-bargaining agreements should also be corrected by amendment to the National Labor Relations Act. In fact, any unwarranted action or abuse on the part of the employers, employees, or labor organizations, where the matter of collective-bargaining representation is concerned, should be adjusted by amendment to this act. By this process this kind of

dispute or controversy would be outlawed by utilizing the machinery already established to insure the proper exercise of the collective-bargaining process. On the other hand, any action to cure these abuses which would allow direct court procedure and at the same time bypass the agencies of government I have mentioned or which would revive other abuses that the Norris-LaGuardia Act was intended to remove, would appear to offer no appropriate solution to the jurisdictional problem.

In seeking to answer the question of industry-wide bargaining there is insufficient information at the present time to permit of satisfactory legislation on this subject. No one is sure, for instance, what the appropriate bargaining unit should be. Presumably the company is the most natural unit and is subject generally to the least objection, but even here there are a number of important situations which cannot be handled on a company-unit basis.

All the legislation thus far proposed for the purpose of abolishing industry-wide bargaining contains some seriously objectionable features, aside from the dubious matter of the bargaining unit itself. One provision which might easily cause serious repercussions is that by which the international union in the labor organizational structure could be destroyed or at least made impotent. Although I recognize that the organizational structure of trade-unions is far from perfect in some respects and should be altered for the welfare of labor itself, I can see no profit for anyone in abolishing the international union or in attempting by statute to reorganize the structure of our trade-unions. To say the least, such an undertaking would very likely result in added strife and turmoil.

The complicated problems to which I have referred fall almost entirely within the purview of the National Labor Relations Act and should be corrected by amendment to that act. They should not be handled by new statutes bypassing the act or by establishing new governmental machinery which would either parallel or compete with the machinery already established by the provisions of the act.

There is, however, great need for other legislative action if we are comprehensively to meet the management-labor problem with which we seem now to be confronted. Insofar as strictly legal compulsion is concerned, further action would seem necessary to make certain that the contractual obligation, which is the foundation in the labor-management relationship, is fully supported and protected by law. Additional legislation of this nature is now proposed, and I am hopeful that it will be enacted. The sacredness of the contract is the keystone in the arch of collective bargaining.

At the same time let us remember that legal compulsion alone and of itself is no adequate answer to the problem of establishing happy labor relations. Unless we are able to make more effective the voluntary processes by which workers and employers can get together and reach agreement harmoniously, our efforts, no matter how lofty in purpose, must fail. To this end it is now proposed to reorganize and reorient our national mediation and conciliation services. This would be done under the direction of a single administrator, presumably with an advisory council or panel consisting of leading representatives from management and labor.

Heretofore in the field of mediation the chief emphasis has been placed on applying the remedy after the disease of industrial strife has taken hold. And yet, this is only half of the real function of mediation. Prevention of industrial strife is just as important as is its cure. So, in the proposals for a new and broader approach through mediation, emphasis is being placed just as much upon prevention as upon cure.

Furthermore, in the legislation before us, Nation-wide work stoppages in key industries affecting the health and safety of all the people are recognized as requiring special attention and provision is made in such cases for a possible 80-day delay through court injunction obtained by action of the Attorney General of the United States and beginning with the effective date of the strike or work stoppage. Before taking such drastic action, however, a board of inquiry would be appointed by the Attorney General to ascertain the facts and to report the facts to him and to the public—without recommendation. This board would collaborate with the mediation services and would act as an instrument in helping to reduce tension and to bring about peace even before the effective date of any strike.

Thus, before the exercise of the injunctive process, every possible means of utilizing all the voluntary processes would have been exhausted. In the course of the over-all procedure, moreover, it is altogether probable that nearly every situation of the kind I have described would be reconciled long before reaching strike proportions.

In view of the fact that it is probable that legislation providing for this kind of approach by mediation and special governmental intervention will be passed during the present session of the Congress, there would seem to be even less need for immediate direct legislative action against industry-wide bargaining. As I have stated, the most serious consequence of industry-wide bargaining is its potential for Nation-wide paralysis, and with this potential largely reduced through the operation of the procedures I have outlined, there remains for the most part only the question of dealing with its monopoly aspects. Here again the program which I hope will receive favorable consideration by the present Congress provides an answer.

This program, as presented in the United States Senate, provides for the creation of a joint congressional committee to make studies, surveys, and investigations into all aspects of the management-labor relationship. Furthermore, such a committee would investigate the industrial set-up in the United States and in this investigation would be able to determine on the plan or pattern which would seem most suitable for the effective solution of the industry-wide bargaining problem. Not only would this committee investigate the whole industrial field from the aspect of labor, management, and ownership, with the purpose of ascertaining what additional legislation might be needed, but it would have as its responsibility the checking of existing statutes and their operation through existing administrative machinery with the further purpose of ascertaining what amendment or changes might be advisable, either in the law or in its administration. Nine years ago this policy was adopted in the State of New York where it has met with extraordinary success. If it can be employed effectively in the Empire State, with all of our variations in population, in interests, and in activities, it should work with equal success in the Nation.

In this outline of proposed corrective measures to deal with present labor-management difficulties—an outline which is of necessity perfunctory—I have indicated a comprehensive approach to the solution of every major problem in the field of labor relations. If such a legislative program were to be enacted this year, it would largely overcome present difficulties and go far toward establishing industrial peace.

It seems to me vital that in our approach to this most important of all domestic problems we should be as nonpolitical as possible. I have always felt that the relationship between management and labor never should be permitted to become an issue in partisan politics, and during the major portion of my activity in public life I have sought to obtain as wide acceptance of this policy as possible. No good can come to management and no good can come to labor when either or both of them are made footballs in the game of politics. Nor do I believe that in the long run it is profitable for any political party or for any other group in our society to try to play politics with questions pertaining to the worker-employer relationship.

It seems to me most unfortunate, therefore, that some would now play politics with labor relations. In dealing with this subject, what the country needs right now is the enactment of sound corrective legislation and not an issue for a political campaign.

A great social and economic upheaval, such as that from which we are now emerging, is followed generally by a tendency toward reaction. There are some who would like to turn the course of progress backward and to revert to the so-called good old days. Obviously, such a course of reaction can never be long followed without leading to further complications and difficulties.

All of us know that we are living in a dynamic society. It is constantly on the move. When we try to hold it back, we are overwhelmed by conditions over which we can have no control and we are engulfed in consequences far more serious than those which we would at first avoid.

If during the years immediately ahead we shall strive blindly to deny great social and economic demands with which we may be faced, we shall lay in store for ourselves an even more evil day than any we would thus escape. The reaction of today must inevitably produce the counterreaction of tomorrow.

Moreover, in a world where popular government is more and more giving way to statism, we can survive only if we make of our own free society the great success which it can be in meeting and overcoming the problems and difficulties and obstacles which may confront our people. With good faith and good will and sympathetic understanding toward one another, accepting our mutual responsibilities with respect to one another, we can have here in America the kind of country we want. Working together harmoniously, helping one another, cooperating with one another, we can produce here in America among all our people an esprit de corps which will scorn the blandishments and defy the threats of every hostile ideology. We can move forward confidently toward the attainment of new goals in social and economic progress which are within our reach.

Jefferson Day Address by Hon. Spessard L. Holland, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on the occasion of the Jefferson Day dinner, in the city of Richmond.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Tuck, Senator Byrd, Senator Robertson, Senator Burch,

Mayor Edwards, other distinguished guests, and fellow Democrats, I gratefully acknowledge the more than generous introduction which I have just received from your senior Senator, who has long been a distinguished national figure, particularly because of his unceasing insistence upon greater economy and sounder business practices in our National Government. I am proud of his friendship and the friendship of your distinguished junior Senator, who I confidently predict will also attain national fame as a worthy successor to his great predecessor, Senator Carter Glass.

I was greatly honored to receive some weeks ago, through your two distinguished Senators, the invitation of the Virginia Democrats to address the Jefferson day dinner in this great Commonwealth, which claims Thomas Jefferson with such peculiar pride and affection because of the fact that he was one of her own most illustrious sons. I come with humility to speak to Virginians about their Jefferson and our Democratic Party, which he founded, and of which he still remains the great philosopher and continuing inspiration. Inadequate as I am to measure up to such an occasion, I shall be, nevertheless, proud and happy always that you have conferred this honor upon me, for Virginia is the birthplace of my mother and the home of her family since the days of the Revolution—Jefferson's party has always been the chosen party of my people on both sides of my family—and my father and my two grandfathers all wore the Confederate gray under the command of that great and gallant Virginian, Robert E. Lee. So you may be sure that the soil of Virginia is to me almost holy ground and that I come here tonight with a feeling approaching reverence.

The biography of Jefferson is too well known for me to dwell upon it at length. Born in Virginia in 1743, he passed away in Virginia in 1826, singularly enough on July 4, a date which he had done so much to make immortal. In those 83 years he served so brilliantly in so many fields that he shall always be listed as one of the greatest Americans. In public office he served your Commonwealth in his young manhood as a member of the house of burgesses, as delegate to the Continental Congress, as governor, and as Delegate to the Congress during the troublous days under the Articles of Confederation. In his maturity he served the young Republic as Minister to our great ally, France, as Secretary of State, as Vice President, and as President. No other public figure in American history has been so versatile. Great office lawyer by profession, successful planter by choice, brilliant author, architect, musician, scholar, politician, diplomat, and statesman, this tall, graceful, eager, blue-eyed, red-headed Virginian is so colorful as to baffle description. In his own estimation, his three services which counted most were that he wrote the Declaration of Independence, that he was the author of the Virginia Ordinance of Religious Freedom, and that he founded the University of Virginia—that great school to whose presidency you have recently called your distinguished former governor, my friend, Hon. Colgate Darden. But many other specific accomplishments were his. Time does not allow my mention of many. I recall, in passing, the great part he played in helping to locate the National Capital on the banks of the Potomac. Likewise, he successfully put through the Louisiana Purchase, picking up a dozen States in one lot for eleven and a quarter million dollars—a bargain beyond compare—which in itself speaks eloquently of his ability in international affairs and of the vision with which he looked ahead to the time when his youn Republic would outgrow in strength the great nations of his own time.

I feel that as a Floridian I should tell you that while he had on his trading clothes in 1805, just 2 years after the Louisiana Purchase, Jefferson also tried to buy the Floridas from Spain, offering $5,000,000 as the opening bid in a trade that was not completed until 14 years later, in Monroe's administration. Five million dollars for Florida, eleven and a quarter million for a dozen States west of the Mississippi, I am sure that you Virginians will agree with me that the wondrous sense of values which your great Virginian showed so clearly throughout his career was never displayed to better advantage than in this offer which he made for Florida, eagerly but unsuccessfully.

But it was as a great liberal that he attained highest fame. He battled unceasingly in behalf of the rank and file of human beings, insisting on their right to have political independence, personal freedom, religious freedom, equal justice, and as nearly equal education and economic opportunity as could be attained. With a fervor and a devotion that would not be denied he fought for the realization of his vision—for the success of the young republic which to him existed but to serve its citizens and to make possible to them fuller and happier lives than had fallen to the lot of average men and women under other forms of government. We all remember his dramatic words in the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These were not idle words used as a brave recital for a historic document. Over and over again he proclaimed this same sentiment and worked and fought that it might be realized. In 1809, speaking to Maryland members of his party, he said: "The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government." In 1810, writing to a dear friend, he put the same thought this way: "The freedom and happiness of men * * * are the sole objective of all legitimate government." For this ideal he broke with the leaders of the State-supported church in the Virginia of long ago, with the landed gentry of his day, with those who believed in slavery, and those who did not believe in general public education.

For this ideal he battled ceaselessly with Hamilton and all those other Americans, many of them great patriots of high ability, whose plans for the infant Republic did not go so far as to build a place of equal dignity for the ordinary man and the average home. This ideal was the bedrock of his political philosophy, the rock upon which he built our political party, a party that was to have continuous existence, until now, always placing first human rights and needs, always insisting that our Government should be as Claude Bowers so aptly phrased it, "a democracy of men and not an aristocracy of money." He saw clearly that organized and constant effort throughout the life of the Nation would be required if his dream of democracy was to survive. Hence his insistence on the creation of our party as a living, vital political agency for the serving of the freedom and the happiness of men. Small wonder it is that Thomas Jefferson is the only American, other than George Washington himself, in whose memory there stand two statues in the halls of our Capitol Building at Washington.

I hope that we Democrats have lived up to his dream; I hope we are still serving and will continue to serve the ideal of Jefferson.

As we glance down the pages of our Nation's history we note that five of the seven great progressive national leaders have been Democrats—Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt. To complete the roster of those who, following in the path of Jefferson, have been leaders in improving the lot of the average man, we find only two names of those who came from the ranks of the opposing party—**Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, both great Americans.**

In recent years, beginning with our call to accept responsibility in the hectic days of 1933, we have seen our greatest depression conquered and the world's greatest war won under the bold, inspiring, and effectively democratic leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, whose death saddened our Nation on April 12, 1945, just 2 years ago tonight. The history of his leadership is too recent in date to require long repetition here, but we should not for a moment forget it. Strength was supplied to our banking sinews, ordinary honesty required of our investment agencies, and public confidence in our prostrate financial structure was restored. Home owners and farmers were aided to save their homes and farms, agriculture was helped to meet new problems of production and marketing, labor was given new recognition. Sound conservation and power development projects added to our wealth and productive capacity. Forward looking social legislation brought new security to the aged, the blind, the dependent child, and new protection against unemployment to the wage earner and his home. An enlarged health program brought greater opportunity to the ill.

To claim that this great program of human betterment was accomplished without any mistakes would be absurd. There were mistakes, some of which were abandoned as we came back along the road to successful recovery, some of which still require correction. There was, of course, some waste of money, but who would weigh for a moment the increase of twenty billion in our national debt which took place from 1933 to 1940 against the restored and increased strength, confidence, and productive power which resulted and which existed in our Nation when the war clouds came in 1940 and the storm broke in 1941. That $20,000,000,000, about one-fourth of our national income in 1940 and about one-eighth of our national annual income now, probably counted more heavily in enabling us to win the war than any twenty billion of the three hundred and forty-one billion that we spent in the war effort itself. The national strength, confidence, and productive power which resulted from bold, aggressive Democratic leadership was great enough to make us the determining factor in the battle to save human freedom against organized autocracy at its strongest, cruel tyranny in its most vicious form.

The winning of the war on the battle front and on the home front was, of course, national, bipartisan, and nonpartisan. Yet, while giving equal credit to citizens of other political faiths than ours, I feel that we are entitled to peculiar satisfaction as Democrats because our leadership, too, was willing to prove itself clearly nonpartisan, to find high place in the great effort for Stimson, Knox, Patterson, Forrestal, MacArthur, and many others who were not Democrats. I think, too, we shall always be proud of the world leadership which our Democratic President assumed, through which, as the acknowledged world leader in the grim struggle for the democratic way of life, he attained a prestige throughout the world which was never attained before by any other American or by any other mere man. Two years ago tonight our Nation was joined in its sorrow by the mourning of all the other peoples of the earth who love freedom and believe in the dignity of the individual.

But our great party must base its claim to confidence and leadership now and in the future not upon what all of its great leaders from Jefferson to Roosevelt were able to do for the people of America but upon what we are now doing and upon our leadership and our planned course of action for the future.

I do not believe in trying to fool ourselves—in lulling ourselves into a sense of complacency and self-satisfaction which might cause us to do less than our best, as we approach the general election of November 1948. I strongly believe we can and will

win in 1948, but it will not be upon our laurels of the past, even of the impressive past of recent months, but upon what we shall do from now on through our leader, President Truman, and through our own continuous efforts in national and world affairs and in the State and local governments. I think we have made a sound beginning since the disappointing returns of last November, a beginning upon which we can, if we will but continue to work and fight in the thoroughly Democratic tradition, win back, on the merits of our record, full national responsibility in 1948.

First, as to the States. I am impressed with the record of good government which is being made, in general, in the States which have Democratic administrations. I shall not dwell upon the record elsewhere except to say with pride that my own State of Florida is steadily moving ahead in the path of sound and progressive Democratic government. But I think it proper to remind you Virginians that under the wise leadership of your great Governor Tuck, you of the Old Dominion State are continuing to advance in the traditions of Jefferson. During your recent special legislative session I read with great interest the story of the long strides which you made, following the leadership of your governor in improving your public school system, in placing the public interest first and protecting all of your people against the disastrous effects of work stoppages in the public utilities, in enlarging your health program, while at the same time keeping your State in sound fiscal condition. No objectives could be more truly in the pattern laid down by Thomas Jefferson. I congratulate you and I feel that such aggressive Democratic performance here and in other Democratic States will, of necessity, lend great emphasis to the national efforts of our party and contribute to Democratic success next year.

Next, as to the National Government. No man ever succeeded to the Presidency under such difficult circumstances as did Harry Truman. Projected in the twinkling of an eye into an unwanted responsibility at a time of great national and world crisis, and following a predecessor who was recognized as the great world leader of the forces of freedom, a small man would have been marked for sure and tragic failure. I know that all of us remember the apprehensions which were added to our poignant grief 2 years ago. It is understating the fact to say that President Truman has risen marvelously to the occasion, has rallied not only our party but most of the Nation to follow him as its leader because of his own proven qualities and his own peacetime program. Adopting without change the war program of his predecessor, he carried it through to successful conclusion, adhering not only to the war strategy which required, among other difficult things, that he make the hard decision to use the atomic bomb on the Japanese, but also following aggressively the Roosevelt plan for the organization and support of the United Nations.

And then, the war ended, there came upon him more quickly than anyone could have foretold the terrific task of readjustment to peace, a domestic and international task bigger by far than any set of problems which had ever before confronted a President in time of peace. At first he staggered under the impact, and then, gaining perspective, experience, and self-confidence, he called upon his sound common sense, his good humor, his knowledge of men, and his full storehouse of acquired governmental skill; and slowly but with certainty he began to master the problems and to call round him other sound citizens to help him bear the burdens. The degree to which he has gained popularity, confidence, and support is amazing and almost without precedent.

I mention first his key appointment which have been so sound as to show him to be a keen judge of men. Here is a partial list of the great Americans whom he has called to high responsibility. Warren Austin as our delegate to the United Nations, Bernard Baruch to handle before the United Nations the difficult problem of what to do with atomic energy, Fred Vinson as Chief Justice, "Jimmy" Byrnes and later General Marshall—a product of your own VMI—to serve as Secretary of State, Harriman as Secretary of Commerce, the late Max Gardner and then Lewis Douglas as Ambassador to Great Britain, Omar Bradley as Veterans' Administrator, General Eisenhower to head the Army, and Admiral Nimitz the Navy. These men and many others whom he has called to service command the high confidence of the American people and their selection has earned national confidence for their Chief, Harry Truman.

The strong and successful court action which the President directed against John L. Lewis—that widely known Republican—has given the people additional faith in their President. Furthermore, his actions in world affairs have, in general, impressed our people with his soundness. His recent visit to Mexico struck a cordial note in support of the good-neighbor policy. His recent leadership for affirmative action in aid of Greece and Turkey, small independent nations threatened by communism, has shown that he realizes that we can neither stand still nor practice appeasement and hope to have the respect of Russia or attain satisfactory steps for lasting peace. The soundness of his approach to foreign policy is best shown by the fact that he has retained strong bipartisan support in that field.

In the field of national affairs he has so far shown excellent ability to cooperate with the Republican Congress. He is fundamentally sound in his fiscal policy in insisting on balancing the budget for the current year which he has done not by Republican support but through Democratic efforts. The President now insists on keeping it balanced for the year ahead under the appropriations of the present Congress. Likewise, he has been sound in insisting on debt reduction before tax reduction. In many other ways he has shown that he realizes our Nation must make itself ever stronger on the home front, both for our own sake and so that our world prestige may be retained and enlarged. In short, he is making a record as a great and good President, winning the strong approval of his people as shown by the current public opinion polls, the reaction of press and radio, and other unmistakable indications such as the overwhelming Democratic victory in Chicago last week. His philosophy seems to be just the prescription that our Nation needs in these troublesome times of heavy postwar domestic problems and nervous strain in world affairs while we make the greatest effort of all time to work out with other nations a successful formula for world peace.

This being entirely a Democratic occasion, there is little need to discuss our friendly opponents, the Republicans. Last November they were throwing up their hats and making happy reckless promises right and left in a fashion which we had not seen for the last 14 years. I think it is fair comment to say that since Congress met their joy has largely abated. In the more than 3 months of the current session, they have not commended themselves to the people of our Nation by showing ability to work together on any construction program. Perhaps they will learn as the session grows older, and the Nation will be better off if they do. Up to this time, however, they have been split wide apart on such fundamental matters as the size of the national budget, on which subject their House and Senate leaders have been wrangling in conference for 6 weeks. Similarly, they have not been able to take common ground on whether to give first place to debt payment or tax reduction, or on whether to support the activities of the armed forces without material cuts or to cut them heavily. After some weeks they are still debating amongst themselves in conference as to what form the obviously necessary portal-to-portal bill will take. They are still laboring in committee to determine what their labor policy will be, or whether they will have a labor policy.

They have brought to the floor their serious disagreement regarding reciprocal-trade agreements and on the question whether they will go back to the isolationism with which many of them dallied until Pearl Harbor. They have, likewise, brought to the floor their disagreement as to whether they will stand by the wise decision of the last Congress to entrust the development of atomic energy to civilians. I think the good humored jibe of Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, to the effect that the Republicans in Congress are like unto the army that marched up hill, and turned around, and marched right down again was a rather truthful description of what they have been doing this first 3 months and 10 days of the session.

As to what they will do from now on remains to be seen. Whatever they may do we should never expect to win on Republican blunders but on the merits of our own service. It is already crystal clear that between now and November of next year we Democrats have a glowing opportunity to keep President Truman in the White House and regain majority control of both Houses of Congress, provided we work hard together on behalf of our Nation and all its people, staying close to the traditional principles of Jeffersonian democracy. What a challenge and what an opportunity to all Democrats everywhere, particularly to you men and women of Virginia—and I am delighted to see here tonight so many ladies. A truly Jeffersonian program will always have special appeal for women.

It is my earnest hope that the Democrats of this great commonwealth, under the sound leadership of your splendid governor, your outstanding Senators and Representatives, and the efficient leaders of your State party organization, may fully throw the great weight of the democracy of Virginia into the fight to make such an unsurpassable showing of service for our country in these next 19 months that the Nation will joyfully and confidently return to full responsibility in the White House and in Congress our party, the progressive party, the Democratic Party founded by Thomas Jefferson.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO F. RAYFIEL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. RAYFIEL. H. R. 3020, the so-called Hartley bill, now before this House for consideration, could not have been a more vicious bill if it had been prepared by the most notorious labor-baiters in the country. It nullifies the gains which labor has made, only after the most desperate battles, covering more than a generation. It is virtually a repeal of the Wagner Act.

Few, if any, of the Democratic Members of the House will condone some of the acts which have been committed by a few labor officials, and many would support a bill designed to eliminate

some of the abuses for which they were responsible. But this omnibus bill contains many provisions which are intended to destroy the effectiveness of trade-unions, if not the very unions themselves and not, as its supporters so piously claim, to promote improved relations between capital and labor.

Those in and out of this House who have long been listed as enemies of labor unions are the most ardent and vociferous supporters of the bill.

If it should become law it would set off a series of conflicts between labor and industry which would make some of our recent serious strikes appear like minor disturbances.

It is a pity indeed that the supporters of this bill are so short-sighted that they cannot see that the reduced earning and living standards of the workers of this Nation which would inevitably follow, would also affect the very people in whose behalf the bill was introduced. Business succeeds best when the American workingman is employed at fair wages and under decent conditions.

Mr. Baruch's Address to the South Carolina Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, yesterday at Columbia, S. C., there was unveiled in the hall of the house of representatives a portrait of the Honorable Bernard M. Baruch, in recognition of his outstanding work in the war effort, and in recognition of his devotion to, and many charitable and gracious things he has done for, his native State of South Carolina. On that occasion, Mr. Baruch addressed the joint assembly. I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If this portrait could speak, it would be saying what lies so deeply in my heart—home again! Not from a foreign shore, for I have lived for nearly 70 years amidst that most generous, tolerant, kindly, patriotic people in the world's capital—New York City.

But you are my people. This is the land of my birth, where my forebears, together with yours, shared hardships that were bitter from the earliest days down through the lost cause. They fought and died for their principles with a bravery never exceeded anywhere.

Defeated, we accepted that defeat. Although the victors placed unnecessary hardships upon us, we rose from the ruins left by Sherman to a wider and widening life, economically and spiritually. There was no friendly government to give a helping hand or to lend us money. The scallywags and carpetbaggers saw to that. But nothing could conquer the spirit of our people. As we did then, we can do again. I believe the American people will rise to the responsibilities and dangers which face us now.

And this thought is true of other nations, too. England and the English people are not finished. A nation which stood magnificently the dreadful trials of war will not quail at what is necessary to be done in its aftermath. The vast opportunities offered to Britain by the elimination of the sweated labor of Germany and Japan will be grasped by her, to make the world an easier place in which to live.

From the time man appeared from the obscurity of earlier aeons to become the commanding figure among living things, his existence depended upon his ability to adapt natural laws—whether they be physical or economic—to his use. That is still the primal problem of our world—to prevail against animals and insects; starvation, disease, weather—and above all—his own incredible folly—war. Many advances have been made in science, but little headway in controlling economic factors. There is still the threat to our system of ups and downs—plenty and want—boom and bust.

Perhaps the First World War could not have been averted. Who is there to say that the Second World War—with all the danger signals shown—could not have been averted by adequate readiness and alertness of action, for war had indicated its coming as surely as that the day follows the night. Yet the world refused to face the inevitable. So, when the enemy struck, we were unprepared—militarily, economically, and spiritually. We had refused to learn the lessons of the preceding war. We fumbled and stumbled—industrially and financially—without taking heed of the mistakes we had made.

Someone has said that the only lesson history teaches us is that it teaches us no lesson. It seems to me that that is mostly because people do not read history. Particularly is it so in contemplating this second catastrophe into which we were thrust and the manner in which we are now handling the problems resulting from its aftermath.

On the martial side of World War II the spirit of America rose in a mighty effort. We fended for ourselves and provided for our friends. Nothing they needed was too much for us to give, for what we did for them we were doing for ourselves and for the common cause.

Our war was fought on fronts 15,000 miles away from each other. Never in the history of mankind have there been such military achievements. Marshall, MacArthur, Eisenhower, Arnold, Patton, Stillwell, King, Halsey, Nimitz, Mitscher, and all the young men and women in our armed forces added new and great glory to America. The civilians and workers at home did their magnificent share, showing that the greatest form of efficiency is the voluntary cooperation of a free people. You, in South Carolina, took a great part for you were always in the front with volunteers. Finally, the genius of our scientists, our engineers, our industrialists, produced the supreme weapon of all time—the atomic bomb. That we shall never give away, until and unless security for us and for the world is established. Until that time comes, the United States will remain the guardian of safety. We can be trusted with that solemn responsibility. Only two countries—really only one—have dissented from that declaration—Russia and its satellite, Poland, which abstained from supporting the American atomic plan.

So much for the past.

I wish I could say that the immediate future looks bright. But it is not entirely black. The future of ourselves, in fact of the world, lies within our grasp. The Nazis made a thorough job of scorching the earth physically, economically, and spiritually. They destroyed men's faith in their fellow men; in their governments; in their ability to do for themselves; and in the spiritual values of life.

There is no place left to which to turn for regeneration except to America. We must answer that call or we shall fail civilization in its most tragic moment, and thus fail ourselves. We cannot do it by loans, grants, subsidies, bonuses, or pious resolves. We can do it only by showing the real might of America—by justice; by helpfulness which insists upon self-help, and finally, by production and still more production. Then will come a respite in which the world may bind its wounds. Then man will find work so that he and those dear to him may live in a manner of his own choosing.

We are called upon from every direction. Can we answer all the calls? Not long ago I asked for an inventory of America's resources. I wanted this country to know what it has to give before it promises aid. If we find we haven't enough to help everybody, we then must help those who can most readily help themselves.

After the First World War, I urged that the peoples be helped to go back to work. Who, if left alone, is not eager to work, if through his labor, he lives under better conditions in body and spirit? That is the way to gain self-respect and regain human dignity—deliberately destroyed by totalitarianism, regardless of what label it wears.

Never has there been such schisms between segments of society. Never has labor been so powerful. And now it must use that power through leadership in cooperation, or lose that power.

Today, as 30 years ago, the need is present. The same call is heard. Let all of us go back to work—to work, not for war, but for peace—to work under a system that gives each a share of the wealth he produces.

We will find that work will solve many of the problems threatening security—the interrupted productivity in America; the lack of coal in Britain; the deficiency of the food and other life supplies in Europe. Even the spirit of the savage enemy countries will be bettered by bettering their economic conditions. And that can be done only by work.

One of the world's delusions is that the world can be set right by borrowing money. It can get going only if men work. If we accept the challenge to preserve civilization, it means greater effort—greater even than that exerted during the war. It will be without the fanfare of war. It means sweat and thrift to make the things the world needs to start anew, the physical things which it must have in order to feed, clothe and house the peoples—to educate, spiritualize, medicated, transport and entertain them. Work is the alchemist that changes drudgery into joy. That is every man's goal—that is every man's right.

But we might as well look facts in the face: We cannot achieve our purpose with the present hours and limitations on work. Men and women will have to work longer and harder for some time to come in order to catch up with the ravages of war, if we are to regain our heritage; if we are again to be the Missioners of Hope and be rewarded for effort.

During the war I always contended the 6 days a week and 8 hours a day was the fastest pace at which we could go in a long war. That, too, would be the limit for peace. But if we adopted, wholeheartedly a 5½-day, 44-hour week, with no strikes or lay-off, to January 1, 1949, the result would be electrifying.

Production would flow smoothly; a sense of security would return to worker and employer; and the reaction upon the economy of the world would be deep and lasting. Until we have unity; until we straighten out and solve our own problems of production, and have internal stability, there is no basis on which the world can renew itself physically or spiritually.

And upon this change in our material outlook, there would follow a change in our sense of security. Make no mistake; our

military lines are no stronger than the industry behind them. Unless we work, we shall see a vast inflation; unless we work, we shall not be able to maintain our claim to power. That would be the greatest blow we could receive, for it would strip us of our strength to preserve our way of life.

Let us not be deceived; we are today in the midst of a cold war. Our enemies are to be found abroad and at home. Let us never forget this.

Our unrest is the heart of their success. The peace of the world is the hope and the goal of our political system; it is the despair and defeat of those who stand against us.

We can depend only on ourselves. One by one our allies are—or they think they are—exhausted. That means they stop work. But usually we find that exhaustion is the result of stopping work and not the other way around. That can happen here. Don't let us be sucked into the maelstrom.

Be sure of this: Today we are on the brink of an engulfing inflation. There is only one way out. That is by work.

The more we produce, the less will be the cost of living; the more things we can buy; the easier will be the building up of our reserves, physical, financial, and spiritual, too, for we shall be free of worry, the absence of which is a sense of security.

As I say this, there comes to my mind, as support, the motto of our native State: Animals opibusque parati—ready in soul and resources.

And now I close by saying that no greater compliment could have been paid me than to hang my picture in the legislative chamber of my motherland. From her sprang men great in the beginnings of America—the Rutledges, the Pinckneys, the Lynches, Heywards, Middletons, Laurens. And in more recent days, a great Senator, Supreme Court Justice, and Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, has added his name to the immortals.

South Carolina—I thrill at the name. Deserving her place in history, by her years and efforts, she remains forever young in her determination to do even better in the time to come. And to that, as one of her proud sons, I pledge, as did our forefathers, my life, my fortune, and my sacred honor.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the March 29 issue of America, which is a Catholic review of the week. The editorial, which supports the President's suggestions for aid to Greece, indicates the belief that this is the best means available of keeping us out of war.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMONS TO INTERVENTION

Why is there so much disturbance over the President's request for three perfectly obvious things? He asked that Greece and Turkey be assisted in a moment of extreme emergency; that trained American civilian and military men be sent to these countries to aid in reconstruction; and that the plan be put into operation as soon as possible. Furious congressional debates are prognosticated; though it is our guess that most of the debates will be merely for the sake of the record. No clear alternative to the President's demands has been proposed, for none is at hand. The bitter pill may be sugar-coated by a few amendments and restrictions, but there is nothing for it but to swallow the medicine.

The nub of the situation is that intervention has now definitely come to stay. The President has no illusions on this point; he realizes the implications of what he is doing. And the same is painfully evident to his isolationist critics, as it is to Pravda and Izvestia. Once more a frantic attempt will be made to ascribe an inevitably necessary intervention to any convenient scapegoat—to Fascist influence, to the New Deal, to Wall Street, to anything but the plain and evident truth. This truth is that a desperate emergency threatens the security and the very existence of our country. Delay in action is a fatal waste of opportunity. Much sooner than we imagine we may be bitterly reproaching ourselves for neglecting it, as the world reproached itself after Munich.

The President is not "dragging us into war," but is using the best means available here and now to keep us out of war. On the other hand, if prompt action is not taken to preserve the political independence of Greece and Turkey, and to provide some sort of first aid in an economic sense to Greece, we shall find arrayed against us a rejuvenated military machine, a huge accomplished fact of a Soviet-dominated and Soviet-occupied Europe, and a prostrate Britain. We are not seeking war, but taking the only possible step to keep war from seeking and annihilating us.

Equally futile is the argument that by aiding Greece and Turkey we are conferring approval upon a Fascist regime or a corrupt government. "The extension of aid by this country," says the President, "does not mean that the United States condones everything that the Greek Government has done or will do." We have always condemned extremists of right or left. But we are facing squarely the question whether free institutions of any sort can survive. "This is no more than a recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States."

If the President's course is adopted, will there be further demands upon the money and the manpower of the United States to meet with kindred situations in Korea, in Hungary, or in other danger spots all over the world? Quite likely there will be, and these will continue so long as a certain amount of boasting and bluffing is allowed to have its way. But this is not "embarking upon imperialism," or any such fantastic notion. Nor have we been forced to "embark" upon intervention by any cunning schemes or ambitious administrations, past or present. The simple fact is that in the last 30 years the immense evolution of the modern world and the phenomenal rise of totalitarianism have placed the United States in a position of dominance and leadership where we now have only two courses open to us: to intervene actively—through economic aid and political power—in every region of the world where freedom is threatened, or be resigned to our own and the world's destruction.

The President's brusque unveiling of this stark alternative has thrown the pink liberals and the "muddled conservatives"—isolationists and reactionaries—into a common fellowship reminiscent of the Hitler-Stalin pact. But decision can no longer be postponed. Only when America faces her full duty in the present can she hope in the future to be part of a peaceful and law-abiding world.

Don't Delay: Speed Greek Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in today's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "Don't Delay: Speed Greek Aid Bill."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T DELAY: SPEED GREEK AID BILL

Prompt and unanimous approval by the House Foreign Affairs Committee of the $400,000,000 Greco-Turkish aid program stands as further heartening recognition of the urgency of this issue.

It is highly reassuring, from the standpoint of the need for affirmative action by this country to help stem the march of communism abroad, that the House committee, like the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a few days ago, has wasted no time on this imperative matter.

In addition, the House group's action represents an official answer to Henry Wallace, who has been denouncing President Truman's proposal—and the peaceful aims of the United States Government—to the British public.

The truth is, of course, that Attorney General Tom C. Clark, in his Philadelphia speech the other night, gave a substantial if indirect boost to the proposal for help for Greece and Turkey when he declared that anyone "who tells the people of Europe that the United States is committed to a ruthless imperialism and war with the Soviet Union tells a lie."

Thus, without mentioning names, the Attorney General handed a stinging rebuke not only to Wallace but to other Americans, in and out of Congress, who are trying to scuttle the Truman plan by charging that this country, in moving for political freedom in Europe, is following the pattern of aggression.

Nothing could be further from the facts. The plain question involved is whether preventive steps against a form of actual aggression—the imposing by a great and powerful nation of its will upon relatively weak countries—shall be taken now, while there is time and opportunity to make them count, or whether to await an indefinite future when the damage already done to the peace of Europe might be irreparable.

There is nothing to show, as of this date, that the Soviet Union has changed or even modified its expansionist policies. On the contrary, only within the last few days has come new evidence, through Associated Press dispatches, of a Moscow-directed superadministration of the Balkans which purportedly controls military operations beyond the Greek border and dominates political thought in Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania.

There is nothing new about such charges as these. What is new, however, is the detailed disclosure of the organization of Moscow-trained men and women who allegedly get their orders from the Kremlin and have put in operation a superstate that functions with the approval of the Soviet Union.

That Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, is said to be a leader in this imperialist, pro-Communist set-up is no surprise to Americans.

But the point is that if neither the efforts of the United Nations to make a real start

for world stability nor the peace-striving meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers have caused the Moscow Politburo to check its expansionist ambitions, there is need for the utmost speed if the United States hopes to accomplish anything whatever for the preservation of independence in eastern Europe.

The first requirement now is that the proposal in Congress to provide aid for Greece and Turkey should carry a connecting link to the United Nations. The amended Vandenberg plan, now in the Senate bill, but not yet incorporated in the House bill, would permit the United Nations to have a part in ending American aid if or when the need for aid passes. Such a link between American and United Nations procedures is essential.

The second requirement is for both House and Senate to push the aid program to enactment with all possible dispatch. This is not the time for dilatory tactics in the House or filibusters in the Senate. It is time for prompt, wholehearted action by Congress to promote, through this measure, the economic upbuilding of Europe and the maintenance of world peace.

Statement of Principles Dealing With Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial headed "The Chamber's Formula," published in the April 12 issue of the Pittsburgh Press. The editorial states that under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh a group of leaders representing both management and labor unions have drafted a statement of principles dealing with labor-management relations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHAMBER'S FORMULA

Under the auspices of the chamber of commerce a group of leaders representing both management and labor unions have drafted a statement of principles dealing with labor-management relations.

This statement apparently is designed as a general document on which the sponsors hope all labor unions and all employers in this area will agree.

There is, as a matter of fact, nothing new in the statement. The principles it enunciates either are already accepted or should be generally accepted.

Only the most obsolete minds either in unions or in management could fail to agree on all of the 10 points set out in the chamber of commerce statement.

The significance of these principles does not lie in their originality. They have been standard objectives since labor-management relations began. And by now all hands at least give lip service to them. Hardly anyone dares eschew any of them.

Despite this, they are not universally respected.

For instance, violation of contracts is an old story. Both employers and unions have been accused of it. In many cases the breach has been all too obvious.

So, if the higher-ups of management and unions will adopt these principles in good faith, as suggested by the group which drafted them, it will be a long step toward more constructive industrial relations in this area.

Neither side need hesitate about accepting these principles. While they are spread out over 10 specific points, they all add up to one thing: The right of every man to free choice of his course and the dignity of his person.

Once such principles are instilled in the minds and hearts of the leaders on both sides, once it becomes possible to accept them honestly and trustfully, the way will be cleared to decency and sincerity in labor relations.

From then on the path of collective bargaining and the road to more abundant production will be relatively easy.

The Loyalty Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful and incisive critique of the recent loyalty order by four brilliant jurists on the faculty of the Harvard Law School. It appeared as a letter to the editor of the New York Times on Sunday, April 13, 1947. Because of the distinguished character of the writers, the editor of the Times prefaced the letter with an introductory note, which I also wish to insert.

There being no objection, the letter and introductory note were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LOYALTY ORDER—PROCEDURE TERMED INADEQUATE AND DEFECTS POINTED OUT

(Of the writers of the following letter, Mr. Griswold is dean of the Harvard Law School; Mr. Scott, an authority on the law of trusts; Mr. Katz and Mr. Chafee, who served as vice chairman of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, are professors of law at that school.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The moral and political validity of the Executive order "prescribing procedures for the administration of an employee's-loyalty program in the executive branch of the Government" will be measured by its efficacy in achieving its twin purposes. As stated, these are: to afford "maximum protection * * * [to] the United States against infiltration of disloyal persons into the ranks of its employees," and to afford "equal protection from unfounded accusations of disloyalty * * * [to] the loyal employees of the Government."

It is possible so to administer the order as to accomplish these ends. It is also possible so to administer the order as to miss genuine culprits, victimize innocent persons, discourage entry into the public service and leave both the Government and the American people with a hangover sense of futility and indignity.

The nature of the administration will hinge upon the procedures to be followed. This is the nub of the business. Here, as so often in our history, moral and political issues come to focus in a question of procedure. Although the order purports to prescribe a procedure, the prescription is shadowy and incomplete.

Conceivably, the silences of the draftsmen may be redeemed by wisdom in execution. At this time, however, we can only appraise the order according to its terms. The procedure actually described is quite inadequate. It fails to take due account of the gravity of the sanctions invoked against a person to whom the prohibitions of the order may be deemed to apply. It fails to draw upon the cumulative experience of courts and administrative agencies. It fails also to give effect to the conception of sound administrative procedure reflected in the very recently enacted Administrative Procedure Act.

MEANING OF DISMISSAL

It is imperative to keep clearly in mind what a dismissal under the order means. Far more is involved than the loss of job. It means that:

1. The person dismissed will be denied all opportunity for employment anywhere in the Federal Government.

2. As a practical consequence, he will also lose almost all possibility of finding employment within any State or municipal government.

3. Also, he will encounter special difficulties in obtaining employment in private organizations.

Consider the case of one who, for 20 or 30 years—his entire mature life—has worked in the Forestry Service, or the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, or the Postal Service, or the Bureau of Standards, or the Tennessee Valley Authority. To deny him all opportunity for employment in governmental service, Federal, State or municipal, is to deprive him of the only means of livelihood for which he has any training or experience.

The tested wisdom of our tradition and national experience dictate that no sanction so drastic shall be applied save after adjudication of wrongdoing based upon a full hearing before responsible and impartial public officers, who are not themselves in fear of losing their own jobs.

The Executive order provides for a hearing of sorts before a "loyalty board" in the particular department or agency, whose members are to be appointed by the departmental or agency head from the personnel of the department or agency. Since Cabinet officers and other senior personnel are unlikely to have either the time or the taste for such service, the membership will tend to be drawn from third or fourth line employees, who will themselves feel none too secure.

EVIDENCE AT HEARING

And the nature of the hearing? The suspected "officer or employe shall be served with a written notice of such hearing in sufficient time, and shall be informed therein of the nature of the charges against him in sufficient detail, so that he will be enabled to prepare his defense." So far, good. But—"The charges shall be stated as specifically and completely as, in the discretion of the employing department or agency, security considerations permit."

The accused is also given a "right to reply to such charges in writing," and a "right to appear before such board personally, to be accompanied by counsel or representatives of his own choosing, and to present evidence on his behalf. * * *" There the prescription ends. There is no provision that the accused shall be confronted by such evidence as there may be to support the charges against him, so that he may undertake to rebut it. Indeed, there is no requirement that the evidence against him shall be introduced at the hearing at all.

No provision is made for a detailed record of the hearing or, for that matter, for a record of any kind. There is no requirement that the findings of the loyalty board must be supported by the evidence. In fact, there is no requirement that the loyalty board make any findings whatever. After the

"hearing," the loyalty board makes its recommendation to the head of the department or agency. If the recommendation is for removal and is accepted by the departmental head, his decision is subject to an appeal to the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission, which, after review, makes an advisory recommendation.

Since there is no provision for a record, it is by no means clear what the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission will review or on what basis. The order is, moreover, wholly silent as to the procedure to be followed by the Loyalty Review Board upon such review. The membership of the Loyalty Review Board is to be appointed from "officers or employees of the Civil Service Commission," presumably by the Commission.

IMPALPABLE STANDARD

This tells its own tale, but the tale is not yet complete. The charges against the suspected public officer or employee will derive their significance from the standards of wrongdoing defined by the order. The governing standard is explicit. "The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment * * * shall be that * * * reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States." Even in the most mature and most careful and fairest of hearings, it would be sufficiently difficult for the defendant to come to grips with so impalpable a standard.

But even this is not all. The "activities and associations of an * * * employee which may be considered in connection with the determination of disloyalty may include one or more of the following: * * * Membership in affiliation with or sympathetic association with any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons, designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means."

Here we swim in a sea of ambiguity. Is the Attorney General's designation to be taken as final? May the defendant undertake to show that a group with which he is sympathetically associated is not subversive, or must he limit his defense to an attempt to show that he has no connection with the organization? If he concedes his membership, and is foreclosed by the Attorney General's characterization of the organization, will this be taken as proof that he, as an individual, is likewise subversive, or at least as reasonable grounds for belief that he is disloyal? Where is the burden of proof? Is it on the accused?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

These are questions which can be answered, and answered in such a way as to maintain both the integrity of our free institutions and realistic possibilities of control. The task is arduous, but does not lie beyond the reach of legal and administrative imagination and technique. There is an implication of surrender in the apparent abandonment of the elementary requirements that charges be supported, that issues be clearly defined, that the burden of proof be clearly assigned, and that an adjudication must be based upon evidence with which the defendant has been confronted.

As has already been indicated, the order embodies a novel variation of a familiar system of control—licensing. In effect, the public service is made a licensed activity, and a public officer or employee dismissed under the order is in the position of one whose license to pursue his calling has been revoked.

The settled practice of many administrative agencies, judicial decisions without number and a variety of Federal and State statutes have developed a well-established procedure for the revocation of licenses. There is a complaint, which specifies the charges; there is an opportunity to answer; on the issues thus defined there is a public hearing before the licensing authority; at the hearing the defendant is confronted by all the evidence against him and is given full opportunity to introduce evidence in his own behalf; the licensing authority must find that the charges have been sustained by the evidence in the proceeding, and no other evidence may be considered; a record of the proceeding must be kept; the order of the licensing authority must be supported by the findings, and the findings must be supported by the evidence; and the order of revocation, if issued, is subject to judicial review.

POSSIBILITIES OF ABUSE

The Department of Justice and the Congress have lately been much concerned about the possibilities of abuse in administrative procedure. Their concern has been given effect in the investigation and report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure and in the Administrative Procedure Act which became a law on June 11, 1946. These now stand as a somewhat ironic commentary on the misty procedure so indistinctly sketched in the Executive order.

The situation can be redeemed. The order does state that its expressed requirements as to procedure "shall be considered as providing minimum requirements," which may be supplemented by the heads of individual departments or agencies. This affords some possibilities for relief here and there, but is plainly inadequate.

It is for the President and his law officers to make the correction. In default of adjustment by Executive action, the correction may be imposed by the courts, but piecemeal, slowly and after much clamor and confusion.

ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, JR.,
ERWIN N. GRISWOLD,
MILTON KATZ,
AUSTIN W. SCOTT.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *April 10, 1947.*

Will H. R. 3020 Bring Industrial Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, my vote will be recorded in favor of H. R. 3020, for the correction of abuses in labor-management relations. Legislation to cure the various evils prevailing in this sector of our economy is long overdue. I am hopeful that this measure, representing long and earnest endeavors by the House Education and Labor Committee, will largely rectify the many faults of existing statutes on industrial relations.

However, I do not believe that this legislation will inaugurate a period of domestic economic peace and tranquillity.

This legislation comes at a time when humble people are feeling the long-delayed but cruel impact of 14 years of inflationary spending. The consequences of that inflation, familiarly labeled the "high cost of living" are a very real problem today to millions of workers.

During my terms in Congress I have carried on a persistent, but losing, fight against inflation. My second speech in the House, on May 20, 1943, anticipated, in part, the situation that confronts us now. I declared then:

For we are now nearing the crisis in our financial affairs. Strong measures to preserve the value of the frugal savings of the common people of America must be enacted or else the same formula that has produced dictatorship in other parts of the world will produce it here.

First would come social dissensions, resulting from the disruption of home life and skyrocketing of prices. These disorders would take the form of food riots, sectional strife, or recurrent labor disputes. Whatever their apparent nature, the underlying cause would be the protest of the people against destruction of the America they love by unsound economic practices.

I then overestimated the nearness of the consequences of years of inflation. But today those consequences are no remote danger. They have their foot in our front door. Wage earners and all people of modest income are being severely hurt by the deterioration of our money.

Again, a year ago, in my Washington report of May 15, 1946, I warned:

If the fight to stop this British raid (the British loan) is lost, prepare yourself for ruinous inflation—or the Nazi alternative, ruthless regimentation.

The $4,000,000,000 gift loan was passed last July. What has happened? On March 1, 1946, the Department of Labor yardstick on food commodities stood at 107.9. On March 1, 1947, it was 167.5. That is a rise of 59 points, or over 50 percent in 12 months.

What caused this dizzy price rise, which has only partially hit the family market basket? You remember UNRRA, the British loan, and other hand-outs? These schemes supplies foreign countries with almost a blank check against our production. These dollar hand-outs have taken gigantic quantities of American grain and other nonperishable foods. Inevitably, this excessive buying demand has skyrocketed prices—even though original supplies were large. On the other hand, fresh fruits and vegetables, largely nonexportable, are generally working lower in price despite the end of OPA regimentation.

The humble people of America will not quietly endure inflation that cruelly lowers their living standards, especially when they know they are not getting the truth about the causes of that situation.

So continued labor strife is not only possible, but probable, even though this bill corrects many evils.

Until Congress stops the Truman administration from playing Santa Claus of the world, we will have no permanent industrial peace.

Moreover, until the American people get the truth about how foreign hand-outs are raising their cost of living, we are not entitled to domestic tranquillity. Desirable as some of these hand-outs might be, no goal abroad justifies fooling the American people about its cost to them in inflation and monetary deterioration.

The Truman administration is loading the American people with the budget

deficits of unnumbered countries. That policy means continual economic stress and strife in America.

H. R. 3020 does not deal with this basic problem, upon the solution of which depends the future of the American people.

The Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in today's issue of the Philadelphia Bulletin, written by Mr. Paul Jones and published in his column which is entitled "Candid Shots." This column discusses the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it is headed "A CONGRESSIONAL RECORD fan wonders how the snipers at Congress get that way."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANDID SHOTS—A CONGRESSIONAL RECORD FAN WONDERS HOW THE SNIPERS AT CONGRESS GET THAT WAY

(By Paul Jones)

To rise to the defense of representative government seems so old-hat nowadays that we feel a bit embarrassed in pointing out that Congress may be, after all, a very sound institution.

This revolutionary idea came to us after we had leafed through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the fifteenth consecutive day without finding anything with a crackpot angle loony enough to inspire a light paragraph or two.

We do not believe this condition will or can last. When you have 531 people from all over the country and of different ages or backgrounds, each entitled to leap to his feet and sound off on matters of public concern, somebody is bound to make a boob of himself sooner or later.

If we approached this whole thing from a scientific angle, we would judge the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD only after establishing what we research workers call control groups. That is, we would—during a given month—set up an executive record or stenographic transcript of everything said during White House or Cabinet conferences.

We would, also, decree that a strict report be kept of even the lightest words which fall from the lips of agency heads and bureau chiefs during their pow-wows with subordinates. These conversations would appear daily in the Bureaucratic Bugle.

Far from our thought is any wish to be cited for contempt of court, but in the interests of humanity, let all judges consent to publish the obiter dicta of their huddles, the byplay and banter which we suppose adorn even their august consultations. Let all be printed in the Judiciary Journal.

WHY BE FOR CONGRESS BUT "AGIN" CONGRESSMEN?

It would then be possible, each morning, to spread in front of you the four Government dailies—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Executive Eavesdropper, the Bureaucratic Bugle, and the Judiciary Journal. With all the evidence before us, we could then determine whether the debates in Congress are really on as low a level as the enemies of Congress claim.

If we had to make a guess beforehand, we should surmise that our Senators and Representatives would do at least as well as their opposite numbers in the other departments of Government. During our own sketchy experience in Washington, we used to sit in on regular conferences which we believe got through some useful work. But we would hate to have a record of all the false starts, the hums and haws, the thinking-out-louds, the poor jokes, and the hasty proposals which we contributed on occasion (as everybody else did) to the morning sessions.

We are not sure just how it is possible to be for representative government but against representatives whenever they attempt to govern. We can understand a slight sinking feeling when the visitor to the Capitol takes a gander from the gallery and examines the men and women on the floor of the Senate or House. But we contend that any group of people lifted from the 48 States and the 435 districts ought to inspire the same disquiet, because you are really looking at the essence of republican rule.

What we can't understand is the relief some people seem to find in turning to a little group of experts or to the single figure of a dictator.

This leads to another proposal. It is surely not beyond the capacity of our scientific workers to devise some sort of electronic skull cap which would fit over a fuehrer's skull, and make a record of his thoughts. This is the only way we can dream up to make a fair comparison between the debates of a democratic assembly and the cogitations of a superman.

A LOOK INTO A DICTATOR'S BRAIN

By a simple process of telephoto-communications (you work out the details in your spare time) the image of his pondering would be converted into light-impulses beamed into a printing plant. We won't bore you with the details, but the upshot of the whole thing would be the appearance on the breakfast table of the Superman Scimitar.

We will assume that he couldn't edit the sheet except for mechanical errors, so that the fascinated citizen could read something like this: "Shall I attack Russia or not? Well, it's a gamble. Napoleon flopped at Moscow. But then, what was Napoleon compared to me? Himmel, why did I eat that sauerkraut? I ought to know better. What was I thinking about? Oh, Russia. Hmmm. Of course, the general staff is against it. But what do those dummkopfs know about military science, compared to a corporal in the Bavarian line? What does anybody know, except me? Maybe it wasn't the sauerkraut, maybe it was that knackwurst. The economic minister wants me to leave Russia alone, too. But what does Schacht know about banking and finance, when you come right down to it? I mean, compared to me? Would the people stand for it? Bah, they'll stand for anything. Say, maybe it wasn't the knackwurst and sauerkraut. Maybe it was that acorn coffee.

On second thought, we'll settle for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. SOMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter sent by the Puerto Rican Commissioner, Dr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, to the Secretary of the Interior, J. A. Krug, and Secretary Krug's reply thereto:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Allow me to congratulate and thank you on your statement before the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives at the hearing held March 7, 1947, on statehood for Hawaii.

Representing, as I do, a community of 2,200,000 American citizens, who do not enjoy a fully democratic system of self-government, I can certainly appreciate the value of your recognition of the right to enjoy it, which you are advocating for the people of Hawaii, another offshore community of American citizens in a predicament similar to ours.

I realize that the historical background and the circumstances in the case of Puerto Rico are not identical with the historical background and the circumstances in the case of Hawaii. But I believe that, fundamentally, both cases offer an opportunity to apply in practice the principles of democracy in accordance with American principles of government. The philosophy presiding the approach to the Hawaiian problem is equally applicable to Puerto Rico. Governmental authority should emanate from the people. Of course, the form of partnership or relationship between the offshore communities and the mainland which in each case should prevail may offer a field for different opinions.

In the case of Hawaii I have no doubt that the answer is statehood. In the case of Puerto Rico I coincide with your statement: We must find out what the people of Puerto Rico actually want before we arrive at a final decision.

In the name of the people of Puerto Rico I dare say that our aspirations may be summed up in the following: Full democracy; freedom from want; adjustment of relationships with the mainland on the basis of common interests, common ideals, and common consent.

Sincerely yours,

A. FERNÓS-ISERN,
Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

Hon. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN,
Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR DR. FERNÓS-ISERN: Thank you for your kind comments on my statement on statehood for Hawaii before the Public Lands Committee.

I am sure you realize that I feel very strongly that the people of Puerto Rico should be given the opportunity to express their desires as to ultimate political status. In fairness to them, I think this can only be done after Congress has set forth in clear terms the alternatives which it is willing to extend to Puerto Rico. I will continue to press for such a measure at every opportunity.

Both you and I realize that because of the great divergence of opinion in Puerto Rico and in the United States as to what the ultimate solution should be, the problem is not a simple one, and I think that we must be realistic enough to face the fact that it may be impossible to get immediate action from Congress on a satisfactory plebiscite measure. Because I believe so strongly in the principles of democracy, I will vigorously support any measure which provides immediately for a greater degree of self-government in Puerto Rico. I hope that a bill will soon be introduced in Congress to provide for the election of the governor by the people of Puerto Rico and for the local appointment of all of the governmental officials. You can be assured that I will urge the immediate passage of such a measure.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

Secret War Tools Found in Tulsan's Junk Boxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tulsa Daily World of April 13, 1947:

SECRET WAR TOOLS FOUND IN TULSAN'S JUNK BOXES

When a Tulsa pipe and supply dealer offered to buy some sheet metal at Tulsa's WAA base they told him he would have to buy the bitter along with the sweet.

The bitter, apparently, was a pile of boxes and crates, some wooden, some steel, which had to be sold with the scrap metal.

So the dealer—Adolf Neuwald, 2623 East Thirteenth Place—agreed to take the whole lot, at a nominal figure.

Saturday there was some doubt which was the bitter and which was the sweet in the scrap metal deal.

Because the boxes and crates Neuwald was forced to haul away to get his metal were packed with bombsight stabilizers, Army Air Force flight gyros, a few complicated telescope sights and—hold your breath—Norden bombsight equipment.

A quick check late Saturday indicated the instruments, altogether, cost the Government something like $107,000.

"I didn't know what was in the boxes—in fact, I didn't know that anything was in them," said Neuwald. "They were just setting there with the sheet metal I wanted to buy and they told me I'd have to take bitter along with the sweet, if I wanted the metal.

"So I hauled away the boxes. I sold some of them without even opening them—don't know what was in them."

Among the boxes Neuwald sold were 50 small wooden containers, each approximately a foot high and 10 inches square. They were an ideal size for holding milk bottles and the Carnation Co., at 115 North Cheyenne Avenue, snapped them up for $1 each.

When the boxes were delivered, workmen at the Carnation plant opened one.

Inside they found an intricate piece of machinery—a United States Army Air Force glide bombing attachment, manufactured by Carl L. Norden, Inc.

The same thing was inside 48 of the 50 boxes.

"All we wanted were the boxes," explained William D. Ernie, manager of the Carnation plant in Tulsa and a World War II Navy veteran, "and we thought that was all we were buying.

"Now we've got 48 bombsight instruments on hand and don't have the least idea what they are. We're getting in touch with Army authorities to see what we should do. Perhaps they're obsolete or something—but it seems pretty strange to sell them for a dollar apiece."

Most complicated instrument found in the crates sold to Neuwald was a telescopic sighting device, a maze of mirrors, prisms, lenses, dials, wheels and gears.

"I've only found one of them in the boxes so far," the pipe dealer explained Saturday, "but there are a lot more boxes I haven't had time to open yet—might be some more. Thought I'd keep this one for myself."

Army Air Force veterans of Tulsa who viewed some of the equipment Saturday were unanimous in the belief that most of it, at least, is made up of obsolete instruments, already outmoded although they were manufactured only 2 years ago.

On the other hand, they were just as unanimous in pointing out that thousands of Army veterans would appreciate an opportunity to buy some equipment for souvenirs, if nothing more. WAA gave them no chance, however; it was sold only "sight unseen."

From the WAA side came word that that agency could not be held responsible for selling the thousands of dollars worth of instruments as junk.

Officials there explained that if the crates and boxes were declared surplus by the Army Air Force, they were immediately put up for sale. It was the responsibility of the Army either to remove contents of the boxes or permit their sale.

Meanwhile, the Carnation Co. officials still believe the 50 wooden boxes they bought will be ideal to put on customers' porches this summer to store milk when it is delivered.

But they're a little puzzled on how they can attach or use the glide-bomber sights on their milk trucks, and, at last reports, it was apparent the stack of instruments in the company's garage represents a dead loss as far as the dairy industry is concerned.

"We told the WAA about finding the instruments in the boxes," one Carnation man said, "and nobody out there seemed very interested. In fact, what they advised us to do was to throw 'em in the river. Seems kind of a shame; doesn't it?"

Price Fixing of Gas and Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

HOUSTON, TEX., *April 14, 1947.*
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge that your committee favorably report Rizley bill, H. R. 2185. The Federal Power Commission's practice in fixing the price of gas at the well and regulating the end use of gas is disrupting the economy of the entire oil and gas producing industry. True conservation of oil and gas which the American people expect and demand cannot be attained under such governmental interference. Producers of oil and gas must operate under an economy free of Government price fixing. Presently they cannot build the necessary plants for the strippling of liquid hydrocarbons from gas and sale of the residue gas into interstate commerce. Building of such plants under the present interpretations of the law and regulations of the Federal Power Commission might result in their being declared a utility which would mean their ruin. This would cripple the oil and gas producing industry to an extent that reserves will be depleted instead of being built up resulting in shortages of petroleum products and having a bad effect on the entire economy and safety of this Nation.

It is just as practical and reasonable for the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the prices and uses of all commodities that move in interstate commerce as it is for the Federal Power Commission to exercise the authority it is presently usurping. Their agents are infesting the offices of oil and gas producers for the purpose of finding an excuse to classify such producers as a utility and bring them under their complete domination and regulation. Producers are withholding gas from the market for fear of being classified as a utility. If the Rizley bill becomes a law then the Federal Power Commission should be required to reduce the number of its employees and thereby effect a saving in governmental operating costs.

H. J. PORTER,
President, Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners' Association.

Henry Wallace Is Entitled to His Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, on Henry Wallace, from the Washington Daily News of April 15, 1947:

MY DAY—HENRY WALLACE IS ENTITLED TO HIS OPINION

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

WESTBROOK, CONN., Monday.—The front-page stories in one of our metropolitan newspapers the other day showed what a world of conflict we now live in.

In Moscow, Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov had refused to consider an agreement on the Saar until his proposal on four-power rule for the Ruhr was settled. In another column was an account of a speech made in London by Henry Wallace, in which he voiced his apprehension over the policy of lending money to anti-Soviet states just because they are anti-Soviet states rather than because they need money for rehabilitation.

Right next to that article was an accusation by a Democratic Senator that Mr. Wallace, by voicing these sentiments abroad was hurting his country's prestige. At home, the phone strike continued, the coal mines were slowly beginning to reopen, and the wisdom of certain Government loans to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad was being questioned by the Republicans in a Senate committee.

This all looks like a good deal of dissension and more dissension, and yet it is part of the freedom under which we in the United States think the world should operate. When the right to strike is curbed, our free and independent citizens strike all the more readily; and when John L. Lewis is taken to task for his behavior, he tries to find some way of getting back at those who took him to task and turns against the people in general.

To me, some of us seem to be losing sight of certain vital things. What does it matter now whether the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad got a bigger loan than it should have had? It was done to win the war and we won the war.

And Mr. Wallace is entitled to his opinion. It is good for every citizen to realize that the responsibility for helping to rehabilitate countries throughout the world is going to be heavy for us, since we are the only people who can bear the main burden. In the end, it is to our interest that these countries should be rehabilitated. The discussion of how we shall do it is a perfectly good discussion for people in this country to engage in, and will probably be helpful to the Administration in the long run.

Labor Leaders Threaten To Nullify Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the enclosed letter from a patriotic member of organized labor, together with a copy of an editorial which recently appeared in a labor publication.

I believe that the author of this letter speaks for the great bulk of the membership in the American labor movement. He apparently does not speak for that type of union leadership which has chosen to place itself above the law.

The author of this letter has not requested that his name be omitted but, for fear the use of his name might bring about reprisals, I have deleted it.

The letter follows:

MARCH 29, 1947.

Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The attached article recently came to my attention. I feel that as a Representative of the people of our State you should have this article brought to your attention.

First let me state that I am a member of a union. Further, I am a member of a union which is affiliated with the National Federation of Telephone Workers (as is the Association of Communication Equipment Workers). However, when any group or individual of that group, will sit idly by and see such utterances put on record and fail to register a protest—then I believe that group or individual is not in complete sympathy with the principles of democracy.

It seems that all the various unions, mine included, scream to high heaven that they are all 100 percent democratic in their thoughts and actions and that every one else is against them and therefore nondemocratic.

Then in the next breath they seek to influence their members to forsake—indeed to rebel—against any law that is not to the liking of the select group or the leaders of the group.

When it gets to the point where the labor leaders instruct their members to violate the law it is high time some action was taken. Here they seek to influence the member to revolt against the democratic way of life by instructing him to violate a law which would be formulated and made into law through the democratic processes of our elected representatives. And they call their union democratic.

Further, they class all nonunion members of labor as scabs and undesirable characters and free riders. Let me tell you that if the laboring man felt assurance that the union leaders were truly democratic in their hearts and if these leaders would talk and act like they believed in our great country and its principles—there would be no free riders. The simple truth is this—the laboring man is not hesitating to join the union from a financial standpoint—he is just simply not completely satisfied with the leadership. He lacks confidence in them. Their actions leave a doubt in his mind as to the real intent and aim of the leaders.

Such articles as the attached most certainly do not tend to relieve that doubt. Others may see it in a different light, but to me it appears to be a direct challenge to the democratic way of life.

I wish I had the means to furnish a copy of this letter to all the Members of the House. But with my limited means I am unable to do this. I believe you would be furthering the cause of democracy if you would bring this letter to the attention of as many Members as you possibly can. I believe it is time that the people assert themselves. There is no excuse for such abusive attacks as this being leveled against the members of the Senate Labor Committee and the House Members. There is no reason for the closed shop. It is just simply not in accord with the principles of our democracy.

Let me beg of you to use all the influence your office affords to do all in your power to protect the rights of all men to work without allegiance to any union.

The following editorial appeared in the March 1947 issue of the Communicator, the official publication of the Association of Communication Equipment Workers, affiliated with the National Federation of Telephone Workers:

DEFY OPEN-SHOP LAW

There is one thing the agents of the National Association of Manufacturers in the House and Senate of the United States Congress will learn as they pursue their efforts to outlaw the closed shop and that is that labor never will obey any such law no matter how many lickspittles vote for it, or how many Presidential signatures may be scribbled upon it.

Long before there were protective laws for labor unions the principle of insisting that only members of a given union be employed in organized industry was made effective. And no amount of legislation can contrive a law that can compel union men to work with scabs, or to work with people who receive the benefits of organized effort of others and refuse to contribute their share.

* * * * *

Let them pass such laws if they dare. The action of the millions of organized workers will nullify them and thereby prove the utter futility of the frantic efforts of political lackeys to carry out the program of the strike-breaking, scab-bearding NAM.

United States and Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine G. Yavis from the Washington Post of April 11, 1947:

UNITED STATES AND GREECE
(By Constantine G. Yavis)
AID FOR DEMOCRATIC FORCES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. Yavis has spent 10 years in Greece and was in Athens during the year following liberation as chief of research and analysis for the Office of Strategic Services. He returned to Greece a year ago for the State Department on the mission to observe the Greek elections. He is now teaching at Catholic University and George Washington University.)

Hitherto the official American policy has been to refrain from any interference in Greek internal politics, and merely to issue occasional press releases expressing hope that political passions would moderate.

This policy is largely responsible for the development of the present situation. During the German occupation, the United States and Great Britain supplied arms and money to Greek guerrilla groups without any regard to the quality of the persons leading those groups, or their aims. The result was the creation of the Communist-led EAM with 50,000 to 100,000 armed fighters.

In its effort to dominate Greece, the EAM incited against itself undying passions, by perpetrating unspeakable excesses, and by plunging Greece into a destructive civil war, a month and a half after liberation. We are responsible for the arming of the EAM, and, therefore, for the excesses of which it was guilty. We are also considered responsible for the fact that we allowed a civil war to break out, while it was easily within our power to intervene and avert it.

Since this revolt was put down 27 months ago, the rightist governments in Greece have carried on a systematic campaign of oppression and intimidation, looking toward the political extermination of the left and the center. Leftist newspapers were until recently prevented from circulating in the countryside, and leftists were kept under arrest for long periods without trial or adequate cause. At the same time, the rowdyism of armed rightist gangs remained unchecked, and army officers and police who had collaborated with the Germans against the EAM are still retained in service. The right has claimed United States and British support in its program, and no one in Greece doubts this is true, because it is realized that a single word from the American Ambassador would be sufficient to restrain rightist excesses. This presumed American approval has encouraged the worst elements in the rightist camp, and thereby prevented the more moderate rightists from making their influence felt.

Our mission to observe the Greek elections was not empowered to check abuses. This was considered an encouraging gesture to the right. Our ultimate approval of the conduct of the elections was interpreted as full approval of the rightist oppression and intimidation which had been exercised before the arrival of the mission. Intimidation was not visible to our inexperienced Army officers who toured Greece for the mission, but the very essence of intimidation is that its effects are felt after the threatening force is removed.

Even our economic aid to Greece, which totals $187,000,000 to date, has unavoidably supported the rightist government by enabling them to remain in power. And, since we neglected to attach political conditions to our aid, it appeared that we were content with the rightist campaign to exterminate the left.

It is worth adding that the economic and political problems now plaguing us in Greece have to a great extent been aggravated by the widespread feeling there that Russian occupation was imminent. Until the President's speech of March 20, we had made no gesture to dispel that feeling. If we had maintained our ATC bases, or other token forces in Greece, this would have been considered sufficient guarantee against Russian aggression. Private capital would then not be in hiding, creating the present business paralysis, and the unhappy guerrilla movement would find it much more difficult to attract recruits.

It is clear that our policy of nonintervention has been largely responsible for a disastrous civil war in Greece, and for the depredations of the left which have embittered large segments of the Greek population. This same policy has strengthened and encouraged the right in its oppression of the left and the center. No policy could have served better to weaken the democratic forces in Greece

and to strengthen the two extremes, both of which are abhorrent to our political ideology, to the point where an explosion is now imminent.

This means that willy-nilly, we are already a force in Greek politics, and that we have already intervened in one manner. No one, therefore, can object to the Truman plan for aid to Greece on the grounds of intervention in Greek domestic affairs.

There are strong reasons for supporting the President's plan: we should offer aid to a war-tested friend, to prevent imminent economic collapse. Besides, collapse of Greek economy would have a depressing effect all over the world, and, worse, would be the signal for a Communist revolution in Greece. Even if this revolution did not bring on World War III, it would, if successful, install a government unfriendly to us.

But if we carry out the State Department plan and hand over to the present reactionary Government of Greece $250,000,000, while continuing our policy of nonintervention in Greek internal politics, it is clear that this will be a green light for worse rightist excesses. An explosion will then take place, which will embroil us beyond our worst fears. Besides, Russia will have good reason to complain that the State Department plan encourages the rightist persecution of all nonrightist elements in Greece. The whole world will so interpret the purpose of our aid.

We have no alternative, therefore, but to drop our hands-off policy, and to take steps to curb the right, repress its fascistic elements, and strengthen the democratic forces of Greece.

This is, of course, intervention in Greek internal affairs, but in practice it is less so than our present policy. This is the only way we can redeem ourselves before Greece and the world for having set up first a tyranny of the left and now a tyranny of right.

There have been objections against our becoming entangled in the maze of Greek politics. But a very simple means of strengthening democracy in Greece is at our disposal. Our Ambassador can be authorized to call the King's attention to undesirable actions and personalities of the Greek Government, and to insist that corrective measures be taken. This method involves neither entanglement nor American civil government of Greece. A whispered word—plus the threat of withholding aid—will be enough. It will be as simple as that. Or, rather, it will be simple, provided we take certain common sense measures.

1. We must try to formulate advance plans. Obvious as this may appear, past experience justifies the fear that American personnel will arrive in Greece, and money will be spent, without adequate advance planning. A full week after the President's speech on Greek aid, Secretary Patterson testified that no definite plans had been made yet.

2. We will need an adequate number of political experts, probably 10 to 20 times the present number. They will collect and prepare the information needed by our Ambassador.

3. Our technical experts must be assisted by political advisers. In many instances our technical advisers have worked without awareness of the elementary political considerations involved.

4. An effort must be made to recruit political and technical experts who have had previous experience in Greece. Obvious though this also may appear, past experience again makes one apprehensive that experts with previous experience in Greece will not be sought out.

5. The Greek Government must be informed in advance that we shall insist that our technical and political advice be followed.

6. The presence of our mission will be considered by the Greeks as a guaranty against Russian aggression for the 18 months it is there. This in itself will act as a tonic to business and as a deterrent to those who for good or ill reason take to the mountains as outlaws. Our economic and political problems in Greece would be further alleviated if we could give a direct or implied guaranty of Greek territorial integrity for a longer period.

We must not neglect to take steps to disperse suspicions abroad and at home as to our motives in Greece.

1. Frequent reports must be issued on our activities in Greece.

2. The size of our military mission must be clearly stated, and it must be made clear that our military aid will aim merely to make the Greek Army capable of fulfilling internal security functions, as, for example, against the guerrillas.

3. An advance commitment of some sort must be made as to the exact time and conditions under which the UN can begin to undertake our economic burden in Greece. Until that time UN observers must accompany our mission. We need not feel embarrassed about bypassing the UN politically because even if the UN were able to deal expeditiously with the political complexities, it would require a minimum of a year to acquire the requisite background, channels of communication, and sources of information. The explosion in Greece is more imminent than that.

4. It should be a matter of pride for the United States to set right the political picture, since the United States has such a large share of the responsibility for the present fiasco. We should, therefore, declare openly that we shall use our influence to moderate political passions in Greece and to eliminate undemocratic excesses of any kind.

A policy such as described above will serve as a stimulant to the democratic forces which throughout the world are on the defensive against totalitarian ideas. This encouragement is needed desperately at this critical point in world politics.

Henry Wallace and the Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes on Henry Wallace, dated April 15, 1947:

The noisy reaction here over Henry Wallace's adventure in free speech abroad has demonstrated how far we have strayed from the high idealism of the war and in creation of the United Nations.

This reaction, some of it absurd and ridiculous, shows how rapid has been the retreat into nationalism.

The United Nations was a start on something that we hoped, and still hope, eventually will become a world government, in which individual nations are subordinated in a world society and a common brotherhood of man. Lip service was given freely by our leaders to this ideal. None expressed it better than President Truman, who said in a message to Congress in January last year:

"It is important that the nations come together as states in the Assembly and in the Security Council and in the other specialized assemblies and councils that have been and will be arranged.

"But that is not enough. Our ultimate security requires more than a process of consultation and compromise. It requires that we begin now to develop the United Nations as the representative of the world as one society."

It is in entire accord with that ideal that Henry Wallace, a leading citizen of our country and the world, ventured beyond our borders to speak to people elsewhere as citizens of a common world in the interest of peace, and the utilization of the UN for its appointed purpose of keeping the peace.

Mr. Wallace does not happen to agree with the so-called Truman doctrine. Lots of people don't, here and in other parts of the world. He said so here, repeatedly. This is a matter of concern to people all over the world, not just here. What is wrong with his speaking to people elsewhere in the general debate that is going on all over the world?

He has a right to speak, however his wisdom may be questioned. He has as much right as Winston Churchill, who spoke at Fulton, Mo., in a speech virtually sponsored by the President of the United States. Many think that speech started the division of the world into two conflicting camps that Henry Wallace, among others, believes is dangerous to the peace of the world.

Few would question that Mr. Churchill was trying to influence the people of this country and thus its policy. Nor is he the only one. We have had others from Britain trying to influence the policy of this country. Anyone who covers Washington daily is conscious of that.

No; there's something else in the outcry against Henry Wallace, as there always is, more than meets the eye and ear. He accurately labeled the hullabaloo here "hysteria." And back of that is fear. It is the fear some interests in this country have of Mr. Wallace because he has the habit of speaking unpleasant truths about what goes on, and because he has a large following for that reason. They call him a "crackpot." If they really believed that, they would dismiss him. But they don't.

It is amusing to see how he stirs them up. They do not like it when Henry Wallace says both parties here are being captured by the conservatives, for they don't like to be caught at this game which goes on before our eyes. They do not like it when he says the way to combat communism is to have something like the New Deal all over the world, for they are working like fury here now, night and day, to destroy that.

Truman and Monroe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post of April 8, 1947:

TRUMAN AND MONROE

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is this most critical difference between President Monroe's message of December 2, 1823, and President Truman's of March 12, 1947: Monroe made his declaration only when he knew beyond a reasonable doubt how the commitment was to be met, indeed that there was virtually no chance whatever that he would be unable to meet it. The Monroe Doctrine, unlike the Truman, was preceded by negotiations abroad and by cool and studied consultation at home in which Jefferson, Madison, and John Quincy Adams played the leading parts.

They approved the declaration when they had before them the definite assurance, given in August to the American Minister Rush by Canning, that Great Britain, then in undisputed command of the sea, had decided to prevent the reconquest of the Spanish colonies in the Western Hemisphere. It was then, when Jefferson had read the dispatches from Rush about the British decision, that he approved what became the Monroe Doctrine, saying that "all Europe combined would not undertake such a war, for how could they propose to get at either enemy (Britain or the United States) without superior fleets." Madison was equally definite and practical in realizing that it was the assurance of overwhelming power which justified the commitment: "It is particularly fortunate," he wrote to President Monroe, "that the policy of Great Britain, though guided by calculations different from ours, has presented a cooperation for an object the same as ours. With that cooperation we have nothing to fear from the rest of Europe, and with it the best assurance of success to our laudable views."

The Truman doctrine expresses our laudable views. But unlike the Monroe Doctrine it has been declared to the world without the kind of careful calculation of the assurances of success, which were made by Jefferson, Madison, Adams, and Monroe before they announced their laudable views. The difference is a big one—between making a promise which you know you can carry out, and making a promise first, and then wondering how you are going to carry it out. It is the difference between bold but astute statesmanship and reckless rhetoric.

As a result Senator BYRD has asked the administration a question which is quite proper but, under the so-called Truman doctrine as it now stands, is quite unanswerable. Senator BYRD wants to know whether "we have the resources alone to pay the bill."

What bill? The immediate bill for Greece alone is nearly $300,000,000. But under the administration policy this can be only the first installment. The money is to be used to balance the Greek budget this year on behalf of a government which collected almost no taxes and is, with our approval, conducting a civil war. Conceivably this installment would pay the Greek bill if there were set up promptly in Athens a government which can collect taxes and can unite the bulk of the Greek people. But the deficits of this government, which protects the profiteers and is trying to crush the Republicans as well as the Communists, will continue as long as the Government, as now constituted and conducted, exists.

Yet Greece is only a pinpoint in the Truman global policy. There can be no end to the financial costs of that policy because adequate precautions have not been taken to see to it that the money will accomplish the purposes for which it is given. Unless the Greek Government is reformed, Greece will not be stabilized by our meeting the deficits of that Government.

The case of Greece illustrates concretely the basic fallacy of the Truman doctrine in its present uncorrected, unqualified, and unbalanced form. It is that the expansion of the Soviet Union and the spread of communism can be checked by subsidizing all the governments, parties, factions which are most undeniably anti-Communist. A policy of this kind is bound to fail because it commits us to an alliance with the most reactionary forces in the world and alienates the moderate and democratic forces.

It assumes that mankind is divided into totalitarian Communists and Jeffersonian Democrats. It is not. There are also Nazis. Fascists, feudal lords, war lords. There are also Republicans, enlightened conservatives, liberals, Progressives, Social Democrats, Socialists, Christian Democrats, cooperators, labor parties, democratic planners, and what not.

If we conduct the Truman policy on the principle that whoever is most vehemently against the Soviets is our friend and ally—and in his heart a Jeffersonian Democrat—we shall separate ourselves from the masses of the people almost everywhere. We shall have embraced the extremists of the right as against the extremists of the left, when it is our interest and our duty to aline ourselves with the middle and the moderate parties. They are our real friends in the struggle for freedom, and they will decide the issue.

Rich as we are, and powerful as we are capable of being, we are not rich enough to subsidize reaction all over the world or strong enough to maintain it in power. The American people and the Truman administration do not want to do that, of course, nor do they think they are doing it. But that is what we shall be doing, nevertheless, if we intrust the formulation and execution of the new policy to men whose zeal has gotten the better of their judgment.

Army Air Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Washington Post reporting the timely observations of Gen. Carl Spaatz, Army Air Forces commander, of how delay on the decision on unification is undermining our national defense. General Spaatz echoes the point that I have been making repeatedly for many months—that we must make a decision on whether to adopt unification or not as a prerequisite to the planning and organization of our postwar armed services. He put it succinctly when he said:

The question of unification is the most important defense problem at the moment because, until it is disposed of, we can't have any permanent planning.

The article follows:

DEFENSE DELAYS, THREAT OF CUTS IN AIR POWER WORRY SPAATZ

(By John G. Norris)

Gen. Carl Spaatz, Army Air Forces commander, yesterday expressed concern over threatened cuts in American air power and delays in completing United States defense plans.

He told the Post that the AAF's striking power is now being rebuilt from the low point where left by demobilization a year ago. But he warned that enemy planes could "drop bombs on us" even when these defenses are complete.

The AAF Chief said that budget cut-backs already made—reducing Air Forces strength from 70 to 55 groups—represented an air power cut of 20 percent.

This reduction, Spaatz said in an interview, left the AAF with "not enough to do the jobs" and added that it "weakens us to the limit of elasticity." Asked about congressional proposals to slash an additional two and one-half billions from the Army, Navy, and Air Forces budgets, he replied:

"Any further reduction would weaken our posture before the world and should be of grave concern to everyone."

Further reduction beyond the 35-group strength provided in President Truman's budget, Spaatz added, will be "a challenge to someone to start something."

Some of the 55 groups now authorized have been entirely rebuilt in recent months, the AAF chief declared. He said that they now are "well trained" with combat and ground crews reestablished on an efficient, operating footing.

Some time in the future, he declared, all of the 55 groups will be similarly reorganized and ready, with jet fighters largely replacing wartime types and some huge, new B-36 and B-50 strategic bombers augmenting our B-29's. The B-36 is expected to have a range of close to 10,000 miles.

Could the reorganized Air Forces prevent enemy bombers from making a successful attack on the United States? Genera' Spaatz was asked.

"They could drop bombs on us," was the reply, "but they could not deliver a decisive attack."

The existence of a strategic United States Air Force "in being," capable of retaliatory attacks, would be the greatest deterrent against such raids, he added.

Spaatz declared that long-range bombers as we know them will continue to be the chief weapon of strategic bombardment for a "long time in the future." Guided missiles will be only a subsidiary for some time, he said.

The AAF Chief echoed the concern felt in high military circles about the delay in reaching a decision on Army-Navy unification.

"The question of unification is the most important defense problem at the moment," he declared, "because, until it is disposed of, we can't have any permanent planning."

Spaatz pointed out that, as the matter now stands, the AAF will revert to its old status of an Army branch 6 months after the war is officially ended. The old Air Corps—which the AAF would go back to legally—is limited to a strength of 6,000 planes, and otherwise does not fit modern conditions, aides declared.

The AAF commander said the Air Forces would go slow in making changes under the separate status proposed under the unification bill. Asked about plans for a new Air Forces uniform, Spaatz returned:

"I don't expect to change mine."

And the veteran airman made it plain that this did not mean he is contemplating retirement, as has been reported. He declared flatly that he had no present plans to this end and expects to stay on at least for the next year.

Spaatz added that the question of a new Air Forces uniform will not be considered officially until after the separate air force is an actuality. Then he plans a sort of Gallup poll on the subject.

How about substituting new ranks like those of the RAF for the AAF's Army titles? Spaatz said he was against it.

"I don't see any reason to change anything after the separation unless it's necessary," he added. "We don't want to be different just for the sake of being different."

A Weapon Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include in the Appendix of the

RECORD an editorial taken from the Republican Journal, Belfast, Maine, A Weapon Against Communism:

A WEAPON AGAINST COMMUNISM

Until recently we thought that the 20-percent income tax reduction proposed by some Members of Congress was an admirable goal but that it should not be attained at the expense of our national defense—particularly in view of the critical situation in Greece and Turkey and our avowed opposition to the spread of communism. But we overlooked one vital factor—the factor that enabled us to provide the fighting material for our soldiers and their allies in World War II. That factor was production and this tremendous and speedy output could have been achieved only under a system based on free capital and private enterprise.

Let us face the plain fact that capitalism is one of the greatest weapons against communism.

And by "capitalism" we mean a system free from excessive profit grabbing—a system which enables the worker in America to earn more than he could in any other nation because he is benefiting from the private capital invested in modern plants, machinery, and research. This is clearly shown by some figures we found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which states that an American railroad worker can be paid his high wages because there is an investment in plant and equipment of $25,000 per employee. The textile worker can draw over $7 a day because there is an investment in machinery and equipment of $6,000 per employee.

We no longer look askance at the proposed Federal income-tax cut. We believe that such a reduction must be made if we are to prevent the destruction of private enterprise and eventually the American form of government. The disastrous effect of a heavy, graduated income tax on individuals in England is now grimly apparent, and there a deteriorating democracy has all but succumbed to socialism.

It is clear that our present tax structure is gradually eliminating savings that would otherwise be invested. And if there is no capital available for productive enterprise, we will face unemployment, depression, and Government control of major industries.

If we are to combat communism, we must do more than give aid to democratic nations, more than purge the Government of subversive workers. We must protect our economy because it is a basic element in our way of life. Only a system that is sound to the very core can withstand the noxious effects of communism.

Labor Rights and the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the big job before this Congress is to pass labor legislation which will prevent the many crippling strikes which have in the past, paralyzed our country.

I am one of the Members of this Congress who had some conferences last December with Mr. William Green, of the AFL, and Mr. James Carey, of the CIO. I urged these gentlemen as representatives of these two large unions to invite several Members of Congress to a meeting with their legislative policy forming committee which was to meet early in January, with the thought in mind of trying to work out some legislation which would be in the interest of the public, the workingman and the unions themselves. I went over in great detail what I thought the elections of last November indicated. I asked them if they did not feel that jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, and secondary boycotts should be outlawed. I must say to my colleagues that these men were not very agreeable. All suggestions for constructive approach to the problem were greeted with the thought that we are antilabor and are trying to stab labor in the back. That has always been the cry of the union leaders. If you will read the hearings before the Labor Committee, you will see that they carried this same theme all through their testimony.

After these conferences, which were futile, I introduced legislation to stop jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, and secondary boycotts. I introduced legislation to outlaw the closed shop. I introduced legislation to provide for a cooling-off period and compulsory arbitration and for a judicial finding by a court in essential industries affecting the public, when labor and industry came to a terminal point. I also introduced legislation providing that labor and industry must keep their contracts.

The bill before the House now is an omnibus bill covering not only the principles of the bills which I introduced and supported before the Labor Committee, but covering the whole field of labor as we understand it under the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Wagner labor law. The committee handling the bill is to be complimented because I know it has put in long hours of hearings and study in an effort to bring out a bill which would be in the interest of first the public and then labor and industry.

The two most controversial features of this bill are the ones on industry-wide bargaining and the use of the injunction in those industries vitally affecting the public health and welfare. These two procedures seem like major operations with the ultimate outcome somewhat in doubt. These two phases of the bill will be difficult to administer and will probably call for a review by the Supreme Court.

Now, as to industry-wide bargaining, I do feel that if labor is to be prohibited from this phase of bargaining, then the same rules must apply to industry. I am not sure that it does so apply in the bill we are considering. I do understand that the prohibiting of industry-wide bargaining would stop such men as John L. Lewis. It would not have permitted a telephone strike or a near railroad strike. It would probably have the effect of stopping labor czars like Caesar Petrillo and his outrageous activities.

There has been a great deal of talk about the right of a man to quit his job. There has been a great deal of confusion about involuntary servitude. It seems to me that in our society there are no absolute human rights. You and I may have the right of free speech, but it gives us no right to commit libel. Our Constitution permits us the right to bear arms, but it does not give us the right to go out and engage in a duel or to kill someone. We have limited our private rights in the name of public welfare many times—so we have limited rights.

I think the worker should have the right to quit a job; that right does not carry the right to conspire with others to help paralyze an essential public service as is being done in the telephone and the coal industry. Is there any reason why a union leader should have the right to conspire with others and actually cut off telephones, the light, or the heat. It does not give a group the right to deprive a city of police protection or the essential services for public health.

It seems that we have used these words, "involuntary servitude," as a cloak to cover up some actual abuses and have tried to use it as a license to permit acts which if done by the individual would be unlawful. Certainly we must circumscribe the right of a union or any industry to hold a city or a Nation for ransom. This right of unions to keep others from working is wrong. Let the man quit, but he should not conspire to prohibit others from working.

The section of the bill dealing with a cooling-off period and use of the injunction should be circumscribed to apply to those industries where the Government fixes rates, wages and hours of labor. They should apply only to those industries vitally affecting the health, safety and welfare of the public. I have always felt that there should be some machinery of a judicial nature which could settle these disputes when they arise. A terminal point is reached and, at the present time, a strike is called. The public must have some protection. All of us, Mr. Speaker, when we have differences have access to the courts. It is necessary that we do present our problems for a final determination. We may not like the decision, but we must abide by the findings of the court. Labor should have a right to strike under due process of the law.

As I read the bill, the injunction can last for 75 days and then a terminal point may be reached. A strike can be called. I do feel that some judicial court must make a finding in settling strikes in those industries which so vitally affect our Nation. Strikes cannot be permitted in those industries and businesses which are carefully controlled by Government. As an example of this, we have the present telephone strike. The telephone business is a huge monopoly, carefully controlled by the Government acting in the public interest. The unions are also a monopoly, but they are without control by Government. It seems certain that the public must be protected from the excesses of any unregulated party to a monopoly. Certainly, if we are to regulate business in the public interest, we must also have some regulations upon unions and the workmen in those industries.

The Wagner labor law and the Norris-LaGuardia Act were needed when passed because industry was taking undue ad-

vantages of the laboring man. He needed protection, but in the last quarter of a century labor has grown so large that it is now bigger than the Government.

I am certain that there is a great desire on the part of the public not to have vindictive legislation which would cripple the proper activities of organized labor or industry, but they do feel that there are a great many unfair labor practices which must be regulated.

The law this Congress will pass must follow justice and common sense. It must have the support of the public or it will be to no avail.

The bill outlaws the closed shop. It does permit the union shop. There is a distinct difference between the closed shop and the union shop. In the closed shop a man must be a member of the union before he can be hired. The union really hires the man. In the union shop, the employer will hire the man and then in 30 days he must become a member of the union. The bill does not permit a union shop unless there is a majority vote of all members of the union for that purpose. It also requires consent by the employer. Several agencies in the country have conducted polls on the closed shop. Every poll indicates that the people want it outlawed. The citizens of Nebraska voted to outlaw the closed shop. Many States have outlawed the closed shop. The laboring man is against it. I believe it is a wise provision to permit the union shop as set up in the bill. It is a democratic procedure.

Mr. Speaker, as I read this bill, I feel it will give to the American laboring man, much needed protection from some of the present unfair practices of many labor unions. This will give the union back to the working man. It is truly his "bill of rights." The American people expect—yes; are demanding—that the Congress pass legislation which will protect them from unscrupulous labor leaders. This Congress must recognize that the public interest is paramount in disputes which affect the public health, safety, and welfare of the Nation.

I can understand why the labor czars and racketeers hit the ceiling when this bill came to Congress because it strips them of their great power over the American laboring man. It cuts them down to a size where they belong. They will no longer be more powerful than the Government itself. The bill spells out their legal responsibility; it circumscribes their activities.

I am delighted that the bill does favor the laboring man—the fellow in the ranks who up to this time has had very little to say about how his union is to be run. Certainly this bill cannot be called anti-labor, when it protects the laboring man. The bill will bring better wages and working conditions for the man who labors. He has protection and rights in this bill such as he has never before enjoyed.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to vote for this bill. I believe it is a step in the right direction in trying to solve some of the difficult problems affecting labor and industry.

The House Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, the main objective of all legislation should be to maintain and encourage a prosperous, peaceful economy. I would support the Hartley bill if it aided such an objective. However, it will only increase industrial strife and thereby impair America's opportunity for continued prosperity. This bill is unfair to management and labor and would not prevent strikes, but will provoke more strikes.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore morning Sun of April 14, 1947:

THE HOUSE LABOR BILL

When President Truman vetoed the Case bill last summer, he explained that, in his opinion, it would not "help to stop strikes and work stoppages and prevent other practices which adversely affect our economy." Unless the President has changed his thinking meanwhile, he is hardly likely to accept the labor bill which the House may pass this week.

The Case bill, like the present House bill, was an all-inclusive one. It would have created a new labor-management mediation board, which would inject in strikes and lockouts a cooling-off period, within which an attempt at settlement would be made. It would have made contracts equally binding on labor and management. It outlawed violence in strikes. It banned the organization of supervisory employees. It prohibited secondary boycotts, sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes, union racketeering, and welfare funds.

The new bill which the House Labor Committee has prepared does all that the Case bill did. In addition, it prohibits industry-wide bargaining. It rewrites the Wagner Labor Relatons Act to restrict the rights of employees and to give rights to employers which the law now denies to them. The House bill would abolish the National Labor Relations Board and replace it with two agencies, one administrative and the other quasi judicial. It would remove the United States Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor and establish a new independent agency to perform its functions.

One of the most important aspects of labor relations which the two bills treat is the use of injunctions in strikes. The Case bill provided for limited use of injunctions to maintain the status quo during the 30-day cooling-off period which it required in strikes or lock-outs over which the Mediation Board assumed jurisdiction. The new House bill makes it possible for the Government to enjoin strikes for as long as 75 days, and in some cases longer, if the public health, safety, or welfare is sufficiently affected. It also extends to private employers the right to seek injunctions as protection against unfair labor practices outlined in the bill.

The Senate Labor Committee also is considering an omnibus labor bill which stops short of the drastic provisions in the House measure. Some modification of the House bill, then, is most probable in any law which Congress may pass at this session. But even the Senate bill may go further than the President wants to go.

The Truman Price Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News carried a most interesting editorial on April 11, entitled "Truman on Prices." It points out very clearly that unless the Government cuts its own spending the Truman program is bound to defeat its own policy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial as part of my comment:

TRUMAN ON PRICES—GOVERNMENT SHOULD CUT ITS OWN EXPENSE

Big price rises have generally been followed by steep drops not only in prices but in business activity.

Second guessers and hind-seers have often remarked afterward that a moderate voluntary price cut in time would have prevented the severe one that actually took place.

The theory is that the moderate cut in time would have kept buyers buying. If prices get too high, they quit buying, either because they run out of money or get sore and go on strike.

President Truman yesterday repeated his expression of hope that American industry will find a way to check the rise of prices in time.

We share that hope, as every thoughtful person must.

When OPA controls were lifted, believers in the free-market system predicted that production would increase and that competition would finally check the rise of prices and reverse it.

The first prediction has come true. Production has greatly increased. It would not have increased to the same degree if OPA had still been operative. For one thing, it took too long to get decisions.

But competition has not yet reached the point where prices have turned down. Some weeks ago, the commodity index passed the highest point reached after World War I.

Today the managers of industry are not entirely free to do what President Truman asks of them. Many corporations made huge profits in the first quarter of the year. One reason was that they were safeguarding against uncertainties—the possibility of big new wage demands, a decline in the value of inventories, or a business slump.

Yet these profits they put away, defended as precautionary, are now being cited as the justification of higher wage demands.

At some point the spiral must stop. It ought to stop before the public quits buying. It ought to stop while the higher wage demanders are still wage earners, and before the profits turn into losses.

In basic industries, including steel, wage negotiations are now going on. This industry, because it is basic, has been specifically exhorted to lead the rest of industry by reducing the price of its product. To do this, it should have some assurances from the leaders of its unions that they will collaborate in making this possible.

Little purpose will be served by recriminations between President Truman and Republican Congressmen as to which of them is to blame for the present difficulty.

Fundamentally, the war is to blame, and the spending policies that preceded it and have followed it. No system of price control could do more than palliate the inflationary effects of so gigantic a spending spree. With

the spending, we destroyed enormous quantities of goods all over the world and much of the equipment for replacing it. The world is wallowing in cheap money and is short of everything else.

But we are not living by ourselves. We are making domestic shortages even out of great surpluses by shipping wheat and flour to the hungry abroad.

The President is equally unrealistic in failing to harmonize his price policy with his budget. Surely he is in no position to lecture industry about cutting costs and prices when he refuses to admit the possibility of cutting $1 off his $37,500,000,000 budget proposal.

David Lawrence pointed out on this page the other day that instead of a $1,000,000,000 deficit, the Government will have a $2,000,000,000 surplus at the end of this fiscal year. That is a net change of $3,000,000,000 in the prospect since the budget was prepared; it is half the whole $6,000,000,000 tax cut proposed by the House, and bitterly opposed by the President.

President Truman is also urging on us a program of foreign assistance that goes far beyond the relief of destitution, that goes beyond economic rehabilitation. It aims to build up weak nations like Greece and Turkey into military bulwarks against Russia.

Senator VANDENBERG is more candid than the President in conceding that this program will not be confined to these countries alone. Nobody knows the limits or the end.

President Truman's price program is bound in the long run to be defeated by his foreign program, if he carries it to its logical conclusion.

Federal Assistance for Airports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from the department commander of the Iowa department of the American Legion, Mr. Jesse W. Halden. He expresses the concern of himself and others in the Iowa department of the Legion about the amount of money being spent to improve the big airports in the larger cities while the smaller communities, which are equally in need of assistance in constructing and maintaining their airports, are not provided for, and he urges Federal assistance in the establishment of adequate airports in the smaller towns. Commander Halden's letter follows:

IOWA DEPARTMENT,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
April 12, 1947.

Hon. KARL M. LECOMPTE,
Congressman, Fourth District,
State of Iowa,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: I wish to call your attention to the fact that Congress has passed an airport law and has made an appropriation to be spent in different communities throughout the country, similar to the money spent on our national highways. Now, it seems they want to revert themselves and spend this money on the big airports in the big cities so as to improve them further for the trunk lines.

After consultation with others in the Iowa Department we feel that the money should be spent in the smaller communities to build up their little airports. It is my personal opinion that with adequate airports in our smaller towns the feeder lines thus established will furnish plenty of business for the trunk lines and that their facilities will develop to adequately meet the needs in any eventuality.

The Iowa Department is interested in your calling to the attention of all of our Representatives the above facts as an expression of our opinion. I will write our two Senators direct. I will be glad to learn of the reaction of our Representatives relative to this communication.

Sincerely,

JESSE W. HALDEN,
Department Commander.

Time Runs Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial on the problem of the DP's, the displaced persons, from the New York Herald Tribune of April 11, 1947, truly reflects the current situation. Time does run short. The problem of these DP's cries out for solution to the heart and conscience of all the United Nations.

TIME RUNS SHORT

Time for effective action in behalf of the million displaced persons in Europe runs short. All UNRRA operations cease at the end of June. It is now April and a functioning International Refugee Organization does not yet exist. Twelve nations have signed its constitution. There must be 15, and they must guarantee 75 percent of a $151,000,000 budget, before the IRO can go to work. Only two of the signers, Great Britain and New Zealand, are ready with funds. The others, like the United States, must appropriate them. The Senate passed the measure authorizing this country's participation on March 25. It is important that the House pass it forthwith. For participation by the United States, whose contribution will be 45 percent of the budget, is essential if there is to be an IRO.

Participation in the IRO presupposes this Nation's interest in finding a solution of the refugees' problem. That problem is eventual resettlement of most of the 850,000 who remain in the camps. Only 20 percent of these are Jews, who may look, however despairingly, to Palestine as the land of opportunity. The rest are chiefly Balts, Poles, Yugoslavs, and Ukrainians who are unwilling or afraid to return to their homelands under the present regimes. If they do not find haven abroad the United States will have to continue to support those in its occupation areas.

Again, United States leadership in securing homes and opportunity for them is important. This Nation has in the past prided itself on giving haven to downtrodden and persecuted peoples. It proposes at the moment a vast program to give the peoples of Greece and Turkey a fair break against authoritarian forces. If the hundreds of thousands of individual refugees from totalitarianism are also to have a fair break this country must permit a reasonable number to come here.

Proposed legislation to this end may take one of two forms. Congress can authorize utilization of quotas or parts of quotas which were unfilled during the war period. Or Congress can pass temporary legislation to admit a prescribed number annually over a prescribed period. There will be opposition to either plan. The still potent forces of isolationism may be trusted to focus upon preventing any relaxation of the immigration laws. But we can hardly hope to persuade other nations to practice what we preach unless we also practice. The practical measures now required of us are to make funds available to the IRO and to permit entry of a fair share of the displaced here.

"Keep America a Free Land for Free Men"—By Eddie Rickenbacker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address delivered in New York on April 14, 1947, by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker.

As everybody knows, Eddie Rickenbacker is one of our leading Americans, and one of the outstanding heroes of all times.

I hope every Member of the House, and everyone else who scans this RECORD, will read what he has to say and join in this fight to save our country, our way of life, and our civilization from destruction at the hands of those communistic elements that are working to destroy everything for which we stand and for which our heroes have fought and died.

The matter referred to follows:

KEEP AMERICA A FREE LAND FOR FREE MEN

(Address by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker to Notre Dame Club of New York, Commodore Hotel, New York City, April 14, 1947)

Ladies and gentlemen, on the eve of this land's greatest gamble in international relations for world peace through the Greek and Turkish loans, let us reevaluate the penalties of the past and the prospects of the future.

Instead of waiting until world conflicts decimated nations, bringing disaster and exhaustion to many, would not a conference of the leaders and statesmen of the world powers have reasoned more calmly and in a more friendly atmosphere had they met on the problems of the people in the early thirties on the enterprises of peace with the same energy that they prepared to squander in the futility and frightfulness of war?

This thought, in my opinion, must be broadcast daily throughout the world as the sign posts indicate now unless we guide new history with a firm hand, old history may well repeat itself.

If there ever was a time in the annals of man where men must act with clear-eyed thought, without blind emotion, that time is now. Our main salvation—and by that I mean the salvation of mankind—is to think things through.

I am neither a historian nor a strategist, a statesman, nor a world observer. Like most of you, all I know is what I hear over the radio or see in the newspapers—read in print or between the lines.

But reading up and down the columns—and thinking things through, as my eyes travel from left to right—anyone, who has eyes to see with, and a head to think with, can easily appreciate that we are heading into a situation that may destroy us.

That we face the loss of the things we hold dear unless we stop fumbling—unless we prepare for action now, and take our battle stations in the war of nerves that is now being waged by Red and reactionary Russia to test the strength of the structure of peace, and the durability of our belief that all men are born free and equal.

So, in 1947, we ask why can't treaty talks and peace conferences be made to produce the peace? I am afraid that the answer is that even as it takes more than one to start a fight, so it takes more than one to keep the peace.

Neither America, England, nor the other western nations want war. In fact, they have gone far—some observers think, even too far—to prevent war.

On the other hand, Communists and their sympathizers seem to feel that every Russian claim is decreed by human destiny and that any opposition is an act of vandalism.

I read last fall, and with intense approval, the statement issued by Cardinal Spellman and other Catholic bishops of the United States. It was entitled "Man and the Peace." It declared that, at the bottom of all problems of the world today, is the problem of man and his right to enjoy spiritual, physical, and intellectual freedom.

I sincerely hope that this statement by Cardinal Spellman and his associates will be republished and given wide circulation. In my opinion, it summarizes the reasons why we are fighting communism.

If you gentlemen haven't read it, you should. It reveals, in few words and without subterfuge, that questions of human freedom stand in the background of the conflict between Russia and the West. That it is the inability of Communists to see human rights as we see them which is really delaying the winning of the peace.

Let us look the facts in the face and see what Russia wants. It seeks a made-in-Moscow peace that will give Russia a czar-like feudal power that is above criticism, comment, or correction, a power that would strangle world freedom; a power that would return human society to the bleak misery of the Middle Ages.

Those, to put the point bluntly, are Russia's terms for peace. But are they our terms? Are they the set of standards we will knuckle down to in abject surrender in order to live in one world of slavery?

Or are they to be the terms that will drive us into a Third World War to save ourselves and those who follow us? I have no doubt that such a war would end in Russian defeat.

But I have grave doubt that such a war is necessary if we only can convince Russia that we mean what we say. If we only can awaken Stalin and his henchmen to the realization that our chips are down and that we are ready to call the cards.

In 1917 we went to war to save democracy. We won the war. But because of our failure to remain strong and vigilant in the interest of democracy, dictators rose to power in Europe and other parts of the world, created military dictatorships and totalitarian states. Thus we lost the peace.

In 1941 we went to war to destroy totalitarian dictators in Europe and in Asia. We won the war.

But now, after the great sacrifices of combat, we find ourselves confronted by a Red reactionary dictatorship that seeks to inflict its will wherever it can in the old world from the Middle East to the Baltic.

Not only that, but Red reactionaries are planting seeds of discontent, turmoil, and distrust in the hearts and minds of men in every corner of the world.

They are doing this for the outspoken purpose of destroying human rights, human dignity, and human freedom as practiced and promised by spokesmen for democracy.

And mainly because freedom-loving people have failed to oppose them, the Pied Pipers of Kremlin have created a world-wide following.

Thus, again, we face the prospect of losing the peace.

In saying this, I am not forgetting the programs now started and the plans now pending to support the crumbling democratic structure with a new type of super-duper dollar democracy—a policy that plans to buy our way to world-wide peace and progress.

Up to a certain point, this policy is sound and desirable. But let us not fool ourselves into the belief that mere money will keep freedom and independence alive when the will to survive has gone the way of the softest flesh.

You can't make moral fiber out of money—you can make it only out of men. There is not wealth enough on earth to provide the mountains of cash and resources such a program would demand once it rolled into the inevitable avalanche proportion.

It is futile to think that by giving our material wealth to the rest of the peoples of the world, that we can raise their standard of living to equal ours.

But it is a positive fact that if we try, we will find ourselves lowered to the standard of living of the rest of the world—in one generation—and thereby lose our God-given opportunity of spiritual and material leadership as an example for other peoples of the world to follow and strive to equal.

To be powerful to oppose world communism, this Nation must remain strong. From the standpoint of strength, we stand alone. England and our other allies have little to contribute beyond moral support.

To be sure, money might has its place in the scheme of things, but so has military might. The Red Napoleons understand and respect but one thing—and that one thing is force.

The best peace insurance we can carry is a policy of strength on land and sea and in the air—a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force on hand and in being, backed by intense research in laboratories and actual experiments.

The Russians know, as well as we do, that if there is a next war, it will be known as the War of Know-How. Let us be so far ahead of the rest of the world in new-weapon development and ready striking power that any nation that pulled the trigger of aggression would only aim bullets at its own head.

There are millions of people throughout the world today who believe that a Third World War is inevitable. Well, that all depends upon what kind of war they mean. First, there is the old-fashioned kind of war, where men go out to wage war with bullets, bombs, and bayonets.

And then there is another and newer kind of war—a warfare of conflicting ideals and ideologies—the so-called war of nerves.

Up to now it must be admitted that Russia has held the upper hand in the war of nerves she has been waging with increasing pressure since the conquests of Germany and Japan.

And when I speak about manning our battle stations, as I did a moment ago, I express the belief that it is high time for Uncle Sam to begin his counteroffensive against the Red reactionary pressures from within the United States and from across the seas. We have in this country, ready for instant use—if we only employed them—the greatest weapons for winning wars of nerves the world has ever known, namely, the various organizations and mediums for making and molding public opinion.

I refer to our great advertising agencies, our vast public-relations organizations, our numerous industrial advertising units, our motion-picture industry, our radio industry, our newspapers, periodicals, and book publishers.

Before I submit any plan for combating communism here at home and around the world, let me first analyze, in terms of geographical spread and organized numbers, the ideological army we have to fight and defeat.

According to figures recently made public in England, there are in the world today about 17,000,000 declared Communists, members of Communist fronts, and fellow travelers.

This includes the 6,000,000 Russian Communist Party members who have a death grip on the remainder of Russia's 200,000,000 population.

In other words, outside Russia the Communist organization amounts to about 11,000,000 people. This is about the population of the State of New York.

I thought it would be interesting to divide this Communist army into geographical units and to use population centers with which we are familiar, as means of giving a graphic picture of the world-wide Communist line-up and here it is.

In Germany there are almost 2,000,000 Reds—a group that is slightly larger than Los Angeles.

In all of Asia, the 2,175,000 known Reds are less than the population of Brooklyn.

In Scandinavia, the 191,000 Reds would fill Atlanta, Ga.

In northern Europe—not including Germany—a total of 1,500,000 Reds falls slightly short of equaling the population of Philadelphia.

In southern Europe, 3,500,000 Reds would barely top the inhabitants of Chicago.

In the Balkans, 1,480,000 Reds almost equal the population of Detroit.

In the whole Western Hemisphere, the known 587,000 Reds are less than the population of San Francisco. Of these, about 95,000 live in the United States, plus their several hundred thousand fellow travelers.

Just for good measure all of the 6,000,000 Communist Party members in Russia fail to reach the population of New York City.

Thus, if you consolidated all Communists, their termite fronts and tumble-weed followers—you have a total of some 17,000,000 and they would barely equal the populations of Ohio, Illinois, and Texas.

These are startling figures, gentlemen, because they reveal that the Communist forces are much smaller in number than most of us are inclined to believe.

But let us not commit the fatal mistake of letting those small numbers misguide us.

Communists have long ago learned that the quality of effort by well organized, thoroughly regimented and aggressive minorities is far superior to mere numbers of indifferent, unorganized and undirected majorities.

Many people are mystified—even frightened—by the almost fantastic success of communistic minorities in sabotaging public opinion and political morale in various sections of the world, and in various stratifications of society from Government officials to college professors—from labor unions to artists and writers.

And yet, there is no mystery, there is no magic, there are no mirrors. It is all done by hard, relentless work. The enemies of Democracy have no 8-hour day or 5-day week. They work around the clock and they work around the calendar.

If we who oppose them would work as aggressively and as intelligently to preserve our freedom, as Red reactionaries work to undermine and destroy it, there would be no communistic problems.

Gentlemen, the day is here when we must forget not only time clocks and holidays, but we must be prepared to take our battle stations for a knock-down, drag-out fight against forces who have nothing to offer but slavery and shackles, whose goal is not to improve mankind but to imprison it.

We must fight this war on two fronts—the home front and the global front.

We should have started this battle in the open a long time ago. But our leadership was either too timid, too blind, or too selfish to call a spade a spade.

True, there were some organizations like the Vatican and the Catholic Church that dared to fight the Reds in the open.

A handful of individuals—and I'm proud to say that I served among those—had the courage to speak up and stand up against communism in the days when Washington looked and talked like a suburb of Moscow.

To people like myself it is a wonderful thing to be at a meeting like this and be able to stand up and speak through love of God and truth and country without fear of any kind of reprisal, except that which will come from the scuministic communistic smear artists. In fact, it is this new freedom to speak that surges from coast to coast—in this land of free speech—that encourages me to believe that the battle against Red reactionaries will be won by waging a vigorous war of nerves and without the employment of military strength.

Up to the time President Truman announced the so-called Truman doctrine, the American war of nerves against communism was an undeclared one. President Truman's statement was a declaration of ideological hostility. Although he did not name Russia, it was a flat declaration of active opposition to Moscow and its world-wide aims.

In brief—although no bombs are dropping or cannons roaring—we are, for all practical purposes, at war. The war of nerves.

That being the case, it is imperative that we muster and send into action our vast civilian and commercial propaganda machine. And I predict right here and now that once it swings into action, it can outthink and out-talk any ideological barrage the Red brain trust in the Kremlin ever will be able to produce.

The plan of the campaign to be employed by our propaganda machine is very simple. All we have to do is to spread the truth about the Russian way of life and the American way of life to the four corners of the earth. For the battle is not what it is labeled. It is not a contest between Red dictatorship and democracy, nor is it a line-up of communism against capitalism.

It is a battle between lies to enslave mankind and truth to set men free.

Over the years, within Russia and beyond its borders power-thirsty dictators in the Kremlin have tried to capture the world with a lasso of lies. I admit, with regret, that they have made considerable headway in that direction. And, as I said before, they have succeeded mainly because they met with no opposition.

Let us look at ourselves. Where we should have employed forceful determination, we offered weak appeasement.

Where we should have shown the mailed fist, we used the velvet glove. The time for those things has passed.

We must be militant and uncompromising in our stand for human rights. We must let our opponents know that we are prepared to fight, if necessary, for human freedom.

Even as Abraham Lincoln said that you cannot have a nation that is half free and half slave, so you cannot have a world that is half in the daylight of free democracy and the other half in the dark night of enslaving tyranny.

It has been said, and rightly so, that freedom is the only thing in the world you cannot have and cannot keep unless you share it with others.

So, for the sake of our own freedom we must continue our effort to set all men free. That is the destiny of America in the making of the world as the Lord intended it to be.

Freedom is the God-given birthright of mankind, but too many of us are so short-sighted that we are willing to trade our heritage of freedom for the mess of pottage called security.

There are, so far as I know, only three places in civilian society where a man can find complete security, including three meals a day, clothing on his back and a roof over his head:

One is behind the bars of a prison.

The second is within the walls of an insane asy·um.

The third is in the poorhouse.

In those places you have security, true enough, but think of what you pay for it—your freedom and opportunity.

Russia baits its freedom-killing trap with sweet-sounding slogans like security, equality and opportunity. Its spokesmen in this country mouth fine-sounding phrases about the utopia Stalin and his henchmen in Russia and Communist controlled Europe will bring to mankind.

It seems rather strange to me that nobody, not even the American Communists, their friends and fellow travelers, are crowding our airports and steamship piers in a mad rush to leave this country of the down-trodden proletariat for the glorious freedom of Russia, Poland, Yugoslavia, and other salve-ias.

I also notice that the Red brothers and sisters who go to Europe always buy round-trip tickets and never stay away for long.

On the other hand, ships and planes from nearly all European ports and airports are crowded with Europeans who are only too glad to breathe the air of this new world of democratic thought.

Speaking of trans-Atlantic travel, I hope that the anti-Communist house cleaning ordered in Washington, and which seems to extend into labor unions and other private fields, will increase the traffic trail from here to Europe.

The pressure that must be brought to bear to open the communistic carbuncle on our body politic should produce a healthy effect. I am not at all sure that it would be either necessary or wise to go to the length of outlawing the Communist Party and putting the Red brand on Communists. It might tend to turn them into martyrs, which is precisely what they feed on and use to attract the tumbleweed thinkers who follow them.

Let us shy a brickbat at communism whenever it lifts its ugly head and let us laugh a. the stupid stooges who are brainless enough to follow them. The kind of Red egomaniacs who thrive on sneers would be destroyed by laughter. Expose them to ridicule and watch them run.

I am told that there are almost 4,000 Russian agents under State Department visa in this country, and that nearly 1,000 of those are honor graduates of the Red spy and sabotage school in Moscow, known as the Lenin Institute. Let us send them back where they belong.

It is also revealed that about 400 American Reds hold key jobs in the Federal Government. If that can be proven, every one of them should be turned out. How many thousands more there are in less conspicuous positions time alone can tell.

Don't think for a moment that this stiffening of our attitude has not had its effect in Moscow.

And the more we do to show the Red leaders that we are in this contest to win, the sooner you may expect a softening in the Russian attitude. They are not people with whom you can argue points of right and wrong.

So far as they are concerned, no principles are involved—only their will to master the world. There are no moral issues, for with them truths and untruths are mere tools to serve their needs.

The only way to deal with them is to expose them and lay their sinister aims before the world—to break their power and explode their prestige with the power of truth—a greater power than any devised by man, including the atom bomb.

I propose that the most effective way of staging this campaign would be to ask the directing and producing heads of advertising, public relations, the press, periodicals, screen, books, and radio to formulate a global campaign employing the use of every medium to spread the truth about the champions of spiritual, mental, and physical freedom—the trinity of human rights—which the Red reactionaries hate as deeply as the Devil hates holy water.

In my wartime missions around the globe I found an amazing lack of information about the United States—and an even more amazing amount of misinformation.

One way of clearing up that situation would be for every American exporter to enclose with every item a brief history of America and its aims, printed, of course, in the language of the country to which it is going.

True, many would be destroyed by Reds, but some of those pamphlets would survive and spread their important messages.

Let us set up the machinery for global infiltration into Communist-controlled countries—over, under, around, and through their iron curtains of thought control, truth control, and firing squads.

Let us start, fifth, sixth, and seventh columns overground and underground, and show the Reds that what is gravy for the Russian bear is sauce for the American eagle.

One of the most straightforward indictments of communistic aims that I have read is contained in the statement entitled "Man and the Peace," issued by the Catholic bishops of the United States following their meeting in Washington last fall. I referred to that statement before. And I repeat—read it. Here is an excerpt that hits the nail on the head, and states the entire case in a few, carefully selected words. I quote:

"Throughout the war our battle cry was the defense of native freedoms against Nazi and Fascist totalitarianism. The aftermath of war has revealed victorious Soviet totalitarianism no less aggressive against these freedoms in the countries it has occupied.

"Totalitarianism does not acknowledge and respect these freedoms. It persecutes the citizen who dares assert his native rights. It imposes on peoples its philosophy of life, in which there is no authority above the state, and in which all values in life are derived from human conventions.

"The corollary of such philosophy is the police state, which terrorizes its citizens and dominates them in all fields of human behavior. Before we can hope for a good peace there must come an agreement among the peace makers on the basic question of man as man."

That type of concession never will be won from the Reds unless we stand firm and unified in our demands. Unless we have the strength in a military and moral sense to back them up.

The stronger we are, the less chance there is that we ever will be called upon to use our strength. Meanwhile, the war of nerves is on.

Let us plan and act with clear-eyed thought, without blind emotion—let us think things through.

Let us fight communism wherever it lifts its ugly head, here at home. Let us combat it all over the world where it threatens to rob men of their freedom. For that task we need no new or secret weapon—only the bright and shining sword of truth.

Let us take our battle order from the eighth chapter of the Book of St. John in the Bible: "Ye shall know the Truth—and the Truth shall make you free."

The Mandate of Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of George Meany, secretary-treasurer, American Federation of Labor, over the Mutual Broadcasting System, Station WOL, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, April 16, 1947:

Our Nation is the strongest in the world. We are strong for a number of reasons, but the No. 1 reason for our strength is that we are a nation of free men.

America's strength and the fact that we are the symbol of liberty to the peoples of the whole world have combined to give us a position of world leadership. We have served notice that we stand not only for freedom here at home but also for liberty, democracy, and the rights of governments and peoples everywhere to be protected against the enslavement of totalitarianism.

Today there is serious danger of America's position, as the champion and bulwark of freedom, being undermined through action of our own Congress. This would be the inevitable effect if Congress were to pass the labor legislation now proposed by the majority party in the House of Representatives.

The bill I refer to is one which has been approved by the Republican Policy Committee of the House. This measure emanates from the House Labor Committee and is being called the Hartley bill. The bill should be known as the National Association of Manufacturers bill, which in fact it is.

The Hartley-NAM bill now before the House of Representatives is designed to bring about the destruction of free trade unionism in our country. It proposes to achieve this nefarious purpose by enacting into law the program adopted by the National Association of Manufacturers last December.

The Hartley bill would definitely effectuate the NAM program. For example, the NAM urged that "the protection of law should be extended to strikers only when the majority of employees in the bargaining unit, by secret ballot under impartial supervision, have voted for a strike in preference to acceptance of the latest offer of the employer." The Hartley bill accepts this proposal in toto—in fact, almost word for word.

This situation prevails all through the bill. Throughout the 68 pages of the Hartley bill we find the ideas and the very language of the NAM's antilabor program lifted bodily and incorporated into the bill. There can be no doubt on this score. The committee minority has stated quite definitely, and I quote, "During the period of the hearings the representatives of the NAM, working behind the scenes, were writing the legislation." This quote refers to the so-called Hartley bill now fraudulently offered as the brain child of Mr. HARTLEY himself and his fellow committeemen of the majority.

The NAM is evidently not concerned with the world position of the United States of America. The NAM is clearly not disturbed that enslavement of the plain citizens of America would destroy our Nation's position as the standard bearer of freedom in the effort to halt further expansion of communism. The NAM doesn't seem to care about anything except profits, more profits, and still more profits. Last year the corporations of America as a whole made far more money than in the highly profitable war years, but the NAM wants more, and this bill is designed to achieve that greedy objective at the expense of the Nation's workers.

Our Government has adopted a policy of preventing the spread of Communist influence abroad and at home. It has been announced and reiterated that the administration is determined to carry this policy out in an effective manner. The overwhelming majority of the American people are in complete sympathy with this program of the Government. Most Americans have no use whatsoever for the hateful tenets of communism or any other form of totalitarianism.

This anti-Communist program will be torpedoed if the Hartley bill is enacted into law. American workers will not cheerfully accept any statute which compels them to work against their will. They will resent and resist such a flagrant violation by Congress of the Constitution of the United States, in particular the thirteenth amendment, which forbids involuntary servitude.

This bill will bring more recruits into the ranks of those opposed to the American way of life than the Communist Party of the United States has been able to enroll in 30 years. Communism thrives on chaos, disorder and oppression, and this bill sponsored and written by attorneys for greedy antilabor employers, will surely bring about chaos, disorder and oppression.

At a time when our nonpartisan foreign policy is directed toward making America a vital influence on the side of human liberty in world affairs, it is little short of criminal to create a condition here at home that will render our Nation completely impotent as a world power. A Nation torn asunder by internal strife cannot exercise leadership in world affairs.

This measure if enacted into law will weaken our internal economy to the point where America can no longer command respect in its dealings with the other nations of the world. This would no doubt please Molotov and Stalin. This is what the Communist Party and the actual and mental foreigners who are associated with it would most ardently desire. Henry Wallace would giggle with glee.

Mr. HARTLEY and many of our big-business newspapers state that antilabor legislation must be enacted by this Congress because of a so-called mandate from the people. It is claimed that the November election results constituted a mandate to clamp handcuffs and a strait-jacket on the American wage-earner.

There is not a particle of truth to any such claim. The fact is that last year's election mandate was to eliminate bureaucracy, to wipe out regimentation. It was a protest against high prices and administrative failures in price control. It was a protest against the very bureaucracy and regimentation that this legislation would bring about. It was a protest against the failure of Congress to pass bipartisan housing legislation so people could have a roof over their heads. It was a protest against the complete inability of Congress and the OPA to do anything when the country's meat producers went on strike against the American people. Those were the issues involved in the election last November.

It seems strange to see leaders of a party which has been assailing regimentation for fourteen long years now advocating regimentation for the 40,000,000 wage earners of the Nation.

Those who are now attempting to put America's workers in a straitjacket of legal restrictions that would virtually chain them to the work bench forget one very important thing—the American workers' love of liberty. They forget that the free workers of our Nation outproduced the slaves of totalitarianism. They forget, above all, that even if this NAM bill was enforceable, it still would not help production.

Perhaps the NAM and its congressional agents might even succeed, through the brutal methods of totalitarianism in making slaves of America's workers.

But what good would that do for the NAM and its constituent corporations, interested as they are solely in greater and ever greater profits? They would find their profits not enhanced but reduced. The American worker would not produce much if he were deprived of his freedom. The NAM and its agents would find out, as the directors have found out, that forced labor is not productive labor.

The results that the authors of this bill desire to achieve are best described by a statement issued by Congressman LESINSKI speaking for the minority:

"This bill would return us to the dark ages of labor exploitation. It is only the beginning. After the unions are broken and split and formed into a labor front for exploitation, then we will see the return of child labor. Small boys will once more be fed into the mines, young girls will sweat in the garment shops. Cheap labor will be achieved. The 'yellow-dog contract' will reappear. The black list will once more become a weapon against the livelihood of the worker."

Thus states a group of Congressmen who are quite evidently aware of the real purposes behind the program of Mr. HARTLEY and those whose interests he represents.

If it were possible for American labor on the one side and the profit-greedy employers and their spokesmen in Congress on the other side to battle this out for the next two or three years, we could perhaps afford to suffer the chaos and disorder that would result. It would perhaps be worth while, in the long run, to let this internal battle take place, even with all the suffering it might entail, in order to clear up once and for all in the minds of the employers and their agents the question of whether or not American workers are by right entitled to maintain free trade-unions for their own benefit and protection.

But unfortunately we cannot build a wall around America for the next two or three years and indulge in a private fight of this kind. The world in 1947 is looking to America for leadership. America can furnish that leadership only by remaining strong. America cannot remain strong if it is torn asunder by the bitter strife which will surely ensue if the Hartley bill becomes law.

The legislative theory behind this measure, if it can be dignified by conceding that it is the result of any legislative theory, seems to be that the key to industrial peace in this country is the weakening and ultimate destruction of trade-unions. Unions are all right if they can be rendered so weak that they can no longer carry out their obligations to the worker. The worker is to be protected in this bill by the destruction of his union. Well, I am sure the American worker is not going to suffer his union to be destroyed. He knows that the high standard of life enjoyed by the wage earners of America did not come as a gift from the employer. He knows that he is the best-paid, best-housed and best-clothed worker in the world because of his right to maintain free trade-unions as an instrument to achieving a better life. I am sure America's workers will fight to retain these rights because in the final analysis their destruction means the destruction of our form of free society.

There is one aspect of this antilabor proposal that is perhaps more disturbing than any other. This is the political aspect.

The American wage earner has been told over and over again down through the years that the Republican Party was the party of privilege, of profit, the party of Wall Street and the big corporations. The American worker has hesitated to believe these charges because he was convinced that this was the one country in the world where the class struggle could not be a national political issue. But when we scrutinize the origin of this vicious antilabor proposal, when we hear the paid spokesmen for big business strongly urging its passage on the air, when we see the large corporations using the power that comes with a swollen treasury proposing its restrictions through full-page advertisements in our daily press, when we see and hear all these things and then in addition hear the official spokesmen for the Republican membership in the House of Representatives, not only endorsing this bill but boasting of their ability to enact it into law, we wonder if the class struggle is about to shift from the economic to the political field.

For nearly three-quarters of a century the American Federation of Labor has maintained itself as a strictly nonpartisan organization representing workers as workers, not as pawns in a political game. I am sure that our organization desires to continue as such. In the face of the political aspects of this proposal to destroy trade unionism, the question arises as to whether or not we will be compelled by force of circumstances to revise our basic position in order to protect the future of the wage earners of our country who in themselves constitute the vast national wealth of which Americans so often boast.

Appropriation for the Department of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE H. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I submitted to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations regarding the appropriation for the Labor Department, to be considered in connection with the hearings being held on that matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of the desire and necessity for reducing expenses in Government and for practicing economy in all departments. I am thoroughly sympathetic with this purpose, but in reducing appropriations for the various Government departments we must have a care to see that we do not render ineffective and inefficient any essential governmental agency. In my opinion the action of the House in the drastic reduction it has made in the appropriation to the Labor Department does just this and I do not believe that your committee should approve this action on the part of the House.

I shall not contend that no reduction should be made in the appropriation to the Labor Department as recommended by the President's budget, but such reduction as is made should be carefully studied and discriminatingly applied, rather than a mere slashing of the appropriation by which important phases of the work and activity would be altogether abolished, or desperately crippled.

As former chief executive of a State, I have had some experience in the balancing of immediate money savings against necessary public services and the holding together of staff and morale required to discharge those services efficiently in the public interest. It has been my experience that the saving of dollars may cost many times the immediate amount, in both the cutting off of services and the eventual reconstruction of the service and the personnel that must do the job. My experience was gained during the difficult prewar years when there was even more reason for the strictest economy than exists today—I am not minimizing in the least the need for economy to balance the budget, reduce the public debt, and as soon as possible to reduce taxes. I want to make the point clear, however, that we will harm our economy and the public welfare irreparably by permitting the proposed cuts in the 1948 budget for the Department of Labor.

In discussing the budget for the Department of Labor, I have in mind the services which the various bureaus and divisions of the Department have rendered and are rendering to the employers as well as to the wage earners of this country and of my own State.

In this connection it should be borne in mind that the Labor Department is currently operating on a budget of approximately $113,000,000. In view of the President's determination to balance the National Budget, that Department as all other executive departments, pared to the quick its operations in submitting its request for 1948 funds. The Department has asked for $103,000,000 to carry out its minimum essential functions—of which amount $72,000,000 is for grants to the States for the operations by the States of local employment offices. Thus, funds requested for operation of the entire Department of Labor itself was actually $32,000,000. This indeed is a modest sum for the executive department which performs the services of the Federal Government in the important field of labor, labor-management relations, and employment.

It is being proposed, however, that those requested funds of $31,000,000 be slashed by nearly $14,000,000, and thus leave the Department of Labor with only about $18,000,000 with which to conduct its activities through 1948.

This proposed action, I submit is not in keeping with our national postwar needs and our postwar determinations, or with the law which established the Department of Labor.

I am opposed to the action proposed to this body in H. R. 2700, because the facts indicate that such action would emasculate the Department of Labor. I wish briefly to point out just how complete the emasculation would be:

The Division of Labor Standards would be cut 100 percent.

It would be liquidated, except for the function of child-labor inspection, which, with its funds severely cut, would be transferred to another division of the Department.

The United States Employment Service would be cut 77 percent.

In addition to this cut, the Veterans' Employment Service in the USES would be cut 34 percent, and, furthermore, this appropriation bill proposes to direct the internal organization of the USES by eliminating field offices.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics would be cut 60 percent.

The Solicitor's Office would be cut 50 percent.

The Conciliation Service would be cut 25 percent.

In addition to the cut, this appropriation bill proposes to control the internal organizational structure of this Service in such a fantastic fashion as to eliminate permanently the 102 top administrative positions of the Service.

Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions would be cut 25 percent.

These cuts total in all a 43 percent slash in the 1948 funds that have been requested for the Department of Labor, and requested funds are below the current budget of operations.

Providing adequate funds for the running of the Federal Government should never be a partisan matter, regardless of which of the political parties is represented by the majority of Members in Congress. I am taking the time of my colleagues today to make an appeal for action which should transcend party affiliation. In so doing, however, I should like to point out that in 1944 the Republican platform stated: "The Department of Labor has been emasculated by the New Deal." Mr. President, in all earnestness, I say that if the present budget of the Department is emasculation, the proposed budget is an attempt to destroy the corpus delicti.

To protest the proposed action in H. R. 2700, the commissioner of labor of my State of North Carolina, Mr. Forrest H. Shuford, felt compelled to appear before the subcommittee considering the appropriation for the Department of Labor. He protested as president of the International Association of Governmental Labor Officials whose members are labor commissioners of the various States, and he protested personally the services and assistance which would be lost to the State of North Carolina, if H. R. 2700 should become law.

To the subcommittee, Mr. Shuford said:

"As president of the International Association of Governmental Labor Officials—an organization which has been functioning for the past 60 years—I wish to present to you the viewpoint of the association concerning the need for adequate appropriations for the Department of Labor. * * *

"But we are concerned about the serious cuts which have been made in the work of all branches of the Department of Labor. * * *

"The Federal Department of Labor, in our opinion, has never had sufficient funds with which to operate. This Department has always had much smaller appropriations than many other Federal agencies which are devoted to the interests of other segments of our population. This is difficult to understand, when we realize that the Labor Department renders invaluable services to both industrial management and industrial workers in the many areas in which its responsibilities lie. In my judgment, the interests of workers and of management are so interrelated that they cannot be segregated. Any action which is crippling to either labor or management will affect the other adversely, and will seriously affect our entire national economy. We hope that this Congress will not make drastic cuts in all Labor Department appropriations."

I wish, Mr. Chairman, to comment briefly on the proposed cuts for the several divisions and services of the Department of Labor.

1. THE DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS

This Division of the Labor Department was founded by the Secretary of Labor in 1934, by virtue of the executive powers lodged in the Secretary by section 161 of the Revised Statutes, to carry out statutory requirements in the organic act of the Department, that, among other things, it improve the working conditions of the working people of the United States. The Division carries out this purpose through advisory assistance rendered to the States, particularly in the field of industrial safety and the removal and elimination of the hazards of employment. It is in a very real sense a service agency, which recognizes that the problem of working conditions is primarily a local matter of State

concern. This Division makes its services, standards, and assistance available to the appropriate State authorities for their use. I should like to quote what the labor commissioner of North Carolina came to Washington to say about this Division, and the proposal to liquidate it.

"As an association of State labor commissioners, we are greatly concerned over the House action in abolishing the Division of Labor Standards. This Division was created at the request of the State labor commissioners so that we might have machinery within the Federal Government to strengthen our hands in dealing with the difficult problems of labor-law administration that face us. We wanted a friend at court—someone familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of the State labor departments, sympathetic with their programs and with an understanding of their needs—an agency that would be genuinely interested in strengthening State labor departments instead of whittling away their functions. We have had that kind of agency in the Division of Labor Standards. It has served us well. The staff has been largely recruited from persons who have served their apprenticeship in one or another State labor department.

"Time and again, without the Division's assistance, we as State representatives would have found ourselves in a position where we could not move. When the war broke out, for example, one of the first thoughts of the Army and Navy was to lay aside the State labor laws affecting hours of work. The Secretaries of War and Navy sent telegrams to various governors requesting immediate action to permit wholesale lengthening of hours of work for women and children. No one governor would have been able to determine whether increased production would have resulted from such a move. We appealed to the United States Labor Department for assistance. At conferences arranged by the Division of Labor Standards, officials of the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission conferred with a group of State labor commissioners from important industrial States. As a result of these conferences, and with the assistance of the Division of Labor Standards, reasonably uniform and satisfactory standards were worked out for the temporary relaxation of State labor laws during the war period. The production of war materials achieved during the years which followed was of such magnitude that it appears evident that such a solution was the logical one. The labor laws were saved and now are again operative.

"The conferences which the Division has arranged for discussion of current problems and the larger national conferences that have been held each year have done a great deal to stimulate more harmonious relations between the States and to better administrative practices.

"We need the continuing watchfulness and service of the Division in the postwar years ahead. We believe we have a right to ask this sort of assistance from the Federal Government. Our departments receive no Federal financial aid of any kind. Yet we probably have one of the toughest assignments in all of State government. We are not asking for Federal funds. But we do ask for a minimum of assistance such as we have received from the Division in improving our safety and health programs and our labor law administration.

"I am sure other witnesses have told you of the terrific cost of industrial accidents. We in the States have responsibility for reducing this toll. We want to do a good job. But most of us have neither enough funds nor trained personnel to carry the load unaided. And we know full well that if we fail to bring the accident rates down, irresistible pressure will develop for the Federal Government to take over the job. * * * If the States can continue to receive assistance from the Division of Labor Standards in training factory inspectors, in preparing safety codes, and in planning and developing State safety programs, we believe that Federal intervention in this field will not become necessary. * * *

"The advisory and technical services of the Division have been of much practical value to the North Carolina Department of Labor during the past 12 years. Following its reorganization in 1933, our Department has undergone a gradual expansion in keeping with the growing needs of labor and industry. * * * Much of this development and improvement is the direct result of the technical assistance which we have received from the Division of Labor Standards in the training of inspectors, development of codes, and through the informational and educational services which it has made available. * * *

"We have gone over the House committee's report with care. Based upon our experience, we can see no economy which will result from the elimination of the services of the Division of Labor Standards. It is hard for us to understand why an Appropriations Committee should eliminate this small accident prevention service and at the same time grant $18,000,000 of Federal funds to rehabilitate workers after they are injured. Yet that appropriation is carried in the same report in which the Division of Labor Standards is abolished. Similarly, we cannot see why the United States Public Health Service should be granted millions for building up State health departments—particularly in the field of industrial hygiene—when we in the State labor departments are denied all assistance."

2. THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

The 77 percent proposed cut in funds to operate the United States Employment Service—the national office of our public employment service system—would completely incapacitate the Federal Government in discharging responsibilities placed upon it in the law which established our Federal-State system of public employment offices. Just why H. R. 2700 proposes to cut the funds requested for operations of the national office 77 percent—from $3,912,000 to $900,000—yet proposes to grant the full amount of funds requested to operate the State and local offices—$72,000,000—is difficult to understand, as all of the money to run the USES and the State employment services comes out of the Federal Treasury, 100 percent.

The committee report accompanying H. R. 2700 leads me to believe that there are some who do not understand that the public employment service system which was created in 1933 was created as a Federal-State system—not as a Federal or a State system, but as a Federal-State system with nonduplicating and nonoverlapping responsibilities delegated to the Federal and to the State governments. That is the system that was in operation prior to federalization of the employment service for the war job, the system by which we have seen a basic democratic institution come into being and mature. Unless we repeal the Wagner-Peyser Act the Federal-State cooperative system should remain in operation now that we have returned the running of the State services back to the States. Because the report accompanying H. R. 2700 seems to reveal that the committee felt it was taking care of the operations of our public employment service by providing all the funds requested for State operations but cutting the national office 77 percent, I wish to point out the protest to the proposed cut in requested funds for the USES which has been made by Col. Henry E. Kendall, the chairman of the Unemployment Compensation Commission of North Carolina. He has appealed to the chairman of the Senate subcommittee to restore requested funds, and to me, he has written:

"It is my opinion that this cut has been such that it may seriously endanger the entire developmental program of the USES and that the amount allowed by the House of Representatives is insufficient for the USES to provide the various States with the services the States would like to have. * * *

"I think one of the most important technical services the national office should be able to provide is in the field of occupational information. It seems to me that if the employment services in the States are to do an adequate job and to continue to develop that some central group will have to provide revisions for the dictionary, trade questions which cover additional occupations and are revised to meet technological changes, aptitude and performance tests which are one of our most valuable services to industry, interviewing aids and job descriptions to be used as devices for improving the efficiency of our local office personnel, particularly in interviewing and placing applicants. While some of this work could possibly be done by the various States it seems to me that a well administered national program should be able to provide this for the various States at a lesser cost and with better coverage than any individual State could possibly do.

"In addition to this technical assistance in the way of occupational information and occupational tools, we feel that it is worth while for the United States Employment Service to continue within reason their work on manual preparation and manual revision. While all of these manuals do not exactly meet the needs in this State I find that with minor revisions we have been able to issue these manuals and have not been required to maintain a procedures section of any consequence.

"In the field of labor-market information we feel that the requirement and requests from the USES have been a great many times too burdensome and that in many instances they established requirements which has required the expenditure of too much staff time for the results achieved. I feel that a portion of their work should be continued so that the various States may be provided with over-all information on labor-market trends for their consideration in planning the program for their individual State.

"In addition to these things which I have mentioned, I think it would be wise for a reasonable staff to be maintained by the USES to provide for the interchange of information on Employment Service operations among the various States. It is not anticipated that this group would have direct supervisory responsibilities with regard to any State but where good practices are found in States this information could be passed on to other States for their use.

"In regard to the regional offices, I cannot argue that we [North Carolina] would have any great difficulty in our relationship with the USES if the regional office was discontinued, because of our geographical proximity to Washington. However, it would seem to me that in those States which are at a distance from Washington it would be wise to continue the regional offices so that the States would have assistance in their problems without the necessity of traveling to or corresponding with the officials in Washington. This presupposes, of course, that the regional office people would be given sufficient authority to take necessary action with regard to the problem the States might present and, if given such authority, the regional office would be valuable to the States near Washington since there would be a small staff of persons assigned to work with a group of States and would be more cognizant of the peculiar problems of the State."

Mr. Chairman, concerning the appropriations for the USES, Mr. Kendall has said to me:

"I would like to urge that you take any action which you may deem advisable in securing the restoration of sufficient funds

for the USES to carry out a program which can be beneficial to the States which are attempting to operate a most satisfactory employment-service program."

3. BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is a fact-finding arm of the Department of Labor. Its activities, developed in response to congressional mandate in the course of the years, have become an essential part of the functioning, not only of the Federal Government, but also of State governments, which owe much to the Bureau for technical and financial assistance. The proposed curtailment of the budget will mean the severe limitation, if not the abolition, of at least six specific activities in North Carolina, which may be grouped under these specific titles:

(a) Occupational wage-rate surveys.
(b) Consumer price indexes.
(c) City workers' family budgets.
(d) Building materials price indexes.
(e) Employment statistics.
(f) Services to the States.

4. OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

The Office of the Solicitor is chiefly responsible for the enforcement of the laws that are administered in the Department of Labor. It has been erroneously assumed that because of the decrease in the Department's over-all budget the responsibilities of the Solicitor's Office will be correspondingly less, but this is not the case. The duty to prosecute violations of minimum-wage, maximum-hour, and child-labor statutory requirements will continue mandatory until those laws are repealed. The duty to respond to public inquiries concerning the application of those laws will continue so long as the public continues to inquire. The duty to make predeterminations of prevailing wages under the Davis-Bacon Act, the National Housing Act, the Federal Airport Act, and the Hospital Survey and Construction Act is not only required to be performed under these acts, but affects the operations of all the agencies of the Federal Government which contract for or are interested in construction under these acts.

In the State of North Carolina alone, for example, through the end of March in the present fiscal year, 99 requests for wage predeterminations have been made. Much of the construction involved in these requests closely affects veterans: Educational facilities are being constructed at Raleigh, Louisburg, Black Mountain, and Holly Ridge; and construction on Veterans' Administration buildings is taking place at Fayetteville and Charlotte. Improvements to the airport are being made at Charlotte by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The Navy is engaged in extensive construction in many locations: Greensboro, Wilmington, Raleigh, Winston-Salem, Durham, Asheville, and Charlotte. These are only a few examples of the type of work which would be delayed and hampered, to the detriment of the prosperity of North Carolina, by reduction of the Solicitor's Office budget.

5. UNITED STATES CONCILIATION SERVICE

I am very concerned about the proposed budget cut for the United States Conciliation Service which is the only agency aside from the National Mediation Board charged with the responsibility for settlement of industrial disputes.

I agree with President Truman when he said in his Jefferson Day speech that it is false economy to reduce the budget of the agency responsible for the maintenance of industrial peace. If facilities are not available for the prompt handling of labor disputes, we will have more strikes with consequent economic disruption to the country. That economic disruption of the economy will inevitably affect everyone and will affect the people of my State of North Carolina.

In the calendar year 1946, the United States Conciliation Service in conjunction with the State service, handled a total of 176 labor disputes in North Carolina, involving 46,796 employees all told. Thirty-nine of these were work stoppages, involving 8,221 workers. Fifty-seven were threatened work stoppages, in which 22,871 workers were involved, settled by the Conciliation Service without a strike. In addition, 47 disputes involving 10,150 workers were settled by the Service before any threat of a strike. In 8 cases involving 237 employees, an arbitrator was appointed. Twelve were handled by the appointment of technical commissioners to make work-load surveys and other kinds of technical studies in the affected plants, to settle issues in the disputes. Four thousand, nine hundred and seven employees were involved in these cases.

One of the most important steps taken by the Conciliation Service since Director Warren assumed office was the establishment of a Labor-Management Advisory Committee. This committee consisting of representatives nominated by the NAM, Chamber of Commerce, AFL, and CIO was established pursuant to the unanimous recommendation of the President's Labor-Management Conference on Industrial Relations in November 1945. The Labor-Management Advisory Committee meets regularly with the Secretary of Labor and the Director of Conciliation to provide advice and guidance on the operations of the Service. The establishment of the committee is particularly significant in that it marks the first time in the history of the Department of Labor that management has had a voice in the functioning of that Department. No major reorganizational step taken by the Conciliation Service was taken unless it was made upon the recommendation of or with the approval of the committee. One of the most important recommendations made by the committee was for the establishment of a panel of 26 special conciliators. These special conciliators are the outstanding people in the field of labor relations in the country who have agreed to keep themselves available for assignments to particularly important cases affecting the national welfare and economy. They are the type of people that could not ordinarily be attracted to regular government service, but who are willing to serve from time to time to assist their country in the peaceful settlement of major disputes. North Carolina is particularly proud of the fact that it has contributed two of its native sons to the list of 26—Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Professor Harry D. Wolf, of the University of North Carolina.

In addition to the above, Hon. Walter P. Stacy, chief justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, was Chairman of the President's Labor-Management Conference in 1945 and served on the fact-finding board and filled other special assignments of national importance in conection with the administration of the labor conciliation program, in which he reflected great credit upon himself and made a fine contribution to the Conciliation Service.

The Conciliation Service, in addition to the National Labor-Management Advisory Committee, has established regional advisory committees, composed of representatives of the same organizations, who advise the regional directors on a local level on problems affecting the regional offices. North Carolina has contributed two representatives to the Regional Labor-Management Committee for the southern area—Mr. Roy Lawrence, southern director of the Textile Workers' Union (CIO), and Mr. T. G. Moore, secretary and general counsel of the T. H. Hanes Knitting Co., represeting the NAM.

In talking about the Conciliation Service I would like to refer briefly to an incident that has come to my personal attention, whereby that Service was particularly helpful in assisting labor, management, and agricultural interests in resolving a dispute which affected all of them. It did so in a competent and fair manner that won the applause of all three groups. I refer to a letter addressed to the Secretary of Labor from the executive secretary of the State Farm Bureau Federation relating to a threatened strike in tobacco redrying plants. The letter is appended at the end of this statement. It would certainly seem to be false economy to reduce the effectiveness of an agency which in a single case makes such a tremendous saving to the industrial, agricultural, and laboring people of this country. Particular praise for the handling of this one dispute was paid to Commissioner of Conciliation Yates Heafner. I am proud to say that I know Mr. Heafner personally, as well as Mr. Seth Brewer, the other commissioner assigned to the North Carolina area. Both of these men have a general reputation for a high degree of competence and impartiality and they have the confidence of all the people with whom they deal. I am sure that they are typical of the Commissioners assigned to other States. They are the kind of men we need to help solve our industrial disputes. We certainly should do nothing to reduce the budget in such a way as to limit their effectiveness.

The President's Labor-Management Conference unanimously recommended not only that the Conciliation Service be strengthened and improved, but that sufficient funds be made available to retain and attract the highest type of personnel to perform the duties assigned to it. I believe that that recommendation is entitled to great weight.

6. WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

There are 10,840 establishments in North Carolina subject to this legislation. It had originally been planned to inspect about 10 percent of these for compliance. Under the proposed budget reduction, only about 7 percent or less than 700 of the covered plants can be inspected since the State will be left with only 8 of its present 12 inspectors.

The foregoing is a brief outline of the services rendered by the Labor Department, with special reference to the cooperative service with the States.

I recognize the advisability and necessity of reducing expenses and contracting Government services wherever it is possible to do so without causing serious detriment to the public service. However, it is a short-sighted policy and one I do not believe the American people will commend, to cripple a Department that has been so long established and that carries forward a broad program of service to the large and ever-increasing number who constitute the workers of America.

This Department is entitled to that same fair and just consideration which should be given to all agencies ministering to the public service and I trust that this committee will see to it that an adequate amount is provided in the appropriation for the Labor Department.

The letter referred to in the above follows:

NORTH CAROLINA
FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Greensboro, N. C., September 24, 1946.

Hon. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWELLENBACH: I am very happy to inform you that the strikes have been settled in the tobacco redrying plants of the Winston Leaf and Piedmont Tobacco Cos. of Winston-Salem, N. C. The redrying industry will begin on September 24 to operate at 100-percent capacity.

The other day when I wired you, the tobacco farmers of our State were very fearful that these strikes were going to spread throughout the entire industry, and leave them with approximately $500,000,000 worth of tobacco, which is highly perishable, in their hands.

I want to take this opportunity to express to you our sincere appreciation for the fine cooperation of the Department of Labor in terminating these two strikes. I want to pay special tribute to Mr. Yates Heafner of the United States Conciliation Service for the fine service that he rendered to the farmers of our State by his untiring efforts to bring about a settlement in these two plants. We were not only impressed by his ability to grasp the issues involved but his determination to maintain a strict neutrality through the deliberations. He brought about a settlement that leaves the industry, labor, and farmers in a very happy mood. We hope that we do not have any further trouble in the redrying industry this year, but in case we do, the farmers of this State will appreciate very much your assigning Mr. Heafner to these cases. In the meantime, you might assign him to arbitrate the dispute between Mr. Wallace and Mr. Byrnes.

Yours very truly,

R. FLAKE SHAW,
Executive Secretary.

Jefferson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Tom Connally, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very able speech delivered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] at the Jefferson Day dinner held in New York City last night.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster and fellow Democrats, it is with a deep sense of appreciation that I respond to the invitation to join in honoring Thomas Jefferson, the profound political philosopher and founder of the Democratic Party.

He gave inspiration and leadership to the period of the revolution and the foundation of our Government. In the Continental Congress in 1776 he gave to the world that flaming declaration that stirred the colonists to the high resolve to pledge their lives and fortunes to the cause of freedom and independence. He served as Minister to France. He was Secretary of State under the great Washington, and Vice President under John Adams.

The American people called him to the high station of President. For eight dramatic years he guided the Republic with patriotism and wisdom.

Though Jefferson filled many distinguished offices, he directed that his epitaph should simply state that he was the author of the Declaration of Independence and the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom and the father of the University of Virginia. The pomp and circumstance of office were ignored. He desired to be remembered by his countrymen as the champion of liberty, religious freedom, and as the sponsor of education for our people. He urged the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

As President of the United States, with a vision that looked down through the years—yea, through the centuries—he consummated the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. This courageous stroke brought under the flag the magnificent territory of the Northwest. Jefferson was abused and denounced by political enemies, but he thought of America and the millions who were to come after him. He was dreaming of the future and of the destiny of the American Republic.

Tonight we are interested in Jefferson's philosophy of government and his founding of the Democratic Party. He made it a living force among the people of the United States. The Democratic Party has survived its antagonists. During Jefferson's time the Federalists disintegrated. The Whig Party was vanquished by Andrew Jackson and those who followed his banner of militant democracy. The Democratic Party has contributed more to the development of free government and to the rights of the body of our people than any other force in our history.

There stands in Washington a handsome memorial to Jefferson. I frequently observe it and reflect that, magnificent as it is in design, and constructed of gleaming marble, Jefferson will be remembered and revered and will influence the world when this monument shall have turned to dust.

In 1948 the American electorate will select a President, a Senate, and a House of Representatives. We face that contest with confidence.

In the backwash of war, in the confusion and uncertainties which beset our people, the Republicans by a narrow margin in 1946 elected a Senate and a House of Representatives. We are not discouraged. Our swords have not been dulled. Our strength has not been dissipated. We are ready for 1948. We are ready for battle.

What is the Democratic record during the years it was in power? They are known from 1933 to 1947.

The farmers know what has been done for agriculture. The depositors in banks remember the guaranty of bank deposits that protects their savings and prevents panic. Bank depositors can never forget the heroic action of the great and beloved President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his superb leadership in closing the banks to save them from collapse and ruin. The candid industrialist knows what has happened to factory production and the tremendous volume of wealth that has been created and distributed among our people.

The unemployed will remember that their ranks were reduced and those who toil have received increased comforts and conveniences of life.

Men and women of advanced years will never forget that old-age legislation has relieved their necessities. The whole country will never forget tremendous advances in liberal and social legislation.

The owners of insurance policies and stockholders of railroads, trust companies, mortgage and loan companies and other business concerns should never forget that these interests were guided to successful operation instead of being plunged into bankruptcy and ruin. Millions of businessmen everywhere in America are enjoying an increased volume of business and security in their investments which resulted from lifting the Nation out of the ruin and wreckage of 1932.

Nor will the world ever forget that under the leadership and direction of President Roosevelt, the most colossal war in all of the annals of time ended in complete triumph for American arms.

They will not forget that under Democratic leadership our heroic soldiers and sailors and marines are receiving aid, and education, and hospitalization.

It will never be forgotten that the Democratic administration championed the cause of world peace and was instrumental in establishing the United Nations. Our program was so compelling that it has had the approval and cooperation of the Republican Party. We accord to the Republicans our recognition for their nonpartisan cooperation and we know that under the leadership of President Harry S. Truman, our voice will have a mighty appeal in the cause of peace and in the rights of men and of nations.

The national income for 1932 was $39,900,000,000. In 1933 it was $42,000,000,000 and it grew under the Democratic administration until in 1946 it reached the astronomical figure of $165,000,000,000. Can there be any doubt that this reflects increased business activity, increased earnings to the masses of the American people and increased prosperity throughout our broad land. These are the facts that cannot be ignored. They cannot be dismissed by a shrug. They stand out in vivid contrast to the ruin and devastation and panic which we faced in March 1933 like Washington's monument when it greets the rising sun.

The Republicans in the campaign of 1946 made wild and extravagant pledges to the American people. They agitated against war controls necessary in the prosecution of the war. Some of them were irritating to the people. This irritation was exaggerated and magnified. The country ought to know that a majority of the Republicans in both House and Senate had voted for most of these restrictions. They dared not do otherwise during war, but with wild shoutings, they denounced them. President Truman has already ended nearly all of the controls. He will end them all when circumstances warrant.

The Republicans promised a 20 percent reduction of taxes across the board. They promised a balancing of the budget and payments on the national debt. They ought to know and the country now knows that they cannot reduce taxes by 20 percent and also make any substantial payment on the public debt. President Truman has stated that according to the most reliable estimates, the budget will be balanced in the present year.

The Republicans are now in power in both the Senate and the House. What have they achieved? They have been spending too much time thinking about the campaign of 1948 and the prospective Republican candidates for President. Too much maneuvering over politics has prevented the performance of their promises, advanced in the heat and hope of securing place and power.

The Gallup poll of April 8, 1947, reported that the following question had been propounded according to its system: "If hard times come again would you rather have the Republicans or Democrats in office?" The answer was: Republicans, 30 percent; Democrats, 51 percent.

A second question was as follows: "As you feel today, what political party—the Democratic or Republican—can better handle the problem of keeping wages high?" The answer: Republicans, 22 percent; Democrats, 54 percent.

Dr. Gallup reports: "Other polls in the past have found that the voters believe the Democratic Party is best for people of below average income, while the Republicans are the party which look after the interests of the more well-to-do."

The American people, prefer the Democrats to be in power in times of crises because they know we led them out of the greatest depression within a hundred years.

The recent election of a mayor in Chicago gave victory to the Democrats by an overwhelming majority. This is a symbol of what the people are thinking and of what they intend to do in 1948. President Harry S. Truman assumed the Presidency amidst the gloom and grief that followed the death of the beloved and gallant Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mighty tasks faced the new President both at home and abroad. He faced them with courage and patience and patriotism. He faced them with a sincere desire to serve the interests of the whole

people of the United States. The responsibilities of the Presidency are heavy and difficult. They challenge all of the abilities of the wisest and best. Harry Truman has grown in the affections, the admiration, and the respect of the American people. His increasing popularity is proof that the people trust him and are ready to follow him. Both in domestic and international affairs he has demonstrated rare leadership. Domestic, as well as foreign problems, have been difficult but he has met them with marked success. The slanders spread in Europe by an American that he is an imperialist fall harmless at his feet. Domestic detractions rebound on their authors.

President Truman will lead our party in 1948. Upon the record of achievement of the party since March 1933 and upon the record of Harry S. Truman, the people of the United States will triumphantly elect him in 1948. His arm is long enough to reach the humblest citizen in the land. His vision is clear enough to encompass all of the people of the United States. His heart and head are patriotically devoted to world peace and to his country's welfare and prosperity. Inspired by Jefferson's philosophy and democracy, he will meet the mighty problems of the future with lofty patriotism and will justify the trust and confidence of his people.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before the Kiwanis Club of Kenosha, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered in Kenosha, Wis., on Wednesday, April 16, 1947, before the Kiwanis Club of Kenosha.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SERVICE SPIRIT IN THE ATOMIC AGE

Last night I had the privilege of speaking before the Wisconsin Manufacturers Association in Milwaukee. As I stood before this group of men, there flashed in my mind the difference between the Milwaukee of today and the Milwaukee of 50 years ago, and for that matter the difference between Wisconsin of 1947 and of a half a century ago. Wisconsin is the result of that typical American quality known as American ingenuity, a combination of work, thrift, and enterprise.

Last week, as you know, a great American passed on—Henry Ford. He was typical of this American quality—a quality which is also evidenced in another great automotive industry—the Nash plant of this city. In a lesser degree we have had countless immigrants and sons of immigrants from Europe who have builded vast enterprises in our own State. I trust that we who are the beneficiaries of their enterprise will not forget in the days that are up ahead the lessons that their lives have taught.

KIWANIS' ENTERPRISE

We Kiwanians know that the great material advancements that have come to our country have come because on this blessed soil; we Americans have largely given primacy to a combination of the human and spiritual values of life, because we have encouraged the daily living of the Golden Rule in all economic relationships.

Kiwanis has blazed countless new trails along this very line.

But we also know that we've got a long road to travel before we arrive at the place where we, as Americans, can be satisfied. We Kiwanians will carry on our job of personal service, of service to underprivileged children, of creating intelligent and serviceable citizens, of building friendly understanding among all classes of our citizenry.

THE MEANING OF OUR SUBJECT

It is on this subject that I want to chat with you at this time. I want to express to you, first, my deep appreciation for the opportunity to do so—this opportunity to meet old friends and make new ones.

My subject is The Service Spirit in the Atomic Age, the Kiwanis spirit, we may call it, the warm, friendly, honest spirit of sympathy, understanding, and aid.

NEED FOR HONEST SPIRIT

We need this spirit now more than ever before in this complex technological era—this era of machines, of speed.

We might recall an interesting incident in this matter.

On one occasion, back before the Civil War, when there was a question of whether or not Illinois should default on some of her bonds, Stephen Douglas, in the State legislature, introduced a resolution which read, "*Resolved*, That Illinois be honest." The resolution carried, and Illinois made good on her bonds.

I sometimes think that a simple resolution such as Douglas introduced 's what we need, each and everyone of us, to keep ever before us in our minds.

AREAS FOR SERVICE ACTION

In our own minds and in countless other spheres there is need for more and more of the friendly service spirit. Let us list some of these areas:

1. Friendly service in the labor-management field.

2. Friendly service in helping the underprivileged old folks, widows, and orphans.

3. Friendly service between Federal, State, and local governments in cooperating with harmony for our free enterprise system.

4. Friendly service in that most challenging sphere of all—the international sphere—between nations in this war-torn world.

1. Friendly service in industry

There is vast need for more of this service spirit in industry, for more of management sympathy with the problems of labor and vice versa—each putting itself in the other fellow's shoes, each seeking areas of agreement rather than areas of conflict, each seeking not to dominate and bind the other into submission, but to work together as a team like a captain and his crew.

But we know that although the primary harmony job must be done by labor and management in the grass roots, there is a job for Congress to do also.

In Washington, we must meet what I call the pro-American issue, or what some call the labor issue.

This cannot be met with anger or hate or fear. It has to be met head-on, having in mind principally the public interest, the interest of all of us in full, uninterrupted production, particularly in public utilities.

I have long stated my own personal conclusions on this subject, and I have been called a few harsh names. But, as a result thereof, I have not been convinced that I am wrong. I listen to facts, not name calling. I will, however, give earnest heed to the opinions of all economic segments when this subject is thrown into the lap of the Senate, after the bill is reported from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which I am not a member.

I do insist, however, that the public interest, and by that I mean the economic health, the social health of our society as a whole, must be borne in mind in the legislation that is to be passed. Whatever legislation is passed, it should be adequate to curb any racketeering element which would absolutely trample the rights of the public.

2. Friendly service in Social Security

Now, for a second area, I recently reintroduced a resolution in the Senate, Concurrent Resolution 13, for creating a 14-member Joint Committee for Social Security. The purpose of this resolution is to create a group that would thoroughly study this whole subject and then report back to the Congress. It is obvious in this period when prices have gotten far out of line and the purchasing power of the dollar has declined, that our present system of old-age compensation, of unemployment insurance, of aid to widows and orphans, of aid to the blind needs overhauling.

After all, we Kiwanians preach the doctrine that "We do not live unto ourselves alone." Throughout the country, there is an average of social-security aid of only $33.67 per month to 60,000 blind persons. There is also an average payment per family per month of $55.42 for 887,000 dependent children.

The fraternal spirit calls out to us to reevaluate the adequacy of such aid.

We in Kiwanis recognize the value of work and know that it is not our purpose to make loafers of our citizenry. We recall, too, what Grover Cleveland said: "It is the purpose of the people to support the Government rather than of the Government to support the people." But we recognize that there are many in our land, old folks who have retired on meager incomes, widows and orphans, and others who need the helping hand that is offered in friendship and understanding.

3. Friendly service in intergovernment groups

There is a vast need for the service spirit to be displayed between governments in our land—between Washington, D. C., and Madison and Kenosha governments, for example, to solve common problems, primarily at the grass-roots level.

Last year I introduced a resolution to create a Joint Federal State Relations Committee in order to encourage harmony of work between all units of government in order to curb the tendency toward centralization in our society, in order to encourage fiscal independence of State governments in place of more and more Federal aid.

It is time that Washington, D. C., recognized that neither legislation nor Executive orders can bring about the millenium, but that it must cooperate with the States and localities to meet common issues.

4. Friendly service in the world

But the biggest challenge to friendly service in this world today is at the international level. Here we have nations in different strata of development; nations with different economic, social, political, racial, and religious backgrounds; nations in Europe, for example, which have known only centuries of war and invasion.

And the biggest specific issue here is for meeting of minds and understanding so that the people of Russia and the United States can meet to head off any conflict between them.

The fact that we have different approaches does not mean that we are doomed to failure. In the Senate of the United States we have 96 men, no 2 of whom are alike economically, politically, socially, racially, geographically; and yet out of this diversity we succeed, I believe, in a common effort in the public interest. With diversity of approach, men have to reason their way through to a conclusion, and that is what is needed in the solution of most problems; an honest desire to get at the best solution.

CONCLUSION

I have spoken, gentlemen, of the service spirit in four areas. You and I know that there are many other fields for the Kiwanis spiri' to shine forth. In all of them, we must create that solid public opinion and idealism which makes for an increase of righteousness, of justice, of patriotism, and good will.

Tribute to Former Senator William H. King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of April 14, 1947, by Mr. T. Odon Mathews, president of the Utah State Society, together with enclosure, which is a copy of a resolution adopted by the society as a tribute to William H. King, for many years our colleague in the Senate, on the occasion of his return to Utah.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH STATE SOCIETY,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1947.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Fulfilling the desire of all Utahans in Washington, I am enclosing a copy of a resolution prepared as a tribute to the Honorable William H. King on the occasion of his return to Utah.

I have been instructed to forward this resolution to the United States Senate. I believe that all Senator King's friends and fellow Utahans would deem it most appropriate and appreciate it greatly if you could present this resolution on the floor of the Senate and have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,
T. ODON MATHEWS,
President.

To the Honorable William H. King, Utah's elder statesman, a servant of the people, who through the eminence of his service to State and country has gained international renown:

Whereas 1947 is the year of Utah's centennial and thus a milestone where all Utahans pause to give thanks for the guidance of men who have led the State so safely and surely through its first 100 years; and

Whereas you, by virtue of your outstanding leadership, intelligence, and energetic ability, have played so vital a part in guiding Utah's destiny for more than three score of these 100 years; and

Whereas you have so generously given of your time and talents to all the citizens of Washington, D. C., but more especially to your fellow Utahans, since the date of your first arrival in 1897 as a Member of the House of Representatives, through your four terms as United States Senator, and in various other capacities to this day; and

Whereas you have so earnestly and wisely promoted the principles of freedom and righteousness for all peoples in such a manner as to bring honor to the State of Utah and its citizens; and

Whereas you have been so untiring and unselfish in your devotion to the needs and wants of your manifold friends and fellow citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That all your friends and fellow Utahans in Washington, D. C., take this occasion to express to you heartfelt thanks and appreciation and send with you warm good wishes as you journey once again to the valleys of the mountains; be it further

Resolved, That, as a tribute to your distinguished record, all your fellow Utahans in the District of Columbia request that the Utah State Society send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, the Governor of the State of Utah, the Utah State Senate, and the Utah State House of Representatives.

Dated this 11th day of April in the year of our Lord 1947, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia.

UTAH STATE SOCIETY.

Jefferson Day Address by Hon. Hugh Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Jefferson Day address delivered by Hon. Hugh Mitchell, former Senator from the State of Washington, at Wenatchee, Wash., April 10, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One hundred and forty years ago a great President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, delivered his sixth annual message to Congress. He reported that Lewis and Clark had, in his words, "descended the Columbia to the Pacific Ocean."

The men who came down the Columbia to the Pacific were scientists, not foot-loose adventurers. They were seeking facts and making studies for the development of new country. This was Jefferson's plan. Capt. Meriwether Lewis was Jefferson's own secretary. Following the President's detailed instructions, he and Clark made careful and painstaking reports on plant and animal life, on the nature of the country and its people, and on the possibilities for trade.

These possibilities attracted great interest back East. Popular editions of the Lewis and Clark journals were widely read in America. Their fascinating stories fired the imagination and speeded westward migration.

Estimating that in 1805 half a million Americans went West from the States, Jefferson predicted "about one-half the number of our increase will migrate westward annually."

The opening of the Pacific Northwest for American settlers and American enterprise is due in large measure to the pioneering vision and active interest of Thomas Jefferson.

Jefferson was the son of a pioneer father, and as the historian tells us, "a product of the first West in American history." Even as a youth in college at Williamsburg Jefferson's sympathies were enlisted for the growing Democratic movement of the small farmers among the upper rivers, the tobacco growers, the hunters and trappers of the Allegheny slopes.

He kept his eyes toward the West and dreamed of a great commercial empire on the Columbia River. When he became President he took steps to make this dream a reality. A scientific mind and a steadfast Democratic faith enabled him to see clearly that the West was vital to American life. His determination to use the power and the resources of the Federal Government for promoting western development was unyielding.

In his confidential message to Congress outlining his plans for a western expedition Jefferson said: "The interests of commerce place the principal object (of the expedition) within the constitutional power and care of Congress." Suppose an economy-minded Congress had struck down his modest request for $2,500 to finance the expedition. Because Jefferson saw fit to explain so small an appropriation we know there must have been opposition. So we know that even then there was opposition to a principle we are still fighting for—the principle that western development is national development.

Today many people in high places, lacking the courage and vision of Jefferson, seem to be turning their eyes away from the West. Our welfare and progress hang on the whim of Republican Congressmen who do the bidding of eastern masters. They place a heavy discount on our aspirations.

The budget debates in Congress have given us an exhibition of Republican intentions. Senator TAFT, chairman of the Republican steering committee and commander in chief of congressional budget cuts, speaks nobly of the need "to maintain a stable and expanding economy." Then he shows how reductions can be made by cutting down on what he terms "popular projects." We have some very popular projects here in the West, wealth-creating, self-liquidating projects essential to the growth of the western economy.

Those are projects which would be abolished or curtailed by the commander in chief of congressional budget cuts. He finds his justification in an alleged mandate of the American people. By some twisted logic, we are told that the American people have exacted a promise to curtail their own welfare. On the floor of the Senate TAFT said:

"I shall do everything in my power to see that, regardless of where the chips fall, the promise is carried out and the appropriations are held down, and that even essential services be eliminated, if that be necessary, in order to keep the promise that we here, I believe, are making to the people of the United States."

Mark what he said: "That even essential services be eliminated." Does anyone doubt where the chips will fall most heavily, if this Republican axe is applied to the budget? Only the big, "popular" projects can add up to billions of dollars. Columbia Basin is a big project.

And what are we to say about the so-called mandate? Was there any mandate to cut Columbia Basin funds? It is not necessary to be a Democrat to come up with the answer. Senator AIKEN, a statesman and a Republican who has seen fit to vote against his party on 72 percent of the Eightieth Congress issues said in eloquent reply to Republican budget policy:

"Their imaginary mandate does not come from the people * * * They speak only for a little group of blind, selfish, ruthless men whose voices are loud and persistent and whose influence is far out of proportion to their numbers."

A great noise and a shouting rang through the halls of Congress during those days of budget debate. Some said that three or four billions should be pared, others said six billions. One young Republican Senator, carried away by the enthusiasm of the moment, let his voice be heard above the clamor and ventured to say that ten billions could be lopped off—"without injury to anyone."

This particular Senator purported to speak for the State of Washington and for the

Pacific Northwest. He went on record in favor of the $6,000,000,000 cut, and expressed his gratitude to those who had recommended it, and his willingness to be guided by their advice. On the floor of the Senate he said:

"That such a figure is concretely attainable, I do not know and I do not particularly care. That it cannot be too far away from what can be accomplished is certain because of the men, both Senators and Representatives, who have said that the figure, from their point of view, is reasonable and possible."

Mark those words, "That such a figure is concretely attainable, I do not know and I do not particularly care." And mark those words: "from their point of view." From whose point of view? Certainly not from Washington State's point of view. We are fighting to sustain the economy of the West. The Republican policy-makers and committee chieftains stand drawn up in a phalanx of reaction against the legitimate demands of this great western area.

Oregon's Senator MORSE will want to remember what his colleague from Washington said, because Senator MORSE is testing Republicans for the future. He has put his own Republican colleagues on notice that he will support them in 1948 only if their stand on western development is right. In the budget debates he said:

"In my judgment * * * the people of the West * * * will want an answer to the question, 'What was your position when it was proposed blindly, by guesswork, to cut $6,000,000,000 out of the budget, when you did not have one iota of factual information showing what effect that cut would have on the great projects of the Western States?'"

The Republican Senator from our State also has a test for Republicans. During the budget debates he complained vehemently that certain Senators were not impressed, as he put it, "with the imperative need for Federal retrenchments." Then he went on to say:

"In my American eyes these gentlemen are recognized for what they stand for, and I shall fight to stay here long enough to see them eliminated one by one."

Thus we see that the Republican Senator from Washington takes his stand with the budget-slashers, and the Republican Senator from Oregon takes his stand for prudent expenditures, and each would excommunicate the other.

Were the welfare of this area not at stake, were today's events not so tragic, there would be humor in the contest between two Republican Senators from neighboring States in the Pacific Northwest. It is humorous, yet tragic that each is trying to establish political loyalty tests for a party in which neither can effectively influence a single major policy decision.

Because there is so much double talk, it is important to get a straight answer to this question:

Does the northwest delegation present a solid front of opposition to eastern maneuvers that would rob us of our potential for industrial and agricultural growth?

Personalities aside, the question must be asked, and it must be answered to make the issue of western development clear to all in Congress.

It seems to me that our Republican Senator has left Congress misinformed as to our essential needs when, in the budget debates, he said: "all regions and areas are expected to make the same kind of sacrifices. I lay particular stress on the need for an equality of sacrifice because I am a western Senator, and as such I have a greater selfish interest in continuing Federal expenditures than do most Senators. The West is a going and a growing concern. Its destiny continues to lie beyond the horizon. Billions of dollars can be invested out there, and there will long be need for billions more. Were I a Senator only from my State of Washington, I might care little for the state of the Nation, or for the rights and needs of others. I might only insist on getting more and more from the Federal trough. * * * If in being a Senator from Washington State I got for that State everything it wanted, but in getting things it could get along without at this time, I helped, along with other Senators who were doing the same thing, to bring financial ruin and a valueless dollar to the Nation of which all States are a blessed part, I should have done my State no favor; I should have betrayed my public trust."

It will be for the people of the West to judge whether that public trust is safeguarded or betrayed. But what do you suppose that statement meant to the House committee which cut western reclamation appropriations—Columbia Basin included—to the bone?

The policy expressed in the above language is not equality of sacrifice but a policy of mutual impoverishment.

Whoever says that providing Federal funds for great self-liquidating Federal projects which reclaim farm land and generate industrial power, would bring financial ruin and a valueless dollar, has learned his economics poorly. He speaks as the political branch manager for vested corporations that dictate the livelihood of the Nation from their private offices in Wall Street and Chicago.

We in Wenatchee, in Washington State, in the West, know the meaning of the reclamation dollar to the West and to the Nation.

But let us recall the words of a great easterner which are appropriate to the budget debates of today. I am quoting this great man:

"The great Columbia Basin project in the Northwest, the projects in the Missouri River Basin, and others of equal significance, will * * * be golden opportunities for returning veterans. Such projects constitute great increases in national wealth and income. * * * Full enjoyment of the great productive resources of this Nation by all of the people requires that all have an opportunity to engage in productive labor. The purchasing power created by reclamation projects is a stimulus to industry and commerce, thus promoting full employment throughout the Nation."

These are the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt which he put in a letter to the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation exactly 2 days before he died. These words of a great President express the philosophy of western development to which we subscribe. We repudiate the concept of mutual impoverishment which would indeed put our destiny beyond the horizon.

Men like Rufus Woods started fighting 40 or more years ago to bring our destiny within the horizon. The Democratic administration, with Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and plans for Columbia Basin and Foster Creek brought destiny over the horizon. Is it now going to recede again into the dim future?

Senator MORSE has given clear and unequivocal warning of the danger we face today. On the floor of the Senate he said:

"I feel that as a result of the action taken in the Eightieth Congress great projects which are needed for the development of that section of the country and, for that matter, for the benefit of the economy of the entire Nation are being thwarted.

"The responsibility in the last analysis must rest upon the majority party in the Eightieth Congress, which happens to be the Republican Party. I want the people of the Pacific Northwest to know that as the campaign of 1948 starts, because if my party becomes responsible for stifling and preventing the development of needed and wealth-producing projects, then it is not entitled to the votes of the people of the Northwest in the 1948 campaign, and, in my judgment, it will not win the campaign in 1948 without the votes of the Northwest."

Let us pursue the logic of Mr. MORSE'S position. He is an able and distinguished Senator whose fidelity to the Pacific Northwest is not in question. Not so many months ago he campaigned diligently for the Republican Party and now he sharply reprimands his colleagues for their indifference to western welfare. He is to be commended for his consistency and candor and acknowledgement of the majority party's responsibility. But what does this position add up to? I say it adds up to one thing and one thing only—Mr. MORSE is embarked on a course of political futility.

To suppose that 1 man from the West, or even 20 men from the West, can rejuvenate and liberalize the Republican Party is to disregard the character of Republican leadership, to disregard the lessons of 12 years of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, and, more pointedly, 3 months of Taft, Taber, and Reece. In the 1920's great western Republicans attempted this herculean task without success. Today the eastern leaders of the Republican Party have an even tighter grip on Republican policy making.

Mr. MORSE himself has publicly acknowledged that his party "perpetrated those depression-causing policies on the American people" during the 1920's. Does he think that by raising his lone voice in the barren wilderness of Republican economic policy, the Republicans will desert the gloomy caverns of Wall Street and walk with him in the sun? The big mastiffs of the Republican Party do not change their course simply because they hear a barking at the heels.

Mr. MORSE now struggles in the Republican fold to preserve what 14 years of Democratic administration have secured. By trying to make the Republican Party a vehicle of progressive policy, Mr. MORSE makes himself a martyr to a hopeless cause. Again I say, he pursues a course of political futility.

There are indications that Mr. MORSE himself is coming to that realization. He has spent many long hours on the Senate floor and consumed page upon page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD admonishing his Republican colleagues. Fifty-six percent of his votes in the Eightieth Congress were cast against his party majority.

Day after day he tries to convince himself that the Republican Party is progressive. He promises to campaign for the party in 1948. He pleads with the party to give him something to work on, to show to the people. And each time he tastes the bitter fruit of defeat as the majority goes about its business of undoing what is good and essential to a prosperous, developing economy.

A man of Mr. MORSE'S understanding ought not to expect the impossible. His eloquent pleas to his Republican colleagues are wasted. I am reminded of the ostrich story in this connection. Strolling into a field where other ostriches stand with their heads buried in the sand, the one bird whose head is in the air looks around and asks: "Where is everybody?"

The talent and energies of the Senator from Oregon will be more truly helpful to the Pacific Northwest when he refuses to dissipate them in fruitless endeavor. When he gives up his course of political futility. In short, when he joins the party that has demonstrated its capacity and performance for the West and for the Nation. To Mr. MORSE I extend an invitation to join the Democratic Party.

The heritage of Jefferson is the monopoly of no party, but both parties have been tested in the hard school of performance. With the Democratic Party, which has laid the groundwork for the development of this great region, we can build for a prosperous future.

A Labor Policy Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 24), 1947

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very remarkable editorial under the title, "A Labor Policy Needed," by James Kerney, Jr., of the Trenton Times newspapers, Trenton, N. J.

This editorial, in my opinion, is about as sane as any expression I have seen on the labor problem, and shows a proper respect for the rights of both the employer and the employee, with the objective of finding a fair balance in equity between all groups in American life.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LABOR POLICY NEEDED

Congress has fumbled with new labor laws for months. There seems to be no idea in Washington of what is needed by labor and management and the whole country.

Some Congressmen seem to have forgotten that as industry has grown and new business practices developed, it is necessary to protect the individual workman by giving him the right to join a union. Part of this privilege of collective bargaining is the right to strike. But just as freedom of the press is not the right to libel any citizen and freedom of speech is not the right to demand the overthrow of our Government by violence, so the right to strike needs to be restrained from abuses. In this matter, there has been a lack of responsibility on the part of some unions and some union leaders.

We must recognize that big labor monopolies are as dangerous as big business monopolies. Our kind of economy creates both kinds of bigness. The restrictions on labor, like the restrictions on business, should not be on their rights, but on the way they conduct themselves. Any changes in our labor laws must protect labor's right to organize and bargain collectively.

Most of the labor bills in Congress put the Government in the business of regulating labor relations. It's time we got away from overregulation by the Government. Cooling-off periods and arbitration are good things only if both sides of the argument agree to them. We need only look at the mess Government has made of the coal and telephone strikes to see how basically ineffective is Government interference in labor relations.

There are other Congressmen who want to outlaw the closed shop. Yet plant after plant in America has had closed shops and happy relations with responsible unions for years. Difficulty only arises when a union closes its mind to any settlement short of its full demands or closes its doors to the basic principles of democracy. The trouble is not with the closed shop but with the closed unions.

Of course, there are faults in the way labor conducts itself. Some of them can be corrected by law. The carpenters' union, for instance, boycotted a beer because of a dispute they had with the machinists' union at the brewery. This boycott hurt workers and employers as well as consumers all over the country. It was foolish, like all jurisdictional strikes. It is not unfair to labor to abolish by law sympathy strikes and secondary boycotts, and to insist that the one place where labor injunctions be allowed is to settle jurisdictional strikes.

On the financial side, unions must have treasuries. It is impossible to organize and manage so large an institution as a national union without a sizable treasury. But unions should be as liable for a breach of contract as is management. And there is no reason why there should not be a public accounting of union funds so that the workmen of America can understand where their contributions go.

There are other aspects of labor that need correction by law. The practice of featherbedding—the creation of unnecessary work—is complete nonsense. The musicians' union, for instance, is a prime example of a union demanding the employment of unnecessary manpower to do unnecessary jobs. This kind of nonsense can contribute to the downfall of capitalistic democracy.

There will be labor representatives who will denounce these suggestions as an effort to return labor to the bitter past. On the other hand some management may prefer to outlaw the closed shop and limit more severely the right to strike. Nevertheless, we believe Congress should pass no law to punish whatever sins may have been committed. We believe our need is a law which preserves for labor its right to organize and bargain collectively but which also brings to labor a sense of responsibility in America.

Labor, Management, and the American People Have Rights That Must Be Respected and Protected—Neither Should Ask for More nor Receive Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

H. R. 3020, THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT BILL

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House, by a vote of 308 to 107 passed H. R. 3020, the labor-management bill. This bill was reported favorably to the House from the Committee on Education and Labor by a vote of 18 to 4. This committee had been investigating and holding hearings on this bill for about 3 months. A great many witnesses appeared and testified, some for and some against the bill. Everyone who desired to be heard either for or against the bill were given an opportunity to do so. Few bills have been given more thorough hearings and consideration than this bill. The House spent 3 days in consideration of the bill. Every word and every line was read. Many amendments were offered and discussed. Some of the amendments were agreed to and some were rejected and at the end on a roll call, 308 voted for the bill and 107 against the bill.

LEGISLATION URGED

This legislation was urged by groups and individuals in all walks of life. In fact, many labor leaders and individual union men and other workers urged that a number of the important provisions of this bill should be enacted into law. An overwhelming majority of the Members of the House, after having spent many weeks in their districts and States last summer and fall, and after having made a careful study of the whole question, realized that there was great necessity for legislation on labor-management relations, and in supporting this legislation they felt that they were carrying out the mandate of the American people and serving the best interests not only of labor and management but the best interests of the American people as a whole. There has been, for a number of years now, growing unrest between management and labor, as is indicated by a constant increase in the number of strikes, number of workers involved, and the man-days lost.

It is shown by the records that during the 6 years preceding the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act—NRA—of 1933, the United States had an average of 733 strikes a year involving a yearly average of 297,000 workers; during the next 6 years there was an average of 2,541 strikes per year involving an average of 1,181,000 workers, and during the next 5 years, from 1939 through 1944, there was a yearly average of 3,514 strikes involving an average of 1,508,000 workers per year. The number of strikes and workers increased during 1945, and there were 38,000,000 man-days lost of labor as a direct result of those strikes. It remained, however, for the year of 1946 to reach the high-water mark in strikes and man-days lost. In 1946 there were 4,985 strikes, and the man-days lost reached the amazing total of 116,000,000 as the direct result of these strikes. As I pointed out in my speech on the floor of the House, in discussing this bill on April 16, these figures do not include the number of strikes in the various years, the number of workers involved, or the man-days lost by reason of sympathy strikes in other plants or the closing down of thousands of plants by rea on of the lack of supplies caused by strikes in other plants, mills, and mines. The last coal strike caused 27 daily trains in the State of Kentucky to be taken out of the service, and 85 percent of the trainmen in my particular section that handled a great deal of coal were laid off.

Beginning with the NRA in 1933 up to and including 1946, there was an increase in the number of strikes on an average annually of 800 percent and the number of workers involved and the number of man-days lost greatly exceeded 800 percent. All of these strikes, directly and indirectly, caused a loss in wages, in business amounting to several billions of dollars. During that period of time many laws have been passed by Congress to correct these conditions, but instead of bringing about more peaceful relations between management and labor, conditions have grown worse and, therefore, an overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress have indicated, by their votes yesterday, and in our opinion a great majority of the American people definitely have reached the conclusion that Congress should make a thorough study of this whole subject and, if possible, amend our labor-management laws to bring about a more peaceful relationship between them so as to

avoid as nearly as it could be reasonably done this tremendous loss to labor, business, and great inconvenience to the American people. The American people, for a number of years, have been denied almost everything in the way of necessities, also homes, furniture, and so forth. They have the money, and they need quantities in everything that can be produced in our factories, shops, plants, mills, and mines, and if a more happy relationship could be established between labor and management, it would result in great benefit to each and a period of great prosperity to the American people as a whole. I am sure that the average Member of the House, like myself, had no purpose in mind except to do the right thing and the very best thing for labor, management, and the American people as a whole. Inasmuch as under our present set-up, strikes with their bitterness, loss of wages, profits, and increased hardships to the American people are on the increase, it seems to me that we must modify our laws in the hope that such action will slow down this progressive increase in the number of strikes and the millions and millions of man-days lost.

MANY PROVISIONS AGREED UPON

Let me say here that the provisions of H. R. 3020 expressly exempt railroad management and railroad workers. Their labor-management relations are covered by other acts of Congress. This bill does not disturb them, and I might say here that under the railroad labor acts they do not have closed shops or even a union shop. No railroad worker can be required to join any labor union. However, they have the right to do so if they choose. Railroad management cannot require them to belong to any union and neither can they discriminate against them because they do belong. The railroad workers, as a rule, under the railway labor acts, have left it entirely up to the workers themselves as to whether or not they will join any union. They strive to make their union so attractive so as to secure their membership through voluntary action.

Management and labor, coming under the provisions of this bill, have agreed generally that the following practices should be outlawed:

First. Jurisdictional strikes.

Second. Sympathy strikes.

Third. Violence and lawlessness in strikes.

Fourth. The right of workers to organize and bargain collectively.

Fifth. Responsibility not only of management but also of labor for violation of the provisions of collective-bargaining contracts with the right of the persons suffering damages to recover from the party violating the contract. It is only fair to say that the purpose of collective bargaining between management and labor is to reach a contract. It would be a waste of time and effort to enter into a contract and then one party or the other disregard the provisions of the contract or refuse in good faith to carry it out.

It has always been the rule among honorable men to carry out their contracts. I repeat, if contracts are not to be carried out in good faith by the parties, there is little reason for the making of the contracts. I stated the other day in my speech that Chief Justice Taft in a celebrated case wrote a very able opinion as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in which he declared that the workers of this country, under our United States Constitution, had the right to organize and he further said that it was necessary that workers have this right as a single worker could not combat organized brains and capital. In order for the worker to have protection where he must deal, as a rule, with great aggregations of capital and brains, he and his fellow workers must have the right to organize brains and brawn to place them on an equal footing with their employers, but it must be said, however, that those who invest their money in enterprises in this country also have rights that should be and must be respected. This is true as to workers and it also must be said that the American people as a whole have rights that must be protected and respected. The proponents of this bill urge that this measure will protect the rights of the workers as well as the investors and the rights of the American people as a whole. This bill undertakes to protect the rights of all of these and protect the rights of the individual worker against wrongs that might be committed against him by some officers or members of his own union.

Sixth. Labor and management generally agree, as I understand, that we should encourage and strengthen mediation and conciliation in the settlement of disputes, and where the parties cannot agree to do everything possible to have them arbitrate their matters before unbiased arbitrators. The hard problem to solve in management and labor relations is where one or both parties fail to settle their matters through mediation, conciliation, or arbitration. Machinery is set up in this bill seeking to meet a situation of that kind especially where the dispute endangers the public health, safety, or welfare of the Nation itself. It must be conceded by all that no individual or group, however powerful, has the right to endanger the national public health, safety, or welfare, and if the parties themselves to the dispute cannot agree between themselves, then some agency of the Government must step in so as to prevent national disaster to the health, safety, and welfare of the Nation.

It seems to me that every fair-minded person must subscribe to this principle. The American people and their elected officials cannot stand idly by and see the sick and disabled in the hospitals of the Nation as a whole suffer or perish, or to deny to the people heat, light, water, and other everyday necessities, or cause many people of our great cities to perish because of lack of transportation facilities to provide food and other necessities for the people; or to see thousands of factories, mills, shops, and mines closed down, and millions of workers thrown out of employment, and the Nation threatened with disaster because one or two groups fail to settle their differences.

I am one of those who want to avoid, as far as is possible, the interference of Government in the lives and activities of the American people. However, when the Government does take a hand it should be as an impartial umpire and seek to do only the just thing and the fair thing for both parties and protect the people as a whole in their health, as well as safety and security of the Nation.

The powerful, whatever group it may be, should be restrained when attempting to do that which is wrong and defy the rights of individuals and the welfare of the Nation and protect the weak and defenseless in their rights.

THE FIRST STEP IN LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Of course, many managers of business as well as leaders of workers are not satisfied with each and every provision of this bill. If I were writing the bill, there are provisions that I would omit. In the process of the consideration of the bill on the floor of the House I voted for a number of amendments, and some of these amendments that I voted for were defeated. If I thought that every line and word of this bill should become law, I would be constrained to vote against it.

The bill will now go to the Senate and there it will be considered at great length, and perhaps some of the objections that I have to the bill will be eliminated, and after the Senate has considered the bill and passed it with changes, the House bill and the Senate bill will go to a committee of conferees, made up of five Members of the House and five Members of the Senate. They will review all of the matters involved in this proposed legislation. All of the important and especially complex and complicated legislation like this that is covering millions of industries and affecting tens of millions of workers and 140,000,000 American people, is the result, more or less, of compromise. No one can get the very exact thing that he wants, and these conferees then will no doubt, in a number of respects, revise the bill and arrive on an agreed bill. They will make their report to the House and Senate. The Senate and House can adopt or reject the conference report, which contains the completed legislative proposal. If either House rejects it, then we must review the whole process and get a bill on which the conferees of the House and Senate can agree, and if they do agree and the House and Senate accept their compromise bill, then that becomes the bill that goes to the President for his approval or disapproval. If he vetoes the bill, it will come back to the House and Senate where efforts will be made to pass the bill over the President's veto. If they fail to pass it over his veto then the whole process must be gone over again. Therefore, no one can say what the act will contain when it is finally approved by the House and Senate and by the President or his veto is overridden.

The bill that we voted on yesterday is the first step in the legislative process and no group should be too much elated or too much disturbed until all the steps have been taken. I am hopeful that in these subsequent steps that it may be

found possible to improve the bill, as I am sure that every Member of this House wants to see a bill adopted that will be fair, both to labor and management, and also fair to the American people as a whole.

I stated the other day in my speech that I had only received two telegrams and a letter in opposition to this bill, and a larger number in favor of the bill. Since we voted and passed the bill yesterday, I have received a number of telegrams in opposition and others in favor of it. It appears that a number of persons had the impression that we would not vote on the bill until today.

Let us indulge the hope that when this legislation is completed, it will bring about more peaceful relations between management and labor, and that strikes, lock-outs, and stoppage of our industries and the loss of hundreds of millions of man-days and billions of dollars may be greatly diminished.

Washington Daily News Questions Soundness of Hartley Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

The House of Representatives has passed—308 to 107—an omnibus labor bill which should not, and will not, become law in its present form.

It is a huge conglomeration of proposals aimed at practically every fault that has been found with organized labor in the last 14 years. Some of its provisions are sound. Others are of most questionable wisdom. Still others, in our opinion, would be almost certain to create resentment and strife that this country is in no condition to afford.

The overwhelming vote for this bill is conclusive evidence that a great majority of the American people want corrective labor legislation. Members of the House are keenly sensitive to public feelings in their home districts. They have to be. When nearly three-fourths of them vote for a measure, defying such threats as union leaders have made against all who might dare to support this one there's a compelling reason.

What the American people want, in our opinion, is a law to hold unions and their leaders responsible for proper use of the great power the Government has helped them to attain; to correct the Wagner Act's bias; to protect workers, employers and the public against abuses that have become flagrant and habitual under the present system.

We do not believe they want a law to go as far as the House bill goes. We know that many of the Representatives who voted for this measure would have preferred, and that a number who voted against it would have supported, something less drastic. But the Republican leadership's strategy permitted no choice. It was this bill or nothing.

We hope the Senate will pass a more temperate bill, that the House will agree to modify its stand, and that the final result will be a measure in which President Truman can find no convincing cause for a veto.

Obviously, there are more than enough votes in the House to override any veto. But that is not likely to be true in the Senate—not if what goes to Mr. Truman is as extreme as what came out of the House yesterday. We do not believe the reports that the President will try to kill whatever labor legislation Congress finally sends him. He, too, is well aware of public opinion.

Congress should send him legislation that is fair and wise. That is the only kind that should be enacted—and under the circumstances, we think, the only kind that has a chance to be enacted this year.

Jefferson Day Address by Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, at a Jefferson Day meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., on April 15, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST HUNDRED DAYS

My task tonight has been made difficult by the splendid Jefferson Day talks of 10 days ago. But I wanted to come here just the same. It is always in order for a nation to honor its great men. It is especially fitting for the Secretary of Agriculture to pay tribute to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, who was a farmer not only by the grants of circumstance but by his own choice—a man who displayed in his agricultural toil the same genius with which he served the Nation as its Chief Executive.

The name of Jefferson at this precise moment has a new significance to the American people. He believed that a nation must grow in spirit and in substance as the workings of time and fate brought to it the responsibilities of leadership. He saw a little confederation of States hemmed in by great powers—by Great Britain to the north; by France and Spain on the south and west; and even by Russia from the Columbi River to San Francisco Bay. Thus restricted, the future of the tiny republic was not hopeful. But when the hour struck—when Napoleon, on the verge of war with England, offered to sell the Louisiana Territory, Jefferson moved boldly to acquire a huge empire that stretched from the Mississippi River to the Rocky Mountains and from the Gulf of Mexico to Canada.

To this day men debate the constitutional authority for his action—but they love him for his courage and vision. He set the stage for the growth of this Nation to the stature of a world power and a leader in world affairs.

Thus, we see how men make history and how we today are privileged to live in the tradition of great leaders like Jefferson, the patron saint of our party. The era of Thomas Jefferson was one of the most important periods in the history of this Nation.

But you and I have been privileged to live through another great era. We have seen at first-hand how another man made history in his generation. We saw in his lifetime how the spirit of the people and their leaders can make a nation great; how the lack of spirit and vision can allow a nation to fall into decay.

I want to talk of that man and his first hundred days as President of the United States. I want you to refresh your memories—to think again of the American scene when the Nation called into the White House Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In this day of unprecedented prosperity and activity in every walk of life, it is difficult to visualize again the almost unbelievable misery and despondency of that time; the cold smokestacks of the closed factories; the bread lines and the bank lines; the farm strikes and the sheriffs' foreclosure sales; the suicides and the general distress.

Let me paint a picture of one typical scene on an American farm. A mortgage is being foreclosed and a great crowd of farmers is assembled. They are grim and determined. A noose hangs in the open barn door. It will be another penny auction, and heaven help the auctioneer if he fails to sell to the penny bidders who seek to protect their neighbor.

The day before Roosevelt was inaugurated, in Wall Street and in the Loop of Chicago, howling mobs surged around the great pillars of the banks and the police were hard put to keep them in check. That was Friday, March 3, 1933.

That night, after a conversation with Roosevelt, Governor Lehman, of New York, declared a 2-day banking holiday and by morning all banks were suspended or severely restricted in operation in every State of the Union.

Thus on March 4—Inauguration Day—the financial life of the country had come to a dead stop and the American people were tortured by a sense of blind fright.

But see what happens. A magnetic personality—a great leader—takes a place of dominance on the American stage—a man who cannot even walk unaided, but who possesses in his heart a wealth of courage and human understanding comparable to that of any man in history.

"This," he says, "is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. * * * This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive, and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."

The logic is so clear, the voice so reassuring, that almost at once the people take heart. The clammy fingers of fear are loosened, distraught nerves are quieted, and some faces even wear a smile again.

Thus we see, on Inauguration Day, the rebirth of a people's faith in America—a faith which they had almost lost.

On that very day the President asks the Senate to confirm his Cabinet at once. The Cabinet members are sworn in and they take over their departments.

The next day, Sunday, is traditionally one of rest. But congressional leaders meet with the President and a proclamation goes out calling Congress into extraordinary session on March 9, the earliest date upon which Members from the far West can be expected to reach Washington. Meantime, frightened officials of the great banks of America had streamed into the Capital, the Cabinet convenes, and the President decides to use a lingering power from World War I to declare a 4-day bank holiday.

The next day—Monday, March 6—a conference of governors is held at the White House.

On Thursday the Seventy-third Congress convenes. Before nightfall the emergency banking bill is passed by both Houses and is signed by the President.

Six days later the economy bill becomes law.

One day later the President sends his farm-relief measure to Congress.

That was the pace of things throughout the first hundred days of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In that short span the Seventy-third Congress enacted many items of major legislation. Let me call a partial roll:

The emergency banking acts that restored confidence in the banks and made the entire system sounder than it had ever been—sound to this day.

The Economy Act, creating a new pension system and bringing the budget under control.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act that aimed to restore and stabilize farm income.

The National Industrial Recovery Act, designed to provide jobs for the unemployed, to improve wages and working conditions, and to eliminate unfair competitive practices in business.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act which provided an example of long-range planning and use of natural resources of soil and water.

The Civilian Conservation Corps Act which took hundreds of thousands of boys off the street and out of the hobo "jungles" and gave them opportunity to do useful work.

The Home Owners' Loan Act that enabled people to save more than a million homes from foreclosure—and it is worth our while today to remember that the $3,000,000 loaned on frozen assets has all been repaid to the Treasury.

The Railroad Coordinator Act which helped keep the great railroad systems in operation.

The Glass-Steagall Bank Act, establishing the Federal Deposit Insurance program which protects our dollars to this day.

The Emergency Relief Act, to furnish food and clothing to the hungry and destitute—to wipe out the bread lines in America.

The Securities Act, to safeguard legitimate investors from sharp dealing in stock promotion.

The Wagner Employment Exchange Act, to help men and women finds jobs again.

Here was action—quick, confident, far-reaching—and the country loved it. The mood of the people changed from fear to faith. Nothing like it had ever been seen before.

And at the end of it the President calmly set off on a cruise up the New England coast. His first hundred days had turned the tide—and the people knew it, and loved him for it.

The guiding principles that activated that first hundred days and the years that were to follow were faith in the people and a conviction that prosperity cannot be siphoned down from the top but must be built from the bottom up.

Here was demonstrated adherence to the principle that the chief responsibility of government is people—their happiness, their well-being. Like Jefferson and Jackson of the past, Roosevelt was a humanitarian, convinced that government exists for the whole people, not just for special interests.

For, in the words of Jefferson, he believed—as Democrats over this Nation believe—that "the mass of mankind was not born with saddles on their backs."

Government for the whole people makes sense. It works. Look at the record of the last 15 years. Back in 1932 national income was down to about $42,000,000,000. Last year it was up to one hundred and sixty-four billions.

Farm net income in 1932 was only two and three-tenths billion dollars—less than $400 per farm, just about a dollar a day.

Last year farm net income hit an all-time peak of sixteen and a quarter billions—not twice, not three times, but seven times that of 1932.

In 1931 nearly 2,300 banks suspended operations and in 1932 over 1,450 more. But in 1934, the first full year of Democratic administration, only 57 banks suspended operations, and since then the number has been negligible.

Yes; government for the people makes sense.

But last November the people forgot some of these things. Some of the same farmers who had helped to prevent sheriffs' sales in 1932 had in more recent years paid off their mortgages and were irked by price controls. People who once had borrowed from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation got out of debt later, bought the house next door—and didn't like rent control. Some people who needed work from emergency relief agencies in the early thirties now had good jobs with fat pay checks, and they wanted sirloin steaks and weren't getting them.

Over the land went hordes of Republican speakers, crying to a people worn out by the sacrifices of war: "Have you had enough?" Many people did not vote. Many thought it was time for a change. The Republicans won both branches of the Congress.

Like an old fire horse going to the fire, I was on Capitol Hill January 3 when they took over. I saw SAM RAYBURN hand the gavel to JOE MARTIN in the House. The Senate was a little delayed, but the Republicans took over, appointed some new doorkeepers—and settled down.

At noon, day before yesterday, on April 13, they had had full control and legislative responsibility for 100 days. And now the people are beginning to admit that they have had enough. The contrast of this hundred days with the first hundred days of Franklin D. Roosevelt is just too pronounced.

To appreciate how the people feel, we have to remember what they had been promised. The campaign of 1946 was no pink tea. It was a hammer-and-tongs brawl.

The Republicans were going to balance the budget, end controls, reduce taxes, cut the war debt, and fire the bureaucrats. It was as easy as that—just like shooting fish in a rain barrel.

Everywhere the sky was full of swords. Republican speakers, whenever they saw a Federal employee, cried, like the Queen in Alice in Wonderland, "Off with his head." A million public servants were to go—and the swords were sharpened at Republican rallies from one ocean to the other.

Expenses must come down. The President's budget, paring expenditures to the bone, had been prepared, but the swords were swinging at it. "We'll chop six billions off the budget." That was the cry.

Taxes must be cut—and the Republicans had the swords to do it. "Twenty percent across the board"—that was the program. It wasn't the most discriminating plan, but when you carve with a sword you take things off in chunks.

They won the election. They got control—and responsibility—in both Houses. The Republicans have had their hundred days. What has the harvest been?

Have they repealed the Roosevelt legislation? No, indeed. This Nation still has social security, the Federal insurance of bank deposits, a Security and Exchange Commission, an agricultural conservation program, and a Tennessee Valley Authority. No one has challenged the soundness of the Roosevelt reforms.

But, in fairness, I must report some progress. They have proposed an amendment to the Constitution limiting future Presidents to two terms. In effect, they are saying to the American people, "We don't trust you." They fail to see that poor administration will be its own limitation, but that the American people have a right to depart from traditional patterns in time of great emergency. Washington wrote to Lafayette on this very point: "I can see no propriety," he said, "in precluding ourselves from the services of any man who on some great emergency shall be deemed universally most capable of serving the public."

The American people agreed with Washington. In the emergency of economic depression, then the threat of war, and finally in the struggle for survival of democracy, they followed his advice. They deemed Franklin Roosevelt most capable of serving the public in 1932, in 1936, in 1940, and in 1944. The American people have said to many Presidents: "We take you for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer," but only in the case of Franklin D. Roosevelt did they add "in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, until death do us part."

Now, I would not have you think that the proposal of a constitutional amendment limiting future Presidents to two terms is the only progress of the Republicans in their first hundred days. They have extended some of the legislation already in force—the act to continue rationing of sugar, the act to continue collection of luxury taxes, and some of the still-needed provisions of the Second War Powers Act.

But these are virtually all of the accomplishments of the first hundred days of the Eightieth Congress under Republican control. Instead of a dynamic program, we have seen controversies between the two branches of the Congress, arguments between leaders in the same branch, disputes and bickering, delays of essential legislation.

Meanwhile, the Republican campaign promises on tax and budget reduction have boomeranged. They now have the Republicans divided against themselves. Did not one of their great leaders predict that a house divided against itself cannot stand?

The House of Representatives pulls out of thin air a proposed budget cut of $6,000,000,000. Senate leaders jigsaw the figures and come up with their own goal—a four-and-a-half-billion cut.

The House leaders push through their tax bill. They estimate it will reduce Treasury collections by three and eight-tenths billion dollars. Senate leaders estimate that it will reduce Treasury collections by five and seven-tenths billions.

The House slashes the appropriation of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, wipes out the salaries of the top officials of the Conciliation Service, and strikes hard at the National Labor Relations Board. Dismayed at such tactics, Republican Senator MORSE, of Oregon, cries out: "This is not fiscal therapy; this is not surgery. I think it is butchery of the welfare of the workers of this country."

Have the Republicans forgotten the statement in their own party platform in 1944? "The Department of Labor," they said, "has been emasculated by the New Deal." Have they forgotten their promises to the American laborer that if they were elected they would strengthen this Department?

No wonder the boys sing, "The GOP she ain't what she used to be."

Senator AIKEN, the Republican Senator from Vermont, suggests that his Republican colleagues have forgotten more than their campaign promises; that they have forgotten reality and are living in a dream world. Let me read you a few sentences from his indictment:

"The people," he says, "gave the Republican Party no mandate to take from the American workingman his high standards of living and his right to organize effectively to maintain that standard.

"They gave no mandate to repudiate the agreements which the United States has made in good faith with other countries.

"They gave no mandate to set the railroads of America and other businesses controlled by financial interests above the provisions of the antitrust laws.

"They gave no mandate to take away the milk and other nourishing food which millions of little children are now receiving through the school-lunch program."

Such are the words of one aroused Republican.

For years the Republican Party has clamored for a balanced budget. And now they find that it is balanced—balanced by President Truman and balanced much sooner than most people had thought possible.

For years Republicans have clamored for debt reduction. Harry Truman has proposed to reduce the debt, and now the Republicans would jeopardize debt reduction by lowering taxes at a time when we are better able to pay taxes for debt reduction than ever before in our history.

The Republicans know they cannot put the sword to President Truman's budget without destroying essential public services. The action of the House on the Labor Department budget illustrates the point. What is there left against which they can wield the sword? The Atomic Energy Commission? The housing program? The day-to-day services of Government to its citizens?

During the first hundred days of the Republicans in 1947, even as during the first hundred days of President Roosevelt back in 1933, we find the spirit of the people changing. But it is not the kind of change that the Republicans were counting on.

When you pick up a newspaper these days or start through the columns of a magazine, you are almost certain to find some comment about the rising popularity of the leader of the Democratic Party—Harry S. Truman. If you like to measure these things in terms of the Gallup poll, it is comforting to realize that his popularity, which stood at 32 percent during the campaign and sword-swinging exhibition of the Republicans, rose to 35 percent in January, 51 percent by early March, and now has reached 60 percent. This is one of the most painful political reversals the Republican Party has ever encountered. Harry Truman has earned the confidence and respect of the American people, not by swinging swords around their heads, but by displaying the kind of spirit that has made America great.

As a member of his Cabinet, I could easily go too far in praise of him, impelled not only by my respect for his performance as President, but also by my friendship for him as a man. But I have never seen a public servant more honest and sincere than he. At Cabinet meetings and private conferences, he sits in judgment on our plans. He displayed, while head of the Truman committee, an instinct for honesty and fair dealing—and it serves him well now.

He made no boast that this fiscal year the budget might be balanced—but only a few days ago there was complaint that he had done too well and might have three billions of tax dollars left. Wasn't that too bad?

He made no heroics out of his plan for Greece and Turkey—and possibly in his modest and cooperative conduct lies the explanation of its legislative success.

You can sense the trouble with me: I am a prejudiced witness—prejudiced because I have found Harry Truman to be the most honest public official I have ever known. So let me give you an unbiased appraisal in the terms of an editorial from the Washington Post, a great independent newspaper that has had a chance through the generations to observe public men and their conduct:

"Mr. Truman," says the Post editorial, "has made his remarkable headway in the people's estimation by his own contribution. He took the defeat of his party last November in a spirit of sportsmanship that won instant recognition. His head was bloody but quite unbowed. He demonstrated a quality that could be revealed only by adversity. Some men thrive on adversity, and Mr. Truman proved he is one of them. He refused to stop being the people's President simply because the country had elected a Republican Congress.

"It is this sense of responsibility to his office that has marked his conduct of affairs since November.

"Not a single issue has he ducked, and some issues he has anticipated, as, for instance, when he headed off the witch hunt for Communists in administrative offices that sadistic Congressmen were itching to lead.

"The straightforwardness and statesmanship of his approach to our domestic problems is matched in the President's attitude to world problems. The Truman doctrine summed up our duty no less than our policy.

"The doctrine, far from being novel and irresponsible, is in the grand American tradition."

Only a week ago another great Washington newspaper—the Washington Star—recalled the President's goal, which he stated after the November election: "To do in all cases, from day to day, without regard to narrow political considerations, what seems to me to be best for the welfare of all our people."

"The record," says the Star, "will show that he has adhered to this guiding principle. And to the consternation of his political opponents, the record will show also that there has been a favorable public response to this quality of leadership. * * *

"What the future will bring is uncertain," the Star continues. "But as long as Mr. Truman keeps his sights trained on that objective he deserves the support of his fellow Americans."

So where do we go from here? What does the future hold for our party? Can we, will we, receive from the people of this land another call to leadership in the election of 1948?

I'm going to let you in on a little crystal gazing. You know there was an election held in Chicago just a few days ago. It happens to be a most peculiar trait of Chicago elections that they usually give a very accurate indication of the strength of a Democratic Presidential candidate in the following election.

For example, in 1931 Mayor Cermak received 59 percent of the Chicago vote. In 1932 Roosevelt received 59 percent of the national vote.

In 1939 Mayor Kelly received 56 percent of the Chicago vote. In 1940 Roosevelt received 55 percent of the national vote. In 1943 Kelly got 54 percent of the Chicago vote. In 1944 Roosevelt picked up 54 percent of the national vote.

And just a couple of weeks ago what happened? Mayor Kennelly, the Democratic candidate, polled 59 percent of the Chicago vote.

I don't want to make a forecast, but if as Chicago goes so goes the Nation, then President Truman would carry nearly 60 percent of the popular vote next year and along with it two-thirds of the States.

I say this to bring hope to those millions in an anxious world who look to the United States for continued, and now expanded, leadership. While governments rise and fall, swing to and from political ideals, change character sometimes overnight, our land retains its eternal strength. We emerged from the war with industry going at a great pace, with farmers enjoying the highest income they have ever known, with employment at record highs. Tonight, 2 years after the German surrender, business still booms. Employment figures show 56,000,000 civilians gainfully employed with less than 2,500,000 out of work, and most of these are only engaged in moving from one job to another. National income is running at the annual rate of $177,000,000,000, an all-time record. Farm income during the first quarter of 1947 averaged 28 percent above last year. The steel industry, usually regarded as an index, is operating at 97 percent of capacity, a peacetime record. And the people of this country have $150,000,000,000 tucked away in liquid assets to buy consumer goods if their earnings are not sufficient. That is the story of the present-day American leadership of Harry S. Truman.

The world looks with hope at America as one great economic pumping plant that has not shut down. People may have become tired of wartime controls, and while tired they may have kicked our party around a little bit, but they have not lost faith. Though swords may be brandished from a thousand hilts, America still loves the spirit that Thomas Jefferson knew as he moved the loose confederation of tiny States toward the path of empire; the spirit that Woodrow Wilson cherished as he fought to bring into being a league of nations strong enough to stop aggression before it could again endanger the peace of the world; the spirit that Franklin Roosevelt exalted as he made his Government so responsive to the public will that neither precedents nor political pirates could stand before him; yes, the spirit that Harry Truman trusts to guide him as he dares to expand the Monroe Doctrine into humanity for the oppressed who still cling to that love of democracy that our own example may have nourished within them.

I have no fear of the swords. Do you recall the impressive paragraph with which Sholem Asch concludes his remarkable book The Apostle?

The old Rabbi stands up before his congregation and says:

"See you not what has happened to Rome? The more they burn the believers in the Messiah, the more they fling them to the beasts, the mightier grow their numbers. Behold! Rome went forth against Jerusalem with the sword, and Jerusalem went forth against Rome with the spirit. The sword conquered for a while, but the spirit conquers forever."

Accomplishments of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Hon. Gael Sullivan, executive director of the Democratic National Committee, regarding accomplishments of the Democratic Party, broadcast over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., April 18, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two years ago a great city fell in battle. In an underground cell below the shattered streets of that city a man vanished from the sight and knowledge of his fellow men.

What happened to the man nobody knows. But with him there was canceled out, once and for all time, an evil dream of conquest—the dream of a world, America included,

brought to its knees and doing the bidding of the gauleiter and the Gestapo. The Hitler myth was smashed.

We crushed that myth. We Americans, with the peoples of many other nations, stamped into the dust of history that foul design of a Nazi west, a Japanese east, and a slave world in between.

In those years we fought hard. We gave our all. And we worked together, in the face of a common danger, as one. Our political differences we sank before a patriotic urge that made everything else look very unimportant. And when we won our fight, we hoped for peace and we looked for peace.

We built for peace, too, and we asked our neighbor nations to join us in the task, for it was a work not for one nation but for all. We knew it was to be a mighty task—the fulfillment of 1,900 years of hopes and prayers. We knew there was no magic, no shortcut to the end of war.

Yet, even so, the way has been harder than any of us could foresee. It has drawn again, and drawn deeply, on the reservoir of our fortitude. We see now that the winning of the peace means a renewal of great effort. It means, once again, the unshaken resolve of a unified people. It means working together, once again sinking our political differences before a higher assignment.

Looking back now over the years of war and the years that we have tried to call peace, we are aware of a profound change in our thinking. World crisis is prolonged. The menacing shadow darkens great expanses of the earth. And the dread of new and terrible weapons is in men's hearts.

Under this stress old accents have shifted. No longer do we think of ourselves first as Democrats or first as Republicans. Those differences between us are secondary. We think of ourselves first as fellow citizens of the United States.

In our dealings with other nations this is reflected in a nonpartisan foreign policy. In the steps we have taken toward world peace, we have made a bipartisan effort.

But at home, in our own life as a people, we also feel this pull toward one another, this need for a new unity. We live our political lives under a two-party system. But today the accent is on one Nation. The accent is on the United States.

We have learned this lesson through the 2 years of our struggle for peace. We have learned, through the inspiring example of Harry S. Truman, that the President of the United States is the President of all the people.

Our political differences remain sharp and clear, as they should. But we have a President who sees, in this stretch-out of crisis, the need of a strong Nation—strong morally, physically, spiritually. And to make America strong, and keep her so, he has risen above party politics.

Under President Truman's leadership we have labored to make ourselves physically strong in the health of our young men and women; in the striving for economic betterment that will follow in the wake of physical well-being and the elimination of the slums and conditions that breed fear and want.

In times like these there is no place for name calling in the political arena. There is no room for political oratory without political performance. The only valid debate in American politics today is the America that we are for, not the Americans that we are against.

The only valid claim a political party can make is its performance for the strengthening of this Nation.

The Republican Party holds majority control—and with it the major responsibility—for the performance of our Congress.

There has already developed a gap of more than a hundred days between Republican promise and Republican performance.

For 14 years the Republican Party sat on the sidelines, sniping while, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, great problems of our country were faced and won.

During the time when the social and economic structure of the Nation was revitalized, the Democratic Party sought to balance the human budget. It strove to better the lot of the many who had little rather than to give more to the few who had much.

During those years while the Democratic Party fought the battles of the people, the GOP watched and found fault. There was no need for statesmanship on their part.

Now with the responsibility of exhibiting statesmanship, the Republicans are confronted with the problem of resolving the differences between their own leaders.

Grave problems of national policy lie waiting while Presidential candidates angle for position.

In this atomic age when the world cries for leadership—a leadership that only a vital, living America can give—the time has come for a reaffirmation—a rededication to the principles of democracy. Only thus can we live in peace—live in a world without fear.

The Democratic Party is the liberal party. It represents the people. It seeks always to balance against the forces of reaction a positive program for the betterment of conditions that affect us all, high and low, rich and poor.

Tonight, for the Democratic Party I wish to reaffirm its traditional stand. I wish to emphasize in doing so that the Democratic Party is a positive force—it is for things—not passively in opposition.

Our foreign policy: By aiding other peoples to restore their hope, by restoring their ability to produce, we make our concept of freedom strong.

Only thus can we strengthen our kind of life and secure for ourselves peace and an era of abundance.

Security at home: The Democratic Party stands squarely in support of the President's efforts to secure our Government from subversive elements that may be present within the ranks of those who administer this Nation for us. Any subversive—any disloyal person on the Government rolls—must be sought out and discharged. At the same time, this must be done in such a way as not to endanger our democratic processes.

Prices: In his Jefferson Day speech, President Truman pointedly said:

"In further evaluating the strength of our domestic economy, I must express to you my deep concern over the level of prices prevailing today. A system of free enterprise does not automatically work out its own adjustments without our giving thought to the process.

"The main factor that can weaken our economy at this time is our own selfishness—the kind of selfishness which is now expressed in the form of unnecessarily high prices for many commodities and for many manufactured articles. These prices must be brought down if our entire economy is not to suffer.

"With the exceptions of a very few items, all price controls have been removed. But freedom from such controls, like other freedoms, cannot be abused with impunity. A profound moral responsibility rests upon those citizens whose decisions have widespread effect on our markets—to put it simply, the responsibility of playing fair, of not going whole hog for profits. The alternative is inflation, industry priced out of the market, and, eventually, men priced out of their jobs."

No words of mine could make our duty more clear.

A balanced budget: The Democratic Party stands behind the President in his financial program to balance the budget and reduce the debt.

The Democratic Party does not stand for a type of economy that would save a dollar today at a cost of thousands of dollars in the future, when through senseless economies we have wasted our natural resources, cut back the reclamation projects, the public-power enterprises, and the labor and agricultural aids which mean so much to this Nation.

Surely no man can believe that a program of economy which cuts off the exploration for new sources of oil and other vital raw materials can be successful.

Social security: The social-security plank in the 1944 platform of the Democratic Party and the economic report of the President to the Congress both outline our position on this important issue.

The Democratic Party still stands for the revision of payments of benefits to relieve hardship arising from the rise in the cost of living.

Housing: The President has repeatedly urged enactment of a housing program. In his economic report to the Congress, he stressed the need for legislation to bring about at least 1,000,000 housing starts this year. No such legislation has been forthcoming.

Utilization of the labor force: The Democratic Party stands firmly on President Truman's program for preserving the Nation's labor force as its greatest productive asset.

This program must embody a formula for labor peace. Most essential is the safeguarding of the right of collective bargaining. The formula must protect the Nation from abuses. At the same time it must not imperil the gains achieved during the years of Democratic progress.

In the time available to me on this radio program it is impossible to cover the many problems that now face the Nation. But on every national policy, on every question as to the future welfare of our great body of citizens, the Democratic Party stands firmly for progressive, liberal thought—for progressive, liberal action.

And it stands for the rights of all the people, not just for the rights of some of them. The Democratic Party is not a reactionary party. It must be the party that moves forward to create, through the techniques of abundance, an era of prosperity and well-being. The Democratic Party will be the party of the Nation in the time of the Nation's need.

Is There an Absolute Right To Strike?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article on the subject, Is There an Absolute Right To Strike? which appeared in the April number of the Republican, and which I wrote at the request of Mr. Richard Nowinson, editor of that magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THERE AN ABSOLUTE RIGHT TO STRIKE?

(By Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee)

In all the hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare involving legislation to cure some of the obvious abuses

that recently have been threatening the welfare of our country, the stone wall that we run up against continuously is the so-called absolute right to strike.

IS A STRIKE SACRED?

At a time when our labor leaders should be in the forefront of those who are trying to correct the existing evils we find them saying: "We regret we can make no suggestions, because anything that would tend to correct labor evils might impair the right to strike." They say that any impairment, even the so-called cooling-off period, creates involuntary servitude. The apparent complete vacuum of ideas of William Green and Philip Murray, for example, is profoundly distressing. To them the right to strike, as they define it, is more sacred than the health, safety, and welfare of 141,000,000 Americans. They even feel compelled, in their public statements at least, to imply support of the defiance of the Government by John L. Lewis.

I am one of those who has tried sincerely to support the labor-union movement. I believe in it profoundly. I believe our workers should have the right to organize and to have representatives of their own choosing; I believe in the collective-bargaining process; I believe that management and labor can and should settle their differences without the intervention of government. But this great country of ours is doomed the minute we admit that the Government can be defied by any individual or by any group, or that any minority seeking its own ends, however worthy they may be, can place those ends above the welfare of all the people. The very purpose of government is to protect all our people from monopolistic privileges, vested interests, or the uncontrolled power of any groups in our midst.

As for the so-called absolute or unconditional right to strike—there are no absolute rights that do not have their corresponding responsibilities. Under our American Anglo-Saxon system, each individual is entitled to the maximum of freedom, provided however (and this proviso is of first importance), his freedom has due regard for the rights and freedoms of others. The very safeguard of our freedoms is the recognition of this fundamental principle. I take issue very definitely with the suggestion that there is an absolute and unconditional right to concerted action (which after all is what the strike is), which endangers the health and welfare of our people in order to attain a selfish end.

ANYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO WORK

Nor can we leave the matter there. We may agree that no man should be compelled to work under conditions to which he has not voluntarily agreed. Any individual has the right to quit his job at any time. But this is a very different matter from his quitting with his fellows under a concerted arrangement to force his demands on others, irrespective of the rightness or wrongness of thore demands. This distinction is especially important since, under the Wagner Act, he has the right, after the battle is over, to insist on his status as a continuing employee.

Under the Wagner Act as it now stands, the collective-bargaining process was legalized and a Labor Relations Board set up. It is that Board's duty to see to it, first, that the worker is protected in the bargaining process and, second, that the employer does not use his economic strength to exploit the worker. Under the act, we have recognized that when management and labor come to the end of the road of the bargaining process, a stoppage of work may be preferable to compelling either party to continue a relationship that is not voluntarily entered into.

This was a necessary step in the evolution of management-labor relations. It was necessary because we have not been able to invent any form of judicial procedure which would do justice to both parties in a labor dispute, and would bring about what both parties would look upon as a satisfactory settlement without a work stoppage. If we are honest with ourselves, however, we must frankly admit that in recognizing the strike at all, we are approving a medieval system for the adjustment of disputes.

WE STRUGGLE OVER FREEDOM VERSUS JUSTICE

Mankind has struggled through the ages over this principle of freedom and justice. As far back as Biblical times we find the principle of retaliation—"an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth"—which permitted the aggrieved party to retaliate in kind for an injustice done to him. In our Anglo-Saxon law, the principle of self-help was permitted until a fairly recent date. Self-help recognized the power of might; if between two individuals there was a difference, it was a crude way of permitting that difference to be settled so long as the interests of a third party were not affected. Illustrating this great principle is the history of our West, where once contending parties "shot it out."

Unfortunately, in all disputes of this kind, which become violent before they are settled, innocent bystanders were injured and it was recognized that certain kinds of disputes might lead to a breach of the peace and might damage whole communities. In the course of time, the Anglo-Saxon people, following principles laid down in early Roman law, developed tribunals of justice where disputes could be heard, and where parties were compelled to submit their disputes for determination in what came to be courts of law. After the judgments of such courts were announced, the parties were compelled to accept them and were not allowed any longer to rely on the earlier principles of retaliation and self-help.

I have gone into this detail to emphasize the point that in management-labor relationships, we still admit the self-help principle. When free bargaining comes to the end of the road, we insist that the dispute be left to the disputants. We say to them, to use a slang expression: "Now you can slug it out—may the better man win." We have permitted the rule of force and might to determine the issue with no reference to the more fundamental question: What is right and what is just?

When employers were strong economically—when they could oppress and exploit their employees—we did not try to determine the principles on which the disputes might be settled on the basis of right and justice. Through the Wagner Act, we gave the workers a stronger position at the bargaining table. Then we let them slug it out. Now many of us feel that the strength given to workers through their unions overshadows the strength of the employer-management group, and there is much sentiment for equalizing the weight of the brass knuckles on both side. (I use the expression brass knuckles advisedly instead of boxing gloves.) We delude ourselves that if there is an equality of armaments, there will be labor peace. This is like saying that if every nation in the world could be absolutely equally armed there would be no more international disputes. It is the balance-of-power principle.

EQUALIZING ARMAMENTS DOESN'T MEAN PEACE

But we have been struggling with this principle for some time in the international field, and we know that equalizing armaments or limiting armaments does not and cannot bring peace. The issues are far deeper and we are obliged to find some way in any dispute, no matter what its nature, to answer the question, "What is right and what is just, especially to protect the weak?" rather than, "Who can be strong enough to win in a death struggle?"

That is one reason we voted recently for optional adherence to the World Court, surrendering a measure of sovereignty—so that international disputes which are justifiable may be settled by judicial procedures and not by resort to arms. In labor-management disputes, on the other hand, we still function under the so-called Wagner Act, the National Labor Relations Act. Well-meaning as it was, its effect has been to intensify the conflict—to raise barriers between employers and employees and make them contending parties where they should be partners in a common enterprise to produce the necessities and luxuries of life for our Nation and the world. If we attempt further to equalize the brass knuckles instead of going to the heart of the matter, which is to bring about understanding human relationships, we only extend the days of these difficulties and conflicts and ally ourselves with those insidious forces in our country which are aiming to divide us on the basis of class.

So today American statesmanship finds itself challenged—challenged to establish tribunals, call them labor courts or what you will, to which persons aggrieved can go, where their cases can be heard and justice done. We still can perfect and develop the voluntary collective bargaining process; we still can support the mediation and conciliation service of the Labor Department; we still can call on the parties to the dispute to settle their differences between themselves. But suppose when we come to the end of that road, we find that the inability of the parties themselves to settle their difficulties is going to lead to the impairment of the health and safety of our whole population, or large segments of it—is going to lead to a national paralysis of our economic life as in the case of a transportation strike or a coal strike or a steel strike? Then, are we not justified in saying that this is a matter that concerns the public interest? Are we not justified in saying that the parties must settle this dispute among themselves without stopping production and threatening our national life?

I believe we are. I believe that if they decline to do so within a reasonable time, on the initiative of the Government of the United States they should be brought before some properly composed tribunal. That tribunal would have jurisdiction definitely to say that concerted work stoppages would not be tolerated, and that, for at least a limited period, the parties must continue under such and such terms and be obligated within that period to come to an agreement. If they still were unable to agree, there should be a heavy penalty imposed on whichever party the court found to be at fault and whichever declined to cooperate with the award made. The court must have power to cite for contempt those who fail to obey its judgment, and to inflict such penalty as should be inflicted on any of our citizens when they defy the power of government to protect all the people.

WE AVOID THE REAL QUESTION

The whole issue can be summed up this way: We are confused because we do not courageously face the answer to a very simple question. We try to answer the question: Who is right or who is economically strongest in a life and death struggle? We should be trying to answer: What is right and how can we do substantial justice under these conditions?

Many students of these matters are already developing criteria and formulas which properly could be applied in management-labor disputes where the parties cannot agree. These criteria and formulas can be developed, in my judgment, in the course of time into

a code to govern management-labor relations. I strongly favor the recommendation of President Truman that a committee be set up, composed of leaders of management, leaders of labor, and Members of the Congress, who would explore the specific question of how we can develop such a labor code, to be applied only in cases where the parties are unable to get together themselves, and where a national paralysis threatens in consequence.

However, I would oppose the appointment of a commission that would simply go on a fishing expedition to review again the myriad of possible regulations that could be imposed on one party or the other. Neither am I desirous of developing further the equalization of brass knuckles.

On a broader basis, I am profoundly interested in developing the right kind of environment for the worker and his family in our American life; in the way he can receive a proper reward for his contribution to national production; in the way he can be stimulated to be a part of the enterprise in which he is engaged by proper incentives, either for him individually or for his group of workers; in profit-sharing plans; in a satisfactory solution of the annual wage issue; in a proper handling of health and welfare funds—whether by individual industrial taking care of their own people, or by an expansion of our social-security system; the whole question of profits; the question of lower prices so that all our people may participate in the fruits of our production and gain a higher standard of living; and similar suggestions which can be brought out in the consideration of our American free-enterprise system.

This is a matter that comes down to the simple but important problem of human relationships. The size of our industrial establishments has broken down the personal family relationships of the smaller industries of bygone days. In dealing with people in the mass, we unfortunately have been tending to treat labor as a commodity to be bought and sold for a price, a commodity which, under the Wagner Act, is cold-bloodedly bargained for. We must find some way to correct this atmosphere of antagonism and come back to recognition of the principle that in order to attain the production we will need, for both the prosperity of our country and of other countries, there must be a happy environment in which the individual works, and where he becomes enthusiastic about the quality and quantity of his industry's output. It must be a partnership principle; we must in some way see to it that management takes a more personal interest in the welfare and prosperity of the workers, while the workers have a more personal understanding of the problems of management.

WE CAN PROGRESS

These considerations may look a long way ahead and will, perhaps, be characterized as too idealistic and seeking the millennium. I am willing to accept that challenge because progress always has come from the leadership of those who "hitched their wagon to a star." We can progress even though we cannot attain immediate perfection. But first, we must put ourselves on the right road. All our legislation must be directed toward establishing ways and means of determining what is right in these controversies and putting an end to this continuing struggle of might.

America cannot afford the luxury of division among her people. The world looks to us for leadership because we have been the land of the free and as a free people we must maintain the principles of unity and equality of opportunity. Unless we lead, the other nations of the world are going to falter. Should we fail in a crisis such as the present, civilization may well be doomed.

Proposed Antidiscrimination Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent statement by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, which has a direct bearing on important legislation now before the Congress. The statement has great significance, and it is brief, and it is for that reason that I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real privilege to take part in this gathering held in the Capital City of the United States, the city which stands today before the peoples of the whole world as the stronghold of democracy and freedom, and as a symbol of free and equal opportunity.

Equal opportunity for all men in a community to enjoy the full fruits of their labor and through their productive contribution to earn a better standard of living, without regard to race, religion, color, or national origin, is a sacred principle, inseparable from the true practice of democracy in a free society.

It is a principle which America has affirmed to the nations of the world in the midst of the clash and thunder of a devastating war.

It is a principle which America has reasserted in proclaming its dedication to a lasting peace.

It is a principle which has given us, as Americans, dignity and stature in our own eyes and in the eyes of others.

It is a principle which has given both hope and faith to men and women oppressed by economic discrimination and political dictatorship.

As a principle, and as a way of living and working, equality of economic opportunity cannot become a reality through mere affirmation. A national policy to which Americans have been dedicated from the early days of our Republic calls for more than affirmation. It must be put to practice.

Too many of us, while firmly believing in the deep injustice of economic discrimination, have given little more than lip service to the need for firm and unequivocal action for the eradication of intolerance, hatred, and blatant discrimination against minorities.

The need to deal effectively with discrimination in employment has long been realized. It is by no means easy to devise effective means whereby the community can prevent economic discrimination and yet safeguard the rights of individuals against undue invasion through Government intervention.

Legislation designed to prevent discrimination, which is written without exhaustive study and thorough consideration, would be only ill-conceived and unrealistic. But during the past 6 years the Government of the United States has given careful thought and thorough investigation to discriminatory employment practices in private industry mobilized for war, as well as in the Government itself. Extensive private studies have been conducted by national organizations, welfare, religious, and labor groups determined to further the attainment of the goal of fair employment opportunity for everyone. In addition, Congress itself has conducted lengthy hearings on a variety of legislative proposals concerned with the implementation of the fair employment policy of the Nation. And finally, and of equal importance, has been the experience built up under the enactments of the several States translating the fair-employment practice policy into reality.

The Ives-Chavez bill in the Senate, and the Fulton and Norton bills in the House are based on a firm foundation of both study and experience. They constitute not only a true effective instrument of national policy, but also accord with the ideals and freedoms proclaimed and guarded by our Constitution.

The enactment of this legislation is more urgent than it has ever been before. The future prosperity and strength of our Nation depend on economic unity. There can be no prosperity for some without a firm assurance of a full and equal opportunity to share in that prosperity extended to all.

Our economic transition to a peacetime pace has not yet been completed. Full production and full employment have not yet been assured. The signs are multiplying that minority groups, and especially the Negro, are being dealt out of the deck in the reshuffle of jobs throughout our industry and trade. Those who have acquired skills and have been given special training and who could make an important contribution to the production and economic progress of the Nation find themselves left out altogether or offered jobs only at the lowest paid and most menial occupations. That is a threat to our economic strength as a nation. It is a threat which we cannot afford to let go unheeded when the economic reconstruction of the whole world and the survival of freedom in it depend in such a large measure on the economic stability and power of the United States.

More than 800,000 members of the American Federation of Labor are Negroes. Among more than 50,000 of our local unions banded together in our great national federation there have been in the past, and are today, those who have violated the principle of nondiscrimination. As a great federation, made up of men and women living and working across the length and breadth of the land, we have many among us who are not without sin. Yet our federation is unswervingly and decisively dedicated to the principle of equal employment opportunity open to all without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin. Our sixty-fifth annual convention, held in Chicago, reaffirmed its urgent call for congressional enactment of fair employment practice legislation at the earliest possible date. The American Federation of Labor has also given its unqualified endorsement and support to the National Council for a Permanent FEPC as the proper agency for the coordination of the great citizens' effort toward the enactment of this legislation.

With the active support of the national council and with the counsel of representatives of the American Federation of Labor, the Ives-Chavez bill has been drawn. It is my impression based upon an examination of an analysis of the bill that the proposed statute is as effective as has been drawn. I believe that bill is far superior to previous legislative proposals in its effectiveness and its realism. It provides a procedure which affords the fullest opportunity to be heard to all parties concerned and completely safeguards any final action of the national commission with fullest judicial review. It provides, as it properly should, for conciliation and mediation in any situation where those concerned refuse to cooperate in making nondiscrimination effective. And above all it encourages the effective exercise of the voluntary processes, so that out of that use can come the understanding which will enable all of us to work together.

The Ives-Chavez bill is fair and reasonable in every respect. While it rejects oppressive intervention, it makes effective enforcement certain. Its enactment can be opposed only on the grounds of dark prejudice or hate. I know that the final enactment of this bill will not be easy. It calls for the vocal support of millions of Americans to whom the Congress must be responsive. On behalf of 800,000 Negro wage earners of every skill and calling and on behalf of hundreds of thousands of Catholics and Jews whom I have the honor to represent as a spokesman of a great brotherhood, the American Federation of Labor, I call on every American, through his active support, to contribute to the utmost of his resources to the speedy passage of the Ives-Chavez antidiscrimination bill.

Concentration in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the April 19, 1947, issue of the magazine America. The editorial discusses the problem of concentration in this country, with special reference to concentration in agriculture.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT AND UNITED STATES LAND POLICY

Current congressional bills proposing to modify laws governing the Central Valley project have more than local significance. Others than Californians have interests at stake in this latest threat to our traditional land policy. Interest should grow as more and more citizens come to realize that millions of dollars appropriated for the betterment of agriculture and protection of the family-farm principle are now in danger of being diverted to the purposes of large commercial landowners. These individuals want all the benefits of the project but none of its restrictions. Wherefore they propose to change the law which regulates excess holdings in land.

A question of principle is involved. Hence some reflection on the historical basis for United States land policy is called for. History, recent and ancient, demonstrates that private ownership of productive property can be effectively destroyed or unnecessarily abridged in either of 2 ways. One lies along the road of communistic collectivization; the other along that of progressive concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. Both methods are severely condemned in the writings of the Popes; both are rejected in the traditional American concept of private enterprise.

Unfortunately, much of our American campaign in behalf of the dignity of the person and in defense of his rights has been directed against the communist menace alone. Our norms and practice in regard to monopoly are by no means clear. In fact, for reasons difficult to understand, we choose to shut our eyes to the growing threat of concentrated wealth which progressively reduces American citizens to proletarian status. With what approaches childish naivete we allow our attention to be diverted from the capitalistic collectivists as we look in all directions for allies in the fight against communism. A calm consideration of the facts should lead us to realize that the desire for productive ownership can be frustrated in other ways than by nationalization.

Different degrees of concentration are required for rational and efficient production in various industries. Railroads are hardly a family-sized project, nor are some of our manufacturing and service industries. But agriculture has long been and can remain a family-type enterprise. Periodically in the world's history it is menaced by the commercial collectivists, who threaten to overthrow the family-farm pattern and proceed to reduce as many farmers as possible to the status of underpaid, propertyless wage-slaves who till the broad acres of prosperous landowners.

Europe and Latin America, as well as Asia, have seen much of their land thus concentrated in earlier generations. This concentration, combined with under-industrialization and lack of technical know-how, contributed materially to the pauperization of the peasants. Let those who can read look at the record. When it comes to land and its tilling, the threat to private property and the family comes as much from selfish landholders as it does from government ownership. Lenin knew this well, and opportunistically exploited the grievances of the dispossessed in persuading peasants to the Revolution.

History is repeating itself in the Central Valley of California, as elsewhere throughout the West. The article of Bishop Armstrong of Sacramento in this issue tells the story. Land monopolies grow and the ranks of the migrant agricultural workers are swelled as farms of thousands of acres come to depend upon cheap labor.

To prevent just such abuses our Government in the nineteenth century put acreage restrictions on homestead projects. Later, with the passage of the Reclamation Acts in this century, ownership limitations were laid down as conditions for participation in the benefits of irrigation. When the Central Valley irrigation project was planned in the thirties such limitations were included.

Today the owners of our native latifundia are displeased that they cannot get cheap government irrigation water for limitless acres. Through Senate bill 66 (introduced by Senator DOWNEY) they would have all "excess land provisions" made inapplicable. In House bill 655 (introduced by Representative ELLIOTT) we read: "No benefit of the Federal reclamation laws shall ever be denied because of the size of any holding of private lands within or served by said projects." Was land greed ever more blatant in denying to the Government its right and duty to regulate ownership of private property for the common good?"

The So-Called Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The So-Called Truman Doctrine, by a distinguished citizen of my State, Alfred Baker Lewis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The policy of giving effective aid to Greece and Turkey so as to enable them to resist aggression is one that true liberals and peace lovers should support.

We should, in my opinion, aid democratic nations if we can afford it even when they are not the victims of aggression. But in the case of nations faced with the fact or the threat of aggression, I do not believe that the test of democracy should apply.

In regard to Greece, where the Communists are in revolt against the Greek Government, the EAM was part of the coalition government which welcomed the British troops when they first landed in Greece. About that time the Bulgarian Government, which had been at war with England and America but not with Russia, surrendered to us. This did not please the Russians so they declared war on Bulgaria, and since their armies were at the border of Bulgaria, the Bulgarian Government which had surrendered to us was overthrown and replaced y a Communist-dominated government, which surrendered to Russia. This Communist-controlled government, a Russian puppet, then made demands on Greece for Greek territory including Salonika, bordering the northern shores of the Aegean Sea.

The discipline and in fact the very reason for existence of Communist Parties is to follov and support Russia's foreign policy, as I showed in detail in my pamphlet on Liberalism and Sovietism. Consequently, the Greek Communists had to support the demands of the Bulgarians for Greek territory. Once the Bulgarians were hated by the Greeks because Bulgaria had helped the Nazis, the Greek Communists knew that no Greek government except one completely controlled by them would surrender Greek territory to Bulgaria. They therefore withdrew from the coalition government and started a revolt against it to seize complete control of it by force. This revolt was put down with the aid of British troops.

Since then the Communist bands have been suppressed everywhere in Greece except in the northern part, where they slip across the border into Greece's Communist-controlled neighbors' territory and they get protection, more arms and equipment, and possibly reinforcements, and come back to fight again. Thus Greece is the victim of aggression by Communists, Greek and foreign, seeking to dismember her on behalf of a foreign government controlled by Communists.

The Communists obviously hope that the attacks of these bands will help to prevent Greece's economic recovery long enough so that the desperate Greek people will turn to communism unless help comes from us.

In the case of Turkey, Russia denounced her friendship pact with Turkey and then made demands for surrender of the Turkish territory known as Kars and Ardahan, and also demanded military control of the Dardanelles, although her ships are now guaranteed full use of the Dardanelles in peacetime by treaty, and the same treaty closes the Dardanelles to warships of all powers during war. Russia also insisted when making these demands that the matter be settled by direct negotiations between Russia and Turkey.

Thus Turkey is faced with the threat, though not yet with the fact, of aggression, and has mobilized her army to prevent a Russian sneak attack against her such as was made by Russia on Finland.

Frankly, I think genuine liberals should end the double standard of morality which totalitarian liberals so often apply in dealing with Russian foreign policy. If the United States, for example, demanded from Mexico the parts of her territory bordering our country plus control of the Tehuantepec Peninsula so that we could dig a canal from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific and greatly shorten the present distance from our east to our west coast through the Panama Canal, every liberal would denounce such American imperialist aggression. Russia has done a precisely comparable thing in the case of

Turkey, yet the totalitarian liberals object not to Russia's demands but to Turkey's resistance to them.

If the United States Government, on behalf of the oil companies which hold the so-called Barco concession in Columbia, took over the government of Columbia and then our puppet Columbian Government demanded from Venezuela the surrender of part of her territory, that would be analogous to what is being done to Greece by Russia. Genuine liberals would certainly denounce our Government in that case. But when Russia makes, through her puppet, Bulgaria, similar demands on Greece, the totalitarian liberals denounce the Greek Government, not Russian imperialism. I submit that that is a clear case of a double standard of mortality. I believe we should judge a totalitarian dictatorship like Russia as harshly and as gently as we would judge our own Government in similar circumstances.

Surely it is not right to claim that only those nations which are democracies are entitled to freedom from fear of attack. Russia is certainly entitled to freedom from fear of attack, in my opinion, although she is not democratic. When Poland was attacked, those of us who were not isolationists denounced the Nazis for attacking and praised the British for supporting the Poles, regardless of whether Poland was at that time a real democracy. Genuine liberals were opposed to Mussolini's attack on Ethiopia, although Ethiopia was not a democracy; and were also opposed to Axis attack on Greece, although the Greek Government was an ironclad dictatorship. We opposed the Nazis' attack on Russia and gave her lend-lease aid, although Russia is a dictatorship. If we are ever going to have a warless world, aggression must be opposed and stopped because it is aggression, just as we would not justify A in maiming B because B was accused of shady financial dealings.

As a matter of fact, the best way to make a nondemocratic nation democratic is to make it free from the fear of foreign attack, for often the denial of democracy is due to the attempt to gird a nation against a foreign aggression. In the case of Greece the Government is certainly not democratic, but it is far more democratic than the totalitarian dictatorship of Communist Russia. Communist papers are being published in Greece and a parliamentary opposition exists and speaks up. The EAM was urged to participate in the election which resulted in the Greek Government. Strikes have taken place under the present Government, including a successful strike of civil servants, which means that Greece is less totalitarian than New York State, where such strikes today are forbidden by law.

There is evidence that the process of further democratizing the Greek Government has begun. The Greek Premier Tsaldaris has officially offered amnesty to the EAM if they will lay down their arms, with a new election to be held if necessary under international supervision, after a reasonable period, plus the use of Salonika as a free port by Greece's Communist neighbors. This seems to me a reasonable and statesmanlike proposal.

Instead of bypassing the United Nations by our proposing aid to Greece and Turkey, we are supplementing the UN in a situation where it cannot act. The ultimate purpose of the UN is to prevent aggression and war. But as it is at present constituted, the UN is unable to prevent aggressive war when committed or threatened by any member of the Big Five or any ally of the Big Five because of the veto in the Security Council. The UN could not prevent our attacking Mexico, for example, if we had a Government which was imperialist enough to do that, because any action against us by the Security Council would be vetoed by such an American Government. This veto as insisted on by Russia and agreed to rather reluctantly by Roosevelt probably because he thought that it should and could be removed after a while and because having it in the Charter would avoid opposition by one-third of the Senate to ratification of the United Nations Charter. But the veto makes the UN useless in preventing certain kinds of aggression.

The policy which the ADA favors is to strengthen the UN so that it can provide economic aid where needed, which it cannot, in fact, do now, and also prevent all aggression, and meanwhile have the United States act to prevent aggression where the UN is powerless because the aggressor is a nation possessing a veto or a puppet or ally of such a nation.

Needless to say, public opinion cannot be relied on to prevent aggression by a totalitarian dictatorship such as Russia because public opinion cannot function inside Russia and world opinion cannot reach the Russian masses. Their Government may, if it wishes, tell them, without contradiction, that Russia is in danger of attack by Turkey and Greece, just as they were told that Finland was about to attack them, and were told that England and France were the aggressors in the war against the Nazis. (This was the official opinion of the Russian Government at the time, as propounded by Molotov and repeated by the Communist Parties throughout the world.)

In any case, any charge that the proposed Greek and Turkish policy bypasses the UN is answered fully by the Vandenberg amendment, which, I understand, has been accepted substantially by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the effect that the UN by a majority vote may take over aid to Greece and Turkey and stop unilateral American aid.

What the so-called Truman doctrine amounts to is an end to appeasement of totalitarian aggression. We are not proposing to oppose Communist influence on governments such as France where the influence is the result of free elections. We are opposing aggression, and that means opposing communism, only because and insofar as the Russian Communist dictatorship and its satellites are guilty of aggression. Naturally, there are dangers to peace in such policy, for peace is not easy to achieve with any totalitarian dictatorship, since the foreign policy of such a government is independent of any internal opposition. We know from experience with the Nazis that appeasement of a totalitarian dictatorship certainly leads to war. A policy of firmness which will stop aggression before it snowballs into a world war offers a very much better chance of lasting peace. We can then work out reasonable relations with Russia on the basis of security for her neighbors, as well as for her, if we recognize the principle that nondemocratic countries also are entitled to freedom from the fear of aggression.

The Italian Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an advertisement entitled "Why We Are Opposed to the Ratification of the Italian Peace Treaty," which appeared in the Washington Post on April 16 last.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE ARE OPPOSED TO THE RATIFICATION OF THE ITALIAN PEACE TREATY

The proposed Italian peace treaty shortly coming up for ratification in the Senate does not square with our new policy toward Greece and Turkey. It renders helpless before aggression the country with the third largest population in Europe; the country with the most strategic position in southern Europe. Who controls Italy controls the Mediterranean.

DOES IT MAKE SENSE TO TRY TO SAVE GREECE AND TURKEY FROM COMMUNIST INFILTRATION AND AGGRESSION WHILE WE LEAVE ITALY TO ITS MERCY?

The treaty is already obsolete because it was negotiated when we were still trying to appease Stalin, before the Truman doctrine was announced, before America was fully aroused to the totalitarian danger. Former Assistant Secretary of State A. A. Berle, Jr., says:

"The only certainty resulting from immediate ratification of this treaty would be that Italy would be disarmed, that American and British troops would be withdrawn; that a disarmed Italy and Adriatic would be left facing Yugoslavia with an army estimated at 600,000 men, maintained at war strength, and backed by a militarist Government which has proclaimed its desire to seize more Italian territory and dominate or, if possible, annex the proposed free territory of Trieste; and to strengthen its position in the Adriatic and the Balkans by every possible means, including use of force short of war.

"It follows that the wise and prudent course, in the point of view of the United States (and, I think, of the rest of Europe), would be to delay ratification of this treaty until we know with reasonable clearness, what else is going to happen."

AMERICA WILL PAY ITALY'S REPARATIONS

The treaty makes a nearly bankrupt Italy agree to pay $365,000,000 in reparations. Italy cannot pay this unless the United States puts up most of the money.

The treaty gives Tito's Communist government all but one of Italy's coal mines.

The treaty also give to Tito all of Italy's bauxite mines in Istria and nearly all of the great hydroelectric plants developed by Italy in Istria since the last world war.

Secretary Byrnes admitted that the treaty was a compromise, unsatisfactory in several respects.

The American delegation went to Paris with a proposal for a boundary line between Italy and Yugoslavia based on an attempt to leave the smallest number of Italians under Yugoslav control and vice versa, but Tito, with the help of his Russian masters, got what he wanted.

Trieste and the area internationalized by the proposed treaty are admitted by both sides to be overwhelmingly Italian in population.

ITALY DESERVES BETTER AT OUR HANDS THAN THIS TREATY

Did you know:

That more than 100,000 Italian partisans died fighting against the Germans?

That both Field Marshal Alexander and our own Gen. Mark Clark called the Italian resistance movement, the partisans, "the most effective in Europe"?

That the Italian resistance, and the six regular divisions which went into combat on our side, saved many thousands of American and British lives?

That since the Italian armistice in September 1943 Italian casualties in the common cause exceeded the combined casualties of the American and British Armies in Italy?

That the overwhelming majority of Italians were on our side when it was dangerous to be so? That at the risk of their lives they protected tens of thousands of escaped Allied prisoners of war through their powerful underground movement?

That all the members of the present Italian Government were anti-Fascist when to be so meant financial ruin, risk of prison or death, or exile?

WHAT KIND OF A WORLD ARE WE BUILDING FOR OUR CHILDREN?

The United States is working for a world based on justice. How are we removing the causes of war and fascism if the peace treaties are to follow the pattern of this treaty based on looting the weak and dividing the spoils, without regard for the right of all peoples to decent standards of living, equitable access to natural resources, emigration or elimination of economic monopolies?

MEN AND NATIONS PAY, IN THE END, IF THEY FORGET THE THING CALLED MORAL RIGHTEOUSNESS: IF THEY SELL OUT JUSTICE FOR EXPEDIENCY

It is crystal clear, now, that the Italian treaty which sacrificed justice for a supposed expediency, failed even to achieve expediency, and has instead become a grave threat to our country's own interest. It is not too late to avoid the danger and dishonor which a hasty ratification of this treaty will involve. Under our Constitution the Senate has the final word. It will heed the voice of the American people. Write or wire Senator VANDENBERG, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and your own Senators at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. Urge them not to ratify these treaties before the pattern of the European peace has been set, before the German and Austrian treaties have been negotiated or before every effort has been made to renegotiate more just and more workable treaty terms. Meanwhile, let Congress by appropriate resolution declare officially the end of the war with Italy, and pass such special legislation as may be necessary, as was done in the case of Germany after World War I.

Committee for a Just Peace With Italy, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Charles Poletti, Chairman of General Committee; Edward Corsi, Chairman of Executive Committee; John B. Salterini, Treasurer; John J. Lamula, National Organizer; Joseph Di Fede, Executive Secretary; Prof. Paul Shipman Andrews, Rev. Robert W. Anthony, Luigi Antonini, George Baldanzi, Roger N. Baldwin, Harry Lorin Binsse, Dr. L. M. Birkhead, Msgr. John P. Boland, Ray Brock, James Burnham, Philip Burnham, George Creel, Frank R. Crosswaith, Mrs. Carl Doelger, The Reverend Vincent Donovan, O. P., Christopher Emmet, George Field, Henry P. Fletcher, Judge Felix Forte, Varian Fry, the Very Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J., Harry D. Gideonse, Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Joseph C. Grew, Prof. Ross J. S. Hoffman, Prof. Sidney Hook, Prof. Horace M. Kallen, Councilman Chas. E. Keegan, the Reverend Wm. C. Kernan, Christopher LaFarge, Roger K. Larkin, Mrs. Wales Latham, Samuel Levitas, Eugene Lyons, Clare Boothe Luce, Prof. Robert M. MacIver, Walter Mansfield, Reuben H. Markham, Col. Robert P. Marshall, David Martin, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Prof. Maurice Newfeld, Liston M. Oak, Gov. John O. Pastore, Judge Ferdinand Pecora, Vincent Sheean, Wm. Philip Simms, Sterling Spero, Chauncey Stillman, Benjamin Stolberg, Norman Thomas, Dorothy Thompson, Frank Trager, Judge Matthew J. Troy, James N. Vaughan, Oswald Garrison Villard, Robert J. Watt, William L. White, Samuel Wolchak, Bertram D. Wolfe.

The Alarming Merger Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 27, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of April 12, 1947. The editorial deals with the necessity of amending the Clayton Act so as to prevent the accelerated trend toward monopolistic mergers. The editorial is as follows:

POST-1940 MERGERS

Under the Clayton Act the Federal Trade Commission has the power to prevent a company from acquiring the stock of another company if the purchase would lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. However, owing to various Supreme Court decisions the FTC cannot prevent a company from purchasing outright the assets of another company, unless the resultant merger creates a monopoly. Consequently the agency is handicapped in its efforts to enforce antitrust law prohibitions against collusion among competitors and against practices that result in the suppression of competition and tend to monopoly. Because of this loophole in the law, the FTC states that "a powerful impetus was given to the growth of giant corporations, by accretion, at the expense of small independent firms." The evidence to support this contention is found in an extremely interesting survey of the merger developments of the last few years.

Since 1940, over 1800 independent manufacturing and mining concerns, with assets in excess of $4,000,000,000, have been bought up and have disappeared. A unique feature of this concentration movement is that a large number of mergers have occurred in the food, nonelectrical equipment, and textiles and apparel industries—all regarded as the strongholds of small business. According to the FTC, fully 90 percent of all the firms acquired since 1940 held assets of less than $5,000,000, while 70 percent had less than $1,000,000 of assets. Moreover, nearly 75 percent of these firms have been absorbed by corporations with assets in excess of $5,000,000, and 27 percent have been taken over by 120 concerns ranked among the top 200 manufacturing corporations of the country.

The character of this merger movement is also noteworthy in some respects. While 60 percent of the concerns purchased have been so-called horizontal acquisitions—that is, firms engaged in similar lines of production—17 percent are vertical acquisitions—i. e., the purchasers have reached backward to obtain supplying firms or forward to secure further fabricating facilities. Another 22 percent of purchases are classified as conglomerate—i. e., the acquired businesses are unrelated to those of the purchasing companies. A typical example of the backward vertical merger is afforded by wartime purchases of Safeway Stores—the country's second largest grocery chain. It not only absorbed other grocery chains but acquired 12 independent meat packers, a gelatin-dessert manfacturer, a biscuit-and-cracker factory, a butter plant, and a cheese-processing company. The big steel producing companies, on the other hand, have been acquiring new fabricating facilities, mostly by absorbing small independent companies. Thus large steel producers now own 87 percent of the country's heavy steel drum fabricating capacity, and 10 tight cooperage firms, representing virtually all the country's production capacity, have been taken over by large distillers during the last year and a half.

The adverse effect of these acquisitions on small business competitors is grave, especially during a period when industrial supplies are hard to obtain. If large companies succeed in buying up most of the concerns that supply them with scarce materials or equipment needed for their business, the small independent business is seriously handicapped and may be squeezed out entirely. Moreover, both the vertical merger and the conglomerate merger have competitive advantages over small-unit establishments, because they can offset low prices at one level where competition is strong by charging more for other products.

Since the country is committed to the policy of fostering small business, the FTC's appeal for revision of the antitrust laws to permit it to proceed against corporate mergers that unduly restrain trade or tend to monopoly is, in our opinion, well taken. That does not mean that we regard all the mergers cited in the FTC report as against public interest. On the contrary, the vertical combination often results in great gains in efficiency that are shared by the integrated companies with the public in the form of lower prices. However, it is open to debate whether the gains from mergers do not in numerous cases outweigh the losses suffered by weaker competitors. There is certainly no hard-and-fast rule by which to determine where the balance lies. At the same time there is neither rhyme nor reason in authorizing the FTC to proceed against combinations effected by means of stock purchases, while permitting mergers of the same type to be consummated without interference. The rapid growth of the movement is a danger signal that calls for a strengthening of the law so that the FTC will be able to take corrective action when and if particular mergers constitute a threat to free competitive enterprise.

Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, within the next hour we will be called upon to vote on two separate propositions. One will be a motion made to recommit this bill to the House Committee on Education and Labor, with instructions that House Joint Resolution 83 be reported back forthwith. This resolution provides for the creation of a Commission composed of Members of the House, Senate, and others to be appointed by the President to make a complete and comprehensive study of all labor-management relations. The second vote will come on the passage of H. R. 3020 which we have been debating for the past 3 days.

May I as briefly as possible outline the history of this legislative proposal. In 1935 Congress passed an act known as the Wagner Act, intended to promote economic peace and security. Unfortunately, as administered, the Wagner Act failed to carry out its declared purposes. Certainly it has not given us the desired results. It has not been a panacea for the existing evils. It has

not lessened strikes but on the other hand seems to have caused an increase in both the number of strikes and the man-hours lost annually. Last year for example, this country witnessed 4,985 strikes resulting in 116,000,000 man-days lost. Unhappily my own State of Connecticut lost 3,160,000 man-days or 2.7 percent of this total.

Particularly during the past 6 years there has been an increased demand from all over the country that Congress amend the Wagner Act. I recall that during the Seventy-eighth Congress, 4 years ago, we debated and considered legislation dealing with labor-management relations. I recall the debate on the Connally-Smith bill. I voted against passage of the Connally-Smith bill, not because I failed to realize that there were abuses that needed correction but because I was confident then that the great mass of laboring men and women would, when the facts were brought to their attention, clean up the abuses and the racketeering that had developed in the so-called high command of some labor organizations.

During last fall's campaign on at least two occasions I discussed over the radio the necessity for new legislation to give to the Federal Government power and authority to deal with strikes that were, in fact, menacing the life, health, or safety of the American people. In addition to those broadcasts, I circulated several thousand copies of a Statement of Principles, Policies, and Objectives of Republican Members of Congress. That document contained the Republican Party's position on future labor legislation. I publicly accepted that document as my platform. May I quote from that document the paragraphs referring to labor legislation.

> We reaffirm our belief in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively with employers as one of the cornerstones of competitive enterprise. The processes of such bargaining must be protected and strengthened if we are to have real jobs and prosperity for all.
>
> For that purpose we believe that governmental decision must not be substituted for free agreement, but governmental machinery to promote peaceful settlement of disputes should be improved.
>
> Demands by either side must be kept within the bounds of reason and fairness and both sides must recognize the rights of the general public.
>
> The desired end of bargaining between management and men is a contract. Once that contract is made, it should and must be equally binding on both parties as to agreements made.
>
> Free collective bargaining and contracts resulting therefrom must not be nullified or destroyed by resort on either side to willful violence of unlawful destruction of property.

Soon after the present Congress convened a great many bills dealing with labor-management relations were introduced by individual Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans. All of these bills were referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor. In due time this committee commenced hearings on the general subject of labor legislation. Representatives of both labor and management were invited to present their views to the committee. No citizen was denied an opportunity to present his views as fully and as freely as he desired to present them. Several national leaders of organized labor appeared before the committee and without exception took the arbitrary stand that no new legislation was needed and they had no constructive suggestions to offer the committee. That attitude was most unfortunate. I believe we might have a better bill before us today if men who have devoted their lifetime to studying labor relations had been willing to assist in the preparation of needed legislation. For whatever defects may become apparent in this legislation, leaders of organized labor will have to assume at least a part of the responsibility.

Now as to the provisions of H. R. 3020, upon which we will soon vote. This bill was written by members of the House Committee on Education and Labor following the lengthy hearings to which I have referred. It was approved by this committee by a vote of 18 to 4, and it is interesting to note that those members of the committee who have been most vocal in their opposition to this bill attended very few of the lengthy hearings that were held. One member of the Labor Committee now opposing this legislation stated that he attended the first day's hearings and absented himself from then on. The ranking Democratic member of the Labor Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], stands before the House today wearing a beautiful sun tan acquired in Florida while his colleagues on the committee were conscientiously striving to write a good bill.

It may be interesting to recall that President Truman in his message on the state of the Union last January asked for several specific things that are in this bill. The President characterized jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts as an abuse, and he referred to the sanctity of obligation of contracts. He said we needed a strengthening of the conciliation processes. This bill contains the provisions of law asked for by the President.

Some of the opponents of this bill base their opposition on the fact that it destroys the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I do not believe that making use of the injunctive procedure is the way to settle strikes, but I do believe, as President Truman evidently believes, that any constitutional method must be invoked when the health, safety, and lives of the American people are threatened or when our whole economy is either threatened or has been brought to a standstill. I say that President Truman believes as I do because he made use of an injunction to bring the recent coal strike to an end.

Some of those who are today opposing this bill might well recall that back in 1940, when there were only 150 or 160 Republicans in the House of Representatives, the House voted for a great many of the things that are in this bill—amendments to the Wagner Act, the separation of the prosecuting from the judicial functions, the right of an employee to petition for an election, the free-speech amendment; all of those have been approved by previous votes here in the House of Representatives, and they passed here by votes of 2 to 1 or better.

There are two new provisions in this bill, generally speaking. One of them is the closed-shop and union-shop provision and the other is the attempt to deal with industry-wide bargaining. I think that the right-thinking people of the country by an overwhelming majority insist that Congress undertake to deal with these two propositions. These two sections of the bill are not written exactly as I would write them if I had the opportunity, but legislation cannot be written just the way each individual would like to have it written. On the whole, there is no question in the minds of a substantial majority of Members of this House on both sides of the aisle that this bill is fair; that it is an honest, sincere effort to solve the problem of bringing about some sort of equity and fairness and peace into industrial relations throughout the United States.

This is but the first step in a long legislative process. After we pass this bill here in the House it will go to the Senate. It will be debated and discussed in the Senate. It will undoubtedly be revised in the Senate. At that point the Senate version and the House version of this legislation will go to a committee of conference. They will try to work out the differences in the two bills. We then will have another opportunity to vote on the revised version, and when in final form it secures the approval of a majority of the Members of the House and Senate it will go to the President of the United States for his approval. Those who will vote to send this bill back to the committee are taking the position that they just do not want any labor legislation at all. And if we fail to pass this legislation we leave the country open to attack by those who in the past have shown no regard for the welfare of the rank and file of labor nor for the protection of the American people as a whole.

There are those who insist that strikes should be outlawed. I do not agree with that view. There are those who insist that no legislation should be passed, although designed to assist in curing some of the evils of our industrial relations. I do not agree with that extreme view, either. The fact is that various mistakes in the administration of our labor laws have occurred. The fact is that some abuses have arisen under our labor laws. The fact is that a national policy can be developed which will permit our industrial workers to organize their strength collectively under beneficial Federal legislation for the improvement of their status in American life. We believe that any such national policy devised and extended under Federal law which confers rights upon our workers, so organized, will carry with it certain duties. If a citizen has the right to own property, for example, it is the duty of every other citizen to respect his right of ownership and the duty of government to safeguard the rights of all parties.

Similarly, if the National Government is to sponsor the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively, it must protect the worker so organized against

a dictated domination by those at the head of any such organization. It must protect the workers, whether organized or not, against abuses by their employers. It must protect all other citizens against abuses by both the labor organizations and the employers, for all are an essential and indispensable element of our whole national economy. Thus, the public has a definite interest in labor disputes, particularly when they shall be carried to the point of unduly interfering with the productivity of the whole Nation whose collapse would result in anarchy, the elimination of our most treasured institutions, and the destruction of whatever rights are held by any of us, whether organized or not. Surely with the experience of other nations before our very eyes, it cannot be denied that misery and misfortune for all are the end result. Perhaps the Hartley bill is not the final answer. If, in any respect, it shall not succeed, Congress will be here again in 1948.

Wild, irresponsible statements that this is a Fascist bill; that it destroys labor's rights; that it will destroy unions and set us back a hundred years will not be accepted by the millions of dues-paying union members who know what has been going on in labor organizations throughout the United States.

I have talked with many, many constituents who belong to unions, some because they believe in unions and others who stay in the union to keep their jobs. They want this legislation enacted into law now. A few months from now the great masses of our citizens who toil in our industries will commend the Members of this Congress who refuse to yield to the threats and demands of the very men who have brought about the situation that makes the passage of this bill necessary in the public interest.

Tribute to Wiley O. Couch, of Hamilton County, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the South Pittsburg Hustler, a newspaper published in South Pittsburg, Tenn., concerning the work of the late Judge Wiley O. Couch, recently deceased, a very prominent man in Tennessee who was county judge of Hamilton County, and who lived in Chattanooga. In the interest of time, I shall refrain from making further comment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE COUCH WORKED, LIVED FOR OTHERS

In this period of our Nation's history when governments, large and small, are tottering under the strain of taxation, and when a national bonded indebtedness that will be handed down to an innocent generation causes the wisest financier to wonder, there was great need of public officials like Judge Wiley O. Couch, of Hamilton County, who passed away at his home on Duane Road Friday. It is said of Judge Couch that as chairman of the court in Hamilton, he paid something like $1,000,000 of the county's indebtedness and when his health forced his resignation his wise policies had resulted in the accumulation of a surplus of equal amount if not more. Not a single bond was issued under his leadership.

Judge Couch possessed three great qualifications: One, to make friends among all classes of people. Another secret of his success was the fact that he was a man of outstanding ability, and still another was that he made use of that ability by putting it into practical use—by working. He went to Chattanooga from his birthplace near Guntersville, Ala., when only 17 years of age, and well do we remember the story as told by himself upon a recent visit to this office. "I worked the first day I landed in Chattanooga and I have worked ever since."

The accomplishments of this man have well been told by the daily press, but this newspaper, serving so many of the deceased's friends here in Marion County as well as those in Hamilton, feels to add its word. Much has been said about his businesslike administration of his home county's affairs. His accomplishments in this field speak for themselves. Wisely he guarded the people's funds during the war years in anticipation of the demands for improvements that would confront the county government when the war was over. In order that the county would have funds with which to meet the postwar needs, he decided the best thing to do would be to save. This policy paid big dividends.

Judge Couch did not have his heart set on dollars and cents, either, as was brought out by one citizen who had lost his grocery store and everything he possessed in the way of household goods. He had lost all and had no insurance. He said the next morning after he and his faithful wife had spent a sleepless night, "Wiley Couch poked his head in the door and said, 'How much will it take to set you up in business again'," and added, "the money was forthcoming."

In his funeral oration, Dr. Bachman G. Hodge told the assembly that Judge Couch had the welfare of his county at heart throughout his administration, and even on his deathbed. There was something better in his heart as demonstrated in the story of how, in his delirium, he arose in bed and said, "We must help that man." Asked, "What man?" he replied, "You know." It was Wiley Couch's big heart crying out for the less fortunate as it had all along the line. And lastly, as he came face to face with the One who admonished that we visit the widow and the orphan, give help to the poor and hungry, we can imagine none other than the blessing so anxiously bestowed by Him who one day walked the same paths, had like compassions, and finally went back to His Father to intercede for those whose gracious hearts commend them to the everlasting throne of God.

Family Farm Versus Factory Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the magazine America entitled "Family Farm Versus Factory Farm," by Bishop Robert J. Armstrong, of Sacramento, discussing the campaign to remove the acreage limitation from the reclamation law.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY FARM VERSUS FACTORY FARM

(By Most Rev. Robert J. Armstrong)

Psalm 106: "He turned rivers into what was a desert and fountains of water into a thirsty land; and there He made the hungry dwell and they founded a city in which to live; and they sowed fields and planted vineyards and obtained the harvest of fruits."

The problem of California in its efforts to secure water for its parched lands is not without interest to every American by reason of the magnitude of the project and the issues that are involved therein.

Surrounded by the snow-capped Sierras in the east and separated from the Pacific Ocean by the Coast Range on the west, the Central Valley of California is a great basin—an area larger than the State of Illinois—oval shaped, more than 500 miles long and 100 miles wide, extending from Mount Shasta in the north and Tehachapi Mountains in the south, comprising an area of 60,000 square miles. In it are approximately 1,500,000 people. It contains about 9,000,000 acres of irrigable land. Because of deficient rainfall, the land must be irrigated for the successful growing of the fruit and vegetable crops for which the valley is world famous. Only one-third of the land is now watered.

The Sacramento River, which drains the north portion of this valley, flows to the south, where it joins the San Joaquin and empties into the ocean. The latter river draining the southern two-thirds of the valley gets but one-third of the total rainfall. As no rain falls from spring to autumn, the rivers either dry up or run very low.

Particularly for the southern valley has it been necessary for the farmers to pump water from wells. These were once shallow, but through excessive need of water the wells have had to be deepened, and in recent years the need has become acute.

To meet this problem, and also to bring the entire area under cultivation, the Federal Reclamation Bureau was asked by California to undertake a vast engineering enterprise. It has to build dams at various places in the mountains, and there balance the available water supply for the whole valley. This would add thousands of acres of irrigated land for the creation of prosperous farms and communities. These reservoirs of water would also supply hydroelectric power. Releasing the water in the summer months, they would not only insure navigation in the Sacramento River, but also maintain a flow of fresh water which can serve as a barrier to keep the salt water from backing up into both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. This is a tremendous project, one of the greatest in the world, and these incidental benefits play a great part in justifying the cost of its construction and maintenance.

More important than the physical features of this master plan, however, is the question of the policies and principles under which these costly works are built and operated.

The Reclamation Bureau was established in 1902 to reclaim the arid West. When President Theodore Roosevelt urged the passage of the act authorizing it, he said prophetically: "Our people as a whole will profit, for successful homemaking is but another means of upbuilding the Nation."

The Bureau's ideal has always been to establish family-owned and operated farms and therefore it set a limit of 320 acres for husband and wife. This principle of limiting acreage in single ownership to be served by

water from a Federal reclamation project was clearly laid down in the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902. It was signed by President Roosevelt and hailed at the time as a great Republican measure. In fact, the policy was supported by both parties, and this endorsement has been renewed since by each party when in power.

The purpose of acreage limitation is to promote sound communities of independent farmers who will make homes on the land. It controls speculation. Those who own more than this limit can receive project water for 320 acres, but for no more unless they agree to sell their excess lands at fair, appraised prices.

These provisions have been successfuly applied in many areas and have given the Nation such outstanding communities as those in the Yakima Valley in Washington, the Boise Valley in Idaho, the Salt River Valley in Arizona, and many others. The same rule applies to the present Columbia Basin project, where, in fact, the limit is 80 acres per family; so those who own thousands of acres will only obtain water for 80 of them. Thus the law encourages small acreage and is the enemy of monopoly and speculation.

Conditions in the California Basin are somewhat different than in other reclamation projects, for there already exist large land holdings in this territory. In one section of the valley to the south, large landed estates are numerous. It has been computed that in the southern section alone 1,183,000 acres are owned by 376 individuals or corporations. In four counties, the 13 largest owners possess 20 percent of the land. There are four who own 447,000 acres; three who own 54,000; six who own 68,000. In recent years a great investment has been made by liquor interests in the purchase of vineyards thousands of acres in extent. It must be borne in mind, however, that these holders of vast possessions are not directly penalized by reason of their landed wealth. Their present private systems of irrigation remain their own; in fact, they may be benefited if the underground waters are restored.

When in 1937 the project was authorized by Congress, State and congressional leaders from California were conspicuous at the hearings in urging passage of legislation which specifically states that the usual provisions of the Reclamation Bureau will apply. They knew that interest-free money meant a handsome subsidy to California water users. Perhaps they thought the law could be ignored or might be changed after the project was built with Federal funds, thus ignoring the fact that this project is an investment by the Nation's taxpayers for the establishment of family-sized farms.

Oblivious of the terms of the contract which was entered into with the Bureau of Reclamation and which California landowners should and must have understood at the time, a determined effort is now being made in Congress for repeal of the acreage limitation. It can readily be seen that the great benefits which are supposed to follow upon this repeal would accrue solely to owners of large acreages. The present heavy pumping charges they must pay and which serve as some restraint would be removed and cheap water would be theirs.

There is another danger, also. Following the introduction of bills to repeal the family farm and antispeculation provisions of the reclamation law as applied to California similar bills were introduced to repeal the law governing the Colorado and Texas projects. Thus it becomes apparent that should the repeal movement succeed for California, it would constitute an opening wedge for lifting the acreage-limitation law for the entire 17 Western States wherein irrigation is practiced.

To those who own and cultivate lands this could mean immense profit, for the difference between dry and watered land is considerable. This profit would come from Federal tax-free money appropriated for the purpose of developing family-sized farms. It would, indeed, give further encouragement to the corporate land monopoly in California and add impetus to the present trend toward industrialized agriculture and absentee farming. At the time of writing, almost 50 percent of the land to be benefited by water from the Central Valley project is held by less than 10 percent of the owners.

"The National Catholic Rural Life Conference has always advocated the better use of America's precious soil. It has always opposed factory farming and advocated more families living on the land, using the best and latest machinery which they would own cooperatively," says Monsignor Ligutti, executive secretary of the conference.

There exists a heavy demand for land in the country simultaneously with the dangerous national trend toward corporate farming and absentee ownership. This was demonstrated in the recent opening of 86 farm units on the Klamath reclamation project in northern California. Fifteen thousand veterans sent inquiries to the Bureau in the hope that they might obtain one of the available units, which consist of approximately 100 acres each. Unfortunately, there were only 86.

There has developed in California a sad situation that stems directly from the prevalence of large farms. It touches the heart of every priest or sympathetic observer. The situation is the condition of the migratory farm workers, who number over 300,000 and who make large farms and commercialized agriculture economically feasible. A fundamental principle in our American tradition has always been that farm workers should have the hope of someday owning their own little acre of land.

The Senate's Small Business Committee in its December 1946 report pointed out the social implications of corporate farming and industrialized agriculture in the detailed study of two California towns of about the same size. They were Arvin, a town surrounded by large absentee-owned farms, and Dinuba, the community trade center for an area of small family-type farms. In pointing out the better social conditions in Dinuba, the report states: "The social poverty of the great bulk of the Arvin population is more evident than their material poverty."

In releasing this report to the Senate committee, Senator MURRAY, of Montana, said:

"In manufacturing and commercial life the rapidly growing concentration of economic power in great corporations is a menacing threat to our whole economy, but when it takes hold of our farm areas in the form of great acreages of intensively cultivated tracts using hired labor and machines, veritable factories in the field, then that threat takes on a new and awful form. Our most cherished traditions are at stake."

The very existence of the migrant farm labor required by large farms is a basic problem in the establishment of a Christian social order. The migratory workers of the California farms are not to be excluded from among those whom Pope Pius XI referred to when in his encyclical Quadragesimo Anno he said:

"The number of the nonowning working poor has increased enormously, and their groans cry to God from the earth. Added to them is the huge army of rural wage workers pushed to the lowest levels of existence and deprived of all hope of ever acquiring some property in land and, therefore, permanently bound to the status of nonowning workers, unless suitable and effective remedies are applied."

In the encyclical Rerum Novarum, of 1891, Pope Leo XIII was thinking along similar lines when he declared: "Men not only should possess the fruits of the earth, but also the very soil. The law should favor ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many people as possible to become owners."

The latest attempt, therefore, to change our national land policy is a challenge which cannot be lightly laid aside by those who have faith in the liberty-loving independent American farmers who cultivate the soil. They rear the families that support and people America's large cities. The fight against the political power of corporate monopoly demands an extra effort from the unorganized majority of American cities. The same fight must be waged on the land.

The proposed legislation to repeal acreage limitation does not reflect the majority viewpoint of the residents of California's Central Valley or of the Nation. Indeed, protests have risen loud and long from many societies—religious, civic, and labor, in the hope that Congress will adhere to the established policies of the Reclamation Bureau that have brought homes and people into what were once the arid plains of the West.

Oregon Legislature Joint Memorials on Health of United States Livestock, Federal Social Security, United States Crab Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave heretofore granted, I include in my remarks the following joint memorials adopted by the legislature in the State of Oregon:

Senate Joint Memorial 5

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas it is possible to maintain livestock in health in the United States only by exercising vigilance to prevent the incidence and spread of communicable diseases of such livestock; and

Whereas there is now prevalent in Mexico a highly contagious, infectious, and injurious disease of cattle and other livestock known as epizootic aphtha, or more commonly hoof-and-mouth disease; and

Whereas there is urgent necessity for preventing the spread of such disease across the international boundary line to livestock in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to enact legislation authorizing and enabling the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Mexico in checking the spread of said disease of livestock and authorizing the Department of Agriculture of the United States through its Bureau of Animal Industry, and other appropriate Federal departments and bureaus, to render expert advice and practical assistance to the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of controlling and eradicating communicable diseases of cattle and other livestock; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President

and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by senate March 20, 1947.
M. E. CORNETT,
President of Senate.
Concurred in by house March 27, 1947.
JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.

House Joint Memorial 18

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the State of Oregon by extending public assistance on the basis of individual need bears more than 50 percent of the cost in many instances, especially for recipients of blind assistance and aid to dependent children, because of existing Federal maximums for purposes of matching funds; and

Whereas the Federal Social Security Act contains no provision for Federal matching funds for the aid of the parent or other related person assuming responsibility for children receiving aid to dependent children; and

Whereas the State of Oregon, in order to extend assistance to all needy persons in accordance with their needs, irrespective of cause, is providing general assistance and to the extent of 85 percent of such total expenditures, there being no Federal financial participation through grants-in-aid for general assistance; and

Whereas the State of Oregon, through general assistance, is expending large sums of money for medical care for persons who are receiving old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children as well as medical care for other needy persons who are not eligible for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, or aid to dependent children; and

Whereas foster family home care is provided to a large number of dependent and neglected children and children in danger of becoming delinquent by the State of Oregon at a considerable cost from general assistance funds; and

Whereas the State of Oregon carries sole financial responsibility for the administration of general assistance; and

Whereas the present limitations in the Federal matching maximums particularly with respect to aid to the blind and aid to dependent children and the lack of Federal financial participation in the assistance of all other needy persons and dependent children as well as in the administration and expenditures of general assistance place excessive demands upon general taxpayers of Oregon, and constitute an increasingly serious financial burden for the State of Oregon and its political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby most respectfully petition and request that the Congress of the United States, during the present session thereof, do enact appropriate amendments to the grants-in-aid programs of the Federal Social Security Act providing: (1) For the elimination of Federal matching maximums for individual payments of aid to dependent children and the deletion or increase of such maximums for old-age assistance and aid to the blind; (2) for Federal financial participation in assistance to a parent or other related person assuming responsibility for children who are recipients of aid to dependent children; (3) for Federal grants-in-aid to States for general assistance to any needy person as well as for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children; (4) for Federal financial participation in the costs of medical services made available to needy persons under State public assistance programs and in assistance payments to needy sick persons who reside in public or private medical institutions other than mental hospitals and tuberculosis sanitaria; (5) for Federal grants-in-aid or other appropriate provision of Federal aid to States in providing foster family home care for children in accordance with their individual needs; (6) for Federal financial participation in the administration of general assistance, including such welfare services as the States provide through the staff of the public welfare agency to help persons become self-supporting or avoid becoming dependent, and to contribute to their general welfare.

Adopted by house March 13, 1947.
JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.
Adopted by senate Marcl 28, 1947.
M. E. CORNETT,
President of Senate.

House Joint Memorial 19

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the processing and marketing of crab meat is an important industry of the Pacific coast States and Alaska that is capable of supplying the needs of the United States for such product, if given a fair opportunity so to do; and

Whereas the importation of foreign crab meat has hampered the development of this industry and will, if unrestricted, seriously curtail and impede the growth and development of an important industry of the Pacific coast States and Alaska: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to enact legislation reasonably restricting the importation into the United States of foreign crab meat, and defining that term to include not only crab meat produced in foreign waters, but also crab meat produced, processed, canned, marketed, or distributed by foreign nationals outside the United States and Alaska; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by house, March 15, 1947.
Readopted by house, March 29, 1947.
JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.
Adopted by senate, March 29, 1947.
M. E. CORNETT,
President of Senate.

Divided Loyalties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial entitled "Divided Loyalties."

This editorial appeared in the Chattanooga News-Free Press of April 7, 1947. The editorial is well worth the reading of every person who enjoys the freedom and liberty of our American democracy.

Specifically, the editorial refers to a protest made by Americans of Armenian extraction against President Truman's plan to aid Turkey in the stop-communism program, and, as the editorial points out, such a protest on the part of these Armenian-Americans is a reminder that all too often immigrant groups in this country are prone to put bitter hatreds and other prejudices that they and their forebears brought with them from the Old World ahead of the welfare of the United States.

Mr. President, regardless of the matter of lending money to Turkey, Greece, or any other nation, the chief consideration for doing such a thing should be the welfare and the security of our democratic form of government and of our people, the citizens of the United States of America.

Of course, consideration should be given to the welfare of the world as a whole. The important question raised by this editorial, however, is that these Armenians who have become American citizens are thinking more of their homeland overseas than they are of the home of their adoption. It emphasizes a thing, Mr. President, with which we have been confronted daily in recent years, and that is pressure brought by so-called foreign nationals and racial groups who are making this country their home, yet are apparently more interested in persuading America to do this, that, or the other, in the interest of their home across the seas.

In these matters too often the welfare of our democracy is wholly a secondary consideration. Those who are citizens in this United States of America and enjoy the privileges, protection, and advantages which are given to all American citizens should not take these privileges so lightly. It seems to me that throughout the recent years we have permitted too many hundreds of thousands of these foreigners to become citizens without impressing upon them what it really means to be an American.

We give our citizenship away too cheaply and, too often, I fear, to unworthy persons: if not unworthy, indifferent to the blessings which come with such citizenship. Too much of the free giving of citizenship rights can and will destroy our country.

It seems to me that it would be a very good time now to begin to review the background, and indeed the recent activities, of many of those who have been granted naturalization, with a view of taking away from them the rights of citizenship where they appear to be more interested in the welfare of other lands or other people. That which is given easily is often cherished indifferently.

To be an American citizen is the greatest material privilege that can be extended to any human being. There is not another nation on the face of the earth which gives to its people the things that America gives to them. From childhood they are given a free education in

every State of the Union, and after completing their education they are afforded business opportunities which defy comparison in any land.

They enjoy the right of freedom of religious worship and the right of freedom of speech. When they are imposed upon or injured to their damage, they have full and complete recourse in the courts of the greatest government on the face of the earth. Their case may be passed upon by a jury of their peers in a court that is honest, and the right of appeal to the highest court of the land is always possible. There is no sham and dishonest trial in the name of justice, but their rights of all kinds are protected in competent and honest tribunals.

They enjoy the right to own property in their own name. They have the privilege of casting a free and honest ballot in the elections throughout the land. They have a voice in their Government and of its citizenship they are considered a component part. They are employed at work in industry, or by their Government, without discrimination, and their success is limited only by their ability. They are paid the highest wage received by any citizens of any land upon the globe, and they enjoy the highest standard of living afforded anywhere.

Here they are out of reach of secret spies and they can lie down and rest under a roof of their own when night time comes, without fear of invasion of their homes. Here they are not molested by the gestapo or by so-called SS troops, and they may live in peace and quiet and happiness with full and complete individual protection. They may rear their families under the good influences of fine communities built up by honest, fearless, God-loving citizens of a great land, and when old age with its infirmities finally overtakes them, they are cared for by a grateful government and protected throughout the years that be ahead of them, until the end of their mortal existence.

Mr. President, we should turn our serious attention to improving the conditions of our own people in this country in time of stress and teach these comparative newcomers that the price of citizenship in the greatest Christian government in the world does not come cheap.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIVIDED LOYALTIES

Announcement that an organization claiming to speak for 150,000 Americans of Armenian extraction wants to be heard in Washington in protest against President Truman's plan to aid Turkey in the stop-communism program is a reminder that all too often immigrant groups in this country are prone to put hatreds, loyalties, and other prejudices that they bring with them from the Old World ahead of the welfare of this country.

No one can blame the Armenians for hating the Turks. The history of Turkish treatment of Armenians is a dark chapter indeed.

But we do not propose to help the Turks because we love or admire them. We plan to strengthen them against Communist aggression because they occupy a strategic position in the Middle East and we do not want Russia to take over control of this strategic position. If we do not help the Turks, Russia will probably take them, and the Dardanelles with them.

The Armenians say they do not object to this country helping the "heroic Greeks," but that it would be very bad for us to help the Turks.

In the interest of the safety of the United States and of freedom in every part of the world where it still survives, however, it is just as important for us to help the Turks as it is for us to help the Greeks. It doesn't make a bit of difference how bad the Turks have been or now may be.

Because of their ancient hatred of the Turks the Armenians who are protesting the Truman program do not understand this.

These Armenians are now Americans, or at least they should be. They and all other immigrant groups should put the welfare of their new home—the land that has given them the priceless blessings of freedom—first in their thoughts and should welcome that which is best for this country, even if it means something advantageous for people they hated over there.

The Armenians in this country are relatively few and are not strong enough to do much harm.

There are, however, a great many other newcomers in the United States, and far too many of them cling to old world prejudices, ideologies, and ways of thinking to a degree that makes it impossible for them to be desirable Americans. In the aggregate, they are capable of exerting influences that could be—and some that are—definitely harmful to the America that is loved by those who have been here longer. Communism, and other forms of radicalism, for examples.

VITO MARCANTONIO, the most un-American of all the men who have ever gone to Congress, who follows the Communist Party line on many issues, although he denies being a Communist, is kept in Washington by a hodgepodge of foreign groups in Harlem.

Perhaps a congressional immigration committee, as well as that on foreign affairs, could find food for thought in the protest of anti-Truman policy Armenians.

The Price Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article discussing the trend of prices, the causes of that trend, its significance, and what should be done about it. Since the preparation of this article prices have gone up 2.1 percent further. This is a careful analysis of the most important problem confronting the country, and should have our serious study if we are to avoid disastrous consequences.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times magazine of April 20, 1947]

THE PRICE PROBLEM: AN ANALYSIS BY BOWLES—"SETTING STRAIGHT" THE RECORD OF WHAT HAS HAPPENED, HE PROPOSES A SEVEN-POINT PROGRAM

(By Chester Bowles)

(The upward trend of prices is now being widely debated. Here is one view of the significance and causes of that trend. The author was head of the Office of Price Administration from July 1943 to February 1946, and Director of Economic Stabilization from then until his resignation last June.)

In the last few months I have frequently been asked to express my views on the upward rush of prices which has now been in full swing since last July.

I have refused these past requests for one reason. Like most other people, I am bored by ex-Government employees who spend their time explaining how much better things would be if only their advice had been followed.

Last week, however, I changed my mind. Some recent explanations for the price increases of the last 10 months simply cannot go unchallenged. Here are a few of the most serious:

1. "Certainly, prices are too high. But incomes are high, too, and so there's no great burden on anyone. In addition, our people have plenty of savings to fall back on."

2. "Of course, this inflation is dangerous. But it was the only possible way that we could get production rolling."

3. "Our businessmen and farmers could cut these high prices quickly enough if they really wanted to."

4. "The whole trouble lies with labor, with its constant strikes and incessant demands for higher wages."

None of these explanations can stand up under close examination. Each one does some group in our economy a grave injustice. If we are to learn anything from this unhappy experience we should set the record straight without delay.

First, let's see what has actually happened to prices since Congress decided to abandon over-all price controls last June. How do the increases of the last 10 months compare with the action of prices when effective over-all price control was in operation

Between Hitler's invasion of Poland in September 1939 and February 1942, prices in general rose with increasing rapidity. The passage of the Price Control Act in February 1942, enabled the Government to check the rate of increase. But it was not until President Roosevelt's "hold-the-line" program began operating in May 1943 that price control really became effective.

Between May 1943 and VJ-day in August 1945, average prices were held almost completely stable, while production zoomed to higher and higher levels. (The prices of some things, of course—such as apparel—went up. But the prices of others—such as fresh vegetables, fruits, and fish—came down.)

Between VJ-day and last June price increases were necessary on some manufactured products to smooth out the adjustment from war to peacetime production. But even with these post-VJ-day adjustments, the increase in the cost of living between May 1943 and June 1946, according to the Department of Labor, was only 6.6 percent, while the official index of wholesale prices rose only 8.5 percent in this entire 37-month period of heavy inflationary pressures.

When effective over-all price controls were abandoned by Congress last June 30, prices immediately shot upward. In July alone the increase in living costs equaled the accumulated increases of the last 3 years.

In the last 10 months wholesale prices have risen 31 percent—that's almost as much as in the previous 7 years, and nearly four times more than in the previous 37 months of effective price controls. Moody's index of general commodity prices shows an increase of 63 percent since a year ago, while Moody's index of raw industrial material prices shows an increase of 61 percent. Food at retail, which had increased only 1 percent in the 37-month period between May 1943 and June 1946, has increased 31 percent in 10 months.

How about the prices that our 40,000,000 families are now being asked to pay for

individual items? Since last June drug and pharmaceutical products are up 67 percent. That alone put a big dent in many family budgets—particularly those of our older people who can afford it least.

Fats and oils have doubled. Soap has increased 62 percent. Lard 72 percent. Oleomargarine 73 percent. Milk is up 32 percent. Coffee 49 percent. Wheat, which last June was selling at $1.60 a bushel, recently hit $3, with a resulting 25-percent increase in the prices which Mrs. Housewife now pays for bread.

Meat for the average family is up 60 percent. Pork chops, which cost you 38 cents a pound last June under price control, now average 63 cents. Veal cutlets have risen from 45 cents to 75 cents. Sirloin steak from 55 cents to 73 cents.

And you had better think twice before you say "Let 'em eat fish." Cod steaks, which cost Mrs. Housewife 27 cents last June under price control, are now selling for 45 cents. Flounder has risen from 16 cents to 35 cents. Boston mackerel, 18½ cents at the June OPA ceiling, has also hit 35 cents, with Spanish mackerel 10 cents higher.

We who were responsible for price control thought that apparel prices were too high last June. And yet, in the last 10 months, cotton goods have shot up 39 percent, with other apparel rising from 10 percent to 50 percent. Leather prices are up 63 percent.

In the building material field price rises in the last 10 months have been equally startling. Take paint, for an example. Since last June pig lead has increased 60 percent. Cottonseed oil has more than doubled. So has linseed oil. Copper has gone from 14 to 21 cents a pound.

These increases have inevitably led to price rises of 60 percent in household paints. Lumber, which was high-priced even under price controls, has shot up an additional 50 percent since then, according to the Department of Labor.

So much for the dismal inflationary record of the last 10 months. How about the so-called explanations which I listed earlier in this article? Let's take them in order and see to what extent each may be valid.

1. "Certainly, prices are too high. But incomes are high, too, and so there's no great burden on anyone. In addition, our people have plenty of savings to fall back on."

If you are tempted to offer this suggestion to an average American family, you had better smile when you do it.

In spite of our widely heralded prosperity, more than half the families in the country are still living today on less than $2,000 a year; and, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 40 percent of their incomes must go for food. Because of the price increases of the last 10 months the standard of living of tens of millions of our people has been sharply reduced.

"But," you may ask, "why don't people dip into their savings in order to tide them over a temporarily rough period?" For the simple reason that most people do not have any real savings into which to dip.

Our total savings during the war period were admittedly great. But the Federal Reserve Board has established that 65 percent of these savings are held by the third of all our families with the highest incomes. The average savings of the lower-income half is only $700 for each family.

But these figures are already 9 months old. By now the savings of the majority of our people have sunk to still lower levels.

How about explanation No. 2? "Of course, this inflation is dangerous. But it was the only possible way that we could get production rolling."

This argument will not stand examination any better than the first. As prices have moved up, the purchasing power of millions of families has been reduced. As a result, production in many fields is actually less than a year ago. The actual unit volume (not inflated dollar value) of food sold today is roughly 8 percent below that of a year ago. The increase of 30 percent in milk prices in the last 10 months has resulted in a 10 to 15 percent drop in fluid milk consumption (that's the technical term for the milk you give the kids).

There's about 8 percent more meat available for civilians than a year ago, largely because of lower Army requirements. The increase seems much greater to our upper-income and middle-income families. Why? Because tens of millions of lower-income families have been forced to reduce their meat purchases sharply. The well-to-do may be eating half again more meat; but our less fortunate citizens are eating less.

Restaurants on the average are showing a reduction in business. Drug store business for the country as a whole is 5 percent less than a year ago.

Each week the newspapers still herald an increase in department store volume over the previous year. But an examination shows that this increase in recent months has been the result of inflated dollars. The actual volume of goods moving across the counters is less today than a year ago under the price controls which were said to make production impossible (remember?).

Nondurable goods are off 15 percent. Durable goods production is, of course, higher than a year ago. In the Federal Reserve Board index civilian production (which excludes foods) is up about 8 percent, although the monthly rate of increase has been far less than in the price control period between VJ-day and June 1946.

Automobile production has climbed steadily. So has the production of washing machines, radios, and vacuum cleaners. There are still many people who can afford them even at the present high prices (40 percent to 70 percent above 1940).

The record in housing offers additional proof that inflation tends to diminish total production rather than to increase it. The immediate emergency demand for new housing has been estimated at not fewer than 5,000,000 units. In 1946, during the better part of which price controls on building materials were effective, we started to build roughly 1,000,000 new units.

As the distortions of the war period dropped further behind us, we might have expected to increase this figure in 1947 to a million and a quarter new homes, or perhaps even to 1,400,000.

How much new housing are we likely actually to get? The experts estimate a maximum of only about 800,000 units. Very few of our GI Joes can pay the present high prices, and not many have rich fathers-in-law. The building industry is pricing itself right out of the market in the face of the greatest housing demand that the country has ever seen.

How about explanation No. 3? "Businessmen and the farmers could cut these high prices quickly enough if they really wanted to."

There have been many efforts to talk prices down by appealing to the better nature of our businessmen and our farmers. These efforts have been notably unsuccessful, and for two excellent reasons:

In the first place, no individual businessman is wholly the master of his own decisions as far as prices are concerned. One businessman's price is the next businessman's cost. No one businessman, no matter how enlightened or public-spirited he may be, can do much by himself to control what happens to the final price that we consumers pay.

A second reason why price control by entreaty has proved ineffective lies in the basic nature of the profit system. In the free-enterprise system most prices will adjust themselves to reasonable levels under normal conditions. When the supply of goods and the money available to pay for them are in balance competition will tend to bring prices down, and, by and large, to assure the public improved values.

Since 1941, however, conditions of civilian supply and demand have been badly distorted by the war and its aftermath. We have been in a seller's market—a market in which supply and demand on most products have been unbalanced to the advantage of the producer and the distributor.

It's all right to talk glibly about the public duty of our businessmen and our farmers to sell only at reasonable prices in a period in which they can, for the most part, get whatever they ask. But, human nature being what it is, can we really expect the individual farmer to sell his wheat at $1.60 a bushel when his neighbors are selling theirs at $3 a bushel? Or the businessman to cut his prices 30 percent or 40 percent below what he knows he can get? Businessmen and farmers, for the most part, are no more selfish than the rest of us. But what would you do under such circumstances?

How about the fourth explanation? "The whole trouble lies with labor, with its constant strikes and incessant demands for higher wages."

The claim that higher wages since last June are the basic cause for the sharp increase in prices is simply untrue. Average wholesale prices for all industrial products have risen 26 percent in the last 10 months. Wages in this same period are up only 5 percent. In most industries—thanks to rapidly increasing volume and lower overhead costs—this 5-percent increase could, in all probability, have been absorbed under price control with no increase in the final price at all.

Nor can we explain away the sharp price increases or the slackening of production in some industries since last June on the basis of strikes and work stoppages. During the last 10 months the number of hours lost by strikes has been at much the lowest point since VJ-day.

The myth that our working people are reveling in fat incomes and luxury living dies hard. Our average wage earner is worse off today than he was 3 years ago. It's true that his hourly wage rate on the average is 20 percent higher. But because he is working fewer hours his weekly pay check has risen only 3.6 percent.

Figure in the increased prices that he and his wife have had to pay since last June and you find that his weekly pay check will buy 16 percent less today than in 1944. Add on the fact that our working people are clearly conscious that business profits after taxes and net farm income are running at a rate 30 percent to 40 percent above the wartime peaks, and you will understand their rapidly growing bitterness.

If it is unfair to blame the individual businessman, the individual farmer, or the workers in our plants for what has happened since last June, whom should we blame?

Price control for the average businessman was a headache. In the vast OPA pricing operation, there were often delays and occasionally some stupid mistakes.

With only 1 year to go, many business-association leaders rejected the counsel of such seasoned businessmen as Eric Johnston, George Meade, Jack Straus, of Macy's, and the heads of the Committee for Economic Development, and impatiently went all-out for a "free economy"—in the face of conditions that made the normal working of a free economy impossible.

In one of their anti-price-control advertisements last June the National Association of Manufacturers assured us:

"If OPA is permanently discontinued, the production of goods will mount rapidly, and through free competition prices will quickly adjust themselves to levels that consumers are willing to pay. * * * Supply will

quickly catch up with demand. Prices will be fair and reasonable to all. Quality will be improved. * * * Send for a booklet that explains how price controls cause inflation."

Some of our leading politicians who should have known better must also bear their share of the blame. Senator ROBERT TAFT was one. Senator KENNETH WHERRY was another. On June 12, 1946, Senator WHERRY said: "Mr. Bowles has said that if price controls were eliminated, the price of meat would go up 50 percent. Mr. Bowles is trying to scare us. My prediction is that without price control meat will cost less than today." If Mrs. Wherry keeps a budget, the Senator will find that meat is now up 60 percent.

Last June, in the face of weeks of skilled anti-price-control propaganda, three out of four Americans—according to Gallup—were still solidly in favor of the OPA in its fight to hold down prices. But a majority in both Houses of Congress chose to listen instead to the lobbyists who represented vested interests.

It's easy to blame our elected Representatives for folding up under pressure. But, in all fairness, we should recognize that never in our recent history had any Congress been faced with so much pressure applied with such finesse.

Some competent economists have figured that the resulting price increases which American families had had to pay since last June (that is, the price increases which would have been avoided if price controls had been continued for another year) have already totaled $8,000,000,000.

What is likely to happen in the next few months? Will prices continue upward? Will they soon start down? When they drop, will they drop with a bang?

Clearly, no one really knows, and the wisest are the least inclined to prophesy.

Many economists feel that prices will continue to rise in an increasingly erratic fashion until late spring or early summer; that a sharp decrease will occur then in farm prices, which will be the signal for a general break in all prices.

Some of them expect that the drop will be sharp; that production will be curtailed; that we shall be faced with unemployment ranging from four to seven million, accompanied by a flurry of bankruptcies and foreclosures; and that recovery will take place in 1948.

It may be that the drop-off in prices will be much sharper and that unemployment will be substantially increased above the guesses of the economists.

Or it may be that shipments of food and other economic aid overseas will tend to cushion the adjustment. While many prices may move sharply downward, with some accompanying economic pain, the adjustment in general may be made without too much damage.

Let's hope and pray that we'll be let down relatively lightly.

There are, of course, certain steps that we can take in the next 60 days which will cushion whatever economic shock may lie ahead. None of them could be called radical by any stretch of the imagination. If we are wise, we will join together, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, eliminate the political maneuvering, and promptly put them into effect:

1. We can continue rent control for one more year from June 30, 1947. A sharp increase in rents right now, added to the sharply increased cost of living since last June, would be disastrous for the 18,000,000 families who live in rented dwellings.

2. We can pass the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill promptly. (Senator TAFT deserves full credit on this one.) This bill, vigorously administered, can put our housing program back into high gear. Not only will it assist veterans and others in getting decent homes but it will help materially in maintaining employment.

3. We can broaden social-security payments to include farmers and self-employed.

4. We can raise minimum wages from 40 cents an hour (the figure set in 1938) at least to 65 cents an hour, to make up for the increased cost of living.

5. We can assure our farmers permanent protection against disastrously low prices. (The legislation is now on the books; but they need to know that it will be renewed in 1948.)

6. In the international field we can adopt a bold program of economic aid to the war-torn peoples of western Europe and Asia.

7. We can forget the optimistic political promises of last fall and pass a really adequate tax program, predicated on a reasonable Federal budget, with a reduction in the national debt.

Such measures will not neutralize our mistakes of the last 10 months. They will not restore our $8,000,000,000 of lost purchasing power. But, if we act promptly, they will help. They might even turn a potential smash-up into a modest readjustment of the cream puff variety.

Hunger, Canals, and Oil Fields in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered recently by Samuel Guy Inman on the subject Hunger, Canals, and Oil Fields in the Near East. This splendid address deals with the pending measure and should be in the hands of all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNGER, CANALS, AND OIL FIELDS IN THE NEAR EAST

(By Samuel Guy Inman, guest professor of international relations, Ohio Wesleyan University)

President Truman warned Congress, in his epoch-making speech of March 12, that he was making a proposal that would profoundly affect the foreign policy and the national security of our country. It is this section of his proposal, and with full approval of aid to the suffering people of Greece and a full recognition of the difficulty of the problem which the President and his advisors are seeking to meet, that I respectfully challenge, what is being called the "Truman doctrine."

When we talk about a doctrine as a basis for a foreign policy of a great nation, we get into serious business. First and foremost is the Monroe Doctrine. This was announced after years of discussion, and months of correspondence between President Monroe and some of the wisest statesmen the world has known, including Thomas Jefferson, John Q. Adams, ex-President Madison. Because it was so carefully and patiently worked out, it became the rock on which our foreign policy has rested for a century and on which the greatest democracy in the world has been built. A substitute for the Monroe Doctrine cannot be composed in a cabinet meeting or two and a few days debate in the Congress.

Another doctrine, the Coolidge doctrine was much discussed in 1927. It proposed that wherever there was an American citizen or American property, there was likewise a part of American territory. It was backed by the President's statement that "the legions which she (United States) sends out are armed not with the sword, but with the cross—we have no purpose save to merit the favors of Almighty God."

Another famous pronouncement was made by President Theodore Roosevelt. It was called, probably because of the modesty of the author, "The Roosevelt Corollary of the Monroe Doctrine." The central point in the Roosevelt corollary was that disorder in any nation would require intervention by some outside power. In the American continent, such police power, because of the Monroe Doctrine, should be exercised by the United States. The United States Senate refused to endorse the doctrine. But President Roosevelt carried it out anyway. It led the United States into a series of interventions in Nicaragua, Panama, Dominican Republic, Haiti, and other Caribbean countries. From 1900 to 1932, there were forty such armed interventions in the affairs of our neighbors. In those days the Latin Americans called the Pan American Union "the colonial section of the Department of State."

Every one of these 40 interferences was undertaken under the same formula—there was disorder; if the United States did not stop it, some other nation would. Major interventions were accompanied by loans and United States experts, who were to aid, it was said, the suffering people. We now know that the people who were actually aided, as President Taft bluntly stated, were our businessmen.

INTERVENTION OUTLAWED

Finally we realized that what we were actually doing was to lose trade, alienate our neighbors, and build up suspicion and hatred around the world. The United States Senate made a thorough investigation of the whole mess. President Hoover sent an investigating committee to Haiti and withdrew the marines from Nicaragua. (Most significant is the fact that Nicaragua, where our reforming soldiers were there the longest, from 1912 to 1932, conditions today are the worst.)

Under the wise leadership of Cordell Hull at the Montevideo Conference the United States signed a solemn treaty we would never again intervene in the affairs of other American Republics. The new good neighbor policy won the Latin American Republics to our side during the Second World War.

Only 3 weeks go in Mexico City, President Truman told the Latin Americans we would always keep not only the letter but the spirit of this pledge. It was Mr. Truman also who made a solemn appeal to all the nations at the close of the San Francisco Conference to keep their word to settle all disputes according to the United Nations Charter.

Unilateral intervention by this country was about to destroy the Pan American Union, when we right-about-faced, and saved that institution. Unilateral intervention in Greece and Turkey would kill an effective United Nations.

It would also start driving the nails in the coffin of the Pan American Union. Already we have begun to show indifference to inter-American affairs because of our interest in far-away places. Two years ago we signed the Act of Chapultepec, which was hailed as a great step toward peace. But we have failed to do anything about implementing that pact. This inaction is raising the old suspicions south of the Rio Grande.

Gentlemen of the Senate, let me pose a question: If we take on Turkey as our partner, who remained neutral and played with the Nazis during the war, how will we explain our policy in Argentina, where we work against the Government because it remained neutral and played with the Nazis?

A GLANCE AT THE MAP

"It is only necessary to glance at the map," says President Truman, "to realize the impor-

tance of Greece and Turkey." That is exactly what the Senate should do—take a look at the map—and what do you see? You see not only the suffering Greeks, whom we all want to help; you see the Suez Canal, the Dardanelles, and the oil fields of Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Iran, announced by American oil companies last week as the richest in the world. "We floated to victory on a sea of oil," said Winston Churchill when referring to the First World War. Let us be careful that we do not also float into the third world war on a sea of oil.

"Look at the map," said Henry Cabot Lodge to the Senate, which had an immense map before it at that session, which showed the rich oil fields of South America recently discovered. Stay out of the League of Nations, the Senator appealed, and make a deal with Colombia, near home, for oil. So we stayed out of the League and went into the South American oil fields.

"Look at the map," said President Theodore Roosevelt, when explaining his statement, "I took the Canal Zone," and his interventions in the nearby Caribbean countries.

One week after President Truman addressed the Congress on the Greek question, the Navy announced the sending of a task force to the Dardanelles. By its name that force of battleships must have a task to perform.

THE DARDANELLES

In all honesty, the Congress and the people of the United States must not allow themselves to be drawn in the question of the Dardanelles without recalling what this country did in a similar situation in regard to the Panama Canal. Colombia originally held the potential Canal Zone, as Turkey now holds the straits which connect the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. When Colombia would not accept our terms for the Canal Zone we encouraged a revolt in a part of her territory, Panama, and sent battle cruisers to keep Colombian troops from landing to suppress the revolution. We then arranged a quick lease with Panama. We justified it on the grounds of not allowing a backward country to hold up the progress of a world power.

As early as 1850, when Great Britain was strong in Central America, we signed the Clayton-Bullwer Treaty, which stipulated that the United States and Great Britain should build and fortify the Isthmian Canal. After the Spanish-American War, when we definitely became a world power, we told Great Britain that if she would not agree to abrogate that treaty we would ignore it anyway. We alone must have the right to build and fortify the Canal. Realizing there was nothing else to do, the British promised to let us have our way in the Caribbean if we would not limit her around the Suez Canal.

Does not our own experience suggest that we get together with Russia and arrange the question of the Dardanelles, now that Russia has become a great power, as we had at the opening of the twentieth century? According to our history, what would we do about the Dardanelles if we were in Russia's place?

THE UNITED STATES IN THE NEAR EAST

Following the First World War, the United States was asked to take a mandate over Armenia, which the Turks were about to wipe out of existence. We refused for good reasons. But the reasons given by Senator Brandegee, in opposing the matter in a notable Senate debate was, "Why should we take a mandate over Armenia? She has no coal, she has no oil." Conditions have changed in the Near East.

Recently oil has appeared in quantities in Saudi Arabia. The most juicy gossip at the San Francisco Conference was the competition between the Standard, Dutch Shell, and Sinclair interests as to which one could entertain most lavishly the Arabian delegates. During the last few weeks the Arabian Oil Co. and the Anglo-Iranian Co. have announced plans to build a 1,000-mile pipe line from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean.

Bitter debate in the Security Council was caused by the presence of Russian troops in Iran. We denounced their presence. They withdrew. Since then the United States sent a military mission to Tehran, which is today busy organizing an Iranian army and police force, as our experts are aiding in the reorganization of Persia's finances and public-health program.

We can evidently take care of our interests in that section of the world without taking on the responsibility for adjusting all the political problems in that boiling caldrom of human passions.

USE THE UNITED NATIONS

There is just one way to face this terrible dilemma. It is not by challenging our opponent to war. It is by challenging him and all other nations to work out the problem, as all have pledged, through the United Nations.

If the United States bypasses the United Nations in the very first days of its life, we will never live down the accusation that we killed the organization. We are the most powerful nation in the United Nations. We pay around 37 percent of its budget, we have the largest number of people in the secretariat, and we have invited it to make its home in our midst.

If the United Nations has been slow in organizing, now is the time for us to use our great power to speed it up. If we would put our moral passion, our financial power, and our experts to work and appeal to our friends in the organization to help, we could with hope put the whole crisis up to the United Nations. A country that can speed up its processes from making 1,000 airplanes a year to 50,000 to win a war can speed up the work of the United Nations sufficiently to win the peace. What the united group could not possibly do, it could allot to this country. That is a common process in international organizations.

One more step is open to us—a serious one. If Russia is violating its pacts and preparing for war, let us accuse her before the tribunal that we have pledged to use in such cases. She could not veto action regarding such an accusation. Article 27 clearly states the decisions of the Security Council "shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members, providing that * * * a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting." It is important for the public to realize that Russia, according to the Charter, cannot veto an action against her when she is the accused party.

Article I of the Charter, which President Truman so earnestly pleaded for at San Francisco, says that the purpose of the United Nations is "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace [and] settlement of international disputes or situations that might lead to the breach of the peace."

If we do not keep this pledge so soon after making it, we will give to the outside world the proof of their belief that recent appointment of a considerable number of military men in our diplomatic service contrary to former precedents, indicates a fundamental change in the traditional principles of the nations. Students of international problems know that one of the most fruitful causes of war has been loans by big countries to little ones. So when the United Nations was organized, care was taken to get away from this old imperialistic custom. A world bank was set up by the nations in a meeting at Bretton Woods so that loans could be made by a group of nations and not by individual countries. A total capital of $9,000,000,000 was subscribed by more than 40 nations, not including Russia. This bank has been slow in starting. It needs some big challenge to get it going. Greece could be that challenge. And Russia could not stop the loan, because Russia is not a member of the bank. The United States, on the other hand, could put the loan through, because it is the largest stockholder and furnishes the most important officers of the bank.

The Balkans are the powder house of Europe, and the Near East is a stalking caldron of religious, racial, and political passions. All the big European nations have gotten their fingers burned, when they have not actually started a war, by attempts to mix in the affairs of those unhappy lands. Great Britain is the last one to acknowledge defeat. Now, as good friends, they want to turn over the job to us. By recent experience, we learned there was nothing but trouble and expense in such an intervention in China, so we have withdrawn our troops. How can anyone look forward to the long future and expect that this proposed departure from all our past will bring us, unaccustomed to such a task, anything more than a final disillusionment and ruin that it brought Rome, Spain, and other empire builders.

AN APPEAL

Mr. Chairman, I heard you say to a little group of consultants of the State Department at San Francisco that your experience at that Conference had converted you completely to the method of consultation. "I believe there is no problem so great," you declared, "that it cannot find a settlement through conference if the interested parties are honest and intelligent, and will take sufficient time to work the matter through."

I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, to Senator CONNALLY, your running mate at San Francisco, Lake Success, and other recent meetings of the United Nations, as I appeal to every one of the 79 Senators who voted so heartily for the United States to join the United Nations, as I appeal through this Committee of Foreign Affairs, to President Truman, who stirred us at San Francisco when he exclaimed on the final day, "What a wonderful day this can be in history"—I appeal to all of you that you do not depart from the glorious traditions of our country and rush quickly into this Near East adventure. Rather, let us keep our word with the rest of the world, call their representatives together, and lay before them this overwhelming problem, too big for any one nation to solve.

The Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement written by Fred P. Myers, a prominent attorney of voteless Washington. It expresses a viewpoint worthy of study.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Let us hope that the adoption of the Truman doctrine will be accomplished without any delusion and with a full realization of its commitments and implications. Whatever its apparent purpose, the practical and ultimate effect is gradually to integrate our foreign policy with that of Great Britain

and to underwrite the British Empire, beginning at the point of most imminent danger, at the crossroads of the east. It will be recalled that this matter was first publicly precipitated by the urgent request of Great Britain to assume and take over her commitments in Greece, because of her inability to maintain her position there after March 31. Now the proposition is presented under the harmless guise of a humanitarian appeal for relief of a newly-discovered condition of distress in Greece (to which as such there may be no serious objection), but extended to aid to Turkey, and reinforced by a proposed world-wide crusade against communism. Although in a recent letter to Mr. Earle, President Truman referred to the fear of communism in our country as a "bugaboo," it is now found necessary to brand the opponents of the proposal with the stigma of that dreaded ideology. If there is any doubt as to where the proposed Truman doctrine is expected to lead our Nation, it should become clear from great Winston Churchill, who as Prime Minister of England said several years ago of his Empire, "We mean to hold our own." In an article entitled "If I Were An American" in last week's issue of Life Mr. Churchill said in a flattering challenge:

"Britain has, of course, been grievously weakened. * * *. The British nation will rise again, if not to its former preeminence, at least in solid and lasting strength * * *. But Britain and the British Commonwealth as a whole will welcome the establishment of American power in the Middle East and will give potent aid by every means. Americans should not hesitate to march forward unswervingly upon the path to which destiny has called them."

A study of the map of the eastern countries and waterways, and a familiarity with history clarifies the interest and the plight of Great Britain in connection with the present proposal of the administration. In order to maintain her vitally important imperial life line through the Mediterranean Sea, the Suez Canal, to the Persian Gulf and eastward to her vast possessions and conquests, it is necessary for Great Britain to have pro-British and subservient regimes in the countries adjacent to that life line. It will be recalled that the Crimean War, nearly a century ago against Russia was but an incident of Britain's necessary policy to protect her far-flung empire along the line of the Mediterranean Sea and the region referred to by Kipling as "east of Suez." Now since Great Britain confesses her inability to maintain that position, we are about to step in to hold the line against Russia. In effect, we are thus about to commit our Nation irrevocably to a policy of making our Monroe Doctrine practically coextensive with the British Empire, and to intervene wherever the alarm of communism is sounded. We are thus about to follow the siren voice of manifest destiny apparently heedless of the inevitable complications and historic fate of self-appointed rectors of the destiny of other nations and peoples.

FRED P. MYERS.

Funds To Fight Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the April 1 issue of the Newark Evening News. The editorial is entitled "Give To Conquer Cancer."

I wish to make the following comment in connection with the editorial: I think it most important that we in the United States recognize again the very important, old American habit of contributing to drives for public benefit. I think there is too great a tendency for those of us in the United States to assume that these great public-benefit problems should be taken care of entirely by the Government. I am perfectly willing to support some Government aid for cancer research, but I also think it is important that we, as individual Americans, make substantial contributions to such great public causes as the cancer drive.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"GIVE TO CONQUER CANCER"

The American Cancer Society today begins a month-long, Nation-wide public appeal for funds to fight cancer, now second to heart disease as a cause of death in the United States. The national goal is $12,000,000, with New Jersey asked to contribute $750,000, although an attempt will be made to raise $1,000,000, of which 60 percent will be spent in the State.

"Give to conquer cancer" is the slogan of the appeal for funds to battle this scourge through research, education, and service. The need is great. An estimated 184,000 persons will die of cancer in the United States this year, an average of one fatality every 3 minutes. The New Jersey toll is estimated at more than 7,000. No respecter of social position or age, cancer kills four times as many children as does infantile paralysis.

While cancer statistics are horrifying, there is a bright side—a side which has grown brighter since the first extensive effort was organized in 1945, and which will grow even brighter if the present appeal has the wide public support it merits.

With funds raised the last 2 years, 94 research projects have been financed and are being conducted by outstanding scientists. Three times as many projects await funds to be started.

In New Jersey, an encouraging battle against the disease is progressing with funds raised the last 2 years. Facilities and expert personnel have been provided to treat patients in 30 hospital clinics which report numerous cures. The field army volunteers have been aided in their year-around education and service program. Knowledge is being spread that cancer is curable if the public can be made sufficiently alert to have regular physical examinations. At last progress is being made by the weapons of research, education, and service, weapons which can be put to full use only if everybody will "give to conquer cancer."

The Proposed Loan to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of a public letter written to the President by Mrs. Alexander Stewart and others on the proposed action with respect to Greece and Turkey.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The administration's proposed course with respect to Greece and Turkey accepts the division of the world into American and Russian spheres of influence and proposes to stop the expansion of Russia and the spread of communism by force of arms.

By its failure to deal with the needs of the Russian people and by intensifying their fears of being surrounded by hostile military forces, this policy will actually help to bolster up the Stalin dictatorship in Russia. And since communism thrives on war, civil disturbances, and poverty, American dollars devoted to bolstering the military forces of dubious regimes in Europe and Asia will serve to multiply the grievances which make people outside Russia also a prey to communism. American resources will be drained as the Nation is thus drawn into the conflict against Russia and mounting chaos throughout the world. In the end our own country will be militarized and dragged into an atomic war with no prospect for the survival of democracy anywhere.

We see no hope, on the other hand, in any program of appeasement of Russia, since this does not change the radically evil pattern of international relationships and only postpones the inevitable clash of power against power. Nor is it possible for the United States to isolate itself from the rest of the world.

The only hope is in an integrated program which includes:

1. Rejection of the policy of military intervention.

2. Abandonment of the atomic armaments race which places an intolerable burden on the economy of every nation, including our own. An offer to take immediate steps toward placing strategic points such as the Dardanelles, Suez, and Panama under international control, and toward universal disarmament and establishment of international controls for the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

3. Use of our God-given resources, no longer squandered on armaments competition and military adventures, for immediate relief of the homeless and starving, and for an all-out world-wide reconstruction program for peace, before it is too late.

As things stand now our contributions for relief and toward the restoration of the economic life of the peoples of Europe and Asia are too small to prevent starvation and increasing disintegration. The need for putting an end to the threat of war and to international unrest grows daily more desperate but the good faith of our disarmament proposals is in question and progress toward disarmament is completely blocked so long as we are engaged in an armaments race and a power conflict wtih Russia. Everywhere and every day hunger and fear breed more hunger and fear.

An integrated program such as we have outlined can break the deadlock. It will enable the peoples of Europe and Asia to become rapidly self-supporting. It will create demands for the products of our farms, factories, and mines. It presents a challenge worthy of the inventive and organizing abilities of American scientists, industrialists, farmers, and workers.

The adoption of the course here outlined is also the one way to dissolve the fear and suspicion which grip the Russian people today. It would give the United States the moral leadership of the world, and would create the atmosphere of security, confidence

and hope in which democratic forces all over the world could be revived.

George A. Buttrick, Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York; Allan Knight Chalmers, Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York; Bernard C. Clausen, Euclid Avenue Baptist Church, Cleveland, Ohio; Donald B. Cloward, Council on Christian Social Progress, Northern Baptist Convention, New York; Phillips P. Elliott, First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Donald Harrington, The Community Church, New York; John Haynes Holmes, The Community Church, New York; Jessie Wallace Hughan, War Resisters' League; Hannah Clothier Hull, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Swarthmore, Pa.; Charles W. Iglehart, Union Theological Seminary, New York; Abraham Kaufman, War Resisters' League; Frederick J. Libby, National Council for Prevention of War, Washington, D. C.; Albon Man, Committee for Amnesty, New York; A. J. Muste, Fellowship of Reconciliation, New York; John Oliver Nelson, Peace Fellowship of Presbyterians; Ray Newton, Peace Section, American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mildred Scott Olmsted, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Philadelphia, Pa.; Edwin McNeill Poteat, President Colgate-Rochester Theological Seminary; Halene Rea, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Devon, Pa.; Paul Scherer, Union Theological Seminary, New York; Mark A. Shaw, National Council for Prevention of War, Boston, Mass.; Alexander Stewart, Peace Section, American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pa.; Annalee Stewart, National President Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Arthur L. Swift, Jr., Union Theological Seminary, New York; Evan W Thomas, M. D., War Resisters' League; E. Raymond Wilson, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Washington, D. C.

MARCH 17, 1947.

Policies of Americans for Democratic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 21, 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered on April 8, over the American Broadcasting Co. network, by Mr. Wilson W. Wyatt.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I speak for a new movement of American liberals. But it is new only in the sense that American liberals have at last established their own organization, free of totalitarian influence and dedicated to the basic American faith in reason, justice and the dignity of the individual. The underlying spirit of our organization is in the oldest tradition of American liberalism. The values to whch we give allegiance have rallied Americans throughout our history in the unending fight for a greater and fuller democracy. Today these same values are rallying free men throughout the world in their struggle against the twin evils of hunger and despotism.

The name of this organization is Americans for Democratic Action. ADA does not pretend to speak for all progressives everywhere. No single organization—no single man—can soberly claim to be the chosen and exclusive representative of American liberalism. But we do believe we speak for the overwhelming majority of American progressives—those whose hearts and minds rebel at the extension of tyranny, whether it takes place in Franco's Spain or Tito's Yugoslavia; those who repudiate the police state, whether imposed by the totalitarians of the right or of the left. We reject intolerance, repression or terrorism under any banner. We believe free men can work out their own destiny without being reduced to the false and desperate choice between fascism, on the one hand, and communism, on the other.

The liberal who believes in the middle way has been too long silent, bewildered and homeless. Now is the time for him to speak and act—if freedom and democracy are indeed to present hope to the people of the world. This is why thousands of us, sharing these convictions, came together to form Americans for Democratic Action.

Tonight I want to speak primarily on the foreign-policy program of the ADA, with special reference to the question of aid to Greece and Turkey. ADA's foreign policy is not the product of back-room intrigue, nor of minority manipulation. It was prepared after months of discussion and adopted at our national conference after two long days and nights of debate. More than 250 leading American progressives took part—such men as Leon Henderson, chairman of our executive committee; Franklin Roosevelt, Jr.; and Mayor Humphrey, of Minneapolis, our vice chairman; Paul Porter, special Ambassador to Greece; and others on our foreign-policy commission including Marquis Childs, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Bishop William Scarlett, and Thomas K. Finletter.

ADA rejects the theory that war with Russia is inevitable. It rejects with equal conviction the theory that we must purchase peace through continuous surrender to Soviet pressure. There are some who proclaim that we cannot escape armed conflict with Russia and hence we should abandon all attempts at peaceful settlement of our differences. There are others who contend that our own country is engaged in a program of cynical and ruthless imperialism, and that liberals must therefore oppose the United States at every point where our position collides with that of the USSR. Both views are extreme and dangerous. We believe that it would be a world tragedy if the peoples of Europe were misled into thinking that any substantial group of Americans supports the extremes of war or appeasement.

Americans for Democratic Action rests its foreign policy program on three basic principles.

First, any return to isolationism means disaster for America and for the world. From the extreme right and the extreme left—from the Chicago Tribune and the Daily Worker—come demands that we keep our hands off the crises in Greece and Turkey and stay out of the affairs of Europe and Asia. These same demands came from these same sources with regard to Hitler in 1940. We rejected that alliance of the isolationists and the Communists then, we reject it now. No longer can the United States resign from the world and pull the oceans over its head. To insure peace and our own security, we must assume the responsibilities of greatness. This means that we must pursue positive policies—and we must recognize that doing nothing is itself a policy decision which may undermine our national security.

Second, the United States must exercise its power, wherever possible, through the United Nations. We must work in every way we can to strengthen the United Nations and to support its economic and social agencies—and we ask that other great powers meet us half way. The existence of the United Nations does not, however, eliminate the need for action by individual nations where the United Nations is powerless to act.

Third, the United States must throw its moral, economic, and political support to nations struggling for survival and to the forces of independent democracy within those nations. We must let the world know that our vast resources will be used to create economic and political conditions favorable to the growth of democratic ideals.

The choices we face are not simple. In Greece we are confronted with a reactionary and corrupt government which has shown neither the will nor the capacity to undertake long-overdue economic reforms. Turkey is still far from democracy as we know it. These countries have asked for economic and military aid and the United States proposes to supply it. Let us be clear why this is done, and why, after long and full discussion, Americans for Democratic Action voted to back the proposal.

Our essential purpose is the protection of international security. Greece is sinking into bankruptcy and political chaos. Both Greece and Turkey are faced today by external forces that threaten to annex their territories, subvert their institutions and destroy their national sovereignty. If the integrity of nations can be openly challenged, either by a systematic war of nerves, or through a civil war supported by a foreign country, then all our hopes for the United Nations and for the peace of the world lie in ruins.

There are many men who proclaim themselves the true executors of Franklin Roosevelt's will. No man can say with absolute certainty what Franklin Roosevelt would have done in all the crises confronting the world today. But certainly it was the essence of his position that America must stand for help to the weak against the strong, for the protection of peace-loving nations against aggression.

The world must act today to insure the security of nations in the eastern end of the Mediterranean. The natural center for such action is the United Nations. But the United Nations today simply does not have the troops, the money, or the legal power to deal with the crisis. Americans for Democratic Action favors the immediate strengthening of the UN so that it can take over the Greek and Turkish problems as soon as possible. Pending the full assumption of responsibility by the UN, we see no choice except for the United States to take immediate action to safeguard the independence of Greece and Turkey. We are confident that such action will encourage the hands of those in the Soviet Union who are arguing for friendly relations with the West. We are equally confident that failure on our part to check aggression in the eastern Mediterranean would strengthen the hands of those in the Soviet Union who seek to dominate Greece and Turkey as a step toward the domination of Italy and France and the rest of Europe.

Military security, however, is only a temporary answer. It is an essential part of the solution, but only a small part. The lasting answer to the problem of communism is the removal of the conditions which invite its spread. The only anti-Communist policy which will work in the long run is a policy of

striking boldly at hunger and want wherever they may exist.

American liberals for a long time have been calling for a positive, prodemocratic foreign policy. What can such a positive policy be other than a determined effort at political and economic reconstruction under United States leadership along lines which will favor the growth of freedom? In this sense aid to Greece presents United States policy with its greatest opportunity. It is a challenge. It calls the bluff of all who have been pleading that the United States assume its world responsibilities.

The enactment of the aid-to-Greece bill will be the beginning, not the end, of our Greek policy. The crucial issue is how that aid shall be administered. There has never been a question, as some have charged, of an unconditional subsidy to the present Greek Government. Secretary Marshall's note to the Greek Government in February laid down immediate objectives toward which the United States desires that Government to move. No one knows better than our two Ambassadors, Paul Porter and Lincoln MacVeagh, that aid turned over to that Government unconditionally will be money wasted. We have made it clear that American assistance will not be a blank check for grafters and reactionaries.

The United States must follow through on the use of our aid. We must ensure that all military supplies be used against external aggression and not against the liberties of the people. We must insist on a genuine amnesty—so that all who have fought against reaction and corruption in the interest of a decent and independent Greek Government shall be free to lay down their arms, without fear of reprisal, and begin the rebuilding of their country. We must employ our influence to democratize the civil service, to revise the tax system, to institute effective price and exchange controls—in short, to tighten up the whole Greek economy and set it on a firm and healthy basis. If we do our job well, we will have shown that we can meet the totalitarian challenge on the level of economic reconstruction; that we can fill stomachs, and do it without cutting out tongues.

This will be a tough job. We need time and tranquillity in order to build dams, to plan soil-erosion programs, to revive and expand industries. Our task is to place the Greeks on the road to a reasonable standard of living and at the same time guarantee the free play of political expression.

If we continue to allow the ragged and hungry people of Greece to be exploited, we shall only fan the fires of communism. But if we assume the burdens of guarding national independence and supervising economic reconstruction, we will give the democratic alternative to fascism and communism new strength and vitality throughout the world.

American liberals have a special responsibility today. The alarmist outcries of a hysterical minority have created the impression abroad that all liberals believe that our Government is embarked on a hopeless course and that the only salvation lies in Moscow. This is a false picture. We have many criticisms of United States foreign policy. But if irresponsible liberals succeed in convincing the peoples of the world that the great mass of Americans are indifferent to the fate of independent nations, aggression will be strengthened and the courage to resist will collapse. Our only hope of peace lies in vigorous action in support of the principles in which we deeply believe.

I stress foreign policy tonight, but ADA regards its domestic program as equally important. As the champion of democratic principles in the world, America must eradicate the imperfections and intolerances of its own society. ADA is pledged to make America the world symbol of progressive democracy. We must be strong at home—free from unemployment and inflation—to be strong abroad.

ADA stands for free men everywhere. We have no belief that the values of free men are going to have an easy time in the next few years. But these values have survived bombings, torture, and concentration camps. They remained alive through the nightmare of a World War. They are the universal qualities of goodness and decency on which a united world must one day be built. It is the obligation of Americans to protect and advance them.

Department of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include two essays, one written by Miss Mary Helen Bruffy, of Webster Springs, from the Second Congressional District, and the other being written by Miss Margaret Curry, of St. Albans, of the Fifth Congressional District, the latter I insert at the request of Mr. KEE, Representative from that district, on the subject of creating a Department of Peace within our National Government.

I introduced in the House a bill which would create such a Department, styled, H. R. 503. Mr. R. M. Davis, of Morgantown, one of West Virginia's distinguished citizens, sponsored an essay contest on this subject and the two essays being introduced here were the ones selected as being the best from the First and Fifth Congressional Districts of West Virginia.

The attention of the House is invited to these essays, because they deal with world peace, the major problem facing the world today.

CREATING A DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

(By Mary Helen Bruffy, Webster Springs High School, Second Congressional District)

"*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby created a Department of Peace." What hopes of happiness might be given life were these words to become a reality instead of a dream. This step would form a nucleus in the United States of a movement that would free us from many of the bonds that tie us to a policy of war as a means of settling differences.

Our Nation is a success only as it leads the world toward a greater endeavor in the field of human relations. Building a road to peace would represent a full measure of such success.

The transition from a policy of war to a policy of peace has been taking place for centuries. At one time war was recognized as a proper and legal method of settling disputes. But from time to time peace-minded people have endeavored to bring to the recognition of nations the possibility of living in harmony with other nations.

The first movement was the making of treaties between families, tribes, and nations. Treaties mean nothing now, and meant nothing then, only as the nations who composed the treaty were favored by its enforcement.

Then nations began calling in a third party to hear a dispute and render decision on the problem. This principle of arbitration was notably championed by the United States in such cases as the Oregon boundary dispute and the Alabama claims.

Nations of the world, at the invitation of the Czar of Russia, met at The Hague, in the Netherlands, and established an International Court of Arbitration. This tribunal had no force behind it except the integrity of nations who abided by its decisions.

President Taft negotiated treaties with several countries, saying that any disputes arising between them would be settled by arbitration. William Jennings Bryan negotiated treaties with certain countries stating that any dispute should be investigated, and that recourse to war would be delayed for at least a year.

With the Treaty of Versailles, Woodrow Wilson introduced a new and revolutionary measure—an organization of nations.

The nearest step to world peace was the Kellogg pact in its official renunciation of was as a national policy. But it lacked the support of a spirit of peace in the people of the signatory nations. It fell into the heap of discarded measures and left the world at the mercy of any new movement toward war.

The greater the war, the greater the lesson which the world must learn from it. Is human intelligence too small to grasp the lesson taught by the last struggle? Humanity must not fail again. It must gather together all lessons learned before and use them to fight the urge to abandon the principle of the League—the principle of the United Nations.

Any movement, any organization, must be backed by the public sentiment of the whole world. We are now striving with another organization for peace. Whether or not this movement succeeds will depend not on individuals—they are too small; not on nations—they are too weak; but it will depend upon the combined will of the peoples of the world. Changes in the attitude of a nation must be preceded by changes in the attitudes of her citizens; just as a change in the attitude of the world must be preceded by changes in the attitudes of the nations that make up that world.

Because of her strength in war, the United States has been accorded the leadership of the world. The greatest demand placed upon her in her new role is that of promoting peace.

One of the sources of the strength of our system of government is the fact that it is adjustable to the changing needs of the people. Its pliability has been notably demonstrated in the development of our Cabinet.

When our Government was first established there were but four Departments in our Cabinet. These were the Department of State, Treasury, Post Office, and War.

As the uselessness of a land defense against the rising magnitude of sea power of other nations was realized there was added a Department of the Navy.

The rapid rate of depletion of our natural resources occasioned the creation of a Department of the Interior to oversee internal affairs.

In order to place the courts of our Nation into a system whereby the same principles of equality might be administered throughout the United States, a Department of Justice was established.

To promote the interests of the farmer, a Department of Agriculture was added; to oversee business relations of our people a Department of Commerce and Labor was

created, and later separated, as labor was recognized as a great voice in Government.

Now another need has arisen, that of peace. Never before in the history of man has that need been more apparent than it is today. Since the need is recognized by all peoples, would not now be the propitious time for the United States to lead a concentrated movement toward world peace?

Transportation and communication have been developed to such a degree that nations of the world are living in the proximity of next-door neighbors; but attempts toward understanding and international education have not kept pace with the mechanical relations of our world.

We believe that a prerequisite to world peace is world understanding. The most satisfactory means of securing a sympathetic, friendly attitude of the world is through an educational system for that purpose.

Mr. R. M. Davis' vision did not end with the creation of a department of peace in our Government structure, but spread to the incorporation of the attempts of nations into one movement to be handled under the Office of Education. This office, in turn, would cooperate with the Economic, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and the Security Council.

The League of Nations failed not because of faulty leaders but because it lacked the support which only public opinion can furnish. This public opinion must be formed upon the only basis fair to factions for and against a measure, and this basis is facts. The United States must develop the principle of "liberty enlightening the world" into a scope that would inform all peoples concerning movements for peace.

An enlightened people is a democratic people, and a democratic people is a peaceful people; thus it behooves the United States as a world leader to begin a concentrated effort toward peace for all mankind.

Would not a purpose behind our democratic principles be the education of our people as to the history of our national policies and upon what facts and incidents that policy is founded? Would not a person who knows what is being done in the United Nations be more able to form unbiased opinions on its functions?

Public opinion, whether it is right or wrong, is a force which cannot be subdued by arguments or by arms, and if not based on facts it is forever changing. Only an educated people are able to separate facts from bias and prejudice and to form a sound opinion.

If a person knows about the customs of his neighbor and the motives behind them, he is more able to adjust his own sentiments, traditions, and customs, abolishing the conflict which might be present.

Suspicion has become such a monster in our modern diplomacy that it is virtually impossible for political representatives to meet and discuss politely, simply, and candidly the problems mutually confronting the nations of the world.

We must learn to trust each other, and trust can only be accomplished by knowledge of our neighbor nations and the history of their policies. We must have faith in peace and strive for that good, establishing principles of Christianity and democracy and practicing them. The basic principle of our Government is the greatest good for the greatest number, but are we, as a Nation, willing to live the principles set forth in our own Government? We must realize that we are a part of a world and have responsibilities as a member of the world. We must learn to practice group solidarity as a world and group loyalty to that world as nations and individuals.

Tolerance is the watchword of the hour, and understanding is the key to the problem of peaceful living. In developing this understanding, we must begin in the mental capacity of the people, developing the mind to its fullest means of grasping a situation and of figuring a solution to the problem presented to us—this is the task of the Department of Peace.

Promoting better understanding of the fundamental principles of international relations is a challenge to be caught only by a structure in the government of a world leader—this is the task of the United States.

The League of Nations had no support within the member-nations to aid in promoting its principles. Let us be sure that the United Nations does not fail for lack of organized support within individual nations. Let us buttress the structure of this world organization by a unit of our National Government, a Department of Peace in our Cabinet.

From the beginning of the movement toward peace there have been treaties, organizations, and movements that have served only as interludes between wars. These interludes have been violated by nations who thought it to their advantage to do so. The Kellogg Pact brought to the minds of the people the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy. This treaty, for lack of force within individual nations, failed in its signal purpose and became only a denunciation of war.

We must have a combined force of an informed public throughout the world in order to carry the efforts of our forefathers and our contemporaries to success in ridding ourselves of war. The treaties, tribunals, and the League have been steps toward an ultimate victory of peace over war. This victory must be insured by the establishment of a sentiment within individuals; this sentiment would make up the policy of a nation, thus spreading from individual to national and international good will. A sentiment for peace, established in citizens of the world, would carry the principle of the United Nations to a success.

Therefore, we propose the creation of a Department of Peace within the structure of our Government. This would lead a concentrated movement toward world good will and set the example for similar efforts to be begun in other nations throughout the world.

Let this, our last effort, be the combined effort of all peoples, culminating in the final renunciation of war by an enlightened world.

CREATING A DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

(By Margaret Curry, St. Albans High School, Fifth Congressional District)

As we all know, World War II is over. We fought to preserve our democracy, but now that our democracy is safe, many of us have relaxed. However, we have a responsibility to those who died, to those who made possible our victory, and last of all to ourselves. What is this responsibility? Peace—this is our duty.

An important step toward peace would be the creation of a Department of Peace. Many feel that the United Nations organization alone can create peace, but peace is a continuous process of achievement. One of the deeper causes of the failure of the League of Nations was the lack of sufficient machinery for the enforcement of peace.

To begin with, the creation of a Department of Peace would prove to other nations that we are striving for peace, not a third world war. It would also prove that we are behind the United Nations Charter, a charter that is the hope of the world. It would show that we are willing to spend our money for peace, just as we spent billions of dollars for war. This business of peace is really a challenge to us. We hear on all sides that everlasting peace is impossible, but aren't we Americans noted for doing the impossible?

At present we have the War and Navy Departments that have the responsibility and supervision of our military forces. The State Department, which has charge of foreign affairs, tries to see that things do not happen which will result in war, but they do not see that things will happen which will lead to peace. So if there were a Department of Peace, there would be no reason for duplication of any other department.

The Peace Department would function just as any other department does in our Government. The Department of Peace would be headed by a Secretary of Peace appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, with a salary of $15,000 a year. There would also be an Under Secretary of Peace, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, with a salary of $10,000 a year. The Under Secretary would take the place of the Secretary in his absence and perform other duties as prescribed by law. The Secretary should have the duty of formulating educational programs for better understanding, of supervising the interchange of ideas and persons among institutions and groups in the United States, and of assisting educational and religious groups in formulating problems of peace.

This new Peace Department could offer advanced relations in friendship. It should encourage the exchange of students and professors between our country and others, for example, for the last few months South American students have been living and studying in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. These students were selected on their ability to speak English, their personality, and intelligence. It is hoped that this practice will be continued and that many United States citizens will be invited to South American countries. However, this practice should not be limited only to South America, nor should it be on such a small scale.

The Department of Peace could handle this problem very easily. Too, this practice leads to a better understanding of the people of other countries, and this better understanding can help to prevent war. In this way we would be practicing peace, not just thinking about it.

We must also realize at this time that we are living in "one world." The Atlantic and Pacific Oceans have been overcome by modern transportation. Telephones, radios, telegraphs, airplanes—these are just a few of the inventions that make it impossible for a nation to be isolated. Such problems as trade and commerce and even unemployment are now international concerns. Even the Jews in Palestine concern not only Great Britain, but also all other nations, who must work together to solve this problem. In such cases the Department of Peace could prepare the facts and make them available to every American.

It can be seen that a tremendous educational program will be needed. The main purpose of the Department of Peace will be to formulate this program and to start it moving. There was a failure after World War I to set up such a program. That failure resulted in perhaps 50,000,000 casualties from the European and Asiatic wars and a property loss of $1,000,000,000,000. A costly failure. Too, the war created problems that were not solved by the mere ending of the war. People were left homeless, without clothing, and starving to death. Such problems cannot be overcome in a night.

Marjorie Van de Water also points out the need for education. There must be a defense against the atomic bomb of today. Probably the only defense is intelligence. She reminds us that our industries, military installations, and the population of our big cities could be wiped out in a sneak attack. So no matter how good the defensive weapons of the future might be, they would be useless. The only assurance we have of protection is not to have enemies who would attack us in that

way. Too, if a small fraction of the $2,000,000,000 used for the atomic research program were used for a program of understanding people, there would be no need of a defensive weapon for the atomic bomb.

The cost to carry out such a program of peace would be less than the cost of one modern battleship. Our war has cost us nearly 1,100,000 lives, and our national debt has reached almost $300,000,000,000. Perhaps these figures could have been avoided if after World War I we had worked for peace. We need a Department of Peace to help us work toward that objective now.

The Department of Peace must work with the churches, schools, civic groups, and business in order to carry out its program successfully.

All these institutions have a responsibility to aid peace, but the church has the greatest. As the church stands for brotherhood, it is instrumental in trying to teach tolerance and understanding among the peoples of the world It is now its duty to see that Christian life extends further than the door of the church.

Courses in international relations must be taught in our colleges and universities. Students must study governmental systems, learning to recognize peaceful political organizations. It is even more imperative that courses in fundamental world politics be taught in high school, as the majority of high-school students fail to go on to college. The Department of Peace could help to develop these courses and provide information on our foreign policies and on the international organizations. It must also be remembered here that tolerance is developed before one becomes an adult, so the schools must try to help to develop tolerance.

Education for adults must also be offered more extensively. Many students fail to finish high school, but later realize their mistake. As adult education has been so sadly neglected, few have had a chance to learn about the affairs of the day. The Department of Peace could remedy this situation by developing an international educational program for adults.

The Department of Peace must also work with civic clubs since often they are influential in a community and could very easily become centers for distributing material for the communities.

Businessmen have a selfish reason for wanting to avoid war. Business profits are either lost during operation in wartime or during reconstruction, so businessmen naturally do not want war. There needs to be a study of business methods used in the world in order to understand why certain economic policies are desirable. Such understanding could easily lead to a better international economic system.

It is also up to industry to provide a better relationship between labor and management. Wages must be kept high enough in order to assure the worker of more than just bare necessities. The worker must also be able to educate his children. Providing such favorable conditions could also aid the capitalistic system as you don't find the demagogue gaining leadership in a happy and prosperous nation. So, the Department of Peace and business could work hand-in-hand.

The Department of Peace must also teach democracy. The best way to teach democracy is by contrasting our form of government with other governments. No other type of government is able to stand such comparison. This practice would lead to a stable form of government and a stable government has no place for revolutions or dictators. Too, it is an aid to peace while an unstable government is a constant threat to peace.

We must remember, however, behind all government action is public opinion. So, if certain policies lead us to war or destruction, we have no one but ourselves to blame. Even in a country with a dictatorship public opinion can be heard. That is why dictators so often must use ceremony and conquest in order to keep the support of their people. Public opinion is either asleep or awake, but always potentially powerful. It will be the job of the Department of Peace to present true facts to the people of the United States in order that they can form unbiased opinions.

Peace has made her challenge to us. I believe that the creation of a Department of Peace is an answer to that challenge. We must accept the challenge as "only a world of peace can be a world of righteousness and justice—and only that nation which is willing to leave no stone unturned in its world leadership toward peace can present to the world an effective and commanding leadership in this field."[1]

Appeal for a United States of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "An Appeal to Citizens of the United States of America for Support of a United States of Europe," with the names of the persons who signed the appeal.

There being no objection, the appeal and the names attached thereto were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPEAL TO CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SUPPORT OF A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Twice within our lifetime the national interest of the United States has demanded that we send the flower of our youth across the Atlantic to fight, to suffer, and to die for the peace and freedom of our mother continent.

Both cruel wars resulted mainly from Europe's disunion. And a third world war, springing from the same causes, lies as a threat to our peace and prosperity as long as Europe remains split up into isolated national units.

Nothing short of a European union, inspired by our American ideals of federalism and of democracy, can break this fatal chain of wars.

European union is possible, in spite of Europe's varied mother tongues and traditions. But it can come only if the European peoples who aspire to its attainment are given the aid and comfort in their aims which America's example and American good will can provide.

A united Europe would break down the trade barriers that cut through Europe's life lines, hampering its recovery and sabotaging its efforts to achieve prosperity. While respecting its member states' various democratic constitutions and traditions, the European union for which we stand would serve to protect all Europeans against the slaughter and torture they have known—against oppression and aggression; against concentration camps and dictatorships. It would release the nations of Europe from the crushing burden of competitive armament by setting up a federal police force.

The United Nations is destined to become the cradle and framework of such a United States of Europe. The League of Nations failed in its purpose because it attempted to organize a peaceful world around a disunited Europe. Warned by this costly experiment, the United Nations Charter recognizes the principle of regionalism, thus paving the way toward a United States of Europe. Such a united Europe, under the Security Council's supreme authority, would give additional force and stability to the World Organization by providing the groundwork for a good-neighbor policy toward the United States and the U. S. S. R.

The alternative to such a United Europe is a continent permanently divided into spheres of influence, and by an artificial and arbitrary line of barbed wire slashing across Scandinavia and Germany, across Austria and the Balkans. The permanent partition of Europe into hostile camps would inevitably draw east and west into the turmoil of conflicting interest and ideology, and, finally, into a world war of atomic horrors.

A divided Europe would also give the chance to a Fourth Reich to regain its lost power by assuming the role of balance-of-power arbiter between east and west. Within a United Europe, a German commonwealth would be no threat to its neighbors, and the German economy would be integrated in the continental system of free trade. The European police force would also release America and Russia from their heavy duties of occupation.

Only by a policy of economic union can Europe hope to repair rapidly the devastations of the war and pave the way to future mass prosperity by mass production. Only by such a policy can it overcome the present state of social unrest with its threat of revolution. A prosperous Europe would become our best market, increasing international trade and American wealth.

Politically and economically a divided Europe would constitute a permanent threat and a heavy burden—a United Europe would be a pillar of peace and a source of world-wide prosperity.

After the untold sufferings of this war, most Europeans favor the idea of a United States of Europe. But the peoples of a prostrate Europe feel too weak to start such a gigantic task without the moral encouragement and support that only the United States of America can provide.

It is up to us to assist the European peoples on this path toward union, peace, and prosperity which our own national interest demands they take.

After the sacrifices we have made to set Europe free, the use that is made of that freedom in seeking peace and prosperity must always be our concern. Technology has brought Europe and America close together; our own well-being is bound up inextricably with the well-being of the nations that border the Atlantic to the east. That ocean has become a bridge rather than a barrier; uniting, and not separating, two continents. Europe's future involves definitely our future. Europe's peace our peace, Europe's prosperity our prosperity, and Europe's freedom our freedom.

Let us, therefore, go ahead boldly and wisely, in the spirit of our forefathers who saw that in union there is strength, so that we may assure our own future by helping our parent nations to create a United States of Europe dedicated to liberty and peace.

James Truslow Adams, Most Rev. Karl J. Alter, Emily C. Balch, Percival Brundage, Hon. William C. Bullitt, Rev. Adelbert Chapman, Harry Woodburn Chase, Richard S. Childs, Norman F. Coleman, Frederick R. Coudert, Rev. C. W. Covey, George Creel, Rev. W. Lee Cutts, Hon. John W. Davis, George Denny, William J. Donovan, Stephen S. Duggan, Rev. H. C. Ed-

---

[1] Boyd, W. S., Hearings on International Affairs. H. R. 3628, p. 31.

dington, George A. Finch, Clayton Fritchey, Frank Gannett, Rev. Elbert E. Gates, Frederick W. Gehle, Harry D. Gideonse, Rev. James W. Graves, Albert Guerard, Robert I. Elder, Edna Fenell Haskins, Hon. Carl A. Hatch, Philip Hockstein, Hamilton Holt, Sydney Hook, Graeme K. Howard, Edith K. Isaacs, Oscar Jaszi, Rev. Vaughn M. Johnston, Hans V. Kaltenborn, James Kerney, Jr., John Y. Keur, Rev. Henry S. Leiper, Samuel M. Lewitas, Alice Roosevelt Longworth, Ernest O. Lothrop, Clare Booth Luce, Pauline Mandigo, John H. M. McPherson, Robert A. Millikan, Edgar A. Mowrer, Malcolm Muir, Rev. C. K. Newsie, Hon. F. H. Norcross, Joseph H. Park, Hon. Herbert Pell, Reginald Lang, Lewis Perry, Rev. Edward J. Pouls, Philip D. Reed, Rev. William Reid, Rev. A. W. Rogers, Jules M. Salmonowitz, Rev. Mark F. Sanborn, Wm. Y. Schieffelin, Henry D. Sedgwick, George N. Shuster, Lawrence Spivak, Rinehart Swenson, Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, Norman Thomas, Dorothy Thompson, Rev. John F. Vichert, Oswald O. Villard, Harold O. Voorhis, Eric M. Warburg, George E. Warren, Rev. Thomas Wearing, Paul Lester Wiener, Abraham Wilson, Mary E. Wooley, Rev. P. C. Wright, Arnold J. Zurcher, Franz Hirschland.

Violence at Army Bases in the Philippine Islands

REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have just received air mail from the Philippine Islands an Associated Press article written by Spencer Davis and published on the front page of the Manila Times of April 1, 1947. The article is entitled "Organized Gangs Wreak Havoc in United States Army Bases Here." I personally know nothing about these statements, but if they are even half true, the matter justifies prompt and proper action. The article presents a picture of violence, pillage, larceny, and corruption such as not heretofore seen in our generation. If true, it does not argue well for the new Philippine Republic which is having a difficult time. I hope every Member gives this article careful study and attention.

ORGANIZED GANGS WREAK HAVOC IN UNITED STATES ARMY BASES HERE—CONNIVANCE BY INSIDERS SEEN—PHILRYCOM ACTS

(By Spencer Davis)

The United States Army after 2 months of top priority planning, and the Philippine Government are taking forceful coordinated action to halt huge losses at Army supply depots in the Philippines.

Well organized gangs of pilferers and black marketeers in the year and a half since the war's end, according to reliable sources have inflicted staggering losses on supply depots with the connivance and sometimes active participation of some American officers and enlisted men as well as former servicemen working as civilians inside the bases.

Major General Moore, commanding general of Philrycom, for the past 4 months pointed out that shortly after his arrival plans to effectively halt depredations were under preparation and for the last 2 months has had top priority at headquarters. A little more than 2 weeks ago this program was put into action.

This has been the situation according to Army officers and other informants:

Army trucks manned by Filipinos have boldly passed in and out of heavily guarded depots with forged requisitions as their sesame.

In the month of February of this year looters were carrying off from an Army engineer sub-base depot on the outskirts of Manila heavy construction equipment and supplies approximating $50,000 to $100,000 each week.

In the same month security officers estimate the huge Quartermaster depot 17 at Quezon City suffered losses approximating $350,000 per week. When an order was issued holding depot commanders responsible for losses in their command 27 Filipinos were killed by security guards in a single week, 14 of them in a single night of blazing guns.

Last December Quartermaster depot No. 1 at the mouth of the Pasig River on the Manila waterfront lost between 200,000 and 300,000 pounds of prime beef which was described as spoiled by faulty refrigeration. Records show that refrigeration units at that base during December were never over 20 degrees and usually between 10 and 20 degrees Fahrenheit.

Port security officers have reported as high as one-third of their incoming shipments stolen. Innumerable trucks loaded with supplies off Army docks have failed to reach their destination with loads intact.

The Army installation on Engineer Island in Manila harbor has been looted of property conservatively estimated at more than $1,000,000 through the operation of one ring alone.

The Pacific air material area with Air Force supplies has taken a $10,000,000 or more beating.

Army security officers and investigators who made these facts known to me of their own volition, described the situation as a sickening mess.

In words of one colonel who refused to be identified "this would all come out on the floor of Congress one of these days."

The American taxpayer and the financially hard-pressed Philippine Republic are taking these losses on the chin. As one indication of what the Philippine Government has suffered with the knowledge if not direct involvement of some high functionaries there has been a semiofficial revision of the value of surplus property which the United States Government has turned over to the Republic. Property with a book value of $623,000,000 some 18 months ago is now estimated to be worth $100,000,000.

Part of the shrinkage is ascribed to depreciation but another large segment of the loss is due directly to brassy, open-handed embezzlement.

Within the past 2 weeks Maj. Gen. George F. Moore, commanding general of the Philippine Ryukyus command and President Roxas through their representatives have brought civil and military investigating agencies together for a joint offensive. Piecemeal investigations heretofore have proved ineffectual in combatting murder, graft, corruption, petit and grand larceny of buy and sell artists, hijackers, harbor pirates and their pay-off men who brazenly conducted their business over the soiled tablecloths of known Escolta Street coffee houses and in the flossy atmosphere of Manila night clubs.

A spokesman of President Roxas last week told me that the President was anxious for information on these illicit operations to come out "no matter who it involved."

Col. Angel Tuason, former Manila police chief has been the President's representative at coordinating conferences.

General Moore has turned over coordinating work to the new Philrycom operations officer, broadshouldered leather-necked Brig. Gen. George D. Shea, Augusta, Ga., late of the Eighty-sixth Division and former artillery officer of the Nineteenth Corps in the European theater of operations.

Shea has been ordered to close the gates to pilfering and he is convinced that in another 2 week "we will have it stopped."

Soviet and Yugoslav Officers Reported Settling in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report by an accurate observer on how the international Communist conspiracy directed from Moscow is following in one more country, Italy, its usual pattern of infiltration, division, confusion, in order to prepare for taking over—all under the fancy names of democracy, agrarian reform, liberalism, concern for the common people, and so forth.

The pattern was established in China beginning just 25 years ago. Chiang Kai-shek learned in 1927 from hard experience what its real nature was and is. Unfortunately most western peoples refused to wake up until about 1947. Some are still slumbering. Perhaps the struggle in Greece and the preparation to have Italy follow Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, and others into the fold of Russia's imperialism may assist in their belated awakening.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of April 18, 1947]

SOVIET AND YUGOSLAV OFFICERS REPORTED SETTLING IN ITALY

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—Russian and Yugoslav officers, camouflaged as business representatives, are known to have settled in many northern Italian cities, such as Milan, Turin, Florence and Genoa.

Using import or export businesses as window dressing, they are known to be in close touch with Communist headquarters and are preparing for the day when American troops leave and the signal is given to the Communists to undertake an active campaign for power.

Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito has concentrated a sizable force on Italy's borders. He has no intention of doing anything as long as there is even a thin curtain of American forces in Italy and as long as the Communists in Italy are merely agitating without using direct action. But many prominent Italians and foreigners believe that northern Italy, with its large and modern industries which suffered little damage from the war, is coveted by the Slavic bloc.

Militarily northern Italy is of paramount importance for the U. S. S. R. and her satellites. They want to establish direct contact between Trieste and Genoa and thus reach the French border.

Any military aggression, such as an invasion of Italy, seems to be precluded because the United Nations would react immediately. But if Palmiro Togliatti's party decides that democratic northern Italy must break away from the reactionary and royalist south, the situation might become very serious.

Italy became a united country less than 100 years ago. Before that it was divided into small states which frequently fought each other. Political observers here say it would not be difficult for a well organized group under the orders of a foreign power to divide the Italian Republic again. And it might be in order for a newly organized government in Milan or Turin to ask the Yugoslav Government to come to its aid in breaking away from the reactionary south.

This may seem far-fetched at the present time, but it is a matter which is being seriously discussed in many Italian and foreign quarters. The fact is that the Italian Government has no means at its disposal to deal adequately with any threat to the nation.

The Italian police force is weak and demoralized. So is the army, which is composed at the present time of only seven divisions, strewn the length and breadth of the country. The Italian Army and police combined in northern Italy would make a very poor showing against the well organized and well equipped Communist groups trained in guerrilla strategy.

The tragic economic conditions which prevail in Italy are playing into the hands of the Communists. The fear of what will happen tomorrow results in stagnation of Italy's economic life. People still work hard to obtain a meal a day for themselves and their families. But there is fear everywhere about what will happen when Togliatti inside Italy and Marshal Tito outside decide to show their hands.

Establishing a Peace Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. LOVE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay on world peace:

ESTABLISHING A PEACE DEPARTMENT

(By Eleanor Crigler, West Fairmont High School, First Congressional District)

The establishment of a Peace Department in the Cabinet would be the greatest achievement for the good of all mankind in the history of the United States. Its value to the world in general would be incalculable. It would start a new trend of thought toward peace throughout the entire world and will be an ideal and challenge to all nations.

Throughout all history humanity has been plagued by the terrible curse of war. As General Sherman once said, "War is hell" and during all time nations have discovered the truth of this statement. The greatest era of peace in the history of man was the Age of Pericles in which learning and culture reached the highest peak ever known. This Golden Age was broken only by the advent of the terrible Peloponnesian War. The civilization of Rome, another great period of advancement, was partly broken by the constant wars with the barbarians. The Aztecs in Mexico had reached another height in learning when they were destroyed by the Spanish. Each new war adds its horrors and terrors until it has been said that "Another war will be the end of modern civilization."

World War II has, of course, been the most terrible of all wars. One generation in Europe has been partially wiped out while the present one, the hope of the world, is stunted in growth and warped in mind. War brings destruction of cities, industry, and human lives. In its wake follows disease, famine, and moral deterioration. The cost to the United States was not as great as that of Europe, but it still was almost unbelievable. Three hundred billion dollars and 1,100,000 men were our contribution to this world catastrophe. Charles Sumner once said, "War is futile, senseless, savage, and is utterly inadequate to decide the question of right or wrong. War crushes with bloody heel all justice, all happiness, all that is godlike in man." With this in mind it seems that the promise of a lasting peace would be a shining light to all mankind.

Could all the money, time, and talent spent on the war be used for peaceful pursuits such as research in disease and industry, social problems, internal improvements, and so forth, another Golden Age would come upon this earth and benefit the people of all classes and creeds.

Since peace, therefore is so desirable, many plans have been formed to obtain it. Peace must, of course, be international as the attempt of the League of Nations showed. This was the idea of Woodrow Wilson, our twenty-eighth President. In his 14 points he set forth the principles which the United States should follow in order to keep peace. The failure of the United States to join the League of Nations, nearly killing the great man of peace, was the reason for the failure of the League. This concisely shows that we have the power to keep peace and should use it.

The United States stands definitely for peace. Since the other countries of the world look to us for leadership and an example, we must show where we stand and that we are not going to lapse into isolationism again. The inclusion of a Peace Department in our Cabinet will be a definite step on the road to a lasting peace.

The Peace Department will, of course, work with our hope for world peace, the United Nations organization. This will be its most important duty. But there are other plans for peace which should be incorporated into this main department: The work of Nelson D. Rockefeller in South America, the UNESCO, United Nations Educational Scientific Cultural Organization, whose aim is "to advance, through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world the objectives of international peace * * *," and the exchange of students and teachers with other countries. These organizations and many more are planned to help our people understand, tolerate, and comprehend the ideas of other nations. It will be the duty of the Peace Department to coordinate, enlarge, and direct these worth-while activities.

Since thoughts of war begin in the minds of man, it is in the minds of man that the peace must be constructed. The Peace Department must set up a program of teaching, not only in schools, colleges, and so forth, but through adult groups and civic organizations to combat ignorance, mistrust, and suspicion of others. People should study internal affairs, foreign languages, and political science in order to appreciate and understand problems of war and peace. Perhaps a training center for the Peace Department, such as the War Department's West Point or the Navy's Annapolis, could be established in which students could train as diplomats, teachers, and so forth. The work done at George Washington University is the nearest approach to this plan. The peace cannot be founded on a wholly political and economical basis but must also have foundation intellectually and morally.

The United States must have a Peace Department in the Cabinet. We must escape another war and build a lasting peace for generations to come, for as Anthony Eden said, "Another war might mean the end of modern civilization." This Government agency will stand as an example to other nations. It will show our definite decisions and attitudes toward peace. We can only hope that other countries will follow our example and create similar departments in their own government systems. The work done by these departments will be more effective than all treaties and agreements of peace ever written, for the people will be back of every move. The creation of a Peace Department in the Cabinet will be the United States' first constructive step toward another "Golden age."

"Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war."

Former Senator Robert L. Owen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the advent of statehood in Oklahoma, one of the two United States Senators elected to represent Oklahoma in the United States Senate was the Honorable Robert L. Owen. His long and distinguished career in the United States Senate is well known to everyone and the service he rendered to the new State of Oklahoma and to the Nation as a whole is a source of pride to everyone in Oklahoma, regardless of party affiliation. One of the outstanding measures sponsored by him was the Federal Reserve Act.

Although he has passed his ninetieth birthday, his brilliant mind and intellect are still keen and alert. His latest achievement is the invention of the global alphabet. This alphabet of phonetic nature has been worked out through his genius and was introduced before the Committee on Foreign Relations in the United States Senate about a year ago. It is the dream and prophecy of this great man that with this alphabet the people of any language in the world will be able to write their own language and print it stenographically. Only 1,200 words and their derivatives are necessary for day-to-day conversation.

Senator Owen is firmly of the belief that such a language will afford an opportunity for mutual understanding of various racial groups, and that such understanding will be a major factor in outlawing and abolishing war. As a part of my remarks, I include an article appearing in the Scottish Rite News Bulletin under date of March 20, 1947, likewise, a statement from the Underwood News appearing in the March–April 1947 edition:

[From the Scottish Rite News Bulletin of March 20, 1947]

LAUBACH FOR GLOBAL ALPHABET

In the Scottish Rite News Bulletin of October 21, 1946, there was an account of the

global alphabet invented by the former United States Senator, Robert L. Owen, head of the World Language Foundation, 2400 Sixteenth Street, Washington 9, D. C., a nonprofit, educational institution.

Senator Owen has now brought out his Global Alphabet Guide Book.

Dr. Frank C. Laubach, one of the world's outstanding authorities on languages, states: "If Senator Owen can wield enough influence to get his alphabet started, it has a chance of winning by sheer merit. It is the simplest, best alphabet I have ever seen."

This is indeed strong commendation coming from one of Dr. Laubach's acknowledged standing. For years he was a missionary of the Congregational-Christian Churches. He gave the Moros of the Philippines an alphabet and taught them how to read and write with the technique of "each one teach one." When the war came, he returned to the United States and obtained financial aid to go to South America and a similar technique was used in Mexico, Ecuador, and other Latin-American countries. Dr. Laubach, an alumnus of Princeton and 62, is now in Cairo, Egypt, where he is setting up literacy charts in 20 languages and dialects and is using his "each one teach one" method in the hope of eventually making Africa literate. He has used similar methods in India. He has spent more than 30 years in teaching millions of illiterates to read and write.

Dr. Laubach is also special counselor and representative, committee on world literacy and Christian literature, Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Thus, when Dr. Laubach places the seal of his approval on Senator Owen's global alphabet, he is speaking from first-hand knowledge of the subject.

Senator Owen feels that English is of right the language that should be universally known and used because 200,000,000 people, one-tenth of the world's population, speak it and, furthermore, most of the world's great books are to be found printed in English. Also, another 200,000,000 use English as a secondary language. This does not mean that any race or nation is to give up its native language—far from it. It merely means that this global alphabet will enable other people to learn to read, write, and speak English in from 4 to 6 months. In the same way, the native English-speaking peoples can learn any of a dozen languages in the same length of time by use of the same global alphabet.

The result of such international understanding, made possible by the ability to speak and write a common language, is seen as tremendous in helping abolish war and promoting world peace.

S. W.

WORLD LANGUAGE NOW POSSIBLE—GLOBAL KEYBOARD TYPEWRITER CONSTRUCTED

You may not live to see it, but some fine day in the future your grandchildren may be speaking the same language as our Russian, Chinese, Japanese, Spanish, and French neighbors—and liking it. And to make things stranger yet, they may all be writing alike. That, we would say, is the modern age ahead, but according to former Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma, not too far in the distance.

It has always been the dream of scholars and diplomats that the world could have one language for the human race. And now Senator Owen has completed a global alphabet which may mean the fulfillment of these dreams The latest is that our engineers have designed an Underwood keyboard for the global alphabet characters.

The global alphabet of phonetic nature was worked out through the genius of Senator Owen and was introduced before the Committee on Foreign Relations in the United States Senate about a year ago. Briefly there is a phonetic stenographic alphabet of 33 letters, using letters having one immutable primary sound of the human voice, with no silent letter, and the forms simplified to the last degree humanly possible for perfect legibility and speed in writing with a pen.

With this alphabet, the people of any language in the world can write their own language and print it stenographically. Only 1,200 words and their derivatives are necessary for day-to-day conversation. It has always been the belief that such a language affords an opportunity for mutual understanding of various racial groups, a big factor in abolishing war. Even ancient history will recall that the conflict of tongues stopped work on the Tower of Babel, and ever since, men have wanted to understand each other. Perhaps the global alphabet will make this possible.

Senator Owen has pointed out that Russia has made the most tremendous advance in overcoming illiteracy since the revolution in 1917. The revolution, he explained, resulted in the adoption of a 33-letter alphabet which any Russian could learn to read in one day, and by which an intensive educational campaign was carried on in Russia, going from the kindergarten to the elementary and high school, thence to the universities and, the technological laboratories and to the factories dealing with technological matters. "What has taken place in Russia," Senator Owen pointed out, "has removed the deadly blight of illiteracy in Russia." From the literacy of 9 percent, they have now developed a literacy of over 90 percent. So, Senator Owen designed his global alphabet with 37 letters as a result of a close study of Russia's situation.

Recently through close work with Senator Owen, the Underwood Type Department in Hartford designed a complete global keyboard, and the Senator now has three new Rhythm Touch Underwoods equipped with global type. Phonetically, the global typewriter can write with high speed any language in the world with 37 symbols.

The National Education Association Journal, January 1947 issue, in a communication from Frank Laubach, declares the global alphabet the best ever devised. Dr. Laubach represents 123 foreign mission societies of the United States and has taught 88 different nationalities how to read and write their own language with short phonetic alphabets which can be learned in 1 day. According to Senator Owen, he is the greatest man in the world in a war to abolish illiteracy.

It seems this new modern age is upon us, and if left to Senator Owen will be coming along faster and faster. He unhesitatingly says, "The world needs a million of these typewriters."

Moral Aspects of Use of the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by me, dealing with the moral aspects of the use of the atomic bomb. This article appeared in the magazine Air Affairs, which is an international quarterly journal, in their March 1947 edition.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORALS

(By United States Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS)

Probably no one would dispute that war and threats of force are illogical and therefore immoral ways of settling disputes among nations. After the din of battle has cleared away and the two exhausted combat teams have withdrawn from the field, no one can say without fear of being at least half wrong that anything was proved except, perhaps, that one side won and the other lost. And yet, while we recognize the lack of logic in war, the battle and the planning for battle are as much a part of our culture as the Bible, and accepted as hard facts to be reckoned with by any so-called civilized nation. Rationalized nationalism has lulled us to sleep with the familiar notion that, while we would not, of course, make war, we must nevertheless watch out for the other fellow. The other fellow meanwhile is getting ready for us, and suspicion spirals to bloodshed. Killing to redeem the honor of the state is tacitly accepted as right conduct, the question of which side is being justified for fighting amounting to simply which side we are on.

Once war itself is accepted as proper conduct, what we have come to know as total war is inevitable. And atomic war is total war carried to its illogical extreme. There is no escape from this conclusion. Indeed, the self-styled realist may scoff at the very idea of injecting into the mass of material that has been written upon the morality of the use of poison gas, and other chemicals and biologicals, a discussion of any ethical guide for the use or nonuse of atom bombs. The bomb itself, it might be said, proves the futility of moral standards. Does not this most terrible weapon prove that if a nation would preserve its conception of right, it must be physically strong? Is not self-preservation the first law of nature? After all, says the man from the front, war is war, and there is no use being prissy about it. Shall we kill or be killed—it's as simple as that.

Though warfare has always been of the last-ditch variety—a fight to the finish—probably no one has believed that rational intelligent humankind would act so illogically, so immorally, so stupidly, as to prove this hypothesis. The universal acceptance of man's inherent intelligence has precluded adoption of the idea that such a course would be practically conceivable. What happened at Hiroshima, however, made what has been a fine-spun theory a ghastly, terrible possibility. In a few hours, with relatively little advance planning, a nation using atom bombs could wipe another nation off the earth. This is no longer built on suppositions; it is actually as grim as life itself.

We need not delude ourselves into looking for possible defenses. We are assured by competent scientists, and there has been no contradition, that no adequate defense exists. Even so, the bomb itself is final proof that the creations of man have become superior to the very matter from which the brain itself is constructed. Undoubtedly even more terrifying tools of death can and will be conceived and perfected. The answer to physical force ends with more force, we had better give up because there are no limitations to the means of destruction. Nor can we hide behind the fact that no other nation has, at the present time, the formula. We are assured by the very men who perfected the weapon that it is only a matter of time before others will find the secret. The basic materials are common knowledge in the scientific world.

What has been made physically possible by the atom bomb will have our implied

ethical sanction if the conscience of mankind continues on its downstream trend. We have developed in the last generation in geometric proportions our callousness to human values and human suffering. In 1904, in the Russo-Japanese War, General Nogi of the Japanese Army performed one of the most notable acts in all the history of warfare when, in a battle to capture Port Arthur, he sacrificed several brigades of men and his own sons in order to capture a certain strongly defended hill. He wanted the hill so that he could direct his artillery fire against the Russian naval base. He could have fired over the hill without taking it, but refused because blind fire would have endangered innocent noncombatants. Less than 30 years later, it was the Japanese who first practiced wanton deliberate killing of massed civilians by the bombing of Chapei, a suburb of Shanghai. Then there followed the rape of Nanking, and Pearl Harbor. What happened to the conscience of the Japanese people during those years was also happening to our own. During the First World War, we were horror stricken by the first accounts of such new weapons as the bomb dropped from an airplane, the machine-gun, the poison gas. Indiscriminate submarine attacks so provoked our sense of dignity that they became a real factor toward our entering the conflict. We were even then told that war would be impossible in the future because it had been made so deadly and effective. How many of us stop to realize that we, once the defenders of humanity, and the foremost advocates of international law, have unleashed a weapon which actually wipes out whole cities at a time? Something, indeed, has happened to us, and who is there to say that it is not worse, even, than military defeat. Has there been a terrible weapon invented that has not brutalized its users? Surely what is happening in the physical realm cannot compare in significance with what is happening in men's minds. We are certainly approaching the point where the bomb's use would find justification of some kind, though it would lead eventually to our own destruction. That there can be moral sanction for such completely illogical acts, among thoughtful men, is unthinkable.

A moral principle is not an ethereal concept having no relation to life or living. It is instead founded on human relationships and exists to promote human betterment. It is generally accepted, for example, that telling a deliberate falsehood to deceive is ethically wrong. Not because a mysterious power from afar has enjoined us from lying is it wrong, but because society could not exist based upon falsehood. The lie is based upon the major premise that men usually tell the truth. If men did not usually tell the truth there could be no lie, because the wrong statement would not mislead, and if men could not rely on representations as truth, intercourse between men would necessarily cease. The major premise, it is wrong to lie, is based upon social necessity. The principle finds its roots in the fact that a lying society would be chaos. Equally clear is the same reasoning applied to atom bombs. The real ethical prohibition against their use and the weapons to which their use will inevitably lead, finds its basis in that such conduct will end in annihilation. We may shrug our shoulders, but we cannot escape reality. The position is of our own making.

In many ways, the world we have today is like the world implied in Cicero's great orations against Catiline. Catiline, a choice heir among the youths of Rome, had all the opportunities available to anyone, yet he deliberately chose wrong. Is the world, too, deliberately to choose evil? We can either live blindly, nonchalantly, dangerously, in a world which threatens at any moment to destroy us—or driven by necessity, we can rise to a new level of social responsibility and mark the beginning of a new period of human relationships. The nations of the earth will make a choice based upon reason and ethical principles—or they will perish.

Funeral Sermon for the Late John J. Cochran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the funeral sermon for the late John J. Cochran, a former Member of this body, delivered by the Right Reverend John J. Butler at St. Leo's Church in St. Louis, Mo., on March 10, 1947:

"I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. As to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the just judge will render to me in that day: and not only to me, but to them also that love His coming." (II Timothy 7: 8.)

This second letter to Timothy was probably written by St. Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, during the time of his last imprisonment at Rome, and not long before his martyrdom. In this epistle he instructs and admonishes Timothy in what belonged to his office and also warns him to shun the conversation of those who erred from the truth, describing at the same time their character. He tells him of his approaching death and desires him to come to him speedily. It was in a way a farewell message to Timothy and his other disciples and the members of the church for which St. Paul had suffered so many hardships and for which he was soon to follow in the footsteps of Jesus Christ and give up his life.

In the few words which I have quoted, St. Paul refers to his life as a fight—yes, a battle for God, for truth, for the doctrine of his Master, Jesus Christ. A fight which started on the road to Damascus when he was struck blind and heard the voice say to him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" It came to an end only when he gave up his life as a martyr defending truth.

St. Paul was anxious to impress on Timothy, his disciples, and those entrusted to their spiritual care, as well as to all others who were to follow in their footsteps in future ages the meaning of the sacrifices that they would be called upon to make in order that they might spread truth. He wanted them to realize that no sacrifice made in the cause of truth would be in vain, and that all who fought the good fight and kept the faith would be rewarded when their course has been finished by the just judge with the crown of life, which means happiness with God in heaven for all eternity.

Today, we bow our heads in reverent tribute to the memory of Jack Cochran, for whose soul we have just offered the holy sacrifice of the mass, and whose mortal remains will receive in a few minutes the last blessing of mother church before being carried to Calvary, there to be laid to rest under the cross of Christ. With heavy hearts, sorrowful souls, and eyes dimmed with tears we meet here today. Had I the eloquence of Cicero or the ability of the greatest poet who ever lived, I could not add one star to the crown that Jack richly deserves. I believe truthfully that he could repeat with pride as he was nearing the brink of eternity after a life so well spent, a life so useful and effective in the interest of his fellow neighbor, his country, and above all—his God—"I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith"—and I also believe that the just judge will bestow upon him the crown of life which he has so justly earned.

He was one of us. He loved St. Leo's where he spent a great part of his childhood—his family having moved to this neighborhood a few weeks after his birth in Webster Groves. He often recalled for me some events in his childhood, especially his attendance at holy mass here with his dear mother, who taught him to lisp for the first time the sweet name of Jesus, and the day he received in this church for the first time our dear Lord in the most holy eucharist with a thrill of joy which no other experience can ever surpass.

I am convinced that he had a true appreciation of the virtue of charity, upon which all virtues are based—faith, hope, and charity, but the greatest of these is charity—and in his own humble busy life that virtue was very active, for he made an honest effort to follow the words of St. Luke: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul, and thy neighbor as thyself." (Luke 10: 27.)

At an early age he started to work, and as idleness was not in his vocabulary he forged forward with marvelous success, which was the reward of industry and attention to duty. These characteristics became the rule of his life and had much to do with his success in the Halls of Congress. Somebody has well said, "He began hustling for the little people when he first viewed the Potomac back in 1913. He's been hustling ever since." He fought for the truth in season and out of season, in the Halls of Congress, and any other place where he could secure an audience.

With the courage of a soldier and the patience of a saint he overcame physical handicaps that other men would consider insurmountable. Several major operations did not deter him. In the hospital he was cheerful and busy. When his friends urged him to take it easy and thought their arguments were convincing, they learned later that he was back on the firing line busy as ever. His interest in the afflicted and his zeal to help, forgetful of his personal suffering, are so well described in his own words in a three-page letter written by his own hand just before Christmas 1943, when he was making preparations to go to an institution in New York to be instructed in the use of his artificial limbs—I quote: "If I can get so I can walk with crutches, in time it will turn to canes. How I would like to do it, and then I would have plenty of time encouraging those disabled like I am. I have met some who have learned to walk, but it took them years. How I would like to have money that I could spend to help the afflicted. I know some rich men in this country, and I am going to try to sell them the idea. They cannot take it with them, so why not do something for those unfortunates who need help? In the last analysis, they became disabled fighting to protect them and their money. Why not reward them by setting up a dozen or more institutions like the one in New York? Endow them—thus helping those to whom they are obligated. Thank God I have a disposition that enables me to refrain from worry. In the hospital I would go around and cheer up the afflicted. In the end the doctors told me I had assisted several men. When they looked at me with no legs, they had nothing to complain about. The nurses used to tell me to call on some fellow and cheer him up. I would do it. I

figure the good Lord let me stick around for a purpose."

Jack Cochran loved God, he loved his Catholic faith. He loved his neighbor, he loved his city and State. He loved his country—but above all he loved his God. He had a deep appreciation of the holy sacrifice of the mass and prayer. His letters to me always ended with a request for a prayer. A request for masses for his friends who had passed away came as soon as he learned of their deaths—frequently with a request that I go to the wake and console in his name the bereaved.

St. Louis has lost a great leader. In his sight all were children of God and neighbors. Though his body is dead, his soul still lives.

To the relatives of Jack, may I extend in the name of the clergy, religious, and laity our heartfelt sympathy in your sad hours and may God grant you strength and courage to bear up under your grief.

It is our earnest prayer that God has already accepted his unselfish deeds performed during his busy active worth-while life and welcomed him with the words, "Well done, good and faithful servant, because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will place thee over many things: enter thou into the joy of the Lord." (Matthew xxv: 21).

So, dear Jack, with you dear brothers and sisters, your fond relatives, your friends and pals I bid you farewell, but not forever. We pledge to keep your memory ever green. For all you have done for us, your district, your city, your State, and your Nation, we in return will try in our own way to repay you in our masses, our holy communions, and our prayers as long as God blesses us with our faculties.

May God grant you eternal rest, and may a perpetual light shine upon you.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated April 16, 1947, from Capt. Nishan der Hagopian, on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey. Captain der Hagopian is a reputable and popular lecturer on Near East questions.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 16, 1947.*
THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I speak with these words to the United States Senators of America, the greatest lawmakers of democracy. Our forefathers who have pledged justice to all humanity, and brotherhood of man.

In the first place, it is wrong to compare the Turks with the Greeks. The Grecians for thousands of years have stood for democracy and cherish justice to all fellowmen. Since when have the Turks had the love for democracy? They have been international gangsters for centuries among the European nations. When they conquered the Dardanelles the middle of the fourteenth century they have caused jealousy, hatred, and war. This is a historical monument in the civilized world.

Today we wish to repeat the history by giving our aid to gracious Turkey. This will cause or strengthen the Turkish position to further their ambitious as a buffer state as it has been in the past. Therefore how can we trust them?

The climax is this: Our helping the Turks at this time will destroy the Armenian cause. I believe you are aware of the fact this martyr nation is preparing now their just cause to lay on the altar of the UNO.

For the last 50 years our great men like Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Senator King, of Utah, thousands of laymen, and other great Americans stood fast for the justice of Armenia.

It was not so long ago that we Americans witnessed the horror of the Turkish massacre during the First World War. In 1915 deportations into the desert totaled 1,500,000 Armenians slaughtered. This is the undeniable truth you have witnessed in your own time.

Here is another true fact. One hundred thousand young girls were left in the harems of the Turks and in addition to that 100,000 orphans from 2 to 7 were snagged into Turkish homes. Perhaps we are asking these unfortunate orphans to defend our democracy by giving $150,000,000. Gentlemen, do you think God will be pleased with this kind of an act? Since then our American educational institutions, missionary churches, Armenian monasteries, churches, and the homes, property, wealth was all confiscated by the unreasonable Turks. These are the facts, gentlemen, that will remain down through the history of mankind. Therefore, I would like to have the opportunity and pleasure to be among you to challenge the Turks.

I ask you, why did President Coolidge in 1924 make a trade pact with the Turks that doomed the Armenian cause a few years after the Izmirna horrible massacre had shattered the imagination of civilized man in 1921. Furthermore, the only remnant of the nation left throughout Turkey is approximately 200,000. This sealed the minority freedom throughout the Turkish empire.

The last 25 years we have not heard a decent communication from Turkey to their relation outside the world. We do not know whether they are free or they are worshipping something else. Also, it has been prohibited for outside visitors to enter the homeland. This has been the rigid policy of the Turks for the last 25 years. Is this democracy of Turkey?

Gentlemen, do you believe and approve of this dictatorial act imposed upon these Christian people. Now you are offering the gracious aid as if the honorable Turks deserve this wonderful gift from America. Remember, if there is a justice in heaven, there should be one on earth.

This might be food for thought, but let us analyze racial differences between the Turks and the Armenians. For instance, the last 60 years, approximately a quarter of a million Armenian immigrants came to the United States of America. Every one of these refugees had seen massacre at least three times in their lives. They have made marvelous progress with adapting themselves to the American way of life and received the highest education. Some of them became professors of universities, scientists, writers, businessmen, artists, and many of them became millionaires, but the beautiful part is they all became loyal citizens of the United States of America. Their younger generation in the First World War served the country that they loved. They have built several hundred churches throughout the country for their own belief. In this last global war their sons and daughters served the Stars and Stripes, and many have received citations and the highest honors. Now, gentlemen, how many Turks have you in this country that have accomplished anything to compare with this?

These are the outstanding facts. I leave it to your imagination. What makes the American love for the Turks?

Quotation from Matthew, chapter 7, verse 6: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet and turn again and rend you."

Another quotation from the Holy Bible, Hebrews 10: 30, 31: "For we know Him that hath said vengeance belongeth unto Me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, the Lord shall judge his people. But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions."

Now, gentlemen, you must not forget this martyr nation. Also the tears and blood they have shed for centuries. Remember the judgment of God.

Very truly yours,

NISHAN DER HAGOPIAN.

"The Federal Excise Taxes on Freight Shipments, Passenger Tickets, Long-Distance Telephone Calls, and Telegraphed Messages Are Grossly Inequitable, Utterly Unjust, and Discriminatory in Their Unequal Application to Various Sections of the Country, Especially to the Far West—and They Must Be Changed" —*Justus F. Craemer*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, of all of the wartime excise taxes, the levy upon freight shipments, passenger tickets, long-distance telephone calls, and telegraphed messages are the most unfair, unjust, and least defensible of all of the revenue-raising measures that are upon our statute books. Yet the Congress does nothing to relieve the situation. It is high time that something be done.

In the hope that the country may be aroused to a consciousness of the utterly unfair character of these particular excise taxes, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD of this day's proceedings a very able article on this subject from the capable pen of the Honorable Justus F. Craemer, an article which first appeared in the January issue of California, the magazine of the Pacific, as it is known throughout the West.

The author of this most timely article is, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, an outstanding citizen of California, one who is now serving his State with distinction as a member of the California Utilities Commission. A life-long student of government, he is especially well qualified to write on the highly technical subject of taxation, the subject to which he addresses himself.

The article to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

IT'S TIME TO ELIMINATE TAX INEQUALITIES

(By Justus F. Craemer, member, California Public Utilities Commission)

Our Boston forefathers held a celebrated tea party to protest against unjust taxation.

Thousand of shippers in the West today feel that it's about time a western barbecue was held to protest against the unfair and discriminatory tax burden carried by the Western States just because they happen to be farther away from the great consuming markets than other Commonwealths.

A part of our tax burden is grossly inequitable and punitive, speaking mildly—so unfair, indeed, that it is amazing to understand why the voices of western citizens have not already raised a tremendous roar of protest reaching the ears of Congress.

I refer specifically to the Federal tax levy on freight shipments and the heavy Federal taxes imposed upon rail tickets to and from the West as well as the Federal levy on our long-distance telephone calls and telegraph messages.

Perhaps the reason why the welkin has not been shattered by such protests is because the seller's market predominated during the war and immediately thereafter; but today we are in a transition period and the sands of a seller's market are steadily running out. Today the motto is "Start using sales technique," because buyers are becoming coy. Thus, tax discrimination against the West forces consideration of taxes upon us more compellingly. It is beginning to hit the westerner in the worst of all possible places—his pocketbook. The buyer's market adds to the impact of tax inequities.

In no other fields of taxation is a western citizen so discriminated against as those enumerated. Presumably, Federal taxes are levied upon each citizen of each State with a bland impartiality which he pays, more or less gracefully, on the ground that his Uncle Sam is a square shooter. He believes that while taxes may be high he shouldn't grumble too much since Joe Doakes, of Tuscaloosa, pays the same rate on the same basis, and Nellie Brown, of Oshkosh, does the same.

But this is not true, and the fact that it is not true is what causes a westerner to grow red around the gills and tugs at his collar to relieve his blood pressure.

Let's take a look at the record to see exactly how adversely we are affected.

DISCRIMINATION PLUS

Since commodity transportation taxes are assessed at the rate of 3 percent of the transportation charges, an orange grower shipping a carload of oranges from Lake Wales, Fla., to New York would pay $371 in shipping charges as against a shipping charge of $701 by a Pomona grower shipping the same carload. No one will quibble over the difference in transportation cost based upon the length of haul, since a service is involved here, but the Lake Wales shipper would pay only $11.73 for taxes upon his carload, while the Pomona man would pay a tax of $21.03. This is where the discrimination comes in.

The question immediately arises as to what extra services the Nation performs for the Californian as compared with the Floridian, which would account for the fact that the westerner pays almost twice the tax that the Floridian pays on an identical carload of oranges. Let's take another one:

Maine produces good potatoes and so does California. New Yorkers enjoy eating the spuds from either section. The Caribou, Maine, grower can ship his carload of potatoes to New York, paying a transportation tax of $7.50, but when a Shafter, Calif., grower sends his identical carload to New York he pays an $18 tax—a little more than twice as much as his Maine competitor, and so it goes all down the line.

A Harrisonburg, Va., shipper sends lettuce to New York and so does the lettuce-bowl grower of Salinas Valley, but the Harrisonburg grower, shipping his product to New York, pays a tax of $6.42 on a carload as against $14.58 taken from the pockets of the Salinas man.

New Orleans ships sugar and so does Crockett, Calif. The New Orleans sugar refiner can ship his sugar to Chicago and pay a tax of $11.52, but when the Crockett refiner ships a similar carload of sugar to the same destination the tax is $19.20.

NO REASON

No sound reason can be advanced by anyone why this should be true, but the tragedy for the Western shipper, as well as every Westerner, is that it is true.

And it is true in reverse also. The Western farmer who purchases a tractor, a truck, an automobile, or piece of farm machinery has to pay a greater tax bill on his freight charge for the manufactured product shipped to him from the eastern production center than the farmers of, for example, Ohio, Minnesota, or any other State geographically nearer the factory.

Example after example of discrimination can be offered. The Alexandria, La., lumberman ships his carload of lumber to New York and pays a tax of $9, but to the Eureka, Calif., lumberman pays $13.80 in taxes on a comparable carload to the same market.

Now, of course, there are only two ways in which such taxes on products can be recovered—one, from the ultimate consumer; the other, straight from the pockets of the shipper. If the tax is to be paid by the ultimate consumer it simply means that the western producer cannot compete on the basis of parity with producers from other sections of the Nation which, fortuitously, happen to lie closer to the large consumer markets. If the second happens, and the taxes are recovered from the shipper, then it simply means that the cost of goods produced by a westerner is greater because of the differential in tax than for the Louisianan, or the Missourian, or the Kentuckian, or the residents of more than 3 dozen other States—simply because our Uncle Sam, who is supposed to dispense evenhanded justice in tax matters, has stubbed his toe on this one.

This is only part of the story.

TOUGH ON TOURISTS

Assume you are a New Yorker, with winter approaching, and you feel you would like to bask in the sunshine, either in Miami, Fla., or sunny California. You visit the rail ticket station and find that to travel round trip, New York to Los Angeles, with a Pullman lower, it will cost you $174.90 in fare; and to make the same type of trip, New York to Miami, would cost you $89.40 in fare. The fare is based upon the haul and service, and there is no complaint on this ground, but on your trip to Los Angeles and back your tax is $26.23, while on the Miami trip it is $13.42, or just about half as much as far as taxes are concerned, and there is no reason under the sun why this should be so.

The same situation applies with equal force to the communications picture. A flat 25-percent tax on long-distance telephone calls penalizes the western shipper and businessman in competing for markets with the citizens of other States closer to the East. For every $100 spent on telephone tolls, the westerner pays $25, but the tax is decreased proportionately as the telephone user is closer to the point called.

The discrimination goes on down the line and applies to the type of taxes based upon services whose cost is predicated upon length of haul, as in shipping, communications, rail and Pullman fares.

The end result of this entire sorry situation is that the westerner is penalized when he endeavors to market his commodities to the people farther away, or to attract tourist business from outside his own section of the country, or even when buying the products of the eastern manufacturer.

The problem is one for western delegates in Congress. Their effort to remove or minimize the continued overcharge of western service should receive the strong support of every citizen of the Western States.

It may be true that, because of the heavy national debt, the Government should seek heavy tax revenue, and no one can object to the present need for taxes, but certainly we can object to a tax situation which places our Western States on an unfair competitive level.

I have been fighting this discrimination for several years, and shall continue to fight it vigorously.

A tax that completely disregards all sound theories for equitable distribution of tax burden is a bad tax.

It must be changed.

* * * * * *

HERE'S HOW THE TAX WORKS

A glance at the following table shows how the Federal tax on transportation charges operates to the definite financial detriment of the westerner. Figures utilize California shipments for comparison, but the inequality of tax impact is proportionally applicable to any other Western State in the use of long-haul transportation:

Destinations	Commodity (single car iced except*)	Transportation taxes
To New York from—		
Lake Wales, Fla.	Oranges	$11.73
Edinburg, Tex.	do	18.03
Pomona, Calif.	do	21.03
Caribou, Maine	Potatoes	7.50
Harlingen, Tex.	do	16.83
Shafter, Calif.	do	18.00
Fort Valley, Ga.	Peaches	12.27
Benton Harbor, Mich.	do	12.57
Yuba City, Calif.	do	19.89
Webster, N. Y.	Pears	6.06
Benton Harbor, Mich.	do	8.67
Santa Clara, Calif.	do	20.01
Shelby, Mich.	Plums	13.26
Newcastle, Calif.	do	20.19
Penn Yan, N. Y.	Grapes	8.40
Sandusky, Ohio	do	10.35
Lodi, Calif.	do	19.89
Harrisonburg, Va.	Lettuce	6.42
Salinas, Calif.	do	14.58
Alexandria, La.	Lumber*	9.00
Eureka, Calif.	do	13.80
Le Sueur, Minn.	Canned foods*	14.04
Oconomowoc, Wis.	do	11.16
Stockton, Calif.	do	20.70
To Chicago from—		
New Orleans, La.	Sugar*	11.52
Crockett, Calif.	do	19.20
To Denver from—		
Chicago, Ill.	Structural iron* and steel	18.18
Torrance, Calif.		22.86
To Lawrence, Mass., from—		
Columbus, Ohio	Wool in grease*	6.84
Willows, Calif.	do	18.21

AND HERE'S WHAT IT COSTS

Estimated transportation taxes paid on California fruits and vegetables shipped to markets, Denver and East, in 1946, and prospective taxes on same number of cars in 1947 based on average charged to all destinations. The table does not show the taxes paid on other abundant California products such as lumber, canned goods, rice, wool, nuts, dried fruits, etc.

Commodity	Number of cars	Estimated average per car transportation tax		Total tax	
		In 1946	In 1947 [1]	In 1946	In 1947 [1]
Fruits:					
Apples	1,800	$15.00	$16.50	$27,000	$29,700
Grapefruit, lemons, and oranges	56,000	17.00	19.00	952,000	1,064,000
Grapes	17,000	16.50	18.20	280,500	309,400
Pears	2,600	16.50	18.20	42,900	47,320
Other fruits	10,600	16.50	18.20	174,900	192,920
Total	87,000			1,477,300	1,643,340
Vegetables:					
Carrots	9,000	13.50	14.80	121,500	133,200
Cantaloups and white melons	14,000	14.00	16.30	196,000	214,200
Celery	6,800	13.80	15.20	93,840	103,360
Lettuce	31,000	13.00	14.20	403,000	440,200
Potatoes	24,000	13.00	14.20	312,000	340,800
Other vegetables	22,200	13.00	14.20	288,600	315,240
Total	107,000			1,414,940	1,547,000
Grand total tax				2,892,240	3,190,340
Increase in tax					298,100

[1] Increase due to raise in freight rates and charges.

Kidding the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the Washington Daily News of April 16, 1947:

Pressure from Government agencies may raise the cost of living still further. But if President Truman talks often enough about bringing prices down he may shift the blame.

If Congress really wanted to lower the cost of living, and had the political courage, it could pull enough of the Government's supports out from under the prices of farm products to bring about a noticeable decline.

Such action would do more to lower the consumer's outlay for necessities than any number of press-conference challenges to business and free enterprise.

Another thing that keeps the cost of living up is Government buying of grains and other commodities to ship to needy countries abroad. This aid ought to be continued. But business is not to blame for its effect on prices.

Mr. Truman may not be trying to conceal either of these Government pressures for higher prices, but sooner or later, if he goes on talking about lower prices, he will have to admit that the largest single share of responsibility for the higher cost of living lies with the Government.

Many concerns are making large profits and could cut prices. The cuts, though, would be mainly in a list of manufactured articles which don't figure as largely in the cost of living as those commodities whose prices the Government supports or influences through its export buying.

Take wool, for example. Men's clothing prices have increased more sharply than those of women's clothing, because men wear more wool. There's a great surplus of wool, but the Government has been supporting the price of wool so long it has accumulated nearly a year's supply. It has kept prices so high that nearly 3 pounds of foreign wool go into cloth for every pound of domestic wool, and these 3 pounds pay a duty.

Agriculture Secretary Anderson said he would discontinue price support for wool, but the Senate has passed a bill to continue it at the 1946 level, though with a provision by which the Government would be allowed to sell at a loss.

The Government has been supporting the butter and egg market, but a good many producers are convinced the policy will lead to overproduction in the end, with losses to everybody in the business.

Supports for dairy products are most complex. In this field the Government aids the operation of cartels in the metropolitan milk markets. The Government is opposed to cartels only in industries not connected with farming.

Support of the potato market involved the destruction of large quantities of potatoes.

Price increases have been greatest in farm products. These bulk largest in the cost of living. And the Government supports many of the prices there, either by Commodity Credit machinery or by buying for export.

Grains, livestock, and poultry increased most of all, over 200 percent from 1939. Lumber and foods come next, around 150 percent. Get down to manufactured goods like autos, and the increases have been on the order of 50 percent.

The Government has made a heavy commitment to the farmers in the form of parity, but Mr. Truman at least would appear better informed, if he recognized what the Government itself is doing to keep the cost of living high.

Not so many people would think they were being kidded.

In analyzing this article, I call your attention to: First. "If Congress really wanted to lower the cost of living and had the political courage, it could pull enough of the Government's supports out from under the prices of farm products to bring about a noticeable decline."

Surely Congress could repudiate its promises and commitments but it most assuredly should not.

Second. The fact that "Government buying of grains and other commodities to ship to needy countries abroad. This aid ought to be continued. But business is not to blame for its effect on prices" presents a viewpoint that is most assuredly true. When one-third of any crop is purchased and taken off the domestic market for export one can expect a strengthening of prices.

Third. The reference to wool will be clarified when the wool bill is up for consideration. The support price on wool happens to be below the cost of production and the main reason the American wool producer is in distress is because the world wool monopoly operated by John Bull is breaking the American market. So long as there is only $3 worth of wool in a $100 suit other factors than price support must be considered.

Fourth. Price supports of farm products does not mean high food or agricultural prices. Supports of farm prices means a guarantee of so much per hour for producing these foods. Price supports can and should mean adequate supply of food at reasonable prices.

Fifth. There is not any doubt but what there has been a nonpartisan commitment to the farmers, so the articles state. There is no doubt but what President Truman has the power and the funds to control most any commodity market. His administration has put the American fur-farming industry on the rocks. If President Truman put the fur farmer formula into operation, he can also ruin other groups of producers of farm products and put them in the same position that they have the fur farmers of America today.

There are only 8,000 fur farmers and only a few people are included, so it would not be so politically expedient to extend this formula to crops and products where thousands and millions are involved.

Sixth. The American farmer has never asked for any legislative advantage over any group. He expects his Government to fulfill its legislative commitment. In 1943–44 this administration did not fulfill the commitments made under the Steagall amendment. The result was that the LaFollette-Taft amendment was adopted that compelled the administrative leaders to follow the provisions of law that had already been enacted.

No, and many no's. No one should try to influence the administration leaders to go back on the commitments and provisions of the Steagall amendment. There is no floor price on butter. There is no announced floor price on milk. It appears it is a secret because the Secretary has not announced it. There is a cellar instead of a floor price on dried skim of 10 cents per pound on a product with 35.6 percent protein, even though the OPA in its magnanimity did allow it to sell for 45 percent more, or 14.5 cents per pound. Milk in the Midwest has already had a reduction in price of $1 to $1.25 per hundredweight. Those producers did not get any publicity for taking this reduction in price. They also now pay 20 percent more for what they buy than they did when they received 20 to 25 percent more for what they produced. This shows that the dairymen of America have absorbed more than their share of the readjustment and, this being the fact, they should not now be asked to have the rug jerked out from under their economic feet, the same as has been done to the fur farmers by the present administration.

Is the United States, the Last Stronghold of Free Enterprise, Going To Benefit From Participation in the International Trade Organization, a Plan Which Proposes That World Trade Shall Be Controlled by an International Commission?—The Agricultural Council of California Believes That No Benefit Will Accrue to the Nations of the World From an International Share-the-Wealth Program Which Denies the American People the Right To Make Through Their Congress the Basic Decisions Affecting Their Own Economic Welfare. The Idea Is Revolutionary

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as the views of the Agricultural Council of California and the 70,000 California farmers and their families who compose it, in respect to the proposed International Trade Organization, are of most timely importance, I ask unanimous consent that the documents in which their position is revealed, each one on the official stationery of this highly influential western agricultural organization, may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

And in so doing, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that Mr. Ralph H. Taylor, whose name appears frequently in the correspondence, is, perhaps, the foremost spokesman for western agriculture in these troublous times. There is no one in his field who is held in higher respect or warmer affection—and justly so.

Mr. Speaker, the documents to which I have just referred—two letters and an official statement—are the following:

AGRICULTURAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA,
Sacramento, Calif., April 5, 1947.

Hon. BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEARHART: We believe the enclosed "statement by the Agricultural Council of California, presented March 10, 1947, at hearing in connection with the proposed charter of an international trade organization," will be of interest to you as indicating the policy of the council, which represents about 70,000 California farmers and their families.

The accompanying letter, addressed to Mr. Clair Wilcox, of the Department of State, is to follow up the earlier inferences at the hearing in San Francisco that the statement did not represent the official view of the council.

This is very important to us, and we hope you can find time to familiarize yourself with this statement and assist our growers in the important matter of preserving for our California farmers an even break in our own domestic markets.

Very sincerely yours,

R. H. TAYLOR,
Executive Secretary.

AGRICULTURAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA,
Sacramento, Calif., March 24, 1947.

Mr. CLAIR WILCOX,
Director, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILCOX: Yours of March 18 is before me. I appreciate your kindness in including my wire of March 12 in the record of the San Francisco hearings.

With reference to the second paragraph of your letter, may I say that I am sorry that Mr. Knight was not in a position to answer some of the questions which might have been put to him by your panel. If I had been there, there would have been no question about it, but preparation for a meeting of the council on March 13 and 14 and important legislative conferences here, which could not be changed, prevented my personal appearance in support of the statement. Mr. Knight has only recently joined the Council's staff and his statement at the hearing that he was unprepared to answer questions was not any indication of unwillingness at all but was due to his lack of knowledge of the earlier policy actions of the Council which were involved in the statement which he read.

Had the legislature not been in session, the writer would have been present and happy to answer any questions you had in mind; in fact, if you have any such, we shall be more than glad to answer them by mail, should you care to submit them that way.

Reports from some of those present at the hearing indicated that the question was raised—indirectly, if not directly—as to whether the statement Mr. Knight read on behalf of the Council represented the official view of the Council. My wire to you was in response to it. At the Council's meeting held in San Francisco on March 13, the entire statement was presented to the Council members. After reading it, on motion duly made and seconded, the Council unanimously endorsed the statement as presented by Mr. Knight, specifically confirming it as representing the previously adopted policy of the Council.

Since this letter indicates the specific action taken by the Council in confirming its previous position as stated in the presentation made at your hearing, we would appreciate it if you would also make this letter a portion of the record.

Thanking you for your courtesy and hoping this makes it clear, I am.

Very sincerely yours,

R. H. TAYLOR,
Executive Secretary.

STATEMENT BY THE AGRICULTURAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA PRESENTED MARCH 10, 1947, AT HEARING IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROPOSED CHARTER OF AN INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

This statement is presented by the Agricultural Council of California on behalf of 34 California farm organizations, whose $450,000,000 volume represented a major portion of the total value of this State's 1946 agricultural production.

For many years the Agricultural Council of California has been on record in favor of the preservation of a tariff system which would serve to equalize the differences in production costs here and abroad. For this reason, the council is vitally interested in certain provisions of the proposed charter for an international trade organization.

The council is in full agreement with the principle that unnecessary tariffs, cartels, embargoes, trade restrictions, and discriminatory treatment in international commerce should be eliminated. It is our feeling, however, that an international trade organization should be in the nature of an advisory body, leaving trade controls in the hands of individual nations whose governments can then consider the special problems of their own economies and the needs of their citizens.

Provisions in this proposed charter appear to place the control of world trade, including our own, completely in the hands of an international organization. Penalties are provided for the express purpose of enforcing the decisions of this body. It is the belief of the agricultural council that these provisions may well jeopardize the welfare of American agricultural producers and that carte blanche authority over our prices, production, and marketing methods should not be granted. In article 24 of the proposed charter, we find a clear-cut commitment involving the surrender of the tariff protection on which many of our national farm groups depend. We do not propose here to discuss the case for and against tariffs. The operation of the so-called reciprocal trade-agreements program has been the subject of violent controversy in and out of the Congress, and recent negotiations have drawn protests from more than 1,000 organizations representing American industry and agriculture. For this reason, we believe that the charter provisions dealing with tariff may well become the subject of such future controversy as to endanger the operation of any international trade organization and to limit its chances of becoming a useful and effective instrument.

There is evidence that we are not alone in our misgivings.

It has been reported that one of the conditions on which Great Britain got a loan of three and three-fourths billions from the American Government was that she should support the American proposals for an international trade organization. However, the opinion has been advanced in England that she has signed away her economic freedom by this action and that the loan was a poor bargain. We believe that there is danger that America's overwhelming financial and industrial power may be used to coerce other nations into an organization such as the proposed ITO under such conditions as to make cooperation on an international level impossible, or at best unfruitful. Coercion can hardly lead to peace, harmony, and mutual trust.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, noted American commentator on international affairs, quoted last week a statement from the British Government's white paper entitled "Economic Survey for 1947," which said: "We have not enough resources to do all that we want to do. We have barely enough to do all that we must do."

Mr. Lippmann went on to comment as follows:

"The question is how much economic freedom—as we understand it—can a country in this position afford? It is evident at once that it cannot afford to allow the people freedom to buy abroad. It has to control and ration its imports; otherwise Britons will buy more than the nation has American and Canadian money to pay with, and individuals will buy goods which they would like to have rather than those goods which the whole Nation most needs. The people of Britain cannot afford the freedom to import."

This very accurate analysis of Britain's plight must bring to mind some obvious questions. Our Government has told us that one of the objectives of the ITO is to promote American prosperity through increased exports of American goods. Yet we see from Mr. Lippmann's analysis that Britain, and

obviously many other nations, have problems of their own which make it impossible for them to buy our exports.

The paradox in the objectives of this proposed international organization appears in the claim that it will benefit both the United States and Great Britain, and all other nations, despite the fact that their interests and needs appear to be diametrically opposed to our own.

We believe we will be forgiven if we question whether the ITO can be all things to all people. Pending further analysis and discussion, we would suggest that considerable further study should be made before the proposed charter can be accepted as a workable instrument.

Its advantages to the people of the United States have already been widely questioned. One of its basic principles; namely, the general reduction or elimination of tariffs, has been criticized by American business and agriculture alike. The United States Chamber of Commerce has gone on record with the statement that "all branches of agriculture must be continuously alert to the effects of both imports and exports, and to determine the point at which the general benefits from foreign trade are offset by an impairment of the standard of living of individuals and groups. Obviously, the outlets for the products of other industries could not be maintained if the income of agriculture declines."

Even in our Southern States, which historically have advocated low tariffs, we find today general recognition of the need for cost-equalizing tariffs which will enable us to compete with foreign producers using cheap labor and operating without minimum wage laws or social-security taxes.

"Let us not swap our automobiles and tractors with foreign nations, who can only make payment with agricultural products of which we have an excess." The statement comes from Mr. C. C. Hanson, secretary of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture.

Another leading farm organization which has gone on record in favor of a realistic tariff policy is the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, representing farm organizations whose members throughout the United States include more than 2,400,000 farm families. This organization has gone on record as favoring the review and approval of trade agreements by an agency beyond the State Department, and a ban against "inclusion in a so-called negotiating or bargaining list of any agricultural commodity, the actual or potential domestic production of which is certified by the Secretary of Agriculture to be equal to domestic consumption or to a substantial portion thereof." Other organizations which have taken a similar stand include the California State Grange, the California Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and scores of other organizations.

The reasons for the concern of these and all American farm organizations are aptly expressed in the remarks of Congressman BERTRAND W. GEARHART, of California, entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 4, 1947.

Speaking on the theme Who Double-Crossed Whom, Mr. GEARHART quotes the late President Roosevelt when he gave this assurance to the American people in a campaign address in 1932:

"Of course, it is absurd to talk of lowering tariff rates on farm products. I know of no excessively high-tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived."

Mr. GEARHART'S statement continues:

"Shortly after the enactment of the so-called Trade Agreements Act of 1934, redubbed by the State Department for political effect 'the reciprocal trade agreement program,' the then President, to allay the fears of the agriculturists of the country, wrote, on June 15, 1934, the following letter to the then Congressman Frank Buck, of the Third District of California, as follows:

" 'MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCK: I am somewhat surprised and a little amused at the fears you say have been aroused in California because of the enactment and the possible administration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act.

" 'Certainly it is not the purpose of the administration to "sacrifice the farmers and fruit growers of California in pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp of foreign markets," as published reports would make believe.' "

Mr. GEARHART continues further:

"But in spite of these Presidential assurances, sincerely made, no doubt, the international New Dealers down at the State Department, those who had been entrusted with the administration of this measure, continue to throw agriculture to the wolves, to cut and slash agricultural tariff rates with a gay indifference of this to the following result:

"First, the protective tariff schedules on 449 agricultural products have been cut, slashed, as the record reveals, to an average of 45 percent of the tariff schedules established by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

"Second, absolutely no tariffs on agricultural products have been raised, though the Trade Agreements Act authorizes it in appropriate cases.

"Third, on 95 crop and livestock products the Smoot-Hawley tariff rates have been frozen, that is, they cannot be raised by Congress during the period of the agreements, without resorting to the drastic but short-of-war action of denouncing the agreement or by the exercise of an escape clause which has been inserted in a few of the more recent trade treaties.

"Fourth, 77 agricultural items that were on the free list of the Smoot-Hawley tariff law have been frozen in that status; that is, the State Department, in its 29 trade agreements, has effectively and morally tied the hands of Congress, and by the same device, has rendered itself utterly impotent to protect the people from the consequences of their own folly.

"And now, Mr. Speaker, with this shocking record of repeated defiances of their late chief of state, the former President of the United States, the boys down at the State Department now announce, with a gay nonchalance that is indeed intriguing, a new list of several hundred agricultural items, all crop and livestock products, which it intends to slash an additional 50 percent in trade agreements now under negotiation, many of which have already been cut to the limit previously allowed by the Trade Agreements Act as originally enacted."

It is our belief that American participation in an International Trade Organization should be withheld until the American public more fully understands the complex provisions of this proposed charter, and until responsible authorities in other nations have reached full agreement as to the changes which must be made to protect their own special interests. Obviously, no international organization can promote harmony and cooperation if the United States uses its power of persuasion through gifts and loans abroad to secure adherence by countries which may, as the American Tariff League has put it, become members "less through conviction than through gratitude or fear of giving offense to a benefactor."

Many of the organizations appearing at these hearings will favor or oppose this plan for an international trade organization because of its apparent effect on their own special interests. It is our belief that the Nation as a whole should consider a far more vital question: Is the United States, the last stronghold of free enterprise, going to benefit from participation in a plan which proposes that world trade shall be controlled by an international commission? This is a revolutionary step. Sentiment in this country is now overwhelmingly against a continuation of Government controls over business. Will the American public sanction international controls even more stringent which supersede even the authority of our own Congress?

All the arguments and statements of organizations represented at these hearings should not be allowed to obscure this vital question.

The Agricultural Council of California believes that the answer to this question can only be negative. We believe that no benefit will accrue to the nations of the world from an international share-the-wealth program which denies the American people the right to make through their Congress the basic decisions affecting their own economic welfare. The Council can only urge that the Nation be given time for public discussion and analysis, so that the step, if taken, will be taken with the full knowledge and support of the American people.

Mr. Wallace's Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

DEAR KIM AND MERETE: I am addressing this letter to you because as Danes, you seem to me more completely to incorporate the European spirit at its best.

For the first time in history, the United States is deliberately intervening in the peacetime development of Europe. It is essential that Europeans should understand what the United States is trying to do.

In our judgment, the facts speak for themselves. President Truman aims solely at defending basic liberties where they still exist. Political intervention outside the Western Hemisphere is foreign to American thought. Yet three-fourth of the American people are supporting the President. Their only motive is the belief that without our action, a still larger part of the world will fall victim to Soviet tyranny.

Unhappily, not only are the usual Communist and pro-Russian voices rising to denounce the American initiative as defense of "reaction" and "fascism."

These voices are soon going to be reinforced by that of a former American Vice President. At home, Mr. Wallace has lost most of his former following. Though an able farm expert, he is without deep understanding of those world affairs he insists on talking about.

It is essential that Europeans should know these facts when considering the case of a once eminent American who is now going abroad to seek support against the Government of his own country.

As for the charges themselves, well, here are my answers.

1. Imperialism: Bunk. Unless with Lenin you believe that capitalist nations are inevitably imperialistic. The United States is definitely not trying to build up an overseas empire. Contemporary Americans are not imperially minded. The danger now is, not that they may use their unsought power to prevent aggression but that they may refrain from doing so—as in 1939.

2. Mingling in European affairs: Twice in one generation Americans have died in Europe to preserve their freedom—and yours.

It is solely in order to forestall a third European campaign that we are intervening in Greece and Turkey at the present time. No Americans enjoy bivouacking on the Danube or at the Dardanelles.

3. Provoking the Soviet Union to war: Since 1939 the Soviet Union has annexed nearly 20,000,000 human beings and subjugated 100,000,000 more. None of them, with the possible exception of the Czechs, have welcomed Soviet rule. Such expansion is a danger to all non-Communist countries. After 3 years of patient protests the United States of America has finally decided to stop further Russian aggression.

Would you really have preferred to see us wait until the Red Army reached the Atlantic shores? Was it frank opposition to Hitler that brought on the last war—or was it uncertainty and appeasement?

4. Dollar diplomacy: During the war we put our wealth as well as our lives behind defeating the Axis. Now we are putting some of the same wealth behind the preservation of peace and of the kind of free world we want to live in. Can free peoples regret this?

5. Promoting fascism: Rubbish. In no country have we even helped introduce fascism except—unconsciously—in Spain. In Argentina we have reluctantly refrained from eliminating it by force. In Greece and China, we have supported old-fashioned conservatism against Communists who, if successful, would side with Soviet power against democracy.

6. Opposing socialism: Not guilty. As beneficiaries of capitalism, most Americans feel that state socialism is not the key to a better life. But where—as in Britain—socialism is accompanied by the maintenance of basic freedoms, the majority of Americans sincerely trust that socialism will succeed. This applies to the rest of the world as well. In Austria, the United States of America has defended socialism against the Russians.

7. Opposing communism: Yes and no. We find communism objectionable particularly because, unlike former despotisms, it disguises serfdom as liberation. We shall try to prevent its imposition by force.

Yet, if any people decide freely to embrace communism, we shall, however reluctantly, acquiesce in their choice.

8. Bypassing the United Nations: Correct—and necessary. Unhappily, at San Francisco the United States joined with the Soviet Union in creating an international organization that can function only when the five largest countries find themselves in agreement.

In less than 2 years, the Soviets have invoked their veto 10 times. The United States and the Soviet Union have been in general disagreement, notably over atomic control and Soviet expansion.

Both these questions will be settled outside the present United Nations or not at all.

A large number of Americans believe that, along with an expressed willingness to stop aggression everywhere, the American President should have taken the lead in offering to strengthen the United Nations to where it could compel obedience from all governments. The President was not yet willing or ready. Here—and not in proclaiming the Truman doctrine—he deserves criticism.

So much, dear Kim and Merete, for my answers to what Henry Wallace is likely to tell you. I hope you will find them convincing. In any case, I am sure that you will respect the disinterested views of an American friend who has spent half his life abroad, who is certainly neither nationalist nor imperialist, and who holds the defense of human liberty first among civic virtues.

Always affectionately yours,

E. A. M.

Agriculture's Stake in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of the timely importance of the subject, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which this day's proceedings will be recorded, the text of a very able address which was delivered at Phoenix, Ariz., on January 9, 1947, by the Honorable Richard Laban Adams, professor of farm management of the University of California, an address which has been appropriately captioned "Agriculture's stake in the reciprocal trade agreements program."

Mr. Speaker, the very able address of Professor Adams, to which I have just referred, is the following:

AGRICULTURE'S STAKE IN RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen and friends of the National Cattlemen's Association, two pictures hang on the wall of my office. One is a placid scene of a couple of cowboys herding a small bunch of whitefaces. They are in a stretch of country remindful of a part of Arizona's desert. The other is a rough and tumble fight outside a saloon of pioneer days. These pictures typify what is ahead in my talk. We want the cattle industry to continue to be safe, conservative, and peaceful. Yet it is a continual fight to reach that objective. And it well may be that reciprocal trade agreements will be a part of that fight.

Since I have been assigned this beautiful, controversial subject, perhaps I had better give you a bit of personal background.

Since 1914 I have been a member of the staff of the California College of Agriculture, as professor of farm management and agricultural economist. Before that I was employed by the Spreckels Sugar Co. (5 years) and the old cattle empire of Miller and Lux (2 years). And were those the good old days. More fun to talk about that than tariffs. I have raised and sold feeder cattle and purebred Herefords on my own account on a small scale. I spent 1929 in Washington working on tariffs in the interest of California growers. Since then I have written briefs and appeared before various Washington committees on reciprocal trade agreements. I do not admit that I am one of those dry-as-dust academic guys who are notorious for telling you what should have been done when it is too late to do anything about it. (One of those funny woofus birds, who fly backward to keep the dust out of their eyes and who know where they have been but not where they are going.) Or to those economists, who—it is claimed—if laid end to end would reach no conclusion. Or that unkindest cut of all: Maybe it would be a good thing if they were just laid end to end. I couldn't be a "long hair" if I wanted to. There is a good reason—bald. Agricultural economists, however, do some good work. They are in the same position as a dentist. One doesn't go to a dentist for entertainment and relaxation. (One sits in a barber chair for that.) Instead one visits a dentist to find out if he can fill a cavity before it is so late that the tooth has to be pulled. So the agricultural economist hunts for economic cavities with the thought of filling them before more radical treatment is required.

Times certainly do change! When I went to California 40 years ago, individualism was about 100 percent to the front. Farmers and stockmen produced what they wished. If they wanted to take a chance, to speculate, they did. And some of them did. If they couldn't find a market within the State they went outside. The pioneers built a State. They used brains and brawn. They used their imaginations. They did some other things such as getting land under the swamp and overflow act by swearing they went over the land in a boat. Did, but boat was on a wagon hauled by a team of horses.

Personally I believe that the past 50 years will go down in history as the 50 golden years of western agriculture. It has been half a century of opportunity, for full display of initiative. Just a fortunate matter of birth for us who are 50 and past.

Today we have to think not only in terms of economics, but of social betterment. We are facing a changing order. Now it is less a case of individual initiative and more a matter of the greatest good to the greatest number. We now deal not only with statistics but with far-reaching social planning. It is with us whether we like it or not.

Eventually a down-turn may be expected, and when we do go into changing economic conditions, tariffs will be an important factor affecting farmers, livestock men, and in fact all who are connected with agriculture.

All of which is a prelude to a consideration of what reciprocal trade agreements can or may do to agriculture and its various segments.

AGRICULTURE'S STAKE IN RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

This subject was chosen because tariffs can and frequently do help or hamper, depending on what rates are set and how the administration performs. It is well, therefore, to know something about them.

At the request of your officers I intend to discuss briefly the present philosophy of tariff making including reciprocal-trade agreements, how tariffs are made, and what a group of farmers or stockmen face when seeking protection. I hope to be fair-minded and judicial, but I doubt if I succeed. Few of us can talk judicially about tariffs—and this includes that phase known as reciprocal-trade agreements. Few can because most of us (I am one) are individually biased. The reform economist seeks a better way of life: the protectionist thinks in terms of his particular business. The protectionist claims the economist is at heart a free trader. The economists claim the protectionists are selling the country "down the river." No one can stand before a great audience such as this and conclude his talk with a feeling that his hearers are satisfied with what he has said. I know. I have tried it before. Yet, like the night-blooming cereus, I periodically blossom out again.

So at the start here are some of my convictions—or perhaps I should say premises:

1. The home market is the best market for the great majority of United States producers—and this includes the cattle industry.

2. The interests of industry and agriculture are somewhat opposed. Industry is definitely more interested in the export business than is agriculture, so industry feels a greater

need for imports in order to export than does agriculture.

3. That agriculture must strengthen itself in order to insure adequate protection.

4. Some officials in Washington lend a sympathetic ear to the requests of agriculture but are outvoted by others who think in terms of modified free trade, outright Santa Claus gifts, loans, and subsidies to other countries, including—as one vehicle of approach—a lowering of tariffs.

5. Tariffs are needed to iron out inequalities in the economic conditions as between the United States and other countries.

6. The interests of all farmers and stockmen are not identical.

7. Tariffs do not necessarily increase prices. Rather they comprise one means of insuring the American market to American producers by regulating supplies.

8. Protection of some products of American agriculture would cost more (and I am now thinking of the consumers) than would be fair and reasonable.

The other side of the shield

In all fairness and to complete the picture, let us probe into the thinking of those who do not subscribe to the premises I have just listed.

Many heavy volumes (heavy in weight of paper and in reading) have been written setting forth a new foreign policy. All include tariff considerations. The basic thought is that international trade far transcends domestic industry interests, especially if these interests are of minority groups with small voting power. Starting from the premise that huge international trade and prosperity are synonymous these suggestions follow.

The No. 1 suggestion calls for general lowering of tariff rates—perhaps on a graduated scale; use of subsidies to offset losses to certain industries (including agriculture); possible use of quotas on imports; tariffs on a graduated scale for seasonal products when domestic production is small or nonexistent (namely, certain winter fruits and vegetables from West Indies and Mexico); selecting items for reducton not liable to create widespread unemployment; discouraging reprisals by foreign countries; discouraging smuggling and bootlegging; discouraging use of quarantines primarily as trade barriers.

Those who favor lowering of tariffs include not only reform-minded economists but also those whose business is dealing in imported goods, users of imported goods (such as the candy manufacturers using various kinds of nuts, chocolate, etc.), and, in addition those whose primary interest is in the exporting of various goods—largely manufacturers of automotive equipment, farm implements, machines, etc.

Today it would be difficult to find advocates of over-all free trade. Even the most rabid attackers of tariffs recognize the need of some restrictions.

Leaders seeking tariff reforms point out what to them are several inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the thinking of the protectionists. For example: (1) Evidence is presented to show rightly that high tariffs and low imports do not necessarily bring prosperity: That a high tariff does not assure a high price. (In this connection attention is called to the 1914 price of wheat at 97 cents when on the free list, 92 cents in 1923 with a tariff of 30 cents, and 38 cents in 1932 when the tariff was 42 cents. Another example is flaxseed: $1.31 in 1914 and $4.42 in 1919 with a tariff of 20 cents versus $1.94 in 1928 with a tariff of 40 cents and 88 cents in 1932, tariff 65 cents.) (2) Trading with countries of low standards of living may be a factor worthy of consideration, especially with countries producing at a high level of efficiency and with low wages. (Our greatest competition comes from high-wage countries—Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, for example—and especially when their currencies are depreciated in relation to ours.) (3) A proper basis of comparison is wage costs, not rates. Cheap-rate labor may prove expensive if incompetent and inefficient. Think of the Italian turning his soil with a spade, the Japanese planting rice by hand, the Chinese irrigating by lifting water by foot power. Contrast this with our tractors, airplane seeding, and powerful pumps.

In presenting data of lessened imports those critics fail to show to what extent low exports to us from other countries might have been due to lack of things to ship. Moreover, they do not take into account the extent that internal upsets occur not related to international trade, and which of themselves can cause depressed conditions. In other words, imports can drop off because of reduced buying power on the part of our consumers.

It is my contention that prosperity starts here at home. Here is our most important market. We have many raw materials here; we have ample and trained workers; we have inventive genius; we have ample financing. If we are prosperous we will buy from other countries and they can share in our prosperity. If we are in a depression some other country must be prosperous so we can sell to them and, in turn, share in their prosperity. Enlargement of an export (or import) trade depends on the degree of prosperity throughout the world. In other words, I believe that prosperity creates world trade, not that world trade creates prosperity. And prosperity is the result of employment and buying power. As one speaker aptly stated: "Foreign trade is the fruit, not the seed of prosperity."

Let us not forget, too, that during 1925–29 when exports rose—i. e., 56-percent cotton, 21-percent wheat, 40-percent tobacco, 10-percent lard was artificially stimulated by loans, most of which proved worthless. I guess anyone can build up a tremendous business if he gives his goods away.

I take issue with the thinking of some international-minded Washington officials, that the tariff is a failure. Maybe it has developed by the trial-and-error method but I will take that rather than the thinking of certain internationalists who (I quote and paraphrase) "simply know what they know and do not want to know why or what it is they know. These people worship their convictions as a Chinaman does his ancestors and regard any questioning of their creed as sacrilegious and not debatable."

These differing schools of thought boil down to one question: Shall we abandon the American way for internationalism? And by the American way I mean preservation of the domestic market for our own producers, with attendant greater opportunity for employment of American workers. If we do take the down-grade road, then what? As one writer puts it, "Shall we dilute our strength with the world's weakness?"

Let us now turn our attention specifically to reciprocal trade agreements.

What is a reciprocal trade agreement?

I could—but I will not—quote the first sentence of the Enabling Act. This consists of 22 lines or about 250 words—longest sentence I have ever read so far as I can remember. Very lofty and laudable objectives are set forth. In substance, however, a reciprocal trade agreement is a mutual contract between the United States and a foreign country setting forth concessions in tariff rates or lessening of quotas or removal of embargoes in order to stimulate trade between contracting countries.

This provision comprises title III (added 1934) of the Tariff Act of 1930.

It empowers the President (and through him the State Department) to negotiate with foreign countries and permits changing the tariff rate on items not on the free list by an amount not in excess of 50 percent. In addition to reducing (or increasing) the existing rate, the agreements may also bind (viz, freeze) an existing rate against an increase, and may bind an existing duty-free status.

We have had 12 years of experience with reciprocal trade agreements. Originally set for 3 years as an emergency measure, periodic renewals have retained this plan of rewriting the tariff act. For whether Congress knew it or not, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 delegated to the President the power of changing tariff rates by 50 percent. Thus tariff legislation was to this extent removed from the Congress.

Once made it cannot be modified or withdrawn during the effective life of the agreement, and usually this life is 3 years.

To last May 29 trade agreements had been effected with 25 countries.

In these 29 agreements the United States reduced duties or tax on 342 agricultural tariff classifications; bound 95 more against an increase and bound 77 more on the free list. None were increased. Of particular interest to this audience are the trade agreements with Canada and Mexico. You will recall that agreements with Canada were changed January 1, 1939, and with Mexico January 30, 1943, reducing the tariff from 2.5 cents to 1.5 cents on light-weight cattle, and 3 cents to 2.5 cents on heavy cattle.

Other cuts of interest to agriculture generally include:

January 5, 1942: Fresh, chilled, and frozen meat from Cuba, 3 cents (from 6 cents)—50-percent cut.

January 1, 1939: Fresh pork from Canada, 1¼ cents (from 2½ cents)—50-percent cut.

January 1, 1939: Venison from United Kingdom, 3 cents (from 6 cents)—50-percent cut.

November 15, 1941: Flaxseed from Argentina, 32½ cents (from 65 cents)—50-percent cut.

January 1, 1943: Flaxseed from Uruguay 32½ cents (from 65 cents)—50-percent cut.

February 1, 1936: Pearl barley from Netherlands, 1 cent (from 2 cents)—50-percent cut.

January 1, 1939: Hay from Canada, $2.50 (from $5)—cut 50 percent.

Note the recurring 50-percent cut—the maximum permitted under the act.

On the whole, past history of concessions affecting agriculture does not cause needless alarm. Some portions of our agricultural economy have been hit, but generally the items are not of great importance, except to the individuals concerned. For instance, cutting the tariff on Canadian blueberries and buckwheat is not liable to cripple us; nor concessions to Cuba on cane and meat is not liable to result in much of a disjointing of our over-all economy. To properly weigh the facts one must compare not only rates but the real effect on imports.

The real fear is that a rash of internationalism may break out and cause wholesale reductions sufficient to upset seriously—perhaps irretrievably—agriculture's apple cart. This could certainly happen under the present terms of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Basic philosophy

The basic philosophy, or reasoning, which created legislation permitting negotiations leading to these reciprocal trade agreements is neither profound nor involved. It is based on a premise that world prosperity cannot be attained until the present race by different nations to build up tariff barriers for their individual protection is not only stopped but reversed until these barriers are materially reduced. I talked with many people in order to determine the reasoning beyond this theorem, what evidence there is to show that such reductions will accomplish the desired ends, to what extent those in authority are prepared to accept the consequences if future developments prove them wrong, what industries are to be called upon to pay a price. I found a rather wide

divergence of opinion as to how tariff barriers are to be reduced and to what extent such reductions will help. In fact, much of the reasoning is based on personal opinion rather than on definite evidence. I was struck with "the wish being father of the thought" as constituting a not inconsiderable basis for the trial.

To sum up, the basic philosophy contemplates a program of reestablished foreign trade as a means of stimulating business, reducing unemployment, and starting industry full speed ahead; a program that considers the welfare of the Nation as a primary requisite even though it demands sacrifices of groups of industries in order to further the national weal: a program built around tariff reductions; such tariff reductions to be the work of a small, secretly appointed group, working in the dark, rather than patterned after the swapping and logrolling of congressional action.

Variations in farmer's interest

Agriculture is not a single homogeneous industry. Hence interests in tariffs vary with individuals. One group of producers may seek tariff protection to insure as much of the home market as possible, with the added hope that a higher level of prices may be forthcoming. The same group can, however, develop an adverse attitude to the things they have to buy. For instance, importations of cheap sources of protein feeds at as low a cost as possible concerns the cattleman. Yet protection against Mexico, Canada, Australia, and Argentina strikes a distinctively different note. So, too, the orchardist prefers as low a price in fertilizers, spray materials, fruit boxes, etc., but wants as little competition as may be had against importations of foreign-grown fruits—fresh, dried, and processed.

Specifically this means that producers of some fruits, nuts, dairy products, eggs, cattle, and other farm commodities sold primarily—and almost exclusively—in the home market feel a need for tariff protection; producers of farm products for export favor low tariffs in order to insure foreign trade. The latter group includes producers of corn, cotton, tobacco, and—in normal times—pork and lard, for we normally export 45 to 50 percent of our cotton; 30 percent tobacco; 40 percent prunes; 12 to 15 percent of our deciduous fruits; 15 percent rice; 10 percent lard; 8 percent wheat, and citrus fruits.

On the other hand, as buyers, agricultural people want to buy to their best advantage lumber, steel, clothing, foodstuffs, etc. So most everyone views tariff with mixed thoughts.

Individuals, therefore, tend to be interested in agreements that may help or harm their specific commodities. It is at this point that I note confliction between the ideas of the State Department and those of private business, including agriculture. The State Department, in planning a program designed to reestablish and restimulate foreign trade, is making adjustments in tariff rates downward. Their thinking appears to consider that, in the national interest, what is good on the whole will eventually be good for all, even though certain industries (including parts of agriculture) may be temporarily or permanently harmed or even completely demoralized. Many members of Government are undoubtedly motivated by genuine impulses of a truly patriotic nature. But, in addition, there is a group of economic theorists, lacking in business experience, at heart very close to being free traders, who in their positions of advisers are able to counsel moves which in effect will serve as a testing ground for their personal beliefs. This can be an expensive experiment.

Mechanics of reciprocal trade agreements

When a given group of producers—growers of almonds, walnuts, figs, and a host of other commodities decides it is time to take off its coat and jump into the tariff whirlpool, then some ideas are needed of the mechanics of reciprocal-trade agreements.

The procedure involved in negotiating reciprocal-trade agreements is rather intricate and with various ramifications, and by the time one gets at the bottom of the whole arrangement he sees a parallel case to that of getting to the heart of an artichoke.

The first of the machinery is set in motion when, following sounding out, a favorable response to negotiating a reciprocal-trade agreement is forthcoming. Then begins feverish collection of statistical and other matter to permit formulating a statement of what concessions are to be requested and what are to be granted by the United States. This initial movement begins long before public announcement is made of the pending negotiations. When the Department of State thinks the time is ripe, then notices of the pending agreement are published and dates set for (1) final submission of briefs by interested persons, firms, or representatives of industry; and (2) for a public hearing to which interested parties may go or send representatives. Usually only 4 to 6 weeks elapse between the dates of the first notices and the closing of all avenues for presenting views, data, recommendations, or counterproposals.

The internal machinery is complicated by a multiplicity of committees. The basic theory of the number, character, and personnel was evidently conceived along lines designed to bring together in a common committee representatives from the major governmental departments who might possess information or be sufficiently concerned to justify places on the committee. Thus the major committee is designated as the Executive Commercial Policy Committee sometimes called the Import-Export Committee or the Central Inter-Departmental Committee. This committee is composed of representatives, with alternates, from the Departments of State, Commerce, Treasury, Agriculture, Tariff Commission, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, RFC, and others.

This Executive Committee—the fountainhead for policy decisions, and made up of seven members—is flanked by a committee answerable to it known as the Committee for Reciprocity Information. This committee is the only connecting link between the Executive Committee and interested members or representatives of private business and agriculture throughout the country. It is this committee which receives briefs and holds hearings in connection with each proposed international pact. This committee is made up of members from the Tariff Commission, departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce and others.

Under the Executive Commercial Policy Committee are other committees, their personnel and duties not receiving much publicity, such as the Trade Agreements Section, and "Country Committees." The make-up and personnel of these country committees is held confidential in order not to embarrass or harass, or slow down their work by onslaught of lobbyists, strategists, private representatives or possible pressure (from industry, members of Congress, and others). A similar alinement of different interested departments is continued in designating men to serve on these committees, so that the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, etc., is full represented in all the deliberations. The country committees are designated as soon as a chance of negotiating trade agreements has been determined, there being a committee for each country—Belgium, Brazil, Spain, etc. Under them are so-called commodity committees, conceived as clearing-houses for commodities likely to be of significance in connection with several pacts. It is a veritable spider web—but just try and find the spider in all this planned confusion.

Once the accumulated material is ready, including pertinent material submitted in briefs or presented at hearings, summaries or digests are made for the various country committees, which in turn draw a first draft of possible concessions to be requested or granted, these going to the Executive Commercial Policy Committee for determination of policy.

Out of this mass of data finally evolves two lists—one of products upon which concessions may be granted to the interested countries, and another listing concessions desired from that country.

In the meantime the interested foreign country works upon what it desires and is willing to concede.

After all the preliminary work is done by both interested countries, on a prearranged date each conveys to the other through diplomatic channels the concessions that it desires. The United States consul or other designated diplomat in the foreign country concerned receives that country's statement of position and immediately cables the State Department the essential features, while promptly mailing the entire statement. At the same time the United States desires are handed to the duly authorized foreign diplomat resident in Washington. Then the Executive Commercial Policy Committee compares the lists, suggests a basis for training, and advises the State Department of its decision.

In the meantime the Department of State, jealous of its prerogatives, appoints one or more negotiators to conduct the actual bargaining. These men are secretly appointed and their identity is concealed so far as anything in Washington can be hidden.

After both countries have had a chance to study each of the other's proposals, there then comes the actual negotiations. Representatives of both countries then sit around a table, hear, weigh, consider, offer, reoffer, compromise, and barter, until finally all are agreed (or find they cannot agree) upon a common acceptance of concessions one to the other. This constitutes the basis for wording the reciprocal trade agreement to be actually put into practice.

It is a long drawn-out affair, consuming months rather than weeks, between the time that a proposed pact is first suggested until the finally accepted agreement is actually signed.

Let us now turn to

The position of the cattleman

Cattle, fresh, frozen, and chilled beef; hides and leather are of particular interest to this group. These at present carry tariff rates. For example:

Present tariffs on items of specific interest to this group are:

Cattle weighing less than 200 pounds, 2½ cents per pound.

(NOTE.—By trade agreement cut to 1½ cents for Canada and Mexico.)

Two hundred to seven hundred pounds, 2½ cents per pound.

(NOTE.—Mexico 1½ cents.)[1]

Seven hundred pounds and over not specifically provided for, 3 cents per pound.

(NOTE.—Canada and Mexico, 1½ cents.)

Meat: Fresh, chilled, or frozen beef and veal, 6 cents a pound.

(NOTE.—Canada, 3 cents.)

Hides: Cattle hides, dry or salted, 10 percent.

(NOTE.—Argentine and Uruguay, 5 percent.)

Leather (made from cattle hides), 12½ percent.

(NOTE.—10 percent United Kingdom and Mexico.)

[1] All notes by trade agreements.

On Free List

Cattle (for breeding purposes), free—can't cut that!—but can be "bound." (Is for Canada and Mexico.)

"Hoofs, horns, and bones," free.

(NOTE.—Where concessions granted, full 50-percent cuts in case of cattle 700 pounds and over; fresh, chilled, and frozen meats; and cattle hides.)

Tariffs Over the Years

Beef cattle less than—

1909: One year old or over, valued at not more than $14 per head, $3.75 each; at more, 27½ percent.

1913: Free.

1921: (Emergency Tariff Act), 30 percent.

1922: Less 1,050 pounds, 1½ cents; 1,050 and over, 2 cents.

1930: 175 to 700, 2.5 cents; 700 and over, 3.0 cents.

One disturbing thought is that a stable industry cannot be fully realized if every few years the cattlemen must face fluctuations in protection tariff rates.

Out of a welter of words, statistics, and facts, one concludes that the cattle industry is in a fairly neutral position with respect to the tariff in that the domestic market constitutes the primary outlets for cattle, and production about balances with market requirements. Moreover, reduced food supplies prevailing in many countries means that any surplus for export from foreign countries should have a variety of outlets to choose from, provided that the purchasing power is present or can be created. Probably shipments from Canada and Mexico will continue, as for several years past, to be our principal source of imports.

If you think all is quiet on the trade-agreements front, then note this: On November 9, 1946, the Department of State signified its intention to conduct trade-agreement negotiations with Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Lebanon, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and areas for which these countries have authority to negotiate. There you have 18 countries specifically named. Of these you as cattlemen are particularly interested in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and perhaps Chile.

A list of products to be considered for possible granting of tariff concessions by the United States includes several of particular interest to this group, viz, edible cattle (except those weighing from 200 to 700 pounds); meat—fresh, chilled, and frozen; hides, leathers; cattle for breeding "hoofs, horns, and bones."

It is too late to do anything more than has been done about tariffs. These had to be in by December 21. So, too, December 21 was the last day for filing applications to be heard by the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Old in experience with tariff matters, I suspect your officers have safeguarded both these avenues. If not, there still are other ways. One, for example, is via some interested Congressman or Senator. The stop watch doesn't run against them. By the way, public hearings start at 10 a. m. January 13, 1947. I hope that "13" is not prophetic.

What it means to cattlemen

Internationalists contend—and often ruthlessly—that the only industries fit to survive are those so efficient that they can compete in world markets irrespective of the varying standards of living. If the less efficient "go to the wall" why that is just too bad. What about your industry? Is it efficient? Could it compete in a free or low-tariff market with Argentina, Australia, New Zealand and Mexico? What can you do to cut costs and raise efficiency? What special advantages have you other than shorter hauls that cattlemen of these countries do not—or cannot possess? Better breeds? (But others can breed up.) Lower real wages? (I doubt this.) Cheaper feeds? More skill?

Does the cattle industry need tariff protection? Will the cost of such protection cost more in indirect ways than its worth?

These are the questions an industry may best answer for itself. Perhaps we need to assemble what we know about the cattle business of foreign countries in the exporting of beef and cattle. Perhaps we need to send someone to various cattle and meat exporting countries to make a first-hand up-to-the-minute appraisal of what the American industry is, could be, or may be up against, not only today, but in the years to come. Personally, I cannot answer the questions raised above with too much assurance. I admit, were I to make such a study, I think I would be likely to start with the premise. We do need protection—then I would need an answer to the question: "How much and how soon?" I imagine your officials face a similar situation. The billboards used to say "there's no substitute for butter."—Similarly, "there's no substitute for facts."

A few suggestions:

1. Both as individuals and as an organization make up your minds as to what protection you deem to be both fair and necessary—then go after it "hammer and tongs."

2. By resolution or other appropriate means express your convictions firmly and courageously.

3. Arrange to appear at all hearings scheduled on tariff matters affecting your industry.

4. Precede appearances with well-considered and well-prepared briefs. See that these presentations cover a full statement of needs, backed by ample evidence and adequate facts, and specific recommendations.

5. Insure suitable representation in Washington.

6. See that Congressmen and Senators are fully appraised concerning your problems and solutions.

7. Likewise see that the proper people in the Tariff Commission, State Department, and Department of Agriculture are given full information of what is going on.

8. Put pressure where it will do the most good.

During the past dozen years advocates of protection were either ignored or else feared or liked. Maybe the ignoring will be out of the window for the next few years. As to whether fear or liking should prevail, I point out that sentiment leaves more room to shunt one aside than does fear. Fear in Washington generates respect and one can do more if he is respected than if he is merely liked.

9. Remember there are two sides to tariff matters. Learn the other fellow's thinking, and at all times be prepared for arguments, counter-arguments, backed by the image of your convictions.

Mr. Mollin, your esteemed secretary, has ably represented you in Washington. He knows his way around. I met him in Washington in 1929 when he appeared in your behalf, along with C. E. Collins, of Colorado, and Victor Culberson, of New Mexico, before the Ways and Means Committee to advocate proper tariff protection. Mr. Mollin also testified (this time single-handed) before the Senate Finance Committee—submitting a prepared brief to supplement his oral presentation. In 1934 I note that he addressed the Senate Finance Committee on Reciprocal Trade Agreements. He could make this talk as well—perhaps better than I. But I suppose you are intrigued, perhaps intimidated when the speaker is called "professor," "doctor," "economist." However, I hasten to add that most people call me by my initials—"R. L." And I like it!

Finally, don't let me ever inflict another tariff speech upon you!

Lewis' Memorial? to Labor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine has just given expression of his views to the "Lewis' memorial? to labor?" It gives a new slant, as it were, to the idea of what could have been a great memorial, one of tremendous benefit to the widows, orphans, and other dependents of the victims of the recent Centralia, Ill., mine disaster. Would that more emphasis was placed upon the continuation of service and production in order to obtain more money with which to benefit our loved ones.

It might be interesting to contemplate that much constructive good could have been accomplished, not only for the dependents of those victims but by the use of a portion of this money that would have been earned if the holiday—a disguised strike—had not been declared, to proceed in an orderly manner to insure safe working conditions in the other mines. Vigilance and aggressive and constructive action and programs insuring safety for the miners might be assumed as part of the responsibility of the miners. This does not mean that they should pay out of their salaries for installations, but if they are to be protected by safety devices, measures, and methods, it does seem that their leadership should be interested in checking inspections and reports and in taking the necessary steps to protect the individual miners in their work. Certainly if, instead of losing time and production, a portion of what they lose every time they go out on strike, by whatever name called, if spent under proper supervision for their own protection and safety, it would be a wise investment. No one knows better than the man who does the work where the danger lurks, and he should be encouraged to be interested enough to help correct bad situations and prevent the loss of life and promote the efficiency of the workers.

The following is the reactions of one of my constituents, Mr. Hiram Preston White, an attorney of Pawhuska, Okla., which I quote:

LEWIS' MEMORIAL? TO LABOR?

Estimating that coal miners earn $10 per day, 400,000 of them would earn $4,000,000 per day, or $24,000,000, collectively, in 6 days.

By laying off for 6 days they lost $24,000,000 in wages, contributed nothing to the dependents of departed brothers, but did contribute to nonproduction and depression in all lines. What a memorial!

Had the 400,000 miners worked the 6 days and contributed their combined wage to create a trust fund to care for the bereaved of the late disaster, and future disasters as well, $24,000,000, what a memorial that would have been.

If the 400,000 miners would create a befitting memorial it is not too late. If each miner will work overtime each day a sufficient time to earn an extra $2 each day for 30 days

and contribute that extra earnings, amounting to $24,000,000, to the creation of such a trust fund, what a memorial that would be. But apparently Lewis would not have it so. Who suffers? Who are the losers under the Lewis memorial?

ODE TO A JACKASS

Yes, you can put a bulldog's head
On an old jackass, but gee whizz
That old jackass will just remain,
The same old jackass that he is.

—*H. P. White.*

The Test Relative to Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, for many years we have heard a lot of people talking against economic concentration and monopoly. Most organizations go on record against monopoly. The test of the genuineness of such statements is determined by the attitude taken in connection with specific measures before Congress. An editorial in the Nashville Tennesseean of April 10, 1947, states well the proposition. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial:

PUT TO TEST

Judging by words, there is not a corporation or a man in America who favors economic concentration or monopoly. They are all on record against it—the Republican Party, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and so on down through the list. The real test of their attitude is what they will do when a bill is presented in Congress to block the monopoly movement.

Consider the case of the Kefauver bill.

Congressman KEFAUVER has introduced a bill to correct the hole torn in the Clayton Act of 1914 by a Hughes-dominated Supreme Court in 1926. The object of the Clayton Act was to prevent consolidation in any instance in which competition would be materially lessened. The Court held that the Clayton law prohibited the acquisition of controlling stock in a competing company but did not bar the acquisition of the physical assets of the company. This narrow, legalistic interpretation was contrary to the purpose and intent of the 1914 law. Nevertheless, the Court opened the door to the wildest concentration spree in our history prior to 1941, and Congress has remained amazingly indifferent to the imperative need to patch up this hole, which is big enough to allow consolidation at any level.

Mr. KEFAUVER's bill would simply close the hole by prohibiting the acquisition of the physical assets of another corporation where the result would be restraint of commerce.

And what happens among these defenders of free enterprise? The United States Chamber of Commerce promptly announces its opposition to the bill. And nobody will dare strain their imagination so far as to try to picture the NAM throwing its propaganda machinery back of the measure.

In the face of the most gigantic merger movement in our history, the chamber proclaims that "present provisions of law are quite adequate to deal with monopolistic and unfair competitive practices * * * (and there is) no need for further remedies."

Mr. KEFAUVER has produced a sound and urgently needed measure. It ought to be passed at once. But he will not be disappointed by the announced opposition of the chamber and the unannounced opposition of other interests. Every reform bill looking toward the preservation of a genuinely free enterprise system has had to be pushed against the opposition of the very elements that subscribe in words to antimonopoly sentiment.

H. R. 3100

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, on April 17, 1947, I introduced a bill to continue rent control until June 30, 1948.

If such positive action is not taken by Congress, rent control will be done to death within the next few weeks. Rent increases and eviction notices will follow.

The rising living costs confronting everyone can no longer be denied. Every newspaper tells the grim story, but the housewife does not need to read the newspapers to keep up with the facts of life.

She is told that she should be happy because the counters are now filled with choice, juicy steaks. There are plenty of shirts on the shelves; shoes, too, to be had. But she is not told where to get the money to pay for them.

The answer to that, to date, is punitive labor legislation.

Let us never forget that more than half of the American families are living on an annual income of less than $2,000 a year—$500 less than the expense account for a Congressman. And let us not forget the fact that the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which Congress has just voted to emasculate, reports that the average family spends 40 percent of its income for food.

In my speech on the floor of the House on March 13, I showed that food costs had risen 30 to 35 percent. I said then that the lifting of rent controls coming on top of the high and rising cost of food would be too much for the American housewife and her family to bear.

Recognizing the political factors involved, I waited for a member of the majority party to introduce a bill to renew effective rent control. No such bill having been offered, I introduced H. R. 3100, which I hope will be considered on its merits at an early date.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of my bill, H. R. 3100:

H. R. 3100

A bill to continue rent control until June 30, 1948

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and all regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder, insofar as rents are concerned, shall be continued until June 30, 1948.

No general increase in rents shall be granted under authority of that act except as may be required under the provisions of section 2 (b) thereof.

Oklahoma's Lieutenant Governor Blames Wagner Act for All Our Troubles and Wants It Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from the Honorable James E. Berry, who has been for many years the Lieutenant Governor of the State of Oklahoma, and is one of our outstanding and most respected citizens, and who always has the interests of our people at heart. Lieutenant Governor Berry is very much perturbed about the management and labor-relations conflicts, the strikes, and other disruptions to our economy, just as thousands of others from our part of the country who have written me, clamoring for Congress to take some definite action to correct these ills.

Governor Berry insists that the Members of Congress can do something about it and he insists that we enact laws which will make it impossible for these strikes to continue. He emphasizes that it has become apparent to many, and that it is his belief that the Wagner Act, which is sometimes referred to as the Wagner Labor Relations Act, has "caused all of the trouble which our country has had to endure," and he expresses the hope that we in Congress "will vote to repeal the Wagner Act." It will be remembered that when our subcommittee in charge of the appropriations for the Labor Department recently reported its bill to the House, and the House approved it by a substantial vote, the bill contained a drastic cut in the appropriation item for the National Labor Relations Board. This is the Board that was created by and set up pursuant to the Wagner Act. While the bill was being considered on the floor, I offered an amendment striking the entire appropriation item for this agency on the ground that the appropriation was premature and pointed to the fact that the House Committee on Labor and Education, after many weeks of hearings and after taking the testimony of hundreds of people from both management and labor, was soon to bring a bill to the floor of the House, and that until such bill was acted upon by Congress, no appropriation should be made for the National Labor Relations Board and its activities for the 1948 fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1947.

The House Committee on Labor and Education last week reported out their bill, H. R. 3020, the Hartley bill, and I believe it is a fair deduction to say that if this law is passed, the appropriation which was carried in our bill is far in excess of the amount of money that will be needed for that agency to function pursuant to the Hartley bill. Be it known that the Hartley bill was one of the most controversial measures that will come before this Congress and one in which the public is perhaps most vitally concerned.

Four hundred and fifteen of the 435 Members in the House were present and voted on this measure. Three hundred and eight voted in the affirmative and 107 in the negative. Only 22 Republicans voted in the negative and more Democrats voted in the affirmative than voted in the negative. Hence, it was in many respects a nonpartisan measure in which the people of this country, through their Representatives, expressed themselves as thoroughly disgusted with the conditions that prevail. The bill is proof that conditions are not right as was admitted by nearly all speakers pro and con, and that Congress must enact legislation which will remedy the ills which now so banefully beset our economy.

It is heartening to have the reactions of people like Lieutenant Governor Berry and I am pleased to quote his letter in full for the benefit of my colleagues and the public, as follows:

[Official seal of the State of Oklahoma]

JAMES E. BERRY,
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF OKLAHOMA,
Stillwater, Okla., April 14, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Member of Congress,
First District, Oklahoma,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWABE: At last Oklahoma, and especially Stillwater, is going through the inconvenience and hardships caused by the strike of the telephone operators. I don't know what has caused the difference of opinion between the management and the employees, but I do know that all of the citizens are being penalized by reason of this condition.

You and other Members of our Congress can do something about it, and I sincerely hope that you will enact laws which will make it impossible for these strikes to continue.

I am told and I believe that the Wagner Act has caused all of the trouble which our country has had to endure, and I hope that you will vote to repeal the Wagner Act.

With best wishes for your continued success, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES E. BERRY.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, during the past 2 weeks I have participated in several radio programs on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey. I ask unanimous consent to have the addresses printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM COLORADO, ON MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, APRIL 9, 1947

SHOULD WE USE OUR FUNDS TO HALT COMMUNISM ABROAD?

Well, today, an epidemic of communism is said to be sweeping over Europe and Asia. Should we attempt to stop this irresistible tide or would it prove better strategy and better judgment to let it run its course? In my opinion, the best cure for communism is a good dose of communism. If it is as bad as I think, its most enthusiastic sponsors will turn against it if given a little time. Anyway, long experience has proven that ideas cannot be halted by anything except better ideas.

Former Secretary of War Pat Hurley says, "A mule driver must know more than his mule." I feel the same way about halting communism. Before we try to cure this political fanaticism, either at home or abroad, we should know what makes it tick.

Communism's primary causes are empty stomachs and political persecution. When capitalism disintegrates ruinous inflation takes over and communism follows, just as night follows day, and it can happen here!

So before we embark on a wild-goose chase of halting communism all over the world, it would be prudent to estimate the probable total costs of such a venture. Our economy, already badly warped and extremely shaken, cannot stand much more global spending.

We start out to rid the world of communism and wind up by destroying the last remaining citadel of capitalism. What an ironical and hideous result?

The other twin cause of communism is political persecution. We drove the Jap Fascists out of Formosa and invited Chiang Kai-shek to move in. The other day his man, Chen Yi, brutally murdered 5,000 Formosans. During the past 20 years it is estimated that the lives of 7,000,000 noncombatant Chinese have been snuffed out by civil war. Formosa and China today are fertile fields for communism. In Greece, a Fascist Government has been supported in large part through the sale of UNRRA relief supplies. A worker in Greece, due to inflation, cannot earn enough to purchase one-tenth of his family requirements, and while his family starves he must witness the privileged classes living in luxury. Yesterday the Greek Parliament voted a dowry of $40,000 for Princess Catherine, the sister of King Paul, who will be married April 21 to a British officer. That almost makes a Communist out of me.

Sure money borrowed from American taxpayers and poured into Greece by the millions will not halt the cruel barbarism of foreign-born rulers who have been imposed arbitrarily on Greece by Great Britain.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO, OVER THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO. COAST-TO-COAST NETWORK, APRIL 12, 1947

SHALL THE UNITED STATES GIVE AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY?

Many Senators who are rabidly opposed to the Greco-Turkish military grant and loan say they shall not vote against it, since they do not want Stalin and the world to know there is division in the United States on our foreign policy.

American unity is most desirable but the State Department ought to think of that before they launch a program so controversial and so filled with dangerous military implications. The Congress was given no advance information nor was it previously consulted. Suddenly the President canceled his Caribbean vacation and presented it as a pressing world crisis which must be met with no delay.

That is not proper procedure in a democracy. The United States of America is not a dictatorship. I have long advocated a united front, nonpartisan foreign policy, but since the proposal had no preliminary exploration or public examination, all of its phases must be studied and discussed thoroughly now. I shall do my best to bring before the people and the Congress its many far-reaching implications as I view them. That I conceive to be my duty.

It is no light matter to bypass the United Nations organization as it was bypassed by the President. Upon the urgent demand of Warren Austin, our representative to the Assembly, who made a special trip to Washington for the purpose, the President, 16 days after his address to Congress, officially assured UN that he was still friendly to it and backing it.

We must choose either the high road of collective security or the low road of unilateral action. We cannot travel both roads if we would fulfill our destiny to lead the world to peace. No one, eloquent though he may be, can deny successfully that the prestige of UN has been dealt a body-blow by the Truman proposal. It has been branded officially as an impotent instrument. It has been subordinated to an inferior position, and in an inferior position it cannot function. I doubt that it will ever recover its lost standing.

Thus the United States, preaching collective security, stabs collective security in the back and adopts the discredited system of power politics and unilateral action in its stead.

It is no idle passing matter to form what amounts to a military alliance with Turkey. Russia dares not ignore such a threat to her security and to world peace. If you will glance at the map, you will see that Turkey and the Black Sea reach far into the vitals of the Soviet Union. Turkey, by herself and on her own, is no threat to Russia, but when she makes a military alliance with the leading power—the United States—it is a horse of another color. Russia must deem this an act of aggression on our part just as we would be compelled to view a like move by Russia in one of our neighboring states.

Always and traditionally we have refused to intervene in a civil war raging in another state. Under the new Truman doctrine we depart from that wise policy and place the world on notice that henceforth, if it suits our mood, we shall pick one side or the other in every civil war and wade in. Reduced to a few words, it means that henceforth we take it upon ourselves to police the world.

Russia has proven exasperatingly uncooperative. Her obstinate spirit of stubborn and sullen negation would try the patience of a saint. But we, with world peace our most cherished objective, must not fly the track. I earnestly hope that the United Nations rises to its full stature and puts both Russia and the United States in their place. Otherwise Turkey will become an armed camp and throw the whole world into an armament race which must quickly lead to World War III.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDWIN C. JOHNSON, OF COLORADO, ON BLAIR MOODY'S RADIO FORUM APRIL 13, 1947

Close by the Persian Gulf, the very area which envelops the earth's most extensive deposits of petroleum, is said by historians to be the Biblical site of the Garden of Eden. The drama of Adam's original sin is about to be reenacted by modern man. The apple, the ancient symbol of temptation, is replaced by the modern "black gold" altar of petroleum. Otherwise, the setting is the same. Today men fight and die for oil. As certain as we live and breathe World War III is going to be fought in the Middle East over this tempting fruit. The battle lines for an unspeakable war are about to be drawn in the deserts of Turkey. It promises much in blood, death, and destruction.

A military alliance between Turkey and the United States is now pending in the Congress. They do not call it a Turkish military alliance; they call it Turkish aid, but in reality it is a military alliance—pure and simple.

Turkey stands on guard between Russia and the richest oil domain on earth and in

my opinion that is the basis for our hideous proposal to form a military alliance with her. Russia and her satellites must be cut out of this tremendous natural resource. Five of our largest domestic oil companies and certain British oil companies in which the Crown owns a sizable slice, hold joint concessions to all of this vast oil empire. To make their holdings secure the American flag must fly from the highest derrick. So the American people pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to defend to the death the modern Adam's apple.

The Atlantic Charter specifically provides for all nations and peoples on the earth to share alike in the world's natural resources, but we are about to reduce the Atlantic Charter to a scrap of paper and turn this priceless bonanza over to private American and British oil interests to have and to hold and to exploit.

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO ON BEALL HEADLINE EDITION, STATION WMAL, APRIL 10, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Senator JOHNSON, what are some of your main reasons for opposing the President's bill?

Senator JOHNSON. Well, in the first place, it's a program which eventually must lead to war.

Then, it inevitably destroys the United Nations organization, which has been so carefully built up as a bulwark for peace.

It is a radical departure from our long-established and traditional foreign policies.

It effects a military alliance with Turkey.

And it wastes the taxpayers' money in a futile effort to stop communism all over the world.

Mr. BEALL. Speaking of the United Nations, Senator JOHNSON, the Soviet Delegate, Andrei Gromyko, has urged on the United Nations Council at Lake Success that the Council create a special United Nations Commission to oversee any economic aid to Greece. He also opposed any aid at all to Turkey. Would that strike you favorably?

Senator JOHNSON. Strange as it seems to me, I am in complete agreement with Gromyko on both points. Certainly UN should superviser aid to Greece, since a civil war has been raging there for many months. We propose nothing but military aid to Turkey, which can be considered little short of an American-Turkish military alliance. As such it ought not be permitted by UN.

Mr. BEALL. How do you think the country feels about the President's program, Senator?

Senator JOHNSON. My mails indicate overwhelming opposition. All polls which I have noticed shows the same thing.

Mr. BEALL. Well, how do you predict the Senate will vote?

Senator JOHNSON. I have heard many Senators say they do not like it, but they will vote for it in order to prove to the world that there is no division in America's foreign policy.

In my opinion, not five Senators are really for it; yet there will not be two dozen votes against it on the floor. Almost every Senator has deep reservations in his heart.

Mr. BEALL. How do you account for this discrepancy—what has happened, Senator?

Senator JOHNSON. What has happened is this: The freedom of the Senate to vote as it would like to vote has been foreclosed by the executive branch. That is a traditional thing in our foreign relations. Too often there is nothing left for the Senate to do but follow the President. When the President is wrong, it is just too bad.

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM COLORADO, ON UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUND TABLE FROM WASHINGTON, D. C., STATION WRC, APRIL 20, 1947

SHOULD TRUMAN'S GREEK AND TURKISH POLICY BE ADOPTED?

Question. What kind of policy is the President proposing?

Senator JOHNSON. In the Ides of March, 1947, President Truman appeared before a joint session of Congress and, in a tense atmosphere, solemnly pronounced a new and dynamic foreign policy. Senators and Congressmen received it in gloomy silence. They sensed in it a declaration of a future war with Russia. The President suggested his right and duty to intervene in any country anywhere in which there was civil strife or outside pressure. In the Monroe Doctrine, we denied such a right in the Western Hemisphere to all European powers.

In other words we assert that the United States is a privileged power. If intervention everywhere becomes our foreign policy, the comity of nations which is based on equal justice must insist that other powers exercise the identical rights and privileges we claim for ourselves. The Monroe Doctrine obviously is inconsistent with this new policy of American aggression and should fall, but the State Department pledges to strengthen it instead.

The inconsistency of such a position is pointedly significant. The Truman doctrine is a demand on our part for freedom from all international restraints. It is a policy of international anarchy. Under this preposterous theory we assume the responsibility of policing the world all by ourselves and denying such a right to all other powers.

Question. Is our only alternative either a do-nothing policy or the adoption of the Truman proposal?

Senator JOHNSON. Either a do-nothing policy or the Truman policy are equally bad. Fortunately, there is a middle-of-the-road course which is not a contradiction to all of our vaunted ideals and postwar objectives of world peace. My suggestion is that we follow such a course and not become international anarchists.

Admittedly, unrest and discord prevail over much of Europe and Asia. Hunger and misery, the aftermath of war, is widespread and severe. Communism, the symptom of distress, is spreading. Prompt and effective action is imperative. Some say radical departure from our traditional policy of nonintervention, say that if we do not back the President we will give the green light to Russian expansionistic tendencies, and thereby dash to earth all hope of independence of the peoples who are resisting Russia.

Greece must have food, and we should provide it, but at a price, and that price should be a restoration of democracy, immediate amnesty should be declared, and a free and popular election held to select a representative government. A constructive program of restoration and manufacturing and transportation should follow. No guns, no soldiers, just economic aid wisely administered which will help the Greeks help themselves, is all that is required. The Truman policy of military intervention in the civil war raging in Greece must fail just as Britain's policy of violence failed.

Question. Will Truman's program succeed in checking communism in Greece?

Senator JOHNSON. The answer is a very positive no. Greece is torn by civil war and revolution. Her production is far below consumptive needs, her Government is despotic and unacceptable to the rank and file of her people. Her transportation system has collapsed. Disease and malnutrition take their daily toll. Wild and uncontrolled inflation make it impossible for a worker to support his family. British troops, despised—and humiliated by their failure to put down a people's rebellion—are getting out. German collaborators hold high office and serve in the King's army. Political prisoners are starved and tortured. The Truman policy advocates the status quo for Greece. Britain tried to do that. We will fail also.

Question. In your view, what is the connection between Truman's proposal and the interests of the British Empire in the Dardanelles?

Senator JOHNSON. The United Nations should undertake at once the solution of the Dardanelles dispute. Britain does not want Turkey to make any concessions to Russia and now we underwrite that Britain's vicious, narrow, selfish policy of negation on the Dardanelles is in a century-old quarrel with Russia over the Dardanelles, and so Mr. Truman would pay her tribute to encourage her to carry out Britain's obsolete and insane scheme to stop Russia at the Turkish border. Purchasing our way into this ancient British-Turkish-Russian controversy is not statesmanship. It is international suicide. I have every reason to believe that Turkey and Russia would find a fair and friendly basis of cooperation if we and Britain maintained a hands-off policy. Winston Churchill gleefully boasts about the bill of goods he sold us at Fulton, Mo., last year.

Question. What about the relation between the United States and the United Nations?

Senator JOHNSON. The sickening proposal before Congress to sidestep the UN makes both the United States and the United Nations ridiculous. If we ignore her with impunity and go off on a tangent of our own, seeking our military security in Russia's backyard, Russia should be able to do the same thing in the Western Hemisphere. How can the UN keep her from moving into Cuba for instance? Cuba contributes as much to Russian security as Turkey contributes to our security. What a furore it would be if Russia moved into Cuba for Russian security. No, Americans, the United Nations is either our first line of defense or it is nothing.

We marched up the hill on the high road of security for all with high hopes and devout prayers and we created the United Nations; there we pledged our enthusiastic support for collective security. Today we march back down the hill to travel the mud-deep, wreckage-strewn, low road of power politics and unilateral action. It is a wicked thing to destroy humanity's hope. We must not stab UN in the back.

Question. Will our intervention in Turkey lead to war with Russia?

Senator JOHNSON. Our vulgar display of the American flag in Turkey and our provocative threat to send a token army there must lead to war with Russia. It is a bold brazen attempt to bolster Turkish resistance, not to communistic infiltration, pressure, or coercion, but to cause her to repulse all effort to resolve the Dardanelles controversy. How Russia will deal with our unfriendly challenge, I do not know. She will know that $100,000,000 can accomplish very little, but she will also know that our intervention in Turkey constitutes a military alliance between the United States and Turkey.

Reduction of Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OLYMPIC LUGGAGE CORP.,
KANE, PA., *April 21, 1947.*

Mr. ROBERT F. RICH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RICH: Conforming with the request of President Truman we are sending out a letter, per attached copy, to our trade reducing our prices 10 percent. This reduction in prices is not warranted from a standpoint of labor costs or material costs. Our

labor costs are continually increasing and not one of the raw materials we use has been reduced at all, while some of them are increasing. However, as stated in our letter we hope this reduction will stimulate sales resulting in greater volume which will help to reduce our cost per unit. Whether or not the sales will be stimulated by this reduction remains to be seen.

The 20-percent Federal excise tax which now has to be paid by the consumer on every piece of luggage bought drastically reduces luggage sales, and, of course, seriously affects our business. We do not think that moderately priced luggage is a luxury nor should it be placed in the same category as jewelry. We, therefore, strongly urge Congress to abolish this tax completely.

In the matter of taxation we do believe that if the Government would follow the same procedure recommended by Mr. Truman for manufacturers, that individuals as well as business of all kinds would be materially helped. Many nations starting with Egypt have fallen because of oppressive taxation. The latest example before our eyes is the British Empire. When taxes reach the point where incentive for capital investment is gone, business dries up and as a result the amount of taxes collected by the Government as excess rates is less, rather than more. As you well know our Nation has reached its high standard of living as a result of capital invested in tools and equipment and the higher the amount of investment per worker the higher the standard of living for all.

We are sure there is no need for us to elaborate on this matter further, but we are writing this letter to you urging that unnecessary expenses of Government and Government bureaus be reduced or eliminated, and urging Congress to reduce income taxes which at the present rates have already largely nullified any incentive for individuals to risk their money or put any effort into productive enterprises.

We believe that only by the drastic reduction of Government extravagance and progressive reduction of income taxes can this Nation return to the way of life which we want and avoid following in the footsteps of other nations whose downfall was caused by oppressive taxation.

Yours very truly,

H. D. MACEWEN.

OLYMPIC LUGGAGE CORP.,
Kane, Pa., April 16, 1947.

To Our Customers:

In line with President Truman's appeal for lower prices, we have cut the prices of our entire line 10 percent. This we are doing as our contribution toward stabilization of the economy, in spite of the fact that labor cost and the prices of many materials we use are increasing.

The success of this program will, therefore, naturally depend upon increased volume, which should result from the proportionate retail prices this reduction will make possible.

Your orders will have our most careful attention.

OLYMPIC LUGGAGE CORP.

Some Apparent Inconsistencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following news article by Mr. John W. Ball, of the Washington Post, indicates that someone should be acting to prevent waste of funds, fertilizer, and effort:

HOOVER HITS WRECKING OF GERMAN PLANTS

(By John W. Ball)

Former President Herbert Hoover yesterday angrily attacked Army occupation forces for destroying German fertilizer plants urgently needed to restore Europe's food production.

Hoover's denunciation of Allied policy in Europe took place just after he had testified before a closed session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of the $350,000,000 general foreign relief bill.

The former President's attack was not reserved for American forces alone. He spread his criticism over all occupying forces, the United States, British, and Russian armies jointly.

All, he said, had been busy as bees destroying fertilizer plants when all Europe is gasping for fertilizers for food production.

Most important, he said, is to get the productive capacity of Europe built up again.

The Army policy of destroying phosphorus and nitrogen plants in Germany, Hoover said, was carried out while United States taxpayers were being asked to pay the food bill for Europe's starving.

Many of the plants in Germany that were dismantled, Hoover admitted, during the war were producers of war materials for Germany. But the prime need, he added, is to restore production in Europe instead of tearing down industries.

Hoover was emphatic on still another point—that of food relief for nations now within Russian Communist control.

He replied with a positive "no," when asked if such relief should be withheld.

"You've got to keep charity separate from politics," he declared.

From the Capitol, Mr. Hoover went to the White House, where, he told reporters, he had a pleasant, social gossip with President Truman.

"We settled no international problem," he laughed; and then added that he did not find it necessary to discuss with Mr. Truman the subject of foreign food needs.

"I didn't have to go into that," he said with a smile. "He knows all about that."

Hoover told reporters that if this country was going to take the line the Army is following in Germany, "we might as well conclude that the American taxpayer is going to pay the food bill of Europe from now on."

The former President was obviously upset by what he had seen during his recent food survey in occupied areas abroad, and by the recent disastrous explosion at Texas City. The Texas disaster resulted when a ship loading American fertilizer for France exploded in the harbor.

Following the former President's appearance, the Senate committee arranged to act Tuesday on the European relief bill.

Mr. Speaker, why in the name of common sense should we allow the destruction of German fertilizer plants at the very hour that an inadequate United States supply of fertilizer is being shipped to Germany?

In a previous report by former President Hoover, it was explained that the Germans could not fish because of a fishing-boat shortage.

The American people complain about high food prices at the very time that our domestically produced foods are being transferred to areas in need, although the means of producing in those areas are being impaired. People who have any respect for the American taxpayer, the American consumer, and the United States Treasury, can well inject common sense into these programs.

Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., April 19, 1947; also an article from the Washington Sunday Star of April 20, 1947:

ADDRESS OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

It is a great honor and one I highly prize to have this opportunity to speak to this gathering of newspaper editors from all parts of this broad land. I am especially appreciative of your invitation because of certain recent events of a rather tumultuous character in which I played a not-too-happy participant. I am told by more experienced criminal defendants than I am that it is not considered the best form to thank the jury after they have brought in a verdict of "not guilty," the idea being, apparently, that they only did their duty and thanks are, therefore, not good form. Nevertheless, I cannot refrain from commenting that had it not been that the press of the United States is overwhelmingly fair, decent, independent, and above narrow partisanship, your present speaker would almost certainly not be talking to you tonight as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Now this result may or may not be a good thing, but as a statement of fact about the press of this country, it is something I felt I should like to say to you directly.

This black object that I hold in my hand is a cylinder of pure uranium. The amount I hold here is small, as you can see. It is harmless. Five years ago no man had ever seen even this much pure uranium. Not that it was rare, but it was simply of little importance. Tonight this black metal, this inanimate substance, is the central figure in the councils of the peoples of the world.

Why this should be so is not difficult to understand. Look at this small cylinder for a moment. It weighs about 2½ pounds. That much coal or oil, burned under the boilers of industry, would provide a trifling amount of useful energy. Compare the technical opportunities of the controlled release of nuclear forces. The energy resulting from the fission of the 3 million billion billion atoms in this small cylinder, converted into electricity, would equal about the total daily use of electricity in the city of Washington, which now requires about 2,500 tons of coal.

This amount of TNT would produce only a small explosion. But the destructive power of the energy in the nuclei of this handful of material is very great, is catastrophic, the equivalent of many, many tons of TNT. As you know, one bomb derived from this stuff destroyed an entire city in a single blast. This material is so dense, so heavy, that 60 tons—about the capacity of a railroad coal gondola—could be piled up here in a block about 8 feet long by 3 feet high by 4 feet thick. Yet the energy in that material, if only 25 percent of its heat were converted to electricity, would provide an amount of electricity as great as the entire country uses in a year.

Now, these are opportunities that lie in the future and I cite them only to show how great are the economic stakes of further development to bring these opportunities into living reality.

But there are even more important reasons why the recently acquired knowledge about this black cylinder is so vital. Uranium and certain other substances can be put into a kind of furnace called a reactor, or pile, in a particular way so that a terrific radiation is created, a fantastically intense and powerful bombardment by infinitesimal particles that makes the beam from X-ray machine or a piece of radium seem faint. This violent barrage of particles and the resulting radioactivity can perform scientific miracles. Materials, familiar materials like iron or carbon or gold are thrust in that furnace. They go into that bombardment one substance, they frequently come out another. Transmutation of the very elements, the dream of the ancient alchemists, is realized at last, in the day when you and I are living. The characteristics of familiar substance can be changed—made more or less brittle, more or less electrically conductive, and so on. Even more important in terms of human benefit, this intense radiation is a means whereby we can expand our knowledge of nature, push back the frontiers of darkness in a hundred fields—in medicine and the knowledge of how to conquer disease, in industry, in nutrition, in agriculture. It uncovers new concepts of the nature of the universe, brings new skills, new professions, new ideas into being, as basic knowledge always does.

Now, the present discoveries of the controlled release of nuclear energy are the barest beginning. Almost nothing yet is known of the nucleus of the atom; almost everything lies ahead. In our own day the knowledge thus far acquired can be used to unfold vast new understanding of the world, bringing human benefits in its wake.

Our knowledge of the nucleus, of the development of nuclear heat and energy, of neutron bombardment, of the secrets of all physical matter—these are in their earliest stages. The atomic bombs thus far used are also only a beginning, perhaps but a crude beginning, when compared with what further research and development may produce. This may seem rather grim. But what I am talking to you about are the facts and possibilities in the world, regardless of whether they appear grim or pleasant. And the fact is that only a beginning has been made in the destructive potentialities of nuclear weapons. As to the military uses of nuclear energy this must always be remembered—atomic energy research and development, whether for the uses of war and destruction or for beneficent and creative purposes, is virtually an identical process—two sides of the same coin. It is only in the very final stages that a difference arises between destructive and peaceful uses, a difference between what you need to know to make the forces within the nucleus serve the interest of human kind and what you need to know to make them destroy it. Up to that final point the road is the same.

The United States has a head start on the rest of the world. Are we to maintain that preeminence, maintain and increase it, or are we to fall behind? Will we fool along or politic along, or are we to press forward in the vigorous tradition of a pioneer nation?

The answers to such questions depend largely upon you. This is the theme of what I have to say to you of the American press. What our course shall be in the development of this portentous discovery will depend upon how important forward strides in atomic development appear to the American people, depend upon how well the whole American people understand the essential facts, understand the human implications of this discovery.

How well the people understand depends largely upon our institutions of education and communication, the schools and universities, the churches and religious organizations, the radio, and most of all the press.

This great venture into new fields of knowledge can progress no more rapidly than the public's understanding. The American people must know in broad terms what is at stake for themselves and their children.

Our problem is first to understand. This is not easy. It is not easy for any of us—it is not easy to sense that a profound change has taken place in the world. And it is not enough that a few people understand, a few grasp the facts. This comprehension must become widespread. And in the process we must come to grips with reality but without hysteria.

This is not only a large order for the press and for educational forces. This my friends is a large order for humankind.

What are the essential facts that must be known? Let me illustrate with a few. And may I say that none of these facts are highly technical. None of them are secret scientific data. At the threshold of progress in public understanding we must overcome the prevalent feeling that all this atomic energy business is over my head. That is simply not true.

First, take the present condition of our atomic energy development as of this 19th of April 1947. This is a vital fact for the American public to know and to understand in broad outline.

We all know that when the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima August 6, 1945, the United States had a very considerable head start on the rest of the world. It was estimated that we had a start of between 5 to 15 years. What is the situation today? It is this painful fact, that since Hiroshima, the United States has lost momentum in atomic energy development. For from the level of VJ-day we have actually gone downhill, measured in such vital factors as scientific personnel, depreciation of plants, intensity of effort, and in other important ways.

This is wholly understandable, for a relaxation in a transition period was inevitable. But it certainly presents a state of affairs that is not compatible with our conception of the responsibilities that the country has now laid upon this new commission. Accordingly the Atomic Energy Commission has appraised the situation and initiated steps to change these conditions. Nothing less than a major effort is called for, a program under full head of steam, carried forward jointly by American science, industry, the armed forces and Government.

We have lost time and momentum. It is clear that much of this lost time was quite unavoidable. But to face the facts of lost drive, the dribbling away of time, this is the beginning point of any understanding by realistic men of what America's course should be from here on out.

What other facts must become widely understood? I would say high on the list is an understanding of this country's official proposal to the world for international atomic control, the Baruch plan, now being carried forward by Senator Warren Austin and Mr. Frederick Osborne. This must become known to all of us. The physical facts that make the safeguards in that proposal, if agreed to and put into effect, a protection to the American people, must be understood. These are scientific and technical facts that make anything less than those controls and safeguards no protection to us at all. These, too, must also be widely known.

The alternatives to no international atomic agreement are grim. You know what they are as well as I do. You know, too, that statements are made, and they will continue to be made, abroad and at home, that tend to confuse the American people on these issues. Therefore we must all know the facts that make our proposal a fair, a decent basis for other peoples—as well as a protection to us. For in view of these alternatives to no agreement it is essential that the American people should be in no doubt as to the solid moral ground on which the American proposals rest.

Then there is a somewhat different kind of knowledge that must become widespread.

Bear in mind that the decision to develop atomic energy as a weapon was made in utmost secrecy. The American people knew nothing of it and measures were taken to see that they did not know. Over $2,000,000,000 were spent without public participation or a chance to criticize the manner of spending. This was a war necessity. But it is no precedent nor example of the working of peacetime democracy. The fact is—and we might as well face it—that it has yet to be demonstrated that in peacetime the necessarily cumbersome and time-consuming processes of our Federal Government can make a success of such a scientific and technical undertaking as this. It has yet to be demonstrated that in peacetime the United States Government can retain in its service and attract to its service the top creative brains of science and of industry and of management that we simply must have if we are to maintain our preeminence. It has yet to be demonstrated how much secrecy the American people and its representatives will accept in peacetime, since it is their money that is being expended and their destiny that is at stake. And yet it is perfectly clear—no one has suggested an alternative—that atomic energy is an undertaking that under present world conditions must remain in Government hands. It is clear too that under present conditions a large area must be kept secret at all costs.

We of the Atomic Energy Commission—which happily includes your fellow editor Bill Waymack—firmly believes all these things can be demonstrated. We realize fully that it will be an accomplishment without precedent, but it can be done if the American people are constantly aware of how vital it is to our country that it shall not fail. Here is your great function.

There are other situations that the public should understand. Thus, it must be recognized, for it is true, that this is an ever-changing field, that what we have today in the way of plants, of research and developments, may be obsolete tomorrow—indeed it should be a measure of our success that we strive to acquire new and better ways that will make today's plants and processes obsolete. There should also be the fullest understanding of the identity, or virtual identity, of research and production for peaceful uses and for military uses, an identity that reaches a parting of the ways only at the very end of the course. There should be a clear understanding of the possible ways in which in the future nuclear science can contribute to the everyday life, health, and prosperity of our people—a fascinating story. These things lie ahead. The country should know that they can be brought to fruition by good, solid, imaginative work.

A final illustration of the kind of knowledge that must become general is this: That the scientific basis of nuclear-energy release is not an American monopoly; that this scientific knowledge about atomic energy is part of a basic store of knowledge that is world-wide, and that other nations, including Russia, will inevitably in time have learned on their own what we know today. The truth of this comment is not new to you, but anyone who reads public statements these days will agree with me that it needs to be better understood. There are still those who think that what we have is the kind of scientific secret that can be put in an envelope and locked in a vault, and thereby kept as our sole possession for all time. It is not that kind of secret.

These then are some of the facts that the American people must know. For the vitality of our democracy rests upon the widest public participation in those majestic decisions

of policy which determine the course of the Republic.

Probably among the most important decisions in our history as a nation will be those made concerning the course and direction of atomic energy development, and the uses to which this new force is put. These decisions will affect our most cherished institutions. They will have a deep and all-important effect upon our relations with other nations and peoples of the world and upon the very preservation of civilized life. These are not scientific nor industrial decisions. They are human decisions, decisions about human organizations, about our way of life, about the relations of science to well-being, about the issues of peace, or of war, war of a destructiveness beyond our imagination.

Those decisions will be made with wide understanding by the people of the facts, of the consequences of the decisions, that is to say, in accordance with the democratic process, or these decisions will be made without understanding, made in the dark, made under the compulsions of hysteria and fear, not of reason and judgment.

The first decision to be made may be the most important of all. It is an answer to this question: "How important is it to the security and well-being of this country that atomic energy development be pressed forward urgently and vigorously?" For the country to answer this question will require knowledge on the part of the people of what is at stake. If they do not know what is at stake, then the chances are great that this development will slow down, even more, that it will be exposed to all kinds of petty frustrations. Top scientists will adjure it; a good administrator will have nothing to do with it. It will become a fine nestng place for industrious mediocrity.

It is true that the American people on their own, without the agreement of other nations cannot develop international action which will remove the threat of atomic warfare. But, if we as a people thoroughly understand the implications, both destructive and creative, of this new force, if we keep way in the forefront in its development, it is not fantastic to hope that the time will come when in spite of all political obstacles to the free flow of news, the peoples of the whole world will also come to realize that there is no security for anyone unless international agreement safeguards the whole world against the misuse of atomic energy. And this decision will come about among our people and among the peoples of the world through the educational forces of which a free press is the most vital.

It is because of the American people's faith in public knowledge that alone of all our private business institutions the freedom of the press has been enshrined in the very Bill of Rights itself. We as a people have a faith in knowledge, have a belief in the beneficent consequences of an expanding area of reason based upon knowledge. Never in our long history has it been more important that we live that faith, that faith in the principles of self-education.

What I am proposing is a great and sustained program of education at the grass roots of every community in the land. And this leads at once to the question: Who shall be responsible for the dissemination of the facts concerning atomic energy? Clearly, it should not be the Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission does not plan and we are opposed to the idea of a large information staff. Clearly, it should not be any branch, executive or legislative, of the Government of the United States. This is a high function of the people's institutions of education and communication. It is a heavy, and I may say, a sacred responsibility of a free press. It will be your job in my opinion, not only to disseminate the facts, within the limits of security, but to interpret and give meaning to those facts. It will be your job to see that your public servants, legislative and executive, are held to the highest standards of performance, to see to it that atomic energy shall never become the victim of petty politics or narrow partisanship. It will be your job not simply to increase public knowledge but to make it effective. It is for such a historic and fateful function as this that through 150 years this Nation has never wavered in its determination that the schools, the churches, and the press shall remain vigorous, independent, and free.

[From the Washington Sunday Star]

UNITED STATES IS LOSING ITS LEAD ON ATOM, LILIENTHAL TELLS ASNE MEETING

Warning the United States is losing rapidly its preeminence in atomic research, Chairman David Lilienthal of the Atomic Energy Commission call on the Nation's newspaper editors last night to lead an educational campaign to acquaint the public with what is at stake.

"From the level of VJ-day, we have actually gone downhill, measured in such vital factors as scientific personnel, depreciation of plants' intensity of effort and in other important ways," he declared. "Nothing less than a major effort is called for, a program under full head of steam, carried forward jointly by American science, industry, the armed forces and the Government."

Mr. Lilienthal spoke at a banquet concluding the 3-day convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in the Hotel Statler.

WARNS OF DECLINE

If the people do not realize the importance of persistent atomic research to national security, he said, the program "will be exposed to all kinds of petty frustrations.

"Top scientists will adjure it; good administrators will have nothing to do with it. It will become a fine meeting place for industrious mediocrity."

Mr. Lilienthal said it had yet to be shown in peacetime that the Government could attract and hold first-rank scientific talent. "Further," he continued, "American people and their representatives will accept in peacetime, since it is their money that is being expended and their destiny that is at stake.

SECRECY IS REQUIRED

"And yet, it is perfectly clear—no one has suggested an alternative—that atomic energy is an undertaking that under present world conditions must remain in Government hands. It is clear, too, that under present conditions a large area must be kept secret at all costs."

Mr. Lilienthal said many people still had the false impression "What we have is the kind of scientific secret that can be put in an envelope and locked in a vault, and thereby kept as our sole possession for all time."

He said the Commission was opposed to creation of a large Government information staff to disseminate atomic data.

REFERS TO CONFIRMATION

"If the public became informed generally as to the implications of atomic energy and if this country maintained leadership in research," he declared, it would not be "fantastic to hope that the time will come when, in spit of all political obstacles to the free flow of news, the peoples of the whole world will also come to realize that there is no security for anyone unless international agreement safeguards the whole world against the misuse of atomic energy."

In beginning his address, Mr. Lilienthal recalled the controversy concerning his confirmation in the chairmanship. He said:

"I cannot refrain from commenting that had it not been that the press of the United States is overwhelmingly fair, decent, independent and above narrow partisanship, your present speaker would almost certainly not be talking to you tonight as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission."

BUSH ASKS MORE RESEARCH

In another address at the banquet, Dr. Vannevar Bush, director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, said the United States must move promptly to restore its reservoir of scientific learning through increased basic research.

"During the past decade, our scientific advances have been noteworthy, but they have been primarily in applied science, and have drained very nearly dry our resources of fundamental knowledge," he said.

"The Nation must share in the investment," since the work needed is beyond the financial capacity of private institutions, he declared.

INDUSTRY SEEN CARRYING LOAD

Industry will carry the major load in applied science, Dr. Bush said, if it is given a situation in which new businesses "can pioneer with courage, courage enough to make mistakes and start over again."

"We have made the way unnecessarily hard here," he commented, "partly because in the effect to regulate big business we have gone too far, overshooting the mark and virtually prohibiting the venturesomeness essential to the launching of pioneer undertakings."

He praised legislation which would create a national science foundation to seek out and train new scientific talent and emphasized the necessity for "judicious governmental support" of science.

He warned, however, that if Government support means Government control and dictation by the nonscientific, we face failure.

HOWARD ELECTED PRESIDENT

The convention elected N. R. Howard, editor of the Cleveland News, as its president to succeed Wilbur Forrest, assistant editor of the New York Herald Tribune. Mr. Forrest remains on the board of directors until 1950.

Others elected are Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, first vice president; B. M. McKelway, editor of the Star, second vice president; Dwight Young, editor of the Dayton Journal and Herald, secretary; and Alexander F. Jones, managing editor, who on May 1 will become assistant to the publisher of the Washington Post, treasurer. Mr. Young also was secretary last year.

Later the editors adopted four resolutions, including endorsement of the proposal that the United States negotiate separate treaties with other nations to promote world-wide freedom of the press.

INFORMED CRITICISM WELCOMED

Introduced by Mr. Forrest, the resolution asserted that "if the United Nations or other means of multilateral action fails to produce results in reasonable time, this society urges that the United States Government make a beginning through the negotiation of bilateral treaties with individual nations."

After a long discussion, members adopted a resolution by a 37-to-35 vote declaring that ASNE welcomes informed criticism of the press. Discussion centered around a paragraph which was deleted. It stated that the recent report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, issued through the University of Chicago and proposing several press reforms, had been analyzed by many newspapers and found to contain inaccuracies and omissions.

The resolution as adopted stated that the society "constantly recognizes the need for

self-improvement of newspapers, but believes our press is performing with increasing effectiveness and fairness the duty of keeping the American people the best-informed people in the world."

PRESS INSTITUTE PRAISED

A third resolution declared the society "heartily endorses the work of the American Press Institute, established through the leadership of Sevellon Brown of this society at the Graduate School of Journalism of Columbia University. We believe American Press Institute is already helping measurably to raise the practical standards of operative journalism in the United States."

The final proposal submitted by the ASNE resolutions committee and adopted by the members voted "unanimous thanks to its officers who have managed its affairs during the past year and expresses especial appreciation of the services of President Wilbur Forrest and convention program chairman Alexander F. Jones."

Earlier in the day, the board of directors adopted a motion which has the effect of excluding from memberships those who are publishers exclusively. The test of eligibility shall be "50 percent of hours spent as editor, managing editor, editorial editor, or supervising executive editor."

EDITORS HEAR EISENHOWER

Members rose in silent tribute to Joseph Pulitzer, whose centenary is being observed this year by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

General Eisenhower, Army Chief of Staff, told the editors at an afternoon session that "our job is to try to make of every nation a friend, regardless of how hard the problem might be." Failing this, he added, the United States must make as many friends among nations as possible.

The wartime chief of Allied forces received a standing ovation from the group at the beginning and end of his address. He pointed out that this country must set an example in demonstrating that democracy—which he defined as "cooperation"—works at home. Thus other countries would be influenced, he said.

NEWSPAPER ROLE IMPORTANT

In this task, newspapers will have to play an important role, General Eisenhower indicated.

He warned that American occupation forces had reached the very lowest possible level in personnel and added that "when you get below that level, you are asking for trouble."

General Eisenhower said that "come what may, we will keep a strong and effective air force." Asserting that while the superblitz is not yet here, he said this country would have to retaliate quickly to a surprise attack.

Warren R. Austin, United States representative on the United Nations, declared at a luncheon meeting that "we must never give up trying to secure unanimous agreement on world issues, but in the meantime we must maintain our own military strength."

DEFENSE BUDGET SUPPORTED

"Few acts could be more damaging at this stage in history to the cause of collective security and of ultimate disarmament than ill-considered reductions in our budget for national defense or failure to establish a universal military-training system," the former Senator from Vermont declared.

Milton Murray, president of the American Newspaper Guild, disclosed that the union's international executive board was meeting in Chicago to consider a proposal giving the board veto power over local guild strikes.

He said this was being done because of "our strike experiences, particularly in Philadelphia and Los Angeles." The proposal will be submitted to the membership meeting in its annual convention in Sioux City in June.

Amendment of Natural Gas Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, on April 14, 1947, in support of H. R. 2185, a bill introduced by me and now pending, having for its purpose to amend the Natural Gas Act:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Natural Gas Act became a law June 21, 1938. Since then the Federal Power Commission, and the courts which have reviewed the Commission's action, have interpreted and applied the act differently from what the Congress intended in several important respects.

In the face of the clear provisions of section 1 (b) that the act shall not apply to the production and gathering of gas, the Commission has adopted, and the courts have sustained—always by a divided court—certain regulations which have had both a direct and indirect effect upon the production and gathering of gas. Highly technical and unconvincing reasoning has been employed to circumvent the congressional intent.

The Commission has at times even asserted the power under this act to say for what purpose natural gas may or may not be used. It has formulated a distinction between what it terms "inferior" and "superior" uses of gas. It has undertaken to weigh the economic interest of the Nation in the use of one class of fuel as against another and, thus, to envisage dictation by a Federal administrative agency of who may use natural gas as fuel and for what purpose it may be used in the national economy.

The Commission has attempted to extend its authority over local distribution companies already subject to State regulation, contrary to the real intent of Congress, and merely because those companies take gas from an interstate pipe line.

The slow and cumbersome regulations adhered to by the Commission in administering the certificate provisions of the act have resulted in great delays, confusion, and public inconvenience.

The Commission has prescribed no definite or satisfactory standard for segregating property and business over which it has jurisdiction from that over which it does not have jurisdiction in cases where a concern engages in both jurisdictional and nonjurisdictional operations.

The uncertainties, doubts, vacillations, and delays that have arisen in the administration of this act make it imperative that it be amended. It should be amended so that the Commission's jurisdiction, powers, and functions may be readily determined with precision and definiteness, and to the end that the Commission, the persons who are subject to its provisions and the courts may know what the act covers and what it means in all of its material aspects.

H. R. 2185 will amend the act so that there can be no doubt in any quarter that production and gathering of gas and sales incident thereto are not subject to regulation thereunder. The point where the Commission's jurisdiction begins and where it ends will be clearly defined.

It will simplify the certificate provisions of the act so that the unnecessary and cumbersome procedure now employed may be eliminated and essential public service expedited.

H. R. 2185 will make it clear that the commission shall not have the power to control the purposes for which the public may use natural gas. Manifestly, if the commission were possessed of the power to specify by whom and for what purpose natural gas may be used, then through the exercise of such stupendous power it could say to the consuming public what fuel they must use, and by such indirection control the energy resources of this great industrial nation.

In order to accomplish the primary objectives to which I have just referred, the proposed amendments supply the appropriate definitions and standards which are not now in the act.

At the outset let it be understood that I endorse fully Federal regulation of the transportation of natural gas between the States and the sale for resale of gas so transported. I would neither sponsor not support any measure which would nullify regulation of those activities. But I believe that Federal regulation should go no farther, and that the Congress intended that it should go no farther when it enacted the present statute. The amendment which I propose leaves intact all authority and power necessary to effectively regulate those activities and transactions of the natural gas business over which it is desirable to assert the Federal regulatory power.

The Natural Gas Act has been so administered and interpreted that practically every oil- and gas-producing State of any consequence has, through its public officials, vigorously urged its amendment. Practically all of the oil and gas associations of the Nation have done likewise. The Federal Power Commission itself has been urged by these parties to recommend to the Congress the appropriate and needful remedial legislation. The Commission has admitted the existence of doubts, fears, and confusion regarding the meaning and application of the act. It has recognized that in the past both it and the courts have given the act meaning and application which the Congress did not intend. But the Commission proposes that it alone should be allowed to prescribe, and if you please, proscribe, the remedies which are necessary for elimination of the evils.

In September of 1945 the Federal Power Commission commenced a series of hearings in a Nation-wide investigation of the natural-gas business under its Docket No. G-580. Hearings were held in the States of Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Illinois, and West Virginia and the investigation was concluded after a lengthy hearing in Washington last summer.

Preceding these hearings, the Commission declared its intention to inquire into, among other things, "the extent and probable life of natural-gas reserves; present and prospective measures for preventing waste and prolonging the life of such reserves; the present and probable future utilization of natural gas for domestic, commercial, and industrial purposes; the extent, character, and results of the competition of natural gas with other fuels; and such related matters as may be helpful in the administration of the Natural Gas Act or in determining what additional legislation, if any, should be recommended." But the Commission has not recommended any amendments to the act. What it proposes is the employment of administrative fiat to meet the widespread appeals for the needed reforms. I believe that the Congress and not the Commission should respond to these appeals.

After I introduced H. R. 2185, and by letter of transmittal dated March 6, 1947, the Federal Power Commission released four staff reports. The first of these reports

deals with section 1 (b) of the act and relates to the Commission's jurisdiction over the production and gathering of gas. Another one relates to the natural-gas reserves of the United States. Another one relates to practices and problems in producing, gathering, and processing natural gas; and still another one relates to State conservation laws and activities. You will readily note that some of these subjects are not even the proper concern of the Federal Power Commission.

PRODUCTION AND GATHERING AND SALES INCIDENT THERETO

In the report dealing with production and gathering the Commission admits that, "No subject relating to the administration of the Natural Gas Act has received greater attention throughout the course of the natural-gas investigation than the meaning and implications of section 1 (b) with reference to the exemption of the production and gathering of natural gas from jurisdiction under that section."

The report says, "It is evident from the testimony, indicating a widespread atmosphere of anxiety and uncertainty among State officials and the industries concerned, that this matter is in need for further clarification. A continuance of the existing disturbed situation is certain to interfere with the effective performance in the public interest of the duties of both the Federal and State regulatory agencies in their respective spheres, and it will also affect adversely the interests and actions of oil and gas producers, land and royalty owners, and the transmission companies which purchase gas in the field. It may be expected, also, that unless this issue is clarified, the results will be detrimental to those who consume natural gas and to the efforts of conservation authorities to prevent its waste."

Thus, it is clearly admitted that a disturbed situation exists and that public interest demands "further clarification."

Who is to provide this clarification of a congressional act? The Commission, which for 9 years has construed and applied the act in such manner as to arouse the fears, doubts, and uncertainties just noted?

At this late date, after almost 9 years of administering the act, the Commission professes a willingness to yield partially to the plain congressional intent that the act shall not apply to the production and gathering of gas or to the sales made by producers and gatherers to pipe-line companies for transportation in interstate commerce.

But even now the Commission apparently proposes to qualify this exclusion of production and gathering. It says that production and gathering, and sales incident thereto, are excluded from the act if there is no affiliation between the producer and gatherer and purchasing pipe-line company itself. In other words, the Commission would continue to exercise jurisdiction over production and gathering if John Doe owned the gas instead of Richard Roe.

I submit that no such sectionalizing of the Commission's jurisdiction and of the act's application can be fairly read into or out of section 1 (b) as it now stands. This proposal by the Commission illustrates the great danger of leaving to administrative agencies the right to determine their own self-serving powers and jurisdiction.

The language of the Supreme Court in the recent Packard Motor Car Co. case is pertinent. In referring to the vacillations of the National Labor Relations Board, the Supreme Court said:

"If we were obliged to depend upon administrative interpretation for light in finding the meaning of the statute, the inconsistency of the Board's decisions would leave us in the dark. But there are difficult questions of policy involved in these cases which, together with changes in Board membership, account for the contradictory views that characterize their history in the Board" (Mar. 10, 1947, 15 LW 4311).

With reference to these problems arising under the Natural Gas Act, the issue which the Congress must determine is clear. Will it assume and discharge its rightful function by amending the act? Or will it acquiesce in the administrative agency's suggestion that it be permitted to exercise the legislative function? I propose that the Congress shall discharge its full responsibility in this important matter.

The scope which the Congress intended that the act should have is set forth in section 1 (b), as follows:

"The provisions of this act shall apply to the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, to the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale for ultimate public consumption for domestic, commercial, industrial, or any other use, and to natural-gas companies engaged in such transportation or sale, but shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution or to the production or gathering of natural gas."

The shall-not provisions contain no exceptions. Their application does not depend upon who owns or gathers or transports or sells the gas. But the Commission, even now, is unwilling to give full effect to this plain language. It proposes a partial exclusion of production and gathering although the act expresses a total exclusion thereof. It would make the exclusion hinge on ownership of the property used in the production and gathering although the act expresses no such distinction. The Commission's proposal evidences an unwillingness to abide by the language of section 1 (b) in its full meaning or to follow the well-settled rule that,

"Where a Federal agency is authorized to invoke an overriding Federal power except in certain prescribed situations and then to leave the problem to traditional State control, the existence of Federal authority to act should appear affirmatively and not rest on inference alone." (*Connecticut Light & Power Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 324 U. S. 532.)

An examination of the legislative history of the act reveals beyond doubt that what the Congress intended to regulate was the interstate trunk line transportation of natural gas and the sales for resale after such transportation. When the act was passed the States had already successfully asserted the power to regulate all important aspects of the natural-gas business, except where the gas was transported and sold in interstate commerce for resale to nonaffiliated concerns. It had been finally determined that the States could fix burner tip rates, even though the gas was transported in interstate commerce and distributed to the ultimate consumer by the same concern. It had also been finally determined that the States could regulate the conservation, production and gathering of gas. Therefore, in keeping with its traditional policy the Congress did not undertake to assert its power over all of the incidents of the natural gas business to which, conceivably, the Federal power extends.

The Supreme Court has appropriately observed, in construing the Federal Power Act, that the Congress is aware of the fact that complete centralization of the control of an industry may overtax the administrative capacity of a Federal commission, and that "the insulated chambers of the States" are still laboratories where many lessons in regulation may be learned" (*Connecticut Light and Power Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (324 U. S. 515, 530)). Delay, misunderstanding of local law and needless Federal conflict with the State policy are the inevitable products of any different policy.

With reference to the Natural Gas Act, the Supreme Court in *Public Utilities* v. *United Fuel Gas Co.* (317 U. S. 456), correctly said:

"It is clear, as the legislative history of the act amply demonstrates, that Congress meant to create a comprehensive scheme of regulation which would be complementary in its operation to that of the States, without any confusion of functions. The Federal Power Commission would exercise jurisdiction over matters in interstate and foreign commerce, to the extent defined in the act, and local matters would be left to the State regulatory bodies."

Notwithstanding what appears to me to be an emphatic and clear exclusion of production and gathering from the operations of the act, there has been much misunderstanding, confusion, doubt and actual disregard of the congressional intent with respect to the lack of jurisdiction in the Federal commission to regulate production and gathering and sales incident thereto.

Let me point out that in construing these "shall not" provisions of the act, administrators and judges have given practical meaning to the utterance of a Supreme Court Justice that, "The notion that because the words of a statute are plain its meaning is also plain, is merely pernicious oversimplification." (Mr. Justice Frankfurter dissenting in *United States* v. *Monia* (317 U. S. 424, 431).)

Shortly after the act was passed the Federal Power Commission asserted the right to regulate the price which a producer and gatherer of gas received from an interstate pipe-line company (*The Columbian Corporation* (October 31, 1939, 2 F. P. C. 200)).

This assertion of jurisdiction over a mere producer and gatherer of gas was vigorously contested by the States of Kentucky and West Virginia, the N. A. R. U. C., the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association and the Independent Petroleum Association of America. After almost 8 months of deliberation on the question, a majority of the Commission reached the correct conclusion that it did not have the asserted jurisdiction. It is noteworthy that this conclusion was reached after a consideration of the language of the act as a whole, the reports of the Congressional committee recommending the legislation and the expressions of individual Congressmen in the course of the debates on the bill.

But there was an ominous dissent by one of the Commissioners in the Columbian case. This dissent is important because the reasoning which it employed was used later by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the *Peoples Natural Gas Company* case (127 Fed. 2d 153) and by the Commission itself in the *Interstate Natural Gas Company* case (3 F. P. C. 416). The dissenting Commissioner contended that the producer and gatherer was a natural-gas company. By splitting hairs he reasoned that even though producing and gathering were not interstate activities subject to regulation under the act, still the sale of the gas by the producer was a sale for resale in interstate commerce subject to regulation under the act.

In the Peoples case, to which I have just referred, the Commission sought to regulate the rate charged by the Peoples Gas Co. for gas sold to an affiliated pipe-line company at a compressor station. Although the facts were not fully developed in this case and it is difficult to determine just what the factual situation was, the language of the court is very significant. The Court said that, "Sales of gas which has just moved interstate and sales of gas which is about to move interstate have like practical effects."

In the Peoples case the court brushed aside the Columbian case and the congressional history of the act with this statement: "We cannot disregard the plain language of the statute because the Commission at one time

interpreted it narrowly, or because the reports of congressional committees show an intention not to 'disturb' State regulation, or because appellants fear duplicate regulation."

Regardless of the particular facts in the Peoples case, it is certain that the reasoning which the court employed in reaching its decision could be easily employed to bring under the act every producer and gatherer of gas who sells it to an interstate pipe-line company. Every sale to an interstate pipe line at the well or from the gathering lines is "about to move interstate." It is a sale for interstate shipment and a sale for shipment across State lines. And let me emphasize that in its language and reasoning the court affirmed what the Commission advocated.

In the *Interstate Natural Gas Company* case (3 F. P. C. 416, 1943) the Commission sought to regulate certain sales of natural gas which the Interstate Co. made to other pipe line companies in the State where the gas was produced and before transportation across State lines. The Interstate Co. contended that such sales constituted sales in the production and gathering of gas and fell within the exemption stated in section 1 (b) of the act. In overruling this contention, the Commission said:

"The negative language in section 1 (b) upon which the Interstate Co. relies for its claimed exemption involving these sales provides that the Commission shall not have jurisdiction over 'the production or gathering of natural gas.' When the distinction between production and gathering of natural gas and the sale of such gas in interstate commerce is kept in mind, effect is given to the congressional objective. The Commission is bound to obey the command of Congress to regulate these sales in interstate commerce for resale to the three pipe-line companies. Such is clearly the implication of the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals in *Peoples Natural Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (127 F. (2d) 153, cert. den. 316 U. S. 700)."

It is important to note that here the Commission adopted the views expressed by its dissenting member in the Columbian case, to the effect that the exemption of production and gathering does not exempt the sales of gas by the producer and gatherer. The Commission grounded its acceptance of this theory on "the implication of the decision" in the Peoples case.

The Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the Commission's decision in the Interstate case (156 Fed. (2d) 949 (August 1946)), and the Supreme Court has issued a writ of certiorari. One of the circuit court judges dissented. The majority of the court reasoned that the exclusion of production and gathering, as contained in the act, related only to the properties used in production and gathering and not to the sales made by the producer and gatherer to an interstate pipe-line company. It cited with approval the Peoples Natural Gas Company case, to which I have already referred. And it concluded that the exemption of production and gathering as now contained in the act merely precludes the Commission from any control over the activity of producing and gathering, as distinguished from the sale of gas for resale by the producer and gatherer.

The dissenting opinion said that the majority opinion nullified the plain intent of Congress to except from the act the production and gathering of gas.

From what has been said, it must be clear to the gentlemen of the committee that the act has been construed to mean that only the properties and physical functions of producing and gathering are excluded therefrom, and that the sales of gas made by producers and gatherers to interstate pipe line companies are sales for resale in interstate commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

This means that all producers and gatherers of gas who sell it to pipe-line companies for transportation and sale for resale in interstate commerce are threatened with regulation under the act. There are thousands of such producers. Many of them produce gas as an incident to the production of oil. These producers and gatherers are fearful that they will be given a public-utility status under the act and subjected to the limitations and burdensome regulations which have been applied to natural-gas companies by the Federal Power Commission. They are unwilling to risk regulation which would limit them to a 6½-percent return on the prediscovery cost of their leases and on the original cost, less depreciation, of their well equipment, gathering lines and other similar property.

The report of the Federal Power Commission to which I have previously referred notes that—

"The crux of all this disturbed feeling traces to language used in certain of the cases on this subject which seems to distinguish between price control over production and gathering and the regulation of the physical facilities used in performing these functions."

"It is contended with much force that there is no basis in the act for any such distinction, for the reason that the exemption as to production or gathering is unqualified and plenary and cannot, therefore, be narrowly construed so as to assert authority to regulate the sale price received by producers or gatherers who do not engage in operations making them natural-gas companies."

"As a result of this feeling of uncertainty regarding the status of sales by producers and gatherers, there have been indications that producers of gas and associated oil may be unwilling in the present situation to contract for the sale of gas intended for interstate movement, for fear that they may thereby become subject to regulation as natural-gas companies under the act. The oil industry, which produces large amounts of natural gas, has been particularly apprehensive of this possibility.

"Most important of all are the indicated effects of this situation on efforts to prevent gas wastage. State officials and others have warned that the reluctance of some gas producers to sell their gas for interstate marketing is interfering with the progress of conservation measures and is a contributing factor in the continued flaring of large volumes of casinghead (oil-well) gas. Col. E. O. Thompson, of the Texas Railroad Commission, testified that greater success in preventing waste would have been realized 'had it not been for the fear of the producers of gas, this casinghead, that if they hooked onto a pipe line they would be declared a public utility and limited to 6½ percent of the total earnings.' He stated that certain desirable conservation projects had been held up, among other possible reasons, because of this fear of producers that by selling their gas they might become subject to Federal regulation under the Natural Gas Act.

"All those who have manifested concern with respect to this matter strongly urge the need for clarifying the situation and setting definitely at rest the doubts and uncertainty which now prevail. In view of the importance of this issue, it is said, the determination of this question should not be permitted to depend upon the outcome of closely contested administrative and legal proceedings which are concerned with the special circumstances of particular cases. In their view, the only satisfactory solution is considered to be specific amendatory legislation which would establish beyond doubt that producers and gatherers who sell their gas to interstate pipe-line companies are not subject to regulation under the Natural Gas Act by virtue of such sales."

PROVISIONS OF H. R. 2185 RELATING TO JURISDICTION OVER PRODUCTION AND GATHERING AND SALES INCIDENT THERETO

H. R. 2185 would make the act apply to:

1. The transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce;
2. The sale, after such transportation, in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale; and
3. Natural-gas companies engaged in such transportation or sale.

H. R. 2185 makes it clear that the act shall not apply to:

1. Any other transportation or sale;
2. The transportation between the well or wells where produced and the point of delivery to or reception in the interstate trunk transmission facilities of a natural-gas company;
3. Any sale at or prior to such point of delivery or reception;
4. The production or gathering of natural gas;
5. The producing, gathering, treating, or processing facilities utilized or operations conducted in handling or preparing the gas for delivery or reception into the interstate trunk transmission lines; and
6. Local distribution of natural gas or local distribution facilities.

These provisions are contained in the proposed subsection (b).

In subparagraph (c) of section 1 it is made clear that the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission will be coextensive with the jurisdictional provisions contained in subparagraph (b).

In section 2 of the amendments the definition of "natural gas" contained in subdivision (5) of section 2 of the Natural Gas Act is amended. The present act defines natural gas as being "either natural gas unmixed, or any mixture of natural and artificial gas."

This definition is wholly inaccurate when applied to most of the gas now transported to interstate markets. As already pointed out, the greater portion of such gas is residue gas from which the liquid hydrocarbons, consisting of gasoline and LPG, have been extracted. Much of that which is transported from the Gulf coast and other fields is residue from gas which has been recovered in recycling operations or residue from casinghead gas. In order that the act may classify as natural gas the product actually being transported, it has been thought advisable to define "natural gas" as meaning either gas in its natural state as produced from the well, or residue gas from gas in its natural state, from casinghead gas, or from other gaseous substances after extraction of hydrocarbon liquids, or any mixture of natural and artificial gas.

The definition of "natural-gas company" in section 3 conforms such definition to the jurisdictional provisions of the act by providing that " 'natural-gas company' means a person engaged in the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission as in this act defined, or the sale in interstate commerce after the commencement of such transportation of natural gas for resale subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, as in this act defined, but to the extent only that such person is engaged in such transportation and sale."

Production and gathering are not defined in the existing act. It is important that these terms be defined so that the regulatory body, the producers and gatherers, and the natural-gas companies may know definitely what activities and sales are under the act and what activities and sales are not under it. H. R. 2185 contains these necessary definitions in section 4. These definitions have been framed with regard to the usual and normal practices in the oil and gas industry. When taken in connection with the jurisdictional provisions in section 1 (b), they have

the effect of excluding from the act operations incident to the recovery of natural gas from the reservoirs, the recovery of residue gas from natural gas, casinghead gas, or other gaseous substance, by treating or processing, and the delivery and sale of natural gas from production facilities. "Production facilities" are defined as the land, leaseholds, wells, separators, extraction plants, and other facilities used for, or incident to, such production.

Under the definition of "gathering" there would be excluded from regulation under the act the facilities used for moving natural gas produced or purchased in the producing and gathering area to the point of delivery into inlets of the trunk transmission facilities used for the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, and the sales and deliveries of gas from such gathering facilities would be excluded.

The term, "transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission," is also defined so that the interstate transportation which is subject to regulation under the act may be definitely determined. In this respect the definition of "transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission" is an aid and auxiliary to the definition of "production" and "gathering." By this definition the interstate transportation which is subject to regulation under the act commences at the trunk pipe line compressor station or main receiving point of a natural-gas company. It extends therefrom to the point in the State of local distribution, or on the boundary of such State, at which the gas moves from the trunk transmission facilities of the interstate carrier into the local distribution or trunk transmission facilities of the person who sells such natural gas in local distribution. If the gas is transported across a State line in the trunk transmission facilities of the person who sells it to consumers in local distribution, then the terminus of the interstate transportation is at the point where the gas enters the pressure reducing or measuring station or local distribution facilities for local distribution.

The term, "sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission," is defined as the sale which is made after the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

"Local distribution" is defined as the operation of local distribution facilities and the delivery or sale of gas therefrom. "Local distribution facilities," means the pipe lines and other facilities used for, or incident to, the distribution of natural gas to the general public within a community or distribution area for ultimate public consumption, for domestic, commercial, industrial, or any other purpose.

All of these definitions have been framed with regard to the limits of jurisdiction embraced in sections 1 (b) and 1 (c), and I consider them essential if the confusions and misunderstandings of the past are to be avoided in the future.

In its report on production and gathering in Docket G–580, to which I have previously referred, the staff of the Federal Power Commission pointed out that "With particular reference to the present problem, it would not be practicable for the Federal Government to attempt to regulate sales of natural gas by the producers and gatherers thereof, unless it also took over from the States essential functions now performed by them relative to oil and gas conservation and the protection of correlative property rights in these resources." This report also says that, "In view of the widespread uncertainty which has been manifested regarding the Commission's view of its jurisdiction over production and gathering sales, it is important that the Commission take appropriate action to relieve the doubts and fears now prevailing in this regard." It suggests that this action may be accomplished through Commission rules or by an amendment to the act. The report recommends, however, the administrative rule method instead of amending the act.

In addition to the reasons I have previously given, the Congress should be unwilling to leave this important matter to be settled by administrative rules because such rules can be changed from time to time and at any time. There is another cogent reason which is revealed by the report to which I have made reference. The Commission's staff does not propose to define production or gathering in the administrative rule which it recommends. After referring to the "significant distinction * * * between the functions of production and gathering, * * * and the functions of interstate transportation and sale" the Commission's staff proposes to leave these definitions open for determination in each case by the Commission itself. The staff of the Commission says that "it must be granted that there will be some situations where the determination as to jurisdiction under the act can be made only after examining into the facts and circumstances with respect to the particular functions actually performed." It further says that "there can be no single test or formula which will afford an appropriate and ready answer, applicable to all of many different situations, in determining when production and gathering have been completed and transportation in interstate commerce within the purview of the act has begun."

I very definitely disagree with this conclusion. The definitions which are in H. R. 2185 can always be applied by a producer or gatherer or by the Commission itself under any factual situation for the purpose of determining the question of jurisdiction.

If the Congress does not write some standard into the law to govern the Commission in its determination of when production and gathering end and interstate commerce subject to its jurisdiction commences, then the producers and gatherers will still be at the mercy of the Commission in each case. Whether or not a producer or gatherer is under the act will depend not upon what the Congress has said in the act itself, but rather upon what the Commission may determine in each individual case is production and gathering.

Under such a policy a producer and gatherer could never be sure of his status until after a trial before the Commission and the rendition of a judgment by it. And the Commission's judgment would be rendered only after the producer had made his investment and contractual commitments.

In the staff report this rather amazing statement is made: "Since the conditions of gathering operations are varied and sometimes complex, determinations as to what marks the beginning of transportation for jurisdictional purposes may properly be somewhat flexible in accordance with the circumstances" (p. 44). I submit that this flexibility regarding the Commission's jurisdiction—jurisdiction which may be bent the one way or the other in accordance with the circumstances—is what has given rise to the evils that the Commission recognizes now exist. The Congress can and should provide definite standards by which the industry, as well as the Commission, can be governed in determining the all-important question of jurisdiction.

PRODUCTION AND GATHERING IN RATE CASES

Results reached in rate cases arising under the act afford glaring examples of why oil- and gas-producing properties should not be subjected to the conventional principles of public utility regulation. The Commission has treated the producing properties of natural gas companies just as it has treated pipe lines and similar types of property. One Justice of the Supreme Court has said that the results were "capricious," "delirious," and "fantastic." The Commission has put the producing leases and proven gas reserves of natural gas companies in the rate base at their cost before development and allowed 6½ percent return thereon. In some instances the original cost of wildcat leases was zero. Hence, the company was allowed no return on them, nothing whatever for the gas itself, although the leases were admittedly very valuable due to the discovery of gas after their acquisition.

In the *Hope Natural Gas Co.* case (320 U. S. 591), in reference to the adoption of the field price method in fixing rates for natural gas companies, the Court said: "Such theories of rate-making for this industry may or may not be desirable. The difficulty is that section 4 (a) and section 5 (a) contain only the conventional standards of rate-making for natural gas companies" (p. 616).

H. R. 2185 will, as I shall later point out, remedy the difficulty thus referred to by the Court, by providing for the application of realistic and appropriate stands.

In the Hope case the Court sustained what the Commission did solely because it felt bound by the terms of the statute to do so. It emphasized that difficulty arose because the statute prescribed only the "conventional standards" of rate-making for natural gas companies.

Referring later to the Hope decision, Mr. Justice Jackson said that it introduced into judicial review of administrative action the philosophy that the end justifies the means (*Colorado Interstate Co.* case, 324 U. S. 581, 609).

Justices Reed, Frankfurter and Jackson dissented in the Hope case. Mr. Justice Jackson took sharp issue with the way in which the commission had dealt with the producing and gathering properties. He said that, "The case before us demonstrates the lack of rational relationship between conventional rate-base formulas and natural gas production and the extremities to which regulating bodies are brought by the effort to rationalize them" (320 U. S., 645).

And he pointed out that the business of a natural gas company has two components of quite divergent character. The transportation phases of its business he classed with the conventional common carrier undertaking—"a relatively routine operation not differing substantially from many other utility operations." The other part of the business, "to reduce to possession an adequate supply of natural gas—is of opposite character, being more erratic and irregular and unpredictable in relation to investment than any phase of any other utility business." The former—the public utility phase of the business—he recognized as being susceptible to the conventional rate-base calculated on the prudent investment formula. The latter—the nonutility aspects of the business—he thought wholly unadaptable to such concepts and formulae. He recognized that: "The service one renders to society in the gas business is measured by what he gets out of the ground, not by what he puts into it, and there is little more relation between the investment and the results than in a game of poker" and that, "To regulate such an enterprise by undiscriminatingly transplanting any body of rate doctrine conceived and adapted to the ordinary utility business can serve the 'public interest' as the Natural Gas Act requires, if at all, only by accident" (320 U. S. 647, 649, 650).

I agree fully with these statements and the further statement by Mr. Justice Jackson in the Hope case that, "If natural gas rates are intelligently to be regulated we must fit our legal principles to the economy of the industry and not try to fit the industry to our books" (320 U. S. 650).

Mr. Justic Frankfurter agreed fully with Mr. Justice Jackson's analysis of the natural-gas business. Addressing himself thereto, he said:

"The Natural Gas Act of 1938 should receive application in the light of this analysis, and Mr. Justice Jackson has, I believe, drawn relevant inferences regarding the duty of the Federal Power Commission in fixing natural gas rates. His exposition seems to me unanswered, * * *" (320 U. S. 625).

"Either the fixing of natural gas rates must be left to the unguided discretion of the Commission so long as the rates it fixes do not reveal a glaringly bad prophecy of the ability of a regulated utility to continue its service in the future. Or the Commission's rate orders must be founded on due consideration of all the elements of the public interest which the production and distribution of natural gas involve just because it is natural gas" (320 U. S. 626).

The "relevant inferences" and "unanswered" logic of Mr. Justice Jackson in the Hope case found no response in the Commission. In later cases the Commission again applied to the producing and gathering properties of the companies the same unworkable public utility concepts that it applied in the Hope case.

In *Colorado Interstate Gas Co. v. Federal Power Commission et al.* (324 U. S. 581), the question of the Commission's jurisdiction over producing and gathering properties was pinpointed. By a bare majority the Court again affirmed the Commission.

Chief Justice Stone wrote a vigorous dissenting opinion in which four other Justices concurred.

In describing what the Commission had done the learned Chief Justice said:

"In fixing rates for petitioner's interstate business of transporting and selling natural gas for resale, the Commission included petitioner's gas wells and gas gathering facilities together with all its transportation and distribution facilities in a single rate base. It valued the wells and gathering facilities at their prudent investment cost of many years ago, a valuation drastically less than their present market value. It then restricted petitioner's return to 6½ percent of the rate base, including the wells and production facilities, constituting approximately two-thirds of the total rate base. It thus subjected petitioner's production and gathering property to the same regulation as that which the statute imposes upon petitioner's property used and useful in the interstate transportation and sale of gas for resale. This, we think, the Natural Gas Act in plain terms prohibits." (324 U. S. 616).

The Chief Justice thought that the majority of the Court had overridden the plain language of the statute excluding production and gathering from the other activities of transporting and selling. He thought that the langauge of the present act was well chosen to accomplish this exclusion and differentiation; and that the House committee reports showed "beyond doubt that the purpose of the legislation was to bring under Federal regulatory control the interstate transportation and sale of natural gas which had been held not to be subject to State regulations, * * * but to leave undisturbed all other matters which were then subject to State regulation, which included rate-making for production and gathering." (324 U. S. 620–621).

Although expressing disagreement with the views of the majority and referring to his dissent in the Hope case, Mr. Justice Jackson felt bound to follow the precedent established by the Hope case. But he was unwilling to leave unchallenged the ridiculous results reached by the Commission in its treatment of the production and gathering properties. The following quotation from the separate opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson gives a vivid description of what was done and of the infirmities of the Commission's processes under the present act:

"To let rate-base figures, compiled on any of the conventional theories of rate making, govern a rate for natural gas seems to me little better than to draw figures out of a hat. These cases confirm and strengthen me in the view I stated in the Hope case that the entire rate-base method should be rejected in pricing natural gas, though it might be used to determine transportation costs. These cases vividly demonstrate the delirious results produced by the rate-base method. These orders in some instances result in three different prices for gas from the same well. The regulated company is a part owner, an unregulated company is a part owner, and the land owner has a royalty share of the production from certain wells. The regulated company buys all of the gas for its interstate business. It is allowed to pay as operating expenses an unregulated contract price for its coowner's share and a different unregulated contract price for the royalty owner's share, but for its own share it is allowed substantially less than either. Any method of rate making by which an identical product from a single well, going to the same consumers, has three prices depending on who owns it does not make sense to me.

"These cases furnish another example of the capricious results of the rate-base method in this kind of case. The Commission has put five of the most important leaseholds, containing approximately 47,000 acres, in the rate base at $4,244.24, something under 10 cents per acre. Three such leases are put in the rate base at zero. This is because original cost was used, and these were bought before discovery of gas thereon. The company which took the high risk of wildcat exploration is thus allowed a return of 6½ percent on nothing for the three leases and a return of less than $300 a year on the others. Their present market value is shown by testimony to be over $3,000,000" (324 U. S. 610–611).

In the more recent *Cities Service* case (155 Fed. 2d 694, certiorari denied), a majority of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals considered themselves bound by the decision of the Supreme Court in the Colorado Interstate case to affirm the Commission's assertion of jurisdiction over the production and gathering properties and the application thereto of the Commission's public utility rate formula of cost-plus-6½-percent return. The dissenting opinion of Circuit Judge Phillips in that case is enlightening. I hope that every member of the committee will have an opportunity to read that opinion in its entirety.

In that case the Commission again included in the rate-base what it found to be the legitimate cost to the regulated company or its predecessors of the leases, administrative cost of acquisition, and the cost of physical structures. Where no bonus or consideration was paid for a developed lease the Commission allowed no cost in the rate-base for the lease itself. For example, 68,086 acres of leases in the Panhandle field, constituting one of the most valuable proven gas reserves in the world, were put in the rate-base at zero, because no bonus consideration was paid for such leases. The results reached by such a system of regulation were thus described by the dissenting judge: "Thus, the allowances in the Oklahoma and Kansas fields were approximately 11.4 cents per thousand cubic feet of gas reserves, whereas the allowances in the Panhandle field and the Hugoton field were a nominal fraction of a mill per thousand cubic feet of gas reserves" (155 Fed. (2d) 707).

From what has been said it should be apparent that the fears of thousands of producers of oil and gas, the oil and gas producing States of the Southwest, as vigorously expressed in the Federal Power Commission's general investigation under its Docket No. G–580, are well founded. It is also apparent to me, as it was apparent to Mr. Chief Justice Stone and Justices Reed, Frankfurter, and Jackson, that the Congress never intended to authorize or sanction such a system of regulation over natural gas production and activities as the one employed by the Federal Power Commission.

H. R. 2185 PROVIDES APPROPRIATE STANDARDS FOR DEALING WITH PRODUCTION AND GATHERING IN RATE CASES

H. R. 2185 not only excludes from the act the production and gathering business, but it provides standards by which the Commission can effectively regulate the public utility phases of interstate transportation and sales for resale without exercising jurisdiction over the excluded business, and without applying the unrealistic and impracticable formulas which it has applied in the past.

In section 5 of H. R. 2185 appropriate standards have been prescribed. In fixing the rates of a natural gas company the Commission is directed to allow as an operating expense the actual price paid for gas purchased from nonaffiliates and nonsubsidiaries. If the gas is produced by a natural gas company or purchased from a subsidiary or affiliate, the Commission is directed to allow as an expense of operation the prevailing current market price in the field or fields where produced for natural gas of comparable quality, volume and pressure, delivered under similar conditions. If no prevailing current market price exists in the field, then the Commission must allow the fair and reasonable value of the gas, taking into consideration the prevailing current market prices paid for gas of comparable quality, volume and pressure, delivered under similar conditions in the general vicinity, and other pertinent factors. The Commission is expressly prohibited from using "a calculated value for such gas based upon the producer's investment in and cost of the properties from which such gas is produced." The Commission is also authorized to allow reasonable compensation for gathering and delivering the gas to the inlet of the transmission facilities of the natural gas company.

In its recent report the Commission's staff recommends that field price be accepted only when there is no affiliation between the producer and the purchasing pipe line company. If this recommendation were followed the existing chaotic condition would be given unwarranted affirmance.

There is no sound reason for making a distinction based on ownership as suggested by the Commission. Where the transaction is not at arm's length the Commission can ascertain the fair unregulated value of the natural gas produced in an unregulated field, in order to regulate appropriately the rates of the natural gas companies which are subject to its jurisdiction. But, as was observed by Chief Justice Stone, "This does not mean that in fixing rates for a regulated business which derives its distributed product from an unregulated business that the property of the latter is not to be segregated from the regulated property, or that there can rightly be applied to it standards of valuation and rate of return which are applicable only to a regulated business." (324 U. S. 622).

On this point the Chief Justice expressed the following additional sound reasoning:

"The standards to be applied in order to make certain that the regulated business is not paying too much for the product are those which currently apply in the unregulated business. This, as we have pointed out, was recognized by the Solicitor of the Commission in the hearings on proposed legislation culminating in the present act. He said that the unregulated field price was controlling upon the Commission 'if the transaction is at arm's length. If the transaction is not at arm's length, of course, its reasonableness may be inquired into, under the decisions of the Supreme Court.'" (324 U. S. 622–623).

In conclusion the Chief Justice recognized that the appropriate way to meet the problem "is by treating the property unregulable in law as unregulable in fact, and applying to it those standards of value and return which currently prevail in an unregulated business when it is conducted at arm's length." (324 U. S. 623-624).

If one principle were applied to arm's length purchases and another wholly unrelated principle were applied to gas owned by the natural gas company or purchased from affiliates, then throughout the producing areas there would be an inevitable turmoil and confusion in prices. The royalty owner would receive royalty based on market price in the one instance and 6½-percent return upon prediscovery value in other instances. The States which derive substantial revenues from taxes on natural gas would receive one tax if the gas were sold under an arm's length transaction and another tax if it were not. The question of ownership should not determine the price or the value of the gas. And the gas should be worth the same price in the same field when produced under similar conditions regardless of ownership. I agree with and paraphrase what I have already quoted from Mr. Justice Jackson on this point, namely, that—

Any method of rate making by which an identical product from a single field or producing area, going to the same consumers, has three prices depending on who owns it does not make sense to me. We should not exclude production and gathering from the act in part and include it in part. We should not include production and gathering if it is owned by one person and exclude it if it is owned by another. We should not apply one rule to one owner and a different rule to another owner. Oftentime the ownership of the producing lands is multiple, even in the same lease. The complexities that would arise from the application of artificial distinctions based on ownership would be insurmountable. The value of gas in the field has no relation to its ownership. The value should be the same, other conditions being the same, whether the gas is owned by an independent producer, a natural-gas company, or the affiliate of a natural-gas company. The major oil- and gas-producing States have elaborate laws for regulating the producing, gathering, and conservation of gas. These laws are not framed to apply with reference to who the owner may be. Uniformity and equality of treatment under the Natural Gas Act is essential.

Section 5 of H. R. 2185, insofar as it makes the field price the governing criterion, conforms with the principles sanctioned and advocated by the States of Texas, Kansas, Oklahoma, West Virginia, and others. In addition to this, practically all of the oil and gas associations have advocated the same principles.

There is a provision in section 5 of H. R. 2185 which would permit a natural-gas company to include its production and gathering properties in the rate-base. This provision is intended to cover the particular circumstances under which gas is produced in the Appalachian area. Under the provision, a natural-gas company is given the right to elect within 90 days after the amendment becomes effective, to have its production and gathering properties included in the rate-base. Such election when made would be final. The special conditions existing in the Appalachian area which this provision is intended to cover will be explained in detail by a witness who will follow me.

THE LOCAL DISTRIBUTION OF GAS

The Natural Gas Act in section 1 (b) provides that the provisions of the act shall not apply "to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution." That same prohibition is contained in the proposed amendments. The act does not, however, contain a definition of "local distribution" or "distribution facilities." Nor, as has been pointed out, is there any definition in the present act of "transportation." There is, as a result, no statutory standard by which to determine where transportation (subject to regulation under the act) ends and local distribution (not subject to regulation under the act) commences. This lack of authoritative definition has resulted in much confusion and in the assertion by the Commission of jurisdiction over facilities which are a part of and employed in local distribution and subject to regulation by local regulatory bodies. Distribution companies have been held to be natural-gas companies under the act merely because they own lines connecting with those of an interstate transporter, and some distributing companies have refrained from changing over to natural gas because of their fear that if they should construct a line to connect their facilities with those of an interstate transporter, they might be classified as a natural-gas company under the act and subjected to regulation thereunder.

With the proposed definitions, there should be no controversy as to where the Federal regulatory jurisdiction ends and that of local regulatory authorities begins, and local distribution companies will feel free to connect their lines with those of an interstate wholesaler of gas without incurring the hazard of being subject to double and conflicting regulation, both by the Federal Power Commission, and by State regulatory bodies. And the States' jurisdiction will not be interfered with by Federal regulation.

SEGREGATION OF THE JURISDICTIONAL FROM THE NONJURISDICTIONAL

The present act does not contain any standards requiring the Commission to segregate the property and business of a natural-gas company over which it exercises jurisdiction from that over which it does not exercise jurisdiction. Due to the absence of any such statutory standards the Commission has employed various and conflicting formulas. In fixing rates it has not segregated the jurisdictional property and business from the nonjurisdictional according to any definite standard.

Referring to the allocations made by the Commission in the Colorado Interstate case, the Court said:

"The findings of the Commission in this regard leave much to be desired since they are quite summary and incorporate by reference the Commission's staff's exhibits on allocation of cost" (324 U. S. 595).

In *Colorado-Wyoming Gas Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission et al.* (324 U. S. 626) the Supreme Court remanded the cause to the Commission because of defects in the allocation formulas applied by the Commission. The Court said:

"Here as in the cases of Canadian and Colorado Interstate the findings of the Commission leave much to be desired. The findings are general and incorporate by reference the staff exhibits, on which reliance is put for the subsidiary findings. But in this case there are added difficulties. The staff used one system, the Commission another. * * * When we read that finding against the record there are ambiguities which we are unable to resolve were it our province to do so" (324 U. S. 631-632).

In a separate memorandum Chief Justice Stone and Justices Roberts, Reed, and Frankfurter were of the opinion that the case should be remanded to the Commission for separate allocation of investment and operating cost between the regulable and nonregulable properties (324 U. S. 635).

In the *Panhandle Eastern* case (324 U. S. 635) the principal argument hinged on the failure of the Commission to make proper segregations between the regulated and unregulated business of the company. The Court observed that the Commission made no segregation or separation of the properties used in these two classes of business. Nor did it make an allocation of costs between the regulated and unregulated phases of the business (324 U. S. 639).

The Court, although affirming the Commission's order under the particular facts of that case, nevertheless agreed that the Commission must make a separation of the regulated and unregulated business when it fixes rates. "Otherwise the profits or losses, as the case may be, of the unregulated business would be assigned to the regulated business and the Commission would transgress the jurisdictional lines which Congress wrote into the Act." (324 U. S. 641-642.)

An example of how the Commission—absent statutory standards—may utilize the unregulated business of a natural gas company to the advantage of the regulated business in the fixation of rates is found in the Cities Service case, to which I have previously referred. There the Federal income taxes of the entire concern were allocated to the unregulated business and the regulated business was given a free ride so far as these taxes were concerned. Referring to the formula of allocation used by the Commission in that case, the majority of the court said: "If some of the specific allocations appear to be illogical and unfair, they necessarily pose techonlogical problems of accounting and finance upon which the administrative judgment has been declared virtually supreme. We shall not criticize that which we are powerless to correct." (155 Fed. 2d 705.) And the dissenting judge observed that, "* * * the nonjurisdictional earnings in excess of 6½ percent are saddled with all Federal income taxes. It seems to me, therefore, that there should have been a reasonable allocation of Federal income taxes between jurisdictional and nonjurisdictional earnings" (155 Fed. 2d 710).

This Cities Service case affords another glaring example of the assertion of jurisdiction by the Commission over nonjurisdictional properties and activities through the utilization of unapt allocation formulas. The natural gas company involved in that case permitted an affiliated oil company to extract gasoline, butane, and propane from a part of the natural gas which it produced, transported, and sold. The oil company paid 7 cents per thousand cubic feet for the gas which it so utilized. Instead of crediting the natural-gas company's operating income with the 7 cents per thousand cubic feet of gas which it received from the oil company, the Commission proceeded to evaluate the oil company's extracting plant and to allow it a 6½ percent return thereon after operating expenses, depreciation, and taxes.

The Commission thus in effect regulated the rate of return received by the natural gas company from direct sales of gasoline, butane, and other products extracted from the natural gas produced by it, and, also, regulated the earnings of an oil company over which it had no jurisdiction whatever.

Section 5 of H. R. 2185 provides that the Commission shall segregate the properties and business of a natural-gas company over which it has jurisdiction from those over which it does not have jurisdiction, according to the use made of the properties. In other words, if a pipe line is used in interstate commerce it will be allocated to the jurisdictional business. If it is used in intrastate commerce it will be allocated to the nonjurisdictional business. There is nothing new in requiring segregations between jurisdictional and nonjurisdictional properties and business on the basis of "use." That is the standard employed for many years in fixing the rates of railroads and telephone utilities. It has been sanctioned by repeated decisions of the Supreme Court of

the United States. *Smith* v. *Illinois Bell Telephone Co.* (282 U. S. 133, 150–151); *Simpson* v. *Shepard* (Minnesota rate cases) (230 U. S. 352); and *Missouri Rate Cases* (230 U. S. 474), are illustrative.

CERTIFICATES OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

Section 6 of H. R. 2185 amends subsection (c) of section 7, relating to the granting of certificates of public convenience and necessity. The purpose of this amendment is twofold.

First, it would permit the Commission to issue certificates after notice but without the necessity of formal hearing if no protest is filed.

Second, it would permit a natural-gas company to maintain, extend, or enlarge its facilities, for which a certificate had already been issued, for the purpose of maintaining continuity of service or of supplying increased demands in existing markets without the necessity of obtaining a certificate.

Under the present act, as it is construed and applied by the Commission, a natural-gas company is required to apply for and obtain a certificate for every addition to its existing facilities, even though the additional facilities are necessary in order to continue an existing service.

Recently the Commission has released a staff report which reviews the administration of the certificate provisions of the act. In that report recognition is given to the fact that great and costly delays have resulted from the procedures of the past and that both the public and the natural-gas companies have suffered as a consequence.

Certificate applications (other than "grandfather") received by the Commission in the period from February 7, 1942, to October 15, 1946, numbered 319 and the estimated cost of the facilities involved was $1,300,363,773. Of these, action had been taken on 227 as of October 15, 1946. At that date the number of applications pending was 92, involving facilities having an estimated cost of $444,-614,972.

Commissioner Olds, in addressing a subcommittee of the Senate of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, said: "The Commission realizes, I think, as much as you do and as much as the natural-gas companies do, that there are a great many certificates today required for minor additions and changes, etc., in natural-gas facilities that it would be desirable to enable the companies to take care of without having to come to the Commission for certificates." The staff report, to which I have already referred, contains a similar recognition.

Writing to the Commission on this subject, one natural-gas company has said: "We have had to have the officials of the company in Washington for prolonged periods of time, and in most cases the Commission has not issued certificates until long after the hearings were closed which delay, in the natural-gas business, frequently is critical as at times construction cannot be carried out after the certificates are issued due to weather conditions."

Another company wrote that: "For one reason or another the certificate hearings are now a major legal proceeding, involving the making of a tremendous record, oral arguments, briefs, formal opinions, and orders of the Commission * * * the delay in securing a certificate has resulted in higher construction cost because of the time lapse during which costs increase materially."

And still another company wrote: "Since the passage of the amendment, certificate applications have been filed in such numbers and the procedure established for the consideration of such applications has been so exacting that delays and expenses at times all out of proportion to the issues involved have been encountered."

These are examples of the prevailing views and conditions. Under the act as it now stands it is not clear that the Commission is authorized to issue certificates without hearings, even when no protest is filed, except in the case of grandfather certificates and temporary certificates to meet emergency conditions. Under the existing procedures natural gas companies are unable to improve and enlarge their existing facilities in order to maintain continuity of service or to supply increased demands in existing markets without first applying for a certificate in each instance.

In an effort to alleviate this situation in part the Commission by order No. 130, dated March 29, 1946, instituted a shortened procedure which expedites the determination in uncontested cases. This new procedure is helpful but it is not a complete remedy. It should not be necessary for a company to file an application at all in order to meet the demands for gas in existing markets.

The Natural Gas Act in many respects was patterned after the Motor Carriers' Act. It provides that:

"No terms, conditions, or limitations shall restrict the right of the carrier to add to his or its equipment and facilities over the routes, between the termini, or within the territory specified in the certificate, as the development of the business and the demands of the public shall require" (49 U. S. C. 308).

In the 1942 amendment to the Natural Gas Act, the Congress sought to give this same authorization to natural gas companies. In section 7 (f) it authorized the Commission, after a hearing, to determine the service area of a natural gas company, and then provided that:

"Within such service area as determined by the Commission a natural-gas company may enlarge or extend its facilities for the purpose of supplying increased market demands in such service area without further authorization."

Not one service area has yet been determined by the Commission. The Commission has expressed doubt about the meaning of the service-area provision and how it can be administered.

The difficulty encountered by the Commission in interpreting and applying the act should not deprive a natural-gas company of the ability promptly to carry on such construction as its existing markets may require.

It is proposed, therefore, in section 6 of H. R. 2185 that prompt settlings be made of all applications for certificates; and that, without obtaining an additional certificate, a natural-gas company may maintain, extend, or enlarge its facilities for any transportation or sale of natural gas for which a certificate has been issued, for the purpose of maintaining continuity of service, or of supplying increased demands in its existing markets.

END USE

I have referred to the provisions in H. R. 2185 which would prevent the Commission from controlling the use for which natural gas may be sold. This provision is found in subsection (b) of section 1 of the amendment (H. R. 2185).

The Commission has asserted the power to condition certificates of public convenience and necessity according to the purpose for which the gas is to be used. In one case it specified that gas could not be used as boiler fuel in the generation of electricity. It modified its order in this case so that the power plant could use gas during the coal strike of last summer but recently revoked the right of the company to continue this service (Northern Natural-Boone Iowa case).

In its report to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in January 1944, the Commission disclaimed any intention to deal with the end uses of natural gas until the Congress amended the act to confer on it such specific powers as the Congress desired it to exercise in such matters. But in a later certificate case (Apr. 26, 1944, FPC Opinion No. 114) the Commission stated that considerations of conservation were material to the issuance of certificates; and that it gave consideration to the contentions of the intervening coal and railroad interests who contended that natural gas should not be dissipated in large industrial plants where coal is available and can be readily and economically substituted.

Still later, in June 1944, in the Memphis Natural Gas Co. case, the Commission concluded that the natural gas resources should be conserved insofar as possible for domestic, commercial, and superior industrial uses. The Commission later reversed its decision in this case and granted the certificate applied for. Upon the appeal of the State of Louisiana from this last order, the Commission was sustained by the circuit court of appeals (148 Fed. 2d 746). The court pointed out that the Commission "gave sympathetic consideration to the facts of inferior use along with all the other facts in the case." The court agreed that the Commission may consider as one of the factors entering into the granting or denying of certificates the purpose for which the gas is to be used.

In outlining the principal topics intended to be covered in its general investigation of the natural gas industry in Docket G–580, one of the topics for consideration and investigation was:

"The question of controlling end uses, including: (1) History and objectives; and (2) concepts of superior and inferior uses, as to (a) the technical aspects, efficiency of utilization of energy potential, and (b) the economic aspects dealing with (i) comparative essentiality of use, (ii) availability of a feasible alternative, (iii) the extent to which price can be relied upon in prorating supply and in providing an incentive to efficient use, (iv) the significance of incremental-cost prices and price disparities as affecting utilization of gas, (v) effect of rate policies on end uses, (vi) the view that gas lawfully produced may be sold anywhere for any purpose at any price which the market will afford, and (vii) administrative problems of end-use control."

In an article appearing in Public Utilities Fortnightly (35 PUF No. 7, 410–414), under the title "The New End-Use Doctrine of Gas Regulation," the following statement is made:

"State regulatory bodies and conservation and utility commissions are presently viewing with many gradations of opinion the excursion of the Federal Power Commission into jurisdiction over the end use to which natural gas may be put. It has been pointed out that if the Commission can establish its right to grant or withhold certificates of convenience and necessity to natural-gas projects on the basis of its approval or disapproval of the purposes for which the gas is to be used, then it would be but a simple step for it or some other Federal body to establish that authority over all fuels and over electric power as well.

"Members of many of the State utility commissions, companies in the natural gas industry, and petroleum producers have all expressed their fear that this objective is precisely what the FPC now has in mind."

It must be clear to all men that if the Federal Power Commission can regulate the use which can be made of gas, it can, by the same power, regulate the purposes for which gas can be produced. Gas cannot be produced and transported except for consumption. Thus, under the guise of end-use control the Commission could effectively control the economics of natural gas and of the other energy resources as well.

It has been suggested that this abortive attempt at end-use control is but an element of a national plan to federalize all of the energy resources of the Nation to the end that the entire national economy may be controlled through Federal administrative decrees. In January 1939 the Energy Resources Committee made a report to the National Resources Committee. As stated in President Roosevelt's letter transmitting the report to the Congress, "it suggests policies, investigations, and legislation necessary to carry forward a broad national program for the prudent utilization and conservation of the Nation's energy resources." In this letter of transmittal the President referred to "the widening interest and responsibility on the part of the Federal Government for the conservation and wise use of the Nation's energy resources." In its recommendations the National Resources Committee, among other things, said: "We propose that a Federal oil conservation board or commission should be created within the appropriate Government department to administer the Federal interest in the oil and gas industry and to make necessary rules and regulations concerning the production of, and commerce in, oil and gas. It should have the authority to require that oil and gas be extracted by such methods as are adequate to avoid waste and to protect the interest of all producers drawing from a common reservoir."

Under the heading, "Public policy toward the oil and gas industries," the report says that "perhaps the strongest basis for Federal regulation of production and distribution of oil and gas lies in the Federal Government's power to regulate interstate commerce." Reference is then made to recent extensions of the Federal powers under the commerce clause and to a decision of the Supreme Court. With respect to the latter it is said "this decision would seem to furnish a basis for Federal regulation of production of oil and gas and of conservation measures looking to the protection of the public against the waste of an irreplaceable resource."

Summarizing its conclusions the committee, inter alia, states: "* * * The energy-resources industries are thoroughly interstate, in production as well as in the use of their products. Thus the chief recommendations of this study contemplate a continuing or a broadening of the Federal interest * * * The production and transportation of oil and gas make up a stream of interstate commerce so continuous, so widespread, and so essential that the legal basis for protection of the Federal interest is scarcely subject to debate."

The petroleum industry and some of the oil- and gas-producing States have recently expressed alarm over and opposition to the current trend. The National Conference of Petroleum Regulatory Authorities, composed of State conservation officers, on September 15, 1945, stated that the regulation of the production, conservation, and utilization of natural gas was the inherent right and vested duty of the producing States; that they are intelligently performing these functions; and that the proposed investigation of the Federal Power Commission and the additional legislation contemplated thereby would constitute Federal encroachment on State sovereignty. The United States Chamber of Commerce, the Petroleum Industry War Council, the Independent Natural Gas Association of America, the American Gas Association, the Independent Petroleum Association of America, and the American Petroleum Institute have adopted resolutions and policies of similar tenor. The Governor's committee of the State of Texas recommended "that the Natural Gas Act should be amended so as to definitely inhibit Federal regulation over the production, conservation, processing, gathering, compressing, and sale before transportation in interstate commerce; that the end-use of natural gas should not be regulated, because competition is the best arbiter.

I am opposed to the nationalization of our energy resources. I am opposed to any board of men undertaking to pass judgment upon what fuel the public of this Nation shall or shall not use. I am opposed to the creation of governmental spheres of monopoly as applied to our basic fuels and energy resources. For these reasons and many others, which time will not permit to be presented, I believe that this Congress should definitely express its opposition to regulation by the Federal Government of the end use of natural gas, and for that matter, any other of the fuels commonly available to the general public.

The staff reports of the Federal Power Commission and other reports show that there is not likely to be a shortage of natural gas within the foreseeable future. With this plentiful supply of a desirable fuel we should not place restrictions on its utilization as fuel by our citizens.

CONCLUSION

Subsequent witnesses will bring facts and arguments on gas reserves, the producers' viewpoint, the States' viewpoint, the consumers' viewpoint and related topics. I urge this committee, after the deliberation to which it is accustomed in a matter of this importance, to report favorably on H. R. 2185.

1946 Primary Election Returns in Congress Race, Third Congressional District of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I quote, as an example, a totally false statement which was printed in one of the papers in the Third Congressional District, January 10, 1946:

Typical of comments and letters received by the Times is a letter from a resident of BECKWORTH'S former home county, Upshur, before he built a beautiful home near Tyler.

Anybody can find and see or feel a thing as big as house. I repeat, the statement is 100-percent untrue.

For persons running for office to base hope of gain on a 100-percent untrue statement like the example above quoted or any other total falsehood is a mistake.

The same paper a short time thereafter—March 21, 1946—printed on the first page an article which contained the following paragraph:

First reports were that one or more candidates from Longview and possibly one from Tyler would feel out the situation. What they learned apparently was sufficient to cause District Judge ——, of Longview, and former District Judge ——, also of Gregg County, to challenge the present incumbent, BECKWORTH. The same article has in it these words, "citing an article which mentions a '10-man team'."

The result of the 1946 race was that BECKWORTH received a clear majority over both judges in the first primary; he carried 7 of the 8 third district counties; he carried exactly one-half, or 50 percent of the voting boxes in the eighth county, which was and is the home county of both judges who ran against him. There are 209 voting boxes in the Third Congressional District; BECKWORTH carried 191, one of his opponents carried 9 boxes, the other opponent carried 9 boxes. One of the opponents carried no box in 4 counties, the other opponent carried no box in 5 counties. BECKWORTH carried every box in 3 counties, including all of the 27 boxes in his home county, Upshur.

Foreign Policy and United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Blaine County Citizen, printed at Hailey, Idaho, April 10, 1947:

SOUNDINGS FOR SANBORN

Representative SANBORN has taken up the general sounding of opinion among the newspapers of his State as has been the custom with so many representatives of late. We received a query of sounding from the Representative this week and reply openly to his questions.

Do you favor President Truman's proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey? Our reply is emphatically no. We do not believe in bluff diplomacy nor do we believe in force diplomacy. Hitler tried it and succeeded grandly. We do not believe that a page from Hitler's international relationship will guide our Nation as a free and democratic government. What can be settled by sword can be settled by wise men before the sword becomes necessary. We have no business furnishing Greece or Turkey with arms. We do have a humanitarian responsibility of furnishing devastated and starving nations with food, clothing, and shelter. But the good Lord did not put us on this earth to manufacture implements of war with which to threaten our neighbors with. As for Turkey she deserves nothing. Throughout our relationship with that nation we have gained nothing but disharmony. She has sheltered our most vicious enemies: during World War I she took up arms against our Nation and against democratic governments. The great Dardanelles which she holds a protective hand over is rightfully no more her's alone than the Atlantic Ocean is ours alone. What would the people of our great Nation think if a foreign power were to encroach upon the waters of the Mississippi River? Russia has as much right to the Dardanelles as we have to the Mississippi. The waters of the Dardanelles wash the coastline of Russia. One lesson should be enough. We gave our enemy, Turkey, after World War I the mandated powers over the Dardanelles. We knew at the time it was an error. But we did it. Let us make no mistake by giving arms to Turkey, indirectly threaten Russia, and start the brewing of another war. Ask the man who has seen the blood of battle and the diplomats in Washington will think twice of this indirect act of hostility against another nation. Let us keep peace by peaceful actions.

Do you believe it should be put up to the United Nations first? Our reply to this is definitely yes. For what purpose, may we ask, was the United Nations Security Council

formed? For the purpose of settling differences among nations. All the nations of the world are represented in the chambers of the United Nations. If they see fit and find that international law endorses such actions to furnish Greece and Turkey with arms, then they will do it and Russia must submit to the majority rule, which she will. Give the United Nations Security Council a chance.

If it were put up to the United Nations and the United Nations was not able to handle it, do you believe the present form of United Nations worth further support?

No; we don't believe the United Nations worthy of any further support if it cannot handle this problem. What better place is there to discuss such problems of international concern? The millions we are pouring into the armaments of war to furnish Greece and Turkey should be poured into the settlement of problems peacefully. There should be no ceiling on the price of peace. A million Americans lost their lives so that we could have peace. Now let us have it, and let the immortal patriots rest in peace.

Do you favor further straight relief to Greece without the military feature?

Our reply to this is definitely yes. We believe that we owe all we have so that human sufferings can be diminished. Babies are still dying in the streets of Greece, and our diplomats have the gall to furnish that nation with bullets. If there be a Lord above, and we believe there is, then let Him see to it that we abide by the laws of humanity and God's will by feeding the starving, ravished peoples of other nations. Yes; give the people of Greece food, clothing, and shelter at our cost.

Do you feel that President Truman's proposal is necessary to stop the spread of communism?

Our reply to this question is definitely no. If he be the guiding hand of 140,000,000 people, then let him guide us in peace and not in fear. We fought for peace and now have it. The President can propose peaceful methods of halting the march of communism. We know that communism is the enemy of constitutional government. But we have had enough bloodshed. Among 140,000,000 people there must be some wise men the President can choose to peacefully find ways of helping our neighbor and stopping the spread of communism. We do not think that our present Secretary of State is the right man for the job. Didn't he put his blessings upon the Nationalist Government of China? Didn't he think for a minute when he did this that he was supporting one of the greatest forms of Fascist tyranny blessed to man? When the Chinese National Government democratizes their own nation they are deserving of our support. Never in the course of history has this Nation been blackmailed into a deeper rut than the conception that the Chinese Nationalist Government is a democratic form of government. We suggest, Mr. Representative, that you study any of the reports given by that great American journalist, Edgar Snow.

Do you believe that the Truman proposal has war possiblities with Russia?

Our reply to this question is yes!

If we furnish the two mentioned countries with the armaments of war then we are the criminals. We happen to be veterans. We were in the last war and know just how terrible a slaughter war is. We cannot hope to achieve international peace and harmony among nations unless we act in a peaceful manner. By waving the "big stick" at Russia we will be inciting war. The foolish folly of furnishing armaments of war to two nations to scare another nation can hardly be taken as anything else but a direct insult and a challenge of war. We might win a war with Russia. But remember Mr. SANBORN, the blood of Idaho and 47 other States will be running in the streets of Europe. Our Nation asks for help when we are at war. Everyone pitches in to do his or her share. But we do it to protect our democratic government and our sacred ground. But when it is over we want peace. Never in the history of our Nation has so many of our statesmen made so many blunders and brought us so close to the brink of war. The Monroe Doctrine is flouted around as so much piece of paper by the present administration. The words of Washington have done nothing but gather dust in the halls of the immortal. Let us be American by acting American. A threat to another nation is the asking for bloodshed. We believe it is about time that the Capitol at Washington resound with some brainwork. If some Congressmen and Senators are so keen on furnishing arms to another nation, then put them in the front lines as a infantry soldier with the rank of private if we do have war over it. There are still people back home that can run our Government as a democracy. Yes, Mr. SANBORN, we are against the furnishing of arms to any nation; but are for the feeding of all nations.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Post of April 21, 1947, a very timely article by Randolph Paul, formerly general counsel for the Treasury Department, on the important subject of tax reduction which is now before the Congress and under leave already given me, I include it in my remarks. The article follows:

1947 TAX CUTS

(By Randolph Paul)

REVISED DISTRIBUTION NEEDED

Within the next few weeks the Senate will be faced with the troublesome problem of tax reduction in 1947. The House has already voted a tax cut practically as large as total Government receipts in the boom year 1929. Many arguments can be made against cutting taxes in a period of budget uncertainty and high national income. This, if ever, should be the time for a budget surplus and debt reduction, if we hope to attain the highly desirable objective of budget balance over a period of years.

Prevailing economic climate is a paramount consideration in the timing of tax rate changes. It is hard to imagine a less opportune moment than the present for increasing spending power via tax reduction, except in the income brackets which are feeling the tightest pinch of high prices. It is true that the actual increment of spending power which would be released under the House bill might not be too large, considering its allocation to the different income groups. But it is equally true that if nearly $4,000,000,000 of tax reduction is given out now, the chances for further tax legislation in the near future are exceedingly slim. Consequently, if any margin for tax reduction is prematurely used, it will not be available to bolster purchasing power when it may be needed.

Under the reduction formula in the House bill almost 40 percent of the tax cut would go to less than 2,000,000 individuals with incomes over $5,000 a year, who normally save a substantial part of their incomes. About 60 percent of the aggregate cut would be divided among about 45,000,000 individuals with incomes under $5,000 a year who, at present price levels, spend all of their incomes and, in many cases find it necessary to dip into their savings.

Currently, signs of a downturn in markets for consumer goods are developing. Indications are also strong that a substantial decline in investment activities is imminent, due not to any lack of investment funds but rather to a lack of confidence in substantial consumer markets. Plainly, the reduction formula in the House bill which, in terms of additional spending power, does much more for high-income taxpayers in the low brackets, would contribute little toward forestalling an incipient depression.

In considering the important question of tax-cut distribution, we must remember that Congress is cutting wartime, not peacetime, taxes. It is pertinent then to inquire how the distribution of the tax burden contemplated in the House bill compares in the several income brackets with the distribution in 1939. If our Federal taxes were wisely placed in 1939, a proportionate return to prewar levels would be the logical solution of the present problem.

The House bill would leave taxes substantially above 1939 levels for low income taxpayers; it would leave a proportionately heavier burden on the middle brackets; and it would bring taxes for persons in the highest brackets back nearly to 1939 levels.

For example, in 1939, a man and wife with a net income of $1,500 paid no tax. Under the House bill, they would pay $67. At $10,000 the 1939 tax for a married couple was $415, as compared with $1,748 under the House bill—a 321-percent increase. At $100,000 a man and wife paid a tax of $32,469 in 1939. Under the House plan, they would pay $50,502—an increase of 55.5 percent. At $500,000 the 1939 tax for a married couple was $304,144. Under the House bill, it would be $342,074—only 12.5 percent more than in 1939.

From this standpoint the House bill fails to recognize that war taxes were placed principally in the low and middle income brackets; increases had to be limited in the higher brackets. In its failure proportionately to reduce war increases, the House bill inaugurates a new distribution of our tax burden.

The distribution of the tax burden is a matter of natural concern to all taxpayers. Existing rates in the upper brackets are doubtless too high, but in this area the remedy lies in the context of over-all tax revision rather than in any variation of a crude across-the-board individual income tax cut.

In the lower income brackets the distribution of the tax burden is a grim matter of existence. In this area the amount of the personal exemption is of utmost importance. When the existing $500 per capita exemption was enacted, it barely covered minimum living expenses. At present price levels the value of the exemption has fallen to about $300, much less than the minimum living costs. Taxes now imposed on the lower income groups therefore take funds that ought to be spent for food, clothing, and housing. Many of those who favor a broad base because it develops widespread tax consciousness will recognize the conflict between the obligation to pay taxes and the right to subsistence.

The problem of the distribution of the tax burden goes even beyond equity. If we are to use the vast production potential we developed during the war, we must distribute our tax burden in a way that will permit mass consumption. A stabilized market for mass consumption is a prime requisite for productive activity. We can have neither mass consumption nor an expansion of productive activity if our taxes drain off too much purchasing power from the low incomes.

It is generally admitted that our whole Federal tax system—in spite of much constructive legislation in 1942—badly needs overhauling. Some changes are certainly a

first order of business. For instance, the citizens of 39 States justly resent the undeserved tax advantage enjoyed by married couples in the 9 community-property States who may divide their income equally for tax purpose. To correct this inequity, as has been suggested, by permitting the citizens of all States to divide the combined income of husband and wife in the same way, would cost a billion dollars in revenue. A revision of this would be a tax cut fairly distributed among taxpayers.

A number of other improvements would likewise have the effect of fairly distributed tax cuts. This is true of accelerated depreciation and the revision of the net loss carry-back and carry-forward provisions, which would help small business. The coordination of personnel and corporation taxes is overdue. Improvements of this kind should have priority over indiscriminate rate reduction. If the House bill will become law, the opportunity to obtain these revisions within any reasonable length of time will be fatally lost.

A 1947 tax bill which took all these items into account could not be dashed off in a few days of superficial consideration. Members of congressional tax committees would have to sacrifice vacations and endure the heat of a Washington summer. Taxpayers would have to resign themselves to a period of uncertainty. But the time required would be well spent if in the end everyone benefited, with the initial advantage going to those who are now most unjustly treated.

Tax reduction has irresistible charm. The question a 1947 tax bill puts squarely up to all of us is whether we have the maturity to shift our sights from the prospect of immediate gain to the development of the tax system we imperatively need for the future. A sound tax system will mean greater gain even for those who would at once profit most from the House bill, if as citizens they have the statesmanship to recognize their ultimate welfare.

Congratulations, Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Lynn Item, Lynn, Mass.:

CONGRATULATIONS, LAWRENCE

Our neighboring city of Lawrence this week is observing, with appropriate pomp and ceremony, the one hundredth anniversary of its incorporation as a town.

In the past century the Merrimack River community has developed from what was chiefly a farming area to one of the great textile manufacturing centers of the Nation. Today its vast mills dominate the city and provide the lion's share of employment to its more than 85,000 population. In 1920 the city proper had 94,270 inhabitants, and the decline is due to no recession in the city's prosperity or activity, but to a trend toward housing developments in the nearby suburbs. Thousands of these suburbanites still work and spend in Lawrence and contribute to the maintenance of its many excellent civic, educational, and philanthropic institutions.

As the Evening Tribune, Lawrence's excellent newspaper, says, Lawrence still has the vigor and optimism of youth, confident that the greatest era of the city and its people still lies ahead.

One Road to Labor Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby wish to submit an editorial from the Chicago Sun, entitled "One Road to Labor Peace."

The thoughts set out therein are timely and practical especially at this time when an intense frenzy has been artificially built up against organized labor in our country. It follows:

ONE ROAD TO LABOR PEACE

Everybody knows that the House labor bill will not become a law. Its passage by a 3 to 1 vote is significant rather as an index of the reactionary swing and a token of the shortsighted leadership of those business interests which sought to take advantage of it.

One might have thought that the NAM type of business leadership, even though riding high at the moment, would have understood from history that it is riding for a fall. Smart industrialists know that they cannot turn back the clock to the days of disorganized labor. Smart industrialists know that the business excesses of the twenties produced a sharp reaction of public sentiment against them in the thirties, and that pushing their luck now means a peck of future trouble for the free-enterprise system they profess to cherish.

But such counsel did not prevail. It is on the record now that management seized upon the temporary condition of a reactionary coalition in Congress to push through a measure intended to cripple the labor movement.

If the bill is bad tactics from the business point of view, it is also bad policy from the national point of view, for its underlying assumption—that industrial peace can be promoted by weakening labor and inordinately strengthening an already powerful management—simply does not accord with reality. Granted that labor has been guilty of its own excesses, granted even that legislation is needed to protect the public interest in industrial peace, the fact remains that this cause is not advanced by denaturing the Wagner Act, banning the closed shop, localizing negotiations in essentially national industries, and otherwise imposing on labor unrealistic and purely punitive restrictions.

There are three major labor problems that deserve national attention. One is the establishment of improved machinery for conciliation and mediation in labor disputes. One is the carefully considered development of processes of collective bargaining which provide a just alternative to strangling tie-ups in essential utility services. One is the elimination of restrictive practices by unions which restrain trade and promote monopoly for purposes other than the legitimate concern of collective bargaining with wages and working conditions.

The House bill makes no serious attempt to grapple with these problems. Instead it frankly and boldly sets out to strengthen the hand of irresponsible management in every labor dispute that may occur. The Senate bill, though milder, is not much better.

Some day, perhaps, business and its servants in Congress will learn that there is only one road to industrial peace—a steadily rising standard of living, complete acceptance of genuine collective bargaining in letter and spirit, the conscientious development of peaceful methods of settling disputes.

Filipino Veterans of United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include an article entitled "The Filipino Veteran of the United States Army" by Francisco Ortigas, Jr. This is an expression by a Filipino of the outstanding contribution made by the Filipino veteran and the Filipino citizen toward our great victory in the Pacific. I know of the valor of the Filipino soldier, and especially of the Filipino guerrilla, and I have asked permission to cause this to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the contribution of our Filipino brethren may be more generally known.

The article follows:

THE FILIPINO VETERAN OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

(By Francisco Ortigas, Jr.)

I

USAFFE stands for United States Armed Forces in the Far East. It was the command created by President Roosevelt in the Orient when he sensed the tense situation some months before Pearl Harbor. To be its commanding general, Douglas MacArthur, then military adviser to the Philippine Commonwealth, was named. Into it were incorporated all active elements of the Philippine Army.

When war actually broke out, the United States forces in the Philippines were composed, by a big majority, of Filipino soldiers. They were not very well equipped. Few had steel helmets, many had no gas masks, and their rifles were not as modern as could be desired; yet they fought the Battle of Bataan as fiercely as their American comrades-at-arms. They surrendered only when General King gave the word.

To the American soldier in the Philippines, the word USAFFE has lost its meaning. It belongs to the same category as AFWESPAC, AFPAC, PACUSA, and the many others that have been created and discarded with the march of events. But to the Filipino soldier, USAFFE is still a symbol. To him, the USAFFE veteran is he who fought the Japanese in order that those democratic principles for which the United States stands might not be eradicated from the Philippines.

The delaying action at Bataan, and its part in the early strategy of the war, now belong to history. Both Americans and Filipinos, in the making of that history, shed blood and gave up life and limb. The United States has honored the American dead and has taken creditable care of the American wounded and the dependents of those who had made the supreme sacrifice, but up to now has not done anything substantial for the Filipino soldiers of her Army of that memorable siege. A bill to extend hospitalization and other benefits to those Filipino veterans was killed in the Congress of the United States by the objection of one Member of the House. Has the role played by the Filipino veteran of the United States Army in the last war been so insignificant or so lacking in merit as to be taken for granted and so soon forgotten?

II

The Filipinos are essentially a free and independent people. They had a history of greatness in pre-Spanish times. Then came the Spaniards who ruled the country for about 300 years. We all have read of the

Aguinaldo Revolution of the '90's. The end of Spanish rule had dawned, but by one of those curious twists of fate, the Spanish-American War broke out and the Philippines was ceded to the United States by the Treaty of Paris of 1899. General Aguinaldo fought a losing battle against the Americans. When the fight became hopeless, the Filipinos surrendered. Some die-hards, like General Ricarte who went to Japan, were never reconciled to the new regime, but the bulk of the people decided to cooperate with the Americans. The Government of the United States proclaimed a policy of "the Philippines for the Filipinos", and promised to grant the Philippines eventual independence as soon as a stable government could be established. America has kept that promise. The Commonwealth regime was established on November 15, 1935, and on July 4, 1946, the Republic of the Philippines was born.

The foregoing is a brief background to the Filipino soldier who fought under the USAFFE in Bataan. He was by nature free. He was not a colonial fighting the mother country's battles. Had he hated the United States, he would have fought her. Had he been indifferent, he would have fought half-heartedly. That he died and suffered a hero's fate in Bataan showed clearly that he was fighting in earnest for the Philippines and for a mother America.

Senator TYDINGS, in a report submitted to the United States Senate, said this of him: "The Filipinos have been loyal to us during these trying years. They have died by our side. Almost to the man and woman they have carried on the long battle without complaint, and with valor and determination. Through their cooperation and assistance the length of the war has been greatly shortened. This has meant the saving to us, not only of countless treasure that otherwise would have been expended in a long war, but it has been a means of saving the lives of countless thousands of Americans and the saving of other thousands from serious and permanent wounds and incapacities which would otherwise have been received on the battlefield."

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his Philippines visit on May 4, 1946, said of the Filipino soldiers of the last war that they showed loyalty and determination to the common cause, and their contribution to the allied war efforts was of incalculable value.

And President Truman, in his message to Congress on May 21, 1946, when he sent the bill providing hospitalization, pensions, and burial allowances for Philippine war veterans, said: "The record of the Philippine soldiers for bravery and loyalty is second to none. Their assignment was as bloody and difficult as any in which our American soldiers engaged. Under desperate circumstances they acquitted themselves nobly."

And that epic fight for American ideals was fought in spite of the fact expressed by Ambassador McNutt in a statement made on January 21, 1946, that we (Americans) involved them (Filipinos) in the war.

III

Members of the Philippine armed forces before the war had to take an oath of allegiance to both the Commonwealth Government and the United States of America. They were not citizens of the United States, but they were American nationals. If they committed acts inimical to the interests of America, they were liable to prosecution for treason against the United States. Upon their induction into the USAFFE, they had to specially renew their allegiance to the Stars and Stripes. Except for their color, it was impossible to distinguish them from American soldiers insofar as their duties were concerned. Is it therefore fair to consider that for purposes of treason the Filipino veteran of the United States Army was an American, but for veteran's benefits an alien?

The Philippines are independent now. In spite of that fact, the United States Army has recruited 50,000 Filipinos for use as an occupation force in Japan. Other countries are now also independent again. But the War Department has not attempted to recruit soldiers of these other nations for purposes of the occupation of Japan. There is one explanation for this. The United States Army has confidence in the Filipinos' ability and loyalty, and know that the Filipinos do not view the American flag and Nation as being really alien to them.

IV

Nor did the help and support given the United States come solely from the Filipino veterans in the United States Army. Consider the following poem written by American internees in Manila during the occupation:

A MESSAGE TO MARIE VICTORIA ORTIGAS AND HER PARENTS—MARIE'S FIRST BIRTHDAY

TO MARIE VICTORIA

You're a year old today, Marie, 1 year old
And there's one or two things you should be told
Before they are forgotten.
We, my lassie, are prisoners, we are interned
Within four walls, and we've just learned
About your celebration.
Congratulations today, Marie, many congratulations!
And let us include your near relations
For reasons we'll explain.
Do you know, little Marie, what it means
To be interned for 18 months, until it seems
The end is never coming?
To lose your friends, all your money, home,
Possessions, comforts, the right to roam
Whenever you may choose?
Please God you never will know, Marie, what
It really means—degredation—mental rot,
But not
The loss of everything.
No, Marie, we still have friends. We haven't lost
Our Friends. And when we count the final cost
Perhaps we've even gained.
It seems this way: that if a friend stands by
When you're in trouble, would rather die
Than help your enemies.
Then you've gained something, Marie, gained an end,
If it was only to find he was really a friend,
A friend in rainy weather.
You may not understand, lassie, at your age
Why we prisoners wish to fill a page
With sentiments like this.
But keep it, Marie, and cherish it; never mind the bother
Some day you'll know the friend we meant—
Your Father.

James Koch, Edith Koch, C. A. DeWitt, N. V. Sinclair, H. C. Morrisson, E. A. Perkins, Dora Perkins, Ford Wilkins, J. Wolfson.

SANTO TOMAS, *July 12, 1943.*

Shortly after the Americans raised their flag in the Philippines, they set up a public-school system where the study of democratic principles and the brotherhood of man was emphasized. As a result of kindly treatment received from American administrators, the Filipinos learned to love the Americans as their own brothers. The regard which the Filipinos had for the Americans clearly manifested itself during the occupation. At great risk to their personal security, they smuggled whatever they could to the American internees at Santo Tomas and to the prisoners of war in Cabanatuan.

Under rules of international law, the Japanese had the obligation of caring for internees and prisoners of war. This they did very badly in the Philippines, and a number died in their hands. The civilian population of Manila had no duty to extend help to the jailed Americans—on the contrary, the extension of aid to them was a punishable act. Yet the Filipinos exhausted their ingenuity to send that help because they knew of the plight of the Americans. The Mencarinis, the Scarellas, Jose Miranda Sampedro, Juan Miguel Elixalde, Elsa O'Farrell, and Liling Roces, to name only a few, were apprehended in their attempts to aid the internees and prisoners of war. They were charged with treason, and with rare exceptions, executed.

Take the specific case of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Escoda. They were among the most active aiders of the Americans. Caught and accused of treason, they were killed by the Japanese. Some grateful American internees of Santo Tomas have formed a fund, and the fund is now being used for the education of the Escoda children. It is difficult to realize that while a group of American civilians can recognize a moral obligation in favor of Filipino citizens, the United States Government itself cannot immediately concede veterans' benefits to Filipino soldiers who fought so gallantly for and under America during the war.

V

It is to be regretted that there are no standing rules in the United States regulating the benefits which should be extended to war veterans. After every war the United States has engaged itself in, victory has been assumed by the American public at home to have been a matter of course, and the role of the soldier in achieving that victory quickly forgotten. After every war, the veterans have found the need of organized efforts to receive their due. This attitude necessarily affects the patriotism of the individual adversely, for the average man is made to prefer to fight the war in a non-combat capacity in view of the disadvantages accruing to one who becomes a combat soldier.

In a recent magazine article, Brig. Gen. Leon W. Johnson, Chief of Personnel Services Division, AAF, had this to say: "Will those who survive the fighting come back to find indifference and another standard of values, in which the dollar counts for more than courage and integrity and unselfishness? Will these magnificent American boys be forgotten and kicked about by those who moved up while they were away?" Verily, then, if even his American brother must plead his case to get recognition of his right, the Filipino veteran must do the same. But I believe that the root cause of this indifference to the veterans is not ingratitude but lack of understanding. If the American public could be made to comprehend the situation the veterans find themselves in, be they Americans or Filipinos, they would not refuse to do the proper thing by them.

These times are real days of need and stress for the Filipino veteran. The Philippines has been ravaged by war both from Japanese looting and incendiarism, and from American shelling and bombing. The sugar centrals were the backbone of industry in the Islands. They were used by the Japanese for the manufacture of alcohol and were therefore destroyed by American planes. Philippine roads were worn away by heavy American military vehicles after the liberation. The Philippines has really become impoverished. To be able to provide a certain measure of effective government, taxes have been raised fifty to a hundred percent and over. Under these circumstances, the struggle for a decent living has become problematical even to the able-bodied. What chance, then, has a maimed Bataan veteran to make both ends meet? What chance have the widow and the minor children of the soldier who has given up his life? I am sure that if only the average American could realize the handicaps under which the Filipino veterans and their widows and children must struggle to

survive, he would not hesitate to urge the extension of benefits to them.

VI

There is an angle to the question of payment of benefits to Filipinos which may be deemed a delicate matter, and which we would not care to discuss about with Americans lest we be misunderstood. The world is now divided into two parts: one influenced by the democratic principles of the Anglo-Saxon nations, the other dominated by Soviet Russia. The Philippines has already taken the side of the Americans in this division. The Americans have decided to maintain bases in the Philippines, for the initial battleground of a possible clash between the United States and Russia can very well be the Far East. The Philippines again may receive the brunt of enemy attack. If this should happen, it will in all probability again be destroyed. In such a conflict, the Filipinos will once more fight by the side of the United States. Their blood will redrench their own soil. They will again be veterans.

If the Filipino veterans of today are denied disability and other humanitarian benefits by the United States, what will the Filipino youths of 10 years hence believe in respect of Filipino-American relations? Will they fight again for America with that same tenacity and fierceness with which they fought in Bataan and Corregidor? That is a question which the United States Army authorities may well pause to consider. There are Filipinos who, lack of benefits to Filipino veterans notwithstanding, will eagerly fight in any war with Russia or their ally, the United States. But doubts regarding the wisdom of aiding the American war effort, if and when that time comes, may assail the minds of many. There will be individuals who will reason out this way: The Philippines is small and poor. Win whichever side, she will be an underdog. So why take sides? Let the Americans and Russians fight it out, and let us make the most of it.

Will such reasoning be to the advantage of the United States or of the Philippines, or for the good of Philippine-American relations? Certainly not.

VII

Before the war ended, responsible Americans had promised the extension of veteran benefits to Filipino soldiers fighting under the United States Army. Those promises, even if not legally binding on the Government of the United States, should be kept because they were made in good faith by American officials and were likewise accepted in good faith by the Filipino people.

I am positive that the average American will readily recognize the injustice of the present situation. If all Americans would only try to understand sympathetically the position which the Filipino people have held and still hold with respect to the United States, they would clearly see the justice of extending benefits to the Filipino veterans of the United States Army of the last war.

Community Property Laws and the Federal Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial from the General Assembly of Colorado:

Senate Joint Memorial 9

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve pending legislation concerning Federal Income Tax returns

Whereas several States now have community property laws by virtue of which certain citizens of such States receive Federal income tax advantages over the citizens, similarly situated, of other States, including the State of Colorado, which do not have community property laws; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado that the citizens of each State should be permitted to file Federal income tax returns on the same basis, whether such State is a community property State or not; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Colorado is advised that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States certain proposed legislation which is designed to eliminate Federal income tax discrimination between the citizens of community property States and the citizens of noncommunity property States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the house of representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve said proposed legislation or so much thereof as is necessary to eliminate the Federal income tax discrimination between the citizens of community property States and the citizens of noncommunity property States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

Benefits of Wagner Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to incorporate the following editorial, which sets out the viewpoint of an employer regarding the Wagner Act. Thousands of employers throughout America possess the same thoughts on this legislation:

EMPLOYER SPEAKS UP FOR WAGNER ACT

Occasionally, out of the confusion which seems to encompass us these days, there comes a voice that speaks with authority to reveal the real motives behind what is going on.

Enlightenment on the movement for restrictive labor legislation comes from an expert witness, an employer for 30 years—Roscoe H. Cannaday, past president of the New York Kiwanis Club and member of the international business standards committee.

Cannaday spoke for the negative in a recent debate on whether the Wagner Act should be repealed. He said:

"We employers have always felt that our businesses were our own and that we should have full and complete control of them without interference by Government or by our employees.

"We knew that in order to be successful, a business must make a profit and the more profit it makes the more successful it is; that in order to make a profit we must keep costs down, and, as wages are a major part of costs, we must keep wages as low as possible.

"We, by more or less agreement or concerted action, usually kept our wage rates about the same as those of our competitors. We said, in effect, that the function of management was to make money for the owners of the business, not to solve social problems.

"For many years we had predominant control of the economy and, in all honesty, we must admit that some of us were quite ruthless in use of our power. The idea of our employees organizing and of having, as we said, 'Our hired hands or a union racketeer tell us how to run our business' was most repugnant to us and we fought it by fair means and foul.

"But, in spite of everything we could do, unions grew and grew. They first organized in the smaller industries. As they moved into the bigger industries, the strife became more and more violent and disruptive.

"In 1935 Congress decided something must be done about it, and the Wagner Act was passed.

"Of course, the only reason for wanting to repeal the act is the hope that by so doing we would be able to prevent the formation of additional labor unions, and that we would be able to destroy or at least cripple unions already formed.

"I am convinced that it is absolutely impossible to prevent our employees from joining labor unions if they wish to do so. I am convinced that it is absolutely impossible, by strong-arm methods or by any law, to destroy labor unions already in existence in most of our major industries.

"I am convinced that more thought about the general welfare and a more generous attitude on the part of employers and the use of more intelligent and more cooperative, democratic methods either directly with employees or with their chosen representatives in the long run not only will be the most economical and most profitable for business but, indeed, may be the only way we can save ourselves from some form of socialistic government."

That makes sense and is a refreshing contrast to some of the things we hear around here.

Cause of High Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID M. POTTS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, people are wondering what is the cause of the present high prices. Their question is answered in the following editorial from the New York Sun of Monday, April 21, 1947.

YOU, MR. TRUMAN, YOU MADE PRICES WHAT THEY ARE TODAY

President Truman's assertion at his press conference this month that prices must come down if wages are not to go up is meaningless unless read against the background of what has happened since August 18, 1945, 4 days after VJ-day.

The Executive order issued just after the Japanese surrender was supposed to "promote a swift and orderly transition to a

peacetime economy" and to "assure the general stability of prices and costs."

But that Executive order, stripped of its official sounding language, was actually a political formula for higher wages, high farm prices, and an unchanging price level. Politically it made sense to call upon the Secretary of Agriculture and all other Federal agencies to support farm prices. Politically it made sense to instruct the OPA and other Federal agencies to hold the line generally on prices. For the purpose of getting votes it made sense to invite labor-union leaders to start a campaign for higher wages which should not be used by employers as a basis for higher prices.

But the economic nonsense of this Executive order made it impossible that reconversion to a peacetime economy should be either swift or orderly. It made it impossible that private enterprise could be free and independent.

In that Executive order Mr. Truman chose to ignore the fact that wage and salary payments amount to about 60 percent of the national income and are naturally reflected in the costs of production. Mr. Truman also chose to ignore the fact that food costs—to be supported by administration policy—make up the biggest part of the family budget.

In October 1945, 2 months after VJ-day, the Truman administration changed its mind and modified its policy slightly in the right direction by ruling that wage increases based on increases in the cost of living after January 1, 1941, could be taken into consideration in applications for price increases. But this modification, slight as it was, came too late.

Labor union leaders had already eagerly seized upon the invitation contained in the executive order of August. They presented demands for sharp increases in wages, coupled with the insistence that there be no rise in prices. They supplemented these demands with a demagogic ultimatum that they be allowed to "look at the books."

Then came the curious and unsavory incident of the "official" study purporting to show that the automobile industry could pay much higher wages without increasing prices. This report was released on November 1, 1945, just when the United Automobile Workers were concentrating their campaign upon General Motors. Two days after the General Motors strike was settled, Henry Wallace, then Secretary of Commerce in the Truman Cabinet, admitted that the study was not official and indulged in general in a lot of fancy double-talk to the effect that there never had been any intention that this should be taken so seriously.

It is not necessary to dwell on relatively ancient history, for Mr. Truman persists in his economic illiteracy. At the press conference this month, when he expressed his judgment about prices, he did not go into detail. He did admit that the administration which he heads is committed to support farm prices through this year and next. But he did not mention the fact—though it must be familiar to him—that nearly three-quarters of the increase in the cost of living in the past year has been the result of increases in food prices. Private enterprise—the President's whipping boy—can do little about high prices of foodstuffs as long as the Truman administration continues support of prices and farm subsidies and as long as heavy governmental buying for export keeps grain and other commodity prices sky-high.

Nor did Mr. Truman mention his stubborn opposition to tax reduction, which offers the one certain method to provide additional take-home pay and an increase in the standard of living of all Americans. He produced a 1948 budget far above previous peacetime levels and called it a "tight" one. He encourages all the Federal agencies to resist the rigorous reduction of Federal expenditures demanded by the times. He sees nothing incongruous in the presence on the Federal pay roll of thousands upon thousands of unnecessary employees feeding upon the bounty of the real producers of the Nation. These thousands could be in useful production.

Mr. Truman turns to the traditional whipping boy of the New Dealers—American business, which built the greatest Nation in the world. It is a bold strike of politics to attempt to make the public believe that business and business alone can correct all that is wrong in the current situation. It is a bold stroke of politics to pretend that business is free from all controls and curbs. But with the public, the new strategy of the Truman administration is likely to be correctly rated as politics and nothing more—dangerous politics, misleading politics, but politics, nonetheless.

American business, if only in its own selfish interests, will correct what lies within its power or duty to correct. But it cannot accept the responsibility for an economic policy which was invented by Mr. Truman himself 4 days after VJ-day. No, Mr. President, you made prices what they are today.

Too Much Gas Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Post.

TOO MUCH GAS CONTROL

The Government has no more reason or right to dictate the use which shall or shall not be made of natural gas, or to say to whom gas may or may not be sold, than it has to restrict the markets for shoes or canned tomatoes or hair restorers.

But the Federal Power Commission has been assuming more and more control in such matters, through direct and indirect means, by stretching the provisions of a too-unspecific Federal law. It is time the Commission's encroachment upon free enterprise be curbed by Congressional action. Such action is sought in a bill recently introduced at Washington.

By the devious device of denying applications to sell gas in coal-producing regions for certain end uses, the commission has barred gas competition with coal fuel. For instance, it rejected the application of the Northern National Gas Co. for a certificate to provide gas for steam generation purposes at Boone, Iowa, flatly stating that gas thus used would displace a certain quantity of coal.

Under a "reasonable conditions" clause inserted in the Natural Gas Act in 1942, the FPC has issued certificates conditioned on the facilities' not being used to serve gas for steam generation purposes or to serve industrial plants. This roundabout way of controlling end use is resorted to quite freely by the Federal Power Commission, despite the Commission's admission of several years ago that Congress never gave it this authority.

The Commission has even made several moves toward controlling the production and gathering of gas—operations which are expressly excluded from FPC jurisdiction by the present law.

All these interferences and threatened interferences with the production, gathering, and marketing of gas have the industry in a state of uncertainty, fear, and jitters. The producer is reluctant to lay expensive pipe lines or to sign contracts to sell gas for fear the FPC will mess up his business. He already answers to his State regulatory body in most instances, which should be sufficient; but he cannot tell when the Federal arbiters may hold operations he considers local to be interstate.

This is not fair to the industry or to the consumer, who should not be denied a free choice of whatever fuel he wants to use. The law should be made clear and explicit, and insure that the jurisdiction of the FPC shall be limited strictly to the interstate transportation of natural gas for resale, with fair allocations of expense between the regulated and nonregulated phases of the business of natural-gas companies.

The bill introduced in the House of Representatives will accomplish those ends, amending the Natural Gas Act. It is endorsed by Governor Jester, Railroad Commissioner Ernest O. Thompson, and many other State officials, as well as the entire oil and gas industry, both majors and independents. It is a measure of vast importance to the great oil and gas producing State of Texas and should be enacted.

America Vetoes the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial appearing in the American Friend, a publication in Richmond, Ind., which is both timely and constructive. I ask that all may read this editorial, which is as follows:

AMERICA VETOES THE UNITED NATIONS

The American power drive has begun. Beachheads are about to be established on the shores of the Mediterranean. The war has changed from the death grapple of men to the battle of dollars—and such dollars lead to war and yet another death struggle. The Colossus of the West takes over. Where next? How far? Those are questions with an ominous answer. Important also is the question, "Why?" What is the fundamental motivation that powers the American financial machine?

Of course, we must recognize the changing frontiers of national and international interests. No longer are the affairs of other nations an American concern merely because they are geographically near. What happens in a remote corner of the earth may have more importance than a disturbance in Cuba. But what happens in America as well is the business of other nations whose destinies are affected by American policies. The time is here for the cessation of unilateral action and an increasing attempt at united action through the United Nations, difficult as it may be.

This American power drive is also being fed by the fumes of petroleum in the Near East. Smelling these oil wells, we are following our noses into Arabian tents. To others we shall look like the proverbial camel. If other nations followed the same policy in the Caribbean, names other than "camel" would be used in denouncing them.

We could see this blustering foreign policy better if Russia should now bypass the United Nations in giving aid to a Communist government in Cuba with the announced purpose of blocking western capitalism.

Certainly communism is not the answer to human rights and needs. Nor is there a sound defense for Russian obstinacy in the United Nations and her undue insistence on the right of the veto, but if the hasty action of President Truman is followed out, America will also be using her veto. It will not be a veto on the Greek future, but on the United Nations itself.

In fact, America is about to launch a torpedo into the mid-ribs of the only organization that holds any promise of world cooperation. It is time to put our strength into cooperation rather than into disintegration.

We should give relief in food and clothing to Greece but the administration at Washington is not so enamored of the rights of free peoples, 2,000 miles away, or in any system of government, that they rush to a defense with dollars and munitions. Greece and Turkey are geographically strategic. They figure in the economic advantage of nations. Not only are they on the petroleum pipe lines, but they also lie at the gateway of Suez.

This policy may be in part the result of placing a military mind at the top of our foreign relations. General Marshall is among the most understanding persons of our military men, but a lifetime of training in the pyramidal thinking of army organization and functioning is not the preparation needed for a high diplomatic post. Armies are expected to receive orders and smash through to an objective. Foreign relations are on a delicate balance often, requiring a resilience of mind which authoritarian training can hardly create, either in Russia or America.

Either we shall find our answers through the United Nations or face the break-down of cooperation. That can only mean war, and who can say what war means in this atomic age?

The Late Honorable Fred Norman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my tribute to the memory of Hon. Fred Norman. A keen mind, a sincere advocate and a good friend has left the scene.

One of the finest tributes I can pay to him is to request permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a statement made by Congressman Norman before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands when he was discussing H. R. 1886, since withdrawn. Mr. Norman said:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRED NORMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the Public Lands Committee, I appear before you as a friend of reclamation, realizing the need to modernize certain features of the reclamation laws, but out of duty I must strenuously oppose the rate-making provisions that have been injected into H. R. 1886. The power provisions of this bill are so loosely drawn that they do violence to the greatest resource that the Pacific Northwest possesses.

The power-rate sections of H. R. 1886 have just become apparent to the people of my district. Consequently, I have had numerous wires and communications from representatives of all the different groups in my district protesting against these provisions of H. R. 1886. These protests come from real reclamationists, from farmers, from industrialists, and from organized labor. Union officials advise me that they interpret this bill as a means of stopping industrial pay rolls and halting forever the disposition of dinner-pail energy. It strikes me the people of my district have been amazed at the one-sided support of H. R. 1886. The impression has been created that the working people, farmers, and industrialists have not had a day in court. I know that this is not the intent of this committee, but the suddenness of the situation has aroused suspicion, judging by the tenor of communications I have received.

I will endeavor at this time to give a brief factual discussion of the objectionable features of H. R. 1886. In so doing I do not wish to be understood as offering opposition to the modernizing features of this bill.

Unless there is a balance between industry and agriculture, the economy in the entire Columbia Basin will be injured. According to census reports covering the most prosperous sections of this country, it can be seen that for every 100 farm workers there must be at least 500 industrial and associated workers. If power rates are elevated to the extent that one interpretation of H. R. 1886 indicates, then the basic industries in my and adjoining districts will be so handicapped that eventual shut-down will result. When this happens the agricultural products of reclamation projects will lose their markets, and then the large reclamation projects can never pay out. Also the rate proposals in H. R. 1886 are not good business for the Federal Treasury.

The region that I represent is short of fuel sources. Consequently nature has been compensating by giving the region the greatest source of low-cost hydroenergy on the American continent. Whoever drafted the power provisions of H. R. 1886 cannot be familiar with the interrelations that exist in the Columbia Basin. The people in my district do not expect Texas or California oil to be delivered and sold to them as cheaply as it can in the coastal regions of Texas or California. The possession of the oil resource is their gain. In like measure, other sections should not endeavor to penalize the greatest resource that the Northwest possesses.

I am particularly referring to the appropriateness of the rate-making provisions appearing on pages 6 and 7 of H. R. 1886, which provisions are interwoven through the full provisions of this bill. According to the wording of this cited section, electric rates would be dependent on the cost of generating power by an alternate plant in the same area. The extent of the area is not defined, nor is the quantity or quality of the power interpreted. Obviously the large volumes of prime power available from Columbia cannot be placed on a competitive level with lower-grade dump or secondary power generated on smaller tributaries or less fortunate streams.

The Columbia, like the St. Lawrence, is in a class by itself, due to the height of its waterfalls, the large volumes of water carried and the constancy of its flows. H. R. 1886 does not state whether the alternative plant be steam generation from wood, oil, gas, or coal. The bill, as written, indicates a direct conflict between language on pages 6 and 7 and the other provisions of this bill, which set out that rates should be sufficient to cover cost and subsidy allocated to power.

The provisions of H. R. 1886 are in direct conflict with the Bonneville Act, which is independent of the reclamation laws. The evident intent of the provisions on pages 6 and 7 are to require power rates to be fixed at a higher level than economics justify and costs would indicate. The intent of these sections is to gear low-cost power to the cost of higher competitive generating sources in the less fortunate areas. Whoever drafted these provisions of H. R. 1886 apparently worked on the assumption that hydro-cost will in all instances be the lowest cost power. The cited provisions of H. R. 1886 are most confusing and indefinite.

These provisions of H. R. 1886 would certainly remove low-cost hydropower from the category of a natural resource. Also these provisions would retard development in regions where power costs are high, as well as regions where power costs are low. These provisions lose sight of what is actually needed to repay the entire reimbursible portions of the Federal investment in such projects.

The district that I represent has two of the largest basic aluminum plants on the American Continent. Columbia power and these plants provided the tools for victory. I interpret these rate provisions as a means of killing the aluminum industry and stopping the further development of electrochemical and electrometalurgical industries, which are so vital to national defense. While the world at large is uneasy, I cannot see why a rate provision should be injected into the organic law that would be deterrent to the development of critical materials which are so necessary in a defense program. Such a course is just as logical as a proposal to give away the secrets of the atomic bomb.

You will no doubt recall that in the early days of the late war, that the shortness of light metal production capacity in this country prompted high Government officials to make large donations to a competitive Canadian aluminum industry. The Shipshaw development in Canada, which was subsidized by the American taxpayer in 1942, is the principal beneficiary of the rate provisions of H. R. 1886.

The rate provisions of H. R. 1886 are unworkable. The Bonneville plant is partly in my district. The output from Bonneville is tied electrically to the same power grid as the output from the Grand Coulee plant. Bonneville, being a navigation project, cannot come under the provisions of H. R. 1886. When the output from these two plants are intermingled on a transmission line, I would like the sponsors of H. R. 1886 to tell us how the power delivered, say to the Alcoa or the Reynolds aluminum plant can be identified as to source. I would also like the sponsors of H. R. 1886 to advise Congress how it is possible to paint the kilowatts from these two plants with distinguishing colors, so that customers operating under power contracts can tell whether their power bill will be or will not be affected by H. R. 1886.

The attempt to devise such rate-making formulas is unrealistic, unworkable, and destructive to the economy of a large section of this country. These rate provisions in H. R. 1886 do not warrant serious consideration by Congress. Such a proposal, for the reasons that I have given, should never be allowed to see the light of day.

I thank you for the opportunity to discuss the matter.

The Vote on the Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 19, 1947:

THE VOTE ON THE LABOR BILL

When the House of Representatives adopts a severely restrictive labor bill by the decisive margin of 3 to 1, with even a majority of the Democrats voting for it, it will not do for the leaders of the American trade-union movement to interpret this result merely as a plot of big business, a political trick, or a sudden case of jitters in Washington. They will fail to note a fact of great importance to them if they do not recognize that only a widespread powerful public sentiment could prompt the House to adopt so contentious a bill by such an immense majority.

The principal causes of this sentiment can be readily identified. One factor is a belief that, however praiseworthy its purpose, the existing Wagner Act has failed either to diminish industrial disputes or to protect adequately the rights of minority labor groups. Another factor is the unprecedented record of 116,000,000 man-days of work lost in 1946 at the very time when a great increase of peacetime production was so vital both as a restraint upon inflation and a stimulus to postwar reconstruction at home and abroad. Widespread dissatisfaction with the wage-price spiral has been another factor. As matters have worked out, it has been the best-paid unions—Mr. Reuther's automobile workers and Mr. Murray's steel workers among them—that have set the pace for additional wages increases; the inevitable result has been higher prices for the less strongly organized unions and for the great mass of unorganized people who live on fixed incomes or on wages that moved upward slowly. Each round of this continuing process—with Mr. Reuther and Mr. Murray regularly demanding new wage increases to enable their already favored groups of workers to catch up with price increases which their own action has so largely brought about—puts the great unorganized majority of workers at a further disadvantage.

The result of these various influences operating on American public opinion is the bill which the House has now passed by a vote of 308 to 107—a larger majority than practically any other measure of equal importance has received on the floor of the House since the early days of the New Deal. This bill is intended to curb the monopoly power which earlier Federal legislation had conferred on the trade-unions and which some unions have used recklessly.

The bill would repeal a substantial part of the Wagner Act and replace the National Labor Relations Act with a new Labor-Management Board. It would match the Wagner Act's list of unfair practices for employers with a list of unfair practices for employees. It would place a flat prohibition on the closed shop. It would sanction the union shop only in those cases where the employers have no objection and a majority of the employees vote for such a system. It would withdraw the protection of the Wagner Act from unions seeking to bargain on a Nation-wide basis. It would empower the Government to halt for 75 days, by the injunctive process, strikes which threaten the public health or safety, and give private employers the right also to apply for injunctions against unlawful concerted activities. It would ban jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, bar Communists from union office, and establish union liability to penalties of the anti-trust law.

These are severe limitations on the present rights and privileges of union labor—some of them deservedly so, others of more doubtful wisdom, judged from the point of view of their impact on the legitimate interests of labor or by the standard of practicability of enforcement. The House bill now goes to the Senate, where Mr. TAFT's committee has completed work on a somewhat less drastic measure. The hope must be that out of the joint effort of the two Houses will come a bill as fair as it is firm, well devised to restore more even-handed conditions of collective bargaining and so conducive to that end that Mr. Truman will not confront Congress with the test of passing it over a Presidential veto.

South Dakota Public Forum Lists Six Suggestions for Fashioning an Affirmative American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under the guiding genius of Robert D. Lusk, editor-publisher of the Daily Plainsman, daily newspaper of Huron, S. Dak., an interesting experiment has recently been concluded. The contestants in a letter-writing contest on the general subject, America's Course in Today's World Crisis, were asked to participate in a public forum to determine how wide an area of agreement existed among them after they had concluded writing their contest letters. Some interesting suggestions evolved from that discussion forum.

Under leave granted me by the House, I am including herewith the six recommendations which grew out of this South Dakota forum. It will be noted that there was unanimous concurrence on the first five proposals and a divided opinion gave majority support to the sixth proposal.

Mr. Speaker, in the fashioning of a new and realistic foreign policy for America which would guide a program of positive affirmative action by America rather than a continuation of our prevailing policy of trying to create a patchwork foreign policy by tying together our various reactions to the movements of Russia or some other important power, it is my belief that it would be helpful and informative if many American communities would follow the example of Huron, S. Dak., and hold public forums to probe and formalize the thinking of their citizens on foreign policy. Bob Lusk, of Huron, deserves the plaudits of pundits for his initiative in setting up this American foreign-policy forum. The results of this forum and a short explanation of its origin follow:

A PEOPLE'S EXPRESSION

The Daily Plainsman herewith presents the results of an experiment in the determination of public opinion on a vital question and in the spread of freedom of speech through the press.

Immediately upon the promulgation by President Truman of what has been called the Truman doctrine, the Daily Plainsman invited its readers to write their reactions in brief letters on the subject, America's Course in Today's World Crises. To encourage widespread participation, the Daily Plainsman offered prizes of $100, $50, and $25 for the best letters.

The response was far beyond the most optimistic expectations of the editors, both in quantity and quality. The letters came from all over central South Dakota, and from as far away as Emporia, Kans. The names signed to the letters indicated to the editors that the contest had tapped in a voluntarily random method a pretty fair cross section of opinion in this midwestern area. A study of the letters revealed several common denominators of thinking. For instance, there was no evidence of isolationism, no hermitnation philosophy.

To obtain a clearer picture of what the public was thinking, the Plainsman decided to ask the contest participants to join in a discussion of the various points raised in the letters and on which there seemed to be some unanimity of thinking to determine whether full agreement actually could be reached on policy reduced to specific words and sentences. Twenty contestants sat down Sunday afternoon before a blackboard and proceeded step by step, word by word, and sentence by sentence to construct an area of agreement policy. Those who participated included men and women in ages from 18 to 70 years, veterans, students, businessmen, teachers, housewives, a minister, two machinists, and a retired farmer who termed himself a ditch digger.

The six points of policy which they developed are printed in properly numbered sequence.

LET US WORK THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS IN SOLVING INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

Only if the United Nations fails should we act alone.

Let us not pit one nationalism against another nationalism.

But let us have world-wide atomic control immediately.

1. It is geographically, politically, and economically impossible to be an isolationist nation at this time. (Unanimous concurrence.)

2. Because in a democracy foreign policy rests upon public approval and support, the public must be fully and concurrently informed on all commitments, policies, and actions. It should be brought up to date at this time. Where consistent with security, advance information must be given. The withholding of information in the past has been unwise. (Unanimous concurrence.)

3. To implement our foreign policy we must have a strong and successful democracy at home. (Unanimous concurrence.)

4. The imposition of any political ideology upon a people without true consent of the majority presents a menace to world peace. (Unanimous concurrence.)

5. We favor the immediate (underlined) and effective world-wide control of atomic energy. (Unanimous concurrence.)

6. (a) America's first approach to the solution of world problems should be through the United Nations. (b) Only upon failure of the United Nations to act should the United States act unilaterally. (There was one dissent from the (a) portion of this statement and three others dissented from the (b) portion.)

News Letter of Hon. Estes Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of a news letter from my distinguished colleague, Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, member of the Ju-

diciary Committee of the House, who served as a member of the delegation representing our Government at the Inter-Parliamentary Union meeting recently held at Cairo, Egypt:

Over 100 years ago Thomas Jefferson wrote James Monroe from Paris to come there for a visit. He said, "It will make you adore your own country, its soil, its climate, its equality, liberty, laws, people, and manners. How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of and which no other people on earth enjoy."

Last week I returned with nine other congressional representatives from 10 days in the Middle East and Egypt. I understand how Jefferson felt about our country and why he urged his friend to join him. "On your return," Jefferson wrote, "add your testimony in order to satisfy our countrymen how much it is their interest to preserve uninfected by contagion their Government and manners to which they are indebted for these blessings."

And so on my return I want to tell you about these countries we visited—you can make your own comparison. And we can rejoice and be glad of our American way of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION MEETS

The Second World War swept away many international organizations whose aim was cooperation between nations. The Inter-Parliamentary Union was strong enough to survive. Last week it took up its task again. It held the first postwar meeting at Cairo. Four Senators and six Representatives from our Congress were elected to attend. I was among this number.

The Union is made up of representatives from legislative bodies, congresses, or national lawmakers of nations with representative governments. The purpose of the meeting is for mutual discussion and exchange of views on international problems. I have always felt that world security and peace depend on such interchange of ideas and understanding of facts. This is especially important at the congressional level.

At the Cairo conference these spokesmen gave their ideas as to how peace and security can best be secured. Reparations, disarmament, foreign trade, and codification of international law were other major matters considered by the Union.

The United States viewpoint was given careful attention by all delegates. The prestige of our country is high. Senator BARKLEY, chairman of our delegation, made an inspiring speech on America's aims and ambitions for peace and justice. It was acclaimed by every country represented.

I was appointed to serve on the disarmament committee and the committee for codification of international law. Every free nation expressed as their ambition stable world conditions for people to live in peace and plenty. It was a healthy and enheartening sign. Through the Inter-Parliamentary Union the UN will gain strong support from legislators of the nations present. They place their hopes in UN, but they look to America as a leader to map the way out of chaos and confusion. We cannot fail this faith.

GREECE AND PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S AID

What I saw and heard during brief visits in Greece and Turkey strengthen my faith in the wisdom of President Truman's program for aid to these countries. Our mission to Cairo was chiefly for the purpose of attending the Inter-Parliamentary Union. We felt, however, that it was of great importance to see as much as possible of conditions in Greece and Turkey. The Greek-Turkey aid program is one of vital concern to the United States.

We only saw a small section of Greece. It was not possible to do much more in a stay of a few days. We talked to many Government officials and to many of the people. We were able to make first-hand observations by contacting these two groups.

Greece is in a desperate condition. Her country is devastated. The guerrilla bands or Elas are said to be Communist led and supported. They make up about 10 percent of the population. Their strength is largely caused by the need of the people for the bare necessities of life. Food, clothing, and medical care are urgently needed. Help in rebuilding highways, bridges and railroads will go a long way toward making Greece self-sustaining. In my opinion, a chance to return to normal living conditions will wipe out Communist influence.

GREEK GOVERNMENT AT WORK

Prime Minister Maximos impressed me as being a most able man. He was called from retirement to serve his country. King Paul is starting a popular youth movement to help restore the country. Queen Fredrika is dynamic in her efforts to get medical care for her countrymen. This young couple impressed me more favorably than I had expected. They take practically no part in the political direction of Greece. Their friendliness and eagerness to serve their people has made them more popular than the late King George. The people and governmental officials in Greece want our technicians to supervise expenditure of funds made available to them.

I am convinced the people of Greece want to stand with the United States in an effort to make a stable and peaceful world. They can make a most valuable contribution toward this goal with the assistance planned. The prestige of America will be raised and at the same time the going will become harder for Communist expansion. If we withdraw I fear communism will be forced on Greece and other nations in that part of the world. This would mean the loss of the Dardanelle Straits and the eastern Mediterranean.

TURKEY'S PROBLEM

We visited Istambul and Ankara in Turkey. We conferred with Recep Peker, the prime minister and Hasan Saka, foreign minister. Turkey is continuing the development program begun by her former President Ataturk.

This country has a substantial middle class. A majority of the people can read and write. They participate in elections. Most of the farm land is owned by individual farmers. The Turk dislikes communism. There are practically none in the country and the party is outlawed.

Turkey has had five wars with Russia in the last 100 years. In order to protect herself against Soviet expansion, she maintains a standing army of about 800,000 men. The army is a terrible drain on a population of 17 million people. Their military equipment is out of date and their transportation facilities are poor. To modernize these would give the country a stronger military machine. It would also enable Turkey to demobilize many men for work in factories and farms.

Shrinking Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a most timely article which appeared in the Washington Post of April 22, 1947, by Ernest Lindley entitled "Shrinking Air Power." Air power is essential to the security and defense of the United States.

On January 22, 1946, I said on the floor of the House of Representatives:

We have air supremacy everywhere in this world, and I think this air supremacy should be maintained at all costs. In other words, by maintaining air supremacy and by insisting upon it we can make the greatest contribution to the protection of American interests and the greatest contribution to the building of an organization which will preserve the peace of the future.

On April 10, 1947, I said on the floor of the House:

It is not too late to regain our strength and to retrieve the position we have lost. We must develop a powerful Army, continue to maintain the largest Navy in the world and insure air supremacy at all costs. Air supremacy by the United States in this day of guided missiles and atom bombs, will be one of the greatest guaranties in maintaining peace.

Mr. Lindley states "An independent study" of this problem "may be desirable."

On November 29, 1945, 16 months ago, I introduced a resolution providing for a select committee of 23 Members of the House to make a study of the foreign policy of the United States, both political and economic, and to investigate the Department of State. On January 3, 1947, I reintroduced my resolution, which was referred to the Rules Committee and given the number, House Resolution 28.

Such a committee as I have requested would study and report to the House on the question, How extensive should be our air strength to insure the security of the United States. The rapid rush of events emphasizes the great urgency for the adoption of House Resolution 28. The problem of our shrinking air power which Mr. Lindley discusses in the following article could well be brought to the attention of the House by a select committee to study foreign policy:

SHRINKING AIR POWER

(By Ernest Lindley)

DECLINING PRODUCTION PERILS DEFENSE

In probing for soft spots in the President's budget, Congress will find that in some areas the Budget Bureau has already cut too deep into the muscle, if not into the bone. It has already become evident that the President underestimated the funds needed for foreign economic aid. After the bill authorizing aid to Greece and Turkey will come a request for assistance in Korea beyond that already included in the budget. It probably won't be long before we are asked to take over part of the British financial load in Germany.

There are some places also in the national defense budget, which accounts for about one-third of the total budget, where the President may have cut too deep. One of these is aircraft procurement. Our first lines of defense—defense of ourselves and defense of world peace—now lie in the air. To keep these lines strong much more is necessary than well-trained units of suitable size in the Army Air Force and naval aviation. Adequate research and development are also needed. Among the essentials also is a sound aircraft production industry. The size of this industry cannot be more than a small fraction of what was needed during the recent war or would be needed if another war should come. But it must be

large enough to provide a base for rapid expansion.

With the loss of wartime business, this industry has been withering back toward its prewar dimensions. Last year about three-fourths of the major air-frame manufacturers lost money on current operations, although some managed to keep their books in the black by carrying back losses against wartime taxes. At present, the commercial air lines are being reequipped. But their needs are proving to be below earlier estimates and they will be largely met this year. The manufacturers do not yet see a large enough foreign demand to fill the hiatus which will come when United States-owned air lines have been reequipped. If they are to keep going, they must have enough orders from the Army and Navy.

Possibly there are too many aircraft manufacturers for peacetime. Possibly the national defense would not suffer if some of them went out of business or were merged. But there is a point beyond which such contraction would imperil the base of our air power.

The budget presented by the President contains approximately $700,000,000 for aircraft procurement for the Army and Navy combined. This may appear to be a substantial figure. Costs, however, have gone up here, as elsewhere. This sum is the equivalent of perhaps $350,000,000 to $450,000,000 in 1940. In addition, the newer types of planes are more expensive than the old, and the unit cost of producing a few planes is much greater than that of producing a large volume.

To keep our air defenses strong, new planes and equipment should continually be designed and manufactured. Enough money must be spent to preserve a sufficiently large corps of designers, engineers, and workers in the aircraft industry. If these cadres are allowed to shrink too much our air defenses will become like a hollow shell.

The Army and Navy should spend continuously on aircraft enough to assure that the aircraft industry is kept up to the minimum essential for national defense. Some estimates already have been made by the Army Air Forces and probably by the Navy. These are said to show that larger appropriations than are recommended in the President's budget will be needed, at least after this year. An independent study may be desirable, possibly by a special commission or board. The problem is there. Little attention is being paid to it. If it is ignored much longer we may find that it has solved itself at the expense of our safety and the peace of the world.

United States Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon:

Senate Joint Memorial 4

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas there is urgent need for the establishment of a Federal institution for the training of diplomats, economic advisers, and military attachés in the Foreign Service of the United States, to the end that the representatives abroad of the United States may be prepared to meet the responsibilities of their offices; and

Whereas the Honorable LOWELL STOCKMAN has introduced into the House of Representatives H. R. 1770, which provides for the establishment and maintenance of an academy for the instruction and training of students in the theory and practices of international and diplomatic relations, to be known as the United States Foreign Service Academy; and

Whereas the enactment of H. R. 1770 will meet this Nation's growing and obvious need for the training of personnel in its Foreign Service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact H. R. 1770, to the end that an academy may be established for the training of personnel in the Foreign Service of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by senate March 11, 1947.
M. E. CORNETT,
President of Senate.
Concurred in by house March 19, 1947.
JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.
Filed March 25, 1947.
ROBERT S. FARRELL, JR.,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF OREGON,
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, Robert S. Farrell, Jr., secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the Seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the foregoing copy of Senate Joint Memorial No. 4 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and concurred in by the House of Representatives of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon March 25, 1947, and that the same is a full, true and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all endorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 26th day of March, A. D. 1947.

[SEAL] ROBT. S. FARRELL, JR.,
Secretary of State.

Free-Trade Zone for Los Angeles Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissioners has conducted a survey to determine the best location and to draw up plans which will be used in preparation of an application for a free-trade zone for the Los Angeles-Long Beach harbor area.

To date only two free-trade zones have been established in the United States, one at New York and the other at New Orleans. San Francisco has applied for permission to establish a free-trade zone, and Los Angeles should soon be ready to file a formal application.

The cities of Los Angeles and Long Beach share harbor facilities which provide a gateway for the constant flow of raw and processed materials from South and Central America. This harbor is situated more than 300 miles closer to the source of these materials than any other major shipping port.

While not a new project in world trade, the foreign-trade zone is a recent introduction into the United States. The first free port under definite administration as such was established in Europe in 1888, and its success was such that zones increased in number until 43 free ports had been established prior to the recent war.

Proposals to establish free ports in the United States were made prior to the First World War, but no free-trade zone was opened until 1937 when New York City under authorization of an act of Congress passed in 1934 established the first foreign-trade zone in America on Staten Island.

The growth of this port was phenomenal. While only 11,000 tons of cargo were received in the zone in 1937, this tonnage more than trebled by 1938, and in 1941, 137,000 tons of cargo were received. The value of cargo soared from $1,170,000 in 1937 to $89,000,000 in 1941. Foreign export handled for reexport which amounted to only 742 tons with a value of $60,000 in 1937 reached a peak of 24,000 tons and $10,000,000 value in 1941. And customs payments in revenue to the United States Treasury jumped from $30,000 in 1937 to $2,868,000 in 1941.

The benefits which a foreign-trade zone will bring to business and industry in the Los Angeles area are unlimited. The small importer will be able to draw upon a stored reserve in the zone as sales permit, thus controlling payments of duties, since such payments will be made over a longer period of time. Manufacturers of parts which are assembled into a completed product with the addition of foreign-made parts for export out of the United States can be assembled within the free-trade zone, and the foreign-made parts do not pass through customs.

Savings also will accrue to the American importer on live-storage commodities where shrinkage or other losses occur since thorough checking within the zone will eliminate payment of duty on evaporation or leakage.

When a free-trade zone is established in the Los Angeles Harbor area, it will offer a special inducement to the countries of South and Central America to trade through the zone. Materials entering this country under quota can flow freely into the zone to be stored there until quota allowances are available. Through such stock-piling facilities the South American producer is aided in

marketing his goods and our manufacturers in Los Angeles will be given access to additional raw materials.

Los Angeles is now one of the leading industrial centers in the United States. A recent survey has reported that Los Angeles now is tied in sixth place with Pittsburgh, Pa., as an industrial city. A free-trade zone at Los Angeles Harbor will contribute materially to the expanding industry of Los Angeles and southern California, and through increased production in that area will benefit the entire Nation.

Sniping Attacks on Veterans' Administration Officials Are Unwarranted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is beyond contradiction that the Veterans' Administration has a herculean task in administering the affairs of 18,000,000 veterans and millions of their dependents. Despite the necessity of decentralizing activities on a large scale and coordinating the work of far-flung regional and subregional offices, a remarkable job has been accomplished.

While it is only natural that the expansion of activities made necessary by World War II would add difficulty in administering veterans' problems in a flawless manner, viewed from every angle the Veterans' Administration has been quick to correct and improve procedures at every opportunity in rendering the manifold services of the Veterans' Administration.

It is regretted that there has been some undeserving criticism of many of the older employees of the Veterans' Administration and the derisive term "palace guard" has been used in describing a group of hard-working veterans who have followed a career in Government as employees of that particular agency of the Federal Government. Officials and members of organized veterandom, who have had the opportunity since the close of World War I to observe the service rendered by this so-called "palace guard," are quick to realize that the malicious and scurrilous attacks are without any foundation.

In view of the oft-repeated lament by Government officials of the dire need of attracting the highest type of personnel in Federal agencies, and retaining them for a useful career of public service, these unwarranted attacks on certain employees of the Veterans' Administration destroy such frenzied appeals, designed to attract capable and efficient Government personnel.

Members of Congress who have found it necessary to contact the Veterans' Administration over a score of years are keenly aware that the old-timers in this particular agency are not only willing and courteous in rendering service but their years of experience enable them to know all the answers and to function promptly and with a maximum degree of efficiency.

I am certain that all Members of Congress resent the sniping attacks on the personal integrity of Omar Clark, Harold W. Breining, Edward E. Odoms, and Harold V. Stirling. Such baseless criticism is not only undeserved but it is in poor taste and since personal in character it should be exposed for what it truly is—a ruthless distortion of facts.

The campaign to undermine confidence in reputable employees of the Veterans' Administration has aroused the ire of thousands of veteran friends of these maligned public servants, who have given years of faithful service in their respective positions.

The editorial from the April 10 issue of the National Tribune, Washington, D. C., is a timely exposé of the tactics being employed in disseminating propaganda designed to destroy the confidence of the veteran population in the Veterans' Administration and to create doubt in the mind of Gen. Omar N. Bradley that he has the undivided loyalty and support of top-ranking career men in the Veterans' Administration.

The editorial is as follows:

CREPE-HANGING COLUMNISTS

Whenever criticism of the Veterans' Administration or any of its officials is warranted, this veterans' spokesman yields to nobody in its ability to do the job. We believe we have demonstrated fully our capacity, but in every instance we have attempted to be fair, and our purpose has been constructive. It is regretted that not as much can be said for ex-Navy Commander Tyrrell Krum, a veteran of both World Wars, who has written a series of syndicated articles that are now appearing all over the country. Neither the agency that is set up to administer impartially all laws relating to veterans and their dependents nor the individuals at whom Krum is carelessly directing his attacks will admit it, but the sort of thing he is doing is harmful to the morale of the Administration and is damaging to the whole veteran cause. Its content is simple of duplication by irresponsible columnists and commentators, and great injury can result.

It is a mystery what Commander Krum is up to. He is a capable writer and has sufficient intelligence to write objectively. He knows too much not to express himself with a greater degree of accuracy, and the full facts are as available to him as to anybody else, but he has chosen instead to resort to reckless distortion and to treat with abandon the workings of the greatest of all governmental agencies. He uses phrases that attract the gullible and uninformed and are certain to lead many to believe that the Veterans Administration has gone to pot. His charges simply cannot be substantiated.

Not so long ago Krum intimated that former Administrator Frank Hines had been fired by President Truman. Everybody knows better. When he was brought up short, he only reluctantly and partially retracted his statement and then went on with his attacks. He said that the Hines regime ended in near scandal, when he knows it was absolutely free from taint. This does not make sense when it is common knowledge that the man, whose accelerated veterans' program designed to meet World War II needs was turned down, had befriended Krum and aided him. It is known, too, that he was a Hines admirer, and had sought and received from the General a photo subscribed "To my good friend." His present attitude is a strange demonstration of friendship. And now he is also violating Hines' successor by saying that General Bradley is tired and worn out.

The columnist's latest tirade is against what he terms the "palace guard," a group of faithful employes who have been with the Administration since its infancy. They include Omer Clark, formerly in charge of claims and now Bradley's right-hand man; Harold Breining, supervisor of the vast insurance division; Ed Odom, head of the legal service, and Harold Stirling, who manages the enormous GI educational program. Krum points to them and others as reasons for "what is wrong" with the administration of veterans' affairs, and says that they are Bradley's "internal opposition."

We have seen the Veterans' Administration function ever since it was organized. We have known all about its growing pains and saw it recover from one early scandal. The only serious troubles now result from rapid expansion of a huge machine. They are routine concerns only. They are not faults attributable to the shortcomings of individuals. But the Krum articles imply that the "palace guard" is underhandedly trying to prevent an honest service to veterans from going forward and that they are disloyal to their new chief. That is flagrantly untrue. We suspect that they are purposed to undermine public confidence in the agency by raising a ruckus which could easily destroy the reputations of decent, hard-working public servants whose service has been of a high order, and to damage the morale of the entire institution. If he intends only to indulge in sensation in order to fill the bread basket, he should look elsewhere, because his present criticisms are without basis in fact.

The Veterans' Administration is big business. Its budget exceeds $7,000,000,000. It has many thousands of employees and operates 61 regional offices, most of them divided into subregional and contact offices. It supports more than 125 hospitals and homes, servicing well over 100,000 sick and disabled, with more on the waiting lists. It has on its pension rolls 2,500,000 veterans and nearly a million dependents of veterans. It has in schools and colleges over 1,500,000 GI's. Almost a million more are training on the job and over 200,000 are studying vocations, and thousands more have had these advantages. It conducts a multibillion-dollar insurance business with about 6,000,000 policyholders. These are only a few of its varied activities, and it stands by to look after the interests of 18,000,000 veterans, to say nothing of millions more of dependents. Such an outfit deserves more than sabotage and the ill wishes of ranting and destructive columnists.

It would be folly to say that this huge organization does not have problems, that its wheels are always perfectly greased. It is an open secret that General Bradley would like to quit and go back to his beloved Army too, but to infer that he is weary of his job is to say that Bradley is a quitter, and that is far from true. When he first took over, the general spoke of radical changes and new ideas. He said he would make mistakes with his army of occupation, and he did. He will make more of them before he accomplishes the goal he has set to aid veterans. There will be endless delays and more administrative rough spots, and we shall fret about them, but the chore as a whole has been excellently done so far, and when we are critical, we shall not throw brickbats.

Two years ago, when Bradley came in, he said that the then key employees must prove themselves. To their regret some of the "new army" repeated that injunction too often and incurred the Bradley wrath, but the "palace guard" knuckled down and worked. Nearly all have either continued at their old places of responsibility or have been moved up to bigger jobs. That is proof enough for us that they enjoy the confidence of their new chief. It is mute witness to the

experience and knowledge they first possessed, and to their ability to adjust themselves to a new order which they have assisted in strengthening materially. It does not indicate any process of undermining disloyalty. Instead of malicious slander and unjust calumny, they deserve the praise of our whole people because the results of their labors reach out into almost every home in the land.

It appears that some critics alter their tunes with almost every change in the political wind, and that they have no scruples whatever about selling reputations down the river with lurid and emotional misrepresentation. Crape-hanging tactics like these can serve no good purpose, and are nationally a disservice to all veterans. We condemn wholeheartedly such thoughtlessness, and we recommend generous applications of a strong insecticide to kill it off. Morale lifting is the order of the day, not morale breaking.

Italians Fear Tito's Power After United States Troops Withdraw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown in the Washington Sunday Star of April 20, 1947:

ITALIANS FEAR TITO'S POWER AFTER UNITED STATES TROOPS WITHDRAW — YUGOSLAV FRONTIER FORCES REPORTED STRENGTHENED, WITH ITALY'S OWN ARMY AND MILITARY POLICE UNABLE TO OFFER MUCH RESISTANCE

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—The pistol which Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, is pointing at Italy is still hidden, and the presence of American forces in Venezia Giula prevents him from uncovering it, but the Italian general staff, foreign military observers, and some members of the Italian Government feel certain that the threat from the East will become acute soon after Allied troops leave and are replaced by Italians.

Reports from the other side of the Yugoslavian frontier indicate that the Fourth Yugoslav Army, with headquarters at Ljubljana, recently has been strengthened by the addition of two divisions withdrawn from Macedonia. One of these divisions is said to be motorized.

Conservative estimates place the Yugoslav forces near the Italian border at between 65,000 and 75,000 men, provided with the most up-to-date equipment and supported by an adequate air force. In fact, any air force directed against Italy is adequate, since 50 percent of the 200 Italian airplanes are not airworthy and Italy does not possess sufficient gasoline for more than a few hours' flight by the others.

COMMUNISTS RESUME SABOTAGE

Of the seven available Italian Army divisions which are provided with a few armored cars of 1943 vintage, only four are in the north. But even if all were concentrated in that area they would be of little assistance for the defense of the area between the Po River and the Alps.

The men are poorly equipped, war weary and demoralized. The officers are disheartened and feel that whatever efforts they make will be useless. The fear that something may happen after the departure of the Allies is strengthened by the fact that the Communist Party is very active in northern Italy. Its work is not simply electoral.

Secret Communist organizations are reported to have resumed their sabotage campaign. The cells are ordering their men to come and take part in militant activities." The full extent of the understanding which may have been reached between Marshal Tito and Palmiro Togliatti, the Italian Communist leader, at their last meeting a few months ago is not known. But it is suspected there was some pretty definite planning between the two Moscow puppets in regard to correlating their efforts after ratification of the peace treaty and departure of the Allied forces from Italy.

MILITARY POLICE WEAKENED

The preparations of the Communist partisans in Italy are not hampered by the Government because the police forces are not altogether reliable. The famous carabinieri (military police) have been seriously weakened. Because it is a permanent military organization outside the control of the general staff, it was frowned upon by the Allied control authorities.

In spite of their comic-opera uniforms, the military police, whose organization has existed for more than half a century, are considered the toughest and most incorruptible police organization in the country. During the Mussolini regime they loyally did their duty of keeping law and order according to then-existing regulations. But they were never used by the Italian dictator for dirty political work, which always was entrusted to special black-shirt units.

Today the carabinieri continue to work honestly, but their number has been so reduced that they cannot be counted on to maintain order if internal disturbances occur.

CIVILIAN POLICE UNDEPENDABLE

The civilian police have been reorganized and recruited, particularly in the critical northern areas, to a large extent from the ranks of the partisans who were overwhelmingly under Communist influence. Many are former Fascists, who, in order to escape the purge, have joined the Communists.

The civilian police force is underpaid and lacks the tradition and pride of the carabinieri. In sensitive areas those who are not affiliated with any party are taken into camp by the Communists through bribes, such as special rations of food and clothing for the men and their families.

Since the Communist ministers have the reputation for being the most forceful and influential members of the cabinet, the men who have accepted police jobs, because it gives them a livelihood, see no reason why they should not accept the extras which come to them from the Communist cell leaders, and are willing to shut their eyes to anything which it is not desired that they see.

OFFICIALS ARE PARTY MEMBERS

Many top city and county officials in the industrial North are members of Togliatti's party either because they find such membership convenient or because they are convinced Communists. A number of industrialists, who doubt the ability of the West to stem the advance of the East, also have become members of the party, having decided to get on the bandwagon before it is too late.

Taken together, all these circumstances give much food for thought to the Italians, who do not want the most productive portion of the country to separate itself and fall behind the iron curtain. They agree that financial assistance alone will not save Italy. But they are convinced that an American policy indicating clearly to the Italian people the United States opposition to foreign aggression against Italy, regardless of the form it takes, would ward off the dangers which menace this country at this time.

Privileges Beget Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesaay, April 22, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, people are prone to seek and obtain privileges without realizing that privileges beget responsibilities. In the consideration of the Hartley labor bill, recently passed by the House, it was all too apparent that the heads of many of the labor unions have been enjoying privileges at the expense of the general public, and apparently are not willing to release any of those privileges for the common good. Most of all they seem determined that they will not agree to assume the responsibilities that necessarily must accompany the privileges which they enjoy. The general public is more vitally interested than either management or labor. Whenever the law grants a privilege to either management or labor, the one upon whom such privilege is conferred, or the recipients must, for the common good, assume a proportionate share of responsibilities. So I say, privileges beget responsibilities.

A very clear exposition by one of my constituents appears in the following letter which I just received from him today and which I quote for the benefit of my colleagues:

As a citizen sincerely interested in the welfare of this Nation, I am concerned about the labor situation.

During his lifetime I was an admirer and supporter of Franklin Roosevelt and I am aware of the great benefits he brought to the workingman. But the right to privilege must always be accompanied by the duties of responsibility. Management has learned and accepted this fact and it is apparent to thinking people that labor must learn and accept this fact also if this Nation is to remain great. There is too much at stake today to tolerate unnecessary domestic restlessness and strife.

The pendulum of labor's position has already swung dangerously far toward the side of excessive power and excessive abuse of this power. The true friend of labor, I think, should wish to impose the responsibilities upon labor justified by its present power before irresponsible labor leaders create a situation which should cause a too violent reactionary swing. In order to achieve a fair balance of privilege and responsibility between labor and management, I feel that legislation should be passed which will:

1. Outlaw industry-wide bargainng.
2. Outlaw the closed shop.
3. Outlaw the jurisdictional strike.
4. Outlaw secondary boycotts.
5. Open union records to the public.
6. Tax unions according to their gross assets.
7. Make union leaders responsible for any cases of violence incurred in labor disputes.
8. Provide blanket punishment for all members of a union group breaking specific labor laws.
9. Force unions to desist from any practice endangering the national health or safety as defined by the President for 30 days and thereafter as defined by the Supreme Court.

This Nation and the principles on which it was founded is greater than any one group, and we must realize this if we are to survive

in the international struggle already in full swing.

I shall lend my full and active support to any individual or party advocating reasonable labor curbs because I believe this is the single most important factor in stabilizing the domestic economy.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a growing sentiment among the Members of Congress, perhaps particularly those who are here for the first time, that their time ought not to be consumed in the consideration of the myriads of details involved in the administration of the affairs of the District of Columbia.

Problems of tremendous national and international importance press in upon us. Although the Committee on the District of Columbia does an outstanding job, yet in the final analysis the responsibility rests upon each one of us to pass upon the legislation affecting the District.

I have not heard the other side presented and, of course, should wish to retain an open mind until all the evidence is in. I must confess, however, that I was greatly impressed by the remarks made by our distinguished and thoughtful colleague, Hon. EDWARD J. DEVITT, of Minnesota, the other day before this body. I agree with the Washington Post editorial which says that his plea should not pass unapplauded.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial:

TOWN COUNCIL

The eloquent plea for home rule for the District of Columbia delivered in the House last Monday by Representative DEVITT, of Minnesota, ought not to pass unapplauded. It appears that the dinner given new Members of the Eightieth Congress by the Washington Board of Trade was bread cast upon the waters. Mr. DEVITT, at least, acknowledged "it was there that I first learned of my importance as one of 531 members of the town council of the city of Washington." He appreciates the honor, but would like to be relieved of it. And in sober truth we cannot altogether blame him.

"When such matters as the Greco-Turkish loan cry out to the Congress for speedy solution, why should our time," Mr. DEVITT asks, rhetorically no doubt, "be taken up with determining the feasibility of constructing an underpass at Dupont Circle? When the great tasks of reducing taxes, balancing the budget, and paying off the national debt hold first place on our agenda, why should Members of this body spend hours of their time hearing testimony concerning a bill regulating the possession of firearms in the District of Columbia? We spent almost a full legislative day last month deciding that the milk cows of the Midwest would not properly function if the citizens of the District of Columbia operated on daylight-saving time."

It is easy to understand how statesmen with the affairs of nations on their shoulders should grow weary of local trivia. Nevertheless the puny problems of dependents are the price of an overlordship such as that which Congress imposes upon the District. These problems cannot in conscience be evaded so long as an unrepresentative rule over a disfranchised people is maintained. Fortunately Mr. DEVITT does not shrink from facing the only feasible solution. "This Congress," he says, "should grant the District of Columbia a charter providing for a legislative body of its own, which would have more time, more inclination, and a better knowledge of local problems with which to legislate for the good of the District." Local home rule for the District is the inescapable price Members of Congress must pay for freedom from its problems. We should think it a release they would welcome on moral as well as on practical grounds. We should think, too, that it ought to be coupled with full membership in the American society and representation in its National Legislature—so that we can share with Mr. DEVITT and his colleagues the great burdens of statecraft that they bear.

The Telephone Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greeley (Colo.) Daily Tribune of April 9, 1947:

PATIENCE OF PEOPLE PRACTICALLY EXHAUSTED

When Congressmen come home they will find the patience of a patient people practically gone. For a great many Congressmen will go home to districts lacking dial phones. Their friends will want to know why the flower of the Nation's intelligence assembled on the banks of the Potomac cannot keep the basic utilities operating.

Almost daily in our country there bobs up another argument for compulsory arbitration of labor disputes. The telephone strike adds one more to the long list. It makes a stronger case because it is a strike in a utility without competition. It ties up a service very much affected with a public interest, as the lawyers say.

Only certain factors in union labor and certain groups of employers oppose enforced arbitration. The public, victim of recurrent quarrels between the two, wants essential services to go ahead without a break. Only forcing both sides to accept the ruling of an impartial court will guarantee that. Why belittle the United Nations set-up to work on an international scale, destined to bump against the stone wall of sovereignty, when within our own country we are unable to settle industrial differences by peaceful means?

If compulsory arbitration be not applied to all labor relations, at least it should apply to enterprises affected with a public interest. That is a broad term. It would take in coal mines and the telephone company.

Two British dominions have had long experience with compulsory arbitration. They are Australia and New Zealand. There it is taken as a matter of course. Laws regulate labor relations. Both countries are comparatively small. By American standards, they are poor. They cannot afford the waste of anarchy in labor relations. They cannot pay the costs of strikes—the civil equivalent of warfare. Perhaps Australia and New Zealand are politically more mature than the United States. Or would Americans deny that?

This has nothing to do with the merits of the telephone strike. They may be highly technical.

Some facts are simple enough for all to understand.

The telephone company operates under a franchise, without competition, and submits to public utility commission regulation. Therefore, it and other utilities should submit to compulsory arbitration. They do so in rates.

People who go to work for a public utility should realize that their status will be different from that of other workers. They should accept the responsibility of maintaining continuous service. They should be aware that their only protection is compulsory arbitration. They should know that they are bound to settle their differences with the company by peaceful means. They and the company should know that all must obey the order of an arbitration court with no more question than the order of another court. That is the way it should be under compulsory arbitration.

But the present Congress, during the terms of most of its Members, plagued by major strikes, including a railroad tie-up, a coal strike, and a telephone strike—to mention only the big ones—has brushed aside applying law to both sides in labor relations. Congressmen have dodged compulsory arbitration within this country. Yet some of them hope to apply it, in effect, internationally.

Anything less than compulsory arbitration is a subterfuge, a makeshift, an avoidance of basic issues, an invitation to industrial anarchy, and a delay in the solution until the United States becomes as adult in labor relations as are some smaller and less wealthy nations.

Waste of natural resources—soil, forests, and water—is not the only waste which this Nation confuses with liberty.

The Position of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include in the Appendix thereof an article written by Yongjeung Kim appearing in the New York Times of March 14, 1947, entitled "Position of Korea":

POSITION OF KOREA—AMERICAN AND SOVIET LEADERS ASKED TO FOCUS ATTENTION ON PROBLEM

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The appeals of small nations and small men often fail to reach important places. Therefore, through the good will of the Times, I am trying to gain the attention of Secretary of State George C. Marshall and Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov.

The eyes of the world are turned today toward Moscow, where the chief planners of the peace are meeting to formulate treaties for Germany and Austria. The peoples of all nations, great and small, are hoping for a just settlement.

As Secretary Marshall and Foreign Minister Molotov come together there is a unique problem upon which their attention should be focused. It is the problem of Korea.

The unhappy Korean situation is the sole responsibility of the United States and the Soviet Union. Korea is a proving ground of

the relations between these two greatest powers. If they can solve the Korean problem amicably, the relations between the two countries, so often strained of late, will be tremendously improved. Their attention should be given to Korea more than to anywhere else in the world. And if they wish to, the two Foreign Ministers can settle this pressing matter easily and quickly in a brief personal meeting between the formal treaty-making sessions.

ARBITRARY DIVISION

The Korean people are not only racially homogeneous, but economically interdependent. If the industrial north remains separated from the agricultural south, Korea cannot long survive as a nation. The arbitrary division of the country at the thirty-eighth parallel has already caused much irreparable damage to Korean national progress and to good relations between America and Russia.

In Korea today more than 2,000,000 displaced persons wander, cold and hungry. A friendly nation is being needlessly punished. Suffering was expected from the enemy, Japan, but not at the hands of admired friends.

The Korean people become bewildered and restless. The whole world knows that they are not getting a square deal. This makes only the former enemy happy.

One year and 7 months after VJ-day Korea's promised independence is far from sight. The nation sinks deeper into political, economic and social chaos. The people are becoming apprehensive of Soviet and American intentions. Surely Secretary Marshall and Foreign Minister Molotov deplore the continuation of this intolerable situation. They do not wish to see a friendly nation strangled nor do they wish to lose the long-established friendship of the Korean people.

CRY FOR HELP

The Soviet and American commands have been unable to rescue the Korean nation from its disastrous position. Now 30,000,000 Korean people are looking hopefully to Messrs. Marshall and Molotov to save them from the imminent danger of national ruination. It is only humane to answer a cry for help. The two statesmen could spare a few minutes from other problems to iron out their Korean differences and rekindle the fires of hope in the hearts of the Koreans.

If the two foreign ministers make the welfare of the Korean nation their primary concern the settlement of the Korean question will be a simple matter. The United States and Russia told the world that their interest in Korea was to help and not to gain. Respecting the Korean right to self-determination is the key to the solution.

However inferior it might prove to be at first, Korea should be allowed to develop a democracy of her own at once.

YONGJEUNG KIM,
President, Korean Affairs Institute.
WASHINGTON, *March 12, 1947.*

Dedication of Memorial Chimes and Plaque, Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech I delivered at the Bruce School memorial chimes dedication, Lawrence, Mass., on Saturday, April 19, 1947, at 2 p. m.:

In all lands and in all times the ringing of a bell has called people together.

One of our first recollections is that of the school bell, summoning us to join in group study. And throughout the rest of our days, the bell calls to the community, bringing many different messages.

Our ancestors came from Ireland, England, France, Italy, and many other countries separated from one another by race and custom as well as by ocean and mountain and borders. But one thing they did have in common, and that was the universal language of the bells.

In every village, the bell tower of the church rose above the home like a shepherd standing in the middle of his flock. The bell served many civic purposes, but it is one of the reverent ones that I wish to speak. It was a signal of devotion, for the angelus prayers were said at morning, noon, and evening at the sound of the bell.

In between, its cheerful ring brought tidings of marriage and birth. At other times its slow and mournful voice spoke a last farewell for those who grieved a loved one.

We think of that tradition as we meet here today. It is significant that we assemble to dedicate this clock and these chimes in memory of those who sacrificed their lives in World War I, and for those who followed in their footsteps during World War II.

They gave all the wealth of their precious youth that we might live, and go on to do our small part in the great and total effort that must be made to win peace and security for all mankind.

Their loss is our loss, and one that is beyond all reckoning. But the spirit which animated them did not die. It simply passed over from them to us.

May the music from this tower forever remind us of the bond which unites the dead to the living and to those yet unborn so that we, in whom life vests at this moment, shall not fail in our task.

The world is filled with alarms and confusions, and most of us feel that we are being swept along by a restless tide and away from the real work which we should be doing. The daily, commonplace chores of life are necessary. Without them, such life as we know, would not be. At times, they are dull and irksome, and because they seem meaningless, we weary of them.

Yet, in the long and mysterious journey called life, all these little things add up, in a way that escapes our immediate understanding.

There are interludes, however, when the laughter of a child, or the boundless love of a woman, or the faith and courage of a man make us aware of the miracle of creation, and we know the meaning of reverence.

The music of the bells plays on our heart strings, touching unexplored depths within each and every one of us. It was John Donne who said that: "any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind. And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

What he said applies to us today, as we dedicate these chimes to the memory of our war dead. They were involved in the fate of mankind, giving up their lives for the dignity of human personality.

We, the living, are face to face with a terrible challenge. It is this. Shall we learn to control the vast power at our disposal for the good of all mankind? Or shall we fail so that the few who survive shall exist in the loneliness of the ruins?

It is from such small beginnings as this dedication, that we derive hope for the future. This afternoon, we have participated in a neighborhood effort. Here is the very root and source of all democracy. When men and women voluntarily work together to build that which is both beautiful and useful, they are on the road to ever-larger areas of cooperation, upon which the fate of mankind depends.

And when they name it in tribute to the self-sacrifice of their fellow men, we may be sure that such people are on the right road.

The Bruce School memorial chimes, keeping us company through the years, will help us to be faithful to the best that was in the past for the sake of freedom with security which all of us must help to build in the world neighborhood.

International Information and Cultural Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Life magazine for April 14, 1947:

MONEY FOR TRUTH—$25,000,000 IS NOT TOO MUCH TO GIVE THE WORLD A FAIR PICTURE OF OUR AIMS AND POLICIES

The other day in Washington a very competent observer of the national scene indulged himself in a little nonattributable speculation. "If the Russians were thinking of putting $250,000,000 into Greece," he said, "they would probably advance $175,000,000, spend $25,000,000 on propaganda, and save $50,000,000." There is little question but that Congress will approve the $250,000,000 appropriation for Greece. But the budget of the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs (called OIC, and meaning propaganda) is at present receiving the most threatening scrutiny from some economy-minded members of the House Appropriations Committee. That budget anticipates that during fiscal 1948 the Government shall spend on informational activities in Greece an even $125,000.

THE OIC

Formed a year ago last January in a drastically slenderizing merger of OWI and the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the OIC has a staff of 3,000 at home and in the 67 countries where the United States has missions. Each week it broadcasts 393 hours of news, music, and feature programs to Europe, Latin America, and the Orient. The programs originate from 36 short-wave transmitters in the United States and 4 overseas relay stations are used. They are carried in 25 languages, including, recently, Russian. Greek and Turkish are shortly to be added. These radio activities account for about half OIC's budget.

In addition the agency sends in Morse code a daily news bulletin to our embassies and legations, some of which is turned over to local news services at the point of reception. The OIC maintains 67 informational libraries in 41 countries, where exhibits of American books, art, photographs, and documentary movies may also be seen. It assists in the international exchange of teachers and students. The purpose of this large order of business is, according to Presidential directive, "to see to it that other peoples receive a full and fair picture of American life and of the aims and policies of the United States

Government." Or, in the words of George Marshall, "to cover the earth with truth."

The OIC was given $19,000,000 to tackle the job in 1946. It wants $25,000,000 this year, most of the increase being attributable to universal rising costs. It also wants $10,000,000 to build more relay transmitters and is interested in the $5,000,000 interdepartmental request for advisory assistance to Latin America, as well as the granting of our $3,000,000 dues to UNESCO. But the $25,000,000 operating budget is what has Assistant Secretary of State William Benton worried. For whereas it is the nature of a Congressman to appropriate overnight $9,000,000 to keep foot-and-mouth disease from crossing the Mexican border, he needs a great deal more than three times as much soul searching to appropriate less than three times as much money toward creating good will (and combatting ill will) for the United States in the rest of the world.

The legitimate skeptic is entitled to three questions about our informational service as it is now set up: (1) Does it duplicate the operations of private agencies? (2) Does it compete with them? And, most important, (3) is it effective?

The American press, movies, radio, and international philanthropies have long carried the brunt of the burden of conveying the ideas, the image, the voice, and the spirit of America to foreign peoples. But the very complexity of the ideas of a free press may often confuse rather than clarify American issues for that three-quarters of mankind which habitually gets its news from its governmental horse's mouth and in very simple terms, to say the best of it. The movie industry does not as a rule attempt to convey any aspect of America beside glamour, and it is not interested in documentary films to any great extent. The major American broadcasters have no larger commercial interest in short-wave transmission and have recently signified their willingness to let the Government go it alone—with some industrial advice from the side lines. As to philanthropies, the OIC serves only as a catalytic agent, when requested, between them and their overseas operations. In other words, OIC may be absolved of the charge of duplication.

The only voices to be raised on the question of competition from the OIC came from the Associated Press and United Press last year. AP and UP withdrew their services from the agency on the ostensible grounds that they did not wish to be associated with Government propagandizing. But there are exchange agreements between AP, UP, and Tass, the Soviet news agency. More understandable would be the press associations' unwillingness to give news free to parts of the world which might buy their services. At any rate AP and UP are out, and OIC gets along with Hearst's International News Service.

HOW EFFECTIVE?

The question of OIC's effectiveness is, of course, the paramount one, and one which calls for a certain amount of faith. There is no known poll which measures the fluctuations of a nation's world reputation solely on the basis of its informational program. Queried last week about the performance of OIC in their areas, Life correspondents split about even between verdicts of good and bad. In Japan, Korea, and the United States occupied Germany the correspondents turned in low marks (noting, however, that wasted countries make a poor seed ground for planting inspirational good will). In India, Austria and the Balkans the OIC got full credit for bang-up excellence. In New Delhi, where the Indians are now writing their first free constitution, the OIC library is filled with assembly delegates studying American constitutional practice. This fact may some day affect world history.

The quality of OIC broadcasts has received a respectable over-all appraisal from an unexpected source. Recently Representative TABER, of New York, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and the one who used to groan loudest over OWI's appropriations, extensively sampled translations of the OIC product. "Not as good as Fulton Lewis," was his reported verdict, "but better than Raymond Gram Swing." Even so he is out to prune the agency's budget, and it will take all the congressional friends the OIC can get to keep him from doing so. These friends will have certain victories for the agency to point to, such as the occasion when Poland banned the Byrnes Stuttgart speech until the OIC had pumped it into the country for 3 days by air. But mostly they will have to fall back on the argument that OIC has only been in business a year, that it is too early to judge its accomplishments and that with Britain alone spending $40,000,000 a year on its propaganda machine and the Russians, God knows how much more on theirs, we ought to have one, too.

A PROBLEM IN PROMOTION

That is not too good an argument, for the pessimist's reply to the British appropriation might be, "And what has it gotten them?" The answer to that could well be that no amount of advertising can sell a product across public rejection. For in spite of Mr. Benton's reluctance as a former adman to consider his function in advertising terms, propaganda is a promotional and selling job.

As such its first necessity is a good product. The men at our short-wave mikes must have a picture to describe that is clear. Is it clear? Byrnes' Stuttgart speech, the "Truman doctrine" and Secretary Marshall's determination at Moscow certainly make it clearer than it was this time last year. The future performance of our informational activities should be all the more effective as a result. In any case, under whatever direction, called by whatever initials, and at whatever not unreasonable cost, it is a job that must be done and done well. Congress should appropriate the money.

In his Struggle for the World, which Life digested in its March 31 issue, James Burnham suggested that "United States propaganda could be, and would benefit by being, for the most part true, or close to the truth." Such a proposal, in line with so much of Mr. Burnham's thesis, tends to look upon the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as two totalitarian powers already locked in mortal conflict. The Burnham thesis and the extent to which Life agrees and disagrees with it will be discussed at greater length on this page next week. Here let us remark that while Communist radio propaganda habitually refers to Mr. Truman as a "fascist imperialist," the United States does not and will not demean itself by responding in kind. The war of ideas in which we are engaged with Russia is, among other things, a war between truth and untruth, or at least between respect for truth and cynical manipulation of it. The case for OIC is simply this: When there is so much untruth around, the friends of truth are obliged to speak up.

Salute to Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald, Friday, April 18, 1947:

SALUTE TO LAWRENCE

This week the arrow of attention points 26 miles northwest of Boston to the city of Lawrence, which is celebrating its one-hundredth birthday. Lawrence can be justly proud of its century of existence, for more than any other city does this manufacturing center illustrate the spirit of New England enterprise.

The city has been rocked by labor unrest, shaken by depressions, and torn by civic squabbles, but, like Antaeus, the wrestler in mythology who grew stronger with each toss to the earth, Lawrence has emerged the greater for its troubles.

As it has woven fabrics through the years, powered by the great Lawrence Dam, making Lawrence the leading worsted and woolen dress-goods center in the Nation, so, too, has the city woven the blood lines of 46 nationalities into one pattern, the democratic pattern, of life. Today, the excellency of this way of life is evident everywhere in the city.

From its industrial unrest has come systematic studies which have created a new industrial consciousness and relationship between workers and employers.

From its corporation boarding houses, of old, where death, birth, and romance crowded in endless sequence, have sprung an awareness that workers must not live a pigeonhole existence, and today the hillsides of the city are alight with the lamps of modern homes.

The city has developed parks, playgrounds, and recreational centers to match its forward housing program, and it has plucked out the prejudices and misgivings from its foreign population through systematic education in Americanization and naturalization. For many years, a free course of lectures, especially for industrial classes, on scientific and miscellaneous subjects, has been sustained by endowment.

Today, as the Lawrence Dam, a marvel of hammered granite, spills water in an unbroken crest 900 feet long exactly as it did in the city's early days, life has come to mean more than the power of the water over that dam.

It has pivoted itself in the spiritual and social forces of a new age as well.

Hartley Bill Would Aid Justice Department in Antitrust Suits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include that portion of the Justice Department's report prepared last year at the request of the Senate Small Business Committee which deals with prosecutions of labor unions in the construction industry for antitrust law violations:

In 1939, 1940, and 1941, the Department brought a number of cases against labor unions for alleged violations of the antitrust laws. At the outset we made it clear that we were not attacking any of the legitimate activities of labor unions, such as the right of collective bargaining or activities designed to raise wages, reduce hours, and improve working conditions. We recognized the limited liability of unions under the

Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts for activities which, but for the exemptions granted by these two acts, would constitute violations of the Sherman Act. Our program was based upon union activities which, in our judgment, went beyond the exemptions granted labor-union activities by the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts. The activities attacked were: (1) Jurisdictional strikes, particularly those in which one union struck against another union which had been certified by the National Labor Relations Board as the legitimate collective-bargaining agency with whom the employer should deal; (2) strikes to erect tariff walls around a particular locality; (3) refusal to work on and install prefabricated materials; (4) make work, including the transfer of work from one labor group to another, as well as requiring the performance of more work than that reasonably necessary to complete a job; and (5) agreements between employer and labor groups to fix prices on building materials. These latter agreements were enforced usually by refusal of the unions to work for manufacturers or contractors who would not join the price-fixing arrangement. Under such arrangements, the particular unions involved became the exclusive labor supply for the manufacturer group.

The Department lost almost all the cases in the first four groups, the courts holding that as long as the unions acted in their own self-interest and did not combine with nonlabor groups their activities were immune from prosecution under the Sherman Act, although trade and commerce be restrained. In the fifth group, the courts held generally that the unions were liable if they aided and abetted employer groups to achieve market and price control, even though the union's purpose in entering the combination related to terms and conditions of employment.

The Hutcheson case (*United States* v. *Hutcheson, et al.* (312 U. S. 219; 7 L. R. R. Man. 267)) was the first major defeat of the Antitrust Division in its campaign against restraints of trade in the construction industry. The case arose out of a jurisdiction dispute in the Anheuser-Busch brewing plant in St. Louis between the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America and the International Association of Machinists. The dispute arose between the carpenters and machinists as to who should perform various work of erecting, assembling, installing, and setting machinery in the brewery.

The controversy developed into a strike not only of the millrights, but a sympathetic strike of other members of AFL against Anheuser-Busch and against other construction companies who were building plant facilities for the brewing company. Boycotts were declared against the company's beer and notices were published to the effect that the company was unfair to organized labor. The Government lost the suit in the district court, and on an appeal to the Supreme Court the case was decided against the Government on February 3, 1941.

The Government argued that there is no form of labor warfare so opposed to the public interest as a jurisdictional strike and that an employer who finds himself a victim of such a strike is powerless because there is no concession he can make which will stop the attack on his business. The Court, however, decided that the strike was a labor dispute within the meaning of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the Clayton Act, therefore there had been no violation of the Sherman law by the conduct of the carpenters' union.

DILEMMA OF EMPLOYERS

Jurisdiction strikes are permitted by this decision even though they are called by one labor organization against another after a bargaining election under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. This conflict of laws, therefore, places the employer on the horns of a dilemma from which there is no escape under present interpretations.

Two cases brought by the Department of Justice illustrate the dilemma mentioned above. Early in 1940 an indictment was returned against two AFL carpenters' unions in Chicago alleging that they refused to use plywood made by the Harbor Plywood Corp., which operates a factory in Hoquiam, Wash. (*United States* v. *United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America et al.*).

In 1938 the local affiliate of AFL in Hoquiam petitioned the NLRB to hold an election to determine the bargaining agent for the company workers. A little later the affiliate of CIO also asked for an election. In September 1938 the election was held and the CIO local won it. Then the Carpenters Local No. 58 of Chicago, AFL, ordered its members not to work on any product manufactured by the Harbor Plywood Corp. and in October a strike was called against a consumer in Chicago using the product. As indicated above, the Department of Justice obtained an indictment against the Chicago union in February 1940, but because of the Hutcheson decision on February 3, 1941, the Supreme Court on April 7, 1941, sustained the local court's demurrer on the authority of the Hutcheson case (8 LRR Man. 459).

Another similar case was the boycott of CIO truckers in New Orleans by affiliates of AFL (*United States* v. *Building and Construction Trades Council et al.* (313 U. S. 539; 8 LRR Man. 459)).

As a result of an election under the direction of NLRB, the United Transport Workers of New Orleans, a CIO affiliate, was certified by the Board as the bargaining agent for employees of various trucking firms in the city.

All of the defendant labor unions which were affiliates of AFL would not receive material from trucking firms employing members of the local CIO. As a result of this refusal, a large number of interstate shipments of materials and building fixtures were held up and it became necessary for the members of the CIO local to sublease their trucking rights under their contracts with rail and water carriers to other truckers acceptable to AFL unions.

The Government sought to distinguish the Plywood case and the New Orleans Trucking case from the Hutcheson case on the grounds that the CIO union has been selected as the sole bargaining agent at an election under the National Labor Relations Act. Nevertheless, on April 7, 1941, the Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of the district court sustaining the demurrers in the New Orleans Trucking case on the authority of the Hutcheson case.

MAKE-WORK RESTRAINTS

In February 1940 an indictment was returned against a number of contractors and union officials in Cook County, Ill., on the grounds that they prohibited the use of cut or fabricated stone which was fabricated outside of the area. The Bedford-Bloomington district of Indiana is an important center for limestone used in the building industry. The district supplies about 80 percent of the limestone sold in the United States and 90 percent of that used in the Chicago area. Some of the stone is sold in rough blocks and some of it is finished and fabricated and cut to specified sizes and shapes. In the finishing process 15 to 20 percent of the rough stone is chipped off and must be disposed of in metropolitan areas. Therefore, there is a double freight haul on waste stone which is fabricated at the building site—one in and one out. The Chicago stone contractors and unions of stonecutters had an agreement to the effect that they would not install any fabricated stone finished in the Bedford-Bloomington district and the members of the Building Trades Council refused to work on buildings in which limestone fabricated in that district was used. The union boycott applied not only to stonecutters but to other building labor, including ironworkers and carpenters.

The stonecutters case was the subject of two trials in the northern district of Illinois. The second trial resulted in a directed verdict as a result of the Hutcheson decision of the Supreme Court (8 LRR Man. 459).

Another case which the Government lost as the result of the Hutcheson decision was the restraints by the labor unions in Chicago against the use of ready-mixed concrete. The latest development in the spreading of concrete is the use of truck mixers which agitate the cement on the way to the job. Such mixers are generally used in all of the metropolitan areas of the United States except Chicago, but the Chicago cement unions, both the operating engineers and the hod carriers, prevented the use of truck mixers or if mixers were used the same amount of labor must be employed as would have been used under the old methods of mixing on the site. The unions also warned manufacturers of the cement mixers that they would not be permitted to sell them in the Chicago area and prospective purchasers of trucks were warned that they would not be permitted to use them.

As a result of the Hutcheson case, the Government lost the ready-mixed cement suit against the Chicago unions. On April 17, 1941, the Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of the district court sustaining the demurrers on the authority of the Hutcheson case (8 LRR Man. 459).

In September 1940 the Government obtained an indictment against a group of producers of millwork and local building unions in the East St. Louis area which had combined to shut out millwork from other areas and to prevent the erection of prefabricated houses in the city and in adjacent areas. The grand jury found that:

"A condition of affairs has existed in the building industry in St. Clair, Madison, and Monroe Counties in the State of Illinois, which should never be contenanced in a free society."

The indictment then went on to point out that men had been assaulted and beaten up and their families threatened. Workmen had been driven out of the district, houses under construction had been bombed, and building supplies on the site had been destroyed, and the local citizens were afraid to complain.

A number of companies producing millwork and kitchen cabinets agreed with the labor unions that no products would be used which did not bear the AFL label, and contractors were warned that the unions would not erect prefabricated houses or install millwork which did not bear the union label. Products not bearing the label would have to be removed from the job and returned to the manufacturers from which they were obtained. The penalty of the boycott was the removal of all AFL workers of all crafts from the job.

The indictment also alleges that the unions refused to erect prefabricated houses which had been manufactured outside the State of Illinois and that other organized labor groups not affiliated with the defendants had been assaulted and beaten and driven from their work on the prefabricated houses and millwork not bearing the particular label.

A number of motions to quash the indictment on various grounds were filed and were sustained by the lower courts. For technical reasons in connection with the wording of the indictment and because of the court rulings in other labor cases, the East St. Louis case (*United States* v. *Goedde & Company et al.* (9 LRR Man. 662)) was not appealed.

RESTRICTIVE COOPERATION

The Government has lost, without the exception, the purely labor restraint cases which

have been brought under the antitrust laws, even though the jurisdictional strikes have been against other union groups certified after election under the National Labor Relations Act. Another group of cases, namely, those in which there is restrictive cooperation between producers, contractors, and labor unions offer some hope of successful prosecution of restrictive abuses. One case brought by the Government, namely, *Lumber Products Association of San Francisco* (144 F. 2d 546; 15 LRR Man. 510); and a private suit, namely, the *Allen Bradley case* (325 U. S. 797; 16 LRR Man. 798), has definitely raised the question as to the extent to which nonlabor groups can have restrictive agreements with labor unions in restraint of trade.

In the Lumber Products Association case a number of concerns manufacturing millwork and patterned lumber and a number of labor groups boycotted the use of millwork and finished lumber shipped into the San Francisco region from other areas, notably, Washington and Oregon, where the products were made in large volume and cheaper than in the San Francisco Bay district. The labor in the Washington and Oregon areas was unionized but the boycott was imposed nevertheless.

In 1936 the union groups demanded an increase in wages and this demand was acceded to by the manufacturers in the San Francisco area in exchange for an agreement by the union to prevent the sale and shipment to the bay area of products manufactured outside of California. The written agreement provided, among other things, that:

"No material will be purchased from, and no work will be done on any material or article that has had any operation performed on same by sawmills, mills or cabinet shops, or other distributors that do not conform to the rates of wage and working conditions of this agreement."

The district court overruled demurrers and refused to dismiss the indictment and the circuit court upheld the lower court in its ruling. However, there are still undecided questions of law involved and the case is now pending before the Supreme Court with respect to certain details as to whether manufacturers and labor unions can make joint agreements restraining trade in price fixing and in boycotting the products of others who are not members of the manufacturing or labor groups.

ALLEN BRADLEY CASE

Technically the Supreme Court has decided in the *Allen Bradley case* (35 U. S. 797; 16 L. R. R Man. 798) that labor unions cannot combine with nonlabor groups in restraint of trade but that the same restrictions can be imposed by the union acting alone. This may or may not be a hollow victory in favor of the antitrust laws, depending upon the extent to which certain restraints can be imposed by the unions without the connivance of the producer or contractor groups. This was a private suit appealed to the Supreme Court and decided on June 18, 1945. This was the first case since 1926 in which the Supreme Court has held labor-union activity as violative of the Sherman Act where the activity was related directly to terms and conditions of employment. In this case local electrical workers' unions entered into closed-shop agreements with local manufacturers of electrical equipment and electrical contractors in the New York area.

The contractors agreed to purchase electrical equipment only from the local manufacturers having closed-shop agreements and the manufacturers agreed to confine their sales to contractors who employed members of the local union. The local unions agreed in turn to work only on electrical equipment produced by the local manufacturers. The three-way circuit was thereby closed—local manufacturers, contractors, and the unions would have nothing to do with electrical supplies produced outside the New York area.

The Supreme Court said in part:

"We think Congress never intended that unions could, consistently with the Sherman Act, aid nonlabor groups to create business monopolies and to control the marketing of goods and services."

It is not clear, however, whether this decision will be effective, because the Court went on to say:

"Our holding means that the same labor-union activities may or may not be in violation of the Sherman Act, dependent upon whether the union acts alone in combination with business groups."

The net result of all the labor cases brought by the Antitrust Division in recent years is that none of the restrictive agreements involving restriction in production, price fixing, allocation of markets, and boycotts are violative of the Sherman Act if practiced by the labor unions alone. Even boycotts of plants where rival factions have won bargaining elections under the National Labor Relations Act are not restraints of trade within the meaning of the Sherman Act. The Department has received a number of complaints of such boycotts in which the management is helpless, the election having been ordered by NLRB, but no corrective action can be taken on these complaints by the Antitrust Division under the present interpretation of the law.

Mr. Speaker, since the Justice Department report was made last September, the Supreme Court has, on March 10, acted on the Lumber Products Association case referred to. The Supreme Court reversed the decisions and cited section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act as basis therefor.

As evidence of the far-reaching effect of that opinion on future efforts by the Justice Department, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in his dissenting opinion, said:

Practically speaking, the interpretation given by the Court to section 6 serves to immunize unions, especially the more alert and powerful, from Sherman law liability.

The Late Honorable Fred Norman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, all of us were greatly saddened to learn of the sudden passing on last Friday morning of our friend and colleague, FRED NORMAN.

FRED NORMAN was a tireless worker in behalf of his constituents—an able and devoted public servant. It was customary for him to work 15 and 18 hours a day. This work schedule no doubt was responsible in large part for his untimely death.

Although we were of different political faiths, I always found him sincere, friendly, and cooperative. It has been my privilege to work closely with him on various problems affecting the welfare of our State, particularly inasmuch as our districts adjoin.

FRED NORMAN came up the hard way. He was born in Illinois and came to our State as a young man, working for many years in the lumber and saw mills of our State. He was an active participant in various labor organizations, serving as an officer in unions affiliated with American Federation of Labor. He was interested in State politics for over 40 years. He served for several years as a State senator. In later years, he was engaged successfully in various business enterprises.

I join with my colleagues in extending to his family my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Wage Increases and Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

HE'S YOUR POSTMAN

In an editorial not many days ago the Journal-News discussed the relationship between wage and price increases, showing how higher prices follow higher wages. To give this illustration, and to show how the problem came home to the Federal Government, the case of mail carriers and postal clerks was used.

This is an instance in which postal workers were given an increase last July, but while the wage increases naturally increase the expenses of the Post Office Department, those wage increases are not by any means the only reason for the necessary increases in postal rates.

Whether the average citizen knows it or not, the Post Office Department give free services to the public in the amount of nearly $350,000,000 a year in free mail to the blind, in congressional mail, in nonprofit publications, loss on c. o. d., loss on money orders, magazine mailing rates, parcel post loss, free Government mail, loss on direct mail advertising and newspaper rates. And all of these amount to only slightly less than the wage increase granted last year.

And while we're on the subject, perhaps there are a few other things people don't know about the wages and expenses of that man in blue who comes to your door or shop or store nearly every day, snow, rain, or shine.

For instance, do you know that the average mail carrier or clerk in the Hamilton post office is earning around $50 a week, with the increase? Do you know that he must pay income tax and all other taxes, must furnish his own uniforms, must pay 5 percent of his wage into the pension fund for a pension which will be taxable? He doesn't have social security either. The only things Uncle Sam provides are the keys, badge, and pouch.

Overtime rates have been adjusted, but during the war, when manpower was scarce, many carriers and clerks worked overtime, but their overtime pay—get this—was 19 cents an hour less than their regular pay.

These are facts, we believe, that few people know, yet which should be kept in mind. Think of them the next time postal matters are discussed.

United States of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article and editorial:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 18, 1947]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE IS URGED BY 81 AS PEACE KEY—COUDENHOVE-KALERGI DRAFTS APPEAL FOR A UNION AS A LINK BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

An appeal for a United States of Europe, signed by 81 prominent Americans, and calling for a European union under the United Nations Security Council, was issued yesterday by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, president of the Pan European Union and head of the Research Center for European Federation at New York University.

The document said European disunity was a threat to peace and prosperity, and could only be remedied by a union which would "break down the trade barriers that cut through Europe's lifelines, hampering its recovery and sabotaging its efforts to achieve prosperity."

"European union is possible," it said, "in spite of Europe's varied mother-tongues and traditions."

"But it can come only if the European peoples who aspire to its attainment are given the aid and comfort in their aims which America's example and American good will can provide."

"Such a European union," the document said, "could provide the groundwork toward a good-neighbor policy between the United States and Russia."

"The alternative," it said, "is a division into hostile camps which 'would inevitably draw East and West into the turmoil of conflicting interest and ideology, and finally into a world war of atomic horrors.'"

This divided Europe, it continued, would also provide an opportunity for a fourth Reich to regain power by assuming the role of arbiter between East and West.

"Europe's future involves definitely our future; Europe's peace, our peace; Europe's prosperity, our prosperity; and Europe's freedom, our freedom," the appeal said.

Signers were James T. Adams, the Most Reverend Karl J. Alter, Emily G. Balch, Percival Brundage, William C. Bullitt, the Reverend Adelbert Chapman, Harry Woodburn Chase, Richard S. Childs, Norman F. Coleman, Frederic R. Coudert, the Reverend C. W. Covey, George Creel.

Also, the Reverend W. Lee Cutts, John W. Davis, George H. Denny, William J. Donovan, Stephen Duggan, the Reverend H. C. Eddington, Robert I. Elder, George A. Finch, Clayton Fritchey, Frank E. Gannett, the Reverend Elbert E. Gates, Frederick W. Gehle, Harry D. Gideonse, the Reverend James W. Graves, Albert Guerard.

Also, Edna F. Haskins, Senator Carl A. Hatch, Dr. Franz H. Hirschland, Philip Hockstein, Hamilton Holt, Sidney Hook, Graeme K. Howard, Edith J. Isaacs, Oscar Jaszi, the Reverend Vaughn M. Johnston, Hans V. Kaltenborn, James Kerney, Jr., John Y. Keur, Reginald D. Lang, the Reverend Henry S. Leiper.

Also, Samuel W. Levitas, Mrs. Alice Roosevelt Longworth, Ernest O. Lothrop, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, Miss Pauline Mandigo, John H. T. McPherson, Robert A. Millikan, Edgar A. Mowrer, Malcolm Muir, the Reverend C. K. Newsle, F. H. Norcross, Joseph H. Park, Herbert C. Pell.

Also, Lewis Perry, the Reverend Edward J. Pouls, Philip D. Reed, the Reverend William Reid, the Reverend A. W. Rogers, Jules M. Salmonowitz, the Reverend Mark F. Sanborn, William J. Schieffelin, Henry D. Sedgwick, George N. Shuster, Lawrence Spivak, Rinehart Swenson.

Also, Senator Elbert D. Thomas, Norman Thomas, Dorothy Thompson, the Reverend John F. Vichert, Oswald G. Villard, Harold O. Voorhis, Eric M. Warburg, George E. Warren, the Reverend Thomas Wearing, Paul Lester Wiener, Abraham Wilson, Mary E. Woolley, the Reverend P. C. Wright, and Arnold J. Zurcher.

[From the New York Times of April 18, 1947]

A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

While the deadlock between Russia and the Western World continues at Moscow, a resolution to rally American support for a project which is the logical answer to that deadlock has been introduced in both Houses of Congress by Senator FULBRIGHT and Representative BOGGS. In a short but weighty 20 words it would notify the world "that the Congress hereby favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

As Mr. BOGGS declared, this proposal is neither novel nor utopian. In one form or another it has been advocated over a long period of years by such eminent minds as Victor Hugo, William Penn, Immanuel Kant, Aristide Briand, and Gustav Stresemann; and it is supported today by such practical world statesmen as Prime Minister Attlee, President Auriol of France, Winston Churchill, Prime Minister Smuts and, unofficially, by President Truman. Behind them stands a growing mass of public opinion in Europe itself, as expressed in a recent poll of Europe's parliaments undertaken by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, long an exponent of a European Union.

It goes without saying that a United States of Europe can be created only by Europe itself. As Senator FULBRIGHT stated, the resolution does not mean that we shall undertake to impose on the Old World the kind of federation which has worked so well in the New. That would be a futile and dangerous undertaking. But it does mean that the United States would pledge support to the forces already at work to make the dream a reality. Such support, adding another positive element to President Truman's policy of aiding the free nations of the world, would give a mighty impetus to a plan which holds out the best hope not only of putting an end to the nationalistic anarchy which has twice plunged us into world wars but also of bringing about a renaissance of west European civilization.

At best the federation of Europe would be a long and laborious process, as shown by the many practical problems involved in formulating a mere customs union between the kindred Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxemburg. But if it is to come about at all, it must start, as Mr. Churchill clearly saw, with a new deal between France and Germany. That deal cannot begin with either the enforced dismemberment of Germany, as originally demanded by French official policy, or, in the words of Mr. Hoover, with keeping Germany in economic chains, which would also keep Europe in rags. It can begin only by efforts to integrate a federation of German states into a larger federation of as many European states as possible on the basis of ultimate equality. For only in this way would it be possible to enlist all Europe's energies in the reconstruction and protection of the Continent, while preventing a German predominance within the federation by the numerical superiority of the non-German states. In this project France must take the lead.

Until recently, French official policy, torn between foreign political necessities and domestic party maneuverings, has provided little hope for that. But there are encouraging signs of a change. As if voicing a warning to Foreign Minister Bidault, Maurice Half, economic director of the French zone in Germany, declares that while France must fear a strong Germany, she must fear even more a disorderly Germany, made so by economic oppression and looking to the east for salvation. Moreover, as demonstrated at the Moscow Conference, France is turning away from the unprofitable Russian orientation and is now so close to the views of the United States and Britain that full agreement with them is in sight. It is to be hoped that this will include support of a United States of Europe. For it is only too true, as statesmen have said so often in one way or another, that Europe must federate or perish.

Appropriations for Department of Labor Should Be Adequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave already granted me, I include as part of my remarks the following resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Rhode Island, urging the appropriation of sufficient funds to maintain the Division of Labor Standards at its present efficiency:

S. 266

Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give immediate consideration to the restoration of the appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the United States Division of Labor Standards in the Department of Labor

Whereas the United States Division of Labor Standards, one of the oldest in the Labor Department of the United States, has done outstanding work in protecting industrial workers by securing raising of standards in the way of laws to secure shorter hours, higher wages, and by making the conditions under which they work safer by providing information of every kind which has been helpful to the directors and administrators of the labor departments of 48 States; and

Whereas, said Division has operated in such a manner that it has aroused the interest of and been adopted as a model for operation by other countries which have sent delegates here from the Far East, Europe, and South America to study methods of administering their own departments of labor; and

Whereas the lower House in Congress has omitted to appropriate anything for this Division of Labor Standards and, in order to carry on the excellence of the work of this Division adequate appropriation must be provided by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use every effort to have the appropriation for the maintenance and operation of said Division of

Labor Standards restored immediately; and the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, to Mr. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor; Senator Styles Bridges, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; and to Hon. John Taber, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Memorial Address on Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of speech delivered by W. Marshall Bridges, of Florence, S. C., at the grave of Thomas Jefferson. Mr. Bridges is a recognized student of the life and principles of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. Bridges is one of the country's outstanding attorneys and we are proud to claim him as a citizen of South Carolina. We consider it an honor for our State to have Mr. Bridges selected to deliver the address celebrating Thomas Jefferson's anniversary at his graveside at Monticello, Va., Sunday, April 13. I hope that every Member of the Senate and House will take time to read the address delivered by Mr. Marshall Bridges on this memorable occasion. The title of Mr. Bridges' address is A South Carolinian at the Grave of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I greet you as friends of Thomas Jefferson.

During the past, on occasions like unto this, various distinguished Americans of your selection annually have been honored by being invited to this sacred spot to pay tribute to an even greater American, Thomas Jefferson, the first citizen of the world.

Your speaker, in addressing you, today, cannot entertain the high hope of adding materially to the wealth of lasting historical data already assembled concerning the life and accomplishments of Thomas Jefferson. That many books complete and accurate have been written, that eulogies of Mr. Jefferson delivered over the years contain some of the finest strains of eloquence in the whole circle of our literature, should not deter us nor preclude the humble contribution which we would make today. Truth may be told in other words. Truth bears repetition.

A learned and aristocratic gentleman, in the finest sense of those words, Thomas Jefferson was, nevertheless, the friend of the common man. He appraised his fellowman, not by financial worth, literary fame, political prestige, or social standards, but by the trend of the individual's traveling; by the motives and purposes actuating such a one's life.

In the selection of teachers, he demanded for his beloved university the services of the most learned and capable. In appointments to office, his prime consideration was the applicant's fitness. Governed thus by high standards of intellectual qualifications, he could, nevertheless, accept the services of the less qualified, provided they were actuated by noble motives. We, therefore, bottom our right to speak to you now on the simple, yet indispensable, basis that your representative holds in reverence, and loves the name of Thomas Jefferson.

The full life of Thomas Jefferson was spent in public service and in safeguarding the rights and welfare of his fellowmen. He stood eternally upon the watchtower against any who would lessen or destroy the rights of free people.

"I have sworn," says he, "upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the minds of men."

Bonds and barriers about the bodies, minds, and souls of other men were as painful to him as if personally endured.

It was his glorious accomplishments that rightly enshrined him forever in the hearts of grateful Americans. We should never permit our familiarity with these achievements to keep us from their frequent enumeration. Joseph Lewis to the contrary—we know that it was Mr. Jefferson who solely, by his own hand, wrote the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson himself recalled in these words the circumstances attending the writing of that immortal document:

"At the time of writing that instrument I lodged in the house of a Mr. Graaf, a new brick house, three stories high, of which I rented the second floor, consisting of a parlor and bedroom ready furnished. In that parlor I wrote habitually, and in it this paper particularly."

Mr. Jefferson induced this, his Commonwealth of Virginia, to give to the States of the Union as their common property the great Northwestern Territory. He purchased from France Louisiana and all the territory extending from the Gulf of Mexico to Puget Sound, thereby giving to our country full control of the Mississippi River. He successfully introduced and had enacted a measure destroying entailed estates, a bill to abolish primogeniture, an act permitting the maximum of religious freedom, and a measure establishing a system looking to universal education.

From Dr. Alexander Johnson, professor of jurisprudence, Princeton University, we quote:

"There is hardly any point in which the action of the individual American has been freed from (1) governmental restraint; (2) from ecclesiastical government; (3) from sumptuary laws; (4) from restrictions on suffrage, from restrictions on commerce, production, and exchange, for which he is not indebted to the words and teachings of Thomas Jefferson."

In his recent work, Thomas Jefferson, American Tourist, Mr. Edward Dumbald does not mention either of the Carolinas. As far as my research has disclosed, I think it can be accurately stated that Mr. Jefferson at no time visited South Carolina. Regretfully we record, no tourist-home proprietor within my State can truthfully advertise, "Thomas Jefferson slept here."

But, we hasten to declare that Jefferson's absence from the boundaries of our State was due exclusively to the heavy demands upon his time abroad, here in Virginia, and elsewhere. His warm personal friendship for many South Carolinians, his accurate knowledge of our State, its people, and our philosophy of life, brought about in the mind and heart of Thomas Jefferson a continuing love for South Carolina. And that State, then as now, loved Thomas Jefferson.

Two weeks ago, speaking to an appreciative South Carolina audience, Dr. Dumas Malone mentioned the fact that you loyal Virginians, even to this day, speak of Mr. Jefferson as though he were in the next room. In such disposition you are not peculiar. There are many South Carolinians who are familiar with his sweetness of life, his kindness, and his hospitality; those who constantly recall his greatness, reverence his memory, and pattern their lives after his deathless enunciations of democratic faith; Carolinians who even to this day continue to follow the unrivaled leadership of Thomas Jefferson. Indeed, there are South Carolinians who gather more pleasure from Randall Thompson's Testament of Freedom than they find in all of Chopin's melodies.

And, in turn, Mr. Jefferson loved South Carolina.

Some criticism of Jefferson arose here in Virginia, during his term as governor, by reason of inadequate military forces assembled in this his Commonwealth. That criticism was not well-founded, for the fact remains that much of the Virginia Militia had been sent into the Carolinas, there to thwart the plans of the would-be conqueror. An enemy on the soil of South Carolina was as abhorrent to Thomas Jefferson as if the enemy put his foot upon the land of his beloved Virginia.

Mr. Jefferson loved South Carolina. He loved this Little Mountain, the soil upon which we stand. He loved God and His great outdoors. To one of his Carolina friends, he wrote:

"The trees I should propose would be exotics of distinguished usefulness and accommodated to your climate."

He goes on to name these trees: The larch, the cork oak, the mahogany, the Indian rubber tree, the marroiner, and others. In what other individual has there been such marked versatility? Burdened down with the momentous duties of national import, he yet found time to be interested in his neighbor's garden

It was in 1813 to Henry Middleton, of South Carolina, that Mr. Jefferson wrote:

"I see with pleasure another proof that South Carolina is ever true to the principles of free government."

Five years earlier Mr. Jefferson expressed his love for our State in these words:

"The steady union of our fellow citizens of South Carolina is entirely in their character. They have never failed in fidelity to their country and the republican spirit of its Constitution."

On this, the two hundred and fourth anniversary of his birth, we of South Carolina thrill in recalling such words of approbation from the Master of Monticello.

Robert Mills, of South Carolina, was by President Jefferson appointed to the position of first Federal architect. Surviving structures of this man's designing attest to the wisdom of Jefferson's choice.

In need of advice and guidance, everyone felt free to consult Mr. Jefferson. Men instinctively turned to him as an inexhaustible source of wisdom and knowledge. To Jefferson the Santee and the Cooper were more than mere names of South Carolina rivers. Information was sought from him as to uniting these rivers by means of a canal. Mr. Jefferson's helpful reply came promptly.

In the year 1787, while Mr. Jefferson was abroad as our Ambassador, he learned of a species of rice certainly different and supposedly superior to that produced in the lower part of our State. His natural inquisitiveness and constant desire to be helpful led him to a thorough investigation. He thought of the rice fields of South Carolina. He wondered if the process of threshing accounted for the difference. He would find the answer. An arduous trip over the Alps could not deter Thomas Jefferson, if the end of that laborious journey would reveal information helpful to his neighboring Carolinians back home. To John Jay, Secretary of State, and to John Adams, President, he reported his findings. We quote now from only one letter—that addressed to President Adams:

"I had expected to satisfy myself at Marseilles of the cause of the differences of quality between the rice of Carolina and that of the Piedmont. Not being able to do it, I

made an excursion of 3 weeks into the rice country beyond the Alps, going through it from Bercelli to Pavia, about 60 miles. I found the difference to be not in the management, as had been supposed both here and in Carolina, but in the species of rice, and I hope to enable them in Carolina to begin the cultivation of Piedmont rice, and carry it on, hand in hand, with their own, that they may supply both qualities."

Mr. Jefferson's notes in his commonplace book further enlighten us as to the dangers he would undergo where South Carolina's welfare prompted action. From the private notes we read:

"Paggio, a muleteer who passes every week between Vercelli and Genoa, will smuggle a sack of rough rice for me to Genoa, it being death to export it in that form."

It was through these efforts of Mr. Jefferson that South Carolina became acquainted with upland or Piedmont rice.

Another incident must be mentioned. May I not refer to the time when your forebears prevented Dr. Thomas Cooper from taking his place on the faculty of your university, and did it with such decisiveness that he landed in the presidency of South Carolina College? If you have any more faculty members like this one of whom you would rid yourself, be assured they will be cordially welcomed in South Carolina. You need not, however, dismiss them so unceremoniously; in fact, we shall be glad to come for them.

By a deed of conveyance dated November 13, 1802, captioned "Claremont County, Sumter District," and recorded in what is now Sumter County, S. C., Gen. Thomas Sumter sold to Thomas Jefferson, as President of the United States, a tract of land subsequently found by survey to contain 523 acres and located at Great Falls, now Chester County. Ever alert to the best interests of South Carolina, Mr. Jefferson contemplated that the land would be used as a site for some national military academy or arsenal.

Be assured that our forefathers in South Carolina reciprocated fully Mr. Jefferson's admiration and love of our people, the evidence of which is imperishably inscribed within the permanent records of our State.

From the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Honorable David Ramsay had renounced his citizenship and come to reside permanently in South Carolina. Mr. Ramsay had known Thomas Jefferson. Only through the aid and influence of Mr. Jefferson had Ramsay found it possible to have published his history of the American Revolution. The favor was not forgotten. Charleston accepted the accomplished gentleman from Pennsylvania, making him the recipient of honors and the bearer of responsibilities in his newly adopted State. Ramsay's benefactor, Mr. Jefferson, had died on July 4, 1826, Mr. Ramsay had been elected Senator from Charleston County. On the 19th day of December 1826, following the death of Jefferson on the previous 4th of July, Senator Ramsay introduced a resolution in the South Carolina Senate seeking an appropriation by the State to aid in saving the home of Mr. Jefferson.

This Ramsay resolution, appearing on pages 210–212 of the South Carolina Senate Journal for the session of 1826, beautifully epitomizes the life of our State's great friend, the immortal Thomas Jefferson. Through this measure South Carolina had the honor of being the first State in the Union to contribute toward the saving of this, Mr. Jefferson's home place. Prompted by our gift of $10,000, other States and many individuals made similar contributions, resulting in Monticello and this hallowed and sacred spot being saved to the heirs of South Carolina's great friend, that great American and citizen of the world.

Not a single instance can be found where Mr. Jefferson ever gave his approval to the political appointment of anyone who was not mentally and morally equipped for the position to which he had been thus appointed. Never once did he make a political debt. He possessed a profound respect for human personality. He wanted to believe in the potential development of every individual, but he knew too well that many lacked the desire, the power, and will to grow. The weight of his life, works, and ability were thrown into the battle against all artificial barriers tending to thwart opportunities for self-development. Mr. Jefferson's ideal was to make straight the passageways of life; to hold up for others plans for a fuller usefulness, freedom, and enjoyment; to show men generally the way. Yet, he knew many would not walk therein. He never attempted to design a royal road of ease for every man, irrespective of that individual's ability, character, and desires.

"I look to the diffusion of light and education as the resource most to be relied on for ameliorating the condition, prompting the virtue, and advancing the happiness of man. That every man shall be made virtuous, by any process whatsoever, is, indeed, no more to be expected, than that every tree shall be made to bear fruit, and every plant nourishment. The briar and bramble can never become the vine and olive; but their asperities may be softened by culture, and their properties improved to usefulness in the order and economy of the world."

Here in this sacred spot on this Sabbath day I would declare to you that it was no profane, desecrating hand that laid hold of the Holy Scriptures to mutilate them; it was the tapering artistic fingers of Jefferson, who with due reverence and the same loving touch which brought melodic music from his violin the same loving hand that selected beautiful and unusual flowers from foreign soil to send to his Carolina friends and to transplant upon the brow of this, his own "Little Mountain," the same deft touch given to the draft of the Declaration of Independence, and from the same brilliant mind and pure heart—it was through these means and in this attitude that Jefferson selected the portion of Scriptures making strongest appeal to him for his personal, devout use. These he reverently combined into his own "Philosophy of Jesus."

So long as our civilization lasts, appreciative writers and speakers will continue their efforts to portray adequately Thomas Jefferson, his matchless life, his varied contributions to our country, and his genuine worth. In these efforts none will fully succeed. There can never be a complete and definitive exhibition of all that Thomas Jefferson was, is today, and will continue to be.

In Thomas Jefferson's character there was no room for prejudice, pride, hatred, or malice. Such dispositions and tendencies were crowded out by his gentle and refined attributes, his absorbing and sacrificing interests in others, by his belief in the sacredness of human life, and every man's potentialities for liberty, freedom, happiness, culture, and gracious living. In no other individual yet born on American soil can there be found such varied personal accomplishments, such self-effacement for the public good, such matchless contributions toward the formation, preservation, and future greatness of our country.

What Goes To Make Up America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial taken from the Lewiston (Maine) Evening Journal entitled "Three Wise Men":

THREE WISE MEN

Three wise men of this community and of this day symbolize a reason for the greatness of America.

They are:

Retired Active Justice Harry Manser, of the Maine Supreme Court.

Judge John D. Clifford, of the Maine district Federal court.

Benjamin L. Berman, former judge of Androscoggin probate court, county attorney, and one of Maine's, if not New England's, outstanding lawyers.

Last night they, among other wise men, for they do not assume all the wisdom of the hour and no doubt will be embarrassed at these words, they met at Poland Spring to fete Clifford, who recently became judge of the Federal district of Maine.

None of these had roots in the law. Each chose it as his profession. No family tradition of jurisprudence swept them along their way.

One, a youth of Irish extraction, whose father was a successful construction contractor.

Another, as he remarked in toast, a Jewish boy. His father was a small merchant in this city—but never was there a keener student of what went on about him than this father.

The third, the eldest, an Englishman, who settled here as a boy, and who without formal education in higher institutions of learning, read law in a local office and finally through steps of municipal, superior and supreme courts won his way.

The Irish lad. The Jewish boy. The emigrant.

In the party of friends and neighbors who gathered with John D. Clifford were those of other bloods. One could not identify them casually, such is the cosmopolitan complexion of this community.

It doesn't make any difference what language their forebears spoke, nor at what altars they worship. Nor whether their ancestors came here steerage in the *Mayflower* or some other boat. We may all claim descent from Charlemagne, if we wish.

Yet there are those at loose in the United States who would change this form of government. "The greatest Government in the world," remarked the distinguished Joseph B. Keenan, fresh from the prosecution of Japanese war criminals in Tokyo. "This Government will not survive," he suggested, "by its own weight but requires cooperation," he commented, from those that live under it, down into the neighborhood and the home.

What is America? One can but theorize.

It's the Cliffords, the Bermans, the Mansers, and the Greek, Tony Petropulous, the ex-cop who is elected to the city council. The Lemaires. The Gagnes.

America in her great hour of destiny is strong in such heritage!

Disaster at Texas City, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the War Department has just received a telegram from headquarters, Fourth Army, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., relative to the assistance rendered by the Army

in connection with the disaster at Texas City, Tex.

General Wainwright and General Sheetz, AC of S G–2, departed by air early afternoon of April 16 for disaster area. General Wainwright remained in disaster area overnight and returned to Fort Sam Houston this date. General Sheetz remained at Fort Crockett as personal representative of the Army Commander in charge of all Army relief activities in this area with headquarters at Fort Crockett.

Six thousand blankets and 1,000 cots shipped by van from Fort Sam Houston to Fort Crockett. Shipped by air to Fort Crockett afternoon of April 16 were 36 medical officers, 50 nurses, and 30 Medical Corps men. Six Medical Corps officers requested as anesthetists in disaster area are being shipped by air from Dallas at noon today. One medical clearing company and one collecting company with 30 ambulances departed by motor from Fort Sam Houston at 1730 on April 16, destination Dickson Field, just outside of Texas City. Two hundred vials tetanus antitoxin sent to Crockett and 3,000 vials ordered to be flown in from St. Louis. Additional medical supplies flown to disaster area included sodium citrate blood transfusion equipment, penicillin, bandages, dextrose, surgical pads, gauze, oxygen therapy apparatus, morphine sulphate, embalming fluid, etc. Brooke Army Medical Center has placed at the disposal of Fourth Army beds for 500 patients from the disaster area.

Two days' rations for 3,000 people shipped to Fort Crockett. Mess equipment and kitchens for feeding 6,000 people shipped from Fort Sam Houston for possible use of refugees at Ellington Field, Camp Wallace, and Fort Crockett. Mess personnel for feeding refugees at these military installations totaled 10 officers, 14 mess sergeants, and 118 cooks. They are being flown from Fort Sill, Camp Hood, and Fort Sam Houston to arrive at destination by noon, April 17.

Six radio operators with two trucks dispatched from Camp Hood to Crockett to assist in operation of local radio equipment.

One military police company, 4 officers, and 75 enlisted men from Fort Sam Houston alerted for possible use in disaster area. No need is seen at present time but if used will be for control of refugees at military installations.

Latest report from Army representative in disaster area indicated that no Army troops will be used unless fires now burning in the city get out of control.

Army report to this headquarters from disaster area stated two large explosions took place at Texas City at 0110 today. Work on water front was then stopped. It is reported by our Army representative, but unconfirmed, that if necessary some oil storage tanks in burning area may be demolished to prevent fires from getting out of control. Several oil companies have sent special oil fire fighting crews to disaster to assist in the control of oil fires.

Red Cross disaster relief team of 12 individuals from St. Louis arrived in Texas City evening of April 16. Up to that time local agencies were not coordinating efforts, and each was operating on his own. Morning of April 17, meeting of Red Cross, Army, State, and civilian authorities was held in Texas City, resulting in Red Cross directing relief activities and doing a good job. They established main office headquarters at Galveston with a suboffice at Texas City.

Camp Wallace opened up night of April 16 for use by refugees. This station is intended for possible use if situation gets worse in Texas City. All wounded have been removed from Texas City, and dead have been cared for by civilian undertakers. Fourth Army Mortuary Officer is in area assisting. In Texas City electric lights and phone service restored, water operating but may be contaminated, gas and fuel service not in operation.

Fort Crockett Hospital handling patients with minor injuries. At present time only 40 patients at Crockett Hospital. Serious cases are being evacuated to Galveston and Houston.

Ellington Field, Camp Robinson, and Fort Crockett prepared to handled 2,000 refugees each. Less than 100 refugees are at any of these installations. Most seem to be moving to other areas and living with friends and relatives. Municipal auditorium at Houston is housing refugees.

One public relations officer and one photographer departed this morning from Camp Hood for Crockett by air to make Army photographic coverage of Texas City explosion.

Air Force installations have cooperated 100 percent in all requests made by this headquarters.

Use of Federal troops in disaster area is not anticipated unless fires get out of control. There is now at Fort Crockett adequate supplies and equipment to take care of foreseeable needs.

This headquarters no longer on 24-hour operational basis. Personnel are available after normal duty hours to transact normal emergency business. Latest report indicates 400 bodies recovered and 3,000 injured. Complete accounting impossible due numerous areas still burning.

Give the Germans a Chance To Feed Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in December of 1945 upon the return from a study of European conditions, the Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy, of which I had the honor to be chairman, filed a rather comprehensive report with the Congress on the economic situation in Europe.

Among other pertinent recommendations made in that report was one advocating the unification of the control in Germany. We pointed out that Germany could not become self-sustained under such a division of authority as then existed. We took a strong stand against the so-called Morgenthau plan and emphasized that unless that plan was forgotten the United States would be called upon to spend untold millions of dollars in preventing starvation in Germany. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have already expended many hundreds of millions of dollars to that end, and we will continue to pour this money down that particular rat hole with no hope of any improvement in the situation until that policy is changed.

More recently former President Hoover, as an emissary of President Truman, visited Europe and made a particular study of Germany. His recommendations were in line with ours. In fact, the former President spoke with approval of our committee's recommendations. This action must be taken, and the sooner the better.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an editorial which appeared in one of the leading newspapers of Mississippi, the Jackson Clarion Ledger, on this subject. The editorial follows:

GIVE THE GERMANS A CHANCE TO FEED THEMSELVES

Let it be granted that Herbert Hoover was not a very successful nor happy President. Americans are to apt to think a man good in one line must be good in another completely unrelated. Sometimes this works, but too often the specialist competent in his own field is a cat in a strange garret in one not his own. In the Presidency, Hoover was not in a field natural to his temperament.

But when it comes to feeding the hungry, he knows. With the utmost diplomacy and self-control he and his young men fed the Belgians during the World War I, getting along with Germans in occupation because they must. He fed starving Russians after the war. He thoroughly understands Germans and their tendencies, governmental and human. He remembers the Weimar Republic and understands the causes which led to Hitler. He knows what Russia was like in the famines of the first years after the revolution.

When Hoover says that it will take so much food to feed this nation or that, so much work of this kind or that to get Germans out of pauperism into earning their own living, he knows what he is talking about. There may be details requiring further study or adjustment, but on the main lines he knows his stuff and his report should be given thorough consideration.

When Hoover says we must let the Germans revive industry as a means of becoming self-supporting, it makes sense. Except for direct manufacture of arms or ammunition it is foolish to hold down production. Every plant becomes a war plant in a war. Let the Germans get going, and see that they keep the peace.

Labor-Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months two things have become quite obvious in the domestic field of legislation. One is the need for sound constructive labor law to bring about perfection of collective bargaining consistent with fullest protection of the public welfare. The other obvious point referred to is the need for a nonpartisan approach to all labor problems similar to our present nonpartisan foreign policy. The public welfare is so interwoven in the activities of organized labor that it must suffer if labor legislation is to be continually handled as a political "football" game with sides clearly drawn and the partisan rooters crying for blood. Only the innocent spectator, the citizen, is injured, for at no time does he have anything to cheer about, inasmuch as he is seeking permanent industrial peace.

Our Government must develop a constant constructive labor policy that must

not depend on the outcome of any particular election. For years our foreign policy has been completely ineffective, as foreign governments in earlier years knew that this country's foreign policy was subject to change every 2 years, or 4 years, depending upon the results of our national elections.

This nonpartisan policy, I believe, was the object of the President, when, in his recent message, he urged the creation of a joint commission to inquire into the entire field of labor-management relations, composed of 12 Members of Congress chosen by the Congress, and 8 members representing the public, management, and labor, appointed by the President. He suggested that this commission investigate and make certain recommendations on certain subjects as, first, Nation-wide strikes in vital industries affecting the public interest; second, methods and procedures for carrying out the collective-bargaining process; and, third, the underlying causes of labor-management disputes.

The President, consistent with such policy, outlined certain immediate steps to be taken: (a) Legislation to prevent jurisdictional strikes intended to compel employers to bargain with a minority union instead of a majority union in their plants; (b) legislation to provide for peaceful and binding determinations of jurisdictional disputes over which a union is entitled to perform a particular work task; (c) legislation to prohibit secondary boycotts when used to further jurisdictional disputes or to compel employers to violate the National Labor Relations Act; and (d) legislation to provide for final and binding arbitration of disputes concerning the interpretation of the terms of collective-bargaining agreements.

No reasonable man can disregard the President's plea that—

> We should enact legislation to correct certain abuses and to provide additional governmental assistance in bargaining. But we should also concern ourselves with the basic causes of labor-management difficulties. We must not, under the stress of emotion, endanger our American freedoms by taking ill-considered action which will lead to results not anticipated or desired.

The President was catering to no special interest when he delivered his message on labor. He was interested in the public welfare. The President is not soliciting the political favor of either labor or management as is evidenced by his handling of the ship of state in all fields. This explains the high regard in which he is held by the American people as illustrated in the recent Gallup poll. Yet the proponents of H. R. 3020 disregarded the warning of the President and took the ill considered emotional action of presenting the House of Representatives with a punitive and drastic labor bill.

A brief analysis of this bill will demonstrate that it not only endangers our American freedoms but brings about results desired by no fair thinking, informed American. To pass or even support this bill therefore, can be classified as ill-considered action.

ANALYSIS OF THE HARTLEY BILL, H. R. 3020

1. The employer is granted new rights and powers to destroy labor and to substitute individual bargaining for collective bargaining (secs. 1, 2, 7, 8 (b), 8 (c), 8 (d), 9 (a), 9 (c) 2, 9 (c) 3, 9 (f), 10 203).

2. The employer is given the right to bring antitrust actions against his employees, to institute criminal prosecutions against them, to sue them for treble damages, and to obtain ex parte injunctions without a hearing against them (secs. 12 (a) (3) (C), 12 (c), 301). But the employer's violation of the law is subject merely to a cease and desist order issued after administrative hearing and court review (sec. 10 (c)).

3. The employer is granted the right to compel employees to accept a wage cut through forced labor for indefinite periods of time (secs. 2 (11) (B), 2 (13), 8 (b) (3), 203, 204).

4. The employer receives the right to break strikes caused by his own illegal conduct (secs. 2 (3), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3), 12 (c), 301).

5. The employer is granted the right to obtain injunctions against strikes which have been legal for the past 50 years (secs. 2 (13), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3), 12 (c)).

6. The employer retains the right to bargain through an employers' association but bargaining through national unions is outlawed (secs. 2 (2), 2 (16), 9 (f) (1)).

7. The employer is granted the right to disregard the bargaining agent and to play employees against each other (secs. 2 (11) (B), 8 (b) (3), 9 (d), 9 (f) (2)).

8. The employer is granted the right to sit at both sides of the bargaining table by establishing company unions (secs. 8 (a) (2), 8 (d) (3), 9 (f) (4), 10 (c)).

9. The employer is granted the right to disregard the bargaining agent and to refuse to bargain about such matters as health and welfare plans, apprentice-training programs and speed-up (secs. 2 (11), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3) (C)).

10. The employer is given the right to break a strike for recognition even though the union represents an overwhelming majority of the employees (secs. 12 (a) (3) (C), 12 (c)).

11. The employer is given the right to outlaw and to crush any strike by hiring strike-breakers even though the strike is caused by his own misconduct (secs. 2 (3), 12 (a) (3) (C), 12 (c)).

12. The employer is given the right to cooperate with antilabor employers in order to destroy unions (secs. 2 (13), 2 (14), 12 (a) (3)).

13. The employer is given the right to lock-out and blacklist office clerks if they join a union (secs. 2 (3), 2 (12), 12 (a) (3)).

14. The employer is given the right to invoke injunctions, treble damage suits, and criminal penalties against the employees in one department if they strike against a wage cut in another department (secs. 2 (13), 12 (a), (3) 301)

15. The employer is given the right to instigate criminal prosecutions against individuals who exercise the right to picket (secs. 12 (a) (1), 12 (a) (2), 301).

16. The employer is given the right to prevent the designation of a bargaining agent for a period of years (secs. 3, 9 (c) (3), 10 (f)).

17. Spies may be planted in the union ranks by the employer and the union is powerless to expel them (secs. 8 (d) (4), 10).

18. The employer is given the right to grant or deny union security as he wishes; he is not required even to discuss it with the union and he may crush a strike or a threat of strike to obtain it (secs. 2 (11), 8 (b) (3), 8 (d) (4), 9 (g), 12 (a) (3) (C), 301).

19. The employer is given the right to crush any strike when a collective-bargaining contract exists even if the strike is caused by an issue not covered by the contract (secs. 2 (11) (A), 8 (b) (3), 12 (a) (3) (C), 301).

20. The employer is given the power to obtain from the Government a death warrant for the union of his employees (secs. 8 (b), 8 (c), 9 (f), 10 (a), 10 (c), 12 (d)).

It does not, however, require even mature reflection to realize that these proposals are deliberately designed to wreck the living standards of the American people. Under the false guise of correcting labor abuses this bill is designed to so weaken, as in effect to repeal, the National Labor Relations Act. By making practically all strikes unlawful it repeals the Norris-LaGuardia Act signed by President Hoover. By removing the protection of the Clayton Act from practically all trade-union activity, it makes trade-unions and their members subject to suits for treble damages under the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890. It revives the common law doctrine of conspiracy against workers who band together to protect their living standards and thereby throws the law back to where it was in England in the late 1700's. The bill does not merely wipe out the gains of labor in the past 14 years, it turns the clock of history back at least a century and a half and eliminates safeguards and protections which both Repblican and Democratic Congresses have sponsored for generations.

The proponents of this devastating measure strike out at alleged abuses in all directions. But they are not content to merely prohibit jurisdictional strikes or disputes; they, instead, would wholly destroy labor's right to strike at all, as an organizational weapon. They are not satisfied to distinguish between justified and unjustified conduct on the part of labor unions; they just ban or wholly destroy activities of labor that have heretofore been legal or justified.

A nonpartisan policy toward labor legislation would have seen labor abuses corrected by legislation unanimously supported by the Congress, not the emasculation of the rights of the working people. At this very moment a bipartisan bloc in the United States Senate has given notice to the world that they cannot and will not accept the unwarranted legislation incorporated in H. R. 3020, and are presently writing their own bill more closely approximating the needs of the Nation in the fields of domestic labor legislation. When a political body such as the United States Senate, controlled by the same party as controls the House committee that created the present bill, cannot swallow the legislation at hand, I ask you whether or not such legislation is worthy of the support of any fair-minded citizen, much less a sworn representative of the people. I will readily support any legislation that will correct the abuses of labor, but no such bill should be used to mask the true objective of the present proponents, namely destruction of all of the rights of labor and a return to medieval practices.

War or Peace in Europe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden News of Camden, Ark.:

WILL IT BE WAR OR PEACE?

Will events in Europe lead to war or peace? At Moscow a most important conference is being held by foreign ministers of the four great powers in the world. In Washington President Truman has just asked Congress for $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey. In China there is civil war. There is unrest in many areas. History is repeating itself, and there are many similarities between present events and those leading up to World Wars I and II. Whether you want to believe it or not, the United States is facing its most critical period in all its history. That includes the perilous days immediately after the Jap sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, when few Americans realized how badly we were hurt. Now after the war is over and all the facts have been published, Americans now realize that we had no Pacific Fleet and little defense the first few months after that attack. But we rallied quickly.

Today most Americans are more interested in getting a new automobile or more sugar than in world affairs. The News wants to wake you up about the dangerous situation and the nearness we are to war again. Forget a little about your personal pleasures and wants and think about your country and its future. Without a safe nation, all the autos, all the sugar, and all the worldly goods won't help you much. It will be too late then. Americans always are too prone to wait until the fight starts to get worked up. This time let us stop the fight before it starts. How? That is the problem. Start thinking about the President's plea. Greece today is the Manchuria before World War II. Turkey is almost as bad as the Ethiopian situation and China today is the Spain of pre-World War II days.

Whether you like it or not Russia is crowding the United States hard. The Reds are playing their cards close to the vest and they have a huge standing army, lots of tanks, and the world's largest air force. That armed force is trained to the minute. The Soviet has not demobilized. It has armed men stationed all over its domain and on borders ready to spring into action, be it Greece or China or Turkey.

America must give aid to Greece and Turkey now. But we must have some strings attached to it. We must not be the tail to the British kite any longer. The British Empire is no more. Great Britain is great in name only. It is bankrupt and has become a second-rate power. World War II was the finishing blow to this once mighty nation. Whenever a country as haughty and as proud as Britain comes to the United States or any other nation begging, you know it must be in dire straits. It has done that. The British have informed this Government that it cannot meet its financial commitments any more. It is broke. It took a lot of courage for the British to do that. We do not admire everything the British do. They have gotten under our skin a lot, but one thing we do know—the British have saved our hides many times by playing world policeman and patrolling the sea lanes. Now the British are done. They cannot protect us any more. It is either the United States or the Russians. We are the only two great powers left. France is a weakling. China is beset by civil strife. We have no other allies save the stanch South American friends, but they look to us and they have no large armies or navies. Therefore, it is the United States, on one hand, against a Russian-controlled Europe and China, unless we step in now and try to save the pieces.

Secretary Marshall is the best man for the job now, but he can't bluff forever. The Reds know the condition of our armed forces. He can stall and he can talk tough, but he must have something to back him up.

We must step into Greece and aid that gallant nation to save itself from the Reds and also the old imperialistic British plan. We must help the Turks stave off the Red thrust at the Dardanelles and our vital oil pipe lines. Oil is the key to all wars and also the key to peace.

Camden and Ouachita County people, the News asks you to start thinking about this problem. Then do a lot of praying about it. Ask God for divine help and guidance. Pray for this country now. Our leaders need help, and need it badly. Write your Congressman and Senators and let them know you are thinking about this crisis. If we go into Greece and help Turkey, we are in there for keeps. It may stop a war. It may not. But we can't sit back and let the Russians gobble up everything, for that means war most certainly, and then it will be the United States alone against most of Europe and Asia.

Think this over and do not let the myth of peace blind you to the cruel facts that are staring us in the face.

Will it be war or peace?

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on April 12, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my Congressional district, the housing situation seems to be well in hand in Binghamton with the Governor offering to use executive authority in handling it when bureaucratic officials in Washington definitely bungled it.

If the provisions of the veterans' housing bill, passed in the last Congress and which I helped through with my vote and support, had been carried out the way we in Congress intended, veterans would now have all the houses they need, and more, too.

The tragedy of the whole thing is to see agitators and fakers try to grab the spotlight by criticizing, yet offering no solution themselves.

If you attack a man for proposing something, you must suggest an alternative plan or you are all wet. The big talkers who attack me when I try to help the veteran either don't know enough to forward a plan of their own, or they are just knockers. In any event, they ought to crawl in their rugs and give up.

I am sure Governor Dewey will remedy the housing shortage with action. New York State has made a success of housing the veteran and should assure an immediate solution of the lack of facilities in our community.

While we are on the subject of housing, let me say to you veterans that I stand ready to do all in my power to help you. I urge you to write me, not only about housing but about any and all matters with which I can help you.

Remember, action is what counts, not sophisticated talk. I am here in Washington to serve you. Therefore, do not hesitate to call on me when you need help. I have aided others, why not you?

A few days ago I made a speech on the House floor and my words to the Congress are as follows:

"Mr. Speaker, the greatest privilege any man can possibly enjoy is to be an American. This privilege was given us all by our founding fathers when they wrote the Constitution.

"Today, Americanism is being challenged, not only, here, but in many places throughout the world. Other isms are defying and defiling our conception of government and flaunting the sacred folds of our American flag.

"The call to stand fast against the forces which would destroy our country has been sounded by the President and other national leaders. They would have us adopt a strong policy of striking back at the enemies of representative government.

"Today a token force, symbolic of armed preparedness, will march up Constitution Avenue and around the Capitol. This will not be as impressive as in war years. There will not be the great numbers of men or mobile weapons.

"All of which brings us to ask ourselves how well equipped are we to back up the demands our State Department is making in international councils? Will we be called upon to defend the diplomatic positions we are taking on far-flung territory and issues on every continent and ocean?

"We must preserve Americanism at all costs. It is our definition of freedom and liberty, and we believe is our greatest hope today in a troubled and perplexed world.

"But if we expect to preserve this way of life, we must be able to answer the question I asked, How well prepared are we, and how does our power compare with other great powers, some of whom may not see eye to eye with us on the subject of Americanism. We owe it to the Americans we represent to keep this Nation strong so that we may all be secure and our future starry and bright."

Thank you.

Excessive Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the very able and thoughtful statement by Mr. William C. Ross, a successful businessman of many years' experience and a resident of my home city of Knoxville, Tenn.

Mr. Ross emphasizes the fact that punitive, excessive, and confiscatory taxes injure not only the taxpayer but in addition thereto injure thousands of working men and working women who are deprived of jobs by diverting private capital from investment in productive industry into the hands of profligate bureaucrats.

TAX-AND-SPEND IDEA RUINOUS TO NEW INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter from William C. Ross, one of Knoxville's best known and most enlightened business leaders, strikes at the heart of an issue which not only touches every American economically but politically. Economic chaos is the inexorable forerunner of the loss of political freedom.)

EDITOR, THE KNOXVILLE JOURNAL:

I firmly believe that what the big majority of our veterans and other young people want is an opportunity for a job where they can earn for themselves and their families a good living. If this be true, it is absolutely necessary to create new industries and expand old ones to give the ever increasing number of youths coming from our schools and colleges as good opportunities as their parents had. This requires capital and the only possible way to get it is to save it out of income. Heretofore the men in the higher income groups have, unquestionably, been the ones who have been able to save most of the capital necessary to finance expanding industry, create new jobs, and increase production of things required for the maintenance of our young people. Unless we encourage this class to save and invest, there will be few new jobs and little increase of production of the things needed.

Now let's see what our present idea of tax and spend does to our young people. It would seem it destroys their opportunities by completely eliminating every incentive for those best able to save capital and put it into risk investments, if, in fact, it does not make it impossible.

CASE CITED

Let's take the case of an individual who has a taxable income of $50,000. Present Federal taxes take approximately one-half, leaving $25,000 for expenses of all kinds. However, if this individual had sufficient incentive, he might save at the very least $10,000 instead of spending it for things he might want. This $10,000 (and it would have been $25,000 if the tax rate had been 20 percent), together with the savings of others, invested in some productive enterprise could furnish new jobs and more products to take care of our young people. But most people would prefer to spend their money for personal enjoyment or hide it away for future use unless they felt reasonably sure their savings could be put to work to increase their incomes.

Today, this individual finds upon investigation that if he saves $10,000 and invests it in a productive corporation that can earn him 8 percent on his money, the corporation must pay 38 percent on his $800 earned, leaving $496 which, when passed on to him, falls in the bracket taxable at 75 percent and he can retain only $124, or less than 1¼ percent on his investment. He sees that at that rate it would require over 80 years to get his money back without profit. He knows that few if any corporations last anywhere near 80 years before going bankrupt. He sees he can't afford to borrow money for investment at a cost of possibly 4 percent when he could retain only 1.24 percent. (In the highest income brackets where most of the savings come from, as well as the ability to manage them, less than four-tenths of 1 percent would be left. Then he sees inheritance and gift taxes with ever mounting social security, old age, excise, State, county, and city taxes staring him in the face. So he says to himself, "No sane person would consider saving his money for the purpose of starting new enterprises or expanding the old." He thinks it much wiser to spend it or hide it for future spending.

It is not only Federal taxes, but local taxes as well, that are sapping the financial strength of our people. Under present conditions, how can we expect to get the capital for new industries necessary to give employment and consumable goods for our children and grandchildren?

There we have the cause and effect.

All through the records of history you will find wherever more than 20 percent of the income of the individual has been taken in taxes it has been only a question of a short time until the economic and social systems broke down and chaos followed. Surely our future looks dark indeed unless we immediately change our ideas of taxing practically out of existence the high incomes from which we have heretofore drawn most of the capital for expanding industry. Our present tax laws, including exempting from taxes cooperatives competing with taxed private industry, make us the most socialistic country in the world.

QUESTION ARISES

The question arises, "How are we to run our various governments without high taxes?" We can't, if we are to continue big government with extravagant spending. We must demand less government, and efficient government, where the taxpayer gets 100 cents on the dollar for every dollar spent. We must see that great sums of money, which otherwise would be used to finance new industries, are not taken from one small group of taxpayers and spent extravagantly for the so-called good of the many, thus depriving the many of the very opportunity they want for earning an independent living. Few realize what the slogan "Pay according to ability to pay" is doing to the future of our young people.

In the long run, a flat 20-percent tax on all incomes will produce more money than higher rates, because it will encourage savings and investment in the hands of future Henry Fords who know how to provide new industries. These new industries will be an ever-increasing source of more taxes as well as of new jobs and of more things produced to raise the standard of living.

These matters are of vital importance. If the above conclusions are correct, and I sincerely believe that to be, our scheme of excessively high taxes on the high incomes is destroying the opportunities of our war veterans and all other young people. They are not being given a fair deal and they should lead a movement against the policies of taxing away the savings that should go into industry. Everyone interested in the future of the country should join in this movement and let all our lawmakers, local as well as national, know what we think in no uncertain terms.

WILLIAM C. ROSS.

KNOXVILLE, TENN.

Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union of April 19, 1947, entitled "Behind the Iron Curtain":

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Little by little, more glimpses are beginning to come out from behind the iron curtain as to how the Russians conduct themselves. Recently, Alois Daneels, a 27-year-old native of Damne, Belgium, returned home after escaping from a Soviet slave camp near Koenigsberg, where he said there were 3,000 Belgian, Dutch, French, and Czechoslovakian civilian prisoners. Daneels was liberated by United States Army forces in the spring of 1945 after 18 months in German concentration camps, but had the misfortune to be scooped up by the Russians and hustled off to another prison camp.

Daneels said that he was living with 25 men in a working unit in a small stone barrack situated in a quarry, with little light and no heat. The men wore striped prison garments and the guards were regular Soviet Army troops.

The men were aroused at 5 a. m. and received a slice of buttered bread and a cup of malt coffee. At 6 o'clock they were in the quarry—by floodlight if dawn had not yet broken.

There was a 1-hour respite at noon, when some watery soup was served. Five hours more in the quarry rounded out the day. There was one slice of bread at 4 p. m. and two more for supper, when the prisoners returned to their barracks.

People who have seen Daneels say he is a badly injured, beaten man, bearing all the marks of a political prisoner in enemy hands. Before the war he weighed 165 pounds. Now his weight is 120, and at the low point of his imprisonment it dropped to 70 pounds.

About a year and a half ago, rock crushed his right forearm. The Russians permitted him to rest for a week, then ordered him back to the rock face, where a drill was fitted to his left arm. The injured arm and hand are still paralyzed.

This actual story is mild, compared to a recent book entitled "The Dark Side of the Moon," published by an anonymous author, who was a trusted friend of the late Polish Prime Minister, Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, who made available to her hundreds of Government and personal papers. The author can't reveal her name because members of her family are still in the hands of the Soviet.

The description in Dark Side of the Moon of the systematic destruction of a nation is unbelievably terrifying. Men and women in their seventies, pregnant women, children and infants in arms were seized. No charge was made against most of them, although some babies were accused of counter-revolution, and one woman was accused of resisting her husband's arrest by weeping.

Those arrested included not only the wealthy, but shopkeepers, tradesmen, and peasants. All professional men, doctors, teachers, scientists, journalists, were rounded up. Labor leaders, Socialists, and even Communists were seized, together with all their relatives. Anyone capable of keeping alive an independent Polish tradition was marked for arrest.

Crammed into prisons, 12 or 15 in cells meant for 2, with no food fit to eat, with no sanitary facilities fit even for cattle, with screams of tortured victims sounding in their ears, they waited sentence for their imaginary crimes. After sentence came the train journeys to Arctic labor camps and the most remote regions of Siberia.

Packed like herrings into unheated cars, with little food and hardly any water, sleeping in their own filth, with the dead and dying always with them, the Poles were shunted from the White Sea to Kamchatka.

In the forced-labor camps, they were considered political prisoners and so much inferior to the professional Russian criminals, who were the camp labor bosses. They worked 12 or more hours a day and were on their feet 15 or 16 hours. Their food was doled out to them according to how well they fulfilled a norm of hard physical labor. Strong men could usually do only half the norm. Weak ones died of cold, disease, and exhaustion and the weak sometimes were shot.

The author of the Dark Side of the Moon repeatedly emphasizes the point that the Poles were not treated any worse than millions of Russians have been treated for 25 years. In the new Russian civilization that is the way millions of people have to be treated so that stupendous feats of industrialization may be achieved and so that the regime may feel secure.

These are the sort of reports that dreamy-eyed Americans who still believe that communism offers something to America should read.

W. L.

Amendment of the Pure Food and Drugs Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to amend the Pure Food and Drugs Act, as it is commonly called.

The enforcement operations under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act are of vital importance to the public health and welfare. These enforcement proceedings have been drastically curtailed under a recent court decision.

The inspectors seized macaroni and spaghetti found to be adulterated with rodent excreta and insects. This seizure was made under section 304 (a) of the act, which provides that articles which are "adulterated or misbranded when introduced into or while in interstate commerce * * * shall be liable to be proceeded against while in interstate commerce, or at any time thereafter, on libel of information and condemned in any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the article is found." The contamination in this case occurred in the rodent- and insect-infested warehouse of the interstate consignee where the food was stored in its original unbroken packages.

The district court held that the defiled food was not adulterated while in interstate commerce and dismissed the case. The decision was upheld by the Circuit Court of Appeals and the Department of Justice petition to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari was denied. With this decision ended an important protection which the public had had for 40 years.

The bill which I have introduced will make available to the public the protection which they have been receiving by providing that drugs, foods, and cosmetics are subject to seizure for adulteration or misbranding while held for sale after interstate shipment, and before the ultimate commercial transaction has been completed.

In the 1945-46 fiscal year about 550 seizures were made where the adulteration was clearly due to insanitary conditions or other causes at the terminal warehouse. The absence of effective control in this area may result in serious illness, even fatalities. Recently there were a number of poisoning cases resulting from cheese contaminated with toxin-producing bacteria. It developed that a mouse drowned in the milk during manufacture and that the mouse, but not the milk, was discarded. Since the cheese was shipped very soon after it was made, it is doubtful if the toxin had developed before the interstate movement ceased. More probably it actually developed while the cheese was stored in the wholesalers' warehouses.

I believe the people of this country want this type of protection and I am sure it was the intent of Congress to provide it for them.

Mary Lucinda Nance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on the retirement of Miss Mary Lucinda Nance:

MISS MOLLIE RETIRES

Miss Mary Lucinda Nance, better known as Miss Mollie, is one of only eight employees who first came to the Census Bureau in 1900. She will retire April 30, and will move back to Arkansas, where she was born and where she has retained legal residence throughout her life.

Although she has worked in all except two of the Bureau's subject-matter divisions, Miss Nance has been assigned to Governments Division work for the majority of her Federal experience. She has served under eight different Directors of the Census and six different chiefs of the Governments Division.

Educated in public and private schools of her State, she became assistant postmistress in Lewisville, Ark., in 1896. There, in exchange for her services in practically every capacity except delivering the mail, she received as compensation one-half of the proceeds of the office. In 1899, Miss Nance traveled to St. Louis to take a special examination for the Census Bureau. She passed, and was appointed a clerk, at $600 per annum, effective May 1, 1900.

First woman to be appointed a permanent field agent and first woman to be an area supervisor, Miss Nance in 1934 received a letter from former Director William L. Austin, in which he wrote, "You are to be congratulated on being the first woman to receive a grade 6 field appointment." She has worked in nearly half of the States, compiling State and city financial reports for the Bureau. That Miss Mollie made many friends while in the field service is evidenced by the numerous queries and messages for her that our present field representatives receive from State and municipal officials and their employees. Her contributions to the Bureau's work have consistently been of real value.

In addition to her duties at the Bureau, Miss Nance has found time to indulge an interest in music, to attend the Washington College of Law for evening courses in accountancy and to pursue in-service training in State and local government. During World War II, in addition to maintaining a victory garden, she took Red Cross instruction in advanced classes, and taught first aid both to Census Bureau employees and to a troop of Girl Scouts.

Miss Nance is a member of the American Statistical Association, she holds life membership in Esther Chapter, No. 5, Order of the Eastern Star, and is a member of Chapter B, PEO Sisterhood, and of the Robert E. Lee Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy. A great-grandfather, Reuben Nance (who is also great-grandfather of former Vice President John Nance Garner), served in the Continental Army; hence, Miss Nance is eligible for membership in the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Miss Nance's qualities may be summarized in this way: She is steadily loyal; she is unselfish; she is adjustable to new administrations and new policies; she is uncommonly industrious, having what is a veritable habit of staying several hours past closing time; she is devoted to her work; believing she is helping to strengthen community government, and she is technically superior, extraordinarily thorough, and long experienced; of her associates she speaks only good things; finally, her view is always youthful, always looking to the future.

The love, respect, and best wishes of all her many friends go with Miss Mollie as she leaves Suitland for Lewisville. All will miss her.

Problems of Peacetime Scientific Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an address by Dr. M. H. Trytten, Director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council, Washington D. C., may be included as part of my remarks. This speech was delivered at the educational conference of the science talent institute of the sixth annual science talent search for the Westinghouse science scholarships. This conference was held in Washington on March 4, 1947, and was attended by the group of young scienists who had proven their worth by being selected as winners in the sixth annual science talent search and who later during the conference were awarded Westinghouse science scholarships. The address, entitled "Problems of Peacetime Scientific Personnel," follows:

The Science Talent Search has done much to focus attention on the importance of seeking out science talent and providing adequate facilities for the growth of this talent into competent scientific ability. But more than this, it has helped to awaken an awareness of the importance of an early start in the development of scientific interests.

It seems interesting that as a nation we have done so little to study our resources of highly trained manpower. For decades we have carefully studied our resources of water power, of soil resources, of mineral wealth, of timber, of high-grade animal stock, and many other resources important to the national welfare. Many people come to Washington to gaze at the many buildings and to wonder what on earth all these people do. Some of them come here because

they are sent by the voters to wonder about it and I suspect that many of them go back and never find out at all. In fact, a pretty large share of these workers is doing precisely what I have suggested—they study the national resources in diverse fields of importance to the national interest and report on our stock piles and our native undeveloped supplies to the Congress and to the Nation as a basis for future planning.

I believe it would not be difficult to prove that our trained manpower is our greatest national resource. In wartime a relatively small corps of technically trained men produced so much and so powerful equipment that the equivalent in other natural resources, including manpower, defies calculation. No greater demonstration of the power equivalent of the human intellect has ever been given. They not only demonstrated that scientific knowledge is, in every reality, a source of power but they revolutionized almost every concept of war and of international relations besides. What was done for war had in fact been done for our peacetime living, in great measure, in the past few decades and can further be done in the future.

It is, therefore, a curious thing, indeed, that we have never given much thought to our national supply of highly trained personnel. At the outbreak of the war practically no reliable information existed on the national supply of scientists and other highly trained groups, whether of acute interest in the emergency or not. Only in the case of doctors of medicine and a few like groups where the professions had been highly organized and licensed was the census approximately accurate. In other groups, the best available information was found in membership lists of professional societies and was admittedly not even approximately adequate. In many areas of scientific interest membership in societies covered only a fraction of the personnel in the field and often included many who were not even trained in the field at all.

Even today the information is not satisfactory in spite of the great efforts made by various agencies and groups. The National Roster by its wartime registrations and the National Research Council and others have contributed somewhat, but only the beginnings of the necessary accumulation of information have been made.

The reasons for this situation are no doubt many. But primarily they are two. In the first place, the dominance of science in the national scene is relatively recent. Less than half a century ago real scientists were rare birds in America. Those we had were either imported or went abroad for training. Before the First World War, scarcely 250 Ph. D.'s in the sciences were granted annually. Immediately after the First World War this had increased to 500 per year. By the early thirties we had passed the 1,000 mark. The next decade saw the expansion of this training effort to a full 2,000 per year by 1941. We thus doubled our training of scientists roughly every decade up to the Second World War. This means that eight times as many persons received the doctorate in the sciences in 1941 as in 1912. Probably about half of the scientists in the United States trained to the doctoral level were given their final degrees after 1936. The scientific activity and development in the land increased apace. Science was proving itself by the sheer power of its methods. And only during the war did we suddenly realize that it was no longer a decoration to our cultural life but a prime necessity for life in the modern world.

The second circumstance which may have prevented our realization of scientific talent as a national resource was the employment situation in the depression. It was a psychological impediment to a consideration of our scientific resources in trained manpower that we could not even find employment for competent and qualified scientists. The psychological impact of those years even now colors the judgment of many when they think of the personnel problem. Only the acute needs of the war, for this type of personnel, demonstrated that we cannot safely think of this problem without considering the supply of trained manpower from the point of view of the long time well-being of the Nation.

If we have been training double the number of scientists to the doctoral level since before the First World War the question naturally presents itself as to whether we can look into the future to determine what our needs may be in the coming years. It would be pleasant here to pose as a prophet and speak oracularly, but the hazards are too great. The force of circumstance is far too great and too unpredictable for that. However, certain observations are apparently not too hazardous.

The first observation is that there is now an unmistakable shortage of qualified scientists in practically all fields of science. Undoubtedly this is due to readily discernible factors. The first and most obvious is the continuation of researches to guarantee a well-equipped military establishment at least until the international situation has assumed stability. The wisdom of this seems unchallenged. Certainly the country seems united on the policy at present. The second factor is the concerted belief of industry in industrial research as a source of prosperity and higher living standards. The development of older research laboratories, the establishment of new ones, and the spread of industrial research among universities are phenomena observable on all hands. The third factor is the unprecedented enrollment in colleges and universities making the need for qualified science teachers a pressing one. One must add here some consideration of the leadership role of America in world science today. America cannot remain a nation at a high plateau technologically in a world at a much lower level. We are in large measure the custodian of the technological heritage of the ages at the present time. We are the trustees of the world's equities in this sphere and must give serious thought to our responsibility toward raising the standards of the world. A mere glance at the level of development in many parts of the world in such fields as public health, medicine, engineering, agriculture, and the physical sciences may give an idea of the work our scientists could be called on to do if we are to share our technological riches with the world. All of these factors seem to indicate that it will be years before the supply of scientists will equal the demand.

To measure this demand is, however, baffling. There are too many uncertain and qualitative considerations. For scientists are not peas in a pod. They are, if anything, more variable than other types of personnel. Of two apparently comparable men, from the point of view of training and length of experience, one may be ten times as productive as the other. And the demand may fluctuate in any area with every economic wind which blows and with every political shift in the stormy air of Washington. But, in spite of all of its uncertainty, it seems fair to state that if our Nation is to remain strong and progressive we must look forward to a widening scientific horizon with new areas opened up for exploration demanding an increasing number of competent and well-trained scientists.

Much has been said about the shortage of scientists the past year or two. But not enough has been said of the equally increasing demand for highly trained personnel in other fields. It would be unrealistic to assume that only in the science fields is additional personnel needed. It is true in other fields as well. Our technological civilization is characterized by increasing complexity. This gives rise to increased problems in almost every phase of human existence. The fields of social problems, economics, law, medicine, public health, industrial relations, and a host of others are fairly bristling with problems created by our departure from the simple lives of our fathers and our precipitation into modes of living of high interdependence and increasing artificiality. These considerations are important because they raise the question of where additional scientists are to come from. We would be serving ourselves poorly indeed in the long run if we diverted a larger and larger share of the best brains of the Nation into scientific work at the expense of other disciplines, perhaps in the long run of equal if not greater import to the national welfare.

It is interesting in this connection to examine enrollment statistics in American colleges and universities. As was stated earlier, the training to the doctor of philosophy level in the sciences increased by a factor of eight from 1912 to 1941. But in this time college enrollments increased from 375,000 in 1912 to 1,500,000 in 1941, or only four times the 1912 figures. It would be interesting here to have the percentages of male and female enrollments in the corresponding years, since it seems established that the education of women has increased more rapidly than that of men, but I have not found the figures as yet. In this same interval the percentage of the population attending college increased only from 0.4 in 1912 to 1.12 in 1941, or an increase of 2.7 times the 1912 figure. These figures indicate a rapid increase in the training of college graduates in the research sciences. Already the percentage trained in some fields is astonishing. In chemistry, for example, there were approximately 3,900 graduates at the bachelor's level in 1941, according to the report of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars. That same year there were 672 doctorates in chemistry graduated by American universities. This corresponds to 17 percent. Of all the sciences the figure seems to approximate 12 percent.

The exact meaning of these figures, however, is not crystal clear. Our colleges and universities are as yet not standardized nor uniform. But, in spite of that, it does seem that the time has come when the needs of our civilization for high competence may force us to examine carefully our resources in competent young men. We shall need to pay much attention to selection and identification of competent youth so that we can assure ourselves that we are not losing good material through lack of resources to train them, and we need to do this in such a way that no important activity is drained dry of talent to furnish adequate manpower for other activities.

"Buy American" Is a Dead Slogan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, April 13:

"BUY AMERICAN" IS A DEAD SLOGAN

(By W. Averill Harriman)

Every American has a personal stake in the expansion of world trade. What role the United States is to play in this drama is one of the major decisions our Government faces today.

The interdependence of our own welfare with that of the world is today both a great challenge to us and a great promise to the world. My years in trouble-ridden Europe have convinced me that we must accept the challenge and live up to the promise.

Since my return I have become confident that we will. Public opinion is beginning to realize our tasks in today's one economic world.

But to be able to act with sufficient speed and imagination on a wise world-trade policy, every one of us must come to understand more fully the beneficial effects of expanding world commerce on our domestic economy.

DOMESTIC REBATE

What do exports do for us?

They provide at least one out of every 15 jobs in the United States. Through increased sales, they help to keep down domestic prices of passenger cars, trucks, radios, aircraft, machine tools, machinery, farm equipment, movies and many other important products. The large foreign sales of those goods, accounting for 7 to 40 percent of our total output, greatly lower the unit cost of our mass-production industries.

The magnitude of our export trade can be appreciated by comparing it with our domestic trade. Last year, our $12,200,000,000 in exports of goods, including gifts and surplus-property sales, and our $3,100,000,000 in exports of services (shipping, insurance, etc.) were equal in value to all the money America spent in the Nation's clothing and shoe stores, drug stores, and filling stations.

But even with exports so high, there is still much necessity and room—for expanding them.

The needs of foreign countries for larger quantities of machinery and many other kinds of American goods are real and urgent. They will have to be fulfilled in reasonable time if we are to help these countries progress economically—which alone can give free institutions and peace a fair chance.

In our own interest, too, a growing export trade is necessary. Our productive capacity today is far greater than it was before World War II. Technological progress in the future can raise it still further.

STILL A GREAT GAP

To enable the world to buy more from us, we must buy more from abroad. Last year the dollar value of our purchases of foreign goods and services was considerably greater than before the war. With $7,100,000,000, it equaled the total amount we spent at home on furniture, house furnishings, household appliances, radios, hardware, and farm implements. But it was $8,200,000,000 less than the value of our exports.

This great gap, mistakenly called our favorable balance of trade, will have to be narrowed if we are to be able to increase—or even maintain—the level of our exports.

For we cannot indefinitely make gifts to the world, as in 1946, when we made available $2,600,000,000 as taxpayers and $600,000,000 as private citizens. Nor do foreign countries have sufficient war-accumulated dollar balances and other assets in the United States to go on paying us cash from their reserves.

For some time we shall have to loan capital to our foreign customers to help them in a sound businesslike manner to increase their own production. But whether our lending can continue on the $3,000,000,000 level of last year or even a much lower level depends on our readiness in the future to accept interest and repayment of our loans in kind.

PLEASANT INVESTMENT

What can we do?

1. We can and should spend more dollars traveling abroad, broadening our knowledge of the world and enjoying personal contacts with its peoples.

2. We shall have to buy more of certain foreign manufactured goods. Additional imports of luxuries and semiluxuries can greatly add to our enjoyment of life.

3. We must buy more raw materials from abroad. We produce no natural rubber, coffee, tin, cocoa, bananas, and silk, and not enough sugar, wool, furs, lead, copper, petroleum, newsprint, etc.

4. We can conserve our domestic resources through liberal imports of some of our most essential industrial raw materials, like oil, lead, and copper. They're running low. We shall need more of them for our vastly increased industrial machine.

Imported goods are part of almost everything we use. Practically all of our industries would suffer the most critical bottlenecks without them.

Our motorcars, for example, contain some 300 vital foreign materials originating from 56 countries. In our cosmetics are some 150, in our soft drinks over 50 ingredients from the outside world. A good part of our pharmaceutical and other chemical products are partly of foreign origin. Every radio tube and light bulb contains materials from abroad.

OUR SILENT ENVOYS

Good will resulting from foreign commerce is a great factor in international relations. I know from my experience in Russia and elsewhere what an efficient American machine tool in the hands of a foreign worker can do to promote good will toward the United States.

Similarly, our buying of foreign products tends to create friendliness toward us among the farmers and miners, the craftsmen and factory workers abroad who come to realize that we are contributing more and more to their precarious incomes.

We are only 6 percent of the world's population; yet our country today turns out about one-half of the world's industrial production.

We have long been a primarily industrial country; yet our agriculture, apart from providing us with the highest standard of living, produces the greatest exportable surplus of food in the world. Our financial resources dwarf the wealth of the rest of the world.

DEPRESSION

It is true that, having contributed or pledged over $20,000,000,000, in gifts and loans to postwar reconstruction abroad, we are now doing about 25 percent of the world's entire international trade—three times as much as we did in 1939.

But many nations are wondering whether we will continue to assume our share of responsibility in making the world advance from devastation and backwardness to reconstruction and prosperity.

By our actions in domestic and foreign economic policy we can and must give the world a positive answer if we want to escape another tragic involvement in its miseries—first in depression and then possibly in war.

Our slogan, "Buy American," served us well enough while we were a debtor nation attempting to build up our infant industries.

But now that we are a great creditor nation our self-interest requires economic policies that would be better characterized by the new slogan, "Let's import—for peace and prosperity."

Mr. Speaker, note that the article states we do not produce enough wool and furs. Why do we not produce enough wool and furs? Time will tell. To listen to some people one would expect a Utopia when Canada furnishes us all our wheat needs; Australia all our wool needs; New Zealand and Argentina all our beef needs; and Russia all our fur needs. The citizens of the United States can then draw their social security and live happily ever afterward.

The Scientific Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am making a part of these remarks a very interesting address delivered by Dr. Vannevar Bush, president, Carnegie Institution of Washington, at the awards dinner of the sixth annual science talent search, conducted by the Westinghouse Corp.

The Westinghouse Corp. annually cooperates financially in trying to discover young men and women who are specially adapted to training in science. Science scholarships are awarded. The search is conducted by Science Clubs of America, administered by Science Service under the direction of Mr. Watson Davis. Each year the winners of this search are brought to Washington where they spend several days listening and participating in discussions relative to science. The culmination of the visit is a dinner at which the winners of the awards are publicly announced. It has been my privilege to attend several of these dinners and I can say without reservation that they are a most inspiring event. At these dinners we have some of the leading scientific minds of the country and this year we were especially favored by having present Dr. Vannevar Bush, one of the outstanding men of this generation. We also had before us the young men and women who personified for us our hope of the future that science may be utilized in the ways of peace.

In this transition period of the world we have vividly in our minds the ghastly effects of the atomic bomb, which was the creation of our great scientists and their contribution to the winning of the war. We are all hoping, and the Members of the Congress are especially hoping, that policies can be formulated that will bring the world to an even keel and guarantee a long period of peace. Scientists are primarily objective and we earnestly pray that their great talents may be utilized for the blessings of mankind in peaceful ways. We hope that their ingenuity and their scientific ability may never again be needed or used to destroy human beings or any of their works. Science offers so much in the way of elevating living standards and dignifying the individual that we pray that the statesman who must fashion the machinery which will bring a workable and lasting peace will succeed, so that science in the future can be used

for the welfare of the individual as well as the welfare of the whole of mankind.

Dr. Bush's speech follows:

THE SCIENTIFIC WAY

It is both pleasure and privilege to be asked to make these remarks this evening. I say this because, for one thing, I used to have great enjoyment and satisfaction from being a teacher, and an occasion such as this, when we are met to honor a group of vigorous and able student minds, necessarily calls back many pleasant recollections of classroom relationships of years ago. My generation is often criticized, moreover, on the ground that we talk too much. I don't believe I will admit that flatly. But it may very well be that we talk too much to each other, and not enough with other, younger generations whose direct views and freedom from preconceptions would be very salutary for us. On this score you 40 finalists in the sixth annual science talent search have me under an obligation.

For it is a welcome event—to have opportunity to join with a group of vigorous younger minds who have already proved their possession of signal potentiality, and to join with them in examining into such a fascinating, vital, and complex subject as the nature of science and scientific research—the scientific way. We know that occasions are rare when for a little we may stand aside from the exactions and preoccupations of active affairs, in order to appraise and seek to understand the lasting significance underlying them. In such occasions one always finds reward and stimulation, and one always draws from them renewed demonstration of the great truth framed by Socrates, that "an unexamined life is not worth living." The chief among their many values is that they help us in the effort to discern what actually we seek to do, and why we seek to do it. In the hurry and bustle of our crowded and complex daily life we all too easily become engrossed with immediate things to such an extent as to lose sight of lasting things. We hence run a great danger, for unless we maintain the balance and comprehension that come from awareness of the basic and durable reasons for action, we may become as futilely frantic as the squirrel on a treadmill or the rat in a maze.

It is from the point of view of these considerations that I welcome this meeting as an occasion to inquire into the scientific way. I am, of course, an electrical engineer, and speak primarily as an engineer. It is fitting enough for an engineer to examine into science, however, for engineers and engineering depend upon science much as medical practitioners do, or much as, say, the weaver both depends upon and fosters sheep raising, or the publisher is both the servant and the sponsor of literature.

The human being has four great sources of strength on which to draw for the energy which he puts forth in carrying on the varied activities that go to make up civilization and thus serve to distinguish mankind from other forms of life. They are his reason, the exercise of which finds clearest expression in law and science; his imagination, whence spring art, music, poetry; his physique, mastery and skilled utilization of which reaches consummation in the ballet, in sports; and his spirit, out of which grow the lofty conceptions of philosophy and the noble aspirations of theology and religion. Almost anything that man does, of course, calls to some extent on all four of these wellsprings; certain groups of activities, however, draw more heavily on some one, other groups on some other, of them. In science, the great draft is on reason. Naturally, imagination contributes in the building of a theory and in the devising of experiments to test a theory. Sometimes the physique is placed under heavy toll, particularly for adroitness, steadiness, and dexterity in the assembly and use of apparatus and for reserves of stamina to meet the strain of long, concentrated work. It can fairly be said, too, that spirit—maybe simply intuition, maybe something greater and more significant—often has in the work a part which is real, which can be sensed and recognized, even though it cannot be easily defined.

But science, research, the scientific way, place the greater draft on reason. To follow this way demands at the outset a consistent willed effort at concentrating the analytical powers of the intelligence to classify and so to assimilate the necessary and sometimes very large body of existing knowledge. It demands then a different but equally delicate type of analytical skill to study the mass of knowledge, thus accumulated, in order to discern gaps. Once a gap has been discerned and defined—this is another way of saying once the need and opportunity for research with a specific objective have been discovered—there must come into play a further sort of questioning thought, for the possible ways of filling the gaps must be surveyed and evaluated, and the right selection must be made from among them. When procedure has thus been decided upon, the various steps in applying it must be planned, and the performance of them must be controlled. At last, when result has been achieved through these operations, the investigator is faced with the sometimes confusing and always exacting task of assessing his findings, relating them to the problem which he sought to solve, and determining whether they actually do solve it or whether they are deceptive and must therefore be abandoned, no matter how much long and arduous work they represent.

What I have just sketched are, of course, not the only stages by which one travels the scientific way. There is a reverse course, of equal importance and of equal difficulty, which one often takes and which makes comparable demands on reason. This occurs when a new fact is apprehended as new—that is, when the investigator realizes that he has in the process of an undertaking encountered a phenomenon which is an addition to knowledge. To make this realization, to recognize the new as new when it is first met, demands an alertness of mind, a freshness of vision, which are maintained only by deliberate effort; it is perilously easy for man to go through his daily routines almost automatically and thus to relax his vigilance and let his responsiveness to events become atrophied. The follower of the scientific way who guards against this peril, however, and who hence knows when he has come on a new thing, vigorously exercises reason thereafter, to define the new fact, to limit it, to distinguish and explain its similarities and dissimilarities to older known facts.

Thus his effort is to relate the new thing to the whole body of knowledge, finding where it belongs and what its bearing is on the whole and on the several parts of the whole. As he does these things, he works toward establishing the intrinsic signification of the new fact—that is, toward determining what it means in and of itself. In addition he works toward making clear and understandable its extrinsic significance—that is, toward tracing out the ways in which the new addition to knowledge illuminates other matters which have hitherto been obscure, contributes to the ultimate formulation of answers to other problems which have not yet been brought to solution, and so increases the homogeneity of knowledge as a whole.

Now clearly, the intense joint application of the will and the intellect which is involved following either of these courses along the scientific way is no child's play. It is exertion of the most exacting sort. It is just plain hard work. There are a lot of easier ways of earning a living, and sometimes a more cushiony living, in the material sense, than is the usual scientist's lot. Then why do people do it? Inquiry into some of the many reasons for their action will contribute substantially to understanding of the scientific way. In such inquiry, we may leave out of account the practical necessities of earning a livelihood. They apply with equal force to most if not all men, and hence have no special bearing on men's motives in making one or another choice of career. The question hence is found fairly sharply. What are the special satisfactions, the special obligations, of the scientific way?

As is true of any human activity which is carried on with full vigor and full sincerity, a basic motive which for many people is by itself sufficient can be found in the individual personal aesthetic satisfaction which comes from doing a thing well. This is the reward of self-sufficient virtuosity. Just as the virtuoso of the imagination can consider the phrase "Art for art's sake" an all-encompassing answer, so the virtuoso of the reason may declare "Reason for reason's sake" or "Science for the sake of science" cause enough for his doing what he does. Think of the fly-fishing enthusiast who rigs his tackle and solemnly casts and casts again on dry land, sheerly for the zest of doing a difficult thing with all the skill at his command. This joy of the virtuoso, this satisfaction of the connoisseur, is one of the most powerful incentives; it has probably been a principal motivating force in many independent investigations in the most abstract and recondite subjects. I have no doubt that it meant much to Leonardo, to Newton, to Count Rumford, to Lowell, or that it means much to many among our contemporaries, and therefore is productive and vital in the expanding progress of science in our time. It demands a mind strong enough to avoid becoming precious, to avoid taking the position of the scientist who is reported to have boasted of his pride that, as far as he could determine, no conceivable use attached to anything he had ever done in research.

At the extreme from this remark, which really sounds too ivory-domed even to come out of an ivory tower, let alone an ivory lab, is the view that the practical usefulness of the results of research is reason enough for a man's entering upon science as a career. The argument runs that most research, most scientific endeavor, is undertaken primarily in order to produce immediate practical utility. It is true enough that the practical uses of the knowledge gained through scientific research bulk very large, indeed, in our civilization. In nearly all its aspects, our culture relies upon machines, implements, instruments, techniques, and processes which have developed from scientific knowledge, and it relies upon them to a greater extent than has ever been true before, to such an extent that we plough and cultivate science as the Romans ploughed and cultivated their fields.

Even so, a mere moment's glance into the history of science is enough to disabuse us of the notion that practical application is the prime motive of research, or that a research is begun only when a clear objective has been defined in terms of a specific theory, technique, or application to be achieved. In general, the knowledge out of which some practical advantage or benefit grows has itself been long in existence before the application is made—and this is true in general even in our own time of skill in applied research for a definite purpose. Often, moreover, new knowledge comes to light at a time and in a way having no relation whatever to possible applications. Practical use-

fulness is good, of course; for demonstration of that, all we have to do is look at the long curve of history where the trend in spite of many aberrations and fluctuations such as those that indicate the troubled spots and unsettled problems of today, has been steadily toward an easier and richer life for the ordinary human being. Practical usefulness, then, is naturally enough the greatest justification, in the minds of the generality, for science. And to scientists themselves, it is satisfying to see that the general welfare is aided by practical applications of the knowledge which they accumulate. They would be considerably less than human otherwise. But their greater satisfaction, I believe, comes from other sources, primarily from being able and enabled to fulfill the demand, or requirement, or faith which is the essential condition for being a scientist.

What is this condition? It is not a mastery of mathematics or physics or chemistry, nor an adeptness at devising experiments, nor a more than ordinary power of logical analysis, nor even a heightened capacity for the rare combining of intelligence, imagination, and intuition in the act of creative thought which constructs the great hypotheses and syntheses. The essential condition is not the possession or the exercise of any of these attributes, though each is a great value in itself. Rather, the essential condition is an intense, innate conviction that knowledge is good, that knowing is good, and that, therefore, to increase knowledge by conscious willed exertion of the intelligence is both duty and high privilege. Knowing is hazardous, we recognize, and we declare it worth the risk. To follow the scientific way is thus a profession of the faith that as we know the truth, the truth will make us free. Here our distinction of motives or incentives becomes clearly set out. As knowledge contributes to the general welfare, whether through applied science, engineering, or some other avenue, it is a good in immediate or pragmatic senses. In the sense of the essential condition, however, of the scientific way, knowledge is good in and of itself, without regard to such immediate or pragmatic benefit as it may offer.

Now, if we regard knowledge thus highly as a good absolute in itself, we comprehend that knowledge has an integral quality, that it has a virtue; that it has an inherent right to our respect for its integrity. The man to whom this recognition has come is, therefore, humble before knowledge; he will not trespass upon it, but he will rather accede to it, seek to understand it, and to participate in it. Therefore he strives for objective, selfless honesty in approach, in definition, in operation. Here in this objectivity of attitude, far more than any set of working procedures, is the reason for the essential unity of the various scientific disciplines, whether nuclear physics or classical philology.

We come each to our own comprehension of the individual human intelligence confronted by the vast mass of knowledge. The contrast is great, so great that the attainment of a thorough grasp in a lifetime seems impossible on the face of it. Yet we know that a working relationship is attained, and we must recognize this as one of the two or three most amazing and humbling facts. We come each to that comprehension only slowly at best, with many false starts and departures from the true course. History in general, and the history of one's own discipline in particular, are of profound worth in this search, in great measure because through reciting the courses which others followed, history may safeguard us against pitfalls which they discovered. The aim toward which the student of science perseveres is that of ultimately doing original investigation, exploring the unknown. Just as in preparing for this he repeats classical experiments in his studies, so in working toward his philosophy of science—that is, his comprehension of the relationship between himself and knowledge—he is wise to review classical experiences.

You students of science who have attained honor in this sixth annual science talent search have already in your studies and in your own research undertakings made a distinguished start along the scientific way. You have unquestionably seen your own projects state unequivocally one of the great and hard lessons which all travelers along that way must learn—the lesson that in research, in the exploration of the unknown, the price of one success is often many failures, and that therefore the effort and ability to detect failure and error early, and the capacity and strength to abandon a line of approach however treasured and however far committed, once its fruitlessness is sensed, are vital elements in the complex compound of plan, reason, patience, and courage out of which new knowledge is precipitated. You appreciate that the great quality is not simply to be able to stand up under disappointments, but to be able to do so without losing the zest and exhilaration that should attend success. You know the fascination and the compulsion of the characteristic quality of science—that it is in the broadest sense a regenerative system in that a discovery made, a question answered, reveals new unknowns to seek, new questions to ponder.

Before you, as you advance your own investigations and as you develop further your comprehension of the scientific way, is the great and heartening awareness of another truth which is closely akin to this last, and which lies at the vitalizing center of man's existence as a sentient being. Science is a regenerative system. So is the combined act of will and intellect which the scientific way calls forth. By effort of the will the intellect is exercised, that exercise in turn renewing effort of the will, and so in turn again, to one of the deepest satisfactions man can know. In the years before you 40 younger scientists in whose honor we are met tonight, to some we may be sure will come prominence, acclaim. For others among you, maybe, the lot will be one of inconspicuousness if not obscurity. To some, success in the world's terms will be attainable, and there will be satisfaction in it. To all, there will come as there must, reverses, set-backs, disappointments—in the world's terms. It is honest for me to say that all these are temporal and do not matter, and will not matter too much to you, for all of you may achieve the serenity, the equanimity, and the balance which come from certainty concerning what you do and who you are as creators and creations of this conjoint, self-replenishing, and inexhaustible power that resides in will and intellect. It is for that that I congratulate you and wish you well.

King Christian X of Denmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, news of the death of King Christian X of Denmark has saddened millions of Americans. It has been a matter of profound sorrow to the hundreds of thousands of Americans of Danish origin.

For nearly 35 years—during two tragic world wars—the Danish monarch ruled over his industrious, law-abiding people. As in the historic song of Denmark, King Christian Stood Before the Mast, King Christian stood before the mast, sharing the suffering of his subjects as he shared their successes. He towered to the heights in character as he towered in physical stature. It was no wonder that the Danes loved him from the first happy days of his reign through the dark days of Nazi occupation to the hour of his death. He never left them. His ever-present wisdom, his courageous example, was always with them. He was a king among kings. He was a man among men. Under his inspired leadership, the Danish people never ceased to resist Nazi occupation, which contributed to Allied victory.

Since I am of Danish ancestry, and since I have the honor to serve the largest community of Americans of Danish ancestry in the United States in the House of Representatives, I have anxiously watched the bulletins which came from King Christian's bedside after he was stricken on Easter Sunday.

It must have cheered this leader's final hours to have had with him the realization that he was leaving the sacred trust of his people's happiness in the capable hands of his eldest son, now King Frederik IX. When, as Crown Prince, Frederik IX visited the United States in company with Crown Princess Ingrid, I met him and talked with him. His accomplishments in connection with the drafting of the Danish constitution, his sincerity and his understanding of the fine relationship between the people of Denmark and the people of the United States impressed me deeply. I am confident King Frederik IX will carry on his father's tradition of selfless service to his people.

Our heart goes out to the bereaved family of the deceased monarch in this hour of great sorrow.

We who have admired King Christian X will never forget him. His reported words, just before his death, are a lesson and an inspiration to us, the living—"My task on this earth is over. I am at peace with God and myself."

Wallace's Current Activities Recall Dr. Wirt's Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, last November the people of the United States elected a new Congress. Tabulated results of that election proved that the country has had enough of spendthrift policies of the New Deal to reduce the United States to the status of a third-rate power by spending ourselves into national bankruptcy.

The mandate of the people of the United States to the Eightieth Congress was to reclaim America from the communistic ideologies of the New Deal and to reestablish our governmental system of free enterprise.

Today the remnants of the New Deal in the administrative branch of government are still demanding expenditures up to the very limit of income. The administration is fighting reduction of the taxes of the American people, and at the same time seeking to commit us to long-term economic policies which will continue to keep us committed to extravagant spending.

The administration is seeking to commit us to a one-world foreign policy by sending American tax-raised dollars around the world to interfere in the governmental affairs of other nations. The demand is that we fight communism abroad, while within our own borders a Communist fifth column has bored into department after department of our Government, seeking to influence our course permanently into the channels originally dredged by the Roosevelt New Deal in 1933.

Too many have forgotten what has transpired in the 14 years from November 1932 to November 1946. Too many have been indoctrinated by the thought that winning World War II was the sole reason for the weakened state of the Government of the United States today, militarily, economically, morally.

But we must not forget that the Roosevelt administrations, in their early years of power, smugly said, as the successive steps of their plan to regiment the United States unfolded, "We planned it that way."

In view of all of this it might be well for those Members of Congress who were elected by the popular revulsion to 14 years of New Dealism last November, to refresh their minds as to just what has happened since the New Deal began.

It may be well for all of us to look at the record.

We find Henry Agard Wallace, former Secretary of Commerce, former Vice President, former Secretary of Agriculture, in successive New Deal administrations, parading throughout Europe, ridiculing the policies of the Government of the United States, smearing our Members of Congress as "tory," as "reactionary," and as "imperialistic."

We find our State Department and Department of Commerce preparing to attend trade conferences in Geneva in a month or so, to wrap up in an 18-nation agreement more of the reciprocal trade agreements which were the dreamy, idealistic fetish of Cordell Hull and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We find our armed forces, which saved the world from Nazi totalitarianism, demobilized, scattered to the four corners of the Nation. We find our vast industrial organization, which produced the tanks, the planes, the ships, the munitions, and the food to sustain the Allies in the winning of World War II, reconverted to the purposes of peace or entirely abandoned.

We find our natural resources vastly depleted by the very efforts which supplied our forces and the forces of our allies with the finished materials to win World War II.

We find ourselves unable to keep up to schedules for stock piling those strategic raw materials needed to supplement our sources depleted through aid to our World War II allies.

We find millions of our people so indoctrinated with the "Santa Claus" policies of the New Deal that they favor continuation of the theory that the Government owes every American a living instead of the American way of thinking that the Government is the servant, not the employer of the people.

Mr. Speaker, it may well be that the state of the Nation today is a result of the careful schemes of men such as Henry Agard Wallace, Robert Morss Lovett, Dr. Rex Tugwell, and others of that original New Deal group who "planned it that way" prior to 1932.

It may be well to recall that Lenin, one of the original Big Three of Russian communism, discussing the barriers between Russia and world Communist domination, said, in effect: "Great Britain and the United States are our barriers. But in 20 years Great Britain will fall apart from internal political dissension. In that same 20 years the United States will have spent herself into the status of a minor power."

Mr. Speaker, few of us elected last November will deny that the intervening years have proved Lenin to have been a major prophet. It took a few years longer than he predicted, but our gigantic national debt, our unprecedented tax rates, our shrinking national resources, demand that we who carry the people's mandate of last November must look at the record.

Current trends make it most appropriate, in my opinion, to trace back along the trail of Mr. Wallace and his associates to perhaps find the motivation of their entire group, and, perhaps, find signboards which will show where the planners have tried to take the American people under their dream of a planned economy.

During the second session of the Seventy-third Congress the files will show that Report No. 1439 was submitted to this House by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] as chairman of a select committee to investigate certain statements made by Dr. William A. Wirt, at that time connected with the public schools of the city of Gary, Ind. That committee was created under House Resolution 317 of the second session of the Seventy-third Congress. It consisted of five members—three Democrats and two Republicans. The Democrats were A. L. Bulwinkle, chairman; John J. O'Connor; and William A. Arnold. The Republicans were Harold McGugin and Frederick R. Lehlback.

The committee, as reference to House Resolution 317, second session, Seventy-third Congress, will show, was directed to summon Dr. Wirt, require him to reveal the sources of his information, and to summon such other witnesses and make such further investigations as the committee might deem advisable.

One portion of the statements made by Dr. Wirt and circulated by him in printed form, read by James Rand, Jr., before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives on the 23d day of March 1934 stated:

PLAN OF REVOLUTIONISTS

The fundamental trouble with the "brain trusters" is that they start with a false assumption. They insist that the America of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln must first be destroyed and then on the ruins they will reconstruct an America after their own pattern. They do not know that the America of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln has been the new deal, and that during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries we have been making great social progress. The common man is getting his place in the sun. Why try to put him back into the Dark Ages?

Last summer I asked some of the individuals in this group what their concrete plan was for bringing on the proposed overthrow of the established American social order.

I was told that they believed that by thwarting our then-evident recovery they would be able to prolong the country's destitution until they had demonstrated to the American people that the Government must operate industry and commerce. I was told that, of course, commercial banks could not make long-term capital loans and that they would be able to destroy, by propaganda, the other institutions that had been making our capital loans. And, of course, when Uncle Sam becomes our financier he must follow his money with control and management.

ROOSEVELT ONLY THE KERENSKY

The most surprising statement made to me was the following: "We believe that we have Mr. Roosevelt in the middle of a swift stream and that the current is so strong that he cannot turn back or escape from it. We believe that we can keep Mr. Roosevelt there until we are able to replace him with a Stalin. We are thinking that Mr. Roosevelt is only the Kerensky of this revolution."

When I ask why the President would not see through this scheme they replied: "We are on the inside. We can control by avenues of influence. We can make the President believe that he is making decisions for himself." They said: "A leader must appear to be a strong man of action. He must make decisions and many times make them quickly, whether good or bad. Soon he will feel a superhuman flow of power from the flow of decisions themselves—good or bad. Eventually, he can easily be displaced because of his bad decisions. With Mr. Roosevelt's background we do not expect him to see this revolution through. But strong men must take their places when the country is once engulfed in flames."

I asked how they would explain to the American people why their plans for retarding the recovery were not restoring recovery.

"Oh," they said, "that would be easy." All they would need to do would be to point the finger of scorn at the traitorous opposition. These traitors in the imaginary war against the depression would be made the goats. And the American people would agree that they, the brain trusters, should be more firm in dealing with the opposition.

Thus they, the brain trusters, would soon be able to use the police power of the Government and crack down on the opposition with a big stick. In the meantime, they would extend the gloved hand and keep the big stick in the background.

POWER OF PROPAGANDA

I was frankly told that I underestimated the power of propaganda. That since the World War, propaganda had been developed into a science. That they could make the newspapers and magazines beg for mercy by threatening to take away much of their advertising by a measure to compel only the unvarnished truth in advertising. That they could make the financiers be good by showing up at public investigations the crooks in the game. And that the power of public in-

vestigation in their hands alone would make the cold chills run up and down the spines of the other business leaders and politicians—honest men as well as crooks.

They were sure they could depend upon the psychology of empty stomachs, and they would keep them empty. The masses would soon agree that anything should be done rather than nothing. Any escape from present miseries would be welcome even though it should turn out to be another misery.

They were sure that the leaders of industry and labor could be kept quiet by the hope of getting their own share of the Government doles in the form of loans and contracts for materials and labor, provided they were subservient.

They were sure the schools and colleges could be kept in line by the hope of Federal aid until many of the New Dealers in the schools and colleges had control of them.

They were sure that their propaganda could inflame the masses against the old social order and the honest men as well as the crooks that represent that order—communism.

I asked what they would do when the Government could no longer dole out relief in the grand manner. By that time, it was answered, the oft-repeated exhortation to industry and commerce to make jobs out of confidence and to produce goods and wages out of psychology, together with their other propaganda, would have won the public to the idea that the only way out was for Government itself to operate industry and commerce.

They were certain that they did not want to operate agriculture for a long time. But the farmers could be won by doles to support Government operation of industry and commerce. Farmers would be delighted to get their hands in the public trough for once in the history of the country. The farmers would be one with the masses—united for a redistribution of the wealth of the other fellow. All they would need to do with the opposition would be to ask, "Well, what is your plan?"

When the hearings were held Dr. Wirt was permitted to call only six people—five Government employees and the representative of Tass, the Russian Government-controlled news agency who, he said, had attended a dinner at the home of one of the Government employees.

Dr. Wirt was not permitted to call in witnesses to substantiate his claims that his printed statements had been gathered from printed matter of Dr. Tugwell and other brain trusters. He was not permitted to bring in Henry A. Wallace, though he said that one of the Government employees at the dinner had told him that Wallace and Tugwell were the leaders of their group.

Records of the select committee hearings show that the two Republican members of the committee were consistently voted down by the three Democratic members in every effort to permit Dr. Wirt reasonable latitude to prove his points. The hearings were limited to the six witnesses who attended the dinner. They were all but unanimous in insisting that none of the things reported by Dr. Wirt had been said by any one of them.

The majority report submitted by the committee upheld the strange finding that at a dinner lasting approximately 4 hours, no one had been able to edge in any conversation—that Dr. Wirt conducted a monolog.

The two Republican members submitted a strong minority report, but the whitewash had been made complete; Dr. Wirt was discredited, nothing was done, and the New Deal, in its heyday of power, with tremendous power in both Houses, went merrily along with its program.

Dr. Wirt was a prophet ahead of his time. In that early New Deal day, 1934, a full investigation of the charges he made might well have revealed plans for the program which has since become history in part, and which is still on the books of pending legislation.

I want to put before the Members of the House some thoughts of what might have been revealed had not Dr. Wirt been smeared and ridiculed into oblivion.

To examine this situation with some degree of understanding I first read Dr. Wirt's charges, carefully, and then the report of the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and his two supporting Democratic members. Then I read the dissenting report. It seemed to me that the best way to examine subsequent events in the light of evaluation of the Wirt charges, it was best to lay down a definite procedure, under these headings:

First. Motivating groups behind the planned program.

Second. Legislative steps planned to produce pieces of a jigsaw puzzle, which, when put together, would carry out the plan.

Third. Methods and instruments used to bring about the desired legislative jigsaw pieces.

Fourth. The pattern or final picture—the goal desired—and how far we have gone toward achieving that goal, and fulfilling the Wirt prophecy of 1934.

When the New Deal first came to power the "brain trust" was born. Raymond Moley was with it. But Moley chose, before long, to get out.

After the "brain trust" came the full-blooded New Dealers to positions of power—Tugwell, Robert Morss Lovett, Tommy Corcoran, Ben Cohen, Sam Rosenman, Wallace, and the rest.

Then came the National Planning Board—look up their plan for the regionalizing of the entire United States—to get the big picture.

After the National Planning Board came the left-wingers, the Communists and the fellow travelers—Hillman and his PAC and the offshoots of that.

They were the motivating groups. Let us look briefly at what they wanted to accomplish by legislation. These steps come under that phase:

(a) Over-all planning—the planned-economy idea.

(b) Expansion of Federal police power and investigational power.

(c) Development of Government corporations, so set up that they were responsible to the executive rather than to the legislative branch.

(d) Every additional possible means of strengthening the executive branch against the legislative branch.

(e) Use of propaganda and propaganda techniques by the executive departments and branches to boost their own projects and smear those who might oppose them.

(f) Create confusion in laws, agencies, and operations on the theory that confusion divides the opposition, prevents crystallization of new opposition, and overcomes resistance of people to change. One technique is the presentation of recurrent "crisis" legislation. Bruce Barton, when in Congress, listed more than 30 recurrent "crises" from the New Deal.

(g) Inject the Federal Government into the private economy by purchase, persuasion, or force.

(h) Alter the Supreme Court and supporting court system to evolve a political court rather than a justice system of courts.

(i) Make alliances with the mass movements to further pressure.

(j) Wherever possible, widen the prevailing differences between groups of the people on economic, social, and cultural lines—seeking to pit race against race, officer against enlisted man, nationality against nationality.

(k) Infiltrate economic and social organizations and groups with the idea of either neutralizing them or taking them over for use as instruments.

(l) By political and other purges, seek to retire opponents of the plan to private life and if already in private life, smear them into ineffectiveness by ridicule, smear charges, and similar familiar methods.

These points interlock with section III and lead up to the ultimate goals. These are:

(a) Establish a state economic and socialistic system over the private enterprise, or capitalistic system, in the fields of finance, industry, agriculture, transportation, education, health, social security, and every other field affecting the daily life of mass-population groups.

(b) Centralization of power in the Federal Government and reduction of the States to local administrative units to carry out the centralized government policies.

(c) Take over the control of production and finance, public and private.

(d) Work to abolish national sovereignty and set up a world government.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Wirt, discredited as he was in the so-called hearings held in 1934, was a far-sighted individual who, after his death, should be recognized as one of a very few men who realized what was taking place, and had the courage to do his very best to expose it.

I believe that, in the retrospect of what has happened since Dr. Wirt made his martyr-like appearance before a committee of this Congress in 1934, we should fully reexamine the charges he made at that time.

I believe that the mandate of the American people last November calls upon us to check the legislative program of the New Deal from 1932 to date, in the light of those charges. I believe that, before the people of the United States vote again in 1948 to elect a President, 435 Members of the House, and 96 Senators, there should be a full understanding of what the New Deal did toward regimentation of the people, centralization of power in the executive department, and indoctrination of our youth in communistic ideals.

To make certain that a clear picture be gathered and presented to the sovereign people of the United States, I urge the appointment of a committee to reopen the hearings of the committee created in 1934, that the charges made by Dr. Wirt be thoroughly reexamined. I urge that this committee have full power to subpena witnesses, take testimony under oath, examine records, all in the light of events of the intervening years, and report findings and recommendations to this House on or before the opening date of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

I urge that this committee consist of not less than seven members, and that it be given adequate funds, counsel, investigators, and clerical help to carry out the letter and spirit of its mission.

I shall introduce a resolution to carry out this proposal.

Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and yielding to the importunities of colleagues and friends, I include the following address I delivered on March 6 before El Club de las Americas in the auditorium of the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.:

POLITICAL, INTELLECTUAL, AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF PUERTO RICO

After the discovery, Puerto Rico was one of the first places in America where European man established a home. Juan Ponce de Leon, Governor of the Province of Higuey, in the neighboring island of Hispaniola, founded the first Puerto Rican city in 1508. Save for the brief interregnum of a few months in 1598, when the island was occupied by the military forces of England, for 390 years—from 1508 to 1898—Puerto Rico formed part of the Empire of the Crown of Spain.

During this period the Indian population was conquered and enslaved by the colonizers; decimated by European diseases against which the indigenous races had built up no resistance; absorbed by intermixture with their white conquerors and with the blacks brought to the island during the course of three centuries. The slave trade was abolished in the beginnings of the nineteenth century.

In the manner I have referred to, the Indian, as such, disappeared therefore, from Puerto Rico, a long time ago. The last news of a settlement of Indians in Puerto Rico was dated in 1776. But there is Indian blood in Puerto Rico, of course.

Until 1812 Spain was an absolute monarchy. Puerto Rico was governed under the exclusive authority of the King, assisted by his Council of the Indies. In 1812 Puerto Rico was declared a province of Spain and called to take part in the first constitutional parliament. Don Ramon Power, a captain in the Spanish Navy, and a native of San Juan, was our first representative. He was elected vice president of the parliament. In 1814, Ferdinand VII again proclaimed absolutism and dissolved constitutional institutions. In 1820 the constitution was again proclaimed and once more a representative of ours was elected to the parliament, this time the Brigadier Don Demetrio O'Daly, also a native of San Juan.

But in 1822 the hundred thousand sons of St. Louis, the French Army commanded by the Duc of Angulema, invaded Spain and reinstated the king in his absolute power. When years after, on the death of Ferdinand VII, the Queen Regent had to avail herself of the aid of liberal Spaniards to defend the throne of her daughter, Isabella, against the pretensions of Don Carlos, Spain again entered a life under a constitution. The province of Puerto Rico, however, did not have representation in the assembly. "The overseas provinces," recited the new constitution of 1837, "shall be governed by special laws."

It is maintained by erudite students of history that this provision was actuated by good intentions; that it was the expression of a recognition of a reality well understood by the statesmen of the epoch who admitted, basing their arguments on the separation of the settlements of South America, the necessity of recognizing in the overseas Spanish settlements their own individuality which demanded a system of government distinct from that of the metropolis. If this were the motive, it is certain that it was not conducive to a happy fruition.

Some 30 years passed and the project was lost in the confusion of the reign of Isabella II and there lasted in Puerto Rico during these years an absolutist government as in the times of Ferdinand. It was not until the dethronement of Isabella in 1868 that Puerto Rico again had her representation in the assembly. She had it thenceforth the same as the other Spanish provinces, until 1898.

This 30-year period saw in Puerto Rico the formation of political parties, the abolition of slavery, the abolition of the vagrancy law and so-called workers' books and the adoption of freedom of assemblage and freedom of the press. The final result was universal suffrage and the autonomy of the province with a status analogous to that of the English dominions—this in the year anterior to the Spanish-American War.

I do not believe it was the intention of the men of 1837 to initiate the separation from Spain of her overseas provinces; but with the perspective furnished by the years and the accomplished facts, to me it is clear that at that time the hour for this separation was indicated on the timepiece of history. The Spanish-American War was a short-cut of history. The separation occurred at that time as a consequence of the war, but without the war it would have occurred anyway; a little after that time it might have occurred inevitably.

Puerto Rico is a people of America. The men who left Europe to found new homes in Puerto Rico, commencing with Ponce de Leon and ending with the last immigrant of 1898 were carrying out a command of destiny. Europe was becoming a very narrow precinct, and only within those narrow confines did the forces of western civilization operate. The theater should be of dimension commensurate with the magnitude of the drama to be presented. The Eurasian peninsula which we know as Europe decidedly was not a proper stage for the events with which the future was pregnant. The wide lands of America offered space commensurate with the magnitude of the forces of our civilization. America had to be—she is—the see of western civilization.

In the twentieth century Puerto Rico commenced her American life. For a century she has lived under the aegis of the oldest and most developed nation of America, the most portent, above all the one which implanted in America the doctrine of liberty and democracy, the nation which has made democracy the creed of America.

Democracy is not a vain word nor is it a word written only in a constitution, to remain imprisoned and mute in the tracings of the printed letters, juridical language of a document. Just as human speech does not live in dictionaries, so democracy does not live in constitutions. Human speech lives in the man, in the mind, in the heart; it is consubstantial with the man who thinks ideas in terms of words. Democracy lives in the mind, in the heart, of the man who conducts himself in society in compliance with the standards which in themselves are the values of democracy.

When once the spoken language exists, the grammarians write their grammars and the linguists their dictionaries. In case of doubt in our use of words we have reference to them to find our bearings.

When a people lives and understands and conducts itself in a democratic manner then may its lawyers write their democratic constitution. In case of doubt we have recourse to the constitution. There are peoples who have neither an academy of the language to establish an official dictionary, nor do they have a written constitution; yet they speak their language and live their democracy. Use determines the dictionary, and use determines the constitution.

Puerto Rico can now proceed with the writing of its democratic dictionary, can now proceed with the writing of its democratic constitution. She has indeed the democratic custom; the democratic manner of itself forms part of her feeling and living. After 50 years of living in it, believing in it, being in it and it in us, for our people democracy turns out to be indeed our manner of living and being.

Whether democracy ought to be or ought not to be in Puerto Rico, there is no discrepancy in Puerto Rico. In Puerto Rico there is only one problem with respect to democracy, and it is this: That of the life of intercourse of our democracy as regards our economic necessities and as regards hemispheric security.

I speak of democracy for the living, not democracy for the dead. Death is the great leveler—in the cemetery we all occupy the same position, the horizontal. But it is the democracy of the living with their virtues and their vices, their ambitions or their meekness, their great capacity or their great simplicity, their pride or their humility; it is the living democracy which offers problems of facts that must be faced: Above all, the necessity of bread for every day for everyone.

Puerto Rico, an island of only 3,500 square miles, with 2,200,000 inhabitants, cannot live isolated. It is an island that one cannot isolate.

The economic situation of Puerto Rico still is not brilliant. There is unemployment, there is poverty. But 2,200,000 souls live there, and they live because Puerto Rico is not isolated. They will live better and will live more fully because Puerto Rico will be able to augment her production and to live from her production which will have greater value because she is not isolated.

Our economy until the present time was agricultural but not agricultural purely and simply. Ours is an industrial agriculture. We harvest cane but we export sugar. We produce tobacco and export cigars; we produce coffee and we export powdered coffee. We produce fruits and we export canned fruits.

We are growing rapidly towards industrialization: Cement, synthetic wood, glass, ceramics, shoes, toys.

Free trade exists between Puerto Rico and continental United States. The natural play of economic forces makes it possible that we not manufacture that which we are able to buy cheaper than it would cost us to produce it; makes possible that we may produce that which we are able to produce and sell to better advantage.

There are those who see in the present policy directed toward the lowering of international trade barriers a threat to our

position within the tariff sphere of the United States. I confess that I do not have these fears. The change should be gradual and careful, but the orientation is wise. If it has been wise within the limits of the United States, why not extend the sphere gradually until it embraces the world? The readjustment ought to be gradual, but in the end it should culminate in a solid world economic organization based on development and employment at a high level of life for everyone.

The political relations of Puerto Rico with the United States must be modified, clarified, and adjusted; but the life of intercourse, the close association between the island and the United States must endure. As to the form it will take, the voice of the people of Puerto Rico must be heard but their voice cannot be the only voice. Indeed there is no place in the world for monologs, and still less for the monologs of those whose abilities allow them to show them only in the chorus. Whatever be the nature, the character of the intercourse between the continent and the island, it ought to be based upon economic, geographic, strategic, and ideological realities which should determine the political nature of these relationships.

Let us contemplate the map of America. Where is Puerto Rico? It is in the principal avenue of American travel, the point of convergence of aerial navigation, an obligatory stopping place for northern airplanes bound south and for southern airplanes bound north.

The two languages of America live in Puerto Rico. The two cultures of America are intertwined and epitomized in Puerto Rico. The races of America are interlocked and fraternize in Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico knows the meaning of isolation—the sterility, the hopelessness, of isolation. She used to live with Spain, but was distant and isolated from Spain by geography. She is near America geographically, but she used to be remote because of tariffs and language. Upon her separation from Spain she still remained isolated. For a generation she remained isolated from the United States through the barricade of language, even when she was tied to the United States.

Puerto Rico, however, has among her characteristics extroversion and a capacity to associate easily with others. Her geographical dimensions do not correspond with her vision of life. Perhaps population density and internal economic pressure actuate upon that people as a centrifugal force to disseminate it physically and spiritually over the face of the earth. There are more Puerto Ricans in the city of New York than in San Juan, P. R. Many Puerto Ricans reside in Washington and in Miami, and they are found in considerable numbers in the Dominican Republic, in Cuba, in Panama, in Brazil, and Mexico. There are, however, 2,200,000 still in the island of Puerto Rico and the population increases by 50,000 a year.

Prolific Puerto Rico, of such notable vitality, has spiritual and physical resistance. The law of the survival of the fittest has there had a place to manifest itself. Our life is not the conventional life of the Tropics. It is hard, rapid, energetic, and dynamic.

The small island of 3,500 square miles of area with settlements at every interval, highways everywhere, and dwellings the length of every highway, gives the impression of being a crowded human ant hill, of restless, talkative ants. We have an excess of manpower, but we can apply this force to producing for the markets the finished products of industry. We have access to the richest market of the world without tariff barriers in the free exchange that has endured over the 47 years of our relationship. This seems to offer to us the opportunity of selling the fruit of our industry in exchange for raw materials and food that we do not produce ourselves; and this, it may be said in passing, includes all the territory of the United States.

We are changing rapidly to bilingualism. We aspire to use with equal facility two of the three dominant languages of the New World. With one or the other we shall be able to understand and make ourselves understood in almost all of the rest of the world.

We are not able to say that our economic structure is firm and resistant, that our spiritual life is free of anxieties. We are able to say, however, that although our spirit is young we face reality with the spiritual sereneness of maturity.

Puerto Rico still has two objectives to reach: To free herself from want and to attain full democracy. The sure road of her success lies through the way of work, education, health, justice, and peace.

Under the burning tropic sun, in the canebrake, in the workshop, in the coffee groves, in the factories, in business, in the sciences, in the arts, Puerto Rico works. And she puts into education, both academic and vocational, the faith of conviction. In 50 years we have reduced illiteracy from 90 percent to 30 percent, and we are teaching ourselves to read and write in two languages at the same time. Free general education is provided from the elementary school to the university.

Unfortunately, only 50 percent of our population of school age attends school. This does not mean that 50 percent never attend school; it means that a majority attend for only 4 years, a third part of the time they should attend. The practical result is that the entire population of school age for the first four grades go to school; a third of this number concludes primary instruction, but only a minority finishes high school instruction and goes to the university.

Economic necessity is the reason that children leave school when they have barely acquired the most elemental knowledge.

Our primary instruction, until a short time ago, consisting of 8 years, has been reduced to 6. This is followed by junior high school instruction for 3 years and high school instruction for 3 years. It is our object to increase the number of schools and improve the economic situation to the point that every Puerto Rican child may conclude at least the primary school instruction of 6 years.

Where human capital is the only capital, where land is not available, and there is only the shoulder, it is necessary to strengthen the body to lodge a robust heart, to nourish the blood, that the heart may quicken the mind through the iron blows of the blood.

Tropical infirmities are treated as things of importance in Puerto Rico. Malaria and uncinariasis are in the process of rapid and complete subjugation. Deaths from malaria have been pushed down to a seventh or eighth place in causes of death. Uncinariasis causes anemia but does not kill any more.

Our list of the causes of death would seem to be about as they are in temperate countries, including the United States: Diseases of the heart, the kidneys, cancer, accidents. But there is something that sets us apart as would a tragic headpiece: Tuberculosis, childhood diseases of the digestive tract, and the bronchial pneumonia of childhood head the list.

Fundamentally, what are they? Inadequate housing, malnutrition, crowding; in short, unemployment, partial employment, and poverty.

But the mortality figures are steadily decreasing. From 1900 to the present time we have reduced the general mortality rate from 30 per thousand to a little more than 13 per thousand in 1946. With the improvement of the standards of living, both the death rate and the birth rate will be lowered. The ryhthm of population increase will assume a slower pace. Production will increase on the basis of a better and more healthy human element; and the spiral which seemed to have been sinking itself in the abyss like an enormous and tragic corkscrew will unscrew itself in the opposite direction leading toward higher levels of life and civilization.

For all this a wide base of popular cooperation is requisite. This is not the work of the few, it is the work of an entire people. The people have leaders, but the people follow or abandon their leaders. The people know that in a democracy there is 1 day every 4 years in which all authority rests in their hands; and this day in truth they deposit this revocable power for 4 years in the hands of those who should be faithful. Like the Cid, the people say to the elected leadership: "Each one of us is as worthy as thou; and all of us together worthier than thou. Take it or leave it."

So it was that the people caused the enforcement of the law limiting corporative land holdings, wise law of the Congress, the basic element in our organic charter which for 36 years was forgotten by functionaries of the law. This neglect has cost the people uncountable millions of dollars, and in great part is the cause of their present poverty; but from 1936 to the present day the law has been enforced, and the people who a little while ago appeared to be on the road to converting themselves into a landless people now are on the road to recuperation, paying for it the new market price. They cultivate their land with love because they know they will gather from it the full fruit of their labor.

Thus there is in force a law for minimum salaries. Thus there are in force laws on collective bargaining, on industrial accidents, on hours of labor, on the work of women and children; and a program of home construction is beginning to substitute hygienic dwelling quarters for the hovels of the outlying districts.

Intellectually, economically, socially, and politically, Puerto Rico has entered her maturity.

In the portico of America, a gem in the girdle that encircles the waist of America, Puerto Rico, a point in the map of the New World, most decidedly is not an interrogation point in the world of ideas; she is an entire affirmative sentence: We believe in America, in the brotherhood of the Americas, in the justice which is the standard of America. We believe in democracy, which is the creed of America. We believe in peace, in work, and in civilization.

Hartley Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article appearing in the Washington Daily News by Thomas L. Stokes. This editorial is predicated upon a speech made by the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, Mr. HARLESS, when he was discussing the labor bill recently passed by the House.

I think Mr. HARLESS was expressing the view of many Members of the Congress, and his statement on the floor of the House, as well as this article by Mr. Stokes, deserves very careful consideration, regardless of whether one was opposed to or in favor of the legislation passed.

SOWING THE WHIRLWIND

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Perhaps the best one-sentence description of the Hartley labor bill passed so overwhelmingly by the House in a high state of emotion came from a moderate Democrat, Representative RICHARD F. HARLESS, of Arizona, who told the lower Chamber:

"I cannot go along with this measure because I feel that if it is enacted into law it will give the power to the employer to destroy labor unions and to substitute individual bargaining for collective bargaining."

After listing the various weapons the measure gives to the employer, including easy access to the courts, Representative HARLESS summarized the basic change of approach in this bill which cannot be overlooked:

"In substance the employer is given the power of a dictator at the hands of the Government over the union."

The Wagner Act's purpose, which the Hartley bill almost nullifies, was to free the workers from previous business and industry-imposed restrictions that had grown up in custom, and to protect his right to join a union and act collectively to protect his economic interest. The Government, representing the people, thus stepped in on behalf of a large segment of the people, our industrial workers, to readjust the balance which for so many years was overweighted for employers.

The Hartley bill, as well as many provisions of the Senate bill, is to check and reverse this process and return to the employer the power to curb the rights of workers, and in more ways and more devious ways than is apparent on the surface. To implement this power it gives the employer backing of the courts and, to a degree, of the Government itself. Now, we learn, it is the Senate's intention to make its more moderate bill a more drastic measure because of the overwhelming House vote for the admittedly severe Hartley bill.

During the progress of labor legislation in Congress there has been much talk about the lack of cooperation between congressional leaders and President Truman. The two, it is said, should try to reach a general agreement. But the real truth is that the President and congressional leaders are so far apart—poles apart—that it is hard to see how they could get together. This is because of a difference in fundamental philosophy.

This is the difference, on one hand, between the philosophy of the New Deal or progressive wing of the Democratic Party, now much weakened in Congress but still having its only available symbol in President Truman in the sphere of action, and the philosophy of the business and industrial managers of our economy. Businessmen have seized this time, when they are freed of Government restraints and are well heeled financially, to deliver their long-planned blow at labor, deprive it of its protection and recover the control they once had. It is not necessary to rely upon surmises as to their purposes, or privately expressed aims. Their public speeches reveal the intent.

It shows a lack of statesmanship and vision in the managers of capitalism today. The Wagner Act, among other original objectives, was to strengthen labor so that it could gain, by its own efforts, a larger share of the national income and thus help, by spreading purchasing power, to rebuild the shattered economy of our last great depression and thereafter help maintain a balance. If we are to have another depression, or even a recession, it is just as essential that labor be strong enough to act as a brake. It won't, if anything like the bills in House and Senate become law.

And business and industry, as well as labor, will be caught up in the whirlwind.

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Dr. George Schuster, president of Hunter's College, New York City, at the National Catholic Education Association convention held at Boston, Mass., April 8, 1947.

In his address, Dr. Schuster dwelt on the activities of UNESCO in promoting better understanding among the peoples of the world, with emphasis on the problem of our relationship with Russia and the part that may be played by Catholic leadership in this field.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have been good enough to ask me for an opinion of UNESCO. No doubt there is implicit in the request some expectation of views on the relationship of this organization to the educational tasks which you have specially in mind. I should like to assure you that I appreciate the compliment while at the same time feeling a little like a corporal whose captain honored him with a chance to go out and capture the enemy.

No doubt it will help if we do not let ourselves get bogged down in a discussion of the now developing mechanics of UNESCO. All good things by season, seasoned are, Shakespeare reminds us; and certainly an undertaking created to operate on uncharted seas will have to spend some time perfecting a map and a method. The public instinct not to worry too much about how a governmental agency is set up and to concentrate rather on what that agency hopes to do seems to me correct and sound. We shall therefore content ourselves with saying that this latest and not least important of international enterprises is from the management point of view something like a three-leaved clover. One part of it is the International Secretariat, seated for the time being in Paris, the business of which is to carry out the program devised by the periodic UNESCO conferences in which the representatives of the various nations participate. The second part is constituted of the National Commissions, which are groupments of bodies and agencies in the several countries interested in education, science, culture, philosophy, religion, and other intellectual pursuits. And the third part is quite simply the people, speaking through the societies and associations in which the multiform concerns of its culture find expression. UNESCO cannot possibly get on unless all three parts not only function but collaborate effectively and continuously. That will naturally be very difficult. We do not believe that it is impossible.

But just what is to be done by UNESCO? It is this question which is persistently asked. I think the answer can best be given if we avoid being either too specific or too general. After all, we would not try to give some European an impression of American education by sending him the titles of courses or an essay on educational theory. We should attempt rather to describe types of schools, curricula, and objectives. Of course one can say about UNESCO either that it will do such things as exchanging students and studying illiteracy, or that it will try to outlaw war by banning it from the minds of men. But that seems perhaps too little or too much. We all agree that ideas are the forces which control human life. Though we may be awed and cowed by the energies which have latterly been channeled out of the innermost treasure-house of nature, we know that they remain mere instruments in the hands of human beings which will be used in accordance with the social objectives they set for themselves.

The principal question we asked by UNESCO is then, this: How and to what extent can it temper, or civilize, the process of the intercommunication of ideas? In other words, can it find methods for subjecting the convictions and loyalties to a different sort of arbitration than war? We may answer first of all that of course it cannot do so by setting up any one philosophy as binding and orthodox. Even if the failure of every attempt to impose doctrines by force or guile were not so clearly demonstrated in history, the Christian at least would know, if he credited Revelation only and no mundane evidence, that the conflict between good and evil, truth and falsehood, is destined to be grim and unending. Therefore, we must hope for, work for, the creation of a world-wide forum of discussion inside which the teaching of competing views of life, or of rival national allegiances, will be honest and free, rather than fanatical and bloody.

The goals of honesty and freedom have been before UNESCO from the beginning. Both the Constitution and any number of subsequent resolutions emphasize these terms. The organization is committed to fostering the free flow of communication; to promoting the sharing of knowledge by scholars in all fields of enquiry, across national boundaries; to placing at the disposition of less well-educated peoples the educational methods best calculated to insure their mastery of pedagogical and technological skills; to overcoming the handicaps imposed upon countries harassed by war, in the belief that educational retrogression is dangerous to the peace of the world community; and to the gradual development of the cooperative use of the great mass media of communication for the purpose of diffusing knowledge and understanding.

One must of course concede that honesty and freedom are not easy to define. There surrounds all human experience, insofar as it goes beyond a comparative handful of axioms and is not concerned with the apprehension of revealed truth, an aura of relativity. We may, for example, be reasonably sure that the methods employed in American industrial production are more efficient than those used elsewhere, but it does not follow that we can assume with certainty that the application of these methods will in the long run prove beneficial to society. Or we may entertain grave doubts as to whether freedom to argue in favor of a given view of life, even when this view is not discernibly subversive of human welfare, will not in the end lead to the suppression of freedom itself.

But we have no choice in the matter, because the ultimate absolute round which the discussion turns is the freedom of the will of man. Even in hours when we long for some kind of romantic walled town, inside which those we love could be insulated against the impact of alien opinion, we cannot for a moment forget that such towns would be subject to constant siege. The steady, unrelenting pressure of the newspaper, the film,

the radio program, the magazine, the book, the stream of conversation, is so tremendous that any resistance the group or the individual can put up is doomed to be in part at least ineffectual. The only thing to do is to go out and participate in the discussion.

And UNESCO is first and foremost the provision of opportunity for participation in world-wide discussion. I stress opportunity. The right of freedom to speak and be heard may be taken away by dictators, or it may corrode under the evil influence of purely commercial controls. But in the final analysis it can be destroyed altogether only by failure to make use of it. While the practical purpose of the discussion which UNESCO creates is to serve the peace of the world by mitigating blind nationalistic hatreds based on mutual misunderstanding or mutual arrogance, the sources of such hatreds are so complex that practically no subject will be eliminated from the discussion—neither education, nor science, nor culture, in any of its many aspects. It is true that this discussion will proceed regardless of what UNESCO does. In particular it will proceed through the great modern mass media, which will in a year or two blanket the globe. What are new are the standards which UNESCO proposes to advócate for the conduct of the discussion.

Now you will ask what is to happen if those standards are not agreed to? Are we not all interested in the elimination of fearful and venomous animosity? But what if others take a different point of view? Here we come face to face with the most difficult single problem which UNESCO faces—the problem of relationships with Russia. There can be no doubt about it. Russia propaganda is at present ruthless, imperialistic, dishonest, and dangerous. It is an instrument in the hands of would-be revolutionary conquerors who batten on pent-up resentments and inferiority complexes. We have not been able to elicit from the Kremlin any expression of opinion about UNESCO—not even an official newspaper editorial. Nor have Americans as a people succeeded in bringing about any alteration of Russian policy in the domain of international relations. But this does not mean we must conclude that matters will always necessarily remain what they are now, or even that we must now load our planes with cargoes of atom bombs.

That UNESCO will to a great extent fail unless the attitude of Russia toward other peoples can be changed is evident. It is likewise clear that no secretary-general is able to effect that change. But this is in my opinion no argument against UNESCO. I have said that the organization is a cooperative enterprise. If speaking pro domo is now appropriate, let me express the opinion that precisely this Russian difficulty presents the Catholic public with a major opportunity to support the work of UNESCO.

There are in western and central Europe no energies other than those of Catholicism capable of assuming leadership in resisting the onward sweep of totalitarianism. The reasons are twofold. First, every other important group is in some manner allied either with capitalism, in the predatory sense or with Marxism. Second, other groups will follow Catholic leadership if it is offered. If then there is to be any debate with Russian communism in terms which Europe can understand, it will be a debate in which Catholics are protagonists. I have no doubt they can win it, provided they really want to. What is needed is confident eagerness to have a discussion, and careful preparation. I suggest that American Catholics prepare to spend $25,000,000 or even $50,000,000 on financing that venture.

With these sums we can muster a corps of experts and later of workers here and abroad, eager to labor in the spirit of the great Jesuits who in the seventeenth century won back Poland and gained a strong foothold even at the Court of Catherine of Russia. Only this time the majority of them must be laymen, and we must not be too squeamish about each of them except in terms of his complete dedication to the cause. They must know economics, politics, literature, the labor movement, modern life. The mustering of public opinion for the manifest blessings of antitotalitarianism must be their chief interest.. I believe that within 2 years such a group could make a serious dent in the iron curtain, and that in a few more years it could gain access to the Russian people.

The question is not whether the Russians have found an answer to the conundrum of business cycles, or whether the United States is a country of bigger and better bathtubs. It is just what UNESCO wants it to be—namely whether the Russian Government can freely participate in an honest discussion of the values of freedom, or peace, and of culture. I am sure we can determine the answer if we really make up our minds to do so.

You may call me romantic if you insist. I shall merely retort that the record isn't too bad, and that today there is probably nobody who will deny that the Berlin Olympic Games presented in their day a unique and fateful opportunity to carry on the struggle against Hitler short of war. And if you wish to argue about money, let me say that even $50,000,000 would be dirt cheap compared with the levy which will be exacted by another war. That war would cost American Catholics alone billions of dollars and millions of lives.

Before we sit back and complacently declare that UNESCO can't solve the problem of East or West, let us ask ourselves whether we have done our best to help solve it. Perhaps if we tried we would fail. Well, anybody who expects to live during the next 10 years is an incorrigible optimist unless he is willing to assume all the risks which the situation demands.

Imagine what the Catholic position in the modern world would be if it were patent that they had solved the Russian problem. It would constitute one of the greatest achievements in human history since the victory of Constantine, and for my part I believe that this is the hour of our destiny.

Surely our glances should be focused on such matters rather than on whether Mr. Julian Huxley is Secretary General of the UNESCO. Mr. Huxley is only a minor authority on birds and an equally minor menace to them or to anybody else. The important thing surely is the forge on which we can hammer out through discussion such questions as these—and they are tremendous questions:

What do the 250,000,000 people of Europe think they can do in order to rebuild their society? What ideas and plans, what extensions of the intellectual frontier, will help them to succeed?

What is going on in India? What resources of scientific information, of food, and of industrial engineering are required to lift this great people above the level of famine?

What can be done to remedy the errors which in the past have sundered the peoples of China and Japan from the west?

What resources are available in the indigenous cultures of Africa upon which moderate creative effort can be based?

Do we really understand the Near East?

How can we enlarge and ennoble American thinking about the rest of the world? What is realism in international affairs and what is wishful day dreaming?

If we make up our minds to participate wholeheartedly in this colossal undertaking we shall benefit ourselves and others. If we stand aside, it will be carried on, for good or ill, without us.

Of course, the success of this enterprise is not insured. We shall make mistakes—yes, at times we shall make fools of ourselves. But there is for us only one reliable ticket to self-destruction. That is to go out and hide our light under a bushel.

Address by Ralph E. Becker to Young Republican Western Regional Conference

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Ralph E. Becker, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, before the Young Republican Western Regional Conference, at Salt Lake City, Utah, on Saturday, April 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Finlinson, Mrs. Priest, Mr. Romney, fellow Young Republicans, we Young Republicans are making political history here this week end. With the establishment of this western conference on a permanent basis, the Young Republican National Federation now completes its regional organization and looks ahead with confidence to next year, when the American people will complete the job of freeing themselves from a decade and a half of wasteful, expensive, and oppressive bureaucracy.

This enthusiastic binding together of the Young Republican effort in our 11 Western States is a far cry from the situation which confronted us when we returned from the battlefields of Europe and the Pacific. Less than a year ago we Young Republicans held our first national convention since before the war. Eighteen States were represented.

In less than a year's time since then we have taken Paul Bunyan strides—45 State clubs and District of Columbia fully organized. Guided by the impelling thought that ours is the generation which has most at stake in the future of this Republic, we have organized Young Republican clubs. We have enrolled the enthusiasm of college groups. Our teen-age units are growing. The returned veteran has found his medium of political expression in our ranks.

Last year, ours was not only the task of supporting Republican candidates. We did that despite the natural disorganization which war brought to the Young Republican movement. We also faced the job of putting our own house in order for effective work. Yet we met the challenge of last fall's election well.

It is interesting to note that in May 1946 the Gallup poll showed that 40 percent of the young people between the ages of 21 to 40 were interested in the Republican Party. The Gallup poll as of November 6 showed that 51 percent of the same age group voted for the Republican Party—in other words, an increase of 11 percent whereas other age

brackets only showed an increase of 4 percent. Although there were other factors that caused this trend on the part of the young people, it is conceded that one of the major factors was the organization of Young Republican groups throughout the country who participated in practically every major congressional, senatorial, and State campaign.

The result of our work is manifest everywhere. In the Congress, and in legislatures in States where there is a two-party system, there are today young Republican men and women working for a better tomorrow.

Here in your vast western empire, Young Republicans have more than kept pace with their national federation. Your organizational work is reaching a climax today in this formal establishment of a regional conference. But you did not let the details of organization prevent you from aiding mightily in the election last fall.

It is our plan that this organization be permanently set up so that it will be a subcampaign headquarters during the election of 1948. In that way at a centrally located point, such as Salt Lake City, you will be able to render a service to the entire Rocky Mountain Region and the Pacific Coast.

Look at the amazing record of your Republican Party of the West. Of the 49 Representatives in Congress from these 11 Western States in 1944, only 20 were Republicans. Today there are 32. Of the 22 Senators, only 5 were Republicans 2 years ago. There are now 10, and there is every indication that the 1948 election will give our party a majority of the western Senators.

In fact, a critical study of the election returns in the far West convinces me that if your fine organizational work continues all 11 States will be in the Republican column in November 1948.

Incidentally, your achievement at the polls last fall already has assured your mighty west of a greater voice in the selection of our party's nominee in 1948. An unofficial tabulation in this month's Republican News shows that the West's total apportionment of delegates to the national convention in 1948 will be 12 more than it was in 1944. You undoubtedly are pleased to note that of the 36 additional delegates who will vote at that convention exactly one-third of them will come from west of the Rockies.

Perhaps we are counting our chickens before they are hatched. While it is fine to anticipate the victory of 1948 as confidently as we approached the 1946 election, let us not lose sight of the fact that we Republicans control only one of this Nation's three branches of Government. We have majorities in the Congress. The executive branch still is held firmly by the same political party which has dictated our destiny since 1933. We cannot remove that heavy hand until after the 1948 election, but we can do much now—in this off-election year of 1947—to support our Republican Congress and thus insure the election of a Republican President.

Make no mistake about it. The Republican Congress needs support, and it needs it now and continuously until its work is done. It needs support because the vast propaganda army still employed at the taxpayers' expense by the Democratic administration has not been demobilized. That is one army which this Nation well could do without, but those mimeograph mercenaries now are fighting a desperate rear-guard action in behalf of their precious jobs. They are out to silence our Republican tax-cut guns before we can score a direct hit on the citadel of bureaucracy.

Craftily, these tax-fed propaganda experts have played on the impatience of the American voter who last fall said he had "had enough." The voter is impatient for relief from bureaucratic regimentation and controls. It is a natural impatience. The voter also is impatient because he still must lose about 1 day's pay check out of every 4 to the tax collector. Certainly, that is a natural impatience. Likewise, it is natural for the voter to be impatient at such things as the unsolved housing shortage, the evidence of Communists in our Government, and the continuation of labor-management strife.

Such impatience can fall a quick victim to the professional publicity agents of the Democratic administration if we Republicans do not do some plain talking right now. We need no twisted words. We need no half-truths. We need only to tell the facts.

What is the record to date of the Eightieth Congress—the first Republican Congress since 1930?

It has streamlined itself. In so doing it has accomplished what a long procession of Democratic Congresses did not have the courage to do. The old system of a multitude of committees with overlapping duties is gone; there is an efficient Congress at work now.

In less than 2 months, it has determined that President Truman's swollen budget can and should be cut. Being studied now is the amount which will be saved. The House already has passed several appropriation bills at a total saving of a billion dollars.

The House also has approved an income tax-reduction bill which will mean more take-home pay for everyone.

OPA will be a dead pigeon on June 30; sugar rationing has been extended to October 31.

The Presidential tenure bill has been adopted and several States already have ratified it.

Time has been extended for reinstatement of veterans' life-insurance policies.

A bill to outlaw portal-to-portal lawsuits soon will be on Mr. Truman's desk for signature. Both Houses are winding up extensive hearings on measures designed to bring industrial peace to this Nation.

Are these few examples the samples of a "do-nothing" Congress? Emphatically, no. Rather, they are the products of a Congress which has made more rapid progress toward the enactment of important legislation than any other in recent years except that first New Deal rubber-stamp Congress in 1933.

Therein lies the vital difference. The impatience of the voter will disappear as soon as he is reminded that this Eightieth Congress is listening to the voter's mandate, not to the dictation of a so-called Brain Trust. This Congress is not rushing to pass bills which have not even been read. This Congress is not being stampeded into unsound and vicious legislation. This Congress is more concerned with doing the right thing rather than with setting a speed record.

The record of the Eightieth Congress so far indicates clearly that it will do everything within its power to keep the promises its Republican Members made last fall. Whether President Truman permits the fulfillment of those promises remains to be seen. There is much administration talk these days of Presidential vetoes. Strange talk it is, too, because how can there be anything to veto if this is, as administration propaganda experts say, a "do-nothing" Congress?

Yes, here is a chore for all of us now. It is the job of giving the lie to the bureaucrats and their propaganda presses as they insist that their jobs, their spending, and their heavy taxes are essential and indispensable.

But we can do more. We can explode the growing myth of Mr. Truman, the President who offered such fine "cooperation" to the new Republican Congress. To do this, we need again only to look at the record.

Mr. Truman said he would cooperate. Obviously, that meant cooperation in the enactment of a program advocated by Republican candidates who had just been elected by the people.

One point in that program was economy. This is how Mr. Truman cooperated on that score: He presented a budget which was $2,000,000,000 more than he had requested just a year before.

Another point was tax reduction. Just last week, Mr. Truman cooperated by opposing any immediate tax relief. He said he would like to cut taxes at the proper time. There are those who suspect Mr. Truman's proper time will be about 6 months before the Presidential election next year.

A third point was a fair and workable labor policy. Despite 14 years of inaction by Democrats on this critical problem, Mr. Truman's only cooperation has been to suggest another commission to study the problem.

A fourth point was to rid the Government service of Communists and fellow travelers. To be sure, Mr. Truman has cooperated on that score, albeit in a rather confusing manner. On February 28 he was on record as calling communism a bugaboo and as saying that he didn't think anyone really would want to overturn our form of government. A month later, however, he used the other side of his mouth and ordered the Government service to be purged of all whose loyalty is questioned. The record shows, however, that he did not take this action until after a committee of the Republican-controlled House had approved a bill which would have forced him to take such action.

All of this makes one of our jobs as Republican workers in the off-election year of 1947 crystal clear. We must expose the masters of the mimeograph. We must go back home and impress upon our fellow Republican workers the necessity of telling the true story of what is happening in Washington today; of how the Republican Congress stone by stone is rebuilding the badly wrecked structure of our great Republic; of how that Congress is doing the job with little or no cooperation from an administration whose words apparently are much louder than its actions.

That we are doing our second and organizational job as Republican workers is proved by this and other Young Republican meetings which literally are piling one on the other. I have just come from Young Republican State conventions in Arizona, New Mexico, and Nevada. Next week, I look forward to other State-wide conferences in Wyoming and Montana. Meanwhile, Young Republicans are marching forward in the South, in the Midwest, and in the East. We shall meet together in the greatest of all Young Republican national conventions in Milwaukee this June.

I salute the Golden West and this formal proof of the collective strength and vigor of Young Republicans in its 11 States. I welcome you as one of the four great regional pillars of our Young Republican National Federation.

I pledge you the cooperation and assistance of the Republican national chairman, Carroll Reese, and the Republican National Committee as well as the senior State chairmen and your national officers, as together we perform the pleasant and patriotic tasks of bulwarking our 1947 Republican Congress and preparing for the election of a 1948 Republican President.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article by Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, published under the heading "State of the Nation," in the April 21 issue of that newspaper. The articles relates to the political situation which may arise with respect to the labor bill which the Senate is presently considering.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF THE NATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Events are pointing to a deadlock between Congress and the President over labor legislation.

There still is an opportunity to avert this deadlock, but so far neither side is showing any disposition to take advantage of that opportunity.

This means that we have at hand the first concrete test of how well or how badly our divided Government, divided between Republican Congress and Democratic President, can function when faced with a really controversial issue.

There were such grave forebodings when the results of last fall's elections left both parties in charge of the Government—the Democratic Party in charge of the executive and the Republican Party in charge of the legislature—that one Democratic Senator proposed that President Truman appoint a Republican Secretary of State and resign. Mr. Truman wisely did no such thing. The President promised full cooperation with Congress, affirmed that legislative initiative would rest with Congress. He has indulged in no petty heckling from the side lines.

But all this has been relatively easy. It was easy for the President to cooperate with Congress because he has no other choice in the matter. It was easy for Congress to cooperate with the President because the stage where cooperation has to embrace give and take had not been reached.

That stage now is at hand. Last week the House of Representatives passed a far-ranging labor bill by a vote of 308 to 107. The Senate Labor Committee has approved a more moderate measure. Some merger of the two probably will prevail, but before any labor bill can become a labor law it must pass the judgment and the action of President Truman.

Legislation placing restraints upon big labor in the public interest is as reasonable and justified as legislation placing restraints upon big business in the public interest. Big business didn't like it and it fought it to the last ditch. Big labor is doing the same thing.

The trade-union has become a powerful instrument in our industrial society. Twelve years ago the labor unions had only 4,400,000 members. Today they have 14,000,000 members. It's a good estimate that they will have 20,000,000 members in another 10 years. When the economic institutions of credit and of the corporation became powerful instruments in society they had to become subject to regulation in the public interest. It is just axiomatic that the labor union is going to have to accept restraints commensurate with its power.

A new labor law is needed. There is no doubt about that. The President wants one kind of labor law; Congress wants a different kind. Because the Presidency and the Congress are in divided hands, it is imperative that a real effort be made by Mr. Truman and the Republican leaders to work out the widest possible area of agreement between them.

Thus far, there is every evidence that 1948 campaign politics is playing a dangerous part in the strategy of both sides.

Here's the way some of the Republican politicians figure it: Pass an omnibus labor bill; make it as stringent as possible. Put everything into it, including what the President would welcome and what he is most likely to veto. Some would welcome a veto, and since there probably are not enough votes in the Senate to override the veto, let Mr. Truman take the blame for no legislation and keep the issue hot for 1948.

And some of the Democratic politicians see it this way: The Democratic Party needs labor support. It may not be able to win with labor backing next year, but it certainly can't win without it. Therefore, Mr. Truman will be serving his political interests by having no consultation with the Republican leaders on labor legislation. Do nothing to discourage the most extreme bill and then veto it and stand as labor's champion.

This just isn't good enough. The Republican leaders can ignore the President by deliberately throwing everything into the labor bill but the kitchen sink. Such an attitude risks any labor bill.

The President can ignore the Republican Congress by not calling its leaders into consultation before it's too late. By holding back his own views, he will be deliberately courting a labor bill of a kind he can veto—and the Nation will be the loser.

A dangerous legislative stalemate can be averted if Mr. Truman and the Republican leaders are prepared to adjourn 1948 politics until 1948.

Cooperation Between the President and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Star, under the headline "The political mill," there appears an article by Gould Lincoln which I believe to be of interest to the Senate. Therefore I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

How far is President Truman willing to cooperate with the Republican Congress—as he said he would after the congressional elections last November?

Up to date the only real cooperation between the President and the Congress has been on the part of Congress. Under the leadership of Chairman VANDENBERG, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and under that of Chairman EATON, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Republican majority in both bodies has gone along with the Chief Executive on foreign policy. So effectually is this the case that an American foreign policy has evolved—a policy whose severest critic is a former Democratic Vice President, Henry A. Wallace. Further, Republicans in the Senate—again under the leadership of Senator VANDENBERG—rallied to the support of the President's choice for Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, David E. Lilienthal.

When the voters elected a Republican House and Senate it was for the purpose of having them "do something" about serious domestic issues—taxes, Federal expenditures, labor, and so forth. They wanted a reduction of taxes and of expenditures. They wanted laws which would curtail the dictatorial operations of labor leaders, which were hamstringing American industry.

Well, the Republicans have done something about these issues, and from all reports Mr. Truman stands ready to undo what they have done or are in the process of doing. Is that cooperation? Or perhaps the President does not believe that the people were in earnest about these things when they turned a Democratic majority out of Congress and replaced it with a Republican majority.

The Republican floor leader of the House, Representative HALLECK, of Indiana, meeting with the Republican National Committee in Kansas City, has given an account of what the Republicans in Congress have been doing. It is an impressive array of achievement, despite the fact that Democratic leaders have been charging the Republicans with no accomplishment during the first hundred days of the present session of Congress. Some of the legislation has passed both Houses, and some of it only one, but it is all on the way to the White House where Mr. Truman will have to decide whether he will cooperate or not.

Here is what the Republicans have been doing. The House has passed and sent to the Senate a bill to reduce personal income taxes; it has passed and sent to the Senate a bill to amend the Federal labor laws; it has passed four departmental appropriation bills, lopping off hundreds of millions of dollars in expenditures. The Senate and House have both passed the so-called portal-to-portal pay bill to prevent serious attacks on American industry through portal-to-portal pay suits—one of the greatest rackets ever devised. Both Houses have passed and sent to the States for ratification a proposed constitutional amendment limiting Presidents of the United States to two terms.

Both Houses have passed legislation to provide a more liberal allotment of sugar for the American people. Both Houses have contributed to the termination of many wartime powers of the administration to control the economic life of the Nation. Both Houses have given consideration to the President's request for loans to Greece and Turkey—to check the advances of communism—and both Houses will agree to it.

The Republicans have had the support of some Democrats in both the House and Senate for these measures. The Democratic support, however, which is essential if some of these bills are to become law, is that of Mr. Truman. The support for these measures has come in Congress from anti-New Deal Democrats—not from the 100-percent New Dealers. Mr. Truman must determine whether he will go along with the more conservative Democrats or with the New Dealers, who at present are in a minority in the Democratic groups in House and Senate.

Repeated changes by the administration in estimates of both Federal expenditures and receipts since last fall have kept Congress and the people guessing, particularly as to whether it is feasible to have income-tax reduction. The President and his aides estimated first there would be a deficit at the close of the present fiscal year. Later estimates reduced the deficit, and the last estimate shows a surplus of $1,250,000,000. Now it appears there is no adequate reason for delaying tax reduction, although the President continues to insist that this is not the proper time and that he will make recommendations for relieving the tax burden of the people (presumably next year).

It looks, to the man in the street, as though the administration was attempting to play politics with this matter of tax reduction—and very stupid politics at that.

Conservatism in Public Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Something Rare Under the Sun," by John W. Owens, published in today's issue of the Baltimore Sun.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMETHING RARE UNDER THE SUN

(By John W. Owens)

One of the more entertaining of the political curiosities of the day is the spectacle of a Democratic President lecturing a Republican Congress on conservatism in public finance. For decades the Democrats have been suspect. True, Cleveland and Wilson, both sons of Presbyterian ministers, were careful men. But there was Bryan, with his monetary ideas, and there was Roosevelt, with his somersault from the orthodox into spending which made the Hoover deficits shrink to corner-store proportions. Moreover, the Democratic Party has long included worker and debtor groups which could find some advantage for themselves in occasional relaxation of the rigors of conservatism in public finance. On the other hand, throughout the years the Republicans have professed the faith in sonorous tones. Nevertheless, here is the situation: With a national debt on our shoulders far larger than any conservative would 10 years ago have thought bearable and with a hold-Russia policy in the making, the cost of which is unpredictable, the Democratic President is saying, "Hold onto your revenues," and the Republican Congress is saying, "Cut your taxes."

By this time most of us should know that there is no such thing in our day as sure prophecy on the course of business. The forces at play—social and political, as well as economic, are too numerous and too intricate to be brought fully within the purview of any economist or financier or industrialist. That is true in all analyses of conditions within the United States. And, of course, conditions abroad impinge upon us, and the play of these conditions is no less mysterious. There was, as we all remember, almost unanimous miscalculation of underemployment that would follow the end of the war and the cancellation of war contracts. And, at this moment, we are living in the midst of revelation that the National Association of Manufacturers and associated groups overjudged last year their ability to produce in the volume required to balance demand and to level prices. Prices have risen steeply and, consequently, a new chapter of wage increases is being written, which we long were told would be a dangerous step toward inflation. As for theories on ways to prevent inflation's leading to deflation, and vice versa, discussion now verges upon the occult.

But one would suppose that the very complexity of the conditions under which we live, conditions without precedent, would lead to caution. In the debate last year on price control few of those who advocated continuance held that price control was a positive good. The prevailing argument among those who called for continuance was caution, caution against haste in lifting price control as the Nation made its way from war socialism back to free enterprise. Today, amid all the confusion about trends, one would suppose that the instinct of caution would assert itself in conservatism and, as against the vast debt, would hold on to every dollar of revenue that a boom places in the Government's coffers. Instead, we have a Democratic President lecturing a Republican Congress on conservatism. True, Republican leaders say they will so reduce the budget that they can make a reduction of the debt while reducing taxes. But if they should be able to reduce the budget and yet hold on to the full flood of boom revenues, they could take a slice off the vast debt instead of a sliver.

Sage observers of the scene explain that both parties are playing politics in this matter of tax reduction. The Republicans think, one hears, that they will gain an advantage if taxes are reduced this year, in accordance with their rather lavish promises in the congressional campaign. The Democrats think, one hears, that Mr. Truman will have an advantage if taxes are reduced next year when the Presidential campaign will be taking shape. These calculations may well be in the minds of the strategists of each party. The ordinary man must be puzzled. Why should tax reduction, voted by a Republican Congress and signed by a Democratic President, be a Republican asset in 1947, while tax reduction, voted by a Republican Congress and signed by a Democratic President, would be a Democratic asset in 1948? There are times when one suspects politicians of not knowing the difference between strategy and superstition.

But whether such maneuvers be strategy or superstition, why bother about them in these days? So far as anybody is able to see, if the country can keep out of a recession (we called the worst collapse in generations a depression), the parties probably will have an equal chance. If the country goes into a recession, the parties may still have an equal chance. Certainly nobody can say today how prosperity or slump would affect the parties. In the midst of full employment the Democrats were well-nigh overwhelmed in last year's elections. That was unusual, to say the least. Within 6 months Mr. Truman—and presumably his party—had recovered a faint margin in the polls of public opinion. That is unusual, to say the least. Old signposts are awry. The only thing certain about the political situation today is that the right is solid, the left is divided, and the center apparently fluctuates—at present toward Mr. Truman. Why weave partisan webs around the detail of tax reduction? Why try to reason from the flimsy premise that great numbers of voters will plump on this side or that, according to the date of tax reduction?

One is led to suspect that neither Republicans nor Democrats would lose anything if, in thinking about the billions that pour into the Treasury so swiftly in this postwar boom, they took a long look at the towering debt and gave a long thought to the cost of subsidies and of armed forces that may befall us in a divided world. Probably, however, we shall continue to be amused by the spectacle of a Democratic President lecturing a Republican Congress on conservative finance.

Freight-Car Building and Car-Repair Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the following letter and chart received from J. M. Johnson, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, relating to a matter of import to many persons and concerns, as well as civic organizations throughout the country.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1947.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: In conversation with a representative of your office on March 27, I promised to give you a full report of developments in connection with the expanded freight-car building and car-repair program since the March 14 meeting of our freight car builders advisory committee. At that meeting a production committee composed of representatives of the contract car builders, the railroad and private car lines, and the component parts manufacturers was appointed for the purpose of developing actual monthly requirements in steel and pig iron needed to meet the car-building schedule submitted by the American Railway Car Institute as of March 12. The production committee worked with my staff, March 17 through March 22, and the steel requirements as developed for each participant were submitted to the CPA Industry Advisory Committee for Distribution of Steel for Freight Cars (hereinafter referred to as the Steel Industry Committee), which met here on March 25, 26, and 27 for the purpose of distributing the steel requirements in various mill products among the steel mills contributing car steel.

The steel requirements we submitted to the Steel Industry Committee total approximately 239,000 tons per month, of which 171,000 tons was designated for new cars and 68,000 tons for repair of railroad rolling stock and locomotives. The committee disputed the requirements as presented by ODT claiming that there was some duplication and inflation in the figures. I want to point out that the industry representatives on our production committee had made a sincere effort to avoid duplication in the quantities which they reported. Whereas the combined average tonnage per new car on the basis of information developed by our car builders committee called for approximately 17.1 tons per car the steel-industry people insisted on a much lower figure but finally compromised on 15.1 tons per car. On this basis they underwrote a total of approximately 151,000 tons for 10,000 new cars per month. They reviewed the tonnages set up in their January meeting for MRO, which totaled approximately 63,000 tons at that time, and decided in the light of their experience with steel orders since January to underwrite approximately 59,000 tons for MRO at this time. The total quantity of steel underwritten in various products, as detailed on the attached distribution sheet, was 210,063 tons. It should be noted that the figure of 151,000 tons for new cars agrees with a break-down of tonnages prepared by the American Railway Car Institute for cars now on order. Though the Steel Industry Committee cut our requests by about 29,000 tons per month my staff is of the opinion that the 10,000-car program can be reached together with an effective car-repair program. This belief stems partially from the expectation that the quantities agreed to by the steel companies are minimum and will actually be exceeded by deliveries.

The total tonnage of 210,063 tons shown on the Steel Industry Committee's distribution sheet was divided between new-car requirements and MRO requirements approximately as follows:

	Billets	Shapes	Plates	Bars	Pipe	Sheet and strip [1]	Axles	Miscellaneous forgings
New cars	1,835	41,610	50,340	13,320	1,080	23,700	16,123	3,055
MRO		7,000	25,460	17,000	2,900	5,400		1,240
Total	1,835	48,610	75,800	30,320	3,980	29,100	16,123	4,295

[1] The 6,000 tons of galvanized sheets underwritten by the steel committee were not divided between new cars and MRO.

We had hoped that the Steel Industry Committee would agree to increase May rollings to the greatest extent possible and to have the increased tonnages for the 10,000-car program made fully effective with June rollings. The steel committee, however, decided that increased tonnages would be made available to the greatest extent possible for the June rollings, and the program would be placed in full effect in July rollings. The average lead time required between steel production and car completion is about 2 months. The decisions reached by the Steel Industry Committee have been transmitted to all of the participants appearing on the attached distribution sheet, but it is expected that approximately 3 weeks will be required before full details have filtered down to all levels of the steel industry and arrangements can be made for the revision of schedules. It is unlikely that the steel consumers will have much success in placing orders under the enlarged tonnages until this process has been completed in the steel industry. The steel companies have been provided with copies of the detailed requirements prepared by our production committee, and they will be in a better position to determine the actual requirements of each consumer.

As you know, the steel industry in January underwrote 165,000 tons of steel on a monthly basis for a 7,000-car program plus MRO requirements. We are told that tonnages of car steel in excess of this figure will be rolled in April and will be continued through the months of May and June. The car builders' schedule of March 12 indicates that the builders aim to accelerate their fabrication processes beyond the 7,000-car rate immediately so that the 10,000-car level of production would be practically attained in June and would be continued in subsequent months.

We are not entirely satisfied with the results of the steel committee's action, but we are willing to be shown that the tonnages they have underwritten are sufficient for the production of 10,000 cars per month and fully adequate for the car-repair program, as they contend. We will follow the programs closely to obtain the best possible distribution of these tonnages with the thought that if subsequent experience demonstrates the tonnages to be insufficient, we will insist on enlargements of them where needed. We are now establishing here a follow-up procedure under which a running record will be kept of tonnages allocated by each steel mill to steel consumers for this program. This record will permit checking on space available for particular steel products in various mills, and through this procedure we expect to assist consumers who are unable to place their orders after exhausting their own efforts so that they can be told where to make further contacts to have orders accepted.

Cordially,

J. M. JOHNSON,
Director.

Distribution of monthly steel requirements for the production of 14,000 domestic freight cars per month plus tonnage needed for repairs to railroad rolling stock

Companies	Plates	Shapes	Bars	Galvanized sheets	Other sheets	Pipe	Axles	Billets	Miscellaneous	Total
United States Steel Corp	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Bethlehem Steel Co	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
Republic Steel Co	X		X	X	X	X	X			X
Jones & Laughlin Steel Co	X	X	X			X		X		X
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co	X	X	X		X	X				X
Inland Steel Co	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
American Rolling Mill Co	X			X	X					X
Weirton Steel Co		X								X
Great Lakes Steel Co	X				X					X
Wheeling Steel Co	X			X	X	X				X
Colorado Fuel & Iron Co		X	X							X
Lukens Steel Co	X									X
Worth Steel Co	X									X
Central Iron & Steel Co	X									X
Alan Wood Steel Co	X				X					X
Phoenix Iron Co		X								X
Granite City Steel Co	X				X					X
Midvale Steel Co								X		X
Sheffield Steel Co	X	X	X							X
Laclede Steel Co			X			X				X
Kaiser Steel Co	X	X	X							X
Crucible Steel Co			X							X
Continental Steel Co				X						X
Sharon Steel Co				X	X					X
Wisconsin Steel Division, International Harvester			X							X
Acme Steel Co					X					X
Geneva Steel Co	X									X
National Supply (Spang-Chalfant)						X				X
Mercer Tube & Manufacturing Co						X				X
Wheatland Tube Co						X				X
Pittsburgh Steel Co							X			X
Miscellaneous forge companies									X	X
Total	75,800	48,610	30,320	6,000	23,100	3,980	16,123	1,835	4,295	210,063

X marks indicate specific tonnages of various products underwritten by each steel supplier.

Source: Civilian Production Administration, Metals and Minerals Division, Steel Branch.

Labor Bill Nullifies Collective Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a newspaper article by Thomas L. Stokes.

The article is as follows:

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—Perhaps the best one-sentence description of the Hartley labor bill, passed so overwhelmingly by the House in a high state of emotion, came from a moderate Democrat, Representative RICHARD F. HARLESS, of Arizona, who told the legislative body:

"I cannot go along with this measure because I feel that if it is enacted into law it will give the power to the employer to destroy labor unions and to substitute individual bargaining for collective bargaining."

The Arizona Member's diagnosis is valuable because he is for a labor-regulatory bill; he approved many of the provisions of the Hartley bill, and he is a Member-at-large from a southwestern State of small population.

In another sentence, after listing the various weapons the measure gives to the employer, including easy access to the courts, he summarized the basic change of approach in this bill which cannot be overlooked:

"In substance the employer is given the power of a dictator at the hands of the Government over the union."

The purpose of the Wagner Act which the Hartley bill almost nullifies was to free the workers from previous business and industry-imposed restrictions that had grown up in custom, and to protect his right to join a union and act collectively to protect his economic interest. The Government, representing the people, thus stepped in on behalf of a large segment of the people, our industrial workers, to readjust the balance which for so many years, as was clearly recognized, was overweighted for employers.

The Hartley bill, as well as many provisions of the Senate bill, is to check and reverse this process and return to the employer the power to curb the rights of workers, and in more ways and more devious ways than is apparent on the surface. To implement this power it gives the employer backing of the courts and, to a degree, of the Government, itself. Now, we learn, it is the intention of the Senate to make its more moderate bill a more drastic measure because of the overwhelming House vote for the admittedly severe Hartley bill.

Somewhere there is a middle ground to correct the obvious abuses by some labor instrumentalities, but the House did not reach it, and did not try to reach it. Herein lies the real purpose of the measure which Mr. HARLESS accurately pointed out and which goes back to influences behind the bill.

During the progress of labor legislation in Congress there has been much talk about the lack of cooperation between congressional leaders and President Truman. The two, it is said, should try to reach a general agreement. But the real truth, of course, is that the President and congressional leaders are poles apart, and it is hard to see how they could get together. This is because of a difference in fundamental philosophy,

which goes, too, for many other issues in Congress, but is perhaps most vividly illustrated here.

This is the difference, on one hand, between the philosophy of the New Deal or progressive wing of the Democratic Party, now much weakened in Congress but still having its only valuable symbol in President Truman in the sphere of action, and the philosophy of the business and industrial managers of our economy. Businessmen plainly have seized this time, when they are freed of Government restraints and are well-heeled financially, to deliver their long-planned blow at labor, deprive it of its protection, and recover the control they once had. It is not necessary to rely upon surmises as to their purposes or privately expressed aims. Their public speeches reveal the intent.

It shows a lack of statesmanship and vision in the managers of captitalism today. The Wagner Act, among other original objectives, was to strengthen labor so that it could gain, by its own efforts, a larger share of the national income and thus help, by spreading purchasing power, to rebuild the shattered economy of our last great depression, and thereafter help maintain a balance. If we are to have another depression, or even a recession, it is just as essential that labor be strong enough to act as a brake. It won't, if anything like the bills in House and Senate become law.

And business and industry, as well as labor, will be caught up in the whirlwind.

TVA—Built for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Alfred Mynders, columnist and editorial writer of one of Tennessee Valley's leading newspapers, the Chattanooga Times. He discusses the attitude of former TVA opponents as they view this development today. Mr. Mynders writes:

Bill Cunningham, syndicate columnist and a widely heard radio commentator, carried a whole page under a Chattanooga date line in the Boston Herald concerning the TVA. He is among those who oppose the TVA original idea. There is space for only a few of his comments, but since he formed his ideas here in Chattanooga and in the TVA network, those ideas are of interest locally.

About Mr. Lilienthal, he said: "TVA could not avoid being major in the Lilienthal argument because he built it, did it, has been directing it, may have dreamed much of it. While on the subject of Lilienthal, which is not the subject of this article, there is none here, not even amongst those who resent the entire TVA idea, who fails to praise Lilienthal as a fine man and a directional genius. Many strong TVA men, such as States Rights' Finley, general manager of the Chattanooga Power Board, and a Jacksonian Democrat, as witness his baptismal name, say there is no communism whatsoever in Lilienthal and that they know him well from many contacts.

"Others, such as Scott Probasco, the local banker, a staunch Republican, and one of Wendell Willkie's directors during the fight against the TVA, which brought Willkie to national political prominence, says he is fundamentally and immovably against this type of inroad into private enterprise, but that while he has no information concerning Mr. Lilienthal's ideological predilections, if any, no possible criticism can be leveled against the man's honesty or ability as TVA organizer, builder, and administrator.

"I have combed the local territory and can find no one who has any complaint to lodge against Lilienthal either as a person or as an executive. This seems worth noting because Lilienthal came from Wisconsin, and one would expect this district, like most districts, to be suspicious if not jealous of strangers."

Concerning the effect of harnessing the Tennessee River, Mr. Cunningham wrote:

"In the first place, that once murderous run of water is now a series of placid lakes some 600 miles long. A 9-foot channel runs the entire length and barge lines connecting the region with every major city in the eastern United States now haul grain, ore, automobiles, and other freight up water that has practically no perceptible current. The forests, once knocked down and washed out by rains, have been and are being replanted. The hardscrabbled farms that once clung to the hills offering nothing but poverty to the inhabitants are now being restored with fertilizer turned out by the TVA, and farmers have been taught the tricks of terracing their land and rotating their crops."

Fields long barren are blooming again. The farmers have cattle and pigs and something to feed them with. There are statistics on all this, and I have them, but statistics are boring. The net of it is that the rural part of that once poverty-ridden valley is now beginning to bloom like the original Eden. The threat of floods here and farther south now seem completely controlled.

Concerning the power development and the work of the Chattanooga public power board, he writes, in part:

"The result is that Chattanooga now is undoubtedly the electrical center of the United States. Homes completely run by electricity, including heat, have been increasing as rapidly as equipment can be produced. There are 40,000 Negroes in the approximately 200,000 population of Chattanooga. Somebody for some reason wanted a survey made as to how much electricity the Negro families were using, and when that survey was completed it was discovered that these generally considered underprivileged in the South were equaling the national per capita usage of electric lights and equipment.

"Chattanooga's usage of residential electricity is now 2½ times the Nation's average, and the electrical users of this particular city in the 7 years they've been patronizing the TVA have saved $21,000,000, figuring from the rates last charged by the private power operators, which were 3 cents for residences, 3.2 for commercial users, and 0.9 to industrial customers."

Mr. Cunningham goes into the use of electricity in the rural regions:

Little communities have their neighborhood deep freezers. The farmer has an electric feed chopper in his barn. Some who once didn't make $250 a year are now in the dairy business with electrical equipment. The miracle of cheap light and power has struck and has changed this entire part of the world. Even the farthest hills where all once was poverty and hopelessness now blaze with light and hum with hope.

But the big story in cheap power is the story of the big industrial users now flocking into this region to take advantage of it. I have before me a list of more than 80 manufacturing firms that have moved into this city alone since the TVA began to produce and came expressly to take advantage of the cheap electric power. There have been more, but these firms listed require 20 kilowatts of power for operation. That's equivalent to 30 horsepower. That means they're operations of size.

Then he mentions the better health, the great recreation facilities on the lakes, and Mr. Cunningham sums it all up as follows:

"The sum of it is that whether sinister or admirable in concept a whole economy has been saved, a whole region reborn with this experiment.

"But the rest of the country paid for it, the critics protest, and that's correct up to now. The people here, however, resent that sort of talk. They are paying for what they use with their own local money, they say, and they further say that the TVA is clearing around $35,000,000 a year above operating expenses.

"There are no plaques, no tablets saying, 'Built during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.' There are no bronze words reading, 'David Lilienthal, chairman.' There is just one big line carved into each magnificent job of construction. It's the same on each, and it merely reads, 'Built for the people of the United States.'"

Murder in Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent hanging by the Communists of Czechoslovakia of the brave and gallant Monsignor Josef Tiso was murder in its most ghastly and shameful form. The brave and gallant Monsignor Josef Tiso went the way of the immortal General Mihailovich and the immortal Bishop Stepanic, of Yugoslavia. On trumped-up charges, the Communists disposed of these brave men because they dared to oppose communism among their respective people. These murders will set the pattern of what will happen to all who have opposed communism wherever communism takes over.

On trumped-up charges, they held a farce of a trial and sentenced Monsignor Tiso to be hanged. Imagine the joy in the hearts of the Communists when they succeeded and used the Czechoslovakian Government as a puppet to do their dirty murders for them. Yes; this is a modern tragedy, but there will be more like it as time goes on.

But the hanging of Monsignor Tiso itself is not the greatest tragedy. The greatest tragedy is the silence by our American President and by our American State Department while this murder was going on. Our Government gave the Czechoslovakian Government hundreds of millions of dollars in the past 2 years. We are going to give them millions of dollars more. Yet, with this giving of millions of dollars to the Government of Czechoslovakia, our President and our State Department are not even men enough to stand up and protest against this murder by the Soviets. All of this leads me to believe that the leaders of our country in the White House and in our State Department no longer understand the meaning of the term "honor."

Monsignor Tiso is dead. He was murdered. While he was murdered America was silent. The day is not very distant when these American leaders will regret their silence. The day may come and may be too soon when these leaders who were so shamefully silent will be treated the same way that Monsignor Tiso and

Bishop Stepanic and General Mihailovitch were treated. Then maybe there will be protests. But then it will be too late.

Frankly, I do not think America could have saved the life of Monsignor Tiso. But I am ashamed that my country did not even have the decency and honor to file a protest—just for the record. By some miracle such a protest might have at least postponed the execution. Here in America our officials grant our basest criminals a stay of execution. The least that our national leaders could have done is file a plea for the same consideration for a Christian lover of freedom—Monsignor Tiso—whose only crime was that he hated communism just as he hated nazism. But America remains silent and murder has free sway.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial relative to the action of the Senate in passing the bill providing for assistance to Greece and Turkey. The editorial was published in today's issue of the Baltimore Sun.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE'S APPROVAL OF THE AID PROGRAM

Yesterday the Senate voted in favor of the bill authorizing President Truman to furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey. This bill must now be voted on by the House; but today's vote offers a sufficient indication that the proposal will encounter no serious further obstacles. Indeed, a refusal now by the lower House to go along in support of the program would be so damaging to the prestige of the President and the Secretary of State that a favorable vote is imperative.

In the course of the discussion, remarkably little has been said about the contents of the bill itself. Briefly, it authorizes the President to furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey "upon request of their governments, and upon terms determined by him." The assistance would be of four types: (1) Financial aid in the form of loans, grants, and so forth; (2) the detailing of American officials for purposes of assistance; (3) the detailing of limited numbers of military men "in an advisory capacity only"; and (4) the provision of any articles, services, and information which the President may deem advisable.

Thus, the President is granted practically blanket powers, qualified only by the adverse vote of the General Assembly of the United Nations. He will submit a quarterly report to Congress on what he has done.

But what, actually, will he do?

For one thing, he has the crucial responsibility for selecting the personnel to carry out the program. This is crucial because nothing could more quickly pervert the program from its proper objects than the choice of men, particularly in the case of Greece, who do not know the country intimately, whose definition of stability coincides with the Rightist elements who now dominate the feeble Government of Greece, or who misread our purposes in undertaking this new venture in foreign policy.

Second, it will be the President's task to insist on appropriate internal reforms as the conditions of our aid. Most Americans understand, by now, that all is not well with the Government in Greece—that this Government, dominated by a fragment of the population, has done little more than deepen the division within Greece, and has virtually shut out from an effective voice in government the great mass of moderate, middle-of-the-road people. One after another, competent American observers have reported the Government to be riddled by graft and subservient to a military and financial minority. It will be up to the President, in defining the conditions of our aid, to see that the Greek house is really cleaned. Otherwise, we shall aid not Greece but a minority of Greeks whose record to date has shed no luster.

It would be hard to exaggerate the importance of these two decisions. For "aid" is no mere abstraction. Aid wisely given to Greece, as to Turkey, can stop the process of Communist erosion in southeastern Europe and the Middle East. Aid wisely given can be a beacon of hope to the forces of individualism now fighting a losing battle in many lands against extremists of both Left and Right. Aid wisely given can stop Russian expansionism, bring out conditions more favorable to a firm understanding with Russia—and so serve the cause of peace. But aid provided on the wrong conditions and administered by the wrong men could do none of these things.

Failure To Equalize Income Taxes for Community-Property States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, regardless of final congressional action upon the Knutson bill, providing for a reduction in income-tax schedules, one glaring injustice will remain. I refer to the failure of Congress to equalize income taxes for the community-property States and those which do not have community-property laws. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a table which shows how inequitable the present income-tax laws are. Congress should not postpone a correction of these indefensible discriminations. Citizens of all of the States should be permitted to file tax returns on the same basis.

The table follows:

Taxable income	Income tax in non-community-property States	Income tax in community property States	Savings in taxes for man and wife living in community property States	Percent of savings in taxes for man and wife living in community-property States
$3,000	$589	$570	$19	3.2
$5,000	1,045	969	76	7.2
$10,000	2,508	2,090	418	16.6
$12,000	3,230	2,584	646	20.0
$16,000	4,940	3,724	1,216	24.6
$24,000	9,082	6,460	2,622	28.8
$30,000	12,559	8,987	3,752	28.3
$50,000	25,479	19,285	6,194	24.3
$100,000	63,954	50,958	12,996	20.3
$200,000	148,979	127,908	21,071	14.1

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a radio broadcast made by me on April 23, 1947, as follows:

The House of Representatives has passed by a vote of 308 to 107 an omnibus labor bill, which should not, and more than likely will not, become law in its present form.

The bill is a huge conglomeration of proposals, aimed at practically every fault, that has been found with organized labor. Some of its provisions are sound. Others are of most questionable wisdom. Still others, in my opinion, would be almost certainly to create resentment and strife that this country is in no condition to afford.

What the American people want, in my opinion, is a law to hold unions, and their leaders, responsible for proper use of the great power which the Government has helped them to attain; to correct the Wagner Act's bias; to protect workers, employers, and the public, against abuses that have become flagrant and habitual under the present system

We do not believe they want a law to go as far as the House bill goes. It is a fact that many of the Representatives who voted for this measure would have preferred—and that a number who voted against it, would have supported—something less drastic. But the House strategy permitted no choice. It was this bill or nothing.

The history of the last 20 years has taught us that free self-government can exist only in free economies. Political freedom, without economic freedom and security, is a myth that is short lived.

I have always stood for free, competitive enterprise in an economy based on free labor and free management. Freedom of either depends upon the freedom of both. America wants no Government-dominated labor front, nor sovietized industry. Our individual liberty remains real only to the extent that management and labor remain free from the domination of a highly centralized state.

During my campaign for Congress last fall I stated on many occasions that I stood solidly on the platform of the Republican Party of the State of Washington. This platform was adopted unanimously by the Republican State Convention held at Seattle, September 21, 1946.

This platform reads in part as follows:

"The Republican Party fights for a free American society and against any totalitarianism for America. We stand for free enterprise—free from Federal controls and bureaucratic planned economy, which deprives Americans of food, clothing, and housing—a free trade-unionism, free management, free collective bargaining—free from governmental meddling—the right to profit, the right to strike."

The platform concludes: "Finally, the first and greatest issue in this country, and the world today, is that of freedom under self-government as opposed to slavery under totalitarianism. We dedicate ourselves anew to the age-old struggle of man to be free, and invite all freedom-loving men and women to stand with us."

This is the platform on which I campaigned. That is the platform on which I was elected.

Less than 2 weeks ago young Republicans from 11 Western States met at Salt Lake

City, Utah, to organize the Western Conference of Young Republicans. At this conference several resolutions were adopted. Among these was the following statement on labor:

"We stand for free, competitive enterprise in an economy based on free labor and free management.

"We recognize management's right to profit and labor's right to strike. We reaffirm our faith in the American institution of free collective bargaining—free from legislative regulation and governmental meddling.

"We oppose, therefore, legislation which in any way destroys the rights of freemen to negotiate mutually agreeable labor contracts.

"We insist that both management and labor accept equal responsibility in our economy and equal treatment under law."

By this resolution western Young Republicans have affirmed their faith in a democratic society under which both management and labor are protected from an all-powerful state. I commend these young Republicans for their foresight and wholeheartedly endorse their stand.

Last week the House Labor and Education Committee reported to the floor of the House a labor bill referred to as H. R. 3020. I fought to amend this bill and, in the final analysis, I voted against it. I could not support the form in which this bill was presented to the House because it does not achieve the objectives of the people in the Sixth Washington District relative to the industrial-relations problem.

We want industrial peace, but H. R. 3020 encourages and creates industrial strife.

We want equality of the bargaining power, but the bill gives to employers unjust advantages. We want to restore and guarantee free collective bargaining, but this bill seriously restricts collective bargaining by specific limitations and gives an employer arbitrary control over whether he will bargain and, if so, how far he will go in the bargaining process.

We want to make unions responsible for their conduct and safeguard the sanctity of the contract, but this bill denies to unions the security of contract with its members and destroys common disciplinary power without which it cannot be responsible for the actions of its members. We want to eliminate Government from industrial relations, but this bill extends Government control and, in addition, brings court injunctions back into the picture.

America's past industrial confusion is not the fault of free collective bargaining. We have had industrial unrest because free collective bargaining has not been given a genuine opportunity to function. There has been too much Government intervention.

I opposed H. R. 3020 because its provisions are contrary to our American way of life. I cannot vote for a bill which will start America down the road to serfdom.

Poland's Boundaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, January 30, 1944:

POLAND'S BOUNDARIES—READER URGES THAT JUSTICE BE DONE AND OLD ASSISTANCE NOT FORGOT

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE.

Let us sweep fear and self-gain from the international slate. Let us look at the so-called Russo-Polish boundary problem with clear eyes, with eyes guile free and greed free. Then at once we can see to the core of the thing. Actually there is no boundary question. There is only the question of our keeping the faith. Already we—China, Russia, Great Britain, and the United States—have pledged ourselves to fair play and the impartial restoration of all overrun nations regardless of size. We have promised them freedom and independence and the right to run their own interior affairs.

Now, the first test of our honesty has come.

Are we men of our word or not?

This is the prime question.

If not, then we are back in the jungle age of 1938.

We well know where Poland lies on the map, Poland since her miraculous resurrection through the efforts of Paderewski, who pleaded the cause of all lesser countries, not only his own. He had no armies nor underground nor secret police to help him. Generosity and integrity of spirit were his buckler and sword. Yet he won. Ultimately, justice always wins, for there is a law of cause and effect in moral affairs, as well as in all other realms. Faithfulness flowers into friendship, but treachery breeds hate. We cannot found a better world upon an initial iniquity. If we sow devil's seed, we shall not reap oats of peace. Nature does not work that way, nor does the human spirit.

What we sow we reap. It would be wise to remember this before it is too late, before we kick away the foundations of the future by any sacrifice of Poland to expediency. Such sacrifice would shatter the new-sprung hope of small nations (physically speaking) in the magnanimity of the large and irreparably crack the cornerstone of the whole edifice of peace—the cornerstone of mutual trust.

" 'Away with Poland!' they cry. 'Long live humanity!'—as if humanity could live by the death of nations." These are Paderewski's own words, ringing out with energy—as true today as when his living lips uttered them in the year of 1910 at Chopin Centenary Festival held in Lemberg.

Poles fought at Washington's side in his darkest hours, during that uncertain period when our Nation was coming to birth. The souls and swords of Kosciusko and Pulaski flashed for our cause, served under Washington with fire and fidelity. General Pulaski was killed at the siege of Savannah. This Polish noble had, literally, given his life for the freedom of a land not his own. The Poles are like that—freedom is the breath of their nostrils. We have never lived without liberty; they have, and by its loss they know its value. During all the decades since our War for Independence the Polish people have been coming out from under the oppression of the Old World into the free air of the New. Today they are more than 5,000,000 strong here in the United States. They labor and dream under Uncle Sam's flag and contribute much to the general weal, and none among them has maneuvered against us, either above or under ground.

On November 11, 1918, at the ending of World War I, I happened to be in New York and was caught up in a joy-crazed crowd that tramped and milled along Fifth Avenue. Papers and hats whirled high in the air. Church bells and fire bells wildly clanged. Ticker tape streamed down from office windows—a bizarre confetti for this mad Mardi Gras. In the midst of it I kept remembering those who were not there. Shadows were over the day, among us limped shadowy men. A great, deep prayer surged:

"Beneath the clangor of bells, amid the froth of bannered joy, moves a hidden tide of tears, of tears and prayers for those whose ready gift of life and long-drawn sacrifice have made possible this glad security of ours.

"God, harden the fluid texture of our souls into an imperishable selflessness, lest we, who have so little suffered, may too lightly hold this gift of peace, sprung from the yielded hopes and broken bodies of our many brothers in far lands. Fix us in the firm resolve to prove worthy of that exalted kinship; help us to make this world the place of which they dreamed, and dreaming died. Keep us from sloth, from inanition; cleanse us of braggart, puerile pride. May we not lose our new-won vision of an earth made safe for gentle things, nor prove too soon, too cheaply satisfied with slight achievement. May we in utmost fullness share with the triumphant, tried dead their costly victory."

Now this prayer resurges again. Today the need for prayer, for right thinking, for steadfast and loyal action, challenges you and me as never before. With our youth and our dead, with yesterday and tomorrow, with Kosciusko and Washington, with Tolstoy's dream of brotherhood, with Christ's dream of compassion, we cannot break faith.

LUCY EMBURY.

NEW CANAAN, CONN., *January 24, 1944.*

Iowa's Livestock Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from commenting on the facts revealed by the April 1947 publication of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture. On page 9 of the Agricultural Situation, it is said:

Iowa farmers last year produced more corn than any other State—marketed most of it as hogs, as fed cattle, as calves, as butter, as eggs, and as chickens. Iowa led in the marketings of these products—and at good prices. This put her at the top of the list in cash receipts from livestock and livestock products.

The statistical table appearing on page 8 of this publication is headed "Iowa leads in receipts from livestock."

The figures show that the dollar amount of cash receipts from livestock in Iowa for 1947 was $1,493,966,000. This is well over 10 percent of the livestock sales in the entire country, totaling $13,243,419,000.

These comments and statistics from the official publication again impress upon our minds the importance of Iowa's agricultural production. Like every other Iowa congressional district, the Sixth has large agricultural resources. I congratulate Iowa's farmers on their magnificent contribution to the food supply in a sorely disordered and needy world, hungering for the very things we supply.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay written by Lynn Learey, a freshman at the Van West (Ohio) High School:

AMERICANISM BEST OF ALL, SAYS LEGION ESSAY WINNER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following essay, judged one of 12 best in the Ohio American Legion essay contest, was written by Lynn Learey, son of Rev. and Mrs. Kenneth S. Learey and Van Wert High School freshman, and won the author a trip to Washington, D. C., and other points of interest in the Eastern States, April 12–29.)

Americanism or—? What is Americanism? Perhaps we should begin with a definition; let us see what Webster says. In his dictionary we read, "an attachment or loyalty to the United States, its traditions, interests or ideals." The greatest historial tradition of the United States is our democratic way of life. The richest heritage of our Republic is its idealism and its idealism is measured by Americanism.

The dynamic of this American way of life is the spirit of democracy as expressed by the immortal Lincoln, "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Democracy means justice and liberty for all peoples. We are the state, we are the government.

We ask the question, Americanism or else—what else is there? What other form of government, political, economic, or social system has afforded so many opportunities for each person?

Let us look at our Nation; though it has many faults, many inequalities, many problems—yet it has given to its people:

The highest standards of living in the world with its inventive genius, its assembly lines and mass production, its manner of distribution. According to some GI friends who have returned from all over the world, no nation has so many luxuries as we. In fact our economic system has been more efficient than any other.

The highest standards of education and culture. Our free public schools, with its system of education, has given to many generations of boys and girls the training necessary for life. Reading and writing is accepted by all as a normal American standard. We have an abundance of newspapers, magazines, libraries, and colleges, perhaps more than any other country.

More cooperative and free agencies promoting public good for, by, and of the people than reported from other countries.

More freedom of speech is permitted in the United States than elsewhere. We have town meetings, radios, forums, youth groups, and all kinds of organizations in which and through which our democracy operates. Ours is a representative form of government—even with human failures.

Freedom of worship is an American custom. Our Pilgrim forefathers came 3,000 miles across the sea to worship God as they saw fit. No other form of government fosters this spirit of freedom in religion and patriotism.

Freedom of the press is just another expression of our educated peoples living under the Constitution of the United States. Other nations living behind the iron curtain have only propaganda in their newspapers and over the radio.

It was the spirit of Americanism which won the war. It was the love of home and homeland that caused our democracy to mobilize in an all-out effort. It was Americanism expressed in patriotism and devotion that won military victories over totalitarian forms of government. Free peoples together can win.

And this is a postwar world. It was a people's war, a people's victory, and now a people's peace. We can beat all the other "isms" by giving people the advantages of a prosperous and spiritual nation. We can give through our cooperation, in "the land of the free," a high standard of living, a better education, more comfort, and more luxuries. We can produce goods and goodness under the ideals of freedom, justice, and democracy, which are the stars of Americanism.

We can as free peoples keep our feet upon the ground and our eyes upon the stars—the stars of Americanism.

The only answer to the question Americanism or —? is not found in another form of government, be it communism, fascism, or nazism, but rather the answer is found in America and Americans. Peace and prosperity as promoted "for, by, and of" the common good is the spirit of true America. Americanism is the answer.

Resolution Adopted by Richard F. O'Brien Post, No. 2016, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Amesbury, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following resolution adopted by Richard F. O'Brien Post, No. 2016, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Amesbury, Mass.:

Whereas the Government of the United States of America has made no provisions within the continental limits of the United States, for the perpetuation of the memory of individual servicemen who died in action and whose final resting place is unknown; and

Whereas it is impossible to designate a specific final resting place for the above-mentioned casualties; and

Whereas the families of said casualties are, in many cases, without means to provide suitable memorials: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Richard F. O'Brien Post, No. 2016, on January 7, 1947, That this post go on record as unanimously favoring the placing of a bill before the Congress of the United States. Said bill to direct the providing of headstones for individual family lots of all men who gave their lives in the military service of the United States of America, and for whose remains there is no final resting place known or designated.

Is Congress Slow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of April 21, 1947:

IS CONGRESS SLOW?

Under the heading, "Slow-moving Congress," the Philadelphia Bulletin has joined that innumerable caravan of those who think, because the new Republican majorities at Washington haven't accomplished miracles in 3 months, they are hopelessly bogged down in divisions, dissensions, and red tape.

Just what do they expect?

By any fair standards of comparison, the present Congress has been one of the most efficient and productive ever held.

It reorganized last January, only a little over 10 weeks ago. Facing it was a holy mess of domestic and foreign bungles; a tangle of disagreement going right down the middle of the Democratic Party on such subjects as labor, finances, taxation, and foreign policy.

For 14 years Congress had been so buffeted, first by blasts from the White House and second by criticisms identical with those of today, that it was bewildered and disorganized. It had almost completely lost that status of national balance wheel clearly intended by the Constitution.

When it took office, it had before it the promises of the President that he would offer unity and cooperation. Presently it turned out that all he wanted was to have his own way, and that his assurances of cooperation weren't being taken seriously by his followers.

A newspaper-radio barrage that had all the earmarks of being deliberately inspired and operated hit the new Congress at the outset. Every variety of real and imaginary obstacle was thrown into its path. It was told, in one breath, to be quick and to be cautious; to act as a unit and to let all the Members follow their own lead, to take a firm stand on Republican principles and to make big concessions to the President.

Moreover, it found two internal problems on its hands. One of these was the presence of a host of new, freshmen Members who were eager to pitch in, but who needed training and experience before they could be of real help. The other was the compulsion of going through an elaborate reorganization called for by laws passed last year when the Democrats were in power.

There was a still further stumbling block, the nature of which is politically sensitive. In the House, the Republicans had a large and effective majority. But in the Senate, the margin was too close. Moreover, the Senate hold-over Republicans included those with a wide range of political philosophy.

In the House, unity and harmony prevailed. But in the Senate, tie-ins between insurgent Republicans and the Democratic membership started at once. The Senate Republicans, on recent roll calls, have been divided. On several issues which seemed open and shut Democrat versus Republican, two-thirds of the Republicans stood firm, and the other third jumped to the Democratic side.

In the broader field of public policy, Congress was confronted by a general shift of the President's political position. Despite his earlier pledges of "holding the line" for

the Roosevelt program, he presently abandoned it. Congress found its opposition taking up wholly new entrenchments; and performing the most amazing political sommersaults without apology or embarrassment.

That any progress whatever could be made under these circumstances is surprising. Yet real progress has been made. Early as it is—and ordinarily a Congress would still be marking time on preliminaries—a great deal has been done.

This is especially true of the House. Here the Republican unity and solidarity has been outstanding. Speaker MARTIN has done wonders both in holding his boys in line and in keeping their noses to the grindstone.

The House passed its tax plan by a vote which was all but unanimous—and took a bloc of Democratic votes with it. It has its labor program in the final stages. What economies have been made in the President's spend-and-elect schemes have been done in the House House committees have turned the President's budget inside out, and know what they are saying when they report that there is plenty of "water" to permit their 20 to 30 percent tax cuts.

The portal-to-portal pay-suit bill has been passed by both Houses and is in conference. The House has completed and passed the liquidation of OPA and Temporary Controls agencies. Several appropriation bills also have been completed in the House. Many lesser bills have been passed.

Part of the reason why the House is ahead of the Senate in bills passed is the fact that the Senate has had to spend time on treaty confirmations and on Presidential appointments—matters which do not go before the House. Moreover, with the Republicans holding only a slim and uncertain margin in the Senate, the stage is set for dilatory, obstructionist tactics, which have been used repeatedly by White House lobbyists.

There is a wholly different side to this matter. Was it ever intended that Congress be quick on the draw? Quite the contrary; the framers of the American Constitution felt that deliberation and painstaking were admirable virtues. They knew that the faster a government works the more mistakes it makes and the sooner it becomes a dictatorship.

The slowness of democracy—of the representative republican form of government—is one of its great strengths. Only by taking time to be safe, by holding long hearings and discussing all phases of public questions, can the public be informed of these matters, Congress have time to learn the public's sentiment, and the principle of popular sovereignty be maintained.

Does anyone expect the foundation of a great building to be fast, or criticize an anchor because it is slow? Those are far more apt comparisons for Congress than anything in the mind of the present crop of critics.

Congress isn't a jeep.

Republican Congress Delivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the address made by Majority Leader HALLECK before a meeting of the Republican National Committee held in Kansas City, Mo., on Monday, April 21.

This address by the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK should be read by all interested citizens of this Nation. Congressman HALLECK very ably and successfully points out the record being made by the Republican Party in the House. He states very pointedly our party purposes, objectives, and accomplishments, so there no longer should be any doubt in the minds of well-informed citizens that party principles and goals as promised in the November elections of 1946 are rapidly becoming realities and are becoming realities because they are right and in the best interest of our Nation.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESS DELIVERS

I am in Kansas City attending a meeting of the Republican National Committee. I bring you people of the radio audience their greetings and the greetings of the Republican Congress, which is moving full speed ahead to accomplish the things you want done in Washington.

Before last November's elections, you will recall, the Republicans in Congress joined in summarizing the issue as follows:

"Today's major domestic issue is between radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, class exploitation, deficit spending, and machine politics, as against our belief in American freedom for the individual under just laws fairly administered for all, preservation of local home rule, efficiency and pay-as-you-go economy in Government, and the protection of the American way of life against either Fascist or Communist trends.

"We believe that genuine social and economic progress can be achieved only on these American constitutional principles and it is our purpose to give our citizens this clear-cut choice."

We knew then that the things we promised the American people were right. The people said these pledges were right when they voted the Republican Party into control of Congress. And we are going to enact these pledges into law if the President does not get too handy with the veto.

The people gave the Republican Party a go-ahead signal to stop reckless spending of the people's money, to abolish needless, tax-eating bureaus, to lighten the back-breaking tax burden, to pass a bill of rights establishing labor-management peace, and to toss Communists and their New Deal fellow-travelers out of the Truman administration.

It took the President a long time to recognize years of warning by the Republican Party that the executive branch of the Government was infested by Communists.

However, the Republican Party welcomes Mr. Truman's late, very late conversion. We hope that his long-overdue action will match his words, and not give the termites new hope to hamstring our Government by saying communism is a mere bug-a-boo. That is what he said in a letter to former Governor Earle of Pennsylvania, dated as recently as February 28.

Overwhelming defeat in the last election never changed the policies of the New Dealers. From the President down they are fighting the Republican program, as vigorously as ever.

They do not want real economy in Government, industrial peace and tax reduction. They do not seem to realize that the people have said in landslide proportions they have had enough of the New Dealers' game of tax, spend, and elect.

Now, I am going to tell you some of the things the Republican Congress, in 14 short weeks, has done to correct 14 long years of bungling by Democratic administrations.

1. The House has passed and sent to the Senate a bill to reduce personal income taxes—the first genuine tax reduction in 16 years.

2. The House has overwhelmingly passed a bill to establish and maintain industrial peace in behalf of the public, the rank and file of workers and employers. The Senate soon will pass on this measure. Then the President will have an opportunity to sign this bill and take a stand for industrial peace.

3. The Senate and the House have passed a bill to prevent ruin of American industry by the portal-to-portal suits racket. These suits threatened to take $6,000,000,000 from industry and put many firms out of business. Again, when this bill reaches the President's desk in a few days, he will have a chance to take his stand with a Republican Congress to save industries and jobs.

4. Congress submitted to the States a constitutional amendment to limit to two terms the tenure of any man holding the office of President of the United States.

5. Congress insisted upon termination of many wartime powers of the administration to control the economic life of the Nation.

6. Congress has passed legislation to provide a more liberal allotment of sugar for the American people.

7. The House already has passed four departmental appropriation bills lopping off hundreds of millions of dollars in expenditures. Soon they will be on Mr. Truman's desk and he will have his opportunity to cooperate in giving the people the economy they demand.

8. The new Congress has completely reorganized and streamlined the legislative branch of the Government.

9. Both branches of Congress are considering legislation to give aid to Greece and Turkey.

So, you see, the Republican Congress delivers. In looking at the record of 14 weeks, it should be remembered that under the Constitution all revenue measures must originate in the House. It also has been the long-established procedure to have appropriation bills originate in the House.

As majority leader of the House, I report to you that our Republican Congressmen have been working harmoniously and getting good results. The Senate, you know, is much more closely divided between Republicans and Democrats than is the House. Nevertheless, the Republican leadership in the Senate is making good progress, too, considering time required to act on such matters as Presidential nominations and on foreign relations, that are solely the Senate's function.

I am happy to report that in both branches of Congress support has been given to the people's program by some Democrats. The Republican Party welcomes this cooperation for good government. But New Deal Democrats, taking their cue from the White House, have balked all the way.

President Truman's often-repeated statement that he is against lightening the people's tax burden now, and his rigid opposition to any substantial reduction in his budget estimates, have been signals for New Deal Democrats in Congress, administration and pressure groups, to fight the will of the people every step of the way.

Mr. Truman, in his address at the Democratic Party's Jefferson Day banquet, said that he would favor tax relief at what he termed "the proper time." Presumably, since he was addressing a partisan political gathering, he believes the proper time to cut taxes is just before the 1948 elections. He wants to take credit for tax reduction.

You will recall that Mr. Truman, in a message to Congress last January, made the amazing statement that currently high taxes were necessary for the security of the Nation.

The Republican Congress does not go along with that kind of thinking. It is not what the people want.

The people want substantial reduction in Government expenditures without impairing the armed services and other necessary activities—and they want it done now.

They want tax-eating bureaucracy lopped off—and they want it done now.

They want Government personnel reduced—and they want it done now.

They want tax relief—and they want it now.

The Federal Government's annual budget was only $4,500,000,000 when the Democrats, with their tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect program took over the Government.

They increased it to an average before the war of $10,000,000,000. The President last January, when we were again at peace, submitted to Congress a budget calling for expenditures of $37,500,000,000 during the fiscal year beginning July 1.

Your Congress is ignoring his opposition to reduction in his padded budget, just as it is rejecting his protest that now is not the time to cut taxes. We are reversing the trend of almost annual increases in taxes to finance star-gazing bureaus hatched by New Dealers.

Under Republican leadership the House tax-cutting bill was passed. Of the tax reduction provided, 61 percent goes to persons receiving net incomes of $5,000 or less, and of this amount almost 71 percent goes to individuals with income under $3,000. Thus, the largest percentage of reduction goes to the little fellow. It is a fair bill.

The bill for industrial peace passed by the House is now before the Senate. That bill will bring order and sense out of disorder and nonsense in labor-management relations.

It will give to the American worker the freedom that the Wagner Act promised, but took away instead. It, too, is a fair bill. It is based upon the sound premise that the public interest is paramount.

It recognizes the inescapable truth that, to raise our standard of living, and to improve the lot of all our people, we must all work together for output of goods in tremendous amounts so that all our people can buy them at reasonable prices.

The Wagner Act purported to reduce industrial strife. But there were three times as many strikes in the first 10 years under the act as in the 10 years before the act, and in the disastrous year of 1946, there were more strikes than ever before. The bill corrects defects in the act that brought this about.

The bill forbids monopolistic practices in relations between employers and unions that limit competition, restrain trade, hold the wages of all workers in an industry down to the level of those paid by employers who can afford to pay the least, and result in calamitous strikes that prostrate our economy and imperil the health and welfare of our people.

The bill has been called, and rightly called, the worker's bill of rights. It gives him a voice in the affairs of any union that is his collective bargaining agent, guarantees to him fair and honest elections in his union, protects him against excessive dues, fines, and assessments, frees him of fear of losing his job because of his opinions.

It protects also his lawful right to strike and it protects him against strikes that his leaders call without his consent or that deprive him of his work because of disputes to which he is not a party.

A small but noisy minority would have you believe that in order to exist unions must be free to engage in extortion, coercion, violence, and other lawlessness, and must be free to abuse employers, workers, and the public.

We deny this. And we predict that with enactment of the comprehensive, fair measure now taking shape in Congress the labor movement will take healthy root and enjoy healthy growth. Sound American reasoning will be given a chance to supplant the present chaos in labor-management relations.

Yes; the Republican Congress delivers. The parade of bills from Capital Hill to the White House, keeping the Republican Party's pledges, has begun.

The President will have his opportunity to do the right thing as these measures reach his desk. After all, the welfare of the entire Nation is at stake.

Our task in Congress is to go forward—to reclaim and redeem and restore in all its promise and all its power and all its moral glory and spiritual strength the great American heritage of freedom and order, to redeem them from the profane hands of reckless and spendthrift bureaucrats.

And that we shall do.

Refuge Denied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald of March 28, 1947, entitled "Refuge Denied" that presents in powerful and convincing manner a challenge to the Congress to enact legislation in response to the call of humanity set forth in the editorial:

REFUGE DENIED

We Americans have accused the Nazis of some of the greatest crimes in history. Yet with thousands of the victims waiting for a decent, human measure of assistance, we have turned our eyes away. Shall we be quite guiltless in the recording of history?

There are some 850,000 persons in Europe without a country and without any present hope of acquiring one. They are the nonrepatriable displaced persons, living in camps, mostly Poles, Balts, and Yugoslavs, for whom a return to their native land means death or slavery. Some 20 percent are Jews for whom Palestine is barred.

Our immigration quota laws exclude all but a negligible few. Can we sit comfortably down behind those laws and say that we owe no human thought for these unfortunates? Is our membership in the International Refugees Organization to be our only aid, while we piously hope that other countries will show the practical charity we do not?

There is danger of it. For there exists in Congress a terrific fear of immigration which is as senseless as it is heartless.

What is the basis of that fear?

That the admission of a few hundred thousand DP's would increase unemployment? But immigration does not have that effect. Those who come are consumers as well as workers. They bring skills we need, open new enterprises that employ more, relieve labor shortages that slow our economy.

That the racial traits are not those we want, as indicated by the quota preference for western Europeans? But this is rank hypocrisy from we who denounced Aryanism. If this melting pot cannot absorb these people as a small fraction of 1 percent of our population, then we are no better than Nazis.

That we have been admitting too many immigrants? Not at all, for year after year, we have fallen well below the 153,879 admissible annually under the present law. To let in 100,000 a year for 4 years without nationality quota would not begin to make up our deficiency.

That Americans cannot tolerate strangers? Surely this is absurd. Boston could certainly welcome 540 newcomers a year for 4 years, which would be our proportionate share in a 100,000 annual influx.

Yet the bill to admit those 100,000 will go under unless we, the people, disabuse Congress of its anxieties.

What can we do? We can let our delegations in Congress know that we have grown out of any old xenophobia, that we recognize America's responsibility, that we do not wish to expunge those lines on the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me!
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Erie (Pa.) Dispatch-Herald of April 13, 1947:

PROMISED TAX CUT—AN OLD DEVICE

No one—certainly no one of our acquaintance—would object to a reduction of his taxes. A promised cut in taxes is one of the oldest vote-getting devices in history. Only a few months ago the Republicans used it, and it undoubtedly contributed heavily to their success at the hustings.

Politicians were promising tax cuts the first year after the founding of the Republic. They were promising them when Lincoln ran for the Presidency, again when Roosevelt I ran, and still again when Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt II were candidates.

In spite of all these promises, taxes generally are higher now than ever before, representing a steady upward trend through the decades. The truth of the matter is that no politician and no party can guarantee to reduce taxes and the promise is largely an empty bit of hokum.

At the moment, the Republicans are trying desperately to reduce taxes in spite of the greatest national debt in history and the necessity for more huge outlays of Government money in the near future. Citizens are demanding more and more Government service, and more and more from their political subdivisions. The need for preparing this country against armed aggression grows more desperate daily. The veterans want and deserve more financial assistance. Private business has fouled up the housing problem and Government help seems inevitable.

President Truman has cautioned against weakening the Nation's purse. Bernard Baruch pleads that we take stock of our national monetary needs, present and future. Yet the people clamor for tax cuts and the Republicans try valiantly to please them for reasons that seem valid to the politicians of the party.

Tax cuts are nice, on the rare occasions when they come, but less taxes mean less of something else—including national security.

Amendments to Charter of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a copy of resolutions recently adopted by both branches of the General Court of Massachusetts:

Resolutions providing for requests for amendments to the Charter of the United Nations resulting in a limited world federal government

Whereas modern science has now produced means by which mankind can destroy itself; and

Whereas disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order, world law, and some measure of world government; and

Whereas the United Nations is an organization in being and its Charter is capable of amendment so as to make it an effective instrument for the maintenance of world order; and

Whereas the people in 255 cities and towns of the Commonwealth, by a vote of 586,093 to 63,624 favored strengthening the United Nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to direct our delegates to the United Nations to propose or support amendments to its Charter which will strengthen the United Nations and make it a limited world federal government able to prevent war; and be it further

Resolved, That in the preparation of such amendments our delegates should advocate:

1. Delegation to the United Nations of limited but adequate legislative, executive, and judicial powers:

(a) To maintain such world inspection police and military forces as are necessary to enforce world law and to provide world security;

(b) Gradually and progressively to eliminate national armaments (other than those necessary for internal policing); and

(c) To provide for dependable revenue.

2. Balanced representation of each nation in the general assembly upon a just formula which will recognize influence in the world, natural and industrial resources, literacy, population, and other relevant factors; each representative to vote as an individual.

3. Adoption of a bill of rights assuring fair trial and other adequate protection of persons affected by the charter and laws enacted thereunder.

4. Reservation to the member nations and their peoples of all powers not expressly delegated to the United Nations, in order to guarantee to each nation its right to maintain its own domestic, political, economic, social, and religious institutions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to urge the calling of a general conference under article 109 of the United Nations Charter to review the Charter and to recommend appropriate amendments thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution shall not be construed to advocate unilateral disarmament by the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the delegates of the United States to the United Nations.

In house of representatives, adopted March 26, 1947.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 31, 1947.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

FREDERIC W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

King Christian X of Denmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from the Washington Evening Star is a splendid tribute to a man who was held in high esteem by his people. Christian X exemplifies what is best in royalty. As the Evening Star states, "Now that King Christian's life has closed, his services will have formal recognition everywhere." The editorial follows:

The Scandinavians almost invariably have been fortunate in their citizen-sovereigns. Pernaps it is the heroic tradition of the ancient past that prompts them to carry their burdens with quiet distinction. Or it may be simply the inherited gentility of the family to which they belong that commonly endows them with lofty ideals, distinguished bearing and, most notably, chivalrous manners toward all conditions of people. Be the explanation what it may, the line of Northern princes ha· deserved the high place in modern history which it occupies.

King Christian X was the sovereign of Denmark during a whole generation. Relatively few of his subjects can remember any other monarch. The annals of his reign ran the full gamut of administrative experience. He knew great successes and more than his share of sorrowful disappointments. The government he headed managed to avoid entanglements in the First World War, but failed to escape involvement in the Second. From April 9, 1940, until May 4, 1945, his entire realm was held by German troops under a Nazi dictator, Gen. Hermann von Hannecken. The royal family in effect were prisoners during that bitter half decade. But they never compromised their honor.

On the contrary, the late King set an example for other Leads of states who may be caught in similar dilemmas in aftertimes. When the Danes were pressed to adopt the infamous Nuremberg laws Christian led them in a determined resistance to the demand. Not even the slaughter of several thousand men, women and children by German troops firing indiscriminately in public thoroughfares altered their refusal to collaborate. Denmark was overrun by Hitler's forces, but never conquered by them. In spirit the country and its constitutional ruler were allies of the democratic nations from start to finish of the long struggle.

Now that King Christian's life has closed, his services will have formal recognition everywhere. Particularly in America will he be remembered with appreciation. He was a good neighbor in the most inclusive meaning of the term. His successor, who will take the title Frederick IX, is no stranger on this side of the Atlantic. For him and his wife, the new Queen, every blessing is bespoken.

Preferential-Employment Rights of Veterans Under Bonneville Power Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 23, 1947.*

Hon. JOHN RANKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Oregon Department of the American Legion understands that the proposed item for the Boneville Power Administration in the Interior Department appropriation bill, as reported by the House Appropriation Committee contains a proviso that no part of the appropriation shall be available for work performed on a force account basis. Such a proviso would constitute gross discrimination against veterans. It would deprive at least 166 employees of their preferential rights to employment as veterans. (This is over 64 percent of total employment in the construction section.) Under the GI bill of rights, and other statutes and regulations, veterans have preferential rights to employment by the Federal Government. They do not have preferential rights in competing with nonveterans in the general labor market.

Furthermore, these veterans are skilled technicians, trained for construction, operation, and maintenance of the highly specialized electrical power system of the Bonneville Administration, and it would be entirely unfeasible for private contractors to perform much of the work done by these veterans who are used interchangeably on operations and construction under an economical agreement with organized labor. There are large numbers of unemployed veterans in the Pacific Northwest. For example, a recent survey shows 7,500 unemployed veterans in Multnomah County alone and 18,000 in the State of Oregon. There are probably twice as many in the State of Washington. Deprivation of the preferential employment rights held by veterans now working for Bonneville would undoubtedly result in increasing unemployment of veterans in this area.

This provision appears to have been inserted to protect private contractors at the expense of veterans and career employees in the Federal service. The House subcommittee could recommend such a proviso only on the basis of lack of knowledge of large power-system operations, or as discrimination against veteran employees of the Government We strongly urge that you lead the fight to have the proviso removed from the bill.

FRED A. LOTHROP,
Department Commander of Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, a similar telegram was also sent to me by Earl C. Mean, commander, and Fred B. Corn, adjutant, Department of Oregon, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

General Cable Corp. Agrees With President Truman and Does Something About Cutting Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this morning every Member of the House received an unusual and encouraging telegram from Mr. Dwight R. G. Palmer, president, General Cable Corp., New York, N. Y.

Mr. Palmer advises the House that this great corporation, although having recently granted liberal wage increases and other related workers' benefits, now proposes to make substantial reductions in the sales price of its commodities.

The General Cable Corp. is to be congratulated upon taking the lead in heavy industry in the program of bringing prices within reason before it is too late. This action and other related price-reducing steps that have been taken in the last 2 weeks are concrete evidence that the American people are accepting the moral leadership of President Harry Truman in his drive to reduce the cost of living.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the telegram received from the General Cable Corp.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 22, 1947.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Our economy is being challenged on every front while the widely heralded business recession continues its enlistment of recruits from the upwards spiraling of costs and sales prices, each of which vies with the other for top honors.

Such conditions cannot long endure, the law of gravity still prevails.

Far better that all parties at interest try out their landing gear now, making a couple of trial landings while they can afford to, which conceivably may forestall a crash landing later.

As we review our situation we find that the earnings of our own people compare favorably with those of the highest pay industries. Also the wage bracket of General Cable is among the highest if not the highest in the electrical wire and cable industry.

Our people enjoy other substantial benefits, such as payment for holidays not worked, a liberal vacation plan, etc. These are the conditions under which our plants have been operating for some days the management at several of our major plants has been engaged in wage negotiations with the unions representing our people. As the result of such negotiations which were concluded this past week, we increased all these hourly paid workers 11½ cents per hour effective April 13. This new wage level is to be maintained for 1 year. All other terms and conditions of our union agreements remain unchanged and continue for the same period.

Notwithstanding such increases and notwithstanding the fact that our backlog of orders is at record high levels, we feel that it is our job to take the lead in our industry to meet the challenge that has been laid down. We do so confident that all of our people, hourly as well as salaried, will resolutely face their responsibility and provide increased efficiency and greater production.

Accordingly, as of April 23 we will effect the following average price reductions which will be applicable to all shipments made on and after that date, including shipments made account of orders and contracts now on our books:

Building wires and cables for home building, industrial building, and other uses—6 percent.

Weatherproof copper wires for utility and farm lighting use—10 percent.

Bare copper wires and cables for all purposes—7 percent.

Magnet wires for motors, radios, transformers, automotive, and appliance uses—12 percent.

This over-all price reduction of the products listed will beneficially affect the cost of home building, electrical appliances, automobiles, farm lighting, and as a matter of fact all activities where electrical wire and cable are used. To complete the picture we are canceling our escalator clause, thereby stabilizing our prices except for fluctuations in the price of copper and lead.

DWIGHT R. G. PALMER,
President, General Cable Corp.

Interstate Transmission of Alcoholic Beverage Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a petition signed by 60 qualified voters in Gering, Nebr., relative to S. 265, a bill to prevent interstate transmission for advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio. I am sending a copy of this petition to the proper committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives. The petition follows:

PETITION

To the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress—in particular to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the signers of this petition:

We, the undersigned qualified voters, respectfully request that you give favorable consideration and support to S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; and that you support any other bills of similar character, if such support will best serve to secure quick relief from the offensive and injurious promotion of the beverage alcohol custom and traffic. The social and economic evils arising from the present widespread use of alcoholic beverages should certainly not be increased by the systematic promotion of their use. We believe that many millions of people are profoundly concerned because of existing conditions and almost daily offended because of the invasion of their homes by liquor sales promotion.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of April 23, 1947, quoting remarks by Secretary of War Patterson from an article in the Saturday Evening Post in respect to universal military training:

WEAKNESS MAY MEAN EXTINCTION, PATTERSON WARNS

NEW YORK, April 22.—Secretary of War Patterson said today that if the United States becomes weak militarily it is in danger of enslavement or national extinction within the lifetime of most Americans now living.

In a signed article in the Saturday Evening Post, Patterson warned that the United States monopoly of the atom bomb is only temporary and urged universal military training as the only kind of "survival insurance."

DRIFT HAS BEGUN

"If the United States again drifts back—and the drift has begun—to a policy of military weakness, then we are in danger of enslavement or extinction as a Nation within the lifetime of most Americans now living," he said.

Patterson scorned the push-button war as a "vision of the cocktail-party scientist" and advocated a four-point program based on universal military training as a matter of "overriding national necessity." He said this country must have:

1. "An intelligence service which will keep us informed of hostile moves anywhere in the world—military, economic, political, or scientific—and which will assist us in keeping abreast of new developments in warfare."

URGES SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

2. "An intensive program of scientific research and development designed to insure for us continued leadership in the perfection of new weapons and defensive devices."

3. "An industrial mobilization under which we shall have at all times an initial supply of the most modern instruments of war and widely dispersed plants ready at a moment's notice to produce additional planes and weapons of the newest design."

4. "And, basic to all others, we must have the trained military manpower to use the weapons developed by our scientists and produced by our factories."

Patterson declared that universal military training was less expensive than maintaining a large standing Army, even though it would add more than $1,000,000,000—or perhaps as much as 4 percent—to the national budget.

Trade War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 16, 1947:

TRADE WAR

The second meeting of the preparatory committee charged with completing a draft of a charter for the International Trade Organization has begun its work in Geneva. Concurrently representatives of the United States will carry on negotiations with 17 nations for reduction of trade barriers under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act. This may seem, and it is, an ambitious program. But it is a good thing that the work of preparation for a long-range program designed to pare down trade barriers and restore multilateral trade under the aegis of an international organization is being carried on at the same place and time as the conferences looking toward actual reductions of trade barriers by agreement. For the task confronting the proposed ITO is such a formidable one that its sponsors need the support afforded by positive achievements.

Tariff reductions are only one, and by no means the most important, of the reforms essential to free world trade from hampering restrictions. Exchange controls, quotas, and other restrictive devices in monetary and economic relations constitute even more formidable obstacles to free interchange of goods. The world has become a maze of impediments and obstructions far worse than in prewar days. Attainment of some order and stability will necessitate substantial modifications of internal legislative programs that directly or indirectly interfere with conditions by the terms of which goods are exported or imported. And that is true for the United States as well as other countries. Then, too, many restrictions, such as import quotas, cannot be dispensed with by countries having to conserve their foreign exchange funds for a long time to come. The ITO will, therefore, be compelled to subordinate principle to expediency in developing its program of action.

It is the organization of this new world agency that is at present of main importance. The ITO would be a sort of economic United Nations, a body which would lay down rules of international behavior in the buying and selling of goods across national frontiers, a tribunal before which complaints of nonobservance could be brought. With its goal well defined, it can be of immense service by affording trading nations an opportunity to consult with one another, become acquainted with one another's problems, and receive the kind of advice and assistance necessary to speed them on their way toward final emancipation from the discriminations which are strangling world trade. That bondage can only be broken first by a truce and then by cooperation among nations in place of the economic war that is now raging—the same kind of war which Hjalmar Schacht waged for Germany before the outbreak of physical hostilities.

Aid for Countries Devastated by War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following minority views on House Joint Resolution 153:

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. JONKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, submitted the following minority views to accompany House Joint Resolution 153:

The undersigned find themselves in disagreement with the majority with respect to the bill that has been reported out. We find that this bill goes much further in the amount sought to be authorized and the scope of the relief program, as to countries included, and the manner and duration of relief, than is warranted by the actual circumstances. Moreover, the matter of raising the money, outside of the three hundred and fifty million sought from the United States taxpayers, seems to have been given little if any thought.

The original bill stated in its preamble, among other things, that—

"Whereas, for humanitarian reasons, and in order to promote healthy ecomonic conditions abroad which are essential to the security and economic well-being of the United States and of the world, the Government of the United States desires to assist in the furnishing of such relief: Therefore, and so forth.

This is an administration bill. The loose thinking under which it has been brought to the Congress could well support the presumption that the State Department felt that for any Member of Congress to oppose this legislation would mean that he was wanting in humanitarian instincts, and against the security and economic well-being of the United States, and therefore there would be no opposition.

However, such a premise is misleading. The American people have every sympathy for the seriously undernourished men, women, and especially children in other lands and wish to help feed them in accordance with our means. Members of Congress, as Americans, have the same feelings and objectives. But as representatives of the people, they are bound by the time-honored maxim that "they must be just before they are generous with the taxpayers' money."

Before considering foreign grants by our Government for the relief of any and all nations of the world who may be in destitute circumstances, we should consider—

(1) What resources and substance have we at our disposal?

(2) What do we need to maintain and support our own way of life?

(3) What is sought of us abroad, and how long will the need continue?

(4) What good purpose will be served by any program we may initiate?

We have to consider our national debt of two hundred and sixty billion; our over-all National, State, and local tax burden amounting to 35 percent of our national income; whether that national income, at present amounting to one hundred and seventy billion, is temporary or permanent. We have to consider the drain on our production machine (already the State Department admits that we are short two-fifths of the grain cereals in this program and they will have to come from the next fall crop). We must bear in mind that these exports are destroying our economy like a two-edged sword by their cost in taxes and inflation from the resulting scarcity.

In the proposed prodigal program to reach occupied, liberated, and even neutral nations, we will be dissipating our strength and service without having reached the children, the men, and women who really need help, and whom we could reach by a judicious, well-considered application of the limited means at our disposal. If we are to relieve the peoples of foreign nations, it must be done on the limited scale of seeking to meet only the most desperate and necessary needs, and only in those countries where these needs exist.

It seems that the administration has paid very scant attention to these considerations.

In the first place, we know that this bill grows out of the recommendation of the General Assembly of the United Nations, made last December. However, it made a proposal of residual relief for a term of 6 months following the termination of UNRRA on March 31 Herbert Hoover also recommends a 6 months' term, to end with the fall harvest. The budget contains a provision for $100,000,000 for 1947 and $250,000,000 for 1948. In his message to Congress recommending this appropriation, the President stated relief: "The authorization recommended is designed for the urgent relief needs for the balance of the year." But apparently to justify the expenditure of the whole amount, the State Department doubles the term of relief.

The Under Secretary states, on page 3 of the hearings, in accord with the President's message, with Hoover, and the United Nations, that the need is "particularly acute during the spring and early summer months" and that there is every reason for anticipating that these countries will not need further free relief after 1947. Then in the bill the State Department asks for sufficient relief to operate until June 30, 1948. When the Department finds that our stock of grain cereals is only sufficient for three-fifths of their requirements, they blandly propose that the other two-fifths be supplied from our crops next fall (p. 97).

In the second place, the State Department asks for blank checks up to the amount of $350,000,000 to be used in any country they see fit. It is true, they say that at the present time they have in mind six countries; Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and possibly China. But that is only their present intention, and they reserve the right to make changes and additions if, in their judgment, the money should be devoted to other areas.

Not only that, but they wish to keep secret the break-down of this $350,000,000 and the figures they have used as the needs of each country. In other words, they are asking the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to stultify themselves and come to Congress and the people, advocating the grant of $350,000,000, without giving the basis of their calculations. This ostensibly is none of the business of the Congress or the people.

It is true they use as an excuse the pretext that, once the allocation for each country is given, that country will consider that allocation as our debt to them, and a cut would cause dissension. We are not impressed by this argument for keeping Congress and the people in the dark. How can the State Department assure enforcement of the stern conditions precedent proposed in the bill for the giving and continuation of relief when they show the aforesaid weakness?

The State Department proposes to lay down such conditions for the distribution of this relief without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; that where such assurances are not given, they positively will not go in and give relief; that in such cases the allocated amount will be used in other countries. We are not satisfied that such conditions will be accepted, for instance, in Poland or Hungary, which are absolutely dominated by the Communists; and in such event we do not approve of spending it in other countries with prodigality. But even if such conditions were accepted in those countries, does anyone believe relief would go to deserving Polish patriots as freely as to the members of the Communist Party line? Past experiences all show the contrary.

We are just as desirous of aiding those really in need in these countries as any other

person; but, if those people cannot be reached, is it wise to give such supplies to the governments of such countries where they will be used to bolster up the Communist movement?

There are other considerations which fall almost within the same category. For instance, on page 75 of the hearings, it is admitted by the State Department that by this relief to Hungary we will be paying Hungary's reparations bill of twenty-three millions a year to Russia; that if Hungary had no reparations to pay, the relief would not be needed.

Then, in Greece, of course, there will be duplication in that another economic mission will be set up there under the so-called bill for $400,000,000 relief to Turkey and Greece, with which Paul Porter has already admitted the undertaking to Greece provided for in this bill should be merged.

It is even questionable what provision this bill makes for feeding undernourished children in the countries designated. Certainly they should be our first care and consideration. A reading of page 41 of the hearings speaks of a future contribution for that purpose. Certainly, such supplementals as cod-liver oil and milk for children are in as much immediate need as anything for anybody.

While the Greece and Turkey aid bill is primarily concerned with reconstruction and military aid, the bill presently under consideration also transcends the bounds of strict relief and goes into rehabilitation and reconstruction, as indicated on page 4 of the hearings and in the bill itself, reciting processed and unprocessed materials for clothing and fuel, while the so-called secret documents seem to go even further that that.

The State Department, while assuming that other nations will contribute as in UNRRA, has no assurance that they will join us in this undertaking.

The over-all cost of this relief undertaking has been set at $610,000,000, of which the State Department proposes that we pay 57 percent, or $350,000,000, with the other 43 percent, or $260,000,000, to be borne by other countries. However, this seems to have had only scant consideration. On page 81 of the hearings, the State Department says:

"This figure of $350,000,000 was in some respects a figure based on judgment and in part picked out of the air."

With reference to the willingness of other nations to contribute, according to the hearings on page 10, the only definite assurance they had was with reference to Great Britain's contribution in Austria, which they claimed had already received $40,000,000 from Britain. They emphasize this time and again (pp. 3, 10, 11, 88, and 90), although on page 88 it is clear they are pessimistic about further aid from Britain. As this seemed rather anomalous that Britain would be pulling out of Greece and yet be distributing relief in Austria, inquiry at the proper source elicited the information that this $40,000,000 was a sterling loan to Austria and not a grant. The State Department later qualified its statement and admitted that it was partly a grant and partly a loan, and there the matter stands with reference to Britain.

The only other nation consulted, as far as the record shows, was Canada. After several discussions, they got no further than that the Canadian Government was sympathetic and thinking about it.

Australia last year suffered severely from drought and probably will be unable to assist. Yet if other countries contribute in the same ratio as they did in UNRRA, these three countries, United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, will have to contribute two hundred and fifteen millions of the two hundred and sixty millions expected from the other nations of the world under this program.

In other words, the $260,000,000 to be contributed by other countries has by no means been assured to the State Department; nor do they seem to have considered whether, if any countries should contribute, these would have to set up their own relief agencies or whether the United States in this venture would become a fiscal agent of foreign countries.

Finally, the State Department has not made any on-the-spot check of the needs in these countries. It does not know whether there is scarcity in Warsaw or Athens; and if so, which of the two has the greatest scarcity. Its analysis of needs might be very misleading To arrive at a country's needs it strikes a balance of the excess of estimated imports over exports and assumes that the resulting shortage is the exchange needed to buy necessaries of life and to prevent economic retrogression. In other words, if, as was reported from Greece on March 29, she squandered her foreign exchange by "importing 19 tons of colored combs of all sizes, huge quantities of toy balloons, nylon, and lipsticks of all shades, and other fantastic types of commodities," this would raise her imports much in excess of exports; and according to State Department diagnosis, she would need that much more exchange to purchase the necessaries of life. In other words, there may be no relation of this unfavorable trade balance to the food supply. It is similar to a squandering family which may produce or earn (export in goods or services) $100 a week and spend (import) $125. It is certainly running into trouble and will need credits or loans, but that does not necessarily mean that the children are not being fed, although, of course, such may be the case.

The same uncertainty lies in their proposed machinery for the distribution of relief. The relief goods will be turned over to the controlling governments for distribution. This is the same hurdle that caused such a miserable flop in UNRRA. But the State Department says, on page 33 of the hearings, "if you did it effectively (direct distribution with American personnel) it would take all this money to pay for the personnel to look after it."

The question may well be asked: How much of the money will it take to make an effective check on ruling governments' distribution?

We propose to offer amendments which will reduce the authorization in this bill to $200,000,000 and provide that no transfers of supplies or establishment of credits may be made thereunder after December 31, 1947.

This will more nearly meet all the considerations which a judicious approach would recommend and which is adequate to accomplish the desired result if distribution is made with reasonable diligence.

ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD.
BARTEL J. JONKMAN.
LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

Jefferson Day Address by Senator Hoey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a brief summary of a speech which I made at the Jefferson Day dinner at Raleigh, N. C., on Saturday night, April 19, 1947, as it appears in a news report in the Raleigh News and Observer of Sunday, April 20.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Predicting that President Truman would be reelected in 1948, Senator CLYDE R. HOEY asserted here last night that the President "did more by himself in the month after the election than the whole Republican Congress has been able to accomplish during their entire tenure of office."

HOEY's assertion was received enthusiastically by a throng of 550 Democrats attending the party's annual Jefferson Day dinner at the Sir Walter. The diners, exuding confidence that the Democrats not only would name the President next year but also would regain control of the Congress, happily agreed with HOEY when he declared that the majority of the American people have "had enough" of the Republicans and are ready to shift back to the Democrats.

MANY LEADERS PRESENT

It was a typical party dinner, attended by municipal, county, State, and National party leaders. National Committeeman Wilkins P. Horton, of Pittsboro, who was chairman of arrangements for the dinner, presided as toastmaster; Governor Cherry presented Senator WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD, of Durham, and UMSTEAD, in turn, presented HOEY for the principal speech.

Senator HOEY said:

"The Democratic Party has a great heritage of public service. Thomas Jefferson, the founder and patron saint of the Democratic Party, and Andrew Jackson, its militant knight errant, gave to this great party and to the Nation the broad concept of service to the whole people as the dynamic political philosophy to be translated into practical governmental action.

PARTY FOUNDER

"Thomas Jefferson was the author of the American Declaration of Independence and the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom. He was the moving spirit in amending the Constitution of the United States to include the Bill of Rights, and he founded the Democratic Party in 1801. His philosophy of government was expressed in a memorable letter in 1810 in which he said: 'The freedom and happiness of man are the sole objects of all legitimate government.' And he stated the obligation of the citizen in this language: 'A debt of service is due from every man to his country proportioned to the bounties which nature and fortune have measured to him.'

"For 146 years the Democratic Party has served the Nation. Until our country was divided by civil strife, the party had a long and illustrious career of service in power. Following the War Between the States, it has continued to guide the Nation along democratic lines to the achievement of democratic goals, whether in or out of power. It has been able to survive defeats. It has led even when it failed to triumph at the polls. After the war our first victory upon which we were permitted to realize came with the election of the great American Grover Cleveland, in 1884, followed by his defeat in 1888 and his triumphant reelection in 1892. The Democratic Party gave to the Nation and the world Woodrow Wilson as President in 1912 and again in 1916, whose record of service translated into law the progressive measures for which the party and its leaders had battled unsuccessfully for the 16 preceding years. These great measures still remain upon the statute books, and they have made possible the unparalleled growth, expansion, development, and prosperity of this country.

"After 12 years of Republican rule the people overwhelmingly elected Franklin D. Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress in 1932, and successively reelected this matchless statesman and world leader for a total of four consecutive terms. Death removed him

from the scene of action and service on April 12, 1945, mourned and loved by the whole civilized world. His successor was Harry S. Truman, who was elected Vice President in 1944 and who came to the kingdom at the most critical hour in world history. Faced with greater domestic and international problems than any previous Vice President in all of our national history, Harry Truman is measuring up to the full stature of greatness, and I predict that the people of America will give him an overwhelming vote of confidence when they reelect him President in 1948.

"Some people who did not know him well questioned whether he was a big enough man for President. No one now questions his ability, his courage, or his fitness. He is the only man living or dead who has ever brought John L. Lewis to his knees and successfully asserted and maintained the sovereignty of the United States Government and its supremacy over this autocratic labor dictator.

"The legislation enacted during the Roosevelt administration and the policies put into effect under his leadership have saved this country from financial disaster and large-scale bankruptcy and possible revolution. The standard of living in every part of America has been raised for all the people. Better wages, shorter workdays, more leisure for recreation and pleasure, improved educational and health opportunities, and more general prosperity have resulted.

PARTY PRINCIPLES

"More people have more money throughout the United States than at any other time in all history. The Democrats believe in prosperity for all the people. The Republican philosophy is that if you have prosperity at the top that it will trickle down to the masses below. The Democrats believe in starting at the base and let it grow up through every group in our whole economy.

"More people have employment at profitable wages, the farmer is getting a better price for all of his products, industry is being profitably operated on full scale with increasing demand for all manufactured products, the banks are overflowing with money, and there hasn't been a bank failure in the United States in 3 years, although there were 5,302 bank failures in the 4 years of Hoover's Republican administration. No wonder the Republicans are not repealing legislation passed by the Democratic Congress during the past 14 years.

"Playing upon the dissatisfaction of the American people last fall with various restrictions, regulations, and controls which had not been removed as rapidly as the people thought should have been done, the Republicans won the election and obtained a majority in each body of Congress. Their campaign shibboleth took the form of a question, which was 'Had enough?' They have been in power a little over 3 months and Dr. Gallup surveyed the public opinion of the Nation, and a majority of the American people, reviewing the record of the Republican Party, responded that they already 'had enough' of the Republicans and were ready to change back to the Democrats. President Truman did more by himself in the month after the election than the whole Republican Congress has been able to accomplish during their entire tenure of office.

"The whole philosophy of the Democratic and Republican Parties is different. The Democrats believe in legislating and administering government from the human level—the Republicans from the dollar level. Our past experience has demonstrated that the more humanity we put into government the better economy we will have. The genius of our free institutions and our free enterprise must rest upon equality of opportunity for all the people, with full protection of the law for the small and the great, the rich and the poor, the worker and the employer—and the public.

SUSTAINS TRADITION

"The foreign policy of our Government represents the high thinking of America's best minds and most devoted patriots. It sustains the great tradition of our concepts of freedom and justice for little peoples and small nations and our own inherent purpose to maintain freedom, liberty, and justice for the people of our own country, and to protect and make secure our way of life. By following this policy we are the more surely traveling the road to world peace.

"I pause to pay tribute to the Republicans in the Congress who are patriotically supporting President Truman in his firm and intelligent foreign policy. It is gratifying to see national unity in our effort to solve the international problems, and the Republican leadership deserves much praise for joining wholeheartedly in the determined effort to work out a fair and just solution of our war problems and to lay the basis for lasting peace. Whatever differences may exist in domestic matters, when it comes to our foreign policy we are no longer Democrats or Republicans, but all Americans, and with this unity in thought and action there is every promise of finally achieving our goal of world peace.

"The record of the Democratic Party in North Carolina reads like a romance. In the aftermath of the war of the sixties, when the carpetbaggers were pillaging and plundering the State, the Democratic Party gained ascendancy and wisely administered her government until the Republican-Populist victory in 1894. The people soon tired of this regime, and in 1900 the Democrats again came into full control of every branch of the State government and for more than 46 years have given the State wise and progressive government, unexcelled for economy and efficiency. The State has grown and prospered in material resources and in the higher human values. We have surpassed our sister States of the South and advanced to a high place in the Commonwealth of States. Every North Carolinian can feel a sense of pride in his State anywhere and everywhere.

"Under the masterful leadership of Governor Cherry, with the full cooperation of the recent General Assembly, we are advancing to still greater heights of public service, and we shall face the future unafraid. The Democratic Party has justified the confidence of the people in giving it this long lease of power, and its great record of accomplishments in the past is the best assurance for the future.

"This hour calls for a rededication to the cause of popular government and a fresh baptism in the faith of a democracy which has saved the Nation in peace and war and will lead the way to continued peace and prosperity at home and abroad."

Financial Statement of Local No. 1057, Textile Workers Union of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a financial statement of Local No. 1057, Textile Workers Union of America, which the union had published on April 7 as an advertisement in the Fall River Herald-News of Fall River, Mass. I have also received a similar advertisement setting forth the financial condition of the Thread Workers Local 445. I am advised that these unions have from the beginning issued both a monthly and an annual report to their members. I believe that this matter is of distinct interest to all students of labor problems and that it is particularly appropriate that it be placed before the Senate as we are commencing consideration of the labor bill. The advertisement published by local 1057 is a fair sample of what these two unions are doing, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the financial statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF FALL RIVER

It has always been the policy of the locals of Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, to keep its entire membership fully informed as to finances through monthly reports at regular meetings and by presentation of an annual statement.

The so-called Barnes bill requires only that an annual financial statement shall be filed with the Department of Labor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Voluntarily, Local 1057, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, herewith submits to the people of Fall River, through the press, its financial statement for the year ending December 31, 1946:

Income:	
Dues	$152,686.62
Initiation fees	6,510.90
Strike donations	7,935.25
Interest from banks	450.03
Miscellaneous	2,976.45
Total income	170,559.25
Expenditures:	
Per capita tax to national union	75,033.38
Wages	17,581.04
Expenses of officers and stewards	9,895.42
Strike donations	7,938.00
Printing, postage, and office expenses	5,068.76
Expenses of delegates to conventions and conference	4,297.00
Socials	2,674.63
Rent	2,115.25
Dues—Massachusetts State CIO	1,241.00
Organizing committee	1,200.00
Lost time	1,098.92
City, State, and Federal taxes	1,044.33
Legal services	1,000.00
Public donations	800.00
Telephone service	337.79
Electricity	275.98
Premiums for bonds and insurance	143.98
Commission to collectors	137.74
Expenses of election tellers	88.00
Expenses of auditing committee	87.00
Miscellaneous	1,094.52
Total expenditures	133,152.74

ASSETS

General fund:	
Balance in checking account	11,020.10
Savings accounts	16,462.71
United States bonds	23,532.00
Petty cash	150.00
Loan to national union (building fund)	20,000.00
Furniture and fixtures	19,869.85
Total assets, general fund	91,034.66

Mortuary fund:	
Balance in checking account	$6,376.55
Savings account	16,052.39
United States bonds	888.00
Total assets, mortuary fund	23,316.94
Total assets, all funds	114,351.60
Total resources, Dec. 31, 1945, all funds	82,579.80
Increase in net worth during period	31,771.80
Total resources, Dec. 31, 1946, all funds	114,351.60
General fund:	
Balance checking account, Dec. 31, 1945	16,191.45
Cash received, Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1946	170,559.25
	186,750.70
Cash disbursed, Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1946	133,152.74
	53,597.96
Less transfers:	
Savings account	450.03
Mortuary fund	11,607.58
Loan to national union (building fund)	20,000.00
Furniture and fixtures	10,520.25
Total transfers	42,577.86
Balance checking account, Dec. 31, 1946	11,020.10
Mortuary fund:	
Balance checking account, Dec. 31, 1945	3,368.97
Cash transferred from general fund, Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1946	11,607.58
	14,976.55
Cash disbursed: Death benefits, Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1946	3,600.00
	11,376.55
Less transfers: Savings accounts	5,000.00
Balance checking account, Dec. 31, 1946	6,376.55

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, (AFFILIATE OF THE CIO), LOCAL NO. 1057.
JOHN L. CAMPOS, *Treasurer.*
BEATRICE MELLO,
IRENE OLIVEIRA,
FRANK COSTA,
Auditing Committee.

Why Jesse H. Jones' "Boys" Got Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM CONNALLY
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times for April 24, 1947, in the column "In the Nation," by Mr. Arthur Krock, relating to Jesse H. Jones' conduct of the RFC.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—WHY JESSE H. JONES' "BOYS" GOT AHEAD

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 23.—Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire, whose investigation of a loan made to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is developing into an inquiry into the whole record of the RFC, seeks always to be on the side of the angels. Sometimes he loses his sense of direction, but it is never intentional. And his activities thus far in uncovering the history of the Government financing of a sick economy as directed by Jesse H. Jones show once more that Mr. TOBEY's motives are the best.

But, as is often true of congressional investigations, however high the public standards of the chief inquisitor may be, the Senator up to this point has got into the record a lot of good names with an unfair connotation. This connotation is, though Mr. TOBEY has not said so, that the owners of some of these names misused their RFC employment to get jobs in the private industries for which they had approved loans, and that this was a systematic policy formulated and enforced with a strong arm by Mr. Jones.

Everyone familiar with the Federal loans that were made under his direction, and with his employment requirements, knew three things about Mr. Jones' RFC. One was that he got the best and most competent men he could find for the important jobs and helped them to careers in private business when those jobs were done. The second was that whenever he approved a loan of any size to a company, he sent one or more of these men to "watch Uncle Sam's money." The third was that, never doubting he and the RFC would be investigated by Congress, he kept complete records, and on these records are some of the most famous and distinguished initials in recent public service.

Whenever Senator TOBEY gets around to summoning Mr. Jones for testimony these records will be found to be as illuminating as they are precise. And this correspondent ventures the opinion that high authorization will be found in the documentation of any major financing which Mr. Jones did not think met all of his own cold business requirements. If the Senate inquiry should reveal the former Federal Loan Administrator and Secretary of Commerce as wasteful of public funds, careless, confiding, or venal in any instance, most of those who watched his direction of the RFC will be even more astounded than the borrowers with whom he dealt so rigidly.

In fact, the chief criticism of Mr. Jones was that he insisted too strongly on being businesslike in using the funds of the RFC. These were allocated, when the agency was first set up, to protect the depression economy from collapse. When the threat of war came, and then the war, the funds were allocated to produce the materials of combat. The United States had very inadequate reserves of essential imports from the Pacific area when Japan closed it off, and Mr. Baruch among others critized Mr. Jones for the limited funds he had assigned—for rubber, principally—when the threat of war was plain. (He has an initialed paper on the document which authorized the synthetic-rubber program, too.)

Mr. TOBEY has now obtained from the RFC, and published, the names of more than 80 employees or agents of the RFC under Mr. Jones who held or have acquired important places in industries which are on its books for loans. Most of those loans have been repaid, and nearly all the others which were made on the Chairman's own decision are being liquidated. No Government agency has made a more businesslike record.

To assure this, Mr. Jones had two policies: To insist on good collateral, and intimate and complete knowledge of how the Federal money was being used. It is this second precaution which accounts for the disclosures in the list published by Senator TOBEY that, for example, Stanley Reed, now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, was a director of a Detroit bank while he was general counsel of the RFC, and that Stewart McDonald became chairman of the executive committee of the B. & O.

Mr. Jones enforced these policies by attracting to Government service the ablest men he could find, and when on occasion he made a place for the proteges of men influential in politics, he never gave them jobs with a higher rating than he thought was within their capabilities. The assistants who performed the most important duties at the RFC were indeed Jones' boys.

Some of them finished their assignments with the companies that borrowed from the agency and returned to their posts. Some, like Justice Reed, Judge Jerome Frank, and Secretary John W. Snyder, rose to more important places in the Government on the RFC records they had made. Others, like Mr. McDonald, Sam Husbands, John W. Barringer, and Russell I. Snodgrass, so impressed themselves on the RFC clients that they were brought into the management of these companies.

The implication has been made that it was unethical for the latter group to accept the opportunities their RFC connection made possible. But this would condemn to the low pay of Government service men who made heavy sacrifices in the public interest, especially in wartime. Only if it can be demonstrated that Government power was misused to obtain the connection can such an implication be sustained If Mr. TOBEY can do that his list will mean something. Otherwise its publication in the context will only have erected another obstacle against getting men of promise into the Government.

No Freedom of Press in Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I pointed out that freedom of the press does not exist in Turkey. The Greco-Turkish military alliance bill which the President has proposed includes a provision that a free press shall be guaranteed to the American newspapers.

Yesterday the New York Times carried an article on page 3 which I include in my remarks. The story begins with the headline "Turkey suspends two more papers." When we read the story, which I trust every Member will do, we discover that two important newspapers have been indefinitely suspended in the capital of Turkey for criticizing the administration. The Government suspended these two newspapers under martial law which is still enforced in six provinces around Istanbul. It is important to note that martial law has existed for the past 7 years in most of Turkey. The Government, in announcing the suspension of these two newspapers, pointed out that

all writing which aroused doubt and suspicion in respect to the actions of the present Turkish Government should not be published.

It may be of interest to the Congress that the titular owner of one of the two suspended papers is a Turkish general named Saldik Aldogan, who happens to be an opposition deputy in the Turkish Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress might be interested in the fact that Turkey has now suspended a total of 11 daily and weekly newspapers because they dared to suggest that some small criticism should be made of the way in which the present Turkish dictatorship runs the country.

I trust that every Member of this House will read this report from Istanbul by the correspondent of the New York Times. We will be indulging in a criminal waste of the American taxpayers' money if we vote this Greco-Turkish aid bill. We will be forming a military alliance with a government which on the record is proven to be irresponsible and dishonorable. And it will be an unparalleled act of hypocrisy for this House to vote an act which guarantees the freedom of the press to American newspapers when that freedom we know for an absolute fact does not exist in Turkey today. That arrogant Turkish military dictatorship is asking us for money with the full knowledge that they intend to violate every provision required by the Congress. Let us not be hypocrites. Let us for once cease to be a rubber stamp for arrogant bureaucrats of the State Department. Let us defeat this Greek-Turkish military alliance.

The article from the New York Times of April 23, 1947, follows:

TURKEY SUSPENDS TWO MORE PAPERS—OPPOSITION ORGANS PUBLISHED DEPUTY'S SPEECH CALLING ASSEMBLY ILLEGAL

(By Raymond Daniell)

ISTANBUL, TURKEY, April 22.—Freedom of the press here received another set-back today when the Government indefinitely suspended two important opposition newspapers for publishing a speech by a deputy criticizing the administration. The Government acted under the martial law still in force in six provinces around Istanbul—theoretically, at least, because of the danger of foreign aggression.

The two new suppressions bring the total of banned publications, daily and weekly, to 11. The latest victims were Democrasi and Tasvir, both important organs and both critical of the Government. The action closely followed a riot in Smyrna last Saturday when students demonstrating against communism attacked the offices of Zincirli Hurrivet [Freedom in Chains].

The titular owner of Democrasi is Gen. Saldik Aldogan, an opposition deputy. The chief editorial writer for Tasvir is Cihad Baban, independent deputy who has been highly critical of the Government and the dominant People's Party.

On April 19 both papers published reports of a speech by Adnan Menderes, one of four founders of the opposition Democratic Party, declaring that "democracy cannot be established by force, trickery, and deceit." He charged that Celal Bavar, Democratic leader, was followed on his campaign tours by members of the secret police.

The Government's announcement of the suspension said: "Tasvir and Democrasi of April 19, 1947, which, despite an announcement issued by the state-of-siege command on July 24, 1946, to the effect that writings arousing doubt and suspicion should not be published and that the state-of-siege command would take action against provocation, printed a provocative report quoting a deputy as saying the Grand National Assembly was illegal, are suspended and their printing offices are closed for an indefinite period."

Witnesses to Saturday's riot said the outbreak did not appear to be spontaneous and the police made no effort to intervene. The mob destroyed copies of papers, threatened the staff with violence, and did some damage to the plant.

The editor is Mehmit Ali Aybar, whose wife is the American-educated director of physical education at the American college for girls. The paper has been regarded as Leftist, pro-Russian, and opposed to the American loan.

The necessity for martial law here was questioned by Kenan Oner, an influential Democrat, who charged that "internal political questions" were the real reason for the maintenance of the state of siege adopted 7 years ago. He said that the latest newspaper suspension was "nothing else but another in the series of steps taken by the Government to crush the opposition."

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Greek-Turkish Aid," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 23, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEK-TURKISH AID

The overwhelming nonpartisan Senate vote in favor of aid to Greece and Turkey reflects the desire of this country to protect free people from forces which threaten their way of life and, ultimately, our own.

The vote came after a full discussion of President Truman's proposal. It followed closely the latest endorsement of Secretary of State Marshall, who called the program indispensable.

Secretary Marshall participated in the formulation of the program and in the decision to go forward with it. After 6 weeks of fruitless discussion in Moscow, he is still fully in accord with its aims. He attached the highest order of urgency to immediate passage of the Greek-Turkish-aid legislation.

Thanks to a statesmanlike amendment sponsored by Senator VANDENBERG, the program does not bypass the United Nations. Rather, it supplements the purposes of the peace agency. It will tend to preserve the status quo so that the UN ultimately will have a better chance to work. An explosion now in the Middle East could blow the UN out of existence.

The legislation goes now to the House, where we hope the margin of approval will be even greater than in the Senate.

The Power of the Union Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, below is a letter which came in this morning, which is typical of many and which is a complete answer to those who contend that, under the Hartley bill, factory workers will not be forced to agree to a union shop. True, the bill provides that a union shop can be had only when a majority of the workers and the employer agree.

That sounds fairly reasonable; but under present practices, not only can the employer be forced to agree by certain union activities but the men in the plant can be forced to sign a request for a union shop.

If it be answered that the employee can refuse to sign, that he has a remedy at law, the reply to that is that experience has demonstrated that the union has ways and means of enforcing the will of the union boss.

The letter follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *April 19, 1947.*

Representative CLARE HOFFMAN.

SIR: You being for labor legislation, I wish to report the condition in the shop.

Union bosses use pressure in different ways to obtain their end. In the last few days, they came through the department and gave us a post card, telling us to sign it.

The card and also telegrams are to Congressmen demanding a vote against labor legislation. They gave us no choice, gave us the post card and pencil and said sign it. If we don't, we will be in the doghouse and it is almost unbearable conditions to work in from then on.

Now there are thousands of men in the shop that fee' the same as I do. For example in my section, three-sevenths of us are hoping and praying that the day will soon come that we will be away from union dictatorship.

I am not signing my name for if I did and the union run this down, I would be out of a job where I have worked for about 25 years and but little hope of getting another as long as the union is so strong.

A FORD WORKER.

And here is another angle of the situation. This comes from a company manufacturing cheese in a farming area. It reads:

APRIL 21, 1947.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: The writer was in Washington last week trying to sell cottage cheese. I was informed that the union has notified the milk companies that they will not be allowed to handle cottage cheese that is not made in Washington by local union members. This is not an economical operation, since 70 percent of the original milk can be left at the manufacturing plant in the form of whey, which has some value as animal food.

Labor talks about more money because of high prices, but no consideration is given the method of distribution and other related processes that affect costs, so long as they get theirs. Such practices are certainly in restraint of trade and free enterprise and must be treated as such. Government spokesmen are asking industry to reduce

prices but in many cases similar conditions as mentioned are present and hold prices up artificially.

The individual is too small to be heard and if we do not get legislation sufficiently strong to bring about a balance of power, prices will not come down. I commend you on the good work you have been doing and urge you to continue the battle. A union shop instead of a closed shop is not the answer. Men and industry must be free to make their own choice rather than be dictated to by the modern labor racketeer.

Very truly yours.

Retirement of the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me:

A bill to establish a sinking fund for the payment of Government obligations

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. There is created in the Treasury, a cumulative sinking fund for the retirement of the public debt. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, in each fiscal year, place $10,000,000,000 of the money from taxes collected under chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to estate taxes), in such sinking fund, and moneys not expended for payment of interest or principal for one fiscal year shall be added to the fund for the following year.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to use said sinking fund, first, to pay the interest on the obligations of the Government; and second, to retire and cancel such long-term bonds and notes as may mature or become callable within any given fiscal year; and, in the event that several long-term issues mature within the same fiscal year, priority of retirement shall be given to the issue or issues having the longest term of maturity.

(b) The sinking fund shall not be used to pay interest on or to retire obligations owned by Government agencies or corporations and established as trust funds, and special issues by act of Congress, or obligations having a maturity period of one calendar year or less.

(c) Subject to the above limitations, retirement of all other obligations shall be at the direction and discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 3. The sinking fund and all additions thereto are hereby appropriated for use in carrying out the provisions of this act.

Potential War Materials

REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if we are in earnest about stopping communism, then we should stop this practice of giving away potential articles which will make for weapons of war.

I have before me a statement prepared by Chester T. Lane, Lend-Lease Administrator, showing the materials that were shipped to Russia under a lend-lease agreement beginning last July. There are such items as radio stations, steam locomotives, marine Diesel engines, pumps, crushing, screening, and mixing machinery, industrial trucks and tractors, cranes, derricks, hoists, winches, fan and blower equipment, electrical equipment, and so forth.

We are again repeating the very things that we did prior to Pearl Harbor when we sent oil and ammunition and steel and copper to Japan. Let us cut out this monkey business.

The letter and statement by Mr. Lane are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE FOREIGN
LIQUIDATION COMMISSIONER,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1947.

The Honorable CHARLES A. EATON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. EATON: Through the clerk of your committee, we have received a request to furnish the committee with information showing the lend-lease "pipe line" shipments to the Soviet Union made since July 1, 1946, broken down by months, with an indication of the general nature of the material involved. The attached table shows the dollar value of such material loaded aboard ocean vessels in each month from July 1, 1946, through December 31, 1946, with a brief indication of the nature of the bulk of the materials. All shipments consisted of material covered by the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union dated October 15, 1945, entered into under the authority of Section 3 (c) of the Lend-Lease Act.

In a few instances material which had been transferred to the Soviet representatives in this country prior to December 31, 1946, and to which legal title had passed prior to that date, has been physically removed and shipped by the Soviet Government since that date. Except for those items, all shipments have been suspended in response to the General Accounting Office's opinion that shipments should be terminated on December 31, 1946, unless Congress would indicate that such termination had not been intended when the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946 (Public Law 521), signed on July 23, 1946, was enacted. The Department's request for action on this matter is now pending before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

If any further information is desired, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER T. LANE,
Lend-Lease Administrator.

Major categories of material shipped from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1946, lend-lease "pipe line" agreement of Oct. 15, 1945, between the United States and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Month (1946)	Value	Major categories of material
July	$14,003,712	Radio stations, over 1 kilowatt. Steam locomotives. Marine Diesel engines. Pumps. Crushing, screening, and mixing machines. Industrial trucks and tractors. Cranes, derricks, hoists, and winches. Fan and blower equipment. Electrical rotating equipment, marine and other. Generator sets. Metal melting and heating furnaces.
August	$17,598,623	Gas generating and producing apparatus. Machine tools. Secondary metal-forming machinery. Welding machinery. Mining and quarrying machinery. Optical, indicating and controlling apparatus. High-speed tool steel. Insulated wire and cloth. Tires. Rubber products. Engines for trucks. Spare parts for trucks. Steam locomotives. Marine Diesel engines. Compressors, marine and other. Pumps, marine and other. Crushing, screening, and mixing machinery. Cranes, derricks, hoists, and winches. Industrial trucks and tractors. Fan and blower equipment. Bearings. Valves. Electrical rotating equipment. Generator sets. Primary electric-power transmission equipment. Motor starters and controllers. Foundry equipment. Gas generating and producing apparatus. Machine tools. Secondary metal-forming machines. Welding machinery, marine and other. Metal-cutting tools. Mining and quarrying machinery. Excavating and dredging machinery. Industrial-type locomotives Steel-alloy tubes. Insulated wire and cable. Tires. Rubber products.
September	1,813,509	Marine Diesel engines. Marine winches and cranes. Generator sets. Motor starters and controllers. Gas generating, conditioning, and producing apparatus. Machine tools. Metal-cutting tools. Locomotive car wheel tires.
October	6,234,733	Marine Diesel engines. Salvage stations and diving gear. Marine compressors. Pumps, marine and other. Crushing, screening, and mixing machinery. Marine winches. Cranes, derricks, and hoists. Marine generator sets. Primary electric-power transmission equipment. Gas generating, conditioning, and producing apparatus. Machine tools. Cemented carbide cutting tools. Mining and quarrying machinery.
November	4,527,176	Marine Diesel engines. Pumps. Electrical rotating equipment. Generating sets. Blast and reverberating furnaces. Machine tools. Industrial-type locomotives. Mine-type locomotives.
December	1,984,863	Marine compressors. Cranes, derricks, and hoists. Electrical rotating equipment. Generator sets. Machine tools. Industrial-type locomotives. Mine-type locomotives.
Total	46,162,616	

History in the Missouri Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD portions of an address by Dr. Ronald F. Lee, chief historian of the National Park Service, made before the Westerners and the Friends of the Middle Border in Chicago, February 24, 1947:

Director Drury, Sheriff Watson, and friends, it is a pleasure to have this opportunity to meet with the Westerners in joint session with the Friends of the Middle Border and to discuss historic and prehistoric rescue work in the Missouri Valley. I grew up on a tributary of the Missouri—the Heart River, in southwestern North Dakota—and moved to the "effete" East, as Director Drury remarked, a comparatively few years ago.

Living in Washington, D. C., I missed the Middle West until an incident occurred which illustrated to me how close the Great Plains are to the Capital. The father of a friend of mine came to Washington—a lean, wiry individual, his face weather beaten and tanned from 70 years of dry farming in the Dakotas and Wyoming. One Dust Bowl year we stood outdoors talking on a windy Washington day. Suddenly the old man reached up into the air and brought his hand down rubbing his fingers together. "Do you know what this is?" he said, opening his hand and showing particles of sandy dust. "This is soil from north of Laramie, Wyo., and mixed in with a little clay from the Dakota Badlands."

Ever since then, as I walk around in Washington, I spot here and there little patches of Great Plains soil that have drifted in with the big dust storms from the Middle West, and I feel more at home.

Living in the crowded East increases one's appreciation for the spaciousness of the Missouri Basin. It occupies one-sixth of the land area of the United States. It is eight times as large as New England, and 10 times as large as old England. It is equal in area to the combined dimensions of Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, and Latvia. An optimistic westerner has claimed that the Great Plains are bounded on the north by the aurora borealis, on the east by the rising sun, on the south by the procession of the equinoxes, and on the west by the day of judgment. Personally I think he was exaggerating; the Great Plains are only 90 percent that large.

The Missouri River is certainly one of the great rivers of the continent. It is longer than the Yukon, the Columbia, the Colorado, or the Red. Four State capitals are situated on its banks. With its tributaries the Missouri River drains part or all of 10 States and two provinces of Canada. It is one of the crookedest rivers in the country, and in this rivals the Mississippi. It has been said, according to Stanley Vestal, that of all the variable things in creation the most uncertain are the action of a jury, the state of a woman's mind, and the condition of the Missouri River.

When I was growing up the State of North Dakota built a bridge over the Missouri River north of Bismarck at a cost of half a million dollars. The following year when the ice broke and began flowing downstream there was a jam some miles above the new bridge. The water was backed up for miles behind a dam of ice. The pressure of the impounded waters almost forced the river into an alternate channel which would have left the bridge high and dry a mile away from the main stream. As one North Dakota engineer said: "I spent 2 years putting a bridge over the Missouri, and it looks like I will spend every year from now on keeping the Missouri under the bridge."

RIVER-CONTROL PLAN

Since the people of the United States have learned how to control rivers, a vast and magnificent plan to harness the 2,500 miles of the Missouri main stream and many times that mileage of tributary streams has been projected.

Programs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers call for the ultimate construction of 105 dams to provide power, irrigation, navigation, flood and silt control. Five huge earth-fill dams are to be constructed on the main stream of the Missouri, one of which will create a reservoir 200 miles long and another a reservoir 100 miles long. Dams on the tributaries vary in size, but some will be as high as 200 feet.

These great structures, together with their related works, including canals, power plants, construction camps, pumping stations, and so on, constitute a colossal engineering program. With the cumulative changes in the territory surrounding each project that are sure to accompany the development of this program, one may anticipate a vast alteration in the landscape of the Missouri Valley and in the social and economic life of its people.

A generation from now the Missouri Valley will present a vastly different appearance than it does today.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND THE FLOOD-CONTROL PROGRAM

What does the National Park Service have to do with this vast flood-control program? Seventeen units of the National Park System are situated in the Missouri Basin. Four of these are national parks, including Yellowstone, Rocky Mountain, Wind Cave, and Glacier; 11 are national monuments, including Scotts Bluff, Fort Laramie, and Custer Battlefield; and 2 are national memorials, 1 of which is Mount Rushmore.

The first national park established in the United States, and therefore anywhere in the world, is in the Missouri Basin. This park is, of course, Yellowstone. The first national monument, proclaimed by Executive order after the enactment of the Antiquities Act of 1906, is in the Missouri Basin. This national monument is Devil's Tower, in Wyoming.

It is the primary responsibility of the National Park Service, in respect to the Missouri Basin water-control program, to preserve these natural and scientific resources, which have been established as permanent units in the national-park system, unimpaired for all time so that this generation and all future generations may enjoy them to the full.

I am happy to report that, so far as I am aware, none of the 105 flood-control projects in the Missouri Basin will directly affect the permanent preservation of any area in the national-park system.

Such a statement cannot be made, unfortunately, for all the national park and monument areas outside the Missouri Basin. But it is true that within the basin the national-park system, so far as we now know, will not be affected adversely by any contemplated water-control project.

On the other hand, many new recreational resources of the active kind will be developed and made available.

HISTORIC ITEMS IN RESERVOIR AREAS

The National Park Service has a second concern with the flood-control program. Upon the request of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, detailed studies of the recreational potentialities of the numerous reservoirs that are to be developed in the comparatively dry and treeless plains country have been initiated by the National Park Service. These studies, begun more than 2 years ago, are being actively prosecuted at the present time and constitute a significant contribution of this Service to the planned use of water resources in the Great Plains area.

Hardly had these recreation studies begun when it became very evident that the projected reservoirs would seriously affect the conservation of important historic, prehistoric, and paleontological remains found in the valleys where extensive land areas are to be inundated, unless recovery measures could be speedily adopted.

It is estimated by archeologists that 80 percent of the Indian archeological remains of the United States are to be found in 2 percent of its area, namely, along the great river systems. This is, of course, very natural. The Indians traveled the water courses, hunted and fished there, farmed there, built temples there, and there they buried their dead. Evidences of this primitive life survive in the form of village sites, camp sites, mounds, petroglyphs, pictographs, burials, and in other forms. From this evidence, and from this evidence alone, can the story of prehistoric America be reconstructed, including the slow steps of primitive peoples to their artistic and technological peaks, and their subsequent mysterious decline and ultimate disappearance.

This evidence of prehistoric America is of great human and scientific value. It is part of our national heritage, and belongs to the people. Archeological evidence is a natural resource as much as water power, forests, and soil, and it can be turned into scientific and educational value and enrich the Nation. The record of prehistory to be found in these surviving remains is unique and once destroyed can never be replaced.

Conscious of the need to conserve these values, and stimulated greatly by the Committee for the Recovery of Archeological Remains formed by professional associations, the National Park Service, and the Smithsonian Institution entered sometime ago into an agreement to conduct surveys of archeological and paleontological sites that might be inundated and lost as a result of the flood-control program.

With excellent support from the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, preliminary surveys were begun by the Smithsonian Institution in July 1946, under the general direction of Dr. Frank H. H. Roberts, Jr. The field parties were placed under the direct supervision of Dr. Waldo Wedel, of the Smithsonian Institution.

WHAT HAS BEEN FOUND

What has been found by the preliminary Smithsonian Institution and National Park Service survey of the Missouri Basin to date?

During the 8 months since last July, preliminary archeological and paleontological surveys of 28 projected reservoirs have been initiated. Of these 28 projects, 9 are under construction, and 19 are in advanced stages of planning.

Preliminary data show the existence of 300 Indian village sites along the main stem of the Missouri River, many of which will be directly affected. These villages are both open and fortified in type and may be from 100 to 500 years old. Several hundred other sites are also known to be situated in areas on the main stream or along tributaries where they also may be affected by the flood-control program, including camp sites, ossuaries, pictographs, petroglyphs, bison falls, and other evidence of primitive life.

I shall now describe a few kodachrome slides provided by Dr. Waldo Wedel of the Smithsonian Institution, to exemplify the problem as a whole.

THIRTY-FIVE PREHISTORIC VILLAGES IN OAHE

One slide shows an airplane view taken within the area of the great Oahe Reservoir in South Dakota. The Oahe Dam will be located some 50 miles north of Pierre, S. Dak., on the main stream of the Missouri. It will create a reservoir 200 miles long, reaching almost to Bismarck, N. Dak.

Preliminary surveys of this reservoir area show that not less than 35 prehistoric village sites will be submerged at full pool. Many of these Indian village sites are unusually large, occupying from 5 to 50 acres, and containing refuse deposits, house pits, and other features. None of these sites has been comprehensively excavated. Together, these prehistoric remains, according to Dr. Wedel, constitute one of the richest and most important archeological areas north of Mexico.

In the foreground of this airplane view is a roughly circular area known as the Buffalo Pasture site. This prehistoric Indian village site is located near the upstream tow of the proposed Oahe Dam. It occupies an area approximately 175 by 125 yards in extent. It is surrounded by a ditch 7 to 10 paces wide and 3 to 6 feet deep. Within the rampart are 30 to 40 house pits.

Preconstruction operations at the Oahe Dam, and particularly earth borrowing, may destroy this prehistoric village unless archeological excavations are started in the near future.

On the other side of the Oahe Dam location and near to it, is the Scotty Phillips ranch site, another prehistoric Indian village shown in another airplane view. The primitive remains surviving here occupy an area estimated to be 125 by 75 yards in extent, surrounded by a ditch 5 to 6 paces wide, and 2 to 5 feet deep. Within the enclosure are found 18 house pits and many smaller depressions. This important site will be destroyed when the moving of dirt for the south spillway of the Oahe Dam begins.

RACE AGAINST TIME

Salvage archeology is a race against time. Even the preliminary surveys carried out so far were undertaken late, long after the general flood-control program was already underway. Twelve months must elapse from the time a financial estimate of the cost of even a preliminary archeological survey is submitted to the Government before the appropriated funds are available to begin work. After the preliminary survey is completed, another 12 months is very likely to elapse before funds for comprehensive excavation become available. Excavation work may be delayed further by slowness in securing Federal title to land on which the excavations must be carried out.

It is obvious that the recovery of important scientific data must be carried forward in a manner commensurate with the unique and irreplaceable character of the data involved. Painstaking care takes additional time. Unexpected finds may divert or alter the course of an excavation once it is in progress, and create new problems. Engineers have a way of speeding up construction schedules so that the anticipated length of time during which scientific records may be recovered may be shortened unexpectedly. All these factors together with the usually slow processes of Government make doubly and trebly urgent the pressing forward of this program before it is too late.

So far we have considered only paleontological and archeological remains. Many persons underestimate the historical antiquity of life in the Missouri Valley and the long lapse of time which has passed since the earliest days of the white man's exploration there. I believe I am right in saying that Father Marquette was the first white man to have sighted the Missouri River and to have reported the fact. He first saw it in June 1673.

To get some idea of how long ago that was, let me remind you that in 1673 John Milton was still alive and Charles II was on the throne of England. In France, Louis XIV was building Versailles, and 11 years were to go by before Peter the Great mounted the throne of Russia. In America, Miles Standish, one of the Pilgrims, had been dead only 17 years. Only 7 years had passed since the New Netherlands became an English colony. Just a year before Father Marquette glimpsed the Missouri, the Spanish had begun building the Castillo de San Marcos in St. Augustine. Eight years were still to pass before William Penn's charter, and 20 years before the witchcraft episode at Salem, Mass. In other words, the Missouri Valley has a long and respectable history of its own and is not quite the new country easterners are like to believe.

HISTORY FOLLOWS VALLEY

The course of history, as the course of prehistory, tended to follow the river valley. It was a route for explorers. Here were located the early fur-trading posts, the Indian agencies, the military posts, and the pioneer settlements and villages which later became towns and cities.

Beginning last July, the National Park Service initiated a survey of historic sites and buildings likely to be affected by the Missouri Reservoir program. Mr. Merrill J. Mattes, a historian of long and valuable experience in the history of the West, was assigned to this undertaking and for the past several months has been collecting data from his base of operations in our region II office at Omaha.

I will not attempt to summarize all of the findings which Mr. Mattes has made to date, but instead will illustrate with slides recently secured from the United States Signal Corps some of the western military posts which will be directly or indirectly affected by projects which are high on the construction program.

Slide 1 is a view of Fort Randall in what is now South Dakota, the site of which is situated directly at the base of the Fort Randall Dam. Fort Randall, an active military post from 1856 to 1892, was one of a strategic chain of frontier posts which included Forts Leavenworth, Riley, Laramie, Kearney, and Ridgely. It played a leading part in the Indian War, 1862–66.

Here you see the Twenty-fifth Infantry on dress parade at Fort Randall in 1880.

Slide 2 is another view showing Company B of the Twenty-fifth Infantry on dress parade with Captain Bentzoni.

Slide 3 shows Sitting Bull, who led his warriors in the Battle of the Little Big Horn, is shown here with his family as a prisoner at Fort Randall, Dakota Territory, in 1882. Captain Bentzoni is on horseback in the background.

Only one building of old Fort Randall is left. Portions of the chapel survive and, according to present plans of the Corps of Engineers, it will be restored. The site of the fort is immediately below the great dam and may be affected by spillway construction. Plans are under way, in addition to the projected work on the chapel, to recover historical material from the site by excavation, to mark the foundations of certain structures, collect records, and to develop a museum and exhibit program.

The site of old Fort Randall will not be a unit in the National Park System. It will be preserved through the Corps of Engineers or an appropriate State or local agency. But it should be carefully noted that even elementary preservation is dependent upon the expenditure of funds for this purpose in the very near future. Fort Randall is now under construction, and the old fort site must be cared for from the beginning of clearing operations if its full value is to be rescued.

Slide 4 is a view of an Army detachment pitching camp at Fort Bennett, S. Dak., located on the west side of the Missouri, perhaps 40 miles above Pierre and within the Oahe reservoir area. Fort Bennett was established in 1870 and abandoned in 1889. Among other buildings it had barracks for two companies, officers' quarters, guard house, three storehouses, and two blockhouses, all built of cottonwood logs.

Slide 5 is of Cheyenne Indian Agency as located at Fort Bennett and as it looked in 1876.

Slide 6: Proceeding on up the Missouri, we come to Fort Totten, 1867–90. Situated on the southeast shore of Devil's Lake, Dakota Territory, Fort Totten will not be directly affected by the flood-control program, but will be indirectly influenced by developments in the vicinity. It was established as a military post in 1867 by Gen. A. H. Terry. The original fort was constructed of logs which were later replaced with brick buildings, so that it came to be known as one of the best-built forts in North Dakota. It was used principally as troops' winter quarters and housed from one to five companies of soldiers at a time. These troops were occupied in keeping the Indians in check, protecting railroad survey parties, and the International Boundary Commission.

Slide 7: Still further west is Yellowtail Canyon on the Big Horn River near the Montana-Wyoming boundary. This view shows the spectacular character of canyon topography. Here a Smithsonian field party has found much archeological evidence, including fire hearths, rock circles, quarry zones, flakes, and scattered artifacts, as well as rock shelters.

Slide 8: Three-fourths of a mile below the Yellowtail Canyon and dam site is the site of old Fort C. F. Smith, 1866–68. This fort was the northernmost of three military posts established by the United States Government in the summer of 1866 in an effort to protect travelers along the perilous Bozeman Trail. The other two were Fort Reno and Fort Phil Kearney.

This view is from a sketch by Anton Schonborn as redrawn by Captain D'Ismay.

These slides give only a fragmentary conception of the effect of the Missouri flood-control program upon historic sites and buildings. A better conception is provided by a recent statement submitted by Mr. Mattes as part of a preliminary report on the Oahe Reservoir in South Dakota:

"SUMMARY OF SITES IN OAHE

"Following is a highly compressed summary of the more significant sites involved in the Oahe Reservoir, all in South Dakota: The Lewis and Clark Expedition of 1804–6, a primary historical event, left 18 recorded camp sites within the reservoir area which have been identified. The early fur trade, which became the vehicle of western exploration and discovery, is represented by Valle's post (1804), Fort Manuel (1812–13), Fort Primeau (1861), and Ashley Island, the setting for the bloody clash between Arikara Indians and American soldiers and fur trappers in 1823, which precipitated a new era in fur trade history.

"The surviving 'Harney cabin' (1865) and the extensive sites of Fort Sully (1866–94) and Fort Bennett (1870–91) are reminders of the Indian wars and military occupation. The Cheyenne River Indian agency and the St. Stephens and St. Benedict missions on the Standing Rock Reservation are symbolic of cultural values important to the historic Sioux Nation.

"The period of early white settlement, during Dakota Territorial days, is richly represented by the Oahe mission (1874) and the Buffalo pasture of Philips ranch in the immediate vicinity of the dam site, and by such river ghost towns as Fairbank, Forest City, Scranton, and Le Beau.

"The immensity of the Oahe Reservoir project, in effect obliterating the immediate valley of the Missouri River for over 200

miles, prompts the historian to sound a note of warning. Even though we may be able to photograph, chart, study, excavate and otherwise preserve certain fragments, the disastrous effect of the reservoir on important local and regional historic and cultural associations along the main channel cannot be overestimated.

"From the national point of view, the sum total of the loss goes beyond the inundation of individual sites to consideration of the disappearance of this huge section of the natural river valley. America's first continental westward route, which saw the colorful procession of explorers, fur traders, missionaries, soldiers, exploiters, emigrants, and settlers who followed by dugout, keelboat, and steamboat in the wake of Captains Lewis and Clark."

How To Tell Fascism From Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I desire to call attention to the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post. It provides an intriguing and impressive answer to one of the most widely discussed queries in America, How To Tell Fascism From Communism. It provides an answer you will want to read and remember.

It has long been part of the Communist Party line in this country to accuse everybody who opposes communism of being a Fascist, a Hitlerite, anti-Semitic, tory, a monopoly-capitalist, or an imperialist. One good way in which to test the ideological background of some stranger about whose left-wing affiliations you have some question is to sound off in his presence against the sinister aspects of godless communism. If he begins replying in the Commie code words of the party liners, he may not be a Communist, but you can bet your bottom dollar that if he is a Communist he will lapse into the abusive lingo in which the Red Fascists have come to specialize. The Saturday Evening Post, therefore, does well to present its analysis of the kinship of fascism and communism.

Mr. Speaker, for a time one could distinguish between the basic tenets of fascism and communism by the varying lengths of the mustaches of the leading disciples of these totalitarian doctrines, but now that Hitler is dead, even that slim margin of difference has ceased to exist.

However, let the Saturday Evening Post tell its own story in answer to the provocative question, How To Tell Fascism From Communism.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of April 12, 1947]

HOW TO TELL FASCISM FROM COMMUNISM

It may not be too late to commend to puzzle fans Max Lerner's piece in PM pointing to a couple of shortcomings in the resounding apologia of Americans for Democratic Action, the latest coagulation of liberals. The principal misdemeanor was ADA's statement that it rejected association with Communists and Fascists alike. Mr. Lerner felt that the Communists, although they "believe neither in democracy or freedom," are "on the left" and "to cut the progressive movement off completely from the Communists and their sympathizers is—outwardly and temporarily—to weaken the forces of the left." This seems to leave us with the idea that to maintain freedom and democracy, it is necessary to keep up some connection with a group opposed to freedom and democracy. In any event, Mr. Lerner insists that "to lump the Communists with the Fascists is an atrocious reading of history, an invitation to chaos in international relations with Russia and eastern Europe."

There are, it is readily admitted, at least two major differences between communism and fascism. One is that the Fascists, either through carelessness or corruption, permitted a lot of people to escape from their slave states. These refugees were able to tell the rest of us what the Fascist "wave of the future" was like in practice. The Stalinist Communist regime has been tougher; very few escape, even today. Another difference is that, whereas the Fascist fifth column abroad had to depend on a handful of dubious Yorkville Germans and the American wives of broken-down Italian counts, the Communist fifth column includes some of the fanciest intellectuals of the day.

A footnote to this confusion is supplied by Arthur Koestler in an interview in the New Leader. Speaking of what has happened to the left, Mr. Koestler, who regards himself as on that side, said: "Today the left is silent about the crimes of Stalinist totalitarianism, silent by dint of its moral lassitude, because of its false allegiance; the left, by the sin of omission, becomes an accomplice of this eastern neonazism. The left is the prisoner of its own past."

Mr. Speaker, in the same edition of the Saturday Evening Post as that which contained the foregoing editorial I came across another discussion of the events of our times which Members of Congress may well read with profit. Credit should go to this largest of all American magazines for its astute analysis of a phenomenon of publicity which has largely been overlooked by the average American. The following editorial might well have been entitled "The Record Is Broken but the Anthem Lingers On." However, the erudite editors of this journalistic legacy of Benjamin Franklin have named their editorial Lame Duck Columnists Shellac the GOP.

Many Americans from coast to coast may have wondered at times why so many columnists and commentators make a business of concentrating critical blasts upon the Republican Party. Some have thought it to be malice; some have attributed it to ignorance or careless reporting; others have believed it to be the result of something more sinister or startling. The following editorial, however, allays these suspicions and attributes this tirade against Republicans to what appears to be a very natural cause—lame duck columnists like lame duck politicians are slow to relinquish their creeds and their causes. In due time, the great fields of radio and the press will certainly produce columnists and commentators who are more in tune with the times and whose commentaries upon the present are not poisoned or perverted by prejudices of the past.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to your reading and to the thoughtful reading of the Congress and the country the following diagnosis of the strange situation now existing in so many syndicated columns and over so many network broadcasts. Even stranger, however, is the fact that substantial business establishments, newspaper and radio enterprises, and great private profit institutions dig down into their treasuries to pay for the comments of folks whose counsel, if followed, would make impossible the continuance of these self-same profitable private ventures. Some day—perhaps too late—American business will surely realize that it plays with a fierce, uncontrollable fire, when it pays fat checks to support columnists and commentators who make it their main objective to criticize and condemn the business institutions of America. Unfortunately, big business learns its lessons very slowly—in fact, many have already forgotten that it was big business in Germany which gave Hitler his start and which supported his tirades against the establishments and order which made possible their survival.

Here then is an editorial which all should read and which many will want to clip for their scrapbook to have it available for later reference:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of April 12, 1947]

LAME-DUCK COLUMNISTS SHELLAC THE GOP

The Republicans have a rather thin control of Congress, but, because the voters had no way to elect a new set of newspaper columnists, the same old commentators continue to comment, most of them in tones unsympathetic to Republicans. Consequently, the newspapers are filled with endless chatter about how laggard the Republicans are, and how divided they are and how they have no policy—in short, how little they resemble the days when, if you take these critics seriously, everybody agreed with everybody else, the BYRD lay down with the young CABOT LODGE, and the MCKELLAR played in the CLAUDE PEPPER's den.

Actually, of course, the Republicans, taking them across the board from TAFT to MORSE and from BRICKER to SALTONSTALL, are no more divided than any body of men is certain to be when confronted with difficult and perplexing issues. But to hear the column pundits tell it, the GOP is "hopelessly split" because some of its leaders took Lilienthal while others felt that Senator MCKELLAR, in his long lecture course in anthropology covering human life from Adam to Lilienthaler Man, had cast doubt on whether the evolutionary process had reached its full fruition when it produced the former TVA magician. If a party can be split on the elevation of a bureaucrat to new responsibilities, then the Democrats would have disappeared long ago, ground to powder between Bowles and BILBO.

Senator WHITE, of Maine, who is a man of few words but much sense, made a short and unjustly neglected address in the Senate in which he added a few facts to the controversy over congressional and therefore Republican inefficiency. As far as we have seen, no Washington commentator noticed Senator WHITE's remarks.

Senator WHITE pointed out that the Reorganization Act compelled a basic change in the way Congress does business—a change which had to be put into effect by a party which had not been in power for 14 years. While this complicated task was being carried out, the deliberations of the new Congress were interrupted by the Bilbo case, which not even a Washington columnist so far has blamed on the Republicans. On top of that, President Truman handed the Senate, in the first month of its existence, a total of 8,177 executive nominations which

had to be acted on. This number is to be compared with a total of 11,056 nominations for the whole session of the previous Congress. Congress also received, in its first 3 weeks, a total of 472 bills, of which 8 have been passed. In the corresponding period of the Seventy-eighth Congress—1943, that era of harmonious and quiet efficiency—Congress received 591 bills and passed 3. Topping the whole argument, of course, is the fact that the White House and the Federal bureaucracy are still in the hands of the Democrats.

We hold no brief for the Republicans in Congress as the operators of a streamlined, well-oiled political machine. In the early part of the session, the columnists did attempt to show that Senator TAFT was trying to make the party into just that—a smooth, well-oiled political machine. When it looked as if the Republicans might have a machine, this was supposed to be bad. When the machine idea turned out to be nothing but democracy at work, the hammer boys detected chaos. Nothing if perfect, but our feeling is that the Republicans don't look so bad except to those who wish they weren't Republicans at all.

Asia Watches Democracy at Work in Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of Thursday, April 10, 1947, published an article by Mr. William H. Newton entitled "Asia Watches Democracy at Work in Philippines." This is a splendid article and one that I trust will be read by Members of Congress at both ends of the Capitol.

The United States set a new pattern in international affairs when it gave the Philippine Islands their independence.

Our act was a rededication to the basic principles contained in the Declaration of Independence and implemented in the Bill of Rights.

Our act was the remuneration of a policy of imperialism.

Our act struck directly at those forms of government that fail to accept the dignity of the individual as the foundation of civilization and government.

ASIA WATCHES DEMOCRACY AT WORK IN PHILIPPINES

(By William H. Newton)

MANILA, April 10.—This brand-new republic, which has yet to celebrate its first birthday, is carrying the challenge of American democracy to communism in the Orient.

Millions upon millions of people in the Far East, oppressed for centuries under systems of ancient feudalism, today are preparing to choose between western democracy and Soviet communism.

REBUILDING UNDER WAY

In China, Japan, and India the conflict between the two systems is going on, by political means in India and Japan, by civil war in China. What happens here to democracy's newest and proudest offspring may help to decide the issue. The Oriental peoples involved constitute half the population of the world.

Democracy and independence in the Philippines is orchestrated by the steady pounding of hammers, the whine of saws, and the squawking horns of American jeeps. Temporary wooden buildings are going up everywhere to replace homes and offices wrecked in the fight for Manila. The city moves on little jeepneys, jeeps converted into small busses by the addition of wooden seats and tops.

The Philippines are recovering from the terrible devastation of the war. Things are a long way from perfect, but they're steadily getting better. The degree of recovery is probably greater than in any area of the world which was occupied by the enemy.

Here is the record to date:

The export of copra—the vegetable fat obtained from the coconut from which soap is made—is already above the prewar level.

Coastwise shipping has reached 60 percent of its prewar peak.

Of the 12 dividend-paying gold mines in operation before the war, 3 are again in production, and by the end of this year the mines will be producing 40 percent of their prewar capacity. The mining of gold represented 85 percent of all Philippines mining. Chrome mines are operating at 50 percent of prewar capacity. The smaller copper, iron, and manganese mines have not yet resumed operation.

Before the war the Japs controlled the coastal fishing. Their fishing craft were destroyed. But by constructing small craft of their own and obtaining vessels from the United States the Filipinos have brought the catch up to 30 percent of the prewar level.

By the next harvest the production of rice will be above the 1940 war figure. Production of corn is higher than before the war.

Production of hemp is about one-third of the prewar figure.

All these statistics must be considered in the light of the complete devastation suffered by the country. Manila itself was a battleground. All the buildings which they did not use as defense posts were deliberately blown up by the Japs.

CURRENCY SOUND

Prices are coming down. In May 1945, bread cost the equivalent of $2 a pound. Now it's 10 cents a pound. Rice, which in May 1945, cost $2.50 a ganta (5 pounds), now costs 70 cents a ganta. In 1945 cheap cotton textiles cost between $7 and $11 a yard. Now it's 60 cents a yard.

Because of the lack of construction materials, building costs are high. Most of the city's hotels were destroyed. In those that were left rates are astronomical—if you can get a room. Meat is still expensive because Australia, which used to supply the Philippines, has diverted her production to Britain.

But prices of things the average Filipino needs and uses slowly but steadily are being reduced. His wages are paid in national currency which is as sound as the United States dollar and backed by deposits. There's no printing press money here as in China and almost every other war-ravaged country.

GROWING PAINS

This new child of democracy isn't a perfect baby by any means. It suffers quite a bit from growing pains. Currently the fashion in the Philippine Congress is for everybody to accuse everybody else of graft and corruption.

American agencies, involving the United States Army and the Foreign Liquidation Commission, have not been exempted from criticism in this regard.

There is lawlessness and defiance of authority—heritages of the Japan occupation when it was a man's patriotic duty to oppose and defy the government. Young men swagger around the streets with pistols strapped to their belts and there are highway robberies reminiscent of America's old West. But lawlessness gradually is being brought under control.

The Philippines have received American help in their desperate struggle to rebuild their ruined land. That help has been effective. Compared with other war-torn countries the record of recovery and the record of this young democracy is impressive. It has got to be impressive.

Asia is watching.

New Deal OPA for Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 15, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman's proposed Manchurian incident, officially called Greek-Turko intervention, may become a reasonable facsimile of Japanese development for Manchukuo.

In becoming an American puppet state, Greece is to get New Deal OPA and WPA treatments promptly. Light on this project is found in the following article from the Wall Street Journal of April 24, 1947:

AMERICAN EXPERTS PLAN PRICE CURBS, RATIONING IN RETURN FOR GREEK AID—DRAFT OTHER REFORMS, FROM SOAK-THE-RICH TAX TO CONTROL OF LABOR, CURRENCY—PORTER REPORT ON THE WAY

(By Carl Thompson)

WASHINGTON.—The Greeks may have a phrase for it: Omicron Pi Alpha—which means just plain OPA.

Price control and rationing of consumer goods are high on a list of reforms Uncle Sam is likely to exact from the Greek Government in return for United States financial aid.

Specialists on Greece are now preparing a number of other economic plugs to stuff in holes they say drained off a good part of the $360,000,000 or more spent by UNRRA in that Balkan nation up to March 31.

"There've got to be some major reforms in Greece if the spending program there is to be successful," says one State Department official. "We don't want to pour good money after bad."

TAX AND CONTROL

The American planners suggest more "soak the rich" taxation, export and import controls reminiscent of United States wartime regulations, currency and banking reforms, and controls over wages and agricultural credits. And these suggestions, if adopted as firm United States policy, can be backed up by power to withhold the planned aid to Greece.

The experts want their economic program ready to function as soon as Congress votes final approval of the legislation to provide emergency funds for Greece and Turkey. The 67 to 23 vote in favor of the bill by the Senate this week is spurring the State Department's efforts to have an economic program ready to go when the measure gets a Presidential signature. The House will take up the bill next week.

The Truman administration contemplates spending up to $350,000,000 in Greece during the next 15 months. About $300,000,000 of this will come from the $400,000,000 Greek-Turkish aid measure now before Congress. Another $50,000,000 to $60,000,000 is

earmarked for Greece in blanket appropriations for foreign relief.

MR. PORTER'S REPORT

The base of the new Greek economic program will be an official report of the American Economic Mission to Greece headed by Paul A. Porter, former chief of the Office of Price Administration. This detailed study is still in preparation for the President and the State Department.

Here is background for some of the reforms the Greek Government is most likely to be asked to make:

1. Taxation: Increased income and customs taxes. At present only about 13 percent of tax revenues comes from income and inheritance taxes. Nearly 40 percent are raised by a levy on tobacco consumption.

2. Price control and rationing: There have been no such controls in Greece except for certain regulations on UNRRA goods.

3. Control of imports and exports: Many luxury goods have flooded Greece and drained its exchange reserves.

4. Currency regulation: Although a currency committee, largely dominated by British and United States members, has attempted to stabilize the Greek drachma, there is constant pressure to speed up the printing presses.

5. Wage and manpower regulation: Needed repairs to roads and railroads have been neglected, partly through inability of the Greek Government to pay labor enough in terms of purchasing power for consumer goods.

6. Governmental expenditures: The Greek civil-service system is under close scrutiny by our own bureaucrats. They see means for tightening the Greek budget by eliminating padded pay rolls.

7. Merchant-marine control: The Government up to now has exerted little control over sizable shipping interests who reportedly are accumulating profits abroad.

LATITUDE FOR THE PRESIDENT

The bill before Congress leaves almost entirely to the President the spelling out of terms on which Greek aid will be advanced. That was to be left to the mission detailed to Greece under terms of the measure.

Present plans contemplate an American Recovery Mission to be headed by one man, probably borrowed from the Army. But the State Department will have a determining voice in it.

There's still controversy in Washington as to how strongly the United States should swing its economic big stick to bring about internal reforms in the Balkan nation. One group within the State Department contends the sole aim of the $400,000,000 aid program is to stop Communist aggression. And, they say, it's of no concern how the money's spent, so long as it does that.

But another, apparently influential faction believes the Greek people, and even the present Greek Government, will willingly institute major internal reforms, if backed and urged by the United States. Proponents believe inflation in Greece is driving the people rapidly to the extreme left and the extreme right. Reform would lend strength to the moderate center, they believe.

THE CASE FOR CONTROL

The case for controls is backed up by such UNRRA reports as these.

"Only a small amount of food is on the general ration in Greece and only the rationed food is price controlled. These prices are considerably below the price level of necessary supplemental food such as meat, fats and dairy products. This means that, in order to live, a man must buy a good portion of his food on the open market at an estimated cost of three to five times the cost of his UNRRA ration * * * at least 15 percent of the Greek people have to sell part of their meagre ration (about 700 calories a day) in order to be able to afford the balance."

The Greek foreign exchange balance has been rapidly dwindling. Gold and foreign exchange holdings dropped from $170,000,000 on October 1, 1945, to $98,000,000 on March 7, 1947. And $84,000,000 of the $98,000,000 is in sterling balances, limiting its use to the British sphere where there is a shortage of goods on which it can be spent.

One UNRRA observer has called control over Greek imports a joke.

"In both Athens and Salonika, even smaller towns, tremendous numbers of Swiss watches are on sale. Store windows are full of Parker 51's, Dunhill lighters, new kodaks, nylon hose, and all the latest perfumes from France. Englishmen, who have been putting up with the austerity at home in order to build up their export trade are more than annoyed when they find huge quantities of fine English woolens in a country which is much worse off economically than their own. And you can buy good Scotch whisky anywhere."

Greater exports of Greek goods—running about one-third prewar volume—will be encouraged by the American mission. To boost exports of olive oil and other valuable Greek goods, including currants and raisins, sponges, liqueurs, leather, and some spices, the Greek Government may be persuaded to put into force strict inventory and hoarding regulations to pry out the holdings of exportable goods and convert them into foreign exchange.

Reforms Long Overdue on Wagner Labor Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of April 18, 1947:

REFORMS LONG OVERDUE ON WAGNER LABOR ACT—NEW HOUSE BILL SEEN ATTEMPTING TO EQUALIZE ECONOMIC POWER

(By David Lawrence)

A strange psychology has been built around the effort to enact legislation regulating labor relations.

Thus, the bill passed by a majority of the House of Representatives—including a substantial number of Democrats as well as Republicans—has often been described in the news dispatches as severe or tough. If amendments were offered, they were usually referred to as an effort to ease the bill or to soften it.

Such phrases, used as they are occasionally even by the objective correspondents, emphasize the habit of thinking and writing that has been formed under the New Deal. Whatever tends to remove the severe restrictions imposed on employers is now called destructive of liberty or antilabor. One radio commentator from Washington in the early morning hours the other day spoke of the House bill as a man-eating bill.

The truth is that the Wagner Labor Relations Act, passed in 1935, was the most restrictive measure ever enacted on the subject of labor-management relations.

BLANK CHECK FOR 10 YEARS

Although for 150 years the subject of management-labor relations had always been regarded as one coming under the police power of the States, and not a single constitutional amendment had ever been passed by either House of Congress to allow the Federal Government to legislate on either wages or working conditions or strikes, except in transportation and strictly interstate business, the Supreme Court of the United States nevertheless upheld the Wagner Act in 1937 by a vote of 5 to 4 and applied it to virtually all businesses.

Under this decision and under the broad discretion then assumed by the National Labor Relations Board, scarcely a week passed when the Board did not issue a decision that really made new law.

For nearly 10 years the Labor Board and not Congress has been making the pro-labor laws. Now when Congress—which at last realizes that it had granted a blank check on labor relations—undertakes to prescribe standards and specify just what an employer or union can or cannot do, the left wing cries out in horror that the clock is being turned back to reactionary days.

A reactionary is one who believes in letting the state be master and restrict human rights, or one who upholds private mastery or monopoly of the goods or services of other individuals. A liberal is one who espouses individual liberty and opposes monoply. The left wing today insists on the right of monopoly for a labor union. It completely distorts the right to strike and calls any limitation on that right involuntary servitude. The right of an individual to work or not to work is the cardinal right of all. When two or more individuals band together, however, to coerce or intimidate or even to persuade others to quit work, this is a questionable right which the Constitution will protect only as long as exercise of the right does not damage the interests of other citizens by depriving them of the necessities of life.

INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE

To band together as employers and fix prices or gobble up competitors is acknowledged to be monopoly, but for a group of citizens to form a labor-union monopoly and to control whether men shall or shall not work, as John Lewis does with the Nation-wide miners' union, doesn't seem to impress the left wingers as being a monopoly. Nor do they concede that there is any involuntary servitude when a miner is bound by his union's closed shop and can be read out of the union and deprived of a job if he refuses to obey Lewis.

Congress now is trying to prohibit the closed shop, but the left wing wants it preserved. The Republican majority in the House has yielded to the monopolists to the point of sanctioning compulsory unionization in the so-called union shop, where a worker is told by the employer at the time he is hired that after 30 days he must join the existing union or lose his job. Under the Wagner law at present it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to refuse to hire a man because he is a member of the union, but it is not an unfair labor practice for the employer to agree with a union to fire a worker who, after 30 days, refuses to belong to a union.

Isn't it involuntary servitude when a man can't retain his job without accepting union control of his livelihood? Even a conscientious objector against compulsory unionism loses his right to work in his own trade and industry.

To establish justice in these matters is not to pass a tough bill but to apply long overdue reforms. The House bill just passed has in it some faults, but its main objective is to correct inequities in existing law—not really to introduce new laws. An accurate description is to say the new House bill attempts to equalize economic power which has been thrown out of balance through the one-sided Wagner labor-relations law.

James P. Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, in a special ceremony conducted at his home at Sutherland, Iowa, 99-year-old Civil War veteran James P. Martin was recently installed as State commander of the Iowa Grand Army of the Republic, of which he is the only surviving member. Amy Noll, of Des Moines, department secretary of the Iowa GAR, who was in charge of the installation, and members of other Sutherland organizations—the Women's Relief Corps, the American Legion, and the American Legion Auxiliary—together with many friends, also participated.

I met Commander Martin at a Memorial Day observance at Sutherland, Iowa, a few years ago. On that occasion I congratulated him on his long life and the splendid service he had rendered his country and his community. I little realized at that time that he would some day be the State commander of the Iowa Grand Army of the Republic and its sole survivor.

The community of Sutherland and the State of Iowa are very proud of the honor conferred upon this outstanding soldier and citizen. I am especially proud of the fact that Commander Martin is one of my most distinguished constituents and my personal friend. May God richly bless him and keep him in his declining years.

The Administration's Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Test for Free Enterprise," published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 23, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEST FOR FREE ENTERPRISE

In his address to the Associated Press, President Truman dwelt on factors in our national economy that self-evidently are of the highest importance. It is true, as he says, that private enterprise now bears the main responsibility for prices. That restraint in its use of the power to fix prices would benefit business as well as the entire community is beyond question. Some business leaders are strongly advocating price reduction. Others may be expected to join them, but it would be almost without precedent if voluntary action should bring about adequate restraint on the cost of living.

The settlements which have been made with labor are encouraging. The President's list of musts for business, labor, and government covers a lot of ground. If every factor in production should cooperate to the degree needed, private enterprise would score heavily in its contest with state-regimented industry. The few months to come will be a sharp test of whether industry's horse sense measures up to technical proficiency.

The facts plainly stated by the President put Congress under the obligation to scrutinize present policies as to spending, debt reduction, and tax reduction in the light of the considerable degree of inflation under way. These policies were largely framed for their political appeal. They may backfire on their projectors if a President markedly and increasingly in favor with the people can bring home to any party or any political leaders a measure of responsibility for the ruinous consequences which will occur if the price situation really gets out of hand.

Address by Maj. Gen. E. R. Quesada Before Charleston Chapter, Air Reserve Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most excellent and able address delivered by Maj. Gen. E. R. Quesada, commanding general of the Tactical Air Command, before the Charleston Chapter of the Air Reserve Association, at Charleston, S. C., on April 20, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure and a privilege to be the recipient of Charleston's hospitality. When a visitor to Charleston has been entertained as we have been today, he can be sure that he has received an honor of a sort infrequently bestowed—except in Charleston. Charleston welcomes strangers and sends them away with a sense of having been adopted.

I think that Charleston is successful in giving visitors the sense of being welcome and of belonging here, because of the mood it consistently maintains. There is no other city in which the dominant mood is so completely one of repose and of successful adjustment to the problems of communal and personal living. At no time during the year is this mood so easily recognized as during the Azalea Festival.

This mood of peace, which every visitor is certain to assume, is characteristic of Charleston—and is not deceptive. It may seem to some a strange mood for a town with such a splendid military history and so strong a military tradition.

Charleston, that has seen so much of war, has also witnessed the introduction of new weapons. During the War Between the States, the Confederate submarine *Little David* sank the U. S. S. *Housatonic*, in the first such action in the history of warfare. During that same unfortunate war, the Federal troops, just east of Fort Johnson, installed a cannon of a new type, the Swamp Angel. It shelled the city from the tremendous distance of 7 miles. The Swamp Angel introduced for the first time artillery with shells that could explode and not destroy merely by impact.

As much a part of Charleston's history as her role in four major wars and numerous minor ones is the great military academy whose name is almost synonymous with the name of the city. The Citadel has trained many a leader for the armed forces and for the Confederate States. The cadets of the Citadel manned the cannon on the battery that forced the U. S. S. *Star of the West* to retire when it sought to bring supplies to the Federal garrison on Fort Sumter. The graduates of the Citadel have distinguished themselves as leaders in the community and in the civic life of the Nation, as well as in the profession of arms. Today the president of the Citadel is Gen. Charles P. Summerall, one-time Chief of Staff of the United States Army. In his person there is provided a strong link between Charleston and our national Military Establishment.

I think the lesson to be learned from any attempt to reconcile the quiet atmosphere of Charleston with her stirring military history and her noble military traditions is a lesson which all Americans need to take to heart. It is the lesson of preparedness—a realization of the fact that the armies which fight our wars and secure our Nation's integrity must be trained in peace if they are to be prepared to defend us in war. Leaders cannot be trained after war breaks out. Forts that are not built will not defend us in the event of sudden attack. Weapons that have not been designed cannot be used against an aggressor.

What Charleston has learned from her long experience and her wise leaders is what the Army Air Forces asserts as its chief doctrine. A strong nation is a peaceful nation. If America is to be peaceful, she must be strong—in her Army, her Navy, and her Air Force. The citizens who cried so loudly for a rapid demobilization after VJ-day do not yet understand to what a state of ineffectiveness that disintegration brought us, and they face with complacency our present state of preparedness.

World War II was a global war, fought in the Aleutians as well as the Marianas, in Norway as well as in Africa. It witnessed the perfection of the airplane as an instrument of war and as a means of transportation. One aircraft, carrying a single atomic bomb, gave the Japanese an excuse for surrendering, unconditionally. Our Air Transport Command set up a schedule of world-circling flights that made air travel seem commonplace in all parts of the globe. We flew military matériel from India over the Himalayas to the Chinese. We flew troops and matériel across the Atlantic and the Pacific. President Roosevelt traveled by air to confer with leaders of our allies at Casablanca, Teheran, and Yalta. President Truman joined Premier Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill for a conference and a victory celebration in Berlin. We established bases in Brazil, in the Azores, in Iceland and Greenland—in fact, wherever there were land masses suitable for bases our airplanes followed.

The old definition that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points has a special meaning to us. Ships can go only where channel conditions permit. Surface vehicles can travel only where physical barriers do not exist or have been overcome—by the building of roads, tunnels, bridges, and the like. But aircraft fly above such limitations and in defiance of nature's hazards, and modern long-range aircraft go the shortest distance from point to point, which, in the navigator's phrase, is a great-circle route.

Aircraft do not fly east to go from New York to London just because ships sail in that direction; aircraft fly north. Likewise, aircraft fly north instead of west to go from San Francisco to Japan. Last October a B-29 Flying Fortress—of the type that had carried the atomic bombs to Hiroshima and Nagasaki—flew nonstop from Hawaii to Cairo, Egypt, a distance of 9,444 statute-miles. The pilot of this aircraft chose naturally to follow the shortest route between Hawaii and Egypt; he flew by way of Alaska and across the Arctic Circle.

The lesson to be learned from that flight is not merely that an aircraft can fly nonstop so great a distance. It is that aircraft do not follow the routes of ships or land armies, and that attack by air can come over regions uninhabited and uninhabitable by man.

This is the polar concept, which aviation offers as a true concept of the world in which we live. We have replaced the old concept of the Mercator projection and of our grade school atlases. Throw away your old latitudinal projection maps and look at a polar projection map. Moscow is north of New York City. Vladivostok is north of San Francisco. The industrial countries of Europe and of Asia, that have been the aggressors in the world's most terrible wars, lie north of the United States and Canada, beyond the Arctic regions and the North Pole. Should attack come from any one of these countries again it would not come from the west, as it did at Pearl Harbor, or from the east, whence the Germans sought to paralyze our shipping. It would come by modern long-range aircraft or modern long-range aerial missiles across the polar wastes. Oceans and coastal defenses no longer protect the continental United States. A good neighbor on our northern border is no guaranty against attack from that direction.

In the world in which we live, changes have come to us. Charleston was on the outer rim of our continental defense during the American Revolution. During both World Wars German submarines approached near, indeed, to the coast and to Charleston Today Charleston is no more on the periphery of our defense than is Rockford, Ill. No city in the United States is invulnerable to attack by air. The industrial cities of the Middle West, which contributed most of the matériel of our World Wars, might well be the first targets of a new attack. Experiences in World War II taught us, and should have taught, possible aggressors, that armies can be defeated in the field if the industrial potential of a nation is paralyzed. Our strategic bombing of German and Japanese industry may well have set the pattern that a future enemy might choose to follow in an attack on us. It is certainly a logical pattern.

Against such an attack as this the Army Air Forces seeks to employ but a single weapon—and that is a strong air force, adequately staffed, adequately trained, adequately equipped to meet offense with offense, and to make immediate retaliatory action the method of defense in the United States. Our Air Forces should be able to assure the national suicide of any aggressor.

The building and the maintenance of such an air force necessitates primarily a well-integrated organization. The Army Air Forces has, in its three combat commands and its five supporting commands, established itself in accordance with lessons learned and experience gained in World War II.

The Air Defense Command is charged primarily with the defense of the United States and with the training of our civilian components to become an effective element of our regular Air Force, capable of immediate mobilization.

The Strategic Air Command is a global striking force, unrestricted geographically, which must be prepared to conduct long-range operations in any part of the world at any time, either independently or in cooperation with land and naval forces.

The five supporting commands are established to supply the three combat commands with matériel and with trained personnel, and to insure them of the needed services of transportation, communication, etc.

No organization, to be effective, can exist on paper alone. An air-force-in-being, supported by the civilian components, is an essential of national security.

The rapid demobilization that reduced the Air Force from a total of 2,314,000 officers and men on VJ-day to approximately 340,000 at the end of 1946, robbed the Air Force of many of its most experienced, its most highly trained technicians, and reduced its effectiveness to a state that is difficult to measure, but that our enemies as well as ourselves can easily recognize. In our Air Force only 70 percent of our officers are pilots, and over 55 percent of our officers and men, exclusive of our pilots, must be technically trained in long and difficult courses. When such an organization loses its highly trained men as rapidly as we did, its effectiveness cannot be maintained.

The Army Air Forces can, of course, train new men, but training takes time, and our training facilities have had to be rebuilt. Today the Army Air Forces has less than 75 percent of its needed personnel, and among the numbers it has many are engaged in the job of disposing of surplus property left over from World War II or otherwise performing tasks that contribute nothing directly to the combat effectiveness of our interim Air Forces; as such they are ineffective.

The demise of selective service has increased the problem of recruitment. For one reason or another, voluntary recruiting, in spite of all the inducements offered, is not giving us the men we need. Universal training, which is currently considered, may solve the problem of creating for us a reservoir of trained personnel from which to draw in time of need. The problem is one to which there are numerous solutions. I do not suggest or endorse any one, but I do want to stress the problem.

The Army Air Forces that needs men also requires weapons. Today our program for procuring the needed weapons is facing a crucial test. Cuts in the budget for the Army Air Forces threaten the very existence of the program that has been projected. Scientific research, engineering planning, and technical developments are expensive, very expensive; but how much less expensive, in dollars, lives, and misery, it is compared to defeat, I will leave to your imagination. Those of you who have seen Germany or Japan will be the most capable of drawing the comparison.

The Army Air Forces has contemplated the establishment of a program for scientific research and development even before VJ-day. In January 1946 the Office of Research and Development was established on a deputy chief of staff level. The sole duties of this office, General Spaatz stated, "are to guide and control a program of research and development, and to maintain close liaison with Government research agencies." This office keeps informed of what is happening in private and public laboratories throughout the land, and investigates the possibilities of the application of new knowledge and new techniques to military use. The modern airplane is a triumph of science and engineering. New discoveries, or the application of former developments to new uses, may yet give us aircraft and weapons that will make our present methods outmoded. The Office of Research and Development is especially interested in the application of jet- and rocket-propelled aircraft, and the development of pilotless aircraft and guided missiles.

At Wright Field, Ohio, headquarters of the Air Matériel Command, the application of scientific developments to Army Air Forces matériel and equipment is planned and supervised. At the various bases of the Air Proving Ground Command, from Florida to Alaska, the equipment is tested. By one means or another the Army Air Forces makes certain that its weapons will be the finest and the most effective possible.

This, then, is the postwar Air Force with which we hope to secure the integrity of the United States; an air-force-in-being, with its full complement of personnel, adequately trained to carry out their responsibilities, and supported by a program of scientific research and development that will insure our having the most effective weapons, aircraft, and other equipment.

Our Air Force cannot exist without the fullest support of America's citizens, who must always, as General Arnold reminded them, make air power their business. "In the final analysis," General Arnold said, "our air striking force belongs to those who come from the ranks of labor, management, the farms, the stores, the professions, the schools and colleges, and the legislative halls. It is the American people who will decide whether this Nation will continue to hold its air supremacy."

There are three direct ways in which the American people can make sure that our Air Force will remain strong. First, through its Representatives to Congress, it can assure adequate support for our military needs.

Secondly, the American public can make sure that trained personnel will be available at all times in adequate numbers to fulfill the manpower requirements of the Military Establishment. Our economy does not permit us to maintain a large standing Army; but neither does our economy permit us to engage in such expensive wars as World War I and World War II. Maintenance of a strong Military Establishment is the premium we pay on a national insurance policy. It is cheaper in our national defense structure, as it is in any business structure, to pay the premiums than to replace the property when it has been destroyed.

Third, the American people can support the armed services, and specifically the Army Air Force, by voluntary enrollment for reserve training in the Air National Guard or the Air Reserve. Together they are a reservoir from which we must replenish and augment our Regular Establishment in time of war. A flow of such reservists into the combat zone must start immediately after attack, or it will be too late.

Unfortunately, the cuts in appropriations that have threatened the reduction of our Regular Establishment, and which threaten still further reduction, have already effected a serious curtailment of our reserve program. Without option in the matter, the Army Air Forces has had to reduce the active units of the Air Reserve from 70 to 41, and a corresponding number of AAF bases have had to be closed. The Air Reserve training program has been crippled; there is no denying it. How seriously crippled, it may take another war to reveal.

In the selection of bases, the Army Air Forces has chosen to maintain the bases where facilities for the most effective training of the greatest number of Air Reserve personnel are already available, and with regard to proximity to densely populated areas. The units retained are in most cases those with the largest enrollments of reservists. Twenty States are now left without Reserve bases. In most of those 20 States there are units of the Air National Guard. The location of an Air National Guard unit is the prerogative of the State concerned, and the wishes of State authorities must be recognized in instances where units of both the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve are not justified under the reduced program. If an Air National Guard unit exists in your State but not in your city, it is because State officials put it elsewhere. If the Air Reserve

base in your State has been closed, it is because an impartial survey of the situation left the Army Air Forces without alternative in the matter.

The closing of a base does not end the opportunities of a reservist, however, nor should it kill his interest in the Air Reserve program. Rather, it should serve as a challenge to his loyalty and his devotion, and an incentive to fight the harder to put the program across. Much can be accomplished by formal identification with the program. Membership in the Air Reserve Association is an announcement of intention to support the Reserve program. The bigger the membership of the Air Reserve Association, the more weight will the Organized Reserve have throughout the Nation. The prime objective is a strong national defense, unweakened by false economy.

Cheap national defense is the most expensive thing in the world. It cost us hundreds of thousands of lives and $350,000,000,000 in World War II, when the debt—the money debt—was still unpaid on World War I.

The last place to economize is in our Reserve training program. A well-trained reservist costs the taxpayer far less than the trained Regular. Don't forget that the reservists constitute 90 percent of our fighting forces in tim eof war.

In the face of a possible national disaster it is of small comfort to be reminded as a great poet once reminded himself, that: "They also serve who only stand and wait."

It is a great comfort to us in the armed services, to whom national security is our life's blood to have the active support of your own Senator, Senator MAYBANK, and your own governor, Governor Thurman.

In the person of Senator MAYBANK we have found an American well founded in our democratic principles and with a courage capable of supporting them. We like Senator MAYBANK.

In your governor, we find one capable of leadership in peace as well as in war. It is gratifying to us that the same type of man who landed on a Normandy beachhead in a glider on D-day is now engaged in affairs of public interest.

Your own mayor attended West Point, so naturally we consider him among our friends.

Your Congressman, Mr. RIVERS, in addition to his other contributions, is now a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee.

Your own Senator JOHNSTON is naturally aware of what war means and so, therefore, it is assumed that he is anxious to avoid a recurrence. He saw service as a sergeant in World War I.

Those remarks directed to your own leaders and legislators are not made with a view of polishing the apple; they are made merely as an expression of gratification on our part in finding that our leaders are men of understanding, with that understanding having been gained through contact with the horrors of war, as well as a high intellect.

I would like to conclude with a word of appreciation to the Charleston chapter of the Air Reserve Association and to all Reserve officers here for the splendid work that is being done in this area. I know that I also express the thoughts of General Spaatz when I say that the Army Air Forces is deeply appreciative of your many efforts—efforts constantly directed toward insuring the maintenance of an adequate air force in being and an air force second to none. Your active interest and continued participation in furthering the cause of national defense reflects your genuine interest, as citizens, in the affairs of our Nation and is indicative of the patriotism with which you are imbued. This is a mighty fine sign and augurs well for the future of our democracy.

I would like to leave one final thought with you, and it is simply this: Air power was established as a decisive factor in war by the Royal Air Force and the Army Air Forces. What irony it would be if the very countries that created air power were destroyed by it.

Thank you.

Polish-German Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter that was sent to President Harry S. Truman by the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America regarding the Polish-German frontier:

POLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC
UNION OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., April 17, 1947.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: As chief executive of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, the oldest and one of the largest organizations of Polish-Americans, I feel that it is my duty to raise a voice of protest at this crucial moment when members of our Government are trying to perpetrate an additional injustice on the heroic Polish Nation, the land of our forefathers.

I have read with astonishment and indignation the proposition of our Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, at the conference in Moscow: First, for the return of some agricultural territories along the present German-Polish frontier to Germany; and second, for placing industrial Silesia under international control. In the opinion of the Secretary of State, these changes of the present status are necessary for the rebuilding of German economy.

I venture to say that proposals of the Secretary of State create an absurd situation and add new injustice to the betrayals of Poland at Teheran and Yalta.

Our Government has agreed to an unprecedented annexation of almost half of Poland by Russia—without even consulting Poland, and against her protest; now our Government proposes to strengthen Germany, again at the expense of Poland.

During the war we have exploited Poland's valor and Polish blood, promising her and the rest of the suffering world freedom and independence; now we are displaying more concern for the welfare of our own and humanity's enemy than for the welfare of our first, and most faithful, and now most unhappy ally.

If we have wrongly deprived Poland of almost half of her eastern territories, then we should at least leave her those western territories, which have been assigned to her at Potsdam, to which Poland has undeniable rights. It is important to the cause of justice and peace that we give Poland a chance of regaining sound economic equilibrium and independence.

Internationalization of Silesia will not contribute to the future peace; on the contrary, it will surely endanger it, by remaining an open ground for political strife, as was so sadly illustrated by former experience.

Mr. President, when you recently proclaimed a new policy of defending the world against encroachments of Communist tyranny, we had hoped that at last the United States is beginning to embark upon a sane diplomatic course. Now we fear that we are returning to the old system of groping in the dark.

If we are willing to help Greece and Turkey, why at the same time are we destroying all hope for Poland? What is the use of rebuilding Germany at the expense of our betrayed friends when recent past has clearly proved her incorrigibility?

The vacillations of American foreign policy fill us with fear for the future of our country and of the world. We ask for a bold and fearless policy of justice to our friends and all possible help to all nations which form ramparts against tyrannies.

Mr. President, why does the present administration's policy tend to eventually annihilate the Polish nation? Why is it that Poland's rights and territories are repeatedly questioned? Our Government is protecting the rights of Austria, Italy, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, Germany, and other nations, but is constantly neglecting and trampling upon the rights of a faithful ally that has contributed proportionally more to the final victory in the recent war than any other nation. We feel that Poland is entitled to just compensation for her sufferings and losses, instead of punishment by a new partition of her territory.

I sincerely hope that our Government will strive tc undo past errors committed against this old and true friend of our Nation, thus restoring our record as champion of freedom, justice, and peace among nations.

Most respectfully yours,
JOSEPH L. KANIA,
President, Polish Roman
Catholic Union of America.

Wool Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein an article on wool legislation, written by Charles T. Lucey, appearing in the Washington News of April 24, 1947, as well as an editorial appearing in the News of the same day.

(By Charles T. Lucey)

The "wool boys" in Congress have devised a brand-new gadget for price-jumping. It can be fitted neatly into a piece of legislation. That's what they're trying to do now. There's the story—

About 10 days ago the Senate passed a bill providing that the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation c ntinue through 1948 to pay a support price of 42 cents a pound for uncleaned domestic wool. Cleaned, so that it can go into wool fabrics, that comes out at about $1.20 a pound.

But foreign wool, even after a 34-cent-a-pound tariff, can be sold here 10 to 12 cents a pound cheaper than domestic wool.

In recent years the Commodity Credit Corporation has piled up a huge surplus of domestic wool—more than 400,000,000 pounds.

It wasn't permitted to dispose of this wool at below the so-called parity price, and so was at a competitive disadvantage in relation to imported wool.

But still it managed to sell a lot of wool, taking a loss of $38,000,000 on it.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND—DROP

If all domestic wool had gone on the market, the wool price would have been forced down.

Thus while taxpayers provided money to meet the Government's losses on wool, they

paid more for woolen clothes and fabrics because the price-support program held up basic wool prices.

Then the House Agriculture Committee added its further price-jumping gadget. It directed the Secretary of Agriculture, whenever he finds proper cause, to levy an additional import fee on foreign wool to wipe out its advantage—despite a heavy tariff already levied—over domestic wool. With one-half to two-thirds of the total wool used here coming from abroad, the price increase would affect a huge volume of manufactured woolen goods.

The Secretary of Agriculture could do this whenever he found that lower imported wool prices interfered with the domestic price-support program. The additional import fee could go as high as half the value of the wool.

"INTERFERENCE" RIGHT AWAY

Congressmen seem to agree that this could mean slapping on this fee at once since, it is pointed out, there obviously is "interference" when the Government is left holding the bag with more than 400,000,000 pounds of wool, as is the case today.

Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, Republican, of Kansas, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, conceded this proposal might have the effect of increasing prices of some woolen goods and that it was contrary in spirit to the reciprocal trade policy preached so long by the Government.

OPPOSITE TO H. T.'S APPEALS

Other Congressmen agreed that, as far as wool goes, it is contrary to President Truman's appeals to business to keep prices down.

Representative CHRISTIAN HERTER, Republican, of Massachusetts, charged that "in effect the import-fee proposal will mean an embargo on foreign wool, because the Secretary of Agriculture can fix prices high enough to keep foreign wool out until domestic wool is sold.

"There isn't a single manufacturer who can tell what price he may be paying for wool—the Secretary can, without formal or informal hearing, determine what the import price is to be. His decision would be final. It is no derogation of the Secretary to say he should not be given this kind of power."

Mr. HERTER contends the bill is contrary to Congress rules. He points out its import fee would produce tariff revenue, yet it did not originate in the House Ways and Means Committee but came, instead, from the Senate. By rule, the House acts first on all money bills.

Chairman HOPE says the bill may come to the House floor next week, and Representative HERTER says a determined fight will be made against it. But wool, politically, is strong.

SOMETHING MORE FOR WOOL

Unless a sufficient number of Congressmen say "no," the "let's do something for wool" boys are likely to perform an artistic shearing job on that much-clipped fellow, the American consumer. Charles Lucey's story, on page 10, tells the tale.

For a long time now the Government has bought wool at above market prices to help support western wool growers in a style to which they would never be accustomed if they had to compete with imported wool. Much of this the Government has sold, but it holds a 400,000,000-pound bag of wool on which it pays storage charges.

The loss to date on this program is $38,000,000—and that doesn't include increased costs to consumers from artificially supported prices.

The wartime emergency spigot is a hard one to shut off, and now the wool boys are back asking for support for domestic prices until December 31, 1948.

But that's not all. They're asking that the Secretary of Agriculture be empowered to lay an additional import fee on foreign wool over and above a 34-cents-a-pound tariff already levied—this new impost, up to 50 percent ad valorem, to be added whenever the Secretary thinks it wise.

It makes a joke of the foreign-trade expansion idea envisioned in the reciprocal-trade program, and a joke of congressional power to lay taxes. It ignores President Truman's pleas to hold prices down.

That bleat you hear is not from the sheep, Mister, but from the poor old consumer—whose interests so far haven't been considered in congressional debates on this issue.

John Taber: The Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Gould Lincoln has paid just tribute to our friend and colleague the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, in an article which appeared in the Sunday Star, April 20, 1947. The tribute which he passes to our friend is just, and demonstrates that the service he has been rendering this Nation down through the years is appreciated by many. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith this outstanding article by Mr. Gould Lincoln:

THAT MAN WITH THE AX IS LOOSE ON CAPITOL HILL—REPRESENTATIVE TABER SWINGS SAVAGELY AT THE BUDGET—LONG EXPERIENCE WITH APPROPRIATIONS GUIDES HIM

(By Gould Lincoln)

JOHN (Jack the Budget Killer) TABER is wielding the meat ax in the greatest economy drive the country has ever seen.

As chairman of the House Appropriations Committee this veteran Republican Representative from up-State New York is carrying a tremendous burden. He is initiating every move to cut the Truman budget—$37,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948—$6,000,000,000. That is the size of the cut ordered by the House. The Senate voted instead for a $4,500,000,000 reduction in the Presidential budget. The two Houses, it is expected, will ultimately support a compromise slice in the neighborhood of $5,250,000,000.

MADE IMPRESSIVE START

Probably no man better equipped for the economy drive could have been found either on the Republican or Democratic side of the House. JOHN TABER has been a Member of the House for nearly a quarter of a century. During all that time he has been a member of the Appropriations Committee.

It is an unusual thing for a freshman Member of the House to spring immediately into the powerful money-spending committee. But it happened in TABER's case. The late Martin Madden, of Illinois, Republican, was chairman of the committee when Mr. TABER came to Washington in December 1923, to take his seat in Congress. None of the older Republican Members of the New York delegation was available for the vacancy in the Appropriations Committee which TABER ultimately filled.

Representative Wainwright, a New Yorker, too and another freshman Member of the House that year, had been in the Army during World War I and had 2 years as Assistant Secretary of War. He indicated he was willing to serve on the Appropriations Committee, provided he could be a member of the subcommittee dealing with appropriations for the War Department. Chairman Madden, however, was accustomed to settling the question of subcommittee assignments. Mr. Wainwright, he said, would not get the War Department assignment, and that was that.

FAMILIAR WITH MILITARY FUNDS

The late Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., who became a general in the Second World War, was Assistant Secretary of the Navy at the time. After Mr. TABER, through no effort of his own, had been appointed to the Appropriations Committee. Mr. Madden did accept a suggestion from Roosevelt that the New York Congressman would be a good man to serve on the subcommittee dealing with naval appropriations. So Mr. TABER was a member of the naval subcommittee for 10 years. More recently he served as a member of the War Department subcommittee for 4 years. So the chairman of the committee is thoroughly conversant with Army and Navy appropriations.

This is important. For undoubtedly there will be slashes in some of the budget estimates for the military and naval services. Chairman TABER insists they can be made without injury to the national defense; that the new coordination of the military services—in one department—proposed by the President will make possible some savings. Also there are a number of yards and posts for the Navy and for the Army which are merely "political," in the sense it is to the advantage of Members of Congress to have them where they are, spending plenty of money. They are not all essential, and if Mr. TABER has his way, they will go. That is the kind of slash in expenditures, however, which will be followed by screams of pain.

PLENTY OF OPPOSITION

Democratic taunts and charges that TABER cannot cut the President's budget by six billion, or even $3,000,000,000, roll off the broad back of the Appropriations chairman. He is confident, he says, that when all the appropriation bills have been put through the cuts will have been made. He doesn't fool himself, however, over the desperate contests which will be made by the Democrats—who do not want the budget cut with a resultant loss of hundreds of thousands on the Federal pay roll—and by special pressure groups.

These pressure groups include farmers, veterans, reclamation, labor, and river and harbor improvement groups. There are others—but these are principal ones. They all want Federal money—the money that comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers—for innumerable projects and services. Many of these projects and services are worthy. The question, however, is whether the American people can afford to pay for them.

SNORTS AT "FALSE ECONOMY"

Mr. Taber takes no stock at all in the charge made by President Truman in his Jefferson Day address that to cut the budget below the $37,500,000,000 figure would be "false economy."

"False economy," Mr. TABER snorts, "lies in spending money you do not have when taxes imposed upon the American people are higher that ever before in history and a great burden."

Not only does the drive for governmental economy rest in the first instance on Chairman TABER, but it is quite clear that if Mr. TABER fails to deliver, material reduction of the income taxes, promised the people by the Republicans, will be impossible. The same is true about substantial payment on the Government's $260,000,000,000 debt.

GETS HIS OPPORTUNITY

Fortunately for Mr. TABER—and for Congress and the people generally—he is not a

nervous human being. He is a tremendous worker and conscientious. He has been waiting for more than a decade to get to work, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, cutting the swollen budgets of Democratic administrations of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and of President Truman.

This is his opportunity—growing out of the Republican victory in the congressional elections last fall—and he is not going to forego it. For years he thundered in the House and in committee against the big appropriations demanded by the administration—as the ranking minority member of the committee. His constant attention to details probably saved the taxpayers many millions of dollars as it was.

The stentorian tones of Mr. TABER's voice have echoed through the House Chamber in protest against spending and more spending, for years. He has a deep, rasping voice, with the tearing qualities of a file. When he talks over the loud-speaker system in the House his voice carries far out into the corridors.

Chairman TABER does not hail from the big-business center of his home State—New York. He is a native of Auburn. There he went to school, and from school to Yale College, from which he graduated in the class of 1902. He studied law at the New York Law School and went back home to hang out his shingle.

He described himself as "a country lawyer," when he first set sail for Congress. This is, however, not a complete description. He had, as a matter of fact, made a very material success at the law. He had also held important posts in manufacturing and banking institutions in Auburn. In local Republican politics he early became interested, serving on the Cayuga County Republican Committee, as a delegate to numerous Republican State conventions, and then as chairman of the county committee. He was a delegate to the Republican National Conventions of 1920 and 1924. When Norman Gould, his predecessor as Representative of the Auburn district in the House, decided to quit in 1922, Mr. TABER was prevailed upon to run for the nomination and election. It was a walkaway race for him, and he has been reelected every 2 years since then by majorities ranging from 18,000 to 40,000. Last year he was reelected with a lead of 39,000.

HARD MAN WITH PUBLIC MONEY

Before his election to the House, Mr. TABER knew little of the National Capital. He had visited Washington only twice for brief periods. He has learned plenty about the Capital in the last quarter of a century, however. One of the things which has been impressed upon him is the terrible urge that bureau heads, Cabinet officers, and others in the executive departments have for more and bigger funds to spend. They all want more money—so much so that Chairman TABER has come to regard every official who appears before his committee with suspicion—especially if he requests additional appropriations.

For 14 years—from the time the late President Roosevelt entered the office, Mr. TABER was the ranking Republican member of the House Appropriations Committee. Literally thousands of men came before the committee during that period on the appropriation bills. Too many of them, Mr. TABER insists, have not been frank enough, and he has had to fight three-fourths of them over estimates of expenditures. He gives a pretty good bill of health, however, to the officials of the Post Office Department and the Internal Revenue Bureau. Some of the others he describes as awful.

Decidedly Mr. TABER is not against the Army and Navy. He wants a strong national defense at all times. He insists, however, that money can be wasted by the War and Navy Departments, just as it can by other Government agencies—and that he is against. He looks with suspicion on huge foreign loans by this Government always—and wants to be convinced that they are good and that they are necessary.

HIS PHILOSOPHY

In his opinion, the real coordination of the Army and Navy will be accomplished through the appropriations made for both, and his committee will play a major part in bringing about this coordination.

By nature JOHN TABER is conservative, but he is also constructive. His own philosophy he puts something like this: "As a general rule a fellow makes his contribution who looks ahead and tries to have things a little better every day; who tries to keep the Government from spending too much money; who tries to see that the proper obligations of the Government are met, and who puts as much business into running the Government as possible. He promotes the progress of and better things for the people. On the other hand, the so-called liberal, with a paucity of ideas, always running around making demagogic speeches, and trying to play to the gallery, is the real reactionary the Government has to fear."

This is in line with what he wrote in an autobiography for his class book (at Yale) 20 years ago, when he said:

"I have lived in a small city always and have been so busy that I have kept pretty close to my home. I have prospered sufficiently to enable me to satisfy any reasonable want—be it said, my wants are few—and to enable me to devote a very considerable portion of my time to the public service and to quasi-public efforts."

FACING RESPONSIBILITIES

"My ambition is to be of some service in developing and sustaining public sentiment along constructive lines, in trying to make American citizenship honestly realize its responsibilities and meet them face to face."

Certainly Mr. TABER is overmodest in his comments upon himself, in the opinion of his classmates, of whom I happen to be one.

In college Mr. TABER, a long, lanky, friendly fellow, went out in freshman year for his class football team, and for 4 years was a candidate for the track team. Later, when he was at work, he gave as much time as he could to keeping his garden. He never went in for golf. Today his recreation is reading and a bridge game, occasionally, with old friends. His workday, which often includes Sundays, runs from 9:15 a. m. until 6:30 p. m.—long enough.

The Soviet Spies—The Story of Russian Espionage in North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, last year while the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am a member, was trying to run down a foreign spy ring operating throughout this country, the Canadian Government was bending every effort toward the same end.

Canada succeeded in running those spies down and exposed the most vicious plot of international espionage ever used against the people of Canada and the United States.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article on this subject which appears in the May issue of the Reader's Digest which every patriotic American should read.

The matter referred to follows:

THE SOVIET SPIES

At 285 Charlotte Street in Ottawa, the Canadian capital, there is a three-story red-brick building with a sloping slate roof and high white porches, of a type favored by solid citizens in the late nineteenth century, when they built large homes to raise large families. Early in 1942 it was taken over as diplomatic headquarters of the Soviet Embassy. The main portion of the house was used by Ambassador G. N. Zaroubin and his staff, while the rear wing, formerly the kitchen and servants' quarters, was closed off from the rest of the building by double steel doors, and windows with iron bars and steel shutters. Here was located the secret cipher department where the highly technical tasks of encoding and decoding the secret dispatches to and from Moscow were performed.

For the sake of insuring absolute secrecy, each of the five sections of the Embassy maintained its own code, and had its own clerk in a sealed-off room. For example, the military section, headed by Col. Nicolai Zabotin, had one Igor Gouzenko stationed in its code room to handle the communications which went to the Director of Military Intelligence in Moscow. Cipher Clerk Gouzenko's code books were placed every night in a big steel safe which also held the secret diaries of the military attaché. Similarly, the NKVD, or secret police, had its own means of sending messages to Moscow, as did the Ambassador, the commercial attaché, and the chief of the political section.

Gouzenko, a grave-eyed, serious young man of 25, had been handpicked for this highly responsible job. As a lieutenant in the Red Army he had undergone a long period of special training before being sent to Ottawa. He was a graduate of a special intelligence school conducted by the Red Army General Staff. He had seen front-line service, too—a long year of action during 1942, including the winter campaigns before Moscow. Finally, after a tour at the main intelligence division of the Red army, where his past behavior and his reliability were subjected to exhaustive inquiry by the NKVD, he was cleared for service abroad. He was sent to Canada in June 1943.

He took his wife with him—tall, dark-haired Svetlana Borisovna. Soon after their arrival in Ottawa, their son, Andrei, was born. They had a small apartment at 511 Somerset Street, facing a park. The neighbors thought highly of the young couple; they were quiet, courteous, and dignified.

Gouzenko's outward appearance gave no clue to the ferment and turmoil which racked his soul. From his unparalleled vantage point he saw accumulate before his eyes the detailed operations of an espionage system which was directed against a country whose way of life he was coming more and more to respect and admire.

When Igor Gouzenko left his office at 8 o'clock on the evening of September 5, 1945, he not only cut himself off irrevocably from his homeland, but he faced the threat of assassination. All day long he had worked at fever pitch, certain in the knowledge that what he was doing would be of ultimate benefit to all the free peoples of the world. From the safe and the code sacks he had chosen key documents. Some were cables, some were diaries, some were torn scraps of paper which had been given to him to burn. Altogether they made a packet of considerable bulk, but by distributing them among his pockets and by pinning them beneath his shirt, he was able to avoid arousing the suspicions of the door guard, a member of the NKVD.

Safely past the doorman, Gouzenko walked away without a backward glance. Lost among the evening strollers, his spare, slender figure attracted no attention, either by his pace or demeanor. Yet his actions were to be of the utmost significance in their influence on the future relationships between nations.

Carefully he had thought out his task. He intended to reveal nothing less than the Soviet plan to establish in Canada an espionage base for use against not only the Dominion, but the United States and Great Britain as well. He intended to back up his assertions with incontrovertible documentary evidence. In return he would ask only for the protection of the Canadian Government for his wife and child. As for himself, he had weighed the risks, and thought that it was probable that he would be killed before his mission was completed.

Gouzenko walked to the offices of the Ottawa Journal and asked to see the editor. He apologized for not being able to explain his purpose.

"The editor is not in," he was told. "You can see one of his assistants."

To the latter, Gouzenko explained that he had information of the greatest importance, not only to the people of Canada, but to the peace and stability of the world. From a coat pocket he took one of the numerous flimsy sheets in Russian typescript. "I have many documents," he said. "They should be studied by you."

Their talk went on for almost an hour. So fantastic was Gouzenko's story, and so strange to the newspaperman was the collection of documents, that the latter was completely at a loss. Finally he said: "You'd better go to the police. They are the people to handle that sort of thing, not a newspaper."

It was then almost 10 o'clock, too late to accomplish anything till the next day.

The next morning Gouzenko and his wife went to the Ministry of Justice, to the office of the Crown Attorney, Raoul Mercier. Here he spoke to Mrs. Fernande Joubarne, secretary to Mr. Mercier, explaining what he had done and what he proposed to do. He had his wife open her handbag in which the documents now reposed.

"Everything is here," he said, "including secret information on the atomic bomb. You must tell your Government about this."

"The Crown Attorney is in court," said Mrs. Joubarne, "but I will try to put you in touch with the proper people."

She called the Under Secretary of State for External Affairs, Norman Robertson. He said: "Keep him waiting. I will seek instructions from the Prime Minister."

Gouzenko was anxious to get his story heard quickly. He knew that his absence at the Russian Embassy would arouse suspicions. But reaching the Prime Minister the morning of September 6 was difficult. It was the day set for the opening of a new session of Parliament.

At 11 o'clock the Commons were seated in their chamber. It remained only for Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King to enter and the ceremonies would begin.

King was in the cloakroom off the main floor when an aide came up and whispered a few words into his ear. The Prime Minister went to the telephone.

"Sorry to interrupt you, sir," said Under Secretary Robertson, "but this is something which only you can decide." He told King about Gouzenko.

Mackenzie King replied, and these are his own words as later revealed to a special session of the Canadian Parliament: "This is a case where we cannot be too cautious. We do not know whether the documents are fabrications or not. We do not know his state of mind or anything of the circumstances which prompt his offer. I do not think the Government of Canada can take any action which would cause the Soviet Government to believe that we are prying into their affairs. Tell the young man to return to his Embassy with the papers he has in his possession."

It was too late for Gouzenko to do that. He and his wife went back to their apartment. For the time being there appeared no other place to go.

They went into the house by the back entrance. When they reached their apartment, No. 4, Gouzenko peeked out the window toward the park across the street. Seated on a bench opposite, he saw what he had feared—two men rather obviously watching his windows.

Early that night there was a knock on the door. Then came the voice of Under Lieutenant Lavrentiev of the Embassy staff "Gouzenko—otkroyte dver" (open the door).

The cipher clerk and his wife held their breath. But little Andrei ran across the floor toward a toy Teddy bear. He tripped, stumbled against the door. Lavrentiev made no attempt to enter, but he now knew the apartment was occupied.

Gouzenko picked up the child and went out through a back door leading to the rear balconies shared in common with other apartments on the second floor.

Here were seated an RCAF sergeant and his wife. He was smoking a pipe and reading the evening paper.

"Excuse me," interrupted Gouzenko, "May I speak with you?"

The sergeant looked up in surprise.

"Sure, man, what is it?" he replied.

"Please to take my little boy with you tonight—something maybe happen to my wife and me."

"What's going to happen?"

"Get killed," was the laconic reply.

Gouzenko and the RCAF sergeant were standing on the balcony when they saw Lavrentiev walking away down the lane. The cipher clerk paled. "There he is," he whispered. "Perhaps you had better take my wife in your apartment as well."

As they were talking Mrs. C. D. Anderson, a motherly looking housewife who lived in apartment 6, appeared. On hearing the story, she said: "I have plenty of room for all of your family, including yourself, Mr. Gouzenko. I will be very happy to give you shelter as long as you require it."

"You go along with her," said the sergeant. "I'll call the police. Those fellows will not dare break into the house of a Canadian citizen."

That was at 7 o'clock. At half past 7, Constables Tom Walsh and J. B. McCulloch, who had been patrolling the district in their prowl car, responded to the call.

In apartment 6 they found the Gouzenkos. The cipher clerk identified himself, said that he had information of extreme importance to the Government, and requested protection. The officers assured him that they would watch the apartment house.

"Keep the light on in the bathroom here. We can see it from the park. If you need us, put out the light."

When they went back to their car they moved it to a spot in the park.

Nothing happened until 11:30, when four men drove up to 511 Somerset Street. They went at once to Gouzenko's apartment. They began by knocking on the door. They knocked so loud and so long that the RCAF sergeant thought that it was the police returning for a further inquiry. He opened his door and looked out.

Realizing his error he was about to close the door when one of the men ran up to him.

"Where is Gouzenko?" he demanded.

The RCAF sergeant gave him a blank look. "You got me, buddy," he said, and shut the door tight.

There was a conference in the hall, then the four men put their shoulders to the door of Gouzenko's apartment and broke in.

From apartment 6 Gouzenko watched the proceedings through the keyhole. He got up, went to the bathroom, switched out the light.

In the park, the police officers caught the signal. They streaked for the apartment house on the double. In apartment 4 they found all the lights on and all the closet doors open. Consul Pavlov was in one closet, Colonel Rogov in another. Two assistants from the Soviet Embassy were in the room.

"What are you people doing here?" demanded Walsh.

Pavlov produced his card and said that all present were members of the Embassy staff, who were looking for certain official papers. "The man who owns this apartment has left town, but we have his permission to enter and get what we need."

Walsh pointed to the broken lock, part of which still lay on the floor. "For people who have permission to enter an apartment, you certainly chose a funny way to get in."

Pavlov shrugged. "We lost the key," he replied. "This is Soviet property and we can do as we wish. You will please leave."

The officers shook their heads. "Not until an inspector arrives."

Consul Pavlov held a conference with his group, and decided to call it a night. The police made no effort to detain them, and they went back to the Soviet Embassy.

For the rest of the night the Gouzenkos remained in apartment 6 under the watchful care of the city police.

Shortly after daybreak on September 7, the Gouzenkos and their documents were moved to the headquarters of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Commissioner S. T. Wood personally notified Prime Minister Mackenzie King of the events of the preceding evening.

Again the Prime Minister pointed out the need for proceeding cautiously. "Be certain that this man's motives are above suspicion and that his documents are genuine."

The first thing Commissioner Wood sought to establish was the reason for Gouzenko's decision to leave the Soviet Embassy.

"I will be glad to explain that to you," was the reply. His statement is reproduced here because of the lesson which it contains for every thinking person.

"I, Igor Gouzenko, wish to make the following statement of my own will:

"Having arrived in Canada 2 years ago, I was surprised during the first days by the complete freedom of the individual which exists in Canada but does not exist in Russia. The false representations about the democratic countries which are increasingly propagated in Russia were dissipated daily, as no lying propaganda can stand up against facts.

"Holding forth at international conferences with voluble statements about peace and security, the Soviet government is simultaneously preparing secretly for a Third World War. To meet this war, the Soviet government is creating in democratic countries, including Canada, a fifth column, in the organization of which even diplomatic representatives of the Soviet government take part.

"During my residence in Canada I have seen how the Canadian people and their government, sincerely wishing to help the Soviet people, sent supplies to the Soviet Union, collected money for the welfare of the Russian people, sacrificing the lives of their sons in the delivery of these supplies across the ocean, and instead of gratitude for the help rendered, the Soviet Government is developing espionage activity in Canada, preparing to deliver a stab in the back of Canada—all this without the knowledge of the Russian people.

"Convinced that such double-faced politics of the Soviet Government toward the democratic countries do not conform with the interests of the Russian people and endanger the security of civilization, I decided to break away from the Soviet regime and to announce my decision openly."

The next problem was to examine the documents, translate them, and establish their authenticity. A mass of papers, they were of all colors, shapes, and sizes, and one glance at their varied nature told the officials that the task of sorting and checking was not going to be easy.

It was decided to set up a special headquarters for the operation in the Rockcliffe Barracks of the RCMP. Here the anti-espionage squad, headed by Inspector John Leopold, began to uncover a story of intrigue, conspiracy, and treason without parallel in the history of espionage in North America.

Meantime, the Soviet Embassy was not idle. To the Dominion government, it addressed a note which was received on September 8. It read in part:

"A colleague of the embassy, Igor Sergeievitch Gouzenko, failed to report for work on September 6. It was later established that I. Gouzenka robbed some money belonging to the embassy and had hidden himself together with his family.

"The embassy of the U. S. S. R. asks the Department of External Affairs to take urgent measures to seek and arrest I. Gouzenko and to hand him over for deportation."

The Canadian Government requested particulars concerning the stolen funds. The Embassy made no answer. Instead, on September 14, it sent a second note, pitched to a higher degree of urgency. This message read, in part:

"The Embassy, upon instructions from the Government of the U. S. S. R., repeats its request to the Government of Canada to apprehend Gouzenko and his wife and without trial to hand them over to the Embassy for deportation to the Soviet Union."

By that time the Government of Canada had no intention of handing Gouzenko over to anyone. Subjected to the most rigid and searching tests to determine his sincerity and the authenticity of the documents, he had come through with flying colors.

The documents were no forgeries. Dozens of them were handwritten in Russian. Gouzenko said that they were the writings of Colonel Zabotin, Colonel Rogov, and Colonel Matinov. Investigators checked at different houses where these officers had been entertained. At one, a hunting lodge, a guest book was obtained. In it were the signatures of many Government and diplomatic officials who had been guests there—including these three men. A handwriting expert was able to state flatly that Gouzenko had brought genuine writings of the Soviet officials.

There were other tests as well. Gouzenko brought four copies of secret telegrams sent from London to Ottawa. They were dated but a few weeks before—August 24, 25, and 31. A quick check on the official Government files revealed that they were exact copies of highly secret matters supposed to be known only to the British and Canadian Governments.

The problem no longer was one of establishing the veracity of Gouzenko, but of rooting the cancerous intrusion of Soviet secret agents from the innermost channels of the Canadian Government. As quickly as a document was translated, it was filed according to category. The titles themselves were ominous—Atomic Weapons, Radar, Secret Explosives, False Passports—to mention but a few.

Never before in the history of espionage had such a carefully documented plot been presented to the victim in one package. There was almost too much evidence. The list of cover names alone for secret agents of Russian, Canadian, British, and United States citizenship ran to three printed pages.

By the 21st of September, the experts working under Inspector Leopold were ready to brief the Prime Minister.

The briefing officer began:

"Sir, the evidence establishes that a network of undercover agents has been organized for the purpose of obtaining secret information from employees and agencies of the Dominion Government. These operations were carried on by certain members of the staff of the Soviet Embassy under direct instructions from Moscow. All of these agents were known by cover names. The cover name for Colonel Zabotin, for example, appears to have been 'Grant.'

"The specific program of espionage for which Colonel Zabotin was held responsible were, first, the atomic bomb, its composition, its technological processes and drawings; second, a sample of uranium 235, with details concerning the plant where it is produced; third, the library of the National Research Council; fourth, the movements of United States troops."

Other objectives of the Soviet spies were then outlined. They covered such highly secret topics as V-bombs, electronic fuzes for shells, radar, a superexplosive known as RDX.

The Prime Minister spoke: "May I ask to what extent have these objectives been achieved?" The briefing officer kept his face wooden, his voice matter-of-fact. "Sir, there were no failures."

As the meaning of the reply sank in, the group of high-placed government officials sat in stunned silence.

"Am I to understand that some of the details of the atomic weapon have been disclosed?" asked the Prime Minister.

The briefing officer stepped forward with a manila folder. "Here is the file sir, with reference to Agent 'Alek.' Cable No. 241, sent to Moscow on August 9, appears to cover that point."

"To the DIRECTOR:

"Facts given by Alek. * * * The output of uranium 235 amounts to 400 grams daily at the magnetic separation plant at Clinton, the output of '49' is likely two times greater, some graphite units are planned for 250 grams each day. * * * Alek handed over to us a platinum with 162 micrograms of uranium 233.

"GRANT."

"Who is 'Alek'?" demanded the Prime Minister.

The briefing officer shrugged. "His identity has not yet been established, sir. Apparently he is a scientist close to the center of this work. According to cables 244 and 11955, however, 'Alek' should be in London on October 7 attempting to contact a Soviet representative there. I think you'll find these cables contain some interesting clues."

Cable 244 dated a few weeks previously, was from "Grant" to Moscow. It read:

"To the DIRECTOR:

"We have worked out the conditions of a meeting with Alek in London. Alek will work in King's College, Strand.

"Meetings—October 7, 17, 27 on the street in front of the British Museum. The time, 11 o'clock in the evening. Identification sign, a newspaper under the left arm. Password, Best regard to Mikel. At the beginning of September Alek must fly to London. Before his departure he will go to the uranium plant in the Petawawa district. He said that he must come next year for a month to Canada. We handed over $500 to him.

"GRANT."

Cable 11955, in reply, read:

"To GRANT:

"The arrangements worked out for the meeting are not satisfactory. I am informing you of new ones.

"1. Place: In front of the British Museum on Great Russell Street at the opposite side of the street. Alek walks from Tottenham Court Road, the contact man from Southampton Row.

"2. Time: Eight o'clock.

"3. Identification signs: Alek will have under his left arm the newspaper Times, the contact man will have in his left hand the magazine Picture Post.

"4. Password: The contact man, 'What is the shortest way to the Strand?' Alek, 'Well, come along, I'm going that way.'

"The DIRECTOR."

To the Prime Minister's group it was clear that the identification of "Alek" was a matter of the utmost urgency. Otherwise every security measure which had been erected around the atomic bomb's development and manufacture might be utterly valueless. Yet Prime Minister King considered that the matter was so delicate that it could be handled only by means of personal consultations between himself, President Truman, and British Prime Minister Attlee.

"It was a matter that could not be trusted to the cables," was the way he explained it later to the Canadian House of Commons.

On September 28, King left Ottawa. The following day there was a conference with President Truman in Washington. Here the broad outlines of the Soviet spy plot were disclosed. Then the Canadian Prime Minister boarded the liner *Queen Mary* at New York.

Prime Minister Attlee was at Chequers, his official residence. He had been advised of the urgency of King's trip, and invited King to come at once to see him. Before many hours passed, the Senior Commissioner of Scotland Yard was called to Chequers.

To Lt. Col. Leonard Burt, of the special branch of Scotland Yard, fell the task of identifying "Alek" and supervising the watch over the clandestine meeting which was to take place the next evening, October 7. Colonel Burt sent for Detective Inspector William Whitehead. Together they went over the clues presented by the Moscow cables.

One priceless bit of information was: "Alek will work in King's College, Strand."

"If he knows anything at all about atomic energy, the chances are that he is a physicist. Let us find out whether any of that particular faculty has been to Canada recently."

Burt and Whitehead went to King's College. The head of the physics department told them at once: "That would be Dr. May. He's been working with the atomic energy project in Montreal."

Burt thumbed through the pages of the faculty register, found an entry: "Dr. Alan Nunn May, University Reader, Stafford Terrace, Kensington, senior member of nuclear physics division, Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd."

Was this the "Alek" of the secret Moscow cables? His picture showed a short, bald man with rather small eyes, metal-rimmed glasses, and mustache. That this mild-looking individual was in a position to threaten the security of the world seemed almost incredible.

Nevertheless, the next step was clear. Men were sent to Stafford Terrace, a quiet street of row houses, and soon hidden eyes were in position to watch the physicist. Arrangements were also made to cover the vicinity of the British Museum.

As the time approached for the meeting, the detail watching Dr. May could see him in an easy chair with pipe and slippers before the ground-floor window of his house. If he was concerned with anything more weighty than the book he was reading, he did not show it, for as the clock hand passed 8 he still had made no move. At the museum it was the same story.

As he received the reports from the two groups of watchers, Colonel Burt realized that, temporarily, at least, matters had reached a stalemate.

A message from Scotland Yard was sent to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, who were instructed to inquire how closely Dr. May's travels had fitted into the pattern outlined for "Alek" in "Grant's" cable 241 to the director at Moscow.

Chief of the atomic-energy project at Montreal and Chalk River, where the Petawawa plant was located, was Dr. John Douglas

Cockcroft, a scientist of international repute. Dr. Cockcroft's records showed that Dr. May had not only made two visits to Petawawa, the second on December 3, but he had made several trips to the nuclear research laboratories of the Manhattan project at Chicago, where he had engaged in experiments with United States scientists. He had left for England within a few days after his September 3 trip to Petawawa and, as indicated in the cable, was scheduled to return for a month's work the following year.

No other scientist had followed the same schedule or was planning to return the following year. The inference was plain.

The information concerning Dr. May was sent to the headquarters of the Manhattan engineer district in Washington, D. C., where it was brought immediately to the attention of Gen. Leslie R. Groves.

One of the fundamental principles of United States military intelligence is that personnel on secret projects are entitled to know only as much as they require to carry on their work. Thus, months before, when the National Research Council of Canada had proposed that Dr. May be allowed to visit the United States for 1 month, the application had been placed before General Groves personally.

The general had sent for the file on Dr. May. It included the information that Dr. May had already visited the Chicago atomic-research laboratories three times, and that "his third visit occurred between September 25 and October 30, 1944. He carried on extensive work in collaboration with other scientists in a a highly secret and important new field. His work resulted in a research report in which he collaborated with an American scientist."

To Groves a fourth visit by May to the United States ran counter to security principles, for it would allow him to know too much of what was going on in widely separated projects. Accordingly, the answer had gone back—polite but firm—"No."

If vital secrets in the field of atomic energy still rest secure, much credit can be given to General Groves' decision to bar Dr. May. For as the Canadian Royal Commission of Inquiry has stated: "The Soviets failed to obtain details on the structure of the atomic bomb * * * only because there was no one in Canada who could tell them."

Meanwhile, in London, Dr. May was subject to constant scrutiny. Every move he made was duly noted and recorded. As the weeks passed it was apparent that he was either making no effort to comply with the Moscow cable, or had been warned to lie low. But if the spymasters were in no hurry Scotland Yard could match their patience with its own brand of dogged resolution.

Prime Minister King continued to explore the over-all political implications of the documents with Prime Minister Attlee and Foreign Minister Bevin. With the meeting of the Big Four powers scheduled to start in December, they appreciated that premature disclosure of the spy plot might imperil any change of harmony. So complex was the problem that King and Attlee decided to cross the Atlantic and talk with President Truman.

In retrospect, Moscow's reaction to this 3-day meeting is significant. While Truman, Attlee, and King were meeting aboard the naval yacht *Sequoia* anchored in the Potomac, the Soviets were celebrating the twenty-eighth anniversary of the Russian Revolution. Foreign Minister Molotov, in an 80-minute speech, bluntly said:

"It is not possible at the present time for a technical secret of any great size to remain the exclusive possession of some one country or a narrow circle of countries. We will have atomic energy and many other things, too."

When King returned to Ottawa, Attlee went along to learn at first-hand the newer factors in the case.

The first concern of the investigators had been to avoid alarming Colonel Zabotin to the point where he would warn the Canadian conspirators. Although the Russian military attaché knew that some documents were missing, it was felt that he would be unaware that Gouzenko had brought the cable file which had been handed over to him months before for burning. Another factor on which the investigators were gambling was Zabotin's fear of reprisal from Moscow. It was entirely possible that the colonel, fearful of his own fate, was minimizing the lost documents and was, in fact, reporting the incident as a "theft of funds" as the exchange of diplomatic telegrams indicated.

At any rate, it is a matter of record that throughout the months of September, October, and November, Colonel Zabotin and his associates acted as though nothing were amiss.

During the fall of 1945, considerable progress was made toward identifying the principals in the spy ring.

Among the documents was a mailing list on which Colonel Zabotin had tabulated everything dispatched by him to Moscow on January 5, 1945. Inspector Leopold realized that this was the master key to the entire network, for it showed not only the type of information sent but named the source.

No. 175 on this list was credited to "Nora." It consisted of "telegrams 10, questionnaires 3, photos 11." Gouzenko recalled that he had put the telegrams into code. He had been ordered to burn the notes, but, instead, had taken them from the safe; and they were now in the possession of the Canadian Government.

The notes were copies of secret cables received from England. Even today their contents are so important that they cannot be revealed. They concerned matters which belonged not exclusively to Canada but which had been entrusted to Canada by other governments. Unless the leak could be stopped, the relationship of Canada and friendly states might be compromised. The discovery of "Nora" was therefore a matter of high priority.

Fortunately, Gouzenko had learned her name—Emma Woikin. Concerning this he testified:

"Answer. All I know about Emma Woikin is that she became acquainted with Major Sokolov and he proposed to Colonel Zabotin to develop her (as an agent).

"Question. You were present, were you?

"Answer. Yes; I was in the room. Sokolov suggested that he make her a proposal to work as an agent—in October 1944. However, he developed her much sooner. She thought she could perhaps work as a stenographer or clerk in the commercial counselor's office. She said that she liked Russia and wanted to help Russia."

At the Canadian Ministry for External Affairs a check at the personnel office produced the file card on one Emma Woikin. It listed her as an employee of the Cipher Division since February 1944. Her superiors knew her as a quiet, hard-working clerk.

Her personal history statement revealed that she had been born in 1920 in Saskatchewan, of Russian Dukhobor parents. In 1943 she had passed the civil-service examination for stenographer. She spoke Russian as well as English, and was appointed to the Passport Division. Later she was placed in the Cipher Division, where she not only saw all the diplomatic telegrams, but was familiar with the code system itself.

The next day, when Emma Woikin came to the office, she found that she had been transferred back to the Passport Division.

"What is the matter?" Emma Woikin asked. "Is my work not satisfactory?"

"Oh, no, nothing like that—I think they are shorthanded at Passport, and they need an experienced girl like you."

In this manner the authorities hoped to plug the leak while at the same time concealing the extent of their knowledge. There were too many agents whose identity was still unknown to risk any move which might send them scurrying for cover.

While "Nora" was being sealed off, Inspector Leopold referred once more to the master key to the spy puzzle—the mailing list of January 5, 1945. Items No. 109 and 110 were marked "copy" and "abbreviated copy" of secret letters from the Canadian Ambassador at Moscow to Prime Minister Mackenzie King. "Elli" was credited as the source.

In addition, Gouzenko had brought with him a cable from the Director in Moscow to Colonel Zabotin, referring to "Elli."

"And who was she?" asked Inspector Leopold.

"Before I left the embassy I had a look at her file. Her name is Willsher—she works in the office of the High Commissioner for the United Kingdom here in Ottawa."

The British High Commissioner in Canada was Malcolm MacDonald, son of the former British Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald. He was shocked at the disclosure that one of his employees was under suspicion.

The only Willsher on his staff was Kathleen Mary Willsher, who, as Assistant Registrar, had access to all incoming and outgoing letters and telegrams and to all highly secret files. A woman in her early forties, she was quiet, soft-spoken, and had an excellent working record. In appearance she more closely resembled a pleasant-faced school teacher than a secret agent.

Since the need for secrecy was still so great that she could not even be questioned, the only course open to the authorities was to put her under surveillance and gradually change the character of her work until she was no longer in position to obtain important information.

With "Alek," "Nora" and "Elli" now identified and under scrutiny, Inspector Leopold ran down the mailing list to a group of names—"Back," "Bagley," and "Badeau." The "B" group had penetrated into the National Research Council, custodian of atomic energy secrets.

Fortunately, Gouzenko had brought with him from the embassy not only a document in which the group's activities were outlined, but a piece of paper, typewritten in English, at the bottom of which was the warning: "After studying burn it." Containing the secret instructions given to "Back," the leader of "B" group, by Colonel Zabotin's assistant, Lieutenant Colonel Rogov, it started as follows:

"The scheme of your group will be: Jan (Rogov): Back (nickname)—G. Lunan Badeau—Dornforth Smith Bagley—Ned Mazerall.

"You will know me (as Jan) but nobody else."

Inspector Leopold did not even have to consult an Ottawa telephone book to check on Lunan. In the file taken from the Soviet Embassy there was a dossier giving his address and occupation—correspondent for the military journal Canadian Affairs. One line of the dossier read: "Length of time in the net [1]—from March 1945."

To make the file even more complete there was a report from "Back" to Rogov, dated March 28, a few weeks after he had joined the "net." It reveals that months before Hiroshima the Soviets were alerted to United States and Canadian efforts to solve atomic-energy problems.

"Your written instructions are understood, and some preliminary work has been accomplished on the specific tasks set. Badeau in-

[1] The "net" was taken to mean the Soviet espionage organization.

forms me that the most secret work at present is on nuclear physics—bombardment of radioactive substances to produce energy. This is more hush-hush than radar and is being carried on at the University of Montreal and at McMaster University. Fuller details later.

"BACK."

There were other documents, two items in which stood out in bold relief. The first, in Rogov's handwriting, concerned "Badeau." It read:

"Badeau asks for permission to change to work on uranium."

The second item was another of "Grant's" cables to the director. It read:

"We have received from Badeau 17 top-secret and secret documents, English, American, and Canadian. Altogether about 700 pages. In the course of the day we were able to photograph all the documents. In the next few days we will receive almost the same amount of documents for 3 to 5 hours. I consider it essential to examine the whole library of the Research Council.

"GRANT."

The scope of the last project surprised even Inspector Leopold.

The inspector assigned men to check on the present whereabouts of "Back," "Badeau," and "Bagley," and to keep them under surveillance.

Lunan (Back) was found to be still at work as editor of Canadian Affairs. Since he was merely a contact man and had no access to secret information in the course of his own work, it was felt that it was not necessary to have his job changed on orders from above.

No one by the name of Dornforth Smith (Badeau) was known in the National Research Council, but there was a Durnford Smith, graduate of McGill University in mathematics and physics, who had been with the Bell Telephone Co. in Montreal for 5 years previous to joining the Council. Since his work gave him access to secret records, it was arranged to place him elsewhere.

Next to be sealed off was "Bagley," Ned Mazerall, who was found to be Edward Wilfred Mazerall, a bachelor of science in electrical engineering, and a member of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers. He had worked for the Canadian Westinghouse Co. and the Canadian Broadcasting Corp., and in 1942 he had joined the National Research Council in the development of radar. A tall, broad-shouldered man with a large head and an unruly shock of hair, he was married to a well-known Canadian concert pianist.

In various notes written by Lieutenant Colonel Rogov were entries which indicated that, on April 4, he had paid out money as follows: "Back"—$100, "Badeau"—$30, "Bagley"—$30. On May 8 there was another entry showing $100 paid to "Back."

The sums were so small that it was apparent that money had not lured the secret agents to act as they did. There was something far more insidious at work than mere treachery for pay.

Zabotin's mailing list provided a clue to the identity of one of the master minds behind the entire plot. There was the following significant entry:

"108 — Debouz — Notes — Decisions secret sessions of Parliament—1 Page."

There had been a closed session of Parliament on November 25, 1944, dealing with the redisposition of Canadian forces which would follow the collapse of Germany.

An elaborate cross-index system had been set up to keep track of the numerous code names which were creeping into the case. This involved the multi-copying of each document so that the clues under each name were brought together in one folder. Some folders seemed almost empty, others were straining at the metal binders. Into the latter category fell the dossier on "Debouz."

Inspector Leopold felt a kinship with the craftsmen of old who painstakingly arranged bits of colored stone and glass into a mosaic. He too was assembling fragments, seeking to form a picture of "Debouz." Among his fragments, the following items seemed to be the most promising:

The first was:

"To the DIRECTOR:

"Debouz was reelected for the second time as a member of the Federal Parliament. Thus from the Corporants there is one member.

"GRANT."

The second, a single line from a notebook maintained by Lieutenant Colonel Rogov, was:

"Fred Debouz—talked generally."

The third, from the torn page of the notebook which Colonel Zabotin had given Gouzenko to destroy by burning, was:

"Fred—Director of Corporation. Previously worked at the neighbors."

The fourth, another reference from the torn notebook:

"Contact in Washington with Debouz's person. To work out arrangements for a meeting. To give out $600."

The fifth, again from the torn scraps:

"Fred's Work—group in Montreal (activists)."

What was the meaning of all this double talk? Inspector Leopold asked Gouzenka. The Russian explained that the word "Corporants" in the first item was the code word for the Communist Party. The second item showed that "Debouz" was also known as "Fred." The third, containing the phrase "neighbors," showed that "Fred" had previously worked for the secret police. The fourth revealed that "Debouz" had been entrusted with a mission to the United States to make contact with an agent in Washington. The fifth showed "Fred" as the head of an active group in Montreal.

Given these interpretations, even the average Canadian newspaper reader could have solved the identity of "Debouz—Fred." There was only one Communist member of Parliament. He was Fred Rose of Montreal.

A short, peppery individual, Rose had come to Canada from Lublin, Poland, with his parents when he was 13 years old, and had obtained Canadian citizenship in 1926. He had joined the Young Communist League, become National Secretary in 1929, and visited Russia in 1930. In 1931 he had been convicted of sedition and had been imprisoned for 1 year.

Like his fellow Communists he at first bitterly opposed the war against Germany. He was ordered interned, but remained in hiding until September 1942, when he gave himself up. An advisory committee of prominent Canadians was appointed to review his case. Their report said:

"Although the committee was not impressed with his exaggerated opinion of his own importance, we nevertheless are of the opinion that he will follow the party line of supporting the war effort of Canada and that his liberation will no longer prejudice the safety of the state."

In view of what happened the committee's conclusions were too optimistic.

On October 6, 1942, Rose signed a promise not to participate in activities of the Communist Party of Canada, or any organization which it controlled. He swore that he would strictly abstain from communicating any information concerning the war. He further promised that he would do no act which might be of injury to Canada or its allies.

Hardly had his signature dried than he violated both the letter and spirit of his promises. Not only did he play a key role in organizing the B group of agents in the National Research Council, but he was linked to 14 other groups to whom he gave instruction and advice.

No move was made which might alert Fred Rose, M. P., to the fact that his dual role had been uncovered. He continued to appear in the House of Commons, to occupy his office in parliament building and to reside in his cozy flat with his wife and daughter. But his contacts were watched, and there was hardly a moment of the day or night when a plain-clothes man did not know where he was or what he was doing.

During this phase the identity of three of the principal members of Rose's so-called Montreal group was brought to light.

It must be realized that while Gouzenko had chosen the embassy documents with remarkable skill and judgment, he had never seen a single Canadian agent. He could never point to any person and say: "This is the one called so-and-so in such-in-such a report." Always the investigators had to seek their clues in the documents themselves. They relied on diligence in research.

The lead that started them on the trail of the first of the Montreal agents was an extract from Colonel Zabotin's notebook:

"Group in Montreal (activists).

"Gray: Head of a section of the Directorate for securing war materials for the Allies. He works well. Gives materials on shells and cannons."

The rest of the file on "Gray" was significantly thick and showed him to be a prolific source of secret reports on projectiles, guns, and explosives. Inspector Leopold found his best clues in two documents. The first was a cable in which Colonel Zabotin discussed the possibility of setting "Gray" up as a secret agent in the postwar period. The cable disclosed that "Gray" was a geological engineer and was earning a $4,200 salary in his present post.

On a slip of memo paper Inspector Leopold jotted: "Geological engineer—salary $4,200—probably branch chief in Department of Munitions and Supply." He pinned this to the second document, a page torn from a loose-leaf notebook. Handwritten in English, it outlined secret "Proceedings of the Ordnance Board." On the memo Leopold wrote: "Check for handwriting."

An RCMP plain-clothes investigator then waded through the files of the Ammunition Branch of the Department of Munitions and Supply. He found the original document, No. 31,719, in a secret folder of the Ordnance Board. The records showed that this document had been charged out to one Harold S. Gerson, a division chief. Gerson's signature matched the handwriting on the pages brought by Gouzenko from the Soviet Embassy.

Gerson was a native-born Canadian, of Russian parentage. He had been a successful geological engineer with numerous mining companies before the war. He was now chief of a division of the Department of Munitions and Supply, as Inspector Leopold had surmised. He was paid $4,200 a year.

When the investigators went to observe him they found a stocky, pipe-smoking man with curly brown hair, wearing metal-rimmed glasses. In appearance, he resembled a kindly faced university instructor. As in the case of the others in the ring, it was difficult to associate the pleasant, intelligent, self-assured personality of Gerson with the "Gray" whose record of conspiracy was outlined in the Embassy documents. He, like the others, was put under observation until such time as the signal was given to crack down.

The investigators went back to Colonel Zabotin's notebook and found the following:

"Foster: Englishman. Assistant to the superintendent of the Division of Distributing War Production at the Ministry of Munitions and Supplies. He has been giving materials on war supplies. (Ours.)"

Gouzenko pointed out the "'Ours' means that 'Foster' is a Communist. In other words, 'he belongs to us.'"

The man that the investigators found in the post noted by Zabotin was James Scotland Benning. He was a brother-in-law of Gerson, and had been recommended for his job by the latter.

Like the others, Benning was put under observation. Shortly afterward another interesting scrap of information came to light. One night mounted police plain-clothes men made a search of his desk. In an alphabetical list-finder they found this entry: "Fred 3-8605 4394." The numbers proved to be the telephone extensions of Fred Rose at his Ottawa apartment and his office in the House of Commons. This was an entry that Benning was to regret.

The investigators, as their work continued, were shocked to discover so many prominent men of high reputation involved in the plot. To those concerned with the safety of the State, the most sinister aspect of the entire network was that the Soviet agents were able to find intelligent and talented persons willing to betray their country.

This phase was so striking that Winston Churchill was moved to declare in the House of Commons: "Many countries seek information about the affairs of other countries—there is nothing in that—but the difference between the Soviet system and the others is that in the communist sect it is a matter of religion to sacrifice one's native land for the sake of the communist utopia."

Up to this point the investigators had comparatively smooth sailing. They were able to identify and bring under surveillance each of the code names they delved into. Now they were heading into rougher and deeper waters.

For example, there were agents in Fred Rose's "Montreal Group" whose cover names began with "G." One worked in a tank plant, one was owner of a drug store, one was a housewife married to a storekeeper. To this day they have never been located.

For 3 months the mounted police had explored the maze of clues relating to the spy ring and had uncovered an incredible amount of evidence. As it grew in volume Prime Minister Mackenzie King, with a weather eye to the stormy international scene, wondered how long he could continue to postpone action.

The first sign of trouble came during the first week of December 1945. Colonel Zabotin suddenly left Canada. He did not notify the authorities to whom he was accredited, and in New York the Soviet steamer *Alexander Suvorov* was kept at its dock until he scurried up the gangplank. The United States customs guards who saw him go aboard were the last people of record to have seen him alive. Later there was a rumor that he had died of "heart attack" shortly after his return to Moscow.

A few days later Soviet Ambassador G. N. Zaroubin made the rounds of Canadian Government officials. He said he was returning to Moscow for routine consultations. It was not good-by, only au revoir. But he never came back.

It was apparent that the Soviet officials were now aware of the use to which Gouzenko's documents were being put, and with the advent of 1946 it was becoming increasingly clear that events were approaching a climax. The Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers had ended in a stalemate. On February 5, 1946, there was promulgated order in council No. 411, which placed the spy hunt in the hands of a royal commission of inquiry headed by two Justices of the Supreme Court of Canada, the Honorable Mr. Justice Robert Taschereau and the Honorable Mr. Justice R. L. Kellock.

A royal commission, while it is in session, is a completely independent body. Its findings are subject neither to review nor appeal. Its function is to conduct the investigation and to report to the governor in council. Unlike a court, it is the sole judge of its own procedure. It may receive evidence of any kind in its discretion. In this respect it is sometimes in a better position to ascertain facts than a court, which is bound by rigid rules concerning the admissibility of evidence. But a commission cannot enforce its findings. If, as a result of its reports, prosecution is resorted to, well and good, but the courts alone possess the right to punish.

Secrecy was still the watchword, as the slightest leak might imperil the success of the whole operation. However, on the morning of February 14, the counsel of the royal commission sent a courier to the Minister of Justice requesting the detention of a dozen of the persons whose activities the police investigators had traced. Although the facts of the arrests and the names of those arrested were to be kept secret, Prime Minister King realized that such widespread raids would not pass unnoticed. A public statement would be necessary.

To keep the record absolutely clear from the standpoint of protocol, the Prime Minister decided to have a talk with the Soviet Chargé at Ottawa, Nicolai Belokhvostikov, who, in Ambassador Zaroubin's absence, had taken over the Embassy.

Here are King's own words for what transpired: "I said that I was going to state before Commons that an unnamed foreign power had been receiving information, but I wanted him to know that it was the U. S. S. R. to which I was referring. For my own part I was quite ready to pay a personal call upon Premier Stalin in order to get an explanation of these extraordinary events."

While they conferred, the Mounted Police were moving into position. Early in the morning on the 15th they struck, swooping down on McGill University, the University of Montreal, the University of Toronto, the Foreign Exchange Control Board and the National Research Council. None of those arrested that day was aware that he had been shadowed for months.

Before a rapt audience in the House of Commons, the Prime Minister gave only a bare outline of what was in progress. "This government has information of undoubted authenticity which established that there had been disclosures of secret information to unauthorized persons, including some members of a staff of a foreign mission in Canada."

Across the Atlantic, in London, Col. Leonard Burt of the Special Branch of Scotland Yard decided to have a talk with Dr. Alan Nunn May, the "Alek" of the Moscow cables who had supplied the Soviets with uranium samples and atomic-bomb data.

"Are you aware, Dr. May, that there has been a leakage of information from Canada relating to atomic energy?"

Dr. May looked at him steadily. "That is the first I have heard of it," he said quietly.

"Do you realize that we know that you had an appointment with someone in London in that connection and that you failed to keep it?"

Dr. May did not answer.

Colonel Burt and Scotland Yard were not in a hurry to make an arrest, as it was still hoped that he would lead them to a second spy. Therefore, no action was taken at the time.

In Ottawa, the smooth efficiency of the Mounted Police concealed feverish activity. Much remained to be done. In the words of the Royal Commission, "The extent of the ramifications of the espionage organization and the identity of all its agents were not known on February 14. There were a number of agents designated in the Embassy records by cover names only, whom Gouzenko could not identify. It was of the utmost importance that the identity of as many agents as possible should be discovered, together with the method by which each functioned."

The most important phase of the questioning that went on day and night at Rockcliffe dealt with the motives of the suspected agents. Time and again the investigators sought to discover the "why" behind the case.

Most of the suspects were persons with an unusually high degree of education, and of marked ability and intelligence. Their motives, as laid bare in the course of the inquiry, are significant, not only to Canada but to the world.

There was no evidence that money played an important part. The evidence was overwhelming that the original motivation was a product of political ideology plus a program of psychological conditioning in study groups or Communist cells. The Royal Commission found that in the great majority of cases the motivation was inextricably linked with the courses of psychological development carried on by a secret section of what is ostensibly a Canadian political movement—the Labour Progressive Party (Communist Party of Canada). These secret development courses are much more widespread than the espionage network itself.

"It seems to be the general policy of the Communist Party to discourage certain selected sympathizers from joining the party openly. Instead these sympathizers are invited to join secret cells or study groups. The categories of the population from which secret members were recruited include students, scientific workers, teachers, office and business workers, persons engaged in any type of administrative activity, and any group likely to obtain Government employment.

"The object is to accustom young persons gradually to an atmosphere and ethic of conspiracy. The general effect on the young man or woman of secret meetings, secret acquaintances, and secret objectives and plans can easily be imagined. The technique seems calculated to develop the psychology of a double life and double standards."

Only in view of the foregoing can the real significance of the spy ring and its meaning be appreciated. Otherwise the sudden emergence of gifted intellectuals trafficking in state secrets does not make sense.

The behavior of Harold S. Gerson, the pipe-smoking professor, was typical of the group reaction to interrogation. He was confronted with the documents in his own handwriting which had been taken from the Soviet files. We have the testimony of Inspector Harvison for what happened:

"I asked Mr. Gerson if he recognized the handwriting and he said it looked very much like his. I asked him if he ever made notes from documents—if it was part of his duty to make notes. He said that it was difficult to define his actual duties, but that he had made notes.

"I then told Mr. Gerson that I was suspending the interrogation for 24 hours and that during that time I would like him to consider if, as a Canadian citizen, he was willing to assist his Government by supplying any information in his possession regarding Soviet espionage.

"The following day I asked Mr. Gerson if he had made any decision. He said that there were a number of personal problems connected with the decision, that he found it extremely difficult, and asked if I could give him until the following Saturday noon to arrive at a decision.

"On the Saturday noon he said he had made his decision. He realized that the picture ahead was very dark for him, that he had made mistakes. But he would not be able to live with himself if he gave the information that so-and-so had done such-and-such—if 'he put his finger on this man and that man.' "

Meanwhile, in Moscow, on February 20, 1946, Deputy Commissar of Foreign Affairs Solomon Lozovski invited Leon Mayrand, Chargé of the Canadian Embassy, to call at his office. The Soviet official launched at once into the reading of a two-page statement. The excerpts which follow should be

read with Gouzenko's Embassy documents in mind:

"Soviet organizations have become aware that certain members of the staff of the Soviet Military Attaché in Canada received from Canadian nationals certain information of a secret character which did not, however, present great interest for the Soviet organizations. This information referred to technical data of which Soviet organizations had no need in view of more advanced technical attainment in the USSR. The information in question could be found in published works on radio-location, etc., and also in the well-known brochure of the American J. D. Smyth, Atomic Energy. It would therefore be ridiculous to affirm that delivery of insignificant secret data of this kind could create any threat to the security of Canada.

"Nonetheless, as soon as the Soviet Government became aware of the above-mentioned acts, the Soviet Military Attaché, in view of the inadmissibility of the acts, was recalled from Canada."

The Soviet statement's attempt to minimize the importance of the information received was interesting. Disregarding the debatable point of whether there was a "more advanced technical attainment in the U. S. S. R." the fact is that an elaborate organization had been set up to obtain information.

Despite the claim that the information on atomic energy could be found in published works, the Royal Commission learned that none of the secret information had been printed at the time it was handed over. If it had been published it would not have been secret. The fact that the information was considered of such great importance by the Soviet espionage chiefs is probably a fair test of its value.

Many documents in the case were never released for publication, for the Royal Commission ascertained that "some of the information is so secret still that it can be referred to only obliquely and with the greatest care."

Next to the atomic bomb, the most vital work accomplished by the Western Allies in the technical field was radar. Many of the improvements are still in the top-secret category, and information of the greatest importance in this field was communicated by Soviet agents. Asdic—antisubmarine detection devices—was another important item. The Royal Commission noted that "much, and possibly all, of the information available in Canada on this subject has been compromised."

Another item of this type was the "V. T. Fuse," the amazing proximity fuse for artillery shells. The wiring details and manufacture are still secret, and although the fuse was first developed in Canada in 1943, the details of its manufacture are known only to the United States. This fuse is the electro bomb referred to in some of the Soviet documents, and one of the agents had passed along its wiring diagram.

A great deal of the information sought related to the postwar defense of Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The information handed over by such agents as Benning and Gerson falls into this category—production data, location of industries, transportation, and planning, fiscal matters. Said the Royal Commission: "Parts of this information could be useful in connection with possible sabotage operations."

On March 2, 1946, the Royal Commission issued its first interim report, which lifted the curtain of secrecy long enough to describe some of the activities of Colonel Zabotin, Emma Woikin, Kathleen Willsher, Gordon Lunan, and Edward Mazerall. A few days earlier, in London, Inspector Whitehead of Scotland Yard had taken a spin up the Strand to King's College. He arrived as Dr. Alan Nunn May was concluding a lecture on nuclear theory. When the professor had finished Inspector Whitehead, who was waiting at the door, nodded to him.

"I have in my possession a warrant for your arrest," he said. "I will read it to you in a moment."

Dr. May pursed his lips. "Very well," he said. "I was expecting something like this."

During the months that had passed since his cover name "Alek" had first been linked with the traffic in atom-bomb secrets, the investigation had turned up other data regarding his activities. Confronted with these documents, Dr. May was hard pressed to explain not only his activities but his motives. Finally he agreed to make a written statement. In it he said:

"About a year ago while in Canada I was contacted by an individual whose identity I decline to divulge. He sought information from me concerning atomic research.

"I had given very careful consideration to the correctness of making sure that development of atomic energy was not confined to the United States of America. I took the painful decision that it was necessary to convey general information on atomic energy and make sure it was taken seriously. For this reason I decided to entertain the propositions made to me.

"At one meeting I gave the man microscopic amounts of U-233 and U-235. I also gave the man a written report on atomic research as it was known to me.

"The man also asked me for information about the United States electronically-controlled AA shells. I knew little about these and so could give little information.

"The man gave me some dollars (I forget how many) and a bottle of whiskey, and I accepted these against my will.

"Before I left Canada it was arranged that on my return to London I was to keep an appointment with somebody I did not know. I did not keep the appointment because I had decided that this clandestine procedure was no longer appropriate in view of the official release of information and the possibility of satisfactory international control of atomic energy.

"The whole affair was extremely painful to me and I embarked on it only because I felt that this was a contribution I could make to the safety of mankind. I certainly did not do it for gain."

Dr. May's humanitarian motives drew the following rejoinder from Mr. Justice Oliver:

"Alan Nunn May, I have listened with some slight surprise to the picture of you as a man of honor who has done only what you believed to be right. I do not take that view of you at all. How any man in your position could have had the crass conceit, let alone the wickedness, to arrogate to himself the decision of a matter of this sort, when you yourself had given a written undertaking not to do it, and knew it was one of your country's most precious secrets—that you could have done this is a dreadful thing."

A few minutes past 11 on the evening of March 14, Staff Sgt. René J. Noel, of the Mounted Police, knocked on the door of Fred Rose's apartment in Ottawa.

Rose was at the telephone, talking to a correspondent of a Toronto paper who was asking whether he had been arrested yet.

"No," Rose said, "I have not." He hung up, answered the knock on the door and was immediately taken into custody.

Although documentary and oral evidence linked Rose to many individuals in the spy network, he refused to testify before the Royal Commission or to make any explanation of his connections with the case.

From February until June 1946 the Royal Commission was in session. On June 27, after hearing scores of witnesses and reviewing thousands of pages of testimony, their startling findings were made public. In conclusion, the Commission pointed out that "We have seen only the small selection of Zabotin's espionage documents which Gouzenko was able to collect immediately before he left the Embassy. The documents outlined only the work of the espionage system of Colonel Zabotin, although the evidence discloses the existence of other parallel networks, some of which have been functioning for many years."

The matter of punishment was left for the courts of the Realm, and due to the complicated nature of the evidence against each individual it was decided that it would be more expedient to hold separate trials.

Some of the many persons traced by the Royal Mounted were acquitted on the ground of insufficient evidence; others pleaded guilty and still others were found guilty. These proceedings are still continuing. As of this writing the status of some of the principal cases is:

Name	Code	Tria	Sentence
			Years
Dr. Alan Nunn May.	"Alek"	Pleaded guilty.	10
Fred Rose	"Debouz"	Found guilty	6
Emma Wolkin	"Nora"	Pleaded guilty.	3
Kathleen Willsher	"Elli"	do	3
H. S. Gerson	"Gray"	Found guilty	5
J. S. Benning	"Foster"	do	5
D. G. Lunan	"Back"	do	5
E. W. Mazerall	"Bagley"	do	4
Durnford Smith	"Badeau"	do	5

Only time will reveal whether Gouzenko's documents will cause a change in the Soviet tactics of using a diplomatic establishment to recruit a fifth column in a friendly state. In this connection Gouzenko stated: "The last telegram asked about the natural resources that Canada could mobilize in case of war, her coal, oil, rare metals, and so on."

From the cold, dispassionate viewpoint of global strategy the interest of the U. S. S. R. in Canada is obvious. The Dominion lies on the forefront of the transpolar air route between the United States and the Soviet Union.

What About These Mergers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there has been great quickening of interest throughout the country in the bills which have been pending in the Senate and House to amend the Clayton Act so as to prevent monopolistic mergers. A very interesting article on that subject appears in the weekly magazine America under date of April 26, 1947, under the title "What About These Mergers?" I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ABOUT THESE MERGERS?

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

(Eighteen hundred corporate mergers in 7 years (1940–46) works out at about one every day (on the 40-hour week). Father Masse agrees with Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, that this state of affairs will bear thinking about and that not enough thinking is being done about it.)

Toward the close of the Senate session on February 17, Mr. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, obtained the floor to advise his colleagues of

impending hearings on a bill before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. The bill, he explained, aims to plug a loophole in the Clayton Act and help make the country safe for free enterprise. "Everybody talks about free enterprise," he began, "but precious few do anything about it. Everybody talks about competition and the desirability of maintaining it, but few of us seem to do anything substantial about it." And then, warming up to his task, he continued:

"Everybody agrees that the concentration of economic power is a menace to what we popularly call the American way of life, but the concentration of economic power proceeds year by year, month by month, and even day by day. There are appalling facts before us for consideration; yet they seem to make no ripple upon the surface of public attention."

The Senator was right, as the next day's newspapers showed. Although he spread the "appalling facts" on the record—1,800 recorded corporate mergers in manufacturing and mining alone between January 1, 1940, and December 31, 1946—not one of the five papers I regularly see even noticed the speech. It made not the slightest "ripple on the surface of public attention."

When you stop to think of it, this is an astonishing phenomenon in a country whose businessmen worship at the shrine of free enterprise and whose legislators are never too busy to spare time for the problems of small business. It is doubly astonishing these days when there is so much righteous talk in industrial circles about the huge labor monopolies which are strangling the country, and so much fear about the spread of collectivism abroad. You would think that this competition-conscious country would be exceptionally sensitive right now to the first faint signs of monopoly, that the press would be alert to expose and condemn the slightest tendency toward anticompetitive amalgamations, that politicians would be trust-busting up and down the Middle West as in days gone by, raising the specter of Wall Street.

But nothing of the sort is happening. Over the postwar wave of corporate mergers only a few warning voices have been raised on the public platforms and in Congress. Scarcely one important newspaper has spoken out against them. To the best of my knowledge not a single business group has instructed its lobbyists to raise the danger signal on Capitol Hill. Have we all succumbed to the semantics which Mr. Gromyko has been popularizing at Lake Success? Just as the Soviets prate about democracy and practice dictatorship are we preaching free enterprise and cultivating monopoly? Or are the fears which a few have expressed in recent months, notably Senator O'MAHONEY and Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, just the figments of sincere but feverish imaginations?

About 1½ years ago the editors of Business Week took a good look at wartime mergers and found little reason for worry. "Today's consolidations," they reported, "have postwar readjustment rather than monopoly as aim." They found that typical objectives were entering new fields, safeguarding volume, diversifying output, and gaining new markets. And this comfortable, reassuring attitude seems general in business circles.

Before we sit back, however, safe in the knowledge that all is well with the good ship "Free Enterprise," it might be wise to make a quick survey of the situation. Business estimates of economic trends have occasionally been wrong in the past.

To begin with, we can distinguished three distinct types of mergers: The vertical, the horizontal, and the conglomerate.

In the vertical merger, one firm acquires the assets of another firm which is engaged in an earlier or later stage of the manufacturing process. For instance, the acquisition in recent years by seven basic steel producers of 87 percent of the steel drum and barrel manufacturing capacity; or the purchase of 87 percent of the tight cooperage capacity by the Big Four of the liquor industry.

The horizontal merger consists in the combination of two firms engaged in producing identical or nearly identical products. Some recent examples are the acquisition of the Canfield Oil Co. by Standard Oil of Ohio; the purchase of the capital stock of Rhodhiss Cotton Mills by Pacific Mills; the absorption of the Gilmore Oil Co. by General Petroleum.

The conglomerate merger consists in the acquisition by one company of the assets of another which is engaged in an unrelated business activity. This type of merger has become fairly common in recent years and is partly the result of the large accumulation of liquid capital by big war producers. A classic example is the acquisition of the Crosley Corp.'s radio and home appliance business, together with radio station WLW in Cincinnati, by Victor Emanuel's Aviation Corp., which controls the huge Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp. Incidentally, Consolidated Vultee is the result of a horizontal amalgamation of the Vultee Aircraft Corp. and Consolidated engineered by Mr. Emanuel several years ago.

From its very nature the horizontal merger is always monopolistic. Where two competitors existed before, one exists now. According to the United States Department of Commerce, 60 percent of the 1,800 recorded acquisitions in manufacturing and mining between January 1, 1940, and December 31, 1946, were horizontal mergers.

The vertical merger, while not so directly monopolistic in its effect, also tends to restrict competition. Now that seven basic steel producers have taken over 87 percent of the steel drum and barrel manufacturing capacity, they are in a position to narrow or destroy the market of the remaining 13 percent. Similarly, the Big Four in the liquor industry, by acquiring 85 percent of the tight-cooperage capacity, can deprive competitors of necessary supplies, or force them to pay monopoly prices. Such practices have not been entirely foreign to this country.

Even the conglomerate merger is not without some monopolistic effect, since it tends to concentrate economic power in fewer and fewer hands. While some foes of monopoly profess to see no danger in bigness as such, there is obviously a point beyond which bigness and the resultant concentration of economic power become a threat to free enterprise, and even to a democratic society. How long will people permit enormous economic power to be controlled for private profit by private groups? Ten years ago the records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue showed that one-tenth of 1 percent of American corporations owned 52 percent of total corporate assets; that less than 4 percent of them received 84 percent of total net profits. During the 20 years between 1919 and 1939, some 95,000 corporations were swallowed up by mergers, at an average rate, that is, of more than 450 a year. The rate last year was the highest since 1931, and the trend continues strong. How far can this process of concentration be permitted to go before it cries out for Government regulation and control?

It solves nothing to point out, as the editors of Business Week do, that the motives behind today's mergers differ from those which prevailed during the period 1898–1902, when the purpose was clearly monopolistic. Let us concede that businessmen are furiously combining now not to eliminate troublesome competition but to keep their volume high, to diversify their holdings, to acquire sales outlets, and for other legitimate objectives. The fact is that, regardless of intentions, the objective effect of many of these wartime and postwar mergers is to lessen competition, encourage monopoly, and promote a further concentration of economic power.

What is the remedy to this old and persistent threat to the American system of free enterprise?

Congress thought it had found one when it passed the Clayton Act in 1914. Section 7 of this law forbade the acquisition by one company of the stock of a competing company whenever the Federal Trade Commission found that the merger would substantially lessen competition or effect a restraint of trade. Behind the law was the theory that the best way to deal with monopoly is to stop it before it occurs, rather than to punish and attempt to destroy it after it has been consummated. Section 11 of the act empowered the Federal Trade Commission to order divestiture of any stock acquired in violation of section 7.

However, corporation lawyers soon found a loophole in the Clayton Act. They noted that, whereas the act prohibited the acquisition of a competitor's stock, it was silent about the purchase of a competitor's assets. Accordingly, all during the greedy and speculative twenties, businessmen, aided and abetted by investment bankers, proceeded with impunity to nullify the clear intent of the Clayton Act. In this they were assisted by the Supreme Court, which obligingly widened the loophole. In *Swift and Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, decided in 1926, the Court held in a 5-to-4 decision that the FTC was powerless to order divestiture of physical properties if title to the assets had been acquired before the Commission had instituted proceedings, even though the assets had been acquired by unlawful purchase of stock. A second decision by the Court, *Arrow-Hart and Hegeman Electric Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, tied the hands of the Commission more tightly still. In this case, which was decided in 1934 by another 5-to-4 decision, the Court held that the Commission could not order divestiture even if it had issued a complaint before the illegal acquisition of a competitor's assets. The Court required, in addition, that the whole process of causing the case to be tried, briefed, signed, and decided must have been completed before the accused had laid unlawful hands on the assets, else the divestiture order was improvident.

Regularly, year after year for the past two decades, the Federal Trade Commission has asked Congress to plug this loophole in the Clayton Act, but the Congress, though always professing great concern for small business and generous in appropriating money for it, has just as regularly refused. For a few weeks last year it seemed that the legislators were finally ready to correct the weakness in the law. Senator O'MAHONEY and Representative KEFAUVER introduced a bill in their respective Houses which would have effectively blocked the gap in the Clayton Act, and have given to the Federal Trade Commission all the power it needed to enforce it. The bills forbade the acquisition of assets as well as the stock of a competing corporation whenever the merger would substantially lessen competition. It stipulated further that all corporate mergers which concentrated more than 5 percent of the total sales of any business would be subject to Government review. Exempted were mergers where the combined assets of the corporations would be less than $5,000,000; or where the assets of the acquired corporation totaled less than $100,000. Although the House Judiciary Committtee reported the bill favorably, it never reached the floor. According to Business Week, the opposition of the National Association of Manufacturers and other business groups stopped the bill cold in the House Rules Committee.

Taking courage, perhaps, from President Truman's request for antimonopoly legislation in his state of the Union address last January, Senator O'MAHONEY and Representative KEFAUVER are trying again. From the new bills which they have introduced they

have eliminated several items which displeased business in last year's proposals. As the projected legislation stands now, it does little more than amend the Clayton Act by extending its prohibition against acquisition of stock in competing companies to acquisition of assets; that is, it merely plugs the loophole by which businessmen have evaded the clear intent of a law designed to prevent the growth of monopoly.

It will be instructive to watch what position the NAM and other business organizations take toward S. 104 and the companion bill in the House. Here is legislation aimed at fostering the free competition which these business groups praise. Here is legislation designed to prevent the monopolistic practices which they condemn. Will the business exponents of free enterprise rally to support these bills, or will they once again wreck them?

This much seems certain: if organized business defeats this well-intentioned legislative attempt to foster free competition, it had better offer the public some very sound reasons for doing so, together with an honest and acceptable substitute. In case the NAM and certain other groups don't know it, a good many people are inclined to believe that current business pleas for free enterprise and business criticism of labor monopolies are insincere. It won't take much more to convince them of it.

Improvement of Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 24 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the April issue of the Kiplinger magazine entitled "Health Means Plans and Dollars."

This appears to me to be a most enlightening article which I believe should be available to those interested in improving the health of the people of our country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH MEANS PLANS AND DOLLARS—WE MUST FIND A WAY TO MEET OUR CHALLENGING NATIONAL MEDICAL PROBLEM

United States medicine, which has devised brilliant treatments for many of our ills, is having a hard time prescribing for its most acute problem: how to make medical services available for all who need them.

There is wide agreement on the diagnosis: our medical facilities are badly organized and too expensive for most people. There is no general agreement on the right treatment, despite the universal interest in working out some solution. We are all potential consumers of medical services, and we are all affected by the health of our community. And our overburdened doctors need relief from a system under which they can't take care of all the sick, even with charity treatments.

Although the Nation's health cannot be put on a dollars-and-cents basis, employers should be concerned with the terrific inroads, largely preventable, which illness makes on production. Before the war between four and five hundred million workdays were lost annually from sickness—about 40 times the number lost through strikes. The loss of consumption power may be even greater.

Here is what's wrong in the judgment of the American Medical Association, individual doctors, lay experts and Government officials:

The traditional fee system of payment for medical services is too costly. Most people can afford emergency pills and treatment, but not preventive medicine or prolonged, catastrophic illness. Some estimates say about 20 percent of the population can't pay even for minimum medical needs.

There are not enough doctors, especially in rural regions, slums, and small communities. Many doctors are underpaid. Few have time to keep up with developments.

Hospitals and other facilities are too few, poorly distributed, often antiquated.

Medical research is haphazard. We spend a hundred dollars for research on infantile paralysis, which afflicts relatively few, for every 25 cents spent on mental disease, which afflicts millions and fills more than half the Nation's hospital beds.

Many people, particularly if they have no trouble meeting their own medical bills and deal exclusively with comfortably established city physicians, find it hard to accept so sweeping a diagnosis. But the clinical facts are disturbing.

According to the AMA, in 1940, most individuals and families with incomes under $3,000 needed help in meeting medical bills. That amounted to well over 75 percent of the population. People who borrow from small-loan companies need the money most often to pay medical bills.

For many an ailing individual the high cost of sickness poses the question of how much medical attention he can do without, and for how long. The grim consequences of such enforced self-denial showed up in prewar medical statistics, which brutally dispose of the notion that the United States is the healthiest nation on earth.

This country had higher infant death rates than seven other countries; higher cancer, heart, nervous, and mental disease rates. The average life expectancy at birth was higher in 4 countries; at 20 years it was higher in 8 countries; at age 40 in 11; and at age 60 in 12. The subsequent revelation that about 40 percent of young Americans were unfit for military service for medical reasons has hushed our big talk about national health standards.

It's not primarily the doctor's fault that protracted illness and preventive medicine are so expensive, although it is a fact that organized medicine, through the American Medical Association, has demonstrated a minimum of social awareness in facing the mounting medical crisis.

But the individual practitioner usually is too busy with his never-ending responsibilities to think about broader medical issues. He carries an appalling load. In most cases the family doctor has fully earned the respect and affection which millions of Americans have for him. He has a habit of quietly scaling down bills for needy patients, and carrying a load of charity cases without talking about it.

So many doctors have concentrated in the cities that demands on country and small-town doctors are proportionately higher. These small-community doctors are often the ones with poorest facilities, largest practices, and lowest incomes.

The main effort to bridge the economic gap between patient and doctor has been through voluntary group-insurance plans as a substitute for the fee system of payment. During the last two decades, many Americans have got partial coverage against sickness through one of these plans.

But they have three fatal defects: They don't offer adequate coverage, they have proved too expensive for lower-income groups, and they don't include enough people.

Like most commercial health-insurance policies, group-insurance plans tend to restrict services and to neglect thorough treatment. Some group plans provide only hospitalization for limited periods, but over half our medical bills are for treatment given outside of hospitals. Less than 5.4 percent of the population has insurance for physicians' services, and about 2.5 percent have complete home, office, and hospital coverage. Only one American out of four has any kind of health insurance at all.

Many of the people who have had experience administering group-health plans say that these are only a necessary stopgap in the absence of a national-health plan.

There are signs that the tide is setting in the direction of such a national program as a logical extension of social security. Opinion polls show a majority in favor of pay-roll deductions to provide national-health insurance. And in the last Congress, Republicans and Democrats joined to provide Federal funds for the construction of more hospitals and clinics, and for treatment and research in mental health and other fields.

Congress hasn't acted on the problem of providing medical services for those who can't afford them. But it may do so during the present session. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, has revised his health bill, and reintroduced it, with the support of the AMA. Given the Senator's influence and the Republican desire to win votes from those who would benefit by the measure's provisions, chances for his bill look pretty good. Its main provisions:

Coordination of civilian Federal health functions in a new Federal Health Agency.

Appropriation of $200,000,000 yearly to assist States in providing medical care and hospital services for individuals and families unable to pay for them.

Cash contributions by States at least equal to the sum advanced from the Federal Treasury.

Approval of State programs by the Surgeon General, with appeal to a national health council in event of disagreement.

Enactment of the bill, according to its proponents, would probably make some basic medical services available to the poorest 20 to 25 percent of the population; opponents say only 10 percent.

Critics of the bill object strongly to a provision that applicants would have to prove their inability to pay. Too many States require a means test as proof of this inability to pay. This is a throw-back from the concept of social security to that of public charity. It seems needlessly humiliating, say the critics, that sick people should have either to exhaust their savings or stigmatize themselves as paupers, to obtain emergency medical care.

The Taft bill also minimizes basic public interest in good health for everyone. We do not maintain schools only for those who are too poor to go to private schools, nor libraries for those who are too poor to buy books. Why offer medical care to the indigent, and exclude middle-income families for whom, also, medical services are too expensive?

Another criticism is that the Taft bill, by providing only emergency relief, forestalls any attempt to combat disease on a Nation-wide scale. Some doctors think tuberculosis could be wiped out in the United States within a generation, syphilis within a shorter time. But this could be done only through a Nation-wide campaign, with services readily available to everybody.

One major political force interested in going beyond the provisions of the Taft bill is United States labor. With hopes of big wage boosts collapsing, union negotiators are now going down the line for fuller health coverage as well as cash benefits paid for by

employers. Management will be hard put to refuse this demand altogether.

In the next few years an estimated 8,000,000 workers are likely to get new or increased health protection as a result.

Senator TAFT's prescription, limited coverage for bottom-income groups, differs, of course, from the unions' proposal—full coverage for all union labor. But by one of the ironies of politics, both efforts may have the same long-run effect.

Once you provide basic medical care for 35,000,000 citizens under the Taft bill and for additional millions of industrial workers under union contracts, the objection to going the whole hog diminishes. The cost would be much cheaper if it were spread over the whole population. And coverage would be more complete. The financial and administrative burden of health and welfare clauses would be taken off private enterprises and placed on official agencies.

One proposal for such a program has been embodied in the administration-sponsored Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. It is expected to be financed by a 3-percent pay-roll levy divided between employees and employers, plus a general appropriation for research and training.

Payments from this fund would be entrusted for disbursement to the Surgeon General, who would also set standards. But day-to-day administration would be left to States, local communities, and existing medical groups. Doctors would continue, if they preferred, to practice on the present fee system, with payments made to them out of the insurance fund. Doctors who wished to practice on a full or partial salary basis could do so. Those who wished to remain completely outside the system would be free to do so.

Patients could go to any general practitioner in the system. The doctor also would be free to accept or reject patients.

It's worth noting that the British Medical Association once fought a national health system based on compulsory health insurance just as stubbornly as the AMA does now. After a conservative government set one up anyway, the British Medical Association swung to support. One reason—doctors' incomes went up.

Like a number of distinguished medical men, some United States business leaders have come to regard a national-health program as a desirable extension of our present social-security laws. Executives like Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros., Gerard Swope, president of General Electric, and David Sarnoff, of RCA, feel this way.

Total cost of a national-health program has been set at $4,000,000,000 yearly. That's about what we pay now, in doctors' bills, taxation for public-health service, and so forth, for such medical care as we get. Socially and economically, it would seem sensible to organize medical services for faster progress toward the goal of medical science, which is not just care in sickness, but positive health for the individual and for the entire community.

Survey of Ground-Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGIA L. LUSK

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein other material, I offer the following telegrams and article:

SOCORRO, N. MEX., *April 23, 1947.*

Hon. GEORGIA L. LUSK,
Junior Representative From New Mexico,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

At the recent session of our legislature $10,000 annually was appropriated to this Bureau for cooperative work with United States Geological Survey in making a survey of ground-water resources of our State. In view of extreme drought conditions prevailing over entire State, we feel that survey of ground-water resources is urgently needed. We urge that every effort be made to restore to United States Geological Survey budget appropriations requested for ground-water survey.

E. C. ANDERSON,
Director, New Mexico Bureau of Mines and Mineral Resources.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., *April 23, 1947.*

Mrs. GEORGIA L. LUSK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Report has reached us that appropriations for Ground Water Division of Geological Survey of Department of Interior has been almost completely eliminated. We feel that work of this division is of such importance to New Mexico and to the West that the cut should be vigorously protested. Ground-water resources are becoming increasingly important as sources of both irrigation and domestic water supplies and continuous study of ground water is essential. The Ground Water Division has an excellent record and has consistently made useful contributions throughout the entire country. We do not believe that it deserves the severe treatment that has been given it by the Appropriations Committee.

JOHN L. GREGG,
Elephant Butte Irrigation District.

A NATION BREAKS FAITH

It is hard to imagine a more tragic example of the breaking of faith than the failure of the United States Government to carry out its treaty obligations in connection with Navajo Indian education. Under the treaty of peace signed with the Navajos in 1868 the Government bound itself to supply this tribe with a teacher and a schoolroom for each 30 children. At no time have these ever been provided, and the situation now is that not more than one Navajo child in four can be in a schoolhouse. Of 20,000 children of school age, there are facilities for only 5,500 at the outside. Some 2,000 of these are in day or community schools, and 3,000 in boarding schools, although the latter were designed for a capacity of only 2,000. Some 500 more boys and girls are being educated by mission schools on or near the reservation.

Reports of the Office of Indian Affairs indicate that the median years of schooling for the Navajo Tribe is nine-tenths of 1 year, that 80 percent of the tribe are illiterate in the usual sense of that word and about 57 percent unable to speak the English language.

These conditions grow progressively worse owing to the rapid increase of the Navajo Tribe. There are estimated to be 55,000 of them now and they are increasing at a rate of 2 percent, or about 1,000 persons annually. There are said to be 17 percent more children of school age among the Navajos than in the United States generally, owing to this rapid increase.

Of 49 day schools on the reservation, 19 had to be closed for lack of funds. Just last week the closing of one of the boarding schools, that at Tohatchi, with 165 pupils, was announced.

A lengthy report has just appeared by Mary Watson, director of elementary education in New Mexico, and Gail Barber, director of arts and crafts of the State department of education, pointing up facts which should bring the blush of shame to every citizen of the United States. Their report was made after personal investigations arranged by Mrs. John J. Kirk, chairman of the State board of public welfare, in which they were joined by Arizona officials.

Besides citing the lamentable inadequacy of educational facilities, their report pointed to the poor economic situation of the Navajoes which they declared "is beyond the belief of the average American, and is rapidly approaching a crisis." Government reports, they stated, showed that the average per capita income of the Navajoes in 1940 was only one-tenth as much as that of the average American, being approximately $82 each compared with a national average of $861.

During the war the economic situation improved owing to 3,600 Navajo men and women entering the armed forces and 15,000 engaging in war work of various kinds. With the close of the war the investigators estimate that some $7,000,000, or 87 percent of all current income, has been lost to the Indians who "now return to the crisis of 1940."

From personal observation the investigators report large numbers of children turned away at various schools for lack of accommodations and overcrowded conditions at most of the schools both as to classroom and housing facilities. They commended in general the efforts of the educational department of the Navajo Reservation in doing the best possible with limited funds and facilities, but stressed the need for more community schools with dormitory accommodations for pupils from a distance.

"The atmosphere of the dormitories at boarding schools is reminiscent of a poor orphans' home of two decades ago," the report reads. It criticizes the dearth and inconvenience of toilet facilities, and cited as an example the Fort Defiance school where the only such available are in dormitories a block from the school. The report recommends adequate appropriations to build and maintain sufficient schools, the erection of suitable dormitories to convert day schools into community schools, the replacement and enlargement of condemned buildings at Shiprock, provisions for substitute teachers, and for school nurses.

"The boys and girls of the Navajo Reservation * * * are entitled to education considered essential in all other parts of the United States. They are entitled to such an education not only because of the promises of their treaty with our Government, but in their own right as promising young American citizens," the report concludes.

The Daily Independent unqualifiedly endorses the findings of this report and urges that every citizen and every civic organization get actively behind it in demanding that Congress appropriate adequate funds to correct this deplorable situation. A lot of money was spent unwisely on the Navajo Reservation during the highly theoristic Collier administration, but that does not lessen our responsibility for at long last waking up and doing the right thing now.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt: "How Blessed Is America That Out of Her Loins Came Forth This Great Son"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in all the noble tributes to our fallen leader,

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, few have been more eloquent than the sermon of Rabbi Gerstenfeld, of Washington, D. C., delivered over radio station WMAL.

I should have preferred to insert the full text of this beautiful threnody; its length, however, precludes that. Therefore I have selected paragraphs which, I trust, preserve the full meaning within the prescribed length of such extension, and under leave granted insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

This Saturday is the second anniversary of the death of the late President Roosevelt. Two years ago we gathered to pay homage to one of America's great sons. To a little cottage on a southern hill the angel of death had come on the very eve of the great victory for which this brave soul had given all the strength that God gave him. For 12 long years he had borne the burden that no other man had been fated to bear. He achieved his office in the most tragic time in the history of the West. The nations that had built the horizon of the world's freedom had forgotten the moral mandate of their heritage. The First World War had come to engulf the flower of its manhood, but an exhausted mankind failed to rise to the challenge of the future. Freemen beat their swords into stock shares and their spears into the pruning hooks of a vain harvest of desolation. The armistice was soon followed by the awful depression and the spawning of another world war. This young man, made strong by the facing of personal adversity, and with the vision of his great, generous heart, consecrated his life to the service of his country. The New Deal policy for the forgotten poor; the good-neighbor policy for the neighboring nations that were fearfully weak; the friend of world peace who never succumbed to the seductions of appeasement, up through the months of lend-lease, then the defeat at Pearl Harbor, and finally this war, his smiling countenance, resolute and unafraid, became for many the truest symbol in our day of the world's noblest courage, mankind's profoundest faith, and our loftiest hopes.

HOW BLESSED IS AMERICA

How blessed is America that out of her loins came forth so great a son. Even to remember his words uttered at each moment of moral crisis in the past is to bring new strength into our hearts. "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," he said in his first inaugural, as he pleaded for the faith that would save us from the paralyzing terror. "We must quarantine the aggressor," he cried out when the shadow of aggression arose out of the foul gutters of the Old World. "The hand that held the dagger has stuck it into the back of its neighbor," he declaimed as would an ancient prophet, warning the sawdust Caesars of the retribution of a just God that lies ahead. He spoke of the four freedoms, freedom to speak, freedom to worship God in one's own way, freedom from want, and freedom from fear, and spoke of them in the very hour when the swastika flew over all of Europe—from the shores of the Atlantic to the far-off Acropolis and to the shadows of the ancient pyramids of Egypt; when the life lines of the world's freedom seemed about to be shattered forever. When voices of defeat and surrender arose even in the high places of this land, he said that tyranny was not the wave of the future and lashed at the cowards who would surrender the hope of the world's freedom. He rallied his people in a day of infamy; and as the Commander in Chief of this free land he had the genius to carry the struggle to the enemy, instead of awaiting the invasion of the foe. He led his people across the Red Sea of tragedy, in a black night of suffering, toward the foot of a great covenant of Sinai, a covenant of the righteousness of the morrow for which he had labored through the years. From Casablanca to Tehran, from Quebec to Yalta, this brave spirit who could not walk, but whose courage stalked across the earth, rallied the warriors and took counsel with the statesmen until the Caesars were in the dust and the Attilas fled to their mountain caves amidst the ruin of their plunder. The last citadel of the might of the enemy in Europe fell before the brave men of the world moving in as a wall of steel around the lairs of evil. On the outermost naked shingles of the world the devil-worshippers soon found their arms a snare and a delusion before the mighty will of the new weapons of free men who believed in the great God who has, and ever will lead men out of bondage.

WE PRAYED WE WOULD NOT FAIL

I remember the dark hours when his earthly remains moved on to its rest and we knew that the souls of millions on the face of the earth were moving on with it. The steel beat of the train that bore him through the darkness were the plaintive notes of a threnody of lament in the hearts of free men everywhere. We felt it in the sorrow-laden streets of silent men in this city, as they watched the flag-draped coffin. Amidst enshrouding grief there was a new gold star in every home and a bowed head before many an altar; as we prayed that we will be true to his vision. We prayed that we would not fail the peace for which he labored, for which he strove until his brave heart broke under the burden the call of God's duty had rested upon him. With millions laboring in our factories or fighting in the foxholes our hearts echoed the sacred words of the great Lincoln, at whose lonely side he will forever stand, that "It is for us the living to be here dedicated to the unfinished task for which they who have fought have thus far so nobly advanced. It is for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from our honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion."

HISTORY WILL BE WRITTEN

After the funeral had ended we knew that the final epitaph was still to be composed. It would be written by the free nations of the earth, by their responsible leaders and their responsive followers. It would be especially written by the American people and the men who are the chosen instruments of their decision. History can only be written by the survivors and too often—as after the last war—the survivors may be the weaklings, without any vision of the challenge of the morrow. The epitaph of history on the great saga of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whether it will be the transvaluation easy with the morally feeble that will see him as too bold, or whether it will be the judgment of the great souls who will see in him the righteousness of our age pressing forward to new visions of the good and the true, the spiritual imperative of his moral vision, all that would be determined by the decision of the American people.

A JOSHUA NEEDED, STRONG AND OF GOOD COURAGE

All will now depend on whether the heirs of Roosevelt will, like unto Moses, be Joshuas, "strong and of good courage;" who will not turn from his standards, in the world of scripture, "to the right or to the left" and "go forward." Will they be opportunists, weaklings who will imitate his weakness or men of unflinching character who will be exemplars to his strength; or will they be covetous Achans who in selfish greed for personal spoil, for a mere mantle of Shinar, a few shekels of silver or a wedge of gold—will jettison all the cargo of ideals of the morrow for which we once hoped.

As we remember, from the theme of the Passover festival that ends tomorrow, the miracle of God's deliverance comes only to the faithful who resist the broken pledges of cruel Pharaohs, the faithful who renew their pledges to the future as they accept the moral logic of their vision with their own brave steps forward; the faithful who will be satisfied with the unleavened bread of pioneer pilgrims because they believe that man must be better than the Pharaohs we resist. It is only by that faith that we can cross the dark night over a Red Sea; and it is only in that moral strength that there will be faithful who will find the path out of the wilderness into a world of promise.

LET US, THEREFORE, BE VIGILANT

When I think of the plight of the Old World that flows directly from the political opportunism of men who once professed to fight the Nazis, and who will be as responsible for the havoc of the future as were the evil men whose hard hearts they had once pledged themselves to oppose; when I think of one former ally that has perverted the dream of a United Nations from an instrument of cooperation into a device of paralyzing dissension and interminable obstruction; and when I think of our other ally that has put all its ebbing strength at home into the reliance upon rotting reaction abroad until our heart is sickened by the brazen perfidy; when I think of the fragment of Old World Israel that is now left to whom the British have barred the gates of Palestine in violation of the pledges made according to the law of nations and the needs of humanity, then regardless of what legalistic jugglery they may use to confuse the average citizen, they have the blood of the innocent on their hands, even as if they were the henchmen of the Nazis. In the light of the sad facts of the abysmal plight of the innocent who should be liberated, who are caught in a death trap of the Old World with every avenue of escape cut off by the connivery of the blind who once spoke of resisting the Nazis, then one can already see that some in our midst will go down in history as the Achans, who forgot all the meaning of mankind's tragic pilgrimage and succumbed to the very paganism they had once opposed—all for the sake of a mere mantle of Shinah of personal glory or for a few shekels of selfish booty. We thus face the danger in this hour not only of the perfidy behind Russia's "iron curtain" and the infamy behind what has been called the British "silken curtain," but also of the corrupting normalcy behind the democratic forms that drape our own land. Thus in this very hour we face a resulting false boom in our midst, the high prices of the inflationary spiral of a strangling economy because of the witless amongst us, even as we face a false peace in the world—the peace that will be but a brief armistice before the atomic extermination of human civilization.

Let us, therefore, be vigilant in this hour not only for our military strength but for our moral commitments. If we are not to deny all for which we have fought; if we are not to make a profane mockery of all that freemen who faced the evil of our time once hoped; if we are to write a true and proud epitaph of honor upon the grave of our heroes—then now is the time for new Joshuas bearing a sacred covenant of the morrow, faithful Joshuas who are of moral strength and of good courage, true Joshuas who will not permit themselves or this blessed Nation by decision or default to be seduced to the right or to the left and sink into the dark sins of a tragedy-ridden Old World leading deathward. For now is the time we must lift high a divine covenant—now is the time we must take the path upward to a world of promise that righteous men with God's help must now make true. Amen.

Price Cut on Soap Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a splendid telegram I have received from Lever Bros. Co., of Cambridge, Mass., informing me "in accord with President Truman's recent appeal" that this company, effective April 23, has put into effect "a price cut of 10 percent on all major soap products" of this company.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 23, 1947.*
Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Washington, D. C.:

Responding to President Truman's appeal for reduction of prices—a price cut of 10 percent on all major soap products of Lever Bros. Co., effective Wednesday morning, April 23, was announced today by Charles Luckman, Lever president, from Lever headquarters in Cambridge, Mass.

Products involved include Lux toilet soap, Lux flakes, Rinso, Lifebuoy, and Swan, while the price of glycerin was also reduced by approximately 10 percent.

Above-mentioned reductions follow a cut of 2 cents a pound in the price of Spry made April 10.

"This step is being taken because Lever Bros. Co., in accord with President Truman's recent appeal, is fully aware of the responsibility that rests upon American business to take effective measures in order to assure the economic well-being of the Nation," Mr. Luckman stated.

"We are not only willing but anxious to pass along to American housewives all possible reductions, even beyond the amount of any savings which may accrue to us by reason of the downward trend in the prices of raw materials," said Mr. Luckman.

These price reductions are being made despite wage increases granted to Lever employees during the past month.

LEVER BROS. CO.,
Cambridge, Mass.

The Greatest Things

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a poem entitled "The Greatest Things":

THE GREATEST THINGS

The best day—Today.
The best play—Work.
The greatest puzzle—Life.
The greatest thought—God.
The greatest mystery—Death.
The best work—Work you like.
The greatest mistake—Giving up.
The most ridiculous asset—Pride.
The greatest need—Common sense.
The best town—Where you succeed.
The most dangerous person—A liar.
The most expensive indulgence—Hate.
The greatest invention of the devil—War.
The most disagreeable person—The complainer.
The greatest secret of production—Saving waste.
The best teacher—One who makes you want to learn.
The biggest fool—The boy who will not go to school.
The greatest deceiver—The one who deceives himself.
The worst bankrupt—The soul that has lost enthusiasm.
The cheapest, stupidest, and easiest thing to do—Finding fault.
The greatest thing, bar none in the world—Love.

—*Author Unknown.*

The Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, a great many letters and petitions have been received relative to rent control, and the housing shortage. Recently I made a radio broadcast to the people in my district on this subject, which I should like to include in the Congressional RECORD. This situation is of vital concern to a vast number of people, many of whom feel that Congress could and should do something to meet the need for homes, especially among the veterans. My radio address follows:

Tonight from Washington I want to bring you an analysis of a situation that is not news—it's not new to anyone. In fact, it's old stuff. I refer to this housing situation. Few situations are as mixed up right now as the problem of housing. It affects the veterans that have returned from the war, the building industry, and the building investor. I know, too, that it affects many of you folks in the District. For that reason, I would like to go over the problem and try to bring to you a picture of just what is behind the entire mess.

Let's take a short look at the housing situation before the war and before Government control. Before the war over 90 percent of all new homes sold for less than $6,000.

Last year, 1946, which was a year of peace, half of all homes built during the year cost more than $7,500. Actually, there are not enough houses available now even for that price. Real-estate prices have skyrocketed in the face of an acute shortage of houses for sale and for rental.

The pity of the situation lies in the fact that at this moment Government regulations and controls are holding the construction industry down and New Deal red tape is preventing the builders of the Nation from constructing homes at the full capacity of the industry. People who would like to build find that it is just too expensive and complicated—and the situation has not been getting any better despite all the talk of housing programs, housing expediters, and subsidies.

Behind this shameful situation are various factors, all of which we Republicans have inherited from the New Deal. The first thing I want to go into is the labor trouble and its bearing on the current housing shortage.

Not so long ago the gigantic American industrial machine was producing the airplanes, engines, tanks, guns, and complicated fighting ships to supply the entire world for a Global War. Now, however, 2 years after the end of the war and with reconversion of industry accomplished in virtually every phase, the American industrial machine cannot get in gear to furnish the people of this country with homes. Here are some of the ridiculous bottlenecks in housing caused by labor trouble.

Under present laws this Government cannot force labor to do away with certain costly building methods. Much of the mechanical know-how developed and advanced during the wartime period cannot be used now because labor unions fear that it will eliminate jobs.

Industry right now is producing on mass scale complete units of plumbing and heating fixtures. Labor unions, however, can make you hire plumbers to take the units apart and reassemble them when you install them in your new house. This sort of thing has been upheld by the courts of this country under interpretations of present laws.

You can save money building your house by buying windows already painted and glazed ready for installation. Unions, however, can make you hire a painter to go over the unit with a dry paint brush, and you can be forced to hire glaziers to remove the window glass and replace it before it can be installed in your new home. You pay for the time and labor.

Prefabricated wall paneling can be purchased now that the war is over. However, getting it installed in a new house is another problem. Unions can make you hire plasterers anyway, even if you are using sheetrock wallboard which is an excellent substitute. If you refuse to hire plasterers, all work on your home can be stopped.

You can save much time and money by having your new house painted with a spray gun that is much more efficient than a painter. Unions won't let you do this, however. The union will not allow one man to do the work of several painters.

Your contractor might try to save you some money by purchasing panels with your inside wiring attached. Such panels are now available with the wiring done at the factory before delivery. Unions can make you hire union members to unwire the panel, and rewire it while you pay for the time and labor.

That is only part of the picture. In my opinion it is a sad commentary on a Nation that is as highly industrialized as our Nation is. The Republican Congress is now trying to correct this phase of the program through the Labor-Management Relations Act.

The second and other important phase of this situation is the problem of Government controls. I want to quote from a letter I recently read in a newspaper illustrating what the New Deal controls have done to many landlords over the Nation. This landlord wrote:

"My $6,000 houses rented for $45 monthly up to 1929 and gradually this rent was reduced until I was receiving $25 during the depression. The breadwinner of the family was earning around $125 a month while paying $25 per month rent. But all through the war the same breadwinner has earned $400 to $600 a month and still only paid $25 house rent.

"My $8,000 to $9,000 houses rented for $75 monthly up to 1929; they now rent for $40, with similar increases in earnings by the occupant.

"For the past 12 years the Government has entered into the building business and taken increased control, consequently private building contractors have had little inducement to invest their money in private residence construction. That, I believe, has a lot to do with the housing shortage."

That ends this landlord's letter and I believe it states the case very well. That does not mean I am against the tenant, however. You can understand what it will do to the building of homes to rent. The Government

should abandon all building and rental controls, get out of this business, and set the building industry free. I have continually tried to show by actual statistics that private enterprise has the potential to furnish the goods if they could throw off the yoke of Government controls. The bureaucrats who try to control the building business have had little or no experience in that field and the Government cannot furnish the public with the houses that can be turned out by private industry and yet the administration is continually demanding that controls be maintained. It is my belief, at this time, that this control over the construction industry is hurting all efforts of private builders to furnish the veterans and the public with homes. Government controls, just as heavy Federal taxes, are eliminating the incentive of investors to invest money and turn out the goods.

There is considerable conflict of views on legislation proposed in the House and in the Senate, in an attempt to remedy the housing shortage.

It increases the present building demand by encouraging all those who are now adequately housed to immediately borrow money for the purpose of building a new house, and it provides for Government expenditure of approximately $7,000,000,000 in the housing field, at a time when the national debt is taking six billion annually from taxpayers merely to pay interest on it.

Unquestionably, the removal of rent ceilings would do much to encourage and stimulate builders in the matter of providing additional rental properties, but with the ceilings on, certainly such builders cannot afford to take a chance on erecting rental property.

It is a well-known fact that the building industry has a potential capacity of housing in excess of a million units a year and that fact was demonstrated in 1925 when over a million homes were built. That could be attained this year or any other year without New Deal controls being maintained. As long as we have Government bureaus tinkering with the building business, just that long we will be short of houses.

The money is available to finance this housing. The Nation is in need of homes as never before in our history. Continuation of restrictions is destroying the ability of the industry to turn out the maximum number of homes. In my opinion, it is time we let the building industry and the building investor run their own business free from Government snoopers and meddlers and pave the way for a million homes yearly as was done in 1925.

The GOP and Its Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, every day the Republican Party reaffirms its obligation and pledge to the American people to bring about economy, efficiency, and sanity in the Federal Government. Toward these ends a sound and constructive legislation program has been formulated and is in process of enactment. The motives and political self-interests of those who oppose and obstruct the reduction of pay rolls and expenditures, the lightening and equalizing of the tax burden and the many other measures passed by the Republican Congress are well known.

Our responsibility is clear, and we shall not fail to discharge it. The progress made to date and the task ahead were excellently stated in an editorial in the Kansas City Times on April 21, 1947, the first day of the meeting of the Republican National Committee at Kansas City. The editorial is as follows:

THE GOP AND ITS RECORD

In their Kansas City meeting today and tomorrow members of the Republican National Committee will be able to gather valuable impressions of the Middle West politically and otherwise. This section does not pretend to be running the country or to have infallible views on what ought to be done. But it is not a rankly partisan section, it is rather independent in its thinking and its political support goes one way or the other accordingly.

Last year the Republicans made an excellent showing in the Middle West, as in fact in most other parts of the country outside the solid South. They will be able to retain this confidence as their performance goes this year and next. While they have nothing of a serious nature to be worrying about at this stage, they cannot be too cocky about the future. The party is on trial in Congress and in the States where it now has control.

Its leaders doubtless realize the fact. They need not be disturbed by the political sniping from the other side of the fence, because that can be expected no matter what the record they produce. In their program of economy they have aroused the fury of the entrenched Government bureaus which have been turning loose a heavy barrage of propaganda, while the opposition party naturally will make the most of any chance to criticize and to charge the GOP is divided in its own ranks and is unable to make good on its pledges.

All this the public will understand. It's simply a part of the political game. The proper answer is more than simply firing back. It is and must be the party's record itself. So far there is not so much to explain or defend in that record. In their new control of Congress, after 17 years, the Republicans have got down to business and done a lot of hard work. By necessity it had to be done quietly and through committees in the early months of the session.

Now the results are beginning to show up as the bills come out and action is taken. And the answer of the other side here cannot be mere opposition and rejection of what is submitted in the hope of political advantage. If the administration and its party in Congress assume that attitude they will be certain to lose just as the Republicans would be certain to lose if they rested their case simply on politics.

The party now officially represented in Kansas City faces its heavy responsibilities. They can be discharged by a firm continuance of the course that has been followed to date.

Reduction of Research Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New York Times of April 20, 1947:

BUDGET CUTS OPPOSED—CONGRESS ASKED TO RECONSIDER PLAN TO SLICE RESEARCH FUNDS

(The signers of the following letter are distinguished members of the Harvard University faculty in the fields of the natural sciences, the humanities, and the social sciences.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Over a generation our Federal Government has steadily improved its facilities for collecting facts. Its rich harvest has been the envy of the world. Without facts at their disposal, neither Government nor business nor consumers can act intelligently.

The cost of gathering these facts is almost negligible compared to our $170,000,000,000 of national income, or the losses that might be incurred as a result of mistaken policy which might result from the unavailability of statistical information.

We therefore urge upon Congress a reconsideration of recent action drastically cutting appropriations for research, inclusive of fact gathering. We support Congress in its wise policy to cut public expenditures, so long as private spending threatens to be excessive, and inflation is the common danger. We also are sympathetic with Congress when it strives to eliminate duplication of statistical services or series, or to rid the country of any wasteful expenditures. A dollar spent by the Government should be well spent. We are, however, opposed to indiscriminate pruning, whether in the area of research or elsewhere.

A $170,000,000,000 economy does not operate without action by individuals. If these individuals are to act intelligently they must have facts relating to prices, employment, output, wage rates, trade, savings, expenditures, etc.—and on a national, regional, and local basis.

We therefore deplore, for example, the recent proposed cut in the budget of the Bureau of Labor Statistics from $5,500,000 to $2,400,000. Unless a large part of this cut is restored, the country will be deprived of many statistical series which are indispensable for policy making. We shall lose many times the savings to the Treasury; and posterity will lose part of its historical perspective. An interrupted statistical series is likely to be as dead for all time as a man whose heart stops beating for an hour.

We respectfully request Members of the Congress to reconsider their recent proposal to cut appropriations for research in departments of the Government.

Public Demands Reasonable Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an editorial which appeared in the Sunday Star of April 20, 1947, entitled "The Tide Is Strong." This timely editorial indicates that the people are insisting that Congress take action to create a balance of power between industry and labor. For too many years the situation has been one-sided. Today we have a manifestation of the pendulum swinging in the other direction. It is to be hoped that it will not swing too far at this time.

We must maintain the principles of justice and equity between these contending forces so that the public interest will be preserved at all times, insofar as it is possible.

THE TIDE IS STRONG

Critics of the House-approved labor bill are making the point that most of the American people do not know what the bill provides or what it may be expected to accomplish. This probably is true, but it by no means follows that the bill therefore is lacking in public support.

Here is a legislative proposal which reverses what has been a marked trend in the direction of conferring special favors on labor. In one stroke, it would sweep away many concessions won over the years and which have come to be regarded almost as inviolable "rights." Nevertheless, this bill was passed by a vote of 308 to 107—almost a 3-to-1 margin. Not even a majority of the Democrats could be enrolled against it, the Representatives from the South forsaking in droves the opposition stand taken by Minority Leader RAYBURN.

In the face of this, it is sheer whistling in the dark for the opponents of the bill to seek comfort in the assumption that a majority of the people do not support the bill because they do not know what is in it. For the best evidence that the people do support the bill is found in the fact that such an overwhelming majority of Representatives, seeking to please their constituents, voted for it. And if it can be inferred that the public supports the bill without knowing or caring what is in it, that should be even more ominous from the union point of view, since it would indicate that the tide of antilabor sentiment is indeed running strong and deep.

Of course, it would not follow from the mere fact of public support, or public indifference to details, that the House bill is a good bill. In its present form it is not a good bill, although it contains some provisions that are both good and urgently needed. It is to be expected, however, that a balance will be struck somewhere between the severe provisions of the House measure and the decidedly less drastic bill which has been reported out by the Senate committee.

Because the picture is so badly confused, there is little purpose at this time in speculation as to the nature of the bill which finally will emerge. But one thing is virtually certain. Some bill, and probably a relatively stringent one, is going to be passed. If the President vetoes it, it may not become law at this session. That, however, will only serve to postpone the day when new legislation will be finally enacted, for the temper of the peoples is such as to demand action. This being so, it is unfortunate that influential labor leaders persist in their blind opposition to any kind of legislation, for the inevitable result will be a law that is less sound than might otherwise have been the case.

A Foreign Country Is Not the Proper Forum To Debate American Foreign Policy—Stassen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix I include a radio address given this morning in Washington, D. C., by George E. Reedy, nationally famous radio commentator over Station WOL and the Mutual network, wherein he discusses the deliberate refusal of former Governor Stassen to discuss our foreign affairs in a foreign country, and contrasts this admirable conduct with the present objectionable actions of Henry Wallace:

STASSEN VERSUS WALLACE

The screaming headlines over the speeches of Henry Wallace, in Europe, have obscured an important fact. It is that another prominent American is also touring the Old World. His trip, however, is in striking contrast to the barnstorming of our ex-Commerce Secretary.

The second American is Harold Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota, and avowed candidate for the 1948 Presidential race. Without endorsing his candidacy, he deserves to be congratulated for the dignity with which he has handled himself.

Throughout his tour, he has steadfastly refused to issue the headline-catching statements that would have put him on page 1. He has said that he is in Europe to learn and anything he has to say will be delivered when he returns to the United States.

Yesterday it was announced that Stassen had turned down an invitation to speak to England over the British Broadcasting Corp. radio system. He was offered the same amount of time that Wallace took to lambaste the foreign policy of this country.

Stassen's action represents the policy he has followed all along, and which many Americans wish that Wallace had followed. Had that wish been granted, the delicate negotiations of our State Department in Moscow might have been more successful.

The effect of the Wallace speeches is already reflected in the Soviet press. Reports coming back from Russia indicate that the Communists believe this to be a divided country, with Wallace a more popular political figure than President Truman.

This may or may not be wishful thinking, but the Russians are always willing to act on the basis of wishful thinking. And there is nothing they would like to believe more than the idea that President Truman's anti-Communist stand is unpopular.

Wallace has given them plenty of ground upon which to base that idea. He has painted the United States as a nation which is being pushed into imperialistic wars, against the will of its people—and against its own best interests.

In contrast, he has given the Soviet Union only one feeble slap on the wrist. That happened yesterday when he said that both the United States and Russia are pursuing a policy of toughness which canceled the aims for which their soldiers fought.

Had he pursued this line of reasoning throughout his European tour, the whole effect of his speeches would have been different. However, that thought has been injected into his statements only once, and then it seemed to be an almost grudging concession.

Possibly he wished to take the sting off even this mild criticism, for he coupled it with a proposal that the United States lend $15,000,000,000 to the Soviet Union. This, he said, would be a long step toward guaranteeing world peace.

Mr. Wallace's tour of Europe has hardly been profitable to the United States. Perhaps it would have been worth far more had he, like Mr. Stassen, kept his ears open a little wider—and his lip buttoned a little tighter.

Retirement Pensions of Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Brooklyn Eagle of April 21, 1947:

POSTAL WORKERS DESERVE LIBERALIZED PENSIONS

Sam Steinfeld has a wife and two children to support. But after 42 years of service in the Brooklyn Post Office he'll be eligible for a pension of only $1,200 under the present law. Mr. Steinfeld holds he can't keep his family going on that, and it isn't difficult in these days of rising prices to understand why.

Mr. Steinfeld is one of 2,700 borough postal workers who are asking that the postal pension law be liberalized to permit them to pay an extra 1 percent of their salaries into the retirement fund. They also are asking that they be permitted to retire after 25 years of service instead of waiting until they reach 60 years of age.

Mr. Steinfeld's story in the Eagle the other day was enlightening. Postal workers must labor until they reach 60 before they can retire, while most other civil-service employees may retire after 20 years of service, regardless of their age. Postal men and women get 10 days a year sick leave, compared with 15 days for other Federal workers. They get 15 days' vacation, while others get 26 days.

The demands of the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees are realistic and entirely legitimate. Certainly these men and women who toil night and day in one of our most essential services deserve more consideration.

Sanity and Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes, from the Washington Daily News of April 22, 1947:

SANITY AND STEEL

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The new contract between United States Steel and the CIO steel workers comes as a timely example of sanity, common sense and good will in the midst of the noisy confusion generated by extremists on both sides of the current labor controversy.

It was reached through the calm and orderly processes of collective bargaining, without histrionics.

Altogether it represented a victory for public opinion operating from a number of directions and through a number of channels to achieve a balance that still is the best hope of our system of checks and balances.

Steel is a leader in our economy. American public opinion recognizes that. So do management and labor in this industry. It was time for each side to make a showing

for itself as an example in other quarters. They rose to the challenge.

There were clearly discernible pressures on both parties. The more mellow and conciliatory attitude of the important sector of labor involved here reflected plainly the public reaction against some labor attitudes and dissatisfaction over strikes. This public reaction is manifest in the present legislative drive in Congress, though it is hardly likely that a majority of the public intended anything so harsh as the Hartley bill passed last week by the House, which hampers rather than encourages the collective bargaining process so successful in steel.

Labor leadership at the top sees the seriousness of this legislative threat. This certainly was influential in promoting the steel settlement, which case, significantly, was made on the eve of consideration of labor legislation by the Senate, where lies the hope of moderation.

The importance of the steel agreement, aside from the example in a basic industry, is that the head of CIO, Philip Murray, was a party to the negotiations on behalf of his steel workers' union. He was conscious of the importance of this settlement beyond this one industry. It comes, too, as another collective-bargaining trophy to hang beside those in the rubber and electrical industries.

On the management side, the steel agreement likewise represented definite pressures. It signified recognition of public awareness of the handsome profits netted by the steel giant along with other big industries. President Truman has emphasized this much of late, while labor has called attention to it dramatically by specific figures dug out by its research experts in connection with skyrocketing prices. Steel also is among industries cited in the speeded-up movement toward greater concentration of business and industry which is much discussed now, both in Congress and elsewhere.

The steel wage increase is not predicated upon a price increase, according to reports of the agreement. A price decrease had been agitated as an example to the rest of industry and widely rumored. It still might be possible, even with the wage increases. They are somewhat less than those that Bob Nathan, former New Deal economist, had argued (as a CIO consultant) were possible without price increases. His findings were vigorously challenged in industrial quarters.

The steel settlement will be welcomed generally for the hope it gives for maintaining balance in our economy and industrial peace. It may not be good news to extremists of right and left, who obviously had anticipated an era of industrial disorders which they could exploit, one side hoping to break down labor unions, and the other looking to general confusion, which serves their purposes.

The Labor-Management Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. MEADE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1947

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district which contains large manufacturing, shipping, and allied interests, all of which may be vitally affected by the labor-management bill, and I am sure many of my constituents will be asking why I voted for this measure. I think I owe them a duty to explain my vote and to tell them what this bill means to me.

For several weeks I sat in on the hearings before the House Committee on Labor because, frankly, my knowledge of labor law was very limited and I wanted to learn everything I could about the existing law and this bill before I was called upon to cast my vote. I studied the bill carefully and read the committee's report, and I have listened to every word of debate in the House on the various sections of this bill. As a result of all of this, I was convinced this bill was in the interest of the large majority of working men and women, and I voted for it.

The enactment of comprehensive legislation to define clearly the legitimate rights of employers and employees in their industrial relations, in keeping with the protection of the paramount public interest, was imperative. I believe H. R. 3020 does exactly that. It prescribes the rights of all parties having an interest in harmonious industrial relations and requires that each party respect the right of the other.

During the last few years, the effects of industrial strife have at times brought our country to the brink of general economic paralysis. Employees have suffered, employers have suffered, and the public has suffered. I am fully convinced the enactment of this legislation will have the effect of bringing widespread industrial strife to an end and that employees and employers will again go forward together as a team, united to achieve for their mutual benefit and for the welfare of the Nation, the highest standard of living yet known in the history of this Nation.

1. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES OF THE BILL

H. R. 3020 asserts at the outset that it is a bill to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management, to protect the right of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations and to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare.

2. NEW LABOR BOARD

In an effort to improve administration of the Government's laws on labor relations, the bill would wipe out the National Labor Relations Board and would create a new Labor-Management Relations Board of three members who would exercise quasi-judicial functions only.

It would create an Administrator of the Board in an independent agency who would conduct the various prosecuting and investigative functions of the present Board. The Board now is prosecutor, judge, and jury.

Thus the new Board would only decide cases.

The Administrator would investigate cases and present evidence to the Board. The Board could decide only upon the weight of credible legal evidence.

The new Board would not be permitted to condone, first, strikes to compel employers to deprive employees of their rights under the act; second, illegal boycotts; third, violence; fourth, mass picketing; fifth, industry-wide bargaining; sixth, strikes against public health and safety; and seventh, dictatorial control of workers by unscrupulous union leaders.

I believe the appointment of an Administrator will separate the prosecuting and investigative functions of the National Labor Relations Board from the administrative functions. This is a decided improvement over the old set-up.

3. BARGAINING ELECTIONS

An employer could petition the new Board for certification of a collective-bargaining unit, the same as the union may now do.

In addition, the Board could entertain a request for such determination from a union representing at least 30 percent of the employees, or by employees themselves who represent 30 percent of the total.

A particular union in a plant by majority vote could have itself excluded from a larger, over-all union, which might be certified by the new Board as the proper collective-bargaining unit.

It seems only fair and just that the employer should have the right to petition for a certificate of a collective bargaining unit the same as the union, in order that he may present his side of the controversy. This section corrects one of the outstanding injustices of the Wagner National Labor Relations Act, as passed originally.

4. ENFORCEMENT

The new Administrator could not handle complaints of unfair labor practices originating more than 6 months previously. He would have to proceed on them within 6 months. The Administrator would execute the Board's orders.

If the Board was convinced that the law had been violated, it could deprive workers of their rights under the law. The obtaining of court orders would be normal procedure.

In deciding appeals from the Board order, the courts would not be compelled to comply with the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act.

Laws are made for the government of the actions of people. If the unions violate the provisions of the law, then they would lose the right to bargain and violations by individuals would result in the loss of an employee's status under the law. I believe this provision is fair and just.

5. NORMAL BARGAINING PROCESS

Both management and labor would be required to bargain collectively, either as set out in an existing agreement or as provided in the new law. For the first time, collective bargaining would be defined by law.

If there were no existing contract provisions, both parties would have to receive and discuss new proposals or counterproposals at not less than four separate conferences within 30 days after the first conference.

Before striking, notice must be given to the Administrator, who then would conduct a strike vote. Within 5 days, the union would give notice to employees of the issues in dispute and would allow reasonable time for the employer to make his position known.

The employees would have to vote, by secret ballot, on whether they wish to accept the employer's latest offer and whether to strike.

Collective-bargaining issues would include only wages, hours, and work requirements; discipline, seniority, and discharge within the bargaining unit; safety, sanitation, and health; and vacations and leaves of absence.

6. COMPULSORY UNIONISM

The closed shop would be outlawed.

But a union shop would be authorized under certain circumstances. Under the union shop, an employer may hire anyone of his choosing, but that person must become a member of the shop union within a given period, usually 30 days.

The bill would permit the employer and a union to agree voluntarily to a union shop only if the employees, by secret ballot, have selected the union as their bargaining agent and if the majority of all the employees, by a separate secret ballot, authorize the union to make the agreement, and if the agreement is not prohibited by State law.

An employee could be expelled from the union and therefore forced out of his job only for failing to pay fees and duties imposed upon the workers generally. Unions could not strike to compel employers to enter into such agreements, under penalty of loss of bargaining rights.

Under this provision an employer may select his own employees and the employee has 30 days to decide whether he or she cares to join the union. Unions may not cause the discharge of employees by discriminating against them. The agreement must be voluntary. Unions may not strike to compel employers to enter into such agreements. They are subject to the loss of bargaining rights if they do. It seems to me the whole theory of a closed shop is opposed to our ideas of liberty.

7. INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING

The growing union practice of demanding bargaining on an industry-wide basis would be sharply limited through restrictions on the right of the new Board to approve a collective bargaining representative

Under the bill, the Board could not certify one union as the bargaining agent for workers of two or more competing employers and workers of two or more competing employers could not conspire together to strike at the same time.

But there would be two exceptions. One union could represent less than 100 workers of each of several competing employers if the plants are not more than 50 miles apart. Unions that represent workers of competing employers would be permitted to affiliate or associate together if their bargaining, striking, and other concerted activities are not subject to common control.

Then, too, the President would be authorized to seek injunctions against industry-wide strikes that imperil the public health and safety.

Had this law been in effect a month ago, it would have prevented the Nation-wide telephone strike. I firmly believe industry-wide bargaining is monopolistic—is against public interest and should be outlawed. Differences between labor and management can be more easily adjusted locally than on a Nation-wide basis.

8. ESSENTIAL INDUSTRY STRIKES

Injunctive relief and cooling-off periods would be provided to cope with strikes that imperil the public health and safety.

Whenever the President should find that a labor dispute results in or threatens to result in "the cessation or substantial curtailment of interstate or foreign commerce in transportation, public utility, or community services essential to the public health, safety, or interest," he must ask the Attorney General to petition a Federal court for a temporary injunction. The courts would be empowered to grant such injunctions, without regard to the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

After an injunction is issued, the parties for 30 days must "make every effort" to reach an agreement. At the end of 30 days, the new board would require a secret ballot to determine whether the workers want to accept the then current offer of their employer.

If the dispute could not be settled in that manner, the Secretary of Labor would so notify the Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, who, with an employer and an employee representative, would undertake to reach a solution. Within another 30 days, they would have to report. Within 15 days thereafter, the Board would be requested to take another secret ballot on this three-man report.

If this proposal were rejected in the secret ballot, it would mean the end of the official Government peace-making machinery and the temporary injunction would be dissolved.

Surely there can be little question on the part of fair-minded people that strikes which violate or affect public health and safety should be prohibited by law. Think of the untold damage and added suffering brought about in the recent explosions in Texas because of the delay in getting help to that stricken area. Much of this is directly attributable to the fact that they could not get telephone calls through to nearby city fire departments, to doctors, nurses, hospitals, and to relief crews experienced in handling this type of catastrophe. Immediate telephone service would certainly have saved many of the lives lost in this tragic explosion.

9. UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

The bill would reiterate the usual unfair labor practices on the part of an employer, such as interfering with selection of a bargaining agent, would prevent employers from agreeing to the dues check-off system unless each worker had agreed to it in writing, would forbid him to enter into a closed-shop agreement, and then would establish a set of unfair labor practices by workers and their unions.

Under this heading the union could not direct or call a strike unless at least a majority of those voting on the question have, after the membership has received due notice of proposed balloting thereon, authorized such strike; could not seek the closed shop; would be required to effectively bargain with the employer; could not collect initiation fees of more than $25, except with Board approval; could expel a union member for nonpayment of dues, for disclosing information of the union, for participation in a violation of a bargaining agreement, or for being a member of the Communist Party or advocating the overthrow of the Government by force; could not force an employer to violate the new law; would be compelled to conduct a secret ballot on questions involving strikes, fees, nomination and election of officers, and so forth.

This section unquestionably places the employee and the employer on an equal basis so far as unfair labor practices are concerned. I believe this is only fair.

10. FOREMEN AND SUPERVISORS

By definition, the new Board would be prohibited from setting up a union to represent supervisory employees.

This section of the bill is an example of the old adage, "One cannot serve two masters." It would be an utterly impossible position in which to place a man—he would be paid by his employer but he expected to go along with the union of which he was a member. I am convinced the committee acted wisely in prohibiting unionization of foremen or supervisors.

11. FREEDOM OF SPEECH

It would be specifically permissible for an employer to express his own views or opinion, either in written or printed form, if that expression "does not by its own terms threaten force or economic reprisal."

With free speech guaranteed to every American citizen under the Constitution, it seems unfortunate that this section should have been necessary in any legislation.

12. ROYALTY PAYMENTS

The bill would forbid an employer to pay royalties, taxes, and other exactions to unions in the guise of welfare funds or otherwise.

This section speaks for itself and was brought about by Mr. Lewis' demand for a 5 cents a ton royalty for a welfare fund for miners. Although that fund now contains several million dollars, not one dime was paid out of it to the widows and children in the recent Centralia coal-mine disaster.

13. BOYCOTTS AND SYMPATHY STRIKES

The calling, authorizing, engaging in or assisting of any sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes, monopolistic strikes, or illegal (secondary) boycotts or sit-down strikes would be forbidden.

I believe that all workmen should have a right to strike but not unless their own local union is directly involved. For instance, why should the teamsters union refuse to deliver merchandise to a factory on strike over matters of no concern to the teamsters union? We had an example of that in Baltimore last year.

14. FEATHERBEDDING

Strikes or other "concerted interference" designed to compel acceptance of "featherbedding" practices would be forbidden. Such practices, elaborately

defined, would forestall the James C. Petrillo radio and music work stoppages, for instance. Surely every reasonable person agrees that it is high time a stop was put to such racketeering practices.

15. UNIONS CAN BE SUED

For participation in any of the many enumerated "unlawful concerted activities," unions could be sued for damages in the Federal courts. Since an individual, corporation or company may be sued, then I see no reason why an exception should be made to a union if it is in violation of the law of contract, or other statutes. This section was brought about by the flagrant violation of the law of contract by union officials.

16. CONCILIATION

The bill would establish an independent Office of Conciliation, and the duties of which would be to encourage labor and management to make and maintain collective bargaining agreements on wages, hours, working conditions. But neither side would be compelled to accept a recommendation of the director of the service or any of his conciliators.

I am convinced this is a step forward in the settlement of strikes or any differences between labor and management and that an independent conciliation office can do a much better job than one operated under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor.

17. ANTITRUST LAWS

The bill would remove the exemption labor organizations now have from the antitrust laws when, acting either alone or in collusion with employers, they engage in unlawful restraints of trade.

Again, I believe that all persons should be equally guilty under the law whether it be an individual, a corporation or a union, since they all claim equal protection under the law.

18. UNION REPORTS

Unions would be required to make annual reports to the Secretary of Labor which would contain receipts and disbursements, the names of their principal officers and their compensation, and a copy of their bylaws and constitution. Individuals, corporations, and companies are forced under the revenues acts to disclose this information, but since union funds are tax free, they have never before furnished this information to any governmental agency. I believe it right and proper that they should. I also think that every member of a union is entitled to know what his dues are used for—how much the union officials are paid and what becomes of the profits on the huge funds they have accumulated, which run into millions of dollars.

I have talked with many of my constituents about this bill; many of them belong to unions, some because they believe in unions, others because they have to belong to a union to hold a job. A large majority of them were in favor of the Hartley bill, and I feel sure that within a few months most of those who work for a living will be thanking Congress for having freed them from the threats of men who made the passage of this corrective legislation necessary in the public interest.

Legal Executions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the abolition of capital punishment in the United States. The editorial which I am inserting in the RECORD today contains one of the most powerful arguments against this barbaric practice which I have ever read. I am hopeful that the Judiciary Committee will arrange for hearings on this resolution in the near future.

The editorial follows:

[From the Union County Times, Lake Butler, Fla., of April 11, 1947]

MEMORY MARCHES ON

(By D. L. Whitehurst)

Years do a lot to a man.

It all depends upon whether the individual's mind figures they take something, or leave something.

Last week when I was down the State I met a bright newspaperman whom I have known for several years.

He had recently witnessed his first execution. When I told him I had recently acquired the Union County Times, he expressed astonishment that he did not see me at the execution.

He seemed to think because Lake Butler was only a few miles from Raiford that I should have dropped in.

I did not tell him so, but I, too, have seen men die by the legal execution route—many times. I did not tell him, either, that I have never been in the habit of dropping in on planned deaths.

There is something about death by premeditation that reaches out and slips the icy fingers slowly across my brow. I will see no more planned executions.

I have seen men doomed to die in the sunshine of tomorrow spend the night before peering out into the vast darkness of midnight—a blackness as void as the eternity into which the hangman's rope would soon jerk them. I have seen them in the calm of the day's dawn await the firing squad with a face that was as white as the hand of death that awaited in the courtyard.

I have seen them march the last steps, some firmly, some wobbly. I have seen them eat heartily of their last meal and I have watched their lips silently move as the priest, or minister, urged God to forget that they had destroyed with their hands what He had once molded from clay. I have seen them spin at the end of the rope and I have watched the drawn face of the paid executioner writhe, for he knew that he had blundered, and down there in the gallows pit a man was dying life's most horrible end—slowly strangling.

Some of those events passed by my curtain of life nearly 40 years ago but today when they come rolling out of the mildews of memory they sizzle and fry and crackle and explode with the vividness of a wet power line.

I did those things in line of duty. It is too bad now that when I think of warm, welcoming, growing Houston, Tex., that I first must march out the two men I saw die there—by planned execution. It is too bad I cannot think of a quiet little town in the soft hills of north Missouri without hearing a murderer of four say, "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want." It is too bad I cannot think of beautiful Salt Lake, cuddled in the valley and guarded by the Wasatch Mountains, without again hearing a voice, speaking for its last earthly time, "Good bye." When I think of wind-swept, sun-burned Nevada my mind won't let me look at the State's blue skies, nor ponder in the great silence of the desert, because out there is nothing for me but a gray little vault where I watched the Nation's first person die legally of lethal gas.

My young newspaper friend does not know it but I gained nothing and lost much by my experiences with execution. I might suggest to him if he ever wants to solve the old mystic problem, "from whence came ye and whither traveleth your soul" he should not see too many executions.

Know Your Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith an article by Jacob Simpson Payton, which appeared under date of March 27 in the Christian Advocate.

It seems to me as we consider the many conflicting ideologies and philosophies inimical to our free democratic government the enemy of strong drink should properly be included in the list.

KNOW YOUR ENEMY

(By Jacob Simpson Payton)

As seen from Capitol Hill, the woods are always full of public enemies. Usually they are real, but occasionally some are imaginary. Congressional voices, like those of bygone town criers arousing sleepers at the midnight hour because of lurking savages, are constantly heard. Present warnings are against inflation, national bankruptcy through Federal extravagance, monopolistic practices of labor and capital, and Communists in Government posts and elsewhere. And, of course, surmounting those and all other threats is the anxiety shared by everyone over the slow progress toward atomic control.

Congress is almost entirely silent about another enemy within our gates. Reference is to the liquor traffic. At this writing, 9 weeks after our Federal lawmakers took the oath to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, only a few of the 531 Members of the Eightieth Congress have voiced any protest against the bold, steady and deadly advance of the liquor front against American homes, schools, and churches.

While Democrats and Republicans may not confess it, they know that during the 13 years since December 5, 1933, the situation has gone from bad to worse. Evidence of this was presented recently before a congressional committee. Guy W. Pearson, District tax collector, cited figures to show that while Washingtonians set an all-time record during 1946 by consuming 5,521,000 gallons of whisky, champagne, and wine of 14-percent voltage, the indications are that this current year the amount will be exceeded by a half-million gallons. And beer is not included among the intoxicants by which thousands of residents of the Nation's Capital are being drugged, brutalized, and destroyed.

When a people wishes to retrieve its lost ground, a prime requisite is to know the enemy. On January 16, 1920, the liquor traffic was declared a public enemy and was banished from the land. During the 13 years of its sentence, it was not idle. It packed Congress with wet Senators and Representatives, intrigued with bootleggers and gangsters in order to discredit the eighteenth amendment. It bribed law-enforcement officers and went to the social register for names of sponsors who unwittingly yielded to the inducement to be kind to tigers. For 13 years the former outlaw has been at large making increasing depredations upon America's dearest treasures.

Today he is more strongly entrenched than ever before. Congress allows this enemy to continue this public pilfering of morals and health for a price, which is revenue. Such servility is as reprehensible as was ever the payment of tribute for immunity to the Barbary pirates. Moreover, the foe is being aided and abetted by a growing number of parents who really have no respect for the monster, but prefer to become the slaves of fashion at the cocktail hour rather than avoid the example that may lead to the enslavement of their children by strong drink.

Americans had better know their enemy. The distiller and the brewer are literally making life unsafe for millions. That is not a scare line which once called down upon fanatical drys the ridicule of the wet gentry. It is an established fact verified by case-hardened investigators, by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by medical societies, and by scientists. Of course, we must bear with some of those who overwork the scientific approach. Yet from them we learn that in America there are 3,000,000 excessive drinkers, that 750,000 of them are confirmed alcoholics and that the rum-soaked aggregation was responsible for 7,000 deaths in automobile accidents last year.

The makers, venders, and dispensers of intoxicants may be identified not only as America's chief contributors to crime, but as the Nation's biggest swindlers. They rule supreme in the buncombe belt. Where else will one discover another advertiser who is able to put such lying adjectives into print or on the air, or such false portrayals about his wares into pictures? Never once do the distillers or the brewers mention what their product has done for the derelict on the park bench, the criminal in his cell, the wife in the divorce court and the children in the orphanage.

Because of revenue paid to the Government, the liquor barons have come to regard themselves as among Uncle Sam's chief benefactors. Their blood money never exceeded $2,500,000,000 per year. It should be remembered that the distillers and brewers never offer any service to their customers. Instead they turn over to the taxpayer to support all human wrecks of their own creation. The truth is that if Uncle Sam were obliged to send money to ransom present day Americans whom strong drink has led captive, the amount would be double that paid into the Federal Treasury by the victimizers.

The grave apprehensions held by many prior to repeal that the liquor traffic could not be trusted have proved correct. How gullible Americans were in that day can only be realized by reading the request for repeal by the President, the debates in Congress and the public press and then by comparing them with present conditions. The tragedy was that when prohibition had broken down under plotters and bribetakers, there should have followed a system which has proved worse. The saloon has come back with evils even better camouflaged than before.

During the first month of this year, 1,695 liquor licenses were granted in the District of Columbia. Such a number would have staggered belief a few years ago. And all this in the Nation's capital, where we were promised saloons should be no more if only we would allow the closed distilleries and breweries to resume work.

Americans who hope for relief from the contaminating influence of intoxicants certainly should not lose sight of the man who makes them. He is a destroyer. Know your enemy.

St. Ann's Church, Morrisania, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. POTTS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, St. Ann's Church, of Morrisania, in the county of Bronx, State of New York, is a historic site. It should be declared a national historic site.

HISTORY OF ST. ANN'S

Though the Church of St. Ann's of Morrisania is but 100 years old, the history of the land on which it stands, and of the family whom it commemorates, who owned the land by royal letters patent from King William III, dates back 250 years.

Originally, the Morrises came from Wales in 1633, the elder branch of the family, the lineal decendants of the first Morris, consisted of three brothers, Lewis, William, Richard, sons of Col. Lewis Morris.

Richard Morris, the youngest of the three brothers, was the first proprietor of Morrisania in the year 1670. Both he and his wife died there in 1672, leaving one child, born October 15, 1671, the first lord of the manor of Morrisania. History tells us that Morrisania was first part of the County of Westchester, but by an act of the legislature in 1783 was added to New York County.

The name Morrisania is derived from the Morris family, the first part meaning lords and patentees under the Crown; the term "ania" being in general use in the latter part of the seventeenth century. At the time of the Dutch discovery it was styled Ranachque, a name given to it by the Indians, who seem to have resided principally on the shores of the East and Harlem Rivers.

The royal charter of King William III, erecting Morrisania into a township and manor, was given to Lewis Morris, the 8th of May, 1697. The charter distinctly states that the quantity of land was 1,420 acres. However, he had already possessed 800 acres through barter with the Indians which made between two and three thousand acres. Thus it is noted that he was owner of a large part of what is now Bronx County.

LEWIS MORRIS

In St. Ann's Church there is a memorial window on which is inscribed the following:

Gen. Lewis Morris, eldest son of Hon. Lewis Morris and Catherine Staats, born at Morrisania, April 8, 1726, where he died January 22, 1798. He served in the Army of the Revolution as also did his three sons, Lewis, Jacob, and William, and he was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. His wife was Mary Beekman Walton, who died March 11, 1794.

Josiah C. Pumpelly, historian Empire State Society, Sons of the American Revolution, in an article published in Americana, August 1914, has this to say:

He declared that the act requiring him to give additional supplies for the King's troops was tyrannical and unconstitutional and this act caused him to be chosen, after the battle of Lexington a delegate to the provincial convention, held at the City of New York, April 22, 1775.

He was a Representative in Congress from New York and in the legislature of his State as a member of the assembly and displayed undaunted spirit and untiring zeal, and while ably assisting in organizing and equipping the militia in which organization he rose to the rank of major general.

GOUVERNEUR MORRIS

Maj. William Pierce, a Delegate from Georgia to the Constitutional Convention held at Philadelphia, May 17, 1787, had this to say of Gouverneur Morris:

Mr. Gouverneur Morris is one of those geniuses in whom ever species of talent combines to render him conspicuous and flourishing in public debate. He winds through all the mazes of rhetoric, and throws around him such a glare that he charms, captivates, and leads away the senses of all who hear him. With an infinite stretch of fancy he brings to view things when he is engaged in deep argumentation, that render all the labor of reasoning easy and pleasing. In connection with the establishment of a State constitution he advocated the abolishment of slavery. So that in future ages every human being who breathes the air of this State, shall enjoy the privileges of a free man.

PILGRIMAGES

People from all parts of the United States visit St. Ann's. Schools, historical associations, and patriotic groups make pilgrimages to this blessed American shrine. Groups, from time to time, numbering from 600 to over 1,000 people have visited the tombs of the "Signer" of the Declaration of Independence and the "Penman" of the Constitution of the United States.

The following important pilgrimages to St. Ann's of Morrisania have been made: Daughters of the American Revolution, Colonial Dames, Grand Army of the Republic, Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Sesquicentennial Delegation from the State of Pennsylvania who placed a marker at the tomb of Gouverneur Morris. In addition to these, the American Legion of Bronx County, in conjunction with Gouverneur Morris Post No. 1209, have been memorializing Constitution Day in a public ceremony within the walls of St. Ann's.

In the year 1925 the Historical Society of the State of New Jersey placed a bronze tablet in the church in honor of the first governor of the State of New Jersey. On this occasion Governor Moore was present, accompanied by the chief justice and justices from the courts of the State of New Jersey.

ST. ANN'S HONORED DEAD

Capt. Richard Morris (1672): An officer in Cromwell's army. First proprietor of Morrisania.

Col. Lewis Morris (1691): An officer of Cromwell's army. Part owner of Morrisania. Member of Governor Dongan's council.

Judge Lewis Morris (1746): First Lord of the Manor of Morrisania. First native-born Chief Justice of New York. First Governor of New Jersey.

Hon. Lewis Morris (1762): Member of the Colonial Assembly. Judge of the High Court of the Admiralty. One of the judges of Oyer and Terminer.

Gen. Lewis Morris (1798): Member of the Continental Congress. Only signer of the Declaration of Independence from New York City. Served in the American Revolution with three sons as commander of the Westchester Militia, Continental Army.

Judge Richard Morris (1810): Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, State of New York. Member of both houses of the legislature. Champion of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Hon. Gouverneur Morris (1816): Member of the Provincial and Continental Congress. "Penman" of the Constitution of the United States of America. Author of the clause in the New York State Constitution providing religious freedom. Washington's Minister to France during the French Revolution. Projector of the Erie Canal.

Lt. Col. Lewis Morris (1824): Aide-de-camp to Gen. Nathaniel Greene.

Capt. William Walton Morris (1832): Aide-de-camp to Gen. Arthur Wayne. Thanked by Congress for gallantry on the battlefield.

Judge Robert Hunter Morris: Member of both branches of the New York Legislature. Justice of the Supreme Court. Mayor of New York for three terms. Delegate to the Constitutional Convention of 1846. Governor of Pennsylvania.

Maj. Gen. William Walton Morris (1865): Veteran of Florida, Mexican, and Civil Wars. Promoted for gallant and meritorious service at Palo Alto, Resaca de la Palma and in the Civil War.

Maj. Gouverneur Morris (1868): Veteran of the war with Mexico.

Gouverneur Morris, Esq. (1888): Pioneer in railroad building. Founder of St. Ann's Church. First supervisor of the town of Morrisania.

Commander Francis Morris (1883): Veteran of the Civil War. Engaged in both attacks on Fort Fisher. Executive officer of the U. S. S. *Tennessee*.

Col. Lewis G. Morris (1900): Member of the War Committee, Westchester County, 1861–65. Instrumental in organizing the Sixth New York Heavy Artillery. President of the New York State Agricultural Society. Member of the First Vestry of St. Ann's Church.

Annie L. Morris (Fordham) (1848–1933): Distinguished wife of Fordham Morris. Interred in the Fordham Morris vault. Benefactor of St. Ann's Church.

Capt. Lewis Morris, Marine Corps, United States Navy (1867–1940): A distinguished physician who served in the American Navy. A benefactor of St. Ann's Church whose memorial chimes will ring a message of inspiration to the people living about old St. Ann's.

Mrs. Lewis Gouverneur Morris (1935): Distinguished for her interest in public-welfare projects and particularly in the care of little children.

Hon. Fordham Morris (1842–1909): Enlisted September 10, 1862, as second lieutenant and served with great distinction during the Civil War. He took part in all major battles and was discharged June 28, 1865, as first lieutenant by reason of regiment mustered out of service. Elected to Lafayette Post No. 140 on October 8, 1884.

Danger in Reduction of Davis Dam Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, several times during the debate on the Interior appropriation bill today I have expressed deep concern over the unwise cut in the suggested appropriation for continuing work on Davis Dam on the Colorado River. The budget estimate was $18,000,000 for this item and the committee puts in $6,200,000 in the bill before us. To me there is no justification for such a cut, at least none has yet been given me. The chairman tries to lay the blame on the President's freeze-order policy, but the Presidential freeze-order policy did not apply to construction on Davis Dam. I know from visits there several months ago that work on it was carried right along according to schedule.

Why is this so important? It is because we are under treaty obligation with Mexico to build that Davis Dam by 1950, or within 5 years after the ratification of the Mexican Water Treaty. What if we do not keep that obligation and build the dam? In that case our Government will have abrogated the treaty and it will no longer be binding. No doubt there are some in this country, and undoubtedly some in Mexico, who would be glad to abrogate and destroy the recently adopted water treaty with Mexico. What would result? One result would be that water conditions between the two countries would be the same as if no such treaty had ever been entered into between them. And what would be the harm or danger in that situation?

This water treaty with Mexico which was entered into 2 years ago was intended to settle international water problems on both the Colorado River and the Rio Grande River. These two important international streams have numerous and serious problems which have disturbed relations between the two countries for many years. These problems were not easy of solution and perhaps no one is fully satisfied with the solutions in this treaty. However, it takes two to make an agreement. To abrogate this agreement is to open up all those problems again. Mexico has asked for twice, yes, three times as much water out of the Colorado River as this treaty gives her. If this country breaks the agreement she will renew her former demands. In the light of all the historic circumstances, in that case, Mexico would very probably get more water than she formerly demanded.

I want our Nation's interest in Colorado River water safeguarded as it is now by this treaty. Also I want our interest in the Rio Grande safeguarded as it is by this treaty. I believe this treaty arrangement concerning water is as good as we could have obtained some years ago and better than we would ever be able to obtain by negotiation again. We tamper with this Mexican water treaty at our great risk. Our national loss without this treaty could be enormous. If we abrogate that treaty by failure to comply with the treaty and to build Davis Dam by 1950 America stands to lose heavily. Saying nothing about our keeping our treaty obligations, there is no economy in playing with this reduction from $18,000,000 to an utterly insufficient $6,200,000.

How To Cut Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of an able address delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon, of Topeka, Kans., at a meeting held in Kansas City, Mo., on April 22 under the auspices of the Republican National Committee. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer, which indicates that the manuscript of Governor Landon's address will make two and one-half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or one-half page more than the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $177.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today we are living under a Congress that does not owe its election to the slush funds of the Federal Treasury, city gangster machines, or the leftist PAC.

That Republican Congress has gotten away to a splendid start, both in transacting the business of the National Legislature and in returning to the principles on which the perpetuity of the Republic is dependent. The character of government is equally as important as is its direction.

The present Congress is giving a tone to government—almost new—in contrast to following the dangerous New Deal methods of irregular short cuts to legislation.

For the first time since 1933 public affairs are being conducted by the Republican Congress as they must be, if those affairs are to be handled in accord with the liberal principles of genuine representative government.

I mean with its committees giving all sides full and fair hearings—with department heads compelled to reveal their policies to the American people through those committee hearings—and thorough discussion and consideration on the floor of the Congress.

Our country lost its moorings and for years was adrift in a storm of spectacular, irregular short cuts and undemocratic procedure in the transaction of public business. It is but natural for people to become thoughtlessly impatient with the slow visible progress in the return to normal and essential methods of representative popular government. All they see is the surface stuff.

People miss all the labor and time required to investigate and correct the labyrinth of

New Deal regulations forced on the country contrary to the intent of past Congresses.

Understandably, people are anxious to see the Republican promises of the preelection period translated into laws. We want taxes reduced, the national debt cut, a balanced budget, definite reductions of Federal expense agencies and employees, labor laws that will provide for genuine collective bargaining. But most citizens do not realize the arduous and tedious preliminary work which must be done by Congress before needed reforms can be enacted. They do not realize how much New Deal underbrush must be cleared away or how much bureaucratic rubble must be removed before actual work can begin on the construction of sound laws to replace the jerry-built flimsies of the New Dealers. An infinite amount of study, research and surveying has already been accomplished by this Republican Congress. I have no doubt the public impatience will fade rapidly as the fruits of its diligent efforts ripen into honest, fair and workable laws. I am confident that the American public will be quick to salute this Republican Congress as its membership translates the promises of last November into the performance of this summer.

The New Deal bureaucrats are doing their best to "smear" and handicap this Congress by refusing any cooperation on their part. The campaign now going on against the Congress is more than a partisan fight. It involves two distinct philosophies of government. The Republicans are reaffirming their belief in the soundness of government by law. The New Deal bureaucrats still seek a government by men—specifically, their men.

The Republican Congress is showing its ability to curb successfully the totalitarian liberals who had taken us so far down the road to national socialism.

A few years more of unrestrained totalitarian planning from the top down—from Washington bureaucrats infiltrated with communism—and the Soviet would have been warranted in saying to the rest of the world—Look, the United States of America is sick unto death with the weakness inherent in all republics. They cannot save themselves. How can they save you?

The liberal institutions of America and the world owe a great deal to the Republican Congress, as it goes steadily and patiently about the hard work of rebuilding stone by stone the edifice of our Republic.

The mere election of a Republican Congress was cheering and stimulating to liberals the world over.

Today, if a Democratic President would really join a Republican Congress in effecting an about face, on the path leading to the abyss of national socialism that has engulfed so many democracies of the past and present—he would give the world new evidence of the incomparable force and vitality of our great and glorious Republic.

Of course, Mr. Truman has not openly and frankly confessed the mistakes of the omniscient New Deal, nor has he admitted that he is in opposition to the control of this Nation by the leftist bureaucrats.

And it may be that in the end the totalitarian liberals will prevail in the struggle now being waged for control of the administration authority.

Today, President Truman's real political beliefs remain enigmas to the New Dealers—the Democrats—and the Republicans alike. A confused American people cannot at the moment determine whether Mr. Truman will come down the home stretch in 1948 riding a left-wing horse but wearing the right-wing colors.

Our people hunger for courage, clear-thinking, plain talk, and a consistent course of action in the country's leadership. As evidence, we note that President Truman's national popularity rose to a peak shortly after he took office and apparently turned his back to the New Deal. In the months that followed, his popularity rating dwindled steadily, as his behavior contradicted his apparent early stand. After the November elections, when the Republicans gained control of Congress, he expressed his desire for national cooperation and bipartisan unity. Again, he seemed to be returning to his original Presidential position. Up went his popularity rating among the people of his country. They were encouraged when he took his strong stand against communism, within and without our land, and formulated a clear cut and firm foreign policy. The Republican Congress is supporting that foreign policy in the interests of national unity and bipartisan cooperation for the Nation's welfare.

The President will have to take his stand shortly on domestic policy, when he will be confronted with congressional enactments providing for sizable tax reduction and substantial payment on the public debt—and other bills which express anti-New Deal basic principles of government. Cutting Government expense, of course, breaks the heart of the "call me liberal" totalitarian New Dealers. The New Deal, struggling for its existence among real Democrats, is not for any cutting down of government. Its philosophy is for more government, not less—for more Government spending and more taxation.

It is obvious that we cannot undertake the heavy burdens the President's new foreign policies call for without drastic retrenchment here at home. We may have to give up, even if temporarily, services Government should render. It is past time to take stock. Government, the same as any individual, should estimate the cost of any project.

If the President's new foreign policy is to succeed, America must be a sound financial mooring post for the rest of the non-Communist world to tie to.

Will President Truman go along with the Republican Congress on the domestic policies espoused by that body of patriotic, sincere Americans? Will he cooperate with the chosen representatives of the people on the home front, as they are supporting him in foreign policy? Will he hew his way out of the governmental wilderness created in the past 14 years by power greedy, selfish bureaucrats? Their lust for dominance, contempt for individual rights, and disregard of the constitutional processes of government first prostituted the principles of the Democratic Party, and then came close to wrecking the greatest of the world's nations. Will he be courageous and forthright enough to join with the Republican Congress in the interest of national unity and bipartisan cooperation on the home fronts, or will he continue to yield to the power and pressure of the New Deal totalitarian leaders? Their influence now seems sufficient to keep him wavering on domestic affairs. On the answer to that question rests the answer to this country's progress or decline in strength, well being, and advancement in the critical months ahead. A Republican Congress, by building a strong America, is laying the foundation for the success of President Truman's new foreign policy.

We Republicans claim to be the hope of free enterprise and of a financially solvent Republic.

If the Republican Party wants to preserve our country from depression and totalitarianism, and to prove it is not just an agency for the ultra-rich, it now has its chance.

High prices of today are more dangerous to free private enterprise than the Communist Party of the United States has ever been.

About a year ago, we spent a lot of time telling the people that the OPA of wartime was not suited to a free peacetime economy, and it is not. However, instead of disbanding the price control agency on a gradual basis as Congress intended, it was turned loose suddenly by a Presidential veto. A riot of increased prices was the natural and inevitable result.

However, enough time has now elapsed to enable private industry to get back to sanity. But the adjustments in prices are not being made as almost every industrialist and producer will admit privately they should be. The snowball rolling down the mountain has built up into such an avalanche that everyone is afraid individually to try to turn it aside.

Higher wages demand higher prices—higher prices give labor the basis on which to demand still higher wages. And the price structure continues to build up and up until people are wondering if the only cure is to let the avalanche crash into the next mountainside.

That, I believe, is where a Republican Congress can come in with some very timely help in this emergency. Industry needs some encouragement in order that it may apply the wisdom which it possesses and has gathered in the past year.

Up to now all that President Truman has done about prices is mostly conversation. It seems to me the issue is that President Truman believes that he is dealing with a problem that the Government is powerless to solve except through the pressure of public opinion, and the indirect weapons available to the President.

In attempting that he gives the nod to a new wage increase drive by labor. Thus he clears the way for another round of postwar inflation.

I am attempting to offer a definite plan of action. Frequently in the past months I have urged the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department to investigate these prices. Now I propose that the Congress can do something concretely helpful about it.

First, I think it is time for business leadership as a whole to get over the idea that we have to have a boom and bust business trend in this country. I know, of course, that we are never going to be able to have a business trend run absolutely smoothly. There are always going to be periods of readjustment. With wise management, however, these readjustments should take place in more or less one industry at a time, not in the entire economy all at once. But, in my judgment, we are going to have great difficulty getting this kind of a good working economic system if a major portion of business management continues to think in terms of large profits now because no telling what is going to be the situation a little bit hence, and in consequence they must start protecting themselves. The steel industry is a good example. This industry has always been known as a prince and pauper industry. During the period of good times it has made very large profits, and then in bad times it has suffered substantial losses. But I cannot see any reason why this has to be the case. To argue that there can't be anything other than a prince and pauper situation in the steel industry seems to me much like arguing that there can be no stabilization of employment in a particular industry. For a long time that was a fairly widespread view in business. In recent years, however, it has been found that by study and cooperation a perfectly enormous amount could be done in the way of employment stabilization. Sometimes this can be done within a company all by itself through a better arrangement of its production schedule. In other cases it was necessary for different industries to mesh their activities together, with the result that when one was up high on the employment level the other was low, and vice versa. I think it is time for business management as

a whole to start planning on good times more or less indefinitely into the future. Sure that means taking some risk, but so does everything else in business.

At the moment if we could get business management to start planning on the basis of continued good times far into the future, it could do wonders in the way of adding a substantial stability. It would mean that a business could establish prices today which would yield it a profit margin which over the long pull is adequate to attract capital to the industry. It would mean, from the point of view of the public, that business management itself was now saying that it has unlimited confidence in our system of individual enterprise and in our ability to make it work successfully and continuously in the public interest. It would mean that business management would be showing a united front to the public which said, in effect, we are willing to take the same gamble on the future that everyone else has to take. In a word, it would mean, that business is saying to the American public that we are setting prices which give us a fair return on the assumption that business is going to continue to be good—not setting prices which yield such a rate of return that we can ride through the next great storm that may hit us. Let's get rid of the storm psychosis. Let's reveal not only to ourselves, but to the whole world, that we have a system in which we have genuine confidence. There is no reason that we should not keep our economic system on a reasonable, even keel.

Now such an attitude on the part of business management as a whole would not mean that every business organization limited profits to some percent which you or I might think is fair. Granting we are going to use individual enterprise, there always will be some companies, and some individuals, who make more than seems reasonable to the rest of us. That is true in the bottom of a depression. It is, in a very real sense, a price which we pay for the right of freedom—the right for a man to go into business and try to make a larger return on his capital than if he bought Government bonds or some other perfectly safe investment. The public interest would not be served by attempts to eliminate these high profit spots in our economic organization. On the contrary, such elimination would mean the destruction of the individual incentive and opportunity that are the life blood of our economic organization. What we need is to make sure that we keep competition alive so that these excessive profit positions have to be temporary, because some other producer will come along and knock the profits down to a more reasonable level. Granting that we keep the antitrust laws in good shape and well enforced, and granting further that business will take a broad, optimistic position on the fundamental strength of our economic system, we never will have enough of these excessive positions to cause the Nation undue worry.

A second point that I would like to drive at management is that it should get rid of its "follow the leader" psychosis. Today this is probably most evident in connection with wages. I am sure that you are familiar with this. Recently one of the companies in the textile industry gave an increase and within almost a matter of days, a comparable increase went through the entire industry. In the steel industry everyone today, as you well know, is pretty much sitting around waiting to see what United States Steel does. If United States Steel gives, say a 10 percent increase, we will see the same kind of an increase given throughout the steel industry. And this increase will be given regardless of the profit position of the individual company.

This "follow the leader" idea seems to me to be basically unsound. If it continues to grow, it will tend to give us the same kind of an impossible situation that has been one of the curses of England for the past generation. Over there with industry-wide bargaining it became a simple matter for employers and employees to agree not to make a technological improvement. It became a simple matter because one company knew that it didn't need to make the additional investment to get the technological improvement because none of his competitors could make the improvement either. The upshot of all of this has been that productive efficiency in England is distressingly low, as compared to what we have in this country. In my judgment it will be fatal to the progress of this country if we fall into that error. I think every business management should say in effect, I just don't care what my competitor is going to do; I'm going to do the thing which will give me the greatest productive efficiency. I'm going to pay the wages which seem to me to be fair and best. I'm going to price my products at the lowest level I can in order to yield me what I think is fair. In other words, I am going to be a real competitor, not just a member of the herd. Such a policy does not mean that we have competition between management to force wages down. It can just as well mean the exact reverse, as witness the fact that it was Henry Ford in a highly competitive industry who lifted his wages far above those in other companies. He did it—not by following a leader—but by deciding what was best from the point of view of his individual company, and if the others didn't like it that was just too bad.

In my opinion, industry-wide pricing, industry-wide almost anything, is bad. It goes contrary to the basic principles that the different companies within an industry should operate independently. Let's get rid of this war-born, industry-wide approach to our problems and settle down into a good independent, competitive basis. Furthermore, if industry is going to stick to industry-wide pricing it cannot kick on industry-wide bargaining by labor.

On the side of labor what needs to be done is pretty obvious. We are never going to get a declining price level against a rapidly rising wage rate. I believe that we have the right to ask labor to take the same kind of a gamble on the future that we ask business management to take. The real wages of American labor—wages in terms of what they will buy—are far above what they were in the prewar level. Of course, they are not as high as we would like to see them, and they are not as high as we ultimately will get them through technological progress. But when you increase wages without having a corresponding increase in productive efficiency, the inevitable result is an increase in prices. This was shown so clearly last year that the labor leaders must know that it is true. Another round of wage increases will not help labor—it will merely increase prices again and hurt labor and everyone else. If, instead of demanding another substantial round of increases, labor will hold fast and let us get our economy back onto a sound, productive, competitive basis, not only labor but everyone else will benefit. Approximately eighty cents out of every final consumer's dollar represents wages back through the productive process.

On the side of Government, it seems to me that there are three broad constructive steps that could be taken. First, it needs to support legislation which will get rid of the present monopoly aspect of the labor situation. Unless this is done—it will be impossible to get rid of the "follow the leader" attitude on the part of business, which I just mentioned above. Such corrective legislation will not be—must not be—antilabor. It should be no more antilabor than the Sherman Antitrust Act was antibusiness. The latter was antibucaneer, and it has not been enforced as it should be. What we need in labor legislation is anti-labor-buccaneering correction, and with industry antimonopoly correction.

Second, the Government needs to overhaul its monetary policy, or more accurately, see to it that the Federal Reserve System stops following policies which are inflationary in the highest degree. In 1946 we had an increase in the money supply and bank credit which, measured by peacetime standards, was perfectly fantastic. Yet the Federal Reserve never so much as lifted its fingers to hold this expansion in check. The argument in support of this policy is that unless money rates are continued at an artificially low level through Federal Reserve policy, the interest charge on the public debt will increase. If there ever was a case of being penny-wise and pound-foolish this certainly is it. In order to save a little bit on the carrying charges of our public debt, we are endangering the price structure of the whole Nation and thereby undermining the value—the real value—of the entire savings of our people.

Third, it seems to me that it is about time that the Government get itself straightened out on what it is doing to prices. It comes with ill grace for an administration to complain about the rising cost of food when the administration itself is piling up millions of bushels of potatoes to let them rot, and otherwise supporting this and that commodity which are part of the standard diet of the American people. It also comes with ill grace for an administration to blast others about the price trend when through the way it is handling its purchases of grain, and other materials for relief, it is encouraging speculation and driving prices to substantially higher levels than an orderly buying program would necessitate. Granted, the administration doesn't know how much it is going to have to buy for relief purposes. But when it does engage upon a program, it must have some idea of its magnitude. It would permit the markets to know what this is, the markets could adjust themselves in an orderly manner. Instead, the wheat speculators have just had a high time. I am not suggesting that we eliminate or curtail our relief program. But I think that in the interest of honesty, the administration has a responsibility for letting the American public know what the effects of its program is on prices—let the public know that we cannot ship one-third of our wheat supply out of the country without its having an effect upon our cost of living—that we cannot put through and continue one price support program after another and still expect prices to go down.

Fourth, Congress can tackle the cost-of-living situation by bringing leaders of industry and leaders of labor into hearings that will check this "follow the leader" folly. Congressional authority over tariff rates and excess profits—which it should not hesitate to use by drastically lowering the first and taxing the second, if necessary—is a powerful weapon to encourage industrial and labor leaders alike to work together toward a sensible price structure that will halt this spiral of dangerous inflation.

Of course, the thing that will bring prices down best is increased production. But that is being held back by uncertainty as to the entire range of Government policies. Both the President and the Congress have the obligation to clear up that situation forthwith.

If the Congress and the President show producers that they have had enough of New Deal crack-pot schemes of managed currency

and permanent deficit finances, that because we live in a streamlined machine era the old-time tested economic laws are not changed, the outlook for economic stability and lower prices will be materially improved.

If our Government—and that means both the President and the Congress—will do all it can do in establishing beyond any question of doubt a permanent, sound, fiscal policy, balance the budget, make a substantial payment on the national debt, lower taxes, tighten up on credit, make sensible tariff adjustments, maintain a fixed and sound monetary policy, control the personal power of arrogant bureaucrats over labor and industry alike—all that acting together would have a corrective influence on the cost of living.

If there ever was a time when we need statesmanship on the part of labor leaders and industrial leaders alike, this is that time. Unless we get some of this economic statesmanship and some political statesmanship another planned economy—another OPA—is inevitable.

Because permanent economic planning by government is incompatible with freedom does not mean that the elected representatives of the people cannot function successfully in an economic crisis.

Russia is waiting hopefully for another "bust" when she confidently expects us to succumb to totalitarian economic planning and control of everything—including labor.

Without abandoning the principles of our American Republic for any Marxism called "New Dealism," "Kienism," or "Stalinism," we can look to the Republican Congress to meet the present greed of inflated prices.

All of us in a high-standard-of-living economy are interdependent upon one another. Each of us provides a market for the goods and the labor of others. That is why nothing less than some statesmanship, or at least a sense of responsibility, by each group in its dealings with all others will give us full production, an ample market, prosperity, and a reasonable security. It is needless to say that if the various groups do not exercise such a sense of responsibility the relentless force of events or the Government will. And neither of these is apt to be as enlightened or as fair as we would like.

Alfred D. Stedman Answers Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entiled "Alfred D. Stedman Answers Wallace," from the St. Paul Pioneer Press, of April 20, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALFRED D. STEDMAN ANSWERS WALLACE

Two silent figures loom in the background of the competition between America and Russia for leadership of the world. They are the United States farmer and consumer. Their influence has extended to and beyond the Moscow Conference. In many parts of the world they are helping to tip the balance in America's favor.

Together, these figures are enabling America to fight the hunger that grips many peoples. The United States farmer has produced food and the United States consumer is sharing it with those peoples on an unequalled scale. While Russia finds herself able to help little, American food is relieving starvation at her very doors.

America's prestige, therefore, is rising while Russia's is falling. Thus the American farmer and consumer are shaping history.

The big question is whether they are shaping it for better or for worse. Is it right for America to bid for world leadership against Russia with food, as with other supplies and prestige and power?

That question is being raised by Henry Wallace and others. It is not the size of the relief that is challenged by those of the Wallace school. They would send abroad more instead of less relief. What they denounce is the use of relief to strengthen this country's hand in dealing with Russia. They urge that relief distribution be based strictly on need alone. They want an international agency to do the job. And they condemn the United States Government for allowing the demise of UNRRA, which had that function.

So a clear issue is drawn as to the right or wrong of this country's present relief policy as it affects the United States-Russian relations. That issue deserves to be faced frankly by the American people now.

The true answer does not grow out of any emotions for or against Russia. It grows instead out of actual experience in handling food relief.

That handling at first was fitted, to the widespread satisfaction of Americans, into the pattern of one world. Food from this and other countries was distributed, not directly by them, but for them through the United Nations organization, UNRRA.

Relief was to have been just one of several implements of the plan for a united world. A second implement was assurance to peoples of their democratic right to establish governments of their own choosing. A third was the Potsdam pledge of economic unity for Germany, so that food could move from the big producing region in the Russian zone to other zones. A fourth was to have been real cooperation to make the United Nations work. The UN was to have a police force to give it potency. Finally, there was to have been an end of intrigues, either within Russia to upset her, or by Communists fomenting disorders outside to extend her sway.

Such was the plan for one world. What changed it? Here's the story based on official records and reports of facts by the most authentic news organs in the world:

Relief has been used repeatedly to implement not one world but a split-up through an aggressive spread of communism. Russia's satellite, Yugoslavia, took huge supplies of America's food, while the Communist press denounced this country and Yugoslav gunners shot down American fliers. Friendly Americans, distributing United States food for UNRRA in the Ukraine, were spied upon day and night.

Russia sent wheat afar to France for a flaming welcome by the Communist press that paid small heed to American shipments. Near home Russian demands intensified starvation, notably in Rumania and Austria.

Instead of the pledged economic unity of Germany, the continued division bars food and coal shipments from Russian-occupied Germany to the United States-British zone. The resulting misery in that zone is used by Communists to stir up trouble there and to hamstring vital functions such as coal mining and transportation. The United States and Britain thus are forced to keep pouring in money and supplies, some of which in effect are diverted to Russia as reparations.

And Russia has blocked progress of the United Nations by multiple vetoes. She has turned against the plan for a UN police force. She has frustrated negotiations in Korea. She has helped thwart democratic elections in Rumania and Poland. Her satellite forces tried by revolution to seize control of Greece. She obstructed the plan for effective policing against sudden warfare by atom bombs. She seized and held for blue printing B–29 planes of America, her ally. She spied upon atom work in Canada. And now her demands are for outside bases and resources that could be strategic springboards for a war of conquest.

Such are high lights in the story of the set-backs suffered in the struggle for one world. Mr. Wallace now lays the blame for disunity upon the United States Government. His proposal in his own words is for "a world crusade in the name of the brotherhood of man."

But to work in practice a rule of unity must abide by its own first principle. It must apply to all. And after due allowance for United States fallibility, the record shows that repeatedly American cooperation has been set at naught by Russian noncooperation. Mr. Wallace should be directing his plea for unity to the government chiefly responsible for the disunity, which is Russia.

Then is hope of unity gone? Or is there still chance for genuine adoption of the pattern of one world?

There's no complete assurance, no absolute guaranty that some sudden aggression won't upset the peace of the planet.

But certainly there is a chance of unity that is real enough and good enough to strive for. That chance exists because this country and most others still adhere without wavering to the aim of achieving one world through the United Nations. The western nations will never attack Russia nor molest her at all within her own borders. They can give her full assurance of security at home.

Also the chance exists because this country is now and for the past year has been standing firmly against the Russian course of disunity.

This stand is taken because the Russian course, if not resisted, surely would wreck the United Nations. The stand is taken because the successive concessions to Russia were in effect rewarding her for disunity. It is taken because this country's experience with Germany showed how surely appeasement of a totalitarian power leads to repeated aggressions and finally to disaster.

What has happened since this country's switch from appeasement to firmness? This firmness puts a stop to America's subsidizing of disunity. The United States serves notice that while this split continues it will supervise its own relief. It will see that United States relief supplies are not used to bolster communistic regimes, are not accredited falsely to Russia, are not reshipped to her as reparations, and are not looted, or diverted to black markets or sold to finance secret police.

And Russia, while cooperating only in spurts, is less aggressive, less menacing than she was before firmness replaced appeasement. Russian troop concentrations today are less formidable than they were in Europe. The threats of arms by communism to Greece and Iran and Turkey have noticeably waned.

Russia at length may become convinced that disunity does not pay and that cooperation does pay. Then she may reach a decision to throw in her lot with the United Nations, not just for diplomatic maneuvering, but positively and continuously and definitely.

For America to strive firmly to bring Russia to such decision is not easy. But still it offers the only path now visible to one world.

A Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published in the Army Times:

A LETTER TO CONGRESS

The files of Army Times are laden with quotations from many of you—particularly those of you who are veterans—promising before election to wage a relentless fight in Congress to make certain that the veterans of World War II were treated fairly and justly.

Since that time you have been most successful in lining the pocketbooks of thousands of America's manufacturers and industrialists, business and professional men, and wholesalers and retailers with fat profits derived from your haste in ending price controls.

What are you going to do for the veterans?

You have poured out money lavishly—but not necessarily foolishly—for foreign relief and foreign loans, and soon you are going to pour out hundreds of millions more—eventually, billions perhaps.

What are you going to do for the veterans?

You have favored the economy-minded rich; you appeal to the tax-minded corporations, and even now you are flirting with the rent-minded landlords.

What are you going to do for the veterans?

What about terminal-leave bonds in cash? Wasn't that a campaign promise? What about lifting the ceilings placed so unjustly on the earnings and subsistence of on-the-job trainees? Wasn't that one of the first things you promised to do after you got to Washington?

What about higher—at least adequate—subsistence allowances for veteran-students? Didn't you promise them an education in return for the lost years they gave to the job of making it possible for you to be where you are today?

Sure, the war is over. Most of the boys are home. The glory is gone. And you've got to cut back on Government expenditures. But must you always begin and end economy drives with the veterans?

It was you, Congress, who raised prices. It was you, Congress, who bowed to the building industry and refused to give this country a decent and well-planned housing program that would put veterans into homes instead of hovels. It was you, Congress, who tied up the terminal-leave pay veterans had coming to them in nonnegotiable, 5-year bonds.

Do you pay businessmen and farmers the cash subsidies they have coming to them in bonds?

Can you pay your rent, buy food, buy clothing, or pay your bills with bonds?

Something has got to be done. The cost of living is a minute-by-minute, day-to-day threat to the very existence of millions of veterans and their families. The housing shortage is a disgrace and a crime and you constantly turn a deaf ear to the pleas of the veterans. Living conditions among veterans attending school under the GI bill are impossible, the task of studying and maintaining a home on less money a month than you collect for 2 days' work is beyond reason.

Since the first of the year, mainly because of a law you passed hastily and without consideration, the Veterans' Administration has taken $14,000,000 in cash out of the pockets of veterans and it intends to take another $32,000,000 in the weeks ahead.

Is this the measure of America's gratitude to the veterans?

Where are those 83 veterans of World War II among you who promised so glibly that this time the veterans would not be forgotten? Have they, too, become stooges for the rich, the economy-minded, the tax-conscious, the landlords, the profiteers?

You are giving the answer. Every day, every week, every month of the Eightieth session of Congress that passes makes more indelible the impression that your words and promises mean nothing. Many of you are playing a game, a game of hide-and-go-seek with veterans' legislation. Stalls, delays, technicalities, rules, procedure, every trick of the politican is being used to prevent vital and urgently needed veterans' legislation from being brought to the floor of Congress for a vote.

Are you afraid to vote? It looks that way.

The veterans need money to tide them over the difficult days you brought upon them by ending price controls and refusing to act sensibly in the housing crisis. Give them their terminal-leave pay in cash.

The veterans need to make a decent living while taking on-the-job training to become skilled mechanics. Lift the ceilings on their incomes—give them something with which to combat high prices.

The veterans in school need higher subsistence allowances if they are to continue their educations and profit by the millions already spent in their behalf. Raise those allowances enough to put a little food on the table.

Get busy on a plan for a national housing program. Give the fellows who lived too long in the foxholes a place to lay their heads—a home.

All of this can be done in the space of a few days, weeks at most.

The price to the country will be nothing compared to the price you—Congress—are exacting from our veterans in suffering, want, hardship, and discouragement.

It's up to you.

HAROLD G. STAGG.

Billy Williams and George Hoage—Perfect Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, they paid tribute the other evening in Minnesota to two of the best public servants that any State ever had. I refer to Billy Williams and George Hoage, who for the past 42 years have faithfully served the State of Minnesota.

If any of you have ever had the occasion to call upon the Governor of Minnesota you met these two fine gentlemen who have served under 12 Governors since 1905 when the present Capitol in St. Paul was first opened. They have been the Governors' aides during all these years and I never knew a Governor of our State who did not regard these remarkable men as two of the most valuable assets of the State of Minnesota. There was never a Governor, regardless of political affiliation, who ever thought of dismissing them for they were above politics. They served the State. They always gave the same gracious reception to the humble caller as they did to the one of high estate.

In a short time George Hoage will retire, and Billy Williams will continue for a few more years. The Governor's office in Minnesota will not be the same without them. They are perfect public servants. Your life would have been richer if you had known them.

The President's Middle East Policy

REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I bring to you the final answer to the question I have been asking people: "What do you think about the President's proposal regarding Greece and Turkey?" Later on, with your permission, I would like to make a 1-minute summary of the results of this experiment.

Having interviewed people in many walks of life, I thought it might be well, as a final answer to this thing, to interview a man who will have something to do with the final say in the matter; so, Mr. Speaker, I talked to a Congressman about this. I must confess I had some idea of the views of this gentleman before I talked with him, but I have such a high regard for his views on Government spending that I quote to you his answer to me:

To my colleague FRANK MATHEWS, the gentleman from New Jersey, I want to say that I believe you are rendering great service to our country in relating your interviews with people in every walk of life on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey. You are informing the Congress what the people actually think on this issue.

It is proposed to give away $400,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to these foreign countries, without first asking the permission or having the approval of the people who must pay the debt. Then we must tax the people—your constituents and mine—to pay this debt incurred without their permission. My dear colleague, that does not seem right, does it? In view of the fact that they already have a $269,000,000,000 debt saddled on them, it seems only right that the people who must foot the bill should have a say as to whether we are to give away millions and millions to other nations of the world under the guise of charity.

We always have kept our nose out of other nations' affairs. Why not do that now? It smells of oil to me—more oil than charity.

Why should this Government maintain a King and Queen of Greece who do not have a drop of Greek blood in their veins? Why meddle in their Government? Would we want the Greeks to come over here and tell us what kind of a government we should have? The United Nations was set up to take care of situations like this and do the very thing the President of the United States suggests this country do—bypass the UN. Why such a procedure? It implicates the

expenditure of many more millions. It is a dangerous precedent.

A sound America will stabilize the world, but a bankrupt America will pull us all down.

Be wise and economize.

Where will you get the money?

National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 23, 1947:

ECONOMY OR CHAOS?

On March 1, 1946, the National Labor Relations Board had a backlog of 3,875 unprocessed cases. On March 1 of this year, the backlog amounted to 5,225 cases—an increase of more than one-third. This is to say that the Wagner Act is being only partially administered. A great hue and cry would arise, no doubt, if the NLRB were to declare frankly that it could not keep up with its case load and would therefore limit its administration of the act, say, to the States east of the Mississippi or north of the Mason and Dixon's line. That it is now, because of a shortage of personnel, unable adequately to discharge its congressional mandate is painfully apparent. If the cut in its appropriation ordained by the House is sustained in the Senate—almost 50 percent less than the President's budget estimate and 10 percent under the present appropriation—it will be forced to reduce its staff by about 50 persons and, as an inevitable result, will fall still further behind in its work.

This is an expensive form of economy. The Board, like a court of law, has a statutory obligation to process cases brought before it for action; and it has small control over the number of cases filed with it. It is an instrument for the orderly adjudication of disputes or violations of the law which would otherwise dislocate the national economy. As Chairman Herzog, of the NLRB, told the Senate subcommittee in charge of Labor-Federal Security appropriations, "Delays in the processing of cases impair the effectiveness of the (Wagner) act by prolonging employer-employee tension and uncertainties. Further, delays often lead to strikes which prompt application of the judicial procedures of the Board would prevent. * * * Not only may impatience at the Board's slowness in handling organizational issues lead to self-help in the form of strikes, but delays in handling complaint cases often build up employer liability for back pay. In cases where elections are delayed, all parties—labor and management alike—are subjected to tensions which promote unrest."

The goal of economy which the Republican Members of Congress have set themselves is, of course, an important one. It cannot be attained without a substantial paring of the President's budget, which must necessarily entail the sacrifice of some desirable governmental services and activities. But the monetary saving must be weighed in terms of the sacrifice. In this instance it seems to us a form of saving that may prove dangerously costly. We can scarcely afford to carry unadministered or inadequately administered laws on our statute books. It can scarcely be considered economical to promote industrial chaos.

Turkey's Role in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the New York Herald Tribune:

TURKEY'S ROLE IN WORLD WAR II—AN OBSERVER RECALLS HOW NATION RESISTED AXIS PRESSURE

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

As the question of Turkey's role in the Second World War seems to be the subject of much discussion, and particularly of controversy, at once prejudiced and ill-informed, I beg that you extend the hospitality of your columns to the views of an American who spent the entire war period in Istanbul. These views are unequivocally to the effect that Turkey's part in the war deserves our commendation and gratitude, for the following reasons:

1. Turkey was a bastion of defense in our war against Germany and Japan and her stand aided materially in bringing it to a successful conclusion. If Turkey had gone over to Germany the whole Middle East would have been lost. The vital supply route through Iran to Russia would either have never operated at all or would have been cut. The Persian Gulf, the Suez Canal, vital lines of communication, vital sources of oil supplies, would have all been taken away from us. The vista of appalling consequences stretching from Europe, northern Africa, through Russia and the Middle East to the Far East is nerve-shaking even in retrospect.

2. The Turkish bastion did not fall because the Turks—leaders and people—never lost their nerve. Living in Turkey during most of the war was like living on a smoking, growling volcano. We on the Bosporous were only 20 minutes flying time from German airfields in Bulgaria. So strong was the belief in the imminence of a German attack that thousands of persons were evacuated from Istanbul in the spring of 1941. In the autumn of that year it was known that the Germans had everything prepared for an invasion, even to the painting of signs for guideposts for use on roads through Turkey and to Baghdad and to Cairo. The Turks were resolute in their determination to resist attacks and were unshaken by German menaces.

3. The Turks turned a deaf ear to German blandishments when it seemed most advantageous to forsake the British alliance and go over to the Germans—at a time when it seemed that the Germans couldn't lose. There were pro-Germans in Turkey, as there were in every country, but whatever fifth column there may have been made little impression on the firm pro-Allied sympathies of the Turkish leaders and the majority of the citizens. It is true that Pan-Turanian fanatics dreamed of uniting the Turks of a dismembered Russia with those of the Turkish motherland, but decisive measures were taken to suppress this anti-Russian faction and nothing was heard from them after 1943.

4. Turkey did not become an active belligerent because the British and Americans could not spare the munitions and equipment necessary to give offensive power to the Turkish Army. The British and American Chiefs of Staff were opposed to Turkey's entry when Russia urged that she come in early in 1944, because it would have resulted in an inevitable slow-up of the Pacific and Italian campaigns and of the invasion of France and would have reduced the equipment which Russia herself needed to insure mobility for her great armies in her offensive campaigns. Probably Turkey was in error in not declaring war on Germany later in 1944, but her army staff were honestly convinced that the Allies had not fulfilled their promises in the matter of modern equipment, without which the Turkish forces would not have been able to carry out the offensive task expected of them.

5. Turkey did trade with Germany during the war, but, as she was almost completely dependent in 1941 and 1942 on Germany for the marketing of her vital exports, her economy would have broken down and her defensive military strength would have been seriously impaired if she had cut off all commercial relations with Germany. This would have resulted in a serious weakening of the Allied position, as a strong Turkey was essential to the success of the Mediterranean and African campaigns.

6. Turkey was not a war profiteer, all of Moscow's invectives on this score notwithstanding. Of course, she suffered infinitely less than Greece and perhaps less than any other country which was an active participant. Of course, there were many businessmen, industrialists, landowners, and speculators who got rich more quickly than was seemly in a world in distress, but what country was without its shameless profiteers? The mass of the Turkish population, however—the wage earners, officials, teachers, and others on fixed salaries—suffered great privations due to the fivefold rise in the cost of living between 1939 and 1945. The Turkish people thus made a not insignificant sacrifice in the common cause of freedom.

7. We should not forget that Turkey was one of the first countries to commit herself to a stand against Nazi aggression, when in 1939 she signed treaties of alliance with Great Britain and France.

8. That Turkey wished for and did her best to promote friendship with Russia is indubitable. We have only to remember that (a) she negotiated a treaty of alliance with Russia in the summer of 1939. Instead of signing, the Russians turned their backs on the democracies and signed the infamous pact with Ribbentrop. (b) When Russia was fighting the heroic and critical battle of Stalingrad the Turkish Government assured the Soviet Government that any attempt by the Germans to turn the Russian flank by attacking the Caucasus through Anatolia would be resisted. (c) The Turks repeatedly expressed their desire to renegotiate a treaty of friendship and neutrality after Moscow had denounced that of 1925. Russia, on the other hand, despite her promise given in 1941 that she had no claim on Turkish territory, put forward in June 1945, her now famous demands for the cession of Kars and Ardahan and for military bases in the Dardanelles area. It should be said in this connection that Russia's so-called proofs that the Turks actively aided the Germans by allowing the passage through the straits of German ships of war were thin evidence, indeed, to bring to the support of so serious a charge.

In conclusion and by way of summary, let me express my conviction that one of the psychological factors which were decisive in turning the tide against Germany was Germany's realization that the Turk is a tough and resolute fighter. This was enough to make her pause and reconsider her plans for overrunning the country. Is it far-fetched to say that this factor may well have saved Russia and ourselves? In any case, it is not an exaggeration to say that Turkey's part in the war was a helpful and a not inglorious one.

AN AMERICAN RESIDENT OF TURKEY.

NEW YORK, *April 10, 1947.*

A Great New Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, someone once said that age is not so much a matter of years as of mental attitude. Applied to an institution, this is particularly true.

Princeton University, located at Princeton, N. J., in my district, is an example. Celebrating its two hundredth anniversary, it expects to complete in June 1948 its unique $4,000,000 Harvey S. Firestone Memorial Library.

A library is like a residence. The exterior structure supplies protective shelter to books in the one case and to a family of human beings in the other. But this structure is mere housing. What goes on inside determines whether the one is a mere storage space for books, the other just a house; whether one is a vital factor in true intellectual development, the other a social unit of moral and spiritual strength.

Of course there is nothing unique about a university building a library or in spending $4,000,000 for that purpose. The outstanding departure of the Harvey S. Firestone Memorial Library from traditional library building, implying a central core of book stacks surrounded by offices, seminars, and reading rooms, is the abandonment of any distinction between storage and nonstorage space and with the elimination of all barriers between books and the users of books.

The building will consist of six stories and is unusual in concept among libraries in that it has been planned from the inside out to implement the aims and needs of Princeton's philosophy which emphasizes individual instruction and independent work.

Plans call for a book capacity of 1,800,000 volumes and seating accommodations for about 1,875 students. These figures triple the book space and quadruple the number of reader accommodations now available in the Chancelor Green and Pyne Libraries which were completed in 1873 and 1897, respectively, when Princeton's undergraduate enrollment was less than a third of what it is in 1947.

A distinctive feature of the building is the achievement of unprecedented adaptability in function through the use of the modular plan of construction, meaning a building made up of units of space uniform in size, equally illuminated and ventilated, and interchangeable as to function.

The basic unit of space in the Firestone Library measures some 18 by 25 feet, a bay convenient for seminars, for book stacks, or, by a combination of two or more units, for large conference rooms. With a uniform ceiling height and with movable interior partitions, space for human occupancy and space for book storage become interchangeable.

In accordance with the principle of the humanistic laboratory, a library conducive to individual study, the building will contain more than 660 individual cubicles, or carrels, for undergraduates and graduate students. A student's carrel will be his private research office in the library, located in the midst of the book stacks, where the volumes immediately pertinent to his field of concentration are located.

The floors, measuring approximately 350 feet east and west and 225 feet north and south, and providing some 4½ acres of interior space, will house the principal bookstacks and most of the carrels and departmental areas. Each of these three floors will accommodate about 500,000 volumes as well as offices, seminars, conference-lounge rooms, and other study areas.

From the broad base, which is being built of reinforced concrete, rises a superstructure of three additional floors, covering a much smaller floor area and being surrounded in part by terraces formed by the roof of the base floors. The superstructure and its tower, the latter emphasizing the main entrance and building up composition with the chapel, will employ structural steel.

Although the stack floors are below the entrance level, the northward slope of the library site, together with a reverse terrace south from Nassau Street, provides a naturally lighted north wall. The lowest level will have natural light on the entire north side. Nearly half of the perimeter of the floor above will have outside light and three-quarters of the perimeter of the floor above that.

The dangers of institutionalism and of an atmosphere of regimentation on the stack floors have been met by the development of browsing alcoves scattered throughout the book-storage area. The alcoves, intermixing reading space and stack storage at convenient intervals, may be regarded, Dr. Boyd explained, "as oases of light, color, and attractive furnishings in the midst of a regimented stack, giving relief to its severity."

The library, when ready for occupancy, will add two new phrases to the campus lexicon, for on the stack floors there will be two distinctive kinds of seminars, "talk rooms" and "work rooms." A "talk room" will be for graduate seminars held under professional guidance, while a work room, in effect a miniature library of basic research materials, will be intended solely for research.

From the circulation desk on the first floor will radiate the wings of the building, housing a reference reading room, a reserve book room, the exhibition gallery, manuscript and treasure rooms, special collections, and the library services.

One of the rooms on the main floor will replace as nearly as possible the library of the College of New Jersey as it was in the eighteenth century. This room will contain the desk of John Witherspoon, Princeton's sixth president, together with several hundred volumes from Witherspoon's library as well as those from the libraries of Aaron Burr, Jonathan Edwards, and other early Princeton leaders.

Among the great collections that will be sheltered on the top three floors will be the Gest Oriental library of 100,000 volumes, the Morton L. Parrish collection of first editions of Victorian noveltists, the Philip Ashton Rollins collection of western Americana, the Grenville Kane collection of Americana, the Robert Garrett collection of 10,000 volumes of Arabic manuscripts, the graphic arts collections, the William Seymour Theater collection, the Woodrow Wilson collection, and the philatelic and numismatic collections.

A good library affords a miraculous opportunity to reasoning human beings to advance their education by beginning where others left off, with a minimum waste of time and avoidance of the uncomfortable pains of too many courses in the hard school of experience.

To make the best out of a good library, the facilities for research are of vital importance. In this latter feature, the Harvey S. Firestone Memorial Library excels.

Princeton University is demonstrating a far-sighted and progressive policy in this project.

Brooks' Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Brooks' Courage," appearing in the Illinois State Journal of Springfield, Ill., on Friday, April 18, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROOKS' COURAGE

United States Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, Republican stalwart from Illinois, displayed a soldier's courage Wednesday when he criticized the proposed Greco-Turkish $400,000,000 aid program as leading to countless Pearl Harbors and Bataans around the world, as well as national bankruptcy. BROOKS spoke not only as a representative of Illinoisans in the Senate of the United States, but as a veteran who has been under fire in war, who knows what war in its bitterest phases is.

The Senator appended to his criticism the explanation that he held no truck with Communists or communism, which at least pretends to oppose the aid program, but WAYLAND BROOKS need not have taken time out for that. All of Illinois knows he is as militant an opponent of communism as lives. Nor will anyone in Illinois misunderstand.

BROOKS' prime interest is to conserve American strength. He knows, and so does every other informed Illinoisan, that unless we remain strong, we shall become an impotent target in the not distant future for whatever nation or influence chooses to take us over. History on that point is immutable.

There is another angle. A growing number of Americans are beginning to suspect

that the paraded Russian and communistic opposition to the Truman doctrine is camouflage. It isn't the wish of communism that Uncle Sam conserve either his muscles or his resources. Communism wants us weakened, at least to the point of vulnerableness to communistic conquest. They could, and would if it served their purpose, blatantly wave the flag against an aid program such as is contemplated, just for the purpose of insuring its adoption.

BROOKS' position is in the interest of American security. He maintains we cannot pour out arms and substance and stay out of trouble. The historic sequel of that argument is, we never have.

Italy in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

ITALY IN DANGER

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Recent reports reaching this writer from Italy are alarming. Not only are the Communists gaining in strength but the majority of the divided Socialist Party, under the honest but stupid Pietro Nenni, are helping them.

Ex-Fascists and ambitious malcontents of Giannini's Average Man (Uomo Qualunque) Party are also growing. In foreign affairs, this party is nationalist and cynically ready to cooperate with anybody who will help them. They dislike communism but dislike democracy even more.

The west-oriented or democratic parties still nominally control the government. Most people think that in an election held now under the shadow of the unjust Big-Four decision giving Istria to Yugoslavia and internationalizing Trieste, communism and fascism would eat even more deeply into Italy's weakened politic.

Nobody can properly blame the Communists and the Fascists. Both are acting according to their natures. Italy pretty well fulfills the conditions that Communist theorists consider prerequisite to revolution. Communist Leader Palmiro Togliatti is a hardened, intelligent conspirator so well thought of by the Communist fathers in Moscow that he has been made strategical leader of the Communist Parties in all western Europe. The strategy—as everywhere the Communists do not yet dare an open insurrection—is the "patriotic line" and a common front with other "democratic" (meaning pro-Russian) parties. Given the humiliation of defeat and loss of really Italian territory and the physical misery now prevalent throughout this poor and overpopulated country, the growth of communism was a foregone conclusion.

Some revival of fascism was also doubtless to be expected.

But that communism and fascism should have grown so quickly to their present proportions is due, in my judgment, to the short-sighted policies of Britain and the United States. Looking back, one can see clearly how when we prevented the armed revolution that would have buried the worst Fascists and permanently converted the others, we prepared the ground for a new bid for power by some new Mussolini.

Our support of the King, Prince Umberto and Badoglio cost us the confidence of many democratic Italians. The choice of the ultra-businessman, "Admiral" Ellery Stone as chief military authority, cost us a lot more.

Failure to keep western Istria and Trieste safely Italian was a minor democratic disaster.

Underestimating and undercrediting the Partisans who fought consistently and well on our side was another.

Probably the greatest of our mistakes was in overplaying the Vatican. Most male Italians—it cannot too often be said—are both Roman Catholic—and consistently anticlerical. By this I mean they revere priests in churches and resent priests in politics.

There was some reason for our backing the church. Once the Italian Government collapsed, the church was the only reliable concern left. But by giving preferential treatment to a confessional organization to which more than three quarters of all Americans do not subscribe, we alienated large numbers of Italians and drove them into the arms of Moscow.

It should have been our task to bring socialists, democrats and old-fashioned liberals together with the Christian Democrats. When the test came, the Communists, whose only principal is subservience to Moscow, voted for renewing the Lateran Pacts that made Catholicism the state religion. The Socialists, by voting against, widened the gulf separating them from the Christian Democrats.

Italy can yet be saved. At long last, the United States has an Ambassador, James Clement Dunn. Whether this pious American Catholic can bring all the anti-Communist, anti-Fascist groups together remains to be seen.

The American Senate is helping by what looks like a flat refusal to ratify or even discuss the peace treaty with Italy until there is a satisfactory treaty with Austria. The Senators are insisting that our military evacuation of Italy (disarmed by the peace treaty) shall not precede Soviet evacuation of Austria—the necessary prelude for Soviet evacuation of Eungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania. It is believed that left to themselves, the Yugoslavs will hardly dare to jump an internationalized Trieste or move into Venice even if invited by Togliatti.

Pro-Moscow conspirators are clearly aiming at making Italy a second and larger Greece. It is up to us to prevent them.

Certainly, nothing could be more futile than an American security investment in Greece and Turkey if we are going to permit all Mediterranean security to be undermined in Italy.

Government by Wish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Government by Wish," appearing in the Chicago Daily News of Friday, April 18, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT BY WISH

Of all the arguments that have been advanced in support of Greco-Turkish intervention, the weakest is that we must proceed if only because President Truman has proposed it. Otherwise his prestige would be damaged, say the supporters of this "loan."

Senator BROOKS attacked this, pleading forcefully in his address opposing the Middle East adventure. Advocates of the $400,000,000 commitment admit that it is only the beginning. At what point, if any, will regard for national self-interest permit us to say "No" to Mr. Truman? Is ours a government of checks and balances, or merely one of drafts and deficits?

Senator BRIDGES disclosed that the State Department is still exerting pressure to obtain for the Russians another $25,000,000 of lend-lease, including an oil refinery. Can't somebody tell the left hand that the right is trying to "stop Russia"?

Income-Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington (N. J.) Examiner of April 21, 1947:

SMALL FRY CARRY THE LOAD OF UNFAIR INCOME-TAX LAW

Income-tax legislation always has been class legislation and there is no apparent disposition on the part of the present Congress to make it any less so.

Most glaring of its inequities is what it does to the average man, woman, and child working for a living, and the way it discriminates against them as compared to the higher-bracket taxpayers.

This has become even worse since personal and dependent exemptions have been cut to the point where no one will attempt to argue they are comparable to the exemptions granted the big businessman and financier.

Joe Goat, married, two children, annual income $3,000, is taxed about $140, all or most taken painlessly from his pay envelope without him ever having had the use of it. There are no slick operations or manipulations he can resort to for the purpose of going off tax-free or reducing his payment substantially.

Joe Grab, married, two children, annual gross income $300,000, may get stuck for a sizable chunk of tax money. He may, if his lawyers and auditors are slick enough, get by with about the payment Joe Goat makes, maybe without any payment.

Even if he pays $150,000 tax, he pays it at the end of his fiscal year, after having had the use of the money to make more, to save him from borrowing at interest, or to set up investments that might reduce the size of his ultimate tax.

SPECIAL ALLOWANCES

Joe Grab is most likely deriving income mostly from use of his capital. He has allowances for operating expenses, losses, etc., all legitimate; all, also, allowances that leave the door open for tricky operations to reduce the tax.

Joe Goat likewise is a capitalist. He invests in his job the only important capital he has, the productive years of his life. This is subject to deterioration with use, but he gets no allowance for that on his income tax.

Joe Goat has legitimate expenses. If they are incurred directly on his job, he gets a

tax allowance for them. Otherwise no allowance. He has losses, caused by strikes, sickness, unemployment. These are income losses. He doesn't have to pay tax on the money he would have made but didn't. Neither is he allowed, as Joe Grab is, to deduct these losses from the money he did make, thereby reducing the tax.

The $300,000 man probably needs several automobiles in his business. One or more of them can be used for getting him to and from his office, and for other personal purposes, and the cost can be deducted from taxable revenue. The $3,000 man, if he has a car or not, gets no allowance for getting to and from work, or for other personal transportation.

NICE SYSTEM

Joe Grab can have his wife on the pay roll. Her income is deductible from his taxable gross, if she pays tax on it at a considerable saving over what he would have to pay. The fact that her salary pays for the upkeep of his domestic establishment, including education of his children, entertainment and vacations, can give Joe Grab a virtual tax exemption for these outlays.

All expenses of the $3,000 family must be paid out of Joe Goat's taxable income, with no deductions for them.

There are other expenses Mr. Goat is liable to incur that are a legitimate part of the cost of investing his only capital—his ability to earn a living. Included in these are clothing, laundry and similar expenses that are necessary if he wants to hold his job, but could be much less if he had a different sort of job. He gets no deductions for them.

Joe Grab can have a doctor and a dentist and a chiropodist and a masseur and a physical instructor and a psychiatrist and a garage mechanic and a few other specialists on his pay rolls as necessary adjuncts to his plant or office. Their services can be available, without cost to himself and his family—another form of income tax deduction from living expenses.

Looked at from any standpoint, the income tax does not fall in equal proportion on rich, poor and in-between alike; nor on the just and the unjust.

There is too much leeway for the smart guy, if—and he usually is—he is in the upper brackets.

There is an unfair share of the burden on the low-income individuals and families.

A reasonable start on wiping out the inequities would be to exempt all income up to what Government economists fix as a minimum existence income level—around $2,500 for Joe Goat and his family at present prices.

The House Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Miami Daily News of April 25, 1947:

THE HOUSE LABOR BILL

The omnibus labor bill passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 308–107 forbids jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, requires open financial reporting by labor unions and makes them financially accountable in the courts, defines unfair labor practices by unions as well as employers and authorizes the Government to obtain a 75-day injunction against a strike in public services or utilities which would "threaten to imperil" the public "health, safety or interest."

These objectives of the House bill are in keeping with the abuse of its power of which labor has often been guilty in the last decade. The heavy House majority which approved them reflects strong sentiment in the country for greater regulation of the giant labor unions which have so altered the political and economic balance of power in the United States.

Their very size and influence require the open responsibility of labor unions in their financial operations. The very effectiveness of the technique of the strike makes jurisdictional strikes, which represent no actual wage or welfare demands on the workers' part, intolerable. Strikes in an industry vital to the national interest last year twice brought our industrial processes almost to a standstill.

Had the House sought actively to write a law which would curtail labor's excesses, the Nation could look forward to a period of health and security in its industrial life. But the Republican-dominated House chose otherwise. It chose to make basic labor legislation a purely political issue and to wrap up constructive objectives with a whole-hog-or-none assault on union labor which, if it were written into law, would open up the most turbulent period in labor-management relations the country has known.

It will not be written into law, even without the certainty of a Presidential veto. The House bill has no chance of passage in the Republican controlled Senate, where much less punitive labor measures have failed of approval in the Labor Committee headed by Senator TAFT. Passage of the House bill merely ensures a split in the Republican congressional leadership which the House, had it sought to curb admitted excesses in labor's power, could have avoided.

Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my statement to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, Interior Department, appropriation bill, 1948, Indian Affairs, February 28, 1947:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your subcommittee. My interest in Indian affairs is naturally greater than that of most of my colleagues. I grew up in the Choctaw Nation. Some of my warmest lifelong personal friends are Indians. There are probably more Indians in the congressional district which I am honored to represent than there are in any other congressional district in the United States. Most of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians, two of the greatest of the Five Civilized Tribes, reside in my district. Members of these tribes have played an important part in the development of the State of Oklahoma. They occupy positions of leadership in practically every community in my district. Many of them have attained high positions within our State and Federal Governments. They have served honorably and with extraordinary distinction in the great war that has just been won.

I would like to call the committee's attention at this time, to a matter about which many persons outside of Oklahoma are under a misapprehension. The former wealth of the great Osage Tribe has led many to believe that Oklahoma Indians are fabulously wealthy. The fact is, with respect to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes that but very few may be considered prosperous. On the contrary there is widespread poverty among these fine Americans. Except for Government schools like Wheelock, Jones, and Carter, and mission schools, such as Goodland, there are many Indian children who would not have the opportunity to get even an elementary education. These schools have been able to take care of Indian orphans and Indian children whose parents live so far from public schools that they are not able to attend the ordinary State schools. It should be remembered that these are boarding schools which are attended by growing children, some of them very young. The rising cost of food makes it imperative that adequate appropriations be made to insure that these children may have proper nourishment.

There is an urgent need for new buildings at some of these schools. I hope that these buildings can be constructed as soon as possible, and that the old and inadequate structures may be replaced with more modern ones. But in all these matters we are only asking that essential things not be neglected.

Likewise, except for the hospital facilities that have been established, many Indians would not be able to receive the medical and hospital care which they require. The Indian hospital at Talihina, Okla., has experienced a 300-percent utilization increase since the beginning of the last fiscal year. It takes care of more than 100 tuberculosis cases, and considerably more than 100 general hospital cases. In addition to this, it handles hundreds of out-patients. This hospital is desperately in need of sufficient funds to do the job, and such funds should be provided.

These institutions serve not only Indians residing in southeastern Oklahoma, but members of the Five Civilized Tribes and many other tribes throughout the country. The Federal Government has, through the years, rendered assistance along these lines, not only because there has been a need for it, but also because of a solemn obligation which has grown out of our various treaties with the Indians under which they moved from their original homes to settle in Oklahoma. I regret to say that the Federal Government has not lived up to all of its treaties.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore hope that the various services which have been made available to the Indians by our Government will not be neglected during the coming fiscal year. I know there is a widespread desire and need for economy in Government, and I am one of those who believe in rigid economy. Accordingly, I am not asking the committee to consider appropriations not contemplated in the budget. I feel, however, that this program is too important to be neglected.

At this point I think it will be well to point out that the Indian service exists for the Indians and not for the departmental officials. I feel, therefore, that if reductions are made in the budget in the Indian service, they should be made with respect to the overhead, and not in connection with services for the direct benefit of the Indians themselves. In this connection, I should like to call your attention to the fact that branch offices of the Indian service have been established at various communities to serve Indians directly. This is as it should be. The vast majority of Indians are unable to take up their problems with distant offices, whether regional or national. Agencies located near their homes and communities will do more for the Indians than offices located at some remote headquarters. I, therefore, plead with the committee to allow

sufficient funds to keep intact all local contact offices in southeastern Oklahoma.

I do sincerely hope your committee will see fit to recommend sufficient appropriations to provide adequate funds for the health, education, and other services which the Government has heretofore seen fit to furnish our Indian population.

Farm Bureau Members Split on CVP Land Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the matter of the retention of the antispeculation clause in the reclamation law is one of great importance to the people of California. A very illuminating article pertaining to this subject was published in the San Francisco News under the date of April 9, 1947, which reads as follows:

FARM BUREAU MEMBERS SPLIT ON CVP LAND POLICY

(By Vernon O'Reilly)

The growing bitter dispute between a segment of the membership of the California Farm Bureau Federation and its policy-making board of directors over the latter's opposition to the 160-acre limitation in the Central Valley was underscored today in a letter from C. A. Talbott, of Turlock, to J. J. Deuel.

Mr. Talbott has been a member of the CFBF for 30 years. Mr. Deuel heads the organization's utilities department. He has been an active opponent of the Bureau of Reclamation program and bitter antagonist of application of the 160-acre limitation to CVP.

DISCONCERTING

The Turlock man held it "disconcerting * * * to find the California Farm Bureau Federation carrying the ball in this fight for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the State chamber of commerce against the small farmer and the returned veteran."

"This reclamation law with its 160-acre limitation," he wrote, "has served the interests of the farm-home owner for 45 years and now the CFBF has suddenly discovered the technicalities which will make the Bureau of Reclamation, using your own words, 'The economic master of CVP for years to come.' "

PREFER BUREAU CONTROL

"I opine that the people, when they review the past 45 years' operation of the bureau * * * would prefer, if they had the facts, to have it the 'economic master' of CVP than to have CVP controlled by the P. G. & E., Southern Pacific, Standard Oil, Kern County Land Co., Miller & Lux, Boston Land Co., Tejon Ranch Co., and about 150 other corporations and individuals that own approximately 1,500,000 acres of land in the San Joaquin Valley."

He charged Edson Abel, irrigation attorney who speaks for the CFBF at many hearings on reclamation matters, "falsely represents this (160-acre limitation) program as confiscatory."

"I will make a present of $5,000 to the California Farm Bureau if you can prove the reclamation law, as it now stands, has ever confiscated, or can confiscate, one dollar's worth of any man's property," he continued.

CHALLENGE PRESENTED

"I challenge you or anyone to show any instance in the 45 years during which the reclamation law has been in force when it has operated to the detriment of the common people it was enacted to serve."

Mr. Talbott further criticized Mr. Abel for representing himself in the Crittenden committee hearings at Sacramento recently as speaking for 45,000 California farm families, in testimony opposing the 160-acre limitation.

"I am a member of a State-wide committee which has circulated thousands of petitions in the past 2 months requesting retention of the 160-acre limitation," Mr. Talbott wrote. "On these petitions we have secured, by honest representation, the signatures of thousands of Farm Bureau members who were and are very vociferous in their support of the 160-acre limitation and in their denunciation of the CFB for its opposition thereto.

"I therefore challenge your right to testify that you represent 45,000 farm families or any specific number of farm familes. You do have the right to say you represent the directors of the CFB.

"However, those directors have never tried to ascertain the will of the membership on this matter. On the contrary, they have endeavored with some degree of success to mold the opinions of the members.

"Not once to my knowledge, and I have a wide acquaintance in many parts of this State, have the directors sought full and unbiased opinion."

Mr. Talbott's challenge to the Farm Bureau merely placed in writing verbal challenges of like tenor which have been voiced at hearings in various parts of the State within the past year.

Control of Predatory Animals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the general purposes of the Appropriations Committee to reduce expenses of the Federal Government. We now have annual appropriations beyond what the country can expect to carry over any long course of years. Now, while times are flush and the Treasury is receiving a large income, is an appropriate time to begin the reduction of our national debt by substantial payments.

However, we must regard the Government as a going concern whose normal and necessary functions should be kept in a healthy condition as a best means of meeting our obligations. I regret that the committee found it necessary to cut the appropriations proposed for predatory animal and rodent control from $1,000,000 to $750,000 for the fiscal year 1948.

For many years, as a Representative from the West, I have consistently endeavored to support an increased efficiency of the efforts of the Government to cooperate with local interests in carrying on the fight for predatory-animal control against coyotes, wolves, mountain lions, and bobcats.

These animals range over vast areas of the public domain and national forests, as well as over private lands of the West. It has never been possible for private industry to combat the depredations of these animals adequately.

It is recognized by all who are familiar with the situation that the Federal Government is properly an active participant in this program of conservation of the livestock industry. In some instances, the public lands on which these animals are propagated and range, constitute one-half, or nearly one-half, of the domain of some Western States.

Our State and local interests have matched Federal funds and contributed very substantial additional funds in carrying out this program. Unfortunately, during the war the suppression of these predators became more difficult.

The high-paid labor market attracted coyote trappers into other more profitable fields of activity. For the same reason, trapping by private trappers fell off substantially. The result was an increased crop over great areas of the West.

It is said that in some instances the loss due to predators has amounted to as much as 15 percent of the annual lamb crop on sheep ranges.

The Fish and Wildlife Service, which now has charge of the predatory program of the Government, has worked in cooperation with various State livestock associations and individuals in combating depredations by these animals. However, this agency of the Government has been handicapped because of the greater expense of operations on account of the greater cost of both labor and material.

So this sum of $750,000 will be a very substantial aid, but it does not have a comparable effective power to that which a similar sum would have provided 10 years ago.

The increase of these predatory animals, due to the war situation as above indicated, has increased the current necessity for protecting the livestock industry, and the burden of the work is also increased by the decreased purchasing power of the funds appropriated for that purpose.

I am not voicing a complaint against the Appropriations Committee, which has consistently given a substantial support over the years to afford this protection to the livestock industry. I do hope, however, that further consideration will convince the committee that even under an economy program a larger appropriation is now justified and necessary.

Conciliation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial which appears in the Washington Evening Star of April 25, 1947:

CONCILIATION SERVICE

One provision of the House and the Senate labor bills which deserves more careful consideration than it seems to have received is that which takes the Conciliation Service out of the Department of Labor and sets it up as an independent agency.

The reasons for this move are obscure. One theory seems to be that since the Department of Labor is charged with the duty of representing labor, a subordinate agency of the department cannot function fairly in a mediatory role. Another argument is that the present set-up brings the Government into labor disputes in a partisan role.

Actually, however, no evidence has been producer to show that the Conciliation Service has functioned either as a prolabor or as a political agency. On the contrary, there is much testimony on the record from spokesmen for management and labor that the service as currently constituted has functioned impartially and effectively. One of the few recommendations upon which the President's labor-management conference of 1946 could agree called for "reorganization of the United States Conciliation Service to the end that it will be established as an effective and completely impartial agency within the department." The reorganization of the service within the department has taken place, its effectiveness is attested by the settlement of more than 13,000 disputes last year, and there is no complaint of partiality. So why take it out of the Labor Department?

Another proposed change which deserves more scrutiny is the provision for a 60-day waiting period before a labor contract can be abrogated. At best, the usefulness of this is dubious, and many experienced negotiators believe that it actually makes more difficult the adjustment of disputes. In any event, it is a point which should get more attention during the Senate debate than it has received in committee.

A final point, but an important one, has to do with funds for this agency. The Conciliation Service has been doing a good job. But Congress now is considering a reduction in its funds and a complete revamping of its organizational structure. With the prospects for future industrial harmony being none too good, the legislators would be well advised to look a little more carefully before they take this leap.

Industry and Labor Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, as part of my remarks a statement by Mr. C. B. J. Molitor before the Ways and Means Committee on April 24, 1947. This presentation of facts by Mr. Molitor shows clearly the extent to which American laborers are being injured, in fact sold out, by our State Department.

The statement follows:

Our little industry employing approximately 7,000 skilled workers, has appeared before this committee in opposition to the extensions of the Trade Agreements Act in 1940 and again in 1945. On both occasions we have pleaded for just such an investigation as you have very wisely instituted. We have opposed and now oppose continuation of this program which has resulted in "one-way reciprocity." It is time that we calmly take a look at the record to judge just how this wide delegation of congressional power has been used.

Due to the intervention of war, but relatively few American industries have been injured seriously up to the present as a result of tariff reductions effected under trade agreements. You can be certain, however, that with the return of normalcy many more industries will be very seriously injured and most particularly those employing greater numbers of American workers in their production, textiles being a most notable example.

Again, and again, and again have we been told that trade agreements reduce trade barriers and increase American employment. Let us see how much substance there is to that contention.

Our industry was beyond question very seriously injured and was being snuffed out of existence in 1938, 1939, and 1940, as a direct result of the trade agreement with France in 1936. The fall of France in June 1940 saved us. I hesitate cluttering the record with the details of our difficulties and their causes. Believe me the evidence is preponderantly conclusive and it was made a part of the record of this committee then considering the extension of this act in 1945 at the request of Congressman JENKINS.

But, despite the imperiling of the industry through tariff reductions in the previous French and British agreements the ax is about to fall again. Laces are listed in both the contemplated agreements with France and the United Kingdom, for still further reduction in rates. These further reductions are being considered notwithstanding the fact that a substantive provision of the Trade Agreements Act provides that the President may reduce United States tariffs whenever he finds as a fact, that they are unduly burdening or hindering the foreign trade of the United States.

Though neither time nor complete data have been available to me, I have discovered some very irregular procedure in negotiating these trade agreements as well as after their negotiation. Let us once more survey the circumstances preceding the trade agreement with France which has caused our industry so many difficulties.

While we were carrying on preliminary negotiations with the French Government, preparatory to working out specific details of the agreement, the French raised their tariffs on American products avowedly for bargaining purposes. Mr. Cordell Hull acknowledged that fact publicly. He then stated that we may not bargain on tariffs in the light of such circumstances. Time passed and bargain we did.

We reduced our tariffs while France reduced her tariffs to the extent of but part of the increases which had been effected for bargaining purposes.

But that is only the beginning. The French franc was valued at 6.6 cents on the effective date of the agreement, namely June 15, 1936. In 4 months to the day, the franc was devalued to 4.6 cents and by the end of 1939, to 2 cents. It is now 0.84 cent. Article XI of the French agreement states:

"In the event that a wide variation occurs in the rate of exchange between the currencies of the United States of America and France, the government of either country, if it considers the variation so substantial as to prejudice the industries or commerce of the country, shall be free to propose negotiations for a modification or to terminate this agreement in its entirety on 30 days written notice."

As a result of this very violent currency devaluation, French laces landed in the United States—duty paid far below prices in France in 1936—without duty. In effect we had even less than free trade, we were in effect subsidizing French products entering our ports.

Of course, as has been the customary practice, the State Department did not invoke the provisions of article XI. The chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information in 1939 acknowledged off the record our difficulties, but advised us that it was diplomatically inexpedient to take action. Our little industry was being made the sacrificial lamb at the altar of diplomatic expediency.

Under the agreement, France granted us so-called most-favored-nation treatment. But, let us see what that phrase means. The French have a three-column tariff. Under the agreement many of our exports which were previously assessed under the intermediate and maximum rates of their bargaining tariff, were reduced to the minimum rates afforded many other countries.

But, in 1937 and 1938, the French Government raised their minimum tariff rates far beyond the maximum rates existing on the effective date of the agreement, and have repeatedly raised them ever since.

One needs no more outstanding examples than the actions of the French Government in the assessing of their tariffs, to be convinced that trade agreements have not reduced French trade barriers. I shall quote the French tariff rates on American gasoline as an example of what actually has been occurring since our trade agreement with France in 1936.

The French tariff on American gasoline, which was formerly one of our large exports, was 3 francs per 100 kilograms. Under the bargaining tariff it was raised to 63.20 francs. Under the treaty it was 63.20 francs. In 1938 it was raised to 157 francs. On February 1, 1945, it was raised to 300 francs. On September 1, 1946, it was again raised to 1,200 francs, or 40,000 percent of what it was before our so-called reciprocal trade agreement.

Are our industries to be further imperiled in the reduction of their tariffs to obtain a reduction in the French tariff on gasoline that has been increased so greatly and so frequently?

What is more, through economic expediency, the French Government has signed one bilateral trade agreement after the other in the past 2 years, most notable of which are those with Belgium, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, Argentina, and Russia. France has not been alone in that procedure, as Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Belgium, the United Kingdom, Poland, Russia, and Switzerland have negotiated bilateral agreements in the past 18 months with almost every other country in Europe, and as well with many Latin-American countries. These are prior obligations that cannot be changed through trade agreements.

I have just referred to the French raising their tariffs for bargaining purposes. That procedure seems to have become common practice. I shall read excerpts from articles in the press preceding negotiations for an agreement with Argentina. The secrecy surrounding preliminary conversations relative to that agreement can but make one wonder.

A front-page headline of the New York Times, August 24, 1939, reads: "United States and Argentina plan trade pact, Welles discloses—long preliminary talks ease difficulties."

A headline on the twenty-fourth page of the same edition reads: "Argentina begins to check imports."

The article reads:

"One of the most drastic cuts is under the heading of typewriters and cash registers used here, the total imports of which in the first quarter of 1940 may not exceed 20 percent of

imports of the same period of this year. Automobiles and machinery can be imported in the first quarter of 1940 up to the same value as imports for the first 3 months of this year, but all imports under this heading will be at the new rate of 20 pesos to the pound sterling instead of the old official rate of 17."

The article further states:

"The announcement made today in Washington by Sumner Welles, of negotiations for a trade treaty, broke a secret that had been kept carefully at the United States Embassy here, although at semiofficial sources it has been admitted that undercover conversations for several weeks had been leading up to formal negotiations for the final draft of the treaty."

It is of particular interest to note that three of the items listed among those for which Argentina was considering concessions were cash registers, typewriters, automobiles.

On February 26, 1947, Argentina completely embargoed importations of refrigerators, a typical American export.

In event that it is thought that these activities are past history, I shall bring you up to date. As you are aware, we are at present negotiating trade agreements with 17 countries at Geneva.

Relative to those agreements, I shall read to you an article appearing in the New York Times of February 16, 1947. This is a cable from Brussels, Belgium, on February 15, 1947:

"PARLEY ON TARIFFS FACES DEFERMENT

"Most countries in Europe are elaborating new schedules of duties as a basis for bargaining. This work is incomplete."

Same old deal. We are to be hoodwinked again just as we have been for 13 years. In the cases of France in 1936 and Argentina in 1939, we were hoodwinked with the full knowledge of our Department of State. Even little Paraguay, while negotiations for a treaty were pending, adopted a surcharge on all imports of 6 percent.

We signed a trade agreement with Mexico effective January 30, 1943, with the customarily avowed purpose of reducing trade barriers. That country has consistently effected hundreds of tariff increases on American products. I shall read a few headlines from our Foreign Commerce Weekly:

"March 23, 1946: Import duties (Mexican) increased sharply on various textiles and hosiery. Increases range from 150 to 172 percent.

"February 2, 1946: Import duties (Mexican) doubled on a large number of items: Automatic pencils, fountain pens, electric wire, radio cabinets, cigarette lighters, etc.

"March 22, 1945: Nylon hosiery duty (Mexican import) raised 300 percent from 1 peso to 4 pesos per pair.

"August 18, 1945: Mexican import tariff duties on wool have been substantially increased—duty on wool tops raised 280 percent."

I could continue indefinitely to cite to you additional instances to prove conclusively that the Mexican Government has not been convinced of the need for reducing her trade barriers by this program of ours.

Under date of July 29, 1946, the Mexican Government established a commission for the control of foreign trade. It is well to note the thinking of other nations which seems to be in direct conflict with our objectives. I quote the principal stated objectives of this Mexican foreign trade commission.

"1. Protection of national production.

* * * * * *

"3. Protection of industries with due regard for repercussions on related branches of industry.

* * * * *

"5. Permission to import raw materials semimanufactured and manufactured products only when these do not exist in the country or exist in insufficient quantities or when they are necessary for the development of a domestic industry."

There, in my opinion, is sound realistic principle.

We negotiated a trade agreement with the United Kingdom in November 1938, when the pound sterling was valued at $5.05; 4 days after and even before the treaty was effective, Great Britain devaluated the pound to $4.65. It is now $4.04.

War intervened too soon to judge the true effects of the duty reductions and concurrent currency depreciation as this agreement was effective on January 1, 1939. But, before war changed the situation a good many of our industries were beginning to feel the impact of competition of products from the British Isles. The operations of the sterling bloc before and even after our agreement made the British agreement in effect a joke. No less an administration stalwart than Dean James Landis has publicly stated that no importer within the sterling bloc could import any American products unless such products were not made by sterling bloc countries.

Today there is almost no freedom of trade within the British Empire.

Despite our agreement and as well, despite the provisions of our loan, the United Kingdom currently has been pursuing the same tactics. Mr. Snyder recently "slapped them on the wrist," but it is interesting to note that they did not change the objectionable provision in their bilateral agreement with Argentina, whereby funds were frozen for purchases within the sterling bloc.

I do not criticize the British Government for their operations of the Sterling Block and for their empire preference tariffs. I admire their customary realistic approach to their problems. I pray that some day we in America may practice some realism as well and stop preaching the nonsense that trade agreements are the panacea for all the ills of world trade and will insure world peace. It is high time that our State Department learned the facts of life relative to world trade.

When we realize that the regulation of foreign trade by all the other nations of the earth is predicated on economic necessity and with a view to national security, we shall stop being naive in the belief that this one-way reciprocity of ours is going to change the actions of the other nations.

This program of ours cannot possibly be successful in the next decade, at least.

Take a look at Europe. We have within the Russian orbit, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, Austria, Hungary—and only time and the Politburo can name the others. There surely can be no freeing of trade within those nations; Russia will see to that.

On the other hand, we have the many countries of sterling block and empire preferences within the British Dominion. The United Kingdom would commit economic suicide if they abandoned these two trade procedures. You can be certain that she will not do that. In fact, Sir Stafford Cripps stated, at Geneva a few days ago, that Britain must continue empire preference tariffs.

Let us survey the situation in Latin and Central America. At Chapultepec we were soundly rebuffed in our suggestions of eliminating tariffs and practicing free trade within the Americas. Our neighbors to the south very wisely and again realistically stated their insistence on protecting their existing and contemplated new industries. Some of their actions which I have quoted, indicate their intentions. At Geneva the representatives of both Chile and Brazil recently frankly confirmed those intentions.

Asia holds out no great hopes of effectuating this program. India who has empire preference tariffs has been feverishly industrializing and has been rigidly controlling its imports and currency. China is in the throes of civil war which may last for generations. It will take Japan many decades to return to economic normalcy. Korea and Manchuria are in the Russian orbit. In addition to these areas, we find nation after nation resorting to state trading under socialism, communism, and authoritarianism. The question naturally arises, which are the countries whose trade barriers we possibly can reduce? I believe the answer to that question is self-evident. In pursuing this ephemeral objective we are consistently jeopardizing the jobs of our American workers whose standards of living are the highest, by far, of all the nations of the earth.

If there was evidence of one burning desire on the part of the American public last November, it was to return to democratic processes of government. Our country has issued a mandate to the Executive and to Congress to rid them of bureaucratic, unconstitutional controls. The Constitution has placed in the hands of the Congress the important power of levying tariffs. It is their duty to see that they are properly and equitably administered. It is time that Congress again assumes its obligations and divests us of this unconstitutional delegation of power.

However, it has been often stated that repeal or a weakening of this act would cause serious repercussions to our attempts at insuring the future peace of the world. I question the validity of that contention. However, the intensive propaganda disseminated by the State Department and others, currently, has, no doubt, created just such a thought, as it was so intended, in the minds of the many member governments of the United Nations.

As a result, Senators VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN have agreed to compromise provisions to eliminate the possibilities of imperiling American industries through tariff reductions in future trade agreements.

We have currently heard repeatedly from them, as well as from the proponents of this act, of the great benefits of so-called escape clauses to be incorporated in future trade agreements, patterned after that clause in the Mexican agreement. Let us not be lulled into acceptance of such assurances. There has been no evidence in the past of any desire to invoke these escape provisions; and this power still remains in the same hands. The interests of our industries under current tariff procedure will ever be subordinated to diplomatic expediency and international pressures.

Furthermore, suppose we grant as an assumption that escape clauses will be invoked in future trade agreements. How about the existing agreements under which tariff rates have already injured American industries? What is to be done about them?

Escape clauses have been a part of almost all agreements written to date, principally those provisions making changes permissible due to currency depreciation. I defy the Department of State to show one instance in which they have been invoked in 12 years, despite very violent currency devaluation.

Recent statements in the press report that Mr. Truman will give serious consideration to recalling tariff cuts in future trade agreements if they imperil American industry. He and his predecessor have had that power since 1934. Again, I defy him to indicate one instance in which he has acted to save an American industry.

If it be determined essential that trade agreements be negotiated in the future and if their proponents within the administration are sincere in their oft-expressed desire to insure the future of threatened American industries, I offer the following suggestions for adoption:

1. A mandatory automatic provision for the immediate invoking of compensatory tariffs to adjust any devaluation of currency exceeding 10 percent.

2. A mandatory provision requiring the President to adjust United States tariffs to equalize landed costs of foreign products with American selling prices of like or similar articles whenever it shall be found upon investigation of the United States Tariff Commission in public hearing, that an established American industry is being injured or threatened because of duty reductions made in any trade agreement. Such hearing shall be called at the request of such American industry.

3. Restore the application of the provisions of sections 336 and 516 B of the Tariff Act of 1930 to items, the duties of which have been reduced or bound in trade agreements. The restoration of section 336 will effectuate my second suggestion.

The restoration of section 516 B will grant to an aggrieved industry the constitutional privilege of litigating matters arising out of trade agreements.

4. Make it obligatory that the State Department publish the specific items of a tariff paragraph that are to be negotiated and the contemplated reductions in tariffs, prior to public hearings preceding trade negotiations. Only with that knowledge can an industry present to our negotiators relevant facts in defense of their future welfare.

I offer these recommendations as a realistic approach to the political as well as the economic phases of this problem. We are most unalterably opposed to reciprocal trade agreements as enacted in the 13 years of the existence of this act. They have not reduced trade barriers except our own tariffs.

That statement has been confirmed by Mr. Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, on March 17 last. Before the World Conference on Mineral Resources, he stated that world-trade barriers are far worse now than before the war and that international trade pacts had failed. He further stated "much of the world's trade today is carried on within a framework of specific quota restrictions. These, obviously, are likely to be much more harmful than tariffs." That, from the lips of one of our chief proponents of trade agreements. And we have been jeopardizing our industries through tariff reductions for 13 years to accomplish that.

Never before were truer words uttered than those of Senator HUGH BUTLER, when he recently stated that the reciprocal trade-agreement program was a "gigantic hoax on the American public." A gigantic hoax, indeed, it has been. Mr. Thorp's remarks acknowledge the bankruptcy and futility of this program. As a matter of record, there is ample evidence of a lack of a sincere desire on our part to reduce trade barriers of other nations, except those of the United States.

Our State Department was fully aware of the fact that France raised their tariffs prior to specific negotiations for bargaining purposes. The secrecy preceding the news exposure of preliminary negotiations with Argentina had, in my opinion, sinister significance. Except in the single instance of our objections to Sweden's bilateral trade agreement with Russia, we have remained mute while practically every nation with whom we have negotiated trade treaties have effected bilateral agreements, have invoked exchange controls, import quotas, import licensing, application of varying currency values to various nations, continuous increases in their tariffs, embargoes, internal taxes, and surcharge taxes on our imports and devaluation of currencies, all contrary to our agreements. This program is bankrupt. How much longer must we pursue it?

Unless one is possessed with a fanatical desire to destroy our standards of living for which we have worked so diligently, or to effect social revolution, it just does not make sense.

In view of the many acknowledged evidences of the infiltration of disloyal forces within our Government, it is well to question the purposes of our continued advocacy of reduced tariffs and in fact, free trade. For let us remember that the founder of communism, Karl Marx, categorically indorsed free trade. He stated that free trade broke up old nationalities and hastened the social revolution.

You are to be soon confronted with consideration of our participation in an International Trade Organization. We firmly indorse such participation but we unalterably oppose participation in the contemplated organization as proposed in the so-called preliminary redraft of a charter for an International Trade Organization, as published recently by our Department of State. That is a plan for world collectivism, which may well sound the death knell of American free enterprise and delegates to an international authority the control of our economy.

It is a pity that such a document has been promulgated. There is such obvious need for an organization to aid in the encouragement of world trade procedures that no argument need be advanced to prove the case for it. Why the gentlemen within whose province it was to phrase the contemplated charter, have vitiated its possibilities of acceptance by attempting, in one fell swoop, to cure all of the economic ills of the world, is beyond comprehension. To study with you the 89 articles incorporated in this charter would require weeks instead of minutes of your time. There are, of course, many beneficial proposals that should be a part of any International Trade Organization that may be ultimately adopted.

Due to restrictions of time, I shall confine my remarks to but a few of the most objectionable articles.

Under chapter III, article 2, on employment, we may well transfer the right to jobs for workers to the dictates of an international authority. That article provides, in the event that our own domestic measures do not accomplish "effective demand and employment," they "should be supplemented by international action." There we have pregnant possibilities for a world WPA, CPA, or OPA.

I refer you to chapter IV, article 12, paragraphs I, II, III, and IV. Under those provisions we shall have agreed to furnish to any member nation, in fact any business entity or any private individual within any member nation, within our power to do so, the capital, materials, equipment, advance technologies, trained workers, and managerial skill necessary for the establishment within that nation of any industry which is now existent in the United States.

Due to our wage rates, which are exceedingly higher than those of the rest of the world, we have been compelled to develop technologies which in some industries have made it possible to export their products to the rest of the world on a competitive price basis. In the cases of other industries, those technologies have made possible competing with foreign products in the United States, despite tariffs insufficient to equalize wage differentials.

Such a provision, together with our current program to reduce our tariffs further, can do nought but bring economic chaos and reduce our standards of living to the average mean-low world standards.

Let us not believe for a moment that the gentlemen of our Department of State, have not in mind the serious fulfillment of that provision.

With Export-Import Bank funds they have already been doing just that. We have constructed one of the most modern steel plants in Volta Redondo, Brazil, with United States funds, technologies, materials, equipment and managerial skill. A huge and most modern textile plant has been constructed in Mexico under the same circumstances. Our State Department has been quite vociferous in announcing their plans for the continuance of this procedure.

Under chapter IV, article 24, provisions are set forth for so-called "reciprocal and mutually advantageous negotiations" for reductions in tariffs, in other words, trade agreements.

You have already heard from me on that question, but under this article, something new has been added. We are to be coerced and intimidated into reductions in our tariffs at the request of any member nation. If we do not see fit to reduce our tariffs, say on laces, at the request of the French Government, they are empowered to lodge a complaint with International Trade Organization. If the member governments sustain their complaint, ITO may withhold from us any of the tariff benefits which we shall have obtained under trade agreements negotiated under this article. This is not only tariff writing by coercion, but an invitation to international log-rolling and will set up irritants that can well be inimical to the basic objectives of any international trade organization.

Under article 24, we are now negotiating 17 trade agreements with 16 countries, at Geneva. How any results can be expected from such complicated procedures, is beyond my ken. Sir Stafford Cripps, chairman of the British Board of Trade, has currently stated that nothing like it has ever been attempted in the history of the world, except in the Tower of Babel.

From the Conference of British Empire Nations, held prior to the Geneva Convention, has come the inference that if the United States did not agree to reduce its tariffs on cotton and woolen textiles by 50 percent, there was no need for those nations to go to Geneva.

There you observe, is the first indication of tariff writing by intimidation. Here we have a nation, who through necessity, I admit, is practicing the most rigid control of her foreign trade, attempting to coerce the United States into further tariff reductions, and we practice today the freest trade of any nation of the world.

Under chapter VII, entitled "Inter-Governmental Commodity Arrangements," we shall indeed give away our birthright. I quote article 3:

"To provide, during the period which may be necessary, a framework for the consideration and development of measures which will have as their purpose economic adjustments designed to promote expansion of consumption or of a shift of resources and manpower out of overexpanded industries into new and productive enterprises. To fortify and augment those contemplated actions we find in article 52, paragraph 3, second part, the following:

"Such agreements shall be subject not only to the principles set forth in this chapter, but also to any other requirements which the organization may establish."

The commodity dictators of ITO can well regulate our domestic production and employment under that provision, which is contrary to the very principles of our Republic and in defiance of the mandate of the American public on November 5, last.

I pray that Congress will adopt a charter for an international trade organization, but one divested of such provisions as are so inimical to our heritage of freedom.

Department of Labor Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial which appeared in

the Milwaukee Journal of April 15, 1947, entitled "Mr. Schwellenbach's Protest." This editorial very properly criticizes the action of the majority members of the House subcommittee handling the appropriation for the Department of Labor, and characterizes that action as "irresponsible and false economy." It seems to me that it is appropriate to insert this editorial at this time because of the general interest which was engendered by the action of the majority.

The editorial follows:

MR. SCHWELLENBACH'S PROTEST

Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach seems justified in his complaint against the way the House and its appropriations committee dealt with the Labor Department's appropriation. The House did not vote to liquidate the Labor Department, as some labor leaders are charging, but it certainly moved to cripple it.

The Department of Labor is one of the smallest in the Government. It employs about 6,700 persons. Its operations budget, approved by President Truman and the Budget Bureau, was $31,850,000. The House Appropriations Committee slashed this by $12,000,000 and the House itself pared another $1,000,000—to come from the Bureau of Labor Statistics fund. The total budget cut would be 43 percent.

Schwellenbach has told the Senate that if the House budget were approved, he would have to discharge 2,800 persons and make a drastic cut in services to the public. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, he said, would have to change its monthly consumer price index to a quarterly basis, discontinue retail food-price indexes for a number of cities, and drop monthly national reports on employment, hours, and pay roll. The Conciliation Service would be left without directing heads.

The Employment Service budget was cut 80 percent. Schwellenbach said this would necessitate elimination of all aid to State employment services and leave the bureau little more than a bookkeeping agency. The Division of Labor Standards would have to halt its program of industrial safety promotion. The Wage and Hour Division would have to reduce its regional offices and cut its inspection force by 25 percent.

There is undoubtedly room for cuts in the Labor Department budget, sizeable ones. It does seem, however, that the House used the cleaver rather than the paring knife. The result would seem to be some irresponsible and false economy. After all, reliable labor statistics, strike conciliation, and betterment of labor standards, benefit industry and the Nation as well as labor.

It will be well if the Senate treats the Labor Department budget with more reason and less emotion than the House apparently did. The country needs an efficient Department of Labor, now if ever.

Playing Politics?—David Lawrence Calls on President To Be Realistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in last evening's Washington Star appeared an article by David Lawrence entitled, "Politics Seen Dealing Blow to Economy," which I sincerely hope came to the notice of President Truman. I also hope that he took the article to heart.

Mr. Speaker, the country demands labor legislation and tax reduction and the Congress will give heed to these demands. Already the House of Representatives, under its able leadership, has passed an excellent labor measure, also H. R. 1 to reduce personal income taxes. We have faith that the Senate will be equally responsive to popular demand and that both measures will receive Executive approval.

Mr. Lawrence's able and understandable analysis of the situation follows:

POLITICS SEEN DEALING BLOW TO ECONOMY—TRUMAN REASONING ON WAGES AND TAXES CALLED CURIOUS

(By David Lawrence)

Something curious is happening to the reasoning processes of the Truman administration—something that may result in a serious blow at the American economy.

The administration, on the one hand, is saying that it would be inflationary to reduce taxes and put extra money into the pockets of the people and, on the other hand, it is encouraging wage increases which also put extra money into the pockets of certain workers and is saying nothing about this inflationary trend.

The tax reduction is spread straight across the board, affecting all people, while the wage increases affect a small segment where union pressure or political influence of the administration causes an uneven application of the wage-increase idea.

The Congress last year passed a law creating an Economic Council and experts have been appointed to it, but the political views of the administration seem to have pervaded the so-called economic theory that emanates nowadays from the Government. The argument against tax reduction while encouraging wage increases is a case in point.

RECESSION IS IN SIGHT

Most serious, however, is the fact that high prices are not being really remedied. In many instances industries cannot reduce prices even if wages are kept at present levels. Other industries where the labor cost is the paramount factor will find it necessary to increase prices if wage increases are forced on them by unions.

A recession is in sight but union labor leaders, aided and abetted by President Truman's misguided remarks, are slowly but surely threatening something more serious than a recession. Already many companies which had high profits in 1946 are finding their profits absorbed by high costs of materials. Already, also, many companies which have the capital available to use for new equipment and for expansion have stopped their buying because they cannot pay the high prices involved either in equipment or materials. Such prices cannot, in various instances, be reduced because the labor cost will not come down.

It had been hoped that the increased wages would mean increase in output per man and that in this way price reductions could be brought about. But the increase in output per man-hour has been alarmingly small since VJ-day and the disappointment that has swept industry over the failure of labor to cooperate in increasing output is noticeable.

ISSUE TO BE FORCED

It looks now as if wages will not be revised downward as they were in the recession after World War I and that the union pressure will be adequate to maintain high wage scales. This ultimately will mean a tremendous unemployment roll for America. Companies will force the issue by laying off men and insisting on higher output per man.

The rise of unemployment will be more serious this time than it was after World War I because the wages paid now are higher in total and the cut in family income will be felt more acutely. Employers, however, who have to meet expenses will have no alternative but to cut down their number of employees. This is already happening in some industries.

President Truman's responsibility for the debacle will become clearer as unemployment grows. For he has supported the unionized group's wage demands and compelled the unorganized workers and persons on State, city, and Federal pay rolls, who have had no commensurate increases in income, to foot the bill. These people cannot continue to buy, and that will be one of the factors in the eventual drop off of retail sales in various communities.

The economy is out of balance because the politicians, led by the President, have put it out of balance. All the political speeches denouncing business and encouraging wage groups to ask for more pay at the expense of the other groups in the community will not erase the facts when they emerge—as they certainly will before the end of 1947.

Why Export Our Pay Rolls?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting testimony offered before the Ways and Means Committee in opposition to the free trade reciprocal trade agreements. Those who are opposed to bartering away our markets to the detriment of our economy may well read this testimony of Mr. Arthur Besse, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, before the Ways and Means Committee, April 25, 1947:

There are a number of circumstances in connection with the negotiations for the multilateral trade agreements and the formation of an international trade organization which strike one as exceedingly curious.

One is the fact that the United States delegation, which appears to believe that these devices will prove of substantial aid in developing backward countries and in rebuilding war devastated nations, appears also to consider it necessary to bribe other nations to join an international organization set up ostensibly for their benefit. We induced England to support the idea of an international trade organization with a loan. We are now seeking to induce her to reduce her Empire preferences by offering reductions in our tariff rates. We go about the world sowing the seeds of what we mistakenly think is "good will" by trying to induce or coax nations into doing things they will not do of their own volition. We solicit members for an international trade organization by offering freer access to our American markets and proposing restrictions which at least appear to give other nations the means of protecting themselves against competition from our exports.

Another curious fact is the haste to conclude new reciprocal trade agreements at a time when there are no bench marks to indicate normal price levels and no data on which to base a judgment of the adequacy

of existing tariffs either of the United States or of other countries. There are no impediments to international trade today except the scarcity of goods to trade. But our State Department insists on cutting tariffs which it believes may be impediments a few years hence when economic conditions become more stable. How can this be done under delegated powers which provide that the President must find as a fact that certain barriers are unduly burdening and restricting foreign trade at the present time? And why the haste anyway? Could it be because certain people feel future conditions are apt to show that our tariffs are already too low, and they, therefore, wish to commit us to foreign nations now in the hope that we might hesitate to denounce an international agreement once it has been accepted.

Another very curious aspect is the different emphasis on international trade which is characteristic of our State Department representatives according to the audience which they address. In the United States, the emphasis is on exports. We are led to believe that the United States is to have more and more exports; we are to get rich supplying everything to everybody, whether they have the means of paying for it or not. There are to be a few more imports but not enough to disturb any American industry.

But observe the change in emphasis when the benefits of a trade agreement or an international trade organization are explained to foreigners. The foreigner is to have easier access to our markets; we are to remove the barriers that may prevent the foreign producers from sending vastly increased quantities of goods to this country. We want a little something in return, of course, but have indicated that we will not be too technical over the adoption of quotas, exchange restrictions, and other devices which might serve to invalidate concessions which foreign countries may accord us. We provide in the International Trade Organization Charter that if the monetary reserves of other nations are threatened, they may adopt restrictions to exclude our exports; and that if other nations wish to embrace state trading, they may exclude our products by the use of quotas or import licenses. We further stipulate that we will not seek by trade action to frustrate the purposes of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund. We thus, in effect, agree to prevent our nationals from promoting a drive for exports since, if such a drive were successful, it would make dollars scarce abroad and thus frustrate the purposes of the fund.

Our aims, as explained to the citizens of this country, seem somewhat different than they do when they are set forth for the enlightenment of the representatives of foreign nations.

This inconsistency perhaps springs not primarily from an intention to deceive, but rather from the fact that our State Department does not fully comprehend some of the essential factors governing trade between nations.

The Department appears to make two very fundamentally incorrect assumptions: The first is that international trade is an end in itself. The second is that tariffs serve no useful purpose, were adopted in error, and should be abandoned.

The thesis that international trade is an end in itself was clearly developed by Mr. Clayton in his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee on March 20, 1947. Here is what Mr. Clayton said:

"Chapter III (of the ITO Charter) relates to employment. This chapter gives recognition to the fact that trade may be seriously affected by changes in the level of business activity and employment in important member countries. In recognition of the importance of this fact, members obligate themselves to take action designed to achieve and maintain full and productive employment and high and stable levels of effective demand within their own jurisdiction."

Note the curious thinking here. Full and productive employment and high levels of demand are not to be promoted for their own sake but because international trade may be adversely affected if the level of business activity and employment should decline. Mr. Clayton seems to believe that it is not business and employment which are important but international trade. I cannot believe that one who makes such a statement has a carefully-thought-out concept of international trade.

Mr. Clayton's preoccupation with the mere volume of foreign trade is evident throughout his testimony. He said:

"The abolition of quantitative restrictions will do more to bring about the expansion of our trade and the trade of other countries than any other single step that can be taken in the field of commercial policy."

And in speaking further of quantitative restrictions states:

"I would only add by way of general comment on these provisions that only by the expansion of international trade to the maximum extent of every country's ability to do so can these balance-of-payments restrictions be gotten rid of. It is only as countries in financial difficulty are able to export and obtain foreign exchange that they will be able to relax the restrictions imposed for balance-of-payments reasons."

It is evident that Mr. Clayton believes that if international trade can only somehow be made big enough, the present economic inequalities between nations will be wiped out. Recent history proves him wrong, and logic would seem to indicate that mere volume of trade is no answer to the world's ills.

Mr. Clayton's ideas are the same he expressed in 1945 when the trade agreements amendment was before this committee for consideration. At that time, he envisaged an export trade of ten billions. It is now running at the rate of more than thirteen billions, and none of the advertised benefits of increased volume are in evidence. In fact, it is freely admitted that never before in the history of the world have so many barriers to trade existed. Most of these barriers are those raised by foreign nations. They have not been raised in retaliation for the Hawley-Smoot tariff as some of our so-called economists insisted was the case with the barriers of the early thirties.

These new barriers were developed as a means of self-preservation, which, of course, was the purpose of like barriers in the thirties. To worry too much over these barriers is to worry over the symptoms and ignore the cause.

No matter how many barriers you may remove nor how much you may increase the aggregate of the international swapping of commodities, the cause of unbalanced foreign trade remains untouched. So long as the productivity of the United States exceeds that of the other countries of the world the other nations of the world must retain barriers limiting their purchase of our goods; otherwise they will not be able to pay for the goods with which we may supply them. It does no good to rail about the barriers. The only way you can provide for freer trade is to reduce our standard of productivity or increase the productivity standards of the rest of the world.

We certainly would not want to reduce our productivity standards, so the obvious thing is to help in raising the productivity standards of other countries. But we do not do that by asking them to reduce tariffs so we can make goods for them. The right method would be to let them erect barriers against the importation of our goods so that they could develop their own production. And those barriers would presumably continue until the other countries had developed their production to a point which was roughly on an equality with our own. The point at which these foreign barriers could be removed would be the point where they were no longer needed, which, of course, is equivalent to saying that their removal would not increase international trade in the slightest. This illustrates a point which seems little understood, namely, that the only barriers which can safely be removed are those the removal of which will be substantially without effect.

A case in point may be found in the last annual report of the Australian Tariff Board. The board stated that Australia might be able to offer substantial reductions of duties on a wide range of British goods because the Australian costs of production are now much closer to British than before the war and "manufacturers who in 1939 would probably have been unable to compete with British supplies without protection now seem able to do so." In other words, now that a reduction can be made without affecting trade, Australia is willing to make it.

Mr. Harry Hawkins, of the State Department, falls into the same error when he says that the object of the International Trade Organization and the reciprocal trade agreements is to "squeeze out the excess water" in tariff rates and cut those which are unnecessarily high. If one can be sure that a tariff is unnecessarily high, there can be no logical objection to a reduction; but, if the reduced rate is still high enough to accomplish its purpose, the State Department does not secure the increase in foreign trade which it so ardently desires.

Mr. Clayton shows the same lack of realism when he says that the record discloses no instance of an industry which has been hurt by the operation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and further, that no industry will be hurt. Mr. Clayton is not quite correct about the record, but it is correct to say that not many industries have been hurt. This fact may be attributed to the war, however, and not to the alleged care with which tariff reductions have been made. By the same token, foreign producers have not yet been helped by the reductions made pursuant to these reciprocal trade agreements.

In saying that domestic producers have not been hurt, Mr. Clayton is saying, in effect, that foreign producers have not been helped. I find it difficult to understand how he justifies the use of the phrase "tried and proven system of tariff reductions under the reciprocal trade agreements." If it is true, as Mr. Clayton claims, that previous reductions have had no effect on domestic producers, what is it that has been proved? The fact of the matter is that you do not help a foreign producer unless you give him a part of our domestic market, and you cannot give a foreign producer a part of our market without taking it away from our own producers.

This is where the tariff comes in. A tariff is not, as Mr. Clayton seems to believe, an abomination; it is a device to reserve certain parts of our market for our own producers. It may be that we are producing things in this country which we should give up producing here and buy abroad; but, if there are such items, nobody in the State Department has publicly told us what they are. And we cannot go on whittling away our tariff structure unless we want to face the prospect of losing those industries which the tariff was designed to promote.

From Geneva comes word that underdeveloped countries insist that they must maintain tariff protection "while they industrialize their economies." That industrialization must, of course, continue to be protected unless it progresses to a point where it equals our own. In the same way, certain industries in this country must continue to be protected if we want to keep them. These are industries, such as the one with which I am connected, which do not lend themselves

to extensive mechanization. These industries, whose products have a relatively high manpower content, cannot compete with low-paying producers abroad without some tariff protection. No decision has been made that we no longer want these industries; in fact, the matter has not even been discussed. And yet the State Department negotiators are in Geneva prepared to give away the tariffs that have made it possible for us to retain these industries.

Mr. Clair Wilcox stated at the opening of the conference in Geneva that "the United States had sent its delegation to the conference, prepared for bargaining, armed with lists of commodities upon which it is willing to lower tariffs. What he did not say was that the lists also show how great a cut the delegation is prepared to make in each of the items on the list of commodities. Our delegation is willing to lower tariffs. The delegation has no possible knowledge of what the effect of such cuts will be. Obviously, they will have little effect at the moment. But what their effect will be 3 or 5 years hence no one knows. And all this is done in accordance with Mr. Clayton's theory that the more international trade the better. If the tariff cuts now contemplated do result in increased imports—which can be their only purpose—those imports will be at the expense of our own producers of the items to be imported. And who benefits? Presumably the exporter of some product that is made by some industry that has produced or wants to produce more than is needed for our own consumption. But should the State Department be allowed to exercise the authority to say that we must provide for the export of Hollywood movies by cutting back our textile production; that we should promote the export of burly tobacco by a reduction in our output of pottery; or that it is essential to export automobiles even though we have to take chemicals in exchange and thereby restrict our chemical industry?

It appears certain that the State Department officials are completely unsympathetic to the idea of tariffs, if indeed they understand them at all. Their statement that they realize that we cannot adopt free trade immediately certainly suggests that they would like to if they dared.

Mr. Clayton said before this committee on March 26 last that "ground was lost during and after the war" in the checking of foreign barriers against United States trade and that that ground "can be regained only through prompt and vigorous action along the same lines as those followed in the trade agreements program in the past." This is a confession that, despite the concessions which we made in our tariffs, things are worse now than when we started to cut our own rates in the 30's.

But it is also a confession that Mr. Clayton does not realize why foreign nations have resorted to trade barriers. It would appear that he does not appreciate that because of economic dislocation foreign countries have erected these barriers as a means of self-preservation. England has not recently increased the duty on tobacco because her Government believes the British smoke too much or because the Government wants to grow tobacco in Cornwall but because the government wants to use its dollar credits for other more important purposes. I admit it is tough on our tobacco growers, but it sounds intelligent from England's point of view. On the other hand, England's high tariff on optical products is not due to a fear that her people will spend an excessive quantity of dollars for American-made kodaks or for German field glasses, but is for the express purpose of protecting her own optical industry, which England believes is important to maintain. That also sounds intelligent to me.

It is, I believe, equally intelligent to maintain certain industries in all countries, including the United States of America. And I certainly do not believe we should give away our tariffs, which are the means of maintaining certain of our industries, unless we first decide that those are industries we should dispense with.

If Mr. Clayton is sincere in telling our industries that no one will be hurt, he cannot be sincere in explaining to other nations the virtues of expanding world trade and in promising them easy access to United States markets. He cannot give the same market to foreign nations that he promises our own producers they will be allowed to keep.

Through the impractical nature of the proposals for an international trade organization and through the continuance of the so-called reciprocal trade-agreements program, we are building up another mirage of promises and setting the stage for future disappointments. Just as we promised the world democracy and freedom from want, we are now promising them economic salvation through world trade. It is, I am afraid, another mirage. Economic salvation can come only through production. Trade is not a stimulus to production; it is production which is a stimulus to trade.

I have had the privilege of appearing before this committee on each occasion when the reciprocal trade agreements amendment has been up for renewal. I am here today not to completely restate my views on foreign trade but rather to make a single point. That point is important because the proposals of the State Department contemplate a continuance of the reciprocal trade agreements program as an integral part of the International Trade Organization. If incorporated in the charter for an International Trade Organization as now proposed and approved by the Congress, section B of chapter V would provide for an indefinite extension of the trade-agreements program, now scheduled to terminate in June 1948.

The trade-agreements program is a mistake; it should not be continued. In essence, this program seeks to induce other nations to give concessions which they are loath to make in return for concessions we offer to them. And the concessions we accord them are bound either to be less valuable than the foreign countries have been led to expect, in which case they are dissatisfied, or more serious in their effects on our producers than we intended, in which case we will have to withdraw them by invoking the escape clauses.

The agreements cannot be of any particular benefit to foreign producers unless our tariff rates are cut to a point where our domestic producers surrender a part of the United States market to foreign competitors. That is something we should not consider unless there are certain of our own industries that Congress believes we can afford to dispense with. That is a frank statement of the problem before you.

More Cities Cut Prices 10 Percent as Newburyport Plan Gains Momentum

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE J. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this plan has attracted Nationwide interest. A report has been made of the success of the plan by Dorothea Andrews in today's Washington Post.

I am sure that the report will be of tremendous interest to everyone in respect to lower prices to the consumer public. It follows:

NEWBURYPORT STORES JAMMED AS PLAN BOOSTS SALES 30–200 PERCENT

(By Dorothea Andrews)

NEWBURYPORT, MASS., April 24.—There has not been so many people here since the circus.

They have been coming in all day from all around to take advantage of the Newburyport plan—to see if it actually works. They are housewives and businessmen and the curious. They are flocking into local stores at such a rate that they make normal Saturday sales look like poor business.

A checkup showed just how much Newburyport business had picked up. Stores representing various business classifications checked their traffic and increase in dollar volume over a normal Thursday with these results:

Men's clothing, 100-percent increase in both;

Women's clothing, 200-percent increase in both;

Department store, 110-percent increase in dollar volume, 100-percent increase in traffic.

EVERYTHING PICKS UP

Hardware, 45 percent in dollar value, 38 percent increase in traffic.

Drug stores, 75 percent traffic, 46 to 60 percent in dollar value.

Jewelry, 55 percent increase in traffic, 40 percent in dollar value.

Specialty, 78 percent in dollar volume, 60 percent in traffic.

Children's stores, 75 percent increase in dollar volume, 55 percent in traffic.

Filling stations—two stations checked reported biggest increase in traffic and dollar volume since 1936.

Grocery store, 35 percent increase in volume and in traffic.

Even cocktail lounges reported a 30 percent boost in drink sales.

You can't find anybody around who doesn't know what the Newburyport plan is—and that goes for the merchants in the nearby towns who are even now in the process of deciding whether they will adopt it or not.

Take Amesbury, 3 miles away, for instance. The plan just went into effect there yesterday. A housewife went into a shoe store and asked for a pair of shoes. The merchant found her a pair she liked and quoted a price.

WAIT FOR MARK-DOWN

"O. K.," she said, "and how about the 10 percent off?"

"That starts tomorrow," he said.

"I can wait until tomorrow," was her reply.

One woman in Newburyport today from Hampton, N. H., bought a pair of white shoes for her small daughter. "They were only $3.65 with the 10 percent off, and I grabbed them," she said.

At the consumer end there is already no doubt that Newburyport has made a hit with its plan.

John Swanson, who conceived the idea in the first place, feels it already has had this effect:

"Anybody who comes out today and announces a price increase—brother, he's on the spot right now."

Newburyporters believe public pressure in the surrounding area is mounting for adoption of their plan. Already a representative of the Essex County Associated Boards of Trade has come to town with a request for full information on the plan. In the surrounding area, the cities of Lynn, Beverly, and Lawrence have sent specific queries. Other Essex County towns are expected to act on the trade board's information.

Meetings are being held or being planned to take some action on the plan—it is not something merchants in this area can afford to ignore.

One of the most hopeful signs for success of the plan came today, with the first replies of local suppliers, queried on their cooperation in the plan.

Two auto accessory firms—the first to reply—both pledged their cooperation. One firm ordered a 10-percent discount to any store in any community which adopted the Newburyport plan, or any similar price rollback plan.

The American Optical Co. has pledged a 10-percent across-the-board cut in its prices. So has the Norwalk Tire Co. The Eagle Mattress Co. has pledged 10-percent cuts to any store that cooperates in the plan.

Hyannis, Mass., has adopted the plan. Inquiries have come from Selma, Ala.; Gary, Ind.; Wayne, Mich.; Burlington, Vt.; Lansford, Pa.; Oldtown, Maine; Swarthmore, Pa.; Hingham, Malden, and Hudson, Mass. The National Association of Dealers wants full information on just how this plan works.

The snowball is gathering momentum. Aptly enough, at the Unitarian Church here, this week's public message is an old Chinese proverb:

"The man who removed the mountain began by carrying away the small stones."

There are all kinds of symptoms here of success for the Newburyport plan. And the men who have put that plan across—the men who haven't even had time to say "hello" to their wives for the last 4 days—are convinced that the plan will work anywhere.

"All you need is the cooperation of five men, in five different classifications of business. When they come in, nobody can afford to stay out." And that's what they are telling the people from all over.

"Everybody has been 'bellyaching' about prices," said Swanson today. "The retailer and the jobber weren't doing anything, and manufacturers were waiting to see what labor would do. And all the time the consumer has been getting madder and madder.

"Now, Newburyport has this plan. It proves to me that the average merchant is more concerned with the Nation's welfare than with immediate profits. And so ought everybody to be."

The Newburyporters are sure that everybody is. Over in Amesbury, they're asking them to call it the Newburyport-Amesbury plan.

"Too late for that now," they say.

And over in Haverhill, they can't seem to make up their minds because some of the merchants are still mad about what happened last Saturday. They decided to have a holiday because it was April 19. And then some of the stores stayed open anyhow. So the other stores had sales on Monday to make up the difference. But the Newburyporters believe the merchants there will patch up their difference and get on the ball soon.

Late today this belief was borne out when it was learned that some independent merchants in Haverhill already had adopted the Newburyport plan, and that a meeting, scheduled for next Monday has been moved up to tomorrow to discuss all elements of the proposal.

Where Karl Marx Went Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I desire to call to the attention of the Congress and the country the following transcript of an interesting and informative broadcast recently delivered by former Congressman Samuel B. Pettengill over the network of the American Broadcasting Co.

The sound sense and the accents on Americanism which high light this broadcast are so important and impressive that it would be well if Mr. Pettengill's comments on this subject could be read by every school and college student in America.

We hear so much about "What's wrong with America" that it is both refreshing and reassuring to read this candid commentary on "What's right with America." Mr. Speaker, we can never hope to make America synonymous with Utopia but as we proceed toward that goal, as we unceasingly should and must, let us not lose sight of the multitudinous advantages which are already ours. Above all, let us not discard the formula which has made us great as we seek to evolve procedures for making us even greater.

The transcript follows:

WHERE KARL MARX WENT WRONG

Now that the whole Nation is talking about the Communist threat to the country—at home and abroad—it seems a good time to ask what is really wrong with Marxism.

It was 99 years ago that Marx and Engels wrote the Communist manifesto which began with the words, "A specter is haunting Europe, the specter of communism." This sounds like today's newspaper. That was 1 year before gold was discovered in California; before the covered wagon began to roll across the plains. Please keep this date in mind. It is significant to what I shall say.

A little later, Marx, in London, wrote Das Kapital, the bible of the Communists and Socialists. As a reporter, Marx was accurate. The conditions of the workers in England a century ago, as he points out, were very grim. Women pulled canal boats along the towpath with ropes over their shoulders. Women were harnessed, like beasts of burden, to cars pulling coal out of British mines. In the textile mills, children began to work when they were 9 or 10 years old, and worked 12 to 15 hours a day. It was said that the beds in which they slept never got cold, as one shift took the place of the other. It was said that they were machines by day and beasts by night. Tuberculosis and other occupational disease killed them off like flies.

Conditions were terrible. Not only Marx, but other warm-hearted men, such as Charles Dickens, Ruskin, and Carlyle poured out a literature of protest which was read around the world.

On his facts, Marx can scarcely be challenged. But his diagnosis was wrong and, therefore, the remedy he prescribed was wrong also.

PREACHED GOSPEL OF HATE

Marx said these terrible conditions were due to greed, exploitation, the theft by the owners of the mines and mills of the "surplus value" produced by the workers. That was his diagnosis and therefore his remedy was to preach the gospel of hate, of the class struggle, of the redistribution of wealth, of the confiscation of property, and its ownership and management by the state, which always means the politicians.

Now, if that diagnosis and remedy were, and still are, in the main, correct we have no business fighting communism—either in Greece or in the United States. We should advocate it. It becomes mighty important to ask whether they were correct.

The diagnosis of Marx was partly correct. "Man's inhumanity to man" has always been a factor in human affairs. Greed can never be defended whether in business or government. Sympathy for the underdog will always have its work to do. Always, certainly, in Communist Russia—with its forced labor camps and human slavery.

Greed and exploitation are not cured by socialism. Stalin and Molotov live like oriental potentates with state dinners that would make Nero and Caligula green with envy. All this, in the name of the downtrodden proletariat.

But greed was not the main reason for the conditions which Marx described. If all the wealth of the owners of the mines and mills had been redistributed to the workers, it would have relieved their condition but slightly, and for but a little time.

So, the class struggle, as the remedy for these conditions was wrong. What was wrong? What was the real trouble?

LOW PRODUCTIVITY AT FAULT

It was the low productivity of the workers, and, as workers can be paid only out of production—whether in England a century ago or in Russia today—wages must be low and hours of work long when production is low.

Production was low because tools and equipment were poor, because human backs had to do what slaves of iron and steel do today here in America, because capital had not been accumulated to buy better tools, because freedom had so recently emerged from centuries of feudalism that the inventors and scientists and businessmen had not had a chance to dream and to plan. They have had that chance today here in America.

Listen! In 1940, before war increased our production, it was estimated that electric power alone in this country was performing work equal to the labor of half a billion men—500,000,000 men—working 8 hours a day. This is equal to nearly 10 times the total human labor force employed in America and 50 times the number employed in manufacturing, and that leaves out steam power and gasoline power and windmill power, with their tremendous contribution for increasing the productivity of workers and lifting burdens from human backs.

Is it any wonder that America outproduced the world in this last war? That wages are higher here than anywhere in the world?

While Marx preached the gospel of hate and the class struggle, America gave the green light to the Edisons, the Whitneys, the Burbanks, and the Fords.

James Watt, the inventor of the steam engine which revolutionized the modern world, and those who followed him in the competitive struggle to make a better engine and sell it for less, did more to take women out of the coal mines, and off the towpaths of the canal boats, more to take children out of the factories, than all the Socialists and Communists and politicians of the world combined.

CAPITALIST HELPED WATT

Yet Watt would be an unknown name today if one of these despised capitalists, a man named Matthew Boulton, had not risked $150,000 on Watt's invention. Would he, by the way, have dared to take that risk under today's taxation?

One measure of the progress of civilization is the mechanical horsepower and tools which supplement human labor. The steam engine did more to outlaw slavery, both in England and America, than all the political humanitarians put together. The laboratories do more for mankind than the legislatures.

Please understand me. Welfare legislation has its place. There must be laws to require safety appliances in coal mines—and they should be enforced, whether private owners or the Government runs them. There must be laws to require fire escapes from factories

and hotels. There must be laws to require the inspection of milk and meat. There must be laws for honest weights and measures. Otherwise, some men would risk death to human beings to make a greater profit.

I do not disparage such legislation at all. I endorse it as part of the responsibility of modern government.

I simply point out that if modern America were to go back to the same tools and horsepower that we had when Benjamin Franklin was trying to capture lightning from the sky our production of wealth would at once go down 90 percent, wages would go down in proportion, hours of labor would increase the limit of human endurance, and nothing that government, or humanitarians, or labor unions, or Karl Marx, could do would prevent it.

I mentioned the discovery of gold in California in connection with the Communist manifesto of 1848.

LACKED PROPER TOOLS

With pick and shovel and the pan with which men washed gravel from gold, did not men work long hours then for a meager return, or none? Did not they sleep in filthy cabins, live on jerked meat, and were covered with lice?

If you saw that great motion picture, The Covered Wagon, you will recall the scenes of terrible toil, of men and women and children pulling the wagons across rivers, and the trackless desert, and over the Continental Divide. Families, on foot, pushed hand carts from the Mississippi to Salt Lake.

Yet were those conditions due to greed and exploitation? No; they were working for themselves. What was wrong? Poor tools. The plow of the pioneer was a wooden plow, constantly breaking, constantly needing repairs. In a newspaper yesterday I saw a picture of a wooden plow used in Greece today.

Up in Vermont where I was raised, on land then worth $2 an acre, a man back in my great grandfather's time dug some iron ore out of a hill. He put 100 pounds in a bag on his back and walked 80 miles through the wilderness to sell it to an iron foundry in Troy, N. Y., and then walked home—an infinite expenditure of human energy for an insignificant return.

What was wrong? Greed? Exploitation? The class struggle? No. He was working for himself. There was no relationship of employer and employee. No one was stealing the surplus product of his labor. He got all of it—and it was little, indeed.

What was wrong? Why did he have to work so hard for so little? Poor tools. Today the steam engine, in the form of the modern locomotive, could move his 100 pounds of iron ore 80 miles for 4 cents—or a ton, 1 mile, for 1 cent. Railroads, paved highways, motortrucks, and automobiles have solved his problem, and will do it even better in the days to come if we stay American.

Let us say that James Watt, and the man who financed him, were not humanitarians. Let us say they put their brains and money together in a common enterprise for the profit motive. What of it? Was the result good or bad? Did they take the women out of the coal mines, or did Karl Marx with his gospel of hate and the class struggle?

What did the profit motive do? It made Watt and his partner, and all who followed them, work to make better engines and offer them at a lower price to get the market from their competitors.

Was the result good or bad? The profit motive is just as honorable and useful to mankind as the wage motive. Both can be pushed to excess. But, both do infinite good.

The wage motive prompts men to become skilled and efficient so they can produce more and earn more, and because they do, all of mankind benefits.

The profit motive prompts men to make better tools, to cut costs, to sell cheaper, and again all of mankind benefits.

The radio, that sold only 25 years ago for $300, now sells for $30, or less, and a better radio.

COMPETITIVE EFFORT NEEDED

Has the result of the competitive struggle in the world of radio been good or bad? The result has been good—humanitarian, if you please.

It brings the news of the world, good music, and discussion of public affairs to the remotest farmhouse, to people on their sickbeds. It was not many centuries ago when starvation was a common occurrence, even where 90 percent of the people lived on land—even in England.

Was the conquest of starvation a humanitarian thing? What conquered it? Who conquered it? Karl Marx? No.

The time in the field required to raise a bushel of wheat in America has gone down from 60 hours of human labor in 1830 to 2 hours or less in 1930. What did it? The steel plow, the tractor, the harvester, better seed, the conquest of insects and plant diseases, and cheap transportation. American wheat now feeds millions today in the Europe that is adopting the philosophy of Karl Marx.

Aluminum was so expensive in 1870 that Napoleon III of France had an aluminum table set for state dinners, more valuable than gold. Today aluminum is found in the American kitchen.

No, my friends; Karl Marx did not have the answer. He lifted no burdens from human backs. The answer is in free enterprise, kept competitive by antitrust and other laws. The answer is not in the class struggle. The answer is in the cooperation of inventor and investor, and manager and the worker with his "know how." The answer is to substitute slaves of iron and steel for the strength of human backs. The answer is constitutional liberty, which sets men free and says that what any man honestly makes is his "to have and to hold."

Wages can be paid only out of the product, and the larger the production the higher the wage. The more money that is invested in horsepower and equipment the more capital that is put to work, the less children and women and men have to work at killing toil.

Let's not divide mankind today in the struggle of classes. Let's unite men. In union there is strength. In harmony there is hope. Cooperation is Uncle Sam's middle name.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

High Cost of Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 21 fairly expresses some of the factors involved in food prices, but not all of the factors by any means:

HIGH COST OF FOOD

F. E. Berquist, economist for the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report, concludes that in general price advances have more than compensated for increases in wages and other costs. "This is confirmed," Mr. Berquist says, "by the very sharp rise in farm income and the markedly improved profits performance of both incorporated and unincorporated business." This recognition of the fact that many farmers as well as industrialists could afford to sell their products at lower prices at once raises the question whether any constructive steps can be taken to reduce prices.

As we have previously pointed out, some large business concerns have considerable leeway in determining their own selling policies and may decide that it is good policy to lower prices as a means of courting good will and helping to counteract dangerous inflationary forces. But it would be a sheer waste of voice to appeal to millions of individual farmers to take less for their products than buyers are willing to pay. Moreover, there are always marginal high-cost farmers who just about break even and would be forced out of production if prices were lowered. It is, therefore, easy to understand why Government spokesmen prefer to stress the importance of reducing prices of manufactured goods and soft pedal the evils of excessively high food prices which constitute the largest single item in family budgets.

However, mounting criticism of the Government's support-price program for farm products has put Secretary of Agriculture Anderson on the defensive. He is undoubtedly right in declaring that, at present, support operations are exerting comparatively little effect on living costs, excepting potatoes and a few other items. For the current prices obtained by farmers for wheat, and other grains, cotton, and livestock are well above the general support level of 90 percent of parity. Furthermore, Secretary Anderson contends that had it not been for consumer subsidies and support prices, which encouraged an expansion of output, food costs would be far higher than they are today.

Sustained high domestic demand, coupled with Government buying for foreign relief, coming at a time when supplies on hand were extremely low, has been a prime cause of the recent sharp rise in grain prices. On the other hand, price support encouraged overproduction of potatoes last year and resulted in the loss by rotting and deliberate destruction of millions of bushels of potatoes. The estimated cost of this one support program is $80,000,000. It is a foretaste of what may lie ahead should farm prices begin to drop within the next 2 years, and support prices once more have to be extensively relied upon to take unsalable crops off the market. Passage by the Senate of a bill providing price support during 1947 and 1948 for domestic wool at the 1946 level also shows that the Government's price-lifting program has not become an anachronism.

Since the Government is pledged to support farm prices until 1949, it may seem futile to emphasize the inconsistencies of its price policies. But it is important for the public to understand that the price-support program is a factor to be taken into account in considering the future course of agricultural prices. While there probably is not much that the Government can do at present to combat high prices of foodstuffs, it can do a great deal to avert price bulges by careful timing of its own purchasing programs. For the rest, we can only hope that bumper crops at home and improvement in agricultural conditions abroad will eventually bring relief from the pressure of excessively high food prices.

Mr. Berquist can find out, if he wishes to be factual, that some major food products already have had a reduction in prices. In fact, one of the dairy products had an OPA ceiling price, which was the selling price, of 45 percent more than the present support price.

Milk in Wisconsin has dropped $1.25 to $1.50 per hundredweight in price at the very time the producer was called upon to pay 20 percent more for what he buys. Maybe the farmer should pay more and more for what he buys and

take less and less for what he sells, but if this formula is put into operation one can expect to see another 5,000,000 people drift from the farms and small towns into the cities.

If the milkers in California are now receiving $245 per month and asking for an increase of $55 per month, just exactly who is going to reduce the price of milk to the consumer?

Secretary of Agriculture Anderson surely does not need to be on the defensive as this editorial states. When the people have the facts they have evidence that the support prices do not necessarily mean high prices. If properly administered, support prices can mean an adequate supply of food at fair prices. If a product has a support price of $1 a bushel and the consumer pays from $2.50 to $3 per bushel for the product there are most assuredly price-effecting factors involved of more importance than the support price.

A desirable approach for lower prices would be for the advocators to promote a reduction in their own salaries before they become too emphatic in their suggestions to lower the hourly wage of other people.

The recent 5-cents-per-pound drop in cheese prices and 4-cents-per-pound reduction in butter prices, advocated and caued no doubt by President Truman's speeches of late, put certain dairy farmers in a position of receiving below Steagall support. Can it be that President Truman is going to extend the "fur farmer formula" wherein American fur farmers are brought to the brink of ruin by the policies of the present administration? So long as the wool in a suit of clothes costs $3 and the suit costs $100 in the market place other factors than farm prices must have consideration.

Gagging America's Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from this morning's edition of the Herald Tribune of New York City discusses a problem which is of vital concern to all of us—what is to be done about America's publicity program abroad? It is becoming increasingly clear that the United States must take effective and practical steps to let the people of foreign countries—especially those behind or near the iron curtain of Russia—know the truth about America. We must help them get the facts about the way freedom works in the United States, about our ideas and our ideals, and most important of all about our plans and our prayers for world peace. The American picture must not be painted in Europe by the Red portrait painters of Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, the final and official report from the Appropriations Committee on our so-called American cultural-relations program has not yet been made. I doubt that it will be as disturbing as the Herald Tribune editorial suggests. However, we all realize that there is no basic legislation upon which the program administered by Assistant Secretary of State William Benton has been constructed. Under the terms of the new Legislative Reorganization Act, it is expected that the regular legislative committees of Congress will write all authorization acts and the Appropriations Committees are to be confined to determining the amount of financial appropriations. Thus it is clear that basic, directive legislation is imperative if the United States is to have the publicity program abroad which it requires.

Last summer our House Committee on Foreign Affairs favorably reported a legislative bill authorizing the development of a foreign information service for our State Department. Congress adjourned before action on this legislation could be completed. It is my hope that we may soon hold hearings on another bill to achieve this objective and that it may receive favorable and early action. In the meantime, it may be necessary for the Senate, which operates under less strict procedural rules than the House, to make temporary provisions for the continuance of our publicity program abroad. This program has made some serious errors, to be sure, in the early days of its development and much is still to be required from the standpoint of the type of personnel on Mr. Benton's staff both at home and abroad. However, these errors can be corrected and the personnel should be strengthened by the appointment of sturdy Americans who are proud apostles of our way of life. The big objective must not be abandoned because of mistakes made on the first stretches of the long trail to the summit. Mr. Benton can help mightily by correcting the deficiencies now existing. Congress must do its part by supplying the finances required to continue this important peace-promoting service.

The following editorial indicates the growing appreciation which exists for the possibilities and potentialities of our foreign information service:

GAGGING AMERICA'S VOICE

A certain element of mystery surrounds the action of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee which has let fall the economy ax upon the neck of Mr. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State; which has lopped huge sections out of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs; which has moved to silence the short-wave "Voice of America" and to quash other efforts to tell the world about the United States through the media of radio, libraries, motion pictures, the graphic arts and foreign information services. The details of this mayhem are not to be revealed until next month. Representative TABER, chairman of the full committee, professes to know nothing about the action. There are discrepancies in the available accounts of just what has been done. But there is apparent agreement in the belief that unless the Senate comes to the rescue the information program will be eviscerated precisely when it was beginning to do some good. It seems an odd way to run a government, or, indeed, an economy program.

Mr. Ilya Ehrenburg and the Kremlin's press officers have just given impressive evidence that the short-wave broadcasts to Russia have been getting somewhere. This information program is, indeed, the only possible means by which in the present facts, American ideas can be communicated to the Russian people. The Senate has just voted overwhelmingly for the Greek-Turkish aid program, which makes sense only as an expression of American democracy on the international stage and makes it imperative that American democracy should be able to speak with its own voice upon that stage. Our whole foreign policy is committed to a course which renders a sound information policy essential; and so it is at just this point that an appropriations subcommittee decides to cancel the whole thing, destroy the organization, and silence the broadcasts in the interests of economy. It is a queer kind of economy to wreck a basic policy for which nearly every one recognizes the need and so to deprive the Nation of an arm which is increasingly important to the peaceful fulfillment or its aims in the modern world.

Prices and Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with all the cheap political claptrap that our New Deal friends have injected into the tax proposals and fiscal policies of our Nation, I wish to submit the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, April 20, 1947:

PRICES AND PROFITS

Corporate profits in 1946 and early in 1947 were at record high levels. On several occasions labor spokesmen have attributed this rise in profits to increases in prices. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has recently completed an analysis which shows that price increases were only a minor factor in the attainment of these profits. According to this study, "had it not been for the repeal of the excess-profits tax and the tax-credit carry-back provision, net corporate profits in 1946 would have been less than in 1945."

This conclusion is amply supported by the available facts. Thus, estimated corporate earnings before taxes in 1946 were moderately lower than in 1945, and about 20 percent below the wartime peaks reached in 1943 and 1944. As a result of the repeal of the excess profits tax, however, profits after taxes were 20 to 30 percent higher in 1946 than in the 3 preceding years. Undoubtedly price increases did contribute to the higher profits for some companies. But on an over-all basis, tax reductions and increasing volume seemed to have been the major contributing factors.

The Library of Congress study also examined Philip Murray's contention that $7,700,000,000 of these profits could be used for wage increases and still leave profits at twice the prewar level without the necessity of increasing prices. Attention must be given to indirect wage costs in the form of higher costs of materials as well as to the higher direct wages paid, in considering the impact upon prices. Even more important, however, is the fact that profit dollars as well as wage dollars create jobs. In the words of the study:

"If $7,700,000,000 were taken from corporate net profits, business investment would be reduced by at least that much and probably by much more. Although this is entirely

ignored by Mr. Murray, we can say with some assurance that when business investment expenditures fall off, we risk business depression as much as when consumer expenditures fall off."

Actions that result in a shift of spending from one group to another do not add to total purchasing power. On the contrary, the process of shifting may be a sufficiently disturbing influence to reduce the over-all total volume of expenditures, as suggested in this comment.

Just exactly who must assume the responsibility for prices? The present Democratic administration introduced and promoted legislation last year to reduce the excess profits. Why did we not hear about the low-income groups then? Who encouraged greater and greater expenditures? What administration said that 25-percent increase in wages could be paid without affecting prices?

The present administration is giving rather rough treatment, however, to certain farm groups. This is correctly named the "fur-farmer formula." What is the "fur-farmer formula"? That is the one, first, where the administration sends a mission to a foreign country to invite imports; second, where the administration does not invoke the provisions of the Antidumping Act; third, floods the domestic market; and, fourth, the result is ruinous prices to the domestic producers.

There is not much use of this administration encouraging a new business, but it may go out and ruin it, the same as they have the fur-farm business, which is also a small and a comparatively new business. The "fur-farmer formula" for the weak and added protection to the strong. For example, President Truman, within the past few days, placed quota No. II now on cotton imports as they apparently forgot this kind of cotton when quota No. I was put on cotton imports. Cotton is an important crop—reporting one-tenth of the national farm income at times.

Then President Truman, also within the past few days, removed the quota on silver-fox pelts. It was a generous quota and there was no apparent reason for removing it.

President Truman may be opposed to quotas, but the new cotton-import quota shows that he is only opposed to them when they are north of the Mason and Dixon line.

The taxes the Government collects from fur farmers in 1946 will be mighty small.

Statements of Representative Lindley Beckworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include statements of my own which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 7 and 12, 1946, and December 12, 1944:

TERMINAL LEAVE FOR ENLISTED MEN AND LETTER ENDORSING BECKWORTH'S BILL—H. R. 1160

(June 7, 1946)

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on December 18, 1943, I introduced a bill (H. R. 3875) to provide terminal leave for enlisted men. On January 8, 1945, I introduced H. R. 1160, a slightly modified form of my first bill. The national legislative committee of the American Legion endorsed my bill H. R. 1160. Several Members of Congress and I appeared before the House Military Affairs Committee urging the passage of the terminal-leave legislation. I include at this point the endorsement of the American Legion:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., October 24, 1945.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are, as you know, vitally interested in your bill, H. R. 1160, which provides terminal leave to enlisted men in the same manner as is now given to officers, except that it also provides that the compensation to which the soldier is entitled shall be paid in a lump sum, which, of course, is a very good idea.

Demobilization is taking place at such a rapid rate at the present time that unless this is enacted into law quickly it is not going to benefit very many GI's.

It does not seem to me as though it is a very controversial issue and that the House Military Affairs Committee could make up its mind very readily as to how they feel about it. We shall appreciate very much if action can be had on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

I was one of 218 Members of the House to sign the petition—the two hundred and eighteenth signature was obtained April 17, 1946—which authorized the bringing of the legislation to the floor of the House. I shall vote for the legislation today.

For some time I have had a bill before the Congress that would give all World War veterans and widows of World War veterans pensions not less in amount than those now received by Spanish-American War veterans. I shall continue to urge in the future this legislation. Note the position of the American Legion, Department of Texas, concerning my present bill, H. R. 360. I quote from a letter written me May 19, 1945, by Mr. Harry E. Rather, department adjutant, the American Legion:

H. R. 360 is the very important legislation which sounds like the kind of legislation that you are always sponsoring, LINDLEY. We know that we can always depend on you. We are delighted that you are back in the harness and on the right side, as usual.

I quote part of a letter I received from Mr. Rather after he resigned his work with the American Legion, dated January 22, 1946:

"Appreciate your every courtesy, many, many times. Your cooperation was everything that I could want and expect and I shall miss you but I know that you can be counted on being in there doing your part in every worth-while matter. We who know you are proud of you and your record."

I quote part of a letter written December 31, 1945, which I received from Mr. Joseph M. Stack, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Kansas City, Mo.:

"I have the page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprinting your remarks and the various communications you have received in connection with your activities in behalf of veterans and their dependents, and I wish to express my appreciation for your efforts along this line."

On January 3, 1945, I introduced H. R. 361 which would make eligible a World I or II veteran for a pension, if that veteran could not qualify for Government or private employment, the nature of which required only reasonable physical standards.

In March 1945 I introduced H. R. 2492 to permit direct sales of surplus property to veterans; many veterans have complimented my bill; in my opinion it practically would have solved the problem of making sure that veterans receive the surplus property they need. Too, I have personally sought to aid many veterans in their individual efforts to obtain surplus-property items.

On June 21, 1945, I introduced H. R. 3526, which would extend the GI bill of rights to widows of veterans and the wives of certain totally and permanently disabled veterans.

On June 26, 1945, I introduced H. R. 3592; this is a bill to help concerning housing problems for veterans. This bill, be it noted, was introduced some 6 months before the real effort to meet the veterans' housing problems got under way in the Congress. I quote from a letter written me November 27, 1945, by Mr. Harry E. Rather, department adjutant, the American Legion, Department of Texas, concerning my effort to help our veterans obtain houses:

"We know that we can depend on you to do everything you possibly can on the housing situation, which is most critical."

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that I was one of the Members of Congress, although we were in the minority at times, that supported every effort to provide housing for veterans.

Last year, October 1, 1945, I introduced H. R. 4219, a bill that would permit a man or woman in service to carry his immediate family with him at Government expense to the place where he was stationed, where practicable, even outside of the United States; too, I provide that the Government will furnish adequate housing for such families; this legislation will do for enlisted men that which has for a long time been done for some of our officers. I am glad to note recently that the Army and Navy are beginning to carry out this objective which I sought to attain by my bill.

As I have told and written a number of veterans who have mentioned the question of paying our veterans a bonus, I favor paying our veterans a bonus. To this end I have worked and shall continue to work diligently.

LETTER TO MARTIN THAMES

(June 12, 1946)

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1946.

MR. MARTIN THAMES,
Henderson, Tex.

DEAR MARTIN: I recall your letter of May 17. It is true on February 23, 1939—51 days after I became your Congressman—I voted to fortify Guam; I voted for the Selective Service Act and the extensions of the act; the first extension passed the House by only one vote—a vote, according to President Roosevelt, the Secretary of War, and General Marshall—which saved the Army of the United States. I voted to arm our ships; I voted to permit our ships to go to any place conducive to the success of our war effort—this measure, although backed strongly by President Roosevelt, passed by only 18 votes, 3

weeks before Pearl Harbor. In the 7½ years I have served you in Congress I have voted for every measure to strengthen and keep strong America. I have supported all legislation coming before the House to bring about an enduring peace, and all legislation providing for the participation of the United States in this effort. On September 21, 1943, I voted for the Fulbright resolution; on June 7, 1945, I supported and voted for the Bretton Woods agreement. On December 18, 1945, I voted for the United Nations Participation Act. I have voted for every measure—including terminal leave, housing, surplus-property preference for veterans legislation—to aid and raise the compensation and pay of all veterans, their widows and dependents, our men in service, and their dependents.

I am the author of H. R. 2349—now a law—to adjust the pay status of warrant officers. On December 18, 1943, I introduced H. R. 3875 to provide terminal leave for enlisted men; on January 8, 1945, I introduced H. R. 1160, a slightly modified form of my first bill, which was endorsed by the American Legion; I was 1 of 218 Members of the House to sign the petition which authorized the bringing of the legislation to the floor of the House. I had 14 first cousins in service—7 overseas; 1 was an officer, 13 were enlisted men. I might add neither had an independent income to sustain his dependents while away and neither had 3 or 4 years of a term of office to which to return. I have responded to every request of veterans and their widows and dependents to represent them before the Washington Board of Veterans' Appeals; I have supported the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, and all legislation to eliminate subversive elements; I was the author of H. R. 4817—now a law—to strengthen our immigration laws. I have worked to prevent delays; I have worked sincerely to help prevent inflation. I have endeavored to aid and I have supported all legislation to assist our farmers, aged, blind, crippled, unemployed, and those who toil, our independent and small businessmen, and our boys and girls endeavoring to attend school.

In the 7½ years I have been your Congressman, Congress, with the exception of some 6 months, has been in session all or part of every month. I have been at my post of duty, which is exactly what was requested of the membership of Congress by our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy. Yes; I have been at my post of duty just like each of the 21 Texas Members of the House is at his post of duty, just like every Member of the 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate is at his post of duty.

I have had 9½ years of legislative experience—7½ years in a wartime Congress dealing with war and postwar measures. I might add I have served on seven committees in Congress. I am the sixth ranking Democratic member of 27 members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the only committee on which Speaker RAYBURN served and the committee of which Speaker RAYBURN was chairman when he became majority leader and later Speaker.

Always I'm glad to hear from you; write me any time. I always shall be grateful for your friendship. Call on me any time.

Your friend,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

TEN-MAN TEAM

(December 12, 1944)

Mr. BECKWORTH. I wish to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the title of an article and excerpts from the same article which appeared on page 8 of the Dallas Morning News, July 12, 1944. The article follows:

"TEN-MAN TEAM LED BY MAN HE BEAT FIGHTS BECKWORTH IN DISTRICT 3

"(By David Botter)

"GLADEWATER, TEX., July 11.—An in absentia candidate without platform figures as a leading contender for the Third Congressional seat from Texas in the primary campaign of LINDLEY BECKWORTH for a fourth term.

"Instead of a personal campaign, ——— will be backed by a team of 10 top-ranking east Texas political leaders and attorneys who will stump the district in his behalf.

"BECKWORTH, who upset dope in 1938 by vanquishing the veteran Morgan Sanders, of Canton, and a group of other leading office-holders with more political know-how, is the principal campaign issue.

"Sanders, the man Beckworth defeated; Judge Merrit Gibson, of Longview, one of the leading forces which delivered the uninstructed Democratic delegation to Chicago from the State convention in Austin, May 23, and first public advocate of free electors from Texas; Jim Strong, of Carthage; Jack Price, of Longview; W. N. Jones, of Mineola; W. Edward Lee, of Tyler; Carroll and Leslie Florence, of Gilmer; Judge W. R. Hughes, of Longview; and Vernon McDavid, of Henderson.

"They will stump the district consisting of eight counties in the East Texas oil-field area, alleging that BECKWORTH has done nothing for the district in Congress and that the area lacks representation.

"BECKWORTH'S platform for reelection shows that he has supported every war measure submitted to Congress, that he advocated fortification of Guam, and has come on down the line in support of the full war program, including endorsement and support of the GI bill of rights.

"The apple-cheeked Congressman, who won election to Congress after one term in the State legislature, went into office the hard way. Lacking sufficient funds for a costly campaign, he used his own personality and his own contacts to win the race from a field.

"He used a loud speaker and toured the side roads, talking with farmers, running his own race against the field. He had his family's assistance. His father, O. J. Beckworth, was his constant adviser and assistant in that race.

"A member of the powerful Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, BECKWORTH'S work in recent months has been concentrated in two subcommittees of this group, one dealing with investigation of brand names and newsprint, and another working on civil aviation matters.

"The Congressman is running on a strong war effort platform and cites his record in that connection.

"In addition, ———, of Longview, an attorney, is making an anti-Beckworth campaign; ——— is running his campaign from his office using postal cards to contact people. The cards are provided for friends who wish to mail them to others.

"Counties in the district are Upshur, Gregg, Van Zandt, Rusk, Smith, Wood, Camp, and Panola. Smith, Gregg, and Rusk form a majority of the district in voting strength.

"The result of the above-mentioned race was that BECKWORTH received in the first primary a clear majority over both his opponents; he carried seven of the eight Third District counties, the exception being Gregg County, the home county of his two opponents; the former county and district official, who had held three offices in Gregg County, received 3,745; BECKWORTH 3,380, a difference of 365."

Intervention in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I would like to include the following article in the Fortnightly Commentary, published by Arnold Bernhard & Co., Inc., of New York:

INTERVENTION IN GREECE

A day after this letter goes to press, President Truman will address Congress on the subject of American intervention in Greece. We are of the opinion that even if the United States should establish an anti-Communist regime on the Greek flank of the Dardanelles, Russia would not immediately go to war. But American commitments in Greece, if they are to achieve their purpose, would have to be followed by commitments in other parts of the world, and such extensive undertakings would weaken capitalism in the American sphere. In so doing they would prove to be self-defeating.

American investors are deeply concerned over taxation. Taxation far more than Communistic infiltration is threatening our way of life. Lest this opening sentence be interpreted as an expression of sympathy for the poor millionaire who is forced now to get along without an extra yacht, let it be stated at the outset that the problem of the rich in this day and age is not lack of money to spend. Faced with enormous inheritance taxes and little possibility of retaining income under existing income tax schedules, the rich man finds it easier to spend money today than at any other time in history. If he does not spend his money, his government will. He has every inducement to waste capital and no incentive to save it.

The function of rich people is to accumulate capital with which to produce more goods for poorer people to consume. That they have done so here is proved by the fact that America has the highest standard of living in the history of the world. That they will not be able to do so much longer is proved by the fact that anyone who accumulates income over $100,000 a year, whether for investment in business or personal spending, must pay back about 87 percent in personal income taxes. Under the conditions, the only large capital that is likely to be accumulated is that which the Government takes in the form of taxes and invests in the form of State-owned enterprises, or that which is accumulated by already established companies. In the absence of all possibility of new competition, these established companies gradually develop into national cartels that in one way or another must be integrated into the Government. In short, under existing tax rates, capital formation will in time become the function of either the Government itself or of industrial cartels integrated into the Government. This is the socialist organization toward which we are blindly moving.

It is against the background of American tax crisis that the proposed intervention in Greece takes on added significance. No one could be naive enough to imagine that the United States of America could gain permanent possession of a flank on the Dardanelles, Russia's only outlet to the Mediterranean, for $250,000,000. The cost will come much higher than that, not only in terms of the commitment in Greece but also in the collateral undertakings in the Near East, in

Europe and in Asia—wherever, in fact, the Russian expansion will have to be bottled up if the new foreign policy is to carry through.

The investor can find no prospect of tax reduction in such a foreign policy. The question he must answer is whether he has a better chance to resist Communism by strengthening capitalism or by aiming a gun at the Russians.

THE SHIFT OF BRITISH POWER

The No. 1 fact of life to hold onto in this maelstrom of postwar political readjustment is that the British are shifting their empire. They are moving out of Asia and east Europe to consolidate in Africa and the Near East. Their great adventure is the chance of developing an Arab world and exploiting Africa. From a speculative standpoint, it seems to be good strategy. Britain has neither the economic sinews nor the firepower to hold India and the Far East or to defend Australia and New Zealand. Her land-based planes probably could hold Africa. There she could obtain raw materials produced with cheap labor to be processed in England for export at a profit to Britain. By agreement with either the United States or Russia she might be able to share the rich oil fields of the Near East, whence would come the oil to power the air force and fleet that would defend the African empire. The Arabs offer a brilliant opportunity, for they are a people of great ability and no organization. Their political life is a jigsaw of feudal rivalries. Their economy is totally undeveloped. Their unity lies in their common Semitic race and in their Catholic Moslem religion, which tolerates no racial discrimination within the legions of the faithful. A relatively small force could balance the powers of the rival Arab potentate while the traditional Anglo-Saxon respect for the other fellow's religion would permit the strengthening of religious ties. A certain amount of industrialization, carefully planned so as not to compete with British industry, might in time be developed.

The big danger to the British scheme is that the Russians may inject themselves into the Near East and North Africa before the British are able to carry their plans for Africa and the Near East to fruition.

It is here that the next American move becomes decisive. If the United States takes up the position in Greece that the British army is evacuating, the burden of defending the British sphere in Africa and the Near East in its formative period falls upon the United States. Not only is Britain's African Empire then protected, but Britain is in a strategic position later on to shift her alliance toward a Russia exasperated by American obstruction. Once Britain's African and near eastern empires are established she would have stock in trade—Arabian oil that could be shared with Russia, and foreign markets in the Balkans and in Asia that might advantageously be shared with the Russian cartels on some basis mutually satisfactory to the two socialist governments. The exclusion of American goods from European and Asiatic markets would naturally be required, since England's production competes in export with America's.

The British shift out of the Far East and eastern Europe into Africa and the Near East, and her political reorientation from the American orbit to the Russian will not come to pass in a day. Britain has still to use up her American loan. She can import only from America, because only America is rich enough to export at this time. But in the long run Britain's interests will dovetail with Russia's more closely than our own and her political alinement with Russia is therefore probable. To think thus may shock the sentiments of many good people. But in the game of power politics, which for four centuries has found England waging wars against Spain, France, Russia, and Germany with complete impartiality, there are no scruples but only interests.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RUSSIAN POWER

Until only a few years ago Russia was an agricultural country with practically no industries. In order to build up her industries—her capital—Russia must keep her current consumption down. That imposes a low standard of living upon the people and requires stern government. It will be difficult for the regime to carry out its program of capital formation—just as if we were to levy heavy sales taxes in order to build TVA's—and at the same time retain its popularity. Therefore it would be quite natural to expect the Russian Government to act like any other government which functions without strong popular encouragement: to emphasize the foreign threat in order to preserve internal unity during a difficult period.

At the same time, the Russian Government is desirous of expanding its sphere of influence to contiguous territories for three reasons: (1) For defense through buffer states, (2) for space in which to build up complementary trading areas, (3) for outlets to the sea.

How then will the Russians react if the United States should formulate a foreign policy that has as its obvious purpose control of the flanks on Russia's only warm-water outlet? Imagine, for a moment, that the United States of America were a landlocked nation without Atlantic or Pacific seaports and that our only outlet to the Atlantic was through the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. Imagine then that Russia, disapproving the Alemán regime in Mexico, decided to intervene with arms and money to unhorse Mr. Alemán and substitute a regime sympathetic to and in close collaboration with one of the totalitarian governments, let us say the Argentine. Even without the Monroe Doctrine, America would spring to arms.

To Russia the American decision to take over Greece must be a particularly bitter pill to swallow, because not only is it a threat to Russia's security as well as her expansion but it comes right after the Russians gave their approval to America's claim for control of the militarily strategic Pacific islands. The Russians must think that we Americans want the whole world, including their back door.

The upshot cannot be favorable for the United States. The Russians will be resentful and even more suspicious than in the past. They will close ranks at home, more willingly suffering a low standard of living in order to build up their industrial potential for defense. They will look to Britain as an ally, even as a partner in the development of oil fields in the Near East, and to the exclusion of the United States.

Almost surely the Russians will not go to war over Greece at this time. Rather, like Germany, they will wait until their industrial potential for war—possibly for atomic war—will be fully developed, at which time they can break the American Maginot line around the Mediterranean as easily as the Germans broke it in France. That kind of a line is more dangerous as an illusion than as a weapon.

THE DEFENSE OF THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

The essential quality of capitalism is this: That it is an economy governed by a free market in which prices, demand, and supply are at liberty to reach an equilibrium without government intervention. Under pure socialism, prices and supplies are determined by the government and the demand is regulated by rationing.

The free economy is clearly the more efficient except during periods of deep maladjustment when, the socialists assert, the people are free only to starve. Economists of the Keynes school reply by proposing that the general level of business activity be controlled through compensating government investments, so that, though the market for specific goods remains free, the purchasing power of the people as a whole is held within tolerable limits of fluctuation.

In every instance where the people themselves have had a chance to choose between an economy that has a degree of free determination and an economy of complete government regimentation, the people have always shown a strong preference for the free economy. Since this has been so wherever the two systems came into conflict, it may be concluded that sooner or later the Russian people will themselves insist upon a greater degree of freedom in their country.

To this the foe of Russia replies that there can be no freedom of choice in that country. That is true today. That is not true of tomorrow. Today the Russians must tighten their belts to produce capital enough to build up their income. Once they have forced through their industrialization—a process which the Russians are attempting to complete in a generation, though other nations have required centuries—they will be ready to live.

The Marxist theory does not contemplate abrogation of personal liberties. To say that it does is to misrepresent. The Lenin theory of taking the leap from an agricultural economy to an industrial economy in a single life span does contemplate dictatorship. But it is a temporary dictatorship and it is worth noting that the goal of personal freedom is not lost sight of. The Russians today are spending about five times as large a percentage of their national income for education as the British and about twice as much as the Americans. Illiteracy has been greatly reduced. No conspiracy of tyrants, determined to deprive people permanently of their liberty and individualism, would sacrifice so much for public education.

The Russian people have a sincere admiration for America and American achievement, as attested by the dispatches of many responsible men who have visited Russia. Why, then, is it necessary to prove to them at the point of a gun that our way of life is superior to their own? Especially so when pointing the gun requires that we weaken our own way of life?

It is necessary to be practical. There must be some lines within which the contest for men's loyalties can be fought out by force of example. We are not yet such a perfect race that we can eliminate power politics altogether. But in the practical application of power politics, the first rule is not to bite off more than can be chewed. The natural—the practical sphere—in which to prove the superiority of capitalism and individualism is North and South America and the islands of the Caribbean and Pacific. These happen also to be the territories that the United States has traditionally defended. The area is large enough to be economically self-sustaining. Yet one imagines that if any responsible government authority advocated intervention in South American political and economic affairs, he would be denounced as an imperialist by the very same people who shout isolationist at anyone who is reluctant to see American control of the government of Greece.

There is not such a vast gulf between the Russians and ourselves that we could not live together in peace in our own parts of the world. It is implicit in the Russian program to relax the present regimentation of the individual's life. When that happens the difference between us will be no greater than that between us and the Socialist state of Great Britain.

The contest of capitalism versus communism will then get down to a question of which works better. That could be settled without warfare. It would seem to be the part of wisdom for America to strengthen capitalism by removing as many as possible

of the controls that make it unworkable, such as tariffs, cartels, subsidized prices, labor monopolies, and income taxes that prevent constructive enterprise. Nobody is going to stop the expansion of communism by sticking a $250,000,000 thorn into the side of Russia. Communism will be stopped by something that works better. Russian Communists are men. They have the same love of God and their fellow men that other people have. They can learn, but they will not be taught at the point of a foreign gun. Nor will they learn to admire the capitalist economy unless we capitalists see to it that it works. We have more to do in North and South America than on the flanks of the Dardanelles.

The danger to Americans is not the activity of Communist agents but the deterioration of capitalism itself. Sensing our own weakness we look for a foreign devil to blame it on. But this is self-deception. Communism would have no chance at all in a world, or even in a part of a world, in which capitalism was working. Rome did not fall because of the power of the barbarians but because of the weakness of the Romans. In weakening capitalism in order to contain Russia by naked military force, we do not defend ourselves intelligently.

J. H. Leib Victorious in Fight to Eliminate Caste System in Army Cemeteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week, Secretary of War Patterson announced that hereafter all veterans of the armed forces will be accorded the same consideration and honor when they are laid to rest in a Government cemetery.

This week's directive brought to a gratifying conclusion a controversy which has been waging for over a year in an effort to stop the caste system that has existed in the national cemeteries of this Nation. Many of us have long felt that when that greatest of all levelers—death—makes its appearance, all distinctions among our heroic dead should disappear. Each has then given equally of himself in the cause of his country, because each has then given his all.

At this time, I desire to present some interesting facts on the history back of his new War Department order. Something over a year ago my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by J. H. Leib, then legislative director of the AMVETS, in which Leib went into detail concerning the discriminations existing in our national cemeteries in a report entitled "Is There a Caste System in Arlington?"

On April 28, 1946, the Washington Sunday Star featured a long front-page story under the heading, "Military caste system divides officers and GI's even in death—Separate sections of national cemeteries are provided—Arlington marker sizes differ." In this article, pictures were carried showing how officers and enlisted men were buried, how they were separated in the cemetery, and how their graves were marked.

This was followed by a resolution adopted by the American Legion national executive committeee on June 12, 1946, calling upon Congress to wipe out the existing discrimination in the assignments of burial plots. The campaign to eliminate the continuance of the caste system posthumously gathered momentum and was endorsed and urged by individual posts of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, and others. Secretary of War Patterson's directive of last Wednesday is in wise conformity with this year-long campaign.

In concluding the issue, Secretary Patterson released the following statement as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 24, 1947:

PATTERSON ORDER ENDS CASTE SYSTEM BURIALS, SEGREGATION OF GRAVES

The so-called caste system in the burial of the Army's officers and enlisted men in national cemeteries today is a thing of the past.

A directive by Secretary of War Patterson at the same time ended racial segregation in national-cemetery burials.

The order issued yesterday applies to future burials in only the new sections of military cemeteries now being developed because of the large number of veterans for whom graves must eventually be provided. It ended the traditional policy which caused the segregation of the graves of enlisted men and officers, white and colored.

The new procedure means a general may be buried beside an enlisted man, a practice that is common in the American cemeteries overseas.

EXPLANATION ISSUED

An explanatory statement issued by the War Department said:

"In accordance with a directive issued today by Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, no distinction will be made in location of graves and burial facilities for deceased officers and enlisted men in new sections of national cemeteries. The policy providing uniform burial facilities without distinction as to rank or race of deceased veterans will be effected progressively as new sections are laid out.

"Burials in remaining grave sites of established sections of national cemeteries will continue under present policies until these sections are filled.

"Because of the large number of veterans entitled to burial in national cemeteries, a material expansion of cemetery facilities has become necessary. For the present this will be accomplished largely through the establishment of new sections in existing national cemeteries. Post sections will be authorized in national cemeteries to serve nearby garrisons where it is impractical to establish military cemeteries within the military posts."

United States Gets Into Cash Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 25, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Toledo Blade recently and, because of the hearing on the fur industry held April 17 and 18 by the Special Fur Committee, it should be of particular interest at this time:

UNITED STATES GETS INTO CASH TRADE
(By Paul R. Leach)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—American exports to Russia are now on a cash basis.

The postwar flood of food, machinery, and other nonmilitary supplies sent to the Soviet Union by lend-lease and by UNRRA is drying up.

Total lend-lease aid to Russia through the war years and up to this month amounted to nearly $12,000,000,000. Settlements are yet to be made between the two countries, although nearly all other lend-lease beneficiaries have made arrangements to clear the books.

In 1946 the United States exported $352,097,000 worth of all kinds of supplies to Russia. Of this, $152,081,000 went through lend-lease in meeting final commitments, UNRRA gave $136,770,000 to White Russia and the Ukraine, and private relief accounted for $10,663,000. Russia paid cash for $52,583,000 worth of goods.

About one-third of the dollar volume went into food. No food shipments have been made since December 31.

Purely military shipments by lend-lease ended with the war except for munitions in the pipe line of preparaton for export or on the way Many of the manufactures, machines, and such like that Russia has been getting since VJ-day, however, can be classed as usable in upkeep of a military establishment.

During the war Russia was given tremendous numbers of weapons—15,000 planes, 7,000 tanks, 8,218 antiaircraft guns, to name only a few—many of which presumably are still usable.

While we were shipping the $352,097,000 worth of supplies in 1946, imports to the United States from Russia totaled $100,635,000. Of this, $67,558,000 represented raw furs. This import figure is four times any prewar year's buying from Russia.

Lend-lease and UNRRA shipments have declined steadily.

In January, the only month's figures available for 1947 at the Department of Commerce, we shipped $24,671,462 worth of goods, of which UNRRA supplied $5,698,000 and lend-lease $4,724,000. The remaining $14,249,462 was in cash purchases by Russia, four times the monthly average of cash purchases in 1946.

February and March statistics are to show UNRRA and, lend-lease reaching the zero point, all exports then being for cash. The wind-up lend-lease shipments of the last year are to be paid for in 30 years on the basis of 90 percent of cost, plus transportation.

Half the Russian cash purchases have been and are now for machinery and trucks. Oil, metals, manufactures other than machinery, and textiles and fibers account for most of the remainder.

The Soviet Union never has spent much of its dollar cash here for food, preferring to use it for the sort of items it is buying now and can't get otherwise.

The United States may be getting into cash trade, but according to my arithmetic the cash imports were 100 millions, and the cash exports were 52 millions, and Uncle Sam will run out of cash with too much of this kind of trading.

The fur-farmer formula put in operation by the present administration consists: First, send Government emissaries to a foreign country to invite imports; second, allow dumping on the American market like the $238,000,000 1946 fur imports; third, remove the quota on imports on the only fur—silver fox—that even had any import duty whatsoever to protect it. The present administration

is evidently trying to extend this fur-farmer formula to other branches of agriculture; fourth, put the producer on the verge of ruin; this is to be followed by sending out propaganda to women's clubs on the wonders of reciprocity, New Deal brand. The New Deal brand of reciprocity is honeycombed with deceit and dripping with deception.

Frontiers of Aviation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, last Friday, April 25, it was my privilege to address the Aviation Law Institute, sponsored by the American Bar Association through its committee on aeronautical law, and the Milwaukee Bar Association, in Milwaukee, at the dinner honoring President Carl Rix, president of the American Bar Association. My subject was Frontiers of Aviation Law. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by me on that occasion may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a distinct honor to have the privilege of addressing the first aviation law institute ever held in the United States. It is all the more an honor because this dinner in turn honors one of the most able lawyers of this Nation, your own Carl Rix, president of the American Bar Association.

It has been my privilege to know Mr. Rix quite well for a number of years, and I, with you, salute him for the lifetime of service which he has given to the improvement of law in this Nation.

With the recent shift in the political picture, Wisconsin's very capable senior Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY, and I, exchanged positions as majority and minority leaders of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate has never operated, in my time, on a partisan basis. My good friend, Senator WILEY, has not changed that policy; and he and I continue to cooperate quite closely on all matters which come before the committee. I am happy indeed to bring with me his personal greetings to all of you, and his special good wishes to his very personal friend, Carl Rix.

Most of you who are present at this dinner have participated throughout the day in an aviation law institute which has dealt with existing law and legislation in this field. Tonight I want to take you with me a little beyond the existing picture for a look at the frontiers of aviation law.

Because aviation is relatively a new art and a new industry, the great body of aviation law still is statutory. It has been the duty of the Congress, and it still is the duty of the Congress, to probe beyond the present to chart the future path of civil aviation in this country. When I first came to the Senate the nearest thing we had to a basic law for civil aviation was the Air Commerce Act of 1926. The development of civil aviation during my 14 years of service in the United States Senate has far exceeded our fondest dreams. It has been my privilege to have participated in the drafting, sponsorship, and formulation of the Federal legislation which made this development possible. It is from this background that I come to you tonight to talk of the frontiers of aviation law.

Aviation law is indeed a quicksilvery field. Yesterday we may have thought we had charted its frontiers; that we had platted a map to enable us to say that aviation law is concerned with this and that; that these are its problems; that it encompasses such and such concepts; that it goes here, but stops there. And then aviation engineers solved new problems, and new horizons were ours to conquer. The useful range of aircraft was extended from a few hundred miles to the entire length and breadth of the globe. Today every spot on earth is within 60 hours of Milwaukee by air carrier. Our whole thinking in the field of aviation law has been forced to change quickly, as the great technical achievements of World War II advanced aviation to undreamed-of accomplishments.

You to whom I speak have witnessed the change of precedent after precedent, in the legal field, as aviation developed. I cite merely one example—the insurance field. There the courts in the early years of aviation held that every person who took a flight as a passenger in an airplane was "participating" in aviation, so recovery for death or injury to such a passenger was barred under a standard clause in insurance policies excluding coverage of persons "participating" in aviation. Today, in State after State, such precedents have been overruled as the courts hold this same language does not exclude passengers, the courts reasoning properly that only the pilot actually participates in aviation under present-day circumstances. As one court has aptly said:

"In adapting the general principles to the newest mode of transportation, it is not altogether 'putting new wine in old bottles.' Although the same principles must obtain and be applied, the law of aeronautics cannot be completely synchronized with the law pertaining to other agencies, for it must be modified to meet the traffic problems of the novel method."

So we have had changes in both technical and legal fields which have greatly affected aviation law. My purpose tonight is to sketch for you a few of the fields in which I believe the frontiers of law must be extended to meet the present and future needs of civil aviation.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 has been on the statute books less than 10 years, but already it is outmoded in many respects, and inadequate in others. That is true in spite of the fact that, when it passed the Congress, it was the best law we could get at the time. We knew then that air transportation was to become a major force in our Nation, both in time of war and in times of peace, but we did not foresee by any means all of the problems which would develop in such a few short years.

The 1938 act was 4 years in the making. The first draft was introduced on March 26, 1934, as S. 3187 of the Seventy-third Congress. Even while the legislation was "in the mill," new developments made changes necessary; and during the 4 years I prepared and introduced no fewer than nine separate bills on this subject, each a complete redraft of the previous bill. The bill which finally became law was S. 3845 of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

I understand that you have heard something of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in your discussions today. My concern tonight is not with the existing legislation so much as with the frontiers to which it should be pushed, to pattern an act for the proper regulation and development of the future of civil aviation. The urgent need for amendment of the present law has been apparent for several years. On March 20, 1944, I presented a bill—S. 1790 of the Seventy-eighth Congress) to completely rewrite all Federal legislation for civil aviation; to codify and bring up to date existing aviation legislation; to bring into one act those unrepealed provisions of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 which many people do not realize are still the law of the land; and to write into law the necessary legislative provisions which experience has indicated will be necessary for the future development of aviation in this country. This bill, with some refinements of language, was reintroduced as S. 1 in the present Congress.

To detail all the changes in language and substance which nearly 10 years of operation under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 has indicated are necessary would require much time. I commend the bill to your study, and I point out a few highlights: New provisions for the granting of experimental route certificates, without the present lengthy certificate hearings, so as to encourage new enterprise in developing a truly Nation-wide air transportation service; the re-creation of an independent civil aeronautics authority and an independent air safety board; new economic regulations for contract air carriers; and a new grant of authority providing control, for the first time, of the rates and fares of our air carriers when operating in foreign air transportation.

You will find by a study of this bill that it contains language extending the frontiers of aviation law to hitherto uncharted fields, some of them fields in which Federal officials now claim the right to pursue an unfettered path, often in conflict with the policy of the Congress.

For example, in 1946 the CAB and the State Department, in the so-called Bermuda agreements; stretched the language of the existing act to the point of claiming that various sections of that act authorize an executive agreement whereby important air rights of this country were bargained away to England. These primarily administrative officials went so far as to agree that the international civil aviation organization could control rates of our air carriers in foreign air transportation in any case where England would not agree to the proposed rates suggested by our air carriers. If you will pause to recall that we are outvoted in the international civil aviation organization by at least 42 to 1, you can see where this policy, if widely followed, would leave us in the race for international air transportation business. At the same time CAB and the State Department agreed to give England certain air rights in this Nation, such agreement being in direct conflict with specific provisions of the existing act. To top this both CAB and the State Department then claimed these gifts of rights and controls, to throttle our civil aviation down to where England wants us to be, were an "executive agreement," and so not subject to review by the Congress or anyone else in authority.

It is full time to extend our aviation law frontiers to the point of preventing such bureaucratic bargaining away of our national rights. To accomplish this, I have introduced a bill (S. 11) providing that:

"No agreement with any foreign government restricting the right of the United States or its nationals to engage in air-transport operations, or generally granting to any foreign goverment or its nationals or to any air line representing any foreign government any right or rights to operate in air transportation or air commerce other than as a foreign air carrier in accordance with the provisions of the civil aeronautics act of 1938, or respecting the formation of or the participation of the United States in any international organization for regulation or control of international aviation or any phases thereof, shall be made or entered into by or on be-

half of the Government of the United States except by treaty."

Much as I realize the need for changes in our basic aviation law, I am not content that those changes should be made administratively. The subject is far too important to be allowed to slip away from control by the Congress, which alone has the right, and the power, to determine national policy.

The pace of the world is geared to transportation, and aviation is the instrumentality which will set the future pace in foreign trade and in the passenger field. In the fight for the air markets of the world our country must not come out second best. In our thinking, therefore, the frontiers of aviation law must be projected upon this world-wide picture and we must, within the constitutional framework of the Government of the United States, chart a pattern which will bring us to the forefront and keep us there.

That is why, in 1944, I proposed putting the entire facilities of the air transport industry and the full weight of the Government of the United States back of a single community company to carry the flag of the United States on the airways of the world. Our national security and our future as a trading nation depends upon maintaining our leadership in international air transportation. The only way to maintain that leadership in the face of growing competition by foreign nations is by consolidating all our resources in the air to meet and surpass that competition. United we stand, divided we fall.

The entire facilities of all air carriers of this country, devoted to foreign air transportation, are valued roughly at $100,000,000. Not long ago England, at a time when she was so desperate for money that she was forced, so she said, to negotiate a loan of approximately $4,000,000,000 from this country, made available to her chosen instrument in the aviation field $600,000,000 for the sole purpose of assuring domination of the airways of the world. No single line in this country, when it must compete with other air lines on the same routes, can secure and expend so vast a sum as $600,000,000. The French have announced an initial subsidy of $40,000,000 for Air France. The Dutch employ the simple expedient of making up each year the annual deficit of their national air line, KLM. Only the united strength of all factors in our national transportation industry, with the full backing of our Government, can compete on an equal footing with the other governments of the world, each of which operates only through one nationally sponsored and financed line in the field of international air transportation.

Recent financial and other troubles of our air carriers illustrates and underlines the picture I paint. We cannot afford financial or other failures which cause our air carriers to fall behind in this race. Our future—the future of our whole Nation—is too dependent on our success. The price of failure could well mean eventual extinction. We dare not fail. What though we have never had such an air line created by law before? Is it not time that our aviation law frontiers are pushed out into hitherto uncharted fields so that we can win in this race for the air markets of the world? I, for one, think so, and I know that many of my colleagues in the Senate hold the same view. Senators WHITE, BREWSTER, and MCMAHON have just joined me in sponsorship of legislation to accomplish this purpose. By consolidating all of our air carriers, operating internationally, into a single community company, and giving our domestic air carriers, our steamship lines, and our railroads a stake in the success of the consolidated company, destructive rivalries between American air carriers abroad will be avoided and at the same time we will present a united front against the competition of foreign government air monopolies. We must meet the chosen instruments of Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Russia, and other foreign nations on an equal basis in the postwar competitive race for air supremacy, and to do that we must fight fire with fire.

In the field of taxation the frontiers of aviation law are even now the subject of intense exploration. In 1944 the Supreme Court of the United States held, in the case of *Minnesota* v. *Northwest Airlines*, that a Minnesota county in which the Airlines' executive offices were located could tax all of the planes of that great air line, which at that time operated from Chicago to the Pacific coast. Maintenance bases were being operated at the time of the court decision in five States, and now with the recent authorization of operation into New York, many more maintenance bases have been established.

When this case reached the courts, precedent offered 2 rules from which to choose—the "ship" rule and the "railroad" rule. Under the "ship" rule which the court adopted, the home port may properly tax all of a carrier's planes. Under the "railroad" rule carriers would allocate taxes among the several States through which or in which planes might operate, based on the proportionate value of the planes found to have acquired a taxable situs in each State. The airplane is, of course, vastly different from the steamship and a railroad, and it seems to me that an entirely new theory of taxation should be worked out to meet its needs.

It is true that, pursuant to a congressional resolution, a very exhaustive study and report to Congress was made by the CAB as a result of the Supreme Court decision to which I have just referred. In general the report recommended creation of a Federal board to prevent the States from imposing discriminatory or multiple taxes on airlines. I have refrained from acting upon the recommendations made in the report to Congress because it seemed to me that it recommended too much Federal dictation to the States and too little in the way of constructive thought toward the solution of this very important problem. My final conclusions have not yet been formulated, but I am at present thinking along the line of a solution to this problem by State legislation; State legislation under which the peculiar characteristics of airlines and air travel, and the peculiar problems which they involve in the way of State police and other assistance of various kinds, will be taken into consideration.

Perhaps a formula based upon aircraft arrivals and departures, revenue tons handled, and revenues originating in each State would be a start in the right direction. Where a plane merely flies over a State for a few minutes without landing, I am not prepared as yet to say that the State should share in taxes levied on the airplane.

The lawyers of this country, and the members of the American Bar Association in particular, should lend their combined efforts toward a solution of this very important problem. I earnestly hope that it can be solved without superimposing a complicated Federal administrative board upon the States. It is important to the future welfare of our aviation industry that, in extending this particular frontier of aviation law, the evils of multiple taxation in this field should be avoided by the creation of taxation machinery specifically designed for air transportation; which will, at the same time, insure to each State its fair share of tax revenue from this source. Aviation is entitled to a fair ride, but not a "free" ride in this field of taxation.

While arguing for more complete coverage of airport problems in the bill (S. 3845) which became the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, I had occasion to say to the United States Senate on May 11 of that year:

"We look at an airplane in the air and we say what a wonderful thing it is. We see it passing overhead and think that is all there is to it, a magnificent structure, a great piece of technical mechanism. But that plane must go up from some point and it must come down, and the landing fields from which it rises and to which it goes are just as important as is the mechanism itself which goes through the air. The landing field is as much a part of the aviation industry and as much a part of the science as is the mechanism which passes from one landing field to another. Indeed, there is nothing more essential, from the standpoint of safety in the air, than safe and adequate places on which to land and from which to take off."

The airport is indeed the keystone of all aviation development. The glamor of the technical and mechanical phases of airplanes has far overshadowed the role of an airplane's first requisite—an airport. Without airports aviation is nothing. I compromised, in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, on a provision for a study and report on the airport problem, in lieu of the more comprehensive provisions I wanted; and it took 9 years after that to get basic Federal airport legislation. Last year the Congress passed and the President approved a Federal airport act. We now have a national airport plan, provided for by Federal law, with $500,000,000 in Federal funds authorized for expenditure on this plan, in cooperation with States and cities.

But the Federal Airport Act, though an important aid to the growth of civil aviation in this country, has not extended the airport law frontier as far as it must go in this direction. If we are to be an airborne nation, in the same sense that we are now sometimes referred to, because of our development and use of the automobile, as a nation on wheels, we must have thousands of new airports; we have, in truth, barely scratched the surface of our airport problem. Just think of how few our airports are, in comparison with our paved roads. Undoubtedly new legislation will be needed, to keep our development in this field abreast of technical achievements.

In another respect, also, the Federal Airport Act may need amendment; and you, as lawyers, and especially as men who worked with me in successfully putting across the need for a Federal administrative procedure act, will be interested in this. Only a few months ago I found it necessary to protest the action of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in attempting to write into the Federal Airport Act, by bureaucratic decree, in the nature of regulations, virtually every power denied him by the Congress in the act. Instead of waiting for the Congress to move the frontiers of the act for him, he sought to lift himself by his own bootstraps. Others protested, as I did, and the result was retraction by the Administrator of his more extreme proposals. But the need for more adequate and definite control of such attempts, in the future, prompts me to make a mental note that if and when a revised Federal airport act is drafted, it must contain specific language to prevent such an abuse of discretion. I should like to hear from you, as lawyers, with regard to any ideas you may have for improvement of the Federal Airport Act. As a lifelong member of the legal profession, I know from experience that it is when actual cases arise that defects and needed improvements in legislation become most apparent. Let me know of any defects or needed improvements which your experience reveals, as I would welcome your cooperation.

I have sketched for you a brief review of how some of the frontiers of aviation law have been, or must be, extended to meet some of the future needs of civil aviation. I have not touched upon all the major problems to which these frontiers must be expanded. Within the time here available to me I could not do so.

For instance, I mentioned contract air carriers; well, what of the nonscheduled problem in general? There one finds a whole multitude of problems which the CAB is attempting to cover by economic regulation, in a manner contrary to the intent of the Congress when it adopted the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. As lawyers you are familiar with statements such as a recent one from the United States Supreme Court that the intention of the lawmaker constitutes the law. Yet on this frontier the CAB is perverting general language to a specific unintended result. There is a problem to challenge you as lawyers.

The bill to revise and restate the civil aviation law of this country, which I mentioned earlier (S. 1 of the present Congress) attempts to further define the respective jurisdictions of the Federal and State governments in the field of civil aviation. The overlapping of these jurisdictions should be avoided, so far as possible, to prevent duplication and waste of effort. This is a problem that is crying out for solution, and here again the cry represents a challenge to the lawyers of America. States, in the field of aviation, often have laws which are in many instances a crazy-quilt patchwork of statutes rather than well-rounded and up-to-date legislation for the aviation field. There is need for vision, for order, and for logic in this delicate field of intergovernmental relationships. It is up to you to chart the frontiers of aviation law in this, as yet, uncharted field.

I could go on and on telling you of aviation and its problems. When one has lived as long with a subject as I have with aviation law, it is most difficult to terminate a discussion of one's ideas for the frontiers of the future. After years of wrestling with this subject, I most heartily welcome your mobilization of the 40,000 members of the American Bar Association for the task of solving the many legal problems which exist in this field.

We in America find ourselves with airplanes operating all over the world. Both domestically and international air transportation our airplanes are second to none. The technical frontiers of aviation have been or are being conquered. It is up to us, the lawyers of America, to conquer the legal frontiers of the aviation field. Man-made laws will govern the future of aviation—it depends upon those laws, and those laws depend upon us. I feel certain that the lawyers of America will rally to this task and see to it that the frontiers of aviation law are adapted to the air age in which we now live.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 25 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, an able and interesting address by former Senator Warren R. Austin, now United States Representative to the United Nations, was delivered on April 19, 1947, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

An estimate from the Public Printer indicates that the manuscript of former Senator Austin's address will make three-fourths of a page more than the two printed pages of the RECORD allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $195.25.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The proposed United States program of aid to Greece and Turkey has caused the American people to engage in a searching examination of United States foreign policy in relation to the United Nations.

This debate has brought to the surface many doubts and fears about the future of the United Nations and about United States foreign policy toward the United Nations. It has also made apparent that the true nature of the United Nations and of the acts and policies necessary to sustain America's vital interest in its success are widely misunderstood.

The editors of America therefore have been given a special opportunity by this debate to help the people find the truth. I am grateful that you have given me this opportunity today to express to you with greatest frankness my own beliefs as to where the truth lies. I hold these beliefs with deep conviction not only as United States representative at the seat of the United Nations but as an American citizen whose 16 years in the United States Senate were devoted principally to measures that I believed would strengthen the security of the United States.

I shall begin with what I believe to be the misconceptions and misunderstandings revealed by the current debate. It is not possible to deal with the doubts and fears about the future unless there is first a common understanding of what we are talking about when we use the term "United Nations."

All of you will recall the wave of enthusiasm for the United Nations that swept the country after the San Francisco Conference. The ratification of the Charter by the United States Senate was by a vote of 89 to 2.

That was the summer of victory in Europe and victory over Japan. Establishment of the United Nations was also a victory for peace. But, unlike the military victories, it was not a final victory. Establishment of the United Nations was only the first battle. Too many people thought of it as the last act, instead of the first, in a long campaign to establish permanent peace by building a system of collective security. Too many people were inclined to say that the problem of peace had been settled and need trouble us no more.

Out of that misconception, carried over to the present, have arisen some of the demands that the United States turn over to the United Nations such difficult problems as the situation in Greece and Turkey. There are those who seem to believe that the United States can somehow escape its own responsibilities by transferring them to the United Nations. This is to think of the United Nations as something separate and apart from the United States and other member states.

Of course, the United Nations exists only as the collectivity of its individual member states. It is only by the policies and the acts of the member states, acting either individually or collectively, that the United Nations Charter can be carried out. The United States cannot bypass its responsibility to use its own strength and resources to uphold the Charter, whether it acts inside the organs of the United Nations or outside of them.

There are others who have asked that we turn over the program of aid to Greece and Turkey to the United Nations because they believe that we weaken the United Nations by acting individually. This is a fair complaint and one that has troubled many sincere and intelligent Americans who deeply believe in the United Nations. It deserves and has received the most thoughtful and careful consideration from members of the administration and of Congress.

So far as it concerns the charge of bypassing the United Nations, this complaint has been answered, I believe, by the action of the administration in reporting to the Security Council on the program while it is still in the tentative stage of a proposal, and by the amendment introduced by Senator VANDENBERG and approved by the Senate.

Beyond this point I believe that those who would turn such a program wholly over to the United Nations at this time have failed to take into account the evolutionary character of the United Nations and the present stage of that evolution. They tend to think of the United Nations as a complete, a finished creation.

The United Nations is, in fact, far from a finished creation. It is in the early stages of its development.

The framers of the United Nations Charter recognized this evolutionary character of the world organization and made provision for the early stages of its development in a number of particulars.

First, and most important, the Charter did not vest in the United Nations responsibility for making the peace treaties. Article 107 of the Charter provides:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall invalidate or preclude action, in relation to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory to the present Charter, taken or authorized as a result of that war by the governments having responsibility for such action."

In accordance with this provision, the Big Three, at Potsdam, established a separate organization for making the peace—the Council of Foreign Ministers.

The principal purpose of this provision is clear. It was to give the United Nations time to develop its organization and prepare itself for assuming the responsibilities of keeping the peace after the peace was made.

The provision is an example of the farsighted political wisdom and sane and realistic appraisal that are so necessary in these days of impatience and tendency to hysteria. The time of peace making is bound to be a time of difficulty. Until the peace settlements can be completed the differences in interest and ideology among the major Allies, particularly between the Soviet Union and the western powers, are in their most acute form. These differences have to be adjusted or settled by face-to-face dealings among the major powers concerned. The United Nations will inevitably find it difficult to exercise all its functions until these differences are adjusted or settled.

Let me give you an example. Until special agreements are concluded between the Security Council and the member nations the peace forces called for by the Charter cannot be brought into existence and the Security Council, therefore, cannot take enforcement action against an aggressor. Progress can and should be made now in securing agreement on the principles and framework of these agreements, but until the peace treaties are completed, and the major powers know what military commitments these treaties will entail, it will be difficult to determine how large the peace forces should be.

Another aspect of the Charter that points to the evolutionary, developing character of the United Nations as it stands today, may be found in 'ts economic provisions. The Charter recognizes that the structure of collective security is an arch founded at one end upon political cooperation and on the other end upon economic cooperation.

Cooperative action in the direction of reducing and removing the economic and social causes of war is coordinated by the Charter under the Economic and Social

Council of the United Nations. But the Charter provisions contemplate that most of the concrete, operation responsibilities will be borne by specialized agencies composed of member states and operating in specific fields. Each specialized agency comes into operation only through ratification by the member states of separate agreements establishing them and defining their powers. These specialized agencies in turn, are to be related to the Economic and Social Council by special agreements concluded between them and the council.

Here, again, you will readily see the evolutionary, developing character of the United Nations. Its whole economic structure is still in its earliest stages of creation. It may continue to develop and evolve by a process of trial and error, of natural historical growth, for as long ahead as we can foresee.

What is the present status of this structure in relation to the reconstruction of those parts of the world devastated by war and those other areas that must be developed if the standard of living of the American people and other peoples is to be preserved and raised? Organizations of a primarily advisory, technical and research character are functioning in the fields of labor, agricultural, and civil aviation and agreements have been signed by them with the Economic and Social council. This is also true of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

But what about capital investment in reconstruction and development? And what about agreement on the rules of the game to expand world trade? These are the economic keystones of the arch of collective security.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund are in being, but they have not yet begun to exercise their functions. No loans have been made. Agreements with the Economic and Social Council have not yet been concluded.

On the other side, the side of international trade, the Preparatory Commission of the International Trade Organization is now holding its second session in Geneva. The charter of this organization has not yet been adopted and concurrent negotiations toward the first all-round reductions of trade barriers have only begun.

The new patterns of economic cooperation that are being worked out in Geneva and Lake Success and Washington are immense undertakings that may have decisive consequences for the future peace and prosperity of the world if they are successful. There is no magic formula by which the hard political and economic realities can be skipped over in their development. They will take time and patience and persistence in the building, just as every other part of the structure of collective security.

I remind you that it is less than 18 months since the Charter of the United Nations came into force. If you will think of 18 months in the perspective of history rather than in the perspective of the editor facing a daily dead line I think you will agree with me that great progress has been made in a very short time upon so monumental a task as the organization of the world for permanent peace.

That conclusion does not, however, alter the fact that the United Nations is necessarily at present in a very early and incomplete stage of its development, in its economic functions as well as in its political functions.

Here again, this fact has a direct bearing upon the proposed program of aid to Greece and Turkey. Pending the peace settlements, pending the full operation of such agencies as the International Bank and the prospective International Trade Organization, it is essential that the United States, as a member of the United Nations, exert its full political and economic influence in support of the objectives of the United Nations wherever and whenever events call for it. In some cases that may be done to best advantage through the machinery of the United Nations. In other cases where the machinery is not yet complete, or where political wisdom indicates such a course, it may be done in other ways—bilaterally, or multilaterally, depending upon the circumstances. There is nothing wrong with bilateral arrangements that are in accordance with the Charter. They are being made every week between various members of the United Nations. Such agreements as those contemplated with Greece and Turkey can result in strengthening the United Nations and in speeding up the process of its development.

I shall return to this point later. I wish now to refer to still another and vital aspect of the evolutionary character of the United Nations.

The same summer that saw the victory over Germany and Japan and the ratification of the United Nations Charter witnessed the dropping of the first atomic bombs. The United Nations Charter does not mention atomic energy but its provisions point the direction in which the answer to the problem of atomic energy is to be sought in its relation to the over-all task of building collective security. The Charter does not set up a system for the regulation and reduction of armaments but it assigns the responsibility for developing such a system jointly to the Assembly and to the Security Council. Until such a system is established the structure of the United Nations cannot be complete.

A beginning has been made in the atomic energy and disarmament resolutions adopted by the General Assembly during its first session, in the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and in the establishment of a parallel Commission on Conventional Armaments.

Effective and enforceable systems of international control of atomic energy and conventional armaments are fundamental to the development of collective security under the United Nations. They require the utmost in persistence and patience in negotiations leading to their establishment. Because agreement has not been secured in a few months on so great and revolutionary a development in international relations is not a valid reason for despair.

Progress has been made. We have covered the first mile of the long journey and we are going forward, not backward. It is indeed remarkable and a cause for confidence that we have been able to cover the first mile at all so soon after the end of the last war and before the peace settlements have been made.

This brings me back to the doubts and fears about the future of the United Nations and about United States foreign policy to which I referred at the beginning of this talk.

These doubts and fears arise primarily from concern over the possibility of East and West cooperating successfully together. They therefore concern the basic premise of the United Nations, which was conceived and established as a world organization and not as an alliance of one part of the world in opposition to the other part.

The policy of the United States as expressed last fall by President Truman is to support the United Nations with all the resources that we possess. That policy was not lightly undertaken. The United States embarked upon that course as far back as January 1, 1942, when the United Nations declaration was signed. It has been followed consistently ever since.

In recent months we have heard increasingly the voices of those who would abandon this policy for one reason or another. Acts and policies of the Soviet Union, the missionary zeal of Soviet communism, the prolonged deadlocks between the Soviet Union and the western powers in the Council of Foreign Ministers, the repeated collisions between East and West in the United Nations, have all contributed to these rising doubts and fears about the United Nations.

They have resulted in such demands as those for the immediate abolition of the veto, as if the abolition of the veto could solve the basic problems between us and the Russians. There are demands for world government, with or without the Russians. There are echoes of the old head-under-the-bedclothes isolationism, dismissing the United Nations as futile but offering no alternative.

So long as the United Nations exists, the disagreements and rivalries of the world can be contained and conciliated within its framework.

The alternative is to destroy the United Nations and to split the world into two or more rival camps, possibly setting a course to war.

In these circumstances, if the United Nations did not exist, it would have to be created. The fundamental premise—universality—upon which the United Nations was conceived is in every way as sound and applicable today as it ever was. Improvement in detail of operation is possible and is hoped for.

Let me remind you that the Soviet Union is structurally and idealogically the same today as it was during the war. The differences of viewpoint between us were as wide then as they are today. There was in fact far less negotiation and intercourse between the western powers and the Soviet Union throughout the war than there has been since the war ended.

Even when the Soviet Union had its back to the wall and the German armies were at the gates of Moscow it was virtually impossible even to talk about plans for coordinated military activity, let along to reach agreement. There were only two occasions during the war—at Tehran and at Yalta—when there was any meeting between the Soviet and American Chiefs of Staff.

In spite of the desperate need of the Soviet Union for American military equipment, it took a whole year to organize the flow of lend-lease supplies through the Persian Gulf area, partly because elaborate transfer arrangements had to be made in order to cross from one side to the other of the iron curtain between the Soviet and Anglo-American zones in Iran. American ferry pilots were not allowed by Russia to deliver lend-lease fighter planes from Alaska across the Bering Sea to the Red Air Force even at the most critical moments of the war for Russian survival. Instead, tedious negotiations had to be completed for Soviet pilots to ferry these planes and most of the planes so sorely needed on the eastern front did not arrive until long after the decisive battle of Stalingrad.

I recall these matters because they illustrate the suspicion and distrust that separated our two great countries throughout a war in which we were both fighting for our lives against a common enemy. Is it any wonder that negotiation of the peace settlements and cooperation in the development of the United Nations has proved and continues to prove to be immensely difficult?

Today, in contrast to the war years, there is virtually continuous negotiation between East and West in the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Council of Foreign Ministers. In the Military Staff Committee representatives of the Chiefs of Staff of all five great powers are doing on almost a daily basis what was never once done during the war itself: Sitting together around the conference table, exchanging views and working on common problems.

It is of course true that many disagreements on vitally important issues have not

yet been resolved. Some disagreements may not be resolved for years to come. But it is not true that no progress has been made. Agreements between East and West—unanimous agreements—have been reached on many matters, including the most basic matter of them all—the charter of the United Nations itself.

The veto has been held up before the world as a demonstration of the futility and weakness of the United Nations. I call to your attention a significant development. It is a development that demonstrates the power of the General Assembly to influence the policies of nations. From February to September of last year the Soviet Union exercised its veto nine times. Public opinion was aroused. The matter was placed upon the agenda of the General Assembly and was fully discussed there. No recommendation was made to change the unanimity rule, but the Assembly did urge that every effort be made to insure that the unanimity rule not be used in such a way as to impede the Security Council in reaching a decision promptly.

Since last September the unanimity rule has been undergoing a modification in practice. Only once since last September has the veto been used. On at least seven other occasions a permanent member has abstained from voting on a proposal of which it disapproved rather than prevent passage of the resolution by use of the veto. On six of these occasions the abstention was by the Soviet Union and one by the United Kingdom.

This practice of voluntary abstention is in addition to the principle already provided for in the charter that a party to a dispute must abstain when the Security Council is acting to conciliate the dispute.

It is true that even parties to a dispute are not required to abstain when the question is one of enforcement action. I do not wish to become involved in an analysis of the veto problem, but I do wish to point out that any nation that exercised the veto in an attempt to protect itself or another nation from punishment for an act of aggression would be violating its obligations under the Charter. It would be nullifying the Charter. It would in effect be engaging in an act of rebellion against the United Nations. There is no constitution that can be written that can prevent an act of rebellion if the will and power to rebel are there.

So serious a violation of the Charter would never be committed by any member nation unless it had sufficient support among other member nations to make such a challenge with some prospects of success. The answer to the veto in such circumstances therefore lies not in amending the Charter but in the policies and strength of the member nations. If they make clear that they are prepared to act together in defense of the Charter, veto or no veto, no nation will dare to embark on a course of aggression.

Too much attention has been given in public discussion to the possibility of an act of rebellion against the Charter by a great power and too little attention to the practical measures that are being taken or prepared every day toward preventing such a contingency from ever arising.

The whole structure of the United Nations and all of the different aspects of the effort to build collective security are aimed at preventing such a contingency from ever arising. To say that the unanimity rule paralyzes the United Nations is to ignore the facts. There is no veto anywhere in the United Nations or its related specialized agencies except in the Security Council, and even there it is severely limited in its application.

The Security Council has already begun to prove its powers to conciliate and to moderate international disputes, regardless of the veto, in such cases as Iran and Greece. It has proved its power to take by unanimity such important acts as approval of the United States draft trusteeship agreement for the Japanese-mandated islands.

No veto can stop the General Assembly from recommending that the member states join in any action which the Assembly sees fit to recommend. No veto can block the operations of the Economic and Social Council or of its commissions, or of the International Bank, or any other of the specialized agencies. The whole vast effort to build the basis of lasting peace is being carried on every day and no one nation could stop that effort if it would.

I turn now to another aspect of the difficulties between the east and west. The Soviet Union is not now a member of any of the United Nations specialized agencies except the Preparatory Commission of the World Health Organization. This hesitation of the Soviet Union to participate in one of the most important phases of the work of the United Nations has been regarded by some as further evidence of the impossibility of a meeting of east and west. I believe this to be another extreme conclusion that does not take account of all the evidence. The Soviet Union is an active member of the Economic and Social Council and of the various commissions dealing with such important matters as human rights, freedom of information, economic reconstruction, and development. Furthermore, the work of the specialized agencies can be and is already being carried on effectively without the participation of the Soviet Union, for the benefit of those nations belonging to them.

I make no predictions for the future, but I believe that the hesitation of the Soviet Union to participate fully in this phase of the United Nations is merely another reflection of the great differences between the economic and social systems of the East and West, and that in the long run considerations of elementary self-interest will cause the Soviet Union to join these organizations, just as they have caused it to participate in other United Nations activities. This will be the more likely as the Soviet Union becomes convinced that the purpose of these United Nations activities is not to impose any particular economic system upon any country but to enable different systems to do business with each other on a fair and equitable basis for all concerned.

What then are my conclusions?

First. Great as the difficulties are now and may continue to be, the course of world-wide cooperation in the building of a world-wide collective security system through the United Nations is the only course that will enable any nation—the Soviet Union and the United States as much as any other—to face the future with hope.

Second. In our attitude toward the United Nations we must never forget its developing and evolutionary character nor the special responsibilities and corresponding opportunities of the United States as the strongest nation in the world to contribute to that development and influence its direction. No veto, either inside or outside the United Nations, can stop progress in the direction we wish to go, provided that we use firmly and with justice the power that is in our hands.

Third. We must use our political, military, and economic strength to the full in support of the charter and in the development of a system of collective security. Such acts as the proposed program of aid to Greece and Turkey and the assumption of a strategic trusteeship over the former Japanese mandated islands will be demonstrations to the world of the intention and ability of the United States to act in defense of peace. They will fortify faint hearts and convince doubters of where we stand. They will therefore advance the cause of collective security. In the field of economic action, we must also act to invest American capital in world-wide economic reconstruction and development and to exert American influence to the full in the reduction of barriers to an expanding world trade, and in the development and use of United Nations agencies for economic cooperation.

Fourth. We must press on for the development of effective, enforceable systems of international control of atomic energy and conventional armaments. Both are essential to collective security. We must never give up trying to secure unanimous agreement upon these issues. In the meantime we must maintain our own military strength. If we fail to do so we shall weaken our own influence and therefore diminish the chances of agreement. Few acts could be more damaging at this stage in history to the cause of collective security and of ultimate disarmament than ill-considered reductions in our budget for national defense or failure to establish a universal military training system.

Fifth. We must make sure that America continues to be a symbol of freedom and fair dealing for all the world. In our relations with the Soviet Union as much as with any other country we must demonstrate by our acts that we do not desire to dominate or threaten any nation or to interfere in its own chosen way of life. We desire to act in defense of the freedom and security of all nations, large as well as small, and to live in friendship and mutual respect with every nation so long as it does not interfere with the rights of other countries or the liberties of other peoples.

The Legal Challenges of the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of an address which it was my pleasure to deliver before the annual banquet of the Law School of the University of Wisconsin in Madison on Saturday, April 26.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEGAL CHALLENGES OF THE ATOMIC AGE

I am indeed grateful to have the opportunity to address this distinguished assemblage.

I find myself in a challenging position, faced by classmates of 40 years ago and by Justices of the Supreme Court—who, I might almost say, on occasion "would not listen to reason" in the past when I appeared before them; and by judges and governors and senators of the future.

Now, if ever, I should like to reminisce for a few moments with old classmates. And, too, I would like to "tell the Court" one or two things for which I won't be held in contempt.

For the younger lawyers, perhaps, I may be able to say a few words that may help to inspire these embryo statesmen and jurists in the wonderful profession they have chosen.

Now, my friends, just how would you face a situation such as this? Way back when we were kids on the campus, we were taught

to face our problems with faith unbounded. Anyway, I am grateful that the situation doesn't restrict my freedom of expression, as the court has done in the past. So here goes.

This is a homecoming to me. I am grateful that after 40 years, I am able to comrade with old friends and enjoy the privilege of making new ones. I have been indeed blessed.

HUMILITY BEFORE OUR PROBLEMS

At the start, I might recall for the benefit of the young barristers present, this incident told by one of the old practitioners who taught us. We used to ask questions that the professor couldn't answer, and, accordingly, some folks indicated surprise at his apparent lack of knowledge. I remember this explanation from the teacher:

"A lawyer isn't one who always knows. If he always knows, he is either a darn fool or a darn liar, and he will make a poor counsel. Don't be ashamed to say 'I don't know.' In fact, you will be fortunate if you know even after you have spent time to look up the proposition."

That advice, I believe, is more pertinent today than ever before. In years of practice, the successful practitioner finds that while some folks seemed surprised when he doesn't know, and says that he would be glad to look the matter up, he also discovers that what this old professor said was true. It is a fact that a lawyer or anyone else who always knows the answers is generally an unsafe person to follow, and folks usually find him out to be unsafe.

SPIRITUAL WITHDRAWAL FROM DAY-TO-DAY PROBLEMS

Here is another suggestion which came to us in law school years ago. It follows the idea of a recent psychologist, but it was given many years ago. It is this: Every day, take at least 15 minutes apart from your work and profession. Lose yourself in reading the greath truths in the Bible, in listening to good music, in reading good books or poetry, as President Wilson did. Do your Boy Scout good deed. In other words, get apart from your law and you will be a better lawyer, because such action clears your brain and you will be better able to see your way. By seeing your way, an old practitioner said, you will be able to see the issue clearly and then prepare your case accordingly.

This same wise counselor gave us three other vital guideposts for life:

(a) Develop a sense of humor. Be able to laugh at yourself and with other people.

(b) Develop a good disposition. It oils the wheels of everyday life, making for friends and clients and saves you from resentment and jealousy.

(c) Seek common sense (which includes faith). It will solve more problems than mere ability or great talent.

Man does not live by bread alone, and wise is the lawyer who realizes that he doesn't live by or for his law business alone.

RESPECT OF CALIBER OF LEGISLATORS

Wise is the lawyer, too, who respects those who have attained judicial position, or others in public office. I know it is easy sometimes for someone to question the caliber, for example, of men in the law-making branch of Government. I am not referring to questioning the caliber of any one man but rather the caliber of legislators as a whole who seem at times to fumble the legislative ball, to be slow of action, and to have other faults.

It is still easier to doubt the caliber of any one given man. On this point, I remember that several years ago, a couple of Senators were talking and one stated: "I wonder how so-and-so (and he named a Senator) ever got to the Senate." The man referred to was an unassuming fellow, talked little, apparently accomplished little. The other Senator answered: "You can't tell by the splash a frog makes, how far he can jump."

My friends, the truth of the second Senator's observation was later proved. When a very significant matter came up for discussion, the unobtrusive legislator took the floor, talked quietly and outlined the subject with few but adequate words, and sat down. In other words, he had said everything there was to say on that question and had said it brilliantly. There were no verbal pyrotechnics on his part. He demonstrated then how he came to the Senate.

It seems to me particularly important that we in the legal profession be the first to respect our brothers in the law-making branch of Government and be the first to recognize the value of quiet, conscientious work in the Halls of Congress, regardless of political faith. Again, I am not referring to any one man, but rather to the principle—to standards which I believe we might all follow—standards of sincere labor, of unassuming toil.

Those standards are, I believe, common sense ones.

What the Senate needs and what business needs and what every segment of our society needs is good judgment or, as Dooley called it, common sense. And, as Dooley said of common sense, "they call it common but it's the scarcest commodity on the market."

WORK OF SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Common sense is what we try to use on the Senate Judiciary Committee.

It has been suggested to me that you might like to get a view of the activities of our committee. Consequently, if no one will accuse me of devoting too much time to a subject with which I am personally concerned, I will make a few comments concerning the committee.

To begin with, the committee was 130 years old on December 10 of last year. Of course, the members of the committee are all very young and vigorous, but at least the committee itself has an historic and impressive background.

EFFECTS OF REORGANIZATION

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Judiciary Committee is concerned with some 18 specific subjects—subjects such as Federal courts and judges, constitutional amendments, bankruptcy, patents, immigration, unlawful restraints of trade, civil liberties, claims, revision and codification of statutes of the United States, and so forth.

I am told that under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the jurisdiction of the committee in terms of the number of bills considered has skyrocketed 600 percent.

Despite the fact that there are 15 standing committees of the Senate, almost one-third of the bills introduced to date funnel to this committee.

Prior to the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Claims had 13 Senators, the Committee on Immigration had 14, the Committee on the Judiciary had 18, and the Committee on Patents had 8. That makes a total membership of 53 Senators, but under the present set-up the membership on the committee has undergone a kind of legislative dehydration and has been reduced to only 13 lawyers, despite the fact that the jurisdiction has been tremendously increased. (Of course, 13 lawyers arguing together can probably make about as much noise as any 53 laymen.) You will observe, too, that we have an odd number so that we can ultimately arrive at a decision.

At times it may appear that we are in the situation which is reported to have prevailed on an occasion when a circuit judge impaneled a jury consisting of 12 lawyers. After hearing the evidence in the case, the jury retired to consider their verdict. After the jury had been in deliberation continuously for 48 hours, the judge became impatient. He sent a messenger to the jury room inquiring as to the status of the jury's deliberations. The messenger returned with the following report: "We are in our fourth nominating speech for foreman."

There are five standing subcommittees and several special subcommittees which we have found essential to efficient production-line committee procedure.

WORK ON PORTAL-TO-PORTAL BILL

The committee has considered a number of extremely important measures. Portal-to-portal legislation—a legislative dike against the economic chaos of a $6,000,000,000 flood-tide of suits—for example, has been one of the most important measures to emerge from our committee. As an illustration of the amount of hard-hitting, day-to-day work necessary to produce an involved bill of this character, I might point out that the subcommittee on this proposal held some 35 meetings, 15 of which were necessarily night sessions. There were 11 days of hearings, and the full committee met 8 times to consider the subcommittee reports.

In addition to all of the foregoing, the conferees of the House and Senate found it necessary to meet for a half dozen sessions. The hearings on this bill ran to 828 pages of solid type. Probably it was no more than proper that in its consideration of portal-to-portal legislation the subcommittee itself constantly worked unpaid portal-to-portal overtime sessions.

I mention all of the foregoing only to illustrate the extent of the legal spadework involved in producing a bill of this character. What is infinitely more important is the degree of sincerity and understanding which any committee endeavors to bring to a given problem such as the portal-to-portal problem.

Another noteworthy measure which passed the committee was the constitutional amendment seeking to limit the Presidential tenure.

This amendment, incidentally, has since been ratified by approximately one-third the States necessary for final ratification, including Wisconsin.

HANDLING OF OTHER BILLS

Another important and very involved measure which was initiated and passed by the Senate Judiciary Committee was the First Decontrol Act of 1947. In this connection, I might point out that the committee is currently engaged in a further study of the Alice-in-Wonderland maze of wartime and emergency controls, regulations, powers, and authorities which may be terminated. Fortunately for all of us, we do not have the time here today to discuss the many categories of bills which are pending before the committee, but I can point out in passing that a number of them deal with important constitutional amendments and others affect virtually all of the jurisdictions under the committee which I have previously mentioned.

WORK IN SCREENING NOMINATIONS

Of course, another function of the Judiciary Committee is to pass on the nominations of United States attorneys, United States marshals, United States district judges, and even United States Supreme Court Justices.

It may be of some interest to the young law graduates here today to know that these appointees to Federal judgeships particularly are screened with a great deal of care by the committee. A Federal judge, like Caesar's wife, must be above suspicion. It has long been a strong belief of mine that the American Bar and the various State bar associations should be consulted with reference to the judicial qualifications of candidates for such an important lifetime post, and consequently, if I may again be pardoned a personal reference, we initiated the policy of securing the comments of the American Bar Association and of the various State bar associations with reference to the various

judicial nominees. It has also been the policy of the committee to require an FBI investigation of such candidates.

Aside from a complete soul-searching scrutiny as to the legal learning and the integrity of the individual concerned, the committee likewise has been very concerned with the political philosophy of the nominee. I qualify this by saying that I do not mean the political philosophy of the nominee in the narrow terms of party labels but rather in the broader terms of what the nominee's political, social, and economic beliefs are as they relate to our constitutional system and to our judiciary.

I trust that all the embryo lawyers here today will bear in mind that they may some day be candidates for a Federal judgship and that nominations for such high office will undoubtedly involve a close scrutiny of their college activities, including reports on any moot court night sessions which may have been conducted at Picnic Point.

Accordingly, it may be appropriate to suggest to all aspiring young potential judicial nominees here that they live a life of circumspection and decorum on the campus.

COMMON SENSE IN FACING OUR CHALLENGES

I believe that advice is just the sort of common sense on which I have previously commented. Our big problem is, of course, to apply common sense to the tremendous challenges we face in this atomic age.

I need not point out to you, who recognize them so well, the responsibilities which have been placed upon our country in this new era that we have entered, following the historic utilization of atomic energy at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The legal profession—more so I believe than every other profession—is confronted by the dynamic realities of this age—realities which require it to become, as never before, a constructive force for good, for domestic and international understanding, for domestic and international encouragement of the forces of progress and liberty.

Just how may the legal profession meet the challenges of the atomic age? I should like to list but a few simple means. More will occur to you, I am sure.

1. Higher standards for the individual practitioner

The most obvious one occurs to us all.

It is the practice of our profession with higher standards than even the splendid ones that we have practiced before with a keener sense of our ethical responsibilities, with a respect for our colleagues and for our judiciary to which I have already alluded.

2. Availability of legal sources

It seems to me that a second way by which we may meet the challenges of the atomic age is to insure the ready availability of our legal sources. I believe that both layman and lawyers have often confronted the fact of the vast disorganization of our legal references. They are scattered among innumerable sources and because they are scattered, our own work is slowed down, often undergoes needless duplicate checking, and the layman feels a still greater sense of confusion before the profession of law than he would otherwise feel.

In order to assure the organization of sources of law, I have taken several steps, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I have, for example, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 69 for the preparation of a new edition of the Annotated United States Constitution. The last such edition was prepared in 1938. In its over 1,000 pages were to be found the interpretations of the Supreme Court of each clause and paragraph of that document, which you will remember Gladstone called the most wondrous work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

3. Repeal of legal deadwood

Another step which I have taken is to introduce bill S. 1120. This bill would repeal some 53 obsolete laws. Subsequent bills which I will introduce will seek to repeal as many or more obsolete laws in one swoop. It will be ideal if we can possibly repeal at the rate of a law a day or two laws or more a day, as the case may be, for as long as this Congress is in session.

My over-all purpose is, of course, to begin to clear our statute books of the vast amount of legal cobwebs which delay efficient legal work.

Toward this objective, I have invited the cooperation of all of my colleagues in the Senate and House and all of the executive agencies in locating other statutory deadwood and in cleaning it out.

I feel sure that I can count on the able support of the American legal profession and, in particular, of the American Bar Association in this endeavor, based upon previous reports to me and warm assurances of eager assistance.

Need for House Cleaning

Repealing obsolete laws is no mere negative activity; it is constructive in that it reveals the core of current law free from the surrounding mass of outdated statute.

Too long have we been so intent on passing laws, with the result that we have often completely lost sight of obsolete statutes which have grown in number to staggering proportions. I believe it should be the continuing responsibility of our executive agencies to winnow out outdated statutes within their jurisdiction and report them to Congress for repeal.

I have always felt very strongly that the particular function of the Committee on the Judiciary is not merely to grind out new laws which are necessary. It should also be the function of the Judiciary Committee to initiate a thorough legislative housecleaning. This I propose we do, beginning now.

This attempt to houseclean our statute books is not the first such attempt, but I, for one, propose to follow it through to the limit of my ability.

Lack of Laws' Coordination

The average practicing lawyer today must devote an extraordinary amount of time and energy in search of the law. The Federal Statute Law is lodged within the pages of 59 heavily bound volumes and a sixtieth volume is ready for binding.

These volumes, the Statutes at Large, are today the basic Federal statutes available to the public. They have continued in substantially the same form down to the present time and contain in chronological order all public acts, resolutions, private acts, and treaties. Publication of those books did not begin until 1845.

A formidable barrier to the successful solution of law problems is presented by Federal law, as administered, to the extent that the task of finding the correct statute to fit a point in a case is very difficult. Each succeeding session of Congress adds confusing numbers of statutes and increases the burden.

4. Need for codification of United States law

Actually the remedy for this disorganized and burdensome state of Federal law lies in an enacted codification, the fourth device by which we can be adequate to our challenges. Statutes must be assembled and codified so that order, coordination, and logical sequence will result where there is now only disjointed bulk and obscurity.

The dean of law at one college last year rightly asked whether a nation could call itself truly civilized when its law could not be located, much less stated by experts.

The Congress has taken no action to enact a general codification of the Federal laws since 1874. By the act of June 20, 1874, the Revised Statutes of the United States were authorized to be published and the first edition was officially published on February 22, 1875. Section 8 of the act stated that the revision was to be legal evidence of the laws and treaties therein contained. By act of March 2, 1877, a new edition of the Revised Statutes was authorized but not enacted, and this edition was published on February 18, 1878. Thus, the Revised Statutes are the only complete enacted codification of the Federal law in existence.

Separate Codifications

Separate fields of the law have been codified, such as are exemplified in the Criminal Code, the Judicial Code, the Internal Revenue Code, the Nationality Act.

United States Code

The United States Code, a codification of the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925, was authorized by act of Congress June 30, 1926. The compilation of this code was a tremendous task—ably accomplished. It has served a noteworthy purpose, and has been invaluable to the lawyer in his search for the Federal law.

By the terms of the act, however, as found in section 2 (a), the matter set forth in this code are only prima facie, the laws of the United States. It still remains for the lawyer to prove the statute upon which he rests his case, should there be a failure of judicial notice or objection to the admission of matter set forth in the code. That points out one of the shortcomings of the United States Code as it is now constituted. The remedy again is a complete codification and recognition of all Federal statutes as the law of the land as of a date certain to be designated in the creating act.

Future Judiciary Committee Action

It is my hope that the Committee on the Judiciary some time before the end of the year will be able to make some conclusive recommendation to the Senate respecting the complete codification and legislative recognition of all Federal statutes.

5. Coordination of legal work

The fifth great means by which I believe the legal profession can be adequate to the challenges of this atomic age, is through the coordination of the finest legal talent in public and private life, of National, State, and local Governments, in order to insure an interrelated harmony of national, State, and local law.

During the Seventy-ninth Congress I introduced a resolution for the creation of a Federal-State Relations Committee. I expect to reintroduce this resolution. I do not know if it will pass, but I feel that if it can help in a small way to indicate the vital interrelationship of our so-called levels of government, the need for them to iron out conflicting sections of tax law, to take an example, then it will have served its role.

I believe that the record of our State governments, in particular, in cooperating in legal coordination is one to be applauded and vigorously encouraged, but we know that there is still vast room for coordination of legal effort.

Insofar as possible we want domestic problems to be solved at the State and local levels rather than at the national level.

6. Legal emphasis on decentralization

I have referred now to phase 6 by which the legal profession can meet the challenges of the atomic age: It is to devise adequate laws by which the trend toward centralization in government may be halted and reversed. From every quarter there are claims that local and State laws on given problems are inadequate. In many cases they are, but the answer to their inadequacy is not the passage of Federal legislation that will attempt to deal with 48 disuniform States—disuniform economically, politically, racially,

religiously, socially—but improvement in State and local legislation so that it fulfills the standards of the atomic age.

There is no reason why anyone in these times should expect that a millenium can be brought about through legislation from Washington, D. C. The grass roots of America have enough wisdom and common sense to handle their own problems, assuming particularly enlightened leadership in State capitals.

I hope that we may be excused our pardonable pride when we say that it is to our State capital of Madison that the people of Wisconsin have always looked and should always look primarily rather than to the National Capitol at Washington for assuring the continued progress of our State.

This seems to me particularly true as we look forward to our centennial next year—a centennial which I feel certain will be not a mere historical review, splendid as that objective is, nor a mere taking of pride in the record that we have made so far, but the inauguration of a new era of progress and plenty in industry and agriculture for the Badger State.

CONCLUSION

Gentlemen, I want to thank you for your patience in listening to the somewhat extended comments on this variety of legal subjects involved in the general challenges to us in the atomic age.

It has been a pleasure to submit these comments to you, and one which I will long remember with other memories of contact with members of the bar throughout my years as a law student and as a practicing attorney.

Being present with so vast a number of distinguished jurists and jurists-to-be, I feel renewed confidence that America's legal profession will indeed be adequate to its challenges.

The Indian Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the issue of the New York Herald Tribune of March 2 last appeared an article by Mr. Ansel E. Talbert discussing the Indian question. As this is such an important question in my State, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIAN WAR HEROES LEARNING WHITE MAN HAS SHORT MEMORY—MUCH OF THEIR LAND TAKEN FOR MILITARY USES, TRIBAL LIFE DISRUPTED BY CONFLICT, THEY FACE ECONOMY DRIVE TO CUT HEALTH AND EDUCATION SERVICE

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

Friends of the American Indian are more fearful for his progress today—despite his brilliant war record—than at any time during the last quarter century.

It was within this period, with the aid of improved Federal health, educational, and other services, that the Indian ceased to be the vanishing American and became the fastest increasing racial group in the United States. In 1924 there were only 250,000 Indians in the Nation, today there are more than 340,000, and the full-bloods have been increasing more than 1 percent a year.

During the decade before World War II, the Indians' total holdings of land ceased to decline and for the first time since the landing of the Pilgrims, began to increase. The per capita income and general economic status of the Indian grew better yearly.

Today, however, there are influences and conditions which it is feared may reverse the trend. Students of Indian life say that the war caused the greatest disruption in 100 years. Many Indian families moved to centers of war industry where serious overcrowding and inadequate educational facilities prevailed.

The shortage of gasoline and transportation during the war made it necessary to close a number of schools for Indians. More than 500,000 acres of land passed out of Indian ownership during the war to be turned into air bases, gunnery ranges, and bombing-practice areas.

During the last few days in Washington, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, who heads the United States Senate's Civil Service Committee, has attacked the entire Indian policy of the Government.

For reasons of economy, Senator LANGER, an indefatigable foe of appropriations for national defense in the past, now proposes to cut appropriations for the Office of Indian Affairs. He would eliminate the Indian tribes from Federal supervision and aid and thrust the problem of Indian progress back on the States.

By coincidence the matter comes to the fore at a time when the American Indian is being congratulated for his superb war record and when the War Department is considering the formation of units of native scouts in Alaska and of special military units of Aleuts in the Aleutian Islands. A short time ago when this correspondent was visiting Adak, Col. A. M. Guerney, commanding officer of United States troops there, informed him the Aleuts were "the best sailors in the world."

Colonel Guerney disclosed that on the basis of performance of native Aleuts in taking all kinds of craft into isolated harbors regardless of weather, he had recommended the formation of a special Aleut unit to aid United States operations in the Aleutians.

There is nothing new in the courage of the American Indian in warfare and his usefulness to the Army and the Navy. The United States Military Academy at West Point had its first full-blooded Indian graduate early in the last century and a number have graduated since. One of the South's military leaders in the Civil War, Brig. Gen. Stand Watie, was a full-blooded Cherokee commanding Texas troops.

FATHER AND SON KILLED

The first American general killed in combat during World War II was Maj. Gen. Clarence L. Tinker, of Osage-Irish descent. General Tinker, who spoke the Osage language fluently, was killed June 6, 1942, leading a flight of Army Air Forces bombers against the Japanese at Midway. His son, Maj. Clarence L. Tinker, Jr., was killed in action a year later leading his fighter squadron in north Africa.

One of the Navy's outstanding air commanders in the Pacific, Admiral Joseph James Clark, whose fast carriers struck the Japanese islands of Iwo Jima and Chichi Jima in the Bonins during the final assault on the Japanese Empire, is of Cherokee extraction.

One of the most active American guerrilla leaders in the Philippines during World War II was Lt. Col. Edward Ernest McClish, a Choctaw, who graduated from Haskell Institute for Indians in 1939 and from Bacone College 2 years later.

Sent to the Philippines in 1941, Colonel McClish was in the hospital recovering from wounds when the American forces on Luzon and at Corregidor surrendered. He escaped and organized a guerrilla army of Americans and Filipinos on Mindanao, which by September 1942 consisted of 300 soldiers with 150 rifles and 4 machine guns.

By the spring of 1943 this force had grown to an entire division, the One Hundred and Tenth, with a full-strength regiment in each of the three eastern provinces and a fourth started. He joined forces with several other guerrilla groups and participated in 350 encounters with the Japanese before contact finally was made with General MacArthur's forces invading the Philippines.

Two Indians won Medals of Honor, the highest award for valor, during World War II. They are Lt. Ernest Childers, a Creek, and Lt. Jack Montgomery, a Cherokee. Thirty-four won the Distinguished Flying Cross.

In the spring of 1945, besides officers, there were almost 22,000 Indians in the Army, almost 2,000 in the Navy and more than 700 in the Marine Corps. Private First Class Ira Hayes, a Pima of Arizona, was one of the six marines who raised the American flag on the summit of Mount Suribachi, on Iwo Jima.

NAVAHOS IN FORTY-FIFTH DIVISION

Oklahoma's Forty-fifth Division, which fought in Sicily and Italy, had many Indian volunteers in its ranks. Its communications men were Navahos, who were able to keep secret, without coding, battle orders given by radiophone through the use of their native language. The Germans, Italians, and, so far as has been determined, everybody else, found the language incomprehensible.

In addition to the military, the Indian has made many contributions to modern civilization, including tobacco, rubber, potatoes and corn; Indian medicines in general use include quinine, cascara, witchhazel, and arnica. Many students hold that the form of the American government was suggested to Jefferson and its other founders by the Iroquois Confederacy, which was in existence for two centuries before the American Revolution.

A number of organizations interested in the welfare of America's original inhabitants are organizing a fight against any cut in expenditures for health and educational facilities for the Indians.

Their leaders are of the opinion that the Indian has shown what he is able to accomplish in many fields if he gets a chance and they are determined to see that he get it.

Program of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on April 25, in New York City, an address was delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] before the Yale Engineering Association. Not only was it a splendid address, but it dealt very directly with the problem which is now before the Senate. I have asked permission of the Senator from Connecticut that it may be placed in the RECORD. Having obtained his permission, I now ask unanimous consent that the address be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure to be with you. I know something of the speakers who have addressed this association in the past and so consider myself distinctly honored to be asked here tonight.

We, in the United States Senate, have had some vexing and serious problems to consider in the past 4 months. I believe the record so far has been a good one. We have kept a schedule equal to that of most preceding Congresses, though we may not have equaled the speed acquired during certain periods of the 1930's when legislative bills hardly slowed down in their rapid circle from the White House to the Capitol and back to the White House.

We have passed some 30 bills of minor importance to the Nation as a whole and several bills of major importance.

In my opinion, if this Congress accomplished four tasks wisely, its record will be outstanding. If, before the end of the session, we have provided substantial reductions in Government expense and so reduced taxes. If, by the end of the session, we have provided legislation that will actually get houses built. If we have substantially contributed to the maintenance of world peace, and if we have contributed to industrial peace by farsighted, objective legislation that will increase production and so lower prices, we can leave Washington feeling the American people are satisfied with a job well done.

I had planned to talk with you tonight about certain aspects of each of these four major issues—and I shall do so briefly—but in view of the fact that we are now dealing with labor legislation, I would like to concern myself largely with that question.

Most of us pledged before the elections in November that we would do all in our power to reduce Government expenses and taxes. Let me assure you here, tonight, that reversing a 15-year trend of free and easy Government spending is not a simple task that can be accomplished overnight. Trying to find and eliminate needless Government services and unnecessary Government employees is a little like trying to pin down a drop of mercury on a waxed floor. Particularly when, as in this case, the mercury is not inclined to be cooperative. However, I do believe we will be able to accomplish some substantial initial steps in the right direction. To do that, however, we will need the cooperation of all the American people. There is, whenever the question of an appropriations reduction comes up, a tendency for the group immediately affected, to insist, and even demand, that that particular appropriations not be touched. The same group may be clamoring for a drastic general cut in spending. This factor does not add to the ease with which reduction of Government expense is accomplished.

Insofar as maintaining the world peace is concerned, perhaps the major test in this session has already been encountered in the question of aid to Greece and Turkey. This question opened our eyes to a good many facts. The reaction of many people was, that, in some way, the United Nations, should handle the matter. Unfortunately, I believe we had all been oversold on the United Nations. By that I do not mean we had been oversold on its necessity or its great possibilities. We had been oversold on its powers. We did not realize, until this question came up, that in such a crisis the United Nations is hampered by a lack of funds, a lack of effective machinery, and the existence of the veto power.

I believe the original statement of the proposal, to some degree, improperly ignored the United Nations. Senator VANDENBERG'S amendments effectively changed the spirit of that original doctrine.

It has been curious to watch the strange reversals of opinion in this country on this question. It has been curious to watch the strange alliances the argument has created. Some of those people who most violently castigated isolationism in 1939, and particularly after the collapse of the Russian-German pact, are today most vociferous in their demands that the United States should not meddle in foreign countries. Then there are those who still believe, as they always have, that isolationism and appeasement are possible.

It was also interesting to observe the objections to the policy of the United States in the United Nations Security Council. Russian representatives insisted that the matter should be referred to the United Nations. Yet, as I recall, Russia followed a program almost identical to this one in Yugoslavia, Poland, and other countries, and so far as I recall, did not refer the matter to the United Nations in any instance.

While I am firmly convinced that we must, and can, deal peacefully with the Soviet Union, I believe we must draw the line somewhere. We cannot retreat all across Europe allowing and condoning what in effect is an aggression, an aggression of an ideology not wanted by most of the peoples involved.

This action has made clear the necessity for immediate strengthening of the United Nations. If we are to give lip service only, to that organization, then we must build and spend immediately in preparation for another war. Will it require another war to teach us the necessity of strong international organizations? Being the most powerful nation in the world today, we have a particular responsibility to see that the United Nations is more than a figurehead for peace. We have an obligation to make it a working machinery for peace. We cannot make it that unless we give it powers and authorities that will make its effective operation possible.

I can assure you that the Senators who passed this bill for aid to Greece and Turkey were a sober, thinking, worried group. I was particularly impressed in watching, one day, a huddle of Senators talking most informally, on the floor, ignoring for the most part Senate formalities and, so far as I could see, entirely ignoring individual interests. One of the men involved had lost his son in this war. Another had been in the midst of the fighting himself. In that discussion there was no question of developing private oil interests; there was no question of getting more votes in the next election; there was no question of propping up the Greek King or an undemocratic Turkish Government; the only question each man had in his mind was, "Which way lies the best hope for peace?"

I believe this bill was passed in the solemn unselfish belief that this way is the best hope for peace. This Greco-Turkish crisis has proven that one's responsibilities are really only beginning.

The third major issue about which we are concerned is housing. For more than 2 months I have, myself, been concerned with a housing bill which I am about to introduce in the Senate. As a result of long conversations with builders, veterans, housing experts, and plain citizens, I am acutely aware not only of the serious housing shortage among veterans but the great difficulty of solving that shortage. Almost everyone I talked with knew at least two or three ways that houses could not be built, but very few could offer any constructive program. My own bill provides a Federal-State subsidy. I have not arrived at that plan lightly because I do not like spending large sums of the taxpayers' money. But I see no other way of providing houses to be rented or sold at prices the veteran can pay. This emergency is the result of a long period of inadequate building. It is not to be solved so easily as the meat shortage or the shortage of white shirts. I am not sure that my bill is the best that could be evolved. I am sure that it will build houses.

Discussion has now begun in the Senate on a labor bill which may turn out to be the most controversial issue before this session of Congress. I would like to briefly go into the history of labor relations before discussing the bill.

Prior to 1900, the matter of labor legislation was not a leading national issue. Our country was still expanding. It had not reached its present status of great industrialization. Consequently, disputes between labor and management were largely local affairs, though already the pursuit of collective security had begun under the Knights of Labor and the growing American Federation of Labor. Strikes were not unknown. Some, like the Pullman strike, were reminders to the Nation of the growing dissatisfaction among the laboring people.

Strikes that were called during this early period of American unionization were bitter and bloody. It was such strikes as the Danbury Hatters strike, the Homestead strike, the miners strike in 1919, and the Pullman strike, that gave birth to some of the bitter differences between management and labor which have not been forgotten to this day. Those were the days of simple and direct remedies. Federal troops and injunctions, combined to break labor's demands for proper working conditions. In some cases, these strikes turned into, what in effect, were small civil wars, and like the Civil War, they were slowly, painfully forgotten. No permanent solution was reached. Management felt that labor was becoming unreasonable and must be suppressed—by force. The struggle only made labor more determined to win regardless of the cost.

The Clayton Act of 1914 sought to ease the difficulties by defining labor as not being a commodity and hence not subject to injunctions under the antitrust acts. The courts succeeded in defeating the purpose of the bill.

In addition to the injunction, Federal troops and the courts, employers had other weapons to prevent union activity—black lists, espionage, and yellow-dog contracts. Under such conditions, labor stiffened its determination. Membership grew until by 1920, unions had gained considerable strength in industries such as mining, construction, printing, and railroads. But by and large, labor organizations were still weak.

Between 1920 and 1930, prosperity in this country caused a reduction in the membership of trade-unions. That decline continued through the early years of the depression, until by 1930 the total union membership was estimated to be not much more than 2,500,000.

It was not until the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which in effect stopped injunctions against normal union activities, that unions began to flourish.

The public had become aware that the labor problem was a public problem. Soon the Wagner Act, or National Labor Relations Act, was enacted to prevent employers from intimidating, interfering with, or discriminating against employees because of union activity, and to put the obligation to bargain on the employer. Then the Fair Labor Standards Act outlawed child labor and set minimum wages and hours for work. This policy of encouraging labor and unionism has brought the strength of union membership to somewhere near fifteen million. This recent period in our industrial history has created labor as a power of great political, social, and economic significance in this country. Again, the struggle has not been a peaceful one. Any such rapid growth is likely to bring with it certain abuses. Together with their power in dealing with employers, has come the union's power over

the members and the power to injure innocent bystanders.

Our problem and our purpose should not be to destroy the rights labor has won. Rather, the purpose of labor legislation should be to prevent powerful unions from using that power to commit injustices against their own members and, against the community, against industry.

I have heard a lot about the mandates handed down in the last election and I am sure you have. I believe the mandate from the people was simply a desire for a change from conditions they did not like. Among other things, they believed that high prices and shortages were being caused, to some degree, by labor disputes that were interrupting production. They hoped that new labor legislation would help correct this situation.

But not all of us mean the same thing when we talk about labor legislation. There are some who, in speaking of adequate labor legislation, mean no legislation guaranteeing labor's rights, or at least no more than we had in 1920. There are others who, in speaking of adequate labor legislation mean maintaining exactly what we have. There is a third group, and I think that includes most of us, who, in thinking of labor legislation, think in terms of sound, long-range planning which excludes entirely the radical desires of either of the former groups.

I have had people tell me that we should repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act, repeal the Wagner Act, and repeal the Fair Labor Standards Act, so that we could have industrial peace. If we did those things, I am sure we could have industrial peace for a time—at the point of guns. I am not prepared to see rights of any group in this country so treated that they can be kept peaceful only by force. A forced peace is no peace. There are those, on the other hand, who have told me we must not touch any of our present labor laws. Yet many of them will admit that certain unions and certain union leaders have taken advantage of those laws to the harm of the general public. Again, I do not propose to see this country allow any group to so use its monopolistic strength that the welfare of public good is frustrated.

I believe, rather, we have to work toward constructive legislation that will have in it none of the violent swings that occurred between 1920 and 1947. It is time that management recognize certain rights and privileges of labor and of the public. It is time, also, that labor recognize certain rights and privileges of management and of the public. I am optimistic enough to believe that we can provide industrial peace if we quit swinging to violent extremes.

These past 15 years have changed this country, and don't forget, that these 15 years have changed all of the country. The public has become more aware of the problems of labor. To try to return to the 1920's would, I am sure, be most unsatisfactory except to those pessimists who live in the dream world of bygone days—while waiting for their Maker to relieve them of the pain of realities.

Now, as a purely practical matter, let us see what would happen if we decided that we should enact, in this session of Congress, labor legislation that sought to repeal most of the gains labor made during the past 15 years.

If such a bill passed the Congress, it would then go before the President of the United States. The President would, very likely, veto the bill. It is unlikely that a veto would be overridden. The net result would be no change in our labor legislation. That effect would defeat our purpose and satisfy no one. If, on the other hand, such labor legislation did by some chance become law, what would the result be? Labor has had a heady taste of freedom and an overdose of power. Does anyone suppose that the laboring people of our country would return quietly to the place they held in society 25 years ago without protest? The result would rather be a wave of strikes and industrial warfare such as we have never seen in this country. Production would come to a halt. Shortages would increase. Prices would skyrocket. The people would violently object. The net result would be that in 1948 a new set of laws, even more unpalatable to management than the existing ones, would be quickly put on our lawbooks.

Those are the simple facts of this case. Without taking either side, any practical man should realize that an employer who believes he can put labor back to where it was 50 years ago is deluding himself, wasting his time, and heading for further labor trouble. He is contributing to his own loss of rights and to an eventual increase in labor powers.

We have an opportunity now to deal with this problem realistically. We have an opportunity to stop the violent swings of labor legislation. Let us consider some of the conditions that appear to require correction. Before blanketly condemning these corrective measures, I hope both labor and management will carefully scrutinize the specific provisions. If both object, perhaps the bill is indeed promising.

Certain practices that grew out of the Wagner Labor Relations Act received particular attention from the public. One of these was the closed shop. Both jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts have caused ill feeling, particularly since the actual relationship between the management and the employees of the company directly involved has nothing to do with the strike.

Demands have been made that industry-wide bargaining be outlawed; mass picketing be made illegal; supervisors be barred from collective bargaining rights; that union shops be outlawed; that injunctions be permitted; that all Communists be barred from unions; that strikes in public service industries be made illegal, and so on.

Comparatively few people, with whom I have talked on this matter, have been able to make specific criticisms of proposed legislation or specific suggestions for better legislation. This is most unfortunate because in building up farsighted, progressive legislation to keep labor-management peace, and so allow greater productions, we have to examine specific legislation. We cannot deal in generalities.

Let us consider, briefly, the bill agreed on by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I don't agree with this bill in all details, but I do believe it is a long step in the proper direction. I do not believe the President could conscientiously veto it, and I do believe it would stop certain abuses on the part of certain unions and leaders without disturbing the fundamental rights and privileges of either labor or management.

In this committee bill, the right of collective bargaining is reaffirmed. Certain procedures are outlined and certain methods of selecting representation are prescribed. The National Labor Relations Board is maintained with certain changes—seven members are provided instead of the present three. The review section is abolished but will—in effect—be reestablished under each of the seven members. The purpose of this is to prevent the review section from becoming a policy group. An independent Federal Mediation Service is created. In this bill, industry-wide bargaining is not mentioned. Industry-wide bargaining is favored by labor, and in many cases by management, and has existed for many years as a stabilizing influence in some industries. The whole problem will require considerable additional attention and thus may quite properly be further reviewed by study committees established under this bill. To make geographical limitations in bargaining is hopelessly arbitrary as any competent economist knows. The Senate bill effectively postpones strikes or lock-outs, which affect the public health or public safety, by permitting injunctions for a minimum period of 75-days during which the case can be mediated. The court may continue the injunction longer. The unfair labor practices of employers, as contained in the Wagner Act, are reiterated with certain additions and changes. But certain employees' practices are also made unfair labor practices. The employee is not allowed to interfere with the employer in his selection of representation for the adjustment of grievances or for collective bargaining. The employees or unions are prevented from refusing to bargain, from engaging in secondary boycotts, or from attempting to persuade an employer to discharge an employee who has been denied union membership for reasons other than nonpayment of dues. The closed shop is made an unfair labor practice, but a union shop is permissible if a majority vote of all the employees favor it. Jurisdictional disputes are effectively handled by the provision that required the National Labor Relations Board to settle such disputes immediately. No employer, under this act, is required to deal with organizations of supervisors for purposes of collective bargaining. Free speech is guaranteed for employers. Unions are made suable for violations of contracts. Unions must make certain reports to their members. A House-Senate Committee for the study of labor-management relations is established.

This bill deals effectively with the principal objections to labor unions' misuse of power. I believe it will serve to lessen industrial strife, and so will serve the public good.

There has been entirely too much loose talk, in my opinion, about curbing labor, stopping power-mad leaders, wrecking unions. This kind of talk is of an inflammatory nature that has no place in sound considerations. We are dealing, here, with human beings. More than that, we are dealing with American citizens, men that you and I know and live with. If we pass any legislation that will drive them to violent action by the punitive nature of its provisions, we are doing this Nation and ourselves a disservice. I have said before, and I say again, to you here, that we should rather be thinking about constructive, objective legislation designed to reduce strikes, rather than to incite trouble. We cannot return to the 1920's, but we can make constructive additions in the legislation of the 1930's designed to equalize the obligations of labor and management. It seems to me that this Senate bill does that.

If we pass legislation that we are aware the President will veto and that we are aware will not be passed over that veto, we will have created a great political issue, but we will not have served well the American people, because we will have left them, so far as labor legislation is concerned, in the same condition we found them in November 1946.

Maine Mother of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD certain newspaper items and an editorial dealing with an event which is of supreme interest and gratification to a Member of this body,

the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. The mother of the Senator from New Hampshire was chosen as "Maine Mother of 1947." This distinction, which has come to the Senator's mother, emphasizes the fact that in Maine we might be said to have three Senators representing us, the third being Senator STYLES BRIDGES, who was born in Maine, who received his education there, and to whose mother has now come this unique distinction.

I also ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a brief statement concerning Mrs. Alina F. Bridges.

There being no objection, the newspaper items and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. Alina F. Bridges, of West Pembroke, Maine, was recently named as Maine Mother of 1947 and, as a result of this honor, was considered for the title of American Mother of 1947, an award made annually by the American Mother Committee of the Golden Rule Foundation.

Mrs. Bridges was born in West Pembroke, Maine, September 14, 1875. Upon the death of her husband, Earle L. Bridges, when the eldest child, STYLES BRIDGES, was but 9 years of age, she supported the family and provided for their future education, supplementing the income from their small farm by teaching school. Mrs. Bridges taught in the village school in West Pembroke for 22 years and taught 8 more years in the Pembroke schools before her retirement when she reached 60 years of age. Mrs. Bridges still retains her residence in West Pembroke, although she now lives through the winter months with her daughter, Miss Doris Bridges, in Milton, Mass. Her three children are STYLES BRIDGES, United States Senator and former Governor of New Hampshire, Miss Doris Bridges, a graduate of Farmington State Normal School, Boston University, and Columbia University, who is presently head of the English department of Milton High School, and Dr. Ronald Bridges, president of the Pacific School of Religion, at Berkeley, Calif., and national moderator of the Congregational-Christian churches.

Since her retirement, Mrs. Bridges has maintained an active interest in community and church affairs.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Daily Globe of April 15, 1947]

BRIDGES' MOTHER NOMINATED FOR HONOR

WEST PEMBROKE, MAINE, April 14.—Mrs Alina Fisher Bridges, 71, named by the Golden Rule Foundation today as its Maine nominee for American Mother of 1947, taught school here for 30 years and reared three children, two of whom have become known nationally.

Her sons are United States Senator H. STYLES BRIDGES, representative of New Hampshire, and Ronald P. Bridges, president of the Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, Calif., and national moderator of the Congregational-Christian Church.

Mrs. Bridges' daughter, with whom she now lives, is Doris Bridges, head of the English department at Milton (Mass.) High School.

Mrs. Bridges' husband died when her elder son, the Senator, was 9 years old, and she began teaching in the village school to augment her meager income from the family farm. She retired about 10 years ago.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Morning Union of April 15, 1947]

SENATOR BRIDGES' MOTHER CHOSEN AS MAINE MOTHER OF 1947

The last-minute withdrawal of her name by the woman selected as New Hampshire's candidate for American Mother of 1947 was expected last night to mean that the Granite State will be without a nominee this year. Mrs. Hugh Berquist, of Meredith, State chairman for the Golden Rule Foundation, stated that she did not think there was time to make an alternate selection.

Meanwhile New Hampshire can share some of the honors with Maine, since the candidate chosen for that State is Mrs. Alina Fisher Bridges, 71, of West Pembroke, the mother of United States Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger of April 15, 1947]

HONORED BY MAINE

Now a Milton resident is Maine's nominee for selection as the American Mother of 1947. She is Mrs. Alina Fisher Bridges, 71-year-old mother of United States Senator STYLES BRIDGES and Miss Doris Bridges, head of the English department at Milton High School, with whom Mrs. Bridges now makes her home at 36 Pine Grove, Milton. Another son is Dr. Ronald P. Bridges, president of the Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, Calif., and national moderator of the Congregational-Christian Church. Mrs. Bridges, who taught school and brought up her three children after their father died, was named today as Maine's American Mother of 1947.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of April 15, 1947]

PARENT OF UNITED STATES SENATOR CHOSEN 1947 MAINE MOTHER—FIRST NOTIFIED BY NEWS

Mr. Alina Fisher Bridges, 71, retired West Pembroke school teacher and mother of United States Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, has been named the 1947 Maine State Mother, it was announced last night by the Golden Rule Foundation in New York City.

IT'S WONDERFUL

First notification of the signal honor reached Mrs. Bridges at her daughter's home in Milton, Mass., last night, through a telephone call made to her by the Bangor Daily News. Mrs. Bridges has been spending the winter with her daughter, Miss Doris Bridges, who is head of the English department at Milton High School.

"It's very wonderful," exclaimed Mrs. Bridges. "I don't know what to say. I'm overcome. It's—well, it's just wonderful. That's all I can say. I had no idea I was even being considered."

In addition to the Senator and Miss Doris Bridges, she is the mother of Dr. Ronald Bridges, president of the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, Calif., a prominent churchman and civic leader. He is moderator of the Congregational National Conference.

Those who know Mrs. Bridges in West Pembroke and, in fact, all who know her can easily understand why she should have been chosen as an outstanding mother. Her husband, Earle L. Bridges, died when the eldest child, STYLES, was only 9 years old and she supported them by teaching school.

She was able, moreover, to maintain the old family home in West Pembroke and to give the children an opportunity to acquire educations and get started on their successful careers.

Mr. Bridges was operating a general store in West Pembroke when he died. It previously had been conducted by his father. Mrs. Bridges took a position in the village school where she taught for 22 years. She taught 8 more years in Pembroke schools before her retirement when she reached 60 years of age.

A friend in Eastport, who has known her for many years, declared last night that Mrs. Bridges was typical of the "finest of American school teachers and of American mothers." She won both the respect and popularity of her pupils during the many years she taught six different grades in the village school.

Her daughter is a graduate of Farmington State Normal School and also has degrees from Boston University and Columbia University.

[From the New Hampshire Morning Union of April 16, 1947]

PERFECT TRIBUTE

Selection of Mrs. Alina Roxiana Bridges, STYLES BRIDGES' mother, as Maine Mother of 1947, an honor that makes her a nominee for American Mother of 1947, is mighty appealing to New Hampshire people. So is the comment of Robert Peter Tristram Coffin, Bowdoin professor and Pulitzer prize poet. Mr. Coffin remembers that Mrs. Bridges was "left a widow in straitened circumstances in one of our tiniest and out-of-the-way villages, far from opportunities of any kind; her children have made their marks high in the annals of America."

Thus is tribute paid to a mother's love and guidance, a perfect tribute.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Santa Fe New Mexican appears an open letter, addressed to President Truman, by C. Andrade III, of Dallas, Tex., discussing a rather novel provision for national defense. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. CITIZEN PROPOSES SUPREME UNITED STATES DEFENSE COUNCIL

OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

In view of the serious charges made against the Communists and the U. S. S. R. by such outstanding authorities as J. Edgar Hoover, ex-Governor Earle of Pennsylvania, ex-Ambassador Bullitt, and others, I feel that drastic action should be taken for the defense of the United States.

We have had one experience in fighting gangsters and they do not fight according to the Marquis of Queensbury rules. I agree heartily with everything ex-Governor Earle says. Before we could call Congress and declare war against the Soviet Union this Nation could be obliterated.

I propose the immediate formation of a supreme national defense council, to be headed by yourself with every member of your Cabinet on this council and an equal number of Republicans. A committee should be appointed consisting of three Republican Senators and three Republicans from the House of Representatives to select the names of the Republican members of this council. All members of the council, including your Cabinet as well as the Republican nominees, must be confirmed by a majority vote of the House and Senate.

This council should be vested by Congress with the authority to take any measures the council by two-thirds vote might deem advisable for the safety of the United States from any threat from any nation.

If we just sit by playing this diplomatic game with Russia gaining a point here and giving one there until they have the bomb fully developed, we are just putting off the inevitable day until they have sufficient atomic weapons to destroy us.

The supreme national defense council should be able to order our armed forces into any part of the world on instant notice, to drop bombs, or do anything necessary for the welfare of the United States.

We should take immediate steps to deport all known Communists who are not American citizens. The other Communists should be made to report to the FBI once every 2 weeks. All labor organizations should be made to oust known Communists forthwith. It is time we got our house in order. I realize that a great many citizens will claim that too much power would be vested in the body which I propose should be created. I know you will be accused of playing party politics in creating an emergency, but the emergency is real and the threat is genuine.

Should the Democrats not elect a President in 1948, then, immediately upon the inauguration of the new President, he should forthwith form his Cabinet and an equal number of outstanding Democrats should be put on this commission. Men of unimpeachable morals and ethics are the only men that should even be considered for this council.

Secrecy is of the utmost importance. Let's ready ourselves so that if our Army G2 or Navy Intelligence, the FBI, or the State Department have conclusive evidence of an impending attack, we can beat our enemies to the draw.

It would seem that Russia is our only potential enemy of any magnitude, so we will have to be realistic. Molotov is notoriously anti-American—much more so than Stalin—and Molotov is slated, according to all reliable reports to be the next top man in Russia. In fact, right now Molotov on external affairs probably has more actual influence than Stalin.

I believe that if this proposal is carried out Russia would immediately do two things. First, give up the veto power, which is one thing which makes the United Nations organization weak; and the other would be to grant open inspection by the United Nations of the U. S. S. R. territory and the territory of their satellites, to keep control on atomic development. If these two purposes could be accomplished, then we could fall back on the United Nations organization.

C. ANDRADE III.

DALLAS, Tex.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on April 24, 1947, the Arkansas Democrat published an editorial entitled "Senate Takes Momentous Step," dealing with the Greek-Turkish loan bill. I think this editorial is a very able statement of the situation, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE TAKES MOMENTOUS STEP

A momentous step was taken by the Senate Tuesday when it approved the President's request for $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey. The frank purpose is to help those two nations to stand against the Communist tide which has been sweeping out of Russia over much of Europe.

There is danger in that course. W are opposing the all-too-plain and much-too-successful efforts of Russia to use the miseries of war-shattered peoples as a means of extending her political power.

We are saying, "Thus far and no further," to the autocratic government of a mighty nation—a government which has shown that it is bent on expansion, and ruthless in the means it employs. Russia has already annexed a huge territory, and has backed Communist minorities in neighboring countries, enabling them to take control by corrupt and often brutal methods.

It is no light thing to oppose such a power. But it is more perilous to do nothing, while a tyranny grows and spreads. We did that in the 1930s.

We looked the other way, refused to act, when Mussolini and Hitler and the masters of Japan were grabbing and oppressing and intrenching themselves for an assault on the dearest values of our civilization. And it cost us the frightful price of World War II.

So now we are acting. The Senate voted almost three to one for the aid to Greece and Turkey. Our two Arkansas Senators were among the heavy majority for the bill.

That vote is in vivid contrast to the isolationism which gripped Congress and the Nation after World War I—which scuttled part of our Navy, dwarfed the Army to a feeble gesture, and refused to give our strength to make the League of Nations effective.

We have been one of the foremost peoples in supporting the present United Nations—while Russia has hung back, vetoed the majority will, and obstructed both the UN and the peace settlement.

What will come of this Greek-Turkey aid, no man can say. The ultimate decision is with Russia. Our national leaders do not believe that she wants war. Certainly, this country does not. The Senate has greatly strengthened our moral position in this action by giving the UN power to halt it.

Now the Senate bill goes to the House—which has a similar bill of its own. Approval seems assured. We are on a ne world course, having chosen the lesser of two evils—the only road which seems to promise security for ourselves and peace for the world.

Prisoners of War

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. OWENS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago I addressed the House with respect to the terrible situation which existed in Europe so far as German prisoners of war were concerned; that is, prisoners of war who were being used as slave labor over there. I spoke about complaints of labor leaders of America to the effect that slave labor was having on our own labor over here.

Last month I placed in the RECORD a letter from Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State, which showed a considerable improvement in this situation. I have another letter from Dean Acheson showing further improvement. However, there are still millions of those prisoners in the countries of our recent ally, the Soviet Union, and that country has refused to explain how they are using these prisoners although we are certain that they are using them as slaves. They have not given our State Department any information. I believe something should be done about that matter.

The letter from Acheson is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 18, 1947.

The Honorable THOMAS L. OWENS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. OWENS: I have received your letter of April 9, 1947, further in regard to the repatriation of German prisoners of war.

With respect to your question concerning the program in France, you are informed that the two phases of the program, that is, repatriation to Germany and liberation on the spot, are being carried on concurrently. There are now in France sufficient numbers of eligible prisoners of war desiring repatriation to fill the quota of 20,000 per month which, as you know, is the minimum rate agreed to at the Paris meeting of American and French representatives. In addition, 25,000 per month will be approached by the French authorities and given the opportunity of remaining in France as free workers. Those desiring to do so will be immediately released from prisoner-of-war status, while those indicating that they do not wish to remain will become eligible for repatriation. Both these rates are subject to upward revision as circumstances permit.

With regard to German prisoners of war captured and held by the U. S. S. R., as indicated in my previous letter, no transfers of American-captured prisoners of war were made to the Soviet authorities. Consequently, you will appreciate that in these circumstances there does not exist the same basis for unilateral action by this Government as in the case of governments holding American-captured prisoners of war. The problem is rather one to be resolved on a quadripartite basis as a matter affecting the over-all administration of Germany, and is of interest to us as one of the occupying powers.

I have noted your opinion concerning the accuracy of the recent Tass report, and your interest in receiving further information on this subject. I shall keep your request in mind and communicate with you again should additional pertinent information be received in the Department.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary.

Wool Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post this morning an editorial entitled "Wool Dilemma." I ask unanimous consent

that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOOL DILEMMA

We pointed out the other day that Senate passage of a bill providing price support until 1949 for domestic wool at the 1946 level (incidentally that level is above parity) shows that the Government's price-lifting program for agricultural products has not become an anachronism. If the House follows the advice of its Agriculture Committee, the Secretary of Agriculture will also be empowered to impose import fees on foreign wools, in addition to regular duties, whenever he thinks that imports are interfering materially with the domestic market.

There has been a good deal of sniping at these proposals for maintaining wool prices at levels which have pushed domestic wool out of the market and opened the door for a veritable flood of foreign wool. Obviously the price support program is inconsistent with the President's drive to bring down living costs, since the higher price for wool will raise the cost and prices of woolen fabrics. The proposed import fees are likewise, as Representative HOPE, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, admits, contrary in spirit to the reciprocal trade policy which the Government is pushing so energetically.

Although continuance of support prices at existing high levels are, in our opinion, indefensible, the proposed additional import fee appears to be a logical accompaniment of the support program under conditions now prevailing. For the Commodity Credit Corporation is stuck with a huge wool surplus acquired at high support prices that is unsalable in competition with foreign wool. Secretary Anderson has long been pressing for permission to dispose of this wool without regard to legal restrictions on selling price. The Senate price-support bill permits him to do so, provided sales are made "at such a rate and in such manner as will avoid disruption of the domestic market."

The Government has large amounts of money tied up in wool. In fact, more than half of all the funds now invested in the price-support program have been used to support wool prices. It will benefit the taxpayers if this wool can be disposed of while demand is strong at prices entailing no great loss. Its sale would also dissipate fears that some day this wool might be suddenly released, with resultant demoralizing effects on market prices. Obviously, if this disposal program is to be pushed without disrupting the domestic market, it will be necessary to curb foreign wool imports, either by imposing import quotas or fees of the type recommended by the House Agricultural Committee.

Incidentally the wool price-support program has conferred substantial benefits on foreigners, since it has enabled exporting countries to dispose of some of their surplus wool in the American market at very high prices. Last year about 80 percent of all the wool consumed in this country was imported. With annual consumption totaling a billion pounds, the take was a large one. With foreign wools, duties added, selling at prices not far below comparable domestic wools, the American consumer will not benefit greatly from this foreign invasion while the taxpayer will have to shoulder the losses of the domestic support program.

The wool program emphasizes the need for a reexamination of our price-support system in the light of its effects upon our domestic economy and our foreign relations.

The Advertising Council

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to pay tribute to a significant anniversary—a fifth anniversary which, in my opinion, is of the greatest possible significance to this democracy.

For five uninterrupted years, with little credit and no acknowledgment from the legislative branch of the Government, American business has devoted a good share of its advertising to the solution of broad national problems. And it has done this in an orderly, planned, and efficient way through its own nonprofit, public-service organization—The Advertising Council.

The lasting success of a representative form of government such as ours rests upon one all-important basis—an informed people. We firmly believe in our democratic system because we also firmly believe that, if the people are given ready access to facts, uncolored by prejudice or propaganda, they will act wisely, vote wisely, and wisely work together for the common good.

Because we live in a complex society, the Government often is in sole possession of facts which it is vitally necessary that the public know. The Government is also aware of nonpolitical, nonpartisan, national objectives which can be attained only if the public is informed of the facts. It is the Government's clear duty, therefore, to see that such facts and such objectives are made clear to the public. It is the duty of both the legislative and the executive branches of our Government, not only to make the facts necessary to intelligent action available to the people, but to use every legitimate means to see that those facts reach the people.

Five years ago this obligation of the Government became vastly more important and vastly more difficult. The war had brought a greater need for common action for the common good than had ever existed. The principles of our Government led us to secure this common action by persuasion rather than by compulsion. Action could be secured only by the presentation of persuasive facts which would induce people to buy War bonds, plant Victory gardens, salvage paper and metals, work in a war factory, and do the hundred-and-one things that would meet the needs of the home front.

The persuasion could be effective only if the facts should be repeated again and again until everyone should know them. The most powerful modern technique for simplifying facts, for bringing them to great masses of people, and for repeating those facts over and over until action results is advertising. Nowhere has advertising been so highly developed as a means of mass communication than in the United States. American advertising has sold merchandise and sold services, and thereby helped to develop the highest standard of living in the world. A group of public-spirited advertising men thought, very early in the war, that advertising could also be used to sell ideas, to spread essential home front information, and thereby to persuade people to common action for the common welfare.

So it was that, shortly after Pearl Harbor, representatives of every phase of American advertising organized themselves for the purpose of mobilizing advertising support behind essential home-front campaigns. They financed and set up the War Advertising Council, which is today continuing to serve the public interest as the Advertising Council.

The Advertising Council aided the Government in preparing more than 150 home-front campaigns, at no cost to the Government. Then it went to American business—big business and little business—and American business voluntarily contributed more than $1,000,000,000 of advertising space and time to those campaigns during the war years.

The result was that more Americans took part in more common action for common ends than at any time in any country's history. The people learned the facts from advertising—radio advertising, newspaper and magazine advertising, outdoor posters, window posters, car cards—and the advertising was contributed by every sort of business from the industrial corporation with national advertising budgets to the city department store and the small-town bank. The newspapers and magazines, the radio stations and radio networks, and the billboard and car-card industries also contributed advertising space and time running into millions of dollars. And the advertising agencies—more than 400 of them—volunteered their services in the preparation of advertisements without charge.

The part American business and American advertising played in keeping the people informed during the war and in persuading them to necessary cooperation in war programs is easily the greatest single contribution to the Nation's welfare that has ever been accomplished on an entirely voluntary basis.

The first week in May marks the fifth anniversary of this organized use of advertising to help solve national problems, of advertising's new role of public servant as well as private salesman, and of business using its voice to display its good citizenship as well as its good salesmanship.

There is no greater tribute to the virility of our democracy, to the willingness of its business interests to work for the common good, and to the efficiency of voluntary action as compared with governmental compulsion, than the record of 5 years in which public-service advertising, contributed by American business interests, has helped this Nation solve some of its most critical problems.

Public-service advertising was a wartime discovery. It continues as a power

for good in peacetime, for The Advertising Council continues to aid both the Government and private groups serving the public in the preparation of public-service advertising campaigns and in securing advertising contributions to those campaigns from business. And business is continuing thus to serve the public interest with contributions both of money and of its advertising at the rate of more than $100,000,000 per year.

The cost of this great public service is borne by business. It costs the Government nothing beyond the very small comparative cost of providing the paper and printing to take advantage of the contributions of space and time by advertisers and advertising media—and this cost to the Government is less than 1 cent for every dollar of advertising space and time, plus the cost of the Division of Advertising Liaison, now lodged in the Office of Government Reports, of about $100,000 per year. It is easily the biggest bargain ever offered to the Federal Government—$100,000,000 worth of service at a cost of less than one-half of 1 percent.

Let me contrast for a moment the voluntary contribution of advertising in the public interest with the system which is in effect in England.

England likewise has discovered that advertising is essential to the distribution of public information. In fact, they consider it so essential that the Government appropriates large sums to be spent upon the purchase of advertising space and time. We are apt to consider British postwar problems as different from ours, but if you examine the list of British Government advertising campaigns, you will find that both we and they are attacking through advertising the problems of health, accidents, sale of government bonds, recruiting nurses for hospitals, and many others—as detailed in a recent speech by the Right Honorable Herbert Stanley Morrison, Lord President of the Council and leader of the House of Commons.

The striking difference between the two systems for the distribution of information through advertising is that England's is government controlled and government paid for, while in this country American business voluntarily foots the bill.

Why is American business contributing the force of its advertising to public-service campaigns? Not only because it is good for the Nation. Not only because it is good for the Government. But because it is also good for business. Public-service advertising is proving that competition is not inconsistent with cooperation. It is proving that business can contribute effectively to the social welfare of the people as well as to their economic welfare. It is proving that business has the Nation's good at heart, not by merely saying so, but by contributing in a practical way to the Nation's good.

I do not hesitate to say, in fact, that the Advertising Council, supported as it is by business interests of every size and throughout the entire country, is doing as much to demonstrate the value and effectiveness of our system of individual enterprise as any organization in the country, and that the Advertising Council is providing a most practical and effective reply to the critics of our system who say that business is essentially predatory and opposed to the common interests of the people.

The men who direct The Advertising Council include some of the most prominent names both in advertising and in industry. During the war, these men dedicated The Advertising Council to the war effort, working exclusively with those agencies of the Federal Government which were concerned with the prosecution of the war, with the American Red Cross and with the National War Fund.

Since the war, The Advertising Council's services and facilities are available to any Government agency or any private organization, whose cause is important to the public interest and whose objectives are nonpartisan, nonpolitical, and noncontroversial. The Advertising Council will conduct no campaign unless, in its opinion, it is clearly in the interest of the whole public and is outside the realm of controversy. Each campaign must either have had its policy established by an act of Congress, or it must be approved by three-fourths of the Council's public-advisory committee. This public advisory committee consists of 19 men and women representing a cross-section of America. They are all prominent, public-spirited citizens reflecting the thoughts and aspirations of business management of labor of the social services, of our three great religions, of education, and of agriculture.

Perhaps the most dramatic and far-reaching campaigns now on the Advertising Council's docket are the American heritage campaign and the American economic system campaign.

The American heritage campaign will reaffirm the principles of American democracy and liberty, and will call the attention of Americans both to their political rights and to their duties as citizens. This campaign is allied with the Attorney General's plan to send a "Freedom Train" through the 48 States beginning this fall. The "Freedom Train" will be a traveling shrine of Americanism, carrying a collection of the original documents, such as the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, which evidence our liberties.

The American economic system campaign will bring home to the American people the great achievements of our free economic system and the absolute interdependence of its various parts, and will rally all Americans in a national effort to raise our living standards by making the system work for the benefit of all. This campaign was approved unanimously by the Council's public advisory committee in which both labor and management are represented.

Last year United States Savings bonds redemptions were far above purchases. The Advertising Council began a campaign in cooperation with the Treasury Department. The result was that bond sales reached unprecedented figures and this spring are soaring far above redemptions.

For more than a year, the Advertising Council has conducted a traffic-safety campaign in cooperation with the National Safety Council. The National Safety Council gives the Advertising Council credit for having done much with this campaign to bring the traffic death rate to a figure 19 percent less than the last peacetime year.

These are but a few of the many campaigns conducted in the interest of the whole people by the Advertising Council with the space, time and money contributed by American business. Five years of public-service advertising by business has proved that it is good for the public, good for Government, and good for business.

Through the Advertising Council, American business is contributing in a new way to the better working of our democracy.

Settlement of Displaced Persons of Baltic Origin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Maine has recently passed a bill, introduced by Charles A. Peirce, representing the capital city of Augusta, in an attempt to effect the settlement of displaced persons of Baltic origin on private property in Maine. This indicates the deep concern of our people over this subject and, while extending assistance to displaced persons, makes productive abandoned Maine farms. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the act in the RECORD:

H. P. 1543—L. D. 1173

An act setting aside certain lands for settlement by displaced persons of Baltic origin

Whereas the problem of the resettlement and readjustment of displaced persons of Europe is one of the major problems confronting framers of permanent world peace; and

The people of the State of Maine, descendants of former tyranny's refugees who sought freedom and opportunity within these boundaries, express deep sympathy for the plight of today's displaced persons; and

The people of this State have great faith in its future economic and cultural development; and

The economy and culture of the State, temporarily weakened and threatened by the removal at the present time of many of its young men and women to other States, would be strengthened by immigrant settlers from other lands; and

The contribution already made to the State's economy and culture by settlers of Scandinavian and Baltic origin, among others, is of great value and could well be increased by such additional settlers; and

Among the displaced persons of Europe, those of Baltic origin, i. e., natives of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, appear to be particularly adaptable for settlement in this State by reason of similarities in the natural economy and climate of Maine and those countries; and

It seems likely that displaced persons from these Baltic Nations will never be able to return to their native lands which have lost

their sovereignty and have been absorbed by a stronger power: Now, therefore

Be it enacted by the people of the State of Maine, as follows:

Revised statutes, chapter 32, sections 49–A, 49–B, additional. Chapter 32 of the revised statutes is hereby amended by adding thereto two new sections to be numbered 49–A and 49–B, inclusive, to read as follows:

"SEC. 49–A. Statement of policy: It shall be and is hereby declared to be the policy of the State of Maine to encourage the settlement within its borders of displaced persons of Baltic origin; provided nevertheless that nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to discourage immigrants of other nationalities.

"SEC. 49–B. Maine Development Commission to arrange for settlement through negotiations with the Department of State, Deparment of Justice, and the United Nations: The Maine Development Commission is hereby empowered and authorized to negotiate with the United States Department of State, with the United States Department of Justice, and with the United Nations, or with any proper agency or department of the United Nations, to arrange for the settlement in this State of such displaced persons of Baltic origin who are able to buy, or who may have brought for them, private property within the State owned by private persons."

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an account of a recent sermon delivered by Rev. Robbins Ralph, of the First Congregational Church, of Northampton, Mass., as reported in the Daily Hampshire Gazette of that city. The sermon is particularly timely in view of the fact that the House is about to take up the issue of President Truman's proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey.

LOCAL MINISTER DEPLORES TRUMAN'S NEW ISOLATIONISM—REV. ROBBINS RALPH FEELS UN, CREATED FOR DEALING WITH EMERGENCIES, SHOULD NOT BE BYPASSED IN GREECE-TURKEY MATTER

With Divided We Fall as his sermon subject, Rev. Robbins Ralph of the First Congregational Church took as his text last Sunday morning the twenty-fifth verse from the twelfth chapter of Matthew: "Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste; no city or house divided against itself will stand," and presented arguments, so based, for supporting the United Nations organization rather than going it alone as President Truman has urged, in the issue concerning Greece and Turkey.

Rev. Mr. Ralph spoke of the terrifying decision facing our Nation today, as Congress debates the proposal that, quite apart from UN, we rush into Greece and Turkey and attempt to solve the problems in our own way.

WORST ISOLATIONISM SINCE 1920

The clergyman said that President Truman's policy in this matter represents a new isolationism * * * a worse isolationism than that of the 1920's, in that it fools itself. He continued: "It is an isolationism disguising itself as a democratic concern. Many are the nations which will find it hard to see the democratic nature of such action when they are given no voice in determining its necessity or manner of execution. The President is sadly deluding himself in his claim that in his proposed intervention "the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations." Why was the United Nations created? For this specific reason: To rule out just such unilateral action by a single nation as Mr. Truman asks us to take. He and Senator VANDENBERG have talked so much, and so long, and so loudly in defense of the proposal as a measure harmonious with our adherence to the world organization, that I think they must be having a bad time with their own consciences.

"The President asks us to assume a responsibility that belongs to the United Nations. America was one of the prime motivators in the setting up of the new regime. Now in less than 2 years since the adoption of its Charter this great Nation is on the verge of repudiating the whole enterprise. The President's excuse is that the United Nations is too feeble and slow moving to do any good."

EMERGENCY JUST THE TYPE UN WAS MADE TO HANDLE

"I call that a feeble excuse because the Security Council of the United Nations is in continuous session right here on American soil. The full Assembly can be brought into special session if necessary just as quickly as Congress can act. Furthermore, the emergency to be dealt with falls clearly within the scope of the United Nations: It is precisely the type of situation which the UN was created to handle.

"Now in spite of our solemn pledge to maintain international peace by collective action, the United States is asked to take the law into its own hands. There is a speculative threat of Russian aggression, and Mr. Truman proposes that it be met by an overt threat of American military power. We hate to think what would have happened to our infant democracy if the strongest of the original Thirteen Colonies had insisted for long on blundering ahead by itself regardless of the other 12. I hate to think what may happen to our already slender hope for peace if the exhausted and anxious nations of the world find in America an unwillingness for teamwork. It seems to me that one of the most powerful things we could do to increase our influence around the world and to lessen Russia's influence, would be to get down off of our high horse, to rid ourselves of this prima donna complex and to count ourselves one among many. America could be a uniting influence and united the world will stand. The proposal before us is divisive."

SHOULD EXTEND RELIEF—BUT

"I am not saying we should refuse to extend relief to Greece, or any other people in need. We should do even more. Why the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was scrapped so early I do not understand. We are the richest and most comfortable people on earth. Let us back up our President in any humanitarian move he makes. And I am not saying that we should appease Russia and take no notice of Communist tactics, Communist infiltration, or Communist expansion. Russian communism is a cruel tyranny; all Christian people, all lovers of freedom and democracy will combat its spread. Nor am I saying that we should leave Greece or Turkey or any other nation helpless like a lamb before the onslaught of the wolves. I am not even saying that Mr. Truman's proposal is wrong; it may be and it may not be. I am not canny enough or well informed enough to know."

WHY BYPASS THE UN?

"But I am raising this question: Why did he bypass the United Nations? If the action he suggests is needed, it would come before the world through a majority of the United Nations Council and Assembly with a vastly greater moral undergirding than coming from us alone. Why did Mr. Truman jump the gun in this way? Could it be that he fears our sister democracies would not see eye to eye with him? Was he not willing to risk the shared viewpoints of the rest of the world? Perhaps the emergency is not as great as he thinks. How are we to know? Can we take his word, and that of his Near East advisers, alone? I sent telegrams several days ago to our two Senators and our Representative, stating, 'Don't scuttle United Nations. Aid Greece, Turkey through cooperative action.' Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., in his courteous and thoughtful reply to me, said, 'It is unquestionably true that the administration was guilty of clear error in its neglect to consult with and advise the United Nations regarding American foreign policy in the Near East.' Senator LODGE is right."

UN AT LEAST AS STRONG AS UNITED STATES

"Now, I know there will be many questions troubling you as I criticize the proposed action, and applaud the United Nations. You will say, first, 'Is the United Nations strong enough to take action?' I would answer: As long as we are in the United Nations, it is at least as strong as we are. If the UN needs $400,000,000, if it needs an army, a navy, some guns, or what not; if it needs these things, and we have them, and if we believe in the action which requires them, then these assets can be put at the disposal of the UN. The Continental Army was not weaker in 1776 because the Massachusetts men joined in its efforts, and the United Nations is not weak as long as some of its members are strong.

"Second, you will ask, would the UN be likely to get down to business and do anything? Well, last year the UN handled the situation in Iran pretty well, a situation quite similar to that in Greece and Turkey. Its record in that instance is better than that of our unilateral action in China or the Balkans. And, furthermore, whether the UN could and would handle this trouble never will be known unless we pull with it and give it a chance. If the President sees a fire, why doesn't he inform the fire department instead of organizing his own bucket brigade? If the United Nations fire department should only slumber, then on with the bucket brigade, but, at least, let us turn in the alarm at headquarters.

"Third, you will ask how about the Russian veto? Does not that make it impossible for the United Nations to take any action which Russia does not like? Technically, I don't know. Perhaps there is no clear way provided in the United Nations Charter to override a veto. Actually, however, it is impossible to believe that if a good majority of members in the United Nations saw a clear need for joint action against one of its members, action would be taken. The veto could be overriden by common consent. Russia, quite frankly, is a stumbling block to the success of the United Nations. Its insistence on the veto power is a nuisance, an exasperation, and an obstruction. In the eyes of the world, from New Zealand to Norway, Russia is being thought of as a nation which is hard to get along with. I would hate to have America, in the eyes of the world, viewed as the other major obstacle to the success of the United Nations. When Mr. Truman takes the ball away from the world organization, and runs wildly out of bounds in total disregard of the team play which was called for at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco, he is endangering such moral leadership as we still retain before the nations of men. The kind of action proposed is on precisely the same moral level as Russia's persistent use of the veto.

"Common sense and the lessons of history combine with the word of Holy Writ: 'Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and no city or house divided against itself will stand.' May the Almighty Sovereign of all men aid and assist us, as we grope toward the reign of peace, and the realization of human brotherhood."

The Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed when I heard the message of President Truman in which he expounded our new foreign policy in these words:

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

It was not many years ago that we heard much about the terrible Turks and indignation ran high in this country because of the throat cutting of the Christian Armenians by the Turks. Are we about to arm them to do some more bloodletting of their Christian neighbors for the selfish purpose of facilitating exports from this country. It is probably true that "truth crushed to earth will rise again," but it will probably be too late because the appropriations will have been made.

I wonder how long the taxpayers of this country will continue to have their pockets picked by nations located in an area where blood, pillage, and rape have been their chief contribution to world affairs for thousands of years.

War has been a constant element in the relations between the states. No exact calculation can be made, but J. Novicow has estimated that 3,130 of the 3,357 years between 1496 B. C. and A. D. 1861 were years during which nations were engaged in warfare, while there were only 227 years of peace.

By his count, there have been nearly 300 wars during the 3 centuries of the modern state system.

But Novicow clinches his point by showing how futile war is as a basis for settling the disputes of states.

From the year 1500 B. C. to A. D. 1860 (3,360 years) more than 8,000 treaties of peace meant to remain in force forever were concluded. The average time they remained in force was 2 years.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Times-Herald under date of April 28, 1947:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The bill authorizing a further expenditure of $350,000,000 for relief originated in the United Nations, which wanted an additional $610,000,000 spent for relief and rehabilitation.

The share of the United States was put at 57 percent of the program, but as the other countries are not likely to put up a red cent, this is, in effect, an American matter, a continuation of the flood of American dollars to Europe and Asia.

That is UN's way of getting American dollars to flow.

As the bill originally came to the House of Representatives, it gave the State Department a blank check to use $350,000,000 of American money anywhere for any purpose and through any means.

Under Secretary of State Clayton suggested that relief would be limited to Austria, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and China, but the bill itself made no such stipulations.

Greece has been attended to in another measure and the present Government of Poland has chosen to assume the role of an enemy of the United States.

Certainly, there ought not to be so loose an arrangement that the State Department can slip any country a few millions as a night-club playboy might hand a tip to a head waiter.

A proposal was made that the bill be amended to limit aid to countries other than on Mr. Clayton's list to $15,000,000. It would be wiser if Congress specifically determined which country would receive American aid.

Under the bill, the American dollars contributed out of the earnings of the American people through taxes might be spent anywhere in this world.

It might even be collected as dollar exchange by Soviet Russia through her puppets and satellites. It has been proposed that all this money be spent on American products and transportation with such exceptions as are inevitable.

Apparently those in the State Department and in the United Nations who drew the bill do not understand how dollar exchange operates and how avidly some countries garner and hoard dollars.

The bill itself provides that the relief may be provided in the form of supplies or funds or the establishment of credits. Of course, it might be said that American dollars could be used in such a manner as not to increase the scarcity of goods in this country by making purchases elsewhere.

But the converse of that is that American dollars could be used to build up the industries of our present competitors and potential enemies.

Even more, if dollars are promiscuously given to foreign purchasing agencies, they could come into the American market, bid up our prices, causing a price inflation to our detriment. It is sound that American money for relief be spent by the United States directly and not through foreign agents.

An amendment should be adopted that the procurement and transportation of relief be made by agencies of the Government of the United States. Certainly we want no repetition of UNRRA, into which we poured more than 70 percent of all funds made available for it and yet the results were disastrous from an American standpoint, foreign governments selling our relief to make a profit for themselves.

And that raises an interesting point. Some of these governments can afford to pay back something. Certainly Poland and Hungary are likely to have a fine harvest in 1947. We might lend them grain to be repaid in kind out of their 1947 surplus.

The bill ought to protect the United States against mooching by Europeans. If we provide relief prior to the harvest of 1947, and a country has a surplus in 1947, they should deliver the surplus, equal to the quantity they received in relief, for use by the United States in relieving other countries. Charity ought not to be a one-way street.

Certainly, 2 years after the end of the war, some of the agricultural countries of Europe ought to be back to normal production. The good earth knows no politics, but it requires the labor of man to produce grains, fibers, and other food and agricultural products.

As long as American charity is on the basis of WPA profligacy, it demoralizes those whom we seek to aid. Our task is to help peoples become independent—through work.

Crisis in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 22, 1947

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an address by Mr. Hubert W. Kregeloh, political commentator for radio station WSPR, of Springfield, Mass., delivered over that station on April 4. The address, entitled "Crisis in Education," contains a great deal of food for thought for all of us interested in education and the preservation of our American ideals and institutions. The address is as follows:

America is faced with a crisis fully as grim as the feared aggressiveness of the Soviet Union or the evil machinations of the Communists—and fraught with equally dangerous long-term possibilities. It is the crisis of education and, incidentally, there exists a clearly recognizable link between it and the other two problems I mentioned. If our educational standards deteriorate, we become a Nation of ignoramuses, and we fall behind in the race for technological, scientific, and cultural leadership. In the end, such a condition could only constitute another temptation to Russian leaders to practice aggression, for it would suggest to them that their scientists at last could beat ours and that consequently an armed showdown would embrace lower risks for them than prevail now.

As far as the danger of communism at home is concerned, it is obvious that our young people are potentially most vulnerable. Communists work hard to get party members or fellow travelers placed in schools and colleges, in order to influence American youngsters while they are at their most impressionable age and while they have neither the experience nor the knowledge to refute the glib arguments of Red teachers, instructors, and professors. The danger from this direction is far greater than most Americans suspect, although there are many parents who have been perturbed at the strange ideas their children espoused on their return from high school or college.

In the educational field the Communists have, in fact, been unusually successful, and if true Americanism, respect for God, parents and the rights of the individual, observance of law and order, and love for the country are not taught in our schools—how can we expect the rising generation to be able and willing to carry on the tradition handed down to them? The public schools of New York City are positively crawling with Red teachers, and in the majority of our colleges there are instructors who teach such subject as history, international relations, current events, philosophy, and economics with a bias favoring the Soviet Union and the Communist ideology. One can perhaps understand that some of these teachers honestly believe that socialization and nationalization are preferable to the capital-

ist system of free enterprise and therefore say so. One can perhaps also understand that some share the peculiar ideas of such confused thinkers as Henry Wallace; and since it is impossible to interpret certain subjects without offering some sort of opinion, a certain amount of bias in such cases appears, indeed, unavoidable. But cases are known in which shabby Americans in classrooms have ridiculed patriotism and love for flag and country as outmoded, reactionary sentimentalism. In short, if we want to purge our system of the Communist and fellow-traveler fifth column, we should start with the classrooms where they obviously do the most harm when a long-term view is taken.

However, we cannot do this simply by ferreting out and firing those who subtly favor the Soviet Union and the Communist philosophy. If we do no more than that we shall only end up with having our schools even more disastrously understaffed than they are already.

For there is a plain and valid reason why so many teachers are Reds. That reason is their economic plight. Considering the grave responsibility they are called to assume, the education demanded of them, the personal appearance that must serve as example, and the social prestige and obligations we connect with the profession, our teachers are so blatantly underpaid that debates on the question are really quite silly. In their justifiable bitterness, is it at all surprising that many incline toward a political philosophy specifically aimed at the underprivileged and at those who feel the existing order is deliberately giving them a raw deal?

The responsibility is ours, and especially of those businessmen whose only anxiety is not to see any of their profits diverted to taxes. Here we have a legion of smug individuals enjoying comforts far above the average. For their little darlings only the best is good enough, and that goes for teachers, too. They demand that the teachers to whom they entrust their children are fortified with as many imposing diplomas as possible, that they are fine Americans and not Reds or pinks, that they are well-mannered and well-dressed, and that they are devoted to their profession. Parents in this category watch the teachers carefully, are ever ready to criticize and demand improvements, and in PTA's they indulge in forceful oratory. Yet they are adamantly unwilling to do the one thing which is the crux of the problem—to help provide the financial means which alone can raise our admittedly not so perfect educational standards, especially on the lower echelons. With characteristic selfishness, these people demand the best but are not prepared to pay for it. It is high time someone awakened them to the fact that although we boast about being the richest Nation on earth, there are quite a number of much poorer countries in which teachers receive relatively better pay, and in which far greater sums are expended for the benefit of the educational field generally.

A pertinent editorial by James McGraw, Jr., president of the McGraw-Hill Publications, appears now in all the publications of that company. Calling the question of teachers' salaries a "major emergency," Mr. McGraw addresses an appeal specifically to the financially well situated business community of the Nation and, he says, "to its hard core of common sense."

"According to the best figures available," the editorial states, "the Soviet Union is spending about twice as large a share of its total national income for education as we are. The figures compared included our expenditures for both public and private education. That comparison is really something to worry about."

Including librarians in the underpaid group, Mr. McGraw says that in purchasing power, public school teachers' salaries, after taxes, average about 20 percent less than they did 8 years ago. Beginning salaries of librarians, always low, have fallen behind an equal amount in purchasing power, and college and university teachers are not much better off, he contends.

"Unless this situation is remedied promptly," the editorial warns, "it is confidently to be expected that:

"1. The more competent teachers will continue to desert our schools in droves, and our libraries will remain understaffed. More than 350,000 teachers—many of them the very able ones—have left the public school teaching staff of about 900,000 in the last 6 years. More than 100,000 of the replacements are 'substandard.' They cannot meet the minimum educational requirements of their jobs which, by admission of the profession itself, are none too high.

"2. Those who remain will be organized increasingly into economic pressure groups. Teachers' strikes and the rapid growth of unionism among teachers at present clearly indicate what is in store.

"The crisis in education is a crisis for the Nation as a whole. However, the salary crisis in education is in special measure a crisis for the business community. That community has a special stake in having a well-educated and well-disposed constituency."

Mr. McGraw goes on to say "there may be room for disagreement as to whether teachers should organize themselves in trade unions, and follow union tactics. But there is no conceivable room for disagreement as to whether organization into fighting economic pressure groups under the lash of a teachers' salary crisis would be a body blow to business.

"Among our teachers it would foster an abiding hostility to the institution of business which, occupying a key position in the life of the community, had not done its utmost to make such unionization unnecessary by taking a lead in relieving the teachers' salary crisis."

Mr. McGraw warns, however, that "the crisis in education is not exclusively a matter of salaries. Unsatisfactory working conditions also play a part. Many schools and libraries are dilapidated and overcrowded. Some small-town school boards oppressively insist that the school teachers be the paragons of piety the board members themselves wish they were but are not. Protection of a proper degree of academic freedom is sometimes missing. The teacher is rarely accorded a prestige comparable to the importance of the job. Elements such as these aggravate the crisis. But the first and absolutely essential step toward surmounting the crisis is to provide tolerable salaries."

The editorial points out, however, that "because of the enormous diversity of local conditions affecting the salaries, no general rule for emergency action would fit all cases. From State to State, average yearly expenditures on education in 1940 varied all the way from about $30 per pupil to about $150. Some States, like Nebraska, finance their schools almost exclusively from local taxes. Others, like Delaware, rely almost entirely on State taxes. But it can be safely said that the minimum requirements of the emergency will not have been met so long as the salaries of classroom teachers and junior members of college faculties and library staffs have not been increased by the amount necessary to keep them abreast of the increase of about 50 percent in the cost of living since 1939." Mr. McGraw thinks that in many cases a temporary cost-of-living adjustment might prove the best way to handle the problem. However, the danger is here that morale is inclined to suffer when the time for removing the temporary increase arrives, no matter how justified and logical removal may be.

Addressing himself, in conclusion, to the teachers, Mr. McGraw says, "It is up to them, in dealing with the salary crisis, to display a maturity and integrity worthy of their profession. Teachers have many employment advantages such as long vacations. Employment in teaching and libraries has been notably stable. Teachers and librarians should not ignore these facts in comparing their position with those whose employment has been less steady. At the same time, the great fiscal difficulties involved in solving the crisis must not be used as an excuse for postponing effective action. The States are better equipped financially and otherwise to take such action than is the Federal Government and, with the localities directly involved, should take the lead. If the price of effective action is a heavier tax burden for communities already too heavily burdened, that price must be paid nonetheless. "For," the editorial ends, "the intelligent self-interest of business requires that it leave nothing undone to meet and master the grave crisis in education."

American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., on March 3, 1947, in support of efforts to build and maintain an adequate merchant fleet for this Nation.

I believe that the sentiments expressed in this resolution are those which prevail very generally throughout the United States and that the Congress would do well to give heed to the feeling that we must maintain a merchant marine sufficient to transport a considerable portion of our import and export trade, as well as to act as an auxiliary to the Navy in time of national emergency.

The City Council of Baltimore is to be commended for its action in adopting this resolution which follows:

Resolution 1341

Resolution requesting the United States Congress to build and maintain a modern American fleet.

Whereas this Nation's welfare and prosperity depends upon the welfare and prosperity of the world; and

Whereas, to accomplish this, it is essential that an American fleet be maintained, competent in speed and tonnage to compete with fleets of other nations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of Baltimore, That the United States Congress be and it is hereby requested to see that sufficient funds are placed at the disposal of the Maritime Commission to operate, build and maintain a large merchant fleet; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States Congress be requested to see that the merchant fleet be so developed as to become a great aid in national defense, prosperity and welfare of the people of this Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the City Council be and he is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Maritime Commission and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress.

The Moscow Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an analytical and interpretative editorial on the Moscow Conference appearing in the Boston Post of April 25, 1947:

MISFIRE AT MOSCOW

The conclusion, or truer, perhaps, the break-down of the Moscow conference, which meant so much to the world, confirms again that the way to peace is a long road which must be patiently and persistently trod without losing heart or faith in the main objective—the banning of war forever.

No American has reason to be disappointed over the failure to conclude an agreement on the German question. All of us were forewarned by ex-Secretary of State Byrnes that such a settlement would take years to complete.

There were lofty hopes, as the Moscow meeting opened, that at least Austria would be straightened out. But Russia was adamant on even this concession to concord. Months of intensive study and debate on moot, minor points, which would make an Austrian treaty possible, have been wasted.

Yet all is not lost at Moscow. We knew the Russian negotiators before we started—hard-headed, tough, one-way fellows—more bent on wringing out every last ounce of spoils for what the Russians in arms did, than arriving at the goal for which the war was fought.

But the Russians learned something from us and about us. They can sit back today and say, "The days of appeasement are over." The line has been drawn. For we, too, have raised an iron curtain beyond which communism cannot pass. Peace at any price is no longer an American doctrine.

The Russians understand that today. Mr. Molotov made it clear when on Tuesday he said, "If it is the intention of the United States delegation to substitute a new and a narrower agreement for Potsdam and Yalta, it would be better to say so."

It did not have to be said. The agreements were not narrowed. If such agreements out of Yalta, Potsdam, and other meetings—to allow other nations to decide their form of government and live free—had been fulfilled by the Russians, the United States would not have insisted that the treaties with Germany and Austria be ironclad. The inches bestowed on Russia at Yalta and elsewhere, which she stretched into miles, rebounded.

Moscow was a failure and yet not failure. Little, if anything, was settled. But as an able journalist, an American, who covered the Moscow Conference as well as previous big-nation conferences, pointed out last Sunday, in one aspect it was a success for the United States, even though negatively. This time we gave nothing away.

The Moscow meeting has been beneficial in another, if negative, way. It should make even clearer to all Americans—even Henry Wallace—that Russia thinks it is the boy with the ball who will not let the game go on unless he is given five strikes at bat.

By walking off with the ball, Russia assumes that the game cannot go on and that in time we, who protest such tactics, will give in. The Russians thereby confirm again that they hope to wear us down, make us despair and throw us back into isolationism, leaving the field clear for them.

But we cannot afford to give in now. Too many Americans died for the goal we seek. Too many Americans live only that we reach it. Peace has been coupled with patience. Firm, strong, even tough, but patient, we may win out. At least we must keep on striving and hope for the best. The alternative is too ugly to contemplate.

Sky High Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, pork has reached an all-time high of $30 per hundred and we are told that pork chops will be $1 a pound. So what? General indignation, and the general statement, "Something should be done about it." By whom? "By the Government, of course." But who is the Government? Lincoln said ours is a government of the people, by the people, for the people. The sooner the American people get away from the mistaken notion that a mythical, paternalistic Uncle Sam has magical powers to bring about higher wages and lower prices the better it will be for all of us.

The only way to reduce prices of scarce food items is not to buy them; buy substitutes for them. The American housewife has the remedy in her own hands. Today eggs and poultry are so plentiful that prices have dropped sharply. Turkey raisers from coast to coast have produced more turkeys than they know what to do with. Cold-storage plants are bulging with them. So what happens? Uncle Sam buys 10,000,000 pounds of the surplus for school lunches and thereby keeps up the price of turkeys. Uncle Sam through parity prices, commodity loans, export subsidies, price-support floors, and the purchase of huge quantities fer relief shipments to foreign governments is doing everything he can to keep up the price of the food you buy; and he is using your money, the American taxpayers' money, to finance this market rigging. Instead of letting supply and demand take its course, he uses your money to boost the price of the eggs, the milk, the potatoes, the cheese, and the meat you have to buy. No wonder prices are sky high.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, already granted, I include the following two editorials on the same subject, one Price of Food, which appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, April 25, 1947, and Only Half Right, which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Saturday, April 26, 1947:

[From the Washington Post of April 25, 1947]

PRICE OF FOOD

(By Mark Sullivan)

GOVERNMENT EGG POLICY INCONSISTENT

The Government is buying eggs in order to keep the price up. For this purpose it anticipates buying an immense quantity of eggs. In the budget for the coming year the administration has asked Congress for $175,000,000 to buy eggs.

That would buy 1 egg out of every 10 laid in the country. Whether all the $175,000,000 will be used cannot be known in advance. Whenever the price of eggs in the market falls below a certain figure the Government steps in and buys. The figure changes from time to time. It is based on a flexible standard called "parity price." Always the purpose is to stop a drop in prices. In this the Government buying is successful, of course. But for buying the Government did a few weeks ago, eggs today would be materially lower in price.

After buying eggs to keep the price up, the Government finds various ways to dispose of them, with an aggregate loss. In the administration's budget for the coming year, it estimates the loss on eggs at $42,899,000. The eggs are sold in powdered or frozen form. Some are sold to the British Government, some to processors, some for industrial purposes. None are sold to consumers. Consumers must buy their eggs in the regular market, and the purpose of the Government buying is to keep the market price up. In addition to loss incurred through selling at a lower price than the Government paid, there is loss through expense of storage and handling. Occasionally there is a loss by wastage. In 1945 some 20 carloads of eggs spoiled on sidings. Last year, in another farm product, potatoes, several million dollars' worth bought by the Government while still in the ground, were left there and rotted.

Besides eggs, several other farm products are bought by the Government to keep the price up. They include potatoes, sweetpotatoes, chickens, turkeys. On all these, losses are expected. In the budget for the coming year the estimated loss on potatoes is $28,290,000; on sweetpotatoes, $8,694,000; on chickens, $10,250,000; on turkeys, $6,000,000.

In addition to these losses on the farm products named, other losses are incurred on other farm products, the prices of which are kept up by the Government through various methods and actions, including and besides direct purchase. On one minor crop, peanuts, the loss in the coming year is estimated in the budget at $10,000,000. Besides the crops already mentioned, the Government, through what it calls its "price-support program" as a whole, supports many other crops, including wheat, cotton, wool, hogs, milk, dairy products. On these, no loss is anticipated the coming year, and no provision for loss is included in the budget. When conditions call for it, the Government supports the prices of these crops.

The losses which the Government does expect the coming year, and for which provision is made in the budget—an aggregate of $160,870,000—come directly out of the Federal Treasury, hence out of the pockets of taxpayers. But this direct loss to the taxpayers is much exceeded by the loss to consumers due to paying higher prices for food than they would need to pay if the Government did not keep the prices up. How much consumers lose cannot be estimated. It might well run into billions of dollars.

The most serious consequence of all is the effect on the whole economy of the country. Concern about the danger to the country caused by high prices is the reason for the series of warnings recently issued by President Truman; and these warnings started the agitation about high prices now conspicuous in the news.

A main cause of high prices, not only of food but in the whole price level, is the Government itself. Because the Government keeps prices of food up, cost of living is high. Because cost of living is high, workers demand increase of wages. Increases of wages cause increased cost of manufactured goods. These in turn are a further addition to the cost of living. It is a vicious spiral.

[From the Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio, of April 26, 1947]

ONLY HALF RIGHT

President Truman in his Associated Press talk made a good deal of the point that the Government's support price policy carried over from the war had little to do with the present high cost of foodstuffs. Quite properly he observed that most agricultural prices were currently well above their support levels and that Government purchases were now confined to potatoes.

That, we suspect, is only part of the story. It leaves wholly untold the fact that the Government has recently been engaged in the purchase of staple farm products for export, that it purchased large quantities of wheat in the first quarter when the domestic supply was approaching the seasonal low point, and when accordingly Government buying was responsible for the sharp price rise which was recorded.

There is as yet no way of knowing how much of the $400,000,000 to be made available for assistance to Greece and Turkey will go for food. If, however, the purpose of this grant is to prevent the expansion of communism, and if, as is commonly believed, the best protection against communism is well-filled human stomachs, it is a reasonable expectation that Government purchases of farm products and foodstuffs for foreign relief account will continue high, and that the pressure of this buying on the domestic market will remain strong for many months to come.

We are not objecting either to aid to Greece and Turkey or to the use of American funds to buy food for the hungry in nations abroad. We are merely pointing out that as long as the foreign policy to which we seem to be committed continues, the price of foodstuffs is likely to be maintained at high levels by Government purchases. And, as we have said many times before, hope for relief from high costs and high prices generally will be disappointed until the cost of food can be considerably reduced.

Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted April 9, 1947, by the Legislature of the State of Michigan:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 21

Concurrent resolution respectfully urging Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress to exert all their efforts in attemping to stop or at least reduce the offering of Federal aid to the several States and Territories

Whereas our sister State of Indiana has shown the courage to declare against the unsound financial practice of so-called Federal aid, and the general assembly of said State has passed a concurrent resolution calling upon its Senators and Congressmen "to vote to fetch its country courthouses and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue"; and

Whereas the said State of Indiana has called upon the legislatures of her sister States to join with her in appealing to Congress for a cessation of this unsound political fiscal extravagance; and

Whereas when a State legislature is confronted with a Federal-aid law, the legislature must either comply or forfeit money which has been or will be taken from the citizens of the State in taxes, the effect being virtual compulsion; and

Whereas it is obvious that unless Federal aid is discontinued to all States, it will not be refused by any State; and

Whereas the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Michigan Legislature agree with Gov. Thomas Dewey, of New York, when he said that, "It is a fundamental truth that when a unit of government spends money that has not been raised locally through taxes, the inevitable result is irresponsibility and waste, and it is old-fashioned common sense that best government is that which is closest to the people and their pocketbooks"; and

Whereas our Nation is financially embarrassed to the amount of one quarter of a trillion dollars and should divert so-called Federal aid toward reducing its indebtedness; and

Whereas Michigan and most other States are in sound financial condition, able to handle their own fiscal responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Michigan Legislature joins forces with our neighboring State of Indiana in denouncing this practice of so-called matching dollars; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully petition and urge Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress to exert all their efforts in attempting to stop or at least reduce the offering of Federal aid to the several States and Territories; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the legislatures or assemblies of the 48 States, and to the Michigan Senators and Congressmen in Congress.

Adopted by the senate March 13, 1947.

Adopted by the house of representatives April 9, 1947.

FRED I. CHASE,
Secretary of the Senate.
NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Passing of the Tailor Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been brought to my attention a situation that threatens to destroy one of America's oldest and most honored trades, and that is the tailor shop which is so familiar to every American. Because of the hard work that is required of a tailor, and because of the number of years that is required to learn the business and the high standard of workmanship demanded by the American people, less and less young men are entering the trade, and every city and town in America has been feeling a serious shortage of tailors for the last decade.

In the great metropolitan area of Pittsburgh, Pa., with its more than 2,000,000 people, a combined effort of the tailors of western Pennsylvania resulted in only 18 young men deciding to learn the business and entering an apprenticeship in the past year. Another decade and the ancient business of the community tailor will be a thing of the past and men will buy only clothes made on the assembly lines of the great clothing manufacturers.

The tailors of Pittsburgh, in conjunction with tailors all over the Nation, have requested me, and will request the entire Congress, to consider the matter of bringing to America some thousands of skilled tailors who cannot make a living in Europe because of the chaotic conditions there and because thousands of them are among the displaced persons. This is a matter that should be considered by the House of Representatives, and to shed more light on the situation I include in my remarks here a letter from Leo Petrilli of Pittsburgh, a well-known master tailor, who expresses the situation confronting the American tailor in business.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *April 25, 1947.*

Representative JOHN McDOWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McDOWELL: We feel that you are well aware of the precarious situation the tailoring industry is in due to the ever-growing shortage of skilled needle workers.

Mr. Seifert, local business agent of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, states that in Pittsburgh and vicinity alone there is an urgent need of at least 800 tailors. The total need all over the country has been set at over 15,000.

With the cooperation of the union, we have established in Pittsburgh a school class for tailors which, at present, is attended by 18 students. However, due to the fact that the average age of skilled mechanics now employed in our industry is between 60 and 62 years, the death rate among these men is far greater than the new supply that we can expect from this school, especially as it takes years to train a man in the fine art of tailoring.

This condition exists all over the country and the tailoring industry is faced with certain extinction within very few years unless ways and means are found to overcome this critical shortage.

After long and careful study of the situation, it has been agreed that the surest and quickest way of saving the tailoring industry would be the selective immigration of artisans from Europe.

We wish to respectfully request your kind consideration of our plight and urge your cooperation in our effort to bring in a sufficient number of tailors from Europe to save the fine, old craft of tailoring, and enable us to serve the public with the best possible product.

Respectfully yours,

LEO PETRILLI.

United States Conciliation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a splendid editorial appearing in the Pilot, of Boston, Mass., under date of April 25, 1947, deploring the action taken by the House of Representatives in so drastically reducing the appropria-

tion of the United States Conciliation Service and crippling the agency of the Labor Department that has and is doing such effective and constructive work in the adjustment and settlement of industrial differences and disputes:

UNITED STATES CONCILIATION SERVICE

The country is convinced that we are paying too much for Government. The people are correct. A democracy always spends too much for public services—and always will. This, apparently, is an inevitable part of the price of liberty. Now we are in the throes of a reformist mood. "Economy" is the watchword.

It is not a bad slogan—we have marched under worse. But let's define economy. Let's apply it sensibly and fairly.

Crippling the United States Conciliation Service is not a wise economy. No statistician could tell Americans how much the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor saves them in dollars and cents in the course of the year. But there is no question that it is an enormous sum. It is far larger than the money appropriated for this service. And the man-hours which, through the medium of the United States Conciliation Service, are spent in productive work, instead of picketing, are only one phase. There is also the matter of better feeling between labor and capital which results when a strike is averted.

The United States Conciliation Service has done noble work in Massachusetts. Its appropriation has been cut to a point that cripples efficient functioning. We urge that the United States Conciliation Service be given the funds it needs in order to work effectively.

We've a grave problem in this country—the task of averting a kind of civil war between labor and capital. As the Popes have insistently, time and again, pointed out, the two were meant to be friends—this "class-struggle" nonsense was the invention of an ivory-tower thinker who all his life was supported by capitalist friends.

It is no true solution to strait-jacket either labor or capital. Each must learn to face the reality that they are Siamese twins, that they live together or die separately.

Conciliation is the one right approach. Granting the imperative need of economy, we insist that it is the silliest kind of extravagance to refuse the United States Conciliation Service the means to continue and extend its excellent work. We have made a mistake here. But it is still possible to repair the mistake. Your political representatives would like to know your views.

Hartley Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 28, 1947:

NO SOMERSAULT

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt says we need a little clear-cut thinking. She asks if the vote on the Hartley labor bill was genuinely representative of majority opinion in this country, and adds:

"If so, then the people have done a somersault in their thinking since 1944, when they elected as President a man who believed in the Wagner Act."

Clear-cut thinking might suggest, however, that the late Mr. Roosevelt was not reelected in 1944 because of his views on the Wagner Act, but in spite of them. We were then in the midst of war. Mr. Roosevelt was reelected, it is reasonable to believe, because there were so many people in the country who thought he was the man to lead the war to its successful conclusion.

Events in the labor field since 1944 could have led to such a somersault in public thinking as Mrs. Roosevelt seems to be skeptical about. But those who are doubtful of the state of opinion toward labor's excesses in 1944 might turn to a Fortune poll conducted in February 1944. The outcome was as follows:

Which one of these four statements comes closest to expressing your feelings?

	Percent
(a) Labor unions have done an excellent job for this country, and they should be given more power than they now have	6.5
(b) Labor unions have made a number of mistakes, but on the whole they have done much more good than harm, and the public should continue to support them	28.4
(c) Although labor unions have done some good in the past, they have gone too far, and should be prevented by law from doing many of the things they now do	49.3
(d) Labor unions are a bad thing for the country, and they should be done away with entirely	7.0
Don't know	8.8

The country has done no somersault. It thought in 1944, and it thinks now, that under the Wagner Act as interpreted by administrators and courts, labor has exercised autocratic power, and that union members themselves require protection against abuses perpetrated in their name and at their expense by some unwise leaders.

Oregon House Joint Memorial 21 With Reference to Housing at Celilo Indian Village

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I include in my remarks the following resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Oregon:

House Joint Memorial 21

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oregon, in the forty-fourth regular session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas many Indians from various tribes gather at and in the vicinity of Celilo Falls on the Columbia River, located in Wasco County, State of Oregon, to fish at said Celilo Falls on said Columbia River and elsewhere; and

Whereas these rights of the Indians to fish have existed and have been continued and maintained for many generations, and granted to said Indians under the treaty of June 9, 1855, with the Government of the United States of America and otherwise, and are the principal source of livelihood and food for many of said Indians; and

Whereas said fishing operations by said Indians are a valuable source of attraction to thousands of motorists and tourists annually as they drive along the Columbia River Highway, since these fishing grounds are adjacent to said highway, and said motorists and tourists usually stop and view and visit them; and

Whereas the present buildings for many years past used by said Indians at said Celilo Falls are entirely inadequate, unsanitary, unsightly, and very dangerous not only to said Indians who are compelled to use them, but also to the traveling public, and are without sewer connections or disposal or water supply whatsoever, which leaves a bad impression on out-of-State tourists as well as to jeopardize the health and welfare of said Indians who must dwell there; and

Whereas the United States Department of Indian Affairs is the appropriate and responsible governmental agency to relieve and remedy this deplorable and long-endured situation; and

Whereas the Columbia River Indians have long lived at Celilo Village and are without any reservation such as other Indian tribes enjoy and their long and continued residence there makes them familiar with conditions at and near Celilo Falls and Celilo Village: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, hereby do petition and request the Congress of the United States of America to take the proper steps to immediately have removed the shacks and filth in the present Indian quarter on that certain 7½ acres of Government land at Celilo Village in said country and State, and to have properly and adequately constructed, suitable and appropriate buildings and dwellings for the use of said Indians, as well as an adequate pure and sanitary water supply; also an adequate sewer system and/or sewage-disposal system to take care of each building and/or dwelling, as well as properly equipped rest rooms, containing wash basins, urinals, toilets, and shower baths, for the use of both said Indian village as well as the tourists, and general public on the adjacent Columbia River highway.

Adopted by house April 3, 1947.

JOHN H. HALL,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate April 4, 1947.

M. E. CORNETT,
President of Senate.

An Editorial on Federal Responsibility for Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, I addressed the House on the subject of H. R. 3042, a bill I have introduced to supplement State responsibility for highway safety with

Federal responsibility. This proposal has met with widespread public interest and approval.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial:

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Press-Register of April 25, 1947]

FRIGHTFUL COST OF TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS BROUGHT SHARPLY INTO SPOTLIGHT AGAIN

Representative MARION T. BENNETT, Republican, of Missouri, has started something.

He did that when he introduced a bill known as H. R. 3042.

As summarized by Mr. BENNETT, the purpose of this bill is to reduce the accident toll on the Nation's highways by establishing and enforcing uniform regulations for the issuance of drivers' licenses, and requiring financial responsibility on the part of drivers, and thus to insure, so far as possible, that those operating motor vehicles are reasonably fit, competent, and able to do so.

In proposing that Congress step into the question of qualifications for driving motor vehicles by writing uniform requirements into Federal law, rather than leaving the question in the hands of the respective States for local treatment, Mr. BENNETT has obviously touched off an argument.

For the moment, we do not intend to dwell on the issues involved in his bill. Instead, we call attention to the indictment he delivered against the incompetence of many drivers and the laxity of some States in regard to the qualifications of drivers.

Mr. BENNETT said:

"Too many Americans apparently accept traffic accidents as inevitable. They do not see or possibly comprehend the tremendous daily toll of killed and injured and the vast property losses resulting from a sum total of many millions of individual acts of thoughtlessness and indifference.

"It is true, but difficult to believe, that while we have had the automobile for about 50 years, numerous States still permit anyone, regardless of his physical or mental fitness, to operate with abandon a killing machine capable of traveling up to 100 miles per hour and weighing thousands of pounds.

"Some of the States which do have license requirements for drivers nevertheless issue licenses cheerfully to lunatics, habitual drunkards, and narcotic addicts. Many drivers are more dangerous than a maniac with a meat ax. In my own State you can get a driver's license renewed for 25 cents and without a test of any kind. In many other States and numerous cities, the drivers' license is a revenue and not a safety measure.

"Statistics gathered by various authoritative sources show that since the end of the war and the resumption of heavy motor travel, the death rate from automobile operation is again decidedly on the increase.

"This deadly killer now ranks tenth in the list of causes of death in this country, and no less a person than the President himself has publicly predicted that on the basis of known figures the automobile accident toll this year in this country will reach 30,000 fatalities.

"This does not even take into account the great loss and suffering from personal injuries not fatal, or the tremendous property damage resulting from motor accidents, or the inevitable business and financial losses accruing therefrom, or the delays and hazards created in travel and interstate traffic. A study of these accidents will demonstrate that many arise from the presence on highways of persons who are unfit or incompetent to drive an automobile.

"It is hardly arguable that something must be done to correct a situation which goes to the very heart of the well-being of the public and of business. Some States, of course, have adopted stringent measures for the regulation of motor-car operation and the careful examination of those who seek to drive.

"Others, unfortunately, have little real effective legislation on the subject and there is a general lack of uniformity in laws presently existing. A number of States do not even require an examination of a person's fitness or ability to operate a motor vehicle."

Mr. BENNETT's bill brings up the States' rights issue, not to mention expansion of Federal bureaucracy and any other angles that may arouse argument.

All this, however, is apart from the fact that he took occasion in his remarks to emphasize the frightful cost of incompetency, carelessness, and recklessness in traffic on streets and highways.

Those States which are open to criticism for laxity where qualifications are concerned could give a lift to responsibility in driving through their licensing policies.

But another factor figures heavily in traffic-accident experience. That factor is careless and chance-taking pedestrians.

Address of Magistrate Maurice Simmons, Past National Commander, United Spanish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Magistrate Maurice Simmons, past national commander, United Spanish War Veterans, at Ulysses S. Grant birthday anniversary exercises, Grant's Tomb, Riverside Drive, New York City, April 27, 1947:

Ulysses S. Grant is a statuesque figure on the American landscape. He was called to command in the agony of the most tragic of civil wars. By his relentless strategy he saved the Union. Through four long years of doubt, defeat, and despair, he never gave up. From Shiloh to Appomattox he stood on the rock of unconditional surrender. At Spottsylvania, after an unbroken chain of Confederate victories, when the armies of Lee seemed invincible, Grant grimly pledged, "I propose to fight it out on this line if it takes all summer."

It seemed that the indecisive strife and the unprecedented loss of life were about to sunder the Union. Abraham Lincoln's calls for conscription of manpower were darkened by draft riots. As treason ran rampant throughout the land, native-born appeasers and Copperheads plotted a peace of dishonor. Thanks to sage and humane statesmanship our gates were kept open to immigration. The sons of Ireland fleeing British persecution, the refugees escaping the bondage of Prussian militarism, and the other victims of Old World autocracy emigrated to the land of the free. These were the men who filled the gaps in our armed forces, brought about by Grant's inflexible policy of military attrition. Through all the campaigns of the Army of the Potomac their bodies buttressed its bleeding flanks.

Today the survivors of Nazi slavery and Soviet savagery are herded by us behind barbed wires in Germany, Austria, and Italy. They dare not return to the hell holes of horror from which they have providentially escaped. Their kin slain in gas chambers or done to death in concentration camps, will our Republic slam the gates of hope in the faces of these tortured exiles? To admit them will work no change in our present immigration policy. About 20 years ago we set up the quota system. The number of immigrants now admissible annually is 154,000. Much of this quota has been untouched. In 1945 only 7 percent of it was used. Of the 850,000 displaced persons in the American zones, 650,000 are Catholics and Protestants and about 20 percent are Jews. Legislation is pending to admit 400,000 of them, over a 4-year period, to be charged to our unused quotas. This is half of those eligible for admission during the recent war years. Will their entry work to our detriment? The Labor Department reports serious shortages in many trades and professions. Among these dispossessed are masses, skilled in the professions, arts, and crafts, needed to fill our labor shortages—agricultural workers, farmers, lumbermen, foresters, construction workers, and household domestics. They will enrich our economy, for they surpass in quality the throngs of immigrants who, during a century of the American cavalcade, built the foundations of our economic supremacy. The upkeep of these displaced persons is now costing us, and over the years will continue to cost us, millions of dollars. Remove them from their bleak barracks overseas and they will become productive taxpayers and help lessen our national budget.

Both World Wars have demonstrated that to maintain its war potential, a nation must keep a large reserve of population. Government statisticians predict that less than a quarter of a century hence, because of our declining birth rate, we shall fall dangerously behind Russia and other emergent world powers. The present postwar increase in population is only a temporary phenomenon. Enlightened self-interest should welcome these 400,000, if qualitatively screened, measured by rigid health standards, financially sponsored so as not to become public charges and scrutinized by our Army Counter Intelligence Corps and other governmental agencies. This legislation has the support of the President of the United States, Secretary of State General Marshall, Governor Dewey, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Catholic War Veterans, the American Federation of Labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Who can question their prudence, patriotism, and statesmanship—these exemplars of the American way of life?

Because these unfortunates have eaten of the bitter herbs of totalitarian rule they will never go back to their uprooted homes in Russia, its satellite states, or return to the Fascist regimes. On their backs they bear the bestial scars of the Red terror and the Nazi swastika. We are either immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. If we deny sanctuary to them, how can we keep faith with our immigrant forebears who paved the freedom road. Shielded in almost impregnable security and blessed by the bounty of divine providence above all the peoples of the earth, shall we heed the smug, confused, or intolerant voices that counsel us to lock our hearts to the pitiful plight of these disinherited victims of man's inhumanity to man?

Wool Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many times the metropolitan

press gets a wrong slant on agricultural legislation. I am happy today to call your attention to an editorial that is in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Wool Dilemma." I do this for the reason that within the next few days I presume the wool bill will be here on the floor, and I am sure that anyone can profit by reading this editorial. This editorial points out that a certain situation has developed. It is not a matter of the Smoot-Hawley tariff and whether it is good or bad, or whether the reciprocal trade treaty is good or bad, or whether the Underwood tariff or the Fordney-McCumber tariff or any other tariff is good or bad. This editorial presents the picture we are faced with so far as wool is concerned, and I want to commend the writer of this article for putting in a metropolitan newspaper a factual editorial. Here is one example of striking the nail right on the head:

WOOL DILEMMA

We pointed out the other day that Senate passage of a bill providing price support until 1949 for domestic wool at the 1946 level (incidentally that level is above parity) shows that the Government's price-lifting program for agricultural products has not become an anachronism. If the House follows the advice of its Agriculture Committee, the Secretary of Agriculture will also be empowered to impose import fees on foreign wools, in addition to regular duties, whenever he thinks that imports are interfering materially with the domestic market.

There has been a good deal of sniping at these proposals for maintaining wool prices at levels which have pushed domestic wool out of the market and opened the door for a veritable flood of foreign wool. Obviously the price-support program is inconsistent with the President's drive to bring down living costs, since the higher price for wool will raise the cost and prices of woolen fabrics. The proposed import fees are likewise, as Representative HOPE, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, admits, contrary in spirit to the reciprocal trade policy which the Government is pushing so energetically.

Although continuance of support prices at existing high levels are, in our opinion, indefensible, the proposed additional import fee appears to be a logical accompaniment of the support program under conditions now prevailing. For the Commodity Credit Corporation is stuck with a huge wool surplus acquired at high support prices that is unsalable in competition with foreign wool. Secretary Anderson has long been pressing for permission to dispose of this wool without regard to legal restrictions on selling price. The Senate price-support bill permits him to do so, provided sales are made "at such a rate and in such manner as will avoid disruption of the domestic market."

The Government has large amounts of money tied up in wool. In fact, more than half of all the funds now invested in the price-support program have been used to support wool prices. It will benefit the taxpayers if this wool can be disposed of while demand is strong at prices entailing no great loss. Its sale would also dissipate fears that some day this wool might be suddenly released, with resultant demoralizing effects on market prices. Obviously, if this disposal program is to be pushed without disrupting the domestic market, it will be necessary to curb foreign wool imports, either by imposing import quotas or fees of the type recommended by the House Agriculture Committee.

Incidentally the wool price-support program has conferred substantial benefits on foreigners, since it has enabled exporting countries to dispose of some of their surplus wool in the American market at very high prices. Last year about 80 percent of all the wool consumed in this country was imported. With annual consumption totaling a billion pounds, the take was a large one. With foreign wools, duties added, selling at prices not far below comparable domestic wools, the American consumer will not benefit greatly from this foreign invasion while the taxpayer will have to shoulder the losses of the domestic support program.

The wool program emphasizes the need for a reexamination of our price-support system in the light of its effects upon our domestic economy and our foreign relations.

General Vandegrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the News of Elmira, N. Y., entitled "General Vandegrift Should Be Heeded":

GENERAL VANDEGRIFT SHOULD BE HEEDED

The Marine Corps, famed in song, story and history for its fighting ability, now has its most important fight on its hands. It is literally fighting for its life, as the high brass of the Army and, in some cases, the Navy, seek the power to emasculate the Marine Corps and leave it in a position where it can only be assigned inferior tasks in the event of future hostilities.

The unification merger plan for the armed forces threatens the Marine Corps as no Japs or Germans ever did. As the Senate Armed Services Committee pondered this week the question of whether to recommend President Truman's unification plan for passage by Congress, Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the most brilliant general in Corps history, gave his testimony on the merger.

General Vandegrift did not oppose the main idea of the merger—but he stoutly insisted that the Marine Corps' role and missions be written into the bill and thus make them into law, rather than left to be defined by executive order of the President. The bill as it now stands, he declared, would leave the Marine Corps "stripped of everything but name—reduce it to a role of military impotence."

"The failure of the bill to assign specific functions to the Marine Corps," said General Vandegrift, "is a source of grave concern to me, for it allows the corps to be stripped of everything but name."

The Marines have a hard-won glory and fame. Thousands of them have died on the field of battle. Their ability to overcome almost insuperable odds time and again have won them the respect and admiration of the country and the world. No other fighting outfit occupies the high place in world opinion, a place that approaches reverence in many cases, such as the Marine Corps enjoys.

Army generals have envied since time immemorial the high estate of the Marine Corps in the eyes of the public, and a few Navy admirals are not above suspicion of jealousy. The merger plan is dangerous to the Marine Corps, not as something it can fight and vanquish as it has so many enemies on land, at sea, and in the air, but through Washington politics, and the danger is very real.

The fact that interested persons are trying to push the bill through in its present form, and that they are fighting to keep from specifying in exact language the Marine Corps' place in the new arrangement, but insist instead that the Marine Corps be at the mercy of the whim of the President, himself an ex-Army man, is indicative of the deadly danger inherent to the Corps in the merger bill as it is now written.

In company with General Vandegrift, the News has no fear of the ultimate fate of the Marine Corps if left to any representative body or to the public at large. The gratitude and pride which Americans take in the Corps is second only to the famous esprit de corps of its own members and former members. But like the general, we are apprehensive of a bill that might be loosely drawn in such a way as would make possible a large degree of interpretation of its meaning. Should the bill be thus loosely drawn and should an Army man be appointed to the post of Secretary of National Defense, a post which the unification bill creates, the Corps might well become the victim of the fate the general has pointed out.

This newspaper cannot urge too strongly upon our legislators that they listen and give heed to General Vandegrift. There may very well come a time in the future—perhaps in the near future—when this country may again have desperate need of the kind of services rendered to it by the Marine Corps at Belleau Wood, Chateau Thierry, Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Bloody Nose Ridge, and Iwo Jima, to mention but a few of the battles that are responsible for its illustrious fame.

Comment on the Wisconsin Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert herewith the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of April 24, 1947:

DRIVING REPUBLICANS OUT OF THEIR PARTY

The alien-minded, un-Republican members of the so-called majority in the upper body are doing all they can to drive voters from their party. They are meeting astonishing success in this folly, as the returns from the special congressional election in the Second Wisconsin District demonstrated on Tuesday.

The voters of that district went to the polls, while the other body was approving the Greco-Turkish scheme, to choose the successor to the late Representative Robert K. Henry. Mr. Henry was elected last November by a majority of nearly 30,000. Glen R. Davis, of Waukesha, won the Republican nomination for the vacancy in a primary on April 1 in which he received about 42,000 of 65,000 Republican votes cast.

In the election on Tuesday Mr. Davis barely won. If another 921 Republican voters had stayed home, he would have been beaten in a strong Republican district. As it was, more than 40,000 of the voters who had participated in the Republican primary failed to go to the polls in the election.

There was nothing in Mr. Davis' record to explain the falling off in the vote. His Democratic opponent got 4,000 more votes in the election than were cast in his party's primary. That may be a fact of some significance, but much more noteworthy is the circumstance that the Republicans just stayed home. Obviously they were disgusted with their party leadership and had decided that

the difference between VANDENBERG and Truman is so negligible as not to justify an expression of opinion at the polls.

The Republican Party has now had 7 years of experience with "me, too" tactics. Every time its candidates adopted them they were beaten, as they deserved to be. Last fall the party, for the first time, gave the voters a genuine choice and received a tremendous endorsement at the polls. The fruits of that victory have largely been wasted in the ensuing months.

Mr. Truman and his policies are hardly more popular, actually, today than they were last October or November. His apparent rise in popularity derives solely from the fact that the Republicans in the Senate have given the people of the country no choice.

The election Tuesday in Wisconsin is a precursor of worse to come unless the party changes its tactics. Hope still remains that it will do so. The House, unlike the Senate, has been making a valiant effort to redeem its election pledges. It still has the opportunity to repudiate the Greco-Turkish policy.

If Mr. Truman wants a war with Russia let him say so and submit the proposal to honest debate. If the House approves his current plan, it will be giving him carte blanche to stage another Pearl Harbor in the Piraeus or the Dardanelles.

Federal Aid and the Interstate Highway Network

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, contained in the policy statement adopted by the forty-fourth annual meeting of delegates of the American Automobile Association at San Francisco, Calif., are numerous assertions of marked significance to highway development in America today, along with recommendations on subjects of national interest, some of which are covered by bills now pending before Congress. As this organization, with more than 2,000,000 car-owner members, has given careful and deep consideration to these matters, I include the text in the RECORD:

FEDERAL AID AND THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY NETWORK

I

The American Automobile Association reaffirms its support for the Federal-aid principle and for the limitation of Federal-aid to a single Federal-aid system of general-purpose roads of national significance, clearly defined and strictly limited as to mileage. The 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways should be the backbone of this network.

II

The Congress of the United States is commended for its vision and progressiveness in calling for the designation of the national system of interstate highways. The State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration are commended on completing or practically completing the designation of this network. Because of these steps, there is now available a definite pattern for the most important road program ever conceived.

III

The American Automobile Association strongly favors the interstate highway network and urges its expeditious development at high standards suitable for the requirements of each section thereof for both present and future anticipated traffic. The association pledges a vigorous program of informing public leaders and motorists in general, so as to aid in developing strong public support for this road network.

IV

Believing it to be the step which will produce the greatest progress, the association strongly urges the early construction of a suitable number of demonstration sections of high standard, particularly in urban and other heavy traffic areas. To this objective the AAA pledges vigorous activity.

V

The association urges cities to complete plans for their parts of this network at the earliest possible date and to take steps such as Baltimore and other cities have taken whereby demonstration sections will be constructed in the city.

VI

State and local highway authorities are urged to devote substantial proportions of their highway revenues to development of this network because of the advantages which will accrue from such expenditures. At the same time, the AAA urges that the Congress direct the Public Roads Administration to make a study and proposals as to methods of financing this road network, including recommendations as to Federal, State, and local responsibilities therefor and as to the proportions of highway and other taxes which should be devoted to this road network.

VII

Numerous conditions, largely if not entirely unavoidable, have interfered with utilization of Federal-aid funds under the Federal Aid Act of 1944. In the meantime, much planning has been done in States and cities on the basis of that act. Hence, without prejudice as to its general position on Federal aid, the American Automobile Association urges the Congress to take suitable legislative action to permit such funds to be used over a longer period than is now provided for in that act.

VIII

The American Automobile Association reiterates its position that since Federal aid is based on acceptance by the Congress of the vital interest of the Federal Government in the development of an adequate highway system, the cost of Federal aid, in whatever amounts the Congress sees fit to authorize and appropriate, is properly a charge against general taxes and in no way should it be related to, or be made contingent upon the productivity of Federal excise taxes levied on automotive fuels, motor vehicles, and accessories.

FEDERAL AUTOMOTIVE EXCISE TAXES

The levying of special motor-user taxes should be the prerogative of the State and of the State alone.

The Federal gasoline-excise tax should be worthwith repealed.

The other Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles and parts should be reviewed, modified, or repealed in line with the policy on special excise taxes of similar character on other commodities.

HIGHWAY AND TAX PROBLEMS AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS

I

There should be set up in every State a special highway committee, composed of representatives of the State legislature, the highway department, the counties and cities, the automobile clubs, and other major groups interested in highway development. It should be the function of this committee to make a comprehensive study of road needs, road revenue, and total road costs within the State as the basis for a long-range highway-improvement program, preferably for not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years. Another function of this committee should be to work for continuity of the road program and of major technical staff of the highway department.

II

The State's long-range highway program should utilize the State-wide traffic surveys to determine needs and priorities for construction; in order to assure financial stability for the programs there should be in every State a road budget geared from year to year to the planned construction. It is of the utmost importance that this budget make substantial provision for the requirements of the National System of Interstate Highways.

III

The American Automobile Association vigorously urges that there be a halt in the extension of motor vehicle user taxes to the support of large mileages of local roads. This extension has prevented, and is preventing, the programing of expenditures in accordance with traffic needs on roads of general use, and if continued will reduce State highway departments to mere maintenance organizations and produce a break-down of the present motor-tax structure.

IV

As the tax-collecting and the revenue-distributing agent, the States should have the legal authority to require a strict accounting of all funds given to the subordinate units of Government for road purposes. Such authority is vitally needed as a hedge against the more flagrant kinds of dispersion.

V

The crux of the highway transportation problem today is in American cities. It is essential that progressive programs be developed for major urban highway improvements. The American Automobile Association urges cities expeditiously to carry on thorough analyses of their highway transportation needs so that a master plan, suitable for the motor age, will soon be developed.

Equally important with physical planning is financial planning. Moreover, financial planning must take account of all kinds of community needs which must be met from taxation. Hence, it is further urged that cities prepare 5- or 10-year plans covering their principal needs of various types, including highways, estimate costs and resources which will become available, and determine upon an over-all program with priorities which will be of the most benefit to the development of the city. Highway improvements are bound to occupy an important part of any such over-all program.

VI

To protect the Nation's investment in the highways it has today and the highways it will build tomorrow, it is strongly recommended that all States provide for protection of their highways against undue commercial encroachment through adoption of sound highway zoning measures. AAA clubs everywhere are urged to take the leadership in seeking the passage of highway zoning measures in accordance with the general principles of the AAA's study of roadside problems and its Highway Zoning Legislative Guide.

VII

To make possible the construction of the projected 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways, built to adequate standards, with particular emphasis on incorpora-

tion in such a network of the freeway principle, all States are urged to adopt legislation giving State governments the right to provide for access to main thoroughfares only at selected points. To this end consideration of the recommendations for limited access highway legislation, developed by the United States Public Roads Administration, is recommended.

VIII

Gasoline tax exemptions and refunds have reached scandalous proportions in a number of States—so much so that in one State in a recent year 61 percent of the motor fuel consumed was tax free. Such evasions are unfair and detrimental to the best long-range interests of all concerned—farmers, city dwellers, and other road users—and proper steps should be taken to stop this serious leakage of road revenue.

IX

Due to the war, State highway departments suffered serious losses of technical and engineering personnel. Despite the need for enlarged staffs because of large highway programs, losses of key personnel are continuing. The primary reason is that highway department salaries are not in line with what technicians can earn elsewhere. This condition is a serious threat to the efficient prosecution of highway programs and the intelligent expenditure of huge road funds. Hence it is strongly recommended that in those States where this condition prevails, immediate steps be taken to correct the situation by assuring job security, improving conditions of employment, and instituting a salary scale which is suitable in comparison with salaries paid for similar skills by private industry.

PARKING

Most American cities, large and small, have failed to meet parking needs especially in their central business districts. Furthermore, relatively few cities have instituted measures for meeting present and future parking requirements. In cities the utility of the automobile is steadily being diminished because of lack of adequate terminals. Parking costs have often risen to unreasonable levels because of scarcity of parking space; in fact, the annual outlay for parking by the urban automobile user who travels daily to downtown destinations in many instances surpasses any other single cost involved in operation of his vehicle.

The anticipated growth of traffic in the next two decades and improvements in urban traffic arteries accentuate the need for immediate vigorous attack on the parking problem. Therefore, the American Automobile Association urges that city leaders, both official and civic, take the following steps which are described and discussed extensively in the new AAA Parking Manual:

1. Decide to face and, within reasonable limits, solve their city parking problems.

2. See that the community is organized to do the job. Each city is urged to centralize administrative responsibility for parking problems in a parking authority or parking agency and to arm it with suitable staff, authority, and resources.

3. Get the facts which are a necessary basis for decisions and analyze them carefully.

4. Determine basic parking policies which shall apply in the city, such as whether off-street parking facilities shall be provided by private enterprise, or by a municipal parking authority, or by both, or whether public controls (as to insure permanence of parking facilities, and over parking rate schedules) shall be imposed, with private enterprise operating parking facilities. Zoning ordinance requirements for provision of off-street parking and loading in connection with new buildings should also be considered.

5. Develop and put into effect an adequate community parking plan and program, designed for, say, a 10-year period, with priorities for development so as best to meet needs. This program should cover both curb parking and off-street parking. The closely related problem of off-street loading should be dealt with in the same plan and program.

6. Conduct a program of public information to assure public understanding and support.

7. Coordinate the parking plan and program with other related city development plans and programs, including improvement of public mass transportation and the development of a balance between the two transportation methods, in line with the free choice of the people.

The American Automobile Association urges State legislation which will enable municipalities to create parking authorities or parking agencies with necessary financing and other powers.

It is recognized that adequate parking facilities will involve considerable expenditures. They can, however, be made largely or wholly self-liquidating. A plan of this nature will do much to assure continued economic health of the downtown district with resulting satisfactory tax returns therefrom. Moreover, only by some such plan can cities meet their responsibilities for adequate highway transportation facilities.

ROUTE MARKINGS

I

A number of State highway departments pursue the deplorable practice of changing route numbers after the principal publishers have issued read maps and tour books for the year. This causes much confusion and loss of time to automobile travelers. The American Automobile Association urges that all State highway departments plan and announce changes in route numbers well before the new numbers are posted and avoid making changes immediately before or during the season of heavy travel in their respective sections.

II

The AAA urges affiliated automobile associations and clubs to take vigorous steps to secure route markings through cities which are effective both day and night and so designed that the motorist can follow them without undue difficulty, and so that he will have reasonably frequent reassurance in case his view is blocked or his attention is diverted from a particular route marker. It is particularly urged that turns be clearly indicated by advance warning, with a confirmatory marker beyond the intersection.

It is urged that AAA clubs make a restudy of routes and route markings in the communities in their territory and confer with appropriate authorities on desirable changes. Clubs are urged to keep their members informed of such studies, to seek their views, and to advise them of results.

It is also urged that where necessary legislation be promoted by AAA clubs to put all route markings on Federal and State highways in each State into the hands of the State highway department.

ROADSIDE SANITATION

The United States Public Health Service and the public health departments of all the States are urged to give immediate attention to the problem of the sanitary conditions in roadside establishments serving the motoring public. Diseases caused by unsanitary conditions in roadside establishments are spread to all corners of the Nation. There should be set up a system of inspection to assure that all establishments catering to the traveling public meet at least minimum standards of cleanliness.

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL

The United Nations organization is urged to take the leadership in simplifying international passage of both individuals and automobiles. To that end, early and careful study should be given to the possibility of developing a passport, registration, and driving licenses and customs documents of worldwide recognition, assuring freedom of travel for all bona fide tourists.

INTER-AMERICAN TRAVEL

I

All Latin-American countries are urged to adopt and ratify, at the earliest possible moment, the convention on the regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, to the end that private passenger cars may circulate with maximum freedom throughout the nations of the Western Hemisphere. In addition it is strongly recommended that, pending the adoption of a world passport, all countries of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States of America, adopt a simple tourist card permitting Americans to cross international boundaries without being forced to obtain passports, visas, entrance and exit permits, and all the other unnecessary and outmoded documents that are now hampering travel in the new world.

II

The controversy between the United States and Mexico concerning charges that have been imposed for tourist cards issued to visitors from each country is contrary to the spirit of the Good Neighbor Policy and is to be deplored. Also, the charges now being imposed are in direct violation of a long-standing agreement between the two countries. The American Automobile Association joins the Asociacion Mexicana Automovilistica in urging the Government of both the United States and Mexico to eliminate immediately these charges on tourist cards.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION

The United States Customs and Immigration Services are respectfully urged to reinstitute campaigns among their officers stationed at international borders to raise their standards of courtesy. AAA clubs are receiving many complaints from their members and from the public regarding instances of discourtesy and arrogance. Generally, members of the public do not like to make direct complaints because of fear of reprisals, but it is undoubtedly true that these departments of government are being made unnecessarily unpopular because of the actions of a minority of their officers.

ALASKAN HIGHWAY

It is essential for the defense of this continent—if occasion should ever arise making defense necessary—and essential for the commercial development of Alaska, that a highway connection should be available between continental United States and Alaska. Such a connection is now available by way of the Alaska Highway and will remain available if it is not allowed to deteriorate from want of maintenance. The AAA strongly urges that the Governments of the United States and Canada work out arrangements for the continued maintenance of the Alaska Highway.

NATIONAL PARKS CONCESSIONS AND FEES

I

The American Automobile Association finds that hotels and other accommodations in the principal national parks have deteriorated badly and no longer meet the needs of the large number of people visiting these areas. It is recommended that Congress appropriate sufficient sums of money to modernize and expand these facilities, and to provide other conveniences, including directional signs to points of interest and facilities.

As a matter of permanent policy, it recommends that these facilities continue to be operated on a concession basis, with the

Park Service exercising jurisdiction to control the prices charged to the visiting public.

II

The toll now being collected by the National Park Service on the Shenandoah Parkway—a major through route handling large volumes of interstate travel—is contrary to the public interest and violates the expressed intention of Congress, which prohibits the collection of tolls on any State highway built with aid of Federal funds. The National Park Service is urged to eliminate this toll and to drop any plans it may have for imposing additional tolls. In the event such action is not taken by the National Park Service this convention calls upon AAA national headquarters to test the legality of this toll in the courts.

III

Present policies of the National Park Service have resulted in a scarcity or complete lack of facilities for the comfort and convenience of the traveling public. The American Automobile Association, while not condoning the marring of our national parks and parkways by unsightly roadside stands, urges the National Park Service to provide, or encourage the controlled provision of, comfort stations, automobile service stations, eating and sleeping accommodations, and informative directional signs at appropriate locations. The AAA strongly urges the modification or change of such policies or regulations of the National Park Service as may discourage the greatest, most democratic use of our national parks and parkways.

Pending the development of adequate facilities in national parks and along national parkways, it is urged that the National Park Service amend its policy so as to permit the erection of informational or directional signs at appropriate locations directing visitors to points where they may obtain sleeping, eating, fishing or motor service facilities located outside the park area.

RUBBER POLICY

I

As a primary requirement for national security, the American Automobile Association strongly recommends that the Government of the United States take prompt action to establish a long-range national rubber policy and that the Congress in determining the future operation of our synthetic rubber plants require the following two conditions:

1. The continued production of general purpose rubber to insure that not less than one-third of the Nation's total annual rubber consumption be American-made rubber; and

2. The maintenance—in condition and ready to run on short notice—of stand-by facilities capable of producing an additional 350,000 tons of general-purpose American-made rubber per year.

II

Since the world's rubber supply—crude and synthetic—will exceed the demand in 1947, consideration should be given to the early abolition of governmental controls and the restoration of the commodity to a free world market.

III

Government and industry should continue to pool their resources in further basic and technological research for the improvement of synthetic rubber.

IV

The United States Government should continue its experimental work in the development of natural rubber in the Western Hemisphere.

SAFETY-RESPONSIBILITY LEGISLATION

In the interests of the motorists of America and the public generally, the American Automobile Association strongly urges that every State legislature enact progressive safety-responsibility laws with provisions in conformity with the AAA safety-responsibility bill as it now exists.

CONSUMER RELATIONS

I

The "Public Protection Program" developed by the National Association of Better Business Bureaus for the prevention of abuses in the field of automobile financing is hereby heartily endorsed; AAA clubs are urged to give full support to this program in their respective communities.

II

Also attention should be given to the reasonableness of service charges imposed upon the financing of automobile installment sales.

III

Final solution of the problem can be achieved through corrective State legislation, where permitted, and in other States through extensive educational and cooperative programs. The AAA should undertake prompt and thorough study of existing legislation and legislative proposals with a view to working out a recommended uniform bill or legislative guide that would form the basis for State action.

IV

In order to give full protection to the motorist as a consumer it is recommended that a special committee on consumer relations be appointed and charged with the duty of studying motorists' problems in the consumer field and of working out programs for correction of all abuses that are disclosed by such study.

POSTWAR CARS

Polls of motorist opinion conducted by the American Automobile Association and its affiliated clubs show clearly that motorists want practical improvements designed to add to enjoyment and utility of car use. Outstanding demands include provision of greater visibility for the driver, better means of jacking cars, greater accessibility for greasing and servicing, windshield defrosters, and automatic turn signals. It is recommended that there be continuing surveys of motorists' preferences in design of cars and other automotive products, and that the findings be made public.

ACTION PROGRAM FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY

The American Automobile Association believes that the action program of the President's highway safety conference provides a generally effective guide which, if properly utilized, can produce a very substantial reduction in traffic accidents. Very encouraging progress has been made in a number of places. The establishment of the Federal Committee on Highway Safety by the President through Executive Order No. 9775 is commended. About one-third of the States have held the recommended State conferences and some cities have already taken action. However, in general, there is need for more expeditious and extensive utilization of the excellent recommendation of the action program. The AAA urges that the remaining States hold State-wide conferences and that cities take actions recommendation in the action program.

AAA automobile clubs are urged to make full use of the conference publications, to reappraise the needs in their States and communities in light of these recommendation, and to take vigorous action on such parts of the conference recommendations as will be most effective in reducing traffic accidents in their areas.

IMPROVING AAA CLUB SAFETY PROGRAMS

The governing board of each AAA affiliated association and automobile club is urged:

1. To make an immediate reappraisal of the club's traffic safety activities to the end that each club shall have an effective traffic safety program consistent with its resources in the limited areas being emphasized by the traffic safety committee and national headquarters, and to carry on such program in a thorough and effective manner.

2. To see that the club has a safety director on a full-time basis where club resources make this feasible; otherwise, either on a part-time staff basis or on a volunteer basis;

3. To consider the desirability of having in addition an active traffic safety committee of which the safety director might well be the chairman, at least in the smaller affiliated clubs;

4. To arrange for the presentation at least once a year to its entire membership of a statement, in summarized form, on the traffic safety activities of the club.

National headquarters is requested to prepare a checking-form for use by the governing boards of affiliated associations and clubs in reappraising club safety activities, to maintain a record of club safety directors and safety committees, to set up a plan for maintaining contacts with the club safety directors so as to be of maximum help to them, to set up a training program for club safety directors if the demand warrants, to provide suggestions for effective graphic statements on traffic and safety activities of clubs for use in reporting to club members, and to report to the next annual meeting on these matters and on the activities reported by the clubs.

UNIFORMITY OF TRAFFIC REGULATIONS AND OF TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

There are now available generally excellent revisions of the uniform vehicle code and the model traffic ordinances. There will shortly be available a revised manual on uniform traffic control devices. These three documents provide extremely valuable bases for uniformity of motor vehicle legislation and of signs, signals, and other traffic control devices.

The American Automobile Association pledges an intensive program of activity for the full utilization of these models in the States. It urges affiliated automobile clubs and associations to follow the recommendations in the action program and the report of the committee on laws and ordinances of the President's highway safety conference for securing maximum progress in the adoption of uniform motor vehicle laws and ordinances. It urges cooperation with other interested groups in the State to the maximum feasible extent in securing such advances toward uniformity as are considered most important and attainable.

Affiliated clubs are urged to promote the adoption of the recommendations of the manual on uniform traffic control devices to the maximum extent feasible in their area. It can properly be pointed out that section 12 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 provides a basis for expediting the securing of uniform traffic-control devices.

MARKING NO-PASSING ZONES

Motorists traveling across State lines often encounter differences in the highly important markings which are intended to indicate the zones in which the motorist is not to use the other side of the roadway to overtake and pass another vehicle. Many different kinds of markings have been used for this purpose. Confusion and increased hazard result.

What the motorist wants is one adequate standard system of marking no-passing zones. This desire of the motorist should be the predominant factor in the decision on this matter—and not past experience or existing pet designs.

The American Automobile Association strongly urges that those responsible for standardization present one adequate standard design.

REEXAMINATION OF DRIVERS

As to reexamination of drivers, the greatest traffic-safety values will be attained by

giving emphasis to those drivers who are involved in accidents, who repeatedly violate traffic laws, who have physical or mental disabilities or infirmities. Thorough reexamination of such persons who are most obviously in need of it is urged and is considered more desirable than general periodic reexamination which would all too likely prove to be hurried and of dubious thoroughness and value.

DRIVER TRAINING

Sixty percent of persons in the 25–34 age group are motor-vehicle drivers, and the percentages of adults who drive are growing. Today it is widely accepted that driver education and training is primarily a function of the high school and that teachers should be trained for this specialized work. Analyses show much lower accident rates for high-school-trained drivers. Over one-third of the States have taken progressive action; several provide for driver education in high schools by legislation or State education department regulation.

The AAA urges that credit courses in driver education and training be presented in every high school in the United States and that these courses include behind-the-wheel instruction. (A home-school cooperation plan is available for high schools which are not yet prepared to include behind-the-wheel instruction in a school-operated dual-control car.)

AAA associations and clubs are urged to institute vigorous programs for the development of public support for such high-school programs, working in cooperation with the school authorities. National headquarters is requested to formulate methods for developing public support, and is urged to continue to provide the services of experienced educators for training teachers and for other aids to educators upon invitation therefrom.

ADULT DRIVER TRAINING PROGRAMS

There is ample evidence that high-quality driver-training instruction presented by AAA automobile clubs is very popular. A number of clubs have very active and highly successful programs. It is strongly urged that other affiliated clubs give serious consideration to the institution of such adult driving schools with suitably high standards. In order to help protect against driver training of substandard quality, the traffic-safety committee and national headquarters are requested to review existing standards for such adult driver training programs and to consider the availability of publishing recommended minimum standards.

PEDESTRIAN PROTECTION AND REGULATION

For many years the American Automobile Association has been very active in the promotion of pedestrian-protection programs in States and municipalities. It continues to believe that protection of pedestrians should be the major objective. However, the pedestrian toll continues to be very high. For the country as a whole it involves nearly 4 out of 10 of the persons killed in traffic. In cities it averages nearly two-thirds. For the protection of pedestrians, therefore, the AAA now urges that following adequate educational periods in each community, regulations be put into effect which will place upon the pedestrian appropriate responsibilities as a part of the traffic stream, just as the motor-vehicle operator has, and should continue to have, his responsibilities in traffic and in relation to the pedestrian. There should be no weakening of proper requirements for motor-vehicle drivers, but there should be enforcement of appropriate pedestrian regulations.

PROTECTION OF SCHOOL CROSSINGS

As the demand for police engaged in traffic work grows, the need of providing officer protection at certain crossings used by school children is being increasingly examined. Each such location should be studied carefully, giving due attention to traffic volumes, speeds, roadway widths, sight distance, accident experience, and to whether by rerouting school-child traffic, the crossing can be eliminated.

In some places satisfactory protection can be afforded by the use of civilian crossing guards in place of police officers, or by pedestrian-actuated signals preferably supplemented by school safety patrols. In other places, where the main hazard is an unusually wide roadway, pedestrian isles of refuge can be installed which with efficient patrol operation will be satisfactory. In yet other instances, school safety stops by motorists may be warranted. In such cases the stop sign should be covered or turned away at all hours except when school children are using the crossing.

In some places, use of efficient, well-trained, and well-supervised patrols will be satisfactory where an officer is now stationed. However, this substitution should never be made where there are not lulls in vehicular traffic occurring at reasonably frequent intervals and of sufficient duration to allow children to cross the street or highway safely. If there are not such adequate lulls, as is stated in the Standard Rules, the traffic problem is not a patrol responsibility, but should be handled by the municipality.

VEHICLE SIZE AND WEIGHT STANDARDS

The AAA reaffirms its position adopted in 1933 for the following limitations: 12-foot 6-inches height limit, 35-foot length limit for single vehicles, 18,000-pound axle load limit (for pneumatic tires only), 8-foot width limit.

Concerning a proposal for 102-inch maximum width, the American Automobile Association for reasons of safety opposes such an increase until a preponderant majority of roads of general use have pavements of at least 20 feet in width.

The American Association of State Highway Officials' policy provides for a 50-foot length limit for a tractor and semitrailer and a 60-foot length limit for other combinations of vehicles. The American Automobile Association believes that the safety aspects of these proposals warrant greater consideration and urges further study on these matters.

The American Automobile Association strongly favors the setting forth of maximum loads permissible on any group of axles through the use of a table in place of the formula heretofore set forth. The table will be much better understood and adoption of it by the States will prove a valuable aid to enforcement.

The American Automobile Association urges that in publishing and using the new size and weight standards there be included a proposal that States having higher limits than those recommended not increase their limits and other States not adopt higher limits than those proposed by the AASHO committee. This seems necessary because of a considerable understanding that the proposed AASHO standards are the lowest standards or floors which States should adopt, but are not intended to be ceilings. The American Automobile Association points out that safety and vehicle performance call for maximums which will not be exceeded.

The American Automobile Association urges the importance of adoption of minimum performance standards (speed-ability on say a 5-percent grade with maximum legal load, and minimum braking efficiency on the level with a maximum legal load) to accompany new size and weight standards. Proposed increased sizes and weights accentuate the need for reasonable minimum performance standards.

Does Appeasement Lead to Better Relations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio statement by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

Americans like Wallace and PEPPER are doing their country untold harm at the moment of the greatest political crisis in its history.

They are—like Brutus—honorable men. But in their stubborn justification of past Soviet expansion and advocacy of its farther growth (PEPPER advocated giving the Russians control of the Dardanelles and a share of middle eastern oil), they are misleading the American people. They are glossing over the real basis of the Russo-American dispute.

Since June 1941, the Soviet Union has waged successful war not only upon its enemies but upon its allies, among them, the United States of America.

In 1941, Washington and London had small grounds for loving Moscow, whose nonaggression pact with Berlin had cleared the way for Hitler's attack upon Poland. But when Germany attacked Russia, Churchill and Roosevelt decided to forget the past and try to make a new start in world history.

Ninety percent of all Britishers and Americans applauded this decision. They wanted nothing more than to be friends with the Russians.

The United States and Britain poured into Russia all the war material they could spare. They gave the Russians complete freedom of movement in their countries. They tried to cooperate in all possible lines—from propaganda to strategy. They offered Moscow cooperation in war and friendship in peace.

And they found themselves knocking on a closed door. Stalin accepted American aid upon terms so humiliating for us that Gen. John R. Deane, head of the United States Military Mission in Moscow, justifies our toleration of them only on the ground that if we had bucked, Stalin would have sought a new alliance with Hitler (The Strange Alliance, the Viking Press, New York, 1947).

Soon Moscow went further. After signing the Atlantic Charter (no annexations) it began to claim territories of its allies. It demanded a vast sphere of influence and friendly (meaning subservient) governments in formerly independent little countries. When Roosevelt and Churchill sought to refuse, Stalin blackmailed them into acceptance. Soon we found ourselves acquiescing in the same program of Soviet expansion that Adolf Hitler had refused to grant Russia.

Poland, which fought Hitler when Stalin was cooperating with him, was partitioned. The Balkans and Finland were enslaved. The Baltic States were reannexed. China was compelled by Roosevelt to grant the Soviets special rights in Manchuria.

Our officials and officers submitted to systematic humiliation at the hands of the Russians in half a dozen countries where they were supposed to collaborate. The American administration carefully hushed these degrading stories lest knowledge of them should make the American people unwilling further to collaborate with the Russians.

American armies that could have prevented endless future difficulties by occupying liberated Berlin, Vienna and Prague stopped short in order that our Russian allies should enjoy this satisfaction.

Our "neutrality" in China went so far that in December 1945, Secretary of State Byrnes promised at Moscow to withdraw the American armed forces from China. At Paris last summer he signed away Italian Istria to a Moscow satellite and consented to the internationalization of Italian Trieste.

In creating the United Nations, Roosevelt bent over backwards to give the Soviet Union not one but three seats. We accepted a veto (also unhappily desired by many American Senators) that has enabled the Soviet Union to defy the United Nations.

Had we obtained a really satisfactory peace, these sacrifices and these humiliations would not have mattered. But with each retreat by us, Russian arrogance increased. Instead of harmony, further demands—Turkish provinces and the Dardanelles. A constant Moscow barrage of mendacious propaganda about our motives, steady Soviet intrigue in France and Italy, Communist infiltration into Greece, a deadlock in Germany, Austria, and Korea.

In short, instead of clasping the outstretched hand, Moscow remained true to its dogma that in a war between capitalistic countries, the Soviet Union should participate only as a third party, a tertius gaudens, seeking to realize its aims at the expense of both camps.

Wallace and PEPPER either do not know these things, or they do not care. But the American people have a right to know and judge.

The real cause of Russo-American rivalry is not of private enterprise versus socialization. (Or why would we be working with socialist Britain?)

It is not communism versus capitalism or communism versus Christianity. It is not even totalitarian tyranny versus civil liberties (though this comes closer). It is simply the Soviet claim to dominate which if realized would spell the downfall of the United States. In the jungle of international relations (short of world government) any great increase of power by a great state is a danger which other states must resist or submit to.

Only very slowly the American President, the Congress, and the people have admitted the disagreeable truth. Now that our eyes are open, people of the Wallace-Pepper school would throw sand in them. We cannot afford to be blinded.

In the concluding words of honest General Deane:

"We have the moral and physical power to stop the Soviet leaders cold and should not hesitate to use it. We can check any future aggression if we are alive to the danger that confronts us. If we emulate the ostrich and bury our head in the sand, we shall get the resounding kick from a Russian boot that such an undignified posture invites."

Drive for Lower Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, during the past week we have learned of the concerted effort on the part of the retail merchants in many communities voluntarily cutting their prices by a flat 10 percent and in some instances even more. This action by these merchants, I presume, is a patriotic one and a gesture to carry out President Truman's plea in his address to the Associated Press at a luncheon in New York for lower prices. In the face of recent wage increases granted by the major steel companies, electrical manufacturers, and automobile manufacturers, I greatly fear this reduction in profits by retailers will be short lived. Unless these merchants are ready to admit that their margins of profit were already too high, when they undertake to replace their stocks, they might find that this patriotic experiment was rather costly.

I am a retail merchant myself; our business is highly competitive and we merchandise essential consumer commodities. Our margins of profit have a well-established historical mark-up. I believe there are thousands of merchants in our country who cannot afford to join in any community, straight across the board flat 10 percent or better cut. We realize sales have dropped off, but until we are assured of lower wholesale costs, we certainly cannot conscientiously reduce prices. To me the movement is inconsistent with the trend.

I notice some of our Government economists are praising this wage rise pattern, stating that it will give the Nation's purchasing power a much needed bolstering. To me, it is only a shot in the arm, as it were, and will definitely lead to that much dreaded inflation. A wave of wage increases is sweeping the country. Increased costs are bound to result. True, we shall have more automobiles, more electrical devices, and many more products made from steel. There will be more places to spend our money, if we have it to spend. What is the answer? We know the administration has always encouraged reasonable increases in wages. If someone would only define "reasonable," we might have the answer. Certainly it is time to think of the consuming public. All of us do not belong to some highly organized working unit. Manufacturers are giving in to demands because they are tired of strikes and know we need increased production. But what about the unorganized—that great group we hear talked of so much, the rank and file, the white-collared class, and millions of others. Theirs is a dark and drab future unless someone—and that means the Chief Executive or the Congress—faces this issue with sound honest-to-goodness horse sense.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MITCHELL JENKINS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas it has been called to our attention that there is a bill in the House of Representatives of the United States, designated as H. R. 2910, to authorize the United States during an emergency period to undertake its fair share in the resettlement of displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy, including relatives of citizens or of members of our armed forces by permitting their admission into the United States in a number equivalent to part of the total quota numbers unused during the war years; and

Whereas there are tens of thousands of Lithuanian displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy who are unable or unwilling to return to the country of their nationality or former residence because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions, all as specifically set forth in said bill designated as H. R. 2910; and

Whereas relatives of these unfortunate displaced persons are anxious about their present and future welfare and would like to arrange for their resettlement in the United States, all in accordance with the immigration laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Branch No. 44 of the United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc., located in the city of Pittston, Luzerne County, Pa., for the reasons above stated, fully endorses bill designated as H. R. 2910, and urgently requests Congressmen, Senators, and the President of the United States to pass favorably on this act.

WILLIAM GRIESTARAITIS,
Chairman.
JOSEPH MACEINA,
Secretary.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 24, 1947

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from a young man in high school at Langdale, Ala., which is one of the most eloquent appeals I have ever read for Federal aid for education. This young man points up America's only hope for the preservation of our free democratic institutions, an educated citizenship. The letter follows:

I pride myself on being an American. Our great country has for many, many years been at the top. We have led the world in everything. We have proved to them that democracy is not decadent. From my social study book, which contrasts democracy with other theories of government, I quote, "Freedom in education is its foundation." Surely no true American would contradict this. Yet, a bitter lump swells in my throat when I realize that Britain spends 3.5 percent of her annual income on education, more than twice ours, and that Russia spends 7 percent. In addition, the American public schools are in a turmoil as never before; you find it in every paper you care to read. What is wrong? What America will be tomorrow depends upon how she is trained today. Will we drop to a level of illiteracy and ignorance if good teachers and students alike continue to quit? Will the highest calling of man be allowed to starve itself out? Will unqualified teachers warp rather than mold our mind of tomorrow? We here are hardest hit. The only convention of any kind that I've attended without receiving a heckle has been the annual Beta Club convention for Alabama. We can take no pride

or recognition in our training outside the State, nor can any teacher.

Equalization of school funds (bill S. 472) is our only immediate hope. O, would that I had your opportunity to serve. I am going to graduate in May as valedictorian. Next election I shall be old enough to vote. I can but hope that every American youth will realize what is happening and will strive to pull Alabama and all American schools from a seemingly chaotic state.

Daylight Saving in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by George E. Reedy:

One-third of the Nation will enjoy an extra hour of sunlight today. But voteless Washington, dependent upon legislators who owe no responsibility to the city, will carry on under a time schedule designed to fit the bleak winter months.

There is, of course, still a chance that the District will be able to go on daylight-saving time. It depends entirely upon a vote scheduled in the House today—a vote on a bill to give the city the right to act on the will of its residents.

Backers of the legislation believe there is some possibility that the House may approve the measure, but should it do so it will be reversing an overwhelming vote by which it turned down a daylight-savings bill a few weeks ago.

It is rare for either branch of Congress to make such an abrupt about-face. It has happened, however, and today it is the only chance for District residents who want that extra hour of sunshine to have their wishes carried out.

There is much more involved than just a few extra hours of recreation for city office workers. The pressing problem under standard time is to adjust the activities of Washington to other metropolitan centers operating on different schedules.

Railroads, bus lines, radio stations, and long-distance truckers have already put into effect complicated changes in their operations to meet this situation. However, there is a certain amount of confusion that just cannot be eliminated.

Should the bill go through the House today, this problem could be solved very quickly. The measure has already passed the Senate, and there is little doubt about the desire of Washingtonians for daylight-saving time.

Polls conducted by local newspapers, the board of trade, and citizen's associations have demonstrated that conclusively. The only barrier is lack of congressional permission for the District Commissioners to go into action.

When the daylight-saving bill was before the House a few weeks ago, it was defeated by the opposition of Representatives from nearby rural areas. It has never been popular with farmers who, unlike residents of the District, have the right to vote.

The opposition of the Virginia and Maryland Representatives, is in a sense, fruitless. It does not solve the problems of their rural constituents because all of the other large centers in the surrounding area have gone on fast time.

The farmer doesn't like daylight saving because his working hours are adjusted to rural conditions that cannot be changed by moving the hands of a clock. No one has ever succeeded in convincing a cow that 4 a. m. is actually 5 a. m.

However, the farmer is faced with the fact that practically every large city is on daylight-saving time. To keep Washington on the standard system will not help him in the slightest. It will do nothing except thwart the obvious will of a majority of the District's citizens.

Dangerous Trend to Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on industial mergers written by Mr. Robert E. Freer, a member of the Federal Trade Commission and a trustee of George Washington University. This article appeared in the Washington Post, April 28, 1947, and is as follows:

We have a declared public policy regarding monopoly that is rooted in the principles of the common law and which has been embodied in and implemented by a series of antitrust statutes including the Sherman and Clayton Acts. But in the dynamic development of industry based on modern technology, the facts of concentration constantly tend to outrun the law.

The factual diagnosis showing the relation of corporate mergers to concentration is as complete and as exact as specialists in the field can make it. Today's choice is one between legislative action recommended by the Federal Trade Commission to plug a loophole in the present laws against such mergers and continued frustration of our declared public policy.

Simply stated, the Commission's proposal is that the Clayton Act be so amended that acquisition by a corporation engaged in interstate commerce of the assets of a competing corporation also engaged in interstate commerce be made unlawful where the result tends to monopoly. Presently on stock (not asset) acquisitions so tending are unlawful under that act and legal actions against even such unlawful acquisitions easily may be defeated.

More than 1,800 formerly independent manufacturing and mining concerns have been swallowed up through merger and acquisition since 1940. Their combined asset value was $4,100,000,000, or nearly 5 percent of the total asset value of all manufacturing concerns in 1943. Moreover, it was the larger corporations, each having assets of over $5,000,000 (in many instances achieved through earlier acquisitions), that accounted for some three-fourths of these recent 1,800 acquisitions.

The war contributed powerfully to the trend of concentration. Government purchases and Government financing of productive facilities were channeled predominantly into the hand of corporations which already occupied positions of dominance. Surplus profits created by such channeling have contributed powerfully to the trend by providing funds for additional wartime and postwar expansion through acquisition of former competitors. Out of $175,000,000,000 of Government contract awards between June 1940 and September 1944, $107,000,000,000, or 67 percent, went to only 100 of the more than 18,000 corporations receiving such awards. During the war 68 corporations received two-thirds of the $1,000,000,000 appropriated by the Government for research and development purposes in industrial laboratories.

The most recent information on the wartime growth of concentration available from the Bureau of Internal Revenue shows that the larger manufacturing corporations—those with assets of $50,000,000 or more each—increased their share of total assets from 42 percent in 1939 to 52 percent in 1943.

The degree of prewar concentration in the economy as a whole and in manufacturing industries in particular was stated in the report of the Senate Small Business Committee, submitted in January 1946.

The 200 largest nonfinancial corporations owned about 55 percent of all the assets of all the nonfinancial corporations in the country. One-tenth of 1 percent of all the corporations owned 52 percent of the total corporate assets. Less than 4 percent of all the manufacturing corporations earned 84 percent of all the net profits of all manufacturing corporations.

More than 57 percent of the total value of manufactured products was produced under conditions where the four largest producers of each product turned out over 50 percent of the total United States output. One-tenth of 1 percent of all the firms in the country in 1939 employed 500 or more workers and accounted for 40 percent of all the nonagricultural employment in the country. One-third of the industrial research personnel were employed by 13 companies.

More mergers and acquisitions in the manufacturing and mining industries took place in 1946 than in any of the previous 15 years. In 1946, the number of mergers was 26 percent above the number in 1945, and 225 percent above the annual average of the years, 1940–41. Years of greatest business activity and high price levels are the years in which the greatest number of mergers take place. In 1920, the number of mergers increased more than six times over the number during 1919.

The stock market crash of 1929 which heralded the onset of the great depression was preceded by a great wave of corporate mergers and a wild speculation in their securities. Today speculation in the future of merged concerns, supported by war-swollen profits, is again operating as one of the important causes of the present upward trend in merger activity. This speculation, which stems from the expectation of greater profits resulting from the elimination of formerly competing concerns, leads inexorably to the elimination of our competitive economy and thus to the elimination of the possibility of legitimate speculation.

Assuming as we must that the Government, acting in the general public interest, can, if Congress so directs, prevent the further growth of monopolistic power through mergers of competing corporations, the question is one of ways and means of halting mergers that tend toward monopoly regardless of whether consummated by sale of stock or of assets.

When section 7 of the Clayton Act was passed in 1914, it was assumed that consummated monopolies could be dissolved under the Sherman Act pursuant to the Supreme Court's decrees of dissolution in the Standard Oil and American Tobacco cases decided in 1911. It was assumed that the only remaining problem was how to prevent the formation of monopoly.

However, about the time that the Federal Trade Commission began to institute a number of proceedings for enforcement of section 7 the Supreme Court interpreted the Sherman Act to mean that huge size and power

acquired through acquisition of competing corporations did not necessarily violate the act and that it was only the abuse of such power and not its existence which would make such acquisitions unlawful. A few years later when the commission's cases under section 7 reached the Court, it was held that the commission had no power under section 7 to halt the incipient monopolies where the unlawful acquisition of stock was followed by an acquisition of the physical properties without which the stock had no value, and where this was done before the commission could complete the hearings and enter its order requiring divestiture of the stock unlawfully acquired.

The practical status of section 7 is that no matter how unlawful an acquisition of stock in a competing corporation may be, the remedy provided by the statute easily can be defeated, leaving the acquiring corporation in possession of the assets which are the fruits of its unlawful acquisition of stock. And if the assets are acquired directly without any intervening acquisition of stock, as has become the prevailing method, there has never been any legal ground for a contention that this was prohibited under section 7.

Thus the brave start, under the Clayton Act, has ended in complete frustration. And at the same time, the Sherman Act has been so construed that it seldom has served to unscramble corporate mergers, no matter how great the size and power of the acquiring or of the consolidated corporation. The contrast between the rapid evolution of economic concentration of power and the feebleness and slowness with which effective legal remedies have been and are being applied is striking. It is sufficient to call in question the reality of our faith in the validity of the competition presupposed by the free enterprise competitive system.

A paradoxical aspect of this problem is that while corporate mergers and acquisitions proceed unrestrained and unrestrainable by law toward an ultimate maximum in unified ownership and concentrated economic power, we still enforce the law against the more transient and more vulnerable forms of trade restraint represented by price agreements and conspiracies among competitors. The process of corporate acquisition proceeds side by side with such forms of trade restraint among competitors. The presence of large-scale unified ownership in any industry is a most powerful guarantee of success in the operation of a price-fixing combination among the competitive units of that industry. The very success of law enforcement against such combinations highlights the advantage of unified corporate ownership as a legally invulnerable means of accomplishing similar ends. Carried to its logical result, there will probably be less and less opportunity to score victories against price-fixing combinations as corporate mergers immune from legal attack take their place.

No one has summarized the danger of monopoly any better than President William Howard Taft, under whose administration some of the most far-reaching antitrust actions of all time were taken. On December 5, 1911, he stated:

"When all energies are directed not toward the reduction of the cost of production for the public benefit by a healthful competition, but toward new ways and means for making permanent in a few hands the absolute control of the conditions and prices prevailing in the whole field of industry, then individual enterprise and effort will be paralyzed and the spirit of commercial freedom will be dead."

The facts of the present situation constitute an increasing threat not only to our traditional antitrust policy but also to the American system of free competitive enterprise which that policy is designed to foster and to protect.

Oil and Gas Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a statement by Hon. Walter S. Hallanan, chairman of the National Petroleum Council of Washington, D. C. Mr. Hallanan is a citizen of West Virginia and has had extensive experience in matters pertaining to the petroleum industry and his observations should receive careful attention. His statement follows:

Serious misconceptions of the relations of the service being given to the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior by the petroleum industry are indicated in the report of the Appropriations Committee on Interior Department appropriations now before the House of Representatives.

The petroleum industry answered the request of the Government to provide, through the National Petroleum Council to the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior, such essential information as various arms of the Government deem necessary to the purposes of national defense and public welfare. The representatives of the petroleum industry—both large and small and coming from every section of the country—responded to the Government request as a public duty. They accepted membership on the National Petroleum Council at the invitation of and under the appointment of the Secretary of the Interior. It should be made crystal clear that the Oil and Gas Division was not created at the request of the oil industry or any part of it. The industry answered the invitation to join in this Government-industry peacetime cooperative effort in consideration of an obligation which we recognize as an industry very closely allied with the problems of national welfare and security. The Government, through the Oil and Gas Division, has requested information from the oil industry on various matters and the industry has responded unselfishly and in the spirit of complete cooperation.

It is unfortunate that in the recent report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives dealing with the Oil and Gas Division of the Interior Department, the factual situation is so grossly distorted as to make it appear that the statistics and studies which the Oil and Gas Division is requesting through the National Petroleum Council, are solely a service to the oil and gas industry. The committee report further states that its (Oil and Gas Division) service to industry is to provide information which the industry cannot get without violating the antitrust laws. This is a wholly untrue and indefensible statement which would indicate that the committee has been grossly imposed upon in the representations made to it.

The petroleum industry is making a sincere effort, through the medium of the Oil and Gas Division, to provide the Army and Navy and other governmental agencies with such information, with respect to oil and gas, as intelligent and correct understanding and protection of the national welfare may require.

This effort is being made in pursuance of the suggestion by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives. This committee, in its final report to Congress recognized the stupendous job done by the petroleum industry in cooperation with the Government and suggested continuance of an organization along this same pattern whether for peacetime or military purposes. The report declares:

"The committee regards the creation of the NPC as a significant development, a natural outgrowth of the cooperative accomplishment experienced during the war. Prior to the war, relationships between the petroleum industry and the Federal Government were anything but close and harmonious. Machinery did not exist for enabling the industry to contribute effectively out of its benefits of information and recommendations upon problems of common and public concern. This alliance, if a genuinely cooperative relationship is maintained, will benefit both the Government and industry in terms of a better understanding of petroleum problems and an improved governmental administration of oil and gas activities."

In order that the record should be clear the facts are that although the Oil and Gas Division may render some service to the oil and gas industry the oil and gas industry through the National Petroleum Council renders much greater service to the Government and renders it gratuitously.

It would seem that in order to eliminate any appropriation for the maintenance of the Oil and Gas Division, the Appropriation Committee of the House of Representatves has permitted someone to atempt to "smear" the petroleum industry and its motives in what has been a sincere effort by the industry to provide the Government with industry data and information necessary to the welfare and security of the Nation.

Policing of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. WALLACE CHADWICK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, speaking as if to H. R. 1624, a District of Columbia police bill, I claim just 2 minutes of the time of the House to call the attention of the House to a very special and personal obligation of our Members with respect to one aspect of the policing of the District.

LET'S PROTECT OUR HOME FOLKS HERE

We all of us welcome the visits of our constituents to Washington, and we know that many come here in their cars. Accustomed as we are to seeing Pennsylvania licenses on the streets here, nevertheless, each one I see carries a pleasant suggestion of home; I am sure that colleagues from more remote States get a like special pleasure when they see licenses more familiar to them than they are to most of us.

We who are here by reason of the confidence and support of these good people back home owe them, I think, a little special solicitude, to be sure that when they come here as our guests, they are courteously, as well as efficiently, served by the traffic police of this District.

We all know the difference between good policing and bad; we have all suffered at one time or another, somewhere or other, from exhibitions of arrogance and unreasonableness by traffic officers

in strange cities, from which we being strangers could have no assured protection.

But Washington must not be permitted to be a "strange city" to any American who chooses to pay a visit to his Capital. It is his city, in a very peculiar sense; he is not only welcome here, but he is here by special right—a right which I think our traffic force will have to learn to respect.

This lesson does not seem to have been completely learned; I can only assume that some persistent effort is being made to teach it. Unless I am very much mistaken, there are still a few policemen on our Washington streets who might make efficient, or at least formidable, guards in some maximum-security prison, but who lack either the intelligence or the requisite finesse to deal with the American motoring public, who are their real employers.

Personally, I have already observed two such occurrences here which were made unnecessarily annoying by the demeanor of traffic-squad officers. Those I hope were exceptional, but if I observe a third, I am going to do a little investigating on my own account to find out just what happens down here to my constitutents and yours, Mr. Speaker, when they unintentionally fall afoul of some of these hard-boiled babies in uniform. And if I do, I intend to report the facts back to this body, and ask your aid in helping make Washington the most hospitable city in the world to its great hosts of visiting drivers, rather than the motorists' nightmare it now sometimes appears.

In this connection, I call the attention of our Members to an editorial in today's Washington Post under the caption "Sensible signs." We might all do well to commend Director Keneipp's efforts in this direction; and we certainly should commend the concluding sentence of the editorial which reads as follows: "Life in the Capital of the United States is complex enough these days without continuing any minor vexations we can do without."

I trust that those responsible for the discipline and training of the Traffic Squad will not think I am aiming at any unreasonable or impossible standards of perfection. I know that policemen are human, like the rest of us. I know that they sometimes forget their duty, often under great provocation. But it is my experience that a few judiciously administered suspensions go a long way in helping them remember.

Facts on Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on April 7—Army Day—J. E. Schaefer, vice president of the Boeing Airplane Co., Wichita, Kans., addressed the Wichita Rotary Club on the subject, Facts on Air Power. Since the address contains many important facts concerning the airplane industry and its relation to world security, I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last week I received a letter from a friend in London and in it appeared this thought provoking statement: "Our need now, as I see it, is no longer for the spirit that rises to meet common danger or adversity, but one which seeks the hidden dangers of today and rises to part company with indifference and complacency." Our own Alf Landon put it in another way in his recent Wichita speech which was widely commented on in New York papers. Alf said, "We must keep alert and we must be prepared to maintain a long-range, stout-hearted American policy for the benefit of the American people." We have won a war, but we have not yet won a peace. Indifference and complacency can and will lose that peace if we are not prepared to assume international obligations in accordance with circumstances and conditions growing out of our participation in World War II. Air power had much to do with the final results of that war and will by direction and indirection have much to do with any peace growing out of it.

We here in Wichita have been very closely associated with an important segment of air power and the results it achieved during World War II. We know what it means to work long hours and make business and personal adjustments in order to build this necessary air power. With all of this experience and background, I am, however, wondering if we understand and appreciate the extent to which our air power of VJ-day has been reduced. You may be surprised to know that we are today following the same road to airpower impotency which we followed after World War I.

In 1918, we increased our aircraft production to 14,020 units per year. This fell to 780 units in 1919. Seventeen aircraft plants were producing airplanes in 1918. Three were producing aircraft in 1926 when the Morrow Board brought out its report on our aircraft impotency. This, together with the Lindbergh flight, stimulated aircraft activity to the point where it was barely able to pull through the depression years. It may interest you to know that we at Boeing-Wichita got down to 13 people during those trying years.

In 1939, as the war clouds began to gather, the aircraft industry ranked forty-fourth in value among all industries. It had a total annual output of $279,000,000 for aircraft and engines as compared with $4,039,000,000 for the motor-vehicle industry. Aircraft was sandwiched in between the sausage and candy industries. This will give you some idea of its relative importance and position in 1939. Early in 1940, a 50,000-airplane program began to be discussed. I well remember the first knowledge I had of this astronomical goal. Gen. H. H. Arnold, then Chief of the Army Air Corps, came to Wichita for one of his periodic visits. We had a good steak dinner at the stockyards and afterward he suggested that I arrange for the guests and his staff to return to town so that he and I could drive back to the hotel together. Soon after we crossed Thirteenth Street and Broadway, he asked me to pull over to the curb, for he said he was worried and wanted to talk with me. When I had done this and had parked, he said, "Earl, what I am telling you is a deep secret at the moment, but within a few weeks the President is going to announce a program to build 50,000 airplanes per year. That is more airplanes than you and I ever dreamed of. If you were in my position and had 50,000 airplanes thrown at you, what would you do?" General Arnold asked. I thanked him for this inquisitive compliment and told him that my first act would be to catch my breath. "Well," he replied, "the first thing I will have to do is train pilots and that is where you come in. We will need training planes and I am going to expect Wichita to build them for me."

Wichita did just that, and later on, after we went through the agony of Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, we were given other jobs to do. In every instance Wichita came through with its quota, until the total military aircraft production throughout the country early in 1944 reached 9,000 airplanes per month.

Because of the many models of different and varying sizes and the attendant difficulty in properly describing production in terms of airplane units, the aircraft industry and the armed services finally agreed on pounds of air-frame weight as a proper basis for measuring productive capacity. Pounds of air-frame weight simply mean pounds of airplane structure exclusive of engine, propellers, and accessories. It is essentially the wings, control surfaces, landing gear, and body of an airplane. These 9,000 airplanes per month, which represented the peak of our air-frame production in 1944, totaled approximately 255,000,000 pounds of air-frame weight exclusive of spare parts. Spares must have added another 10 or 15 percent. It is estimated that the aircraft industry, for the 5-year period between 1940 and 1945, produced $48,000,000,000 worth of aircraft and engines for World War II. This averages nine and one-half billion dollars per year. Remember the automobile industry was a $4,000,000,000 industry in 1939. From a dizzy production peak of 255,000,000 pounds of air frame in 1944, military aircraft production fell to less than 1,000,000 pounds of air-frame weight in December 1946, or to one-eightieth of its 1944 level and one-sixth of the 1941 level, the last year before World War II. From 1920 to 1939, $30,000,000 per year were spent for military aircraft and engines. From 1940 to 1945, $9,600,000,000 per year were spent for military aircraft and engines. Proper and wise planning during peacetime might have saved billions during the war, might even have prevented it from happening. Proper and wise planning is the basis of our concern today.

Now, let's see how the present low levels of industry activity threaten national security. Let us examine a typical development schedule for an airplane with which we here in Wichita are familiar—the B–29. In 1935, we entered into a Government experimental development contract which, in 1939, finally culminated in a definition of the military characteristics for the B–29—4 years were required for this.

I doubt that so long a period of time would be required for similar work today, since great progress was made during the war toward a modern definition of military characteristics as applied to aircraft construction. From this point forward, however, the time element is important and it is doubtful that for any completely new airplane a time lag of approximately 5 years between the design approval contract date and the maximum wartime production peak could be greatly reduced.

The first design-approved contract for the B–29 was let in 1940 and the first flight of the experimental XB–29 was made in 1942. Early in 1943 the first production model came off the lines. All of this was accomplished with unlimited funds and a priority second only to the atomic bomb, officially called the Manhattan project. In the spring of 1944, the first B–29's went overseas. As you will well recall, these first B–29 airplanes came from Wichita. In 1945, five years after the first design-approved contract was let, four plants were producing B–29's. They were

located in Seattle, Wash.; Omaha, Nebr.; Marietta, Ga., and Wichita. These plants reached a maximum monthly production of approximately 380 units, with slightly more than 40 percent of the final total B-29 production being accomplished here in Wichita. It will be seen from this progress report on the B-29's that the military airplanes of 1950 must at least be in the design and development stages today.

Since VJ-day, the B-29 has been succeeded by the B-50, the control surfaces and outer-wing panels for which are produced here in Wichita. The remaining assemblies are being produced and the airplane assembled in our Seattle plant. Boeing's successor to the B-50 is the B-52. It is estimated that approximately 2,000,000 engineering man-hours will be required to design and develop the B-52. In connection with the research and development aspects of air power, it is well to remember that no airplane used in World War II was designed or engineered after we got into the war. All airplanes used in World War II were in or being readied for production when we entered the war.

In 1945, the President appointed an Air Coordinating Committee consisting principally of the Assistant Secretary of War for Air, the Assistant Secretary of Navy for Air, one of the top Assistant Secretaries from the State Department, and top representatives from the CAA and CAB. The report of this Air Coordinating Committee submitted in October 1945, indicates that the current unsettled international situation requires a substantial striking force ready at all times to cooperate in the maintenance of world peace. The committee's study showed that approximately 60,000,000 pounds of military air-frame weight annually, or roughly speaking 5,800 airplanes, are required to maintain this striking force. "After maintenance of world peace is assured and a substantial degree of disarmament has taken place"—and this is quoted from the committee's report—"this annual production of 60,000,000 pounds of military air-frame weight could be halved." As you well know, we have not yet arrived at a place where the maintenance of world peace is well enough assured, nor has there been the substantial degree of disarmament contemplated to assume the degree of safety implied by such a reduction in aircraft production potential, so we should now be producing approximately 60,000,000 pounds of military air-frame annually.

In spite of these recommendations by the Air Coordinating Committee, our actual military production in 1946 was 12,500,000 pounds of air-frame weight. Remember these figures, please. Sixty million pounds is the required military production level set by the Air Coordinating Committee for ready defense and rapid expansion of the aircraft industry under current conditions of unrest. 30,000,000 pounds is the absolute minimum to permit rapid expansion after world peace seems assured; but, in 1946 we produced only 12,500,000 pounds of military air-frame weight. Also remember that the United Nations Charter assumes that, in the beginning at least, we are to keep the peace by enforcing the peace. The United Nations, therefore, in order to be at all effective, must be implemented by air power, for UN effectiveness is based on strength—not weakness. To be more specific—air power is the only force Russia fears from the United States.

If the President's current policy of firmness with Russia—a policy to which I think most of us subscribe—should result in a "put up or shut up situation" the aircraft industry is currently in no position to fulfill the requirements of that situation. It would take 18 months to 2 years to establish reasonable production of modern military aircraft. This was a surprise to many of our Congressmen and Senators to whom I told this story week before last. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to even start producing the aircraft with which we ended World War II inside of at least 1 year and possibly 18 months. As many of you know, substantially all of the jigs, dies, and fixtures for producing B-29's in Wichita, costing approximately $48,000,000 to develop and build, were destroyed and sold for junk. This figure is exclusive of the facility cost which includes buildings and machine tools and which are presently available for emergency use. This facility cost was $27,000,000. All of the B-29 jigs, dies, and fixtures would have to be rebuilt before we could again start production of that model and for any new model these tools would not only have to be built but in many instances designed and engineered for high-production output. Other plants throughout the country are in very much the same situation with respect to military aircraft production. Now what should be done?

First of all, I would want to emphasize the fact that we in the aircraft industry are as much interested in saving tax money as any group of businessmen. We, however, want to save it by judicious spending through proper planning. We have to spend money where it needs to be spent but let's be sure to spend it where it will do the most good. As an industry, we want to be self-supporting and self-sustaining. To accomplish this requires an understanding of the scope of aviation. Aviation is global in its aspects—militarily as well as commercially. It provides one of the best possible answers to the indeterminate time and space factors in the physical equation of economic progress. Understanding this, you can appreciate why we at Boeing, for example, cannot realize the full potential market for our Stratocruisers in a war-torn world. We must have peace to properly organize and exploit this market. We want peace, but we also want to be realistic in our approach toward peace. It is not here, and at the moment it is not imminent. So, in order to properly plan our organizations and development programs, we of the industry are advocating:

First, a constantly up-to-date 5-year program which will—

(a) Establish the Nation's annual requirements in advanced aircraft;

(b) Determine the size of the industrial program necessary to produce these aircraft; and

(c) Devise means and procedures to make rapid expansion possible for the industry.

Secondly, we advocate procurement legislation and procedures which will assure the most efficient execution of this 5-year program.

Third, and most important, we advocate an Air Policy Board established by Congress and operating on the highest policy level. This Board would be directly charged with the development and maintenance of air power. It is my firm belief that only through the adoption of such a program can we spend public funds wisely and economically and at the same time be prepared to back up General Evans and your sons and mine with the air power which they will need when and if a "show-down" comes.

Painful Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior was before the House last week, I made some remarks on unexpended appropriations. The total is about $24,500,000,000. Some of this huge sum accumulated during the war years, but a substantial part for public works has piled up since the war ended. The carry-over fund is held in varying amounts by many departments, bureaus, and other agencies of the Government.

The important feature of the $24,500,000,000 carry-over is that Republicans last fall promised to take the water out of the administration's padded request for money. The Republican Congress cannot carry out its promise to the taxpayers of the Nation unless it takes this $24,500,000,000 money "in the sock" voted in prior years when it considers 1948 requests for funds. Therefore, the Government's "sock" should be washed to do a clean job of economy.

It is plain to me, and I believe that you will agree, that Congress should review this tremendous carry-over of appropriated funds, all of which are available for expenditure in the fiscal year 1947 and a substantial amount indefinitely. In the light of current conditions, it is prudent that we examine these funds with a view to determining those that should be allowed to stand and those that should be held up or rescinded.

The Congress would be derelict in its duty if it permitted this gigantic fund—more than $24,000,000,000—to be spent at the discretion of department heads, bureau chiefs, and underlings spread across the country. There should be coordination and over-all planning by the Congress on this huge carry-over.

Obviously, the review should be made with care and wise discrimination to see that the worth-while construction is carried forward and that no mistakes are made that would cost more in the long run than if they were not made. That, of course, is what the House did when it passed the Interior Department appropriation bill.

I made the statement during debate on the Interior Department appropriation bill that this $24,500,000,000 in carry-over funds could be used as a handy political weapon in the 1948 national elections. In view of what we have seen in recent years under a tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect philosophy of government, we must be alert. That is why I now repeat the statement I made last week that public-works construction funds held up during and since the war could be used by the administration in an effort to prevent their inevitable defeat in the 1948 elections.

There has been considerable newspaper editorial comment on this $24,500,000,000 carry-over. The opinion is general that Congress should look into that fund and treat it in the light of present conditions. The Washington Star of last Sunday carried an editorial which approaches the painful problem of reduction of expenditures from the same point of view that our appropriation subcommittee approaches it: to make every feasible reduction in expenditures in the light of our present fiscal condition. I am appending the editorial for the information of the House:

PAINFUL OPERATION

Anyone reading the record of the House debate on the slash in the Interior Depart-

ment appropriation would be hard-pressed to find justification for the extravagant charges and countercharges which various parties to the dispute have made.

The wisdom of some of the cuts may be debatable. But it is difficult to take seriously Secretary Krug's contention that the reductions ordered "might be enough to set off a major depression," or to be impressed by the pronouncement from his predecessor, Harold Ickes, that the Republicans responsible for the slash are "political vandals" in the service of "Eastern exploitation." By the same token, it is a little silly for the Republican spokesman, Representative JONES of Ohio, to be accusing the President and Mr. Krug of a plot to keep control of $24,000,000,000 in frozen or inactive funds so that they can use it in the 1948 campaign "in an effort to whip every Republican Congressman."

As the matter stands now, the House has approved $161,413,513 for the Department for the 1948 fiscal year. The requested appropriation was $295,420,420. This cut has been most severely criticized in its application to construction work under the Department's reclamation program, and the question is to what extent, if any, this actually will cripple the program.

Some time ago, as an anti-inflationary measure, the President froze a portion of the Department's funds, the effect being to conserve materials for other and more urgent purposes and to check the flow of money into the hands of the public. Under this freeze order, according to Mr. JONES, the Department in 1947 was authorized to spend only $162,750,000 on construction. He also says that with the new but reduced appropriation plus unfrozen funds, the Department will have 25 percent more to spend on construction than would have been possible under the President's order.

Possibly this is not enough. Or it may result in a situation which interferes with the best long-range planning. But, at all events, it would not seem to produce a result which justifies the extremely intemperate criticism which has been heaped upon the heads of the Republican Congressmen. Economy is always a painful operation and it can easily be carried to a point that is harmful in the long run. But in our present fiscal condition every feasible reduction in expenditures is desirable, and those who challenge the wisdom of particular cuts should not lapse into the error of confusing sheer abusiveness with intelligent criticism.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many other Members of Congress are receiving expressions of interest and concern from their districts, and especially agricultural districts, with reference to next year's program administered by the Production and Marketing Administration, successor to what is generally known as the AAA program.

Many of the farmers and those associated in agricultural pursuits are tremendously interested in continuing the program of soil-building practices, preserving our soil and building for the future. We hear, Mr. Speaker, about a recession and the possibility of a depression. As I have said many times, if the farmers of this Nation are prosperous we will have a prosperous Nation. The farmers are the first of our people to be hurt by any recess in business or general depression. If we are to continue to have a prosperous Nation we are going to have not only to preserve but build our soil, prevent continued erosion and the devastation of this greatest of our resources.

I believe in economy, Mr. Speaker, and the elimination of unnecessary expenditures in any governmental program. I do not believe it is economy to permit the continued depletion of our resources and the opportunity for a prosperous agricultural industry in the future. There is nothing in my opinion more essential than a well-rounded agricultural program. Yet there is no group of people in this country more disturbed today than the farmers of this country, because they are fearful of what the future holds for them. There is a determined effort being made to make a drastic reduction in funds for the next fiscal year and, in fact, to completely eliminate a part of the program so basic to the agricultural industry such as the agricultural conservation program, Federal crop-insurance program, the school-lunch program, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, remembering that we have a definite commitment for the next 2 years of price-support loans and purchases.

Among other communications I have had from my district, I have received a statement of appreciation from a committee of outstanding men for the Congress having given agriculture an opportunity to compete in our national economy, restore our soil, and increase the standard of living of our farm population. With that statement, Mr. Speaker, that transmits a statement on the history of the AAA program, its importance, its accomplishments and why have the AAA. Because these statements express so well the importance of this program and the need for the future stability of the agricultural industry, I include them in the RECORD, under permission to extend my remarks, as follows:

APPRECIATION

To the Congressional Members who have made possible the program of conservation in the Seventh Congressional District, who have given a helping hand to the custodians of our soils during this generation, and who have given agriculture an opportunity to compete in our national economy, who have made possible the restoration of our soils, who have lifted our farm population from the depths of bankruptcy to a higher level of prosperity and who have given assurance of a secure and sound agriculture for future generations.

In behalf of farmers and other county committeemen in this Seventh Congressional District, we the undersigned, express our most sincere thanks.

EARL N. MARTINDALE,
Chairman, Hempstead County.
BRUTIUS HARRELL,
Chairman, Union County.
JAMES B. CEARLY,
Chairman, Nevada County.
ROY H. SHEFFIELD,
Chairman, Chicot County.

HISTORY OF TRIPLE-A

The agricultural conservation program was inaugurated in the year 1936. At that time agriculture was in a state of bankruptcy. Stability of agricultural prices had been lost. In order to survive, agricultural people were forced to drain every ounce of fertility possible from the soil. Large acreages were planted; prices dropped.

The following year an even larger acreage was necessary to furnish the bare essentials needed for existence. It was apparent to everyone that something had to be done, as our soils were becoming entirely depleted and erosion was on a rampage. As a result of the above, health, education, and community life were seriously affected. No new soils could be cleared and no longer could a move to new and fresher lands be made.

These conditions were responsible for the inauguration of our first control program. Compulsory allotments were placed on the planted acreage of cotton in the Seventh Congressional District. This program was not dictatorial. It was very democratic in that before this program could be put into effect, it had to be approved by a referendum requiring two-thirds approval of all cotton producers in the Nation.

It is now recognized that this program was the turning point of our agricultural unrest and devastation. With allotments, a smaller acreage was devoted to cotton, thus allowing thousands of acres to be diverted to other uses. This gave that diverted acreage an opportunity to rest and regain some of its lost fertility. Serious thought was given to the future. Analysis was made of our soils' bank account, revealing a great deficit. The accounts had been overdrawn for a hundred years and still withdrawals were being made. Eroded fields, washes, and gullies took on the appearance of a giant octopus with millions of arms reaching into our soils, carrying them into our streams on down into the Gulf of Mexico, to no longer produce and stabilize our economy.

The second important achievement of this program was the opportunity given farmers to predict the income from the crop year. With allotments as a production-control measure, cotton loans guaranteed a minimum price at harvest time. This gave farm producers the opportunity to use foresight for the first time in planning a budget for the year. With average weather farm producers could have confidence and look to the future not as something to fear but rather as a dream to be conquered. Debts were paid off. Banks exchanged their mortgages for cash and once again became sound. This new stability and economy on the farm influenced the economy of our Nation.

With this chaos conquered there only remained to be found the solution of the insecurity of weather, seasons, and insects. In 1942 the first cotton crop insurance program was put into effect. With this, farm producers could look to the future and plan on an equal with industry and business. At the time of planting, with crop insurance, a producer is guaranteed a minimum production and through cotton loans is guaranteed a minimum price for this cotton. No longer are weather, insects, and price fluctuations a fear.

With fear and uncertainty eradicated and a somewhat higher standard of income guaranteed, more and more thought and effort could be brought to bear on the problem of soil conservation. A study had revealed that one-fourth of the total top soil of Arkansas had been lost to erosion, and that approximately a third more had lost more than one-half of its top soil. These were alarming figures when it was learned that it took several thousand years to build this top soil. Muddy rivers in Arkansas reflected the loss of income, health, and security. The next important finding was that plants do not thrive on soils alone. It was found that there were needed minerals that nature had put in the soils to add life and strength to the plant. In direct relations to this it was found that man and animal must obtain their supply of necessary minerals from the same source—our soils.

Investigations revealed that even though a sufficient quantity of plants were consumed the body might be deficient in needed minerals. This brought up the added problem of restoring the needed minerals to our soils as well as conserving them. These conditions were recognized by the triple-A farmer committeemen throughout the county and programs to correct these conditions were recommended to Congress. Congress accepted its responsibility and has approved programs to help correct these deficiencies. The triple-A committeemen throughout the Seventh Congressional District have made great progress in soil conservation and restoration in the past 11 years; however, it is realized that the program is only in its infancy. Continued vigilance and effort must be expended in future years to correct the destruction of the past 100 years.

WHY THE TRIPLE A?

The paramount function of the triple A farm program is to furnish financial assistance to aid in the carrying out of needed soil conservation and soil-building practices. The program was developed after a great deal of study of the needs of our soils and was inaugurated as an encouragement to farm producers to carry out a continuous cycle of better farming practices.

The need for financial assistance is becoming more apparent each day as we are made to realize that farm producers, even though they have titles to their soils, are only custodians through their lifetime. As custodians over a short period of years the selfish inheritance of man calls for a farming program, developed for the primary purposes of draining all of the strength from the soil so as to furnish the greatest amount of pleasures throughout their lifetime without regard for future generations. There is a great temptation to sacrifice our soils for both selfish and unselfish endeavors. A farm producer will sacrifice his soil to obtain an education for his children, not realizing that the sacrificed soil will be the determining factor in the economy in which his children must survive. Farm producers need financial assistance to lighten the burden they must carry through their guardianship in order to preserve our agriculture for future generations. This responsibility to our future generations must be borne by all civilization. We are equal in this responsibility as farmer, doctor, businessman, or laborer.

Financial assistance is needed by the farm producers to carry out the more expensive practices which they are unable to carry out alone. Lime, terracing, ditching, and pond building are some of the practices that would come under this classification. Farm producers share in the profit in only a small way from these practices, whereas all civilization shares in the benefits. When a farm producer uses lime and phosphate the city dwellers receive the benefits in products containing greater amounts of minerals.

A great percentage of our farm population is made up of tenant farmers. In general these tenant farmers constitute a danger to our soils in that their tenure is over a short period of years. The only interest of this migrating population is the products taken from the soil during their tenure. Financial assistance offered to this population to practice conservation measures is the only guard against this danger.

Our farm program is at the cross roads and the question facing our congressional leaders is, Shall we continue with our soil-conservation work that was started 11 years ago or shall we discontinue it or cripple it by a drastic reduction in funds and lose the gains we have made? It is the sincere desire of the farmers of this district that the program be continued in its entirety without any reduction in funds.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WTBF on April 19, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, I am breaking away from Washington next week to keep a date with old friends. An invitation has been tendered me by Mr. Marlin Casterlin, Townsend national representative, to attend a dinner next Friday evening in my honor at your home library in Johnson City, sponsored by the Broome County Townsend organization.

This occasion will afford me the chance to confer and talk with Triple Cities' friends who are dedicated to Americanism and to the survival of our great country. To those who write me for personal interviews I suggest you come to this dinner in your home library in Johnson City next Friday evening. I will be glad to see you and to converse with you after the program is over.

You will also be interested to learn that I have a message of special significance to the people of Broome County which I will deliver at this affair. It will contain a few questions and will call for some answers which ought to be cleared up by a handful of persons engaged in smearing your Congressman. This handful is dangerously near to subversive and undercover groups, and I want to know a few things about how close they really are to un-American activities.

All in all, my remarks at this dinner my Townsend friends are giving me next Friday will be direct and to the point and will be inspired by honesty and sincerity of purpose on the part of your Congressman in his crusade for straightforward and progressive government. Let us drive out the phonies and make America safe for our citizens.

Tonight, I want you folks to know that I am against the proposal of charging 2 cents postage for the present penny postcard. To me, this is an outrage. It heaps another burden on the shoulders of the great majority of people now groaning under the high cost of living. It is unfair to the public, which often depends on sending important messages for a penny.

To defend their position, some officials say that doubling the cost of the penny postcard is the only way the Government can carry the increases in pay for postal employees and costs for services. That is pure bunk. The Post Office Department has always been a paying proposition; in fact, it is one of the very few Federal Departments that are self-sustaining.

I don't believe you people want to pay 2 cents to send a postcard and I think it is unreasonable to ask you to pay that much. I expect to oppose attempts to make this ruling a law, although I suppose those who favor this increase are prepared to steamroller it through.

The American people are in distress over the rising of living costs which is continuing in spite of promises given us by those who can control them. As the head of a family of six, I deplore these terrific prices in spite of a good income. I am at a loss to understand how the average citizen can possibly feed himself and his dependents with prices as high as they now are.

I feel it is my duty to try to do something about the high cost of living. Therefore, this week, I am drawing the matter to the attention of the Congress, introducing a resolution which proposes an inflation-proof and depression-proof dollar.

My resolution which I expect to have ready for introduction next week reads as follows:

"*Be it resolved*, That it is the sentiment of Congress that as quickly as possible the United States be provided with an inflation-proof and depression-proof dollar, that shall be permanently stable in general purchasing power; so that the people will no longer be plagued by sudden depressions in the general level of prices as in 1929–32; nor by long-drawn-out periods of subnormal prices as in 1933–39; nor by sudden inflationary pressure on the general level of prices as now being experienced."

Thank you.

Community-Property-State Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include the following resolution adopted by the Minnesota Society of Certified Public Accountants urging the Congress to enact legislation equalizing the income-tax burden now existing between citizens of common-law and community-property States. Our able and distinguished colleague, Representative ALBERT L. REEVES, of Missouri, has introduced H. R. 1759 which seeks to abolish the discrimination and to equalize the tax burden. It is a commendable effort to correct an obvious injustice in our tax structure. Other bills have been introduced having the same objective. It is urged that the Congress take some action on this important subject in the present session. The resolution follows:

Whereas Federal income taxes should be levied without discrimination as between residents of different States; and

Whereas the community-property system adopted by nine of the States (Arizona, California, Idaho, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Washington) by dividing the income of husband and wife has resulted in lower Federal income taxes to married residents of those States than must be paid by married residents of the other 39 States earning identical income; and

Whereas such unequal tax burden is repugnant to the sense of fairness of the American people; and

Whereas the effect of such Federal income-tax discrimination is aggravated by the present high rates and is causing taxpayers and wealth to migrate from the 39 common-law States to the 9 community-property States; and

Whereas it is undesirable that the 39 States now using the common-law-property system should be compelled to consider changing to the community-property system, which system they would not otherwise favor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Minnesota Society of Certified Public Accountants duly assembled, That the foregoing inequitable situation be called to the attention of the Congress of the United States and that the Congress be urged to enact such remedial legislation as is necessary, to the end that the Federal income-tax burden of a taxpayer shall not be different if he is a resident of one of the 39 common-law-property States than it would be if he were a resident of one of the 9 community-property States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the House of Representatives and to each United States Senator and that it be given appropriate publicity.

Wood-Pulp Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Sun of March 21, 1947:

WOOD-PULP PAPER FIRST MADE IN UNITED STATES 80 YEARS AGO—SMITH CO., IN LEE, MASS., USED WOOD GROUND BY GERMAN MACHINES

(By Elizur Yale Smith)

In February of this year North American newsprint production reached a record high of 433,607 tons, and in 1945 the production of all grades of paper made from wood pulp amounted to more than 10,000,000 tons. Yet, it was only 80 years ago this week that the first sheet of paper made from ground wood in America was manufactured in my father's paper mills in Lee, Mass. Now wood-pulp paper production in North America is valued at approximately $600,000,000 annually.

Prior to 1867 paper manufacturers had experimented with wood as a basis for paper for decades, and in 1830 an Ohio newspaper, the Crawford Messenger, printed a single edition on a paper made from wood shavings. Similarly in 1863, the Boston Journal printed one edition on a wood-fiber paper. The reduction of wood for this paper was by a chemical process that did not prove successful, and it was not until March 18, 1867, that the first paper was successfully made from ground-wood pulp by the Smith Paper Co. in one of its five paper mills.

The story of the experiment has often been told to me by my father, the late Wellington Smith, and by the late Frederick Wurtzbach, the man who made the ground-wood pulp, at a small pulp mill—the first in America—in the hamlet of Curtisville in the town of Stockbridge among the Berkshire Hills of Massachusetts.

EXPERIMENTS BEGUN IN 1854

As far back as 1854 a Frenchman named Mellier interested my great-uncle, Elizur Smith, and his then partner in paper manufacturing, Cyrus West Field, in a machine of his invention to make paper out of wood. The result was a fair paper made out of basswood, but it was far from being the same quality as is now made from wood. When my father entered the company in 1865 newsprint paper was selling at 24 cents a pound, or $480 a ton, as against a price of $85 to $100 on most contracts today. The idea of making paper out of wood kept going over and over in my father's mind. He got Prof. Paul Ansel Chadbourne of Williams College to experiment in making ground-wood paper stock by filing and scraping wood under water, and although the process was patented it did not turn out to be practical.

Meanwhile in Germany a paper maker named Gottfried Keller and his friend Heinrich Voelter, a paper-mill mechanic, studied wasp nests that are made out of paper and pondered the idea for a few months; then, together, they decided to experiment and try to imitate the process of the wasp. They started to granulate wood with a large grindstone, and instead of the wasp's saliva they used water. This gave them a pulp similar to a rag pulp, but not so fibrous or tough, so they added a small proportion of rags and found they could make the material into a paper with good tensile strength, and one that would quickly absorb printing ink. Voelter invented a machine for grinding the wood into a pulp.

GERMAN MACHINES USED

In the summer of 1866, Theodore Steinway, then the head of the piano manufacturing industry in America, told two of his friends, Albrecht and Rudolph Pagenstecher, that paper was being made successfully from wood in Germany, and suggested the possibilities of profit being made of the venture here in America. Rudolph Pagenstecher made a trip to his homeland and investigated the matter. He was delegated by the others to purchase two of the machines invented by Voelter. These arrived in America in December 1866 in charge of an ingenious worker in wood and metal named Frederick Wurtzbach, whose inventions later on not only increased the quality but also the quantity of wood-pulp paper. To Wurtzbach the newsprint paper mills of America owe a great debt.

In the meantime the Pagenstechers had gone up to the Berkshires and had interested Wellington Smith, then the active head of the Smith Paper Co. in the idea. They financed and built a pulp mill in the nearby hamlet of Curtisville. At that time Lee was the largest paper-manufacturing center in the country; it had cheap and abundant water power and its nearby hills were covered with poplar and spruce. Today, only the five mills of the Smith Paper Co. remain there, making a different grade of high-class paper.

In the early days of March 1867, after much experimentation, the first ground wood that looked like a reasonable product came over the feed belt at the Curtisville mill. It was put into hogsheads and hauled to the Columbia mill of the Smith Paper Co. in Lee. The first run was made on March 18, and after some further experimentation Wellington Smith was able to sell the entire product of two of the paper mills to newspapers at a much reduced price from that paid for rag newsprint. The Smiths paid 8 cents a pound for the ground-wood pulp.

PULP PAPER IN DEMAND

There was a great demand from newspapers for the new paper; the Pagenstechers expanded and built pulp mills in other parts of the country, leased their grinding machine on a royalty basis, eventually became interested in large paper mills, while Wurtzbach built a machine shop where he made improvements on the grinding machines; the Smith Paper Co. built a pulp mill of their own, at Lee, and eventually secured the services of Wurtzbach to superintend the production of the wood-pulp industry.

I find that the first time the New York Sun used the new product was in its issue of May 20, 1874, and in 1880, when the supply of the new paper began to be plentiful, the Sun used it entirely and has done so ever since.

Federal Workmen's Compensation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, although I have been one of the loudest protesters against the size of the Federal pay roll, and am gratified that steps are being taken to reduce it substantially, I am no less firm in my conviction that we have a duty and responsibility to extend to those who continue as employees of the Government every protection which would be afforded them in industry or private employment.

Many years ago it was recognized by the progressive States of this Nation, including among the first my own State of New York, that an employee injured in the course of his employment should be compensated without regard to any requirement that he must establish any fault or negligence on the part of his employer. That principle is now well accepted and can no longer be said to be open to challenge. In 1916 Congress adopted a Federal workmen's compensation law.

A serious deficiency in this law in making adequate provision for injured employees was recently brought forcibly to my attention, in a case involving one of my constituents. This young man tried to enlist in the Navy during the war but was turned down because of a stomach condition. He then became director of a proving ground in a civilian capacity, and did outstanding service in the field of explosives in the development of the now famous proximity fuse.

In an explosion in late 1944 his hand was so badly injured that it had to be amputated. If he had been wearing a uniform at the time he would have become the beneficiary, and quite properly so, of many benefits from a grateful nation. I was quite amazed to find, on checking into it, that under the Federal workmen's compensation law no provision is made to compensate for their permanent disabilities civilian employees who receive injuries resulting in the loss of an arm, leg, hand, foot, eye, or loss of hearing.

Parenthetically, may I say that this constituent has, with rather unusual conscientiousness, declined my offer to introduce a private bill for his benefit.

Today I have initiated legislation to correct this situation which I consider a deficiency in our obligation as a nation to those who daily serve us faithfully as our employees. This bill provides a specified number of weeks' compensation in case of the loss or loss of use of an arm, leg, hand, foot, eye, finger or toe, or loss of hearing, to the extent of two-thirds of his monthly pay, subject to the present limitation of $66.67 a month, as follows:

Member lost:	*Number of weeks' compensation*
Arm	312
Leg	288
Hand	244
Foot	205
Eye	160
Thumb	75
First finger	46
Great toe	38
Second finger	30
Third finger	25
Toe other than great toe	16
Fourth finger lost	15
Loss of hearing, both ears	200
Loss of hearing, one ear	52

There are further provisions defining to what extent loss of parts of an arm, leg, or digit shall be compensated, how far loss of vision shall be equivalent to the loss of the eye itself, that loss of both hands, arms, feet, legs, eyes, or any two, shall constitute permanent total disability in the absence of conclusive proof to the contrary, and that any such compensation payable to an employee who dies after an award, shall be paid to his widow or children. It is also provided that an injured employee, instead of receiving the benefits under this bill, may make an election to receive compensation for loss of wage-earning capacity under the existing provisions of the law, if he should determine that he is better off to pursue that remedy.

The suggested compensation in this bill is proposed after considerable study of the question, but with no particular pride of authorship. It may be that amendments should be made to change many of the provisions of this rather comprehensive legislation. I am confident, however, that it is a problem to which we should direct our early attention in hearings to be conducted by the appropriate subcommittee. The essential outlines of such legislation warrant overwhelming support.

Western Polish Border

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article that appeared in the Polish Daily News of Chicago, Ill., relating to the Moscow Conference and the present western Polish boundaries:

THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE AND THE PRESENT WESTERN POLISH BOUNDARIES

(By Rev. Dr. Andrew J. Krzesinski)

In connection with the Moscow Conference, in the New York Times and other newspapers, the news was published, according to which, the present Polish western boundaries on the Oder and Neisse Rivers shall be subject to discussion and changes. This news is very astonishing because the new western boundaries were offered to Poland at Yalta and Potsdam Conferences as a compensation for the eastern territories annexed by Soviet Russia. But much more important is the fact that these new Polish western territories since the tenth century belonged to Poland and were inhabited by the Polish population. Later, the Germans took them by violence and slaughtered Polish inhabitants, as they did during the war that has just ended (cf. Andrew J. Krzesinski's Poland's Rights to Justice, pp. 19–20).

These lands are now returned to Poland according to historical justice. They are, however, 20 percent smaller than the eastern Polish territories annexed by Russia. They should, by no means, be regarded as a compensation for the wrongs and injuries inflicted upon Poland by the Germans during the last war.

It is also evident from the documents that before World War II in the eastern territories of Poland annexed by Soviet Russia (46 percent of the whole Polish soil) not only was the Polish population more numerous than any other national group, but that through the centuries until the First World War it was in an absolute majority. In other words, the Poles were more numerous than all other nationalities altogether. The number of Poles was diminished after the First World War because, at the beginning of this war, more than a million of the Polish population were sent by the Russians to Siberia. But, still, in spite of that, this Polish population constituted there a relative majority (Poland's Rights to Justice, pp. 62–74).

According to justice these eastern territories should be returned to Poland.

Furthermore, Poland should be recompensed for all the wrongs committed against her by Germany as well as by Soviet Russia.

England and the United States made great mistakes in their policy toward Poland. Now is the time to correct these mistakes and to restore the full independence and integrity of their faithful ally.

It is human to make mistakes; but it is divine to correct them and act according to justice.

Outlaw the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WIRT COURTNEY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a resolution passed by the L. O. Crane Post, No. 63, the American Legion, Lawrenceburg, Tenn., which is in my district.

This is a most unusual post of the American Legion. It is located in a town with less than 5,000 population but now has an active membership of 1,509 members, and apparently during the present year it will have a membership of 2,000. At the present time it is the largest country post of the American Legion in the world and this organization and its membership constitute a great influence for good in Lawrenceburg and in Lawrence County.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the L. O. Crane Post, No. 63, the American Legion, of Lawrenceburg, Tenn., the largest country post in the world with 1,509 members, strongly believes that communism is directly opposed to Americanism and the American way of life and is a threat to the foundation of our Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That all lawmakers be urged to sponsor and vote for legislation that will:

1. Outlaw the Communist Party;
2. Ban the use of the mails to Communist publications;
3. Provide universal fingerprinting and identification;
4. Continue the registration of all aliens and authorize a check of their activities;
5. Deport all aliens advocating the overthrow of the Government by force;
6. Deny admission to the United States of nationals from any country refusing to receive United States aliens ordered deported;
7. Discontinue Federal aid to institutions of learning which refuse to purge their faculties of Communists and fellow travelers.

Unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of April 8, 1947.

CHARLES S. MCLEAN,
Commander.

Attest:

HORACE W. BLAIR,
Adjutant.

Poland's Western Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution I have received from the Polish-American Congress that opposes the revision of Poland's western frontiers, as proposed by Secretary Marshall. If revised, it will be a definite gain for Germany, although she has brought so much misery upon the world and she does not, in my opinion, deserve such consideration.

The resolution follows:

THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS OPPOSES REVISION OF POLAND'S WESTERN FRONTIERS AS PROPOSED BY SECRETARY MARSHALL

At the recent conference in Moscow, Secretary of State George C. Marshall proposed that Poland's western frontiers be revised.

The motivating reason behind Secretary Marshall's statement was the declaration made at Potsdam, according to which, the territories granted to Poland would be temporarily administered by the Polish Government until the final ratification by the peace treaty.

A technical argument arises over the interpretation of the wording of the Potsdam agreement—is the final decision of the peace conference to be only a formal ratification of the Potsdam declarations—or the detailed revision of the text of the agreement itself?

However, the arguments put forth as the principles by which the American delegation is guided are more important. In brief, they carry the following meaning:

1. Poland should obtain certain German territories as compensation for the lands taken in the east by the Soviets.
2. Germany, prior to the war, bought one-fifth of her food abroad and obtained another one-fifth from the lands now occupied by Poland.
3. The moving of the population into Germany and the delivering of the lands they

occupied over to Poland can be the cause of the reestablishment of strong nationalism in Germany and of eventual conflicts with Poland.

4. Land in Silesia containing ores, and above all, coal mines and steel mills should be granted to Poland, but under condition that the production of these areas shall serve the economy of all Europe, including Poland.

5. In view of this, the American delegation proposes a revision of the western Polish frontiers for the benefit of Germany to be carried out by a special commission.

The Polish-American Congress considers the declaration made by the delegation of the United States as politically unfortunate in that it is detrimental to world peace, degrading to the position of the United States, unjust in principle and presupposition, impossible of realization, illogical and impractical.

The proposal of Secretary Marshall is unfortunate because it clearly shows that the United States is more interested in the future and fate of the enemy than it is in the future and welfare of a most loyal and most wronged ally.

The proposition is detrimental to world peace because it would strengthen Russian influence in Poland and consequently deprive other nations of hope of continued defense of their interests by the United States.

The mere assumption that the recovered lands are due Poland only as token compensation for lands grabbed by Russia is erroneous because it recognizes Russia's right to aggrandizement and grants the right to the delegation to fix reparations for a condoned robbery.

Arguments that Germany had obtained one-fifth of her food from lands restored to Poland and that the overcrowding of Germany's population will cause conflict have no foundation. When Germany held possession of these lands during both world wars we often heard that she needed "lebensraum." It makes no difference how much they have, the Germans will always seek "lebensraum" and always will be potential robbers.

To entertain unfounded fears of an aggressive German nationalism at the expense of Poland and delegates of other nations is plain capitulation and a declaration of helplessness, because this betrays a conviction that all the nations together are unable to guarantee future peace to countries bordering on Germany.

Poland's western boundaries are being drawn on the theory that they will create a better economy for the rest of Europe. While this sounds logical in theory, it loses its meaning because it is applied specifically to Poland and not other nations.

Secretary Marshall claims that in drawing up frontiers the guiding thought is the welfare of all nations of Europe. But, from his assertions, it is apparent that he is more concerned with the future of Germany and continues in his belief that the German nation must be strong. It is time to put an end to the conception that Germany must remain what she was. It is time for courage enough to say openly that Germany must be a third-rate nation and that the Germans, who have brought so much misery upon the world, do not deserve any consideration.

No one cares or should care that the German potential be preserved. This is not a question of vengeance but a historical necessity—a judgment of history—to be carried out by the whole civilized world so sorely tried through generations.

Our delegation must not forget, for even a single moment, what the Germans did in this war, the previous war, and in the wars before 1914.

Instead of worrying about a strong Germany, it would be by far more logical to make Poland the stronger nation so that she could become the dominant factor in insuring peace in Europe.

We are troubled and apprehensive because the new course of our foreign policy which we have started to apply to Russia does not also apply to Germany.

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.
APRIL 1947.

Military Aid to Turkey and Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that American foreign policy is at the crossroads, and that this body is being called upon to make momentous decisions affecting the future of our country in a troubled world. In making these decisions, Congress has an obligation to closely follow public opinion because all of our people are directly involved, and no policy can ever be effective without public support.

The people of northern Indiana have not blindly accepted President Truman's proposals for bypassing the United Nations by extending military aid to Greece and Turkey. They are deeply troubled by the implications of the Truman policy. Their concern is eloquently reflected in the writings of one of our leading newspapermen, Clifford B. Ward, editor of the Fort Wayne, Ind., News-Sentinel.

Mr. Ward is the author of a daily column, Good Evening, which has a wide following in the Middle West. It is a soberly written, well-thought-out feature, with unusual readership interest.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include at this point Mr. Ward's column of April 23:

GOOD EVENING
(By Clifford B. Ward)

Without its being brought sharply to the people's attention, this country's State Department has recently made a radical shift in its foreign policy views. The shift is front-page news with a bang and yet the press has been unable to write the story in so many words, for the simple reason that diplomatic language is difficult to understand and usually deals in attitudes which can't be accurately defined.

Only a few days ago, in a very off-hand manner the State Department let it be known that from the American viewpoint the UN is only a forum. Now mark that well. The UN is only a forum or a world debating society in which the views of all the member nations can find expression. If that is not a radical shift in the foreign policy of this Nation, there never was one.

When the war ended, this country was sold on the idea that there must be organization of the leading nations of the world to provide collective security for world peace. The people of this country were told that hereafter the well-intentioned and nonaggressor nations must stand ready at any time to apply force to restrain any ill-intentioned and any aggressive nation or groups of nations from threatening world discord and war. It was to be a solid, substantial world organization of nations with both the will and the power to step into a disturbed situation and quickly right it. It was to be a big-stick proposition.

ONLY A FORUM

Now note and note well that the people are being told that the UN is nothing more than a forum where grievances are aired and that no one should expect the UN to be the solid, substantial organization that it was supposed to be and that rather than being an instrument of collective security, it is only a sounding board.

Honest people, who have been taught to speak the truth and demand the truth, have been casualties of our wartime and our postwartime foreign policy. When the four big powers quickly assented to the demand of one of them that each should have the right to veto any action against an aggressive member of the big four, the tipoff should have been apparent to the world that not one of the big nations intended to be restrained from any evil course of action by a world organization. The setting up of the veto powers was itself a confusion to the intelligent people of the world that while the so-called internationalists were talking out of one side of their mouths and suggesting a surrender of sovereignty by little nations of the world, they wanted none of it for themselves. Even they knew that the medicine which they were so freely praising was lethal to all proper nationalism.

Right now, there are two great powers in the world. It is a situation which has not existed since early days of recorded history when one great power like Rome stood opposed by a second great power like Carthage. Today instead of it being Rome against Carthage, it is the United States against Russia. But it was this country which built up Russia. It was this country which by its mistakes during and after the war created the Frankenstein which now threatens us. And if you say it does not threaten us, you contradict our President and our State Department.

ISSUES AT STAKE

At stake in the Second World War were many issues, but the one that was most important to this country was the dollar diplomacy and the world imperialism of the British-American setup. We resolved against the other issues, but we only went to war when the dollar diplomacy and the world imperialism were threatened. We saved that diplomacy and that imperialism, but by attempting to give too moral a front to our participation in the world's troubles, we made fiction writers out of ourselves. We may have deceived ourselves but we did not deceive the Russians.

They showed no gratitude for the help we gave them, because realistically they saw that they owed us none. We were fighting not to save Russia, but only using Russia's help as an end to a means. Russia today is strong—not strong enough to defeat England and the United States unless she miraculously learns how to make atomic bombs quickly, but strong enough to know that she can bluff us from here to there over a very wide area without us suffering the pain of calling that bluff.

Eventually, I think, one of two things is bound to happen. Either Russia and the Anglo-American set-up is going to clash in the final Armageddon of civilization or Russia is going to cease being the Russia which she now is. The issue is a free state versus a police state fighting for world leadership. Capitalistic western democracy may have tried to delude itself into thinking that it can avoid the show-down battle, but communism has never tried to kid itself thus and is not trying to kid itself thus at this point.

So someone says, if nothing less than a miraculous change of political philosophy in Russia can prevent a final Armageddon between the modern Rome and Carthage, why do you oppose Truman's loan to Greece and

Turkey? I oppose it for reasons of simple honesty and truthfulness, as I opposed "all aid short of war" for Britain and for the reason that I opposed the use of the terms "lend-lease." If we are going to call the turn on Russia and start the shooting in Greece and Turkey, let's say so, step in and do the job, with everyone knowing what we are intending. If we don't want to call the turn on Russia at this time, then let's keep the hell out of Greece and Turkey except as a Red Cross or relief agency.

The real isolationists today are, as they have been all along, the professed internationalists who, while talking in moral world terms, were only masking an American-dollar and a British-pound nationalism.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Wednesday's New York Times, which announced the Senate's overwhelming vote for military and reconstruction aid to Greece and Turkey, also carried in its letter column a communication from Miss Sarah Wambaugh, of Cambridge, Mass. It contained more horse sense than we are accustomed to find, and the best answer I have yet read to the charges that we are bypassing the United Nations.

Miss Wambaugh has been a lifelong student of international affairs. Few Americans know European politics more intimately, and it is doubtful whether anyone is more expert in plebiscites and elections under difficult conditions. She participated as an expert in most of the plebiscites held after World War I. She was logically chosen as adviser to the chief of the United States mission to observe the Greek elections.

Miss Wambaugh points out that our proposed action is in no sense a violation of the UN Charter. The Charter exists to protect nations from aggression. "Every member of the United Nations is under obligation never to act contrary to the Charter, but there is no requirement in the Charter to act always through the United Nations."

Miss Wambaugh confirms that Greece and Turkey are menaced in their territorial integrity. "The distance across Greece from the Yugoslav and Albanian frontiers to the Aegean * * * is only 75 to 100 miles. In many parts of this line the guerrillas are entrenched and, thanks to the neighbors, are * * * proceeding with their project of cutting off Greek Macedonia. * * * Success would mean that Yugoslavia and Bulgaria would * * * divide the area * * *. Russia would then be at the Turkish frontier."

It is under these conditions that Greece and Turkey have asked us for aid, as they have every right under the UN Charter to do.

Greece needs to reorganize her army and disarm all other forces. And if we are bypassing UN in this action, why did not the opponents of unilateral action—including Mr. Wallace—raise voices of protest when the Soviet Union did the same thing?

Miss Wambaugh recalls that during the last 2 years the Soviet Government, without consulting the UN, signed three treaties—with Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia—involving military aid, assistance with financial loans, arms, and military and civilian army instructors. These armies are, indeed, Soviet creations—in form (political commissars) and in equipment.

One of these armies, the Polish, defends frontiers that were unilaterally created. Another, the Yugoslav, serves a government which has successfully claimed Italian territory, never Yugoslav. It also is aiding Greek guerrillas, and demanding a large province from Austria.

It is certainly dolorous that 2 years after a war to end war new armies are being created everywhere and that we have a hamstrung UN.

But one really loses patience with those persons who prefer to trust the good intentions of any other country than their own; who cry "war" and "imperialism" when the United States acts to protect the threatened, and neither report nor denounce certain actions of foreign powers.

Miss Wambaugh also speaks an expert word on the Greek elections. The country swung to the right. So will every country which is threatened by or has suffered from a left-wing rebellion and massacre. The left abstained from voting and claims to represent the people, but Miss Wambaugh, who was there, states that careful investigation showed it could have marshaled to the polls not more than 15 percent of the electorate.

It is a habit now to denounce as "undemocratic" all conservative regimes, however representative of a majority. Actually, free countries swing from left to right and vice versa in response to conditions with a tendency to avoid extreme sways. Communism, however, is always a creator of right-wing swings, which is one trouble with it.

The Late Evalyn Walsh McLean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald and an editorial from today's Washington Star:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

MRS. EVALYN WALSH MCLEAN IS DEAD HERE—DEATH CAUSED BY PNEUMONIA AT AGE OF 60—ONE OF WASHINGTON'S MOST BELOVED WOMEN

Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean, one of Washington's most beloved women and a world-known personality, died at 6:15 p. m. yesterday in Friendship, her home at Wisconsin avenue and R street NW., at the age of 60.

Dr. Bernard J. Walsh pronounced her dead of pneumonia which had developed only 48 hours previously. Her last 24 hours of life were spent in an oxygen tent.

GIVEN LAST RITES

The last rites of the Catholic church were administered by the Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., a personal friend of many years standing.

The Georgetown University vice president also led the recitation of bedside prayers said by the small group of persons present as the end approached.

Those present when Mrs. McLean died were Dr. Walsh and Father Walsh, Mrs. Eleanor M. Patterson, Supreme Court Justice Frank Murphy and his secretary, Miss Eleanor Baumgardner; former Federal Circuit Judge and Mrs. Thurman Arnold, Frank C. Waldrop, former Senator Reynolds, Nannie Chase, personal secretary to Mrs. McLean, and members of the Friendship household.

SONS FLYING HERE

Flying from Dallas, Tex., last night was her son, John, while her other son, Edward, was en route to Friendship from Beverly Hills, Calif. Both took off for Washington upon receipt of word that their mother's condition had taken a critical turn.

Mrs. McLean had been in poor health since her knee was broken in a fall last year. She had returned from a recuperative visit to Sarasota, Fla., only 10 days ago. She had been back at Friendship only a few days when she became ill. Dr. Walsh said his patient's general condition had worsened 48 hours before she died, but that she had seemed to rally under the oxygen treatment he started later Friday night. Yesterday morning, however, her condition became critical.

In addition to her two sons, a first cousin in Colorado Springs, Colo., and six grandchildren survive Mrs. McLean.

BORN IN COLORADO

Mrs. McLean's death followed by seven months that of her daughter, the wife of former Senator Reynolds of North Carolina, and with her passing ended one of the most colorful careers in Washington history.

Mrs. McLean was the daughter of Thomas F. Walsh, an Irish immigrant, and Carrie Bell Reed Walsh. She was born in Deadwood, Colo., August 1, 1886, a mining community where her parents had been married.

For the first 10 years of her life she lived in mining communities. In 1896, her father became part owner of the famous Camp Bird claim, near Ouray, Colo., one of the world's richest gold mines.

That year, the family moved to Denver, and in 1897 came to Washington and lived in the old Cochran house. The heiress was sent to Miss Somers' School and Mt. Vernon Seminary here, and her brother, Vinson, attended the Friends Select School for boys.

MET M'LEAN WHEN 11

When she was 11, she enrolled in a children's dancing class here and met Edward Beale McLean, whom she later was to marry.

The childhood romance was interrupted the following summer, when the Walshes returned to Colorado, but was resumed when they returned in the fall and took a house at Leroy and Phelps Places NW.

After President McKinley appointed Mr. Walsh commissioner to the Paris exposition in 1899, the family toured England, France, Switzerland, Austria, and Bavaria, and spent several days at the farmhouse in Clonmel, Ireland, where Mr. Walsh had been born.

Mr. Walsh's charity was extended to all the poor of Clonmel and the surrounding area, and the happiness at relieving misery, perhaps more than anything else, always made that part of the European visit most enjoyable to his daughter.

MONUMENT TO FATHER

In later years, the people of Clonmel erected a monument to the man who had helped them so much.

It was during the European tour that the Walshes and the royal family of Belgium developed such a strong friendship.

In Paris, Mr. Walsh entertained King Leopold several times at dinner, and the mine owner's daughter was one of the monarch's favorites.

Upon their return to Washington, the family made plans for the construction of a home at 2020 Massachusetts Avenue NW. When completed, the mansion contained a special suite for the use of King Leopold, who never was able to accept the invitation to visit the Walshes here. The structure was said

to have cost more than $1,000,000. On later trips to Europe, however, the friendship with the Belgian royal family flourished as before.

ROMANCE MATURES

During subsequent years the Walshes lived alternately in Washington and Denver, and Evalyn's romance with young Ned McLean matured.

Balls, banquets, dances, and other social events at the residence on Massachusetts Avenue had become almost legendary in 1905, and it was here that the young hostess developed much of the grace and poise that were to make her one of the Nation's foremost hostesses.

But the year was marked by tragedy. Evalyn's brother, Vinson, was killed and she suffered a leg injury she was to carry to her grave when the auto in which the two were riding blew a tire and plunged into a creek.

The finest surgeons in the world were called in for consultation before her leg was saved—through the use of a 15-inch silver plate to replace crushed bones in her thigh.

During the months following the accident, when Evalyn was confined to bed, Ned McLean was a daily visitor.

As a result of the tragic accident, the Walshes moved back to Denver, but Evalyn made frequent visits to Washington, and on each trip saw Ned. It was while young McLean was covering the Democratic Convention in Denver, in 1908, for his father's newspaper, the Washington Post, that the engagement of the couple was announced formally at the Walsh home there.

Although no date was set for the wedding, the couple took matters into their own hands and married in St. Mark's Episcopal Church, near Denver, July 22, 1908, with only a few close friends in attendance. A few months later they were married according to the rite of the Catholic church by the Rev. Father Dennis J. Stafford at St. Patrick's Church here.

Mr. Walsh and young McLean's father, John R. McLean, each gave the couple $100,000 as a wedding present, and the newlyweds left on a honeymoon tour of the world.

It was during the world tour that Mrs. McLean bought the Star of the East diamond, said by collectors to be of greater value and beauty than the Hope diamond, which so long was associated with her name.

The McLeans returned to Washington in 1909, and on December 18 their first child, Vinson Walsh McLean, was born. The boy was known as "the hundred-million-dollar baby" and slept in a gold crib given the young couple by King Leopold.

Joy over the birth of her first son was blotted out a few weeks later, however, when Mrs. McLean's father passed away. The grief-stricken bride and her husband shortly afterward left for Europe.

It was during this trip that she bought the Hope diamond from M. Cartier, in Paris, scoffing at the superstition that the gem brought tragedy to all who owned it. In later years she was to turn down offers of as much as $2,000,000 for the bluish stone.

CENTER OF SOCIAL LIFE

The couple returned to Washington and for the next several years were the center of the Capital's social life. In January 1916 a second son, John R. McLean, 2d, was born in the mansion on Massachusetts Avenue.

The following June, McLean's father died and the youth took over the management of the Post. Mrs. McLean took great interest in the paper and often directed it policies.

Following the death of Ned's mother, he and Evalyn and their two sons moved into the McLean town house in the 1500 block I Street NW., and the family estate, Friendship, on Wisconsin Avenue. The Lafayette Building now occupies the site of the former structure and McLean Gardens was built on the grounds of Friendship.

A third son, Edward Beale McLean, Jr., was born to the couple June 28, 1918.

Again a birth in the family was to be offset by tragedy. While the McLeans were in Louisville, Ky., a few months later they received word that their oldest son, Vinson, had been struck by an automobile and died within a few hours.

The couple's fourth child, and only daughter, Emily Beale McLean, was born November 16, 1921. She later changed her name to Evalyn Washington McLean.

Subsequently, Mrs. McLean entertained royally in her town house and at Friendship, and became socially famous throughout the world.

So important was the couple socially that they never went out but only received. Royalty, Presidents, diplomats, Cabinet members, Senators, and Congressmen were regular guests at the Sunday luncheons at Friendship.

Among the most frequent visitors at Friendship were President Harding and members of his Cabinet. They played golf on the private course and it was there that Calvin Coolidge, then Vice President, played one of the few games he ever played.

DOMESTIC TROUBLES ARISE

In the late twenties the McLean-Walsh fortune began to dwindle. It was during this period that Mrs. McLean parted with the Hope diamond for the first and only time. She used the stone as collateral on a loan needed to save the Post for her three children. She lost the newspaper, but regained possession of the diamond.

Much of the couple's fortune was restored after the loss of the Post, but they soon were afflicted by matrimonial troubles. McLean's attempts to obtain a divorce in Mexico and Europe were unsuccessful, and he later was committed to a sanitarium near Baltimore. He died there in the late thirties.

Always known for her generosity, Mrs. McLean became interested in the Lindbergh kidnaping and offered $100,000 to Gaston B. Means for information which might lead to the recovery of the child. Means was unable to return the child or the money and was convicted of obtaining money under false pretenses. He died in prison.

Friendship was sold to make way for a war-housing project a few years later, and Mrs. McLean moved to the residence in which she was to die She renamed the cream-painted brick structure after the old estate of her husband's family.

During World War II the Georgetown house was the scene of servicemen's dances and USO gatherings as well as outstanding social affairs. The spacious ballroom of the old house on Massachusetts Avenue was used by the Red Cross for classes in making surgical dressings. In the stables behind the home her father built Mrs. McLean opened a club for Government personnel employed in war work here.

NOTED FOR GENEROSITY

She frequently canceled social engagements to take gifts to amputees in service hospitals in this area and entertained them whenever possible at Friendship. Occasionally she "took in" service families who had no place to live because of the housing shortage.

Mrs. McLean's generosity manifested itself in little things—such as putting an ice water dispenser out in front of her new Friendship estate at a bus stop—and of big things, such as providing the 1932 bonus marchers with food and the shelter of a circus tent.

Among her varied talents, she included authorship of Father Struck It Rich, a sparkling account of her father and their early Washington days.

THE FINAL TRAGEDY

Last year, while walking a pet dog in the rain she slipped and fell, breaking the kneecap of the leg injured in the accident which had taken her brother's life in 1905. For weeks she lingered near death because of the injury.

Then, on September 20, 1946, the last great tragedy entered her life.

On that date, Mrs. McLean's daughter, Evalyn, 24, was found dead in bed at Friendship. An overdose of sleeping pills, which she had been taking for a nervous disorder, was blamed for the death. The girl had been married just 5 years earlier to Senator Reynolds.

Grief over the passing of her daughter was believed to have been one of contributing factors to Mrs. McLean's death yesterday.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

EVALYN WALSH MCLEAN

The fact that she was a woman of fabulous wealth probably would have been enough to insure Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean being famous in her own generation. Both by inheritance and by marriage, she was so rich in the world's goods that she would have been celebrated even if she had had no other claim on public attention.

But she also was a person of natural distinction and charm. Mrs. McLean possessed beauty that no camera ever caught, a keenly intelligent mind, a generous heart, a tireless willingness to spend her talents and her energies in the interest of people. Above everything else, she was patently sincere. When she endeavored to help the Lindberghs to recover their baby, or fed the bonus marchers, or kept open house for GI Joes and Janes, her motives were completely philanthropic. Nothing compelled her to devote herself to the welfare of strangers. She voluntarily chose to be the "lady bountiful" she most notably was.

The explanation is obvious. Mrs. McLean loved humanity. There were no classes in the old Friendship or the new. Believing devoutly in good manners as an aspect of democratic civilization, she was an aristocrat in the classic sense to which Shakespeare referred when he made Hamlet say to Polonius concerning the players: "Use them after your own honor and dignity."

The Spend-and-Tax Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, at the recent meeting of the Republican National Committee in Kansas City, Mo., Hon. Frank Carlson, Governor of Kansas, and for many years a distinguished Member of Congress, was one of the principal speakers. Those of us who heard him were of one accord in acclaiming his address as one of the outstanding events of the meeting. Because of the righteous condemnation of the New Deal philosophy of government, the high idealism, and the pro-Americanism embodied in it, it merits the widest dissemination and publicity. As a contribution to that end, Mr. Speaker, I therefore have availed myself of the permission granted me, under the unanimous-consent rule, to quote Governor Carlson's address in full in the RECORD at this point:

I want to thank our good friend, Barak Mattingly, who, for a Missourian, has set

something of a record in setting up two Governors of Kansas for a meeting. I have a suspicion that in using two governors its a Missouri trick to make Kansas look like Georgia. You committeemen really ought to appreciate Barak and that fine 1946 election record that Missouri turned in. As Barak says, it's true that here in Kansas City I can say nice things about Missouri and I'm glad of the opportunity. After all, they are human beings, and I don't know what our Kansas universities would do without the fine football exercise we are able to get—sometimes—from these Missourians.

Oh, we are a couple of jealous sisters, all right, but you'll find no two States of the Union with stronger bonds of comradeship. We were both carved out of the Louisiana Purchase, and together we have built this fine city. The nice part is on the other side of the Kaw.

And we are both glad to have the Republican National Committee to come here, so close to the heart of the Nation. We believe that here you will be able to feel the throbbing pulse of our country, which most surely is beating out a new rhythm of mankind's eagerness to strive together, to turn under with our plows and other productive efforts the hates that made us strive against each other.

Perhaps this explains, if any explanation be necessary, why, as a personal choice, I chose to leave Washington and the Congress, to seek the office of Governor. I wanted to get back among my own people. And, of course, it was a promotion. In Washington I was one of the directors of a big corporation that was $250,000,000,000 in the red—practically insolvent. In Kansas, I'm the general manager for a corporation that is not only solvent, but has several million in reserves, thanks to the foresight of Republican governors.

Recently it has been interesting to note how some of our States have stepped forward to assert a new independence. New Jersey and Indiana Legislatures both have resolved that they want "government to come home." Belatedly we have realized that in its true meaning, there is no such thing as Federal aid. Federal aid is simply the money we send to Washington returned to us with the fees and expenses of bureaucrats deducted.

There is no magic of Federal aid to prevent us from paying for it more dearly than if we supplied and administered it ourselves. The States are now realizing that Federal aid from beneficent "uncle" carries with it the loss of local autonomy.

This is part of the realism that we have gotten out of the terrible lesson of war. The 15-year flirtation with socialism is over—a weird experiment that would shame our heritage.

Inside our Nation, this Democrat policy has caused great masses of people to look to government and politics for their welfare.

Outside our country, this Democrat policy has made whole nations dependent upon the credit of the United States.

It is a policy of trying to bully our way through domestic and international troubles with dollars. We have little Caesars striding up and down the globe clanking their swords and trying to jam down the throats of strange people the idea that we are a peaceful Nation. Other little Caesars walk the highways of our Nation trying to tell us what to wear, eat, plant, sow, and reap—yes, and they've been trying to tell the Republican Congress how to act and how much to spend.

It was such a time, 2,000 years ago, when Rome's vaunted legions were setting up their despicable Herods over the civilized world. Let us shake this idle dream of conquest by lustful men from our eyes before another Pontius Pilate nails civilization to another Roman cross. Let us resume setting before the world—not the dollar mark—but our ideals of government by law and not by opportunists.

Our United States Treasury is not the world's honeypot, although the political entrepreneurs of other nations and of our own city machines may think so.

The test of our time will be whether we have the hardness of character and inflexibility of purpose to deny to ourselves the easy course of "spend and spend" against our grandchildren's bank accounts; to deny ourselves the monetary gains of subsidies and hand-outs before national ruin engulfs us all.

Lenin, godfather of communism, predicted that the United States would spend itself to destruction. The Democrat policy of spending American dollars to meet the threat of the Communist words appears to me a losing battle, since words are so easily coined.

The cause for which we fight in reality is the dignity of man. Whether the man be a penniless American or starving Greek, his true rehabilitation lies in the preservation of a soul and mind fixed on God-given freedom of thought and action, plus a firm reliance and belief in his own destiny.

So what will it matter if we gain a world with dollars and lose our ideals of freedom and justice. We want no puppet states. We will feed the hungry within our powers, but the individual man and the individual nation must work out their own destinies.

Within our Nation there is a similar maladjustment. For instance in Kansas and Missouri we have broad acres to be farmed and mined. There is here power for countless factories; thousands of tons of raw materials to be processed. Here is a great frontier where millions more people may live amid plenty. But, suppose in our congested cities there arises idleness and economic failure of the local economy.

We know the stock Democrat answer would be to "tax and tax and spend and spend" from Federal aid for the support of the destitute. This western frontier under that policy would always remain untouched; indeed it would be taxed to keep needed populations away from it.

Thus, nationally and internationally, the Democrat policy has only "frozen" our problems. The problems have multiplied because not one of them was solved. The mischievous politicians, both native and foreign, have adapted the misfortunes that resulted to their own purposes.

Thus we have the sordid record of the WPA—not as a humanitarian welfare agency—but as a shameless vote machine.

Thus we have the allegedly great Social Security Act, with its benefits being destroyed by debt and inflation; with its future in question because of fiscal mismanagement.

Thus we have in 5 years the financial picture of a Federal Government taking one-fourth of the Nation's income for itself. All the money paid for school teachers, policemen, firemen, State, county, city, and local employees—in fact all local taxes are less than one-tenth of the money we pay for Federal taxes. In 1940, Federal taxes were only 38 percent of the Nation's tax dollar, and the rest went for local and State government. Today Federal taxes are 82 percent of all taxes collected.

This is why throughout the Nation we are hard put to pay our school teachers and police properly. Our Republican cause is the cause of all citizens against bureaucracy and the elimination of that deadly peril of taking so much of our productive effort to dump in the economic wasteland of government. Taxes are a dead weight on our people, for a government cannot earn nor produce new wealth.

Jefferson no doubt was thinking of this evil when he said: "If we were told in Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread."

Now I suppose that along with the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule, it will be considered reactionary to quote any authority before Frankfurter, Wallace, or Hannegan, but I will just have to risk it.

For that matter, they are the more reactionary because old King Rehoboam had a palace guard just like the New Deal and right there in the record of the Good Book is the record of the same kind of moth-eaten advice. And I must tell you that Rehoboam was a wash-out—just like the New Deal.

If our campaign wants a text, I should like to proffer this one to illustrate how ancient, how reactionary is this New Deal policy of tax and spend.

Just for fun read the twelfth chapter of First Kings in your Gideon Bible tonight or you can read about the same story in the tenth chapter of Second Chronicles. I think it is in there twice for emphasis, but both seemed to have escaped our current soothsayers.

But here is the story of how treasury pilferers and tax-spenders split an empire, brought down the glory of Solomon and David, deserted their God, morals, and laws—and the destruction of a nation which was never rebuilt.

Compare this with President Truman's utterance at the Jefferson dinner the other night, where he agrees with his advisers that the only course ahead is the spend-and-tax delusion which means less and less pay for every worker in the Nation.

What hopeless, visionless future is portended by our leaders by the policy of endless debt and mismanagement of our productive powers. The Nation, the world, wants only an opportunity to right itself—not Uncle Sam as a wet nurse.

In other years, when our fathers found their economic ceilings were limited and opportunities had dried up, they yoked oxen to prairie schooners; crossed the prairies; fought the Indians and the elements and conquered the soil. In proving their own destinies, they retained their own freedom.

Against this is the crassness and the cheapness of trying to buy men's votes at home and to purchase democracies throughout the world. The very idea of trying to make political capital out of misfortune is as un-American as it is inhuman.

But observe how lightly are the terms of freedom mouthed by the superworld patriots. They talk of "economic justice" when they mean the enslaving dole. They arrogantly adorn themselves in the cloak of liberalism, when their product is the rankest type of defeatism. They cultivate the cancers of our economy by never-ending subsidies. Now they are trying to buy the world, because the gates of the Treasury have turned loose a golden flood.

But we midwesterners see an infinite hope for the future. Our sons are back from the wars, tired in body and of bloodshed, but refreshed in their love of the greatest Nation under the sun. We are relearning from them the magnitude of our great blessings. To them we turn for our vision of the future. If they can harness the desperate sciences of war they will bring a wonderful peace.

It is wonderful to see our party recognize the veteran's place in the body politic. Half of our Republicans in Congress have worn their Nation's uniform. It is a matter of record that we are the veterans' party.

And in another year we shall have a Republican President. The Members of the Republican Congress and we Republican governors have the burden of setting before the Nation an example of unity in thought and action in order that we may more easily win the battle ahead and also ease the task of regeneration that is to come.

Time is working on our side. The seeds of the godless socialism—communism—will rot in free soil, and sooner or later, death will take all dictators by the hand. We do not fear for the deathless philosophy of our own

Government of law and justice, so long as the Nation desires to remain true to its established principles.

In this momentous period, the Republican National Committee, together with the Republican National Convention of 1948, faces its most awe-inspiring task of history.

The people of Kansas and Missouri eagerly look to our party as the only hope for a nation and a world torn by deceits, hate, hunger, and class chaos. And you, for the time being at least, individually in your States and collectively in the Nation are the official representatives of the Republican Party. I pray for your wisdom because I believe it is a prayerful need. This Nation, this world, cannot long endure the mischief that has been loosed. The Republican Party, strong in principle and made stronger by adversity, must return the Government to its people. The national committee in its plans, its organization and in its actions can ill afford to anticipate nothing less than victory.

The Governor of Kansas will be at your service. I hope you will have time to set foot on Kansas soil—or to call at the Governor's home in Topeka.

The Moscow Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the end of the Moscow Conference is a time for most sober and careful evaluation of our whole position in today's world. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following two realistic, sensible, and sound editorials:

[From the Washington Post of April 26, 1947]

AFTER MOSCOW

Devoid though it was of constructive achievement, the Moscow Conference appears to have brought forth some useful consequences. One of these is the clear demonstration to all the world of Secretary Marshall's firmness as well as his patience. Throughout the Russians' war of nerves he held tenaciously to the principles that he had carried with him to Moscow 7 weeks ago. In his parting words he spoke of "our impatience" to get ahead with the business of peacemaking. But no impatience was manifested in his conduct. On the contrary, he let the fruitless talkfest run on 2 weeks beyond the point at which we thought he would have been justified in coming home. Nor did he permit his so-called impatience to detract one iota from the principles of freedom, democracy, and good faith on which the new peace must be established.

One other result from the conference that ought to prove an asset in the long run has been the final dissipation of the fog in which the Big Three have enveloped most of their agreements of the past. Yalta and Potsdam brought a semblance of harmony because differences were concealed by such words as "democracy"—meaning liberty and free elections to us and an open door for communism only, to the Russians. At Moscow confused verbiage was discarded. At least the conflicting policies of the east and the west have been clarified before the world. The result, of course, is unmistakable exposure of the Soviet program for the domination of Europe—a sorry sequel to the San Francisco Conference of 2 years ago which set up the United Nations.

The emergence of this Soviet policy in naked form was the motivating force behind what may well be the most significant consequence of the Moscow gathering of the Foreign Ministers. Great Britain, France, and the United States have undoubtedly been drawn closer together by Mr. Molotov's rededication of Russia to totalitarian aims and techinques. Indeed, all statesmen who are not under the domination of the Kremlin must now see that the peacemaking will have to go forward without Russian participation. Russia's price for prompt peacemaking is the communization of Europe, which would be a disaster to the rest of the world. The other nations which united their forces to destroy Nazi and Japanese aggression will not pay that price, and yet they must have a peace that will permit reconstruction to go forward. The only course open to them is further agreement among themselves for the rehabilitation of Europe, so far as that is possible, in the hope that lessening tensions may later convince the Russians that they should join in this undertaking in pursuit of their own interests.

It is not merely the failure of the Moscow Conference which points to this conclusion. Moscow is only an incident in a long series of events pointing in the same direction. The Soviet Union has flatly rejected any sort of plan that would make international control of atomic power feasible. Her agents are carrying out aggressive tactics designed to subvert such countries as Greece and to intimidate Turkey. Our patient efforts to reach an understanding with the Russians to let democracy and communism exist peacefully side by side, in accordance with the preference of free peoples, have failed. Democracy can now defend itself only by taking a positive stand against further totalitarian encroachments, while strengthening its own lines by extensive reconstruction measures.

Some of our more excitable citizens insist that the outcome can only be war. We think they are mistaken, and, fortunately, even the final collapse of the Moscow Conference helps to dispel their fatalistic conclusion. The Council of Foreign Ministers could agree on virtually nothing, but it ended with a sumptuous state banquet at which Premier Stalin offered a toast to President Truman. Further meetings of the council are to be held, perhaps in September and November. The point is that complete disagreement has not festered into hostility. We have no idea that Russia wants war any more than the United States does. War is likely to become a real danger only if irresponsible people on both sides begin to shout for it.

In deploring such reckless talk in the Senate the other day, Senator VANDENBERG described our policy as one of "friendly firmness." Complete failure of the Moscow Conference gives no reason to change that description. The United States can join in a reconstruction scheme for western Europe, we can save the independence of Greece and Turkey, and work through the United Nations for the protection of freedom and peace without assuming a hostile attitude toward any people. Secretary Marshall has already pointed the way. If the Russians decline to work with us, we must do the best we can to bring peace and stability back to this battered old world without them. But the objective must remain the same, and the door to Russian cooperation must be kept hopefully open.

[From the New York Times of April 28, 1947]

THE EAST AND THE WEST

When Secretary of State Marshall broadcasts his report on the Moscow Conference tonight, the world will be able to obtain an even clearer picture than already provided by the events of just what the differences between Russia and the west really are, and what the United States proposes to do about them. No doubt the whole world endorses Mr. Marshall's sentiments, expressed in ruined Berlin, that these differences must be reconciled, for that is the one certain way of averting even greater ruin on a world-wide scale. And it is gratifying that the peace-seeking attitude of the west is being echoed by at least a part of the Russian press, through which the Soviet Government is beginning to talk of the possibility of compromises which it failed to offer at Moscow.

It has been one of the characteristics of Soviet diplomacy that whenever it had pushed its viewpoint to the utmost limit and had produced a deadlock it came up with conciliatory statements and even concessions "in principle" that were sometimes uttered by Premier Stalin himself. And as lubricants of the diplomatic machinery, helping to keep it from breaking down, they were not without value. But the experience of the past five years should have convinced by now all but the incurably gullible that such statements and "concessions" were too often flanking maneuvers to shake the opponents' will and to enable Russia to gain the same old objectives by another route. In any case, none of the Russian pledges during and after the war have been kept, and we can put our trust in new promises only if they are accompanied by an easing of Russian pressure or other actions to convince the world that they will be carried out.

For the present, such actions are conspicuous by their absence. On the contrary, immediately after the Conference was over, the Soviet Government again rang down the Iron Curtain and is now proceeding to tighten its grip on eastern Europe. A new wave of terror appears to be sweeping through Rumania, where the remaining opposition is being crushed by mass arrests and where former Fascist Iron Guardists are being organized into the Communist-dominated Government's "security corps." The new threats against his opposition uttered by Marshal Tito, together with the increase in his personal bodyguard, indicate like developments in Yugoslavia. And there is, unfortunately, little hope that the rest of eastern Europe will fare better.

However, the hearty endorsement which President Truman gave to Mr. Marshall's firm stand at Moscow in the interest of the United States and of world peace confirms that the United States will no longer encourage such Russian methods by appeasement. Indeed, the atmosphere at the White House conference between President Truman, Secretary Marshall, and the key leaders of Congress last night suggested further measures to meet Russo-Communist expansion. It is to be hoped that the results of this conference will enable the leaders of the House to end what begins to look like deliberate delay in the passage of the Greek-Turkish aid bill, already passed by the Senate. But that other measures will follow is shown by action in two other fields. The first is the decision to proceed with the industrial rehabilitation of western Germany, which France is expected to accept, in the effort to make western Germany self-sustaining, bring some relief to American and British taxpayers, and vindicate both our war aims and our way of life in the eyes of the Russian zone in Germany and all Russian-dominated Europe. The second is the transfer of small American naval surplus vessels to China—an action which was facilitated by the end of one-party tutelage and the introduction of what one can only hope will become an increasingly liberal coalition regime, but which also marks the beginning on our part of a more realistic policy in China than the attempt to force Communists into the National Government.

In short, there is no blinking the fact that Russia on the one side and the west, led by the United States, on the other are now engaged in a diplomatic contest in which they

not only maneuver for positional advantages but also struggle for the soul of nations. Russia is doing so in order to impose on them her own system, which she has been able to do thus far only by ruthless force; the west, in order to preserve and widen the frontiers of freedom. On the outcome of that contest will depend the relative moral and strategic position of each side when they meet for the next test in a new conference. On it will also depend the kind of peace we will get, and our own safety.

Veterans Entitled to Increased Aid To Continue Training and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, our veterans have returned to civilian life and are now trying to bridge the years which were sacrificed willingly during the war when these young men gave up their personal plans and ambitions and fought for the protection of this Nation. Many have turned to on-the-job training where they are learning a trade to take their place in industry and business. Others have returned to college where they are preparing for a professional career.

Today veterans in both categories are facing barriers that have sprung up from the increased cost of living, the low ceiling on their allowance in addition to subsistence, and, where the student-veteran is concerned, the scarcity of part-time jobs when he seeks to supplement his subsistence allowance to cover the bare cost of living necessities.

Our veterans are confused to find their hopes of completing their education and training dissolving before their eyes. Students attending universities have had estimated food cost increases of over 30 percent, clothes cost increases of about 18 percent, and an increase in housing cost that cannot be determined because the veteran has had to pay whatever was necessary to get accommodations.

The married veteran with small children cannot support his family on the present subsistence allowance of $90 a month. He cannot hold his family together and maintain his scholastic average while working at a part-time job, and his wife must remain at home to care for the children.

The married veteran without children can get by if his wife works to augment the meager family income. The single veteran finds $65 inadequate to cover his living expenses, and must draw upon his savings, get help from home, or seek part-time employment to provide additional funds.

When the GI bill of rights was originally considered by Congress, it was expected that the veteran would find part-time work which would provide him with adequate funds to meet additional expenses over and above the tuition and the $65 subsistence allowance from the Government while he was in school. But in many parts of this country, part-time jobs are just not available. Student-veterans have applied for jobs at school, have tramped from employment agency to employment agency, but have been unable to get any regular part-time work.

Nearly every college in the United States is overcrowded, and the communities cannot offer part-time employment to all the student-veterans who need it. Even where jobs are available, with the increased number of students in every university, instruction periods generally cannot be arranged consecutively and few students have regular free periods of sufficient length to permit part-time employment.

During recent hearings before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Robert McLaughlin of the American Veterans of World War II brought many of these conditions to the attention of the committee. He said in part:

Amvets hold no brief for the indolent veteran who makes no effort to help himself. But we know from interviewing GI students that the college communities cannot provide adequate part-time employment to supplement the income of a substantial number of these boys. The picture has changed since the college days of the average Member of Congress when nearly any student with enough ambition could earn a modest income by part-time work.

Mr. McLaughlin continued:

It is our deep concern that veterans who have resolved to improve their education, and who have planned their rehabilitation in our college halls, may be forced to abandon their plans because of their inability to find work sufficient to supplement their incomes to a minimum of living. If they have to give up their education, their futures are questionable. Many of them will immediately find jobs. Others may become discouraged and never find their proper place in our American life.

I agree with Mr. McLaughlin and I share his concern for the future of our veterans who may be forced to leave school and begin again the task of rehabilitation and adjustment to civilian life. Most of our veterans are willing to make every effort to earn the funds to complete their education or training with the help of the Government. But if work is not available, then it is up to us to act now to help these men. We must not break faith with our veterans. We should increase subsistence to the extent that our veterans, married or single, will be able to complete their training in universities or on the job.

Real Help for Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of April 26, 1947:

REAL HELP FOR NEGROES

When the Reverend Marian Sanders went to James Island, S. C., that isolated community was not only without a pastor but also lacked any educational opportunities. He established classes for children and adults, and eventually succeeded in getting a modern school, a clinic, and a community building.

Cleo W. Blackburn went into the slums of Indianapolis, established a health center, day nursery, community gardens, a community cannery.

Sanford H. Lee became county agricultural agent in a poverty-stricken section of Georgia. He showed the farmers how to enrich their soil, improve their livestock, live better.

These men are all Negroes, trained in Negro colleges, who have gone out to better the lot of their people. There are many others like them.

Persons who are disturbed about the lot of the Negro in America can do something about it, in a practical way, by aiding the educational institutions that train such leaders.

An opportunity is coming up. The United Negro College Fund has launched a national campaign for $1,300,000 to help support 33 Negro colleges. Pittsburgh's share is $65,000, and a drive will be started here shortly.

Fund officers have some convincing arguments for the training of more Negro leaders.

Although the Nation has one white doctor for every 900 of population, it has only one Negro doctor for each 4,000 Negroes.

It has one white teacher for each 122 pupils; one Negro teacher for each 201 pupils.

There are 67,000 white dentists, but only 1,400 Negro dentists; 400,000 white nurses, only 8,000 Negro nurses; 176,000 white lawyers, only 1,000 Negro lawyers.

And Negroes number 13,000,000 in the United States. Approximately one-tenth of the population.

Address by Secretary of the Treasury at Unveiling of His Portrait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, last Sunday, April 27, a ceremony was held in the State capitol at Little Rock, Ark., when an excellent portrait of our able and distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. John Snyder, was unveiled and presented to the State of Arkansas. This public ceremony was attended by a host of admiring friends and neighbors of the Secretary from his native State of Arkansas, and from other States, who joined in paying an appropriate and sincere tribute to him as one of the Nation's most able and distinguished public servants.

Following the unveiling and presentation of the portrait, Mr. Snyder responded with a splendid address, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The desire for approval and good wishes of friends and neighbors is inherent in every man. Particularly does he want the honor and respect of those in his home town, his own community, and his native State.

Consequently, I deeply appreciate the courtesy you pay me today. I feel doubly honored that you have chosen to place my portrait here in our imposing capitol building alongside those distinguished governors who have helped to guide the destinies of this State.

It is with sincere humility and a strong sense of responsibility that I accept this high compliment. And, I will do my best to be worthy at all times of your generous tribute.

Business and Government service have taken me away from Arkansas. But my childhood was spent in the northeastern part of the State at Jonesboro, and I began my banking career at Forrest City. So I have always claimed full citizenship.

We never forget the influences of our early environment. And certainly Arkansas, so suitably named the Wonder State, has richly endowed her sons.

They can take pride in the beauty of her streams and mountains, in the sturdy character of her people, in the steady progress of her industries, and in the growth of her fine cities.

For in her reservoir of wealth are the extreme fertility of the river belts, the rich production of oil and gas deposits in the southwest, the timber growth of nearly every variety known to the temperate zone, the mountains of coal, the precious metals, and in addition the many industries covering the State.

We were singularly blessed by the great Mississippi and Arkansas rivers. They provided a gateway, first to a rich plantation life in their bottom lands, and later to the development of the agricultural riches and extensive mineral resources of Arkansas. And we can have a particular pride in this capital city of Little Rock, whose importance is reflected in this magnificent State House in which we are now met.

This building depicts, in its beauty and dignity, our principles of cooperative freedom; it represents to us the power of justice in our complex social and economic life; it symbolizes the duties of our Government—to serve and to guard, constantly and zealously, the American birthright.

Arkansas today is beginning a new era of industrial, economic, and social progress. This era holds promise of increasing prosperity for our people, and of expanding influence in the trade marts of the world.

Our productive contribution to the Nation's war effort has fully demonstrated our capabilities. When we consider the factors of size and population, no State has a more impressive record in this respect.

During my service in Washington, first, with the Defense Plants Corporation, and later, as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, I had opportunity to scrutinize Arkansas' wartime accomplishments.

In terms of war production, we ranked high in aluminum. Here the greatest bauxite deposits our Nation possesses provide 94 percent of all the ore mined in North America. From them came an astounding proportion of the air-force fighters and bombers so essential to the defeat of our enemies. Arkansas aluminum went into numerous other products essential to our military effort, and this metal is only a part of the story.

Manganese output increased 37 percent over 1939. Petroleum and its byproducts, building materials of all kinds, forestry yields, cotton—all these came out of the enterprise of our Commonwealth in ever-increasing quantities. Meats, dairy products, poultry, and other foodstuffs for our armies and those of our allies were supplied in great amounts.

And, at the same time, Arkansas established a record of particular importance to the Treasury Department. Her citizens invested more than $375,000,000 in savings bonds to help finance our defense and war efforts. More than $290,000,000 of this amount was in series E bonds, savings largely arising from the earnings of our workers and farmers.

There was, of course, another contribution, the greatest of all, that Arkansas made to the cause of freedom. She sent her men and women by the thousands to serve their country bravely and devotedly.

The veterans now returned take up their civilian occupations with a broader vision and a keener sense of responsibility. In memory of the men and women who gave their lives, and in the name of our physically incapacitated, all of us are challenged to further and greater service in peacetime America.

For there is a new call in public service for that leadership such as made Arkansas a great State. The importance of public service, in these significant and troublous times, cannot be overemphasized.

Never have we had a more urgent need than today for the talents and energies of capable, conscientious men and women in the administration of our affairs, whether at local, State, or national levels.

We must do all we can to encourage and attract such leaders to public life.

We must develop and manifest a wider understanding of the great problems incident to government, give a greater degree of appreciation for efforts expended in public service, and then demonstrate that appreciation, as you have done so impressively here.

Certainly we are more conscious today than ever before of the tremendous burden that rests upon the man who occupies the Presidency of this Nation. I am sure, too, that we realize more and more the great demands that the vital problems of government impose upon other leaders in our national establishment and in our increasingly complex State and local administrations.

If we are to attract the most capable administrators, the keenest intellects, and the leaders of vision to public service, we must vest in such service not only adequate material compensation, but the incentive produced by recognized efforts.

Appreciation cannot fail to inspire in men of public office a spirit of unselfishness in rendering service. And the great majority of our public leaders have sought to place the welfare of all the people ahead of any other consideration. They have not been deterred nor influenced by the prospect of personal gain or by the fear of personal loss.

Such is the philosophy that Harry Truman has brought to the Presidency in these critical times.

I know from intimate personal experience, too, that the majority of Federal employees, from Cabinet members and heads of departments to clerks in the most routine jobs, are serving energetically and well.

The right to object, and to criticize, is in the American tradition, and none of us would change that. But the criticism that at times has been heaped indiscriminately upon public servants, has not made easier the task of filling posts of responsibility.

Another way in which we can elevate the standards of public administration is to push energetically a widespread program of training for such employment.

A great number of our young people, returned from military service, are taking advantage of Federal assistance in further preparation for civilian careers. Many of them are displaying an eager interest in the field of government.

We find in our colleges and universities an unprecedented demand for courses in civil administration, economics, law, finance, and in statistical studies—all branches of training that seem to lead naturally to careers in government.

Even if such students turn their talents to the fields of private enterprise, the training they receive will make them more alert to the responsibilities of citizenship.

In the Treasury Department, we are developing a definite program to enlist for Federal employment, those so qualified. We are hoping in the years to come, that the most able men and women from our universities, business institutions, and like fields, will be well represented in Government personnel.

While we are in the process of reducing the Government establishment to a peacetime level, no large-scale recruitment is in prospect, but we are undertaking this program on a long-range basis.

We are asking colleges throughout the country to advise us of the names of prominent students in their classes which deal with subjects related to Treasury activities. I hope that a number of the young people of my own State will be interested in qualifying for positions under the civil service.

There is still another way in which the character of our Government can be improved. That is through a vigorous and continuing interest in her functions on the part of our entire people.

We are fortunate that through our educational system, the radio, newspapers, and other informational media, our people are in better position than ever before to understand and to help solve the problems of government.

We have had a wonderful example of the value of public understanding in the unity with which our citizenship, regardless of party or particular interests, has supported the President in his conduct of world political and economic affairs.

The expansion of this Nation, in industry, in population, and in world interests has placed upon our National Administration a responsibility far greater than on that of any previous generation. The welfare of all of us, and to a great extent, world progress toward economic stability and peace, depend upon its leadership. The responsibilities of the leaders of our State and local governments are hardly less important.

It is not enough today that we have good Government. We must have vigorous Government, government by men of integrity, energy, vision, and unselfishness.

A democratic government is worth our sincere endeavors. It is worth making a matter of personal, individual concern. We must exercise the responsibilities of citizenship by proper selection of our officials, and by willingness and ability to give of our own talents to public service.

Having assured the selection of the right men, we must give them our support. We must demonstrate that an alert and informed citizenship expects of them the highest ideals of performance, and backs them to the limit in the execution of their trust.

In such manner, our Government will be well equipped to meet the tremendous responsibilities of this modern world.

The people of Arkansas, by a wholehearted devotion to the economic goals we have set for ourselves, can, I am confident, reach a level of material prosperity such as we have never before known. By the same token, the cooperative endeavors of the American people will assure the continued material and spiritual well-being of the Nation.

The road of progress is a difficult one. The path to economic, financial, and political stability, in the face of our present national

problems, is not smooth. Within the next few years, democracy must demonstrate her competence to overcome the obstacles and hindrances before us. Democracy will succeed if all of us actively cooperate to this end.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject entitled "Federal Aid for Education," delivered by me and broadcast from Station WPTF at Raleigh, N. C., on Sunday, April 27, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today American education—our Nation's priceless heritage—is facing the greatest crisis in its history.

At a time when our national wealth has reached a new peacetime high, our entire elementary and secondary system of education, which is the base of our total educational structure, is threatened with break-down. During the present year alone it has been estimated that some 6,000 schools will be closed and 75,000 children of school age will receive no schooling because of the lack of teachers.

The principal reason for this condition is, of course, low salaries. Our teachers are finding it more and more difficult to earn a decent living in a period of rising prices. A recent survey shows that the classroom teachers throughout the country receive an average of about $37 per week. This is less than $1 per hour for a 40-hour week, and most teachers work far in excess of 40 hours per week. The same survey shows that almost 200,000 of the Nation's teachers are receiving less than $25 per week, which is hardly as much as the average wage rate paid for unskilled labor.

We have paid too little attention to our teachers and to their problems and difficulties. The war years and the reconversion period, with the high cost of living, have merely intensified these problems and difficulties. About 350,000 teachers have left the teaching profession since 1940, which is more than one-third of the total number of teachers. Never before has there been such a tremendous turn-over in the teaching profession during a similar period of time. Today, there are 70,000 unfilled teaching positions in the United States and many inadequately trained teachers have been pressed into the service. The public-school system of North Carolina has felt the impact of this situation.

It is perfectly clear, therefore, why fewer and fewer young people are entering the teaching profession today. In 1920, 22 percent of all college students were enrolled in teachers' colleges. Today, there are less than 7 percent. Along with the laudable ambition to serve mankind in the training of youth, there must be, of necessity, some consideration given to the matter of making a decent living. These facts and conditions make it mandatory that we take immediate steps to restore the dignity of the teaching profession and recognize once again the importance of the teacher to the education of our youth, to the community, State, and Nation. We must devote more attention and more of our resources to the strengthening of our secondary school system, which is the pride and bulwark of our democracy.

It has become apparent that without Federal aid it is impossible for all of the States in the Union to provide anything approaching equal educational opportunities. In view of this situation, the President of the United States, in his budget message last January, placed himself squarely on record for "basic legislation under which the Federal Government will supplement the resources of the States to assist them to equalize educational opportunities and achieve satisfactory educational standards." The present crisis dramatizes a fundamental weakness in our system of secondary education. For many years tremendous differences have existed between the States and the amount of money spent per pupil. In 1943, this difference ranged from $179 per pupil in New York to $35 per pupil in Mississippi. These figures, while significant, do not tell the whole story. They must be studied in relation to the wealth of the various States. Some States are making every possible effort to develop and maintain a sound educational program, yet their educational system remains sub-standard because of their inability to raise sufficient funds for education through taxation.

North Carolina, for example, according to a study by the National Education Association, was spending more for education in proportion to its income than many other States, even though its expenditure per pupil of $52 in 1943 was among the lowest in the Nation. When the number of pupils and the per capita cost of each is measured against the State's income, North Carolina, on the basis of its ability to pay for education, was spending as much as New York and considerably more than such States as Ohio and California. In spite of this splendid effort on the part of North Carolina, it is to be admitted that even with the increases made in 1945 and 1947, the salaries paid to schoolteachers in the State are still inadequate.

Because of the difference in the wealth and income of the various States, and the unequal burden imposed on some States in developing a sound system of secondary education, Federal aid is now being seriously proposed.

Assistance by the Federal Government to the States for educational purposes is nothing new. It actually began about the time the Federal Government was established and has been continued through the years. At the present time, this assistance is given in the form of grants for the support of land-grant colleges, agricultural experiment stations, cooperative agricultural extension services, vocational education, vocational rehabilitation; and more recently, in the educational assistance provided for veterans in World War II. However, Federal aid for education, such as above mentioned, has been provided to meet special and specific educational needs. Through the years, and especially during the past 5 years, the critical condition of our secondary school systems has spotlighted the necessity for Federal aid, not only for specific needs, but for general assistance to our entire elementary and secondary educational systems.

There have been many bills introduced into Congress since 1938 for the purpose of providing Federal aid to public schools. Certainly, such aid, if provided by the Federal Government, should be divided among the States largely on the basis of the number of school children in each State, the ability of each State to adequately finance its public-school system by taxation, and the effort being made by each State in behalf of its public-school system. Such a method of distribution would mean much to North Carolina, with its 900,000 children in its public-school system, and in view of what the State is now doing for its public schools in proportion to its ability to pay and the total amount of taxes collected by it.

Since I retired from Congress, in 1938, I have given the question of Federal aid to schools a great deal of thought. I was once a schoolteacher. I know something of their place in the community in which they teach. I know something of their problems and responsibilities. I know something of the many things expected of them and the many demands made upon them. I also understand something of the devotion to mankind which impels them to continue their work, in spite of adverse circumstances and inadequate salaries. In my opinion, the people in North Carolina have come to realize more than ever before the acute and serious condition which our teachers have faced during the past decade and its serious effect upon our public-school systems. Not only in North Carolina, but throughout the Nation, there is an awakening of public sentiment which will ultimately, in my judgment, demand and see to it that the importance of our elementary and secondary school systems is not only recognized, but adequately provided for.

In this hour of our Nation's history our form of government, our institutions, and our way of life are being tested at home and abroad. We face more difficult problems than ever before in time of peace. If we are to meet the test we should not forget that our whole structure of government, our way of life, our economy, and our national defense are all vitally affected by our educational system, and, certainly, we cannot forget the duty we owe to the citizens of tomorrow. The poorest man and the greatest industry in the land should be vitally interested in the effectiveness of our public-school systems.

The crisis is acute. It must not be permitted to continue. I can see no solution other than assistance from the Federal Government. I therefore am in favor of Federal aid for public schools, and I expect to support it as vigorously as I can. To me, this is one of the most important domestic questions now before the people of America, and I hope that everywhere, in every State, there will be an uprising of deep concern and interest in the condition of our public schools which will result in a general effort to improve the situation which exists today. It can, and must, be done.

Plight of the DP's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial entitled "Plight of the DP's," which appeared in the Providence Journal on February 14, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLIGHT OF THE DP'S

Too little has been said and too little done about the plight of the estimated 800,000 displaced persons in Europe. Most of them, for political or other reasons, dare not return to their homelands for fear of persecution or death. And most of them have suffered more cruelly during and since the war than any other people in the war-stricken world.

Bold plans have been discussed from time to time to create havens where these un-

fortunate DP's can rebuild their shattered lives. Zionist groups would open Palestine to all the Jewish DP's who care to go there. But even if that suggestion should be accepted, it wouldn't solve the problem because only about one-third of the DP's are of Jewish extraction. The others are of many faiths and many nationalities. All that they have in common is their homelessness and their desire to find a place to live in peace.

President Truman has proposed that more refugees from Europe be permitted to enter this country under unused quotas of the immigration law. Brazil and Argentina have elaborate plans, on paper, for admitting thousands of immigrants. Australia and South Africa are eager for new settlers.

But when it comes to the practical point of finding havens for the displaced, innumerable difficulties stand in the way. Some countries won't accept paupers. Some want only settlers with special skills. Some South American countries require prospective immigrants to show certificates of baptism in the Roman Catholic Church before they can be admitted.

The net result is that precious little is being done to help the 800,000 homeless persons in Europe. They deserve more than sympathy. It is time for this Nation and others to demonstrate the ideas we preach about good will, charity, and brotherhood.

Only Two Terms for a President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry Steele Commager appearing in Sunday's New York Times magazine section:

ONLY TWO TERMS FOR A PRESIDENT?—A HISTORIAN OPPOSES THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT—LEAVE THE QUESTION TO THE PEOPLE, HE SAYS

(By Henry Steele Commager)

In the 160 years since the founding of the Republic there have been some 300 attempts by Congress to change the constitutional provision for Presidential tenure and reeligibility. Now, mirabile dictu, one of these attempts has been successful—at least so far as the Congress is concerned—and State legislatures have the opportunity of passing on an amendment limiting Presidents to two elective terms.

Could the success of this amendment—so easily achieved—have anything to do with the fact that Franklin Roosevelt broke the two-term tradition and that now for the first time, the party that opposed him is in control? The question—so congressional debaters insisted with monotonous regularity—was a nonpartisan one. But the amendment was passed by unanimous Republican vote in both houses of Congress, and Representative SABATH had the bad manners to call it "a pitiful victory over a great man now sleeping on the banks of the Hudson."

Let us—like the Republicans—consider the amendment in a nonpartisan spirit, judge it purely on its merits, or demerits. And here we are confronted and distracted at once with a veritable Bartlett's compendium of familiar quotations. Proponents of the amendment rang the changes on Washington, Jefferson, Cleveland, and Wilson with tireless regularity; certainly they proved that at one time or another a great many distinguished statesmen had disapproved of more than two terms for any President.

Yet we should disregard this smoke screen of quotations. We should disregard it for two reasons: Because, in the idiom of a past generation, the quotations don't signify, and because quotations cancel each other out. For every apt quotation against two terms which the Library of Congress dredged up for Republican Congressmen there is another, often from the same source, supporting the right of people to exercise their own judgment on the matter.

Quotations may be disregarded, but history should not be disregarded. And history, ancient and recent, has much to tell us that is both edifying and relevant. For it is instructive to recall that this question of Presidential reeligibility was thoroughly canvassed by the wise men who made the Federal Constitution. No part of our Constitution received more attention, gave rise to more discussion, than that dealing with the Executive.

It is needless now to rehearse that discussion. What is important is to keep in mind that after the most exhaustive inquiry and debate on the matter of Presidential reeligibility the framers left the question open. Whatever opinion individual members may subsequently have expressed, the combined wisdom of the makers of the Constitution dictated the conclusion that this question was best left to the judgment of the American people.

And if we turn from a consideration of the conclusion of the framers to that classic exposition of the Constitution, the Federalist, the moral is the same. No. 72 of the Federalist is devoted entirely to this matter of Presidential reeligibility, and it is perhaps appropriate to recall what the grandfather of the Republican Party, Alexander Hamilton, wrote there:

"Nothing appears more plausible at first sight, nor more ill-founded upon close inspection, than a scheme * * * of continuing the Chief Magistrate in office for a certain time, and then excluding him from it, either for a limited period or forever after. This exclusion, whether temporary or perpetual, would have nearly the same effects, and these effects would be for the most part rather pernicious than salutary. * * * There is an excess of refinement in the idea of disabling the people to continue in office men who had entitled themselves, in their opinion, to approbation and confidence; the advantages of which are at best speculative and equivocal, and are overbalanced by disadvantages far more certain and decisive."

These are wise words, but they represent, after all, theory rather than experience. As it happens we are not without experience with this matter of Presidential tenure. Sixteen of our Presidents were elected to the Presidency but once, ten twice, and one four times. Those who sponsor this amendment insist that long tenure of office makes, inevitably, for dictatorship, despotism, and tyranny, and the longer the tenure, so the argument runs, the greater the danger. Has there been, in fact, any correlation between tenure of office and dictatorship or tyranny? Was Washington more dictatorial than John Adams, Monroe than Polk, Cleveland than Harrison, Wilson than Hoover?

But the amendment, it will be said, applies only to more than two terms. The logic of a denial of a third term applies equally to a second, but let that pass. We have had one experience with a President elected to more than two terms. And during that same period, 1933–45, we had an opportunity to see real dictatorship, real despotism, in one country after another. Did Roosevelt's tenure of office for longer than two terms in fact lead to dictatorship, despotism, tyranny? Did it in fact impair the vitality of the American constitutional system or of the republican form of government? As Jefferson said in his first inaugural address, "Let history answer this question."

Nothing reveals more glaringly the danger of deductive reasoning in the realm of politics than the glassy complacency with which otherwise intelligent men assure us that a tenure of more than 8 years in the Presidency will lead to dictatorship. Gladstone was Prime Minister of Britain for 14 years, but there was no dictatorship. Mackenzie King has been Premier of Canada for some 20 years, but Canada has not suffered from dictatorship. Franklin Roosevelt was President for 12 years, but the United States did not experience dictatorship.

Once, when dealing with a perplexing tax case, Justice Holmes was confronted by his colleagues with the old dictum: the power to tax involves the power to destroy. His answer was succinct and conclusive. "Not," he said, "while this court sits." So we might say to all admonitions that long tenure in office leads to dictatorship: Not while the American people are on the job, not while democracy has any vitality.

It was Justice Holmes, too, who said that even for practical purposes, theory is sometimes more important than fact. Let us turn then to the theory of the matter—to theory not as vain speculation, but as principle.

There is one principle that is inescapably involved in this question of limited tenure, and that is the principle of democracy. Turn and twist it as you will, the proposed amendment is a vote of no confidence in democracy. What those who support it say is that the American people cannot be trusted to decide wisely on the question of their Chief Executive. Moreover, they say retroactively, the American people, by their decisions in 1940 and 1944, justify this mistrust. They made mistakes then; they are not to be permitted to make similar mistakes in the future.

But why are the people not to be trusted in this, the most important decision that they can make in the ordinary course of politics? They can be trusted, apparently, to vote for a man once, or even twice, for the Presidency, but not three times. They can be trusted to vote for Senators and Representatives any number of times, and Senator O'DANIEL'S proposal that President and Congressmen alike be limited to a single term received only his own vote. They can be trusted to vote for State executives, State legislators, and even State judges any number of times in most States. They can be trusted to vote on new constitutions and on constitutional amendments. It is only in this one political choice that they are to be limited.

Have they merited this distrust? Suffice it to say that in 160 years they have never elected a bad President, a President of whom it could fairly be said that he was dangerous to the Republic.

It may be said, to be sure, that the people are not free agents in this matter. They do not exercise real choice, but are limited to the candidates presented to them by the conventions of the major parties. And history reminds us that Presidents can exercise a very real influence over party conventions, and indeed frustrate popular will through packed and controlled conventions. The most notorious example of this was the Republican Convention of 1912.

Yet it is well to remember that however influential Presidents may be in obtaining a second nomination, only one—Roosevelt—obtained a third, and there is little evidence that he or his henchmen packed the Democratic Convention which gave him that third; it wasn't necessary. Grant, one of the most popular of American Presidents, was unable to win a third nomination; Wilson, who at least flirted with the idea of a third term, was wholly unable to win any support to that notion.

It should be admitted that these precedents are far from conclusive. A shrewd and ambitious President could probably force his nomination on his party a third time if he wished to do so, and if he seemed like a winner. But this is a criticism not of the reeligibility of the President but of the convention system. That the convention system needs reform is notorious, but criticism of Presidential control of party conventions comes with bad grace from a party which has consistently blinked at its own "rotten boroughs" in the South. If the present nominating system plays into the hands of unscrupulous politicians, the thing to do is to reform the nominating system, not to limit the democratic process.

This notion that the people are not to be trusted is no new thing in our history. It was a favorite doctrine of the Federalists. It was taken up by Calhoun and the southern democracy in the generation before the Civil War. It has rarely been heard in blatant form since then, but it pops up, again and again, in the theory that the people are likely to be carried away by their passions, that democracy may turn into mobocracy, or that men may be misled by pernicious propaganda. Of recent years the favorite form is the argument ad horrendum from European experience. It happened that way in Germany, we are told, or in Italy, or in Spain, so it can happen here.

These insinuations do not rise to the dignity of an argument, for if democracy isn't to be trusted with its most important responsibility, we might as well give up the whole business now and look for something else. Americans have not, in fact, yielded to the blandishments of dictators, been misled by propaganda into countenancing despotism. In theory, to be sure, it is not impossible that they may do so in the future.

Two observations are relevant here. The first is that in a democracy people have a right to make mistakes and to learn by mistakes. The second is that if Americans ever do arrive at the point where they wish to retain a dictator in power, no constitutional amendment is going to stop them. By that time democracy will be gone anyway.

There is one other principle that is involved in this question of a limitation on Presidential tenure. It is not as obvious as the principle of democracy; it was, in fact, barely hinted at in the congressional debates on the amendment, but it is of vital importance. And that is the principle that the Constitution should contain limitations, not on the machinery of government but on its scope.

This—so far have we drifted from sound constitutional doctrine—takes a bit of explaining. The framers of our Constitution were determined, above all, to erect barriers against arbitrary government, to insure a "government of laws and not of men." That government was good, they knew, which did not have the power to be bad. And in innumerable ways they threw restrictions around goverment. But those restrictions were designed to fence off, as it were, certain areas from government control. There were some things no government could do, some rights no government could invade. Parliament, as James Otis neatly put it, could not make two and two five, nor could Parliament, or any government, deprive men of their life or liberty or property without due process of law.

And to make sure that government could not invade these sacred domains, governments were limited, and limitations written into the constitutions and the bills of rights. But the limitations were on the realm or scope of government. Where government had, of necessity, authority, it must clearly have sufficient authority to do the job well. To confuse limitations on the realm or scope of government with limitations on the authority of government when it operates in its proper field is a fundamental error.

From time to time we have committed this error in our law-making, but heretofore—with the possible exception of the Prohibition amendment—we have not committed it in our Constitution. The original Constitution set careful limits to the realm of Government, but where authority was granted, it was granted fully. And that is the interpretation which John Marshall and most of his successors placed upon the Constitution.

Now for the first time we are adding to our Constitution a limitation on the power of Government, or of the people in their relation to their Government. We are confusing what belongs in a Constitution with what belongs in administration, or in ordinary politics.

The concept of democracy was far more limited in 1787 than it is today, and the framers of the Constitution confessed to more and deeper misgivings about it than any statesman would admit today. Yet, with all their misgivings, all their uncertainty about the future, the framers did not make the fundamental mistake we are now asked to make. They did not write into the Constitution a limitation upon the exercise of power in that field where power must be exercised. They left this matter to the judgment of the people not only because, in the long run, they trusted the people, but because, logically, that was the right place to leave it.

It still is.

Greek-Turkish Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me on the Greek-Turkish aid bill, H. R. 2616:

MINORITY VIEWS OF MR. SMITH OF WISCONSIN

The undersigned respectfully disagrees with the majority members of the committee which has reported the bill.

Justification for enactment of the bill must be found in President Truman's speech of March 12 to the Congress. He said: "The foreign policy and the national security are involved." Aside from pointing out the deplorable situation in Greece, politically and economically, and the threat to Turkish sovereignty, he was strangely silent as to just how our own national security is involved. Greece and Turkey are a long way from the United States of America.

There can be no doubt that the President has embarked upon a new foreign policy for this country. He now seeks congressional approval, so it is up to us. One writer has said that it is a global anti-Communist policy. It is far more extensive than the Monroe Doctrine and, historically, more uncertain and much more dangerous. This is what he said:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

The implications of this policy are so great that even the President's advisers in the State and Armed Services Departments refused to venture a guess as to what it will cost or where it will ultimately lead. If the bill is adopted in its present form it will commit the United States to unlimited expenditures of money and resources and call for military expeditions in an effort to support free peoples all over the world. It is the certain course to imperialism and the imposition of permanent conscription upon our people.

It is quite obvious that Mr. Truman has failed to consider all the implications of his policy at home and abroad. At home, wide segments of our people oppose this program because of this uncertainty. Abroad, many nations other than Russia wonder if this plan will ultimately affect them or interfere with their policies. Historians tell us that President Monroe took no such chance when he announced the Monroe Doctrine. He sounded out those nations that might become involved in such a policy. He was absolutely sure of all the implications involved. This is not the case with the President.

This issue is now squarely before the people. Under our form of government the Congress will accept or reject the "Truman policy." We believe the evidence submitted in support of it fails to meet the burden of proof. It is designed, so we are informed, to "stop the onward rush of communism." This is wishful thinking and propaganda aimed to gain popular support. More about that later.

The President has said that the situation in Greece and Turkey is a threat to our "national security" and hence we must appropriate $400,000,000 to stop the rush of communism. In Greece, communistic bands in the north, aided by Tito and other pro-Soviet leaders, threaten the established government in Greece. The situation in Turkey is different, in that some 20 Russian divisions are massed on the border and the preservation of its integrity is essential to order in the Middle East. The internal situations in these countries are entirely different. The Greeks are in a bad way, financially and politically, but that is nothing new. Since 1823, historians say that Greece has been sustained by loans from other countries. The British, French, Germans, and Italians have at some time bolstered the economy of that nation. Now it is proposed that we, in time of peace, should step in and carry the burden which the others left off.

Turkey has a strong government, politically and economically, and its only need is for modern military equipment Weapons which it has are obsolete, and new arms call for instruction by men who have led modern armies.

With utmost respect, I challenge the President's sincerity when he calls upon us to stop communism in those countries because it is a threat to our national security. We yield to no one in our desire to stop communism, for it is a diabolic ideology; it is un-Christian, and would set up a police state to govern men. Is it not, however, wholly inconsistent to stop communism in Turkey and Greece, at an original investment of $400,000,000, while communism is rampant in these United States? And how much money would the President invest to stamp out communism in this country? He has suggested that it would cost $50,000,000. What kind of consistency is this, four hundred million abroad and fifty million at home?

The fact is that President Truman does not fear the spread of communism in this country at all. He has said so in plain, understandable language. In reply to ex-Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania, he said in part:

"People are very much wrought up about the Communist "bug-a-boo," but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe so far as communism is concerned—we have too many sane people."

In this country the President says communism is a bug-a-boo, but in Turkey and

Greece it's a threat to our national security. This is utter nonsense. It is a wholly inconsistent position and especially so when it is recalled that on March 22 Mr. Truman issued an Executive order that Communists and Communist sympathizers be removed from their Government jobs because they are a threat to "our democratic processes." What kind of hocus-pocus and double talk is this?

If there is a threat to our security it comes by way of pressure by Russia upon Greece and Turkey. Russia wants a share in the control of the Dardanelles and the Middle East oil fields. It could well be that there is this threat, but the President did not predicate his request upon that premise. He is avoiding the real issue. His responsibility is to spell out clearly that our objective is a military one. There is hardly any proof that it aims to put down communism.

I am opposed to this bill because:

1. It is uncertain as to scope and cost.

2. It is a serious threat to our entire social and economic structure, as it will eventually lead to war. It could easily bankrupt the Nation.

3. Aggressive action against Russia will result in dividing the world into two armed forces. This would lead to an unbridled race for armaments. War and bankruptcy would be certain.

4. There is no justification for bypassing the United Nations organization, even though we believed it was important to act.

If we believe in collective security, that organization should have been requested to act. We have now dealt it a blow from which it can never recover.

President Truman came to the Congress on March 12 and said we were suddenly in the middle of an internal crisis and something must be done about it before the end of the month as the British were pulling out. Almost 30 days have elapsed, and nothing has happened. Members of this committee know that the State Department was well aware as to what was happening in Greece, and this knowledge is certainly chargeable to the President. What kind of leadership is this?

Felix Morley, Human Events, March 5, 1947, said:

"As the sun sinks slowly on the British Empire it would seem time for the American people to ask themselves, very seriously, whether their leadership in the last 10 years has been sufficiently forthright or sufficiently intelligent to encourage trust and confidence now."

The test will come on the vote for or against this bill. If Members of this Congress hear the voices of their constituents it will be an emphatic "No."

How long will it take to realize the limits of our possibilities to help the world? In World War I, it was to sacrifice in order to make the world safe for democracy. Our treasure in life and property was shed unselfishly upon that altar. Then we defeated German militarism and the Kaiser. From 1939 to 1941 we inched our way into World War II. Then it was to destroy Hitler and nazism; under the Atlantic Charter we were pledged to eliminate fear from the world and to make peace and freedom secure. In 1941 we became an ally with Russia; we furnished it with that military equipment which ultimately helped to drive the Germans to defeat. We have sacrificed billions of dollars, thousands of lives, and untold and irreplaceable resources in this last war. For what? That is what troubles our people today; that is why they are confused.

The time has now come to save our own land and the heritage we received. The world looks to us for leadership; but if we become weak and impotent, if we dissipate our resources and spread ourselves too thinly, it will look elsewhere for that leadership, to the next strong nation. Call this what you will; but we believe it is realism, in the light of world conditions. To follow the President means that we are again embarking upon a course that calls for the exercise of force, not in the United States but thousands of miles from it. It will not make for peace—but war.

The Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy recently said that before other foreign grants or loans are considered by our Government we should take stock to find out (a) what we have, (b) what we need to maintain our own life, (c) what is sought of us abroad, and (d) what good purpose it will serve. The preponderance of the testimony by top-flight Government officials who appeared in support of this legislation indicated that they have no idea as to what we have or what will be the upshot of the policy advocated in this measure. Secretary of War Patterson was frank to admit that if the objective sought in this legislation was not achieved he did not know what our policy would be from then on. Obviously, it could only lead to increased military preparation and untold additional expenditures of money.

Our foreign policy should rest upon a real desire to maintain peace and to make secure our own system under which this country has grown and developed to a greater extent than any other on the face of the earth. We, of course, must resist the encroachment of communism which seeks to destroy this country. If this is really our purpose, it is essential that we survey our resources, which should be done before any further commitments are considered. It has been pointed out that there are approximately $100,000,000,000 in short-term internal obligations, and in view of this situation the United States cannot possibly finance resistance to other systems of government to the extent and for the period proposed or required without impoverishing this Nation. Even with the expenditure of all the money today, there is no definite assurance that we can meet the objective sought in this bill. If we impoverish ourselves we will be in extreme danger of a forced importation of the very political philosophy we are trying to check everywhere.

I believe the wise policy is to keep the American way of life as strong as our resources can make it. This is the way for the United States Let us face the issue without equivocation.

LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

Filling of Vacancy in the Office of Vice President

REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which provides that in the case of a vacancy in the office of Vice President, the Senate and the House of Representatives shall, meeting jointly and by a majority vote, fill the vacancy from among those persons constitutionally eligible for the office of President. If the Congress is not in session at the time the vacancy occurs, the President is required to issue a proclamation convening the Congress.

Several bills and resolutions have been introduced in the Congress providing for changes in the present law governing the succession to the office of President. Under these measures, the succession would pass to some public officer who had been selected because of his qualifications for the particular office which he holds rather than his qualifications to serve as President of the United States. The amendment proposed by me is not in conflict with any bills which have been offered to change the statute relating to succession, but it would do away with the necessity of using the statute except when vacancies occur simultaneously in the office of President and Vice President.

Under my proposal whenever there is a vacancy in the office of President, the Vice President would immediately be elevated to the Presidency. The Senate and the House would then hold a joint session and by a majority vote elect a Vice President. They would not be limited in their selection to a Member of the Congress, but could elect anyone eligible for the office of President. It is to be assumed that in discharging this responsibility, the Members of the House and the Senate would consider not only a person's fitness for the office of Vice President, but would also consider his qualifications for the Presidency in the event of his elevation to that high office.

In his message to the Congress on the question of Presidential succession, President Truman pointed out that the existing statute, which provides that the members of the Cabinet shall successively fill a vacancy, gives him the power to nominate his immediate successor. He expressed the view that in a democracy this power should not rest with the Chief Executive, but the office should be filled by an elective officer. He, therefore, recommended the enactment of legislation placing the Speaker of the House of Representatives first in order of succession. The Speaker is an elective officer, but he is elected because of his ability as a presiding officer, and seniority is a strong factor in his selection.

The President further suggested that, if his recommendation did not meet with the approval of the Congress, "some other plan of succession be devised so that the office of the President would be filled by an officer who holds his position as a result of the expression of the will of the voters of this country." I cannot conceive of any method short of a popular election which would more accurately express the will of the voters of this country than election by those whom the voters have selected to represent them in the Halls of the Congress.

Tribute to the Late Senator Josiah W. Bailey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. GEORGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial

entitled "The Testament of a Great Public Servant," from the Southern Agriculturist, a publication founded in 1869. The editorial pays a tribute to our late colleague, Josiah W. Bailey, of the State of North Carolina.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TESTAMENT OF A GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT

In a political last will and testament, the late Josiah W. Bailey, who served with great distinction as a United States Senator from North Carolina from 1931 until his death in Raleigh on December 15, 1946, cited three major dangers as threatening the freedom and security of the United States. They were (1) the growing dominating influence of the Soviet Union, (2) a reckless fiscal policy, and (3) our ruthless labor leaders.

Regarding Russia, Senator Bailey, a devout Baptist who edited the Biblical Record from 1893 to 1907, warned the United States to be on the alert against possible world domination on the part of that government. He said, "There are those who think that Russia does not intend to destroy the United Nations Organization. It is my opinion that Russia does not intend to go along with it unless Russia can have her way. She means to dominate Europe and Asia and then the whole world."

The Senator asserted that there was evidence that the Soviet Union was operating in the United States by propaganda and infiltration. He cautioned, however, that failure of the United Nations did not necessarily mean war, and that internationalism did not mean that "our country must have a hand in every controversy, or that we should assume responsibility everywhere."

Senator Bailey called for a strong, firm, and peaceful foreign policy on our part and our getting into no controversy except in clear defense of our own country.

Senator Bailey who served as United States collector of internal revenue in North Carolina, from 1913 to 1921, deplored extravagant national spending policies, saying:

"No country has ever spent the earnings and the substance of its people as this country has without ruining itself and its inhabitants. The war expenditures were necessary, but there is absolutely no excuse for the extravagant civilian expenditure during the period in which I have been Senator.

"We must stabilize our currency and our economy at the earliest moment possible if we are to avoid disaster and chaos."

In one portion of his philosophical document, Senator Bailey charged that labor leaders had repudiated collective bargaining and undertaken to substitute dictatorial demands for it. He suggested that antitrust laws could be applied to monopolistic practices in labor relations just "as we can apply them to any relationship affecting commerce among the States."

Among his labor recommendations were restoration of the injunction to prevent irreparable injury, a requirement that unions perform their contracts or be held liable in damages if collective bargaining were to be preserved, and settlement of labor controversies in courts of justice and not by boards, commissioners, or panels.

"I could not support a considerable number of measures put forward by President Roosevelt because it was plain to me that they were unsound and the long-run consequence would be bad for the people. I voted against the Wagner Act. It was and is a plain piece of political class legislation. We now see its consequences. Purporting to avoid strikes, it is an inducement to strike. Proposing to free the workingmen, it has placed them under the power of labor bosses."

Senator Bailey advocated freedom for both employers and workers. He said that there can be no right to prevent a man from working just because he does not belong to a union. This is not freedom, it is coercion.

This warning comes from a patriotic American who was one of the most eloquent statesmen of his time with a reputation for clear thinking. When he spoke, the Senate Chamber was filled. He was the champion of individual freedom. He was the defender of States' rights against the encroachments of Federal power. He consistently upheld the integrity of the courts. He was an advocate of sound monetary policy. And he believed in and fought for a strong agriculture in a balanced economy.

Realizing that the end was near, Josiah Bailey bequeathed to the people of his beloved State and Nation the benefit of his experience and observations in a lifetime of patriotic public service.

Federal Aid for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, we have been having some very interesting hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the subject of Federal aid for schools and education in America. I noticed in the New York Herald Tribune on April 26, and again on April 29, two very interesting editorials by Mr. Walter Lippmann, one entitled "Federal Aid for Schools," the other "More on Federal Aid for Schools." They are so relevant to the subject of Federal aid for education that I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 26, 1947]

FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS

(By Walter Lippmann)

The case for spending Federal money on the public schools must be very strong indeed, or Senator TAFT would hardly be sponsoring a bill (known as S. 472) at this time for just that. The Senator is no spendthrift. Nor is he one who likes to extend the responsibilities of Government, much less of the Federal Government, in a field which belongs primarily to the States.

But he has studied the facts, and he has concluded, as any man must who will also study them, that the condition of our public schools in many parts of the country is deplorable, indeed a national disgrace and a national danger, and that the need for Federal aid is absolute and compelling.

Yet there may be some who suppose that this bill is a departure from the American tradition. It is not. Since the earliest days of the Republic the principle of Federal aid to public education has been well established. Congress has enacted some 160 laws in support of education, beginning with the so-called Land Ordnance of 1785, which reserved to the United States the lot No. 16 of every township in the western territory, for the maintenance of public schools within the said township. That policy was continued under the Federal Union, and as public lands became scarcer, Federal aid to education has since 1802 been given also directly in money.

In all 175,000,000 acres of public lands, an area larger than Indiana, Ohio, and West Virginia combined, have been devoted by the Federal Government to the support of education. Grants of money for various forms of education—agricultural, vocational training, military training and the like—have been made regularly and under various laws.

There will be others who feel that we have spent too much money in recent years, and that the Nation cannot afford new and additional expenditures for the schools. The Taft bill, which the Senator admits is only a humble beginning of what ought to be spent, would cost $150,000,000 the first year, $200,000,000 the second, and after that $250,000,000 each year. It ought to be more than that, and eventually it will have to be, once the mechanism for distributing the funds has been tested. A fair estimate would be $500,000,000 in aid of education, and another $500,000,000 for school and library buildings.

For the time being, however, we are talking only of the modest sums in the Taft bill. In the year 1945 the American people spent more than three times as much for drink as they did for their elementary and secondary schools. They spent $7,700,000,000, or about $55 per capita, on drink and $2,500,000,000, or about $17 per capita, on schools. No one can keep a straight face and argue that this country could not afford to spend $2 per capita more on schools when he looks at what it does spend on other things.

Perhaps the simplest, clearest, and most accurate way to judge the need for Federal aid is to use as our measuring stick the average amount spent by the Northern and Western States per classroom unit. This would cover the teacher's salary, janitor service, equipment, heating, upkeep for a classroom of 30 children in the elementary schools and of 27 in high schools. In 1944 the northern and western States spent on the average $2,199 per year per classroom unit.

That was not nearly enough. There are places where the expenditure is $6,000. But the figure of $2,199 is certainly the minimum that could be called tolerable. Now if we closed all the classrooms where this minimum was not spent, two-thirds of the school rooms in the country would be closed. In 21 States over 90 percent of the children would be without schools.

If we raised the standard, as we ought to do, to $3,000 per classroom unit, 8 out of 10 children in this country would have no school to go to. In 22 States there would be no schools at all.

The trouble with these statistics is, I realize, that they are so bad that they seem incredible. But as a matter of fact the condition of education in great parts of the country is incredibly bad. The results of our neglect of education are spectacular and humiliating. In the 1940 census there were 3,000,000 adults with no schooling. There were 10,000,000 illiterates, who could not read and write as well as a child in the fourth grade. Among the young men who registered for the draft, there were 350,000 who could not sign their names. There were nearly 3,000,000 boys and girls between 7 and 17 years of age who were not in school. There are States where many children go to school less than 5 months a year.

The more you look at the facts, the more certain it is that the National Government will have to act. No one who looks at the facts will, I believe, come to any other conclusion.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 29, 1947]

MORE ON FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS

(By Walter Lippmann)

Many would agree with what was said in the preceding article about Federal aid to

the schools—as in the bill sponsored by Senator TAFT—that the principle is well established, that the Nation can readily afford to spend more on education, and that the need is very great. Yet some will be reluctant to act, feeling that a bill of this kind is a measure to tax the people of States that do well for the benefit of States that do badly.

They will, however, be astonished to find, if they look into the matter, that the people of the poorer States with the poorest schools actually make a greater effort, actually devote a larger part of their income, to educate their children, than do the people of the richer and more favored States. The people of the poorer States can accept Federal money for their schools without loss of self-respect.

The reason for this is obvious, once you think about it, but the obvious often escapes us. The poorer States have, of course, less income per taxpayer. But they have more children per taxpayer than the richer States. They have to educate more children out of smaller resources.

If we are talking of justice and self-reliance, then the comparisons are in their favor. A poor family with five children cannot give each child as good opportunity as a rich family with one child. But that does not mean that the poorer family has not tried to do as well by its children as the richer one. Now, on the whole, the States with the worst schools spend a bigger proportion of their incomes on schools.

The fair measure of a State's ability to pay for education is the size of its income per child of school age. The 11 States with the smallest income per school-age child in 1939 were, in the order of their poverty—Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, New Mexico, Tennessee, Louisiana, West Virginia. But none of these States would be found on a list of the 11 which devote the smallest part of their income to schools.

Mississippi, for example, is at the bottom of the list in what it spends on schools. But it is near the top of the list, actually ninth, for the whole country in the percentage of its income which is devoted to education. It spends 3.41 percent of its income. New York spends 2.6 percent of its income. But because Mississippi is so poor but has relatively so many children, it has an average of $400 to spend on a classroom unit whereas New York has $4,100 to spend per classroom unit.

In other words the States with the poorest schools are not those which make the least effort. Many of them make the greatest effort. New Mexico, for example, though it is among the eleven which spend the least, leads all the other States in the proportion of its income which it spends.

I do not, however, mean to give the impression that the effort of the poorer States is consistently greater than that of the richer ones. But it is true that most of them make an effort which is near the average for the Nation as a whole.

There is, therefore, no moral basis for objecting to Federal aid. The Taft bill would tax individuals wherever they live, and would distribute the proceeds to States which, though they spend 2.5 percent of their income on schools, do not have enough money to provide $40 per pupil per year.

I have labored this moral issue because I assume that there is no need to persuade any American that schools are vitally important, or that the Nation as a whole suffers if the children of any part of it are illiterate, or grossly uneducated, or miseducated.

No doubt the mere expenditure of money will not give this country the education it needs to govern itself and to prosper. That calls for a lot more than money. But mere money is needed urgently, even desperately, to provide the simplest kind of ordinary literacy throughout the Nation. On that, whatever our theories of education, we can all agree, and there is no point in being complicated and subtle about it.

The Moscow Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial entitled "The Moscow Failure," from the April 25, 1947, edition of the Chicago Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOSCOW FAILURE

General Eisenhower told the American Society of Newspaper Editors last week that there is only one sure protection for the people of this country. This, he said, is the friendship of the other peoples of the world.

It would be hard to say that world friendship had been promoted by the sour and fruitless wrangle of the foreign ministers just concluded at Moscow.

If any improvement in United States-Soviet relations resulted from this meeting, it has come from incidentals. We believe there has been some real increase in sympathy here for the Russian people, based upon news stories about how they live and work and play, what they eat, what they wear, and how they pay for it. William McGaffin has contributed many such stories to this newspaper.

When the Russian is reduced to his specifications as a human being it is impossible not to recognize in him our brother; it is impossible not to hope that he will become our sincere and loyal friend.

It will be fortunate if the Soviet Government will see the good that came from the presence of a more numerous body of correspondents than usual. It should encourage a more open policy on news. The gain in unofficial relations might ultimately offset the failure on the official level.

Truman's proposal to aid Greece and Turkey, in a military as well as an economic way, worsened at least the surface of American-Russian official relations. The best to be hoped for is that the strain and alarm it produced may prove to be preliminary to a better and clearer understanding. But there is no evidence of this process in the news from Moscow.

Though the Truman doctrine is often regarded in this country as a process of helping out the British, it has been widely criticized in Britain in circles far removed from those to which Henry Wallace addressed himself.

The Economist, for instance, complains that the manner and timing were decided without consultation with London. If this is true, it would seem to reinforce the idea in this country that the manner and timing of the British announcement of withdrawal had not been sufficiently, at least, discussed with this country.

The Economist concludes its considerations of the question with this sentence:

"But if it is to lead to a kind of indefinite phony war with dollars and words, then Bevin, with the British people deeply divided, will have to find a way to security and prosperity within the Empire and western Europe."

Watchdogs Damage Economy of Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Miami Herald of April 24. For 2 days Congressman DWIGHT ROGERS and I attempted to point out to the Congress the great damage that would be done to the people of Florida if the Committee on Appropriations persisted in its efforts to eliminate all underground water surveys.

This editorial points out in a few well-chosen words this policy of being "penny-wise and pound-foolish" now indulged in by our alleged "watchdogs of the Treasury."

I hope that all the Members of Congress will read this editorial. It follows:

WATCHDOGS DAMAGE ECONOMY OF NATION

Self-constituted "watchdogs of the Treasury" are having a field day in Washington, getting particular glee and satisfaction, apparently, out of devastating attacks on the budget of the Department of the Interior.

As usual, when men develop a misguided fervor, their thinking becomes lopsided.

It is particularly so in this instance since, from the standpoint of sound economics as well as politics, the department's worthwhile services should be strongly supported.

These services are the constructive extension and use, or conservation, of the Nation's natural resources, and represent for the most part a point of close contact with the people.

Newest of the "pound-foolish" decisions of the "watchdogs" was made Tuesday when the House Appropriations Committee, working on the Nation's biggest peacetime budget, cut out of the department's request all moneys that would go to ground water and geodetic surveys throughout the United States.

This decision, if it stands, would end the work of these surveys on June 30. Guessing, much of it selfish and purposefully inspired, would take the place of the findings of facts, which are the sole objective of the studies.

The result could, and probably would be, catastrophic.

South Florida, particularly the Miami area, has an especial interest in this situation, since the work of the survey here, which is jointly financed by the cities of Miami, Miami Beach, Coral Gables, and Dade County, with matching funds from the Federal Government, would be ended.

The survey is the agency which has developed the outline under which the metropolitan Miami area's fresh-water supply is being stabilized.

As the result of its findings, too, work is proceeding successfully to halt the salt-water infiltration under this, and surrounding communities, to the end that the penetrating tongues of damaging salinity may be pushed back.

The survey's contribution to the State's water-resources program—it joins with the Florida Geological Survey from Orange County southward—also would cease.

Multiply the situation here and in south Florida manifold, and you have a picture of the far-reaching and disastrous effect of such

short-sighted economic policy throughout the United States.

The Senate should promptly restore the House-deleted appropriation.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a radio speech which I made on April 19, over Station WBAB, Atlantic City, and WSMJ in Bridgeton, N. J., dealing very briefly with the labor bill recently passed by the House:

The House of Representatives pretty closely reflects the desires and policies of a majority of the people in the country. The very substantial margin by which the labor bill was passed this week was certainly in response to the insistence by the people back home that an attempt be made to introduce equity in our labor laws, and to avoid constant interruptions in production by our present bad labor relations.

This bill does not and cannot satisfy everybody, and certainly it does not completely satisfy me. It contains features which I would prefer had not been included. Other desirable provisions are lacking. Nevertheless, it responds to an overwhelming need that the present system be changed; a system which has paved the way for a concentration of power in the hands of a few national labor leaders, so great that it is inconsistent with the welfare of a free and productive people.

I stress the words "national leaders" advisedly because the ultimate result of this bill will be to restore to local labor leaders, and particularly to the rank and file of working people, the powers which are rightfully theirs, and which have been taken away from them by a few very shrewd and ruthless labor politicians.

Illustrations of the evils of such concentrated authority were brought out in the hearings before the committee. In one instance, it was testified that a steel factory in the West received notice from the Labor Board in Washington that the employees of the factory were going on strike at the expiration of 30 days. This notice was received by the management with great surprise, because they were wholly unaware of any labor dispute whatsoever among their employees with whom their relations had been consistently good. They immediately asked the leaders of the local union what disputes or demands were pending, who replied that they themselves were unaware of any difficulties, and the company had better consult the national headquarters of the union in New York. This was a political strike, not a workers' strike.

You will remember that I said to you recently, in discussing the telephone strike, that in many instances the operators were out against their will. This was graphically indicated a day or two later by the action of the operators in Woodward, Okla., following the devastating tornado which struck that town. The union instructed their operators not to return to duty even in view of the great emergency created by the storm, which had destroyed one-third of the city. The operators, according to Associated Press reports, returned to their posts and resigned from the union. We can applaud their action.

Strong labor unions are necessary. The workingman must be protected in every fundamental right that he has won after a long struggle. I believe that the bill, admitting again its many faults, actually strengthens the right of the worker himself at the expense of a few national leaders, who should be the servants of the workingman but who have become his masters. One whole section of the bill is devoted to the rights of union members. They are protected against unreasonable assessments and initiation fees, against the practice of some leaders to perpetuate themselves in power by undemocratic means, and in the language of the bill they are firmly guaranteed the right to have the affairs of their own union "conducted in a manner that is fair to its members and in conformity with the free will of a majority of the members."

I again emphasize that this bill is not wholly desirable. But I know many local labor leaders in our own district, and I know thousands of union members in south Jersey. I would rather by far see control restored to them than to have it continue to be exercised in a dictatorial fashion from New York, Detroit, or San Francisco. Our labor record in south Jersey for the most part has been very good. Most of our local leaders are intelligent and patriotic citizens. It is in their interest and in the interest of the average workingman that their own organizations be free from the dictatorship of a handful of tyrants acting contrary to the Nation's interest.

An Indictment of Russia—From the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to shipping war materials to Russia. Our people have had a ghastly experience as a consequence of arming potential enemies. Is is possible that our people, many of whom sacrificed their sons as a direct result of arming Japan with scrap iron, copper, oil, airplane engines, and other war implements, have forgotten the tragedy resulting from the New Deal program of appeasement? Are those Members in Congress who vote to ship steel and other war material to Russia really representing the true sentiment of their constituents? I cannot believe that such a vote on my part would be in accord with the mature judgment of my constituents.

The request made by President Truman for an appropriation to buy food to feed the starving will, if granted, be used instead to support the communistic program in the satellite countries of Russia as was done by UNRRA. It is time to look at the record before letting sentiment dethrone reason.

I am inserting, under leave to extend my remarks, An Indictment of Russia—From the Record prepared by David Lawrence which appeared in the United States News of May 2, 1947:

AN INDICTMENT OF RUSSIA—FROM THE RECORD

UNITED STATES HAS CONSISTENTLY OFFERED COOPERATION WITH THE SOVIET UNION IN MILITARY, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL FIELDS DURING AND AFTER WAR—RUSSIAN RECORD IS ONE OF NONCOOPERATION IN ALL EFFORTS INVOLVING MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND ACTION

I. Summary of acts from United States side evidencing desire for cooperation with Soviet Union

A. War Aid

1. Military and civilian supplies to a value of over $11,000,000,000 were supplied the Soviet Union under lend-lease.

2. Military and technological information was furnished through United States military mission in Moscow.

3. Substantial medical supplies and civilian goods were sent to the Soviet Union by American agencies, such as the Red Cross and Russian War Relief.

B. Postwar Aid

1. UNRRA supplies to the value of $250,000,000 were sent to Byelorussia and the Ukraine. Seventy-two percent of the cost of the UNRRA program was borne by the United States.

2. The United States agreed to discuss extension of large credit to the Soviet Government to assist in postwar reconstruction.

C. Decisions Made at Meetings of Heads of States

1. At Yalta:

(a) United States agreed to cession of Kurile Islands and Southern Sakhalin to U. S. S. R.

(b) United States agreed to organize independence of Outer Mongolia.

(c) United States agreed to Soviet interests as paramount in Dairen, Port Arthur, and the Manchurian railways.

(d) United States agreed to fixing of Curzon Line as western border of Soviet Union, thereby incorporating in Soviet Union sizable area of prewar Polish territory.

(e) United States agreed to participation of Byelorussia and the Ukraine in UN, thereby giving Soviet Union three votes.

(f) Agreement was reached with Soviet Government for exchange of nationals liberated by Soviet and American armed forces.

2. At Potsdam:

(a) United States agreed to the Soviet annexation of northern portion of East Prussia.

(b) United States agreed to provisional Polish administration of eastern Germany.

(c) United States agreed that postwar conditions required modification of Montreux convention in respect to the Dardanelles.

(d) Recognition was given to Soviet claims for preferential reparations from western Germany.

D. Peace Treaties

1. Concessions were made to Soviet claims for reparations from Italy.

2. Compromises were made with Soviet and Yugoslav viewpoints on boundaries and administration of Venezia Giulia and Trieste.

3. Soviet Union was offered 25-year mutual guaranty pact against Japanese and German aggression. Period of proposed agreement was later extended to 40 years.

4. Secretary Byrnes publicly recognized special security interests of U. S. S. R. in central and eastern Europe.

E. United Nations

1. United States has displayed considerable patience with Soviet use of veto in the Security Council.

2. Generous United States offer on atomic energy is unprecedented in world history.

F. International Organizations

United States has advocated Soviet participation in all specialized international organizations and has made direct efforts to obtain Soviet participation.

G. Cultural

United States has constantly sought to arrange for the exchange of publications, scientists, artists, students, and so forth, between United States and Soviet Union.

H. Civil Aviation

United States has persistently sought to negotiate agreement with Soviet Union for reciprocal civil air traffic between the two countries.

II. Soviet response to United States efforts toward cooperation

A. War Aid

1. Grudging Soviet recognition of extent and value of lend-lease aid and long delay in agreeing to begin negotiations for a settlement.

2. Complete lack of reciprocity in exchange of military and technological information during the war.

3. Little publicity given in Soviet Union to nongovernmental aid received from people of the United States.

B. Postwar Aid

1. Refusal of Soviet Government to discuss settlement of outstanding economic questions between the two countries in connection with credit negotiations. Constant reiteration by Soviet propaganda of theme that United States was threatened by imminent economic crisis which would oblige it to grant large credits to Russian market.

C. Political and Territorial Questions

1. Failure of Soviet Government to observe Yalta commitments for free elections in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

2. Encouragement by Soviet Union of obstructionism and truculence in Governments of Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia.

3. Noncooperation by Soviet Union in implementing occupation policies in Germany, Austria, and Korea.

4. Widespread Soviet removals from eastern Europe, Manchuria, and Korea, thereby seriously interfering with resumption of industrial production.

5. Obstructionist Soviet tactics in negotiations for Italian and Balkan peace treaties in meetings of both deputies and Foreign Ministers. Negotiations on these treaties extended from September 1945 to end of 1946. Soviet Union has likewise delayed consideration of proposed guaranty pact against German and Japanese aggression.

6. Soviet Union has refused to agree to organization of Germany as an economic unit, thereby preventing a more rapid return to a self-sustaining German economy and the recovery of Europe.

7. The Soviets have rejected all overtures directed toward an agreement on international civil aviation.

8. Freedom of navigation on the Danube has not been restored because of Soviet opposition.

9. Soviet Union has declined to participate in most specialized international organizations. In those which it has joined its attitude has been distinguished by either obstructionism or disinterest.

10. Soviets refused to permit access by American repatriation teams to American citizens liberated by Soviet armed forces. For their part the Soviets have insisted strenuously that all Soviet citizens, including persons coming from areas incorporated into Soviet Union since outbreak of war, be forcibly turned over to Soviet repatriation authorities, regardless of their individual desires.

D. United Nations

1. Soviets have used United Nations as an instrument for political maneuvering and propaganda purposes and have shown little interest in true aims of the Organization.

2. Soviet attitude has prevented any progress in work of Military Staff Committee.

3. As a result of Soviet tactics, the UN has made little progress for a year in solving the problem of control of atomic energy. While preventing agreement on this, Soviets have exploited propaganda possibilities of their general disarmament proposals.

4. On 10 occasions Soviets have utilized veto in Security Council to prevent UN action. These occurred four times regarding Spain, three times concerning admission of new members to UN, and once each regarding the Syrian and Lebanon case, the proposal for a commission of investigation in Greece and the British charges against Albania in the matter of the Corfu Channel.

E. Propaganda

Since the war ended Soviet propaganda, both for internal consumption and as distributed through controlled outlets around the world, has been violently and abusively anti-American. United States is pictured as imperialistic, reactionary, Fascist, and striving for world domination. United States Government is alleged to be in hands of small group aiming at imposing its will on world by force and as being entirely out of step with desires and aspirations of American people.

F. Cultural

United States efforts for cultural exchanges have not been reciprocated. On the contrary, the Soviet Government has made strenuous efforts to further isolate Soviet people from any cultural contact with outside world, except such as occurs under auspices of Soviet Government agencies.

An Appeal for Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published April 14, 1947, in the Larchmont (N. Y.) Daily Times titled "An Appeal for Understanding":

AN APPEAL FOR UNDERSTANDING

Building now, as in past years, constitutes the largest single industry in Westchester. Those connected with building, including not only workers but affiliated materials corporations, architects, and contractors, constitute the largest of the bases upon which the county's economic well-being rests. That is why the threat of higher prices and a possible strike by building trades unions should cause serious concern to all who have the county's best interests at heart.

There is at present what might be called a consumers' strike against these high building costs, brought about mainly by higher union wage scales than exist elsewhere in the New York area. This has resulted in a let-down in employment in the building trades which cannot but have its ultimate effect upon merchants and the professions in general.

The State of New York now has available at Albany approximately $50,000,000 earmarked for public improvements in Westchester. But Governor Dewey and State Public Works Superintendent Sells have declared openly that contracts will not be let until costs shall have come down. Similarly, the county has projects which will cost in the neighborhood of $3,500,000, while an estimate by the county planning department is that $25,000,000 worth of construction is planned by our 6 cities, 18 towns, and 22 villages—all when and if building costs are readjusted. Those in authority do not ask or expect a return to prewar prices. But they are adamant that they will not pay prevailing costs. The same sentiment has deterred thousands who want homes from building, and has affected similarly large developments which have been laid out.

There is, admittedly, the possibility that a large number of workingmen may be needed for the veterans' hospital being erected at Crugers Point on the Hudson, but late reports from that project are that applicants for work are being turned away and some others who had been employed have been laid off. Certainly, this project will not be sufficient to give employment by any means to all in Westchester in the building trades.

Altogether, we face a common problem, one which will affect not only workmen, unions, and contractors, but also the prosperity of all who have their economic roots in the county. Should a serious strike develop, should unions remain determined to keep labor costs high, should materials remain out of reach because of prices, all of us will suffer.

This is, then, an appeal to members of the unions and to members of the employing organizations that they pledge themselves to determined efforts for understanding of the problems of each group. If one suffers, all will suffer; but if reasonable agreement can be reached, all will prosper. Above all, we appeal to those who have threatened a stoppage that this be averted by any means. With millions of dollars available for work which will extend over years ahead, it would be little short of asininity to allow shortsightedness to interfere.

Westchester, a county which must grow tremendously in the near future, should not be handicapped now by unreasonable demands. We must get our building costs down to a dependable equitable basis, where a contractor will know in advance what his costs will be and can figure accordingly. So long as prices of labor and materials remain sky high, this important segment of our economic system will remain blighted and everybody concerned directly or affected indirectly will lose.

Dangerous Trend to Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article based on a recent report of the Federal Trade Commission, and written by Hon. Robert E. Freer, a member of the Commission.

The report of the Commission, and the article of Mr. Freer which summarizes the report, present a situation that the Congress should consider and act upon at once. The prevention of monopoly in this country is a matter of paramount importance to our people and particularly

to the ability of small and independent businesses to survive and continue.

The recommendations of changes to existing law to prevent the present way of bringing about monopolistic situations should be considered at once by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

INDUSTRIAL MERGERS

(By Robert E. Freer)

DANGEROUS TREND TO MONOPOLY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Freer is a member of the Federal Trade Commission and a trustee of George Washington University.)

We have a declared public policy regarding monopoly that is rooted in the principles of the common law and which has been embodied in and implemented by a series of antitrust statutes including the Sherman and Clayton Acts. But in the dynamic development of industry based on modern technology, the facts of concentration constantly tend to outrun the law.

The factual diagnosis showing the relation of corporate mergers to concentration is as complete and as exact as specialists in the field can make it. Today's choice is one between legislative action recommended by the Federal Trade Commision to plug a loophole in the present laws against such mergers and continued frustration of our declared public policy.

Simply stated, the commission's proposal is that the Clayton Act be so amended that acquisition by a corporation engaged in interstate commerce of the assets of a competing corporation also engaged in interstate commerce be made unlawful where the result tends to monopoly. Presently only stock (not asset) acquisitions so tending are unlawful under that act and legal actions against even such unlawful acquisitions easily may be defeated.

More than 1,800 formerly independent manufacturing and mining concerns have been swallowed up through merger and acquisition since 1940. Their combined asset value was $4,100,000,000, or nearly 5 percent of the total asset value of all manufacturing concerns in 1943. Moreover, it was the larger corporations each having assets of over $5,000,000 (in many instances achieved through earlier acquisitions) that accounted for some three-fourths of these recent 1,800 acquisitions.

The war contributed powerfully to the trend of concentration. Government purchases and Government financing of productive facilities were channeled predominantly into the hands of corporations which already occupied positions of dominance. Surplus profits created by such channeling have contributed powerfully to the trend by providing funds for additional wartime and postwar expansion through acquisition of former competitors. Out of $175,000,000,000 of Government contract awards between June 1940 and September 1944, one hundred and seven billion, or 67 percent, went to only 100 of the more than 18,000 corporations receiving such awards. During the war 68 corporations received two-thirds of the $1,000,000,000 appropriated by the Government for research and development purposes in industrial laboratories.

The most recent information on the wartime growth of concentration available from the Bureau of Internal Revenue shows that the larger manufacturing corporations, those with assets of $50,000,000 or more each, increased their share of total assets from 42 percent in 1939 to 52 percent in 1943.

The degree of prewar concentration in the economy as a whole and in manufacturing industries in particular was stated in the report of the Senate Small Business Committee, submitted in January 1946:

The 200 largest nonfinancial corporations owned about 55 percent of all the assets of all the nonfinancial corporations in the country. One-tenth of 1 percent of all the corporations owned 52 percent of the total corporate assets. Less than 4 percent of all the manufacturing corporations earned 84 percent of all the net profits of all manufacturing corporations.

More than 57 percent of the total value of manufactured products was produced under conditions where the four largest producers of each product turned out over 50 percent of the total United States output. One-tenth of 1 percent of all the firms in the country in 1939 employed 500 or more workers and accounted for 40 percent of all the nonagricultural employment in the country. One third of the industrial research personnel were employed by 13 companies.

More mergers and acquisitions in the manufacturing and mining industries took place in 1946 than in any of the previous 15 years. In 1946, the number of mergers was 26 percent above the number in 1945, and 225 percent above the annual average of the years 1940–41. Years of greatest business activity and high price levels are the years in which the greatest number of mergers take place. In 1920, the number of mergers increased more than six times over the number during 1919.

The stock-market crash of 1929 which heralded the onset of the great depression was preceded by a great wave of corporate mergers and a wild speculation in their securities. Today speculation in the future of merged concerns, supported by war-swollen profits, is again operating as one of the important causes of the present upward trend in merger activity. This speculation, which stems from the expectation of greater profits resulting from the elimination of formerly competing concerns, leads inexorably to the elimination of our competitive economy and thus to the elimination of the possibility of legitimate speculation.

Assuming as we must that the Government, acting in the general public interest, can, if Congress so directs, prevent the further growth of monopolistic power through mergers of competing corporations, the question is one of ways and means of halting mergers that tend toward monopoly regardless of whether consummated by sale of stock or of assets.

When section 7 of the Clayton Act was passed in 1914, it was assumed that consummated monopolies could be dissolved under the Sherman Act pursuant to the Supreme Court's decrees of dissolution in the Standard Oil and American Tobacco cases decided in 1911. It was assumed that the only remaining problem was how to prevent the formation of monopoly.

However, about the time that the Federal Trade Commission began to institute a number of proceedings for enforcement of section 7 the Supreme Court interpreted the Sherman Act to mean that huge size and power acquired through acquisition of competing corporations did not necessarily violate the act and that it was only the abuse of such power and not its existence which would make such acquisitions unlawful. A few years later when the commission's cases under section 7 reached the court, it was held that the commission had no power under section 7 to halt the incipient monopolies where the unlawful acquisition of stock was followed by an acquisition of the physical properties without which the stock had no value, and where this was done before the commission could complete the hearings and enter its order requiring divestiture of the stock unlawfully acquired.

The practical status of section 7 is that no matter how unlawful an acquisition of stock in a competing corporation may be, the remedy provided by the statute easily can be defeated, leaving the acquiring corporation in possession of the assets which are the fruits of its unlawful acquisition of stock. And if the assets are acquired directly without any intervening acquisition of stock, as has become the prevailing method, there has never been any legal ground for a contention that this was prohibited under section 7.

Thus the brave start, under the Clayton Act, has ended in complete frustration. And at the same time, the Sherman Act has been so construed that it seldom has served to unscramble corporate mergers, no matter how great the size and power of the acquiring or of the consolidated corporation. The contrast between the rapid evolution of economic concentration of power and the feebleness and slowness with which effective legal remedies have been and are being applied is striking. It is sufficient to call in question the reality of our faith in the validity of the competition presupposed by the free enterprise competitive system.

A paradoxical aspect of this problem is that while corporate mergers and acquisitions proceed unrestrained and unrestrainable by law toward an ultimate maximum in unified ownership and concentrated economic power, we still enforce the law against the more transient and more vulnerable forms of trade restraint represented by price agreements and conspiracies among competitors. The process of corporate acquisition proceeds side by side with such forms of trade restraint among competitors. The presence of large-scale unified ownership in any industry is a most powerful guarantee of success in the operation of a price-fixing combination among the competitive units of that industry. The very success of law enforcement against such combinations high lights the advantage of unified corporate ownership as a legally invulnerable means of accomplishing similar ends. Carried to its logical result, there will probably be less and less opportunity to score victories against price-fixing combinations as corporate mergers immune from legal attack take their place.

No one has summarized the danger of monopoly any better than President William Howard Taft, under whose administration some of the most far-reaching antitrust actions of all time were taken. On December 5, 1911, he stated:

"When all energies are directed not toward the reduction of the cost of production for the public benefit by a healthful competition, but toward new ways and means for making permanent in a few hands the absolute control of the conditions and prices prevailing in the whole field of industry, then individual enterprise and effort will be paralyzed and the spirit of commercial freedom will be dead."

The facts of the present situation constitute an increasing threat not only to our traditional antitrust policy but also to the American system of free competitive enterprise which that policy is designed to foster and to protect.

The Lost Battalion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, several bills are pending in the Congress designed to help the boys who toiled and suffered as prisoners of war. I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter I have just received from J. B. Heinen, Jr., president of The Lost Battalion organization of Texas. The indescribable horrors of

Japanese prison camps, the savage and inhuman treatment of American prisoners of war by the Japanese, are known to all of us. Time should not dim our memories or cause us to forget these black pages in the history of war. Insofar as possible, we should compel our late enemies, both in Europe and Asia, to pay for their treatment of prisoners of war and for their violations of the rules of war and of human decency. Such payment as we may be able to extract from them should go as a partial reward to these men who, in some miraculous way survived, and to the families of those who did not survive.

The Lost Battalion, composed almost entirely of Texans, was sent into Java in January of 1942 at a time when those islands were already lost. There was no hope of successful defense, no hope of this unit's being reinforced, no hope of its escape or retreat. The Lost Battalion was confronted by the overwhelming force of a then-conquering army.

Some have said these boys were sacrificed to American prestige. May it be said to their eternal glory, they lived up to the highest traditions of American valor. That any of them lived to tell the story is a tribute to their indomitable will and courage. They have not become embittered. They continue to serve in peace as they did in war. A proud and a grateful Nation should never forget them. They were great soldiers. Those who still live are our best citizens.

THE LOST BATTALION,
Dallas, Tex., April 11, 1947.

The Honorable ED GOSSETT,
Representative from Texas,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

This is written to reacquaint you with certain facts concerning the well-being of a group of your Texas constituents.

The Lost Battalion, a Texas National Guard unit, was ordered to the Philippines in November 1941. We were the Second Battalion, One Hundred and Thirty-first Field Artillery, Thirty-sixth Division. The battalion never reached the Philippines. On January 11, 1942, we set up defense for the Nineteenth Bombardment Squadron on the island of Java. Through war urgencies, we actually became an integral part of that organization. Our mission was the defense of the Philippines. As the war progressed, Java was threatened and our mission became the defense of Java. When finally it became evident that Java could not be properly defended by the Allies, all United States forces, with the exception of ourselves only, were ordered to evacuate Java. We then became "The Lost Battalion," as we have been named by our Texas newspapers. And "lost" we have been ever since. There is little official record of our part in the war. For 42 months we remained as POW's of the Japanese in Java, Sumatra, Singapore, Burma, Siam, and Japan. Eighty-nine of our members died of the indescribable hardships we were forced to endure during those 42 months. Others have died since our return to our homes from causes encountered during those 42 months. It is doubtful that there is a single truly healthy man of the entire unit today because of those 42 months.

It is true that we have been accorded every consideration by all facilities of the War Department in accordance with what regulations prescribe as due POW's. It is also true that in the opinion of most people, in accordance with what was asked of us, that recognition of our services in the form of adequate promotions combined with the monetary benefits derived therefrom falls short of what members of the service with the same length of service as ourselves, but not in our plight, have received in fact. It is hard to reconcile one promotion as just in the face of over 5 years' service, nearly four of which were spent overseas under the conditions we were asked to face. General Ulio's speech on the occasion of the liberation of the first group of POW's of the Philippines, and I quote: "Truly these men deserve all that a grateful nation can accord them," has in fact up to the present time only been well-meaning words.

It is realized that what should have been accomplished for us in the form of adequate promotions some 2 years ago becomes extremely difficult to accomplish now. It is also realized that the difficulty now involved does not in any manner detract from the justification of our cause.

Bearing in mind that we did not fail our country, and bearing in mind that there has never been uttered one complaint of having been asked to do the impossible or of having been sacrificed as a token of our Nation's obligations in world interests, the Lost Battalion urges you not to allow present proposals that concern our well-being to go unattended. It is today that we need financial assistance to rehabilitate ourselves in the face of the extremely high costs that we encounter at every turn. I repeat, it is doubtful that there are many of us who can withstand the continuous physical effort necessary to maintain a normal standard of living.

Therefore the Lost Battalion asks your wholehearted support of bill No. 172 which has been read in this present Congress—the type of support that brings that bill into action and prompt passage. It is known that there is more than one proposed bill for POW's but we do feel that our (including all military, naval or civilian personnel connected with the defense of the Far East during the first phases of the war) deserves consideration over and above what is just for those who were unfortunate enough to have been captured later in the war. They at least had a chance; were a part of a force sufficient in strength and arms to expect victory; did not face a situation where the only two possibilities were to be killed or ultimately captured; did not spend the excessive length of time in bondage as ourselves; were allowed to receive mail and packages; had a knowledge of the true progress of the war and were not so severely maltreated. There is a difference.

Trusting that you will not let the ravages of time further subtract from just compensation to ourselves, we close our appeal to you for action in our behalf.

Sincerely,

THE LOST BATTALION,
J. B. HEINEN, Jr., *President.*

Industrial Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Sumner H. Slichter, which appeared in the New York Times magazine on April 27. This article is entitled "The Great Question in Industrial Relations" and deals with the major problem of interruptions to production which jeopardize the public health or the public safety, a problem with which House Resolutions 17, 34, 68, 75, and 76 also deal.

Professor Slichter has been Lamont University professor at Harvard University since 1940. Previous to that, he was on the faculties of Princeton and Cornell Universities. He has written extensively on the problems of business economics. More recently, he was the chairman of a labor-management committee appointed by the Honorable Robert F. Bradford, Governor of Massachusetts. This committee filed an unanimous report with Governor Bradford and, for the convenience of those who may wish to refer to that report, portions of it appear in the Appendix of the RECORD at pages A1438, A1446, and A1448.

The article emphasizes the fact that existing methods of handling such emergencies are completely unsatisfactory. The suggested procedure obviously might involve compulsory arbitration, which will result in vigorous objections, yet, as Professor Slichter points out, it "would probably cause compulsion to be used less frequently than has been the practice in recent years."

The article also stresses the responsibility of those who oppose compulsory arbitration in this limited and vital field to suggest something better. At least one means of meeting the challenge of the final sentence of the article lies in the method proposed in House Resolutions 17, 34, 68, 75, and 76.

If the occasion arises again, as it has in the past, when the public health or the public safety is in jeopardy, a failure to have created an effective means of protecting the people of this country will be the responsibility also of Congress.

The article follows:

The great question in industrial relations is: "What does one do when a strike or lockout imperils the public health or the public safety?"

It is a question which nearly everyone dodges. Sometimes the dodge takes the form of the suggestion: "Let us improve collective bargaining." Obviously this suggestion does not tell the community what to do when bargaining fails to produce a settlement. Sometimes the dodge takes the form of saying: "Let the parties fight it out." John L. Lewis made this second suggestion before the Senate Committee on Labor early in March. He said that he did not know how you are going to compel the seller to sell if he does not want to sell or the buyer to buy if he does not want to buy. Hence, the only effective limits on the refusal of prospective buyers and sellers to deal with one another are those imposed by economic necessity.

If Mr. Lewis is right, the prospect is indeed a grim one. The economic forces to which Mr. Lewis refers may take months to operate. The General Motors strike, for example, lasted over 100 days. No one would pretend, however, that the country could stand a general railroad strike 100 days. Even a general steel strike of 100 days would be disastrous. In some way the community must be prepared to have its representatives step into the picture and protect the health and safety of the people.

Lack of preparedness is dangerous—dangerous to the workers as well as the community. The railway strike of last May led over 300 Members of the House to vote to draft railway workers, and the telephone strike led New Jersey to impose criminal penalties upon utility workers who strike

contrary to law. These are indicators of the hysterical legislation which may occur if the country is caught unprepared by a grave emergency. What should be done?

Let us inquire first what methods have been used to handle emergencies in the past and how well these methods have worked. Three principal methods have been used: (1) Emergency or fact-finding boards; (2) Government seizure of plants; (3) direct intervention by the President.

1. Emergency or fact-finding boards: The principal use of emergency boards has been in the railway industry but during the last year so-called fact-finding boards have been appointed in a number of other cases, most of them disputes which did not threaten public health or public safety. An emergency board or fact-finding board is not appointed until bargaining has failed to settle the dispute and the parties have rejected arbitration. The boards hear evidence and arguments and make a decision, but the proposed terms of settlement are not binding upon either party.

Although some emergency boards, such as the board of last summer in the Milwaukee gas dispute, have been notably successful, the record of the boards on the whole has been disappointing. Two serious charges lie against the boards—they have undermined collective bargaining and voluntary arbitration and they have frequently failed to settle the dispute. Naturally it is easier for the representatives of one side or both to refuse to negotiate an agreement or to submit a case to arbitration if the immediate result is, not a strike or lock-cut, but the appointment of an emergency board which has no authority to make a binding award.

Indeed, the prospect that the Government will appoint an emergency board is virtually an invitation to the parties not to settle their differences by bargaining or arbitration. Of the eight principal disputes in the railway industry during the last 10 years, only the wage case of 1937 was settled by bargaining and only the wage case between 18 railway unions and the railways in early 1946 was settled by voluntary arbitration. The other six major railway disputes were referred to emergency boards, but only one of these six cases was settled by acceptance of the recommendations of the emergency board. Certainly this record does not make a strong case for emergency boards.

2. Government seizure of plants: Seizure may be precipitated by rejections of the recommendations of an emergency board, as in the railway wage cases of 1942–43. More recently the Government ended the interruption of coal production by seizing the mines in May 1946. Seizure is provided for in public-utility disputes by the laws of New Jersey, Virginia, and Indiana.

Government seizure may occur (as it has) even though the employer has been willing to arbitrate the dispute, but the principal objection to seizure is that it does not settle the dispute. It is only a stopgap. For example, the railway disputes of the 1942–43 which led to seizure were settled only after the President had arranged terms which were acceptable to the unions. Thereafter the roads were returned to their owners.

The shortcomings of seizure are vividly illustrated by the coal dispute of last year. After seizure, the Government made a contract with the union which specified the wages and terms of employment under Government operation. This contract, of course, did not settle the differences between the operators and the union. As a result today, nearly a year after the strike, the mines are still in the hands of the Government.

3. Direct intervention by the President: In recent years this has become the principal method of settling disputes which create national emergencies. All of the five principal railway disputes during the last 10 years in which the recommendations of emergency boards were rejected eventually went to the President. So also did the steel case of 1946. In some cases (the railway wage dispute of 1941 and the Diesel engine case of 1943) the President acted as a conciliator and settled the dispute by asking the employers to make additional concessions. In the three other railway cases and in the steel case of 1946 the President acted as an arbitrator and suggested definite terms of settlement.

One objection to intervention by the President relates to procedure. The President does not invite the two sides to submit briefs and arguments and he cannot give thorough study to the case. In fact, the proceedings before the President have usually been ex parte. No ordinary arbitrator would dare proceed in such a one-sided manner and with so little study of the case. Even more important is the objection that the President is not likely to be the person whom the two sides would select as a neutral. Nevertheless, his prestige is so great that a decision by him is virtually an order. It is equivalent to compulsory arbitration—but compulsory arbitration in its most undesirable form, namely, by a political officer of the Government.

This review of recent experience shows that there have been three principal shortcomings in the methods of dealing with national emergencies:

1. These methods have undermined the willingness of employers and unions to settle disputes by collective bargaining or by voluntary arbitration.

2. They have permitted disputes to be settled by elected officers of the Government, thus creating the danger that politics will be introduced into industrial relations.

3. They have failed in several instances to protect the community against an interruption to the production of essential goods and services.

What should be done? The ideal solution would be for trade unions and employers in essential industries to negotiate agreements to submit disputes over the terms of new contracts to arbitration in case bargaining fails to produce a settlement. These agreements might be called procedural agreements to distinguish them from the ordinary agreements which stipulate wages and working conditions.

These procedural agreements should run for a long period—say, 5 years—and should specify the rules under which arbitrations would be conducted and including the way in which arbitrators would be selected. If trade-unions and employers were to blanket the essential industries of the country with procedural agreements of the sort suggested, the community might feel that it was adequately protected against strikes or lock-outs which imperil the public health or the public safety.

If the unions and employers in essential industries fail to protect the public by negotiating agreements to arbitrate future disputes, how should the public interest be safeguarded? Any new arrangements, of course, should be carefully planned to avoid the three major shortcomings in the methods that have been used in handling emergencies. As a foundation for dealing with emergencies, the Government should have authority to require the parties to maintain the status quo for a reasonable period—say, 30 days—subject to reasonable extension. Such authority is needed in order to give the Government an opportunity to use its emergency powers before essential services are interrupted.

The Government should have several instruments for dealing with emergencies. The first instrument should be a show-cause hearing in which the parties should be required to show why they should not submit their dispute to arbitration. The use of the show-cause hearing should be optional with the President. The hearing should be conducted by an impartial person skilled in industrial relations. It should not be a broad review of the merits of the unsettled issues in the dispute, but should be sharply focused on the reasons for the refusal of arbitration. It should be the duty of the hearing officer to endeavor to work out an acceptable formula for arbitration.

The possibility that the President might order a show-cause hearing would, of course, greatly stimulate the parties to settle their differences by bargaining or by voluntary arbitration. If a show-cause hearing for any reason seemed inappropriate or if it failed to produce an agreement to arbitrate, the appointment of an emergency board would probably be desirable.

Neither trade-unions nor employers, however, should be given any reason to expect that the emergency board might be slanted in favor of one side or the other. Hence the board should be appointed by a nonpolitical officer of the Government, say the head of the Conciliation Service, from a panel of men who have been jointly recommended as neutral and competent by representatives of labor and management. Fortunately, such a panel now exists—it has been selected by the Labor-Management Advisory Committee of the Conciliation Service.

What should be done if one party or both reject the recommendations of the emergency board? This is the crucial question, because at this point present arrangements for handling emergencies have broken down again and again. It is obviously inappropriate for the President or any political officer of the Government to act as a conciliator or an arbitrator. That practice should cease. Likewise Government seizure of plants should be avoided. It settles nothing—as recent experience clearly demonstrates.

The most appropriate procedure would be to authorize the President to require the parties to try out the recommendations of the emergency board for a limited period—say 6 months—unless they agree to different terms. This is a reasonable procedure because the recommendations of the emergency board would undoubtedly represent the best-informed and most impartial of all available opinions on the merits of the dispute.

The proposed procedure would meet each of the three tests suggested above:

(1) It would greatly reduce the attractiveness of emergency boards to both unions and employers—and thus encourage the parties to settle their differences by bargaining or arbitration.

(2) It would keep politics out of industrial relations (a) because emergency boards would be picked by a nonelective official of government from a panel selected in advance by representatives of labor and industry and (b) because the President would be discouraged from attempting to arbitrate disputes himself.

(3) It would protect the public health and safety by providing a basis on which production would continue. Either party would, of course, be free instantly to start new proceedings for the purpose of determining what wages and working conditions would be put into effect at the end of the 6-month period.

How would the requirement that the two sides try out the recommendations of the emergency board be enforced? No individual, of course, could be compelled to perform service against his will. And it would be ridiculous to make striking a crime, as New Jersey has attempted to do. Unions or employers, however, could be required to rescind strike or lock-out orders, and interference with persons willing to work could be forbidden.

In addition, refusal of any employee to work under the conditions recommended by the emergency board could, if necessary, be treated as a termination of employment and

employers might be forbidden to rehire such persons except as new employees. Most important of all, however, would be the requirement that the employer maintain the wages and working conditions recommended by the emergency board and that he be forbidden to enforce other wages and conditions by a lockout or to concede other wages and conditions in order to end a strike.

Many persons will object to these proposals on the ground that under certain circumstances they would result in compulsory arbitration. Both trade-unions and a large part of American business are strongly opposed to compulsory arbitration. They assert that it would undermine self-government by employers and workers, plunge labor and management into politics, and threaten free institutions.

Although the proposed arrangements might at times result in compulsory arbitration, they would probably cause compulsion to be used less frequently than has been the practice in recent years. Furthermore, the procedure is so safeguarded that the usual objections to compulsory arbitration do not apply. The period for trying out the award of the emergency board is limited to 6 months.

Perhaps persons who object to compulsory arbitration of the limited sort here proposed may be able to suggest something better. Let us hope that they will do so. Objections to compulsion should not obscure the basic point that the Government must in some way be able to prevent interruptions to production which would imperil the public health or the public safety. To hold otherwise would be to argue that the right of employers and unions to settle their differences by a fight is more important than the public health and the public safety.

That is a proposition which no community can accept. Production cannot continue, however, unless there is a way of determining wages and working conditions. If the parties cannot agree on wages and working conditions and will not arbitrate them, then the Government or its representatives must fix them.

It is not enough to say that one is against compulsion. The crucial question is what procedure does one favor after negotiations have broken down and after refusal of the parties to arbitrate jeopardizes the public health and the public safety. That is the insistent question which requires an answer. The most constructive step that could happen in industrial relations would be for the organized employers and the trade-unions to cease merely telling the community what they are against and to join in proposing to the country constructive arrangements which will assure continuous production in essential industries.

Former Prisoners of War Are Expected To Provide a Field Day for Ambulance-Chasing Attorneys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and incensed at a situation which was brought forcibly to my attention at a hearing last week before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H. R. 1000, a bill sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and introduced by me to provide indemnification for former prisoners of war who were victims of brutality, starvation and inhuman treatment by Japan, Germany and Italy in violation of the Geneva Convention agreement on treatment of prisoners of war.

Veterans of Bataan, survivors of the infamous "death march" and Japanese "hell ships," and European prisoners of war related in a simple, undramatic manner the torture and suffering which they were forced to endure, and proved their unqualified eligibility for indemnification from these enemy nations. It was a shock, then, that we heard some of these former prisoners tell of a group of Washington attorneys who would capitalize on their sufferings by acting as agents on a percentage basis to handle their claims against these enemy governments. The witnesses further testified that the solicitation which they received offered the expert services of these attorneys to recover on these claims and influence legislation on their behalf for the modest fee of 15 percent of the amount recovered for the claimant.

Before introducing H. R. 1000 I was assured by the sponsoring organization, and by the other recognized veteran organizations, that they would file and process indemnification claims of former prisoners of war without one cent of cost to those veterans. I am certain that the Congress recognizes the services which these organizations are willing and able to render and from past experience is convinced of their integrity and sincerity in all matters affecting the welfare and rights of veterans.

It is immediately apparent that veteran organizations represent only one medium for filing and adjudicating, without cost, claims of former prisoners of war. Our own governmental agency, the Veterans' Administration, is experienced in this type of work and especially trained to handle such claims. General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, on several occasions has cautioned veterans against accepting offers from private individuals who would secure recovery of claims, obtain confidential information on deceased relatives or influence veterans' legislation for the particular client—all for a nominal sum.

In all legislation affecting veterans it has been the intent of Congress that veterans should receive the benefit of such legislation without cost. Expenditure of personal funds by veterans to retain private counsel for purposes of litigation or adjudication was never contemplated in any of the legislation which the Congress has enacted. I am certain that consideration of current and future bills will embody this same intent. It is evident, however, that certain individuals do not care to interpret this desire of Congress as an implied provision of legislation which we have or will enact.

Despite a flagrant violation of legal ethics by Messrs. George A. Nugent, Harold H. Martin, and other Washington authors of the solicitation which former prisoners of war testified as having received, these attorneys are legally unassailable and are considered as practicing attorneys of good standing and of excellent reputation. To substantiate this professional consideration, Mr. Nugent brazenly appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and frankly admitted having approached several of the veteran witnesses with a straight-forward, above-board business proposition.

To prevent a continuance or recurrence of a condition whereby fellow Americans, in evident clear conscience, can trade on the physical torture and mental cruelty suffered by former prisoners of war, I urgently recommend to the Congress that any legislation affecting these veterans specifically spell out the rights of claimants to obtain the cost-free services of veteran organizations, the Veterans' Administration, or any agency designated by Congress. I further recommend that it be prohibited, and so stated in the act, for any person or group of persons to accept financial consideration for filing, adjudicating, and recovering the indemnification claims of former prisoners of war.

Protecting the rights and interest of these and all veterans to the fullest extent possible by law is the obligation of Congress. We have evidenced recognition of this responsibility by our intent as expressed in past legislation. We must now insure adherence to this desire by spelling out in specific provisions our intent in all future acts.

We Must Have More Hydroelectric Power—Not Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week Arthur Goldschmidt, director of the Power Division of the Department of Interior, showed why we must have greater support for increased hydroelectric power in a graphic speech before the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association at Spokane, Wash.

About the same time the House of Representatives began its systematic reduction of the appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation, the Southwestern Power Administration, and for Bonneville. Under the bill passed by the House, not only will we be unable to increase our facilities for producing power, but we will not even be able to fully utilize the facilities that were so wisely provided by earlier Congresses. An adequate power supply is basic to the defense of our Nation and essential to the peacetime development of our agricultural, commercial and industrial strength.

I insert Mr. Goldschmidt's remarks in the RECORD in the hope that they may be read and heeded by Members of the Congress, in order that the short-sighted action of the House will not be finally sustained by the Congress:

I deeply appreciate the opportunity you have given me to talk to you about our joint

problems and joint undertakings in the development and disposal of electric power. There is hardly an area in this Nation where we do not have present or prospective associations in the power business—we as wholesalers and you as distributors of public power. The Department of the Interior, through its various agencies, is engaged in marketing power from existing dams and projects under construction in States comprising more than four-fifths of the Nation's area.

The department's combined power wholesaling job already involves more kilowatt hours than that of any other agency, public or private. Power demands throughout the areas in which we operate are forcing tremendous increases in this capacity. Throughout the 17 Western States, the Bureau of Reclamation is working on a program of multiple purpose water developments that will more than double its existing two-million-odd kilowatts of capacity within the next 6 years. In these States and eastward to the Atlantic, the Corps of Engineers is undertaking construction on water-control programs that will develop another million and a quarter kilowatts of power, or twice the capacity already installed in its dams. In the southwest the Corps of Engineers is doubling the capacity of the existing dams and has additional projects under construction. Here in the northwest scheduled additions to the Columbia River development required by the Bonneville Power Administration look to making available another 745,000 kilowatts of capacity and requirements indicate that another 1,500,000 will be needed by 1953.

The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are continuing their surveys for the multiple purpose development of the rivers of America and tremendous additions to the power capacity figures I have mentioned are in the making. Although these figures seem large, we can today, without fear of the ridicule of the past, ask: Will this be enough? Will these plans and projects, even if brought into production at the earliest possible moment, catch up with the tremendous power demands that are currently swamping us? Are our sights high enough?

The answer is simply that this is not enough. Neither our present nor our prospective power supply is adequate to maintain full production and full employment. In this Nation, power supply has become a basic factor in our way of life and in our ways of making a living. When we plan, authorize, and budget additional power capacity in the power business, we must take into account the planning, authorizing, and budgeting of our consumers. The millions of farmers that you represent and the millions more that you will come to represent, the householders, shopkeepers, businessmen, and industrialists are planning, authorizing, and budgeting for power consuming appliances and equipment. The result is that we have outgrown our plants. We threaten to outgrow our plans.

The total of consumers of the electric industry has risen to over 36,000,000. The average annual residential use of power has increased to 1,296 kilowatt-hours from 735 kilowatt-hours 10 years ago, an increase of 76 percent. We know that this figure is not a stopping point for here in Washington where abundant low-cost power has been available, the annual residential use is now about 3,000 kilowatt-hours. Business and industry are using more power than ever before. The Nation's primary aluminum load alone has increased from about 4,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1940 to the rate of about 10,000,000,000 annually today. This spring the Nation is consuming over 4,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours each week compared to 2,000,000,000 weekly 10 years ago.

These figures didn't just happen. They are not an accident. The tremendous increase in the use of electricity in our Nation has come about as a result of definite programs and policies intended to bring it about. We as a nation set out to make power widely available to the people under programs and policies designed for that purpose. The Congress undertook to encourage multiple purpose water conservation and development programs that would make large power supplies available at low cost. We undertook as a matter of national policy to get those power supplies to the people. We undertook to encourage wider rural electrification for the Nation's benefit. These policies have been consistent and interdependent. Low cost hydropower has made many of your projects feasible and low rates to consumers have made our projects pay out.

The power policies and programs thus undertaken in the past few years reflect the best of our American tradition in business, finance, and government. They were not particularly new when they were reenacted in the Bonneville and TVA Acts, the Rural Electrification Act, and the Flood Control Act of 1944. But in these and other acts the Congress supplied the missing ingredient—action. Congress authorized the jobs to be done and made the funds available to do them. Sound policies were backed up by concrete and steel, copper and aluminum, in dams and transmission lines. These policies and programs are a part of progressive American thinking, our desire to develop and grow, to build bigger and better and to greater purpose. The same policies that have brought about our greater use of power have been tested in business as well as Government with the same result. They constitute the dynamics of the American economy.

A great American who had much to do with these policies—in business rather than Government—died this month. He greatly affected the pattern of our industry, our thinking, and even our language. He believed in mass production and he knew that mass production required mass consumption. This simple truism and the logical extension of it in the fields of production techniques and pricing policies was the foundation of his unquestionably great contribution to the development of our country.

Henry Ford believed in cheap and abundant automobiles. He wanted to produce and to sell. He broke with the tradition of monopoly and of getting out of the consumer all that the traffic would bear. Instead of thinking in terms of investment, Henry Ford thought in terms of production. I'm not suggesting that he wasn't interested in making money or that he had some philanthropic notion of putting a steering wheel in each pair of hands. But he was interested in making money out of production rather than out of scarcity. And any businessman who follows that line of reasoning—and Ford proved it was profitable reasoning—automatically casts his lot with the consumer. That is the simple business basis of our Federal power policy. We believe in the development of abundant supplies of low-cost power and in making that power widely available to the people.

Henry Ford also set out to make low-cost cars before there was a sure market, before there were adequate roads, before there were people who knew how to run them. His action, and that of others who followed his pattern, created demand, created roads, created drivers, created the success of Henry Ford. This policy of not selling short on America's capacity for continued growth has also been the basis of the Government's program of placing generators in dams it was building for other purposes, and of carrying the power to prospective markets. Those generators and transmission facilities were ordered ahead of the market demand—and they created that demand. This bold move to build ahead of the market—ahead of predictions of power use, predictions based upon obsolete power sales theories and unsound rate practices, has turned out to be as good a business proposition for Uncle Sam as it was for Henry Ford. We are today selling all of the power that we can produce and are returning the cost of its production to the Government. We see no let-up in this demand.

Let me draw one further analogy. The Ford policy of mass production for mass consumption did not injure the automobile industry. He made the country car conscious and the spur of his competition was a driving force in the industry. Whether they derided his efforts or feared them, his competitors were benefitted by Ford's policies. Today the fruits of our power policies are meeting a similar test. The public power capacity of the Nation is larger than ever before and represents about one-fifth of the national capacity. According to the Edison Institute the profits of the private utility industry in 1946 rose to $685,000,000, increasing more than 20 percent over 1945. Never had publicly owned power been a larger percentage of the total power available in America—and yet never have the profits of the private industry been higher. Representatives of the private utility industry have ridiculed our progressive plans, complained of our accomplishments and have sought to hamstring our development. But in spite of their ridicule and anguish and lobbying against our efforts to increase power supplies at lower rates to the consumers, our programs are paying out and the private utilities are making profits.

The fact is that the bold development of power resources and the sound mass consumption pricing policies of public agencies have started a chain reaction in the development of the American power market. The current sharp upward trend in power demand is creating our most immediately pressing problem. Today, we can no longer build ahead of demand. Even if all agencies, public, and private, got together with the greatest combined effort, we could not meet present demands for power. To be sure, the shortage of material supplies to add new customers is in many cases putting off the day of reckoning on power supply. But the Nation as a whole is today operating its power system by heavy encroachments on its reserves. The combined national peak was 93 percent of the total dependable capacity of class I utilities in January. This means we had an average of only 7 percent reserves. Our output has been above wartime peaks for the last 6 months. Many important power areas are operating well above their net assured capacity. We are relying on luck. England's power experience this spring with unusual weather provides us with an example of the dangers and hardships that can result from relying upon inadequate power supplies.

We must as a Nation do everything in our power to catch up with ourselves and get on a sound basis of power supply. This country cannot defend itself without adequate power. We cannot, moreover, maintain a sound level of employment or business activity or even our standard of living without adequate power. We must not cynically rely upon the inevitability of recessions. Indeed, nothing short of a depression, with its toll of national insecurity and individual hardships can prevent us from hitting the ceiling of our power supply with serious repercussions, unless public and private agencies both buckle down to the task of getting every available kilowatt on the line as quickly as possible.

A short recession cannot solve our problem even if it were sound to count on it. Such a period would inevitably slow up the

private companies in buying new equipment. It would further tend to unbalance the Federal budget and make difficult the securing of funds for Federal expansion. By cutting consumption to the bone, a recession might give our utility systems a breather which would last only as long as the recession itself and from which we would emerge worse off than before. Even with the best of will, the bottlenecks in capacity to produce power machinery are omnious. Our three generator manufacturers can put out only about 12,500,000 kilowatts in the next 3 years. Increases in plant capacity, if they can be completed, may bring this up an other one and one-half millions by 1949. This must take care of all electrical capacity, including foreign orders. The excessively long delivery time of 27 to 39 months for power transformers and the shortage in distribution transformer manufacturing capacity and the difficulties of getting other materials add to our problem. It is evident that manufacturing capability must be increased.

Let us look down the next 10 years. Assuming the 4½ percent rate of growth in peaks that was experienced by our power systems from 1930 to 1939, a period that included a major depression, we will need 26,000,000 kilowatts of additions to our installed capacity to meet our peaks in 1957 without reserves. I am not using the so-called abnormal increase of more than 12 percent in the peak in the last year because I am developing a very conservative estimate. Assuming only 15 percent as average national reserve and our total requirements for 1957 will be 84,000,000 kilowatts. I have allowed for no retirements nor for the rate of growth we have experienced since the war. This must be our minimum target. The growths of this year and next cannot be met with adequate reserves—but we must plan to get upon at least this footing before our 10 years are up. This means that every kilowatt of Federal capacity now on order and every project having power potentialities must be hastened to completion as rapidly as possible.

For American industry cannot operate its electrical equipment on excuses—or even on reasons for power deficiencies. American farmers cannot electrify their farms on promises of more capacity.

Just what constitutes a shortage? There is never a meat shortage among vegetarians. Doubtless there are large areas in the world with a fraction of our own electrical capacity, where there is no bottleneck in power or transformers or consumers' equipment. But we cannot compare the power requirements of our highly complex economy with those of any other nation in the world.

When we ushered in the age of electricity, we moved down a road from which there is no turning back. Some people may prefer the good old days of the smoky lamp and the old oaken bucket and a few of them may be able to find these treasures in wayside antique shops. But there are not enough such lamps and buckets to go around and there are not adequate means of keeping them in use today.

This Nation needs and will continue to need more electric power than any comparable nation on earth for its day-to-day living. It needs more power for its day-to-day production. We use Coulee kilowatts here in the Northwest instead of coolie labor and there is no way to reverse this process of substitution. All the manpower in the region cannot replace electricity in the production of aluminum. Nor can manpower replace electrical power in the tremendous pumping operations on the irrigated lands in this area. We cannot replace machines with men and maintain our level of living or our national security.

I am aware that we have greater electrical capacity than any other nation in the world. But to a large degree our kilowatt strength is a measure of our weakness. A knight in full armor may have been able to win over a group of unprotected fighters. But he must depend upon the Percheron that was bred to carry him. We, too, are dependent upon our horsepowers and cannot maintain our production, our health, or our national security without them. We cannot take electricity from our homes, shops, and factories and switch it to other uses at a moment's notice or at all.

Our food habits, for instance, are based upon ample refrigeration in the home, in the markets, and in transportation—all requiring electricity. Our sanitary facilities are dependent upon electrically driven pumps for which there is now no substitute in most of our crowded urban areas. This requirement that we have power for our national health and security is not only true of our cities, although here it is a fact to an absolute degree. On the farm, the introduction of electricity has increased our capacity to produce manyfold—and we are dependent upon this increased capacity to produce. Moreover, any effort to move backward, even temporarily, to the use of other than electrical means of refrigeration, heating, cooling, water pumping, and cooking would require equipment that no longer exists or makeshifts for which there is not the manpower on our farms to operate.

So I think we can assume that electric power is here to stay. But if it is to do the job that only it can do, in providing the basis for a strong national economy, we must move ahead to install additional capacity as rapidly as it can be fabricated.

I believe that it is sound national policy to increase the production of public power in connection with Federal multiple-purpose water developments because those projects are conservative of our energy resources and provide other lasting and essential benefits to our people. I believe that it is sound national policy to increase the ratio of these public power installations to the total capacity of the country because under the policies that have been laid down by the Congress for their handling they provide an opportunity to develop undeveloped areas and afford a means for consumer protection on price and availability of power. But as much as I favor the continued development of publicly produced power for the long run, I believe even more strongly that our present task is to add kilowatts to our national capacity and I would not think of discouraging any development of additional electrical energy at this time—whether by steam, hydro, or diesel, by cooperatives, private utilities, or by public agencies.

We have reached a point where the necessity for more power production facilities overrides any other consideration. I hope that the utilities will bend every effort to increase their capacity. At the same time I consider that the attempts being made to delay or halt the progress of the cooperatives and the Federal Government to be dangerous in the extreme. The work of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, of Bonneville, of Southwestern, and of TVA is vital to supply the power requirements of our Nation.

I assume that the agreement reached by public and private utilities alike in this region, calling for more and faster Federal power facilities was motivated by a knowledge that this power is essential to the development of the Northwest and the maintenance of its agricultural, commercial, and industrial strength and is basic to the defense of our Nation. I suggest that the time has come for others in the utility business, public and private cooperative, to take a similar responsibility for the economic welfare and the security of our country and its people.

You have your share of the obligation to see that the Nation's power needs are supplied. You cannot fail to support increased production of hydroelectric power at Federal projects. This must be done in the interests of the farmer, the consumer, the worker, and the businessman. It must be done in the interests of our economic well-being and our national security.

Suggestion on Lowering Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 28, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a letter which I have received from my friend and constituent, A. J. Boudreau, of the New Drug Store, of Lake Charles, La., in respect to his suggestion as to how to lower prices. The letter follows:

THE NEW DRUG STORE,
Lake Charles, La., April 23, 1947.

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Of late I hear quite some discussions, especially in the press and over the radio, pertaining to the reduction of the high cost of living, and from all indications, even to the remarks of the President, it seems that the solution is for the retailer to start reducing prices on articles which he has had to pay prices above the average in order to obtain. It strikes me that an investigation by Congress into the vast amounts spent in radio advertising alone on commodities could be curtailed to a point whereby that would reduce the cost of merchandise a great deal. What price is paid by the manufacturers on radio programs and radio advertising? Compare that with the squawk of the union man's wages. How many union laborers do you think draw the salary that some of our spot programs pay to the entertainers. I think that a thorough investigation as to the amount of money spent on advertising of toothpastes, face powders, beautifying creams, cigarettes, tobaccos, and hundreds of others too numerous to mention could bring down that cost of these products to a level whereby a retrenchment would be made that would be justifiable and still very few people would be affected. I would like to see a just and impartial investigation along these lines, and then I feel that the source of price reduction could be started where it rightfully belongs.

Trusting the pleasure of an early reply. Everybody O. K. down here, working hard, and still hearing lots of fine remarks in your favor down in this city.

Regards to all.

A. J. BOUDREAUX.

Russia Indicted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 14, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit an article

from the Washington Daily News by Peter Edson which is self-explanatory. The article follows:

MORE CONCESSIONS TO RUSSIA?—TAKE A LOOK AT RECORD

(By Peter Edson)

May 8 will be the second anniversary of VE-day. In all that time the United States has been doing its darnedest to cooperate with Soviet Russia. The result—climaxed by the outcome of the Big Four Foreign Ministers' meeting at Moscow—has been pretty much of a large goose egg.

The record of American attempts to be pals is long as a telephone pole. It begins with $11,000,000,000 lend-lease aid furnished in wartime, and it runs through 72 percent—the United States share—of $250,000,000 UNRRA aid to White Russia and the Ukraine. Until this month it has been impossible to get Russia to even talk about making a settlement for lend-lease or extension of further credits.

REPULSED ON ATOM

The United States offer to share the secrets of atomic energy production and work out effective international controls was unprecedented in its generosity. It has met only obstruction.

Offers for closer cultural ties through exchange of students, professors, scientific and technical information have been repulsed. Offers to negotiate treaties settling economic and trade relations have likewise been repulsed.

To American eyes, war-torn Russia could have used this help. She spurned it, drawing back into isolation like a hibernating bear, exercising tight discipline over her people to turn them away from the West. Moreover, Russia has refused to allow her neighbors to be economically free. She apparently feared that if they were free they would be dominated by the West. By this action Russia has in effect alarmed the West against her.

CONCESSION AT YALTA

At Yalta the United States agreed to cession of the Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin to Russia. The United States agreed to recognize the independence of Outer Mongolia. The United States agreed to recognize Soviet interests in Manchurian railways and ports. The United States agreed to cession of eastern Poland to Russia.

At Potsdam the United States agreed to cession of northern East Prussia to Russia. The United States agreed to Polish administration of eastern Germany. The United States agreed to consider revision of the treaty governing control of the Dardanelles. The United States agreed to reparations for Russia from western Germany.

In drafting the United Nations Charter the United States made many concessions to the Soviet. The United States agreed to admission of White Russia and the Ukraine as full members to give Russia three votes. The United States gave in to Soviet ideas on the veto.

In the Council of Foreign Ministers, the United States agreed to Russian reparations from Italy. Concessions were made to the Soviet viewpoint on the boundaries of Trieste and Venezia Giulia. Recognition was given to Russian security interests in eastern Europe.

BLOCKED AGAIN

The United States even offered Russia a 40-year guaranty against German or Jap aggression. Russia has blocked this, and all other American, British, and French proposals for settlement of the Ruhr and reparations questions.

For over a year the Russians delayed the peace treaties with German satellite countries. At the Moscow Conference just closed the Soviet blocked completion of an Austrian treaty and the drafting of a German treaty.

In the four-power Allied Control Councils for governing occupied territories, the Soviet has bucked the organization of Germany, Austria, and Korea as economic units. Moreover, the Russians have removed vast quantities of capital goods from these areas and from Manchuria, further retarding their recovery.

RUSSIA RENEGED

Russia has failed to carry out her commitments. She failed to carry out free elections in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria. She has refused to talk about abuses in Hungary. She has encouraged Yugoslavia to obstruct policies not approved by Moscow. She has blocked freedom of navigation on the Danube.

In the United Nations the real lack of progress can be attributed principally to Soviet obstruction. Ten times the Soviet has used the veto. Work of the Military Staff Committee has been delayed interminably. The Russians have refused to join various UN subordinate organizations—the Food and Agriculture Organization, International Trade Organization, Aviation Organization, World Bank and Monetary Fund.

In the main, the Russians have used the United Nations as a sounding board for their propaganda, with complete disregard for real UN objectives. This propaganda, at home and abroad, has been a vicious, anti-American line.

The question is how anyone reading this record can still follow the Wallace line of offering Soviet Russia further concessions. In the past 2 years this policy has merely encouraged the Russians to hold out for more.

Resolution Adopted by National Association of Wool Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following resolution respecting the wool support program adopted by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers at its eighty-second annual meeting on April 22, 1947:

Whereas because of the increased cost of raising wool, the Government has, until April 15 of this year, given support to the wool growers of the United States by purchasing their wool through the Commodity Credit Corporation; and

Whereas there is now a bill before the Congress, designated as S. 814, to continue the support program through 1947 and 1948; and

Whereas an amendment to this bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may, in connection with this support program, levy an import fee up to 50 percent ad valorem on wool or products thereof that may be imported or withdrawn from bond or an equivalent floor tax on wool that may have been imported or withdrawn from bond and not processed at the time the import fee is imposed; and

Whereas we are opposed to such a provision for the following reasons:

1. This represents a delegation of tariff-making power to the Secretary of Agriculture. The members of this association have consistently opposed a similar delegation of tariff-making power to the Secretary of State under the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program.

2. The use of import fees and floor taxes would mean that the woolen and worsted manufacturers of this country would have to sell goods far in advance of the time they knew the cost of the raw materials they were to use therein. Although this material would be purchased by the mill on firm contracts many months in advance, the mill would not know its actual cost until the material had been put into process.

3. The imposition of import fees on imported wool would raise the cost of yarn and fabrics manufactured in the United States without a corresponding increase in the landed duty paid cost of imported yarns and fabrics, thereby vitiating the compensatory feature of the wool tariff and putting domestic manufacturers at a serious disadvantage in meeting competition from imported manufactured wool products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the unanimous opinion of the members of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, in convention assembled, that the proposed amendment providing for a delegation to the Secretary of Agriculture of authority to levy import taxes on imported wool is without merit, inflationary, unnecessary, and destructive of normal business, and that such a delegation of tariff-making power should be deleted from the wool support bill, S. 814; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the appropriate Cabinet officials, to Members of Congress and to other Government officials with a request that steps be taken to delete this import excise provision from any bill which may be adopted by the Congress or approved by the President of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of great satisfaction that I learned of the President's selection of Brig. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss as the Surgeon General of the Army, with rank of major general.

Aside from General Bliss' fine record as a soldier, he is a real physician—the patient comes first—exceptionally experienced and able. He knows, from first-hand experience, the problems which face our service medicos in the discharge of their duties.

Those of us who come from Massachusetts are proud to claim General Bliss as a native son, for he was born in Chelsea, Mass., on May 17, 1888, and received his medical degree at Tufts Medical School, Boston, later receiving a degree in surgery at Harvard and an honorary doctor of science degree at his alma mater, Tufts College. He lived for quite a time at Billerica in my own district. His sister still lives there.

His Army career has been a long and illustrious one. After his graduation from Tufts College in 1910, with the degree of doctor of medicine, he was com-

missioned a first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps in September 1911. He served on active duty until May 1913, when he was commissioned a first lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Regular Army. He was graduated from the Army Medical School, Washington, D. C., in June 1913.

After tours of duty at various stations in the United States and Hawaii, he entered the Harvard Medical School for a special course in surgery from August to December 1920. He remained at Boston for further clinical study and instruction at Harvard College, receiving the degree in surgery from Harvard in 1921. In October of that year he became executive officer of the Hospital Subdivision of the Veterans' Bureau at Washington.

Subsequent to World War I, General Bliss served as chief of surgery at Sternberg General Hospital, Manila, Philippine Islands, at Fort Sam Houston and at William Beaumont General Hospital, El Paso, Tex.

He was a military observer in London from September 1940 to January 1941, and became surgeon of the First Army and Eastern Defense Command in 1942. He was assigned as Chief of Operations, June 1943, and Assistant Surgeon General August 25, 1944, in the Office of the Surgeon General, Washington, D. C., serving in that capacity until his appointment as Deputy Surgeon General, January 1, 1946. He was made Assistant to the Surgeon General, February 1, 1946, with permanent grade of brigadier general.

General Bliss, who was awarded an honorary doctor of science degree by Tufts College in 1943, is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons. During World War II he made extensive tours of the Pacific areas, and later served as an observer at the atom bomb test at Bikini. He has just returned to Washington from a 2-month inspection trip through the European and Mediterranean areas.

General Bliss has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, French Legion of Honor, and the Award of the Italian Crown.

He will give superlatively good care to the soldiers.

No Private Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News of April 23, 1947:

NO PRIVATE AFFAIR

In the midst of Congress' debate of the proposed loan to Greece and Turkey there has been revealed the almost incredible story-behind-the-story of this country's $500,000,000 loan to China in 1942. Peter Edson, the NEA Service Washington correspondent who unearthed the story, could scarcely have picked a timelier moment to write it. For it provides a perfect object lesson in the unsound use of public funds.

The purpose of the Chinese loan was praiseworthy. Here was a brave, beleaguered ally fighting in the common cause. The fight was going badly, for China lacked food, clothing, and an abundance of modern war equipment. She also needed money to support a tottering financial structure and retain her entity.

It was to America's advantage, naturally, to keep China strong and fighting. But because of the Jap blockade the material requirements could not be supplied. As Mr. Edson says, "It was impossible to ship her anything but love and credit."

Details of this necessary transaction were vague. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek asked for the loan but wouldn't discuss how it was to be used until it was granted. President Roosevelt got congressional authorization to make the loan; then he and Harry Hopkins handled the deal themselves, with a later assist from Morgenthau, then Secretary of the Treasury.

China's Foreign Minister T. V. Soong listed seven broad purposes for which money might be spent. And the money was forthcoming. There were no strings attached. Discussion of repayment was deferred until after the war.

The upshot was that nine-tenths of this half billion went into a financial juggling act which was supposed to stabilize Chinese currency and retard inflation. It didn't work. The remaining tenth did go for consumer goods that China desperately needed.

In all, China received some $3,000,000,000 in assorted war aid from the United States. China stayed in the war. She deserved our help and got it. But did she use that help to the best advantage? Where is China today? And where are the $3,000,000,000?

Mr. Truman asks for $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey. Generalissimo Chiang wants another $500,000,000, already earmarked for China but not delivered. The purpose of these loans is praiseworthy, too. Greece and China are former brave allies. Their people are in need, and their Governments are insecure. The people are ripe for an imposed totalitarian rule if those Governments fall.

Mightn't it be well this time, however, to mix some crass, hard-headed business methods with idealism? The Government should tell its citizens, who are the source of its billions, how those billions will be spent. It should insist on assurances from debtor nations that those billions will be used wisely and for the greatest good.

The Members of Congress can and should read Mr. Edson's story and ponder its moral—that in an era of even nominal democracy the spending of public money is not the private affair of Government officials.

Legislation Before the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. McGARVEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently delivered by me:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be present at the first annual banquet of the Baltimore Avenue Business Men's Association, because it brings back memories of many years ago, when I was a resident of this neighborhood. Although I won't say how many years, I might mention the fact that your businesses flourish today in what was then open country.

As businessmen you are naturally interested in, and vitally affected by, the legislation now before the Eightieth Congress. After 14 years of a New Deal regime which sought by excessive taxation and one-sided labor laws to stifle the free enterprise system in America, a Congress has come into being which has in mind the interests of all the American people.

I would like to emphasize "all the American people" in order to refute those who claim that the Republican Party is the rich man's party, and that the measures passed by this Congress benefit only the rich. These people chose the income-tax bill as their particular target. Why, it is hard to say. This bill will not only reduce taxes, but will release a stream of venture capital from the upper income levels into the field of productive enterprise, resulting in more jobs at higher wages and a sustaining of consumer buying power.

As you know, the House last week passed a labor bill, designed to correct the many abuses which have resulted from the Wagner Act. This legislation, like the bill to outlaw the portal-to-portal pay suits, was necessary to protect both labor and management from the excess of union leaders.

And protection is what the American businessman needs at the present time in order to recover from the overwhelming effects of the war years and to survive the monopoly of industry which threatens smaller businesses.

The tariff is another obstacle which looms in the path of the American businessman. It is to be hoped that the members of the American delegation to the International Trade Conference in Geneva will remember that, while talk of free world trade sounds good and beautiful; in effect, any substantial lowering of the tariff rates would prove disastrous to both industry and labor. Since foreign goods are generally cheaper and produced at a much lower cost, the demand for American products would decrease and the skilled American laborer would find himself without work.

A nation's economic stability cannot be restored overnight. However, we of the Eightieth Congress, are trying to do our best in this direction. In January we voted to extend the excise tax. I do not favor this legislation, however, and it is my sincere hope that in the near future we shall be able to end this restrictive wartime measure. Many businesses from this locality have written to me about the excise tax, and I am glad to have this opportunity to say that you have my full sympathy in this matter.

As America returns once more to her normal prosperity, I hope to see again the country where all men are equal, where the so-called little man can, by hard work, attain success, and where his achievements are not penalized by excessive taxation.

MacArthur Bridge, St. Louis, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD

an editorial taken from the April 26 issue of the St. Louis Star-Times dealing with tolls on the MacArthur Bridge at St. Louis. The matter of tolls over this bridge is a hotly contested question in St. Louis at this time and this editorial raises a very interesting point which should be considered by all interested parties. The editorial follows:

ANOTHER PARTY TO THE FREE BRIDGE ISSUE?

A dispatch from the Star-Times Washington bureau yesterday called attention to the possibility the War Department could help St. Louis citizens free themselves from the tolls that are charged for use of their free bridge.

A legal test of the city administration's right to continue its claim on MacArthur Bridge as a source of easy revenue is before the Missouri Supreme Court. A ruling there in favor of the bridge users—represented by the Automobile Club of Missouri—should settle the question. Meanwhile, however, the War Department's interest in the bridge tolls is an aspect of the situation worthy of consideration. It directs attention to a policy of the Federal Government that has been flouted in the case of a bridge that was built with the understanding that it was to be and forever remain a free bridge. It offers an alternative procedure in the event the bridge fight is lost in the State courts.

Several laws have been passed giving the War Department power to regulate bridge tolls. The latest of these, enacted last year, establishes the principle that any bridge built over a navigable stream shall be a toll bridge only for the purpose of paying a reasonable return on the bridge debt and the maintenance.

This law further states that if tolls are charged for use of an interstate bridge by a city or other governmental subdivision, rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to pay for the bridge within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquisition or construction.

How the handling of MacArthur Bridge—the Free Bridge it used to be called—fails to square with this philosophy is well known. The bridge was built with the understanding it was to be free. In 1932, however, tolls were applied to pay off $8,200,000 in relief bonds, and because of the emergency that confronted the city, there was no serious objection. The relief bonds were retired in 1945, but the tolls continue, simply because here is a convenient source of revenue—legal or illegal—for the city's general fund.

As pointed out in yesterday's dispatch from Washington, the War Department will look into such situations if appealed to by a representative group. In the case of a municipally owned bridge at Hudson, Wis., a group of truckers complained against toll policy. A hearing was held by the Corps of Engineers, and the result is lower tolls for the next 6 months and the possibility of further changes at the end of that period. The Public Roads Administration has cited the bridge in Wisconsin as the No. 2 example of "improper public operation of a toll enterprise." The No. 1 example is none other than our own free (pay your tolls) bridge.

The autocratic attitude of the city administration, therefore, is not only out of line with assurances given when the construction bond campaign was launched in 1905. It is out of line with an established Federal policy, a policy which can and should be invoked if other efforts to give St. Louis a free bridge over the Mississippi do not succeed. In fact, there is no reason why a complaint should not be filed with the War Department while the court test is pending. This is a suggestion to the Automobile Club or to any of the many other organizations of users interested in making the "free" bridge truly free.

The Eighteth Congress and United States Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Michigan Committee for Displaced Persons, Rackham Auditorium, Detroit, Mich., April 28, 1947:

I will try to tell you something about the details of the subject of immigration policy in this Congress, but I am also here to ask you to do a job in seeing that we get action by this Congress.

We must first understand the size and nature of our problem. There are about 1,200,000 displaced persons in Europe, of whom about 850,000 are found in the United States zones in Germany and Austria and in Italy. These are the remains of the Nazi's slave laborers and the unhappy remnants of the martyred Jews of Europe. One-third of them are Poles, one-fifth Balts, and one-fourth Jews, with a sprinkling of white Russians and Ukranians. Seventy-five to eighty-percent are Christians—mostly Catholic.

In a speech I made on the floor of the House some weeks ago, I called this group the "walking dead of Europe." Anyone who has been to the DP camps knows the blackness of despair, the hopelessness which overwhelms these unfortunates. When we realize that the Jews who remain are the sturdiest survivors of the Nazi holocaust which wiped out 5,000,000 Jews in Europe alone, we realize the extent of our responsibility. These are the Jews of whom 75 percent long to go to Palestine, the doors of which have been shut against them—but more of that later. When we talk about immigration into the United States of refugees and DP's, we are not talking about overhauling our national immigration policy but only about liquidating our war obligations. These 1,200,000 refugees and DP's have no place to go back to or quite properly don't want to go back to where they came from. They represent about one-eighth of the total of 8,000,000 refugees and DP's who our forces found when they entered the enemy countries. The other 7,000,000 have been repatriated. These 1,200,000 are either in legitimate fear of persecution from communistic regimes which have taken over their former homelands for the most part—or if they are Jews, find it impossible to face the surroundings and the people directly responsible for obliterating millions of their brothers.

Two things are sought of the United States: First, the opening of its doors to enough immigration, within, and not outside of, the over-all existing quota of 153,789 persons per year to resettle its share of the refugees and DP's; and second, affiliation with the International Refugee Organization under the auspices of the United Nations. The latter will not cost us any additional money. On the contrary, it will help save us money. Yet until the public conscience begins to be awakened there will be all sorts of objections to this very elementary measure of justice.

Some people in the Congress are demanding that all immigration be stopped for 5 or even 10 years and others that immigration, already low in a country of 140,000,000 people which was built on immigration, should be cut in half.

We might pause here to ask, "Who are we to talk about immigration?" Are we not all descendants of immigrants? What is America if not a land built by immigrants? In the years 1880–1930 we admitted almost 30,000,000 immigrants. Never in recorded history has a Nation grown so great, so powerful, and so rich as we did in those 50 years. Was that bad?

During the war years despite our meager quota of 153,789 immigrants per year, hardly any immigrants could come here and we admitted 700,000 less than the quota figures. Some bookkeeping in heaven would certainly dictate that we now use this unused number of quotas to look after those who have been made so miserable by a cruel fate.

The greatest pressure on the national immigration quotas is from those in countries with very low quotas, while those countries with high immigration quotas have no one to send or have no one to send that we would let in. This is attributable to the heavy weighting of our quota system, based on the national origins of our population in 1920 according to place of birth, which gives large quotas to the northern and western European nationals and discriminates against the southern and eastern Europeans. The British quota, for example, is the largest of any, about 60,000 per year, yet almost 95 percent of it has been unused in the last 15 years. The German quota now is about 20,000 per year and is hardly used at all because the Jews of Germany have all left or been killed and the Nazis cannot get by the screening of our Army; but Poland with its 572,920 displaced persons has a quota of only 6,524 per year. At that rate it will take 50 years for even half the Polish displaced persons to immigrate to the United States. Under the Austrian quota it will take about 25 years to accommodate all of the DP's who want to enter the United States. The Estonian quota tops the list for under it, it would take 300 years to admit the Estonian displaced persons on Estonia's quota of 116 per year. Despite the desire of all these people to come to the United States, and although 153,789 quota immigrants are allowed annually, over 70,000 visas or almost 50 percent will go unused during the year 1946–47.

Obviously the question cries out for solution. You are anxious to know, I am sure, what can be done about it. The objection to immigration in the Congress is very great. I believe it is misguided; but it is so real that only the most powerful action from home communities like yours will check it and then it will be checked only in favor of a bill of a moderate character.

Three approaches to this type of legislation have been made by bills pending in the Congress and I would suggest yet a fourth.

The pending bills may be divided into three categories. Category No. 1 seeks the admission of a number of displaced persons and refugees equivalent to part of the unused quota numbers for the 2 years immediately succeeding the war or a variant of that time and is designed to admit 150,000 to 250,000 refugees and displaced persons over a 2-year period. Category No. 2 proposes the admission of certain types of artisans and specialists within limited numbers and particularly chosen because they can be beneficial to our Nation's economy. The numbers in this category are limited automatically by the qualifications. Category No. 3 proposes to admit an arbitrary number of displaced persons per year—the aggregate number to be well within the quota numbers unused during the war years. And the last category which I would suggest myself is the granting of authority to our Government to join in an international compact for absorbing the refugees and displaced persons within as many different countries as will agree to take them, the United States taking its share within the limitations of its unused quota numbers.

In the third category which I have listed—to admit a certain fixed number of displaced persons—is the Stratton bill, H. R. 2910.

Under this bill 400,000 displaced persons may be admitted during the four fiscal years following passage of the act at the rate of 100,000 or more per year but not more than 100,000 in the first year, 200,000 in the second year, 300,000 in the third year, and the remainder in the fourth year. Priority under the act would be given to relatives in the fourth degree of citizens of the United States and all persons who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States in World War I or II. It is noteworthy that this bill is sponsored by the Honorable WILLIAM G. STRATTON of Illinois. It is fitting that a midwesterner should sponsor this bill. The Midwest has sometimes been charged with holding aloof from active support of our assumption of an international position and responsibilities. But our fine meeting here tonight, the introduction of this excellent immigration bill by Mr. STRATTON, the unparalled position of leadership held by your own Senator VANDENBERG, in causing our country to play its full part in the world system of cooperation which is the United Nations, all demonstrate that the Middle West is coming into its own in United States foreign policy.

Of the bills already introduced I urge support of the Stratton bill. It advances a solution of the problem and it lends encouragement to other nations to take the same action—a result essential for the displaced persons and refugees to be absorbed and the problem ended. The bill calls for such minor addition to our population that they can have no ill effects, but will broaden and improve our culture and economy in the same way that we have experienced with immigration in the past. The bill does not expand our quota immigration system, but comes well within it in using up only a part of past unused quotas.

We must note that European countries such as Belgium, France, and Great Britain as well as other American Republics like Venezuela and Brazil have already taken in displaced persons and refugees. As recently as February, Venezuela, a small country, agreed to take in 15,000 European displaced persons, and Brazil has agreed to take 50,000 refugees, while Argentina has opened her doors to the new immigration of 100,000 Italians and Spaniards. Special agreements have been made by which Great Britain has taken artisans and other skilled workers, and the same is true of the other European countries named. These are strong indications of what will happen throughout the world if the United States, the leading nation in the world, once determines its immigration policy.

A panel of distinguished professors and researchers in the special field of immigration made a study called Economic Aspects of Immigration within the last 3 months. This study analyzes our past experience with immigration and shows that none of our important economic difficulties have ever been traced to immigration. The study concludes: "Eras of heavy immigration in our history have been eras of prosperity as well as of rapid expansion and have not been marked by any significant amount of unemployment."

No discussion of immigration as it affects refugees and displaced persons would be complete without consideration of the problem of Palestine. Here is a land hungry to receive the Jews of Europe with 600,000 of their coreligionists struggling to enable them to enter and with hundreds of thousands in the whole world ready to finance their resettlement. At one time provision can be made for 75 percent of the Jewish DP's to be resettled in Palestine, aside from other thousands of Jews in Europe whose only reason for living is for the day when they can see Palestine. I have been to Palestine. There is room for them there—ample room and a place for a peaceful and happy life if the United Nations of the world will but this once honor their solemn covenant with a people strong only in justice and not in armies and navies. A special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations met today to take up this problem. Let us pray for justice and, above all, for just action.

I also would like to draw your attention to a bill introduced by Senator IVES in the Senate and myself in the House, H. R. 2446, in which we seek to admit free of quota restrictions children under 14 years of age orphaned in this war who are to be adopted by citizens of the United States. The number of such children who could be admitted under the bill is unlikely to be very great, though I wish it were. Senator IVES and I estimate that it would not amount to more than 25,000 per year.

The primary objections to other immigrants do not apply to these children as they will not occupy the housing space and take the jobs of other Americans. They are too young for jobs and will move right into the homes of their foster parents as actual adoption is required before a child could be admitted under this bill. But the human and spiritual salvage value is enormous, for the bill saves and introduces into the freedom and advantages of this unique land children otherwise destined to languish in the ruins of Europe. It is indeed a priceless gift so easily within our bounty with no disadvantage whatever.

We have talked about the urgent need for an immigration policy which will resettle this martyred remnant of refugees and displaced persons, but what of their case in the meantime until we and other nations get around to resettling them, and what about help in resettlement?

The General Assembly of the United Nations, after a year's study, dealt with this problem on December 15, 1946, when it adopted the constitution of the International Refugee Organization. The IRO is designed to deal with the repatriation, resettlement, and interim care of the refugees and displaced persons and to take it out of the hands of any one nation. This happens to be an enormous boon to us for our refugee and displaced-persons camps have been under the direct jurisdiction of the Army, with UNRRA taking care of administration—but UNRRA is finished on the 30th of June and our military authorities have been aghast at the prospect of taking over the whole job. The IRO is the best way out for them and for us.

All of the United Nations are invited to become members of the IRO but it can get started when 15 have joined; those 15 to include the United States. So far 11 have joined and the United States has joined subject to the approval of Congress. Enough nations to enable the IRO to go ahead will surely come in, once Congress approves. Our commitment for the first year is about 45 percent of the IRO's budget or roughly in the neighborhood of $72,000,000. but this does not represent a new expense for us because we are now spending some eight to ten million dollars a month through our military services for the maintenance of refugees and displaced-persons camps in the United States occupied zones. In other words, we exchange a $72,000,000 contribution to the IRO for the headache of running displaced-persons camps at the expense of about $120,000,000 a year now. The Senate has already passed the necessary measure and it now awaits action in the House, where I hope it will be passed promptly. Time is very short now and the stake is very great.

I stated before that I would try to tell you what you could do about bringing to pass these measures on the immigration into the United States of a fair share of the refugees and displaced persons, the increase in admission of quota immigrants through existing laws and regulations, the passage of the bill to admit war orphans for adoption, the entry of Jewish displaced persons into Palestine and the confirmation of membership by the United States in the International Refugee Organization. You can best help in getting these measures effected by three courses of action: (1) Extensive educational campaigns through all media of press, radio, mail, meetings, and discussions which will disclose the facts to every citizen. It will amaze you to know how many citizens do not know the facts and believe that what is being attempted in measures like the Stratton bill is to open wide the doors of the United States to millions of immigrants from Europe as we did in the nineties and early 1900's. (2) To let your legislators know how you feel about these issues and to discuss them with your legislators. You should be very careful to recognize, however, that a legislator wants to learn the views of the whole community before he acts and therefore is not being arbitrary if he does not go along with you until he gets an opportunity to see how the whole community feels about the subject. (3) To be sure that those refugees and displaced persons who do come in under our existing immigration laws are settled in the community agreeably, harmoniously, and without any dislocation to other citizens. This is truly a program of action by which you, with your own means, may assure the success of all our efforts.

Let us now consider the whole immigration situation in the light of our foreign policy. The United States enjoys the highest moral credit of any nation in the world today. Any cause for which we plead has the sympathetic consideration of the majority of the nations of the United Nations. The maintenance of this position of leadership in the world gives us the opportunity of attaining a century of peace from today through the effectiveness of the United Nations, but it also involves the responsibility that we shall participate in the solution of the world's problems and take our share of the world's burdens. One of the most plaguing problems of the postwar era and constantly a stark reminder of the imprint of war are the refugees and displaced persons. We must take our share of this responsibility and in good season.

We are also engaged today in considering a great problem of foreign policy of aid to Greece and Turkey. Why do we consider it? It is primarily to protect the forces of individual freedom and the security of a private economy in a world endangered by the suppression of the individual and the deification of materialism. It is noteworthy in all the discussion before the United Nations about the refugees and displaced persons that the Soviets insist that every one of them must be repatriated—that even if a displaced person legitimately believes that he would be persecuted if he returned to his country of origin due to his political beliefs, or if a Jewish person—that he cannot face a land where he has lost every relative and friend in gas execution chambers or lime-filled freight cars—he still must go back where he came from. Our ideology commands that no man, under such conditions, should be made to go back, and I hope the U. S. S. R. will come around to the same conclusion with us one day.

But the triumph of our ideas, their humanity and justice, is not demonstrated by stating them alone, but by showing that we have the will and ability to care for these unfortunates and to resettle them elsewhere. In the measure that we solve this problem with efficiency and justice will we be judged in our ability to solve the greater problems of world peace, security, and individual freedom.

Jackson Heights Merchants Association, Long Island, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Monday, April 28, issue of the Long Island Star-Journal. This article points out the sound approach of the Jackson Heights merchants to bring prices down. It follows:

QUEENS MERCHANTS LEAD IN PRICE CUT PROGRAM

Queens is taking the lead today in following the so-called Newburyport plan to reduce prices by at least 10 percent. The Jackson Heights Merchants Association has announced a plan of its own beginning Wednesday which will drive prices down even further.

Alfred M. Berger, president of the association, has announced that the 250 merchant members serving an estimated population of 100,000, will "cut back prices to what they think is normal."

The price slashes are expected to range from 10 to 50 percent, depending on the type of merchandise.

"We have told the wholesalers and manufacturers of our plan and with their cooperation, the plan will be extended indefinitely," Berger stated.

He explained that the move was made because the Jackson Heights merchants do not believe a flat percentage decrease has the same relative importance for all types of merchandise, and therefore this scheme was adopted to bring prices down to their true values.

High Time To Stop Kidding Ourselves About Communism and To Look the Facts in the Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paterson Evening News, Paterson, N. J., which appeared on April 15, 1947:

HIGH TIME TO STOP KIDDING OURSELVES ABOUT COMMUNISM AND TO LOOK THE FACTS IN THE FACE

The basic fact about which public knowledge must be aroused is that communism is a world movement directed from a single center in Moscow.

The purpose of that movement is to overthrow every capitalist, socialist, and democratic government in the world.

Abolition of the Comintern merely transferred its direction to the central committee of the Communist Party in Russia.

The great social war which Lenin declared has been going on for 30 years. Stalin and Trotsky split not over the ultimate goal of world revolution, but over the tactical point of timing.

We are confronted in this country today by the advance guard of Communist infiltration and termitism.

As a matter of self-preservation, we have the right—and if we are not completely insane we shall exercise it—to meet this challenge by every legal expedient at our command.

J. Edgar Hoover is in a position to know more than any other American about subversive activities in this country.

As Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation he smashed every Nazi sabotage plan before it could get started. At the same time he kept an eye on Communist sabotage efforts during the early months of the war, when Stalin and Hitler were pals.

The Communists, according to the FBI officials, were even then so widely infiltrated in our labor unions that, if Stalin and Hitler had not split, this country would have been faced with an uncontrollable wave of sabotage against production and national defense.

When, therefore, J. Edgar Hoover tells the House Committee on Un-American Activities that American Communists constitute a "fifth column," doing Moscow's bidding he knows what he is talking about.

The Communist Party in the United States is better organized, testified Mr. Hoover, than the Nazi "fifth columns" were in Europe before the war. Then he added:

"Communism in reality is not a political party. It is a way of life—an evil and malignant way of life."

The dangerous element in the Communist Party here and abroad has been drilled and disciplined in deception. When cornered it denies any connection with the movement to which it is dedicated.

Anyone who got up in the Red Square in Moscow and advocated democracy, as we understand the word, would be promptly shot or whisked off to a "correction camp" and worked to death.

The Communist Party in Russia does not tolerate subversion as we do.

Whether or not the advantages of outlawing this movement would outweigh the disadvantages is now being debated throughout the country. A good many people believe that it is dangerous folly to allow the Communist Party to take advantage of the Bill of Rights in order to plot destruction of our form of government.

A good many others share Mr. Hoover's fear of making martyrs of Moscow's agents and their dupes. They fear, too, that outlawing the CP would "drive communism under ground."

Communism already is underground in this country, as well as above ground. The menace is not from Communist Party members, who go around showing their cards, but from those who conceal their membership, and take their orders secretly from the hundreds of NKVD agents working in our midst.

Were it possible, all Communists might be forced to wear labels so that they could be publicly known for what they are.

Whether our own form of government can long survive the tolerance shown in the past to Communist activities right under our noses is a moot question.

Any attempt to restrain these activities is immediately met by the cry of "witch hunt" or "Red baiting." When the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the dismissal from the War Manpower Commission of a member of an out-and-out Communist organization, the appellant's counsel accused the Court of joining in a witch hunt. That is Communist technique.

The bill in Congress to outlaw the Communist Party may not indicate the wisest course to be taken to meet this menace.

Yet the hearings on it serve the useful purpose of attracting public attention to a movement that has heretofore received all too little informed notice. The people do not want emotionalism. They do want the facts.

The Communists work throughout the world under many different party names. They outlawed their own party here by changing it to an association when Russia entered the war. Then, when the war ended, they cropped up again as an American political party.

The mere outlawing of their official organization would still leave their agents and dupes to carry on their intrigue and propaganda through American-Soviet Friendship and hundreds of similar fronts and transmission belts.

Inequalities and Secondary Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me with reference to H. R. 156, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds in order to assist in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities in elementary and secondary schools, introduced by me and pending before the Committee on Education and Labor:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it has always been my belief that the financing of education is a responsibility of the local community and the States. In my opinion, any departure from this practice must be examined carefully lest the Nation's schools, like schools in so many unfortunate lands, be brought under the control of some centralized bureau of government.

I know that voluminous evidence will be presented to the committee for the purpose of showing that an inequality of educational opportunity exists among the States. But we must not be too hasty in jumping to the conclusion that inaction by the Federal Government is the principal cause of this inequality. In the very States which are requesting aid from the Federal Government there are inequalities of educational opportunity within the States themselves. I should think that States which have amassed huge surpluses in their State treasuries would spread this money through the State so that more children, especially those in rural areas, would have an opportunity for a decent education. Certainly the States should examine their own methods of educational finance before they plead to the Federal Government for aid. However worthy may be the States' requests for Federal aid, they must be considered in light of the Federal Government's stupendous national debt, and in light of the catastrophe which would befall our country if the Federal Government were to fail in its interest payments to its debtors.

Nevertheless, I realize that there is an emergency in American education at the present time. Thousands of public-school teachers are leaving the profession to take other jobs which pay a just wage. As a result, many school boards have been forced to hire incompetent teachers who lack both talent and training for the important task of training our citizens of the future. Experts tell me that immediate salary increases must be granted to teachers or else our Nation will face its worst educational crisis in

the history of American education. I'm proud to say that my State of California has enacted a minimum-wage law for teachers requiring a beginning wage of not less than $2,400 a year.

As far as I can determine, there's no way for the Federal Government to demand that the States spend more money for their schools. Hence, we are faced with the fact that unless the Federal Government grants some money to the poorer States, particularly those in the South, thousands of American children, through no fault of theirs, will be deprived of an opportunity for an adequate education. I have too much affection for our young people, and too much understanding of the national disaster which would result from an unintelligent citizenry to permit these children to go through life without the advantages of a good education.

Once I made up my mind, and I reached the decision reluctantly that Federal aid to education was necessary despite the risks involved, I looked for a pattern of Federal aid legislation which would be acceptable to all interested groups. I studied carefully the Senate report accompanying S. 181 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. I understand that the information in this report was compiled by experts in educational administration and finance, and that the specific recommendations in the report are the fruit of much hard work by a subcommittee of the Senate which heard a great many witnesses present extensive testimony on the Federal aid question.

Therefore, my bill, H. R. 156, follows the pattern suggested in this report. Federal control over the school curriculum, the selection of teachers, and methods of instruction is expressly prohibited. The bill restricts aid to the poorer States according to a formula which correlates total child population, State-wide average income and effort to support schools. I understand that only 25 States would receive funds under this formula. The bill requires State-wide equalization so that 4 years after the act is in effect, at least $40 will be spent for every child in the schools of the State. Perhaps this amount should be raised to $50. Perhaps, too, my bill might be amended so that a large percentage, if not all, of the funds would be earmarked for raising the salaries of classroom teachers in the public schools.

One section of the Senate report which attracted my attention was a bipartisan separate statement of views. I think that every member of the committee should read this statement carefully. It sets forth a practical solution for a problem which has disturbed the Congress for some time and proposes a reasonable plan for working out a Federal aid bill which is so fair that it should appeal to all persons sincerely interested in the educational welfare of the Nation's school children.

With the committee's permission, I'd like to quote a few important sections of this statement. It says: "A functional democracy makes it possible for many people to do the same thing in different ways. Consequently, the Federal Government should not discourage in any way the different activities of several kinds of schools, all of which are devoted in various ways to the common purpose of producing the good citizen. To the degree that the nonpublic school is directly or indirectly suppressed or discouraged in the attainment of its purpose, to that same degree does education become the potential tool of a totalitarian state."

I think that the principle just stated is more important. It recalls to mind the famous decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Oregon case in which the Court held that the State could not force parents to send their children to public schools. The Court declared, "The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instructions from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

In another section the statement says, "In spite of evidence to the contrary, some people sincerely fear that Federal aid to church-controlled schools would bring about the union of church and state. We have considered this problem very carefully, and we have concluded that such a fear is groundless. If it were not, we would be the first to oppose such aid. Another tenet of our democratic belief which we hold to be just as sacred and important as the separation of church and state is that of freedom of religion. Such freedom should not be limited by imposing, in effect, certain penalties on those who faithfully carry out the practice and teachings of their religion. In this connection, also, we must recognize that the Government does not wish to supplant the duty of parents in the instruction and training of their children, but merely wishes to supplement and facilitate it."

It seems to me that this quotation expresses the American theory of separation of church and state. And I certainly hope that the committee will not accept any other theory such as one which would deprive children of governmental benefits, particularly in the line of service, such as transportation, nonreligious textbooks, health, and welfare services, simply because they attend parochial schools.

My bill simply incorporates into several of the bills pending before the committee, and directly into Mr. McCowan's bill, the amendment proposed in the separate statement of views. The formula in my bill requires the State to count all the children, 5 to 17, regardless of whether they attend public or nonpublic or no school. The Federal Government has a duty towards all children, not merely towards those in public schools. Now if a State is to count all the children, then it must see to it that all the school children in the State are made eligible as beneficiaries of the Federal Government's aid.

I think of the State governments as a trustee for Federal funds which must be spent according to the provisions of the Federal Constitution and the Federal law. Now if a State government is permitted by law to disburse Federal funds to both public and nonpublic schools, it should do so. I understand that 20 States are so doing in the National School Lunch Act. If a State is not permitted by law to disburse Federal funds to nonpublic schools, then the Federal Government should withhold a pro rata share of the States' allotment for direct distribution to such schools None of the funds alloted to nonpublic schools would be used for paying the salaries of teachers in nonpublic schools. I understand that this restrictio is acceptable both to labor and to the large nonpublic school interests. Under the provisions of my bill, therefore, States' right are protected, and at the same time the Federal Government adheres to its traditional policy of equity toward all schools both public and nonpublic. If there is some amazement at the idea that Federal funds should be granted for at least the indirect aid of nonpublic schools, may I cite a remark in the separate statement of views:

"Under the terms of the GI bill our National Government will pay millions of dollars in tuition fees to privately controlled schools. It appears that a Congress which has agreed to pay a veteran's tuition to a privately controlled school should not hesitate to grant aid or service to a similar school to which he chooses to send his children."

Let there be no misunderstanding. I do respect States' rights in education. I do believe that the State and not the Federal Government should set educational standards and should supervise in a general way the schools within the State. But State control of education does not mean that the Federal Government must bring its educational legislation into conformity with the antisectarian prohibitions in State constitutions which are not found in the Federal Constitution. The Federal Government must not be partial to either the public or nonpublic schools. It must treat both fairly.

I am told that under my bill about $242,500,000 would go to the public schools and only $7,500,000 to the nonpublic schools. I shall be disappointed if our educational leaders refuse to endorse my bill simply because of this little recognition to the nonpublic schools.

I'll tolerate Federal aid, but only on condition that Federal aid legislation is fair to all needy American school children.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, each week Congress has been in session for the last 4 years or more I have given my constituents a report over the radio about legislative developments in Washington, D. C. These broadcasts are over Stations KWTO and KGBX at Springfield, Mo., and KDRO at Sedalia, Mo. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address which I made over KDRO and KGBX, Saturday, April 19, and on KWTO, Sunday, April 20. This speech is on the subject of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 which passed the House by a vote of 308 to 107:

LABOR'S NEW BILL OF RIGHTS

Fellow citizens, the work of the House of Representatives in the past week was almost wholly concerned with passage of H. R. 3020, the Hartley labor bill. Passage of this bill represents another pledge which the Republican Congress is keeping with the people. Other pledges on which the House has recently made good include a balancing of the budget, reduction of the national debt and bureaucracy, driving Communists out of the Government, and passage of a tax-reduction bill. Today I will give you a report on the labor bill.

The purpose of this bill is to be found in the language of its preamble, which I quote as follows:

"To prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes."

Of course, fellow citizens, it will not be possible for me in these few minutes adequately to cover all of the arguments and points about this bill which were discussed

for four full days by the House last week. I will cover the main points. If you wish further information your Congressman, on request, will be glad to send you a copy of the bill, together with the committee report on it containing both the majority and minority views. If you want copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of the debates your Congressman can probably get them for you, too.

I want to say a few words now about the necessity for legislation of this kind. During the last few years, the effects of industrial strife have at times brought our country to the brink of general economic paralysis. Employees have suffered, employers have suffered, and above all the public has suffered. The enactment of comprehensive legislation to define clearly the legitimate rights of employers and employees in their industrial relations, in keeping with the protection of the paramount public interest, is necessary. The bill, H. R. 3020, does just that. It prescribes the rights of all parties having a stake in harmonious industrial relations and requires that each party respect the rights of others.

The House by its action last week indicated its belief that enactment of the bill will have the effect of bringing widespread industrial strife to an end, and that employers and employees will once again go forward together as a team united to achieve for their mutual benefit and for the welfare of the Nation the highest standard of living yet known in the history of the world.

During the 6 years preceding enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, the United States had an average of 753 strikes a year, involving an average of 297,000 workers; during the next 6 years 2,541 strikes per year involving an average of 1,181,000 workers and during the next 5 years—that is through 1944—3,514 strikes a year, involving an average of 1,508,000 workers. In 1945 approximately 38,000,000 man-days of labor were lost as a result of strikes. And that total was trebled last year when there were 115,000,000 man-days lost and the number of strikes hit a new high of 4,985. The resulting loss in national wealth is staggering. These figures do not take into consideration the man-days lost as a result of the indirect effects of these strikes.

In face of this record, there are few who would have the temerity to assert that labor relations in the United States are today satisfactory. The American people, and their representatives in Congress, are insistent that some means be found by legislation to reverse this alarming trend and to bring about industrial peace.

The bill passed by the House last week is really a bill of rights both for American workingmen and for their employers. For the last 14 years, as a result of labor laws ill-conceived and disastrously executed, the American workingman has been deprived of his dignity as an individual. He has been cajoled, coerced, intimidated, and on many occasions beaten up and murdered in the name of the splendid claims set forth in section 1 of the National Labor Relations Act, sometimes known as the Wagner Act. His whole economic life has been subject to the complete domination and control of unregulated monopolists. He has on many occasions had to pay them tribute to get a job. He has been forced into labor organizations against his will. At other times when he has desired to join a particular labor organization he has been prevented from doing so and forced to join another one. He has been compelled to contribute to causes and candidates for public office to which he was opposed. He has been prohibited from expressing his own mind on his own employment. He has frequently against his will been called out on strikes which have resulted in wage losses representing years of his savings. In many cases his economic life has been ruled by Communists and other subversive influences. In short, his mind, his soul, and his very life, have been subject to a tyranny more despotic than one could think possible in a free country.

The employer's plight has likewise not been happy. He has witnessed the productive efficiency in his plants sink to alarmingly low levels. He has been required to employ or reinstate individuals who have destroyed his property and assaulted other workers. When he has tried to fire Communists he has been prevented from doing so by the National Labor Relations Board. He has seen the loyalty of his supervisors and forcme undermined by the compulsory unionism imposed upon them by this Board. He has been required by law to bargain over matters which were economically impossible for him to agree to, and when he refused to agree has been accused of failing to bargain in good faith. He has been compelled to bargain with the same union that bargains with his competitors and thus to reveal to his competitors the secrets of his business. He has had to stand helplessly by while employees desiring to enter his plant to work have been obstructed by violence, mass picketing, and general rowdyism. He has had to stand silent while irresponsible detractors slandered, abused, and vilified him. His business, on occasions, has been virtually brought to a standstill by disputes to which he himself was not a party and in which he himself had no interest. And, finally, he has been compelled by the laws of the greatest Republic with the most democracy in the world, or at least by their administrators, to treat his employees as if they belonged to another or different class or caste of society. This sordid story was unfolded before the Labor Committee in 3 months of hearings during which all sides were given opportunity to be heard, and over 2,000,000 words of testimony for and against the bill was recorded on 3,600 pages of the printed hearings. The Wagner Act was passed after only 3 days of consideration. It was a rubber-stamp measure written by the administration and rammed through Congress. In contrast, the bill last week had 3 months of hearings, 4 days of debate, and was under an open rule on the floor, which means that any Member could propose amendments to it and that the debate on it was unlimited.

This bill, which is now pending before the Senate, attacks the problem in a comprehensive, not in a piecemeal fashion. It is neither drastic, oppressive, nor punitive. It does not restrict or in any manner interfere with employees' rights to organize and to bargain collectively when they wish to do so. It does not restrict in any way employees' rights to engage in lawful strikes. It does not take away any rights guaranteed by the existing National Labor Relations Act except where unions violate the law. It does not even apply to railroad workers who have their own successful system known as the Railway Labor Act, passed by a previous Republican Congress and which has, by mediation, almost eliminated railroad strikes, there having been only one in many years. The bill was written by the Congress and not by the CIO or the bureaucrats. It is not an antilabor bill.

In the year 1215, at Runnymeade, England, King John delivered the Magna Carta, surrendering to the British Barons sovereign power. In 1789, the Constitution of the United States gave to the common people of our country their Bill of Rights. History repeats itself. In 1933 the New Deal brought forth the National Labor Relations Act, rightly called another Magna Carta, and by it surrendered to the labor barons sovereign powers over the working man and woman of the United States. This year the Congress gives to these working men and women their bill of rights. It gives them at least 18 rights they have not had before. And the bill itself contains 20 major provisions.

As time will now permit I will list these provisions and rights for you. And I remind you that for the asking your Congressman will send you detailed and official information on the subject.

The new bill of rights for labor and the public puts an end to the business of the National Labor Relations Board being both judge and prosecutor. It outlaws the closed shop and monopolistic industry-wide bargaining. It gives both parties to a labor dispute the obligation to bargain and a secret ballot for workers. It eliminates Communists from jobs as officers of unions. It outlaws sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes, illegal boycotts, sit-down strikes, strikes against Government, mass picketing, and other forms of violence designed to prevent individuals from entering or leaving a place of employment. It outlaws picketing of a place of business where the proprietor is not involved in a labor dispute with his employees. It subjects unions to provisions of the antitrust or monopoly laws. It gives the employer and worker free speech. It makes labor organizations equally responsible with employers for contract violations and provides for suit by either against the other in United States district courts. It provides a means for stopping strikes which imperil or threaten to imperil the public health, safety, or interest. This bill gives the worker the right to know how much money his union has, how much it pays its officers, and how much of the union's money the officers use for their expenses. It gives the worker the right, without fear of reprisal, to support any candidate for public office that he chooses and to decide for himself whether or not his money will be spent for political purposes. It gives the worker the right to go to and from his work without being threatened or molested, and the right to have a fair hearing before an impartial board, without cost to himself, whenever he believes that any employer or union is depriving him of these rights. It outlaws racketeering under the guise of legitimate union activity.

The professional labor leaders, those who make their living by working the worker, don't like this bill very well, but the common workingman and the general public, as indicated by the Gallup poll of public opinion, are strongly for such a measure to put labor and management on an equal footing before the law, with neither above the law. That is in the American tradition.

The Senate will pass the House bill, with slight modification, and then it will be up to the President to say with his signature or a veto whether or not it shall become law. Last year he vetoed the Case bill, which was similar in character. Since that time, however, conditions have grown steadily worse and the time has come to determine which is the bigger, the CIO unions or the union of the United States of America.

That's all for today. Thanks for listening.

Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein quotations from outside groups which have studied oper-

ations of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs:

COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS

Concluding paragraph of the report of the special committee appointed by the American Society of Newspaper Editors to study the overseas information activities of the Department of State (quoted from Editor and Publisher, December 14, 1946), the committee, by unanimous vote, presents this final conclusion:

"The present uncertainties in international relations justify an effort by the United States Government to make its activities and its policies clear to the people of the world through the agency set up in the State Department. Your committee recognizes, however, the dangers inherent in Government dissemination of news and suggests that the society appoint a special committee to review at intervals the work of the State Department agency and make its findings available to the membership."

Respectfully,

N. R. Howard, Chairman, Editor, Cleveland News; George Cornish, Managing Editor, New York Herald Tribune; Oveta Culp Hobby, Executive Editor, Houston Post; Edwin L. James, Managing Editor, New York Times; Ben M. McKelway, Associate Editor, Washington Star; Hamilton Owens, Editor, Baltimore Sun; Benn Reese, Managing Editor, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Gideon Seymour, Executive Editor, Cowles Newspapers, Minneapolis.

From a group who were associated with Government overseas information work during the war, who are now with private information agencies, and who volunteered this statement:

The signers of this statement were associated in one way or another with the Government's effort to combat enemy propaganda during the war. * * * What had to be faced and counteracted during the war was the fact that for 20 years the American people and their institutions were misunderstood, deprecated, and defamed. * * * Today even that inadequate program (State Department's International Information program) is threatened. * * * An effective foreign policy is inseparable from an alert overseas news and information program. * * * Our policies are being deliberately misinterpreted or innocently misunderstood throughout much of the world * * * a United States Government program costing $50,000,000 a year to help win the peace would not seem excessive, although the State Department has only requested half that amount. * * * What is needed is an intelligent and dynamic expansion of the State Department's overseas program, rather than an ill-considered and costly retreat.

Edward Barrett, Editorial Director, Newsweek Magazine; Thurman L. Barnard, Vice President and General Manager, Compton Advertising Agency; Simon Bessie, Harper Brothers Publishing Company; Norman Cousins, Editor, Saturday Review of Literature; Louis G. Cowan, Louis G. Cowan Co. (Radio Productions); Harold Guinzberg, President, Viking Press; C. D. Jackson, President, Time-Life International; James Line, Publisher, Time Magazine; Tom Malley, Associate Editor, Newsweek Magazine.

Digest of Earnings Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, you need consumer buying power to maintain profits. I have pointed out again and again that the buying power of the mass of the American people is not sufficient to maintain the kind of profits indicated in this report of the Wall Street Journal.

If decisive action is not taken by this Congress, we are headed for grave trouble. Punitive labor legislation is not the answer.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following Digest of Earnings Reports which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 18, 1947:

DIGEST OF EARNINGS REPORTS

A summary of corporation earnings reports published today by the Wall Street Journal appears below. Further details on the reports of the larger and more widely held companies appear elsewhere in this issue or in the case of a few reports received just at press time, will appear in tomorrow's issue. Unless otherwise noted, Federal taxes have been deducted in arriving at net income. When available, comparisons with the corresponding period of the previous year are shown—Thursday, April 24, 1947:

Company	Period	Net income		Earnings per common share	
		1947	1946	1947	1946
Acme Steel Co	Mar. 31, quarter	$2,055,118	$679,329	[1] 2.09	$0.69
Alabama Power Co	12 months, Mar. 31	7,167,474	6,009,996		
American Chicle	Mar. 31, quarter	1,124,700	746,131	2.60	1.72
American Hide & Leather	9 months, Mar. 31	1,323,445	257,413	2.00	.17
Do	Mar. 31, quarter	598,084	70,389	.93	.03
Atlas Imperial Diesel Engine	Feb. 28, quarter	55,869	71,675	.14	.16
Autocar Co	Mar. 31, quarter	1,326,253	521,159	[2] 2.37	[1] 1.01
Babbitt (B. T.) Inc	do	506,925	769,429	.50	.75
Barnsdall Oil Co	do	1,664,542	1,022,406	.75	.46
Belding Heminway Co	do	248,413	177,135	.60	.43
Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania	12 months, Mar. 31	13,459,657	11,051,918		
Bethlehem Steel Corp	Mar. 31, quarter	16,090,426	4,804,438	4.84	1.06
Black & Decker Manufacturing	6 months, Mar. 31	845,407	835,050	2.17	2.14
Brunswick-Balke Collender Co	Mar. 31, quarter	260,485	36,639	.50	.01
Butler Brothers	do	[2] 542,098	613,296		.44
Corn Products Refining Co	do	5,198,944	[2] 1,068,470	1.89	
Eastern Corp	Mar. 31, quarter	326,388	111,861	.96	.33
Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	12 months, Mar. 31	5,389,384	4,943,841	[2] 11.44	[2] 10.25
Freeport Sulphur	Mar. 31, quarter	776,438	1,057,429	.97	1.32
Florence Stove Co	do	336,141	[2] 254,910	.97	
General Foods Corp	do	[4] 5,446,075	4,644,274	.98	.83
Georgia Power Co	12 months, Mar. 31	6,783,642	6,035,659		
Gimbel Brothers, Inc	Year, Jan. 31	[5] 13,418,851	[5] 5,749,283	6.46	[6] 2.50
Hecht Co	do	3,324,928	1,786,833	4.20	2.09
Houdaille-Hershey Corp	Mar. 31, quarter	836,065	[2] 269,002	.93	
International Railways of Central America.	do	1,013,757	705,623	[7] 10.14	[7] 7.06
Iowa Southern Utilities Co	12 months, Mar. 31	535,478	366,274		
Keystone Steel & Wire	9 months, Mar. 31	3,434,350	1,351,370	[1] 5.58	[1] 1.78
Keystone Steel & Wire	Mar. 31, quarter	1,342,814	528,901	[1] 2.18	[1] .69
Lehigh Valley R. R	do	301,935	[2] 20,351		
Mack Trucks, Inc	do	1,380,759	411,658	2.31	.69
National Cash Register Co	do	2,373,669	[2] 343,206	1.46	
Do	12 months, Mar. 31	6,068,091	1,234,337	3.73	.76
National Distillers Products Corp	Mar. 31, quarter	11,770,885	9,306,434	[1] 1.47	[8] 1.16
National Gypsum Co	do	1,314,617	673,960	[1] .72	[1] .42
Newport Industries, Inc	do	968,779	447,864	1.49	.65
Do	12 months, Mar. 31	2,802,610	898,826	4.24	1.38
New Orleans Public Service	do	2,552,847	2,321,616		
Outboard Marine & Manufacturing	6 months, Mar. 31	1,202,166	176,347	2.02	.30
Do	Mar. 31, quarter	545,228	76,932	.92	.13
Paraffine Cos., Inc	9 months, Mar. 31	2,365,968	[2] 530,508	4.67	
Do	Mar. 31, quarter	835,343	[2] 614,311	1.65	
Parker Rust Proof Co	6 months, Mar. 31	770,116	351,904	1.79	.82
Square D Co	Mar. 31, quarter	784,545	356,105	.57	.26
Texas Gulf Sulphur Co	do	4,512,978	2,952,734	1.18	.77
Union Bag & Paper	do	2,671,941	956,820	2.10	.75
Union Pacific R. R	do	10,917,323	5,429,619	4.46	1.99
United Public Utilities	do	149,443	117,914		
United Public Utilities	12 months, Mar. 31	443,981	257,043		
		1946	1945	1946	1945
American Barge Line Co	Year, Dec. 31	[2] $40,376	$250,590		$0.80
Coty, Inc	do	1,236,295	940,111	[1] $0.28	[1] .64
Hunt Foods, Inc	9 months, Nov. 30	4,088,815		8.50	
Pathe Industries, Inc	Year, Dec. 28	1,014,938	511,212	.67	.32
Radio-Keith-Orpheum	Year, Dec. 31	12,187,805	6,031,085	3.17	1.59

[1] On shares outstanding at close of the respective periods.
[2] Net loss.
[3] On second preferred shares.
[4] After provision of $1,000,000 for contingencies.
[5] After deducting provision for possible inventory reserves and other contingencies of $2,000,000 in 1947 and $1,000,000 in 1946.
[6] Based on common shares outstanding as of Jan. 31, 1947.
[7] On preferred shares.
[8] Based on present capitalization.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WLBF on April 26, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, you can take all the serious questions now before Congress, roll them into a bundle and forget about them, unless one great question is settled and soon. I refer to the high cost of living.

As head of a typically American family for nearly 20 years now, although it is a little larger than ordinary, I can honestly say I never saw prices so high, never remember food costing so much, never realized how many dollars it takes to clothe and put shoes on six children.

Frankly I am alarmed at the continual soaring of prices. I don't see how the American people can keep their heads above water. It is hard enough when one has a reasonable income, but when smaller amounts of money come in to the family treasury, you just can't make ends meet.

The fact remains that people have to eat, they have to enjoy shelter, they have to wear clothes. If they can't do these necessary things, then something is wrong with the system.

Some say the Government doesn't owe anybody a living. Perhaps not, but the Government is responsible for seeing that people have opportunity to work for that living. Certainly the President and Congress should deplore the terrific costs of food and other necessities the public must buy.

No matter how abundant the harvest, regardless of how ripe and numerous the crops, of what good are they to the people when no one can pay the prices asked for them. The answer is starvation in the land of plenty.

Such a condition results in misery for the consumer, who is the worker, ruin for the farmer, and failure for everybody concerned. This kind of economic disaster brings on chaos and disorder. We must not let it happen in the United States.

An inflation-proof dollar will solve the greatest issue before the country, the problem of making a living. That dollar will buy a fair share of food, will give the American people a roof over their heads, will clothe them and make it possible to raise our standard of living which we need to push up instead of down.

Yes, prices are too high. Those who are responsible for raising them are not helping themselves any more than they are the people they expect to pay the prices. Nobody will profit by bringing desolation upon the beautiful country and progress can come only by taking the opposite course.

In a recent speech to the House I stated:

"Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a resolution which was adopted by the Binghamton Central Labor Union, an organization representing all the affiliated unions of the American Federation of Labor in my area. The CLU hereby goes on record as being against the doubling of the penny postal card charge. Speaking for myself, I join with them in saying that I think it is ill-advised for a proposal of this kind to be made, when important communications by means of this service to the rank and file of our people are being sent through the mails by the millions every month. The penny postal card is the only way they have ever been able to send messages, because they cannot afford telegrams, or in many cases, special-delivery letters, or in some instances even regular postage. So I bring the central labor union's protest against the doubling of this rate to the floor of the House. This is a reasonable request and should be seriously considered. I think the penny postal card ought to be kept at a penny.

"I have heard the argument that raising the cost of postage all along the line is the only possible way we can balance the Post Office budget. That sounds like 'bunk' to me.

"You will get as much revenue from people who depend on the penny post card as you will by charging the public 2 cents. This is a small thing, but the little things sometimes hurt the masses of Americans more than the big ones.

"Let us forget about socking those who depend upon the penny post card to get their messages to loved ones and friends. Let us figure out a more equitable way to tax the public. I hereby declare myself against this skulduggery and demand that the lowly but dependable penny post card be kept inviolate to the American people for one red cent."

Thank you.

Portrait of a Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article taken from the April 25 edition of the Minneapolis Star Journal, which is a reprint from an article in the May 1947 issue of Reader's Digest entitled "Wanted: More Men Like JUDD." This is a splendid exposition of the unique background and exceptional ability of our able and distinguished colleague from Minnesota, Dr. WALTER H. JUDD. I introduce it in the RECORD so that his colleagues in the Congress and the public generally may have a better knowledge of the splendid qualifications of the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman JUDD. It follows:

PORTRAIT OF A LEADER—WHOLE NATION LISTENS NOW TO WALTER JUDD

(By Stanley High)

WALTER JUDD, of Minneapolis, is a physician and was a missionary. He had never been in politics—had spent most of his adult life abroad. When his neighbors suggested he would make a good Congressman, he laughed it off. He'd never do as a candidate, he said. In the first place, he couldn't even cast a ballot for himself—he hadn't lived in the district long enough, a fact which the machine politicians certainly would make the most of.

Besides, if he ran, he would have to say frankly that he believed a Congressman should be guided in his voting less by what the voters of his district want him to do than by what he thinks he ought to do. An impossible candidate!

So the people drafted him, elected him, and have reelected him twice. Today JUDD is an outstanding leader in Congress. When word goes around that he is to speak, fellow Members crowd the floor as for few other speakers. Few Representatives are so widely known outside Congress, or are so eagerly listened to.

Among the influences which help to account for JUDD are a map of the missionary journeys of St. Paul; a talk about the parable of the rich young ruler; a piece of shrapnel which JUDD removed from the body of a dying young Chinese and a telephone call, late one afternoon in Minneapolis, from a man he scarcely knew, who said: "The time has come for you to put up or shut up."

In Rising City, the tiny Nebraska town where JUDD was born 48 years ago, the Congregationalists could not afford a regular preacher.

But his mother kept the Sunday school going. The map of St. Paul's missionary journeys was on the wall of the Sunday school room.

"Sunday after Sunday, year after year, there it was"—JUDD says—"the world staring me in the face."

When he was in high school his parents permitted him to attend a YMCA conference in Lincoln. He doesn't remember anything about that conference except a talk about the rich young ruler: "The story of a young man who had everything except courage enough to put a cause before himself. Instead of helping to make history, he walked out of it and became history's greatest quitter."

Back home JUDD told his dubious family that he had found a cause. He had resolved to be a medical missionary.

After working his way through the University of Nebraska and its medical school, he went to China in 1925—to a mission hospital 12 days' river-journey from the coast of southern Fukien province, an area infested with bandits and malaria. He escaped the bandits, but 46 malaria attacks nearly killed him and, in 1931, forced him to return to the United States. In 1934 he went back to China to head a hospital in Fenchow in Shansi Province.

The Japanese, meanwhile, had invaded Manchuria and captured Peiping. While studying at the Mayo Clinic after his first stay in China, JUDD had warned every audience he could round up that Japan was embarked on one of the great aggressions of history, that by fueling Japan's war machine the United States also was preparing an inevitable attack upon itself.

What he saw when he returned to China confirmed his fears and kindled his wrath.

Fenchow, 400 miles southwest of Peiping, was in Japan's line of march. The mission compound became a haven for fleeing Chinese. The hospital filled with men, women, and children torn by American scrap iron processed into Japanese shrapnel.

Early in 1938 a copy of the Reader's Digest, 3 months old, reached Fenchow. In it JUDD read the condensation of a letter to the New York Times by Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of State: "Shall we keep on helping Japan?

"Is the condition of our statesmanship so pitifully inadequate," asked Stimson, "that we cannot devise the simple means of international cooperation which would stop our participation in this slaughter?"

Those were precisely the things which JUDD had been burning to say to his countrymen. That Stimson had said them gave him hope that, if he returned to America to tell his ominous story, his countrymen would listen.

Fenchow, repeatedly shelled and bombed, had been captured in February 1937. Thereafter, JUDD got a close-up of Japan's war machine and war mentality. He stayed for 5 months under the Japanese until he was able to put the hospital in order and bring in large quantities of medical supplies to guarantee that it could carry on.

One day a 17-year-old Chinese soldier was brought to JUDD's hospital. Wounded in a bombardment near Peiping, he had been carried from village to village for 60 days, his

wound untended. JUDD removed a piece of shrapnel from the boy's body, but the youngster died.

With that piece of shrapnel before him, JUDD wrote a letter of resignation to his mission board:

"I have no delusions that I will be able to change the course of history as soon as I land. But I have to try my hardest in order to get at peace with my conscience."

JUDD and his wife, who had come home with their children before the city was captured, figured they could finance his campaign for 1 year by using savings and a legacy of $1,000 from his grandfather.

Though more than half his speeches were free and many "honoraria" were only $10 and $25, they financed it for more than 2 years.

Calling on Americans to boycott Japan now or give up their sons later, JUDD made 1,400 speeches in 46 States.

"Whenever I got overly discouraged and felt like giving in," he says, "I'd just reach in my pocket for that bit of shrapnel."

But JUDD's efforts were no match for America's unconcern. Toward the end of 1940 he realized it was too late to stop Japan by measures short of war.

On a temporary basis he took over a medical practice in Minneapolis. But he continued to preach his warning message. He gave it from a Minneapolis pulpit one Sunday morning and that day it was confirmed, in blood and disaster, at Pearl Harbor.

At a small luncheon in the spring of 1942, an editor friend suggested that a good place for JUDD to help win the war and to start to win the peace was the Fifth Congressional District and that a good way to start might be with JUDD as candidate.

JUDD laughed it off, but it was less funny when, a couple of evenings later, a doctor friend and a prominent young lawyer called to make the same suggestion.

"We aren't politicians," they said; "we're just citizens who are steamed up about getting better people in government. What we want from you isn't 'Yes' or 'No,' but permission to find out whether anyone else feels the way we do."

The next week a delegation from the Minneapolis Junior Association of Commerce invited JUDD to lunch.

"We are the committee on honesty and efficiency in government," they told him. "There's a congressional election coming up and we are considering you."

JUDD still was unconvinced when two other nonpolitical groups made like appeals. Then one day he got a phone call from a young Minneapolis businessman.

"Look here," the man said, "you've no right to go up and down our community telling us what our civic duty is and then refuse to do yours. You've got to put up or shut up."

JUDD's campaign was a joke to the ward heeler. It started without money, organization, or politicians. Its strength was the "JUDD for Congress volunteers"—preachers, teachers, day laborers, clubwomen, young businessmen, even a group entirely made up of JUDD's patients—who, save for voting, had never before lifted a political finger.

Elected, JUDD became a leader of the campaign, in Congress and the country, to arouse American support for world collaboration. His 10-point plan for the treatment of Japan, outlined in 1943, was the basis for the policies of MacArthur and our State Department.

No other Member of Congress speaks with such authority on Far Eastern affairs.

But JUDD's leadership in Congress and the country rests on something even more significant—his position as a politician who regards politics as a duty on behalf of better government and Congress as an opportunity to be, for his constituents, "not a mirror, but a window."

"Many Members of Congress," said one of them recently, "think it is their job merely to reflect the opinions and prejudices of their constituents. But not JUDD. He goes after the truth about both sides of an issue and he makes up his own mind. Then he tries to inform and lead his constituents—not simply be their echo."

JUDD's Minnesota constituents like it. So, if they had a JUDD, would most Americans.

Address By Senator Myers, of Pennsylvania, Before the Associated Motion Picture Advertisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 30 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, in New York last week, at the invitation of Mr. Rutgers Neilson, president of the Associated Motion Picture Advertisers, it was my pleasure to address the thirtieth anniversary meeting of that organization. Since my remarks concerned the present and future standing of an important part of America's film industry, I ask unanimous consent to have the address placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS IS YOUR BUSINESS, TOO

As a moviegoer of long standing, I am glad to see what manner of man—and woman—it is which has been enticing me into your theaters these many years. That you have been doing an effective job is evident, for 60,000,000 Americans can hardly be wrong.

Much of the credit for attracting such a tremendous Nation-wide audience for the motion picture each week rightfully, of course, belongs to your publicity and advertising specialists who make up the Associated Motion Picture Advertisers. But, of course, you could not have achieved such success without having a product with sufficient appeal to support the exploitation you give it. I gather that inside your industry there is a continuous controversy over whether the moviegoers really do pay much attention to the product, but the evidence is clear to me that the public is becoming more and more discerning each year.

As a result motion-picture advertising, as I evaluate it, has been learning not to cry "wolf" over a turkey, so that when it does have an outstanding production it has not used up all the superlatives on lesser accomplishments.

This is all to the good, and I trust the trend will continue.

I am informed that this is your 30th anniversary—a span of years that very nearly matches the history of the film industry itself. Because you have provided it with an audience, the motion-picture industry has been enabled to improve its standards continuously, and although there are times when each of us could wish for greater improvement in higher standards, I think, generally, the progress has been outstanding.

I noted with great interest the presentation of your citation to Mr. Dietz for an outstanding job in public relations. This is certainly fine recognition for a fine job. It is my thought, too, that some organization, inside or outside your industry, should give your entire association a similar citation for an outstanding job in public relations for you people certainly deserve it for your work for this great enterprise of yours.

Your organization has taken on many obligations outside the strict field of "selling" motion pictures to the public, and I salute your members for demonstrating interest, as an organization, in things and events not strictly related to business. I am informed that your organization has actively supported the task of making the United Nations and its work more familiar to all the people of our country, and I think that is a very worth while thing. I am told of other ways in which you have demonstrated your consciousness of a public responsibility, and for that, too, I congratulate you.

Tonight you are giving your salute to the presidents of your various companies, thus helping to cement the production and promotion branches of your industry and emphasizing the interdependence of both.

As you get together and chart the future of your motion-picture industry, I hope you will provide in the future, either under the heading of public service or as plain ordinary good business, a greater place in the preparation and production of motion pictures for the things which truly represent America. This is not to say that many of our motion pictures now being shown do not reflect some of the best features of American democracy and of our traditions of decency among men, but rather, that every film with an American locale should, in my opinion, manage in one place or another, in one way or another, to show some of those things of America of which we are all proud.

You know, of course, why I suggest such a thing. The motion picture is without a doubt the outstanding cultural ambassador of the United States. Your stars are known as universally as Mars and Jupiter. The motion pictures we send abroad have a profound influence in building knowledge abroad of our country.

I am not pleading for a propaganda drive, nor do I suggest that art be made secondary to politics. I do not ask that the movies gild the American lily and show us all as supermen wearing halos. Americans are people, and people have faults; American institutions have faults; America does have gangsters and cut-throats and thieves and liars and cheats and venal politicians and scheming women and designing men; greed is universal, and, of course, Americans have their share of it. But we also have things in this country which few other countries enjoy: rights, privileges, immunities, yes, but obligations, too, and duties, and we are jealous of them, and I think the rest of the world should know about them, and I know of no medium better able than the motion picture to reflect our lives and our times and our hopes and desires.

The opportunity of the motion picture to advance the cause of human understanding is not restricted by any means to the foreign market. The motion picture can play a tremendously important role here at home. It has a political mission in America if it will assume it.

By politics I do not mean partisan politics. Politics is not a field restricted to the politicians and to those who actively support or attack politicians. Politics in America is the fabric of our very existence. On international politics depends the future of the world, the existence of the world.

Thirty years ago, when your organization was born, anyone making a statement like that might well have been hooted off the platform. We knew something about international politics in those days, and we knew international politics could lead to war and war could lead to great personal and national suffering. But it was not a matter of great concern to us. However, just as the motion pictures have learned a lot in those 30 years, so we have learned a lot about international politics and war. No one hoots now at any

prediction that a war—the next war—could wipe out an entire world.

But while we are encouraging greater national and international concern with the problems that lead to war—and while your industry is taking what no doubt will be a very significant role in bringing home to the people of this country and of other countries what future wars could mean to us—we must also keep in mind all the time how important it is to us in America to see to it that our own institutions we treasure so dearly are maintained and defended and that our children are impressed with their value. This is the political mission of our generation, a mission in which the motion-picture industry is admirably equipped to participate.

It would be presumptuous for me to tell the motion-picture industry how to do this, for your industry has indicated that when it wants to it can do it not only with finesse but with exceptional success.

You have done it many times in your documentaries. But every motion picture which is produced is a documentary in one sense or another, a commentary on the age and the society out of which it has come. The code of the motion-picture producers recognizes this fact by enforcing certain taboos. Crime must not pay, the guilty must be punished, certain moral standards must be maintained. These are to prevent the movies to some extent from being a bad influence. Why not a supplementary code to make sure that the movies are a good influence?

I spoke earlier of politics and the screen. In the days when the movies were young, politics provided some of the circusy atmosphere, some of the entertainment we now derive from the movies. We had torchlight parades, and flowery oratory, and band concerts and all sorts of trimmings—they were only trimmings—which came to be recognized by many of our people as politics itself. Communication was far from swift, and Washington was a far-away place, and even our State capitols were far removed from the day-to-day lives of our people. Politics in the nineties and the first quarter of the twentieth centry was largely what you people might call a "B" production.

Politics is out of that class now, far out of that class; it's big time now, it's colossal. In Washington alone in the year beginning July 1 it will be nearly a $38,000,000,000 business. During wartime, it was much bigger. It will be some years, assuming the peace we are trying to build endures, before it is a much smaller business. Our State governments are talking of billion-dollar budgets. Our municipalities, many of them already debt-ridden, are looking at their needs and requirements and then at their revenues with trepidation. Politics is the biggest business in America—this business of protecting our security, of building a better country, of improving living standards, of eliminating slums, and with them one of our worst breeding places of crime, of educating our children, of harnessing nature and putting it to work for us, of protecting our resources, of doing all the things we expect of an enlightened Government in an atomic age.

Politics now is a personal thing, which touches all of us. No medium of information, no medium of entertainment as far-reaching in influence as the motion picture can ignore the force of politics on our lives.

As recently, perhaps, as 1929 politics was not nearly of such real and personal concern to every man, woman, and child in America. There was seemingly no threat of war and little concern about the rest of the world and those parts of the world where wars were then being conceived. The stock market was booming and fortunes were being made—on paper—by everyone every day in the week. Credit was unlimited. The world was our oyster.

And then something happened. Not immediately, but soon thereafter, the people of the United States began to realize that what happened in Washington was of vital personal concern to them. Then began some of the most controversial years of political history, and out of that controversy, that continuous battling over issues and ideas, came more than just the New Deal; out of it came the education of our electorate in the field of government.

And ever since then Americans have been doing some real thinking about their Government and what they think it should be. For instance, they are wondering right now, while business is pretty good, whether Government should have any "say" on the questions of prices and controls and safeguards. They are beginning to wonder and worry now whether the present level of prices is inviting the same economic disaster we experienced less than 20 years ago. They are alive to issues which once were thought to be only the concern of the politicians and the bankers and the manufacturers and the lawyers. They watch the stock market, yes, but not as speculators and not merely as spectators; they know now that what happens in Wall Street often has repercussions on Main Street. They watch the foreign news now, too, because they know that things that happen 10,000 miles away have a distressing habit of confronting us later in crisis form, and people who have been through two World Wars in one generation learn to recognize a crisis pretty quickly.

I cite these things because the American people have impressed me as a United States Senator with their awareness of the world of today, of the atomic era. Depressions and wars are not pages out of a history book; they are not what you people might call period productions. They are life today.

The workingman no less than the businessman and banker insists on knowing these days what "they"—we in Washington—are doing, or failing to do, on matters vitally affecting jobs and businesses. And I think that's fine.

That being so—that politics is not only cracker-barrel conversation in America but also dinner-table talk and shop talk and the subject of sermons and, if you will, even a pertinent matter for young sweethearts to discuss on a moonlight night—when they start thinking about a house—and the 35 cents' worth of building materials they can now buy for a dollar—then it seems to me that the motion picture, which seeks to mirror modern life and modern thought, can well fit politics—politics in the broad sense—into its art form

The motion-picture industry has done it well on several occasions, beginning back many years ago in Birth of a Nation. It has done it in Wilson, a historical which was as much a picture of the immediate present as it was of its own era, for its ideas, its issues are as alive and compelling today as they were in Wilson's day.

I understand that a major production is now contemplated on the life of Franklin Roosevelt. I would not presume to give any technical advice to those planning such a picture but I would like to put in my two-cents worth on one aspect of such a picture and that is: if a picture is made of FDR and his remarkable life, the American people are going to insist that it be good.

Speaking, not as a Democrat, but as one of the millions and millions of Americans who loved Franklin Roosevelt, I think that each of us—Democrat or Republican—could dedicate our lives to no cause greater in scope or in significance or in challenge than that cause to which Franklin Roosevelt gave his life and that is the cause of decency among men and among nations.

There is certainly room in this cause for your industry, an industry which has shown in countless ways that the cause of America is its cause.

Week in and week out you entice us into your gleaming palaces and generally you manage well to keep us entertained and for that we thank you. But teach us, too, as only Hollywood can teach a mass lesson on a grand scale, that what we enjoy in America is not an accidental heritage but one which was brought for us by the blood and sacrifice and the imagination and daring and determination of men who loved humanity because they loved God.

An FEPC Bill Will Shackle Ohio People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Here in Ohio, for March 1947:

AN FEPC BILL WILL SHACKLE OHIO PEOPLE

When Ohio, like the rest of the Nation, voted last November, it did not necessarily vote Republican in the political sense.

It voted against past and future regimentation of business, industry, and individuals. It voted against turning the country over to the Communists and labor radicals. It voted the way it did because the vast majority of its citizens knew there was no sane reason why there was no soap, no meat, no toilet paper and the thousand-and-one items which business could produce under normal conditions.

Notwithstanding this very obvious mandate from the people, there is every indication at this time that the top-heavy Republican Ohio Legislature intends to jam through a bill which will give radical communistic labor leaders and other minority agitators more power than they ever had before with which to further harass business.

This bill will appear under the title of a "Fair Employment Practice Commission Act."

If this passes, the result will be that Ohio's business and industry will be shackled and hamstrung to an extent far greater than ever experienced under the restrictive, unfair class legislation of the New Deal.

The name sounds nice. Particularly the "fair" part. It's a good label on an unfair bill. The mere fact that it is labeled "fair" will cause thousands of people to support it without any knowledge of its far-reaching effect on business and worker. It will be highly propagandized with emotional appeals.

But make no mistake about it. Despite its pleasing title there will be concealed restrictions, enforcement methods and penalties all aimed at the employer which will make the iniquitous Wagner Act mild by comparison, if the final bill is patterned in even small measure after Senate bill 10, introduced by Senator Howard M. Metzenbaum of Cleveland.

The bill would create a State bureau with agents and examiners to police all businesses in Ohio which employ three or more persons. They will see that the employer does not discriminate because of race, color, creed or ancestry in the hiring, firing and promotion of his employees.

Under such a bill, it would be illegal for an employer to even keep a record of the race, color, creed or ancestry of his employees. He could not upgrade any where ability and race, color, etc., conflicted without laying himself liable for prosecution. And his prosecution would be before a commission or agent who would not be bound by the regulations of common law or statutory rules of evidence and procedure.

Such a bill would open wide the doors of nearly every business in the State of Ohio to those agitators who are skilled in stirring up unrest and dissatisfaction by playing upon the racial and religious intolerances of employees in a drive for recruits for labor organizations or radical political parties. That's one reason so many Communists and certain other minority group leaders are already behind the movement to put over the bill.

Under this bill, the employer could be held responsible for the intolerances of his employees. For example, an employer hires a perfectly competent and capable Negro machinist. This is resented by some of his less tolerant workers and the employer is served with an ultimatum to get rid of the Negro "or we quit."

He faces the problem of either having trouble in his plant or of violating the law.

It is unfortunate that such conditions of intolerance and cruelty exist—but they do. Every informed person knows it, and we are not so naive that we believe all employers are free from the taint. But there is one thing certain—you can't change human nature with a law and a policeman's club. It's been tried too many times—and invariably has failed. It takes education.

There are many racketeering and Communistic union organizers who can only exist through disunity and disorder. Such a bill would play right into their hands by supplying them with a legal manner of harassing employers whose men were perfectly satisfied with wages, hours, and working conditions.

Through the discriminatory provisions of the bill they could virtually force the employer to hire, when men were needed, some notorious trouble-making union organizer who soon would have the plant in a virtual uproar of dissatisfaction, well softened up for organization purposes.

Why should any Federal or State bureau, at the instigation of agitators, labor or minority group leaders or anybody else dictate to any private citizen whom he must hire? That kind of tyranny might go over in Russia, but it is not the American way of doing things.

Assuming that even a moderate FEPC bill would have some merit, we are still of the opinion that any legislation which could tell an employer whom he could hire, whom he could fire, and whom he could promote is unwarranted at this time. We have had enough of that type of legislation to last for a long time.

Nothing should be done which would in any way interfere with full production and full employment in Ohio industries. Without governmental meddling, this goal is in sight.

It is a foregone conclusion that anyone opposing such a measure will be sharply criticized by Communists, radicals, spokesmen for minority groups and by many well-meaning but perhaps misguided citizens.

However, we feel that the dangers of industrial disruption which are inherent in such a bill far outweigh its possible advantages and that it should not be passed.

The Americanism of Dr. Francis E. Townsend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, some days ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER] extended his remarks in the RECORD and presumably quoted from the Townsend National Weekly. He expressed misgivings regarding an editorial in this paper and quoted comments, attributed to Dr. Townsend, regarding communism and free enterprise.

I have no thought of repeating the quotations. I would like the gentleman from New York to know that many of us were concerned, a year or more ago, with the editorial policies of that paper, but that we have been convinced that these have returned to normal.

I was startled to read the quotations included in the extensions of the gentleman from New York on April 17. I immediately sent for a copy of the editorial. The answer is readily apparent. The quotations are only partial quotations. They are picked out of the context and asked to stand alone, without their supporting words. The gentleman from New York was distressed over what seemed to be a support of communism.

The editorial, in my opinion, was absolutely right when it said that:

A dictatorial system under a benevolent and all-wise manager woud probably be the most nearly efficient of any conceivable system.

Who denies that? It has been stated and restated since the beginnings of government. The trouble is, of course, that no such government remains benevolent. We say, in the United States, very properly, that we will sacrifice some of the efficiency of such managership in favor of the blessings of representative government.

Dr. Townsend then seemed to compare such dictatorship with communism. What is wrong with that? Communism, as practiced today in the world, is the most arrogant, the most selfish, the most stupid, and the most retrogressive doctrine ever offered intelligent people, but it is still dictatorship. I think the gentleman from New York should have concluded the quotation, which was as follows:

Hence we think it safe to assume that communism developed by force will never long prevail in a world that is rapidly becoming enlightened by science.

So far as free enterprise is concerned, I can only quote again the words of the editorial:

Any system that produces goods with a speed out of all proportion to the ability of the population to buy and use is bound to collapse.

And again, Dr. Townsend says:

Profit, in the near future, will mean profit for all, not aggrandizement of the few at the expense of the many.

Is not that true? If it is not, then the platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties, the antimonopoly acts, and innumerable laws passed by the Congress in years past, and the general thinking of the people of this country, have been sadly mistaken over the years. Dr. Townsend continues:

Let us make that transition—

That is, from monopoly and Government controls and OPA's and all the children of tyranny, to free enterprise—

as quickly as possible and avoid a total collapse of industry and a condition of chaos.

And, finally, as you would expect, Dr. Townsend concludes:

The first step? National insurance for all a la the Townsend plan.

I am only suggesting to my good friend from New York that he read the editorial again. If he wants to suggest that it may have been hastily written, and that it shows signs of that haste, I will not have the heart to argue the point. Having written a weekly column for more than 15 years, sometimes under conditions of such haste that I held my mental fingers crossed until I read it again in print, my sympathy goes out to all men and women who have to meet deadlines. But it is quite another thing to charge Dr. Townsend with an interest in, or a desire for, any other form of government than the one under which we now enjoy the freedom of the United States of America, and the only form of government under which such a beneficial program as the Townsend plan could be put into operation.

I much prefer to think of the quotation from the London magazine known as Bookshelf, which said recently:

Dr. Francis E. Townsend is one of the greatest thinkers in the field of economics * * * it will not be long before the entire United States will recognize the eminence of the father of the Townsend plan.

Marshall Pins It on Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of even date:

MARSHALL PINS IT ON STALIN

Secretary of State Marshall made his eagerly awaited Moscow Conference report to the Nation Monday evening over several networks.

We're sorry to say we don't think the World War II Chief of Staff ever will be a ball of fire as a radio speaker. The speech, too, seemed seriously loaded up with big words and long sentences.

The only news in it was Secretary Marshall's partial account of what Stalin told him when the two men met in Moscow a few days ago.

What Stalin said was that the Moscow parley on a peace treaty for Germany had made clear the issues and points of disagreement between Russia and the western allies, and that after a while some kind of treaty probably could be patched up.

The "one worlders" are grasping at this straw as a means of keeping alive their theory that Stalin is the salty but benevolent Uncle Joe of wartime legend.

He isn't, of course, and he never was.

Marshall, we're glad to see, doesn't fall for that "one world" piece of wishful thinking. He rolled out a blunt and forceful retort in his Monday evening speech to this soft soap of Stalin's.

What Marshall did was to blame the Moscow stalemate on Russia. He charged the Russians with welshing on plainly written agreements. And he said that "the patient is sinking while the doctors deliberate."

Townsend concludes:

Once the workshop of Europe, Germany is now flat on its back, producing little; and all Europe is suffering as a result. Plainly, Stalin wants this to go on indefinitely, in the hope that the western allies will quit Germany in disgust and thereby give him a chance to communize the whole Reich plus Austria.

Stalin feels that it will be time enough to talk again about all this when the foreign ministers convene in London in November for another whirl at a German peace treaty.

But November is 6 months away. What happens in the meantime to Germany, and to the American, British, and French taxpayers now supporting the western German poorhouse at a cost of hundreds of millions a year?

Our own feeling has long been that the best thing we could do would be to get out of Europe as fast as possible, leave it to go Communist if the Europeans haven't the guts to resist the Reds, and devote ourselves to girding the Western Hemisphere against any possible future attacks.

However, it is a safe bet that our present rulers have no idea of doing that, and that the Vandenberg Republicans are going to go along with the Truman plan to fight communism with dollars around the world.

PUTTING GERMANY TOGETHER AGAIN

Under these circumstances, it seems to us that the best thing we can do is to get western Germany merged economically as soon as possible and help its industries step up nonmilitary production as fast as they can.

Such a merger already has been accomplished in the American and British occupation zones.

The French zone should be brought into the set-up, and the whole combine fueled with the necessary money, credits, and material. Western Germany should be enabled as soon as may be to start buying enough food to feed itself properly, by selling manufactured goods to other nations.

If Stalin raises any objections, as he may, the Western Allies should tell him to put up or shut up—meaning to become reasonable and honest about a final peace for Germany, or keep eastern Germany and see how far he can get with it. Judging from the way the poor Russians are still starving and scratching along, almost 30 years after the Communist revolution in Russia, he won't be able to get very far.

In doing all this, the Western Allies would not be acting out of any sob-sister pity for the Germans, who after all let Hitler lead them into that 1939 attack on Poland which precipitated World War II.

The object would be the cold and businesslike one of taking some of the present crushing loads off American, British, and French — especially American—taxpayers, and stopping some of the drain on United States food which is helping to keep our own food prices so high.

Let's get started on this plan now, without asking Stalin's or anybody else's leave, or waiting for November. November may be too late.

Moscow Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I arise to call attention to the report of a distinguished citizen of my district, Hon. John Foster Dulles, a delegate to the recently concluded Moscow Conference. The subject matter is of vital importance, and Mr. Dulles' observations are remarkably enlightening. His statement, as it appeared in the New York Times of April 30, 1947, is as follows:

DULLES' REPORT TO THE NATION ON MOSCOW CONFERENCE OF BIG FOUR FOREIGN MINISTERS

Eight weeks ago, I went to Moscow with Secretary Marshall. I went, as a Republican, to add another chapter to the growing history of bipartisan cooperation in foreign policy. Now we have returned. We did not go to Moscow with great expectations. We came back with even less than we had expected. We had not expected much because we were tackling, for the first time, the most difficult of all peace problems. We had, however, expected three results:

1. Increased economic and political unity in Germany, now divided into four compartments by the four military zones of occupation.

2. Agreement in principle on a four-power treaty to keep Germany disarmed.

3. An Austrian treaty.

The Conference did not conclude any of these matters. That was a grave disappointment to us. It was a tragedy to millions in Europe whose suffering is prolonged because the big powers cannot agree on the kind of a peace that they want. I shall recount some of our difficulties.

GERMANY

We did not get agreement on economic and political unity for Germany because the Soviet delegation wanted to rebuild Germany in a way which the other three delegations thought dangerous. We all wanted a Germany which, we hoped, would never again want to make war. But the United States, the British, and the French also wanted a Germany which could not again make war even if it wanted to.

The Soviet leaders were willing to take a chance on rebuilding a powerful Germany which might again be a powder keg in the middle of Europe. That represented a big change in Soviet thinking since the Potsdam Conference of 1945. Then the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the United States had agreed that peace would best be served if Germany did not have a high-powered central government, and if Germany were economically weakened by the removal of industrial plants, particularly those which could readily be converted to war purposes. Those plants, it was agreed, would be taken from Germany and shipped to the Allies, principally to the Soviet Union, as reparations.

GERMAN REPARATIONS

That Potsdam scheme did not work out very well in helping the Soviet Union. After the German plants were taken apart the Russians could not always put them together again. Even if they could, it was expensive business to get them going in Russia. Housing had to be built around the machinery and power lines and railroad tracks had to be connected with it. By now, the Russians have lost most of their original enthusiasm about getting plants from Germany. Many parts of German factories are rusting on the railroad sidings between Berlin and Moscow, and the Soviet authorities have taken from their own zone in Germany only about half of the plants to which they were entitled under the Potsdam Agreement. They have switched to taking, as reparations, the goods which the Germans manufactured there.

The Soviet Government now wants to extend that scheme to all of Germany and to get $10,000,000,000 worth of German goods. That, however, involves much more than writing a new reparation formula. It involves making Germany into a high-powered industrial state. Even if Germany does not go into the business of making goods for the Soviet Union, Germany will have to have considerable industry.

Much of the farm lands of eastern Germany have been taken away and given to Poland. Also, about 10,000,000 Germans who used to live there or in Czechoslovakia have been expelled into Germany. The result will be nearly 70,000,000 Germans crowded into a Germany much smaller than before and with relatively little farm land. There will be about three times as many Germans per square mile in Germany as there are Frenchmen per square mile in France. The people will starve unless they can get food from abroad. They can only pay for that food by manufacturing goods for export. That, as I say, will require considerable industrialization.

The new Soviet plan would add the further industrialization needed to enable Germany to go into the mass production of goods for Soviet needs. If that happens, Germany will again be a great industrial power. A little over a year ago, Marshal (Vassily P.) Sokolovsky said, "To leave Germany an annual capacity of 9,000,000 tons of steel will mean war within a few years." Yet at Moscow the Soviet delegation proposed that Germany's steel capacity should be raised not to 9,000,000 tons, but to between 10,000,000 and 12,000,000 tons.

GERMAN POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

The Soviet leaders, of course, know that this involves risk. However, Soviet economic needs are so acute and so vast that they are now willing to take risks in order to get goods. They plan to reduce the risk by tying Germany tightly into their own political system so that, they figure, Germany's industrial might will never be used against them. They want in Germany three things: A strong central government operating from Berlin, which is in the Soviet zone; a single dominant political party, in which Communists will play a leading part; a trade union federation which will put all German trade unions under central control located at Berlin. Such a set-up they believe they can control by penetration, at which they are past masters. Under those conditions, they are willing to risk turning Germany into a workshop for the Soviet Union. The plan, of course, also fits into Soviet world strategy.

The British, the French, and ourselves could not agree to this new Soviet plan. We had very different ideas about the new Germany. We wanted political institutions which would train Germans to think and act individually and not be mass followers of some fanatical leader. We wanted to see authority grow from the bottom up and not be imposed from the top down.

Favored federal system

We felt that Germany would be more apt to be peaceful under a federal system like our own—where there are checks and balances through states' rights and an independent judiciary, competing political parties, and trade-unions with local autonomy.

We wanted a Germany where ideas and people and goods could move about freely. Such conditions, we thought, gave the best chance that Germans would become self-supporting, self-respecting, and peaceful members of society. Those are some the things we wanted.

There were other things we did not want. We did not want Germany quickly rebuilt as a great, modern industrial machine. We did not want political and economic centralization so that anyone who controls Berlin would automatically control all Germany.

In other words, we did not want all the German eggs in one basket. That is too great a temptation to dangle before militant and vengeful persons who will surely again be found in Germany. Furthermore, we did not want a Germany which would be a projection into western Europe of a totalitarian system.

After the First World War German industry was rebuilt with Allied money and Germany was politically centralized under Allied pressure on the theory that such a Germany would pay more reparations. Instead, that centralized, industrial machine proved to be made to order for Hitler's purposes. It seems that history is trying to repeat itself.

It is natural that the Soviet Union should seek much reparation from Germany. Their land was horribly devastated by German armies. Due to that and other causes, Soviet economic needs are today very great. So Soviet leaders are willing to take the risk which proved so disastrous after World War I. The British, the French, and the United States delegations were not willing to take that risk.

CONSEQUENCES OF DIVISION OF GERMANY

So the Council of Foreign Ministers disagreed on the future of Germany. As a result Germany remains economically and politically divided by zones of occupation. That is bad—not just for Germans but for Germany's neighbors, the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, the British, and others. All of them, in one way or another, are injured by the present state of German economy.

There are many burdens which the German people in justice ought to bear. There are many burdens which unhappily Germany's victims must bear. But there is one burden which ought not to be inflicted—that is the burden of incompetent government of Germany by the victors. No one of the four powers which today rule Germany believes that Germans ought to be herded into four closed compartments. On the contrary, they have repeatedly proclaimed that what is left of Germany ought to be politically and economically united. That does not happen, only because the Allied Government of Germany is paralyzed by its internal differences.

Germans lack national will

Today the German people are so shattered that there is no national will. But such a will is bound to emerge. It will emerge as an ugly thing if the four-power government of Germany persists in inflicting on Germany that which they themselves proclaim to be wrong.

To relieve the situation, the British and Americans are trying to unite their two zones. There is outstanding an invitation to the other zone to join that merger. In the meantime, it is imperative that our two-zone merger be a success. Our joint area includes the Ruhr, which is the economic heart of Europe. Today that heart is barely beating. The situation gives us a great responsibility and a great opportunity. If our joint administration can pump vitality into western Europe, that will bring about more competent administration elsewhere. We will have achieved, by force of example, what we could not achieve by persuasion at Moscow.

FOUR-POWER TREATY

We did not agree on a four-power treaty to keep Germany disarmed. Senator VANDENBERG had suggested such a treaty nearly 2½ years ago. Secretary Byrnes had submitted a draft of the treaty over a year ago. It was a single-purpose treaty. It was designed to show the world that, whatever else happened, the four great powers would stand united in their determination not to let Germany rearm. We thought that if that simple step were quickly taken, men's minds would be freed from the paralysis of fear, and wisdom and justice would be more apt to prevail.

At Moscow, the British and French wanted to go ahead with such a treaty. The Soviet countered with many proposed riders. Their effect was to commit the parties to the highly centralized, industrialized Germany which the Soviet wanted. While the Soviet delegation professed to want a four-party treaty, they knew that the conditions they proposed would make such a treaty impossible. A Communist newspaper in Rome let the cat out of the bag when it said:

"It is certain that Mr. Marshall's proposal, which tends to make the United States of America remain in the center of Europe for fifty-odd years, cannot be accepted lightheartedly by any European power." There is little doubt that Soviet leaders would heave a great sigh of relief if the United States were to quit Europe and go home. Then they would automatically dominate the whole continent.

The United States delegation made clear that Soviet rejection of our proposed four-power pact would not, in fact, end the determination of the American people to interest themselves in Europe. We cannot afford to be aloof from conditions which have twice involved us in great wars.

AUSTRIAN TREATY

We did not get an Austrian treaty although at times we seemed close to it. The Soviet delegation wanted Yugoslavia to get an important slice of Austrian territory and to get $150,000,000 from Austria by way of reparation. But the most debated clauses were the economic clauses. The Soviet delegation wanted economic provisions which, as Secretary Marshall put it, would have made Austria a puppet state. They demanded ownership of the most important part of Austrian economy and the right to operate it free from the controls of Austrian law. The effect would have been to make much of Austria a part of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet claim derived from a prior agreement that the Soviet Union could take over, as reparations, German external assets in eastern Europe, including German external assets in the eastern part of Austria, which the Soviet Army occupies. There was, however, at Moscow, much dispute as to what were really "German" assets. When, in 1938, Germany had seized Austria, German interests proceeded to take over a great part of its economy. The Austrian owners, many of them Jewish, were coerced into selling their property. Usually they got only a nominal price.

The Allies, including the Soviet Union, had at London in January 1943 and again at Moscow in October 1943 taken the position that they would regard such German acts as null and void. However, the Soviet Union now insists that, even when the Germans had acquired such Austrian assets by duress, the assets should not be restored, but should be turned over to the Soviet Union as the legitimate heir to all so-called "German assets."

The result, we estimated, would have been to leave the Austrian state a shell from which the Soviet would have picked the kernel. There would not be that "free and independent" Austria which had been pledged by the Moscow Declaration of October 1943. Under the circumstances, the United States delegation did not accept the only kind of a treaty to which the Soviet would agree.

We did, however, arrange for further study of the facts by a four-power commission which will operate from Vienna. We hoped that its findings will make possible an early treaty. If that does not happen, then we said that the future of Austria should be put before the next September meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations. We felt that differences among the four Allies ought not indefinitely prevent Austria from recovering her independence and freedom from the burdens of military occupation.

DEVELOPMENT OF UNITED STATES POLICIES

For the reasons given, we came home with virtually no agreements. However, we did not come home empty-handed. Neither did we come home discouraged.

We did not come home empty-handed because at Moscow we worked out policies which can be of tremendous value for the future. If the United States, for the first time in its history, is going to take a continuing interest in the affairs of Europe, it is imperative that we have clear-cut policies. We need to know our own mind. Also, the peoples of Europe are entitled to know our intentions, so that they can judge them.

Moscow was a splendid testing ground for the development of concrete policies. When we discussed there the political future of Germany, we had to make clear what democracy meant to us in terms of human rights. Also, we had to spell out the political processes through which men can combine for the common good, and at the same time keep their personal freedoms.

When we debated the economic future of Germany, we suggested practical ways whereby the peoples of Europe can use their assets to greater advantage. We proposed that great industrial centers like those of the Ruhr and upper Silesia should not be operated merely as national assets, but as assets which would serve many people in different nations.

We suggested that they be under the jurisdiction of some over-all European body, such as the Economic Commission for Europe set up by the United Nations. It would be the job of that commission to assure that the resources of the Ruhr, for example, would be shared on fair terms both by Germans and by Germany's neighbors and not be an economic club in the hands of Germany.

As we studied the problem of Germany in its European setting, we became more and more convinced that there is no economic solution along purely national lines. Increased economic unity is absolutely essential to the well-being of Europe.

In our opinion, these statements of American position will constitute an asset of tremendous value to the future. They will give content and cohesion to our own foreign policy. It was significant that they were developed under conditions which drew together, on a nonpartisan basis, top representatives of the State Department, of the Foreign Service, and of the United States Army in Germany. The positions we took will show the world that we have ideas and ideals and not merely dollars. Also, the peoples of Europe will see that while we have European policies, they are not the kind of policies which we would or we could impose from without. What we want for Europe can happen only if the peoples of Europe want it for themselves.

FRANCO-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Another gain from the Conference was the establishment of closer relations with France. Franco-American relations have been bedeviled for several years by a succession of irritations. At Moscow, we cleared away much misunderstanding. It became plain that the American and the French nations today stand together for the basic rights of man just as they have stood together for 150 years. Our relations with the British continued intimate and cordial. On all vital matters, the British, the French and ourselves came to similar conclusions. That was not because our positions were concerted in advance. They were not. We thought along similar lines because we have a similar spiritual and political background.

Still another asset we bring back is better understanding of how Soviet foreign policy works. It depends little on getting results by diplomatic negotiation. It depends much on getting results by penetrating into the political parties and labor organizations of other countries. I have already mentioned that Soviet leaders have such confidence in these methods that they are willing to let Germany again become a great industrial power. They are using those methods now to get the kind of Germany they want.

In the Soviet zone of Germany, the dominant political party and the labor unions are already subject to Soviet will, though they may not know it themselves. It is much the same in the French zone of Germany. In the British and United States zones, Soviet influence in the political parties and labor unions is growing rapidly. Soviet agitators there, as elsewhere, have ample funds, they are well trained, and they are adept at enlisting local zealots and malcontents and getting them into key positions.

The American people should draw some conclusions from that. One conclusion is that we cannot afford to feel complacent merely because, at conferences, we have stopped surrendering our principles. Soviet activity is not suspended merely because the Council of Foreign Ministers disagrees and takes a recess.

Also, we must not feel complacent because we have supremacy in certain kinds of military weapons. The challenge we face is not a military one. I am confident that Soviet leaders do not want war. Also, they are too smart to challenge us at a level where, temporarily at least, they are at a grave disadvantage. The present challenge is at a level where they are well-equipped and where we are poorly equipped.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion is that we Americans must work unceasingly for our ideals and we must work in ways that count. It greatly encouraged us in Moscow to know, through President Truman and Senator VANDENBERG, that at home constructive policies were being formulated and implemented. We should, of course, seek international agreement whenever such agreement is possible.

We should, of course, invoke the aid of the United Nations whenever it can do the job. But we cannot let ourselves be stymied merely because we cannot get agreement or because the United Nations is not yet able to take over the full task of maintaining freedom in the world. It is up to us to show, in every available way, that free institutions are the means whereby men can save themselves from the sea of misery in which they find themselves.

I do not doubt that such efforts will succeed. Also, as they succeed, they will reduce our differences with the Soviet Union. There is one powerful unifying force; that is the will and the welfare of the peoples of the world. We must both appeal to that. Take, for example, the will and the needs of the peoples of Europe. They do not want to be divided against themselves. They do not want to be unified under the domination of any great power. They want to increase their economic productivity. They do not want human freedom blotted out. After all, Europe is the cradle of western civilization.

Defends our policies

No European policies can, over a long period, be sustained unless they conform to those basic facts. The United States delegation believes that the policies which it developed at Moscow do conform to the desires and needs of the people of Europe. We feel that the Soviet policies do not conform to those desires or needs. If we are right in that judgment, if we are steadfast, if, in the face of misrepresentation, we can find the way to bring other people to understand what our policies really are and how they work, then I am confident that our policies will be so welcomed that the contradictory policies of the Soviet Union will give way before our own.

Four-power unity could then become a solid reality. That is a result devoutly to be hoped for. It is good to have increased unity between the British, the French, and ourselves. But that is not good enough. We all want four-power unity whenever it can be obtained as a reality, not as a sham.

It was somewhat of an ordeal to have spent these 7 weeks in unceasing negotiation at Moscow. It was particularly hard because we never had the lift which comes from achieving agreement. There is a tendency under such conditions to become impatient and either agree merely to break the monotony or come home before the possibilities of genuine agreement are fully exhausted.

I think that the United States delegation held to a steady course. That was largely due to the calm yet strong leadership of Secretary Marshall. Also, we were sustained by a sense of unity at home. The Moscow press and radio featured minor defections and dangerously magnified them out of all proportion to their reality. They gave their own people, and some others, the impression that behind the United States delegation was an American people who were vacillating and were divided. As far as the United States delegation was concerned, we knew better. We knew that the American people were solidly backing positive foreign policies which would build peace on its only tested foundation, the foundation of human liberty.

Crossroads in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MONROE M. REDDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in Smoky Mountain Times, Bryson City, N. C.:

CROSSROADS IN EDUCATION

Now before the United States Senate is bill S. 472, bipartisan-sponsored and introduced by Senator TAFT, of Ohio, which provides as follows:

1. Authorizes Federal funds up to $250,000,000 a year to assist public schools in the neediest States.

2. Apportions these funds on the basis of need determined by the number of children and the wealth of a State.

3. Guarantees that every child in every school district of every State shall have at least a $40-per-year education.

4. Guarantees local control of the public schools.

5. Provides for fair distribution of the Federal funds in the education of minority races.

Now we have always deplored the spending of Federal funds, often needlessly and with great waste and inefficiency. Too, we have always opposed Federal aid for education because it usually carried with it the danger of Federal control. This we felt could never meet the varied needs of our States and their communities.

The present bill, however, seems cured of these defects. Under these conditions we favor Federal aid for education, being of the opinion that the public welfare of this great Nation demands it.

If the Federal Government can pour out untold millions of dollars to buy up a so-called surplus of potatoes, spend more millions to store and hoard them while many of its citizens could well use them, and then end up by plowing these potatoes back into the ground—and there are many similar instances of such waste in the recent history of our National Government—then we are convinced that Federal aid for education by comparison would be money mighty well spent.

The boys and girls of America are worth more than any dozen potato crops, or the money we might spend to subsidize them.

There has long been too much pork-barrel statesmanship in our National Government. The silver bloc wants special consideration, the potato Senator needs subsidy for price protection, the wheat farmer and his Representatives then want their share and so it goes. The wind-up, when everybody gets through scratching the other fellow's back, in order to get his own scratched in return, is that more and more billions have been poured down the drain.

It's time we spent a few million where it will really do some good for everyone by raising the level of our citizenship during the coming generation. If freedom (whether it be from foreign aggression or home-grown ignorance) and equality are to be more than an empty phrase, glibly recited by favored children in our richer States and unknown under the Constitution to others, then it is time we spent some money in this direction where it will do something concrete and lasting for the public good.

Considering the wide differences in the ability of the States to finance an adequate educational program, considering further that the national public welfare demands equality of educational opportunity, and that only the Federal Government through its power of taxation can equalize the abilities of the States to finance such adequate programs of education, there is only one answer—Federal aid.

If youth can be sacrificed in time of war without regard to native State or place in society; if every citizen is to shoulder his proper responsibility in this great Nation of ours—then society cannot afford to be less generous in providing equal educational opportunities for all. It is the inalienable right of every child.

Hon. Elpidio Quirino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following biography of Hon. Elpidio Quirino, Vice President of the Philippines and concurrently Secretary of Foreign Affairs, written by Dr. Diosdado M. Yap, editor and publisher of Bataan magazine, an independent monthly publication of Philippine affairs and trade. Mr. Quirino is scheduled to arrive in Washington on May 6 as a guest of the United States. I believe Members of Congress and others may be interested to know of Mr. Quirino's background in view of the high office he holds in the Philippines and because of the strategic position of

the Philippine Islands in the Far East. The biography follows:

QUIRINO—SYMBOL OF FILIPINO GREATNESS

(By Diosdado M. Yap, editor and publisher of Bataan)

One of the most colorful characters in the contemporary history of the Philippines is Elpidio Quirino, Vice President of the Philippines and concurrently Secretary of Foreign Affairs. His meteoric rise from obscurity constitutes one of the most enviable records in modern political history.

Acclaimed as a lawyer of great distinction, able orator, eminent and far-sighted legislator, and above all, an economist of vision and analytical mind, Quirino's life is full of adversities, trials, and privations. Like President Roxas, he is a product of the American-patterned public-school system in the Philippines. Like many of the great American leaders, Quirino is a self-made man.

Summing up his interpretation of American-Philippine relations at this crucial stage in world uncertainty, Quirino stated that "happily, Filipino bonds with America are infinitely stronger today than they had ever been. American concern for the future of the Philippines was never more truly felt and more genuine."

TAUGHT SCHOOL AT 15

He was born on November 16, 1890, in Vigan, Ilocos Sur—the third among nine children of Don Mariano Quirino and Gregoria Rivera. So hard was the life of his family that when he was 15, he taught in one of the barrio schools of his home town. His teaching experience gave him a grasp of fundamental school problems, making him an enthusiastic champion of the public-school system in the islands. It was undoubtedly his insight into the educational needs of his people that prompted him to fight in the halls of the Philippine Congress for legislation designed to improve the educational standards of his country.

At the age of 18, he left the barrio school and went to Manila, where he enrolled in the Manila High School. He supported himself by sketching and illustrating for several publications and by doing clerical work in the government. It was in the high school that he learned the rules of discussion and debate, heading the Cryptia Debating Club which was the opposing group to the Rizal Debating Society led by Manuel Roxas, now President of the Philippines.

Graduating in April 1911, he enrolled in the College of Law, University of the Philippines. He won his degree of bachelor of laws in March 1915, and passed the Philippine bar in the same year. In 1921, he was admitted to practice in the United States District Court of China. In 1934, as a member of the last Philippine independence mission, he was admitted to practice in the Supreme Court of the United States.

WAS QUEZON'S SECRETARY

Upon becoming a lawyer, he served as a law clerk in the office of the Philippine commission. Because of his eminently satisfactory record in this post, he was selected as secretary to Manuel L. Quezon. From then on, he established a relationship with Quezon which the years did not change or destroy, but enriched. It was a relationship based on mutual trust, confidence, and affection.

After serving as secretary to Mr. Quezon for 2 years, Quirino resigned in 1919 to launch his candidacy for membership in the lower house of the Philippine Legislature. He won and served as Representative from the First District of Ilocos Sur. In 1921, he became a delegate of the House of Representatives to the International Bar Conference in Peking, China.

Believing that his sphere of activity as a representative was too limited, he launched his candidacy for the Senate in 1922. He was defeated. But in 1925 he tried again and was elected as Senator from the First Senatorial District. He served in the Senate continuously thereafter until he became a delegate to the Philippine Constitutional Convention.

As a member of the Senate before the establishment of the Commonwealth Government, Quirino was the Senate majority floor leader. He was ranking member of the last Philippine independence mission to the United States headed by the late Manuel L. Quezon which secured the passage of the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Law in 1934. As a member of the Constitutional Convention he was responsible for breaking the long deadlock on the question of whether the constitution being drafted was also going to become the constitution of the Philippine Republic. Quirino advocated that the matter be left to the people and the leaders of the new republic.

HELD MANY CABINET POSTS

Resigning from his active legislative portfolio, he served as Secretary of Finance under Governor-General Frank Murphy, 1934-35, and was the first Secretary of Finance under the Commonwealth Government from 1935 to 1936. During 1936 to 1938, he was Secretary of the Interior. While in the Cabinet, he was chairman of the National Information Board, the National Relief Board and the board of trustees of the Philippines Charity Sweepstakes.

As Secretary of Finance, he advocated the creation of the National Loan and Investment Board and the National Economic Council. As Secretary of the Interior, he advocated the conversion of several barrios into municipalities and municipalities into cities. He was responsible for the creation of the National Information and Radio Boards for the purpose of informing 18,000,000 Filipinos what the Government is doing, and what its problems are, and how they are being solved.

Before his return to the Senate in 1941, Quirino was vice chairman of the board of directors of the Agricultural and Industrial Bank; a member of the board of directors of the National Development Co. and several of its subsidiaries. At intervals, while not serving the Government in any official capacity, he practiced law and taught in various colleges and universities in Manila. He was dean of the Adamson College of Law before his election to the senate in 1941. On the eve of the outbreak of the war, Quirino was elected senator-at-large, and upon the liberation of the Philippines in 1945, he was elected President pro tempore of the Philippine Senate, while Manuel Roxas was the President of the Senate.

From the foregoing background events of his colorful life, it is clear that several factors merged to make Quirino what he is today. Even as a student he had displayed grit and perseverance in the face of hardships. He decided to attain a goal, and he bent all his efforts to it. His enviable accomplishments as Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the infant Republic, which included the negotiations of the various treaties signed by the United States and the Philippines may be attributed to his simple formula of never flinching from hardship and danger; of never disdaining to undergo the sacrifices called for by the poverty of his origin.

NEVER SULKY, NEVER PROUD

Quirino is a fighter. His political adversaries readily admit that their definite extinction from politics is due to the hard-hitting, uncompromising fighting spirit of the Philippine Republic's first secretary of foreign affairs. He does not admit any compromise. As a politician, he has had his defeats and triumphs. But in defeat he is never sulky; in triumph he is never proud.

In all his activities as a public official one mark stands out in bold relief. It is that the the escutcheon of his name has suffered no blot nor blemish, even during those critical days of the Japanese occupation of the Philippines. For three years and a half of the Japanese domination of the islands, Quirino consistently refused to accept any position under the puppet government. No one can point to his political career the finger of scorn or contempt. His official and private transactions are above any reproach, his honesty beyond question, and his integrity without stain. To him public office is a public trust. So binding upon him is this consideration that he would not even dare practice his profession as long as he is in the Government service because he does not want his professional duties to interfere or to conflict with his duties to the public.

Elpidio Quirino married Alicia Syquia on January 16, 1921. They had five children. As revenge for his consistent refusal to accept any position offered him by the Japanese military command during the regime of the puppet government in the islands, his wife and three of his children were massacred by the Japanese in his presence during the slaughter of Manila in February 1945.

Labor Unions and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a most able and learned presentation of the labor-management problem was made by Hon. B. A. Lynch, of Blytheville, Ark., before the Blytheville Rotary Club on April 10, 1947. Mr. Lynch, who is a past president of the Arkansas Bankers Association, has given this most important issue painstaking and thorough study and his speech deserves careful attention and earnest consideration of the Congress:

As a preface to the remarks that I am about to make, I would like to state that I am not antilabor union. I feel that labor unions have their place in the economic set-up and that it is necessary to have unions in order that the workingman may receive just compensation and reasonable working conditions.

I am going to talk to you today about a modern version of an ancient vice—a vice which throughout the centuries of man's existence has caused perhaps more misery, more suffering, more blood letting than any other. I am going to remind you of conditions we face today, and consequences which threaten us tomorrow, as a result of evil and irresponsible lust for power on the part of scheming and unscrupulous men.

Lust for power is by no means in itself a new sin. Genghis Khan and his generals had it so strongly that they put the Oriental world to the torch to satisfy their craving. Caesar had it. Al Capone had it. Hitler and his Nazis had it and would gladly have enslaved you and me, starved us or tortured us to insanity or death to satisfy their phobia for domination.

As we examine history's record of power-mad individuals and groups, we find two points of similarity which apply in every case. First, lust for power feeds on the attainment of power and quickly becomes insatiable. Second, man has always, at some point, been forced to overthrow those who would oppress him, and the longer he has waited the more difficult and bloody has been his job.

These same fundamentals apply to a small group of men who have it within their power today, legally, to reach into our homes and private business, to disrupt the life of this community, to order that we shall receive no food or clothing by rail or highway, that we shall have no coal or automobiles or radios. They have the power to tell the young men of this community which trades or crafts they may enter, and on what terms. Theirs is a tyranny no different in principle, and no less dangerous in potential consequences, than the tyrannies which recently have been overthrown at such staggering costs in lives, dollars, and material resources.

I refer, of course, to those barons of labor who through sly campaigns of attrition have successfully entrapped a large segment of the wage earners of our Nation and who already have attained such power that they have no hesitancy in bringing difficulty and discomfort to every man, woman, and child in America to gain some immediate selfish end. You are perhaps familiar with various examples of the ruthless ambition of these men, but you may not have recognized the full extent of their shrewdness in preying upon the normal human tendencies and habits of people like you and me.

Right now, today, this week, we are being taken into camp through a maneuver so simple as to be almost childish, and yet so shrewd that I dare say not one man in a thousand recognizes what is happening. If you will but check your own memory I believe you will find that there were many times in 1946 when you became so incensed at the unreasonableness and presumptuousness of labor racketeers that you fairly exploded with indignation. You were not alone. Throughout the Nation, other men and women felt exactly as you did, and enough of them expressed their feelings at the ballot box to sweep into office a political party whose most popular promise was one to put the gods of labor in their proper place.

Have you felt during the past few weeks as you did during the steel strike last year, during the auto strike, the rail strike, or the coal strike? You have not, and neither have I—and that is exactly the result which shrewdness has accomplished. We in this room are living evidence of the success which has accompanied the efforts of our would-be dictators to see that our influence, and the influence of millions like us, was largely immunized during this vital period when Congress is considering labor legislation. The flood of letters and telegrams that swamped the desks of Congressmen a few short weeks ago has become a trickle. In some cases even those who rode into office under the banner of labor reform are weakening under the double drag of public apathy and all-out labor lobbying. That condition, fraught with more immediate peril to you and me than anything that Stalin can do, was brought about by the simple expedient of calling off strikes for a brief period so that you and I might yield to our normal inclination to tend to our personal affairs and forget our determination to protect ourselves from legalized economic domination.

Let me remind you of a few of the things our labor barons and monopolists are seeking to maintain as their legal rights—a few of the issues for which they are fighting so violently while you and I sit by—a few of the instruments through which they expect to continue to gorge themselves with power at our expense.

Among the foremost tools of their despotism is a legalized racket which you and I know to be wholly antagonistic to the intent of the very Constitution of this Nation. I refer to the "closed shop"—a form of totalitarianism so incompatible with the principles of democracy that it should make any free man recoil in disgust. Under it the dictators of national labor unions, each in his own sphere, have established systems of government wherein they are privileged to make their own laws, collect their own tribute, extend or deny to any individual craftsman the right to work, and punish without jury trial any citizen of their realm who incurs their displeasure.

Under such a system the vaunted "rights to strike" becomes the right of a few professional labor monopolists to order tens or even hundreds of thousands of American citizens to quit work whether they wish to or not, under penalty of permanent expulsion from the trade through which they earn their livelihood.

Under such a system the individual worker is no longer a free man. He is no longer a man who can make his own decisions, who can decide where he wants to work, for whom, and for how much. He is no longer a man who by working harder and more skillfully may hope to advance above the level of the less ambitious. He becomes not an individual, but merely the one one-thousandth fraction of a group of a thousand workers. He is told how many bricks he can lay in one day, or how many feet of concrete he can pour, and woe to him who dares to give his best to his job if his best is more than the rules allow.

If you have any doubt as to the extremes to which such tyranny can go, I refer you to a mandate of the American Federation of Musicians. The mandate provides that if a professional musician is offered a job in some city other than that in which he is working, he must wait up to 6 months before the union will permit him to move. If he should make the mistake of accepting a better job in another locality without written permission, he may be permanently barred from again earning his living in his chosen field. On union orders he may be banned from radio stations, from public auditoriums, from concert halls, and even from hotel orchestras.

Let me show you how such a system can be reflected in costs. A few days ago, in one of our southern cities, a public-welfare group sought to produce a series of four short radio announcements in transcribed form. They wanted to open each of these four announcements with a few seconds of music. The radio station which was to make the transcriptions offered to contribute its organ without charge. A church organist offered to play the necessary bars without charge. But the owner of the radio station could not allow the church organist to enter his studio under penalty of a strike which would have taken him off the air. Union rules provided that the fee for less than 6 minutes of music, with the musician on the premises for a total elapsed time of less than 30 minutes, should be $104.

Perhaps you don't make transcriptions or employ organists. Perhaps you don't even like radio stations. But you do employ plumbers or electricians now and then. You do depend on railroads and trucks and gasoline refineries. And I say to you that the cancer which is eating at the heart of American industry today will take you and me to destruction with it unless we assert ourselves while there is yet time. I say to you that the right of a man to work is more sacred than the right of a labor baron to call a strike. I say to you that the spirit and original meaning of this Nation's Bill of Rights is more sacred than the Wagner Act, and that when any group of citizens attempts to become bigger than our Government it is high time the rest of us put that group in its place.

We have seen that happen before. We once saw big business become too powerful for the good of the rest of us. We put it in its place with the Sherman Antitrust Act. Yet the monopolies of big business at its all-time worst were child's play as compared with the monopolies which the lords of labor have attained through the technique they refer to as "industry-wide bargaining." If even as many as two manufacturers of automobiles get together to fix prices they are subject to fines and penitentiary sentences. Yet it is perfectly legal, according to our present laws and their interpretations, for automobile labor leaders not only to get together and fix industry-wide prices for automobile labor, but to enforce their prices by denying automobiles to you and me until their demands are met.

What justice is there in such a situation? What justice is there in a situation which provides that the Government itself shall fix the prices which a railroad may charge for hauling freight, and then permits a labor monopoly to tell the railroads of the entire Nation how much they shall pay their workmen, how many men shall be employed aboard each train, what jobs each workman may and may not do, and the terms and conditions under which each workman may be employed.

There was a time, even since today's labor laws were put upon the statute books when matters such as I have been discussing were of only remote concern to you and me as individual citizens. But that was before labor's lust for power began to feed so ravenously upon the attainment of power. That was before its appetite had become insatiable. Today it has become the standard practice of "big labor" to use you and me as pawns. By depriving you and me and the rest of the public of coal, of cars, or of railroad service, these monopolists seek to make us scream so loudly for relief that a manufacturer, an entire industry, or even the Government itself must yield to their demands.

The degree of discomfort which we in this room have suffered because of the labor racket has of course varied with our individual problems and our individual exposure. Yet all of us know that our discomforts of the past are but forerunners of greater discomforts to come unless we join together, and join with straight-thinking citizens throughout the Nation, to bring an end to the growing dictatorships which surround us.

I know that none of us is so naive as to believe that if Congress should adjourn without passing corrective legislation we could see a continuation of the relatively good behavior which now exists. Certainly the tremendous war chests allocated by the CIO and AFL for organization work in the South do not indicate any lack of fervor for expansion and further conquest. On the other hand, we may depend upon it that the captains of labor will not be satisfied until they can tell each of us whom we may hire, how much we must pay, what amount of work is to be done, and whom we may and may not fire. They will not be satisfied until every shop is a "closed shop," until every industry must bargain with them on an industry-wide basis, and until the technique of the secondary boycott is so refined and perfected that, for example, truck drivers may be ordered to quit handling cotton for farmers or cotton products for manufacturers until southern Congressmen and Senators vote for labor-sponsored bills.

I wish that I might discuss with you fully the alarming potentialities of this matter of secondary boycotts—a practice already so vicious that an industry or a business can often be brought to its knees through sympathetic action by unions in no way associated with the particular question in controversy. If, for example, an organizer seeks to persuade the employees of your grocery store to join a clerks' union, it is entirely legal for him to call on the truck drivers' union to refuse to make deliveries to your store until your employees give in.

There are many more such unjust and un-American practices against which the individual citizen has no legal defense under today's statutes. Not the least of them is the jurisdictional strike, through which a

business may be brought to bankruptcy while two unions fight over the one question of which shall be boss. You have recently seen a prime and much publicized example of such a strike in the film studios of Hollywood. Here heads were cracked, property was destroyed, thousands of employees were prevented from working, and millions of dollars were lost to the studios while two relatively minor unions fought with each other, not over wages or hours or conditions of work, but over which should control the workmen building certain scenery for sound stages. The principle involved is exactly the same as though your drug store were closed down by picket lines while the pharmacists' union and the clerks' union threw bricks at each other over whether or not your pharmacist or your counter clerk should have the exclusive right to sell bottles of patent medicines.

What can you and I do about this? What positive action can we take? What effective resistance can we, as individuals, put up against huge Nation-wide monopolies which operate within the law and, therefore, with the support of the courts and law-enforcement agencies of the land? Our position under such circumstances is difficult, but it is by no means hopeless. For we are the people who can change the law. We, as average Americans, are the people who can say, and see to it, that there shall no longer be one set of laws for us, and an entirely different set of laws for the professional practitioners of labor. We can insist that the right to work be restored to every American, that unwilling and involuntary taxation and tribute shall no longer be exacted as a condition of employment, that labor monopolies of vital industries shall no longer be tolerated, and that written contracts between workers and employers shall no longer be binding upon employers alone. We can insist, in short, that the benefits and privileges of democratic government be restored to all Americans alike.

In Washington today are men whom we have sent there, among other things, to cast our vote on this particular problem. It is your job and mine, as individuals, to see that they know how we feel, that they know how our friends feel, and that their votes reflect the will of the majority rather than the pressure of the privileged. I seriously doubt that there are half a dozen men in this room who have told a Senator or Representative from this State, either orally or in writing, how they feel on this question. I doubt that there are two of us who have called on even our closest friends to express themselves to those who represent them. This is exactly the situation which contributes most to our danger. It is exactly the situation which the bosses of "big labor" counted upon when they let the steel industry and the coal mines and the gasoline refineries operate smoothly during this period of legislative crisis. All that you and I need do to make possible still further and still more offensive encroachments is to continue exactly what we are now doing.

Cussing John Lewis or Dan Tobin among ourselves may be an entertaining pastime but it will not get results. Speeches like this won't do it. There is one thing, and one only, that will—positive action in the form of written demands upon those whom we have elected to handle this matter. May I urge upon you that before this day has passed you dispatch your own message by wire or letter. May I urge that as leaders of this community you accept the responsibility for seeing that a minimum of 10 of your friends also express themselves in writing. May I beg, in the name of the preservation of your independence and the future of this Nation, that you pledge a solemn oath to fulfill this simple but vital responsibility.

At some point you and I, as have other men in other times, shall be forced to overthrow those who would oppress us. We shall find, as others have found, that the longer we wait the more difficult will be our job. A matter of letters today may grow into a matter of lives tomorrow. It is a job which inevitably you and I must do—a job which will never be easier than today. I have accepted my part of it. I earnestly plead that you accept yours.

House Joint Resolution 153

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, for 3 days I have watched gallons of crocodile tears flowing down the aisles of this House and into this well—shed over the pitiful plight of those unfortunates across the waters, half of whom only 3 years ago were running bayonets through the bellies of good American soldiers: As previously stated by my distinguished colleague, Mr. RANKIN, about 80 years ago a fellow by the name of Sherman marched through the Southland pillaging, burning, and destroying everything in his wake. The South felt the cruel hand of total war in its fight for independence the same as these people in Europe, but the only thing in the form of relief that was sent south was a bunch of carpetbaggers who came down and relieved our people of what little they had left. And yet these people literally beat their guns into plowshares and plowed the earth with milk cows, saddle horses, and anything they could get strong enough to pull a plow. They used their resources at hand, and they did not starve, and today we find our stanchest advocates of the democratic way of life in the South.

No, I cannot reconcile this sending of millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money on an overseas joy ride and at the same time refusing to pay the terminal-leave bonds of our soldiers in cash; I cannot reconcile the sending of these millions overseas and at the same time cutting in half appropriations for our own interior development; I cannot reconcile the sending of thousands of tons of fertilizer overseas when our own farmers are crying for fertilizer with which to make their crops to feed America; I cannot reconcile the sending of these millions overseas and at the same time refusing to raise ceilings for veterans' on-the-job training so that our veterans in training may have a livable income; I cannot reconcile the sending of these millions of dollars overseas when at the same time we stagger under the greatest national debt that the world has ever seen; I cannot reconcile the sending of these millions overseas when we know that most of it will go into the hands of Communists who are waiting to stab us in the back the minute we turn around.

I am tired of fighting wars for the sole privilege of feeding the world. To continue this policy will wreck any country or people.

We owe it to our people to take care of them first. It is their money, and before voting to ship it overseas, stop and try to justify your action of Friday in the light of your action today.

Another Gift to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this pending measure, House Joint Resolution 153, provides for a gift of $350,000,000 to Europe. Other nations are not joining with us in this proposal, but our Nation is proposing to extend this huge sum of money, which we do not now have, for some purpose—and that purpose is largely unknown to any of the Members of this body. We will remember, I am certain, that we have heretofore extended relief to Europe, and the devastated countries, in the sum of $2,700,000,000. I was one of those who aided in the passage of those laws, because I wanted to aid, insofar as we could, in those areas where the need was great and the people were hungry and were suffering. At the time we extended that aid to Europe, it was represented to the Members of the House that the sum embraced in that relief measure, in the sum of $2,700,000,000, was the entire and full amount which the United States of America would be called upon to contribute for all such purposes.

And, we must not forget that our Nation, at that time, contributed 72 cents of every dollar that was provided for those purposes. We met that request, and we have provided that huge sum of money for those stricken areas. While, we are now advised that the crops are developing and the harvest will soon be upon them, yet someone has suggested to the President that "we should extend additional aid to Europe," and he has requested the Congress for the sum of $350,000,000 for some country, or countries, in Europe—no one can now state what those countries are—and no one can now tell, with any certainty, whether the communistic-dominated countries will participate in this fund or not. Even Russia, who has participated in aid during the war, and since the war, can participate in this fund—if those in charge of it shall so decree. With all of the aid we have extended, under lend-lease, and in direct assistance, we have granted something near $55,000,000,000 to $60,000,000,000 to Europe during and since the war. Now, we are asked to provide this additional sum of money, alone—as no other nation is bound to participate in the extension of such aid at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious to know who will administer this fund, if this measure passes? I am also very anxious to know in what countries, and among

what people, this proposed aid will be available? And, since the European harvest time is at hand, what effort will be made by the people of any country seeking aid, to harvest and save their crops and thereby take care of the people of their own country? These are pertinent questions, I am certain. The people of the United States of America desire to know these answers—and they are entitled to have each one of those questions answered.

Mr. Speaker, there are other considerations here involved to which I desire to address myself. We are embarking upon a new enterprise, because our Nation is assuming to extend this huge sum of money to some country, or countries, hereafter to be determined, located in Europe, without any assistance from any other country, insofar as the record shows. Certainly some other European nation should have the love of Europe sufficiently at heart to come forward and offer to aid, if the need is great, and if any people in any country are in great distress. But they do not come forward. Yet, their financial structure is as good, or better, than our own. And, if this gift is extended—then we have embarked upon the highway of greater aid, in time of peace, and I wonder when the next request will come for additional funds for this same purpose? This is a most serious problem before us. We are staggering under the load of taxes, and the withholding taxes are deducted from the pay envelopes of every man, woman, and child who now work for wages, and the huge debt that stands before us is unpaid, and the interest upon it is accumulating. As we contemplate this measure, today, we are constrained to wonder what the end will be? We wonder what the plight of the average American will be, in the future, and if there should be a recess in employment—or if there should be a depression, and I am convinced there will be a depression in the future—then the huge sums of money that have been so ruthlessly given away to Europe, long after the war is over, would be a welcome asset in our own country to drive need and starvation from the doors of our own people.

Mr. Speaker, in the confused state of this measure, and in the face of that which we have already done to aid in those countries, and that further fact that we are embarking, alone, upon this project—giving away the funds which are so sorely needed here—and no one can tell whether we are aiding the spread of communism in Europe by this action—we are probably doing just that—I cannot lend my voice and vote to this measure.

While I desire to aid those in distress, yet when I am voting to spend the people's money I demand to know the facts, and all of the facts, and I desire to know who is going to handle the money, and to whom and for what purpose the same will be used. The membership of the House are without that information. The Foreign Affairs Committee has not provided that information. We are merely asked to give a blank check, for a huge sum of money, to be used by someone, for some purpose, somewhere—and that policy is not subscribed by me in this or any other problem.

Let us transact business in a business-like manner, and let us reject all proposals which fail to measure up to that correct and long-determined standard.

Address by Vice Adm. P. N. L. Bellinger, United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address made at the Ninth Annual Azalea Festival at Charleston, S. C., on April 21, 1947, by one of South Carolina's most distinguished sons, Vice Adm. P. N. L. Bellinger.

No man, living or dead, has contributed more to air power in this Nation. Admiral Bellinger was a pioneer in this field. He flew the Atlantic in the NC4 in the early days of aviation history. He has served on many boards during the development of heavier-than-air craft.

During the war, he was in charge of the Atlantic Naval Air Command protecting the shores of this Nation. The record of his contributions to the security of our Atlantic shore line is replete with acts of heroism, rescue, and protection.

It is a distinguished honor to me personally to call to my colleagues' attention the words of wisdom spoken by the gallant admiral; words that will bear fruit to our children in the future and words which it will be well for us all to take note of and to heed.

The address of Vice Adm. P. N. L. Bellinger follows:

I am indeed honored to be with you today as the Navy's representative at your Ninth Annual Azalea Festival. I was born and raised in Cheraw, about 150 miles north from here. I can still remember the great interest displayed by my elders as each spring approached. Would it be a good season for the azaleas? Would they bloom early or late? And these beautiful old gardens, such as Magnolia and Middleton were, of course, household names.

In later life, I have often encountered people in other parts of the country who were heading south to see these magnificent azalea gardens. As a native South Carolinian, this has always given me a sense of pride. I liked the idea of strangers taking an active interest in the beauties of my home State.

For many years you have been carrying on this fine tradition. It adds to the joy and appreciation of living. I would like to think that my grandchildren, too, will enjoy it, year after year, without interruption such as that which prevented the festival from being held for the last 6 years. I would like to believe that peace and our scheme of democratic life, which encourages such individual expression, will last eternally.

However, many differences must be resolved to guarantee that peace. The ravaged peoples of the world must be restored as peaceful, independent, democratic nations. Lies, false propaganda, mud slinging, and distrust must be replaced by international friendship and cooperation. It is not an impossible program. It is a difficult one. But until the day it is realized, war is more than just a possibility. Until that day comes, we must remain prepared against that possibility.

The democratic method of attaining that program is opposed, at home and abroad, by an alien philosophy. Professing to seek the same end, its advocates declare that a communistic form of government would solve all problems, domestic and foreign. But nowhere on earth is the true communistic principle of government actually in practice. Through appeal to the have-nots, the hopeless, and the desperate, whole peoples have been enslaved by small, powerful, persuasive minorities. In the guise of a glorious crusade to free the workingman, the professional Communists have further enslaved him. In promising them peace, the masses are being prepared for a fanatical war, and with the technique of totalitarian governments everywhere, the most elaborate precautions are taken to prevent their citizens from learning the true conditions under which the American people live. They dread publishing the truth, for they know too well that the truth will incite their own peoples to demand more rights, higher standards of living, fewer working hours, higher pay, better equipment, better housing, better working conditions. The governments so created are indistinguishable from the Fascist governments we fought to destroy. It is a matter for sober thought that there are more dictatorships flourishing throughout the world today than in 1939 when Germany invaded Poland without cause, treaty notwithstanding. We speak of the war being over, of being at peace, but let us not confuse ourselves with empty words. There is no peace. We must not confuse our definitions like the little boy who came home with a big bump on the back of his head. His mother asked him if he'd been fighting. "No; I wasn't fighting," he said, "I was just sitting on Willie Jones and forgot to hold his feet."

We have placed our faith in peace treaties before, and they have failed. Some well-meaning souls—and others not so well-meaning—are proposing disarmament as the surest solution to the intricate puzzle of world peace. Disarmament is nothing new to this country, either. We have tried it—and each time laid ourselves open to attack. International disarmament would effectively disarm only the United States. It would leave the communistic powers free to follow their insidious scheme of expansion. And presently a disarmed United States, unable further to argue the cause of freedom, would become the easy prey of the Eurasian conqueror.

Wars, like fires, are better prevented than extinguished after they start. But if they are allowed to start, they are prevented from doing maximum damage by extinguishing them before they become holocausts. Just as each member of a community subscribes to a fire department, or a police department, so must each member of the international community strive to establish and support a mutual brigade for the enforcement of peace. That is why we place our hope in the United Nations. We will always have to contribute to that agency, in money, in men, and munitions. Modern wars are never won by defending your home soil. They are won on the enemy's home grounds. The best deterrent for any war is to make the United States so powerful that it would be suicide for any nation to venture a sudden attack upon us. How can we make ourselves so powerful that it would be suicide for any nation to venture a sudden attack upon us? How can we make ourselves so powerful that any nation or combination of nations would hesitate to attack us? Does this not sound prohibitive

economically? This can be accomplished both expensively or relatively economically.

A war machine consists of immense quantities of expensive equipment, and the most expensive of all, our young men and women. The lifeblood of this machine is national morale. This costs nothing but is the most valuable of all.

We must inculcate in ourselves, I pray we all have it, in all our citizens, and in our children a feeling of intense nationalism. Let us become informed of the beauty, grandeur, and advantages of this great country of ours, the pricelessness of democracy.

Just prior to the last two wars we were adjudged weak by our enemies because of internal arguments. Democracy is based on individual expression. We must always have it, but never let it be thought that we will not solidly pull together and fight any aggression. Our armed forces are the visible guaranty of strength to any power contemplating attack. They must be strong. They must withstand the shock of initial attack. They must be maintained at maximum strength with maximum economy. Your Navy is your shock absorber in the initial attack. It must be strong. Its ability to counter the initial thrusts of the enemy will determine the length and quite probably the outcome of the struggle.

Your Navy is a modern Navy. It does not neglect any means of carrying out its job. It employs submarines, all types of on-the-sea warships and is the foremost of all nations in the integration of air-sea warfare. Its amphibious force—the Marine Corps—has no par.

The speed of naval attack may now be measured in the hundreds of miles an hour. The Navy has perfected a guided missile which can be carried from the deck of a carrier by a fighter airplane, released at great distance, and guided to its target with devastating effect.

Your Navy, through the integration of its fighting forces, is a mighty insurance policy. Let us not cancel this insurance in favor of much-talked-of but untried weapons. One of our leaders recently said that all we have perfected in push-button warfare is the push button. Certainly at the present time war is more imminent than push-button warfare.

Our fleet has proven its ability to operate away from its bases for extended periods. The fast carrier task forces demonstrated this off the shores of Japan and Okinawa, through the Central Pacific, and off the Philippines.

The world is in a chaotic condition today. Most of the nations are impoverished and famine stricken. The United States is bearing the largest part of the responsibility for feeding and clothing Europe, without thought of profit. The four freedoms we fought so hard to establish are not yet realities in many parts of the globe. Such conditions are fertile territory for the growth of distrust and desire which create war. Of necessity the United States today wears the mantle of world leadership. The international situation requires that we wear it. Our own security demands it. A weak nation cannot wear the mantle of world leadership. Weakness has only gained the doubtful privilege of appeasement. We can't afford to follow the theme of the two rabbits who were trapped in a hollow log by a pack of yelping dogs. Father Rabbit calmed Mother Rabbit with "Take courage, my dear. If we can just hold out for a short time we will outnumber them."

Your Navy can move as a unit throughout the seas of the world. It can defend itself and yet attack—and its reach through naval aviation, is deep into the enemy's homeland. It both keeps abreast of and originates new weapons, new developments, new techniques. It operates the latest in aircraft. Freedom of the seas is a plank in the platform of democracy. No country having the freedom of the sea has yet been conquered. There has come into being during our generation a new sea. That sea bounds the known world and is navigable only by airplanes and guided missiles. The combination of ships, airplanes, and men is as yet unbeatable.

Our country is dedicated to peace. Our Navy is a member of that team. Its mission is to prevent war, but if war cannot be avoided, to win it as swiftly, as decisively and as economically as its power permits.

But these are grim thoughts to inject in this scene of peace. I suggest we return now to the more pleasant contemplation of the beauties of nature which God has so lavishly bestowed upon this community. It is my earnest hope that never again will these festivals have to be interrupted by war.

There's Danger Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the current issue of the National Tribune:

THERE'S DANGER AHEAD

For parts of 2 days last week we sat at the press table in the meeting room of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, listening in on the presentation of testimony designed to secure free automobiles for some of our veterans who were maimed in their country's service. In that room were some 20 or 30 heroes whose arms and legs had been blown off in the hell of war. Some were in special wheel chairs, others leaned on crutches or stood against the side walls of the crowded room. Some had empty sleeves or possessed those glistening hooks that are such a sad substitute for hands.

With an eager ear and with intent and searching looks on their wan faces, these men, too, listened as representatives of veterans' organizations pleaded for modifications of existing law that would open to them the promise of a car, free and equipped with special appliances, and they heard questions being asked and answered. They also heard Members of Congress talk in terms of cash settlements in lieu of autos. Perhaps they were not as confused in mind as they might have been if they had been able to read behind some of those questions to which witnesses replied as best they could. Certain it is that they could not have been versed in the complexities of legislation and the wiles of legislators as hope eternal beat within their breasts, but we had cause for meditation, and we could not refrain from posing to ourselves two or three disturbing questions. Are the veterans' spokesmen rendering to these boys the best type of service of which they are capable? Are the lads themselves seeking the sort of relief that will most suit their needs? Are those Congressmen who sat there in judgment trying sincerely to meet the issues, or are they permitting their hearts to warp their judgments?

The case of the amputees is not unlike many other demands for our veterans that are phrased in bills pending before the committee, and the reception of their claims is no different from that which may be granted to similar measures. It is not easy for an elected representative of the people to look upon the victims of war and fail to accede to their wishes. Their sacrifices have been many, their wounds grievous. They were sent away to a war they did not order. They were told that when they returned nothing would be too good for them. Cost was then no consideration. It must not be now, but, we thought, wisdom exercised in a choice of legislation is of great moment, so we wondered, up there at the Capitol, just where we were heading and why. This was but a single benefit, but its implications could be applied to many another bill that has been dropped in the hopper.

Here were a dozen or so requests to extend the autos for amputees bill that went through the Congress last August as a rider on an appropriation measure. It provided $1,600 automobiles for our boys who lost, or lost the use of, both feet above the ankle. Rushed through in a breeze during the closing hours of the session by a spirited lobby made up largely of the injured veterans themselves, it had many imperfections. It was intended as a rehabilitation aid to those who needed cars to reestablish themselves in business careers. It little matters that some have variously abused their privileges, but it is of importance that the hastily conceived legislation has left behind scores of discriminations about which something must be done.

It was brought out last week that while some of the legless veterans who could pass driver tests were able to get autos, others were not; that $1,600 would supply an appropriate car in one locality and not in another; that those injured at one date were eligible, and some who lost legs earlier were out of luck; that actual loss of use of limbs was difficult of definition, and so on. Request piled upon request that the same benefits should go to those who lost arms above the wrist, to the blinded and to those who suffered paralysis. And these were only a few of the issues discussed. It is proposed in some of the bills that World War I veterans must also be included, and one wag of a Congressman suggested that Spanish War veterans should likewise be remembered. Many were the complications that evidenced themselves before the hearings were adjourned and the whole matter referred to a special subcommittee.

How measured was the thought given to the original legislation is now water over the dam. It will appear strange to many of our readers that we discuss it briefly here, because we have fought consistently over the years for proper benefits to the one class of our country's citizens that deserves special recognition over all others, and we have fought as desperately against those who find it possible in their narrow minds and flintlike hearts to deny them. Nevertheless, we must insist now that careful consideration be given to all of these bills, and to many others that like them promote uncommon advantages. We support some of the extensions sought by amputees because the precedents have been established and because no laws applying to veterans and their dependent loved ones can be permitted to be discriminatory, but we do believe that greater thought must be given to all proposals that are to be made for our service men and women, and we are sure that all veterans, their legislative representatives and those whom they send to the Congress should stop, look, and listen before they seriously pass on measures that are a far departure from a pattern of benefits which can stand the acid test of public opinion.

This Congress is economy minded. It is driving hard to curtail expenditures. Already it has demonstrated that it cares not who or what is hurt in its effort to reach a given objective, and veterans and their plans have not been unaffected. We recall the year 1933, when most of our younger veterans were still in knee pants, and when by stealth and deception another Congress was led to enact an economy act that wiped out the

then structure of veterans' laws, drove thousands of needy out of hospitals and homes and sent hundreds to premature graves by the suicide route. We have no desire to witness a repetition of those awful days. We who are experienced have no stomach to fight our way back along the long and hard reenactment trail. It is unthinkable that such a black and horrible page could ever again be written in American history, and it certainly could not come so soon after World War II, but legislation that is written now is permanently placed upon the statute books; it is not intended to be temporary. That is why we are concerned for all veterans, and for all of the widows and orphans of our comrades who lie cold in death. Economy is a nasty word when it is applied to veterans and threatens to wipe out all they have.

Legislation for the veteran class should be most carefully studied and be exact in its language. It must be soundly based so it will not encourage the resistance of nonveterans and of the more fortunate veterans who can afford to forget. We wish it understood fully that we are not opposing the bills that we point to as examples of unorthodox requests, yet we suggest as strongly as we can that unusual demands can conceivably wreck the entire structure of benefits unless they are flagged down.

Support the Labor-Union Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 23, 1947

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me last week, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Argus, published in Mount Vernon, N. Y., entitled "Support the Labor-Union Bill":

SUPPORT THE LABOR-UNION BILL

Voters of this city and county should understand that the Hartley labor-union bill, principal features of which are outlawing of the closed shop and of industry-wide bargaining, was presented as a new bill of rights for the American worker.

Already there are strong indications that international labor leaders will endeavor to smear the bill as antilabor, whereas it really contains more protection for the individual workingman than any piece of national legislation conceived in the last decade.

This bill was adopted in the House with 74 percent of the Members in favor. That means about a 3-to-1 approval, and includes not only Republicans but Democrats. Naturally, having taken this bold step, Members of Congress now are awaiting the public reaction. They have the right to know whether their constituents feel they have acted properly.

That is why it is advisable that voters here inform our two Congressmen, RALPH A. GAMBLE, of Larchmont, and RALPH W. GWINN, of Bronxville, of their views and desires. Make no mistake about the organized pressure which will be brought upon them, including threats of reprisals, by the labor leaders. Yet a study of the bill shows clearly the protection given the worker against regimentation and rigid discipline which have handcuffed union members for years.

We recommend to all readers a careful perusal of the bill, and then that they write their Congressmen. Here is a situation wherein it is essential that the public voice be heard if we are to escape from the oppression of arrogant labor leaders.

This Is a Time for Teamwork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. E. M. Elkin, chairman, committee on taxation and Government expenditures, Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, on Monday night at the Mayflower before the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce:

THIS IS A TIME FOR TEAMWORK

It is ar honor indeed to meet with you tonight and to discuss some of our economic and financial problems in this critical period. If we are to find sane solutions for these important problems, then teamwork by all of our citizens is imperative. If we are to hold the line against the forces of economic instability and financial insolvency, it can only be done by the united efforts of everyone. You, our distinguished guests, are playing a leading role in this serious drama and we, your constituents, must aid you in every way possible. This, gentlemen, is a time for real teamwork.

Ours is one of the few countries remaining, in which the fires of freedom have not been extinguished by dictators and tyrants who have capitalized upon the internal jealousies and dissensions that have split the people into weak minority factions. We owe a responsibility to ourselves and to the world to cooperate with each other in keeping our democracy alive and in preserving individual initiative and free enterprise.

Our common goal, regardless of class or party, should be a strong and prosperous America—blessed with economic stability—jobs for all who are willing and able to work—adequate rewards for the exercise of productive energy by management, labor, investors, and all other groups—and an ever rising level of living for our 140,000,000 consumers. Our foreign problems are baffling indeed, but the fear of various alien ideologies rightfully unites us against our external foes. Our domestic problems, however, are in many ways more numerous and complicated, and here each class and group, if its selfishness is not curbed by a true cooperative spirit, may endanger the equilibrium of our economy.

There is a human tendency to hope for an easy solution—a miracle that will immediately solve all of our harrassing social problems. Much as we would like deliverance from the necessity of hard and straight thinking and from the necessity, by strenuous mental and physical labor—of producing the increased flow of goods and services which are required to win the war against inflation and economic insecurity—we know in our hearts, that we must save ourselves from that predicament. This we can do only by teamwork.

BATTLING THE BUSINESS CYCLE

NOW I should like to refer to a few areas of action in which the cooperation of Government and business, and of all groups, in fact, is especially imperative.

Recently we have been hearing much concerning the specter of inflation—the high cost of living—and the imminence of a severe economic recession. There may be some justification for such thinking if the historical pattern for the adjustment of a nation's economy in a postwar period is considered. But, surely, as we progress with our understanding of the factors involved and if we are to profit by past mistakes, we may at least alleviate the impact of an economic depression if, in fact, it cannot be entirely avoided. The psychology of fear and uncertainty is as influential a factor as any in the generation of economic crises and the consequent industrial stupor and unemployment that may strike a nation low. Since the competitive free-enterprise system is based upon the mutual cooperation of all the economic elements in our society for its successful operation, it is highly sensitive to frictions of every kind—psychological, economic, and political. Obviously, where possible, these frictions should be removed.

Some Government spokesmen have lately attributed to the increased prosperity of business the blame for the present high prices. They have urged business to cut prices and at the same time have referred to the justice of the demands of labor for higher wages.

It has been my observation that businessmen generally have been working vigorously to lower costs and prices. They realize that they can find markets for their products only if the consumers possess adequate purchasing power and are willing to spend it. Businessmen well know that maximum profits over a period of years can be enjoyed only when prices are within the means of the consumers they serve. They also know that more money can be made by selling large quantities of goods at moderate prices than small quantities at high prices. It is, therefore, to the interest of the owners of business and management to keep prices down to the lowest level consistent with a reasonable return on the investment of capital and enterprising skill.

The present economic situation, as we all know, is primarily the byproduct of war financing and its inflationary manufacturing of bank credit, and the multiplication of money in the hands of consumers, at a rate faster than the output of goods and services. It is only by producing more and more goods that inflationary scarcities will be eliminated and prices will be brought down. As Bernard Baruch recently said, "The more we produce the less will be the cost of living; the more things we can buy; the easier will be the building up of our reserves—physical, financial, and spiritual, too, for we shall be free from worry, the absence of which is a sense of security." (New York Times, April 17, 1947, p. 21.)

I believe that it is idle to seek to avoid the consequences of inflation by boosting wages, the money incomes of farmers, and other compensation to our population. These artificial palliatives only temporarily relieve the feverish irritations of inflation. They eventually compel prices to rise still further and cause the purchasing power of money to depreciate to lower levels. We cannot lift ourselves by our boot straps.

Some business enterprises may be obtaining excessive profits, and business profits in the aggregate, after the payment of taxes, have recently been increasing. But investments have also increased tremendously, as have sales, and why should the investor not have increased returns and thereby gain some relief from soaring prices? In boom periods profits customarily rise rapidly, but in periods of recession they tumble swiftly. It is also a noteworthy fact, as economists have frequently observed, that the profits of the smaller concerns soar upward faster than the profits of the larger concerns in times of prosperity and they also decline faster in a depression. Even in the best years a large number of business concerns have no net income, and in years of depression the great majority of all of them have losses. Profits are the return for risk taking, and as such are notoriously uncertain.

The various standards of business earnings do not indicate that such profits are generally excessive, particularly in view of the evanescent nature of profits, the most volatile type of income. While total wage payments have declined since the war, this trend

has not been caused by the growth of business profits but is the natural result of strikes, a shrinkage in the labor force as women and other temporary war workers left the ranks of labor, and a lessening of overtime work. Wage rates, as we all know, have steadily risen since the war, and labor is now in an excellent economic position which can be preserved and even improved if the productivity of labor can be increased. It is entirely possible that there is nothing wrong with our economy which hard work and intelligent cooperation will not correct.

The high prices created by a superabundance of currency can be brought down if the Government and all important economic groups will team together to accomplish that goal. I believe we can all subscribe to the appeal of Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder for lower prices expressed in his editorial in the Treasury Bulletin of April. He says, "I trust that all groups—manufacturers, distributors, workers, farmers, and all others—will recognize and carry out their part in this contribution to continued national prosperity." The reference to "all groups" undoubtedly includes the Government.

Inflation knows no politics, Republican or Democrat, and we can minimize its ravages only if we all cooperate constructively in combating this scourge of mankind.

BRINGING DOWN THE BUDGET

Another challenge to our willingness and ability to cooperate in the fight for economic stability and financial solvency, is the huge Federal budget. It must be brought down to a much lower level if the pressure of inflationary spending is to be reduced and if taxes are to be greatly lightened. You are all familiar with the proposal of the President in January for a budget of $37,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948 and the preelection promises of many Members of Congress to bring that total down considerably and also to lower taxes and the debt. Some think that Congress never will be able to bring the budget down to $25,000,000,000 or less. Many of us, however, are more hopeful, and the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, in cooperation with other business organizations, has been urging that the budget be cut to $31,500,000,000 in 1948, subsequently to $25,000,000,000 and eventually to a much lower figure. We are not unmindful that the results may be accomplished only by eliminating extravagance and waste in the operation of our Federal Government and by the people making less demands on our Federal Government. As to this latter, not only the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, but many other State chambers throughout the country, are urgently pleading with their members and the citizens of the respective States they represent, to refrain from asking for Federal grants in aid and to restrict their demands to only those of vital necessity. We hope that local chambers of commerce can be persuaded to follow this laudable example. It is also urged that both the huge Federal debt and the taxes on individuals and business should be cut concurrently. Is this program an unreasonable one?

It is a choice here between spending at a fast rate and maintaining the present heavy taxes, or spending at a slower rate and reducing taxes while simultaneously reducing the debt.

It has been said by those opposing tax reduction that this is inflationary. Apparently it is assumed that any money saved in taxes would immediately be entirely spent. This is not necessarily true. We do know, however, that the money collected by the Government in taxes really will be put in circulation.

The reduction, or elimination of certain taxes, moreover, would lower business costs and thereby operate to lower prices. This in turn should lessen the pressure for higher wages. Tax reduction for individuals would also increase the rewards to wage earners and risk takers, too, for the successful venturing of their capital in productive opportunities.

Those who have opposed tax reduction because it would be inflationary have, strangely enough, not opposed the high rate of Government spending as an inflationary influence. But Federal spending bids up the demand for labor and materials, prevents the faster retirement of the debt, and speeds the inflationary spiral. Such spending requires the continuance of our present onerous taxes and discourages the exertion of workers, managers, and others to increase output and overcome the scarcity of goods and services. I am convinced that many of those who oppose tax reduction because it is inflationary, are really opposing it because they wish to maintain a high level of spending. I believe that they are not correctly informed as to the preferences of the citizens for tax and debt reduction in preference to a spendthrift budget.

It is an exceedingly difficult task to cut a budget when those responsible are importuned by office holders, department heads, and other persons who find it to their selfish advantage to pour out vast amounts of Federal money, but it can be cut and it should be cut.

Those of us who do not live in Washington are always impressed with the fact that the spending pressures seem to prevail here in the thinking of almost everyone, and the taxpayers are so far away that the burdens placed upon them by a big budget appear to be of little importance. The time has come, in my opinion, for a change of attitude, for an appreciation of the tax consequences of Federal spending.

TEAMWORK WILL REDUCE TAXES AND THE DEBT

My remarks here are not directed simply to those in Congress. They are directed to all of us, because in the final analysis we must all share responsibility for governmental spending. We can have more efficient and economical government if we insist upon it, and I think that we as citizens have been negligent in not telling our Senators and Representatives more frequently what we folks back home are thinking about. We have also been negligent in not praising them when they do a splendid job, sometimes under the most trying circumstances.

One of the crying needs of the times is for our citizens to take a greater interest in their governments at all levels. This lack of interest on the part of most of us, is without question a deep tragedy and, as long as I have a voice, I shall put it to use to shame those who enjoy the benefits of our wonderful system without making the slightest effort for its preservation. I say to you that we cannot expect an efficient and economical government unless a larger number of our citizens come to the aid of government.

It seems to me to be silly to argue whether taxes or the debt should first be reduced. If we fail to lower taxes, we shall have to accept more inflationary Federal spending, and if we fail to lower the debt we shall continue to be haunted by its problems.

The Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce is in sympathy with the personal income-tax reduction contemplated by the House of Representatives.

We believe that extensive tax revision will be both highly desirable and feasible in 1948, and that we should plan now the stable structure of an adequate tax system which will be moderate and equitable in its burdens. The advantages of such a tax system can be obtained if we have the wisdom and courage to cut Federal spending to a more rational level.

Tax reduction in 1948 should provide lower taxes on corporations, as well as on individuals. It will then be time to drop the loss carry-back and to extend the loss carry-forward to cover a much longer period, to allow more reasonable deductions for depreciation, obsolescence, and developmental expenses, to establish a more favorable tax climate for small business, and to remove the penalty taxes on intercorporate dividends and consolidated returns.

The double taxation of dividends, first as corporate and later as personal income, should be alleviated by allowing to investors a credit, at a rate equivalent to the initial rate of the income tax, for the taxes previously paid by corporations on the income going into dividends.

The present inequity in the taxation of the income of married couples in community and noncommunity property States should be removed. Proposals are being advanced in Pennsylvania and other States to correct this inequity by State action, but it would be preferable for Congress to eliminate it by a uniform national law.

While selective excises should be retained to raise substantial revenues, certain discriminatory, obnoxious, and inconvenient taxes should be removed and excessive tax rates should be lowered.

Finally, the estate and gift taxes should be reduced substantially.

This, gentlemen, is a brief summary of the Federal tax program recommended by the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce. While tax reforms will not by themselves guarantee a lasting prosperity, they will be of material benefit in creating a tax environment favorable to high-level employment, production, and consumption. State and local government spending and taxation, which were arrested during the war, have begun to mount again. Unless the Federal Government brings its inflated finances back to a level the taxpayers can afford to maintain, the general financial situation will weaken and not improve.

You have been very kind in listening to my discussion of a few serious national problems, and I deeply appreciate your willingness to meet with us and to learn of our objectives and activities. I believe we can overcome the problems of the variations in the business cycle and of Federal spending, taxing, and borrowing by teamwork. I, therefore, invite our two great political parties and all groups and classes to unite in the march toward our common goal of a stronger and more prosperous America. In the language of our popular national pastime, one may now say, "Play ball, America!"

Smith Avenue School, Norwich, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of my colleagues join with me in welcoming to Washington the members of the eighth grade of the Smith Avenue School of Norwich, Conn.

This first visit to Washington for these fine young people was made possible by their own habits of industry and saving. Their desire to work and save so that they might enjoy fully the benefits of their industry is in keeping with the traditional spirit which has made this country a great Nation. These youngsters have set a good example for our entire Nation.

I am pleased to include the names of the pupils making this visit and the name of the faculty advisor. Miss Mary M. Barry, principal; Phyllis Anderson, Jean Danilowicz, Joan Weir, Zeta Shillo, Mary Ann Kirker, Nancy Brantigam, Richard Maynard, and Fred Johnson.

Democratic Gains in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD three editorials from the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of April 23, 1947, and an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal which was reprinted in the Capital Times, all commenting on the recent congressional election in the Second District of Wisconsin:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF YESTERDAY'S CONGRESSIONAL RACE

The phenomenal run by Carl W. Thompson, Democratic candidate for Congress in the special election of yesterday, is one of the most significant political developments in recent years.

In a district which has elected only one Democrat to Congress since the turn of the century and which was considered safely in the bag for the Republican candidate this time, Thompson came within a thousand votes of being elected. The unofficial complete returns were: Davis, 24,124; Thompson, 23,181.

The race was in doubt up until the last 15 of the district's 317 precincts came in. Davis was saved by a heavy majority cast in his own home county of Waukesha. Thompson was given a thumping majority in Dane County, which he carried almost 2 to 1. He showed surprising strength in Dodge, Jefferson, and Columbia Counties, which normally vote conservative Republican.

The strong race made by Thompson is a stunning blow to Republicans and a surprise to the country. In a normal Republican district a Democratic candidate standing on progressive principles came within a handful of votes of reversing the national Republican trend demonstrated so resoundingly in the elections of 1946. The result will have a shattering effect on the smugness of Republican leaders who believed the trend was still running their way and who confidently assumed that the Second District race was in the bag.

Thompson's amazing race was made in uphill climb all the way. He started late and without organization. He was given little chance even to qualify in the April 1 primary. After he had the primary hurdle out of the way he had three short weeks in which to organize and conduct his campaign in the five counties of the district.

His fight was against the formidable and smoothly functioning Republican machine of Boss Coleman, which has had little trouble in this district in recent years. He faced a hysteria of Red baiting and witch hunting which is running strong against men who are talking the progressivism he talked in the campaign.

Yet, he was able to make the remarkable showing he did. He was able to cut down the margin of Republican vote in this district of last November from a 65 to 35 ratio to a 51 to 49 ratio. He came within a few votes of scoring an upset that would have astounded the Nation. He polled a vote that will be heard as ominous thunder in the high councils of republicanism.

A TRIBUTE TO CARL THOMPSON

The phenomenal showing of Carl W. Thompson in yesterday's election was a stirring tribute to the young Staughton attorney who has just recently returned from service in the Army to resume civilian life.

His campaign was in the best tradition of American democracy. He took to the people a campaign based on the outstanding issues of the day on which he took a firm and unequivocal stand. It was on those issues—the principles of progressivism which Franklin D. Roosevelt took to the people—that he asked for support.

His campaign was a refreshing one in a day when candidates are attempting to sell themselves to the voters without making known their stands on current issues. Thompson's Republican opponent conducted his campaign according to the current standards. He ducked, equivocated and pussyfooted. No one knew where he stood.

Thompson's remarkable race demonstrates again that people will respond to a straightout appeal on issues. It shows that a liberal, progressive movement is still alive in this State and will rally to a man who will stand by principles regardless of what party he chooses as his vehicle. His race is the answer to the Progressive defeatists and bandwagon riders who went back to the Republican Party with the alibi that Progressives would not vote Democratic. He has shown that Progressives, independents and liberals will vote anywhere there is a man who stands on their principles.

In its original editorial endorsing Carl Thompson's candidacy, the Capital Times declared: "We believe that the forward-looking people of this State should now be making plans for the day when the people of Wisconsin will be looking for new leadership. We believe that the people of Wisconsin are still essentially liberal in their thinking and outlook."

The Capital Times declared then that the liberals of this State must look to young, idealistic men in the State for leadership—men who are "endowed with ability, idealism, and determination."

Yesterday one of those young men demonstrated his fitness to take a part in the leadership that is needed. The Capital Times is proud to have played a part in the fine, inspiring job Carl Thompson has done for the Progressives of this district and State.

DANE COUNTY HOLDS FAST

Dane County, as usual, struck its blow for progressivism in yesterday's election. The cradle of the Progressive movement in Wisconsin, Dane County, for years has been the banner county in the Progressive fight for liberal, forward-looking government.

Yesterday was no exception. The voters of Dane County gave Thompson 15,767 votes and Davis 8,907—a margin of almost two to one.

Labor in Madison worked hard for Thompson and turned out a fine vote, for which great credit is due some of the leaders who rolled up their sleeves and went to work. Thompson ran well in rural Dane County, too. It was too bad, however, that a heavier vote did not get out.

In some of the tobacco areas of the county where farmers have been objecting to the low prices for their crops there was an exceedingly low vote, although the vote that was cast was strong for Thompson. A little more effort in this county would have given the district liberal, independent representation in Congress.

LESSONS FROM SECOND DISTRICT
(From the Milwaukee Journal)

The result of Tuesday's second district congressional election should be a stiff eyeopener for the leaders of the Republican Party in Wisconsin.

It should disabuse them of the overconfident assumption that they have this State in the bag, and that the opposition is futile. It should indicate to them that the people are getting tired of machine politics, expenditure of excessive sums of money, a lobby infested legislature, and a general fumbling all along the line.

In a district that traditionally is overwhelmingly Republican, the Republican candidate for Congress, backed by the plentiful funds and influence of the Thomas E. Coleman machine, narrowly nosed out a former Progressive running as a Democrat and making his first try for an important office.

Certainly the vote was small and the Republican campaign suffered a let down after a hard primary battle, but election apathy cuts two ways. There is no proof that a much larger turn-out would have had a different final result. The simple fact remains that the Republican vote dropped off 17,000 from the primary and the Democratic vote increased by 11,000. The Democratic vote in the district was 49 percent of the total on Tuesday, as compared to only 36 percent last fall.

The trend in the second district follows a national trend, as evidenced in the Chicago mayoralty election and other elections. The Democrats have been coming back since November. This indicates that next year's Presidential contest will be a spirited one—one that will awaken the people to the issues and constitute a much needed national referendum.

Mr. Thompson's strong showing against Mr. Davis indicates that Wisconsin is not in too much danger of becoming a one-party State; that the people are alert to the dangers of control by one man, one machine or one party. It shows that liberalism is not dead in the State.

Ambassador Kyle Is Great Aid to Agriculturists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed gratifying to me to learn recently of the many accomplishments Ambassador Edwin C. Kyle has achieved with agriculturists in Guatemala. I am quite familiar with his many good deeds at the Agriculture and Mechanical College of Texas when he was dean of the school of agriculture. I was one among many Texans who benefited from his great knowledge of agriculture as a student there.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Douglas Meador concerning Ambassador Kyle which appears in the Bryan Daily Eagle, Bryan, Tex., of April 24, 1947:

AMBASSADOR KYLE GOOD NEIGHBOR IN ACTION, SAY GUATEMALANS; IS GREAT AID TO AGRICULTURISTS

(By Douglas Meador)

Edwin C. (Dean) Kyle, former dean of Texas A. & M. College and now United States Ambassador to Guatemala, is a good neighbor in action.

Kyle, tall, genial, and soft-spoken, is using his great knowledge of agriculture to aid this Latin-American country.

When he arrived in Guatemala, he seemed to ignore the social aspects of his office to the extent that some of his wealthy countrymen

visiting in the Republic were alarmed. His heart, experiences, and energies, and the resources of his country, were directed to the rich soil, 60 inches of rainfall, planting seed, farming equipment, erosion, and other factors that affect the two and one-half million Mayan Indians as well as the half-million people of other races who comprise Guatemala's population.

Kyle asked no favors. Perhaps few men in the entire United States were better qualified than this dean of agriculturists to render so great a service. He is still Dean Kyle except to those who want to use the more impressive term of "Ambassador." He is loved by Guatemalans.

NOT OFTEN BALKED

Two questions cause him to use diplomatic answers; all others are quick and easy. It requires time to explain why Texas is not still a republic since it is five times the size of Guatemala It almost requires a change of subject when someone asks him why the United States, richest Nation on earth, owes over $200,000,000,000, while Guatemala, which has no coal or oil, few resources, and limited manufacturing, owes not a single quetzal in national debt.

Until air lines spanned the deep canyons, torrential rivers, jungles, and cloud-piercing mountains of Guatemala, few inhabitants had heard of Texas.

Those who traveled went by boat either to the west coast or to the east coast of the United States. Then the great silver birds began leaving visitors at Guatemala City's modern air depot and Guatemalans began to ride the planes. They landed at Houston, Brownsville, and Corpus Christi, and it was then that they discovered Texas.

RENDERS GREAT AID

Flying in and out of Texas, Guatemalans learned that thousands lived in the great modern cities, on the broad plains, on the farms, ranches, and oil fields, who spoke the same language as Ambassador Kyle and who, although perhaps not being able to speak Guatemalan (Spanish), spoke a language of friendship, sincerity, and good will; men who looked you in the eye and said what was in their hearts and their hearts were in what they said. Guatemalans like those who visit from the United States in general, and those from Texas in particular.

Carlos Dorion, native Guatemalan and one of the wealthiest men in the republic, said, "Dean Kyle is doing more to improve the conditions of Guatemala than all the other ambassadors have done in a hundred years." Enrique Asturias, who recently transported an entire flock of sheep from Texas to Guatemala by plane, said the same thing.

Since Guatemala's chief exports are coffee, bananas, and chicle, Dean Kyle is at a loss to understand why better trade relations cannot be established between the United States and the diminutive republic. Certainly there can be no conflict in the products of the two nations. There is no difference in money exchange. One quetzal is worth one dollar. Guatemala needs many things produced in the United States and this fabulous republic to the north is already buying most of the export products of Guatemala.

CAN PICK TEXANS

Ambassador Kyle can almost always pick a native Texan visiting his office, by the look of interest at a certain picture. It is the Alamo. It hangs above a small table on which are many trophies, including pictures of boys whom their fathers, former A & M students, have named for the dean.

Kyle is proud of the splendor of the embassy—its stained glass windows, great mahogany doors, inlaid and tile floors, the thick white wool rug in the banquet room, the solid silver chandeliers and engraved ebony-black mahogany cabinets containing silver services.

He will show you the sunroom, the fountain and the patio. He will tell you to pick some coffee berries from a coffee tree conveniently close. (He will not tell you, perhaps because he doesn't know, that the California fruit frontier men will take the coffee berries away from you.) With pride he will show you a small copper-bound keg in which one strawberry vine provides him many a bowl of luscious fruit.

PEPPER PLANT AND SADDLE

He will also show you a potted pepper plant that produces far more red pods than even the embassy household can consume. With a trace of shyness, the Ambassador to Guatemala will show you the exquisitely hand-stamped saddle, tooled in black leather and mounted in silver, which an admirer presented him. The saddle tree was ordered from Texas and the saddle made by one of Guatemala's most expert craftsmen.

Esteem of the government for Ambassador Kyle is contained in the following excerpts from a letter to him from Guatemala's President Juan Jose Arevalo: "Your personal impressions are an indication of your friendly, sensitive nature, as well as your deep-rooted democratic convictions and your noble sentiments of affection and understanding for Guatemala * * * and I state a truly national sentiment in expressing to you the gratitude of Guatemala, where the living masses as well as the government which represents them and which I have the honor to preside over, know full well that in you they have a loyal and sincere friend, a great democrat, and genuine spokesman for the heroic American people, whose love of liberty has twice in modern history prevented slavery in the world of men.

HAND ON SHOULDER

The distinguished, greying ambassador will probably place his hand on your shoulder and walk down the embassy steps with you to the waiting taxi. The dozing driver will wake, make a sign to the religious image secured to the left of his wheel, and step on the starter.

His English and your Spanish will fuse in a deadlock over the charge—and then you will remember that the gasoline his coughing motor is trying to consume costs 47 cents per gallon—and you will agree that two quetzal is not too much. You will feel at ease regarding the relationship and the good-neighbor policy between the United States and at least one Central American republic.

In a moment of desperation you may wonder why this Nation has produced only one Dean Kyle.

Visit of the President of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the United States is honored by the visit of the President of the great Republic of Mexico. I am sure that all of us appreciate the friendliness of our southern neighbor and the cooperation that she has extended to us throughout the years.

I sincerely hope that the President of Mexico and his official party will realize and feel the warm friendliness which we have for him and the people of his country.

We sincerely hope that he will enjoy his visit and that it will further strengthen the ties that bind us.

Another Appraisal of Truman's Scheme for American Unilateral Interference in the Affairs of Other Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the following is from the April bulletin Analysis, edited by Frank Chodorov. He points out how Truman's Greek-Turkish intervention scheme will actually promote communism:

A BYZANTINE EMPIRE OF THE WEST?

* * * * *

If we don't help Greece and Turkey, we are told, European culture must give way to this horrible communism. But the fact which that scarehead obscures, and which is sustained by a mounting mass of evidence, is this: Communism is already the religion of Europe.

It is the desperation of hopeless poverty which makes converts to communism, and to this desperation our national policy has made its contribution. By preventing the people from producing, by destroying the tools of production, by condoning wholesale robbery and the rooting up of populations, our politicians and our generals are the unwitting missionaries of communism.

If we would kill that strange cult, we must abandon the policy which creates the conditions on which it thrives. Bayonets, or dollars to pay for bayonets, will only aggravate the conditions. The only antidote to communism is to let the people of Europe produce and exchange.

* * * * *

Above all, we must take our armies off their backs. The way to stop communism, to put it briefly, is to let the people alone.

If it is argued that such a hands-off policy does not take into account the ruthless and malevolent Russian military machine, that our departure from the scene would leave the people its helpless prey, let us admit the possibility of that consequence and consider the outcome.

Suppose Russia imposes on the peoples of Europe the slavery conditions prevailing within her borders. Without arguing the point that these conditions have so reduced her own economy that the robbery of subject peoples has become a policy of necessity, we must admit as a matter of experience that slaves are poor producers, and we can predict the collapse of communism in Europe from lack of production.

There is the added fact that, unlike the Russians, Western Europe did experience a measure of freedom, the memory of which will engender subversive activity, further slowing up the productive machinery. In short, the slave economy will bring about primitive conditions (such as Morgenthau envisioned), and the vulture state will die from lack of sustenance.

It is poor prospect for the next generation of Europeans, to be sure, but is it any worse than another war? Something might survive a spell of communism, while the result of another war, no matter which side wins, will be annihilation.

* * * * *

Thus, even if we accept at face value the worst forebodings our empire builders dish up, reason tells against carrying the fight to the Communist's lair. There is, however, an even more vital argument in favor of minding our home affairs.

If we go along with this poking into the business of Europe, what will happen to the liberty we have left in America? Already there is a Red witchhunt afoot, and experience tells us that when the exigencies of the situation require it the definition of "Red" will include every person who raises his voice against the going order. Mass hysteria will conveniently support such a definition. So that, in the shadow of the impending emergency, the outlines of a crowded concentration camp can already be detected.

If war comes—and when did imperialism not bring it?—the worst of what we call communism will come with it. The essential dogma of this creed is that the individual exists only for the purposes of the State. In that respect it must be identified with all other forms of statism, from pharaoism to nazism.

Now, when the existence of the state is at stake, even the fiction of individual liberty cannot be tolerated. This is particularly true under the totalitarianism necessitated by modern warfare. Therefore, when our imperialism comes to grips with the empire of the commissars, the very thing we are presumably fighting to preserve will go by the board. Automatically, our liberties will vanish into—communism.

This is what your historic periscope should show you. But, since history is what people make it, the smash-up which the lens suggests is not inevitable. What men can do, men can undo. We—you and I—can help to prevent it, if we will but assume the responsibility and accept the consequences. Even a losing fight for liberty is worth while, for there is always the profit of self-respect to be had.

Work of the House of Representatives So Far in the Eightieth Congress Through April 30, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country have been misled by the misinformation given to the public by those who would willfully wreck the Republican congressional program. They have termed this Congress the "do-nothing Congress." The facts disclose the opposite is true. Therefore, it seems timely to lay these facts before the country, especially as regards the activities of the House of Representatives.

With this thought in mind, I have secured from the Clerk of the House a detailed statement covering our work during this Congress up to and including this day of our Lord, Wednesday, April 30, 1947. In pondering the following facts, we should not forget the time necessarily spent in the reorganization of the two legislative bodies, made mandatory by the Reorganization Act of 1946. This delayed legislative work for approximately 3 weeks. Taking this into consideration, I believe the records will disclose the fact no House of Representatives during my many years of service in this body has made the progress and disposed of the business of the House as expeditiously as has been done under the able leadership of the Republican Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., and the able leader of the House, the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK.

I include as a part of my remarks the data supplied by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, John Andrews:

WORK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SO FAR IN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS THROUGH APRIL 30, 1947

Despite the handicap of having to reorganize the entire committee structure and much of the legislative procedure because of the Reorganization Act adopted in the last Congress, the House of Representatives has compiled an impressive work record and has built up a tremendous backlog of committee work accomplished which has not yet reached the floor of the House. Months of committee hearings have been and are being held, and the results of that work will pour a large amount of needed legislation onto the floor of the House for consideration of that body.

In the field of major legislation, aside from the appropriation bills for the operation of the Army, Navy and other departments of Government, the House has completed and passed bills providing for:

1. Reduction of individual income-tax payments.
2. Increasing amount of sugar available for homes and providing for termination of controls.
3. Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.
4. Portal-to portal pay limitation. Conference report filed in the House and full agreement has been reached by the conferees.
5. Amendment to the Constitution to limit the tenure of the President to two terms.
6. Set a top limit on the Federal Budget at a figure considerably below that requested by the President.
7. Readjusted excise taxes.
8. Relief assistance to people of war devastated countries.
9. H. R. 3203: A bill relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes (housing and rent controls). House will continue consideration tomorrow, May 1, 1947.
10. Conference report on first deficiency appropriation bill, H. R. 2849, containing, among other items, funds for payments to veterans under the G. I. bill, agreed to in House today, April 30, 1947.

The statistics of work so far accomplished follow:

Public Laws	41
House bills reported and passed the House	124
House bills reported and pending	64
House joint resolutions reported and passed the House	15
House joint resolutions reported	4
Senate bills reported and passed the House	15
Senate bills reported and pending in the House	4
Senate joint resolutions reported and passed the House	7

Of the above categories, 73 bills and joint resolutions were for the relief of individuals and corporations, and are not hereafter listed by title.

Five major appropriation bills for the departments of Government have passed the House, of which two have passed the Senate and one has become a law.

Bills in various stages of progress through the Congress with relation to House action thereon are listed as follows by numbers and titles:

HOUSE BILLS WHICH HAVE BECOME LAWS

H. R. 731: To establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes. Public Law 38.

H. R. 1030: To continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes. Public Law 17.

H. R. 1040: To authorize the payment of $425.88 by the United States to the Government of Switzerland. Public Law 14.

H. R. 1240: To provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws as applied to vessels operated by the War Department upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended. Public Law 28.

H. R. 1327: To amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies for another 5-year period. Public Law 34.

H. R. 1353: To amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. Public Law 5.

H. R. 1621: Boy Scouts of America world jamboree. Public Law 31.

H. R. 1713: To provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes. Public Law 35.

H. R. 1778: To amend the Federal Firearms Act. Public Law 15.

H. R. 1968: Making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes. Public Law 20.

H. R. 1943: To establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army. Public Law 36.

H. R. 2045: To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of streptomycin, or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes. Public Law 16.

H. R. 2102: To provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes.

H. R. 2413: To amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS WHICH HAVE BECOME LAWS

House Joint Resolution 57: Extending for 7 months the period of time during which alcohol plants are permitted to produce sugars or sirups simultaneously with the production of alcohol. Public Law 2.

House Joint Resolution 76: Authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard. Public Law 27.

House Joint Resolution 114: To continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947. Public Law 6.

House Joint Resolution 118: To strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry. Public Law 24.

House Joint Resolution 121: Granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations. Public Law 7.

House Joint Resolution 122: To authorize the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska until July 1, 1948, and for other purposes. Public Law 12.

House Joint Resolution 146: To extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes. Public Law 30.

House Joint Resolution 154: Making an appropriation for expenses incident to the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest. Public Law 22.

House Joint Resolution 159: Making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes. Public Law 25.

HOUSE BILLS WHICH HAVE PASSED BOTH HOUSES BUT HAVE NOT BECOME A LAW

H. R. 2157: To define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

H. R. 2404: To suspend certain import taxes on copper.

H. R. 2849: Making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REPORTED AND PASSED HOUSE

House Joint Resolution 27: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President.

House Joint Resolution 90: To correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve.

House Joint Resolution 92: Authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy.

House Joint Resolution 116: To correct technical error in the act approved August 12, 1946 (Public Law 723, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

House Joint Resolution 140: To restore the name of Hoover Dam.

House Joint Resolution 153: Providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

HOUSE BILLS REPORTED AND PASSED HOUSE

H. R. 1: To reduce individual income-tax payments.

H. R. 4: To safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases.

H. R. 173: To authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.

H. R. 193: To amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 191), as amended.

H. R. 197: To transfer part of block 14 and the school building thereon of Petersburg town site, Alaska, used for school purposes, to the town of Petersburg, Alaska.

H. R. 236: To amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals.

H. R. 450: Providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use.

H. R. 490: Providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes.

H. R. 492: To authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment.

H. R. 493: To amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition).

H. R. 495: To amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

H. R. 597: To protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, and the public health by prohibiting the unauthorized importation into, or the depositing in the territorial waters of, the United States of garbage derived from products originating outside of the continental United States, and for other purposes.

H. R. 603: To amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries.

H. R. 729: To provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park.

H. R. 804: Authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the Farmers' Irrigation District, North Platte project.

H. R. 828: For the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California.

H. R. 1030: To continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1040: To authorize the payment of $425.88 by the United States to the Government of Switzerland.

H. R. 1098: To authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

H. R. 1099: To declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

H. R. 1203: To provide compensation to persons performing the duties of postmasters at post offices of the fourth class during annual and sick leave of the postmasters.

H. R. 1240: To provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

H. R. 1327: To amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies for another 5-year period.

H. R. 1350: To amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes."

H. R. 1353: To amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

H. R. 1358: To amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944.

H. R. 1359: To amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy.

H. R. 1363. To amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended.

H. R. 1365. To establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1366: To facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1367: To authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1368: To include civilian officers and employees of the United States naval government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1369: To amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1375: To further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve.

H. R. 1376: To amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases.

H. R. 1381: To amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics.

H. R. 1448: To amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902.

H. R. 1514: For the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1584: Authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho.

H. R. 1605: To amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.).

H. R. 1621: To authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France in 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports.

H. R. 1636: To amend section 6 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to the application of such section to rural carriers. (S. 547 passed in lieu.)

H. R. 1713: To provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1777: To amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the term of office of members of the Federal Power Commission.

H. R. 1778: To amend the Federal Firearms Act.

H. R. 1819: To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease.

H. R. 1844: To authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1888: To incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II.

H. R. 1943: To establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

H. R. 1968: Making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1975: To amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940.

H. R. 1997: To provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States.

H. R. 1998: To amend section 48 of the Criminal Code relating to the receiving of stolen public property.

H. R. 2032. To preserve the continuity of residence in the United States for naturalization purposes in the cases of alien residents who departed for service in Allied armed forces during the Second World War.

H. R. 2045: To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of streptomycin, or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes.

H. R. 2102: To provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

H. R. 2109: To amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

H. R. 2123: To amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended.

H. R. 2183: Providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of that portion of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department.

H. R. 2336: To amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages.

H. R. 2339: To amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes.

H. R. 2369: Providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska.

H. R. 2436: Making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

H. R. 2535: To amend the Reclassification Finance Corporation Act.

H. R. 2659: To establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

H. R. 2700: Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

H. R. 2758: To amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940.

H. R. 3020: To prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3123: Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3203: Relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REPORTED AND PASSED HOUSE

S. 220: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland. Public Law 18.

S. 221: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes. Public Law 19.

S. 231: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif. Public Law 32.

S. 234: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga. Public Law 13.

S. 235: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., an easement for construction and operation of a storm drain in and under certain Government-owned lands situated in that city. Public Law 11.

S. 276: To provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance account of military personnel. Public Law 21.

S. 363: To amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.), larceny in interstate commerce. Public Law 37.

S. 516: To authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes. Public Law 33.

S. 547: To provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers.

S. 568: To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other American countries in the control and eradication of foot and mouth disease and rinderpest. Public Law 8.

S. 736: Authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947.

S. 875: To authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

S. 918: To establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the Selective Service records and for other purposes. Public Law 26.

S. 931: To extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act. Public Law 29.

S. 1009: To extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the base 6 property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REPORTED AND PASSED HOUSE

Senate Joint Resolution 3: Relating to employees of Senators and Senate standing committees. Public Law 1.

Senate Joint Resolution 4: Relating to the salaries of certain Senate employees. Public Law 3.

Senate Joint Resolution 24: Providing for a more effective staff organization for standing committees of the Senate. Public Law 4.

Senate Joint Resolution 27: Amending the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942 to provide for the consideration of any claim decided by the General Claims Commission in which the United States filed a petition for rehearing. Public Law 23.

Senate Joint Resolution 33: To amend the act of August 9, 1946 (Public Law 711—79th Cong.), for the purpose of allowing the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission additional time in which to prepare and to submit its report to Congress. Public Law 9.

Senate Joint Resolution 60: To authorize the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, Ariz., to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use on the San Carlos irrigation projects. Public Law 10.

Senate Joint Resolution 97: Limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46. Vetoed.

SENATE BILLS REPORTED AND PENDING IN THE HOUSE

S. 26: To make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape.

S. 64: Granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina.

S. 321: To amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes.

S. 814: To provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have felt that we in Congress should recognize the justice in granting some relief for the many hard-pressed property owners presently located in areas having rent control. H. R. 3203 may not be a perfect solution but to my way of thinking, the passage of this bill should accomplish much.

I know there are landlords who would take advantage of their tenants should all controls be removed. We have seen that happen in other fields of our economy where controls were released. On the other hand, there are landlords who have tenants who appreciate the fact that it has cost the owners of property considerably more to keep their properties in good, livable condition, willing and ready to make an agreement for a reasonable increase in rents. I have them and I know others have them. An increase up to 15 percent means in many cases a change of showing a profit or loss in the operation. This bill gives the landlord and the tenant the opportunity to get together.

This bill also removes practically all controls on building materials. Now if the building-material manufacturers can voluntarily come down from their high horses, and back to earth with real, sound, favorable prices, we can expect a reasonable flow of materials to the market. Reports show that lumber shipments are very low. Some of our lumbermen can only blame themselves for this condition. I am a retail lumber dealer and I have not been able to recommend to the average GI to start his hoped-for new home. It is the old story: we need production and a leveling off of prices so one will have confidence in the market. I hate to hear these threats that carpenters are about to strike for more wages.

From reports I receive I believe we can soon expect lumber prices to settle down and any approciable demand for higher wages by those skilled in the building trades will very seriously delay further home construction.

Personally, I am for the conventional type of home. That is only natural, I suppose, but if I could see a prefabricated

house worthy of the name, structurally sound and durable, I hope I am open minded enough to accept it and approve of a loan on it equal to that given on a conventional home. I recommend that those granting loans up to 90 percent on this type of house, give worthy appraisals and thought to its durability. It takes years to pay off mortgages, generally speaking, and a house mortgage is the best loan in the world when the value is there. A man's home is his castle and that means his heart is there. We feel that a home built to one's own taste, with architectural designs of his own choosing, something distinctly individual, is by far the better risk for our banks and our Government.

It is hopeful the demand for homes by December 15, 1947, will be such that our President will release rent controls in accordance with the terms of the bill by December 31, 1947. This is a long time and a great deal can be accomplished. And then, too, we must remember that the head of the new department administering the provisions of this law can take rent controls from any area when a housing shortage no longer exists. I hope my friends in the retail lumber business will agree with me that this bill, although far from their expressed desires, is certainly a step in the right direction and here in Washington we have to legislate for what we believe is best for the citizens in every sector of our country. I hope the President will select an agency to administer this law mindful of the many arbitrary decisions made by the OPA authorities and realize the landlord has his troubles, too. We as Americans, look forward to the day when all controls can be lifted and once again we can function as a free America.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of rural electrification, delivered by me at the National Convention of REA Cooperatives held at Spokane, Wash., April 24, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to have this opportunity to address the delegates of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and I feel highly honored by your kind invitation to appear here. As representatives of Rural Electric Co-ops, which operate throughout most of the United States and some of its Territories, I believe that you made a happy choice in selecting as your convention site this fine city of Spokane in the great Pacific Northwest where electrification has made its greatest progress in recent years.

You and the people you represent have done more to improve rural life in America today than any other group. You have brought the tremendous benefits of electricity to many areas which could never have enjoyed them except through cooperative action. And, in making thousands of farms more livable, you have also made them more efficient and more productive. The real importance of increased and more efficient production will be most apparent when, in the not too-distant future, we may again be faced with the problem of competing with foreign farm goods produced by cheap labor in other parts of the world. In meeting this type of competition, our improved efficiency will, in my opinion, be our greatest asset.

And while you have increased the efficiency of our farms, you have made them far more attractive places on which to live. This, it seems to me, is the most important benefit of all, because in recent years too many of our young people have been leaving their farm homes to seek employment in the cities. The comforts of modern homes and apartments in the cities have proved to be attractions which could not be offset by other benefits which rural life has to offer. No matter how sympathetic the public may be toward the general farm problem, only those who have lived on farms lighted by kerosene lamps, those who have pumped water by hand, those who have enviously glimpsed the gleaming electrical appliances in store windows only to realize that such things were not for them could fully realize what electric power means to the farm family. You men and women have done a truly remarkable job in making the dreams of millions of rural folks come true.

Yet, in spite of all the clearly apparent benefits which this program has brought to the Nation, REA today faces an array of opponents as powerful as any you have met in the last 10 years or more. Your program is being attacked on a wide front by an abundantly financed group which boasts some of the highest-priced lobbyists in Washington. Of course, they say they are not out to destroy REA, or even to cripple it. No; they just want to "improve" your program here and there. They want to help you. In fact, they would even be willing to take over your co-ops and run them for you at a slight, or perhaps not so slight, profit to themselves. Now that you have demonstrated that you could do what they once said could never be done, they are eager to take over the show.

In Washington we can see this attack moving into full swing on a national scale. Locally, you can see the pattern take form. Whatever high-sounding promises may be uttered by the spokesmen for this lobby, whether in Washington or in your home town, their plan has but one purpose: To cripple REA and destroy your cooperatives. Your very success has brought this mighty attack down upon your heads.

The political upheaval in Congress, brought about at last November's elections, has been interpreted in various ways. And whatever mandate was expressed by the people has come to mean all things to all men. In my own opinion, the people of this country want real economy. But I am also firmly convinced that they do not want false economy. As I read the signs of the last election, there was no mandate to wipe out or even curtail REA and other farm programs, which have largely been responsible for the present favorable position of agriculture. I do not know of any candidates for Congress who urged such action before election. And I am well enough acquainted with the political thinking of the people of my own State, to know that I would not be addressing you today, as a Member of the United States Senate, if I had campaigned on a platform advocating curtailment of REA and junking of our national farm program. In fact, the last national platforms, adopted by both major parties in 1944, pledged continuance, and even expansion, of REA and other programs designed to aid the farmer.

I do not recall that American farmers have ever organized for the purpose of telling Congress what laws it should write, for the regulation of business, but it is certainly true that industrialists, manufacturers, and businessmen, are endeavoring to rewrite our agricultural program. Today, it would appear, just about everyone is trying to set himself up as an agricultural expert.

The chambers of commerce, the grain trade, the wool trade, the cotton trade, and even certain manufacturers' organizations, have set themselves up as experts in the agricultural field. Many of them have gone so far as to send their so-called agricultural authorities on speaking tours over the Nation, men who sadly lack sympathetic understanding, or even factual information, men who themselves would be a failure if actually operating the best farm in America.

Now, I have no quarrel with businessmen. They have their problems just as we have ours. In fact, I think we could learn a most important lesson from them—the lesson of organization. Because they are so well organized through their trade associations, they today exert an influence all out of proportion to their actual numbers on our State and national legislative programs. If the farmers of America were even half so well organized, your REA program would not be in jeopardy now.

I know that there are honest and sincere men in Congress today who have the reputation of being unsympathetic to agriculture. Their views have been molded by the nonagricultural farm experts; they have simply never heard your arguments. I believe that such misunderstandings can be quickly cleared up by an aggressive and intelligent campaign waged by the farm people of this Nation through such organizations as yours. You should urge farmers everywhere to write to their Congressmen and Senators telling them in plain words of the great need for continuance of such programs as REA and what will be necessary in the way of appropriations. Identical letters and telegrams are ineffective. A few penciled words on a sheet of tablet paper will carry far more weight. Congressmen will recognize the true voice of rural America when they hear it, and I would have no fear of REA's future if every farmer took the trouble to let his Representative know his views on this matter.

Recent propaganda released by private-power interests would lead one to believe that they could make rural electrification possible without cost to the Government. Whether or not they could is beside the point. The cold truth is that these interests have had years and years to do the job, but they succeeded in bringing electricity to only a very small percentage of our farms.

In little more than 10 years, you have done what they were either unwilling or unable to do. You have done it without experience, and you have made the remarkable record of repaying more than 99 percent of your Government loans as they fell due. In fact, many of your rural co-ops have been able to meet their payments well in advance of the due dates. All of this was accomplished through your determination, initiative, and ability and, I might add, your sympathetic understanding of farmers' needs and wishes.

The farmers you represent, by any yardstick the Government may care to apply, are the best credit risk in the entire world. Farmers, in recent years, even repaid 78 percent of the old feed and seed loans made for extreme emergency purposes at unreasonable interest rates of 5 percent, and where, oftentimes, the accumulated interest amounted to as much as the principal itself. In the light of past records, it is a sad commentary on American Government that farmers now

have to virtually beg for adequate funds even to carry on a worth-while REA program.

Before you took the rural electrification program and went into action few of our farms had electricity. Of the approximately 6,000,000 farms in this country, only 3 percent had power-line electric service in 1925 and only a little more than 10 percent in 1935. The fact, that, today more than 53 percent of all our farms enjoy electricity, is testimony to the effectiveness of your work, and the program as a whole. As a farmer and a resident of a farm State, I am especially proud of your accomplishments.

While the percentage of farms electrified in North Dakota lags far behind the national average, our situation in all other respects parallels that now existing in your States. You have reached the farms located in the most populous areas, and the more readily accessible farms. The easier half of your job is done. The harder part now remains. To complete area coverage and bring electricity to all those still awaiting it, you must push into the more sparsely settled areas, where consumers average but one or less to the mile.

Finishing the electrification job is not going to be made easier by the forces opposed to it. I think it is time we took stock of what we are up against, so that we may be able to anticipate the attacks and be prepared to do something about them in time to be effective.

As I see it, the current attack against the rural-electrification program has five major prongs. We all know the offensive may shift but these are the points to watch right now.

First of all, the present attempt is to use national economy as a smoke screen for killing the program. Our foes hope to persuade economy-minded Members of Congress that REA is using the taxpayers' money to sponsor electrification which, they claim, private interests could as well provide. They hope that Congress, in its enthusiasm to reduce Federal expenditures, will cut proposed REA loan funds for the coming year so sharply as to cripple REA or sharply curtail future expansion.

While I favor drastic reduction in over-all Federal expenditures, I think it should be pointed out that there is much distinction between spending—as such—and the investment of public money in a self-liquidating enterprise. The REA program is a splendid example of what can be accomplished for the benefit of millions of our citizens without cost to the Government and as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Agriculture Committee, I shall vigorously oppose any attempt which may be made to curtail appropriations for this agency.

During the war years shortages of critical materials and labor, as we all know too well, brought REA expansion to a virtual standstill. The program is now moving into high gear. During the last fiscal year, REA service was extended to 255,000 new consumers and even under present disappointing shortages of essential construction materials the rate of additions is now about 25,000 a month.

All of us know that loan funds must be authorized and earmarked before construction progress can start.

Despite the record of repayment and the present need and opportunity to push the program rapidly ahead to reach those who have waited so long, many Members of the present Congress are apparently inclined to favor a reduction in the coming REA appropriation. It is imperative that they understand what such a cut will do to the job of bringing electric service to the millions of farm families who do not have it now.

The second prong of the attack on the REA program centers on the authority in the law to finance generating plants where necessary.

I am sure I do not need to emphasize the importance of this provision in the REA law. Without the right to construct power plants, REA would have absolutely no bargaining power whatever with private power and would be completely at their mercy. This is a very important part of the appropriation and one which will be sharply attacked by the private power interests.

I hope that no REA cooperative will abuse the privilege that it has in constructing power plants. Wherever low-cost electricity is available through existing power concerns, REA should, by all means, purchase it through these sources. Not only because it would be unwise to construct additional and unnecessary power plants, but for other reasons, too. There is a real possibility that within a very few years electricity will be generated through atomic energy at far lower cost than now is possible through water power or any other means. In fact, I am told by scientists that even today electricity could be generated through atomic energy as cheaply as through the use of coal. Scientists estimate that only 2 pounds of nuclear fuel would supply the power needs of a city such as Pittsburgh for 1 day. There is another equally important reason for using existing facilities where possible. I am one of those who believes strongly in our free enterprise system. If private power can furnish you current as cheaply as you can generate it yourself, I think you would be doing an injustice to private enterprise, and even to your own cause, by constructing power plants with borrowed Government money.

I think that at this point in my remarks I should point out that private enterprise, as it exists in the ordinary business, is far different from that of the private power industry. Private enterprise, by and large, is highly competitive. Private power on the other hand usually operates under exclusive franchises granted by cities. The fact that they have these long-term franchises free of all competition has too often encouraged the practice of gouging the public through unreasonable rates. For example, there is this incident which occurred in my own State. A power company operating in the city of Fargo, which has only about 35,000 population, lost a rate reduction lawsuit instigated by the public service commission and, as a result, had to refund to its patrons in that small city approximately $1,000,000.

Time and experience have proved that rural electrification can best be accomplished by cooperative effort and there is nothing undemocratic about it.

Long ago our Government decided that the mail service and public roads were fields where even Government ownership and operation were to the best interests of the people. Even the most ardent leaders of the free enterprise system could not call this democracy of ours socialistic simply because our Government went into those fields of business.

The third prong of the great attack now being launched is being directed against the authority to buy up power facilities in small rural towns.

This authority again is most necessary if REA is to meet the problem of rural electrification in very small towns surrounded by sparsely populated farm areas. I see no reason why REA, in the best interests of all who live in such communities, should not have this continued right.

The fourth major prong of attack is right in your own cooperatives. This is different from the kind of fighting you have encountered in the past. Your opponents now are trying to buy out some of your older, well-established, and profitable cooperatives. Having watched you do something that they themselves were unable or unwilling to do, they now hope to take over the projects that you have proved to be sound financial undertakings. They hope to persuade you that since you are well established there is no reason why you should continue bothering to operate your co-op. They are trying to relieve you of your obligation to extend your lines. They tell you they will give you the service at even lower rates than you now pay. Some cooperatives may be disposed to sell out to these interests, but I predict they will see the day when they will regret such action.

The fifth major prong of your opponent's attack consists of proposed legislation which, if you examine it carefully, has no other purpose than to cripple the basic REA law. One such plan proposes that REA, instead of lending money directly for REA projects, should merely underwrite loans which you then would have to obtain from private interests. This proposal many of you may have read about in a recent issue of News Week. Perhaps many arguments could be advanced for this idea that would, at first glance, seem attractive. But again, in my opinion, this would be the beginning of the end of rural electrification expansion.

Personally, I see no need whatever for these proposals when the REA co-ops have operated so successfully, with practically a 100-percent record of repayment of their loans.

Another proposal is for the Government to sell its loan securities to private interests. This means that your REA mortgages would be placed in the hands of private financial institutions. Perhaps in some years a successful program could be carried out by this means of financing, but I need only recall to you who are farmers that in years past credit of any kind, except Government feed and seed loans, was all but impossible to obtain, even for the best of farmers. I myself can remember only a few years ago when private banks would lend nothing at all on farm machinery, and only a few dollars a head on livestock. The banks could not be blamed, as the earning power of the farmer was at such a low ebb that he was no longer considered a good risk, and as a result the Government, through its various lending agencies, had to take over. This again could happen, but God forbid. REA is now on a sound financial basis, under a workable Government program, and why in the name of heaven should any change be made to accommodate interests which have anything but a record of sympathetic understanding of the farmers' problems?

I have talked of the five major attacks now being waged against the REA program. Other proposals equally dangerous to you have appeared already in Congress in the form of more than 20 bills which would, in one way or the other, cripple the REA program. Several of these, through indirect methods, would raise the cost of power to your cooperatives now being supplied by reclamation power dams. Other contemplated proposals would require all REA borrowers to release co-op members upon request if not connected within 1 year after application for service. Then there are various provisions for raising the public power rates to all the traffic would bear; by raising interest rates; by amending the Reclamation Act to place a greater cost burden on irrigation and power. Another proposal would require projects to pay out before new projects could be undertaken. There is a plan to direct RFC to sell all notes and mortgages on the open market. These are only some of the proposals contained in the many bills now before Congress.

Perhaps one of the most dangerous threats to REA has come with the introduction of bills in many State legislatures that would place REA cooperatives on the same tax basis as corporations which operate for a profit. Millions of pieces of propaganda have been placed in the mails all over the United States on this one proposal alone. People who do not understand the objectives of cooperatives such as yours, which is to furnish power at cost to their consumers, might well think that REA should be placed under the same taxing provisions as corporations. It will require a constant battle, in my opinion, on

the part of all farmers under REA to combat this vicious type of legislation. You must constantly be on the alert.

Since the feasibility of electrifying farms of America is so closely tied with future farm prosperity, I wish to discuss briefly other farm legislation.

Some have forgotten the farm poverty of a few years ago: The dust storms, grasshoppers, drought, and, worst of all, low prices. No REA program can pay out if we again allow agricultural prices to slip back to those prevailing only a few years ago. Our present favorable position is somewhat artificial and was brought about by the wartime disruption of agriculture in other parts of the world and by American charity appropriations to feed the people of Europe and Asia.

Foreign production will come back, perhaps by 1948, and their cheap labor will mean the toughest kind of competition for our farmers. The only guarantee we now have against recurring depressions in farm prices is contained in the so-called Steagall amendment. But even now there are many in Congress who want to repeal the Steagall amendment or slash the appropriations needed to make it effective.

It has been a favorite pastime for certain publications and even for some Members of Congress to spread the propaganda that American farmers have been heavily subsidized at the expense of the taxpayer. The inspiration for these attacks comes, I believe, largely from the phoney farm experts retained by industrial organizations and from the middlemen in the grain, cotton, and wool trades who have been so handsomely rewarded for moving the products of our farms to the hands of the eventual consumers.

These same spokesmen have nothing to say on the matter of subsidies to industry. Actually, over-all price support operations of the Department of Agriculture haven't cost the American taxpayer one penny. On the contrary, they brought the Department a net profit of $227,000,000 as of December 31, 1946.

All of the so-called war year subsidies commonly charged to agriculture were instead consumer subsidies designed to keep grocery bills down while encouraging food production under price ceilings.

At the very beginning of the war, Congress realized that in order to secure the production of food and materials necessary to insure victory incentives and guarantees would have to be offered to both agriculture and industry. It was recognized that with the end of the war both agriculture and industry would have to reconvert to peacetime conditions. The Steagall amendment, guaranteeing farm price supports in the reconversion period, was intended to give to agriculture what repeal of the excess-profits tax and approval of contract termination settlements was to industry.

But while the Government was showing an actual profit on its over-all farm price support program, payments to industry mounted into billions. By February 28, 1947, the Army had already made contract termination settlements totaling $4,694,055,000 while the Navy had made similar settlements aggregating $1,326,430,000. At the same time, industry benefited by the certification of $4,000,000,000 worth of privately financed war plants, which meant that about $2,000,000,000 in taxes owed by these corporations which built the plants may be charged off. In addition, it is estimated that wartime tax refunds to business will total $5,000,000,000 or more when the books are closed. And on top of that, the Government spent more than $17,000,000,000 to build war plants which were operated by private corporations for their private profit and which are now being sold to these private corporations at a small fraction of their original cost. At the same time, the RFC was paying out huge subsidies: including $438,000,000 to the oil industry between 1942 and 1946, plus $283,000,000 to producers of lead and zinc. These subsidies or aids to business during the war years and reconversion period total at least $20,000,000,000. And that is why I sometimes get a bit excited when I hear spokesmen for industry condemning the American farmer and accusing him of treasury raiding.

The Steagall price support amendment expires with next year's crop. With prices for most farm commodities at their present high levels, it is highly unlikely that the Government will be called upon to protect support prices this year, except in the case of one or two crops. And in this connection, I should like to point out that thousands of potato growers would have been financially ruined last year had not it been for the Steagall amendment which permitted the Government to step in and save the situation.

Likewise, American wool prices would drop sharply if it were not for Government price supports. Some 80 percent of the American market is now supplied by foreign wool growers and without price support domestically our own wool growers would face even greater liquidation of this industry so vital to the economy of many Western States.

While we still have the time, and while the American farmer is still relatively prosperous, I believe that Congress should draft a long-range program designed to insure the future stability of agriculture and this can be done with small cost to the Government. Certainly no one wants a return to the chaos of the thirties but even that will be possible unless we act now to forestall it. Business and labor have as much of a stake in this program as the farmer himself for history has proven over and over again that without a prosperous agriculture we cannot have a prosperous America.

In conclusion, may I say that farmers who toil more hours than others and make possible most of the new wealth are entitled to a better living. You need REA, not only for cheaper and more efficient farm production but also for real comfort on the farm. You are entitled to the same modern homes, with water systems, good heating plants, and other modern conveniences that city people have so long enjoyed. Only through REA is this possible, and it is not in conflict with our free enterprise economy, or our system of Government. The modernization of American farms will provide a greater market for American industry than can be found any other place in the world.

Let not anyone forget that our free enterprise system, in this great democracy, has already given to our people—labor, farmers, and businessmen—the highest standard of living ever attained in any place in this world through all the history of civilization.

Rural America has long been the most consistent and determined supporter of our American methods and our way of life. We will continue that support, always looking toward making America even stronger and more secure as a Nation. With a happier and more contented people, we can demonstrate to the world that our democracy offers to all the people the greatest opportunity for social advancement.

A. F. of L.'s Red Herring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial under the heading of Review and Outlook, appearing in the Wall Street Journal of April 29, 1947:

A. F. OF L.'S RED HERRING

In this and other newspapers of yesterday appeared an advertisement of the American Federation of Labor. It was an appeal against the bills now being considered in Congress. Its general theme is set forth in a caption "A free America cannot exist without free labor."

The inference is that the House and Senate bills do something to make labor less than free. The advertisement contains not one specific support of its main assertion and this newspaper is constrained to think that it does not do so because any such attempt would make the assertion ridiculous.

Both the House and Senate bills provide that labor shall have the right to organize. Employers are bidden to bargain with such organizations. Government machinery is set up to see that these purposes are carried out. To say that such a law intends to enslave labor is to say something absurd.

Labor leaders say that the bill passed by the House is worse than the one under consideration in the Senate and so we will look at some of the provisions of the House bill.

The House bill would prohibit industry-wide bargaining, that is, it would prevent the employees working for the many employers in an industry from joining to control employment in that industry. It would not prevent unions from forming national organizations and getting the benefits of such organization. The aim is to prevent concerted action to close down a whole industry on the part of employees just as the employers are forbidden to take such concerted action. If that is intended to enslave labor the Sherman Antitrust Act is an enslavement of industry.

For taking action designed to fix prices, restrict production, or allocate customers, unions under the House bill would come under the antitrust acts. Is that enslavement? To be free must a union have the power to refuse to work with any but certain materials and to bar competing materials?

Another provision is that unions can be sued for violating their contract. If that is slavery, all of us are slaves.

The bill bans the closed shop, a system whereby an employer hires only men sent to him by the union. In its extreme form this system has resulted in formation of unions where only close relatives of present members are allowed to join. Is such a privilege necessary to freedom?

The bill also contains a list of unfair labor practices such as jurisdictional strikes, boycotting, and mass picketing. Let's see what obstacles to freedom lie there. Since labor leaders themselves no longer defend jurisdictional strikes, we can pass that one. Mass picketing means that a union can throw an army of men about your store or plant—they may or may not be your employees—and prevent you or anyone else entering.

You and your employees may be perfectly satisfied with your arrangements but a union may not, in which case they can refuse to allow your products to come into the plants where it has jurisdiction or it can picket a plant which does use your products. Is that something necessary to freedom?

When Mr. Truman once proposed drafting men to force them to work this newspaper protested. If we could find anything in the labor bills which remotely approached that idea we would protest again. If there were anything in those bills which withheld the right of a man to work or to quit work or to join with others to better himself and to protect himself, there would be grounds for protest.

It is up to the American Federation of Labor to analyze these bills and to point out where the rights of any man have been infringed.

The Increasing Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am moved to call the attention of this God-fearing Nation to the threat embodied in the direction taken by that section of the United Nations known as the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which threat is so ably covered by Mr. Wilbur M. Smith in his brochure entitled "The Increasing Peril" and from which the following is extracted:

THE NON-CHRISTIAN PROGRAM OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

That the assemblies of the United Nations, and their far-reaching decisions and their increasing mountain of publications should give no attention to the existence of a Divine Being, I suppose in this materialistic age is not too surprising, though we deeply regret it. We would expect that departments and agencies created by the United Nations should likewise partake of this irreligiousness, but when an agency of the United Nations in its assemblies openly declares that God is dead, then it behooves that great body of American citizens, who still believe in a living God, to express their strong disapproval of such public, universally publicized statements.

I am referring now to the recent conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, generally referred to as UNESCO, which will probably play a greater and greater part in the thinking of the peoples of our bewildered day on both sides of the world. Months ago when this agency of the United Nations was announced, many began to wonder what they would do when they came face to face with the problems of religion, and asked themselves frequently, "Who will be the head of the United Nations Educational Scientific, and Cultural Organization?"

Well, we did not have to wait long to discover who would be the head of this organization. In their meeting, held in Paris, on December 6, 1946, in a secret session (and why secret I do not know), Dr. Julian Huxley, the British biologist, was elected Director General for a 2-year term, having been before this Secretary General of the Preparatory Commission. Of the 27 voting members present at the primary session, 3 voted against him, while 2 abstained. Lebanon, Syria, and Ecuador did not assent.

There can be no question but that this gifted, brilliant, internationally known British scientist will exercise an enormous influence over this body, and certainly men of the type that were elected to this commission which voted on Dr. Huxley knew something of the man for whom they were voting. They unquestionably know that he is definitely not only an enemy of the Christian faith, and really a bitter opponent of the Bible as any revelation of truth, but he is an outspoken denier of the existence of a living and personal God. I think we ought to give some consideration to this, because in 2 years Dr. Huxley may be the responsible initiator of a number of decisions, and I am sure he is not taking this position just to be a figurehead or for any particular notoriety. He is not the kind of man that delights in remaining silent, nor does he fail to have courage to speak out his convictions.

Nearly a quarter of a century ago, in his Essays of a Biologist, published in 1923, Huxley said, "It is impossible for me, and those who think like me, to believe in God as a person, a ruler, to continue to speak of God as a spiritual being in the ordinary way."

In another work, published in 1941, he says, "The scientific approach renders either futile or illogical all straightforward personification of divinity." Of course, to deny God a personality is to deny God. A God who is just the wind is no God at all, you and I would agree.

In a recent article, Huxley even declares that we ought "to cease tormenting ourselves with questions that ought not to be asked because they cannot be answered, such as questions about the cause of creation or ultimate reality." In fact, this new director of an organization for the education of a new world has actually suggested that we perhaps would do well to go back to the paganism of the Greeks. "One of the obvious attractions of the Greek paganism was the variety of human actions and expressions which it could accommodate within its boundaries. Free from the necessity of propitiating or imitating a unitary being, a modern religion could revert to that rich variety."

Elsewhere it is true he does speak of "the heights to which the religious impulse may bring man," and he admits that "the Christian introduction of the idea of general altruism as opposed to tribal solidarity." But nowhere is God referred to as existing; nowhere is there any dependence upon a divine ruler of the world; nowhere is there, of course, any indication that man has an eternal destiny, nor that the world depends upon God for its origin and maintenance. He does not anywhere recognize the values of Christian faith, but, strange to say, he proposes that there should be a careful examination of "physiological and psychological mechanisms involved in the bodily exercises of Hindu yogis." Is it not strange that Huxley can take deep interest in yogis, but no interest in the faith that has dominated the Western World for 1,700 years?

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that such doctrines are wholly at variance with those enunciated by the framers of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution and certainly are in conflict with the sentiments proclaimed by our Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, in his opening address before the Eightieth Congress. In short, it seems to me that the UNESCO should have the vigilant attention of every Member of this House and I for one am determined to oppose all appropriations for the promotion of any such program which denies the existence of God and tends to further such atheistic misconception.

Congress Should Investigate the Epidemic of Rail Crashes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there has been an epidemic of automobile, airplane, and railroad-train crashes this year. Congress is investigating safety in air navigation. I have introduced a bill which, if adopted, would cut down the slaughter on the Nation's highways. I now wish to urge that Congress, which has the power and responsibility to do so, conduct an investigation of the causes and remedies for recurrent train wrecks.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the May 3 edition of Labor, a national weekly newspaper of the railroad unions. I commend to you a careful reading of the startling information contained in this editorial:

CONGRESS URGED TO SLOW UP RAIL WRECKS; INEXCUSABLE NEGLIGENCE CHARGED IN DEATH TOLL

The increasing number of shocking railroad accidents has at last aroused the country. Committees on Interstate Commerce of the House and the Senate are being urged to draft safeguarding resolutions.

In a vigorous editorial, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch declared that "an inexcusable act of negligence caused the deaths of 24 persons and the injury of 138 in the wreck of the Pennsylvania Railroad's Red Arrow" and that this tragedy has been followed by an epidemic of wrecks.

The editorial wound up: "The painful fact is that the railroads are trying to compete in twentieth-century speed but with nineteenth-century equipment for doing so safely.

"Such railroads as want to continue to operate without speedometers, without two-way radios, without automatic train control and other modern safety safeguards for modern speeds should resign themselves to jogging along at the leisurely pace to which their equipment entitles them.

"If they want to compete with the air lines in speed, they should be required to equip themselves with the devices that will make high speed safe.

"In addition, speed limits should be rigorously enforced, regardless of schedules, for no amount of safety equipment can make recklessness safe."

This was further underscored by a report which the ICC issued a few days ago on the pile-up of a Seaboard Air Line streamliner at Cassatt, S. C., on the night of March 22, and a similar wreck last week on the Illinois Central.

The Seaboard train was being operated at its scheduled speed of 65 miles an hour when it hit an open switch and was shunted to a sidetrack. The Diesel locomotive and seven cars were thrown off the track. Luckily, no one was killed, but the engineer, baggageman, five mail clerks, and nearly a score of passengers were injured.

According to the report, there was no warning to the men in the cab until the train was a few hundred feet from the switch. Then the headlight illuminated a red reflector disc on the switchstand. Of course, every effort was made to stop, but at better than mile-a-minute speed the distance was not sufficient.

More than a year ago the ICC ordered the carrier to install an automatic block-signal system, which would have prevented the crash, but it has not done so in that territory.

At the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON (Republican, New Jersey), chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, introduced a bill which would not only give the ICC authority to order the installation of safety devices, but would enable it to further promote the safety of workers and passengers by establishing rules, regulations, and practices with respect to train operations.

Also, Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH (Republican, Oregon) has proposed a measure giving the ICC authority to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for in-

spection, maintenance, repair, and construction of track. It now has this authority over signal systems under the Signal Inspection Act.

The latest reports from the ICC emphasize the tremendous hazards of the rail industry. The employees are the chief victims.

In the first 2 months of this year, 114 were killed in the line of duty and 6,374 were injured. For all of 1946, the toll was 670 killed and 38,324 maimed.

A Concurrent Resolution of the Minnesota Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following copy of a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota on April 24, 1947, having to do with income taxes in non-community-property States:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America that H. R. 1759, introduced by Representative REEVES, of Missouri, or any other suitable and appropriate legislation, be now enacted permitting equal division of income between husband and wife for income-tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States

Whereas an inequity exists between the citizens and residents of the several States of the United States in that residents of 9 States having community-property laws are privileged to divide incomes between husband and wife for income-tax purposes, thereby reducing the income taxes required to be paid by said residents, which privilege is being denied to the residents of the 39 States not having community-property laws; and

Whereas by reason of the premises legal privileges are enjoyed by a minority of the citizens of the United States of America, solely determined by residence, which are not permitted to all the citizens of the United States, which fact gives rise to a discrimination in respect of income taxes which should be removed; and

Whereas it is within the power of the Congress of the United States of America to correct such inequity by adopting suitable and appropriate legislation therefor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized now to enact into law as a part of the Internal Revenue Code, H. R. 1759, introduced by Representative REEVES, of Missouri, or any other suitable and appropriate legislation permitting equal division of income between husband and wife for income tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States; and be it

Resolved, That the attention of the Congress of the United States be invited to other bills now pending in the United States Senate and in the United States House of Representatives embodying the principle of the aforesaid Reeves bill (H. R. 1759), among which bills are the following: Amendment to H. R. 1 (Knutson bill), introduced by Mr. BUTLER; S. 626, introduced by Mr. CORDON; S. 649, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS; S. 550, introduced by Mr. LANGER; H. R. 2219, introduced by Mr. ANGELL; H. R. 2002, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON; which principle is hereby approved and recommended for enactment by the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate; the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Minnesota.

What Is Ahead in Aviation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "What Is Ahead in Aviation?" delivered by me before the Advertising Club of Washington on April 29, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The topic assigned me today is, What is ahead in aviation? I wish it were possible to speak in terms of limitless horizons, to describe proudly a continuing American leadership in the field of aviation which we so largely pioneered. Unfortunately, I am unable to do that. The facts as they stand would not support it.

The United States is no longer the world's leading air-power nation. Many of you may be shocked to know that we are running a poor third. In practically every branch of air power, Britain and Russia surpass us.

A few weeks ago I made a similar statement, based on information then at hand, before the American Legion Aeronautics Conference. Since then, important new evidence has come to light.

The first new and startling evidence was an article by William Courtney in Collier's of Friday before last, April 25. Courtney states that Russia, far from demobilizing her air power since VJ-day, has expanded it in all its branches, including her manufacturing industry and air lines. Courtney reports that Soviet aircraft factories will produce 100,000 planes, military and civilian, in 1947. This is approximately four times our probable production in 1947.

Courtney declares that Russia, turning out 200 transport planes a month in 1944, is now producing 360 transport planes a month. The American aircraft industry produced only 467 transport planes in all of 1946. The total will not be much larger in 1947. Russia had only a few hundred miles of scheduled airways several years ago, Courtney says, but now she operates 50,000 miles and plans 150,000 airway miles during the next few years.

The article is packed with amazing data on Russian air power. It tells about expansion of aviation in the satellite countries. It asserts that the Soviet Air Force is now twice as strong as in early 1945, and that the ratio of fighters to long-range bombers has been changed to provide a great many more long-range bombers.

Courtney's figures are his own, and he does not reveal his sources. However, Courtney's analysis of expanding Russian civil and military aviation is borne out by evidence from other sources.

We know that Russia has established weather bases in the Arctic. We have heard Radio Moscow announce their policy of becoming the world's strongest air power.

That is a policy firmly established at the top and forced, nationally, from the Politburo down to the most ignorant peasant.

Britain is the other great air power.

Although England is withdrawing from India and is turning the role of policeman in Greece and Turkey over to us, she is maintaining a powerful air arm. The RAF budget for 1947–48 provides for 370,000 officers and men. This is an air force larger than our own Army Air Forces, under the President's budget submitted in January.

Another bit of testimony can be given you by a quotation from a recent issue of the authoritative British magazine, Flight, March 13. I quote:

"That the Royal Air Force had become our front line of defense in the recent war is no longer denied. Consequently the nation must be prepared to pay the premium exacted for the insurance which the RAF represents. In the White Paper on Defense issued recently, the net estimates for the three fighting services were: Army, 388,000,000 pounds; Air Force, 214,000,000 pounds; and Navy, 196,700,000 pounds. That the RAF should be so far above the Navy in its allocation is an indication of how the defense picture has changed during the last few years. One doubts that the general public fully realizes the fact. The amount by which this year's air estimates exceed the Navy estimates is as great as the total of the air estimates some 10 or 12 years ago."

The New York Times reported on April 22 that Britain's first jet air liners has had a successful flight test. Britain also has at least two jet fighters in large production—and they are superior to ours—for immediate operational duty.

We have thus seen some impressive evidence that Britain and Russia are determined to stay ahead in the air. Let's quickly look over the situation in this country

First, the air lines. They experienced a substantial increase in traffic last year. But because of a great many problems of conversion and reconversion, the domestic air lines operated at a loss in 1946 of more than $7,000,000. Of the air lines that have reported so far for 1946 operations, 11 ran at a loss, while 9 earned a small profit.

The air lines' more pressing difficulties have been temporarily eased by the seasonal upsurge in traffic. Serious long-term problems, such as adequate traffic control for a greatly increased number of high-speed planes, the research and development of facilities for all-weather flying necessary to insure maintenance of schedules, these and other problems are as challenging as ever.

General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, all authorities, have warned us that armies of the future will move almost entirely by air. Provision should be made for maintaining as large a part of the needed reservoir of civil air transports as is economical and efficient. Our policy with regard to commercial aviation should be firm and clear-cut and should be established by law.

AIRCRAFT MANUFACTURING

The situation with regard to the aircraft-manufacturing industry is even more alarming.

Eight of the twelve largest aircraft-manufacturing companies operated at a loss in 1946. Their profit of more than $60,000,000 in 1945 was changed to a loss of more than $8,000,000 for last year. That aggregate loss for the 12 companies was after taking full advantage of all tax carry-backs available

to those companies. Contrast this record with that of industry in general. The National City Bank of New York recently reported that net income of all manufacturing corporations in the country increased by 36 percent from 1945 to 1946. The same report showed that net income of aircraft companies decreased by 95 percent from 1945 to 1946.

And what about the future? In 1947 and in early 1948 the industry will deliver a substantial number of new high-speed transports equipped with the latest and most improved devices making for maximum in safety and passenger comfort. These new planes will be more than 50 percent faster than planes now in service. When this greater speed is added to the 50-percent increase in available seats contained in the new planes, it can be seen readily that the air lines by early next year will be completely reequipped. There will be only limited reordering by the air lines until the problem of all-weather flying is solved, and until present planes wear out, processes that will take some years to come about.

In the field of military production, the official Air Coordinating Committee has stated that in the interests of national safety we should maintain a manufacturing industry producing at least 3,000 military planes every year after maintenance of world peace was well assured. This production, according to the committee, should be in addition to a reasonable output of commercial and personal aircraft. Actual production last year was 1,330 military planes and 467 transport planes, figures which contrast most strikingly with those reported for Russia by William Courtney. Clearly our industry is not being maintained at the levels recommended by official administrative agencies; and just as obviously our failure to do so is a risky and hazardous business. After the last war we also neglected to maintain an aircraft industry, and the 17 firms established in the business during World War I dropped down to 7 by 1922 and to 3 by 1926.

It was about that time that Gen. Billy Mitchell charged the armed services with being guilty of treasonable neglect of air power. President Coolidge moved promptly in response to that charge and established the Morrow Board, which was organized in September 1925 and which completed an exhaustive survey and filed its report by the year end. Its recommendations were embodied in the following year in the Air Corps Act, the Naval Air Corps Act, and the Civil Air Commerce Act, all of which were signed by President Coolidge in 1926. This legislation, which constituted the magna carta of air power, kept American aviation alive during the following years, indeed gave us ascendency in most branches of aviation for almost a decade.

Then, once again we began to neglect aviation and air power, ignoring the warnings of the Morrow Board. That neglect hit a nadir in 1934 and 1935, when appropriations for the Air Corps and the Bureau of Aeronautics reached a 10-year low. That neglect at a time when Hitler and Mussolini were on the march was of course a major reason why those aggressors started on their march.

A spot check of other branches of aviation reveals the existence of serious problems in those fields, too. Production of personal aircraft has fallen from last summer's 4,600 a month to the current level of around 1,700 a month. Numerous reasons are given for this abrupt contraction, including lack of landing facilities, cost of the aircraft and the expense of operation, and others. We lack the time here to examine reasons or analyze the situation, but the existence of serious problems is clearly indicated.

Even in the radically new field of helicopters problems of regulatory policy have appeared. We hear that helicopters cannot operate inside the city limits of a great many metropolises. Since the ability to do so is their chief advantage, we can perceive that this is a truly acute problem.

Thus, it is that no matter which branch of air power we examine; air transport, air manufacturing, the size of the air forces, research, personal aircraft, and helicopters, challenging problems involving national and local government policy bar the path of progress. Does all this mean that the brilliant promise of aviation and air power is not to be fulfilled? Are we to be denied the thousands of new jobs, the new enterprises springing up around the airports, the convenience, comforts and luxuries that aviation seemed likely to bring us?

I do not believe it. We simply must take a careful reading and formulate a policy that will allow aviation to grow and assume its rightful place.

I submit here today that we as a Nation cannot afford again to drop behind in air power. We must remain strong to discourage aggressors.

What is needed is a comprehensive review of American air power and its components: the air forces, air transportation, and the aircraft industry, to formulate consistent national programs for each branch. Only the Congress can establish these programs, but to do so it must be equipped with authoritative facts and studies.

I feel therefore that we should at the earliest possible moment establish a board or council at the highest level to recommend action that would strengthen American air policies and prevent loss of aeronautical leadership to foreign rivals. Several other leading nations—Britain among them—considered the establishment of national air policy as one of the first steps to be taken in postwar reconstruction. We can do no less if we wish to remain a leading air power. We should not repeat the mistake that we did in the maritime field—of twice surrendering a hard-won leadership.

Program of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Denunciation of GOP and Program Comes Too Heavily and Too Early," by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Star of Wednesday, April 30. 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—DENUNCIATION OF GOP AND PROGRAM COMES TOO HEAVILY AND TOO EARLY

(By Frank R. Kent)

As this session of Congress goes into its fifth month many detached observers agree that the current unrestrained denunciation of the Republicans, imperfect though they undoubtedly are, has been much overdone. At the moment there seems every prospect that before adjournment in July a program will have been enacted that not only will be widely approved but will make the violent hysteria with which it is now assailed seem pretty silly.

That fact is beginning to trickle into the minds of the more astute critics on the Democratic side and there is a present tendency toward some restraint. It is natural, of course, that opposition should come from the left-wingers, including the Communists, who have permeated the CIO to the point of at least partial control.

Their quite open goal is wreckage of our governmental system. But the political wisdom of wholehearted opposition from the Truman administration certainly is open to doubt, for, after all, what is it the Republicans propose? First, to slice governmental expenses and reduce the size of the Federal pay roll; second, to cut taxes; third, to curb the power of the labor-union bosses, which concededly has been greatly abused.

It is true that for 13 years the Democratic administration went in the exact reverse direction of these proposals. While the billions were pouring out in doles and subsidies, while the war was on and clear thinking impossible, waste was made to seem right, a degrading political alliance appeared a noble concern for the common man, and the basic iniquity of these policies was obscured. But something like sanity has returned and no one can doubt today that the public desire is for curtailment of governmental size and cost, reduced taxes, and restraining laws against labor-union abuses.

CUTS EVOKE HOWLS

Administration Democrats from Mr. Truman down have declared themselves in favor of these things. Nevertheless, along with the radical groups, they strongly oppose the Republican effort to do them now.

The contention is that the Republicans cannot cut expenses without crippling the Government, reduce taxes without endangering stability, or correct labor abuses without depriving labor of its basic rights. All of which is nonsense.

Take the question of cutting expenses. Every cut that has been voted in the House committee has produced a terrific chorus of squeals, bleats, and threats. Yet in not one case has the opposition presented facts that stand up under scrutiny.

The latest instance is in the reduction in the Interior Department. This evoked a most enormous howl. The Department would be ruined. The natural resources of the country would be lost. So would every State in the West to the Republicans in 1948.

MORE FOR RECLAMATION

None of this is true. House leaders prove that the bill as passed will provide more funds for reclamation next year than ever has been spent in any one year; that actually more funds for reclamation are provided for next year than the Department is empowered to spend this year under President Truman's freeze order limiting expenditures to $130,000,000.

On this, as on other budget cuts, the Republican position is measurably approved by Senator BYRD, the acknowledged authority in this field; Senator GEORGE and other Democrats who feel that unless drastic cuts are made now they never will be made and eventually our system will collapse under the sheer weight of its size and cost.

It is the same way on taxes. The President and Secretary Snyder are on sound ground in opposing any tax reduction not justified by budget balance, debt reduction, economies and income. Yet their position is weakened, first, by the fact that they put through the repeal of the excess-profits tax last year; second, by their own huge mistakes in surplus and revenue estimates; third, by the powerful arguments, among others, of John

W. Hanes, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, and quite the ablest man in that Department during the last 14 years.

In the matter of labor legislation it already has been pointed out that a majority of the House Democrats voted for the Republican House bill, which undoubtedly will be the basis of the eventual law, if Mr. Truman does not veto it.

TRUMAN COULD JOIN MOVE

So what is the situation? The situation is that before the end of July, if the Republicans do not weaken, they will have greatly cut down the size and cost of Government, made a real start on reducing the debt, lowered tax rates, and, unless prevented by Mr. Truman, given the public protection against the power-drunk labor bosses.

If the enactment of this program is not followed by the dreadful disasters forecast by the raucous voices of the left, the administration will be in a painful position. If the reductions in the Truman budget fail to paralyze vital Government functions; if the tax cut stimulates business and does not perilously reduce revenues; if the labor law is found not to have crucified labor but merely to have protected the public—in other words, if calamity does not quickly ensue, then all the radical prophets will be discredited and Mr. Truman, by measurably taking their view, will suffer.

As things stand now, he is on the wrong side of a program desired by the people and to which he himself is pledged. Instead of helping, he stands in the way. It would have been intelligent had he joined—or even now should join—in getting these things done quickly and well. He would have had at least half the credit—perhaps more.

Trying To Do Too Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Trying To Do Too Much," from the New York World-Telegram of last night. It bears on the measure now pending before the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRYING TO DO TOO MUCH

If corrective labor legislation is to become Federal law—

Each branch of Congress must pass a bill (the House has passed one; the Senate is debating another). A conference committee then must take the two bills, reconcile their differences, and write them into a single measure. Both branches must approve the committee's work. Finally, President Truman must sign the measure; or, if he refuses, 2 to 1 votes must be mustered in both branches to pass it over a veto.

There probably are enough votes in the House to override any veto. But there are not enough in the Senate to override a convincing veto.

Mr. Truman could write a convincing veto of a measure as extreme as the House-passed bill. It includes, according to the National Association of Manufacturers, virtually all of what management believes essential in the public interest. To us, this means that it goes too far. We distrust the NAM's opinion as to all that is essential, just as we challenge the CIO and AFL inflexible opposition to any legislation whatsoever.

The Senate has before it a milder bill, a product of study and compromise in its Labor Committee. It is not namby-pamby. It provides for many urgently needed reforms. There is no assurance that Mr. Truman would sign it, but it would give him no such reason for a convincing veto. And more Senators would vote to override a veto of it than of the tougher House bill.

Senators TAFT and BALL and others are fighting for amendments to strengthen the Senate bill. If they win their fight, the probable result will be that no corrective labor legislation will become law in this session of Congress. House Republicans will be encouraged to resist any toning down of their extreme measure in the conference committee. And the bill finally sent to Mr. Truman will invite a veto which cannot be overridden in the Senate.

We don't agree with those who argue that this would put the President in a political hole. The country won't like it if he vetoes a labor bill that is manifestly sound and fair. But the country won't blame him for vetoing a bill that goes too far. It will blame the Republicans for sending him such a bill.

No single piece of legislation is going to correct all the abuses, excesses, and bad practices of the labor movement. Here, for the first time in years, Congress has a real opportunity to correct many of them.

Mr. Wallace Explains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Wallace Explains," which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. WALLACE EXPLAINS

One of these days it may be plain to Mr. Wallace that he can never be a peacemaker by adopting the role of apologist for Soviet Russia. At his press conference he sought to recoup any reputation he may have as a constructive force in our society by disavowing the more glaring of his recent boners. He denied, for instance, saying that the Truman doctrine is "ruthless imperialism." Yet he could not refrain from the most arrant propaganda in behalf of Moscow. One of the choicer bits was his opinion that Russian noncooperation derived from fear of an American depression.

What danger could there be of a link with our economy or of contamination with our society in the cooperation that the Russians have rejected? In not one constructive project will they participate. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, World Bank and Monetary Fund, Food and Agricultural Organization, International Civil Aeronautical Organization, International Labor Organization, International Refugee Organization, World Health Organization—to all of these bodies the Russians have turned a cold shoulder. Nine months ago they even refused to attend the London Conference of the United Nations Subcommittee on Devastated Areas which was called merely to survey reconstruction needs in Europe. Surely Mr. Wallace in his right mind would not contend that fear of an American depression had anything to do with this long line of refusals. The common denominator of all these bodies is eleemosynary. They are intended to aid the unfortunate, fulfill a common responsibility, make visible the unity of mankind. As Lief say that a private person might be ruined by helping the Red Cross as say that Russia would be hurt by joining in these good works for the common benefit.

We may grant that there is a factor of fear in the make-up of the Kremlin's hierarchs. It is the fear of people who are sure neither of themselves nor of their power. That is the reason they are averse to freedom of communication. Their fear has lately been expressed in a refusal to allow Russian brides to join their British husbands in England. But it is their own weakness, not ours, that they are afraid of. They fear that with intercommunication our system will undermine the confidence of the Russian people in theirs. This accounts (in part) for their noncooperation in peace-making and in the establishment of a world society. As for the Wallace argument, he knows as well as anybody that Russia's economy is shielded from the effects of any American depression by her system of state control and state trading, as was shown in the 1929-1932 depression.

How are we to get cooperation with Russia? Mr. Wallace, who swears that his only purpose is to promote precisely that, implies that such cooperation is impossible as long as we retain our system of free enterprise. He has only himself to blame if the impression is that he thinks his (and our) object can be attained only by our copying the Russian system. That solution will be rejected by the American people. We are so unafraid of our institutions that we are members of all the world organizations that the Russians reject. The better way of promoting Russian cooperation is the Marshall way. That is to say, by working at nonexclusive cooperation with other nations and by refusing to appease Russia by negotiating a peace with a worm in it.

The Tariff Problem

FXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a very cogent discussion of the tariff problem by two very able citizens of Idaho, speaking on behalf of the Senior Citizens Pension League of Boise, Idaho. I am in complete agreement with the sentiments expressed in this very intelligent and helpful communication.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That we express our views to Congress on the tariff question, as follows:

We believe that as our country has as great natural resources as any country on earth, that it has by far a greater use of labor-saving machinery than any nation; that we have equal intelligence and industry of any people, and that trade is the easiest way of production; we can therefore compete with the world and need no tariff.

That if we seem to not be able to compete that there must be some other cause, and that Congress should seek out such cause; that Congress should move gradually in the direction of free trade with the world; that this Nation and the whole world will benefit from every removal or lowering of tariff barriers whether they be domestic or foreign.

There may be need to have tariffs to offset the subsidies of foreign nations not for our direct benefit, but for the benefit to the world in which we find ourselves very much interested.

Tariffs are as reactionary as it would be to compel our people to abandon the use of labor-saving machinery. It compels us to produce the hard way.

Those who believe they need a tariff do not believe in their most touted individual enterprise and their vested interests in their advantages should be ignored in the interest of an improved democracy and world peace.

Resolved, That we send copies of this resolution to the Senate, the House, and to the President, and that we seek Senator GLEN TAYLOR to get this printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Passed by the Senior Citizens Pension League of Boise, Idaho, this 9th day of February 1947, at Boise, Idaho.

M. E. COPE,
President of Senior Citizens Pension League of Boise.

ETHEL BROWNING,
Secretary of Senior Citizens Pension League of Boise.

The Need for Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Ease the Housing Shortage: Pass These Bills," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 25, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO EASE THE HOUSING SHORTAGE: PASS THESE BILLS

With Washington admitting that the housing situation is not improving but is, if anything, getting worse; with many builders in the Philadelphia area preparing price rises on new homes; with continued scarcity of dwellings going hand in hand with increased construction costs, any encouraging development in the housing field is reason for loud cheers.

Two such developments appeared on Wednesday: Approval by a House committee at Harrisburg of the bill to permit insurance-financed housing projects in Pennsylvania, and release to the Senate floor in Washington by the Banking Committee of the long-stalled Wagner-Ellender-Taft long-range housing legislation.

Passage of these two acts would stimulate dwelling construction of many kinds. Other large cities have benefited from the vast housing developments built with insurance-company funds, and the shortage of homes in Philadelphia would be relieved, especially in the rental field, by similar projects here.

The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, national in scope, calls for an integrated housing program with its objective the building of 15,000,000 homes by 1958. It would push the construction of 500,000 public low-cost dwellings as soon as possible, stimulate private construction of moderate-priced homes, foster farm and rural housing, and facilitate slum clearance.

Unfortunately, neither measure is yet in the clear. The insurance bill has hurdled a number of obstacles, has been passed by the Senate, and needs only approval by the House. But strong lobby pressure is being brought against it—pressure that was able 2 years ago to restrict insurance housing so drastically as to defeat the purposes of the bill.

The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill has even a tougher road ahead. It is opposed by the same groups, centering their fight upon its public-housing provisions, that helped kill it off in the House last year. It was reported out of committee by the slim margin of 1 vote, and an arduous struggle for survival is inevitable in the Senate.

The one thing that may confound the pressure groups opposing both these bills is the continued gravity of the housing shortage. In the face of pressing necessity for large-scale action to promote home building, opposition to legislation that would insure such action is impossible to justify.

Appropriations for Foreign Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Letting Marshall Down," published in the May 1 edition of the Philadelphia Bulletin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTING MARSHALL DOWN

The $100,000,000 slash made by the House in the fund proposed by the administration for the relief of distressed populations overseas was unwise as well as ungenerous. Also it was in effect a denial of the cooperation to which Secretary Marshall is entitled from Congress. His program has wide bipartisan support, and there has been no dissent expressed to it by the House leadership or by any but minority elements in the House.

This fund takes the place of the former American contribution to UNRRA; so we as a Nation are pledged to furnishing it in adequate amount. Secretary Marshall placed the legislation carrying out the administration's relief program on the Department's must list of legislation. It is important to our all-around international policy that the United States, as the richest of the belligerent nations, and the one whose territory suffered the least material damage, back up championship of democracy for the European nations with a fairly liberal measure of practical relief. Decidedly the House has let Marshall down.

The restrictions imposed on distribution seems to stem from a desire if not entirely to deny aid to the populations of Soviet-dominated countries, at least to attach conditions which may be resented and in effect curtail relief. On this matter surely the advice of the Department is worth following.

In the case of Poland, for instance, if we hold that the desire of the majority of the people for democratic freedoms is being thwarted by a Soviet-controlled minority, why add to the masses' sufferings and deprivations?

The Senate is looked for to back the administration fully. Public opinion will support such a stand.

United Nations Committee on Future Government of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 1 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a memorandum which has been sent to the Secretary General of the United Nations for submission to the General Assembly jointly by the Nation Associates, the CIO, the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union, the Council for Democracy, the Church Peace Union, and the Progressive Citizens of America.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION ASSOCIATES,
New York, N. Y., April 23, 1947.

PRESIDENT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
The United Nations,
Lake Success, N. Y.

SIR: In view of the fact that an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations has been called in order to establish a committee of inquiry whose function it will be to prepare proposals for the future government of Palestine, we, the undersigned, beg leave to make the following suggestions with respect to the composition and procedure of this committee.

We propose that the membership of the committee be limited to representatives of such states as are not directly concerned with the Palestine question.

Since the terms of reference of the committee require that it should propose the character of the future government of Palestine, it must of necessity review both the history of the mandate and the record of the mandatory in discharging its obligations, as well as such aspects of the world situation as relate to the terms of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate.

If a decision is to be rendered which will be acceptable to the Jews of Palestine, the Jews of the world, and the Arabs, as well as to world public opinion, it is necessary that no color of prejudice or special interest be attached to the committee.

For this reason we oppose the participation, as parties in interest, of the Government of Great Britain, now the mandatory,

and the governments of the Arab states in and out of the United Nations.

That Great Britain is a party in interest is self evident. A further reason for its exclusion from the committee of inquiry is to be found in its record as mandatory power. Since May 1939, it has governed Palestine under the terms of the white paper restricting immigration and land sales, despite the fact that the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations ruled that the white paper contravened the purposes of the mandate, which required the mandatory to facilitate Jewish immigration into Palestine and to support close settlement of the Jews on the land.

Since 1939 there has been no official review of British policy under the mandate. While the war, with the subsequent disruption of services and communications and the disappearance of the League of Nations, may provide some excuse for this lack of review until 1945, no such argument applies to the unilateral action which Great Britain has taken with respect to Palestine since that date. The Charter of the United Nations drawn up in April 1945, provided, under article 80, that "with respect to mandated territories nothing shall be done to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which members of the United Nations may respectively be parties." The action of Great Britain in protracting the illegal policy of the white paper of 1939 may be regarded as an infraction of this provision, and was so regarded when the Anglo-American Committee unanimously recommended on April 20, 1946, that the provisions of the white paper be immediately abrogated, the doors of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration, and the land-restriction laws be repealed.

Notwithstanding these facts and recommendations, the British Government has continued its policy unchanged, and even issued a statement from the Foreign Office asserting that it regarded the terms of the mandate as having been "fulfilled."

This claim was contested by the President of the United States who, in a communication to King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia on October 28, 1946, stated that in the judgment of the United States, "the Jewish National Home has not as yet been fully developed."

The Government of the United States, although not a member of the League of Nations at the time of the issuance of the mandate, under a special convention between itself and Great Britain, ratified in 1924, was accorded all the rights belonging to the League with respect to Palestine; by the terms of this convention Great Britain was obligated to make no changes in the mandate without prior consent of the United States. The white paper of 1939 was a direct violation of this convention and has not at any time been accepted by the Government of the United States.

In further abrogation of its international commitments, the British Government, in January 1946, proceeded, without sanction by the United Nations, or the United States, to accord independence to Trans-Jordan, which had been administered under the same mandate as Palestine.

The British Government has made the Arab states parties in interest in the Palestine question, although nothing in the mandate, or any other international agreement, grants special rights to any of the Arab states. This was accomplished by drawing the Arab states into consultation with the mandatory on various aspects of the Palestine problem. As a result, the Arab states have, individually and collectively, demanded the establishment in Palestine of an independent Arab state, and, to achieve this purpose, have embarked on a policy of intimidation, both against the Jews of Palestine and their fellow members of the United Nations. The Government of the United States on repeated occasions has been threatened with economic reprisals if it continued to manifest a friendly attitude toward the Zionist claims. Over the world at large the Arab states have held the threat of a general uprising in the event of a decision favoring the Jews in Palestine.

A token of this promised revolt is the action of the King of Egypt in granting asylum in his palace, to the former Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, convicted by evidence now in the hands of the Allied War Crimes Tribunal of complicity with Nazi Germany, Italy, and Japan in organizing Arab sabotage of the Allied war effort and of stimulating the program of extermination of the Jews.

The Mufti, from his headquarters in the King's palace in Alexandria, is today directing the organization of an underground Arab army, in Palestine and outside, and openly reviewed in Egypt elements of these forces. Moreover, the member states of the Arab League, including those represented in the United Nations, have organized a boycott of the goods and products of the Jews of Palestine.

Some Arab countries, and particularly the Government of Syria, now represented in the Security Council of the United Nations, are conducting a campaign of intimidation against the Jewish populations of their own countries in an effort to produce a disavowal of support of the Zionist cause. The Government of Syria has imposed the death penalty on Syrian Jews helping refugees to escape into Palestine.

From the foregoing it must be apparent that the presence of either the mandatory government or any of the Arab states on the committee of inquiry would be a priori regarded as prejudicial to its conclusions. It would, moreover, constitute an act of discrimination against the Jewish people. The interest of the Jewish people with respect to Palestine was established first by the Balfour declaration and subsequently by the terms of the mandate. Under article 4 of the mandate, the Jewish Agency for Palestine is recognized as a public body for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the administration of Palestine in such economic, social, and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish National Home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine, and, subject always to the control of the administration, to assist and take part in the development of the country.

The same article also provides that the agency shall take steps in consultation with His Britannic Majesty's Government in securing the cooperation of all the Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish National Home.

If any parties in interest were to be members of the committee of inquiry, it would be essential that the rights of the Jewish people be safeguarded through the presence in the committee of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

The exclusion of parties in interest from membership in the committee of inquiry should not, however, preclude the granting of full opportunity to all parties to present their case to the United Nations, whether in the extraordinary session beginning on April 28, 1947, or to the committee of inquiry, or in the regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in September. Great Britain and the Arab states are already represented in the Assembly and their rights of participation are thus assured and protected. The Jewish people alone are not. In view of the recognition of the Jewish Agency for Palestine under the mandate as the representatives of the interests of the Jewish people on this question, we ask that in all discussions and decisions with respect to Palestine, the right of full participation be accorded to the Jewish agency. There is nothing in the Charter of the United Nations or the rules governing the procedures of the General Assembly to preclude such participation. Fairness and decency, moreover, demand that this be accorded.

Respectfully yours,

FREDA KIRCHWEY,
President The Nation Associates.
PHILIP MURRAY,
President Congress of Industrial Organizations.
JAMES G. PATTON,
President, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union.
HENRY A. ATKINSON,
Secretary The Church Peace Union.
JAMES E. GREER,
Executive Secretary Council for Democracy.
JO DAVIDSON,
FRANK KINGDOM,
Cochairmen, Progressive Citizens of America.

Foreign Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that I am convinced this bill will pass, and after it has been passed by both Houses in some form and been signed by the President, it will be my duty to back this foreign relief and use what influence I have to see that it is properly administered and that it alleviates the suffering for which it is intended. I wish to commend the sincerity of those who have been working for the passage of this bill. They are fine men and I respect their motives and their purpose in diligently listening to the hearings and reporting it out and fighting for final passage of the bill. I have the utmost respect for Mr. Hoover and the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House. However, I must add that some of us who served in the various European countries during the late war, and who associated with those people in the various countries who will need relief, are not going to take Mr. Hoover's advice in full or that of the Foreign Affairs Committee, because we feel that we are qualified to speak on the problem and are comparably acquainted with this problem to anyone else.

There has been a great deal of argument and debate here the last few days about something having to be done to relieve the suffering and to fight communism, and to build up the prestige of America in these foreign countries. If the money we send overseas will accomplish the desired end, I would be the first man to vote for the passage of this relief bill but let us look at the record of American money spent on foreign soil in the past.

I would like for you to think a moment about England. As I recall, $40,000,000,000 was sent to England during the recent war in the form of lend-lease. This money was used by England in the prosecution of our joint war and in feeding

her people, but did it prevent England from voting, before the war was over, a form of semisocialistic government, which is a step towards communism? Did it prevent the British people from repudiating Churchill, and indirectly the United States, before the war was even over? Of course, the answer to this question is obvious. Then let us look at the approximately $4,000,000,000 loan by this country to England last year to help bolster its economy and prevent the country from going communistic, and all the other things outlined by the proponents of that loan, but what are the facts? England today is in worse condition economically than ever before in her modern history, and I am told that even Churchill in a recent statement charged the labor government with squandering a large part of this $4,000,000,000 loan. The records seem to show that when American money is spent overseas, it tends to have the adverse effect for which it was sent.

Let us look at China. China was supposed to have been greatly aided by American relief through UNNRA and otherwise, but China today is in worse condition than before this money was spent, and we are told that about $1 out of every 60 which is sent for Chinese relief in the interior actually reaches those for whom it was intended, and even UNNRA is going to discontinue sending any more supplies to China because the people who need it do not get it.

Let us look at Russia. What did we get from Russia after sending her about $11,000,000,000 in lend-lease? We made an avowed enemy, or at least she is today, after reaping the benefits of this fine loan or gift.

Let us look at the record of Japan. After the great earthquake in 1923, Americans contributed millions of dollars in supplies and money for the relief of the people of Japan. Did they pay us back in kindness? Rather they started immediately to embark on a program of war and eventually a conflict with the United States.

What about Germany after the last war? After Britain and America had tried to lighten her reparations burden and loans had been made by American industry, Germany went to war against those that helped her. The same might be said of Italy and other examples too numerous for me to mention here.

Under the provisions of this bill, and the very nature of relief and delivery abroad, it will be impractical and somewhat doubtful that this money will be used to advantage. We say in this bill that the administration will be entirely in the hands of Americans but when Communists in the various countries learn that relief is coming, or can be obtained, what will prevent them from becoming social democrats or followers of some other political creed temporarily to secure these supplies, and after they have grown fat at the hands of American relief, revert back to the Communist Party or some other outfit which is inimical to the interests of America and the whole world. What will prevent a large part of this relief going into the black market, or being hijacked at night along the roads or in the warehouse, as has been the case in the past? Even after someone who obtains relief who is eligible for it, and has carried the goods to his home, what will prevent him from being robbed or selling his portion to the black market? These are things that I found in the late war to be the rule rather than the exception, and there is no sure way of seeing that this relief is properly administered and delivered to the people who need it.

It is difficult for those here in America who have never been abroad to comprehend the almost insurmountable difficulties involved in administering relief properly in countries where there is practically no law and where communications are still in need of repair. Those of us who were in Europe during World War II remember well the difficulty the United States Army had with supplies and the distribution of relief, and so forth. There were instances of whole trains on the way from the channel ports into the interior being pilfered and diverted from their original destination into the black market; there were vast auctions going on in the streets of Paris of American goods and supplies; there were refugees wearing combat boots and Eisenhower jackets before even our soldiers could obtain these materials; there were hijacking of American trucks—and all of this with armed American soldiers on every corner. Black-market rings were exposed in the armed forces that amounted to millions. I know personally of instances where American soldiers on British ships were eating British rations of two meals a day of partially rotten food and at the same time buying from the British crews at enormous prices American lend-lease foods. There were places we could obtain American steak on the black market in the occupied countries when it could not be obtained through the United States Army ration.

The great civilizations of Rome, Spain, Carthage, France, and even England today, are only memories because of their depleted soil, iron, coal, timber, and other resources. We wish to prevent this same thing from happening to America, and we must conserve our resources and guard against the future needs of our people. It is evident that scattering the already diminishing resources of America to the far corners of the world would only weaken this Nation to the extent where it eventually would have to take second place among the powers of the world.

In my opinion, this whole problem of foreign relief is just a temporary expedient, even if properly administered; the basic, underlying cause for this need will remain. We need to do something permanent. This situation abroad is based on overpopulated areas and under-production. This problem, unless it is rectified, will always remain so regardless of its accentuation by post-war chaos. We need to follow a policy more far-reaching, and I would vote for an appropriation by this Government to assist those areas of Europe that are overpopulated and need assistance in this way: I would vote for a loan to resettle these people in areas such as South America, Africa, Australia, or any of the other great frontiers of the world today, where they can work and build their own and a new civilization but my observation is that they are not willing to pay that price for a new civilization. They want to reap the benefits of the high standard of living such as we have here in America without working for it. These payments overseas tend to make the people less thrifty and to disregard the necessity of work and one's own individual efforts. I doubt if Abraham Lincoln would have risen to the Presidency of the United States if because of his poverty when he grew up, and he was at times a little hungry, had he been pampered and fed by the Government or some humane neighbor or kinsman. The fact that he did live hard, and fought against adversities, molded his character and made a man of Lincoln. The same might be true of our own people in America who sometimes clamor for relief, and I believe the same might be true of those around the world. Then, too, sometimes, as you gentlemen of the House know, it is human nature to visit one's benefactor with ingratitude. A lot of the time, those in your district for whom you do the most, will eventually turn against you. The great conservative elements that shift for themselves very seldom request any aid from a Congressman or any other public official.

Human nature being such as it is, and for the above-mentioned instances where relief was sent to great countries abroad, I am opposed to the continuance of extensive relief abroad by the Government of this country. By welfare organizations, yes, but I believe when the Government, through ill-trained administrators, sends large amounts of relief abroad, it only plays into the hands of our enemies and has an adverse effect upon the situation we attempt to alleviate. I am reminded of a verse from some of Shakespeare's writings:

Blow, blow, thou winter wind but thou art not so cold as man's ingratitude;
Freeze, freeze thou bitter sky but thou dost not bite as nigh as benefits forgot.

This is very true and most often the case concerning foreign relief.

Trained To Raise Hell in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I hereby call attention to the following article from the April issue of Nation's Business. It contains a startling revelation of how American Communists and others are trained in Moscow to sabotage freedom and to destroy our concepts of Christian civilization. It is an article which every American should read:

TRAINED TO RAISE HELL IN AMERICA
(By Junius B Wood)

Attention, ambitious young men and women. A well-established and liberally endowed university offers you free courses in factory sabotage, bomb making, kidnaping,

train wrecking, bank robbery, fomenting armed mutiny—and other techniques of violence and treason.

Scholarships cover all expenses, including recreation and annual vacations at summer resorts.

This university is the West Point of world revolution.

That it exists is surprising. That it is sanctioned and supported, according to its graduates, by a recognized government, is more amazing.

Other State-supported schools educate their youth to become better citizens. This university teaches youth of other lands to go back home and wreck their countries.

Over the years it has trained and returned to the United States an estimated 800 disloyal Americans. They are the leaven of some 50,000 Communists and 100,000 pinkos in our land; they are the high officers of a secret army now being drilled to overthrow our Government and social order.

Most startling of all, from an American point of view, is the diplomatic amiability which bolsters and bows to a government that is diligently working to wreck our institutions.

This university is the International Lenin School in Moscow. Conspiracy and secrecy are the essence of all it teaches. Outside of top levels in the Communist party and in the Soviet government, few even in Moscow know of its existence.

It is behind a stucco-covered brick wall, high enough to baffle prying eyes. It is on the left side of Vorovskaya Ulitza (street), a few blocks beyond Arbat Ploschad (square of the telegas). Old-timers, before adopting names of Communist heroes became the vogue, knew the thoroughfare as Povarskaya Ulitza (Cook street). Even earlier, in 1613, Arbat Ploschad was where a Russian volunteer army under Prince Pozharsky and a Nishni Novogorod (now Gorki) tradesman broke through the defenses of the White city and drove the Polish invaders from the Kremlin.

In olden days this was the genteel neighborhood of court attendants. Later, the aristocracy found it convenient for extramarital ventures. Now it is dotted with diplomatic offices and homes. Students can look across the street from dormitory windows at the former British mission building, now a consulate, at the one-time German embassy and the official abodes of other capitalist countries.

The present site of higher education in bank robbery—rechristened "revolutionary self-help"—and kindred arts was once the quiet love nest of a Russian prince. His lady friend's little palace in the spacious grounds has been remodeled into the students' auditorium, classrooms and dormitories. It faces a plain, unnumbered gate in the wall, guarded 24 hours a day by a Red sentry so none may enter without a Communist identification card.

More buildings were needed for the growing school. Overlooking the wall is a structure in modern Soviet architecture with classrooms on the lower floors and sleeping quarters on the others. Back of the modest palace is a building for political police and secret paraphernalia, to which even students do not have free entrance. In the rear of the school building is a larger one with halls for demonstrations in street fighting and other activities. A smaller administration building is near the center of the campus, still leaving ample space for outdoor exercises away from inquisitive eyes.

SIBERIA AWAITS THE CURIOUS

Native Russians have learned that the reward for curiosity may be an extended visit to Siberia or an appearance before a firing squad. Patrons of the school admit that the Japanese did photograph the establishment and from within the compound. This was considered an act of treachery (the two countries being friends at the time) which was not discovered until a Soviet spy fraternally stole a copy from Japan's secret files.

When a stranger asks any Muscovite in the know about the Lenin School, the prearranged reply always is:

"It's up Tverskaya Ulitza, off the square with the Moscow Soviet Building," meaning the city hall. This college with so similar a name is the Lenin Institute. Its field is scholarly and theoretical, shouldering the big task of compiling biographies of Marx and Lenin which will account for their acts during every day and hour of their lives.

The International Lenin School started with Nikolai Bucharin, party doctrinarian, as its first director. Lenin passed into posthumous fame, and Bucharin did not survive the Stalin purges, but the school grew. War temporarily interrupted plans for expansion as well as the flow of students from other countries.

The school has a permanent faculty, mostly from the Academy of Red Professors, and a director, at one time a woman. Highlights of the Soviet hierarchy, past and present—Stalin, Trotzky, Kuusinen, Molotov, Manuilsky, Yaroslavsky, Lazovsky, Budenny, and others—serve as guest lecturers.

Students are immediately inducted into the air of conspiracy in which these veterans have lived. With matriculation, each student takes a revolutionary or party name by which he will be known in Communist circles and outside activities. Mark Aldanov in The Fifth Seal tells of a party worker who had so many aliases that he forgot his baptismal name.

Even party workers not in the top holy of holies speculate over the identity of Josef Broz Tito, belligerant dictator of Yugoslavia. They explain that Tito is a party label from "Third International Terrorist Organization," the initials being the same in Slavic and English. They surmise from his photographs that Tito may be Rudolph Baker, a promising American student of Slav ancestry who was detailed to district organizing after his return to the United States and then mysteriously disappeared.

Dual names as party labels are not limited to students. The old-timers needed them as revolutionists, and aliases are now a stylish party custom. Among the emissaries sent by Moscow to run party affairs in the United States, the Hungarian Pogany was "John Pepper" and "Schwartz"; the late Gussev was "P. Green"; Alpi was "Fred Brown," and the Finn Sirola was plain "Miller."

With his rebirth under a new name, the student gets more instructions in life behavior. He must blindly obey every order. He may associate outside with the unfaithful, but not disclose that he is a Communist, must not dress or act conspicuously, be photographed, answer questions, or become talkative from drinking. If positively identified as a Communist, he shall frankly admit it but under no circumstances, even if it means imprisonment or death, disclose anything about the party.

WARNED AGAINST UNITED STATES CONTACTS

The first business of any meeting, even casually on the street, is to agree on a fictitious story of what is being discussed to avoid disclosing the truth if interrupted later. Students should not recognize each other off the campus or cultivate fellow countrymen, Americans being warned particularly against American engineers, newspapermen, tourists, and Government employees in Moscow.

The freshman student is already familiar with some tricks of deception. In the United States he got a passport on the pretext of sightseeing in Europe. If he used a false name, the American party which paid his expenses to Moscow corroborated his "legend," or fake biography. In the school, the political police can supply a forged identification for any country.

Unless unusually naive, the student senses that permission to be off the campus until 11 p. m. is to enable the police to check on his actions and acquaintances. He learns that they watch his political "progress" or "deterioration" and control him as they do every Russian. He is now dependent on the Russian Party and Soviet Government for existence.

He is instructed to be peaceful and disingenuous with authorities pending the day of revolution. Instead of avoiding military, police, or other law-enforcement service in his own country, the graduate must welcome it. These are not only choice fields for spreading Communist doctrine among associates, but the military will supplement the school's instruction in tactics and weapons. A surprising story is told of the recent war:

"Today, I'll start your lessons on dismantling and assembling a machine gun," an American captain told a likely appearing enlisted man. The officer started to take the gun apart.

"Let me try," the soldier suggested. In a few minutes he had the gun apart and before long the complicated mechanism was back in place and working.

"Where did you ever learn that?" the captain asked, amazed at such dexterity by a raw recruit.

"In the Lenin School in Moscow," the man explained. Instruction in weapons of other countries is one of its courses.

This man was one who had belatedly realized that his first loyalty was to his own country and not to Moscow and world revolution. Nurserymen figure that 20 percent of seeds will not germinate and the Lenin School figures the same percentage of its alumni may lapse from communism.

PARTY IDEOLOGY FIRST

To keep the percentage down, the first studies in the school's 3-year course are intensive indoctrination in the theories of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. Once well grounded in party ideology, a party member will realize that winning a wage increase or election or disrupting his own country's economy for the benefit of the Soviet Union are only steps toward the final goal.

"Strikes are skirmishes that force the class solidarity of the proletariat, that oppose class against class and train the masses for the final struggle—the destruction of the state apparatus in a capitalist state," is quoted from a lecture by Abraham Branovich, better known as A. D. Lozovosky, lately Secretary of War in the U. S. S. R. and tops in Profintern and Comintern.

"The most glaring weakness of our members is inability to connect particular tasks with party outlook," Beatrice Siskin, alias Shields, a Lenin School alumna, warns in Party Organizer, the monthly magazine circulated only to trusted American party members. It also fell to name changing and is now Contact.

The Lenin School student who survives volume I of Marx's involved and obtuse Capitalism, can go on to volumes II and III, to the clearer philosophy of Lenin, the mistakes of Malthus, Ricardo, Smith, and other bourgeois economists and to increasing instruction in practical communism. As volumes II and III were written by Engels from notes left by Marx, faculty members doubt whether Marx himself would understand them.

In addition to its 3-year course, the school has short courses in labor activities, party organization, propaganda, and such, according to graduates of the school.

The labor movement is next traced from ancient times to the Red Revolution in 1917. In Marxist dogma, the struggle between employers and workers is irreconcilable. Christianity, according to Marx, came from a slave rebellion against the masters. In modern society the struggle is between capital and labor, farmers and distributors. It will be

solved only when civilization returns to the collectivism of tribal days and the masses take over the factories and farms. This is the version to be expounded to the masses, but it is made clear to the students that actually a government, as in the Soviet Union, will take over with the Communist Party in control and today's students as the actual rulers.

"Saying there can be unity of interests between employers and employees is treason to the working class," says a textbook by Olgin, followed by instruction that a collective agreement should be broken at the first opportunity.

Stalin, always direct, clarifies this with, "The mightiest ally of Russia is strife, conflicts, and wars in every capitalist nation."

Comrades who recant communism are to be ostracized, slandered, and accused of stealing and swindling, according to the school's instructions. The easiest way to answer charges by outsiders is to denounce them long and loudly as lies until they are doubted.

When the student reaches the courses on Communist Party organization, the haze of theory clears and action starts. He is taught what methods to use, based on party structure and ideology, in any foreseeable circumstance.

In a country where the party is outlawed, it must work entirely underground. In the United States, where it is legal but suspect, it should work under cover of other organizations, but the strategy of conspiracy to create internal disorder and to undermine the Government is the same.

TAUGHT BORING FROM WITHIN

The Lenin school student must join trade-unions or liberal societies when he returns to his own country—attend all meetings, pay dues promptly, be eager for work, unite others by party discipline until the organization is blindly following the party line in which he is so well grounded.

"Never in our wildest dreams did we imagine a simple-minded government would permit trade-unions and strikes by its employees," a professor in the school commented on the United States. "We have unions but here all workers are government employees and a strike is the same as mutiny in the armed forces, punishable by death. Nor did we foresee that a government would facilitate Communist infiltration into independent unions."

Students who can stand it, get the powerful dose from A to Z. They have now reached Z which is insurrection or revolution—how to put propaganda and organization among the masses to a practical test. Red Army officers and technicians, shadowy shapes from the MVD (Ministry of Political Police) and veterans in revolution take over. The course is based on actual experiences, a few successful and many bitter, each teaching something. When the time comes to apply these lessons there will be no turning back, and the penalties for failure are death.

"Too great humanity is a danger as it is interpreted as a sign of weakness," says the textbook of Hans Kippenberger, who, under the name of Alfred Langer, writes as a former revolutionary leader in Germany. "That is the great lesson from all revolutionary conflicts. Humanity should be extended only to those who may be won over to the cause. The revolutionary procedure—that is, the terror—should be applied most strictly to all adversaries."

PREPARATIONS FOR REVOLUTION

Though Moscow does not consider revolution imminent in the United States, American pupils get the course so they will be ready if the occasion arrives. Russia is the shining example of a small well-organized group taking over a country, and the lessons have succeeded in China and the Balkans.

Four "conceptions," using the school's phraseology, for an insurrection are: preparation, timing, knowledge of tactics, and complete surprise. Though loyal to the Communist world capital and well-instructed, the local leaders still will be amateurs—and Moscow prefers to send experienced revolutionaries to take charge and avoid disastrous bungling and overleniency.

Like the party policies and the life of a party member, nothing is left to chance or to personal vagaries but is planned in advance on party principles and experience.

High points of the plan for the capture of Chicago—when the time comes—sound like an army operation with everything provided for from psychological warfare to dropping paratroopers.

The peaceful preparations are to go on for years through capable party members burrowed into trade-unions, public offices, police force, liberal clubs, and other sources of information. Vital spots such as power plants, radio stations, and airports must be mapped.

All the working masses and unorganized proletariat may not be aroused to join in the fracas but the needed knowledge of where to attack to paralyze the city will be at hand. Even recording such a small detail as whether a watchman has a dog is called for in the instructions.

A headquarters, known only to a selected few, will be set up, a courier system organized; telephone talks will be in code, party papers or names memorized and destroyed. Until the zero hour, nonparty friends should be used as blinds and communications written on borrowed typewriters.

Police forces are notoriously unreliable for insurrections. Consequently, the city's riot squad—sure to put up a fight—is studied. If it is on three shifts, the weakest one is picked for attack. Once it is subdued, other police can be mopped up. If there is a suspicion that police officers are alert to what is brewing, the advice is to telephone them on a phony pretext to learn whether they are home or on duty.

The habits and daily routine of the chief of police, also the mayor and leading citizens, must be learned. A blacklist is to be prepared of politically undesirable citizens for summary liquidation or temporary use while their families are held as hostages.

Squads are assigned to capture each objective. Getting arms for them is easy in the United States. The hour and minute when the groups will strike simultaneously will be the final instructions.

To prevent calls for outside help, communications will be interrupted immediately. Railroads are to be wrecked several miles outside the city, either by sending out maverick locomotives or by blowing up incoming trains. Armed men will hold the airports.

Captured radio stations will order a general strike which will be easy if the power plants are seized. The mayor, chief of police, and other officers and leaders are to be captured early. If the mayor refuses to read the proclamation which must be prepared for him, he can be disposed of on the spot and somebody with a similar voice, already selected, can read it.

According to the time schedule, a city like Chicago should be captured in less than 48 hours. By that time the insurrectionists will have all the weapons and can arm more supporters. They are to proceed to setting up the government from officials picked in advance.

POSTGRADUATE TRAINING

After completing this practical phase of his studies, the graduate of the Lenin school leaves Moscow to begin his career. He may be sent to a colony for a year or more of postgraduate training or to his own country where Communism may be outlawed. He has mastered the technique of working undercover. Even in the United States and other countries where the party is permitted, it is actually two parties—one in the open and the other in the shadows.

A party worker or returned student is ostensibly assigned to duty by the proclaimed head of the Communist Party of the United States. Actually, his job is picked by the party's American politburo which acts under Moscow's direction. He may be detailed as a state secretary or to other organizational work, for propaganda or writing artcles, for special work among Negroes or foreign language groups or to get a job and build up party influence in a particular union.

The International Lenin School, of special interest because of American students, is only one of several which the Soviet Union operates for this purpose. The Eastern University, formerly the Sun Yat-sen Institute which Chiang Kai-shek's son attended, has graduated nearly 10,000. Its efficient work shows in China and Korea, making trouble for young Chiang's father and for us.

Graduates of Western University are active in Balkan and Baltic countries and scattered foreign language groups from the United States. Tiflis, scene of Stalin's youthful exploits, has a school for Communists from the Near East. Another in Vladivostok is chiefly for Koreans.

The Academy of Red Professors with a 7-year course is scholarly and philosophical. It is for heavy thinkers and high-browed evangels of communism with little appeal for less sedentary Americans.

SCHOOL FOR SECRET POLICE

On an equally high pedestal above the other schools for world revolution is the supersecret Kirov Academy in Leningrad. It is under the MVD or secret political police. Only candidates who have proved their do-or-die stamina enter its classes. It teaches higher level underground work and how to organize a police force which can control a nation, even its army, and keep the Communist Party in power. Its alumni are active in both Hungary and Greece.

By fostering so-called liberal schools in American cities, some formerly under party names, selected students can be instructed in revolutionary tactics. Summer camps with intensive courses are even safer from intruders. A goodly portion of some 20,000 graduates of these schools become converts to communism or sympathizers.

With the American schools, the International Lenin School in Moscow has become less essential for the program in the United States. It does, however, continue as a goal or finishing school for the hopeful young party member or graduate of the American classes.

The Soviet schools for foreigners are not too alarming when they are stripped of mystery. It would be well to know their 800-odd American alumni, also their instructors and what secret plotting is behind the formal handshakes over a conference table or the clink of cocktail glasses at a banquet board. It also will help when they know that we know—an interesting long-range job for our State Department and FBI.

Defects in Our Present Social-Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House debated and passed the measure which would provide hundreds of millions of dollars for the relief of victims of World War II in foreign countries, I wished that we could,

and would, give adequate attention to the thousands of aged persons in the United States who also are deserving of our consideration.

There is something basically wrong with our Federal social-security system, and as the average age of our people is steadily becoming higher a solution of the existing problem cannot be delayed much longer. The New Deal has given our older persons a raw deal, if the article entitled "Our Present Dishonest Federal Old-Age Pension Plan," by John T. Flynn, in the May 1947 issue of the Reader's Digest, is worthy of publication in that fine magazine. This sentence arrested my attention:

Now, after 10 years of the experiment, we find that families of the retired workers got an average pension last year of $6.40 a week.

The New Deal has collected $9,000,000,000 in taxes for old-age pensions and survivors' insurance and paid only one and a half billion for those purposes. This Government has spent the other $7,500,000,000 on other purposes entirely. Our aged people remain in need and in fear. Mr. Flynn points out that each year the workers employed in the United States must pay the pensions of those who are retired. In that way no worker need ever fear for his security in his old age. I believe this program can be broadened to include all Americans. The pensions may have to vary from year to year, depending upon the national prosperity.

If a proper plan was established by our Federal Government, I would not receive a letter like the following from a highly respected, well-educated gentleman in my district:

The old-age-retirement insurance is in need of a change. It is manifestly unfair to many groups of people. My own case may be typical of our group.

I was employed by a corporation until October 1940 and paid in the maximum up to that time when the corporation was sold and I was out of a job. I then became a partner in this firm and offered to pay social security, but it was refused by the local office. I am now told that the money paid in is lost, and that I will receive nothing.

It seems to me that it should be open to anyone who is willing to pay; and that we who have lost out should have the privilege of making up the lost time when we were ineligible just because we were not a corporation.

It is because of that letter which I received just before reading Mr. Flynn's article that I ask each Member to read the following reprint of the article from the Reader's Digest:

OUR PRESENT DISHONEST FEDERAL OLD-AGE PENSION PLAN

(By John T. Flynn)

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—In 1939 the old-age pension tax was due to be increased from 2 percent on workers and employers to 3 percent and then an additional 1 percent every 3 years. At this point, John T. Flynn, author of the following article, presented in Harper's Magazine for February 1939 an extensive argument to freeze the tax at 2 percent. The article attracted the attention of the Ways and Means Committee of the House then considering the subject. Mr. Flynn was invited to appear and present his case. After he had spent a full day before that committee, opposed by the Treasury, the committee decided immediately after the session to freeze the tax, but served notice on the President that it would give him an opportunity to approve the plan. The tax has remained frozen at 2 percent ever since at a saving in social-security taxes of $7,000,000,000 to the workers and employers of America. In this article, Mr. Flynn describes the flagrant misappropriation of most of the money that has thus far been collected for old-age pensions.)

For years I have been an ardent advocate of public old-age pensions. I was a member of the national organization that worked for social security. My purpose is not to oppose public pensions but to expose the indefensible methods by which the plan is being rendered ridiculous.

We have heard much of the great friendly State that would produce security for all. One form of this is the old-age pension plan. Now, after 10 years of the experiment, we find that families of the retired workers got an average pension last year of $6.40 a week.

The Government has collected $9,000,000,000 in taxes for old-age pensions and survivors' insurance. It has paid a billion and a half in pensions. It has borrowed and spent the other seven and a half billion on other things.

Not only is it dishonest, it is poor administration besides, to collect taxes under one guise and spend them for another purpose.

Workers and their unions sense this inadequacy and are again appealing to private business concerns for pensions. As a result over 10,000 plans for retirement benefits have been established by private corporations under carefully guarded trusteeships that guarantee that all benefits go to the worker.

Let us have a look at the dishonesty in the Federal old-age pension plan. The original plan proposed to lay a tax of 2 percent of the wage a year on employer and employee (1 percent each) beginning 1937; 3 percent in 1940; 4 percent in 1943; 5 percent in 1946 and 6 percent in 1949, at which point it would remain. However, in 1939 Congress, convinced that the rates were excessive, froze the tax at 2 percent and has repeated this action each year since. But unless action is taken, extortionate high rates will go into effect next year.

Had Congress not stepped in, the Government would have collected $16,500,000,000 since 1937 out of which it would have paid only $1,500,000,000 in pensions. The Government would have collected last year in old-age taxes $3,000,000,000 out of which it would have paid only $320,000,000 in benefits. Thus Congress saved the workers and employers over $7,000,000,000 in social-security taxes by resisting the demand of the Executive for higher rates. Even at the 2 percent rate at which Congress has held the tax since 1939 the Government has collected nearly $9,000,000,000, of which it has borrowed $7,500,000,000 to pay running expenses of the Government. Instead of social security for the workers this looks like political security for the politicians.

How does the Government get away with this? It is done by means of a very plausible and tricky fiction. Here is the theory. Employed workers who are protected by the plan will collect pensions after reaching 65. The number will be small at first, but will grow and in time will be so numerous that the highest tax of 6 percent will not pay all the pensions. The Government, therefore, should collect more than it pays out while the pensions are few and save the surplus. This cash is exchanged for United States bonds, and the bonds constitute the old-age reserve fund. In time this fund may reach forty, fifty, or, it is estimated, even as much as ninety billion. The interest on the bonds when added to the taxes will pay all pensions. To the untrained mind this may seem plausible. It was thought up by untrained minds and opposed by all the experts. A moment's reflection will show why.

At present the old-age fund holds nearly $8,000,000,000 in United States bonds. That means the Government has collected $8,000,000,000 more than it paid out in pensions. If in 30 years the old-age fund should hold $40,000,000,000 in bonds, that would mean it had collected $40,000,000,000 more than it paid out. The $8,000,000,000 surplus has been appropriated by the Government in exchange for United States bonds and the money is gone—spent on all sorts of things except pensions. No matter how big the fund gets, the money will be gone, having been spent by the Government on current expenses.

But you ask, are these United States bonds not gilt-edged securities? Are not the savings of the workers and employers thus safely invested? The answer is yes, if the Government ever plans to borrow more money in order to redeem these bonds. But it has no intention of ever paying these bonds. That would be contrary to the plan. The plan is for the old-age fund to hold the bonds forever in order to collect interest on them from the Government. Now, you say, is not the interest on their savings a legitimate method of producing pension income for the workers? That seems plausible. But consider it a moment and you will see it is a pure fiction.

If I own a United States bond, then all the taxpayers owe me the interest. But when the old-age fund owns a United States bond the situation is different. The fund is set up for the benefit of the workers. It is created by payments from workers and employers. Now if the bond belongs to this fund, before the Government can pay interest on it the money must be collected in taxes from the taxpayers. And the taxpayers are the workers and their employers. The Government will again have to collect taxes from workers and employers in order to pay the interest on the bonds in the old-age reserve fund. All this is done because, we are told, the number of persons drawing pensions after a number of years will be so great and the amount of money required so large that the highest tax of 6 percent will not produce it. In theory the workers and employers will pay a 6-percent tax, leaving a large sum still to be raised to meet the pension rolls. The Government is supposed to supply this in the form of interest on the bonds. But actually the interest money must be collected largely from the same people who pay the old-age taxes.

To put it differently, let us suppose that in 1970 the old-age taxes will fall a billion short of paying the pension rolls. The difference will be made up by the interest paid on the Government bonds owned by the fund. Therefore the pensions will all be paid (1) by the old-age security taxes and (2) by the interest on the bonds. The old-age security taxes will be paid by the employers and employees. But the interest taxes will also be paid very largely by the employers and employees.

At present the reserve fund is nearing eight billion. That means the workers and employers have been charged nearly eight billion more for old-age pensions than they cost. No matter what year in the future you select where there is a reserve fund of twenty or forty or fifty billion, it will be because the workers and employers have been charged twenty or forty or fifty billion more for pensions than they cost.

But, you will say, what about insurance companies? They have reserves. But an insurance company does not pay policy benefits out of reserves. The reserves are required by law because an insurance company is a voluntary association which the policyholders may quit or which may get into trouble for some reason. And they spread the cost of a bad year, such as the influenza epidemic of 1918.

A man has a life-insurance policy for $10,000. He pays a premium every year. The company uses that premium and all

other premiums each year to pay the death benefits which fall due that year. Insurance is reduced to a scientific basis. Experience informs its operators that so many people will die in a given year and so much insurance will fall due. Insurance rates are arranged so that the premiums collected in any year will cover all the death benefits that will normally be paid in that year. The benefits are not paid out of reserves. In the worst depression years premiums always covered death and other insurance claims. And so in 20 years from now—in 1967—should that man with the $10,000 policy die, his widow will collect his insurance benefit—$10,000—but the company will that same year collect in premiums from the surviving policyholders the money to pay it. It must be so.

Our politically minded social-security operators refuse to face the one great central fact in this problem. The Government old-age security plan is merely a Government insurance agency. Therefore, old-age benefits, like life insurance and other contingent benefits must be paid out of the income of the people concerned, earned by them in the very year when the benefits fall due. If there are 50,000,000 workers employed and 5,000,000 retired, the fifty million must each year, by their contributions, pay enough to support the five million on pension. There is no other way. The payments may be masked or disguised in whatever form a timid politician wishes to hide them. But that stern fact must be faced. And any honest system of old-age pension must be built on it. The Government does not provide the money. Its only role, like that of the insurance company, is to act as the agent which collects from the employees and employers and pays the benefits to those who are retired.

In the case of old-age pensions the great role which the Government can play is in bringing all workers into it, giving it the permanence essential to the plan and protecting it from disintegration by making it compulsory on all.

The benefits paid now are small. They will increase as the plan grows older and pensioners accumulate higher wage averages as the basis of pensions. Whether the pensions are increased or not it must always be kept in mind that they must be paid for by the workers and employers. There is no other way. Any slick scheme to fool the worker into believing the Government is paying any part of it should be swept aside.

The Government's course is clear:

1. The plan must be on a pay-as-you-go basis. The taxes collected should be sufficient to cover the pensions of that year and no more.

2. The idea of a reserve fund greater than that already raised should be abandoned. When the present plan of the reserve fund was adopted the three distinguished actuaries called in as advisers protested against it. In addition to the arguments against it already mentioned there are two others of grave import: (a) It is a plan to add a billion or two every year to the national debt which we are supposed to reduce. (b) It entangles the whole social-security system with the fiscal difficulties of the Government which are bound to increase. The old-age plan should be kept clear of that.

3. The present arbitrary system of increasing rates should be by law abolished without delay and rates for from 2 to 3 years should be fixed on a rigid actuarial basis.

4. The system should be enlarged to include all workers, save civil-service workers of Federal, State and city governments already protected by public retirement plans.

5. Benefits should be kept as they are for the time being until the country arrives at a state of reasonable postwar stabilization.

Finally every effort should be made to protect the whole system from politics—the politics of the politicians and the politics of the dreamers. We must close our ears to the politician in either party who uses social security as a vote-getting racket and who beguiles the workingman with his tales about all the wonderful things the great benevolent State can give him.

The State can give him nothing. It has nothing to give. It has no way of getting money save by taxing someone, including himself. If it hands him anything it must first take it from him or someone else. The idea that it may take it from him and give it to someone else does not seem to have occurred to him. Yet this is precisely what the old-age pension plan is doing.

The Evils of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of Hon. William C. Bullitt before the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, on H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122, bills to curb or outlaw the Communist Party of the United States:

THE EVILS OF COMMUNISM

(Testimony of Hon. W. C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to Russia, at investigation of un-American propaganda activities in the United States)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.,
Monday, March 24, 1947.

The committee met at 3:30 p. m., Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS (chairman) presiding.

The following members were present: Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, Hon. JOHN MCDOWELL, Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON, Hon. RICHARD B. VAIL, Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, and Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER.

Staff members present: Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator; Louis J. Russell and Donald T. Appell, investigators.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. This afternoon the committee will hear the testimony of the Honorable William C. Bullitt on the bills H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122, which seek to curb or outlaw the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. Bullitt, if you will please stand and be sworn.

(The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bullitt, we have certain bills before us, H. R. 1884, introduced by Mr. RANKIN, and H. R. 2122, introduced by Mr. SHEPPARD, both aimed to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States. We have invited you and some other prominent people in this country to come here and express your views in relation to this legislation. We appreciate very much your acceptance.

For the record, I would like for you to give your full name and your address and then a statement of some of the very important posts that you have held, and then, if you will, just continue with any statement that you would like to make showing the connection between the Communist Party here in the United States and a foreign power, and make any other observations as you think would help us in the consideration of this legislation and in the consideration of this very important subject.

Mr. BULLITT. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you please give your full name and your address.

Mr. BULLITT. William Christian Bullitt, 1811 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.

You would like me to name some of the posts I have held under the American Government?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BULLITT. Well, in recent years: I was special assistant to the Secretary of State in 1933; I was a member of the American delegation to the International Economic and Monetary Conference in London in 1938; I was Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1933 to 1936; I was Ambassador to France from 1936 to 1940; I was personal representative of the President with the rank of Ambassador for all countries in 1941 and 1942; I was special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy thereafter for approximately a year and a half.

Is that sufficient?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, anything else that you think of at the moment?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I think that covers it. I could go into a lot of other things.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, if I may interpolate, he is also the author of a very important and factual book on modern Russia entitled "The Great Globe Itself," published by Harper's, I believe——

Mr. BULLITT. Scribner's.

Mr. MUNDT. Published by Scribner's, and which I think ranks right along with "I Chose Freedom," by Victor Krishenko, as the most readable and understandable and factual books from the American press today on modern Russia. "I Chose Freedom" was also published by Scribner's.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bullitt, if you will just make whatever observations you care to make, keeping in mind that we are particularly interested in communism in the world as you have seen it. And I would like to suggest this to the members of the committee: That we permit Mr. Bullitt to go ahead and make his statement and afterward we will ask him questions, so that we will not interfere with his statement.

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Chairman, I have no prepared statement, but I shall try to follow the line that you have indicated.

The basis of Communist action in the world, whether in the United States or any other country, is the Communist creed, which is a belief that there will be no peace on earth until all the nations of the world are Communist. This is a very genuine belief which is held by a large number of people, and in the furtherance of that belief they have developed a doctrine that the end justifies the means, and that any means, even the most foul, are justifiable in order to achieve this domination of the world by communism.

I don't know whether you would care to have some citations on that, but I can find you some which perhaps might be of some interest. Here are four short statements by Lenin and Stalin which cover the fundamental thesis on which Soviet policy is based.

First, a statement from Lenin, from his collected works, volume 24, page 122, Russian edition. The statement of Lenin:

"We are living not merely in a state but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

The second is from Lenin's Twenty-one Theses of January 20, 1918:

"From the time a Socialist government is established in any one country questions must be determined * * * solely from the point of view of what is best for the development and the consolidation of the Socialist revolution which has already begun.

The question whether it is possible to undertake at once a revolutionary war must be answered solely from the point of view of actual conditions and the interest of the Socialist revolution which has already begun."

The third is from Lenin's book, The Infantile Sickness of Leftism in Communism:

"It is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth."

And the fourth is from Stalin's speech on the American Communist Party on May 6, 1929:

"The Comintern is the holy of holies of the working class."

The Comintern, as you know, is the international organization of the different national Communist parties.

The doctrine that war is inevitable between the Soviet Union and the states which the Communists call bourgeois or imperialist, which includes the United States of America—indeed, all states which are not Communist—grows from the fact that what the Communists intend is the conquest of the earth for communism. It is entirely clear and one may find it in writing after writing, and there is not much point in my quoting further excerpts.

The present situation in the world is the following: The Soviet Government, in the furtherance of its intention to control the earth for communism, has annexed Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and a large portion of Poland, a portion of Finland, a portion of Rumania, and has established absolute control, through puppet governments, over the whole of Poland, the whole of Bulgaria, the whole of Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Albania, and it is closing its iron fist steadily on Finland, on Hungary, on Czechoslovakia. It also controls fully the Red Army zones in Germany and Austria. Thus, the Soviet Government has brought under its control more than 100,000,000 persons in eastern Europe.

In addition, through its fifth columns—and its fifth columns are like the Nazi fifth columns since the truth is that communism is Red fascism and uses fifth columns just the way Hitler used them only much more effectively. Hitler was never able to build up in the countries which he intended to conquer parties or fifth columns having anything like the strength of the Communist Parties which have been built up by the Soviet Union. Using these Communist Parties as fifth columns Stalin is threatening the independence of the remainder of Europe.

The Communist Party in France, for example, is extremely important. It is, in fact, the largest party today in French Parliament. But there are so many other parties in the French Parliament that, although the Communist Party is the largest party, it only has 28 percent of the seats in the French Chamber of Deputies. Nevertheless, it has acquired control of the French CGT, which is the one big trade-union of the whole country, and it can pull a general strike in France whenever it may choose. Since France has not yet recovered from the war and has a very difficult economic situation to deal with, the threat of a general strike is an appalling one.

Moreover, the Communists have infiltrated the air force to such an extent that they fully control the ground crews of the air force, and there are many officers in the French Air Force who are also Communists. Furthermore, they have got such a grip on economic life in France that today any manufacturer who wants to get raw materials for his business is obliged to pay regular monthly sums in blackmail to the Communist Party treasury, or gets no raw materials.

The result is that in spite of the fact that 72 percent of a democratically elected Parliament in France is anti-Communist, there is a very good chance that the Communists, through a general strike and revolutionary activity, may be able to take over France.

What does that mean for us? If France falls into Communist hands it will produce a cataclysm in Europe. Without question Italy, where the Communist Party is also very strong, would go Communist. Spain and Portugal and all the smaller European countries would follow suit. A Communist France would, therefore, mean not merely a Communist continent of Europe, but also a Communist Mediterranean, because France, as you know, has as colonies Morocco and Tunisia, and as one of her Departments, Algeria. The result is, if by action of the French Communist Party, France begins to take Stalin's orders, we shall have to expect that Casablanca and Dakar, which lies in the French colony of Senegal opposite the bulge of Brazil, will be in Stalin's hands, and his planes will be stationed there. Furthermore, the French colonies on this side of the Atlantic will be open to so-called French planes, which will be Russian planes with French markings, and we shall have them off the Panama Canal, at Martinique and Guadeloupe, and shall have them at the entrance to the St. Lawrence River, at St. Pierre and Miquelon.

Those are some of the consequences to the United States which would ensue from a triumph of the French Communist Party in France. And if it may seem strange that Communist penetration of France has gone this far, let me add this fact: That the vice president of the French Government today, Thorez, is actually a deserter from the French Army in the year 1939. He deserted the French Army in full fight against the Germans and left for Moscow, but the Communists have been able to impose him on the French Government.

I merely call your attention to this situation. I don't propose to try to go into all the situations in the world, but the French situation is so extraordinarily serious that I think it is worth while calling it to your attention, because if France goes we will be closed out of Europe by Stalin's iron curtain. It is as simple as that.

At the other end of the world, in China, the situation is very much worse than it was when General Marshall was sent there to try to reconcile the Communists and the National Government and stop the fighting, more than a year ago. It is always, in the long run, impossible to have a national government working with Communists, for the simple reason that to take Communists into your government, or into close association with it, is to take an assassin into your bed, since the objective of the Communist is, invariably, to overthrow democratic government in the interest of the domination of the democratic country by the Soviet Union and the world Communist movement.

That may suffice as an example of the world situation. Perhaps I might go on to the domestic problem of the American Communist Party.

Here our Communist Party, like all other Communist Parties, is subject to orders from Moscow. It follows the party line laid down in Moscow with extreme care. We are all familiar with the manner in which the American Communist Party has followed faithfully the line laid down in Moscow and has shifted its position in accordance with every shift of Soviet foreign policy. The party is, in the first place, an agency of the Soviet Government for the purpose of weakening the United States for the ultimate assault that the Soviet Government intends to make on the United States. It is, furthermore, if you will look to the experience of other countries, a conspiracy to commit murder, since in whatever country the Communists dominate they establish a so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, which is defined by Stalin in the following words—this quotation, I may say, is from his book Problems of Leninism:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie unobstructed by law and based upon violence, enjoying the sympathy and support of the working and exploited masses."

Now, "unobstructed by law and based upon violence" means that what is done is what is called liquidating the opponents of the government, and "liquidate" is simply a happy euphemism for murder. Murder is carried on on the very large scale. Individual assassinations are not very often used by the Communist Party, but murder on an extremely large scale is very frequently used and is a regular piece of the mechanism of establishing their authority.

Therefore, I should consider the Communist Party of the United States composed, in the first place, of potential traitors, since certainly if the United States were in war with the Soviet Union the members of the American Communist Party would do all they could to help the Soviet Union and to injure their own country. In the second place, I should consider it a conspiracy to commit murder on a mass scale.

That, I think, confronts us with a very practical question of what to do under the present circumstances. The United States, without question, today is in danger, as President Truman very clearly brought out in his statement asking for support for Greece and Turkey. He said "that the national security of the United States was involved." I believe those were his exact words. Perhaps I have not quoted him correctly, but that was the sense of some of his words. The safety of the United States is involved because the gradual taking over of countries, the gradual taking over of areas, while possible future victims are lulled into a false sense of security, is the essence of the Soviet tactics, just as it was the essence of Hitler's tactics.

And I make this observation, realizing that it is one that it will be difficult, perhaps, to believe: The situation of the United States today very greatly resembles the situation of the French Republic in the year 1936. At that time France had the largest air force in the world, by far the most powerful army in the world, and a navy which was vastly superior to the German navy. Nevertheless, at that moment Hitler dared start on his career of conquest by marching his troops into the Rhineland on the 7th day of March 1936. The French could have crushed him with extreme ease. They had every right to, as it was a flagrant violation of the Treaty of Versailles, and they had a right to march to Berlin, if they chose, and take over Germany and impose whatever terms they pleased.

But France wanted to balance its budget. Mobilization of the army was extremely unpopular, as it always is, because it tears men away from their homes and their affairs, and, furthermore, Hitler constantly was saying that he bore no ill will toward France, and that he had no intention of ever attacking France. In consequence, there were a lot of perfectly good Frenchmen of good intention and weak heads who believed that Hitler would never attack France—like certain stargazers in the United States, who believe that the Soviet Union will never attack the United States. So what did the French do? They did nothing. Hitler consolidated his position in the Rhineland, built the Siegfried Line, and by it locked France out of central and eastern Europe entirely, successfully seized the countries who were France's allies in eastern Europe, made his deal with Stalin, divided Poland with Stalir, and finally attacked France. The only thing that France had gained by not marching and smashing Hitler, as she could have very easily in 1936—in fact, we even have the document in which Hitler ordered his troops to leave the Rhineland if the French should mobilize—the only thing they acquired by their quiescence was to be crushed completely 4 years later.

At the present time the United States is far stronger than the Soviet Union. We are

as much stronger than the Soviet Union today as France was stronger than Germany in 1936—and Stalin knows it.

When we took a strong stand on Turkey last year, when we took a strong stand on Iran this year, the Soviet Union did not dare to move. But time is running against us, exactly as it ran against France after 1936. The Russian Army and Air Force are growing stronger every day. They are still turning their major energies into the production for war and not into consumer goods. They are consolidating their hold on the hundred million people they have taken over in eastern Europe and could use them all today, or almost all of them, for war purposes. Their aggression in China is progressing, although at the moment Chiang Kai-shek's armies are advancing, for behind his lines there is such economic difficulty that the whole Chinese Government position is threatened. Communists trained in Moscow have achieved leadership of the Indochinese independence movement, an entirely genuine movement at bottom, but now in the hands of the Communists.

In South America the Communists are increasingly infiltrating the trade-unions and have control of the trade-unions in many countries. There are three Communist member today in the Government of Chile. The Communists have grown so strong in both Cuba and Venezuela that democratic government is threatened in both countries, and in Brazil recently, after an election, the country woke up to discover that the Communists had become the largest party in the city council of its capital, Rio de Janeiro.

Now, under these circumstances the existence in the United States of an enormous fifth column of the national Communist dictator is an even greater threat to the United States than was ever the fifth column of the National Socialist dictatorship of Hitler, and, therefore, I think that you have brought up this question at an extremely appropriate moment.

Nevertheless, I should like to say that I am not at all sure that it is wise, in the public interest of the people of the United States, to declare it a crime, at the present time, to belong to the American Communist Party, for the following reasons:

We know that the Communist Party in this country is organized as follows: There are the dues-paying members, who have party books, and so on. Those are the more or less public members of the party. There is then the underground organization of the party. That is a series of small groups, of three or five persons, organized secretly in a secret organization, which, even if the party should be suppressed by law, could continue to function. In the third place, there is that extraordinary group, usually very able men, men who are so important to the Soviet Union and to the Communist Party that they are not allowed to admit that they are members, because it may get them into trouble. That is a very important group, although not large.

If we should make it a crime to belong to the Communist Party, I do not believe that today we have sufficient information with regard to all these groups to put our hands on them effectively, nor do I believe that if we did put our hands on them effectively we would actually go through with any punishment of them.

For example, when I was Ambassador to Moscow, one of the minor tasks I had was to ask the Soviet Government to accept again into the Soviet Union a number of its subjects who were illegally in the United States. We tried to deport these persons to their country of origin and the Soviet Government refused to receive them, just wouldn't take them back. Well, what are you going to do with them? You get out a deportation order against a man who is obviously an undesirable citizen of any country, and his country of origin refuses to receive him? Well, you may keep him under arrest pending deportation for a given period, but you can't keep him very long, and you just have to turn him loose again. We do not shoot people whom we dislike, as they do in the Soviet Union.

Now, in the Communist Party in the United States, according to such information as I have, approximately 60 percent of the members are of alien origin. Sixty percent of the members, I believe, are men and women who have come to the United States, and after being here a given length of time have sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me that one of the things that we should look into is perhaps this: That we should make, perhaps, membership in the Communist Party on the part of a naturalized citizen prima facie evidence that his citizenship was fraudently acquired and that the immigrant in taking the oath of allegiance to support the Constitution of the United States committed perjury. That, I think, might hit 60 percent of the party.

There is a good precedent for that. We did exactly that with the German Bund, as you know, and deported from the United States—I have forgotten how many thousands of German Bundists—and I fail to see why we might not try to do that with Communists of alien origin. But when we consider doing that, let's also consider the fact that the Soviet Government will refuse to have these people sent back, and let us then try to think, before we pass any such law, what we are going to do with them.

These are some practical considerations that I am just bringing up as suggestions.

Another point which I should like to suggest to you is this: We have a requirement of the election laws that all campaign contributions made to the Democratic and Republican Parties—to all political parties—should be reported. The major parties all make returns of the names of their contributors. The Communist Party, I believe, under that law should be required to list all its contributors and duespaying members—because the payment of dues is just as much a contribution to a political party as the making of a campaign contribution once every 4 years, or whatever the period may be.

That is another suggestion which I should like to make, which probably will be ineffectual, but nevertheless it seems to me to point in a direction that might be useful.

And third, I should like to say this. I am perfectly certain that a time will come, and it may be close at hand, when it will be essential to our national safety to break up this criminal conspiracy, which is worldwide, break it up as far as we can in the United States.

In other words, that we shall have to take extremely severe action against the Communists, both those who are openly members of the party and those who are secretly organized in the undeground, and those who are the, so to speak, unparty members, because they are too important to be jeopardized.

We will have to take action against them. The only basis upon which we can take action is the basis of knowledge, and I believe that at this moment the first thing we ought to do toward insuring the safety of the United States at a moment which may not be very far off, is greatly to increase the appropriation of the FBI for handling precisely this problem of the Communists in the United States.

I know that the FBI has done excellent work on this line. They have proved what they could do in the case of the German Bund, but in the case of the Communist Party you have many, many more, thousands and thousands more dangerous persons than you had in the German Bund; and I believe that the FBI should be given sufficient funds so that when the crisis comes it can seize all the members of the Communist Party who have any importance, just as effectively as it seized the members of the Bund.

I do think, therefore, that at the present time we are not equipped to face this issue by passing legislation making it a crime to be a member of the Communist Party. I do not believe that the people of this country are quite sufficiently aware of the danger to them involved in the existence of the party and the determination of the Soviet Union to conquer the United States, to face up to the penalties involved. The last thing we want to do is to make martyrs of anybody. The last thing we want to do is to throw away one iota of our Bill of Rights contained in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. Our glory in the world and, indeed, our great strength, is in the fact that we stand for freedom. The Soviet Government today, in the world where it is really known, stands for just one thing, which is slavery.

It is a very old fight, an extremely old fight, which has gone on for 2,500 years at least, between the idea of freedom, exemplified at that time by the Athenian democracy, and the idea of tyranny, exemplified at that time by the great kings of Persia. This fight is on today, and the great explosive idea which we have to offer to the peoples of eastern Europe who are under the heal of the Soviet Government, to all the peoples in the world, even the peoples of the Soviet Union who are under the heel of the Soviet Government, is the idea of freedom; and in my belief while we have to devise with the utmost care a method of handling this criminal conspiracy, I think it has to be done so as to avoid, meticulously, touching one iota of our Bill of Rights and our personal freedoms.

That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bullitt, the committee certainly appreciates the very fine statement that you have made to us.

The committee now has some questions to ask, if you don't mind.

One thing that I would like to know from you is this: Do you consider that communism is the greatest threat to the world today?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, there is very little left of fascism, and therefore the brown fascism is out of the world, and you have left the Red fascism, which is communism; and, in my opinion, it is the greatest threat there is to any form of decent life on this globe.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bullitt, I have been serving on this committee now for 8 years. I was with the Dies committee when it was originally established. That committee, and later committees, built up a tremendous record against the Communist Party, but many times we wondered if our efforts weren't futile. It is all right to talk about appropriating $25,000,000 now to investigate un-American individual in the Government, but we can look back and see that for just a few hundred thousand dollars a committee of Congress did exactly the same thing, and yet how futile it was at times because of the lack of cooperation that we got.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I would like to ask you this question in regard to that: Do you think now, and in the future, we are going to get real cooperation, or do you think it will be as it was over the past 8 years—the kind of thing that weakened this country just as France was weakened back in 1936?

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Chairman, I think that at the present time we are beginning to have a realization in this country of the facts with regard to the threat of the Soviet Union to the United States. It is perfectly true that from the autumn of 1941 until, certainly, the spring of 1945, all the agencies of the American Government which had anything to do with the problem were employed in trying to make the Soviet Government popular in the United States. That we have to recog-

nize—from what came out over the radio, what was gotten out by the OWI, the statements made at the State Department—in which the Soviet Government was constantly referred to as a peace-loving democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. Did we know, though, that that was absolutely wrong, that it was just as much of a falsehood as anything that we might say?

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Chairman, that is a very difficult question to answer unless I were to talk for 15 minutes on it. I will say this, briefly: Mr. Roosevelt was perfectly aware in 1940 of what the Soviet Union was. In his speech of February 10, 1940, to the American Youth Congress, he said:

"The Soviet Union, as everybody who has the courage to face the facts knows, is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world."

On November 7, 1941, in decreeing the extension of the Lend-Lease Act to the Soviet Union, the President declared:

"I have found that the defense of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics is vital to the defense of the United States."

Now, in my opinion, both of those statements were true. The fact is that in the last war we associated ourselves with one totalitarian imperialism, the Soviet Union, and two or three democracies in order to defeat another totalitarian imperialism Germany, which was associated with another totalitarian imperialism—Japan, in the Pacific—and in order to make the Soviet Union more popular in this country the Government deliberately engaged in propaganda on its behalf. Of that there is no question.

The hope of President Roosevelt was that in the end, if we gave Stalin everything he asked for, if we treated him with the greatest possible generosity, if we treated him as if he were a great gentleman, that in the end Stalin would turn out to be a peace-loving democrat and all the problems of the world would be solved. In that he was wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. I have just one more question. You mentioned France.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your opinion that France will be able to stand up against the Communist influence, or that France will fall and become a Communist state?

Mr. BULLITT. My opinion is that the 72 percent of the French Parliament which is anti-Communist can form a government of national unions, leaving the 28 percent of Communists in a minority and maintain legal democratic government in France—and I trust that they will do so, and I think that we should give them every encouragement to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. MUNDT.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Bullitt, I believe that in calling the roll of the countries which had fallen under the complete domination of the Soviet you omitted mentioning the country of Albania.

Mr. BULLITT. Albania and Yugoslavia I perhaps didn't mention. When you are mentioning a list, when you are just speaking, it is difficult to remember them all—because there is a very large number.

Mr. MUNDT. That is right. I wish you would tell the committee for the record your interpretation, from your vast knowledge of the international machinations of communism, what is entailed in this phrase which is so glibly referred to frequently by ill-advised college professors, political preachers, and other people occasionally who apologize for communism, when they say, "There is nothing to worry about any more; the Comintern has been dissolved."

Mr. BULLITT. That is pure nonsense. The Comintern is—you may recall the American Communist Party was also dissolved and it became the Communist Political Association—I believe that is what it was called—because it suited the political book of the Soviet Government at that time to try to make it appear that the Soviet Government was no longer directing the Communist Party in the United States, but just as soon as it was no longer politically useful the Communist Party was revived in full form.

The Comintern being officially abolished means almost nothing. The Soviet Government now has such mechanisms throughout the world that it doesn't need the old mechanism of the Comintern. It has the Profintern; it has its own diplomatic service; and it has also the diplomatic services of all of its satellite states. There is a Polish Embassy today in Washington. I have no hesitation in saying that the Polish Embassy in Washington is certainly directed by the puppet government of Poland, which, in turn, is directed by Moscow, and therefore the Polish Embassy in Washington is merely another adjunct of the Soviet Government.

Now that they have so many mechanisms, now that they have spread so widely, they no longer need the Comintern as a mechanism, but I quoted you before Stalin's statement that the Comintern was the "holy of holies of the working class," and if anyone thinks that in reality that holy of holies has been abolished he is very naive.

Mr. MUNDT. As a matter of fact, some of the former members of the Comintern, such as Georgi Dimitrov in Bulgaria, have been transferred from one "holy of holies" to an operative post, as a dictator of a satellite country; is that not right?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MUNDT. You mentioned the Vice President of France, I believe who was a deserter. Who was that?

Mr. BULLITT. Maurice Thorez. He is vice president, not of France, but of the French Government. We talk about the French Prime Minister; they call him President of the Council, and then there is the Vice President of the Council, who takes the place of the President of the Council if the President of the Council is ill, or away.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you.

I am frank to say that I share your concern and skepticism as to the efficacy of outlawing the Communist Party, but I am highly desirous of taking every constitutional step that we can to restrict and restrain and repeal their activity in this country; so I was highly gratified to have the list of three or four suggestions which you made by which we could curtail, to a certain extent, these operations without making them actually an outlawed party. On the other hand, I presume that we cannot give too much credence to the theory that by outlawing them we drive them underground, because, as you have correctly pointed out, some of their most important operators are underground anyhow.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Because they do not openly admit membership in the party.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if you can give the committee any suggestions as to what can be done constitutionally, under our American Bill of Rights, to curtail the supporters of communism, who have that unfortunate habit of joining a lot of front organizations, and thus give them an atmosphere of respectability, because they are decent Americans, but are careless, and carelessly join these organizations and contribute, by their prestige and money, to the promotion.

A definite case came out in the papers this morning. A fellow by the name of Dr. Condon, head of the Bureau of Standards, whom I presume is a good American, was lending his name to a Communist movement, and then said, "I didn't know it was a Communist organization. Somebody called up and said will you join, and I said 'Yes.'"

Now, something should be done, it seems to me, to alert Americans against giving aid and comfort to the enemy, as it were, simply through carelessness. Such gullibles as Dr. Condon present a tragic case.

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I think that that might be handled very easily by, in the first place, an investigation of such Communist-front organizations so that we are perfectly certain they are Communist-front organizations, and then information being given directly—and I should not object to having it given by the American Government—to respectable persons who may have been hooked into their lists, that they were acting as screens for a Communist-front organization.

I think it might be, perhaps, worth while to go back and ask the State Department for the records of the Comintern Congress of 1935, which took place in Moscow, where American Communists were very prominent, despite all the promises made by the Soviet Government to the contrary, the promises made by Litvinov, written promises that the Comintern would cease to direct the American Communist Party.

Mr. MUNDT. Given as a condition precedent——

Mr. BULLITT. Given as a condition precedent to recognition; yes, sir.

At that time they developed the entire Trojan-horse policy and the statements are really extraordinary, the statements of the leaders of the Comintern, saying if any man thinks that it is beneath his honor to go into church organizations, into welfare organizations of every kind, in order to better undermine them, and the state in which they function, then he doesn't know what it is to be a real Communist.

Now, I think you might, perhaps, get some excerpts from that record and send them to these people who get drawn into these Communist-front organizations. That record exists, I know, because I was the Ambassador in Moscow at the time of the occurrence.

Mr. MUNDT. The record is in the State Department?

Mr. BULLITT. Certainly.

Mr. MUNDT. I have no other questions. I simply want to join with the chairman in expressing appreciation to you for your very helpful and informative and thought-provoking statement on a difficult problem. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. BULLITT. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. MCDOWELL. Mr. Ambassador, for the first time, I think, in the Nation's history, America is becoming, rapidly becoming, acutely conscious of the Communist situation here and around the world.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MCDOWELL. I feel that all of the eyes of America are on this hearing today. Most certainly those things that you have said today are going to have a profound effect upon the people of America. I have attended many Communist meetings—not as a member. One of the frequent occurrences at the meetings was a comparison between living here in America and in Russia. The comparison, of course, was bad, so far as America was concerned. Would you care to make any observations on the things that occur in Russia?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, of course, statements of that kind are so fantastically distorted that it is very difficult to answer them.

In the first place, life in Russia is lived under the constant fear of the knock of the secret police on the door in the middle of the night. No man when he goes to bed—and no woman—knows that in the middle of the night the secret police aren't going to arrive—and then comes disappearance. Then comes either death in a cellar with a shot in the neck or deportation to one of the forced labor camps. We do not know exactly how many men and women are in those forced labor camps today, but there is extremely reliable testimony that there are more than 10,000,000 human slaves today in those forced labor camps working under the NKVD in the Soviet Union at this time.

It is worse than at the worst moment of Negro slavery. There were never so many slaves as there are today in the Soviet Union actually working in slavery.

That being the basis for life, whether you have more or less makes very little difference, because you can't call your soul your own; you are scared every minute. The actual scale of living of the ordinary people of the Soviet Union is fantastically low. It was certainly at the beginning of the war, in 1939, lower than that of any country in Europe, and, of course, infinitely lower than that of the United States. That is not to say that the commissars and the big leaders of one kind and another do not have everything. They do. They have their town houses, they have their country places, their automobiles, they have special shops where they get clothing, and their wives and children are clothed. They have enormous privileges. But when you get down to the great mass of the Russian people and the great mass of the other peoples in the Soviet Union—because the Soviet Union is, as you know, not populated exclusively by Russians; it contains 167 different peoples and tribes; they issue their primary schoolbooks, or did in the year 1936, if my memory is correct, in 165 different languages and dialects—the standard of life of these peoples for the most part is unbelievably low.

You can't describe it to an American because he has never seen anything like it and cannot imagine what it is.

The statement that the standard of living is higher in the Soviet Union than in the United States is, of course, the most outrageous lie possible. I don't know that it is worth while going on talking about it.

Mr. McDOWELL. I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. I would like to join with the rest of the committee in extending the thanks of the United States Congress to this great patriotic American for coming here.

Mr. BULLITT. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Bullitt, I particularly noticed in your comment that this Congress must be careful not to place the Communists in the United States in a position of martyrs.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. NIXON. Would you even go so far as to say that although Communists will appear before this committee in opposition to this proposed legislation, that it might well be part of their program to welcome the passage of such legislation so that they could be placed in a position of martyrs?

Mr. BULLITT. No; I don't think so. I think they are very well satisfied with their present set-up and don't want it disturbed. I think that they will oppose it and they will oppose it on different grounds—but that seems to me one step too subtle. I don't believe they will go that far.

Mr. NIXON. You mean, then, that you think their opposition to this type of legislation is honest in this case?

Mr. BULLITT. I think that if they could get an outrageous bill passed, which the Supreme Court would unanimously throw out, they would be perfectly delighted, obviously, but I don't think that they would——

Mr. NIXON. They wouldn't oppose a reasonable bill which was held constitutional?

Mr. BULLITT. I don't think they would like that.

Mr. NIXON. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Bullitt, you have indicated that communism was a very definite threat to America today. I wonder whether, based on your experience, you could indicate to us the period in which that movement has gained the greatest impetus.

Mr. BULLITT. In the United States?

Mr. VAIL. In the United States.

Mr. BULLITT. Without question, during the war. During the war.

Mr. VAIL. You don't think that that movement has been progressive since the war?

Mr. BULLITT. I should doubt it very much. It may have been—and I don't pretend to be a specialist on the activities of the Communist Party in the United States in the different trade-unions and in the different fields of life—but I think that there has been a very general awakening to the fact that the Soviet Union is not a peace-loving democracy and that the Communists representing it are not good American citizens, that they are serving a foreign power, and not the United States of America. I think that the Communist Party has less influence than it had during the period when it changed its name to "Communist Political Association" and was garnering a great many people of decency and good will, who were unaware of the facts.

So that I don't think it is so powerful. Nevertheless, that is not really the question. The question is, Does it occupy sufficient strategic points of importance so that it can, for example, paralyze our electrical industry by sabotage in case of an attack on the United States by the Soviet Union? That is one example. Can it operate in different fields equally effectively? For example, I understand that a very large number of all the radio operators on the merchant marine are in Communist unions. What would be the consequences of that? The question is extremely specific. Where they are; what they are doing.

Mr. VAIL. There isn't any question but what ours is a tolerant nation. I am wondering whether you believe the framers of our Constitution and Bill of Rights had in mind the situation that has arisen today, a definite threat, an intent on the part of certain people living in our country to destroy our Government.

Mr. BULLITT. No; I certainly think they had no such thing in mind; and furthermore, when a Communist talks about free speech it is almost comic, for this reason: he has no speech that comes out of his mouth that isn't dictated to him by his rulers in Moscow. Now, the essence of free speech is that you honestly consider a subject and you develop your own opinion. You then have a right to express it. But the Communist simply follows the party line, which is laid down for him in Moscow. There is an interesting distinction there, which perhaps is not worth anything from a practical point of view, but nevertheless is a fact—that they do not think for themselves; they change their opinions en masse whenever they get an order to change them from the Soviet Union. In a book which I published last year there is an appendix in which I have recorded the different changes of line expressed in the Daily Worker in exact accordance with the changes in Soviet foreign policy.

Now, I think it is impossible to read that and believe that any American Communist thinks for himself. He gets his orders from Moscow what to think—which is something, certainly, that was not envisaged by the framers of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. VAIL. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rankin.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Bullitt, the advocates of communism in this country keep harping on democracy. Is there any democracy in a Communist country?

Mr. BULLITT. There isn't the slightest trace of democracy.

Mr. RANKIN. A statement was made before this committee that there was no more democracy in a Communist country than there was in the penitentiary of the State of New Jersey or Mississippi or Texas. Is that statement correct?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I would not put it in that form. The fact is that there is no democracy of any kind without political democracy.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, the masses are the slaves of the state or the commissars?

Mr. BULLITT. That is correct. Completely the slaves of the state; and furthermore, the doctrine which is taught is the doctrine of the omnipotence of the state—that a man is good insofar as he serves the state; a man is bad insofar as he doesn't serve the state.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, were you in Moscow in the late thirties?

Mr. BULLITT. I was in Moscow, Ambassador in Moscow, from the autumn of 1933 until the autumn of 1936.

Mr. RANKIN. Did you see a large streamer across the gates of Moscow with the inscription on it: "Religion is the Opiate of the People"?

Mr. BULLITT. That streamer I saw in Moscow in 1919, and in 1932, when I was there, but it is my impression that it had been removed in 1933. I am not certain of that, but that is my impression.

Mr. RANKIN. I give you my impression. My recollection is that former President Hoover went to Moscow in 1936; is that about right?

Mr. BULLITT. I don't know. He wasn't there when I was there.

Mr. RANKIN. He made a radio speech when he returned to America, and told about seeing that streamer.

Mr. BULLITT. That is a statement which you may find all through Moscow and Leningrad, and the country, "Religion is the Opiate of the People."

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, communism is atheistic?

Mr. BULLITT. Completely.

Mr. RANKIN. Completely?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. They believe in outlawing all religion?

Mr. BULLITT. You have to qualify that now to this extent; they have an ideal, which is the state. It is a form of state worship. They did their utmost to destroy Christianity in Russia; they conducted campaign after campaign against Christianity in Russia. When the last war, the war of 1939, came on, they found that they needed the support of a lot of religious people. Therefore, they stopped the persecution of the church in violent form; they permitted more churches to open, and they took the other course, which was of getting the leaders of the Orthodox church under their thumb, so that today they control the Orthodox church as one of the apparatuses by which they control the peoples of the Soviet Union. But they do permit it to function.

Mr. RANKIN. Also they propose to take over all property, all land, all factories, all methods of production and distribution; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, when the revolution came there they took everything over.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, a man cannot own his own home or land in Russia?

Mr. BULLITT. That is true, basically; but now they allow, for example, the peasants on the collective farm, they allow a peasant to get the product of an acre or a half acre that he has back of his place where he lives.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, they permit him to have what we call a garden in the South?

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. But the land that he tills, to make his living, is owned by the Russian Government.

Mr. BULLITT. Owned by the state.

Mr. RANKIN. And it is dominated by commissars?

Mr. BULLITT. Completely.

Mr. RANKIN. And instead of imposing the usual amount of rental, as we impose, a certain percentage of the crop, they demand that they deliver a certain amount of production, do they not?

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. In 1933, I think it was, they had a crop failure in the Ukraine. Do you remember that?

Mr. BULLITT. I do; very well.

Mr. RANKIN. And the people of the Ukraine are among the best people in Russia?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And they went down and took everything away from them and starved five or six million of the best people in Russia to death, in their own homes; that is correct, isn't it?

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Congressman, it was, in one way, even worse than that. They set the grain quotas higher than the total grain crop. They then took the entire grain crop, but because there wasn't more, to come up to quota, the man was a criminal, and, therefore, he was treated as a criminal, in addition to being starved, and his wife and children as well.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BULLITT. They managed to dispose, by systemically organized starvation, they managed to dispose of some three to five million Ukrainians.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, the people in the Ukraine are the white people of Russia, the Nordics; are they not?

Mr. BULLITT. No; that you can't say. The Ukrainians are an extremely fine people. Russians are a very fine people. Both the Russians and the Ukrainians are extremely Nordic.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, what I mean by that is that these people were Nordic people; they were not orientals?

Mr. BULLITT. Certainly not.

Mr. RANKIN. The people in the Ukraine are among the best people in Europe.

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Yet they went in there and took everything they made and starved, you say, five or six million of them to death?

Mr. BULLITT. Three to five million.

Mr. RANKIN. Men, women, and children starved to death, eating, in their frantic misery, the bodies of their own children, of their own families; that is correct, isn't it?

Mr. BULLITT. I am extremely sorry to say that I actually have two photographs of a father and mother and the skeleton of the child they had eaten, which were taken down there in the Ukraine.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is what I am trying to bring out.

Mr. BULLITT. I still have two photographs of that. There is nothing more horrible.

Mr. RANKIN. You spoke a while ago of there being 10,000,000 people in concentration camps.

Mr. BULLITT. I should say, at least.

Mr. RANKIN. You said that they were infinitely worse off that the slaves were in the Southern States.

Mr. BULLITT. What I said was this, sir, that there were more slaves today in the Soviet Union than there ever were at the height of slavery, not merely in the Southern States but in the world.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. Well, in the Southern States I don't think it ever got higher than 4,000,000, and never were the slaves in the Southern States treated as brutally as the people are now treated in those concentration camps in Russia.

Mr. BULLITT. I think——

Mr. RANKIN. According to the information we get.

Now, you spoke awhile ago about outlawing the Communist Party. The bill before us simply proposes to prevent men from being elected to office on the Communist ticket, to put a stop to the sending of Communist literature through the mail, and to put a stop to certain professors teaching communism in the schools and colleges of this country. Is there anything wrong in preventing those encroachments?

Mr. BULLITT. Personally, I think the more people in the United States know about communism the better.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but——

Mr. BULLITT. And I would hate to see any bill passed which forbade people to tell the people of this country what communism was, right down to the last detail and very accurately.

Mr. RANKIN. You are aware of the fact that communism is much better financed than fascism was in this country. I am talking about the fifth columnists, as we call them.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Through certain foundations, alleged foundations, they are financing professors in the various colleges throughout the country, who are continuously lecturing those students and misleading them as to what communism means.

Now, don't you think that ought to be stopped?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I think if that is being done—and I have no personal knowledge of it—it is an extremely grave thing, which the Government ought to look into immediately.

Mr. RANKIN. There have been two professors in the University of Chicago—one of them is named Adler and the other one I believe is named Miller—who spouted off recently, making speeches advocating the abolition of the United States and saying boldly we must get rid of the United States. You know what that means, don't you?

Mr. BULLITT. Well—

Mr. RANKIN. Would you outlaw that kind of procedure?

Mr. BULLITT. I think anybody who chooses to advocate the abolition of the United States is taking quite a burden on his shoulders.

I may say there was a moment when most of the members of my family, and probably most of the members of yours, were engaged in trying to abolish the United States, by the Civil War.

Mr. RANKIN. I am glad you brought that question up, because if you will get the constitution of the Confederacy and read it——

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. You will find that it was almost a duplicate of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes; it was, surely. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. There was a secession over two questions——

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. The spread of slavery and the right of a section of the country to secede.

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. But we never undertook to undermine and destroy all forms of government.

Mr. BULLITT. Oh, no.

Mr. RANKIN. Including the right to own property.

Mr. BULLITT. No; Congressman. Excuse me, I misunderstood your question in that case.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, you spoke about prosecuting these fellows. You know that no Communist will tell the truth, if it suits him to prevaricate; do you not?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes; that is quite true.

Mr. RANKIN. No oath will bind a Communist; will it?

Mr. BULLITT No.

Mr. RANKIN. None whatever.

Mr. BULLITT. No.

Mr. RANKIN. Nothing they will sign will bind them; will it?

Mr. BULLITT. No.

Mr. RANKIN. Then why do we spend so much time in trying to find out whether or not we can enter into some agreement, when we know that our side will be the only one that will feel bound by it?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, Mr. Congressman, for very practical reasons. For example, if we had come to an agreement in the year 1941, when the Soviet Union was dependent for its life on supplies from the United States—if at that time we had come to an agreement with Stalin that at the end of the war there should be set up a United States of Europe and that he would not extend his boundaries beyond the boundaries with which he started in 1939—if we had done that we could immediately, and should have, started an immense movement for the consolidation of a western European federation or United States of Europe, in whatever terms you want to put it.

Mr. RANKIN. Speaking——

Mr. BULLITT. May I finish what I am saying, sir?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BULLITT. If we had had a formal written agreement from Stalin, he could not have objected to our starting practical measures to set that afoot, and we might have established a very great element for democracy and peace in the world if we had done that.

Now, the advantage of coming to agreements with the Soviet Union is merely that their agreement estops them from immediately making efforts, and public efforts, to prevent you from carrying out your side of the agreement. That is the practical value of any agreement with the Soviet Government.

Mr. RANKIN. When I think of the meeting of the United Nations, I am reminded that the towers of Babel have been collapsing in a confusion of tongues ever since the days of Genesis, and it is a sound warning to me that the United States had better be very careful. These professors that go out and say that we ought to abolish the United States, to become a subsidiary of a world government, in my opinion are spreading treason.

Now you spoke awhile ago of the FBI. The FBI hasn't a better friend in Congress than I am. But don't you think that we ought to make the FBI an independent agency and extend its powers and furnish it all the funds it needs to make any investigation necessary anywhere at any time?

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Congressman, that is a question which I have never thought about—the question of making it an independent agency.

With the latter part of your statement I agree heartily, and that is the FBI should have very greatly increased funds and that it should be encouraged by the Government to go into all the many ramifications of Communist activity in this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, you said awhile ago that 60 percent of the people coming over here from Russia were Communists?

Mr. BULLITT. No, sir. My statement was, if I remember correctly, that 60 percent of the members of the Communist Party had come to the United States as aliens. They were immigrants. Many of them have come from other countries than Russia.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, you are aware of the fact that there is a wide breach between the Communists and the anti-Communists in the Jewish race, are you?

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think we ought to get into that question.

Mr. RANKIN. You wait. I am doing the questioning now. I am a Member of Congress. I want to ask you what percentage of those Communists, that 60 percent that you spoke of, are Jews?

Mr. BULLITT. I don't know.

Mr. RANKIN. You don't know?

Mr. BULLITT. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. RANKIN. The information we have is that 75 percent of the members of the Communist Party in this country are Jews.

Mr. BULLITT. I have no knowledge of that, if that is so.

The CHAIRMAN. You say, Mr. Rankin, the information we have or you have?

Mr. RANKIN. I say we have. I don't know whether you have it or not, but we have.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think the committee has.

Mr. RANKIN. I do.

Now, they have gone down through the Southern States and all over the country and tried to line up the Negroes. They don't care anything about the Negroes, you understand, but they are using them to try to carry on their program. They have taken these Negroes to Moscow to teach them how to carry

on revolutions in this country. Are you aware of that?

Mr. BULLITT. I have no personal knowledge of that. That may be entirely true, but I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. RANKIN. We had one before the committee the other day——

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And he said that they took him there, and had other Negroes from the South—which we already knew—and taught them how to carry on revolutions. They taught them, as you say, how to begin, by destroying the waterworks and the light system, blowing up bridges, and doing whatever is necessary to paralyze a city or a community.

Now, were you aware of the fact that they were teaching that in that Communist school over there?

Mr. BULLITT. I know that they have a school of revolution, in which they have representatives from very nearly every country in the world. I have no specific knowledge, as I just said, of the presence of American Negroes there, but, obviously, it wouldn't surprise me because they have had Chinese, Indochinese, Moroccans, Algerians, Frenchmen, Italians, Germans—everybody. It is a world school of revolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, you may read the Communist Daily Worker. It is constantly maligning the anti-Communists in this country on the race question, and constantly maligning the Southern States, attempting to stir up race trouble all over the South, just as they are in other sections of the country.

Now, this Negro from the North, who was here the other day, testified that they stirred up the race riot in Detroit last year.

Of course, we finally got through the press that there were about 30 or 40 Negroes killed, and then we got the report which showed, I think, there were about 600 of them. They have been using that kind of method to stir up race trouble over this country.

Mr. BULLITT. They will try to put race against race.

Mr. RANKIN. That is it.

Mr. BULLITT. And creed against creed——

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BULLITT. And I object very much, in this fight, to singling out any race or creed for special criticism.

Mr. RANKIN. All right.

Mr. BULLITT. I think that this fight is one which is essentially American. After all, we have our strength in the fact that we are people who came to this country from all over the earth, to try to find freedom, and we learned how to work together—people of all nationalities and all races—for the common good of all. I personally don't feel that there is any racial issue whatsoever in this fight against communism.

Mr. MCDOWELL. That is a very fine statement.

Mr. RANKIN. When you get along further, and if you will talk to these high-class American Jews, you will find just what I am telling you.

The CHAIRMAN. I think this part of the discussion is out of order, and I would suggest that the gentleman from Mississippi confine his questions to the statement that Mr. Bullitt made, and also to pertinent matters.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Bullitt, I want to ask you about this drive against the British Empire. You realize, of course, there is a terrific drive being made now in Great Britain——

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN (continuing). By what they call the Zionists. Isn't that a Communist front?

Mr. BULLITT. No.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the difference?

Mr. BULLITT. No, no.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the difference?

Mr. BULLITT. No. Mr. Congressman, to call the Zionists a Communist front is, I think, to disregard the history of the past 40 years. I personally knew, and knew very well, the great Zionist leader of Palestine, whose name was Aaron Aaronson, who, unfortunately, was killed at the time of the Peace Conference at the end of World War I in an airplane accident. That man, who was one of the most eminent scientists in the world, being a great agronomist, the discoverer of wild wheat, was the leader of the Zionist movement in Palestine. No one could have been further from communism. No one could have been further from any Communist ideas. He was one of the finest human beings I have ever known. He started that.

I have also known Dr. Weizman, who was the leader of the Zionist movement until the most recent congress, and Dr. Weizman is also among the most eminent men in the world, and certainly is no Communist. I do not think it is fair to say that the Zionist movement is a Communist front; emphatically no.

Mr. RANKIN. One of the outstanding Zionists in this country, and the one who has criticized me most, boasted that some of his children were Communists, and I am just wondering how much of it is interwoven with the Communist movement throughout the world.

Now, then, they are opposing the British Empire, are they not? And if we go into Greece—I am asking this question because I want to know. I have had the white people of the South alarmed by these Reds sufficiently. I can take it and I can give it. They are asking us to go into Greece and Turkey, to stop the spread of communism, because Great Britain is no longer able to protect herself there; that is, protect the Greeks and the Turks, because she has to exhaust her efforts protecting her own Government, you might say, in Palestine; is that correct?

Mr. BULLITT. No, sir; I don't think that that is correct. I have never heard that statement made, and I don't think it is correct. The British problem is a very much more serious one than that.

At the time of Napoleon there were 10,000,000 in what is now Great Britain. They achieved a population, and were able to support them, of 45,000,000 before this last war because they had coal at seaboard, quantities of the very best steam coal at seaboard. They sent that coal out in their merchant ships all over the world. They brought back, when they discharged the coal, the raw materials they needed for their factories. Following those merchant ships and that coal went British banking, British insurance, and British investments.

During this last war they had to liquidate their investments abroad, to pay for the war. At the same time their coal seams in Great Britain have become so small that they are worked down to seams of 2 and 3 feet. You know what coal mining is, and how hard it is to get coal out of a seam 2 or 3 feet wide. Our seams for the most part may be 8 or 10 feet, which makes comparatively easy mining. They no longer have sufficient coal for their own needs in Great Britain. They, therefore, cannot export coal throughout the world. They, therefore, have great difficulty maintaining their merchant marine and getting cargoes for their outgoing ships, when they have to bring large quantities of raw materials for their manufacturing industries.

The consequences of that plus their consumption of their overseas investments, are that they have a very big fundamental problem of how to keep alive this enormous population, which has increased from 10,000,000 to 45,000,000 in the past century.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand they have——

Mr. BULLITT. But that is a much larger question and a much more profoundly difficult question than the question of maintaining troops in Palestine.

Mr. RANKIN. Now I am going to say to you, while I am on that subject——

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. That one of the men who gave us the information as to the number of Jews, percentage-wise, in the Communist Party, was a Jew himself and was an anti-Communist Jew. There are plenty of them in this country that are anti-Communists and they know what these Communists are doing to them, as well as to the rest of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. RANKIN, may I say something? Mr. Bullitt was very kind to come here today.

Mr. RANKIN. I know.

The CHAIRMAN. He has been sick for 4 months.

Mr. BULLITT. It is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. And if we could just bring the questions to a close soon, I think it will be helpful to Mr. Bullitt.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me ask you about the British Government as it now stands——

The CHAIRMAN. Doesn't that get into the field of foreign affairs a little bit, and isn't that a matter for the Foreign Affairs Committee?

Mr. RANKIN. I was just going to ask him if he was familiar with the Strachey philosophy in Great Britain, and if he could distinguish between it and the Communist philosophy in Russia.

Mr. BULLITT. That is all right. I have no objection to answering that.

Mr. RANKIN. How is that?

Mr. BULLITT. I would be very glad to answer that question.

Mr. RANKIN. I would be very glad to hear you.

Mr. BULLITT. The distinction is the following: The philosophy of the present British Government is Socialist. It is not Communist. The distinction between the Socialist and the Communist is the following: The Socialist in the first place believes in a gradual approach to the establishment of socialism, by legal and democratic means. They stand for democracy. The Communist stands for dictatorship.

Mr. RANKIN. Have you ever read Strachey's bock?

Mr. BULLITT. Which one? I have read several.

Mr. RANKIN. He is a member of the cabinet.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes; I know him. I have known him personally for 30 years.

Mr. RANKIN. Doesn't he advocate taking over all the land, just as they do in Russia, together with all the factories and all other means of production and distribution?

Mr. BULLITT. So far as I know—and I may be entirely wrong, he may have written a new book which I haven't read, but so far as I know, what is advocated by the present labor government of Great Britain is the nationalization of certain very large industries. They have taken over the coal industry. They intend to take over, I belive, the production of electricity, the railroads, and various other large units. They do not intend to abolish private property. They do not intend to take over small businesses or small manufacturing units.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the information I wanted. They do not propose to take over the land?

Mr. BULLITT. No; I do not think so.

Mr. RANKIN. And to make slaves out of the tillers of the soil?

Mr. BULLITT. No; emphatically not. There is no government in the world that stands more firmly today for all the rights in our Bill of Rights than the present British labor government.

Mr. RANKIN. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. BONNER.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Bullitt, your statement today, considering the great background you have, startles me and would startle thou-

sands and thousands of other people in America could they be here to hear you.

The thing that interests me is what is the delusion that attracts American citizens to the Communist Party and movement?

Mr. BULLITT. I think it is largely that they have swallowed the propaganda which has been poured on this country in very, very large quantity.

There are a great many more true believers in the Communist paradise outside the Soviet Union than there are inside, because inside they have to live with the facts. They have to live with the NKVD, that is, the secret police. They have to live under absolute tyranny. Over here, people can read propaganda tracts written by Communists and imagine this beautiful world, this beautiful Utopia. Well, people have been writing books about Utopia ever since Plato's Republic and much later Thomas Moore's Utopia, and so on. It is wonderfully nice to read about. It has no relation whatsoever to the truth.

I think that a great many perfectly good Americans have simply been taken in by extremely brilliantly conceived and written propaganda.

The Communists have never hesitated to spend a great deal of money over here, to send lecturers of all kinds, to send agents. There are a great many intelligent men in the American Communist Party. Their bread and butter is in it, and they have a vested interest in maintaining it.

Mr. BONNER. My first keen interest in this subject was brought about by a gentleman who appeared before this committee, who comes from one of the oldest families in America. When he first appeared before the committee, I thought the committee had made a serious mistake. On his second appearance, I knew the committee hadn't made a mistake. He is a highly intelligent man. I observe that a lot of men this committee calls before it are highly intelligent men.

Now, why do these people, who are an intelligent group, fall for this? I can understand just the run of the mine reading these stories on utopia and falling for it, but these other people are able to read and are able to understand beyond that and read between the lines, and they contact men like you and other people who have traveled abroad and know. What is it that attracts these highly intelligent people?

Mr. BULLITT. I think, in the first place, they are men who are attracted by the ultimate idea. There is an enormous philosophy behind this thing. The theory behind it is that if you can abolish private property and establish communism everywhere, then finally the state will wither away, that there will be no state and everybody can live in sort of happy anarchy. [Laughter.] This is a fact. If it interests you, I can give you a couple of quotations on the subject.

Mr. BONNER. I would like to hear it. That is the most interesting part of this to me.

Mr. BULLITT. I hope I can find these readily, and not keep you waiting.

I am quoting my own book. I suppose it is justifiable to quote yourself:

"The Soviet Government believes in a Communist creed, which it teaches to all its children, for which it prepares them to live, and, if need be, to die. That is the Marx-Lenin-Stalin creed which denies God and claims to be based on scientific fact; but is based on the improbable assumption that the establishment of Communist dictatorship throughout the earth and the abolition of private ownership of the means of production will end all war, civil and international, and so improve the nature of all men in all nations that, in Lenin's phrase, 'the state will wither away' and all men will live without a state in perfect freedom and happiness. As Engels, the collaborator of Marx, envisioning a Communist world, wrote, "The machine of the state is put into the museum of antiquities, alongside of the spinning wheel and the bronze ax.'

"Lenin * * * believed that the state, whether in his hands or in the hands of a 'bourgeois government' was an instrument of violence; but that, while living under Communist dictatorship, men could be prepared for perfect freedom."

And here is another quotation from Lenin:

" 'While there is a state,' he said, 'there is no freedom.'

" 'When there is freedom there will be no state.' "

And then here is perhaps the explanation that you are looking for:

"The mysticism of this belief is perhaps the reason why it has evoked as great devotion and self-sacrifice as many religious creeds. The Communist true believer offers his life as gallantly as an early Christian. He believes that he is fighting for the emancipation of all humanity from all evil. He thinks he serves eternal truth. The Communist Party, to him, is a union of the faithful. His old testament is the books of Marx and Engels; his new testament the works of Lenin and Stalin. In his idolatry he is profoundly religious. The Soviet Union is to him the Church Militant."

Is that sufficient?

Mr. BONNER. Yes; then they are going to lead us back to the Garden of Eden?

Mr. BULLITT. A very, very heavily and evilly populated Garden of Eden.

Mr. BONNER. I want to ask you one more question, and I am through. In certain substantial and reliable papers I see editorials that this committee witchhunts. Of course, I haven't got the time to do any witchhunting. From your observation of this committee, are we proceeding along the right line, in your opinion?

Mr. BULLITT. I hope so.

Mr. BONNER. You don't hope so. I am asking you.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes. I think you ought to go into this just as far as you can go into it. I think you ought to make the recommendations.

I do not believe, as I said previously, that the time is now ripe to make it a crime to belong to the——

Mr. BONNER. You wouldn't sponsor this legislation?

Mr. BULLITT. No; I should say not. I don't think the time is ripe.

Mr. BONNER. Then am I right from what you said, that the greatest good that this committee can do is just pour light on this whole subject, all over the country?

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Congressman, I have made certain specific suggestions. I think you were here when I made them.

Mr. BONNER. Yes.

Mr. BULLITT. I made certain specific suggestions. If this committee can use its influence to go into the things which I suggested, I think it would be wise. I think, further, it would be very wise to attempt to work out legislation which at some later date, when the emergency is more acute and more felt by the country so that you could be certain of great national support, and that moment will come——

Mr. BONNER. But what you have said leads me to fear that we haven't got much time.

Mr. RANKIN. We are at war now.

Mr. BULLITT. Mr. Congressman, we do have time, in this sense——

Mr. BONNER. You know, I listened very carefully to what you said about the downfall of France, and that it happened in about 4 or 5 years.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. And you compared the two periods.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. Which were very similar, and it threw the fear of God into me, when I heard you say what you said.

Mr. BULLITT. May I finish this, sir?

In my belief, the Soviet Union will not dare to attack the United States until the Soviet Union has manufactured the atomic bomb in quantity and until it feels that it has an air force superior to the air force of the United States.

That gives us a certain period in which we will definitely remain stronger than the Soviet Union and during which, when we say "Stop" to Stalin, and mean it, he will stop.

But the fundamental thing which we have to realize is that Stalin, like Hitler, will not stop of his own accord. He can only be stopped.

Mr. BONNER. Yes. We are tearing down our national defense, and according to your testimony, they are building up theirs.

Mr. BULLITT. Very much so.

Mr. BONNER. I was in France during the last war, in an infantry company, and I went back there in 1937 and visited a lot of people that I knew. I saw what was going on, and it surprised me, and it shocked me that they didn't believe Germany meant anything but a big parade.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BONNER. Your statement of the short time within which France fell and your observation of what is going on today leads me to believe that we haven't got much more time.

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I think this, that it is utterly vital for us to support the policy of President Truman, to stop the Soviet Union where she is and not to permit her to take over a series of new peoples. The whole strategy of conquest of Stalin is to lull powerful peoples into a sense of false security, while he is securing strategic areas and additional strength with which to attack them. It is precisely the Hitler strategy all over again.

Mr. BONNER. According to your testimony, they have already got the French Government. Now, what can we do——

Mr. BULLITT. No; they haven't already got the French Government. They already are extremely powerful in it and may be able, by a general strike, to produce a revolutionary situation, but the French Parliament is an absolutely democratically elected parliament, just as democratically elected as our own Government. And 72 percent of the French deputies, that is to say representatives, today are anti-Communist. Only 28 percent are Communist. The power of the Communists in France lies in their control of the trade-unions and their infiltration through economic life.

Mr. BONNER. Isn't that rapidly developing here?

Mr. BULLITT. I trust it isn't, and I don't believe it is.

Mr. BONNER. According to the testimony we have had before this committee as to the mode which is followed in selecting the officers of certain unions, it is rapidly developing.

Mr. BULLITT. I think it is extraordinarily dangerous to have any Communist union leaders anywhere in this country.

Mr. BONNER. Since we are thinking about helping Turkey and Greece, what could we do to help France? They are so close to this borderline now. What must be done to help them?

Mr. BULLITT. A great many things. In the first place, President Truman's action the other day points the line, I think.

Mr. BONNER. You refer to the Greece situation?

Mr. BULLITT. You see, although he hooked this policy onto the action for Greece and Turkey, it had a world-wide significance, much greater than the problems of the Near East. What he said was—and I wish I had the text of his remarks here——

Mr. BONNER. I think we have already heard so much about that we know it by memory.

Mr. BULLITT. I read it enough and I ought to remember it exactly, but I am afraid I can't quote him accurately. However, what he said was, virtually, that we must support nations which were resisting conquest by outside totalitarian regimes or their inside agents. That is virtually what it amounted to.

Now, that applies to France as well as to Greece and to Turkey, and I believe we ought to do everything we can to aid the anti-Communist Parties of France to eliminate the Communists from their present threatening position and to help France get back on her feet as a great democratic nation.

Mr. BONNER. What do you think Russia would do with the atomic bomb?

Mr. BULLITT. If she had it and we did not, it would already have been dropped on the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. If she had and we didn't.

Mr. BULLITT. If she had it and we didn't.

Mr. BONNER. Your testimony frightens me. I am glad to have heard you, and I think you have told the American people something—if the newspapers would carry it—that would open up their eyes and maybe make them realize what a dangerous threat we have now before us, notwithstanding all that certain papers say about this committee and those who are interested in the preservation of this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. BONNER, will you yield there for a question?

Mr. BONNER. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. MUNDT has another question.

Mr. MUNDT. Speaking further about these restraints which possibly we could apply and stay within our constitutional confines and not take the step of outlawing the party now, it has occurred to me that we look a little bit foolish by granting passports to fellows like Foster which enable them to travel around overseas and contact directly their sources of information and direction, and then come back.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. You are a former member of the State Department?

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Would there be a way in which we could somehow circumscribe the right—it isn't right, but it is a privilege—to get a passport.

Mr. BULLITT. It is a privilege.

Mr. MUNDT. To get those passports.

Mr. BULLITT. All that has to be done is for the order to be given to the Passport Division of the Department of State to give no more passports to Communists, and that ends the matter.

Mr. MUNDT. That would be a strictly constitutional matter?

Mr. BULLITT. Strictly constitutional and within the right of the Government. No one has the right to have a passport. The passport is a privilege.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, just one short question.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. When you were in Moscow, you said that you knew about this revolutionary school which they have over there, to which nationals are brought in from all over the world. I just wondered, as a matter of getting the thing specifically for the record, whether it has a name.

Mr. BULLITT. I am sorry to say, I have forgotten what the name is.

Mr. MUNDT. When I was in Moscow, about a year ago, several members of our Embassy staff—not the Ambassador, but some of the staff members—said in viewing this change in the attitude toward the church which you have described——

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. That that might be a device by which the Soviets were attempting to supply a new emotional urge for communism, because the old promises, 5 years apart, have begun to work kind of thin, and perhaps they were utilizing the Russian Orthodox Church to supply that urge. Would you think that might be a possibility?

Mr. BULLITT. I think they will use the Orthodox Church to the greatest possible extent and they certainly have the leaders in hand now, but how far they will be able to go in really using the church for such purposes I don't know because any Christian church teaches the Gospel and it teaches God, and Christ crucified and believed in, which is contrary to every basic belief of the Communists and of the Soviet Government. If they try to use that too far, they are likely to find themselves blown up by their own bomb.

Mr. MUNDT. I like your statement in your book which, like your memory of President Truman's statement, isn't perfect, but in which you bring out the point that if they let God get his foot in the door he may shoulder himself all the way in. I think there is that danger, from their standpoint.

Now one other statement. It is not a question. The last time I heard you before a congressional committee, you were testifying before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the lend-lease issue, and I just want to say to my colleagues that I think we have a very far-sighted witness before us today, because at that time, as I recall his testimony, he suggested that in the event lend-lease was extended to Russia, we should set up certain quid pro quo, such as he described today, which would compel her to let us have something to say about the direction of that part of the world afterward. Unfortunately that was not written into the bill, but you were certainly very prophetic in your pronouncements at that time.

Mr. BULLITT. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bonner, you had another question?

Mr. BONNER. You interested me, in that part of your talk that Russia was refusing to permit the entry of persons we desired to deport.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. Yet we are still permitting them to come into this country.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. Their Embassies, and other Government functions, in this country are highly staffed, and overstaffed, apparently, compared to any other nation.

Mr. BULLITT. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. You would advocate, then, putting a limit on those we permit to come into this country?

Mr. BULLITT. Oh, emphatically. I think we ought to, insofar as it is in our national interest to do so, run our relations with the Soviet Union on a complete basis of reciprocity.

Mr. BONNER. In other words——

Mr. BULLITT. May I finish?

Mr. BONNER. Yes; excuse me.

Mr. BULLITT. For example: They will not permit us to put a consulate in Kiev. There is no earthly reason why we should permit them, then, to put a consulate, say, in Chicago. They will not permit us to have a consulate here, there, or elsewhere. There is no earthly reason why we should permit them to have any more people in the United States than they permit us to have in the Soviet Union. I think that throughout we should treat the Soviet Government on a basis of reciprocity.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. BONNER. If they won't permit the reentry of the people that we desire to deport, then we should stop the entry of their citizens into this country. I gather that from your statement.

Mr. BULLITT. No. I think there is a very interesting question which you have raised there, but I wouldn't quite agree with the sentence in which you expressed it.

You see if you let in persons born in what is now the territory of the Soviet Union, you can deport them only to the territory of the Soviet Union, and since the Soviet Union will not permit them to come back—I am not talking about diplomatic officials, I am talking about ordinary immigrants to the United States, and not officials—you have them permanently on your hands, whether you like it or not, because there isn't any place you can send them. I think it is one of the questions that you may very well consider, one of the questions that might very well be considered by this committee, whether we should permit immigration from countries which refuse to take back their citizens if, under the law of the United States, they are condemned to be deported.

Mr. BONNER. That is the very question I asked you.

Mr. BULLITT. That is precisely it. I didn't understand you.

Mr. BONNER. Then, where a person has lost his country, by the fact that Russia has taken it over, the same rule would apply, wouldn't it?

Mr. BULLITT. Well, I should say that under no circumstances should we send back any anti-Communist Pole, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, or Rumanian.

Mr. BONNER. Though we wish to deport him?

Mr. BULLITT. I said anti-Communist.

Mr. BONNER. Oh, oh.

Mr. BULLITT. I would not send back any man to certain death at the hands of the Soviet Government, and that is what it means if you send those people back. I would not deport them, either, to the Soviet Union from our zone of occupation in Germany.

Mr. BONNER. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ambassador, you mentioned reciprocity. You probably read in the papers in the last 2 weeks, the reciprocity on the question of patents. I just happened to make a statement on the subject on the floor of the House, and General Marshall brought up in his conference with Mr. Molotov. I made the statement how we had given Russia all of our patents, at prices ranging from 10 cents to 25 cents apiece, and one day we gave them 60,000 patents, and how Russia hasn't given us a single patent since 1927.

The reciprocity that would apply in these other cases should also apply on the question of patents, don't you think?

Mr. BULLITT. I think it should apply throughout. There is no reason why we should permit any nation to treat us in a manner which is not that generally accepted as denoting good neighborliness in the world, without treating them in precisely the same way.

I will give you a very simple example of it. In the Soviet Union all ambassadors are spied on constantly.

Mr. BONNER. What was that?

Mr. BULLITT. In the Soviet Union, all ambassadors are spied on constantly by the Soviet secret police. They are followed everywhere they go, wherever they go, by an automobile containing the chauffeur and three additional members of the NKVD, even if they go to the country for a picnic, or anything else. They are followed every place they go, so their movements are recorded. Everyone they speak to is recorded on the books of the NKVD.

Well, the Polish Ambassador, when I was there, got a little bit angry at this, and he, five times, asked the Soviet Foreign Office to stop it. Then he asked his government to apply reciprocity. So the next time that the Soviet Ambassador in Warsaw walked out of his house, there was an automobile behind

his car containing four Poles, in medieval costumes, with swords and plumes, and every place he went he was followed by these people. When he protested, they said, "This is just for your protection, the way you protect our Ambassador in Moscow."

Well, 3 days later there was no more NKVD following the Polish Ambassador in Moscow.

Now, that was a very simple and rather comic little episode of reciprocity, but the Russians understand that. If they choose to kick you, all right they must expect one back. They simply think you are no good and soft, if when they kick you you simply hand out everything they want.

So, I believe very much in reciprocity in dealing with the Soviet Union.

Mr. RANKIN. Just one question——

The CHAIRMAN. Now, gentlemen, we have been on this a long time. Make your question short, because the Ambassador is tired.

Mr. RANKIN. I will make them short.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand you have two or three questions

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I will make them short.

Mr. Bullitt, according to your statement, Russian communism is already making war on the United States?

Mr. BULLITT. No, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. On the people of the United States.

Mr. BULLITT. I didn't say that, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. They are virtually in a state of war with us, so far as attempting to destroy our system of government.

Mr. BULLITT. They are engaged in an effort to seize strategic positions throughout the world, for eventual use in an attack on the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. Then you would say they are preparing for war.

Now, the most important military object on earth today is the atomic bomb. You said a moment ago, in response to Mr. Bonner's question, that if Russia had the atomic bomb and we did not she would already have blown our cities to pieces. Was that your statement?

Mr. BULLITT. I said she would already have dropped it on us, which I believe sincerely.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. In other words, if they had the atomic bomb and we did not she would already have blown our cities to pieces and blown our people into submission, or into eternity.

Now, do you not think, under those circumstances, that we should not only keep the atomic bomb but keep an ample supply of them on hand, and keep planes equipped to distribute them and aviators trained for that purpose?

Mr. BULLITT. I do.

Mr. RANKIN. So as to keep one step ahead of any other country in the world that would attempt to develop the atomic bomb with the intention of using it on us or on any other nation.

Mr. BULLITT. I do; emphatically.

Mr. RANKIN. I think that is our duty, for our own safety.

You have made a great statement, and I want you to know I am grateful, indeed.

Mr. BULLITT. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ambassador, the committee deeply appreciates your coming here today, and we hope that we were not too long and that you feel absolutely all right.

The Chair wants to announce that tomorrow we will have Mr. William Green at 10:30 and Mr. Ray Sawyer, national commander of the American Vets, World War II, at 2:30.

Mr. Ambassador, I again want to thank you, and we hope you will be with us and that we will be seeing you soon again.

Mr. BULLITT. Thank you very much, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 5:40 p. m., the committee adjourned.)

Western Frontiers of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter that was sent to the Honorable George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, by the Polish-American Congress, Inc., of Chicago, Ill., voicing a strong protest against the plans to revise the present western frontiers of Poland:

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, State Department,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the Polish-American Congress, representing 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, we file with you a strong protest, on the eve of your departure for the Moscow Conference, against any plans to revise the present western frontiers of Poland, as outlined at Potsdam, for the benefit of Germany, an enemy, and to the detriment of Poland, an ally.

These recovered areas were not only once an integral part of Poland but their return to their original owners constitutes at least a partial compensation for the irreparable damage caused by Germany's aggressive war against Poland.

Furthermore, the Oder-Neisse line is the only one which gives Poland some guaranty of security against future German aggression.

Even with the return of these western lands to their rightful owners, postwar Poland possesses only 80 percent of its prewar area and two-thirds of its prewar population.

While that section of East Prussia, assigned permanently to the Soviets at Potsdam, never belonged at any time to Russia, the whole of East Prussia was a Polish fief until 1657, the whole of Silesia was an integral part of Poland until 1335, and the whole of Pomerania had been in early centuries within the boundaries of Poland, extending even beyond the Oder-Neisse line. Stettin, annexed by Prussia in 1720, and Silesia, in 1742, in spite of a long process of Germanization, have kept until today many traces of their originally Polish character.

If the United States and England had considered the Oder-Neisse boundaries as temporary and not final they would never have authorized Poland to occupy this recovered area, to establish a Polish administration there, and to provide for the gradual transfer of population, with the result that 4,000,000 Poles have now settled there. Therefore, any revision of the western boundaries would result only in more suffering of the Polish people.

From the American point of view it would be highly regrettable to create the impression that it is precisely our own Government, which participated in the infamous Yalta agreement, that now advocates additional punishment for allied Poland.

Those who are at present illegally in power in Poland would thus be given an excellent argument in support of their policy, based upon subservience to the Soviet Union and opposition to the western democracies. So far such a policy has not had the support of the Polish people, but through fear of new territorial losses it could become a reality, thus depriving the United States of a natural ally while at the same time strengthening Russian influence in the most crucial parts of Europe.

Let us not try to defy history. To restore Germany, the perpetual disturber of the peace of Europe for countless centuries, within its prewar boundaries would be a stupid and tragic diplomatic blunder.

Peace won't come by the resurrection of a strong Germany but only by the rejection of the Yalta pact and the speedy withdrawal of Russian troops from Poland and other Soviet-occupied countries of Europe and Asia.

For the Polish-American Congress:
CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President.

The Wallace Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, many labor leaders are very clear thinkers and upright Americans. I have been proud of the labor leaders of my home city, Long Beach, Calif., for some time, but I have never been more happy to live in the same city with such gentlemen than when I read the editorial from the April 25, 1947, issue of the Labor News, Long Beach, Calif., which I present herewith. The editor of the Labor News is the Honorable Carl Fletcher, long a leader of labor in southern California, and now assemblyman from the seventy-first district in the Assembly of the State of California. His views as expressed in the following editorial are worthy of a permanent place in the archives of this Government:

THE WALLACE AFFAIR

One shudders to think how close Henry Wallace came to being President. For 4 years he was only one step from it. Then, within 12 weeks after he was out of the Vice Presidency, his successor stepped into the White House.

Undoubtedly Mr. Wallace felt keenly disappointed at the turn of fate—and politics—which deprived him of the Nation's highest office. Maybe his increasingly bitter attacks on the administration's foreign policy in the past 6 months have been prompted more by this frustration of his political ambitions than by his apparent fervor for world peace.

Time was when a good many Americans thought he was a misunderstood crusader. But as a crusader—if that's what he is—he had gone completely off the beam. His speeches abroad have made that clear.

No one questions his right as a citizen to oppose the policies of the Government when he is here at home. But when he carries his quarrel into a friendly foreign country and tries to drive a wedge between that country and ours he is indulging in dangerous mischief.

Now, he has chosen another crucial time to assault the program for aid to Greece and Turkey. And now, by that assault and the manner of making it, he has buried himself deeper than ever in the political graveyard.

But the American people don't care about Mr. Wallace's political future. What they do care about is the future of their country. And Mr. Wallace is not making it brighter. The greatest service he could render to the Nation at this time would be to hold his tongue—at least until he can get over his tendency toward rash, irresponsible talk. That might silence him for life.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter including a resolution:

PITTSBURGH CHAPTER HADASSAH,
WOMEN'S ZIONIST ORGANIZATION
OF AMERICA, INC.,
April 22, 1947.

Hon. JOHN McDOWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On Sunday, April 20, the board of the Pittsburgh Chapter of Hadassah, which represents over 3,200 Jewish women in this community, met and passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the British Government's action in submitting the Palestine question to the General Assembly of the United Nations has been revealed as an empty gesture since, by its own admission, the British Government will not be bound to execute recommendations that may be forthcoming from that body; and

"Whereas the British Government has repeatedly violated its obligations as the mandatory of Palestine by repudiating the solemn pledges expressed in the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine mandate with regard to the facilitation of Jewish immigration into Palestine and the continued development of the Jewish National Home; and

"Whereas the British Government has imposed totalitarian measures of repression on the entire Jewish community of Palestine; and

"Whereas the plight of the Jewish survivors in Europe is steadily worsening, making it imperative that they leave that hostile continent at the earliest moment; and

"Whereas, the seizure and mass deportation to Cyprus of so-called illegal Jewish immigrants constitute a brutal campaign against helpless men, women and children, completely inconsistent with the principles of the Atlantic Charter; and

"Whereas such immigrants embark for the Holy Land as of their legal right, since the white paper of 1939, which bars their entry, was repudiated by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations as inconsistent with the Palestine mandate—thus making illegal the policy pursued by the British administration; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States of America, through the passage of resolutions in both Houses of Congress, and through planks in the platforms of both major political parties, is pledged to free Jewish immigration into the Holy Land and the establishment in Palestine of a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we respectfully call upon the Government of the United States to take the initiative during the forthcoming special meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations, in vigorously championing the program for Palestine which it has repeatedly reaffirmed, thereby defeating the British Government's attempt to employ the United Nations session as a maneuver to retain its present Palestine policy; and be it further

"Resolved, That pending a final settlement of this question by the United Nations the great weight of the United States Government should be brought to bear on the mandatory government to the end that an interim policy based upon the existing mandate to set into motion at once providing for immediate large-scale Jewish immigration into Palestine and the removal forthwith of the discriminatory land restrictions in the Jewish National Home."

Very sincerely yours,
SARA JEAN MUNTER,
President.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I wish to insert the following editorial from yesterday's Washington Star relative to the fiasco which occurred in the House in connection with our foreign policy:

WHILE THE PATIENT SINKS

The House could hardly have chosen a more inopportune time than the present to vote a drastic slash in the proposed $350,000,000 fund for relief of war-stricken peoples in Europe and China. Its tentative decision to make a meat-ax cut of $150,000,000 in the relief appropriation, coming so soon after Secretary of State Marshall's urgent radio plea for "unity of action on the part of the American people," is certain to be interpreted abroad as a sign of disunity. It may even be viewed in Moscow as a symptom of the type of exhausted patience which Premier Stalin says may lead to compromises. But, as Secretary Marshall stressed in his address, there can be no compromise with principle.

Countering the House move, fortunately, was the action of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in unanimously approving the $350,000,000 relief appropriation. But the forthright vote of the Senate committee was quickly overshadowed by the short-sighted stand taken by the House.

The stand is short-sighted because it seeks to economize at the expense of one of the keystones of our foreign policy—the rendering of financial and other aid to nations now struggling against the postwar specters of hunger, unemployment and general unrest. Representative JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, stated the case succinctly when he warned his colleagues that millions of people in Europe who hate communism and who were given a ray of hope by Secretary Marshall's message will be disappointed and bewildered if the House makes its action of yesterday final.

Does the House intend to economize similarly when the $400,000,000 Greco-Turkish aid bill comes to the floor? That bill, already approved by the Senate, was shunted aside yesterday by the House Rules Committee to give priority to rent-control legislation. Both funds—the special one earmarked for Greece and Turkey and the relief appropriation for Italy, Trieste, Hungary, Austria, Poland, Greece, and China—are regarded by the State Department as minimum amounts needed to help forestall economic collapse and worse troubles in the areas concerned. In Secretary Marshall's words, disintegrating forces are becoming evident—the patient is sinking while the doctors deliberate. False economy, quibbling and endless debate now could have serious repercussions later not only for the patient but for the doctors.

I also insert an excerpt from this morning's Washington Post:

The House yesterday dealt its first blow to a war-tested bipartisan foreign policy by confirming a $150,000,000 cut in foreign relief funds.

The slash, only tentatively voted the day before, was approved by a near-party-line count of 225 to 165.

* * * * *

It was the first symptom in the House of what one world-minded House Republican described as "a recrudescence to isolationism."

It might be appropriate to also quote from the front page of yesterday's Star:

For the cut—Republicans, 190; and Democrats, 35.

Against the cut—128 Democrats, 36 Republicans, and 1 American Laborite.

Russian Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky from the Washington Times-Herald of May 1, 1947:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The sum total of George Marshall's speech amounts to this: The Russians like the European situation as it is and seek to delay change. They have been able at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam to achieve major advantages which they do not wish to change. Marshall says, at one point: "All efforts to find a compromise solution were unavailing."

The fact is that every compromise would free some people now enslaved. Why should the slaveholder wish to compromise his holdings?

Diplomacy is the art of achieving the minutest results by means of the widest compromises. When a country chooses not to compromise at all, it gives evidence, one, that it is satisfied with the status quo or, two, that it anticipates an inevitable war and prefers not to delay it.

The second alternative is not within the realm of reason. Soviet Russia cannot afford a war today. But Soviet Russia believes that we also cannot afford a war today. The Russian, in such a war, would have no major allies, but the Russian is convinced that our major allies, Great Britain and France, have lost their vitality.

The Russians are physically incapable of making war on a modern basis unaided by a great industrial power.

After all, it was $11,000,000,000 of lend-lease from the United States to Soviet Russia that threw the balance against industrialized Germany.

In a war against the United States today, no nation exists that can assist Russia with an industrial product of dimensions sufficient to matter. That may not be true 10, 15, or 20 years from now. It is true today.

The Russians, therefore, are not uncompromising because they seek to provoke a war immediately. They do not expect a war immediately. They discount its occurrence. They assume that public opinion in this country would not tolerate it.

They feel that the reason that our Government has agreed to their most outrageous demands was because American public opinion favors Soviet Russia and not the Government of the United States.

Gromyko said as much to Bernard Baruch during the atom-bomb debates at the United Nations. Gromyko insisted that Baruch did not have American public opinion behind him.

They are uncompromising because they anticipate a series of disasters in the United States which will so reduce the might of this country as to make the United States a negligible factor in world affairs.

In these assumptions, the Russians have been supported by the Wallace hybrids, who have preached disaster since VJ-day.

It was Henry Wallace who released phony figures through his Department of Commerce that sent this country into its first round of postwar strikes that nearly did produce disaster.

This school of verbiage has been month by month prophesying recessions and depressions with the apparent hope that disaster would come that they might be proved right. Not only the Russians but all Europeans have noted their statements but have not been able to gage how much of American opinion they represent.

In accordance with Marxian economics, no capitalist country should be able to survive in this era. The economic downfall of Great Britain has encouraged the Marxists to assume that their postulate of inevitability will ultimately send the United States tobogganing.

The Russians are, of course, not averse to using whatever means are available to assist the inevitable process.

In the United States they have maintained a legalized fifth column, the Communist Party, and a disguised mass force, the front movements, to achieve their ends. The leadership of this amalgam of wreckers has fallen to Henry Wallace, who, to encompass one world, encourages every force in American life whose goal is the destruction of American life. It is amazing how strong in him is the instinct for national suicide.

And so the Russians expecting this country to suffer 10,000,000 unemployed in short order, to be accompanied by a plague of strikes and riots and disorders, resulting in our productivity falling short and our standard of life down to the European level, saw no need for coming to terms with George Marshall. They prefer to wait until hell pops.

Hoover Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

HOOVER DAM

President Truman has done a fine and gracious thing by signing the bill passed by a Republican Congress to change the name of Boulder Dam back to Hoover Dam.

Herbert Hoover may not go down in history as one of the most successful Presidents. He has, however, plentifully earned the right to be considered a useful, devoted, and great American. His services to his country and the world have been many, and Mr. Truman has been wise enough to make use of them without regard to political considerations.

Cheap politics took Mr. Hoover's name off the great structure on the Colorado River. Almost all Americans, we think, will applaud its restoration. Of course, Harold Ickes won't like it—but there are so many things Mr. Ickes doesn't like that one more won't make much difference.

Polish National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article sent to me by the Polish-American Congress, Inc., of Chicago, Ill., relating to May 3, the Polish national holiday:

MAY 3, THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3, Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May, to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers in liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late, and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May Third Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the State, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then as it has been throughout the years that followed and even onto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795, Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939, Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish Third of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernible throughout the Third of May Polish constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Meditation on the anniversary of May the Third deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though, Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and her territory by one of our victorious allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

Housing and Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that the House Committee on Banking and Currency did not see fit to report out a bill which would be strong enough to control rents in an effective manner. It is obvious that this bill, H. R. 3203, will neither control rents nor aid in checking inflation. It is so full of loopholes through which rents may rise that it makes it mockery and a farce of rent control.

Title I of this bill would repeal the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act in its entirety with the exception of the loan-guaranty provisions, which are a minor part of the protection offered veterans under this law. As has been mentioned before, veterans' organizations unanimously opposed this action before the committee, and I wish to go on record as wholly opposed to this section of the bill. As has been stated, the combination of two unrelated issues in one bill is indefensible, and can only be interpreted as a device to mislead the general public and the veterans.

I wish to go on record as completely opposed to title I of the bill, and to address the remainder of my remarks to some of the jokers in the rent-control section, title II.

This section contains several major weaknesses, each of which will tend to undermine the rent-control structure. The provision in the bill which extends rent controls until December 31, 1947, or until March 31, 1948, in case the President proclaims it so, is most objectionable. It is most unrealistic to assume that the necessity of rent controls will cease by that time, for by no stretch of the imagination will the present housing shortage be alleviated by March 31, 1948. According to the Bureau of the Census, there are some 3,125,000 families in the United States who are living doubled up with other families; in other words, there is today a shortage of over 3,000,000 housing units.

It will be impossible to build enough housing units between now and March 31, 1947, whereby the supply of homes will catch up with demand. The all-time record for house construction was set in 1946 when about 1,000,000 homes were started under the Veterans' Emergency Housing program. Assuming that this rate of construction can be maintained, we will still be short of housing units until sometime during the year of 1950.

To decontrol rents prior to 1950 means rapidly rising rent levels. The strong demand for and weak supply of housing units make this inevitable. The only logical solution of this problem is to extend the original rent-control law without amendment until sometime in 1950.

My second major objection to this bill is found in its provision which would allow a landlord and tenant to enter into a written lease which is to expire on or after December 31, 1948, whereby the rent fixed in the lease may be increased 15 percent above the present maximum rent. This provision is undesirable for several reasons. It will make it possible for landlords to force a tenant to either sign a lease permitting the 15-percent-rent increase or face the possibility of eviction on the least possible excuse. Furthermore, any landlord can refuse to rent to a new tenant unless said tenant agrees to sign a lease with the 15-percent clause in it. Thus we find that this provision provides a loophole which will allow a 15-percent-rent hike for a great many housing units in America.

Such a rent increase cannot be justified at the present time. Most certainly the landlords do not need such an increase. According to a survey conducted by the OPA accounting office, landlords are making more profits today than ever before. For the year ending June 30, 1946, rental income on apartment houses was 28 percent above the 1939 level, and income from smaller structures was 43 percent above 1939 returns. In 1946 upkeep and repair expenditures were only slightly above 1939 levels, and the vacancy loss today is almost nil.

To allow rents to go up by 15 percent will have a serious effect upon the living standards of millions of consumers. It is estimated that a general rent increase of 15 percent will add $750,000,000 to the Nation's rent bill, which means that $750,000,000 must be used to pay the rent instead of for food, clothing, and other necessities. The inflationary rise in the cost of living—the cost of living has increased 50 percent during the last 8 months—has reduced the real wages of most wage earners, and cut into their savings to the extent that there is just not enough money in the average family budget to meet an increase in rent. If such a rent increase takes place, the tenant must absorb this increase by reducing his standard of living.

A rent increase will make inroads in the purchasing power of the 50,000,000 people who live in rented structures. It is an economic truth that business prosperity depends upon the maintenance of adequate purchasing power in the hands of the consumers. To permit a portion of existing purchasing power to be dissipated by a rent hike is bound to increase the danger of business depression.

Furthermore, to allow rents to go up means that the veteran and his family will not get a square deal. It is agreed that the average veteran cannot afford to pay more than $40 per month in rent; a rent hike will mean that decent housing will be placed out of reach of the average veteran's pocketbook.

I have several other objections to the bill. I do not believe that newly constructed and converted housing units should be exempted from rent control. Neither do I believe that the relaxation of eviction control can be justified; this is bound to bring on many abuses on the part of landlords and impose great hardships upon many people.

I want to go on record right now as favoring the extension of the rent-control law which was in effect during the entire war. The only way to control rents is to pass a law which is airtight and give the enforcing agency the authority and the funds to administer it. I am in favor of amending this bill in such way as to strengthen it and plug its many loopholes. Unless these amendments are accepted, the bill should be sent back to the committee for further study, and strengthening.

I also want to go on record as protesting the irresponsible action of the House Committee on Banking and Currency in reporting out this watered-down rent-control bill which they know full well will not really hold the line on rents. The 50,000,000 people in America who are living in rented homes are depending upon rent controls to protect their pocketbooks and living standards, and they deserve better treatment than this bill affords.

Housing and Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following minority views submitted by me to accompany H. R. 3203, the housing and rent-control bill:

HOUSING AND RENT CONTROLS
MINORITY VIEWS OF MR. SMITH OF OHIO
(To accompany H. R. 3203)

It should be recalled that it was an aroused public that forced the administration last year to generally decontrol prices of commodities. The history of the legislation relating to the OPA in 1946 shows that the President was violently opposed to abandoning any control over prices and precisely on the alleged ground that the removal of rent control is now being opposed—namely, short supply. As a matter of simple fairness and justice rents should have been decontrolled along with other commodities.

Let no one delude himself in believing that the discrimination involved in retaining rent control can possibly have any enduring value for renters. Group discrimination such as this must inevitably have the effect of hurting all, including renters. I earnestly believe that the citizens of the Nation wanted Congress to terminate rent control and not extend it as this measure provides. The vast majority of renters expected this. They are fair about the matter and do not wish any special favors. They know that in general other costs have greatly risen while rents have remained practically stationary.

One can prove or disprove almost anything by statistics. There is a saying that "As the statist thinks, so the bell clinks." All sorts of figures have been brought forward to prove, on the one hand, that there is a shortage of housing and that if rent controls were removed rents would unduly rise. On the other hand, a great deal of data has been presented to disprove this.

I shall refrain from quoting figures and statistics and state that after having gone into this matter as thoroughly as I could, I became convinced that there is no ground for the claim that anything like a substantial shortage of housing will exist in the United States if rent controls are completely removed. In saying this I am taking into consideration the dwellings that are being held out of the rental market, and the living quarters that would be made available for rental purposes in homes that have not heretofore been rented. I am also taking into consideration the fact that since 1940 there has been a great increase in the number of occupied rooms per family. An enormous number of additional dwelling units would be made available for rental purposes from these categories if rent controls were abolished.

I take the position that the rent-control law should be permitted to expire June 30 so as to end all political controls over rents on that date.

The pending bill provides for continuing rent control until December 31, 1947, but authorizes the President to extend the control until March 31, 1948, if he believes that to be necessary. Why should the present Congress vest in this administration such legislative power? If the incumbent Congress is willing to freely and voluntarily delegate this power to the Executive, what good reason can be given for not further relying upon his judgment as to the need of rent control beyond March 31 1948?

I did not find in the testimony given before the committee evidence indicating anything other than that the forces responsible for the present proposed extension will be back with the same arguments for continuance of rent controls beyond March 1948. The grave danger in all these extensions of wartime controls is that succeeding extensions cause such controls to further entrench themselves and make their removal more difficult.

The bill also provides that landlords and tenants may by voluntary agreement enter into a lease increasing rents not to exceed 15 percent above the OPA ceiling prices, such lease to be effective until December 1948. One can do no more than speculate on the implications of this provision. Certain it is, however, that it sets up a special category of renters and landlords.

An extraordinary provision in the bill provides for Treasury financing of manufacturers of prefabricated houses and FHA loans on the finished product. This, of course, is tantamount to a Government-guaranteed market for prefabricated houses. Does the sitting Congress propose to put the Government further in business? Proponents of this particular provision claim it would have the effect of revolutionizing housing. I understand that the houses that would be built under this provision would not be of the conventional type. Well there is nothing particularly wrong about revolutionizing housing construction by whatsoever process so long as it is done in the natural, competitive way;

that is, with private money and not with funds wrung from the public, especially an exsanguinated one. Why should this particular Congress lend itself to promoting a scheme like this? What constitutional or moral right does the Congress have to destroy industries engaged in the construction of conventional type houses?

The bill further provides for the removal of ceiling prices on new homes and also on residences which have not been occupied between February 1, 1945, and January 31, 1947. Price ceilings are to remain on old homes. Surely this is rank discrimination. It is class legislation. The claim which some make that it is only temporary in nowise mitigates the unfairness involved in this arrangement.

The bill provides for the creation of an emergency and predicates the need for the extension of rent control on such arbitrarily constituted emergency. It has been explained that this has been done to make the act constitutional. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, warned future generations to beware of schemes to destroy the Constitution by usurpation. Surely, here is an instance where we might well heed his advice. I am of the opinion that if the mentality of Congress has become so distorted as to cause it to resort to the tactic of overriding the Constitution by the simple device of declaring an emergency, then we have just about reached the end of all constitutional government.

There are a few good provisions in the bill. Title I would remove practically all remaining controls over materials that go into the construction of housing, but these provisions should have been presented to the Congress by themselves and not made a part of the other provisions of this bill.

Full production of housing cannot be expected until rent and all other controls relating thereto are completely abolished. So long as there remains any shadow of such controls hanging over the heads of manufacturers and suppliers of home building materials there will be hesitation and doubt in their minds as to what the future may have in store for them.

FREDERICK C. SMITH.

Waging World Peace: America's New Role—Address by Walter Lippmann at the Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the need of these times is clear thinking based upon accurate information and good historical perspective. A writer who seems to me to be doing some of the best thinking, these days, on America's new role in the world is Walter Lippmann. Under permission heretofore granted, I offer for the RECORD, Mr. Lippmann's address delivered to the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, meeting in Washington, April 29, 1947:

Mr. LIPPMANN. I am sure you would have me come directly to the crux of the matter—that is to say, to our relations with the Soviet Union.

We can best see where we are today by recalling how the situation has developed since the Allies were able to plan for a complete victory over Germany, Japan, and the satellites. That was in the autumn of 1943, when the Big Three met at Teheran. Then, for the first time, they were able to think not about how to hold on in the British Isles, at Stalingrad, at Alamein, and in New Guinea and to avoid being defeated, but how the war was to be won, and what the postwar world was to be.

Before that the differences which were to divide the Allies were submerged by their common danger and the sheer struggle to survive. But from then on, with ultimate victory in sight, it was clear that there could be no peace until and unless there was a settlement among the victorious Allies. The Allies had to make peace with each other before they could make peace with their enemies.

In the work of attempting to make a settlement among the Big Three, we may say that there have been two periods, and that we are now at the beginning of a third. For the sake of clarity and brevity I shall call them the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin period, the Byrnes-Bevin-Molotov period, and the Marshall period.

THE BIG THREE LINES

Reduced to its permanent elements, stripped of all secondary matters, the net result of the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin period was an agreement on the military boundary line where the British-American and the Russian forces were to meet as the fighting ended, and were then to stand still and to advance no farther.

That military boundary ran through Europe from Stettin on the Baltic Sea to the suburbs of Trieste on the Adriatic, then along the northern frontier of Greece, north of Turkey in the Black Sea, along the northern boundary of Iran for the Russians and along the southern boundary of Iran for the British.

In the Far East it ran through Korea at the eightieth parallel.

In China the line was not clear because, though theoretically under the agreement the national government of Chiang Kai-shek was supposed to recover the whole of China, including Manchuria, in fact Chiang Kai-shek was unable to do that. For China was divided by a civil war, one side deriving support from the Russians and the other from the United States. Nevertheless, though there was no agreed boundary line within China, as there was in Europe, between the Soviets and ourselves, there was and is a de facto boundary along the line which separates Red China from Nationalist China. For neither side in China has been strong enough to win the civil war.

The military frontier established during the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin period has endured. It still stands virtually unchanged since it was agreed to with Stalin during the war. It has endured not because it satisfies any of the Big Three but because it registers the actual line where their armed forces met at the end of the war. None of them could cross that line without opening up a battle. None of them has crossed it with military forces. This line, which registered the military situation, became also the political frontier between the Soviet orbit or sphere of influence, and that of the western nations.

The Byrnes-Bevin-Molotov period, which began with the London Conference of September 1945, lasted until the beginning of this winter. During this period each side worked to consolidate its own sphere of influence, and at the same time to push forward into the other sphere of influence.

ATTEMPTS TO CROSS LINE

The Russians tried to cross the line by fomenting a revolution in the Iranian province of Azerbaijan, by pressure on Turkey, by infiltration into Greece, by supporting Tito's effort to obtain Trieste, by laying claim to an Italian colony in Africa, by supplying the Chinese Communists with the Japanese weapons captured in Manchuria. Yet all these attempts to advance beyond the old Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin line were repulsed.

We, too, have tried to cross the line, and to advance our influence into the Russian orbit. With the British we waged a diplomatic campaign for free elections in Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and other satellites, and gave our moral support to non-Communist and anti-Communist parties which, if they came into power, would no longer take their orders from Moscow.

This campaign was unsuccessful, and in the long tedious negotiations by Messrs. Byrnes, Bevin, and Molotov over the satellite countries ended in treaties which register the stalemate at the old military line.

One side or the other, or both, tried to change the boundaries of the spheres of influence by infiltration, by propaganda, by economic pressure, by political intervention and by diplomatic negotiation. But the striking thing about the Byrnes-Bevin-Molotov period has been that all our attempts and all the Russian attempts to change the boundaries of the two great spheres of influence have failed.

In China the result has been the same. The dividing line between Red China and Nationalist China stands approximately where it was at the end of the war. It has not been possible to unify China by a Nationalist victory with our support, or by a Red victory with Russian support, or by the agreement which General Marshall tried to bring about.

The status quo is essentially unchanged, and the upshot of General Marshall's mission to China was a decision to accept this fact, and to limit our intervention in China for the present to supporting Chiang Kai-shek enough to maintain the status quo, but not enough to enable him to win the civil war.

Thus far the Soviet Union has limited its intervention to supporting Red China enough to hold what it has, but not enough to overrun the rest of China.

This decision, which marks what I have called the beginning of the Marshall period, was to limit our intervention to the status quo. It was taken just before General Marshall became Secretary of State.

BRITAIN'S WITHDRAWAL

The China decision was followed by an event which had been foreseen for some time, and could not be postponed much longer. This was the decision of the British Government that they no longer had the military and economic resources to hold all their sectors on the old Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin boundary line.

The reasons which have compelled the British to retire from the front line of the Middle East are, of course, well known to you, and I shall not discuss them at length. They are in brief that the Empire, of which India was the great central asset, is liquidating itself, and that the United Kingdom is so gravely weakened by the two wars of this century that it no longer has the manpower, the military strength, the productive capacity, and the financial resources to hold and to use all the strategic positions of the old empire.

Among these strategic positions none was more important than the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East. Greece and, above all, Turkey are like a door which can swing open both ways. Through that door Russia can come down to the great oil regions of

the Middle East and also into the Mediterranean, and can act against the soft underbelly of Europe. But through this same Turkish door, if it is swung open the other way, it is possible for a great sea and air power to pass up into the Black Sea, and to act against the soft underbelly of Russia.

For these reasons the decision of the British Government that they could no longer hold the Turkish door was an event of transcendent importance. It was the greatest event of the postwar era. For it meant that unless the United States intervened to replace the British, the old Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin boundary line, which at least fixed the limits of Soviet expansion, would no longer hold.

That, of course, is why President Truman went to Congress last March to ask not only for money, but in fact for authorization to have the United States replace Britain and confront directly the Soviet Union in the Middle East.

Though the situation compelled the President to act, though American intervention in the Middle East became unavoidable once the British were compelled to retire, there is no disguising the difficulties, the costs, and the risks of our position today.

WHERE WE NOW STAND

In the first place, though we are not without friends and moral supporters, we now stand virtually alone as respects military power and money confronting the Soviet Union in Asia and in Europe. The weakness which has compelled Britain to withdraw in the Middle East will almost certainly compel her to turn over to us her main responsibilities and commitments in Germany as well. Thus our burdens are immensely extended while the risks of conflict have been sharpened because everywhere the issue is a direct one between Russia and ourselves.

In the second place, as the issue is sharpened there is of course no peace in the world and no recovery and reconstruction, but only a steady economic deterioration which, if it continues, if it is not arrested, and reversed, must inexorably lead, and at no distant date, to the economic collapse of western Europe, including Britain, France, Italy, and western Germany. Moreover, within all the countries of Europe and elsewhere the great struggle between Russia and America—combined with economic misery and hopelessness—has become an internal domestic struggle.

The result will be, can only be, that the more we drift toward the supreme crisis of our relations with the Soviet Union and to the possibility of war, the greater becomes the probability that the countries which we should have to count upon as allies would be incapable because they were divided, and unwilling because they cannot face another war, to help us.

In the third place, as things are developing now, both Moscow and Washington are in the gravest danger of losing control over the choice between war and peace, of losing their power to decide whether they will settle by negotiation or will fight to the bitter end. We are both playing the most dangerous game in the world, which is to deal with one another through satellites and puppets and weak clients. We are dealing through agents, and it is never certain that an agent will follow instructions, that he will not through stupidity or some sinister reason act on his own, and force your hand, and then leave you in a position where you have to back him up.

WHERE DANGER LIES

There, I believe, lies the greatest danger of war. There are desperadoes, gangsters, conspirators in both camps; there are hotheads who are trigger happy, there are fanatics, and there are speculators who have lost power and position and hope to recoup in a war.

The balance of power which was fairly stable in the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin period has now become extremely and dangerously unstable.

The United States stands virtually alone, holding in check the military power of the Soviet Union without effective allies and obligated also to maintain the economic life of western Europe and of a considerable part of the world. There is still a balance. But we can no longer count on it. For we cannot hold defensively such an immense part of the world against the slow pressure and infiltration of the Soviet Union.

If the present position continues much longer, we shall be at the mercy of incidents which could lead to war. The fact that the attempt to hold the line is so exhausting, so expensive, and so dangerous, will increase to a dangerous degree the tension in this country and in the world. This will bring with it the idea of a crusade and of preventive war to end the anxiety and uneasiness.

The position may be compared to the situation during a war when neither side is willing to state the terms on which it is ready to settle, and when, therefore, the prevailing view is that the war must be fought to the bitter end and must terminate in unconditional surrender. We must not let things drift that far. In my view the world cannot stand another war now, and if war comes, it will be a kind of war which will spread everywhere and be not an international war that could end in a peace treaty, but a general civil war which would end in universal anarchy.

Our national interest requires that in resisting the expansion of Russia and even in attempting to reduce the expansion that has already occurred, we should not drift into the position where we and the Russians believe that the conflict can end only with the unconditional surrender of one or the other.

In our dealings with Russia we must take our stand firmly. But we must take it clearly for a negotiated settlement and for a modus vivendi.

We must refuse to appease the Russians and to surrender Europe and Asia to them. But we must refuse also to enlarge and embitter the conflict by asking of them unconditional surrender.

We must, in other words, proceed at once to state the terms on which we believe a settlement should be made, the terms for which we are maintaining and deploying our military forces, the terms on which we are prepared to make our economic contribution to the reconstruction of the world.

LET US STATE TERMS FOR PEACE

These terms, I believe, should be the following:

1. We should say to the Soviet Union that in the Far East we propose that the status quo be maintained in China; that neither Red China nor Nationalist China shall be supported by either of us to the point where it can conquer the other.

2. In the Middle East we should state that our special guaranties of assistance and support to Turkey and Greece are for the object of achieving a treaty which concludes the disputes over the Dardanelles, the boundaries of Turkey and the boundaries of Greece. We should say that in the terms of that treaty we are prepared to acknowledge the special interest of the Soviet Union in the security of the Dardanelles, and in the freedom of passage in time of peace, and of military operations sanctioned by the United Nations. In denying her right to physical possession of the Straits, we should be prepared to consider any proposal which involves international civilian control and guaranties.

3. In Europe we should demand—without compromise—agreement on the political decentralization of Germany and we should be prepared if necessary to federate the three western zones of Germany even if the Soviet Union refuses to permit the Germans of its zone to enter such a German federation. But the constitution of the new Germany which we set up in the western zones should be clearly designed to admit the German states in the Russian zone on equal terms whenever the Russians are ready to permit it.

4. We should also say to the Russians that as far as continental Europe up to their frontiers is concerned, we propose that they, the British and ourselves evacuate all of Europe—leaving only token forces in Germany. We should then ask them to join us in sponsoring the formation of a European economic union. We should ask them to permit the countries of their orbit to enter this economic union, and to instruct the Communist Parties in the rest of Europe not to oppose the formation of such a union.

5. We should say, then, that when such a union is formed, we shall be prepared on terms equivalent to lend-lease to provide it with the working capital required to start the economic life of Europe on a productive basis. We should then say that on the basis of such a general world agreement, we are prepared to consider assistance to Russia in her reconstruction—in the form both of current reparations from Germany, which would then be able to work productively, and also of credits from the United States.

My thesis, in short, is that we must resist the expansion of the Soviet Empire, that we must press for the withdrawal of the Red army within its own borders, but that we must accompany this pressure—which is dangerous, expensive, and difficult—with clear and realizable terms of peace.

The statement of these terms of peace will not please the Russians. Nevertheless, the knowledge of what concretely we want, and that we want no more than that, will make their own resistance weaker. They will know the price on which they can have a peaceable settlement.

The statement of these terms of peace, which are reasonable and constructive, will assure the support to our side of the great masses of the people of continental Europe and of the British Isles. This is vitally important. For these masses will not support us in an unlimited crusade against the Soviet Union. They will, on the contrary, turn increasingly toward neutrality and toward distrust of our motives, and to resistance to our intervention in Europe and the world.

The statement of our terms, moreover, will unify the American people in support of our foreign policy. This support exists, but it is on the surface. It is not so deep and so well founded as it needs to be, if our people are to remain united and strong in the difficult and dangerous days to come.

Portal to Portal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make the following statement:

It is my intention to vote for the adoption of the conference report.

As many of the Members of the House know, I was concerned, when this bill was originally considered, about its effect upon the rights of employees where conflicts existed in interpretations of the Fair Labor Standards Act by govern-

mental agencies. I am now convinced that under the "good faith" provision of the bill as it has come from conference, that it would not adversely affect the rights of the workers in the cases which were brought to my attention.

I have followed the progress of this bill through its original passage and through conference. I believe that the "good faith" defense will not be available where an employer had notice of probable invalidity of a ruling and that this defense will not apply where an employer has not relied upon a ruling and has not been injured by such reliance.

This defense, as I understand it, is intended to be available only where the employer innocently and to his detriment in good faith followed rulings or interpretations given to him by governmental agencies without notice that such interpretations were in conflict with rulings of the Wage and Hour Administrator or were claimed to be erroneous.

It is not intended that this defense shall apply where an employer had knowledge of conflicting rules and chose to act in accordance with the one most favorable to him. Certainly it is clear that an employer cannot claim reliance in good faith when legal actions contesting the regulation, interpretation, or practice were threatened or pending when the act or omission in question took place.

Chicago City Council Urges Passage of Taft-Wagner-Ellender General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks, I include a resolution of the City Council of Chicago urging prompt enactment of the General Housing Act introduced in the Senate under joint sponsorship of Senators TAFT, ELLENDER, and WAGNER, and in the House by Representative JAVITS.

Mr. Speaker, my city of Chicago is the second largest in the United States and one of the largest cities in the world. Under the impact of World War II our population has expanded beyond all comprehension. Under the wise Democratic administration of the last 15 years the city's finances have been brought to a sound basis; we have a clean, honest, efficient city government.

But we do have a critical housing problem, which neither private enterprise nor the city of Chicago with all the willingness in the world, have been able to solve.

The bill now before the Congress, which was filibustered to death last year by the Republican minority of the Committee on Banking and Currency, can and will aid in the solution of that problem.

It is nonsense and political quackery to pretend that this bill is socialistic or will hurt free enterprise.

Actually, this bill, if enacted, and it should be enacted, merely helps free enterprise to be free and to effectively attack the baffling problem of providing low-cost housing, which is low-profit housing, to people of relatively low incomes.

This bill is to help people help themselves.

The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO ENDORSING WAGNER-ELLENDER-TAFT GENERAL HOUSING BILL AND URGING PROMPT ENACTMENT BY THE CONGRESS

Whereas the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, recently reintroduced in the Congress, provides for a unified national housing agency and a coordinated national attack on the housing problem through adequate research, active local planning, a liberal home-loan plan, the construction of homes for low-, medium-, and high-income families and authorizes assistance to localities for public and private slum clearance and housing projects; and

Whereas the city council heretofore on November 19, 1945, endorsed the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, when said bill was pending before the last Congress; and

Whereas said Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill has recently been reintroduced and is pending before the present Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Chicago hereby endorses and supports the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill and urges its prompt enactment by the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be directed to all Members of the Congress from Chicago and to the Senators from Illinois, and to any other persons who may be helpful in effectuating its execution.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held Friday, the 25th day of April A. D. 1947.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 29th day of April A. D. 1947.

LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

Presentation of Award to Senator Wagner by Sheil School of Social Studies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on April 17 in the city of Chicago I was very highly honored by having conferred upon me by the Right Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of that great metropolis, the Pope Leo XIII award. This high award is conferred annually for "outstanding contribution to Christian social education."

I think it is significant at this time, when the act which bears my name is the subject of so much criticism and abuse, that Bishop Sheil in asking me to accept the award referred to the Wagner Labor Relations Act as an example of what he characterized as an "inestimable service to this Nation and the world."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD following these remarks the citation accompanying the presentation of the award and my speech accepting it.

There being no objection, the citation and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION ACCOMPANYING THE PRESENTATION OF THE LEO XIII AWARD OF SHEIL SCHOOL OF SOCIAL STUDIES TO SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER

(Read by John Yancey, secretary-treasurer, United Transport Service Employees of America (CIO))

"Worthy of all praise are those who, understanding what the times require, have, by various enterprises and experiments, endeavored to better the conditions of the working people without any sacrifice of principle. They have taken up the cause of the workingman, and have striven to make both families and individuals better off; to infuse the spirit of justice into the mutual relations of employers and employed; to keep before the eyes of both classes the precepts of duty and the laws of the Gospel."

With these words of the great pontiff for whom its Leo XIII award is named, Sheil School of Social Studies is proud to salute the fourth winner of this award, the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, United States Senator from New York State. It is eminently fitting that this award, given annually for outstanding contribution to Christian social education, should be presented to the distinguished Senator whose long career of service and sacrifice has been dedicated to the principles enunciated in the social encyclicals of Leo XIII and his successors to the throne of Peter.

Although far eclipsed by his subsequent service in the United States Senate, it is in his investigation of the abuses leading to the infamous Triangle Fire in 1911 that perhaps the best crystallization of the brilliant life of Senator WAGNER is to be found. When largely due to his efforts, a code of labor laws protecting the lives and rights of working people in New York was passed, the principle that a people's government must act to remedy the shortcomings of individual initiative whenever the common good was in jeopardy, received new vindication. "Whenever the general interest of any particular class suffers, or is threatened with, evils which can in no other way be met, the public authority must step in to meet them," Leo XIII had written in 1890.

In the United States Senate, Senator WAGNER has become the foremost authority in the field of industrial relations and his Labor Relations Act, which became a law in 1935, is today such an epic milestone in the struggle of workingmen to organize into labor unions for their mutual benefit that it has become known as the magna carta of labor. In conferring the Leo XIII award upon Senator WAGNER, we of Sheil School of Social Studies are fully cognizant of the concerted campaign being conducted today to emasculate this great law which has stood as a bulwark in the defense of those precious rights which have been so deeply the concern of the sovereign pontiffs.

Senator WAGNER participated actively in the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In 1933 he sponsored the National Industrial Recovery Act, and was a cosponsor of the laws setting up the Civilian Conservation Corps. In the past decade, Senator WAGNER has been the sponsor and champion of the Social Security Act, under which 66,000,000 men and women receive the protection of old-age and survivors insurance.

Senator WAGNER'S efforts to assure adequate housing for the American people are well known. He sponsored the United States Housing Act of 1937, which initiated a long-term slum clearance and low-rent housing program, and the National Housing Act of 1938 which greatly enlarged the powers of the Federal Housing Administration. He was one of the chief sponsors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which afforded protection to millions of distressed home owners.

For many years, Senator WAGNER has been fighting actively for legislation to protect the rights of minority groups, including a Federal antilynching bill, the abolition of the poll tax, and the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee.

For his dedication to the cause of working people and for his selfless devotion to the task of reconstructing the social order in the interest of the common good, Shell School of Social Studies is honored to present its fourth Leo XIII award to Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER.

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER, DELIVERED AT CHICAGO, ILL., ON APRIL 17, 1947, IN ACCEPTANCE OF THE POPE LEO XIII AWARD OF THE CATHOLIC YOUTH ORGANIZATION

My friends, the very title of the Pope Leo XIII award endows it with a grandeur which is more than temporal; with a sanctity that is timeless. It is, therefore, with a sense of deep humility that I accept it. I am moved to the very depth of my being with gratitude for your generous judgment. I recognize this tribute as not so much a mark of honor for my small efforts in the field of social legislation in the past, as a souvenir of my responsibility for the work that remains to be done. Indeed, we have only begun our labor to improve the condition of life of those who toil, to mitigate the effects upon them of economic instability, and to remove the causes of civil conflict.

We are midway along the twentieth century. The retrospect of the past decades of this century gives cause for deep concern. Two wars of world-wide magnitude have brought death and suffering to untold millions and devastation to many lands. Today countless humans are grubbing amid rubble for the barest essentials of life. Revolution has followed war, tearing apart the social fabric of many nations. Great powers have died and are dying, leaving disaster and despair as their legacies.

Military warfare has ended but pacific conditions do not prevail. Each day brings its new alarms and each night its terrors. Science has conquered nature and discovered a potent new force that can be used to lift the level of human life to soaring new heights or to debase it below that of animal existence, if not to destroy mankind entirely. Humanity trembles at the future.

The basic reason for the prevailing black mood of cynicism and despair is not hard to find. The divine message of the Prince of Peace is being drowned out by the clamor of contending materialistic forces. Causes that have but a moral appeal to the conscience of mankind are being sacrificed on the altars of greed and power. The progress of physical science has been accompanied by a decay of the ethical standards of men and nations, by a decline in basic human decency. Man has mastered nature, but he has not yet mastered himself. He is indeed at war with his God and his own immortal spirit. On the threshold of a new age, humanity is faced with a burning question: Whether it can or will undergo the fundamental moral regeneration without which all of its labors will not avail.

In this hour of crisis we turn for guidance to God and to His eternal principles of human conduct which the Catholic Church has ever propagated and asserted. In our soul-searching we examine our past conduct to find in it some measure of hope that we do possess the capacity to respond to moral considerations.

Those who have labored to achieve a measure of social justice in our national economy can find just cause for hope. In the past years far-reaching legislation has been enacted to ameliorate the conditions of life of the wage earners of the Nation and to secure to them the benefits to which they, as dignified members of the community, are justly entitled.

His Holiness Pope Leo XIII, whose memory we revere tonight, enjoined the state to protect the poor and helpless. In his great encyclical on the Condition of Labor, he said:

"Still, when there is a question of protecting the rights of individuals, the poor and helpless have a claim to special consideration. The richer population have many ways of protecting themselves and stand less in need of help from the state; those who are badly off have no resources of their own to fall back upon and must chiefly rely upon the assistance of the state. And it is for this reason that wage earners, who are undoubtedly among the weak and necessitous, should be specially cared for and protected by the commonwealth."

This prudent and holy Pontiff, with a vision far beyond his own times, recognized the natural right of workingmen to organize for themselves associations devoted to the betterment of the conditions of labor. He indicated the need for the regulation of the hours of employment that men might not be ground down with excessive toil. The necessity for the elimination of child labor occupied his attention. He recognized that the worker required aid in time of misfortune, in case of accident, sickness, and old age.

Leo XIII was a champion of what has come to be known as the living wage. In his own incomparable language, he said:

"Let it be granted then that as a rule workman and employer should make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If, through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or contractor will give him no better he is the victim of force and injustice."

Leo XIII did not advocate the abolition of the right to strike, the right to cease from labor when other measures to correct inequity had failed. His was the larger view: That wise legislation be framed to remove the causes of conflict between employer and employee so that the need for strikes would not arise.

Many of the social objectives envisaged by Leo XIII have been achieved. In this we may take satisfaction. Founded as those objectives are on fundamental principles of Christian morality, their achievement is proof that we are still susceptible to moral suasion.

But in this field, as in so many others, we are still being put to the test. There is no warrant for smug contentment.

Millions of our citizens who stand in need of the benefits of social security have yet to have them granted. The worker has not yet been adequately protected against the effects of cyclical depressions that have in the past proved so devastating to him. Measures to mitigate the disastrous consequences to the individual of sudden misfortune necessitating medical care are only in the early stages of legislative debate. In a land rich in resources and at a time of unparalleled prosperity, it is unpardonable that decent housing is still unavailable to large numbers of our people. Racial and religious intolerance, coupled with economic and political discrimination continue to defy the spirit of the true faith. These are but a few of the problems calling for action.

At the same time we see many of our social gains threatened. Selfish forces have seized upon this time of confusion to increase their power and wealth at the expense of the laborer. Under the guise of correcting inequities in existing law, they strike at the very heart of the protections against social and economic injustice that have been so laboriously created over the years. Though they plead that they wield the scalpel, they in fact are swinging the sledgehammer. Decapitation is not an approved remedy for a headache. The physician does not resort to it.

If we permit ourselves to be deluded by the false prophets who foresee ruin unless our free workers are once again shackled and bound in economic thralldom, then the small flower of hope growing in the vineyard of social justice will wither and die. Rather should we turn for inspiration to the lofty ideals of Leo XIII and predicate our position on that human dignity which, as that great Pontiff pointed out, "God Himself treats with reverence."

With inspired insight he perceived that liberty and social justice were both corollaries derived from the same fundamental truth; that we strive for one and suppress the other led only to confusion. In this twentieth century, some have pretended to split this unity. They thought they could achieve social justice by sacrificing human liberty. What a ghastly failure they have produced. If only they would learn at the feet of Pope Leo XIII they would realize the futility of their effort.

Then would they discover that social justice is derived from the brotherhood of man in the Fatherhood of God.

They would come to realize that where liberty is banished, social justice cannot abide, for the absence of liberty is tyranny and tyranny is the negation of justice. No, my friends, we cannot choose between them; human liberty and social justice are one and inseparable. They are the twin faces of the same true coin.

For ages we prayed to be relieved of want; and Providence has endowed us with capacity to produce in overflowing abundance. Why then is poverty still the lot of the average man and starvation the portion of many?

We prayed to be relieved of drudgery; and a kindly Father has provided the power and the tools. He lifted the yoke from mankind's neck; but we promptly saddled it with the fear of unemployment. Pride in our industry waxed ever greater; our esteem for man waned. The worker became a lowly and replaceable creature whose desolate fate was to serve the glorified machine.

Is it any wonder that the God-given dignity of man is now in a ferment of rebellion? At every meridian round the globe the laborer is spurning this mechanical idolatry. He reminds us that he and not the machine was created in the image of the Divine.

We have no cause to fear this renascence of the human spirit unless we repress it. Our task, as I read the great Encyclicals, is to lift the banner of social justice and human liberty. Round it let us rally—all those who would build a kingdom of man fit for candidates for the Kingdom of God.

People Want Liberties Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Inglewood (Calif.) Daily News of April 14, 1947:

WE, THE PEOPLE, WANT OUR LIBERTIES RESTORED

To the Eightieth Congress:

Gentlemen of the Congress, the vote which elected you last November was an explicit protest against interference with the lives, liberties, and affairs of the American people.

That vote was the insistent—not-to-be-disregarded—call for you, the supreme law-making body of this Nation, to curb usurped powers of irresponsible and lawless men which, unrestrained, will destroy us.

These recurring obstructions to our getting the necessaries of life—industry-wide strikes in communications and transportation, coal and other fuels, power and light, and other basic sources of supplies, including food—are abuses and excesses not longer to be borne.

Why should Americans constantly be made to fear that our cities, factories, farms, and homes will be plunged into darkness?

Why must we be continually in dread of shortages and famines in a land of plenty?

The Congress knows as well as we do that most of the socio-economic ills now afflicting us spring from three groups who jeer at constituted authority.

These public enemies are:

1. The politico-economic de facto dictatorship of irresponsible and insolent labor union bosses who, too long, have been exempt from laws to which the rest of us must conform.

2. The vast nonelective, self-perpetuating bureaucracy of the essence of totalitarianism—carpetbaggers—impudently domineering over us, mocking the dignity and constitutional prerogatives of the Congress.

3. The Communists, taking orders from the Kremlin, with avowed purpose to overthrow by violence the United States Government, and conquer America as another vassal province of the Soviet Union.

Standing on the solid ground of the Bill of Rights—"to petition the Government for a redress of grievances"—we, the people, make known to the Eightieth Congress our wants.

We want you to return to us our historic Government of organic law—so that we may regain our vanishing liberties.

We want all the people—the working people, the business and professional people, the farmers and the housewives, our children and our children's children—to have all the safeguards and freedoms promised by our Constitution.

I

We petition you to enact legislation that will—

Outlaw closed shop, in all its variations of honeyed aliases. Closed shop is the spawning bed of unionized rackets and thuggery, extortion, and bribery. Without closed shop, unioneering exploiters of the workingman could not set up and maintain job monopolies denying the right to work to citizens who refuse to pay tribute. No American should have to split his pay check with anyone to "buy" his constitutional right to hold a job. Slavery was supposed to have been abolished 84 years ago.

Outlaw hot cargo, secondary boycott, and secondary picketing as criminal conspiracies; declaring it a felony to hinder or prevent by any form of coercion and force deliveries of materials, supplies, merchandise, or services to any person or establishment conducting lawful business.

Outlaw jurisdictional, organizational, and sympathetic strikes; willful slow-downs of production; industry-wide collective bargaining, out of which come those vicious "master contracts" that put Nation-wide essential industries wholly in the power of one man—example: Coal and John L. Lewis.

Forbid Government employees, anywhere, in any classification, to go on strike.

Repeal that portion of the Clayton Act giving preferential position to labor unions over other associated citizens by permitting unionized monopolies in restraint of trade; amend the Sherman antitrust law to apply to unions as well as to business; repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act exempting unions from court injunctions.

Revamp the Wagner Act (in lieu of repeal) so as to equalize responsibility and rights of labor and management; hold unions legally and financially responsible for contracts; make reality instead of farce of employees' rights to bargain "through representatives of their own choosing."

And so protect us from predatory labor unionism and its agents that every person may go about his or her lawful pursuits without molestation—free of fear of intimidation, coercion, force, or reprisals.

II

We want to get the cloven hoof of bureaucracy off our neck.

We want you to slash appropriations on which useless bureaucrats suckle. Stop all wastes in Government. Balance the budget. Make progressive reduction in Federal debt. Cut oppressive taxation to the bone. It is a stupid or corrupt government that destroys the value of the people's money. Stop deficit financing and get back to the ways of common honesty.

Take the Government out of business in subsidized tax-exempt competition with its own taxpaying citizens.

Encourage and protect the free-enterprise system, which built this country from 13 weak colonies into the greatest nation of all time, and which still is the only mechanism that can produce more men with courage and vision who can create pay checks, more pay checks, bigger pay checks.

III

We want communism stamped out in America.

We want all alien Reds deported. We want all Communists, fellow travelers, and other subversives weeded out of Government positions, both high and low. We want Communists barred from running for or holding any public office of any kind, infiltrating into labor-union officialdom, spreading their poisonous propaganda in our schools and through the medium of moving pictures.

We also want this Eightieth Congress to abolish the despotism of big government, big unionism, big business. Again make every person equal before the law, in fact as well as theory. Keep the doors of free opportunity open to every boy and girl, whether born in hovel or mansion.

That is part of our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

That is America.

Gentlemen of the Congress, quit mumbling and bumbling. Get down to brass tacks; matters of immediate practical importance. Bluntly—less meaningless talk, more meaningful action.

The American people—and, for that matter, all the world—know that our country is in jeopardy, partly as a result of your vacillation and inertia.

Wake up, and get to work.

The hour is late; later, maybe, than you think. If "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth," the Congress must reassert and fully exercise its constitutional duties and responsibilities.

Gentlemen of the Congress: You are the trustees of American liberty, the guardians of American prosperity. As you face these responsibilities, act upon what you know to be right, not upon political expediency. Ever bear in mind that the United States is the last great citadel of a free people anywhere on the globe.

Legislate for America.

Do this, and you will keep faith with our founding fathers and generations of Americans yet unborn.

We, the people, trust you. Do not fail us.

Respectfully,

WOMEN OF THE PACIFIC.

Amendment of Federal-Aid Highway Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BROPHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. BROPHY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 authorized the apportionment of certain funds to the various States for each of the first three successive postwar fiscal years for Federal-aid highways, for Federal-aid secondary roads, and for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas.

Section 4 (d) of said act provides that any sum so apportioned shall be available for expenditure in such State for only 1 year after the close of the fiscal year for which it is apportioned, and that any sum so apportioned that remains unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse.

The aforesaid provisions of section 4 (d) of this act will operate to cause each State to lose any portion of such funds apportioned to it for the first postwar fiscal year that may not be expended by June 30, 1947; for the second postwar fiscal year not expended by June 30, 1948; and for the third postwar fiscal year not expended by June 30, 1949.

The elements of inflation and the acute shortages of labor and engineering personnel, materials, and equipment that are known to exist will make it impossible to have these funds expended within the time now prescribed by said act.

The bill submitted extends the periods of availability of such funds for one additional year after June 30 of each of the years 1947, 1948, and 1949. I refer to bill H. R. 3264.

International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of April 14, 1947:

ITO—UN'S VANGUARD

UN—most of us know what those letters stand for. ITO—what do they mean? Success for UN is, as most of us think, synonymous with peace. How many can give a synonym for ITO success?

These questions are more than rhetorical. The United Nations' contribution to peace can be great, because popular support of the UN is great. The ITO—International Trade Organization—may have to make its contribution without such popular support. The conference which aims to set up an ITO has convened at Geneva with next to none of the fanfare of the San Francisco Conference.

But the aims of the two organizations are similar. Their methods are related. Their ultimate resources are identical. Aims, methods, resources, all are dependent on public understanding.

Enlistment of popular interest in the UN was relatively easy. The UN, for the most part is the direct and visible, sometimes spectacular, approach.

But the ITO—and this is assuming that the 18 nations now conferring at Geneva get the agreements needed to under-pin an international trade agency—the ITO will tackle the causes of war before they get really interesting to many of us. It will, like a vanguard, go out to meet them while they are in the dollars-and-pounds, francs-and-lire stage. It will seek them out where they may be hidden behind files of acceptances, bills of lading, and the tangle that these make with import quotas, tariffs, and so forth.

The aims of the Geneva Conference are these: (1) To write a charter for the ITO. (2) To arrive at trade agreements tying the member nations into many-sided trade relationships with one another.

But these two major divisions of effort fall into numerous subdivisions. There will be rules to write, codes of fair play. The conferees must seek out price levels at which countries can supply other countries with wanted products. Experts must canvass possibility of sellers also being dependable buyers. This will apply especially to the United States, a creditor nation. For buying and selling must be balanced in a way to keep money moving all around. It is essential that no country shall suddenly find itself unable to obtain cash in whatever national currency it needs.

This relation of goods and moneys in foreign trade makes the Geneva conference a first cousin to the famous Bretton Woods meeting of 1944. In that year the World Bank and the Monetary Fund were designed. When the ITO emerges it will have to operate in close cooperation with these two world credit agencies. All three will, of course, operate together under their young granddaddy, the United Nations.

This tie-in between the UN and the ITO should dramatize the importance of the trade organization in the business of keeping peace. Many people, to be sure, do not have time to grapple with expert explanations of the relation of trade to peace, and of trade restriction to war. But they find themselves enlisted to support economic as well as political cooperation as the UN and connected agencies move into the field of world trade.

All can understand the UN as a world effort to beat war to the punch if it threatens us. Economic agencies like the ITO represent a world effort to create the positive conditions of peace in which the war menace can never become strong enough to lift its fist.

Fair Play on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from PM for April 30, 1947:

FAIR PLAY ON PALESTINE—DON'T THROW THE JEWS TO THE ARABS

If you don't want to go wholly berserk in trying to make sense out of the bewildering UN debate on Palestine, you have to hold fast to a number of guiding-lines as first principles. Here are several of them:

Don't discount the tenacity of the British in holding on to their power in Palestine. To be sure, Cadogan has been very much on the defensive in the UN debate. He has had to parry the Indian-Arab-Russian demand for a guarantee that Britain will accept the UN recommendations in the end. He has also had to meet the clamor of Arab spokesman Jamali for an immediate end to the British mandate and for an independent Palestine—i. e. under Arab rule.

Nevertheless the UN session is not wholly distasteful to the British. The idea was Bevin's to start with, and in one sense it will yield returns to the British. For up to now the issue has been between the British and the Jews—a straight issue of whether the British would live up to their historic promises and to their mandate. But now in the UN the issue has been shifted to one between the Jews and the Arabs, which is just where the British want it. They can now plead before the world how complex and insoluble the whole problem of Palestine is, how stubborn the Jews are, how dangerous the prospect of an Arab-Russian alliance, how necessary a policy of appeasing the Arabs. What Bevin counted on was that the whole UN show would so bewilder Americans and so frighten them with the specter of Russian power that they would surrender their judgment.

Don't pay too much attention to the apparent hostility between the Arabs and the British. Both of them know perfectly well that the real target of both is the Jewish homeland in Palestine, the prevention of further Jewish immigration, the crippling of present Jewish strength. The Arabs do hate the British (no amount of appeasement will stifle that hate), and the British do fear the Arabs: but neither of them regards the other as the real obstacle to his Middle East plans. Up to now the British have borne the brunt of the attack on the Jews: the UN session changes this in the sense that in the UN the Arab states will have to bear the brunt of the same attack.

Don't be misled by the loud Arab talk of majority rule and self-determination and democracy in Palestine. It is curious to listen to talk about democracy from the Arab leaders like the Mufti of Jerusalem who were the closest supporters of Hitler. It is interesting to get assurances that Jewish rights will be respected from men who helped Hitler plot the mass-extermination of 6,000,000 European Jews. The fact is that a Jew has as little chance of freedom in the Arab states as he ever had in Germany, and his chances for life itself depend only on how far the Arabs dare go.

In this connection it is doubly interesting to note the new line of the American Communists on the Palestine issue. The current Daily Worker position is that the Jews have been foolish to trust the British imperialists and are equally foolish now to rely on the American imperialists. What then should they do? Trust themselves to the honor, fairness, and mercy of the Arab masses and even the Arab states—that is, the Grand Mufti and the desperadoes of the Arab league? Here is the latest of the sorry record of contemptible twists and turns made by the Communists in the interests of Russian policy.

Yet it would be foolish to believe that the Russians and the Arabs can strike up anything but the most temporary alliance. The Moslem religious leaders fear communism far more than the Vatican does, far more than the Protestant leaders. The Moslems are still sunk in feudalism, and whatever else may be said of Russia it is an enemy of feudal power. The Russians will try to use the Arabs as a weapon against Britain and America, and the Arabs will try to use the Russians to frighten Britain and America. The common action won't last long—but it may last long enough to frighten the gullible Americans into the arms of the Bevin-Mufti entente, long enough to snuff out any hope of fair play for the Palestine Jews.

What chances are there of insuring fair play? None, unless the American Government and American public opinion remain unscared and firm on several crucial propositions:

That the problem of the UN is not to throw the Jews to the Arab wolves, but to find a working solution for both.

That the parties at interest—including British and Arabs alike—should be excluded from membership on the UN Inquiry Commission.

That within the Assembly itself the Jewish agency be given the chance to take part in debate, and answer the unanswered and reckless statements of the Arabs and their allies.

That, once the inquiry is decided upon, the British Government commit itself to carrying out its share of the decision. Obviously this does not mean that the British alone should (to use Cadogan's precious phrase) spend their blood and treasure carrying out a UN decision. The Jews have had enough of British rule by barbed wire and noose, and so has the world. But if the British agree to live up to the UN inquiry, the rest of the UN members can take on the job of making sure that the solution stays solved.

How about the Russians themselves? I should say: Take the Russian position for what it is—don't underestimate its cynicism; don't over stimate its chances of success. Up to now in the UN debate on Palestine the Russians have consistently backed up the Arabs. Gromyko says he is backing them only on procedures, and reserves the questions of substance. Which is to say: The Russians are holding out to the Arabs a tempting offer to help them, both against the British and against the Jews, but are warning that they will not sell their help cheap.

On one score it is hard to blame the Russians. The British have been ruthless and cynical in using every weapon against them, and the Americans have their Truman doctrine. So the Russians are hitting back, and their hitting back takes the form of causing as much trouble as possible for British and American interests in the Middle East. If in the process this means helping to crush the remnants of the Jews, that is just too bad.

That the only solution which will now work in Palestine is a partition into a Jewish and an Arab state, each of them representing a majority rule and each of them required

to respect the minority rights of the other group.

Actually the argument about the present Arab majority in Palestine is a hollow one: the British mandate was set up for the express purpose of helping the Jews create a homeland which would eventually become a state, and of admitting enough immigration so that they would become a majority. But by now their hope seems idealistic: it has been shattered by the British white paper, and by Arab-Jewish bitterness.

What remains now is partition as a working solution. This would mean that in the Jewish state there would be an overwhelming majority of Jews, and in the Arab state an overwhelming majority of Arabs. It would mean that each could determine its own immigration policies and carve out its own destinies. To compel each of these states to respect the rights of the minority groups, and to keep both at peace the UN would have to continue supervision with the weapons of inspection, publicity, and (if required) force.

MAX LERNER.

War Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BROPHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. BROPHY. Mr. Speaker, April 29, 1947, I introduced a bill, H. R. 3248, to discontinue in effect the war excise tax of 10 percent on electric, gas, or oil appliances of the type used for cooking, warming, or keeping warm food or beverages for consumption on the premises imposed by the Revenue Act of 1941.

The excise tax on the items eliminated by this amendment was imposed primarily to restrict consumption of essential materials needed for national defense. The need for such restriction no longer exists.

The present tax schedule is discriminatory because it places a tax on certain household appliances while exempting others less essential. For example, floor coverings and furniture may be purchased tax free. Likewise, washing machines were never subject to the excise tax, and vacuum cleaners which originally bore a 10-percent tax were removed by an amendment in 1943. Yet, the cooking range or stove which a returning veteran must have for his family's health are subject to the 10-percent tax. It seems illogical to tax a veteran 10 percent on the purchase of a necessary cooking stove at a time when the Government is reducing the cost of his housing through subsidies.

The excise tax on stoves is not borne by the manufacturer but is passed on to the buyer. It is a tax which bears hardest on the low-income groups.

Cooking stoves are essential home appliances, absolutely necessary to the health of the entire population. They are not luxuries and should not be classed for tax purposes with such luxury items as jewelry, furs, and amusements. On the range three meals a day are cooked, and it is used even more frequently when there are babies or invalids in the family.

Development of Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appreciate the invitation to discuss with you some of the problems facing our Nation having to do with the development and use of our national waterways. The United States is particularly blessed with an abundance of natural resources. The value of our great deposits of coal, oil, and minerals is impossible to estimate. We do know, however, that these enormous deposits of coal and oil are not inexhaustible, and the inroads we have made upon them during the war years have given us much concern as to adequate supplies of these essentials of modern civilization in the centuries ahead. However, among our great natural assets, our rivers and other water resources are practically inexhaustible under proper controls for preservation and use. We in the West appreciate, perhaps, more than others, the great value of our water resources. Without them much of the West would still be a barren waste. The enormous pool of hydroelectric power locked up in the great waterways of the West is an inexhaustible supply of energy to take the place of coal and oil. Fortunately, in the development of these great waterways for reclamation, navigation, flood control, mechanical and industrial uses, we, at the same time, make available this invaluable power resource. Many do not realize that approximately half of the potential hydroelectric power in the United States is contained in the Columbia River and its tributaries.

I hold the view that while we should, as a nation, exercise economy in the cost of government, we should not overlook the fact that it is false economy not to develop and put into full use the water resources throughout the Nation. It was by reason of our foresight in the development of these great projects that we were able to carry the late war to a successful conclusion and, at the same time, supply much of the food and war materials needed by our allies in that great contest. I sincerely hope that in our enthusiasm for economy, the ending of deficit spending, and balancing the national budget, we will not fail to make adequate provision for the development of our great rivers and harbors projects which are the backbone of our economy, and which are only investments in worth-while enterprises which return to the Federal Government, manyfold, the funds invested. It would be a serious mistake for our Government not to embrace the opportunity to make full use of these great resources which a divine providence has bestowed upon us.

As a member of the Public Works Committee, I am also acquainted with, and directly interested in, flood control and related river-basin development, as well as public works in general. I was brought up on the banks of the Columbia River and have watched the continuing development of that great river and its tributaries for navigation, power, flood control, and irrigation. I impose upon your indulgence to outline, as far as my time will permit, some of the major developments which come under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I have the privilege to be chairman:

BONNEVILLE AND GRAND COULEE

The comprehensive plan for the development of the Columbia River Basin is one of tremendous scope. It consists of a series of major projects, the first two of the series to be completed being the Bonneville Dam, built by the Corps of Engineers, and the Grand Coulee Dam, constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. These two great dams played important roles in helping this country and her allies to win the war. Power from them welded our ships, helped perform chemical and metallurgical miracles, and contributed to the creation of the literally world-shaking atomic bomb. The Bonneville Dam, with its ship lock, has made possible the navigation of ocean-going vessels as far inland as The Dalles. Gigantic and beneficial as each of these dams is, they are but the beginning of a long-range program of development. And although their worth has already been fully demonstrated, they are not nearly sufficient to take care of the growing needs of the Pacific Northwest. Bonneville's installation of half a million kilowatts represents about one-fifth of the total present production capacity in the Washington-Oregon area. Eventually the entire Columbia River system must be harnessed if complete beneficial water utilization and control throughout the basin is to be achieved. It is interesting to note that the Bonneville Dam has not been detrimental to the migrations of the Columbia River salmonoid fish. On the contrary, the fish count last year shows that more Chinook salmon ascended above Bonneville than during any previous year since counting started in 1938 with the single exception of 1941. Comparison of the spring run of 1946 showed 11 percent more fish than in 1942, ordinarily considered as the parent stock for the 1946 run. I am told that the experience at Bonneville points to the conclusion that dams which drown out swift turbulent rapids are helpful to migrating adult fish. The fact is that before the construction of Bonneville Dam, it took salmon runs appearing at Bradford Island—site of Bonneville Dam—about 1 week to reach The Dalles, whereas at the present time it takes only about half of this time for them to reach The Dalles from the time they appear at Bonneville Dam.

M'NARY

The next step—and actual construction has now been started—is the McNary Dam project at Umatilla, Oreg., about 290 miles from the ocean. It is imperative that work on this multiple-purpose project be carried along at a steady and substantial rate to an early completion, for, as an integral part of the coordinated program of development of the Columbia Basin, the McNary Dam is vital to the growth of this vast region. And its early completion is essential if the power, navigation, and irrigation requirements of the section are to be met.

Many of you are undoubtedly aware of the impending power shortage in the Pacific Northwest. Estimated power loads for the next few years show conclusively the great need. Bonneville Dam's entire capacity is being used at the present time, and figures of the Bonneville Power Administration show that by 1955 the load will be more than twice that of 1947. Therefore, unless more power

is made available as soon as possible, the development of this region will be severely handicapped.

Besides supplying power from an installed capacity of nearly a million kilowatts, the McNary Dam project will provide a slack-water channel extending some 65 miles up the Columbia and making much-needed low-cost transportation available; it will increase shipping by millions of tons; and it will expedite the movement of vital petroleum, agricultural, and mineral products now seriously hampered by swift, shallow water. Also, inasmuch as the McNary Dam will back water up about 10 miles above the mouth of the Snake, this dam is the key unit on which the authorized navigation project for the Snake River depends, and will benefit more than 200,000 acres of irrigable land as well.

SNAKE RIVER

The authorized project for the Snake River, on which planning is well advanced, consists of a series of dams on that river to provide slack-water navigation from the McNary Dam pool to Lewiston, Idaho, a distance of 140 miles. This waterway for modern barge navigation will facilitate the development of the immense agricultural, mining, and lumber resources of the Snake River Basin and at the same time the dams will make possible the production of a large block of power to feed the insatiable appetite of young and growing industries. Much irrigable land, too, will be benefited.

Other major developments in the Columbia River Basin, which have either been approved by the Congress or are under consideration, and portions of which are now in process of construction, are the Foster Creek Dam, 545 miles above the mouth of the Columbia, which is a great source of hydroelectric power; Willamette River Basin project for flood control, channel improvement and power development, containing 7 dams, two of which have been completed and two of which are under construction; The Dalles Dam, which is one step in the improvement of the main stem of the Columbia River for navigation and power, is under consideration at this time.

NAVIGATION

The works of improvement so far accomplished have made the Columbia River navigable for ocean-going vessels for 183 miles from the ocean to The Dalles, Oreg. The magnificent deep-water channel from Portland to the sea is, of course, world-renowned. Above The Dalles, even at this time, shallow draft barges can ascend the Columbia and Snake Rivers to Lewiston, Idaho, 273 miles above the mouth.

FUTURE OF THE NORTHWEST

It is generally recognized that the Columbia River is one of the great rivers of the world and that this expansive northwest region, rich in natural resources, is a potentially great industrial empire. At present, more than 40,000,000 acres of land in the Columbia River Basin are devoted to agricultural uses. Famous for its minerals, forests and fertile valleys, for its frozen fruits and vegetables, for its apples, honey, and livestock, for its lumber, salmon, and scenery, the Pacific Northwest is truly an "inland empire."

Vigorous prosecution of projects such as the McNary Dam is vitally important not only to this region but to the Nation as a whole. The entire country will benefit by the development and exploitation of the vast resources of the Columbia Basin. Cheap water transportation and cheap power are the basic ingredients for successful industrial enterprises and prosperous agricultural pursuits. As units of the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Columbia basin, the McNary Dam project now underway, the authorized Snake River dams and barge channel to Lewiston, Idaho, the approved Foster Creek Dam, the proposed dam at The Dalles and others, should be carried to completion as speedily as the economic status of the Nation will allow. Such public works need not wait until we have unemployment. They should proceed on a sound schedule to meet the increased needs of all enterprises dependent on water transportation, power, and irrigation.

NATION-WIDE

The prosecution of a continuing and coordinated program of public improvement of our water resources applies not only to the Columbia River Basin but to all other regions of the United States—the Atlantic seaboard, the Gulf Coastal States, the midcontinent region and the Southwest.

Completion of work on all river and harbor developments, and proper maintenance thereof, is not only highly desirable, but also absolutely imperative to the future of the Southwest. Short-sighted curtailment of operations masquerading in the guise of economy should not be allowed to prevail. I do not say this to indicate that a policy of economy is not justified at this time, but only to bring out the fact that waste from failure to develop our vast natural resources is not now nor ever was true economy.

GULF STATES

Along the Gulf coastal area many river and harbor improvements have been completed which have materially contributed and will continue to contribute to the advancement of this section. Included among the more outstanding of these improvements is the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. This waterway served as a protected route for coastwise water transportation at a time early in the war when the security of our oceangoing vessels was jeopardized by enemy submarine activities in the Gulf of Mexico. It has materially aided in the development of industry and the natural resources in that region, and its extension below Corpus Christi should be effected without undue delay.

The feeder channels of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, although serving many of the smaller communities and ports, are, nevertheless, of great benefit to our national economy in the development of the vast oil fields, in benefiting the fishing industry, and in aiding many other important industries.

ATLANTIC COAST

On the Atlantic coast, where the need for the improvement of our rivers and the natural harbors was first realized and undertaken, much has been accomplished. The great ports of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, Savannah, and Jacksonville are well known to all.

The protected inland waterway routes along this coast include the Cape Cod Canal, which affords a short route for coastwise shipping, and the Delaware and Chesapeake Ship Canal, which provides a direct route between Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware River and shortens the distance between Baltimore and Philadelphia by more than 300 miles.

The Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, extending from New England to Florida, eventually to connect with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway via the proposed cross-Florida barge canal, also served a vital purpose during the war, and will continue to serve large numbers of commercial and recreational craft.

In addition to these improvements many other river and harbor projects have been authorized and completed along our eastern seaboard. All of these projects and various flood-control works have contributed to the growth and production of our country and the welfare of the people.

INTERIOR REGIONS

In the interior regions the development of the Mississippi River waterway system and the Great Lakes harbors and connecting channels has been of great stimulus to the growth of midcontinental United States. The total water-borne commerce on the Mississippi system alone aggregates some 124,000,000 tons annually.

The Mississippi River has a channel for oceangoing vessels to Baton Rouge, La., and thence a channel for modern barge navigation to Minneapolis, Minn. In addition, canalization on the tributaries has provided a 9-foot waterway to Pittsburgh on the Ohio River and to Lake Michigan via the Illinois River. This vast waterway network also contributed importantly to our war effort by providing an outlet to the Gulf for war materials and vessels produced in the interior manufacturing centers.

The improvement of the Missouri River from its mouth to Sioux City, Iowa, to provide a 9-foot navigation depth for barge traffic has been nearly completed. The Fort Peck Dam on the Missouri River in Montana for navigation, power, flood control, and other purposes is one of the largest earth dams ever constructed, forming a lake 185 miles long with a total water surface area of over 380 square miles. The further development of the Missouri River Basin, as now authorized, should proceed, for in this vast region some areas are barren because of insufficient rainfall, while other highly fertile areas are unproductive due to annual flooding.

The Great Lakes connecting channels and lake harbors have been progressively improved over the years. Generally, the harbor improvements have consisted of the construction of entrance breakwaters and dredged harbor areas and inner channels.

The development of our water resources, as I have briefly outlined, has been planned and prosecuted in the years gone by as a long-range program to meet the needs of our industrial and machine age. It may not be too great a boast to say that without Federal participation in such improvements to assure their availability when and as needed, this Nation might not now be the No. 1 world power, economically and industrially.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has, in the past, done much to further the development of this country's water resources. The policie enunciated at its various meetings have pointed the way to those who have been responsible for the planning, authorization, construction, and operation of such projects. By continuing your fine work of advocating and supporting a sound, long-range program for this development, your efforts will be rewarded in the knowledge that this Nation has grown and will continue to grow and prosper in no small measure by public improvements for the utilization and control of its natural resources.

International Transport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid address delivered on Wednesday before the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in Washington, by Charles P. McCormick, president, McCormick & Co., Inc., Baltimore, Md., and chairman, International Transport Committee of National Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. McCormick, a nationally known industrial leader and for years a most

active and valuable figure in the civic life of Baltimore and of Maryland, has, I believe, made a valuable contribution in this address to the future of international transport.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After serving on the chamber's international transport committee for a number of years under my illustrious predecessor, William K. Jackson, he passed the chairmanship on to me when he became president of the chamber. Under his guidance the committee was made truly representative of those interested in international transport. It includes steamship and air-line operators, shipbuilders and aircraft manufacturers, export and import shippers, international bankers, and specialists in maritime and aviation law. Its work has covered a wide range of subjects, utilizing the abilities and specialized knowledge and experience of its membership.

Our committee is an offshoot from the chamber's transportation and communication committee which is so ably presided over by the chairman of our meeting here today, Mr. Groner. While the two committees divide the field of transportation into two parts, the international and domestic, respectively, we do have a considerable number of problems in common and it is a pleasure to report that in all cases we have found our opinions completely in harmony.

The committee on international transport was organized in 1943 to consider the manifold problems in both our merchant marine and international air transport which would obviously have to be met after the end of the war. The committee in the early fall of 1943 issued its first report, which was adopted by the chamber's membership in a statement of policy on international transport. In this report particular emphasis was laid on the importance of an adequate American merchant marine, a practical plan for disposal of the Government-owned merchant fleet, a continued shipbuilding program, and rapid expansion of air transport as necessary to communications with all regions of the world. The report disapproved of monopolistic control of international air services and urged that opportunity should be given for competition under Government regulation and support.

A large part of the immediate postwar program recommended in 1943 has since been carried out through legislation and otherwise. In the following years our committee took up a number of more detailed matters such as the ship sales bill, the proposals of the Chicago International Civil Aviation Conference, the problem of blocked currencies and hindrances to international trade and travel. Appropriate recommendations were made and there has been progress on these items.

Coming to this year's work, the committee has prepared a report on international transport policies on which are based the proposed declaration of the chamber's policy committee on merchant marine and international air transport, which are before the annual meeting for action.

The committee in this report points out the importance of America's ocean shipping and international air services, together with the ship and airplane building industries. This is emphasized by the greater international commitments and responsibilities thrust upon the United States by the war.

Advocating a strong and consistent national policy with respect to the American merchant marine, implemented by vigorous administration of that policy, the committee holds that recent war experience clearly demonstrates that the United States must have a higher degree of security and independence in the field of ocean transportation. It urges broad public understanding of the fact that subsidies provided under the Merchant Marine Act do not give advantage to American shipping over that of other nations but only seek to equalize American with lower foreign construction and operating costs where they exist.

Pointing out that foreign competition has rapidly mobilized itself in the first full year of peace, the report stresses the urgent need for passenger vessels and other special types of vessels suitable for conversion to troop transports and naval service in time of emergency. It commends the recent appointment by the President of a special board to study shipping and shipbuilding needs.

In the field of air transport, our committee holds that, as one of the greatest generators of international air traffic, the United States has a legitimate interest in developing and maintaining American-flag services on a corresponding scale. Such a development, in the committe's view, will give the United States a reasonable participation in the international air network, provide an essential minimum of experienced air transport personnel as well as aircraft suited to international service, and contribute to the maintenance of the necessary aircraft manufacturing industry. Provisions for the operation of United States and foreign flag airlines to and from our territory should, it is recommended, be consistent with this policy.

In developing our international air services, the committee commends the Government for wisely following the characteristic American method of enlisting private initiative and enterprise, under suitable public regulation with financial support where necessary.

The committee also discusses at considerable length the policy adopted by the national chamber last year in favor of relying on the conference system of rate making for international air services rather than extending governmental rate-fixing powers to the international field or establishing rate regulation by an international authority. It recommends that, until more need is evident for extension of Government control over international air rates, such extension should not be authorized.

These recommendations form the basis of proposed policy declarations by the chamber to be voted upon at this annual meeting and it is perfectly proper that they be discussed at the conclusion of the addresses this afternoon and we should welcome any such discussion.

Futures Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Several Pertinent Questions Regarding Futures Markets," quoting a letter from Ernest D. MacDougall, published in the February-March 1947 issue of the Farmers' Guild News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVERAL PERTINENT QUESTIONS REGARDING FUTURES MARKETS

The readers of the Farmers' Guild News are invited to study the following letter written by Mr. Ernest D. MacDougall to a professor in one of the leading midwestern universities. If anyone has been in doubt concerning the moral, legal, or economic merits of futures trading, this letter of self-answering questions will clear his thinking and enable him to see the monstrosity in its true light.

The letter follows:

"Dr. ——— ———,

"Professor of Christian Ethics,

"University of ———,

"United States of America.

"DEAR DOCTOR: I thank you for your letter of the 13th in reply to my letter of December 25, 1946, written to you on recommendation of the chancelor of your university.

"I regret, however, that you decline to enter into correspondence with me on the subject of futures trading, which is important not alone from legal and economic points of view, but also from the ethical point of view.

"I note that you are inclined to minimize the importance of the subject of futures trading, and that you are inclined to view it as an isolated problem rather than as an outstanding symptom of a grave malady of our present social order. May it not be that an outstanding symptom may point the way to a cure? Or do you prefer the death of the present social order to its restoration to health and sanity? Do not our troublous times call for plain speaking?

"Notwithstanding your refusal to correspond with me on this subject—nothing personal, of course—I assume that you will not deny me the moral right to comment by way of questions which have arisen in my mind on reading your letter, as follows:

"1. Do you not know that our agricultural economy is basic to our national economy, providing raw materials of food and fiber for industrial processing?

"2. Do you not know that a crooked system of pricing agricultural commodities has ethical and economic ramifications throughout our entire national economy?

"3. Do you not know that no social order can safely be built upon a gambling basis?

"4. Do you not know that no ideological system that is not basically honest can endure?

"5. Do you not know that a solid foundation is more essential to society than any superstructure, however beautiful it may appear to be on paper?

"6. Do you not know that the people have looked in vain in the universities for leadership, and have found only ideological camp followers?

"7. Do you not know that the teachings of Jesus as to brotherly love, honesty, courage, etc., as such, should have as important a place in the university curriculum as any human ideological philosophy?

"8. Do you not know that no ideological system, however perfect it may seem to be on paper, is self-executing, but that it depends for its success upon the character of its administrators?

"9. Do you not know that, in these smug, degenerate days, this country has become a nation of gamblers?

"10. Do you not know that organized 'gambling under the forms of trade' has promoted and encouraged all other forms of gambling in order to build up strong public sentiment, even in your State, in favor of the idea of gambling generally in opposition to the idea of quid pro quo and blur over defining lines of honesty?

"11. Do you not know that the defenders of the status quo regard the continuance of the practice of futures trading as essential to its maintenance?

"12. Do you not know that commodity gambling, otherwise known as trading in futures, runs in this country anywhere from ten to fifty billion dollars per annum of paper transactions?

"13. Do you not know that the definition of 'futures contract' which is found in university textbooks on economics is factually false in several important particulars?

"14. Do you not know that it does matter whether definitions of important terms used in university textbooks are, in fact, true or false?

"15. Do you not know that there is not one single essential element of contract in any so-called futures contract?

"16. Do you not know that there is not one penny of assets back of any futures contract?

"17. Do you not know that Dr. James Monro Smith, former president of Louisiana State University, spent a term in the penitentiary because, as he explained, he did not know the difference between a wheat-futures contract and a security?

"18. Do you not know that all sales of futures contracts are short sales?

"19. Do you not know that the resemblances between stock exchanges and futures markets are but superficial?

"20. Do you not know that there is a fundamental distinction between speculation and gambling—that these terms are not synonymous, as proponents of futures trading would have us believe?

"21. Do you not know that all transactions in futures markets are gambling transactions, in the exact meaning of that term?

"22. Do you not know that no deliveries of commodities are made or are intended to be made in futures markets?

"23. Do you not know that no futures market has any facilities for making deliveries and has no commodities to deliver?

"24. Do you not know that whenever, on rare occasions, delivery of a commodity results from trading in futures, the futures contract must be converted into a cash or spot contract and that delivery must be made, if at all, in the cash or spot market?

"25. Do you not know that any economic practice that is ethically unsound is likely also to be found to be legally unsound and economically unsound?

"You will note from the implications of the foregoing questions that it seems to me that this important subject requires the earnest consideration of professors of Christian ethics, of law, of economics, and of sociology—a project which our universities, with their highly specialized curricula, seem incapable of attempting, to the great detriment of society at large.

"Sincerely,

"ERNEST D. MACDOUGALL.

"WASHINGTON, D. C."

Portrait of Hon. Hatton W. Sumners, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, the good people of Dallas, Tex., presented to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives an excellent portrait of the Honorable Hatton W. Sumners, who for some 15 years served as chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. Judge Sumners, as we have ever affectionately called him, has rendered outstanding service as a great statesman during his entire service as a Member of Congress from his congressional district. This great man will be long remembered for the fine contributions he made to constitutional government in our Nation.

Hon. ED GOSSETT, a Member of Congress from Texas, who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, was in charge of the ceremony. Hon. SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, made the very excellent address of acceptance of this most gracious gift, and because Judge HOBBS is a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, and because of his excellent address delivered in accepting the portrait of Judge Sumners, I extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the excellent address delivered by our colleague, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee of the House, and the friend of every Member in this great law-making body, Hon. SAM HOBBS, which address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Nathan Adams, Mr. D. A. Hulsey, Mr. Ben Critz, and Mr. Waverly Briggs, representing the people of Dallas in this presentation of the portrait of Hon. Hatton W. Sumners to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, it is my happy privilege as the designated spokesman of our committee to accept this princely gift from his friends and former constituents.

Before I proceed, I cannot refrain from expressing my own and my party's deep appreciation of the gracious insistence of the chairman and the majority members of our committee that I as a member of the minority should represent the committee in accepting the portrait.

Having been born in Dallas County (though in Alabama, not Texas), and having begun the practice of law in his native Tennessee, and having had the priceless privilege of sitting for 12 years at the feet of this Gamaliel, at least partially qualifies me to accept your gracious gift and attempt to voice the thanks of this committee to you men of Dallas.

There is one amendment to the statement just made which I must concede. None of us who served on this committee under the leadership of Judge Sumners ever had a chance to do much sitting. Particularly is this true of me, for from the outset, because of my peculiar qualification, I was chosen as errand boy. I was in Alabama when I was elected by the House as one of the managers on the part of the House to present the evidence substantiating the articles of impeachment against Judge Halsted Ritter. Upon my return, realizing that the House had acted upon the recommendation of Chairman Sumners, I called on him to express my thanks. When I had done so, he said: "Now, boy, don't you get the big-head. Randolph and I talked it over. We knew that we had all the brains necessary to do this job. But we decided that we needed an errand boy and that you had the biggest feet in the committee, so we put you on to run errands."

Isn't it true that some of the genius of any executive manifests itself in putting others to work? We worked our hearts out for him, and, in doing so, learned to love him fervently. Isn't that the way of life? Isn't the only way we really learn to love, by serving?

That was certainly true of him. He loved you all from the beginning, but that love deepened into a consuming passion by serving you. You put him to work. You kept him at work for half a century—glorifying Dallas. Not only in the mores of the Chamber of Commerce, but also as your representative, your minister plenipotentiary, and your envoy extraordinary. "Birds of a feather flock together," is just as true of congressional representation as in the choice of personal friends. The Nation knows and loves your district because you were the kind of people represented by Hatton Sumners. We know you not, but know you well. We love you, because we first loved him. And from the depths of that fervent devotion we know how to appreciate this new representation of your Representative, who, at the height of his power and glory, relinquished the official authority you had given him, to wear the crown of private citizen—the only king this Nation knows. In that appreciation our words are weighted with unique significance when we say we thank you.

PROUD OF OUR CHAIRMAN

We of this committee are proud of each of the 40 men who have led us as chairman. Thanks to our distinguished colleague, Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM, who has done prodiguous research and written a history of this committee, we have the facts. Beginning with Charles J. Ingersoll, whose brother, Joseph R. Ingersoll, later became chairman (the two Ingersoll brothers being the only two members of the same family who have had this distinction), Hugh Nelson, John Sergeant, Daniel Webster, Philip P. Barbour, and James Buchanan and running through the list to Hatton W. Sumners, who served longest, and the distinguished gentleman who now adorns the chair, Hon. EARL C. MICHENER, each has exercised the office with becoming dignity and honor.

PROUD OF OUR COMMITTEE

This committee is also proud of its membership. Three, Franklin H. Pierce, James Buchanan, and William McKinley, have been President. Three other members have been candidates for that high office, John Bell, Stephen A. Douglas, and John W. Davis. James S. Sherman became Vice President, while three others were candidates for that office, George H. Pendleton, Allen G. Thurman, and John Sergeant. Seven were Speakers of the House, Philip P. Barbour, John Bell, John W. Jones, Michael C. Kerr, Thomas B. Reed, David B. Henderson, and Frederick C. Gillette. Three were candidates for that office, Timothy Pitkin, Samuel S. Marshall, and Joseph W. Bailey. Armistead Burt served as Speaker during the absence of Speaker Winthrop. Three served as President pro tempore of the Senate, Allen G. Thurman, Isham G. Harris, and William P. Frye. Fifteen have been Cabinet members, Daniel Webster, James Buchanan, Edward Livingston, Charles Toucy, John C. Spencer, John Bell, William Wilkins, George W. McCrary, George S. Boutwell, Thomas Corwin, Hilary A. Herbert, Edwin Denby, Charles A. Wickliffe, Nathan K. Hall, William L. Wilson. Two served as Solicitor General of the United States, John W. Davis and James M. Beck. Twenty-two served in the diplomatic service, one as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Philip P. Barbour. Three were circuit court judges, 12 as district court judges, 4 as judges of Territorial courts. One became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and one chief justice of the United States Court of Claims. One became Judge Advocate General of the Union Army, John A. Bingham, who also served as special judge advocate in the trial of the conspirators against the life of President Lincoln. Several were Assistant Attorneys General of the United States. Thirty-four were United States attorneys, 49 United States Senators, 37 State governors, while Romulus Saunders was defeated by one vote for the office of Governor of North Carolina. Twenty-five have served as State attorneys general. Ten have served as chief justice of their State supreme courts. Twenty-two became justices of their State supreme courts. Four became presidents of colleges or universities, and many were professors of note. More than 300 of the total number of 588 filled, with honor and distinction, various minor offices.

Judge Sumners gave expression to our self-satisfaction. It was in the lengthy hearings some years ago on his resolution giving the residents of the District of Columbia the vote and a measure of self-government. We had been holding these hearings

for 3 weeks, frequently running into the night. The leading proponents including practically every president of dozens of local civic clubs, predominantly feminine, had read to us their testimony. Almost without exception, each statement had begun, like Paul before King Agrippa, eulogizing us and stressing the fortunate lot of the witnesses in having the privilege of appearing before such an able and distinguished group of legislators. Finally the representative of the CIO appeared, late at night, and with the "Harvard accent" usually characterizing such chosen spokesmen, began, "Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this great committee, during the weary sessions of these long hearings, I have been thoroughly sympathetic with you gentlemen, as witness after witness piled eulogy on eulogy and read page after page of unctuous flattery. But I know that you gentlemen are far too astute and discerning to be swayed in the slightest degree from your high sense of duty by any compliments paid you." At this point, Chairman Sumners broke in, "Buddy, if you have any papers to sell, you'd better sell 'em, for we take judicial knowledge of the fact that we are pretty damn smart." This effectively cleared the atmosphere and sped the hearings after a gale of laughter had swept this crowded chamber, relieving the tension.

This portrait will be cherished here as it hangs in this historic room, for we love the judge and you! It will always serve us as an inspiration; challenging us to remember the Sumners leadership, acclaimed through the years by his colleagues in the Congress, by Chief Justice Taft, who referred to him as "the best lawyer in Congress" and "the only man who ever overruled the Supreme Court"; by Senator William E. Borah, who wrote: "You had a delicate and difficult task to perform, and you did it with fine judgment, good taste, and inspiring patriotism." And again, "Your State will be proud of you for what you did and your country will always be indebted to you. Congratulations, from your friend." By Secretary of State Cordell Hull: "Let me take this occasion to express my deepest appreciation to you for your intelligent interest in and exceedingly helpful attitude toward many of the most important phases of our foreign affairs. This cooperation on your part has been of the greatest help and service to the State Department and to me personally." By Attorney General Francis Biddle, in an article in Collier's in 1942: "As a result of a suggestion from Congressman Hatton W. Sumners, of Texas, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who was very much concerned with our experiences in the last war (he became a Member of Congress in 1913), I set up a War Frauds Unit in the Department of Justice in February, 1942." And in a personal letter, later: "The signing by the President of the antitrust legislation to speed the war effort leads me to take this opportunity of telling you how much we appreciate your assistance on this legislation. Your expert and wise handling of such war measures as the First and Second War Powers Acts and the Foreign Agents Registration Act will, I am sure, in the perspective of history, be found to be a marked contribution to our prosecution of this war."

By Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, who, when Under Secretary, wrote: "I wish to express to you the warm appreciation of the War Department for the constructive work you have done recently in carrying the small-business bill to a successful conclusion in Congress. Your assistance in this matter, as in many others, has been of great value to the war effort. I am also mindful of the good work you have done over the past 2 years, in Congress and out of Congress, to arouse the Nation to an awareness of the perils forced upon us by the ambitions of the dictators who control the Axis Powers"; by the award of the American Bar Association medal for distinguished service to American jurisprudence—an unprecedented award; by Washington correspondents, who called him "the ablest and most potent advocate in Congress," "wisest as well as smartest."

Not only was he held in such high esteem by these eminent gentlemen, but also he won national approbation gained by few.

On the occasion of the informal celebration in the House of the completion of a quarter century of service in Congress of Hon. Hatton W. Sumners—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7, 1938, pages 4982-4986—several of his colleagues made heartfelt remarks concerning his career. There may be found fuller treatment than propriety permits today.

Again, on the day of the death of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the honor that had come to our committee and to Congress by the award of the American Bar Association Medal to Judge Sumners, was called to the attention of the House and the speech of presentation quoted. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1944, pp. 9801-9802.)

Judge Sumners, when it had to be done, could criticize. And he could be stern. But he always tempered his criticism with humor—that oil that keeps machinery running. The philosophy, both of his private and public life, was that of the "God-fan," as he loves to call himself. He knows beyond cavil or question that God is the "Big Boss" and that neither life nor law can be good unless in consonance with His will and plan. As a pound of example is worth a ton of talk, his life and leadership will always be revered above all other emphasis because he lived and lives his philosophy.

Army and Navy Construction and the Davis-Bacon Law

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during the war the building trades of this country and the construction trades unceasingly put all their efforts into the building of our war installations. They cooperated 100 percent with the Army and Navy.

Now that the war is over we find that the Army and Navy Departments are making their own wage rates regardless of the Davis-Bacon law and are forcing men to sign contracts in order to gain employment outside the continental limits of the United States. It is about time the Navy especially recognized the past cooperation and took steps to cooperate now with the building trades of this country.

The letters referred to are as follows:

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT,
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1947.

Hon. JOHN FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY: Confirming my telephone conversation with you on Saturday, April 19, 1947, please find enclosed copy of station order No. 29-47, issued by the United States Naval Air Station, Barber's Point, Oahu, T. H., signed by Capt. R. L. Bowman, commanding officer, dated February 13, 1947.

It would appear that while our Government has a committee conferring in Russia trying to arrive at the establishment of some type of permanent peace in which they appear to be meeting the obstacle of a dictatorial government we find one growing in this country among naval and Army officials.

Nobody can question the fact that the building and construction trades department rendered every possible aid to both the war and Navy Departments during the war effort and there are letters in our file from the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War testifying to this fact. However, we found that just as soon as the war is over certain Army and Navy officials are a law unto themselves, and even though we have what is known as the Davis-Bacon law on the statute books, this does not deter them from arbitrarily setting up their own wage rates and demanding that skilled workmen from the United States sign dictated contracts in order to secure employment on outlying bases such as Guam.

I am reliably informed they are placed in competition with Japanese and Filipino labor employed at slave wage rates.

If there is anything you can do in Congress relative to this enclosed order on the part of the Navy, I would appreciate it greatly, as it is useless for us to take it up with the Navy Department, because the usual procedure is to refer us from one office to the other in order to try our patience without obtaining any results.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD J. GRAY,
President.

UNITED STATES NAVAL AIR STATION,
Barber's Point, Oahu, T. H.,
February 13, 1947.

STATION ORDER 29-47

Subject: Group IVB and IVA supervisors—participation of in union organizations.

Reference: (a) NCPI 60 dated June 23, 1945, as amended.

1. Under the provisions of section 4 of reference (a), no supervisor employed by this naval station may actively participate in the conduct of labor organizations and their business.

2. The policy of the Navy Department is that supervisors are representatives of management and the satisfactory exercise of the duties of such positions is incompatible with activity in labor organizations of their subordinates. The Department does not object to supervisors' membership in such organizations or attendance at meetings, but they are required to refrain from active participation in the conduct of union business. Active participation is defined specifically as holding an office in or serving on a board or committee of a labor organization in which their subordinates also are members. In other words, supervisors must so completely detach themselves as to insure strict objectivity and an absolutely unbiased attitude with respect to all official acts devolving upon them in their capacity as representatives of the management.

3. For the purpose of this order, a supervisor is defined as one held responsible by his superiors for the work assignments and work results of a group of assigned subordinates, and who participates officially in any matters of efficiency ratings, discipline, discharge, pay, or promotions of these subordinates. In the ungraded service (i. e., positions other than IVB) the supervisory positions referred to herein are considered to include positions comparable to that of leading man and above.

4. A supervisor who is active in a labor organization shall desist from such activity or resign his supervisory position. Supervisors holding office in or serving on a committee of a labor organization at the present time must resign their office or committee membership as soon as that office has been filled by election of a substitute, but in any

case not to extend beyond the period of 3 months.

5. The appointment or promotion to a supervisory position of an employee holding an office in a labor organization or serving on a labor organization committee shall be contingent upon his prior resignation from such activity.

6. For the purpose of this order, master mechanics and foremen associations, quartermen and leadingmen associations, and other comparable associations as presently constituted are not to be considered labor organizations.

R. L. BOWMAN,
Captain, United States Navy,
Commanding Officer.

Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein quotations in reference to the operations of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.

Ralph McGill, in Atlanta Constitution, April 1, 1947:

Through the years the British, French, and Russians have carried on a vast and constant information program. Other nations have followed suit. It has paid dividends. * * * This country has an information program which is in jeopardy. * * * It tries to show that we are a nation which seeks to give milk to children; that we build dams; that we have a great railway system now being modernized; that we lead the world in air transport and production; that we have a vast country growing cotton, wheat, corn, and vegetables; that our steel mills produce most of the world's steel; that we have writers; poets; good plain people who live for their churches, families, and who believe in God. It reveals the fact that we have artists, singers, composers, musicians, orchestras, and a definite American culture; it shows that we are a nation of homes; it informs people of our court procedures; it does all this, not as propaganda, but factually, out of our abundant supply of illustrative matter. Newspapers, dealing with the daily unfolding of news, cannot do an adequate job, and should not be expected to do so; nor can, or should, a news agency. * * * Newspaper people—all people—have a right to have their country known to the world for what it is—a country of earnest people, interested in peace and the pursuits of peace—not war, murder, lynchings, lust, divorce, and violence.

Malvina Lindsay, in the Washington Post, April 9, 1947:

This is a moment of strategic opportunity for the United States to press its short-wave broadcasting. It built a reputation for truth and fairness with its wartime radio programs. Confused peoples throughout the world are looking to the Voice of America for facts. * * * Strangely, the importance of these new intangible weapons of defense is not yet recognized by the public or by Congress. Billions can be appropriated for weapons of steel, which quickly become obsolete, while the use of words and ideas—in whose manipulation Hitler pioneered so effectively—is neglected, even dismissed as boondoggling. Yet, it is inconceivable that America should try to assume its new role of world leadership without such modern armor.

New Dealers and Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, propaganda machines of the New Dealers and the bureaucrats are grinding away in an effort to becloud the issues as the Republican majority in Congress slashes the budget, cuts out wasteful and nonessential spending, reduces income taxes, and in other respects grimly follows through on its determination to restore the Nation's economy to a sound financial basis. The wails of protest from these propaganda machines are not, however, deceiving the people. In confirmation of this, I quote, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the following editorial by Rolla Clymer, forthright and clear-thinking editor of the El Dorado (Kans.) Times, whose voice and whose pen reflect the sentiments of the people at the grass roots:

NEW DEALERS FEAR INFLATION

One of the least impressive arguments of the New Deal lieutenants in Congress put forward by those seeking to prevent the Republicans from lowering income taxes is that an income-tax reduction at this time will increase the danger of inflation. They say that if taxes are reduced the taxpayer, and this includes the average worker, will have more money in his take-home pay envelope. Having more money he will spend more, and this will cause inflation.

It is true, of course, that higher taxes during war times are a deterrent to inflation. But it is also true that by the time the proposed new tax cut shows its full effect the greatest danger of inflation will be over, especially if government spending is reduced in the meantime. Then the average man can use the extra money to purchase goods at lower prices than at present.

But the New Deal Members of Congress are not concerned with the dangers of inflation. The same statesmen who want to avoid a tax cut to lessen the danger of inflation are the same statesmen who are in favor of greater Government spending, which is one of the prime factors in creating inflation. They are the same persons who want President Truman's swollen thirty-seven and a half billion budget to be passed without trimming, and they are the same politicians who decry all efforts to reduce the Government spending. Swollen budgets pouring out of money to pay useless bureaucrats who produce nothing are two of the most important factors in creating inflation.

The fact is, of course, that when these New Dealers in Congress seek to block tax cuts they do so not to prevent inflation but to keep the Republicans from getting any political advantage next year out of tax reduction. What they fear is not inflation in the realms of finance but inflation in GOP political prospects.

The Taft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following article by Clifford B. Ward, editor of the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel:

GOOD EVENING
(By Clifford B. Ward)

Labor leaders, who insist upon being unfair, will not like Senator TAFT'S labor bill, but the Taft bill is not antilabor. It merely represents an intelligent attempt to endow unions with a responsibility matching the new powers which they have received in recent years. It is very unfortunate that most persons do not bother to acquaint themselves thoroughly with the things which they condemn.

Senator TAFT'S law would ban the closed shop, but it would not ban the union shop and there are a great many persons, even in labor, who do not know the difference between the two. They do not amount to the same thing and there is much more than a technical difference between them. The favorite argument on behalf of a closed shop is that it prevents an employee in a shop from taking a free ride on the past gains of the union by staying out of a union and not paying dues to it. Mr. TAFT'S law accepts that argument and meets it.

But before getting to that, maybe the difference between a closed shop and a union shop should be set forth. A closed shop is where a person cannot get a job unless he is already a member of the union there recognized. The employer has his labor provided him by a union hiring hall or what amounts to the same thing. No matter how badly the employer needs additional help and no matter how badly eligible union members need a job, both are at the mercy of the membership policies of the union.

A union shop, however, is one in which a new employee may be hired without belonging to a union but is under obligation to join the union within the usual period of 30 days. A union shop permits an employer to have control over his hiring, permits an employee to break through the monopoly set up by a closed shop, and at the same time prevents a new employee from taking a so-called free ride at the expense of the union. If a new employee in a union shop does not join the union in 30 days and pay his union dues, the employer must discharge him. Under the Taft bill, however, if an employer hires a new employee qualified to join the union and the union refuses to accept him as a member for reasons of monopolistic practices on the part of the union the employer does not have to discharge the man.

Most shops in this country are union shops, not closed shops.

Among other provisions of the Taft bill are: Ones requiring the filing of nonpublic financial reports by the unions with the United States Secretary of Labor; ones for making the unions suable as corporations are suable; and requirements for unions to deal with the representatives whom employers choose to represent them. Banned are organizational strikes and secondary boycotts. Industry-wide bargaining is not dealt with anywhere in the bill, except as the bill re-

quires unions to deal with the representatives that employers designate.

A very important feature of the bill is that dealing with strikes which endanger the national economy such as the recent coal strikes. If a national emergency strike threatens, the United States Secretary of Labor may go into court and ask an injunction staying the strike for 60 days, during which a board of inquiry is named to study the issues involved and to report back to the Secretary of Labor. If the issues between the employer and employees are not resolved in the 60-day period, an additional 30 days is asked of the court for the Government to attempt to mediate the dispute and bring the employers and employees into agreement. If this mediation, but not an arbitration attempt, fails, then the union goes out on strike, but TAFT proposes that when such a strike occurs the Congress should step into the breach with an emergency law exactly covering each such situation and dealing with it. It does not propose taking away the right to strike except as the right to strike interferes with the operation of the entire economy.

The Taft bill amounts to a rewriting of the Wagner Labor Act to the end that rights of labor and capital are equalized justly. In the end by endowing the unions with more responsibility it may prevent them from acts of injustice which are a national hostility toward them.

The Taft bill does not outlaw shops in which only union men are employed. It does not destroy the right to strike. It does not ban industry-wide bargaining. It only brings unions in out of the jungle atmosphere where they now operate to a realm where they, like employers, are under the influence of the laws of the land.

Ilya Ehrenburg's Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by the Honorable Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution:

YEARNS FOR A MALLET
(By Ralph McGill)

Spencer J. McCallie, when he had a bit of truth which he believed important, used to say to the young dolts lolling on the benches before him:

"I wish I had this engraved on a mallet so that I might hit each of you on the head with it and really impress you with it."

I have just finished, somewhat belatedly, reading European Crossroads, the same being the report by Ilya Ehrenburg of his journey through the Balkans.

I wish I had it engraved upon a generous mallet and might hit squarely and firmly upon the head each Member of Congress who does not see the importance of the American information program to Europe and South America.

The book is a masterpiece of propaganda.

I mean it is propaganda in its real meaning. We have, unfortunately, watered down or so narrowed and changed the meaning of some excellent words until they are cripples peddling pencils along the streets of truth.

A dismaying number of Americans think of propaganda as meaning lies.

It doesn't.

The real sense of the word is the propagation or putting over, in more or less subtle or emotional manner, an idea, a faith, a truth—as the negative of faith or truth.

SUPERB

Ehrenburg is the Soviet Union's best known and most able journalist. He is one of the world's most skillful propagandists. He is a cosmopolitan figure, conversant in several languages, a superb writer.

I was able to find no lies in his Balkan report. A year ago he toured the Southern part of the United States. I was able to find no lies in that report.

But in both of them there was a skillful exploitation of one phase of a truth and an utter neglect of the remainder of it.

There also was a complete avoidance of some pertinent facts. This was less true in the American articles, for obvious reasons, than in those concerning the Balkans.

I must hasten to say that many American correspondents have been equally guilty in writing of the Balkans or of Russia. But, I am sure, none has done it so well as Ehrenburg.

OMISSIONS

Nowhere in the book does Ehrenburg mention, or even casually allude to, the great flood of lend-lease goods from this country, and smaller amounts from Britain, which made possible the advance of the Red army into the Balkans.

He speaks of our guns, our tanks, our rifles, our planes, when many thousands of them were made in America and shipped in American ships, at great loss of American life, to the Soviets. Nor does he mention the enormous contribution of the Americans who opened, and supplied the Persian Gulf ports and railways * * * all going to Russia.

Through it all runs the persistent theme—Russia did the fighting, Russia did the dying, Russia supplied the tanks, guns, rifles, planes—Russia liberated Europe. Russia gave the world the new hope and the new faith.

TRIALS

He attends the Nuremberg trials. Yet, there is no mention of Eisenhower, Bradley, Patton, Montgomery, the American bombers and escorting fighters; no mention of the American landings and bitter fighting and dying as they fought through France and into Berlin.

He speaks only of Russia freeing Germany. The war was a Russian war in which only Russians suffered and died for liberty.

There is no mention of the United Nations.

He writes of Yugoslavia, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, and Czechoslovakia after the war, and it is superbly done.

The book is, essentially, a collection of pamphlets of propaganda. They were widely published in the Soviet Union. They have been widely distributed, and are still being made easily available, to the peoples of the Balkan countries. These same peoples are hearing very little about this country. They will continue to hear very little about it.

It is fair to ask "why?"

ANSWER

The answer is that we have so deluded ourselves with the erroneous meaning of propaganda that we are not willing to spend what is, relatively, a pittance on an information program of news, including news about our culture and our part in the war and peace. We could present our own story in pamphlets and books and by radio. We could let the world know of our aims; of the fact that we are not a race of gum chewers, lynchers, and divorcees.

We whine about the success of the Soviets in spreading their own story.

Yet we are on the verge of killing off, in the name of economy, an information program which costs less per year than 19 bombing planes.

The dawn coming to the new Europe is a very red dawn, according to Ehrenburg's book, which is a boon broadcast like sown wheat in the Balkans.

And we are not permitting any other tint to be added to it.

I wish every American would write his or her Congressman to support an American program of information. General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and Admiral Nimitz, plus all the personalities of our State Department, consider it vital.

I wish it were possible to hit on the head with Ehrenburg's book all those who do not think so.

Budget for Grand Coulee Irrigation and Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted April 28, 1947, by the City Council of the City of Seattle, Wash.:

Resolution 14689

A resolution protesting the House Appropriations Committee's recommendation that the Bureau of Reclamation's budget for Grand Coulee reclamation be cut

Whereas the full and speedy development of the Grand Coulee reservoir for irrigation is vital to the development of the Pacific Northwest and will contribute to the national prosperity and well being; and

Whereas this project will be largely self-liquidating; and

Whereas the recommendations of the House Appropriations Committee that the Bureau of Reclamation's budget for Grand Coulee irrigation be cut will, if adopted, be disastrous to the Pacific Northwest and damaging to the Nation as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Seattle, That for the reasons above stated, the city of Seattle most vigorously protests the House Appropriations Committee's recommendation to the Congress that the Bureau of Reclamation's budget for Grand Coulee irrigation and reclamation be cut; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the city clerk to each of the Members of the House and to both of the Senators from the State of Washington.

Passed the city council the 28th day of April, 1947, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 28th day of April, 1947.

M. B. MITCHELL,
President of the City Council.

Filed by me this 28th day of April, 1947.
Attest:

W. C. THOMAS,
City Comptroller and ex Officio City Clerk.

By C. G. ERLANDSON,
Deputy.

Resolution 14690

A resolution protesting the House Appropriations Committee's recommendation that the Bonneville Power Administration budget of $20,278,000 be cut to $6,907,000

Whereas the full use of water power is vital to full resource development in the Pacific

Northwest, and contributes to the Nation's prosperity and well being, and to the national defense; and

Whereas this region lacks coal in industrial quantity and does not have oil or natural gas and water is the only reliable present and future source of power, the Federal Government has wisely developed the Columbia River for power in the interest of the Nation's welfare, and for the national defense; and

Whereas this development has proved not only a wise but a profitable venture in a field too large for private investment to undertake to develop economically; and

Whereas the demand for this power has increased by leaps and bounds and there is now a shortage which threatens the present and forecloses the future development of industry in the Pacific Northwest, and threatens the national defense; and

Whereas the shortage can only be remedied by utilizing the power available to the Bonneville Power Administration through the building of additional transmission lines, substations, etc., contemplated by said Administration's budget of $20,278,000; and

Whereas the city of Seattle is building as rapidly as it can its own power supply but is unable to build it fast enough to keep up with its load, which is constantly increasing, and it therefore now buys and in the future will buy considerable power from Bonneville; and

Whereas the city of Tacoma is in a similar position; and

Whereas the recommendation of the House Appropriations Committee that Bonneville's budget be cut nearly $14,000,000 dollars will, if adopted, preclude the building of additional transmission lines, substations, etc., which are so vitally necessary for the reasons above stated, will be disastrous to the Pacific Northwest and damaging to the Nation as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the city of Seattle, That for the reasons above stated, the city of Seattle most vigorously protests the House Appropriations Committee's recommendation to the Congress that the Bonneville Power Administration's budget of $20,278,000 be cut to $6,907,000; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the city clerk to each of the Members of the House and to both of the Senators from the State of Washington.

Passed the city council the 28th day of April 1947, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 28th day of April 1947.

M. B. MITCHELL,
President of the City Council.

Filed by me this 28th day of April 1947.
Attest:

W. C. THOMAS,
City Comptroller and ex Officio City Clerk.

By C. G. ERLANDSON, *Deputy*,

The Great Heart of New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by United States Senator IRVING M. IVES at the opening dinner of the Greater New York Fund, tenth annual campaign, Hotel Astor, New York City, Tuesday, April 29, 1947:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, this is the sort of occasion in which I am proud to have a part. New York City, because of its size and its importance in the Nation's economy, has been given many legendary characters. The infinite variety of the lives and the activities carried on in its five boroughs has sometimes made it a sort of fabulous metropolis, glittering and unreal. Some people call it cold, and there was an author who proclaimed that New York is not America.

But you know and I know that it is these characterizations themselves that are false. On an occasion like this New York reveals itself in its true light. It is a community of neighbors, not so very different from any other community in these United States.

It is bigger, to be sure. You number your population in millions rather than in hundreds. The balance sheet of your annual business adds up in billions rather than in thousands. But the heart is just the same. It is laid bare here tonight in the dinner which launches the campaign for the greater New York fund of 1947.

I like this occasion. It springs from neighborliness and the spirit of cooperation that quality always implies. You know, I come from Norwich, in Chenango County, which all of us up there think is quite a metropolis, too. The population is 9,000. We have drives like this one, dedicated to a similar purpose. Sitting here at the head table I have found the same enthusiasm, the same devotion to the community, the same sense of dedication to the neighbors in New York City that a small community feels. It's only a question of widening the base.

Those qualities burrow deep to the foundation of our Nation. The Greater New York Fund is directed toward supporting the hospitals, the health and welfare agencies which care for citizens at those tragic times when personal disaster strikes. By bridging the gap between the income of 433 separate agencies engaged in these humanitarian services and their estimated expenses it insures that they will maintain and develop the aid which they have undertaken to provide. It is as simple as that.

This is the sort of initiative and responsibility which Americans have always been glad to take—and accept. It is part of our national character. As the Nation has matured, we have grown in our constant concern for improving the condition of less fortunate citizens—giving them the aid and strength to come back into the economic struggle, caring for the old and infirm, exercising broadly the humanitarianism which is merely an extension of the neighborliness of an American town.

I like the sense of community responsibility which the Greater New York Fund implies. I think it is right. I think it is sound. I know it is American. There is a false tendency in this country to have Government support everything. In the end, that would do away with such drives as this. Instead of the pride of contributing directly to the welfare of your community you would simply pay more on your taxes—and I might add, as a practical matter, the item would not be deductible. I don't like that sort of philosophy. I don't believe most Americans like it. But I think its implications are worth analyzing at such a time as this.

Leave aside what such a policy would do in blunting the sensibility of citizens to their neighbors' needs. What it really means is this: As local government takes over more and more aid to individuals, the layers of government nearer home become less and less able to swing the expense. Their sources of taxation—and the funds can come only from taxation—are exhausted. If local government cannot supply the deficiency, then the Federal Government must take over the financing. Then we are off on such a spiral of bureaucracy as you and I would rather not contemplate.

No, I think the Greater New York Fund is not only the more appealing idea but it is an expression of policy which will guarantee that the management of these community services remains where it economically belongs—at home. The fund which this city's people are asked to provide is not out of proportion to their wealth. It is no insupportable burden. It is small compared to the alternative of a break-down in this system of voluntary support.

I have spent many years in the service of New York's State government and for eight of them, before I went to Washington, I was in the closest touch with some of the State's machinery for dealing with the welfare of our citizens. As chairman of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Industrial and Labor Conditions it was my responsibility to make a continuing survey, not only of the administration of our own agencies but of those in other States. That service gave me the most direct insight into the areas where State government should leave off and the community take up its responsibility.

There are some fields—social security and unemployment insurance are examples—where there is no alternative to the States' assuming collective responsibility for the welfare of individuals. The problem is too complex for the community to provide adequate care. But the State—and I am referring now both to State and Federal Government—likewise finds the problems of individual specialized care too complex for the broad measures which the State can supply. For the State must deal with its citizens without the direct personal case-by-case care which they may need in time of trouble. It is not enough to satisfy the neighborly feeling which Americans hold for each other.

These hospitals and health and welfare agencies which participate in the Greater New York fund provide services which, in my opinion, the State can never properly provide and should not provide. They are the local guarantee of communities that those in need shall not suffer. Put on a more selfish—or let me say on a more practical—basis, they provide certain insurance that any citizen of a community will not suffer if he is in need of special care.

This drive is being launched at a very critical time in history. I can assure you that from my rampart in the Senate, the grave nature of our problems is borne in upon me constantly. The shrinkage of old barriers in the atomic age provides a nervousness which a man cannot help feeling in Washington. You and I cannot know what the future has in store. The prophets speak their pieces but we know they are guessing—guessing. In this world of uncertainty, there is only one truth for Americans. It is that the shining spirit of democracy is a mirror to peoples, even behind an iron curtain, of a Utopia which they regard as still a dream of reflected glory.

I do not intend tonight to discuss foreign policy. It would be out of place in such a meeting as this. But let me say that there could be no more direct expression of democracy than the campaign which you are launching here. I do not suppose its news will penetrate the curtain, except dimly. But somewhere, somehow, it is such endeavors as this, filtering through, which will remain the convincing proof that America is still a land of promise. Still a better place than all the totalitarian regimes that were ever dreamed of in the crooked philosophies of the dictators.

So you see, your drive has greater objectives than appear on its horizon. You want contributions, but it is what they buy in

human comfort and human happiness that you are giving. You are offering treatment for the sick, care for the aged and infirm, a broader horizon for the young. You are offering sunshine and health. But still those are the symbols of our democracy—of our America. They are the guarantee that the great humanity of the community is a thousand* times better than the cold comfort of the State.

I am a rather historic kind of American. I have been up and down the development of this great Nation through the history books and I have never found that its basic ideals have changed. I find the old virtues most appealing because they represent ideals we have always cherished. Yes, we have advanced—enormously—in our acceptance of human responsibilities. I am proud of it. But that is a development in social consciousness, an awareness of how we could apply more perfectly a community sense. It has not been a change in philosophy. It is a progressive correction of old errors.

I know that there are those who feel that the errors which still exist in our system are symptoms of its decay. I look upon them rather as a challenge. This Greater New York Fund campaign which we are launching tonight is the recognition of such a challenge. It recognizes a community responsibility to provide for those who are temporarily, or through the ill turn of fortune, unable without help to carry through a crisis in their lives. It recognizes that these individuals shall not be allowed to become destitute or to perish. It guarantees that the community will see them through their troubles, not as a charity, but as a rallying-round of the neighbors. It confirms a spirit which maintains self-respect. In this spirit it stimulates self-reliance the moment the crisis is past.

More than that, it stimulates the development of community sense in people, which is the spirit of this Nation. I am a deep and fervent believer in America. In the Senate of the United States, where tempers seem occasionally to grow thin, I have sharpened that belief. The Senate has been called the greatest deliberative body in the world. I believe it is. Certainly there is no council where a man may more readily and frankly express his views. There is no body where the democratic spirit of America and the world breathes more freely. But the Senate is simply an expansion of what a man says anywhere, with the added great responsibility that his opinion and his vote may become the policy of this Nation. In the Senate the community of America has its voice.

With all the tensions, it is a neighborly voice. Idaho contends with Michigan, and California with Maine. Minnesota argues with Mississippi and North Dakota with Texas. But it is neighbors talking. It is a community spirit, talking with the many voices of America.

I mention it tonight, because it seems to me the community spirit of America may be stretched broad across the continent or caught in the local pride of a city. All of you who are dedicating your service through the period of this campaign are simply expressing what in a larger way is the spirit of the Nation. You are dedicating yourselves to the self-reliance which is our national heritage. You are expressing once more your faith in the ancient beliefs.

Your services can never be computed in facts and figures on a balance sheet. You are preserving the way of life that our forefathers laid down 300 years ago and that has been reaffirmed by their successive generations. You have broadened immensely the conception of humanity which has always been a glowing thing in our midst. You are making more perfect our steady march toward the realization of great objectives which all of us understand as the very purpose of democracy, and of America.

Turkey Censures Foreign Newsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the House should note that today on May 2, we have another report from Turkey of their slapping a censorship on our newspapermen. As I have stated twice before the House, a ruthless dictatorship exists in Turkey. This latest censorship appearing in the New York Times demonstrates this fact. I include this article as a part of my remarks:

TURKEY CENSURES FOREIGN NEWSMEN—ATTACKS DANIELL, FORREST AS SPREADING ERRONEOUS DATA—DEFENDS SUSPENSIONS

ISTANBUL, TURKEY, April 30.—Vice Premier Mumtaz Okmen charged tonight that erroneous news on Turkey was spread "by certain foreign correspondents in our country who very often cannot grasp the thoroughly essential laws of Turkey's administration or whose views are unable to reach the depths of the political currents within the country."

Mr. Okmen's accusations were made in an interview with the semiofficial Anatolia news agency in commenting on press dispatches to the New York Times from Turkey and a survey of international freedom of the press by Wilbur Forrest, of the New York Herald Tribune, past president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

The Anatolian agency correspondent reported that the New York Times dispatches, signed by Raymond Daniell, dealt with the recent indefinite suspension of two more opposition newspapers in Istanbul and conditions under which the general elections took place in this country.

Mr. Daniell was criticized twice this week by the semiofficial Tanis.

UNDER SIEGE COMMAND

Giving the Government's attitude on the suspensions, Mr. Okmen, who also is Minister of State, said the newspapers—Democrasi and Tasvir—were suspended by a state of siege command for publishing news of a kind that had been officially forbidden and that was considered criminal by the Turkish Penal Code.

"Otherwise, the newspapers were not suspended by the Government because they published a declaration of an opposition deputy, as the New York Times correspondent, Mr. Daniell, reported," Mr. Okmen said.

"The strategic importance of the Istanbul region, due to the world political situation, is known to everybody," he continued. "During the Second World War, the Government decided to institute martial law in this important region, with the aim of establishing security. The order and decision were approved by the Turkish Grand National Assembly.

"The military administration was authorized to establish and execute extraordinary measures in the regions under martial law. The suspension of newspapers was among these measures."

The Vice Premier, asserted that the elections in Turkey took place according to law and that no observers of a party participating in the polling were prevented from carrying out their jobs.

He advanced the New York Times dispatches and the distribution of Mr. Forrest's statement by the Anatolian agency as evidence of freedom of information here. He said correspondents were free to cable without restriction.

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS CALLED IN

Two days ago, however, a group of foreign correspondents at a conference in the Turkish Press Department, told Sever Iskit, press director for Istanbul, that they did not agree with the Department's view that Mr. Forrest's statement including Turkey among the 23 countries where information was chained up was inaccurate.

The 12 correspondents, most of them American, were invited to the Department, Mr. Iskit said, "to be notified that the Turkish Press Department disagrees with the part of Mr. Forrest's statement concerning Turkey."

"We have also called upon you," Mr. Iskit declared, "to remind you of something you already know: That Turkey is enjoying press freedom."

War Assets Administration Scores Knock-Out in First Round—Veteran, Small Businessman, Socked in Solar Plexus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a World War II veteran, who is also a small businessman, in which he gives a blow-by-blow account of his bout with the War Assets Administration:

PERRY, IOWA, *April 22, 1947.*

Mr. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I started this letter shortly before the first of the year, and should have mailed it long ago, but somehow or another, I kept thinking things would improve. Instead, they have become steadily worse. This letter contains my gripes against the War Assets Administration. I think they are legitimate.

I am a veteran of World War II. I had 44 months of "it." I am a Republican and always have been. Most important of all, I am an American, a citizen of these United States, and I am discouraged, disgusted, and mad, over trying to deal with the Government in surplus property.

I had to fight to get certified. WAA in Des Moines was reluctant to certify me for $25,000 because there was only a limited amount of surplus, and many veterans wanted to start businesses. When I went to buy surplus to stock my business, I found that minimum lots were generally so large that only wholesalers dare buy. For weeks and weeks after I was certified, I received no information on sales. It was not until after I had written dozens of letters that I received any information. After 6 months I found that in general, WAA prefers not to mess with small purchasers. I was practically told that, when I visited the Omaha office of WAA several weeks ago. The paper work involved in processing a purchase through WAA is so voluminous that the officials want as little as possible to do with small orders.

The surplus sale which opened at Ankeny around January 5, 1947, was advertised as being for veterans who wished to buy for their own consumption. When the veterans arrived at the sale, they were required to buy a minimum of 5 pair of overshoes, or 4 pair of 16-inch boots, or 12 winter caps, or 4 pair of hip boots, etc. If the veteran did buy 4 pair of boots, he had to wait around from 2 to 4 hours before he could pick up the boots. Generally, the small purchaser left in disgust. How many men are going to buy 4 pair of boots at a cost of $3 each in order to obtain 1 pair for his own use, when he can buy a new pair for $5? There were more employees at the sale than there were customers, and not one had the authority to change the size of the lots or the procedure for making purchases.

I purchased 60 heavy leather coats in Philadelphia while my certification was still being processed. I was assured that the certificate would be honored when presented. Later, when I tried to exercise my rights as a veteran, WAA said they were sorry but the sale had been processed, and I was required to pay $24 per coat instead of $19.20 which a veteran was entitled to. Only a matter of $288. The papers had been processed, and WAA did not want to be bothered making any changes. These coats were purchased November 22, 1946, with the idea of having them in time for the Christmas market. Five weeks later the coats arrived. I am out $1,440 as far as this year is concerned. Storage and care of the coats over the summer means additional expense. On the other hand, a veteran I know obtained the inside dope on 4,000 sleeping bags, arranged to sell them to one of our big chain outfits, and then bought them and received delivery in 1 week. Right now I would sell all of the leather coats for $1,000.

That brings me to the subject of twenty-five- and fifty-thousand-dollar certifications. I understand that the original intent of WAA was to enable every veteran interested in establishing a business to obtain an initial stock of goods. Thousands of vets like myself have yet to buy on certification. We get what the smart, fast operators don't want, or are already loaded with. How are these brokers or wholesalers operating with a big financial backing able to buy $25,000 worth of a single item such as the very popular B–15 flight jacket, or the Navy N–1 foul-weather jacket, or the beautiful B–11 parka? I can take you out to Omaha and show you 10 places that have purchased from $100,000 to $500,000 worth of choice items alone. I have been trying to buy 500 N–1 jackets for the last 4 months, and all I have received are very polite, I-am-sorry-nonavailable letters; then along comes a catalog from Omaha with a fine selection of items offered for sale January 27 and 28. I received the catalog January 29. Nevertheless, I placed an order and received a very polite letter about how the sale was over, and thanking me for my interest in surplus property.

I happen to know that WAA files are loaded with letters from veterans like myself. I don't want a bonus. I don't want a soft job with the Veterans' Administration. I would dig ditches before I would join the infamous 52–20 Club. I want efficient Government agencies. To date, the vast majority of industrious veterans seeking to buy surplus property in good faith have received a rotten deal from WAA.

Every contract, every offer to buy, is written up so that the small buyer who buys at a distance in good faith doesn't have a chance. I submitted a bid to Charleston, S. C., Navy Yard on used surplus offered by the Navy. The bids were opened January 2, 1947. When I had received no word by January 8, I wired requesting that my bid be withdrawn. On January 11 I received a notification that I had been awarded three lots totaling $1,827. All of this merchandise was winter wearing apparel. By the time they had completed all of their involved paper work and had taken their time shipping the merchandise, it would have been April 1 before I could possibly have received this property. My withdrawal of the bid meant that I must forfeit my $556 deposit. No small businessman can survive if he has to buy, sell, and supervise shipment himself. At the present time I stand to lose $2,500 out of the $3,800 I saved while in the service. Remember, I would not have minded taking these losses if I could have obtained some of the choice surplus which the big operators became rich on. There are risks in any business, but dealing with WAA is a hopeless gamble.

I learned from a former employee of the Ankeny ordinance plant that the employees were directed to pile new lumber on top of new electric motors and set the entire pile afire. He estimated that there were hundreds of new motors and enough lumber to build several new houses all burned. Electric motors are still one of the most difficult items to obtain.

I have talked to many veterans. Every one of them is disgusted with WAA. Most businessmen who have dealt with WAA are disgusted. Thousands of legitimate dealers throughout the country will have nothing to do with surplus property because they have found from personal experience that WAA as an organization is disorganized, inefficient, unreliable, and apparently staffed with men completely lacking in business acumen. The Government is going to end up selling all of its war surplus to the speculators at 1 cent on the dollar. There are billions of dollars in war surplus, yet WAA will list $1,000 worth of an item. They will receive $10,000 to $100,000 worth of orders for that item, and instead of attempting to locate sufficient merchandise to fill all of these orders, they write letters, return checks, and "fiddle around" until the cost of selling the $1,000 worth is more than the value of the goods. Then they turn around and offer thousands and thousands of dollars' worth of the very same item a month or so later. Here is WAA, an organization receiving billions of dollars worth of merchandise from the United States Government free, so to speak, and they can't even do business in a sensible enough manner to break even, so I understand. The Government would be better off and the taxpayer would be billions ahead if all war assets were pooled and used as a reservoir from which to draw for the reconstruction of foreign countries.

It is my opinion that the entire surplus-property program should be overhauled. I would like to know what steps to take to procure my $288 from WAA in Philadelphia. I would like to see something done about a situation that appears to me to be a detriment to the entire country, because I believe sound business in Government is a must if we are to win through the next few years.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE WILTON MILLER.

American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the pleasure of introducing at the annual dinner of the Rochester Consistory in my district, our distinguished colleague from California, Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY, who delivered an address on the merchant marine. Because of the fact that Congressman BRADLEY knows the sea as, perhaps, no other man in Congress, having served for many years in the Navy and, as the holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor, with a record for heroism rarely matched in naval annals, and because he is now continuing his service to the people of this country and to his district with such marked ability as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries I have asked leave to extend my remarks to include the address which he delivered in Rochester, N. Y.:

Mr. Chairman and brother Masons, of the many grave problems which demand solution in the next few months if this Nation is to build a new and satisfactory way of life upon its historic foundations, the question of what to do about our merchant marine is one of the most pressing and challenging. It is a question which is occupying a large share of the attention of Congress and the administration in Washington, and one to which every American might well give his best and most constructive thought now and in the immediate future.

The question of the merchant marine is important, because its answer will influence to a very great degree the shape of things to come, with respect not only to our domestic economy but our international relations and our national security as well. It is so urgent that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives was one of the first committee of the present Congress to get down to work on a subject of major national importance as it undertook immediate study of the Nation's maritime situation. For several months now, the committee has been investigating the postwar status of American shipping, particularly from the standpoint of existing passenger facilities, as a nucleus from which to build to meet our future needs for travel and trade. The President has also seen fit to appoint a group of citizens as an advisory committee on the merchant marine, to survey the situation of the shipping and shipbuilding industries and make recommendations as to their requirements.

It is apparent, at this stage of our postwar experience, that the world faces the early prospect of a new alinement of power among nations. From a war which impoverished its allies the United States has emerged as a tower of strength, both industrially and politically, among the western democracies. If, therefore, we are to enlarge our international commitments due to the force of circumstances we must recognize that the building and operating of ships in international trade will be an increasingly important factor in our relations with the rest of the world as time goes on.

The importance of an adequate merchant marine to our national security was too well illustrated in the recent war to leave any doubt in the mind of anyone. Without the bridge of ships that kept men and supplies moving to battle fronts scattered throughout the world the war could not have been won. From Japan's first blow at Pearl Harbor in 1941 until her capitulation in 1945 the total cargo lift of materials from the United States to the various theaters of the war was 268,252,000 long tons, including 64,730,000 tons of petroleum products and other bulk liquids carried in tankers, exclusive of liquid cargoes carried for the Army and Navy. Between December 7, 1941, and November 30, 1945, merchant ships transported the great majority of the 7,129,907 Army personnel and

141,537 civilians moving overseas and the 4,060,883 Army personnel and 169,626 civilians returning to the United States.

The miracle of this achievement is not alone in the fact that our ships carried such staggering totals of men and matériel, but in the mighty industrial effort which produced the ships that did the job. The American merchant marine was in sorry condition after a decline of 15 years following World War I. Around 1935 we were fourth among the six leading maritime nations in tonnage, sixth in vessels 10 years of age or less, and fifth in vessels with speeds of 12 knots or over. Dry cargo shipbuilding was at a standstill and our ships were rapidly reaching the stage of obsolescence.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was designed to provide the United States with a merchant marine adequate for both trade and defense. A Presidential message to Congress in 1935, recommending its enactment, gave three reasons why the bill should become law: (1) To provide Government subsidies to enable the industry to meet the competition of low-cost foreign construction and operation of ships, (2) to insure adequate tonnage for American commerce in the event of war not involving this country but withdrawing foreign tonnage from normal trade, and (3) to insure an adequate merchant marine as an arm of the national defense.

The United States Maritime Commission, which was established by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, began, in 1937, a program for the building of 50 large, modern, ocean-going vessels a year for 10 years. It was due to the fact that this program was fairly under way that we were supplied with a small nucleus of new ships as we entered the period of national emergency preceding our participation in World War II.

At that time there were but 1,379 ocean-going merchant vessels of all types under the American flag. We were especially short of passenger liners and combination passenger-cargo ships which could be converted as troop ships. Vessels of this type totaled 162 on September 30, 1939, with an aggregate passenger capacity of only 56,516.

The building of nearly 6,000 ships during the war was the greatest achievement in the maritime history of the world. We virtually lifted ourselves by our bootstraps to do it. Shipyards were built from nothing along our coasts. Modern mass-production methods were utilized as whole sections of ships were prefabricated inland and shipped to the yards to be assembled on the ways. We standardized on a few types and pushed for speed to get them built. Vessels were launched in a matter of days and quickly delivered into service after rapid outfitting. The race was against time and the German submarine service in the most critical months of the war, but the resources of American industry proved equal to the task.

After the war we were left with the largest merchant fleet that ever sailed under one flag, a total of approximately 4,800 vessels aggregating more than 50,000,000 dead-weight tons. For a long period after the cessation of hostilities the war-connected work of the merchant marine went right on, however. Tons of food and other relief supplies had to be shipped overseas to war-devastated countries. Nine out of every ten servicemen returning from the war traveled in merchant ships. Vessels specially fitted out for the purpose transported thousands of war brides and their children to this country. Many other ships were kept busy carrying official travelers and displaced persons to ports all over the world.

The present problem of what to do about our merchant marine really dates from the end of the war. Although left with the largest merchant tonnage in the world's history, we were in possession of a fleet of ships composed principally of a few standardized types mass produced to meet the needs of war. It was a fleet completely unbalanced for normal, peacetime competitive trade. Our first task was to dispose of this fleet, since, because of its numbers and composition, it could not be absorbed by private operators in normal trade. The answer was to dispose of the ships through sale, charter, and laying up in a reserve fleet for future emergency or need.

Under the Ship Sales Act of 1946, the Maritime Commission had approved the sale of 950 war-built ships as of March 1, 1947. These sales will bring the Government revenue totaling $850,000,000. Of the sales approved, 330 ships went to American operators and 620 were sold abroad. Because of their priority under the Ship Sales Act, American operators bought 193 of the desirable C-type ships, 68 Liberty ships, 53 tankers, 3 Victory ships, and 13 coastal vessels. Foreign governments and operators received approval to purchase 47 C-types, 363 Liberty ships, 85 Victorys, 50 tankers, and 75 coastal vessels.

At the present time the Maritime Commission is reexamining its whole policy of foreign sales of ships under the Ship Sales Act, on the basis of both sales to foreign purchasers compared to those to United States purchasers, and a comprehensive review of the foreign ship-construction program. The Commission is in process of reporting its findings in this matter to Congress. It is also undertaking a review of its policy with respect to chartering vessels to American operators, since under the terms of the Ship Sales Act chartering, as well as sales, must end by December 31, 1947.

Although a record high number of 1,742 ships of the war fleet had been consigned to the reserve fleet in December 1946, only 1,418 vessels were in the fleet as of March 15 this year. The reduction was due to withdrawal of vessels for sale and chartering. The Ship Sales Act provides that vessels not disposed of under its provisions by December 31, 1947, shall be held in reserve, and it is expected that some 3,750 ships will ultimately comprise the reserve fleet.

Due to the gradual completion of its war-connected obligations, the Maritime Commission is now operating less than 10 percent of the fleet of merchant ships which were under Government control at the end of the war. With a few possible exceptions, if Congress grants any extension, the Government will be out of the shipping business by June 30 of this year.

This brings us once more, then, to the basic purpose for which the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was adopted—to foster the development and maintenance of a merchant marine, privately owned and operated so far as practicable, adequate to carry our domestic water-borne commerce and a reasonable portion of our foreign commerce, and adequate to serve as an auxiliary of the armed services in time of war.

The situation in which we find ourselves, in setting about now to apply the principles of the 1936 act in the rehabilitation of our merchant marine, is far more complicated than when the Maritime Commission launched its 10-year program in 1937. In appointing his advisory committee to study the matter, President Truman said: "As an aftermath of the war, the United States faces critical problems in connection with the construction, modernization, and maintenance of an adequate fleet of passenger and freight vessels. With no passenger liners and few cargo vessels scheduled to be built in the immediate future, the Nation is not assured of the existence of a balanced and modern merchant fleet. This is a matter that concerns not only our commerce and trade, but our national security as well."

The President also pointed out that: "Although our present need is primarily for passenger ships, our ship-construction program as a whole merits careful consideration. As an important element of national security in connection with preparation for expansion in case of emergency, it is essential that shipbuilding skills be maintained by shipbuilders through an orderly replacement program of all types of vessels. Latest technological developments must be incorporated into our future cargo and combination cargo-and-passenger vessels, as well as into passenger liners, if the United States is to maintain a well-balanced modern merchant fleet to meet trade as well as security requirements."

With the close of the war, foreign nations, particularly Great Britain, have been rushing ahead with programs for the reestablishment of strong and modern merchant services. They have been doing this by building fast, new ships of all types, while supplementing their tonnage through the purchase of cargo vessels from the surplus tonnage of the United States. We, however, have failed thus far to do very much of anything to insure a sound position for the American merchant marine in the field of international trade.

At present we have only one first-class passenger liner, the steamship *America*, in service on the all-important North Atlantic run. Passenger service on other established trade routes is also woefully inadequate. The Maritime Commission reports that only 19 vessels, with total passenger capacity of 1,666, are building or under contract for construction under its program at the present time. These include two American President liners, which will handle 550 passengers each on a trans-Pacific route. A combination passenger and cargo liner for operation to the east coast of South America by the Mississippi Shipping Co. will accommodate 119. Three Alcoa Steamship Co. vessels will carry 97 each. The rest are principally cargo vessels which will carry only 12 passengers each.

Under its proposed 1948 budget, as approved by the President, the Maritime Commission's program calls for the building of six modified C3 cargo vessels, and three passenger vessels for the Mediterranean trade. In the light of review of the maritime situation by Congress, the President, and the Maritime Commission, however, this program is probably due to undergo some modification.

In the face of our meager shipbuilding program, other nations are making a much better showing in their determination to recover supremacy on the various trade routes of the world. Lloyd's Register reports that merchant vessels of 100 tons gross and over under construction throughout the world at the end of 1946 (exclusive of wood, composite, sail, and barge vessels) totaled 996 ships aggregating 3,659,335 gross tons. Figures for Japan and Russia were not available, but of the world's total reported, about 53 percent was being built in Great Britain and Ireland, while less than 10 percent was being built in the United States.

Recent newspaper reports state that the Cunard-White Star Line's passenger-carrying facilities for its New York-England service will compare favorably by the end of this year with its accommodations in the early summer of 1939. This report states that the company hopes to have six liners in operation by the end of the year, five of them by the end of the summer. Their schedule calls for return of the 35,000-ton *Mauretania* this spring, the 27,000-ton *Brittanic* by late spring, and the 81,000-ton *Queen Mary* by midsummer. Two new 14,000-ton combination cargo-passenger liners, the *Media* and *Parthia*, are scheduled to make their first voyages before 1948, and the line is building a new ship of the *Mauretania* class, the *Caronia*, which will be completed before the middle of 1948.

We also learn through the press that the Holland-American Line has refloated the liner *Zuiderdam*, which was bombed and sunk

during the war, and will have her ready for trans-Atlantic service in a year. This will give Holland-American four passenger ships on the trans-Atlantic route. The Klaveness Steamship Line, of Norway, has a construction program for nine new motorships and one tanker scheduled for delivery within 2 years.

The question for Americans to decide, especially in view of the new role of this country as leader of the western democracies, is whether we intend to let foreign-flag lines carry our people and our goods in international trade, or whether we intend to build and maintain a strong merchant marine under our own flag. The Department of Commerce has estimated that the United States will furnish about $16,200,000,000 in goods and services to other nations this year, an increase of $900,000,000 over last year. Other countries, in turn, will provide about $9,000,000,000 in goods and services to this country. How much of this great preponderance of export trade will be carried in American-flag ships? What does it mean to our national economy, to our shipping and shipbuilding industries, to the men who build and sail the ships? Those are the questions that Americans must study, and the answers will give us our decision on what to do about the American merchant marine.

In urging passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the President said: "An American merchant marine is one of our most firmly established traditions. It was, during the first half of our national existence, a great and growing asset. Since then it has declined in value and importance. The time has come to square this traditional ideal with effective performance.

"Free competition among the nations in the building of modern shipping facilities is a manifestation of wholly desirable and wholesome national ambition. In such free competition the American people want us to be properly represented. The American people want to use American ships. Their Government owes it to them to make certain that such ships are in keeping with our national pride and national needs."

The whole aspect of international relations has changed since 1936, but the spirit of the act is even more applicable today. President Truman has stated that the future peace of the world depends largely upon the willingness of nations to remove from international trade the restrictions which tend to produce economic struggles which, in turn, can lead to war. He has urged that the United States should take the leadership in removing those restrictions. We cannot accomplish this without full participation in international shipping by maintaining a modern and adequate merchant marine under the American flag. As an instrument of international relations, the merchant marine will carry our flag into every port in the world as a symbol of what this Nation stands for in a world striving to find peace and security. It will also assist us in exercising the industrial strength and political power we hold, as a positive force in protecting the interests of freedom-loving peoples the world over.

From the standpoint of national security alone, the United States cannot afford to take chances in the future, as it has in the past, with its merchant shipping. In World War I we had to depend upon tonnage supplied by our allies to carry our troops and our goods of war to Europe. Most of the ships we built then for the emergency were not even delivered until the war was over. In World War II we performed an almost superhuman feat in building the ships we needed for victory. If another war occurs, we may not have that chance. It may be a very short war, accomplishing within a few weeks the destruction that took years of combat to bring about the last time. If we do not have shipping tonnage ready to go when the attack comes, we may not have the opportunity to build it. As the Army and Navy stand ready for the Nation's defense, so should the merchant marine be ready with ships and men. An adequate merchant marine, kept strong and modern, is the answer to the future of the United States in international trade, international relations, and national security.

The House Should Defeat the Greek-Turkish Military Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee of the House has decided to grant an open rule to the Members of the House in the discussion of the infamous Turkish-Greek bill, which an arrogant State Department has sent up to us under the false assumption that this Congress is a rubber stamp.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in the House who are unalterably opposed to this legislation are grateful to the Rules Committee of the House for the proper and democratic manner in which they have handled this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish in my discussion this afternoon to present a series of six amendments which I ask be printed and laid on the desk of every Member. These amendments are to the bill which has been proposed by the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, the first amendment which I wish to propose reads as follows:

H. R. 2616—AMENDMENT

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. (a) Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States has adopted as its policy in international affairs (1) intervention in civil strife, civil war, or political conflicts in foreign countries; or (2) unilateral action, either now or in the future, in disregard of its obligations to the United Nations.

"(b) The Congress hereby reaffirms the basic policy of the United States to bring before the United Nations all economic, political, or military conditions which may endanger the peace of the world."

Mr. Speaker, this amendment, as is evident, point-blank denies that the Members of this House agree with Mr. Truman, that our basic foreign policy has to be changed. This amendment denies the Truman doctrine. It denies that we intend to intervene in every civil war throughout the world and it reaffirms our commitments to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, as any candid Member of the House will acknowledge, Mr. Truman has stabbed the United Nations in the back. This act bypasses, subverts, rides over, ignores, and violates our commitments to that one hope of mankind for peace.

I do not believe that the House agrees with him in this willful, deliberate, and flagrant violation of our sworn commitment to the United Nations, and I have offered this amendment in the belief that the House of Representatives wishes to make clear that it does not support the Truman doctrine—that we are determined to carry through our commitments to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, as a second amendment to the Turkish-Greek military alliance bill, I wish to present the following amendment:

H. R. 2616—AMENDMENT

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to abolish within 90 days all hereditary offices and titles under such government; (b) to hold within 90 days free and democratic elections for the purpose of determining the chief executive officer of such government and the membership of its legislative body and to grant prior to such election universal suffrage for all persons over the age of 21; (c) to afford to all political parties full opportunities to participate and engage in election activities prior to the holding of such elections; and (d) to grant immediate amnesty to all political opponents of the persons or parties in control of the government requesting such assistance."

Mr. Speaker, this amendment makes absolutely clear that the Members of this House want nothing whatsoever to do with a vicious, corrupt, and venal monarchy which has been imposed upon the Greek people for over a hundred years by the London bankers. One Greek king died peacefully on his throne in the past hundred years. He died from the bite of his pet monkey. One Greek king was assassinated. Three were driven from the throne. The Greek people hate monarchy—and Mr. Truman proposes to keep a hated monarch on his throne by force of American arms. I do not believe that anybody in the House wants anything to do with a corrupt and degenerate institution of this kind. We are for democracy. We are for free suffrage. We are against dictatorial, terroristic, suppression of people who want civil liberties. Greece needs political democracy—it needs political democracy if any government is ever to have the support of the Greek people. Today that condition does not exist, and everybody knows that it does not exist. I am confident that this House wishes to cast its vote for the creation of a genuine democracy free from monarchy in Greece. Therefore, I have presented this amendment for the consideration of the Members.

Mr. Speaker, the third amendment which I wish to present and which I now offer for the RECORD knocks all military aid out of the present bill. It inserts the word "nonmilitary" after the word "furnish" on page 1, line 5, and it strikes out all clauses of the bill which refer to military aid:

H. R. 2616—AMENDMENT

On page 1, line 5, after the word "furnish" insert "nonmilitary."

On page 1, line 9, after the semicolon, insert "and."

On page 2, line 8, strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Beginning on page 2, line 9, strike out all down to and including line 22 on page 4.

On page 4, line 23, strike out "3" and insert in lieu thereof "2."

On page 6, line 1, strike out "4" and insert in lieu thereof "3."

On page 6, line 14, strike out "5" and insert in lieu thereof "4."

On page 7, line 15, strike out "6" and insert in lieu thereof "5."

On page 7, line 18, strike out "7" and insert in lieu thereof "6."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for nonmilitary assistance to Greece and Turkey."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the State Department, in a condition of self-induced hypocrisy, has assumed that any bill which it pretends gives relief will be taken as a relief bill by this House. As all of us know, relief is desperately needed by the Greek people, and for my own part I am willing to vote the funds necessary for clothes, for food, and for shelter for a heroic Greek people. But the State Department intends to send American men, American armed forces, American weapons, American munitions, and our State Department intends to form a military alliance with a dictatorship in Turkey. I do not believe that the House wants to intervene in a military way in the civil war in Greece. I do not believe that we intend to take the responsibility for the actions of the Greek Army. Mr. Paul Porter, in a report just released, has indicated that it will take roughly $500,000,000 for the next 5 years without any regard for military expenditure to put the Greek economy back on its feet. Where in God's name does this business end when we undertake to intervene in every armed conflict everywhere in the world?

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we want no part of this doctrine of military intervention everywhere in the world. Such a policy means financial bankruptcy for America. It means higher prices and higher taxes. It means a third world war. Sons and daughters of American citizens from coast to coast will die on battlefields in Asia and Europe if this type of military bill is enacted into law by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that every Member will be willing and ready to cast his recorded vote on this amendment. The President is determined to embark us on a new policy whose ends and objectives no man can see. His policy will end in disaster and it will end in war. Let the House adopt this amendment. Let us not become a rubber stamp for the insane and frantic desires of impatient men to solve the domestic problems of the world with the blood and wealth of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a fourth amendment, which I now present for the RECORD:

H. R. 2616—AMENDMENT

On page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "and Turkey."

On page 1, line 6, strike out "their governments" and insert in lieu thereof "its government."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 6, strike out "or Turkey."

On page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 18, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 20, strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country."

On page 3, line 12, strike out "or of Turkey."

On page 3, line 13, strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country."

On page 3, line 16, strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country."

On page 4, line 11, strike out "or of Turkey."

On page 4, lines 19 and 20, strike out "either Greece or Turkey" and insert in lieu thereof "Greece."

On page 6, lines 23 and 24, strike out "or Turkey, respectively."

On page 7, line 20, strike out "governments" and insert in lieu thereof "government."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for assistance to Greece."

This amendment strikes all reference to Turkey out of this present bill. Mr. Speaker, our State Department, without any request from Turkey, has decided that we should form a military alliance with that corrupt and military dictatorship. For a thousand years they have persecuted Christians and Jews. The record of Turkey is unparalleled in history in deliberate double-cross. The rulers of Turkey are supreme masters of the art of double-cross. During the war Turkey deliberately sold out the Allies—she reneged on every promise—on every commitment. On the record, the Turkish Government is completely unreliable. In God's name, what fevered mind gave birth to the frantic conception of the military alliance with a nation led by traitors and international bandits?

Mr. Speaker, Turkey is well-fed, well-financed, well-armed, and well-heeled. Her financial condition is better than ours, her national debt is very, very small. It is the part of common sense to put before the United Nations any condition which endangers the peace. It is a part of common sense to present the problem of the Dardanelles before the United Nations. It is plain foolishness to embark on a military alliance with a dishonorable government—to obtain objectives for which no citizen in the entire United States has ever cast a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a fifth amendment, which I herewith read:

H. R. 2616—AMENDMENT

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any loan pursuant to this act, the government requesting such loan shall (a) register with the United States Treasury Department all holdings of gold held by such government, and by the nationals of such government, both at home and abroad; (b) register with the United States Treasury Department all foreign assets, stocks, bonds, or other holdings, of such government and of the nationals of such government; (c) make public the full foreign and domestic indebtedness of such government; and (d) relegate all foreign indebtedness of such government to a subordinate position to the indebtedness incurred pursuant to this act."

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Members of the House will note that clause (d) of this amendment states that all present foreign indebtedness of Greece and Turkey shall be relegated to a subordinate position to any indebtedness pursuant to this act. Mr. Speaker, for 15 years we have put that clause into every loan made by the RFC to our own people. How in God's name after we have pursued a sound financial policy in the lending of money to our own banks and our own people, how can we now undertake to develop an international foreign policy without such financial safeguards? Do we give to the Turkish and Greek Governments in order that they can repay ancient debts made to London banks? Does anybody on this floor think that Uncle Sam is Santa Claus? Imagine what my constituents would think if I were to vote for a measure without knowing what the money is to be used for. Suppose that we vote this money and the Greek Government takes it and begins to pay back the Hambro Bank in London with it, and suppose the Hambro Bank is able to increase its dividends to the Churchill family, and suppose Winston Churchill is able to buy himself a new silk hat and a beautiful Rolls-Royce with the tax money of some family from the beautiful fields of Ohio. How do you suppose that I can conscientiously answer the questions of my constituents?

No, Mr. Speaker, I want to know, and the people of Ohio want to know what is going to be done with the money. We want to know how much gold these governments have got. We are asking them to tell us—to register with the Treasury Department their foreign assets and, Mr. Speaker, we want to know what their present foreign and domestic indebtedness is and we want airtight guaranties that our money is not going to pay back debts made by corrupt monarchies for the past hundred years in behalf of the aristocracy of England. As a matter of plain, ordinary horse sense, ordinary business practice—as a matter of plain common sense which every person in America will understand, I urge the House to adopt this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a sixth amendment which reads as follows:

H. R. 2616—AMENDMENT

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States shall be bound to support private agreements made between American oil companies and foreign governments or between American oil companies and nationals of foreign governments."

Great and powerful oil companies are sitting down in some quiet place in London and there in their quiet, secluded, peaceful conference room they will decide what shall be done with three-fourths of all the known oil reserves in the world. Naturally, Mr. President, I do not object to the activities of oil companies in the pursuit of their legitimate business, but I do object to any agreements that they may make which are binding on me as a Member of Congress.

There have been times in American history when American boys were sent overseas to protect the ill-gotten gains of supposedly reputable business. I, for one, trust that this will never happen again. I am opposed to American arms following the American dollar. I am opposed to American imperialism, just as I am opposed to imperialism by any other large nation anywhere in the world. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is not a rubber stamp for an arrogant and ruthless State Department. It

is not a rubber stamp for anyone but the ordinary American citizen whose votes alone elect its Members. Thank God, Mr. Speaker, that we have a democracy in America; that we live under a Constitution with a Bill of Rights which guarantees to every citizen the inalienable rights of free religion, free speech, free assembly, and free association. Thank God that in our democracy all power derives from a sovereign people. Never yet have the American people submitted to the oppression and the tyranny of dictatorship. Our Government exists to better the common life of the millions of citizens who live in America. Abraham Lincoln said, Mr. Speaker, that this country belongs to the people who inhabit it. Nothing except the needs of the American people and the genuine national security of America should be permitted to influence the Congress of the United States in its deliberations on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that every Member considers well the candid statement of Mr. Truman—that he is asking us to embark upon unknown seas; that every Member, Mr. Speaker, will weigh carefully the consequences of this tremendous change proposed in our Nation's foreign policy.

Harold Ickes Deplores Tie-Up of Truman Administration With Big City Political Bosses—Attacks "Quack Liberalism" of Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in Wednesday night's Evening Star, Harold L. Ickes, long a beneficiary of the New Deal and its largess, reveals a session with his conscience which compels him to deplore in public the unabashed working arrangements which have developed between the Truman administration and the unsavory big city political machines of this country. "Honest Harold" also provides additional evidence to the rapid collection now available which exposes for what it actually is the "quack liberalism" by which the New Dealers have endeavored to ingratiate themselves to a credulous and unsuspecting American public.

I herewith incorporate with these remarks the interesting and significant observations of the former Secretary of the Interior:

GAEL SULLIVAN "BROUGHT UP BY BOTTLE" BY FORMER MAYOR KELLY, OF CHICAGO

(By Harold L. Ickes)

Former Mayor Edward J. Kelly, of Chicago, at last has reluctantly bowed himself out of the city hall, but by no means has he yielded political power. Nor does he intend to. Mr. Kelly wanted to run again for mayor this month, but some of his political friends, plus the Republican landslide the preceding November, caused him voluntarily to decide not to be a candidate.

Then he was persuaded to support Martin H. Kennelly, the present mayor. So Mr. Kennelly, who had been a private citizen of fine standing, ran instead, and won by approximately 275,000 votes, whereas Boss Kelly, 4 years earlier, had been reelected by only 114,000 votes.

It was thought that Mayor Kelly, who is a very rich man after a lifetime spent in active politics and who is well over 73 years old, would also surrender his scepter as boss of the Democratic Party. But he had different views.

Although Mayor Kennelly was to be responsible for the governance of Chicago for 4 years, Mayor Kelly would not even let him organize the city council, a majority of which were Democrats. Mr. Kelly was like a divorced wife, insisting on continuing to hire the help and make out the menus. And, of course, besides the city council, Mayor Kelly controls important county patronage offices. He also continues as the Illinois member of the Democratic National Committee.

TOO GENEROUS AND NAIVE

Mayor Kennelly was so decent a man that he expected the Kelly people also to be decent. Consequently, he was too generous in his attitude toward the holdovers from the Kelly administration and too naive in believing that Mr. Kelly and all of his aldermen would see the impropriety of continuing to take orders from Mr. Kelly. On one point, however, he did stand up. The Kelly aldermen wanted to organize the Council for a full 4-year term. Mayor Kennelly was successful in restricting this control to 1 year.

But this is only part of the story. Mayor Kelly was successful in having his protégé, Gael Sullivan, appointed Second Assistant Postmaster General. Mr. Sullivan accompanied Postmaster General Hannegan around the world, with Senator TYDINGS of Maryland acting as chaperon, at Government expense, to "inspect" postal systems. Returning, Mr. Sullivan resigned as Mr. Hannegan's right-hand man in the Democratic National Committee. His title now is executive director and his salary is considerably above what he received as Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. Hannegan's health has not been good. He, too, has done well in politics and he wants to resign. But he has conditioned his resignation upon the selection of Mr. Sullivan, a second-string ward politician from Chicago as his successor. He has no intention of leaving either his flank or his rear exposed to those who might seek political reprisals.

BROUGHT UP BY BOTTLE

It is a strange circumstance, this rapid rise in political power of Mr. Gael Sullivan, who possesses none in his own right. He has been brought up by bottle by that cunning politician, the ex-mayor of Chicago. When Mr. Kelly, at the beginning, alined himself with Boss Hague, of New Jersey, to try to defeat Mr. Roosevelt for the nomination for President in 1932, Mr. Gael Sullivan was against Mr. Roosevelt. When the mayor, changing his battle cry to "Roosevelt and Humanity," clung desperately to the Roosevelt bandwagon, Mr. Sullivan hung on with him. At Chicago, in 1944, when Boss Kelly and the other city bosses who were running the Democratic National Convention swung to Mr. Truman for Vice President, Mr. Gael Sullivan was at hand within beckoning distance of Mayor Kelly. Mr. Sullivan is a versatile young man. Mr. Sullivan carries his own protective coloration with him. He can be as hard-boiled a politician as Mayor Kelly, but he can also be as liberal as Boss Kelly.

If Gael Sullivan should be selected chairman of the Democratic national committee, Edward J. Kelly could and would be expected to tell him what to do. Thus the Democratic committee would have had as chairman three successive city machine bosses—Edward J. Flynn, of the Bronx, Robert E. Hannegan, of St. Louis, and Edward J. Kelly, disguised as Gael Sullivan, of Chicago. These were the men who, with the aid of Boss Hague and roving boss-at-large Edwin W. Pauley, nominated Mr. Truman for Vice President at Chicago.

QUACK "LIBERALISM"

Perhaps it is natural that President Truman should feel comfortable under the dexterous hands of these expert "liberals." After all, he is, himself, a product of the notoriously "liberal" Pendergast machine of Kansas City.

Work of Production and Marketing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Production and Marketing Administration, formerly the triple A, is doing one of the greatest pieces of work in agriculture in this country today. They are especially active in the district which I am greatly honored to represent. It has been my pleasure from time to time to insert their reports from the various counties in order to show the Congress just what work is being done, and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a letter from the officers of the Benton County association and their report. This is another indication of the great work done by this organization and I trust may be an example to the Congress that to cut down these funds would be against the best interest of the country:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
FIELD SERVICE BRANCH,
Bentonville, Ark., April 28, 1947.

Hon. J. W. TRIMBLE,
Representative of Arkansas,
Third Arkansas Congressional District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are enclosing for your information a copy of Form 46–SR–16, the summary of our conservation practices carried out under the 1946 agricultural conservation program. It is thought that this data might be of value in presenting facts pertaining to some of the pending bills introduced in Congress relative to this program.

We would like to point out the fact that farmers in Benton County earned a total of $134,704.71 in practices carried out under the 1946 PMA (AAA) program. This amount is only about 50 percent of the actual cost to the farmer of carrying out the practices. The benefits derived from these practices not only are an advantage to the farmer, but, if continued, will mean a higher standard of living to the future farmers of this Nation as well as food with a higher nutritive value to the folks who are living off the farm. In our opinion, since only 17 percent of the population of the Nation are classified as farmers who produce food for the other 83 percent, it can be readily seen that agricultural programs making soil-conservation payments cannot be rightfully called a subsidy to the farmer, since we, as taxpayers, are only making our contribution to the future welfare of the Nation and are receiving in return a much better quality of food and a better, more stable agriculture.

It is an undisputed fact that the welfare of a nation depends upon the fertility of the soil and its ability to produce the crops necessary to the livelihood of man. We think this statement was proven during World War II when the farmers of this Nation were required not only to feed our armed forces in addition to the civilian population, but were required to feed other countries as well. We wonder what would have been the outcome if our farmers had been called on to do this in the early thirties when our soil was in a low state of fertility as compared with today. Even at this time, we have only scratched the surface of soil and water conservation when compared with that which needs to be done. We know that building the soil is a long-time operation, even by using the best known practices, and cannot be accomplished in any short period of time.

In a recent letter addressed to you by a committee consisting of county committeemen from various counties in the congressional district, it was pointed out the amount of each of these practices carried out to date in this district, and the amount of conservation needs which should be carried out in order to produce lasting results.

In our particular contribution to this report, it is noted that in our estimation 15,000,000 pounds of phosphate should be applied annually to land in this county in order to bring it up to the point where the plants grown on this land would have the maximum phosphate needed. An estimate of 53,000 tons of ground limestone would be needed annually to supply the minerals for the various plants grown. It is a well-known fact that a deficiency of calcium in the diet of this Nation has existed for some time. With the application of limestone, this deficiency can be corrected over a period of time.

We will not go into detail further on various practices which have been listed in our Arkansas State AAA handbook that are of major importance to the general farming area of this State and to the people off the farm, but we are thoroughly convinced that practices carried out with the cooperation of the Federal Government and its present farm program have done and can do more toward building up the fertility of the soil in this area than any other known means. We do know that larger farmers are more or less financially able to carry out practices of this sort on their own, while the smaller farmers, who comprise about 60 percent of the farm population, are not able to carry out practices of this sort without financial assistance from other sources, due to the fact that the land has been allowed to run down very much in the past, leaving them a mere portion of the fertility originally in the soil, from which they are making a very low standard of living.

We are aware of the fact that the Congress is economically minded and are attempting to reduce Government expenses. To this we have no objection if the reduction is made in proportion to the service rendered by other agencies, taking into consideration the percentage of farmers reached in the county and the administrative cost of those agencies.

We have followed with much interest the action you have taken in regard to this program, and are glad to be represented in Congress by a man so interested in the welfare of agriculture. We will appreciate anything you can do to help continue the Production and Marketing Administration program, which includes the Federal crop insurance, school-lunch program, and agricultural-conservation program.

Very truly yours,

C. R. BROADHURST,
SCOTT EVANS,
D. B. BLAIR,
Members, Benton County Agricultural Conservation Association Committee, Benton County, Ark.

Summary of conservation practice data under the 1946 agricultural conservation program, Benton County, Ark.

[Source 46-SR-54]

Name of practice	Practice designation	Payment unit	Extent	Number of farms carrying out practice	Estimated acres	Payment rates	Value (column 4 times column 7)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Application of phosphate:							
20 percent	1-a	Pounds	$3,198,791.00	641		$0.0066	$21,112.02
20 percent (CMS)	1-aX	do	3,540,505.00	1,021		.0066	23,367.33
19 percent	1-b	do	21,200.00	2		.0064	135.68
18 percent	1-c	do	17,700.00	2		.0062	109.74
Total phosphate			6,778,196.00	1,490	33,891		44,724.77
Application of 60 percent potash (or equivalent).	2	Pounds	41,078.00	132	822	.013	534.01
Application of ground limestone.	3	Tons	4,566.42	160		2.40	10,959.41
Application of ground limestone (CMS).	3X	do	715.00	41		2.40	1,716.00
Total limestone			5,281.42	191	1,760		12,675.41
Ryegrass seeded fall 1945 on cropland or orchard.	4	Pounds	119,125.00	459		.07	8,338.75
Ryegrass seeded fall 1945 on cropland or orchard (CMS).	4X	do	59,960.00	284		.07	4,193.00
Total ryegrass			179,025.00	697	7,161		12,531.75
Lespedeza seeded spring 1946 not harvested for hay.	5	Acres	10,043.00	784		1.50	15,064.50
Small grains seeded in fall 1945.	7	do	1,906.00	185		1.50	2,859.00
Summer legumes or nonlegumes left or turned under.	8	do	507.00	81		1.50	760.50
Seeding hairy vetch	9-a	Pounds	38,537.00	160		.14	5,395.18
Seeding hairy vetch (CMS)	9-aX	do	2,440.00	22		.14	341.60
Seeding crimson clover (clean).	9-f	do	777.00	15		.16	124.32
Total winter legumes seeded fall 1946.			41,754.00	186	2,088		5,861.10
Sodding Bermuda	10	Acres	46.00	23		6.00	276.00
Seeding bluegrass	11-d	Pounds	115.00	7		.25	28.75
Seeding orchard grass	11-e	do	4,239.00	43		.30	1,271.70
Seeding redtop	11-f	do	2,819.00	39		.15	422.85
Seeding timothy	11-g	do	2,376.00	35		.07	166.32
Seeding ryegrass	11-h	do	9,503.00	38		.07	665.21
Seeding reed canary grass (improved).	11-i	do	56.00	2		.45	25.20
Seeding white Dutch clover	11-j	do	155.00	12		.60	93.00
Seeding hop clover	11-k	do	953.00	16		.50	476.50
Seeding Kobe lespedeza	11-l	do	735.00	6		.15	110.25
Seeding Korean lespedeza	11-m	do	14,567.00	71		.08	1,165.34
Seeding Ladino clover	11-q	do	73.00	8		.60	43.80
Seeding sweetclover (yellow)	11-t	do	361.00	7		.09	32.76
Seeding Alsike clover	11-v	do	281.00	7		.25	70.25
Seeding red clover	11-w	do	3,375.00	56		.25	843.75
Total seeding approved pasture mixtures.			39,611.00	126	3,601		5,415.70
Establishing vegetative waterways.	12	Acres	5.00	3		20.00	100.00
Contour ridging pasture land	13	Feet	34,873.00	4	10	.0015	52.31
Producing and harvesting legume and grass seed.	14	Acres	1,152.00	95		3.50	4,032.00
Construction of terraces and outlets.	15	Feet	9,495.00	8		.01	94.95
Total construction of terraces and outlets.			9,495.00	8	9		94.95
Construction of a stock pond	16	Cubic yards.	75,164.00	132		.12	9,019.68
Construcion of a stock pond (CMS).	16x	do	1,519.00	3		.12	182.28
Total stock ponds			77,353.00	135	[1] 135		9,282.36
Construction or enlargement of drainage ditches.	17-a (1)	Feet	1,694.00	2		.009	15.25
Do	17-a (3)	do	850.00	1		.03	25.50
Total construction or enlargement of drainage ditches.				3	45		40.75
Contour farming intertilled row crops.	18	Acres	120.00	17		.60	72.00
Development of springs and seeps.	19	Cubic feet	252.00	4	[1] 4	.50	126.00
Mowing pastures:							
1 mowing	20-a	Acres	12,876.00	787		.50	6,438.00
2 or more mowings	20-b	do	14,044.00	655		1.00	14,044.00
Total mowing pastures			26,920.00	1,343			20,842.00
Total value of all practices carried out.							134,704.71
Total value of all X practices carried out.							29,800.21

[1] Total number constructed.

SEC. II. FARM AND CROPLAND PARTICIPATION

Item		Number farms	Cropland
		A	B
1. Total	acres	5,547	205,271.1
2. Participating farms	do	2,350	114,329.3
3. Percent participat on (2÷1)		42.4	55.7

SEC. III. LIME AND PHOSPHATE MATERIALS

Estimated percent of the following materials applied under the 1946 program to—

		Pasture	Hay crops	Cultivated crops	Winter legumes
(a) Liming materials	percent	45	50	5	
(b) Phosphate materials	do	40	55		5
(c) Potash	do	50	50		

SEC. IV. SIGNATURE

Approved:

H. E. BUSCH,
County Administrative Officer.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on Federal aid to education, prepared by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America has slowly awakened to the fact that it faces a crisis in its educational system.

Letters I have received from educators and parents throughout the Nation clearly indicate that, at long last, the Nation realizes that all is not well with our educational system.

Unfortunately, it has taken a series of shocking, unpleasant events to focus Nation-wide attention on the inequities of our school system.

People throughout the Nation are beginning to listen to the educators and legislators who have repeatedly warned that our school system is not measuring up to our ideal democratic standards.

Comparatively recent events have clearly borne out the warnings uttered by many of us during the past. The case of the vanishing teacher, more than anything else, has emphasized the seriousness of the school problem.

Hundreds of teachers are leaving the educational profession each year because of low pay, ill-equipped schools, and unpleasant working conditions.

Today we have far less teachers in the Nation's schools than during a normal year in the 1930's. In addition, more than one out of every eight teachers lack the educational or personal qualifications normally required of teachers. School boards have been forced to grant emergency teaching certificates to high-school graduates, and they have urged teachers out of retirement, and still there are about 75,000 vacancies in the teaching force.

This means that schools have been forced to close or to operate split shifts. Courses have been dropped. Classes have been thrown together until teachers face 40 to 60 pupils instead of the desirable 20 to 25. State school superintendents estimated last fall that nearly 62,000 children were being deprived of schooling because there were not enough teachers or classrooms and the number is now estimated to be nearly 75,000.

The New York Times recently warned:

"Confronted by the most acute teacher shortage in the history of American education, the Nation's public-school system faces a serious break-down."

Meanwhile, a leading educator, Dr. Harold F. Clark, of Teachers College, Columbia University, declared that if the present shortage continues disastrous educational and social conditions will prevail in a few years.

The exodus from the teaching profession began when wartime industrial wages tempted the low-paid teachers into other work. Many have not returned to the classrooms because they can earn much more money today in other professions.

However, this is by no means an entirely new problem.

For many years our schools have been poorly financed. Of course, some States have good schools, but many other States, with comparatively low incomes, have been unable to properly support public schools. And still others have adopted an attitude almost bordering on indifference.

As a result, the Nation's educational level is far below what any reasonable person could consider an adequate standard.

Before we consider expenditures for public schools, let's examine a few other facts.

For example, 2,000,000 adults in the United States—the richest nation on earth—have never attended any kind of school. By any kind of school, I mean they have never spent as much as 1 day on classroom work.

It may also come as a shocking surprise, but 10,000,000 adults cannot read and write well enough to meet the ordinary demands of modern life.

The Nation also should be ashamed of the fact that more than 10,000,000 children between the ages of 6 and 15—school age, mind you—were not in any kind of school in 1940, and the number is even higher today.

Another equally shocking revelation is that during World War II, Selective Service had to reject, because of illiteracy and other educational deficiencies, enough men for 20 combat divisions. Yes, I said 20 combat divisions.

These are cold, hard facts that we cannot afford to overlook any longer. This does not mean that the individual States are not interested in improving their schools, but incomes vary in the various States; thus the standards range from good to bad.

West Virginia, for example, spent approximately 2.5 percent of its income for schools during the 1943–44 period, and the amount is even higher today, yet our State was thirty-ninth in the Nation in the amount of average expenditures per child. Our expenditures average less than $94 per child in average daily attendance, while other States, with higher incomes, spent a much smaller percent of total income on schools, yet they were able to spend far more per pupil.

This simply boils down to the fact that our State government takes in far less money per capita than many other States. And, as a result, we are the second State in the Nation in the amount of effort—or percentage of income spent on schools—but thirty-ninth in results—or the amount spent per child.

In contrast, New Jersey and New York each spend more than $190 per child, yet this takes only 1.74 percent and 1.54 percent, respectively, of their total incomes.

They rank first and second in the Nation in the amount of money spent per child. But, they are seventeenth and twenty-ninth, respectively, among the States, in the percentage of total income expended on schools.

Many States, including West Virginia, are in the unfortunate position of being unable to increase expenditures without drastic new taxes. Many of our leading industries are owned by people who live in other States, and our State receives comparatively little or no income from many sources that normally would help support our State government. The money goes to support schools in other States.

West Virginia is not the only State in this position.

It is quite evident that one of the chief difficulties in financing education is the tax base on which it rests. According to the exhaustive study by the President's Advisory Committee on Education, State and local governments furnished 99.4 percent of tax revenues devoted to public schools in 1936. And three-quarters of the school expenditures came from property taxes, largely those on real estate, which also had to bear the brunt of most other local expenditures.

These proportions have not changed greatly in the last decade. In addition to having a limited tax base, school taxes often are limited in amount. By that I mean many States restrict by constitutional provision or by statute the amount of taxes which may be levied on real property. Of course, new tax sources have been utilized in some States in recent months to meet additional school needs. But, generally speaking, the situation has not improved very much.

The solution, in my opinion, lies in Federal aid to education. In making this statement I am well aware that some people picture this proposal as a new bureaucratic idea. Nothing could be further from the truth. The facts are that since Civil War days the Federal Government has aided higher education through land-grant colleges, and since 1917 Federal funds have been available for teaching vocations to high-school students.

The first general Federal aid to education program was proposed that same year. Draft rejections for illiteracy in World War I brought out the inadequate school systems in many States.

Immediately the American Federation of Labor launched a campaign for Federal aid to education, and it has been in the forefront of this battle ever since. During the ensuing years, many educators and public offi-

cials joined this worthy drive. Widespread interest was stimulated in 1938 by the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Education which showed the varying ability of the States to finance schools. Unfortunately, legislation was not passed by the Congress. In this respect, the fight has been rather discouraging.

Lengthy hearings have been held in every session of Congress for a decade, but only once—in 1943—did a Federal aid bill reach the floor, and then after 6 days of debate it was sent back to committee. The opposition claimed that allocation of Federal funds would inevitably involve Federal control of local schools.

During the Seventy-ninth Congress sentiment for Federal aid lined up behind two major bills. One was favorably reported in 1946, but it was lost in the closing-day rush.

Several new measures are now pending in both the House and the Senate. Educators, generally speaking, are supporting S. 472, a clearly drawn measure that would offer Federal funds to provide a minimum floor under our educational system. The State schools would have sole jurisdiction over how the Federal funds would be spent. As many educators have pointed out this measure clearly provides good insurance against undesirable Federal control of the schools.

I am informed that this measure starts with an appropriation of $150,000,000 in 1948, and it reaches $250,000,000 dollars in 1950. Other measures, now pending, provide varying sums to be allocated to the States and all are worthy of serious consideration. I specifically referred to S. 472 because I am more familiar with it than I am with S. 199 and the other Federal aid to education measures now pending before this committee.

One big question, of course, is: Can we afford this additional expense? The answer, in my opinion, is that we have never spent enough money to make our school system function properly. It is an undisputable fact that the better the education in a State or city the higher the standard of living. Education makes people good producers and good consumers. Rather than ask, can we afford this additional expense, I believe we should ask ourselves: Can we afford not to make this additional effort to improve our schools?

In closing, I wish to add that if a democratic society such as ours is to endure and prosper, one luxury we can least afford is a static or declining educational system.

I sincerely hope the Congress will do everything possible to place our schools on a standard commensurate with our high democratic goals, for education presents a new frontier for prosperity in America.

I also wish to call the Senate's attention to the following comprehensive study of West Virginia's educational picture, which was prepared by Mr. Phares E. Reeder, executive secretary of the West Virginia State Education Association. This study clearly reveals the need for Federal aid to education:

STATEMENT BY MR. PHARES E. REEDER

During the past 20 years, West Virginia has put forth great effort to improve its public-school system. We know that we have made progress, but the facts provide conclusive evidence which shows that far greater effort must be exerted if we are to rise above our relatively low educational rank.

WEST VIRGINIA'S EDUCATIONAL RANK

The study of education made by the United States Chamber of Commerce and based on the census data of 1940 shows that West Virginia adults rank low educationally. The following rankings high light our status in education:

West Virginia ranked thirty-ninth in the circulation of 18 nationally known magazines.

West Virginia ranked thirty-eighth in the median years of school (8.4) based on population 20 years of age or over.

West Virginia ranked forty-first in percent of population 25 years of age and over that had completed 4 years of college or more.

West Virginia ranked forty-second in percent of population 25 years of age and over that had completed 4 years of high school.

West Virginia ranked forty-seventh in the percent of adults who completed as much as 1 year of high school.

WEST VIRGINIA'S EDUCATIONAL OBLIGATION

The number of children that a State has to educate constitutes to a large extent the educational obligation of that State. According to the most recent information, West Virginia stands first among the 48 States in the number of school-age children, 5 to 17 years old, per 1,000 persons. In 1943, for each 1,000 people in the country as a whole there were estimated to be 216 children in this age bracket. West Virginia heads the list with 281 school-age children in each 1,000 of the population. California stands at the foot of the list, having only 172 children of school age in each 1,000 of the population. West Virginia is forced to provide a school program for its 281 children per 1,000 population out of a per capita income of $790 (based on 1944 data) while California is called upon to support 172 school-age children per 1,000 population out of a per capita income of $1,539.

In considering the extent of the burden of educational responsibility and the per capita financial ability to carry that burden, we wish to emphasize the fact that the West Virginia wage earner is only one-third as able as the California wage earner to support an educational program of equal quality.

WEST VIRGINIA'S FINANCIAL EFFORT

According to information provided by the United States Office of Education and by the National Education Association, West Virginia in 1943–44 ranked second among the 48 States in an effort to support its public elementary and secondary schools. Effort as measured for the States was based upon the percentage which the total current expenditures for education was of the total income payments. At that time, New Mexico, which was spending 2.61 percent of its total income payments for education, ranked first among the States in effort to support education. West Virginia, spending 2.47 percent of its total income payments for education, ranked second. Over the Nation as a whole the percentage was 1.53. The least effort was put forth in Maryland where the percentage was 1.08.

In other words, West Virginia's effort to support education at that time was over 1½ times the average effort put forth throughout the United States and approximately 2½ times the effort put forth in Maryland. Even with this high degree of effort in financial support, West Virginia lagged far behind the United States average and the State of Maryland. In 1944–45, West Virginia's expenditures for education amounted to $93.18 per pupil as compared to a national average of $125.41 and a Maryland average of $113.98. The same year West Virginia's average teacher's salary was $1,526 as compared to a national average of $1,846 and a Maryland average of $2,080.

In 1933, by an act of the legislature, West Virginia brought about a reorganization of school districts for the administration of the public-school system. The new plan of organization provided for a county unit of administration. Today we have only 55 county school administrative units as against 404 units prior to the reorganization. This fact is pointed out in order to show that all nonessential administrative costs have been done away with.

After the establishment of the county-unit system, it was found that many of our rural counties were not able to finance the minimum program of education. There developed within the State the realization that all West Virginia youth must have more nearly equal educational opportunities. As a result of this philosophy and belief and through successive legislative acts, a reasonable equalization of educational opportunities has resulted—limited only by the financial inability of our people to enrich further the minimum program of education.

In order to high light the growth of State aid to our county-school districts, aid necessary for building a more nearly equalized program of education, we submit the following table:

State aid to county school districts

Biennium	State aid	Biennial increase
1931–33	$2,455,518	
1933–35	21,797,478	[1] $19,341,960
1935–37	26,311,838	4,514,360
1937–39	28,334,265	2,022,427
1939–41	28,320,703	13,562
1941–43	30,919,419	2,598,716
1943–45	37,094,214	6,174,795
1945–47	42,292,166	5,197,952
1947–49 (appropriation plus estimated balance from general school fund)	70,043,936	[2] 27,751,770

[1] This large increase in State aid to county school districts came as a result of the organization of the county unit system and in support of the philosophy of equal educational opportunities.

[2] An increase of 66 percent over the preceding biennium.

INCREASED EFFORT FOR NEXT BIENNIUM

The 1947 legislature enacted into law a general-fund budget for the next biennium amounting to $118,732,381. Of this amount more than $87,000,000 were appropriated for all educational purposes, a figure higher than the entire 1945–47 budget of $86,572,908. Of the $87,000,000 set aside for education $70,043,936 represent State aid to be distributed to the respective counties for the support of the public schools during the next biennium.

Extra tax levies voted by the counties during the present year plus the legislative appropriations referred to above will bring public-school expenditures next year to an estimated $53,500,000, an increase of 80 percent over the $29,743,512 spent in 1943–44.

It is estimated that in 1947–48 West Virginia will be spending for education 3.24 percent of our estimated total income payments. In comparing this percentage with our effort in 1943–44, it seems quite probable that West Virginia in 1947–48 will rank first among the States in effort to support education. Even with this greatly increased effort, it is not likely that West Virginia will exceed the national average in school support.

In spite of the strong financial effort that is being exerted, there is much evidence that West Virginia has not provided and, on the basis of her economic ability, cannot provide a thorough and efficient system of free schools. According to 1940 census data, West Virginia adults rank low educationally. The average adult did not finish the seventh grade. As pointed out, the State ranks forty-seventh in the percent of adults who completed 1 year of high school. The erosion of West Virginia's human resources continues. Today, out of every three boys and girls who enter the first grade, one quits before reaching high school and another quits before finishing high school.

Why do we not have better schools—schools that will hold our boys and girls? The No. 1 reason lies in West Virginia's economic inability to provide sufficient money to buy the better schools. We can have better schools only when we solve these problems: (1) better teachers, (2) modern

buildings, (3) adequate program of maintenance and operation, (4) additional supervisory services, (5) improved colleges. None of these problems can be solved unless a much greater investment in education is forthcoming. We are convinced that West Virginia cannot do the job without Federal assistance.

PROBLEM 1. BETTER TEACHERS

How well trained are West Virginia teachers? Of the 15,000 teachers employed for the 1946–47 school year, 308 did not finish high school, 662 more have never gone to college, 500 more have less than 1 year's college training, 2,000 in all have less than 2 years' college training. One out of every seven boys and girls in this State has a teacher with substandard training—a teacher who could not qualify according to 1940 training requirements.

How many teachers are leaving their jobs? Since July 1, 1941, 8,509 teachers have resigned—a 56 percent turn-over in the entire teaching force. Within the current year, if resignations continue at the present rate, 2,548 teachers will have quit the profession. The resignation rate for this year is up 43 percent over last year.

What will keep teachers from leaving their jobs? It is apparent that the answer calls for adequate salaries. In 1945–46 the average earning of West Virginia laborers, exclusive of agricultural and domestic help, amounted to $2,115. For the same year, the average salary for teachers and principals was $1,672. Please note the following average earnings of industrial workers:

Industry:	*Average earnings*
Chemicals and allied products	$2,950
Coal mining and coke manufacturing	2,611
Glass and glassware manufacturing	2,231
Iron, steel, and metals	2,455
Oil and gas production	2,168
Printing and publishing	2,010
Public utilities	2,223
Transportation	2,516

The 1947 legislature enacted into law a new minimum-salary schedule without a dissenting vote. This salary schedule was worked out by the State Education Association and was written into law without a single change. The association built the salary schedule on the basis of what it believed to be the financial ability of the State to support the schedule. The salary increases provided by the legislature call for approximately $5,000,000 per year in additional State aid.

The teachers of West Virginia are highly pleased with the response of the public and legislature in providing for the new salary schedule. But even with this important salary advance 6,745 West Virginia teachers having less than 4 years of college training will be paid salaries ranging from $1,305 to $1,917, or an average salary of $1,572. Slightly more than 50 percent having 4 or more years of college training will earn $1,800 to $2,889 per year. Although the new $1,800 minimum for teachers with 4 years of college training provides an increase of $450, this minimum salary is far short of the $2,400 minimum that is recommended by the National Education Association and the many State education associations throughout the country. Only through Federal aid to education will West Virginia be able to finance a minimum salary of $2,400.

PROBLEM 2. MODERN BUILDINGS

Most of West Virginia's school buildings are of wood-frame construction. An estimated 100,000 boys and girls are housed in substandard school buildings. Many of these are a constant threat to the health and safety of our children. West Virginia ranks thirty-sixth in its investments in school property. On the basis of a school-building survey, it is estimated that $50,000,000 would be necessary to provide for the needed school-building construction program. Practically all money made available for educational purposes must be turned into the current school program rather than into permanent improvement. Only through Federal aid can the pressure for current school needs be released so that a reasonable school-building construction program can be got under way.

PROBLEM 3. ADEQUATE PROGRAM OF MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

The need of paint, the leaky roofs, broken windows, and general run-down condition of many of our school buildings is evidence of the effect of a starvation diet in maintenance and operation funds. The cost of maintaining and operating our schools has increased as much as the cost of living. Salaries of nonteaching personnel are also miserably low—too low to maintain efficient service. The only solution to this problem is that of additional money.

PROBLEM 4. ADDITIONAL SUPERVISORY SERVICES

Although adequate training is the foundation for good teaching, it is true that teachers learn to teach while teaching. The guidance and assistance of a staff of supervisory experts is a wise investment. The average supervisor of instruction in West Virginia has the impossible task of guiding and helping 250 or more teachers. To a large extent this problem can be solved with adequate financial aid.

PROBLEM 5. IMPROVED COLLEGES

An effective system of higher education is essential to the intellectual, social, cultural, and economic welfare of a State. We already have called to your atention the fact that West Virginia in 1940 ranked 41st in the percent of adults who had completed 4 or more years of college. Our full and overflowing colleges and universities face a crisis. They too must have help. But in helping them the State must of necessity take money away from the public schools, for there is just so much cloth and it must be cut to fit the pattern. Federal aid to the public schools in effect also will make possible the improvement of our colleges in that it will relieve future pressure upon the State to exert an even greater effort to support its public schools.

WEST VIRGINIA'S INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION

West Virginia is short $32.23 per child in current school expenditures. As previously pointed out, the Nation spent an average of $125.41 per pupil in 1944–45. We were spending $93.18 per pupil. West Virginia's unit for school administration is the county. Out of our 55 county districts, 51 counties with 95 percent of West Virginia's 400,000 school children provide below national average investments in education.

Eric A. Johnson, speaking in Chicago, March 1946, stated: "Business needs trained workers which only education can supply, and education must have operating funds which business can provide." There is set forth herein conclusive evidence that West Virginia, through its local and State effort, has recognized its responsibility for providing a thorough and efficient system of free schools. The evidence also pointed conclusively to the fact that West Virginia is making an effort to financially support her schools that is second only to one other State. Again it should be pointed out that in spite of this effort we are not providing the kind of educational opportunities that must be provided if America is to continue her greatness as an example of democracy at work. It is hoped that the 80th Congress will write into the law the principles of equal educational opportunities as set forth in H. R. 2953.

The Sort of Pacifism We Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the Atlanta Constitution:

THE SORT OF PACIFISM WE NEED

Three bills on universal military training have been introduced into Congress.

They are supported by many persons, opposed by a few. The Reserve Officers' Association, composed of officers, mostly combat officers who saw service in the recent World War, are among those who support them.

As Gen. Dwight Eisenhower said a few days ago, "The Army officers are the real pacifists. No man who has seen war, or been a part of it, wants another war. The men who spent 3 to 5 years in service and now are in civil life do not urge military training because they want war."

As Secretary of War Robert Patterson has said, "This is a day of the quick aggressor assault. Once attacked, it requires 4 years to create a formidable force. We all know that when the war ended the United States had just attained its full striking force. If we maintain a good force we are not likely to be attacked."

Many other well-known, peace-loving Americans have had something to say. A few of them are:

Bernard M. Baruch: "I favor universal military training so that everyone will have physical training and knowledge of the use of arms, so that he can carry out his moral obligation as a citizen. When we stand up for our rights, we want to be ready."

James F. Byrnes, former Secretary of State: "In the interest of peace, we cannot allow our Military Establishment to be reduced below the point required to maintain a position commensurate with our responsibility, and that is why we must have some form of universal military training."

Warren Austin, United States representative to the United Nations: "The basis of our whole security, under our free democratic government, must be universal military training."

Mrs. La Fell Dickinson, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs: "I personally believe in universal military training as essential to the security of the United States and to the success of the United Nations. Moreover, I believe such training will benefit the young men of our country, and certainly it will save lives if we are drawn into another war."

Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Republican, New York: "George Washington and his immediate successors urged upon the Congress of their day the establishment of a system of universal training. Our failure to heed their advice has cost us thousands of lives and billions of dollars. We must come to grips with this problem and adopt a sound system of universal military training now. By doing so, we shall be safe and better able to lead the world in peaceful paths."

Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican, Washington, who was promoted to the rank of colonel on the Ardennes battlefield: "We learned two things from World War II: One, that modern wars come suddenly. The other (lesson we learned) is that nations which are poorly prepared pay the highest price.

Universal military training is the best solution in sight for our own problem. While my mind will remain open on this subject, I shall solidly support Secretary Patterson's recommendation until its opponents offer something better."

Think it over. Write your Congressman. The Senators are WALTER F. GEORGE and RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Senate Office Building, Washington. The Representatives are CARL VINSON, EUGENE COX, JOHN S. WOOD, PRINCE PRESTON, HENDERSON LANHAM, SIDNEY CAMP, STEPHEN PACE, PAUL BROWN, WILLIAM WHEELER, and JAMES C. DAVIS. Write them calmly, asking them to support some sort of bill to make this Nation safer against aggressor attack.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hanson W. Baldwin from the New York Times of May 1, 1947:

UMT, A HOT POTATO—MILITARY NECESSITY LEADS ARGUMENTS FOR A LAW TO ESTABLISH UNITED STATES TRAINING

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

UMT, or universal military training, is the next hot potato that will be handed to Congress.

The President's Commission on Universal Training, which has been sitting in Washington since last December, has explored many aspects of the problem and is now approaching the end of its studies. Its report, when published, will again focus public attention on this controversial problem.

Anticipatory judgments are never final, but it is possible, nevertheless, to outline a number of arguments that undoubtedly have been put to the Commission and which will influence the congressional verdict.

Most of these arguments apply broadly to the general question of peacetime conscription, but many are specifically applicable to the War Department's 6-month training plan or the 4-month plan favored by the American Legion and some other veterans' organizations.

The specific plans under study propose a compulsory period of 4 or 6 months' military training by the Army and Navy for all youths between 18 and 20. In lieu of another 6 months of training, the trainees would be permitted to take any one of the alternatives—enlistment in the regular forces, enlistment in the National Guard or Reserves, entrance to West Point or Annapolis, etc. The program would be limited to training; none of the youths could serve in occupation forces or outside the United States or in military duties in this country.

WAR DEPARTMENT CONTENTIONS

The War Department has held that this measure is essential to support our foreign policy, is vital to our national security, and is the only way of providing an adequate number of trained Reserves to build up the civilian components of the Army, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserves.

The opponents of peacetime compulsory training point out that the legislation represents a fundamental break with all past American concepts. They hold, contrary to the War Department's assertions, that compulsory peacetime training is not, and, per se, cannot, be democratic in that it involves compulsion to military command, the very principle which so many of our emigrants fled Europe to avoid. Moreover, no military organization can be democratic and still be military.

The byproducts of compulsory military training may be both good and bad. There is no doubt that the forced induction of 1,000,000 or more youths each year will greatly increase the power and influence of the military in American life—always a dangerous trend, if carried too far, in a democracy.

On the other hand, the training will probably benefit the health of many of the trainees, though its effect upon the national health will certainly be far less spectacular than War Department estimates indicate—since serious physical and emotional defects often are irremediably formed before a youth reaches 18.

PROGRAM'S COST ESTIMATED

Economically and educationally, the removal of 1,000,000 youths from schools, colleges and work for 6 months each year, and the addition of a very large item, perhaps as much as $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 to the defense budget represents a backward step. Morally and ethically the training might strengthen the moral fiber of some and weaken that of others, though if military training is to accomplish what the term implies—train for war—it must be tough and realistic and in many ways it must tend to harden and not to refine.

In any case, it is clear that the military services must not—and if they are to be efficient militarily cannot—become educational institutions, Sunday schools or health clinics. The home, the school, and the church must bear this responsibility. Labor unions see an added danger in UMT in that they fear it may tend gradually to restrict the rights of labor.

On the international level, Secretaries Byrnes and Marshall have favored UMT as contributing to a strong military posture, but its critics point out that it has never tended to promote international understanding and peace.

They view the international results of UMT as negative; it might impress those nations that don't matter, but Russia would probably feel neither provocation nor fear because the men in the Kremlin are impressed, not by American mass manpower which they can outmatch, but by American industrial strength, technical skill, and air, and naval power.

Opponents of peacetime training have answered in the negative therefore (and probably to the satisfaction of many influential Congressmen) three of the ancillary questions concerning conscription. Despite Army refutation, it seems clear that peacetime training: (a) will not necessarily promote the domestic welfare of the Nation; (b) will not promote international understanding and peace; (c) is not a progressive democratic force.

Despite these negative aspects of peacetime training, many of its opponents feel—and the Army agrees—that it must be judged primarily upon the basis of its military necessity. Is military training in peacetime an essential, or highly important part of, a sound military policy? Is it a cornerstone—as the War Department claims—of national security? The answer to this fundamental question must determine "UMT's" legislative fate.

Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WMEX on Thursday, May 1, 1947:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, a great and historic change is taking place in the foreign policy of the United States all because of one nation—Russia.

With an area and a population both larger than our own, Russia is truly the biggest secret on earth.

At the moment she is pursuing an expansionist policy which is viewed with alarm not only by her neighbors but by every nation on earth.

For Russia is the birthplace of communism, which is not only a form of government but a materialistic faith which intends to overwhelm all other beliefs, by fair means or foul.

We know that Communist agents are active in our own country trying to confuse and divide the people as the first step toward undermining our constitutional government.

We also know that their clever line of propaganda might mislead some Americans.

Therefore, for our own protection, it is time for us to look behind the iron curtain and see what communism is and not what it preaches.

Communism is barely 30 years old, that is, as an operating system.

With the collapse of the Czarist Empire, the Bolsheviks seized power on November 7, 1917. Yet, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics emerged from World War II, as one of the two great powers.

In this connection we must never lose sight of the fact that communism is a world revolutionary movement and is antagonistic to everything that we believe and cherish.

As knowledge is the strength of a democracy, it is our job to find out what life is like under communism, so that we shall not be misled by its unscrupulous propaganda.

In the first place the American and Russian systems are rival economies.

In our country, production is organized on the basis of the private ownership and operation of factories, machines, and otner facilities; a relatively free market for goods, services, and labor; prices determined by the interchange of willing buyers and sellers, the whole economy stimulated by the wants of the people and their productive power.

Business responds to these wants in its endeavor to produce the goods desired at a profit.

The search for profits results in the growth of competing units of production.

Discriminating buyers trade with the lower-cost firms. Mistakes by producers regarding the volume of demand for particular products are borne as losses by producers who have not met market favor.

New balances are continually created at higher or lower levels of production, prices, employment, wages, and profits, as the public expresses its wants and as its buying power changes.

In normal times, these are the factors at work in our American economy.

There is some regulation of business by the Government through such means as licensing, rate regulation, the establishment of parity prices, and the interference with

free consumer choices in articles or services believed to be injurious to health or welfare.

The Soviet economy permits no such freedom of consumers' choice, private property, freedom of enterprise, general competition, and private profit or loss.

Private enterprise is restricted to undertakings which can be managed by the owner-producer without any hired labor such as handicrafts.

In addition, farmers are allowed to cultivate their own very small plots of land and sell this produce on the open market after they meet the standards of production on collective farms.

With these minor exceptions, and some of the enterprises of the cooperatives, everything is owned and managed by the state.

In comparing the two systems, the vital question is, Which provides the highest standard of living for the people?

The few reporters who have had a chance to see what goes on inside Russia, agree that the conveniences which the average American home takes for granted, would be considered as luxuries by the Russians.

It is ironic that communism, which promises to free the workers of the world, should be guilty of the most repressive measures against labor.

By contrast, our American labor unions enjoy the right to deal on equal terms with employers on all matters of mutual interest.

Our industries are privately owned, and collective bargaining is encouraged in recognition of both the common and opposing interests of workers and management.

In different industries and trades, union representatives bring up and negotiate and bargain about those matters which are of greatest moment to them.

These include not only wages, hours, overtime, holidays, shift differentials, standard work loads, methods of remuneration, transfers or changes in work assignment, but also such matters as seniority, the control of hiring and lay-off, the training of apprentices and learners, union participation and agreement in job evaluation, the handling of grievances, and shop discipline.

Many employers have not been happy about the aggressive independence and increased power of unions and are trying to limit their power.

It is a fact, however, that trade unions in the United States are independent, fighting representatives of the workers, interested in the success of the enterprise which employs them, to be sure, but primarily interested in protecting the human and democratic rights of the workers against the indifference, the convenience, or the self-interest of the employer.

In Russia, which boasts of being a paradise for the worker, unions are puppets of the state.

Most American unionists will probably agree with the Russian father who, in spite of the fact that his son was a member of the Soviet hierarchy, exclaimed:

"The worker doesn't much care who exploits him, a private owner or the state.

"When he's dragged off to prison or exiled, it's small consolation to him that it's being done in his own name.

"After all, when the capitalist boss didn't pay me enough, or failed to give me decent working conditions, I could change my job.

"I could propagandize my fellow workers, call protest meetings, pull strikes, join political parties, publish opposition literature. Try any of it today and you'll end up in a prison camp or worse.

"Believe me, we had more chance dealing with a hundred thousand capitalist employers than we have now with one employer, the state. Why? Because the state has an army and secret police and unlimited power.

"There was a time when labor organizations were really spokesmen for the workers.

"There were political schools in which we learned to demand our rights and to fight for them. Who dares protest against anything today?

"The press, which poses as a mouthpiece of public opinion, is now the property of the party and the state.

"It reflects only their opinion."

Such is the disillusionment of one Russian in the revolution which brought him slavery instead of freedom.

Which brings us to the matter of forced labor.

Although the Soviet Government publishes no figures regarding the camps in which prisoners are concentrated, and thus confuses and throws out of line all its other employment figures, there can be no doubt that several million workers are employed under police discipline and receive only miserable keep for their labor.

No foreigner or correspondent is ever permitted to see them.

One Canadian newspaperwoman who succeeded in gaining entrance to a concentration camp was quickly expelled from Russia.

Our information comes from those who escaped, from Russian writers now living abroad, from Americans who have worked in Russia, and from American correspondents who were able to write about the institution of forced labor after they left the Soviet Union.

The camps grew rapidly in the 1930's, when it was decided to keep most of the "liquidated" alive and working for the state, rather than to kill them.

The men and women—for there are large numbers of women among them—work on railways, highways, and canals, cut timber, mine metals and minerals, fill swamplands, help on large construction projects, and open up new areas for settlement.

The population of these camps was drawn from political offenders, nonconforming engineers and intellectuals, recalcitrant peasants, former industrial and other officials, and deviating Communists of the right and of the left. They are exiles who are sent thousands of miles from the towns or villages of their birth.

Let those few Americans who believe that communism is leading the world in improving the conditions of those who toil and labor face this terrible fact.

Conditions, discipline, death rates, etc., are appalling and cannot be described over the radio.

Suffice to say that millions in Russia who have been sentenced to these slave camps, work for years or for life like animals, until their sentences run out or they find a blessed relief in death.

You and I and an overwhelming majority of Americans deplore this callous regimentation of the body, spirit, and mind of man. We, with our freedoms and rights and our standard of living which is not a promise but a fact, would never willingly bow our heads to tyranny.

We have no intention of telling the Russians how they should govern their own country, but we are definitely opposed to the spread of this fanatical faith because we know it is directed against us.

We have seen how some gullible people, deceived by its propaganda, would have the United States sacrifice its security to communism in the name of appeasement. Such a policy not only failed to stop the Nazis but actually encouraged their aggression.

It will just as surely fail with communism unless the American people, informed of the facts, realize that communism has no conscience and will use every trick in the book to weaken us.

Foreigners who try to understand Soviet policy, usually come up with a lot of contradictions.

They fail to see that the Communists believe in "two truths"—one for the people and the world at large and another for the insiders.

Their propaganda is as supple as their ballot.

During the war, the boring-from-within tactics in the countries who were their allies were temporarily suspended.

The morale values of old-fashioned patriotism were suddenly revived.

So-called backward elements at home and abroad had to be pacified with a seeming restoration of religion.

All this was done for expedience.

Some people have fallen for this and have accepted it as proof that the Soviet leaders have experienced a change of heart. In doing so, they are cruelly deceiving themselves.

Until the whole world has been transformed into a single Soviet Union, Moscow will have to maneuver, now attacking, now lying low, sometimes retreating, always spreading the confusion on which it depends.

Let us never forget that their fundamental belief is that the two worlds of capitalism and communism cannot forever exist side by side.

By arming ourselves with the facts of life as lived behind the iron curtain, we shall not be misled by Communist propaganda.

For the protection of our freedoms, our homes, and our developing institutions, it is our job to speak the truth whenever and wherever communism seeks to divide us.

Knowledge is the foundation of our strength, and the evil forces of Communist propaganda shall beat in vain against it.

America in the Postwar World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Paul Hutchinson appearing in the Christian Century for March 12, 1947. Mr. Hutchinson is the managing editor of this undenominational magazine of the Protestant churches. I read this article, Mr. Speaker, with great interest and I call it to the attention of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

AMERICA IN THE POSTWAR WORLD

HONOLULU, February 18.—This, I realize, is the subject for a book, not for a single letter in a publication whose space limitations have been all too painfully clear to me for, lo, these many years. Nevertheless, it is a subject which cannot be left out of any attempt to estimate the prospects for world peace. I am constrained, therefore, to deal with it, but in order to hold my reflections within governable limits I will try to concentrate on aspects of the topic which many Americans are in danger of ignoring. In what follows it will be understood, I trust, that I am trying to stand outside America and report how the part the United States is playing in world affairs looks from that vantage point.

The first reminder most Americans need is that, to the other peoples, when the prospect of future peace is under discussion the United States is regarded as the big question mark. I am sure that most of my countrymen do not realize this, and nothing that can be said will make them believe it. To them, Russia is the big problem. Their

press, their politicians, their radio, their generals and admirals, the discussions in their clubs and the informal conversations in their commuters' cars and country stores all make it appear that if any nation constitutes a particularly thorny international problem, Russia is that nation. In the eyes of the rest of mankind, however, this is not so. Russia is a problem, and a big problem, for the other nations. I tried to show why this is so in my previous letter. But the big problem is the United States of America.

A second reminder, which likewise may shock many Americans, is that our country is regarded elsewhere as the great champion of conservatism, and on occasion even of reaction, in international affairs. We have become so accustomed to think of ourselves as leading the van, and of most other nations as saddled with old, outworn, tradition-encrusted systems which presently they will cast off to follow our pioneering example, that it is difficult to readjust our minds to the fact that others now view us as stalwarts of the status quo. Yet brief reflection should show us that they do and why they do.

The rest of the world is going left. It is going collectivist. This is as true of Great Britain, France, Scandinavia, the British dominions, India, and China as of nations in the Russian orbit. (The collectivism of many of these may not be communism, but it will be collectivism just the same.) The United States is going right. At home, it has a Congress which has had enough of the mild collectivist tendencies of the New Deal. Abroad, ever since we began the process of liquidating the war, from Darlan to Chiang Kai-shek, we have backed conservative forces. Understand, I am not making a blanket charge of error in so doing. In certain instances I believe that, in view of all the circumstances, we did the wisest thing. But that does not alter the fact that our record, from the time when Mr. Roosevelt started parceling out the postwar world in diplomatic poker sessions with Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin, has uniformly been one of trying to put or keep conservative governments in power.

A searching question for future American policy arises at this point. If the United States remains a bourgeois stronghold, is it possible for it to play any other role in world affairs than that of the champion of conservatism? Can it be a torch of promise to the world's exploited masses while it is devoted to the preservation of the capitalist order? It is time to examine that "torch of promise" idea which the sentimental view of America held by most Americans has so cherished. The GI's were shocked by some of the discoveries they made about the way in which the peoples of other countries regard the United States. Anti-American riots in China are dealing another blow to the romantics. Behind the bitter words to which the GI's listened, behind the riots, there is hunger and envy. The envy, the bitterness, will persist while the hunger persists. And a wealthy, abundantly fed, bourgeois America, which naturally wants to keep the apple cart as undisturbed as possible, will find it no easy matter to command the confidence of desperate, revolution-intent peoples.

For the fact is that the masses of the rest of the world, however limited their information on issues of government and social organization, have at last got one simple idea through their heads. They believe that the conditions under which they have lived can be changed, and they mean to change them. They mean to have a better livelihood for themselves and better opportunities for their children. Their political and economic ideas do not go much beyond that. They don't have to. That is enough to make this a revolutionary age. As General Smuts—who is for liberalism everywhere except at home—put it, "Humanity has struck its tents and is on the march." Marching toward what? I have already answered: Collectivism. Even the Roman Catholic Church has discovered this; the Catholic parties which are attempting to ride the European maelstrom are, most of them, Christian Socialist parties.

I have frequently doubted during these months while I have been observing the international policies of my own country from abroad whether even the White House and the State Department grasp the nature of the difficulties which must be overcome before the United States can gain this sort of world leadership. True, President Roosevelt thought he had gained it and dramatized his claim all the way from Casablanca to Yalta. But all he had really proved, as time has shown, was that while American funds continued to gush forth from the lend-lease spring, America's popularity knew no bounds. Even crafty old Ibn Saud was ready in those halcyon days to whoop it up for a ride on the American bandwagon.

The lend-lease spring has gone dry, and America's world leadership is sagging. The Christian Century says, rightly, that a "democratic offensive" is needed to restore it. But the primary requirements for a successful democratic offensive are two: First, that we shall see that the people in the countries we wish to keep in the democratic orbit are well enough fed, clothed, housed, and employed, and provided with enough opportunity to lift them out of misery; second, that we shall support the local democrats who offer the most honest promise of providing what the Christian Century calls "peace, bread, and freedom." What chance is there for adoption of the first costly policy in a Congress that is having conniption fits over so minor a matter as the renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements or of the second in a Congress that thinks David E. Lilienthal is a dangerous Red?

But I must get back to the main line of this letter. A third thing many Americans do not yet realize is the extent to which the United States is feared by the rest of the world. It is not only Russia that fears us; they all fear us. They fear our power and our purposes. And sometimes they fear our weaknesses as much as our strength.

The nations on which we count for friendship fear absorption in a growing American sphere. I doubt whether many Americans suspect how general this fear is in England, in the British dominions, in Latin America, in Scandinavia, in China. Even in Japan, where many industrialists look in this direction as the best hope for a revival of Japanese economy, their hope is accompanied by fear of the exposed position in relation to Russia in which, as an American satellite, their country will be left. Once in the American orbit, these nations fear that the United States will deal with them on terms which condemn them to restricted levels of industry and low living standards.

I

Because of their fear of Russia or of internal Communist revolt, such nations feel that they have no choice but to play along with us. But they do not love us, and they do not trust us. They fear us. They fear us as much as they fear Russia, although in ways less immediately divisive. Listen to the talk in London or Paris or Stockholm or Shanghai for a few days, and you will quickly discover how pervasive is this feeling. Opinion there holds that the United States will offer support as long as it can use these other states to its own short-envisoned advantage, but that the minute anything they do may threaten our profits, we will cast them adrift.

This fear in which even our "friends" hold us has also its negative aspects. They fear a coming collapse in America and what it will do to them. A feature review in the New York Times of a current economic study begins: "The United States is proceeding headlong toward the worst economic crisis of all time." That is exactly what most of them believe, and what such nations as England and Sweden are desperately trying to hedge against with their nationalization of basic industries and the Swedish trade agreement with the Soviet Union. Other nations in the democratic camp are in such an economically helpless position that all they can do is cross their fingers, try to get as much help from us as possible as quickly as possible, and hope for the best. In occupied Germany and Japan, the democrats can only hope that an economic debacle in the United States does not cause us to pull out and leave them to face the Communist challenge alone before we ever arrive at a constructive policy, much less carry it to completion.

II

This fear with which the United States is regarded takes many forms and is fostered by many factors. One of these is our military policy. To the rest of the nations, our cries of insecurity sound like the rankest hypocrisy. For with our possession of the atom bomb and our demonstrated gigantic industrial potential we seem more secure than anyone else. Agitation regarding our insecurity is therefore interpreted as simply a device to induce the American people to approve a huge navy and naval base system, backed by a mass conscript army. And that, in the eyes of others, is held to mean preparation for other overseas occupations, since a mass army has no other purpose, in days of atomic and rocket warfare, unless it is needed to hold down a revolting population at home. No one believes that the United States stands in danger of that sort. Moreover, the rapid increase of military participation in our administrative and diplomatic processes has not escaped notice abroad. All these things create fear.

Our diplomacy is likewise a source of apprehension. What is our policy in Germany? The kind of naked military rule in which we are now involved is leading nowhere, unless it be to prolonged confusion. We have discarded the outrageous Potsdam policy, and that is to the good. But what policy have we to take its place? Perhaps the Moscow conference will show. So far, however, we seem to others to have no affirmative policy in this key spot. Mr. Dulles' proposal for an economic federation in the parts of the Rhine Valley where we have a free hand has awakened no response from the American public. Seemingly, Americans are not interested? Then what are we going to do in western Europe? Because no one knows, everyone is afraid.

What is our policy with regard to Great Britain? How far will we back the interests of that beleaguered empire? And how long? Are we entering into secret commitments with the British General Staff and with the British Foreign Office? To other nations, it is amazing that the American people should not be any more interested in these questions than they appear to be. What is our policy toward Russia? Is it quarantine, or isn't it? What is our policy toward China? For the moment this has been partially cleared up by General Marshall's statement and by the American withdrawal. But what if Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist government falls, especially if it falls to a Communist uprising? What will we do then? The accumulation of such uncertainties adds up to fear.

Our industrial drive creates fear. We now have a war-expanded productive machine which, largely bereft of Government buying, must find markets for approximately 50 percent more goods than we were turning out in 1938—or else. That or else puts a terrific impulse behind our attempt to penetrate export markets. But it is not yet clear that we do not intend to return to our high tariff policy. The result, insofar as we are able to bring it off, will be that American economic imperialism which is already being denounced all around the globe. Economic imperialism, when it runs into trouble,

has a way of demanding support from political imperialism. The result? Fear.

Limitations of space compel me to crowd into a few concluding words what is in some respects the most important fact concerning America's relations with other nations and our service to lasting peace. Are the American people sufficiently taking into account the tension being generated by our exclusive possession of the atom bomb? I doubt it. Yet all our protestations of devotion to world organization, all our expressed hopes of peace through the United Nations, are discounted by Russia because of this. Russia thinks what we really mean is that we are for peace and a world organization if the other nations (in especial, Russia) accept our blueprints. Otherwise, we fall back on our possession of the bomb.

III

No international confidence, no honest cooperation and so no lasting peace can be built on this foundation. The thing that will come out of it is what is already coming out of it—an atomic arms race. And that will end, when the Communist world gets the atomic and biological weapons it is after, in a show-down. The American people will first be stunned and then enraged by the catastrophic nature of that eventuality.

How is that catastrophe to be escaped? By giving Russia the bomb now? Henry Wallace and those who follow his leadership, as well as Communist Party members and fellow travelers in the United States, say yes. I find it impossible, after seeing Russian expansionist policy in action in so many parts of Europe and Asia, to say anything but no. I do not believe that the men in the Kremlin can be trusted with such a weapon. (I am not now arguing the question whether the men in Washington can be trusted with the bomb. The fact is that we have it, and the pursuit of lasting peace must go on from there.)

But if we do not give Russia the bomb, and the result is an atomic arms race, what then is the hope of peace? At this point I must confess to seeing only a very narrow and flickering ray of light. Perhaps readers of the Christian Century will not regard it as a ray of light at all; they may dismiss it as a will-o'-the-wisp. This ray of light which I think I see is the possibility of a sufficiently rapid development of the constructive, peaceful uses of atomic fission to raise living standards everywhere to a degree sufficient to make senseless a military outcome. The scientists tell us this can be done. Of course, we should keep working for the universal adoption of the Lilienthal plan—or something equally promising—for inspection and control of atomic plants. Yet if we fail to achieve this we might still, by pouring our resources of science and materials into raising the standards of living of all peoples, resolve most of the tensions of this desperate world. However, if that is what we mean to try to do, it is terribly late to start.

PAUL HUTCHINSON.

The Palestine Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, since my first day in Congress and before, I have been greatly concerned with the Palestine problem. I have done everything that I know how to do to be of assistance. Now that the problem is on the calendar of the United Nations, I have expressed my views to the Hon. Warren R. Austin, our chief delegate, with the hope that he will urge a solution in accordance with the expressed policy of the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a copy of my letter to him dated April 19 1947, together with his prompt reply:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1947.

Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Chief United States Delegate,
United Nations Organization,
Lake Success, N. Y.

MY DEAR SENATOR AUSTIN: I am, and have been for a long time, very gravely concerned with the Palestine problem, which seems to worsen rather than approach a solution.

It is needless to point out in detail the bitterly disappointing conduct of Great Britain in repudiating the solemn and official pledges made by His Majesty's Government regarding free immigration to Palestine, and the ultimate establishment of a Jewish National Home. I am taking the liberty, however, of enclosing a statement I made on the subject to the Congress on July 12, 1946, which, I think, points out very clearly the wholly unjustified breach of covenant.

The disappointment with which I have watched the tragic and time-wasting maneuvers of Great Britain has been intensified by the unconscionable and insulting statement made by the British Foreign Minister, Mr. Bevin, in London last February, in which, in an amazing piece of political chicanery he attempts to escape the blame, which is properly his, by complaining about American pressure in behalf of Jewish rights in Palestine.

Notwithstanding Mr. Bevin's speech, I sincerely trust that American pressure will continue and increase until a humanitarian solution is found, which will alleviate the tragic suffering of the remnants of the Jewish people in Europe.

The American Zionist Conference held in Washington January 17, 1947, in dealing with the new hope that the United Nations might solve this problem, said this:

"Great Britain's announced decision to refer the Palestine question to the United Nations affords an historic opportunity to the members of that international body. A generation has passed since the nations of the world resolved to end Jewish national homelessness and to reestablish Jewish nationhood. They entrusted the British Government with this great task, but the guardian proved unfaithful to its trust and sought to frustrate its fulfillment.

"Once again the international community, represented by the United Nations, can reaffirm the decision made following the first World War. To that end, the main elements of the solution—freedom of Jewish immigration to Palestine and the establishment of the Jewish state—should be spelled out in clear and precise terms.

"It is only reasonable to expect the United Nations, in dealing with this problem, to be faithful to its role as the guardian of international law by issuing an interim order that pending the final decision, the mandate for Palestine—the only internationally valid instrument governing that country—be fully applied, free from all restrictive enactments imposed by the mandatory government in violation of that fundamental document."

It is this statement that I want to call most particularly to your attention with the hope, and with the confidence, that you will do your full part in the deliberations of the United Nations on Palestine on April 28.

The American people are deeply sympathetic to the appeal of the Jewish people for a place of refuge. The American Congress has formally expressed its policy in this regard. I pray that you will do what you can.

Cordially,

MILLET HAND,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 23, 1947.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
Second District of New Jersey,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAND: Thank you for your letter of April 19, enclosing copy of the extension of remarks made by you on July 12, 1946, Bevin breaks Palestine pledge.

I greatly appreciate your courtesy in making your views known to me in this way. I assure you that I will consider them carefully in connection with all of the evidence available to the United Nations on this subject.

With cordial regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WARREN R. AUSTIN,
United States Representative
to the United Nations.

Human Stakes at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, we cannot have political peace without economic peace.

The International Trade Conference being held at Geneva is of paramount importance to every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following article by Malvina Lindsay entitled "Human Stakes at Geneva," which appeared in the Washington Post on April 3, 1947:

HUMAN STAKES AT GENEVA

(By Malvina Lindsay)

PEACE AND PRICES

The average family is probably not aware of how a meeting next week in far-away Geneva, Switzerland, may affect its pocketbook and even its safety. But the International Trade Conference—whose name suggests merely a group of experts about a big table bandying statistics—will be jockeying behind its dry figures with the future budgets, pay checks, jobs, ambitions, and security of billions of human beings.

While the Nation watched eagerly the San Francisco Conference, where the latest political attempt at world cooperation was born, it is not likely there will be comparable breathless waiting to see if Geneva can produce the infant of economic peace. Yet whatever is done at Moscow or Lake Success will be largely a loss if Geneva fails.

Also, oddly, the average citizen repeatedly reads or talks of a predicted depression of 1952 or 1955, wonders idly why somebody doesn't do something about it, yet fails to recognize that the men in Geneva may have that opportunity in their grasp—if their governments will back them up.

A few national women's groups that worked for the Dumbarton Oaks proposals are trying to arouse their membership to what is at stake at Geneva. Yet comparatively few of the masses of women who are the buyers of the Nation recognize that future costs and quality of goods—as well as their husbands' jobs and the avoidance

of World War III—may depend on whether the 18 nations in the conference are able to write an International Trade Organization charter and draw up trade agreements with each other.

Also at stake is whether the average family will be freed from the constant toll it pays to business monopolies known as cartels. One of the American proposals for the Trade Organization charter is that cartels be prevented by national and international action from restricting the commerce of the world.

If this were done it would mean that prices of hundreds of products used daily, as cooking ingredients and utensils, cosmetics, apparel, household devices, medicines, foods could not be maintained by secret agreements among industries and by planned scarcity, but would be determined by democratic free competition. It would mean, as Darel McConkey points out in his recent study of cartels, Out of Your Pocket, that the housewife would not be constantly contributing "a few mills into the cartel turnstile."

If tariff agreements are worked out satisfactorily at Geneva, it will mean that many high-class products from abroad, as woolens, linens, pottery, handicraft, foods, will be available to the average American at less cost, and that American cotton, wheat, apples, tobacco, farm machinery, trucks, motion pictures, other goods, will find freer and larger markets abroad.

Thus the expected—and feared—excess production in this country could find a market, industries expand instead of contract, new jobs be created, mass unemployment prevented. History might even be stopped from repeating itself with another world economic slump, and the attendant trade wars which preface the shooting.

Since lessons of the 1930's taught that world trade cannot be a one-way arrangement, that this country cannot export goods profitably without also importing them, so that its customers abroad will have something to pay with, American consumers as well as their Government face the trade problem.

The Government will need to offer tariff concessions on products that can best be produced abroad and on which foreign nations' economic life depends, and ask concessions from other countries on goods this country is best equipped to produce. Consumers will need to become world conscious in their buying, recognize that their use of products of potential customers now trying to beat back economically is not only good business but the main road to peace.

Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a United Press article of April 24, 1947, setting forth the views of my British namesake relative to the latest escapade of Henry Wallace:

FOOT GIVES HENRY THE OLD BOOT

BOURNEMOUTH, ENGLAND, April 24.—Henry Wallace was censured for criticizing his own Government today by Dingle M. Foot, one of the top leaders of the British Liberty Party.

"We should make it quite clear that we have no sympathy with Mr. Wallace's criticism of his Government," Foot declared at the opening of the Liberal Party's annual conference.

Foot, who is the son of Isaac Foot, newly elected president of the Liberals, said his party always had admired and respected Wallace, but that now it appeared some distinction must be made between Wallace's policies and his economics.

"We welcome President Truman's action with regard to aid for Turkey and Greece," he said. "No one should make the mistake of supposing that Mr. Wallace speaks for the whole or even for the majority of American liberal opinion."

"The picture which he draws of a reactionary United States wantonly seeking a quarrel with a demure U. S. S. R. is a picture which I do not recognize," Foot said.

The remarks came as Foot moved adoption of the Liberal Party's 1,000-word policy statement on world affairs. Earlier, his father called on the party to declare its complete independence of other British political groups.

Opportunity Implies Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the forward-looking industrial organizations in my district is the Young Radiator Co. at Racine, Wis. Mr. Fred Young, president, is a progressive and outstanding industrial engineer. The firm that bears his name is one of the leaders in its chosen field, and it has at all times endeavored to maintain harmonious relationships with its employee group. From time to time Mr. Young brings home to his workers thought-provoking articles. As a part of my remarks, I am including the most recent, entitled "Responsibility":

STEADY WORK

Week in and week out, the Young Radiator Co. has provided steady employment for those who want to work. Never has the work week been less than 40 hours. There is an ever-increasing demand for our product, and our production curve is forward and upward. With more than a quarter of a century of engineering skill and reputation in the field of heat transferring equipment back of Young Radiator products, it is with confidence and pride that we look to the future for business which will provide you—our workers—with steady work and income.

STEADY PAY

Opportunities to advance—with steady work comes steady pay. You have reasonable assurance of a steady income here that few companies have. For unskilled labor for 40 hours per week your earnings per week for the first month will be $36.40, second month $37.40 per week, third month $39.10 per week. From then on, if you are industrious and your aptitude and interest increases, you can make application for a production job. The average wage for production workers is $60 per week; some men are making $100 per week.

YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO YOUR FELLOW WORKER AND THE COMPANY

You and your family, too, all have an interest in our business—so here is where you come in.

All of you are important in our organization and program. Each of you is important to our success as a whole. Everything you do, either good or bad, affects your fellow worker and your department, too. When you are absent, unless you are quickly replaced, production goes down. If ever you should decide to leave us—cooperate with us and your fellow workers, giving us a week or two notice in order that we might replace you and not disrupt the work in your and other departments. Every job is dependent on every other job because of continuous flow of work from department to department.

COMPANY RESPONSIBILITY TO YOU

Our responsibility to our workers: To keep sufficient market and work in varied products so you can be assurred, with reasonable conditions, a weekly and monthly pay return. Your company has never lacked in this and we pledge ourselves in your and our mutual behalf to providing jobs and work and within these precepts, viewing our responsibilities, we ask you to respect your part in return.

AS WE WORK TOGETHER

Because so much of our time is spent at work, we like to work with friendly, agreeable people. Each member of the force can help to make it a more pleasant place to work by your own attitude and conduct on the job. Young's is noted for its friendliness and character of its personnel, and, therefore, is a good place to work.

Let us all work together for the future of our company—for as it progresses, we will all progress. Our company's reputation is your future.

Message by the President and Address by Senator McClellan to National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the message sent by President Truman to the thirty-seventh annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, held in Washington, D. C., May 2 and 3, 1947, and a copy of the remarks I made at the opening of the congress.

There being no objection, the message and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 25, 1947.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I am glad to convey to the members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress my deep appreciation of the public service rendered by this organization.

The need to protect and improve our natural resources has become acute as a result of the war, and we must plan and carry out an adequate program to this end at all times if we are to avoid waste. We canont risk retarding our growth by lack of the necessary instruments of progress. Navigation, flood control, conservation, and reclamation are among the important activities upon which our prosperity as a nation depends.

I therefore take pleasure in commending the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

on its untiring efforts to foster and guide the development of our water and land resources, and in extending my sincere wishes for a highly successful meeting.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN L. M'CLELLAN, OF ARKANSAS, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, AT THE OPENING OF ITS THIRTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 2, 1947

Distinguished guests, delegates of the convention, ladies, and gentlemen. It is indeed a high privilege and an esteemed pleasure to greet you at this opening assembly of the thirty-seventh convention of the Congress. It is most gratifying to all of us that our organization is now able to resume its long-established custom of holding annual conventions for the discussion of important problems associated with our natural waterways resources and their future development, and for the transaction of such business as may come before the congress. Your presence here today—this excellent attendance—is a strong manifestation of the progressive spirit that abides with our people and gives reassurance that our Nation is determined and destined to continue setting the pace in the future march of world progress and civilization.

Due to the war, we were compelled to suspend holding our annual conventions, but now that we are in the midst of the postwar era, in the period of readjustment, in the shift back to a peacetime enterprise and economy, we have the opportunity of further service to our country by making substantial contributions to its future growth and progress as we have contributed in the past 45 years since the National Rivers and Harbors Congress first came into being.

It became necessary during the war to restrict Federal public works to only those projects that were essential to the prosecution of the war and to our national defense. Worthy and needed improvements in our river development and conservation programs, which normally would have been constructed during the past 5 or 6 years, had to be deferred, but during that time Congress continued to promote the general program by enacting authorization legislation that has created a large backlog of approved reclamation, flood control, and rivers and harbors projects. They can now go forward as soon as the Congress can advisedly, taking into account other economic factors incident to Government expenditures, provide the necessary funds for their construction.

We have today some 434 flood-control projects, with an estimated cost of $2,122,000,000, authorized. Of these projects, 165 are now in course of construction. Work has not yet been started on 269, for the majority of which no appropriations have yet been made. We have 280 rivers and harbors projects, with an estimated cost of $3,051,000,000, authorized, with 56 now in course of construction and 224 not yet started.

While there are many other worth-while improvements yet to be developed and submitted for congressional action, still we have this large reservoir of public improvements on rivers and harbors ready to go when the money for construction can be made available.

Experiences we gained during the war, conditions that now prevail in the aftermath of war, and the exactions the war made in heavy drains on our natural resources, emphasize as never before the wisdom and necessity of our employing all prudent measures for the conservation of our natural resources and the extensive development of them for their fullest utilization and benefit to our people and the Nation.

In the past, many who had not caught the vision of natural resource development condemned our rivers and harbors and flood-control projects as being of the "pork barrel" quality, and charged that legislation and appropriations of this character were wasteful expenditures of public funds. Such charges have long since been refuted by benefits that have accrued as a result of such improvements already constructed. The American people are no longer deceived or confused by such attempts to discredit and condemn our program, the worth and value of which has been demonstrated beyond successful challenge and which has become irrevocably established as a sound national policy. Instead, our people expect the Congress, and the Congress has the responsibility, by appropriate legislation, to continue and expand, as economic conditions may warrant, the policy and program of developing our natural strength and wealth.

Notwithstanding the increasing need for the advancing of our waterways program and the general favor and popular approval which has been accorded to it, we are confronted with a problem of serious magnitude in attempting to carry on construction in this postwar period due to the economic burden occasioned by our national debt, the current operating expenses of Government, and the highest tax rate in the history of the Nation. Under these circumstances, we can hardly hope to go forward with the full speed we should like to make and which would be possible and warranted under normal conditions. All these factors must be weighed and taken into account. But, when viewed in their proper light and with a correct perspective, though our national debt is tremendously high, our current cost of Government and our present tax rate burdensome, the Congress and the Nation will not be justified in pursuing a policy of extreme conservatism that would place this program in jeopardy, and stop or seriously retard the development and utilization of the bountiful water resources with which our Nation is so fortunately endowed.

While we are all stanch advocates of economy in government, there are degrees of economy and conservatism that are wise but when carried to extremes become unwise and improvident. The continuation of a reasonable construction program of these essential improvements is imperative and indispenable to progress, to the increasing of our national strength, and to the welfare of our people. To stop construction and lose all of the momentum that has been gained by years of intelligent effort would be the height of national folly.

Expenditures of government can properly be placed in different categories. There are expenditures for many functions that, although they are essential functions of government, do not yield dividends in terms of tangible material values. There are other expenses of government that properly come within the category of capital investments, just as business interests and private enterprise make investments in plants, equipment, and expansion for greater efficiency and increased production. Flood control, reclamation, and rivers and harbors projects clearly fall within the category of Government investments. Many of them yield substantial returns to the Government on the investments made and, in fact, are self-liquidating in the course of a very few years. Many, many others enhance our national wealth and increase the annual income and thus greatly broaden our tax base. This contributes to a higher national income and standard of living for the individual citizen and to increased tax revenues for the Nation, and municipal, county, and State governments.

It would therefore, be highly reactionary and injurious to the country for the Congress to deny reasonable appropriations to keep this program active and progressing.

I sincerely hope the Congress will not commit such a grave error but that we will have the sound judgment, good wisdom, and the courage to carry on in the fine traditions of the progress and development that have made our country preeminent and supreme among the nations of the earth.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column appearing in a recent edition of the Washington Post, by Mr. Marquis Childs, discussing the subject of soil conservation and certain relations between our country and the Republic of Mexico.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

SOIL CONSERVATION

Behind the warm-hearted greeting for President Miguel Aleman, of Mexico, is a serious objective. The hope is to link the two countries as equal partners in a working relationship.

President Aleman and his Secretary of Finance, Ramon Beteta, want loans to promote Mexico's industrial and farm production. They realize that greater production, and quickly, is the only cure for Mexico's threatening inflation. In both Washington and New York, they are discussing loans from the United States, from the World Bank, and from private banking sources.

It so hapens that there is one kind of aid which President Truman can offer to President Aleman without any fear of what Congress may do or say. In fact, it is Congress that seems determined to make this form of aid possible.

The suggestion originally came from Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson. Shortly before Aleman's visit, he reminded the President that an economy-minded Congress seemed determined to pare down the reclamation and soil-conservation work being done by our Government. This, said Anderson, would release a number of top technicians and experts who understand how to work with soil and water to make the earth give forth in abundance. The United States today has the greatest body of such experts in the world. What is more, they have a high scarcity value. Nations all over the world want to use their technical skill to build up basic natural resources.

If a number of these experts could be encouraged to go to Mexico, they could at least be kept in this hemisphere, where they would help to build the productivity of a good neighbor. President Truman thought well of the suggestion and passed it on to his friend President Aleman.

Mexico already has an extensive program of dam building and irrigation, with her own corps of technicians. Expansion of this program would mean an immediate demand for more men with the proper know-how, and such men do not grow on trees.

Particularly in Mexico's border States, development of irrigated land has gone on at a pace more rapid than in the United States of America. That was one reason for the Mexican-United States of America water treaty which was ratified by the Senate in April 1945. Mexico was beginning to use water from the Colorado River at a rate of increase greater than in this country.

India, Iran, Iraq, Palestine, and many other countries with a water-land-use problem are looking to the United States for

technical help. Private engineering firms are sending experts out on private contract. But there is a ceiling on this kind of help, since the number of Americans with the proper skills and knowledge is definitely limited.

One of the most striking examples is that of Afghanistan, a little known country which lies across the Khyber Pass between India and Iran. Some years ago, a visitor from Afghanistan came to this country to learn about our irrigation and conservation projects. The visitor, Mohammed Kabir Ludin, talked with officials here in Washington and inspected projects in the Western States.

Now commissioner of public works in Afghanistan, Mohammed Kabir Ludin is putting into practice what he learned in the United States. Using money which his government has on deposit in New York, he signed a contract with a United States engineering firm to initiate a sizable irrigation project.

In this is a contrast that is very funny. At least, it is funny in one sense of the word. Afghanistan, a small country in the highlands of the Himalayas, can afford what the greatest power in the world says, through its Congress, that it cannot afford.

It should, of course, be put another way. The richest country in the world can hardly afford not to conserve its soils and to develop new soil and water resources. Economy that shuts off such projects is tragically short-sighted.

That is obviously something our neighbors south of the border have learned. They will borrow money and they will borrow technicians to restore and replenish the good earth of Mexico. We seem to be determined to go in just the opposite direction, chasing an economy wholly false in terms of the basic wealth and the basic needs of our own people.

The Faith of the Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Faith of the Fathers," which I delivered at the Cape Henry Day program, commemorative service, Cape Henry, Va., on April 27, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At this season of the year, when the rebirth of nature confirms our faith in immortality and the beauty and fragrance of spring flowers "glide into our darker musings with a mild and healing sympathy," it is meet and proper for us to gather at this historic spot and honor the memory of those who founded a new empire dedicated to freedom, equality and justice.

The fact that 340 years later and in the foremost file of time we, their heirs, are privileged to live in the most-favored Nation of the world is no accident. "Without the shedding of blood," said St. Paul, "there is no remittance." The blessings of democracy we now enjoy were bought with a price and that rich heritage will not be passed on to succeeding generations if this day and generation adopts as its philosophy of life "enjoy thyself."

The philosophy of ancient Greece was "know thyself;" of ancient Rome "discipline thyself." But the philosophy of the Christian religion, upon which a new experiment in self-government was to be founded, was symbolized by the cross erected on this spot by the first settlers—"give thyself."

In 1607, while the mother country had made notable progress since Runnymede in combatting the injustices of feudalism and the divine right of kings and its common law had declared a man's home to be his castle, the fact remained that the castles were the property of the privileged few. The masses had to be content with shelter they did not own and to rely, to a large degree, upon the kindheartedness of an overlord for the essential needs of food and clothing..

The first settlers came to this virgin land to secure homes of their own and the personal and economic freedom implicit in their ownership. As compared with the architecture of a mature civilization those homes of hewn logs in the wilderness were crude. But in their building the founders of our Republic experienced the inspiration of freedom of action, reacted to the stimulating influence of a system of private enterprise and learned, by stern necessity, that the foundation of democracy is personal responsibility.

The practical and successful application of that fundamental principle attracted the attention of freedom-loving people throughout the world. In the brief span of a half century weak and struggling settlements at Jamestown and Plymouth had developed into Thirteen Colonies, with a population of 6,000,000 people. Then it was that faith in their institutions and the courage of their convictions was challenged by the mother country. Oh, how proud we in Virginia can be of the fact that in the ensuing struggle for the preservation of the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness Virginia furnished the leadership. When representatives of the Thirteen States met in the first Continental Congress in Philadelphia it was that immortal Virginia orator—Patrick Henry—who sounded the keynote for independent action when he said: "I speak, now, no longer as a Virginian. I now and henceforth shall speak as an American."

The ashes of Patrick Henry were buried in Charlotte County but the spirit of Patrick Henry lived on. "For the whole earth," said Pericles, "is the sepulchre of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on, far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives."

In two global wars we have fought to preserve the principles of our founding fathers, and yet the world peace for which we sacrificed blood and treasure eludes our grasp. Instead of the world being made safe for democracy we find today the totalitarian and anti-God ideology of communism feeding on the measureless misery of war-torn countries in Europe, while many of our own people have so lost faith in the fact that God governs in the affairs of men they think another armed conflict is inevitable.

After the atomic bomb tests at Bikini Admiral Blandy said: "Civilization faces the choice of living under God or of living underground."

I rejoice in the leadership of the noble, Christian, and patriotic women of this community who, in organizing annual pilgrimages to this sacred spot, have kept us and the Nation reminded of the faith of our fathers.

Another war, in which civilization, as we know it, would undoubtedly perish, is not inevitable. In war we have always recognized our fundamental principle of individual responsibility. In winning the peace a distressed and war-torn world looks to us for leadership.

If we are to meet that challenge there is a job for all of us to do. We must rededicate ourselves to the faith of our fathers and renew our allegiance to the fundamental principle of individual responsibility.

Criticisms of Pending Labor Bill by Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio, entitled "Major Defects in the Taft-Ball Bill, S. 1126." In its criticism of the pending measure, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen objects particularly to title II of the bill, which would abolish the present United States Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor and establish an independent Federal Mediation Service outside the Department of Labor. I am inserting this statement in the RECORD, because I believe that Members of this body should be familiar with the position of one of the major labor organizations of the country while we are considering the proposal to amend the labor laws.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR DEFECTS IN THE TAFT-BALL BILL, S. 1126

1. Page 41, section 202: It will be noted that this section abolishes the Conciliation Service, as such, and establishes in its stead a Federal Mediation Service beyond the jurisdiction or authority of the Secretary of Labor or any other official or division of the Department of Labor—it is not responsible to any department, to any Cabinet officer, or to any authority beyond the Director of the Service.

It will be noted that the Director of the Service—at $12,000 a year—is to be appointed by the President, and the bill does not provide any requisite qualifications, experience, or fitness. The President may appoint anyone he cares to appoint and this man, under the provisions of section 202, will have at his disposal funds appropriated for the operation of the Conciliation Service (perhaps $2,500,000) and he will be empowered by the provisions of this bill to appoint, without regard to civil-service provisions, conciliators and mediators (without regard as to number) and fix their compensation (without limit). It will be noted that the Director may establish regional offices (no limit) anywhere and that he may establish the procedure to be followed in contact with any State or local mediation agency.

Note particularly page 43, commencing with line 18, "The Director shall not be subject in any way to the jurisdiction or authority of the Secretary of Labor or any official or division of the Department of Labor." This simply means that he will be a free agent with perhaps $2,500,000 at his disposal and responsible to no one. It means that he will be empowered to recruit and build a Nation-wide organization, with branch offices everywhere, that he will have several hundred appointments at his disposal, at not less than $5,000 per year and expenses.

This is a very dangerous set-up. It places far too much power—far too much money and far too much organization—under the control of one man, and the man under

the control of no one. Some of the President's appointments to date have not been too hot and no one can at this time tell who might be appointed to head the Federal Mediation Service and what his attitude might be toward labor or toward business, or toward our form of government, toward our President, or toward any Presidential candidate in the year just ahead.

The above defect in the bill disturbed Senator TAFT when it was brought to his attention, and we think it should disturb anyone who is interested in good government and in an efficient nonpartisan Conciliation Service.

2. Page 45: It will be noted that whenever the parties to a labor dispute consent to submit the same to arbitration that this bill authorizes the Government to pay the cost of arbitration up to $500 per case. Last year the Conciliation Service handled in excess of 1,000 arbitration cases, and in the vast majority of these cases the parties absorbed the expense of the arbitration. This proposal to have the Government pay the cost of arbitration will provide a field day for broken-down lawyers and politicians who are always eager for fees. It will greatly increase the number of grievances and labor disputes submitted to arbitration and it will completely offset the fine educational work which the United States Conciliation Service and the Department of Labor have done for several years in requiring the parties to stand the expense of arbitration so as to discourage submitting grievances and labor disputes to arbitration, which can better be settled around the conference table with a conciliator or by the parties through direct negotiation.

Now note that commencing with line 12, the bill provides that in any case where the suggestion of arbitration is refused by one or both parties that the director of the service shall notify the President to that effect in writing. This is wholly impractical and completely unworkable. It makes of the President of the United States a labor conciliator and places on his desk thousands of cases in which one or two of the parties will not go along with the suggestion that the matter be arbitrated. Anyone who knows anything at all about management-labor relations knows that the mere fact that one or both parties have refused to go along with the suggestion that the dispute be arbitrated does not conclude mediation effort and everyone is in agreement that in no case should a labor dispute be taken to the White House for settlement.

Time and time again the President has told newspapermen that the oil dispute or the telephone dispute or some other dispute is being handled by the Department of Labor and he has respectfully pushed the subject away from his desk by referring reporters to the Secretary of Labor.

3. Page 47, section 205: The bill here establishes a national labor-management panel, composed of 12 members, who will serve at $25 a day for a period of 3 years, "to advise in the avoidance of industrial controversies." This is silly and is simply another opportunity for the Director of the Mediation Service to provide jobs for his pals or cronies, to enter and mess up the field of labor-management relations.

4. Page 48, section 206. This is perhaps one of the most vicious provisions of the bill. For the first time in American history, it injects the Attorney General (a prosecuting attorney) into labor disputes whenever in his opinion a controversy threatens to disturb national health or safety. Management and labor alike should resist and resent this provision. Reading the section through, it would be noted that it provides an opportunity for the Attorney General to appoint a board of inquiry composed of a director and such other members as the Attorney General shall determine, at $50 per day and expenses, for an undetermined period of time. What an opportunity for the Attorney General to remember the boys and provide places for broken-down post office lawyers and for his pals, and what a temptation it will be to provide an opportunity for anyone to tip the Attorney General that a labor dispute exists, with the suggestion that he appoint a panel.

Under section 208 the Attorney General may petition any court of the United States having jurisdiction to enjoin the threatened strike until such time as the Attorney General finds it convenient to reconvene his panel, which will then conduct the second investigation (presumably at $50 a day and expenses for each member of the panel) and for a period of 60 days.

Page 51, commencing with line 9, empowers the Attorney General to require the National Labor Relations Board to take a secret ballot of the employees (behind the backs of the union's negotiating committee) to present to the members of the union the company's offer of settlement. Under the Smith-Connally Act the National Labor Relations Board was required to conduct, at Government expense, a secret ballot vote of employees and in a short time the National Labor Relations Board was busted. It is said that the cost of conducting the United Mine Workers' poll cost in excess of $160,000 and made it necessary for the Board to petition the Congress to excuse them from conducting any more polls. The Board is now hopelessly behind in its regular work, with more than 5,000 cases on the docket, and to throw this added responsibility on the Board would sink it for sure.

It will be noted also that the proposal is unjust and unfair, in that it does not require the Board to submit any union proposal to the shareholders of a corporation for their consideration. We know of numerous instances where the union has made a proposal which was so reasonable and so fair that if it had been submitted to the shareholders it would have been approved, yet it was blocked by an obstinate vice president or some lawyer representing the corporation who was employed to say "No."

Section 210: It will be noted that after the ballot has been taken, regardless of how the employees vote, the Attorney General is then directed to petition the court to dissolve the injunction and the strike may then take place. It will be noted that, after much delay by the Attorney General, after the expenditure of much money for a panel and for court action, the unsettled dispute is then referred to the President of the United States. This again makes a labor conciliator of the President and requires him to pass the unsettled matter to the Congress for appropriate action. What the Congress will do or can do is not specified nor what will happen in the event the Congress is in recess for 4 or 5 months, or is actively engaged in major legislation, as it has been for several months during the present session.

Time and time again Frances Perkins, former Secretary of Labor, has told the world in general and parties to a labor dispute in particular not to carry their troubles to the White House—that it was not the function of the President of the United States to act as a labor conciliator, or mediator, or arbitrator.

5. Page 55, title IV, section 402, paragraph (3) empowers the joint committee on labor-management relations, composed of seven Congressmen and seven Senators, to go on a fishing expedition into the internal affairs of any labor union. This is particularly objectionable.

Section 405, page 57: It will be noted that this congressional committee is empowered to require, by subpena, the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents. We will remember the howl that went up last year from General Motors when it was simply suggested that they produce their books to sustain their contention that cost would not justify a further wage increase and that a further wage increase would inevitably result in a substantial increase in retail prices. This bill empowers the investigating committee to require any corporation or any business anywhere, at any time, to produce books, papers, and documents, and is a wide-open door for the fishermen.

6. Page 36, paragraph 3: It will be noted that the language here requires a person to testify, even though it violates his constitutional rights and might tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty for forfeiture.

In conclusion, in an attempt to deal with some abuses, such as jurisdictional disputes and secondary boycotts, this bill goes far too far and would in effect contribute to industrial chaos and industrial strife. It absolutely destroys the United States Conciliation Service, the most effective agency in the United States for the preservation of industrial peace and for the settlement of industrial strife, and it completely violates the plank in the Republican platform of 1944, which read as follows:

"All governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor." (See p. 26 of the minority report relating to S. 1126.)

Tourism in World Peace and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine, has written a very able and thoughtful article on the importance of tourism in the development of world peace and prosperity. The article has been published in the American Motorist magazine and other publications of the American Automobile Association.

Senator BREWSTER's basic thesis is simple: Through travel there will develop a greater understanding among nations; money expended by travelers will make an impressive contribution to world trade.

Senator BREWSTER's declaration has already evoked considerable interest in all parts of the country. The Hartford Courant published much of the text under a headline "International travel seen aid to world recovery." The Indianapolis Star used an eight-column headline and opened its article with this sentence:

> A great international travel boom soon will "roll back the iron curtains of prejudice among nations," Senator OWEN BREWSTER forecast this week.

The New York Times commented editorially on another important phase of the Senator's article. The Times declared that—

> The American Automobile Association has urged the Department of State to transmit to the United Nations a request to use its influence in lowering barriers to travel. There exists today a bewildering procedure of passports and visas, entry and departure permits, health and vaccination tickets, police permits, photographs, tax certificates, and the like * * * Senator BREWSTER * * * emphasized the simplicity of the convention

on the regulation of inter-American automotive traffic, sponsored by the AAA, already ratified by the United States and eight other countries, as a pattern for standardization of forms and procedure for all kinds of travel in many parts of the earth. Such freedom and ease of travel hardly can fail to extend the concept of one world.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article by Senator BREWSTER:

TOURISM IN WORLD PEACE AND PROSPERITY

(By Senator OWEN BREWSTER)

Today the nations of the world stand at the threshold of tremendous opportunities for more friendliness and tolerance, for greater productiveness, higher standards of living for more people, and, consequently, increased happiness for all. It can be either those things or the alternatives of recurring wars, misery and poverty, and further destruction to national institutions and cultures.

The key to this is greater understanding between nations, founded on a sound economic basis and through more and more individual contacts that will give a wider knowledge of the habits, customs, and historical backgrounds of all people, the one to the other. It is only in this way that we may roll back the iron curtains of blind prejudice, intolerance, and suspicion.

The United States has a unique opportunity in this respect, both historically and from the standpoint of our role of world leadership today. To begin with, Americans are cosmopolitan. In the almost 200 years since the Republic was founded we have welcomed and assimilated millions of people from all over the world—from a large number of nations, all classes of society, many shades of political opinion, and a variety of creeds. This has given us a certain flexibility in our relationships—a tolerance for the habits, beliefs, and customs of others, no matter what our own individual backgrounds may be.

As a nation we are great travelers—the greatest in the world—both within our own borders and abroad. At home this has been made possible by the excellence, variety, and relative inexpensiveness of our transportation facilities, including first and foremost the motorcar, which has been brought within the reach of virtually every citizen during the short space of half a century. This has meant that the Californian has had the means of knowing the rock-bound coast of Maine, the Floridian of exploring Puget Sound, and the Minnesotan of seeing the broad plains of Texas.

Year after year in normal times this interchange of visits has been going on, from the Black Hills to the Gulf of Mexico, from the Sierra Nevada Mountains to the Appalachians. It has increased steadily until today it is estimated as being a $6,000,000,000-a-year business, not only providing employment for scores of thousands of people, but constituting one of the major industries of our country. As a byproduct it has meant increased knowledge of one another, greater respect for our national institutions and cultural backgrounds, and more appreciation of both our progress as a Nation and our potentialities for future development—results that cannot be measured in terms of dollars.

The story of American travel abroad is equally interesting. Before the start of World War II the number of United States citizens touring outside the borders of our country had risen to a peak of 600,000 annually. These travelers spent an estimated $1,000,000,000 a year on such trips. When the war came, still more Americans, numbering in the millions, went abroad and became familiar figures in all quarters of the globe. While these men and women in olive drab and blue were traveling for reasons far removed from pleasure, they gave other nations a fresh and, on the whole, favorable opinion of our country and people, and they in turn absorbed something during their grim missions about life in those countries through which they traveled. In some cases this whetted a desire for further travel. And it meant that many of those who had stayed at home would be inspired, in listening to the experiences of service men and women, to see for themselves the people and places they had heard described.

The flood of applications for passports this year, especially since the bans on pleasure travel abroad have been partially lifted, indicates that tourism will quickly resume its importance as a major factor in world economy. That it will play an even greater role than in prewar days is suggested by other considerations, chief of which is the efficiency, speed, and economy with which air travel has been developing.

Recent hearings before the Committee on Air Safety of the United States Senate have demonstrated conclusively that flying by scheduled American airlines at home or abroad is one of the safest forms of transportation in the world. It is relatively inexpensive, too, and will become more so. Indeed, 10-hour trips to Europe for $100 are a distinct possibility. As facilities and schedules are expanded, no spot in the world will be more than 2 days distant from any other spot in the world. This means that for millions of Americans, the most remote sections of the globe will become 1 day as familiar as parts of their own country are now.

Not only does travel abroad constitute a significant influence for peace through understanding, but it has a more tangible benefit in that it contributes importantly to world economic recovery and stabilization. Those of us who believe in protection for American industry and agriculture are concerned with the challenge presented by the ability of our foreign customers to pay for the things we have to sell.

In a gradually improving world economy an export goal of $9,000,000,000 may be reasonably anticipated. Under existing law something like $6,000,000,000 may be expected in duty-free non-competitive imports, leaving a balance due from foreign customers of from two to three billion dollars.

Money expended by Americans in travel abroad may well contribute impressively toward the settlement of this balance. With a national income of $160,000,000,000 a year as compared with the $80,000,000,000 of prewar years, we may confidently look forward to the goal of two to three billions in expenditures for travel abroad. This, it should be pointed out, can be accomplished without interfering in any way with the continued expansion of our great domestic recreational and travel industry.

In view of these considerations, those who are endeavoring to promote travel, both abroad and at home, are to be highly commended. And at this point it seems fitting to pay tribute to the work being done by the American Automobile Association with its members and their families, totaling 6,000,000 people. Since the war, this organization has reactivated its international travel department, and vastly increased the scope of its activities so that it is now prepared to serve all of the travel needs of its membership by any mode of transportation and to any point in the world.

AAA contacts in large cities abroad have been reestablished, and the association has also created a new department of Latin-American affairs which is working to make travel in the Western Hemisphere countries below the Rio Grande easier and more pleasant. The inauguration of this department has already resulted in moves to establish new motor club affiliates, and to increase the number of service facilities and other accommodations for tourists in Mexico, Central America, and Panama.

In passing it should be mentioned, too, that the AAA has been at the forefront in the drive for adoption by the various Western Hemisphere countries of the Convention on Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic. This agreement, already ratified by the United States and eight other countries, provides for the free circulation of automobiles through the signatory countries, with a minimum of red tape. The AAA believes that with this beginning it may be possible to establish a similar standardization of forms and procedures for all kinds of travel to other parts of the world, thus doing away with the elaborate, repetitious, and tedious formalities required by many nations before visitors are admitted.

American leadership in the world today, both from the standpoint of our interest in world problems and the fact that our Republic is a shining example of freedom to people of other lands, makes it obligatory on us to promote better understanding and real friendship wherever and whenever we can. That an increasing interchange of touring visitors and ideas on a free and unfettered basis is a real step in this direction cannot be gainsaid. Herein lies the hope of that peace that passeth understanding. Herein lies the hope of that domestic tranquillity and prosperity that shall make America an example of ordered progress for the salvation of the world.

"And I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto Me."

Are Wallace's Views Fooling Some Congressmen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, are Henry Wallace's views fooling some Congressmen on the Turko-Greek deal? Is his opposition to that scheme causing a number of Congressmen to favor it—afraid to vote against it, regardless of its booby-trap aspects.

Is the Wallace hullabaloo carefully staged to divert attention from the fact that the New Deal crowd is overwhelmingly backing the Truman scheme?

If conversation in the House and around the cloakrooms is an accurate criterion, the answer is "Yes." That verdict is hard to swallow—that Members of Congress would let the position of Henry Wallace warp their vote on the most dangerous scheme ever considered by an American Congress.

For there is no surer way to destroy America than to commit this country to underwriting the combined budget deficits of all non-Russian nations on earth.

That impossible task, Mr. Speaker, is what the so-called Truman doctrine proposes. Under this scheme every nation in the world—tyrannical, despotic, or what not—can be enabled to balance its finances by drafts on the United States Treasury.

If an easier or more certain method can be shown to destroy America by bankruptcy, I hope someone will explain it.

MOST NEW DEALERS ARE FOR TRUMAN SCHEME

If it were not tragic, the attention given the Wallace side show would be

an amazing demonstration of the use of a counterirritant. The focus on Wallace has completely blacked out the factual truth that the New Deal radical crowd is overwhelmingly for the Truman scheme.

The propaganda drive has carefully directed the attention of Congressmen away from the New Deal gang licking their chops at the prospect of a world-wide WPA program all dressed up in the lily-white robes of anticommunism.

Let us call at least part of the roll on the New Deal crowd on this deal.

First is the ADA—Americans for Democratic Action. The ADA has in its own words "committed itself to the broad objectives and methods proposed for aiding Greece and Turkey."

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was chairman of a nominating committee which recently selected the executive board and officers for this group. Here are the officials:

Officers: Wilson W. Wyatt, national chairman; Leon Henderson, chairman of the executive committee; Louis Harris, national treasurer; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., national vice chairman; Mayor Hubert Humphrey, of Minneapolis, national vice chairman; Joseph Loeb, Jr., executive secretary.

Board members: Harvey Brown, Melvyn Douglas, David Dubinsky, George Edwards, Ethel S. Epstein, Hugo Ernst, William Evjue, David Ginsburg, Lester Granger, Sal B. Hoffman, James Killen, Frank McCullough, B. F. McLaurin, Othoer J. Mischo, Reinhold Niebuhr, Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, Edward F. Prichard, Right Rev. William Scarlett, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Monroe Sweetland, Barney Taylor, Mrs. M. E. Tilly.

Other prominent ADA New Dealers include Charles Bolté, chairman of the AVC; Andrew Biemiller, former Milwaukee Congressman; and Herbert Lehman, former UNRRA head.

NEW YORK LIBERAL PARTY

The Liberal Party of New York State has gone on record in favor of the Truman intervention scheme. A recent official party statement declared:

> The Liberal Party greets President Truman's message to Congress proposing immediate and adequate aid to Greece and Turkey.

Vice chairmen of the New York Liberal Party include George S. Counts, Alex Rose, and Reinhold Niebuhr. The executive director is Ben Davidson.

ANOTHER NEW DEAL CROWD ON THE BANDWAGON

Another New Deal crowd that is quietly promoting the Truman scheme is Freedom House, Inc.

The board of directors of Freedom House have voted overwhelmingly to support the President's program. This fact is announced in the April Freedom House News Letter, and it is based on a poll of their board of directors.

The following directors of Freedom House are specifically recorded in favor of the Truman intervention program:

Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, Thomas K. Finletter, Leo Cherne, Rev. George B. Ford, Elmo Roper, Herbert Bayard Swope, Bishop Henry W. Hobson, Newbold Morris, Spyros P. Skouras, Rex Stout.

George Field, Herbert Agar, Cass Canfield, Norman Cousins, George Fielding Eliot, Christopher T. Emmet, Jr., Mrs. Henry Gale, Arthur J. Goldsmith, Harold K. Guinzburg, Mrs. Andrew Jackson.

Rev. William C. Kernan; Edgar Ansel Mowrer; Elizabeth M. Riley; Nathaniel Singer; Frederick F. Umhey.

This news letter did not report the views of Freedom House Director Chester Bowles, although his OPA associate, Paul Porter, is a leading ball carrier on the Greek deal.

NEW DEALERS 95 PERCENT FOR TRUMAN DOCTRINE

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing evidence seems to indicate that 95 percent or more of the leaders of the New Deal socialistic crowd in America are for the new handout venture.

The fact that administration propaganda seems to have been able to magnify Henry Wallace's opposition into confusing the thinking of some Congressmen bespeaks the power of modern political hypnotism.

"I do not want to be on the same side as Henry Wallace" is the wail that goes up among conservative Democrats and Republicans. And so they may play right into the hands of the New Deal by voting for the Turko-Greek scheme.

By setting that scheme into motion they may enable Stalin to sit on his front porch and watch America bleed to death.

Mr. Speaker, I pointed out the foregoing danger to an able Member of Congress recently. His answer was, "Howard, I think you are giving Stalin credit for being smarter than he is." Now the question I want to ask is, "Will Stalin have to take every trick from America for 14 more years before Congress will concede the cleverness of his strategy?"

How long must we be fooled?

America's Patent System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by me before the Patent Office Society on May 2, in this city. The subject of the address was America's Patent System, and among the matters considered was the question of reducing the high mortality rate of patents through various ways and means of strengthening the patent system.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC WELFARE AND PUBLIC POLICY IN THE FIELD OF PATENTS

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, my friends, I am grateful for this opportunity to submit a few brief thoughts on a subject in which we are mutually interested.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor and early in 1942, some 800 employees of the Patent Office were moved out of Washington to Richmond, Va., in order to make room for various war agencies. It wasn't until 1945 that the return to Washington began and the return wasn't completed until just a few months ago. Along about the time that your move back to Washington was really getting under way, the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States passed Public Law 601, which brought the subject of patents within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. As chairman of this committee, I am happy to join with the Patent Office's many friends in welcoming this fine group back to Washington.

THE CASE OF THE VISITING SOUTHERNER

I'm certain that it isn't like the case of the old southern family where the widowed mother-in-law of the family went off to visit in New England. While she was in the New England States, she met a very congenial Massachusetts farmer—and after a few weeks' courtship—they decided to get married. The widow was a little apprehensive as to how her southern daughter and son-in-law would receive the news, but nevertheless wrote her daughter of her intentions to marry the northerner.

The daughter was very reluctant to broach the subject with her husband because she knew how he felt about northerners, but she finally screwed up her courage and decided to ask him.

"Joe," she said, "you know mamma's been up nawth visitin' in Massachusetts. What would you say if she were to marry a nawthener?"

Joe thought it over for a while and then said, "Well, sir, that would be one way of paying back the 'damyankees'."

And so tonight we're glad to have the disenfranchised Virginia rebels back in the fold here in Washington and to welcome them in this homecoming celebration.

Now that you folks are back in Washington, I am sure that your presence here will enable you to fulfill with greater efficiency than ever before your high responsibility. There have, as you know, been some critical statements that the Patent Office has not been as efficient as it might be in the processing of its work. However, your return to Washington, I am sure, will contribute greatly to the handling of your work.

THE CRISIS OF PATENTS

Just as you folks were Pearl-Harbored into Richmond, just so was the entire subject of patents Pearl-Harbored into page 1 prominence.

About the time that you first began to look for quarters in Richmond, the President of the United States was saying—on April 13, 1942—"Patents are the keys to our technology, technology is the key to production, production is the key to victory." Congress was still studying the report of the so-called monopoly committee, which charged that patents had become a "device to control whole industries, to suppress competition, to restrict output, to enhance prices, to suppress invention, and to discourage inventiveness."

Members of Congress were discussing the charge that American patents had become a Nazi weapon. Government-granted letters of patent were called the arsenal of monopoly.

ORIGIN OF PATENT SYSTEM

Mr. Toastmaster, we have come a long ways as a people and as a nation since the framers of the Constitution first wrote in article I, section 8, of the Constitution that—

"Congress shall have the power to pass laws to promote the progress of science and the useful arts by securing for a limited time to the authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective discoveries."

We have come a long ways as a people and as a nation in the century and a half since

George Washington gave his approval to the first patent act on April 10, 1790.

We have grown from a population of less than 4,000,000 to a hundred-and-forty-odd million. Throughout that span of a century and a half our land has been richly blessed with and by inventions.

Agriculture, industry, and plain, ordinary, day-to-day living have been enriched as a result of American ingenuity and American inventive genius.

Throughout the years our patent laws have in part been changed and improved. They were extensively recodified in 1870 and there are innumerable proposals for further change at the present time.

As a relative neophyte in the involved and specialized field of patents and patent law, I do not feel competent to express any hard and fast convictions on the future of the patent system.

I will say at the outset, however, that in its basic purpose and in its fundamentals, our patent system appears to have proved its worth in accelerating the American march of progress.

STANDARD FOR EVALUATING SYSTEM

As you all know, a patent is in substance a contract between the Government representing the people and the inventor, by which the owner is given an exclusive power to use, manufacture, and sell his invention. It creates a monopoly and the justification therefor, as we have stated, is that it advances the material prosperity of the people and tends to the betterment of our way of life. After the patent has expired, it becomes public property. A patent right, like any other property right, is subject to draft when the national safety is threatened, upon the payment of fair compensation.

STRENGTHENING THE PATENT GRANT

There are many avenues of patent policy which should be explored.

Basically, we must strengthen the patent grant in the eyes of the court. Probably because of certain procedural weaknesses, and because of periodic bloodletting by the court, patents are suffering from a particularly dangerous type of legal anemia. One distinguished Federal judge has made the statement that unless the patent grant can be strengthened in the eyes of the court, the patent system as we know it will be virtually wiped out in 8 years. While I do not agree with this conclusion, one cannot lightly brush it aside, it being the judgment of an able jurist.

HIGH MORTALITY RATE OF PATENTS

When a patent leaves the Patent Office, it carries with it a presumption of validity. The cold facts are, however, that most of the patents thrown into litigation are invalidated. In all fairness, however, it should be pointed out that the majority of patents are not thrown into litigation. The administrative rulings of the Patent Office have relatively little stature and standing in the court.

From time to time we have amended our laws relating to administration and procedure, and in this field further consideration should be given to the subject. It is claimed on good authority that patents too often are issued for things that are not in fact new inventions. If this is correct, it is a fault of administration. It would call for increased quality in the examining work.

It has been alleged that one serious fault is that patents often do not conform to the law and that they fail to clearly point out and distinctly claim the exact improvement of the invention. Again, it is said that mistakes are often made where multiplicity of claims contribute much to obscurity. This presents a challenge not only to administration, but also to the patent lawyer, who could do much to correct this evil by a more careful analysis and discrimination in the drafting of the application for patents and by not indulging in the shotgun method in drawing claims.

It is incumbent, as you and I know, upon the Patent Office, under its definite administrative duty, to compel compliance with the law in this respect. Again, I repeat, the examiners have the primary responsibility to see that applications for patents comply with the statute.

What has been characterized as a third administrative defect is the one known as the long-pending application. This should be stopped, and it is the obligation of the Patent Office to act accordingly. Perhaps legislation should be introduced that would provide that the patent would expire so many years after the filing date of the application for patent.

POSSIBLE MEANS OF REDUCING PATENT MORTALITY

This much is certain. The patent mortality is high. I believe it can be lessened if what has been suggested above is followed through, to wit:

(a) That no patents be issued * * * that are not for things that are in fact new inventions.

(b) That the personnel for the examining of patent applications be of the highest quality.

(c) That the patents conform to the law, pointing out and distinctly claiming the exact improvement invented.

(d) That the multiplicity of claims be obviated as far as possible, that the legal practitioners be more discriminative in drafting applications for patent and avoid the shotgun method in drawing claims.

(e) That the Patent Office accept its responsibility and compel compliance with the law with respect to (d).

(f) That the administrative defect of permitting long-pending applications be corrected.

MAKING PATENTS DYNAMIC INSTRUMENTS FOR PROGRESS

May I also add the following suggestions:

1. We must strengthen our patent system to make it a force for encouraging progress in the technical sciences.

(a) Prevent side-stepping of the system by those with an unwarranted amount of economic power—discourage contracts which destroy the incentive to invent.

(b) Correct whatever evils exist in the use of patents by those dangerous so-called patent pools which unduly restrict licensing.

WORLD EXCHANGE OF PATENTS

2. We must improve our international standing by utilizing the patent system to encourage disclosure to us of inventions made in foreign countries—and in so doing, we will be protecting ourselves against ignorance of foreign technology in the event of war. The international use of patents cannot be a one-way street.

INVITATION OF SUGGESTIONS FOR STRENGTHENING PATENT SYSTEM

You who have been in this field and have learned by experience, undoubtedly have many ideas that would be valuable to the legislator. Thus, I can assure you that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate would welcome any of your suggestions. You can write to me personally.

Already, we have had suggestions along the lines I have embodied above. What, however, are your answers to these questions:

(a) Do you think there would be any way that we could by legislation improve the practice in the patent litigation before the Board of Appeals and before the courts?

(b) Would you suggest the elimination of any defenses against patents issued?

(c) Do you think it would better the situation if a single Court of Patent Appeals were created?

I am sure many more questions will occur to you.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I repeat my belief that the fundamental principle of recognizing a property right in a technological creation is sound. The paramount interest, however, must always be the public interest, and our problem is to prevent the abuse of the right of the patent while maintaining the basic purpose and fundamentals of the system.

The industrial horizons of tomorrow are limited only by the vision and the ingenuity of American inventive genius. Our frontiers are frontiers of the mind and frontiers where invention and industry can join to raise the American standard of living to yet undreamed of heights.

May I express to you again my sincere appreciation for the opportunity to be with you tonight. I feel renewed confidence that through your able endeavors and those of the Congress, we will be able to fuse the public welfare and public policy with able administrative policy into harmonious and dynamic unity.

The War Widow: America's Forgotten Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 2, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Seventy-ninth Congress did everything in its power to provide helpful legislation to the returning servicemen of World War II. Our grateful Nation desired to help these men and women return to useful civilian life and the Congress was generous in providing for their needs in this transition period. However, I believe that one group of our fighting men was forgotten, or at least not given the proper consideration I feel that they should have been given. I refer to the more than 300,000 servicemen who gave their lives in training and in combat.

These men have been taken from us and it is our responsibility to care for their widows, children, and dependent parents. I regret that the first order of business concerning veterans' legislation in the Eightieth Congress was not to give consideration to the plight of these widows, children, and parents who truly gave more than anyone else in the recent conflict. I sincerely hope that they will not be forgotten in this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry Lee entitled "The War Widow: America's Forgotten Woman," which appears in the Coronet magazine of April 1947:

THE WAR WIDOW: AMERICA'S FORGOTTEN WOMAN

(By Henry Lee)

This is a report to America's war dead about the widows and children they left behind them. It is not a pleasant report—but it is a true one. It should shock us both in heart and mind, and make us pause to reexamine, in the light of simple human compassion, the promises we so glibly gave to the men who marched off to die on global battle fronts.

We have consigned 200,000 forgotten women and children to the half-life of a Government dole and the uncertain charity of family and in-laws. We have done little to relieve the tragedy of their past, the misery of their present, the grimness of their future.

A generous postwar Congress, while raising its own pay last year by some $96 a week, increased the widows' pensions—by $10 a month. They get about half of what the Government considers a fair, minimum wage for the working people of this country. Their children—heroes' children—get about half of what the Government considers the basic cost of rearing a child under decent circumstances. And to inflict the final cruel touch, they are not included in GI loans, benefits, or priorities.

The living conditions of war widows are pathetic. I found them in furnished rooms in YW's, in the homes of in-laws, or doubling up with any girl who had a spare bed. Many of them live like floaters, without a home, without furniture, without any possession more substantial than a compact and the snapshot of a man in uniform. They are, to all practical purposes, displaced persons.

Without any directed program, we give our war widows off-the-arm, contradictory advice. Should they seek out social activities, trying to forget? Should they remarry? But Mrs. Grundy demands respect for the dead. If, after 2 years of mourning, a girl has a date, it's quite likely to stir a neighborhood scandal.

I talked to one girl, a 21-year-old blonde with blue eyes. She has to live with a mother-in-law who half died when her son did, and expects her daughter-in-law to do the same.

"I loved Bill," the girl said simply. "I guess I always will. I know he'd say, 'Go ahead, have fun. Marry some good guy if you want to—just keep a little place in your heart for me.'

"I met a good guy who wants to marry me. But my mother-in-law says I ought to be ashamed of myself. So I just can't go on living with her. But on $60 a month, it's almost impossible to live any place else until I get married. I sneak out of the house when I want to see my fiance. Then I have to lie to my mother-in-law. It makes me feel mean and small. But what else can I do?"

For the older women with children, just existing day-by-day is the major problem. In many cases the situation is bleak. Take the 28-year-old mother who lives alone in New Jersey with a mentally retarded son. Or the woman in Massachusetts whose 5-year-old boy has a heart ailment, whose 3-year-old suffers from bronchial asthma.

Yet even more appalling is the public's ignorance and indifference. I've talked to Government officials, welfare workers, and plain, everyday Americans who were so proudly patriotic during the war. "Nobody starves in this country," they say complacently.

Maybe not. But almost no organization comes forward voluntarily to help these women. Few individuals know or care what's happening to them. Congress, breathtakingly liberal with billions of our money, turns a deaf ear to their modest requests.

The situation comes as a stinging shock to returned GI's. One veteran I know looked up a buddy's pretty young widow. He found her living, frightened and confused, in a furnished room, trying to subsist on her $60-a-month pension till she found a job. But she had never worked before, and personnel managers were sympathetic but firm. No experience, no job. Shocked, the ex-serviceman made a point of going to the next meeting of his veterans' organization, and walked right into a heated discussion about bonuses.

"Bonuses hell!" he stormed: "Is this what we fought for? Everything for the boys—and nothing for the women and children?"

Promptly his organization set up a widows'-aid committee. But veterans are in no position to handle the complex job of rehabilitation by themselves. Job training is one of the musts in helping our widows to get on their feet again. Thousands of them are either too young to have had business experience, or have been housewives for years. Recently an air line in the East offered a half dozen jobs as phone operators to a widows'-aid committee. But the committee was unable to find a single widow who could operate a switchboard.

When the women try awkwardly to help each other, they run into heartbreaking public ignorance. For example, I have a conscientious friend who feels a personal obligation to war widows, although she lost her own husband in the Pacific. She has a job, but in her spare time has organized a widows'-aid group in her town, spending $200 of her own money to launch the project. Recently, while arranging a benefit for the widows, she approached a clergyman.

"What's in it for you?" he asked frostily.

When she explained, his eyes opened in amazement. "Why, my dear," he said, "I thought the Government was providing liberally for you people!"

Even some welfare organizations show surprising ignorance. About 30 widows in one town arranged to meet monthly in a small, unused room in the central welfare building, which has recreation rooms, a swimming pool and a dance hall. At their second meeting the welfare secretary addressed them. "As you know," she said brightly, "we care for many needy and deserving people. So, hereafter we will have to charge you for coming here—$2 yearly for each member."

The widows couldn't afford $60 for the use of chairs and a speaker's table. So now they are meeting in one another's homes scattered all over town.

Widows like these are going through a profound revolution that touches every phase of their lives—social, economic, psychological. Even the younger, giddier women have been shocked into maturity. One, a gentle girl in her twenties, told me she was through with asking for assistance.

"I don't like to seem ungrateful," she said apologetically, "because several times when the children were sick the nursing service was wonderful. But they can't seem to understand that all we have left is our pride. They budget us, ticket us, pry into our lives. Then they lecture us. You'd think we were shiftless people who'd gotten on relief through some fault of our own."

On the economic front, the widows find they are being pushed backward while veteran legislation is pushed ahead. During the war they received $30 a month for the first child, plus free medical and dental care. Now they get $18 monthly for the same child, who eats more and scuffs more pairs of shoes. And they get no medical or dental care.

Of the two billions disbursed annually by the Veterans' Administration, only a small part goes to the 110,000 widows and 90,000 children of dead servicemen. The widows get $60 a month ,or $720 a year. Yet liberal-minded Congressmen deplore a 40-cent-an-hour minimum industrial wage—which is nearly $70 a month—as an impossibly low living standard.

The widow with more than one child is further penalized. For all children after the first, the Government allotment is pared down to $187.20 a year. Today, probably no widow is in rags, no child actually starving. But is that all a grateful country can guarantee them?

Many widows—but by no means all—receive income from the husband's service insurance. If he carried an average policy of $10,000, that adds $55.10 to the monthly budget, providing the widow is under 30. But the catch is that after 20 years—as the war widows reach middle age—the insurance lapses and the women go back to $60 a month.

Some widows also receive aid from social security, but thousands do not, for their husbands went into service before completing the necessary employment period. "Our men apparently died to provide for everyone else's children but their own," say the widows.

I have talked to these women, visited them in their homes. Each case is different, but each has a common gray thread. One small, dark, motherly person, a simple housewife by instnct, was head of her family by necessity. Her bewildering, grinding problem is best told in these figures:

Income, $201.50 monthly, comprising $109.20 pension for herself and 3 children, aged 9, 8, and 5: $49.50 service insurance; $43 social security.

Expenses, $170.54 monthly: Rent, $20; gas-electricity, $6; coal, $10.66; wet wash, $7; insurance, $6; milk, $13; food, $100; telephone (a necessity because of the children), $2.88; payment or debt, $5.

Balance, $30.96, to cover medical expenses, clothes, recreation, school funds, incidentals.

This war widow has no plans for her children's future beyond eighth-grade schooling, and when she feels ill it frightens her. If she should die, the children—as orphans—would receive a total of only $57.60 monthly.

These are the mothers. But what of the lucky childless ones—if you can call a childless widow lucky? In New York a widow of 22 decided to plunge into study to forget her sorrow. But the colleges, preoccupied with the Government-financed boom in education, made it plain that they had neither time nor funds for her. Undeterred, she learned that a small Texas college would take her in. With lower living costs, she could get by on her pension and savings.

"The going is certainly tough," she says. Then she adds: "But when I compare myself with widows who have children I realize how fortunate I am."

Here, you think, is a typical college girl, luckier than most widows. Then she adds wistfully: "Just the same, I'd give anything to have my husband's child." These are the people, frustrated of deep desires, whom we so quickly forget.

Even if a woman has proved her "business sense," the Government won't life a finger to help her. I know of one who earns money by using her car as a neighborhood taxi, by baking bread and cakes, by making aprons for sale. Her chief worry is funds for clothing and educating her teen-age daughter. Will she be able to send the girl to college? She could manage it easily, if the Government would endorse a business loan for her, as it does for vets.

And so the stories go. In each case the widow needs so little. A few dollars more, a business loan, tuition funds, medical care. But they may as well ask for the moon.

Desperate, a few widows went to Washington last year to plead their case. The pilgrimmage was pathetic. While slick, professional lobbyists got millions for special interests, the women stumbled through an unfamiliar legislative maze, getting brush-offs. After all, there are only 110,000 of them—and votes weigh more than blood.

A few Congressmen, genuinely touched by their pleas, introduced bills—to extend the GI bill to cover war widows, to insure educational opportunities for children. The bills were printed—and then died in committee.

When Congress did increase allotments by 20 percent, it was in no specal recognition of the women's plight. The increase applied to all dependents of World War I and II veterans, and was a somewhat tardy answer to the skyrocketing cost of living.

Announcing the boost, the journal of the Gold Star Wives of World War II said: "Almost a pint of milk a day added to the menu of war orphans. That's all for now, kiddies."

Despite the programs now under way in some States, calling for bonus payments and

educational grants, the Gold Star Wives firmly believe that God helps those who help themselves. National headquarters in New York and local chapters in every State give the women a rallying point and help them stand on their own feet.

Through an "Aunt Susie" program, the organization encourages childless women in a community to care for the families of widows while the mothers seek part-time work. It also sets up job bureaus, offers legal aid and house-hunting assistance, and even stages monthly birthday parties for children.

Gold Star Wives started with a membership of four, but in the last year it has grown swiftly, with city and county chapters springing up all over the country. Dues are a maximum of $2 yearly, while sale of $1.50 widow's pins—a gold star with a purple bar emblematic of the Purple Heart which their husbands earned the hardest way—is another modest source of revenue.

Directing the Gold Star Wives is Mrs. Marie Jordan of New York, a small, pretty, hard-working widow who has a 3-year-old son. Mrs. Jordan helps to set up new chapters, explains the cause to the public, appears before legislatures to urge a square deal.

The widows give enthusiastic support to the organization—"200-percent cooperation" in the opinion of Mrs. Myrtle Verzi, energetic president of the Bergen County chapter in New Jersey. Her unit contains 40 women, ranging in age from 22 to 50. A few are fairly well off. The rest need help. More than half have children, while only a third are working. Theirs is typical of a situation that exists everywhere.

What must be done to correct the tragic plight of America's war widows and their children?

First, and immediately, Congress should increase their allotments to assure a normal, decent living, not a relief subsistence.

Second, since widows are heads of families, they deserve the same priorities in education, housing, job finding, and business opportunities which the veterans enjoy.

Third, instead of making it possible for them merely to live, we should help them to start living. If Government, welfare organizations, and private business cooperated, every widow who wants to work could be quickly trained for a job.

Finally, children's education must be assured. Every public and private college should have a yearly quota of scholarships. There are more than 1,000 such schools. If each accepted 90 of the children, they could quickly absorb all 90,000 in the country.

Despite experience, America's war widows persist in their faith in the future. "We know that they died so that we and our children might live in a better world," they say. They are working toward that goal as best they can. But obviously they need our help—and they need it quickly.

Reply to Representative William G. Stigler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, it should be apparent to any thoughtful person that there is a definite conspiracy being engineered by left-wing New Dealers to smear, and destroy if possible, any Member of Congress who has the courage to fight for reduction in expenditures by the Federal Government. Many smug and self-satisfied bureaucrats who never have faced the wrath of an electorate are utilizing all of their propaganda resources in an attempt to head off the Republican efforts to balance the budget, to reduce taxes, and to begin paying the national debt. Certain commenators, columnists, and some Congressmen are unable to adjust themselves to the present Republican control in the Congress and hope that by spreading half-truths, innuendoes, and outright falsehoods they will be able to return to the lush, good old days when blank checks were passed around and no one inquired why or what for.

The chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the respective subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee are the special targets of this "goon squad" of character assassins. The strategy seems to be to attack the chairman of the Appropriations Committee continuously, and before each subcommittee bill is reported to the House and thereafter to attack the chairman of the subcommittee. It will be understood that the end in view is the retention of access to lush funds that can permit application of the old Hopkins motto—"Spend and spend and elect and elect." The very thought of reducing Government spending and thus reducing Government personnel is repulsive to the New Deal. They have always preached the philosophy that if you have an end in view, any means adopted can be justified to attain it. It is against this screen of political intrigue that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] projected himself on the 7th day of April 1947. The gentleman indicated that he intended to direct his remarks particularly to the appropriation for the Veterans' Employment Service, carried in the Labor Department appropriations bill. He stated that he had notified my office that morning that he intended to speak of and concerning the gentleman now addressing you. Unfortunately I was out of the city. The gentleman from Oklahoma was so advised, yet he saw fit in my absence to make a speech on the floor of the House that contained some of the worst and most violent falsehoods that have ever been uttered on the floor of Congress. I realize that this is strong language, but before I have finished I am satisfied that every honest, fair-minded Member of Congress will concede that it is a correct appraisal of the gentleman's remarks.

On page 3185 of the RECORD of April 7, 1947, the gentleman says that he did not have an opportunity to answer the gentleman from Wisconsin and did not have an opportunity to obtain recognition on the day the bill was being discussed. The gentleman says, and I quote:

> I, too, have spent some time since the bill was passed, in research work, getting material which I expect to deliver to the House at this hour.

Thus it is apparent that the statements made on April 7 by the gentleman from Oklahoma were deliberate, willful, and intentional. In the heat of debate, things are sometimes said that the speaker frequently regrets upon mature reflection and consideration. However, the things which the gentleman from Oklahoma stated are not the result of heated debate and must therefore be discussed in that light. The gentleman stated:

> The gentleman from Wisconsin boldly stood before this House a few days ago and, perhaps thinking that his words might go unchallenged, defied any Member to justify the continued existence of an expanded Veterans' Employment Service. I made an effort to accept the challenge then, but the gentleman seemingly wanted to cut off all debate after he finished, and made a motion that all debate cease. His party having the votes, the motion prevailed. In his brief hour of glory, he accused us of failing to read the RECORD—and when I am finished I believe you will agree with me that he must surely have uttered those words with a fervent prayer that no one accept his challenge, for the RECORD has revealed some very interesting things.

This quotation is characteristic of the things said by the gentleman throughout his speech. I have examined the RECORD which he refers to, of March 25, 1947. This RECORD discloses that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] offered four amendments to the bill then under consideration. The RECORD also discloses that Representative VAN ZANDT discussed those four amendments at length. This appears on pages 2559, 2560, and 2561 of the RECORD. At the conclusion of the argument of Mr. VAN ZANDT, the gentleman from Wisconsin in charge of the bill answered him, and this will appear on pages 2561 and 2562 of the RECORD. The RECORD will also show that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] then arose and was recognized in support of the amendments. The RECORD will further show that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] asked unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute, whereupon the gentleman from Wisconsin now addressing you objected unless the gentleman would yield. The RECORD further shows the following colloquy:

> Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.
>
> Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I object unless the gentleman will yield to me.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. I will gladly yield.
>
> Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.
>
> Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments do now close.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.
>
> Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendments do now close.

Thereafter on a division, the motion was adopted, and on a teller vote, the motion was adopted. At no place in the RECORD does it appear that the gentleman from Oklahoma made any effort to obtain recognition, and his statement above quoted that the gentleman from Wisconsin was in any sense fearful of anything that the gentleman from Oklahoma might say is a simple effort on his part to lend dignity and importance to his palpable misinformation on the subject under discussion. If debate was cut off, it was the result of action of the House of Representatives.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, as appears in the RECORD on page 2562 under date of March 25, 1947, in discussing the Veterans' Employment Service in the

United States Employment Service, did make this statement:

> Now, the fact of the matter is, when you provided in title 4 of the GI bill for this committee, and Mr. Faulkner was appointed secretary of that committee, there was absolutely not a thing in that bill, and I defy anyone to get up here and point it out if he thinks otherwise, that provided for a Federal veterans' placement service of the character and kind that is contemplated in the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. In fact it is the opinion of those who know about it that the whole thing is subject to a point of order and there is no authority for it in point of law.

I reiterate that statement as a statement of law and fact. The gentleman from Oklahoma attempted to respond to that challenge. He refers to some debate on the Wagner-Peyser Act which took place in the month of May 1933. This is the beginning of the confusion of thought that is so apparent in the speech of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He simply does not understand the subject he attempted to discuss. The arguments which he presented on page 3185 of the RECORD clearly indicate that certain people then believed that there should be a separate and distinct veterans' employment service created by Federal law. Others argued that the Veterans' Employment Service should be a part of the contemplated employment service to be set up under the Wagner-Peyser Act. The history of those debates and the later action of the Congress clearly demonstrates that the intent of Congress was to establish a system of employment services to be operated in the States on a Federal-State relationship. The Congress of the United States in 1933 adopted the Wagner-Peyser Act, setting up such an employment service and in that act provided:

> It shall be the province and duty of the bureau—the United States Employment Service—to maintain a veterans' service to be devoted to securing employment for veterans * * * establishing and maintaining a system of public employment offices in the several States and political subdivisions thereof in which there shall be located a veterans' employment service.

Mr. Speaker, ever since 1933, there has been a veterans' employment service, operated by virtue of the express direction contained in the Wagner-Peyser Act. In 1939 pursuant to the first reorganization plan of Mr. Roosevelt, the employment service was transferred to the Social Security Board. It continued to operate under State auspices with Federal contributions as provided in the Wagner-Peyser Act. It continued to maintain a veterans' employment service in every employment office in the land. January 1, 1942, the employment services were transferred to the Federal Government at the request of the President, and with the organization of the War Manpower Commission, the functions were transferred to that body. Later in the fall of 1945, by Executive directive, the service was transferred back to the Labor Department. During all of this period of time a complete veterans' placement service was maintained in the employment service as directed by the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

The Congress in 1944 passed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, commonly known as the GI bill. I suggest that the gentleman from Oklahoma and any others who may be interested in this subject read that act. The passage of the GI bill did not destroy the employment services for veterans set up under the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933. It was intended by Congress that the veterans placement service contemplated by title 4 of the GI bill would be ancillary to and supplemental to the services already being performed by virtue of the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act. One fact has escaped the attention of the gentleman from Oklahoma—namely, when the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was enacted, the employment service office was under Federal direction and dominion. A careful reading of title 4 will demonstrate to any impartial mind that it anticipated the situation that would prevail when and if the employment services were returned to the States. Nothing could be clearer than that the Congress intended that when the employment offices were returned to the States, the veterans' placement activities were to be conducted in the field by State personnel. Title 4 of the GI bill provides for a veterans' representative to be attached to the headquarters staff of each State office. He was to be the liaison man between State operations and the policies promulgated by the veterans' placement board. It was his specified duty to see that there was a proper execution of the board's veterans' placement policies through the public employment service in the State. In it the veterans' representative was not authorized to directly administer the board's placement policies but only to see that there was a proper execution of those policies through the public employment service in the States.

Further emphasis is given to this status by the further specifications of the veterans' representatives' duties as set out in section 601. It is there specifically stated that these duties are to be carried out in cooperation with the States' employment service. The Congress further indicated its attitude when in section 602 it was provided that the State employment service director is required to appoint in any local office under his jurisdiction such staff as the board created under title 4 considered necessary for "discharging the duties prescribed for the veterans' employment representative."

Thus by clear and explicit language it is stated that the duties of the veterans' employment representative which are specified in section 601 are to be carried out by State personnel specifically assigned to the discharge of those duties in the local employment offices. It is true that the veterans' representative is given carte blanche authority in determining the number of local office personnel required for implementing the duties and policies placed on him by the Congress and the veterans' placement board.

It will be borne in mind that the employment services were returned to the States on last November 15. The operational procedure in vogue prior to that time must now be modified accordingly and any apparent change in attitude of the gentleman from Wisconsin is predicated upon the fact that there has been since last year the return of these services to the States, and Congress never intended that there be two overlapping and duplicating field staffs—one Federal and one State—carrying out the provisions of title 4.

It is clear that the so-called field assistants of Mr. Faulkner and his so-called veterans' placement service are all merely doing the very things that the law explicity provides shall be done "through the public-employment service in the State." I may say that it is not difficult to see how the situation became messed up. Section 604 provides that the Federal agency which was at the time administering the employment service—the services being federalized at the time—would administer the program as an entity and "during the period of its administration shall effectuate the provisions of this title."

Therefore, since there were no State organizations, to deal with the veterans' placement board through the United States Employment Service, which was then directly administering the entire employment service, it proceeded to hire its own field staff and directly administer the duties described in title 4. This was all right as long as there was direct Federal administration of the field activities of the employment service. In fact, since there was no State employment service organization, the only way the Federal organization could be set up was through a system of field representatives directly responsible to the veterans' placement representative who was at that time located in the headquarters office of the Federal agency in each State.

As I heretofore pointed out, however, the organization prevailing before November 16 went out the window when the employment services were returned to the States on that date. One does not have to be a lawyer to determine that under existing law, with the employment offices now being operated by the respective States, the veterans' placement representative set up under title 4 of the GI bill is now required by law to carry out the duties prescribed by statute and promulgated by the veterans' placement board "through the employment services of the respective States." There is every good reason why this should be done. Under the present arrangement the field assistants of the veterans' representative attached to the headquarters staff in each State are Federal employees and are therefore paid considerably in excess of State employees performing the same function. This dual wage level for the same job is administratively a very undesirable thing to have in any State.

The charge by the gentleman from Oklahoma that I have changed my position is not warranted by the facts. The facts are that the employment service has changed. Prior to November 15, 1946, it was completely under Federal operation. Since then it has been under the direction and operation of the various States and State agencies. This

requires a complete readjustment and realinement administratively of the veterans' service provided for in title 4 of the GI bill. I have no objection to it and in fact have voted to provide sufficient funds to set up additional services for veterans as contemplated in title 4, not for the purpose, as appears to be the suggestion of Mr. Faulkner and the gentleman from Oklahoma, of setting up a duplicating, competing Federal employment service, but for the purpose of supplementing the services already being performed by the States under the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act. The gentleman from Oklahoma made this statement on page 3187 of the April 7 RECORD:

The gentleman from Wisconsin has implanted his foot upon the prostrate body of the veteran and stamped out a service which is vital to the welfare of the veterans. I hope the gentleman's conscience will not suffer when he reads about and sees thousands and thousands of our heroic veterans trudging our highways and byways in search of employment with no Government agency to sympathetically administer to their needs. In defense of his actions as he prepared to crack the partisan whip to close off the debate he obviously feared, the gentleman from Wisconsin referred to organizations of veterans as pressure groups, and he told you that they should be ignored as they protest his actions.

That statement is a monumental falsehood from beginning to end and violates every rule not only of the House but of good conscience and decency. What are the facts? The facts are that the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Wisconsin has the honor to be chairman recommended to the full Appropriations Committee that there be appropriated to the States for maintenance of the employment service under the Wagner-Peyser Act the sum of $71,728,000. I requested the director of the United States Employment Service to advise me what proportion of this sum would be devoted to veterans. I have a letter from Mr. Robert C. Goodwin, director, in which he states:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEEFE: This letter is in compliance to your request for an estimate of what proportion of the funds for grants to the States included in H. R. 2700 is for service to veterans.

An analysis of the estimated work-load factors upon which the request for funds for the States has been based indicates that approximately 40 percent of the sum requested is for service to veterans.

The gentleman from Oklahoma ought to feel very small and puny indeed in the face of this authentic information. Here is a veterans' employment service for which the committee recommended for the next fiscal year nearly $29,000,000. It also represents every single dollar that was requested by the Department of Labor, and its United States Employment Service for State operations of the service. Does this look as though the gentleman from Wisconsin "has implanted his foot upon the prostrate body of the veteran and stamped out a service which is vital to the welfare of the veterans?"

The gentleman from Oklahoma may say, "Oh, I did not intend that. I was referring to the veterans' placement service provided under title 4 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944." At least, a reading of his statement shows that it was callously general in character and was intended to arouse hate in the minds of veterans toward the gentleman from Wisconsin and against the members of the committee and the Congress who voted for this bill. If so, it ought to backfire, because the gentleman from Oklahoma voted for the bill.

As a matter of fact, let us see what the committee did for Mr. Faulkner's veterans' placement service. The gentleman from Oklahoma says that we "stamped it out." The fact is that the amount available for expenditure in 1947 was $2,342,500. The budget estimate for 1948 was $2,650,600. The committee recommended $1,756,800. This is a reduction below the budget estimate of $893,800 and a reduction below the amount available for expenditure in the current fiscal year of $585,700. Now, in view of the fact that the committee gave to the State employment services nearly $29,000,000 for veterans' placement activities, plus $1,756,800 for an additional veterans' placement service, under Mr. Faulkner, can anyone other than the gentleman from Oklahoma say in good conscience that "the gentleman from Wisconsin has stamped out a service which is vital to the welfare of the veteran"?

The gentleman attempts to smear and belittle the gentleman from Wisconsin in saying that I stated that veterans' organizations and veterans should be ignored. I defy the gentleman from Oklahoma or anyone else to search the entire RECORD and find any statement on my part that would even remotely justify such a statement. This is a pure figment of the imagination of the gentleman from Oklahoma, or the ghost writer that prepared his speech. The gentleman says, "Perhaps he does not now appreciate their sacrifices." May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma that the gentleman from Wisconsin has four veterans in his immediate family, one of whom is local commander of the American Legion. They and thousands of their buddies will resent the untruthful false and malicious allegations placed in this RECORD for purposes of pure partisanship by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Not content with attacking the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from Oklahoma turns his venomous attack upon Mr. Stanley Rector, president of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies of this country. The gentleman from Oklahoma attempted to see something sinister in the fact that Mr. Stanley Rector was a witness and testified before the subcommittee. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma that for years the president and representatives of the Interstate Conference have appeared before this committee—long before the gentleman from Wisconsin was chairman. It so happens that the president of the Interstate Conference this year is Mr. Stanley Rector, of Wisconsin, and may I state that he is honored and respected by people of intelligence in the field of employment security as one of the outstanding men in that field. He has a right to appear before the committee and did appear in his capacity as president of the Interstate Conference. The mere fact that he is from Wisconsin or the mere fact that he is a friend whom I cherish and respect affords no basis for the charges made by the gentleman from Oklahoma and the implications and innuendoes in his speech that Mr. Rector was brought before the committee as one who hates the Employment Service and every other Federal agency of Government.

The gentleman from Oklahoma said:

If under the new leadership we must resort to calling admittedly prejudiced and biased witnesses who hate anything done by the Federal Government from our home States to advise us as to the meaning and intent of laws, I think the people ought to know about it.

I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, and to any others who feel as he does, that the forum of the committee that I have the honor to head will always be open to those people from the States who have charge of the functions for which we appropriate the administrative funds. I am glad to state that my predecessors, the Honorable Butler Hare and the Honorable Malcom C. Tarver before him, as chairman of the subcommittee, have always been glad to receive the benefit of the advice and judgment of the people in the States who are spending Federal money in this whole field of social security and employment security. The attack, therefore, upon Mr. Rector comes with poor grace from one who knows so little of the matter of which he presumed to speak.

I may say that I have been doing some research since his speech of April 7, and I am reliably informed that the major portion of his speech was prepared in the Veterans' Employment Service office here at Washington. I am further reliably informed that the sole purpose of this vitriolic exhibition of hate and venom is all part of a political scheme to attempt to discredit those who are courageously trying to save the fiscal structure of our Government.

I wondered why the gentleman from Oklahoma had such an interest in this matter. Certainly the remarks made do not indicate that he has any extraordinary knowledge of the subject. Why, then, should the gentleman from Oklahoma join as an active party in this smear-bund campaign? Perhaps these facts might be a clue to the interest of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Recently I came into possession of a memorandum dated March 10, 1947, from Perry Faulkner, Chief, Veterans' Employment Service, to headquarters staff. In this I find this statement:

William E. Morris is hereby designated as Assistant Chief of the Service. He will continue to perform substantially the same supervisory and review duties, will be authorized to represent and act for the Chief, and will act in the absence of the Chief. He will be immediately responsible for the coordination of all operations.

The moment I saw that I recalled that the secretary in the office of the gentleman from Oklahoma was named Alice F.

Morris. I wondered—could there be any connection? I called the office of the gentleman from Oklahoma and Mrs. Morris answered that call. She stated that her husband was the William E. Morris designated as Assistant Chief of the Veterans' Employment Service. It then became perfectly clear to me why the gentleman from Oklahoma has such an inordinate interest in the veterans' placement service. His attempt to make the veterans believe that it is because of them that he is spewing his hate and venom toward the gentleman from Wisconsin will, I believe, fall upon deaf ears when the veterans know the real, true facts of the situation.

I am further advised that the headquarters office of the Veterans' Placement Service planned to distribute thousands of these speeches of the gentleman from Oklahoma in an effort to cast discredit among the veterans upon the gentleman from Wisconsin. I may say that in my opinion such efforts will be rebuffed by every decent veteran in America who will not countenance shady politics hiding behind the decent mantle of the American veteran.

There has been too much of political chicanery indulged in in the name of protecting the veteran, and the veterans of America know this to be a fact. The time has come, therefore, to speak plainly in order that the American people, of whom the American veteran constitutes such a large part, may know the real facts.

The President's Loyalty Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which was published in the New York Times of Sunday, May 4, 1947, on the subject of the President's loyalty order.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS TO THE TIMES—LOYALTY ORDER OPPOSED—IS CALLED NAZILIKE LAW WHICH SHOULD BE REPEALED

(The writer of the following letter was former deputy chief counsel (economics) at Nuremberg. As such he was senior trial counsel in all Nazi industrialist cases.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Having recently returned from Nuremberg, I am struck by certain ironical contrasts between our Government's prosecution of Nazi criminal organizations at Nuremberg and our parallel proceedings here against so-called disloyal American organizations. It would seem that we are providing American justice for Nazis, but Nazi justice for Americans.

In Germany, when it was determined to prosecute the notorious S. A., S. S., and the German general staff, we observed the highest traditions of American legal process. Indictments, setting forth the charges in detail, were served on the affected organizations. They were afforded the right to counsel of their own choosing, failing which, we furnished them with counsel. They were given their day—indeed, their months—in court. And it might be added parenthetically that, in spite of our Government's sincere belief in the criminality of these organizations, two of them, the S. S. and the general staff, were exonerated.

KNOWLEDGE OF ACTIVITIES

But even with respect to the convicted SA, our legal process was by no means ended. For the condemnation of the SA in itself condemned nobody. Membership in the organization, per se, was no crime. It became additionally necessary to show that each person sought to be charged with responsibility for membership joined the convicted organization or remained in it, knowing of its nefarious activities.

No member of the SA could be convicted on the basis of the condemnation of his organization without first being afforded a full hearing at which he could submit any exculpatory or extenuating testimony. Only after this double trial could a member of an illegal organization be punished, and then generally by a token fine.

This was American due process in Germany. This was our show window display for the German people to see that no one, not even Goering, could be condemned without a fair trial.

Upon returning to the United States I found that, whatever we may have taught the Nazis, we have absorbed into our own legal system the German tyranny that we fought and inveighed against. I refer to our Executive order which provides that any one of the 2,500,000 employes in the executive branch of our Federal Government can be summarily fired if he is, or ever was, a member of, or in "sympathetic association" with, any organization or combination of persons placed by the Attorney General of the United States on his private black list.

CONDEMNED ORGANIZATION

The condemned organization receives no indictment or even intimation that its loyalty is impugned. It gets no hearing or opportunity to contest the charge. The Attorney General merely says: "Thou art condemned." Thereupon its members, past, present, and future, are automatically adjudged guilty of the heinous offense of disloyalty to their Government. The American citizen, unlike his German counterpart, is afforded no opportunity to challenge the Attorney General's ex parte condemnation of his organization.

This conviction without trial, borrowed from the darkest days of the Nazi inquisition, is a startling innovation in American judicial procedure. Its gravity is accentuated by the fact that the member of the condemned organization is subject to an extraordinarily severe penalty. Nominally, he is discharged from Federal employment. This is bad enough. But the practical effect is an economic death sentence. For one can imagine how remote are the chances of a person, discharged for disloyalty to his Government, finding other employment.

Another aspect of the Executive order presents a striking and sickening parallel to a Nazi decree which provided that no person could hold public office unless he could prove "by his conduct that he is willing and able to serve loyally the German people and the Reich." (Law regarding citizens of the Reich of September 15, 1935.)

Our own order likewise provides the very fluid word, "disloyalty," as a criterion of removability.

ELASTIC CONCEPTION

We know that in Germany any whisper of dissent was considered disloyalty. Do we have a right to assume greater tolerance of opposition here? We have all witnessed how the more circumscribed words "Communist," "totalitarian," and "subversive" get flung around even by men in high places. Breathes there a liberal worthy of his salt who has not been called a Communist? How much more misused will be the new criterion, that very elastic conception, "disloyalty"?

On this charge of personal disloyalty, the governmental employee gets a trial—a mockery of a trial. The charges, says our Executive order, shall be only as specific as, "in the discretion of the employing department or agency, security considerations permit." And this is further hedged by the rule that the investigative agency may refuse to disclose the names of confidential informants.

Yes; you get a trial on an indictment that doesn't inform you of the charges, and with no opportunity to confront or examine, or even to know of, the complaining witnesses. And the burden of disproving undisclosed charges rests on the defendant. It should be added—shades of the malodorous German people's courts—that the tribunal which hears these cases is appointed by and responsible to the department head, who may be the complainant.

This is twentieth century American justice.

The letter of Zechariah Chafee, Jr., et al. (the New York Times, April 13), while assailing the Executive order, takes the calm view that the situation can be redeemed by the self-imposed discipline of the heads of the individual departments or agencies charged with enforcement.

Sure, the department heads can go beyond the requirements of the law and gratuitously create for themselves more reasonable standards. But I find no comfort or redemption in this hope. In the first place, we proudly boast that ours is a Government of laws, not of men. It is our laws which furnish us the prophylaxis against the possibility of abuse from evil or stupid men. Second, I would prefer, particularly in this hysterical period, not to be dependent on the grace and conscience of the wild-eyed crusaders who may make up a large part of our enforcement units. In these days, when the issues are getting sharper and hotter, when dissent from Government policy brings down on the head of the dissenter pathological fury, even threats of jail, it is dangerous to have to depend on those who have the power to use it temperately.

In my judgment, the Executive order is, both substantively and procedurally, the most Nazi-like and terrifying law since the Alien and Sedition Acts. It should be repealed in toto. There are enough laws already on our books to protect us against treason, sabotage, and real disloyalty.

A. L. POMERANTZ.

NEW YORK, *April 26, 1947.*

Reclamation, Flood Control, and River and Harbor Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. OVERTON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on appropriations for reclamation, flood control, and river and harbor work, delivered before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington last Friday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been my privilege for a good many years now to appear before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to discuss river and harbor and flood-control legislation. At the time of most of those meetings, we have faced great problems of varying degree, but at no time, in my opinion, have we faced a greater crisis in our labors to develop the enormous natural resources of our Nation than that which is before us at the present time.

Our problem now is not necessarily one of legislative authorization in the usual sense of the term. Our great projects, by and large, have been authorized, and, in many instances, not without much difficulty. Nor is our problem one which can be cured by the Executive, even if he were inclined to come to the rescue; on the contrary, he has manifested an opposite view, as witness his Executive order of last August, which drastically reduced funds for public-works improvements. The answer must come from the people themselves crying out from the wilderness of flood destruction, wasted arid lands, and neglected valleys.

Our progress was slowed by the illegal Executive order of last August, when our appropriated funds were impounded; the Bureau of the Budget recommendation for 1948 funds is so inadequate that in many instances work will come to a practical halt; and now, if we are to believe the rumblings on the horizon, we are to be dealt the knockout blow.

This is not a sectional problem, nor is it one of concern to a single great river basin. As I look down the roster of projects, I find them located in Vermont, in Pennsylvania, in Texas, in Kansas, in Illinois, in North Dakota, in Colorado, in Oregon, in California, in Mississippi, and in Florida. They involve the great basins of the Missouri, the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Columbia, the Willamette, the Sacramento, and the Red.

I have tried to compile a rough estimate of the amount of funds which the Budget has recommended for fiscal year 1948 and compare that figure with what I am informed by competent authority could be economically expended during the fiscal year 1948. I find that the Budget has recommended an appropriation of approximately $102,000,000 for rivers and harbors when twice that amount should be appropriated, if we are to proceed on a sound economic basis in our development of our water resources. On flood control projects, I find that the Budget has recommended approximately $188,000,000, as against an amount of more than $500,000,000 which should be appropriated in a sound economic program.

That our troubles are not sectional or regional is aptly illustrated by the amounts which the Budget has recommended for appropriation compared with the amounts which could be economically expended during the coming year. For instance, in the rivers and harbors appropriations, we find a recommendation of zero for the Great Lakes to Hudson River waterway, as against an economically justified expenditure of $3,000,000; a recommendation of $200,000 for New Haven, Conn., harbor, as against an economic figure of $1,450,000; zero for Kanawha River, W. Va., as against an economic figure of $515,000; zero for Crescent Harbor, Calif., as against a needed $600,000.

Under the flood control appropriation, one of the great follies already committed is in the paltry $24,000,000 recommended appropriation for the lower Mississippi River project, as compared with the $113,000,000 which could be expended economically. But there are others, and they too can be found throughout the country. There is nothing recommended for Punxsutawney, Pa., as against $1,363,000 which could be spent under a sound program. The recommendation for Cannelton, Ind., is zero, when $1,440,000 should be spent. Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla., would receive nothing, as against an economically justified $3,087,000. East St. Louis, Ill., is recommended for no appropriation, when $1,000,000 should be made available. The great project for the metropolis of Kansas City is recommended for an appropriation of $1,800,000, when $6,900,000 could be economically expended.

Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak., one of the key items in the comprehensive Missouri River Basin program, is recommended for an appropriation of $13,000,000, when $30,000,000 could and should be expended, if the project is to be prosecuted on a sound economic basis.

Syracuse, N. Y., would receive nothing, when $1,564,000 is needed. Parkersburg, W. Va., would get $300,000, when $2,200,000 should be spent. There is nothing recommended for Sutton Reservoir, W. Va., as against an economically justified $3,435,000. Where $7,715,000 should be spent on a series of Illinois projects, the Budget recommendation is absolutely nothing. That same zero recommendation is made for Kings River and Tulane Basin, Calif., when $1,700,000 should be appropriated.

And now they tell us that the Budget figures are greatly in excess of what should be and will be appropriated, and that in the face of a Budget recommendation of about 40 percent of what sound engineering and the economic welfare of the country dictate.

If I might digress for just a moment, I want to urge each one of you to become a committee of one to call on your Senators and Representatives during your stay here this week and press upon them the vital necessity for maintaining appropriations for these projects. They will welcome your views and, certainly, if our cause is to maintain itself, those views must be expressed.

Do those who would now engage in a meat-ax slashing of flood-control appropriations remember that 2,142 lives were lost in the great Johnstown flood? Would they be parties to a repetition of the 1927 Mississippi River flood when 900 perished? Have they forgot that 730 lives were taken by the great Ohio River flood of 1913? Can the 250 lives lost in the Texas flood of 1886 be ignored? Only a few weeks ago the Nation was shocked by the holocaust at Texas City, but few realize that floods which have visited the country periodically have many times taken more lives and left in their wake the same horror, disease, and destruction.

Are we, who have fought so long and so well for development of our natural resources, to stand idly by while a wave of hysteria based on false economy not only wipes out the great advances which we have made, but threatens to bring to a standstill our future operations? Are we to stand helpless as our cities and fertile farms are ravished by flood waters? Is this the time for us to say to those intrepid pioneers of the great Northwest that there will be no more water to feed their arid lands? Are we to see our great seaports become ghost towns of empty warehouses and decaying wharves, unused and neglected? Are our people to be told that no longer will they have the advantages of cheap transportation on our great inland waterways?

These, my friends, are the issues. They not only go to the core of our very existence as a great nation with a free and abundant economy, but in many instances they strike at the very heart of human existence. The challenge is clear. The gauntlet has been thrown down. Our whole future has been endangered. For myself, I have fought too long and too hard on these questions to avoid my responsibility in this fight. I, for one, pick up the gauntlet. I accept the challenge and call on all those who earnestly believe in the welfare and future of this greatest of all nations to go with me into the fray.

The President's Loyalty Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Loyalty Order," published in the New York Times of April 13, 1947. The article is signed by four members of the Harvard Law School faculty, including its dean.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LOYALTY ORDER—PROCEDURE TERMED INADEQUATE AND DEFECTS POINTED OUT

(Of the writers of the following letter, Mr. Griswold is dean of the Harvard Law School; Mr. Scott, an authority on the law of trusts; Mr. Katz and Mr. Chafee, who served as vice chairman of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, are professors of law at that school.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The moral and political validity of the Executive order "prescribing procedures for the administration of an employe's loyalty program in the executive branch of the Government" will be measured by its efficacy in achieving its twin purposes. As stated, these are: to afford "maximum protection * * * [to] the United States against infiltration of disloyal persons into the ranks of its employees," and to afford "equal protection from unfounded accusations of disloyalty * * * [to] the loyal employees of the Government."

It is possible so to administer the order as to accomplish these ends. It is also possible so to administer the order as to miss genuine culprits, victimize innocent persons, discourage entry into the public service and leave both the Government and the American people with a hang-over sense of futility and indignity.

The nature of the administration will hinge upon the procedures to be followed. This is the nub of the business. Here, as so often in our history, moral and political issues come to focus in a question of procedure. Although the order purports to prescribe a procedure, the prescription is shadowy and incomplete.

Conceivably, the silences of the draftsmen may be redeemed by wisdom in execution. At this time, however, we can only appraise the order according to its terms. The procedure actually described is quite inadequate. It fails to take due account of the gravity of the sanctions invoked against a person to whom the prohibitions of the order may be deemed to apply. It fails to draw upon the cumulative experience of courts and administrative agencies. It fails also to give effect to the conception of sound administrative procedure reflected in the very recently enacted Administrative Procedure Act.

MEANING OF DISMISSAL

It is imperative to keep clearly in mind what a dismissal under the order means. Far more is involved than the loss of job. It means that:

(1) The person dismissed will be denied all opportunity for employment anywhere in the Federal Government.

(2) As a practical consequence, he will also lose almost all possibility of finding employment within any State or municipal government.

(3) Also, he will encounter special difficulties in obtaining employment in private organizations.

Consider the case of one who, for 20 or 30 years—his entire mature life—has worked in the Forestry Service, or the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, or the postal service, or the Bureau of Standards, or the Tennessee Valley Authority. To deny him all opportunity for employment in governmental service—Federal, State, or municipal—is to deprive him of the only means of livelihood for which he has any training or experience.

The tested wisdom of our tradition and national experience dictates that no sanction so drastic shall be applied save after adjudication of wrongdoing based upon a full hearing before responsible and impartial public officers, who are not themselves in fear of losing their own jobs.

The Executive order provides for a hearing of sorts before a "loyalty board" in the particular department or agency whose members are to be appointed by the departmental or agency head from the personnel of the department or agency. Since Cabinet officers and other senior personnel are unlikely to have either the time or the taste for such service, the membership will tend to be drawn from third- or fourth-line employees, who will themselves feel none too secure.

EVIDENCE AT HEARING

And the nature of the hearing? The suspected "officer or employee shall be served with a written notice of such hearing in sufficient time, and shall be informed therein of the nature of the charges against him in sufficient detail, so that he will be enabled to prepare his defense." So far, good. But—"The charges shall be stated as specifically and completely as, in the discretion of the employing department or agency, security considerations permit."

The accused is also given a "right to reply to such charges in writing," and a "right to appear before such board personally, to be accompanied by counsel or representative of his own choosing, and to present evidence on his behalf." There the prescription ends. There is no provision that the accused shall be confronted by such evidence as there may be to support the charges against him, so that he may undertake to rebut it. Indeed, there is no requirement that the evidence against him shall be introduced at the hearing at all.

No provision is made for a detailed record of the hearing or, for that matter, for a record of any kind. There is no requirement that the findings of the loyalty board must be supported by the evidence. In fact, there is no requirement that the loyalty board make any findings whatever. After the hearing, the loyalty board makes its recommendation to the head of the department or agency. If the recommendation is for removal and is accepted by the departmental head, his decision is subject to an appeal to the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission, which, after review, makes an advisory recommendation.

Since there is no provision for a record, it is by no means clear what the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission will review or on what basis. The order is, moreover, wholly silent as to the procedure to be followed by the Loyalty Review Board upon such review. The membership of the Loyalty Review Board is to be appointed from officers or employees of the (Civil Service) Commission, presumably by the Commission.

IMPALPABLE STANDARD

This tells its own tale, but the tale is not yet complete. The charges against the suspected public officer or employee will derive their significance from the standards of wrongdoing defined by the order. The governing standard is explicit. "The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment * * * shall be that * * * reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States." Even in the most mature and most careful and fairest of hearings, it would be sufficiently difficult for the defendant to come to grips with so impalpable a standard.

But even this is not all. The "activities and associations of an * * * employee which may be considered in connection with the determination of disloyalty may include one or more of the following: * * * Membership in, affiliation with, or sympathetic association with any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means."

Here we swim in a sea of ambiguity. Is the Attorney General's designation to be taken as final? May the defendant undertake to show that a group with which he is sympathetically associated is not subversive, or must he limit his defense to an attempt to show that he has no connection with the organization? If he concedes his membership, and is foreclosed by the Attorney General's characterization of the organization, will this be taken as proof that he, as an individual, is likewise subversive, or at least as reasonable grounds for belief that he is disloyal? Where is the burden of proof? Is it on the accused?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

These are questions which can be answered, and answered in such a way as to maintain both the integrity of our free institutions and realistic possibilities of control. The task is arduous, but does not lie beyond the reach of legal and administrative imagination and technique. There is an implication of surrender in the apparent abandonment of the elementary requirements that charges be supported, that issues be clearly defined, that the burden of proof be clearly assigned, and that an adjudication must be based upon evidence with which the defendant has been confronted.

As has already been indicated, the order embodies a novel variation of a familiar system of control—licensing. In effect, the public service is made a licensed activity, and a public officer or employee dismissed under the order is in the position of one whose license to pursue his calling has been revoked.

The settled practice of many administrative agencies, judicial decisions without number and a variety of Federal and State statutes have developed a well-established procedure for the revocation of licenses. There is a complaint, which specifies the charges; there is an opportunity to answer; on the issues thus defined there is a public hearing before the licensing authority; at the hearing the defendant is confronted by all the evidence against him and is given full opportunity to introduce evidence in his own behalf; the licensing authority must find that the charges have been sustained by the evidence in the proceeding, and no other evidence may be considered; a record of the proceeding must be kept; the order of the licensing authority must be supported by the findings, and the findings must be supported by the evidence; and the order of revocation, if issued, is subject to judicial review.

POSSIBILITIES OF ABUSE

The Department of Justice and the Congress have lately been much concerned about the possibilities of abuse in administrative procedure. Their concern has been given effect in the investigation and report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure and in the Administrative Procedure Act which became a law on June 11, 1946. These now stand as a somewhat ironic commentary on the misty procedure so indistinctly sketched in the Executive order.

The situation can be redeemed. The order does state that its expressed requirements as to procedure "shall be considered as providing minimum requirements," which may be supplemented by the heads of individual departments or agencies. This affords some possibilities for relief here and there, but is plainly inadequate.

It is for the President and his law officers to make the correction. In default of adjustment by executive action, the correction may be imposed by the courts, but piecemeal, slowly and after much clamor and confusion.

ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, Jr.,
ERWIN N. GRISWOLD,
MILTON KATZ,
AUSTIN W. SCOTT.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *April 10, 1947.*

Congress in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Congress in Action," delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] over the facilities of radio station WJR in Detroit on Saturday, May 3, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, members of the WJR radio audience.

I speak to you this evening from Washington, the home of Congress. The problem I would like to discuss with you in your homes is your Congress in action.

On January 3 of this year the Eightieth Congress went into session. It is composed of two parties—the Republican and Democratic. The real genius of the American Government lies in this two-party system. At the elections the people determine which of these two parties is to control the machinery of Congress. On January 3 the Republican Party, having a majority in both Houses, undertook the responsibility of guiding the legislative program for the next 2 years.

We do not have the sole responsibility because the minority can play its part, and, therefore, does not cooperate in the policies determined by the majority. It must also be remembered that the executive branch—the Presidency—lies in the opposite party, and that that branch controls the agencies and departments of Government.

In order that we may preserve the two-party system, each party has in it various shades of opinion, and, of course, these shades of opinion do not always permit complete unity. That is probably one of the saving graces of the two-party system.

The Eightieth Congress faced an enormous task. For 14 years the previous Congresses had been controlled by one party and one Executive.

Each party in Congress has a policy committee. I, personally, am a member of the

Republican policy committee. It consists of seven men. We hold many meetings at which we examine the public questions of importance and determine what should be done about them. When it is deemed advisable, the entire party is called into a meeting to determine whether or not the party as a whole wishes to take a certain stand. In these meetings the issues are debated and an attempt is made to reconcile the various shades of opinion. This is why, on occasions, it is difficult to determine just what stand should be taken.

It is not the number of laws which are passed by Congress which will determine whether or not Congress performs its services to the Nation as a whole. It is the kind of laws which are passed. It must always be remembered by the people that, as a rule, the passing of laws creates additional bureaus and agencies and therefore the tax burden of the people back home is increased. It must also be remembered that in the passing of laws, as a rule, the rights and liberties of people are restricted. Therefore, it is only when the general welfare of the people demands the passage of legislation, that Congress should act.

The great issues before Congress this session are, first, the cost of government. When it is realized that it costs more to govern the people of America than it does to feed them—that in other words the cost of government is more than the food bill—we can understand the enormous problem which must be solved in seeing that this condition does not continue and that the cost of government is cut. In cutting the cost of government, naturally taxes can be reduced.

What has Congress done in the 4 months which have passed? First, this Congress took a definite and determined stand against controls over the lives of our people. The President, following that mandate, ended many of the controls. Congress will continue in its endeavors to eliminate controls and to restore to our people all those freedoms consistent with the public interest.

The change in our governmental structure was not just the repairing of the machinery. We found a wrecked machine and it was necessary to rebuild the entire structure. Therefore, a great deal of confusion exists and we are going through a painful transition.

The more freedom which can be given to labor, business, and management, to work out their own problems, the more we have the right to look for a rising standard of living and a better America. The American way of life demands the elimination of governmental controls.

Those who are not familiar with the way Congress functions are naturally impatient because we have not worked miracles. I hope I can make clear to you the great problems which faced us when we met here in January and impress upon you that the process of making laws should not be a hasty one. When Congress met in January, it faced the task of completely reorganizing our legislative machinery. Last year the Republican Members of Congress voted overwhelmingly to modernize Congress. The people back home naturally were skeptical that this modernization would be carried out. It was feared that the old committee system, with its plums for the chairmen, would continue on. But the Republican Party has stood firm on its pledge to modernize Congress and took steps immediately to do so. We reduced the number of committees in the Senate from 33 to 15, and in the House from 48 to 19. We cut down the number of subcommittees from 176 in the Seventy-ninth Congress to 151 in the present session. At present, Michigan Congressmen are chairmen of 5 of the 19 committees in the House and 1 in the Senate. It was a difficult job to set up competent staffs and to select professional advisers for each of these new committees. But this job was done, and done well, by the present Congress. The enormous task of modernizing Congress was done speedily and efficiently in addition to all the many other problems which faced us before we were ready to go to work. This is a new foundation, and a new structure, and future Congresses will benefit from it and I am sure will be able to carry on their work much more efficiently. Better laws should come from this improved system.

I know you are interested and want an insight into the volume of work undertaken during the first 4 months of this session. The amount of work transacted by this Congress compares favorably with previous Congresses. Already there have been sent to the Senate 15,000 nominations and many of these nominations involve long and exhaustive study by the committees and on the floor before they are approved by the Senate. We acted upon 13,000 of these nominations. There have been 401 bills and 36 nominations presented to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member. The committee has reported out 28 bills and 27 nominations.

Probably the most difficult work of the present Congress is done by the Appropriations Committee. I speak from personal knowledge because I am a member of this committee. All proposals for raising revenue and all appropriation bills must originate in the House of Representatives, and the work of the Senate is delayed until after these measures have been passed by the House. To date, the Senate Committee on Appropriations has reported out four appropriation bills, three of which have been passed by the Senate, and the other, the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, has been reported to the floor of the Senate. The hearings on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill have been completed and ne t Monday open hearings will begin on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

A new idea has developed in connection with appropriation hearings. Instead of secret sessions, we now conduct public hearings. In order to be able to intelligently cut billions of dollars from the executive demands, long hours must be spent in study and research. We are endeavoring to get Government out in public so the taxpayers may know where their tax dollars are going. This work is especially difficult this year because the present Congress is determined to cut down the enormous Government spending. We are making a careful study of every dollar asked for by the governmental agencies in order that we may grant some relief to our people from their tax burdens. And believe me, friends of the radio audience, saving the taxpayer money is an extremely difficult task. Government agencies, used to spending the taxpayers' money lavishly, fiercely resist any reduction in their appropriations. For example, I hold in my hand a memorandum put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which purports to be a report from a Mrs. Johnston, customs collector at Minneapolis, to her chief, the Customs Commissioner, W. R. Johnson, here in Washington. According to this memorandum she says and I quote:

"I have written to the importers, to civic organizations such as the chamber of commerce, to the mayors and to the foreign departments of banks which handle foreign credit.

"The Customs Service Association (employees' organization) wired our two Senators and the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee (Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire).

"The entire customs personnel, members of their families and friends, are sending letters and post cards to the Senators involved."

So, you see that every time that we try to cut a Government department that department and others go into action and generate all kinds of resistance to these reductions so that it is a very difficult job for us to get the unbiased facts, and to save the taxpayers' money from being lavishly expended.

During the past 4 months there have been 5,110 bills and resolutions introduced in Congress, 1,418 in the Senate and 3,692 in the House. The Senate committees have reported 127 and the House committees 326. The fact that there are more bills reported in the House of Representatives than in the Senate can be attributed to the fact that in the House no Member has to serve on more than one committee. Consequently there is no difficulty encountered by the committees in getting a quorum present at each meeting, whereas in the Senate a Senator serves on more than one committee, and at times conflicts develop in the time set for committee meetings, and it is impossible for the various committees to have a quorum present to do business. So far as the House passing more bills is concerned, this is due to the fact that the House operates on a limited-debate system, while the Senate has unlimited debate, and hence the House can act more speedily under the practice followed by that body. The House has 435 Members capable of proposing laws, while the Senate has only 96 men. The Senate has actually passed 149 Senate and House bills and resolutions and the House 153.

Of course, figures alone cannot tell the real story of the work in Congress. Few realize that the hardest and most painstaking work on legislation is done in committee.

Congress also has another function, and that is in connection with the investigations of public business. The white light of investigation has been put upon public business in order that our people may know of its operation. If this were not done, it would cost the taxpayers many more billions of dollars, and they would be continually in the dark as to what is really going on in Washington.

No bill should be passed by Congress without a full and complete hearing in the open and an opportunity given for all parties on both sides, and the general public, to appear and give their versions. Do you realize, fellow citizens, that America is the only place in the world where such hearings can be held and where investigations bring tl e true facts to light in order that the people may be advised? After all the committee work is done, reports must be made to the Senate and the House, and then debates are carried on on the floors of both bodies.

If a bill is passed in the same form by both Houses of Congress, it immediately goes to the President. However, if the House or the Senate passes a bill, and the wording is changed in any degree by the other body, it must go to a conference committee of the House and the Senate, so the differences may be ironed out. An identical bill must then be passed, and it is ready for the President's signature. All this takes time, but it is really the finest example of free people making the laws which are to govern them through their chosen representatives.

Tribute to the Late Franklin Delano Roosevelt by Charles M. LaFollette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address in tribute to the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, by Hon. Charles M. LaFollette, former Member of Congress from the State of Indiana, delivered in Berlin, Germany, on April 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two years ago today the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, died at Warm Springs, Ga. The plain people of the world mourned.

Just 8 days later on the 20th of April 1945, in a prison in this place, 33 men convicted for opposing the Nazi regime, many of whom had undisposed of clemency pleas pending, were prematurely executed to furnish the celebration of the anniversary of the birthday of Adolf Hitler. Their survivors added their heartaches and tears to those of the other mourners who had previously suffered from and under the impact of viciousness incarnate.

We have come together as citizens of the sovereign nations which overwhelmed that viciousness to commemorate the death of the man who all men acknowledged was one of the great leaders of that fight. But we know even as we gather here by the troubled stirrings in the secret recesses of our hearts that until and unless we can come together as citizens of the world we shall desecrate the memory of all who died in and suffered from that viciousness.

Those who arrogate to themselves the privilege of commemorating the dead, may act in either of two ways. They may very easily, and therefore cheaply, cast upon themselves and momentarily bask in an unearned eerie light from the past, by an eloquent, throat-catching review of the deeds and accomplishments of the dead. Or they may earnestly and arduously try to evaluate the significance of the acts and deeds of those whose passing they prefer to memorialize. The first way gives to shallow and purposeless people a fleeting moment of emotional vicarious grandeur. The second affords to purposeful people some aid perhaps in their earnest attempt to create a living memorial. The completion of the unfinished tasks which the mystical forces of the universe required the living to lay down.

If anyone gathered here has not the purpose to create such a living memorial, then he or she should not be here. I shall not demean your intelligence nor impugn your good faith by offering you an emotional bauble. I choose to offer you with earnest, and I assure you not simulated, humility some thoughts which might perhaps make significant that which we attempt to do here.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was a leader of men. Like all leaders, he was a controversial figure in his own land. To deny this is to state an untruth. To state such an untruth here would desecrate this service. For it is the weak not the strong who need the protection of untruth. Time, which inexorably increases the capacity of men for objectivity, is even now turning into gray that which was once black and white. This is good. We serve no purpose here in disturbing the effect of time. Certainly this is true when those things which are uncontroversial offer us so much to learn from and build upon.

First, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was a fighter. Inevitably therefore, he surged into many battles. Second, it was his lot that every effective battle he fought as President of the United States was a counterattack, a counterattack against relentlessly moving, pressing forces.

What do these two uncontroversial facts in the life of Franklin Roosevelt furnish us in the way of guideposts to the unfinished tasks which we must complete if we intend to do more than to give lip service to the life of the man whom we here memorialize? First, we shall fight the fight for a better world and find our reward in the battle itself. Every good fighter so finds his reward. The goal for which he fights is, of course, before him, but it is to him an accomplished certainty; therefore, having no doubts as to the ultimate attainment of victory, he does not need victories as a reward for his efforts. I have always felt, and I believe that you will agree with me, that those who have publicly mourned over the fact that Franklin Delano Roosevelt did not witness through mortal eyes the victory against viciousness which he had so splendidly fought have unfairly measured the true fighting qualities of the man. Therefore, they have attributed to him a desire which only an inferior fighter would have felt, and thus depreciated this greater quality which was his outstanding characteristic.

But it is not enough that we here avoid that mistake which others have made. Constructively we accomplish nothing unless we also learn to fight for the things which are good and to value the privilege of participating effectively in the fight as sufficient reward for our efforts. For actually he is a mercenary, who fights only because he hopes to gain some reward in his time for the efforts which he makes. The achievement of a better world, in which people can live free from the fear of destruction from that form of mass murder which we call war, is a victory which must be an impersonal objective of the man who fights for it. For it will not be a better world if we still expect to engage in a mad scramble for a disproportionate share of the benefits to be found in such a world. Therefore we must learn to find our rewards for the efforts which we make toward achieving this goal, solely in the fact that we are engaged wholeheartedly in the making of that struggle. Only thus do we carry on in the world as a force for good the standards of all great fighters which Franklin Roosevelt demonstrated so clearly to us.

Again we must understand that the leader of a counterattack inevitably has before him the unaccomplished task of directing and leading his own attack. For he who leads a counterattack against an aggressive pressing foe cannot at the same time successfully and effectively develop the strategy or evolve the tactics for his own attack before and until his counterattack has driven the foe from the field which the foe first chose to fight upon. It must follow, therefore, that when such a leader is forced to abandon his leadership, unfinished tasks are passed on to those who follow.

We here are primarily concerned not with the unfinished domestic tasks but with those which affect the hopes and aspirations of the plain people of the whole world. The forces of racial prejudices and racial superiority and nationalistic greed, which sought to overrun the world, chose the time and place and field of battle first. This was true not only in the world of material things—of planes and tanks and overrun lands and destroyed people—but it was true in the world of mystical spiritual forces which affect men's minds and emotions. Therefore, the task of the counterattacker was not only to drive back from the overrun surfaces of the world the forces of the attacker but also to fight back against the vicious thoughts and ideologies spread and broadcast over the world by a scheming, designing, effective propaganda machine, which had been instilled into the minds of men far behind the material fighting lines, where these mystical forces of evil had extended themselves.

All this time the Hitlerite forces, material and intangible, were pressing, fighting, and surging to break out and enslave the bodies of men and permanently infect their minds with the vile of viciousness, which was the motivating force of those forces. To hold and contain them and to drive them back was of necessity the immediate objective toward which Franklin Roosevelt led the people of America, and, indeed, inspired the peoples of the world. In such a crucial battle, the replacing of evil by positive good was, of course, always a subsequent goal, but the opportunity to complete the plans and the designs and the program for the attainment of that goal was of necessity denied him.

The attainment of that goal is the only effective monument which we, the living, can build as a memorial for those who have died. Because of the very nature of things, we cannot look backward and rely upon the strategy and the tactics, which were sufficient for an effective counterattack, as furnishing us with the new plans and strategies necessary to make successfully the attack upon those forces of the world which would still deny to the plain peoples of the world that goal they so instinctively seek.

Every person here engaged in this quadripartite effort is a fighter for the creation of that goal. Axiomatically with each degree of authority there arises a corresponding degree of responsibility. Inevitably the higher the position of authority, the greater becomes the remoteness of the person who exercises it from the simple thoughts, hopes, and aspirations of the mass of the people he desires to serve. The essentially plain people, people in humble positions, we must remember are not infected with prejudices or hatred of other peoples unless they are given to them by those who exercise authority over them. The task that lies before us, the obligation to these people, who don't want to hate, or starve others or indeed to die in an attempt to starve others, requires us to open our minds and our hearts; to analyze and reject our false prejudices and those things in our dogmas which are false, if we intend to serve these people well.

Mankind has heretofore never attained this capacity but the necessity of mankind to attain it has never been so great before. We either attain these things or we destroy ourselves. And, if we destroy ourselves, then all of the lives which have been sacrificed throughout the preceding centuries will not be commemorated but desecrated by those of us of this generation who have this task entrusted to us. If we fail, let us at least be honest. Let those few who will remain after the holocaust, which will follow that failure, hold no more memorial services, not only for Franklin Delano Roosevelt but for all of the unknown people who have died and who were loved and mourned in the humble dwellings of the world.

Let us not add to our failure the sign of hypocrisy.

Address by Senator Martin Before Executive Committee of the American Legion

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] at the banquet of the National Executive Committee of the American Legion, at Indianapolis, Ind., on Monday, May 5, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor to come here tonight. I regard an invitation to speak to the National Executive Committee of the American Legion as equivalent to a military order, which cannot be refused. It is also a real privilege to come to the great State of Indiana which is so widely known for its highly developed industry and agriculture, and the cultural and spiritual attainments of its people.

During my term as governor of Pennsylvania, it was my good fortune to come in frequent contact with your distinguished governor, Ralph F. Gates. As a result of my associations with him in the meetings of the Governors' Conference, I developed great admiration for him.

Then later when I went to the United States Senate I found in Congress Senators HOMER E. CAPEHART and WILLIAM E. JENNER, and the Majority Floor Leader of the House—Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK. What a team! My association with them is one of my valued possessions. My, but Indiana is fortunate to have such able, outstanding and respected public servants. All are real veterans and are imbued with the true American spirit.

During my lifetime, the Legion and other veteran organizations have been a source of great inspiration to me. As a boy I was thrilled by the long line of blue-coated men of the Grand Army of the Republic as they marched to the stirring tunes of war. Those men lived for and preached a great, strong and dynamic America.

Then I joined the United Spanish War Veterans and marched with them. Our dress of blue wool shirts, khaki pants and leggings was not like that of the Grand Army, but we stood for the same kind of America.

Then I joined the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion. I have continued to join various veteran groups—all having the common purpose of helping the veteran and standing firmly for the ideals and purposes of the United States. I am also proud of my membership and fine association with that younger organization, the Amvets of World War II.

All these organizations are outstanding and of great aid to veterans and to America. But the greatest of them—the greatest organization of its kind in the world—is the American Legion. It has the greatness of numbers and a long record of unselfish accomplishment. Therefore, as an American and a veteran, I appreciate this invitation to speak to this important gathering of the keymen of this powerful organization. It is particularly important because it is your preconvention meeting to lay the ground work for the most important national convention of Legion history.

I am also proud of the invitation to come here tonight because the national commander is one of my own boys who served with me in France during the critical days of 1918. He was a leader even then, when he got his baptism of fire as a young doughboy. He was a fighter then and he is a fighter now. I have watched his brilliant advancement with the pride of a father.

As long as we have men of the same courage, understanding and ability as Paul H. Griffith to lead institutions like the Legion, the United States, as we know and love it, will be preserved.

The real greatness of the Legion is that through the years it has stood firmly and unselfishly by its ideals of aid to our disabled comrades, the dependents of those who made the supreme sacrifice, and for 100 percent Americanism.

While others slept, the Legion kept the watch. It did not court popularity but advocated the things that would preserve and make us a greater America. Its fight for our buddies and their dependents; the demand that all subversive influences be removed from the United States; and that we be adequately prepared to defend our institutions, are only a part of the greatest patriotic program in the history of the country. It has been an inspiring demonstration of what a great patriotic organization can do.

If Americans had acted upon the Legion's appeals for an adequate defense, Pearl Harbor might not have happened. If Americans had acted when the Legion urged that the disloyal be removed from high places, many embarrassments might have been avoided.

The Legion also made a great contribution to winning World War II by its experienced personnel joining the colors and assuming other positions of importance. It was a real example to the Nation.

The record of the Legion is glorious. It is one of the bright pages of American history. Its job, so well done, is only a forerunner. The Legion faces work ahead as difficult and as important to the future of America as anything it has done in the past.

I am not presuming to advise you experienced Legionnaires about your future role. Your record gives you the right to lead and direct. I am only too glad and honored to follow. Therefore, what I shall say is only by way of suggestion for your future consideration.

I believe that red-blooded Americans want a strong dynamic America. They want an America strong enough to preserve the American form of government and the American way of life. They believe that the American Republic is a better form of government than that of any other country in the world.

They want peace and good will in the world. They know you cannot buy peace. They know that peace, like war, is won by work, courage, sweat, and sacrifice, and by maintaining ideals, regardless of cost.

To achieve those objectives, our people must be well educated and physically fit. All Americans should know fully the proud history of our country—and of the God-fearing men who carved out its destiny.

I am not unmindful of the splendid Americanism program carried on by the Legion. Through essay contests and other activities that program is instilling into the hearts and minds of our youth love of our country and devotion to its ideals.

In recent years, however, I have been gravely concerned by the failure of our educational system in teaching American history. During my term as Governor of Pennsylvania hundreds of high-school delegations visited my office. I made it a practice to question them about the history of their county, their State, and their Nation. All too often I was disappointed to find that they lacked even a basic knowledge of our history.

Only recently a young man with the finest American background applied for an appointment to Annapolis. He wrote me very much concerned over the fact that one of the requirements for admission to the Naval Academy was American history. He had been graduated from a class A high school and was completing his course at one of America's leading preparatory schools. In his letter he stated that while he had studied ancient and medieval history and modern European history, he had never had any course in the history of his own country. He knew more about the Medes and Persians, the Greeks and the Romans than he did about the men who signed the Declaration of Independence; wrote the American Constitution; and fought our wars.

This, my comrades, is a sad commentary upon the teaching of history in our schools. This situation calls for correction. It calls for a job by the American Legion. There is plenty of room for an American educational campaign, one to prevent our schools from turning out a generation of youth which will know more about others than about itself. The curricula of our educational institutions should be revised so that American history becomes a cornerstone of the teaching.

Our children must be taught that while we have more rights than any other people, yet with those rights we also have real obligations. These obligations are to preserve America for future generations.

A firmer foundation in our history will serve as a shield to turn away alien philosophies. It will create greater pride in our own free institutions. Communism—the rankest growing weed on the face of the globe today—will not gain a foothold where the lesson of our past and the development of our present are known and understood.

We, in the American Legion, have been fighting communism over the years, trying to point out the dangers to people in high places. We have been fighting it at the national and at the local levels. I can disclose here tonight that I found it in the National Guard of Pennsylvania when I served as commander of that grand body of men. When we learned that the Reds infiltrated our guard, we quietly ferreted them out. Our G-2 did a fine job.

Today, at last, the job of ferreting the vermin from places in our Government has begun. They have built themselves warm and comfortable nests over the past years. We all recall clearly how at our last national convention, J. Edgar Hoover, whose Americanism has never been doubted, ripped aside the crimson curtain and warned us that we had better clean house before the house was destroyed.

We were all encouraged, recently, when President Truman issued his loyalty order to clean the Reds our of Government positions—despite the fact that only a few days before—on February 28, 1947—he had written to former Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania:

I quote: "People are very much wrought up about the Communist 'bugaboo' but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe so far as communism is concerned."

I compliment our comrade, President Truman, upon his recognition of the menace, belated though it is.

In view of the President's loyalty order, it is hard to understand the failure of the Attorney General of the United States to set the wheels in motion to prosecute Communists for violations of Federal statutes. Congressman J. PARNELL THOMAS, of New Jersey, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, has, on three separate occasions, reported 45 violations to the Justice Department. Nothing happened.

Only the other day, in despair of getting results by any other means, Mr. THOMAS addressed a letter to President Truman asking him for action. It is hoped this will have the desired effect and that the conspirators will be brought to justice.

I am not one of those who believes that war with Russia is close at hand. A recent survey reveals that Russia, in its sphere of influence, has but 15 percent of the war-making resources. We, and the nations outside of the Russian sphere, control 85 percent.

I am convinced that Russia's immediate plans do not contemplate war. Their policy is to build up a fifth column to spread hatred, prejudice, and eventually to lead to civil strife. They plan to create doubt and suspicion. They encourage a spendthrift government, so as to weaken the financial stability of the country in which they operate. Hence, eventually, if war should come, they will have little trouble in accomplishing their purpose. They will cause

confusion and turmoil within our own borders.

Communism is a real menace, not a fanciful one. It isn't necessary to have a majority of Communists to rule a country. Russia has a population of over 200,000,000 and probably rules over twice that many. Yet in Russia there are fewer than 6,000,000 active Communist Party members.

The number of Communists in the United States is small, but a great many leftists, pinks, and fellow travelers are working in cooperation with them. The number of Communists in South American countries is becoming alarming. The people of the United States should realize the danger and work to eliminate the corrupting influence of communism, particularly from all high places in our country.

I want to assure my comrades in the American Legion tonight that I shall stand shoulder to shoulder with you and fight with every ounce of strength and energy to root out this menacing alien growth.

While war with Russia may not be imminent we must be ready for any eventuality—strong, alert, and united at home. We've got to keep America a powerful enemy and a powerful friend abroad.

Our fathers settled this land with a rifle in one hand and the Bible in the other. There has never been a better formula for national defense. It is just as good today as it was then. Until the nations of the world indicate their willingness to live in peace, let us go our way with an atomic bomb in one hand and the spirit of the cross in the other—then every nation can choose which hand it prefers.

Our national defense must be based upon the ideals of our Republic. That means equal obligation as well as equal rights for every citizen. In the kind of world we live in today, in which things happen swiftly, equal obligation means to me universal military training. That is the only way to be ready on time when an emergency occurs.

I stand for, and I know the American Legion stands for, a highly trained Regular Army backed by a well-organized, properly trained civilian reserve.

We should have the best and strongest Navy and the best and strongest Air Force we can conceive. We had them in the recent war. Only fools would think of surrendering them now.

No matter how hard we hope and pray, this world and this Nation have not yet finished with conflict for all time.

Until the aggressor nations agree to lay down their arms and prove they want to live in peace with us, let us keep our muscles hard.

An America gone soft and flabby is an America inviting attack.

Behind the front line of steel and fire we must keep our industry, our labor, and our agriculture ready. Today American management and the American workman have the finest know-how. They must be ready to produce without delay the food, munitions, and transportation to support the armed forces. This is a cardinal principle.

In order to do this we must bring about industrial peace. Our country became great and strong by increased industrial production. That gave us the highest living standard the world has ever known. During the war no country on earth produced like the United States. We must do the same thing in the critical years ahead.

To strengthen our industrial plant Congress must enact laws—not to punish labor—but to correct abuses and inequities which, in recent years, have crept into labor-management relations.

The racketeer and the Communist must be driven out of the labor movement.

Now I want to discuss one of the most alarming situations we face today. It has caused me many sleepless nights. It is the solvency of America. Despite the fanciful theories of fuzzy-minded elements of our population, every clear-thinking American agrees that our country should be made financially sound. A minority of our people, composed of misguided do-gooders and those who deliberately seek to weaken us, would squander our substance and bleed us white.

Our fiscal policies must include a balanced budget, reduction of the debt, and equitable distribution of the tax burden. Every expenditure of our Government, whether for use at home or abroad, must be carefully scrutinized by organizations like the Legion.

The astronomical public debt of $258,000,000,000 endangers our solvency. If we collapse financially or if uncontrolled inflation results, America could easily drift into a dictatorship or a socialistic pattern of government.

This will result in America, as it has resulted in every other country, in the loss of individual freedom.

After World War I Germany had inflation which brought economic collapse. Hitler followed. Then we had confusion, war, and mass murder.

Our national debt is now almost $7,500 per family. After World War I we had a national debt of nearly twenty-five and one-half billions, or approximately $970 per family.

After the War Between the States the debt was two and three-quarters billion, or about $340 per family.

Italy is now on the brink of ruin and owes about thirty-five billions, which is $2,500 per family. Japan owes less than $40,000,000,000, or $2,200 for each family.

The public debt of Germany was about $138,000,000,000. This was $8,300 per family, $800 more than America's national debt per family today.

The time has come for Americans to stop and think when our Government is making an expenditure. Our world-wide financial commitments since VJ-day now total $31,000,000,000. We are a strong country, but can we stand the strain? Men like you must make the decision.

Our country in 14 years gave in grants and subsidies to State, municipalities, corporations and individuals $43,000,000,000. That means more than $1,250 per family.

The Federal Government is now too big, too complicated, and too much involved. It all means curtailing the rights of the individual citizens. In 8 years the cost of government has increased 371 percent. Remember, this is a peacetime increase.

The over-all cost of government, Federal, State, and local, is more than $52,000,000,000. That is more by billions than the entire national income in 1932, 1933, or 1934. By way of further comparison, let me point out that the highest national income in any year in the history of the Nation prior to World War II, was $83,000,000,000.

If I leave but one thought with you tonight, if I have but one plea to make to you, my comrades of the American Legion, it is this: That the American Legion spearhead the drive for a solvent, sound, and dynamic nation.

We in Congress who are working and fighting to accomplish this, need your help and assistance.

Let the veteran, who made the greatest sacrifice to preserve America, set the example to all pressure groups who would come to Washington demand the continuance of the philosophy of spend, spend, and spend.

Let me point out to you, first—that four-fifths of the huge, back breaking national debt will be paid by the veterans themselves. It is to their own interest to support us in our efforts.

Second, and more important, we must do it for our disabled comrades of all wars and the dependents of those who gave their lives in the defense of our freedom.

One of the great objectives of the American Legion has been the care and comfort of wounded and disabled veterans, and the widows and orphans of servicemen.

If we become unsound financially, it will destroy many of the benefits and annuities which these survivors are now receiving.

Yes, we want economy. We want it to save America and to insure the well-being of those whose care is our sacred obligation.

The 1947 Congress will never enact laws such as Public Law No. 2 of the 1933 session which economized only by reducing the benefits to disabled veterans and their dependents.

To me, economy in government means cutting to the bone consistent with efficient operation of essential Government services. It means trimming even the budgets of the Veterans' Administration and the armed forces—to wring out the water and remove the deadwood—but it does not mean reducing by even a hair's breadth the benefits to the disabled and to the survivors of the dead of our wars.

The liberty-loving people of the world are looking to the United States for leadership. Every nation, even those that criticize our form of government and our way of life, are begging for aid, loans, and grants.

In my opinion that is another convincing evidence of America's greatness. It is proof that our system has succeeded, while others failed.

We must consider these applications most carefully. We cannot help the weak unless we remain strong. Nations can go broke the same as individuals.

We must appeal to Americans to love and support the American flag and the things for which it stands—its red—hard work, industry and courage; its blue—loyalty to all our ideals, which have always been tolerance, good will and freedom to do the things of our choice; its white—purity, righteousness and peace.

Its stars—the guiding beacons of hope that the United States may always rightly govern its people and safeguard our sacred Bill of Rights.

We look to the future with hope and prayer in the lofty spirit expressed by Stephen Decatur 131 years ago:

"Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be right; but our country, right or wrong."

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an interesting address delivered by the Honorable Smith L. Multer, past president-general of the Sons of the American Revolution. This address was delivered at the Jefferson National Memorial in Washington on April 13, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We gather here this afternoon in this hallowed place to commemorate upon the anniversary of his birth, the deeds, and life of a great American and to endeavor to gather renewed strength and inspiration from the contemplation of it all. We meet at one of the three great patriotic shrines here in the

Capital of the Nation. Here fitting memorials have been erected to the three commanding figures in the temple of this Republic—Washington, the Father of his Country; Lincoln, who preserved it; and Jefferson whose idealism and ringing words for the rights of men have given vitality to its life throughout the years.

It is difficult to speak of Jefferson, to know what to take hold of in this many-sided man, the most versatile chief magistrate of the Nation. With his philosophic foresight he probably better than anyone else appraised himself.

He sleeps within the confines of his estate at Monticello beneath one plain white shaft upon which is inscribed a remarkable epitaph composed by Jefferson himself. It reads as follows: "Here rests Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, of the Statute of Religious Freedom for Virginia, and Founder of the University of Virginia." He did not write a single word of the high positions he had held and adorned, twice President of the United States, Secretary of State under Washington, occupying diplomatic posts of distinction abroad and showered with many honors by the Old Dominion.

Jefferson rested his name and fame upon the three great achievements he enumerated, which stand out as milestones along the pathway of human liberty and the liberation of the human mind. They all center about the preservation of liberty for men—liberty, the grandest word in all our language without which all the words are vain—liberty to live and to do and to accomplish, unfettered by the uncertain restrictions of government or the decrees of tyrants, freedom of the minds and souls of men, the promotion of knowledge and the strengthening of character that will enable men to know and to defend their rights and to remain free. That is what Jefferson did so much to achieve. And so he placed these accomplishments of his career above all others.

From Plymouth Rock and Jamestown on, men came to these shores in search of a larger liberty, an opportunity to do, and to achieve, and to work out their own destiny in their own way. And so they opposed the encroachments of the Crown with courage and determination. And finally, expression was given to their dreams and aspirations in the stately words that fell from the pen of Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It was for these rights and for such a government that the Continental soldier marched and fought through the weary years to Yorktown. And then with American independence achieved, it was the task of the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia to set up a form of government that would secure these rights and protect them from assault by any department of government or any man or group of men. The deputies knew that the great rights and freedoms would only be safe in a government of laws and not of men. And so they provided for a government of checks and balances with three great coordinate departments so constituted that each should be independent of the other and each revolve about in its own appointed orbit. While certain specific powers, such as were necessary for a national government to function, were given to the Federal Government, the great residuum of power was reserved to the States and to the people.

The founders believed, and experience has vindicated their wisdom, that government should be kept close to the people; that the people in their own States and communities are better able to know and are better informed as to their own local wants and affairs than a bureaucracy far away in the Nation's Capital.

Under such a form of government, into which has been breathed the soul of Jefferson's doctrines as enunciated in the immortal Declaration, for 150 years and more, of the matchless growth of this Republic, unparalleled in the history of the world, under an ever-advancing and changing civilization, all emergencies in peace and in war, at home and abroad, have been successfully met; and there are no problems nor difficulties however grave that may arise that cannot be met and solved within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

Under our form of government and way of life, the American people have gone from pinnacle to pinnacle to reach the heights upon which they stand in the enjoyment of the noblest civilization ever known to the children of men here in this favored land of ours where, despite all our troubles—and they have been many—human happiness, security, and well-being have existed as nowhere else since time began.

Nowhere is property so equally divided as here. Nowhere are wages so high. Nowhere are comforts and well-being so universal. Nowhere does hope fly on such high and rapid wing.

Everywhere the strength and growth of our form of government profoundly affected the human race. Other governments modeled their constitutions on our own and upon the American continents the flags of freedom waved unvexed from our southern borders to the Antartic seas.

The forces of liberty gathered momentum; and their impact was felt against the thrones of kings; and rights and some form of representation were given to the people in nearly every land. It looked as though the heavens above would soon bend their starry arch over a world of freemen. This was not so long ago, within the memory of many of us here.

And then a strange spell came over the earth and all was changed. Democracy was challenged everywhere. Peoples surrendered their liberties for a false security that faded into ashes as they were betrayed, as they were bound to be, by the dictator and the tyrant. These dictators and tyrants reached out threatening the safety of the world; and we were plunged into a world-wide war to preserve our own freedom and the freedom of all mankind. A year and a half ago we emerged triumphant with our enemies utterly vanquished and lying prostrate in the dust.

With the invention of new instruments of warfare with unheard of range and destruction, we recognized the fact that oceans are no longer the barriers of old and mountains do not divide. And so we joined with 50 other nations in a compact known as the United Nations for the preservation of peace and the prevention of aggression. We knew that another such catastrophe as the one through which we had just passed, would wreck civilization. We were the first to ratify the Charter of the United Nations, believing that the example of the strongest nation on earth so to do would lead other great powers to join in working out the problems of peace in a spirit of justice to the smaller nations and a respect for their sovereign rights. Hardly had the ink dried upon the Charter of the United Nations, when we saw Russia reaching out everywhere, dominating and establishing spheres of influence and throwing communistic shadows over vast reaches of the European and Asiatic Continents. She set up puppet governments in eastern Europe and extended her sphere of influence westward to the banks of the Elbe. She has embarked upon a policy of delay in order to impregnate those countries as well as Germany itself with her communistic doctrines. No one knows what is going on there behind the iron curtain.

She marched her armies in little Iran and negotiated with a pistol at the head of that government and with longing eyes is looking upon the warm waters of the Persian Gulf. She has long waged a war of nerves on Greece and on Turkey and asks surrender of Turkish sovereign rights in gaining control of the Dardanelles in which event Turkey, Greece, and the Middle East will become her satellites, and then she will be knocking on the doors of India as soon as the British move out.

And in China, where we have long had the policy of "the open door," she is in Manchuria, marching in and out and back again and has incited disorder and chaos with a million Communists in arms waging civil war. She is endeavoring to obtain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere, and the upward surge of the Communists throughout the nations to the south of us threatens inter-American solidarity. Her agents are working in every nation as fifth columnists to create disorder and hatred and be ready to inflict grave sabotage in the event of any trouble with Russia.

Look at it as you will, it is the pattern of Hitler picking off free nations one by one; the pattern of a nation with an eye on the empire of the world.

In the midst of it all it has been the purpose of our representatives in the conclaves of the nations, former Secretary Byrnes and now Secretary Marshall, and the leaders of our foreign policy in both great political parties, CONNALLY and VANDENBERG, to work out some system of peace wherein there would be no further encroachment of Russia upon the rights of sovereign nations and to bring about a settlement of all problems within the orbit and spirit of the United Nations.

This policy has been termed by her sympathizers as getting tough with Russia. Upon the contrary, as President Truman said in his message to the Congress on January 6, "Our policy toward the Soviet Union is guided by the same principles which determine our policies toward all nations."

In other words, we would be opposed to any other nation encroaching upon the rights and imposing its will on any other people. The United Nations was brought into being to prevent just that sort of thing, to preserve peace and prevent aggression. When it fails so to do, it will have failed of the purpose of its being and become one more melancholy failure to establish peace among mankind.

It is to prevent such a failure that President Truman has announced the policy to aid peoples who are struggling to resist subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure. This means that Russia must be stopped in her march of aggression. Of course, each case must be carefully scrutinized and judged on its own merits not only by the President but also by the Congress of the United States which holds the purse strings.

At present, we are confronted with the question as to what course of action to pursue in the case of Greece and Turkey, who have applied to us for assistance. The destruction of their independence by the Communists and the dire results that would follow are clear and obvious. Extending aid to them does not mean bypassing the United Nations. We are simply calling a halt to Russia and her satellites, which the United Nations would not be able to do, with no armed forces at their command and no means to sustain their economy. And in this connection it is well to remember that it is Russia that has continually blocked any effort of progress for the establishment of an international police force.

We also stand ready to desist at any time when the Security Council or the Assembly by majority vote asks us so to do. But to

stand idly by simply appealing to the Security Council to do something they are not able to do, and which no doubt would be frustrated by Russian veto, would make for the complete destruction of the prestige of the United Nations and more conquests by Russia in her control of other peoples and governments. Our course of action means not a weakening but a strengthening of the United Nations.

I have no doubt that the President will be sustained. Then, too, it will redound to the everlasting glory of the United States to come to the assistance of heroic Greece, where the spirit of liberty was born 500 years before the Christian era beneath Athenian skies. There is no doubt that our course of action is fraught with danger. But it is far less dangerous than to let another tyranny in the shape of communistic, atheistic Russia to continue on her quest for world dominion.

The conduct of Russia, to put it mildly, is disturbing; while Stalin in timed interviews proclaims there are no dangerous differences between Russia and the United States, yet at the some time the sinister facts stand out that at all times the Russian-controlled engines of propaganda continually emit their violent diatribes to poison the minds of the Russian people that we are an imperialistic, capitalistic Nation plotting the destruction of the Soviet Union. Of course, the powers that be in the Kremlin know to the contrary. We have no desire nor have we made any attempts to interfere in their internal affairs or form of government. We got along with the Czars and we can get along with communistic Russia if, in the same good faith which actuates all our acts, she will go along with us in carrying out the purposes of the United Nations. In her hands and not in ours rest the issues of peace or war.

Knowing that the struggle for peace is a continuing and an unending one; and that we are living in an uncertain and a dangerous world, it behooves us not to lower our guard but to remain strong in the world in which we find ourselves.

Twice within a generation we were drawn into a world-wide war and in each we were the deciding force in determining the issues thereof. Each time we were unprepared but we were enabled to prepare; in World War I, behind the English Navy and the armies of France, and in World War II behind the indomitable strength of England and Russia. Next time we will not be permitted to rally our resources behind any nation's protecting arms and, if not ready and able to face attack delivered with telling power and unprecedented speed, we will go down to irretrievable defeat.

We will not be saved by good conduct nor pious hopes nor hanging a motto on the wall, "Let us have peace." We must keep in mind that we are dealing with some peoples who have respect for force and power and that alone. We must look upon the world as it is and not as we would wish it to be. If we had been reasonably prepared, Japan would have hesitated to have attacked us and Hitler would have paused in his dreams for the conquest of the world. Anyway, being unprepared has not kept us out of war. It would be criminal folly not to be on the alert until such time at least as the United Nations is able by its military power to cope with any aggressor.

There is nothing un-Christianlike in this, I submit. Upon the contrary, it is the highest form of practical Christianity; for it means the preservation of this land of ours, the last great refuge of civil and religious liberty upon this planet. If she be saved, then all is saved; for "Time's noblest offspring is the last."

With communism and socialism sweeping over many portions of the earth, their repercussions are felt here; and the contest is on between the lovers of liberty and the exponents of the tyranny of the state. The continued preservation of the land of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln will demand our best thought and the most earnest efforts of which we are capable. Those who would undermine our form of government have the advantage in that they are bound by no rules of intellectual integrity and so promise the fantastic and the impossible. They magnify evils manyfold and decry the blessings of liberty as cheap and unsubstantial things.

The enemies of our institutions are everywhere, the Communists and their fellow-travelers. Wherever there are differences between capital and labor, wherever there is any disturbance, no matter what its nature, there they are attempting to foment trouble and disorder and to intensify bitterness and discontent.

Confronted by these dangers here and abroad, what is needed is unity among our people here at home—a supreme need that the devotion and consecration to our country in time of war be carried over into these days of peace; that there be a production from field and forest and rolling off our assembly lines unimpeded by any cause or any group; that an enduring faith in our form of government and way of life exist without which constitutions availeth not; that a wider brotherhood and tolerance may prevail, bringing about a kindlier feeling among our people so that the effort to arouse class hatred and class consciousness will be in vain—all to the end that we may work out our problems and live our lives as a resolute, a united, and a liberty-loving people.

And let us listen to the words of wisdom and admonition in these troubled hours of the great men in whose honor memorials have been here erected by a grateful people, as they spoke long ago and still speak to us: Washington, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest may repair. The event is in the hands of God;" Jefferson, "Equal rights for all—special privileges to none;" Lincoln, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

Accomplishments of Midwest Research Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Midwest Research Institute was born out of a desire of public-spirited businessmen of the six-State area surrounding Kansas City, Mo., to enlist the principles and resources of scientific research in the commercial and industrial development of this region. How well the effort has succeeded in a little more than 2 years is shown by the fact that the Institute has participated in the development of a process for making corn sugar from grain sorghums; it has turned out the paper-tape sound recorder; perfected a coating for ammonia nitrate crystals, and has other accomplishments to its credit.

The Midwest Research Institute has recently announced a new process for milling grain, which may well be revolutionary in character. I ask the unanimous consent that an article from the Kansas City Star of April 20, 1947, describing the method, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, since this process may be of interest and significance to industry and agriculture throughout the country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW GRAIN ERA—REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS OF MILLING IS EVOLVED BY MIDWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE—BLASTS WHEAT INTO FLOUR—AFTER COMPRESSED-AIR TREATMENT, FOOD SEEDS ARE EXPLODED IN CYLINDER—WILL ADD PILOT PLANT—PLANS CALL FOR $100,000 EXPENDITURE HERE TO CONTINUE LABORATORY EXPERIMENTS

(By Alvin S. McCoy)

Grain that explodes like a firecracker after being treated with compressed air or other gases forms the basis of a new process announced yesterday by the Midwest Research Institute, which considers the development its outstanding work to date.

Wheat literally has been blasted into flour by compressed air. Oat husks have been peeled off by lesser explosions. Grain sorghums have been shattered into bits.

Harold Vagtborg, president of the regional industrial research organization, believes that the revolutionary process may conceivably "bring improved methods to the milling industry to the advantage of both the miller and the consumer." It might even affect the bread on the table, or the breakfast cereal.

A NEW PROCESS

Scientists working in the collection of laboratory buildings at 4049 Pennsylvania Avenue have hit on something new. They have accomplished "the preferential segregation of the component parts of the grain berry." They have separated husks, bran, germ—the part that starts the roots and plant—and endosperm, or the flour part, with comparative ease.

That, to the scientists, is far more significant than merely being able to blow grain into bits. It has been a tough problem for milling.

The experiments have been carried as far as they can with the present laboratory unit. Plans have been made for the investment of $100,000 in a pilot plant at the institute to continue the tests on a commercial scale. Patent rights have been applied for in the name of the institute. Actual loaves of bread have been baked from "exploded" grain flour.

The process is known as explosive dissociation. It is brand new. No previous record could be found that it ever had been applied to grain before. Its principle is fairly simple.

INTO A METAL CYLINDER

Wheat, or any other grain cereal, for example, is put into a metal cylinder and the lid is screwed on. An ordinary filling station air compressor is started. The air, under pressure, fills the tiny pockets and cells in the grain. An electric motor is started to feed the wheat evenly. When a valve is turned, the wheat shoots like a stream of bullets through a small brass nozzle within the pipe. Instantaneous releasing of the pressure at the other end of the nozzle causes the compressed air in the cells to explode the grain.

Wheat cells are shattered by the violent escaping of the air. That is explosive dissociation. Strange and unexpected things happened. When the grain was examined under a microscope, to the surprise of the researchers, they found that wheat first split into halves, then quarters, and the germ came free.

The experiments have shown, Vagtborg said, that germ-free flour can be made. Some germ usually is retained in the standard grinding processes. Flour with too much

germ has a tendency to spoil, and does not make good bread.

Two batches of flour were run, one completely germ-free and the other with all the germ, or fortified. They were baked into bread in the laboratory of the C. J. Patterson company with several control loaves from regularly-milled wheat. The germ-free flour produced a whole wheat loaf that rated good-minus, or the same as the control loaf. It was slightly gray in color and had a slick crust. The test loaf with the germ remaining produced poor quality bread, as is true of all flour containing too much germ.

DIFFERENCE IN TASTE

Experiments point to the fact that breakfast foods or bread may be produced from exploded grain flour that even has a different taste, Vagtborg said, due to the complete separation.

For more than 8 months tests have been made on various types of grain sorghums, wheat, and oats. Varying humidities, different times of pressurization, different nozzle sizes, and pretreatment of grain with enzymes have been tried.

At the institute today one would see a contraption of pipes that might suggest a Rube Goldberg device, but one that the scientists take very seriously. An air compressor is beating. The process is noisy. When a valve is turned, the apparatus roars. A stream of shattered grain spins into a cyclone cone and drops out the bottom.

The result is a mixture of whole wheat berries, halves, quarters, bran, germ, and clear down to flour sizes. About half the grains are shattered in the first operation. Some flour is obtained. Separation is obtained by a series of screen meshes, shaken in an agitator. The dissociater might be compared to the first set of rollers in a mill. Some flour is obtained with each grinding, the rest is recycled.

NEED PILOT PLANT

"We have reached the stage," Vagtborg said, "where we shall need a large-scale pilot plant at the institute to carry the tests further. We are proposing to invest $50,000 in equipment in a continuous-process plant, and $50,000 in personnel and supplies to carry out commercial tests for 2 years. It is my belief that industrial cereal processors will cooperate with the experiments and assist in the sponsoring."

Plans have been drawn for a continuous-process plant, much like a complete mill, with a series of explosive dissociaters. Flour will be coming from each. There will be separation processes between. The final product will be flour and its byproducts, or experiments may be made at stages in between.

Letter to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PANDIT JAWAHARLAL NEHRU,
Government of India
New Delhi, India

HONORABLE SIR: I note with keenest disappointment and sadness that you are supporting the Arab League in its demand for an independent Arab State in Palestine.

In the cable you sent to the League, you express sympathy for the Jews persecuted by the Nazis, but nonetheless insist that Palestine is an Arab country and should remain so.

Were there no reasons other than humanitarian ones, and there are many, the closing of the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration would still remain one of the cruelest acts of our times. Six million Jews were slaughtered by the Nazis. Had the nefarious White Paper of 1939 which closed Palestine to Jewish immigration not been in effect, many lives would have been saved. After the sufferings of the Jews which the whole world witnessed, it is more than wanton indifference to keep hundreds of thousands of these innocent people in camps, stateless, without dignity and without hope. Only Palestine offers them both security and welcome and the opportunity which is rightfully theirs to begin life anew.

If the world is so constituted today that reasons of humanitarianism leave it cold, then we should examine the legal and political justification for not only the abrogation of this white paper, but for the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish national homeland as well. 52 nations, including the United States, consented to the granting of the mandate over Palestine to Great Britain for the specific purpose of facilitating Jewish immigation therein and for the establishment of a Jewish national home. All of Arabia was freed from Turkish domination by the victorious Allied powers and given independence, either immediately or through relinquishment in due time of class A mandates held by Great Britain and France. All class A mandated territories have received their independence save Palestine which by international covenant was reserved for use as a national homeland for the Jews. Out of the huge Arabian territory, this small land was set aside. So specifically and clearly had that intent of the League of Nations been set forth that when the Palestine white paper of 1939 was promulgated it was denounced by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations as illegal. The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry after an exhaustive study last year likewise maintained that this white paper must be abrogated to permit immigration of the Jews into Palestine. In fact, it has been the conclusion of 19 investigating committees and commissions, both government sponsored and otherwise, that the Jews are in Palestine "by right and not by sufferance."

I cannot quite grasp why you as a courageous leader of your people and with your evident and concrete concern with the well-being of all peoples have not taken into consideration the obvious social and economic benefits Jewish colonization in Palestine has brought both to the Jews and Arabs of that area. It is an established fact that Palestinian Arabs have the highest standard of living in the Middle East. It is likewise establish that the Arabs of Palestine have achieved a level of social and scientific progress beyond that of their neighbors in adjoining territory.

I can hardly believe it possible that you with your statesmanship and zeal for the welfare of the downtrodden would place yourself on the side of those interests which resist the social and economic development in the East and which fear the awakening of the populations of that area. I surely thought that you with your acute imagination would visualize the development of that country which had been so barren prior to Jewish colonization for the benefit of all peoples therein. The evidence is there before us how the will and the labor and the planning of the Jews in Palestine have already begun that development.

I, of course, realize the difficult plight in which India finds itself, torn as it is by factional and religious strife. I realize that peace in India is difficult without the good will of 90,000,000 Moslems, but I assure you that your statement on Palestine will make no difference to Mohammed Ali Jinnah. I am sure your statement is a matter of political experience. I am sure too that it is utterly foreign to your philosophy. I feel that to this political expediency you have sacrificed principle.

You have expressed sympathy for the Jews, but, of course, verbal sympathy will not save human souls.

I write thusly with great reluctance, but I am compelled to do so by my sense of duty. I write also as one with the deepest feeling for India and her people. I have not hesitated to join in the fight for India's independence and have espoused this cause both in and out of the halls of the United States Congress. I authored the congressional act which placed India within our immigration quota and permitted the entrance thereunder of Indians and their naturalization when resident here. It is my intention to do much more to bridge the chasm that exists between your people and mine. Not infrequently I am called upon by your people in this country to come to their aid and I have been happy and privileged to help on more than one occasion. I have advocated consistently the consummation of a treaty of trade and friendship between our two countries. The trader, for example, from India has none of the benefits accorded traders from other countries protected by trade treaties. I am certain my activities on behalf of the people of India are not unknown to you.

I shall continue to act for the best interests of both our peoples, despite the political opposition I encounter. This is so deeply a matter of principle.

I regret deeply that you deemed it necessary to aline yourself with the Arab League in the matter of Palestine.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of April 19, 1947:

OUR SAFETY IS THE ISSUE, NOT ALIEN ISMS

The debate brought on by President Truman's proposed aid to Greece and Turkey illustrates the confusion inherited from past propaganda efforts to base foreign policy upon ideology instead of upon American security. The debate also suggests how much better ordered these things were in the days when certain concepts, like our Monroe Doctrine and Britain's defense of the Empire life line, were understood, and did not have to be laid on the line in crude terms almost certain to be interpreted as hostile by other countries.

Mr. Truman describes his policy as "support to free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure," but he also makes it plain that "the security of the United States" is our reason for action. To base our aid to Greece, Turkey, nationalist China or Brazil on ideological grounds, as certain commentators pretend to think we are doing, would lead to the same confusions which have grown up out of the propaganda fiction that Russia was being aided during the war because she was democratic, rather than because her millions of soldiers were mowing down Germans. Even the "Truman

doctrine," which is and has to be "power politics," is presented as some sort of crusade. In such circumstances it is not remarkable that people tangle themselves up in arguments over the relative democracy of the controlling elements in Greece, Turkey, Argentina and Soviet Russia—ignoring the far more important strategy of power politics of the situation. If a universal war against communism is the issue, why have we spent 2 years trying to force Communists on Chiang Kai-shek, and why did we fight a war which has resulted in the spread of Communist regimes all over the place?

The answer is that the westward march of the Soviet Union is a worry to the United States, and that this would be true even if the Soviet Union's present tactics were carried out by a government conservative enough to be headed by Senator WHERRY in an astrakhan hat. Furthermore, support for Greece and Turkey is not a reward for their qualities as liberals, but is offered because geography makes Greece and Turkey our babies in that part of the world. The British Empire would not have lasted for 200 years if its leaders had got into rows over the relative democracy of the Bey of Tunis and the Khedive of Egypt. What the British wanted to know was whether this or that quaint character in a fez was their man. The Russian play it the same way.

If our policy is at last to be related to American security first and to ideological conceptions later, our officials will have to smarten up their education so that the more flagrant inconsistencies can be avoided. It would be pretty foolish to hope to contain the Soviet Union by supporting Greece and turkey, while going out of our way to support Soviet puppet governments in Yugoslavia and Poland. And it would be even more stupid to hold the line in Turkey and permit Russia to gain Germany's war potential. Only a few weeks ago, the War Department, over General MacArthur's protest, permitted a delegation of the World Federation of Trade Unions—the outfit through which Russia hopes to infiltrate her line into labor movements all over the world—to visit Japan. If we are to contain Soviet imperialism in Europe, it is hard to see why we should facilitate its propaganda operations in Asia.

Once the strategic realities behind what we are attempting are understood, it will be easier to support a realistic power-politics policy, keyed where possible to reliance upon the United Nations and certainly to coordination with British policy. We can then laugh off hysterical deviations from American principles like Secretary Schwellenbach's demand that Communist candidates be excluded from the ballot in the United States. We have at least been liberated from the dangerous complacency into which propaganda had lulled us. To avoid eclipse and at the same time maintain peace will tax the skill of our national leaders to the utmost. That they have begun to tell the truth is at least a partial encouragement.

Appropriations for Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I would like to tell you about a letter I received from Charlie Tye. Charlie Tye is a sort of an institution in the East Bay area of California. Charlie Tye is a big fellow with a friendly grin, knows everybody and likes people. He is a human individual. Charlie is a rabid sportsman. He broadcasts at the ball games. He encourages clean sport among the kids because he has a boy of his own and knows the meaning of clean sports to clean kids. Everybody likes Charlie Tye and Charlie Tye likes everybody. During the war he published a four-page paper that was sent free of charge to the boys in service. It was a clearing house for the news avidly devoured by them. It carried items about the fellows who were inseparable, fellows who played on the same softball team and now found themselves serving on different continents the width of the world between them. Charlie knew what they liked and he gave it to them. It was full of homey, homely gossip. You see, Charlie Tye has a boy and he knew what that boy liked. That boy was in the service and he was intensely proud of that service. That boy is now in a Veterans' Administration hospital as a result of his service. Charlie goes to see him regularly. He knows his doctors, his nurses, the orderlies, and the people around the hospital because he is vitally concerned with the treatment his son is getting, just as he is vitally concerned with the treatment other men in that hospital and in the hospitals throughout the United States are getting.

I received an interesting letter from Charlie Tye the other day dealing with the subject of hospitalization and drawn from his own broad experience with that subject. I commend it to you because I think it is good reading. I think it has a message we all might gain by reading. Here is Charlie's letter:

OAKLAND, CALIF., *April 29, 1947.*
Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND GEORGE: As you know my son has been a patient at the Palo Alto veteran's hospital since his return from the Navy service.

I have been a frequent visitor to see him and have closely observed the attendants, nurses, doctors, and the general service and so forth.

I want you to know I think those people are doing a great service to our boys, and I am entirely satisfied with the treatment accorded my son, even though he is still in bad condition, but I know it's no fault of theirs. They have tried every method known to aid him.

Today I learned that Congress is contemplating cutting the appropriations of the veterans' hospitals. George if you could visit these places and see the yeoman service being rendered to these poor unfortunate souls, you would yell to the high heaven against such a short-sighted and selfish action.

Instead of cutting, Congress should increase the amount of money so that these doctors, nurses, and attendants could have the proper number of helpers to aid them in their work.

There is much to learn about the care of the sick-minded, and our mental institution doctors are in a real good position to learn if we give them the tools to work with.

If we can spend billions on war, we should be able to spend millions on the care of the boys who were injured through war, and to find better methods to take care of all our citizens through the knowledge gained in our hospitals.

Palo Alto has a healthy climate, with a wonderful site, but they need more athletic rehabilitation directors, more attendants, more doctors, more nurses, and more equipment.

George, you know many people cannot express themselves, and so perhaps you never hear of our boys in the hospitals, but having a personal interest, I feel that I speak for thousands of parents and for those who work in the hospitals, when I say, "let's give the veterans' hospitals all they need to do a job, which every good American will applaud.

My best wishes to you and your family.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLIE TYE.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN GORSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the following resolution passed at a huge rally of Americans of Polish descent at Humboldt Park, Chicago, Ill., commemorating Polish Constitution Day:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL POLISH THIRD OF MAY CONSTITUTION COMMEMORATION, MAY 4, 1947, AT HUMBOLDT PARK, IN CHICAGO, ILL.

We, 100,000 Americans of Polish descent, massed in a rally under the auspices of the Polish National Alliance at the statue of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Revolutionary hero of Poland and of the United States, in Humboldt Park, Chicago, Ill., to commemorate the anniversary of the Polish May 3 Constitution.

Being imbued with the spirit of genuine liberalism that emanates from that great document, moved by its concept of moral right and stirred by its faith in the dignity of the common man, stand apprehensive of the Communist forces that imperil these ideals and menace our American democracy, and thereupon resolve these declarations:

1. We approve wholeheartedly the new doctrine enunciated by President Truman to quarantine communism by bringing immediate aid to Greece and Turkey and urge the Congress to effect quick passage of the bill embodying that program. To implement that doctrine more fully it is necessary that such aid be also extended to other countries such as Poland where the people are in mortal struggle with their Communist oppressors.

2. We commend the House Committee on Un-American Activities led by Representative THOMAS for its fearless and vigorous campaign to expose and prosecute members of the Soviet fifth-column operating in this country. The activities of termites that would bore into the framework of our institutions from within must be relentlessly suppressed.

3. We support bill H. R. 2910 introduced by Representative STRATTON which would admit the 400,000 displaced persons from Europe into the United States through the application of the unused immigration quotas of the last war years. Admission of these victims of Nazi cruelty and Soviet despotism would not only be in the finest tradition of our noble history but would strengthen the moral fibers of our Nation in its challenge against totalitarianism, revitalize our national economy, and atone for the Allied blunders that aggravated their plight.

4. We urge most strongly President Truman and the Congress to reject the recent

proposal of Secretary of State Marshall made at the Moscow Conference to partition Poland again by revising her western borders in favor of our German foe. The proposal is inherently wrong and is in utter disregard for the bitter lessons of history. Return of these Polish western lands to Germany would not spell the desired political stability and economic health of Europe but would inevitably plunge the world into another conflagration.

These western lands cannot be considered as compensation for the much greater Polish eastern territory seized by Soviet Russia. That seizure was criminal and cannot ever be sanctioned or condoned by any amount of compensation. Moreover, the western lands have always been culturally and economically an integral part of Poland since the tenth century except when seized and held by German military might and now at best can constitute but small compensation for the unprecedented pillage and destruction inflicted by Germany upon the land and people of our Polish ally.

These western lands, having now been resettled by 4,000,000 Poles with the full approval of the allies, are fast becoming interrelated with Polish economy that will redound to the general peacetime stability of western Europe.

The severance of these lands in favor of our German enemy would discredit the democratic forces in Poland and diabolically enough thrust the Polish Nation into the monstrous Communist empire which is even now striving to absorb it.

5. The fundamental evil responsibility for the European disintegration can be traced to the infamous Yalta deal where great principles were compromised for questionable political expediency. Now only a swift disavowal of the Yalta pact will restore European cohesion and equilibrium.

Let us strive to effect the withdrawal of the Red forces from Poland and the other countries of eastern Europe, recognize the sovereign independence of the Baltic nations, restore the eastern lands of Poland—about which issue there prevails such morbid silence—bring about the free and unfettered elections in Communist-dominated countries and the secretary's objective for a peaceful and stable Europe will at once become a reality.

6. The current congressional debate to bar all nations under Soviet domination from participation of the administration's $350,000,000 foreign-relief bill ought not to be applied to the Polish Nation. For that nation was saddled with a Soviet-dominated regime by the Allies themselves contrary to its will and desire. We, therefore, beseech our Government to extend the proposed relief to the destitute people of Poland provided that it is administered under strict American supervision to assure its fair distribution.

7. To former Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane for his forthright and undaunted stand in behalf of the Polish Nation and for his stirring patriotic address here, we express our deep thanks and sincere gratitude. May his clarion call for national unity and concerted action against the spreading menace of communism find a resounding echo in the hearts of all Americans.

May Providence in these perilous times bless our Government with wisdom, foresight, and daring and endow our Nation with moral strength and bodily vigor that our world responsibilities might be discharged with dignity and honor.

We, on this Constitution Day, aware of our liberal heritage, rededicate ourselves to the preservation of our American way of life and to the constant vigil of world peace and American security.

CHARES ROZMAREK,
Chairman.
JOSEPH WOJCIK,
Secretary.

Veterans' Administration

REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to read this morning that General Bradley has announced he will not quit his Veterans' Administration job until the job is done. It has been very confusing to everyone in the Veterans' Administration to feel that he may resign any minute. I am sure every Member of Congress wants to help him in the tremendous job he is doing.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter written by General Bradley to his assistant and deputy administrators. I hope every Member of this House will take the time to read and study this letter. It sets forth, clearly and understandingly, the general's aims and policies:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1947.

To All Assistant and Deputy Administrators:

Next week I shall go before Congress to show why we shall need $7,000,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration in 1948.

However justified our requirements may be, those vast expenditures offer a challenge to reductions in Government spending. The billions of dollars involved can too easily create false hopes for large-scale savings. Even the accepted necessity for our veterans' program cannot save the Veterans' Administration from becoming a target in this effort to reduce the budget.

The Veterans' Administration has sought reductions wherever those reductions might be made without imperiling our operations. But if further reductions in the name of economy threaten to cripple our program and dull its objectives, I feel it my duty to point out the danger. Where reductions in readjustment expenditures might result in the waste of human resources, where reductions in expenditures for hospital treatment might threaten standards of medical care, I shall oppose such reductions and defend the budget we shall need.

Our role unfortunately is an awkward one. At a time when other agencies can trim their budgets to peacetime needs, we are compelled to increase ours to pay for the effects of war. As far as expenditures for veterans are concerned, the war has only begun. We cannot hold out a promise of near or substantial reductions and at the same time provide the services and benefits voted by Congress. It is not possible to legislate benefits on one hand and refuse to pay their costs on the other. It would be folly for the American people to anticipate anything other than a period of unprecedented high expenditure for veterans' benefits for half a decade or more.

The pattern of this spending has already been set. During the next fiscal year, taxpayers will pay approximately 20 cents out of each Federal tax dollar for benefits to veterans. This proportion will increase before it begins to slacken. Our Veterans' Administration budget for the next year alone almost equals the entire cost of Federal Government in 1939.

An expenditure of this magnitude presents incredible dangers of waste in the administrative procedures this program entails. It will tax each employee of the Veterans' Administration with the sternest responsibility for competent, effective, and intelligent administration of those funds.

I have no doubt that Congress and the American people will pay willingly for the benefits voted veterans of this and previous wars. But they will not tolerate excessively high administrative costs. They will not tolerate extravagance and waste. And certainly they will not tolerate surplus or incompetent employees.

In appropriating funds for these activities of ours, Congress must also find the taxes that will support them. To warrant those tax levies on the people, Congress must determine to its own satisfaction that our appropriations are merited and just. For this reason, it becomes the duty of Congress to scrutinize our program and to direct wherever it can reductions in personnel and cost.

If I am shown that any of our estimates are needlessly high or inflated, I shall be the first to agree in cutting them down. For while I am determined to achieve our objectives, I am also determined to reach them at the lowest possible cost.

Our $7,000,000,000 budget for 1948 is divided into three principal parts.

Approximately $5,275,000,000—or 75 percent of the entire budget will go in the payment of direct cash benefits to veterans and their dependents. These benefits consist principally of pensions, compensation, educational subsistence, and readjustment allowance.

Approximately $1,365,000,000—or 19 percent of the entire budget will go in the form of indirect benefits to veterans. These benefits include the cost of medical, hospital and domiciliary care, educational tuition and counseling, vocational rehabilitation, hospital construction, veteran travel, and insurance.

Approximately $430,000,000—or 6 percent of the entire budget will be devoted to administrative costs—excluding the medical service. This expenditure includes salaries, office rentals, printing, travel, and such items as administrative supplies and equipment.

Administrative costs are a burdensome but essential part of any Government operation. This is particularly true in the Veterans' Administration where we administer an intricate and complex program involving a wide variety of benefits and laws.

The $5,275,000,000 payable in cash to veterans and their dependents is a charge for which Congress has already obligated the American people by law. This obligation cannot be reduced without changes in the law.

Of the $1,375,000,000 requested for indirect benefits to veterans, the greatest sum will go for the payment of tuition for approximately 2,000,000 students in schools and for the payment of medical care for patients in our Veterans' Administration hospitals and out-patient clinics.

It is true that this latter expenditure could be reduced by lowering our standards of medical care. However, I cannot countenance any reduction that might imperil our medical program and endanger the results we have obtained. If the American people risk this program to decay in their effort to save money, they shall reckon its cost the rest of their lives in the loss of health and human resources. I shall not be party to any retrenchment that might threaten to drag this agency into the backwaters of American medicine.

During the last 20 months since VJ-day we have been struggling through an emergency phase of our work. At the very time we were compelled to reorganize, decentralize, and expand, we were confronted with our heaviest burdens. Within 20 months more than 12,000,000 veterans emerged from the armed services. In addition to compensation, insurance, and medical care, millions of them sought benefits of the virtually untried Readjustment Act.

From the outset we looked upon the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as emergency legislation designed to meet the emergency brought on by demobilization. I did not hold you to penny-wise administration of the law, but asked that you do the job as promptly, effectively, and as inexpensively as you could. The speed with which we tackled the task resulted in some waste, some inefficiency, and some extravagance. This is unavoidable in an emergency operation. Even waste was preferable, however, to the loss that might have resulted had we concentrated on costs instead of results. The results indicate that in 20 months we have already come a surprisingly long way:

1. Medicine in the Veterans' Administration has advanced until today it ranks as the outstanding medical program in the world. Veterans entering our hospitals are assured of treatment at the hands of physicians who are among the most qualified in the Nation. This goal has been achieved primarily because the doctors of this country responded wholeheartedly to our call for help and brought into our hospitals the vast resources of their skills, training, and knowledge. We met this crisis, not because we depended upon ourselves but because we said, "This is not a problem for the Veterans' Administration. It is a problem for American medicine. More than that, it is a problem for the American people." This achievement, made possible through the fullest use of outside resources, is our best example of the new thinking and the new technique that should guide all operations in the Veterans' Administration.

2. In 20 months we have discharged more than 685,000 patients from our rapidly growing hospital system. With improved medical care, we have more than doubled the rate of turn-over in patients. We have added more than 23,000 hospital beds in VA hospitals alone. We have provided almost 8,000,000 out-patient examinations. We have given almost 6,000,000 out-patient treatments.

3. We have established 13 branch offices for supervision and control of local operations. We have opened 14 new regional offices and have moved 28 regional offices from remote locations to downtown centers of metropolitan areas. We have established 721 contact offices in the smaller towns and 305 advisement and guidance centers. We have opened 29 additional hospitals, including surplus Army and Navy institutions. We have opened 152 out-patient clinics and 31 clinics for mental hygiene.

4. During this same period we have handled more than 5,500,000 pension and compensation cases for veterans and their dependents. We have paid more than $1,865,000,000 in disability benefits.

5. In 20 months we have guaranteed $3,875,000,000 worth of veterans' loans on homes, businesses and farms.

6. We have paid out more than $2,000,000,000 in readjustment allowances.

7. In 20 months we have handled almost 6,500,000 applications for education and training. We have paid out more than $2,000,000,000 in subsistence and tuition.

Most important, we have been able to meet with only rare exceptions the demands of more than 14,000,000 veterans of World War II during the critical period of their readjustment. We can take some satisfaction in knowing that our work has substantially aided the rapid return of more than 11,000,000 veterans to jobs and the enrollment at one time or another of approximately 3,200,000 veterans in education and training. All this has been accomplished without any significant failure or serious break-down within the Veterans' Administration.

We have now completed this emergency growth.

The emergency phase of our work is ended; a new high-production period has just begun.

Although we have leveled off in size, there has been no slow-up in our work. We have reached the point where we can put greater emphasis on more efficient production and strive for steadily increasing quality.

For the duration of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, there is little likelihood of any substantial cut-back in our need for personnel funds. However, when the life of this act eventually runs out, we can anticipate sizable reductions in both employees and in costs. This will signal the start of a third or peacetime cycle in our work. Even during that period, however, reductions in readjustment services will be offset partially by increases in the medical and compensation programs provided by existing laws.

During the new high-production period we have entered, the tempo of our activity will be governed considerably by the economic climate of the Nation. As long as we maintain prosperity levels of employment and income, veterans will have lesser need for their readjustment benefits. However, if an economic recession should strike the Nation, the Veterans' Administration will be confronted with a new and critical period of emergency. Readjustment allowances would be called upon to support jobless veterans during their period of unemployment. And it is probable that education and training benefits would be sought by many other veterans in their effort to ride out a recession.

In spite of the rapid strides we have made in the Veterans' Administration during the emergency readjustment period, I am disturbed by reports of failure to render service. I know that in an undertaking as huge as this, we can never reach perfection. But too often when I am called before Congress to explain our personnel requirements, I am confronted with examples of carelessness and delay in the performance of our work. We must remember that we shall be judged not so much by our accomplishments as by our deficiencies.

Now more than ever before we must concentrate on prompt and direct service to veterans. We are dealing with men, not procedures; with their problems, not ours. We must constantly seek to understand those personal problems and exercise the imagination to solve them. We cannot permit administrative difficulties to obscure the objectives of our work. We shall not do our job as it should be done until we remember that the end is more important than the means, that every bit of work must contribute something to the welfare of the veteran.

When I came into this agency on VJ-day, I recognized that we faced a period of crisis which we could not survive without the trust and confidence of the American people. We asked them to be patient with us and to endure delays while we sought to modernize and expand the machinery for this job. I can no longer ask for more patience. The public has a right to expect prompt, courteous, and efficient service from the Veterans' Administration. More than ever before, I must hold each assistant and deputy administrator individually responsible for the efficiency of services under his direction. I am not at all unmindful of the strenuous effort most of you have already put into this job. But I doubt that any of you are as yet satisfied—any more than I—with what we have achieved.

One of the purposes of decentralization was to give managers in the field authority to handle their local problems promptly. Central office retained only the responsibility for determining policy and for supervising the program through deputy administrators. In general, this practice has achieved the gains we sought from it. However, I am still concerned with the failure of some employees to exercise their full authority in meeting local problems. Sometimes this may have been due to confused instructions from central office, to complicated directions and befuddled language. In still other instances this is due to unwarranted timidity on the part of officials themselves. There are still too many people who would rather pass the buck than make their own decisions.

Muddy language is not confined to policies alone. Each of you has seen replies to simple questions in which the meaning was lost through hopelessly obscure wording. When a person writes to the Veterans' Administration he is entitled to an easily understood, frank, and courteous reply. If our replies cannot be understood, they are not only not worth writing but they simply create additional work.

During the period of expansion when we were forced to add more than 150,000 new employees to the Veterans' Administration we suffered from understandably low worker production. Now that these employees have been trained in their tasks we must expect greater and more efficient output. There is no room in the Veterans' Administration for negligent or incompetent employees.

In an activity as vast as the Veterans' Administration we are cursed with the problems of bigness. In view of the number of employees required to supervise the work of others, in view of the overhead required to keep our machinery in order, there is the danger that we may become so involved in the tools and crafts of administration that not enough of our effort is expended directly in aid to the veteran.

When I came to the Veterans' Administration I said that we wanted men and women who would keep their eyes on the human needs of the veteran. I am told that some employees have drifted away from this objective, that they have permitted red tape to blind their vision and obstruct their judgment.

This rigidity, this unyielding attitude, on the part of some employees who put their methods before results, who employ the letter of regulations without applying their common sense, is at the root of many problems that leap up to confront us.

There is likewise an unfortunate tendency on the part of some employees to look on their jobs with almost divine right. The Veterans' Administration is not a proprietary bureaucracy. It belongs to the people, not to the employees. We are simply servants of the public, ordained to represent their wishes through administration of the laws of Congress.

I am making this letter public not only because it marks a new phase in our work but because any matter of vital concern to this program is also a matter of vital concern to the American people. They have ordered this program and they will be paying the bill. They have a right to know what their money is buying. It is as important that we represent the American people in the administration of this program as it is that Congress represent the American people in the enactment of its laws.

Many of you have probably been reading in the newspapers that I am tired and discouraged and want to quit. I am no more tired than many of you. Certainly I am not discouraged. I mean to do my best and I shall not quit of my own accord until my job is finished.

Sincerely,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a great help to us and a great help to the veterans if, as a result of General Bradley's directive, official correspondence is clarified and simplified. When veterans write the Veterans' Administration they are often told things that are extremely confusing. That is one reason why the men have had such difficulty with their insurance, and why many have allowed it to

lapse. They have received the same letter over and over again from the Veterans' Administration regarding reinstatement. If his men carry out General Bradley's orders, we will have a much better administration.

Long Beach Federal Savings and Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, the unwarranted confiscation of the solvent $26,000,000 Long Beach Federal Savings and the $43,000,000 solvent Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles have jeopardized the homes and savings of 24,000 people in my district. Such seizures and confiscations by public officials of solvent financial institutions without notice, without hearings, and without cause, for the purpose of reprisal and intimidation as disclosed in testimony before a committee of the Congress, render officials responsible for these outrages unfit for public office.

Nine months ago a congressional investigating committee, after full hearing, recommended return of both of the above-named seized institutions. These recommendations have not been carried out.

Therefore, on Friday, May 2, I introduced a resolution requesting the removal of John H. Fahey and Harold Lee as officials of Federal Home Loan Bank Administration. This is the exact resolution introduced some time ago by the Honorable Cecil King and its reintroduction is by agreement between us. It is unfortunate that this Congress, with its multiplicity of problems, should be burdened by such maladministration on the part of executive agencies and with having to air such flagrant abuses of authority which go to the very foundations of our democracy.

I hope that prompt action by this Congress may be accomplished to rescue the homes and savings of 24,000 citizens of my district.

The conclusions and recommendations of the congressional committee are as follows:

CONCLUSION

The action here complained of was not only a disservice to the Government but also a greater disservice to the people for the protection of whose rights and affairs our Government exists. Should the time come when our Government is incapable of discharging that fundamental function, it must cease to exist in the form and for the purpose for which it was founded. The same end is inevitable for any endeavor with which the Government is identified. The necessity for unquestioned rectitude of purpose and sound, just, and impartial administration of governmental endeavor is paramount.

The Federal Home Loan Bank System was created to meet a need which the Nation experienced. It is a potential factor in the era which lies ahead of us. The functions of this Government agency loom up as far more important in the future than it has ever been. Unless its administration is elevated to a higher esteem and undergoes decided improvements, its efficiency will be seriously impaired.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of your committee are—

(1) That the Commissioner revoke the order reducing the number of districts from 12 to 11 in the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

(2) That the Commissioner take all necessary steps to reestablish a Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles and a Federal Home Loan Bank of Portland, and revoke the order or orders by which the assets of these two district banks were intermingled.

(3) Should the Commissioner, in the light of the evidence adduced before your committee, still adhere to the opinion that the number of districts should be reduced from 12 to 11, and is still of the opinion that he has the legal authority to reduce the number of districts, he should proceed to give due notice of such intention to all of the associations in the area affected, hold hearings, and give due weight to the recommendations of the officials of the banks involved and to the views of the associations which are members of the regional banks affected, and should likewise take into consideration the views of the industry generally. Any sudden and unheralded action, such as that taken in the case of the Los Angeles bank, is certain to have an unfavorable effect on the confidence of the public in the institutions involved.

(4) That the Commissioner revoke the order appointing a conservator for the Federal Savings and Loan Association of Long Beach and restore the assets and affairs of the association to its duly elected management, and render a proper accounting for the same, as expeditiously as is consistent with judicial determination of the questions at issue. Your committee questions whether the law ever contemplated that the Board should have the extraordinary power to seize and appoint a conservator for a solvent institution as a part of the supervisory functions entrusted to the Board over member banks.

(5) That the appropriate committees of Congress give consideration to the necessity (if, in the opinion of such committees, the necessity exists) of amending the Federal Home Loan Act in the following particulars:

(a) Clarifying the authority of the Board in the matter of approval of elective officers of the regional banks to the end that neither the Board nor other officials may exercise such authority arbitrarily.

(b) Clarifying the authority of the Board or the Administrator to increase or decrease the number of regional banks, and specifying the conditions and procedure under which such changes may be made.

(c) Prohibiting the agency from appointing conservators for any member association except under specific and well-defined limitations.

(6) It developed in the hearings that the order relating to the appointment of a conservator for the Federal Savings and Loan Association of Long Beach had not been filed with the Federal Register, as required by law. The Division of the Federal Register advised your committee that only on three occasions has the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration complied with the requirement that its orders be filed with the Federal Register. Your committee further recommends that the Administrator comply with the law in their respect in the future.

HOWARD W. SMITH, *Virginia.*
JOHN J. DELANEY, *New York.*
HUGH PETERSON, *Georgia.*
ALBERT GORE, *Tennessee.*
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr., *New Jersey.*
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., *Tennessee.*
CLARE E. HOFFMAN, *Michigan.*

In addition to Resolution No. 203 to remove these undesirable officials, I have introduced other bills, Nos. 3301 and 3302, to supplement pending legislation to fulfill the unanimous recommendations of the investigating congressional committee.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey reports from his district that the people of that district with whom he has conferred wish to fight communism in this country first.

I yield to no man in the United States in my desire to stamp out communism in this country. In fact, in my opinion, one of the excellent byproducts of the bill we are about to consider will be that it will tend to cause the communistically inclined people of this country to stop, look, and listen. I cannot help but wonder, as I heard the gentleman's report from his people, how they would have felt had we waited to fight Hitler first in this country?

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 4:

AVOIDING A BLUNDER

It is not so much the bill to aid Greece and Turkey as the Rules Committee which has been saved by its belated decision to let this measure go to the floor of the House. The bill could not have been bottled up by the rule-makers without bringing an avalanche of wrath upon their heads. More than a week ago it was reported favorably to the House by that body's Foreign Affairs Committee with only one outright dissent and one plea for amendment. Of course, the Foreign Affairs Committee is the only House group which has a right to pass upon the merits of legislation in this sphere before it reaches the House itself. Had the Rules Committee undertaken to veto what Foreign Affairs had done, such a high-handed usurpation would certainly have brought demands for stripping the committee of dictatorial power, and such demands would have had strong support among both House Members and the rank and file of citizens.

We think that Chairman Leo E. Allen, of the Rules Committee is entitled to a good deal of credit for subordinating his personal opposition to the bill to his sense of duty in letting the House vote on it. The same can be said for Representative HARNESS, who is reported to have voted to send the measure to the floor in spite of personal dislike for it. Yet these men have merely acted in accord with the proper function of the committee on which they serve. Their task is to facilitate the movement of important legislation through the House—not to sit as supercensors on every important bill that is approved by the legislative committees. We hope that their action will be regarded as a precedent whenever the committee is tempted to arrogate to itself the so-called "gag" power that it has so frequently exercised in the past.

As for the aid bill itself, it is obvious that the House should lose no more time in

enacting it. The opponent's next move will be to destroy or impair it by means of amendments. Some of these may seem plausible, but their effect would be to tie the hands of the Administration in carrying out a policy of inestimable importance. Congress is naturally concerned that the money be wisely spent and that as much as possible of it shall be devoted to actual reconstruction in war-torn Greece. But wise administration cannot be guaranteed by attaching restrictive amendments to an authorization bill. It can come only from the selection of an able and fearless administrative staff having the full confidence of the President and congressional leaders. The greatest contribution that Congress could make, in our opinion, would be for all of its members to recognize the Truman doctrine for the momentous policy that it is and to stop trifling with it as if it amounted to only the creation of a Mediterranean WPA.

Greco-Turkish Loan

REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have been accused many times of being mistaken. I have been accused many times of being wrong, but I have never been accused of being inconsistent. I voted in the first place against lend-lease. I did not believe that if we provided the tools, as Mr. Churchill suggested, we would not have to provide the men. I voted against UNRRA and every appropriation for UNRRA. I voted against the British loan. Today I do not need tell you how I am going to vote on this Greco-Turkish loan.

Mr. Speaker, the $400,000,000 lend-lease request for Greece and Turkey is the first step in the 3-year program of world rehabilitation that will cost American taxpayers at least $21,000,000,000. This estimate is made by conservative authorities in the field of world finance. If we extend this new lend-lease aid to Greece and Turkey we will be forced to follow through with a complete program of world rehabilitation as a part of our new policy to stop Russia now.

If we do this, however, we should not lose sight of the fact that the financial burden we are assuming is not the whole burden. This new foreign policy will mean that we must continue to export huge quantities of scarce goods—food, clothing, fats and oils, sugar, farm machinery, and so forth—thereby boosting prices of these scarce articles higher and higher. It is estimated that the program will require us to export between thirteen and fourteen billion dollars' worth of goods each year for the next 3 years. This will result in an ever-increasing spiral of price and wage boosts, with their attendant labor frictions and work stoppages.

President Truman's new foreign policy, if adopted, will also mean that Uncle Sam accepts the role of world policeman; that from now on he will have to furnish the military might required to stop trouble wherever and whenever it arises in any corner of the world. It will mean that he has taken over the responsibilities and obligations that we had hoped a strong United Nations organization would assume and carry. The world now recognizes the fact that the UN is a weak reed, and so Uncle Sam is being called upon to feed the world, to finance the world, to police the world, and to support the world, in order to same the world from communism.

We saved the world from Hitlerism at a cost of $300,000,000,000, plus thousands of lives, and "blood, sweat, and tears." Now we are asked to save the world from communism at a cost that can neither be estimated nor predicted. Before taking the first step we should ask ourselves, "Is Uncle Sam strong enough to do all this, even if he should be willing to do it?"

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the San Francisco World Peace Conference many Members of Congress urged that the United States, with England and other peace-loving nations, should offer the following amendments to the Charter of the proposed United Nations Peace Organization, and demand that they be adopted:

(a) Abolish the veto power in the Security Council.

(b) Require all nations to agree to world-wide inspection upon atomic energy development.

(c) Agree upon a world-wide limitation of armaments.

We suggested that if Russia refused to agree to these amendments, or safeguards, and walked out of the Conference, the United States and England, with the other peace-loving nations, constituting at that time at least 70 percent of the world's military power, should go ahead and complete the UN, leaving Russia on the outside. After the organization was set up and functioning then Russia should be given the opportunity to come in or stay out as she desired. However, if she remained outside and thereafter disturbed the peace of the world—as she has done in the Balkans, Greece, Turkey, China, and elsewhere—the UN could brand her as an aggressor nation and throw the military might of the rest of the world against her. Our recommendation would have forced Russia to join the UN or commit national suicide if and when she became an aggressor nation. The recent stalemate at the Moscow Conference, as a result of Stalin's attitude, causes the same Members of Congress who recommended that action at the San Francisco Conference to wonder if it is too late to act now.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing prospective aid from the United States with an American representative, a prominent Arab of the Middle East said:

> All we are interested in is how many dollars will we get and when.

This statement expresses the general attitude of Europe, of the Middle East, and of the Far East. If we assume financial and economic responsibility for the rest of the world in an effort to stop the spread of communism, what will the program cost?

Since VE-day we have spent on International commitments between $8,000,000,000 and $9,000,000,000. That is the net amount of our postwar capital exports to date, and that is only the beginning. We are committed to extend further credits to foreign countries of approximately $12,000,000,000. There is no knowing when these distressed countries will be able to stand upon their own feet and pay their own way, as evidences of this condition in both England and France are much worse today than they were a year ago when we provided them with their first postwar loans. This means that both England and France will each soon be asking for another sizable loan to further bolster up their tottering financial and economic systems.

Summing up the serious world situation in which we find ourselves today, and the part the United States is expected to play in straightening out that world situation, I use the words of Chester D. Trip in his economic trend-line studies of April 30, 1947:

> An improverished world needs our help. But that help must not bankrupt the benefactor by raising domestic prices sky high. And with or without such help, the world can survive peace only if it works out its own troubles, concentrating on the burning problems of the present instead of chasing after Utopian ideals of the future.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed Italian peace treaty is a very drastic one. If ratified in its present form, Italy will be rendered helpless before her Communist-dominated neighbor, Yugoslavia, whose dictator ruler, Tito, is a Charlie McCarthy for Stalin. Thus the provisions of the Italian peace treaty, that we have agreed to, go absolutely contrary to President Truman's announced policy in connection with aid for Greece and Turkey. On the one hand we strengthen Stalin's hands by weakening Italy, and on the other hand we propose to strengthen Greece and Turkey in order to block Tito and Stalin. Does this make sense? Can Uncle Sam ride with the hounds and run with the hare at one and the same time?

Mr. Speaker, how long can our capitalistic system last under the continuous drain that has been placed upon it? England has gone the way of all Europe, at least she has deserted the capitalistic system and become a hybrid government, half democratic and half totalitarian. She has at the same time gone on relief. Not only has she gone on relief herself, but she is asking us to place her former dependent nations—Greece, Turkey, Iraq, and Iran—on our relief rolls. The idea of placing these impoverished nations on our relief rolls is to keep them from falling into the outstretched totalitarian arms of the U. S. S. R.

Democracy is dead in Europe. It died of war wounds. Democracy as we know it never existed in Asia. Democracy in South America exists in name only, because dictatorship is the order of the day south of the Rio Grande. In view of these facts we should devote all our efforts to preserving democracy at home. In order to do so we must keep our finan-

cial house in order; we must keep financially strong and solvent; we must not dissipate our strength nor our resources in trying to revive democracy in other parts of the world. If we weaken ourselves in an effort to revive democracy elsewhere, the last stronghold of democracy will become an easy victim for totalitarianism, the enemy of democracy.

In an address at Springfield, Ill., on January 27, 1837, Lincoln said:

If danger ever threatens us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher.

Lincoln's words are prophetic. In the light of that warning uttered over 100 years ago, perhaps we should today stop, look, and listen.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a digest of the deliberations of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D. C., during the past week, as reported by the Associated Press and published in the Washington Post of date May 4, 1947. The article follows:

FUNDS TO DEVELOP RESOURCES OF UNITED STATES URGED BY RIVERS GROUP

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress requested yesterday adequate appropriations for all phases of our national resources development program.

It said in a resolution:

"We appeal to the Congress of the United States not to be swayed by the hysterical and verbose cries of advocates of a false economy which would deprive great sections of our Nation of funds for protection from devastating floods; would deny the necessary monies to keep open important arteries of commerce, and would fail to provide funds which would keep the arid lands of our country from returning to dust and desolation."

At its final session, the Congress also passed resolutions:

1. Urging that a study be made with a view to formulating a national power policy.

2. Favoring the construction of multipurpose dams, with full development of hydroelectric possibilities (for flood control, navigation, and irrigation.

3. Opposing the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority.

4. Recommending that Congress provide funds to continue the reclamation program in the most economic and beneficial manner.

5. Requesting the appropriation of funds for advanced planning of rivers, harbors and flood control projects that have been authorized by Congress.

The organization closed its first postwar convention shortly after hearing Gov. J. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina urge continued development of river and watershed programs, and receiving reports of its project and resolution committees.

As a final act, the conference elected these directors:

One-year terms—Floyd O. Hagie, Washington; W. A. Smith, California; Walter Gahagen, New York; R. B. Page, North Carolina; Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Massachusetts; O. F. Wakefield, Ohio; Thomas B. Stockham, Pennsylvania.

Two-year terms—Dewitt L. Pyburn, Louisiana; H. H. Buckman, Florida; Al Hansen, Minnesota; Walter G. White, New Hampshire; Representative Sid Simpson, Illinois; William B. Rodgers, Pennsylvania; J. E. Sturrock, Texas.

Three-year terms—Fred D. Beneke, Tennessee; Senator Chapman Revercomb, West Virginia; Senator John L. McClellan, Arkansas; Senator John H. Overton, Louisiana; Representative Will M. Whittington, Mississippi; Representative Dewey Short, Missouri, and William H. Webb, Maryland.

The directors elected Senator MCCLELLAN as president of the congress, and Senator OVERTON and Representatives WHITTINGTON, FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota, and CHARLES R. CLASON, Massachusetts, as vice presidents.

Labor Law Not "Repressive," Merely Regulatory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, upon a passage of a bill regulating labor, the hue and cry went out that it would result in industrial chaos; that the bill was "unfair to labor," "restrictive," "repressive," and so forth. It was even stated that the purpose of the bill was to destroy labor unions. I have talked to dozens of men who voted for this bill, many of who have been and are friendly to labor. I have yet to find one who had any malicious motive, as far as the members of organized labor or unorganized labor are concerned, in the vote which they cast for this bill.

It seems to me that it must be obvious to any impartial person that the way labor leaders have conducted themselves the last few years that there must be some regulation whereby their powers may be restricted for the interest of the general public. Furthermore, many individual laborers are merely pawns in a great system in which they have very little, if anything, to say about what their union or the leaders of their union do. The purpose of this legislation is to try to bring balance to our industrial relations. Some of the things that labor leaders do, if done by employers, have been declared an unfair labor practice. Yet, these things are legitimized by the Wagner Act and its administration. In other words, one side of the bargaining table, the employer, may do something which the law or the administrative agencies administering the law declare an unfair labor practice. Yet, this same conduct or similar act when done by the employee or his agent on the other side of the table is not considered an unfair labor practice.

It is obvious that the right of employers has been curtailed too much with respect to the matter of freedom of speech. The way the law has been administered it practically closes the mouth of the employer as far as discussing anything with his employees.

The fights and controversies between unions, such as occurred in the movie industry and other places, are tragic, not only as far as the individual workmen are concerned but as far as the great public which is affected thereby is concerned.

It may be that the Senate may change or refine certain policies laid down in the House bill. What the American public should understand is that this law was aimed at some regulation of the excesses of labor leaders and some protection for the individual workman and his right to work as well as protection of the public.

An interesting editorial occurred in the Washington News on May 1 which shows that history points out that every group whose status quo and special privilege is effected always cries "wolf" when some change is made for the benefit of people and the public who suffer by virtue of the especial privileges of that group. That is true in this case. For the information of Members we hereby quote the editorial:

OLD STUFF (AND NONSENSE)

Labor-union leaders aren't too smart in screaming that legislation they oppose would bring on chaos, disorder, depression, regimentation, and slavery.

And they aren't at all original.

Down through the ages, the beneficiaries of status quo and special privilege have always raised just such cries against proposals for change.

In our own country, it wasn't so long ago that workers who wanted protection for their right to organize unions were denounced by employers as anarchists plotting to undermine the foundations of society.

Plenty of statesmen, and even preachers, defended chattel slavery as an institution ordained by God for the uplifting of inferior races.

The Government-owned postal system—many businessmen thought—would mean the beginning of the end for private ownership of property.

Pure-food-and-drug laws were sure to wreck business and starve our people. Pasteurized milk was an assault on the freedom and the very existence of dairy farmers.

Regulation of railroads and public utilities was certain to destroy free enterprise. Antitrust laws would spell stagnation for industry and permanent unemployment for millions.

Equal suffrage threatened our noble womanhood with degradation. Laws against child labor would deprive parents of the direction of their children and wipe out the incomes of widowed mothers.

Federal regulation of stock exchanges and security issues was an open invitation to national disaster. And only recently the National Association of Manufacturers saw in Government control of atomic energy a dark plot to socialize patents and stifle invention.

All this doesn't mean that Congress can afford to ignore the danger of going too far in writing labor legislation. It does justify belief that legislation can be written to regulate unionism in the public interest with no such disastrous consequences as the union politicians are predicting.

This on the basis of past experience. For all this old hokum about chaos, disorder, etc., has been used before. And the things that were going to bring destruction became law and were accepted, while the dire prophecies that greeted them them are almost forgotten.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I realize that those of us who are against the Greek-Turkish loan will not be given time to discuss the matter at any length. I am therefore taking this opportunity to present a few matters for your consideration with regard to it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It was agreed in the Rules Committee when this measure was under consideration that time would be granted for the opposition to be heard. I understand that is a gentleman's agreement with the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. REED of New York. I am very glad to know that that condition now obtains.

Mr. Speaker, Lenin, godfather of communism, boldly declared: "We shall oblige America to spend herself into destruction."

It is my contention that every vote cast for a foreign hand-out of our taxpayers' money will be the acid test as to whether or not Lenin's prediction will come true.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article published in the Jamestown Shopping Guide, May 1, 1947:

LENIN SAID: "WE SHALL OBLIGE AMERICA TO SPEND HERSELF INTO DESTRUCTION"

The endless schemes of planners to spend the American Republic toward destruction are without end. Is it only a coincidence that this mad spending fits perfectly into the well-known and diabolical Communist objective to bankrupt us?

Lenin, godfather of communism, boldly declared: "We shall oblige America to spend herself into destruction."

This is the master plan of the Communists to wreck our country. It is part of Lenin's Collected Works, the bible of the Communists. For many years its contents have been known to every intelligent person who wished to know the truth. Officials have known this for 30 years.

Stalin, in his Communist strategy, page 95, of his official book, Foundations of Leninism, published 13 years ago, in 1934, declares that "practical bankruptcy" is a special means of preparing a nation for easy victimization or communistic take-over.

People who lay awake nights worrying about the Russians showering terrible atomic bombs on American cities and towns need not worry. The Russians will not need to shoot anything, if we are so foolish as to go bankrupt, and complete the softening-up process by spending ourselves into our own destruction. Alert, patriotic Americans oppose taking the Communists' bait by playing their game, by squandering our remaining dollars all over the world, only to leave the home base bankrupt, wide open to the Communist take-over.

In view of these facts, some of the people who today claim they are out to defeat communism and save America, look ridiculous. By advocating spending plans, they are playing the very game the Communists most desire them to play—wreck the United States.

You can't eat your cake and have it, too. You can't spend the remaining dollars of Uncle Sam in a score of foreign lands, and still have the money here when you need it to save your country. Any grade school kid knows that.

The proposal to "save democracy" in Greece and Turkey, at an initial expense of $400,000,000, is but the curtain raiser in a gigantic fantastic campaign of the planners, to export $39,000,000,000—yes, thirty-nine billion American dollars, abroad in the next 3 years, starting right now. If you just add what we now owe in Federal debt, $260,000,000,000, plus the annual costs of our armies of occupation abroad, plus the local, State, and Federal annual tax costs, you can easily see that this is a starter to spend the last dollar we possess. At most, after the plan has been carried out, as mapped by planners, there would be only a few crumbs remaining for United States.

Financing foreign countries with American dollars to the tune of $7,000,000,000 a year for the next 3 years—$21,000,000,000 in "loans"—is planned to hand a ready-made economy to foreign lands.

Planners have blueprinted a plan to boost American foreign trade to $13,000,000,000 or more a year, for the next 3 years. Experience tells us that a dollar sent abroad as a gift or loan, does not return to America. It is a dollar gone forever.

But, if we stretch our imagination to the breaking point, and assume that foreign countries will spend all the $21,000,000,000 we hand them in the next 3 years "to put them on their feet," and we hope to sell our goods to the bankrupt countries of the world to the tune of $13,000,000,000 a year for 3 years, that it would be necessary for us to accept each year for 3 years, $6,000,000,000 worth of I O U's of very doubtful value. Figured this way, the whole $13,000,000,000 is converted into I O U's, or $39,000,000,000 in 3 years, plus the $21,000,000,000, or a grand total of $60,000,000,000.

In the most prosperous year the United States ever experienced, our foreign trade never exceeded 6 percent of our whole business volume. To expect to expand that small percentage, at such tremendous risk, is like wagging the dog with its tail.

But the foreign countries we expect to sell our goods to, and create prosperity on American farms and factory, all pay such low wages that it is utterly impossible to compete on our high wage scale. We cannot hope to develop an export trade unless we are willing to flood the American market with cheap, inferior goods made abroad. This would result in boosting by millions the number of unemployed American factory and farm workers.

A recent comparison of the world's wages, shows by what a wide margin the American factory worker's income tops all others. For an average 40-hour workweek, workers of the world receive the following weekly pay:

	Weekly wage
Czechoslovakia	$8.40
Netherlands	12.80
Russia	14.40
France	16.40
Britain	17.60
Sweden	18.40
Canada	29.20
United States	46.40

This puts the American worker in a class by himself; of all world workers, he is best able to use his 40-hour week to provide himself with an income that supplies home, food, clothing and shelter for self and family and have enough remaining to purchase a motor car and electric appliances. The worker in Britain, with his $17.60 weekly pay, must work 46 hours, or six extra hours a week, to repay the Socialistic-imposed food subsidies he pays for less and cheaper food.

How do our planners hope to develop and expand an export trade which will profit anyone, in foreign countries, when Czechs for example—receive only $8.40 per week—less than one-fifth the weekly pay of the American? Then there are the vast hordes of China, Japan, and India, all ready to flood the American market with their goods—millions of workers who receive 50 to 60 cents a day—$2 to $3 per week for a 50-hour work week.

After World War I, planners set out to redesign the world. We squandered $6,000,000,000 on worthless bonds in Germany, and a like sum in South America. We never realized a return to pay for the printing of the bonds. Today the world is in a far worse financial condition than 30 years ago.

Suppose your local businessmen developed sales as do Washington planners? They discover the people out in Pan Cake Hollow are not buying enough good and services in their city. A commission of smart young men is named to see what can be done about it. After numerous meetings, investigations, and goings-on (behind closed doors), they discover the folks out in Pan Cake Hollow just do not have any money to spend.

"We'll attend to that," report the local planners. "We'll just give them the money to spend, so they can come to our stores and buy things."

So, the local chamber of commerce stages a money-raising campaign to provide the folks in Pan Cake Hollow with some money to spend. Enough money is contributed by local business and professional people to hand each resident—man, woman, and child—$100 each, which they are asked to please spend in the city stores. No strings are attached to the deal; the money is simply handed over. The businessmen have given the money, a dead horse to them, but the people in Pan Cake Hollow are very, very happy. They have a lot of money they didn't earn, never expected to get, and what to do with it is now the question?

Now, as an added cost on top the gift, the businessmen put on a high-pressure advertising and sales campaign to get back, if possible, as many of their dollars from Pan Cake Hollow, as they can. But the people out there find that they can make the money go farther if they spend it in the local store or in the stores of another city, and so most of the money never is spent in the town which gave it.

You would imagine after one experience like that, no one would waste any more time mapping out a do-good campaign. But, you imagine wrong; after several similar experiences, in which billions and billions of American dollars flew away never to return to the United States, a band of self-appointed planners in Washington have mapped out the most gigantic give-away campaign in history, and intend to put it over at a time when the American people are mortgaged for about all they are worth.

The planners have neglected to date to advise either Congress or the people, to which country the United States will turn for a hand-out when we go bankrupt and our people are freezing and starving. We ought to know that address now.

Pressed for details as to how planners expected to supervise the expenditure of the vast sums of money, planners were forced to acknowledge that they had absolutely no over-all plan. It will be done on the typical American "on a wing and prayer" method of trusting the gods to deliver good returns for noble deeds performed.

Take one instance as an example. Planners hope Congress will let them ship $350,000,000 worth of food and clothing to certain starving people. But they frankly told Congress-

men that they had no supervisory staff to make certain how the food and clothing is to be distributed. They expect to depend on reports of American newspaper correspondents to investigate and report. Since few foreign countries even permit American newspapermen to wander around, write dispatches and make uncensored reports to home folks, we know before we start we shall receive very skimpy reports. We also know that vast stores of food and clothing have been diverted and ended up in Russia.

So, we find the planners are willing to place American taxpayer's money in new bets on the international gambling table, and take chances on the results.

"The shocking thing is to spend without a plan, to make "loans" willynilly as the breezes of UN oratory rise and fall," declares the editor of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. "We need a blueprint of the kind of world we will build. Unless we have a simply stated plan of action we shall get nowhere. Unless our spending is done with a time table and greater and lesser objectives we shall succeed only in dissipating our national wealth, bringing the United States down to the same bankrupt level of the rest of the world."

We are told it is necessary that we take over the world's troubles "because the British Government is practically bankrupt," and unable to assume responsibilities. Recently, British officials proudly announced to the world that they had balanced their budget for the first time in several years, and had a surplus of nearly $1,000,000,000. Yet, we are told it will soon be necessary for us to assume the British job of German occupation, half of which has been carried by Britain.

Planners have arranged for Great Britain to draw $1,600,000,000 in United States loans this year, an additional $1,300,000,000 in 1948, and $300,000,000 in 1949. Some extra financing then may be covered by the World Fund. Is it any wonder the British think U. S. means "Uncle Sucker?"

The gigantic $39,000,000,000 foreign-loan campaign will mean every American citizen—man, woman, and child—will contribute in increased taxes about $330 per head per year. We would have added to our present $2,200 individual Federal debt mortgage $330.

Before your family of four, with your present income, purchased, say, a motorcar costing $1,320, would you stop and consider whether, with your present debt compared to your income, you could afford the car? You will be forced to pay for this program of the planners just the same as you would for that car. Wise people are now telling their Representatives in Washington what they wish done about this.

Would the American people perform a greater good to the world's people by demonstrating that our kind of government and productive system is a success, providing the greatest good to the largest number of people, or would we perform a greater service by going bankrupt trying to free 2,000,000,000 people of worry who desire to live under their present conditions or who are doing practically nothing to change their condition?

If it is necessary to hold a special election to build a schoolhouse in your community, say at a cost of $100,000, should we not also hold an election before we permit exportation from the United States of $100,000 or $1,000,000 from each community?

Should a few unknown planners, behind closed doors, decide for us what we shall do with the remaining surplus we have, or shall we, the people, decide? Just what is this democracy we are setting out to save for somebody else?

Britain balanced her budget (with billion-dollar surplus).

This is how we stand:

United States funds available for world aid since war's end

Contributions:	
UN	$29,289,349
UNRRA	2,700,000,000
World Bank	3,175,000,000
World Fund	2,750,000,000
Lend-lease	2,163,000,000
Other advances:	
Surplus property	1,148,000,000
Loans to Great Britain, Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Department grants	1,771,926,293
Export-Import Bank	2,931,209,176
Total	21,058,422,818

The Government received last month $5,700,627,639.

The Government spent last month $3,958,257,688.

The Government owes $259,123,934,984.

May 3, the Polish National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May, to pay tribute to the Polish Nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

Just recently the Polish Constituent Diet adopted unanimously the following declaration:

(1) Equality before the law, regardless of nationality, race, creed, sex, origin, social status, and education.

(2) Liberty of person, life, and property.

(3) Freedom of conscience and worship.

(4) Freedom of scientific research and the publication of results thereof, and freedom of creative artistic endeavor.

(5) Freedom of press, speech, association, assembly, public meetings, and demonstration.

(6) The right to vote and to seek public office.

(7) Inviolability of the home.

(8) Secrecy of the mails and other means of communication.

(9) The right of instituting court actions and of filing petitions with the proper state authorities.

(10) The right to work and to periods of rest.

(11) The right to relief in case of unemployment and incapacitation.

(12) The right to education.

(13) Protection of family life and care of mother and child.

(14) Protection of health and working capacity.

This reaffirmation of the rights and liberties of its citizens is greeted with great joy by every freedom-loving American. This proves to us that the good, Christian people of Poland are not Communists and that Poland will be a great free and independent republic again.

From the many visitors who have been in Poland we learn that the Polish Nation is rising rapidly from its ruins and destruction. They have revived their ruined capital and have brought back life to their savagely destroyed country.

The will and fortitude, and love of country is beyond description. This was the one thing that Hitler and all the Nazis could not destroy.

This then, too, is the guarantee to the world that Poland will never go communistic.

But today I am deeply disturbed. I am not disturbed about Poland and that the Polish people shall not be successful in their struggle for reconstruction. I am fully confident that these virile, heroic and indestructible people will overcome all of their difficulties as they have throughout history. I am worried and deeply disturbed because of what has been said by former Secretary Byrnes and Secretary Marshall on the subject of Poland's western boundaries.

This policy must be strongly opposed. It would mean a weak Poland and a strong Germany. It means World War III.

Who is behind this policy? Not the American people! Big investment interests, both British and American, see the chance to make huge profits quickly by taking over German industry. They are behind this policy. They will reap tremendous profits. Europe is so devastated that the market is unlimited. They aim to obtain German good will by revising the Polish-German boundaries. In the next 10 or 15 years they will rebuild a stronger and more powerful Germany than before World War II.

Then will come another Hitler, Kaiser, Bismarck, or Frederick the Great. Another German leader will arise to expel the British and American investors and take over the new and powerful rebuilt Germany. Then will come World War III.

What about our allies? Who will be with us? Can we expect the support of the nations who were victims of Nazi aggression? We should rebuild the economy of those Allied nations now. They should not be made to depend upon German industry again. They are our friends. They have never been against us throughout the entire history of the United States.

The recent Gallup poll indicates that the overwhelming sentiment among the peoples of five allied nations—the United States, Great Britain, Canada, Holland, and France—is that the warlike ideals of Germany have not been rooted out, and that she will one day become an aggressor nation again.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the results of this poll deserve careful consideration by my fellow colleagues, by our foreign policy makers, and particularly by Secretary Marshall. Here is an expression

on the part of the peace-loving peoples of five allied nations that they are fearful that we are rebuilding Germany's war machine so that some day it will be able to threaten world peace again.

We hear expressions of sympathy for Germany with increasing frequency. More and more we are told that the rapid reconstruction of Germany, before it is denazified and democraticized, is essential to world peace. This is simultaneously accompanied with a "get tough with our allies" attitude. In some circles our wartime reliance upon our allies to help us defeat Germany has now been replaced by a reliance upon Germany to assure peace.

This attitude has alarmed the constituents of my district, as well as myself and many of my friends. I come from Detroit, Mich. I come from a district largely populated by Americans of Polish descent—a district which took no second place in its contributions toward victory. From this district flowed a steady stream of arms and munitions which hastened the end of the war. All the various phases of activities to promote the war effort found enthusiastic support in my district. To many of the people there the complete destruction of the German war machine would provide a twofold satisfaction, for they knew what it would mean to their kinfolk in Poland.

They are disturbed by the growing feeling of compassion for those responsible for World War II, which is combined with a more calloused and harsh approach to our ally, Poland. When they hear new proposals which would reward Germany at the expense of its victims, they feel that it is time to protest.

They are aware of the great sacrifices of Poland and cannot grasp why an ally that was never found wanting by us in 6 years that it fought overwhelming odds should today find its considerations secondary to those of Germany in the thinking of certain circles in this country and abroad. Perhaps this would be a good place to refresh our memories and impress us of our moral obligations to a heroic people by presenting some statistics. Six million one hundred and four thousand nine hundred and ninety Poles were tortured, burned alive, and murdered by the Nazi butchers. This includes millions of women and children. Nearly a million civilians have suffered heavy injuries of the body and mind. This was the human cost to Poland of German aggression.

Since, in our approach toward the peace treaty with Germany, the question of the western frontiers of Poland plays such an important role, I think it is necessary for a clarification of American policy to eliminate some of the confusion and distortion which has been injected into the case. It is important to the United States that this problem be settled justly and correctly, for it will be one of the pillars of the future peace structure. Failure to do so will endanger world peace and possibly involve our country in another world war.

A brief examination of the developments affecting the question of the Polish frontier in the west up to the present moment might contribute to a better understanding of the problem.

It was at the Crimean Conference in February of 1945 that the Big Three agreed that the eastern border of Poland should follow the Curzon line, with a few digressions in favor of Poland, and in return for which the three heads of government recognized "that Poland must receive substantial accessions of territory in the north and west."

Poland agreed to accept this decision and proceeded to make the painful readjustments which such a revision of its eastern borders entailed, accepting in good faith the pledge made by all three governments that she would be compensated in the north and west by "substantial accessions of territory."

The Big Three further agreed that:

> The opinion of the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity should be sought in due course on the extent of these accessions and that the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should thereafter await the peace conference.

At Potsdam on August 2, 1945, both pledges were realized. After consultation with representatives of Poland, the Big Three agreed to grant "substantial accessions of territory" to that country. The Potsdam accord declared that:

> The three heads of government agree that pending the final determination of Poland's western frontier the former German territories east of the line running from the Baltic Sea immediately west of Swinemunde and thence along the Oder River to the confluence of the western Neisse River and along the western Neisse to the Czechoslovak frontier, including that portion of East Prussia not placed under the administration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in accordance with the understanding reached at this conference, and including the former Free City of Danzig, shall be under the administration of the Polish state and for such purposes should not be considered as part of the Soviet zone of occupation.

The language is clear and the implication is obvious. There is not the slightest suggestion that the frontier defined was simply a demarcation line. This decision was hailed joyously by the Polish people, who now, with the return of their former areas, could look to a happier future.

It is obvious that the Potsdam Conference was not the peace conference and that any steps undertaken there would have to await formal ratification at the peace conference when it would be held. Here only the principles and bases for the peace conference were under preparation, and one of the most important dealt with the question of Poland, and it cannot be shrugged off through any verbal gymnastics or ingenious interpretations.

Following the Potsdam Conference, specific agreements were reached within the Inter-Allied Commisison on the evacuation of Germans from the areas granted Poland, which further implemented Potsdam and which permit of no misinterpretation as to the proposed permanency of that frontier.

The attack upon the Potsdam decisions and specifically in reference to Poland was launched by Winston Churchill at Fulton, Mo., where he wept bitter tears over the sad fate of those who only recently were dropping bombs on the defenseless women and children in London, Paris, Warsaw, and scores of other heavily populated areas. This stanch defender of the British Empire, which seethes with unrest and strife, took his place in the vanguard of those who defend the Germans when he charged that the Polish Government has been encouraged to make enormous and wrongful inroads upon Germany and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed of are now taking place.

But the American people are alarmed most not by what Churchill, who was decisively repudiated by the English people, said, but by the statement made by former Secretary of State James H. Byrnes at Stuttgart. Byrnes gave hope to the unrepentant Germans when he declared on September 6, 1946, that—

> The United States will support the revision of these (western and northern) frontiers in Poland's favor. However, the extent of the area to be ceded to Poland must be determined when the final settlement is agreed upon."

I am disturbed by the Stuttgart speech and Secretary Marshall's views, as are many of my constituents who had looked to the United States to take the leadership in living up to the spirit and intent of the Big Three commitments to Poland made at Crimea and Potsdam. The Big Three had committed itself to grant Poland substantial accessions of territory, and at Potsdam compensated Poland with 39,000 square miles of territory for its loss of 69,000 square miles in the east. To lessen the amount of territory granted as suggested in the Stuttgart speech and Marshall's Moscow report would be to take it out of the realm of substantial compensation.

Understandably, the Poles and all of the Slavs are more than perturbed by these developments. The hobnailed boot of the Nazi aggressor is still a very fresh memory in every Slav home in Europe. Recollections of the unexampled bestiality of the Germans will live for generations and every move that would strengthen Germany is regarded with great doubt and suspicion. When one keeps this in mind, one cannot help but be surprised at the remarkable restraint of their criticism of the suggestion that there is a possibility that the Germans will again be provided with a dagger aimed at the heart of the Slav nations in the form of areas rightfully Poland's. Two world wars were largely fought on Slav soil—they do not want a third to devastate it again.

Since the Stuttgart speech there have been many inspired stories in the press quoting responsible sources calling for the return of Pomerania and Brandenburg to Germany. Some Congressmen, and even congressional committees, have joined the press and radio in the hue and cry to defend German interests attempting to justify their position in various ways, with which I will deal later.

It is interesting to note here that those who cried most loudly against the injustice done Poland at Crimea when the Curzon line was accepted as Poland's

eastern border are among the most vehement and determined to see that the Potsdam accord which compensated Poland for its loss of territory in the east be violated grossly. It might also be in order to make the observation that those who shed themselves of isolationism rather belatedly are numbered among the most ardent defenders of the poor Germans. They are, at least, consistent.

A profoundly disturbing document was released recently which attempts to make a case for the need to rebuild Germany while simultaneously calling for cutting off all forms of assistance to our allies in Europe. It was the House joint committee report released December 30, 1946, by my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, Representative COLMER. Its solicitude and good will toward the Germans, whose crimes against humanity have been unequaled, is alarming.

This report takes us, the Congress, to task for having made inadequate provisions for feeding both Germany and Austria. At the same time it calls for the liquidation of UNRRA which was, and continues to be, so important to the rehabilitation of the victims of Nazi aggression and degradation.

It does not require prophetic power to show that a continuation of this plight for Germany—

Declares the report—

means slow starvation and disease on a widespread basis to say nothing of the effect upon the working ability and political unrest of the population.

It then proposes that:

An immediate increase in the funds available to the Army for relief to bring the ration up to a real subsistence level is essential and should be regarded as the most serious emergency action immediately confronting American foreign policy.

There are, at the moment, 3,500,000 children in Poland who need additional nourishment. Two million five hundred thousand children require medical care. There are 1,000,000 orphans in desperate need of assistance in a country which fought the full fury of the Nazi Wehrmacht for several years before we entered the fray against Germany, and the Colmer report runs history upside down and declares that the "most serious emergency action confronting American foreign policy" is to feed the Germans.

A stranger unacquainted with the events of the last decade could only conclude that Germany had been our ally in the last World War, and that Poland, France, Czechoslovakia, and our other European allies were our enemies. He could only conclude that Germany must be rewarded for its role, and the other nations punished.

But the report raises an even more fundamental problem: Are we to rebuild Germany first or are we to rebuild those nations destroyed by Germany? Are we to again establish Germany as the dominant European power, or are we to guarantee the peace of Europe by rebuilding its neighbors? The problem comes down to that. The American people, I am convinced, do not want a Germany that will be a threat to world peace again.

The Colmer report adopts the position that a loan should be granted Germany and that no loan should be granted to the greatest victim of German brutality, Poland. It states:

In the final report of the committee, therefore, a special emphasis has been put upon the key problems which revolve around the position of Germany and Austria in the European economy because of their crucial import to the recovery of western Europe.

This approach is so reminiscent of the post World War I period which saw Germany rebuilt, granted loans and concessions, wooed by world powers and placed in the position where it challenged the world to combat and left over 30,000,000 dead on fields of battle.

I deal at length with this report because I am firmly convinced that this approach can only do irreparable harm to the cause of world peace and security. I am of the opinion that not Germany but the victims of German aggression should be reconstructed. It is my considered opinion that the reconstruction of Poland and the development of its recovered territories has greater importance for Europe and world peace than the resurrection of Germany. I cannot forget that we who hailed Poland as the inspiration of the world during the war have a deep responsibility toward her. It is no accident that the Colmer report derived satisfaction from the Byrnes Stuttgart speech which it says "reminded the world that the western boundaries are not yet drawn," while at the same time it calls for a return of railroad cars from Poland to Germany, a step which would further cripple Poland's economy which relies so much upon its coal production.

Further, in the last few weeks we have been showered with reasons which purport to prove why Pomerania and Brandenburg should be returned to Germany. All sorts of spurious arguments have been advanced which will not hold water upon closer examination in an effort to camouflage the real reasons behind the desire to return these age-old Polish areas to Germany.

An Associated Press dispatch dated December 29, 1946, which was prominently displayed on the front pages of the American press declared that:

The American position will be that Germany cannot be self-sustaining with the loss of 25 percent of her best agricultural land and that this loss will only provide for a new war, these sources (that is responsible sources in Berlin) said.

Now on April 28, 1947, Secretary Marshall states:

But the perpetuation of the present temporary line between Germany and Poland would deprive Germany of territory which before the war provided more than a fifth of the food-stuffs on which the German population depended.

Well, one-fifth would be 20 percent, so the Associated Press dispatch from Berlin was off by 5 percent. But both of these statements are wrong, as I shall now prove to you.

There is a remarkable coincidence between this line and that followed by the German delegation at the Versailles Peace Conference. There the Germans talked about these areas being economically indispensable to Germany, but conveniently forgot to mention that in comparison with the rest of Germany they were not economically developed.

What are the facts? These areas are no more indispensable to Germany after this war than they were after the first. I want to quote Dr. Wilhelm Volz, professor at the Leipzig University, who in one of his most important works issued in 1930, wrote that:

For the German Reich the east plays no role whatsoever as a supplier of wheat and a quite insignificant role as a supplier of rye. The Reich has no need whatever of the east for its supply of potatoes.

Dr. Volz points out that the Polish recovered territories supplied the Reich with only 0.77 percent of wheat, 4.53 percent of rye, 2.27 percent of potatoes, 5.68 percent of pigs, with 2.75 percent of cattle.

And in a letter to the Manchester Guardian on November 15, 1946, Prof. W. J. Rose, of the London University, said that on the basis of prewar German statistics, the territories lost to Germany supplied the rest of the Reich with 0.86 percent of the total wheat, 5.1 percent of rye, and 2.7 percent of potatoes. These figures include areas now ceded to Russia.

The same conclusions were reached by many other German scholars who cannot be considered prejudiced toward Germany.

Further, there has been a constant migration of Germans from these areas over the recent years, leaving them so depopulated of Germans that they depended upon Polish migratory farm workers for harvesting the fields. Pomerania and Brandenburg by no stretch of the imagination can be termed a granary of a peacetime Germany.

But the German delegation at Versailles fought for the retention of these lands for a much more important reason. They are a first-rate military base for operations in the east, and World War II confirmed that indisputably. We cannot shut our eyes to this danger. We cannot be lulled to sleep by that familiar refrain harking back to the period before World War II, that Germany could never again wage war.

On the contrary, it can be proven that these territories never were indispensable to Germany and constitute a hinterland for Poland now needed as never before in its history.

German written history is replete with reference to Pomerania, Brandenburg, and Silesia as colonies. The many years of Germanization and colonization never succeeded. The Prussian east as it was known, had the lowest density of population as a result of the exodus of German colonizers in the last century. It was impossible to sow the fields and reap the harvests without Polish labor. The huge estates of the Junkers would have been forced to lie fallow if Poles were not seasonally employed. In marked contrast, there was a dense population across the border in Poland with sufficient surplus labor to migrate seasonally

to sow and reap the German harvest. Minus the lands of the east, Poland today more desperately than ever, requires its lands in the west.

A further point emphasizing the fact that these lands were considered as a colony was the presence of only 1,500,000 Germans in all of these territories as of July 1945. The Germans had fled into their native land.

Where, then, is the argument advanced by some German apologists today that Poland cannot exploit the land and that the economy of Europe requires that they be returned to Germany? They have simply turned the facts topsy-turvy. The only guaranty that these lands will be fully exploited to balance the food supply of all of Europe is their possession by Poland from whom they had been wrested by conquest.

Now, for the first time in its history, the Polish nation has an opportunity to develop a healthy, industrial economy. The return of Stettin, Pomerania, and the control of the Oder River insures rapid expansion of the Silesian industries and the possibility of unlimited foreign trade. Pomerania and Brandenburg are rich in agricultural potentials. In the recovered territories are situated 25 percent of Poland's textile industries, 30 percent of her metal production, and 50 percent of her freight-car and trolley manufacturing plants, according to a recent dispatch from Marguerite Higgins in the New York Herald Tribune, dated February 19. With the acquisition of these areas, the mining and industrial production, which amounted to 215 zlotys per head before the war, will show an increase to 324—or 96 percent. The Polish cotton industry will increase production by 30 percent; wool industry by 60 percent; linen industry by 25 percent; sugar industry, 60 percent; cement industry by 30 percent; steel by 100 percent.

But. without the recovered territories, Poland's 3-year plan for economic reconstruction will be severely wrecked. The 6,000,000 Poles who will have resettled in these areas would have to live in a much smaller area. It would mean overpopulation, unemployment, and low consumption, which not only would cripple Poland's economic recovery and lower the standards of its people considerably, but would have drastic effects on world trade. For its reconstruction Poland desperately needs heavy machinery. America has this needed commodity. In the interests of American businessmen, Poland should retain these territories. In the hands of the Germans these territories would once again provide the base for international cartels, which benefit, not the independent businessman in America, but the cartelist and monopolist.

The economic, political, and social achievements that have been realized in these territories since Potsdam solidifies Poland's claim to these lands. Devastated areas have been rebuilt. Transportation and communication lines have been repaired. Over 5,000,000 Poles have been resettled, while only approximately 500,000 Germans remain. Factories and industries are flourishing.

Here are some figures: As of August 1946, 825 factories were operating, employing 226,305 workers, or 13 percent of the total for all Poland; 10,000,000 tons of coal were produced last year; the lower Silesian mines produced 60 percent more coke than the Germans did in 1939; despite the complete destruction of nearly all factories and the removal of all machinery the metal industry in the recovered territories has been built, and is now producing 19 percent of the overall Polish production, the ports of Stettin, Danzig, and Gdynia, which were mined and blocked by sunken ships when the Poles received them, are back in operation. Prussian estates have been and still are being broken up and parcelled among the peasants.

In the field of cultural advancement, much progress has been made also; trade-union membership in lower Silesia exceeds 12,000; there are 4,000 schools of all types, three polytechnics one university, and one academy of medicine; there are about 1,000 kindergartens and 130 homes for children; there are 31 newspapers and magazines, and 800 libraries; about 6,000 workers have been trained in special courses; over 80 industrial schools have been organized, training 9,000 pupils.

In short, the foundations for a fuller and better life have been laid. If these territories are taken away from Poland, all the good that has been accomplished will be undone. It would mean misery, privation, and despair for the millions of Poles who are now permanently resettled there.

What are the guardians of German interests doing when they ask that these territories revert to the Germans?

When at Potsdam, the accord of the Big Three was reached and the western territories reverted to Poland's possession, the Polish Nation embarked on one of the greatest tasks in European history—the resettlement and reconstruction of a war-devastated area which involved the movement of millions of people. The enormity of the problem is difficult to grasp. Since then, the bulk of the Germans have been evacuated and over 5,000,000 Poles resettled despite the lack of transport, food supplies, housing, medical supplies, and services. All public bodies had to be reconstituted and a million and one complicated situations resolved at a tremendous cost of both money and expenditure of human energy. Order has replaced chaos. Fallow fields have been resown. Devastation repaired. Transport and communications lines reestablished. The preconditions for an expanding and richer life were being fulfilled.

And with this as a background, just to pose the question of the return of these areas to Germany seems like a crime against the Polish people. In fact, it is rewarding the aggressor at the expense of the victim. Not only was Poland devastated by the Germans but she now also would have to reconstruct territories deserted by the Germans for the Germans. That is exactly what it means to raise any doubt about the permanency of Poland's western frontier.

From whatever angle you examine the question of Poland's recovered territories, you cannot help but be convinced of the justice of the decision reached at Potsdam.

Militarily it means that Germany will be deprived of a huge arsenal of war in Silesia. The Junkers, arch proponents of militarism and the Drang Nach Osten policy, will be rooted out from their huge estates in Pomerania and Brandenburg. Germany will be deprived of a place d'armes for future aggression. Poland will be provided a defensible frontier based on the Baltic, the Oder, and the Neisse Rivers—a frontier which now will have decreased almost fivefold from 1,180 miles to approximately 250. This is a practical program for the disarmament of Germany. Secretary Marshall should realize the defensive value of this frontier and its significance to future world peace.

Historically it will mean the righting of a grievous wrong done Poland. The area between the Oder and the Vistula Rivers was the cradle of the Polish Nation. Poland was deprived of these lands through the aggression of Teutonic hordes. Until the German invasions Silesia was uninterruptedly Polish and from there came several of her kings. Despite many years of the most unmerciful Germanization, the Germans did not succeed in accomplishing their task. From 1919 to 1921 there were three successive uprisings of Poles in this area, only subdued by the greatest brutality. Stettin was Poland's outpost on the Baltic which was seized by conquest together with Pomerania and Brandenburg. These areas are studded with ruins of Polish castles and churches. Historical archives are replete with evidence of the Polish character of these lands. Archeological excavations further confirm Poland's just claims to this area. The cultural ties of this area were never severed with Poland.

Economically, these lands were always a hinterland of Poland. The economic interdependence of Poland and Silesia was freely admitted by the Germans. Except in time of war, Silesia had to rely upon Poland to keep its industries going. Its fields in Pomerania and Brandenburg could not produce without Polish labor. The return of Silesia provides Poland with an industrial base which prewar Poland lacked and as a result fell before the Nazi onslaught. By the return of Stettin and Pomerania, Poland has been provided with broad access to the sea routes of the world, and, with the possibility of developing its foreign trade to record proportions. Its control of the Oder River assures the rapid expansion of Silesia which is indispensable for the task of reconstructing war-devasted Poland. For the first time in its history Poland will have the opportunity to develop a healthy economy which will be further assurance of a peaceful world. If the pledges we made to Poland during the war that we would help in her reconstruction are to be kept, we cannot retreat from our position adopted at Potsdam.

Morally, by supporting Poland's claim to these areas, we recognize the tremendous sacrifices made by the Polish people, both in human lives as well as in material wealth, in the common cause of victory

over the Germans. Polish arms played an important role in recovering these areas. Poland won back these lands not in a war of conquest and aggression, but in a just war against a nation which was out to rule the world. Furthermore, this territorial readjustment is not at the expense of Germany. Poland is being rewarded with not one inch of German lands. The policy is one of restoring to the Polish people lands that had been previously stolen from them by German military power.

For the past 1,000 years Germany has followed a policy of brutal military aggrandizement against all of its neighbors and particularly against the Polish nation and the Polish people. The territory east of the Oder and the Niesse Rivers is ancient Polish land which was taken away from them by German military power. It is time to declare an end forever to the German policy of Drang Nach Osten.

The Potsdam agreement has created the basis for an ethnographically homogeneous Poland, uniting all of the Poles within areas clearly Polish. They have also created the conditions for Poland's most rapid recovery and development. They have given Poland safeguards against future German aggressions. Had the Poland of 1939 been a homogeneous nation with a strong economy and based on strategic frontiers rightly hers, then it should be obvious to us that Germany would have found itself confronted by a foe able to withstand its onslaughts. The Potsdam agreement eliminated sore spots and trouble areas which remained after Versailles because of the short-sightedness of the peacemakers. To revise the Polish western frontier is to invite trouble and conflict. Even to raise the question is to create doubt and distrust among the Allies to the benefit of Germany.

Poland was the battleground of two World Wars. Poland was repeatedly the victim of aggression throughout history. One of the deepest desires that the Polish people possess is the desire for peace—lasting peace. On that score the Poles and the Americans think in similar terms. To hear arguments which, in effect, imply that Poland is seeking a peace settlement which would not assure her of peace is simply so much balderdash. The traditional friendship between Poland and our country goes back to the day of our Revolutionary War of Independence in which Kosciusko and Pulaski and their compatriots distinguished themselves. It is natural, therefore, that the Poles look to the United States for support of their sacred cause, a cause which will promote peace.

The Atlantic Charter, signed by our late great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, declared that—

After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny they—

The signers—

hope to see established a peace which will afford all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries and which will afford all nations assurance that all the men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

We recognized that principle at Potsdam. All that remains is that it be formally accepted. I think we would make a great contribution to the peace negotiations and eliminate a serious source of friction and delay if we were to announce unequivocally that we will live up to our commitment at Potsdam by supporting Poland's just claims to Silesia, Pomerania, and Brandenburg. This would be a serious blow to all those who are already conniving and plotting for another war. It would deprive them of the opportunity of fishing in troubled waters and trying to establish blocs and unholy alliances.

The Prussians, the Junkers are now where they belong—in Germany, on the other side of the Oder and Neisse Rivers. It took a long time to drive the Nazi-Prussian barbarians off of Polish soil. They should be kept out forever from now on.

Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, those who wish to know the real facts with reference to the failure of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act might wish to study the statement made to the Ways and Means Committee by Dr. John Lee Coulter on May 3, 1947:

INTRODUCTION

My name is John Lee Coulter. For many years I have maintained a service with headquarters at suite 600 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., as consulting economist and statistician for many clients.

My present appearance is in behalf of the National Renderers Association. That organization is tremendously interested in many of the different products listed by the State Department for possible concessions to foreign governments in the matter of tariffs and excise taxes in connection with negotiations now in progress in Geneva, Switzerland, as a basis for entering into a series of 18 trade agreements, such as are authorized in section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 known as the Trade Agreements Act which was passed on June 12, 1934, and since that date extended and amended and which at the present writing will expire on June 12, 1948. This organization is also tremendously interested in the proposed charter for an international trade organization likewise being negotiated at Geneva, at the present time, under provisions in the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Because of extraordinary changes which have taken place since the turn of the century (1900) and especially during the 30 years since our entry into World War I in 1917, in so many departments of political, economic, scientific, social, and military conduct of people in so many different parts of the world, the whole problem of international exchange, foreign investments, world trade, tariffs, and other forms of regulation and supervision of foreign economic relations and policy has fundamentally changed. I am pleased to appear before you today to examine some of the more important aspects of the subject as they pertain to the organization which I represent.

I am convinced that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress is in position to make one of the greatest contributions in our time not only to our general welfare but also to world prosperity, in its action pertaining to many phases of life which are directly or indirectly related to the economic activities of all people.

As provided by the Constitution, the Congress is charged, among other duties, with the power—

"(1) To coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin * * *";

"(2) To borrow money on the credit of the United States";

"(3) To pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States";

"(4) To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises * * *";

"(5) To regulate commerce with foreign nations * * *";

"(6) To promote the progress of science and useful arts."

To perform many other useful services, and finally—

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Under the above constitutional authority the Congress passed the Tariff Act of June 17, 1930, and later amended that act on June 12, 1934, to provide section 350, known as the trade-agreements amendment of the act of 1930. Section 350 has been several times extended and amended, but will expire on June 12, 1948, during the life of the Eightieth Congress, while the act of 1930 will be continued in full force and effect indefinitely or until otherwise amended or repealed.

The Tariff Act of 1930 is entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes."

Section 350 added to the act of 1930 on June 12, 1934, has for its purpose "to promote foreign trade."

It is particularly important to note that while the trade-agreements amendment stipulated as its purpose "to encourage the development of the export trade of the United States," it did not repeal the basic purposes of the Tariff Act of 1930 of which it was an amendment. In other words, the law on the statute books at this moment is (to repeat) an act "to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes." Within that framework the President was authorized to carry on negotiations in the form of trade agreements with foreign countries (a) to modify tariffs wherever that could be done without injury to the domestic interests of this or other countries; and (b) to eliminate or modify other control measures, the result of which was to decrease or discourage international trade.

Within that framework it was thought that special commercial treaties—specifically designated as "trade agreements" would serve a useful purpose—supplementing commercial treaties on the one hand and modifying tariff acts and other regulations of trade on the other hand.

In spite of the limited scope set up in the amendment there has developed a perfect hysteria to eliminate all tariffs, excise taxes, and other regulations governing international trade. And widespread propaganda would have us believe that free, private, competitive enterprise is somehow to be destroyed unless we adopt world-wide free trade. Officially, this is toned down to "freer trade," but actions speak louder than these official words. The list of products now on the agenda for concessions covers substantially 90 percent of all import trade

of this country and the goal is another reduction of 50 percent (and in no case any increase) in customs duties and excise taxes on top of the tremendous reductions already made. And this is in the face of the present economic chaos which is world-wide, and far worse confusion in foreign countries than here. They ignore the facts that in our domestic economic life we must have taxes, and regulations of all economic activities such as ICC, FTC, FPC, FCC, SEC, etc., and would abolish revenue from foreign trade and destroy most existing commercial treaty provisions for regulation of foreign trade and other economic activities.

NEED FOR A FORMULA TO GUIDE THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The first point which we wish to bring to your attention is the fact that literally no formula or guide or measuring device was provided in the trade-agreements amendment, as a result of which members of the staff of the State Department and other executive agencies were empowered arbitrarily to make, in the case of each commodity, any change in classification or description which might appeal to them and any change in rate of duty or excise tax (falling within a 50-percent limitation up or down).

Many of those who favored the original amendment assumed that the Chief Executive would be guided by the provisions of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 since those provisions were not repealed. In other words, a real formula was written into the Tariff Act of 1922 and carried forward in the Tariff Act of 1930. While the formula provided was difficult to administer in some cases and relatively slow, in view of the necessity for a thorough investigation before action, nonetheless it was thought that this represented the general view of Congress and would be used as a guide in any adjustments in rates or changes in classification which might be agreed to in trade agreements negotiated. In practice, however, the State Department has consistently since the passage of the original amendment of June 12, 1934, completely ignored provisions of section 336 of the Tariff Act of which the trade-agreements amendments forms a part.

The first criticism therefore we have to offer with reference to the negotiation of trade agreements has been the fact that no adequate investigations have been made and that no legislative formula has been followed. In other words, members of the staff of the State Department and other executive agencies have been in position to act arbitrarily and in many cases it is believed that their action has been injurious to the best interests of the agricultural, mining, quarrying, forestry, fishing, and manufacturing industries of the United States. We shall not, however, at this point go into a detailed discussion of specific illustrations of injury. On the other hand, we are satisfied from a continuous study of operations since June 12, 1934, that there has been very little, if any, encouragement to the industries of the United States; certainly there does not appear to have been any effort to protect American labor; and finally the administration of the amendment has not been carried on in such a manner as to provide revenue. As a matter of fact, whereas the amount of revenue coming to the National Treasury during the 5 years 1925–29 averaged about $600,000,000 annually, during recent years the amount of revenue fell as low as $301,375,000 in 1938 just before the beginning of World War II. Since the law does not permit the shifting of any commodity from the dutiable to the free list it is apparent that the more than 40-percent decline in revenue must be accounted for by the lowering of rates of duty, the falling of the price level in the case of products with ad valorem rates of duty, and the decline in physical quantity of imports of important dutiable items.

THE PRINCIPAL FOREIGN COMPETING COUNTRY

The second major complaint which we have to offer is the fact that the amendment itself did not require the Chief Executive to carry on negotiations with the principal foreign supplying country. In the formulas spelled out in detail in section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 adjustments in rates of duty and changes in classification of commodities could be made only in contrast with the situation in the country which was the principal foreign source of supply of the competing commodities. Those who followed the introduction and adoption of the trade-agreements amendment assumed that the Chief Executive would be guided by this provision. Your present witness was at that time a member of the United States Tariff Commission and an examination of my office files discloses the fact that I called attention to this point and suggested that this particular requirement be written into the amendment. I was told, however, by leading Members of the Congress that the Chief Executive would, of course, be guided by the major provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 which unless changed in the amendment would be binding upon the Government.

We shall not at this time present the many illustrations which might be cited in which the State Department and associated agencies have completely ignored the requirements that negotiations and concessions shall be made in agreements with the principal supplier. This criticism is presented at this point, however, because it is pertinent in connection with commodities with which we are particularly concerned. We shall, therefore, cite only this one major illustration for purposes of documenting the record. When negotiations were in progress with Argentina the rate of duty on tallow was reduced from one-half cent per pound to one-fourth cent per pound and this became effective November 15, 1941. In the same agreement the excise tax on tallow was reduced from 3 cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound, and was made effective on the same day. At a later date when negotiations were carried on with Uruguay the lower rate of duty and the lower excise tax were bound effective January 1, 1943. It is to be noted that the Chief Executive kept within the law so far as spelled out in the trade-agreement amendment and so far as the general principle is stated in section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930. In other words, over any considerable period of years Argentina and Uruguay would be the principal sources of foreign competing animal tallow.

For purposes of the record, it may be stated here that the largest quantity of imports, prior to the period of World War II, were during the years 1934, 1935, and 1936, which corresponded with the great American drought and period of dust storms. In the single year 1935, following the drought year 1934, imports of tallow amounted to nearly 250,000,000 pounds. While this was less than the quantity of copra, coconut oil, and palm oil, it nonetheless stood out as an extraordinary item, but in all fairness should be related to the fact of the greatest drought in American history.

We come now to the particular criticism which we wish to place in the record. When the State Department in November 1946 published its list of products on which possible tariff concessions will be considered in trade-agreement negotiations with a group of some 18 countries, tallow was not included and the members of the National Renderers Association felt that they were to be spared a possible further 50 percent cut in both the tariff and in the excise tax—especially since Argentina and Uruguay were not included in the list of countries with which negotiations were in progress. To our amazement, however, at a later date a supplementary list of products was published and this supplementary list included tallow. On the day of the oral hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information we learned that the request for this new 50-percent concession both in tariff and in excise tax had come from Australia and New Zealand.

Technically it may be argued by the State Department that during some of the war years relatively small amounts of tallow did come from Australia and New Zealand to the United States on return vessels engaged in the carrying of supplies from the United States to our Army and naval forces overseas and to our allies in the far Pacific area. This, however, does not appeal to us as a reasonable justification for again bringing this item into the picture and perhaps making a new 50-percent reduction across the board. Presumably, under another section of the trade-agreements amendment, any concession made at this time to Australia and New Zealand will in turn be extended to Argentina and Uruguay (under provisions for most-favored-nation treatment) just as the earlier concessions to Argentina and Uruguay were extended to all other countries (except Germany). This question of generalization may be dealt with as a separate problem.

It is our judgment that the Congress should, if it extends the trade-agreements amendment beyond June 12, 1948, write into the amendment a specific provision that hereafter concessions should be made only in negotiations with the principal foreign supplier, and further, that these concessions shall not be extended to other nations unless or until equivalent concessions are received from them in trade agreements negotiated with them.

GENERAL GRANT OF ALL CONCESSIONS TO ALL COUNTRIES

The third point which we wish to bring to your attention has to do with what is known as the application of the most-favored-nation principle. Section 350 (a) (2) carries the following provision: "The proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall apply to articles, the growth, produce, or manufacture of all foreign countries, whether imported directly or indirectly * * *." In other words, when concessions have been made to any one country in a trade agreement all concessions are immediately extended to all other countries (except in the case of countries discriminating against the exports of the United States, provision for which is likewise contained in section 350 (a) (2)). In every case it is presumed that the foreign country with which negotiations are carried on will in turn make equivalent concessions to the United States in the case of products which we may export. Since the foreign country in question is expected in turn to generalize all concessions made to us it must be evident that no new benefit can come to us compared with benefits to other countries (in other words, concessions granted to us are at once given to all other countries). There remains only the general fact that rates of duty have been reduced and "other import restrictions" have been removed or at least modified. In turn, since concessions which we make are likewise generalized to all other countries, it must be apparent that the country with which we have negotiated has not gained in contrast with benefits extended to all other countries, except again the fact that the tariffs have been lowered and other trade restrictions have been removed or at least modified.

If the above statement as to procedure is correct, as it clearly must be correct, then any claim (1) that we have benefited in our export trade because of concessions made by foreign countries with which we have negotiated, or (2) that the other countries have benefited because of our concessions to them, must be wholly false, except insofar as the total volume of trade of all the different countries might be affected by lower tariffs

or changes in classifications or other regulations. In other words, neither we nor the country with which we negotiate will have gained any special advantage as a result of any trade agreement. This is the same as saying that these trade agreements are not, in any proper use of the word, "reciprocal" in nature. "Reciprocity" as defined in all economic literature for a hundred years has been tied in with the conception of "conditional" most-favored-nation treatment rather than "unconditional" must-favored-nation treatment. In other words, in order for a commercial treaty or a trade agreement to be reciprocal in character, the two or more specific countries carrying on negotiations must make concessions to each other and these concessions in turn will be extended to other countries only if they in turn make equivalent concession in order to gain any benefits which might come to them.

Because of this analysis of the subject we specifically protest the constant use of the word "reciprocal" in connection with the trade-agreements program as provided in the Trade Agreements Act and as administered by the Chief Executive at the present time. Obviously, we likewise protest against the fallacious use of statistics which purport to show specific gains either to us or to the country with which we negotiate (other than the general increase in volume of trade which might result from lower tariffs and the modification of other trade restrictions) since this cannot be true as long as we and the other countries follow the "unconditional" most-favored-nation method of procedure.

We are not protesting against general application or extending all concessions to all countries. It is in the tradition of the United States that we have at all times maintained a single column tariff schedule with only special exceptions as in the case of Hawaii, Cuba, Canada, the Philippines, and other special cases. The principle of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment has been expounded most effectively by such great statesmen as Mr. Elihu Root, Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, Mr. Kellogg, and others during recent decades. Three phases of the subject which we desire to emphasize here are:

First, that negotiations should be carried on only with the principle supplier.

Second, that these concessions should be extended to others only on receipt of equivalent concessions.

Third, that an honest use should be made of the word "reciprocity."

We are not here attempting to make an exact comparison of the relative importance of concessions which we have made and of concessions which we have claimed to receive from other countries. This is largely a matter of human judgment since no dependable statistical measure has yet been made on this point.

DID TARIFF ACT OF 1930 CAUSE DEPRESSION?

The fourth point which we desire to make is the constant claims made by the most vigorous proponents of the trade-agreements program to the effect that the Tariff Act of 1930 preceded and caused the depression which engulfed the United States during the decade 1929–39 and that the trade-agreements program contributed very useful results in the recovery from that depression.

In the first place it should be borne in mind that the collapse in dollar value of imports of products on the free list from 1929 to 1932 was as great as the collapse in dollar value of imports of articles which were dutiable. Bearing in mind that commodities on the free list accounted for two-thirds of the dollar value of all imports, and that there were neither tariffs nor other trade restrictions, how can it be said that the collapse in volume of imports was due to tariffs or other trade restrictions when the decline was as great in the case of items on the free list as in case of items on the dutiable list? In this connection, the same thing should be said with reference to exports. The decline in dollar value of exports was almost exactly the same as the decline in dollar volume of imports and this applied to commodities on which foreign countries had relatively high tariffs, medium tariffs and low tariffs and on commodities which were admitted free of duty by foreign countries.

There are three points here which must be considered. The first is that the 70-percent decline in volume of foreign trade was almost entirely a collapse in the price structure; and second, that this price collapse was already well advanced before the passage of the Tariff Act of June 17, 1930; and third, had its origin very largely in foreign countries.

(It is not to be denied that the stock market collapse in the United States in 1929 was a factor in the depression, nor is it to be denied that the widespread collapse in banking in foreign countries was perhaps an equally important factor. Nor is it to be denied that the tremendous crops of cotton, wheat, corn, and other farm products in the United States was a factor in bringing about the widespread collapse in the price structure. It is not our purpose here, however, to attempt to present a detailed analysis of the major factors which brought about the world-wide depression.)

In order to fortify the brief statements already made with reference to the collapse in dollar value of both imports and exports the following brief table is presented showing an almost identical reduction in value of imports of commodities on the free list and of those on the dutiable list and likewise presenting the comparable reduction in value of exports from the United States.

Decline in dollar value of products on free list contrasted with dutiable imports and with exports, 1929–32

	Free list imports ($1,000)	Percent free	Dutiable imports ($1,000)	Exports ($1,000)
1929	$2,880,128	66.38	$1,458,444	$5,240,995
1932	885,536	66.82	439,557	1,611,016
Decrease	1,994,592		1,018,887	3,629,979
Percent	69.3		69.8	69.5

In order further to document this presentation it seems desirable to call attention to the fact that the world-wide depression not only did not start in 1930 but in fact was largely related to the collapse in prices in foreign countries. A few illustrations will suffice for this purpose. In 1925 the foreign invoice value of tin, bars, blocks, pigs was 55.40 cents per pound. This increased to 60.63 cents per pound in 1926 and 63.30 cents in 1927. But by 1930 the price had completely collapsed to only 33.31 cents per pound. In other words, there was a reduction of almost 50 percent in the price of this commodity, which incidentally was on the free list. The price of newsprint paper declined from 3.7 cents per pound in 1924 to 2.9 cents per pound in 1930—a decrease of 0.8 cents per pound or more than 20 percent. Newsprint also was on the free list. The price of carpet wool, also on the free list, fell from 30 cents per pound in 1925 to 20 cents per pound in 1930, a decrease of 10 cents or 33⅓ percent. The same was true of other types of wool. The price of jute or burlap fell from 13.6 cents per pound in 1925 to 9.1 cents per pound in 1930, a decrease of 4.5 cents per pound, or about 33⅓ percent. The same is true with reference to most if not all of the other fibers. Thus raw silk fell from $6.21 per pound to $3.57 per pound, a decrease of $2.64 or over 40 percent.

Many other items fell much more violently. In 1925 the foreign price of crude rubber averaged 48.4 cents per pound. And in 1926 the average was 54.6 cents per pound. Rubber also was on the free list. By 1930 the average price was down to 12.9 cents per pound. This was a decrease of more than 75 percent in the price of rubber. The price of coffee, also on the free list, fell from 22.3 cents per pound in 1925 to 13.1 cents in 1930—a decrease of not far from 50 percent.

The purpose of these illustrations is to bring us to the group of items with which we are particularly concerned. The principal foreign fats and oils of tropical, vegetable origin include copra, coconut oil, palm oil, palm kernel oil, and so forth. For our purpose it will be sufficient to cite the experience in the case of copra which is produced in the greatest quantity and is most available in the world market. In 1925 the average foreign invoice value of copra was 5.0 cents per pound and in 1926 the average was 5.1 cents per pound. By 1930 the average price was down to 3.7 cents per pound. This was a decrease of nearly 30 percent before the passage of the Tariff Act of 1930. Since copra was on the free list it cannot be said that the tariff had anything to do with the world price structure. There were no other trade restrictions to complicate the situation.

The price of copra continued down and during the period from 1926 to 1934 the price fell from 5.1 cents per pound to 1.2 cents per pound. This was a decrease of slightly more than 75 percent. In other words, a billion pounds of copra at 5 cents per pound would be worth $50,000,000, but at 1.2 cents per pound the value would be only $12,000,000. Here we have a concrete illustration of what really happened to our import and export trade. Taking all commodities combined, the dollar value of imports, free or dutiable, fell about 70 percent and the same happened to our exports. About one-half of the decline in prices had taken place before the passage of the Tariff Act of 1930. The other half of the decline took place between June 1930, and 1932-33. This should be sufficient to establish the point that since the collapse preceded the passage of the Tariff Act of 1930, that Act could neither be charged with being the cause or in fact with having anything directly to do with the world-wide depression. Incidentally, it may well be noted here that, assuming the same price level for all dutiable commodities, the rates of duty established in the Tariff Act of 1930 were only 1.6 percent higher than the average in the Tariff Act of 1922. And yet under the Tariff Act of 1922 the Nation grew rich and prosperous and foundations were laid for the greatness which was ours when we were called upon to participate in World War II.

Before passing to the next point, it should be noted that a very large part (if not overwhelming) which accounted for increases in dollar value of both imports and exports after the depth of the depression had been reached in 1932-33, came about through world-wide recovery and was in large measure due to the partial restoration of the world price structure. Here again it should be added that most of the recovery took place during 1933-34-35 before the trade agreements program had gotten into operation (except for the minor agreements with Cuba—September 3, 1934, Belgium—May 1, 1935, Haiti—June 3, 1935, Sweden—August 5, 1935). In other words, increases in foreign trade during the period 1936-39 were merely a continuation of increases which began during the years preceding the active negotiation of important trade agreements.

PARTIAL SUMMARY

From the analysis thus far made, it appears that in order to try to increase the volume of foreign trade, set forth as the purpose of

the amendment known as section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (to authorize the negotiation of trade agreements), the State Department has been willing:

I. To ignore the title of the Tariff Act of 1930 which states as its purpose (1) to provide revenue; (2) to encourage the industries of the United States; and (3) to protect American labor.

II. To ignore all provisions of seetion 336 which provides the formulas to be applied as a guide in adjusting tariff rates within the range of 50 percent above or below the rates of duty set forth in the basic act, and to substitute therefor any arbitrary reduction (up to 50 percent) which may be proposed by importers or by potential foreign suppliers of competitive products, even in cases where the tariff was as low as 5 percent or 10 percent and in no sense a barrier; and

III. To ignore the requirements of section 336 which specify that cost comparisons shall be made with the principal foreign supplier, in the principal American markets.

On the other hand:

IV. There is nothing to indicate that equivalent concessions have been granted by foreign governments;

V. Such concessions as were granted by foreign governments have immediately been extended to all others so that there could be no specific gain to our producers seeking export outlets;

VI. Our own concessions were immediately extended to all other countries (with two exceptions due to charges of discrimination) so that the foreign country with which we were negotiating gained no specific advantage in our markets over other foreign competitors, but only an advantage over our own producers;

VII. When these concessions were generalized to all others these other countries were not required to make any equivalent concessions to us.

VIII. In spite of the fact that there could be no exact matching of equivalent concessions (country by country) and no direct benefit to us or to the countries with which we concluded agreements, the State Department erroneously, and evidently with the purpose to deceive the people of this country, has continuously referred to the trade agreements program as "reciprocal" in character when in fact it was merely a scheme to carry out a wide-spread reduction of all rates of duty, without formulae, in the midst of the worst world-wide depression on record, during the 6 years 1934–39, and the greatest military conflict of history, during the 6 years 1940–45. This program is now being carried forward, during an era of world economic chaos and confusion.

IX. In turn the State Department, when it was eminently clear that there could be no special benefit either to the United States or to the countries with which agreements were entered into, has continued to put out false and misleading statistics purporting to show that, while following the dual policy of country by country negotiation combined with unconditional most favored nation treatment, nonetheless special benefits could and did accrue to the negotiating countries.

X. Finally, the general downward revision of the entire tariff rate schedule in this piecemeal fashion is explained on the grounds that "the Tariff Act of 1930 was the highest on record in this country," "the highest of any country in the world," and "the cause of the depression" which we have seen began in foreign countries as much as 5 years before the passage of the act of 1930. They have even charged that the British Empire preference system was in retaliation when in fact Empire preferences had been developed over a period of more than 100 years and likewise existed with other colonial powers. Other charges have been found, upon examination, to be equally false. And finally, the trade agreements neither brought about prosperity or preserved peace.

REAL BASIS FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

What, then, is the basis for the whole trade-agreements programs? The answer is clear that it is a plan to take jurisdiction over all tariffs, excise taxes, and the regulation of foreign trade away from Congress where it was placed by the Constitution and to carry out a widespread program of free trade, or as near an approach to that doctrine as can be accomplished under such benevolent slogans as "freer trade," "reciprocity," "removing barriers to world trade," and "world-wide economic peace, harmony, and prosperity."

While setting up the laudable purpose of reducing hunger and suffering all over the world, raising foreign living standards, and stimulating full employment and abundance, the program in fact contemplates opening the American market to cut-throat competition from low wage countries, exposing our markets to the unlimited dumping of low-cost and low-priced products from everywhere, produced under conditions which would not be countenanced in this country, eventually leading to a new collapse in prices, a new scourge of low wages to meet this competition or unemployment, and a new era of deficit financing, and the ever-present threat of communism. In the process we are asked to place the making of the rules of trade and their enforcement and policing in the hands of an international trade organization and thus to surrender national sovereignty in this field.

Undoubtedly the present price level is higher than we would want to continue. It is one of the results of wartime forces, unwise postwar economic actions encouraged by the Government as to wages and cost of production, and our foreign giving and lending policies. However laudable our foreign relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction programs, they must soon be brought to an end. We, with 6 or 7 percent of the world's population, cannot rebuild and reorganize the whole foreign economic structure without insolvency or bankruptcy of our own Government and economic structure. Our greatest task is to bring the war's aftermath to an end as rapidly as possible and see to it that our own American market is protected for our own gainfully employed while efficiency, wages, and living standards of others are being raised.

If a collapse in prices is countenanced as a result of this drive to expand foreign trade (beyond reasonable postwar price readjustments now in progress) how shall our National Government support a national debt of over $260,000,000,000 or raise an annual tax bill of more than $26,000,000,000, or sustain a national income of anything like $150,000,000,000 when our population shall reach 150,000,000 people, or hope to maintain anything like present wage levels, or keep 60,000,000 persons employed?

And yet the ultimate goal of the trade-agreements program seems to be to bring the American market into open competition for all the low-cost products of foreign areas—including farm, fish, forest, mine, and quarry, and factory products—and thus to force prices back down to the levels of the 1930's—with collapse in wages and employment following the downward trail of prices.

It cannot be claimed that these foreign products are either efficiently or economically produced. We have the best balanced diversified economic structure in the world, and in efficiency, or production per man-hour, we lead the world through extraordinary use of plant, power, and machinery. The large use of capital for this purpose is why we call our system capitalistic. But it is also privately operated and competitive in character. The capital invested in plants, power, and machinery must earn interest or profits and management must have salaries. How is this system to compete with low foreign wages and low living standards, without the use—where necessary—of tariffs, excises, imposts, fees, processing taxes, or quantitative controls over potential imports if, as or when our price structure is endangered. These tools needed to protect our economic structure we now propose to take away from Congress and to give to an international organization.

In closing, permit me to call attention to a historical parallel. After a brief period of price inflation and an equally brief period of deflation, after World War I, prices leveled off to a plateau with a wholesale price index which we officially call 100.0—using the calendar year 1926=100.0. The range during the 15 years 1921–35 was as follows:

Wholesale price index numbers

[1926=100.0]

1921	97.6
1922	96.7
1923	100.6
1924	98.1
1925	103.5
1926	100.0
1927	95.4
1928	96.7
1929	95.3
1930	86.4
1931	73.0
1932	64.8
1933	65.9
1934	74.9
1935	80.0

From this we see a narrow range in price movement between 1921 and 1929 from a low of 95.3 to a high of 103.5. Then came the collapse, originating in many parts of the world. We were not prepared for it. The decline in our wholesale price index was about 35 percent by 1932, while the decline in dollar value of foreign trade was 70 percent. But between 1925 and 1930 the decline was from 103.5 to 86.4, a decrease of 17.1 points or one-half of the total decline before the Tariff Act of 1930 was passed and before any excise taxes or quotas were introduced in an effort to save us from the foreign collapse.

Now I must conclude with specific reference to certain tropical and other foreign vegetable and animal fats and oils.

[All values are cents per pound]

Year	Copra, foreign invoice	Coconut oil, crude (Pacific coast)	Palm oil, Sumatra (New York)	Palm kernel oil[1] (New York)	Tallow, inedible (Chicago)	Grease, A—White (Chicago)	Cottonseed oil, prime summer (New York)	Peanut oil	Lard, refined (Chicago)	Butter (Chicago)
1925	5.0	9.8	8.6	10.3	9.7	9.8	10.8	10.5	17.9	45.2
1926	5.1	9.4	8.0	10.0	8.7	8.5	11.8	11.3	16.9	44.4
1927	4.6	8.2	7.1	9.1	8.1	7.7	9.7	11.3	13.7	47.2
1928	4.5	8.0	7.3	9.1	8.8	8.3	9.9	9.6	13.3	47.4
1929	4.2	7.1	7.4	8.4	8.5	8.0	9.7	9.0	12.9	45.0
1930	3.7	5.9	5.7	6.8	6.8	5.6	8.1	7.2	12.0	36.4
1931	2.4	5.3	3.9	5.5	3.9	3.5	6.0	6.2	9.0	28.3
1932	1.8	4.5	2.9	4.8	3.2	2.6	3.8	3.6	6.2	21.0
1933	1.4	4.2	3.2	4.3	3.4	3.0	4.5	4.1	6.4	21.7
1934	1.2	3.9	3.1	4.0	4.2	4.0	6.5	6.0	8.8	25.5
1935	2.1	4.7	4.3	5.4	7.0	6.8	10.4	9.5	15.0	29.8
1936	2.1	5.3	4.4	8.1	6.6	6.3	9.8	8.8	12.2	33.0
1937	3.3	6.3	5.0	5.2	8.2	8.0	9.2	8.6	12.6	34.0
1938	1.8	3.4	3.1	4.1	5.6	5.3	7.9	7.1	9.2	28.0
1939	1.6	3.1	2.7	7.3	5.1	5.2	6.6	5.9	7.4	26.0

[1] Denatured, 1926–32; crude oil, 1933–39.

In this table the first four columns have to do with tropical copra and three tropical vegetable fats or oils. The last six columns are fats and oils, vegetable and animal, of domestic origin.

The price of copra fell from 5.1 cents per pound in 1926 to 1.2 cents in 1934—a decrease of 3.9 cents or 76.5 percent, or more than double the decline in wholesale prices for all commodities in the United States.

Crude coconut oil fell from 9.8 cents per pound in 1925 to 3.9 cents in 1934—a decrease of 5.9 cents or over 60 percent.

Palm oil fell from 8.6 cents per pound in 1925 to 3.1 cents in 1934, or 64 percent. Palm kernel oil fell from 10.3 cents in 1925 to 4 cents in 1934, a decline of 6.3 cents or over 61 percent.

Now let us see the effect upon our domestic price levels of competitive American products of farm origin. Inedible tallow fell from 9.7 cents in 1925 to 3.2 cents in 1932, a decrease of 6.5 cents or over 67 percent. It was trying to hold its place in the American market. The quantity depended upon the number and finish of cattle and sheep slaughtered and could not be reduced merely by closing a factory door. White grease (grade A) fell in price from 9.8 cents per pound in 1925 to only 2.6 cents in 1932—a decrease of 7.2 cents or 73.5 percent or equal to the decline in price of copra. It, too, was trying to hold its place in the home market.

Cottonseed oil, a joint product with production of cotton fiber, fell from 11.8 cents in 1926 to 3.8 cents in 1932—a decrease of 8 cents per pound or 68 percent. Peanut oil fell in the same proportion.

Lard fell over 65 percent from 1925 to 1932 and butter fell nearly 60 percent from 1928 to 1932.

It is important that we remember that coconuts, palm fruit, and nuts grow on tropical palm trees. Production was increasing by leaps and bounds during the period in question. Europe was short of fats and oils and needed billions of pounds, but wanted them at the lowest possible prices. They were willing to exploit the Tropics, as well as the whale fisheries in Antarctica. But why should we sit by and leave control to foreign groups?

Incidentally, European countries—in control in a buyers' market due to tropical expansion—because they paid such low prices to the people of the exploited areas, could sell little to them and lost a potential market in their tropical, colonial areas for manufactured products up into billions of dollars. Then they demanded entry into our markets for their surplus manufactured goods. This access to our markets they now expect to get under the trade agreements and International Trade Organization program.

In contrast with foreign commercially produced copra and coconut oil and palm and palm-kernel oil, such domestically produced items as tallow, grease, lard, and cottonseed oil are joint products of the livestock and cotton branches of American agriculture. Corn, oats, barley, and other feed grains, hay and forage crops, were equally affected, since they furnished the feed for livestock. All of these were affected in like degree. Peanuts, soybeans, and flaxseed are special oil-bearing crops which were affected incident to the general collapse. Although there was some recovery in prices between 1932 and 1937 due to partial world economic recovery, another period of depression set in during 1938 and 1939 and was only overcome by the outbreak of World War II. Now we find many of the fats and oils items, such as inedible tallow, fish oils, cottonseed, soybean, peanut, corn, and linseed oil, produced from materials grown on thousands of American farms, fisheries, and ranches being considered for substantial concessions in the pending negotiations.

WHAT IS AHEAD?

What have we to look forward to in the years just ahead? While present prices are excessive due to war and early postwar circumstances and should presently settle down to what we may hope to call normal levels, we cannot look upon present State Department programs of removal of all tariffs and excise taxes, or prohibitions of processing taxes on imports or quotas with anything short of fear, since present plans are to pledge foreign countries to tie the hands of Congress, fix or bind reduced status against congressional action and prohibit the use of quantitative and/or other forms of control. At the same time the general program of the State Department is to place extensive authority in the hands of an international organization to make the rules, enforce them and police the agreements—an organization in which we shall have only 1 out of about 50 votes, all of the others seeking a favored place in the American market.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The presentation of certain facts and figures with reference to fats and oils in which the National Renderers Association is principally interested and the accompanying discussion of economic principles, legislation and administration leads to the following conclusions and recommendations:

I. The Ways and Means Committee could to advantage make clear to the country that, until repealed, the law providing for the regulation of commerce with foreign countries, is still contained in the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and that the guiding principles still are "to provide revenue, to encourage the industries of the United States, and to protect American labor." Within that framework a large and increasing volume of international trade is to be encouraged (as provided for in section 350) by the negotiation of trade agreements with individual foreign countries, with necessary safeguarding provisions to assure the national defense and general welfare against possible injury. Laws providing for excises and processing taxes on imports and laws providing for protection of agriculture against excessive imports as well as the Anti-Dumping Act are supplementary and should be administered consistent with the Tariff Act.

II. Sections 336, 337, and 338 of the Tariff Act providing for tariff rate and classification changes, and action in cases of foreign discriminations and unfair methods of competition, are (like all other parts of the act) in full force and effect and cannot be changed except by legislation. The same applies to the Webb-Pomerene Act providing for coordination in the development of export trade. None of these provisions can be suspended in trade agreements, but can only be changed by acts of Congress or negotiation of treaties as provided by the Constitution.

III. Section 336 of the Tariff Act provides that changes in rates of duty or classification shall be made in relation to trade with the principal foreign competitor. This should be equally binding in negotiations under section 350. This is particularly important since concessions are then generalized to all countries. Where there are two or more important foreign suppliers of any commodity, each should be required to make equivalent concessions before being granted concessions by us.

IV. Before the present version of section 350 is extended an attempt should be made to work out more definite formulas or guides in order to avoid the possibility of error or arbitrary changes in the intent of the law. It may be that this could best be done by changes in section 336 and requiring the administration of section 350 in harmony therewith.

V. The organization and functioning of the Tariff Commission as an active agency of Congress needs review and important improvements, far beyond new instructions recently set forth by the Chief Executive.

VI. The Ways and Means Committee might well caution the Chief Executive against too elaborate a general revision of tariff schedules in the present negotiations in Geneva, Switzerland. The President, from time to time, in special messages, addresses, and press releases, advises the Congress and informs the public. Why not "reciprocate"? The Tariff Commission, after 2 years of study (since the last 3-year extension of sec. 350), has concluded that: "The economic conditions * * * throughout the world were so disturbed in 1939, as the result of preparations for and actual outbreak of war, that the statistics of United States imports for that year cannot be taken as indicating what would have been the effects of * * * duty reductions under peacetime conditions; the import data for the war years are still less indicative of what would have been these effects." They might very well have added that the same conditions prevail since the order to "cease fire" and may well continue until peace treaties have been agreed upon—if, indeed, not for a period of 2 or 3 years thereafter. All of this would justify a word of caution in order to avoid the possibility of a forced retreat along the tariff front.

VII. What has just been said with reference to revisions in rates of duty should be said with emphasis as to the inclusion in trade agreements of a great mass of legislative provisions unless these agreements are to be submitted to Congress for review before final acceptance.

VIII. It would seem to be especially desirable to warn against inclusion (in pending trade agreements) of the substance of proposals being considered for inclusion in the suggested charter for an international trade organization, unless or until the charter has been perfected, submitted to an international conference, and approved either by Congress or in the form of a worldwide treaty by the Senate. To include these tentative proposals might indicate not only a desire to avoid submitting them to Congress but might later cause utmost confusion if important changes were found to be necessary.

IX. Special precautions should be taken to make sure that functions assigned by our Constitution to Congress or to the House of Representatives are not delegated to any international body or traded away in any agreement entered into, without previous consideration by Congress or the Senate.

X. Since it is the duty of Congress—among other responsibilities—"to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States"; it may be placing the national economy in jeopardy by binding present or reduced rates of duty against increase or by binding all other imported products on the free list. The Constitution prohibits the imposition of duties on exports, but authorizes their use as a source of revenue on imports. It should be remembered that during the first 70 years of our Nation's history customs duties provided about 90 percent of the total ordinary revenue collected by the National Government; and from 1860 to 1915 nearly 50 percent came from the same source. In contrast, at the present time, customs duties provide only about 1 percent of the total ordinary revenue of the National Government.

During the last full year before the outbreak of World War II, the United Kingdom and Dominions, including Ireland and India, collected revenues from customs duties and excises of $1,637,153,000. This represented 20.6 percent of the value of all imports. On that basis the United States might set as a goal a revenue of a billion dollars a year (a flat 20 percent duty on $5,000,000,000 of imports), or 4 percent of a budget of $25,000,000,000. The question may some day be asked by some why foreign trade should be tax free while domestic production and trade bears the burden. Many of the imports are luxury goods and a tax on these might not be in conflict with sound fiscal policy.

We need not limit this comparison to contrast of United States policy with the British Empire. The 55 countries, outside of the United States and Soviet Russia, which will go to make up the United Nations organization reported imports valued at about $22,000,000,000 during their fiscal year 1937–38, and revenue from customs duties of $4,000,000,000, or almost exactly 20 percent. If we are to become the world's leading trading

nation and are to maintain the world's greatest naval and air service to aid in the maintenance of world peace and prosperity and to protect our commerce, the people of the United States might think it wise public policy to assess part of the cost of this enterprise to our foreign trade especially since billions of the people's savings are being invested in foreign areas in the form of government contributions to world relief, rehabilitation, stabilization, and development.

Tribute to James E. Shepard, Negro Educator of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD an article from the Durham Morning Herald of May 4, 1947, which tells a most interesting story about a North Carolina college, one of the great institutions of North Carolina, maintained for the education of Negro boys and girls.

Dr. James E. Shepard, one of the outstanding Negroes of America, and in many respects the North Carolina successor to Booker T. Washington, was the real founder of this institution, and has been its president since it was established. He has shown great wisdom in the direction of this splendid college and in his leadership and guidance of the Negro race in North Carolina and throughout the South. This article was accompanied by many pictures of this institution, its president, its large student body, and its many activities.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGE, ONE OF FOUR INSTITUTIONS OF KIND IN UNITED STATES, STANDS AS MONUMENT TO JAMES E. SHEPARD

(By Tom MacCaughelty)

In a country where even Negroes are divided into two camps over techniques of raising the status of America's minorities, the North Carolina College at Durham stands as a living monument to a Negro who preaches and practices the philosophy that the minority group should emphasize its duties more than its rights.

This is not to say that Dr. James E. Shepard, founder and president of the college, is fully satisfied with the attainment of his race in North Carolina, nor that he has closed his eyes to the claims of discriminations against his people. It is to say that Dr. Shepard puts little faith in the efficacy of racial feuds in courts or elsewhere and much faith in the friendlier processes of democracy, which he describes as "that audacious belief of our people that in the most ordinary men there are resident the more extraordinary possibilities, and that if we keep the doors of opportunity open to them, they will amaze us with their achievements."

Symbolic of that definition of democracy, the college has become an open door to opportunity for countless Negroes, and both a producer of and a working place for men of achievement, as the following facts show: (1) Together with great numbers of needed but less outstanding workers in a wide variety of pursuits, the college has produced such men as A. T. Spaulding, the only Negro insurance actuary in the country; H. M. Michaux, head of the Union Insurance & Realty Co. of Durham; R. L. McDougald, vice president of the Mechanics & Farmers Bank; and J. L. Tilley, president of the Florida Normal and Industrial School; (2) out of its 43 faculty members teaching in the undergraduate school, 12 hold doctor of philosophy degrees; (3) the college is one of only four Negro colleges in the country that is approved by the Association of American Universities.

The college's history and growth offers one of the best arguments for its founder's philosophy of race relationships. And since one man, Dr. Shepard, is largely responsible for its inception, success, and prestige, the story of the college begins properly with him.

SON OF MINISTER

He was born the son of a minister on November 3, 1875. He attended Shaw University in Raleigh, receiving a degree of doctor of philosophy from the department of pharmacy in 1894. That same year he opened a drug store in Durham. In 1898, he became comparer of deeds in the Recorder's Office, Washington, D. C., and from 1899 to 1905 was deputy collector of United States internal revenue in Raleigh. Between 1899 and 1905 he traveled the country as field superintendent for the International Sunday School Association.

While working in this capacity he became convinced of the need for trained Negro ministers to act as leaders for the race, and soon afterward set about raising money to establish a training school. (In 1907, he was the only Negro speaker at the World's Sunday School Convention in Rome.)

The school, known as the National Religious Training School and Chautauqua, was established in 1910 on a 25-acre tract, forming part of the present site. The land was a gift largely of the white people of Durham. By January 1912, 10 buildings had been erected, 2 of which, Avery Auditorium and Chidley Hall, still stand on the campus.

Those early years were characterized by a wealth of enthusiasm but a dearth of money. Private donations and student fees were the institution's only support, and the latter had to be kept low. Board and room cost $7 per month; tuition $1 for the same period. A teacher or professor earned $500 to $1,000 a year.

Designed as a college, it was found necessary to include a high-school course; so the institution at first combined a high school, 4-year college training school for country ministers, commercial school, and home-economics school. What was to become, after 37 years and four changes of name, the North Carolina College at Durham, with approximately 1,100 students and over 100 staff members, began with a staff of 21 persons and 109 students.

ADDED MORE DEGREES

Dr. Shepard struggled to raise necessary funds and at the same time added more degrees to his name—D. D., Muskingum College, Ohio, 1912; A. M., Selma University, Alabama, 1913. Nonetheless, in 1915 the financial difficulties became so great that the school had to be sold and reorganized. In this second stage of its development the institution was known as the National Training School. Mrs. Russell Sage, of New York, came to the rescue by giving enough money for the property to be bought back.

The school had begun to attract the attention of observers throughout the South when the First World War dumped it into another financial depression. To insure the survival of the school two plans were considered. One was to turn over the control of the school to one of several interested denominational boards. The other plan, which was adopted, was to give the property to the State as a public institution. Accordingly, in 1923 the National Training School became the Durham State Normal School.

In 1925 the school experienced two important events. A fire destroyed three important buildings, the administration building, the classroom building, and men's dormitory. These were immediately replaced, but of more importance, that same year, Dr. Shepard, with a brand new literary degree from Howard University, and others were successful in a legislative campaign to make of the school the first State-supported Negro liberal arts college. The school became the North Carolina College for Negroes.

Then came expansion of the plant, with B. N. Duke contributing $42,000, the citizens of Durham $8,000, and the State $100,000.

But a new crisis arose in 1929 when the legislature considered the consolidation of the North Carolina College for Negroes with A. and T. College at Greensboro. Protests from citizens of Durham resulted in the appointment by Gov. Max Gardner of a fact-finding commission, whose unanimous recommendation that the college be continued at Durham was adopted.

NEW BUILDINGS ADDED

The world-wide depression in the years following 1929 checked college enrollment, but, at the same time, indirectly made possible Federal and State building projects which added a library, three dormitories, six cottages for faculty members, a gymnasium, a laundry, a science building, and an auditorium. Worthy of note, in this connection, is the fact that Dr. Shepard was instrumental in getting Federal and State grants from Democratic administrations, although he was and is an outspoken Republican.

Today the North Carolina College at Durham (so named by the last State legislature) not only offers 26 undergraduate courses in subjects from art to zoology, but also includes a graduate school of arts and sciences, a school of hygiene and public health, a school of public-health education, a school of library science, and a school of law.

The student body, about 60 percent women, represents nearly every State in the Nation, with a majority from North Carolina. Students represent all economic brackets.

There are accommodations for only about half the students to live on campus, the others rooming or living with relatives in town. All facilities are crowded, dormitories particularly, with four students often living in rooms designed for two occupants. Nonetheless, rigid scholastic standards are maintained, and graduating students have no trouble in entering graduate schools.

Being a State school, the college can't be highly selective in accepting students, but can and does bounce those who don't make the grade, once they have entered.

Dr. Shepard's fondest hope is for the college to become a university in the fullest sense. As might be expected, he doesn't expect this to be accomplished overnight. He hopes that a school of public-health nursing will be established this fall, and looks forward to the establishment of a school of social work that will lead eventually to a school of medicine.

Growth of Industrial Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles

by Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post of May 1, 1947:

GROWTH OF INDUSTRIAL MONOPOLY

(By Marquis Childs)

The visitor from Mars—and if we accept the word of our more romantic scientists, he may be here any day now—is bound to find many puzzling contradictions on our troubled planet. Here in the United States, he is certain to be confused by the way in which the word monopoly is bandied back and forth.

It figures largely in the drive for restrictive labor legislation. The National Association of Manufacturers is spending a great deal of money on advertisements hitting at industry-wide bargaining. The public is being told that this is a monopoly of a little clique of labor leaders.

But curiously enough, at the same time we find the NAM growing red in the face with anger at anyone who dares to say that monopoly in the ownership of business is growing at a new and accelerated pace. It is only left-wingers and "collectivists" who would dare to say such a thing.

Specifically Earl Bunting, head of NAM, attacks a report issued by the Federal Trade Commission. Now the Federal Trade Commission is a respectable old-line agency that existed long before the New Deal was ever heard of. Yet Bunting interprets the report as sinister evidence that the FTC has been captured by left-wingers.

The NAM president has chosen an odd way to refute the FTC report on the growth of monopoly. He, or his economists for him, takes the number of corporations that have been absorbed by merger since 1940 and compares it with the total number of business firms. Thus he reaches the conclusion that, at this rate, it would take a thousand years to monopolize American industry and therefore we are perfectly safe.

In so doing, he ignores the major conclusion of the report. That was the fact that the 1,800 companies which were merged with larger companies represented 5 percent of the total value of all manufacturing corporations. Most of those mergers took place in the last 2 or 3 years.

The total number of companies is not the important point. The important point is that 5 percent, which is not to be derided as the bogey of left-wingers and collectivists. Five percent is a sizable chunk of our economy. The threat of merger and absorption is a very real one to thousands of smaller businesses throughout the country.

Name-calling is so silly and futile. It is always the last resort of a man with a bad case or a bad conscience.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY of Wyoming is no left-winger. He has been fighting for the past 10 years to keep the free-enterprise system free by keeping it competitive. He has had the courage to say that the giant corporations are in reality collectivism—a kind of private socialism. And being wise in the ways of politics and human behavior, he knows that private socialism will sooner or later in a democracy become public socialism.

O'MAHONEY and Representative ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, have a bill before Congress which would stop one of the loopholes in our antitrust laws. The law, as it stands today, says that one corporation may not acquire the stock of another where that would help to create a monopoly. It says nothing about acquiring the physical assets—plants and machines—of another corporation.

Most of the mergers in recent years have been by the latter method. The O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill would close that gap.

If Congress is going to attack the labor monopoly by law, as the NAM wants, then Congress cannot very well ignore the monopoly that exists in many fields of business. There seems to me to be little point in arguing which monopoly came first. Industry-wide bargaining may have grown up because of the existence of industry-wide trade associations and industry-wide price-fixing. But like the argument over which came first, the chicken or the egg, this is irrelevant.

"Now is the time," said NAM President Bunting, "to clean out the system changers from the temple of Government." As Senator O'MAHONEY sees it, the system changers are those who would monopolize all business and thereby prepare the way for the all-dominant state.

Hon. Charles L. Gerlach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a brief tribute to my dear friend and colleague, CHARLES GERLACH, who passed away on Sunday. When I first came to Washington as a Member of Congress, it was my good fortune to meet Mr. GERLACH. He began to take an interest in me, advising me on legislative matters and functions of the Government I should know. This friendship became warmer and closer and in his passing I know that I have lost a friend. The people of his district have lost a courageous representative, one who rendered great service to his people. We shall miss him greatly, those of us who served with him. A kindly, gracious, and courteous gentleman and friend, CHARLIE GERLACH will always remain in the memory of those of us who were privileged to know him.

Fascism in Action—Will It Be Printed as a Public Document?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the booklet, Fascism in Action, was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It contains a thorough discussion after exhaustive study and research of fascism in Europe, particularly Italy, Germany, and Spain. The other work which was prepared contained a discussion on fascism in the United States.

February 5, 1947, I endorsed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the manuscript of a documented study and analyses of Fascism in Action, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.

This resolution was referred to the Committee on House Administration. The Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE, chairman of the Committee on House Administration, referred the resolution to the Subcommittee on Printing. The Honorable ROBERT J. CORBETT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Printing, reported the resolution on April 29 back to the Committee on House Administration, for consideration and report to the House of Representatives; this report carried neither a favorable nor an unfavorable recommendation. It is my understanding that it was reported to the Committee on House Administration for such action as that committee desired to take. The Committee on House Administration has a regular meeting next week, May 14, at which time this resolution is expected to be considered. It is my hope that the resolution will be favorably considered and the document printed as a public document.

COMMUNISM BAD—FASCISM EQUALLY BAD

The booklet, Communism in Action, has been very popular and very helpful to people who are trying to understand the different forces that are trying to undermine and overthrow our Government. We must be on the alert against the spreading of communism. It is wrong in principle, and there is nothing right about it, and our country cannot survive under the leadership of Communist dictators. At the same time, while we are fighting communism coming up from the left, we must not overlook the serious threat to our country from fascism on the right. In other words, while we are so fiercely and successfully defeating the enemy communism, we must not permit an enemy equally as bad and equally as destructive to approach us from the rear, and just as successfully destroy our country as communism would destroy it.

When a Member of Congress sends out the booklet, Communism in Action, it occurs to me that he should at the same time send out the booklet Fascism in Action, which represents the second threat to our democracy. In most of the requests I receive for the book Communism in Action—and I have sent out lots of them—a request is also made for the book Fascism in Action, but of course it cannot be sent now, for it has not been printed.

I do not favor either fascism or communism. I am strongly opposed to both. It is just as important that information be disseminated about fascism as it is about communism. We should never get ourselves in a position in this country where one will be fought so bitterly and nothing said about the other, that the other will remain the only alternative in a crisis.

It is my hope that on May 14 the Committee on the House Administration will authorize the printing of this document.

Twenty-five Cents a Thousand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Amboy Herald, of Amboy, Minn., concerning the printing of stamped envelopes by the Post Office Department:

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS A THOUSAND

This is no secret for these facts are available at every post office in the land. Anyone can purchase 1,000 three-cent stamped envelopes for between $32 and $33, $30 of this sum being the postage. And, then, for around 25 cents extra per thousand, you can have your return card printed in the corner. No small-town publisher can compete with this kind of competition, and there is something wrong somewhere when the small publisher and printer is expected to tolerate this competition; and, then, on the other hand, to accept a big increase in second-class postage rates. Figured on that basis, the small newspaper man and printer is paying a premium for the second-class postage privilege. But we are told that a postage increase is necessary to wipe out a deficit in the Post Office Department, but they fail to give as one of the reasons of this deficit the Department's practice of printing 1,000 envelopes for the paltry sum of 25 cents. Such a practice is utterly inexplicable and unsound and must be abolished if the Post Office Department wants to be made even fairly solvent. But there is a ray of hope at last. One bill has now been introduced into the House and another into the Senate to eliminate the printing of envelopes by the Post Office Department, and if every newspaper in the country does not urge support of these bills, then he or they should have their heads examined. It's our move, and are we moving!

Address of President Aleman at the Pan American Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of President Aleman at the special meeting held in his honor by the governing board of the Pan American Union:

Your Excellencies, in behalf of my country I thank you for the cordial honor that the governing board of the Pan American Union has bestowed on me.

I am sure that my countrymen will, like myself, see in this gathering not only an act of international courtesy for the President of Mexico, but a recognition of the steadfastness with which my country from the earliest years of its independent life, has made the destinies of America a main object of its interest and of its devotion.

I am also grateful to his excellency, Don Antonio Rocha, president of the governing board, for the words that he has addressed to me and which I value in all their generosity. They are for me singularly significant coming from the representative of a republic with which my people and myself feel bound by strong ties of friendship and admiration.

On the magnificent perspective of history, the political thought of the Americas stands out over many others by virtue of its belief in the power of ideals. An ideal is always, in fact, a dynamic principle, pregnant with the marvelous power of projecting itself into the future. Like a seed, an ideal carries in itself the traits of a development not always foreknown. Maturing in time, it acquires a tangible form that brings out the growing power synthesized in its origin.

ADMITS SLOWNESS IN ACHIEVEMENT

From Simon Bolivar to our day the Pan American ideal has been felt to be the desire of our republics to unite. The liberator thought that the hour was at hand to lay the bases of his doctrine of perpetual alliance, although, certainly, his clearsighted genius was aware that such a union could not be achieved at once, as by a prodigy, but "through sensible effects and well directed efforts."

How did our peoples respond, for long years, to that purpose of unity? What efforts did they make?

We have to admit that for long whiles wraths and discords darkened the horizon. But despite several crises, our nations, at times unwittingly, made headway as desired. And if there were times when our nations despaired, it was because the road led constantly uphill, cutting into the hardest granite of the mountain.

Now that we find ourselves at a height from which we can view how far our republics have advanced, we marvel at the success attained. Many interests, apparently opposed, have been harmonized and many situations, irreconcilable in appearance, have been directed to the single goal which the liberator prefigured in full light during his poignant exile in Jamaica.

MANY OBSTACLES SURMOUNTED

Between the Congress of Panama and the creation of the commercial office of the International Union of the American Republics, and between this last and the Pan American Union of our day, many obstacles have been surmounted and much selfishness has been overcome.

The fulfillment of Bolivar's ideal is at hand.

The international situation over and above what our peoples may claim, shows how necessary the Americas are for the peace of the world and for the United Nations, an organization within whose worldwide scope, the usefulness of regional agreements is recognized.

Under such pressing circumstances, we must not defer making actual the principles that for more than a century have served us as solid bridges for our cooperation and our unity.

Our common love of freedom offers our hemisphere with honor and offers the best foundation for the political solidarity in which we live. Without the support provided by that common consciousness we might be, in the panorama of the present world, only a multiplicity of countries bound together by geography but dispersed by holding policies at variance with one another.

SPRINGS FROM LOVE OF LIBERTY

That which groups the stars of our skies into a clear constellation, what binds together and coordinates our countries without impairing the independence and the dignity of each, springs precisely from their essential love of liberty.

For us to be persuaded of this fact, it is not necessary here to recall that Hidalgo in 1810 decreed the abolition of slavery. The treaty of Panama condemned the slave traffic. The Mexican constitution of 1857 declared any slave free by the sole fact of setting foot upon territory of the Republic.

In prophetic vision, Abraham Lincoln, speaking of Negroes, said that "in some trying time to come they would probably help to keep the jewel of liberty in the family of freedom." Jose Marti movingly endeavored to institute "the cult of the full dignity of man" as the first law of his nation. In Brazil, Nabuco waged a fearless struggle. Benito Juarez, of unflinching will, made peace synonymous with the respect for the right of others.

The history of our people is the rehearsal of the enfranchisement of our citizens. We have wanted men free in order to have free countries, countries capable of achieving their union, as in this symbolic massing of flags, under a sun of freedom that does not deprive any of our banners of its colors and that shines with equal brightness upon the insignia of all.

Together with the feeling for liberty that so deeply in their being unites our countries, let me point out one of the more stable characteristics, the idea that liberty is to be preserved through the conjoint effort of our peoples.

CITES TREATY OF 1826

In proof enough of what I affirm, let us remember that Article 3rd of the Treaty of Union, League and Perpetual Confederation of July 15, 1826, contains in embryo the Act of Chapultepec. "The contracting parties"—that article stated—"obligate and commit themselves to their mutual defense against every attack that may jeopardize their political existence, and to employ, against the enemies of the independence of all or of any of them, all their influence."

These words burn with a faith that is still for us the faith of the Americas, the faith in the Americas. We have indeed formed an association to live in peace, and we do not wish to have our peace at the mercy of aggressors, because we know that sooner or later any aggression, wherever launched, imperils the peace of the Americas.

That fidelity to peace, as a bond of progress, is the essence of our heritage and is the truest promise of unity for the States of the New World.

Time flows by and is gone, circumstances change. But from generation to generation and from hand to hand, like the torch of Lucretius, the unchanging desire to live in independence is passed on. It is a desire that the independence of each nation, through the solidarity of all, may be the monument of an enduring peace, born in liberty, consecrated to justice and perfected through democracy.

Mexico, your excellencies, has never stinted its efforts to the task that this institution is designed to serve and to ennoble. Therefore, in expressing to you my appreciation of this ceremony that has brought us together, I but interpret the sentiments of my countrymen when I greet in each one of you a sister nation and when I express the fervent wish that continental brotherhood may always justify the pride of our republics in having achieved it, as well as we all desire it, with a heroic resolve, with foresight and with all our hearts.

Some American Problems, Immediate and Long Range

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, the annual Americanization Day parade and exercises took place in Jersey City on April 27.

This day was established in that city by the Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post, No. 134, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. From small beginnings it has grown to become one of the most important days on the civic calendar. The celebration is still sponsored by the

post, which organized it. Long since it drew the cooperation of Mayor Frank Hague and the city commission, as well as that of many other posts of all veteran organizations and of patriotic societies generally.

This year the parade was led by Mr. John W. Meagher, one of Jersey City's two gallant holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor. His chief of staff was Mr. Daniel D. Kemp, Sr. The general committee in charge of the inspiring event consisted of Hon. Frank H. Eggers, city commissioner, honorary chairman; Mr. George A. Thornton, Sr., of the Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, was general chairman; and Mr. Alex B. Luken of the same post, honorary general chairman.

More than 10,000 men and women participated in the parade, which was witnessed by more than 50,000 people. At Pershing Field, where the parade terminated and where the reviewing stand was set up, patriotic addresses were delivered to an audience of several thousand. Among the speakers were Hon. Frank H. Eggers, Mr. William G. McKinley, national executive commander of the American Legion, and myself. Invocation was made by Rev. A. E. Lyman-Wheaton, a prayer was offered by Rabbi Theodore Adams, and benediction pronounced by Rev. Walter P. Artioli. The master of ceremonies was Mr. Charles A. Peterson, past State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Each year on the occasion of this great and stirring demonstration Jersey City is honored by a visit from the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Our citizens were glad this year to welcome the present holder of that high and responsible office, Mr. Louis E. Starr. His splendid address, marked by eloquence, force, and wisdom, and received with enthusiasm, follows:

The lives of most of us are punctuated by occasional great moments. The opportunity to be with you here in Jersey City on Americanization Day and to address this wonderful gathering of Americans is one of the high spots of my life. I deeply appreciate this honor which you have bestowed upon me.

This organization which I represent, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is a patriotic organization, united in comradeship, to promote the best interests of our country. Ours is an organization of more than 2,000,000 members who have been tested in war. Ours is a fighting organization composed only of those who served in combat zones overseas. Our members know, first-hand, the utter futility of war. We are determined that the world must not again be further devastated by armed conflict.

But our members are realists; the millennium is not here, and until the United Nations is able to keep the peace we feel that America must keep it.

Nearly 90 percent of the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have recently returned to their homes from combat areas all over the world. There they observed some of the results of life under various political system. Actually, the composite GI—if there were such a person—would know more about the world than anyone in America. The GI returned to his country convinced that the American way of life is the best in the world. I believe it is literally true that not a single member of our organization who returned from overseas and joined the VFW in good faith would exchange our concept of government and way of life for that of any other country. Consequently, when we see our American system threatened the Veterans of Foreign Wars considers it a solemn obligation to combat the dangers which threaten our country.

Today America faces unprecedented problems and responsibilities—both at home and abroad. The returned veterans who risked their lives for the country they love are now determined to save it from the dangers of the postwar world.

There are two phases to our country's problems today: The immediate or temporary phase which demands action now, and the eventual or permanent phase.

Our immediate need is for sufficient military strength to keep the peace. Sound strategy for America demands that we use the talents given us. Our people belong to the mechanical age. We have the genius for mass production. We very recently astonished the world by our industrial productivity in weapons of war.

The outstanding event of World War II was the emergence of air power as the greatest striking force known. Wars of the future will be decided by air power. Once a nation gains mastery of the air, war becomes a shuttling problem—a mere matter of dumping explosives on targets in enemy territory. And today, fortunately, our country is more capable of producing striking force in the form of air power than any other country in the world. But, for economy's sake, we immediately converted our war industry into peacetime production at the war's conclusion. Thus we permitted our Air Force—the strongest in the world 2 years ago—to dwindle into third-rate status. It was false economy and now we must make amends quickly.

I am advised by those in a position to know, that our Air Force today needs some $5,000,000,000 for its proper development, maintenance, production, and training. I believe that this money should be made available now, and that economy should be exercised elsewhere.

I do not mean to slight the other arms of the service by this remark. I invite your attention to the fact that we already have the most powerful navy in the world; that the only other navy in existence is friendly; that our only potential enemy of consequence has no fleet. Our position with respect to naval power today is, therefore, entirely favorable.

In the war of the future, our ground forces will be used largely to defend bases from which air striking power is launched and as troops to administer enemy lands.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, therefore, has justifiably placed the development of the strongest air force in the world—capable of rapid expansion—as our first priority in the steps to safeguard our American way of life.

There is a second immediate problem. It is aid to the countries devastated by this last war. In these unfortunate countries, the economy has collapsed, the people are impoverished, the government structures are dislocated and threatened by totalitarianism. Such help as our country is able to give worthy peoples in need must be extended. But these measures must be considered merely as temporary expedients.

In the final analysis—if our way of life is to survive—people must want to enjoy the advantages of our system of government. If communism were to be destroyed, it could neither be destroyed by dollars nor by bayonets. It can only be eliminated by a better ideology.

Our long-range planning, therefore, must contemplate making our system work efficiently, effectively, economically—giving our people the maximum liberty with minimum interference from the Government. At the same time, our Government must be strong, yet liberal—a model for other peoples of the world to emulate, if they desire, so that they, too, will enjoy the benefits which we enjoy.

Certain results of the second war are possibly being overlooked by some of us. In Europe and in Asia some 15 countries are changing rapidly their economic and political structures. Imperialism is dead. The colonial system of the European countries is being dissolved.

The model in Asiatic countries is our successful experiment in the Philippines. These countries would copy this model.

From the ashes of World War II are arising new countries and new governments. All these new governments must eventually select their ideology. Totalitarianism through Communist agencies is making strenuous efforts to aline these new governments on the side in which the state is all, and the individual nothing.

Only the United States is strong enough spiritually and physically, to oppose the efforts which the Communists are making to establish puppet regimes. By word and by deed, our country must assume leadership. We must make our country and our way of life a model which the new nations, now emerging from the chaos of the war, seek to emulate.

The immediate problem at home today is to be strong militarily and at the same time preserve our economy. We are faced with an unprecedented public debt. We have operated with our books out of balance for nearly 20 years. Taxes have become so burdensome that the incentive to create new production is being imperiled. An examination of the history of taxes shows that throughout our country's existence, high taxes have limited production and low taxes have had the opposite effect.

Moreover, high taxes tend to deaden individual initiative. Today there are many able men in business who are unwilling to assume the responsibility of which they are capable. This tendency exists merely because their salaries and their income are so reduced by taxation that they elect an easier method of livelihood which pays as much as if they labored to the limit of their capabilities.

If our system of free enterprise is to survive, it must be unshackled and permitted to produce. As taxes are reduced, the incentive to use—and the availability of—venture capital increases.

I doubt if many of us have given much thought to the enormous and alarming increase in Government subsidies the last 5 years. We are spending billions in subsidies each year. This tremendously expensive practice must be curtailed as quickly as possible—lest the entire economy of our country become dislocated.

One of our great elder statesmen has recently remarked that the only salvation for America is increased production. With increased production and lower taxes, subsidies become less necessary.

Our world relief must be phased with our home planning. The two are not separate and distinct projects; rather they are analogous problems. World aid can arise only from a sound domestic economy.

Simultaneously, with the readjustment of our economy, our Government must cleanse itself of foreign influences which seek to concentrate power in the Government by taking it from the people. To free our Government of foreign influence is a matter in which we must all take a hand. We must devote the utmost attention to the selection of public officials who represent us.

Our Government can be no better than the people who support it. More than ever before, it is the duty of Americans to interest themselves in the policy and operation and effectiveness of our Government. If everyone in America would give his best

thought to the selection of public officeholders, and if everyone would study and express his conviction on public issues, I have every confidence in a great destiny for our people. If, on the other hand, we take no interest in preserving this great heritage of freedom which is ours, enemies, both from within and without, will rapidly rob us of our freedom. Let's be strong. Let's make our Government work. Let's put Americans on guard.

We Still Admire Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mankato Free Press, of Mankato, Minn.:

WE STILL ADMIRE CONGRESS

Americans like to have a laugh or two now and then at the expense of Congress; but only good-natured, well-intentioned laughs. Congress is, after all, a cherished institution, the citadel of democracy; the body, no matter what its shortcomings, that can come to bat and safeguard its citizens' rights. So it didn't go over well when a CIO organizing director, in speaking before a congressional committee as spokesman for organized labor, said "It would be a wonderful thing for the United States if Congress met only every ten years."

In reply to a question he added that he doubted if the committee, made up of 25 Congressmen, could do anything to improve the Wagner Act since no one of them had any comprehension of union labor's problems. It happened that some of them did have such comprehension. They had been workers in a number of trades and hold union memberships.

The Congress of the United States is the official organ for setting up national legislation covering labor and everything else. No institution representing a special class will get anywhere at all with the American people by flouting or ridiculing that body.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MITCHELL JENKINS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 171 years ago our forefathers expressed, in our own Declaration of Independence, the doctrines of freedom and personal and political liberty, which have been the guiding principles of this Republic of ours from that time down to the present. Those doctrines were not firmly established until they had been tested in the crucible of war and had been embodied in our Constitution. In that conflict there came to fight with us a great Polish patriot, Thaddeus Kosciusko, who had been nurtured in those same tenets of liberty and freedom in his native land. Fifteen years later, on May 3, 1791, he participated in the signing of the Constitution of—his own—Poland. What the Fourth of July represents to us here in America, the 3d of May represents to all true Poles, to those in Poland and those in exile, and to the millions of our fellow citizens of Polish extraction, in whose hearts burns the same love of freedom that drove Thaddeus Kosciusko to fight on the side of a few weak colonies against one of the great powers of Europe. We have in America no finer citizens than those Poland has given us, none more devoted to the fundamental concepts of a free society, none more willing to suffer privation and hardship, and to die, if need be, to preserve for themselves, for all of us, and our children, the precious heritage of freedom that has been bequeathed to us.

We in America can well be grateful to Poland and to the Americans of Polish extraction for what they have contributed, from its inception, to our country. And we can, with profit, scan that constitution which, long before we freed our own slaves, made every man who set foot on Polish soil, a free man; recognized the responsibility of the legislative body to the people, who were its creators; removed economic barriers; guaranteed religious liberty; and placed upon all citizens the responsibility for the defense of their country.

Today Poland is not free. As happened in the days of Catherine of Russia, today the same Russia has trampled ruthlessly upon the freedom of the Polish people. Its liberty gone, that word but a mockery, its constitution today but a farce, and the Russian usurper ruling in Warsaw, in the spirit of that constitution yet lives the soul of the people, and always will. As it did after Catherine's dismemberment of it, Poland will again be a free country, and, as we salute Poland on this anniversary, let us not forget that on us, and on our acquiescence in the Yalta agreement rests part of the responsibility for what is happening in Poland today. I hope the day may soon come when America can cleanse itself of that sin against a people whose only fault was that they were our allies and fought with us and for us to the bitter end, and can play its part, and it should be a major part, in driving out the usurpers and in restoring to those valiant people their freedom and their native land.

Alabama Department, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is now embarking upon a campaign to raise funds with which to erected in the State capital of Alabama, a suitable State headquarters. While this headquarters is primarily for the purpose of providing adequate facilities for the Alabama Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to discharge its obligations in behalf of the disabled veterans and the widows and orphans of those who paid the supreme sacrifice, as well as for the administration of that organization in Alabama, nevertheless, it will likewise serve as a living memorial to members of the armed forces who have lost their lives in the defense of our country. By unanimous vote of the administrative council of the Alabama department, it was decided that this proposed building would be dedicated as a memorial to those heroes, and the name of each preserved in bronze display in a special chapel of the building for this purpose.

This great organization of overseas veterans, now by and large made up of World War II veterans, has undertaken in Alabama to aid in the readjustment of veterans to civilian life by seeing that each post of the organization becomes an integral part of the civic life in the area where it is located, and that each member actively assume and discharge his civilian responsibilities and support his Government in a manner commensurate with the patriotism of wartime service in the armed forces. Accordingly, this veterans' organization is not calling upon Government directly or indirectly to burden itself by providing financial assistance so badly needed for an adequate department headquarters. But, on the other hand, the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Alabama are raising the necessary funds by their personal contributions, and by donations from private businesses, industries, and individuals who are the friends of the overseas veterans.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, PETE JARMAN, GEORGE ANDREWS, and ROBERT E. JONES, and I, all of whom are oveseas veterans and members of the Alabama Department, Veterans of Foreign Wars, have been authorized by the entire Alabama delegation to commend this organization of young veterans in their behalf for the work that it has done in Alabama and for the undertaking of the meritorious project of erecting a State headquarters as a living memorial to our comrades who have fallen. I am pleased to remark that each and every Member of Congress from the State of Alabama has pledged himself to aid in every possible way in making the memorial drive of the Alabama Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars a success. There are over 170 posts and approximately 30,000 members of this organization in Alabama, all of whom are overseas veterans. The people of our State will not soon forget the sacrifices that these patriots have made, nor the hardships they have endured, and it is the considered opinion of the Alabama delegation that industries, businesses, civic organizations, and numerous individuals, who are true

friends of the overseas veterans and wish to be identified as such, will lend liberal support, both spiritually and in material contribution, to this undertaking. Their names will be displayed in the memorial as the friends of the overseas veterans, and will be permanently preserved along with the names of each and every soldier, sailor, and marine from Alabama who has given his life in the defense of our country.

Efforts of this nature by returning veterans cannot but be applauded, and in behalf of the Alabama delegation, I commend this project as a shining example of the spirit and attitude of those returned veterans who meant so much to preserving the freedom and happiness of our land during the past wartime years.

A Housewife Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem by Mrs. Ida Skinner, of Boonville, Mo., an active leader of women in my congressional district, which is pertinent and timely, and I think expresses the feeling of the large majority of housewives who struggle daily to make ends meet without any apparent recognition of their efforts and courage.

Now, I'm just a housewife, don't you know,
I do all my own work and even sew.
I work outside because I can't pay,
Some lazy helper eight bucks a day.
I don't mind this work one single bit,
Even if I don't have the time to sit,
And read a book or go to a show,
But here's one thing I would like to know.

What would happen if the wives would belong,
To a housewife union, big and strong.
When the union says, "You don't cook on Sunday,
And maybe don't have to wash on Monday.
For mending you will draw double pay.
Time off each week to even play.
A game of tennis or round of golf,
And your husband at home won't dare to scoff
For fear he might his union wife offend
And she would walk out and let him tend
The housework, the cooking and children too
What on earth would the poor man do.

We wives are getting tired of this union way
Of stopping the manufacturing in the U. S. A.
By just walking off of every job,
And forming a roaming angry mob.
We work under hardships every day,
And when you try to buy, what do they say?
We have no sweepers, and no refrigeration,
Because the strikes are paralyzing the Nation.
Now, I bet Congress some labor laws would pass,
If the housewives would join this union class.

How To Lose Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, quite recently an editorial appeared in the Indianapolis Star, which analyzes, to a certain extent, the general attitude of the people regarding the attempts that have been made to force legislative bodies to pass certain legislation which would be favorable to some certain group in our country. It is my considered judgment that this editorial expresses the general opinion prevailing throughout our country. I desire to insert this editorial in the RECORD in order that all may read it.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial to which I have referred, which is as follows:

HOW TO LOSE FRIENDS

It takes little insight to understand that you rarely make people sympathetic to your viewpoint by threatening them with violence and calling them names. But this is too often the method of union officials in trying to block any new labor legislation.

A delegation from the CIO met with Indiana Congressmen in Washington to protest the Hartley-Taft labor proposals. They were asked for specific recommendations. They replied with blanket denunciation of both bills and with threats.

One union official said labor's future would be in doubt if any new laws were passed and implied that workingmen would again have to "work like a slave 60 or 70 hours a week for practically nothing." He did not say which sections of the bills would endanger labor's future.

Walter Frisbie, CIO secretary in Indiana, said that the details of the bill were unimportant—a view most Congressmen do not share—and asserted that "when you put them all together they spell out hodgepodge that would create a field day for lawyers and that's about all." He offered no constructive proposal to replace the "hodgepodge," and no detailed criticism of either bill.

To cap the climax of this foolhardiness H. J. Noll of the South Bend UAW told Congressmen that if the labor movement is crippled by legislation "there is going to be bloodshed."

The present campaign of labor's leadership against all proposed labor legislation is the most stupid kind of lobbying they could possibly devise. They are doing themselves and their unions a great disservice by the unbending and threatening attitude they take toward Congress. They are forcing Congressmen to be severe because their belligerent stand lends support to the growing belief that without severe laws they would continue to grow more and more unmanageable and threaten the Nation's industrial recovery.

Fair, reasonable and temperate laws could have been written and passed by now if the leaders of labor had gone to Congress with constructive plans for labor-management peace, and helped frame new legislation. But fairness and reason do not thrive in an atmosphere of bullying and threats.

What labor's leaders get in the form of new legislation will be what they brought upon themselves.

Spread of Communism Throughout Central Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD several news articles that have been sent to me by Mr. John C. Sedlacek, of 1321 North Thirteenth Street, East St. Louis, Ill., who is vice president of the National Slovak Society, Assembly 501. This organization, represented by Mr. Sedlacek, is deeply concerned with the spread of communism throughout central Europe. The National Slovak Society seeks action by the United States that will guarantee that the traditional rights of free assembly, free speech, and religious worship free from control be restored. The articles follow:

DR. TISO HANGED, GOES TO GALLOWS IN CALM PRAYER

(By Jan Mauthner)

BRATISLAVA.—The Reverend Dr. Joseph Tiso, wartime president of Slovakia, went to his death on the gallows Friday morning, his plea for clemency rejected by President Eduard Benes, of Czechoslovakia.

A Capuchin priest, who had spent the night praying with him, accompanied Dr. Tiso to the gallows. Dr. Tiso prayed while he walked up the gallows steps and continued his prayers aloud until the last.

The execution took place at 5:30 in the morning, 3 days after the Slovak National Court had pronounced sentence against him. During the period between the verdict and the execution, violent discussion took place behind closed doors between political parties in Prague and Bratislava, debating whether the plea for mercy should be recommended to President Benes. Dr. Tiso's sentence had been the subject of intense discussion by small groups huddled in streets throughout Slovakia. While 2 days earlier special editions had announced the news of the sentence 30 minutes after it was pronounced, the Slovak papers were cautioned to publish only brief accounts of Dr. Tiso's execution, and without comment, and special editions were barred.

On the day before his death Dr. Tiso was informed that his petition for mercy had been denied. He received the news calmly and requested the ministrations of a priest. It was like the composure he had displayed before the judges when his death sentence was read. He had stood erect when the verdict was announced and appeared calm although the klieg lights of newsreel cameras were focused directly in his face.

The reading of the sentence, which covered 215 pages, was a matter of hours. In it Dr. Tiso was found guilty on 97 of the 113 charges which had been placed against him at the beginning of the trial.

Questioned by Dr. Daxner, the president of the court, whether he wished to ask for clemency, Dr. Tiso replied: "I ask it for moral reasons." His lawyer then immediately submitted a petition for grace.

Before his execution Dr. Tiso requested that he be buried at Banovce, his parish for many years.

EXECUTION OF FATHER TISO COST BENES CHANCE TO WIN LOYALTY OF SLOVAKS, VATICAN PAPER SAYS

ROME, April 19.—The Czech government of President Eduard Benes sacrificed an opportunity of easing the tension between the Czechs and the Slovaks when it executed the Reverend Joseph Tiso, Osservatore Romano declared today in its comment on the hanging of the priest on a charge of treason for his part in serving as President of the Slovak state during the war.

Reliable sources both in Czechoslovakia and outside had expressed confidence that the death sentence would not be executed. Osservatore Romano said, "Whether this sentence was the just punishment of a guilty person, as one side asserts, or an act of political revenge as claimed by the other side, one thing is certain: an act of clemency would have contributed greatly to a spiritual union between the Czechs and the Slovaks.

"When the people are tired of war hatreds (that divide the world), this execution compromises in the Czechoslovak Republic the precious possibilities of pacifying the minds of the people. It is a sad thing, this germination of hatred by which anyone injured, reciprocates with evil and evil multiplies evil.

"Christ alone and His divine charity is capable of extinguishing such a sinister fire."

WSNY, SCHENECTADY, N. Y., BROADCASTS ABOUT TISO—STATEMENT OF APRIL 16 TELLS OF ANXIETY OF SLOVAKS OVER TISO VERDICT

An atmosphere of anxiety and grief has settled on the homes, as well as on the social and religious circles, of thousands of Americans of Slovak ancestry, says the Reverend Florian C. Billy, O. M. C., pastor of SS. Cyril and Methodius Slovak Catholic Church and national supreme secretary of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, which includes all parishes, organizations, and groups of Slovak Catholics in the United States of America.

This atmosphere is caused by the current news dispatches telling of the condemnation to death by hanging of Msgr. Joseph Tiso by the Czechoslovakian courts.

Notice, continues the local pastor and national official, that I do not call it "surprise or shock; for how could I with all the advance information that has been coming to this office as well as to the general reading public on the eventual outcome of this far too little publicized trial. For instance, I can personally testify that in my own presence a certain very high official of the Czechoslovakian Government, now still President of the Slovak National Council, stated these words long before the trial of Msgr. Joseph Tiso began: "Dr. Tiso must be judged; Dr. Tiso must be adjudged guilty."

And I have before me a copy of the New York Times dated March 2, 1947, from which I quote the following: "Judge in Tiso Case Hostile to Defense.—It has been a peculiarity of the trial that the presiding judge, from the beginning has never attempted to conceal his hostility toward the accused."

Yes, American Slovaks are filled with anxiety and grief, rather than surprise and shock, because they felt that they had reason to hope that our United States authorities could and would influence the Government of Prague, which tells us so much of its American-like democracy and United States style of freedoms, in securing for Monsignor Tiso and all other citizens the kind of justice described in the pronouncement of our Hon. Robert H. Jackson in his statement: "All experience teaches that there are certain things you cannot do under the guise of judicial trial. You must put no man on trial before anything that is called a court, if you are not prepared to establish his personal guilt. If you are determined to execute a man in any case, there is no occasion for a trial. The world yields no respect to courts that are merely organized to convict."

While we grieve the impending loss of Monsignor Tiso, as well as the sufferings of countless other victims of injustice, who were guilty of no other "crime" except "wanting to have their own independent Slovak state and government," we are especially anxious that our American fellow citizens, as well as all liberty loving and doing peoples of the world know the true facts.

Contrary propaganda notwithstanding, we know:

1. That Msgr. Joseph Tiso and his government were not captured by, but delivered themselves voluntarily to the United States Army forces. Thorough and correct information is available to all, who want to know the facts.

2. The trial of Msgr. Joseph Tiso was by a packed court, tersely defined in the above quotation from Justice Jackson, and presided over by a judge who is a personal and political enemy of the accused.

3. From testimony at the trial it is evident that if Monsignor Tiso had agreed to the Soviet plan of making Slovakia a Soviet Republic, he would not have been tried as a war criminal.

4. A true and correct narrator of facts will also tell the world, that Monsignor Tiso's Slovakia was recognized duly by 27 countries, including the Vatican and Soviet Russia.

5. Silence of the press notwithstanding in the matter, it is known that the friends of Msgr. Joseph Tiso raised a purse of 450,000 crowns and engaged a lawyer, Alois Loyek, to prepare the defense for Monsignor Tiso and represent him at the trial in view of the inertia of counsel assigned by the court. None of the accounts in the American press have said anything about the fact that Loyek was abused by the security police, told he could not represent Tiso and all his material in preparation for trial was confiscated.

International Financial Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following National Association of Manufacturers recommendations on international financial policy of the United States as approved by the board April 25, 1947:

The foreign financial loan and aid policy of the United States will have important effects upon the intergovernmental relations upon which peace largely rests and will seriously affect relations between businessmen of different countries.

The eventual goal should be replacement of Government loans and credits to foreign countries by international financing through private sources or international institutions as normal international relations become established.

It is recognized, however, that when critical conditions arise Government gifts, loans, or credits may be advisable. Proposals for gifts, loans, or credits at such times should be approved or disapproved, dependent upon the circumstances then existing, upon the objectives of such proposals, and upon the possible effects thereof.

Current and future proposals for gifts, loans, and credits by the United States to other nations should be judged according to the extent of their conformity to the following standards:

1. A gift, loan, or credit by the United States Government to another nation will not benefit the other nation in the long run if it does not contribute to the welfare of the people of the United States and does not help the people of the recipient country.

2. Gifts made by the United States to foreign countries should not be disguised as loans or credits. In every case current circumstances and prospective developments should determine whether action taken should be in the form of a gift or a loan.

3. United States gifts for economic rehabilitation should be limited to an amount necessary to put the recipient country in an economic position to apply to the International Bank or similar international agencies, or to private financing, for further economic rehabilitation.

4. The Government should not enter into negotiations for gifts, loans, or credits to foreign countries unless such countries:

A. Accord to business establishments in such countries owned by nationals of the United States treatment at least as good as that accorded to its own nationals in respect to police protection, access to courts, liability to taxation, and the conduct of commercial and industrial enterprises.

B. Permit representatives of United States companies and individuals with property in such countries to visit and inspect such properties.

C. Permit representatives of the press and business of the United States to visit freely in such countries and to report their observations without fears of subsequent discrimination or punishment.

D. Accord fair and nondiscriminatory foreign exchange treatment to United States private commercial and investment interests abroad, in the granting of applications for the remittance abroad of foreign exchange, in the exchange rates applied to such remittances, and in the imposition of taxes on exchange transactions.

5. No gift, loan, or credit to another country should be granted except on a basis of an adequate survey of the actual needs of such country. Such survey should determine the designed and probable effects of the financial action under consideration.

6. Any government gift, loan, or credit for relief or economic rehabilitation is unsound which does not provide definite limitations and requirements as to what the beneficiary will do in consideration of the benefit received; it should also provide for adequate United States supervision of the expenditure in an economic and strictly nonpartisan manner.

7. Gifts, loans, or credits to foreign nations should provide that wherever feasible, expenditure for goods should be for goods produced in the recipient country or in the United States.

8. Government loans or credits should not be granted to other nations which have confiscated (or expropriated) the property of United States nationals without having made prompt, adequate, and effective compensation, and this Nation's representative in any international lending authority should oppose loans or credits by such authority to nations which have so acted. It should be understood that adequate, just, and acceptable compensation should remove such barriers to loans or credits. Our Government should not extend financial aid which would be used, directly or indirectly, in a manner prejudicial to legitimate American interests.

9. Loans and credits should not be made to countries which show no evidence of intent or reasonable prospect of balancing their budgets and providing a sound currency.

10. Congress should confine the power to make loans and credits to foreign governments to only one government agency.

11. There should be full publicity, within the limitation of military security, on all forms of financial action taken by the Government.

With reference to the foregoing statement of objectives and standards to be used in any consideration of gifts, loans, or credits by the United States to other nations, we submit two concluding observations:

The United States will be able to supply financial aid and goods to foreign nations, even within the limitations listed only to the extent that we have a sound internal economy for whose maintenance we greatly need revised tax laws, constructive revision in our national labor laws, and confidence and harmony between all major groups in the country.

The United States will best support the cause of freedom throughout the world by itself furnishing an example of domestic poli[illegible], economic, and social freedom.

Heroes of the Alamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Saluda (S. C.) Sentinel:

MONUMENT ERECTED TO TWO SALUDA HEROES OF ALAMO

The 12-ton granite shaft which is the monument to the two heroes of the Alamo who were natives of Saluda County, Colonels Travis and Bonham, was set in place this week. The memorial was sponsored by local fraternal and civic organizations and paid for by public subscription. Plans for dedication have not been announced.

The monument stands on the west side of the courthouse lawn, facing the sidewalk, which goes from Church Street up to the courthouse entrance. It is actually made of three stones, two square blocks, one on top of the other, forming the base, with the large shaft rising about 12 feet from ground level.

Colonel Travis was born in Saluda County, about 6 miles from the present town of Saluda, near the Johnston highway. His old home stood for many years and elder citizens of the county can point out the site, which is still marked by some of the old brick and stone which formed part of the original building.

The home of Colonel Bonham still stands near Saluda, although some of the beautiful fireplaces and mantels, it is said, have been removed.

The inscription on the granite monument follows:

"MEMORIAL

"Col. William Barrett Travis, born near Saluda, S. C., August 9, 1809, gave his life for liberty and freedom at the Alamo, March 6, 1836.

"His last message for reinforcements ended thus: 'I have held this place against overwhelming numbers and will continue to hold it or perish in its defense.'

"Col. James B. Bonham, native of Saluda County, born near here February 20, 1807. Died with Travis in defense of the Alamo.

"Travis and Bonham were friends in boyhood, comrades in arms, and perished together in battle.

" 'Thermopylae had its messenger of defeat. The Alamo had none.' "

Federal Aid for Louisiana Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the condition of the public schools throughout many States in this great Nation is indeed deplorable. In the State of Louisiana a very serious situation has developed in the public-school system because the teachers are not receiving sufficient remuneration for their work. With the increased cost of living and present income taxes, salaries of the teachers are entirely out of proportion, and America's only hope for preserving its democratic institutions is through Federal aid to education.

Legislation is urgently needed to obtain adequate funds for public schools to equalize education opportunities. Teachers' salary schedules must be maintained at a level so as to make teaching more attractive to talented, young people as a life career. The National Education Association, largest organization of teachers in the country, declares that, in order to attract people of high caliber to the teaching profession and keep them, the minimum wage for teachers should be $2,400. The average teacher's salary in the State of Louisiana in 1945–45 was $1,515 per annum. Financial assistance is of vital importance to the elementary schools and high schools to modernize their program, better equip their facilities so that all children may have the best educational advantages possible.

As demonstrated during World Wars I and II, adequate health facilities are vital to our Nation. Health and proper educational training cannot be neglected if we are to have a generation of healthy minds and in order to have healthy minds we must have healthy bodies. The existing conditions hamper the educational training of our children as well as our Nation. On March 12, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2525, which is similar to the Taft bill, S. 472. The only difference between the Taft bill and mine is that my bill carries a $50 minimum for all school-age children instead of $40. This, of course, would increase the amount of the appropriation which would adequately finance the program. The legislation outlined below if enacted into law would help to provide a good education for all American children rather than make a minimum education available to public school children in some States.

The bill reads as follows:

H. R. 2525

A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Educational Finance Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to any school, or any State educational institution or agency, with respect to which any funds have been or may be made available or expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school, or any State educational institution or agency, or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this act, seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, or authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or control in any manner, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction, nor shall any provision of this act be interpreted or construed to imply or require any change in any State constitution prerequisite to any State sharing the benefits of this act.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZED

SEC. 3. For the purpose of more nearly equalizing public elementary-school and public secondary-school opportunities among and within the States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the sum of $218,750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the sum of $312,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the sum of $375,000,000 to be apportioned to the States as hereinafter provided.

APPOINTMENT

SEC. 4. Ninety-eight percent of the funds appropriated under section 3 of this act shall be apportioned to the respective States, excluding those enumerated in subsection (G) of this section, in the following manner:

(A) Multiply (a) the number of children from 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, in each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the third year next preceding the year for which the computation is made by (b) $50.

(B) Multiply (a) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for 5 years including the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh years next preceding the year for which the computation is made by (b) 1.1 percent.

(C) If, for any State, the amount calculated under (A) exceeds the amount calculated under (B), the difference shall be the amount of Federal aid due each such State.

(D) Determine the percentage ratio of (a) the amount spent in each State from local and State revenues for current expenditures (excluding interest, debt service, and capital outlay) for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education for the third year next preceding the year for which the computation is made, to (b) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for 5 years including the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh years next preceding the year for which the computation is made.

When the percentage ratio thus determined in (D) for any State is less than 2.5, the amount of Federal aid due each such State, as computed under (C), shall be proportionately reduced.

(E) Determine the percentage ratio of (a) the estimated current expenditures (excluding interest, debt service, and capital outlay) in each State from local and State revenues for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education for the year for which the computation is made, to (b) the average of the annual income payments for

each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the most recent 3 years, for which annual income data are available in the year next preceding the year for which the computation is made.

When for any year the percentage ratio thus determined for any State, after the fourth year of the operation of this act, is less than 2.2, such State shall be ineligible to receive any part of the funds authorized in section 3 of this act for the year for which the computation is made, and shall remain ineligible for that year until such time as revised estimates of expenditures, as determined in the preceding paragraph of this subsection, produce a percentage ratio equal to or greater than 2.2.

(F) In the event 98 percent of the funds authorized for any fiscal year in section 3 of this act are insufficient to pay to all eligible States the full amount of Federal aid due each such State, as computed in subsections (A), (B), (C), and (D) of this section, the amount of Federal aid paid to each eligible State shall bear the same ratio to the amount of Federal aid due each such State as the total amount of Federal aid paid to all eligible States bears to the total amount of Federal aid due all eligible States.

(G) From not to exceed 2 percent of the funds appropriated under section 3 such sums as may be necessary shall be apportioned by the Commissioner to Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam according to their respective needs for additional funds for public elementary and public secondary schools upon the basis of joint agreements made with their respective State educational authorities.

CERTIFICATION AND PAYMENT

SEC. 5. The United States Commissioner of Education shall certify regularly the amounts allotted under this act to each State that has accepted the provisions of this act to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the treasurer or corresponding official of such State the amount certified for each fiscal year in four equal installments, as soon after the first day of each quarter as may be feasible, beginning with the first quarter of the fiscal year for which appropriations made under the authorization of this act are available. Each such treasurer shall account for the moneys received, and shall pay out such funds only on the requisition of the State educational authority.

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 6. (A) In order more nearly to equalize educational opportunities, the funds paid to a State from the funds appropriated under section 3 of this act shall be available for disbursement by that State to local public school jurisdictions, or other State public education agencies, for all types of current expenditures (excluding interest, debt service, and capital outlay) for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education.

(B) No provision of this act shall be construed to delimit a State in its definition of its program of public education: *Provided*, That the funds paid to a State under this act shall be expended only by public agencies and under public control, except that in any State in which funds derived from State or local revenues are disbursed to nonpublic educational institutions for expenditure for any of the purposes for which funds paid to such State under this act may be expended, funds so paid to such State may be disbursed to and expended by such institutions for such purposes; but the amounts disbursed during any fiscal year to any such institution from funds paid to a State under this act shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount disbursed to such institution during such fiscal year from funds derived from State or local revenues as the aggregate of amounts disbursed by such State during such fiscal year from funds paid to such State under this act bears to the aggregate of amounts expended during such fiscal year for current expenditures (excluding interest, debt service, and capital outlay) for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education in such State from funds derived from State and local revenues.

STATE ACCEPTABLE PROVISIONS

SEC. 7. (A) In order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this act a State—

(1) through its legislature, shall (a) accept the provisions of this act and provide for the administration of funds to be received; (b) provide that the State treasurer, or corresponding official in the State, shall receive the funds paid to that State under this act and shall be required to report to Congress, through the United States Commissioner of Education, on or before the 1st day of November of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received and of its disbursement; (c) provide that its State educational authority shall represent the State in the administration of funds received; (d) provide for an audit by the State educational authority of the expenditure of funds received and apportioned to local school jurisdictions, or other State public educational agencies, and for a system of reports from local school jurisdictions and other public educational agencies of the State to such authority; (e) provide that the State educational authority shall make reports to the Commissioner with respect to the progress of education on forms to be provided by the Commissioner, which reports said Commissioner shall convey to the Congress with recommendations for such revisions of this act as in his judgment the Congress should consider, with particular reference to recommendations arising from changing conditions in our national economy; (f) in States where separate public schools are maintained for separate races, provide for a just and equitable apportionment of such funds for the benefit of public schools maintained for minority races, without reduction of the proportion of State and local moneys expended for educational purposes during the fiscal year ended in 1947 for public schools for minority races: *Provided*, That in any State in which the legislature has not taken the action specified in this section, the chief executive of such State may, until such action has been taken or until 6 months after the adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature in such State following the date of the enactment of this act, whichever first occurs, take such action for such period as is required by this act to be taken by legislative enactment;

(2) either through its legislature, or through its State educational authority, if the legislature so directs, provide in such manner as to comply with the provisions of section 6 of this act a plan of apportioning the funds authorized in section 3 of this act that will make available, not later than the fourth year of the operation of this act and each year thereafter, from all sources, to all local school jurisdictions not less than $50 per annum per pupil in average daily attendance for current expenditures (excluding interest, debt service, and capital outlay) for the maintenance of a program of elementary- and secondary-school education. The plan shall provide that in local school jurisdictions where separate schools are maintained for separate races current expenditures (excluding interest, debt service, and capital outlay) for the schools maintained for each separate racial group shall be not less than $50 per annum per pupil in average daily attendance; and

(3) shall transmit through its State educational authority to the United States Commissioner of Education official notice of acceptance and certified copies of the legislative enactments and the official regulations that may be issued by the State educational authority in connection with such funds. Any amendment of such enactments and revisions of official regulations shall in like manner be transmitted to said Commissioner.

(B) The funds appropriated under the authorization of this act shall be allotted only to those States which, during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the apportionment is made, have provided from State revenues for all public elementary-school and public secondary-school purposes not less than either the total amount, or the amount per pupil in average daily attendance, actually spent for such purposes in the fiscal year ended in 1947. The funds allotted to any State from the funds appropriated under section 3 of this act shall be paid by the State authority only to those local school jurisdictions that from State and local funds (which shall not be interpreted to include funds made available under this act) pay average monthly salaries to their teachers not less than the average monthly salaries paid as of February 1, 1947, or the nearest prior date when school was in session.

RIGHT OF APPEAL

SEC. 8. In the event a question arises at any time with any State educational agency, in any State eligible to share the benefits of this act, involving the administration of this act in relation to the purposes for which it is intended, such State educational agency shall have the right to appeal such question, with such statements and evidence as in its judgment are appropriate, to the United States Commissioner of Education: *Provided*, That within 90 days after such appeal, if not satisfactorily terminated, the State educational agency shall have the right to appeal to a United States district court, and such court shall have jurisdiction as to both fact and law.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. As used in this act—

(A) The term "State" shall include the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

(C) The term "minority race" or "minority State or Territorial legislature or other comparable body, except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education, and in American Samoa and the Virgin Islands it shall mean the Governor.

(B) The term "legislature" means the racial group" shall mean any race or racial group that constitutes a minority of the population of the continental United States.

(D) A just and equitable apportionment, allotment, or distribution of the funds provided under this act for the benefit of a minority racial group in a State which maintains by law separate educational facilities for such minority racial group, means any plan of apportionment, allotment, or distribution which results in the expenditure, for the benefit of such minority racial group of a proportion of said funds not less than the proportion that each such minority racial group in such State bears to the total population of that State.

(E) The term "State educational authority" means, as the State legislature may determine, (1) the chief State school officer (such as the State superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer), or (2) a board of education controlling the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education, and in American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, it shall mean the Governor.

(F) Annual income payments for each State, as determined by the Department of

Commerce, shall be defined as the total amount of income in cash and in kind received by residents of each State, from business establishments and governmental agencies, consisting of (1) wages and salaries after deduction of employees' contributions to social security, railroad retirement, railroad unemployment insurance, and Government retirement programs; (2) proprietors' incomes, representing net income of unincorporated establishments, including farms, before owners' withdrawals; (3) property income, including dividends, interests, and net rents and royalties; and (4) other income payments including direct relief, work relief, labor income items such as pensions, compensation for injuries, and social insurance benefits, mustering-out payments to veterans, and family allowance payments and voluntary allotments to dependents of military personnel (allocated to State of dependents' residence).

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act or aplication thereof to any State, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other States, persons, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Bonneville Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as I have recently pointed out on the floor, hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest is being overtaxed to meet the demands of industrial and domestic users. Unless a forthright policy is continued to provide increased facilities for production and distribution of power the Northwest will suffer great injury in the years ahead. This whole subject was discussed by Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, before the annual session of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Spokane, Wash., on April 24, 1947. I include in my remarks his factual and timely discussion on this important problem which is as follows:

During the past few days you have had an opportunity to learn something of this great Pacific Northwest region of ours—of its rivers, its mountains, its resources and its people; of the hopes and plans for its full development, not only for the benefit of those living in the region but for those of the Nation as a whole.

Many factors enter into regional developments, but the complexities of the problem are to a large extent dissipated if, in approaching the matter, immediate consideration is given a single basic element. This element is the provision of an adequate and expansible energy base—the base upon which rests the entire economy of any region or any nation, for it is energy that turns the wheels of the factories, lights the cities and the farms, puts water on the land and in general gears the progress of development in this technological age of ours.

This was the approach taken by the Federal Government here in the Pacific Northwest when it embarked upon the construction of multi-purpose dams along the Columbia River and its tributaries. Here, in this great river system, was the greatest energy base available—a base predicated upon the inexhaustible power of falling water.

Development of waterpower was, and still is, the only answer to the region's problem of supplying an adequate base to bring about full resource development in the Pacific Northwest. The region lacks coal in industrial quantity. It does not have oil. It does not have natural gas. All of these energy resources must be imported. Wood waste, burned to a considerable extent in the past for steam generation of energy, is becoming more valuable as a raw material to provide the fibers for building board needed in a critical housing program, or for use in the manufacture of alcohol and other higher products.

So, we find water the only reliable future source of power, and the Federal Government is attempting to help with the job on the Columbia River, a stream too large for private investment to undertake to develop economically.

With the completion of Bonneville Dam near at hand, the Congress determined that the power generated at the plant be put to the widest possible use at the lowest possible cost throughout the region. In August of 1937 it established the Bonneville Power Administration within the structure of the United States Department of the Interior. The purpose of the Administration at that time was to market at wholesale the available electric energy generated at Bonneville Dam. Subsequently, with upstream development at Grand Coulee and elsewhere on the river system, the Administration's market functions were expanded by departmental and Executive orders and by Congress. Today it is the designated marketing agent for Grand Coulee power and for power to be developed at McNary and Foster Creek Dams on the Columbia below Coulee, the series of projected dams along the lower Snake River and in the Willamette River Valley, and the Hungry Horse project in northwestern Montana.

Thus, over a period of 10 years, the Bonneville Power Administration has become the major wholesaler of power in the Pacific Northwest, and as such the key agency in the program for the development of the region's energy requirements.

In order to provide the Administration with the necessary tools for the marketing of the Columbia River Basin power, Congress specified in the Bonneville Act that transmission lines, substations, and other necessary facilities be constructed throughout the area "for the purpose of transmitting electric energy * * * to existing and potential markets." These lines, Congress said, would "encourage the widest possible use of all electric energy that can be generated and marketed" and at the same time "prevent the monopolization" of the power "by limited groups."

The administration has built lines—some 2,900 miles of high-voltage circuits to date—and is selling the power at wholesale to both publicly and privately owned distribution systems, as well as industry, throughout the region.

The administration, in order to chart its course more clearly in the work of giving the region the full advantage of the power from the Columbia system, set up five major objectives, and it is of some of these I wish to speak today.

Our first objective is to make the power a tool for the development of new wealth—to make it the means of opening up new opportunities for investment, enterprise, and employment—for agriculture, for new industries, for small business, and for the individual.

Secondly, we believe that increasingly large quantities of power at consistently low rates should be provided in order to create new opportunities for free enterprise. In industry and agriculture, the key to the whole power question is price with the cost to the consumer determining finally the extent of its use.

Our third objective is to make low-cost hydroelectric power provide new sources of tax revenues. New farms and new industries mean taxpaying population. They mean tremendous gains in tax income for local, State, and Federal governments; tremendous gains in the wealth and general welfare of the Nation economically and from the standpoint of security.

Fourth, we believe that the hydroelectric resources of the Northwest should be the means for providing asset-building jobs for returning servicemen and for war workers who are now seeking employment in the region.

Our final objective is to return to the people of the United States, with interest, their investment in the Federal power facilities of the Northwest, and this is being done today ahead of schedule and at the lowest wholesale rate for power in the country.

For purposes of discussion today, I want to go into some detail on the matter of what this Government development—this expansion of the energy base in the region—has meant out here and to the country as a whole in terms of the creation of what we call new taxable wealth. This is one of our key objectives and as such is directly related to the others I have just mentioned. The story is a thrilling one and well documented.

Creation of new taxable wealth is important to every taxpayer. Generally speaking, by increasing the base which bears the tax, the individual burden is decreased. This is particularly evident in the case of public debt and fixed governmental costs. Likewise, the larger the tax base in a county, the lower the tax rate to raise a definite amount of money.

The Federal-power development along the Columbia River and its tributaries is expanding the taxable wealth of the Nation. Not only is it paying its own way and subsidizing irrigation through power revenues, but it already has resulted in contributions in taxes on new private investment and incomes in excess of the total power investment on the river of $280,000,000 as of the end of 1946. These returns to the Federal Treasury can be traced directly or indirectly to Columbia River power—the tool that has created new opportunities for regional development through development or expansion of industry and business and other related activities.

But let us examine more closely what this cheap, assured, and potentially expansible energy base in the form of Columbia River power has accomplished to date in the creation of this new taxable wealth in the Nation.

In 1944, 12 new industrial plants served by the Bonneville Power Administration represented an investment in fixed plant and equipment of some $160,000,000. The size of this investment can be more fully appreciated when one considers that it is equivalent to 4 percent of all taxable property in the States of Oregon and Washington in 1939.

Construction and operation of these industrial establishments served directly by the Bonneville Power Administration, exclusive of the shipyards, have paid $58,000,000 in income and excess-profits taxes. Utilities purchasing Columbia River power have collected and paid large sums of excess-profits taxes which can be attributed to their sale of low-cost Federal power. Customers of both publicly and privately owned systems have received rate reductions because of low-cost Federal power. REA cooperatives in this area have benefited, bringing low-cost power to farmers and making more certain the payment of their loans from the Federal Government.

These figures represent direct benefits to the country in the form of new taxable wealth—of new, hitherto nonexistent income.

Indirect contributions of this new wealth-creating development out here are much larger. Boeing Aircraft alone paid $116,000,000 in income and excess-profits taxes in the 6 years 1941-1945. This company could not have made such a showing without aluminum produced by Columbia River power, which in 1947 will account for 40 percent of the country's entire output of the metal. Yes, the indirect effects are very great. For example, the aluminum industry here in Spokane, dependent wholly upon Columbia River power, is now supplying about 20,000,000 pounds of plate, sheet, coil, and circle monthly to some 600 fabricators throughout the country. An aluminum pot and pan manufacturer in New York, a building contractor in Chicago, a lawnmower manufacturer in Los Angeles, a truck body builder in Spokane all have made large investments based on the availability of the aluminum from these power-generated plants of the Pacific Northwest. They have made their tax contributions, as well as their job contributions, because the Government pioneered this cheap power program. Over 2,000 products are manufactured throughout the Nation from Spokane aluminum alone. Some 350,000 workers in all sections of the United States are dependent upon the supply of aluminum from the plants in this city. A billion-dollar pay roll is dependent upon it, and that pay roll in itself is taxable wealth.

The Spokane plants are only part of the story. The same thing is true with respect to all of the others in the region that are feeding upon the energy of the Columbia River.

Besides supplying materials for increased national production, the Columbia River power has expanded the income not only in the Pacific Northwest through large, new pay rolls, but also in the East, South, Midwest and other regions by building Pacific Northwest industry and Pacific Northwest residents into a larger market. This has made a better market for the products of the farms, as well as the factories.

New factories attracted to the Pacific Northwest by Federal power from the Columbia River projects too have made large local tax contributions. Through 1946, the 12 plants served directly by the Power Administration paid over $2,500,000 in local property taxes. Taxes on the homes of the workers directly employed amounted to about $1,000,000. Taxes for 1945 based on peak valuation of 1944 totaled $734,000. Workers' housing paid an additional $275,000. In many cases the new plant is the largest single taxpayer in the county. Clark County, Wash., for example, has 85,000 residents. Only 900 of these are directly employed in the new aluminum plant. Yet this company paid 8 percent of all property taxes payable in the county in 1947. Here in Spokane the three light metals plants paid $395,000 in property taxes in Spokane County for 1946. This is more than the combined property taxes in the county of all six railroads serving this important rail center. It is 75 percent greater than the property taxes paid by the Washington Water Power Co., one of the major taxpayers of the county.

Similar situations exist in other Pacific Northwest counties securing new factories as a result of this newly developed energy base. To a lesser extent local tax bodies throughout the Nation are also securing advantages as new factories rise to utilize Pacific Northwest materials or to supply the rapidly expanding Pacific Northwest market.

I spoke earlier of what the creation of these new tax sources do in the way of affecting the general tax structure of the country. We already have had some local examples, particularly in the case of Clark County, Wash. There farmers, home owners, merchants, the railroads, and the utilities have smaller tax bills as a result of the establishment of the aluminum industry in the county. In 1940 the county levied 12 mills to raise $249,494. In 1947 it levied only 9.37 mills to raise a larger amount—$277,891. The same can be applied to the national picture, for the contributions of the development here in the Pacific Northwest bear directly upon the income of the Nation and ease the problem of taxation on a national scale.

So here we have the picture of the Federal program in the region—what it means in the light of cold business terms. To me it is a convincing picture. To me it is an example of the true purpose of government, namely, to help, where necessary, to provide the tools with which the people of the country can make a living through private initiative, and live in peace and security.

But what of the future out here? We have enjoyed the prosperity of our new growth. The future can be promising but it may not be if we fail to expand our energy base. In the years ahead we can achieve greater goals for the benefit of the region and the country. The tax returns from the development out here thus far is but a pittance compared to what will be returned in the future if we are not short-sighted and delay in the expansion of our energy base—the element that makes such growth in the future possible. The industry which has grown in the Pacific Northwest on our present available energy base should not be considered the ultimate, but rather as the beginning. It should be regarded as but the first step in realizing the potential that can be ours, for the region and the Nation. McNary Dam, Foster Creek Dam, Hungry Horse Dam; these should be rushed to completion if we are to keep abreast of our energy requirements.

There is much concern over the problem of national security. This worry reflects the realization that as a nation we have seriously depleted many of our key resources to support the past war. We are on the verge of becoming an importing nation for many of the basic raw materials which in the past we have always felt were ours in unlimited abundance. This is the problem that has made it necessary for us to readjust our thinking from isolationism to internationalism, whether as individuals we wish it or not.

Our existence as the industrial leader of the world is predicated upon the availability of raw materials and the stability of our energy base. We can have the greatest technological developments in the world, but if we do not have the raw materials and the energy, we have nothing.

Hydroelectricity alone has not developed this region. We have prospered on California oil and Rocky Mountain coal. They are important sources of energy, but they are of necessity expensive and subject more and more to interrupted supply. As for oil, it is anticipated that within 10 years California's reserve will approach the point of depletion and that State, instead of being an exporter will become an importer. Coal no longer is the cheap fuel that it was, and there is constant disruption in its production and supply.

But we do not need to depend on forecasts to see the seriousness of the oil situation. There is a national shortage of fuel oil today and a critical oil shortage in the Pacific Northwest. The private and public utility agencies of this region, meeting in Tacoma, Wash., on April 14 estimated they would require 3,000,000 barrels of oil for fuel for their steam-generating plants this fall. They have thus far been unable to obtain commitments from oil companies to handle the supply. They must have this oil if the Northwest is to carry through the year without curtailment of power supplies because the hydroelectric capacity in the region is insufficient to meet the demand. This situation will become progressively worse until the program of the Federal Government for building additional dams on the Columbia and its tributaries catches up with the demand for power. More steam plants are not the answer because of the oil shortage. More hydro plants are the only solution to our problem here.

With this situation facing us, the Federal Government must turn to the waters of our rivers for future supplies of energy. We cannot predicate our future growth upon any other source. To do so would be foolhardy. We must take from our rivers their energy, thereby contributing not only to the continued industrial and economic growth of the Nation, as well as the region, but at the same time conserving our other energy resources for higher economic uses than fuel for electricity generation.

Creation of new taxable wealth with its attendant benefits in new jobs, new investment opportunities, and a broader tax base, together with conservation of our declining oil supplies, would be reason enough to justify the Government expenditures for these great dams, generators, and transmission lines. But we are not depending on these justifications alone. We are paying back to the taxpayers of the Nation the full costs of these power projects.

As of January 1, 1947, we had gross revenues of $94,753,000 from power sales. Out of this we had set aside $29,417,000 of interest on the power investment; $15,291,000 had been set up to cover depreciation of the property; $31,122,000 had been used for the expenses of operation and maintenance, and $18,923,000 of net surplus remained. Our pay-out studies show that we will pay off the Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects over a 50-year period while at the same time making a direct subsidy payment to the cost of the Columbia basin irrigation project of $250,000,000 from power revenues and have $195,000,000 left over for contingencies. The land owners on the Columbia basin irrigation project, in the meantime will pay $85 per acre on some 1,000,000 acres during the same period.

This program is not a gift from Uncle Sam. It is a big business proposition in which the Government is in partnership with the people of the region who will foot the bill. The people and the Nation will reap the benefits.

In closing I would like to leave this last summary thought about this great developmental program out here in the Pacific Northwest. It is a program to undergird and expand the free enterprise system. It is a program to expand opportunities for the exercise of individual initiative and of private capital. For the private capital system anywhere depends for its success on three factors—one, an assured energy base; two, an expansible energy base; and, three, a cheap energy base. Finally, it is a program to bring to the people of this fine land of ours a richer way of life, and to the Nation greater security by contributing to the industrial might that is already ours.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr Speaker, to show that there is more than one phase to this issue, I am inserting typical let-

ters from two landlords. They read as follows:

BUCHANAN, MICH.

I am a veteran of World War II and, last January, purchased a home in the suburbs of South Bend, Ind. The tenants, now residing there, are paying me a frozen rental of $25 monthly, yet I am obliged to pay out $57 monthly on the mortgage. In addition, I must lease accommodations for my family and drive 40 miles to work each day. Consequently, such an arrangement is not a paying investment.

The local rent control officer, Mr. Jackson, can do nothing about the situation except to abide by the stupid rules which govern your agency. However, you can take action on this unusual case and dispatch an appraiser to that property, 115 East Darden Road, South Bend. Get a complete report on the condition of the premises and the taxes paid on them. Other properties in that neighborhood are getting twice that rental for facilities much poorer.

I will expect immediate action from you, through Mr. Jackson perhaps, so that some sort of justice will be forthcoming in this case.

ST. JOSEPH, MICH.

In regard to rent control, I feel that it is high time we should have relief. I am a widow and have to work for a living and I have an apartment to rent, but my food bill has just about doubled and my decorating and everything I have done just about costs me double until I could just about lock up my apartment and be money ahead. With the high withholding tax I pay on my wages plus this rent control business is far more than I can carry and I think it is very unfair to penalize people who try to earn their own living. Furthermore, the wages in most cases are so high I cannot see why people earning such wages as most working people earn, why they should be protected from paying a reasonable rent. A great many of them spend their money in taverns and such places and never will have anything anyway no matter how much the Government tries to help them.

Treatment of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit herewith an editorial by Frank C. Waldrop, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Sunday, May 4, 1947. Most real Americans continue to be amazed by the un-American treatment of the Finnish people, which is described in this article. Americans like myself continue to sympathize with Finland, the only country which recognized and fulfilled their obligations to the United States. Unlike other countries, we owe them much. We true Americans put both Greece and Turkey on their guard when they accept willingly or unwillingly the offer contained in the so-called Truman policy.

The editorial follows:

OUR DIRTIEST TRICK

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

People who are rushing around to sell the need of American investment in Greece and Turkey as post-World War II insurances should be reminded of what our money has done to another small country.

First we handed that nation a few million dollars with which to get going after World War I. At the time we did it, hardly anybody in the U. S. A. had any idea where or who or what the country was, but it was in need and we felt generous.

As time passed, the country in question became a sort of pet.

We were proud of its record in the world and proud that we had financed its independence—especially proud because of all the nations we had backed, that was the only one to show any gratitude.

Billions that we loaned out elsewhere went a-glimmering. But that one nation never missed a payment.

Right. It's Finland we're talking about.

By 1939, Finland was completely convinced that right living and good conduct had made it a place in the world.

The Finns were progressive, democratic, energetic, businesslike, and highly cultivated.

They had no illiteracy, no slums, no radical extremes of wealth or poverty, and only one national fear—that something would happen to submerge them again under the heel of Russia, which had never stopped in 500 years a determined campaign to control the Finnish peninsula.

Well, in 1939 catastrophe struck. Hitler and Stalin made a deal against humanity. Between them they split Poland. Stalin also swallowed Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Then Stalin undertook to swallow Finland, too. In that he made a bad miscalculation. The Finns refused to be swallowed.

Instead they fought like demons while we cheered them on from a very safe distance.

They came finally out of their first round in 1940 still with their independence but very badly clawed and shaken.

They had showed up Russia's weakness by slaughtering dozens of divisions of ill-trained troops, though in the end the sheer weight of Russian mass had smothered them.

And they had not only showed up Russia. They had also showed up the United States of America.

For a generation America had petted and praised the Finns. Yet when the Finnish chips were down our chips were not. We were looking the other way.

The Finns couldn't understand that and who could?

They had hardly expected us to go to war on their side but at least they expected our friendly support and some kind of material aid in the clinches. They were wrong.

Not only did we duck out on them then, but as the World War wore on past Pearl Harbor we followed Russia's orders and really cracked down on the Finns in a dozen nasty ways.

Finally, the Russians attacked Finland for the second time, and so, in desperate self-defense, they tied up with Hitler.

Yet even in that they really stood alone, for before the end they were fighting not only Russians on the one side but Germans on the other to preserve the last shreds of their independence.

Their story is one of the war's most poignant tragedies, and one in which we played our most ignoble part.

The dirtiest trick of all was America's pretending to be the great, big-hearted pal of Finland and then running out when trouble followed.

We might at least have tossed the little fellows a few dollars in our prodigal performance of the past 3 years, and we might have done something at the peace table to make the Russians ease up on them.

But we didn't.

Today, Finland is a completely subject state. Russia dictates its politics, economy, and foreign relations. As a sovereign power, Finland does not exist. And in Finland today the United States of America lacks what you might call popularity.

The Finns have seen the seamy side of our character.

And so the Turks and the Greeks, whose fingers are twitching to get hold of that glittering bauble of money the Truman administration is holding up to them, had better think twice.

So had we. Our reputation for constancy is bad enough already.

If we were really interested in square deals abroad, we would have cleaned up our debt to the Finns which we obligated ourselves to pay when first we dangled our dough before their eyes a generation and more ago.

That debt of ours needs no describing. Every American knows what it is. And every one of us knows it is unpaid. We owe those people a national apology.

Scientists and Atomic Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include the following editorial from the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal of Wednesday, April 30, 1947:

SCIENTISTS AND ATOMIC CONTROL

There is, understandably, a great deal of pessimism regarding the possibility of the United States and Russia resolving their differences to the point where agreement for effective international control of atomic energy can be achieved.

For more than a year there has been fruitless debate concerning atomic control; and each statement of principles by American and Soviet spokesmen has merely served to emphasize the basic conflicts between the minimum requirements of the two great powers. Even such a patient and seasoned statesman as Bernard Baruch, after a year as chairman of the United States delegation to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, resigned in ill-concealed despair.

There has been no sign of compromise on the fundamental differences by the two powers who must agree if there is to be agreement. Shall we, then, give up in despair?

By no means, in the opinion of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, published by scientists who took part in the development of the atomic bomb. In an editorial, the Bulletin declares:

"* * * We cannot rest in the satisfaction of having offered a fair and imaginative plan for international atomic control, and the disappointment of having seen that plan derided and largely rejected by the Soviet Union.

"We do not believe that all the possibilities of a peaceful solution have been exhausted."

Writing in the Bulletin, Prof. Leo Szilard, one of the world's leading atomic scientists—and the author of the technical memorandum that accompanied Albert Einstein's letter to President Roosevelt in 1939 which resulted in creation of the Manhattan project—calls for a crusade for a world-wide

system of economic and cultural cooperation within the framework of which atomic agreement might be reached.

Szilard's idea is that if we bait our atomic hook with other desirable international activity, Russia might bite.

But the point is that rather than giving up hope for international atomic control, the men who created the A-bomb are more insistent than ever that we keep striving for a settlement.

The Only Way Is To Be Prepared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following editorial from the Carroll County Independent, published in Center Ossipee, N. H., of May 2, entitled "The Only Way Is To Be Prepared":

THE ONLY WAY IS TO BE PREPARED

While the peace conference in Moscow was getting nowhere very fast and broke up without a single important decision being made, Congress was doing little to merge and increase the efficiency of our armed forces.

If we are honest, and face the facts in the case, we must know that no nation in the world can protect us if another war breaks out. France is smashed economically. The English Empire is disintegrating. These once great powers that absorbed the initial offensive in World Wars I and II will not be in a position to play the same role if World War III should come.

If we are to win, or even survive World War Three, when, and if it comes, we must have an extremely well integrated and efficient armed force for both offense and defense.

International conflict of the future will move with such speed that only the nation that can move with unified command and complete integration of all the branches of the service can hope to survive.

It is common knowledge that the army of the future will move in at least 200 miles per hour, completely air-borne. Pursuit planes will travel above the speed of sound, and bombers well up to the limits of sound. Already we possess bombers that can fly to any city in the whole world, drop atomic bombs, and return to their base.

If we can do this, it is foolish to say that another great nation cannot do the same.

Yet some Members of our Congress seem to be ridden by Civil War psychology, when an army's rapidity of movement was limited to the distance the average soldier could march under full equipment in a day.

We all know, or should by this time know, that there is no second price for the loser of a war. The loser is left with nothing and the winner is left in a semicrippled condition.

A Third World War would probably leave us with a wrecked financial structure, depleted national resources, and a dozen bombed-out cities, even if we should win.

The only way to avoid another conflict is to be so strong—with the best air force, army, and navy, all integrated under a single Secretary of Defense—that no nation will challenge us.

Pearl Harbor is only 6 years ago this next December 7, but already its fearful memory is slipping away.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Johnstown Tribune, Johnstown, Pa., Saturday evening, May 3, 1947:

GOVERNING TOO MUCH

In writing labor legislation the job of Congress is to establish basic policy—not to decide upon matters of detail which can better be left to the mutual give-and-take of private bargaining.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act of 1935 not only set a policy, but tried to regulate many details of the relationship between employer and employee. The policy lacked that impartiality which Government should preserve toward every citizen, regardless of class, creed, or color. The interference in details necessarily reflected that lack of balance and not only favored employees as against employers, but some segments of labor as against others.

As it moves toward correcting the errors of the Wagner Act, Congress should avoid the "ancient insanity of trying to govern too much." There are certain fundamentals which should be included in the contemplated labor legislation. These are:

1. Equal responsibility of both parties for breach of contract. To give either side the prerogative of irresponsibility is an invitation to neglect the primary obligations which are implicit in the signing of any contract.

2. Establishment of democratic practices. No citizen should be coerced in expressing his wishes regarding bargaining representation, whether the coercion comes from the employer or agents of the union.

3. Protection of the public interest. The injunctive power of the courts should not be impaired, but that power should be invoked only when it is evident that the public interest is truly affected. The right to bring this injunctive force into play should therefore be confined to responsible public officials.

These things are basic, and a law which established such principles could last for centuries without being altered by changes of administration.

Certainly no strike should be permitted against Government, because such strikes imply the power of a minority to paralyze Government, which is wholly incongruous with our conception of majority rule. We believe also that the secondary boycott contains an element of the fatal principle of the general strike which has been so disastrous wherever it has been tried. But as for strikes in private industry, we shall have to depend in the final analysis upon the good sense of employers and employees to avoid work stoppages which are costly to both.

Whether collective bargaining is industry-wide or local ought to depend very largely upon the nature of the industrial area in which the bargaining takes place. The closed shop works well in some cases, badly in others. The proper type of bargaining unit must be determined by the conditions in each case. These are details, concerning which general legislative regulation would fail of its purpose.

By making collective bargaining really democratic, making union and management equally responsible for breaches of contract, and protecting the public interest through the courts, Congress will have set a policy under which employees and employers can fairly work out their own destinies. The aim should be the ultimate withdrawal of government from interference in all the details of labor-management agreements.

Senator TAFT is right in his contention that the labor bill presented to President Truman should be a unified and coherent whole, and not a set of piecemeal regulations. But the bill should avoid the error of the Wagner Act—the error of requiring government to decide matters which should be left, as far as possible, to private negotiation.

Address of Dr. James B. Conant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the following address by Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, delivered at the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on Thursday, May 1, 1947:

In the announcement of your annual meeting your officers have said that the world is on the threshold of a new era—the atomic age. Now as the former Chairman of the National Defense Research Committee and former deputy to Dr. Bush, the Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, you may expect me to give you all the answers to the $64,000,000 questions about the future of atomic energy. Yet I find it difficult to comply with this request. In the first place, it is my contention that we must be careful how we use this phrase "atomic age." Scientifically, we are now living in the atomic age. The physicists and chemists are exploring a wonderful universe to which there seemed no access a short 10 years ago. And from this exploration will undoubtedly flow many practical consequences of which we cannot now even dream.

From the industrial standpoint, however, the atomic age is quite another story. That age lies over the horizon and it is not for me to gaze into the crystal ball and tell you either when this age will dawn or what it will be like. I content myself by warning you against taking your technical prognostications from the daily press or current gossip. I content myself with quoting from the official bulletin of the United Nations Technical Committee, wherein it is stated that "The large-scale production of electric power from atomic energy appears feasible though still in the developmental stage." In guessing at a time scale far be it from me to stick my neck out any further than the scientists of the United Nations.

Finally, as to the atomic age from a military point of view, it is my contention that we are not living in this age in spite of the fact that the atomic bombs have since 1945 been part of the official armament of the United States. We shall only be living in the atomic age when two nations have bombs in quantity sufficient to constitute a military menace to each other. And I am frank to say I hope we shall never have to live in such an age. I hope before that grim time comes, the United Nations will have adopted and put into operation something approaching the famous Acheson-Lilienthal plan.

As far as public opinion in the United States is concerned, I think most people are now convinced that if we are to avoid living

with a sword of Damocles hanging over our industrialized civilization an international control of atomic energy is essential. To date, however, we appear to have had some difficulty convincing our Russian friends of the desirability of such a scheme. Now the dwellers in the Kremlin are hard-headed realists; I can only conclude, therefore, that these gentlemen think that an international control of atomic bombs is unnecessary. Perhaps, they do not appreciate the military value of the bomb; perhaps they do not realize that until atomic bombs are abolished by international agreement they remain a method of waging war, if war should come. But it seems more likely to me that they may well expect the United States to disintegrate in a whirlpool of internal troubles in the postwar world. Even the shrewdest of men, if thoroughly imbued with the Marxist philosophy, can hardly escape wishful thinking about the United States; and as long as this thinking seems plausible to our Russian allies of World War II, so long, perhaps, may the international control of the atomic bomb be delayed.

Now if there be any merit in this line of argumentation, the healthy growth and continued strength of this country is a prerequisite to the successful solution of the problem of the atomic bomb. And tonight I am going to be bold enough to maintain the thesis that the strength of our free society is intimately connected with our success or failure in making our system of public education work. To me, our free tax-supported schools are the sinews of our democracy. For they are a product of that special history of this Nation which has likewise produced the unique American ideals which must guide our future. They are likewise the guardian and transmitting agency of those ideals on whose vitality the future of our democracy depends.

Before attempting to document this proposition, which has probably already aroused a spirit of skepticism among you, I must first trespass on your time to consider what are in fact the goals which we Americans have set ourselves as a free people. For a sound educational philosophy must be based on a considered social philosophy. This in turn requires a formulation of ends to be achieved in a democracy by the cooperative action of the citizens. The schools and colleges of this country are powerful instruments for forwarding our ideals and shaping the nature of our country. Therefore, we do well to face the question at the outset: What sort of a society do we want to develop here in the United States in the next 100 years?

To do justice to this question one should write a volume, but in spite of the complexity of the details I believe we can sum up our typical American hopes and aspirations in a few words and phrases. Our American ideals spring from the history of this Nation. Our political creed was formulated in a revolutionary era which has been nourished by the writings of the eighteenth century. From this heritage comes our adherence to a form of representative government based on free elections, untrammeled discussion of political issues, universal suffrage. Our legal system is founded on the centuries of evolution of the doctrines of the common law and we consider the rights of the individual as of paramount importance: trial by jury, the writ of habeas corpus are as essential to us as the air we breathe; likewise, the civil liberties, including religious freedom embodied in the Bill of Rights. However much we may differ among ourselves in the inevitable cleavage between the right and left as to specific measures to be taken by governmental bodies (local, State, or Federal), we never cease to think of officials of the Government as our agents. American conservatives and American radicals alike join in repudiating the alien notion that the state as such is a mystic entity to be worshiped or a transcending force to direct the lives of ourselves or of our children. All this is so obvious as hardly to be worth taking your time to restate here tonight. I do so only to contrast these political ideas common to all democracies with certain unique ideals which are the hallmarks of American democracy.

To my mind, these ideals which I shall sum up by the words "equality of opportunity" and "social democracy" are a product of our special history. In the first place, this Nation, unlike most others, has not evolved from a state founded on a conquest. As a consequence we have nowhere in our tradition the idea of an aristocracy descended from the conquerors and entitled to rule by right of birth. On the contrary, we have developed our greatness in a period in which a highly fluid society overran a rich and empty continent, and one of the highly significant ideals of the American Nation has long been equality of opportunity. This implies on the one hand a relatively mobile social structure changing from generation to generation, and on the other mutual respect between different vocational and economic groups; in short, a minimum of emphasis on class distinction. That is why we Americans so often refer to a man as being "democratic" when we have reference not to his partisan affiliations but to his social habits. That is why we Americans have insisted that our public schools be as far as possible ladders of opportunity.

Our economic system, our political institutions, and our social ideals form a closely interwoven pattern. Equality of opportunity could only be a reality in a political democracy, it would have meaning only in a competitive society in which private ownership and the profit motive were accepted as basic principles. If I had time, I should like to discuss at some length how the impact of the European radical doctrines of the nineteenth century based on the notion of a class struggle has confused the thinking of some of our reformers in this century. These foreign doctrines have to a considerable degree diverted the attention of forward-looking men and women from the social goals implicit in our native American tradition. As a consequence, we have thought too little of our system of public schools—the concrete expression of our belief in equality of opportunity—we have thought too little of this system of universal education as an instrument of national policy.

Our type of political, social, and economic system is on trial in the grim world of the mid-twentieth century. I have no doubt that it will prove its worth not only here at home but in distant lands if we regard it as a growing, changing system moving gradually forward toward certain distinct and characteristic goals. These goals include:

1. The continuation of a form of government based on free elections and free expression of opinion.

2. A continuation of the many relatively independent government units, towns, cities, States, and the Federal Government—a flexible though complex system which allows for the maximum of home rule.

3. A much greater degree of honesty and efficiency in all these governmental units.

4. A continuation of our highly competitive economic system with its wide divergence of pecuniary rewards.

5. A greater degree of social mobility and fluidity and a lesser degree of social distinction between occupational groups.

6. A greater degree of equality of opportunity for the youth of each succeeding generation.

With some such goals in mind, let me turn to the role of our public schools in strengthening our democracy. In so doing we may think of our system of education as having a twofold purpose. First, the preparation of the future citizens of the nation for life in the kind of democracy we have in mind. Second, in developing all the varieties of talent latent in each generation and educating this talent as fully as is required. The first aspect of education may be spoken of as general education or education for citizenship or education for the good life; the second, as vocational training of which professional education is one special aspect. In short, we must concentrate on two problems: first, how to promote the best education in a democratic land for all American youth; second, how to find and develop the special talents needed in the great variety of occupations and professions characteristic of a modern industrialized nation.

Now, let me remind you of the fact that the situation which confronts our public schools today has little or no relation to that of 40 or 50 years ago.

I suppose everyone realizes to some degree how fast we have been moving toward the goal of universal education. But let me remind you of some startling figures. Seventy years ago there were 80,000 students in our high schools, in 1940 there were 7,000,000; 70 years ago there were 60,000 in our colleges, in 1940, 1,500,000. In the 70 years the population went up three times, the number in the secondary schools 90 times, the number in our colleges 25 times. We are now very close to our goal of universal education through the first eight grades, and have reached a point where one can argue as to how much larger a percentage of our youth should finish high school and go on to college work. In the last 50 years the American people have constructed a vast engine of democracy, our system of tax-supported schools. Now the problem is to make it run smoothly and in the best interests of the United States. Or to change the metaphor, our problem is one of improving at every level the quality of the job. And in many instances on the quality turns the difference between success and failure of the system.

But before discussing how we are to improve our schools, let me dwell a moment longer on the general nature of our effort. I have spoken of the uniqueness of our public schools. This uniqueness of our American system of public education lies in its flexibility and its democratic spirit. As contrasted with systems of universal education which have grown out of the European countries, it is unique, first, because there is little or no differentiation according to ability or taste or vocational goal among students in our public schools until after the high-school years are past. Second, because a very considerable percentage of the students go on to high schools, and, as compared to any other country, a very large percentage go on for post-high school education.

How significant is the first point is brought out by some comments of the United States educational mission which paid a visit to Germany last summer. They found the basic education system of Germany had been little modified by the Nazis, though the machinery had been captured by them to promote their totalitarian ends. But the fundamental structure of the German school system long before the Nazis reflected a spirit which differed from that which prevails in American schools. It was based on the philosophy of a class structure. It was the antithesis of our system which reflects the spirit of a democracy committed to the idea of equal opportunity for all.

"The German school has hitherto been a dual system," the Commission writes, "one for the 5 or 10 percent of intellectually, socially and economically favored who go on to secondary school, university and the professions; the other for the great group who have 4 years more of tuition-free elementary school and three or more years of vocational training. When he is 10 years of age or younger, a German child finds himself grouped or classified by the factors over which he has no control; such grouping to determine almost inevitably his status

throughout life. This system has cultivated attitudes of superiority in one small group and inferiority in the majority of the members of German society, making possible the submission and lack of self-determination upon which authoritarian leadership has thrived."

There is no need to point out to this audience the difference between such an educational philosophy and our own. Our democratic educational philosophy is a reflection of the ideals of this Nation. If we are to be strong in this tough postwar world we must strengthen our faith in these ideals and make our social realities a closer approximation to these ideals. Seen in such a setting the problems of our public schools take on an exciting nature, they are recognized as second to none in importance from the viewpoint of the survival of our free society.

To turn from the general to the specific the immediate job is to raise teachers' salaries and recruit more and better teachers for our schools. We are now in a crisis of public education. The situation in regard to teachers' salaries has been bad in many localities for decades. The drastic upswing in prices has made a bad situation a nation l scandal. The revelation of the shocking conditions has awakened public opinion, and locally in many States something is being done. But very much more needs to be accomplished.

If the gravity of the situation is brought home to the American public I am convinced that through local and State taxes, funds will be forthcoming in many sections to improve matters to a considerable degree. You have already had one session of this meeting devoted to the question of the financing of education. I do not want to repeat the arguments here again tonight. But I do wish to go on record as favoring a law providing general Federal aid for schools in those States which require this assistance, and a law which will stimulate the States to spend more on their public schools. Such a law would be in existence if Senate bill 472 sponsored by Senator TAFT and others should be passed by the present Congress.

Some of you may be suspicious of Federal aid bills. You do not want Federal strings to your local schools. Neither do I. Bill S. 472 is a very careful device. It seeks to maintain minimum educational levels by Federal aid where needed. But without Federal control. The abstention from any degree of Federal control over the States is painstakingly detailed in the bill.

Why should the citizens of a relatively wealthy State be taxed to help the education in poorer States? I often hear this question asked by those who oppose Federal aid. The answer is obvious and twofold. First, as the population figures show, we are a mobile people; there is a constant movement of inhabitants from one State to another. Particularly is this true as regards rural and urban areas. The future citizens of many of our wealthy cities are now being educated in our poorer States. Second, all the youth of the country are future citizens of the entire country; their activities as citizens and voters will determine the kind of nation we and our children are going to be living in in the next half century. Indeed, I can go further and say the education of all our future citizens may well determine the kind of world we are going to live in. As I said a moment ago, democracy is now on trial and only a strong democracy can prove itself in this century; a democracy can only be strong if all the citizens are properly educated and careers are freely open to all the talented.

Careers open to the talented. Let me dwell on that aspect of our system of public schools for just a moment. We are living in a complex society in a highly technical, industrialized age. As never before our professional men and women, using the word "professional" in the broad American sense, play an almost determining role in our national life. We must have the very best doctors, public-health specialists, lawyers, economists, research scientists, engineers, public servants, to mention only a few examples.

Thanks to our public schools, we are today, I believe, finding and developing a larger percentage of our potential talent than in any other nation, with the possible exception of the Soviet Union. But I am convinced there is a considerable untapped reservoir in many sections of the country because of the inadequacies of the elementary and secondary schools. Just as an illustration, I may mention some figures I have compiled from a survey of American Men of Science. A certain group of outstanding scientists are starred every 5 years by the vote of their colleagues and thus recorded in a sort of who's who among scientists. Taking the distribution of the younger group of distinguished scientists thus listed by the place of birth, one finds strange discrepancies among the States. One might imagine the numbers would parallel the distribution of the population, but they do not. Some States have failed to supply the average number. Why is this the case? No one can say with certainty, but it may well be the inadequacies of the educational system of the States in question. For this interesting fact appears on examination. There is a fairly close correlation between the number of scientists on the list in question and the expenditure per child for educational purposes in the States that spend less than about $120 per year per person. The State of birth of the scientist is presumably the State in which the elementary education was received, one might note in passing.

Of course, there are other factors, but the correlation is strong evidence that in the 25 or so States with the lowest expenditures for schools, the lack of adequate education may be the determining one. Certainly I see no reason to believe that potential scientific ability is not about equally distributed among all the inhabitants of the United States. But I am sure that in many areas we are not doing what we should to find and develop this particular brand of skill. The same is true, I believe, for all other types of talent which today require careful schooling in order to be of benefit to the Nation. To the extent we fail to discover and utilize the potentialities of the youth of each generation, we are dissipating our greatest source of wealth: the young people of the Nation.

Very well, some of you may reply, by all means let us improve our public schools so that our professions may be recruited from all sections of the country and no boy of real ability shall be overlooked. Our belief in equality of opportunity, as well as our desire, to have the best brains at the disposal of private initiative and public service combine at this point. But you may say, what about those who do not fall within this category? Is there not a real danger of overeducating the young people of the United States? Is there no danger of sending so many to college that we will have a white-collared proletariat, an army of unemployed, because many more will desire professional and semiprofessional work than our society can support? Yes; there is real danger in this direction. Though I should not use the word "overeducate" but rather say there is grave danger of giving boys and girls the wrong type of education. And here we arrive at one of the knottiest problems over which educators now wrangle. What sort of high-school education should be given and what type of institution should be provided to meet the increasing demand for post-high-school education? To sum up the matter in a few words we may ask the question, Is everyone to go to college? If so, what type of college?

Let me consider for the moment the average type of high school in the United States where only a third of the students now go on for further education. How can such a school through wise guidance and counseling see to it that the percent who go on to college are those who can really benefit from the college?

The difficulties in practice are very great, but with the improvement of our tests and examinations and our understanding of the issues, I look for great progress in this matter of counseling in the years ahead. It has been well said that educational guidance is the keystone of the arch of public education.

But even the best counseling and guidance will not alone provide the answer. For as everyone is saying nowadays, higher education is contagious. Some 2,000,000 veterans are receiving an advanced education with the aid of what amounts to a vast Federal-scholarship plan. These veterans are giving a splendid account of themselves in all the colleges. They now make up most of the college student bodies; about three-fourths at Harvard. They constitute the first student bodies whose chance to go to college was not dependent on geographical location or the financial ability of their families. This is a significant expansion of educational opportunity for one college generation. The younger relatives of these veterans, to a considerable degree, will want the same opportunities. In all likelihood there will be a pressure to increase the educational facilities beyond the high school. How is that to be done? What sort of facilities are to be offered?

In our thinking about this whole subject, I suggest we would do well to distinguish between general education (for broadening a man's horizon), vocational education, and professional education. Beyond the high school, vocational and general education can be provided locally in 2-year terminal institutions. And for many students this seems to be the answer. The expansion of these local 2-year terminal colleges seems to be of great importance for the immediate future. I underline the adjective terminal, for a local 2-year college which merely duplicates the first 2 years of a 4-year college is quite another story.

The provision for general education and vocational education is a responsibility of the State. On the other hand, training for the professions is a more national concern. The professions transcend State boundaries; therefore, professional education might well be financed to some degree by a direct Federal scholarship or fellowship program. This is one of the features of the proposed National Science Foundation. It finds its parallel in the new Naval NROTC program already in operation. In the present bill for a National Science Foundation only the scientific professions are specified, but to my mind medicine should eventually be included. Indeed, the case for a Federal scholarship program for premedical and medical students is very strong. You may ask why not other professions as well. I would have no objection to enlarging the list eventually if the expenditures were not too great. But we must make haste slowly in these matters, and a few selected professions should be tried first as a sort of pilot-plant operation.

In conclusion, I should like to speak for a few minutes of that core of common learning which should be the common heritage of all American youth. It will be composed of material drawn from the fields of history, political science, economics, fine arts, and literature, that is, the social sciences and the humanities.

In our ideal republic of the future we are surely concerned not with what a man has studied but with what he does. We may hope that men and women will be more interested in wise collective action of the citizens; that there will be less "gang politics," less despoiling of the public treasury, fewer completely selfish pressure groups, more self-

sacrificing men in public office—in short, a much healthier body politic.

The future citizens we desire to educate must have strong loyalties and high civic courage. These loyalties must be to the type of society we are envisaging and to the United States as the home of this society. Such emotional attitudes are in part the product of a common set of values. One of the tasks of the public schools is to evoke these loyalties through the medium of formal study. This can be done to some degree by the study of our heritage.

But the war has underlined the fact that the most effective loyalties are often to small groups of men bound together by a common experience and a unity of immediate purpose. A unifying faith is in such instances not a matter of words or intellectual concepts but a direct relationshp between men in danger. A not dissimilar loyalty, though in a lesser degree, is seen at work in athletic sports and certain types of extracurricular activities. Having once experienced this type of emotional situation, a man or woman is more likely to respond another time and is probably more inclined to transfer such loyalties to larger groups.

For these reasons the present emphasis in many public schools on "democratic living" seems to me to be of first importance. I should place high in the priority list of goals to be achieved by every teacher the inculcation of what we Americans call a "democratic attitude," and a firm character which is nonetheless tolerant of other views. A loyalty to the type of society we are slowly endeavoring to shape on this continent can be evoked far better by action than by words. To the extent that the school itself is a society exemplifying the ideals we extol, to that extent we tend to win the loyalty of even the most ruthless individuals in the group. And there is a good chance that this loyalty will be transferred later to the Nation.

Now, I should not want to leave the impression from my remarks tonight that I thought there were no problems other than financial in connection with our public schools. There are many and none more difficult than in the controversial area of the general education of which I have just been speaking. The social sciences and the humanities are the core subjects and we all know that it is possible for teachers to interpret the past of the human drama in a variety of different ways. As we all know, these interpretations may be grossly distorted for propaganda purposes. The totalitarian states have always regarded their schools and colleges as instruments for forming the political and social philosophy of the coming generation into relatively narrow molds. Is it possible in this democratic country with our wide diversity of religious, political, and social outlooks to have any agreement as to what our schools should teach in these controversial areas? To my mind it is, provided we are agreed at the outset that we must base our case on the importance of a diversity of opinion. I believe there is a group of American ideals of which I have already spoken which spring from the history of our country and which can be taken as the core of our common faith.

Such phrases as the dignity of the individual, the spirit of democracy, equality of opportunity, freedom of expression and political action, may sum up some of the most important characteristics of the common denominator which binds us together as a free people with a special history of our own. But there can be no doubt that it is characteristic of our tradition and our faith that we must be free to allow wide differences in interpretation of these basic ideals, and we must insist as far as possible that our teachers be neither propagandists nor dogmatists. Rather they must stimulate freedom of thinking and discussion to the degree that the maturity of the people makes this possible at every stage in the educational process.

In short, our education is based on our belief in the efficacy of free inquiry and the use of reason. Our system of education is diverse and flexible in its structure, and both comprehensive and tolerant as to the many ways in which our fundamental faith may be expounded or interpreted to the young people of the land.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a telegram which I received yesterday from Mr. C. M. Burgess, an important manufacturer in the State of Illinois. It indicates his position with reference to President Truman's proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey.

The telegram follows:

GENEVA, ILL., *May 5, 1947.*

Hon. ROBERT J. TWYMAN,
Congressman from Illinois, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I still urge you to oppose Greek-Turkish subsidy and any other gifts or loans to foreign countries unless there is a definite and guaranteed basis of repayment with interest. History has demonstrated that most loans are defaulted. This Greek deal can be a precedent for others which can bankrupt us. It is entirely political and the Russian situation is not and will not be involved except as New Dealers try to involve Russia so as to secure public approval of themselves. Certain business interests and bankers approve of it for their own selfish reasons. This is demonstrated when National Manufacturers Association board approves loan on recommendation of John R. Suman, vice president, Standard Oil, New Jersey. Most members of NAM in down-State Illinois are opposed to action taken by NAM. My company is resigning its membership in NAM because of the un-American position assumed by NAM board in respect to this cheap political issue.

C. M. BURGESS.

Address of Hon. John Davis Lodge Before Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is a genuine pleasure to include the following very timely speech made by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, Congressman JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Fourth District of Connecticut, before the Polish-American Congress, district of Connecticut, in Hartford, Conn., on Sunday, May 4, 1947:

Mr. LODGE. Ladies and gentlemen, I am very pleased and honored to participate in these exercises celebrating the one hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791. I am happy, also, that the State-wide campaign for American-Polish relief is getting under way.

I am particularly grateful to you for this opportunity because as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have some thoughts with respect to the world situation, and Poland in particular, which I should like to discuss.

With respect to relief to the needy of Poland, as you probably know, the relief bill was passed by the House last week. Unfortunately, it was amended on the floor so as to reduce the amount of relief from $350,000,000 to $200,000,000. I objected very strongly to this reduction. There was also an attempt to take Poland and Hungary out of the relief bill on the ground that they were Communist-dominated and that therefore the relief would be misused. Fortunately, we were able to reach a compromise so that Poland and Hungary will now receive relief, provided the Polish and Hungarian Governments will allow American missions to go into these countries for the purpose of seeing to it that the relief actually reaches the needy and is not used by the Communist plutocrats for their own nefarious purposes. This seemed to me a wise provision in order to avoid the fiasco connected with Polish relief under UNNRA.

As I have said, I vigorously opposed depriving Poland and Hungary of relief. I pointed out that if we acted in that fashion it would constitute a sort of double betrayal. We betrayed Poland at Yalta, and we would have compounded this shocking crime had we deprived her of relief. I believe that there are adequate safeguards in the bill so that if we find that relief is not in fact reaching the needy we can terminate that relief. It is my hope, however, that the bill as now written will bring relief to those who need it.

It was my position that we should not by hasty and ill-considered action throw millions of freedom-loving and hungry Poles into the uncharitable arms of the Communists. It is my settled conviction that we must instead give them hope, help them to revive, and indicate to them that we are prepared and determined to salvage from this troubled world some of the blood-soaked and tear-drenched principles for which we fought a successful war.

Let us now turn our attention to international events. These have been such as to cause us to reexamine the world situation with reference to its basic and essential outlines. The deadlock at Moscow with respect to Germany, the inability of the conferees to reach a decision on a treaty for Austria, the Greco-Turkish problem, the difficulties in Korea, the political disturbances in France and Italy, and many other signs of increasing disruption make it necessary that we take stock of our position in the world, and that we scour our brains in an effort to preserve a peace based on the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations.

The problem of Poland, which is still one of great importance and urgency, is a problem which many people here and abroad regard as the test case of American resolve toward questions of international justice and that fair play among nations which alone can provide an enduring basis for peace.

I know that I need not recall to you in any detail the part played by Poland as our loyal and gallant ally in the war. Her military effort inside and outside Poland, on practically all European fronts, on land, on sea, and in the air, the courage of her indomitable people, their fighting spirit and readiness to sacrifice their lives for their independence and the principles at stake in the common cause, greatly surpassed all estimates. In fact, Poland's record as a fighting nation, as an unswervingly faithful

ally, as the only nation which, regardless of Hitler's unprecedented barbarisms, never produced a quisling—stands out unexcelled.

You will recall that on the 3d of September 1939, 3 days after Germany's attack on Poland, Great Britain declared war on Germany in accordance with her treaty to defend Poland's independence and territorial integrity.

You will recall further that on July 30, 1941, the day that the Polish-Soviet treaty was signed by General Sikorski and Ambassador Maisky in London, Mr. Anthony Eden, then British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, handed to General Sikorski a statement which ended with these words:

"I also desire to assure you that his Majesty's Government does not recognize any territorial changes which have been effected in Poland since August 1939."

You also know that the Atlantic Charter which was incorporated in the United Nations Pact of January 1, 1942, declared:

"Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

I think you will agree that free public opinion in all the countries which were signatories of this pact widely construed these phrases as a guaranty by the United Nations, jointly and severally, of the independence and territorial integrity of Poland, as well as of Holland, Belgium, France, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Austria, China, Korea, Ethiopia, Iran, Iraq, Arabia, and also of Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania. Many Americans are deeply disturbed by the fate of Poland which stands today as ineluctable testimony to our failure to live according to the principles for which Americans have died in two world wars.

This concern was accentuated by the fraudulent Polish elections held on January 19, 1947. The American people realize that particularly with respect to Poland, the United States is suffering serious strategic set-backs and losses in prestige all over the world. This active interest in international affairs is further demonstrated in the press and in the unusual demand for literature dealing with problems of our international relations. In my own survey of public opinion, it appears to me that aside from the normal political considerations and desires arising out of readjustments to peacetime economy—basic problems of taxes and wages and living costs—there is in America a groundswell of apprehension regarding the conduct of our foreign affairs. As so often happens under our system the people are in this instance a step ahead of their own Government. It appears to many Americans that we have not only sacrificed moral principle but also needlessly weakened our strategic and economic position in a confused effort to preserve by appeasement something of what we gained by force of arms. These concessions, largely predicated on our military position at the war's end, make it increasingly difficult for us to use our strength to achieve the peace which is the declared purpose of the United Nations organization.

I favor the proposed aid to Greece and Turkey not as a solution even of the problem there but because there is no constructive alternative and because it is an indication, I hope, of our determination to stand against the freedom-hating forces of the world.

It is a good beginning but it must be followed by determined efforts to reach the core of our dilemma. The core is, I believe, the betrayal of Poland. In this particularly tragic case, we not only failed to live up to our promises, we also participated in the partition of Poland which has made all subsequent problems much more difficult to solve.

Now, I do not suggest that the American people should be prepared at this time to implement the terms of the Atlantic Charter by force. However, we fail even to interpose a consistent policy of diplomatic insistence on the principles agreed to. In plain words, we acquiesced in and countenanced Soviet expansion not only in Asia but throughout eastern Europe. This diplomatic weakness was certainly no help to General Marshall in Moscow. He felt as many of us have felt all along that it is better to reach no agreement than to reach a bad agreement.

By agreeing to the compromise on Poland reached at Yalta and implemented by further concessions at Potsdam, we assumed in fact a responsibility for this fifth partition of Poland and for the imposition of a provisional government composed mostly of Comintern agents known to have been selected by the Soviet oligarchy.

Our Government has failed to obtain the carrying out of the one and only condition upon which it attempted to justify its recognition of that government, namely, the holding of free and unfettered elections.

The elections held on January 19 were officially declared by the United States Government to have been conducted in flagrant violation of pledges, and of the three solemn warnings contained in official notes addressed by the then Secretary of State on August 19 and November 22, 1946, and on January 9, 1947, to the provisional Polish Government and on January 5, 1947, to the British and Soviet Governments as cosignatories with us of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements.

While I understand fully the desirability of maintaining contact with the Polish people through our diplomatic officials in Warsaw, it should be noted that this continued recognition of the Polish Government by the United States constitutes in the eyes of many people a recognition of the validity of the very elections which we have officially condemned.

As I have indicated, the Soviet Government continues to regard Poland as the test case of its relationship to its western allies. For in this specific case, in which our signature on definite tripartite agreements involves our direct responsibility, the Soviet Government, barely 8 weeks before the momentous Moscow Conference, appeared to make use of the Polish elections to sound out our Government on its policy. Implicit in this Soviet attitude was their desire to ascertain whether we were ready to make further concessions or were at last determined to insist on the sanctity of those international agreements to which we are directly committed.

The fact that in the case of Poland we are now once more given the opportunity to make a definite stand on a matter of fundamental principle in which our immediate interests are secondary should afford our Government a welcome opportunity to reassert our determination that these principles shall be established as the true basis for international relations.

It is my considered opinion that although we must give firm and patient support to the United Nations organization, we must also take into consideration the elements of power and basic strategy which still operate in spite of the war's end. We are living in a period of continuing conflict, and I feel that it is vital that we make full use of our residual strategical position in order to salvage at least some of those things for which the war was fought. With that idea in mind, may I suggest that in spite of our dwindling Military Establishment, in spite of the severe drains which have been made on our financial and industrial resources, we still have substantial bargaining counters left with which to insure the rights of self-determination guaranteed by the terms of the Atlantic Charter. We can in this way regain the initiative which was ours during the war; we can by this method give a vigorous demonstration to the world that we are prepared, in the interests of peace, to exercise the responsibilities of leadership to which our military and industrial predominance entitle us.

The proposed aid to Greece and Turkey constitutes an admission that our foreign policy urgently requires revision. The coincidence of moral principle and strategic considerations in the case of Poland seem to me to indicate that Poland should be the focal point for such a new policy.

It has been maintained by many of our most distinguished thinkers that the European dilemma cannot be brought to a satisfactory solution until the problem of Germany has been dealt with. For this reason increasing sentiment was evidenced to postpone the ratification of the four treaties (Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania) until the German and Austrian problems had been decided at the Moscow Conference. Since neither the German nor the Austrian problems have been negotiated, it would seem most unwise, not to say dangerous, for the Senate to ratify these four treaties, particularly those which concern Hungary and Italy. Furthermore, it appears clear that a satisfactory arbitration of the German problem is almost impossible until the Polish question has been solved. If we fail to face-up to this original mistake, all our actions based as they must be on that mistake, will be fraught with portentous implications for the future. With the case of Poland as a significant precedent, the Soviet Government is in a far stronger position to establish a similar government in Germany. Since no freely elected German people's government would consent to the transfer already made of a large part of eastern Germany to Poland, the Soviet Government has an added reason for imposing a Russian gauleiter on the German people. Once that is accomplished, it is but a step to build up a strong Germany under Soviet tutelage by restoring these vast agricultural tracts to Germany. Since Russia is unlikely to return to Poland the territory east of the Curzon line, a sixth partition of Poland can in that fashion be easily accomplished.

If Russia could be persuaded to return to Poland the eastern territory which it now occupies, then the anti-Communist Poles would, I believe, not object to restoring to Germany that part of eastern Germany now occupied by the Poles. It is quite natural that the Polish-American Congress should object to this transfer back to Germany until the Russians have renounced their claim to eastern Poland.

Let us make our purpose plain. It is a reasonable speculation that had we done so in 1914 and 1939 war might have been avoided. Let us help the Soviet Union at least by making it abundantly clear what our purpose is. Let us by all means avoid being dragged into another war by the miscalculations of others with respect to our true intentions. If we fail to do this we run the risk of going from one Munich to another, until at the last, confused and alone, we are routed and overwhelmed within our own borders by an apocalypse of our own creation.

What then is to be done? Our participation in the Yalta and Potsdam compromise agreements can be justified only by the holding of genuinely free and unfettered elections, which would allow the people of Poland to express their untrammelled right to order their internal existence as they see fit. It follows that our obligations under these agreements were provisional and conditional. These were bilateral contracts which, because of the violation by one of the contracting parties, can be automatically regarded as null and void. In this fashion the entire problem of the independence of our wartime ally, Poland, can be reopened. In my opinion, the American Government should take this

stand. It should ascertain if the Soviet Government is prepared to withdraw its troops of occupation and its open and secret police and agents from Poland. If it is not, it should refuse further recognition to the present Beirut government. It should demand that a specifically appointed three-power committee cause new elections to be held in Poland on free and democratic lines as previously agreed.

In view of the probable refusal of the Soviet Government, I believe that the United States Government should accept no further compromise and should withdraw recognition of the present Polish Government, on the ground that it regards the violation of the solemn international agreement signed at Yalta and reiterated at Potsdam as a violation of the first, second, third, sixth, and seventh principles of the Atlantic Charter which were embodied in—and made a part of—the Declaration by the United Nations signed at Washington January 1, 1942, by the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and Poland, among other signatories; and also, as a violation of the Charter of the United Nations in the first and second paragraphs of its preamble; in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of article 1; paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4 of article 2 of chapter 1; and paragraph 1 of article 33 of chapter VI; and that, in view of these violations, the United States will recommend to the General Assembly of the United Nations that it resolve:

"That the Beirut government of Poland be debarred from membership in international agencies established by or brought into relationship with the United Nations, and from participation in conference or other activities which may be arranged by the United Nations or by these agencies, until a new and acceptable government is formed in Poland; to secure the participation of all peace-loving peoples, including the people of Poland, in the community of nations; if within a reasonable time; there is not established a government which derives its authority from the consent of the governed, committed to respect freedom of speech, religion, and assembly, and to the prompt holding of an election in which the Polish people, free from force and intimidation and regardless of party, may express their will, the United Nations consider adequate measures to be taken in order to remedy the situation; to recommend that all members of the United Nations immediately recall from Poland their ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary accredited there; further to recommend that the states members of the United Nations report to the Secretary General and to the next session of the United Nations Assembly what action they have taken in accordance with this recommendation."

This is a job which the United Nations can now perform. It is unfortunate that this body, which represents the aspirations of so many people for a peaceful and prosperous world, has neither the resources nor the power to act in the Greco-Turkish crisis. The main reason for this is the Russian attitude. In fact the real bypassing of the United Nations has been accomplished by Soviet Russia. She has achieved unilaterally what the United Nations would never have sanctioned. Here, then, is our chance to present the United Nations with a vital undertaking. Here is our opportunity to face up to the principles to which we have given eloquent lip service. Here is a challenge to the United States, which took a leading part in the creation of the United Nations, to take a leading part in its perpetuation and enhancement by calling upon that body to decide one of the most crucial questions of the hour.

In addition, I need hardly point out that there are at our disposal means other than the United Nations organization and short of armed force for asserting our deep interest in this matter. The reciprocal-trade policy testifies to the fact that other nations have great need for our exports and that ours is the best market for their exports. Loans, UNRRA aid, relief aid, and other substantial assistance is further evidence of our power to promote a diplomatic climate appropriate to peacetime settlements. Since the Soviet position as acquired since VJ-day is based largely on power can we continue to sacrifice principle when we may ourselves have the peacetime power to make principle secure?

These vast and explosive issues should not be oversimplified but neither should they be avoided. There is a time for decision. The proposed aid to Greece and Turkey will give encouragement to the forces of freedom everywhere. If we follow this up with a determination to bring justice to stricken Poland by means of the United Nations, we shall not only be strengthening that body, we shall be solving a critical and urgent problem. In addition we shall be serving notice on the world that although we love peace we know that it cannot be predicated on weakness. We shall have solemnly proclaimed the exhilarating fact that there are certain principles from which we will not depart, and that we are resolved to devote our energies to a peace based on freedom, virtue, and reason.

The Panama Canal and Theodore Roosevelt Inseparable in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the following address delivered by the Honorable WILLIS W. BRADLEY, Representative from California, at the annual banquet of the Panama Canal Society held in Washington, D. C., on Saturday, May 3, 1947, in order that the ideas contained therein may be available to the people of the Nation:

In all the modern world we, who look upon the accomplishments of the present, are prone to discount tremendously the great feats of the past.

Happenings during the recent years, both in civil life and in warfare, have been on such vast scales that they have dimmed our perspective of what might be and should be considered as great—as wonderful—accomplishments.

Today we gaze upon the Washington Monument and we realize that it is a majestic shaft indeed, but only we older people have even the faintest conception of the labors of designers and constructors which went into the building of the obelisk, because now, without modern technique of concrete reinforced with an intricate network of steel bars, it would be no particular trick to build another Washington Monument—even to build one twice as large. It would be merely a question of having the necessary money available, and the job would be done in almost routine manner in a comparatively short time.

And when we look back upon the ships of a few generations ago, such, for example, as the *Oregon*, we are prone to smile at her and to think of her as something close to the tugboat class. Of course, we realize in our lighter moments that there is something of a legend attached to the *Oregon* and that some of our so-called iron men in former seagoing days are said to have made quite a remarkable jaunt in this ship, as they took her around Cape Horn during the tense days of the Spanish-American War, but when she is compared to ships of the present time, to vast ships of war, such as the battleship *Iowa* or the carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, or to great passenger ships, such as the *Queen Mary*, the *Oregon* fades into insignificance and, unless we can understand the struggles which went into her construction due to the lack of modern materials, due to the lack of modern machinery, and due to ignorance of present-day technique we lose sight of the great deeds of our forefathers in the way of ship construction.

So also it is with the Panama Canal, which I have had the opportunity of visiting just recently. Now one sails through the Canal in peace and safety. Much of the great work which was accomplished is concealed beneath the waters of Gatun Lake and long stretches of the canal. As one goes through the cuts there seems nothing particularly striking about them because their sides have been eroded by rain and wind; vegetation has grown upon them and they appear almost natural. Sometimes it would seem that they have been there since the beginning of time. The vastness of this cut going through the hills strikes one in the same way as if he were approaching a natural canyon through some part of the Rocky Mountains, when, looking through the windshield, he glides along on a fine concrete road and takes almost everything around him merely as a matter of course. The traveler has lost that conception—that awe—which came to his father or grandfather some 40 years ago when, perhaps, he stood in the bottom of the Gaillard cut (then the Culebra cut) and looked up at the mountains towering on both sides and realized that man had made this vast excavation which seemed on both right and left to reach to high heaven—when he realized it, because there were hundreds of shovels and trains and other pieces of machinery working therein, because thousands of men were toiling to dig even further into the rocky sides and bottom of the proposed Canal.

Yes, time and circumstances, and our vast accomplishments have dimmed our perspective in matters concerning the Panama Canal until now we hear responsible Americans speak of it as an outmoded, outdated, obsolete thing—almost as though it were in the covered-wagon class, rather than as one of the greatest accomplishments of man on this earth of ours.

Some 46 years ago the world was shocked by the news that the then President of the United States, William McKinley, had been assassinated while visiting the exposition at Buffalo, N. Y. As a consequence of that foul deed there came to the office of President of the United States one of the most able, determined, and picturesque men who has ever been in public life in the Western Hemisphere. That great American, that great Republican, Theodore Roosevelt.

When President Roosevelt was inaugurated into his high office, the idea of an interocean canal across the Isthmus of Panama was a dream—for decades it had been debated and discussed—the French, under DeLesseps, had made their great effort to sever the land at Panama and had failed. America was hoping to take the place of France and to proceed with the work, but had not been able to make the arrangements necessary to do so.

Theodore Roosevelt saw clearly that this great work must be undertaken for the security and prosperity of the United States. He knew that this Nation was on the way toward becoming one of the greatest—or even the greatest—powers on earth and that to fulfill its destiny it must have a way to get its shipping from one coast to the other without the long voyage around South America.

Fortunately, the people of the isthmus determined that they too must have the Canal, and, when negotiations with Colombia

reached a deadlock, they rebelled against the government of that country and declared their independence. Almost at once the United States stepped in and recognized the newly formed government of the Republic of Panama, shortly thereafter making a treaty of peace and friendship with that new state.

Naturally the United States gained some privileges from this treaty—it would have been ridiculous if we had not done so, for why should one offer its protection and give its financial assistance unless it has some recompense therefor. We are truly fortunate in that, at this time, we had in the White House an American imbued with those attributes which are commonly thought of in connection with a Yankee trader.

With only a small amount of delay operations on the Canal were commenced and were pushed forward steadily until its completion. During most of this time the guiding hand was that of Theodore Roosevelt, for while the problems of those who actually supervised the construction and who carried out the necessary measures of sanitation were great indeed, it was recognized that the master hand was in the White House in Washington, D. C.

It is not necessary for me to dwell upon the details of construction. These have been recounted to you many times and were actually witnessed by some of you who participated therein. Suffice it to say that a great work was done—and that there should never be any belittling of the colossal job of constructing the Panama Canal.

With only a few mishaps the Canal has served the people well—it has answered every call and every need through the two greatest wars of history and it has never let us down when there has been a real and imperative need of getting our ships from one ocean to the other.

During recent years some of the privileges acquired by the American Government at the time of the first treaty with Panama have been abrogated and returned to the Panamanian Government. Most marked of these is that which covered the right of the United States to take possession of such part of the Territory of the Republic of Panama as it might deem necessary for the defense of the Canal. At present, the United States must negotiate with the Republic of Panama for even such an insignificant move as the establishment of an antiaircraft battery, or for placing any other defensive equipment within Panamanian territory. This feature may prove to be one of embarrassment and may involve considerable risks in the defense of the Canal at some time in the future.

As time went on it was found that the locks of the present Canal were becoming inadequate for the accommodation of ships of the maximum size under construction or contemplated. Some years ago it was decided, therefore, to build a third set of locks somewhat detached from the others, of a size more than adequate to accommodate the largest ships on our present-day horizon. Construction on these locks was commenced and had progressed to the extent of the expenditure of about $70,000,000 when all work was discontinued due to outbreak of the recent war and the need of all of our resources to oppose the enemies of the Nation.

After termination of the war, the question arose as to whether or not the present lock canal—with three levels—is the best type to serve our needs across the Isthmus. Since it would be very foolish to proceed with the expenditure of large additional sums to complete a third set of locks for a canal not calculated best for our needs, the Congress decided to have a thorough investigation made before proceeding further with the third lock project. A commission, or Board of Consultants, was then appointed and directed to study all problems involved in the transit of ships from one ocean to the other via any practicable route across Central America and to bring in its report not later than December 31, 1947.

This commission has been at work diligently and the time is approaching when it will be submitting its report to the Governor of the Canal Zone for ultimate transmission to the Congress, where the final decision must be reached.

It is apparent to those who have looked into the question at all that there are only three types of canal which are likely to receive serious consideration. One is the present three-level canal with necessary improvements. Another is the so-called terminal lake canal in which the San Miguel locks are eliminated, the level at Milaflores raised to the optimum level of the Gatun Lakes, and only two sets of locks remain. The third is a sea-level canal in which all locks except those for tidal purposes would be eliminated.

At present there are only a few ships which cannot get through the locks now provided in the Canal. These, according to my recollections, are the carriers, *Franklin D. Roosevelt* and *Midway;* several of the older battleships, which have had extensive blisters installed; and one or two of the largest passenger ships afloat.

One is now led to wonder if it would not be for the best interests of the United States to postpone all action in regard to extensive modifications of the Canal, thereby currently saving great sums of money, rather than to go in for present expenditure of anything from one billion to two and one-half billions to acquire facilities which may not be essential for many years to come. If reasonable modifications and improvements were made to the present system, it should be practical to handle all shipping with all needed dispatch, and to offer passage to all ships except those few enumerated. It is difficult to conceive of any international situation wherein it would be vitally necessary to get those few warships, which are too big for the Canal, into another ocean with such haste that they could not make the trip around South America.

Also it is difficult to conceive just now of any situation in which a navy or navies could be built in this world capable of opposing the Fleet of the United States in more than one ocean, without this Government knowing of such construction for many years ahead; in fact, the inauguration of a policy of the building of heavy ships adequate to defeat the American Navy would certainly be known in ample time to allow the 10 or 12 years necessary to make all needed changes in the Canal to accommodate even our largest vessels. Without knowing what report the special commission will bring in, it would seem that inflation might be deterred somewhat and that a reservoir of work might be built up for a time of depression by holding off the vast expenditures needed to reconstruct the Canal during current years.

The second type of canal mentioned, that is, the terminal lakes canal, is not really new, but is generally recognized as being sponsored by the gentleman who is probably our foremost canal expert in governmental service, Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, to such an extent that it is frequently called the DuVal plan. In this plan, which provides a two-level canal with a terminal lake near each end so as to give ample anchorage space above the locks, we have what to my mind is undoubtedly the very best answer to navigational problems connected with the movement of ships between the seas. In all the talks I have had with the veteran pilots of the canal, I have not encountered a single one who has opposed this DuVal plan. In fact, as far as I can recall, every pilot except one has favored it, and that one merely thought that the sea-level canal plans will prevail if recommended by the board of consultants. Bear in mind, I have not said all pilots of the canal, but only all pilots with whom I have had the privilege of talking. According to my ideas, this DuVal plan will be far less expensive than a sea-level type canal and far more satisfactory unless some question of defense with which I am not familiar is brought into the picture.

The third proposed type is a sea-level canal. Under this proposal, the canal would be dug to sea level for the entire distance across the isthmus and there would be a navigable ditch of about 32 miles in length. The cost of construction would necessarily be tremendous, but the work can be done if the American people so order and make the money available.

I appreciate that with the immense engineering skill and with the immense facilities we have for the manufacture of machinery there is practically no limit upon what we can accomplish in the way of construction jobs.

While personally I have not favored a sea-level canal because, from a navigational viewpoint, I have seen no necessity therefor, and I see many disadvantages therein when compared to a terminal lakes set-up, I realize that a new factor has come into the scene—a factor about which I know very little. This is the atomic bomb which has a faculty of contaminating everything within a considerable radius of its explosion, and which sets up intense radioactivity in structures of various kinds, and which contaminates the waters in the vicinity of its explosion to such an extent that they may be impracticable for the use of modern vessels as the crews of such ships would be seriously affected, or even ultimately destroyed, by the radioactivity encountered.

I say, therefore, that one must not close his mind to the construction of the sea-level type of canal regardless of expense, and regardless of less desirable operating conditions, until we know more of the probable effect of an atomic bomb or of its probable use in the event of another war.

I would also say frankly that the engineering consultants are carrying on experiments which are developing great accuracy in predicting the actual currents which might be encountered and that they are developing the possibility that, during certain hours of the day (probably 6 hours out of each 24), ships might safely proceed through a sea-level canal without the use of any tidal lock.

I have given you this short description of possible changes or improvements in the Canal, without any thought of technical data, merely so that you may see the problems which are ahead.

To me it seems the ultimate change of the Canal into one of the two latter types—that is, either the Duval terminal lakes type or the sea-level type—is most desirable, but, as I have stated previously, it seems also that, if possible, the Nation should prefer to hold all plans in abeyance after reaching a definite conclusion as to what it desires (unless international conditions make other action advisable) until the level of prosperity in the United States shows a definite need for the expenditure of large sums of public money to keep industry and wages up to a satisfactory plane. This Canal modernization project would be one of the great reservoirs of employment which we could have and, quite to the contrary of what some might think, it would afford employment to thousands of people not actually in the Canal Zone, for it would involve the labors of many American citizens in the manufacture of machinery and in the production of other supplies for use in the work.

During our recent trip to the Canal Zone, I observed that everything is going on in a thoroughly satisfactory state, insofar as Canal operations are concerned, and that other conditions are reasonably well taken care of. It is my own opinion that the Canal is suffering from the same disease which has afflicted practically all other departments of

the Government under the New Deal—that is, the number of employees has been increased tremendously for the accomplishment of practically the same work as was done theretofore, and that a sufficient reduction of employees is not being carried out. I know this is a very difficult problem, for when once the work done by one man is divided between two it thereafter never seems possible to impose heavier loads upon either individual, and that when once new jobs are established in time of war it seems thereafter impossible to do away with any of them, but, in the long run, this must be done. I look to see it come about gradually, both in the United States and in the Canal Zone, for certainly the experiences we are having in the Eightieth Congress, when it comes to reducing governmental expenditures and bureaucratic personnel, are not such as to lead one to believe that reductions in governmental expenses can be made except through the most desperate efforts spread over a considerable period of time.

In general, I believe that the Canal employees are well taken care of when compared to similar categories in the United States. I know that they do not have everything they wish, nor even everything I should like them to have, but, after all, one must compare their work with similar positions in the United States where we assume that jobs are paying in cash, or other remuneration, all that they will bear in our present economy. On that basis the total remuneration of the Canal employees is certainly reasonable and I am not inclined to believe that the greater part of the claims for further privileges and for higher remunerations are justified at the present time.

I know that this address has been somewhat rambling and I have attempted particularly to keep it away from anything which might be called technical as I do not believe that the ladies would be interested in technical conversation. Rather, I have tried to give a running story of the Canal as it might well be seen through the eyes of the average American. I have tried not to talk shop, but to present to you the story of one of the greatest feats of man on earth. The story of what, to me, is a vast monument to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt, and of what, to me, would seem to make the name of Theodore Roosevelt stand out among Presidents of the United States in equal degree and in equal stature with that of any wartime President.

I appreciate your kindness in giving me this opportunity to address you.

Trap Doors in the Rent Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times, of St. Louis, Mo., dated May 3, 1947:

TRAP DOORS IN THE RENT BILL

Given the House's undeviating desire to unfurl the national economy to whatever winds may blow, the local-option rent-control bill the Representatives produced looks, at a quick glance, better than might have been expected. At least the House trod daintily around voting the landlord's dream of a straight increase. The mere fact that the bill could have been worse, however, is no earnest that it is good.

Admittedly Congress faces a tough decision on rents. It would be obviously unfair to make landlords the one group to be denied income boosts to meet rising costs of living. At the same time, some of the landlords already have had boosts of a sort. Many are coasting on a 100-percent occupancy, for which they once didn't even hope. Many have saved by skipping maintenance work. Others have received adjustments through OPA. It would be unwise to let such as these trade on the acute housing shortage for profiteering. Sound legislation will have to pick its path carefully, then, avoiding double pitfalls. The House's bill hasn't done it.

Two of its provisions on rent, for instance, though they sound innocent enough, are tamped full of dynamite. One is the clause that permits a 15-percent increase in rent on a 2-year lease if the tenant agrees. The other is the local-option clause dreamed up by the Congress as a quick way of passing the buck.

Explained by its proponents, the 15-percent raise provision sounds most reasonable. Here you have a landlord eager to brighten up his property; here you have a tenant who would like to be sure of a roof over his head for the next 2 years. So the two sit down and chat amiably, agreeing finally on a 15-percent hike to be used for paint and wallpaper and new guttering. Only one small factor is overlooked—the landlord in today's market holds all the trumps. He need not offer a doorknob in trade for the increase; obviously he can make life miserable for any tenant who won't come through freely on an agreement. And a tenant presented with a take-it-or-leave-it deal cannot leave it; he has no place to go.

The local-option provision sounds as good—and can prove in practice quite as bad. Let any county, city, or town in good democratic fashion decide when it wants to end rent control, said the House. Who could object? But the legislators know well what real-estate lobby pressures will be exerted on the local governing bodies. They know, too, that they double the lobby's chances of success by tossing the decision on control or no control to small groups poorly equipped to resist those pressures. It's as if the circus strongman, tired of wrestling with a lion, had turned the animal over to Mr. Milquetoast in the audience to handle.

Yet the House hasn't stopped even there. In addition to rigging the machinery for rent boosts without regard to real needs, the Representatives elected to throw away almost the last shred of Government control over building. The decontrollers already have had their inning in construction; they managed to drum Wilson W. Wyatt out of his office as Housing Expediter and they got a wholesale weakening in controls when he left. In return, they promise a quick building boom. How they fulfilled the promise can be read in the reports that tell of the abrupt collapse of construction. Now the decontrollers want to try another dose of the same medicine. To help housing, they propose to let commercial and industrial building go on without a check. Presumably they work on the theory that it will warm a veteran's heart to see a new store going up even if he can't find a home.

Add it all up, the House bill comes to a retreat on the whole issue of rent and housing, no less complete for being concealed. In the Senate, where the Banking Committee has shaped a bill that would be fair alike to hard-pressed landlords and to tenants and would leave the few remaining controls untouched, wiser heads may prevail. If there is not to be an abject sell-out to the real-estate lobby, they had better.

Death of Hon. Charles L. Gerlach, Representative, Pennsylvania Eighth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, as one of the new Members of the Eightieth Congress and a Member of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation, I wish to express my sincere regrets in the loss of our fellow colleague, CHARLES L. GERLACH, late Representative in Congress from the Eighth District of Pennsylvania.

It was a shock to turn on my radio the morning of May 5 at 7 a. m. and hear the news of his passing announced on the air.

I am sorry that we new Members did not have more opportunity to know Charley well. My contacts with him in our Pennsylvania delegation meetings and on the floor of the House, prior to his recent attack, showed him to be a loyal and true American, one deeply interested in his fellowman, cognizant of the views of his home constituents, and truly interested in protecting their interests, as well as the interests of his fellow Americans.

We Members of the Eightieth Congress have lost a true friend, the people of his district have lost a faithful servant, and our Nation has lost the services of an able legislator.

I wish to express my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Charles L. Gerlach and family in this time of their deep bereavement. May God give them strength to bear this burden of grief and sorrow and give them the faith necessary to heal all wounds.

Snappy Fight at Washington Over Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. J. Russell Larcombe, editor and publisher of the Phillips County News, of Malta, Mont., which appeared in that newspaper May 1, 1947:

SNAPPY FIGHT AT WASHINGTON OVER EXPENDITURES

Proceeding briskly in Washington these days is an acrimonious feud over reducing public expenditures. On the one hand we have the Republicans who feel bound to try to redeem their campaign pledges. On the other we have the administration forces who, naturally enough, cannot admit publicly that they are extravagant. In the middle

are the sectional groups, both Republican and Democrat, who think it is a great idea to cut expenses everywhere but in the districts they happen to represent. Trailing the procession, of course, is the Remnants' Club of the New Deal which still thinks we should spend whether we have the money or not.

Before the final appropriation bills become law the real men in Congress will have a chance to stand up and be counted. So will those who talk eloquently about economy being a good thing for the future, but vote otherwise now. Probably somebody will do a good job of separating the sheep from the goats. The sheep will yield to sectional pressure and survive nicely, while the goats will be in hot water next election.

Republican Members in particular are having their feelings hurt. The more intelligent of them realized after the last election why they were given control of Congress. It was not because the people liked the way they parted their hair—it was because the Nation realized that a house cleaning was in order. And now, when the boys try to push the broom, they find even a good share of the press heaving rocks at them. Each of us seems to think that saving money at the expense of the other fellow is a good idea but we don't care to be injured ourselves.

Our own hard-boiled notion is that the way to reduce expenses is to go ahead and reduce them. We don't believe that any desirable governmental function is necessarily crippled because its appropriation is reduced, and we think the decision should be made by persons not employed by the agency concerned. Unfortunately, there is a well-organized opposition dedicated to scuttling the Republican program. Since the election there has been a rush toward the newspapers, magazines, and radios by New Deal left-wingers and they have done a remarkable job of embarrassing their enemies with the very weapons of publicity which previously helped ruin the New Dealers themselves. It is normal to hear bureaucrats squeal when their funds are reduced but the present blast is far more than normal. Its violence suggests a professional touch, an inspired campaign aimed at the Presidential election of 1948.

Politics being what it is, there is no cause for alarm in this. Least of all should the Republicans worry. They will be judged on their record no matter what they do, for they are distinctly on trial with the general public regardless of how the organized opposition performs. And it is the temper of the general public which decides elections.

Most of the noise out here will be over reclamation and any Congressman from the West who dares to trim a project appropriation will receive considerable attention. Some of us will want to shake his hand and others will call him a stingy curmudgeon out to crucify the old home acres. In the middle, however, and also voting, will be thousands of sober-minded citizens who know the difference between wrecking a program and reducing its scope temporarily. They will remember that most of these plans will go through eventually, anyway—the only question is, Shall we build them rapidly or more slowly? We doubt that any western Congressman has outright murder in mind. Personally, we hope that most of our Representatives will feel as the majority of their constituents must feel—luxuries are very nice to have around if we have the money but if we don't have it we must do without. Private citizens are required to operate that way and it is time the Government did the same. After all we still have a national debt of more than $160,000,000,000.—J. R. L.

Charles L. Gerlach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am moved to take this opportunity to express the deep sense of personal loss which I have in the untimely passing of our beloved colleague, CHARLES L. GERLACH.

It was my privilege to have known him but a short while before he was forced to absent himself from the House by what we now know was his last illness, but in that short period I came to appreciate that in him were lodged those sterling qualities which contribute to honest public service and stanch citizenship.

Too many men upon being elevated to high places forget the basic fundamentals or their origins, and the greatest tribute that we can pay Brother GERLACH is had in the conviction that here was a man who was truly representative of his constituency; that here was a citizen who never lost sight of the responsibilities bequeathed to him by his patriotic forebears.

In joining with this House in mourning his passing, I can only set forth the prayerful hope that an all-wise Providence will temper with pity the overwhelming loss to his loved ones and that there will be for them the consolation that comes from knowing that here was a life that was lived to the utmost for others and that there must come, for those who believe as he did, a day of final glad reunion on that other shore when there will then be no more parting.

Address of Senator Edward Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of EDWARD MARTIN, United States Senator from Pennsylvania, to the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, at the Penn-Harris Hotel, Harrisburg, Friday evening, April 25, 1947:

Mr. Toastmaster and fellow Americans, it is a pleasure to address organizations representing commerce, industry, labor, agriculture, education, the organized veterans, or any organization unselfishly striving for the common good. We can have real progress only when there is serious consideraton and frank discussion of the end result as it applies to all our people.

Tonight, I want to discuss certain principles and in doing so it will be necessary to present certain figures relating to governmental expenditures.

America, as I see it, is confronted with three dangers—big business, big labor, and big Government. All the faults of the first two should be corrected by the heads of their own organizations, but the evils of big Government, the most dangerous of all, must be corrected by the people themselves. The first two can be of inestimable service to our country if they will police themselves. If they look only to their own advantage and ignore the rights of others it will mean continual strife, and the general public will be the loser.

One of the reasons for the great centralization of Government in Washington is the never-ending demand for more services under the mistaken idea that the Federal Government has an inexhaustible revenue that comes from some mysterious source, a fountain of gold that will never go dry.

That idea seems to be held even by people and organizations that were most emphatic in their demands for curtailment of Government spending, for rigid economy, for a balanced budget, tax reduction, and a start on paying off the huge, crushing national debt.

Today, from these same sources—even from chambers of commerce and similar bodies—the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives are swamped with pleas, protests, and threats of impending disaster when it is proposed to cut down any of the services to which they have become accustomed in the years of reckless spending. They profess great interest in saving the taxpayers' dollar, but are prompt, loud, and vigorous in opposition to every economy proposal which would reduce in any degree the specialized activities of their own pet projects.

Federal agencies resist every effort to cut down the swollen pay rolls and have not hesitated to organize pressure campaigns to have their activities continued on the broadest scale.

When I took office as United States Senator from Pennsylvania there was unmistakable and convincing evidence that the people were determined upon relief from the back-breaking burden of taxation and debt imposed partly by the war, partly by spend-thrift administrations of our domestic affairs and partly by the cost of relief in war-devastated countries.

Obviously two steps were necessary. One was increased industrial production to raise the level of our national income. The other was to eliminate waste, extravagance, overlapping, duplication, inefficiency and fancy frills in Government services.

Without reduction in Government spending there can be no hope of return to national solvency. It will take hard work and sacrifices. States, communities and individuals will have to learn once more to do for themselves the things that many of them have looked to the Government to do for them.

There is no easy way out. Continued deficit financing is the road to national bankruptcy. Nations can go broke the same as individuals and corporations. In recent months we have had a grim demonstration that even the richest nation can suddenly find itself poor. Britain, within our own lifetime, the wealthiest and most powerful nation on earth, reached a financial condition which forced her to call upon America to assume commitments she could no longer carry out in Greece and Turkey. From the experience of Britain we can draw stern warning that it can happen here.

In order to combat the growing menace of big government, the people must take a greater interest in government. Local government must be put in a position to function as was intended by the founding fa-

thers. That means certain taxes should be earmarked for local governmental use.

The higher levels of government, and particularly the Federal level, can destroy the lower levels by misuse of the power to tax. Big government at Washington means regulation and control. Eventually it means regimentation.

Regulation by the central government curtails the initiative of the individual, of business, labor, agriculture, and the lower levels of government. We must never forget that every grant made by the Federal Government carries with it certain restrictions and takes away rights which properly belong to the States or to the people.

In order to get at the continual increase of the scope of government let us take some figures. I regret burdening you with statistics, yet I know no other way to impress upon an audience the trend toward unwarranted bigness in government.

Townships in Pennsylvania in 1910 expended $6,000,000; in 1930, $21,000,000; and in 1940, almost $41,000,000.

Counties in Pennsylvania in 1910 cost $30,000,000; in 1930, almost $57,000,000; and in 1942, $196,000,000.

Schools in Pennsylvania in 1910 cost $30,000,000; in 1930, one hundred and fifty-seven million; and in 1942 almost $192,000,000. This was the cost to the districts and does not include State appropriations.

In 1910 the State appropriated for the public schools $7,500,000; in 1930, $28,500,000; in 1942, $43,500,000, and in 1946 almost $70,000,000. This does not include State appropriation for the State teacher's colleges and other colleges.

The over-all cost of State government in Pennsylvania in 1910 was $35,500,000; in 1930, $203,000,000; in 1942, $307,500,000. Much of this increased cost of State government was by reason of functions assumed by the State that formerly were done by the local level of government.

For example, mothers' assistance, $68,000,000; mental hospitals, $19,000,000; indigent mental patients, $13,000,000; city and State extension of highway roads, $30,000,000; township aid for roads, $62,000,000; maintenance of bridges, $24,000,000; construction of main roads and bridges, $180,000,000 or a grand total of about $610,000,000 in a 20-year period.

As a further illustration, in 1931 the State highway system consisted of 13,500 miles of road which has now been extended to over 40,000 miles of road.

Thus, it is apparent that the State has taken the burden off real estate by almost eight mills, but unfortunately, the cost of local government is higher now than it was 20 years ago regardless of the relief by the State. We want local government. It is self-government. It is home rule. The closer government is to the people the more efficiently and the more economically it will be administered.

Now for a moment let us consider some figures relating to Federal expenditures. In 1910 the over-all cost of the Federal Government was $693,617,000; in 1930 it was $3,994,152,000; and in 1939, the last prewar year, it was $8,765,338,000.

Now we are talking of a Presidential budget of almost $40,000,000,000. It is so large and startling that no one individual can comprehend it. It includes national defense, aid to veterans, conservation, and world-wide aid. The United States News gave an over-all picture of the foreign-aid program which should be closely studied by every American.

Here are the figures:

Active credit commitments, including loans, property credits, and advances, $9,270,000,000.

Credits in view, which include unused authority for the Export-Import Bank, subscription to the International Monetary Fund and the maximum loanable fund subscribed by the United States Government to the World Bank, $4,304,000,000.

Private credits in view through the World Bank: $7,200,000,000.

For relief purposes there are included funds spent or budgeted for UNRRA; War Department funds for occupied countries; general relief in other areas and to finance the International Refugee Organization, $4,206,000,000.

Surplus property to be sold abroad accounts for $5,760,000,000, the excess of cost over the sale price.

This adds up to the appalling commitment of $31,885,000,000. And yet from the dark shadows of the near future will come new demands for Korea, India, and other places all over the globe.

These shocking figures should bring the American people to their senses. If we are to continue on such a policy the American people must know that sacrifices must be made here at home. They must prepare to pull up their belts a couple of notches. They must save and pinch if we are not to become an insolvent and bankrupt Nation.

Every department of the Federal Government is now larger than it was before the war and so many people are demanding that the services they have enjoyed shall remain. In 14 years $43,000,000,000 of subsidies and grants have been made to States, local governments, corporations, and individuals. Unless checked this enormous expenditure at home and abroad will eventually curb the initiative of the individual and if carried on will destroy the financial structure of the Nation.

America has been able to make its great advances because of the liberty of the individual, and because the small business concern or the small labor organization can move forward as its ability warrants. It cannot do so if big government is to have control.

If we are to have complete control of our Government all the people must take a part in that Government. In the past people have lost their liberty because of an all-powerful Central Government. America can travel the same road.

What are we to do? I would like humbly to suggest the following:

1. Let everyone take an intense interest in government.

2. Let us not advocate the expenditure of any public money unless we agree we can afford it.

3. Let us all oppose the demagogue who seeks public office by promising the people to expend their own money.

4. Streamline local government and give it taxes to perform its functions. Its functions should be the public schols, care of the indigent, local police power, and the local courts, and elections.

5. Let the State care for the mentally defective, penal institutions, natural resources, roads and higher education, without curtailment of the expansion of our liberal arts colleges.

6. The Federal Government should care for the veterans, national defense, foreign affairs, and interstate relations where necessary.

7. Peacetime spending by the Federal Government must be cut to the bone.

8. State and local governments must not be curtailed as to their taxes. They must not be forced to be niggardly in their expenditures. This is the only way to curb the centralization of government at Washington.

9. Let us all realize that a strongly entrenched central government has always been the arch enemy of freedom. It derives its power from the failure of the individual to assert himself.

10. If we are to remain free, organizations of labor, agriculture, business, education, and the church must assert themselves, and work with each other for the best interest of all the people.

America is the last remaining hope of a free world. We cannot make the weak strong by making the strong weak. We cannot be an influence for good in the world by destroying our own financial structure. If we fail—civilization may not have another chance for a hundred years.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD an excellent article by Walter Lippmann discussing Federal aid to education. Mr. Lippmann states the case very clearly and effectively. Unquestionably, the time has arrived when Congress should pass a measure providing this necessary assistance to the schools of the various States of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—MORE ON FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS

(By Walter Lippmann)

Many would agree with what was said in the preceding article about Federal aid to the schools—as in the bill sponsored by Senator TAFT—that the principle is well established, that the Nation can readily afford to spend more on education, and that the need is very great. Yet some will be reluctant to act, feeling that a bill of this kind is a measure to tax the people of States that do well for the benefit of States that do badly.

They will, however, be astonished to find, if they look into the matter, that the people of the poorer States, with the poorest schools, actually make a greater effort, actually devote a larger part of their income, to educate their children than do the people of the richer and more favored States. The people of the poorer States can accept Federal money for their schools without loss of self-respect.

The reason for this is obvious, once you think about it, but the obvious often escapes us. The poorer States have, of course, less income per taxpayer. But they have more children per taxpayer than the richer States. They have to educate more children out of smaller resources.

If we are talking of justice and self-reliance, then the comparisons are in their favor. A poor family with five children cannot give each child as good opportunity as a rich family with one child. But that does not mean that the poorer family has not tried to do as well by its children as the richer one. Now, on the whole, the States with the worst schools spend a bigger proportion of their incomes on schools.

The fair measure of a State's ability to pay for education is the size of its income per child of school age. The 10 States with the smallest income per school age child in 1939

were, in the order of their poverty—Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, New Mexico, Tennessee, Louisiana, West Virginia. But none of these States would be found on a list of the 10 which devote the smallest part of their income to schools.

Mississippi for example, is at the bottom of the list in what it spends on schools. But it is near the top of the list, actually ninth, for the whole country in the percentage of its income which is devoted to education. It spends 3.41 percent of its income. New York spends 2.61 percent of its income. But because Mississippi is so poor but has relatively so many children, it has an average of $400 to spend on a classroom unit whereas New York has $4,100 to spend per classroom unit.

In other words the States with the poorest schools are not those which make the least effort. Many of them make the greatest effort. New Mexico, for example, though it is among the 10 which spends the least, leads all the other States in the proportion of its income which it spends.

I do not, however, mean to give the impression that the effort of the poorer States is consistently greater than that of the richer ones. But it is true that most of them make an effort which is near the average for the Nation as a whole.

There is, therefore, no moral basis for objecting to Federal aid. The Taft bill would tax individuals wherever they live, and would distribute the proceeds to States which, though they spend 2.5 percent of their income on schools, do not have enough money to provide $40 per pupil per year.

I have labored this moral issue because I assume that there is no need to persuade any American that schools are vitally important, or that the Nation as a whole suffers if the children of any part of it are illiterate, or grossly uneducated, or miseducated.

No doubt the mere expenditure of money will not give this country the education it needs to govern itself and to prosper. That calls for a lot more than money. But mere money is needed urgently, even desperately, to provide the simplest kind of ordinary literacy throughout the Nation. On that, whatever our theories of education, we can all agree, and there is no point in being complicated and subtle about it.

Cost of World-Wide Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able editorial entitled "Rationing Relief," appearing in the Chicago Daily News of May 2, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATIONING RELIEF

The House rebellion which chopped $150,000,000 off the administration's $350,000,000 foreign relief measure, and threw anti-Communist safeguards around the expenditure, proves once again that the House is much more sensitive than the Senate to popular sentiment.

If the country was not awake to the staggering cost of world-wide relief, the realization came with the disclosure that Paul A. Porter's economic mission to Greece envisions another $350,000,000 program there. It is to come on the heels of the $400,000,000 Greco-Turkish project now before Congress. Both these, of course, are distinct from the relief bill.

Those who had been saying that $400,000,000 was only the beginning hardly expected such prompt corroboration. The relief millions are likewise only another item in that final bill. The true utopians of the we-owe-it-to-ourselves-don't-we school have hardly started. How else can we continue to produce, they are beginning to argue, unless we give most of it away?

The reduction voted in the House appears to have been purely arbitrary, based less on objections to any specific project than to the conviction that the United States taxpayer is being burdened too heavily.

The vote was an indication of the overwhelming extent to which the principle of relief is accepted. Only 45 Republicans and 21 Democrats voted against it.

An effort will be made in the Senate to restore the original $350,000,000. This was the administration's calculation of the amount needed to do the immediate job.

The administration has been remarkably unable to figure its own financial position correctly. We see no reason to suppose that it can come closer to calculating the Chinese and Italian relief budgets, unless it simply takes the position that they can use all they can get.

The anti-Communist barriers which the House erected around the use of the money are elemental common sense in view of the other costly projects for blocking the spread of collectivist slavery.

So long as Russia is draining the economies of the nations under her heel, we can hardly hope to restore them to prosperity. The most we can do is to alleviate human suffering. Experience with UNRRA has shown that, without supervised spending, relief money becomes another weapon for the subjection of people by Communist masters.

The House requirement that 90 percent of relief supplies be purchased in this country emphasizes a fact too often forgotten. It is not dollars that we are sending abroad, but wheat and shoes, lathes and locomotives.

This country does not begrudge the help it can give to cruelly stricken peoples. It does object to giving the administration too big a blank check; to sacrificing to maintain an iron curtain that disrupts the food and coal economy of Europe; to providing the whip wherewith revolutionaries tame hungry people; to inviting denunciations as an imperialistic Uncle Shylock; to paying war reparations by supplying the needs of countries whose own production is bled away.

The human needs of the world must be met. But our aim surely should be to help people to help themselves, and to stop somewhere short of sharing our charitable loaf in so many places that we lack the strength to bake another.

Retirement Pay of Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Faithful Service Deserving of More Attention," referring to increased retired pay for letter carriers, published in the Seattle Times of April 25, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITHFUL SERVICE DESERVING OF MORE ATTENTION

A group of old friends of thousands of Seattle households seeks support of the community's citizenry and of the State's Representatives in Congress in behalf of themselves and of thousands of their colleagues throughout the Nation.

Seattle's retired letter carriers, all of whom have been familiar daily visitors at this city's doorsteps for 30 years or more, ask that early consideration be given to their plea for increased pensions.

Their request is one which can be urged without any fear of upsetting Congressional efforts to reduce Federal expenditures. The modest increase in retirement pay sought by these veteran public servants will require no added appropriations from public funds. Its cost would be defrayed from the retirement fund to which the letter carriers themselves have contributed through long years of service.

The present maximum pension for letter carriers amounts to about $23 a week, though in many instances they receive less than that—some as little as $56 a month. A bill introduced in the Senate last January would provide an increase of 25 percent in these monthly stipends, or, as an option, it would provide annuities for the letter carriers' widows. Needless to say, the alternative provision for their families would be chosen by the majority of these faithful retired employees of Uncle Sam, if they were given the opportunity.

Seattle's contingent of retired letter carriers—men who have tramped these hillsides in all weather for three decades and fully earned the modest compensation they received for their peripatetic chore—number around 100. Their colleagues across the country constitute a small army of several thousands. Yet the bill designed to give them a greater measure of security in old age has received scant attention in Congress. It has lain in a Senate committee for 3 months without action.

That bill should be reported out and passed. By helping to accomplish this, the Washington delegation in Congress will earn the gratitude of a group of loyal and devoted citizens and their many friends.

Popular Election of President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 7 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Sun of Attleboro, Mass., on the subject of the joint resolution which I introduced providing for the popular election of the President and Vice President.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SATURDAY MUSINGS

The fact that Oregon a week ago became the eighth State to approve the constitu-

tional amendment limiting the term of Presidents is indication enough that remedial action can be obtained in a hurry if the machinery for it is provided. That lends added interest to the fact that Senator LODGE has reintroduced a constitutional amendment to provide for the popular election of Presidents and Vice Presidents. It is the same amendment he proposed in 1941 and it deserves some study by the people whose rights it aims to protect.

The electoral college, as set up by the founding fathers, was intended to be an independent body which would select and elect the Executives. Two electors, back in 1796, attempted to use their independent judgment and that resulted in the formation of electoral groups pledged to certain candidates. Thus the method of the founding fathers went overboard and political parties took over. The electors became Charlie McCarthys with no will of their own though, since they are not formally pledged, there might come a time when a sufficient number of them could upset an entire election.

It is admitted that possibility of such skulduggery is remote but other objectives to the electoral college cannot be thus lightly dismissed. The principal objection is that minorities are disenfranchised by the unit rule in each State. Willkie with 4,200,000 votes in the States he carried received 82 electoral votes but he was 250,000 votes behind Roosevelt in New York State and the 3,000,000 Willkie votes in that State did not count as the unit rule gave all the electoral count to the top man. In 1944 Roosevelt similarly lost 1,500,000 votes in Ohio because Dewey carried the State and took all the electoral votes. In 1924 Davis received 6,000,000 votes that brought him no electoral votes. The examples could be multiplied.

In the election of 1944, the votes of 45 out of every 100 people who went to the polls were in effect disenfranchised. That one statement is sufficient reason for changing any such system. But that is not all. Three times the candidate with the most popular vote received the least electoral vote—Jackson, Hayes, and Cleveland. Then, since electors equal the number of Congressmen and senators from each State, a number based on population, small States have an extra advantage in the Presidential poll. South Carolina in 1944 had one electoral vote for each 11,983 votes cast in that State while New York had one electoral vote for each 133,869 popular votes. Each South Carolina voter was thus equal to 11 New York voters in electing a President.

Senator LODGE, in his list of eight defects in the present system, goes on to point out a deadlocked election thrown into the House is to be settled by unit voting in the States' representation and thus 25 small States could control such an election. Then there is danger that electors might be ill, go insane, or be killed before performing their duties. Finally there is the chance that elections might be swung by concentrating on doubtful States; Cleveland lost New York State by 1,200 and thereby lost 35 electoral votes which might win or lose an election. Someone has figured that a candidate could lose 36 of the 48 States and still win the office.

All these objections are not new. Benjamin Franklin and Charles Carroll argued in the constitutional convention for popular elections; Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and Senator George Norris all called for the reform of the system. Objection can be expected from smaller States which figure they would lose in importance and from the poll-tax States where fewer votes are cast than in free-vote States.

The subject is timely again and Senator LODGE'S move opens the way to a real discussion. The reception given the two-term amendment suggests that the time is ripe.

Admitting that the founding fathers did the best possible at the time and that their work represented only a compromise between differing schools of thought, the ancient idea that the Constitution was too sacred to be changed has now gone by the board. Both the States and the Congress have proposed amendments, 21 of which have been adopted. The amendments have considerably changed the fundamentals of the original draft and there is no need to suppose that other changes will not come. After all, no one of the founders could foresee the size or the number of the problems involved in the Nation as it grew and any pride in the authorship would have to yield to the needs of the moment. The Constitution is made for the Nation and not the Nation for the Constitution. When a serious situation presents itself, like that of the electoral system, it deserves a remedy lest it lead to greater dangers.

Power Politics or Justice in the Mediterranean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 1, 1947

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to extend an address delivered by Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, which are his opinions, on the subject of power politics or justice in the Mediterranean.

The address follows:

So frequently people tell me that they would like to have a voice in the making of important decisions, in the shaping of the destiny of other nations, and in the formulation of policies in our own country. They feel that the individual counts very little and that his or her opinion is not given the opportunity to be heard in critical matters. In the important question which the President has placed before the Congress of the United States about financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey, the individual American citizen has an opportunity to make his influence felt and his voice heard. Not only has he the opportunity, but he has the duty. Not only will the President's recommendation change the foreign policy of America, but it may make the United States of America a party to a global system of power politics which may lead to war or all sorts of imperialistic adventures.

In Europe the game of power politics has been played for centuries. It brought Europe no peace, but periodic wars. Alliances and counter alliances were always made against the stronger nations, and the interludes of peace were periods when nations jockeyed for war. As a result of the new inventions in transportation and communication, the whole world has become as small as the European continent. Is the power politics that brought so much tragedy to the peoples of Europe to be reenacted on a world basis, and is America to become a party to it? In the issue now before Congress, at stake are war and peace, catastrophe and civilization, the destiny of America, and the destiny of humanity. Every citizen has a moral responsibility to participate in the national debate that now confronts us, to study carefully the issues and to help come to a conclusion. Only that individual is impotent who refuses to use the power that is his and abdicates his responsibility. Today are to be made the decisions for tomorrow. Everyone is morally responsible to share in them.

The proposal that the President has placed before Congress urges us to appropriate large sums of money to feed the people of Greece and to sustain the army of its present government with equipment and techniques to end its civil war. We are also to appropriate a large sum of money to help modernize the army of 600,000 of Turkey. We are doing this to prevent the sweep of communism and to preserve the independence of nations threatened presumably by Russia. If Russia were to propose to send military specialists and technicians to strengthen the army of Mexico or of Cuba whose governments were hostile to us, we would regard that proposal as an unfriendly act, and as a prelude to war. That Russia has not boldly so proclaimed our action is indicative of her military weakness and of her desire to avoid war with the United States. The proponents of the Truman doctrine contend that if there must be war between Russia and America, it would be to our advantage to have it out today while Russia is still weakened from World War II, and we are still near the height of our potential strength. So much stronger are we than Russia that we still can afford to threaten today, whereas tomorrow we may be threatened.

The average American citizen has a right not to have too much confidence in the State Department and in the reports that it may have prepared, on which the President's important decision was made. The State Department, itself, has made many glaring diplomatic errors. It has been so guided by the prejudices of the individuals who comprise it that it has hardly merited the confidence of the American people in a decision as momentous as this one. The State Department has, to a large extent, echoed the views of a small class of the social elite who had enough wealth to make a career of diplomacy. This group does not represent the broad sweeps of American life and has blundered seriously in the past decade. It urged our country to stand behind the Franco government in Spain, which destroyed democratic government with the help of foreign systems, the very thing that we are now trying to prevent in Greece. We have recently seen how the State Department was divided as to which policy to pursue in Argentina. Under Secretary of State Braden, a former Ambassador to the Argentine, an authority on Latin America, is convinced that the Peron government is a Fascist government, hostile to our form of government, hostile to the United States. It has given shelter to Nazi leaders. It controls large stores of the minerals essential in the making of the atom bomb. It has destroyed the freedom of organizations of labor. It has tampered with the freedom of the press, and in other ways it has indicated its contempt for the basic Bill of Rights. The Braden policies were challenged by Stettinius, who did not block Argentina's admission to the United Nations, and by Ambassador Messersmith, who had become a buddy of Colonel Peron, who meets and greets the former when he arrives and leaves the Argentine. With these differences within the State Department, the average American citizen knows that the report of the internal conditions of any country depends on who writes it. Braden writes one report; Messersmith writes another. If this is true of the Argentine, this may be also true of Greece. Who wrote the reports on Greece? What was their background, and what was their political and social philosophy? This the American citizen should know before he makes up his mind.

The American citizen also must not forget how grievously our State Department blundered in north Africa. There it persisted in doing what it may now be urging us to do in Greece—support the former enemies of the Allies and oppose the former friends of the Allies. Our representative, Ambassador Robert Murphy, was wined and dined by collaborators afterwards executed by the French when liberated. The men who had helped us were arrested after we arrived in north Africa, and some of our friends, even when

our troops were in control, were kept in prison for months. The money, prestige, wealth, good clothing, the good homes of Algiers were in the hands of the friends of Hitler, and with these best people, our diplomats liked to fraternize. The foes of the Hitler regime had been stigmatized as Communists or radicals, and these were ignored even after our landing in north Africa. All the men in important positions were Vichyites. The foes of nazism were ruthlessly eliminated, and our representatives flirted with the men in authority. Giraud, now the forgotten man, was preferred over De Gaulle. The American citizen should ask himself whether, in backing the King of Greece, our State Department is backing another Giraud.

But a much more important matter to consider is the international principle involved. There are bound to be, in the future, differences between nations, and it is not impossible that individual nations may seek to conquer smaller nations. The only possible cure for this situation that man has been able to devise is enclosed in the principle of collective security, through which all nations would unite against an aggressor nation. Therefore when wars would occur, they would be between an aggressor nation and the rest of the world. If this principle were securely established, it would tend to restrain aggressor nations. It would give small nations a sense of comfort and security which they have never had in the whole history of mankind. It would end the jockeying for alliances. It would eliminate all power politics. Nations would cease to fear the growing strength of other nations, and outlaw nations would be restrained by the thought of antagonizing the whole of mankind. When Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, we, the United States, appealed to the principle of collective security. If our appeal had been heeded by the members of the League of Nations, Japan would have disgorged Manchuria, and a whole new code of international morality would have been established. When Italy prepared to invade Ethiopia, Ethiopia appealed to the League of Nations. The League of Nations could have prevented that invasion, but again the principle of collective security was ignored. It means united action against an aggressor. It is the only principle on which wars between nation and nation can be avoided.

We had hoped that this principle would be embodied in the United Nations, as it was. It would therefore mean not that force would not be used, but that force would be used collectively by all nations against any aggressor. There would be a police force, but it would be an international police force. There would be armies, but they would be international armies against aggressor nations which violate the moral code. Action would be taken, not by one nation which would bring war, but action would be taken by the United Nations. This was the great advance of the United Nations. This principle, developing through the United Nations, could have brought to an effective end unilateral action which is the prelude of war. Why was not the United Nations used in this instance? The American citizen has a right to ask. And the answer is that the United Nations is not effective enough. Now, if the greatest power in the world does not use the United Nations in the greatest crisis which confronts it, a crisis which may lead to war, how can we expect lesser nations to make use of the United Nations organization? Right now, we need not fear Russia. Right now, we have tremendous power. We could have waited and delayed to give the newly created international machinery a chance to work. That machinery did prove effective in the Iranian crisis. Russia did withdraw her troops from Iran, and the United Nations gained in prestige. Why did we choose to bypass the United Nations and thus give that international body a body-blow from which it may not easily recover?

The Russo-Turkish question is not a new question. Russia has for generations wanted a warm-water port. Between the conduct of Russia and Turkey during the war, there is no choice from our point of view. Russia gave everything she had to the Allied cause, and her contribution was significant. Turkey was ready to sell herself to the highest bidder, and at one time she stood prepared to let German troops through her territory to complete the encirclement of the Middle East by Rommel from Africa and by other German armies marching through Turkey. Because Turkey maintained a dubious neutrality, it does not mean that she should now be victimized by her powerful neighbor, but it should mean that Russia's claim for access to a warm-water port should receive favorable consideration. If Britain has a moral right to command the Straits of Gibraltar and thus determine who shall and shall not enter the Mediterranean, then Russia's claim on the Dardanelles should be heard. I do not believe that the Dardanelles should be given to Russia, but I do believe that these straits should be internationalized so that all nations of the world would have equal access to them. But if these straits should be internationalized, then all seaways, including the Suez and Panama Canals, should also be internationalized and placed at the disposal of all human beings. For us to send military personnel to Turkey now is carrying our "get tough" policy to dangerous extremes. It is taking a chance which the American people should not be asked to take, in view of the existence of the United Nations.

Greece is a heroic little country, to whom civilization is greatly indebted. Its 7,500,000 people put up a magnificent struggle against the Germans and Italians. That country has suffered woefully during the occupation. The Germans stripped it as a locust plague. Heroic Greeks never yielded but carried on a terrific underground existence. As in north Africa, so in Greece, there were elements in the Greek population in whom the spirit of liberty had died, and who came to terms with the Germans. They did not find it difficult to do so. They were Fascists themselves, and had crushed democratic processes in Greece. These Greeks joined their Fascist German allies and waged a cruel, unremittant war against the Greek underground resistance movement. When the war came to an end, the British hastily landed troops in Greece in order to prevent the resistance forces from taking over. British soldiers fought side by side with pro-Nazi Greeks and defeated the resistance and liberating forces. The elections held under the threat of British guns were not free elections, and were boycotted by large elements of the population. The choice given to these people was a choice between monarchy and communism. They were given no chance to choose democratic institutions. In such a small country, an army of 113,000 was necessary to keep the peace. In that army, according to the British Foreign Office, there were over 200 ex-German Army officers. Of all the liberated countries of Europe, Greece is the only one in which no Quisling has been tried. Is this the type of government that America wants to uphold? It may well be that Russia or her allies are supplying the resistance forces with weapons. If that is so, why can we not appeal to the United Nations to stop the flow of Russian weapons to the Greek rebels and to cease support of the Quisling army. Then, let the Greek people make their decision without outside weapons. Or is it our intention to prevent any radical governments, even if the people want them, to establish themselves in Europe? In that case the role of America is an unenviable one. Shall we become the supporters of reactionary and oppressive forces all over the world? What a role for the greatest Republic in the world to play.

When we act outside of the United Nations, the smaller nations of the world, even though they fear Russia and expansionism, will not be too happy. They will fear American expansion just as much. We believe that we shall use our power only for good and just causes, but smaller nations will not believe that of us. No one nation has the right to be the arbiter of the world. America does not want the role of determining by force the destiny of nations. This would be a destruction of freedom. I do not doubt that small nations tremble before Russian expansionist ambitions. I believe that these expansionist ambitions should be curbed, but they should not be curbed by any one nation. If they were curbed through the United Nations, then America could be a big factor in curbing them, and then it would have the confidence and good will of the whole world. The smaller nations would know that they have a voice. They could speak their minds with courage and integrity. They would be afraid neither of Russia nor of America. We would not be exposing ourselves to the temptations of imperialism, nor would the world think that our decisions, garbed in altruism, are motivated by oil in Arabia. There has been talk in our country of America dominating the world. Our acting outside of the United Nations gives credence to that talk.

It is very clear that our new policy was not born out of a great passion for democracy. Not only is the Greek Government undemocratic, but the Turkish Government is definitely tyrannical. President Truman's talk was devoid of great ideals, because it is impossible to link the American ideals of freedom and justice with the Governments both of Greece and Turkey. Are we, the United States, setting out to curb Russia now? Do we have to go to war with Russia? Do we have to go to war with any power which may become as strong as we are? There would be no hope for peace at any time if that were the case. We are the strongest Nation in the world today, but there are other nations which, in 25 or 50 years, may equal or surpass our strength. The people and resources of Russia, when their potentialities are fully developed, will be stronger than America. Are we now going to build an American empire so that we shall always stay ahead of a Russian empire? This will surely lead to war and catastrophe. This will never bring peace on earth. Powerful nations must learn to work together. They must learn to curb themselves and they must learn to work through existing international organizations. Small nations should seek refuge, not in alliances with powerful nations, but through the United Nations. Turkey and Greece, if threatened by the power of an ambitious neighbor, should seek protection, not from Uncle Sam, but from all the nations of the world. The prophets of old warned Israel against making alliances, either with Egypt or with Syria. They knew that small nations which make alliances with strong ones lose their freedom and become subject nations to the powers whose aid they sought. If Greece and Turkey receive American aid and accept American orders and allow Americans to dominate their economy or their military, then the Greeks and Turks become the vassals of America instead of the vassals of Russia. They will be better off under our tutelage than under that of Russia, but nevertheless they will have lost their freedom. It is that freedom that the President seeks to uphold. Then the way to uphold it is to extend whatever relief Greece and Turkey need through the United Nations. Then these countries will not be obligated to any one state. They will be obligated to humanity. Then they will be protected not by the armies and navies of one country, but by the armed forces of the world. Then the principle of collective security will be made secure and the principle of international war will have been undermined and weakened. By all means, let us help Greece, or let us help Turkey, or let us

help all states that need food and protection from aggressive neighbors, but let us help them through international and not through national agencies. Working through international agencies is to secure the peace of the world. Working through national agencies is to bind mankind to the rack of war.

The ideological warfare between American democracy and Communist autocracy will not be settled by armed force. It is one of the historical conflicts in which the march of events and time will be the umpire. The use of arms in this clash will becloud the issue and delay the decision. This is a debate of generations. Let that debate take place, not on the field of battle, but in the arena of life. And I am convinced that no philosophy which denied the basic liberties of man, as defined in the Bill of Rights in the American Constitution, can ever dominate the earth.

Hon. Charles L. Gerlach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join others today in expressing profound sorrow for the passing of one of our most useful and beloved colleagues who reached his earthly journey's end only yesterday.

Although we were of opposite political faiths, yet I came to know him as a high-class gentleman, a deep student of the principles of sound government and their proper application, and a fervid patriot.

Mr. GERLACH had an initial advantage in being born a Moravian and in a splendid community in Pennsylvania inhabited largely by Moravians, than whom there are no better. He was a member of the Unity of the Brethren.

During World War I, I was requested to make a series of addresses before gatherings of war workers and others, and it so happened that I was sent to Bethlehem, Pa., the birthplace of Mr. GERLACH. I soon found myself very much at home as one born in Bohemia, because Bohemians and Moravians, who formerly occupied the Northern Province of Austria-Hungary, which is now part of Czechoslovakia, are close kinsmen. We all well know the splendid reputation of Moravians for responsibility, adherence to compacts, and excellence of citizenship.

In my visits throughout the United States during the First World War I did not find any community more alert, intelligent, and assiduous in promoting and defending the national welfare than the citizenry of Northampton County, Pa. This was the source of much satisfaction to me because of the very close kinship between them and my own people. Mr. GERLACH in all his activities personified those good qualities. Although he had known or suspected for several weeks that the sun was about to set permanently for him, he did not quail, but with an approving conscience looked with confidence and serenity to the future.

In the 10 years he labored as a worthy servant of an intelligent and discriminating constituency he established a reputation that all of us may emulate with profit and enduring satisfaction.

UN and Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles from the Washington Post of May 7, 1947:

UN AND PALESTINE—TIME FOR ACTION, NOT DELAY

(By Sumner Welles)

Will the Assembly of the United Nations assume the full authority conferred upon it by the Charter? Will it now, as the spokesman for world public opinion, boldly recognize its obligation to press for an equitable settlement of the Palestine controversy? Or will it let itself be used by the major nations as a tool in their contest of power politics?

Present prospects are encouraging. They are the more so because of the election of Oswaldo Aranha as President of the Assembly. His ability and character are unquestioned. His lifelong devotion to the principles of human liberty and human dignity is recognized. No wiser choice could have been made.

The issues are plain.

On the one hand, it is clear that the restoration of the legitimate rights, and even the salvation of the very lives, of a great number of the most tragically afflicted people in the world of today depend upon a decision of the Assembly that a just settlement of the Palestine problem must be found before the end of 1947. On the one hand, it is equally clear that Great Britain is determined to continue to rule Palestine, and to oppose any solution which would transform the present Jewish minority into a majority, or provide for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth. She wants Palestine as a strategic base to replace that which she is losing in Egypt. She wants to retain Arab support. She considers the achievement of these objectives as essential to any successful attempt to check Soviet expansion in the Near East.

Great Britain has never shown greater ineptitude, nor a more callous disregard for her obligations to humanity, than in her recent policy in Palestine.

Mr. Chamberlain's white paper of 1939, continued in force by the Attlee cabinet, which practically prohibits Jewish immigration, is a violation of Great Britain's mandate. The persistent refusal of the British Government to reopen Palestine's doors has deprived the Jewish survivors of Hitler's mass murders of the hope that they can obtain security and a chance to start life anew.

There need be no extenuation of the crimes of the Jewish terrorists. But these are primarily a result of British policy and of British military repression.

When the British Government at last submitted the Palestine problem to the United Nations, it declared that it merely sought an advisory opinion, to be accepted or rejected as it saw fit. It was later explained that Britain could not undertake new responsibilities in Palestine unless they were acceptable to her. In her present predicament Britain should certainly not be asked to assume obligations she cannot readily carry out. But if the recommendations of the Assembly involve new military or financial burdens, these can surely be jointly shared by several states as provided in Article 106 of the Charter, until the United Nations is able to take them over.

What is imperative is that the United Nations shall not submit to pressure for further sterile delay. The Assembly cannot afford to appoint a new fact-finding committee to formulate recommendations, only to have these once more ignored or rejected by the British Government.

The present session of the Assembly should limit itself to the appointment of a special committee, preferably composed of only a few states, none of them major powers, and all of them devoid of any selfish interest in Palestine. This committee should receive categorical instructions to submit its recommendations for a permanent settlement to the regular session of the Assembly next September. The committee should be instructed to visit Palestine, to familiarize itself at first hand with the condition of the Jewish survivors in Europe, and to hear the views of all of the several interests involved.

The Assembly should agree at this extraordinary session that final action will be taken upon its committee's recommendations at its regular session next autumn.

Regrettable as it may be for several reasons, the only solution which will now be viable for a solution providing for a form of partition which will give the Jews ample territory within which to resettle the survivors of the Nazi massacres, and within which to develop a prosperous economy under an independent and democratic government. The region of Palestine assigned to the Arabs might well be incorporated within Transjordan. The Holy Places should be placed under the control of the Trusteeship Council. Britain's legitimate needs for strategic bases may be properly determined by the Security Council.

If our Government has as yet decided upon a Palestine policy, this has not been disclosed. Its backing and filling when responsible representatives of the Jewish people asked that their voice be heard at this session of the Assembly was not an exhilarating spectacle. It may be hoped that enlightened American leadership will still be undertaken before it is too late.

If the American Government is chiefly guided in this controversy over Palestine by what are alleged to be strategic considerations, and refrains from standing foursquare for the principles of human liberty and of justice that are involved, it will lose a great opportunity to enhance its own moral prestige and to increase popular confidence in the authority of the United Nations.

World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of C. D. Jackson, vice president of Time, Inc.,

managing director of Time-Life International before the Committee on Ways and Means, May 7, 1947:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Ways and Means, it is a privilege and honor to be able to appear before you at this time.

I asked for this privilege not because I was in any way an international economist, professional, or even amateur, but because I am an importer of news from abroad, and an exporter of American magazines to virtually the whole world. Furthermore, during the war I was attached to the Psychological Warfare Division of General Eisenhower's headquarters, and part of my job was to appraise the reactions and ideas of liberated and conquered peoples toward the Allies in general and the United States in particular.

Like a great many other people in business in America today, I have come to realize since the end of the war that the United States businessman has not only a commercial, and if you will, selfish, responsibility to discharge today, but also an unselfish patriotic responsibility to assist his country in every possible way to achieve its proper place in the world—a world of which it is today an indissoluble part, whether or not that is a pleasing thought to individual Americans.

Trade is a great peacemaker and peace preserver. More world trade is what this world needs today. But in order to get world trade off dead center, someone must assume leadership, and obvious to everyone all over the world is the fact that the United States should and can assume that leadership if she so wishes.

In order to assume that leadership, and have it understood and accepted by the world, two things are necessary—one is intangible, the other is tangible.

The intangible one is evidence to the whole world that the United States truly desires an orderly, prosperous, trading world. Mr. Clayton is in Geneva now trying to get some 18 nations to believe that intangible.

Unlike a great many other countries today, the American democratic system of government can present the confusing spectacle of having an officially accredited representative abroad with a directive from the President of the United States to achieve certain ends, while simultaneously other official representatives of the same country are publicly attempting to counter his directive. This is understandable and acceptable to us because we have been brought up in the American tradition. It is terribly confusing to non-Americans, and sometimes can prove disastrous.

Therefore, on the intangible that Mr. Clayton is trying to put across, which can unite these nations within the western American orbit instead of driving them in confused despair to seek refuge if not safety in some other orbit, I hope and urge that this committee will find that the International Trade Organization program is something to be endorsed and heartily recommended to the Congress.

On the tangible side, there is the matter of actual trade—the exchange of goods, services, and money between these countries. For a variety of reasons, some of them historical, we have forgotten that the word "import" is inseparable from the word "export," unless we are willing to embark on the long term international trade suicide of unpaid loans of one sort or another, or unless we believe that we can cut ourselves loose from the rest of the world and exist happily and prosperously on a self-contained basis.

I do not believe that the latter needs much argument today, even for those who wistfully wish it might be true, if for no other reason than the fact that the American standard of living must be exported if there is to be peace in the world—and the American standard of living cannot be exported if we set a wall around ourselves.

Today there is not enough world trade. In order to have more world trade it must be freed from some of the present unnecessary and occasionally obsolete barriers which have been set up. One of those barriers is what is now being discussed in Geneva under the general name of the reciprocal-trade program.

It is proposed that the United States will sit down with these other nations of the world and will negotiate reciprocally the lowering of tariffs. This does not mean the abolishing of all tariffs; it does not mean that United States industry or the United States worker, either in general or in particular, is to be ruined. It does mean that certain tariff barriers will be lowered between the United States and other nations in order to permit a freer, faster, and larger flow of goods, from which this country expects to derive considerable benefit through increased exports.

But to export a product from this country requires dollars to pay for it. The foreign countries cannot obtain dollars except through loans or through imports into this country. Unless this Government is prepared to lend indefinitely, with little hope of repayment, then we must have added imports, and the best, most normal, and in the long run, most painless way of increasing imports is through the lowering of tariffs.

I mentioned above that the American standard of living must be exported if we are to have long-term prosperity and peace in the world. The troubles and wars of the world arise much more out of economic than geographical reasons, and if some of the trouble-making nations today and in the past had had more economic lebensraum—in other words, had been able to bring their people closer to the American standard of living—there would have been less shouting and eventually less shooting for geographic lebensraum.

In my own business, international magazine publishing, we receive thousands of letters a year from all over the world on a thousand different subjects. But the one common denominator that appears in almost all these letters, no matter what country they are from, is the desire on the part of the readers to see more American advertising. To them, an advertisement is not what it is to us, namely, a more or less ingenious sales appeal. To them, an advertisement is an editorial on the fact that America is functioning. They give us credit for having a virtual monopoly on all the great words such as freedom, liberty, democracy, etc., but they want to see what we make, because they know in their own unhappy, inarticulate way, that when we are making things, and displaying them, and selling them, we are functioning well, and when we are functioning well, there is a chance that they also may pull themselves out of the mess in which they are.

Therefore, let a functioning America send as much as it possibly can to the people of the world, and let us not give it, but let us sell it—because this is a capitalistic country and should produce and sell. But let us also be paid—and that can only be done by letting these other nations obtain the necessary dollars by selling to us.

Let us increase the velocity and volume of two-way world trade, in order to increase our national income here and raise the standard of living abroad.

It is inconceivable that we should once again revert to the dismal techniques of the twenties, when in order to get the necessary dollars into the hands of our customers we embarked on a program of indiscriminate foreign loans whose default unquestionably was a major factor in the 1929 crash. Then the machinery of the United States virtually came to a halt. As a desperate expedient we started buying the gold of the world, a great part of which is now buried in Fort Knox. This device kept exports alive until the world's gold was virtually exhausted, at which time the war came along and lend-lease furnished a new formula for getting dollars in the hands of our customers abroad. Now we are right back where we started, with the even grimmer necessity today for getting the trade of the world off dead center. On the basis of our actual experience with these past nostrums, can we again, as intelligent Americans, deliberately refuse to adopt healthy, normal, and permanent measures instead of the synthetic makeshifts of the past?

Here again you have it within your power immeasurably to influence this most tangible aspect of the problem through your findings and recommendations on the reciprocal-trade program which is now entering its first difficult stage in Geneva, where many eyes will be looking to you for a sign of hope.

Decisive choices are going to be made within the next few months. With your endorsement, the choice can be for world-wide peace and prosperity.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we do well again to pause for a while to commemorate May 3 as Poland's national holiday. Undoubtedly, one of the world's greatest documents, looking to freedom and progress after many, many years of oppression, was signed May 3, 1791. It is not exaggeration to say that the Polish Constitution, assuring the basic rights of man, be his station high or low, takes its high place alongside our own Declaration of Independence and the Magna Carta of 1215.

In commemorating this anniversary, we are reminded of the painful evoluticns that have brought Poland to her current high stature among the leading nations of the world. Her indomitable will to live, exhibited many times from 1772, when one-third of her territory was shamefully wrested from her, to the present day, is an example of courage, devotion, and fortitude not surpassed, if paralleled, in all earth's history.

In 1795, when Poland ceased to exist as a nation, the world thought she could never rise again; but, with unmatchable persistence, after 123 years of struggle under the heels of a conqueror, she again emerged to take her rightful place among the nations of the earth.

Obviously, people of common clay do not usually arise after being submerged 123 years, but that is exactly what the doughty Poles did.

Then followed 21 years of reasonable prosperity for the Poles, which the whole world, with but one exception—Germany—hoped might be permanent. But, alas, 1939 came, and Fate decreed that Poland be the scene where the issue of peace or war should be decided. The heroic action of Poland, in the face of

great military inequality, in opposing the further encroachment of the despicable Nazis is as inspiring a deed as covers the pages of all history. That opposition proved the mettle of a great people, and we all hope that Poland may enjoy forever a sound government of her own choosing. Indeed, her important contribution to the enormous scenes of especially the last 8 years entitles her to a lasting place in history and in the hearts of all who appreciate and love character, honor, fair dealing, and rectitude of purpose.

Admiral Frederick J. Horne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would give full active duty pay to any officer of the Army or the Navy who has retired upon completion of 50 or more years of service. So far as I know there is but one person now living who can qualify, and it is my information that there is no one else in all our national history who could have qualified.

Admiral Frederick J. Horne holds a unique and enviable place in American military and naval history, having served in an active capacity for over 50 years. His service with the Navy was not emblazoned with the roll of drums, the blaring of bands, the great acclaim, which are the usual deserved lot of our national heroes; yet the contribution which this man made to our national security is fully deserving of the plaudits of his countrymen as can be testified by those who knew him, his work, and his responsibilities during wartime. To me Admiral Horne is the unsung hero of World War II.

America has had many heroes who over a short space of time have cut their niche in a permanence of glory, but few have been the stalwarts whose quiet, conscientious, thorough, and constructive work has endured for year in and year out, decade after decade, unknown and unheralded. Such people are the great in America, and such a person is Admiral Horne.

Admiral Frederick J. Horne was born February 14, 1880, at New York City, and was appointed to the Naval Academy by Gen. Daniel Sickle. He entered the Naval Academy May 20, 1895, and was placed on the retired list on August 1, 1946, serving on the active list a little over 51 years.

As a first-class naval cadet he was present, on board ship, at the landing of the Army in Cuba in June 1898, and at the battle of Santiago on the U. S. S. *Texas*. Those naval cadets returned to the Naval Academy in October 1898, and their class was graduated on 28 January 1899.

Admiral Horne has been pretty well all over the world and served in about every kind of duty. He went through the insurrection in the Philippines from December 1899 to the end, and spent 14 years in the Orient altogether, in tours of from 2 to 4 years. He had command of the following ships: *Rainbow*, surveying French Frigate Shoals for an air base in 1914; *Von Steuben*, ferrying troops in 1919; *Buffalo*, destroyer tender; *Birmingham*, light cruiser, Mexican waters during the revolution in 1921; *Vestal*, repair ship for battleships and cruisers; *Omaha*, light cruiser, flagship of destroyers, Pacific Fleet; *Wright*, aircraft tender; and *Saratoga*, carrier.

As a flag officer, he had command of base force, United States Fleet; aircraft scouting force; aircraft base force; aircraft United States Fleet as vice admiral; and a cruiser division.

Admiral Horne's decorations are as follows: Navy Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Navy Commendation Ribbon, Sampson Medal for the Battle of Santiago, Spanish War, Philippine Insurrection, First World War, Second World War, American Defense, American Theater, and decorations from Brazil, France, Poland, and British Empire.

He became Vice Chief of Naval Operations, with the rank of vice admiral, in March 1942, and served in this duty until October 1945. He was promoted to admiral under date of December 15, 1944.

Following are the citations received:

Navy Cross: For distinguished service in the line of his profession as naval attaché, Tokyo, Japan, in which capacity he had remarkable success in establishing and maintaining friendly relations with the Japanese authorities in supplying valuable information to the Office of Naval Intelligence and to the commander in chief of the Asiatic Fleet. He also performed extremely meritorious service in connection with the purchase and building of ships in Japan for the United States Government.

Distinguished Service Medal: For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as Vice Chief of Naval Operations from March 26, 1942, to August 31, 1945. Displaying sound judgment, superb professional ability, and meticulous attention to detail, Admiral Horne directed the planning and operation of the logistics, intelligence, and communications systems of the Navy. An outstanding administrator, Admiral Horne, by exercise of unrestricted energy, excellent foresight, and management, brought about the vastly complex organization that provided the fleets of the United States and supported them throughout the world. Through the qualities of leadership which he displayed, Admiral Horne inspired in his subordinates a high degree of loyalty and devotion to duty. His conspicuous achievements contributed materially to the successful prosecution and outcome of the war.

Legion of Merit (from the Army): Admiral Frederick J. Horne, from May 1943 to September 1945, as senior member and later as Chairman of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board, provided astute guidance in staff planning and logistical collaboration concerned with problems of petroleum supply. The policies of the Board, coordinated with other organizations and Allied agencies, resulted in the adequate supply throughout the world of petroleum products to meet the essential wartime needs of the Army, the Navy, and civilian agencies.

Admiral Horne is certainly one of the most beloved officers in the history of our Navy. He was always gentle, courteous and considerate in dealing with people, and this particularly applied to enlisted men and junior officers. At the same time, Admiral Horne was a firm disciplinarian, and could be a hard-boiled fighting seadog when the occasion required it.

The least spectacular, but perhaps the greatest, contribution he made in his long and distinguished naval career was the quiet behind-the-scene job of being Vice Chief of Naval Operations during the Second World War. The Chief of Naval Operations and the Commander in Chief of the Fleets, Admiral King, was heavily involved in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the combined chiefs of staff work, and left most of the administration and guidance of the Navy Department itself to Admiral Horne.

It was Admiral Horne's unfailing tact and vast knowledge of the Navy and naval operations that was mainly responsible for the smooth running of the Navy Department and of naval operations.

I do not believe that the country will ever know the full contribution to the prosecution of the recent war by this quiet, modest, sincere, but tremendously effective and capable naval officer. He leaves the naval service in the full, mellowed vigor of his years, and with him go the genuine affection of these who knew and worked with him, and the profound appreciation of a grateful people.

Fascism in Action—Resolution to Print as a Public Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, next week, May 14, the Committee on House Administration is expected to determine whether or not it will recommend to the House of Representatives adoption of my Resolution No. 83 which provides that the booklet Fascism in Action be made a public document.

On September 24, 1946, after conferring with Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, I addressed the following letter to Dr. Griffith, as Director of this Service:

I have received and read with interest the booklet which you prepared at the request of Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN on Communism in Action. It is House Document No. 754, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. This booklet is very fine and I have enjoyed reading it. If it does nothing more than arouse a lot of people about the evils of communism, it will certainly be worth while. It is my belief that the book will serve a very fine, useful purpose and you are to be commended for the contribution you have made in its compilation.

I am opposed to communism in any form. It should be fought with every means at our command. It is obnoxious to our American democratic system of free enterprise

based upon initiative, intelligence, ability, and hard work. Our system is the best in the world and although it is so much better that communism, I just can't believe that communism can get any hold in America, yet we must be on the alert and make sure that there is no formidable start toward communism.

At the same time I dislike fascism. I think fascism is just as bad as communism. They are both equally bad. I would not attempt to say which is worse. To my mind fascism has a stronger hold in our country today that communism because its roots have become so firmly planted by so much abler and stronger hands and minds. Fascism in our country today is backed by plenty of wealth and a day never passes that the people of our country are not flooded with literature which would lead them down the road to fascism.

Therefore, this letter, in addition to commending you on the book on Communism in Action, is to request you as Director of the Legislative Reference Service, to prepare a book on fascism to show how fascism operates and to cover generally the same line of approach that you covered in the book on communism.

If you will prepare such a booklet I expect to offer a resolution in Congress, January 3 next, asking that it be made a public document in order that it may receive wide distribution.

I hope the time will never come in this country when our people will fear only communism or only fascism. They should fear both. Since the book has been prepared on communism I hope that people will not get the idea that fascism is not feared just as much by Congress and the Legislative Reference Service as communism.

Please advise me at your earliest convenience if you will undertake the preparation of the booklet on Fascism in Action.

Dr. Griffith advised me that the work would be undertaken, and I assisted to the best of my knowledge and ability. The booklet has fourteen chapters, as follows:

PART I.—POLITICAL AND SOCIAL

Chapter I, Government and Political Parties.
Chapter II, Education.
Chapter III, Use of Leisure Time.
Chapter IV, Living Standards.
Chapter V, Religion.
Chapter VI, Freedom.
Chapter VII, Foreign Policy.

PART II.—ECONOMIC

Chapter VIII, Organization of the Economy.
Chapter IX, Public Finance.
Chapter X, Industry.
Chapter XI, Agriculture and the Farmer.
Chapter XII, Foreign Trade.
Chapter XIII, Transportation.
Chapter XIV, Labor.

An effort was made to keep it around 100 pages, but it now appears that it will be nearly 150 pages. However, the number of pages is not as important as the value of the contents of the booklet.

A correspondent in Texas in a letter to me of October 1, 1946, stated:

Indeed, I believe that the Fascists in an effort to further their program are responsible for exaggerating the danger from communism. Fascism is the greater danger today. I look forward to the pamphlet on Fascism in Action.

Another recent letter states:

You're right. Americans should hear both sides. Fascism in Action should be published.

From New York a veteran of the war writes:

The fight you're putting up to get your resolution, H. R. 83, out of the congressional subcommittee is a heartening thing to an ex-soldier who fought this menace of fascism, only to see the possible recurrence of it in this country.

I trust you are successful in getting Fascism in Action published by the Government Printing Office. It is necessary reading for all Americans.

From the west coast, a correspondent writes:

It appears to me that many people who are prone to raise an outcry about "iron curtain" in other countries aren't aware of those forces in our own Government who are attempting an American iron curtain.

Still other correspondents write:

I have been reading about the book, Fascism in Action, which you hope to have published.

From the description, it must be an excellent book—just what is needed at this time to combat trends in this country.

What can I do to help get Fascism in Action printed by Government Printing Office? We need to expose fascism and communism both.

A correspondent in Ohio writes:

Why anyone not a Fascist or a Communist should oppose the widest publicity in showing up these two totalitarian twins is beyond me. Your efforts are to be commended by loyal Americans (and I don't mean either Communists or Fascists).

In a letter to me of March 20, 1947, a correspondent in Ohio wrote:

I am grieved to learn that the publication of the manuscript Fascism in Action is being delayed in the House Subcommittee on Printing—especially at a time so critical in our history. I hope you will do your utmost to hasten the publication of this manuscript and I should indeed appreciate a copy of the book, if and when it is printed.

Another recent letter from Texas states:

Our greatest danger today lies in fascism and the people should be made conscious of what fascism means and how alarming the trend is toward fascism in America at this time.

Aid for Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, if the so-called Truman doctrine of stopping communism in Greece and Turkey, and throughout the world, is accepted by this Congress, it will merely forge another link in the heavy chain that already binds the American taxpayers to a debt so great that the annual interest exceeds $5,000,000,000. And this link for Greece and Turkey will only be the first of a series of links in the already too burdensome chain that, in the end, can only succeed in sinking the American taxpayer and the Nation into an economic mire blacker and deeper than that of the Nations we are proposing to help fight off collapse.

Under the proposed Truman doctrine, the economies of Greece and Turkey are to be saved by $400,000,000. Communist infiltration is to be blocked by the $400,000,000. The integrity of two middle eastern nations is to be saved, and democracy is to be preserved with this $400,000,000. Standing alone, that amount of money looks more than sufficient to bolster a weakened nation if it were placed in efficient hands and fed into proper channels. But let us see how these countries have managed their affairs in the past.

Greece was one of the nations most ravaged by the war. Its economy was wrecked, its villages burned, and its people impoverished. The record, however, shows that during these trying times, and since the end of the war, Greece has received more than just sympathy from the United States. Here is what Greece has received to help her combat the evils that have plagued that nation.

In lend-lease materials, Greece was given $71,697,000 from March 11 through VJ-day. Since VJ-day Greece has received $3,970,000. That makes a total of over $75,000,000 in lend-lease alone through the end of last year.

Our Maritime Commission extended credits totaling $45,000,000 to Greece.

The Export-Import Bank committed $25,000,000 for Greece.

The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration allotted Greece $350,500,000. Over $7,000,000 of this remains to be shipped to that nation at this moment.

Truly, it cannot be said that Greece has not had a helping hand from this country already. These figures, all of which come from the agencies through which the aid was forwarded, show that the American taxpayer has given to the Greek Government a total of almost $500,000,000 to help it over the rough spots during and after the war.

Turkey was not even a party to the war just concluded. Yet, Turkey has received $90,000,000 in lend-lease from the United States taxpayers. The Turkish economy, in the opinion of many economic specialists, is today on a more sound basis than is the economy of the United States. In Turkey today, there is a standing army of somewhat over 500,000 men. Conditions inside Turkey are said to be good. Aid being asked for that nation, however, is of a military character to enable the Turks to better train, equip, and feed that huge standing army, and at the expense of the American public.

So here is what we have in this situation. On the one hand, aid is asked for a nation that already has received half a billion dollars from United States taxpayers, and whose economy today is on the verge of total collapse in spite of all of this money and aid. So why should Uncle Sam play Santa Claus any longer? Why should Congress not treat the taxpayers' dough as would a sound and dependable banker?

On the other hand, we are asked to support a grant of aid to a nation that is spending a great percentage of its income for a large standing army, and a nation that did business with Hitler while the democracies of the world were fighting to crush the Nazi military machine.

In the middle, and in a very tight squeeze, we have the American little man—the little men who have had to make good on all these checks written by the administration, that have done so little good. Here is what this policy means to the little men of America we are being asked to forsake:

For every $3 future generations of Americans have to pay in taxes, they will have to dig down for one more dollar to pay for all this foreign aid granted to nations abroad during the past 7 years. To further increase such a heavy burden is only a policy of self-destruction.

The solvency of America is today the real secret weapon in this war to preserve democracy on the face of the earth. The old adage "Give until it hurts" applies today to America. We have given already until it hurts. To give more will hurt us far more than any of us now can realize.

If these countries believe in themselves, and are willing to make the sacrifices our forefathers made for the cause of freedom and liberty; and if they will give satisfactory assurances of repayment, then let us quit talking about grants, gifts, or credits, and start talking loans to these people. No doubt private banking concerns in this country could handle the needs of these nations, thereby relieving Uncle Sam whose back is terribly bowed with our huge debt.

Intelligence System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 3, 1947:

INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM

Nothing is so important to an adequate American intelligence system as continuity, both of effort and direction. For that reason another change in the leadership of the Central Intelligence Group is to be regretted. At the same time, it would be less than generous not to recognize the valuable service of Lt. Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg during his tenure as Director of Central Intelligence. He pieced together a working top-level organization to evaluate the many reports in a field where lack of coordination previously had been the most conspicuous feature. We hope that his successor, Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, will have similar success. Admiral Hillenkoetter's background will help him in his new duties.

General Vandenberg's resignation points up a fundamental weakness in our intelligence set-up which is carried over in the new Central Intelligence Authority envisioned under the armed forces merger bill. That is the weakness of permitting a military man to retain his active-duty status while serving as director of Central Intelligence. Inevitably this results in a tendency on the part of incumbents to regard the job as merely a stepping stone in an essentially military carrier. Hence it invites the trading back and forth between the Army and Navy evidenced by the appointment of two admirals and one general in 16 months. What is needed is to develop the concept of long-term career service in this highly important job. We hope Congress will see to it that the merger bill is amended to establish a specific term of office and to require that the director be in fact a civilian. This need not militate against Admiral Hillenkoetter if he is sincerely interested in an intelligence career, for he can relinquish his active Navy status and retain the directorship as a civilian.

Aside from these deficiencies, the part outlined for intelligence under the merger is highly significant. The merger sets up as a permanent part of our national policy activities which so far have had only the tentative backing of an Executive order. General Vandenberg outlined the vital functions in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Foreign intelligence, he pointed out, is equally as essential in peace as in war. Indeed, good intelligence, in our opinion, can be a potent force for peace, since by acquainting policymakers with the facts, it helps to insure wise policy. That is the reason we have constantly emphasized a civilian appointment with assurance of continuity of service at the helm of intelligence.

Failure of Government Agencies to Cooperate in Scrap Efforts Causes Shortage of Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the district I represent is devoted predominantly to farming. Our farmers are progressive. They make wide use of mechanical equipment. Shortages of farm equipment during the war handicapped them severely in their vital work of providing food for our armed forces, the Nation, and our allies. Nevertheless, they performed miracles in making inadequate equipment do, and in keeping worn-out equipment on the job.

Now it has been almost 2 years since the surrender of Japan brought the war to a close. Yet farmers in my district are still suffering for lack of machinery and other products made of metal. Mail and urgent telegrams come across my desk every day, asking what I can do to help our farmers get badly needed farm machinery, roofing sheets, nails, and baling wire. And each time I turn to manufacturers and distributors of these products I hear the same story—shortage of steel.

Going into the matter thoroughly, I was amazed recently to discover that our Government is doing little or nothing toward returning to this country the scrap steel resulting from the war. This is the scrap which our steel mills desperately need if they are to reach full production.

Because of this, the facts contained in a leaflet entitled "A Memorandum on the Iron and Steel Scrap Situation" have caused me a great deal of concern, if not downright irritation.

That memorandum states that present stocks of iron and steel scrap are the lowest on record. They are even lower than back in the war years when we were conducting scrap drives. Yet in Europe and on the Pacific islands, there are millions of tons of scrap in the form of out-of-date or damaged war equipment, bombed bridges, buildings, and so on. This memorandum points out that there are many other thousands of tons of scrap steel, in the form of obsolete machinery and industrial equipment, being held by the War Assets Administration, the Army, and the Navy. It is almost treason how this material is being held and stored at great expense to the taxpayers when it is so greatly needed by industry for American business, and agriculture, and to provide labor for American workers.

As a representative of a district clamoring for steel products, I demand to know why the War Assets Administration and the Army and Navy have not exhausted every means to get this steel scrap flowing back to the United States.

Now is the time to take measures for getting it back. It can only be done while prices are high enough to pay the cost of handling, shipping, and processing scrap. The present scale of prices cannot be expected to last forever.

My speaking out against the sluggishness of Government agencies in this matter is not a case of the pot calling the kettle black. My constituents, and American farmers generally, have done a good job of conserving scrap. Flow of scrap from farms to dealers has been very high. The amount of scrap remaining on farms is small, indeed.

Since farmers have scraped the bottom of the barrel, they are not feeling exactly happy to hear that stalling, delay, and indifference on the part of Government agencies is responsible for a good portion of our current scrap famine. Their resentment will be deepened, of course, every time they are unable to buy nails, baling wire, and farm equipment; every time they read or hear over the radio the fact that Washington's failure to move mountains of rusting war scrap back to America is causing an ever more rapid depletion of our ore reserves, the reserves we had to gouge into so heavily to win the war.

Our Government knows the basic facts. Why has it not acted?

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to introduce the full text of this leaflet for the observation of the American people who are entitled to know the facts and a more complete survey of the scrap situation, and why farmers are not getting much-needed agricultural equipment.

The text of the leaflet entitled "A Memorandum on the Iron and Steel Scrap Situation" follows:

The present visible stocks of iron and steel scrap are the lowest on record and considerably below the quantity on hand in the early part of 1942 when it became necessary to conduct a Nation-wide scrap drive in order to maintain production of steel and castings for the "Arsenal of Democracy."

The heavy exportation of ferrous scrap, amounting to some 20,000,000 tons in the 10 years prior to our entry into World War II, plus the tremendous tonnage of steel in many forms sent abroad during the war, and other factors have combined to effect the present definite scrap shortage now existing in this country. Ferrous scrap is one of our important sources of metallics and it will never be possible for us to make up this loss of one of our basic materials for the production of finished steel and castings.

The present collection of scrap from the farms and rural areas, plus the generation of scrap by fabricators and automobile graveyards and the daily obsolescence of equipment in this country are not sufficient to meet the demands of the steel and foundry industries and accumulate safe reserves for the future. If the present scant supply is not augmented, production of finished steel and castings may have to be curtailed, as well as the production of commodities made in whole, or in part, of steel and/or castings.

The largest and most accessible sources of scrap to increase our present supply are under the control of the United States Government as:

(1) Surplus military and industrial equipment in the United States, occupied Germany and Pacific islands which is no longer usable and, therefore, to be scrapped. This surplus equipment is now under the controls of War Assets Administration, the Army and the Navy.

(2) Scrap resulting from warfare and worn-out equipment in occupied Germany and Pacific islands.

(3) The conversion to scrap of damaged and obsolete Navy and maritime vessels.

It is estimated that the potential scrap from these three sources would aggregate many million tons.

A bold and vigorous policy and program should be adopted by these Government agencies in:

(a) Declaring as scrap and selling these otherwise unusable surpluses.

(b) The return of all scrap under the control of these agencies for sale at Atlantic and Pacific ports.

The proposed and talked of sale of scrap in the European areas and Pacific islands on an as-is and where-is basis is wholly unsatisfactory. The number of companies in the scrap industry and steel industry which would or could bid on that basis is very limited. The necessity of the prospective bidders' visiting and having to view the scrap to see what they are bidding on, the making of arrangements with the Army and Navy for the rental of equipment to load the scrap, the transporting of scrap, and other problems would only drag out interminably and frustrate our mutual efforts to return this scrap to this country. The return of scrap to the Atlantic and Pacific ports by agencies of the Government would assure the return of all this scrap which is so badly needed, and would also give the Government a higher sales realization than if sold on a basis of delivery to the buyer in Germany or Pacific islands.

(c) The acceleration of the Maritime Commission and the Navy Department programs for the sale of damaged and obsolete vessels for scrapping.

The lack of a definite and immediate program for the sale of these ships makes it impossible for shipbreakers, many of whom entered the field at Government behest, to look ahead and plan for their operations. It also discourages many additional companies from participating in this shipbreaking program.

With a full realization of the seriousness of the situation there has been formed the Steel, Foundry, & Scrap Industries' Committee for Expediting of Iron & Steel Scrap, composed of the following:

American Iron & Steel Institute: Walter S. Tower, president, American Iron & Steel Institute; Robert W. Wolcott, chairman, Committee on Iron & Steel Scrap, American Iron & Steel Institute; L. D. Greene, consultant, American Iron & Steel Institute.

Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel: Philip W. Frieder, president, Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel; Edwin C. Barringer, executive secretary, Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel; Charles H. Lipsett, publisher, Waste Trade Journal.

Steel Founders' Society of America: Edgar D. Flintermann, president, Steel Founders' Society of America.

Gray Iron Founders' Society, Inc.: R. L. Collier, executive vice president, Gray Iron Founders' Society Inc.

American Malleable Society: W. W. MacMillen, general purchasing agent; c/o National Malleable & Steel Casting Co.

The Steel, Foundry, & Scrap Industries' Committee for Expediting Iron & Steel Scrap has the full-time services of L. D. Greene, located at Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., and Edwin C. Barringer, located at 1536 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C., who are coordinating the efforts of industry and Government to accelerate the flow of Government-controlled scrap to the mills and foundries.

This memorandum is sent you with the earnest request that you aggressively support the program it outlines.

ROBERT W. WOLCOTT,
Chairman, Steel, Foundry, and Scrap Industries Committee for Expediting Iron and Steel Scrap, Washington, D. C.

The National Archives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, you have all probably heard about the National Archives. You know it is a Federal agency—a fairly young one, having been established in 1934—and that it occupies a big pile of a building on Constitution Avenue here in Washington. It is an impressive building, almost too impressive. The name, National Archives of the United States, is also a bit overwhelming. The word "archives" sounds so formal, so solemn, so remote from your everyday affairs and mine. "Archives," however, simply means the records of a government or other institution or the organization that takes care of them. And I have found, as I know some of you have, that the records of the Federal Government in the National Archives are not at all remote from the lives of private citizens as well as officials and that the National Archives preserves these records for the use of the public as well as of the Government.

In the National Archives are some of the most significant documents in the history of the United States. These particular records are not often consulted by the average citizen but they are important to him as a part of his American heritage. Our struggle for independence is pictured in order books of Gen. George Washington and oaths of allegiance to the Continental Congress taken by Washington and his officers during the grim winter at Valley Forge. America's first diplomatic triumph is embodied in the Treaty of Alliance with France of 1778, which brought vital aid to us in the Revolution. The achievement of our independence is recognized by Great Britain and symbolized for all time in the Treaty of Paris of 1783, which brought the Revolution to a close. A draft of the Constitution, with changes made in it in Washington's handwriting, shows the thinking of the "founding fathers" about the fundamental framework of our Government. Civil liberties, personal freedoms—often denied in colonial days—are guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. Other amendments to the Constitution, Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, acts of Congress, and records of Congress, including petitions from the people, illustrate the ceaseless striving for greater freedom and greater humanity that is characteristic of our democracy.

That "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" has been truly said. Many times since the Revolution we have had to fight for freedom and American rights. The records of those struggles are also in the National Archives. Freedom of the seas was won in the War of 1812. Old Ironsides, the United States frigate *Constitution*, whose logbooks bring to life such famous encounters as that with the *Guerrière*, and "Old Hickory," Gen. Andrew Jackson, whose hand-written account of the Battle of New Orleans pictures that noted victory, symbolize the toughness of the American fiber that enabled the young Nation to command respect for its rights. The Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and World Wars I and II are all variously recorded in orders, letters, muster rolls, account books, treaties, photographs, motion pictures, and even sound recordings in the National Archives.

The peaceful internal development of the United States is also mirrored in records in the Archives Building. The advancing tide of settlement upon the abundant land, the criss-crossing of the continent with lines of transportation and communication, the development of natural resources, and the advancement of agriculture, industry, trade, education, and science—on all these facets of American life Federal records throw some light.

Documents illustrating our priceless heritage of liberty and the development of the American way of life are kept on display in the Exhibition Hall of the National Archives, where the public is welcome. Most people expect to find such historic documents in the Archives Building. I doubt, however, that many realize that the greater part of the 800,000 cubic feet of valuable Federal records preserved there, which were transferred from Congress, the White

House, most of the Government agencies, and several of the Federal courts, are not important-looking papers with ribbons and seals. They are nevertheless vital to the conduct of public business, the protection of the rights of citizens, and to the advancement of knowledge.

Federal agencies, as you might expect, are the biggest users of Government records, but I am not going into those administrative and research uses. Congress itself uses records in the National Archives. It not only consults House and Senate files but records of the State Department, the Federal Reserve System, and of other agencies to determine precedents and to obtain other needed information. Such congressional committees as the one that investigated the Pearl Harbor disaster used transcripts of enemy messages recorded by Government listening posts and other records. Individual members can often get help from the Archives for themselves or their constituents.

Not long ago Representative KEAN, of New Jersey, learned about a man in his district who was trying to establish his American citizenship. Although the man was 26 or 27 years old, he could not prove that he had been born. His parents said his birth had taken place aboard the *Susquehanna*, an American ship that was bringing them to this country from Poland, but his parents' word did not constitute legal proof. There was no record of his entry at Ellis Island so he could not prove that he had been legally admitted to the United States. Thus, though he had been trying for years, he could not establish his citizenship.

Representative KEAN thought that surely the skipper of the ship would have recorded a child's birth aboard, and his efforts to locate the records of the *Susquehanna* led him to the National Archives. There it did not take the trained reference employees long to find the log of the ship. The entry for December 12, 1920, showed that a male infant had been born to the Polish couple, whose names were recorded, and the entry was signed by the ship's chief officer, purser, and master (for whom the boy was named). Since his father had been naturalized while the young man was still a minor, a certified copy of the entry in the log was all he needed to prove his birth and entry and to establish his long-sought citizenship.

In this case, a Congressman acted for a constituent, but anyone can write to the National Archives for information that he has reason to think may be in the records preserved there, and the small but competent staff of the agency will supply a reasonable amount of data by mail. Furthermore, anyone can obtain certified copies of records in the National Archives for a very small fee. If you want copies of documents, such as the surrender papers that brought World War II to a close, for framing or for some purpose other than legal, you can obtain photographic facsimiles from the Archives at cost.

In these still troubled times, as during the war, requests for information that would help to prove citizenship are constantly received by the National Archives. Only a limited quantity of naturalization records received from a few Federal courts are in the Archives Building, but records pertaining to passports, passenger lists, and even census population schedules often yield information vital in proving citizenship. Many pitiful letters are received from American nationals abroad who lost everything, including their papers, during the war. Some of them want to come back to the United States but cannot replace their destroyed passports because they cannot prove that they are citizens.

One American woman, whose entire family was killed when the Nazis invaded Holland, wrote that she had been born in New York City in 1878 but that her birth had not been recorded. Could the National Archives produce evidence that she was entitled to a passport? She wanted to spend her last days at home. Even in 1880 New York City was a big place, too big for the Archives to track down in the 1880 census of population everybody in New York who bore the name the woman gave. Further questioning of the woman and persistent effort on the part of the Archives, however, finally led to the location of the woman's name in the 1880 census of Staten Island. Armed with this presumptive proof of her birth in the United States, the old lady could again seek, this time with hope of success, a passport to her native land.

Some people have even fewer clues to offer when they turn to the National Archives. A swarthy young man appeared one day to appeal for help in establishing his citizenship. He had been born in this country, he said, but he did not know where. About the only pertinent information besides his name he had to offer was that his grandfather, an Arabian camel driver, had come to America nearly a century ago. To search the passenger lists of all the ships that brought in immigrants about 100 years ago would have been an impossible task. It looked as though the experts had been stumped. Then one Archives employee recalled that when Jefferson Davis was Secretary of War under President Pierce he had imported camels and camel drivers for transporting Army supplies over our western desert. Investigation of Quartermaster Corps records told the rest of the story. One of those camel drivers was the man's grandfather, who, it developed, had become a naturalized citizen.

Proof of age as well as of citizenship is important and can frequently be obtained from the National Archives. Old-age benefits guaranteed by law often hinge on proof of when a person was born. The recording of births is the business of the States, of course, but census schedules, military-service and pension records, and Federal employment files in the Archives contain data on birth dates that is often accepted in lieu of a birth certificate.

Service disability pensions may depend on such documents as sailors' health and welfare files. During the war many such records were soaked with black oil when ships were torpedoed, and when the records were recovered they were unreadable. The National Archives devised a way to dry clean these records, however, thus reclaiming them for the future protection of those sailors who were injured in line of duty but who would have great difficulty proving it without such records. Other service records in the National Archives bolster and protect the benefits that have been voted for those who have fought to protect this country.

Property rights of the people of the United States are also witnessed and protected by the preservation of certain records in the Archives Building. General Land Office records, which are basic to establishing title to three-fourths of the land area of the United States—all the public lands—are in the National Archives. When people get involved in litigation over titles, the National Archives can, and does when requested, furnish copies of the original land-entry papers, including the land warrants themselves. Every time a new oil field is discovered, for instance, the Archives does a land-office business in supplying those concerned, and those who would like to be, with facts about titles. Patent records protect the interests of those whose inventive genius has helped to make America the great industrial country it is.

You would expect historians and political scientists to use records in the Archives Building, and they do. Until the National Archives was established, many Federal records were inaccessible in basements, attics, and warehouses, but now they may be used by anyone who has a legitimate reason for consulting them in well-equipped search rooms, where attendants who can offer helpful suggestions are always on duty. Journalists and novelists also often search records for material. Carl Sandburg, in preparing his monumental volumes on Lincoln, used documents and photographs in the National Archives. Margaret Landon consulted diplomatic and consular reports relating to Siam in writing Anna and the King of Siam. King Mongkut's offer to the President of the United States of elephants which might live and multiply on our western plains was a genuine gesture of friendship documented by the records.

Sometimes it is not even necessary for scholars and others to come to Washington when they want to use records in the National Archives for research. Some important series of records have been reproduced on microfilm, and when orders for copies of such records are received positive prints of the microfilms are made at cost. Thus for a few dollars all the records of the Michigan Indian superintendency or of the American Embassy at Paris can be obtained on microfilm and used anywhere that a reading machine is available. If you have read Kenneth Roberts' recent historical novel, Lydia Bailey, you know what effective use he made of information in Federal Archives. It was chiefly microcopies of records in the National Archives that he utilized, I am told, microcopies of diplomatic and consular records relating to Haiti in the time of Toussaint L'Ouverture and to Tripoli during the war with the Barbary powers, which he bought

and took home to use at his leisure. Libraries and universities throughout the country have sent in so many orders for such microcopies that the National Archives is swamped with them. This service is justly popular, because it affords a convenient and inexpensive way of building up collections of source materials in institutions in many regions. Furthermore, by the production of multiple copies on microfilm the Archives is insuring the preservation of important materials even in the unhappy event of the destruction of the originals.

Personally I am interested in photographs. I have discovered that the National Archives has a very rich collection of pictures, which it has received from various Government agencies. There are more than a million photographic items in the collection, and they range in date from the Civil War through World War II. Since many of them came from the Army Signal Corps, a large part of the collection relates to the various wars we have been engaged in, but many personalities, the scenic wonders of the country, industrial developments, educational institutions, the District of Columbia, Federal buildings throughout the country, railroads, ships, airplanes, and even foreign countries are also pictured. In fact, the Archives can produce photographs on almost any subject you can name, and copies of the pictures may be obtained for a small sum.

Schools, libraries, and private collectors order thousands of prints every year. Among the most popular are pictures made by the famous Civil War cameraman, Mathew Brady, the granddaddy of all the ace war photographers. He persuaded President Lincoln to allow him and his assistants to photograph the armies in the field. As a result there is available a collection of portraits and scenes that in realism and excellence of photography cannot be outclassed even by the best of today's output. Brady's portraits of Lincoln, Grant, and Lee are especially good and are in much demand. Portraits of Indian chiefs made by Smithsonian Institution photographers and pictures of Indian villages are used by grade schools as teaching aids. American Legion posts are good customers for pictures of World War I units and heroes.

Hollywood, which ought to know the value of pictures if anybody does, is a constant user of photographic records. There is always somebody to squawk about historical inaccuracies in movies, but, if one may judge by the amount of research the industry does in the National Archives, it goes to great lengths to achieve verisimilitude. In making Gone With the Wind, searchers not only combed contemporary documents in the Archives Building but whole sets showing fortifications at Atlanta and street scenes were copied from Brady photographs there. For Wilson, pictures of the Versailles Conference were studied in great detail and news reels of the Conference made by the Signal Corps were interpolated into the picture. For utilization in the latest Hi-ho Silver picture, sound recordings of Indian chants have been obtained.

Educational institutions and private citizens may also obtain at cost copies of individual scenes (still pictures) taken from motion-picture film in the National Archives. In the custody of the Archivist there are about 40,000 reels of motion pictures. Most of these were made by the Government. They include training and incentive movies, reconnaissance and other films made for intelligence purposes, documentaries, and films such as those made on the 1939–41 Government expedition to the Antarctic picturing the areas explored. Wellesley College, for instance, recently obtained copies of films made on that Antarctic Expedition to illustrate for classes in geology the formation of icebergs.

Radio stations, colleges, historians, students of speech, and collectors also find the more than 200,000 sound recordings in the National Archives of great use. The voices of such noted men as William Jennings Bryan, William Howard Taft, Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Harry Truman and of such notorious characters as Mussolini and Hitler are among those on recordings. Reproductions of these recordings may also be obtained at cost.

The movie industry recognized from the first the help it could get from the Archives, and during the war many other businesses turned to the agency for information. They were chiefly interested in learning how industry adapted itself in World War I and what substitutes for strategic materials could be found. One manufacturer's representative said that what he learned from a study of World War I records in the Archives saved his company months of time valuable to the war effort in World War. The Federal Register, which contains Government rules, regulations, and orders and which is published by the National Archives, helped to keep the businessman informed of all the wartime regulations he had to comply with. Since the war representatives of business and industry have continued to utilize Federal records, for instance, for a study of the development of aviation, and many companies now utilize copies of photographs in the National Archives in advertising.

If you have ancestors, as who has not, you may be interested in genealogy or family history, as some prefer to call it. There are in the National Archives probably more original source materials about more people than in any other one place in the United States. Every day the search rooms of the agency are filled with men and women who earn their living tracing the descent of others or whose ancestors are their hobby. It is not possible for the Archives to supply much genealogical information by mail. The attention of the staff must first be given to facilitating Government business and to answering questions involving the legal rights of individuals. The nearly 5,000,000 case files of those who have been pensioned by the Government for service in wars from the Revolution through World War I, however, are available for consultation. Among these files are many odd documents, such as embroidered samplers listing the names of a father and a mother and all their children. There are also many family Bibles among these records. Some of you recall that these venerable Bibles are a kind of capsule family archives. They are a great find for the family historian. Although neither they nor the samplers were official records to begin with, they became so when the Government accepted them as proof of marriages, for instance, instead of certificates, which were not often given in early days.

Schedules of population made in the censuses of 1790–1880, 1910, and 1930, which are in the Archives Building, contain much data about individuals. Appointment papers and the personnel records of Federal employees also yield rich returns for the genealogist or the biographer.

The National Archives is not a bureau of missing persons but sometimes it can help locate members of families. One woman who had been adopted as a child found herself alone in the world when her foster parents died. She determined to try to locate her real family if any members of it remained alive. All she knew about it was that her father had once been in a veterans' hospital. Her search for him was unsuccessful until she tried the Archives. There a pension case in her father's name revealed that he was dead but that she had brothers and sisters, whom she lost no time in locating.

The services I have mentioned are just a few samples of those constantly performed by the National Archives. The agency is the repository of masses of records that can be of inestimable use to you and to your constituents. A trained staff is ready to serve you. Why not make use of the Nation's archives?

Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent a congressional district, a portion of which is largely devoted to the dairy industry. A great investment has been made in tested herds of cattle, in buildings, in farm land, farm machinery, and in specialized dairy equipment. The dairy farmers have been a large contributing factor to the community life and to the stability of the economy of Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, and Allegany Counties, N. Y. The trade agreement program threatens to weaken, if not ruin, the prosperity of the dairy farmers. I have opposed this whole scheme of opening our market to the dairy products of low-cost-producing nations.

The testimony presented to the Ways and Means Committee on May 7, 1947, by Mr. Charles W. Holman, a distinguished economist, who has long fought for the

best interests of the dairy farmer, is a masterly contribution. Under leave, I am extending his remarks:

The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, with offices at 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C., is an organization of 83 dairy cooperatives which are owned, controlled, and operated by approximately 380,000 farm families. These farmer-owned cooperatives market about 17,000,000,000 pounds of whole milk equivalent annually, delivered by their farmer members in the form of whole milk or farm-separated cream. That is more than 17 percent of the total whole milk equivalent sold by farmers.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

The manner in which the trade-agreement program affects dairy products is of tremendous importance because dairying is the backbone of American agriculture. Not only does it contribute more to the country's farm income, but it is more widely distributed over the entire country than any other single enterprise. Cash farm receipts from dairy products constitute 8 to 9 percent of total cash receipts from farm marketing in the South Atlantic and South Central regions, and up to 33 percent in the North Atlantic region.[1]

Dairy cows are kept on 4 out of 5 farms in the United States. There are 25,000,000 milk cows on these 4,500,000 farms. More than 2,000,000 farms are engaged in commercial dairying.[2]

Cash farm income from dairying in the United States in 1946 was about $3,900,000,000. Total milk production in 1946 was nearly 120,000,000,000 pounds[3] providing a milk supply of 850 pounds per person in the United States.

For more than 20 years total milk production in the United States has been virtually self-sufficient. Total milk production in the United States rose from 69,000,000,000 pounds in 1924 to 107,000,000,000 pounds in 1939, an increase of 20 percent, in line with the increase in domestic requirements.

During the war, production was pushed up from 107,000,000,000 pounds in 1939 to 122,000,000,000 pounds in 1945. Even though total civilian per capita consumption of dairy products was raised, we met war needs for dairy products with exports totaling 6,500,000,000 pounds of milk equivalent plus military procurement of more than 14,000,000,000 pounds.[4]

During the prewar years 1934 to 1938 average exports of dairy products from the United States in all forms were valued at $5,000,000,000 annually. Imports from foreign countries averaging $14,000,000 annually were principally types of cheese, of which small quantities could obtain a high retail price premium over similar domestic types.

THE FEDERATION'S TARIFF POLICY

The policy of our federation as to trade agreements is of long standing. Dairy farmers are dependent upon the stability of the domestic market and have needed protective tariffs against foreign competitors ever since the end of World War I. Throughout this period our organization has sponsored a policy of rational tariff-making. We have consistently supported the principle of levying import duties so as to equalize differences in the cost of production between domestic products and products of the principal competing foreign countries. Our federation worked diligently to secure adequate protection for dairy farmers in the Tariff Act of 1930.

Since the Trade Agreements Act first came up for extension and amendment our federation has consistently opposed it. It is unsound and unwise and ought not to have been extended. Knowing that extension was inevitable, we sponsored certain fundamental amendments which in our judgment should have been minimum requirements. These amendments included:

1. Senate ratification of agreements.

2. Permission to parties injured by the operation of tariff concessions to take their grievance into the courts of the United States.

3. Extension of benefits only to nations granting concessions in return.

None of the relief which we sought has been granted and we are now pessimistic as to the outcome of the current trade agreement negotiations being carried on in Geneva, Switzerland. Our fears are based on the following facts:

1. Reduced tariffs on dairy products, cattle and cattle products, fats, and oils endanger the livelihood of dairy farmers.

The dairy tariff structure has been built around the butter tariff of 14 cents per pound and duties on other dairy products equivalent to the butter rate on the basis of their butterfat content. A 7-cent tariff reduction would lower the farm price of butterfat 8¾ cents per pound. On the basis of the 4,000,000,000 pounds of butterfat sold in all forms in 1946 this would mean a loss of $340,000,000, exceeding by 24 times the entire value of dairy products imported in prewar years.

Mr. Will L. Clayton of the State Department, in his testimony before this committee, attempted to give the impression that dairy farmers would be among the principal agricultural beneficiaries of reduced tariffs. It is apparent that Mr. Clayton was drawing unwarranted inferences from the fact that large quantities of dairy products were exported during the war. It is true that dairy product exports during the war totaled 6,500,000,000 pounds of milk equivalent. These exports, however, were stimulated by a $2,000,000,000 subsidy program designed to lower consumer prices, and furthermore were virtually outright gifts through lend-lease and UNRRA to their foreign recipients. We do not see in this experience any ray of hope for the dairy farmer for extensive foreign markets for dairy products.

Contrasted with wartime, when our dairy exports were high and there was a worldwide decline in production of dairy products outside the United States, we are now facing a different situation. While world shortage of butter and cheese still prevails, world milk production is increasing and may soon reach prewar levels. In addition, the rush to rehabilitate the industries of war-torn countries may lead regimented economies to deny exportable dairy products to their own citizens in order to exchange them for industrial products of the United States.

A dangerous element is the prospect of the depressed level at which controlled prices have been held in foreign countries. During the present year the United Kingdom is buying New Zealand's entire butter exports for 35 cents per pound. This purchase was made by an adjustable contract which runs for two more years. The United Kingdom has similar contracts with Australia and Canada. The latest price report from Canada shows a price of 39.75 cents per pound (Canadian currency).

Against a world background of low prices, rising production, and trade manipulation, the outlook for United States prices, based on internal conditions is in sharp contrast. Dairy products here are in ample supply. Butter production is steadily approaching prewar levels. Butter prices in recent months have been mostly in a range of 60 to 75 cents per pound. At worst, butter may sink to the equivalent of the 90 percent of parity support price guaranteed by the Steagall amendment. In April parity was 59.9 cents per pound of butterfat at the farm, equivalent to approximately 55 cents per pound of butter. At 90 percent of parity, butter prices would be 50 cents per pound. This is 15 cents per pound over the 1946–47 prices in the British purchase contract with New Zealand. We may, therefore, find Britain tempted to unload her New Zealand butter on us as a means of repaying the three and one-half billion dollar loan which we recently made her.

2. Reduced tariffs on one dairy product lower the price of all.

It is proposed to reduce tariffs on all important dairy products except casein. A reduction in the tariff on one dairy product may have the same effect as a reduction on all, due to the intimate interrelationships between prices of dairy products. Dairy-product prices are closely interrelated because large quantities of milk may be quickly diverted from one product to another. Today flexibility of production results from the operations of multipurpose plants and from interplant shifting of producers.

The dairy tariff rates in the act of 1930 recognized these interrelationships. Trade agreements have breached this balance at some points. Reductions on cheddar and Italian cheese duties were put into effect only after war had spread itself over the globe. These duties, therefore, have not had a chance to display their harmful effect in normal times. Further reductions of these, or reductions of other duties untouched until now, will be evidence that the State Department, heedless of consequences, is determined to strip the American dairy farmer of every shred of defense against world depression.

3. Predatory practices in international dairy trade will persist in spite of trade agreements.

Predatory practices in international dairy trade were not affected by previous trade agreements. It is not to be expected that these practices will be remedied by further trade agreements.

Low world butter prices during the 1930's were in part assured by dairy price policies of practically all exporting nations. There were a variety of devices employed by these nations to bolster their domestic prices and directly or indirectly to subsidize exports. We know of such programs in Argentina, Australia, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, New Zealand, and Sweden.

Four of those eleven countries, Netherlands, Canada, Finland, and Sweden, had trade agreements in effect with us during the time they used export subsidies. This gives us adequate reason to believe that the State Department's give-away program is unilateral in practice, whatever it may be in theory. It is to assure protection against such subsidized surpluses that the present butter and dairy tariffs should be retained without change, if not increased.

An example of the futility and one-sidedness of the State Department's trade agreements is found in the experience with Canada. Trade agreements with Canada in early 1936 and 1938 reduced the United States duty on cheddar cheese. Beginning June 1, 1939, however, Canada began to subsidize cheese production. It is true that after a

---

[1] Farm Production, Disposition and Income From Milk, 1944–45, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, April 1946, and Farm Income Situation, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, June 1946.

[2] 1945 Census of Agriculture, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

[3] Farm Production, Disposition and Income From Milk, 1945–46, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, April 15, 1947.

[4] Sources of Production, Consumption and Foreign Trade Data as follows: Production, see footnote (1). Consumption, Production and Consumption of Manufactured Dairy Products, E. E. Vial, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Technology Bulletin 722, April 1940, and Dairy Situation, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, September 1946.

delay of 7 months our Government got around to applying a countervailing duty against the subsidized Canadian cheese. The point is that the powers of other Government agencies had to be called on to offset a development that the State Department's program could not forestall.

4. Major dairy export nations stand to gain from present negotiations without granting any concessions in return.

The State Department purports to consider trade agreements only with countries which are principal sources of supply of the commodities in question. This policy is not being rigidly followed with respect to dairy products in the present instance. Three major dairy export countries are not participating in the present negotiations—Denmark, Italy, and Switzerland. Forty-nine percent of the world exports of butter, twenty-eight percent of the world exports of cheese and twenty-four percent of the world exports of condensed milk come from countries which are not parties to the present negotiations. Thus these countries which will give us nothing in return, will share the benefits of any concessions which we may make on butter, cheese, and condensed milk under the terms of our Trade Agreement Act.

5. Rapidly changing world conditions make it unwise to bind our tariffs against possible increases in the future.

I have already reviewed the dangers which threaten us because of existing price levels of butter, particularly those negotiated by Britain with her empire countries. Illustrations of the precariousness of world dairy price conditions could be multiplied.

During the war New Zealand increased her output of cheese 15 percent, Canada and Australia each 60 percent, and Argentina 160 percent. The United States is therefore faced with an expanded supply of cheese which dangerously threatens a sound domestic balance of prices and production.

Production of condensed and evaporated milk in the United States increased about 40 percent during the war, and Canada, Argentina, Australia, and New Zealand similarly increased their output. The opening up of the domestic market to the newly developed foreign production would further burden what is likely soon to be an overburdened domestic market.

Production of dry milk, like condensed milk, has increased vastly in the United States and abroad. Argentina produced practically no dry milk before the war, but she now has an established industry. Australia has nearly trebled her prewar output. The United Kingdom, Canada, New Zealand, and Switzerland have made great strides.

The oils and fats situation likewise threatens the United States dairy industry. Tariff reductions on oils and fats are harmful because competition of cheap imported oils has an unfavorable effect on the price of butter. Also, domestic producers of other animal and vegetable oils tend to become dairymen and create a surplus of dairy products when their markets are injured by foreign competition.

The world shortage of fats currently sustains domestic prices but within 2 years the world shortage will be over and the foreign areas will be knocking at our doors with cottonseed, coconut, palm and other oils. Then prices of oils and fats will tumble sharply and an era of wild readjustment will set in. It is questionable whether existing tariff duties will adequately protect against this eventuality. Members of this committee will recall having to report and pass the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921.

During the war we attained self-sufficiency in oils and fats and had an exportable surplus. Any threat to American self-sufficiency in oils and fats, such as reducing duties or binding them against necessary increases, would drag down producers of raw oil-bearing materials and overburden the dairy industry.

CONFLICTS TO DAIRY FARMERS' INTERESTS IN PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL TRADE SET-UP

The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation has not yet considered approval or disapproval of the International Trade Organization. The federation's policies, however, are broad enough to call for the protection of the dairy farmers from those parts of the proposed international structure which appear to be oppressive. We therefore offer three objections: (1) the treatment of nonmember nations; (2) lack of representation of those affected by ITO policies; and (3) danger to sanitary standards.

1. Treatment of nonmember nations: Article 36 of the proposed ITO charter would prohibit the United States, if it becomes a member, from entering into any agreement with a nonmember nation under which such nonmember would be entitled to any of the benefits under the charter. It would also provide that tariff reductions effected by negotiations under the charter could not be extended to nonmember nations except with the concurrence of the Organization.

These provisions are apparently intended to force nonmembers to join the Organization. Such provisions, however, may hamper our trade relations with friendly nations that for some good reason do not desire to become members. The United States should be free to trade with nonmember nations on the best terms that can be worked out.

Under the 1934 amendment to the Tariff Act, sponsored by the State Department, the benefits of any trade agreement are extended automatically to all other nations except those proscribed by the President. It was under this policy that the act was used as the instrument for general tariff reductions. Today it is proposed to punish nations which are not members of the International Trade Organization by making it possible to deny them entirely the benefits of future tariff reductions made under the ITO charter. The United States, in effect, would be restricted by an organization superior to the Congress of the United States in negotiating trade agreements upon such terms as it might choose.

The federation has historically opposed the policy under which trade agreement benefits are automatically extended to all nations. It believed and still believes that negotiations should be conducted with each nation on an individual basis. This is regardless of whether that nation belongs to the ITO.

The State Department apparently has shifted its policy. Where it once meticulously enforced the Tariff Act by the extension of benefits far and wide, it now apparently seeks to circumvent the law. It would remove the tariff-making powers of Congress still further from our people to the orders in council of a world authority.

2. Lack of representation of those affected by ITO policies: Under the tariff acts, such as the Tariff Act of 1930, tariff rates on imports are controlled by Congress. Each dairy farmer is represented in Congress. The farmer himself or the cooperative association of which he is a member can consult with his Representatives in Congress and discuss the effect of tariff changes. Hearings also are held before congressional committees at which interested parties may appear. But under the Trade Agreements Act the dairy farmer has no representative in the office of the Secretary of State.

Although the law requires that hearings be held in connection with the negotiation of trade agreements, these hearings are pro forma and are indifferently conducted by minor officials below the negotiating levels of government.

In contrast to the democratic attitude of the Congress, the State Department is aloof and suspicious of representatives of our citizenship groups. To illustrate, during these hearings a member of this committee asked Mr. Clayton if he would consult with American representatives of industry at Geneva. Mr. Clayton replied that he would be willing to talk to them but "we could not tell them, we could not give away our case to them."[5]

It readily appears from the foregoing that under the Trade Agreements Act dairy organizations and other industries as well, have a very small voice in matters that may seriously affect them.

If we go into the International Trade Organization, the dairy groups as well as others, will be removed still another step from effective representation. Decisions which may affect materially the investments and income of dairy farmers will be made by an organization in which the United States will have but one vote.

3. Danger to sanitary standards: We are concerned also with the effect the International Trade Organization may have on sanitary standards for dairy products. There is, as you know, a marked difference in the sanitary standards for the dairy industry in this country and those in effect in many other countries. Our dairy herds are tested for tuberculosis and Bang's disease. Our dairy barns and milk-processing plants are required to meet rigid sanitary requirements. We are thus assured of a supply of milk and its products of a high quality. But these sanitary requirements add materially to the cost of producing milk and its products.

If milk and its products are to be in free trade, how much of an adjustment will be necessary in our sanitary standards?

We would like to see the standards of other countries raised to our level, but we doubt that it can be done under the International Trade Organization. We think that if the issue comes up, the majority of the members, having standards lower than ours, will not vote to raise them to our level.

Thus the International Trade Organization may make it difficult, if not impossible, for us to require milk and its products imported into this country to meet our sanitary requirements. If so substantial imports of low-cost products produced under insanitary conditions may force our own industries out of business or make it necessary to relax our own standards to meet such competition.

Article 37 of the proposed ITO charter would except measures necessary to protect human, animal, or plant life or health. However, article 35 would further provide that if any member should consider that any other member has adopted any measure, "whether it conflicts with the terms of this charter," which has the effect of impairing any object of the charter, consideration should be given to effecting an adjustment. If not adjusted, the question would be referred to the Organization. The Organization would investigate and, if necessary, consult with United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations. It would then make recommendations which, if not carried out would result in the imposing of sanctions.

Should the ITO conclude that some sanitary law of a member nation violates the spirit of the charter, it can order the law to be terminated and enforce its decision by oppressive sanctions even though the nation has not violated the letter of the charter.

---

[5] Hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means on the operation of the Trade Agreements Act, etc., pt. I, p. 266.

In such a way a super-world government could be able to override decisions of our Congress and force us to adhere to lower sanitary standards as long as we might remain a member of the organization.

In conclusion we respectfully represent that in some way, somehow, this Congress should block, if possible, the consummation at Geneva of the proposed trade agreements with 17 nations.

It should tread carefully the road of international trade entanglements, envisaged by the ITO. For I truly believe that our Nation is on the verge of giving away the sovereignty of its people.

Charles L. Gerlach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, death's messenger is unwelcome, but will not be denied.

In times of sorrow it is quite impossible to find words to express the emotions of the heart. This is particularly true when we suffer the loss of such a close associate and colleague as CHARLES GERLACH. Those of us in the Pennsylvania delegation probably knew him best; we were in a position to observe at close range his knowledge and ability, his energy and devotion, his vision and courage, all factors in his able qualifications as a legislator. We prized and cherished his friendship and his conscientious devotion to the performance of his duties and as one who was ever ready to sacrifice his own individual welfare in the interest of his constituency, his State, and his country.

I would not fail to record my personal affection for CHARLIE GERLACH. I sympathize deeply with the members of his family, as well as with his constituency. We shall miss him in these days to come.

Opposition to Merger of the Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Mr. John P. Bracken, president of the Reserve Officers of the Naval Services made to the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 30, 1947, during the hearings on S. 758 to provide for the merger of the armed forces:

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, I am speaking to you as the representative of the Reserve Officers of the Naval Services—better known perhaps as RONS—an organization with a membership of over 36,000 Reserve officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. The Reserve officers, the greater part of whom have now resumed their places in civil life in their home community, are vitally interested in the proposed reorganization of the armed forces. Most of them left positions of standing in their chosen profession or occupation to serve in the naval services for periods ranging from 2 to 6 or more years. Their number provided 350,000 officers to the naval services in World War II. They were active in every function of that tremendous wartime organization. While in the service, they saw many things done in a way which shocked their civilian concepts of the businesslike way of doing things. They experienced, in fact participated in, what were apparently gross duplications of effort by the Army and the Navy—in procurement, in research, in services. They condemned this then, and condemn it still. On the other hand, they, as officers, faced many situations where civilian experience gave no answer to the problem, where they were forced to recognize that the business-like way, the civilian way of approaching the problem, just wouldn't work.

No group in the country today has a better grasp, a more thorough understanding, a more intelligent approach to the underlying causes which impel a reorganization of our armed forces than the Reserve. Perhaps no group can more dispassionately weigh the pros and cons of reorganization than such a one. Yet to what extent has this vast reservoir of real experience been made available to this committee? How much of the testimony before this committee has come from the 10 percent who are still in the service rather than the 90 percent who have returned to civilian life, but who are still subject to recall in any emergency.

The membership of RONS has weighed the pros and cons of the bill now before this committee and by action of delegates to its national convention has overwhelmingly voiced its opposition to it.

I do not believe that the membership of this organization is opposed to comprehensive and intelligent unification legislation. They are opposed to this bill because it is not that; because on its face it will increase rather than decrease the cost of our Military Establishment; because its full implications are obscured by its intentional vagueness; because it reposes too great a power, places too much emphasis upon the authority of one man; because it seeks to replace an organization which successfully won the war with something that can best be called a pig in a poke.

As taxpayers, we are keenly interested in reduction of expenditures for the Military Establishment. However, nowhere within the four corners of the bill now before your committee is there even the slightest indication that this so-called merger will result in any saving to us in tax money. Instead of two departmental heads, with their staffs, we have a plan proposing three. In addition, we have superimposed upon the Military Establishment as then constituted a Secretary of National Defense, with four special assistants at $12,000 each, with a staff costing more thousands. Where are the savings which those who believe in a true unification desire? The bill which you are asked to enact does not in any word, phrase, or sentence direct the Executive to affect the savings which can and must be made. Will these savings be brought about by Executive order? What assurance does the Congress have that its wishes in the matter of unification will be carried out by the Executive or by this superchief of national defense? None whatsoever unless its wishes and intentions become law, and they are not law unless they are included succinctly and unmistakably in the four corners of the legislation as it passes the Congress.

We in RONS are against this merger bill because we believe that its full implications have not even yet become evident. We want to know why it must be couched in language so general that it can mean all things to all men. We want to know whether the present disagreement on its implementation, made so obvious for example by the testimony of the medical heads of the various services, does not make the surface unanimity of its support somewhat subject to question. Its vagueness obscures, possibly deliberately, many questions which we feel must be answered legislatively and not by Executive order. We want to know whether the Army will continue to maintain its fleet of transport and cargo vessels or whether there would not be greater savings by having them pass under naval administration; we want to know how this merger bill will affect the Coast Guard, which did such a magnificent job in the war as a component of the Navy; will it be merged too, will its Reserve be trained under Navy supervision or Treasury supervision. We want to know if the Marine Corps is to be relegated to the task of landing only in areas where it is hoped to establish naval bases and not on an island that is to be used exclusively as an air field. The glorious chapter written at Iwo Jima by the lads of the Marine Corps, many of whom were too young to be taken into the Army, would never have been written had this bill been law. Will the marines continue to be the specialists of the armed forces in amphibious invasion? We want to know what is going to happen to naval land-based aviation, to the blimps, the whole lighter-than-air program which proved its value in antisubmarine warfare. Is it part of this vague plan eventually to include the Veterans' Administration as a part of this proposed military establishment? What about long-range naval air reconnaissance over ocean areas? Will the Army continue to supervise, survey, and chart the navigable waters surrounding the country, the Great Lakes, and the rivers, while the Navy charts the seas; is not this, too, a duplication of services; is this, too, to be merged? And what about procurement; what about hospitals, hospital ships, and medical services? What about administration of military justice?

These, gentlemen, are but a few of the questions which are bothering us and which are unanswered by this bill. Perhaps you feel that these are details which can best be handled by Executive decree. If this act is passed, gentlemen, they will be handled by Executive decree and there will be no compunction upon the Executive to follow the wishes of the Congress unless the Congress has made these wishes law. I feel that I sense correctly the spirit of this Congress when I say that it will refuse, and the Nation will applaud its refusal, to permit the return to the days of rule by Presidential decree, by so-called Executive order.

We in RONS are bothered by the emphasis which this bill places upon the authority of one man, the Secretary of National Defense; "he shall establish policies and programs"; "he shall exercise direction, authority and control"; he shall have power of decision in the war council; the performance of duties by the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall be subject to his authority and direction: he shall direct the activities of the Munitions Board and the Research and Development Board. Is this man to be just an over-all supervisor, a mediator reconciling the differences of the three branches of the service—which is one interpretation that can be placed upon the functions that have been delegated to him—or is he to be an all-powerful, compelling and coercive force applying his limited, general experience, or the single-minded experience of his dominant adviser of the moment to problems of national defense? No one would question the reposing of such powers on a military leader in the field in wartime; there is serious doubt however whether it is necessary, or whether it is not in fact dangerous to

repose such power, in wartime or peacetime, in one man whose functions are planning and not operations. The man who holds that position must have a comprehension of and a deep appreciation of the missions of each of the components of the Armed Forces. With the tenure of Cabinet offices averaging 2 years, the military establishment will be subject to the whims and vagaries of successive Secretaries of National Defense. A Navy man might be tempted, under the guise of economy or expediency, to jeopardize the over-all security of the Nation by emphasis on the Navy as the chief arm of our defense and, in like manner, an exponent of air power or tank warfare, to a like degree. The man must have sound judgment, he must know when to act and when not to act. We in RONS most emphatically do not subscribe to the theory expressed by some military men that a wrong decision is better than no decision. Yet, this committee can certainly conceive of the possibility that one with that philosophy of command might well be chosen to head this establishment.

It is perhaps unfortunate that this whole unification movement had its inception, received its impetus, from isolated examples of noncooperation between branches of the services. Let us not lose sight of the fact that the war was the greatest cooperative venture ever undertaken by man. Not only did we cooperate with each other to win it but we cooperated with allies of considerably greater differences of opinion than that of our brother officers. The examples of cooperation are legion; of noncooperation, few. Already the Army and Navy have consolidated a tremendous amount of their procurement activities; integrated their medical activities; already there is in existence a joint Army-Navy aeronautical board; an Army-Navy munitions board; a joint board of the ranking officers of both War and Navy Departments; a joint economy board; a joint research and development board; a joint staff college; a joint industrial college; a joint war college. This is the organization which won the war. Is it to be scrapped in favor of a noble experiment?

I realize that it is very easy to point out the defects in legislation; to tear down; to criticize. I would be unmindful, however, of the high privilege which you have accorded me and the organization which I represent if my efforts were wholly destructive, if we made no effort to offer anything constructive in an endeavor to help the committee in its deliberations on this legislation.

We therefore propose, first, that where legislation is necessary to bring about the benefits of unification, that problems should be approached step by step, with the Congress enacting specific legislative bills to merge specific functions of the services, and not by enacting a general bill leaving, as does this one, all major questions to the Executive. Only should the national security demand immediate action on unification would legislation giving such a general delegation of power to the Executive, as proposed by this bill, be justified.

This committee has given much valuable time to this legislation. Undoubtedly, these hearings have clarified many points connected with merger. I repeat, however, that this committee has not as yet tapped the great reservoir of unbiased, experienced opinion which should be made available to it before it passes the bill on to the Senate with its recommendations. I speak of the Reserve officers of the Army and the Navy, the investment broker of today who was the Army quartermaster of yesterday; the certified public accountant back in Philadelphia who was the Navy supply officer in Trinidad; the banker in Baltimore who was the finance officer in Paris; the engineer from New Mexico who erected steel hangars in the swamps of British Guiana; the physician from Mercy Hospital who under great odds organized one of the largest blood banks in the jungles of New Guinea. The experiences of these men should be before the committee just as are those of the Regular officers of the Army and Navy who have appeared before you. Of equal importance to the committee are the experiences of the retired officers of military services, only one of whom has as yet been heard by this committee, and he is a former Member of the Senate. These men, Reserve and retired, have no compulsion to testify one way or another. Their opinions are based on their own experiences, not on the policies of their superiors.

I cannot help but feel that RONS is not only the voice of the Reserve but the voice of the conscience of the Navy; that it not only reflects the opinion of the Reserve officers but likewise the opinions of a large proportion of their brother officers in the Regular services. I respectfully submit that the announced official policy of the Navy Department is not a representation of the feeling of the officers within the Naval Establishment.

I urge this committee to delay immediate positive action on this bill and further I propose and urge the appointment of a commission of Reserve officers of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Air Corps to study the unification of the armed services, drawing upon the wartime experiences of their Reserve brother officers to assist them in this study and giving to this committee its recommendation based on that study. I offer the committee the fullest cooperation of RONS in conducting this survey.

Russian Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with very grave concern the speech which was made in the Western High School here in the city of Washington by Mrs. Aleksandra P. Lewis who was born and reared in Russia and who married a diplomatic clerk. According to news reports this party has been making other speeches. If it had not been for the fact that some courageous and upstanding young Americans in the school resented this strongly pro-Russian speech, we might never have heard of it. I deeply appreciate the students who walked out on this speaker and who protested what she said. To my mind, the protest of these students was most heartening. I am glad that these students appreciate the American way of life. I extend to them my congratulations.

The woman who made this speech, in my opinion, does not reflect the proper attitude for anyone to take who has come here and who is permitted to enjoy the blessings of liberty in this country. Her praise of Russia clearly shows her political philosophy. Feeling as she does about this country as compared to Russia, she ought to go back to Russia on the first boat and stay there.

The occurrence yesterday should serve as a reminder that our American schools and American institutions should be more on guard than ever against speakers of this class spreading their foreign ideologies. I hope this person who made this speech yesterday will never again have an opportunity before an American student body to repeat this performance.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a radio address delivered by me over radio station WMEX, Boston, Mass., May 4, 1947:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, the men, women, and children of Poland were the first victims of Nazi aggression. And because they dared to resist, even against impossible odds, they felt the full fury of hate and terror.

That they survived at all is a tribute to their unconquerable spirit.

Yet, human beings can only stand so much. The agonies which the Polish people experienced have left deep and painful wounds on mind and body which only an abundant mercy on our part can heal to health again.

For life itself, they need food and clothing and medical supplies. With the liquidation of UNRRA, private agencies must assume this responsibility.

The Polish people do not cry. Their suffering has been too prolonged and tragic, leaving no energy for idle tears. Written on their gaunt faces, however, is the mute record of what they endured in defense of our common humanity.

A few days ago, I saw a picture in a newspaper which graphically told the story. It was taken in Warsaw, with lingering traces of snow in the foreground. A wandering photographer had found a customer for his wares and he proceeded to set the stage. From his kit, he took a long roll of canvas. This he hung up between the skeletons of two small trees. On this canvas was painted an attractive rural scene, to serve as a background for the picture he was about to take. It showed a neat cottage * * * crops in the field * * * and a pleasant summer sky. In front of this canvas stood the Polish woman who was posing for her picture. Her clothes were poor, but she carried a bunch of artificial flowers in her hand, and there was a glimmer of a smile on her face. The illusion was almost perfect.

But, on either side and above this canvas, one could see stark and dismal reality. The shattered buildings of Warsaw framed the scene.

It was a touching bit of "make-believe"—the wandering photographer, the woman, and the canvas, trying to recapture a picture of happier days, against the background of ruin and desolation.

There was one figure missing, without which even this pathetic attempt at "make-believe" could not succeed. The Polish woman had no child, at least not with her. Perhaps she did have children, and perhaps some of them are still alive, torn from their mother's arms and lost in the frightful upheaval of total war.

This picture of a photographer trying to make a happy picture, brought forcibly to my mind an ugly fact. The recent conflict produced new and hideous forms of torture, not the least of which is the one described by that feeble term "displaced persons."

Heretofore, we have considered the innocent children who have been orphaned by man's inhumanity to man, as the worst evil of war. But to this has been added a refinement in cruelty. This is the sadistic practice of taking children from their homes and parents to toil at slave labor. Final defeat of the evil-doers did not correct this wrong. For many of the liberated children are adrift, never to know and recognize their parents in the years to come, even though they may pass one another on a crowded street. Parents and children are alive, but separated forever. These displaced children are the psychological orphans of war, and no more anguishing sight can be seen in Poland today than the roving children who will never see their living parents again.

The civilized people of this world recognize their obligations in this matter. The Nazi evil has been destroyed. Its victims must be fed and clothed to protect the spark of life still in them. We must bind up their wounds, beginning with the women and children who have suffered, and are suffering from the backwash of the most vicious attack ever loosed upon the peoples of this world.

Buildings and machinery and raw materials are essential to the material recovery of a nation, but these are secondary to the immediate and pressing need of keeping body and soul together.

The physical vitality of a people is its primary asset. It must be safeguarded, whatever the cost may be. Without health, there can be no recovery in agriculture, industry, education, or any other expression of a nation's culture.

American relief for Poland faces this first fact.

It is not known how many children perished from the cold; how many were deported, never to be heard from again; how many died from hunger, exhaustion and disease, but their number is estimated at 1,000,000,000.

Those who live, are old before their time, never having known the joys of a secure and carefree childhood. These Polish children came out of the war physically undeveloped, mentally neglected, their nervous systems wrecked, their sense of moral values distorted by their terrible experiences.

No man or woman worthy of the name can think of this awful legacy of war without feeling it in his conscience. Maybe we, in the ignorance of our isolation, were responsible in some measure for the tragedy of this war. It is too late to make amends for that. But we are responsible, now, to give a helping hand to the stricken children of Poland, the first nation to fight in defense of our common freedom.

The orphanages of Poland need our help, and so do her hospitals.

The Nazis systematically looted and wrecked even those hospitals which engaged in no war activity, but ministered only to the needs of the sick and the aged among the civilian population.

Not only were there shortages of food and medical supplies and interrupted service caused by the frequent arrest of hospital staffs, but the meager supplies of linen, food, and drugs were burned by the invaders or thrown into the streets. Precious X-ray apparatus and medical instruments were taken away to the third Reich. Hospital buildings were repeatedly set on fire. Libraries, clinical and histological laboratories were wantonly destroyed. Many of the helpless patients were shot in their beds.

The few hospitals which escaped pillage were kept in isolation and were not permitted to learn of the medical progress which was made throughout the world during those long 6 years of the Nazi terror.

During that time, the undernourished people of Poland were denied adequate medical attention as well as food. Disease became rampant.

American Relief for Poland is urgently appealing to us for help in the present crisis. Mobile hospitals must be sent as crusaders of health, to fight widespread disease on every front. Many, many people in Poland are barely existing and the decision as to whether they shall live or die rests squarely with us.

Emergency relief is desperately needed in all the areas which were ravaged by the war.

It was Poland which gave to the world Madame Curie, leader in the fight to save humanity from the scourge of cancer.

In justice and in mercy, we can do no less than to try and repay the great service which she, and Poland, have given to the world.

The dollars that we give will never pay that debt. But they will be appreciated by the children of Poland, whose lives depend upon our conscience and our help.

Americans are a grateful and generous people. We who have been spared the martyrdom of the Poles will not stand by and see her little children endure further suffering.

I am confident that we will open up the latchstrings of both purse and heart to that most worthy cause—American Relief for Poland.

For as the people of Poland recover from the effects of war, the day will come when the liberal constitution, adopted by the Polish Parliament on May 3, 1791, will come into being again and Poland will be a free, happy, and prosperous member of the community of nations.

Christian Science Monitor Says Program for Supporting Farm Prices Must Be Continued Beyond 1948; Commends Secretary Anderson's Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 1, 1947:

One thing seems certain: When the present Federal program for supporting the price of farm products expires at the end of 1948, some other agricultural stabilization legislation will take its place. To talk about other possibilities appears as academic as to expect completely tariffless foreign trade or wage rates rising and falling in a free labor market. Furthermore, because the farmer cannot adjust his production quickly to fluctuations in demand, and because he is so utterly essential, the American people are unlikely to toss him overboard to sink or swim.

The question is, therefore, not whether there will be a new program, but what kind.

The old approach seems to have worn itself out in the public's opinion. There is widespread dissatisfaction among farmers themselves, not over the fact of Government support, but the manner.

During the early years of the depression, incentives to cut production made some sense. Demand had fallen sharply. The price bottom dropped out. Farmers tried to sell more—hence, produced more—to keep afloat. That glutted the market, prices fell even lower, and the farmers' plight was sad.

The farmers feel they have had just as much justification in asking and getting some help in maintaining a parity between the price of their products and the cost of the goods they must buy as labor has had in demanding wages which take account of the cost of living.

With the Nation and the world at war, it was doubtless necessary to underwrite maximum food production and to protect the farmer for a couple of harvests against a calamitous drop in demand.

All of these needs and efforts to meet them are understandable in their several contexts. Yet, in practice the remedies have been often proved egregiously clumsy. There has been something about payment for crops not grown, killing pigs that are not eaten, subsidizing more cotton than can be sold, and buying potatoes to be dumped out in the weather that deeply offends the sensibilities of even so prodigal a people as Americans.

That is why Secretary of Agriculture Anderson's outline for a new approach is likely to get a sympathetic hearing. He would stabilize consumer demand for farm products, instead of regulating supply and supporting prices. In times of depression at home he would bolster the buying power of inadequate incomes by extensive use of the food-stamp system. He would undertake agreements providing for sale of surpluses abroad at cut prices to needy countries.

Obviously, many difficulties of administration stand between the idea and a practicable execution. But in just venturing to walk around the farm problem and to look at it with some imagination from the other side, Mr. Anderson has made a contribution of some proportions.

Revolt Against Communism at Western High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, those students at Western High School who revolted against the communistic lecture on yesterday deserve the undying gratitude of patriotic Americans everywhere.

They simply raised the little iron curtain and gave the American people a glimpse of the treacherous and insidious method by which the Communists in this country are attempting to poison the minds of our children.

If we are going to try to check the spread of communism in Europe, we had better clean house at home, and drive them from the Federal pay roll, the State pay roll, the moving-picture industry, and above all else from our schools and colleges.

Charles L. Gerlach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. SARBACHER, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join with all of the many friends

of CHARLES GERLACH in this moment of sadness.

A few months ago I had the opportunity and privilege of meeting Charles for the first time. I, like the other new Members, was deeply impressed with his warm personality and fine character.

Our country has lost a good citizen, our State of Pennsylvania an outstanding Representative, we new Members of Congress—who look for guidance to men of his caliber—an immeasurable loss.

Bonneville Power Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include a letter and a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Spokane regarding the budget items for the Bonneville Power Administration.

While the House has already acted on the Interior appropriations bill, I do feel that this fundamental statement from a great metropolitan area in my district has a place in the RECORD and in the fullest consideration of Interior appropriations as they will be presented to the Senate and reviewed in conferences between the two bodies later.

The letter and resolution follow:

CITY OF SPOKANE,
Spokane, Wash., May 1, 1947.

Hon. WALT HORAN,
Representative, State of Washington,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith is resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Spokane at its administrative session held this date, requesting that the Senators and Representatives of the State of Washington support the Bonneville Power Administration's budget in the sum of $21,578,000 for the fiscal year of 1948, so that this community and the Pacific Northwest will have a continued source of low-cost power necessary for their continued growth and development.

Yours truly,

A. A. BROWN,
City Clerk.

Whereas it is recognized that provision for future supplies of electric power adequate to maintain continued industrial, agricultural, and utility development in the Pacific Northwest depends upon the construction of multiple-purpose projects on the Columbia River and its tributaries, and the Federal Government has assumed responsibility for the construction of these projects; and

Whereas the existing generating capacity in the Pacific Northwest is now fully utilized and studies have revealed that new Federal generating capacity in the amount of 318,000 kilowatts over and above the 745,000 kilowatts of generating units now on order will be required between the present time and November 1, 1949, to meet the present critical power-supply problems, and 1,565,000 kilowatts will be required by November 1, 1953; and

Whereas these Federal generating plants are located a considerable distance from the region's load centers, and any limitation upon the Bonneville Power Administration to build substations would, in effect, cause an increase in the basic Columbia River power rate, and since such an increase would be unjustified in view of the fact that existing rates will provide a surplus in addition to repaying within 50 years to the United States Treasury the full power investment plus interest, a large irrigation subsidy plus interest, and all operation and maintenance costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Spokane, That the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senators from the State of Washington be requested to support the Bonneville Power Administration's budget in the sum of $21,578,000 for the fiscal year of 1948, in order to insure that this community and the Pacific Northwest will have a continued source of low-cost power, so necessary for their continued growth and development.

Adopted this 1st day of May 1947.

A. A. BROWN,
City Clerk.

Federal Spending and Taxes Too High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark., of April 29, 1947:

FEDERAL SPENDING AND TAXES TOO HIGH

Why should a reduction of Federal income taxes this year be a credit to the Republicans, and one next year be a gain for the Democrats?

That curious reasoning is intimated in a lot of the political chatter from Washington. We are told that high officials in the administration, who oppose a tax cut now, will plump out for it in 1948, in the expectancy of reaping pleased and delighted votes for their belated approval.

But why in all mystery would it work out that way? Wouldn't a 1948 reduction be put through by the same Republican Congress that wants to reduce the taxes now? And why wouldn't they make political medicine for themselves by reminding the electorate that they tried to reduce taxes in 1947, but were thwarted by the Democrats, who wanted to postpone it a year for their own political benefit?

The Republicans would do just that, brother and sister, and in a big way. They'd hire every available larynx to proclaim up and down the land that while they wanted to relieve John Citizen forthwith, as they'd promised to do, the administration kept his nose to the tax grindstone for a year, just to serve its own selfish purpose.

This paper believes that the administration is playing with dynamite in resisting a cut of income taxes now, and in standing for continued heavy Federal spending. Millions of Americans who haven't profited much by wage and salary boosts are having a hard time to make ends meet. They're sour on the necessity of pinching money out of their living needs to finance the extravagant ideas of Federal bureaucrats.

President Truman has gained in popularity. The Republicans no longer regard him as a push-over whom they can defeat with anybody they might nominate. He has them worried. But he is giving them effective campaign thunder in standing for inflated public spending and opposing tax reduction.

Economy in Washington and a tax cut are not a Republican idea. They grabbed it, true enough. But it was urged by Democrats in Congress of high rank, notably Virginia's Senator BYRD, long before the GOP made it a campaign issue in 1946. It is supported by three or four former Democratic Treasury officials, among a host of prominent citizens, Democrats and Republicans, in private life.

The President's budget request for the next fiscal year, $37,500,000,000, would mean an average of about $268 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation. It's too much—far too much. The people know it is too much. And the administration is making a mistake in defending such a gouge, and letting the Republicans slide into the role of defending the citizen from a horde of wasters in Washington.

Truman Should Practice What He Preaches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Register-Star-News, of Sandusky, Ohio, written by a former Member of this House, Hon. Dudley A. White. I commend this to the attention of the membership. It follows:

TRUMAN SHOULD PRACTICE WHAT HE PREACHES
(By Dudley A. White)

The costs of living must come down. Inflation must be stopped to stave off a depression.

President Truman is right about that, but he abandons sound economics for the sake of an obvious political play when he fails to point out that costs must also be lowered if reduced prices are going to amount to anything more than a flash in the pan.

The penalties, sacrifices, and responsibility of the fight against inflation are a burden of war that falls on the doorstep of every American citizen. No one segment of our population can assume this burden for another.

It is no more than plain political hogwash to suggest that rising costs can be ignored or that special groups need not share the obligation of halting disastrous price rises.

Certainly excessive profits can block the path of return to reasonable prices. But such cases are few and far between as compared with the effect of the endless spiral of rising labor costs that have no basis in increased production.

The trouble is that everybody is demanding more and more for less and less. The American people have a right to expect that somewhere in the wilderness of 1947 unrest and confusion there might be a voice crying out the need for achieving greater production in return for increased earnings. Yet this is a forgotten principle in administration policies.

A nation's wealth does not grow on trees. And when we say "wealth" that means jobs, pay, profits, new enterprise, the necessities, the comforts and the standard of living enjoyed by the nation as a whole. No, sir, that kind of wealth does not grow on trees or blossom from political legerdemain. It must be produced. There is no way in the world for any nation to create wealth, except

through productivity. There isn't anything wrong with the United States today that could not be cured in a hurry by increased production.

If President Truman expects to stem the rising tides of recession he had better stop playing to the gallery of special political privilege and show the courage necessary to demonstrate that costs must be held in line in order to hold prices in line or lower them—and to drive home the important realization that increased production is the soundest means of all to bring about increased wages without the harmful or paralyzing effect of increased costs.

At the same time the President should do one other thing in this particular field of action. As everybody knows, the cost of government has become one of the most important elements in today's cost of living or doing business. How can Mr. Truman fairly ask laborers, white-collar workers, the retailer, the wholesaler, the farmer, and manufacturer to join in reducing prices for the good of the country unless he sets the example and starts the ball rolling by adopting corresponding policy to lower the costs and prices of the business he heads—the biggest, most costly, and far-reaching enterprise of all—the United States Government. This is Mr. Truman's opportunity to practice what he preaches.

American Economic and Technical Aid to Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include a summary of the report of the Division of Historical Policy Research of the Department of State, dated March 1947, entitled "American Economic and Technical Aid to Foreign Countries Since Mid-1945." Copies of the full report may be obtained by Members of Congress on request to the Department of State.

The summary follows:

AMERICAN ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL AID TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES SINCE MID-1945

INTRODUCTION

This report is a summary of a 70-page study which was undertaken at the request of Assistant Secretary of State Willard Thorp in response to the suggestion of the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, Member of the House of Representatives from New York. The full study was prepared in the Division of Historical Policy Research, with assistance from officers of other divisions of the Department of State and various other Government agencies. Copies of the full study may be obtained from the Department of State.

As suggested by Congressman JAVITS, information was assembled for each country, regarding general aid (including loans and technical assistance), fixed war installations transferred, "hard goods" distributed through UNRRA, and special bilateral financial arrangements. The scope of the study, as thus defined, necessarily excluded a number of factors, such as American contributions to international organizations other than UNRRA, the regular or "routine" operations of the United States Government which may be of aid to some foreign countries, sales of combat matériel (as distinguished from fixed installations), and administrative expenses resulting from the extension of American aid abroad.

The study, therefore, was designed to furnish a general survey of certain significant items of American assistance to foreign countries rather than a definitive tabulation of such aid. In order to achieve the desired broad picture of American aid since the end of World War II, the starting date of the study has been indicated as, in general, mid-1945. This date, however, has not been adhered to so rigidly as to preclude the utilization of significant data covering periods which began somewhat earlier or later.

In view of the omission of certain countries from the following pages it is important to note that the sources used in the preparation of this study do not indicate that any direct American aid of significant proportions has been accorded during the period under consideration to the following countries: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Eire, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Monaco, Morocco, Muscat, Palestine and Trans-Jordan, Union of South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Siam, and Yemen.

The full study was prepared under the direction of William M. Franklin by the following members of the Foreign Policy Studies Branch of this Division: William Gerber, E. Taylor Parks, Seward W. Livermore, Isaac Stone, and Velma H. Cassidy. The following summary is the work of one member of the group.

G. BERNARD NOBLE,
Chief, Division of Historical Policy Research.

GENERAL RÉSUMÉ

American economic and technical aid to foreign countries since mid-1945 adds up to an impressive record of concrete achievement. As a result of American loans, technical services, transfers, settlements, allocations, and surplus-property sales, many countries on every continent have a greater share of roads, hospitals, airfields, libraries, machinery, sanitation, cargo ships, and other tools of a civilized economy.

Lend-lease aid since VJ-day, having the character of "pipe line" shipments, i. e., continued shipment of materials for which contracts had been previously signed, amounted to almost $2,000,000,000, of which China received $673,000,000, France $344,000,000, the British Commonwealth $428,000,000, and the Soviet Union $198,000,000.

Loans and credits granted during the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1946, including Export-Import Bank loans, credits for the purchase of surplus property, etc., amounted to $2,163,000,000, of which $119,000,000 were allotted to the American republics, $100,000,000 to Belgium, $67,000,000 to China, $1,200,000,000 to France, and $310,000,000 to the Netherlands.

The value of fixed war installations transferred to foreign countries and the amounts of "hard goods" made available through UNRRA have contributed materially to the welfare of the recipient countries. It is not feasible to present over-all figures for these types of aid, as the fixed installations were in some cases sold at prices nearly reflecting actual value and in other cases transferred either for a small consideration or for no monetary return, and the bases of estimating the value of "hard goods" vary in different situations.

AMERICAN REPUBLICS

From July 1945 to December 1946, Export-Import Bank credits totaling over $125,000,000 were made available to governments and enterprises in Latin America. Surplus property costing $14,267,811 was sold to those republics for $3,796,120. The United States furnished lend-lease aid totaling $5,000,000 to the American Republics between VJ-day and June 30, 1946.

Some $16,000,000 have been expended in cooperative health and sanitation projects benefiting many millions of our southern neighbors. Cultural and technical cooperation with the other American Republics, including aid to United States cultural centers, exchange of agricultural and scientific skills, etc., will amount to over $2,500,000 in the fiscal year 1947.

Expenditures for the Inter-American Highway were approved by the act of December 26, 1941, which authorized the appropriation of $20,000,000 for the construction of a road from the Mexican-Guatemalan border to the Canal Zone, provided that one-third of the cost in each country would be met by the respective countries. The total work contemplated on the Inter-American Highway is said to be slightly more than one-half finished and to require about 4 years and $65,000,000 for completion.

For cultural and technical cooperation in Argentina the United States expended some $42,000 in the fiscal year 1946 and will have spent approximately $62,000 in fiscal 1947. The Export-Import Bank extended a credit of $193,000 to an Argentine firm for the purchase of harbor barges in the United States.

Half a million persons out of a total Bolivian population of 3,500,000 are estimated to have benefited directly from the United States-Bolivian cooperative health program. In addition, the United States expended some $74,000 in fiscal 1946 and will have spent $171,000 in fiscal 1947 on cultural and technical projects in Bolivia.

The Export-Import Bank granted credits totaling some $46,000,000 to Brazilian governmental and private agencies from July 1945 through December 1946. Brazil also benefited from cultural and health projects, the transfer of numerous fixed war installations (including air fields and hospitals), and the sale of surplus property at reduced prices.

Expenditures of $125,000 in Chile by the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation in fiscal 1947 (compared with $70,000 for fiscal 1946) will provide aid to United States cultural centers and to several new projects. From July 1945 through December 1946, the Export-Import Bank granted credits of $42,000,000 to Chilean agencies.

The United States had contributed $1,805,000 and Colombia $3,436,170 as of September 30, 1946, to a cooperative health and sanitation program. Sixty-four health and sanitation centers and projects were in operation on September 30, 1946. The program of technical cooperation includes the development of rubber production and grants to various specialists.

Between June 1945 and January 1947, a total of $1,286,900 was expended for equipment, materials, and construction on parts of the Inter-American Highway in Costa Rica. By September 1946, 19 health centers and projects were in operation and 26 were approaching activation under the cooperative health and sanitation program.

On May 20, 1946, the United States transferred to Cuba an air base at San Antonio de los Banos, one at San Julian, and 13 buildings. On technical and cultural projects in Cuba, the United States expended $79,607 in fiscal 1946 and will have spent about $110,243 in fiscal 1947.

Under the agreements for a cooperative health program, the United States had contributed $400,000 and the Dominican Republic $175,000 as of September 30, 1946. Between July 1, 1944, and February 21, 1947, 22 Dominicans completed or continued specialized training in the United States under grants from the Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

One-third of Ecuador's population benefited directly from the cooperative health and sanitation program, according to reliable estimates. The Export-Import Bank

made $1,000,000 available to Ecuador to pay for American engineering services. An airbase at Salinas and a military base in the Galapagos were turned over to Ecuador in 1946.

Between June 1945 and January 1947, the sum of $167,500 was expended by the United States for construction of parts of the Inter-American Highway in El Salvador. The cooperative health program covered 29 health centers and projects completed and 44 in process of organization as of September 30, 1946.

The United States expended $232,700 for construction of parts of the Inter-American Highway in Guatemala between June 1945 and January 1947. Guatemala's contribution to the health and sanitation program exceeded, as of September 30, 1946, that of the United States: $3,905,444 from Guatemala and $1,050,000 from the United States.

Development of rubber production and support of cultural centers are major projects in Haiti of the Interdepartmental Committee. The United States contributed $808,000 and Haiti $192,850 toward the cooperative health and sanitation program, which covers 33 health projects in operation on September 30, 1946, and 35 nearing completion.

Puerto Castilla, a naval base, was returned to Honduras in 1946, and surplus property left there was sold to Honduras for $56,000. For the health program, the United States contributed $800,000 and Honduras $605,400 through September 1946. For the Inter-American Highway, the United States expended $354,500 since mid-1945.

The Export-Import Bank granted credits totaling $37,000,000 to the Government of Mexico and Mexican enterprises from July 1945 through 1946. To the health program, the United States contributed $4,000,000 and Mexico $2,550,000 through September 1946. Cultural and technical cooperation will come to over $300,000 in fiscal 1947.

The naval base at Corinto and the Army air base at Puerto Cabezas were transferred to Nicaragua in 1946. Other aid of the United States includes $405,800 for the Inter-American Highway, $845,700 for a road across Nicaragua, $800,000 for the health program, and (for fiscal 1947) $101,000 for cultural cooperation.

According to information available in the Department of State, 98 defense sites out of 134 have been returned to the Republic of Panama. Between June 1945 and January 1947, the sum of $13,000 was expended in Panama by the United States for construction of parts of the Inter-American Highway.

As of September 30, 1946, the United States had contributed $1,500,000 and Paraguay $500,000 to the cooperative health and sanitation program. Improvements in crops, dairies, etc., have been sponsored by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs with contributions of $600,000 from the United States and $275,000 from Paraguay.

It is estimated that at least 1,000,000 of Peru's 2,000,000 inhabitants benefited directly from the 44 health centers and projects in operation on September 30, 1946, under the cooperative health and sanitation program. The United States airbase at Talara was transferred to Peru.

A credit of $666,666 was extended to Uruguay for the purchase of surplus United States property. The cooperative health and sanitation program benefited one-third of Uruguay's population, according to reliable estimates; the program cost the United States $575,000 and Uruguay $252,298.

Expenditures in Venezuela by the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation will have doubled in fiscal 1947 as compared with last year, $96,663 as against $48,353. The chief projects are aid to United States cultural centers and training grants in civil aviation. A cooperative health program is also in operation.

EUROPE AND BRITISH COMMONWEALTH

Export-Import Bank credits totaling almost $2,000,000,000 were made available to European countries from July 1945 to December 1946. Certain details respecting these loans, and a statement regarding the British loan agreement of December 1945, will be found in the appropriate country paragraphs below.

Some continental European countries received substantial amounts of "hard goods" through UNRRA, while the British Commonwealth was a source rather than a beneficiary of this type of aid. Many valuable fixed installations, however, were transferred to British Commonwealth countries as well as to continental countries, in some cases for a financial consideration far lower than the original cost.

Credits for the purchase of surplus American property amounting to approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars were made available during the fiscal year 1946 to countries in this category. Planned programs of technical and cultural cooperation, including the exchange of persons and of cultural resources, will total an estimated $736,321 in fiscal 1947.

The United States share of supplies furnished to Albania by UNRRA in fiscal 1946 was $13,052,284, of which about $500,000 was for (a) industrial and agricultural equipment, and (b) facilities for communication and transportation. Of the $27,450,000 allotted to Albania by UNRRA in July 1946, almost $14,000,000 was for agricultural and industrial rehabilitation.

As of June 30, 1946, the United States had transferred to Australia 178 fixed war installations, including 30 airports and 11 seaports. Lend-lease shipments since VJ-day are estimated at $17,500,000 in value. Of the funds received under the lend-lease settlement, the United States will spend $5,000,000 in Australia for educational purposes.

The Export-Import Bank made $100,000,000 available to Belgium. Lend-lease aid from VJ-day through September 1946 totaled $68,000,000. Two airports and 39 other installations were transferred to Belgium through September 24, 1946. Surplus property costing approximately $380,000,000 was transferred for a return estimated at $54,000,000.

The Alaska Highway was turned over to Canada on April 1, 1946.

Of the credit of $50,000,000 extended to Czechoslovakia for war-surplus property on May 29, 1946, $9,304,694 had been committed up to September 13, when the remainder was suspended. A $20,000,000 credit was extended by the Export-Import Bank. The UNRRA program for Czechoslovakia as of January 31, 1947, totaled $104,622,000 for industrial and agricultural rehabilitation.

Credits extended to Denmark include $20,000,000 by the Export-Import Bank and $50,000,000 for surplus war property. An unused portion of the latter credit was suspended. The United States has contributed to the maintenance of commercial air fields in Denmark which are available to American air lines.

Finland received credits of $40,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank and $15,000,000 for the purchase of surplus property. Civilian relief supplies shipped from fiscal 1942 through fiscal 1946 cost $2,566,180, of which the American Red Cross furnished three-fifths and UNRRA the remainder; some $50,625 of the total went for agricultural supplies and equipment.

The United States has extended credits of over $1,750,000,000 to France for reconstruction purposes, purchase of Liberty ships, and other uses. Some 468 fixed war installations were transferred to France for $196,000,000, and other such installations have been transferred as they became surplus.

The loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain is giving that country a breathing spell. The sum of $20,000,000 has been set aside from surplus-property proceeds for educational exchange with Great Britain, under the Fulbright Act. As of June 30, 1946, approximately 800 fixed installations had been transferred to Great Britain, in some cases for a small fraction of the original cost.

The United States has advanced to UNRRA about $350,000,000, or about 72 percent of the total UNRRA program for Greece; approximately $91,000,000 of this sum is for agricultural machinery and industrial equipment. Other American aid includes a $25,000,000 Export-Import Bank credit; lend-lease aid of $75,475,720 as of June 30, 1946; $90,000,000 in credits for purchase of 100 ships and of surplus property; and the services of an economic mission.

As of June 30, 1946, 27 fixed war installations costing $65,000,000 had been transferred to Iceland. Of these, three were air fields.

Prior to the beginning of UNRRA aid, the United States appropriated $140,000,000 for civilian aid in Italy, which permitted the shipment of 1,800,000 tons of coal and 750,000 tons of foodstuffs, plus substantial quantities of industrial materials. Other aid included UNRRA shipments (begun with an appropriation of $500,000,000, the United States being the major supplier); Export-Import Bank credits of $125,000,000; transfer of 117 installations; sale of Liberty ships; and crediting of Italy with the dollar equivalent of the Am-lire used to pay American troops.

The Export-Import Bank extended $260,000,000 in credits to the Netherlands. Lend-lease shipments to that country from VJ-day through June 1946 totaled $50,000,000. A $20,000,000 credit was extended for purchase of surplus property, and the United States disposed of 84 installations in the Netherlands and possessions.

On July 10, 1946, a credit of $5,500,000 was extended to New Zealand for the purchase of surplus war property. Of the amount to be paid by New Zealand for this property, a part will be used for educational exchanges. As of June 30, 1946, the United States had disposed of 22 installations.

The United States has furnished over $6,500,000 in lend-lease supplies to Norway since VJ-day. A $50,000,000 Export-Import Bank credit was extended in March 1947. The Coast and Geodetic Survey has aided Norway in special tide predictions for nine ports.

Credits of $40,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank and $50,000,000 for the purchase of surplus war property were made available to Poland. Equipment and materials for agricultural and industrial rehabilitation were shipped by UNRRA to the value of almost $140,000,000 through January 1947.

Portuguese personnel have been trained in weather-observation techniques and in the operation of communication equipment by the War Department and the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Fixed installations in the Azores were transferred to Portugal.

The United States has transferred to Spain, for half the original cost, certain air strips, housing, and weather-reporting facilities constructed in the Spanish West African colony of Rio de Oro and used for maintaining air communication with the European theater of operations.

The lend-lease pipe-line agreement of October 15, 1945, with the Soviet Union called for the delivery of some $250,000,000 in goods, for which the Soviet Union will pay in 22 annual installments beginning in 1954. The program of UNRRA shipments included some $69,000,000 for rehabilitation supplies for the Ukraine and $23,205,000 for similar goods for Byelorussia.

Supplies for industrial rehabilitation amounting to $109,249,000 and for agricultural rehabilitation amounting to $37,188,000 were included in the United States share of the UNRRA program for Yugoslavia. Of these amounts, 79 and 78 percent, respectively, had been delivered as of January 31, 1947.

NEAR EAST AND AFRICA

Export-Import Bank credits of over $30,000,000, cultural-cooperation programs costing approximately $500,000, bulk sales of sur-

plus property on terms highly advantageous to the countries concerned, and other types of aid were rendered by the United States in the recent period to the countries of Africa and the Near and Middle East.

More than $18,000,000 in credits was made available to countries in these regions during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for the purchase of surplus United States war property.

Approximately $10,000,000 worth of lend-lease goods were moved into Burma by the United Kingdom armed forces. The United States cultural program for Burma includes maintenance of information services at Rangoon.

The bulk-sale agreement of June 15, 1946, with Egypt provided that a considerable part of the proceeds received by the United States would be used for acquisition of official real estate in Egypt and for cultural exchange. An airport near Cairo was transferred to Egypt under the agreement.

An Export-Import Bank credit of $3,000,000 and a credit of $1,000,000 for the purchase of surplus property were made available to Ethiopia. Vehicles ($350,000), agricultural machinery ($400,000), and hospital supplies ($400,000) are included in the UNRRA program for Ethiopia.

Under the mutual-aid settlement of May 6, 1946, with India, that country is to retain the first $50,000,000 of the proceeds of the sale of surplus American war property in India plus one-half of the remainder. The United States had transferred to India 174 fixed installations, including 62 airports, by March 31, 1946.

Lend-lease aid furnished to Iran in fiscal 1946 amounted to $4,803,538. By April 1946 surplus property costing $72,293,000 had been sold to Iran for $24,867,000. Sixty-one fixed-war installations in Iran were disposed of by March 31, 1946.

Approximately $41,000 have been spent by the United States since mid-1945 for educational aid to Iraq.

The United States has granted $80,000 to the American University at Beirut, Lebanon, and the International College at that city, and has made grants totaling over $10,000 for other educational projects in Lebanon.

Approximately $19,200,000 in lend-lease funds have been allotted for construction of a port at Monrovia, Liberia. The cost is to be repaid from port revenue. An American economic mission and a Public Health Service mission have been operating in Liberia in the recent period.

Educational aid to Syria included $10,000 for Damascus College and several thousand dollars for travel grants and presentation of books.

Credits to Saudi Arabia were granted in the amounts of $10,000,000 by the Export-Import Bank and $2,000,000 for the purchase of surplus war property. The United States also transferred the air base at Dhahran to Saudi Arabia on March 15, 1946.

Assistance to Turkey since VE-day has included credits of $40,000,000 for general economic improvement, purchase of surplus property, and purchase of ships from the Maritime Commission; cultural grants of $60,000 to Robert College, $15,000 to Women's College at Istanbul, and others; and sale to Turkey for $862,000 of airfields and other installations costing $1,474,000.

FAR EAST

Outstanding examples of recent American aid are the extensive assistance rendered to China in the form of credits, lend-lease materials, and hard goods distributed through UNRRA, and the special cooperation with the Philippine Republic under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

Of the Export-Import Bank credits made available to China, three-fourths had been utilized before the end of 1946. Certain surplus United States war property was sold to China for roughly one-third of its cost. The sum of $620,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated in various categories, by the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

Lend-lease aid supplied to China from September 2, 1945, to the end of 1946 amounted to approximately $700,000,000. Surplus materials costing about $62,000,000 have been sold to China for $20,000,000. The United States transferred to China fixed installations valued at $84,000,000. UNRRA shipments to that country of machinery for industrial and agricultural rehabilitation totaled some $97,900,000 through January 1947.

Titles I to III of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, authorized the appropriation or expenditure of $400,000,000 for private war-damage claims; $100,000,000 for rehabilitation; and $120,000,000 for public roads, port facilities, etc. Actual appropriations have been passed for $10,000,000 under title I and $43,918,000 under title III.

OCCUPIED COUNTRIES

Loans for the purchase of surplus property amounting to $45,000,000 have been made available to Austria, Hungary, and Korea. Substantial amounts of "hard goods" have been distributed through UNRRA to Austria and Hungary. Germany, Japan, and Rumania have also received American economic aid, but no significant American aid in the categories under consideration appears to have been extended to Bulgaria.

During 1945–47 the War Department spent $51,500,000 for civilian supply in Austria. Credits were granted of $1,000,000 by the Export-Import Bank and $10,000,000 for purchase of surplus property (but only $2,000,000 worth of the articles were found to be suitable for purchase). UNRRA shipments of agricultural supplies and equipment amounted to $2,022,801 in fiscal 1946 and (projected) $20,000,000 for fiscal 1947.

From August 1945 through December 1946, the United States imported into Germany some $352,000,000 worth of food, fuels, medical supplies, and raw cotton. It was announced on February 11, 1947, that the largest sale of American surplus property in Europe was under way in the United States Zone of Germany.

Credits of $30,000,000 were extended to Hungary for the purchase of American surplus war property. The United States has returned to Hungary a sizable quantity of gold which had been removed from Hungary by the Germans. As of January 31, 1947, industrial-rehabilitation material amounting to $250,000 had been shipped to Hungary.

An appropriation of $186,000,000 for Japan for the fiscal year 1947 has been spent primarily for foodstuffs, agricultural supplies, medical supplies, civilian pay, and commercial ocean-transportation costs.

The 1947 War Department appropriation for South Korea was a little over $70,000,000. A credit of $25,000,000 was granted to the military government for the purchase of Army surplus property. UNRRA allocations for South Korea have been limited to $500,000,000.

As requested by President Truman on February 17, 1947, the American Red Cross appropriated $3,500,000 to finance and supervise distribution of relief supplies in Rumania.

UN Must Enforce Its Palestine Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann, from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 3, 1947:

UN MUST ENFORCE ITS PALESTINE DECISION

(By Walter Lippmann)

The opening statement made by Mr. Herschel V. Johnson, speaking for the United States on Palestine in the UN, has not attracted the attention which it deserves. For the statment recognizes accurately the new situation created by the British appeal to the UN, and defines the working principle which is bound to be controlling in the inquiry, in the debates, and in the conclusions, if there is to be a practical and constructive result.

The crucial sentence in the American statement is that "it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to enforce any decision which does not rally the support of most of the peoples of the world." These few words are pregnant, and they say a great deal. For they commit the United States to work for a decision which can be enforced by the United Nations.

This formula marks a definite break with the past. Hitherto the decisions have been taken by the British Government, as was inevitable since it alone had the responsibility and the burden of enforcing decisions. The American contribution has been purely advisory. The American advice has been given freely and copiously, sometimes, by invitation of Britain as in the case of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry of 1945, and oftener without being invited.

The new American formula calls for a decision which, not Britain alone, not Britain and America together, but the United Nations can enforce. That this is the right and the statesmanlike formula is plain. There is no point in submitting the problem of Palestine to the UN except to arrive at a decision that the UN will and can enforce, that Britain, and also America as members of the UN will faithfully participate in deciding and in enforcing.

There are three controlling terms in this formula:

First, that there should be decision, since all the many competing claims on Palestine cannot be satisfied.

Second, that this decision must be enforced since it must be assumed that no decision will be accepted voluntarily by all the parties concerned.

And third, that this decision must be one which can be enforced by the United Nations now, as they are today, in their present stage of development, not as they might be, ought to be, and some day, we hope, may be.

* * * * *

We have to find the solution within the limitations of UN. Now there are things which UN cannot do. They will have to be ruled out. There are things which UN can do. The solution will have to be that kind of thing.

What can UN not do? It cannot enforce any decision which requires it to crush the opposition of large organized masses of Palestinian Arabs or Palestinian Jews. It does not have the military power to do that sort of thing, and the UN would never sanction it anyway. This rules out any decision which would cede the whole of Palestine to the Arabs or to the Zionists.

Nor can UN enforce a decision which calls for the international government of the whole of Palestine. In the present state of the world—the rivalry of the great powers being what it is—an international administration of Palestine is a utopian solution. The utmost that can be done in this respect, and it is also an irreducible minimum which will have to be done, is to set aside Jerusalem and the other holy places as neutral and inviolable whatever else is done in the rest of Palestine.

We may generalize and say that UN is not competent to enforce any solution which requires it to govern within Palestine.

What kind of thing, then, can UN do? It can guarantee a lawful political boundary line. This is the kind of international function which UN is best able to perform. To be sure, a frontier cannot always be guaranteed absolutely. It can be crossed, as is now the case in Greece, by surreptitious bands. Nevertheless, as compared with any other type of international enforcement, the defense of a frontier is the most likely to be successful. Violations can most easily be detected. Resistance to aggression of this kind will, in the present state of world opinion, most surely rally collective action. Such collective action cannot, under article 51 of the Charter, be stopped by the veto.

Our international society is still an exceedingly primitive one. But it has reached a stage in its development when the violation of a frontier is universally recognized as aggression, and when under the Nuremberg precedent, the individuals who plan it and conduct it are subject to arrest and to trial as international criminals.

There can be little doubt that a partition, if objectively done, would leave only the extremists on both sides, who have grandiose and dangerous ambitions, to be dealt with by force. For once the line was drawn by authority of the civilized world, agitators and conspirators who sought to violate the line would be isolated as rebels against the world society, and as criminals subject not only to local law but to international law.

Gasoline—Five Hundred and Thirty Billion Barrels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the interest that is being taken in our oil and gasoline reserves reminds me that this is a good time to call attention to the immense reserves of gasoline that exist in the vast fields of lignite coal in Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

Until recently, these gigantic fields of sub-bituminous coal have gone almost unnoticed because of the large quantities of industrial coal in other places and because we have never had the spur of necessity to develop processes for their use. The Germans did, however; that is, they developed methods of producing synthetic liquid fuel from their brown coals with a high degree of efficiency.

The application of those processes to our lignite coals opens the door to a vast new industry, for the Geological Survey estimates the reserves of lignite coal in this 3-State field at 916,000,000-000 tons.

The Secretary of the Interior tells me that on the basis of a 70 percent recovery under processes of conversion now available, this field alone is equivalent to 530,000,000,000 barrels of gasoline as compared with proved reserves of crude petroleum in the United States of about 21,000,000,000 barrels.

The figures stagger one's imagination. They become even more impressive when it is estimated that the cost under present methods of conversion mean a gasoline competitive with one produced from oil at $1.50 per barrel. They become even persuasive when it is realized that one of the large oil companies has recently announced plans for a $125,000,000 synthetic plant in Pennsylvania, and that the lignite fields open a coal reserve that is not presently used for the general industrial purposes of anthracite and bituminous coals.

It was with this situation in mind that I introduced H. R. 2161 on the 24th of February, 1947, to extend and expand the Government's program for "the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil, shales and other products, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation."

I urge its early and favorable consideration.

In order that the members of the House may be aware of the official nature of the figures I have used on the extent of these reserves, I shall place in the RECORD, under permission heretofore granted, a letter from the office of the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 14, 1947.

I might add that it was because of my interest and belief in this program and because of the knowledge of the facts given in this letter that I raised the point of order against a clause in the Interior appropriation bill a few days ago to strike from that bill what appeared to be a reduction in the authorization to proceed with contracts on the intitial phases of this program which my bill seeks to extend.

The letter from the Secretary of the Interior follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 14, 1947.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: In reply to your letter of January 29, I can assure you that lignite is one of the most promising source materials for synthetic liquid fuels to supplement our diminishing supplies of petroleum.

The lignite field of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana, to which you refer in your letter, has estimated total reserves of 916,000,000,000 tons, according to the Geological Survey. On the basis of 70-percent recovery and present processes of conversion, this field is equivalent to 530,000,000,000 barrels of gasoline as compared with proved reserves of crude petroleum in the United States of about 21,000,000,000 barrels.

Small-scale tests made by the Bureau of Mines have shown that lignite from this field is readily liquefied. In a demonstration plant to be erected this year, provided Congress approves the necessary appropriations, large-scale costs will be determined and practical operating procedures developed. This information could enable private industry to apply the processes commercially to the production of oil from coal and lignite. While the demonstration plant is to be built at Louisiana, Mo., it will be used to test coals from the various coal-producing States. It is expected that the first coal used will be from the northwestern area.

To produce any significant portion of our oil requirements from solid fuels is going to require the establishment of a large new industry. The location of the necessary low-cost coal reserves will determine to a considerable extent the areas in which this new industry will be established.

Those sections of the country having large lignite reserves are in a favorable position. In planning such an industry, geologic surveys to determine the thickness and extent of available coal, and engineering surveys to formulate plans for the development of industrial water supplies, and low-cost power are important considerations. Therefore, the development of the Missouri Basin may promote the commercial production of synthetic liquid fuels.

There is enclosed a copy of my report to Congress on the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act for the last calendar year, which describes the progress that has been made. I shall also be glad to have a Bureau of Mines representative acquainted with the synthetic liquid fuels program call at your office to discuss it in detail should you so desire.

Replying to the last paragraph of your letter requesting suggestions as to ways the people of South Dakota can advance the matter, it is my opinion that their interests can best be served at this stage by supporting the continuance of the synthetic liquid fuels program that Congress has established. House and Senate committees investigating petroleum have reported recently in favor of this work and a bill (S. 134), has been introduced in the Senate to authorize continuation of this work beyond the initial 5-year period which ends April 5, 1949.

Sincerely yours,

C. GIRARD DAVIDSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

A Poor Rent Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 3, 1947:

A POOR RENT BILL

The rent-control bill approved in the House by a narrow margin is bad legislation. It should not be approved either by the Senate or by the President. It would mean the end of effective rent control.

Possibly the worst of its several bad features is the provision authorizing landlords to raise rents 15 percent in return for a 2-year lease if the tenant agrees.

On the face of it this may sound reasonable enough. Actually it is a club with which the landlord can beat the tenant into a 15-percent rent boost over and above any increases already allowed by the OPA.

The House bill provides that rent control would end next December 31, although the President would be given authority to extend this to March 31 if he finds it necessary.

The landlord could go to the tenant with this proposition: Either sign a 2-year lease calling now for a 15-percent rent boost or risk an unlimited rent increase when rent control expires within a matter of months The choice in such a situation is obvious.

There would be justification for permitting landlords a 15-percent increase if they had no other recourse for increases. But such is not the case.

Under the present law, there are several considerations under which the landlord can obtain Federal permission to increase rents. He can show capital improvements, increased services, increased occupancy of the property, or he can obtain relief through a substantial hardship petition.

This latter provision recently was liberalized so that the landlord has to show only

that his increased operating expenses have resulted in a decrease in his net income for 1946 as compared with the average incomes of any two previous years since 1939.

Under this provision, 6 petitions affecting 479 tenants in the Pittsburgh district have been granted in the last week. In April alone 178 petitions of all kinds, affecting 327 tenants, were granted. Last year the OPA granted rent increases affecting 3,020 tenants to 1,825 district landlords. Over the period of a year the increases granted in 1946 alone will total $201,360. It is evident from these figures that landlords have not been denied relief.

Another bad feature of this poorly written bill empowers local governments to end controls whenever they decide there is no longer a housing shortage in their areas.

Local governments are far more susceptible to pressure than the Federal Government. It is not unusual to find affected property owners sitting in local governing bodies. The result of this provision would be spotty rent control difficult of Federal supervision.

Space does not permit discussion of other features of this bill fully as objectionable as those described above. Suffice it to say that the measure in no sense resembles the effective control President Truman has asked for the proper protection of millions of our American families pending an easing of the housing shortage.

The House shouted down an amendment by Representative ROONEY, who called for an expression by Congress that "In view of the desperate housing situation, the American people deserve our sympathy." But such an expression would certainly have been appropriate in this bill

The American people deserve sympathy not only because of the desperate housing situation but because it does not have in the House enough men with courage to resist the forces of further inflation and hardship.

Aiding Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a very thoughtful and timely article on aiding displaced persons, appearing in the America magazine of May 3, 1947:

Americans would like to believe that displaced persons returning from western Europe to countries east of the Oder-Neisse line will receive treatment worthy of human beings. They would prefer to think that the returnees run no risk to their lives or liberties in trusting themselves to governments which employ the MVD or its affiliates.

Good people among us would like to believe that there are no slave labor camps in Russia or that, if there are, none but genuine criminals are confined there. One of the anomalies of current human behavior is the apparent eagerness of many otherwise responsible persons to interpret the actions of the Soviet rulers in the best possible light while manifesting an unwillingness to listen to the factual testimony of reliable witnesses who report on Russia's ruthless disregard for human rights.

Europe's displaced persons are again in danger of becoming victims of this American credulity. On their return trip to the homeland they expect to get a through ticket to Siberia or some other place where they will be punished for disloyalty to the regime and for accepting western ideas about human rights. The fact that there are now over a million DP's presents no particular problem to the MVD. The latter agency has established its reputation for handling well over 10,000,000 noncriminal prisoners—a number which makes the Czar's most ambitious compulsory-labor program look like a Boy Scout encampment. Upkeep, of course, is no obstacle. Many Americans find it hard to believe these things, just as they did of the Nazi regime, but that is because they see little more in communism than a reform movement.

Still others among us have or think we have plumbed the depths of dialectic materialism and love to reveal the evils of Stalinism in resounding pronounciamentos. Meanwhile on the question of giving substantial aid to victims of Communist terror we succumb to the penny-pinching views of Representative TABER and the NAM.

The more thoughtful Americans are rightly alarmed at the new line of thought on refugees appearing in American military circles abroad. The issue was clearly put in the open letter addressed to President Truman by the Refugees Defense Committee:

"We believe that neither UNRRA nor the IRO nor the American administrative authorities have any moral right to attempt to persuade the displaced persons to return unless they are prepared to guarantee that they will not be subject to racial and political persecution in the countries to which they are asked to return."

After the display at the Moscow Conference, who would risk making such a guarantee?

While the Refugees Defense Committee was drafting its letter, the executive committee of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference was passing a forcefully worded resolution on our duty to aid the refugees, especially by providing them a place for resettlement. The conference is rightly disturbed about the duplicity of our Nation, which allows large commercial farmers to bring in thousands of alien and West Indian agricultural workers, yet refuses to admit even a handful of bona fide refugees. At its meeting the executive committee of NCRLC made it clear that it has actual commitments for resettling displaced persons and that it stands solidly behind the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons in its attempt to have legislation passed to permit entrance of refugees.

Distribution and Use of Railroad Freight Cars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following factual statements on the car situation by the Car Service Division of the American Railway Association:

DISTRIBUTION AND USE OF RAILROAD FREIGHT CARS

THE SITUATION IN 1947, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO WESTERN CAR SUPPLY

Statements to the effect that there is sectional discrimination in the distribution of railroad freight car supply are based, in large part, upon superficial examination and misunderstanding of the regularly published car location reports of the Car Service Division, Association of American Railroads. These reports show the ownership of cars of various types by individual railroads and also the number of cars of each type on the lines of each railroad on each reporting date.

They show that Eastern railroads as a whole have on their rails more than their ownership of box cars. They also show, on the other hand, that Western railroads have on their lines more than their ownership of open-top cars. Both situations are normal. They are not due to discrimination in distribution of either type of cars but rather to the way commerce moves in this country.

Ordinarily and properly, those railroads on which there is a heavy origination of a certain kind of traffic have a relatively large ownership of cars suitable for that traffic. These cars are not intended to be kept at home. The very purpose of owning them is to have them loaded and shipped to points of consumption, commonly involving movement on other railroads. This is true of box cars of western ownership and of open-top cars of eastern ownership. The basis of the continental commerce of the United States is that these cars shall move freely from railroad to railroad, carrying the products originating in one section to consumers in other sections. The importance of this interchange among railroads of cars carrying loaded freight is indicated by the fact that during the week ending April 26, 1947, the latest for which figures are available, when shippers loaded a total of 894,000 cars, the number of cars interchanged among railroads totaled 715,000.

THE MEANING OF "ON LINE PERCENTAGES"

To attempt in a time of car shortage to keep 100 percent of ownership of each type of freight car on the originating and owning line at all times would result in intolerable congestion and delay to traffic, and unnecessarily add hundreds of millions of dollars to capital expenditure of railroads to own and maintain unneeded equipment, as well as add great expense in the cross hauling of loaded and empty cars. Furthermore, it is the history of railroad car ownership that since the beginning of interchange of loaded cars, one road with another, there has never been a time when each railroad had on line 100 percent of its ownership by types of cars. Such a situation would not be practical or economical, or in the interests of good transportation policy. Whatever may be said to the contrary, it is wholly impractical to distribute car supply solely with relation to individual railroad ownership without a disregard of the interests of the shippers and disastrous results to the commerce of the country.

Shippers are familiar with the movements of traffic and the return flow of cars which result in the fact that at any particular time any particular railroad may have less or more than its ownership of any particular type of car on its line. They know that to select the figures as of one time for one type of car, and for one railroad or one group of railroads, does not present a fair picture of car distribution.

The fair over-all picture takes into account all cars and all sections. Car distribution in the United States is on a national basis, not a sectional basis. The aim is to distribute all cars among all sections to meet, as nearly as may be, the needs of all shippers. The full reports of car distribution and location indicate how nearly this is achieved.

DIVISION OF CARS—EAST AND WEST

Taking all railroad-owned cars into account on April 1, 1947, there were on western railroads 99.7 percent of car ownership, and on the railroads east of Chicago and the

Mississippi River, 95.9 percent. (The approximately 3 percent of ownership remaining was in the hands of switching lines, or in process of transfer and not reported, or in Canada or Mexico.)

Breaking this over-all picture down to show ownership and location of major types of cars in the different sections, the railroads west of the line of Chicago, St. Louis, and the Mississippi River own 317,329 boxcars, or 43.6 percent of the whole number, and 189,498 open-top cars, or 21.9 percent of the total, while the roads east of that line own 409,796 boxcars, or 56.4 percent, and 675,539 open-top cars, or 78.1 percent.

As of April 1, 1947, the western railroads had on their lines 91 percent of their ownership of boxcars and 121 percent of their ownership of open top, while the eastern railroads had on line 104.9 percent of their boxcar ownership and 89.3 percent of their open tops.

Refrigerator cars constitute a special group, handled on an entirely different basis. Only three railroads in the United States own any significant number of refrigerator cars. The figures published in the Car Service Division reports refer only to these few cars, owned by individual railroads. The great bulk of the total refrigerator-car fleet of 140,000 cars, are those of refrigerator-car lines, either privately owned or controlled by groups of railroads, with which the railroads contract in order to supply cars for their refrigerator-car shippers. The distribution of these cars is handled upon advice of specialists, experienced in meeting the needs of the perishable-freight industry. The picture of distribution of refrigerator-car supply is not to be found, therefore, in the general Car Service Division car location Report CS–8A, but in special monthly reports covering all refrigerator cars, filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission. These reports show that on April 1, 1947, the distribution of all refrigerator cars among the sections was as follows:

	Percent
Lines west of Chicago, St. Louis, and Mississippi River	47.3
Lines east of Chicago, St. Louis, and Mississippi River	44.3
In Canada and Mexico	8.4

This distribution is believed to be as nearly responsive to shippers' requirements at this season of the year as it is possible to make it.

THE RETURN FLOW OF CARS

Insofar as box and open-top cars and the other railroad-owned types are concerned, there is a constant shifting and flow of these cars in the movement of commerce. Nevertheless, an approximate balance is maintained in the distribution of the car supply as a whole among the sections of the country. This is accomplished through the efforts of the Car Service Division of the Association of American Railroads.

In times of normal car supply there is a more or less automatic return of empty cars following generally in reverse direction the routes by which the loaded cars moved. In this way the same railroads which enjoyed the revenue on the loaded hauls carry the burden of returning the empties, when it is necessary for cars to return empty. This more or less automatic flow is governed by the car service rules, to which all railroads subscribe.

Loaded freight cars are almost always routed by the shippers and receivers of freight. They are sent over a great variety of routes to secure the benefit of various tariff provisions as to transit, reconsignment, delivery, etc., so as to market products to best advantage. A striking example of this is the movement of perishable freight, much of which is sold while it is en route, with the car being held, diverted, and reconsigned over various routes upon shippers' orders. There necessarily results a certain amount of circuity in some loaded movements, yet this is incident to the according of commercial advantages which are important to shippers and which they would hardly care to forego.

In times of car stringency, such as we have had during the war and since, it has been necessary to suspend the operation of car service rules, in many instances, and to send empty cars home by short routes, regardless of the route over which the car moved under load. Thus, under Car Service Division orders, eastern railroads have been required to make long hauls of empty cars, without compensation, for delivery to western lines at Chicago and St. Louis, in many thousands of cases in which the eastern railroads concerned enjoyed only a short haul on the loaded cars. The number of empty boxcars relocated from eastern to western railroads under special orders of the Car Service Division since December 6, 1946, has totaled 176,089, or an average of 1,214 cars a day. The fact that the Car Service Division has made such requirements of the eastern railroads is in itself a sufficient answer to the often-repeated but baseless allegation that the association is dominated by these eastern lines.

THE EFFECT OF CAR-SERVICE RULES

It has been suggested that the emergency system by which the return of empty cars to the West is expedited through Car Service Division direction should be discontinued, and the return flow of cars left to be governed by the full and strict application of car-service rules. If there were an ample car supply in the country, this would be both feasible and proper. It would divide the burden of handling returning empties among the different railroads more nearly in accord with the proportion in which they enjoyed the revenue hauls of loaded cars. But in the opinion of men who have lived and worked with car-service matters, both before and during the war, to restore the full application of car-service rules at this time would mean both fewer cars for the West and less freight-carrying capacity for the country as a whole, rather than more.

The power to require such returns of empty cars, regardless of revenue earned on the loads, is one entrusted to the Car Service Division by the railroads. The Interstate Commerce Commission is vested by law with authority over car distribution and car service. In seeking the most efficient and equitable distribution of cars, the Commission has made use of the long-established and Nation-wide machinery of the Car Service Division by designating W. C. Kendall, Chairman of that Division, as its agent. As such agent, Mr. Kendall makes daily reports to the Commission, and his actions are at all times subject to its direction and authority.

RECORD FREIGHT LOADINGS IN THE WEST

Despite statements to the effect that the West is being strangled for lack of freight cars, the fact remains that western car loadings are keeping pace with loadings in other sections and that more freight is being loaded on western railroads than ever before. In the first 3 months of this year, western loadings were more than 3,666,000 cars. That is nearly a quarter of a million more cars than were loaded in the same months last year. It is more, even, than were loaded in the peak war years of 1944 and 1945.

The loading and movement of grain and grain products in the West, in fact, has been greater in recent months than ever before in a similar period.

Such loadings on western railroads in the past 4 months have totaled 601,828 cars, as compared with 526,016 in the corresponding period of 1946 and 505,995 cars in 1945. According to the April 1 reports of the Department of Agriculture, the stock of wheat on farms is smaller than at any time in several years, despite the fact that we have had five bumper crops in a row. The number of country elevators reported closed for want of cars has been reduced in the past 2 months from 1,295 to only 46 out of a total of approximately 14,000 such elevators. In short, grain is moving and moving in record volume.

Reference has been made to mills closing down in the Pacific Northwest for lack of grain. Such temporary difficulties as have been experienced were due to lack by such mills of a particular type of grain grown in Montana. This lack was not due to failure on the part of the railroads to move the grain, but to the fact that because of price differentials the grain moved east to Minneapolis and beyond rather than west to the Pacific Coast. It was not a transportation condition at all but a marketing condition.

Many of the cars loaded in the West have gone east, carrying the products of western producers to eastern consumers. That's what the western producers and shippers wanted, and what the eastern consumer wanted, and what the railroads wanted to do—to use their cars to carry freight to those destinations where it is needed. There is no such movement of boxcar freight from east to west, so that it is necessary to return many of these boxcars empty, just as it is necessary to return large numbers of eastern open tops empty from the West, under special orders of the Car Service Division.

THE GENERAL SITUATION

Speaking now of the country as a whole, it is true that railroads have not been able in recent months to place currently for loading all the cars ordered at all points in all sections. The shortage has been general, and not sectional. It was due to general causes, which began to operate years ago. During the long years of the depression, when the surplus of freight cars was measured in the hundreds of thousands, few new cars were built. In 1938 it was proposed that the Government build several hundred thousand cars and lease them to the railroads. When it was held that there was no warrant in law for such a proposal, the proposal was embodied in the lend-spend bill of 1939, which, however, did not pass. The proposal was made more as a pump-priming device to increase general employment than it was as a railroad measure. It was made months before the war began in Europe, and of course without reference to that event.

When war started, the railroads began to build up their car supply, out of their own resources, even before the inauguration of the American defense program in 1940. Between the outbreak of war in Europe and Pearl Harbor, they put into service 158,000 new freight cars. By the time of Pearl Harbor, materials difficulties and Government priorities and allocations restricted freight-car construction. This condition continued throughout the war.

Since the close of the war the stringency in car-building materials has continued, with the result that during the past 20 months the number of new cars built for United States railroads has averaged barely more than 3,000 per month, or less than the number of cars worn out in war service which have had to be retired. We are assured now, however, that beginning in the middle of the summer materials will be available for building as many as 10,000 new cars per month. Orders from the railroads for more than 100,000 new cars are now on the books, with approximately 30,000 additional cars programed for future order.

But right now there simply are not enough cars to go around, and the job is to get the most use from those which are available. That is what the railroads, the cooperating shippers and receivers of freight, and the Government agencies concerned, all are trying to do. The record is that they are moving more freight more miles than ever before in peacetime

"We Believe America Can Enhance Her Prestige and Win the Admiration and Respect of the People Everywhere Only by Championing the Cause of Justice and Decency, Rather Than by an Unholy Alliance With the 'Unspeakable' Turk."—Armenian National Council of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because I am deeply impressed by that which is contained in the pamphlet and I believe the membership should have the benefit of the views of those who sponsored it, it is my privilege to hand to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorandum on the subject of aid to Turkey which was recently released by the Armenian National Council of America, a patriotic society composed of American citizens of Armenian descent, one well worthy of our respect and confidence.

The memorandum to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

MEMORANDUM ON THE PROPOSED AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY PRESENTED TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY THE ARMENIAN COUNCIL OF AMERICA

The message of President Truman to Congress on March 12, 1947, promulgated a new American foreign policy, in proposing to extend financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey, and to assume new political responsibilities in the Mediterranean area.

OUR DUTY AS CITIZENS

This new step imposes upon us as American citizens a grave responsibility; and because of our special interest and knowledge of the conditions in the Near East, we would like to present certain important facts for the serious consideration of our Government, and point out the far-reaching implications of the proposed new foreign policy in the Near East.

The Armenian people, having suffered long and bitterly under the despotic misrule of the old and new Turkish regimes, value highly their now-found liberties in this land of their adoption. They are devoted to the American democratic institutions and American way of life, and are therefore unalterably opposed to tyranny of all kinds. For over a century the American educational, philanthropic, and missionary institutions have been operating among the Armenians in the former Turkish Empire. It was through this close contact, that the American people came to a more intimate knowledge of the historical struggles and ideals of this ancient Christian people, and took a genuinely friendly interest in their welfare. It was during World War I, however, that the tragic fate of the Armenian people in Turkey, shocked the conscience of the American people, and aroused their deep sympathy and admiration.

We are told by our President that both Greece and Turkey need our help to maintain their independence and integrity as nations, and he has requested the American Congress to extend to Greece a loan of $250,000,000, and to Turkey $150,000,000.

GREEK PEOPLE DESERVE OUR AID

We believe that the heroic Greek people, who fought so valiantly for our common cause against Fascist and Nazi hordes, have a just claim and deserve every help we are able to give them to reconstruct their national economy and to maintain their freedom as a democratic nation. Our help, however, should not fortify the reactionary elements in Greece, nor force upon the Greek people a government not of their own choosing.

AID TO TURKEY UNJUSTIFIED

The proposal of financial and military assistance to Turkey, however, falls under a different category altogether, and can never be justified. It will not further our own national interest and security, and cannot promote justice and peace in the Near East. We wish to remind our Government of certain facts, which should be known to our Department of State:

First. Turkey has never been, and is not now a democracy, as we understand and conceive the meaning of democracy.

Second. Turkey is an aggressor nation. It has always nurtured plans of expansion using pan-Turanism and pan-Islamism as its double spear-heads.

Third. Turkey was an ally of our enemy Germany during World War I, and an underhanded collaborator of the Axis Powers during World War II. The protocol of the Tehran agreements of December 1943, reveals that U. S. S. R., the United States, and Great Britain had decided that Turkish active participation was vital for the Allies. Turkey, however, refused to enter the war on the side of the United Nations. The assertion by an official of the State Department that Turkish neutrality was beneficial for the Allied cause is contrary to the facts. It is a deliberate attempt to whitewash Turkey.

Fourth. Turkey did not fulfill her obligations under the Treaty of Mutual Aid, signed by her with England and France at Angora, on October 10, 1939, and the obligations assumed to come to the aid of Greece when attacked by Italy. Turkey declared war at the last minute, against Germany, without firing a shot, when the defeat of the Axis had all but been accomplished in order to secure for herself a seat in the United Nations.

Fifth. The alleged neutrality of Turkey during the Second World War, was bought at a high price. Turkey received as a consideration the Sanjak of Alexandretta, a mandated territory which was transferred by France unlawfully. Turkey also received considerable aid from England and the United States in lend-lease, but furnished nothing in reverse lend-lease. On the contrary, we had to purchase from her at exorbitant prices, chrome and other materials, in order to stop their sale to our enemy Germany. Turkey did not suffer any ravages of war; on the contrary, she traded with both sides and prolonged the war, and enriched herself at the expense of the United Nations.

Sixth. Turkey, taking advantage of the war, and under the guise of taxing wealth (Varluk Vergisi), robbed and crushed economically, all its minorities, especially the Armenians.

Seventh. Our financial or military aid to strengthen Turkey, will make here a menace to the middle eastern states, such as Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, and Iran, and will revive the danger of pan-Turanism and pan-Islamism, and will serve to encourage the aggressive designs of Turkey against her neighbors.

TURKEY NOT A DEMOCRACY

Turkey is not a morally defensible state, and our Government cannot, and should not undertake to assist and defend Turkey on the following grounds:

(a) Turkey does not recognize the validity of the Naturalization Laws of the United States. The Turkish Government has consistently refused to recognize the American citizenship by naturalization, of former Turkish subjects such as Armenians, Greeks, Jews, and other minority groups.

(b) There is no religious freedom in Turkey. She deprives the exercise of religious freedom by the American educational, philanthropic, and missionary institutions, within its borders. The reading of the Scriptures and the offering of prayers are forbidden in these institutions, in the presence of Turks.

(c) Discrimination is rampant in Turkey today. The minority races are denied the equal rights of citizenship, contrary to the stipulations of treaties of peace signed between Turkey and the Allied Powers after World War I. The Turks are a privileged class in all parts of Turkey. No non-Turkish school, business firm, or institution can run their own affairs without having a Turkish teacher, partner, or representative.

(d) For centuries, Turkey has trampled on and violated every treaty she has signed, she has always been a destructive force, and has not contributed a single iota to the progress of civilization.

TURKEY NOT DEPENDABLE

Within the last 100 years, all the great powers of Europe, at times, have bolstered up the Turkish state, hoping thereby to enhance their own interest, but their efforts have always failed; every time Turkey has come out weaker and more wicked, and at the crucial time betrayed her friends. Our help will only prolong Turkey's misrule and menace world peace. The security of the United States cannot be based upon the protection of a barbaric state like Turkey.

TURKEY, THE AGGRESSOR

The President's declaration to the effect that the integrity of Turkey is menaced is not justified by facts; even if Turkey felt that her integrity was being threatened, she had the recourse to apply to the United Nations, of which she is a member. The fact is that Turkey herself stands condemned by international law as an aggressor nation. The present Turkish Government not only defied the Allied Powers, in refusing to comply with the arbitral award of the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, in regard to Armenia, instead it committed an act of aggression in seizing by force the provinces of Kars and Ardahan, and now she is maintaining a huge army to defend her loot.

AMERICA'S COMMITMENT TO THE ARMENIANS

The demand of the Armenian people for the restitution of their ancestral home, in accordance with the decision of the Allied Powers and the United States, cannot be construed as a threat to the integrity of Turkey. Our Government has a prior solemn commitment to the Armenian people for their liberation from Turkish rule.

The proposed policy of our Government in attempting to perpetuate a barbaric government like Turkey is contrary to all American traditions and commitments, and will arouse a righteous indignation in the hearts of all justice- and peace-loving people throughout the world.

We believe America can enhance her prestige and win the admiration and respect of the people everywhere only by championing the cause of justice and decency, rather than by an unholy alliance with the unspeakable Turk.

Therefore, in the name of peace, justice, and humanity, as well as to safeguard our own national interest and security, we are absolutely opposed to giving any financial and military aid to Turkey.

Bonneville's Industrial and Resources Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., for May 3, 1947:

KILLING THE GOOSE

Among the departments the House Appropriations Committee considered superfluous in reporting out the Interior Department bill was the division of industrial and resources development of the Bonneville Power Administration. While the Senate is studying the drastic House reductions in the budget for western power and reclamation, it is timely to consider the record of the industries and resources division of BPA and the case for its maintenance.

The division, headed by able Ivan Bloch, has been spending from $200,000 to $250,000 a year to develop industrial power markets. This is less than 2 percent of BPA's present revenues of $13,000,000 a year from industrial customers. Utilities customarily spend at least twice that much for all kinds of sales promotion. The division's budget for the next fiscal year, entirely eliminated by House action, was $300,000. What are the Northwest and the Nation getting in return for such expenditures?

This division had the major part in locating in the Northwest and in arranging for peacetime operation of those which are war babies of the following electroprocess plants (new plants, not transplanted eastern facilities): Aluminum Co. of America, Vancouver; Reynolds Metals Co., Longview; Tacoma aluminum reduction plant, now operated by Kaiser; Troutdale aluminum reduction plant, now operated by Reynolds; Spokane aluminum reduction plant, now operated by Kaiser; Spokane aluminum rolling mill, now operated by Kaiser; Spokane magnesium plant; Wenatchee ferrosilicon alloy plant; Pacific Carbide & Alloys corporation's calcium carbide plant, Portland; Penn Salt Co., Portland; Electrometallurgical plant for ferro-alloys and calcium carbide, Portland; Salem alumina plant (now producing fertilizer material).

These Bonneville customers have a total plant and equipment value of $160,000,000. Federal, State, and local governments have collected more than $60,000,000 in taxes from them since their establishment. The total value of products manufactured by them is $475,000,000. They have provided direct employment for 7,500 persons, and indirect employment in mining, transportation, remanufacture, fabrication, and service industries to other thousands.

But the Division does not limit its activities to establishment of industries served solely by Bonneville power. It was responsible, to a great extent, for these other plants: Oregon Electric Steel Co., Portland; Ohio Ferro-Alloys, Tacoma; and Tacoma Powdered Metal Co. It assisted in establishing the Willamette Valley Wood Chemical Co. at Springfield, Oreg.; plants for manufacture of synthetic resin, and shipment of high-purity limestone for chemical purposes from Alaska. Samuel Moment, of the Division, was chiefly responsible for Federal policies which saved the wartime aluminum plants of the Northwest for peacetime operation.

The Division now is negotiating with important industrial concerns for the manufacture in the Northwest of phosphorus and phosphate fertilizer from the Idaho-Montana beds, hydrogen peroxide, silicon carbide, exothermic alloys, zinc, lithium, additional calcium carbide, rayon, acetic acid, aluminum fabricating such as wire and cable. The surveys, charts, and files of information compiled by the Division and made available in reports which gained national attention and have been of invaluable assistance to industrialists and to communities seeking industries are exhaustive and authoritative.

Bonneville's industrial and resources development program, which means jobs and profits for the Northwest, markets for the rest of the Nation, and national strength if war comes again, is just entering a period of great productivity. It is beyond comprehension that Congress, if it has the facts, will finally decide to knock this wealth-producing agency on the head. A $300,000 investment, fully repaid out of earnings, is hardly a risk when measured by performance in creating hundreds of millions in new wealth.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I am inserting herewith an article on Memorial Day which recently came to my attention:

MEMORIAL DAY—TIME CHANGES EVERYTHING; YES; MAYBE IT DOES

In America we celebrate Memorial Day once a year—but for the thousands of mothers who have lost their sons and daughters every day will be memorial day for them—their own flesh and blood, buried in some lonesome grave, marked only by a cross. After every famous battle there comes marching out of the past these same heartaches, the same sorrow, that same lonesome despair for those we love who will never return.

Down through the ages men have marched away to war to fight for the "four freedoms" as they are fighting today. From Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, and Verdun they are all the same. Out of these great conflicts march ghosts that will walk with those of Guadalcanal and Italy and Tarawa, and many will be added to that march of death that leaves scarring memories and steals from us those we love.

Let's keep believing that time heals everything. But will the memories of those gold stars, shining so brightly in so many windows tonight, ever be erased? That widowed mother down in Texas whose son was killed early in the war—and who had worked and sacrificed and slaved day after day on their tiny farm that her son could be a great lawyer. What went through her heart when she received that telegram "the War Department regrets to inform?" That's her memorial day and always will be. Her reason for living gone—nothing left but bare existence, no tender love, nothing but memories of her son and an aching void and a gold star that will always shine—yes—maybe—time changes everything.

Tonight as I sit alone, I realize that all those men, from the Revolution down to the present conflict, died for me. Yes, the civilization that I now enjoy, they made possible. The spirits that march hand in hand with their ancestors will go on marching that you and I may enjoy democracy and live in memories

May we be of some help to those boys of yesterday—happy go lucky when they went away, yet broken men of many battles when they return today. May I do something—anything to stop this march of death so that those young men can look forward to a world much greater and more peacefully democratic and say truthfully, "Those that did not come back did not die in vain." May I, by my vote, by my living example and by honest effort help make the victory they have won lasting and complete, that tomorrow's grandmothers—they are the gold-star mothers of today—can truthfully say, "Yes, the waters on the sands of time wash clean and time truly changes everything." May that everlastingly be true.

America's Pledge to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OI
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when it is becoming increasingly evident that the American people are concentrating upon the pressing need for a prompt, over-all European settlement, it is vitally important that the Government of the United States decide whether any peaceful and lasting world order can be created, when such international commitments as those incorporated in the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta Agreement are boldly violated.

The reports of the American correspondents who covered the "rigged" January elections in Poland, and events before and since, make it obvious that there is no semblance, and no intent whatever, of any real democracy in Poland, under Russian imperialistic influence.

The United States should make it clear that, in its considered judgment, what has occurred and is occurring in Poland constitutes a violation of the third article of the Atlantic Charter, to which every member of the United Nations is committed, under the United Nations' declaration, as well as a violation of article one of the United Nations' Charter.

The need for the American Government to take a forceful attitude in Poland's case must not be evaded. It is a matter of official record that in addition to the pledges set forth in the Yalta Agreement, the United States during the war years repeatedly and specifically assured the Polish people, through their representatives, that it would never recognize a government "not representative of Poland."

The United States cannot hope to retain the confidence of the smaller nations, and to exercise a continued influence in world affairs, if it disregards pledges of so solemn a character. The United States must redeem our pledge by calling upon the United Nations to assume the humanitarian responsibility of demanding that the Christian people of Poland, who suffered so much in the Allied cause, shall not become victims of the ruthless pagan imperialism of an oppressive totalitarian government

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Press of May 4, 1947:

THE NATION'S NO. 1 PROBLEM: UNITED STATES HOUSING NEED STILL GREAT AS EVER, BUT BOOM FOLDS UP UNDER PRICE PRESSURE—SMALL BUYERS OUT OF MARKET—LABOR COSTS A BIG FACTOR

(By S. Burton Heath)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—Almost the first thing Jim and Mary did, when the Navy turned them loose, was order a $10,000 house in a veterans' emergency development.

They couldn't afford to buy. Both had gone directly from college into the Navy and had served in a high-living-cost area. They had little financial backlog.

Jim's salary in his first civilian job was not large. And there was a baby on the way.

But they needed some place to live. Even a tiny furnished flat was not found until Mary had spent the summer in a shore cottage, 35 miles from Jim's work, where he visited her week ends.

The other day word came that their house would be ready in a month. It was time to sign papers and prepare to put up cash.

Mary looked the house over. It wasn't bad—about a $5,500 prewar job, but honestly constructed. Much better than their inadequate flat, certainly. But they turned it down and canceled their order.

"We just can't afford an almost $10,000 mortgage now especially with a new baby," they explained.

This decision is being duplicated every day all over the United States. It is cutting seriously into the once huge backlog of demand for new housing.

BUBBLE THAT BURST

A few months ago it seemed that the enormous market for new housing was one of the most certain features in our transitional economy.

It was one demand that would not be satisfied for years.

The pressing need for new housing was estimated by the National Housing Administration last year at 3,195,000 by the end of 1947.

This still would have left 1,200,000 families doubled up.

Housing Expediter Frank R. Creedon says that 661,900 were completed last year, including some started in 1945. Estimates for this year place completions well under a million.

The National Association of Home Builders says it would take 1,500,000 new homes to "take the edge off" the need, and that 1,600,000 could be disposed of this year if they could be built.

Yet demand is slackening. Reports tell of cancellation of orders.

Why?

The NAHB blames it on those who have given veterans and others the "misinformation" that "new homes today are not good value and that construction costs will recede."

But the NAHB also notes that the slowdown began last fall in those areas where costs were highest, and has been getting slower recently.

ARTIFICIAL DEMAND

Thomas S. Holden, president of the F. W. Dodge, Corp., a leading source of building statistics, believes that a lot of the apparent demand was artificial in the first place.

He does not question that new homes are needed and wanted.

But he feels that continual emphasis upon the housing shortage, and the Government's provision for easy financing, combined to exaggerate the veterans' sense of frustration and the intensity of their demand for new houses.

Now that they have been back for a while, they have found some sort of roofs, however unsatisfactory. They have learned that they can get by without buying houses they know they can't afford.

What this country needs is from one and a half million to two and a half million more homes—not too expensive and most apartments.

The veterans' emergency-housing program got off to a wrong start for two reasons:

First, because emphasis was on houses rather than on homes.

Second, because the veteran was treated as a distinctive race that should be segregated in a new development of his own, while nonveterans continued to live on the other side of the tracks.

PROGRAM SET BACK

Both assumptions now are recognized as false. Both have been dropped.

But they persisted long enough to set the whole housing program back months—and at least scores of thousands of homes.

When the veteran came back for demobilization all the desirable homes were occupied. Something had to be found for him.

So a United States program was evolved with the idea of getting homes built at a price that the veteran could pay. This assumed that those already in existing housing would stay there, and veterans would take all the new housing.

"Within 48 hours after I became Housing Expediter last December I rescinded the regulation which prohibited nonveterans from building for their own occupancy," Frank R. Creedon said. "I believed this regulation to be undemocratic, and I know that it prevented many homes from being put under construction."

Mr. Creedon also relaxed the rule that required that every new housing unit be held at least 60 days to see if a veteran wanted it, before it could be sold or rented to anybody else.

And he has somewhat increased the ceiling on sales price or rental for new housing.

Most veterans do not want to buy homes—now, at any rate. They want to rent.

Former Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt tried to shift emphasis from houses to rental homes—which means mostly apartments in the larger communities, at least. But those putting up the money say they didn't dare gamble much on rentals. They would rather take a small profit on a sale and get out.

An Army survey at separation centers last year showed that 70 out of every 100 married veterans felt they could not pay more than $50 a month rent.

TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTEEN DOLLARS AVERAGE INCOME

The Englewood (N. J.) Emergency Housing Committee recently found that the average veteran's family in that above-average community had an income of $216 a month.

There are two rules of thumb in real-estate practice to apply to such figures.

One is that the average family should pay about 1 week's income a month for rent.

The second is that a property owner must get 1 percent a month on his investment, as rent, to show a modest profit. That means that the average vet can afford to rent only a $5,000 house—or ignoring a number of complications, to pay only about $5,000 for a house for himself.

Because these economic facts are pretty hard and fast, the housing program for veterans only ran into a stone wall which is resulting in the slow-down reported from all over the country.

From Cleveland comes word that less than 7 percent of veterans want to buy. The sales range for new housing is in the $12,000 bracket—for rentals, the $80 to $100 range. This is above the vet's reach.

At Houston, the market in $9,000 to $11,000 houses is getting saturated. Demand now is in the $6,000 to $7,000 class (which vets can hit by a bit of financial jockeying) and in the $15,000 to $20,000 bracket.

These checks confirm the opinion of experts generally that the way to get the 1,500,000 to 2,500,000 new homes we need is to get houses—and particularly apartments—built at the lowest reasonable cost—let whoever wants and can afford them buy or rent them—and thus open up vacated homes to the veterans.

COSTS BEING STABILIZED

Most experts feel that the cost of building a house or an apartment building is becoming stabilized.

Materials are beginning to flow from mills and factories at an encouraging rate. In most lines the cost has stopped rising, or shown a tendency toward stopping. It is possible that costs may even begin to fall before long.

Myron L. Mathews, vice president of Drew Service, says that the house that was planned in 1941–42 for $5,000 cost $9,400 in February. The apartment scheduled before Pearl Harbor to cost $1,300 a room now costs $2,200 a room.

Building materials, over-all, are 77 percent above 1926 costs, the National Association of Home Builders reports. Brick are up 96 percent since 1939, Matthews says; lumber generally 150 percent, hardwood flooring 120 percent, plaster 58 percent, and so on.

The wages of construction labor have mounted and labor productivity has fallen, builders claim. O. J. Hartwig, executive secretary of the Long Island Builders Institute, says that before the war an $8-a-day worker laid 800 to 1,000 bricks.

Now a $18.03-a-day worker lays half as many. A typical small house has 9,000 bricks. The cost of laying them has risen from $72 to $324.

Of the increase, $113 is because the bricklayer is drawing higher pay; the remaining $139 is because he does less work.

Prefabrication has proven a disappointment thus far. With all the encouragement Government gave, Housing Expediter Creedon reports that only 37,200 "prefabs" were shipped last year and that things may speed up this year.

MASS PRODUCTION

Long Island, N. Y., builders long have been famous for their ability to give the maximum in value for the minimum in cost and still make a profit.

They do it by large-scale buying plus precutting and prefinishing of much of the material.

More and more the large-scale builder, financially backed to handle big projects, is going to be able to cut construction costs.

Prices never may settle back to pre-Pearl Harbor levels, but they should drop well below those that now are frightening veterans out of the home-buying market.

How Northwest Projects Pay Their Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portland Journal of May 3, 1947:

HOW NORTHWEST PROJECTS PAY THEIR WAY

The Pacific Northwest needs to make no apology for its power and reclamation projects. They're not only playing a major role in the development of the region and the Nation, they are producing new wealth and they're more than paying their own way.

For example, Paul J. Raver, Bonneville Power Administrator, dramatized these facts effectively when, in addressing the City Club of Portland the other day, he pointed out that Bonneville and Grand Coulee have been responsible for new industries that have paid more taxes (Federal, State, and local) than all the money spent on these two great multiple-purpose projects to date—that is, more than $280,000,000.

In documenting this case, Dr. Raver said that 12 of the major industrial plants made possible by cheap Bonneville-Coulee power and representing an investment of $160,000,000 have paid almost $60,000,000 in Federal income- and excess-profits taxes and have paid more than $2,500,000 in local taxes, and workers in these plants have paid more than $1,000,000 in taxes on their homes. Four new electrochemical and electrometallurgical plants in Multnomah County pay $465,000 in local taxes. Alcoa-Vancouver pays 8 percent of all property taxes paid in Clark County, Wash., and aluminum plants at Troutdale, Tacoma, Longview, and Spokane make comparable tax contributions. And the Spokane plant, turning out aluminum sheets and shapes, serves 16 big processing plants making 2,000 different aluminum products and, in turn, creating huge pay rolls and paying heavy Federal and local taxes. As an example of the indirect tax-producing factor, Boeing Aircraft Co., which has been largely dependent upon BPA for power and upon Bonneville-served aluminum plants for aluminum, has paid more than $116,000,000 in taxes in the last 6 years. And don't forget every public power agency and every private company purchasing Bonneville power serves hundreds of new and expanded industries which make jobs and pay taxes.

It's about time eastern Congressmen quit thinking of western power and reclamation appropriations in terms of political largess, and start thinking of them in terms of bankable investments. For that's exactly what they are.

Power Breeds Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the True Citizen by Mr. Roy F. Chalker, editor, Waynesboro, Ga.:

POWER BREEDS TYRANNY

The growing willingness of the American people to depend upon government holds a deadly threat to the preservation of our liberties—and the maintenance of free, representative government itself.

Nothing is more insidious than the growth of the superstate. Power feeds upon itself. Dictators and tyrants rarely come to power by revolutionary means. Instead, they work slowly within the fabric of the law. They distort to their own ends the work of well-intentioned but short-sighted men. They praise freedom—while they are undermining freedom. They talk of the rights and dignity of man—while they plan to reduce man to the status of a helpless slave of the state, who may be used and exploited in any way that seems advantageous.

We have only to look at a map of the world to see what happened abroad. Country after country that was once free has sunk into serfdom. Peoples turned to government to solve all their problems. They gave government unprecedented powers over their lives, their businesses, their manner of living. And the end result has inevitably been tyranny.

It has been said that if government tells us what we must do, it is only one more step before government will tell us what we must think. That is a true and terrible fact. Even in England, which we have long regarded as the citadel of the basic freedoms, this pattern is taking shape, and it is to the credit of the British press than it has thundered its opposition. But, in a state where government is arbiter of all things, resistance can be crushed.

There can be no compromise with freedom. We will be free or we will be enslaved, and no middle ground is possible. And only a people which is ever alert to the dangers can save and defend freedom.

Greek-Turkish Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following amendments which I shall introduce on the floor on Thursday with regard to the Greek and Turkish aid bill:

Atomic energy amendment: Insert after subsection (4) (A) after word "information", page 2, line 19, "except atomic weapons, fissionable material, atomic source materials or information relating to atomic energy or any of the foregoing other than as may be permitted in any general international agreement."

Section I, page 2, line 24, insert the following additional clause: *"Provided, however,* That none of the aid herein authorized for Turkey shall be furnished until the President shall have advised the Congress that the United States has requested the appropriate agency of the United Nations to inquire into conditions in Turkey and to take such action, if any, as may be necessary to safeguard the national integrity of Turkey, and that the United Nations has failed within 6 months after the enactment hereof to take action which in the President's judgment is adequate for that purpose."

Section III, page 5, line 24, insert the following additional clause: "that within 6 months after assistance by the United States has been made available, the Greek Government will cause to be held a free election, the conduct and results of which shall be supervised by a commission appointed for the purpose, by the General Assembly of the United Nations; or, if the President advises the Congress that the United Nations is unwilling or unable to appoint such commission, then, under the supervision of an American commission, composed of five members, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate."

Address of Hon. Arthur Bliss Lane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane, former Ambassador to Poland, on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day of May 3, at Chicago, Ill., before a gathering of 150,000 Americans of Polish descent during the manifestation of this annual event, in Humboldt Park:

Twenty-eight years ago yesterday I had the privilege of witnessing as a junior official of the American Legation in Warsaw the celebration of Polish Constitution Day, its first celebration since the achievement of Polish independence following the First World War. This was the first opportunity which the Polish people have had to give expression to their enthusiasm for Polish nationality and Polish independence. At last they were no longer under the subjugation of the Russian, the German, or the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In keeping with the eastern Polish custom, the open windows of the Warsaw houses on a warm, sunny May 3 morning were draped with carpets. The streets were thronged with enthusiastic people who at last could open their throats and shout "Long Live Poland!"

A parade of the Polish troops which had fought in the Russian, German, Austrian, and French armies and in the German Navy was held, appropriately enough, in front of the citadel of Warsaw—infamous for the imprisonment of Polish patriots during the rule of Poland by the Czarist Russian Empire. The chief of state, General Pilsudski, stood at attention as the various detachments marched by, each with its characteristic march—the Russian Poles, with their long swing gait; the German Poles, with the goose step; the Austrian Poles, with short steps; and General Haller's troops, which had fought so gallantly with the French Army, in the quick march so well known in France. All of these troops wore the uniforms of the armies of which they had formerly been a part. There was but one addition—and a very significant one—the inclusion on each hat or cap of the crowned Polish eagle. Although Poland was no longer a monarchy, the crown was symbolic of the glories and traditions of the past and of the democratic principle in the constitution of May 3, 1791, the anniversary of which was then being celebrated.

It was a glorious day, that May 3, 1919. God had granted brilliant weather which gave to those of us who watched the impression and the confidence that Poland had before it generations of peace and independence to compensate it for the slavery which it had suffered as a result of its three partitions. But, alas, our hopes were short lived. There came Hitler and his aim to subjugate Europe. There came the war of 1939—the brutal attack on Poland by the Nazis. There came the brave but unsuccessful attempt to resist German aggression. There came the agreement between the Nazis and the Soviets to divide Poland—its fourth partition. There came the deliberate liquidation of the Polish patriots and intelligentsia. There came the asphyxiation and cremation of three and one-half million Polish Jews, and, finally, there

came the cruel and vengeful destruction of the city of Warsaw, block by block and house by house, as retaliation against the brave insurrection of General Bor-Komorowski and his followers, who were confidently but vainly hoping for the assistance of the Red Army against the common enemy occupying Warsaw.

And finally the Nazi Army collapsed and retreated from Poland. And again, the hope was kindled in the souls of the Polish people that the independence which had been smothered when the Nazis and the Soviets had overrun the country in 1939 would again be restored. But soon they were to find that the hopes which had been encouraged by repeated statements of the Allied Powers, were not to be realized. Instead of seeing a popular democratic form of government develop, the Polish people found themselves again overrun as during the Nazi occupation by the rule of a police state trained by Russian instructors in the art of spying, intimidation, and forceful measures to suppress liberty.

I happened to be in Warsaw again, this time as the representative of the United States Government, on May 3, 1946, when Poland for the first time since the close of the Second World War was to celebrate its Constitution Day. On this occasion the Polish provisional government took steps to impede the celebration which the people desired to make. Patriotic students in Krakow, who gave vent patriotically to their sentiments, were thrown into prison. It was explained by the Polish Government to foreign diplomatic representatives that May 3 would thereafter be a secondary Polish holiday and that the principal national holiday would be July 22, the anniversary of the formation of the provisional government at Lublin, a government hand-picked in Moscow and utterly unrepresentative of the Polish people. This cynical action to eradicate May 3, the glorious date in Polish history, and to substitute the commemoration of an undemocratic act of perfidy to the Polish Nation, was typical of the policy of the puppet Polish Government to disregard the wishes of the people while hypocritically representing that it was a democratic regime. Comparing the dates of May 3, 1919, and May 3, 1946, one fully appreciates the tragic and sickening change which had taken place in Poland since the end of the First World War.

It is perhaps forgotten that the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was considered at the time of its enactment to have been one of the most liberal bills of rights known to Europe. It was, of course, opposed by the reactionary imperial governments of Russia and Prussia, but it was hailed by the press of the United States of that day with enthusiasm as embodying many of the principles of our own Constitution. Edmund Burke, that great champion of human liberty, whom not even the hypocritical Warsaw stooges of today would dare to call Fascist, described the bloodless revolution which led to the adoption of the Constitution as follows:

"Not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage; no studied insults on religion, morals, or manners; no spoil; no confiscation; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned; none exiled; the whole was effected with a policy, a discretion, a unanimity and secrecy, such as have never been before known on any occasion; but such wonderful conduct was reserved for this glorious conspiracy in favor of the true and genuine rights and interests of men."

And today, as we gather here to commemorate Polish bravery and the independence which was once Poland's and which, God willing, will again be Poland's legacy and to commemorate what Polish arms, perseverance, intelligence, and industry have contributed to the independence and prosperity of the United States, let us bear in mind what this Polish question means to us Americans. I, who have seen the physical suffering and, what is worse, the mental fear of police state methods being used on innocent members of a family, can well appreciate what those of you who have relatives and friends in Poland must feel. But it is important that as Americans we should look at the problem of Poland in the light of our international relations and in the light of the position of the United States.

We entertain, all of us, the utmost sympathy with the Polish Nation in its hour of anguish with its loss of political liberty and its loss of independence in foreign affairs. This tragedy is symbolic of what is transpiring in eastern Europe—due to the aggressive and imperialistic policy assumed by the Soviet Government in eastern Europe, which surely will expand to the west unless the United States Government, supported by the American people, calls a halt. This situation is as dangerous to the United States today as was the situation created by Hitler, which confronted us in 1940 and 1941. It is encumbent on you all, not because you are of Polish descent but because you are American citizens, to urge on your Congress and on your Government that no policy of appeasement be tolerated toward the Soviet Union. Resistance against a policy of imperialistic expansion is not a policy of reckless imperialism, it is a policy of prudence, of caution, and one which should lead to peace. It was the appeasing of Hitler which led to the successive loss of sovereignty of the states of Europe up to and during the last war. In our present crisis, and a crisis it is indeed, a compromise with principle will result only in loss of our own prestige and increase in Soviet expansion. Thank God that our wise and courageous Secretary of State realized that fact and preferred to return from Moscow without a treaty rather than accept a compromise on the position for which we have stood.

In expressing to you my gratitude for giving me the privilege of paying my homage to the gallant Polish people who, unlike the puppet government which has so cynically disregarded its international obligations in the holding of fraudulent elections, exemplify to the world through the support of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, the principles of the freedom of man for which both Poles and Americans fought in the last war.

Mr. Lane's closing remark was "Niech zyje Polska," which translated in English means, "Long live Poland."

Communist Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. OWENS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a telegram as follows:

Request appointment for delegation of Illinois Communist veterans Friday morning, May 9. Please answer.

I replied, as follows:

The word "Communist" between Illinois and veterans is unbelievable. My answer is "No."

I do not know whether such a message as this, coming at a time when we are debating the Greek-Turkish question, has a purpose to accomplish a result one way or the other. However, I do know that it indicates a type of activity to which we must devote our attention. At the same time, we can also turn our attention to subversive activities in nations adjoining our shore, such as Cuba and other Latin-American neighbors. In Cuba, there are far more Communists than there are in Greece. We would do far better to expend our efforts in that direction within our own orbit than to send our men and our money thousands of miles across the sea to intervene in the affairs of foreign nations and to establish a new-world doctrine.

Home Demonstration Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Journal of May 2, 1947:

HOME DEMONSTRATION WORK

What probably ranks as the world's most far-reaching voluntary on-the-job educational program for women of rural areas is that of home demostration work. Assisted by half a million rural women, the program is placed in farm homes and communities by approximately 3,000 demonstration agents, serving as joint employees of the State land-grant colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture. The women of the agricultural sections lend their assistance to the agents as volunteer leaders, serving without charge for the benefit of the public generally and contributing their efforts particularly for improvement of facilities and progress connected with rural life.

The 4–H Club activities and other phases of cooperative-extension service in farm and home economics, which are vital branches of the home demonstration program, are financed by county (parish), State, and Federal funds. The money is provided by governmental authorities because of the proved worth of this constructive movement, whose benefits are evident in all progressive localities. In the territory about Shreveport, in which the work has been directed with increasing success for many years, there is an abundance of impressive proof of the value of the investment in effort and money. Every branch of rural family life has been helped by the home-demonstration program.

Resultant from the guidance they are given by those trained to be leaders in the movement, rural women study ways and means of forwarding the family's health, comfort, and happiness, as was stressed recently by the agent of one of the northwest Louisiana parishes in commenting on the inestimable value of this forward and far-reaching program. The modernizing of the home and causing the work connected with family life to be less burdensome due to the lessening of drudgery is representative of the progress that is being realized through the lessons learned from those serving in the home-demonstration service. Another of many inroads upon the old methods of meeting problems is the improvement in planning for financial solutions, which comes from taking advantage of the demonstration program.

Because of the great strides that are being made through the conduct of this service, the observance of annual Home Demonstration Week, May 4 to 11, is awaited with interest

throughout the rural areas. This year's program will have as its theme, "Today's Home Builds Tomorrow's World." Throughout the Nation home demonstration club women, whose numerical strength and influence have enjoyed gratifying expansion during the past 12 months, will join in giving appreciative recognition of the far-reaching benefits that invariably come to every home and every community in which the demonstration privileges are made use of energetically and sincerely.

Many Brave Irishmen Fought for Our Independence and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following article which appeared in the Irish World of recent date by Maj. Elizur Yale Smith, executive secretary of the Bill of Rights Commemorative Society:

MANY BRAVE IRISHMEN FOUGHT FOR OUR INDEPENDENCE AND FREEDOM

The history of Irish participation in our fight for independence and in the formation of our Union is full of noble deeds, courage, and sacrifices.

Long before the flow of Irish immigration to America many famous Irishmen became intimately connected with the Colony, State, and city of New York. Thomas Dongan, the younger son of an Irish baronet, who later became the Earl of Limerick, came to New York as the royal governor in 1683 and on April 27, 1687, gave the city of New York its famous second charter, the original copy of which is now owned by the New York Historical Society. He was among the best of the Colonial governors. He was a Catholic, but he made no effort to foist his religion upon the Province, which was predominantly Protestant, and Governor Dongan was one of the first advocates in America of religious freedom.

Anthony Duane was another native of Ireland who came to New York as an officer in the British Navy and settled here, prior to 1717. He invested heavily in real estate, both in the city and in the northern part of the State, where he founded Duanesburg. He was the father of the celebrated James Duane, who became a Member of the Continental Congress, assisted in drafting the Articles of Confederation, was a member of the New York Legislature, and who was appointed the first United States district judge for this district in 1789 by President Washington. During the occupation of New York City by the British Army, from 1776 to 1783, there was no mayor in New York, but in 1784 James Duane became the first mayor after independence and served until he was appointed a Federal judge in 1789. Today we have a street and a hotel named after him.

Gen. George Washington was a friend of the Irish for the notable and courageous loyalty they displayed in the Revolution. One of the most famous generals on his staff was Maj. Gen. Richard Montgomery, who was killed at the Battle of Quebec. He was born at Swords, near Dublin, served in the British Army for 16 years, but came to America in 1772. He married a Livingston, from Livingston Manor on the Hudson; captured Montreal for the American Army and was killed leading an assault at Quebec on the last day of 1775. His body was carried off the field of battle by Col. Aaron Burr, under fire from the enemy, and through deep snow. Buried first at Quebec his remains were brought to New York in 1818 and deposited in a vault under the altar of St. Paul's Chapel, on Lower Broadway. A monument to his memory is under the portico of the chapel.

Under the leadership of Jeremiah O'Brien and his brothers, sons of a native of Ireland, the first armed British schooner, the *Margareta*, was captured off the coast of Maine during the Revolution. The O'Briens fitted out their own privateer. Andrew Jackson was one of the three Presidents of the United States who saw active service in the Revolution, and he and John C. Calhoun were sons of Irish immigrants. New York City has had the Emmets, the McCormicks, Dominick Lynch, Michael Hogan, William Mooney, William Edgar, Hercules Mulligan, Hugh Gaine, printer, bookseller, and founder of the New York Mercury, and other substantial citizens of the post-Revolutionary period.

In other parts of the United States, Thomas Lynch, Jr., from South Carolina, and Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, Md., were of Irish descent, while Matthew Thornton was born in Ireland. All three were signers of the Declaration of Independence. One of the foremost patriots of the Revolution was James McHenry, who came to the North American Colonies in 1771, from Ballymena, County Antrim, as a youth of less than 20 years, and had just completed a course of study in medicine under the famous Dr. Benjamin Rush, of Philadelphia, when the War of Independence broke out. As a surgeon in the Continental Army, a prisoner of war, a member of General Washington's personal military staff, and an aide-de-camp to General Lafayette, McHenry saw service throughout the entire conflict and at its close became a legislator as a member of the House and Senate in Maryland. In 1783 to 1786 he was a delegate to the Continental Congress, and in 1787 was a deputy to the Federal Constitutional Convention, and signed the Constitution. He was at Valley Forge with Washington and in charge of the Flying Military Hospital. In January 1796 President Washington asked him to become the second Secretary of War, to succeed Gen. Henry Knox, and he served in that capacity throughout the balance of Washington's second term and also under President John Adams until 1801. The famous fort near Baltimore, which was the inspiration of the writing of Francis Scott Key's Star Spangled Banner is named after him. From the time he volunteered his services to the Congress at the beginning of the Revolutionary War, throughout the period of his active military and political life, he was the intimate friend of the leading men of the country, including Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Hamilton, and others. Next to Hamilton he was a closer friend of, and more beloved by Washington than any other man of his time.

Another illustrious son of Ireland was Charles Thomson, born at Maghera, County Derry, in 1729, and who settled in Newcastle, Del., at the age of 12. The Thomson family consisted of young Charles and his three sisters who had their own industry; they sent the young lad to a private tutor and in a few years he was teaching in the Friends' Academy. Later he went to Philadelphia and gained the friendship of Dr. Benjamin Franklin. He became a great friend of the Indians and was adopted by the Delawares who gave him the name of The Man of Truth. Thomson negotiated several Indian treaties. Being a classical man, he translated the Bible from the Greek into four volumes, and was the author of other cultural works. He was awarded the honorary degree of LL.D. by Princeton College.

Dr. Thomson married Hannah Harrison, a daughter of Richard Harrison, of Maryland, and a member of the famous Harrison family that came to Virginia before 1633 and gave us two Presidents. His greatest work for the cause of independence was as Secretary of the Continental Congress during this legislative body's entire lifetime, from the first day the Congress met in Philadelphia, on September 5, 1774, until his resignation was accepted by President Washington, on July 24, 1789, here in Federal Hall, on Wall Street, when he turned over to the President "the books, records, and papers of the late Congress, the Great Seal of the Federal Union, and the Seal of the Admiralty." The Continental Congress overlapped the First Congress under the Constitution, although no legislative business was transacted after the Government under the Constitution went into effect on March 4, 1789.

Charles Thomson kept a careful record of the transactions of the Continental Congress for nearly 15 years. After the ratification of the Constitution he helped to organize the new form of government. He had the profound respect and confidence of George Washington and when the first electoral votes were counted, on April 6, 1789, and it was found that George Washington was elected our first President, Dr. Thomson was chosen by the First Congress under the Constitution to proceed to Mount Vernon and officially notify General Washington of his election. He lived to be 94 years old, dying near Philadelphia in 1822.

The Irish general officers in Gen. George Washington's Continental Army were eminently brave and susceptible to discipline. Records show that they furnished much of the military skill and training needed at that time. The Moores, Rutledges, Jacksons, Polks, Calhouns, and many other able Irishmen distinguished themselves in the Carolinas. Gen. John Sullivan should not be overlooked. He had a distinguished career in the Army, became the President of New Hampshire and then a United States Federal Judge. Others who greatly distinguished themselves during the Revolution were Gen. Henry Knox, who became the first Secretary of War under Washington; Capt. John Brady, the famous scout; Timothy Murphy who turned the tide of battle at Saratoga; Matthew Lyon, of Vermont; and patriots in other sections of the country named Fitzgerald, Fitzsimmons, Gibbons, Shields, Sheridan, Emmet, O'Connor, Gilmor, Logan, Fulton, Gorman, Geary, Cavanagh, Lynch, Gregg, O'Neill, and others. When Capt. William O'Neill and his gallant troops held in check an entire British regiment at the Battle of the Brandywine, General Washington tearfully said: "God bless you boys; I thought I should never see you again."

In speaking of the early Irish settlers in America, President Theodore Roosevelt once said: "The immigrants from Ireland and those alone, boldly pushed through the settled districts and planted themselves as the advance guard of the conquering civilization on the border of the Indian-haunted wilderness. The Irish people here proved themselves a masterful race of rugged character—a race the qualities of whose womanhood have become proverbial, while its men have the elemental and indispensable virtues of working hard in times of peace and fighting hard in times of war."

Liberalism Versus Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following brief, timely, and thought-provoking speech given by Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California:

Day by day, at every meeting of the United Nations, of the foreign ministers, and of the Security Council, a persistent, frustrating conflict of political philosophies takes the center of the stage and usually obstructs the play. At stake in the conflict is the whole system of free government, private property, respect for human personality, consent of the governed, representative authority, and legal checks and balances for which the English-speaking world has struggled during 300 years. At least a hundred years after it was thought that liberty had been established in western civilization, the very opposite philosophy of the meaning and objectives of government has arisen to deny every principle that Americans have been taught to regard as liberal and progressive.

Our country was founded and has grown great on the philosophy of liberalism. Challenging the substance and reality of the gains of liberalism is the philosophy of socialism; to be more precise, the philosophy of a totalitarian, regimented society. The liberal philosophy holds that government is an agent of its citizens, the Socialist philosophy, that it is their master. The first philosophy would limit the exercise of political authority to the restrictions of constitutional law, and so preserve some humane consideration for individuals and minorities. The second mocks at this "legalistic" theory of the state, and holds that it is the function of government to remove all disabilities to anybody's enjoyment of a life of material abundance, to substitute for the consent of the governed the economic demands of pressure groups, supported by physical force. The Liberal philosophy holds that there are certain necessary truths about the good life, to which individual and social behavior ought to conform. The Socialist philosophy holds that such truths are mere ideologies—i. e., they are merely a way of making people believe whatever is deemed expedient that they should believe in the struggle for the material advantage of a class or political party.

At first the Socialist philosophy seemed innocent enough, even if utopian. It was only a humanitarian siding with the underprivileged. It meant the brotherhood of man; it would substitute economic liberty for the masses in the place of mere political and civil liberty. It would substitute cooperation for cutthroat competition, and would justly distribute the material wealth of society. But it has become clearly evident with the passing of the years and the accumulation of data that the radical movement—socialism in its original and broadest sense—is the wolf in sheep's clothing. Dictatorships, secret police, concentration camps, contempt for human personality, and military conquest are not the accidents of the movement; they are essential to its realization.

Call it what you will, every socialistic movement means (1) the destruction of a government of checks and balances, of principles, of rights, of parliamentary meeting of minds, and popular suffrage; (2) it means government by decree, bureaucratic planning, and concentrated, irresponsible authority; (3) it means the regimentation of the population by means of the expropriation of employing capital and the taking over of the ownership of the wealth of the nation by a class of successful professional politicians; finally, (4) it means the end of the system of free enterprise.

Such, in brief, are the major conflicting philosophies of the modern world. In the dust of their conflict it is difficult to discern, much less understand, what is happening in the world today, even in these United States of America. We Americans hear much about national preparedness for war, but what can arms and munitions—even atomic bombs—avail if our hearts and minds are open to the very subversive influences against which our ports and borders are closed? The best answer to the world challenge of communistic socialism is the recognition, for what they are, of all the steps that lead toward an imposed planned economy and totalitarianism, and the regeneration of the society of opportunity for all, which is our heritage. Let Americans oppose dictatorship at home by taking the lead in a moral and political housecleaning. Thus we shall prove that we are still worthy of the liberties our fathers won for us, and need have no fear for the outcome of the conflict of philosophies in the world beyond our borders. If we are unwilling or incapable of realizing these truths and acting upon them, the coming decades may well visit upon us the sad fate of our European contemporaries.

Office of International Information and Cultural Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein two editorials concerning the proposal to abolish the Office of International Information and Cultural Relations; one from the New York Herald Tribune of May 6, 1947, entitled "Police or Principle?" and one from the New York Times of May 6, 1947, entitled "Mr. Marshall to Congress."

I believe it would be a mistake not to appropriate money for this important agency of our Government. The situation is ably discussed in the following editorials from two of the greatest newspapers in our country:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 6, 1947]

POLICE OR PRINCIPLE?

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover told the House Appropriations Committee that the Communists have penetrated "every field of endeavor in this country" and that there are more Communists per capita in the United States today than there were in Russia in 1917; in the result he got every cent of his requested appropriation for the police activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Secretary Marshall told the committee that the State Department's cultural and information program, largely designed to meet the Communist challenge on the plane of ideas, purposes, and facts rather than on that of police work, is "an integral and essential part of the conduct of foreign relations." In the result the committee gave him nothing whatever for the information program and slashed the State Department request by $60,000,000, or 22 percent below the budget estimate.

Unless we are ready to abandon the field and put our main trust in police instead of principles, this simply doesn't make sense. The whole campaign against the State Department's information activities has been, as a matter of fact, on a low level of obscurantism and irresponsibility. The program is by no means above criticism. It should have been above the kind of criticism which has belabored it, on the one hand, as propaganda and, on the other hand (because it has tried to disseminate a balanced picture of both the blemishes and the virtues of this country), as not being propagandistic enough. It should have been above the cheaper sneers which have been thrown at it. It should have been above the facile arguments about "getting the State Department out of the news business," when the whole purpose of the program was to spread American ideas into those areas which are inaccessible to the normal commercial media of news and information.

In an effort to save at least the short-wave broadcasting part of the program, Secretary Marshall has backed Mr. William Benton's proposal for establishing a public corporation to take over the existing private transmission facilities and to operate them outside of direct State Department control. The suggestion is an interesting one which might meet some of the criticism of the present arrangement. It would still (because there is no possible commercial basis for broadcasting into such areas as Russia or the Near East) have to be supported by public money and operated ultimately under Government direction. It would not relieve the Congressmen from facing up to the issue, which they have not so far faced, as to whether they want to sustain the American system by ideas or by the FBI, by principles or by the police.

[From the New York Times of May 6, 1947]

MR. MARSHALL TO CONGRESS

The State Department's Division of Information and Cultural Relations will be completely wiped out, at a "saving" of $31,381,220, if Congress sustains the action taken yesterday by the House Appropriations Committee. The Division's program, conducted under its present auspices since January 1, 1946, grew out of the wartime work of OWI and the Office of Inter-American Affairs. Where possible, it includes documentary films, libraries of information, the use of representative material in the fields of the arts, and, with Latin America, the exchange of students, professors, and technicians. Since December 15 its radio program has been going to the Balkans, since February 17 to Russia. In countries in which news is heavily censored we have been able to reply to suppressions and distortions.

To Secretary Marshall, who made a special appeal before the House committee and another one yesterday to a group of congressional leaders, the program seemed "an integral and essential part of the conduct of foreign relations." The House committee thought otherwise. The issue now goes to the floor, along with that of other blind cuts in departmental budgets. Congress will have to decide whether a nation which spent $330,000,000,000 to win a world war can afford to spend about 25 cents a year per capita on an important part of its effort to defend democracy and prevent war.

Make Canada a Member of the Pan American Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in our commendable expenditure of unlimited patience, time, and effort in an attempt to understand the aims and objectives

of those countries which seem to differ with us on fundamental issues, we should not lose sight of every opportunity to cement the ties and bind ourselves ever closer to those who have demonstrated over the years their close friendship to the United States.

The geographical border between the United States and the Dominion of Canada is probably unique in the entire world. Nowhere else is to be found such an extensive imaginary line on both sides of which the peoples live in complete harmony and friendship. Both politically and commercially these two countries are finding newer and ever stronger common bonds.

To further this mutually desirable trend I have introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Dominion of Canada should be extended an invitation by the Pan American Union to join that body and take full part in its activities. In a recent address the Canadian Under Secretary of State for External Affairs indicated that Canada might now welcome and accept such an invitation. Although we are only one member of the union it seems appropriate that we should assume the lead in insuring that steps are taken to extend this gesture of friendliness and warm regard to our neighbor on the north. I hope this action may have the generous approval of the House.

Address by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, delivered at the thirty-seventh annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, May 2, 1947, Washington, D. C.:

When I received the invitation to address this assembly—your first convention since 1944—I accepted it with a great deal of satisfaction and eagerness. I have already had the pleasure of meeting many of you, and the sincere interest being shown by you at this time in our common objectives is both impressive and stimulating. And let me assure you that I am most anxious to maintain the cooperative and cordial relationship that has always existed between the Corps of Engineers and your Nation-wide organization, with its long lists of contributions to the development, and proper control of our water and land resources. I am certain that we shall continue to work closely together in the task of examining and recommending Federal activities which will insure the soundest development of our valuable port and waterway facilities, and provide the most effective means of flood control.

Now that you are able to meet again after a 3-year postponement of conventions—due to the war—I looked forward to a resurgence in all your activities. This definitely includes your Projects Committee, whose independent studies afford an additional means of public discussion on the merits of proposed projects, and enable you, as an association, to give the Nation the benefit of your expert opinion on the relative values of the suggested improvements. Your 2-day deliberations by State, local, and association representatives from coast to coast cannot help but have an important influence on public understanding of the stake which the American people have—and their individual responsibility—in a continued development of our water and land resources, and in a continued effort to provide protection for American lives and property from recurring floods.

From so widespread and diversified an attendance at your convention, it is natural to expect an equal variety of opinions. This is not undesirable. In fact, it is clearly in the American tradition. As a democratic nation we have always laid great stress on the opinions of the individual citizen. I like to think that the expression of a different point of view is not so much conflicting as complementary. It gives a well-rounded view to the picture. We encourage it in all our Corps of Engineer investigations and hearings.

In our approaches to the basic question of river and harbor development and flood control, I think we agree that, while our ultimate objectives are the same, there is plenty of room for a variety of opinions as to methods, or to priorities and degrees of importance—all of which may have true merit. By a sound appraisal of them all, we can come out with the best answers. This is the tested American way. It is the way Congress has wisely decreed Federal improvements shall be made to our waterways, and increasing protection provided for our people against the dangers of floods.

We all have a share of responsibility under this democratic procedure. You who come from the smallest localities, as well as you who represent large communities, have the privilege of initiating applications to Congress for an investigation of the merits of a proposed improvement, and of appearing at hearings during the investigation. This convention also presents an ideal forum for the expression of your viewpoints on common objectives. You who are leaders in constituent associations, as well as you who formulate the recommendations of this waterways congress, have the responsibility of lending your influence, or denying it, to some particular river and harbor improvement or flood-control project that has been brought to your attention for association action. The Corps of Engineers, in its traditional role as consulting engineers to the Congress of the United States, gives impartial consideration to all viewpoints, using the best engineering skill available in its deliberations before making recommendations to the Congress. Our national legislative body then makes the decisions as to what improvements are to be made, and annually decides the amount of public money to be spent on them. We all have an important role in this democratic way of life.

When we think of the vast network of improved ports and waterways we have in this country, rated the most extensive in the world—when we think of the chain of flood-control facilities that has been provided for the protection of the American people and their property—we recognize the soundness of the procedure prescribed by Congress for obtaining any changes or additions to these important Nation-wide facilities. The Federal Government has spent to date over $2,000,000,000 on improvements to our harbors and waterways—and dividends are returned every day by way of tangible contributions to the security and prosperity of our people in peace, and to our ability to continue invincible in war. The Federal Government has also spent to date over $1,000,000,000 in flood-control facilities. Here, too, dividends are returned to the American people each day in giving them constantly increasing means of protection from flood waters that continue to annually take a toll of life and property at many points over our country.

I think we can continue from such a gratifying beginning and recognize that—while we do not minimize the existence and value of local pride and local efforts in seeking local improvements to waterways or needed local flood protection at Federal expense—we must strive for a basic unity of purpose. Wherever possible, we must work out our plans on a comprehensive, basin-wide scale, interconnected wherever possible, and all coordinated in a national whole. Our long chain of coastal harbors—our navigable channels in those ports, and in our rivers and other water routes—must be planned as a whole, if they are to achieve their greatest usefulness. The same type of broad planning must go into them as we find in our systems of railroads and highways. Just as railroad traffic would be crippled if we had rails of different gages in various sections of the country, requiring repeated transfers to smaller or larger equipment to complete an extended journey, so do existing differences of channel depths and widths—and in some instances, the absence of connecting facilities—handicap the maximum use of our waterway facilities for navigation.

On our principal inland waterways we have navigation channels that generally range from 6 to 12 feet in controlling depth. In our presently constructed intracoastal waterways along the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico, there are important missing links, preventing the maximum potential use of these protected water routes. More navigable arms into the inland areas are also needed on both of these intracoastal waterways, and on the great Mississippi River and its tributary system. Some of these suggested needs have already been authorized by the Congress. In the over-all planning, however, it is important to keep in mind the advantages of standardization of depths and bottom width channels, and of interconnecting facilities, wherever the traffic warrants these improvements. Only in this way can our modern barges and other freight-carrying vessels extensively traverse the water highways of the country without having to switch cargoes to other craft or other means of transportation. Moreover, water transportation firms would be encouraged to add more services and schedules if the needed navigable channels are added.

Similarly, in our ports we have varying channel depths. As it is shown to be economically sound, more port channels should be improved, not so much from the viewpoint of standardization, as in the case of our waterways, but rather to meet each port's individual requirements for the present or immediate future. In many cases increases in channel depths are desirable to keep pace with the trend toward larger design in tankers and other vessels. In all cases, the aim would be to correct port bottlenecks that prevent the widest possible benefits to the areas which they serve.

In flood control, there is also a challenging need for a continuation of our efforts, if we are to provide protection and other benefits desired—and required—on a Nation-wide scale. Floods continue to sweep over many parts of this country. Easter week-end, still fresh in our minds, was turned into a nightmare for large numbers of American families, as flood waters rolled over areas of Michigan, Illinois, Nebraska, western Pennsylvania, and western New York. No doubt you read the newspaper headlines, stating that 15,000 persons had been temporarily isolated or made homeless, and millions of dollars worth of damage had been done, by the floods.

The plight of those persons caught in this spring flood was dramatized to the whole

Nation when reports of the death of Henry Ford on April 7, told of a scene reminiscent of decades ago. Electrical service was disrupted by the surrounding floods, and the Ford homestead was dimly lit by kerosene lamps and candles, as the great American industrialist passed to his reward.

In the last calendar year for which official figures are available—the year 1945—the loss of property from floods in the United States is provisionally placed at $178,000,000. There were also 73 lives lost. Here in our midst is an enemy that has to be fought with the same grim determination and the same unity that Americans show when faced with a foreign foe. Wherever it is economically feasible to have flood-control facilities—this economic test being wisely required by Congress, so that public money is not spent on uneconomic projects—the National Rivers and Harbors Congress can continue to do a notable public service in advocating projects that will strengthen our offensives against this domestic enemy.

In preparing our recommendations to the Congress on flood-control projects and on navigation improvements the Corps of Engineers seeks to develop each unit as an integral part of a basin-wide program, with each river basin, in turn, a larger unit of a Nation-wide whole. By this plan the widest possible use can be obtained for the projects constructed, and all the secondary benefits obtained where possible. To this end we include in our reports to Congress all potentialities for development of hydroelectric power, irrigation, recreation, pollution abatement, the restoration and preservation of fish and wildlife, and water conservation in the interests of domestic, municipal, and industrial use.

To facilitate the greatest possible coordination in the development and control of the water resources of the Nation, the Corps of Engineers consults regularly with the other Federal agencies concerned with these resources, as well as with State and local officials, and with interested groups, such as your own. Supplementing these consultations, which occur at all levels of our investigation and planning—that is, district, regional, and national—a Federal Inter-Agency Basin Committee meets regularly each month in Washington. On this committee are representatives of the War Department, Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Commerce. There are a number of subcommittees on technical matters, such as benefits and costs, sedimentation, hydrologic data, and power. In addition, the idea of standing inter-agency committees has been extended to the field. Presently, we have two such committees, one for the Columbia River Basin, the other for the Missouri River Basin. Others will be created as the need arises.

Up to this point, I have emphasized the important function performed by citizens, by local interests, and by associations, such as the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in the development and control of our national water resources. I have indicated the great amount of work already done by the Federal Government in the improvement of our rich heritage of ports and water resources, and in providing needed protection for our people against recurring floods. Let me here broadly point out that these civil works projects—the improvement of our vast system of waterways for modern navigation, flood control, power, and other purposes—have an intrinsic value to the Nation beyond the generally considered—and highly desirable—peacetime benefits.

They have a military value that cannot be overemphasized and should not be forgotten. A strong America is a peaceful America—and the proper development of our rivers and harbors is an essential quality of our strength. Let me illustrate:

Declaration of war against the Axis Powers in 1941 brought a period of feverish activity to the navigable rivers and, for that matter, to every other form of transportation in the United States. We had to produce—and in a hurry—training camps, munitions plants, mechanical equipment of all kinds, guns, explosives—in short, practically everything necessary to prosecute a successful war. Steel was at a premium, and you can readily imagine the demands that were made on the plants in the highly industrialized Ohio Valley sections particularly. Towboats, handling long strings of heavy barges, pushed thousands of tons of coal, coke, ore, and limestone to fill the gaping maws of the huge blast furnaces which, in turn, supplied the great steel furnaces with the necessary ingredients for producing the urgently needed steel.

Manufactured products, forestry, agricultural and food products by the thousands of tons, were handled by the rivers, the barges carrying everything from crude oil to breakfast foods; from chinaware to portland cement; 24 hours a day. It is hard to conceive the amount of aid furnished the war effort by our river-transportation system. Boats, for instance, were manufactured on a large scale at inland cities and floated down the rivers to the sea. To illustrate: Between January 1, 1942, and September 30, 1945, there were manufactured on the Mississippi River system, a total of 4,031 craft of various types, all of which were sent down the Mississippi to the sea. They included everything from aircraft rescue vessels to landing ships, medium.

But the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Illinois, and other waterways throughout the Nation, in addition to helping solve transportation problems, played another important role in the war effort. Experience gained by engineer officers in handling civil-works projects prepared them for the task ahead—it enabled them to teach other engineer officers the basic principles of speed in construction—the use of heavy equipment and other features which gained them recognition as the finest body of engineers in the world. It was this unpredictable ability—this uncanny speed at getting the job done that astounded the Germans and Japanese—and much of this ability was the result of training on peacetime civil-works jobs. Most, if not all, top-flight engineer officers in the war received training on civil-works projects. There is an old saying that a high-water fighter can fight anything.

Field action in the late war, in turn, has taught the Army engineer new methods which are valuable in peacetime activities. These new ideas and techniques are bringing improvements in the handling of the immense program of rivers and harbors and flood-control work which confronts the corps. You may be interested to know that during the current fiscal year, which will end June 30, the Corps of Engineers has started or resumed construction of 85 of the 153 flood-control projects for which Congress has appropriated funds since the end of the war. The remaining 68 of these projects are now scheduled to be started this spring or early summer. These projects are, of course, in addition to our regular maintenance, operation, and care of previously existing projects, both for navigation and flood control.

We have a long list of river and harbor and flood control projects which have been authorized as integral parts of the national program of inter-basin and coastal waterways development, but for which money has not as yet been appropriated by Congress. Their estimated construction costs aggregate $3,660,017,634, and include projects in every section of the country. The flood control backlog is $2,001,017,634. The river and harbor backlog is $1,659,000,000. From this you will see that a tremendous amount of work is waiting to be done, if we are to provide the people of this country with needed flood protection, and improve our rivers and harbors for navigation—work which the Congress of the United States has found needed and economically sound and has authorized. I should again remind you, however, that the rate of actual construction is dependent upon the appropriations which Congress in its studied judgment sees fit to make.

As many of you know, the Corps of Engineers recommends only those civil works that are judged to be economically sound. The average annual benefits of a project must exceed the average annual costs—and costs include interest and amortization, as well as maintenance and care. In this way, Congress guards against any additions to our networks of river and harbor and flood control facilities that would be economic white elephants—and, as such, a waste of the people's money. This policy is particularly an important consideration at this time, when, quite properly, Federal expenditures are under close scrutiny following the necessarily huge outlays for war purposes.

In addition to maintenance, the budget recommended by the President for the 1948 fiscal year calls for work on 75 flood-control projects and 36 river and harbor projects. Exclusive of funds for the lower Mississippi River, the President has recommended that a total of $290,350,000 be appropriated for the coming fiscal year and that of this amount $188,356,000 would be for flood control, and $101,994,000 would be for navigation. These recommended expenditures are for the continuation or completion of those projects for which Congress has previously appropriated funds. They also include funds for certain preliminary examinations and regular maintenance work. It should be noted that no provision is made for beginning any new project.

These are only recommendations—made by the President in his budget report of last January. The exact extent of our civil-works program during the 1948 fiscal year will be determined by the Congress, whose committees are at present engaged in studying the recommended expenditures. As Congress approves and directs we will proceed with work on a list of projects in various parts of the country, as well as continuing essential maintenance, operation, and care. The list of projects on which work has already begun include such important units as the Garrison Dam and Reservoir in North Dakota, the Harlan County Dam in Nebraska, and the Fort Randall Dam in South Dakota—all three projects being units in the comprehensive plan for flood control, navigation, and irrigation in the Missouri River Valley; the Fort Gibson and the Wister Dams in Oklahoma—units in the Arkansas River Basin plan; the Bull Shoals Dam in Arkansas, an important unit in the White and Mississippi River Basin programs; the Whitney Dam and reservoir in Texas, which will provide flood protection in the lower Brazos River area; the Fall River Dam in Kansas, affording protection for agricultural and urban areas in the Verdigris River Valley; the Center Hill in Tennessee, the Bluestone in West Virginia, and the Wolf Creek in Kentucky—all three dam units in the extensive Ohio River Basin; the Clark Hill Dam and Reservoir in Georgia and South Carolina, an integral unit in the Savannah River Basin plan; the Allatoona in Georgia, to provide protection for the city of Rome and lower Etowah River Valley; the Buggs Island project in Virginia and North Carolina, to provide protection in the Roanoke River Basin; the Conemaugh River Dam in Pennsylvania, a key unit in the system for protection of Pittsburgh; the Almond project in New York, an integral unit in the plan for the upper Susquehanna River Basin; the Lookout and Dorena Dams in Oregon and the Big Dry Creek Dam in California, to provide important protection from floods on the Pacific coast.

For flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River, the Bureau of the

Budget has recommended that $24,000,000 be appropriated for the fiscal year 1948. It has further recommended that this total sum be divided equally between new work and maintenance. Obviously, essential maintenance on a program that encompasses the vast lower valley of the Mississippi must be provided for first out of any new funds that may be appropriated. New construction must be given a second priority, and be limited to whatever balances may remain after essential maintenance is taken care of. Approximately half of the total money, as recommended, must be devoted to the maintenance of existing revetments and the construction of new revetments, if the 2,000 miles of controlling levees are to be protected from caving banks, subjecting millions of alluvial acres and numerable prosperous communities to direct overflow from the river—if the integrity of the lower Mississippi River flood-control program, on which millions of dollars have been expended, is to be retained. The next largest portion of the funds recommended would be devoted, respectively, to dredging and to main Mississippi River levees. The balance of new work funds would be spread over projects in the St. Francis, White, Yazoo, Tensas, and Atchafalaya River Basins, and would be devoted almost entirely to the completion of detailed plans and studies and to survey work. From this short summary you can see that the $24,000,000 appropriation recommended in the budget—divided $12,000,000 for new work and $12,000,000 for maintenance—permits a very limited program on the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries during the fiscal year 1948, consisting only of the most urgent main river work and of nondeferrable maintenance.

In river and harbor improvements, the President's 1948 budget recommendations call for continued work on the New York and New Jersey channels to improve navigation facilities at New York Harbor; further improvement on the Mississippi River at the Chain of Rocks bottleneck near St. Louis; extensive work on the Missouri River; important early-stage work on the great McNary Dam on the Columbia River, and extension of the main channel of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway below Corpus Christi, Tex., and Dam B for the Neches and Angelina Rivers in Texas.

These are only a partial list of important current projects. Naturally, I cannot say at this time whether they will be definitely a part of the program during the next fiscal year, as finally determined by the Congress of the United States, which, as I have said, has that responsibility.

This I can say with all assurance: We of the engineers will carry out the waterways program exactly as directed by the Congress, through the Secretary of War—and we will do this with the same care, efficiency, and dispatch that have been the traditions of the Corps of Engineers during the 172 years of its proud history.

Peabody, Mass., Goes All Out To Reduce Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a telegram I have received from the Peabody, Mass., Chamber of Commerce, concerning the merchants' sincere and most serious efforts in conforming with President Truman's program to reduce prices. The merchants of the city of Peabody, Mass., are determined that every effort possible will be made to obtain favorable action on this Nation-wide movement. Business interests of that city I know will be complimented and congratulated by each and every Member of Congress in their determination to lower the cost of living.

The telegram follows:

PEABODY, MASS., *May 3, 1947.*

Congressman THOMAS LANE,

House of Representatives:

Peabody merchants have banded together and have forced prices down on about everything except fair trade items under a promotion of devaluation days from May 1 to May 10. Business has been very brisk in spite of inclement weather. Consumers have reacted very favorably to the plan but they realize that this program cannot be on a permanent basis without reductions first coming from the source of supply. Merchants, under the chamber of commerce, have gone all out with banners, newspaper advertising, radio, street signs, and sound trucks. Merchandise has been reduced 10, 20, in some instances 50 percent. We are the only city in your district who is putting on this plan. The buying public is thankful to these merchants for their answer to President Truman's request for lower prices.

PEABODY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
THOMAS E. CYRS.

Soil Conservation in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of L. A. Borne, president, Police Jury Association of Louisiana, in the Louisiana Police Jury Review, April 1947:

Fellow members of the Police Jury Association of Louisiana, we, as members of the Police Jury Association of Louisiana, have many important duties to perform. We are faced with many problems in which we share a responsibility to solve, and which must be corrected in order to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of our people.

Louisiana ranks high in the need for preservation of its natural resources. Exploitation of these is leaving its scars in practically all sections of the State. The soil, our basic natural resource, is being depleted at a rapid rate. Soil erosion in the hill sections and lack of drainage in the alluvial sections is costing millions of dollars annually in crop losses. Every man, woman, and child is dependent on the soil, either directly or indirectly for a livelihood. Every citizen shares a responsibility in its preservation. Our future prosperity is measured largely by the way we take care of our soil today.

A great step forward was taken when the Louisiana Legislature enacted a law to permit the organization of soil-conservation districts, whereby farmers could organize to apply conservation to the land. Of the 29,000,000 acres of land in Louisiana, approximately 26,000,000 are now within the 24 soil-conservation districts. The mere placing of the entire 29,000,000 acres within the limits of a soil-conservation district, however, will not solve the problem. To solve the problem we must take the millions of acres of hill land and do the necessary terracing, contour planting, crop rotations, cover crops, pasture development, reforestation, etc., to stop erosion and increase production. We must take the millions of acres that need drainage and apply adequate drainage and other conservation measures in order to place these acres into fruitful production.

Until we do these things, the job of soil conservation will not be complete. A good foundation has been laid and a good start has been made, but there is still a big job to be done.

The supervisors of the soil-conservation districts have done a good job of laying out the programs and coordinating the work of soil conservation in their respective districts. The Extension Service is doing a fine job of assisting the districts with their educational program by informing the people of the need for soil conservation and how they can secure assistance in this work through soil-conservation districts. The United States Soil Conservation Service is doing an excellent job of assisting districts by rendering on-site technical assistance in all phases of soil conservation including farm drainage. The State Department of Public Works is rendering a tremendous service, through the parish police juries, in providing outlets for farm drainage while the United States engineers are working on the major channels and final outlets.

The Louisiana Legislature at its last session appropriated $500,000 to soil-conservation districts for purchase of equipment and to employ assistants to carry on this important work in the State. Although this is a small sum of money in comparison to the size of the job to be done, it has been a tremendous help.

Many of the parish police juries have contributed directly to this work by providing free office space to the Soil Conservation Service where they have assigned personnel to assist the districts.

By all working together we can achieve our goal by applying conservation to each acre of land in the State, but the job needs to be done now and within the shortest period of time in order to prevent further depletion of fertile farm land. To do the job rapidly, the districts need funds with which to purchase equipment and employ assistants. The Louisiana Legislature should be requested to provide districts with ample funds to do the job quickly and do it properly.

We should all remember that when the land fails, the man fails, and when the man fails, the communities fail; when the communities fail, the States fail; and when the States fail, the Nation fails.

The Story of New Haven's Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Story of New Haven's Industries, written by Henry H. Townshend, and published in the Journal of the Union & New Haven Trust Co. This is a very fine account of

the development and growth of a great city of Connecticut and of New England.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STORY OF NEW HAVEN'S INDUSTRIES

(By Henry H. Townshend)

A substantial number of the founders of New Haven, and certainly the most influential ones, were London merchants. Some of them had occupied positions of considerable importance in the commercial life of that town. Theophilus Eaton had been a deputy governor of the Fellowship of Eastern Merchants, an association trading with countries surrounding the Baltic. Having spent their entire lives as merchants, they expected to make their livelihood here by trading and commerce.

So when the men who chased the remnant of the Pequot Indians from the Great Swamp Fight in Rhode Island to their extermination in the Swamp in Fairfield reported to New Haven's ultimate founders in their temporary abode in Boston the finding of a "fair harbor" and "goodly meadows" about halfway between the settled colonies of Massachusetts Bay and New Amsterdam, it seemed an advantageous place for settlement. They brought with them considerable capital for those times, and they planned their town with regularly laid out streets and a market place in the center as befitted a place of trade, not a straggling frontier settlement; and Eaton, Gregson, Malbone and later Allerton—built themselves pretentious houses as befitted prosperous merchants.

As soon as the pressing business of getting settled was completed they turned to the one activity they knew most about, trade and commerce. As early as 1639 they were trafficking with the older colony of Virginia and its ever merchantable tobacco; shortly after with Barbadoes, Bermuda and the Azores in boats of 12, 17, and 20 tons, and always with Massachusetts Bay, where exchanges were made for European goods. In all cases it was either a matter of barter, or bills of exchange on London were acquired with what commodities they had to offer, and European goods purchased.

OPA 300 YEARS AGO

An OPA was established in 1641 limiting profits at retail in European goods to 3 pence in the shilling above what they cost and charges, and to a lesser amount at wholesale. At first it was furs that were the principal exportable product and later grain, beef, hides, and lumber. It did not take long for them to discover that in native resources their immediate surrounding had little to offer.

By 1641 they were looking further afield, and the rich furs that found their way down the long reaches of the Delaware and Susquehanna Rivers tempted them. For 60 pounds certain individuals as a private venture purchased all the land from Cape May to the mouth of the Delaware and started a trading post. The Dutch and the Swedes already there resented these trading Yankees. The Dutch burned their buildings. The Swedes on the western side arrested Lamberton and the whole venture collapsed, standing for a loss of about $1,000. It was New Haven's disaster No. 1.

In 1646, possibly to eliminate the expense of the middleman, a ships fellowship was formed to send a venture direct to England. A ship of about 100 tons was built or purchased in Rhode Island, loaded with peas, wheat, hides, beaver skins, planks and some of their precious silver plate, a cargo worth perhaps $5,000 and supposed to represent about one-fifth of the total wealth of the settlement.

It was January before she was ready to sail. They cut a channel for her through the harbor ice. On board were about 70 souls, some of them among New Haven's most prominent men and women, and she set sail with the prayers and blessings of those left behind, never again to be heard from save to come down to us in legend and story as the phantom ship. This was New Haven's disaster No. 2, and a far greater one than that on the Delaware.

A spirit of almost absolute discouragement settled down on the colony. Some left the settlement. Cromwell offered to transfer them to Ireland, that had just come under his yoke, and he also suggested the Island of Jamaica. Both offers were refused, and New Haven settled down to making the best it could of what the situation offered.

By this time, in spite of losses, some increase in population had occurred and considerable land had been cleared. The exportable amount of agricultural products—grain, beef, hides, pork, and lumber—had increased. Isaac Allerton came down from Massachusetts Bay and put what today you would call pep into the situation. He was a member of the Mayflower Company and had left Massachusetts Bay under somewhat of a cloud. The Pilgrims thought his trading activities were a bit shady, and as their agent accused him of spending too much of the colony's money.

So he found it more convenient to come to New Haven, where he took first rank as a merchant without greatly disturbing the equanimity of the founding fathers, built a fine home and storehouse and died a bankrupt. H. T. Blake claimed he was buried near the flagpole on the green. A great deal of flax was raised, as flaxseed became a valuable export, and we find a record of a cargo of flax fiber going to Ireland, the ship returning by the way of the West Indies with the usual importation of sugar and molasses, a round trip long known as the Southern Passage.

It is easy to understand why the traffic with the West Indies was the chief source of New Haven's commercial activity. We produced the foodstuffs that they needed and could not grow. Their sugar, molasses, and tropical products were something we wanted and could not obtain elsewhere. It was mutually advantageous and freighted with rich rewards. This form of commercial activity continued to be the settlement's chief enterprise and grew slowly without much great prosperity until around 1763.

TRADE WITH THE WEST INDIES

We are told that for about 60 years prior to 1740 the whole navigation out of New Haven consisted of two coasters and one West India vessel, while from 1740 to the Revolution some 30 vessels annually were engaged in foreign voyages. Benedict Arnold owned at least three of them and commanded one. This decade saw the heyday of New Haven pre-Revolutionary commercial activity. Then came the Revolution and the ships were taken up the Quinnipiac, the East Haven, and the Housatonic Rivers, dismantled and laid up.

The war over, trade picked up and the arrival and departure of ships averaged 70 yearly. Ships became larger, more firms engaged in foreign and coastwise trade. The New Haven Bank, the New Haven Marine Insurance Co., and the New Haven Chamber of Commerce were started. Long Wharf, which had been begun in the 1600's by conscripting the labor of male citizens from 16 to 60 for 4 days a week, was added to and completed. Ships like the *Neptune*, the *Oneida*, and the *Hope*, of 350 and 200 tons, sailed around the Horn to China and came back laden with tea, silk, nankeen and porcelain; to the East Indies and came back with spices; to Europe and came back with European goods. This trade with the Orient did not depend on native produce.

Take the most famous of these ships, the *Neptune*. She was outfitted for $48,000 and in 1796 sailed for the Falkland Islands, where same sealskins were obtained and cured on the "New Haven Green," as a beach in Patagonia was named. She proceeded around the Horn to the Seal Islands of the Pacific, Juan Fernandez, and the St. Felix Islands, where more seals were taken, then to Canton where the skins, some 80,000 of them, were disposed of for $3.50 per skin; 3,000 chests of tea were purchased, also 54,000 pieces of nankeen, large quantities of silk, and 547 boxes of chinaware.

THE FABULOUS NEPTUNE

She came back to New Haven after an absence of about 3 years, paid $74,000 in custom duties and divided among those who took a venture in the voyage, the captain, officers, and crew $220,000, an enormous sum for those days, and she took no cargo from New Haven. Other ships tried the same procedure, but none was ever able to equal it. New Haven ships visited nearly every European port, carrying agricultural products or lumber either for New Haveners or under charter to outsiders. Until the embargo of 1808 fully 100 foreign-bound ships paid in customs duties an average of $150,000 annually.

The water of the harbor then came up to where the Yellow Building now is, and the head of Long Wharf was in the area where George, State, and Water Streets now are. This was known as Custom House Square. No part of New Haven has made a greater physical change than this area. The offices of the shipping firms, Prescott & Sherman, Kidston & Bishop, H. Trowbridge & Sons, Bradley & Mulford and perhaps 10 or 12 more stretched along Long Wharf all the way from Sperry & Barnes, across where the railroad tracks now are and around the Square, which had a liberty pole in the center. In addition to this dominant business activity there was a host of minor ones—carpentry, rope walks, blacksmithing, tanners and shoemakers, brick makers, plasterers, weavers, tailors, gunsmiths, millers, bakers, coopers and potters—some of which had existed from the first days of the settlement, conducted by many artisans in many small establishments.

Our picture of these first 150 years is enlivened by characters of strong individuality thrown on their own resources. The second and third generation still retained the vigorous initiative that characterized the first settlers, who unless they had possessed it never would have left whatever of comfort their European homes had to offer. These traits continued down into the new age inaugurated by the advent of the 1800's, but the subjects on which they exercised their talent changed.

The Revolution and the embargo of 1808 had aroused their resourcefulness. While shipping still continued, especially with the West Indies, well down into the middle of the nineteenth century, the emphasis changed from commerce to the workshop and the factory. Harassed by the decrees of Napoleon and Great Britain, by the embargo of 1808, and the War of 1812, New Haven depended less and less upon the coming and going of its ships.

THE BEGINNINGS OF INDUSTRY

The next picture is a very difficult one to treat briefly, the canvas is so crowded with characters and activity. Almost coincident with the founding of the Colony a grist mill was constructed at the only spot offering water power—where Mill River falls over the trap-rock barrier at the Whitney Lake Dam—and by 1655 bog iron was transported down the Quinnipiac from North Haven to a forge at the outlet of Furnace Pond in East Haven, now known as Lake Saltonstall. Flax was raised in considerable quantities, and there was hand weaving in pre-Revolutionary times.

These and the trades already mentioned were primarily performed by individual craftsmen. Not until about 1780 did this

craftsmanship take on a more pretentious aspect than catering to the wants of the local inhabitants and assume some of the aspects of a growing economy. A curious individual, Abel Buel, who started his career as a forger and counterfeiter, perfected a machine for stamping out metal coins and started a mint in Water Street in 1785, where he made pennies for the new Federal Government and for local merchants. There was no United States mint.

He also brought over a Scotchman, William McIntosh, to manufacture cloth by the new power loom. President Stiles of Yale and the Connecticut Silk Society were busy introducing a silk industry; some of the old mulberry trees you see today stand as a hoary memorial to their effort.

THE DETROIT OF CARRIAGES

By 1794 John Cook had started the carriage industry on its career. Jonathan Mix's invention of the elliptical spring in 1807 and James Brewster's decision to locate here in 1809 and apply factory methods to carriage construction accelerated the spectacular rise of that industry until it dominated all others. With its highly skilled workmen and allied industries of carriage hardware, New Haven was what Detroit now is, minus the CIO and A. F. of L.

There were close to 50 concerns making vehicles of all sorts that went to all parts of the country and to foreign lands, and the factories were scattered all over the town from Newhallville to East Street. As late as 1888 carriage building accounted for $2,000,000 of New Haven's total manufacturing income.

Eli Whitney came back from the South, which he had enriched with his cotton gin to his own financial loss, and plunged into the Government's first rearmament program, contracting to deliver 10,000 stack of arms in 2 years. He failed to meet his commitment but invented new machinery and became the father of mass production with his new conception of interchangeable parts.

His nephew, Eli Whitney Blake, in order to make Whalley Avenue something more than a streak of dust in summer and a river of mud in winter, invented the stone crusher to utilize the trap from West Rock. Ithiel Town, besides adorning New Haven with his architecture, designed the first successful truss bridge and sold the right to use it all over the country at $1 a foot.

Sparks of the spreading surge of inventions and manufacture that was sweeping the Nation fell in New Haven and fired the local talent. For the remaining years of the century this initiative and energy continued, clouded only by the Eagle Bank failure in 1825, New Haven's disaster No. 3, the panics of 1837 and 1857, and other years of lesser depression. We are now at the 1820's. Henry Clay's American system was already overcoming the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian philosophy to shape the course of events for the next eight or nine decades, and New Haven profited by it.

THE COMING OF THE RAILROAD

Strategically located geographically as a communication center, the town, again to be disappointed, was buoyant with the prospects offered by the Farmington and Northampton Canal; but by 1838 it was the terminus of one railroad and by 1848 of another, and hopes and expectations were as lively as ever. The 1830's and 1840's and 1850 came with their increased tempo and rising tide of optimism. Persons engaged in manufacture are said to have increased 127 percent between 1820 and 1840 for the country as a whole.

New Haven shared in this increase. Joseph Parker, noting the discarding of cotton waste as refuse by the mills, used it to make the first American blotting paper, a most successful venture for many years. And his neighbor in Westville, Aaron Beecher, not only began making matches but perfected special machinery for their production, a business continued until absorbed by the Diamond Match Co. in our day.

Charles Goodyear's fortuitous discovery in a nearby town led L. Candee and my grandfather to apply it to the manufacture of rubber footwear, the first successful venture of its kind. Locks and household hardware were being made by the predecessor of the Mallory Wheeler of our day and by 1888 accounted for $2,500,000 of New Haven's industrial income; and G. F. Warner brought over the malleable iron industry from the Naugatuck Valley.

Chauncey Jerome moved his clock factory here where, after many vicissitudes, it became with the help of Henry English's father the New Haven Lock Co. of our day. All this was in the early 1840's. This bustling activity not only grew richer in variety and more animated in character as the decade lengthened into the 1850's, but also an interest in city improvement was aroused.

GAS, WATER, TELEPHONES, ELECTRICITY

Benjamin Silliman, Jr., as civic-minded as he was academic-minded, was active in introducing the new lighting from the distillation of coal, and all New Haven turned out to see his home on Hillhouse Avenue illuminated on Thanksgiving eve, 1848. Oliver Winchester, a shirtmaker in Court Street, bought the Volcanic Repeating Arms Company of Smith and Wesson, and after a try in Bridgeport settled down here to making the Henry rifle, an important arm in the Civil War. This company became the Winchester of our day and after absorbing the old Whitney Arms in 1888 was absorbed in turn by Olin Industries.

So the Civil War found New Haven a place of many industries. The activities during those 4 years were but a repetition of your more recent experiences, minus governmental limitations and restrictions; but the boys who were fortunate enough to come back found their city with more improvements than do the GIs of today. After 10 years of bitter controversy the citizens had absolutely refused to have a municipal water supply. Eli Whitney 2d almost singlehanded undertook the project and the first water came through the pipes in December of 1861.

The city hall was built and the Fair Haven & Westville Horse Railroad got as far as Broadway by the fall of 1861 and stopped because of the scarcity and cost of iron. The Civil War drawing to a close, J. B. Sargent moved from New Britain and brought along his friend, O. B. North. The old paper box concern of Henry Gladden became that of P. J. Cronan Co., which I think developed into the National Folding Box. The corset industry, later to employ 20,000 hands, and the organ and piano industries came and now, as the 1870's open, meat packing, plumbing supplies, rolled iron, and dyeing.

From the 1850's, at least, machinery and machine tools had been one of our activities. Some of the earliest milling machines and lathes in the country were made here at the corner of Audubon and Whitney Avenue, and now Mr. Bigelow added boilers to his engine and machinery output. George W. Coy, listening to Alexander Graham Bell in Skiff's Opera House on Chapel Street in 1877, used his experience as a telegrapher, the wires from his wife's hoop skirt and $500 of H. P. Frost for the first telephone switchboard in the world; and so the Southern New England Telephone Co.

Late in 1881 the same Mr. Frost with Morris Tyler, Wilbur Day, and Charles Mitchell had vision and initiative enough to install two of Weston and Maxin's dynamos in the C. Cowles & Co. plant on Orange Street near Crown, and persuaded the Cowles engineer to keep steam up after hours to run them, a project that after many vicissitudes and under the careful nursing of James English became the United Illuminating Co.

All ages are only relative, but it is not inappropriate to look back on the 1830's, 1840's, and 1850's as an age of awakening a silver age, and the 1870's, 1880's, and 1890's as a golden era of accomplishment. There were financial disasters, poverty, misfortune, but there was also an underlying feeling of confidence in the fundamentals of the business world, the rules that governed it and the possibilities of success. At no time in our history has the right of Government to regulate been questioned. While this period after the Civil War saw more of it than any prior one, it was on the whole more in favor of than detrimental to industry.

Labor had been organized, was being organized, and there were some bitter fights, but its organization was loose, its outbreaks sporadic and consequently the more controllable. The stimulation of new business ventures and exciting inventions fired the imagination, the aspirations, and the hopes of men. All this was part of the New Haven picture.

THE OYSTER INDUSTRY

There is one activity not yet mentioned that must not be neglected. It does not come under any of the categories already touched on, but it is the oldest, the most continuous, and the one that, through all the centuries, has added a distinctive note to our commercial drama. I refer to the oyster industry.

Long before the white men, Indian tribes from far inland annually came here to partake of its bounty. The first settlers depended on it for sustenance. Until 1800 it was pretty much a free-for-all proposition. Nature provided, man simply garnered; and to Fair Haven and Fair Haven East it brought great activity, monetary reward, and a place in the sun.

By the 1850's the Quinnipiac, in season, was a forest of masts. Its shores swarmed with men, women, and children catching, unloading, opening, and packing oysters in kegs, loading them on wagons to be peddled all over the countryside and as far north as Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont. By the 1860's propagation and cultivation had made it a year-round occupation. While laws, regulations, modern business methods, and modern transportation ruined the picturesqueness of the animated scene around John Rowe's Tavern, they have not destroyed oysters as an important New Haven industry.

There is neither the time nor the need to portray the 1900's. You here are part of the picture. It can be drawn with a few bold, broad strokes.

The pattern of the closing years of the 1890's, highlighted by the prosperity that followed the war with Spain, was the pattern of the opening years of the 1900's to at least the close of World War I. Most of the older firms were still functioning even though business was not very good just prior to 1914. New ones, small perhaps in size but of considerable value in the aggregate, were being added, a trend that has continued to our day. So in the place of a few dominant industries we now have over 400 listed activities, from razor blades and insulated wire to precision instruments and mechanical toys and a newcomer of considerable importance, the garment industry, all of which is in my opinion a change for the better.

Another trend, especially since the end of World War I and perhaps not quite so pleasing to our native pride, has been the gradual absorption of the older firms by outside interests and a lessening of local management in others. I wonder, however, if the extent of this in the over-all picture has not been exaggerated by the fact that it has principally occurred in the larger concerns. With the growth of the oil industry and increased shipments of coal the harbor has reclaimed some of its strategic importance, a matter for sincere congratulations; and the industrial area has stretched beyond the actual city limits, a necessary component of growth and therefore encouraging.

A GROWING INDUSTRIAL AREA

Where the value of manufactured products was only $188,000 in 1811, it rose in the following 70 years to about $30,000,000 in 1888. We were keeping our end up during this long period of industrialization, which for Connecticut did not get well started until about 1830. By the early 1900's it was around $50,000,000 and, eliminating the distortion of the war years 1914–19, it was in 1935 about $80,000,000 and in 1940 around $100,000,000.

I use these estimates with considerable hesitancy, for I am uncertain as to how many industries are included in each period, or whether the same area is covered in each case. In this hasty survey I have always had in mind not the corporate limits of the city but the territory purchased by Eaton and Davenport from the Sachems, Momauguin and Montowese. That is the real commercial New Haven. These estimates can, however, be taken as a rough approximation as to what has been and is taking place in our local commercial community. While they do suggest a certain slowing down, the broader view offered by our metropolitan district should give us a picture of a growing, not a dying, organism.

Putting the Pressure on Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Putting the Pressure on Congress," written by Richard L. Strout and published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 7, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUTTING THE PRESSURE ON CONGRESS—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Ten big organizations listed their financial expenditures for lobbying, under the new Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, as $532,588, in the first quarter of 1947. Besides this top 10, 114 other organizations filed financial statements saying they were trying to influence or exert pressure on Congress, the total expenditures amounting to $928,022.

Many organizations did not file financial statements on the ground that their "principal" activity was not influencing legislation. Among this group were the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

It can be conservatively estimated that at least $5,000,000 is spent annually for direct, first-line influence on Congressmen in Washington. Some 500 organizations are now responsible for 745 listed lobbyists. Many of these lobbyists are working for exactly opposite things.

First-line lobbyists in Washington only begin to tell the story, however. Take the case of the National Home and Property Owners Foundation, fifth among the big 10 spenders in the first quarter. This group spearheads the fight against the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill and in favor of ending rent controls. Organ of this influential body is a monthly, the Property Owner. This periodical carries on effective presentation of its views, and the current number paints Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, as a rather radical fellow, surrounded by "a strong left-wing faction."

The magazine shows the kind of work that an energetic group can undertake. For example, it explains that 14 members of the Ohio congressional delegation, "accompanied by 40 prominent Republicans," were mobilized recently for what was described as "a secret caucus in Mr. TAFT's office." The statement continues:

"When the meeting ended there was little doubt in the Senator's mind that the 'thinking majority' was in open revolt against him. Mr. TAFT may yet mend his ways."

The Property Owner likewise noted that its spokesman had been asked to appear before a closed session of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. "Of the dozens of organizations fighting the Federal housing bill, only the National Foundation has been requested to attend the closed-door session."

There are all sorts of ways of trying to persuade Congress. In its antitrust suit against western railroads, started last week, the Justice Department introduced a letter from R. V. Fletcher, then vice president and now president of the Association of American Railroads, explaining an effective procedure. Incidentally, the well-organized AAR helped get the Bulwinkle bill through the House recently after a brief 40 minutes' debate.

"All of us have long recognized that the only effective way to influence congressional action is to convince the influential men in each congressional district that the public interest and the interest of the railroads coincide," explained Mr. Fletcher.

"I have the impression that most of the Congressmen, particularly those living in the smaller States and in rural districts, depend for their support upon a comparatively few men in each county in their respective districts."

Mr. Fletcher sketched his program for card listing not merely Congressmen but the important men back home who assist them in their campaign—such assistance presumably including campaign contributions. It frequently happens, he said, that a Congressman from a smaller State occupies a "key position in connection with some measure pending in Congress." As worked out, the Fletcher organization was not designed to work directly on a Congressman but at second-hand, upon his important campaign backers.

A program like this does not, of course, present Congressmen in a very favorable light. For our purpose it merely shows how relatively unimportant the $5,000,000 annual expenditures for Washington lobbyists may be. Much bigger sums are probably spent in individual districts with the Washington headquarters merely signaling the plays.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, there are four compelling reasons why I will cast my vote for the pending legislation.

First. The program is in the mind of the world a fact accomplished. Not to pass this bill substantially in its present form would constitute a retreat—a retreat that could be interpreted in no other light than as an abandonment of free people everywhere to whatever fate may befall them. The President by his action and the Senate by its majority support have left us with little choice except to go forward or to abjectly retreat.

Second. It is desirable that we should go forward because the people of America favor this action. I know it has been stated here that the people of America oppose this loan and that no polls of opinion record the public as being favorably inclined. These statements I dispute. As most of you know, I conduct frequent scientific polls to ascertain public opinion in my district on national issues. My district is a fairly typical one as regards economic activity and levels of financial well-being. The registered voters in the district are numerically almost exactly divided between Republican and Democrat. Very recently the district was polled on the simple question "Do you favor the proposed loan to Greece and Turkey?" According to the signed replies 60 percent of the Republicans voted "yes" and 55 percent of the Democrats voted "yes." Even allowing for a margin of error, I submit these figures as convincing evidence that the public favors the passage of this bill.

The third reason I favor the approval of this loan to Greece and Turkey is, because it is a measure of national defense. Everyone now recognizes that science and technology have combined to shrink the world into a unit so small that serious trouble in any part of the world affects all other parts. We likewise know that insecurity anywhere means insecurity everywhere. Does anyone doubt that the seizure of Greece or the Dardanelles would not bring us to the brink of war or actually plunge us into war? I know what many others think, but I sincerely believe that this proposed action pushes back the threat of war and provides necessary time for the reconciliation of differences between the great powers. Therefore, I believe that this loan is in reality an act of national defense and self-preservation.

Fourth, and of greatest significance, the inclusion of the Vandenberg amendment changes the whole complexion of our action. Without the Vandenberg amendment, which in effect gives the United Nations a veto power over the exercise of our policy, the United States could be charged with imperialism, power politics, and even aggression. In this situation such charges should not deter any affirmative vote, but charges of this kind are vaporized by the Vandenberg amendment. This amendment in effect makes the United States simply the instrument of the United Nations to stop the threat of aggression and to maintain the security of nations in the Mediterranean area. It is not too much to hope that by this act we will establish a precedent that will result in the future in international action to stop aggression anywhere in the world at any time. It is not too much to hope that our action now will be the forerunner of a series of similar actions later that will finally establish international security and lasting peace.

Therefore, being firm in my conviction that the loan to Greece and Turkey will serve the best interests of this Nation and of the world I will cast my vote for this measure and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Greek Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, nearly 100 years ago there was one who saw very clearly the unchangeable and unchanging direction of Russian policy and who warned the world against the consequences of its future developments. It is ironic that this prophet has since been virtually canonized in certain countries. On April 12, 1853, he wrote of the danger of Russian aggression in the Near East:

The vital interests should render Great Britain the earnest and unyielding opponent of the Russian projects of annexations and aggrandizement. England cannot afford to allow Russia to become the possessor of the Dardanelles and Bosporus. Both commercially and politically, such an event would be a deep, if not deadly, blow at British power. Let Russia once come into possession of Constantinople * * * in that case the Black Sea would be * * * a Russian lake * * * Trebizond would be a Russian port, the Danube a Russian river. * * * But having come thus far on the way to universal empire, is it probable that this gigantic and swollen power will pause in its career?

Circumstances, if not her own will, forbid it. * * * With Constantinople she stands on the threshold of the Mediterranean. * * * With the Albanian coast * * * she is in the very center of the Adriatic. * * * It would appear that the natural frontier of Russia runs from Danzig or perhaps Stettin, to Trieste. And as sure as conquest follows conquest, and annexation follows annexation, so surely would the conquest of Turkey by Russia be only the prelude for the annexation of Hungary, Prussia, Galicia, and the ultimate realization of the Slavonic Empire.

The arrest of the Russian scheme of annexation is a matter of the highest moment. In this instance the interests of * * * democracy and of England go hand in hand.

Are you curious as to the name of this clear-sighted gentleman who was then the European correspondent for the New York Tribune? Well, many Soviet citizens are told that only those who have accepted the teachings of Karl Marx enjoy the absolute power of judgment. I am inclined to doubt whether this particular warning by Karl Marx, of which he wrote in 1853, is given any extended circulation within the Soviet confines.

The trouble with attempts to appease the demands of expanding and dynamic communism is simply this: The demands are followed by still greater demands and those by greater still and ultimately the time will surely come when aggrandizement shall have to be opposed by force.

But our hope of peace lies much more surely in the other direction in a firm stand now in a "thus far shalt thou go and no farther" attitude. Our hope lies in a continued program to convince the Third International that we do not fear the conflict of the two ideologies when the people may choose for themselves without fear or coercion; let us tell the Soviets that we intend vigorously to maintain from now on out that principle of free choice.

No man can say which way, beyond dispute, lies the sure way of peace, but I do believe that we follow after the things that make for peace when we assert our beliefs in justice, fair dealing, and free will.

As the ancient poet Menander wrote about 2,000 years ago; "We live not as we would, but as we must," and so, although we would live undisturbed by a concern for our relation with the rest of the world if we can, it should be obvious now that we cannot. We live as we must; which is to say that we live within a world community with obligations which we cannot ignore and which we must assume notwithstanding our traditional reluctance.

The onward sweep of events has made impossible for us a policy of inertia upon this madly spinning globe. We go forward into a new and revolutionary way of life. Let us pray God to attend our enterprise, and grant us wisdom to see and to follow the right as He gives us to see the right, to follow after the things that make for peace.

State Department Encourages Foreign Competition With American Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the letters which I am inserting under leave to extend my remarks furnish a typical example of the bureaucratic mind now engaged at Geneva in bartering away our United States products and pay rolls. It is not only ceramic products which the State Department seeks to eliminate from our economy in favor of foreign low-cost producers but also United States agricultural products. Industrial products are on the auction-block at Geneva including, of course, the pay rolls of our laboring men.

The letters follow:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 19, 1946.

Mr. HOMER LAUGHLIN,
American Domestic Pottery Manufacturing Co., East Liverpool, Ohio.

DEAR MR. LAUGHLIN: We are seeking your assistance in the selection of two ceramic engineers to serve as advisers to the chief of the economic and scientific section of the military government and control activities in Japan regarding technical problems of the Japanese ceramic industry.

We do not have full details regarding the duties but we understand that these positions require highly qualified technicians with a broad experience in the various fields of ceramics. The salaries will range up to $7,800 per annum.

All positions in the military government activities are, of course, under the jurisdiction of the War Department. In accordance with a cooperative arrangement, however, the Department of State is responsible for recruiting and recommending personnel for certain specialized positions such as these. The minimum period for an assignment of this nature is 9 months, though it is hoped that an appointee may remain for an indefinite period. Transportation is provided at Government expense, and living costs are exceedingly low since the Army provides living quarters and meals similar to those of officers at a nominal charge of approximately $40 per month. Families cannot accompany civilian appointees at present, but there is a fair prospect that they may be able to follow later on in the summer or fall.

We would greatly appreciate any suggestions which you may be in a position to make regarding personnel who may be qualified for and interested in these positions.

Very truly yours,

T. M. BREWER,
Recruitment Officer, Special Recruitment Section, Division of Departmental Personnel.

NEWELL, W. VA., *April 1, 1946*

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary, the State Department,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Several days ago I received a letter addressed to Mr. Homer Laughlin, American Domestic Pottery Manufacturing Co., East Liverpool, Ohio, and signed by T. M. Brewer, recruitment officer, Special Recruitment Section, Division of Departmental Personnel.

The letter requested that we recommend two experienced and competent ceramic engineers for service in Japan at the expense of the State Department, to teach the Japanese how to improve and increase their production of ceramic products.

This is the most brazen example I have yet encountered of the State Department's consuming desire to spend our people's tax money to take their jobs away. It is particularly galling that the beneficiary of this incredible plan should be the vicious, bloodthirsty Japs, who were responsible for the killing and maiming of so many thousands of our fine young men—many of them from our ceramic industry. Just what answer can there be to our question, "Why does our Government spend our money to make jobs for the members of this despicable race, which will mean that our men, who fought and suffered in defeating them, will be walking the streets jobless?"

Now, please don't insult my intelligence by dragging out the old and absurd bromide that we must buy their competitive merchandise so that our workmen will have employment in making the things they will buy from us in return.

Let us take a single simple example and see how we Americans make out. First of all, as you are well aware, the Department of Commerce, in reporting the balance of trade figures, uses the indefensible and wholly fallacious method of balancing imports at foreign values against exports at American values. So we accept a thousand dollars' worth of china dinnerware (Japanese value) to balance a thousand dollars' worth (American value) of automobiles, business machines, farm machinery, or what have you. In manufacturing the china dinnerware in an American factory, that such an import displaces, there would be paid out in wages to American workmen more than twelve hundred dollars. The wages paid out for producing the balancing export of automobiles or what not would be less than $200. And you ask us, as though it was a patriotic duty,

to assist you in spending the pottery worker's tax money to improve and increase the dishes made in Japan for export to the United States! Fantastic!

You will admit, I am sure, that it is inconceivable Great Britain or any other of the United Nations would give a moment's consideration to a plan so prejudicial to the welfare of a large number of its nationals, as is this. Is our State Department, then, the only one that is right and all the rest of the world wrong?

Another question. On what information, and by what reasoning, did the State Department determine that American ceramists could teach anything to the Japanese potters? Before the war they were making and selling in this country just as fine chinas as any made here and at less than one-half the American cost of production. At that time, according to the Tariff Commission reports, Japan was shipping more than 80 percent of all of the china dinnerware used in the United States. England furnished about 15 percent and, of the balance, only 3 percent was produced in American factories.

If the State Department must spend money on ceramic technicians would it not be the most ordinary kind of common sense to pay them to work with the American potters in an effort to produce china that could compete in price with the imports? But I presume it would be pure isolationism to suggest that the State Department should show some remote interest in job opportunities for the people who supply the funds to carry on its activities.

It is probably too much to expect that this letter might actually reach your hands, Mr. Byrnes; but, if it should, will you please advise Mr. Brewer that his request is respectfully but very definitely refused.

Very truly yours,

THE HOMER LAUGHLIN CHINA CO.,
J. M. WELLS, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

Charles L. Gerlach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening, May 7, the Bristol Courier printed the following editorial upon the life and service of our beloved colleague the late Representative CHARLES L. GERLACH. Inasmuch as this editorial clearly shows the appreciation of his achievements and his great service to the Nation and the community, by those who knew him best, I am including it in the RECORD under permission to extend my remarks:

CHARLES L. GERLACH

The death of Congressman CHARLES L. GERLACH has removed from the Bucks-Lehigh District a man who will be missed both for what he was and what he did.

America was truly the land of opportunity during the times when men could rise, as Congressman GERLACH did, lifting themselves by their own bootstraps out of poverty and obscurity into financial security and responsible public position.

Mr. GERLACH was born poor and died an officer in a well-to-do business which he had helped to found. He grew up with little schooling and died a well-read man, with a broad knowledge of the world and its works. He built, out of the wreckage of three successive defeats, the political strength to wrest the office of Congressman from an entrenched opposition and hold it successfully through five elections in a row.

The day of his death the National Congress paused for an hour to hear eulogies of a man who, had he been content to live the life into which he had been born, would have never been heard of beyond his own neighborhood.

Flags at the National Capitol fluttered to half-staff for a man who refused to be dismayed by early discouragements—who found the open doors of his native land and carved out his own niche in life.

A delegation of fellow Congressmen was officially designated for the funeral of a man who had started out as an obscure apprentice in a steel plant.

The energy, independence, and stick-to-itiveness of Mr. GERLACH was shown equally well in his personal affairs and his political career.

When still a youth, he began as machinist's apprentice in the Bethlehem Steel Co. plant, Bethlehem, and later at the Traylor Engineering Co. in Allentown. So well did he fit himself into this work that he rose to assistant superintendent.

But working for someone else did not satisfy him. From his savings he became a cofounder of a hay, grain, and feed concern which, through the years, gradually expanded into other lines and became a flourishing business. He was serving as treasurer of this concern at the time of his death.

His political career began with his interest in a Republican club in Allentown, where he became an officer. In 1925, in 1931, and again in 1935 he made unsuccessful bids for various Lehigh County offices.

Three such defeats in a row might have taken the steam out of another man, but Mr. GERLACH was not discouraged. He made his bid again in 1938, this time for Congressman.

Those were dark days for his party. Only 2 years before, the New Deal had swept all the Nation except Maine and Vermont. The little New Deal was entrenched at Harrisburg. The congressional seat of the district had been held for 3 terms by a Democrat.

Nevertheless, Mr. GERLACH was victorious. He was part of the Republican shock troopers of that year who, on Pennsylvania soil, turned the tide against the New Deal and since have steadily advanced their party in national power and until with Mr. GERLACH'S last reelection, it regained control of both Houses of Congress.

As a Congressman, Mr. GERLACH'S position was that of independent Republican. He rarely joined in floor debates on the various issues, but was known as extremely active in Washington on behalf of his district and his constituents.

His campaigns were straightforward and businesslike. He indulged in no personalities. Even in the campaign of last year, when he was singled out for especially vicious attacks on the basis of garbled versions of his voting record, he made no attempt at a rejoinder in kind.

He staked his chances for reelection on the proposition that his record itself was sufficient reply. In his words:

"In the 8 years I have been in Congress, I have honestly and sincerely voted, after careful study, for what I believe to be the best interests of the majority of my constituents and of the people of the United States."

Vindication of both his record and his unwillingness to get into a "smear" campaign came when the votes were counted, and he was found to have swept the district by 14,000 votes.

Death of Hon. Charles L. Gerlach, Representative, Eighth District, Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, the death of my colleague, Representative CHARLES L. GERLACH, was a shock to me in spite of the fact that he has been in poor health for the past 2 months.

His district adjoins mine, and naturally we shared some of the problems together. Frequently, our mail crossed back and forth over the district lines. It is natural that frequent consultation on mutual community needs, over the past few years since I have been a Member of Congress, developed a friendly association which will now be terminated suddenly by his death. His departure leaves a void which will be more pronounced because of that past association.

CHARLES GERLACH had a firm and profound belief in the principles which were responsible for the development of this country from a wilderness to its present position of eminence in the world. He was a stanch supporter of those ideals which he believed essential to the continuance of a free America, and he abhorred any compromise which he felt would undermine them.

My deepest sympathy goes forth to those who were near and dear to him, and I sincerely hope that time will ease the shock and the pain of his departure from their midst.

Fascism, as Well as Communism in Any Form, Should Be Stopped—KKK Form of Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Ku Klux Klan during the 1920's represented fascism in its worst form. However any form of fascism is bad. During my 26 years of public service I have always opposed every form of fascism and communism.

When I was a member of the legislature in the State of Texas in 1921, a resolution was introduced in the house of representatives, of which I was a member, providing that the hall of the house of representatives could be used that evening by a prominent minister from Atlanta, Ga., to address an audience. I knew that this prominent minister was a lecturer for the Ku Klux Klan, and would address a KKK meeting right

there in the State capitol if the resolution passed.

When the resolution came up for consideration I opposed its adoption and gave my reasons. I considered the Klan un-American and destructive to our form of government. Fascism was not talked about at that time a great deal, but we can now look back and see that if the Ku Klux Klan had not been restrained, and had progressed to the extent of running the country, it would have been the worst kind of fascism; just as bad as Hitlerism.

The resolution was defeated on a record vote, and this famous lecturer met his audience that night on a vacant square, privately owned, near the capitol, and I was roundly denounced by him and those present for being opposed to the Ku Klux Klan, and for leading the fight to prevent the minister from making an un-American speech in the hall of the house of representatives in the State capitol at Austin.

My desk at the State capitol was broken into and my papers examined, many of them stolen. Fortunately the most incriminating evidence I had against the Klan was stored in another place and later exposed by me on the floor of the house, very much to the embarrassment of Klan defenders.

I did not stop the fight there, but continued to sponsor bills which, if enacted, would have successfully broken up the Klan in that State. By carrying on a vigorous campaign with other people in the State, we succeeded in stopping the progress of the Ku Klux Klan without the enactment of a law. My life was often threatened, if I did not cease and desist my active opposition to this organization which was very strong in our section at one time.

The narrowest escape I have had in politics during my entire career was the next year in 1922 when a Ku Klux candidate opposed me, and used the tactics for which such an organization is noted. In 1922, a large percentage of the office-holders in Texas were elected with the support of the KKK. It was dangerous for any candidate to openly oppose the KKK as they worked in the dark, behind bedsheets and voted solidly together. I have been honored by the people by election to two terms in the Legislature of Texas, two terms as district attorney of the fifth judicial district of Texas, and 10 terms as a Member of Congress from Texas. The solid KKK opposition in 1922 gave me my closest race. In fact, very close.

The remnants of the Klan have continued to oppose me at every election since 1921, when I made the fight against them, up to and including the year 1946, and will always oppose me.

KU KLUX KLAN FORM OF FASCISM

Fascism includes such organizations as the Ku Klux Klan, the Columbians, and all others of that type. There is a strong undercurrent of fascism in our country today. It must not be permitted to grow and progress. We must continue to be on the alert against fascism just as much as we are on the alert against communism or any other destructive force.

I am inserting herewith excerpts from letters, telegrams, and cards I have received concerning House Resolution 83, which provides for the printing as a public document of the book which has been prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, with the little assistance I was able to render in connection with its preparation. These communications come from every section of the Nation. This resolution, I am informed, is expected to be passed on by the Committee on House Administration next Wednesday, May 14. I hope the committee recommends the resolution favorably to the House of Representatives for passage. I am impressed that there is a universal demand for the publication of this document, and it is my hope that it will be printed without further delay. They are as follows:

I urge you to carry on the fight for publication of Fascism in Action.

House Resolution 83 must be passed if America is to continue to function as a democracy. All we fought for is in vain if the people do not know the forms that fascism can take even in this country.

DEAR SIR: I am looking forward to the day when I can read your book called Fascism in Action. I have read Communism in Action, and want to compare both. I hope you get authorization from Congress to print it soon.

Wish you success in your House Resolution 83, to publish Fascism in Action. This country has more to fear internally from native Fascists than Communists.

I want to add my voice to the fight for the publication of Fascism in Action. This manuscript is another bulwark in our defense against antidemocratic tendencies in America.

Just a word of encouragement and support for your action in trying to get Fascism in Action printed. There is certainly a great need for public enlightenment in this field.

As a student of American history, who expects to be teaching it before long, I am much interested in the document called Fascism in Action which you have been instrumental in preparing. I am told that you have encountered difficulties in getting it published. I very much hope that you will succeed in doing so, and if so, I am most anxious to obtain a copy.

I feel that it is very important that this pamphlet be printed at once and made available at a cheap price through the Superintendent of Documents. I know of many people who would be glad to buy copies and who feel that it is as important to understand fascism as communism.

I hope that you are successful, because we need a book of that kind to explain what fascism really is.

I am pleased to know that some people are aware of other subversive and un-American groups than the Communist. The country has lost sight of almost every un-American group other than Communist because our press uses the Communists as their whipping boy and I believe they do so to distract attention from the native Fascist and other isms.

Communism should be exposed and treated as any other subversive ism and so should any anti-American group. I believe we are in more danger from fascism in America today than from communism, it has stronger backing. It appears under patriotic names and associates with the best society. It is more subtle.

I understand there is a companion study to Communism in Action that has been prepared by a committee under your chairmanship—to be entitled "Fascism in Action." Since the teachers under my supervision wish to make a companion study, may I have an idea as to when the second report will be available to the public at large. I found your first study extremely readable and instructive.

Will be happy to receive a copy of Communism in Action, Government publication.

Will also be happy to receive copy of Fascism in Action, Government publication.

I think it imperative that Fascism in Action be published. I have just finished preparing a term research paper on the American press and am now more convinced than ever that at the present time fascism is much more, and undoubtedly so, a menace to this country than communism.

Its been just about 2 years ago that I returned from fighting a war against fascism overseas; must we face it again, this time right at home.

My husband and I are strongly in favor of your resolution, H. R. 83, calling for publication of Fascism in Action. We think it would be a dreadful mistake not to make this information available to the public.

In this country we spend much time, and rightly so, exposing communism and Communists. But let's not forget it was fascism which we fought in the war just ended.

The book on fascism, Fascism in Action, should be published without further delay, and every American really interested in the survival of democracy is behind your House Resolution 83, authorizing publication of this document.

I say that every true American is behind you, but I must qualify that and say that every true American who knows about it is behind you. If the fact of attempted suppression of this study were widely known, public pressure in favor of publication could not be resisted.

In the matter of House Resolution 83 offered by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN to require publication of Fascism in Action, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, the agency which also prepared Communism in Action.

The spread of any "ism" is a threat to democracy and the Congress is to be commended for having ordered 500,000 copies of Communism in Action printed for circulation. However, it is disturbing to learn that now Representative PATMAN must fight to compel the issuance of Fascism in Action.

Early release for publication of this agency's facts on fascism will dispel the belief harbored by some that the Congress is not seriously alarmed over this growing danger.

The publication of this work will be a great contribution to the cause of democracy and peace. The American people are being stampeded into fascism under the guise of anticommunism, and they must be awakened to the fact that what happened in Germany is happening today in America.

These lines are not from one of your constituents, but I want to congratulate you for your truly splendid efforts to expose the imminent danger of a Fascistic trend made responsible by certain groups and individuals.

The writer is a fellow American 73 years young and is as much a foe of communism as he is a foe of fascism, believing in a truly democratic form of government, as was guaranteed to us under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights by the founders of these great documents.

Just as the threat of communism was publicized and the book thereon was made available to the people of this country, so should the threat of fascism, as described in your book, Fascism in Action, be made available and be otherwise publicized.

Perhaps there is little that I can do to help you to prevent the tabling or bottling up of your resolution, House Resolution 83. I want you to know that I shall be happy to do my share, feeling that I am only performing a duty as a fellow American.

It seems ironic that after fighting the most costly and devastating war in history, a war against fascism, a report which would reveal the very fundamentals of fascism is being suppressed. Ironic is not the word. It is a tragedy.

The menace to our democracy stems from fascism and Fascist-like sources, aided and abetted by all other phases of reaction. Unfortunately, too, a large mass of American sentiment, which is basically liberal and democratic, is misled into acceptance of reactionary dogma by the same kind of fears and prejudices which were nurtured by the Nazis.

The public is entitled to know about the methods of fascism. This book should be published without delay.

Congratulations for your sponsorship of the report, Fascism in Action, and for your continuing efforts to have said document published.

The threat of fascism is particularly menacing in that so many Americans fail to recognize fascistic propaganda when they encounter it. It is my belief that documents such as the above will prove helpful in demonstrating to more people the dangers to democracy inherent in the activity of our native Fascists, even as they have been awakened to the dangers of communism.

Greek-Turkish Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of a radio address by Don Pryor and four letters:

Mr. PRYOR. I used to believe that Rome had nothing to learn in the field of corruption and official venality. But I've just arrived here from Greece. By comparison, the atmosphere in this unhappy country is sweet and pure. Here in the original home of fascism a traveler from Greece feels suddenly free, wonderfully free. Just before I arrived, eight people were killed in a vicious massacre. Harmless men, women and children. Thirty-three were injured, another one died last night. A boy of 12. And that is politics in Italy—harsh, vicious, explosive. But in Greece, violence and terror are a national policy. Corruption is the rule. Ordinary honesty is a form of weakness. No place in the world, perhaps, is more depressing for any man who tries to find the truth. This is what some of our people began to learn this week, and this is the greatest obstacle we shall have to overcome if the aid we propose to give to Greece is to be effective.

The State Department is certain of its ground, however. And for better or worse, our program of aid to Greece actually got underway this week. Our Ambassador, Lincoln McVey, returned to Athens fully confident that Congress would pass the Greek aid bill. He set to work immediately to prepare the ground for the American mission which will move into Greece within the next week or two. He brought with him a bright, young economic expert, William Roundtree, who was a member of the Porter mission. He is now working out details of the agreement that is to be signed by the Greek Government as soon as Congress acts.

And, if present plans are carried out, this agreement is going to be a bitter pill for the Greek Government to swallow because we are going to insist on strict controls over the spending of American money. Not only that, but the American mission intends to supervise the entire Greek economy to see to it that the nation's own resources, for the first time, are used for the benefit of all the people. And that will be something new.

This is Don Pryor in Rome, I return you to CBS in New York.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *May 4, 1947.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: All of our lives members of this household have supported the Republican Party; we have opposed communism in America, particularly those hiding under the skirts of the Democratic Party. We are opposed to military loans to either Greece or Turkey. Our frank opinion is that President Truman is willing to blow in $400,000,000 of our cash to erase from next year's campaign the telling blow our party gave to the opposition when it reiterated Pravda's support of the PAC last election. Truman doesn't want to be caught again; but how can our party members swallow the bait?

Reading John Fischer's article in Harper's magazine for August 1946 (Reader's Digest, October 1946), the Scared Men in the Kremlin, Russia has good grounds for fearing aggression. During War I she was attacked by practically all her former allies; 14 times since 1800 has she been invaded; some of her cities have been occupied over 100 times. I would like to know how we can draw up a working agreement with her, when we boldly intend arming a neighboring country, Turkey, on her weakest frontier.

Reading the Standard Oil Co.'s (New Jersey) report for 1946, pages 8–9, convinces me that Middle East oil exploitation by Texaco, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Standard Oil of California, etc., has a great deal to do with sudden State Department et al. interest in Greece and Turkey. While Great Britain has exploited southern Iranian oil to the limit, and we have been bribed to defend her interests by being cut in on the exploitation, Russia is being fought tooth and nail to obtain like concessions in northern Iran. All of this doesn't square with the Atlantic Charter.

All of these loans are, furthermore, inflationary; while our party is trying to fulfill its campaign pledge to reduce taxes this year (Truman wants any surplus to reduce debt this year, and taxes next year by him in an election year), it is piling up further loads on the taxpayers by all these external loans—gifts.

TAFT tells us that the President has committed the country to all of this, and we must back the President in his dickering with Russia. Is this the function of an opposition party, to back the leader, however wrong he may be? Truman had no qualms about freedoms of peoples when he permitted American soldiers to shoot down revolting natives in Indochina.

I am simply against our party backing up those loans.

FRANK MOCK.

ITHACA, N. Y., *May 3, 1947.*

The Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Member of Congress from Wisconsin,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: This is written to convey to you my appreciation, encouragement, and support for the fight that you are making against the pending bill for military intervention in Greece and Turkey. I believe that full three-quarters of the people are opposed to this revolutionary and unnecessary program, which may very well end in bankrupting the United States. I also believe that the bill would confer upon the executive department such tremendous power that it will become impossible for citizens to withstand the mobilized pressures which the administration may bring to bear in behalf of any demand that it may make in the name of this un-American program. In view of the unlimited ramifications, foreign and domestic, of the plan, it may lead to a form of executive dictation that would practically destroy the check-and-balance feature of our Government, and that separation of powers which is so essential to the preservation of the liberty and the internal stability of the country.

With many thanks for the stand you have taken, and with best wishes for the success of your efforts, I am,

Yours sincerely,

CURTIS P. NETTELS,
Professor of American History, Cornell University.

JACKSON, MISS., *May 5, 1947.*

Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: As one who has taught history in college and university and has written a comprehensive history on Turkey, may I suggest the following facts concerning the Turks.

To arm Turkey will be a great danger to the peace of the world and to the best interests of the United States, on account of the past Turkish history and character. This undoubtedly will invite war and perpetuate wrongs Turks have committed and this is exactly what the Turks are aiming at.

The Turks have made a scrap of paper of every treaty they have signed.

England and France helped the Turks before the First World War; but the Turks treacherously waged war against them.

During the Second World War they were under treaty obligations to help the Greeks but left them to the tender mercies of the Axis Powers.

What guaranty do we have that the Turks, armed, fed, and trained by us, will not turn against us?

The Turks' nefarious designs and insidious intrigues are aimed to instigate a war between the United States and Russia and not to protect us against communism.

The proposed "gift" of $150,000,000 to the Turks can be used by us for the purpose, but surely not by the Turks if it is given to them.

In case of war with Russia we can easily occupy the Dardanelles and Asiatic Turkey and paralyze any Turkish move and forestall any Russian advance.

We cannot make the Turks the guardians of our ideals in the Near East. Historically, politically, and economically such a procedure will put the United States alongside of international intriguers and bandits.

Communism is an idea, and we have to fight that idea with a stronger and a better idea. Guns never stopped an idea.

The Turks do not deserve any help whatsoever.

The Turks cannot be trusted. They are playing a diplomatic double game which will eventually benefit only the wily Turk.

The Turks received from us as lend-lease more than $26,000,000 but did not shed a drop of blood for the cause of the United States. And now some deluded persons propose to extend them some more help. What a folly!

Under the cloak of neutrality, they helped materially our enemies and sold us goods at outrageous prices, thereby accumulating a gold reserve of $200,000,000.

The bolstering up of Turkey will never work. Turkey is a cancer on the body-politic of the world. Only amputation—that is, division of Turkey in three distinct parts—will remove the cancer of the world: (1) Make a state of Constantinople, including European Turkey and a generous slice of Asiatic Turkey, governed internationally; (2) free President Woodrow Wilson's Armenia from the yoke of the Turks; (3) make the remainder of Turkey a purely Turkish state, so she cannot play one nation against another as she is now doing.

Arming Turkey will be an open challenge to Russia which eventually will result in a conflict.

Helping the Turks will not help fighting communism for there are no Communists in Turkey. The ignorant Turk does not even know what is communism. This is all a pretense and a sham on the part of the Turks.

It will be a great injustice to the American people to take away their honestly earned money and donate to the dishonest Turks, as it is proposed by Dean Acheson, Acting Secretary of State.

Records show that the Turks robbed and massacred since 1915, Armenians, Greeks, Kurds numbering not less than 4,000,000 victims.

The Turks deliberately ruined the noble and self-sacrificing American missionary work of a century in Asiatic Turkey during the First World War.

Thank God, we're strong enough to protect ourselves and our interests in the Near East, or anywhere in the world without the help of criminal Turks.

With admiration and applause for your courageous crusade against the intrigues and machinations of the Turks, I am,

Yours very respectfully,

JOHN G. MOSKOFFIAN.

HARTFORD, CONN., *May 3, 1947.*

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: As a citizen who is greatly disturbed at his Government's proposal to undertake this Greek-Turkish adventure, I want to express my appreciation for the intelligent and strong fashion in which you have opposed this ill-considered legislation.

Of course, I am not directly one of your constituents, but on a matter of this importance I am assuming it in order to communicate with any Congressman and I am taking the liberty of writing to you.

While the Senate has passed this measure, I—and a great many of my friends—count upon the Members of the House, those who have most recently come from election by the people, to bring a little more light into this controversy. Certainly, the Senate passed the legislation without enthusiasm, and merely as the choice between two terrible evils. I deny that there are only two alternatives, and I see no reason why we cannot give every possible economic assistance to Greece (Turkey doesn't need this), under such supervision, for instance, as the American Friends Service Committee might render, or directly through the United Nations (which, in turn, might act through the AFSC).

But, under no conditions, should there be the chance of a military imbroglio, and I surely hope that you will continue to use your splendid influence to prevent the passage of this bill. The whole thing is absolutely silly, or would be, if it were not so desperately serious at the same time. We are talking of the U. S. S. R. as if it had all the power in the world; yet our own Government knows perfectly well that Russia is most emphatically not able to offer more than token resistance to anything. There are a thousand confirmations of this; in our Hartford Times, on May 1, for example, there is an article by Cecil Dickson, just returned from Russia; Mr. Dickson is very conservative, and is probably not opposed in the least—neither is his paper—to this Greek-Turkish incursion of ours. Yet the facts in this article offer some of the best possible proof of the stupid straw men we have been building up. I am enclosing article herewith.

Thank you again for your leadership.

With deep appreciation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES P. JERVEY.

Portal-to-Portal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, which has already been made public, addressed to the President of the United States, concerning the portal-to-portal pay bill. This letter, with the character of the signers, is of such historical and general public interest that I feel justified in making this request.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 3, 1947.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On May 1 the Congress enacted H. R. 2157 entitled "An Act to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes." The measure is now before you for consideration. We most earnestly urge you to veto it.

The background of H. R. 2157 is, of course, well known. Congressional interest was stimulated a few months ago by the filing of a number of lawsuits involving large claims for portal-to-portal pay. Many of the suits have since been abandoned and others appear to be without merit. But the mere institution of these legal actions aroused fears of economic dislocation. As a consequence there was insistent demand that employers be protected against unanticipated liabilities which had been incurred without negligent disregard of the protective provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the so-called wage-hour law.

If H. R. 2157 related only to this issue, its significance would be narrow. But in truth, the bill deals with much more than portal-to-portal-pay suits and profoundly affects the whole national effort to maintain minimum working standards not only under the Fair Labor Standards Act, but under the Bacon-Davis and Walsh-Healey Acts as well.

The major objections to H. R. 2157 are these:

1. The bill loses sight of the fact that the wage-hour law is intended to protect over 9,000,000 unorganized workers against oppressive working conditions and to guard the great mass of honorable employers against unfair competition of unscrupulous business rivals. To impair the enforceability of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the two other acts mentioned above is to destroy the standards themselves. Enforceability of these acts would be greatly impeded if H. R. 2157 were to become law, and to that extent ethical employers and necessitous employees would be exposed to the pressure of substandard producers.

2. The bill imposes a 2-year statute of limitations upon all claims arising under these acts. This is an unduly short period. The process of inspecting pay rolls and detecting violations is necessarily a lengthy one. Too brief a statute of limitations puts a premium on attempts to violate the law, for even a conscious violator would be immune from the consequences of his wrongful acts if they remain concealed for 2 years. All the leading industrial States have much longer periods of limitation than H. R. 2157 proposes: New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, for example, allow 6 years for the bringing of suits to recover past-due wages. Nothing less than 3 years can be deemed fair or workable.

3. H. R. 2157 makes an employer's duty to pay the wages prescribed by law turn on subjective rather than objective tests. At present an employer is liable, as he should be, to pay wages for time spent by employees in his service, for his benefit, and under his direction. If H. R. 2157 were to become law, he would be relieved of liability if his failure to pay was consistent with his own past practices or if he believed in good faith that he was not liable. To establish liability by these tests would be a task of major dimensions. Moreover, this provision would legalize unfair competitive advantages in interstate commerce which it was the very purpose of the Fair Labor Standards Act to eliminate. Thus, for example, if an employer had never paid for inspection time, although it was the prevailing industry practice to do so, he would by this bill be excused from paying in the future, as well as excused from liability for past delinquencies in this respect. But employers who had always scrupulously observed the requirements of law would be under a duty to continue their proper course of conduct. Hence those who had in the past been least attentive to the statutory command would be rewarded instead of penalized, for they would be given a future competitive advantage over more conscientious employers.

4. The new definitions plus the new and untried language with respect to compensable activities, such as "postliminary" and "good faith," makes future enforcement speculative. Certainly years of litigation will be required in order to bring about a working understanding of the language of the amendment and to give any degree of certainty either to enforcement or compliance.

Time has by no means fully eliminated the evils which called forth the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. Too low pay and too long hours can now, as then, blight the lives of the workers immediately involved, the fortunes of ethical employers who must face unscrupulous competition, and, ultimately, the national economy. The present law safeguards what were deemed in 1938 to be minimum standards of decency. Assuredly those safeguards cannot be lowered in 1947 without destroying a statute which for nearly 10 years has proved its worth.

We oppose H. R. 2157 because, whatever may be its professed purposes, we believe it will have this destructive effect. Accordingly, we join in requesting you, most respectfully, to withhold your approval of the bill.

Very sincerely yours,

Mary Anderson, Washington, D. C., former chief, Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor; Mrs. John B. Andrews, New York, N. Y.; Sarah Gibson Blanding, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., president, Vassar College; Charles Bolte, New York, N. Y., president, American Veterans' Committee; Elizabeth Brandeis, Madison, Wis., professor of economics, University of Wisconsin; Emily Brown, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., professor of economics, Vassar College; Charlotte Carr, New York, N. Y., social worker; Mrs. Allan K. Chalmers, New York, N. Y.; Edwin L. Clark, Winter Park, Fla., Rollins College; Morris Llewellyn Cooke, Philadelphia, Pa., consultive engineer; Grace L. Coyle, Cleveland, Ohio, professor of group work, School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University; Hartley W. Cross, New London, Conn., professor of economics, Connecticut College; Merle Curti, Madison, Wis., University of Wisconsin; Mary W. Dewson, Castine, Maine, former member, Federal Social Security Bank; Mrs. Dorothy Douglas, Northampton, Mass., professor of economics, Smith College; Paul H. Douglas, Chicago, Ill., professor of economics, University of Chicago; Clark Foreman, Washington, D. C., president, Southern Conference for Human Welfare; John A. Fitch, New York, N. Y., economist; Walter Gellhorn, New York, N. Y., professor of law, Columbia University Law School; Mildred Gutwillig, New York, N. Y., New York Consumers Council; Most Rev. Francis J. Haas, Grand Rapids, Mich., bishop of Grand Rapids; William Haber, Ann Arbor, Mich., professor of economics, University of Michigan; Helen Hall, New York, N. Y., head worker, Henry Street Settlement; Alice Hamilton, M. D., Hadlyme, Conn., president, National Consumers League; Marvin C. Harrison, Cleveland, Ohio, attorney and president, Consumers League of Ohio; Marion Hathway, Pittsburgh, Pa., professor of public welfare, University of Pittsburgh; Leon Henderson, Washington, D. C., economist; John Hope 2d, Nashville, Tenn., specialist on industrial relations, Social Science Institute, Fisk University; Rev. Thomas B. Keehn, Washington, D. C., legislative secretary, Council for Social Action, Congregational Churches of U. S. A.; William M. Leiserson, Washington, D. C., director, Labor Organization Study, Johns Hopkins University; Mrs. Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich., chairman, board of directors, National Consumers League; Elizabeth S. Magee, Cleveland, Ohio, general secretary, National Consumers League; Rev. Benjamin L. Masse, S. J., New York, N. Y., associate editor, America; Clyde Murray, New York, N. Y., president, National Federation of Settlements; Rev. James Myers, New York, N. Y.; James G. Patton, Denver, Colo., president, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America; Morris S. Rosenthal, New York, N. Y., executive vice president, Stein Hall & Co.; Rev. Lee Sheppard, Raleigh, N. C., pastor, Pullen Baptist Church; Russell Smith, Washington, D. C., legislative secretary, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America; Rev. William B. Spofford, Jr., New York, N. Y., executive secretary, Church League for Industrial Democracy; Mrs. M. E. Tilly, Atlanta, Ga., Women's Society for Christian Service, Methodist Church; Ralph B. Tower, Morgantown, W. Va., professor of economics and business administration; Mary Van Kleeck, New York, N. Y., division of industrial studies, Russell Sage Foundation; Colston Warne, Amherst, Mass., professor of economics, Amherst College; Edwin Witte, Madison, Wis., professor of economics, University of Wisconsin; Mayor Hubert Humphrey, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mrs. Joseph Welt, president, National Council of Jewish Women; Mrs. J. Birdsall Calkins, Arlington, Va.; Mr. Arthur Bester, University of Wisconsin.

Displaced Persons of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial entitled "People Without Countries," which appeared in the New York Times on May 2, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE WITHOUT COUNTRIES

In the displaced-persons camps of Germany and Austria, in the deceptively serene hillside villages of the American zone and the shelled barracks that once housed the SS, and in the Allied Commission Camps of Italy, live the new race of DP's, as the euphemism goes, people who once had a country. Numerically, as a human group, they are small—some 834,000 former nationals of Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Polish Ukraine, Czechoslovakia. Psychologically, they represent the greatest living challange to the purposes for which the UN was created—"to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person."

Their one immediate hope for decent living rests on the establishment of an International Refugee Organization. In less than 2 months UNRRA, which has administered the camps and provided some sort of organized activities and schooling for the children, closes down. Yet no organization is equipped to continue UNRRA's humanitarian work. The IRO, whose Preparatory Commission met in Lausanne yesterday, will probably become a reality with the accession of China and the expected accession of Australia. These adhesions, when ratified, would provide the required 15-nation membership and the required 75 percent of the proposed operating budget of $151,060,500. But 11 countries, including the United States, have joined, subject to ratification. There will, therefore, be some delay before IRO can become a going concern.

Even so IRO provides nothing concrete for the DP's resettlement. Nor can it do so unless immigrant-receiving countries are willing to open their doors. As a world power the spotlight falls most unpleasantly on the United States.

Immigration to this country, regulated by quotas, is limited to 153,929 aliens each year. Britain still is assigned 65,000 of these numbers (which she never uses up) and Germany-Austria 26,000. The remainder are sprinkled among threescore countries—Poland, for instance, 6,524; Estonia, 116; Lithuania, 386; Latvia, 236. Quotas are not cumulative and expire at the end of each year. Except for 1939, the number of unused quotas each year since 1931 has exceed 100,000; in the years 1945–46 less than 20 percent of quotas were used. The President has asked Congress to show leadership "in the form of new legislation" to admit displaced persons, saying, "I do not think that the United States has done its part."

At least three bills buried in congressional committees—the Stratton bill to admit 400,000 DP's over a 4-year period, the Ives and Javits bills to admit DP war orphans of 14 years and younger—deserve a better fate. There is a way for America to induce other countries to take new settlers—by showing an example and opening her doors to a fair share.

Lucas Offers a Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking editorial entitled "Lucas Offers a Tax Plan," from the Chicago Sun of Sunday, May 4, last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LUCAS OFFERS A TAX PLAN

Senator LUCAS has introduced a tax bill which he urges the Senate to adopt as a substitute for that passed by the House. With President Truman, the Senator says he is against cutting taxes now. But if the Republican leaders twist his arm, he offers a more equitable method of proceeding with the tax cut.

First of all, Senator LUCAS would make the cut effective next January 1 instead of July 1 or last January 1. This, in itself, would be a major improvement. Postponing the cut would cushion the loss of revenue to be sustained by the 1947–48 budget, which Congress has not yet succeeded in trimming significantly. It would permit high 1947 incomes to be taxed, as they should be, and yet would come into effect at about the time mass purchasing power will most need a boost.

The ideal way to handle this problem would be with an optional date, permitting the Treasury to put the cut into effect whenever it would produce the greatest beneficial effect on the national economy. But a Republican Congress is not going to hand President Truman such a politically pleasant perquisite as that. Indeed, it will be reluctant to take advice from any Democrat, lest the precious boon of lower taxes shed its Republican auspices. Nevertheless, the Lucas plan has high merit for its greater fairness

to individual taxpayers and greater contribution to economic welfare.

Instead of a modified flat-rate cut for everybody, as proposed by the House, Senator LUCAS would increase personal exemptions from $500 to $600 a person, and reduce surtax rates by two points in each bracket. As he says, this would cut taxes, roughly, in the same way they were raised, whereas the House plan would benefit most the most well-heeled. In addition, LUCAS would eliminate a long-standing inequity by permitting a husband and wife to split their income for tax purposes.

The net effect of his plan is to give the greatest proportionate tax relief to those in the lowest income brackets. While reducing revenue by about the same amount as the House bill, it would eliminate nearly 5,000,000 persons in the lower brackets from the tax rolls. Those are the people who do most of the buying in the consumer markets.

Senator LUCAS' proposal that husband and wife be allowed to divide their income for tax purposes is an outgrowth of a situation arising from community property laws now existing in nine Western States. It was an old Spanish custom to regard a husband's property as 50 percent owned by his wife. States which have adopted this system treat income in the same way. Consequently a man earning $50,000 in California pays Federal taxes as if he earned $25,000 and his wife earned the same amount. At present this would mean a tax of $18,164. In Illinois the same man, same income, same wife pays a tax of $24,795.

The direct and fair way to deal with this obvious inequity is to compel families living in community-property States to pay the same Federal taxes as those living elsewhere. There is a legal fiction involved in pretending that part of a man's income is his wife's when it is not. But the fact is that the community-property States do so pretend, and the fact is that Congress for years has declined to abolish the pretense. As an alternative to permitting nine States to become a tax haven, it would be distinctly preferable that all families in all States be placed on the same footing.

No doubt the Republican leaders of Congress will look down their suspicious noses at the Lucas plan, since it has the implied sanction of the Treasury. But if they insist on cutting taxes they can do so far more fairly with his plan than with the House bill.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway," published in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Final agreement on the St. Lawrence seaway project seems to be closer than it has ever been before. Supporters of the project have evolved a new plan calling for self-liquidation that should remove one of the most formidable objections previously raised. Canada is said to have agreed to this principle and a bill to put it into effect so far as the United States is concerned now has bipartisan support. With such stalwarts as Senator VANDENBERG, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator BARKLEY, minority leader, behind it, and with the added approval of the State Department, the legislative authorization of this great project should at last begin to move forward.

Development of the proposed 27-foot navigation channel connecting the Atlantic Ocean with all the Great Lakes, with accompanying facilities for the generation of electricity up to 2,200,000 horsepower, has been delayed for many years. Much of this delay, however, has been unavoidable. Certainly it would have been unwise to divert large resources of manpower and materials into such a long-range undertaking during the war years. Even now it would be premature to start the actual construction because of numerous shortages resulting from the war. But it is not too soon to pass the necessary legislation and complete the agreement with Canada so that the project may be undertaken within the years ahead. In the case of an undertaking of this sort careful planning and the achievement of a meeting of minds conducive to its success are more important than speed. We have little doubt that the end result will be more satisfactory because the plans have been so extensively discussed and revised over a period of years.

How a Lobby Tricks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "How a Lobby Tricks," written by Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the Washington Daily News of May 3, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW A LOBBY TRICKS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Why are the railroads so successful in getting what they want from Congress?

There is considerable illumination on this subject in exhibits submitted by the Justice Department in the antitrust case started a few days ago in the Federal district court at Lincoln, Nebr., against 47 western railroads, the Association of American Railroads and others.

They show the clever technique by which was developed the powerful lobby that has operated here. Its current objective is passage of the Bulwinkle-Reed bill to exempt railroads from the antitrust laws and thus reinforce the monopoly which already is so costly to consumers.

The efficacy of this lobby was demonstrated in the last Congress by the ease with which the Bulwinkle bill was rushed through the House after only 40 minutes debate. It was checked in the Senate only by threat of a filibuster by foes of the measure. Early this session again it was pushed through the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee by its sponsor there, Senator CLYDE REED, Republican of Kansas, and now is awaiting Senate action. It must also go through the House again.

The railroad lobby technique, developed by officials of the Association of American Railroads in the middle thirties, is explained in a letter from R. V. Fletcher, then AAR vice president, now its president, to E. E. McInnis, general counsel of the Atchison, Topeke & Sante Fe Railway dated September 27, 1934. Here are excerpts:

"All of us have long recognized that the only effective way to influence congressional action is to convince the influential men in each congressional district that the public interest and the interest of the railroads coincide.

"I have the impression that most of the Congressmen, particularly those living in the smaller States and in rural districts, depend for their support upon a comparatively few men in each county in their respective districts. If we could reach the men upon whom a Congressman depends for advice and assistance in his political campaign, we could go far toward having the problem solved.

"I have visualized a type of organization with which we could assemble here in Washington information as to who are the influential men in each congressional district. I am, of course, aware of the dimensions of such a task and we can only approximate complete success. * * *

"We could then be in a position to suggest to railroad officers, local attorneys, railroad security owners, and others with whom they might discuss these matters, so that our influence would be felt. It frequently happens that a particular Congressman occupies a key position in connection with some measure pending in Congress.

"If at that time we could call upon a hundred of his influential constituents in his congressional district and persuade those persons to write or wire him their really sincere convictions on the question, I think the influence would be almost immediately felt."

None of this, of course, is flattering to the Congressman who is represented as rather a dupe. But important men back home who assist him in his campaign, which presumably includes campaign contributions, unquestionably do have influence with him.

This organization was worked out, as proposed, with dossiers on Members of Congress and names of those who were regarded influential with him. It is such a commentary on our supposed democratic process that its development and how it was used to check legislation the railroads didn't want will be disclosed subsequently from correspondence of those who perpetrated it.

Odyssey of a Jewish Partisan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Josef Sigelbaum, from Plain Talk for May 1947:

ODYSSEY OF A JEWISH PARTISAN

(By Josef Sigelbaum)

On June 4, 1943, the New York Times carried a long dispatch from London announcing the suicide there of Szamul Zygielbojm, Jewish labor leader and member of the Polish National Council. It was a story which went around the world, even at the height of the war, because the suicide had left a moving letter which showed his act to be a last resort to shake world apathy in the face of

the unprecedented mass slaughters of Jews. In it he charged that "the responsibility for the crime of murdering all the Jewish population in Poland falls in the first instance on the perpetrators, but indirectly also it weighs on the whole of humanity, the peoples and governments of the Allied States, which so far have made no effort toward concrete action for the purpose of curtailing this crime."

(Mr. Zygielbojm died in the belief that his whole family had been wiped out. He did not know that his son, the author of this exciting outline, had survived, and had joined first the Red partisans and then the Red Army to fight against the Nazis. Josef Sigelbaum (anglicized spelling) attained the rank of captain, was wounded twice and was repeatedly decorated for bravery in action, having been awarded the Order of the Red Star, the Medal of Moscow, the Medal of a Partisan of the War for the Fatherland, first class. In spite of a promising career in the Soviet service he found life unbearable under the Communist dictatorship and made his way to Poland, thence to Germany where he landed in a concentration camp. He finally reached a DP camp in the American zone. He arrived in the United States last December, and published a series of articles on his experiences as a Red guerrilla in the Jewish Daily Forward. He is now writing the story of his 7 years' Odyssey under the title of "The Bleeding Earth," some highlights of which are presented below.)

I close my eyes and I can see the entire terrible nightmare which was my life during the last 7 years—and I can hardly believe that all of it is already part of the past; that I go on, living; and that I am in a free country, that the people around me are free people, that I can truly tell—tell without fear, without danger to my life—all that has happened to me during these blood-drenched 7 years.

I was in Russia for almost 6 years. In September 1939, when Hitler struck, I was one of the horde of 600,000 Jewish refugees who fled from Poland eastward, in the direction of the Soviet Union, in the hope that there all our sufferings would end. When I first heard that the Russians had crossed the Polish border I naturally assumed that they were coming to help the Polish Army in the fight against Nazi Germany. What a shock it was to learn that both the Fascists and Communists entered Poland as aggressors.

I reached Brest Litovsk, normally a small city, where 250,000 human beings were encamped. Soldiers and refugees were all over, wherever there was a bit of space to stretch or a corner to huddle in. Here I met two of my closest comrades in the Socialist movement, who had been schoolmates of mine and were still under the impression of an astonishing scene they had witnessed.

On September 19, 1939, the day when the Germans had handed over the city to the Red Army, there was an impressive military parade. A reviewing stand had been erected in the main street of Brest Litovsk and was decorated with red banners and swastikas. High Nazi officers stood side by side with high Soviet officers while first the German and then the Red formations passed in review. A military band played the Horst Wessel song first, then the International. Photographs of the ceremony appeared in the German press.

The populace, particularly the Jewish onlookers, were dumbfounded by the spectacle. A few days later large-scale arrests of both inhabitants and refugees began. The NKVD struck first at those known to be Socialists. It was here, while I was still in town, that the Jewish leader, Henryk Ehrlich, whose wanton execution together with Victor Alter aroused world-wide protest, was arrested. Here I saw many of my comrades for the last time.

I moved eastward and arrived at Gomel with a large transport of Polish refugees. The Soviet administration received us in a very friendly manner.

I found employment at a peat works, about 12 miles from Gomel, as a lathe operator. I did piece work aiming at the best quality, but soon found that it took me longer and my earnings were correspondingly less. I recall how the foreman of my group told me smilingly, "We work here differently than in capitalist Poland."

The following morning I went to watch one of the Soviet lathe operators. I stood in front of his bench for almost 2 hours—and I could not help staring at him in utter amazement. He turned out triple the amount of work I was doing. I checked the bearings which the operator was producing with lightning speed. About 70 percent of them were faulty—they simply fell through the holes in the wheels. When I showed it to the operator he merely took a sharp hand tool, made a few notches on the outside of the brass bearing, and forced it into the wheel. "Ready," he said, and laughed heartily.

"But in three more days the wheel will have to be repaired again," I said with astonishment.

"That is none of my business," he said with a smile, "in the meantime we'll make money * * *."

Once, long before the war, I had read in a newspaper that Soviet locomotives had to be completely overhauled every month. I could understand the reason for it now.

I finally quit my job and went back from White Russia to the occupied Polish regions. I was arrested in Lida in the course of the mass round-ups of refugees. My wife and I spent 3 months in the prison. We were freed, but our new passports contained the stipulation that we were forbidden to live in larger cities and within 60 miles of the border. Eventually I came to Baranovichi, where after many difficulties I was granted permission to live and work.

All this took place during the first half of 1941. Then came Hitler's sudden attack on Russia, followed by terrible months in the ghetto of Baranovichi, where we felt the full force of German brutality.

* * * * *

Joining the underground resistance movement, I smuggled arms into the ghetto. We learned to use them in cellars and in specially constructed subterranean passages. Floggings, hangings, and shooting of Jews for the smallest offense were a daily occurrence.

My wife and child were betrayed, and slain by the Nazis. Already as a full-fledged guerrilla, I later caught up with the traitor to avenge their death.

This period of my life was spent with a band of partisans fighting the Nazis in the Pripet marshes of Polesye.

From there I was sent with another man across the front lines to establish contact with the Red Army. We were looking forward with joy to our reception. Instead, when we arrived on the Soviet side, we were seized as spies, and narrowly escaped being shot.

I was then sent to a military school at Moscow, where I was trained for sabotage and reconnaissance work. We were dispatched for a brief but difficult assignment amidst the snowfields of Murmansk, Kandalaksha, and Petsamo. Then, for several months, we took part in the defense of Moscow.

* * * * *

In October 1942 I was one of 10 Red Army officers parachuted by a Soviet airplane behind the German lines in Yugoslavia. All of us were graduates of the sabotage academy of the secret section of the NKVD. Our mission was to instruct the raw troops of the partisan chief, Josip Broz, better known to the world as Tito.

We were expected. Seven fires on the ground marked the spot. I jumped into the strangest, most intensive adventure of my war experience. A crowd of rough-hewn partisans greeted us enthusiastically. Among them I recognized Tito—I recognized him as one of the Yugoslavs who had attended our school in Moscow.

The same night a group of 10 British officers were dropped at the same spot. All of us, Russians and Britons, were attached to the personal staff of Tito; I was one of those who shared a dugout with him during the first few weeks.

Thereafter we were deployed among different partisan divisions. Mine was stationed in the hills between Split and Sarajevo; a British officer, John Scott, was also attached to my division. My special assignment was to train the partisans in reconnaissance and sabotage activities; Scott taught them mass attack and strategy.

For nearly 8 months I shared the life of a Red partisan. One of my first undertakings, at the head of a fine lot of courageous fighters who seemed contemptuous of death, was to ascertain the German positions on the Sarajevo-Zagreb railway. It was during this episode that we ran into a large group of Chetniks, at the grave of the legendary national hero Milosh, in the Jancharn hills. They greeted us with the cry, "Long live free Yugoslavia." Among them was a stocky man with a thick, gray-streaked beard, wearing horn-rimmed glasses. Later I learned that it was the fabled General Mihailovich. Such bloodless meetings of partisans and Chetniks became rarer with every passing month.

Early in 1943 the Germans surrounded our territory. Tito was cornered and wounded in the hand in the course of the fighting. We understood later that he was rescued by a daring Soviet air mission which made a miraculous landing under the most difficult conditions.

I was in the thick of the great partisan offensive in the spring of 1943. My group captured a small town on the river Vrbas. In the abandoned German staff headquarters I picked up a copy of the Berlin paper, Voelkischer Beobachter. Casually I glanced through its pages. Suddenly my own family name caught my eye in a headline.

It was a cynically written report of the suicide of my father in London.

When my unit returned to Moscow, I was assigned once more to guerrilla warfare behind the German lines. I spent the last 2 years of the conflict operating as a partisan in the vicinity of Pinsk, Baranovichi, and Brest Litovsk, and rose to the rank of captain in the Red Army. During reconnaissance raids we often crossed the Bug River and met Polish partisan bands. We also encountered and sometimes joined forces with Jewish partisans from Slonim and Volkovysk, fraternizing with Jewish heroes who had distinguished themselves in battle against SS and Gestapo troops.

I visited scores of cities and towns and villages where the mass of Russia's Jews had once lived. It was impossible not to realize that although officially anti-Semitism is forbidden in Russia, nevertheless one feels it in daily life, in the factory, in the office, and most of all, in prison.

Conversations with Russian Jews on the subject would almost invariably strike the note of praise for the Communist regime, although the speaker might have been suffering acutely. The reason for it became clear. It is generally believed that a third of the adult urban population serves the NKVD. Brother fears brother, a father fears his son. Each high official, each officer, has his aides in the NKVD, and these in turn are watched by other informers and operatives.

The powerful machine of the NKVD sees to it that no vital news from abroad penetrates the cage which is Russia. The youth of the country does not know any other life and has no conception of how workers, for instance, live in America.

I once saw a picture in a Soviet newspaper designed as propaganda against the United States. The picture showed a group of tramps. The legend underneath it read: "This is how American workers live."

I left for good the Soviet "land of promise" where a great career beckoned, to return to my native Poland. Here I met comrades who had fought in the ghettos, and lived to tell their tales of horror.

Columns of refugees streaming back from Russia to Poland looked like people from another world. Their experiences still form one of the great untold chapters of our times. These were survivors of the hordes which had been deported to do forced labor. They had died by the thousands at their tasks, in their bunks at night, of typhus and malaria. They had died on the roads, and no one cared.

Of the 600,000 Polish Jews who had escaped to Soviet Russia during the war, only 200,000 had come back by the end of 1946, according to the official figures published in Warsaw. The remaining 400,000 perished, not in gas chambers and crematoria, but in the forests of Siberia and the wastelands of central Asia. They died building "socialism" on the Soviet pattern, creating "the happy life" according to Stalin.

Appropriation Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Cumberland News, Cumberland, Md., May 6, 1947:

EVERY APPROPRIATION CUT BRINGS BUREAU PROTESTS

Expanding on our editorial of yesterday dealing with how bureaus and agencies of the Government are squealing like stuck pigs because a Republican Congress is determined to reduce the cost of Government through Budget slashes, it has come to our notice that free-spending bureaucrats are raising a hue and cry because a House committee has killed an appropriation of $31,381,220 to maintain and expand the State Department's new program of "cultural diplomacy."

Secretary of State Marshall is endeavoring to have this appropriation restored to the Budget and to that end held a conference of Congressmen and diplomats last night at his office, with a proposal that the "Voice of America" undertaking be removed from his Department and placed in the hands of a committee, comprised of civilians and representatives of broadcasting companies.

This appropriation, like every other item in the budget, has its friends who call it indispensable. But is it worth $31,381,220 to the taxpayers? We doubt it. This operation is one of the war babies that survived demobilization. It has continued without authority of Congress, by virtue of a Presidential decree, which is not a practice to be encouraged in peacetime. It includes, among other things the so-called Voice of America, which has 36 radio outlets overseas.

Contention that this Voice, the cost of which represents about half the total appropriation, is on the air in various languages for some 400 hours a week, means little when we don't know how many listeners the program reaches. Even good propaganda is valueless if no one hears it. And we aren't satisfied that ours is good propaganda.

The Voice, on February 17, began hour-a-day broadcasts to the Soviet Union. Reception in Moscow was not good at first. Later, it was reported as moderately good to unsatisfactory. For one period, the program got off the beam and was heard in Latin America, where the Russian-language production must have caused some mystification.

It has been established that the Voice is heard in our Moscow Embassy, and in the Kremlin itself, for it has provoked criticism there. But surveys by American reporters in Moscow disclosed little evidence that it had any general audience among the Russian people.

Reliable statistics as to potential listeners on all of the program's outlets should be demanded by Congress before seriously considering a revival of the Voice.

The State Department was at the point of adding Greek and Turkish broadcasts when the appropriation was eliminated. Were surveys made to determine whether there were enough receiving sets in those countries to warrant the effort? There are no iron curtains in those areas, so such check-ups would have seemed practical, and certainly they were essential.

A study of the broadcasts themselves would be in order once the potential audience for the 36-language Voice is determined. But let us hold up on the money until both studies can be made, because, to reiterate: $31,381,220 is a lot of money to spend if it isn't getting results.

Hospitals, Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, of all the legislation enacted throughout these many years in behalf of the veteran, that which means most to him is the authority given the Veterans' Administration to construct, maintain, and operate hospitals wherein he may secure relief from his ailment and disability. America's first duty is to the veterans beset with disease or disability.

Ample authority for expansion of the hospital program was carried in the GI bill enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress. Unlimited appropriations were authorized to put the program into effect. But construction is lagging and lagging badly. The situation is deplorable. No effort and no appropriations should be spared. I hope that everyone charged with responsibility and authority in this program will spare no time nor effort in speeding constructions and that the Congress will make unlimited appropriations available.

As a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an editorial taken from the Disabled American Veterans' Semi-Monthly of April 29, 1947. Every Member of Congress should read it and then make an earnest effort to do something about it. The editorial follows:

HOSPITALS, NOW

What has halted the construction of the veterans' hospitals which have been authorized by Congress?

Who is responsible for this sorry and contemptible piece of negligence on the part of our Government?

Wounded and disabled veterans of World War II, 10 times in numbers of our comrades of World War I, are awaiting and in need of adequate hospitalization and treatment—the kind of hospitalization, treatment, and modern methods of healing and rehabilitation envisioned by General Hawley and not only promised but approved by unanimous congressional action. Yes; we have said it before, and we say it again: This failure to meet the medical needs of the men and women who have actually saved this country from destruction has reached the proportions of a national scandal.

We learn that some Congressmen propose to postpone construction of all veterans' hospitals in the name of economy. What kind of economy is it that will disregard the responsibility of relieving the pain and misery or lengthening the lives of these American youths who gave so much in America's wars against oppression?

Why is it possible for private enterprise to construct a great 20-story modern hotel in a great city, a hotel which was started and will be completed within 12 months, while in the same community not a spade full of dirt has been turned over toward the construction of a much-needed 750-bed veterans' hospital authorized months ago? Why the construction of great, new race tracks, new night clubs, new everything, everywhere, but no new hospitals with needed beds for the men who brought back from the jungles of Africa and the fever-ridden swamps of the South Pacific tropical diseases which need immediate treatment now, unless the victims, American war heroes, are to become chronic invalids beyond the help of modern medical science and a charge on their people and their country the rest of their lives?

Sure, some think the temporary shacks or frame barracks thrown together during the war emergency are good enough for the hundreds of kids now dying of the dreadful tuberculosis picked up during the stress and strain and the exposure of war. Well, we of the DAV don't think they are good or safe enough, and as we write this editorial on behalf of our comrades we of the DAV welcome the opportunity to tell Congressmen and Senators of every State in the Union and from both great political parties that the people of America, the real people of whom these boys are a part, don't think these temporary and makeshift buildings are satisfactory, either.

Let us forget the humanitarian phases of this disgraceful situation. Let us forget America's promise to these kids who have returned from northern Africa, Salerno, Normandy, the Philippines, Guadalcanal, or Iwo Jima, and who are dying in these temporary barrack hospitals. Let's get just as cold-blooded as the gentlemen who want to interrupt the further construction of veterans' hospitals in the name of economy. What kind of economy is this? Will it save this country one dime to deny proper hospitalization and treatment to America's battle casualties now? Is there any real economy in refusing hospitalization and treatment which might not only improve the condition of the war casualties but possibly cure them? What kind of economy is it to deny proper neuropsychiatric treatment to battle casualties who came out of combat with their minds gone? Hospitalization and treatment now may fully restore thousands to normal healthy lives. The lack of it will only insure the permanency of the condition, and as a result the veteran who is refused treatment because no hospital bed is available will draw full compensation for the rest of his sorry miserable life. Yes; this war hero will live, a sad care on his loved ones and a charge against his Government because that same Government, the richest and most pow-

erful in the world, could not afford to try to get him well.

Daily, we of the DAV read of the miseries and woes of Europe's displaced persons. We listen or read of the charge that we, as Americans, are responsible for their welfare and rehabilitation. Indeed, we are at times urged to tears by some who feel that our former enemies should be wholly forgiven and that we as Americans must accept the task of feeding, clothing, and fully restoring them to their former place in world affairs. Perhaps a great majority of our comrades of the DAV carry no hate in their hearts for any people. We feel safe in saying that these men and women, Americans all, who have already proven their charity and generosity in peace to be as great as their bravery and zeal in war—these DAV's—will be the first to subscribe to a program of restoration to friend and foe alike. But we are not fools. We are awake enough to know the needs of these, our comrades, who have suffered most because we have sacrificed with them. Indeed, we would be cowards all, if we failed to demand that this country do first things first, and in this instance we mean for our sick and broken and failing comrades the finest hospitals and the best medical care and treatment that the richest and most powerful country in the world, their country, can afford. Remember always for whom we speak and then ask, "Is it too much?"

A Consistent Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, this House is now engaged in one of the most critical debates in its long history. The ultimate decision on the Greco-Turkish loan will affect the future course of this Nation and the lives of every American citizen for generations to come. On this decision hinges our relations with individual foreign governments and our participation in the United Nations.

Whatever the outcome, it must be clear. We cannot say one thing and do another. Our actions must not becloud the issue. We cannot merge our destiny with the world's destiny and, at the same time, withdraw from the world. Our policy as a nation must bear the stamp of certainty, not of contradiction.

At this hour of decision it is ridiculous to talk about buying security for $400,000,000 while, at the same time, deliberately cutting ourselves off from all communication with the countries behind the "iron curtain" by abandoning the State Department's overseas cultural and informational program. The OIC is the only way of projecting American thought into these countries.

The new relationships which any decision of the House will establish between our Government and the Governments of Greece and Turkey demand that OIC be continued. The Greeks and Turks must know what our foreign policies are, how they were determined, and what they mean to people other than American citizens. We cannot help them nor can they help us unless they know the nature of this cooperation and the reasons for undertaking it. It is impossible to acomplish this vital task without the Department's factual information program. The Greek and Turkish peoples—all the peoples of the world—know us by our deeds. If we maintain our OIC libraries and institutes, if we go on giving them the full news of our Government, if we continue to show America to them through OIC's documentary motion pictures, if we continue to present America over the Voice of the United States of America, if we continue to support the interchange of students, technicians, and others—then, this will be concrete evidence to all peoples that we intend to honestly and courageously participate in world affairs. If we jettison the essential functions of OIC, there can be only one conclusion drawn by the peoples of foreign countries—that we are withdrawing from our world contacts; that our country has erected a new intellectual wall of China, bounded by New York Harbor and San Francisco Bay.

Our foreign policy calls for consistency from this Congress. If we are to participate in world affairs, we must do so wholeheartedly. OIC must be continued if we are to effectively implement our foreign policy as exemplified in the Greek-Turkish loan.

EFFECT OF ELIMINATING INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The immediate effect of the action recommended by the House Appropriations Subcommittee, if approved by the Congress, would be:

First. To silence the Voice of America now broadcast by short-wave radio in 26 languages, more than 56 hours a day, to Europe, the Far East, and Latin America. The daily broadcast to Russia would cease.

Second. To deprive our embassies and legations abroad of the daily wireless bulletin which keeps them informed of what is going on in America and which carries the full texts of important public statements, official documents, and so forth.

Third. To close American information libraries in 70 foreign cities. During the past year more than 3,000,000 people have used these libraries for source material about America, our scientific and technical knowledge, and our way of life.

Fourth. To stop the flow of documentary and educational films which are now being shown to eight or ten million people monthly in other countries.

Fifth. To reduce drastically the program of Government aid for exchange of students, professors, and specialists between the United States and Latin-American countries.

Sixth. To strip our embassies and legations abroad of a trained staff of 350 information and cultural officers who are serving in the Foreign Service Reserve or Staff Corps at 115 Foreign Service posts.

FACT SHEET ON OIC

The Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs (OIC), was established in the Department of State on January 1, 1946, under a Presidential directive to present "a full and fair picture of American life and of the aims and policies of the United States Government" to other parts of the world. OIC functions are carried out through the media of radio, press, motion pictures, libraries and the exchange of students and specialists.

In terms of present personnel and appropriations, OIC represents about one-seventh of the over-all functions of the Department. Out of the Department's total budget of $128,008,752 for this year, $20,207,038 is devoted to OIC. The 2,861 OIC employees in the United States and abroad are among a total of 20,000 employees of the Department, including the Foreign Service.

Of the total OIC personnel, 1,070 are stationed in Washington and New York, and 1,781 at 86 posts in 67 foreign countries. The domestic staff is made up of 460 persons in Washington and 610 in New York, most of the latter engaged in the short-wave broadcasting activities of the Voice of the United States of America.

The overseas staff is made up of 337 trained American personnel in charge of OIC activities under embassies or legations, with routine tasks performed by 1,454 aliens employed at relatively low prevailing local wages. OIC activities overseas are known as the United States Information Service (USIS). A typical USIS office consists of a public affairs officer, an information officer, a cultural officer, a confidential secretary, and about 20 alien translators, motion-picture operators, clerks, messengers, and service employees.

The OIC program is carried out by the office of the director through five area divisions corresponding to the political desks of the Department, and five operating divisions listed below. The area divisions, for Europe, Near East, and Africa, Far East, American Republics, and Occupied Areas, guide the activities of the operating divisions affecting their areas, and supervise the programs of USIS offices overseas.

For the fiscal year 1948 OIC requested a basic budget of $25,213,220 and 2 additional sums that bring the total to $37,181,220. One additional sum was for $6,168,000 for the erection of 2 new radio transmission relay centers to step up the power of voice broadcasts to the Balkans and Middle East. Another item of $5,800,000 was included for the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation. This committee, with a membership of 22 Government agencies, was authorized by Congress in 1941 to carry on a coordinated program of Government agencies for sending technical experts to Latin America and bringing trainees to the United States to study industrial techniques.

The OIC budget request for 1948 was one-tenth of 1 percent of the total Federal budget. It compares with a British overseas information budget this year of about $45,000,000, or about three-tenths of 1 percent of the total British budget. No figures are available on Soviet expenditures for overseas information but Soviet activities in this field are estimated at far in excess of the

United States and Britain combined. Other countries engaging in overseas information activities on various scales include France, Argentina, Canada, Australia, and China.

Of the increase of about $5,000,000 in the basic OIC budget, $2,333,000 represents obligations for salary and allowance increases provided for by Congress in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, plus increased costs of materials and contractual services, and higher wages for alien personnel in inflationary areas. The remainder was for a moderate expansion of short-wave broadcasting in additional languages and for the establishment of missions in additional countries overseas.

Here are brief outlines of the activities of the five OIC operating divisions:

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING (550 EMPLOYEES)

Produces and transmits short-wave voice radio broadcasts in 25 languages to Europe, Latin America, and the Far East, over 36 transmitters on the east coast, Midwest, and west coast of the United States. Also sends recorded programs overseas for distribution to local broadcasting stations by OIC foreign missions. The IBD budget for 1947 was $7,570,579 and a total of $8,632,098 was requested for 1948. This total includes $2,873,323 for salaries. The remaining $5,758,775 was for equipment, maintenance, and contractual services, including the leasing and operation of short-wave facilities.

INTERNATIONAL PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS (128 EMPLOYEES)

Produces and transmits to all countries a high-speed daily 7,000-word Wireless Bulletin of textual and official material for use by the foreign press and for the information of United States and foreign officials, and factual articles and photographs on United States life and developments for press use and public display overseas. Also publishes Russian-language magazine Amerika, and assists foreign journalists in gathering background information about the United States. The INP budget for 1947 was $896,387 and the request for 1948 was for $1,733,217. The increase was principally for the magazine Amerika which has been expanded from 6 to 12 issues a year and from 10,000 to 50,000 circulation through arrangements with the Soviet Government.

INTERNATIONAL MOTION PICTURES (77 EMPLOYEES)

Procures and distributes documentary films in 20 languages to be shown in schools and exhibition halls abroad through OIC missions overseas. The division also advises on production, by all Government agencies, of documentary films on American life, industry and accomplishments to be shown abroad. The 1947 budget was for $2,678,010 and the request for 1948 was for $3,041,822. This total includes $2,041,281 in contractual services for new productions, and for the adaptation in foreign languages of documentary films acquired from private companies at no cost to the Government.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES (69 EMPLOYEES)

Maintains 75 United States Information Service libraries in principal countries of the world with collections of American books, periodicals, newspapers, and documents. Also maintains 24 cultural institutes with 47 branches, which sponsor classes in English and lectures on American industrial and cultural developments. The 1947 budget was $423,091 and the request for 1948 was for $977,933. The largest item of increase—over $200,000—was for the purchase of comprehensive collections of reference books and Government documents for the libraries.

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PERSONS (78 EMPLOYEES)

Arranges for the international exchange of students, professors, and specialists between the United States and other countries and maintains contact between American and foreign private organizations in the fields of science, the arts, and professions. The budget for 1947 was $223,000 and the request for 1948 was for $425,010. The increase was largely for carrying out the Fulbright Act to finance a greatly increased exchange of students and professional leaders through the sale of United States surplus property overseas.

Where Do We Go From Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have received from a constituent, Harold C. Patch, of Perkinsville, Vt., an original poem expressing the feelings of one who is being flooded out for what is supposed to be the public good. I ask unanimous consent that the poem may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

They are going to flood our homesteads,
So the good folks down the line
Won't get water in their cellars.
That will be just simply fine

For those who get the benefits
From modern flood control;
But as for us Vermonters,
Well, it leaves us in the hole!

They tell in calm statistics
Of the loss to our fair State
In acreage and quarts of milk.
Before it is too late

Let's give some consideration
To the folks we're losing, too!
When we're driven from our homesteads
What are we supposed to do

For another place to live in
That will really take the place
Of the one we're booted out of,
Through governmental grace?

Oh, yes, no doubt they'll give us
What they think is a fair price;
But what good will that do us?
Think it over once or twice!

Can you build another homestead
For that same "fair price," today?
Or buy some other fellow's home
Without you're giving—say

Twice or three times the money
They gave you for your home?
I doubt it, friends! We'll just pack up
And sadly start to roam

With all the present homeless throng
We read about each day;
And some will leave their native State
To find a place to stay.

For years "a housing shortage!"
Has been dinned into our ear.
Vermont, our parting song must be;
"Where Do We Go From Here?"

—From One of the To-be-dammed

Greek-Turkey Loan Favored by Minnesota United Nations Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a telegram from the chairman of the Minnesota United Nations Association in support of the loan to Greece and Turkey:

MAY 7, 1947.

HON. GEORGE MACKINNON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Speaking for entire State membership, we ask your vote in favor of loan to Greece and Turkey with Vandenberg amendment. United Nations has no funds nor military power to stabilize Greece. If bill fails it will be green light to Soviet to dominate and communize Europe.

MINNESOTA UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION.

Report on New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Laurence F. Whittemore, president, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, secretary, New England Council, at the New England congressional dinner, sponsored by the New England Council and chambers of commerce in New England, Washington, D. C., April 28, 1947:

I am keenly aware of the fact that I cannot expect on this occasion to add much to the knowledge of this distinguished audience on the affairs of the day. Those Senators and Representatives here assembled are in a much better position to know what is going on in the world at large and in the United States in particular than I. My remarks, therefore, I think should be limited to answering the question (to use the name of a popular song), How Are Things in Glocca Morra, or a report on conditions in New England. I am assuming that the nostalgia expressed in the song is not unfamiliar to New England people away from home. Perhaps in addition to this I may be forgiven if I seek to point out the effect of some of the proposed and recent legislation on our New England economy. I do not claim that my opinions or my observations are sacrosanct, but as such they are intended to be a careful analysis of what things look like from my seat in the grandstand.

Contrary to the opinion of some crepe hangers within New England and some wishful thinkers outside, New England's economic position today is good. This statement can be supported by accurate statistics and I submit that the past can only be analyzed, the present weighed, and the future charted by the use of pertinent statistics, honestly compiled and thoughtfully interpreted.

There was some discouragement about New England's prospects before the war; partly because we did not have complete information. We were discouraged because in the manufacturing and mechanical industries employment had dropped 7 percent between 1920 and 1940. We did not think the problem through far enough to realize that what really counts is total employment. The total number of persons gainfully employed in all lines increased over 14 percent during that same period. What happened to account for this difference? It was a matter of an increase in our standard of living which was accompanied by more jobs in services, trades, and professions. These jobs more than made up the loss of jobs in manufacturing. We do not know what the increase in total employment has been from 1940 up to this date because nobody is presently collecting the statistics, although some are promised by one of the Federal agencies if it is able to collect them within the budget limitations not yet determined.

We do know what has happened to employment in manufacturing up to date. Our factories are now giving jobs to 39 percent more people than they employed in 1939, 24 percent more than in 1929, and 3 percent more than at the highest peacetime peak in our history in 1919.

The nature of our New England economy has greatly changed since before the war. In 1939 we were primarily a non-durable-goods-manufacturing area producing textiles, leather, shoe, paper, and the like. Two-thirds of our people worked in non-durable-goods industries. Now our employment is about equally divided between the making of durable and nondurable goods. Such lines as electrical and other machinery, iron and steel products, and transportation equipment have been responsible for most of the new jobs. The growth in our metal-using industries should be kept in mind when we consider the impact on our future of such projects as the St. Lawrence waterway and others, having in mind the opportunity now presented by the discovery of significant iron-ore deposits in Labrador and other foreign areas, as well as the possible development of the manganese deposits in Maine.

To measure our prosperity by the number of jobs afforded is not the whole picture in measuring our economic progress. Our income is at least as important a measure. New England's income per capita has run on the average about 27 percent above the national average, according to figures supplied by the Department of Commerce. It has been argued that, measured by what has happened to our per capita income, New England's position deteriorated during the war. The Nation's per capita income rose 113 percent between 1939 and 1945; New England's rose only 89 percent. But our per capita income rose almost the same number of dollars as did the Nation's per capita income. The difference in percentage is caused by the fact that we started at a higher level.

What we have in this case is somewhat the same as what happened in a Maine logging camp. There were 50 loggers employed and 2 women cooks. One day a logger married one of the cooks. The camp superintendent soberly reported to the management that 2 percent of the men had married 50 percent of the women.

We have compiled at the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston many other figures which show that New England is, as it always has been, a region of growth and opportunity. It will have its ups and downs as the country has its ups and downs. We will probably have some readjustments in the months ahead when the inflationary balloon we have been riding comes to earth again; but the indication is that New England will fare as well in such readjustment as the country as a whole.

We may never regain the relative position in industry which we enjoyed a half century ago. Our percentage of the Nation's people, of its employment, and of its income has declined. That was to be expected as the rest of the country grew in population and in industry. This Nation, now containing about half of the world's industrial production, must expect to decline percentagewise also in production as the other nations of the earth get back into the race and improve their standards of living. What New England must be sure of, and what the Nation also must be sure of, is that even though it gets a narrower slice, that slice will be cut from a bigger pie. New England and the Nation cannot prosper merely by maintaining a relative position; we prosper by growth. The Nation and New England alike have grown and will continue to grow. That is what counts.

The more we study New England's economy, the more we are impressed with the fact that it has forged ahead despite a long history of Federal aid to other sections of the country. Our part of the country grew up and reached a high state of industrial development during that period of the Nation's history before Federal aid became fashionable and before the means to finance it—primarily the corporate and personal income tax—were available. We built our railroads without Federal grants, developed our water power with private capital, and our economy in each separate situation rose and fell under the free exercise of competition based on the laws of supply and demand.

In progressive social legislation and in our treatment of labor we led the Nation, sometimes at the expense of our own pocketbooks. Partly because of a tradition of self-reliance and partly because we had already attained a high state of industrial development, we have not in recent years led the raids upon the Federal Treasury for aids and subsidies of every type and description.

We have paid and paid heavily for Federal assistance to other areas. In 1945, the latest year for which figures are available, we find that only one other area, the Middle Atlantic States, contributed more per capita to the Federal Government, and only one other area, the Central States, received less per capita in Federal payments than New England. Direct payments to individuals from the Federal Government made up only 12 percent of New England's per capita income. In contrast, such payments accounted for 23 percent of the per capita income in the Southeast.

This taking from the haves for the benefit of the have-nots is not something to be entirely deplored. We are one Nation and one people. If we can assist other areas to develop their resources and to raise their standard of living, then New England's contribution to the process may be repaid. We will, over the years, get back more than we gave if we succeed in developing markets in areas in the country whose purchasing power is increasing. We cannot deny within this country the same principles for which we stand firmly committed in our relations with other countries. It is not the principle, but the method, that bears criticism.

Let us take an honest look at Federal aid. New England industry has received some protection from the tariff. Our industries receive less of such protection now than they did formerly, and the tendency seems to be that we will give up more of such assistance in the future. But there is a vast difference between, on the one hand, the levying of a tariff either for revenue only or for protection as we have known it for over a hundred years in this country and, on the other hand, the latter-day type of subsidy now so prevalent. The tariff, placed by the central Government on the importation of goods from foreign countries and paid into the Federal Treasury, is vastly different from the subsidies now being paid out of the Federal Treasury. The tariff gave help to all regions in relation to their accomplishment in developing manfacturing. Under the provisions of the Constitution as originally ratified, the tariff applied to all sections of the country equally. The subsidy by its very nature is discriminatory; that on cotton can only benefit those areas capable of growing cotton. Nature's idiosyncrasy rather than man's ingenuity determines who gets the subsidy. Moreover, a subsidy must be paid to individuals and it is not one of those matters which individuals determine for themselves. This means that the Government decides who gets what subsidy and how much.

We have an example of what this "who gets what" principle means in the case of the potato-support-price program. To insure that the support prices do not lead to excessive production, potato planters must limit their acreage. During the war the most efficient producing areas—Maine, California, and Long Island, for example—increased their production more than the rest of the country. Maine, to take only one case, had an average yield for the past 10 years of 277 bushels to the acre compared with an average of 126 bushels for the other 17 States producing a surplus of late potatoes. The "who gets what" principle requires that acreage be reduced. So acreage is allotted on the basis of production in past years. The high yielding areas, which expanded most during the war because they could produce most efficiently, are being cut back most. The consumer pays more for potatoes, the Government subsidizes inefficient areas, and you worry about how to cut the budget. Feather-bedding in agriculture is just as reprehensible as feather-bedding by labor unions or suppression of competition by businessmen.

We all want lower prices and we all want to cut Government expenses. Someone should ask a few pointed questions about how we are going to accomplish these things, for instance, if the public continues to be fleeced for its wool. We used to urge that the lion lie down with the lamb; now the lamb wants the lion's share.

I am talking about our wool program. The Government bought wool at prices averaging 31 percent above parity from 1943 through 1946 to make sure we could have enough for military purposes. Despite wool prices now 70 percent above prewar and the highest since 1920, we have only two-thirds of the number of stock sheep on farms that we had 5 years ago—the number is lower than at any time since 1867.

Despite a domestic stock pile of wool equal to 6 months domestic consumption and a foreign stockpile which, if used here, would keep American mills running for nearly 5 years at the 1946 rate; despite the fact that Britain must sell us something to repay her debt to us, and she has wool to sell; despite the fact that the Government has obligated itself to support major farm commodities at only 90 percent of parity—what is proposed for wool?

The Senate has already passed—let me emphasize, it has passed—a bill which would guarantee until the end of 1948 to support domestic wool prices at the 1946 level, which was 120 percent of parity and which now stands at about 100 percent of parity. That isn't exactly what the bill says, but that is what it means. Wool is to receive far more favorable treatment than other basic farm products, which are supported at only 90 percent of parity.

Since the market will support no such price, the CCC would be authorized to liquidate the domestic stock pile at whatever price is necessary to compete with imported wool. It is estimated that the Government has already taken a loss of $37,000,000 on its wool program; the CCC has a reserve of

$55,000,000 for additional losses. Perhaps because it fears even greater losses, the House Committee on Agriculture has voted to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to impose a fee on imported wool.

If we are to handle our international responsibilities and our return to a free-enterprise economy by methods comparable to that proposed for wool, we are on the road to state socialism and international anarchy.

What I have just said illustrates the unpleasant fact that for more than two decades our Government has been influenced to a considerable extent by blocs—groups representing relatively small sectional interests. They sometimes, it seems, are concerned more with using Government to their small sectional advantage than to the advantage of the economy of the country as a whole.

The domestic wool growers, producing a commodity worth only $118,000,000 at the farm in 1946, are protected to the detriment of the manufacturers and distributors of wool clothing on which 140,000,000 American consumers spent an estimated $4,800,000,000 in 1946.

We saw another determined bloc last year get a guaranteed price for silver, although the value of silver production was in 1946 estimated to be only $26,000,000. In contrast, it is estimated that the value of silverware and silver-plated ware at the factory was at least $150,000,000 in 1946, or almost six times as large as the value of the silver produced by our mines. Numerous examples of special-interest legislation which harms a far larger part of the economy than it helps could be cited.

There has never really been a New England bloc in Washington unless the uniting of the New England delegation in the Congress for the purpose of defending us against these sectional raids can be called such.

New England is not asking its Senators and Representatives in Washington to form a bloc which sets up our area as a section, the interests of which are to be forwarded at the expense of the rest of the country. We ask no advantage to accrue to us in New England at the expense of the country as a whole. We do welcome fair competition and expect your help in protecting, within reason, our economic position and our opportunity for fairly meeting such competition.

We do not expect, and to the glory of New England do not want, special privileges for ourselves to the injury of the economy of the country, but we do expect you to fight against the efforts of such blocs as may be formed in the Congress by the representatives of those sections whose thinking may not have matured sufficiently to make them realize that aggressive sectionalism on the make is a danger to our form of government.

It now happens that New England, owing to the statesmanship and prominence of its Senators and Representatives here assembled, stands in a strategic position with reference to the present and future trend of Government policy. We are proud of the fact that, and we have confidence that, you will act as Senators and Representatives of the United States of America, broad-minded enough, as are the people whom you represent, to think of the Nation as a whole.

New England during the course of its long history has often held a preeminent position in material, cultural and spiritual matters. We have often led the Nation in matters of wise Government policy and tolerance, and our standard of living has in the past reflected and does now reflect our preeminence according to our size in manufacturing and trade. As other regions developed we lost our relative position in each field, it is true, but I cannot fail to point out with pride the fact that little New England with 2.2 percent of the land area of the Nation, with 6.4 percent of its population, produced over 9 percent of the commodities necessary for the war effort.

There is an opportunity for the New England Members in the Congress of the United States to forward policies which are for the benefit of all the people. If we can maintain leadership in this field we can look forward with firm confidence to New England's future in a Nation dedicated to world leadership.

Prejudices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, when the labor bill was under consideration on the floor of this House it must have been as apparent to other Members as it was to me that those who profess to be the great proponents of eliminating racial and religious prejudice were the most active in sponsoring class prejudice. I believe that prejudice is indivisible and that the way to eliminate it is to strike at all prejudices in whatever form they appear. We cannot do a piecemeal job.

Because of its very penetrating observations of the actions in this respect of some in the House, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of April 29, 1947, entitled "Labor's Opportunity":

LABOR'S OPPORTUNITY

Ten days ago we censured an outburst in the House of Representatives which revealed an undertone of economic class consciousness every thoughtful American should regret. It took place at the time the House passed overwhelmingly the restrictive Hartley labor bill.

Today we have before us a recent issue of the CIO News vigorously attacking the Hartley bill and all the labor bills before the Senate. Interwoven with and overshadowing some rational arguments are shopworn appeals to emotion and to prejudice—photographs of Newport-like palace, swanky dinner party, top hat, and ermine cape; cartoons of money-grabbing tycoons, contrasted with the smoky bleakness of a steel mill.

Thus some gentlemen of Congress and some gentlemen of labor echo each other. And the sound does not make cheering music for America.

Some of the pressure on Congress has come, no doubt, from reactionary quarters with which we have no more sympathy than does union labor. But organized labor must know by now that it is going to be regulated. It needs to understand that such regulation is backed not merely by big business but also by millions of farmers, professional people, little businessmen, and unorganized workers.

These people don't want unions destroyed. They do want them brought under controls which balance things up a bit and which will discourage the kind of private wars which can paralyze a whole nation. They do not wish laws which would undermine their own or anyone's civil liberties.

Wouldn't the CIO do better to fight now for the wisest regulation than to battle futilely any regulation at all? Wouldn't it get a wider public hearing were it to point out how to correct whatever real threats to freedom may lie in the wording of the bills instead of shouting slavery and fascism to everything?

The AFL, in its newspaper ads, says it will analyze the bills. We hope for the best. Both big unions muffed one chance to give Congress constructive advice. It will help no one if they miss another.

Execution of Rev. Dr. Joseph Tiso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 8 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Victim," dealing with the execution of Rev. Dr. Joseph Tiso, wartime President of Slovakia, which was published in the Messenger, official publication of the diocese of Belleville, Ill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER VICTIM

Rev. Dr. Joseph Tiso, wartime President of Slovakia, went to his death on the gallows 3 days after the Slovak National Court had pronounced sentence against him. Dr. Tiso prayed while he walked up the gallows steps and was accompanied by a Capuchin priest who had spent the night praying with him.

Thus another noble character who opposed Red Russia pays the penalty with his life. Dr. Tiso is one of millions who has suffered the same fate at the hands of a godless atheistic country. Stalin and his cohorts may feel satisfied and gloat over their victories but with the apostle, St. Paul, we can say: "O grave, where is thy victory?"

Future Western Development Depends on Control and Use of Stream Flow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address by John W. Haw, director of the department of agricultural development for the Northern Pacific Railway Co., at the annual meeting of the Western Snow Conference on April 22, 1947, in Portland, Oreg. This address contains much factual information and is an excellent presentation of an important subject worthy of study by all Members of Congress and others interested in the development of the resources of our country.

The address follows:

If the potentialities of the Western States ever are completely exploited—if their land, timber, and mineral resources finally are to be capitalized fully for the welfare and prosperity of this country—it will be as a result

of complete control, and use for the highest purpose, of the waters of western streams. Water is now the principal limiting factor in slowing down industrial and agricultural development. Finally it will be absolutely controlling. Every drop that falls, regardless of form, must be held, hoarded, and harnessed to many jobs before it is allowed to escape to the sea. I do not know of any western group unwilling to make this the paramount goal in long-time planning. In no other way can the Western States fulfill their ultimate national destiny.

The responsibilities of those in attendance at this convention are of primary importance in this connection. To you we look to preserve a condition on the watersheds which will result in retention of precipitation. To you we look for the records and data essential to the wise location and sound design of the structures which harness the streams. To you we will look for the forecasts which control the releases from storage structures and to gage how much and when users may make their demands upon that commodity which finally never will go around—water. The spotlight is turning slowly your way. Still I fancy you do not as yet fully appreciate the intensity with which it will be focused on you or on those who inherit your responsibilities 25 or 50 years hence. When the last second-foot becomes supremely important to some irrigated acre, some machine powered by electricity, or some person who wants a drink or a bath, then, and then only, will there be a full recognition of the importance of the role you play in the western scheme of things.

There are, as you know, five stream basins in the Western States in which the problem of capture and use of water is of importance—the Columbia and Missouri in the Northwestern States and the Rio Grande, Colorado, and the rivers of central California in the Southwestern States. The degree of importance attached to complete capture and use on these streams and their tributaries widely differs at this time. But ultimately the scramble for the waters of the Missouri and the Columbia will equal that recently witnessed on the Colorado. I suspect that as we approach complete utilization, California may be up in the Columbia Valley securing rights to divert water from its mouth near Astoria through a pipe line down the coast.

It happens that the company I represent and its subsidiaries, the S. P. & S. and the C. B. & Q., have a rather intimate acquaintance with two of these major western streams, i. e., the Missouri and the Columbia. The acquaintanceship with one, the Missouri, and its tributaries, the Big Horn and Yellowstone, frequently has been too intimate for comfort. In any event, we of the Northern Pacific have lived, though not always in peace and quiet, alongside these two streams since 1880. They are a great team, though very, very different. The Missouri, a totally unpredictable, unbroken bronco, the Columbia a reliable, substantial work horse of a stream. We yield to no one in our interest in a goal of their full regulation and use. We know of the part played by the services with which you are connected and we have endorsed and supported them on many occasions. May I add that we are anxiously awaiting the day when your releases not only will give full and accurate information on the water reserves in the snow pack on every mountain course, but the time when you can calendar the melt with information on when, for how long, and how high the floods are to be in the streams on whose banks we live. That one is indeed a "toughy," and I fancy it will perplex you for many years to come.

A railroad's interest in these streams is primarily to put them to work irrigating acres and turning the wheels of industrial machinery. There was a time, not too long ago, when it was thought that our trains might some day be powered by electricity generated by them. But that was before the Diesel-electric locomotive. Today electrified sections of some railroads are being violated by Diesels running over them without tapping their readily accessible power lines. As the need arises to rebuild and modernize existing rail-electrification facilities completely, the decision is very apt to be, first cost and maintenance considered, to forget electrification and go to Diesels. At the moment, Northwest rail lines are consequently not interested in the generation of abundant, low-cost power as a means of moving trains. That, however, is not to say we do not fully comprehend the implications trafficwise of irrigation development and power production. It is largely on the build-up of revenue freight directly resulting therefrom that the northwestern transcontinental carriers stake their hopes for future solvency. Assuming increasing incursions into the existing volume of traffic in this area by highly subsidized air, water, and highway carriers, that which could be held to rail haul would be insufficient to maintain existing rail lines as profitable enterprises, at least not without what would appear to be a burdensome and wholly unacceptable upward revision of rail rates. Indeed, there is informed opinion to the effect that further agricultural, industrial, and population growth may not come soon enough to provide the traffic volume required for future profitable operation.

Yes; it is both short as well as long-sighted selfishness which dictates our interest in, and encouragement for, the elaborate plans now under study for complete control and beneficial use of western streams. The Northern Pacific's interest has been manifest in many ways, as those familiar with our part in these developments well know. As for myself, my friends in St. Paul speak of me as a congenital reclamation enthusiast. I'm not sure just what that means but am told that it's something that cannot be cured in one of my age.

But what bothers me and will constitute the main theme of my discussion is the approach which we of the West may use to convince Congress that it is sound national policy and smart business to furnish the funds to fashion the expansive harness which will put these streams to work.

As basin-wide plans begin to take form and shape after years of investigation and study, a discussion of the magnitude of the engineering and economic problems and the over-all cost is causing Nation-wide reverberations. Accustomed as we have become to dealing in large figures, the cost estimates are arresting. Authorizations and, finally, appropriations are quite obviously not to be had from the budget-balancing representatives of a tax-conscious public without the most careful appraisal and detailed scrutiny of every item. We should not ask or expect it to be otherwise. It does make it our immediate obligatory job to marshal, arrange, and publicize a clear justification of the funds requested.

Let me refresh your memory with a few figures. To do a complete job on the Colorado, Secretary Krug now says it will cost $2,158,442,000 more than has already been spent. In the report on the Columbia released recently the sum estimated as still to be required is $5,600,000,000. Consummation of the joint Army-Bureau program for the Missouri was estimated in 1944 to cost $1,739,245,000 over and above the huge amount already spent at Fort Peck and for canalization and flood protection below Sioux City. We may as well be realistic and admit that similar estimates have proven serious underestimates in the past. Perhaps, therefore, it would be smart to proceed on the basis that those now made are similarly in error. On these three streams we are, therefore, recommending that the Federal Government invest the tidy little sum of $9,497,687,000, which in turn means an extraction of about $65 from every man, woman, and child in the country. Our case for such expenditures had better be good and, fortunately, it is good. But it must be told in the right places to the right people. We are just naturally running low on water to prime the pump.

In the February 22 issue of the Saturday Evening Post a lead article by Edward Churchill is entitled "Shall We Spend $2,000,000,000 More on the Colorado?" If you have not read it, you should. It merits a place on your list of must reading. Mr. Churchill refers to the Colorado as a "muddy, turbulent, screwball torrent knifing its way from Colorado to the Gulf of California" and fittingly labels it as "The Lifeline of the Southwest." He quotes an engineer who is familiar with the river and the economy of the Southwest. The statement is particularly significant to the subject of this paper.

"Within the foreseeable future industrial and agricultural expansion, and even population, will be limited because there isn't enough water in the Colorado. The country fed by its lower reaches has no other supply to which it can turn."

He apparently had not thought about diverting the Columbia into California. This statement might also appropriately be made, with certain qualifications, of the other great streams which drain the arid and semi-arid West.

Now, referring back to the need for marshaling, arranging, and publicizing the justification for Federal expenditures on these streams, for the balance of time available to me I shall endeavor to state a few of the cogent arguments which will, in my humble judgment, be persuasive in the examinations made by Congress of the proposed plans for these rivers.

First, they are self-liquidating except as to allocations of cost for such historically nonreimbursable public purposes as flood control, navigation, fish and wildlife propagation, and abatement of salinity and silt. I have purposely omitted from this list recreational benefits. It is difficult to assert that the general American public should at great cost provide recreational facilities, local in use, to a country originally endowed by nature with a great wealth of just such facilities. Such claim is, in my opinion, a weak link in the chain of argument. Although by tortured reasoning it might be included, I believe it renders our case vulnerable to attack. Arguments could similarly be conjured up that certain scenic, spiritual, and esthetic values of national significance result from these multiple-purpose projects. As a group these intangible benefits should be discarded even though a finely spun argument can be improvised by the nature lovers and the sociologists. The point is we don't need these fanciful, nebulous, nonreimbursable factors in order to write down costs to a point where the irrigation water user, municipal water user, and consumer of power can amortize the remainder if easy terms are granted, and proper allowances are made for other provable national benefits.

If, to spin on such reimbursable basis as is prescribed by law, it becomes necessary for a project to secure substantial write-offs to general public benefits, such allocations should be susceptible of clear proof and accurate evaluation. It should be proven that such benefits clearly exist, that they are of general public value and, finally, that the allocation is strictly in line with a sane, practical estimate of the value of these benefits to the general American public as well as the local region. It is easily possible to dissipate the public good will built up so assiduously over the past 45 years for arid land reclamation and more recently for generation of hydroelectric power by inflating the values of subsidiary functions performed by multiple-purpose projects.

Projects remaining to be built are huge, expensive affairs made increasingly costly by the recent precipitous rise in prices of materials and wages. Construction agencies of the Government appear reluctant to depart from the level of power rates and irrigation water right assessments which had taken shape in the prewar years. Today no one is able to argue that we are not dealing in thinly diluted dollars. Most students of this country's fiscal affairs contend that such dilution must continue into the dim future, although they differ as to the degree, if we are to service the enormous national debt and live up to our responsibilities as the dominant world power. If this be so, are we not being unrealistic in contending that prewar rates are the limit which can be assessed against the user of power and irrigation water? Primarily it is this contention which has resulted in a frantic attempt to draw in and overvalue the project benefits that have the color of nonreimbursable general public values. In order to stretch the feasibility tent over any and all of these projects those who draft the reports have been forced to draw heavily on their imagination and in so doing have already alienated the support of important groups in this Congress.

I fully recognize that what I have just said will be unpopular in this western country. It does become necessary, notwithstanding, for someone to state, as it were, "the facts of life" regarding the future financing of these projects out of the general treasury. As a friend of both irrigation and hydroelectric power development I conceive this to be a necessary duty, albeit a disagreeable one.

In this connection I am prepared to risk the condemnation of many of my western friends by asserting that the recent upsurge in industrial growth in the west coast area is certainly not wholly, and perhaps not importantly, the result of low cost electric power. This is not to say that available electric power was not important, indeed even controlling, in the location in this western area of many huge industries during the war years. Available power from Coulee, Bonneville, Boulder, Parker, and Davis Dams was the weight in the scales that finally tipped them in favor of large scale industry developed on the west coast. That power rates were most attractively low was extremely helpful. My point is that the exact level of rates was not controlling and I suspect that this may be even more true in the future.

My experience with industry scouts leads me to believe that there is a long list of factors that must be assayed and calculated in arriving at a decision as to where in a peacetime economy industries will locate. Each industry has its own score card of weights to apply to these several factors. To many it is proximity to raw materials and to the consumers who buy the finished product. Transportation charges on raw and finished products are important. To others it is wage scales, for as to many finished products labor costs are of extreme importance, ranging upward from 40 percent of the cost. Involved in labor costs, as you well know, are food costs, housing and climatic conditions. To others a plentiful, potable water supply would rate even more controlling than fuel or power costs. Need I mention the importance of local tax rates or the attitude of local government in labor disputes?

I do not intend here to disparage the importance of power at either low or comparatively reasonable rates, but let's view the entire picture in true perspective. I strongly suspect that what we in the West popularly refer to as low-cost power has become a veritable fetish among some individuals and groups seeking to induce industries to a western location.

For emphasis, I wish to review my thoughts on point 1 of this discussion. Above all things we must retain the confidence and the good will of the country, as represented by Congress, in these great water control and use projects. The strongest, most compelling argument favoring their authorization is that they are wholly or in large part self-liquidating as to capital cost and that as to power features interest is returned to the Federal Treasury to offset the interest which it in turn pays on the money borrowed from its citizens. To validate this claim it may become necessary to raise somewhat the yearly assessment for provision of an irrigation water right or the rate at which power is merchandized in order to establish these projects as a national investment rather than an expenditure. That this is preferable to congressional refusal to carry forward the program of western stream control further must be apparent.

The situation described above is pointed up by the present impasse between the Interior subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee and the Bureau of Reclamation with respect to funds required in the 1947–48 fiscal year.

Second, their contribution to national defense is now one of the strongest arguments for the completion of these projects. It has not been given sufficient emphasis heretofore. In fact, military and naval men, while zealously regarding the provision of ships and implements of war, trained men and fortifications, fail to be impressed by the need for strengthening and knitting together this Nation's domestic economy so necessary to back up our fighting forces. I recall the disparagement launched when this argument was presented in the early thirties. I had some part in formulating the grounds for this contention. I was told that most weak proposals for expenditures on public works finally drag in the national defense angle by the shirt-tail. Such presentation was, therefore, considered to weaken rather than strengthen the case for reclamation proposals. It was considered that the great potential threat to world peace was Germany, as this was prior to World War II, and that any war, if it came, would be fought over the Atlantic Ocean and from the east coast. The West was a hinterland to be affected lightly if at all by such a war.

Now, and in the distinguishable future, it is Russia and the countries in its orbit which are a threat to the peace of this country and the world. If such proves the case, it seems inevitable that World War III, if it comes, will be fought over the Pacific and to a major extent from the west coast. In such a situation this country faces a tremendous disadvantage if its war-making potential in food and industry remains, as at present, so largely concentrated east of the Mississippi. Even in the last war when military and naval activity shifted after VE-day from the East to the West, expeditious prosecution of the war almost completely bogged down in the space of a few months. Why? Because of lack of close-up food supplies, industrial facilities capable of conversion to a war supply basis, inadequate transportation (particularly rail lines), housing, communications and port facilities. I speak with some knowledge when I say that at the time of Japan's surrender transcontinental rail lines were so jammed with traffic that only with long, heartbreaking delays could freight be moved at all.

Full expansion of our western economy is urgently needed if we are to be ready for war with a country whose attack will be launched directly at our west coast. The growth of industry, agriculture and of transportation facilities in this area must be aided substantially and encouraged if we are to gird ourselves in advance for a conflict in the Pacific theater. It cannot be satisfactorily accomplished with the enemy at our throats, perhaps armed for immediate atomic warfare.

Indeed, the smart planners of the future economy of this vast country are insisting that regional economic balance is essential to sound prosperity in the intervals between wars. They bemoan, and I believe rightly so, the industrial economy of the East, the cotton economy of the South, the wheat economy of the Plains States and the natural resource exploitive economy of the West. While time is not available fully to develop the reasons why these unbalanced and highly specialized types of regional economy are not in the national interest—why they lead to violent swings of prosperity and depression, to lack of full and satisfactory employment conditions and intermittent political upheavals, I leave with you, nevertheless, the thought for development on some future occasion. For my own account I have come to the conclusion that to the extent permitted by conditions over which we have control, it is wholesome for the geographically separated regions of this country to maintain a balance between industry and agriculture and to capitalize fully all the existing possibilities for a stable employment base for the country's expanding population. It is sound in peace and it is essential for defense in time of war that the country be well knit together with self-sufficient regional areas. We could be dismembered easily and rendered defensively impotent if our great geographical regions are highly interdependent.

I pose this question to you. How can we convince the great population masses of the Midwest and East that self-sufficient regional areas are desirable? How can we convince them that funds derived from taxes which they largely pay should be used to capture and put to work our rivers upon which to rear a sound, self-reliant western economy?

Third, and last, may I discuss briefly my feeling that we are neither regionally nor nationally secure as to future food and fiber supplies without full development of the West's irrigation possibilities. If this is true, it should be a telling argument with the public and with Congress.

At the moment we live in the midst of plenty surrounded by a hungry, or more accurately a starving, world. Authorities differ as to whether 50,000,000 or 500,000,000 of the earth's 2,200,000,000 of people were in 1946 actually dying of starvation. Certainly the figure of 500,000,000 is conservative as to the number subjected to such malnutrition as to retard normal growth and development. Some even place the figure at two-thirds of the earth's population as suffering a nutritional handicap. It is a recognized fact among students of world population that growth in population takes place up to the limit of the food supply. The fact is not well known that world population increased 200,000,000 in the 10 years immediately preceding World War II. The increase in world population of 563,000,000 between 1900 and 1940 may well have set the stage for both World Wars I and II. Throughout all history, pressure of population on the food supply has been one of the great underlying causes of war.

So it will continue to be even in the case of Russia. We are accustomed to thinking of Russia as an agricultural surplus country. Its huge size and expanses of comparatively undeveloped areas give rise to the view that its agricultural resources are only in part developed. This is far from the fact. Much of Russia's area is too far north or too arid or with soils too thin to permit of productive agriculture. Russian population is increasing rapidly. In 1940 it was 170,467,000 as compared to 134,000,000 in 1920. At present, its yearly excess of births over deaths per thousand is 18.6—the fourth highest of any country in the world, exceeded only by Formosa, Mexico, and Puerto Rico in the order named. This increase may be compared with a 6.3 rate in the United States.

Even at the moment information is seeping out from behind the iron curtain that starvation has exacted a heavy toll in parts of Russia during the past winter. Something of the world struggle for adequate food supplies is indicated by the fact that China now irrigates one-half and India one-fourth of all cropped land. One-fourth of the world's people not only live on irrigated land but are both fed and clothed almost exclusively by the products produced on these lands. India's population has increased 50,000,000 in the past 10 years and to ward off famine the country is desperately striving to bring more acres under water.

These facts are recited for the purpose of indicating the wisdom of endeavoring to maintain in the United States a situation for the long pull of self-sufficiency or self-containment as to food and fiber supplies. In the March issue of Population Bulletin is this significant statement:

"In countries where there is a favorable relationship between number of people and natural resources, we find peace and prosperity, and personal liberty is an attainable ideal. Where there is an unfavorable relationship between these factors, we may expect poverty, social unrest and a threat of aggression."

We have been lulled into a false feeling of security and complacency by the huge exports of foodstuffs from this country during and since the late war and the current discussions of some agricultural surpluses. This situation is partially due to favorable weather and freedom from plant disease outbreaks, with resultant phenomenal crops of wheat and corn.

Little is being said about our continued imports of agricultural products. In 1946 they exceeded any year since 1929–30. The blunt fact is that immediately before the war the value of our agricultural imports exceeded our exports. In 1946 agricultural imports were valued at 1.8 billions while agricultural exports were 2.8 billions.

This point is worthy of special stress. If population overtakes our domestic food supply or, put another way, if aggregate consumption overtakes aggregate supply and we are forced to bid against other countries in a world where malnutrition and starvation are an ever present threat, what price may we be forced to pay and what will be the adverse effects upon our relationship with other more critically needful nations? I commend to you a closer study of what, for want of a better term, may be called population dynamics as related to supplies of foods and fibers in a world of increasing population and we hope—higher standards of living.

May we now focus down on this problem from the standpoint of the United States and then to the western United States.

The population of this country was 105,710,620 in 1920; today, 27 years later, as estimated for January 1, 1947, by the Bureau of the Census, it is 142,656,000—an increase of 36,945,380. In the decade between 1920 and 1930 the increase was 17,000,000 and between 1930 and 1940 it was 8,900,000. It will come as a surprise to those who do not follow these statistics that between April 1, 1940, and January 1, 1947—an elapsed interval of 6 years and 9 months—this country's population increased 10,986,725, or 2,000,000 more than in the preceding 10-year interval. Even more arresting is the population increase of 1,225,000 in the 5-month interval between August 1, 1946, and January 1, 1947.

This phenomenal upsurge in population since 1940, and which at least momentarily appears to be gaining momentum, may be—no doubt is—capable of several explanations, all of which fortify the belief that it is transitory. Just how transitory it is, no one can positively say. In my view it depends to a major extent on continued full employment at good wages. I have yet to talk to a young couple who would not like to have a family of three or four children, if they could afford it, and if domestic help were procurable. But be that as it may, there still remains the far-reaching implications of an infusion of 11,000,000 more people into this Nation's population bloodstream in the space of the past 6 years and 9 months, a major World War and increasing automobile fatalities notwithstanding. I direct your attention to the fact that, statistically, it requires about 2½ cropped acres per capita to supply food and fiber requirements at present levels of consumption in this country.

Turning now to population shifts of important concern regionally within this country. In the 11 Western States which begin on the east with Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico, the census estimate of January 1, 1947, shows these States with a population of 17,656,000 as compared to 13,824,000 in 1940—a gain of 3,832,000, or 27 percent in 7 years. This 27 percent gain for the West should be contrasted with a gain of 7.3 percent for the whole country, or nearly four times as great. Stated another way, these States now contain 12.5 percent of the entire population instead of 10 percent in 1940.

The story in the three Pacific Coast States is even more arresting. Washington shows a percentage population gain between 1940 and 1947 of 30 percent, Oregon 26 percent, and California 39 percent. Actually, 3,517,000 more people live in these States today than 7 years ago in the spring of 1940.

Starting with the premise—which I believe is unassailable—that it is sound policy for this country to be in a high degree self-sufficient as to fibers and the staple foods required by our high level of diet and that regional economic balance is desirable and perhaps necessary, what are the facts as to prospective food supplies?

The facts are that cropped acreage has in recent years declined nearly 18,000,000 acres in the country as a whole and also there is a similar percentage decline in the western region. Apparently we are not again to see in this country the 367,000,000 acres that were planted to crops 15 years ago, in 1932. If such an area could be cropped profitably it certainly would have been as a result of high prices and the world-wide appeal for food during the war and since. Actually only 349,000,000 acres were cropped in 1946, or 18,000,000 less than 15 years ago.

Now I am not so naive agriculturally as to believe that cropped acres are the only measure of food production. Shifts from extensive to intensive crops as well as higher acre unit yields must also have consideration. As to both of these factors some progress has been made in the past 15 years. I am aware of the figure of a 34 percent greater output of farm products in the all-time banner year of 1946 as compared to the 1935–39 average. But I am likewise aware of the fact that 1946 was tailor-made climatically from Maine to California for high production. I know that it is unsafe to figure into the future on a continuation of such climatic conditions. I know that by erosion, by weeds, and by loss of fertility less, rather than more, acres will be available for profitable crop production as time goes by, and this in spite of some gains through irrigation, clearing, and drainage. I know that the cushion of horse-feed acres released for production of human food has just about run out. And finally I know that the tremendously stimulating effect of record price levels for farm products cannot reasonably be expected to continue.

The long-time outlook nationally is that only by heroic methods can we keep production of farm products ahead of an increasing population demanding an ever-rising standard of living. There is reason for alarm over the rate at which these demands are outstripping production west of the Continental Divide. An ever-increasing list of commodities, in ever-increasing volume, must be moved westward from the Mississippi Valley States to fill the vacuum created by recent phenomenal western population increases.

Current rates of population migration westward will not subside. Too many young people were exposed during the war to the seducing influence of the soft, healthful western climate, the scenic beauty, and the nearby opportunities for recreation. Too many older people believe they can piece out their lives a few years longer by living in the temperate atmosphere and filtered sunshine of the west coast. Excellent highways, fast air lines, and comfortable rail travel have moved up the West to within easy reach of the densely settled East. No longer is the East, East, and the West, West, and never the twain shall meet. They have already met and the consequences are well known.

Earlier I said that in seeking the assistance of the Federal Government and in making requests for appropriations on the basis that it will prove a sound investment, the West has a good case for full development of its scanty water resources. Industrial development is keyed closely to abundant, reasonably priced power, to adequate nearby food supplies, and to a plentiful, potable water supply, all of which hinge on further development of western water resources. Complementary agricultural development similarly depends on the same program of river-control works.

The question still remains whether we can convince the 87.5 percent of the stockholders of these United States who live east of the one hundredth meridian that they should sink billions of their tax dollars in this western development over the next 25 years. Can we convince them that as long as this country's natural resources remain untapped, standards of living continue to rise and population to increase that calculations for the future must be predicated on a dynamic, not a static, economy; that the area with the greatest potential in this respect is the West?

When you are measuring the snow courses of the Rockies, the Bitterroots, the Cascades, and the Sierra Nevadas, keep always in mind that you are in reality gaging the future of this western country. Water will finally determine the last man this western country can support.

Furthermore, bear in mind that western development, of immediate and crucial importance to the Western States, is also of great national import. The endurance of our institutions and liberties in a troubled world will be substantially enhanced by an employment base resting on balanced regional economies well integrated one with another. We face up to a challenging task in securing an extension of our generous good-neighbor policy to include the country west of the one hundredth meridian in years to come. But in so doing it, it be understood we are asking for credit, not charity.

The New Deal's Propaganda Forces Continue To Be at Large

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the essential Government services can be carried on and that worth while internal improvements such as irrigation and flood control can be made, and at the same time efforts can be put forth to eliminate extravagance, unnecessary spending, and waste.

Neither the American people nor the Congress should take the position that they must accept gross extravagance, waste, and the continuation of unnecessary activities of Government in order to have adequate Government services and public improvements.

I have received a letter which illustrates the confusion that is being dispensed by the New Dealers. That letter is as follows:

I am a Republican. But I have been informed that the Republicans are trying to make it hard on the present administration, particularly in the Post Office Department. I understand that the reason we do not receive two deliveries of mail per day as we have been accustomed to for many years is because the funds of the Post Office Department have either been cut or in some way something has happened to prevent the usual postal service. I understand that on one day we received no mail delivered by the postman because of that reason.

Can this really be true? If so, I protest it. If not, I would appreciate a correct answer.

I have taken this matter up with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations charged with the responsibility of providing funds for the Post Office Department. His reply is as follows:

Your letter of May 2, with enclosure regarding the postal service and appropriations therefor, has been received.

As you correctly pointed out to your constituent, the Post Office is presently operating under appropriations passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, although the Department has already come before the Eightieth Congress with requests for deficiency appropriations, both of which have been granted. This is an interesting observation, inasmuch as there were speeches made on the floor during the debate on the 1948 Treasury-Post Office bill by Members of the minority assailing the fact that the cut in post office appropriations for 1948 was not as great as the cut made by the Seventy-ninth Congress. We did not strive to match last year's action because we did not want to force curtailment of any service or to make it necessary for the Post Office to make several requests next year for deficiencies.

The committee therefore recommended, and the House unanimously approved, an appropriation containing a reduction of only 1 percent. In the specific instance to which you refer, city delivery service, the House allowed $295,300,000, which is $7,300,000 more than was available for this service in the current year. The amount approved is only $338,000 less than requested, so the Department can obviously provide full and complete service.

The First Assistant Postmaster General has made the following statement about city delivery service:

"During the war it was the policy of the Department to restrict the city delivery service to the minimum requirements that would meet the bare needs of the public. Following the termination of the war the Department has been restoring this service to prewar standards as rapidly as practicable. Indicative of this is the fact that the number of regular city delivery carriers increased from 57,993 as of June 30, 1945, to 65,770 as of June 30, 1946, an increase of 7,777."

Restoration of prewar delivery service is receiving active consideration at the Post Office Department, and efforts are being made to restore it as rapidly as possible, not only because it is a convenience to the public, but also because when there is only one delivery a day, mail must be stored overnight in the post offices, and there are not enough facilities for such storage in most post offices.

The Appropriations Committee in the House is cooperating with the Post Office in this matter, which is one of the reasons why the amount allowed for city delivery service was increased in the 1948 bill even in the face of the Nation-wide demand for economy. I believe that you can safely assure your constituents that ample money has been provided to restore full delivery service and that no curtailment of any essential service was made necessary by the action of the House.

Trusting that this information will be helpful to you, I remain, with kindest regards and best wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress.

Main Street Musings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Iola (Wis.) Herald:

MAIN STREET MUSINGS

President Truman continues to make statements that prices must be reduced to prevent inflation. It seems to us that instead of talking so much about reducing prices, Mr. Truman should do something toward reducing the "price" of government and cutting taxes. That's where he can really make a contribution to the battle against inflation.

The article may have been inspired by the fact that the dairymen of this community have already seen milk prices reduced by one-third. In fact the price of milk is lower than the support price is supposed to be under the Steagall amendment, even though the producers pay 20 percent more for what they buy and a 10-percent increase over 1946 in farm-labor costs.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Minnesota Legislature:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue its appropriations in support of the rural-electrification program and to refrain from enacting any legislation adverse thereto

Whereas the rural population of the State of Minnesota is vially interested in the benefits and conveniences afforded by the Rural Electrification Administration; and

Whereas there should be sufficient appropriations of the Rural Electrification Administration as approximately only 55 percent of the rural population of Minnesota is served by this program; and

Whereas the rural population of Minnesota is anticipating the time when rural Minnesota will be 100 percent electrified; and

Whereas rural electrification has proved a good investment to the Government by reason of the fact that it has met its obligations, both principal and interest, in advance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring, That the Congress of the United States shall continue to provide funds for the expansion of rural electrification where such construction is economically feasible and likewise to refrain from passing any legislation adverse to the Rural Electrification program; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Minnesota.

LAWRENCE M. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

C. ELMER ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives, the 4th day of February 1947.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate, the 6th day of February 1947.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE NATIONAL BOARD OF THE
YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN
ASSOCIATIONS OF THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., April 18, 1947.

Representative FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The public affairs committee of the national board of the Young Women's Christian Association has been following with interest the progress of labor legislation through your committee to the floor of the House, and the final action of the House.

Recognizing that the House and Senate will have to reach agreement before the measure becomes law, we nevertheless feel that we must register with you our feeling about this type of legislation and its possible implications.

We are interested in seeing industrial peace maintained in the Nation. Our national convention, in March 1946, reaffirmed its belief in collective bargaining and in labor-management cooperation. We seriously question whether passage of such legislation as that now being considered will reduce industrial strife, because it does not strike at the roots of the causes of unrest among the working people of the Nation.

It is difficult to see the value of abolishing the present National Labor Relations Board and setting up entirely new machinery. The present Conciliation Service should be strengthened through additional funds and personnel. It should, with additional strength and prestige, be able to encourage voluntary arbitration of disputed questions. In disputes affecting vital public services every effort should be made for conciliation or voluntary arbitration. As a last resort, but only as a last resort, the Federal or State governments should seize the struck industries and enforce compulsory arbitration. Workers in public utilities and other public services which are privately owned should not be treated differently from other workers in their basic rights. Their basic needs are the same and must be provided for.

The YWCA, which numbers thousands of employed women in its constituency, has always been interested in seeing that high standards of employment and efficiency are maintained. This is one reason why we feel that industry-wide bargaining should not be outlawed. Standard labor conditions should be maintained throughout an industry. An employer who recognizes a union and maintains high standards should not be compelled to compete with other firms in his industry where nonunion labor has been hired at cheaper wages. The same is true in industries where closed-shop agreements have been in operation for many years. Shops could hire nonunion members and place the union shops in the same industry at a great disadvantage. In many industries through closed shop or union shop and by means of industry-wide bargaining, conditions have greatly improved and the small businessman greatly benefited. To change these through sweeping legislation would again result in a lowering of standards throughout the industry. Likewise, some forms of secondary boycott are employed in an effort to maintain standards.

From the practical standpoint of enforcement, we question the usefulness of such restrictive labor legislation. Flagrant cases of violence and racketeering can and should be dealt with severely and could under present law be handled with increased vigilance of the police and courts.

However, new Federal legislation would be costly to administer both in terms of time and money. Small businessmen and manufacturers could not stand the costs of endless litigation. For larger manufacturers the time wasted in court trials would be costly. For the Government it would be far better at this time to appropriate the necessary funds to strengthen the National Labor Relations Board, the Conciliation Service, and the Department of Labor so that they can obtain the skilled personnel they need.

Basic economic needs of people must be met to prevent unrest and industrial strife. Many leading businessmen and manufacturers have spoken out recently on behalf of the dignity of the worker and the necessity for improving human relations in industry. The Government should not remove from organized management and labor their responsibility for dealing with each other in ways that will improve living conditions, and maintain high standards of employment and efficiency. Leaders of labor and management must feel equally their responsibility in peacetime, as they did during the war.

If they are "frozen" by laws that will be difficult, at best, to enforce, they will not be free to carry forward the production of vital goods and services the people of this country need. The time and money of management, labor, and the Government are needed for all-out programs to maintain employment and production.

We urge, therefore, that you and your committee bend your efforts to the strengthening of present machinery for handling labor disputes, and to passage of positive legislation to meet the basic economic needs of the people.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ALFRED E. MUDGE,
Chairman, Public Affairs Committee.

Hon. Charles L. Gerlach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret I learned of the passing of my friend and colleague, CHARLIE GERLACH. I came to know him very well as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. It was my privilege to have had him as a companion on an inspection trip to Europe for that committee.

To know Charlie was to respect and admire him. He was most sincere and had the capacity for true and abiding friendship. He never disappointed anyone who placed confidence in him. Charlie had an abundance of sound, common sense, and he was always faithful to the principles in which he believed. There never was any austentation about him. He was a man of absolute integrity. His unfailing kindness made him beloved by all who knew him.

The people of his district have lost an able public servant who regarded his office as a public trust, and we all suffer a deep personal sorrow at his passing.

The Chamber of Commerce and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a brilliant and provocative speech by my illustrious predecessor, the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce:

Grateful as I am for your friendliness today, I know that you know this is no day for an honest speaker to waste time exchanging compliments with the chamber of commerce. This is May Day, the international holiday of world communism. The word "holiday" once meant "holy day." And this is a holy day of vast account to millions of people everywhere on the march under the blood-red banner of the hammer and sickle. As a religion of mass salvation, communism increasingly appeals to the stricken and dispossessed and bombed-out all over the world. That is as it must be, for the history of all mankind proves that civilization cannot subsist without a dynamic religion. Let us note in passing that communism, as a religion of mass salvation, has not succeeded because Christianity has failed in our times, but because Christianity has not been tried in our times. Saying which—the only thing of importance that can be said on May Day—let me lurch back to my subject, the chamber of commerce and communism.

The problem which faces an honest speaker on May Day is this: How to talk to the chamber of commerce about communism without helping the Communists. If this time is spent telling you what a monstrous, cruel, and fallible system communism is, compared to democracy, only one effect may be achieved: To send you all away feeling delightfully complacent about democracy in general, and the chamber of commerce in particular, as the gallant custodian of the brightest jewel in its crown—the world's highest living standards. And the one fatal attitude in times of danger is complacency. Neither saints, nor heroes, nor patriots, nor even very good businessmen are products of the complacent mood. But our times call for such men: men of humility and courage, and mercy and lucidity. Complacency is pride grown fatuous and senile. It is the death of these vigorous and necessary virtues. It is for this reason, today, you would not want your speakers to increase your self-esteem.

Then let's ask, in a mood of wholesome uneasiness, why things have come to such a doleful, bloody pass with this generation. For we live in an age of hideous human disorders and intellectual confusions. Is there not at least one fact about that confusion which is plain to any lucid mind? There is—the fact that everybody blames somebody else for it.

For example, abroad whole nations blame other whole nations for a large part of their domestic troubles, and all of their international troubles.

We, in concert with the 55 United Nations, lately blamed Hitler and the Nazis as the sole authors of World War II. Now we have crushed the Nazis. And Hitler rots in ignominy. And yet our troubles continue, indeed grow worse. Whom shall we blame for them now? Whom, in the words of the journalists, shall we flay, flail, and lash out at? Why, by popular demand, of course, the Commies. Communism abroad and subversive elements at home are now held responsible for everything and anything that sours, or stinks, or hungers or thirsts or bleeds anywhere.

What shall we say of this astonishing and melancholy state of affairs, in which the men of every nation point the finger of judgment at their neighbors? I think one thing we can say is that the Devil has a very big bag of tricks. (You will see at once that I intend to blame things largely, though not exclusively, on the Devil.)

Baudelaire, the French poet of the nineteenth century, said, "It is the Devil's cleverest trick to convince us he does not exist." And this was the trick he practiced all during the last century, with what ghastly success our own suffering century now shows. In the nineteenth century, the majority of rational men had come to the happy conclusion there was no such thing as a force of evil. There was only blind nature, which presently would be overcome by clear-eyed science—science, the master of inexorable progress, the god of the approaching millennium. All that man called evil would presently yield to benevolent science; poverty, disease, unsound economics, poor communications, the lack of recreational, educational, and plumbing facilities. And perhaps certain pituitary and other glandular deficiencies. The worst of these—old age—might even be remedied by the grafting of monkey glands. Who knew? Man, who had swung down from the trees as an ape, might soon swing up to the stars as a god—with a liberal injection of his simian forebear's gonads. Science was the nineteenth century religion of mass salvation.

But science is neither good nor evil in itself. Science is simply a tool, or a technique, to be used by man for good or evil. This we found out when we saw how Hitler used it. He built great roads, hospitals, schools, maternity centers. He eradicated slums. He bred literate children, plumped up with vitamins. His chemical, physical, medical laboratories were the busiest in all Europe. With applied science, Hitler plunged the nineteenth century world, which believed in inevitable progress, into chaos and barbarity. Then once again, as so often happens in history, the world was confronted by the visible existence of the power of evil, which can come to capture and control all things thought, or invented, by man—including science.

Let us note again in passing that, in order to unleash his fury on the world, Hitler had first to destroy, by scientific methods, any allegiance to any higher authority than that of the state in the minds and hearts of the German people and their scientists. He had first to persuade, or seduce, or condition, or breed out of them the notion that they were personally responsible to their consciences before God for every day's actions. Then we witnessed, under Hitler, in an age of science such monstrous crimes against human flesh and spirit as would have made Caligula and Genghis Khan pale.

By the time the holocaust of Hitlerism had spread upon the earth the Devil could no longer remain incognito. Discovered, he played his trump card. He convinced us that Hitler himself was the Devil. Not, mind you, the Devil's puppet, which Hitler certainly was, but His Satanic Majesty in person. In short, the Devil's smoothest trick was to convince us that the force of evil was the other fellow's leader.

Then we finished off Hitler. Whereupon shame, cruelty, greed, and corruption still stalked the world. That might have been a bad moment for Old Scratch if he had not had Stalin handy to fill Hitler's place in the minds of the majority of the world's democrats and possibly in the minds of the majority of the members of the chamber of commerce.

At any rate, with communism on the rise and democracy on the defense, the spirit of evil has at long last surely concocted the perfect recipe for chaos—the world is divided in two and each half thinks the other half is the Devil. For capitalism all the forces of error are now more and more personified in communism and its leaders. For communism the forces of evil have long been personified in capitalism and its leaders. And should each decide to demand louder and louder, as the only price of peace and truth, the destruction of the other, this could lead to only one result—mutual extermination, atomic destruction, the obliteration of man.

What, then, is the answer? Surely one of the answers is for us to begin by admitting the fact that the Devil helps us to conceal from ourselves: that some of the blame for the present world mess can be laid at the door of America and faulty—no evil—American policies.

For example, does any of us say that Stalin is a murderer? That his hands are red with the blood of thousands upon thousands of his own countrymen? Shall we say that the rosy stain on the hands of some American statesmen is just the red ink which diplomats must use in balancing the economic books of war? But it isn't. That, too, is blood: the blood of the Poles, and central Europeans, and Koreans that we sold out to Stalin when we dishonored the Atlantic Charter. Do we abhor and fear Stalin's victories abroad? Let us remember to say, then, that Stalin's victories were not achieved in spite of all we are and do—but in spite of what we have failed to do and be.

At this point I am constrained to ask you very frankly if you do not think I sound very much like Mr. Henry Wallace? For this is precisely what he has been saying in Europe. Wherefore he has become the scorn of many men who call themselves "100-percent Americans." But have Mr. Wallace and I really said the same thing; do we share the same attitude in this matter?

May we hold a consideration of that question in abeyance for a moment while we review a little congressional history?

A little over 4 years ago, a newly elected Member of the House of Representatives—myself—rose to make a speech about the need to plan then—even in the midst of a World War—for a vigorous American peacetime civilian air policy. The policy advocated by that inexperienced Member, although bitterly attacked from all sides at the time, has since been adopted by this Government. What had then prompted the Congressman to advocate this now-accepted policy was the projected plan of Mr. Henry Wallace—a powerful Roosevelt Cabinet member—to internationalize all American airports and throw them open to the planes of every other nation on a wholly free-trade basis. Today, this idea would seem idiotic if for no other reason than that the Russians have for 4 years, as predicted by that Congressman, refused to drop the "iron curtain" in any sphere of world-trade cooperation. But then it was being seriously considered. In that speech—and now I quote accurately—the Congressman, attacking specifically these air policies of Mr. Wallace, said:

"I am a great admirer of some of Mr. Henry Wallace's ideas" such as feeding Europeans and helping to rehabilitate the war-torn world. But "Mr. Wallace's warp of sense and woof of nonsense is very tricky cloth out of which to cut the pattern of a postwar world. He has a wholly disarming way of being intermittently inspiring and spasmodically sound, and says much that all men of good will must agree to. But much of what Mr. Wallace calls his global thinking, is, no matter how you slice it, still 'globaloney.'"

Today I tell you that the "globaloney" of our times is the insistence by any nation that all error, all blame, and all responsibility for failure rests exclusively in any one capital or economic system. And I repeat, this is—or seems to be—exactly what Mr. Wallace is saying. Or is it? Or is Mr. Wallace saying something else which makes his utterances so distasteful to many men of good will and honest purpose? Well, it is not that he accuses his own Nation of faults and sins. A patriot is frequently commanded to do so by his patriotism; and Wallace serves us wonderfully well to point out our faults. It is not that in accusing America of so much, he seems to excuse Russia of so much worse; that in making a great deal of the crimes of imperialist leaders he makes nothing at all of the blood-soaked hands of Stalin. When we have reviewed—honestly—our own crimes, we are in much better shape to combat worse ones, in others. What is it then, that repels us in the personal attitude of Mr. Wallace? Is it not this: That while he blames all other living statesmen, he loudly professes the impeccability of his own political record, and the pristine purity of his own personal motives? Is our real resentment not born of his prideful insistence that complacency, greed, inertia, indifference, compromise, selfishness, ambition, evil, are harbored in every political heart but the heart of Henry Wallace? Is it not, in short, his failure to take any personal responsibility for the mistakes of the past, the very core of what we dislike most in his utterances?

But, is it not precisely this lack of personal humility, of self-criticism, that makes Wallace, for all his excellent criticism of others, the very tragic symbol of our times? Which makes him, even while he says some true and useful things, still the Devil's advocate?

If it is, then let us remember, when we see him, many of us are seeing ourselves, as it were, in a mirror, blaming everything on the other fellow, and finding excuses for none, save those who are at that moment agreeing with us.

For example, at home: The Government blames business for all failures of domestic policy. Business blames labor and Government. Labor blames Government and business. The people—failing to see they are all three—blame all three. Look or ask where you will, no individual, group, organization, or party but calls another largely culpable—and, therefore, responsible—for the many failures which on all fronts devour our hopes of peace and prosperity. And few will take personal responsibility.

Today we see many of our statesmen refusing to stick their necks out, fearful of personal consequences, if they whisper in public what they bellow in private about countless matters. They are afraid to inform public opinion, until public opinion is formed. They consult the Gallup poll as once the Roman senators consulted the entrails of geese.

We see the American citizen clamoring that his Nation halt the spread of communism and yet refusing to pay for either armaments, or foreign loans, or relief shipments out of his own pocket. We see him demanding in one and the same breath that the Government balance its budget, cut taxes, and increase in a wide variety of fields, his own hand-outs from the public Treasury.

But also, we hear the mournful holler of the American businessman that he can't do anything until Government gets out of business, rhythmically drowned out by the holler that he can't do anything until the Government gets into business to control the unions, and so forth. Above all, we hear the average businessman deplore the loss of self-reliance in the average American, and his unwillingness to take any risks.

This is the question to ask of yourselves today: Which of you is self-reliant; who among you will take risks today without waiting to see what happens to his neighbor?

Who says here, it may be that I, the person, am at the very bottom of all this: I have done wrong. I will act to do right. I will risk. I will begin to establish a chain reaction of self-criticism and self-reliance in my group. Does no one say it? Are we then mass-minded men, totalitarian hearted like our enemies. Trembling puppets of an all powerful state? Men who dare not take the risk of doing what they believe to be sound, just, merciful, right? Is this then the Devil's last terrible trick: to make us become like the thing we claim to despise?

Now here you are, generally supposed to be a most powerful group of businessmen. What power do you really have to save yourselves, or our Nation, from communism or catastrophe? As an original group, very little. For as an organized group all you probably will ever be able to agree upon is to pass a resolution that somebody else has done wrong; somebody else has to mend his ways, or act first, before your group can "take effective democratic action." But as persons—John and Jim and Joe and Bob and Herbert—you are all-powerful.

If each man here took the risk tomorrow to increase production, or cut prices, or raise wages—whatever your conscience tells you—you would be doing the one thing you could do to defeat communism: accepting personal responsibility to avoid that American depression which you know and I know is the one temporal circumstance that must make world-wide communism inevitable.

How do you begin accepting personal responsibility? You begin by kicking the one who tells you that you don't need to, or you can't, square in the teeth; that's the Devil. And, in case I forgot to mention his precise locus up to now, it is not only Moscow and Berlin and London and Washington. It's right in the chair, not next to you but with

you. And right here, on this platform, prompting me, as he so often does, to some uncharitable or prideful utterance.

For example, I am a retired politician. And yet I dragged in by the heels an example of my own political astuteness in the matter of our air policy as though it mattered. And I succumbed to the temptation to berate Henry Wallace before the chamber of commerce, which is on all points and at all times completely prepared to condemn him. Yes; the Devil is not only everywhere, he was here, imbuing me, even as I attacked him, with the very same devilishly messianic windbag spirit that afflicts poor Henry Wallace.

And now to answer the question: How can the members of the chamber of commerce help to reverse the present global trend towards identifying the Devil as the other fellow, a trend which must result in atomic war and unspeakable desolation. It is very simple. But it is not easy. We can reverse it when we begin to hold ourselves as persons responsible for it. And as we, as persons, take action every day, cost what it may at the hands of state or society, according to the dictates of our personal conscience. A sense of one's neighbor, of personal responsibility, and of liberty is the 3-in-1 sense without which freedom must perish.

In the final analysis, there is no other solution to a man's problems, even in the year 1947, but the day's honest work, the day's honest decisions, the day's generous utterance, and the day's good deed.

We are Americans. We think we are different from the Communists. In what does our difference lie? Only in this: We are each of us still free to do what our conscience dictates to us, and what is suggested to our minds and hearts by courage and charity. Let us do it. For, as Walt Whitman said, "The American compact is altogether with individuals."

General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of a newspaper article from the Boston Herald and several letters:

VETS PRICED OUT OF NEW HOMES, GI LOANS TO DROP, BANKERS TOLD

(By Arthur Stratton)

High construction costs have priced out the veteran from purchasing his own home and will mean a considerably lessening volume of GI home loans this year, the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks was informed yesterday.

The highest authority on the subject, T. Bertram King, director of the loan guaranty section of the Veterans' Administration, told members of the association at its annual conference at the Hotel Statler that "present-day costs have taken the price of new housing far beyond the ability to pay of the average veteran purchaser."

SIX THOUSAND DOLLARS VET'S LIMIT

"There just isn't any sizable group of prospective veteran buyers that can carry loans above $6,000. And how many will prove to be anxious to buy when they see what they can get with their $6,000 loan?"

King reported to representatives of 531 mutual savings banks throughout the country that construction costs, figured on the basis of a standard, six-room frame house, have risen about 10 percent since November. He added that "new starts" for the first 3 months of this year totaled only 133,000, as compared with a total of 160,000 for the first quarter of 1946, when materials were in shorter supply and controls were on.

EAST BOSTON SOCIAL CENTERS COUNCIL,
Boston, Mass., April 29, 1947.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is an appeal from East Boston to you to do what you can to get the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill passed.

You know East Boston and you know what sort of housing we have in some sections here. Our people deserve a better break, and we believe the passage of the above bill would help a lot.

Thanking you.

Very truly yours,

S. MAX NELSON,
General Director.

CAMBRIDGE POST NO. 35,
JEWISH WAR VETERANS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Cambridge, May 1, 1947.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Congressman From Massachusetts,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At a regular meeting on Monday, April 28, 1947, the Cambridge Post No. 35, J. W. V., strongly urges you to support the Taft-Wagner-Ellender housing bill and favor passage of same.

Obediently yours,

Dr. M. SCHERTZER, *Adjutant.*

Can American Dollars Thwart Kremlin Aims?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial dated May 4, 1947, by one of the famous editorial writers of the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, Carroll Binder, on the important question as to whether it is possible for the United States to stop the spread of communism by the United States furnishing assistance to the Communist-threatened countries:

CAN AMERICAN DOLLARS THWART KREMLIN AIMS?

(By Carroll Binder)

How much is the United States spending for foreign relief, rehabilitation, and political stabilization? How much would American taxpayers have to provide during the next 5 years to make good on the Truman policy of supporting menaced free governments? How would a major American economic depression affect this program?

These questions are being discussed at home and abroad as Congress debates appropriations and tax reduction and as the Kremlin speculates on a major crash of the American and British economies.

Russia's refusal to join with the western democracies in making decent peace settlements and Russia's behavior toward non-Communist countries arise out of the Kremlin's conviction that the United States and other capitalistic countries are heading for unavoidable economic catastrophe.

As times get harder in the United States, Russia and Marxians in other countries calculate, American taxpayers will be increasingly reluctant to provide funds for the Truman program.

When American financial assistance dries up, Russia expects the countries enjoying or anticipating American aid to be far more responsive to Communist pressure.

To make sure that its predictions come true, Russia is offering increasing opposition to creation of an international trade organization.

Russia wants the entire program of international economic cooperation, symbolized by the International Bank, the International Fund, and ITO to fail, so that the anticipated depression will attain maximum proportions and leave the United States too weak and discredited to stand in Russia's way.

RUSS SELF-DECEPTION

In anticipation of that development the Kremlin is engaging in some fancy self-deception.

In a significant article to aid the agitator and propagandist Pravda, on April 28 declared there are 5,700,000 unemployed in the United States. Unemployment and strikes are assuming an extensive and steadily increasing scope, resulting in an increasingly tense internal situation.

There were 2,300,000 unemployed in the United States in March, and 2,500,000 in February, but statistics, as Pravda long ago observed are an instrument of the class war.

The House last week appropriated $200,000,000 to aid Austria, Hungary, Poland, Italy, Greece, and China. The Senate Foreign Affairs Committee previously had unanimously approved a $350,000,000 appropriation for this purpose, but a tax-reduction-minded House cut that figure by $150,000,000.

REPLACES UNRRA AID

This appropriation is in addition to $400,000,000 previously voted to assist Greece and Turkey along lines laid down by President Truman. It is designed to relieve acute distress incident to the discontinuance of UNRRA.

This also is independent of $500,000,000 worth of assistance the United States is committed to give the people of the American-occupied zone of Germany during the next 3 years; $600,000,000 worth of assistance General MacArthur feels must be given the people of Japan during that period; several hundred million which will be required if we are to make a success of our occupation of southern Korea, and almost as much to carry out our responsibilities in Austria.

BRITAIN MAY NEED MORE

This list does not take into account the possibility that Great Britain may have to ask the United States to assume at least part of the commitment to provide $500,000,000 worth of assistance to Germany which Britain undertook last December at our behest.

Uncertainty as to the extent of present and prospective American commitments has prompted Representative HERTER, of Massachusetts, to introduce a resolution in Congress authorizing the creation of a select committee on foreign aid. Its object would be to make a continuing study of the best way to relate our expenditures abroad to our resources and objectives.

Pending the findings of such a committee, we have only a series of informal estimates and reports to guide us.

WHAT UNITED STATES HAS GIVEN

On the basis of official reports of 16 Government agencies, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, says that between July 1, 1945, and July 1, 1947, the United States will have allocated money or goods for foreign relief

and assistance in the amount of $16,788,091,000. This is exclusive of the $600,000,000 for Greece, Turkey, Italy, China, etc.

This includes the British loan, lend-lease, Export-Import Bank, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, UNRRA, foreign liquidation, and a variety of other disbursements.

Beardsley Ruml, former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, thinks the United States could afford $3,000,000,000 in foreign gifts and loans beneficial to the American economy. Any money sent abroad for world reconstruction would have to come back to the United States because there is no other place to spent it, Ruml argues.

CLAYTON'S ESTIMATE

Under Secretary of State Will Clayton has expressed the opinion that it would take $20,000,000,000 to finance the Truman policy during the next 5 years.

He believes a country with a national income of $165,000,000,000 a year should be willing to devote some of its surplus to the assistance of free countries.

Henry Wallace topped everybody by proposing a $50,000,000,000 American contribution to world reconstruction, with $10,000,000,000 to $17,000,000,000 allocated to Russia if Russia agrees to a settlement of the German and perhaps other problems.

In addition to the sums sent or expected to be sent abroad by the United States Government, generous Americans have donated large sums through private-relief agencies and as personal gifts.

Only the future will tell whether our attempts to alleviate distress and facilitate recovery by gifts and loans will be more effective than Russia's attempt to foster economic collapse in shaping the postwar world.

Only the future will tell whether our foreign assistance has spared us a major depression or weakened our ability to withstand economic decline, as isolationists contend.

Monopolies Great Concern of Small Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a forceful and timely address by Mr. Ed. Wimmer, editor of Forward America and vice president of the National Federation of Small Business. His address was delivered over radio stations WHIO and WSAI on April 29, 1947. The address merits the consideration of everyone interested in thwarting the march toward monopoly and centralization of economic power. The address is as follows:

ANNOUNCER. Abraham Lincoln said of the free market, and I quote: "The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy tolls or land for himself, or a small business—then labors on his own account for another while, and at length hires some other beginner to help him. This is the just, generous, and prosperous system which keeps the way open to all, gives hope to all, and conserves energy and progress and improvement of conditions for all."

This quotation from the life of Lincoln, ladies and gentlemen, is the theme of a talk you will now hear from Mr. Ed. Wimmer, editor of Forward America, and vice president of the National Federation of Small Business.

Mr. WIMMER: Every Tuesday night at this time, ladies and gentlemen, it has been my purpose to challenge your patriotism and thought with certain statements pertaining to national and international developments now affecting the lives of all people in all nations. Most of my arguments have been centered about the subject of concentration of power in the hands of the few, and I have endeavored to prove that such concentration has not only caused all the great wars, but that power in the hands of the few is now laying the groundwork for a third world war.

There is, of course, a way in which we can minimize the threat of too much power in the hands of the few, and if this goal can be reached, we can usher in the longest period of prosperity ever known, and end, so far as this generation is concerned, the threat of another world conflict. The remedy is simple. It can be applied scientifically, with no real loss to any, but with untold gains to the many. The remedy for curing the evil of which I speak—centralization of power in the hands of the few—is decentralization. If we do not apply this remedy—American democracy is doomed—and the social, religious, economic, and political conflagration which would follow such a disaster needs no picturization.

I shall make no attempt to prove this entire statement in this evening's broadcast, but I will prove certain things to your entire satisfaction, which should remove from your mind any complacency you may feel about the present trends to centralization.

During the past several weeks I have been urging support of the Kefauver-O'Mahoney bill, now pending in Congress, which would prohibit any future merging of competing corporations, and I promised to give you a more detailed report on what we hoped to accomplish through the passage of this legislation. Broadly stated, the bill to outlaw mergers between competing corporations, and known as the O'Mahoney-Kefauver bill, has been prepared with a view to prohibiting unlawful restraints and monopolies, and to prevent certain trade practices not covered by existing antitrust laws. The Congress did pass antimerger legislation in 1914, which was intended to halt the trend toward monopoly, so evident during that period, but, like all important laws, this one had its loophole for those who wanted to find it. The law was known as the Clayton Act, and section 7 of this act specifically stated in clear-cut language that no corporation could acquire any part of the stock or share capital of another corporation where the effect of such purchase would tend to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

Every corporation lawyer who studied the legislation knew that the intent of the Government was to prevent too few corporations from getting too much control, and the merger trend should have slowed down as a result of this knowledge. The lawyers of the larger corporations, however, discovered a loophole in the law, which was the omission of a prohibition against the acquisition of the properties and physical assets of competing corporations, and as soon as these corporations found that they could evade the intent of the law by purchasing the properties and other physical assets of competing corporations a new wave of mergers got under way, and each year there has been an increase in their number.

Let us look at a few startling figures to see just what has, and is still happening to us. Statistics of the Bureau of Internal Revenue reported in 1919 showed that "200 leading corporations had assets of $43,000,000,000." The assets of these corporations had doubled in the years beginning in 1909 and ending in 1919. By 1929, the assets of these same 200 corporations jumped from "forty-three to eighty-one billion dollars," and by 1935, "one-tenth of 1 percent of all corporations owned 52 percent of the assets of all corporations." Less than 5 percent of all corporations, in other words, "owned 87 percent of all assets of all reporting corporations," and "one-tenth of 1 percent of the corporations reporting in 1935 * * * earned 50 percent of the earnings of all corporations."

By 1941, there were 32 corporations in America with assets of $1,000,000,000 or more. By 1943, the number had jumped to 41, and today this figure has been almost doubled.

In the boom year of 1929, there were 1,245 mergers of competing corporations, all of which were in violation of the spirit of the antitrust laws. All through the depression, the merging continued, with the bigger corporations buying out competitors at their own price.

The Federal Trade Commission recently reported that a total of 1,800 mergers took place during the years from 1940 to 1946. During the war, 107 big companies absorbed 300 smaller competitors in the food industries. Six distillers acquired 49 independent distillers and other kinds of businesses, the larger distillers gobbling up virtually all of the country's supply of liquor barrels, forcing the smaller company to sell out because it could get no containers.

One big dairy combine has nearly 500 separate enterprises, and sits astride as much as 60 percent of the dairy business of some of our largest cities. This same dairy combine controls at least 55 percent of the cheese business, 21 percent of the ice cream business, 12 percent of the fluid milk business, 8 percent of all butter sales, and it is operating in many other fields entirely foreign to the dairy industry.

In the tobacco industry, in agricultural implements, in the chain-store field, in banking, and in every other phase of our national economy, the story is the same, and it is this monopolistic trend to merging of the economic resources of the Nation under the control of a few boards of directors, that has led to monopolistic practices of labor unions, and to the growth of big, bureaucratic government.

The whole tendency in this direction is destructive to American ideals, and foreign to all of our ideas of what constitutes the free market. James H. McGraw, one of the leading industrialists of the country, said not long ago, and I quote: "Competition requires independence of action, free access to markets, and no large degree of control by any buyer or seller. The more the sellers, the more easily the buyer can shift from one seller to another."

Henry Luce, publisher of Life, Time, and Fortune magazines, said in 1935, and I quote: "If neither business nor government make any move in the direction of breaking down business into smaller, more compact, more mobile units, if bigness is allowed to remain as the standard concept of our economy, then the American businessman and the American politician, and in fact, all American citizens, must prepare themselves for a different order of things; an order in which the powers of government are not limited, in which the right to risk and profit is not clear, and in which the making, selling, and even the buying of the products of the biggest show on earth, are all mysteriously controlled from above." End of quotation from Fortune magazine, the publication of big business, and written by Henry Luce, its publisher. After reading this sensational statement, I bombarded Life, Time, and Fortune magazines with literature and letters. From time to time, articles did appear, especially in Fortune and Time magazines, and then in 1943, under the title of "America and the Future," John K. Jessup, one of the top men among Luce publications writers, stated: "Many businesses are too big for their own good.

No government can ever locate that point at which a business reaches its exact optimum size, but ours can at least make a start. We can oppose unnecessary gigantism and make corporations prove that they need to be as big as they are." By no other course can we escape socialization of banking and industry within the next few years, which would lead us straight into the arms of the Communists.

I told you before that I had testified in behalf of the Kefauver bill, which I believe is the first step we can take this year to lay the foundation for a real decentralization program. There is no doubt in my mind that the bill will be reported out of the Judiciary Committee, but indications are that it will take a fight to bring it up for a House vote.

If the bill should pass the House I believe it will go quickly to passage by the Senate, where Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, the sponsor, and other top Senators are already making a real fight.

Mr. KEFAUVER's bill is known as H. R. 515. I am not going to ask that you wire or write your Congressman, but I do urge you to consider well what little thing you may do to keep the monopoly issue the hottest issue in America. We have been shadow boxing with phantoms long enough. It is time that we challenge the real enemy of the American way of life: centralization of power in the hands of the few.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WHDH, Boston, Mass, on May 3, 1947:

On this day dedicated to the glory and greatness of the Polish Nation, I am very highly privileged, as Congressman from the Third Massachusetts District, to participate in this most appropriate and impressive program in tribute to an outstanding nation and a noble people. Americans of every race, class, and creed join today with all our fellow citizens of Polish descent in commemorating the stirring events of the founding of this inspiring nation and paying our humble homage to the historic achievements of the Polish people.

No nation in history has sacrificed more for freedom. No people in history have suffered more in the name of free institutions. From time immemorial down to the very present moment the Polish Nation and the Polish people have struggled with tremendous faith, unyielding tenacity and unsurpassed courage to serve the cause of self-determination and human liberty, yes, and to serve the cause of the living Christ.

During the recent war the Polish people and Americans of Polish blood gave living proof of their devotion and loyalty to the eternal principles of freedom and democracy. In their own land, suffering under the lash of an unspeakable tyranny, stricken more cruelly perhaps than any other single nation, the Polish people waged an unflinching battle against overpowering odds and against a ruthless enemy which laid waste their beautiful country, ravaged their homes, slaughtered the helpless and the innocent, and threatened all free institutions throughout the world.

At home here in America our own brave Polish-American sons in the armed forces by gallantry and heroism unexcelled by any group proved to us and to the world that there is no braver, no stronger, and no more courageous American than the Polish-American. Grateful as we all must be for the opportunity to live as citizens of this great free Nation, they demonstrated that they were prepared to discharge in full the debt which they owed to our own beloved country, because they believed, like all of us believed, that they were fighting to preserve democracy and fighting to defend the principles of freedom and justice, upon which all democratic institutions are based.

They believed, as all of us believed, that our Nation and the nations associated with us in the devastating world-wide conflict were fighting for the doctrines set forth in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." They had every reason to believe, once our enemies were crushed, that the promise of speedy liberation and self-determination for Poland and other small nations, reiterated so often during the war, would be kept, that the guarantee of a free, independent Polish nation set forth in the Atlantic Charter and pronounced in many other wartime declarations would be respected, that the right of the Polish people for self-government and self-determination would be redeemed and enforced, that their birthright of freedom and independence, for which so much blood had been spilled throughout the ages, would be recognized.

Yes, my friends, these were the solemn promises made to the Polish people, made to all other small nations. But these promises have not been kept. These guarantees have not been fulfilled. These rights have not been enforced. Instead, through a series of shameful compromises, concessions, and appeasements at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam in which, I am ashamed to say, our own Government took a leading part, the Atlantic Charter was thrown overboard, the "four freedoms" was consigned to the scrap heap, and the Polish nation was thrown into shackles and slavery under the domination of Godless, antidemocratic communism—a system of government and a condition of servitude just as detestable and obnoxious to the liberty-loving, peace-seeking Polish people as the brutal tyranny of the Nazis and just as detestable and obnoxious to all the decent, right-thinking peoples of the world.

On this day dedicated to the glories of the past of this ravaged Nation, I desire to declare that there is no crime in all the annals of history perpetrated against any nation more ghastly, more horrible, or more perfidious than the high international crime which unconscionably cast the God-fearing peoples of Poland into slavery under a Communist puppet government. This crime cries to the American people, not only for redemption, but for correction. The cruel betrayal of the Polish people, a betrayal without hardly a counterpart in all human history, must be corrected. The great wrong that has been done to this noble people must be righted, if the United States of America and the United Nations are to maintain self-respect and the respect and confidence of lovers of freedom and justice throughout the world.

The Polish people are not seeking special favors from anyone or from any nation. They are merely seeking their God-given right to be restored to their previous status, to be released from cruel, inhuman serfdom and to be permitted to live as free citizens of a nation ordained and developed under the same principles of self-determination upon which our own Nation is based and in the name of which and to perpetuate which so many Polish and American sons and sons of other free nations fought, bled, and died.

The moral sense and the conscience of the loyal American people have been deeply shocked and aroused by the plight of Poland and they will insist that the Polish people shall be released from bondage and accorded the right, so dearly won, to maintain their own form of government free from the brutalizing shackles of communism. The cause of Poland is and will be the one great test of whether or not this Nation and the United Nations will be able to carry out the great basic principles for which we fought the war of establishing freedom and liberty on a secure foundation or whether we, on the other hand, will sit back in craven submission and appeasement and surrender to the accomplished fact of communism on a world-wide scale.

As we observe the steady pressure against the aspirations of the Polish people and other peoples who have a right to be free, as we observe the spread of infiltration and control beyond the gateways of western Europe into practically all parts of the world, and especially into the very heart of western democratic civilization, thinking Americans must be gravely disturbed at the expanding and ominous power of the mighty octopus of Red fascism which is so ruthlessly spreading its deadly tentacles over so many free democratic nations.

If the freedom our sons fought for is to live, if the rights of nations, small and large, to ordain their own form of government are to be preserved, if the dignity and liberty of the ordinary human being is to be recognized, then it is the sworn duty of every American who believes in the basic truths and doctrines of his own Nation to rally to the cause of Poland, and indeed to rally to the cause of every helpless, inarticulate nation, beaten down, suppressed, and struggling to be free from oppression and tyranny.

Our sons have fought and died for freedom and the very least we can do is to stand for and strive to fulfill the ideals for which so many of them paid the supereme sacrifice and offered their all. Poland must and will be free or else the cause of democracy, which she symbolizes so nobly, will be submerged under the wave of totalitarian dictatorship and the world will ultimately revert, as it has in dark times of the past under conditions very similar to the ones which now confront us, into brutality and barbarianism.

And so, my friends, on this glorious Pulaski Day that typifies some of the noblest and most inspiring chapters of man's struggles for freedom and light, which exemplifies so magnificently the devotion and sacrifice of Poland and the Polish people, I am proud to pay my humble tribute. And I am proud to pledge my continued and my unflinching efforts to the sacred cause of Poland and human freedom.

Yes, my friends, Poland must be free. With God's grace and with the help of the millions of patriotic people of our own great Republic and liberty-loving peoples the world over, may Polish freedom soon come to pass.

Search Without Warrant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in a 5-to-4 decision handed down by the Supreme Court this week, a decision marked by a bitter minority dissent, the right of search without warrant was pronounced.

By reason of my votes in several instances during the course of this session,

I have been attacked as a "reactionary" and a "Red baiter," both of which terms I consider ridiculous. I have stood, and shall continue to stand for what I believe to be the constitutional rights of all American citizens, whether those rights take the form of control of one's own property, as in the case of rent control, or whether it be the right of management to have a voice in the conduct of legitimate business, as in the case of the labor bill.

I do, however, view the decision of the court as an attack on the constitutional right of an American citizen to be free within his own home from search and seizure at the whim of law enforcement agencies great and small.

I deplore the decision as a step away from liberty and freedom of the individual.

Assistance to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence regarding a Soviet-Yugoslav agreement:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 5, 1947.

The Honorable JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FULTON: I refer to a telephone conversation between Miss Cameron, of your office, and an officer of the Department of State, asking whether the Department had any information regarding a Soviet-Yugoslav agreement whereby the Soviet Government agreed to give certain assistance to the Yugoslav Government.

There is enclosed a communication which I believe covers the matter in which you are interested.

Sincerely yours,
DURWARD V. SANDIFER,
Acting Legislative Counsel.

[Enclosure: Telegram from Moscow, June 11, 1946.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Moscow, June 11, 1946.

SECSTATE,
1834, Eleventh:

Soviet press June 11 announces Soviet-Yugoslav communique recent negotiations between Stalin, Molotov, and Mikoyan on one hand and Yugoslav Government delegation headed by Tito on other. Substantive provisions are translated as follows:

Questions were reviewed of interest to both sides in regard to Soviet-Yugoslav treaty of friendship, mutual assistance, and postwar cooperation of April 11, 1945, and full agreement was achieved on all questions involving economic collaboration, trade, supply of material to Yugoslav Army, and close cultural and political collaboration.

Government U. S. S. R. agreed to supply Yugoslav Army with arms, munitions, etc., on conditions long-term credit, and also to assist in reestablishment Yugoslavia's own war industry.

Trade negotiations conducted between both governments terminated successfully with conclusion agreement on mutual deliveries of goods. Soviet Government responded to fullest extent to requirements Yugoslav economy, both in regard to raw materials and to technical and other materials.

Decisions were adopted regarding close economic cooperation between both friendly countries.

Negotiations transpired in atmosphere of cordiality and complete mutual understanding.

Repeated to Belgrade as 29.

SMITH.

Record of Republican Congress Reveals Positive Redemption of Campaign Pledges—Republicans Get Fast Action on All 10 Major Preelection Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln once said, "Calling the tail of a cow a leg does not prove that a cow has five legs." It is equally clear that the mere fact that a few lame-duck columnists and commentators who are carryovers from the heyday of New Deal ascendancy continue to mouth the fallacy that the Republican Congress has not met its responsibilities does not prove that fallacy to be a fact. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the exact opposite is demonstrable from the printed record of accomplishments.

Such discerning and objective columnists and commentators as Fulton Lewis, Jr.; Richard Harkness, Frank Kent, George Sokolsky, Westbrook Pegler, and David Lawrence have pointed out over and over again the exact and specific manner in which the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress has acted to redeem its campaign pledges and to restore sensible and solvent Government to this Republic. Mr. Speaker, the record of achievement is as clear as the path to the country school house. All that is required by any analyst is the time and patience to study the record of events which has transpired since the opening of the eightieth Congress last January plus the election-stimulated pronouncements coming from the executive departments during the interim between the great Republican victory on November 5 and the opening session of Congress when the Republicans organized the legislative branch of Government with complete control of it for the first time since 1930.

Once upon a time, Mr. Speaker, a great and good Democrat by name of Al Smith offered a blunt proposal for dispelling such fictitious propaganda as that which the New Dealers of this country have attempted to foist upon the American public in connection with the achievement record of the Eightieth Congress. Al Smith put it well when he said, "Let's look at the record." We Republicans echo the words of Al Smith. We urge our fellow citizens to follow this maxim. "Let's look at the record" for January, February, March, and April. It is a record of which every Republican in America may well be proud and one for which Americans of every party affiliation may well give thanks, since it has headed our country away from the shoals of disaster toward which it had drifted so long and so dangerously.

It is important that objective students of government, and partisan enthusiasts as well, should keep certain stern facts in mind when they endeavor to evaluate the record of the Eightieth Congress down to date. Let me enumerate a few of these stubborn, irrefutable facts, Mr. Speaker, before spreading on the record the achievement score of this Republican Congress. Here are some facts which nobody can deny and which nobody dare dispute:

First. The Eightieth Congress was faced with the necessity of reorganizing and modernizing the functional machinery of the legislative branch of Government in the first major remodeling job of that nature undertaken in many generations. The mandate for this streamlining procedure was provided by the Seventy-ninth Congress, and the Eightieth Congress kept faith with the people by faithfully reorganizing the new Congress in conformity with the terms of the Reorganization Act. It took time to complete this prodigious task and it necessarily slowed down the early activities of Congress. Nonetheless, the Republican majority faced up to the job and Congress is now rapidly making up for the time lost in the difficult problems of reorganization.

Second. The New Deal Democrats maintained their complete control of Congress for something over 720 weeks. We Republicans have been in control for slightly over 20 weeks. It would be a prejudiced jury, indeed, which would expect the Republican Party to correct all of the abuses and excesses of the preceding New Deal majority in less than one-thirtieth of the time it required the New Dealers to write their pattern and their philosophies into law. After all, ordinary common sense and elemental justice require that it will take longer than 20 weeks to free America from the entangling legislative strings which the New Dealers required over 720 weeks to fabricate.

Third. Inasmuch as the Presidency and all of the executive departments and agencies are still in Democratic hands it is impossible for the Republican Congress to move as far or as fast as it could if the Republican Party were in control of both the executive and the legislative branches of Government. The full force and power of New Deal patronage and propaganda emanating from hundreds of executive offices is being used to defeat and distort Republican proposals. After 1948, it is indicated the Republicans will be in charge of both the White House and the Congress; when that occurs, reforms can be both more speedy and more substantial.

Fourth. Under the New Deal pattern of performance, legislative proposals were largely fashioned in the White House and handed down to the controlled congressional committees in the form

of must legislation. That is no longer true. Under the Republican congressional majority, committees devise their own legislation and perfect it through public hearings and following numerous conferences. It is obvious that a deliberative legislative process of this type moves more slowly than the shot-gun wedding technique employed by the New Dealers. It is also obvious, however, that this Republican technique is more representative of the people's views and more reflective of the concepts upon which America's Government was founded.

Mr. Speaker, as written testimony evolved by following the admonition, "Let us look at the record," I now offer the following article which was written by me for the April issue of the Republican magazine, published in Chicago, Ill. It should be kept in mind that this article was written early in April. Since it was written, substantial additional progress has been made in the matter of freeing America from administrative controls, writing foreign policy by bipartisan action, and effecting reductions in the President's budget. However, even this brief review of achievements by the Republican Congress up to the first part of April provides an effective answer to those who carelessly contend that the Eightieth Congress is not getting results.

On the basis of the following record, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Republican majority in this Eightieth Congress has established a performance pattern of redeemed campaign pledges which is almost without precedent or without parallel in congressional history.

[From the Republican magazine of April 1947]

THIS MONTH IN WASHINGTON

(By Hon. KARL E. MUNDT)

The brilliance of Washington's famed cherry blossoms is rivaled these days by the blushing faces of embarrassed critics who prematurely criticized the new Republican majority in Congress for "not living up to campaign promises."

Discerning Washington observers with long memories say that they cannot remember any Congress, since the turn of the century, which has done so much in so short a time to vindicate its pledges to the American voters as has the Eightieth Congress.

To demonstrate that the foregoing analysis is not merely the unsupported opinion of a few observers and that this writer is not engaging in hyperbole in bringing you the Washington rating of the Eightieth Congress, let us review the record.

The Republican Party made 10 specific promises to the American public during the last campaign. These pledges were not weasel-worded generalities nor ambiguous platitudes. They are in the files of every metropolitian newspaper of the country and are a matter of public record.

Here is the list of 10 specific promises. After each pledge follows the performance record which is already a matter of actual achievement after only 90 days of Republican leadership in Congress.

COMMUNISM MUST BE CURBED

1. Republicans promised that they would compel the administration to remove the Communists which it had been admitting to the Federal pay roll for more than 14 years.

Performance: Speaker JOE MARTIN of the House of Representatives made the demand that "Communists must be fired from the Federal pay roll," the major theme of his address on the opening day of Congress. The House Committee on Un-American Activities, operating with a Republican majority for the first time in its history, recommended specific legislation providing for a loyalty test of all Federal employees. A Republican-controlled Appropriations Committee denied public funds entirely to one administration agency dominated by subversive fellow travelers. On March 22 the President threw in the sponge and issued an Executive order, providing for a loyalty purge to remove the Communists from the Federal pay roll. Thus, the Democratic administration which had appointed them to office, and which had resisted all efforts to drive them out for more than 14 years, was compelled by Republican action to yield to the growing demand.

WASTE MUST STOP

2. Republicans promised to put an end to wasteful extravagance and endless confusion in the administrative agencies.

Performance: Every appropriation bill proposed by the President and his subservient Bureau of the Budget these first 3 months has been sharply reduced by the House. Millions of dollars have already been saved the American taxpayers. The biggest cuts are yet to come in the most excessively padded budgetary proposals, which are scheduled for congressional action in April, May, and June. By eliminating unnecessary agencies, the march back toward orderly government has begun.

THE GOP WILL DECONTROL AMERICA

3. Republicans promised to free this Republic from the shackles of oppression and unneeded restrictions, restraints, and regulations in order that production might replace shortages.

Performance: Confronted by a determined Republican majority in Congress, the New Deal and wartime agencies of the administration have bowed to the inevitable. There has been a noticeable slow down in the stream of directives flowing out of Washington. Some of the reforms were made voluntarily by bureau chiefs who sensed the trend. In some cases appropriations were denied, pledges to decontrol America were exacted in others before administrative agencies were allotted the public funds they required. As a result, clothing, food, automobiles, tires, plumbing supplies—the materials America needs—are becoming available again.

GOVERNMENT BY EDICT MUST END

4. Republicans pledged their countrymen that a Republican Congress would turn America away from the road toward one-man government.

Performance: Notified by the Republican congressional leadership that his wartime powers would not be extended, President Truman saved what face he could by issuing his declaration "that hostilities are at an end." By such a declaration, made just ahead of congressional action, many of the presidential powers to issue edicts were terminated. Others are being ended by congressional action. Congress is once again the legislative authority in America.

WILL PROMOTE PRODUCTION

5. Republicans promised production. They pledged themselves to work out labor legislation and tax laws which would give labor and management the opportunity of working together for maximum production; that they would retain enough of what they earn to serve as a spur to far greater production.

Performance: Congress has already acted to stop the portal-to-portal pay fiasco which was the direct result of New Deal maladministration. The House has acted to reduce taxes up to 30 percent in the lowest brackets and to 10.5 percent in the highest brackets; the Senate may have acted on the tax legislation by the time this article is printed. By mid-April, a comprehensive "bill of rights for labor and management" is promised from Congressman HARTLEY'S hard-working House Labor Committee. Strikes had been reduced to a new minimum during the first quarter of 1947. Unethical labor bosses can no longer threaten the American public.

FOREIGN AID MUST BE RECTIFIED

6. Republicans promised that our aid to countries overseas should be used to provide relief from suffering rather than political fuel for rival ideologies.

Performance: The Republican Congress announced that UNRRA must be liquidated due to the sorry record of ineptitude, inefficiency, and waste. In its place has come a new formula for foreign relief—largely the program of Herbert Hoover, former Republican President. Our foreign relief will henceforth be supervised by American citizens rather than foreign Communist leaders. It will be used to extend relief to human suffering. Any assistance extended above the level of that required to prevent abject starvation or slow death will be provided only to areas where the precepts of freedom are permitted to function. No longer will American taxpayers provide fuel for the torches of totalitarianism.

THE GOP WILL DEVELOP AMERICA

7. Republicans promised to support rural electrification, to aid veterans, to develop American resources, to try to force the administration once again to direct the flow of American substance so as to strengthen America from within as well as to safeguard it from without.

Performance: Republicans have kept that pledge. In three short months, in addition to putting into practice a streamlined Congress, the Republican congressional majorities demonstrated their determination to press for the internal development of American resources. Such projects as REA, reclamation, soil conservation, veterans' aid, flood control, and the like are receiving favorable consideration. Waste is being eliminated where evident. By adding another $500 to the tax exemptions of folks over the age of 65, the Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee provided immediate aid to America's elder citizens. By scrutinizing our foreign commitments carefully, the Republican majority is making more money available for immediate domestic objectives.

BUREAUCRACY MUST BE REDUCED

8. From Maine to California, Republicans promised that they would reduce bureaucracy—would separate from the Federal pay roll thousands of unnecessary chair warmers.

Performance: Separating a bureaucrat from his bounty in Washington is numbered among one of the most difficult acts in American political experience. But it is happening. Already 200,000 of the political extras have been severed from the taxpayers' pay roll. Many more are to go. Several investigating committees under such able Republican leadership as that of Representative ED REES, Kansas, chairman of the House Civil Service Committee, and Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, Michigan, chairman of the House Executive Expenditures Committee, are now making a careful examination of this problem. On the Senate side, such Senators as BRIDGES, of New Hampshire; BREWSTER, of Maine; FERGUSON, of Michigan; and WHERRY, of Nebraska, are taking a leading part in purging the pay rolls.

THE FBI MUST BE FREE TO ACT

9. Prior to last November Republicans pledged themselves to "prevent the FBI from being brought under the domination of the White House." J. Edgar Hoover's early public service in the crusade against communism had exposed him to the vindictive attacks of political progressives who were White House favorites.

Performance: Republicans have kept that pledge. J. Edgar Hoover has been given to

understand by Congress that he is a free agent. He may attack subversive forces in this country wherever he finds them. The Bureau of Investigation can count upon the full financial and political support of the Republican majorities. The FBI will be instructed by Congress to follow through on the loyalty purge without fear or favor. It will be asked to report its results to Congress. Legislation is now in the hopper to make the FBI an independent agency of Government, completely out from under the Attorney General's political control. It is certain to be passed at the first sign of executive interference with the FBI. Last month the Attorney General permitted J. Edgar Hoover to testify for the first time before the House Committee on Un-American Activities—an indication of Republican pressure.

FOREIGN POLICY MUST BE OURS

10. Republicans promised to cooperate with the White House and the State Department in the development of an American foreign policy based on realism and honest reciprocal cooperation among the nations of the world * * * designed neither to appease nor antagonize any nation but rather to promote the peace for all."

Performance: Probably in no other single aspect of our national affairs has the Republican influence been more emphatically noticeable than in our American foreign policy. Early in January the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held conferences with Secretary of State Marshall, with the President, with Under Secretary Dean Acheson, and with important administrative figures in the field. Republicans insisted that the era of the cringing and continuous appeasement of Russia, which marked Roosevelt's foreign policy from 1941 until his death, and continued to earmark our foreign policy under President Truman, must end.

Republicans told the administration that the formation of a bipartisan American foreign policy was a joint undertaking—that it involved more than Republican support for Democratic suggestions. Republicans proposed that the secret agreements at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam should now be made public; that international control of the atom bomb must be expedited; that there must be an end to the pattern of vengeful death by starvation which Morgenthau had sold Roosevelt for Germany. Republicans demanded that consistency become the guide lines of American foreign policy rather than political spite.

The President's speech to the joint session of Congress on March 12 was a recognition of Republican insistence that we begin the formation and functioning of an American foreign policy consistent with American principles and expressed with the candor of American tradition. The era of appeasement for Russian communism which began with Roosevelt in 1941, and even earlier, ended on March 12, 1947, with President Truman's address to Congress on the challenge presented by the conditions in Greece and Turkey. Realism has once again replaced reckless opportunism as the basis upon which to build an intelligent and understandable American foreign policy. The reason for the change was the strength of the Republican influence flowing from the victory in the November elections.

EXCELLENT PERFORMANCE RECORD

On all 10 of the major Republican preelection promises America has witnessed in a short period of 3 months a greater degree of postelection performance than in almost any similar period of our national history. In the months ahead Americans and all the world will continue to reap increasing dividends as a result of the wise decision which John Q. Public made last November behind the curtains of the secret voting booths in this greatest and freest of republics.

Hon. Charles L. Gerlach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILSON D. GILLETTE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 5, 1947

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing my feeling of genuine sorrow over the passing of our friend, CHARLIE GERLACH. In the death of this fine gentleman, his family has lost a cherished member and his community has lost an exceedingly valuable citizen. He was a good man, quiet and sincere, and he will be missed by his friends, the State of Pennsylvania, and in Congress. To those he leaves behind, I want to extend my deep and heartfelt sympathy.

Don't Sink the Navy!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, because of the interest there is, or ought to be, in the needs of our country insofar as the armed forces are concerned, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an informative article presented in the current issue of Liberty Magazine as a part of an informative debate entitled "Navy Versus Air Force on How to Fight the Next War." The author of the Navy point of view is the Honorable H. Struve Hensel, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Ably qualified to speak, and free to do so without the restrictions of current Government service, Mr. Hensel has this to say:

DON'T SINK THE NAVY! PUTTING ALL ON AIR POWER WILL WRECK OUR SECURITY, WRITES H. STRUVE HENSEL, FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The Army Air Forces did a wonderful job during the war. But if the more radical spokesmen for air power in general and the Army Air Forces in particular make headway with the public, it will endanger our national security. It is time some of the wilder statements were challenged.

An example was the extravagant clamor attending the advent of the new B–36 bomber.

The B–36 was widely advertised as having a 10,000-mile range with 10,000 pounds of bombs, and as capable of carrying an atomic bomb to any inhabited region of the world and returning home without refueling. The manufacturer may have estimated 10,000 miles, but on combat missions it is necessary to allow for such things as take-off, climb, possible head winds, and a fuel reserve. Aeronautical engineers tell me a practical combat radius for the B–36 would be about 3,000 miles. This would allow us to bomb London and return to New York. From any other possible take-off point in the United States, including Alaska, no strategic target could be attained.

Talk about rockets by the less restrained Army Air Forces spokesmen has grown so absurd that the War Department tried unsuccessfully to stop it. Gen. George C. Kenney, head of the Strategic Air Command, sent spinal shivers through the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense in Washington recently by predicting that the next war would open with an attack on us across the north polar basin, made by both piloted and pilotless aircraft, by radio-controlled missiles, by rockets—all loaded with atomic bombs, superexplosives, superincendiaries, bacterial weapons, or other means of mass destruction.

"The result may be a casualty list of 25,000,000 men, women, and children in the first 24 hours," he told them.

A few weeks earlier, General Eaker predicted that any of the principal industrial nations "can, by 1950, develop a super-rocket with a range of from 3,000 to 5,000 miles which can travel at a speed of 1,000 to 3,000 miles an hour * * * and deliver 10 to 20 tons of explosives with great accuracy."

Many of these aerial wonders may come to pass some day. But that day is still beyond the ability of practical scientists to predict. As a matter of fact, the secret of how to guide missiles even 1,000 miles has not yet been discovered. Dr. Vannevar Bush, the distinguished scientists who heads the Joint Research and Development Board, publicly deplored not long ago that sort of exaggeration of push-button warfare. He declared that it warped public thinking about present problems. Some of it is a lot of hooey, he said.

We might think the AAF had already invented a plane that would fly over a jungle-infested Pacific island, drop its landing field from the sky (thereby automatically destroying all the enemy in the area), land, and then pull its bombs and supplies down from the skies. Unfortunately, the self-operating air strip and the floating gas drum have not yet been invented. In the meantime it doesn't make sense to drop the bone we have for the reflection of one in the water.

Intemperate AAF enthusiasts, forgetting the job the Navy did, heap ridicule on its ships, its aviators, and its marines. The Marine Corps was inelegantly described by an AAF general at a public dinner in Norfolk a few weeks ago as "a small bitched-up army talking Navy lingo." His remarks, as quoted to me by half a dozen auditors, were unusually frank. He continued, "We're going to put those marines into the Regular Army and make soldiers of them."

The Navy has never claimed it won the war unassisted, and never will. Its function is to dominate the seas by excluding all enemy transportation, maintaining our own lines of supply and communication, and carrying—and keeping—the war in the enemy's own area. This function will remain vital as long as sea transportation is important, and there are no planes on the field or on the drawing boards at present capable of taking over the job. Another Navy function is to help both the air forces and the ground forces establish bases. Furthermore, the Navy has no mean offensive power of its own.

The President's plan for unification, announced on January 16 with the approval of the Secretaries of War and the Navy, recognized that the Navy and ground forces have important roles in our defense, and will have until and unless they are outmoded by inventions of the future.

As for the past, some of the AAF's advocates tend to oversell the excellent job it did in Europe. Take pin-point bombing, for instance. The impartial civilians of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey had difficulty in telling precision from area raids. In the AAF's bombing of German oil plants, the survey found that only 12.6 percent of the bombs landed within the plant fences.

The score chalked up for the Pacific by the strategic bombing survey wasn't very high. During the first 3 months that the B–29s bombed Japan from the Marianas, less than 10 percent of the bombs hit the target areas. They were dropped from about 30,000 feet.

Later, the survey notes, accuracy increased "and averaged 35 to 40 percent within 1,000 feet of the aiming point in daylight attacks from 20,000 feet or lower." By contrast, the low-level attacks by carrier planes got at least 50 percent hits within 250 feet of the aiming point.

Iwo Jima, less than 20 square miles in area, was bombed heavily for 2½ months, but the Japs were still using its airfield at the end of that time. And despite the Seventh Army Air Force's 10-week attack, it took 26 days at a cost of 20,000 lives for the marines to conquer the island.

If the AAF's record against land targets is not flattering, its score against shipping is even less so. In the Battle of Midway the B–17s made 62 sorties and, according to Japanese survivors, made no hits at all.

The classic example of AAF optimism was the reported sinking of the Japanese battleship *Haruna* off Luzon in the first week of the war. According to Japanese naval officers, she was not in that area and none of the Jap ships attacked suffered any damage. The *Haruna* was actually sunk by naval carrier aircraft in July 1945 in the anchorage at Kure.

AAF spokesmen take it for granted that in the event of future war, coastal aerial antisubmarine forces will be provided from their own land-based units. This summary dismissal of the intricacies of antisubmarine warfare may be contrasted with the record in World War II: Naval aircraft sank 83 German submarines to the Army's 14, and 20 Japanese submarines to none for the Army.

General Kenney told a Senate committee that the AAF under his command in the Southwest Pacific alone sank, probably sank, or heavily damaged about 3,000,000 tons of shipping. The Bombing Survey credits the entire AAF with 907,800 tons (10.2 percent) of Japanese merchant shipping sunk or seriously damaged, and with the sinking of 55,000 tons (4.2 percent) of warships in the carrier, battleship, cruiser, and destroyer classes. As only 444,000 tons of smaller military vessels were sunk by all arms, General Kenney seems to have used a multiplier of at least two.

Navy and Marine aircraft accounted for 11 times as many tons in the major warship class as did the AAF, and more than twice the merchant tonnage. Navy mines (mostly dropped by Navy-trained AAF B–29s) took 9.3 percent of the merchant tonnage, or 827,700 tons. The submarine was of course the greatest killer, being credited with more than half the Jap Navy and merchant shipping losses.

High officials of the War Department, civilian and military, show plainly by their public statements that they do not understand the functions of sea power—on, under, and above the sea. The keynote was struck by former Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle in testimony before a Senate committee that "the battleship has been obsolescent for the last 20 years and obsolete for the last 10. * * * The carrier is going into obsolescence." He forgot that without the submarine, the carrier, and even the battleship and the marines, the B–29's could not have come within a thousand miles of Hiroshima.

General Spaatz is quoted as having said at a dinner last year that "to talk of fighting the next war on oceans is ridiculous."

No navy opposed ours at Okinawa, in the longest and bloodiest battle of the maritime war. The Fifth Fleet was there to support the ground and air forces. It concentrated 1,450 ships, under incessant attack by Japanese land-based planes. We lost 36 ships, and naval gunfire and fighter planes brought down 4,500 enemy aircraft. Most of the Navy's job in the war was putting enemy ground installations out of business, putting troops ashore, and protecting them there.

Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, former head of Manhattan Project, said recently that with the advent of the atomic bomb the need for a navy has passed. Maybe times have changed, but the B–29 which dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima flew from a base in the Marianas captured by sea power, flew on gasoline delivered in a Navy tanker, and parts of the bomb it dropped had been transported by the Navy.

At the Norfolk dinner attended by high officers of the armed services, the general was outspoken about the AAF's intentions. In substance, according to his auditors, he said, "The AAF no longer is going to be a subordinate outfit. It was a predominant force during the war and it is going to be a predominant force during the peace, whether you like it or not.

"The AAF is going to run the show. The Navy is going to end up by only supplying the requirements of the Army air and ground forces."

The more generous of these spokesmen would keep certain ships for heavy freight, and perhaps would allow some armament to protect that freight. But the less generous would apparently be not at all more reluctant to sink the whole fleet.

Many of the uninitiated who listen to the aerophiles must believe that in the event of another war it will merely be necessary for a few AAF planes to take off from the United States with atomic bombs and obliterate the enemy cities, after which other AAF planes will ferry paratroopers over to effect occupation.

Unfortunately, it won't be as simple as that. We shall need the integration of all our defensive agencies—Army, Navy, Air, industry, manpower, natural resources, and diplomacy. And the integration can't be brought about merely by having the AAF take everything over.

By the President's plan, the Navy would retain its Marine Corps and its own aviation, which are vital to it. The AAF would get the autonomy which it has been demanding, and parity with the ground forces and Navy under a Secretary of National Defense. But if the views of some of its generals prevail, we may doubt that the AAF will long be content with mere party.

The AAF's worship of the heavy bomber blinds it to certain facts. It likes to think of Japan as having surrendered without an invasion. "The Navy had the transport to make invasion possible," said General Doolittle. "The ground forces had the power to make it successful, and the B–29 made it unnecessary."

But Japan was invaded, in the sense that even Japanese inland waters were completely dominated by our surface fleet and naval air. Iwo Jima was invaded by the Navy and Marines. Okinawa was invaded by the Navy, Marines, and Army. We might as well deny, if an enemy took Seattle and San Diego, that the United States was invaded, just because these cities are so far from Washington.

Ours is an island continent. We must have warships to gain and hold control of the oceans and to protect convoys. We must have cargo ships to carry troops and their supplies and to transport short-range aircraft, with fuels and spare parts, to distant bases or beachheads, if we are to keep war at arm's length from us. The length of that arm is the radius of the Navy's ships and airplanes.

The public is beguiled by such statements as that of Maj. Gen. F. L. Anderson, made recently before a veterans' group that "it may well be that the next war will be fought by air forces alone." Gen. Jacob L. Devers, commanding the Army Ground Forces, recently spoke of plans to fly every infantry division to future battles, and of planes being developed so large that 300 of them could transport a division. He even envisioned flying 60-ton tanks to battle. To realize this dream we should need to build and protect greater airfields at home and near the scene of battle than exist anywhere in the world today. And we should need an aircraft industry on a scale far greater than we had in World War II.

Within the foreseeable future, we need the fleet. To defend itself against hostile submarines, aircraft, and warships, our fleet must be armed with all the types of airplanes that experts in sea power deem necessary. It must be protected by land-based search and patrol planes under its own control. And it must be able to man its aircraft with pilots and crews who know not only aerial fighting but the tactics of surface ships and submarines.

The pilot of a naval plane must understand what he is attacking, what counterattack to expect, the points of greatest vulnerability on his target, the speed and turning radius of, say, an enemy destroyer, and the diving angle of an enemy submarine. In short, he has to be a naval officer in the air, not merely an air officer flying over water. Naval aviation is not just a small bitched-up air force, and its men must know more than Navy lingo.

If future attacks, as predicted, come across the polar icecap by air, I think all will agree that the way to dispose of the transpolar rocket is to destroy it at the factory or the launching platform in the enemy country. Here the Navy can help by carrying the war to the aggressor. Its battleships and submarines will be equipped as launching platforms for V2-type guided missiles with their known range of hundreds of miles. Its carriers can send aloft medium bombers, using jets to help them get off the decks. These bombers need not even be piloted, as they can be directed and protected by fast fighters sent aloft with them.

Without any more antiaircraft protection than they had against the kamikazes at Okinawa, task forces equipped with these modern weapons could dominate all Europe and the Near East from locations in the North Sea, the Persian Gulf, and the Mediterranean. There would be a vast saving in fuel and time over attacks from more distant points.

Guided missiles will be increasingly potent weapons for the future, and at least in our time they will have to be guided from points not too far from the enemy. A 500-mile-an-hour jet fighter is itself a recoverable guided missile—guided by the pilot. Arm it with self-contained, radio-equipped shells having directional fuses, and what chance has a lumbering 350-mile-per-hour bomber? There is, incidentally, no bomber that fast yet in existence.

The future of the heavy bomber is, indeed, uncertain. If the enemy has any aircraft, the bomber has to be protected by fighters. These must come at present from near-by airfields or from the movable bases which the carriers provide. Unless we can develop a fighter with normal range three times the bomber's (so as to allow for excess fuel consumed in combat), long-range operations may be impossible. At any rate the bomber's death knell is likely to be sounded by the ground-launched rocket fitted with directional fuse.

If another war comes, the man in the street and the housewife in the kitchen will be as much the target as the soldier and the sailor. To meet the danger, we need a true coordination of all our forces, military, civil, and private. We need friendly competition between the branches of the service to produce the most effective weapons. But more than that, we need mutual confidence and understanding. Army, Air, and Navy must know one another's capacities, appreciate one another's problems. And the wild assertions of intemperate spokesmen are of equal disservice to all branches, in delaying our equal task of achieving full cooperation.

John Taber's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, Monday, May 5, was the anniversary of the birth of the Honorable JOHN TABER, of New York, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. On that day the Appropriations Committee paused to observe the occasion and to honor this great man, our friend and distinguished chairman, JOHN TABER.

Under permission heretofore granted, I would like to insert in the RECORD the tribute paid to Mr. TABER on his birthday by the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois:

Mr. Chairman, before the committee undertakes consideration of the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice and Commerce, let me intrude a moment to say that this is a state occasion in more ways than one and that justice requires that we put aside the cares of commerce for a moment to observe with fitting ceremony the sixty-seventh birthday anniversary of our distinguished chairman, the Honorable JOHN TABER.

JOHN TABER was born 67 years ago in the city of Auburn, N. Y. I do not remember whether this is the sweet Auburn which Oliver Goldsmith had in mind when he wrote The Deserted Village, but I do know that JOHN TABER still lives there. That is indeed testimony to his stability and firmness of character. Lindbergh may fly the ocean, Admiral Byrd may make frequent pilgrimages to Little America. Others may succumb to the fever of mobility, but JOHN TABER lives and serves the place where he was born.

In 1880, when he was born, Rutherford B. Hayes was the occupant of the White House. Down through the years and in the course of JOHN TABER'S lifetime, Hayes was followed by Garfield and then came Arthur, Cleveland, and Benjamin Harrison. Later there followed McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, and Harding. Then came Coolidge, Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Truman. The fruitful life of JOHN TABER spans through the administrations of 14 Presidents of the United States.

When JOHN TABER was born the Forty-sixth Congress was in session. Samuel Randell of Pennsylvania was the Speaker and Thurman of Ohio was the President pro tempore of the Senate. It was in 1902, the year after the assassination of President McKinley at the Buffalo Exposition, that JOHN TABER graduated from Yale University and then went to the New York Law School, where he completed his studies in 1904. He has been a practicing attorney and a member of the bar for nearly 43 years.

It was in 1922 that he first gave attention to public service and was elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress. Frederick Gillette of Massachusetts was then Speaker of the House and Albert Cummins of Iowa was the President pro tempore of the Senate. Calvin Coolidge was serving as President of the United States.

It is rather interesting to go back now and then and to note the names and the accomplishments of the men who were John Taber's colleagues in the Sixty-eighth Congress. There was Hayden of Arizona, Barkley of Kentucky, White of Maine, Tydings of Maryland, Schall of Minnesota, Hawes of Missouri, Burton of Ohio, Gibson of Vermont and Connally of Texas, all of whom graduated to the United States Senate and most of whom are still there. Among other of his colleagues, William Bankhead of Alabama became Speaker of the House. Tilson of Connecticut was a candidate for the leadership, Crisp of Georgia was one of the great parliamentarians. Madden of Illinois and Wood of Indiana both served as chairman of the same committee over which our distinguished chairman now presides. There was also Haugen of Iowa who was reputed as one of the great farm leaders. Another colleague was Ramseyer of Iowa to whom we still pay testimony when we invoke the Ramseyer rule in our deliberations. There was also the distinguished Nick Longworth of Ohio, Pou of North Carolina, Vare of Pennsylvania and Hawley of Oregon. Still another distinguished member of the House in those days was Cordell Hull of Tennessee, who later became Secretary of State and John Garner of Texas who became Vice President. Other interesting members who left their names upon the pages of history were Victor Berger, the eminent Socialist for Wisconsin and Fiorello LaGuardia, who has served in so many public capacities since that time.

The roster of Senators who were Members of the Senate when JOHN TABER came to the Sixty-eighth Congress was indeed a distinguished group and included among others Underwood of Alabama, Robinson of Arkansas and Johnson of California. There was also Borah, the Lion of Idaho, McKinley of Illinois, and Jim Watson of Indiana, whose familiar face is still manifest occasionally on Capitol Hill. There was Albert Cummnis of Iowa and Curtis of Kansas who later became Vice President. Henry Cabot Lodge was there, grandfather of the present Senator LODGE and of our own distinguished colleague, JOHN DAVIS LODGE of Connecticut. There was also Pat Harrison of Mississippi and Jim Reed, the master of sarcasm from Missouri. There was Tom Walsh, the great investigator from Montana, and Norris from Nebraska. George Moses of New Hampshire was there, who coined that intriguing phrase "the sons of wild jackasses." Our present and distinguished colleague, JAMES WADSWORTH of New York was then a Member of the United States Senate. There was also Overman of North Carolina and Simeon Fess of Ohio. Charles McNary of Oregon was then in the Senate and later became candidate for the Vice Presidency. Others whose names were household words include Pepper of Pennsylvania, Smoot of Utah, Glass of Virginia, Elkins of West Virginia, and La Follette of Wisconsin. Also in the Senate in those days was Swanson of Virginia, who later became Secretary of the Navy.

JOHN TABER is serving his twenty-fourth year in the Congress. It is indeed a long and distinguished record of steadfastness and devotion to every American ideal and American tradition. He was here in those feverish and tumultuous years which followed World War I and had first-hand experience with the boom and bust results of that era. Today he serves in the postwar period that follows World War II and the American people may well be glad for his stability, his devotion to high purpose and his forthrightness as we meet the challenge of the postwar period and seek to find solutions of a durable character for the problems which presently beset us.

I have been here for 15 years and I cannot recall a single instance in which JOHN TABER ever stepped out of character or departed from those principles which have won for him the respect and admiration of every Member of the House who has ever served with him.

Mr. Chairman, I know I bespeak the sentiment of every member of this Appropriations Committee when I say to you with sincerity and joy—happy birthday to you.

Jewish National Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a resolution of the Minnesota Legislature calling upon the Federal Government to support the long established and officially declared policy of our Government favoring the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine and the immediate opening of the doors of Palestine to large Jewish immigration.

This resolution, in general, conforms to the unanimous position taken by the Minnesota delegation in Congress in a letter addressed to the Secretary of State, under date of March 20, 1947, copy of which letter is also included:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President, Secretary of State and Congress of the United States to direct our Representatives in the United Nations to support the long established and officially declared policy of our Government favoring the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine and the immediate opening of the doors of Palestine to large Jewish immigration

Whereas at the 1945 general session of the legislature of the State of Minnesota a joint resolution was adopted approving the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish national home as called for by the Balfour declaration and the mandate entrusted to Great Britain by the League of Nations and calling for the abrogation of the white paper restricting Jewish immigration into Palestine and limiting the purchase of land in Palestine by Jews; and

Whereas, since the adoption of said resolution, said restrictions have continued, and the displaced Jewish persons of Europe have been prevented from finding in Palestine the home which had been promised to them by 52 nations of the world, including the United States of America; and

Whereas the attainment of a just peace and the maintenance of a peaceful world requires a righteous and equitable settlement of the Palestine question to the end that the hundreds of thousands of homeless Jews of Europe may, as of right, be afforded the opportunity to enter Palestine and there reestablish the Jewish commonwealth; and

Whereas the United Nations, at the request of Great Britain as the mandatory power, is convening a special session of its General Assembly to consider the Palestine matter on April 28, 1947: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Government of the United States, through the State Department and the President, direct our representatives in the United Nations to support the long established and officially declared policy of our Government favoring the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine and the immediate opening of the doors of Palestine to large Jewish immigration; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Senate and the

House of Representatives of the United States of America.

C. ELMER ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE M. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 23d day of April 1947.

H. G. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 23d day of April 1947.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

MARCH 10, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On numerous occasions since May 1939, the members of the Minnesota delegation have expressed to the State Department their support for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine and urged every possible effort to bring about an equitable and amicable conclusion to the problems confronting the Jewish people.

On May 24, 1946, we again communicated with your Department in behalf of the immediate admission to Palestine of 100,000 displaced Jews.

We regret to note that no satisfactory conclusion has been reached and that none appears to be in sight. In view of this, and in view of the disturbed conditions now existing in Palestine and the fluid conditions in the Near East, we respectfully urge a fresh effort by our Government to bring the parties together to work out a solution of the problem of succoring the displaced Jews of Europe, and bring about a realization of the long-promised Jewish homeland in Palestine.

We appreciate the involvements, but believe that a fresh effort by our Government, wherein we would actively participate and offer to assume our share of the responsibility, would aid materially in bringing about a satisfactory solution.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD J. THYE, United States Senator; JOSEPH H. BALL, United States Senator; AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, First Congressional District; JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Second Congressional District; GEORGE MACKINNON, Third Minnesota District; EDWARD J. DEVITT, Fourth Minnesota District; WALTER H. JUDD, Fifth Minnesota District; HAROLD KNUTSON, Sixth Minnesota District; H. CARL ANDERSEN, Seventh Minnesota District; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Eighth Minnesota District; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Ninth Minnesota District.

A Bulwark of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered at Natural Bridge, Va., on yesterday evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an honor as well as a great pleasure to welcome to Virginia this distinguished group which has dedicated its talents to the improvement of the American home. That the United States is a Nation of home owners is no idle boast. No nation in the world approaches our percentage of privately owned homes, and in that accomplishment we have demonstrated the efficacy of free enterprise operating in a capitalistic system.

The first English settlers who came to Virginia 340 years ago came primarily to secure homes of their own. Those homes of hewn logs in the wilderness were crude. But in their building the founders of our Republic experienced the inspiration of freedom of action, the stimulating influence of private enterprise and learned, by stern necessity, that the foundation of democracy is personal responsibility.

Under the English common law, as well as under our own law, a man's home is his castle. Our traditional love of that tangible evidence of our personal freedom is expressed in the old refrain: "Be it ever so humble, there is no place like home."

When the Confederate gray and the Federal blue were blended into the khaki of the 1917 American doughboy, they marched to battle with the song on their lips, "Keep the Home Fires Burning."

I recall giving a ride to a soldier in the fall of 1943, who told me he was on his last leave pending the overseas movement of his outfit. When I asked him how he felt about the war against Germany he promptly replied: "I would rather die than to have those Germans drop a bomb on my mother." That was the spirit of the boys who won a great victory for us on the battlefield.

In two global wars we have fought to preserve the principles of our founding fathers and yet the world peace for which we sacrificed blood and treasure eludes our grasp. Instead of a world made safe for democracy we find the totalitarian and anti-God ideologies of communism feeding on the measureless misery of war-torn countries of Europe. Many of our own people have so lost faith in the fact that God governs in the affairs of men that they think another conflict is inevitable.

After the atomic bomb test at Bikini Admiral Blandy said: "Civilization faces the choice of living under God or of living underground."

The development of the atomic bomb and the supersonic plane, which defies interception, has made it crystal clear to us that democracy in the world cannot be preserved by force.

In full consciousness of the fact that in the event of another global war there would be no victor, our Nation sponsored an International Conference at San Francisco to outlaw war and to build a new world founded upon the Christian principle of mutual understanding and mutual cooperation. But we made the mistake of placing too much dependence upon a blueprint for peace, and in our war weariness and in our eagerness to be relieved of war sacrifices we demobilized the greatest military force the world has ever known before United Nations had an opportunity to function successfully. Our war ally, Russia, for whom and with whom we fought to destroy one type of totalitarianism in Europe, took advantage of that situation to block the proposals of all other members of United Nations, except Russian satellites, to agree upon treaties of peace with the Axis powers.

As a result of that action we distrust Russia and Russia distrusts us and the recent Four-Power Conference in Moscow involving a settlement of problems with Germany and Austria was to a large extent a failure.

Tonight, in discussing the problem of peace which confronts us, I speak only for myself and without the benefit of secret or confidential information concerning our future plans.

We are proceeding, I believe, on the assumption that the Lenin philosophy of world revolution has been altered to contemplate world domination, either directly or by means of controlling Communist-dominated states. We assume that the Soviet Union wants to take advantage of confusion and chaos in Europe to extend its influence wherever possible. We fear that the complete domination of Europe and large segments of Asia by Communist-controlled governments would constitute as great a threat to democracy as a similar control under the leadership of Adolf Hitler.

With a view to carrying out the provisions of the Charter of United Nations we have taken a firm stand against the demands of Russia in Germany and Austria and our President has promised aid directly to Greece and Turkey and indirectly to other nations whose opportunity to enjoy the form of government they prefer is being threatened by external aggression. As amended in the Senate the President's proposal will be subject to the approval of United Nations.

While the immediate areas of conflict between us and the Soviet Union are in Germany and Austria, they will ultimately concern eastern Europe, now dominated by Russia; the Near East, where there are vital oil supplies, and the Far East, now torn by civil war. They also involve, of course, our proposal, to which Russia refuses to agree, for international control of atomic power.

The peaceful solution of these differences between us and Russia is handicapped by mutual fear and mutual distrust. We have no occasion to fear an immediate war with Russia. In the last war she not only lost millions of men but the property destruction in Russia leaves her at present without the potential production essential to make war. In addition to that, we and our democratic allies control 85 percent of essential raw materials and their processing facilities, while Russia and her satellites control only the remaining 15 percent. Our fear of Russia, therefore, must of necessity be based upon the strength which Russia may develop 10, 15 or 20 years from now, plus the fact that within that period she will undoubtedly discover the secret of the atomic bomb.

In our own Government there is a difference of opinion as to whether Russia's fear of us is real or simulated. We have done everything humanly possible to convince the Russian leaders that our supreme desire is for peace and, by refusing to demand territory or economic advantages and by pouring out our treasure to feed the starving, clothe the naked and rehabilitate war-torn countries, we have attempted to demonstrate to Russia and the world that we are actuated by the highest ethical principles.

Yet, because of a real fear or for the purpose of delaying a peace program while they drain the resources of Germany and Austria for the rebuilding of Russia, the Russian leaders point to our possession of the atomic bomb, our air forces in Central Europe, troops in the near East and unilateral control of Japan as evidences of imperialistic designs essentially offensive rather than defensive.

No man is wise enough to know the answers to all the problems which confront us and no man can lift the veil of the future. In steering a safe course for our ship of state the first fundamental fact for us to recognize is that we can furnish neither moral nor material leadership to the world unless

we make our own democracy work, thus demonstrating its superiority over the conflicting ideologies of either communism or fascism.

We must meet the threat of an inflation to be followed by a possible deflation by increased production. Such a program involves changes in our labor laws to make the rules of the game fair. It also calls for mutual cooperation between management and labor to be characterized on both sides by more charity and less selfishness.

The Glasgow, Va., carpet factory of the James Lees & Sons Co., which you visited today, offers an illustration of how such cooperation can be achieved and how our Nation can make democracy work. This plant received five Army and Navy E awards, and in the postwar period both wages and output have continued to increase.

We must carefully and cautiously plan our international program of relief and rehabilitation in a manner that will not exhaust our Treasury and ultimately reduce us to the state of bankruptcy of those we seek to help.

We must frankly recognize the fact that, for the present at least, the choice of the presently dominated countries of Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Albania, has been between communism and fascism. The leaders of those countries are either extreme right or extreme left and the people have no clear conception of the meaning of democracy. The futility of our efforts to bring together the warring factions of China as the first essential of a program of postwar rehabilitation has already been clearly recognized.

Physical science has taught us that we are living in one world, but man's progress in the physical sciences has outstripped his progress in the social sciences. If, in spite of our best efforts, Russia refuses to live with us in one world, our next best hope for peace will be through a firm alliance with the Christian people to be found in the Western Hemisphere, in continental Europe, Great Britain and her dominions. That will be a last resort if Russia violates the covenants and wrecks the program of United Nations.

I have attempted to indicate that the greatest handicap to the peace of the world is the conflicting ideology of democracy and communism. If you accept that premise as true it necessarily follows that in this crisis in world affairs we, as a Christian nation, can make a major contribution to the cause of world peace if we practice what we preach.

Only about 2 percent of the people of Russia belong to the Communist Party and in the entire world there are only 18,000,000 party members. In this country alone there are 72,000,000 members of Christian churches and the 140,000,000 people of this Nation are being led by a President and a Secretary of State whose supreme ambition is to prevent another war.

It has been my happy privilege to know our distinguished Secretary of State, George Marshall, for a quarter of a century. We in Virginia are proud of the fact that he was educated at Virginia Military Institute, which you delegates to this conference will visit tomorrow. We are proud of the fact that General Pershing regarded him as his ablest subordinate in World War I. In World War II we trusted him as the leader of the largest and most powerful military force ever sent into battle. He emerged from that victorious conflict as the leading military figure in the entire world. We trusted him then. I appeal to you to trust him now, because, like Stonewall Jackson, who was the idol of his cadet days at VMI, he is a Christian whose life has been motivated by the highest ethical principles.

In his report to the American people when he recently returned from Moscow, Secretary Marshall said: "We must not compromise on great principles in order to achieve agreement for agreement's sake."

In war we have always recognized our fundamental principle of individual responsibility. A distressed and war-torn world now looks to us for leadership in winning the peace. If we are to meet that challenge, we must rededicate ourselves to the faith of the founding fathers, sharing Jackson's reliance upon God and adopting as our motto the injunction of Robert E. Lee:

"Duty is the sublimest word in the English language."

Editorial Tribute to Wendell Berge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial tribute paid by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch to the Honorable Wendell Berge, retiring Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WENDELL BERGE RETIRES

A quiet public servant quit his troubled desk in Washington and yesterday went back to private life. He is Wendell Berge, who has been head of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department. In that important post, Mr. Berge sought to restrain the growth of corporate enterprise beyond legal limits. Believing fully with the late Justice Brandeis in the "curse of bigness," he worked long hours for relatively little financial return without too much support in the administration as a whole.

The measure of his success is not so much the apparent accomplishment (which is not too large), as it is in a consideration of how much more monopolistic our economic life might be were it not for those who believe and work as Wendell Berge has done.

Mr. Truman and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert L. Norton, distinguished special writer of the Boston Post:

ROBERT L. NORTON COMMENTS ON MR. TRUMAN AND THE UNITED NATIONS

WASHINGTON, March 16.—Nothing could be further from the truth than the assertion of Pravda that the President bypassed the United Nations in his historical message to Congress, assuming British obligations in Greece. The position taken by Mr. Truman is strictly in accordance with the terms of the United Nations Charter to which Russia is bound, even if it be only giving lip service and in practice doing everything possible to undermine the functions and powers of the World Parliament.

DELAYING TACTICS

The Charter of the United Nations distinctly provides that the "members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state." The facts as rehearsed by Mr. Truman speak for themselves, and it is hardly disputable that the Charter has been violated by the Soviet in seizing control of the governments of various nations without resorting to democratic processes and consulting the choice of their peoples.

It is merely another illustration of the Soviet policy of confusing the issue and creating a diversion so as to kill off or postpone all positive action on all imperative issues pending before the Moscow Conference and the United Nations.

As an illustration, Mr. Molotov attempts to interject the Chinese situation into the Moscow deliberations, and at Lake Success Mr. Gromyko spends hours stalling reference to the committee on the matter of atomic energy, quibbling over the abstract issue of whether a convention or a treaty is at stake. It is all part of the Soviet program to delay while Russian gains throughout the world are consolidated.

DISREGARD POLICE FORCE

Also, in view of attempted Soviet aggression in Turkey, the demand for adjacent provinces and control of the Dardanelles, the assertion that Mr. Truman is threatening the integrity of Turkey is ridiculous on its face. Before the President's message was delivered we had taken occasion to warn Russia that its attempt to dominate the Dardanelles would be resisted. Turkey has been obliged to keep an army of 600,000 in the field, and the enlargement of the United States Fleet in the Mediterranean has its significance.

But, on the matter of bypassing the United Nations, nothing could be further from the thought of Mr. Truman. Rather, the President, Congress, and the American people would welcome the possibility of the UN handling the Greek and all related problems, including Germany and the whole question of world peace. The truth is that Russia is bypassing the UN by steadily and persistently opposing the extension of power, originally contemplated when the Charter was formulated at Bretton Woods and San Francisco, by the use of the veto on trivial questions, by blocking international inspection of atomic energy, and by refusing even to remotely consider the setting up of an international police force.

UN LACKS MONEY

Furthermore, the Soviets have refused to join in many of the social, economic, and cultural aims of the UN. They have also refused membership and responsibility in the International Bank. In view of these irrefutable facts, can there be any question but that it is the Soviet, and not the United States, which has bypassed the UN?

Positive action was needed in the Greek crisis with the near economic collapse of Britain, and this was supplied by President Truman. Attention should be called to the fact that much of the talk of conflict between the program to aid Greece and Turkey and the UN comes from persons who are known to be sympathetic with the policies of Soviet Russia. There is no such criticism from those who are responsible for our foreign policy, as for instance, Mr. Austin, or Mr. VANDENBERG in the Senate.

It is quite possible that considerable misunderstanding exists over the power and responsibilities of the United Nations. The UN will not be able to really function until some semblance of world peace is restored

and after the preliminaries are agreed upon, until it is determined what is to be the future control in Germany and Japan. In the meanwhile the UN has no money of its own to spend on relief, economic construction, nor has it any authority to loan to foreign nations.

There is, however, nothing to preclude transferring ultimately supervision of affairs in dispute in Greece or Turkey, or in any other country, for that matter, where world peace is threatened. Such is the basic purpose of the United Nations. But this desirable status will never be reached if the Soviet persists in its present policy of blocking the fundamental objectives for which the United Nations was conceived and organized.

ARE WE WILLING?

If there is any doubt as to how our own representatives in the UN feel about the Russian charge of bypassing, then it is only necessary to consult the declaration of Senator Austin. He said:

"Prompt approval by Congress of the President's proposal would be a new and effective action by the United States in supporting with all our strength our policy in the United Nations."

Today the UN offers no antidote to power politics or war, due to lack of Russian cooperation. As Congress gets into action this week and explores the whole situation opened up by the message of the President, aside from the immediate question of aid to Greece and Turkey, it must get down to the basic problem of whether we are going to face what it takes to oppose Soviet expansion and also whether the American people are willing to pay the price of creating world economic and financial stability. Thi is the real underlying issue.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of H. R. 2616 and hope it will be passed by the House without crippling amendments. I am in favor of this bill because I think it is fundamental and essential to our national security and safety.

It has been hailed as a bill to fight communism and to aid the freedom-loving people of Greece and Turkey to maintain their freedom. It has been hailed as a bill to prevent the spread of communism. It is all these things, of course, but fundamentally it is a measure designed to maintain and protect our own freedom and security. In its consideration I think we ought to keep this fundamental idea ever in mind.

As I have listened to the general debate on this bill and to the debate under the 5-minute rule in considering amendments thereto, it has seemed to me that our thinking has been somewhat confused because we have not properly defined our terms. It has been said in opposition to this bill that we cannot fight communism with bullets or any other kind of force. It has been several times repeated that the only way to fight communism is to demonstrate that our American way of life under a Christian democracy offers more to the peoples of the world than communism. This is, of course, true but it is right here that the confusion in our thinking about this bill is most apparent.

Used in this sense, communism is an idea based fundamentally upon the philosophy and doctrine of Karl Marx and as such, of course, it can be fought only as all ideas must be fought, that is, by the proof and demonstration of higher and better ideas and ideals.

Peter Howard has written a book entitled "Ideas Have Legs." The title might more aptly have been Ideas Have Wings. Communism is such an idea and as such it has truly spread its wings and taken its flight to every corner of the world. Communism is even more than an idea and ideal—it is a religion to those who have accepted it. This ideal is based upon the pagan philosophy that the state is God and that the human, the individual life, is of no value save as it is sacrificed on the altar of the state as God. There is little difference in the philosophy behind communism and that behind the nazism of Hitler and the fascism of Mussolini. In one the state is set up as the ultimate goal while in the others, the human heads of the state, Hitler himself and Mussolini, were the objective of the veneration and worship.

So it is seen that the real threat to democracy as an idea and as an ideal with its Christian philosophy of the worth, dignity, and value of the individual life and personality, is from communism as an idea.

Communism considered as idea and ideal appeals to men and women who are cold, hungry, and miserable. It brings a ray of hope to the oppressed of the earth, and while we know that it is a false hope, it is a ray of light in the darkness and men in their misery turn to it. In many countries of Europe today, especially in Greece and Italy, in Hungary, and Austria, and in France, men are turning to communism because they are hungry and miserable.

We, who know that our Christian and democratic ideal is superior to, and greater than the communistic idea and ideal, are faced with the tremendous task today of proving to the downtrodden, and the underprivileged of the world that our idea is superior to the communistic idea. Out of the hearts and minds of men are born the issues of life, and it is there that the battle against communism is to be won or lost.

Therefore, it is true as so many have said during the debate on this bill that we in Congress today are challenged to make democracy work for the masses of our people instead of the privileged few. If we do not—if we continue to try to turn the clock back to the days of special privilege and big business and the wealthy, if we fail in our efforts to prevent inflation and the depression that is bound to follow, we are doomed to lose our fight against communism as idea and ideal.

The Communists believe, and say, that the great weakness of the free enterprise system that we love so well, and that is at the very heart and center of our democracy, is that alternating periods of depression and inflation are inevitably a part of such a system. They see one just ahead of us, and believe that when the reaction comes, and a greater depression than America has ever known is upon us, our miserable and unemployed and hungry people will turn to communism as their only salvation.

To be ready for this depression which the Communists say is an inherent and unavoidable part of our free enterprise system, Communists have infiltrated into our economic life and even into public office. Our great President has declared war upon this communistic infiltration and has instructed every department of our Government to purge from its pay rolls any who are believers in, and followers of, the communistic idea. Our Un-American Activities Committee in Congress and the FBI are doing a great job in bringing to light the facts about such infiltration. And the Congress has authorized the expenditure of $50,000,000 to fight this sort of communistic penetration into our national economy and national life.

While this bill providing for aid to Greece and Turkey will in a measure be used to help fight the communistic idea as such, and while it will hearten and encourage the freedom-loving peoples all over the world who realize the falsity of the communistic ideal, its main purpose is to fight the spread of the Red fascism of Russia. We oftentimes refer to the "communism of Russia." I think that is where our confused thinking begins. Today there is no real communism in Russia. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a dictatorship as bald and bold as that of Hitler or Mussolini. I think we understand the situation better to call the present government in Russia and the idea behind it, "Red fascism," instead of communism. This description of the Russian system is not original with me but was used first, I believe, by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI.

It is apparent from Russia's acts since the end of the shooting war that she intends to dominate the world with her iron-fisted dictatorship. She has absorbed already Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania, and other of her so-called satellite countries and now threatens to absorb Greece and Turkey without striking a blow. If Greece and Turkey fall to the Red menace of Russia, Italy and France will soon follow. Germany will be next. Eventually, unless this bill is passed, Iran, Egypt, and all of the Near East will come under Russian domination without her ever striking a blow. With Iran and the Near East will go the greatest deposit of oil in the world.

At last our great President has determined to stop the Red fascism of Russia before it can engulf the Near East and eventually Asia and Far East as well as the balance of Europe. It means that at last the United States is determined to help and defend the freedom-loving people of the world from the Red menace of dictatorship and oppression from Russia.

Always America has stood as the champion of oppressed peoples and as the defender of freedom and liberty. But after all, in this instance it is done for our own protection.

Our Government stands as the only bulwark against dictatorship and oppression. Already the President's appeal for the money for Greece and Turkey has strengthened freedom-loving and democratic peoples throughout the world. France has stiffened her fight against the Communists and Italy will be heartened to continue her fight against Togliatti and the Italian disciples of Russia.

As I see it, this courageous and positive stand that we take if we enact this bill, will lead to peace and not to war. Those who know, say that Russia could not now fight a war and would not dare attack us. If we allow her to go her way unmolested, thereby permitting her to take over the weakened and hungry hordes of Europe and Asia, she will soon be strong enough to fight. Appeasement leads to war as we have found to our sorrow. It did at Munich when we appeased Hitler. It did when we let the Japs march into Manchuria without once raising our voice against their aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily favor the passage of this bill and shall vote for it because I think it will lead to peace instead of war.

Workers Entitled to Individual Freedom, Incentive, and the Pursuit of Happiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Manchester Boddy, the capable editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News, has written one of his illuminating and informative editorials on the incentive of workers in their daily tasks. It is vitally important to the future welfare and economy of the Nation that workers be happy and contented and that they enjoy to the fullest extent the freedom of individual initiative they are entitled to. This should be a warning to both labor unions and management. Labor unions have been subordinating their members to many regulations which they accept unwillingly but feel obligated to accept because of loyalty to their unions.

Management has also been guilty of forcing many undesirable regulations on their employees which the employees cannot avoid. Both of these attitudes reduce individual interest and incentive to a minimum.

Congress has been studying this problem, seeking a solution to it by appropriate legislation.

I favor restoring individual incentive and freedom, and have supported the labor legislation submitted by the present Congress to bring this about. I shall always defend the individual worker from oppressive regulations imposed by either labor unions or management.

Here is Mr. Boddy's editorial:

Even in the middle 1800's many observers detected the advent of mass man. One of these was Ralph Waldo Emerson, who wrote:

"Society everywhere is in conspiracy against the manhood of everyone of its members. * * * The virtue in most request is conformity. Self-reliance is its aversion. It loves not realities and creators, but names and customs."

History abounds with the record of tyrannies exercised by minorities over society in general. Since the advent of mass man, however, the situation has been reversed. It is now the tyranny of society over the individual.

A recent survey conducted by Elmo Roper for Fortune magazine to discover what factory workers throughout the United States are thinking, produced these conclusions:

"The impression grows that neither management nor unions are facing the facts. They seem to be trying to cure the patient with cafeterias washrooms, and baseball teams on one side, seniority, shorter hours and higher pay on the other. Whereas the simple fact is that the worker wants to be treated like a human being. He wants to be able to hope for advancement, to have honest effort recognized, and to have an outlet for personal initiative."

In reply to the question: "Which one of these statements comes closest to describing how you feel about your present job?" the answers were given:

	Total	Non-union	Independent union	AFL	CIO
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
My job is interesting nearly all the time	43	48	50	47	35
While my job is interesting most of the time, there are some dull stretches now and then	34	36	28	35	35
Total	77	84	78	82	70
There are a few times when my job is interesting but most of the time it is pretty dull and monotonous	14	11	14	12	18
My job is completely dull and monotonous; there is nothing interesting about it	6	4	3	5	10
Total	20	15	17	17	28

Until the Napoleonic wars ended the "divine right of kings" concept, it was assumed that the masses existed for the benefit of the few. Today it is being argued by totalitarians that the individual exists for the state, society. But there is developing—especially in the United States—a strong demand for more freedom and opportunity for the individual.

The surface picture, the survey discloses, is one of cofidence on the workers' part; but underlying irritations should not be ignored.

"Perhaps young men once tackled their jobs with high hopes, but the young man in the factory today seems sadly resigned not to be getting ahead," Fortune comments. Only 21 percent of those under 40 (compared to 17 percent of those over) think they will ever get beyond a foreman's position. Only 14 percent of those who attended grade school have any hopes of rising higher than foreman. While there are few college people in factory work, it an astonishing fact that less than half of the college-trained expect to be able to push their heads above the crowd. Surprisingly, the length of time a man has been with his company makes practically no difference in his gloomy outlook.

Three hundred thousand little business enterprises that had survived the worst depression in the history of the United States and were in a fairly prosperous condition when the World War broke out, were forced by the exigencies of war to give up in the interest of efficient mass production.

Since the war, America has been called upon to produce more and more for a devastated, starving Europe. When we speak of appropriations running into the billions of dollars for nations overseas, we are talking, really, about exporting the products of our industry. To date at least, we have found it necessary to keep our vast industries working to the fullest possible extent.

As a result, it has been exceedingly difficult for the little business man to engage in profitable, independent enterprise. And, for this reason, we find much of the discontent reported in the Fortune survey.

If the United States is really to exercise world leadership on behalf of economic, political, and social democracy, it must recognize the need—not only in the United States but wherever democracy is to survive—for opportunity for the individual members of society to express their manhood in terms of free, private initiative.

The Greek Government Is a Difficult Client

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of April 1, 1947:

THE GREEK GOVERNMENT IS A DIFFICULT CLIENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Although the administration has stressed that part of its newly announced foreign policy which provides aid for the Greek people, and played down the aid to Turkey, which is much more strategic from a military standpoint, the attention of critics of the current government in Athens has not been diverted by this tactic.

These critics share the general admiration of the Western World for the gallant Greek resistance to the Axis, and the widespread sympathy for the economic and social plight of the Hellenes. But this has not removed the objection of some to extending the proposed aid while the Greeks are governed as at present, or distracted others from insisting that the projected Turkish intervention shall be weighed more realistically than officially it has been. Senator Austin, for example, in his explanation of the new policy to the United Nations, discussed the Turkish program very briefly indeed.

Questionings of the application of the policy, rather than the policy itself, which have arisen on the above grounds and on the possible consequences to the UN are responsible for the additional amendments to the relief bill which Senator VANDENBERG offered today. They provide for cancellation of the programs in Greece and Turkey at any time a truly representative government in those countries may request it. They make the same provision in the event the request

shall come from a simple majority of the Security Council (which our veto could not cancel) or of the General Assembly of the UN. And they specifically authorize the President to abandon the immediate program if he decides either that its purposes have been achieved or cannot be.

These are three important outs for the administration, for its critics in this enterprise, and for Members of Congress who intend to support the plan with misgivings. They demonstrate once again the skill of the Senator in politics and diplomacy, and his ingenuity in removing the objections of intelligent and honest dissenters and doubters.

A REPORT FROM GREECE

The provision that any government representative of a majority may request withdrawal of the plan in Greece and Turkey is especially designed to meet the point that the government in Athens is neither truly representative nor democratic. The President passed this over lightly in his address to Congress. But nearly every day a report comes to Washington from reliable sources, sometimes brought in person, which suggests that Mr. Truman made an understatement when he said the Greek Government is "not perfect." This correspondent today read a report of this character.

"I feel," this trained observer wrote, "that, while the motives of the President's program to combat communism are the very best, he is repeating the same mistake which lost us Poland and other areas now behind the "iron curtain" and conceivably might even lose us South America. This mistake is in endorsing the worst elements of reaction in Greece and ignoring the center and the non-Communist left."

He continued:

"All responsible and reasonably disinterested Americans with whom I have talked in Greece felt that our money would go down a rat hole unless political stability accompanies economic stabilizing and that any stability is simply unobtainable under the present Government, and possibly not without new elections following a general amnesty.

"Whether or not the last elections were fair, it is still a fact that a substantial section of Greek public opinion feels they were not. In any new election the left stands no chance of winning, which makes denial of the electoral test by the government even stupider.

"The announcement that the United States is going to bail out Greece has served to impede many good things Paul Porter, the President's special ambassador, wanted the Athens government to accomplish on the home front. It was also the signal for a new campaign of repression by the Ministry of the Interior, which is neither better nor worse than the Soviet NKVD or the Yugoslav OZNA (secret police)."

ARRESTS BY NIGHT

This observer, who would not be quoted in this space had he not impressively established his reliability, disinterestedness and capacity to report objectively, further asserted that the Ministry, in its renewed campaign of repression, is following the secret police technique made familiar for years in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Spain, Japan, and Soviet Russia. Arrests of citizens were made between midnight and 5 o'clock a. m., and within 24 hours those seized were deported to a lonely island without a public trial.

"In one 3-day period," he added, "after the United States said it would assume political responsibility, the Greek Government arrested about 600 persons in Athens, mostly professionals—doctors, lawyers, etc.—and sent them away, frankly declaring there was no longer any need to exercise restraint. There is no doubt that the loudest shouters in support of the United States are Athens' 3,000 wealthiest citizens whom the government continues to protect against any direct taxation and who, with their gold pounds, hardly realize there is any inflation. And the rightists and extremists, encouraged by the President's speech, now trumpet that the center is almost as traitorous as the left because it doesn't make humble obeisance to the government."

This observer concluded with the statement that, as much as he detests Communists, he would go to the mountains if he were a citizen of Greece.

North Adams Lower Price Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a telegram I received yesterday afternoon from officials of the North Adams (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, advising me of their effort to reduce inflationary prices by means of a program under the title of "North Adams Lower Price Plan," and my reply to them:

NORTH ADAMS, MASS.,
May 8, 1947.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

With an honest belief that cooperative effort on the part of all communities is necessary to check the high cost of living we are glad to inform you that North Adams is taking definite steps to do its part in reducing inflationary prices and will be the first city in your district to attempt a program under the title of "North Adams Lower Price Plan" starting May 13 through May 17 which we have strong hopes will be most effective in eventually reducing the cost of living in our community.

NORTH ADAMS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
JAMES F. CAMPBELL, *President.*
LINDON N. BROOKS,
Chairman of Retail Division.
VICTOR LAMB,
Chairman of Special Committee.

MAY 8, 1947.

JAMES F. CAMPBELL, *President,*
North Adams Chamber of Commerce,
North Adams, Mass.:

Thank you for your wire. Please accept my congratulations on your constructive effort to meet this important problem, my best wishes for your success, and my assurance of every cooperation.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

I understand that more than 100 pledges of support have been received from merchants in North Adams and that the sponsors of the program are confident that at least double that number will participate before the 6-day experiment commences on next Tuesday.

Two wholesalers have notified their local office that they will join in the program and will make price reductions at the source. Mr. Brooks, chairman of the retail division, stated Tuesday "We are asking the local merchants and businessmen to support their Government in its appeal for lower prices by reducing prices wherever they can, and if they cannot do that, at least to endorse the efforts of those who can. We hope this plan will emphasize to the wholesalers and the manufacturers the need for lower prices and a willingness of the retailer to cooperate in any move to reduce prices."

This is a practical and encouraging demonstration of the determination of another New England community to take constructive action in meeting this challenge of increasing prices.

Texas City—Tragedy and Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Texas City—Tragedy and Triumph, a very timely article by Hon. Hubert Harrison, of Longview:

TEXAS CITY—TRAGEDY AND TRIUMPH

The hearts of all east Texans and the rest of the world go out to the brave citizens of Texas City as they bury their dead, bind up the wounds of the injured and prepare to rebuild their shattered city. Suddenly and without warning on an April morning this prosperous and rapidly growing city on the east Texas Gulf coast was rocked by a series of explosions of chemicals and oil. The death list runs into several hundred, the injured total thousands and the property damage amounts to staggering sums in millions.

The fortitude and courage of the survivors, the incredible speed with which they organized relief and rehabilitation and the undaunted will to carry on in the face of this stunning blow, proves that the pioneer spirit of America is not dead. Swift outside aid came from all over the Nation and messages from distant lands which showed that brotherhood and practical kindness still flourish in a strife-torn world.

It seems to take crisis and tragedy to bring out the latent courage in human beings. No doubt there is more abiding local patriotism and love of home town in Texas City now than before the catastrophe. Even before the hot embers cooled, men and women, rich and poor, were at work clearing wreckage and repairing homes. Officials of great corporations gave generously to the families of dead employees and to the general relief fund. Everywhere in town the little people, the unsung heroes, said bravely: "We will rebuild."

A greater, fairer city will rise from the ashes. A new community spirit has been born of travail.

We salute Texas City—with tears for its tragedy and cheers for its triumph.

Statement of Senator Martin to Pennsylvania Members of Communist War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this morning a delegation from the Communist War Veterans, meeting in Washington, called upon the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], himself a distinguished war veteran. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made to them by our colleague, a distinguished soldier and American; and I commend it to the reading of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have left a busy Senate floor to see you, because you are Pennsylvanians. I have listened to you. Now I want to tell you what I have got to say.

First let me make clear that I respect the veteran and all that his uniform stands for. But when you come here, representing the Communist Party, you have no right to claim the respect and treatment due to veterans. No one can be faithful to American ideals and accept the teachings of communism.

I will not now, nor at any future time, discuss the welfare of our veterans with men who uphold your communistic philosophy, even though you have worn the American uniform. Anything I have to say on that subject will be said to the officers and members of recoganized veterans' organizations, or to other patriotic unaffiliated veterans. And if I want advice about veterans' needs, I shall go to those same groups. They recognize the great gulf between American freedom and communistic dictatorship. They do not straddle. They stand foursquare on the side of individual liberty and the rights of freemen. You are on the other side.

The Russian people can have the form of government they want. We are not trying to force our system on them. I will fight with all my power any effort to foist their system on this country whether it comes from you or anybody else.

I have had over 40 years of service in the armed forces of my country. I love its uniform and its flag. I respect that uniform even when worn by a Communist, but I have no respect for the philosophy you have accepted.

Some of you, I believe, were willing to fight under my country's flag solely because Russia was fighting the same enemy.

As late as June 21, 1941, your party and its members in this country were denouncing Americans who opposed the Nazis as imperialistic and war mongers. At that late date you Communists could find nothing wrong with Adolf Hitler or the things he stood for. I remember well your slogan, "The Yanks are not coming."

The next day, June 22, 1941, the Nazis invaded Soviet Russia. On that day, and not until that day, was your party's hate for the unspeakable Nazi regime born. On that day, and not until that day, did you suddenly decide that fighting the Nazis was a holy cause and the highest form of democracy. Your slogan of the day before was dead.

That is one reason why I don't respect you.

I have some sympathy for those of you who have been misled while in the service or since. It is not too late for you to wake up.

It is inconceivable to me how you can follow the teachings of a nation whose basic principles are violently opposed to everything America's uniform symbolizes.

You men stand here, veterans of the American armed services, but preaching alien communism. You are secure in your right to preach it and to criticize our country only because of this Nation's Constitution.

That is Americanism in action.

Is there any doubt what would happen if men like you convened in Moscow, in Russian uniform, to criticize the Soviet Government? Suppose for an instant you were able to get inside the walls of the Kremlin and to stand before the men who make Russia's laws. Suppose you were to tell them that you don't like the Soviet Union—to attack its leaders—and to say that America's form of government was better than Russia's.

You know what would happen.

The lucky ones among you would be those who faced a firing squad and died quickly. The others of you would go in chains to the slave camps, to toil and starve till you died the slow, hard way.

That is Soviet communism in action.

Yet, you have the colossal effrontery to tell the American Congress how you want things run.

There is a place for those of you who prefer to live under communism. I suggest that you go there and stay there.

If I can help to speed your departure, call on me.

I understand you are returning to your convention this afternoon to carry back my views. To assist you, I have made copies of my stand which you can present to your convention.

Shreveport Municipal Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have just received two telegrams from officials of the city of Shreveport, La., regarding the operation of the municipal airport. These two telegrams bring forcibly to mind the action of the Appropriations Committee in cutting budget expenditures and in cutting appropriations generally. The cut complained of in this instance is the elimination of almost $5,000,000, which sum has been used in assisting the municipalities in controlling traffic at the airports throughout the country. As a result of this reduction in appropriations, cities will have deficiencies in their airport budgets.

The proper control of air traffic has commonly been considered a Federal function. From the time the plane leaves the ground until it touches the ground again it is almost entirely interstate commerce. For this reason, in the past, Congress has provided funds to be used in assisting in the operation of airport traffic-control towers. Unless this amount is restored the help which we have been giving throughout the country will be lost.

I think this has been a very useful appropriation, and I hope that Congress will find it advisable to return this amount to the bill. I set forth below two telegrams just received from the city of Shreveport regarding this matter:

SHREVEPORT, LA., *May 8, 1947.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Have been advised that the House Appropriations Committee have recommended the elimination of funds for the operation of all present CAA-operated airport control towers. Our municipal airport would be included in this recommendation, thereby placing an added operating cost of $40,000 per year. Please do everything in your power to have this fund included in the regular CAA bill for control-tower operations.

LANE MITCHELL,
Commissioner, Public Works Department, City of Shreveport, La.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *May 8, 1947.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Paul V. Betters, United States Conference of Mayors, advises that House Appropriations Committee has eliminated all funds for CAA operation of our airport traffic-control tower. This total financial burden will amount to approximately $40,000 per year for the city of Shreveport. Earnestly urge that you use your influence to restore this appropriation. Feel that this is justifiable Federal expense and one that the city of Shreveport can ill afford to assume at this particular time. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated by our entire citizenship.

CLYDE E. FANT, *Mayor.*

Dangerous Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, there is much apprehension as to the future of the agricultural program. We recognize that conditions arise from time to time which will inevitably bring about changes in any program. Many are fearful, however, that our agricultural program is about to suffer a radical change and perhaps tremendous handicap.

It is well known that during the war, when farmers were producing the food and fiber for the war, commitments were made to assure them of a continued adequate price in the postwar conversion. It has only been a few months since the emergency was declared by the President of the United States to be terminated. How swiftly the forces of reaction begin and how quickly do we forget the commitments made during emergency. There is nothing that means more to the future of this country, the strength of our leadership, the influence that we have on world peace than the preservation of our soil. Much has been said

and written on the importance of soil conservation. In these days of uncertainty and reconversion when there is evidence of reduction in such a program on the basis of economy, I am sometimes fearful that we propose paring to carry out an objective and in reality accomplish the opposite. In fact, the proposal to tremendously reduce our soil-conservation program has been, I think, appropriately designated as dangerous economy.

The Camden Daily News, of Camden, Ark., carried an editorial under date of April 15, 1947, on dangerous economy. I think this is a very fine editorial and approaches this issue in a most interesting and fair manner. I think it should be of interest to every Member of Congress as we consider this problem, and I include it with my remarks:

DANGEROUS ECONOMY

If Congress takes out of the conservation or triple A program the $100,000,000 that has been put over in proposed budget-paring column, we may pay for it in the health of this and succeeding generations because a sharply-reduced program won't do much good, and the discouraged agency would likely just fold itself up.

Few people but those engaged in farming and in the soil program realize what has been accomplished in its 10 years of rapid progress. This progress, at that, is only a beginning of what can be done in putting back into the soil what we have taken out of it.

We city cousins may say, "We haven't taken anything out of the soil," but we have.

We, our fathers, and forefathers have continually drawn from the "bank account" of natural soil elements. Like any other bank account, the funds are exhausted when we continue to draw out and never make a deposit.

What we eat, what we wear, what we live in came from the bounty of the land. Each time a pound of produce is harvested something is gone from the soil. Each time it rains and dirt washes into streams, each time the wind blows the sand off our acres, something is gone that only conservation practices can replace.

It's only fair that each of us who takes sustenance from the earth should help the farmer to replace the minerals we've used and help him to replace what's seeped into the rivers or gone with the wind.

We should not look on the soil conservation program as a relief program, as many alphabet agencies are. Under the plan of assistance by the Government, the farmer puts out about $1 of his own money to each 50 cents paid by Uncle Sam.

It would be difficult to arrive at a dollars-and-cents value of the improvements resulting from conservation practices in Ouachita County alone—the figure would be unbelievable, no doubt. Use of phosphate, limestone, winter legumes, pasture seeding lespedeza, pond construction, and many other now common practices of our farmers were practically unknown to them in 1936.

Yes, if we expect to continue our standard of life, we should be willing to cooperate with the farmer by bearing a part of the cost of maintaining the fertility of the soil. We cannot depend on him to assume the entire responsibility. The productivity of the soil concerns us all—in the price of food and clothing we buy, in the quality of food we eat.

Money put into a Nation-wide soil-building program could take the vitamins off the drugstore shelf. It could insure the productivity of the land we pass on to our children.

The Palestine Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. WARREN R. AUSTIN,
United States Representative
at United Nations,
New York, N. Y.

HONORABLE SIRS: Inasmuch as the United States became a party to the international covenant for the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine, as contained in the League of Nations mandate to Great Britain of 1922, through the American-British Palestine Mandate Convention of December 3, 1924, we, as Members of the Congress are deeply concerned with the performance of this promise. When Great Britain proposed recently to refer the Palestine question to the United Nations it was reported that the United States delegate, as a condition precedent to the United States consenting to a special session of the General Assembly, insisted that a concrete formulation of the problem must first be made by Great Britain. Accordingly, we would appreciate information on the following questions:

(1) What proposals, or what concrete formulation of the problem, has Great Britain made with respect to Palestine which induced the United States to agree to a preliminary session of the United Nations General Assembly?

(2) In view of the fact that article 79 of the United Nations Charter states that "the terms of trusteeship for each territory to be placed under the trusteeship system * * *, shall be agreed upon by the states directly concerned," will the United States take the position in the United Nations Assembly and in the Trusteeship Council that it is one of the states "directly concerned" in the disposition of Palestine?

(3) Has the United States formulated its policy with respect to the matters referred to the United Nations by Great Britain on the question of Palestine, and, if so, what is that policy?

In transmitting this communication we imply no criticism or direction nor any variance from the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States in respect to Palestine, but we seek only to ascertain what will be done by the executive branch so that we may consider how the Congress can contribute its part in bringing about a just solution.

Faithfully yours,

RALPH W. GWINN, Member of Congress, Twenty-seventh District, New York; ROBERT J. TWYMAN, Member of Congress, Ninth District, Illinois; HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Member of Congress, Second District, Connecticut; ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE, Member of Congress, Third District, Connecticut; DONALD L. JACKSON, Member of Congress, Sixteenth District, California; KENNETH B. KEATING, Member of Congress, Fortieth District, New York; JAMES G. FULTON, Member of Congress, Thirty-first District, Pennsylvania; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Member of Congress, Thirty-sixth District, New York; EDWARD A. MITCHELL, Member of Congress, Eighth District, Indiana; THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, Member of Congress, Third District, Kentucky; JOHN C. BROPHY, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Wisconsin; HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD, Member of Congress, Fourteenth District, Michigan; W. HOWES MEADE, Member of Congress, Seventh District, Kentucky; WILLIAM G. STRATTON, Member of Congress, Representative at Large, Illinois; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Member of Congress, Twenty-ninth District, New York; FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG, Member of Congress, Thirteenth District, Pennsylvania; J. CALEB BOGGS, Member of Congress, Representative at Large, Delaware; JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Connecticut; EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, Member of Congress, Thirty-seventh District, New York; WILLIAM J. CROW, Member of Congress, Twenty-third District, Pennsylvania; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Member of Congress, Sixth District, Washington; FRANCIS J. LOVE, Member of Congress, First District, West Virginia; GEORGE H. BENDER, Member of Congress, Representative at Large, Ohio; HOWARD A. COFFIN, Member of Congress, Thirteenth District, Michigan; ROY O. WOODRUFF, Member of Congress, Tenth District, Michigan; JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Member of Congress, Forty-first District, New York; WALTER H. JUDD, Member of Congress, Fifth District, Minnesota; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Member of Congress, Tenth District, Massachusetts; JACOB K. JAVITS, Member of Congress, Twenty-first District, New York; CHESTER E. MERROW, Member of Congress, First District, New Hampshire.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 5, 1947.

Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. WADSWORTH: I have received the letter dated April 22, 1947, addressed jointly to me and to Senator Austin by you and a number of your congressional colleagues with respect to the reference of the Palestine question to the United Nations.

In reply to your numbered questions I may state as follows:

1. In the preliminary discussions which took place between representatives of our Government and the Secretary General of the United Nations, as well as with representatives of the British Government, we gave it as our view that the procedure adopted for the consideration of the Palestine question should be of unquestionable legality, and should be undertaken by the appropriate body of the United Nations at the earliest possible date. In accordance with this position, we were able to concur in the calling of a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations for the purpose of creating and instructing a committee to prepare for the consideration of the Palestine problem by the General Assembly at its next regular session.

The concrete formulation of the proposal by the government of the United Kingdom bringing the Palestine issue before the United Nations is contained in a letter from the United Kingdom delegation to the Acting

Secretary General of the United Nations under date of April 2, 1947. A copy of this letter is attached hereto.

2. The question of United States policy with regard to article 79 of the United Nations Charter in its relationship to Palestine will not arise unless or until action is initiated to place Palestine, now held under mandate, under the trusteeship system of the United Nations. According to article 77 of the charter, the trusteeship system applies to such territories, including territories held under mandate, as may be placed thereunder by means of trusteeship agreements. Thus, the transfer of territories from the mandate system of the League of Nations to the trusteeship system of the United Nations is a voluntary rather than an automatic action. The trusteeship agreement must then be approved by the General Assembly or, in the case of strategic areas, by the Security Council.

3. The Department of State believes that, as the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations was called at the request of the Government of the United Kingdom for the purpose of constituting and instructing a special committee to prepare the Palestine question for consideration at the September 1947 session of the General Assembly, it would be premature for this Government to develop its policy with regard to the substance of this question in such a way as to limit the full utilization of that committee's recommendations and its report.

As regards the procedural questions coming before the special session, our attitude is as follows:

(a) We advocate the restriction of the agenda to the single item proposed by the British Government, on the ground that the sole business of this session should be the constituting and instructing of a committee to work on the Palestine problem.

(b) As regards the composition of the committee, it is our view that it should be of a convenient and workable size and might consist of the representatives of 10 countries. We feel that the committee should have neutral character, so that the members would be able to study this complex problem without being bound by any particular point of view, and to weigh the question on its merits.

(c) We consider that the committee should be instructed to give due weight to all facts and information of value in relation to the problem, hear all important and representative points of view which are offered, and present to the regular meeting of the General Assembly several alternative solutions with a statement and analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of each solution, together with recommendations.

I welcome this opportunity to inform you of the Department's position at the present stage of United Nations consideration of the Palestine question.

Sincerely yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Turkey Wants Arms, Not a Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the debate just concluded on H. R. 2616, the Greek-Turk aid bill, I charged that there was no evidence that Turkey had asked for a loan, but what it wants is military aid and nothing else. No real evidence has as yet been submitted by the committee or anybody else.

Since making my remarks, my statement is corroborated by that outstanding journalist, Constantine Brown. In a column appearing in the Star today he points out the true situation in Turkey. Under leave to extend my remarks I insert his article:

THIS CHANGING WORLD—ARMS, NOT LOAN, IS WHAT TURKS WANT; "OTTOMAN DEBT" IS PAINFUL MEMORY

(By Constantine Brown)

The Turkish Government has instructed its ambassador in Washington to make no move and to have no talk with State or War Department officials which could be interpreted as a Turkish request for American assistance, in any shape or form.

This policy of high Ankara officials springs from the loose talk now current in Turkey to the effect that America may want to tie a loan of $100,000,000 with control of Turkey's financial resources.

The memory of the much-hated "Ottoman debt," an institution which existed for many decades before the republic was established, is still vivid among Turkish politicians. The debt arose when the Sultans borrowed indiscriminately from British and French bankers and placed the country's revenues under foreign control. The "Ottoman debt" was abolished by Kemal Ataturk, who repaid the loans and removed all foreign economic and political influence from the country.

MOSCOW RADIO FANS FIRE

The debates in Congress, which are sketchily reported abroad, gave the opponents of Premier Recep Peker's government ammunition to accuse the administration of selling out to foreigners. Foreign propaganda, principally the Moscow radio and its affiliated stations in Syria and Lebanon, are adding fuel to the fire.

The historical truth about the so-called Turkish loan is that Turkey never actually has asked for any specific sums.

Last October the State Department sent a note to Moscow, with President Truman's approval, stating that the question of the Dardanelles must be settled, not by bilateral discussions, which had failed, but by agreement between all the signatories of the Montreux Treaty. The United States, which was not a signatory of the treaty, would take the place of Japan, which could no longer have a voice since it was one of the defeated Axis states.

PLANES AND GUNS ASKED

The note, couched in polite diplomatic language, was laden with dynamite. There was serious danger that Russia might precipitate conflict by attacking Turkey. The Ankara government was asked what type of military equipment was most urgently needed. We knew that the Turks had a large army, but we also knew that they were deficient in modern defense weapons.

The answer from Ankara was prompt. The Turkish military attaché in Washington presented a long list of materials, which made some of our military experts a little dizzy. But among the many items submitted there were some, such as antiaircraft guns, trucks, planes, radar, and materials for airfields, which the War Department considered of top priority.

Since Congress had not been informed yet that aid for Turkey was being considered, it was believed that some of the essentials could be sent from the European areas, particularly from the stock piles of lend-lease materials still in Britain.

PLAN ALLOWED TO LAG

Either because of a lack of equipment in Britain or because of fear that Foreign Minister Molotov's new friendly attitude might be jeopardized, the plan to reinforce Turkey was not followed up at that time.

When, last March, the State Department and our top military men realized that Russian expansionism had not been abandoned, and secret information was received indicating that the Middle East was still a potential target of Moscow's ambitions, President Truman made his well-known speech asking for funds for Greece and Turkey.

Greece, which was expecting the British to leave within a few weeks, appealed urgently for American assistance. Turkey, however, made no new request. It received the official offer of American assistance with joy, but did not make a fresh appeal, since a list of urgent needs had been presented a few months earlier.

Our Stake in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address, Our Stake in Greece, delivered by Hon. Paul A. Porter, of Washington, D. C., and Kentucky, before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations at the Congress Hotel in Chicago, May 9, 1947:

I have agreed to talk today to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations about Greece in the hope that I might make some contribution in the way of information which would serve to clarify opinion about this tremendous issue. It is my assumption that this council is composed of persons who are informed on questions of foreign policy and that membership in this organization is evidence of your belief that Chicago, notwithstanding some local opinion to the contrary, is a part of the world community and cannot secede from the universe.

However, there are many elements in the present picture which tend to confuse. The determined opposition to what has become known as "The Truman Doctrine" by both a former Vice President and one of your local publishers does not contribute to clarity of thinking and the average citizen may be pardoned if he is bewildered by the phenomenon of such strange bedfellows giving voice to similar views. We find many such curious alliances on this issue throughout the country, in the Nation's press, and in the Congress. Some adjudged as liberals discover themselves on the side of their old foes whom they have usually denounced as reactionaries and enemies of progress. And while the public opinion polls indicate popular support of the President's policy, divergence of opinions among those who purport to think for the average citizen perhaps leave him with the unique alternative of having to think this one through for himself. Whatever the unpleasant aspects of this responsibility of citizenship, it is not without its constructive side. We can no longer choose upon the basis of internal partisanship or rely upon our favorite purveyors of opinion and dogma to dish out a neat policy, all ready-made. Apparently, I repeat, we must think this one through for ourselves. And that, I take it, is where the Council on Foreign Relations comes in. Yours is the solemn and difficult responsibility of making things clear. For in the absence of information and understanding on the part of the majority of Americans everywhere, we are truly without a foreign policy and there is real trouble ahead.

Perhaps I can best serve the interests of clarification by talking about Greece in specific terms and then attempting at least to raise a few of the questions which flow from some of the broader implications of our undertakings in this area.

Last January I went to Greece as the head of a small economic mission with instructions to make an analysis of the country's resources and economic policies and further to determine what outside assistance would be necessary in the year ahead for the survival of the Greek people. I have completed this assignment, filed my report, and terminated my official status. Therefore what I have to say are the opinions of a private citizen who has had the recent opportunity in an official capacity to spend 2 months in Greece engaged in an intensive and comprehensive analysis of the country's internal economy.

A summary of the report of the American Economic Mission to Greece has been filed with the State Department and released for publication. It begins with this general observation:

"The people of Greece have an opportunity to move forward to an era of reconstruction and internal peace. Alternatively, if the present policies of drift and expediency are continued, they will result in economic disaster to all her people and perhaps forfeit for a generation Greece's chance to rebuild and to establish a stable economy."

On rereading this generality I have the conviction that its meaning may have a much broader application and that, in fact, upon the success of our venture in Greece depends our own opportunity for security and economic progress. Having assumed this obligation, it cannot be permitted to fail.

A western mind coming for the first time into intimate association with the problems, the habits, and the attitudes of a middle eastern people encounters a number of puzzling phenomena. Yet to generalize about Greece is deceptive. I found the average Greek to be frugal, industrious, and intelligent. Moreover, the people as a whole seemed devoted to basic democratic ideals. What then are their difficulties and why do they need outside assistance? The answer to this question is found in a complex of historical considerations, modern and ancient, political and economic.

At the risk of oversimplification I would summarize the contemporary internal crisis in Greece by stating that after 5 years of dictatorship, 4 years of war and enemy occupation, and more than 2 years of internal strife, Greece's political growth has been retarded, her economic life paralyzed, and her people are thus unable to utilize fully the resources at their disposal.

Add to this the outside pressure of subversive foreign infiltration in a devastated and bankrupt country, and it then appears remarkable indeed that the Greek people have maintained any capacity for embracing principles of self-government. I have admiration for the devotion of these people to the fundamental concepts of human dignity and their determination to maintain their ancient democratic faith in the face of such prolonged adversity.

In considering the Greek problem, it is essential, it seems to me, to constantly keep in mind that for centuries this impoverished country has been a strategic battleground over which great powers have disputed and fought. Those who are sharply critical of Greece's current political institutions and the exploitive economic policies of her dominant commercial groups should remember that the country has really never had a decent breathing spell. Yet, I repeat, her proud people have maintained a fierce and unyielding adherence to political independence and the integrity of their State.

I recognize, of course, that the United States' policy is based upon our own self-interest in resisting the spread of totalitarian methods. But our system and ideals are such that our own interests are identical with the welfare of the masses of the Greek people. I reject therefore the cynical suggestion that we are moved by the commercial designs of classic imperialism in our determination to help the Greek people. I proclaim this policy as one which is based upon the noblest of American purposes and I submit that there is no conflict between the loftiest of democratic ideals and the most practical statesmanship in the world in which we now live. Those who may sneer at this approach as naive are, it seems to me, inviting a rendezvous with extinction.

What are the dimensions of the economic problem in Greece and what do we propose to do about them? First, it is important to bear in mind certain basic facts. Greece is a country of about the area of the State of Illinois, some 50,000 square miles. But only 20 percent of the land is arable. She has a population of about 7,500,000 persons. National income by western standards is abysmally low. Measured in real terms, it is doubtful if it will reach $700,000,000 in 1947. Thus the standard of living has always been dangerously low in spite of foreign borrowing. Even before the war, Greece balanced her trade largely through invisible income such as immigrant remittances, tourist and shipping receipts. The economy of Greece has always been weak, never self-sufficient.

When the Nazis overran Greece after the small Greek army had beaten back Mussolini's "wolves of Tuscany," they inaugurated a systematic and scientific campaign of destruction of the Greek economy. The physical destruction was to come later. For almost 4 years with Teutonic thoroughness, the occupying forces sought to destroy the Greek economy and crush the Greek spirit. One round of inflation followed another. The processes of government and commerce were fiendishly corrupted. Internecine warfare was promoted both by the Nazis and the Allies and the fierce hatreds of this civil strife are still bearing bitter fruit. As the liberating armies approached both from the north and south, the Nazis struck their final, cruel blows. A scorched earth policy, devilishly prepared, demolished the ports, wrecked the railways and highway transportation systems, and annihilated more than 60 percent of the livestock, the basis of Greece's primitive agriculture. Thus the liberators found a ravaged country with only a flaming spirit of resistance to tyranny as its remaining asset.

The tragic events of December 1944, the subsequent supervised election and plebiscite are too well known to warrant repetition. It might have been different and the bloodshed of the past and future might have been spared. There is ample room for difference of opinion on these questions. But I do point out as an obvious fact that Greece did not go the route of her Balkan neighbors and therefore we are considering together today a democratic policy for this part of the Middle East.

Since liberation some $700,000,000 of foreign assistance have been spent in Greece. But, as I pointed out in my report, there is the inescapable conclusion that during the past 2 years, Greece has merely managed to survive. There are exceptions in the revival of agriculture and some of Greece's small industrial enterprises, but by and large the country finds herself in much the same position physically as when the Nazis were expelled 2½ years ago.

I would like to summarize the proportions of Greece's present desperate economic crisis—a situation which she lacks the resources to meet alone. In fact, unless there is prompt foreign assistance, Greece will face widespread suffering and starvation this winter. These are the elements of Greece's current economic predicament, facts which are set forth fully in the report of the American Economic Mission.

(1) The tentative estimated Greek budget, including the expanded military establishment, indicates a deficit of $290,000,000 for 1947, or about three times the amount of currency now in circulation.

(2) Reserves of unrestricted foreign exchange by the end of 1946 were too meager to insure import of Greece's minimum needs, necessitating a severe restriction of basic imports in the absence of immediate outside assistance.

(3) Pressures on the retail price level are severe and further marked increases are indicated unless there are immediate corrective measures.

(4) Wage demands are accumulating as a result of the foregoing factors, adding the threat of wage inflation to the prospect of budget inflation.

In short, it appears that in the absence of substantial foreign assistance and the adoption by the Greek Government of strong control measures, another round of extreme inflation with all of its disastrous economic and political consequences is a certainty.

It is, therefore, apparent that there exists a need for immediate steps if inflation is to be prevented. Recovery and reconstruction in Greece cannot be based upon the present unstable economic foundations.

This raises a question in the minds of most Americans as to what basis do we have for a conclusion that our policies will cause different results from those applied since liberation. This is an appropriate question and one which we should seek to answer to our satisfaction. I believe there is an answer—a hopeful and affirmative answer, both in economic terms and political terms. One cannot minimize the immense difficulties of the undertaking upon which we are about to embark, but I believe solutions can be found to Greece's internal problems with the amount of assistance proposed. And I believe internal peace can be achieved if the United States Government puts forward the proper efforts.

The American Economic Mission to Greece has undertaken to develop a kind of blueprint for Greek recovery. We have sought to chart a course which will avoid previous errors of policy and administration, but which at the same time requires a realistic mobilization of Greece's own resources for recovery. The program, as you know, involves the expenditure of $350,000,000 over a period of 15 months. Of this amount, $200,000,000 is to be expended for relief and reconstruction and the remainder for the military. These sums wisely expended and carefully supervised mean that the Greek people can not only subsist on a diet at the level of approximately 2,200 calories per day, but that in addition many specific reconstruction projects can be begun. But, this can only be done if Greece makes effective use of her own resources.

For example, this program envisages that Greek exports during 1947 will more than double over the previous year. It means that receipts from shipping must be considerably increased and that local taxes will contribute more than in the past to close the internal budget deficit. It assumes further that the present tremendous burden of the military, a disproportionate drain upon the Greek economy, will not be a continuing expenses. It presupposes the resolution of Greece's internal civil war. This is a large order, but I am optimistic that with proper and determined personnel, it can be done.

I will not discuss here the detailed procedures of supervision except to mention one important technique which we have proposed. This is the requirement that the American Recovery Mission to Greece have the obligation, not a permissive right, but the duty to publish periodic reports on the progress of Greek recovery. These reports, either monthly or quarterly, should be made available to the people of Greece, to the people of the United States and to the

United Nations. It is my conviction that informing the Greek people and the world of the details of this program will contribute to the education of Greek people in the process of democratic government as well as constitute an important check upon any efforts to frustrate specific plans for recovery. I do not believe that any government in Greece could long remain in power if it failed to make sincere and determined efforts to utilize what may be its last opportunity for independence.

Two of the principal questions which have been asked me since my return from Greece are addressed first to the British policy since liberation and second to the character and composition of the present Greek Government.

I will deal first with the British participation in Greece since liberation. The British have maintained a substantial complement of armed forces within Greece since early in 1945. These forces have progressively diminished and I understand will soon be entirely withdrawn. In addition, since January 1947, under the terms of the London agreement, His Majesty's Government has maintained in Greece an economic mission and a police mission to train the gendarmerie. The question is repeatedly asked as to what have been the accomplishments of these groups within Greece, particularly the British Economic Mission. This is not a question that is susceptible of a precise or dogmatic answer. I can only volunteer a personal opinion.

During the past year and a half Greece has had a kind of economic stability. The drachma which was pegged at 5,000 to the dollar at the official rate in January of 1946 soon rose on the open market to about 8,000 to the dollar. There have been only insubstantial fluctuations since that time. This currency stabilization was bought at the price of dissipating foreign exchange reserves through the free sale of gold by the Bank of Greece. At the same time, the minister of finance somehow contrived to cover about 70 percent of his budget expenditures through current revenues from ordinary and extraordinary sources. Most of the current income came from the sale of UNRRA supplies as well as Allied surplus property and other miscellaneous extraordinary credits. Nevertheless, the Greek economy has functioned in a relatively stable fashion during the last 14 months. An abstract analysis of the usual factors would lead to the conclusion that a fourth round of ruinous inflation has been long overdue. But in spite of the pressures of a budget deficit, a series of wage increases and a high internal price level, there has been a kind of technical stability. I believe that this achievement even though negative in character is due in large part to the assistance and advice of the British economic mission and the currency committee established under the London agreement. Had it not been for the efforts of these groups, it is my opinion that a complete economic collapse would have occurred early in 1946.

Concerning the composition of the present Greek Government, I feel some reluctance to attempt to catalog the deficiencies of any sovereign power with whom we have friendly relations. I would feel more at liberty to talk about some of the beams in our own eyes. However, the critical question at this time is whether under the proposed program we can work with the existing regime. My answer to this is that we can. President Truman in his message to Congress pointed out that this government was not perfect—the kind of diplomatic understatement which the proprieties require of our Chief Executive. However, it should be remembered that even though an election is long overdue in Greece, the present government does represent some 85 percent of the constituent assembly. Moreover, there is within Greece a vigorous and critical political opposition. There is a free press. The Communist paper is published daily in Athens and each morning in my mail box I received an English translation of the mimeographed bulletin of the EAM bitterly denouncing the present regime. Obviously, the fact that there exists freedom of expression does not justify the shortcomings of any government, but it is my impression that nowhere else in the Balkans can be found this measure of liberty. I regard this as a hopeful symbol.

There are many reforms necessary in the shattered economic and governmental structure of Greece. They run from the necessity for a complete revision of the civil service, its standards of classification and compensation, to sweeping budgetary and tax reforms. A program of reconstruction and reform of this character cannot be put into effect overnight. It is a step-by-step process and must be recognized as such. In my opinion, no enduring political or social reform can be achieved until there is first a restoration of economic health. The first job of the American Recovery Mission is to bring about conditions of renewed economic activity and it is the duty of peoples of democratic faith everywhere to seek a basis for internal pacification within Greece. I am encouraged by the signs of interest on the part of the United Nations on the question of a general amnesty to terminate the present hostilities in the country. Certainly such a program should have the unqualified support of the United States because it is obvious that there can be no real recovery in Greece so long as she undertakes to rebuild and fight an internal war simultaneously.

It has been 2 months since I sat at a little inn at Loutraki on the shores of the Gulf of Corinth and through the Voice of America heard the President's appeal to Congress for legislative authority to come to Greece's rescue. Obviously, such an important issue as this should be thoroughly and carefully debated by the Congress. But all of us should recognize that Greece is living on borrowed time, on the hope of economic assistance from the United States.

The alternative to the Truman doctrine is inaction. Inaction means the swift and certain collapse of Greece. It is my belief that this would produce the kind of chain reaction throughout the Middle East and in western Europe that would not only shatter the structure of the United Nations, but would in addition confront democratic powers with an impossible dilemma. This cannot be permitted to happen. America's responsibility has been proclaimed to the world. It must now be made effective.

I would not undertake to give sweeping assurances as to the success of our policy in Greece. I am convinced that it is technically feasible, that Greece has the resources, the skills, and the will to become a fully democratic society. She cannot do it alone and requires our assistance. I conclude with the observation I made to the House Foreign Affairs Committee that Greece's record in resisting oppression entitles her to that chance.

George Washington University's New Courses Are Designed To Aid Those Seeking State Department Careers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpt from a radio address by David Wills over Station WMAL on May 5, 1947:

With all the expanding interest in foreign affairs and the vast sums being appropriated to finance new adventures in foreign policy, there's sure to be need of many more men and women in the career service of the State Department. George Washington University has decided to do something about it.

Last summer this university ran a summer course for veterans who wanted to take the State Department career examinations; 100 veterans enrolled, 86 took the examination, and 40 percent passed—and that's nearly three times better than the national average. So this year George Washington University has decided to make the course permanent—run it every summer—and not limit it to veterans, which makes George Washington the only university in the country offering such a course.

The course starts toward the end of June and applications for admission have to be made by June 1; information can be obtained from the dean of government at George Washington.

To take the State Department exam, you have to be between 21 and 35 years old, you must have been a citizen of the United States of America for 10 years, and you must not be married to an alien. The rules do not say you have to be literate, but it helps when you try to pass the exams. These examinations are done on the Time magazine current affairs quiz style; check the right answer among four suggested for each question. You have to be able to sling around words like epitonic and etiolated; geoponic and fractious; paralepsis and vaticination. The George Washington summer course aims to set you straight on these and many other matters, and the course takes the students through trial tests at twice the speed of the actual State Department examination—just to make the student feel at ease when he comes to the final test.

The fee for this course is only $188. I mention the figure to show you don't have to be rich or go to expensive prep schools to start a career in the Foreign Service. Of the veterans who took the course last year, the largest single group was composed of sons of farmers, and a big proportion came from western colleges, though they may have been born in the East.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hanson W. Baldwin from the New York Times of May 4, 1947:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING'S VALUE WEIGHED—EIGHT REASONS WHY UNIVERSAL TRAINING IS OF DOUBTFUL MILITARY WORTH

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Peacetime universal military training, soon to be submitted to Congress, stands or falls on its military utility.

Its fair-minded opponents concede that despite its repugnance to the American tradition, universal military training must be supported if it is proved essential to United States security. But the burden of proof, they rightly add, rests upon the military.

The War Department holds, and its official view is probably supported by a majority of Army officers—that universal military training is a vital part, in fact a cornerstone, of our national-defense program.

Some few officers and outside critics are, however, emphatic in their opposition; they charge the War Department with "deception" in insisting that universal military training is essential to national security and flatly deny this assertion.

ON CONTROL OF AIR, SEA

There are extremists on both sides of the argument, but any consideration of all the factors makes it plain that universal military training is a very dubious form of security, if, indeed, it offers any security at all, in this technological and industrial age. Here are some of the factors that tend to minimize its military value:

1. Attack can come to the United States, and we can attack any enemy, only through the air or by sea. In the initial phases of any war of any nature using any weapons what is of primary and fundamental importance is, therefore, control of the air and the sea. Emphasis, therefore, should be on insular strategy as opposed to continental strategy, on air-sea strategy as opposed to mass Army strategy.

2. The problem of United States defense breaks down into time periods, the short-term and the long-term. In the immediate future when the only component of "push-button" war that we have is the push-button—perhaps for 10 years, perhaps longer—the weapons and techniques that won the last war will still have validity. It is in this period, before transoceanic-guided missiles with atomic warheads have been developed, that large ground armies, to follow up and complete offensives launched by sea and sky, will continue to have a very considerable degree of usefulness. But during this period the United States has a reserve of trained manpower (declining in skill and usefulness as the end of the period is reached) already trained far more thoroughly by one, two, four, or more years in the wartime services, than any 6 months' trainee could be.

In the long-term future, when transoceanic-missile war may become possible, initial victory or defeat would not in any case depend upon a mass of semitrained reserves for the ground army. If the war ended quickly, it would be won or lost by our superiority or inferiority in missiles, air power, the atomic bomb, and other new weapons of destruction, and a large ground army could not greatly influence the course of the brief conflict.

TIME FACTOR CONSIDERED

If the war continued without decision, virtually complete control of the air and the sea would be necessary in any case before we could transport large armies overseas by sea or air and time would be required to equip those armies. There would thus be time for training; in fact, training for the ground battlefield is one of the lesser problems of any future war. This is not to say that ground troops will not be necessary; in any future war—clearly they will—certainly for occupation after conquest, very probably to help win the victory. But they cannot possibly influence (except by the firing of projectiles) the initial and supremely vital phases of any push-button war, and if a push-button war devolves into a war of attrition, there will be ample time to train large ground forces, and to train them under wartime incentive far better and with the benefit of higher morale than is possible under a 6-month peacetime system.

3. Today, and even more tomorrow, the offense has such an edge on the defense that the greatest hope of victory or of avoiding atomic attack, is the threat of tremendous and overwhelming retaliation.

In other words, we cannot build any Maginot Line that will protect the United States against all forms of attack, but we can create a mobile, instantly ready striking force, planes, guided missiles, aircraft carriers or fast surface missile launchers, submarines, and small but highly trained forces of airborne troops, which can strike at once against any enemy that attacks us.

This force will need manpower, but it must be full-time highly trained manpower, not half-baked, half-trained reserves. This force will need large numbers of men to launch missiles (it takes several hundred to prepare a single German V-2 rocket for launching), but UMT will not provide the type of training needed.

4. There is need in any future missile war for large forces to provide military or semimilitary disaster control and civilian defense duties on the home front. This should be the mission of the National Guard or some similar force, and it should be specifically trained to that end, but the universal military training program is not pointed toward any such end.

5. A good military case might have been made for extension of the Wartime Draft Act until our occupation duties overseas had ended, but universal military training—limited to training in this country—will not provide a single man for overseas service, and, in fact, will add to the Army's manpower problem by requiring an added 130,000 to 150,000 men for training overhead and cadre.

FLOW TO GUARD, RESERVES

6. Universal military training will provide a flow of manpower for the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, but these civilian components or part-time soldiers cannot possibly be ready for instant action in an emergency, and yet instantly ready forces are the type required in the atomic age.

7. The cost of universal military training—direct and indirect—is likely to be so large as to starve—particularly in this essential era of economy in government—more important aspects of national defense—the diplomatic services; the Regular services which must be instantly ready; intelligence, research, and development; the services' school system; industrial mobilization, etc.

8. Universal military training by its very size and cost may build up the shadow of security without its substance; there is grave danger we may create in our military psychology a Maginot line concept. Air power, missiles, new weapons, sea power must have priority.

In this atomic age the military emphasis—if there is to be any degree of security—must be on Regular forces, highly trained, instantly ready, not on some mass army that may be ready many months after M-day. As Maj. Gen. John S. Wood, wartime commander of the famous Fourth Armored Division, has put it, universal military training "will not produce a single unit ready to fight or a single fighting man for immediate use."

Economic Reform Weapon for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the New York Times of March 19, 1947:

ECONOMIC REFORM WEAPON FOR PEACE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The recent recommendations of President Truman in relation to Greece and Turkey can spell success for the cause of world peace only if our Government makes it brilliantly clear by word and deed that we have not accepted war with Russia and Communist domination as the only possible choices before us. Gradually the American mind is being conditioned to believe that there are no real hopes of averting war with the U. S. S. R. This is a disease so terrible in its ramifications that our political leaders must exert every effort to arrest its metastatic growth.

During the war I served in the Mediterranean theater as chief of Balkan intelligence for the Office of Strategic Services. In that capacity I came to realize that the basic problem of the Balkans was the fact that long-overdue revolutions against feudal social and economic systems were occurring at a point in history when external powers were finding it expedient, power politically, to control the governments of these volatile areas.

While worrying about the dangers of Russian expansion, America and Britain have placed themselves in the untenable moral position of clamping lids on the social and economic changes which alone can produce the preconditions of democracy and world peace.

Anyone who views communism in the Balkans as the result of simple Russian machinations is overlooking the centuries of poverty and aristocratic corruption which have characterized those countries.

Instead of recognizing the revolutionary nature of the post-occupation Balkan peoples and attempting to channel their legitimate drives where we had the opportunity, Britain and the United States have backed the remnants of a decaying system.

A peaceful resolution of the impasse in Greece depends upon two things: convincing Russia that any military expansion will be met by force; using every means at our disposal to hasten long-overdue economic and social reforms.

This, then, is a third alternative to war or Communist domination. We must make clear to all weak peoples who need our aid that we are fighting communism not with atomic bombs and strategically backed military dictatorships but with economic reform and social rehabilitation. We must search out those political leaders who until now have been crushed between the millstones of reaction and communism and give them power.

Finally, we must place as much burden as possible upon the instrumentalities of the United Nations in accomplishing these ends. Any unilateral action is bound to be interpreted by the Russians as an overt military challenge. Insofar as we can enhance the prestige of the United Nations we are keeping open peaceful alternatives.

Above all, President Truman and the State Department must drive home to the minds and consciences of the American people that we are engaged in more than world-wide military maneuvers. The answer to Russian arms is American arms, but the answer to communism is democratic reform. We still have time to lick Russia on the playing fields of social amelioration. If we succeed, one of the basic causes of war will have been forever removed.

STEPHEN K. BAILEY.

MIDDLETOWN, CONN., *March 16, 1947.*

Booklet Fascism in Action Should Be Printed as a Public Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, May 14, next Wednesday, the Committee on House Administration will decide whether or not the booklet Fascism in Action should be printed as a public document.

I hope the committee's report is favorable. It is my belief that we should keep wide awake against any force that is being exerted against our splendid form of government. Fascism or communism are two such forces, either of which could be devastating to our form of government. The booklet Communism in Action has been printed and is being distributed free by Members of Congress. It occurs to me we should also have the booklet Fascism in Action to be distributed at the same time.

FBI HEAD ON FASCISM AND COMMUNISM

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has made speeches about communism and fascism. It will be noticed that in every speech that he makes he condemns both, not just one, although the publicity seems to feature his attacks on communism and very little is said about his attacks on fascism. The statement usually made by Mr. Hoover on these subjects is as follows:

We, of this generation, have faced two great menaces in America—fascism and communism. Both are materialistic; both are totalitarian; both are antireligious; both are degrading and inhuman. In fact, they differ little except in name. Communism has bred fascism and fascism spawns communism. Both are the antithesis of American belief in liberty and freedom.

Mr. Hoover realizes, and has so expressed himself, that our fight against isms that will destroy our country should be directed against all such isms and not just against one.

Correspondents from all sections of the United States write:

I am informed that you are the author of House Resolution 83, providing for the publication of the book Fascism in Action. Myself and many friends here hope that you have success in getting the resolution reported out. Authentic information has long been needed concerning Fascist activities in America.

Certainly no one sincerely interested in our country's welfare would object to giving the public full details concerning any subversive activity.

When Fascism in Action is published, I suppose that it can be obtained through the Superintendent of Documents. I don't want to miss it.

The people must be informed. The dangers of fascism must be exposed. Fascism is a constant threat to the peace and security of our Nation and the public must become aware of this.

We support House Resolution 83 wholeheartedly, and hope that the publication of the manuscript Fascism in Action will be delayed no further. If we want American democratic institutions to survive, our people must understand the tactics and aims of American fascism. We are confident that Fascism in Action may serve as a warning and motivate the people to watch with vigilance its political, social, and economic rights.

A considerable number of Californians are interested in a report that the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared a manuscript on Fascism in America at your request.

The word "fascism" like the word "communism" is so loosely used that any authoritative definition of it in a Government publication would be of very great value to the common citizen.

May I express the hope that there may be no undue delay in the Government publication of the above manuscript and that when it is ready for distribution the public may be generally informed that it is available.

Support for your resolution, House Resolution 83, to have Fascism in Action published, is highly desirable. I am taking it upon myself to add this letter to what I hope will be thousands of others like it.

You may be sure that once said book has been published, as I am sure it will be, I will do everything in my power to obtain a copy, read it, and preach antifascism to whomever I am able. As I am a sophomore at the University of Wisconsin, attending under the GI bill, you can understand that my sphere of influence is not too limited.

As you know, fascism is the greatest threat to America at present. Our boys did a good job of destroying it on the battlefield, now we should help them to destroy it at home.

We have read of your efforts toward publishing the book Fascism in Action. With the evils of fascism hard at work now to undermine and cause disunity among the American people such a publication would be of the utmost value in enlightenment for all. We must have something to combat the poison propaganda of a Fascist nature spread throughout our Nation every day.

Armed Forces Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

STIMSON'S ADVICE

Henry L. Stimson's succinct comments on behalf of the armed forces merger are entitled to the respect due the advice of an elder statesman. During two terms as Secretary of War and one as Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson had an opportunity accorded few Americans to see our national interests in long perspective. His personal integrity rules out any possibility of partisanship. When he stands unequivocally for prompt passage of the unification bill now before Congress, he does so because his long experience has convinced him that this unified approach to national security is organizationally necessary in a modern world.

Mr. Stimson uses the phrase "strategic economy" to describe one of the principal advantages he envisions in the merger. He refers, of course, to economy in lives and natural resources in any future war, and he notes that such an element "might well be critical." He cautions that we cannot continue to operate with the "wasteful opulence" that has characterized our efforts in the past. In this connection, the saving in dollars as well as resources cannot be ruled out, especially at a time when Congress has such a penchant for reducing expenditures. A recent report by Lieut. Gen. Leroy Lutes, Army procurement director, adds weight to Mr. Stimson's argument. During the years 1942 to 1945, the Lutes report charges, "duplication and lack of coordination in the supply activities of the Army and Navy" cost the staggering sum of $1,150,000,000. Regardless of other compelling considerations in the merger, the monetary saving alone should make Congressmen take the proposed integration seriously.

Mr. Stimson demolishes the fear expressed Tuesday by Admiral King that the powers of the proposed Secretary of National Defense would constitute a danger. A strong secretary, Mr. Stimson points out, is essential to accomplish the job, but the Secretary of National Defense is only to be delegated some of the authority over the defense establishment that now rests upon the President. Nor is the bill now pending a partisan bill favoring one service over another. Mr. Stimson emphasizes the careful study and the basic compromises and agreements that went into the measure endorsed by leaders of both the Army and Navy. The crux is expressed by Mr. Stimson in this passage: "I would like to stress the importance of considering this organization of the armed forces from the standpoint of fundamentals rather than details. If the basic plan of centralization can be determined upon, hundreds of vexing problems will fall into proper perspective. They will lose much of their controversial aspect and be decided as a matter of specific planning rather than of primary policy." These words should be pondered deeply on Capitol Hill.

Railroad Trusteeships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News:

HIGH-SPEED COMMUTING FACILITIES FOR PATERSON ARE NOW ENDANGERED; CIVIC GROUPS MUST ACT AT ONCE

Mayor Furrey, the chamber of commerce, and every civic organization having Paterson's best interests at heart are now called upon to go into immediate action in opposition to House bill 3237, introduced by Congressman REED and now before Congress.

The purpose of this bill is to bring to an end all railroad trusteeships and hand the roads now under these trusteeships back to the stockholders.

Hearings on this bill are to begin in Washington next week. The legislation emanates from a Western State where stockholders

lost money in an unsuccessful railroad investment and on its face this proposed legislation looks innocent enough.

Paterson, as a city, however, has a very definite stake in seeing to it that every legitimate effort is made to prevent this bill from being enacted into law.

Should it pass the House and Senate and be signed by the President the effect of this legislation would be to hand back the revivified and rehabilitated New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad to the Erie on a silver platter and wipe out 10 years of hard work and fine results achieved under the able direction of the late Walter Kidde and his successor, Henry K. Norton.

The Erie Railroad owns all of the stock of the New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad and 10 years ago the Susquehanna had been allowed to deteriorate to a point where it was no longer a factor in commuter travel between Paterson, its suburban area, and New York City.

Then came the trusteeship and without any aid from the Erie Railroad, which at that time enjoyed a practical monopoly on the commuter transportation to New York City, the Susquehanna was revamped and new life was breathed into it. The high-speed streamliners were introduced and put into operation, bringing Paterson to within 45 minutes of Times Square and this service has been continually improved and extended until today its continuance and maintenance is of prime importance to Paterson merchants, businessmen, and to thousands of people who find it necessary to travel back and forth to New York.

The financial condition of the Susquehanna Railroad has been greatly improved and the bondholders can now see an opportunity at long last to realize something on their heretofore dormant investments.

Paterson stands to suffer great loss and thousands of commuters and businessmen untold inconvenience if this bill in Congress passes and the Susquehanna, instead of continuing as a live competitor to the Erie, is handed back to that railroad, lock, stock, and barrel and the commuters from this city and its suburbs again find available to them only noncompetitive service to New York City.

The News urges the Chamber of Commerce and all of Paterson's business and civic organizations to get busy at once. Send protests to Congressman CANFIELD and Senators HAWKES and SMITH against the passage of this bill which would wreak such great damage upon the city.

Time is of the essence and the time to act is now.

Cultural-Relations Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of May 8, 1947:

IN THE NATION—SOURCES OF DISBELIEF IN CULTURAL RELATIONS PROGRAM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 7.—Few advocates of the cultural relations program of the State Department, few critics of those Members of Congress who would not appropriate for it at this time or would sharply reduce its proposed budget, have probably taken the trouble to read the hundreds of pages of testimony before the House subcommittee.

On these are based the pending efforts to abandon the program, or economize on it heavily. The volume in which these hearings are published contains 1,068 pages, and they are heavy going.

But those who will read the hearings fairmindedly will discover two neglected facts. One is that the cultural relations program was not examined by a group of hick Congressmen who have no informed views on international policies, only backwoods prejudices.

The other is that the sources of congressional disbelief in the need and effectiveness of what Mr. Benton, the Assistant Secretary of State in charge, is trying to do arise from opinions which are not without substance.

These opinions, as disclosed in the hearings, are:

1. Official statements of our foreign policy have been vague and conflicting; therefore no Government agency can project it effectively in words.

2. Since the Federal budget for fiscal 1948 is certain to be reduced several billions of dollars by resolution, no responsible committee can increase the fiscal 1947 budgets of Government enterprises whose necessity and value have not been demonstrated, and the necessity and value of this program is wholly a matter of opinion.

3. The OIC (which is the State Department unit concerned) is loosely and extravagantly run, and, instead of getting $11,000,000 more in fiscal 1948 as requested, could do whatever it proposes to do at less than the $20,000,000 appropriated for it in fiscal 1947.

4. This extravagance is proved by earnings allowed to a number of OIC employees which exceed the pay of Cabinet members, and by rapid step-ups in the earnings of these same persons in a few months.

5. While the number of aliens on the OIC pay roll has been greatly reduced, there are still too many, and they are too highly paid in comparison with employees who are citizens.

6. The pay roll includes many whose nonpartisanship in domestic politics was challenged on good evidence when they were on the pay roll of the Office of War Information and the Republicans were the minority in Congress.

From the standpoint of practical legislation decision these are formidable objections. And the manner in which they were brought out and discussed by Representative STEFAN, of Nebraska, and his subcommittee was workmanlike and on a high plane, as the witnesses themselves agreed. When this is true of a congressional inquiry, and the management as well as the value of a Federal program is effectively put in question, the debits should be conceded by advocates of the program, and the sincerity and mental quality of the questioners should not be dismissed with an implication that they are blind to or ignorant of the world realities.

A few extracts from the vast record may illustrate the serious and informed nature of the examination:

[By Mr. STEFAN] "Both the Department and I are fully aware of the existing threat of communism, directed by Moscow, to our Constitution and against the political, economic, and social well-being of the American people.

"At this point, however, the Department and I part company. The Department believes that the encroachments of communism upon unwilling peoples and governments abroad can be brought to a jarring halt by the use of cultural and informational fanfare. I believe that these same encroachments can be only effectively stopped by the judicial use of American food produced on American farms and processed in American factories. * * * Such a campaign will cost money. But to me it is far better to spend a large amount * * * and make sure [of protection] from expanding communism than to spend a smaller amount * * * and stand by to see it wasted. * * *

"All of these requests that are being submitted by the various agencies of the Government are higher than their appropriations were at the peak of the war, in 1944. * * * Here are all these [OIC] salaries over $4,000. Here are salaries of $18,000, $17,000, $16,000, $15,000, $10,000, and so on. We wonder where this is leading. Where is the cost of government to go? * * * This Government, this business, this corporation of which we are all stockholders, is broke. We owe close to $260,000,000,000, and we are paying an interest load of $5,000,000,000 every year."

These are not the observations of bucolic legislators or of isolationists, and they are typical of the utterances of all members of this subcommittee. They do not establish—they only offer the opinions of certain Congressmen—that money to foster our international security can be better spent than through the OIC and that, whatever shall be spent by the OIC, the Government cannot afford to increase it now by 50 percent plus.

The contentions are highly debatable. But they are not irresponsible. And, while they dispute the value of such agencies as the OIC to strike at the roots of the world's perils, they do not minimize those perils at all.

School Safety Patrols

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today in Washington two groups are gathering whose philosophies and purposes are as different one from the other as day is from night.

One is a group of approximately 500 Communists, made up of ragtag and bobtail elements from different sections of the country, meeting here in a brazen effort to aid and assist the aims of the Communist Party, the principal goal and purpose of which is to overthrow the Government. One of the leaders of this treasonable hodgepodge is the United States Communist Party secretary, Eugene Dennis, just a few weeks ago voted by us to be in contempt of the House of Representatives, and now under indictment and awaiting trial in the District of Columbia. This group of avowed enemies to the American form of government are, through a mistaken sense of liberality, tolerated and endured only because of the liberty and freedom provided by the Constitution of the very Government they are trying to overthrow by force.

The other group I refer to is a gathering of some 12,000 American boys and girls who represent the finest traditions of American liberty, freedom, and progress. These are the boys and girls of the

school safety patrols, who, in this area, make an annual sight-seeing tour in recognition of their work with the police departments of their respective cities. These boys and girls during the war patriotically discontinued these annual tours. They are making the trip for the first time this year since the war.

These are the patriotic boys and girls, who, early in life, are training and preparing for the duties of good citizenship. Already, at their tender ages, they have become a recognized potent force for safety, order, law enforcement, and conservation of life and limb, in their respective communities.

This House today is preparing to vote the enormous sum of $400,000,000 to stop the advance of communism in Greece and Turkey. The motley group of Communists who are meeting here, together with their associates throughout the world, are costing us this huge sum, to say nothing of the enormous sums of money they are costing other people, in addition to their destruction of liberty and freedom throughout the world, and their cruel taking of millions of human lives and destruction and appropriation of billions of dollars' worth of property.

Contrary to this program of cruelty, despotism and destruction, these fine boys and girls who compose the school safety patrol represent everything that is the opposite of communistic doctrines. They are proud of the American form of government and are anxious to preserve it. They are here in Washington today to learn more of the lesson of patriotism at the seat of government, and instead of enduring and tolerating them, we extend to them a glad and hearty welcome. It is a matter of great pride to me, as Representative of the Fifth District of the State of Georgia, that approximately 500 of our fine boys and girls are here in connection with this annual tour. It will be my pleasure this morning to welcome them personally and to extend to them during their stay here, every courtesy and attention within my power. I know that this is the spirit in which every Member of the House of Representatives welcomes these groups of boys and girls who are here today. I know that the patriotism and fine citizenship exemplified in these boys and girls will be an inspiration to us in the House of Representatives to continue in the weeks and months to come the fight to preserve our great institutions and ideals for the benefit of their generation and generations to come.

The United States Mail—Action Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very timely article from the Christian Science Monitor indicative of the wide reaction to the recent curtailment in the public mail delivery service. Let us hope, as the article suggests, that this interference with an essential public service will be cleared up by appropriate action in the Bureau of the Budget without further delay.

MAIL DELAY SPANS NATION PENDING CONGRESS ACTION

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON, May 7.—Mail deliveries in cities all over the Nation are being curtailed because the Post Office Department's request for deficiency funds is tied up in the Bureau of the Budget.

Clearance is expected shortly, however, and the request will be referred to Congress for action "any day now," according to word from the Bureau.

Meanwhile local postmasters, lacking necessary funds to keep up their present staff of clerks and deliverymen, have had to lay off men and cut back sharply on postal delivery service.

At the Post Office Department it is hoped that the House Appropriations Committee, when it finally receives the request, may take account of the emergency by flashing the green light for the Department to go ahead on the assumption that the funds will be approved.

FIFTEEN MILLION DOLLARS NEEDED

Thus, the cut-back would be only temporary and regular service possible as soon as there is indication from Congress that favorable action and the necessary funds are forthcoming.

What the Postmaster General has informed the Budget Bureau is needed in the way of deficiency funds for the current fiscal year, to July 1, 1947, is $14,000,000 for the payment of clerks, and $1,750,000 for city delivery service.

Deficiency funds are those which are found to be needed by Government departments over and above what Congress made allowance for in budgets approved during the last Congress for the fiscal year 1946–47.

These are made necessary by unforeseen needs and circumstances. Practically all departments have applied to Congress for deficiency funds this year in order to pay the increased salaries for Federal workers approved by Congress during its previous session.

DELAY UNEXPLAINED

The post-office deficiency was caused by increased volume of work during the past year, according to authorities there.

A request for the needed money was submitted to the Budget Bureau in mid-April. No explanation is forthcoming as to the cause of the delay, but it is indicated that some differences arose between the Post Office Department and Budget Bureau officials over the matter which had to be "ironed out."

It is apparent, however, that the hitch delaying the submission of the request to Congress for action has caused considerable agitation in the Post Office Department, prompting a quick warning to local postmasters to watch their funds and keep within present budgets.

QUICK ACTION FORECAST

As one Post Office Department official explained it, "we cannot grant allowances for the expenditure of money which we haven't got and, therefore, we have had to withhold temporarily these allowances for money that is probably badly needed."

In many cities that has resulted in the dismissal of hundreds of employees and a cutback in the number of mail deliveries in residential areas.

It is believed that the curtailment of service will be of short duration. They are hopeful at the Post Office Department that it may not be necessary to wait for final passage of the deficiency bill by Congress before releasing the needed funds.

"We understand that it may be possible for the Appropriations Committee to tell us it is okay to go ahead as soon as they have the measure in hand," said one Post Office official.

ACTION REQUIRED

Formal passage of the request requires action by the House Appropriations Committee, the House itself, followed by similar action in the Senate. In case of disagreement between the two Houses, the bill would require final agreement by a joint conference committee.

Meanwhile, at the Post Office Department optimism is expressed that the things may be "ironed out within a few days" in the Budget Bureau and the request forwarded to Congress.

At the Budget Bureau it is reported that the matter "is moving along and ought to be up on the Hill any day now."

Analysis of Rent-Control Provisions of H. R. 3203

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, in H. R. 3203 the House Republicans have passed a miracle; they have repealed rent control and succeeded in passing it off as a renewal of rent control. Men who can do this and get away with it could crate and cart away the Washington Monument.

I do not believe they will get away with it. Should the Senate adopt a similar bill and it be signed by the President in the same squeeze that was put on him in the so-called renewal of OPA last year, as the alternative to no control even in name, 50,000,000 people living in rented housing will be gouged with higher rents. Unable to pay higher rents, on top of higher prices for food and other necessities, many will be evicted. This is a formula for inflation, for legalized robbery of housing renters and buyers on a runaway sellers' market. It is a formula for housing anarchy, for division among our people.

Step for step, the Republicans have repeated the job they did on OPA. They proposed to cut the heart out of the enforcement program. Their bill would take out from even the pretense of control all new housing, all old housing not now rented, all reconstructed housing, and the hotels and motor courts which now supply more than 900,000 to 1,100,000 rooms, 30 to 40 percent of them occupied by old people and veterans who cannot afford either to buy a house or to rent quarters large enough to meet the American standard of living. With graveyard humor, the bill arranges for landlords and tenants to negotiate higher rentals. With utter recklessness, it takes off the last controls over the allocation of scarce materials, releasing

them for race tracks, night clubs, and commercial buildings—wherever the biggest quick profit appears.

I wonder where the Republicans think the American wage and salary earners, returned veterans, and old people are going to get the money to live, to buy food, clothing, and shelter. The authors of the so-called rent-control bill have given one answer: Rents will come down before long because taking off controls will stimulate construction to the point where the supply of housing will exceed the demand. That is the same assurance the American people were given by the NAM and the GOP when they were asking Little Red Riding Hood to abandon price controls a year ago. It is just as false. Of course, in the long run, rents and prices may come down, but that will be after the inflation bubble has burst and millions are unemployed and without the income to pay even lower prices and rentals.

H. R. 3203 is an incredible, cruel, and dangerous hoax upon the American people. It threatens our economic and social stability, our hope of continued full employment and prosperity, and therefore peace itself. It must not be allowed to go unchallenged. At least my voice will be raised to cry "stop, thief!" at the lobby of housing profiteers that are today laughing themselves sick at their success.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an analysis of the rent-control provisions of H. R. 3203 by the Office of Price Administration, Office of Temporary Controls, as of May 2, 1947:

ANALYSIS OF RENT CONTROL PROVISIONS OF H. R. 3203 AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MAY 1, 1947

I. EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT TERMINATED

The bill terminates all the present provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act, so far as rents are concerned. (Sec. 203.) After its enactment, authority for any action of the rent control administration must be found within its four corners alone.

II. THE PERIOD OF EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

The bill extends rent control until December 31, 1947, unless before that time the President, by proclamation, declares that rent control be continued beyond that date, in which event controls are extended until March 31, 1948 (sec. 204 (e)). However, it is expressly provided that the governing body of any county, city, or town may in their discretion terminate rent control earlier by a finding that the necessity for rent control no longer exists in their jurisdiction. (Sec. 204 (e)).

Since the housing shortage continues to be acute, and will continue to be acute for some time, there is little likelihood that rent control will become unnecessary by March 31, 1948. But the bill does not even guarantee that rent control will be continued wherever it is needed until March 31, 1948. It gives the present officials of any county, city, or town the authority to remove controls earlier[1] by making a finding that controls are unnecessary. No standards are laid down to guide the governing body in making its decision. There is no requirement that an adequate local system of rent control be substituted. No opportunity is given to the people in the county, city, or town to express their views. And the finding of the local governing body is not subject to review by any other governmental authority.

This provision will make rent control a political football in every locality in the United States. It will particularly affect, seriously, those localities which have experienced a heavy influx of war workers who have not yet acquired voting rights where they now live.

III. RENT CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

The bill requires the President to designate the head of a department or agency of the Government, other than the Office of Price Administration or any other temporary agency, to administer rent control (Sec. 204 (a)). This provision would require the transfer of the rent control function from the Housing Expediter, to whom that function was transferred on May 4, 1947, by Executive Order 9841.

IV. STANDARDS FOR RENT CONTROL

A. General

The bill establishes as the maximum rents for housing accommodations, the maximum rents in effect under the Emergency Price Control Act on the date the bill becomes effective (sec. 204 (b)). The requirement contained in the Price Control Act that established maximum rents be generally fair and equitable is not contained in the bill. No other standard is substituted for the "generally fair and equitable" standard.

However, the bill requires the administrative agency to make such adjustments in the maximum rents as may be necessary "to correct inequities" (sec. 204 (b)). But the bill does not define "inequities." However, Congressman WOLCOTT, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, stated his view of the meaning of the term as follows:

"My own thought is that if the landlord is not receiving rent which covers the cost of maintenance, plus a reasonable return on his investment, an inequity exists which should be corrected" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 1, 1947, p. 4403).

This is the only explanation of the term contained in the House debates. In accordance with this explanation, each landlord would be entitled to a reasonable return on the fair value of his investment. This requirement would make effective rent control impossible, because rent control cannot be administered in accordance with the concepts employed in fixing public utility rates. There is no satisfactory standard by which fair value of individual rental units may be measured. Market value, tax valuation, reproduction cost less depreciation, or any other standard, would involve the landlord and the Government in protracted dispute and litigation. Whenever in the past such standards have been introduced into State rent control legislation the whole system of administration has bogged down. The staggering administrative burden involved in any determination of a reasonable return on the fair value of each piece of rental property throughout the United States would reduce the whole rent control system to impotence.

If Chairman WOLCOTT's view as to the meaning of "inequities" is not followed, it is difficult to see what concrete meaning can be given that term. Bereft of meaning, it leaves the bill without any standards for general or individual adjustments of maximum rents and raises serious questions as to the bill's constitutionality.

B. Authorization of 15-percent increases under certain leases

The bill provides that if a tenant and landlord, prior to March 31, 1948, enter into a written lease which is to expire on or after December 31, 1948, the lease may fix a rent up to 15 percent higher than the presently applicable maximum rent. (Sec. 204 (b).)

When this provision is considered in the light of all the other provisions of the bill, it becomes apparent that it will impose 15 percent increases on millions of tenants.

The proponents of this provision argue that it does not come into play unless tenants agree to enter into the lease, and that tenants will benefit by so doing, for they will exchange fear of decontrol after December 31, 1947, or March 31, 1948, or by a locality, and resulting sky-rocketing of rents, for the certainty that they will not have to pay rents more than 15 percent above their present rents until December 31, 1948. But it is precisely this fear imposed upon tenants by the bill which will force them to agree to such leases. Additional pressure upon tenants to sign is exerted by other provisions of the bill as well. Under the bill's eviction provisions, a landlord may evict a tenant if he wishes himself to occupy the housing accommodations, or if he has contracted to sell the housing accommodations to a purchaser who wishes to occupy them, or if the landlord wishes to substantially alter or remodel the housing accommodations, or demolish them in order to replace them with new construction. Any tenant who refuses to sign a lease can thus be threatened with eviction.

Under these circumstances, it is difficult to see how tenants will really have a free choice in deciding whether to enter into these 15 percent increase leases.

There will, of course, be some tenants who will resist pressure and refuse to sign these leases. But even assuming the maximum of tenant resistance, the possibility of widespread 15 percent increases is still great. Even in these days, there is a turn-over of tenancies as people move from one city to another or from one apartment to another. It is obvious that as soon as any house or apartment becomes vacant, the landlord will refuse to rent to any new tenant who will not agree to sign a lease providing for the 15 percent increase. For all practical intents and purposes, therefore, the bill provides for a 15 percent increase in rents for any housing accommodations which, for any reason, become vacant after the date the bill becomes effective.

Furthermore, many tenants who will sign these leases may move before the end of the lease's term. There is some basis for construing the language of the bill as providing that the housing accommodations covered by the lease are, under these circumstances, decontrolled, and that the landlord can charge a new tenant what the traffic will bear. Even if the language is construed as tightly as possible, once the tenant-leasee moves out, the maximum rent for new tenants becomes not the old maximum rent, in existence prior to the 15 percent increase, but the old maximum rent plus 15 percent.

Thus, the bill authorizes widespread 15 percent increases whether or not the particular landlords who will require their tenants to sign these leases, need the increases. It makes the fear of tenants of unlimited increases and evictions the criterion for an upward adjustment in rent.

This provision does a particular injustice to veterans for it also applies to new construction for which veterans obtained priority under law. Rents on this new construction are fixed at very liberal levels by the FHA. There has been no claim, even by real estate interests, that these FHA rentals are not reasonable. Yet, under the bill, landlords may increase these rentals by 15 percent by bringing pressure upon veterans to enter into these leases.

V. THE EVICTION PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill permits tenants to be evicted under the following circumstances:

[1] The bill is ambiguous on whether "earlier" means only earlier than March 31, 1948, but not earlier than December 31, 1947, or whether "earlier" means rent controls may be removed locally even earlier than December 31, 1947. There are other ambiguities in this provision. For example, what happens under the bill if a township votes to lift controls, but the county votes to retain them, or vice versa?

1. If the tenant, under applicable State law, violates the obligation of his tenancy, commits a nuisance, or uses the housing accommodations for immoral or illegal purposes or for other than living or dwelling purposes (sec. 209 (1));

2. If the landlord (a) seeks in good faith to recover possession of the housing accommodations for his own use and occupancy, or (b) has in good faith contracted to sell the housing accommodations to a purchaser for the purchaser's own use and occupancy, or (c) seeks in good faith to recover possession of the housing accommodations in order to substantially alter or remodel them, or to demolish them in order to replace them with new construction (sec. 209 (2) (3) and (4)); or

3. If the housing accommodations are nonhousekeeping, furnished accommodations, located within a single dwelling unit not used as a rooming or boarding house, the remaining portion of which is occupied by the landlord or his family.

The provisions for eviction contained in sections 209 (2), (3) and (4), and set forth in 2 above are subject to very serious criticism. In the first place, and most important of all, they permit the landlord to evict the tenant for the stated reasons within the time allowed by local law. This time, in most States, varies from 3 days to 30 days and was fixed to meet the needs of ordinary time and not an acute housing shortage. They will impose serious hardship upon thousands of families who will find themselves on the street without a place to live. Under present regulations an evicted tenant is given up to 6 months to find shelter.

Secondly, they contain no safeguards against spurious sales to purchasers. Under the present eviction regulations, a purchaser is required to make a 20 percent down-payment in cash as an indication of the fact that he is a purchaser in good faith and not merely a tenant who is willing to pay more than the regular rent for the purpose of obtaining a house. The 20 percent down payment requirement is removed by the bill.

Thirdly, these provisions contain no safeguards against the organization of spurious cooperatives in apartment houses, under which the landlord purports to sell apartments to purchasers who are really tenants forced to pay more than legal rents to obtain an apartment. Under present regulations, the administrative agency is given the responsibility to determine when such a cooperative is bona fide and when it is merely a device used to evade rent ceilings. This lack of safeguards will seriously affect the stability of rents in the large metropolitan areas where controls are most needed.

VI. EXEMPTIONS

A. New constructions and conventions

The bill exempts from rent control (1) new housing accommodations completed after the date the bill becomes effective, the construction of which was unassisted by priorities and allocations, and (2) housing accommodations, the conversion of which from existing residential use into housing use providing additional accommodations was completed after the date the bill becomes effective. (Sec. 202 (c) (3) (A).)

There is no discernible reason why these exemptions should be made. As already indicated, rents on new construction are fixed by the FHA at very liberal levels. No evidence has been introduced that these rents have been discouraging new construction. On the contrary, even industry representatives have testified that these rent levels are adequate. The exemption creates a special class of rental units freed from control. Landlords of old units are discriminated against without reason. In large part, veterans will be forced to pay the resulting high rents because they are the largest group seeking a place to live.

B. Accommodations not rented during the period February 1, 1945, to January 31, 1947

The bill also exempts housing accommodations which were not rented during the period February 1, 1945, to January 31, 1947. (Sec. 202 (c) (3) (B).)

In addition to the inequities mentioned above in connection with the exemption for new construction, this provision rewards those people who withheld housing accommodation from the market, and in so doing, in many cases, deprived returning soldiers of a place to live. It works a manifest injustice against those landlords who cooperated with their Government, obeyed the rent regulations, and made their space available to people who needed it.

C. Hotels

The bill exempts all housing accommodations in hotels and motor courts. (Sec. 202 (c) (1) and (2).) It has been estimated that this provision will exempt between 900,000 and 1,100,000 rooms in which permanent tenants live. Clearly, some protection against exorbitant rentals should be afforded to these tenants, many of whom are elderly, retired people, living on modest fixed incomes, who are unable to maintain their own homes.

Furthermore, the permanent tenants now living in hotels who will not be able to pay the higher rents that will be demanded of them will be thrown into an already tight market for dwellings renting at reasonable levels and will create additional, dangerous pressures upon that market.

VII. ENFORCEMENT

The bill provides only two methods by which rent control may be enforced.

1. Suits by tenants: A tenant who is overcharged may sue his landlord in any State or Federal court for three times the amount of the overcharge or $50, whichever amount is greater. (Sec. 205.) Recovery is limited to $50, however, if the landlord can show that the violation was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practical precautions against the occurrence of the violation. The tenant, in such suit, may also recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

2. Injunction suits by Government: The administrative agency is authorized to bring injunction suits against landlords who have violated or are about to violate the rent-control regulations. (Sec. 206.)

Analysis of these provisions, in the context of the entire bill, shows that effective enforcement of rent control has been made impossible. In the first place, the bill deprives the Government of its existing authority to bring criminal actions against landlords who willfully violate the rent regulations or treble-damage actions against landlords whose tenants fail to bring such actions. The bill also eliminates the Emergency Court of Appeals and permits the validity of any rent regulation or order to be challenged in any suit brought by the tenant or in any injunction suit brought by the Government. Not only will this deprive the country of the services of a court which has gained invaluable experience in the task of reviewing rent regulations and orders and proved itself admirably suited to that task, but it will greatly discourage suits by tenants. Under present law, a tenant who sues his landlord need only prove that he was overcharged. The landlord in such a suit may not, as a defense, plead invalidity of the rent regulation or order. Any issue of validity of the rent regulation or order must be taken up by the landlord with the administrative agency in the Emergency Court of Appeals and not with the tenant. Under this bill, when the tenant sues the landlord, the landlord may defend on the grounds that (1) rent control is unconstitutional; (2) that the general level of maximum rents in the area is too low; (3) that the maximum rent does not yield him a reasonable return on his investment; or on any other grounds the landlord may think of. These issues involve complicated legal and economic questions, on which landlords will receive the aid of landlords' associations, but which will be beyond the financial ability of individual tenants to litigate. It is not realistic to expect that under these circumstances the right of a tenant to sue his landlord for an overcharge will be anything more than a theoretical right. It will not be an effective weapon in enforcing rent control.

Nor will the right alone of the Government to bring injunction suits be adequate to enforce rent control. The bill deprives the Government of the rights, which it has under present law, to make investigations, to require landlords to keep records, make reports or furnish any information, to inspect housing accommodations, to administer oaths and to issue subpenas. Thus, although the bill gives the Government the right to bring injunction suits, it deprives the Government of any effective way by which it can learn of violations or even prove them when notified of violations by tenants.

VIII. SUMMARY

Taken as a whole, the bill substitutes for the present, effective system of rent control, a system that is inadequate and ineffective and which will not give the American people the protection against rising rents and evictions which it needs so long as the acute housing shortage continues.

The Proposed St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, the first entitled "A Self-Liquidating Seaway," from the Pioneer Press of St. Paul, Minn., of May 5, and the other "A Toll Canal?" from the Vindicator of Youngstown, Ohio, of May 4, both in support of the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn., of May 5, 1947]

A SELF-LIQUIDATING SEAWAY

At last, the St. Lawrence Seaway project is being put before Congress in a form that prevents further dodging of the issue. Until now, spokesmen for eastern interests fighting that project have hidden their attacks behind arguments about cost. But now Senators VANDENBERG and AIKEN have maneuvered them out of that position. These Senators have done it by including in the legislation provisions for self-liquidation of the capital costs of the seaway through the collection of toll charges.

The two Republican Senators are to be congratulated on this move. As strategy, it is the best that could be devised. It will throw a light on the true nature of the opposition that will be particularly revealing because the eastern rivers and harbors projects serving the ports that have fought the St. Lawrence waterway never have had to pay their way. They have been a straight charge upon the Government. Thus the Seaway to the Middle West is accepting a test

of Government economy which the eastern elements in Congress have never consented to apply to their regional waterways developments.

But while introduction of the self-liquidating feature does constitute an interesting legislative maneuver, it would be of questionable value if it were only that. Actually, it applies a rule of financing which on its merits deserves increased support from the country, including especially the regions which depend on the Government for development of tremendously valuable projects for power, navigation, irrigation, flood control, and recreation. Just how to apportion such costs and to what degree they should be repaid by amortization charges are complex problems to which no uniform answer is available now. But the benefited regions will gain much strength in an economy-minded Congress if they will support the application of the self-liquidating requirements to the full extent that is clearly in the public interest.

In the long run, the seaway should be worth much more than its costs. It can repay a large part of the Government's expense and in addition create public, private, and taxable values tremendously outweighing those costs.

[From the Vindicator, Youngstown, Ohio, May 4, 1947]

A TOLL CANAL?

The St. Lawrence waterway, often rejected by Congress, comes up again this week in a new form designed to win support. Senator VANDENBERG and others will present it with self-liquidating features—that is, as a toll system. The project itself and its new angle may well affect the Lake Erie-to-Ohio River waterway.

Completion of the St. Lawrence project would strengthen the case for the lake-river canal. Once the Great Lakes cities were, in effect, made ocean ports, it would be more desirable to link them with the eastern end of the Mississippi system.

If the St. Lawrence plan goes through as a toll system, Congress probably would ask that the lake-river waterway be presented on the same basis. Its sponsors would have no objection to this. It might, indeed, make the difference between victory and defeat in the long fight for water transport.

Col. Walter E. Lorence, of the Army engineers' Pittsburgh district, will make the new report on the lake-to-river project in about a month. It is expected to show greater benefits than were found in the 1939 survey. These may well make it possible for canal users to pay tolls on their shipments and still have lower freight costs than by rail.

It is true that such a set-up would be an injustice to this district as compared to the Pittsburgh area, which pays no tolls on the canalized Ohio, Allegheny, and Monongahela Rivers. With tolls on the through canal, the cost of assembling raw materials would still be higher here than in Pittsburgh. But the differential would be less than at present, and certainly the canal would be much more attractive to Congress.

The high Federal debt, the expense of foreign commitments, and the necessity of a strong defense system will keep the Federal budget on a tight basis for an indefinite period. As far as one can foresee there will be need for economy. So Congress will hesitate to spend a large sum, perhaps as much as a half billion dollars, on a waterway across a corner of Ohio.

If the project can be made self-liquidating, with the shippers bearing the cost out of their savings over rail freight, the waterway's chances obviously will be greatly improved. Compared to what we have sought it would be half a loaf, but as Senator VANDENBERG and his associates have decided in respect to the St. Lawrence, that would be better than no bread.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 8:

VOICE OF THE DP'S

It has been 2 years, trying years for all of us, since Hitler's legions laid down their arms. But these years have been harder, incomparably harder, for the 850,000 men, women, and children whom we call the displaced persons.

Most of us do not like to think too much about the DP's. For when we do think about them our consciences are troubled by the realization that these miserable people, 2 years after the end of the war, are still sitting in the detention camps of Germany, Austria, and Italy. Yet if we do not think about them, and if we do not do something for them, the chances are that 2 years hence they will be sitting there—just as miserable and just as hopeless as they are today.

Who are these people? About one-fourth of them are Jews, the first victims of Hitlerism. The story of their persecution has been told time and again. Of the others little is heard. But they are also there—driven from their homes in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and other states by the oppression of dictatorship whether of the right or of the left. Children make up about one-third of the whole. More than half of them are skilled artisans and professionals, while about 90,000 are agricultural workers.

What can be done for them? Republican Representative STRATTON, of Illinois, a war veteran, has introduced a bill to admit 400,000 of them to the United States at the rate of 100,000 in each of the next 4 years. This is less than half of the immigrants who would have come to the United States during the past 7 years had it not been for the war. The bill is carefully drawn to keep out undesirables and to see that those admitted would not become public charges after arrival. The hope is that such a worthy example set by the United States would persuade other countries to lower their own barriers so that all might eventually find some place to live.

Of course, if we want to do it, we can keep on trying not to think about the DP's. We can try to forget that they exist, for they cannot reach us directly with appeals for help. But the fact remains that we can do for them the things provided in the Stratton bill. If we do not do this much, if we close our hearts and our minds, their voices nevertheless will continue to reproach our consciences for the rest of our lives.

Swiss Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of May 7, 1947, as follows:

SWISS FORMULA

As evidence that the democratic way of life can survive and do well in Europe, we are asked to consider the case of Switzerland. In a recent article Dr. George S. Benson, noted southern publicist and president of Harding College, in Arkansas, calls attention to it.

A tiny country without seacoasts, without natural resources, without enough fields to produce her necessary food, and with a nonhomogeneous population comprising French-speaking, German-speaking, and English-speaking peoples, Switzerland, he tells us, pays the best wages known in Europe, maintains the best living conditions and has the highest per capita wealth of any European country. How has she achieved and maintained that fortunate estate? The Swiss formula, as he presents it, may be summarize thus:

Switzerland is a real republic. * * * Political responsibility is a reality and real freedom of opportunity exists. * * * All industry is privately owned and operated. Individual ownership of property is encouraged and protected. * * * Thrift is encouraged by both the local and national governments. * * * Equal responsibility is placed by law upon both labor and capital. Industrial peace is encouraged by local and national government. Industrial cooperation prevails throughout the nation.

Switzerland, Dr. Benson concludes, "is living proof that these conditions will bring prosperity to any country regardless of the quantity of its natural resources." He might have added that Switzerland for centuries has maintained her independence by a system of military training and constant preparedness for defense such as our own Republic needs but historically and expensively neglects—until the arrival of a war usually invited by that neglect.

Congressional Efficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Peter Edson, paging Messrs. La Follette and Monroney, which appeared in the Washington Daily News on May 8, 1947.

My question: "Had Enough?"—period.

PAGING MESSRS. LA FOLLETTE AND MONRONEY

(By Peter Edson)

If it's the little things that count, Congress is doing fine and more attention should be paid to some of the minor measures which have been passed this year.

This Eightieth Congress has been on the job for 4 months. It has 3 months to go. Its record at bat is truly wonderful.

FOUR MONTHS—45 LAWS

Up to the 1st of May, 6598 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been filled with fine-type debate and miscellany. Five thousand one hundred and thirty-eight bills and resolutions have been introduced—an average of nearly 100 per Congressman. But in these 4 months only 45 of these measures have been passed into law—an average of 1 bill for every 12 Congressmen. Average time for getting these 45 laws passed, from introduction to signing by the President, has been 50 days apiece.

The cost of operating Congress, by the way, has nearly doubled. It ran about $15,000,000 a year before the war. Next year's budget calls for $29,000,000.

Maybe it is time to page ex-Senator Bob La Follette and Representative MIKE MONRONEY again, and start getting serious about this business of reorganizing Congress for greater efficiency.

DIGIT DIGEST

The important measures which have been passed this year can be counted on the fingers of one hand. They aren't so world-shaking, either. Putting OPA out of business June 30. Continuing wartime excise taxes. Passing a constitutional amendment to limit future United States Presidents to 2 terms or 10 years.

Important measures which the Republican leadership has put on its "must" list for passage before adjournment in July include: The new labor-control bill. Bill to provide foreign relief where UNRRA leaves off. Tax reduction. New rent-control bill. Aid to Turkey and Greece.

Since this leaves you your toes to play with, you might as well count up some of the unimportant things which Congress has had time to take care of, just to give everybody full credit:

SWISS GET $425.88

There was a bill to authorize the War Department to transport the Boy Scouts to their jamboree in Paris this summer, and to provide them with free passports. This takes care of the international situation in fine shape.

In the way of big financial tranactions, there was a law passed to pay Switzerland $425.88 for the loss of food stored aboard the Japanese ship *Awa Maru*, when it was sunk in the Pacific.

Among the important things about which nothing really constructive is apt to be done this year are: Unification of the armed services. Universal military training. A long-range housing bill. Federal aid to education. A national health insurance program. Minimum wage and social security law revision.

Write your Congressman.

The Way Out of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject the Way Out of Inflation, by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], broadcast on Sunday, May 4, from Station WPIK, of Alexandria, Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. PARMER. Greatest fear for all of us—and our greatest problem at home is inflation. Is it here? Well, you and I can answer that. So—what's the way out? What is the future for all of us? This afternoon, I have the honor of bringing to this microphone a national leader who is thoroughly qualified to answer, United States Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat of Montana, now serving his third term. Senator MURRAY is a Democratic leader on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare and Public Lands Committees. He is also the Democratic leader on the Senate Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business. The Senator was also delegate to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization meetings in London and Paris in 1945 and 1946.

Now, Senator MURRAY, we want you to advise us. We wish to know, Senator MURRAY, what is the way out of inflation?

Senator MURRAY. Well, Mr. Parmer, that is a real $64 question. I could tell you very easily the way into inflation, but the way out is a much more perplexing problem. When inflation once takes hold, it is difficult to restore any semblance of economic balance until the storm runs its course, leaving wrecks and ruins strewn along the highway of business.

Unfortunately, we always find some who are willing to profit by the hardships of the many. In this group, we may include those misguided Members of Congress who last year thought they saw a political advantage in the destruction of price control. The reckless and indecent haste in which they removed all wartime controls which the Democratic administration had set up to protect the American people from inflation is now paying dividends in the demoralization of our economy. Also, we find in the country a small but powerful minority in industry and business wielding concentrated economic power, who appear to look upon a depression as an opportunity to concentrate their power still further through the forced liquidation and pillage of smaller and weaker business competitors—that is to say, the average American businessman. There are also a few who seem to welcome a depression because it creates a surplus labor supply, thus enabling them to reestablish lower standards of wages and enriching themselves at the expense of the whole American economy.

Since the lifting of price controls last fall, we have had a sharp rise in prices and in the cost of living, which has gradually led into inflation. We were told at the time that immediate release from wartime restrictions and controls would cause only a momentary rise in prices; that production would rise rapidly; competition would then take hold and prices would quickly level off. They told us that by their action in destroying price controls they were just restoring free enterprise and we would soon enjoy normal prices and peacetime conditions. These were the claims of that reactionary group in the Congress who last year destroyed all controls and then went before the people in the elections claiming to be great benefactors of the Nation and genuine apostles of free enterprise.

Some of us sought to counsel them otherwise, but they turned a deaf ear to all advice. They refused to heed the warnings of the President and the Council of Economic Advisers to the President which Congress had set up for the very purpose of guiding the Nation through the dangerous postwar period.

Well, the result is that the Congress, led by these false prophets, failed to protect the public interest and the people are now suffering for that deplorable mistake. The question now is, What can we do to combat these high prices and inflation and prevent the country from experiencing a serious collapse and deflation which will mean unemployment, bankruptcy, and ruin for thousands.

Mr. PARMER. Well, Senator MURRAY, that is the question we want you to answer. Can we get out of inflation by acting ourselves—or by legislation which will restore long-needed rights to the people?

Senator MURRAY. Yes; there are several courses we can take: First, we must promptly extend, without crippling qualifications, rent controls for at least another year; rent is the largest single element in the cost of living.

Secondly, we must bring prices down as rapidly as possible. It is true that industry cannot operate without profit but most big corporation are earning huge profits and can easily reduce prices, despite wage increases which have been granted. Many farsighted businessmen are following this course—all must follow suit. It will fail to work unless it becomes a universal program. Third, we must avoid tax reduction programs that provide windfall profits for the wealthy, and insignificant results to the mass of consumers. We need a tax program to give relief to the small-income earners—the farmer and the small businessman. The tax-reduction program proposed by the House of Representatives gives advantage to the high-income earner and would merely fan the flames of the present inflationary boom and make inevitable the final bust. Fourth, we must seek to develop better cooperation between management and labor through wise and well-considered measures which will bring harmony, high production, and prosperity. The ill-conceived labor legislation now before the Congress, designed to weaken labor, restore the use of injunctions, and encourage destructive litigation, if enacted, can only result in fomenting widespread industrial strife and endanger our whole economic system.

These four steps are the immediate steps to be taken. In addition, there are many long-range programs which should be considered if we are to have a balanced economy and full employment. Among these, the most important are the establishment of river-valley authorities, patterned on the TVA, to develop our great water, land, and power resources, providing new opportunities for investments, expanding industrial and business growth, and opening up new homes for our crowded populations. We must also have improvement of our agricultural-support programs, expansion of our social-security system, including a national-health program and rigid control of monopoly and monopolistic practices. These are long-range programs which will contribute greatly to a balanced national economy and general prosperity.

But the first step to be taken is to find a way out of the present dangerous price inflation. If we could bring about a general lowering of prices all along the line in all industries, and especially in the construction industry, as recommended by the President, we would then release a large volume of consumer purchasing power and prevent the further expansion of inflation. Failure to take this course which the President has recommended will surely result in a serious decline in new business, a reduction of incomes and purchasing power, followed by unemployment and finally a serious depression.

We must not fail to recognize the effect of a serious depression in this country such as we had following World War I. Daily, we are hearing ominous warnings of the consequences of another American depression. Our free enterprise system is in a final struggle against the rival systems of totalitarianism and socialism and the stalling tactics of Russia at the Moscow Conference, which ended without results, may be attributed to a Soviet desire to await what happens in the threatened depression here.

As I have already pointed out, many farseeing businessmen are following the course recommended by the President. Montgomery Ward & Co., for example, has been doing a lot of price-cutting, as well as many concerns both large and small which are acting on the assumption that prices are so high they endanger our economy. They are wisely taking steps to prepare for the certain storms ahead instead of seeking cover after the deluge.

These conclusions which I have expressed are not my conclusions alone—they are the conclusions of many farsighted businessmen

who are cooperating with the President, and leading economists of the Nation.

It is now high time for the Republican leaders of the Congress to stop playing politics with the fortunes and livelihood of the American people. They should drop their theory of the desirability of a short recession. They should promptly begin to cooperate with the Democratic administration in working out a practical program for preventing a serious economic collapse and depression.

If the Republican leaders will not cooperate in this manner, there can be no cure for the present inflationary trend except through a serious prolonged depression and unemployment.

If, however, the Republicans in Congress will cooperate with the Democrats on these matters—rent control, price reduction, sound tax measures to stimulate small independent enterprise and purchasing power, fair and sound labor legislation, as well as the long-range programs of reclamation and resource development, social security, and enforcement of antimonopoly laws, then we can cure the economic fever which has developed without killing the patient.

The Democrats have already met the Republicans in an effort to pull them out of the hole in which they have put themselves. It is now up to the people back home to let the reactionary Republican leadership in the Congress know that the overwhelming majority of the American people want an economy of abundance and stability—a strong system of genuine free enterprise and will insist upon the Congress devoting itself honestly to those ends.

Treaty Obligations to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a copy of a letter to Hon. WALTER JUDD, written by Mr. Fred H. Lysons, a well-known Seattle lawyer, and for many years a close student of the political, economic, and social problems of China. The very timely and cogent suggestions contained in this letter are worthy of careful consideration.

APRIL 6, 1947.

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
Representative in Congress.

MY DEAR MR. JUDD: In 1939, you and I were among the many Americans converged in Washington in a movement to halt our shipments to Japan of material in aid of her then war on China—which we foresaw as a prelude to world war.

On August 2, 1939, Senator Schwellenbach, in a Senate address on his bill to end those shipments, made this statement:

"When the Committee on Foreign Relations had heard a number of witnesses it was the unanimous opinion that the testimony of Dr. JUDD had been so outstanding, and had so clearly and exhaustively outlined the situation in the Far East, that there was no need to call any other witnesses upon the Chinese-Japanese problem."

Your testimony emphasized the boycott's crushing effect on Japan, but I am not sure that you, at the time, knew that China's abatement of her boycott was at our request and was in exchange for the nine power treaty, the effect of which treaty, had it been observed by us, would have been a guaranty to China of her sovereignty and national integrity.

The treaty thus became clothed with the element of a bargain for a consideration, in supplement and in addition to its element as an obligation based upon the honor of the United States.

But what happened? All through the 1930's and down to the day of Pearl Harbor, in complete disregard of this obligation of honor, in affirmative repudiation of this bargain of consideration, we supplied Japan with the munitions, the material, and the equipment for her destruction of China, the facts today recognized by us, to our shame, with effect known to the world. While that is past history which cannot be recalled, its lessons are present with us and should be our guide for the future.

Russia is today the threat to us, to China, and to the world—of infinitely greater danger than Japan could ever have become.

With the nine power treaty-bargain obligations still resting upon us, we seem disposed to give succor in every direction except that of China. In a program to stop infiltration of communism, we are giving aid to Europe, where we have no obligation, and are lessening, if not repudiating, our aid to China, with every boo from Russia. Whatever may be the result in Europe, our policy gives Russia assurances of Asia as its vast empire of communism.

The remedy and the preventative are in our hands: A policy of honor and righteousness in fulfillment of our nine power treaty-bargain obligation to China, both in direct affirmative aid to that country and in negatively denying aid to Russia, which directly, indirectly, or remotely may be a hindrance to China and thus in violation of our treaty obligation to her.

From Communists, including Americans, and through avenues of honesty but misinformation, our attention is called to the dissension in China, which we are told makes aid to the central government impractical or ineffective.

Whence came this dissension? There is no better recognized truism than that disaster breeds dissension. The disaster in the central government of China is due directly to our violation of America's obligation (of honor and consideration) to that hapless country, and to its central government; for it was that government to which our obligation ran and which paid us the consideration. This consideration of boycott abatement was based upon the finding of a congressional committee that this boycott had brought distress to America, particularly to our agricultural economy.

Nor may we excuse our past and continuing betrayal of China on the ground that we are but one of several signatories to the nine power treaty. That treaty, drafted by Elihu Root at the Washington Conference, was defined by him as the individual obligation of each signatory. He even went so far in that definition as to say that the treaty obligation "did not import interference by one country with another; that it did import what each one of the countries would do". Truly a document of peace.

Baron Tanaka, Premier of Japan, on a trip to Europe, in the hope of finding some relief from the obligations of the nine power treaty, makes this statement, in his famed "Tanaka Memorial" of 1927: "I was sent to Europe and America to ascertain secretly the attitude of the important statesmen toward it. They were all agreed that the nine power treaty was initiated by the United States. The other powers who signed it were willing to see our influence increase in Manchuria and Mongolia."

America's course is plain and simple, and should be emphatic: The course of righteousness in fulfillment of these treaty obligations.

Let us take unto ourselves the Biblical admonition, "Righteousness exalteth a nation", and avoid the application of the correlative scripture, "but sin is a reproach to any people."

Such course of conduct would bring to America the plaudits of the world and would set an example which no nation would dare disregard for at least a long, long time in the future.

Official record authority is available in support of every feature of such campaign.

Very truly yours,

FRED H. LYSONS.

Elbert S. Brigham, of Vermont, Master Breeder of Jersey Cattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American Jersey Cattle Club, recognizing the outstanding and remarkable record made by former Representative Elbert S. Brigham, of Vermont, as a breeder of Jersey cattle, recently accorded him their "Oscar," the master breeder award. He is the fourth person to be so honored.

From the Jersey Bulletin of March 25, 1947, under permission heretofore granted, I quote the following editorial:

MASTER BREEDER—ELBERT S. BRIGHAM, OF VERMONT, BECOMES THE FOURTH TO BE SO HONORED BY DIRECTORS ON THE BASIS OF HIS CONTRIBUTION TO THE BREED

In according the master breeder award to Elbert S. Brigham, owner of Brigham Farm, St. Albans, Vt., the American Jersey Cattle Club directors, in recent session at Columbus, picked a man whose record warrants the choice and will be unanimously approved by Jerseydom.

Mr. Brigham is a real veteran in the industry, and from the first to last he has striven for production, with due attention to type. Time and again his big herd has broken national records, and if you have been watching the Herd Improvement Registry monthly reports in the Bulletin you have seen continuing evidence of his accomplishments. In the January report in this issue his herd of 118 head leads the list of herds of 100 or more with the astonishing average of 41 pounds fat. It take a lot of good cows to do that.

Furthermore, turn to March 10 issue and consider more carefully his page advertisement which lists the Ton of Gold cows in the herd, 63 of them. Not another herd in the world has such a record in this category. And it is well to remember that this herd is handled as a farmer's herd, on two times milking.

In April 10 issue, 1946, we published report of his fifth amazing year's average of over 500 pounds fat, that with 143 cows. His previous four records, starting in 1941, were 124 cows, 512 pounds fat; 112 cows, 517 pounds fat; 127 cows, 529 pounds fat; 141 cows, 520 pounds fat. It is a Gold Star herd, which again means a top producing aggregation. At its present rate of production it will again exceed 500 pounds.

Mr. Brigham, a constructive breeder, has achieved his remarkable record without any fancy stuff. He is a strong advocate of home-grown feeds and treating his cattle as a practical working herd on two times milking.

Because of this, breeders all over America have studied with deep interest his feeding methods. Breeding plans are carefully laid for production capacity, but considered equally important is an abundance of nutritious feeds. The farm produces legumes, grasses, and clover. Corn, oats, clover, and timothy are rotated, and there is always alfalfa pasture and succulent silage.

In 1941 the Bulletin published an article by Mr. Brigham on his pasture, feeding, and breeding methods, showing progressive diminishing costs, which attracted world-wide attention; for what he had done could be done by others with less operational magnitude. The herd is nearly 50 years old, and always the effort has been toward efficient, economical production.

In 1918 the first bull with demonstrated production in upper and lower lines of his pedigree was secured, and from that day to this bulls have been a major project. How well Mr. Brigham has chosen his succession of bulls is amply demonstrated by herd sires for the past 25 years. Starting then and leading up to today, all proven sires, they are:

Lucille's Golden Owl, 251625, tested sire, 47 daughters, 485 pounds fat, 6 Ton of Gold.

Killingly Torono Lass' Lad, 291790, tested sire, 47 daughters, 512 pounds fat, 10 Ton of Gold.

Floss Duke's Model, 369058, tested sire, 39 daughters, 545 pounds fat, 9 Ton of Gold.

Josephine's Royal King, 250214, tested sire, 101 daughters, 573 pounds fat, 30 Ton of Gold.

Lilac Remus Unrivaled, 409293, junior sire, superior sire, 11 daughters, 582 pounds fat, 18 classify 83.61 percent.

Sybil Ashburn Baronet Owl, 396681, senior superior sire, 23 daughters, 604 pounds fat, 23 classify 83.15 percent, 5 Ton of Gold.

This is unquestioned proof that his search for production bulls has succeeded. And this type of bulls coupled with the production ability of his cows has created a Nation-wide demand for his bull calves. From them he selects some for his own use, but he does not hesitate to go far afield to secure young bulls of promise, as when he bought a John Lindow calf out in Oregon and is growing him up.

Mr. Brigham is a great believer in the right kind of a dam of every bull he buys or breeds for his own use, and a study of his herd reveals that this demand has paid him big dividends in building one of the greatest Jersey herds in the world.

While Mr. Brigham won the Master Breeder award strictly on a Jersey basis, he also has achieved notably in other fields, including as Congressman from his district, and president of a life-insurance company, with upward of a billion dollars in policies.

The fact that he has won the Constructive Breeder award is convincing proof that he has made good use of the various breed-improvement programs established by the American Jersey Cattle Club. He, of course, is a long-time member of the club, and is regarded as one of its soundest advisers in breeding and business matters.

This is not the first master award conferred on Mr. Brigham. Late in 1944 the Vermont Dairy Plant Operators and Managers Association named him "A master dairyman," and termed him "honor student, learned scholar, farmer, cattle breeder, organizer, administrator, legislator, and public servant." A large certificate was presented to him, and with pardonable appreciation of the honor, it hangs on his office wall. His whole record as a Jersey breeder and dairyman fully justify this recognition accorded him by the directors of the American Jersey Cattle Club.

Curtailment of Postal Services Is Not the Fault of Congress

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving complaints from all parts of the country relative to an alleged denial by the Congress of funds to maintain essential postal services. This is just another indication of the confusion that has arisen as to where the responsibility lies for the curtailment of postal services throughout the country.

Releases have been made by local postmasters which have implied that Congress has been holding up funds with which to pay personnel of the postal service during the next 2 months of the fiscal year.

During the past number of years the departments have made it a general practice to rely on deficiency appropriations to carry them over the last few months of the fiscal year. The pattern of their strategy has been to accentuate a crisis in essential services, and thus attempt to place Congress in the position of denying these essential services to the people. I would like to emphasize that it is a basic responsibility of the departments to adjust their expenditures during the fiscal year so that the appropriations will last without a complete break-down of functions in the final months.

I have checked the situation as it relates to the Post Office Department's request for a deficiency appropriation. I find the releases made throughout the country by the postmasters were issued before the request for a deficiency appropriation even reached the Congress. Secondly, I have found the request for funds came so late that it was not submitted in time to be included in a deficiency bill that passed the House of Representatives last week. In this connection, it might be pointed out that Postmaster General Hannegan appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations in February, only 2 months before the request for deficiency funds was made and said nothing of this impending crisis.

The Post Office Department originated its request for a deficiency and sent it to the Bureau of the Budget as required by the President. The Bureau of the Budget did not take action until last Thursday, May 8, 1947. This was after the Post Office Department had sent its notice to the postmasters throughout the country that services must be curtailed because they had spent their appropriated funds. It would appear that if the funds are of such an urgent nature, they should have been given a priority by the Bureau of the Budget, Office of the President, and there the responsibilities lie.

This situation points up three serious deficiencies in our present procedures. First, the tactics of the Bureau of the Budget not only delay deficiency appropriations but, as well, hold up departmental reports on legislation pending before the Congress. I emphasize that action on legislation is delayed at this bottleneck and if the Congressional Reorganization Act as it relates to shorter congressional sessions is to work, we must insist on the Executive streamlining administrative procedure as it concerns legislative reports. Second, when departments send out information which will be the subject matter of newspaper releases throughout th ecountry, they should be required to frankly state the circumstances relating to their activities. Third, there must be more responsibility on the part of the departments for living within their established budget and for instituting controls which will keep them informed in advance as to their fiscal situation.

Communism and Publicity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette of May 5, 1947:

WE PUBLISH THE COMMUNIST ADVERTISEMENT

Despite the newsprint shortage, we make way in tonight's issue for an advertisement of the Communist Party.

We do this because we insist upon a hearing for all people, however much we may despise their philosophy or their methods.

We hope our subscribers all read this advertisement.

Unless they have been asleep during the last 7 years, they will recognize that the advertisement is studded with untruths.

They will not fail to observe how the Communists seek the shelter of the respectable Progressive name.

They will also see the Communist arm affectionately around the neck of the labor unions. But most union men know that when that arm is unrestrained it strangulates those whom its owner once smiled upon.

In the proposal to outlaw the Communists, America faces a new and unique problem. Never before have we had a political party that was openly operated for the sole benefit of a foreign nation.

In the campaign of 1936, when Mr. Browder was shut off the radio down in Indiana, this newspaper protested. It argued that any person had a right to preach any philosophy of government. It added that if the American people by secret ballot and in conformity to our laws and traditions wanted communism or monarchy or tribal relations or anarchy, they had a right to have it.

But the scenes have altered since that time. The sole reason urged to outlaw the Communist Party relates to their trickery. Once the Nation slips and communism gets its Jack the Ripper fingers upon the national throat, the story of America is told for a long time to come.

The Reds use ruse and blind, decoy, and birdlime. They have everything in the way of deceit from a sliding panel to a false bottom, from a spring gun to a booby trap. In their hearts is nothing but a mockery of government and altogether they constitute a painted sepulchre.

But shall they be outlawed?

Instead of outlawry, we should prefer a preliminary law. It would bar Reds from touching the throttle of power, whether in unions, schools, government, or other spheres of activity, from which vantage point they might spew their poison effectively upon the country. Unremitting exposure of these Reds, who they are and what they do, their aims, methods, and activities, the number of them who have served prison terms, and all other material facts should be kept before the people through a nonpartisan congressional committee that makes its investigation by the aid of the FBI.

We suggest this method instead of outlawry solely to keep the American coat of arms unblemished. In the 6,000 years of known human history nothing has developed more precious to humanity than America. It must be guided by those fundamental principles to which Jefferson adverted as the price of liberty.

The claim that outlawry will drive the Reds underground does not move us. They are already underground and as far down as the deepest caverns of the inferno.

We have an educated people and they are going to become more educated as time passes. They are not the dull clods of clay that grew up under czarism.

In other words, we do not think that outlawry is necessary. But if it eventually is needed, there is no reason why it should not be used. Free speech does not permit slander. A free press does not condone libel. Free religion does not support a sham to cover crime. And the free movement of political parties cannot be used to give us a sloppy Judas kiss made possible through the approach of a stealthy rogue.

We prefer to preserve the right of the American people to elect whom they please but protect them from being slugged in the back of the head with a baseball bat.

Veterans' Program

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members have read, I am sure, the editorial in the Washington Post regarding General Bradley's unequivocal promise that he will stay at the helm of the Veterans' Administration. It says, in part:

The general's job is, of course, by no means finished. It will not be finished until the management of veterans' affairs is consolidated along the lines of the efficient regard for the human needs of the veterans.

It goes on to say that the appropriation for veterans should not be cut.

The editorial is as follows:

VETERANS' PROGRAM

Gen. Omar N. Bradley's unequivocal promise that he will stay at the helm of the Veterans' Administration is immensely heartening—not alone to veterans but equally to all Americans desiring fair and generous treatment of the men who wore their country's uniform in war. In a letter to his assistant and deputy administrators, General Bradley declared: "Many of you have probably been reading in the newspapers that I am tired and discouraged and want to quit. I am no more tired than many of you. Certainly I am not discouraged. I mean to do my best, and I shall not quit of my own accord until my job is finished." Here is the language of a soldier. The general's job is, of course, by no means finished. It will not be finished until the management of veterans' affairs is consolidated along the lines of the efficient regard for the human needs of the veteran which he has designated as the keynote of his policy. For this task General Bradley is, in an almost literal sense, the indispensable man.

The letter to his staff, published by the Veterans' Administrator on Tuesday, is an analysis and a defense of the $7,000,000,000 appropriation he will request of Congress next week. It is a huge sum, which, as he observes, "can too easily create false hopes for large-scale savings." About 75 percent of this sum will be expended in the form of direct cash benefits to veterans and their families and cannot be reduced without changes in the law. Six percent of the budget is allotted to administrative expenses, and it may be doubted that this allows much margin for pruning. The temptation to economize in connection with the Veterans' Administration is likely to come in respect of the remaining 19 percent, devoted to indirect benefits, including medical care, hospital construction, and educational assistance.

It is precisely in this field, however, that the Veterans' Administration is doing its most effective work for veterans and has achieved its most distinguished success. General Bradley and his chief medical aide, Dr. Paul R. Hawley, have succeeded in enlisting the cooperation of the medical profession by locating new veterans' hospitals in the vicinity of major medical schools and instituting an extensive teaching and training program. As a result, the Veterans' Administration hospitals, once generally scorned by the medical fraternity, are now universally acknowledged to be in the vanguard of American medicine. Any impairment of the quality of this medical care accorded veterans would be, we think, at once a blunder and a tragedy.

General Bradley is understandably concerned about congressional "economy" in respect of his medical program. "I cannot countenance," his letter declares, "any reduction that might imperil our medical program and endanger the results we have obtained. * * * I shall not be party to any retrenchment that might threaten to drag this agency into the backwaters of American medicine." Congress ought not to make itself party to any such retrenchment, either. Limits should be set, we believe, on new hospital construction and the extension of medical care to non-service-connected cases. This sort of economy would affect the quantity of medical care provided by the Veterans' Administration. But there should be no economy impairing the quality of that care.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Rules will grant a rule on several bills which have regard to the human needs of the veterans. Some of them are for very small amounts. In fact, they are all for small amounts. One is the Kearney bill, H. R. 246, for on-the-job training, which lifts the ceilings in that program. I hope it will go through immediately because many veterans are obliged to give up on-the-job training because the management will not continue it unless the ceiling is raised and veterans cannot afford to continue with their on-the-job training.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. COX. While I am not authorized to speak for the Committee on Rules, I think I am safe in saying that the committee wishes to cooperate with the gentlewoman and her committee as far as possible.

Letter From James L. Smith Relative to His Dismissal From TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from Mr. James L. Smith, of Knoxville, Tenn., one of the witnesses in the Lilienthal hearing and one of those who were tried and dismissed by the TVA. His dismissal and trial were by Communists in the TVA, and was one of the most outrageous miscarriages of justice that ever took place in any Government organization. The testimony of the various witnesses in the Smith case alone, in my judgment, made it a blot upon the good name of the Senate to have confirmed to other offices Lilienthal and Clapp.

I hope that Senators will read this letter, and I ask unanimous consent to have it published in the RECORD.

An estimate from the Government Printing Office advises me that the manuscript in this instance will exceed the two pages of the RECORD allowed under the rule to be printed without an estimate, and that the cost will be $284.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *April 22, 1947.*

DEAR SENATOR: When I left Washington I was aware that you were studying the transcript as recorded by TVA of the circumstances and testimony given at the trial and dismissal of James L. Smith. I believe that with your familiarity with the official record, coupled with the fact that you heard not only my testimony, but the rebuttal by Gordon R. Clapp as well, that you are the person to whom this letter ought to be addressed.

Gordon R. Clapp, in all, gave about 30 minutes testimony before the Public Works Committee regarding my case. Never were 30 minutes spent packed with so much deception. Mr. Clapp took full advantage of the fact that I would not be back to answer him and has literally filled the RECORD with the grossest misrepresentation. His testimony is an insult to the dignity of the Senate and, if you will bear with me and read the remainder of this letter, I will prove it beyond the shadow of doubt by written records. Any man who would deliberately falsify the facts must not be confirmed for a position of high trust in these United States.

First, let me review briefly the salient facts of my testimony: (1) I was not represented by counsel when placed on trial before the TVA personnel department at the request of certain radical employees under my supervision. (2) The case was tried before the personnel department rather than before my supervisor as the TVA employee relationship policy requires. (3) I was denied the right to cross-examine my accusers. The record of the case before the Public Works Committee will reveal that over two-thirds of the employees who purportedly testified against me did not appear in person, instead typewritten copies of what, it is alleged, they would have said was introduced by their counsel. (4) Mr. Clapp had one man hear the case, Mr. Arthur Jandrey. Mr. Jandrey was named in the Dies committee hearings of 1940 as the TVA official who said that none would lose his job in the Authority simply because he was a Communist. Assisting Mr. Jandrey in an advisory capacity was E. B. Schultz, Gordon Clapp's director of personnel relations, who is named in the Dies committee hearings of 1940 as the TVA official who said that the Communist Party could meet in his office if they experienced difficulty in finding another meeting place.

I testified that my dismissal was communistically inspired and the Public Works Committee sought to ascertain from Mr. Clapp his version of my termination. Mr. Clapp was uneasy and uncertain as the committee continued to probe for the real reason. Remember, it was Mr. Clapp, and Mr. Clapp alone, who wrote the decision to dismiss me from TVA, not some underling or another department head. His knowledge of the circumstances is complete. His answer ought to have been complete and specific.

In the original effort to explain, Mr. Clapp got off to a bad start:

"Mr. CLAPP. It was not until he became supervisor of those files and the employees under him that he began to get into difficulty" (R. 446).

This was a remarkable allegation in view of the fact that in length of service I was one of the oldest supervisors in the Authority, having been made assistant in 1933 and supervisor in 1934. I was, therefore, unsatisfactory for some 5 years, or for almost the entire length of service in TVA.

Yet, under examination the incredible Mr. Clapp testified:

"Senator OVERTON. Was Smith as a supervisor rated periodically?

"Mr. CLAPP. Yes.

"Senator OVERTON. What were his ratings?

"Mr. CLAPP. His ratings were satisfactory or better up until the time this situation began to develop" (R. 447).

Please recall that Mr. Clapp had just testified that my difficulties began in 1934. Here he fixes the date of the difficulties late in 1938, or when the union situation developed. Then he goes on:

"Senator OVERTON. Up to the time of the complaint (late in 1938) of these employees Smith had a good rating as a supervisor?

"Mr. CLAPP. That is right" (R. 447).

And later:

"Senator MCKELLAR. You said that Smith was discharged because he was not fit to be a supervisor. Did you ever promote him while he was a supervisor?

"Mr. CLAPP. He had promotions while he was supervisor" (R. 449).

And I add, not one but many promotions, each acccompanied by glowing praise in writing.

Failing in the above, Mr. Clapp tried another approach:

"Mr. CLAPP. It was perfectly clear, and no contention was made to the contrary, that he [Smith] had a knowledge of office procedure and of filing procedures, but that is quite different from an ability to supervise the work of other workers and to keep the work of others in good order" (R. 446).

The work of everyone in my section was in such good order that TVA felt impelled to record, at considerable expense, the procedures of my section on sound films. Those films were sent out over the country so that others might know how orderly and efficient the TVA really was. A sample of TVA's printed publicity is attached. Excerpts read:

"Another new short film * * * lacks * * * popular appeal, but big business men and State and Federal agencies probably will clamor for bookings. It shows what the scientific approach has done in the filing room, the before and after procedure of filing the 100,000 pieces of mail a month in the TVA central files * * *. The new scientific method eliminates 35,000 motions per typist, per day and gives a net production increase of 803 percent per typist. If the old system were still in use 35 instead of 4 typists would be needed."

This is the record from which Gordon Clapp testified that "the efficiency in that unit was going down" (R. 39).

In addition, Allen H. Mogensen, best known office procedure and motion study man in the United States, was so impressed by the order of work in that unit as reflected by the film he wrote and TVA printed the following:

"I believe the film did more to sell these men on the possibilities of the application of motion study to banking work than anything I have said myself as yet * * *. Also, do you object to my telling others about the film and have them write to you for it?"

Again the record stands clearly in opposition to Mr. Clapp's testimony.

Still undaunted, Mr. Clapp tried again:

"Mr. CLAPP. Mr. Smith simply could not handle the employees working with him" (R. 446).

I quote from TVA records:

"He has a pleasing personality and is very successful in his contact work with the various division and section heads. He handles the personnel of the files exceptionally well and they are very loyal to him and consequently work diligently and faithfully." (Exhibit B–1 Smith trial. Official job description of James L. Smith.)

And—

"One of his outstanding qualities is his practical ability in handling the personnel problems of a unit employing 60–70 people." (TVA Form 78, Employee status, signed by six officials, three in Mr. Clapp's department. Photostat attached.)

Subsequently, in what appears to be desperation, this unusual man relates:

"Mr. CLAPP. This committee has heard from his own testimony about the laxity, the break-down of discipline under his own supervision.

"They have heard him complain of two or three instances where employees were irregular in their office hours and that he could not control them. It was his responsibility, not mine, to see to it that those employees did their work."

Indeed, the committee did hear me complain that employees left their work to solicit funds to aid the Spanish Loyalists, North American League, and other Red-front organizations, or to promote strikes in private industry in Knoxville, and so did Mr. Clapp. Now, let the official TVA record of my dismissal tell what Gordon R. Clapp thought of my activity in bringing such business to sudden halt, particularly after a Knoxville businessman wrote in that one of my employees and a TVA lawyer had interfered with the normal conduct of his business by coming to him during office hours to argue against his method of handling his employees. (Exhibit A–1, Smith trial.)

"Considerable evidence was introduced (against Smith) under the designation of 'factory methods' tending to show unduly harsh regulations, including fines imposed for tardiness, posting of names for latecomers, use of buzzer system to maintain promptness, etc.

"The shop committee in 1938, at which time the employees' approach to the problem made clear a desire for responsible freedom.

"The evidence here suggests that Mr. Smith's failure to respond to these proposals and his expression of lack of confidence represented the continuation of long-standing conceptions of necessary employee discipline, quite consistent with the evidence supporting the view that he has denied employees the opportunity to participate in a responsible way in the determination of the matters affecting them." (Dismissal of James L. Smith, pp. 27–28.)

And again:

"Morale was further affected by certain strict regulations." (Dismissal of James L. Smith, p. 4.)

I was dismissed for doing exactly what Mr. Clapp ought to have done with all employees and now testifies that I failed to do.

Mr. Clapp must have sensed he was fighting a losing battle against his own records, so, finally, he introduced what seemed an airtight reason for my dismissal. Yes; here was the reaon—the only reason. Mr. Clapp says so himself. It was "the specific point on which the whole case hung" (R. 447).

All the other flights of fancy are to be disregarded.

"It was a charge of bad faith, or violating an agreement entered into by the department head, not the personnel department, but an agreement between the department in which Mr. Smith was a supervisor and the employees who, through that union, had made the agreement with Mr. Pierce, head of the department" (R. 448).

The agreement is vague in Mr. Clapp's mind. Twice he testified that I made the agreement (pp. 38–39) and twice that Mr. John F. Pierce, head of the office-service department, made the agreement (pp. 447–448). The hearing officer at my trial decided, "On the matter of discontinuing transcripts, the understanding which he (Smith) had with his supervisor was vague * * *" (p. 13) and calls it a "mitigating circumstance" deserving of consideration.

The understanding, however, was this: I was to furnish typewritten copies of shop-committee discussions to the union, provided there was stenographic assistance available. The time came when no such assistance was available, and on August 25, 1938, I explained in detail to the union three points. (See transcript August 25, 1938, shop committee.)

1. That no stenographer was available to me;

2. That my supervisor, with whom the agreement had been made, ordered the discontinuance of free stenographic service to the union, and for the reason stated; and

3. That a transcript of the current August 25 meeting would be furnished so that no element of surprise could be claimed, and that there was ample time to arrive at some other solution.

A day or so later I offered voluntarily to pay half the stenographic cost of future meetings if the union would bear the additional expense. I wanted no transcripts for myself and frankly, I cannot justify in my own mind why Mr. Clapp thought and still thinks that the Federal Government ought to be called upon to bear such an expense solely on demand of a group of employees not recognized by Mr. Clapp or TVA, as he specifically testified, as a legitimate bargaining agent (R. 447). The Comptroller General would never recognize such an expense. However, I did not air my views, but, instead, explained fully that my supervisor would no longer permit such a procedure due to the shortage of stenographic help. That is in the record of the meetings, which were submitted by Mr. Clapp at the trial.

It was not John F. Pierce, my supervisor, whose agreement I am charged with having

broken, who was selected to bring charges against me—it was a then obscure clerk of mine named John F. Frantz.

Frantz is identified as follows in the record:

1. A former TVA attorney appearing in behalf of Mr. Lilienthal describes Frantz's Communistic "mouthings" while the witness was employed by TVA (p. 320–321 A. E. C.).

2. Another TVA attorney had this to say: "John Frantz was an avowed Communist. I knew John personally and I can say that he was the fanatical type. In fact, one day I asked him if he believed in it seriously enough to give his life, and he said he could not think of a finer death than to lead a revolution" (R. 323).

3. An admitted and proved Communist testified that John Frantz was a member of the Communist Party while employed by TVA, and that he attended meetings with her (R. 613).

Certainly no normal person will comprehend that this Communist clerk was allowed to prosecute his employer while both were in the service of the United States Government, but look at the record:

"Senator McKellar. You assisted in the prosecution of the case against Mr. Smith, did you not?

"Mr. Frantz. I assisted, sir, in both the preparation of the petition and in the presentation of the evidence in connection with it at the hearing" (R. 678 A. E. C.).

Again from Kenneth Cameron, a voluntary witness in behalf of Messrs. Clapp and Lilienthal:

"The statement that Frantz was selected to bring the charges is correct, in that Frantz was present at the hearing, and the statement that I and Urban aided Frantz could be considered correct, depending upon who did the major work" (R. 728 A. E. C.).

Compare Cameron's testimony with the Hart report to the Secretary of the Communist Party at Birmingham, Ala., on January 31, 1939, which includes the statement:

"Comrade John Frantz, who was selected to bring the charges, and was aided magnificently by Comrades Cameron, Miller, Urban, and another comrade whose name will not be mentioned here because of the high position he occupies" (R. 71).

Remember that it was not John F. Pierce, the supervisor and the drawer of an agreement, which Mr. Clapp now believes to have been violated, who brought the charges, but the gentleman just described. Every word uttered in every shop committee meeting was transcribed and sent to Mr. Pierce and to the personnel department. Neither of them ever found a single discrepancy or offered a criticism. In fact, the personnel department said nothing, while Mr. Pierce was voluble in his praise of the manner in which I conducted the meetings. So much so, in fact, that the petitioners realized that Mr. Pierce would scoff at the charge that his own agreement had been violated by me, therefore it was imperative that Mr. Pierce not sit in judgment even though the TVA Personnel Policy handbook instructs that grievances must be heard by the official in charge of the Department involved. That would have been John F. Pierce, and he did, in fact, prepare to hear the case. Who would be in better position to judge?

Since this was the sole basis for complaint, as Mr. Clapp testified, I wanted Mr. Pierce to judge the case, but the petitioners would not permit it.

The union introduced subtle controversies over procedure. Mr. Pierce thought I should have counsel, the union did not think so. Mr. Pierce thought I should have the right to face my accusers, the union did not agree. And so on, until the union accomplished its original purpose—to have the trial before their friends in Mr. Clapp's department.

How does Mr. Clapp explain this departure from established TVA law? By the simple innuendo that I had allowed the morale in the files to become so low that Mr. Pierce washed his hands and turned me over to Clapp for crucifixion.

This is sheer fantasy, conjured up by Mr. Clapp to dazzle the Senators, who, he fondly believes, like to deal in folklore and old-wives' tales.

Here is the record—Mr. Clapp's own permanent TVA record of the trial. Since the committee had it in hand at the time, Mr. Clapp's audacity seems all the more incredible:

"I. Review of procedure followed * * *. A number of such conferences were held between management of the Office Service Department and representatives of the petitioners in preparation for the holding of a hearing in that Department in accordance to the regular procedure. In view of procedural disagreements or misunderstandings, the intervention of the personnel department was requested by letter of November 5, 1938, from Mr. Hugh Urban, president of the petitioner's local." (Dismissal of James L. Smith, p. 1.)

Now study Mr. Clapp's interpretation of the above facts:

"Mr. Clapp. I should add that the petition which was brought by the employees in this organization against Mr. Smith was referred to Mr. Smith's supervisor, the head of that department, and he ordinarily would have heard this case and would have decided it, that being his primary responsibility.

"The circumstances were such and the morale in the files was so upset that he (John F. Pierce) asked the personnel department, which ordinarily would take it only on appeal from the department head, to take the case and hold the hearing in the first instance. That is how it came to the personnel department" (R. 447).

The Senate is entitled to believe either Mr. Clapp's convenient explanation or the record.

Mr. Clapp, in an effort to make the charge of agreement violation stick, testified as follows:

"Mr. Clapp. Mr. Smith then began to hold those meetings and they were held from time to time over a period of several months from March until along about September, when the union filed this petition.

"The point the union and the employees were making was that Mr. Smith, not only by his actions and his attitude and the position he took on every question they raised, was uncooperative with the employees throughout the discussion" (R. 448).

The first official shop-committee meeting was held April 13, the last one in August. There were only a half dozen or more meetings all told.

At the risk of becoming tedious I refer you again to the unfriendly TVA record of the findings of Gordon Clapp's assistant, Arthur Jandrey, judge at my trial (pp. 9, 10, and 11).

"In the meetings of April 13 and April 29 there was a creditable discussion and explanation of the industrial-hygiene plans for the files. A request for the showing of a technical-files picture during working hours because it would develop interest and responsibility in the work was granted by Mr. Smith * * *."

"In the meeting of June 15 the committee presented employee suggestions relating to the Files classification system, which were subsequently analyzed in a comprehensive memorandum written by one of Mr. Smith's subordinate supervisors.

"The meetings of June 28 and July 20 proceeded satisfactorily; the latter including a satisfactory discussion of personnel policies by Mr. Smith.

"The final meeting of August 25 was critical for the constructive continuation of the committee. Mr. Smith decided without agreement of the committee that no further meetings would be held on working time though he was agreeable to meeting after hours. There was arbitrary decision to discontinue supplying transcripts although this was expressly part of the original agreement with the Director of the Department. (This stands in contrast to the subsequent reasonable proposal to reconsider the matter in a meeting with the Director of the Department on August 30.)"

Remember Gordon Clapp testified "on every question they raised, (Smith) was uncooperative with the employees throughout the discussion." Again either Mr. Clapp or his own TVA records are proved false.

I do not consider it important that the decision to discontinue furnishing union transcripts on TVA time and TVA money was ordered by this same John F. Pierce who made the agreement. I explained it to the union in the transcript, which is a part of the committee's record, that I was so ordered because there was simply no stenographer at my disposal to do this work. I acted on every major point on strictest orders from Mr. Pierce, a fact which Mr. Jandrey recognized:

"A number of mitigating circumstances appear in the shop-committee transcripts and in the record of testimony which deserve consideration. On a number of points arbitrarily handled, Mr. Smith referred to discussions with his own superiors" (p. 13, Smith dismissal).

Mr. John F. Pierce was loud in his denial that I had broken any agreement except on his specific orders, and, in his absence, sent his assistant, now Commander J. Gordon Reid, to testify in my behalf at the subsequent trial. It is a matter of written record that Commander Reid's testimony so completely broke the back of Union's case that Mr. Jandrey was forced to all but ignore it in his findings.

Neither do I consider it all-important that my dismissal was communistically inspired, but I do deem it of the greatest importance that the Senate is now forced to resolve whether any man who would discharge an admittedly able employee on such flimsy pretense and without warning or without giving that employee an opportunity to correct the error, if indeed, there was an error, is capable enough an administrator to govern one of the greatest Federal projects of all time.

The record is eloquent on this point:

"Senator McKellar (reading from my statement): 'At the trial, TVA could not produce one iota of evidence that I had received any warning, any criticism or suggestion of unsatisfactory service. On the other hand my TVA file contains no less than nine promotion forms, many of which contain most laudatory remarks as to my merit and efficiency, loyalty to the Authority, ability to get along with my personnel, etc.'

"Is that true?

"Mr. Clapp. I suspect it is, Senator."

After my trial, Mr. John F. Pierce, whose agreement I am supposed to have broken, sought to take advantage of the skill I had acquired, and which the TVA had advertised on paper and on film, by offering me a technical job requiring no supervision. Gordon R. Clapp refused personally to permit this arrangement and ordered me to resign or be fired. That I was offered another job is substantiated by the record:

"Mr. Clapp. With respect to the second question, no other kind of job was offered him until after the case was decided" (R. 446).

Compare Mr. Clapp's actions to his glib rejoiner to the committee:

"We try to give a man a chance to learn responsibilities and grow into them" (R. 446).

Again the choice lies between Mr. Clapp's word or the written record.

Gordon Clapp testified that he handled both the Smith case and the Henry Hart case personally. Henry Hart and I represented different ideologies. Contrast the decisions. I, an avowed anti-Communist, was terminated on the flimsiest pretext. Henry

Hart, an admitted Communist, was defended, comforted, and kept by TVA on Mr. Clapp's personal instruction. Gordon Clapp believes, up to the present moment, and testified as much, that such actions conform to his philosophy.

The Senate must decide what act of mine surpassed that of Hart, who entered into a plot to destroy our constitutional form of government. Then the Senate must consider the case of Bradford A. Wignot, a 42-year-old important official in Mr. Clapp's department, who, it was proved in chancery court, was a Communist. He wasn't terminated for communism. Nor was Muriel Williams, another employee of Gordon Clapp's. Nor David Stone Martin. Nor Catherine Buckles. None of them were fired by Gordon Clapp. All were admitted or proved Communists. Gordon Clapp never discovered a Communist on the pay roll, and when they were revealed by others, he never fired one. How can he ever terminate another employee for any cause?

With the committee, Gordon Clapp dealt in double-talk and inanities. Pressed for an explanation about Bernard Borah, well-known Communist and then husband of Muriel Williams, who testified before the committee that she was a Communist while employed by TVA, Mr. Clapp bypassed the inquiry by saying that whatever Mr. Borah had been the stigma was removed when that employee died in the service of this country (R. 307). Mr. Levron Howard, a competent supervisor, rated Mr. Borah as unsatisfactory, only to have Gordon Clapp rescue him. Would Mr. Clapp have the Senate believe that in supporting and saving this known Communist he was so doing with the full knowledge that he would, years later, die of an illness in a Government hospital?

The final outcome of my trial was never in doubt. Denial of counsel, saddled by an unfriendly CIO spokesman, CIO prosecutor and judge, denial of opportunity to examine witnesses, the departure from TVA standard hearing procedure, and the emphatic denial of appeal all combined to make the verdict a foregone conclusion.

Perhaps this is the proper place to comment on the denial of appeal. Attached is a photostat of my resignation; which sets forth that my forced resignation is done only on the grounds that I may appeal the case in keeping with TVA policy. Also attached is Gordon Clapp's reply accepting the resignation as made.

I sought the appeal as a medium to express myself on the subject of communism. I had requested my spokesman, Mr. Krainock, to introduce the subject at the trial, but he refused (R. 39).

I had been able to introduce communism in only two ways—both exhibits. One a letter from R. M. Perrin, a private citizen, protesting interference by two TVA employees in the matter of his firing V. V. Pauls, a Communist exposed by the Dies Committee in 1940 (exhibit Y). The second was this introduction of a book of Communist propaganda entitled "From Spanish Trenches." The flyleaf was signed "Comrade Alber." Mr. Alber was an employee of mine.

Next, I contacted Jack Comer, president of A. F. of L., to solicit his help. Mr. Comer testified before the committee that he explained to Mr. Clapp that evidence on communism was in my possession and that I wanted to present it. Gordon Clapp refused (R. 270 A. E. C.).

I employed Judge James Meek, now United States district attorney general, to attempt to gain an appeal. Gordon Clapp refused (R. 270, A. E. C.).

Finally, Lt. Comdr. Walter S. Smith, my brother and an attorney, testified that he sought to reopen the case. The request was brusquely denied (R. 346).

It is almost unbelievable that Gordon Clapp now chides me for not introducing communism at the trial. He knew more about it than I did.

As a matter of fact, Gordon Clapp knew personally the employees of TVA who either admitted or were charged with being Communists. Does it not seem significant that out of 239,000 appointments in TVA (record, p. 123), of whom Mr. Clapp could have known only an infinitesimal number, that this man was friendly with the rank and file of Communists—ranging from division heads to stenographers? On direct examination, Mr. Clapp admitted knowing Hart, Cameron, Siegel, Mandell, Urban, Frantz, Niehoff, Ruth Martin, Schultz, Borah, Abercrombie, and Williams. All were TVA employees.

This, however, is the clincher: Two paid Communist organizers were moving surreptitiously in Knoxville for a brief period of time in 1938. Their names were Ted Wellman, State Communist Party secretary, and an assistant by the name of Kenneth Malcolm. So well did they conceal their identity that Henry C. Hart, admitted Communist ringleader, did not know Wellman (R. p. 532). Certainly, no one would have suspected that Gordon Clapp, who was seen by appointment only during the day, and who retired to his home in Norris, Tenn., at night, would know these gentlemen, but look at the record:

"Senator MCKELLAR. Now, it has this in it: We assume you heard from Comrades Ted Wellman and Kenneth Malcolm. You knew both of them were Communists, did you not?

"Mr. CLAPP. I did not know it at the time" (R. p. 308).

I knew only the unimportant Red party members. One might refer to Mr. Clapp to learn about the big shots.

Later, in an effort to prove himself ignorant of the charges I made, Gordon Clapp testified:

"Mr. CLAPP. He [Smith] now says that they were absent from duty because of activities connected with their interest in communism and he mentions his immediate assistant and former roommate as an outstanding offender" (R. p. 445).

My immediate assistant and roommate was Harry F. Alber.

Mr. Clapp is again impaled by the record of the Smith trial, for it was brought out that Mr. Alber took part in a local taxicab strike and actually advocated the dynamiting of cabs, page 197, Mr. Alber suggested to the picketers that it made no difference if the cabs contained passengers.

In addition, I introduced a letter from R. M. Perrin, Knoxville real estate man, which complained of Mr. Alber's activities during working hours. In part the letter reads:

"About 9 o'clock Monday, June 27, my office was contacted over the telephone by a man who represented himself as being connected with the Tennessee Valley Authority and by the name of Harry F. Alber. Mr. Alber requested an interview in my office within 30 minutes. * * *

"Alber was a member of the grievance committee and was calling on the writer to ascertain and find the true facts as to why one V. V. Paul, a Negro elevator operator in the Union Building, and on a private pay roll and having no connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority, was not working.

"I wish to state that we will continue to operate the buildings under our management as in the past, and under no condition will we allow any member of the Tennessee Valley Authority to interfere with the operations of such properties unless that interference is a legal one." (Exhibit Y, Smith dismissal.)

The V. V. Paul mentioned in Mr. Perrin's letter was exposed as a Communist in the Dies committee hearings of 1940.

And later from the committee's record:

"Mr. CLAPP. He (Smith) says that his subordinates read the Daily Worker in office hours. He did not report it at the time" (R. 444).

I did report it to my supervisor, I did not report it to Mr. Clapp because the Daily Worker was read openly in his department (R. 230). An investigator for a congressional committee saw 25 to 28 copies of the Daily Worker going into the TVA building of only two floors for distribution. This building housed Mr. Clapp's staff (R. 283). Kenneth Cameron, a witness for Mr. Clapp and Mr. Lilienthal, admitted seeing copies of the Daily Worker in my section (R. 730 A. E. C.).

Gordon Clapp's whole approach has been one of evasion and misrepresentation. The case of Lucille Thornburgh, whom he so eloquently defended, is as good an illustration as any other.

I testified that Thornburgh was taken off a picket line at a spinning mill and forced on me as an employee in November 1934. That there was no application nor interview. I was ordered to hire her to the exclusion of other applicants whose qualifications were stronger (R. 232).

Mr. Clapp testified that I was not a supervisor, and could not have been consulted on the matter of employing her since "he (Smith) was only a file clerk himself" (R. 422).

Later to back up this statement, Mr. Clapp agreed to submit for the record the actual date of my becoming supervisor. He consulted the record and actually wrote a misrepresentation into the record (R. 446). He fixed the date as November 1, 1936, to conform to his repeated statements that I had been a supervisor only about 2 years prior to 1938.

TVA record countersigned by six officials reads: "On November 1, 1934, Smith became supervisor over a large central file unit."

Thornburgh testified that I was the supervisor when she was employed (R. 203, Smith trial).

I further testified before the committee that Thornburgh's actions were those of a Communist. I listed certain strikes in which she participated while in TVA, and enumerated Red-front activities. (R. 233.) Further, I stated that she was the star witness for the CIO group which dismissed me (R. 237).

Mr. Clapp answered:

"Mr. CLAPP. No reasonable person could ever have suspected Miss Thornburgh of being a sympathizer with Communists or with the CIO" (R. 442).

As for her sympathy to Communists, I quote a witness, before the committee, who knew her well:

"Lucille Thornburgh was a strong Communist member, and she told me at one time that there was no need to reopen the Jimmy Smith case because Clapp was a strong member, and there was no need to reopen" (R. 364).

And from a member of her own family. I quote from S. J. Thornburgh, Knoxville attorney. Both local papers carried his statements:

"I know that the TVA encouraged and assisted in the organization of communistic groups in Knoxville. They were organizing what they called a cell. My niece, Lucille Thornburgh, who was an employee in the TVA, was one of them. I have been to some of the meetings of the group. I attended a meeting in the TVA-operated Arnstein building. I heard a speaker denounce our flag and I resented it, as they can tell you." (Knoxville Journal, February 11, 1947. Copy attached.)

So much for the Communist sympathy; now for the CIO. Mr. Clapp repeatedly scoffed at the idea that Thornburgh would assist the CIO:

"Mr. CLAPP. I just want to take one glaring example in the way Mr. Smith's recollection failed to check with the facts of record.

"In his testimony here the other day, the committee will remember that he mentioned a Miss Lucille Thornburgh. He identified her as the star witness who appeared against him

in this case involving Mr. Smith's dismissal and in identifying her as the star witness against him, he used the phrase, 'The CIO, or the Communist group, or the radical element, whatever you want to call them,' and he definitely linked Lucille Thornburgh up with that group" (R. 442).

Suddenly Mr. Clapp reversed his field:

"Mr. CLAPP. The star witness in that proceeding was this Miss Lucille Thornburgh.

"The record of the Smith case in the TVA hearing makes it perfectly clear that her testimony (Thornburgh's) and her knowledge of how labor relations of supervisors ought to be handled and were handled in other parts of the TVA was what made the case really stand against Smith" (R. 493-494).

This is the same Gordon Clapp in both instances, difficult as it may be to believe.

I testified that eventually Thornburgh succeeded to my job.

Mr. Clapp denies this by the statement: "Nor did she succeed to his job" (R. 443) [Smith] "added that she succeeded him, hinting that such succession was Miss Thornburgh's share of the fruits of victory when the so-called plot to oust him was successful" (R. 442).

TVA records reveal that Miss Thornburgh did become Chief of Files in May 1942, following G. A. Hall, who entered into service.

Again the truth stands against the testimony of Gordon Clapp.

This is Gordon Clapp's record. It is more than a record; it is the real Gordon Clapp. It demonstrates the man as we know him, better than argument or words.

All this testimony pushed together consumed approximately one-half hour of Gordon Clapp's time. All this miserable failure to face the issues, the malicious innuendoes and bald misrepresentations are the product of so small a period of time. I am convinced if the Senate approves Gordon Clapp it will be only to gratify an overwhelming curiosity to see what the same man, unrestrained by the cautions imposed by Senate scrutiny as was his testimony, could do to a valley and a people in 9 long years.

JAMES L. SMITH.

Advertisement of American Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hit Dogs Always Howl," published in the Pittsburgh Press of April 29, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIT DOGS ALWAYS HOWL

Once again "the hour of decision is here."

"The next few days will decide the destiny of America."

"Your future and that of your children is at stake."

We face "an open invitation to national disaster."

"The first step toward totalitarianism" confronts us.

"The enslavement of the working man" is about to "bring chaos, disorder and oppression to America."

"Powerful reactionary interests" are attempting "to destroy free enterprise by destroying labor."

"Dangerous experiments with totalitarian controls" threaten us. They would "turn back the clock of social progress."

"Reactionary Fascists" are trying to "wreck our Nation's position as the defender of democracy."

"Will labor's reward be the shackles of slavery?"

If you are not too greatly shaken by these quotations, and have an assuredly strong heart, then you might want to read the rest of the advertisement of the American Federation of Labor in today's Press.

It is, in its way, a masterpiece. For it gathers together, in brief space, an anthology of the classical cries of alarm and forebodings of disaster which have rung out through history whenever a major reform was attempted.

It is a sort of Bartlett's Familiar Quotations for prophets of doom and Jeremiahs of lamentation.

Never have we seen in so few words such complete employment of the more spectacular and exaggerated warnings with which the beneficiaries of the old order always have greeted any effort to change it.

Of course, if you are interested in some details of the specific legislation that prompts this advertisement, you will read in vain. There isn't a word about what the bills provide.

We haven't been too enthusiastic about some provisions of the drastic Hartley bill to regulate labor unions, or the somewhat milder Taft version.

But if either became law, we doubt that chaos, disorder, and depression, or even slavery, and regimentation, would follow.

This on the basis of past experience. For all this old hokum has been used before. And the things which were about to bring destruction became law and are accepted, while the grim prophecies that greeted them are almost forgotten.

It was so in the case of pure food and drug regulation. Many living Americans recall how it was aimed at destroying our businesses and starving our people.

Free enterprise stood at the crossroads when both the public post office and the parcel post were proposed.

Regulation of railroads and utilities menaced our system of enterprise.

Women's suffrage threatened the degradation of our noble womanhood.

There were plenty of statesmen and even preachers who pictured slavery as an institution ordained by God for the uplifting of inferior races.

Securities and exchange regulation imperiled our economy and the jobs of our workers.

Pasteurized milk was an assault on the freedom and existence of our dairy farmers.

Laws against child labor would deprive parents of the direction of their children and wipe out the income of widowed mothers.

Only recently the National Association of Manufacturers saw in atomic-energy control a dark plot to socialize all our patents and stifle invention.

Hit dogs always howl.

Beneficiaries of special privilege always cry out in the name of the masses against regulation of their own private grafts.

So it is now.

These warnings come not from union memberships, not from the great ranks of working people, but from the labor politicians—the ones who have waxed fat at the expense of both the public and their own memberships.

It's all old. There isn't a single new technique in the tactics of the union bosses in behalf of their personal privileges.

The one bright feature connected with this new America-at-the-crossroads crisis is the splendid job which the American Federation of Labor did in collecting all the best of the old bromides in a single piercing shriek.

Prophecy of Former President Hoover of 28 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, with clear foresight former President Hoover pointed out 28 years ago the very problems now facing Europe and their impact on the economic life of the United States. With demands, ever increasing, for support from the United States by European governments, America is faced with the question whether or not it can continue to nurse the entire world. There is great danger that economic collapse may be the fate of the once rich United States.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of May 11, 1947]

HOOVER'S 1919 REPORT WARNED UNITED STATES COULDN'T AID EUROPE FOREVER

A 28-year-old statement by Herbert Hoover that the Western Hemisphere could not meet Europe's economic needs indefinitely was published last night by the State Department in the latest of a series of historical documents.

Mr. Hoover, then relief director, gave his estimate of the European economic situation in the wake of World War I in a report to the Supreme Economic Council of the Allied and Associated Powers.

"During some short period, it may be possible for the Western Hemisphere, which has retained and even increased its productivity, to supply the deficiencies of Europe," Mr. Hoover advised on July 3, 1919.

"Such deficiencies would have to be supplied in large degree upon credits, but, aside from this the entire surplus productivity of the Western Hemisphere is totally incapable of meeting the present deficiency in European production if it is long continued.

"CREDITS MUST BE TEMPORARY

"Nor, as a practical fact, could credits be mobilized for this purpose for more than a short period, because all credits must necessarily be simply an advance against the return of commodities in exchange, and credits will break down the instant that the return of commodities becomes improbable.

"Further, if such credits be obtained in more than temporary purposes, it would result in economic slavery of Europe to the Western Hemisphere, and the ultimate end would be war again.

"The solution, therefore, of the problem, except in purely temporary aspects, does not lie in a stream of commodities on credit from the Western Hemisphere, but lies in a vigorous realization of the actual situation in each country of Europe and a resolute statesmanship based on such a realization.

"The populations of Europe must be brought to a realization that productivity must be instantly increased."

NO ROOM FOR EXPERIMENTS

Mr. Hoover said further that "whatever the economic theory or political cry, it must embrace the maximum individual effort, for there is no margin of surplus productivity in Europe to risk revolutionary experimentation."

"No economic policy will bring food to those stomachs or fuel to those hearths that does not secure the maximum production," he added.

Mr. Hoover's report was contained in a volume on foreign relations of the United States covering the 1919 peace conference.

Republicans, Beware! Truman Foreign Policy Will Be an Issue in 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Republican economy program has gone overboard. It was scuttled by the new Truman foreign policy which was made possible by so-called bipartisan support. It must be perfectly obvious to the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees that taxes cannot be reduced and appropriations cut and still follow the Truman policy. Nor can the budget be balanced. Within the next year, or before, demands upon the United States Treasury will amaze the American people. When they call a halt to this dizzy program the Republican Party will be charged with sabotaging the Truman program. The American people will wake up soon and their voices will be heard in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Joseph Alsop calls the turn. As part of my remarks, I include his article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Post yesterday.

FOREIGN POLICY A LIKELY '48 ISSUE

(By Joseph Alsop)

Making book on politics is a chancy business. Even so, it has now become a good money bet that foreign policy, rather than the labor issue or any other aspect of the domestic situation, will dominate the 1948 campaign.

People in a hurricane rarely pause to argue about what to have for dinner. Their thoughts are concentrated on keeping the storm shutters closed. And by next year the monetary crisis recently described in this space, as well as other obvious factors, will almost inevitably produce a sense of involvement in a hurricane.

The fortunes of every political camp will be thereby affected in a most radical manner. If President Truman continues to lead the country with the same boldness he has shown in the past 6 months, the country's preoccupation with foreign policy will further assist his improving chances. But to the Republicans it will present an acutely uncomfortable choice between openly disavowing the postwar slogans of their more conservative leaders or choosing a standard bearer after the hearts of Colonel McCormick, Mr. Pew, and Senator Wherry.

This is true because the simple magnitude of the problems ahead is their most striking characteristic. They cannot be dealt with on the scale of the Greek-Turkish aid bill. One estimate of the authorization of funds needed, over a 3- to 5-year period, to prevent the world-wide dollar shortage from halting all postwar reconstruction, runs as high as $20,000,000,000. But when it is considered that we are spending half this amount or more in annual defense appropriations, the sum is placed in its correct proportion as a cheap price for a peaceful world.

Furthermore, the monetary crisis is only half the story. The Communist Party line is plainly changing in Europe. At Moscow, the change was first announced by the extraordinary rudeness shown to French Foreign Minister Bidault by Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov. (At one official dinner, Molotov first toasted Secretaries Bevin and Marshall, and then, a few minutes later, offered a toast to Bidault with the remark that he did not want to "leave anyone out.") The rudeness was, of course, merely an outward sign of inner discontent with the system by which Communists all over Europe, and especially in France, have participated in national governments and worked for national reconstruction.

The French Communists have now left the Government. Leaders like Jacques Duclos continue to assert that although no longer taking part in the Government, the Communists will support Government policies. But in Washington, London and, according to report, even in Paris, it is generally expected that this will prove to be nonsense.

If the Republicans are to respond to the emergency abroad by emphasizing national unity, is is essential that the bipartisan foreign policy be measurably strengthened. Prior to Secretary Marshall's return from Moscow, it was repeatedly reported here that bipartisanship was weakening. It must now be added that the situation has lately grown worse.

The Republican symbol of bipartisanship at Moscow was John Foster Dulles, and he came back in a mood to criticize Marshall. Since he has made no secret of his feeling that Marshall, although a very great man, is also a very rigid one, it may be assumed that he has communicated his discontent to the Republican leaders in Congress. And it may be further assumed that his criticisms aroused no great horror, since Secretary Marshall's worst failure—indeed his only failure—has been his neglect to establish relations of genuine confidence with leading congressional Republicans.

Under the circumstances, it is therefore difficult to imagine bipartisan sponsorship of a vast program which would make nonsense of the whole right-wing Republican program of cheese-paring economy, semi-isolationist foreign economic policy and general "back to normalcy."

On the other hand, while Governor Dewey has broken all records for political mumness, he is known to advocate a strong foreign policy. He would certainly not fight a campaign, at this juncture, on the kind of isolationist platform he favored in 1940. And the majority of the most astute political observers in Congress think that Dewey's nomination is a foregone conclusion, as of today.

That's sums up the Republican dilemma. The country had best hope that a wise way out is discovered.

Sugar Plenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal:

SUGAR PLENTY—SOARING PRODUCTION BRINGS END NEAR FOR 6-YEAR-OLD SHORTAGE—RATIONING, PRICE CEILINGS MAY PASS THIS SUMMER; WAREHOUSES ARE BULGING—CUBAN CROP CHIEF FACTOR

(By William Parker)

WASHINGTON—Put it down as possible you can have an inch-high icing on your Fourth of July cake. Make the odds even greater that you can sweeten your Labor Day lemonade with unrationed, price-freed sugar.

Government sugar experts are about ready to concede that America's 6-year-old sweet-shortage is nearing an end. The next 6 weeks will tell the story. If present crop conditions remain unchanged, housewives and industrial users of sugar seem certain to be released from sugar restrictions sooner than expected.

Warehouses in this country and in other sugar-making areas are already bulging with bags of raw and refined sugar. Cuba, biggest sugar producer in the world, is looking for a bumper 1947 crop. Prospects are at least normal in other cane-growing territories supplying the United States market. Sugar beet farmers in the United States expect a near record harvest.

NOT COUNTING ANY CHICKENS

Department of Agriculture economists, who don't subscribe to the theory of counting chickens before they are hatched, are waiting for another look at all these production estimates. But word has been passed along that Secretary Anderson will sanction a quick end to allocation and price controls if things turn out favorably.

At the same time, the Department is reported favorably disposed toward permitting trading in sugar futures to be resumed on the New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange on July 1 if the present rosy prospects materialize. Such a move would officially herald marked improvement in the supply picture. Sugar trading was suspended early in the war when ration controls were established.

Federal restrictions on sugar are slated to expire anyway on October 31, when the authority Congress granted for such regulation runs out. Meantime, the Government is keeping a weather eye on production prospects all over the world. Assuming sugar-making sections get a meteorological break, here is what the authorities forecast:

HUGE CUBAN CROP

Cuban production will probably range between 5,800,000 and 6,000,000 tons. Official estimates as of May 1 place the production up to that time at slightly over 5,000,000 tons. For an idea as to possible cane grindings for the remainder of the season, agricultural authorities leaf back their records to the bumper year of 1925. In that season some 900,000 tons of sugar was produced after May 1. The situation has changed somewhat in the intervening years; there are fewer mills, but the capacity is greater. Unless the Cuban cane fields are bogged by early rains it should be possible to equal or beat the late 1925 production, say the crop forecasters.

A Cuban crop of 6,000,000 tons would be some 1,500,000 tons greater than that for 1946, and almost a half million tons greater than was counted on when world sugar allocations were made last February by the International Emergency Food Council.

The United States, as purchasing agent for itself and 13 other countries, has contracted to buy all the sugar Cuba makes this year, with the exception of 600,000 tons. Of the latter amount Cuba can keep 300,000 tons for her own use and sell the other 300,000 on the world market.

Other areas important to the United States sugar bowl are Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Hawaii. Before the war the Philippines, too, used to send up to a million

tons, but the cane fields have not yet recovered from the effects of war and the islands must import sugar this season for their own needs.

BIG TONNAGE FROM PUERTO RICO

Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are scheduled to furnish the United States with 894,000 tons of their one-million-ton crop. Last year they sent 750,000 tons here. Hawaii is on the books to supply 800,000 tons, but some experts think this sum can be increased if weather continues favorable. Hawaii's contribution in 1946 was 633,000 tons.

Sugarcane areas in Louisiana and Florida vary little from year to year in the quantity of cane grown. Experts look for some 450,000 to 500,000 tons of sugar from these fields in 1947.

The domestic sugar-beet crop this summer will be one of the largest in history if growers live up to their plans. Beet plantings are expected to total 1,000,000 acres, or some 11 percent greater than last year's large acreage. With normal yields, sugar production from beets should amount to 1,750,000 tons, compared with 1,523,000 tons last year.

Taken all together, the United States may, by the end of the year, find itself in control of as much as 9,300,000 tons of both domestic and imported sugar. (In average prewar years, United States consumption averaged 6,700,000 to 6,800,000 tons annually.)

FOREIGN LANDS GET SOME

However, not all this 9,300,000 tons will go to sweeten American food. Of the 5,400,000 tons which may come from Cuba, 1,600,000 have been promised to 13 other countries. The largest portion—989,000 tons—have been allocated to a pool from which Canada and the United Kingdom draw supplies. France and French possessions are down for 273,000 tons, Switzerland is to get 68,000 tons, and other nations have been promised lesser amounts.

Another possible drain on the United States stock pile may come from a category in the world allocation schedule listed as "undesignated sources." Under this heading, the IEFC allotted 736,000 tons of sugar to 15 nations in the hope that such an amount of sweetening would materialize somewhere in world sugar-growing areas. While it's possible a good part of this "paper sugar" may be grown in the countries to which it has been assigned, some nations may look to the United States to make up the difference.

As things look now, the United States appears to have its finger on almost 7,700,000 tons of beet and cane sugar it can keep primarily for its own use. Some new foreign demands may be made on this stock pile for the paper allocations or for additional foreign allotments. However, these added requests may be offset, partially at least, by the failure of some countries to buy all the sugar actually allocated to them.

HEROIC EFFORTS IN EUROPE

Reports to the Department of Agriculture suggest that European countries are making heroic efforts to boost their own sugar-beet production this summer. The winter has been tough and production may be somewhat smaller than was hoped because of delayed plantings in some areas. Still sugar production in Europe is expected to show a major improvement over last year. Countries with a good beet crop in prospect may decide to save scarce dollars and neglect to take up their share of the Cuban crop for which the United States is acting as broker.

Another uncounted source of supply may be the 300,000 tons of sugar which Cuba is permitted to peddle on the world market. The original idea was that this would be sold to South American countries; but some sugar experts are betting that the bulk of it will wind up in United States sugar bins as soon as controls are lifted. Cuba is reportedly asking about 8.5 cents per pound for these 300,000 tons, but is finding few takers.

Not all this avalanche of sugar is going to descend on the United States at one time. The domestic cane and beet harvest, for instance, won't get started until early fall, and the sugar won't be eaten until next winter. But the mere fact that a definite supply can be counted on, plus the bulging stock pile of Cuban sugar already on hand, could bring an official decision to remove controls earlier than the October 31 legal deadline.

Until such a decision is reached, Agriculture Department officials can be expected publicly to throw cold water on any suggestion of an early end to controls. Should advance word leak out that decontrol is set for a given day, the Department fears that speculators might make a killing.

So expect to be surprised when the papers herald the end of sugar rationing and price controls.

New Government Controls Under Truman Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Greek-Turkish bill last Friday, I called attention to a speech delivered by Mr. Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, the night before, at Cleveland, Miss.

It was a frank and forthright statement by him, in which he clearly pointed out the real and true implications behind the announced Truman foreign policy. When the public in this country realizes what it faces in the next decade or more it will be shocked beyond description.

Mr. Speaker, the President will soon call upon the Congress to implement this new Greek-Turkish policy by asking permission to extend Government controls over our entire economic life. We will be asked to approve another OPA, but this time it will be on a global basis—bigger, better, and more binding. Did the people elect a Republican Congress last November to do this kind of thing? I do not believe so.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an article that appeared in the Washington Post on May 9:

ACHESON ASSERTS UNITED STATES MUST START REBUILDING GERMANY AND JAPAN—PLAN TO RECONSTRUCT "WORKSHOPS" OF ASIA, EUROPE HELD VITAL TO TRUMAN DOCTRINE

(By Frank L. Dennis)

Reconstruction of Germany and Japan, even without full Four Power Agreement, is an immediate objective of United States foreign policy, Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, asserted yesterday.

To carry out an effective policy of relief and reconstruction implementing the Truman doctrine first promulgated in the plan to assist Greece and Turkey, he declared that there must be an extension of Government control over domestic sale, transportation, and export of such commodities as wheat, coal, and steel.

Acheson's disclosures were made in an address before the Delta Council, an economic organization, at Cleveland, Miss.

POINTS IN FOREIGN POLICY

After pointing out in detail the economic exhaustion of the world apart from the United States, including the fact that this country is exporting goods and services in 1947 totaling $16,000,000,000, against $8,000,000,000 of imports, the Under Secretary made these points relating to foreign policy:

1. The United States must take as large a volume of imports as possible from abroad in order that the financial gap between what the world needs and what it can pay for can be narrowed.

2. The United States is going to have to undertake further emergency financing of foreign purchases if foreign countries are to continue to buy in 1948 and 1949 the commodities which they need to sustain life and at the same time rebuild their economies.

3. The United States is going to have to concentrate its emergency assistance in areas where it will be most effective in building world political and economic stability, in promoting human freedom and democratic institutions, in fostering liberal trading policies, and in strengthening the authority of the United Nations.

4. The United States "must push ahead with the reconstruction of those two great workshops of Europe and Asia—Germany and Japan—upon which the ultimate recovery of the two continents so largely depends. This is what Secretary Marshall meant when he reported to the Nation on April 28 that action on behalf of European recovery cannot await compromise through exhaustion, and that we must take whatever action is possible immediately, even without full Four Power agreement, to effect a larger measure of European, including German, recovery."

5. In order to carry out an economical and effective policy of relief and reconstruction, the United States is going to need the extension by Congress of certain executive powers over the domestic sale, transportation, and exportation of certain commodities over which presidential war powers control is due to expire June 30.

"It is wheat and coal and steel that are urgently required to stave off economic collapse, not just dollar credits," Acheson said.

Power to assign priorities on transportation is needed, including legislation to insure "efficient use of shipping," he said.

Pointing up the urgency of the situation, the Under Secretary said, "It is of the greatest importance to the foreign economic policy of this country, and thus to the security and well-being of the Nation, that these powers be granted."

In this connection, and related particularly to Point No. 1, he said "There can never be any stability or security in the world for any of us until foreign countries are able to pay in commodities and services for what they need to import and to finance their equipment needs from more normal sources of investment."

GENEVA PARLEY VITAL

Pointing out that our negotiators are meeting in Geneva now with representatives of 17 other countries with Russia not participating to negotiate reduction in trade barriers and agreement on fair rules to govern international trade, he said the Geneva conference must succeed.

"When the process of reconversion at home is completed, we are going to find ourselves far more dependent upon exports than before the war to maintain levels of business activity to which our economy has become accustomed," he said.

Frankly tying this foreign economic program with the political pictures, Acheson said top priority for American reconstruction aid will go to "free peoples who are seeking to preserve their independence

against totalitarian pressures, either internal or external."

This ties in directly with President Truman's message to Congress March 12 calling for help for Greece and Turkey, a matter still before the legislators.

BACKGROUND OF POLICY

In establishing the background for the five-point policy on aid abroad, Acheson said "the extreme need of foreign countries for American products is likely * * * to continue undiminished in 1948, while the capacity of foreign countries to pay in commodities will probably be only slightly increased."

He said that great as is America's aid in commodities, it is still far short of what the people of the world need if they "are to eat enough to maintain their physical strength and at the same time carry on essential measures of reconstruction and become self-supporting."

He said the commodity exports now being shipped from eastern and Gulf ports are twice the volume of those moved from those ports during the war for our armies and for lend-lease.

Production in this country today is at the annual rate of 210 billions of dollars, he said.

"The war will not be over until the people of the world can again feed and cloth themselves and face the future with some degree of confidence," Acheson asserted.

Postal Service Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, as the Appropriations Committee and Congress proceed to reduce expenses and balance the budget, even in accordance with the budget requested by the President, we are discovering the costs of having one administration in power for many consecutive years. The various Government agencies have arrived at the place where they feel themselves almost invincible and when Congress attempts to conform to the demands of the people, and make reductions, these entrenched agencies invoke a program of protest attempting to produce a reaction with the people at large that that action of the Committee on Appropriations and Congress is ill-considered and not for the public welfare.

We had a glaring example of this in the case of the appropriation for the Treasury and Post Office Departments. Particularly was this true of the Bureau of Customs in the Treasury Department. Immediately following the reduction made by the committee and passed by the House, by the way, unanimously, the Customs Bureau sent out dismissal notices to a great number of employees of the border patrol. There was no cut in the budget that necessitated this at all. It was simply a political act on the part of the Bureau and in effect was saying to Congress: "We don't take orders from you. We take them from the people, directly." Before this reached the Senate, it became necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, to dismiss the gentleman who has been the head of the Bureau of Customs and had engaged in this contemptible practice.

Speaking of the postal services, it is the opinion of the committee that they are rendering a great service to the Nation. They are using equipment that today should be replaced in many instances. My personal observations are that they are doing an excellent job. Their cut, if my memory serves me correctly, was less than 1 percent, and still in the face of this rather decent treatment, we find that even the Postal Department is engaging in some of the same practices.

Chairman BRIDGES, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, said word apparently has gone out from Washington to postmasters all over the country instructing them to cut down mail deliveries because of Congress' failure to appropriate funds. The funds in question are contained in a deficiency item which is still in the hands of the Budget Bureau and has never been submitted to Congress, Senator BRIDGES said.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include herewith an article from the Long Beach Press-Telegram, dated May 9, 1947, which treats this postal situation under the title "Postal Service Politics":

POSTAL SERVICE POLITICS

Fifty-eight substitute postal clerks and 34 substitute carriers have been dropped from service in Long Beach.

Working hours of 80 clerks have been reduced from 8 to 4 daily.

The post office will be closed Saturday, and there will be no Saturday mail deliveries.

A population of more than a quarter of a million is deprived of adequate postal service. The clerks and carriers laid off were needed to handle efficiently the enormously increased volume of Long Beach mail, up 30 percent above the estimates for this year.

The local curtailment of postal service followed the Post Office Department's reply to the request for an additional $30,000 to maintain full service here that the Long Beach office must operate on funds already allotted. The postmaster here had no alternative. Other cities of the country are similarly affected.

When the public asks why it is deprived of the service to which it is entitled by the failure to retain a sufficient postal force in Long Beach, the answer given is "politics."

It is politics.

But whose politics?

An effort is being made to pin on the Republican Congress the responsibility for cutting down the postal service. The propaganda is that the GOP majority in Congress forced the curtailment by failing to appropriate enough money to run the post office properly.

Congressman BRADLEY, of Long Beach, makes known the facts of the case. The deficiency appropriation needs for postal service had not been submitted to Congress prior to reduction of the postal force here, although the President yesterday did ask for an additional $10,924,000 to operate the Post Office Department until June 30.

Neither Post Office Department nor Budget Bureau, an agency working under the President, had made requests for deficiency post-office appropriations in time to prevent the cutting down of service in Long Beach.

The Post Office Department at Washington is responsible for the partial break-down of local postal service. Apparently it preferred to wait for the exhaustion of the fund, in order to play politics with the situation by charging Congress with false economy, rather than to take whatever action was necessary to carry on efficient service.

It is pertinent to remark that Postmaster General Hannegan also is chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Immunity Against Unlawful Searches and Seizures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, last week, a majority of five members of the Supreme Court struck a serious blow at the civil rights of the American people, when they rendered their decision in the case of Harris against the United States. Gone with the whip of a pen is the immunity guaranteed the American people under the fourth amendment of the Constitution against unlawful searches and seizures.

The editorial of the Washington Evening Star of May 7, 1947, and the article of Gerard D. Reilly, appearing in the Washington Sunday Star of May 11, 1947, graphically describe the situation brought about by the Supreme Court in this case, which I am setting forth below in full.

I have today introduced a resolution amending the rules of the House which would impose the following additional duty upon the Judiciary Committee, namely:

(A) Examining, from time to time, the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States to determine whether any of such decisions infringes upon any right guaranteed to the people of the United States by the Constitution or any amendment thereto.

(B) Reporting to the House at least once a year the results of such examinations.

(C) Recommending to the House, from time to time, such proposals for legislation or amendments to the Constitution as it deems necessary to protect such fundamental rights of the people of the United States.

If adopted, it will be incumbent upon the House of Representatives to report from year to year to the people the extent to which their constitutional guaranties have been removed or infringed upon, and take appropriate action in view thereof.

COURT RULING RAISES CIVIL-RIGHTS ISSUE—BLOW AT FOURTH AMENDMENT SEEN IN HARRIS CASE DECISION

(By Gerard D. Reilly)

Probably no decision of the Supreme Court in recent years has caused more concern to defenders of civil rights than the majority opinion rendered this week in *Harris* v. *United States*. One of the most cherished heritages of the common law is the principle that "a man's home is his castle." It is embodied in the Constitution by the immunities guaranteed in the fourth amendment against unlawful searches and seizures. The eloquent dissents of four of the justices indicate that in its latest decision the court has done violence to this historic immunity.

Since the prohibition era, when the lawlessness of law-enforcement officers created many controversies with respect to the viola-

tion of consitutional rights, the number of fourth-amendment cases which have come before our highest court has been relatively small. At that time, with one deviation, the court was fairly steadfast in holding that convictions for violations of the Volstead Act would be set aside where the evidence in support of the conviction had been obtained by ransacking the premises without a search warrant. The language of the argument itself is quite explicit in this respect.

Last June a fourth-amendment case, involving the seizure of some gasoline ration coupons, provoked a bitter controversy within the court. This was the Davis case. It involved the conviction of a filling-station proprietor for the illegal possession of gasoline ration documents. In that case two OPA agents after buying gas above the ceiling price and without coupons arrested the defendant for that specific offense. The agents then accompanied him into his office, where he was told to turn over any coupon books in his possession. Under protest he unlocked his filing cabinet and handed over these documents.

It subsequently appeared that he improperly obtained these documents, and he was tried and convicted of unlawful possession of these coupons. The conviction was sustained by the Supreme Court on the ground that his constitutional rights had not been invaded since the documents in question technically remained the property of OPA and were, therefore, in the view of a majority of the court, public documents which the officers had a right to inspect at any time. Mr. Justice Frankfurter wrote a dissent in which he was joined by Mr. Justice Murphy and Mr. Justice Rutledge, in which the literal language of the fourth amendment was emphasized:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

Despite the vigor of the dissenting opinion, little significance was attached to the case for the grounds on which the arrest was made did not differ substantially from the charge on which the conviction rested. Moreover, the lower court had not believed the defendant's testimony that the documents were taken from him under duress, and Mr. Justice Douglas in the majority opinion has stressed not only the public document point but also the fact that the incriminating papers were kept at the place of business rather than in defendant's private residence.

It is against the background of the Davis case, however, that the full import of the latest decision must be appraised. In the case of Harris two FBI agents had obtained warrants for his arrest charging him with violation of the mail-fraud statute and the National Stolen Property Act. These officers suspected that Harris was involved in a scheme to defraud an oil company by negotiating and cashing a forged check in the sum of $25,000. The defendant was arrested in the living room of his apartment and handcuffed. The agents then conducted a systematic ransacking of all four rooms in the apartment and later stated that they were looking for two canceled checks which it was believed Harris had stolen. Neither these checks nor anything bearing upon the suspected forgery was brought to light and the defendant has never been prosecuted for the crime charged in the warrants for arrest. The agents did find in a bureau drawer 11 draft registration certificates and 8 notices of draft classification. The crime for which he was convicted related solely to the unlawful possession, concealment and alteration of these documents.

When the Davis case had been decided the previous term only seven members of the Court were sitting, as Mr. Justice Jackson was in Nuremberg and Chief Justice Stone's place had not been filled. The appeal from the conviction therefore gave the full Court for the first time an opportunity to pass squarely upon some of the issues which the Frankfurter dissent had raised in the Davis case. Indeed the facts in the two cases were sufficiently different so that even the majority of the Justices in the Davis opinion might have distinguished the Harris case on any of the following grounds: (a) the seizure of the documents was undertaken without the consent of the defendant; (b) the search occurred in a private residence, and (c) was entirely unrelated to the transaction upon which the arrest was made.

It should therefore be noted that the majority, in holding that the absence of a search warrant is immaterial so long as it was made in connection with an arrest, not only approved the Davis case as one controlling precedent but went considerably beyond it. It is true that the majority opinion did not specifically overrule the Volstead Act cases in which it held that evidence obtained at the time of an arrest by general search of a home or office without a search warrant was improperly admitted, but it distinguished those cases on the ground that the draft certificates were not private papers. The Chief Justice said:

"In keeping the draft cards in his custody petitioner was guilty of a serious and continuing offense against the laws of the United States. A crime was thus being committed in the very presence of the agents conducting the search."

In his dissenting opinion Mr. Justice Frankfurter disposed of this attempt at distinction by pointing to history to show that "it was for contraband goods that search warrants, carefully hedged about, were first authorized by Congress." He and the other dissenting Justices, Murphy, Rutledge, and Jackson, also stated that to the extent that the right of search incident to an arrest, which has been regarded as an exception to the requirement for a search warrant, has always been confined either to things found on the arrested person or visible and accessible in his immediate custody.

One unfortunate effect of the latitude which the decision apparently gives to arresting officers is that it may discourage the resort to search warrants. If the FBI agents in the Harris case had obtained a warrant to search for the missing checks and had they discovered the draft certificates in the process, the defendant would have been able to reclaim them since they were outside the scope of the warrant. Reclamation of articles not specified in a warrant is authorized by motion under the new rules of criminal procedure. As the Frankfurter opinion points out, "the Court's decision achieves the novel and startling result of making the scope of search without warrant broader than an authorized search."

[Editorial, Washington Evening Star]

SEARCH AND SEIZURE

The Supreme Court for some years has outlawed the use of evidence obtained by tapping a telephone line leading into a man's home. Yet now the Court says that a police agent lawfully arresting a man in his home may proceed to ransack his house from top to bottom and prosecute him on the basis of evidence that is turned up, even though that evidence is in no way related to the offense for which the arrest was made and the search begun.

To the layman, the distinction is one which tortures reason. For at best, or perhaps one should say at worst, wire tapping is a restricted form of search. But the sort of thing which the Court has sanctioned in this latest decision would seem to raise possibilities of search and seizure which, by comparison, would make of the wire tapper an inoffensive creature intent upon minding his own business.

The case before the Court involved one George Harris, under suspicion in a mail-fraud complaint. Five agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with a warrant for Harris' arrest but without a search warrant, went to the man's apartment and found him in the living room. For 5 hours the agents searched the apartment, seeking some stolen checks and other items which they hoped would have a bearing on the mail-fraud case. They did not find them. But as the search was nearing its end, they did find in a bureau drawer a sealed envelope marked "George Harris—personal papers." When opened it was found to contain certain notice of (selective service) classification cards and registration certificates. Harris, over his protest that the search and seizure were illegal, was indicted and convicted of the unlawful possession, concealment and alteration of the cards and certificates.

There is no doubt that Harris was guilty. The question is whether the FBI agents operating without a search warrant violated the fourth amendment's guarantee of "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures." In other words, at what point does a search and seizure become unreasonable?

The Supreme Court Justices divided five to four on this question. The majority, upholding the conviction, decreed that under all the circumstances there had not been such an unreasonable search and seizure as to violate the Constitution. The minority, while not seeing eye to eye on all points, were in emphatic disagreement with this main contention of the majority.

The four dissenters raise interesting points and possibilities. For example, if the agents had secured a search warrant in the selective service case, they would have had to describe the cards and certificates of which they had never heard. Had Harris been arrested on the street, his place of residence could not have been searched. The majority decision, in Justice Frankfurter's view, "achieves the novel and startling result of making the scope of search without warrant broader than an authorized search." And, according to Justice Murphy, the decision means that "a search warrant is not only unnecessary; it is a hindrance."

The practical effect of all this is to leave the layman trapped between learned lines of fire. He can hardly be expected to know who is right and who is wrong. And it is of small comfort for him to discover that a high court of distinguished judges gives visible evidence of the same uncertainty.

Truman Foreign Policy No Crusade Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the suspicion that many Members had during the debate on the Greece-Turkey aid bill that it was designed for purposes other than a fight to destroy communism is now finding support in the public press.

Mr. R. H. Shackford, UP staff correspondent, writing in the Washington

News, last Saturday, said that Mr. Truman and his administration are now embarked on an attempt to shift the emphasis "from an ideological crusade against communism to an economic program for rebuilding western Europe and the Far East into healthy democratic areas."

Mr. Speaker, our fears are now greatly intensified. Under the pretext of stopping communism we find ample evidence that we are now embarked upon a global policy of rebuilding the world a la New Deal. It is a preposterous business and signs are rapidly appearing that the people are becoming alarmed over the trend of events.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include as part of my remarks, the article by Mr. Shackford:

(By R. H. Shackford, United Press staff correspondent)

The administration embarked today on an attempt to shift the emphasis in the Truman doctrine from an ideological crusade against communism to an economic program for rebuilding western Europe and the Far East into healthy, democratic areas.

High administration officials are frankly worried about the trend of the last 2 months' debate in and out of Congress. Some privately admit mistakes of handling the program probably have been made. They fear:

That Congress will consider its duty done once it has approved the Greek-Turkish aid bill, whereas it is only a small beginning in the over-all strategy.

That it will be difficult, if not impossible in Congress' present frame of mind, to persuade Congressmen Greece and Turkey are but a relatively small part—even if the most critical—of the battle against Soviet expansion and influence. All of western Europe and a good portion of the Far East, they feel, are crying for the same kind of aid.

That the current public wave of excitement about communism and Russia will be difficult to deflect into support for dull but vital economic steps to be taken if communism is to be halted in western Europe and Asia.

These officials view the Truman doctrine as a global policy—equally applicable to France and western Germany and Britain as to the temporarily strategic eastern Mediterranean. They believe—especially since failure of the Moscow Conference—if western Europe is to be saved from communism a long-range economic program is the weapon for doing the job.

They want to build the program into a truly peacetime lend-lease measure.

The chief administration worry now is how to keep western Europe from economic collapse in the wake of failure at Moscow to get four-power agreement on German problems.

There is no thought of abandoning the policy that military aid, to such nations as Greece and Turkey, may be necessary. But high officials are convinced the surest and most important way of diluting Soviet and Communist influence in western Europe is to get those nations back on their feet economically.

State Undersecretary Dean Acheson started the real campaign for the change in a speech at Cleveland, Miss., Thursday. He called for immediate economic reconstruction of Germany and Japan and a series of economic measures, including extension of wartime controls over exports, to implement the Truman doctrine.

Last night General Marshall, in a letter to the United States associates regretting his absence from a New York dinner earlier this week, plugged the new line. He emphasized the more he dealt with political negotiations, the more convinced he was enduring political harmony rests heavily upon economic stability—and that only through creating healthy economic conditions can we create an economic and social environment free from the unrest in which political instability is bred.

This is the beginning of what may be a high-level administration campaign to sell the country on the need to help economic reconstruction of that part of the world which may still be saved from Soviet influence.

One administration official put it: "Bread and jobs at the right time are the most effective weapons against communism."

The Pulpit—Fares Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein the following sermon delivered by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, who was formerly Chaplain of the United States Senate and now minister at the Foundry Methodist Church, on April 27, 1947:

THE PULPIT—FARES PLEASE

Text: To whom much has been given much shall be required.

That is as sure as death and taxes. As a matter of fact, it has to do with taxes. This is not just a euphonious motto; it is a law with teeth in it. No camouflaged selfishness can escape its judgment. What we have constantly presents its bill to us. Every talent, every ability, every possession calls for payment. There is the responsibility of ability. It is the most solemn fact of life: The more we have the more we owe; to whom much has been given much shall be required.

We are only stewards of property not our own. Really, we do not own anything. There is not a thing that has any value upon it that we do not hold in trust. A heritage, national or individual, is not something to exhibit, something to boast about like a coat of arms; it is like a coin which we are to invest. On all our treasures there is a high income tax which we owe to humanity.

Strength of any kind is not something to be hoarded. It is never to be stored but poured. Strength that does not serve weakness is itself doomed.

No blessing is really owned until it is universally shared. Service to "one of the least of these, my brethren," far from being a superfluous ideal, is an eradicable law of life. Self-preservation in the last analysis depends upon it. This inevitable sharing of the strong in the ills of the weakest and most helpless people with whom they deal has now been stretched to take in all mankind. Every day in this one world the interlocked, intermeshed relationships grow more intimate and unescapable. We either pay the price of making our democracy possible to all who desire it, in every part of the world, or the springs of that democracy will gradually dry up at home. We either export our Christianity—or, rather, take the world's Christ to the uttermost parts of the earth—or make our own Christian profession but sounding brass and tinkling cymbal.

Riding across the isthmus of life from the cradle to the grave, we travel in a comfortable car we did not build, on tracks we did not lay, a car propelled by power that we do not furnish. But always there is a conductor representing our common humanity coming our way. He disturbs our complacency by extending his hand in our direction and shouting "Fares, please." To some people the art of living largely consists in evading the fare.

What an irresistible force the church would be did it not have to carry so many who merely ride and do nothing else. A preacher was speaking of a man he knows well in a Midwestern city. He said of him: "He is a keen businessman, of high probity, one of the largest factors in the commercial life of his town. But he does not realize that the qualities that have won him success, the aggressive will, the alert mind, even his honesty, are the unearned increment and free gift of six generations of God-fearing New England ancestors." This man prattles in a half-witted manner about being a self-made man. For the church and the welfare movements in his city he has no time; he is too busy. In plain language he is stealing a ride without paying his fare.

Here is another man in whose life the Sunday school has played an immeasurable part. It took the clay of his early years and helped to shape it into something fine. That Sunday school made him into a responsible and upright man. But now, in the institution to which he owes infinite things, he takes only a most nominal interest. He cheerfully leaves to others the real work of training the youth of tomorrow. He is trying to ride on a half-fare ticket.

And what shall we say of the multitude who owe the peace and purity of their homes, the whole core of their life's happiness and security, to the gospel and the church, and who think to cancel the obligation by a few patronizing words or, perhaps, by reluctantly subscribing a few dollars to keep the church going. To avoid paying is not as clever as it seems. It is not just cheating; it is suicide. That is what the Master of Life meant when He declared, in words that go to the very heart of life, if you try to save your life you will lose it; if you lose it for My sake—that is, for mankind's sake—you will find it.

Not long before men were saying that he had died, a glorious friend of mine declared, "I want to put the contribution of my dedicated life in some vital institution that would come on down the years and concentrate forever about it the diviner ideals of city and country; an institution that would maintain open doors to an altar where men and women and little children could kneel in holy communion and consecration; an institution that would furnish an ever-available calm and sure retreat for souls pursued by care, sorrow, and sin, that would make permanent a pulpit where the message of God's love could be proclaimed down the years, that would unstop the uplifting melodies of great hymns and sing to drooping souls in discouragement the eternal optimism of Christian hope. Always, when we think of that kind of contribution we think of the church of Jesus Christ and declare, I would rather have my whole life invested in its ever great and increasing service than in any other, or all other investments, this world has to offer.

Jook Joints, But No Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Ap-

pendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial taken from the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger under date of April 8, 1947, which registers a complaint that is so typical of the so-called efficiency of the present bureaucratic system that I thought it worthy of publication here:

SUNDAY SCHOOL HOUSE BLOCKED WHILE JOOK JOINTS GO UP

Builders of recreational centers, jook joints, and night spots all over Mississippi do not seem to have any trouble in obtaining construction materials, regardless of Federal Government efforts to channel such materials into construction of homes. But up in Greenville, the Civilian Production Administration reportedly is blocking construction of a badly needed Sunday school building, and the Delta Democrat-Times rightly protests it.

"Anyone driving through Mississippi is amazed at the construction in progress in every town and county," the Delta paper says. "Stores, homes, office buildings, recreational centers. And jook joints.

"Greenville is proud of her more than average contribution to the State's building boom. We are proud of the new store buildings, the recreation center, the little and medium-sized homes that are going up all around us. Despite costs, building has been going ahead.

"The churches at Greenville have a building program too. At least four of them plan new places of worship or of Sunday school or daily instruction. The Episcopalians, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Catholics, the Baptists, all have building programs. And the First Baptist Church has progressed so far that it has razed its Sunday school annex, the old Pollock home, preparatory to erecting a $228,000 Sunday school building.

"But permission for construction has been denied by the Civilian Production Administration. We presume that the reason for the denial is the urgent need of homes.

"We have no quarrel with the Civilian Production Administration's desire to accelerate the home-building program. But we'd like to take its director around the county and the State and show him the buildings that have gone up and are going up. One Sunday school building in Greenville is infinitesimal compared with the total amount of nonhome building in the county and State.

"Perhaps, at Easter, it is appropriate to remind the Civilian Production Administration that there are spiritual needs as well as material costs."

The CPA may need the reminder. Similar conditions are reported in other counties, and other States. Drew Pearson has several times exposed the diversion of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of critical materials needed for homes to race-track plants and other gambling establishments. If Editor Carter needs any additional examples of nonhome construction to show the CPA Director, he can find them around Jackson.

We hope his protest proves effective, and that the needed Sunday school building goes up soon.

The Duty of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district: There is a struggle going on all over the world today. This is the struggle of people everywhere against fear and oppression.

It is not a new struggle. It has existed ever since the dawn of civilization. In one form or another, the feeling of insecurity has gripped the hearts of nations and individuals for centuries.

I believe an escape from that fear can be had through our American form of government. To me, Americanism is the greatest positive force in the world today.

Other "isms" are of no use or interest to me. I cannot see how they solve anything that hasn't already been taken care of by our way of life.

As the symbol of what America represents, the Stars and Stripes inspire America's millions to resist the fear and oppression we see about us throughout the world. Americanism cannot stand idly by while people are downtrodden and crushed. We always do something about it.

The recent war was a good example of that. As much opposed to war as the majority of Americans were, they rallied to the side of right and refused to permit the forward march of fascism to proceed unchallenged.

In recent months our flag has been desecrated in several capital cities of the Old World. Our flag was flaunted by a few of the very people we had rehabilitated and helped.

What has prompted such a misunderstanding? Is it propaganda against the United States being spread by ingrates? Is it misrepresentation of our objectives and our ambitions?

I, for one, endorse no imperialistic policy to be pursued by an America setting out to impress all nations of our greatness with force of arms. Rather, I would like to see our procedure one of friendly exchange of human relationships, and I honestly believe that is what it is.

Therefore we are being misunderstood abroad. We go forth to help. Hidden forces try to make other countries think we are being aggressive. Such lies must be overcome by truth.

Our destiny, then, is not imperialism, but Americanism. We must convince the world that our destiny is their hope of escape from the tyranny, the fear, and the desolation which the ruthlessness of the opponents of Americanism are exhibiting to all who come under their power.

The founder of the Republican Party was Abraham Lincoln. He was the first Republican President, and succeeded in mapping a program for his party which has appealed to the majority of American citizens through many years since the Civil War.

I have always prided myself in being an Abraham Lincoln Republican. I believe in the ideals Lincoln believed in. My convictions that freedom and liberty are necessary privileges of all our citizens are patterned after the Lincoln desire for tolerance. I do not believe we can afford to stand for anything less.

My duty, as I see it, is to fight to see the Lincoln principles retained by our Republican Party. Lincoln freed the slaves. Our responsibility is to unshackle any chains which may bind any part of our citizenry to economic slavery.

I am positive that by recognizing Lincoln as our greatest Republican we will inspire the American people in this hour of destiny.

Is Marshall Losing Britain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier:

MARSHALL LOSING BRITAIN?

You won't be hearing it out of the Washington publicists for the White House—but there are grave signs that new Truman-Marshall foreign policy which has strained our relations with Russia is also driving a deep wedge between the United States of America and Great Britain.

The reason why Washington dispatches, radio addresses and statements will probably ignore this, for the time being, is that the United States State Department, biggest press agent office on earth, has succeeded in dominating Washington news sources and in coaxing them to view all White House programs through rose-tinted glasses.

This interference with information and opinion already has caused complications. Two years ago, when the United Nations program was in the making, a sort of conspiracy of optimism prevented any realistic appraisal of commitments, secret deals, and blemishes such as the veto-clause, which we now know were insuperable barriers to "a just and lasting peace"—if not indeed to "peace within our times."

The clues to the British state of mind about President Truman's demand that Uncle Sam interfere directly in Greece and Turkey, with both money and armies, are not to be found in the reports of men like Secretary Marshall nor in disclosures of either the White House or the State Department.

The fact should be given by these sources. Certainly it is wrong for them to withhold information of vital concern to the American people.

The place to look for the signs in the wind is the news columns of such newspapers as have correspondents around the world and print innumerable foreign dispatches which haven't been "slanted" by Washington.

Reconstructng the picture, like a jigsaw puzzle, from dozens of scattered pieces, we can make certain surmises which are strongly plausible, if not yet established beyond question.

The picture which emerges is that the Labor Party Parliament of Great Britain is very much alarmed at the Truman assumption that the Britsh nation will be willing to join the United States of America in a crusade to keep Russia from expanding.

A formal demand already has been made that Parliament "repudiate President Truman's proposals for 'collective security' against communism." (Quoted from a pamphlet offered to Parliament entitled "Keep Left.")

Foreign Secretary Bevin's position is still more complicated, and very interesting. Apparently Bevin was quite as surprised as were Congress and the American people by the Truman address a few weeks ago making our intervention into the Greek situation a first order of business, and calling for us to send both military and financial aid to that land as a means of keeping the Russians out.

It may be surmised that Bevin's request to President Truman for us to backstop England in Greece, where her financial resources did not permit her to continue on her previous scale, contemplated principally financial aid, coupled with shipments of commodities and

equipment urgently needed to keep the people fed and get them back to work.

If this is what he had in mind, he had every reason for surprise that his request was answered with a promise of military aid, coupled with a United States plan to build up a powerful Greek Army; and still more so that the troubled problem of Communistic against Democratic government was brought into the matter at all.

The alarm and unrest beginning to show up in British official circles appears to be reflected in the rank and file of British people. At any rate, a survey conducted by Mass-Observation, which is a sort of British equivalent of the Gallup poll, shows a rapid increase in the unfavorable attitude of British citizens to Americans.

The straw-vote report shows, as its findings about the current opinion in England of the American character, the following representing one widespread attitude:

"The American is immature emotionally and intellectually. He is boastful and flamboyant, bad-mannered and full of intolerance of any minority group, etc."

Even the fact that so unflattering a survey should have been released at all, at the present time, and in a land where publicity is being geared closer and closer to national policy, is in itself a strong indication that Anglo-American friendship is deteriorating.

Secretary Marshall's responsibility in this matter is a very serious one, and any further estrangement with Britain cannot fail to put his own leadership, ability, and program to the acid test.

Unless one goes on the assumption that the Greek speech of President Truman was another of those famous "off-the-cuff" decisions, made rashly and suddenly without prior discussion, then it is inescapable that the new program outlined in connection with the Greek emergency is the first great change in American policy dictated by the new Secretary.

It was a daring step, one bound to be brought under fire sooner or later in this country. Coming as it did, after 15 years of deliberate appeasement of Russia as a fixed New Deal policy, and being made at the very moment the President is entering the political arena for reelection, politics alone would raise many questions.

Secretary Marshall is the first professional soldier to occupy the United States Secretaryship of State at a critical moment in world history. He has been elevated to the next in line for succession to the Presidency if anything were to happen to President Truman.

The Secretary comes to the high office from the so-called brass-hat school of thought which has preached militarism in America for years. He is a believer in peacetime conscription. He is a strong advocate of the proposed Army-Navy merger which would give the military group great new powers over manpower, industry, national finances, and publicity.

Automatically, this background is bound to create uneasiness over radical new proposals such as our direct interference with internal affairs of Greece. Suspicion that the whole matter may be merely an artificial war scare to aid Truman's reelection is bound to arise. So is the suspicion that the crisis was drummed up to strengthen the brass-hat control over the American people.

For the threat to arise that, having wilfully offended Russia, this Marshall policy is about to drive Great Britain, not into an alliance with us but into the arms of Russia, would be catastrophic.

Great Britain would like to remain neutral. Her desire has been to be friendly, on the one hand with Russia in Europe, and on the other with America in the Western Hemisphere.

This she expected to do as one of a family of nations under the United Nations programs. But a collateral of the new Truman-Marshall foreign policy is that Uncle Sam proposes to deal directly whenever he wishes—that is, to bypass the United Nations. And of course this will be fatal to the U. N. program.

Secretary Marshall came back from the Moscow Conference with a great air of urgency, saying that action was mandatory, and that we must take certain unspecified steps—in effect that we must prepare to follow wherever he and President Truman decide to go.

Nothing shows more clearly the great divergence in our new foreign policy and that desired by the British Nation than the Bevin comments on the identical Moscow deadlock about which Marshall says we can't afford to wait.

What does Bevin advise? Patience.

And just in case anyone didn't understand that this advice was deliberate, calculated, and international, he later elaborated:

"It may after all be better to take a little longer this time and do it well, than come back with a peace that is not a peace after all."

Alcoholic Beverage Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink.

The American people spent $7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946, as compared with $3,770,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased but be decreased.

Mrs. R. E. Murphy, Mrs. W. B. Varner, Mrs. M. H. Wood, Mrs. Floyd Varner, Mrs. J. L. Eslinger, Mrs. B. R. Ainoff, Mrs. Paul Severs, Mrs. C. W. Satterfield, Mrs. G. C. Sanderson, Mrs. J. W. Satterfield, Mrs. Jewell Waggoner, Miss Juanita Varner, Mrs. Earl Varner, Mrs. G. C. Kirby, Mrs. R. A. Stooksbury, Walter J. Toppins, J. L. Eslinger, Rex Wilson, Maynard Wilson, J. W. Satterfield, Mrs. Bertha Underwood, F. Earl Wood, Violo Wise, Aubrey Satterfield, Mrs. Ermalee Satterfield, Mrs. J. B. Sanderson, Nick White, Tressie White, Frazier Warwick, Beatrice Violet, Mrs. Clarence Rutherford, T. C. Sanderson, N. D. Wilson, J. O. Neal, Ollie Toppins, Dara Braden, George Runions, Earl Varner, Thomas McCreary, O. L. Weaver, Mrs. R. L. Templin, R. L. Templin, O. H. Varner, Mrs. Oscar L. Weaver, Mrs. F. Earl Wood, Mrs. Elizabeth Newcomb, Mack Holcomb, Mrs. Mack Holcomb, M. H. Wood, Mrs. John H. Price, Charles B. Woodward, Mrs. J. L. Henderson, J. L. Henderson, Mrs. Hellen King, Mrs. Aileene Laughon, Mrs. Neva Everett, Mrs. Helen Allred, Mrs. George Henry, Roy L. Connaton, Jimmy Patterson, James L. Patterson, T. C. McCarty, F. H. Davis, Mrs. F. H. Davis, Mrs. L. C. McCarty, Mrs. John Learn, Mrs. Linda Sharp, Mrs. Clarence McKelvey, Mrs. Maude Hodges, Martha Smith, Mrs. Glenn Cruze, Mrs. James Tinsley, Mrs. Rudolph Burnette, Mrs. Lula Dunlap, S. L. Sherrod, J. R. Lawson, Elizabeth Burkhat, Ethel McGhee, Massie Harding, Mrs. R. J. Branks, Mrs. Clifford Burkhart, Mrs. Joseph H. McKenzie, W. A. Hammack, Mrs. W. A. Hammack, Mrs. Deadrick L. Dunlap, Mrs. Aubrey Underwood, Cas H. Cox, Mrs. J. Ralph Lawson, Charles A. Lusby.

Washington Chief of Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much comment has developed regarding the appointment of a chief of police for the city of Washington. A very enlightening editorial appeared in the Washington Daily News upon this very important subject, of date Friday, May 9, 1947. In order that all may read this editorial, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the editorial to which I have referred, as follows:

INSPECTOR BARRETT

Last week the News published a story containing in some detail a portion of the record of Inspector Robert Barrett, chief of the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department.

Inspector Barrett's record contains no guilty verdict against his name.

But it does show, for instance, that—

In 1931 the then Sergeant Barrett was indicted for the brutal beating of a suspect in a slaying who was, as it happens, innocent. A jury found Barrett guilty of the beating, but the Court of Appeals ordered a new trial on a technical point of law. Eighteen months after the beating a second jury could not agree and the charge was nolle prossed. Sergeant Barrett returned to duty after a 2-year suspension.

For years he has been known as a rough, tough cop.

Our present police chief, Maj. Harvey Callahan, is quoted as saying that Inspector Barrett, in his younger days, had a tendency to "throw his hands around," but Callahan claims that Barrett has outgrown it.

The News printed Inspector Barrett's record because of indications that he may be appointed Washington's chief of police after Major Callahan.

Inspector Barrett's record, in addition to various charges of brutality, lists more than 100 commendations—some of them for undoubtedly able performances of duty in solving crimes, some of them signed by certain citizens for his graciousness in acting as their guide while they were "touring" police headquarters under more or less compulsory auspices. All these items should be considered pro and con.

After carefully considering them, the News believes that Inspector Barrett should not be Washington's chief of police.

Our opposition to such an appointment does not follow from any casual discounting of Inspector Barrett's ability as a tough, bare-knuckle kind of police officer.

Few men remain long in any police department without "throwing their hands around" a bit, to use Major Callahan's phrase.

But men who rise high in a police department usually develop a less primitive conception of police work. It is in a sense analogous to the development, say, that leading physicians attain in their field, or leading lawyers in the legal profession.

Everyone knows that, for a doctor to lead in the medical field, it is not enough if he is simply a good general practitioner. Nor is it enough that if a lawyer is to be a leader of the bar, he is to be merely a good trial lawyer. Both may have these qualities, of course.

But, in addition, they must be familiar with, interested in, and must be able to deal intelligently with the larger policies of their professions and with the ways their professions impinge and affect society.

For instance, they must know and be aware of the importance of public and preventive medicine or of the broader social and welfare aspects and implications of constantly changing laws.

In just such fashion a police chief must have an intelligent and sympathetic approach to, say, juvenile delinquency, racial relations, criminal rehabilitation—what might be called the preventive medicine of police work—and all the other kindred developments that are constantly changing and improving modern police work.

This was true to some definite extent of Inspector Barrett's uncle and patron, the late Col. Edward J. Kelly, who preceded Major Callahan as chief of police here. In his younger days, Colonel Kelly was as rough-and-tumble as the next man. But as he progressed upward in the department he became an administrator of some thoughtfulness and judgment, and Washington was proud of him as a representative of its municipal government.

This, then, is the question The News has in mind relative to Inspector Barrett: Does the record show that he has the necessary qualities for the job?

The News believes it does not.

We hope that Commissioner J. Russell Young will reconsider his plan to try to shove through Inspector Barrett when the time comes. The News believes that unless Commissioner Young does reconsider, and make other arrangements, he will be trying to do Washington a great disservice.

Congressman Stevenson Reports From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, by overwhelming majorities of nearly three to one, Congress passed the bill to provide aid and assistance to Greece and Turkey. As you know, Greece is being overrun by Communist guerrillas, with the active support and collaboration on the part of Communist Russia. President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall told Members of Congress the present government in Greece is about to fall, which will result in complete domination of Greece by the Communists. Then Turkey will be the next to come within the sphere of communism. This will mean domination of the Dardanelles, the Mediterranean, and the Suez Canal by the Communists. Russia will then control all of Europe, Asia and North Africa. The President and General Marshall warned Congress that the bill for aid to Greece and Turkey must be passed.

Moscow, Stalin, Molotov, the Red Star, Pravda, and the Communists of Soviet Russia and the Community Party in the United States and its press were against this bill. During the debate on the bill in the House the Communist Party held its convention in Washington. Such notorious Communists as William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis and some from Wisconsin were here. Hundreds of Communists paraded the Halls and corridors of the Capitol and sat in the galleries of the House of Representatives and harangued Members of Congress in the corridors and in their offices, demanding that we vote against this bill. Some of these Communists, when asked whether they would fight for Russia or the United States, defiantly stated they would fight on the side of Russia in case of war. Is there any wonder the bill passed by such overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Congress?

When the people went to the polls last November to elect their Representatives in Congress they indicated by overwhelming majorities they wanted more efficiency in Government and Government economy as against deficit spending. The House of Representatives has kept its pledge to the people by cutting the budget submitted by the administration by billions of dollars.

The people demanded relief from taxes that have mounted higher and higher every year for the past 16 years. The House of Representatives has passed a tax bill that will reduce your income taxes as much as 30 percent. This is the first real tax relief the people have received in 16 years.

The people demanded reductions in governmental expenses and curtailed pay rolls in Government departments. The House of Representatives has passed several appropriation bills within the 4 months since Congress convened, cutting and reducing expenses of government and wiping out Federal bureaus, saving the people hundreds of millions of tax dollars. The House is not through cutting expenses of Government departments. We expect to save billions of dollars for the people before we adjourn, even in the face of tremendous opposition and a concerted effort by Government department heads to prevent such savings to the people.

There has been considerable sniping against Congress in its efforts to carry out the demands of the people who elected us. Anyone who attempts to undermine Congress is undermining our representative form of government, and thus aiding communism and its fellow travelers in this country to wreck our ship of state.

The people also demanded that fair and equitable labor legislation be passed by their Representatives to prevent the destruction of American economy. In spite of the opposition of Communist Russia and the dominated Russian press, Congress passed legislation outlawing portal-to-portal pay suits against American industry, amounting to more than $6,000,000,000. Our American economy might have been completely destroyed had such lawsuits not been outlawed by Congress. The people demanded that their elected Representatives pass legislation giving the country and the people relief from industrial strife between employer and employee which had caused the loss of many millions of dollars in wages to employees and almost wrecked the country. The Congress has given the people such relief.

Congress has also passed an act to limit the tenure of office of the President of the United States to two terms, thus preventing any President and his administration from building up bureaucratic exploitation and regimentation of the people and political control of our Federal courts.

Thus you see the House of Representatives and Congress have carried out and are continuing to carry out the mandate of the people as expressed in the last election.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much disturbed as to the outcome of our actions here today. I have listened to this matter concerning the loan to Greece and Turkey ever since the President appeared here and declared that an emergency existed. I have also sat here and listened to the matter being debated on the floor for several days. The absurdity and the inconsistency connected with the program make it practically impossible to arrive at a justifiable conclusion.

The President has declared that an emergency exists; that it must be dealt with immediately by this House; it cannot go to the United Nations conference as people believe it should. So he asks for a $400,000,000 blank check which carries no restrictions whatsoever, except that United States officials shall be permitted to observe whether the money is being utilized as per contract, and that United States press and radio representatives shall be permitted to follow up and report freely regarding use of the assistance provided.

The only other restriction is that no part of the millions loaned or given to Greece or Turkey may be used by those countries to pay any foreign debt.

The moneys authorized by this bill will be loaned or given to these countries upon request and upon terms to be made by the President. This is living 1940 all over again. In 1940 similar action led

us to war. Is it any wonder that the country and Congress are confused? We should be informed as to how the money is to be used. The President states it is to stop communism. Some authorities say it is for relief. But Herbert Hoover, returning recently from Greece, declared that Greece needed only $60,000,000 for economic relief and that Turkey needed none.

I am wondering if this is just the beginning of a series of appropriations that will never end, and finally lead to bankruptcy for us under the guise that we must stop communism. We should be assured that this authorization can serve a good purpose.

Now if it is true, and I think we are reliably informed, that there are 20 divisions of armed Russian troops on the borders of Greece and Turkey, and since our fleet is lying in Mediterranean waters, it is altogether possible that if Russia feels as strong as she talks then hostilities may be expected at most any time. Apparently we are not trying to stop communism, we are trying to stop a great Russian Army.

Now the administration has not been quite fair in presenting this matter. This emergency, if there is one, did not come about overnight. England notified us last October that she was getting out of Greece in March. If the withdrawal was because the Greek credits in England were exhausted, we should be told. Russia's action now is the same as Hitler's was in 1937 and 1938. Russia is waging undeclared war under the guise of liberating minorities in other countries. It used to be called aggression. Now it is called liberation.

It might be a case of England wanting us to once more pull her chestnuts out of the fire. It may be a case that American exporters want to continue business with bankrupt countries whether or not it bankrupts our own country.

Now I am informed that Greece expects to use $150,000,000 of this money to equip her army. That definitely makes, so far as Russia is concerned, the granting of this money by us an act of war. Greece is confident that with this expenditure she can conquer the Communist enemies. She is going to spend $80,000,000 for consumer goods for civilians, $50,000,000 for heavy equipment to restore production, and $20,000,000 to restore devastated farms.

Turkey stood neutral and grew fat from the recent war. Her preference is for planes and tanks and funds to permit road and railroad building.

Greece is to get an additional $50,000,000 beyond her share in the joint appropriation.

Communism Grows Under Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's foreign policy is wholly inconsistent with his policy at home. He wants to stop communism in Greece and Turkey, so he says, but his acts belie his words. Surely, the spread of communism is more dangerous at home than it is abroad.

In the Washington News Digest for May 1947, Mr. John J. O'Connor points out very clearly just what is going on in the United States to promote the cause of communism. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article written by Mr. O'Connor. It is a most important contribution to our thinking on this subject.

HOW THEY BUILD A COMMUNIST FIFTH COLUMN IN WASHINGTON

(By John J. O'Connor)

There is a strong move underway to strengthen the Communist fifth column throughout the world, particularly in the United States. President Truman's firm stand against Soviet aggression abroad and Communist infiltration at home has apparently convinced the Comintern that the job must be done quickly and efficiently before the doors are closed.

The planting of Red agents in America has been done so skillfully that it has escaped public attention. Diplomatic missions from Soviet satellite nations are being used as the fronts for Communist representatives. The plan works something like this. A Communist-dominated country will obtain permission to establish a diplomatic mission in the United States. The first group of representatives will consist of a number of citizens who are respected in their own country and, if possible, over here. At least one of them will be a faithful adherent of the Communist Party, although he may not be known as such. This man will be the actual directing force behind the mission. Once firmly established, the non-Communist members of the staff are replaced by Communists or dismissed outright.

THE BULGARIAN COMMUNIST FIFTH COLUMN

Such a shift now seems to be in progress at the Bulgarian Political Mission in Washington. Bulgaria does not have a regular minister in the United States, since the Bulgarian Communist regime has not yet been officially recognized by our Government. Diplomatic recognition was refused on the ground that the Communist Fatherland Front coalition that now rules the tiny Balkan nation has come to power by force and terrorism.

The Communist reign of terror has no parallel in Balkan history since the Ottoman occupation centuries ago. From the day they overthrew the democratic Muravieff government, the Communists began a systematic extermination of everyone who might possibly be expected to oppose them. Personal vengence brought about the death of hundreds of guiltless Bulgarians. As a means of legalizing their mass murders, the Fatherland Front leaders forced through parliament a special law for the purpose of trying "collaborationists." The new law provided for the establishment of special "People's Courts" which were to try offenders for all crimes committed against the state and the people during the Nazi occupation. The law places the constitution of the courts and the management of the trial entirely in the hands of the Communist-controlled Justice Ministry.

In order to expedite the trials, two sections of the People's Courts were established in Sofia. Judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys were appointed by the Communist Minister of the Interior and, on December 20, 1944, 3 Regents, 38 Cabinet ministers, and 130 parliamentary deputies went on trial. Because of the stacked courts, the entire country expected that the major defendants would finally be executed. The prosecution asked for 80 death sentences, which was considered an unusually large number. Actually, they expected to get no more than 50 or 60 capital convictions.

ORDERS FROM MOSCOW

By strange coincidence, both sections of the People's Courts terminated the proceedings on the same day. A few hours before the verdicts were to be handed down, word came from Moscow that the courts were to show absolutely no lenience and that at least 100 convictions were to be ordered. Thus, the judges were placed in the anomalous position of ordering more death sentences than were demanded by the prosecution. But orders are orders, and, 24 hours after the judges' decisions were delivered, 100 men died before Communist firing squads.

Lying dead in a prison courtyard was ex-minister Ivan Bagrianoff who replaced the Nazi government of Premier Bagdan Filoff and then withdrew Bulgaria from the tripartite pact. Bagrianoff deserves the credit for forcing withdrawal of the German Army from Bulgarian soil. Several members of the Bagrianoff cabinet were also killed.

Unusually heavy sentences were meted out to most of the remaining defendants. Two royal secretaries who were participating in the trials largely as prosecution witnesses received life sentences. Former Premier Konstantin Muravieff, who declared war on Germany after he replaced Bagrianoff, was also sentenced for life. Noteworthy is the fact that when Muravieff's government fell before the Communist partisans, there was no armed German soldier in Bulgaria. Nikola Mushanov, Dimiter Gichev, and Atanas Burov, the three venerable leaders of the Bulgarian democratic movement, were given 1-year terms and were sentenced to 2 years' loss of civil rights.

Mushanov, the 72-year-old head of the Democratic Party, was the most outspoken anti-Nazi during the period of the German occupation. He took every opportunity—whether at funerals or banquets—to speak against the Nazi rule of Filoff. His crime was that he was equally opposed to the brand of Red fascism practiced in the Soviet Union. Mushanov was considered by the United States as one of the most promising men to head the Bulgarian Government during the reconstruction period. His imprisonment effectively removed him from the political picture.

THE BLOOD BATH

The unreasonable verdicts of the People's Courts stunned the entire Bulgarian Nation and the people came to the inevitable conclusion that the Communists were determined to remove anyone who might oppose their dictatorship. The blood bath was continued for several more months both in Sofia and the provinces. At the same time, partisan bands were carrying out an execution campaign of their own. Thousands of innocent citizens lost their lives.

The Bulgarian people were violently opposed to this wave of brutality and open revolt was threatened, despite the imposing presence of the Red Army and of innumerable armed Communist bands. As a result of both internal and foreign resentment against the mass murders, the People's Courts were dissolved and the remaining defendants were handed over to the regular courts for trial.

In view of the widespread anti-Communist feeling the Fatherland Front decided to establish itself in power by legal means and ordered the holding of elections. The election date was set so that opposition parties would not have enough time to select their list of candidates. Furthermore, the reign of terror was still so fresh in the minds of the people that no fair election was possible. The United States protested this arbitrary decision and forced the Bulgarian Government to postpone the election date. As a gesture of good will, the American repre-

sentative invited the Bulgarians to send a political representative to Washington.

HOW THE COMMUNISTS WIN AN ELECTION

Despite this promising interlude, the Communists made certain of winning the elections by prohibiting virtually all opposition campaigning and by faking the election results. Both the United States and British Governments protested, but to no avail. The Fatherland Front entrenched its dictatorship.

A second election was scheduled in 1946 and the Fatherland Front attempted to force all opposition parties into the coalition. The leaders of the democratic parties refused to be swallowed up by the Communist machine and the Fatherland Front again resorted to force and forgery. Opposition papers were suppressed on the slightest pretext, their public meetings were virtually banned, they were denied access to the government-owned radio. Nonetheless, as election day approached, the Communists realized that they would be decisively beaten. The Communists thereupon rigged the election a second time. One of their devices was to use ballots of a different color for each party. Opposition groups were denied the right to have watchers at the polls or at the counting of the ballots.

To the surprise of no one, the five-party Fatherland Front coalition announced that it had received an overwhelming majority of the votes. The Communists alone received 2,225,000 votes out of a total of some 4,000,000. At that time, the Communist Party was claiming only 400,000 members out of a population of 6,000,000, yet they claimed 59 percent of the votes. The sweeping election victory of the Reds became a standard joke in Bulgaria for those who had the courage.

DIMITROV

The Communists named Georgi Dimitrov as premier. Dimitrov is the head of the Bulgarian Communist Party and a long-time member of the Comintern. He held the post of secretary-general of the Comintern for several years and thus ranked only next to Stalin in the international Communist hierarchy. Like so many of his comrades—notably deserter Maurice Thorez of France—Dimitrov spent the war years in the U. S. S. R.

Dimitrov rules strictly according to the line laid down in Moscow. As in his neighboring country of Yugoslavia, the Communist secret police maintains a constant watch to prevent any resurgence of the democratic forces in Bulgaria. Although most of the democratic leaders have been executed or jailed, the spirit of freedom is still kept alive by the Bulgarian people.

THE BULGARIAN MISSION TO THE UNITED STATES

The men appointed by Foreign Minister Petko Stainoff to staff the mission in the United States, are Gen. Vladimir Stoycheff, Boyan Athanasoff, Boyan Choukanoff, Marin Pundeff, and Peter Radoyeff. The original list of five included one well-known Communist whose name was quietly withdrawn when the American representative in Sofia, Maynard Barnes, made it clear that this man was not acceptable. Athanasoff was named in his place.

STOYCHEFF

General Stoycheff has a record of prodemocratic sympathies and a good military record. During the war the western democracies considered him as a likely candidate for an important postwar assignment. He had served as military attaché in Paris and is a member of the Legion of Honor. Stoycheff led the Bulgarian Armies which liberated Yugoslavia from the German Army, at a time when Dictator Tito was still busy trying to murder the leader of the real Yugoslav resistance movement, Gen. Draja Mihailovich.

The key railway junction of Nish and the strategic military center of Skoplje were captured by General Stoycheff's army and turned over to representatives of Dictator Tito. The loud victory howls set up by Tito's propaganda agents can still be heard. As a matter of fact, the Bulgarian troops advanced across Yugoslavia into Hungary and Austria, and Tito—despite his long-winded claims—cannot be credited with one single important victory against the Reichswehr. He was more interested in wiping out the democratic resistance movement than in fighting the Nazis.

ATHANASOFF

Athanasoff was second in command of the mission but apparently was the man who actually directed its affairs. He had been a minor diplomatic official under the Nazi government and served in Berlin and Portugal. He was trusted by the Nazi foreign office, otherwise he would not have even retained his post, much less be stationed in the German capital. When the Communists took over, Athanasoff underwent a convenient change of allegiance and came into the good graces of the Fatherland Front. His reward came when he was appointed to serve in the mission to the United States.

CHOUKANOFF

Choukanoff has an unbroken anti-Nazi record. He was the Associated Press correspondent in Sofia and became a close friend to United States Minister George Earle. When the war started in 1939, Choukanoff was placed on the official German black list and pressure was put on the Bulgarian Government to have him jailed. Because of his association with Earle, his high reputation, and his high standing as a foreign correspondent, the foreign office resisted the German demands. When the Nazis occupied the country, the government finally had to submit and for most of the occupation period, Choukanoff was jailed or interned. During his short periods of freedom, he was constantly hounded by the police. When the Filoff cabinet fell, he aligned himself with the democratic movement and there is no evidence that he joined the Communists or any other Fatherland Front Party.

RADOYEFF

Radoyeff was a merchant without a significant political record. He was a close friend of General Stoycheff and came along as the general's personal secretary.

Pundeff was a promising young law student. His father had been a prominent journalist who was assassinated in a political feud. Young Pundeff received his appointment because of the integrity of his family and he is not known to be sympathetic to the Red terror.

NOW THE SWITCH

Despite the high hopes held for the attitude of General Stoycheff the State Department soon found out that he had definitely gone over into the Communist camp. As a result, relations between him and our own officials soon cooled. Stoycheff was guilty of a bad breach of diplomatic behavior when he made an open attack on the American Government in a letter to the Washington Evening Star. He was recalled at his own request, and Athanasoff took over control of the Bulgarian Political Mission. Radoyeff was also recalled, but his stay has been extended, possibly at the request of the general.

COMMUNISTS NOW IN CONTROL

Not long after Stoycheff's departure, orders came from Sofia for the dismissal of the two non-Communists in the station, Choukanoff and Pundeff. Their services were terminated on March 31. Now that the Communists are in complete control, it can be expected that men approved by the Comintern will be sent to replace the discharged staff members.

An indication of the type of Bulgarian representative that will be assigned to the Washington post was given last fall in connection with the American-Slav Congress meetings in New York. The delegate sent by the Fatherland Front to the Slav Congress was none other than Tsola Dragoicheva, the leading woman Communist in the Balkans. She is secretary general of the Bulgarian Communist Party and a high-ranking members of the Comintern.

Thus by the simple expedient of changing the members of their mission, the Bulgarians can plant Comintern agents in the United States. A close examination of the movements of the other Soviet-controlled diplomats will reveal a similar situation.

It has been many years since the Soviet Union has domesticated the Trojan Horse. He is now galloping rampant in our midst.

The Marines' Last Beachhead?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed that in all congressional consideration of the merging of the armed forces so little attention is being given to the status of the Marine Corps. Personally, I shall question the value of such a merger if it contemplates subordinating the position of the corps. I feel it is imperative that the duties of the corps should be spelled out in detail, its functions specified, and none of its duties left to the personal whim of whoever may become Secretary of National Defense. The Marine Corp's brilliant record of the past 172 years must not be lost sight of and I will do my very best to see that the marines, first to fight, are not the first to be liquidated.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting some articles and editorials covering this very important question. These are taken from the News, of Elmira, N. Y., and the Christian Science Monitor.

THE MARINES' LAST BEACHHEAD?

"From the Halls of Montezuma" is the opening line of the gallant marine hymn. And the closing line may soon be written, "To the Steps on Capitol Hill," citing a pathetic finis to the famous corps.

The marines are now engaged in a desperate battle for survival. Ironically, the struggle for existence is being waged in the very Halls of their own Congress, for which they fought so brilliantly to preserve. It looks as though the Army has booby-trapped the leathernecks into their first, and possibly, their last defeat.

There isn't much doubt about the Army's sabotage of the historic corps. Drew Pearson recently reported Brig. Gen. Frank Armstrong as saying: "As for the marines, you know what the marines are. They are a small fouled-up army talking Navy lingo. We're going to put those marines in the Regular Army, and make efficient soldiers out of them. The Navy is going to end up by only supplying the requirements of the Army Air and Ground Forces."

We haven't seen a denial to the above statement yet, nor have we heard of any reprimand to the general, either. Perhaps they will reduce the marines to a handful of bootblacks for the Army.

The Shores of Tripoli, the Boxer Rebellion, Belleau Woods, Tarawa and Iwo Jima may have been tough, but the Marine Corps will

find the battle on Capitol Hill the toughest of their honorable career, with the malevolent Army brass stacked up against it.

Gen. A. A. Vandegrift has asked that the status of the Marine Corps be spelled out in the merger bill, and not be left to the whim or fancy of the single secretary of defense. Their strength and missions should be clearly delineated. Incidentally, the marines were amphibious troops long before the Army learned how to spell the word.

Where are those certain top secret papers on this subject that were mentioned in last year's hearings on the merger act? General Vandegrift said then that they could be found in the 1478 file of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—in papers all marked "Top Secret." These documents will show that there was a determined effort on the part of the War Deparment to abolish or reduce the Marine Corps to a shameful ineffectuality.

Anyone will grant that sentiment has no place in deciding what military structure will most effectively protect the Nation. Pride in heroic achievement should not be the ruling factor. But the Marine Corps has fought too long and too gallantly to be garroted in the corner of a committee room, without the public being fully aware of the facts.

The best argument for the retention of the corps is not only in their brilliant record for the past 172 years, but rather in their immensely valuable sphere in this atomic age of specialization in warfare. This highly important seagoing and flying corps of top-grade fighting men is a mighty cog in our Nation's defense. And the marines have already launched their atomic-warfare program.

The Marine Corps League cannot be gagged. It is the civilian organization of all-marine veterans, representing over one-half million marines and their families, chartered by Congress in 1937. They will continue to vociferously defend their comrades in service. And they are being backed by 3,500,000 American Legion members and 2,000,000 Veterans of Foreign Wars, as well as many other veteran and civic groups.

But against public indifference, an uninformed Congress, and the heavy artillery of Army brass, this may well be the last beachhead for the marines.

[From the News of Elmira, N. Y.]

GENERAL VANDEGRIFT SHOULD BE HEEDED

The Marine Corps, famed in song, story, and history for its fighting ability, now has its most important fight on its hands. It is literally fighting for its life, as the high brass of the Army and, in some cases, the Navy seek the power to emasculate the Marine Corps and leave it in a position where it can only be assigned inferior tasks in the event of future hostilities.

The unification merger plan for the armed forces threatens the Marine Corps as no Japs or Germans ever did. As the Senate Armed Services Committee pondered this week the question of whether to recommend President Truman's unification plan for passage by Congress, General A. A. Vandegrift, commandant of the Marine Corps, and the most brilliant general in corps history, gave his testimony on the merger.

General Vandegrift did not oppose the main idea of the merger, but he stoutly insisted that the Marine Corps' role and missions be written into the bill and thus make them into law, rather than left to be defined by Executive order of the President. The bill as it now stands, he declared, would leave the Marine Corps "stripped of everything but name—reduce it to a role of military impotence."

"The failure of the bill to assign specific functions to the Marine Corps," said General Vandegrift, "is a source of grave concern to me, for it allows the corps to be stripped of everything but name."

The marines have a hard-won glory and fame. Thousands of them have died on the field of battle. Their ability to overcome almost insuperable odds time and again have won them the respect and admiration of the country and the world. No other fighting outfit occupies the high place in world opinion, a place that approaches reverence in many cases, such as the Marine Corps enjoys.

Army generals have envied since time immemorial the high estate of the Marine Corps in the eyes of the public, and a few Navy admirals are not above suspicion of jealousy. The merger plan is dangerous to the Marine Corps, not as something it can fight and vanquish as it has so many enemies on land, at sea and in the air, but through Washington politics, and the danger is very real.

The fact that interested persons are trying to push the bill through in its present form, and that they are fighting to keep from specifying in exact language the Marine Corps' place in the new arrangement, but insist instead that the Marine Corps be at the mercy of the whim of the President, himself an ex-Army man, is indicative of the deadly danger inherent to the corps in the merger bill as it is now written.

In company with General Vandegrift, the News has no fear of the ultimate fate of the Marine Corps, if left to any representative body or to the public at large. The gratitude and pride which Americans take in the corps is second only to the famous esprit de corps of its own members and former members. But like the general we are apprehensive of a bill that might be loosely drawn in such a way and would make possible a large degree of interpretation of its meaning. Should the bill be thus loosely drawn and should an Army man be appointed to the post of Secretary of National Defense, a post which the unification bill creates, the corps might well become the victim of the fate the general has pointed out.

This newspaper cannot urge too strongly upon our legislators that they listen and give heed to General Vandegrift. There may very well come a time in the future—perhaps in the near future—when this country may again have desperate need of the kind of services rendered to it by the Marine Corps at Belleau Wood, Chateau Thierry, Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Bloody Nose Ridge, and Iwo Jima, to mention but a few of the battles that are responsible for its illustrious fame.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

MARINE CORPS IN DANGER?

The American people have a right to expect that the several branches of the armed forces will adapt themselves in strategy, tactics, and matériel to the demands of a new era in warfare. They apparently desire a practicable merger of these branches. But they do not mean that any one of these branches shall be obliterated or undermined by the jealousy or the ambitions of any other. Traditions, esprit de corps, may be intangibles. But they are priceless. And they cannot be mass-produced like tanks and planes.

The Marine Corps is deeply concerned lest the merger bill, as now written, will mean the reduction of that fraternity of amphibious commandos to the role of ships' detachments and naval base guards. Gen. A. A. Vandegrift has said just that to the Senate Armed Forces Committee.

The Secretaries of War and Navy and the President have agreed that the general functions of the several branches should be defined by an Executive order to be issued when the merger bill becomes law. Mr. Truman's definition of such functions is satisfactory to the Marine Corps. But, the Corps points out, without statutory safeguards any subsequent President by a stroke of his pen could wipe the Marine Corps off the map. The merger bill, furthermore, fails to specify Marine Corps representation on important boards. It omits the long-standing 5-to-1 personnel ratio between the marines and the Navy.

If there were not good historical reasons, the marines might be accused of conjuring up bogy men. But there are. The marines have had to fight extinction more than once from other than foreign enemies. In 1932 a Presidential order to dissolve the Corps into the Army was withheld at the last minute. And the Army, throughout the recent merger controversy, argued for elimination of the Fleet Marine Force. The marines suspect that Army intentions really go much beyond that.

The Army insists vehemently that its purposes are wholly honorable and friendly. If this be true—and we are not passing judgment—the Army, of course, can hardly object to writing safeguards for the Marine Corps into the merger bill itself.

Federated Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper articles and editorials:

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram of May 1, 1947]

FEDERATED EUROPE MAY BE KEY TO PEACE

A little more than 6 months ago, in a speech at Zurich, Switzerland, Winston Churchill revived and strongly urged the idea of a United States of Europe, terming it the only road to economic salvation and permanent peace for the war-weakened smaller nations of the continent. The word "revived" is used because the idea of a federation of European countries is far from new. It was foreseen by George Washington and by Victor Hugo, the latter looking forward to the day when "two huge unions, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, will face and greet each other across the Atlantic."

When Mr. Churchill advanced the proposal anew, it was greeted either as a dream impossible of fulfillment or with the objection that it was designed to build up a western anti-Soviet bloc in Europe and therefore was nothing more than an intended instrument of traditional power politics. The latter view, of course, was the one taken by Russia.

That objection, at least so far as this country is concerned, now has been wiped out by the United States' open avowal of active resistance to Russian expansionism and the spread of communism in Europe. A revived and stable economy in western Europe would form the most effective barrier to communism, and without the necessity for a continuous funneling of funds into the area from this country.

Recent experience has given weight to Mr. Churchill's assertion that federalization is the key to stability in western Europe. A higher level of postwar industry than previously contemplated will be necessary if Germany ever is to become self-sustaining, and certainly if it is to pay reparations on

any such scale as is demanded by Russia. The foreign ministers at Moscow were confronted with the problem posed by the dependence of Europe upon a strong German industry and the danger that an industrially revived Germany again will become a menace to the peace of the world. It seems clear that as a member of a European confederation, Germany could do more to sustain and less to endanger neighboring countries than if allowed to go its separate way.

From first-hand observation, Clayton Fritchey, editor of the New Orleans Item, is convinced that federation offers the only promise of permanent solution of the problem of Germany and western Europe. Recently returned from a tour of Europe, he writes:

"It goes without saying that to rescue Europe by federation will be difficult, but to save it without federation is impossible. The nations of western Europe have reached the same crisis that once faced the 13 original American States—they can hang together or they can hang separately."

This statement and the realities in Europe argue strongly for adoption of a joint resolution introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and Congresssman BOGGS, of Louisiana, which reads that "the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News of May 4, 1947]

UNITE OR PERISH?

Henry Sowerby, assistant foreign editor of the Christian Science Monitor, notes that several important movements toward creation of a United States of Europe have been under way for sometime. One is sponsored by Winston Churchill; another by Prof. A. Brugmans, Dutch savant; with another former Premier Paul von Zeeland, of Belgium, is associated; and the president of the Pan-American Union, Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, recently issued an appeal for American support of a European federation—a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

We must unite or perish, some of the most outspoken advocates of federation in Europe say. They point to the example of the United States of America, where millions of citizens of many racial stocks have been able to live in amity these many years, to share such prosperity as modern Europeans have never known. They argue that unity in Europe, with trade barriers removed and commerce moving freely, would insure economic restoration and lasting peace.

The inability of the foreign ministers to reach agreement thus far on major problems born of the war will lend new strength to these several movements toward federation. The chief obstacle, admittedly, is Russian fear that any organization is designed to create a western bloc against her. It is the urgent task of statesmanship to convince the Soviet leaders that efforts to insure unity through agreement are designed solely to promote and maintain peace in Europe and throughout the world.

[From the New Orleans Item]

THE PROBLEM OF GERMANY—FEDERATION: AN END TO MILITARISM

(By Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler)

(Nobel peace prize winner and president of Columbia University, Dr. Butler made the following remarks during a recent address before the Pilgrims of the United States:)

The time has come to consider how the German people can be organized and put back upon the field of contemporary history in order to resume the accomplishments which they were making 50 and 60 years ago, before the militaristic impulse took possession of them.

In my judgment, this reorganization must take the form of federalism. It must resemble the organization of the American Government and the American people if we are to accomplish what awaits us.

I have reference to the federal system of government, which, as American experience shows, is in fact the most effective possible for a nation which like our own, like Great Britain, or like Germany, covers a wide area, a large population, and has many points of contact with the economic and intellectual life of the moment.

We have had the federal form of government from the adoption of our Constitution. But it is not generally known that England adopted what is really the federal form of government in succession to the British Empire, by the Great Statute of Westminster, enacted in 1931. At that time, the British Empire passed into history as a phase and the British Commonwealth of Nations came into existence as descriptive of the organization of what had been the British Empire.

The story of how that happened is not generally known. In 1921, while making my usual annual visit to England, I received a confidential telephone message from the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, asking me to come to Downing Street at once.

I went at once to Downing Street, and Mr. Lloyd George, taking me aside and speaking in entire confidence, told me that he was to have at the week end at Chequers, the country home of the Prime Minister, a group of Prime Ministers of the Dominions. They were going to discuss questions of political organization and international relations. They would like me to be present in order to answer questions which might arise relative to the experience of the United States.

On Friday afternoon I drove down to Chequers and I found that the distinguished guests had already arrived. There were the Prime Minister of Canada, the Prime Minister of Australia, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, and two distinguished representatives of the people of India. The only absentee was the Prime Minister of South Africa.

On Saturday morning the Prime Minister introduced a subject which he desired to have discussed. He told us all that the three Prime Ministers who were there had told him that unless some new arrangement were made their countries were prepared to withdraw from the British Empire and to set up independent existence, through revolution, if necessary. Canada, Australia, and New Zealand were not willing to remain members of the British Empire. They desired to be in a position to maintain their devoted loyalty to the Crown and to accept the principles of democracy as worked out by Great Britain since Magna Carta, but they were not willing to accept the control of the British Parliament or the Foreign Office.

Therefore, the question was, "What could be done?" I listened with great interest, because I saw that I was present at the crossroads in the history of Great Britain, and possibly in the history of the modern world. They were searching for a name to substitute for "empire." After listening for an hour or two, I called their attention to the fact that we in the American Colonies had had three Commonwealths. We had the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Commonwealth of Virginia, among three of the Original Thirteen Colonies. And I suggested that they consider the word "Commonwealth."

But what else could be done to show the relationship between these colonies and Great Britain and how could it be phrased without bringing them under the control of Parliament again?

Finally, the word "nations" was suggested, the British Commonwealth of Nations, and after 2 or 3 hours of discussion, they agreed unanimously to accept British Commonwealth of Nations as a substitute for the existing title, British Empire.

Then the question came, what was to be done about it? Lloyd George asserted definitely that none of those present should mention what had been said or done, that no one should mention the conference or the fact that it had been held, that the matter should be left to him to see what could be done.

The consequence was, that after 10 years, the British Parliament passed the famous Statute of Westminster, in 1931, recognizing the British Commonwealth of Nations, and then the British Empire passed into history.

When that statute went into effect, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa became independent nations, directly related to the Crown, but wholly free from authority of Parliament. That has worked so well, that they are in better relations with the Mother Country today than they were before. The have their independent foreign parliaments and their independent foreign relations. No act of Parliament of Great Britain affects any one of them, unless their national parliament, so to speak, accepts the act and applies it to itself.

Therefore, they have become, as you see, a federal organization, of a very ingenious and very remarkable kind, not concrete and definite and specific, like the Federal organization established by our own Constitution, but still, a most constructive form of federalism.

Now that has suggested the fact that in facing the question before the world today, which is perhaps of outstanding importance, the organization of Germany, we should be guided by the experience of Great Britain and the United States, and should use the federal principle under which to restate and reorganize Germany.

It was a Sunday evening in December 1884, while still a student at the University of Berlin, that I asked a question of Prince Bismarck. I said to Prince Bismarck, "I often wondered, Your Excellency, why in building the German Reich you did not follow the American federal system, which has worked so well in the United States."

Bismarck took his pipe from his mouth and looking at me said, "Germany, for military reasons, requires a strong and highly organized government." He put the pipe back, and the subject was dropped.

That is a long time ago, but Bismarck stated the specific reason why we should not now reorganize Germany on that basis. We should reorganize Germany on a federal basis, and it can and should be done without delay.

We are living in an age when problems are so imperative and so pressing, that one cannot afford to wait. We should act and act quickly. The time has come to rebuild a peaceful and economic and intellectual Germany and to see to it that the militaristic elements which have so damaged that people and brought them to wrack and ruin during the past two generations are no longer allowed to be effective.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Dispatch of May 6, 1947]

DO WE HAVE A PLAN?

Europe is slipping into chaos while nothing is accomplished on the peace treaty with Germany, the American people were told by Secretary of State Marshall in his radio report after returning from the fruitless Moscow Conference. Yet at the same time Secretary Marshall gave only a counsel of "patience, patience." If the State Department

has any other proposal up its sleeve, none has been disclosed.

Yet many students of world problems, both in Europe and the United States, have a plan. It calls for a union of western European states, predominantly economic, but also to some extent political, into what has come to be known as a United States of Europe. Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat of Arkansas, Senator THOMAS, Democrat of Utah, and Representative BOGGS, Democrat of Louisiana, have introduced in Congress a resolution reading in full:

"That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

It is no new idea. Disregarding such early advocates as Henry IV, William Penn, Immanuel Kant, and Victor Hugo, the proposal was pushed after World War I by so practical a statesman as Aristide Briand, 10 times Premier of France, and is now supported by hard-bitten Winston Churchill.

In fact, under Briand's instigation, the 27 European states that were members of the League of Nations met in Geneva in 1930 to discuss ways and means of creating a United States of Europe. The conference got nowhere fast. The delegates praised the principle, disagreed violently on how to achieve it. Some objected that a body outside the League would weaken the League. Others disagreed with the Briand thesis that political should precede economic unification. Others saw an attempt at economic and financial rivalry with the United States.

It will be noted that the Soviet Union was not represented. Some of the delegates at Geneva in 1930 thought it futile to project a United States of Europe with the largest and most populous European state left outside. Others even saw in the 1930 conference another attempt to strengthen the existing cordon sanitaire against Moscow.

At all events, any move to create a United States of Europe in 1947 would in effect be an anti-Soviet move. The great difference would be that in 1930 the Soviet Union was on the defensive, in 1947 it is on the offensive. The move today would be an attempt to avert the chaos which is threatened by the Soviet tactics in international affairs and which the Soviet Union is widely suspected of actually desiring. If objection is raised that a union of western Europe now would create two worlds instead of the one world visualized by the United Nations Charter, the answer would be that in actuality Europe is already divided into two worlds.

Many Americans observe blithely: "If the Thirteen States could create a Federal Union in 1789, why can't the countries of Europe, at least of western Europe, create their own United States in 1947?" But the problem isn't so simple as that.

In 1789 the former British colonies had recently been united in war and had much the same attitude toward all foreign nations. In the war recently ended, Italy, Germany, and Austria were on the losing side; Spain was pro-Axis; Portugal, Switzerland, and Sweden remained neutral; and certain of the western European states harbor pro-Soviet minorities which are powerful both politically and economically.

[From the Herald Tribune of New York of May 10, 1947]

REPORTS AMERICANS SEEK UNITED EUROPE—COUDENHOVE-KALERGI SAYS PUBLIC OPINION IS FOR IT

PARIS, May 9.—American opinion, both public and official, strongly approves the formation of a United States of Europe, Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, president of the Pan-European Union, said here today.

Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, who has just returned to Europe from the United States said "Americans simply can't understand why we on the Continent have tolerated anarchy and autarchy instead of uniting within the type of federal structure thas has made the United States the richest nation in the world."

The count predicted that the first step in achieving the ideal of a federalized Europe would be a union between England and France, and that Belgium and Holland would soon follow suit.

The Scandalous Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from PM for May 11, 1947:

THE SCANDALOUS HOUSING SITUATION

WASHINGTON.—If Wilson Wyatt wants to chortle an "I-told-you-so" about the collapse of the national housing program, he is entitled to the pleasure. But that would be a dubious substitute for the new home construction the Nation needs.

Five months ago, Wyatt was forced out of his job as Housing Expediter by the intense opposition of George Allen, then Reconstruction Finance Corporation Director; Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder, and the private real estate and construction lobbyists.

The lobbyists cheered. They had been saying for months that, if only the Government would get out of the way and take Wyatt out of their hair, private enterprise would build the housing the country—and especially war veterans—demanded.

A typical statement was made by the board of directors of the National Association of Home Builders—an organization which calls itself "small business"—in October 1946. Claiming that price ceilings and other regulations impeded production of building materials, the NAHB demanded "complete removal of controls."

This would "bring many benefits to veterans," said the NAHB, and would "speed home building by making possible a more balanced production of materials and greater output."

The NAHB and the other lobbying groups—the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Home and Property Owners Foundation—got what they wanted. Wyatt quit when President Truman refused to back him in a quarrel which, at the moment, centered around Wyatt's insistence on pushing industrialized (prefabricated) housing and George Allen's refusal to lend large amounts of RFC money to industrial housing.

Price controls on building materials and on completed new houses went out the window.

Here are the results:

Whereas under Wyatt's program 1,000,000 housing units were started in 1946 (including temporary units), some Government housing officials think we will be lucky to get half a million units started in 1947.

Privately financed nonrural new units started in March of this year totaled only 49,800 as against 60,449 in March 1946—a decrease of approximately 20 percent.

Privately financed new units started in April of this year fell even further behind April 1946 when 66,138 new units were started. Final reports on April 1947 are not yet compiled but the estimated decline is from 33⅓ to 40 percent.

Wholesale building materials costs have skyrocketed 25 percent in the 5 months since controls were lifted. Lumber costs are up 50 percent since July 1946, and paint costs up 80 percent.

Labor costs are starting to climb again (hourly wages in the housing-construction trades increased 16 percent between January 1945 and January 1946) but spotty unemployment is spreading. Demand for skilled laborers (carpenters, electricians, etc.) is still good, but the United States Employment Service, reporting that most of the 25,000 unemployed construction workers in New York are unskilled laborers, attributes the cause to the failure of building construction to expand as anticipated.

An investors' and buyers' strike has hit the housing market. The cause of the investors' strike is not only high prices—a small house now costs almost exactly twice as much to build as 10 years ago—but what is termed uncertainty. Investors, who normally finance 90 percent of the country's new housing, refuse to take a chance on further price increases and a subsequent collapse of the markets which would make it impossible for them to amortize their investments.

The lobbyists who forced out Wyatt and Government controls are now singing a different tune than they were last August and October.

Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, expresses skepticism about the need for new housing. Whereas the general estimate is that about 2,500,000 new housing units are urgently needed to care for families now living doubled up—with relatives or friends—Nelson says the only measure of need is what the housing industry can sell—and he means what the industry can sell at present price levels.

(What this means was shown last Wednesday when the New York Times reported that Manhattan builders and investors were on a buyers' strike against high construction costs. The Times survey said that projects totaling up to $100,000,000 were being shelved in the face of a minimum need for more than 75,000 to 100,000 apartment units.)

A Census Bureau survey in July 1946, showed that about 1,600,000 married World War II veterans were living doubled up, and housing production since then, according to Government officials, has not substantially reduced the number.

Nelson and NAREB do not accept the housing goals and needs officially recognized in the pending Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill—1,200,000 units a year for 10 years. They oppose the socialism of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill's public housing sections and the Federal intrusions of its sections to stimulate private construction.

"If we should have a recession," Nelson says, "we wouldn't hear any more about the housing shortage. People have always lived doubled up. That is normal."

Nelson and NAREB are backing the Wolcott bill, passed by the House, which would virtually force a 15-percent increase in rent levels and wipe out remaining Government controls by which building materials are channeled into residential rather than commercial and business construction.

The recession which, in Nelson's viewpoint, would end the housing shortage by forcing people to stop talking about it, is feared by many economists as a serious possibility, and they frankly fear that the slump in housing construction is a first symptom.

The National Housing Agency in its bulletin No. 4 points out that a construction slump followed World War I ahead of the general recession of that period, and events after World War II have followed the same general pattern.

Residential construction boomed quickly after the November 1918 armistice which ended World War I, reached its peak in the summer of 1919, and then dropped 67 percent until December 1920. Total construction—business and commercial as well as residential—dropped from February 1920 until the end of 1921.

Violent fluctuations in building-material prices were a major cause of the fluctuations in production. Wholesale prices went up 72 percent from April 1919 until April 1920.

The NHA comments dryly that this "boom and bust episode" robbed the country of "considerable momentum" in producing badly needed housing. It adds that after a second boom, lasting until through 1925, residential construction again went into a decline "long before the 'new era' ended in collapse" in 1929, and "then caved in along with the rest of the economy."

The present decline in residential construction is a major factor in calculations of Government experts who have recently indicated a "recession" may soon be expected. Whether the "recession" will again be followed by an even sharper "boom-and-bust" is a long-range question with which none of President Truman's administration spokesmen seems disposed to deal.

Frank Creedon, Wilson Wyatt's successor as Housing Expediter with particular responsibility for veterans' housing, has warned constructors, materials producers, and labor that they are pricing new housing out of the market. Creedon has granted market guaranties to 12 prefabricated-housing manufacturers to encourage production of nearly 100,000 units.

Other sources within and without the Government make several major recommendations for encouragement of new construction:

Prompt enactment of the TEW bill, which would grant low-interest rates and long-term loans to private builders and finance some public housing. This bill, approved by the Senate Banking Committee, has not been placed on the Republican priority list for action by its chief sponsor, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio.

Amendment of the TEW bill to insure private builders against major losses through a future economic lapse if they take a chance and construct rental housing promptly.

A vastly expanded program of market guaranties to prefabricated housing producers. This is necessary, advocates say, to break the vicious circle in which, at present, unit costs cannot be lowered except through mass production, and mass production cannot be started except with a mass demand.

An across-the-board cut in materials and labor costs. It is considered unlikely that the building-trades unions would accept a cut, at least unless steady work was assured. AFL officials say that building costs are 30 to 33 percent of total construction costs, a figure unchanged since before the war, and that charges of reduced labor efficiency are explained largely by lags in the flow of materials last year and poor scheduling of the materials flow.

WILLARD SHELTON.

Unification of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, when I was back home recently I was disturbed to have two friends of mine who served with great distinction in both World War I and World War II tell me they had heard rumors that there was so much opposition to the bill for unification of the armed services that it had been decided to pigeonhole the measure for the time being.

I hastened to disabuse their minds and to explain that there are so many important matters vigorously competing for congressional attention that it is extremely difficult for the leadership to establish an agenda, and impossible to do it in such a way as to satisfy everyone. I assured them, however, that although the unification measure was in no sense a partisan issue, it would receive as early consideration by this Congress as legislative pressure permits.

It seems to me absolutely essential in the organization of our national defense that we solve this problem promptly. My only reservation regarding the legislation which is now pending is that it does not go far enough. If there is one lesson the last war taught us, it is the necessity for a unified command, not alone in the field, but also at the top level. We have one national defense problem: We have so many dollars, so many men, and so many materials which we can devote to national defense without pinching ourselves elsewhere. Common sense demands that those dollars, men, and materials be distributed over the entire defense program in accordance with a single master plan, in order that there be no unnecessary duplications and shortages.

In the past, hearings on War and Navy Department budgets were held before two congressional subcommittees, each of which was ignorant of what the other was doing. Moreover, it was repeatedly stated at those hearings that the Army estimates were prepared without knowledge of the Navy estimates, and vice versa.

It is true that some slight integration of the two budgets may have taken place when they were considered by the Bureau of the Budget and by the full Appropriations Committee. But even so, it is no exaggeration to say that in both the legislative and the executive departments of the Federal Government the problem of national defense was viewed for budgetary purposes not as a single problem but as two separate problems.

There is no justification for continuing to prepare our defense program in this fashion. To do so is to invite both danger and waste. Until defense planning is conducted by the services jointly, until some means has been devised whereby conflicts and duplications between the two are automatically resolved before legislation is enacted and appropriations made, until we know that differences in treatment and seeming duplications are due to planning and not to chance and lack of planning, not until that time can we be sure that we are getting full value for our defense dollars. I hope action on this matter will be taken promptly.

Nor, important as it is, does the saving of money furnish the principal reason for a program of unification. To provide an adequate defense for this country until that blessed time arrives, for which we should constantly work and ardently pray, when international disarmament and good will become enthroned, our armed services must play together as one team under a single captain to make final decisions. In that course alone lie the most important economies, of lives and resources, both of which it is imperative, at this challenging hour, should be utilized to the maximum of efficiency.

In this connection, pursuant to leave granted, I include a portion of an editorial from the New York Times, two editorials from the Washington Evening Star, and one from the Washington Post:

[From the New York Times]

The unification bill which the committee is studying was agreed to after months of conferences and compromises among the military forces. It is an attempt to translate into formal organization the better points of voluntary cooperation that were worked out during the war. It seeks to synthesize the costly lessons of the war and organize the best possible defensive military organization. The time it took to work out the compromise is an argument in itself for adoption of the bill.

It is gratifying to know that cooperation among the services on air organization, forced on them by circumstances, has resulted in a large saving to American taxpayers. We take this as an indication that even larger savings will be possible if the cooperation begins before appropriations are granted and not afterward. That is what the bill provides.

But saving money is not the basic reason for unification. The real necessity is to save us from another Pearl Harbor, to save us from the divided command that so hampered operations in the early days of the war, to save us from a revival of the old service jealousies that had such tragic consequences when carried over to the battlegrounds, to give us one quarterback to call the signals and not three the next time our team has to take the field.

If the men who were in command during the war were to continue in command indefinitely the present system of cooperation might work out almost as well as unification. But many of them already have retired. Many more are nearing retirement age. The lessons they learned through experience may not be so obvious to another generation of Army, Navy and Air Force officers. Fleet Admiral Halsey, in testifying during the war in favor of unification, predicted that if it wasn't pushed through in 6 months after the war ended it never would be. The Admiral misstated the time element, but he was basically right in his judgment that lessons are quickly unlearned unless they are translated into actualities.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

MERGER STALEMATE

Advocates of Army-Navy merger legislation have good reason to be worried over the painfully slow progress being made at the Capitol in reporting out a bill that can pass at this session of Congress. It is becoming increasingly evident that a virtual stalemate has developed in the Senate Armed Forces Committee over the administration bill, a stalemate which, unless broken very quickly, could mean the death of this important defense measure as far as the present session is concerned.

The differences which exist among committee members over the President's bill do not appear to be insurmountable. Most of the objections raised against the bill are

met in the proposed Executive order to be issued under the legislation. It would be a relatively simple matter to transfer to the bill some of the language of the order and thus eliminate much of the criticism which is delaying action.

For example, several influential members of the committee feel strongly that the powers of the supersecretary of national defense should be more clearly defined in the bill and that the integrity of naval aviation and the Marine Corps should be guaranteed not only in the Executive order, as is the case now, but also in the basic legislation. These members fear that unless the bill is made more explicit, an arbitrary secretary sometime in the future with Executive approval, could reduce naval aviation and the Marine Corps to a state of military impotence. But efforts to revise the bill so as to preclude such arbitrary action have been resisted by other committee members and by the War Department on the ground that the bill should not be cluttered up with "detail." Guaranteeing the preservation of naval aviation and the marines is something more than a detail to those vital branches of the Navy, however.

The really alarming aspect of the merger delay is the effect it is having on joint Army-Navy planning for national defense. Neither service feels free to go ahead with major undertakings deemed essential to the security of the United States until they know where they stand under the merger legislation. The planning, manning, maintenance, and operation of certain bases and installations are matters of uncertainty until Congress has acted finally, one way or the other.

In these circumstances, it behooves Congress to come to some decision expeditiously. It can be done if the task is approached on a give-and-take basis and with an eye to the dangers of interminable debate. Perhaps the best way to thresh matters out and come to an agreement would be around the conference table—at a meeting of committeemen, heads of the armed services and perhaps a representative of the President. There have been enough indications recently of a disposition to compromise to warrant the belief that such a round-table discussion might break the present deadlock and start the merger moving toward reality.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

BRING IT TO A VOTE

The national security is suffering from the adverse effects of continued congressional delay in coming to a final decision on Army-Navy merger legislation. After months of uncertainty, the War and Navy Departments find themselves facing the approach of another fiscal year without knowing whether they are to be two departments or one, whether they must plan and act independently or together, whether the things they do today will be approved or countermanded under the supersecretary set-up. It is inevitable that the administrative machinery of both departments should be slowed up by the exasperating state of indecision now prevailing.

It is true that there have been interminable delays in past years on the hotly debated question of armed forces unification, but, fortunately, the Nation in those days faced no crisis demanding prompt action. Numerous other merger bills have been argued and allowed to die in committee pigeonholes, without impairing the national defense. A far different situation confronts the Army and Navy in this troubled postwar era, however. The peace is not yet secure. An atomic race is reported to be under way, pending adoption of international compacts precluding possibility of another war.

This is no time for our armed forces to be holding in abeyance their vital preparations to strengthen themselves in a period of revolutionary changes in military equipment, tactics, and strategy. They cannot afford to relax in their planning and training for even a day. Yet they cannot push forward with the requisite determination and confidence when they do not know whether they are to travel separate, though closely parallel, paths, or one course as a consolidated unit.

It is time that Congress make up its mind, one way or the other, on the merger proposition. The subject is too important to be permitted to expire in a pigeonhole. Failure to take decisive action now, for or against unification, will only extend the demoralizing period of uncertainty for our defense planners and further weaken our military position. Congress will be doing a grave disservice to the Nation if it permits this to happen, for want of a vote on the merger issue.

[From the Washington Post]

STIMSON'S ADVICE

Henry L. Stimson's succinct comments on behalf of the armed-forces merger are entitled to the respect due the advice of an elder statesman. During two terms as Secretary of War and one as Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson had an opportunity accorded few Americans to see our national interests in long perspective. His personal integrity rules out any possibility of partisanship. When he stands unequivocally for prompt passage of the unification bill now before Congress, he does so because his long experience has convinced him that this unified approach to national security is organizationally necessary in a modern world.

Mr. Stimson uses the phrase "strategic economy" to describe one of the principal advantages he envisions in the merger. He refers, of course, to economy in lives and natural resources in any future war, and he notes that such an element might well be critical. He cautions that we cannot continue to operate with the wasteful opulence that has characterized our efforts in the past. In this connection the saving in dollars as well as resources cannot be ruled out, especially at a time when Congress has such a penchant for reducing expenditures. A recent report by Lt. Gen. Leroy Lutes, Army procurement director, adds weight to Mr. Stimson's argument. During the years 1942–45, the Lutes report charges, "duplication and lack of coordination in the supply activities of the Army and Navy" cost the staggering sum of $1,150,000,000. Regardless of other compelling considerations in the merger, the monetary saving alone should make Congressmen take the proposed integration seriously.

Mr. Stimson demolishes the fear expressed Tuesday by Admiral King that the powers of the proposed Secretary of National Defense would constitute a danger. A strong Secretary, Mr. Stimson points out, is essential to accomplish the job, but the Secretary of National Defense is only to be delegated some of the authority over the defense establishment that now rests upon the President. Nor is the bill now pending a partisan bill favoring one service over another. Mr. Stimson emphasizes the careful study and the basic compromises and agreements that went into the measure endorsed by leaders of both the Army and Navy. The crux is expressed by Mr. Stimson in this passage: "I would like to stress the importance of considering this organization of the armed forces from the standpoint of fundamentals rather than details. If the basic plan of centralization can be determined upon, hundreds of vexing problems will fall into proper perspective. They will lose much of their controversial aspect and be decided as a matter of specific planning rather than of primary policy." These words should be pondered deeply on Capitol Hill.

Russian Auto Factory Boasts of No Strikes and Certain Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith an article by Russell Barnes entitled "Russian Auto Factory Boasts of No Strikes and Certain Market."

Because this is such an accurate description of the Russian automobile plant, I should like to place it in the RECORD. In fact, I visited this plant myself in the fall of 1945 and have frequently described it to my friends. The article follows:

RUSSIAN AUTO FACTORY BOASTS OF NO STRIKES AND CERTAIN MARKET

(By Russell Barnes)

Moscow, April 28.—The average American industrialist would consider himself well off if he could solve his problems as successfully as has Ivan Likhachev, director of the Stalin automobile works and still the largest producer in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Likhachev, a stocky Russian in a grey blouse, manager of the Stalin plant for 21 years, a member of the Communist Party, sat in his office beneath portraits of Lenin, Stalin, Molotov and Kaganovich and gave this report on his operation:

There have been no strikes in 21 years and he does not anticipate any.

PLANT HAS NO LABOR TROUBLES

The plant has no labor troubles. The Government fixes wages.

The plant works two 48-hour shifts.

Approximately 85 percent of all wages are paid on a piecework basis.

Labor is short but there are plenty of raw materials.

Sales are no problem because the Government takes the entire output.

The change-over for new 5-ton truck which is set for production later this year will require about two weeks. Mr. Likhachev's chief complaint is that it takes a year to 18 months to obtain tool deliveries from the United States, and he suspects politics may be involved.

LIMOUSINE LOOKS LIKE PACKARD

The Stalin plant, which was established in Czarist days, is primarily a truck producer. Mr. Likhachev said it produces a luxury limousine, which greatly resembles a Packard, at the rate of one daily. A new passenger car model is in the works but the director said its design is secret. Asked about the resemblance between the handsome limousine and American models, Mr. Likhachev replied:

"Some parts have been taken from various cars. It is not necessary to get something new when all parts of automobiles have been invented. We are only manufacturing one car a day of this class because we don't need any more."

Asked the size of his labor force, Mr. Likhachev replied it numbered several tens of thousands. But he was more communicative about labor conditions.

AVERAGE PAY 900 RUBLES

He said the average pay in his plant is 900 rubles a month, but it is possible for a skilled worker with bonuses to receive up to 2,500

rubles. It is impossible to translate those incomes into dollars, not only because the ruble has no fixed dollar equivalent, but also because a worker considers the quality of his housing, the amounts of his food and consumer goods, and other such factors as part of his remuneration.

Mr. Likhachev, in addition to the fact that the Government fixes wages, attributed his lack of labor trouble to the speed with which grievances are handled. He said every case is decided within 48 hours. The bulk of complaints, he declared, concerned job quotas, or norms as they are known in Russia.

WORKERS MAY LEAVE

The Stalin plant also operates 23 restaurants and 40 buffets in addition to theaters and vacation resorts for workers. When the plant is closed for retooling or men otherwise are forced to lay off, they receive three-fourths of their basic pay.

During the war men were frozen on their jobs, but now, with the permission of his factory manager, a worker is able to quit and take another job.

Asked about plant efficiency, Mr. Likhachev, who has visited America three times and seemed to be familiar with Michigan plants, declared:

"It is equivalent to American truck plants. We turn out a vehicle with 182 man-hours of work."

MACHINE TOOLS ARE AMERICAN

A partial trip through the Stalin plant revealed it to be a collection of old factory buildings plus some of modern type. All machine tools seen were American except for a few of German manufacture. Materials generally are moved by hand and by truck rather than with conveyors.

The truck production line, which clears from 120 to 200 trucks daily, resembles a Detroit line except for the absence of feeder lines. Parts are stored along the line. Because of the small production of limousines, there is no power line—models are pushed along from operation to operation. But because this job is practically custom-made throughout, the plant seemed more modern and contained the latest models of machine tools.

All told, there are three plants in Russia manufacturing passenger cars and five producing trucks. But plants also turn out other Government work. The Stalin works, for example, also is producing parts for tractors and agricultural machinery. Signs about the factory urged workers to speed the output of farm machinery to help collective farms increase the food supply.

The Stalin works at Moscow does not appear as efficient as Michigan plants but undoubtedly it is producing large numbers of simple, medium capacity trucks, and a trickle of handsome luxury passenger cars.

Housing Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from PM for May 11, 1947:

UNIONS, DO YOUR HOUSING JOB
(By Fiorello H. LaGuardia)

Just as was to be expected, housing construction has come practically to a standstill. With the exception of very little public or institutional housing, highly subsidized in one way or another, there is no construction in sight. The lay-off in the building trades has not only commenced but is well on.

In this instance, I unhesitatingly state that the real estate interests are entirely justified in not venturing any new construction at present costs. I have never hesitated to blame real estate when it is in the wrong. It is simply impossible for any prudent investor to risk construction at present costs. But, what is more, it is impossible to estimate from one day to another the actual construction cost. This goes for material as well as labor. New housing, at present construction costs, would be beyond the rental reach of the average American family.

The building trades are making a most serious mistake. The present policy has brought about almost a complete stoppage of housing and a great reduction in nonhousing construction. Because of this policy, the lay-offs have started and widespread unemployment in the building trades is bound to follow.

What is most tragic is that another building year in housing has been lost. It is now the middle of May, and with the unsettled conditions as well as the failure of Congress to act, and the lack of initiative on the part of the administration in Washington, it is a foregone conclusion that there will be very little housing construction in 1947. Two hundred and fifty thousand families in New York City alone, living in crowded and in some instances unsanitary and in all instances unsatisfactory conditions, are clamoring for a home. At least 5,000,000 more dwelling units are immediately needed throughout the country. These should have been provided last year. At least 15,000,000 more units will be required by 1955.

There is nothing more important in the American way of living than the home itself. We take pride in claiming that our system is better than any other because of our general high standard of living. Yet, through preventable causes, the critical housing shortage is permitted to continue.

To be specific, the building trades have pursued a stubborn and unsound policy. It is not entirely the fault of the top level leadership. It is the fault of many of the various trades. Here, in New York City, a plan was formulated and agreed between the Building Trades Employers Association and the Building and Construction Trades Council, in March 1946, for a 40-hour week at $100 a week. Twenty dollars for an 8-hour day was not a bad settlement. What is more, it would have assured continued employment. This plan was repudiated by several of the trades. In addition to a variance in the hours of work, there are feather-bedding rules, gold-bricking and arbitrary restrictions constantly being invoked which make production uncertain and the cost undeterminable.

When building costs are prohibitive, employment is uncertain. Even highly subsidized Government housing must await stabilization of costs to provide low-rental apartments.

The price of material also enters into present excessive cost. Here is where the Government could be helpful but, to date, either through timidity, lack of vision or downright helplessness, nothing has been done although Congress provided $300,000,000 to aid in the expansion of building material.

Money charges and interest rates continue to be too high. That is something that must be adjusted. The quicker the better. Here, too, Washington has failed to help.

I have been pleading for the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Act, which is the hope of the American family. The provisions of that bill, when enacted into law and with normal conditions, will provide millions of homes. What is more, it will give every American family an opportunity, with a small initial investment, to own its own little home. It will make possible financial institutions, savings banks and insurance companies investing in apartment buildings and multiple dwelling houses. It will provide all the building money that is necessary. The Senate passed the bill in 1946 but it was killed in Committee in the House. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee has again reported the bill, yet no action has been taken in the Senate.

It must be stated, however, that even though all the benefits, the aids, the subsidies, and the encouragement provided in this bill were the law today, it would be difficult if not impossible for much housing to start until the cost of construction is stabilized and at least approaches something within the range of reasonableness. It must be remembered that the cost of construction reflects in the rent.

Labor should take the initiative. It has more at stake than any one else. Unless it does, there will be a break in the ranks and all of the gains obtained through the years may well be lost to the organized building trades. I would hate to see this happen. Besides, a slump in construction may well be the lead to a depression and general unemployment.

The thing to do is to start right here in New York; other cities will follow. Agree on a 40-hour week; accept the $100 a week wage; remove artificial restrictions and feather-bedding rules; take advantage of all improvements in the art and the use of prefabricated material and equipment; demonstrate a willingness to do a good day's work for a good day's wages.

Production must be increased, not curtailed. Employment creates employment. The use of improved and processed building materials, along with prefabricated parts and equipment, means just that much more employment for organized labor. Antiquated methods and restrictions reduce employment and limit construction.

There is so much work available. Once the present obstacles are removed and there is cooperation between all interested groups, employment in construction will be resumed and it will be plentiful, not only for months but for years and years to come.

I am sorry it is necessary to talk in this strain. The facts, however, demand some pretty plain talking at this time.

Attack on Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bruce McCulloch, editor of the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman, has written an editorial regarding farm-product prices. I include it in the extension of remarks in order that other Members of the House of Representatives may read it:

ATTACK ON FARM PRICES

In price discussions, which are very much in vogue just now, it is the popular thing to point to farm product prices as the problem of first importance. In fact, some of the

"experts" leave with the reader the impression that other prices pose no problem at all. Well, it is asserted, maybe they do, in general, but not to compare with food prices.

As the record is read, food prices have advanced more than anything else since the war, and figures are presented to prove it. And the problem—how to get food prices down when Government supports them? The implication is that farmers are rolling in wealth, exacting a defenseless toll on consumers, and threatening the American people with ruinous inflation.

Trying to point the blame on the farmer is not only unfair, it is just plain silly. Consider that farm production, not only last year, but for some years, has been at a record level. If, with this record production, prices are still high, what would prices be under conditions of ordinary production; or, further, under conditions of below-normal production? The farmers don't set prices of their products. It is the buyers who set prices, and in their operations they merely reflect demand. And it may be noted in this connection that Government itself continues a big buyer of foods.

These profound economists who so roundly berate food prices as the arch demon in the inflation picture might stop to consider what happened to food prices during the war years. As every farmer knows, food prices were held down by law. They were not permitted to go up much during the war. So a comparison now with advances since the war is obviously unfair to farm products. And when it comes to wages, not basic pay, but what labor actually costs, these price wizards are strangely silent.

We are not aiming to defend high prices for farm products or for anything else. We do say, up together and down together. It is not fair to single out farm prices for attack, and that is what is being done.

Friendly Relations Between the United States and Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 48, which I introduced, declaring it to be the sense of this Congress that an invitation be extended to the Dominion of Canada to become a member of the Pan American Union, I include an editorial from the Brighton-Pittsford Post bearing on the friendly and cordial relations existing between the United States and Canada.

We cannot stress too much or refer too often to this unparalleled example of good will and amity between neighboring nations, so much needed in these troubled days.

The editorial follows:

FROM THE SEEDS OF INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

The recognition of Good Will Week between this country and Canada is an annual custom, which, as the years pass, grows more and more in importance.

Especially is this true when across the world at large internal and external strife continues, and man meets his fellow man in mortal combat daily. What can be done between two countries can be accomplished between other countries. Of course, the common tongue which exists between the United States and Canada offers a channel of discussion in which no interpreters are necessary, and it is easier to talk over problems affecting the two countries in languages, inflections, and inferences which are common and understood by both nationals.

There is the pride of citizenship which goes with every country's citizens, which is just and proper. There is no idea that Canada would want to adopt the United States any more than the latter country would want to adopt Canada. Individuals sometimes talk in such terms, but the rank and file in both countries have an independence and pride in their own country which would not brook easily the absorption of the one by the other.

This same attitude is found within our own borders, and towns have the same pride in their own boundaries as countries maintain on a larger scale. This is carried down to individual families in our form of society, and it would be unthinkable that two families could be integrated into one common family.

However, more important is the fact that there can be peace between two neighboring families, between two neighboring towns, counties, States, and even between two neighboring countries as evidenced in the latter case by the long border between this country and Canada, still undefended and unguarded, because of the fundamental belief in the integrity of each country.

What a world this will be to live in, when at some future date, men can lay down their arms forever on all borders, as has been witnessed between Canada and the United States. Then will all effort be turned to making production for the enjoyment of all mankind. The savings alone would bring up a standard of living over the world which would fairly overwhelm people. Imagine the money spent by this country alone in World War II going into merchandise of every nature. Its potential possibilities for comfort and luxury, its potential for services to the world are unimaginable.

Under no condition should the effort stop to bring about a form of world union, no matter how imperfect in its beginning, nor how many times it may fail at the outset. A steady attempt down through the ages must some day succeed.

Recurrent pledges of faith between Canada and the United States is another way to raise the flag of peace above a sordid world and point to at least one permanent oasis where trust and affection have supplanted guns and ammunition.

From this seed yet may grow the oak of peace which will spread its branches to cover the world.

Some Are Indiscreet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith a short editorial from the Gulfport-Biloxi Daily Herald under the title "Some Are Indiscreet."

I think the editorial is very timely and wish our military authorities would do something about it.

SOME ARE INDISCREET

We have been utterly unable to understand why Government armed forces officials give out their plans to the world at large—which includes actual and potential enemies. Why do they not keep their secrets, plans, naval information, and projected operations secret? What possible good in letting publicity agents tell all about it? We think it ought to be manifestly obvious to the simplest mind that it is indiscreet and dangerous—at least an unnecessary risk.

We refer to the Washington AP dispatch last week about submarine preparations for operation in the polar region, constructed to detect airplanes passing over that area. Even a child knows what that means. What nation will fly planes (bombers, jet planes, and rocket bombs) over the Arctic? We know, and the armed forces leaders know why these plans, operations, and maneuvers are being provided for—but we shall be more discreet than the official who gave out the information and the man of the news agency who put it on the wires for all the world to know of it.

Has Congress Forgotten?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of May 10, 1947:

HAS CONGRESS FORGOTTEN?

The bituminous coal industry has reason to wonder what Congress is trying to do to it, and why.

Four years ago, Congress wiped out the soft coal stabilization program. That was in the midst of the war and didn't make too much difference at the time.

But during its existence, this program helped the industry work out of the competitive jungle in which it long had been struggling and made possible stabilized prices and standard wage scales.

And, if and when slack markets again develop, another round of ruinous competition may hit the coal industry, put it right back where it was in 1937.

Now Congress strikes another blow at the soft coal industry.

When the stabilization program was eliminated, one valuable function was retained. The Government continued to collect statistics on production, marketing and transportation. This information was tremendously useful to the Government, to the consumers and to the industry itself.

Bituminous operators want this work continued. They are willing to pay for it, but they can't do it themselves—because they immediately get into complications with the antitrust laws. Only the Federal Government can do the job legally.

The Bureau of Mines asked $350,000 to continue compiling these statistics. The Budget Bureau approved the request.

But the House Appropriations Committee struck out the whole appropriation, with the comment that private industry should do the job.

The committee went even farther. It specifically provided that no Bureau of Mines funds may be used to compile economic data on soft coal. But the hard coal industry gets $105,000 for technological research, and an appropriation of $579,000 is allowed for a similar undertaking in the oil and gas industries.

What's the reason for this discrimination? If the need for economy is so urgent, why pick on soft coal alone?

True, the soft coal industry is doing well—right now. But the ravages of the industry's long sickness still are discernible. And if Congress doesn't pay attention, King Coal shortly may become an invalid again.

Permanent Program for American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on Agriculture, United States House of Representatives, on permanent program for American agriculture:

Mr. Chairman, because I represent a congressional district which is predominantly agricultural, I am deeply interested in these hearings, which have for their purpose the development of a permanent policy for agriculture in this country. The Sixth Iowa District consists of 15 counties, located in the heart of the Corn Belt, with a high percentage of cultivated land, and a tremendous production of grain and livestock. Not only our farm people, but also those who live in cities and towns, are absolutely dependent economically upon the prosperity of agriculture. If the farmer suffers in Iowa, then our townspeople likewise suffer. Conversely, a prosperous farming population means prosperity in the centers of population.

I am one of those who believe that this principle applies not only to our agricultural States, but also to our entire economy. Others have appeared before this committee who have gone into technical background of this principle. For my own part, I am impressed by the concept that the farmer, season after season, produces new wealth that never was in existence before. Manufacturing and industry, on the other hand are engaged in processing of products already in existence—changing their form or improving the structure of the material wrought upon. Not so the farmer. He deals with the miracle of new life produced year after year by the bounty of nature.

By this token, and also because the farmer produces the very essential for human existence, food, he occupies a key position in our whole national conomy.

It seems to me there are at least three elements to this problem, to which I wish to allude briefly. They are interdependent, and my presentation does not present a complete analysis. But these elements do represent one man's thinking, who has given serious and careful thought to the vital importance of agriculture.

First, it seems to me that agricultural prices should never be allowed to sink to a point where they will not support the reasonable capital investment in our agricultural structure, plus a decent living for those who till the soil. Having lived in Iowa during the agricultural depression of the 1920's and also the 1930's, I know that the debacle in prices in those two periods was nothing short of disastrous to our people. Many thousands of our farm families lost all savings of a lifetime, and such losses had violent repercussions throughout our entire economy. Such a series of disasters should never again be permitted in this country.

The means and methods of securing an adequate price for farm products, I leave to the wisdom, discretion, and acknowledged ability of this committee. I only suggest that prices for farm products should never reach a point of impending danger for the agricultural producer.

Second, we who live in agricultural areas are more conscious than ever of the utter necessity for soil conservation. That broad term encompasses a wide range of activities, differing in emphasis in various parts of the country. It is certainly true that among all the natural assets given by the Creator to the American people, none is greater or of more value than the fertile soil of our country, so widespread and so abundant in its production.

Already by wasteful and profligate methods, we have wantonly destroyed many of the material blessings of providence. Our American economy is certainly sufficiently mature that we must save and not waste the irreplaceable soil, the one essential and necessary ingredient of any civilization, and indeed the basis of human life on this continent. Already a program of soil conservation is receiving support from the Congress and from the farmers. It should be extended and strengthened.

Finally, I am convinced that all appropriate methods ought to be employed to make life on the farm as attractive and enjoyable as possible. Too often, our farmers have lived a life of unremitting toil and even drudgery, without those amenities of life which we all enjoy and deem desirable. Furthermore, many times rural people do not have the advantages of health and sanitary safeguards, to say nothing of the ordinary comforts of modern life such as electricity and running water. The development of rural electrification has gone a considerable distance in helping this situation. The Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture also has contributed greatly, and should receive our continued support. But we ought not to be satisfied with anything less than a constant effort to lift the level of human comfort and living in our rural areas in the United States.

These suggestions are made to this committee for the purpose of recording my beliefs on those matters of such vital importance to my district, my State, and my country. Yours is the continuing responsibility of grappling with these important and difficult issues.

Jim Eastland Loses One Round in a Fight Against "Stupidity"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an editorial which appeared in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily Clarion-Ledger. This editorial is very timely and is in line with the recommendations of the Postwar Economic Policy Committee to the Congress in December of 1945.

So long as this foolish policy of denuding Germany of all industries, regardless of their nature, is followed, just so long will this country be called upon to furnish billions of dollars' worth of relief to keep the Germans from starving. The editorial follows:

JIM EASTLAND LOSES ONE ROUND IN A FIGHT AGAINST "STUPIDITY"

Senator JIM EASTLAND lost a fight in the Senate Thursday, an effort which would have vastly benefited American farmers and taxpayers had it succeeded, but the manner in which he raised the issue and pressed the fight won for Mississippi's Senator additional recognition by his colleagues as an able and intelligent champion of American agriculture, and an opponent of Government "stupidity."

He headed the move to stop the United States Army from blowing up German nitrogen-fertilizer plants. He tried to do this by offering an amendment to the deficiency bill which carries a $300,000,000 appropriation for food for Europe. The amendment would have forbidden proposed destruction of the German nitrogen fertilizer plants.

Senator EASTLAND contended that the $300,000,000 appropriation for food for Europe would not be necessary if German fertilizer plants were allowed to produce. He contended that this country's serious fertilizer shortage is due mainly to the shipping of thousands of tons of nitrogen fertilizer to Japan and to war-devasted European countries.

"Blowing up these German nitrogen plants is dumb and stupid on the face of it," Mississippi's Senator argued. "It will cause a nitrogen-fertilizer shortage here for years to come. If the German plants were put into operation, they could produce sufficient fertilizer to supply the needs of all Europe."

Senator EASTLAND'S amendment was blocked by a point of order insisted on by Senator KNOWLAND, California Republican. The Commercial Appeal's Washington correspondent reported:

"The move, in the form of an amendment offered by Senator EASTLAND to the deficiency bill, threw that body into an uproar with more than a dozen Senators being on their feet at one time, all attempting to speak, although a point of order is not debatable.

"Support of the amendment came from both Democrats and Republicans with Senator WHERRY, Republican whip, vainly appealing to Senator KNOWLAND to withdraw his point of order that the amendment was an attempt to write general legislation into an appropriation bill.

"President pro tempore VANDENBERG upheld the point of order after announcing he had allowed the debate for his illumination."

That point of order defeated Senator EASTLAND'S move, but, as the news story adds, "The Senator said he was not giving up the fight and the amendment will be tacked onto some other bill where it cannot be killed by a point of order."

Maybe by then enough others, besides Senator VANDENBERG, will have been illuminated regarding this stupidity to enable adoption of the Eastland amendment.

Compulsory Sickness Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, as a stanch supporter of free enterprise, unhampered by governmental regimentation, I wish to call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the

Christian Science Monitor, revealing efforts to revive a program of Government-sponsored sickness insurance. In my estimation, such a program would not solve the problem of medical aid to the needy, and would at the same time destroy the incentive and initiative to individual progress in many fields:

ON THE WRONG TRACK

By a surprising turn in politics, a stepping-stone to a national system of compulsory sickness insurance is apparently being fashioned in Washington by Republicans. During the last session of Congress, Senators TAFT, SMITH, of New Jersey, and BALL introduced a bill providing for Government financing of medical-care insurance for families and individuals of low income. Many thought this simply a political maneuver to offset the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which was then being played up by Democratic sponsors of socialized medicine.

However, the three Senators have lately been holding conferences at Washington with medical leaders to revise their measure for early reintroduction. Their new plan would have the Federal and State Governments furnish medical care and hospital insurance through private voluntary agencies to a section of the population numbering many millions. Start would be made with a Federal appropriation of $200,000,000 a year for 5 years. This would be turned over in subsidies to the States on the basis of $1 for every $2 a State furnished. The States would manage the experiment.

Obviously, for the Federal Government to promote sickness insurance for a substantial section of the population can easily lead to the Government taking over the coverage for the entire population. After the last election, which seemed to have given socialized medicine a sharp set-back, ardent advocates of Government insurance could ask for nothing better than a plan which elsewhere has proved an entering wedge for compulsion. A number of outstanding medical authorities feel that these Republican Senators are mistaken in pushing a Government-sponsored sickness-insurance program.

Better ways of providing medical care for the low-wage and indigent group should and can be found without venturing toward a system of Government insurance that in practice has proved typically bureaucratic and unprogressive.

The Lookout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook:

THE LOOKOUT

So the people may know, including those who arrived in Santa Monica this morning and rushed around this afternoon hunting a place to sleep, we take this occasion to say the birth of the BlockHead Club was not as miraculous as that of a Congressman but came about as a sequence visible to the naked eye.

Santa Monica was buried many layers deep in organizations, yet no one seemed satisfied. The organizers kept organizing. The past presidents formed a club.

To do something to stem the tide and prevent the past vice presidents and the past secretaries and even the past outer guards from banding together and meeting and overeating at banquets, we formed the BlockHead Club. This also gratified our desire to be president of something.

For years we had joined up with everything in town and promptly had been nominated and elected press chairman, though we yearned to wield the presiding officer's gavel and put the previous question.

Only one condition is made for admission to the club. A desire to come in and laugh, coupled with the realization that what one knows is no more than a shadow of what one ought to know and could know with the proper exertion, spells the whole requirement of membership.

Cyrus D. McCarron, president of the chamber of commerce, edged in at the first opportunity and became first vice president. In all there are 57 vice presidents, as well as 100 commissioners, not all of them yet appointed.

Among the outstanding members are Dr. Ernest C. Sandmeyer, president of the Santa Monica City College; Bishop Bertrand Stevens of the Los Angeles Episcopal diocese, who has talked of it on his radio programs; Wyndham Martyn, a mystery novel writer, whose wit convulses audiences wherever he speaks; Nelson Eddy, whose singing delights the Nation; Jefferson Machamer, who is chased by magazines for more illustrations; Mayor Mark T. Gates of Santa Monica, and Representative Donald L. Jackson, who joined before he went to war as a marine. Members from any quarter of the earth are welcome if they can qualify.

Many prominent women of Santa Monica, including members of the Writers' Club, belong. Among them is Jean Leslie, who fills the posts of four vice presidents. Her fourth mystery novel is now on sale.

Some of these women want to make the club slogan "If at first you don't succeed, cry, cry again," but the club president has ruled against it. The argument is that St. Monica brought her son into the kingdom on a tide of tears for his sins. But she also prayed. The club encourages prayer but never a washout of weeping.

The observer will note that the name "BlockHead" is spelled with a capital. This is after the manner of the great Dr. Rufus Von KleinSmid, president of the University of Southern California.

Thus far the club has held no meetings, though there have been clamors for them. Its first banquet will be held whenever the members of the other 278 organizations in Santa Monica (we speak from memory; the figure may be too low) have no other engagement.

CHARLES S. WARREN.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over three stations in Kansas following the passage by the House of the Greece-Turkey loan bill on May 9, 1947:

This evening I would like to consider with you some of the many complexing angles bearing on the proposal of President Truman for a $400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey.

President Truman in laying down this new world expansion doctrine says in substance that the United States Government commits itself to help defend and protect any nation in the world from being overthrown either by aggression or infiltration by another power. This new-world doctrine, committing our Government to the defense of other nations throughout the world which are so threatened, is a thousand times more important than the consideration of the $400,000,000 involved. The President says this move is necessary to stop the spread of communism and the possible overthrow of these two governments leading into the Middle East.

Two questions, as I see it, arise which we should seriously consider. Will this amount of money and what we do for Greece and Turkey under the plan likely stop the spread of communism into the Middle East? The next question arising is how much money and manpower will it take to stop communism in Italy, France, China, and a half dozen other countries in Europe which are on the verge of being thrown over by Communist organizations at the present time? Personally, I seriously doubt whether the money we are called upon to expend and the effort we intend to make in Greece and Turkey will be sufficient to stop the expansion of communism if Russia really desires to go into the Middle East. You can find able men in Washington and throughout the Nation whose judgment is respected on military matters who will tell you that most countries on the European Continent are in such a state of chaos and financial insolvency that Russia, if she so desires, could occupy and conquer the continent of Europe within 8 weeks' time.

Much as I detest the ideology of communism—and let me say here that I yield to no one in our desire to stop communism, for it is a diabolic ideology; it is un-Christian and would set up a police state to govern men—we must not let our hatred of her policies influence our judgment and mislead us in our thinking on so grave a problem as this expansion of foreign policy.

And let me ask at this point, is it not wholly inconsistent to stop communism in Turkey and Greece, at an original investment of $400,000,000, while communism is rampant in these United States? And how much money would the President invest to stamp out communism in this country? He has suggested that it would cost $50,000,000. What kind of consistency is this—four hundred million abroad and fifty million at home?

Another question I want to raise is, with a $273,000,000,000 national debt to start with, can we afford to commit our Government to such a policy that may cost us many billions of dollars, for we will doubtless find that this $400,000,000 is only a first small down payment on the commitment of the American taxpayers to finance and pay out countless billions of dollars to defend and protect the rest of the world.

Let me point out to you that such a move may well wreck our Nation financially, dragging the American people down into abject poverty where we cannot take care of our own people and cannot render further aid to the world. If we, the only great Nation, believing ourselves solvent today, step into this trap and become involved in financing the rest of the world, all Stalin has to do is to threaten a little here, and a little there on starting war on any boundary in Europe till he bleeds this Nation white financially, causing us to finance other threatened Nations with millions of dollars each in their turn, till we wreck our Nation financially.

Nothing is so important to the American people, and to the contribution in leadership it can make to the world for peace in the future, than for us to make certain we keep this country sound financially. Unless

we keep this country sound financially, unemployment, want, and chaos will envelop this Nation as it has other nations under similar conditions. Such a condition will give the Communists in this country who want to overthrow it the very opportunity for which they and Communist Russia are hoping may ultimately happen. We cannot support our Army and our Navy for the defense of this country unless we remain sound financially.

We have expended $3,000,000 in China and we haven't stopped or retarded communism there. We expended over six hundred million on Yugoslavia, millions on Poland, millions on Rumania and Bulgaria, and they are all Communist today and not one of their rulers is friendly to the United States. We have expended over five hundred million on Italy and she is tottering on the brink of communism now.

I submit to you that if this Government wanted to do something in a substantial and in a sensible way to stop world expansion of communism it should have suggested to the other peace-loving members of the United Nations organization that this Greece-Turkish problem be brought with all the force and power before the United Nations organization demanding that Russia and her satellite nations cease and desist putting this pressure on Greece and Turkey. You answer that the United Nations is not completed to the point where it has the power. My answer is that we don't know because we haven't tried it. The United Nations was set up for this purpose and almost a year ago when a like and serious situation arose where Russia would not take her military forces out of Iran, that feeble nation came before the United Nations organization and demanded that it act. It did act, and Russia took her military forces out of Iran.

The only way to call Russia's bluff is to call it before the United Nations, representing 51 nations of the world. In addition to taking this matter to the United Nations, I think that the United States should take the leadership asking other nations to join with her; first, to immediately amend the United Nations Charter, doing away with the veto power; and second, another amendment should be passed that would provide for fixing military armament quotas for nations world-wide. This can be done and should be done without further delay. If these two bold moves were made, Russia would be put on notice before the world and it is the judgment of many of the best minds of this country that the United Nations organization does have the moral power, suasion, and force to stop this expansion in Greece and Turkey by Russia as it did in Iran.

If these amendments were rapidly driven through under the leadership of the United States and Great Britain, millions of subjugated people in Poland who want liberty, millions in Rumania, millions in Czechoslovakia, millions in Greece, millions in Austria, millions in France, Italy, and other nations could then look with hope to the United Nations as a great, powerful living force for liberty, freedom, and peace.

You may answer, if these amendments are made to the United Nations organization Russia may walk out. Well, on her past record, the sooner she walks out the better. This will call her bluff and maybe make her dictatorial leaders think. She should be invited to stay in with the door left wide open, with a standing invitation for her to come back, which no doubt within a short period of time she would do, because she would be given one choice to line up in full, honest, fellowship with the rest of the world for peace, or become an aggressor nation against which 70 percent of the world could be legally hurled, through the United Nations organization. She can join with the rest of the world for peace, or commit national suicide.

Since VJ-day our Nation has contributed over $7,000,000,000 to help feed, clothe, and rehabilitate the European nations and China. We are committed to $1,500,000,000 in relief to other nations this coming year. There are requests for billions of dollars through the Export-Import Bank and a great amount of money will go out through that organization. All of this money must come from the American taxpayers.

While I am willing to go as far as we can to help world humanity, and while I am anxious to oppose the spread of communism anywhere and everywhere, I cannot bring myself to believe that the Truman doctrine is the only approach to these vexing problems.

I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen of the Third Congressional District, that we cannot have world peace unless we cast the burden of keeping the peace of the world on the United Nations organization and back that one organization. We can have peace, world peace, in my judgment, if those who are leading us would reverse their position and join their forces behind the United Nations organization through which, in my judgment, world peace can only ultimately be achieved.

Well, my time's up and I must close. So, once again, thanks for listening, and goodnight all.

National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. HEDRICK
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, the matter of maintaining our national security is of vital interest to every citizen of our land. It is imperative that a method of systematic and specialized training of our manpower be adopted for the protection of our country, yet at the same time preserving the constitutional rights of the individual.

Although I have received some letters from my constituents in support of peacetime military training, I have received many more letters from women's organizations, religious denominations, and mothers, protesting any plan whereby young men would be sent to military installations, coming in contact with older men, and the dangers of a life for which they are unprepared.

For this reason, I have introduced H. R. 3329, providing for regular and specialized training of our young men for a period of 3 years, and their assignment to a reserve component of the land or naval forces for a period of 2 years. The entire training, with the exception of a 2-month period of field or sea training for each year of the 3-year period, will allow these young men to remain at their homes and under the guidance of their parents.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that such training as provided in my bill, H. R. 3329, will not only provide adequate training of our manpower, for the defense of our country, but will be a proper expenditure of funds. It will be a great saving to our taxpayers, and at the same time provide regular defense training for young men of our Nation.

Columnists and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following newspaper article by Marquis Childs from the Washington Post for May 12, 1947:

COLUMNISTS AND POLITICS

(By Marquis Childs)

"Apparently, the Republican idea was that when the New Dealers were repudiated at the polls, automatically their propaganda facilities would disappear and their public effectiveness be curtailed. But that notion turned out all wrong. There are today more New Deal left-wingers astride the channels of communication than before."

That is Frank R. Kent in his syndicated column. This same theme has been sounded, by an interesting coincidence, by Arthur Krock of the New York Times, by Mark Sullivan in the New York Herald Tribune, and by others. It is echoed in a national magazine which editorialized about "lame-duck columnists."

Now Messrs. Krock, Kent, and Sullivan are eminent and important men who have been writing in the press for many, many years. The latter two are widely syndicated. When they join in chorus in an opinion, it has the weight of experience and erudition behind it.

The opinion they express in this instance is that New-Deal writers, whatever that may mean, are preventing the Republicans from carrying out their program in an orderly and effective way by spreading propaganda against the virtues of the Republican objective. It may be presumptuous of me, a comparative newcomer in this business, to raise a doubt.

Yet it does seem that these eminent men put a little too much weight on the influence of writers and commentators—even writers as eminent as they are. Surely they must recall that, for the 12 years Franklin Roosevelt was in the White House, they were almost without exception opposed to his policies. Particularly Messrs. Kent and Sullivan followed an unfailing line of opposition. They delivered frequent jeremiads on the evils of Roosevelt and all his works. In this, of course, they coincided with the editorial opinion of a large proportion of the press.

They were especially vehement in their criticism on the three occasions when Roosevelt was running for reelection. Yet it seems difficult to discover any effect that these and similar strictures may have had on the course of political events in those years.

Perhaps it is nearer the truth to say that commentators may inform their readers—and there are those who honestly try to perform that function. They may flatten them or irritate them by expressing a point of view. But as to exerting a positive influence on the course of political events, there is a great deal of room for doubt.

To use the phrase "lame-duck columnist" seems a little odd, for these three men themselves were for nearly 12 years lame ducks under that criterion. So was the magazine that coined the phrase.

Actually it seems to me to suggest a curious attitude of mind. It suggests that we are to vote our thought and opinion in accord with the election returns. If that is how far we have gone in accepting the totalitarian philosophy, then we are in a bad

way. Thought and opinion are not subject to the veto of a majority. Or they should not be, in any informed democracy.

Within Republican national headquarters here, there are some who take the line that Messrs. Krock, Sullivan, and Kent have expressed. It has come also from Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, who speaks invidiously of New Deal writers.

The natural instinct of the politician is, of course, to look for an alibi. President Roosevelt frequently showed his irritation at the insistent attacks on his policy. If things are not going too well, the politician wants to aim a shotgun at some convenient victim.

In this case, the aim is poor. It is obvious, by mathematical demonstration, not only that the majority of American newspapers are conservative but that the majority of comment which is syndicated is also in that vein.

If one may disagree with so eminent an authority, it sounds a little silly to talk about New Deal left-wingers athwart the channels of communication. It sounds particularly odd in view of the fact that several radio commentators who took a liberal or prolabor tone have now been replaced on the networks by men who are more cautions or more conservative.

The Soviet press is, of course, happily free of opposition opinion. It is one continual chorus of praise and perfection. But that scarcely seems a worthy ideal.

Reduction of Interior Department Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "West Feels GOP Has Put It Back on Pablum Diet," which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Post on May 11, 1947:

WEST FEELS GOP HAS PUT IT BACK ON PABLUM DIET

(By Roscoe Fleming)

DENVER, May 10.—"Sixteen years for the 'winning of the West'—and 16 weeks to lose it," groaned one western Republican as the full impact of the House's slashing of the Interior Department appropriation bill hit him.

It is no mere political protest the Republican Congress is hearing from the 17 States west of the Missouri. It is a deep-throated roar in which old-line Republican organs are joining as heartily as Democratic ones. Nor did Chairman TABER (Republican, New York), of the Appropriations Committee, help his party out here by referring to the thunder as "only the squeal of a stuck pig."

But it is necessary to recapitulate.

RICH SERVING MAID

The West has traditionally felt like a national stepchild, a hewer of wood and a drawer of water in the national household, handicapped in the building of a rounded economy by distance and a late start, and (so most westerners believe) by eastern industrial-financial-political domination which prefers to keep the West as a raw-materials supplier and as a market for eastern manufactured goods.

Yet westerners are aware that the Nation's future lies largely in the vast treasure of resources around them—roaring rivers full of water power, millions of dusty acres that need only water to bloom, trillions of tons of coal, billions of tons of phosphates.

The West is also proudly conscious that its federally developed power plants supplied billions of kilowatt-hours without which the atomics program, the airplane program, etc., might have been fatally delayed; and that more than a billion dollars' worth of food and fiber flowed from Federal irrigation projects during the war.

The West relied on the war impetus, and on national recognition that it could do an industrial job, to push it far along the road toward an integrated, high-income economy after the war. It relied above all upon the national necessity to decentralize in face of the atomic threat.

Further, the West does not forget that it was six western States electing Republican Senators (California, Washington, Montana, Utah, Idaho, Nevada) which capped the Republican congressional victory.

Ever since the election, however, there had been some uneasiness in the West at persistent news references to the intention of the resurgent Republicans to cut off anything that would, to quote one story, "mean luring industries away from the Northeast." But the last thing that anyone out here really expected was that Interior, the Department of the West, would, under pretense of a close shave, be cut right above the chin.

Through its Bureau of Reclamation (irrigation and power), Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey (natural resources), the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, etc., Interior is the Government for many westerners, and Uncle Sam has successively been the face of the Old Curmudgeon and the massive countenance of Mr. Krug.

Yet most of Interior's expenditures have been national investments that have paid off tremendously in increased wealth, productivity, and tax income.

BLOW UPON BLOW

Interior took a savage slashing from the Budget Bureau before its estimates ever reached the House. Then followed the almost 50-percent committee cut, of which only about $5,000,000 was restored on the House floor.

The nature of the cuts was significant: If you want to kill something, you slash at its heart and brain. The heart of Interior's western program was its mighty hydroelectric plants plus the transmission lines to take away the power they generate. The brain was the various planning activities—for such big projects must be planned minutely a decade in advance.

Almost all transmission-line appropriations were cut deeply, or cut out. That would force the Department to sell its power to private companies at the dam, an old goal of the private-utility lobby.

Many a western campaign oration, 15 months from now, will be based on the charge that this shows, rather than a true desire for economy, that eastern Republican leaders are playing footie with the power lobby, now in its fullest flush since the Insull days.

THE "LONG" VIEW

Further along this line the planning activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, which have to do with water storage for new acreage as well as for new power, were cut from $5,000,000 to $125,000. In other words they were eliminated.

This would mean the discharge of 1,000 engineers in Denver alone, and the virtual breaking up of a planning and engineering group that has been called the finest in the world. Similar devastation would be wreaked upon the bureau's seven regional offices, each of which is working on big projects.

At the rate of appropriations left in the bill, it would take from 20 to 50 years to complete various large irrigation-power projects now under way. All the while the Government would be paying the usual construction overhead.

This in face of a severe power shortage in the Columbia Basin, an impending one in California and indications that power elsewhere will be snapped up as soon as it is available.

The Republicans cut off absolutely, the appropriation for Interior's Power Division, which has in charge the biggest nonintegrated power generation business in the world.

GREAT INDUSTRY NIPPED

But power and reclamation aren't the only aspects. The bill virtually cuts off Bureau of Mines research on western coals, which are so different from eastern ones as to demand different conditions of burning and utilization. Some of these researches were far advanced. For example, the high-temperature conversion of lignite coals to gas, gasoline, oxygen, etc., was almost at the industrial stage.

Upon such researches have been based some great hopes, such as that of using western lignite, available by the trillions of tons, to provide cheap gas to beneficiate iron range iron ores now unusable because they are under commercial grade. (At the same time the West notes that researches for utilization of eastern coals, favored by John L. Lewis, were little affected.)

The bill would greatly reduce funds for western nonferrous mineral investigations in the face of growing shortages and of military requests for such investigations.

It would slash the helium program. The West produces a world monopoly of this wonder gas, and, as a result of war development, it is so plentiful that an intensive search for new uses was being carried on, with good results.

POLITICAL REPERCUSSIONS

These are only high lights—but they give you an idea why the West feels it is not true economy to throttle the development of natural resources, and that the slash, in year II of the atomic age, is a blow at the Nation rather than merely at the West.

They are also enough to show why western Republican House Members who glumly obeyed orders and voted against recommitment of the bill, are gnawing their nails; and why western Republican leaders at home feel that a western Democratic upsurge will be difficult to head off in 1948.

Resolutions of Izaak Walton League of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions passed by the twenty-fifth annual conference of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., Chicago, Ill., March 27–29, 1947:

Resolution 4

Whereas Congress has, through various omnibus river bills, authorized so many river projects that no one knows what they all are

or what their ultimate cost or effect will be; and

Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress wisely made a start in analyzing the merits and demerits of such dams and other river projects with the passage of Public Law 732, requiring the assembling and consideration of all vital facts and values through comprehensive biological surveys in advance of authorizations; and

Whereas it will require several years for the required biological surveys to begin to catch up with the engineering surveys already made: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress be urged to declare a moratorium on any further surveys for new river projects until this present imbalance of surveys is corrected; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress and the President be requested, in the interest both of sound conservation of natural resources and sound economy, to bring out for reexamination in line with the intent of Public Law 732, the vast back-log of projects, reported to total more than $6,500,000,000, already authorized.

Resolution 6

Whereas our national parks, national monuments, and wilderness areas of the Forest Service are dedicated to the use and enjoyment of all the people and comprise the bulk of the unspoiled lands that now are, or in the future may be, available to satisfy the constantly increasing demand for such areas; and

Whereas with few exceptions these areas are marred by the existence of interior private land holdings over which the governmental administrative agency has no control, and both their nuisance value to the public and the administration and the ultimate cost of their acquisition increases the longer this obvious job is delayed; and

Whereas the Izaak Walton League of America, other organizations, and individuals have attempted to protect the public interest until Congress shall act in this matter, by purchasing to the limit of their means critical parcels of interior private lands to be held undeveloped until eventually repurchased by the Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress be urged to appropriate without further delay the funds necessary to complete solid Federal ownership within the present boundaries of existing national parks, national monuments, and wilderness areas of the national forests, including the vital roadless area of the Superior National Forest, which amount, approximately $25,000,000, can easily be saved many times over by desirable economies in the budget of certain bureaus whose activities are destructive to natural resources.

Resolution 12

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation was created by act of Congress in 1902 for irrigating arid Federal land for settlement and it is an acknowledged fact that after 45 years of operation the economically sound projects for both public and private land, based upon irrigation alone, have already been authorized or constructed with the result that new projects are obliged to shift much of the actual cost to other fancied benefits under the misleading terminology of "multiple purpose" dams; and

Whereas the actual cost of irrigation projects is commonly far greater than the estimate on which they were authorized and numerous bills are presented to Congress to write off part or all of the principal, reduce the interest or extend the time of payment for the relief of this or that irrigation district; and

Whereas the personnel of the Bureau has progressively increased as the opportunity for additional sound irrigation projects has diminished to the vanishing point: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress be urged to make a thorough investigation of Government irrigation projects, which will show the cost per acre, the principal amounts defaulted and deferred, the loss to farmers through foreclosure because of inability to meet water costs, and other pertinent information determining future irrigation policy; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be requested in the meantime to reduce drastically the personnel of the Bureau of Reclamation to the number actually needed, thereby eliminating the present necessity for surveying and promoting new projects in order to justify the great surplus of personnel on the pay roll, and that similar action be taken to reduce the great surplus of personnel in the civil branch of the Corps of Engineers for the same reasons, in the interest of sound conservation and sound national economy.

Resolution 17

Whereas the Soil Conservation Service has adequately demonstrated its worth in the conservation of our land and water resources; and

Whereas such conservation procedure has contributed directly and materially to the conservation and increased propagation of valuable wildlife as well as agricultural production; and

Whereas the entire Nation benefits from such a scientifically supervised program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Izaak Walton League of America does emphatically urge the continuation and expansion of this all-embracing technical service and to that end assist in securing the necessary Federal appropriations.

Letter From Catholic Labor Guild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Catholic Labor Guild of the archdiocese of Boston, dated May 6, 1947, recording itself against the Hartley bill, H. R. 3020, and the Taft bill, S. 1126:

CATHOLIC LABOR GUILD,
ARCHDIOCESE OF BOSTON,
Charlestown, Mass., May 6, 1947.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the communion breakfast held May 4, following the third annual labor mass that was celebrated at the Cathedral of the Holy Cross, the following resolution was endorsed by the Catholic Labor Guild of the Archdiocese of Boston:

Whereas the Catholic Labor Guild of the Archdiocese of Boston is organized and committed to the proposition that labor unions are basically good and fulfill the means whereby the workingman can best discharge his obligation to his family, his church, and the State;

Whereas the proposed legislation, namely the Hartley bill, H. R. 3020, and the Senate Taft bill, S. 1126, will not lead to a proper solution of our labor-relation problems;

Whereas this legislation as presently proposed would destroy the workingman's associations, destroy peaceful collective bargaining, and drive the worker into the ranks of communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Catholic Labor Guild of the Archdiocese of Boston be recorded as against the Taft and Hartley bills; and be it further

Resolved, That a thorough and impartial study be made of labor-management problems in an endeavor to secure legislation that is equitable and conducive to social justice; and finally, be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen from Massachusetts, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the House minority leader.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. BLANEY,
Secretary.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein two editorials from the Miami Daily News. Each of these editorials points out the realities and the fact surrounding President Truman's proposal of aid to Greece and Turkey. A mature and considered reading of these editorials will to a great extent eliminate the smoke screen which has to date been thrown up to conceal the facts and defeat the program.

While no one could accurately say just exactly where this program will lead, nevertheless when we first tried penicillin as a medicine, no one knew exactly just what it would cure and how effective it would be. However, the decision to use penicillin was affirmative action designed to combat disease. The action of President Truman is likewise an affirmative action designed to combat an evil. It is no more a question of what will happen if we follow this course, than that of what will happen if we do not. History has clearly shown the results of inaction—of isolationism and appeasement—in our foreign policy.

The editorials follow:

[From the Miami Daily News of March 16, 1947]

WE CAN DRIFT NO LONGER

The road which the American people have traveled to the present crisis in their world relations began at Yalta in the Crimea on February 12, 1945.

On that date, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Premier Josef Stalin pledged their three governments jointly to "assist the people in any European liberated state or former Axis satellite state in Europe where in their judgment conditions require: (A) to establish conditions of internal peace; (B) to carry out emergency measures for the relief of distressed peoples; (C) to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population, and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people;

and (D) to facilitate where necessary the holding of such elections."

That pledge has not been carried out. It has been directly abrogated in the countries of eastern Europe with the open support of one of the nations making the pledge, Soviet Russia. The United States has made protest after protest, in President Truman's words to the Congress, "against coercion and intimidation, in violation of the Yalta agreement, in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria." Ten days ago we made a similar protest over Russian aid in the Hungarian Communists' efforts to overthrow the legitimately elected government of Hungary. The protest was rejected; even the news that it had been made was kept from the Hungarian people.

The decision before the American people since the President's message to Congress on Wednesday is this: Shall we act to check the indefinite expansion of the police states being imposed upon people after people around the world, or shall we drift and content ourselves with mere protests?

President Truman believes that we can wait no longer. "Totalitarian regimes," he told the Congress, "imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace, and hence the security of the United States."

That sober statement the President would have no difficulty in supporting out of the history of the past generation. There are few Americans who doubt its truth.

Wherever there is a vacuum, economic or political, in today's world, the people in that area face the threat of a totalitarian regime supported by a vigorous minority at home and a full-scale war of nerves from Moscow. Acting in the name of security—one of the cardinal aims of all men—the Communist minority ends by imposing a police-dominated state to insure it. One more spot in the world is lost to freedom. If the process were indefinitely continued, the greater part of those chaotic areas lying between the Soviet land mass and the Western Hemisphere would become state-controlled, totalitarian regimes hostile to democracy and the free institutions upon which it is based.

For 18 months after the end of World War II, the United States Government witnessed this process in half of Europe. It put its support behind its commitments under the United Nations Charter and attempted to insure that Russia would do the same. Twice, in Iran and over the Dardanelles issue, that insurance took the form of a determined display of power. But the expansion of Russian influence and the totalitarian seizures of power continued outside the functioning of the United Nations organization. There was too much hunger and misery and want in the world, and it bred the strife which allowed a vigorous and ruthless minority to act.

The decision the President has asked of Congress, if it is taken, will not mean that the United States has abandoned hope in the United Nations as an instrument of world politics and the potential creator of the climate of peace and security.

It will mean rather that while seeking a long-range accommodation with Russia through our continued support of the United Nations, we shall attempt to make our own foreign policy positive and forceful in the creation of the only kind of security we believe conducive to peace, the security of world cooperation among free nations.

We are not supporting Greece because we think the Greek Government is an ideal ally for a democratic power. We are supporting Greece because that country is strife-ridden and poverty-ridden and hence marked out as the natural victim of the police states surrounding it in eastern Europe. And if Greece falls today, Turkey will fall tomorrow, and the cordon of totalitarian states subservient to Russia will extend from the Baltic to the Persian Gulf.

If the Turkish Army should disappear, no state west of Communist Yugoslavia in Europe could defend itself except France, and France's defense would last for a matter of days. That is the significance of the President's words on Wednesday when he said: "Should we fail to aid Greece and Turkey in this fateful hour, the effect will be far reaching to the west as well as to the East."

The American people, blessed by fortune, have it in their power to offer freedom with a reasonable guaranty of security to the peoples of the rest of the world. That is infinitely more than Russia and world communism can offer them. But we cannot expect to see the rest of the world choose our way of life and cooperate with us if we offer them merely words.

The world demands freer trade, foreign loans, the chance to live in an economy and a society that is not rigidly controlled for purposes of security. By themselves Greece and Turkey today, and other nations tomorrow, have no choice. With our economic and political support a choice is possible. Have we the faith in our own institutions to submit them to the choice of other peoples?

Never has the United States stood upon such a pinnacle of world leadership. If our grasp upon it falters, if we give it not direction but aimlessness, we can bring ourselves and the world to ruin.

[From the Miami Daily News of March 23, 1947]

UNITED STATES ADDICTED TO EXTREMES?

The days since the President's message to Congress have been filled with shouts and murmurs of pained surprise. How long, it is asked, has the administration kept the situation in Greece from the people? Isn't this a new foreign policy we are being asked to support? And doesn't it mean war, if not now, at least surely in the future?

These questions—any question asked in good faith and for the enlightenment of the people—the Government can and must answer. But all of them, as they have poured out on Capitol Hill and other forums throughout the country, raise a question equally basic and a question the question raisers themselves can help to answer: Can the people of the United States formulate a national policy for the majority only in an atmosphere of crises in which one extreme view vies with another?

The answer to that question is vital, for the policy the Truman administration has developed can be twisted and wrecked if it must be carried out in a broadside, all-or-nothing manner which obscures its whole inception and confounds its very purpose.

Under Secretary Acheson restored a measure of perspective to debate on the President's request in response to Congressman VORYS question whether the State Department had known about the situation in Greece for only 3 weeks. Twenty years would be a more accurate statement, Acheson said. He performed the same function when he told Congressman SMITH that the plan presented for our aid to Greece might not be duplicated in plans for other countries.

Men understand what is easily grasped, what can be dramatized. But it will take more than this simple all-or-nothing, black-and-white understanding to support American foreign policy over the next generation.

The world emerged from the war with a most delicate and tenuous balance of power, for it was a balance actually between only two poles, the United States and Russia. European centers of power were destroyed or bankrupt. Japan, the only country in Asia with an expanding economy, was no longer a power.

Between the United States and Russia were great European and Asiatic vacuums where the people were in want or enabled barely to survive by the strictest control of their economic resources. Of the two great powers which survived, only the United States possessed surpluses of capital and goods which could help fill the vacuums. And unless they were filled, the United States itself could not continue in her traditional paths. Without a market for her continuously expanding industrial and agricultural production, without multilateral trade. America's national income and employment could not be maintained. Reconstruction of the economies of other countries was dictated not only by humanitarian feeling but by sheer self-interest.

But that was not the whole story. So long as other nations faced only more and more shortages, they faced inevitably more and more controls upon their people. And the more controls they were forced to submit to, the less free the governments would become. Representative government, the necessary climate for a world in which the United States might survive, could not exist where first the people's economic life and soon their political life had to be regimented. The process has already gone pretty far, as President Truman analyzed in his Waco, Tex., speech on the necessity of reciprocal trade.

Everywhere since the end of the war two basic aims have animated the people who were its victims—freedom and security. They wanted both; they would, if forced, choose security over freedom. But their chief desire was freedom with a fair guaranty of security. That goal a majority of a people experience today only in the United States. It cannot be attained in other countries without a representative form of government, reconstruction, and world trade. The security of the United States depends upon the attainment of those things in at least the greater part of the world.

Russia, the other center of world power, ended the war in no position to export capital and goods to other nations, her own fixed capital reduced by 25 to 30 percent between 1941 and 1945, her only strength as a world power is her dominant position in Eurasia and the relatively more impoverished neighbors on her western borders.

What she could export was her form of government, the police state made possible by the need for the tightest kind of control over the economic lives of depressed peoples. It was not to Russia's advantage to place in the vacuums representative governments and expanding economies, even had she been able to do so. It was to her advantage if a cordon of Communist-dominated regimes could be built in Europe and the Middle East. In that climate, according to the Russian Communists' line, Russia's security would be enhanced and the attractions of democracy lessened.

The course of Russian-American relations, both in the United Nations organization and in the negotiations of the Big Four victors of the war, has been the impact of two opposing aims—the United States seeking to insure reconstruction and free elections; Russia seeking to bolster the Communist minorities who were imposing upon war-ravaged peoples police states indifferent to the consent of the governed.

The Yalta agreement made the American goal the official goal of the Big Three. But Russia's domination of her eastern European neighbors permitted her to frustrate the Yalta provisions almost at will. Free elections, except in Czechoslovakia, were not held or were subverted by native Communists with Russia's open aid. And relief goods coming into those countries often were used to support the Communists' power. Greece and Turkey became the only two nations in eastern Europe where Russian control was not dominant.

The Greek crisis, then, is but a crisis in the development of America's foreign eco-

nomic policy. The other crisis—the political—stems directly from the agreement made at Yalta; it has been involved in three hearings before the United Nations Security Council. It is not a question of 3 weeks ago or 3 months ago. It is no more likely to lead to war than the Iranian crisis last year, and that crisis, be it noted, developed entirely through the medium of the United Nations.

With the policy of containing Russian military expansion, as in the Iranian case, the Government has concurrently developed a foreign economic policy. It is the only source of our positive action, for it is the one hope of giving other peoples time to solve their problems of reconstruction without going totalitarian.

That policy will cost us great expenditures in money and goods and technical personnel, though it is our best long-range investment through maintaining our export trade and the full employment permitted by it. It will cost not $400,000,000 but an unknown number of billions before we are through. It is for this reason that President Truman went to Congress with an explanation of the course he recommends and a request for the funds with which to launch it.

That course we cannot turn back from. It will require the most intelligent kind of support and the most intelligent kind of planning. Neither can be achieved if we but veer from one extreme to the other in our grasp upon world events.

Flood Damage in Randolph County, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit House Joint Resolution 30, adopted by the Illinois General Assembly:

House Joint Resolution 30

Whereas once again floods have inflicted heavy damage along the east bank of the Mississippi River, and particularly in Randolph County; and

Whereas this damage to crops could have been prevented had levees been constructed and completed according to the original plans of United States engineers: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we do hereby petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to provide for and require the construction and completion of the planned levee system so that future damage to crops and other property in this area will be prevented; that copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State immediately to every Illinois Member of Congress.

Adopted by the house April 29, 1947.

HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House.

Concurred in by the senate May 7, 1947.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Representation Without Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on Representation Without Taxation, by Paul R. Alwine, of Vestal, N. Y., rural delivery 2, which is very timely if we expect to permit the free-enterprise system in America to continue to function:

REPRESENTATION WITHOUT TAXATION

A bitter war was fought in the early days of this Nation, the home of the free enterprise system. The battleground was before Lexington and Concord; the oppressor was the mother country and the oppressed were the colonists, businessmen directly, but indirectly all the pioneers. "Taxation without representation" was the battle cry. Freedom from oppression and equality of opportunity were the promises held forth by victory.

Another bitter war is in the making. The battleground this time will be in the legislative halls of the "home of the free enterprise system." The oppressor is the Congress and the Treasury Department; the oppressed, again, is the American businessman directly—indirectly the people, all taxpayers. "Representation without taxation" is the new battle cry. Freedom from Government-subsidized tax-free competitors and equality of taxes between all engaged in the same line of business is the new promise of victory.

All taxpayers should be concerned about these "tax-free riders," for as they expand their operations and absorb more and more of the volume of the Nation's production and distribution; buy or crowd out more and more taxpaying businesses, the load on the remaining few gets greater and greater—the tax load, if you please, on farmers, wage earners, so-called white-collar workers, businessmen, corporations—all taxpayers alike.

Cooperatives, mutuals, and Government-owned businesses are the beneficiaries of tax-freedom under present Federal and many State income-tax laws. The special privileges granted them other than Federal and State tax laws are myriad and the results of all these favoritisms promise soon the destruction of the very profit motive that has made this "home of the free enterprise system" the greatest nation on earth. Cooperatives are the fastest growing of these free-tax riders and their tax-free earnings constitute the greatest immediate threat to all taxpayers, in or out of business.

Farmer cooperatives were first granted exemption from Federal income taxes by Congress in 1916 as an aid to agriculture. The income tax on corporations was at that time only 2 percent. This exemption has been continued and expanded to include all cooperatives by Treasury rulings and court decisions, although none are actually mentioned in the law except "farmers' and fruit growers' purchasing and marketing associations." Taxpayers, business and individual, have had their income-tax rates increased steadily between World War I and World War II, with excess-profits-business-tax rates ranging as high as 85 percent and today assessed at a maximum of 38 percent. While all taxpayers were paying for the war and are now trying to buy the peace, cooperatives are growing fat by reinvesting their tax-free earnings in new plants and equipment and buying out their tax-loaded competitors.

This legal tax dodging covers all kinds, sizes, and shapes of co-ops: little ones and multimillion dollar big ones, wholly exempt and nonexempt farmer co-ops, city consumer co-op grocery and department stores and gas stations, manufacturing co-ops, wholesale co-ops, former taxpayers that have shifted to co-op status for the sole purpose of evading income taxes, co-op holding companies and subsidiaries, REA's, and countless other varieties.

The economic results of this widespread income-tax freedom are twofold—(1) other companies—corporations, partnerships, and individual proprietorships—which have found no legal way of avoiding their share of the national tax burden, are put to an unconscionable competitive disadvantage; (2) the Federal Treasury loses millions of dollars of tax revenue which can be retrieved only by assessing higher rates against all—yes; all taxpayers.

In their efforts to retain the income-tax exemption that is now permitting them to grow at jet-propulsion speed, the co-ops have dragged some mighty peculiar red herrings across the trail of common sense.

They say—hoping, I suppose, to fool the taxpayers—that only a small fraction of all co-ops are exempt from payment of Federal income taxes.

That's just double talk. There are seven different kinds of co-ops in the United States, but all seven of them have certain characteristics and principles in common, whether they are farmer or city-consumer owned, whether they are legally exempt or nonexempt, whether they are engaged in marketing, retailing, wholesaling, manufacturing, or servicing, whether they are corporations or unincorporated associations, whether they are big or little, holding companies, subsidiaries, sub-subsidiaries, or whatnot.

They are all business operations, aiming to make money for someone.

They distribute their net earnings, which they call "savings" or "net margins" or "over-deposits," in so-called patronage dividends, sometimes in cash money, but more often in stock or other evidence of equity, while they shrewdly add the cash to capital and reserves for expansion.

And they are able to escape all or substantially all Federal income tax on earnings either by specific authority of law, as in the case of the exempt farmers' marketing and purchasing co-ops, or by Treasury approval of their own estimate of the tiny amounts they are willing to pay tax on.

That's silly. The fact that specifically exempt co-ops pay no income taxes, while nonexempt farmers' co-ops and city-consumer co-ops do pay a fractional tax, is of little importance either in the competitive situation or in the computation of Treasury revenues.

Businessmen are not opposed to co-ops as competitors, they only ask equal treatment under the law between all competitors engaged in the same lines of business enterprise.

The demand of competing taxpayers is that all cooperatives shall be required to pay income tax on all earnings, whatever those earnings may be called, and however those earnings may be distributed. That is the way other businesses are taxed, whether they are corporations, partnerships, or individual proprietorships. That is what I mean by tax equality.

In the now famous words of Justice Felix Frankfurter:

"You may carry out your own notations of social policy in engaging in what is called business, but you must pay your share in having a Nation which enables you to pursue your policy."

Certainly the fact that cooperatives have been able not only to maintain but also to expand their tax privileges as well as countless other privileges under the law, proves

that they have strong representation in Government—why are they unwilling to bear their fair share of the cost of that Government?

All Europe Suffering From a Diet Deficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times for Sunday, May 11, there appeared a dispatch from London, entitled "All Europe Suffering From a Diet Deficiency" by Charles E. Egan.

This article brings the present European food situation up to date in an accurate and concise way. Under permission granted me by unanimous consent, I include the same herewith:

ALL EUROPE SUFFERING FROM A DIET DEFICIENCY—FOOD IMPORTS NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN EVEN PRESENT LOW STANDARDS

(By Charles E. Egan)

LONDON, May 10.—An unusually severe winter that killed early crops and flooded wide areas of arable land has left Europe in a precarious position, so far as food supplies are concerned.

And an eminent British doctor's statement this week that Britain was a nation "dying of starvation" probably did more to dramatize the food situation in the British Isles, as well as in Europe as a whole, than reams of dry statistical studies reeled off governmental mimeograph machines here and in the United States over the last 6 months.

The British physician, having the advantage of being a recognized expert on nutrition, touched off a heated controversy in Britain by his observations. Regardless of their merits, the contentions publicized by Dr. Franklin Bicknell in an article in Medical Press were proving highly unpalatable medicine to those in Britain's Government entrusted with supplying foodstuffs and guarding the health of the average Briton.

Dr. Bicknell said that the average man requires a minimum of 3,000 calories a day to enable him to do a way's work and maintain his health. The figure, he said, was one decided upon by the British Medical Association in 1933 and was also endorsed by the United States National Research Council in 1940.

ALL EUROPE UNDER PAR

On the basis of the doctor's statement, there is not a country in Europe where the daily caloric intake of the average citizen meets the minimum requirements at present. According to the forecasts of world food authorities in recent weeks, there is scarcely a nation on the continent where the daily ration for the coming 2 or 3 months will not decline substantially because of the severities of the previous winter.

In Britain, according to Dr. Bicknell, the present calorific consumption provided through foods on rations of one sort or another provides a total of approximately 1,600 calories a day. Foods available off the ration, in industrial canteens and restaurants, afford (except for the very wealthy who can afford to consume most of their meals in restaurants) an additional 400 to 500 calories a day. This gives a grand total of about 2,100 calories for each citizen a day.

Is it any wonder, he asks, that British workmen are incapable of producing on a scale that would be considered normal before the war? As a matter of fact, Dr. Bicknell says that a fully employed worker in Britain at present gets less to eat by some 300 to 400 calories than did the unemployed worker living on the breadlines or off the dole during the depth of the depression of the nineteen thirties.

SERIOUS SITUATION

Taking Britain and the Continent as a whole it is a fact recognized by authorities here and elsewhere that the food situation is serious. According to some authorities, including members of a special economic committee of the United Nations, conditions are every bit as menacing as they were a year ago. The United States will remember that it was just about this time last year that the Government and the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration were conducting a Nation-wide drive to get the average American to "forego that extra slice of bread," to find substitutes for breakfast cereals, and in other ways to conserve bread grains so that large areas of Europe and the Far East would not face famine.

The campaign was effective and famine was averted in Europe and large areas of the Far East. That the food crisis did not end with 1946, so far as Europe was concerned, was no fault of the authorities, but was due to the vagaries of the weather.

From Britain alone demands are sure to be heavy compared with a year ago. The nation has only 5 to 7 weeks' stocks of wheat and flour on hand and must build up a safety cushion against the approaching winter.

In addition, the severe winter and resulting floods have killed off one-third of her population of sheep and more than 50,000 head of cattle ready for slaughter.

LOSS OF FRENCH WHEAT

In France, for example, a large part of that nation's winter wheat was wiped out by one of the most severe winters in more than half a century. The cold weather descended upon acres planted to staple before a blanket of snow could protect the seed. For the second year in succession France must look about not only for replanting, she must look to outside sources for large quantities of grain to supplement her own supplies.

The story of France is that of the Low Countries as well.

Rumania, according to food authorities, is the worst hit of all the nations in Europe. Drought caused the failure of her corn crop last year and brought famine to Moldavia and to some other areas of the country.

The crop prospects there are not encouraging, according to agricultural authorities, but whether the outlook is good or not the nation faces a crucial period of 2 months or more before her harvests can be expected to alleviate the situation.

Official reports also state that food shortages are most acute in Austria, Germany, and Italy. In Italy even last fall the food supplies available to the nonfarm population were less than 2,000 calories a day.

In the British and American zones of Germany the official ration was around 1,550 calories a day, supplemented by supplies made available to the inhabitants through the black market and other means. The total, however, is said to have fallen below 2,200 calories.

AUSTRIAN DIFFICULTIES

Austria went through a severe food crisis last summer and in early fall, during which her average ration was well below 1,550 calories a day.

According to a recent survey of the food situation in other countries, nonfarm (farmers always seem to fare better than their urban fellows and therefore are not considered representative) consumption in Poland, Hungary, and Portugal, and, until recently, in Spain, was below 2,000 calories a day.

The average caloric intake of the inhabitants of Greece, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria has ranged between 2,100 and 2,400 a day.

In Switzerland, Belgium, and the Netherlands diets have shrunk slightly and the average citizen gets along on 2,400 to 2,500 calories a day.

Denmark boasts an average daily caloric intake of 2,900 for her inhabitants. Czechoslovakia has an average of 2,600 calories for its citizens. Norway, Swede, and Finland also report about the same level of diet for their citizens.

Conditions in Rusia are still obscure. According to unofficial observers, conditions there are still "tight" but what foods are available are distributed fairly through the country.

Acording to official opinion, prospects of maintaining the consumption levels of foodstuffs in Europe during the remainder of this year depend largely upon imports.

A Permanent Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Carl H. Wilson, economic analyst, Raw Materials National Council, Sioux City, Iowa, before the House Committee on Agriculture, May 8, 1947, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am very happy to have this opportunity to outline for you a sound and permanent program for agriculture. It happens that I have spent the last 10 years in an independent study of our national economy and I believe that we have carried on the most complete survey of any research organization. Our approach has been impartial and I am here to give you the facts as we find them. Therefore I hope that the committee will realize that the facts will stand regardless of politics or the wishes of selfish groups who feel that they ought to have a preference in different types of legislation.

This matter of a sound farm program is tremendously important. Agriculture as an industry has approximately 25 percent of all the capital invested in farms, mines, factories, transportation, service industries, homes, etc. It has approximately 65 percent of the capital investment in productive enterprise. As a result our entire national economy revolves with an almost mathematical precision around the production and price of farm products which determine farm income. A sound farm program will almost automatically give us a sound national economy.

In addition the course of human events has made the United States the governing factor in world economy. Even though we have only 6 percent of the population of the world, we do approximately 47 percent of the world's dollar business and consume 25 percent of the total production of goods. In the light of these facts this committee, in considering a sound and permanent farm

program, is in reality considering the foundation of the economy of all the world.

Without a sound farm program all the dreams of future prosperity and world peace will end in chaos and confusion.

Many of the members of this committee have spent many hours attending hearings and discussing the so-called farm problem. As you all know many theories have been advanced as to this and that phase of our farm economy and yet we are here today because it is still an unsolved problem. I feel that some people h .ve even reached the conclusion that there is no solution. I know that it can be solved and that the record of our own national economy points the way if we will but use it.

We have failed to solve the farm problem because we have not made a thorough analysis of the facts and the relationship that exists between agriculture and other segments of our economy. Our approach has been too general. We have spent too much time scratching the surface. We have been handicapped because so many theories were in reality untrue and not based on facts or simple common-sense arithmetic.

The farm problem is ages old because a selfish public has always wanted cheap farm products, not realizing that they could not eat properly unless they paid their board bill. Low farm prices and the neglect of agriculture has destroyed nation after nation, and the price of farm products will determine the future of our present civilization.

It happens that there is no reason for confusion. The record of the United States if properly analyzed gives us the answer. It is my purpose to analyze the record for you and in this connection I wish to say that the various graphs and conclusions have been checked by the Country Gentleman. In December 1944 they carried an article entitled "The Key to Prosperity." In this article they called attention to our research work and pointed out that we had evidently found the answer by uncovering certain laws of exchange between the different parts of our economy.

In spite of all the legislation passed by Congress in regard to agriculture, labor, etc., these laws of exchange have permitted little change in the relative position of the different parts of the whole. For example, all the farm and labor legislation did not materially change the pefcent of the national income going to each group.

In my analysis I wish to point out first some of the fallacies that exist; second, to analyze our economy; and, third, to outline a program which will end any depression in 6 to 12 months.

Our present farm program was the result of the severe depression which followed the break-down of our national economy in the latter part of 1929. Since that time we have enacted a lot of legislation and amended this and that. All told, we have enough legislation now to solve the farm problem if it were efficiently correlated and administered. But, again, theories and some of the things we are doing are not based on fact. The result is confusion instead of a proper solution of our problems. In the words of a certain humorist, our troubles result not so much from what we know but because we know so much that isn't true.

For example, on one hand we have legislation to maintain a floor under farm prices at 90 percent of parity and, on the other hand, we are putting through a program to reduce tariffs and in turn our own price level. Again, on one hand we think of curtailing production while on the other hand we ought to realize that the only way to create more income and a higher standard of living is through more production. Curtailment of production to obtain price if it were a sound philosophy would mean that if none of us worked we could all become wealthy.

In regard to our theories to become rich through the medium of foreign trade, we should remember the words of Benjamin Franklin. Mr. Franklin stated "that to become wealthy through trade we must exploit someone." This statement is essentially correct and we should, in this connection, remember the words of Lincoln who stated: "If we produce something ourselves we will have both the goods and the money." In other words, the source of wealth is production, and trade is merely the result of production.

In the early thirties one of the first fallacies, the surplus complex, started us on the wrong road in arriving at a solution. We blamed the low farm prices on our surplus of production. The record proves, however, that we did not have a surplus. We merely had low prices and a shortage of income to consume what was in reality a normal supply.

In this connection a careful study of the record of our Nation and that of the world will reveal that we have never had a severe depression without a drop in farm prices prior to the depression. The reason is quite simple. The income of the United States and that of the world is determined by farm production and farm prices. Low farm income means a low national income and a high farm income means high national income. National incomes follow farm incomes up and down at an interval of 6 to 12 months with almost mathematical precision.

THE RECORD

I would like to use the record of 2 years of the past to prove that we did not have a surplus except that resulting from low prices and underconsumption. I will use the 2 years 1928 and 1932:

Production of corn, oats, wheat, barley, rye, and flax

	Bushels
1928	5,333,000,000
1932	5,253,000,000

Production of beef, pork, mutton, and veal

	Pounds
1928	17,000,000,000
1932	16,800,000,000

In other words, even though our population from 1928 to 1932 increased about 4,000,000, we actually had about 1 percent less production for them to consume. On the same per capita basis there just wasn't any surplus in 1932. Yet in 1928 we had prosperity and in 1932 we had a depression with ten to fifteen million unemployed.

Others say the tariff destroyed our export market. The record proves that this is also a fallacy. For example, in 1932 we exported 8,418,000 bales of cotton, our principal exportable surplus, out of a total crop of 13,000,000 bales, while in 1928 we exported 8,038,000 bales out of a crop totaling 14,447,000 bales. The world price however in 1932 was low so that our exports did not create much income.

The real reason for the depression was a drop in the price of all raw materials starting in 1925 and culminating with the rapid drop after 1929. In the period 1925–29, because of a fixed tariff which prevented adjustment to keep pace with this drop in world prices, we had a net import of farm products totaling $1,750,000,000. This continuous net import finally broke down our own price structure, sending our entire economy into a tailspin.

Many of our economists are continually expressing the theory that as we have a surplus, prices must come down so that the people can buy. They forget that lower price levels mean lower incomes and it is just another one of those things which we know that isn't true. As farm prices drop the percentage of national income spent for food goes up and in terms of per capita income food costs rise. For example in 1932 we spent 30.0 percent of the national income for food and in 1945, the last year for which the Department of Commerce had figures available, a few days ago, we spent 18.8 percent. It is a matter of record that during 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946, the Nation had a lower living cost on the basis of per capita income than in the depression years.

This factor is very important because it proves the necessity of maintaining proper farm prices if we wish to consume our production. By permitting farm prices to drop we add the surplus of underconsumption to the seasonal surplus that weather conditions sometimes give us.

A careful study of the record indicates very clearly that the reason for the depression was nothing more than too low a price for farm products. The cause of the low price in my opinion is expressed quite clearly by Christopher Hollis, an English economist, in his book The Break-down of Money. Mr. Hollis was an exchange professor in economics at our own University of Notre Dame in the twenties. He sets forth the reason for the depression as follows:

"A money-lending country must be a free-trade country, and the purpose of the money-lending power has been to impose free trade upon the United States. It has not been a purpose easy of achievement. For in the days when labor in the United States was scanty and valuable the American workingman succeeded in obtaining for himself a very much higher wage than the workingman of Europe. It has been generally, and rightly, recognized in the United States, that under conditions of free trade, American manufacturers would only be able to compete against European manufacturers if the American wage was reduced to something like the European level—to say nothing of the menace of the still cheaper labor of Japan. Though American free trade is just as necessary to the money lender today as was English free trade to the money lender of the last century, yet the problem is a very different one, and to solve the different problem, merely academic discourses upon the beauties of low tariffs were of little effect.

"In opposition to the sermonizings of the old-fashioned Democrats had been the financiers' policy. Their belief is that the only chance of getting the tariff down has been so to reduce the purchasing power of the American people that they can no longer even approximately consume their own products. As long as that purchasing power was adequate, the American manufacturer was indifferent to foreign markets. But with domestic purchasing power reduced, foreign markets become essential to him. And the more that he can be persuaded to look abroad for his markets, the easier it will be to change his whole attitude toward wages. At present he is in favor of high tariffs and high wages, for he looks upon the workingman as his customer. But if he can be induced to look abroad for his markets, then wages become merely an item of costs and it is to the manufacturers' interest to reduce them as low as possible. If they are reduced—and the odium for reducing them, of course, allowed to fall on the manufacturer—then American industry becomes at once a much more profitable investment for the financier, while the foreign goods can flow into free-trade America to pay the interests on foreign loans."

Mr. Hollis' book was published in the United States in 1935. It is not available at book stores but there are copies in the University Library at Notre Dame. In the light of our inability to consume our normal production in 1932, the propaganda for free trade, and so forth, it might be well that we stop, look, and listen.

The fact that we did lose our income and purchasing power is clearly revealed in a

comparison of the incomes for agriculture, factory workers, and the Nation as a whole in 1928 and 1932:

	Income		
	Gross farm	Factory pay rolls	National income
1928	$11,700,000,000	$11,400,000,000	$82,000,000,000
1932	5,300,000,000	5,200,000,000	39,900,000,000
Loss	6,400,000,000	6,200,000,000	42,100,000,000

You will notice that our farm income in 1932 had fallen off $6,400,000,000. Everyone felt sorry for the farmers and our business economists did not realize what had happened all through our economy. You will notice that factory pay rolls also dropped in proportion to the farm income and that the national income, instead of being $6,400,000,000 less than in 1928—the amount of loss in farm income—had dropped $42,100,000,000.

Even today our economists are preaching lower farm prices, not realizing that lower farm prices will shut off a similar percentage in income for all the major segments of our economy. It is interesting to note the hue and cry at the present time for lower prices. It is a rather dangerous pastime and we can talk ourselves into having a depression. In fact it would be very easy for us to lose $35,000,000,000 of national income if the present psychology for lower prices continues.

It is rather an indictment of our economic leadership to have such a hue and cry for lower prices when at the present time, we are in a position for the first time since 1930 to have full employment, a balanced budget and on the per capita basis the greatest consumption of food and other goods in our history. Why, for example, should we wish to have lower prices, a lower national income, unemployment, and bankruptcy by returning to 1940 price levels. Especially so, when the records reveal that we are consuming 23,000,000,000 pounds of meat instead of the average of 17,000,000,000 pounds from 1934–41, and using ten to eleven million bales of cotton instead of 7,000,000 bales. It seems as if we are afraid of prices which will give us prosperity.

Coming back now to the tabulation of income, you will note that gross farm income, factory pay rolls, and national income were approximately in a ratio of 1–1–7 or seven dollars of national income and a dollar of factory pay rolls for each dollar of farm income. If the committee will check the record for the years 1921–45, you will find that ratio on the average was approximately constant in the proportion of 1–1–7 during the past 25 years. It is very easy therefore to create a depression by lower farm prices and the pyramiding of the loss in farm income by seven times.

I have tabulated the comparison of gross farm income and national income for the period 1929–42:

	Gross farm	National
1929	$11,900	$83,300
1930	9,500	68,800
1931	7,000	54,400
1932	5,300	39,900
1933	6,400	42,300
1934	7,300	49,400
1935	8,500	55,700
1936	9,500	64,900
1937	10,600	71,500
1938	9,400	64,200
1939	9,900	70,800
1940	10,400	77,800
1941	13,800	95,600
1942	16,200	121,500
Total	135,700	956,100

I have used this period because both 1929 and 1942 were the end years from full employment through the depression and back to full employment. The price level in both 1929 and 1942 for all practical purposes were at parity with the 5-year period 1925–29 of farm prices and the price of finished goods. For all practical purposes the price levels in the 2 years were the same.

Many of our economists, Brookings Institution included, will argue that this ratio does not exist and that it hardly ever is exactly a seven times turn. I feel that they are evading the real question. If they really understood our economy they would realize that our gross farm income precedes our national income going up and down by approximately 6 months, therefore it is impossible for the ratio to be exactly seven times on an annual basis. Yet the average since 1921 has been approximately a seven times turn of gross farm income into national income. A careful check of the tabulation will reveal that in 1929 we had an actual seven times turn. From 1930 to 1933 farm income dropped faster than the national income and the turn was a little less, while in the recovery period it was a little over a seven times turn as farm income led the way back. The dislocation in 1942 was the result of our entry into war and the spending of national deficits for war materials.

A few days ago Brookings Institution tabulated national income and farm income for Congressman KNUTSON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. They tried to point out that the seven times turn did not exist.

But, they used net farm income and of course had no relationship. We have continually stated that the gross farm income establishes the relationship.

Brookings Institution ought to know better.

The over-all average for the 14 years is 7.04. The gross farm income for 1929–32 may be different than you will find it in the present figures put out by the Department of Agriculture. They were taken out of the Agricultural Yearbook 1935. For some reason or other the Department saw fit to go back into the records and change the figures. Maybe they were using this method to try to disprove the quite positive ratio which the record reveals.

I would like to say further that the seven times turn of the farm income is an efficiency ratio which increased gradually from a turn of a little over one in 1775 up to approximately seven times turn in 1921. Under full operation of our economy in the next few years it may advance to a 7.5 times turn. It is in reality a reflection of the fairly efficient farm workers to our total labor force.

The seven times turn of gross farm income could be of very practical use to the Members of Congress. Mr. Charles B. Ray, an employee of Sears, Roebuck & Co., has worked out the progressive ratio and in the last 8 years has predicted the national income for his company 6 months in advance of the United States Department of Commerce with an accuracy of over 98 percent. In the process he finds it unnecessary to total up the record of any corporation. It is valuable to his company because their sales volume in turn will run approximately 1 percent of the national income, whatever it may be.

As an example of accuracy in 1945, the departments of Government and many private economists were predicting $140,000,000,000 of income for 1946 and 8,000,000 unemployed. Mr. Ray, using the formula, projected a national income of $163,000,000,000 and no unemployment. The actual result was approximately $166,000,000,000 and no unemployment. Instead of the economists trying to point out the inaccuracy of the ratio, I think they ought to use it so that Congress can have an accurate picture of what may happen. There is no excuse for an underestimation of our national income in the amount of $25,000,000,000 per year.

Going back to the tabulation, if you will take the trouble to use 1929 and 1942 as the end years of the period and take the mean of the two, you will find the average annual national income we should and could have had from 1930 to 1941 if we had maintained farm prices at parity. Our failure to do so caused our farmers to suffer a loss of approximately $68,000,000,000 and the Nation to suffer a loss of $475,000,000,000. From 1929 to 1946 our national income has fluctuated from a low of $40,000,0000,000 in 1932 to $166,000,000,000 in 1946. Such an operation is cockeyed and if permitted to continue we must admit that we have had malpractice of economics.

The Members of Congress and the economists who are worrying about the cost of maintaining proper farm prices had better start wondering about the loss we will take if we don't. For example, if we permit farm prices to drop back to 1940 levels we would lose approximately $13,000,000,000 of gross farm income and $90,000,000,000 of national income and as surely as two times two makes four. With $260,000,000,000 of national debt, we can't afford to lose it.

In this connection I might point out that no matter how much you have been misled by the surplus fallacy we must forget it and maintain farm prices as the first step in solving our economic problems and, if we do, most of the surplus will vanish into the stomachs of the American people.

DEFICIENT PRODUCTION

There is more danger that we will not have enough production than having too much. In January this year I prepared a survey for the Bureau of Reclamation in which I outlined the facts as they exist. They paid me for it but, as far as I know, it hasn't been made available to Members of Congress. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it be made a part of my testimony. It would be helpful to the committee.

In this report I analyze the growth of the United States, pointing out that from 1850 to 1920 we brought in 5,000,000 acres of improved farm land per year to develop our economy. Further, that by 1920 we had reached the end of our natural development and that at the present time we do not have any more harvested crop acres than we had in 1920 or 1929. Also that we do not have any more beef cattle than in 1918 and that our hog numbers were approximately the same as in 1918. (Approximately 40,000,000 beef cattle and 62,000,000 hogs in 1918 and January 1, 1947.)

Of course the human race is rather egotistical and many of us get the idea that we govern things and forget about old-man weather. With the same number of harvested acres we can very easily fall back to the crop production of 1925–29 and 1930–39. The 75-year average for corn per acre, for example, is approximately 26 bushels per acre. The average in the last 25 years is approximately the same as the average for the past 75 years.

I am merely giving you this for something to think about when you get swept away by the surplus propaganda, most of which, in my opinion, is being advanced by those who wish to import farm products to pay for manufactured goods which are to be exported. In this connection, and I want you to throw politics aside, I want to point out that the South and Middlewest, through the trade agreements, were taken for a real buggy ride. And, you are still riding.

The agricultural areas were told that the trade agreements were to promote exports of farm products. This propaganda was in reality an insult to the intelligence of our farm leadership, if they had stopped to analyze the facts. But, they didn't and we had the program.

In our own economy 65 percent of our raw materials come from the farms and it is safe to assume that 85 percent of the economy of the rest of the world is agricultural. Therefore, any expansion of foreign trade above basic needs must be obtained by giving goods away or bringing in farm products and other raw materials to pay for them. It ought to be self-evident that if they are to pay for exports they must do so with farm products and raw materials.

During the period 1934–39 we exported $6,000,000,000 of farm products and imported $10,000,000,000. At the same time we exported $10,000,000,000 of manufactured goods and imported approximately $3,000,000,000. The displacement in terms of acreage from 1934–41 was a net import of approximately 50,000,000 acres annually. Instead of helping to export farm products the trade agreements increased the imports.

Some of the experts in the Department of Agriculture and State Department may deny this, so let us use a little arithmetic. We have $1,060,000,000 acres of improved and unimproved farm land in the United States. In 1941 we had a gross farm income of $13,600,000,000 or approximately $13 per acre. We had net imports of approximately $1,200,000,000 of farm products. Dividing by $13 we had a net displacement of approximately 90,000,000 acres on an over-all basis.

Taking specific items, 2,000,000,000 pounds of fats and oils displaced approximately 12,000,000 acres. A billion pounds of jute displaced 5,000,000 acres of cotton, etc.

The increase in our national debt during the thirties and the curtailment of our farm production, by paying the farmer not to produce, merely created a market for foreign producers of farm products. The rest of the world has been short of food for many years. Our policy of curtailing our own production and buying farm products from the rest of the world helped create and foster hunger and starvation, a fertile field for communism, which we are now trying to head off with loans to nations in need.

The best move which we can make to head off communism is to maintain our farm price levels and then help the rest of the world in using our price level as a yardstick. Then other nations can earn their income from production and natural prosperity will break up the communistic ideology. If we persist in permitting our own farm price levels to be reduced to the level at which the rest of the world can buy we will lead the world into eventual chaos and economic confusion.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF FARM INCOME TO OTHER GROUPS

As I have pointed out, our economy operates on a basic ratio of approximately $1 of gross farm income—$1 of factory pay rolls and $7 of national income. Other segments have the same rather constant relationship. Our mineral production and transportation incomes will each ratio approximately 50 percent of the gross farm income. Retail sales will run approximately $4.20 for each dollar of farm income and 60 percent of the national income in volume. As an example, in 1929 retail sales were approximately 60 percent of $83,300,000,000; in 1932 they were 60 percent of $40,000,000,000, and at the present time approximately 60 percent of $175,000,000,000. The 60 percent is total volume of sales and should not be confused with income from retail trade. In like manner, the income of our service industries, manufacturing, construction, etc., are in direct ratio to gross agricultural income.

One of the reasons for our failure to arrive at the answer to our economic problems is that most economists think of agriculture as just a way of life rather than the generating force in our entire economy. Therefore, they are dealing with the result rather than the cause. If they will realize that agriculture, as a direct industry, has 10 times the capital investment and employs 10 times as many men as the steel and automobile industries combined, they will have a foundation for getting at the real facts. If, in addition, they will realize that our livestock industry, just a part of agriculture, is a factory that processes more tonnage of raw materials than all of American industry added together, then they will stop trying to wiggle the tail of our economic dog. Until our economists recognize that the agricultural production and income determine the number of jobs and wages in all segments of our economy, and also that of the world, they will continue in their guessing contest and economic confusion.

PERMANENT FARM PROGRAM

As a result of our research work by the Raw Materials National Council and that of Mr. Charles B. Ray and Dr. John Lee Coulter, the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries and Directors of Agriculture have for the past 3 years advocated a seven-point program:

"1. Commodity loans as a floor price on seven basic crops—cotton, corn, wheat, oats, barley, soybeans, and flax—as a foundation for our national economy. Such loans should be at a minimum of 90 percent of parity and made callable at not less than parity. They can be made through the Production Credit Associations or the Commodity Credit Corporation. With permanent legislation of this kind most of the loans would be made by the local banks.

"2. Provisions should be made to carry adequate reserves to take up seasonal surpluses and to level off our production cycle resulting from weather conditions. We should at all times carry a reserve of at least 35 percent of 1 year's normal production of each basic crop. Loans on these reserves can be secured by the Government and carried as close to the source of supply as possible until demand or disposal decides their final sale.

"3. Import duties geared to the same commodity index which is used in determining parity prices for farm products should be made a part of our national economic policy. The duties collected should protect manufactured goods and raw materials at the same level and should be flexible so as to reflect the difference in our parity level and the landed costs of imported products. This is for the purpose of protecting our American standard of living and giving us the greatest normal income and purchasing power for needed imports.

"4. Provision should be made for surplus disposal in the following manner:

"(a) By sale into the world market at the world price level with a provision for a drawback from import duties to absorb the price differentials in the domestic and world levels. By proper licensing of importers, proper controls could be exercised without regimentation or excessive Government control.

"(b) By disposal of surpluses for relief purposes.

"(c) By providing for discounts on surplus products as an aid to new industries which may be developed to utilize them in the expansion of our domestic economy.

"5. Provisions should be made that any surplus funds accumulating from import duties shall revert to the Treasury of the United States, and that any deficit be considered as the Nation's cost of insurance for full employment and sustained national income.

"6. A permanent parity formula should be provided, using preferably the most recent 1925–29 period of price balance as a base, and using the General Commodity Index of the Department of Labor for the year 1926 as 100 in adjusting farm parity.

"7. Provision should be made for the handling of perishable commodities and minor crops by marketing agreements with producers of such products."

In summarizing the seven points we now have provisions for commodity loans at 90 percent of parity through the Commodity Credit Corporation. We can easily set aside reserves of 35 percent if and when they again are available. We have under the Tariff Act of 1930 a provision to adjust tariffs on the basis of differences of cost at home and abroad. Under the trade agreements the tariffs can be increased 50 percent under the administration of the act. We have provisions to use some of the import duties for surplus disposal in the world market in present farm legislation.

A permanent parity formula can be established in the bill for permanent farm legislation. I would suggest that a simple formula of prices paid by the farmer as compared to prices received in the base period be used. It will reflect many of the various cost factors, such as interest, taxes, labor, etc., automatically through the prices of finished goods. The use of this formula would give the farmer approximately 7 percent more than the present formula.

I would like to point out that there may be some dislocation of the price of a commodity even in a 5-year period. But, the over-all parity equation is quite accurate. For example, the percentage of parity for farm products determines the employment in the factory. During the 10-year period 1930–39, with farm prices at 82 percent of parity, factory employment was 81 percent (1929—as 100). If our social reformers really want full employment, then all they need to do is have farm prices at parity. Full employment is the automatic result. In this connection, I might point out that no matter what legislation Congress may pass, farm production and the percentage of farm parity will determine the employment in the United States.

The cost of such a program to the Treasury would be nothing. A study of the record from 1922 up to the present time indicates that a tariff at the parity level would have collected enough in import duties to liquidate all our surpluses at the world price level.

The sale of American farm products at the world price level should not be considered as a subsidy to the farmer but as a price correction. The amount of exchange created by the sale at the world price level will be sufficient to buy an equal amount of goods at world price levels as the exchange at the American level. For example, to trade in the United States on the basis of a pound of cotton for a pound of fats and oils, and then to go out in the world and expect 2 to 3 pounds of fats for a pound of cotton would mean that we were exploiting the world by underpayment for their products. The different nations all have a different parity level created by their own particular economy, and each nation will, from economic necessity, protect its own level. This differential must be adjusted if we are to have real reciprocity.

We must maintain parity for agriculture if we wish to remain a solvent nation. We cannot maintain an American parity without a tariff at that level. Our tariff should be flexible so that if and when world prices are at our parity level then we can be on a free-trade basis. Even then, we must realize that because of our efficiency other nations will still have to have tariffs to protect their own producer. And in spite of theory they are going to do so. The Geneva Conference is nothing more than a horse trade in which the American farmer is being traded off so that international capital can market its product, produced with exploited labor, in the United States.

Of the seven points set out in a permanent farm program, the tariff is the most important. With a tariff at the parity level and our present income level, there would be little need for price support. The price support would merely establish the value of the dollar in terms of our basic production as intended

by the Constitution which gives Congress the right to regulate the value of the dollar.

In closing, I wish to make this simple statement. Our farm problem and depressions are almost entirely monetary or a matter of price for farm products. Our failure to solve the farm problem wa due to our failure to restore full parity for agriculture. If in 1933 we had added a parity tariff to our other attempts we would have ended the depression in less than 12 months.

In regard to the potential surplus there is no danger if we maintain parity. An increase in our production will result in increased income and increased consumption and a higher standard of living. Parity prices for agriculture will mean a progressive economy and less than parity will mean a decadent economy and eventual bankruptcy.

We should welcome surpluses for the following reasons:

1. We need surpluses if we are to have world trade.

2. We need surpluses for the expansion of our economy. In the case of agriculture we need the equivalent of 4,000,000 acres of improved farm land annually.

3. We need surplus production to increase our annual income and to employ the labor which has been displaced by efficiency.

4. We need surplus production so that our economic cycle can operate to the fullest extent and continually add to our standard of living.

5. Each $1 for surplus production will mean an increase of $7 of national income.

6. Surplus farm products are the best form of national defense.

7. We need our present farm production of approximately 40 percent above 1930–39 production to employ our labor.

The growth of our efficiency and population requires our present farm production to fully employ our labor force. The rate of this growth is far greater than most people realize. For example, the increase in population since 1932, at present per capita income levels is a dollar market three times as great as our total export market in 1940.

Our farm surplus has swindled down to several hundred million dollars worth of wheat and cotton. With a sustained buying power in the United States we can easily trade these surpluses for such farm products as we need and don't produce enough of.

The tariff duties collected from these imports would pay the cost of price adjustment to foreign levels on exports of surplus products.

Finally, the end result of our economy is that farm products and other raw materials are the annual profit of our economic cycle. The capital worth of the United States will ratio to the raw-material income and a depression is nothing more than a capital adjustment to the annual profit, the income from new-wealth productio from the soil.

Parity prices for farm products assure enough annual national income to consume our annual production or its equivalent.

For society to pay less than parity for farm products means to reduce the profits of our national economy.

United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit House Joint Resolution 27, adopted by the Illinois General Assembly, with reference to the United States Marine Corps:

House Joint Resolution 27

Whereas the United States Marine Corps has protected and defended American interests in all parts of the globe ever since its inception; and

Whereas in every military venture which the United States has undertaken the achievements of the Marine Corps have always typified the ultimate in heroism and self-sacrifice; and

Whereas it would be a shocking travesty for the people of the United States to sound the death knell of an institution which has served them so nobly; and

Whereas legislation pending before the Congress of the United States, if enacted as presently constituted, would bring to an end the existence of the Marine Corps as an independent unit: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That we urge the Congress of the United States not to approve any legislation unifying or merging the armed forces unless there is contained therein assurance that the Marine Corps will be retained in its present form; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded by the secretary of state to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house April 29, 1947.

HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House.
FRED. W. RUECG,
Clerk of the House.

Concurred in by the senate May 7, 1947.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Air Power at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following editorial from the New York Times of May 10, 1947, entitled "Air Power at Stake":

AIR POWER AT STAKE

The argument that air power is the spearhead of security today does not need to be elaborated. It is admitted on all sides. Last year the Air Coordinating Committee declared, after a careful study, that we should procure not less than 3,000 military airplanes annually if the state of the world's peace was settled, not less than 5,180 such aircraft if settlement was still postponed. The actual procurement for 1946, however, was 1,330 military aircraft of all types.

Aircraft procurement cannot rest on an uneven basis, with peaks and valleys from fiscal year to fiscal year. To insure the minimum industry which can be expanded in case of need, procurement must be put on a basis which will encourage continuous development of new and better types. All the combat aircraft which took part in the Second World War are obsolete today. Time is a vital necessity in which to develop new aircraft. It is perhaps not generally realized that not a single military plane which saw combat service in the war was designed during the war. This fact alone should be ample answer to the loose thinking which asks why we should build military airplanes when many thousands still are in existence and technically in possession of our Air Force.

Practically every responsible leader in Army and naval aviation has emphasized the hazards of the complacent assurance that we have achieved the era of push-button warfare and that strong forces of the most modern possible aircraft flown by men no longer are needed. It is the duty of Congress to cut unnecessary budget costs. But the penalty of false economy for the air arm is to imperil not only our own future as a free nation but our ability to work for a just and democratic peace.

The Amazing History of Our National Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday May 12, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on May 2 the Secretary of the Interior, J. A. Krug, addressed the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on Our National Reclamation-Irrigation Program. It was a brief but enlightening account of the growth of this wealth-creating activity during the 45 years of its existence. So revealing is this address and so needed for the information of the public at this critical time that I have asked and obtained permission to extend my remarks and include it in the RECORD today.

Throughout the years America has engaged upon one enterprise after another in successive waves of development as our Nation grew toward maturity. For the most part our Government has followed a policy of encouraging western development through one form or another of internal improvement, and although the benefits seem to be conferred upon a few of our citizens, the total resulting benefits have extended to all of our citizens. Whether it was a matter of transportation by water or by rail, or still later, transportation by good highways and automotive power, and still more recently by air transport; or whether it was encouragement of agriculture through liberal homestead laws or by some other kind of business or prosperity, no program has yielded relatively so much per given dollar of investment as has the reclamation program.

Secretary Krug in the following address indicates the wealth-creating power of reclamation by showing that the production of irrigated land in Federal reclamation projects, which cost less than a billion dollars to reclaim from the desert, produced in the last 12 months a half billion dollars in value. Of course, every dollar invested in reclamation projects by the Federal Government is repayable to the Federal Government over a stated period of years, but

it may come as a surprise to many that such a capital investment in 12 months' time can possibly produce values equaling half of that capital investment. The Secretary's address is as follows:

OUR NATIONAL RECLAMATION-IRRIGATION PROGRAM

The National Reclamation Act is one of the great legislative achievements of President Roosevelt's term as Chief Executive of the Nation. I mean President Theodore Roosevelt, not Franklin. Few Americans today realize that the reclamation program was authorized by Congress in 1902 in substantially the form in which it is being administered today. This 45-year-old congressional authorization has evolved into one of the most effective and far-reaching activities for conservation and use of American natural resources in the history of this country.

It has brought irrigation water to 21,000,000 acres of once arid western soil. It has built 168 dams and 15,000 miles of canals. As a profitable byproduct for the Federal Government, it has constructed 33 power plants with a capacity of about 2,500,000 kilowatts. Some $5,000,000,000 worth of crops has been taken from reclamation lands, and last year alone the value was half a billion.

More important than these inanimate monuments are the homes, businesses, and communities which have grown up on the wealth produced by reclamation.

More than 250,000 fine American citizens live on the 68,000 federally irrigated farms and a million others live in the 322 towns on or tributary to reclamation projects. These citizens have found in the reclamation regions a good livelihood and a chance to raise their families in the American tradition. It is they who have proved the value of the congressional action of 1902.

Now our reclamation program is going through a trying period and before I conclude I shall touch on its current hardships because I think they will interest you who will be directly affected when your river- and harbor-development programs are considered. First, however, I want to touch on some of the successful reclamation activities of the past year.

I think we have been particularly fortunate in our progress on coordinated planning of river-basin developments. The Bureau of Reclamation has assembled a small staff of experts and has had the advice of many more. It has worked out a great deal of the badly needed over-all planning of reclamation and irrigation in the Missouri River Basin and in the Colorado River Basin as well as in the Columbia River Valley.

This planning is being integrated with that of other departments through the Federal Interagency River Basin Committee which has members also from the War, Agriculture, and Commerce Departments and the Federal Power Commission. This committee has made an excellent start and I have great confidence that it will resolve the present conflicts for the maximum benefit to all users of the rivers and their waters.

In the past 2 years this Government started the most extensive construction program ever proposed for the Bureau of Reclamation. In the 5-year period ending in 1951 it was hoped to create more than 45,000 family-sized irrigated farms on about 4,000,000 acres of productive land. It was planned to increase the 2,500,000 kilowatts of installed power capacity to over 4,000,000 kilowatts at existing projects and with the addition of new power projects which have been authorized, to approximately 7,000,000 kilowatts

By whatever standard be chosen, the national reclamation program which began at the turn of the century has been an outstanding success. In periods of crisis such as the war years it has been responsible for absolutely essential electric power and agricultural products. It has been self-evident proof of the value to the American people of Federal investment in useful public works.

The Rivers and Harbors Congress is one of the principal private organizations which has concerned itself effectively with the study and encouragement of Federal investment in useful public works. Its aim "to promote the sound and orderly development of our national water and land resources" could well be used as a motto by the Interior Department. There are many areas of broad joint interest between us. Reclamation is, of course, the principal one.

One of the first studies in the planning of a reclamation dam is its usefulness for flood control. Some of the capacity of virtually every reclamation dam is allotted to controlling floods. Silt protection is a joint problem. Each reclamation dam provides some capacity for collecting silt.

Many of the dams built and planned by the Corps of Engineers have hydroelectric features. The Flood Control Act of 1944 assigned the Secretary of the Interior responsibility for marketing surplus power from these projects. That responsibility will require the closest understanding and cooperation.

There has been extensive discussion in recent years of some differences in the repayment features of Reclamation and Engineer Corps dams. There need be no controversy. The Federal policy is clear, and, I think, sound. Direct beneficiaries of a particular dam who use its water and its power can be easily determined. They pay for these direct benefits on both kinds of dams. The indirect beneficiaries of the flood control and navigation improvement are legion and it is impossible to assess the cost of those features to any but the entire people.

I feel that the controversy over this repayment problem has been unnecessary and the result of misunderstanding. I feel the same way about the present controversy over appropriations for the reclamation program for the next fiscal year.

There appears to be a feeling that money spent on reclamation is a sort of charity to the Western States because they are poor relations and don't have as much in the way of industry and agriculture as the rest of the country.

Nothing could be more of a misrepresentation nor less popular with the people of the Western States. Appropriations for reclamation projects are investments of the people's money and these investments pay off. Earlier this year I was handed a check for $15,000 by the calloused hand of a reclamation farmer in the State of Washington as the final payment for constrction costs on the Tieton division of the Yakima project. The fruit growers of that prosperous valley have paid off $3,400,000 in the last 37 years, the complete cost of project construction to the water users.

When I say the controversy over the reclamation appropriation is over a misunderstanding I do not want to minimize its importance. It affects a significant, if not the most important, part of our problem of adequate resources development in the crucial years of thinning domestic supplies of important and strategic materials.

A week ago today the House of Representatives voted an Interior Department appropriation bill which cut the President's budget nearly half and cut reclamation allowances more than half. When that bill was reported from committee I took public issue with the committee's recommendations because I felt they were harmful to the development and economic welfare of the entire country.

Resources development is not a partisan issue; it is a great national issue. Next to the high cost of living, it is probably the most important single domestic issue facing the American people. Those Congressmen who voted a week ago today to retard western river and land and mineral development did so out of belief that the modest investment of Federal funds required to continue construction of reclamation projects at an economical rate was unwarranted. Those who voted to retain the modest commitment of the President's budget did so out of a conviction that such investment was necessary to the prosperity of this country.

During every day that our river development program is stifled, this issue will grow and grow. This is particularly true of the development of our western rivers which is so essential to an expanding American economy. A determined effort to hold back resource development and utilization west of the Mississippi would eventually split the American people just as prohibition did. These cuts in promised, scheduled, and partially finished river-development projects cannot be airily explained by saying, as did the House Appropriations Committee, that this helps materially "in meeting the promises made in the fall of 1946 to the taxpayers of the Nation." The people of the Western States, whether their votes were influenced by this gaily irresponsible tax cut "promise" or not, did not expect a congressional tourniquet on their economic bloodstream.

I have traveled extensively through these western river-basin areas. I've had meeting after meeting with the businessmen and farmers of the reclamation communities and the surrounding towns and cities. The members of western chambers of commerce and Rotary clubs, the leading merchants and bankers, all of them men who desire tax cuts as much as or more than most, unanimously favor continued Federal investment in river development. They feel that drastic curtailment of this program is reckless and false economy and is subversive of the best interests of the American people.

Western resource development is too important to the economy of the entire Nation to remain in neutral or low gear. It must stay in high gear or it will go into reverse. The United States is a successful Nation and a prosperous Nation because it has been and is a growing Nation. There has been a constant outlet for new savings, new ideas, and new activities in our western frontier areas.

The Governor of California, who is highly regarded by the business community of the country and is a successful leader of both major political parties in his great State, urged the House of Representatives to double the allowance for construction of the Central Valley project. He asked that the $20,000,000 proposed in the President's budget be made $40,000,000. The answer was a cut—or rather, an amputation—to the sum of $6,900,000.

At the rate of appropriation established by the bill which passed the House, the Central Valley project in California would take 40 years to complete. A number of other projects would take even longer. For the Palisades project in Idaho, the time schedule would be 33 years. The Hungry Horse project in Montana would take 30 years; the Gila project in Arizona 31 years. The rate established by this appropriation bill generally moves back the reaping of the benefits in water, power, and revenues for a period of three to four times as long as originally planned. The eventual total cost will certainly be much more. The economic and financial returns will be less by just the amount of the delay.

Several instances of misunderstanding are clear in the committee report. It assumed that reclamation was in general competition with private business for construction materials. By far the largest part of the reclamation expenditure would be on labor, which is not in short supply in the Western States. Where there was to be competition for commodities it was chiefly for such items as transmission lines and substations needed to

service existing and new businesses in areas where electric power is in short supply.

The committee refers to some $85,000,000 for unexpended reclamation construction funds as available for construction during the next fiscal year. However, as the committee itself noted, more than $35,000,000,000 of this will have been obligated by June 30 and therefore actually spent, even if not paid out, and an additional $7,000,000 is earmarked by Congress so it is not available in 1948.

The reclamation expenditures were carefully prepared by a planning staff, which incidentally was completely eliminated by the House so that we can no longer exercise economy by intelligent, advance planning of projects and construction. They were minutely examined by the Budget Bureau, which was faithfully and ably carrying out the orders of the President to pass only essential expenditures. They were broken down and justified by reference to specific locations and to types of construction.

The committee did an able job of its hearings and investigations. It is thorough and well informed. In fact, it was so well informed when it met to mark up the bill that, in the words of Congressman ROONEY, of New York, "the figures had apparently already been decided upon in advance. For instance, we proceeded to mark up as the first item the Bureau of Mines. Every item of appropriation in connection with the Bureau of Mines had been previously agreed upon with somebody, and was written out on a white sheet. There was, therefore, not much sense in discussing the items. Our problem was very simple—the minority states that they disagreed in every instance with the work of the majority of the committee unless we definitely signified our assent."

This well-informed committee was like a small boy with a sickle. It chopped left and right. Some grass was skimmed and some cut to the roots. Every reclamation project suffered. If a project included a power feature to help pay its cost and service the farms and communities with labor-saving electric current, its funds were cut even more drastically than the others.

The situation today in western reclamation and river development is not unlike the housewife's present job of serving balanced meals at reasonable costs. After much study, she arrives at an economical but nutritious menu. Then the master of the house arbitrarily removes all the potatoes, half the green vegetables, and two-thirds of the soup and forbids her to read the meal-planning section of her cookbook. That man will not be adequately nourished and he may get sick. When the economy of our river-basin States is treated the same way, the national economy is sure to get sick and everyone will suffer.

As a partial excuse for this congressional work stoppage, the House committee advanced the specious aim of returning the Department of the Interior to its 1938 size and weight—a bit of wishful thinking which recalls the verse:

"Backward, turn backward, O Time, in your flight,
Make me a child again just for tonight."

This flight of fancy ignores what happened from 1939 to 1945. It ignores the fact that we have increased our American productive plant by one-third, have added 7,000,000 persons to our total work force, and have increased our total annual income from $64,000,000,000 to $165,000,000,000. It ignores 9 years of change and growth in an area of 1,800,000 square miles. It ignores an estimated population increase of over 2,000,000 persons. It ignores the thousands of small and large factories, mills, and shops which were located during the war so as to make use of the power and raw materials and crops of these Western States.

How long would any of us remain healthy if we spent only as much on food and clothing as we spent in 1938?

The 45-year record of achievement in Federal reclamation encourages me to believe that these troubles are temporary. The American people will not permit their resource development to go into reverse.

It has been a pleasure to be with you today and to be able to discuss some of our joint problems. I sincerely hope that I can meet with you in the future at a time when our joint interests are not faced with the present disregard for the long-term interests of the American people.

Higher Prices of Food Stem From World Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the question of food prices is a matter of the greatest public interest at this time. In recent weeks the press has carried a veritable flood of misinformation on this subject. This misinformation is mostly contained in editorial comment or articles by commentators on public affairs, although some of it has appeared in news columns.

For this reason, it was a pleasure to read an article appearing in the New York Times for Sunday, May 11, by Walter H. Waggoner, entitled "Higher Prices of Food Stem From World Need." This article discusses the situation accurately and objectively. I commend its reading to anyone interested in this important question:

HIGHER PRICES OF FOOD STEM FROM WORLD NEED—LARGE EXPORTS TO HUNGRY EUROPE ARE REFLECTED IN AMERICAN MARKETS

(By Walter H. Waggoner)

WASHINGTON, May 10.—The grim reports of the food situation in Europe were a reminder this week of America's plenty. They bore a suggestion, too, that United States foodstuffs would probably be costly for a long time to come.

It is an unpleasant fact that one country's want is another's profit. It is thus to American farmers, who have struggled to fill the world's need for food throughout the war and its aftermath—and have profited handsomely from it. But to the American consumer high food prices are just another pain in the pocketbook.

Actually, food as a component of the cost of living has varied proportionately very little in the last several years. From 1935 through 1946 average expenditures for food have not risen, on an annual basis, above 23 percent of total income, or fallen below 21 percent of it. This would indicate that the chances for bringing food costs down substantially, without bringing everything else, including income, down with them, would run against the pattern of history.

NO DROP IN PRICES

At the present time food prices on primary markets hover at an altitude about 60 percent higher than the 1926 level, and about 45 percent above their level of a year ago. To the great body of consumers whose wages and salaries have not been correspondingly raised—this includes a substantial number of middle-class, white-collar workers, and those on fixed incomes—the rise has been painful.

Producers and merchants of food have, like all other businessmen, recently been the objects of an intense appeal by President Truman to cut prices. Their response in many cases has been, Why should we reduce prices when it is the Government's responsibility that they are so high?

TWO FACTORS

The spokesmen for this point of view have two thoughts in mind. First, they are aware of the Government's program for feeding the hungry of Europe and Asia. Food prices are as responsive to foreign needs as they are to the demand of the consumer up the street. Second, they are thinking of the Agriculture Department's price-support policy of protecting farmers against a collapse.

When the price of wheat recently hit a history-making high as a consequence of Herbert Hoover's report on the acute need of grain abroad, the first influence was being felt. This week cotton prices advanced, partly on the basis of purchases by UNRRA, and grain prices rose in response to indications of poor crops. In each case traders were simply reacting to what is described as the law of supply and demand.

A basis for the other argument that the Government is causing high food prices—the price-support program—is less evident, if, indeed, it can be found at all. Officially, the Department of Agriculture has support programs for about 25 farm products or groups of products.

The list ranges from such basic food items as corn, wheat, hogs, and eggs to flaxseed and hairy vetch, a variety of hay. In most cases the Government guarantees farmers that their prices will not fall below about 90 percent of parity, which is the price they must receive to remain in balance with the prices of goods they buy.

GOVERNMENT BUYING

If the market price should fall below this 90-percent level because of a vastly bigger crop than the market could stand, or because of a sudden drop in demand for some reason, the Government, through its Commodity Credit Corporation, would buy the crop at the agreed-on level.

Today, however, the market price is so considerably above the support or guaranteed price that the latter has no effect at all on the former. Potatoes are the only exception. They are so plentiful they are being destroyed by the hundreds of carloads at the support price.

Dry milk and heavy turkeys are also "supported," but they are of small consequence in the cost of living.

Prices of other agricultural products are in little danger of falling below the guaranteed level. The support price of wheat is $1.82 a bushel, while current market prices are above $2.50. The Government promises not to let the price of hogs fall below $14.94 per 100 pounds. In the market, producers are getting in the neighborhood of $25.

To many analysts, it is important to retain the Federal price support program as an assurance to farmers they will not be victims of a slump in prices similar to that which caught them in the twenties. President Truman, on April 21, said:

"Without the support program, farmers, mindful of the disastrous farm collapse shortly after World War I, would not have planted their tremendous recent crops. The consequences would have been smaller acreage, greater excess of demand over supply, and prices much higher than they are now. Because of the support program, the consumer is better off and the world situation is more manageable."

Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, argues that the administration's program is "holding prices rather than forcing increases."

HOLD PRICES DOWN

"Most of the expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation during the last few

years were designed to hold consumer prices down and keep production up," he said recently.

Until recently farm and food prices were considered the likeliest area for a slump. With the troops home and demobilized, with UNRRA ending its buying, with Europe gradually regaining its own productive capacity, American agriculture seemed to be in for some retrenchment.

So far the slump has not appeared. Although some of the causes of one have already appeared, prices are still high. Army buying is a fraction of what it was and UNRRA is out of the market.

European agriculture, however, has been set back by a crippling winter and demand for American crops is still great. England is already hard put financially, and with its United States loan shrinking rapidly, it may have to spend more of the precious fund for foodstuffs than it had planned to do originally. France, rumored as a possible recipient of a World Bank loan, might also be in the market for American farm products.

The drop in food prices here, if not put off indefinitely, is at least postponed by hunger in the rest of the world. For American consumers it is the price of abundance.

Job of GOP Congress Seen as Remarkable Despite Press Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, out of the welter of New Deal criticism comes the voice of a columnist who deals in realities. I am inserting, under leave to extend my remarks, the article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Evening Star of May 12, 1947:

JOB OF GOP CONGRESS SEEN AS REMARKABLE DESPITE PRESS CRITICS

(By David Lawrence)

The Republican Congress actually has made a remarkable record to date insofar as expeditious handling of public business is concerned, but the left-wing press has managed nevertheless to spread the opposite impression.

Not since the reform days of 1913, when a Democratic Congress and administration took over from the Republicans, has there been so comprehensive a job done on organizing the work of Congress and preparing major legislation.

Before the end of June, the Republican Congress will have put through a bill liberalizing and readjusting the unbalanced provisions of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, strengthening the Mediation Service, and providing machinery for the settlement of strikes; a bill reducing income taxes, a bill to outlaw the portal-to-portal racket, and extortion, and appropriation bills making the first substantial reduction in Federal expenses in nearly 14 years.

NO HURRY IN LEGISLATING

These accomplishments by themselves would be enough to take 6 months, but other important bills will have been enacted by July. Legislation has not been completed in a hurry, either. Exhaustive hearings lasting 6 weeks were held on the labor bills and plenty of time has been afforded for both sides in the debates in the Senate. The tax bill also has required considerable time for hearings and debate.

So far as time is concerned, several Democrats have been responsible for consuming no small part of it. It was a Democrat, Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, who precipitated the controversy of several weeks over the confirmation of David Lilienthal; and it was the leadership of two Republicans, Senators HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, and VANDENBERG, of Michigan, which pulled that difficult chestnut out of the fire for the administration.

Likewise it was the Truman administration which properly enough introduced into the situation the Greek-Turkish legislation which was of a highly controversial character and also the European relief bills. Several Democrats in both houses, some of them New Dealers, did all they could to take up time and sabotage that legislation.

As for the budget-cutting process, never in all congressional history has there been such a concerted effort by persons in the executive departments to block legislation. President Truman has sat idly by while lobbies of his own personnel in the Government departments have used public funds unlawfully to try to defeat economy measures. When the whole story comes out, Mr. Truman's record will be vulnerable, for it was within his power to stop the intrigue and lobbying that was carried on in an attempt to hold appropriations at high levels.

REORGANIZATION WAS PROBLEM

Most perplexing from a time-consuming angle has been the reorganization law passed in the previous session by the Democratic majority. This measure has much merit, but it took the Republican Congress several weeks to adjust itself to the new committee system. This would have happened if the Democrats had been in power. Delays of this kind were inevitable and had nothing to do with the capacity of the Republican Party to govern.

The story that the Republicans have been dawdling or muddling is one that emanates primarily from Democratic political sources and the left wing generally. Anything to smear the majority party is considered good tactics and perhaps there are Republicans now who regret that they did not indulge more in that sort of thing themselves when they were the minority; but, unfortunately for them from a political standpoint, the war was on and the call to patriotism then had priority.

The Republican majority is making a meritorious record, but it could not possibly pass the labor and tax bills or cut the budget if it were not for the help of that stanch group of patriotic and courageous Senators from the Democratic Party of the South. These men, also the targets of abuse and ridicule by the left wing on the radio and in the press, are not allowing party politics or petty calls for so-called party regularity to interfere with performance of their duty.

What America has today in reality is not just a Republican Congress but a coalition Congress in which Republicans and Democrats are combining in an effort to rid the Government of graft and favoritism in the spending of public money and to eradicate special privilege from governmental boards and the courts.

A Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution passed by the Central Oregon Potato Growers Association relative to H. R. 166:

Whereas there is a definite need for the industry to obtain, through any fair means, a program for research; and

Whereas there is already a potato-flour program contemplated, and a need for potato flour through baked goods, such as bread, rolls, cakes, doughnuts, sweet food mixes, and filler for food products and family flour, a factor that will tend to increase the consumption of potatoes; and

Whereas the flavor and vitamin contents of such products will make healthier Americans already proven by scientific tests; and

Whereas such program will cut down on taxes, now being used in the form of subsidies to the farmers, for all taxpayers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Central Oregon Potato Growers' Association have approved of House Resolution No. 166 and do urgently request that it be passed by the House Committee on Agriculture and by the United States Congress or the establishment of such authority, to investigate, and institute studies and hold hearings to determine the feasibility of a program designed to do away with the potato surplus in the United States of America, and to report such findings to the United States Department of Agriculture.

BEN DAVIDSON,
Executive Secretary.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I gave last Monday night at 8:15 p. m. over the American Broadcasting Co. network on the subject of the labor bill (S. 1126).

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been reading with much interest, as you probably have, the full-page advertisements against labor legislation which are being run in our newspapers by the labor unions. I have also listened to their talks on the radio and read their union publications, in which they charge that the pending bills will "destroy unions."

Most of my time for the past year and a half has been devoted to study of labor legislation. Our Senate committee held 6 weeks of hearings and several weeks of executive sessions before it reported a bill. I could almost recite by heart the provisions of the pending Senate bill. But I must confess that I would never recognize it from the descriptions of it by union leaders. I would not for a moment accuse these gentlemen of deliberate falsehood. But certainly their statements as to what the legislation provides are only remotely related to the facts as I know them.

I cannot help but be reminded of the same kind of ridiculous charges made by union leaders in my home state of Minnesota in 1939 when the legislature passed a mild little labor relations bill requiring 10 days of conciliation before a strike. The leaders then

called it a slave act and freely predicted that it would destroy unions and force workers to involuntary servitude, the same charges they are making now about the bills in Congress. Of course the Minnesota law did no such thing. Unions have grown steadily there as elsewhere, although we have had a little more industrial peace.

But the best answer to this kind of distortion is the actual provisions of Senate 1126, the bill which the Senate will pass this week. You undoubtedly have heard the charge that this is an employer's bill, that it will give employers many advantages over their employees they do not now have. The facts are just the reverse.

Most of the bill's provisions are for the protection of employees, the men and women who work. The bill writes additional safeguards on their rights as against employers, union leaders, or biased decisions of the National Labor Relations Board. There are some provisions aimed at protecting the public generally, and a few to place employers on a basis of equality under the law in collective bargaining, but the bulk of the bill safeguards the right of employees to full freedom in their choice of occupation and bargaining agent.

There are two provisions aimed primarily at protecting the public, which is always a secondary sufferer in industrial strife and, in the case of industry-wide or union-wide strikes such as those we experienced in 1946, a major victim. One of these is the mediation section requiring 2 months' notice of termination of existing contracts between employers and unions, with 1 month for mediation in case collective bargaining fails to settle the dispute over renewal. Does that destroy any rights of labor or is it just sound, sane procedure?

A second public-protection provision authorizes the Attorney General to enjoin and stop industry-wide strikes which threaten the national health or safety, for a period of not to exceed 80 days. During that time, Federal mediators would attempt a settlement. If mediation failed, the NLRB would conduct a secret election among the employees to determine whether they wanted to accept the best offer of the employers or strike. If they so voted, they would then be free to strike.

This is the only provision in the Senate bill dealing with industry-wide bargaining and strikes, which all agree is one of our major problems. The Senate rejected an amendment to give local unions autonomy and stop internationals from dictating the terms of collective bargaining agreements on the grounds further study was needed. As it is, the 80-day mediation period applies only to industry-wide strikes, and unions always can avoid its application completely by bargaining on a local or community basis.

There are a few more provisions which protect the rights of employers. Of course those who believe that employers should have only duties and no rights in labor relations bitterly oppose these sections. But if you believe as I do that one sure way to totalitarianism in America is to place employers completely at the mercy of an all-powerful oligarchy of union leaders, then you will agree that, for both unions and employers, duties and rights must go hand in hand.

Employers, for instance, are given the right to petition the NLRB for an election among their employees to choose a bargaining agent whenever one or more unions demand recognition from them. This not only gives the employer some chance when he is caught in a jurisdictional squabble, but gives him the right to make sure, by a democratic election, that a union really represents his employees before he negotiates a contract with it.

Another provision removes bona fide foremen from the definition of employees in the National Labor Relations Act, thereby removing the compulsion on the employer of bargaining with a union of foremen. This is necessary because of divided opinions of the NLRB and Supreme Court. Foremen are an integral part of management and are so regarded now in the law. But the NLRB has also held that they can at the same time be subject to the discipline of the unions of employees they supervise, which just doesn't make sense.

Unions are made suable as legal entities for breach of contract. They are suable now, but in many jurisdictions every member must be served with notice and every member is liable for any damages awarded, which makes suits almost impossible. Individual members are protected from liability in this section, which aims at making unions responsible for their contracts.

Another provision makes it an unfair practice for unions to refuse to bargain collectively in good faith. This doesn't mean much to the big corporations, but it will be a help to the small employer who all too often has had a contract laid on his desk by a powerful union with a "take it or else" ultimatum. Certainly unions should have the same obligation as employers to bargain in good faith.

Finally, one provision helpful to both employers and employees is that dealing with secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. In their essence, these boycotts and strikes are an attempt by the employees of one employer through their union to dictate the terms and conditions and the union under which the employees of another employer shall work, regardless of the wishes of the employees themselves. Very often, an A. F. of L. union will boycott and refuse to work on goods manufactured in a plant where a CIO union has a contract and has been certified by the NLRB. The employer in such cases is a helpless secondary victim. He cannot comply with the boycotting union's demands without violating the National Labor Relations Act. But he is a secondary victim. The primary aim of most secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes is to gain control of the workers who are the primary victims.

The pending bill makes such boycotts and strikes unfair labor practices, directs the NLRB to go into court and obtain injunctions stopping them, and gives the injured parties the right to sue for damages actually sustained. True, this provision, if it works, will weaken the strangling power of those unions which depend for their power and revenue on this kind of racketeering practices. But it is essential if employees are to choose their own union, a right which the law now supposedly guarantees to them.

Including the secondary boycott, there are nine major provisions in the Senate bill protecting the rights and freedoms of employees, and I will have time for only a brief recital of them. Some are opposed by unions, quite understandably, because they will decrease the power of unions to order around and control individual employees regardless of their own desires. I think we must decide in America whether we want an all-powerful labor movement controlling every employee's job and work through ruthless use of economic force, or whether we want a labor movement reflecting the wishes and needs of free American workers who have voluntarily chosen their own unions. For my part, I am convinced that only the latter alternative fits our concept of freedom.

Next to the secondary boycott, the most important provision safeguarding employees' freedom is that dealing with the so-called closed shop in all its forms: closed shop, preferential hiring, union shop, and maintenance of membership. All such clauses make union membership a condition of employment. In other words, the union, instead of the worker himself, decides whether or not he may work in any particular job or occupation. Where there is both a closed shop and closed union, we have one of the tightest monopolies in existence.

It is my own conviction that this kind of shabby bread-and-butter control over a worker's right to earn a living is not only a fundamental violation of individual freedom, but a disgrace to the American labor movement. Unions enjoy many privileges and immunities in law on the grounds they are "voluntary associations." But what is voluntary about compulsory membership? I sought to outlaw all forms of compulsory membership in the Senate but the amendment was defeated.

However, both the House and Senate bills correct the worst abuses. The closed shop is outlawed completely. The union shop, under which employees must join the union within 30 days, and maintenance-of-membership clauses are left valid, but can be bargained for only after approved in a secret election by a majority of all the employees affected. Even then, no employee can be fired by an employer if he is denied membership in or expelled from a union for any reason other than nonpayment of regular dues and initiation fees.

Union leaders of course oppose this provision. It will decrease their arbitrary control over employees. They will not be able to compel employees to join unless a majority of them vote to do so, and they cannot have an employee fired from his job merely because he talked up in meeting or refused to buy a raffle ticket, as happened recently to two veterans in Missouri.

The Senate bill does not prohibit so-called welfare funds, but does require that they be trust funds, with the benefits to which employees are entitled spelled out in the agreement so that any employee denied his rights can go into court to protect them. Far too many of these funds which, after all, represent money earned by the employees, are controlled by union leaders under such loose standards that they are free to give or withhold benefits at their pleasure. Again, all we are doing is protecting the rights of the employees whose toil creates these welfare funds.

Another provision makes it an unfair practice for unions or their agents to coerce or restrain employees in their free choice of bargaining representatives. Again, the only purpose is to protect the rights of employees, to free them from the coercion of goon squads and other strong-arm organizing techniques which a few unions use today.

Section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, which deals with election of bargaining representatives, is completely rewritten in the pending bill, with every change, except that giving an employer from whom a union demands recognition the right to petition for an election, designed to assure to employees, not employers, their full rights and freedoms.

Briefly, those changes (1) give genuine professional and craft workers the right to a separate count to determine whether they want to be represented by a plant-wide union or want a separate unit of their own; (2) provide that in a run-off election, the run-off shall be between the two highest choices in the first count; (3) requiring the NLRB to give the same treatment to all election petitions whether filed by a union seeking certification, a group of employees seeking decertification, or by an employer; (4) requiring the NLRB, in deciding what unions should go on the ballot and in considering company-domination charges, to treat independent unions and those affiliated with national unions exactly alike—at present the Board has two rules, a mild one for affiliated unions and a much harsher one for independent unions; and

(5) providing that when an election is held during a strike, only employees working or entitled to reinstatement may vote. The Board at present permits strikers who have been replaced and have no legal right to reinstatement to vote, and in effect, block the free choice of the real employees.

In view of some of the wild statements being made, it might be well also to emphasize the fact that not a single change is made in the present list of unfair labor practices for employers in the National Labor Relations Act. They are all there and one has been added, making it an unfair practice for an employer to violate terms of a collective-bargaining contract.

This, in brief, is the bill which the union leaders are charging will destroy their unions and enslave labor. Ladies and gentlemen, you are the final judges. Your decision as to whether this legislation will enslave labor or whether it will increase the freedom of the men and women who work will determine the outcome.

I thank you.

The High Cost of Dying

REMARKS
OF
HON. EMORY H. PRICE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on this floor lately about the high cost of living. I guess you could entitle my remarks "The High Cost of Dying," especially in Cuba. I know that every Member of the House is interested in promoting our maritime activities, but I want you to know some of the things our shippers are contending with who run boats between the United States and Cuba.

The stevedores' union, a Communist-controlled union in Cuba, recently charged a company $141.37 for loading a corpse on one of the boats operated into Cuba.

I wish to read this whole bill for your information. They charged for 12 stevedores, $64.27; 1 foreman, $5.32; 1 check, $3.64; and 12 dock laborers, $44.36, a total of $117.59. To the custom house they paid for 4 inspectors at $5, $20; and a 2.75 percent Cuban tax of $3.78, which makes the total, $141.37, that these stevedores charged this company to load one corpse on the boat in Cuba.

I have asked the State Department to take this matter up with the Government of Cuba.

Appropriations for Reclamation and Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper article with reference to a meeting of eight western governors and the representatives of three others—both Republicans and Democrats—in Seattle, Wash., on May 7, 1947, in a campaign for congressional restoration of drastic cuts in the funds for reclamation, irrigation, and power development in their respective States.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the first gun in a campaign on the part of the 11 Western States in protest against the appropriation bill recently passed by Congress which cut to the very bone appropriations needed for the completion of irrigation, reclamation, conservation, and hydroelectric power projects essential to the very life of the West.

It is an undisputed fact that every dollar advanced by the Government to develop and complete these publicly owned projects will be returned to the Federal Treasury with interest.

The article follows:

GOVERNORS JOIN TO RESTORE CUT IN RECLAMATION

SEATTLE, May 7.—Eight Western Governors and the representatives of two others—both Republicans and Democrats—united today on a campaign for congressional restoration of drastic cuts in the reclamation and power development program and decided to carry their fight personally to the national capital.

They decided to appear in force, if possible for all of them to get to Washington, before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations. They will carry an appeal for restoration of appropriations which the economy-determined House cut by more than 60 percent.

In a formal declaration of policy, the Governors asserted "we sincerely believe that the continued development of such wealth-producing and self-liquidating projects is not inconsistent with the commendable aim of the Congress to effect economy in government."

ESSENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

At conclusion of the all-day conference, the Governors described the continued development of the West's reclamation and power projects as "essential to the Nation's welfare beyond any partisan consideration" and contended that failure to make full and adequate provision for the development of these projects would stifle industrial growth of the West.

The declaration was signed by eight Governors: Earl Warren, of California; C. A. Robins, of Idaho; Sam C. Ford, of Montana; and Earl Snell, of Oregon (all Republicans); William Lee Knous, of Colorado; Herbert B. Maw, of Utah (both Democrats). Charles A. Carson joined in the declaration as the representative of Gov. Sidney Osborn, of Arizona, and Alfred M. Smith joined in it as a representative of Gov. Vail Pittman, of Nevada.

Governor Warren, who will fly East this week as the first of the group to carry the fight to Congress, said California, already hard-pressed for water and power, would face "a crisis" if the huge Central Valley project is delayed, "and I know each of the other States has projects which are as vital to them as this project is to us."

LACK OF KNOWLEDGE

Warren attributed main responsibility for the House cuts to easterners' "lack of knowledge" of the operations and benefits of Western reclamation and hydroelectric power development.

Warren described it as "gross ignorance by many in the East as to the real importance of Government investments in the West by the Reclamation Bureau."

He said the House was not only cutting appropriations but has recommended a complete change in the future financing of reclamation projects.

"The House recommendation is that no more appropriations be made from general funds," he said, "but only from the reclamation fund, which is sharply limited."

Governor Maw charged private power supporters are opposing the Government-financed projects, as a phase of the "public versus private power controversy," as strongly as are eastern interests.

All governors in attendance said they would go in force to Washington to press their demands "if at all possible."

Gov. Sam Ford, of Montana, chairman of the Missouri River States committee, had already planned to appear before the committee May 16 in behalf of central-western reclamation development.

Also attending the emergency conference were Govs. Earl Warren, California; Lester Hunt, Wyoming; Herbert Maw, Utah; Lee Knous, Colorado; Earl Snell, Oregon, and C. A. Robins, Idaho.

Govs. Sidney Osborn, of Arizona, and Vail Pittman, of Nevada, were represented by State officials, while Gov. Thomas Mabry, of New Mexico, telegraphed his full endorsement of conference decisions.

IGNORANCE BLAMED

Earlier Governor Warren keynoted the conference by placing the blame on the "gross ignorance" of eastern Congressmen for proposed cuts in western reclamation appropriations.

The 12-point policy statement:

1. Conservation and development of the Nation's water resources for reclamation, power development, flood control, and navigation are vital to the Nation's economy.

2. Resource conservation and development are matters of established national policy in legislation over the past 45 years.

INVESTMENTS REPAID

3. Reclamation and power projects constitute wise investments which are repaid in full to the Federal Treasury.

4. Repayment of funds cannot be made until the projects are completed.

5. Such projects create new opportunities for productive labor in industry, commerce, and agriculture, and augment the national wealth in goods and services; and also create a source of new tax revenue for State and Nation.

6. The development program for these projects should be carried forward in an expeditious and orderly manner, after delay by war and the reconversion period.

COSTLY AND WASTEFUL

7. Drastic reductions in funds would be costly and wasteful disruption of project work already initiated.

8. Failure to make adequate provision for development of the projects would deprive veterans of needed farm land and farming opportunities.

9. Such failure would also stifle industrial growth of the West by preventing the generation and transmission of additional hydroelectric power.

10. Failure to provide funds would also interrupt studies of the feasibility of projects, for water surveys, topographical mapping, and steam gaging; and preclude the orderly development of the Nation's river basins.

CONSISTENT PROGRAM

11. Continued development of such wealth-producing and self-liquidating projects is not inconsistent with the aim of Congress to effect economy in Government.

12. Because the development of these projects is essential to the Nation's welfare beyond any partisan consideration, the governors pledged themselves to a united stand in behalf of the development and urged Congress to make adequate provision to that end.

Hon. J. J. Mansfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members will rejoice to know that there is every indication that our beloved colleague the Honorable J. J. MANSFIELD, of Texas, will soon be out of the hospital and back at the work he has loved so dearly and to which he has given so much. I speak out of the heart of each of you, I know, in saying that Judge MANSFIELD has no equal in this body, measured by the love, affection, and respect that the membership has for him. We have missed him very much, personally and professionally, and anxiously await his return.

We are not alone in our regard for him, as evidenced by the following resolution adopted unanimously by the Thirty-seventh Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at a meeting held this month in Washington. The resolution was offered by Dale Miller, regional director of the southwestern region, and reads as follows:

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is regretfully aware of the absence from this convention of its distinguished and beloved friend Congressman J. J. MANSFIELD, of Texas. This eminent gentleman, who served as chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives for a longer period than any predecessor in the history of the Congress of the United States, is now ill in the Naval Hospital at Bethesda. We bespeak the thoughts of his legions of friends and admirers everywhere in sending him on this occasion our affectionate regards and our prayerful wish for his early and complete recovery.

Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand Detroit Workers Protest Against the Hartley Antilabor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 30, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal of talk about the public demanding that unions be restricted. It is very rare that we have this term "public" defined. We are often led to believe that people cease being members of the public when they join unions. But, Mr. Speaker, they still pay taxes. They still go to church. The advertisements still appeal to their pocketbooks. In short, they are the public. The 60,000,000 wage earners and their families, organized and unorganized, make up the great American public.

I submit a newspaper article from the New York Times of April 25, 1947, showing some of this public. The New York Times estimates that 250,000 people in Detroit quit work as an expression of their fear about antilabor legislation. Over 100,000 people, young and old, male and female, marched to Cadillac Square in Detroit. I am told that this was the greatest demonstration held in the city of Detroit. Similar demonstrations were held in Des Moines, Iowa, and cities throughout the land.

What made these people come out? We are told, of course, that the union leaders are the only ones protesting this legislation. But no one forced these workers to come out. These workers are conscious of the part trade-unions play in their everyday existence and the dangers to themselves, their families, and their communities if the trade-union movement is suppressed.

The remarkable growth of the American trade-union movement from less than 3,000,000 to over 14,000,000 members could not have taken place unless the workingman felt the need for organization and voluntarily joined such organization.

I ask you to ponder, gentlemen, on the meaning of the Cadillac Square demonstration, the Iowa demonstration, and the meetings being held all over the land.

The article follows:

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DETROIT WORKERS QUIT FACTORIES TO PROTEST ANTI-LABOR BILLS AT RALLY

DETROIT, April 24.—More than 250,000 Detroit automobile and allied workers left their jobs here this afternoon in response to a call from the United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, to attend a union mass meeting in Cadillac Square in front of the city hall to protest pending labor legislation.

While most of the large plants were affected and some of them closed completely, a crowd estimated at 60,000 persons filled the square to listen to union officials criticize congressional and State officials. Besides those in the square, another 15,000 or 20,000 filled near-by streets, causing one of this city's worst traffic jams in recent years.

The rally began about 3:30 p. m. and broke up at 5 p. m. The exodus from the plants began at 2 p. m. and thousands of the unionists joined parades that converged on the downtown part of the city from three directions.

Ford Motor Co. officials said that more than 35,000 of its day-shift employees quit and that as a result nearly all operations were suspended. Chrysler Corp., Briggs Manufacturing Co., Hudson Motors and Packard also reported that practically all production was stopped.

General Motors, which at the time of the rally was negotiating a pay rise with the union, suffered the least from production interference. Workers stayed at their jobs in four plants, and only the Chevrolet Gear and Axle and the Fleetwood divisions were closed.

Joining the UAW, which sponsored the rally, were representatives of telephone workers' unions, the United Steel workers, CIO, the Mechanics Educational Society of America, the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen and the Foremen's Association of America.

George F. Addes, UAW secretary-treasurer, told the crowd that Congress was using "every union-busting device that has been conceived by the most vicious of antilabor corporate executives" in framing the Hartley labor bill.

R. J. Thomas, union vice president, charged that "giant monopolies of industry" are seeking to destroy the labor movement, "which stands first and foremost in opposition to destruction of American living standards."

Intelligence Service of the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Providence (R. I.) Journal of May 9, 1947:

SUICIDAL STUPIDITY

If anyone is giving out prizes for shortsightedness and stupidity in the current congressional economy drive, we nominate for the blue ribbon the members of the House Appropriations Committee who sliced in half funds for the State Department's intelligence activities.

Only recently has the effort to put American peacetime intelligence work on a rational, effective basis been making headway. A few months ago, the various phases of the job—which is simply that of acquiring and analyzing information about the rest of the world—were distributed in such a way as to avoid overlapping and duplication of effort. The State Department, logically, was assigned to concentrate on political and economic developments abroad.

Further, to strengthen the set-up, George Marshall, in one of his first moves as Secretary of State, brought together all the intelligence units scattered through the Department into two central agencies—the Office of Intelligence Collection and Dissemination and the Office of Intelligence Research.

"The intelligence program," Mr. Marshall subsequently explained to the House Appropriations Committee, "provides a centralized service within the Department to acquire and analyze objectively all foreign political and economic information. We cannot afford to be without full and accurate intelligence. Only when we are fully informed of the acts and intentions of others can we avoid fatal miscalculations of their future policies and objectives."

In the present state of the world, nothing could be more self-evident. The United States is embarking on an epochal course of world leadership, involving heavy expenditures, delicate decisions, and grave risks. To the average citizen, adequate knowledge about what the rest of the world is up to would seem a minimum essential for such a policy.

But not to the House Appropriations Committee. Blithely disregarding Secretary Marshall's sober reasoning, that group has voted to slash the State Department's intelligence funds 50 percent from the budget figure, and a full third below the amount being spent this year. If it sticks, this move will compel dismissal of one-third of the Department's intelligence staff, and in the opinion of objective Washington observers will cripple a program for which the need has never been more desperate.

To be sure, the committee acted in the holy name of economy. Consider the size of the achievement. The sum asked was about $5,000,000. The saving would be about two and one-half millions—roughly 0.00006

percent of President Truman's $37,500,000,000 budget.

These newspapers believe firmly in Federal economy. We consider it not only desirable but essential for Congress to cut, and cut drastically, in the many spots where waste, duplication, and profligacy mark governmental operations.

But to hamstring the infant intelligence service at a time like this, to choke off our information about the outside world just when we need it most, for the sake of saving a couple of million dollars is not, we submit, economy at all. It is rank, suicidal stupidity.

The Place of the United States in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] delivered a magnificent address before the International Relations Club of the University of North Carolina, on May 8, 1947. I feel that the Senators and the public will read his interesting remarks with both pleasure and profit. I ask unanimous consent to have this address inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, when I accepted your invitation to speak to you this evening, I did so with pleasure. It is always an interesting experience to address any group of American citizens concerned with world affairs. I know this is your concern and all of you keenly appreciate how vitally significant our relations with other nations are today. There was a time when we could and did isolate ourselves and proceed along a solitary way.

I shall not take your time tonight to stress the point that such isolationism is gone forever, regardless of our wishes. Neither shall I discuss how small our world is nor how, with each new advance in energy, power, transportation, and communication, it is continually shrinking. However, in this connection it may be of some interest to mention a trip I made with some other Members of Congress only last month.

Ten of us left Washington late one night to attend the Interparliamentary Union at Cairo. Due to weather conditions, we were forced to spend an entire day in Bermuda. After some time in French Morocco Saturday, all of the next day, Easter Sunday, was spent in Jerusalem visiting the holy places. We stayed 5½ days in Cairo attending the sessions of the Union. Thereafter in rapid succession, but having time in each place to visit with many high officials of government, we visited Ankara, Istanbul, Athens, Rome, and Paris, finally taking off for the return trip across the Atlantic from Shannon, Ireland. From the time we left Washington until the day of our return, including all time spent in travel, we had been away from Washington only 13 days.

Recently the late Mr. Willkie coined the expression, "One World." How much more true that expression will be tomorrow when all the vast potentialities of nuclear fission are applied to everyday life, as they will be, and perhaps sooner than we expect.

No man can foretell today what tomorrow will be. We are limited in our forecast of the future only by the limitations of our own minds and imaginations.

While tremendous advances have been made along so many lines, the almost terrifying thought comes that the nations of the world have not similarly progressed in their political relations with each other.

This was more than confirmed by nearly everything I heard and saw on the trip just mentioned. In Turkey and Greece, so prominent in public mind now, conditions exist which have prevailed almost since the world began. In that area of the world I found beyond any possibility of doubt the age-old ambition of a strong and powerful nation to expand and impose upon weaker and smaller nations its power, influence, and even its philosophy of government. In those small nations there also exists the same age-old determination to resist outside domination and the will to maintain their independence.

In Turkey we met a sturdy people. It is a nation that has made great progress in the past 25 years; one which is determined to protect its sovereignty and to maintain its own integrity. Notwithstanding the strength of that nation, for it is the strongest small nation in that part of the world, it was clearly apparent that to maintain her sovereignty and independence, Turkey does unquestionably require the assistance she has asked us to extend.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the aid requested is largely of military equipment. In a narrow sense this is true. It is military aid. In the broader and better aspects the aid extended will be of great assistance to the economic life of that nation.

During the war Turkey, a nation of less than 20,000,000 people, was compelled to maintain a huge standing army. It numbered anywhere from 500,000 to 1,000,000 men. After the war, when demobilization should naturally have occurred, demands, refusal to renew a former friendship pact, propaganda, threats, direct and indirect, literally forced Turkey to continue maintaining a military establishment far beyond her means to support. Men who are badly needed in productive efforts of every kind are in the army. Not only are their labors lost in fields of production, but they themselves must be supported in their nonproductive military activities. This, with other factors, has produced a heavy drain upon the resources of the country. If such condition prevails very long and no assistance or help is given, economic regression, perhaps collapse and disaster, inevitably await. From an economic standpoint, earnestly I declared the situation in Turkey is grave and it is serious. For, in economic collapse lies, in my judgment, Turkey's danger. In that fertile field the seeds of communism so well sown will bring forth their bitter fruit. If the assistance requested is given and her army is mechanized and modernized, Turkey will thereby be able to continue a strong armed position, if necessary, with far less manpower. It is believed by this procedure thousands of men can be released from the army and returned to agriculture, industry, and other productive, peaceful pursuits where they are so badly needed to support and expand the economic life of the nation. To maintain her economic stability and security is the chief aim of Turkey and such is her strength. While it may be an indirect approach, our aid to Turkey will have its chief value in assisting her to preserve her economy and the government she wants free from outside force or influence. This is what Turkey asks of us. We cannot refuse her request.

In Greece the situation is different. It is far worse. Having gone through an unfortunate dictatorship in years preceding the war, then the war itself, and finally five long years of enemy occupation of a most vicious kind, the situation in that brave little country is most deplorable. Her economy destroyed, her people demoralized, civil strife within and constant pressure from without, Greece cannot, in my judgment, maintain her sovereignty or independence as a nation without most substantial aid and assistance from us.

It was almost pitiable to see the complete reliance Greece places in us. Her confidence is great; her hope is strong. Sublime is her faith in America. She does not doubt that the aid she so greatly needs will be given. If we expect to exercise any degree of influence whatever in world affairs in the future, we dare not betray nor deny the almost simple, childlike faith and trust Greece and her people place in the United States. We must not fail her and we must not fail Turkey. If we do, what may we expect?

If Turkey goes down and if Greece likewise falls, the inevitable results will be swift and sure. The expansion of the Soviet Union and the spread of communistic influence which already has overwhelmed so many of the nations of Europe will continue its onward course into Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, ultimately India, China, and all of Asia. Perhaps what little is now left in Europe of free peoples and nations will likewise succumb and fall.

To aid Greece and Turkey in maintaining their sovereignty, to choose for themselves the type of government they want without domination from the outside, I supported the present program in the committee and on the floor of the Senate. It is my earnest hope tonight that the aid both countries so desperately need will very soon be theirs.

In my remarks about the expansion of the Soviet Union and the spread of communism, I do not want to be misunderstood. We have no quarrel with Russia nor with her theory of government. She has the same right to whatever form of government she desires as we have to our own. Any nation which voluntarily chooses communism or any other form of government has the perfect right to do so and no nation in the world has any right to object. I go further and say there is ample room in the world for both capitalistic and communistic nations to live together, even as friends and neighbors.

It is this fundamental belief in the right of self-determination in all nations that causes my strong opposition to the expansion of any doctrine or state by extending boundaries or theories of government upon or into any other nation by force, conquest, infiltration, propaganda or by any means whatsoever. In this opposition to the domination of weak nations by the strong, in supporting the right of self-determination for all nations, we but adhere to principles for which, with others, we engaged in two world wars, in which we gave most generously, even lavishly, of our money and of the lives of our men. To do less than we propose to do now would be to abandon the principles for which we fought and for which many of our sons laid down their brave young lives. Surely, in times of so-called peace we can exercise some small part of that bravery and generosity which our country always magnificently exhibits in times of war.

But it is currently charged that the path we choose will lead to war, that it is a dangerous course, and that it is imperialistic in nature and design.

That it is a dangerous path I do not dispute. I know of no course that is not fraught with danger today. The world in which we live is a dangerous world. The dangers of

misunderstandings, of discord, division, distrust, and suspicion are so great that any step taken may conceivably lead to war. Great military leaders have recently and often pointed out that mere stupidity can provoke war. So grave are conditions everywhere no person can be sure or certain about the consequence which may follow any step that is taken.

Recently I said in the Senate, and I repeat it here, of these things we must not be afraid. Risks will be inherent in any course we pursue. There is but one thing for us to determine and of which we must be certain. Let us first determine what is right. Having determined what is right, nothing else matters. This, then, must be our guidepost and our sign. Risks may be taken, dangers may be confronted, but so long as we are right we will not be afraid.

It is unfortunate that the charge of imperialistic ambition has been laid against our country. It is extremely unfortunate that a great and good man has allowed himself to be drawn into opposition to present policies and that he has seen fit to repeat here and abroad charges that ours is a dangerous course, one which will lead to war, and especially that we pursue an imperialistic program. For these are the same charges which are being broadcast against us by the propaganda agents of Russia daily and directly into those countries we seek to aid. But regardless of deliberate propaganda or of ill-advised statements by anyone, the history of America, her past and present conduct, stoutly dispute and deny every implication that we have any imperialistic design whatsoever.

It was not imperialism that caused us to fight a war over Cuba and then, after victory was ours, to grant Cuba full independence.

It was not imperialism which caused us, after we had won the Philippines by conquest, to pay Spain $20,000,000 and later give independence to the Philippines.

It was not imperialism which caused us to enter two world wars and, after emerging from both of them victorious, to lend our Allies and others billions of dollars; to support, as we are now supporting, at great expense, vanquished peoples, and all without asking or receiving one foot of territory or one dollar in reparations.

It was not thus, says that arch critic of American foreign policy, Mr. Norman Thomas, in a recent article in Harper's magazine, that empires were built. It was not in this fashion that imperialist Rome ruled the world, nor was it in this manner that the great British or other empires grew and expanded.

It was not imperialistic ambition which caused us to offer to turn the most deadly weapon ever devised by man, the atomic bomb, over to an international authority, asking only that all nations, including our own, be made secure against its use by any nation against any other.

It is not imperialism which causes us today not to follow the example of the Soviet Union, which has forcibly made smaller and weaker nations her satellities and mere puppet states, and demands billions in reparations.

It is not imperialism that causes us today to grant assistance to Turkey and Greece, asking in return therefor only that they be permitted to pursue their own way of life, free from domination and influence of other nations, including ourselves.

In all the history of men, and notwithstanding one or two minor lapses, of which I am fully aware, no nation in all the world can show such a completely unselfish, humanitarian and nonimperialistic record as is written on the clean pages of American history.

Whatever may be our country's faults or errors, and we have made many costly mistakes in our dealings with other nations, imperialism is not one of them, and it ill becomes any American to add to present world suspicion and distrust by laying that charge at his country's door.

But let us now lay aside and forget charges and countercharges. Let us even pass by immediate situations in a more or less gloomy world and think together for a little while about more permanent, lasting, and, I sincerely hope, better things to come.

After the last war we made a valiant start on the road toward an organization which would forever free the world from the folly, stupidity, and curse of war. For reasons unnecessary to recount, we abandoned that child of which we were the lawful parents, the League of Nations, and left it an orphan and outcast on the doorsteps of the war-torn nations of the Old World. No wonder it never grew to that strength and stature for which it was originally created.

However, we did not mean to abandon the world. We did not intend to forsake distressed and suffering peoples. We resolved upon a course, after refusing membership in the League, of giving financial aid and assistance where it was needed. We made loans and even gifts. In such ways, we tried to sustain other nations and to relieve the suffering of other peoples. By giving financial aid, we thought we could make them strong, that by such methods peace would result. Our intentions were good, but we were mistaken. The same mistakes must not be repeated.

On the surface, it seems that we are not committing those old errors. We have joined the United Nations, which we did not do before. We have adhered to the International Court, which we refused in other years. We have agreed to the principle of an international military force. In many other ways we have indicated a willingness to strive earnestly and strongly for a world of order and for permanent peace among all nations.

While such activities do appear on the surface, that is what disturbs me. Are they only superficial steps we and the other nations are taking? Are the nations truly searching for some method which can guarantee peace? If so, it can be found.

In the disordered world in which we live there are many things to be done if any degree of safety is to be had for any of us.

First of all—and this I regret to say—for the time being we must maintain our own strong Military Establishment. Until the strength of the United Nations is fully assured, force will continue to be the one power recognized by some nations.

Likewise, we must keep our own country in a strong financial position. Right now widespread depression in the United States would bring despair and disaster to the entire world.

Fair, just reciprocal trade relations with other nations is an essential step in establishing order thoughout the world. Barriers to trade and commerce will just as surely result in disaster as they did when we pursued that course in the twenties and early thirties. Make no mistake about this, the selfish tendency for greed and gain which abides in all of us to a more or less extent is extremely hard to guard against, and may well prove to be our weakest and most vulnerable spot.

These are but the preliminary matters, for the one thing we must do and in which we must have complete cooperation of other nations is in finding and putting into effect the way to settle disputes and differences according to principles of law and justice and not by the rule of force and might.

Last summer I witnessed the explosion of two atomic bombs at Bikini. If I had seen nothing else, if I knew nothing more than what I saw and learned at Bikini, this would have been sufficient to prove most conclusively that no nation is strong enough to combat or resist forces of total destruction.

Civilization cannot survive an age of wholesale, mass destruction. Even as we now have no choice except to maintain present military strength, so actual realities give no choice as to the long-range program.

The tragedy and folly of the past has been that, notwithstanding his great advance in every field of human endeavor, man has settled disputes among nations exactly as did the barbarians of the most crude and cruel stages of human development. With all his progress and knowledge, he has steadfastly failed to adopt any adequate substitute for war.

I cannot explain what I mean better than to quote from the recent work The Anatomy of Peace, by Mr. Emery Reves, wherein it is said:

"If from the Second World War we emerge with another treaty or covenant, the next war may be taken for granted. If we have the foresight, and decide to make that fundamental and revolutionary change in human history, to try to introduce law into the regulation of international relations, then, and not until then, shall we approach an order which may be called peace. * * *

"Up to now, peace between nations has always been a static conception. We have always tried to determine some sort of status quo, to seal it meticulously in a treaty, and to make any change in that status quo impossible except through war.

"This is a grotesque misconception of peace. After having tried it a few thousand times, it may be wise to remember what Francis Bacon said three centuries ago, that 'it would be an unsound fancy and self-contradictory to expect that things which have never yet been done can be done except by means which have never yet been tried.'"

In this forceful language, Mr. Reves has pointed the way to the one method by which permanent peace can be achieved.

The rule of law must be substituted for the rule of force. To this end the jurisdiction of the United Nations must be greatly expanded. A code of international law must be agreed upon and subscribed to by all nations.

In addition to a code of law, the International Court of Justice must have jurisdiction to construe and apply these principles of law, and all nations must be required to submit their disputes to the Court of Justice. This calls for compulsory jurisdiction in that court.

The United Nations must have a strong international military force, not a police force, but, as my colleague Senator ELBERT THOMAS, of Utah, describes it, "an international peace force."

To prevent war between the several States, the founding fathers of the Republic wisely determined that each State should surrender its separate right to make war, and such power should rest exclusively in the central government. Internationally, we must follow that same pattern.

The right to declare war must be surrendered by every nation in the world. The central organization alone should have the right to maintain any army or make war.

This necessarily includes the complete disarmament of all the separate nations. No nation should be permitted to maintain a separate military establishment. Military power must rest in the United Nations alone. Such plan must include the international control of atomic energy.

The few points I have outlined are not revolutionary. They embrace the experi-

ence of the past and pave the way for a peaceful future.

Let me summarize the simple suggestions I have made.

First. Temporary maintenance of military establishments at whatever level is necessary.

Second. Complete cooperation and reciprocity in trade relations.

Third. Adoption of a code of international law and the substitution of law as the final word in all relations among disputing nations.

Fourth. Enlarging the jurisdiction of the international courts of justice and making that jurisdiction compulsory.

Fifth. The immediate establishment of an international military force.

Sixth. The complete delegation of the international authority of the right to declare war, with each nation surrendering its present, separate right to declare or wage war.

These suggestions all add up to a strong and effective United Nations. Through the organization which is already set up we must proceed to those accomplishments and achievements which can come solely with united action. Through these methods and means, law can be substituted for war and war can be driven from the world of men.

Inadequate as may be present machinery, that must not be too discouraging. The road toward a permanent, effective world organization is neither short nor easy. Evils which have existed since the birth of civilization will not be cured by brief or faltering efforts. Our task is to use the tools we have on hand, improving them as we can, and with determination, faith, and good will continue without faltering until the great objective is achieved. In thus substituting law as the ruling power instead of force we follow the thought of Francis Bacon, and do endeavor to adopt means which have not as yet been fully tried.

But to all of this there must be added another vital factor which also has never before been fully tried and the possibilities of which are inexhaustible. Perhaps this should come from worthier men than I, but, nevertheless, I dare to say that all of our fine ideals and ambitions for a world of justice and right, a world of peace, rest upon something stronger than military might, or even of law itself. The world is sick; some of its members and parts are dying. Evils of many kinds have crept insidiously into many countries. No man can tell how far such evil tendencies may go.

In all the history of men, the forces of evil have never been successfully combated except by the forces of righteousness. Soldier that he was, Napoleon recognized and said there were but two great forces in the world—one the sword, the other the spirit, and, of the two, the spirit was the stronger. Today we must acknowledge this eternal truth. Even though the moral and spiritual fiber of man may have been weakened by war and distress, until the pessimist believes there is no hope, we can hold no such thought. Notwithstanding lapses into dark ages which have occurred throughout the history of different civilizations, I choose to believe that the ultimate destiny of man is to progress and go forward. Trite as it may be to say it, "truth crushed to earth will rise again." Out of the gloom and darkness of war and desperate world affairs, awakened moral and spiritual values will rise to carry mankind forward to that destiny which must be his. As surely as a rising sun drives the darkness of night away, so will the forces of righteousness drive the darkness of evil, injustice, and war from the world of men.

To this faith, to this hope, and to this belief our lives must be dedicated and our souls consecrated. Then, and not until then, may men dare entertain hope for security, justice, or peace.

Prohibition of Alcoholic Beverage Advertisements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Dr. Clinton N. Howard, general superintendent of the International Reform Federation, made a very able statement before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this morning in support of the bill S. 265, introduced by me, which would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, Patrick Henry said he knew no way of judging the future but by the past. Abraham Lincoln said, "If we could first show where we are and whither we are tending, we could then judge what to do and how to do it." Applying these two principles to the discussion we wish first of all to analyze the Capper bill, S. 265.

I wish to congratulate Senator CAPPER on its clarity and its brevity. Like the Lord's Prayer it goes straight to the mark, and no time need be lost in definitives, derivatives, or definitions. It requires only one reading to learn that it is a prohibition bill pure and simple. It states what it wants, how to obtain it, and provides stringent penalties to insure its enforcement.

Quoting its first paragraph it reads, "A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and other purposes," the other purposes being their broadcasting over the radio. They correlate and each are essential to the success of the other. It is prohibition plus prohibition, plus prohibition.

Section two says, "It shall be unlawful, etc." Section 3 says, "It shall be unlawful." Section 4 says, "It shall be unlawful." Sections 5 and 6 state explicitly what is unlawful, and section 7 provides an adequate penalty by fine or imprisonment or both for its violation.

DIVINE PROHIBITIONS

There remains nothing to discuss except the plan and purpose of the act. The plan is in harmony with the divine law from the beginning of time. It aims to prohibit what it conceives to be a public wrong, to the individual and to society at large. In that respect it is a paraphrase of the Ten Commandments, which were engraven with the finger of God on tables of stone as recorded in the book of Exodus. "And He gave unto Moses after that He had made an end of communing with him two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God, and the tables were the work of God and the writing was the writing of God, graven on the tables." The principle of prohibition is of divine origin.

Civil government is a divine institution. The first constitution was written with the finger of God on tables of stone, and 7 of the 10 articles are prohibition. God not only wrote them, but He spoke them. God spake all these words:

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image. * * * Thou shalt not bow down to serve them." Prohibition. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Prohibition.

"Thou shalt not kill." Prohibition.

"Thou shalt not commit adultery." Prohibition.

"Thou shalt not steal." Prohibition.

"Thou shalt not bear false witness." Prohibition.

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, house, goods, or anything that is thy neighbor's." Prohibition.

In the Ten Commandments there are 10 prohibitions. "Thou shalt not" is the beginning of seven of them, and in the First Commandment three times it is written, "Thou shalt not." They have been nullified throughout the centuries. But they have never been modified; they have never been revised; they have never been repealed; and the nations that have disregarded them have perished from the face of the earth.

THE CORNERSTONE OF LIBERTY

Crossing the centuries, American prohibition had its rise in Independence Hall in the cradle of American liberty, when the Liberty Bell was rung and freedom's triumph was sung; and the old bell pealed to the world that the reign of oppression had ceased, and the banner of freedom was unfurled.

When taxation without representation was prohibited, when importation without tariff and taxation was prohibited, when forceful entry without a warrant was prohibited, when titles of nobility from any king, prince, or foreign state were prohibited, when the right of States to keep armed troops or ships or engage in war without the consent of Congress was prohibited; when the election of a foreigner as President of the United States was prohibited; when any religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States was prohibited; when private property, papers, or effects can be seized without due process of condemnation and compensation was prohibited; when the citizen can be imprisoned without trial by jury, held on excessive bail, or inflicted by cruel or unusual punishment was prohibited; when by the adoption of the thirteenth amendment slavery or involuntary servitude was prohibited; when the right of suffrage based upon sex was prohibited. Prohibition. Prohibition. More than three-quarters of the laws of the land are prohibitory. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution not only impose prohibition upon foreign nations, but they impose prohibitions upon the States and the United States.

POWER RESIDES IN PEOPLE

Every power conferred by the Constitution upon the Federal Government is a prohibition upon the rights of the State and every right reserved to the States is a prohibition upon the Federal Government. The most priceless privileges that we enjoy under the Constitution, "The Five Freedoms" emphasized so frequenttly by the late President for which we fought World War I and World War II for ourselves and for the world, the right of free speech, free press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, the right of petition and to vote, and freedom of information, eight freedoms in all are prohibitions imposed on the Federal Government by the people when they ratified the Constitution and the first ten amendments, called the Bill of Rights, including their right to amend their constitutional law. That is the charter of our freedom, the palladium of our liberties, the arch of our American Government for which our fathers gave their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

The Capper bill (S. 265) is but the extension of that right to prohibit the invasion of our homes by either advertisements in the daily press, or magazines and on the radio of intoxicating liquors, whether spirits, wine, or beer.

If those liquid commodities are a good creature of God, then this bill should be defeated; if, on the other hand, they have been condemned throughout the ages by secular and holy writ, this proposed enactment should be favorably reported and speedily enacted into law for the public health, the public safety, the public peace, the public order, and the public morals. That is what Gladstone meant when he said, "It is the object of Government to make it easy to do right and difficult to do wrong."

THE LAW OF NATURE

The Son of Man said, "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so, every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Therefore, by their fruits ye shall know them."

A tree is known by its fruits, and a business is known by the character of what it produces.

Whatever increases the value, usefulness, and character of the raw material with which it works is a good business; whatever decreases the value, usefulness, and character of the raw material with which it works, is a bad business. For example, if it goes in as cotton and comes out cloth, and goes in cloth and comes out as garments; if it goes in as clay and comes out bricks, and goes in bricks and comes out homes, buildings, churches, public institutions; if it goes in as logs and comes out lumber, and goes in lumber and comes out furniture; if it goes in as coal and comes out comfort; if it goes in as rags and comes out paper, and goes in as paper and comes out books, a Post, a Star, a Herald, a New York Times, a Congressional Library; if it goes in as fodder and comes out cattle; if it goes in as grain and comes out flour, and goes in as flour and comes out bread; if it goes in as sand and comes out glass in a thousand forms of usefulness, adornment, and beauty, and if it goes in as ore and comes out iron, goes in as iron and comes out steel, goes in as gold and comes out money, and so on ad infinitum, it is a good business, and if it goes in as advertising and results in increased sales, good.

A LEGAL OUTLAW

How about the liquor business? Does it increase the value, usefulness, and character of the raw material with which it works? It goes in clean and comes out dirty, it goes in pure and comes out defiled, it goes in healthy and comes out diseased, it goes in broadcloth and comes out rags. It goes in sober and it comes out drunk, it goes in a boy and comes out a bum, a drunkard, a pauper, a slave, a criminal, a lunatic, a lost week end, a lost life. It goes in a home and comes out a hell.

Has it improved the value, usefulness, and character of the raw material with which it works? I leave that to the sober judgment of the committee. If it does, advertise it and thereby increase its sale; if it does not, pass the Capper bill, S. 265, and prohibit its being advertised for sale in the public press, the magazines with their millions of circulation, and over the radio, coming unbidden and unwelcome into our homes, every hour on the hour, interrupting, at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of almost every newscast, concert, symphony, and ball game from 6 a. m. until midnight, and worst of all undoing the teaching, the example, the preaching, and the prayers of millions of fathers and mothers at the evening fireside.

We appeal to you, gentlemen of the committee, protect our homes, and our children, our shut-ins and our sick who cannot spring to the radio dial in time to shut out the sound of Senate beer, with its sparkling bubble carbonation, that holds its head high in any company, and calls its corporate name by that name which is above every name. I plead with you Senators to protect your own good name from being dragged down into the worm of the vat and the slough of the still.

THE SUPREME COURT CONFIRMS

Gentlemen of the committee, let me confirm my testimony by a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court—*Crowley* v. *Christiansen* (136 U. S. 86):

"By the general concurrence of opinion of every civilized and Christian community there are few sources of crime and misery to society equal to the dram shop. The statistics of every State show a greater amount of crime and misery attributable to the use of ardent spirits obtained at these retail liquor saloons than any other source. It is a business attended with danger to the community. It is not necessary to array the appalling statistics of misery, pauperism, and crime which have their origin in the use and abuse of ardent spirits.

"Liquor in its nature is dangerous to the morals, good order, health and safety of the people, and is not to be placed in the category with the ordinary commodities of life. We do not suppose there is a more important factor in keeping up the necessity for asylums, penitentiaries, and jails and in producing immorality and crime throughout the entire country than liquor."

THE SUPREME JUDGE WARNS

Having heard from the Supreme Court, let us hear from the Judge of all the earth, as spoken by His prophet of the ancient time: "I will stand upon my watch, and I will set me upon the tower thereof, and I will wait to hear what the Lord my God shall speak * * * and the Lord answered me and said, Write the vision, make it plain that he that runneth may read; for the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it: woe to him that buildeth a town with blood, and stablisheth a city by iniquity; woe to him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him and maketh him drunken."

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we do not believe that such a business ought to be allowed to advertise its wares in the public press or broadcast them into the homes of what the Supreme Court has by a unanimous decision declared to be a Christian Nation.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For the Sake of Peace and Safety," published in the Chicago Herald-American of May 5, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE SAKE OF PEACE AND SAFETY

The Congress of the United States is confronted with the necessity of performing the essential and urgent duty of securing the peace and safety of the Nation by passing, and immediately enacting into law, a practical and efficient system of universal military training.

The lessons of the past few tragic years, the turbulent and ominous state of world affairs, and the insistent demand that arises from patriotic organizations and persons high in the councils of national affairs, demand that this be done.

Factual arguments in favor of the measure are numerous.

The most important may thus be summarized:

World affairs today are conditioned by tension between two forces: One, of which the United States is dominant, composed of democratic societies anxious to liquidate the conflicts of both World Wars and by equitable agreement enlist all peoples into the work of peace;

Another, of which communistic Russia is the leader, determined to forestall peace and find, in the consequent dissension, the opportunity to impose its dominion over all others.

This can be done by war alone.

Sudden, ruthless, total war.

Modern warfare has so compressed time and space, so fearfully augmented the power of weapons, that an unprepared nation, no matter how potentially strong, cannot hope to weather attack any longer than a few days or weeks.

Formal declarations of war, intervals permitting training and mobilization, protracted maneuvers, and gradual conversions of industry are things of the past.

A nation like the United States, with its vast wealth and technology composing the only substantial obstacle that remains in the path of arrogantly ambitious, inexhaustibly greedy communism, is compelled to maintain its defenses at the highest possible degree of efficiency.

For the United States to be less than ready to repel attack, less than able to strike back with devastating promptness, is to invite aggression, disaster, and extinction.

It is therefore the duty, the obligation, and the best individual and collective insurance for Americans to establish and support a state of constant military preparedness.

A system of universal training for our youth is the first step, but only one step, in this direction.

Modern warfare is total warfare.

It is fought by farmers, artisans, housewives, technicians, scientists, businessmen, and, of course, also highly trained and specialized soldiers.

Each must fit into a vast, coordinated plan.

Every one of them will find himself in what was once a front line reserved for riflemen only.

In effect, what does military training mean to the young man?

Physical fitness, mental quickness; close contact with lads of other States, classes, and conditions, and thus a school in social democracy, knowledge of skills and arts up to then unknown, lessons in command and in obedience, discovery and test of abilities otherwise dormant throughout life, appreciation of patriotic principles and processes.

Would a year or two in this atmosphere make him a militarist?

Well, has it ever?

Has America ever become militarist, even after 1865, 1918, and 1945?

Militarism is a national psychosis which often produces armies and incites wars.

Adequate defense in itself seldom, if ever, produces militarism.

The tiny nation of Switzerland, where every man is a soldier from boyhood to past middle age, with an army often able to whip its bigger neighbors, democratic, peace-loving, and industrious, is not militaristic.

But it has always been safe, because the price of defeating its 450,000 men, in a population of 4,000,000, has always been too high.

The aggressive imperialists of communism would, of course, pay a much higher price to defeat America.

For once America ceases to exist, and every one of us with it, the globe becomes communism's property and plaything.

That is why the cost of eliminating America must be high, exorbitant, and prohibitive.

It must be such a price as any of us can conceive for life and liberty. A price representing fatal consequences to the bidder.

And that is why the Congress of the United States must listen to the warnings and facts which the American Legion and American people have presented spontaneously and through their responsible leaders.

We stand practically alone in an uncertain and threatening world. Time is running out, space is no longer a defense.

Let us train our manhood, for the sake of peace, safety, and civilization.

The State Department's Broadcast to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the State Department's broadcast to Russia, published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 9.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO IN REVIEW—THE HENRY WALLACE AFFAIR

(By John Crosby)

The interest abroad, in American culture—its books, its plays, its art—is intense, far more intense than most Americans realize. When the Office of War Information followed American troops into Italy with boatloads of American books they were eagerly snapped up by Italians who had been cut off from American thought for years.

The State Department's overseas broadcasts quite sensibly cater to this hunger for American culture by broadcasting dramatizations of books, plays, and short stories. It also broadcasts weekly book reviews of leading American books. Representative TABER has stirred up an unreasonable fuss over the broadcast of one of these reviews on the Wallaces of Iowa, by Russell Lord. At the time, Henry Wallace was in Europe sabotaging President Truman's foreign policies and Representative TABER roared that the Department was praising a man who was trying to wreck its own policies.

This is gross misrepresentation. In the first place the review of the book on Wallace was transcribed weeks before Wallace went to Europe. In the second place, the review was highly critical of the Wallace family statesmanship while it praised the family's contributions to agriculture. Besides, the State Department had quite a good case for broadcasting the review even though the Wallace controversy was at its height at the time.

The Wallaces of Iowa has been reviewed on the front page of the New York Herald Tribune book section, the New York Times book section, and many other book sections of leading newspapers. It was without doubt the leading book of its week. It is the policy of the State Department to present a fair and impartial picture of American literature, whether it praised or damned American life. The omission of the Wallace book, certainly the most discussed book of the week, would automatically lay the Department open to charges that it was presenting only the favorable and withholding the unfavorable. This would be directly contrary to the United States information policies developed during the war and followed by the State Department ever since.

The drama and cultural aspects of the State Department's overseas broadcasts certainly should not stand or fall on the Wallace book review, which has been blown up out of all proportion to the facts. About 6 percent of the overseas broadcasts are devoted to drama and culture. One of the best of these programs is called America Speaks. This is a program of dramatizations of outstanding books, plays, and short stories. Here are a few of the titles recently broadcast: Arrowsmith, by Sinclair Lewis; A Farewell to Arms, by Ernest Hemingway; Moby Dick, by Herman Melville; Abe Lincoln in Illinois, by Robert E. Sherwood; A Diamond as Big as the Ritz, by F. Scott Fitzgerald; and the Magnificent Ambersons, by Booth Tarkington.

A variety of techniques are used in these broadcasts. A Farewell to Arms, for instance, was simply read in condensed form by alternating voices, a simple device which is extremely effective when the story is good enough to carry it. In that case it was. Fitzgerald's fantastic short story A Diamond as Big as the Ritz was given a full-scale dramatization, which by American domestic standards was a little thin in spots. Here again the story was so effective that it didn't matter. While the State Department can't afford to hire a galaxy of film stars, the acting in general is good to excellent and once in awhile a name player lends his services to these dramas.

One of the most popular broadcasts to South America is Radio Theater, another series of dramatizations of famous American books. Among this series was Huckleberry Finn, by Mark Twain, Ah, Wilderness, by Eugene O'Neill, Penrod, by Booth Tarkington, Look Homeward, Angel, by Thomas Wolfe, The Scarlet Letter, by Nathaniel Hawthorne, and The Turn of the Screw, by Henry James. It sounds like a weighty list—in fact, you can't find anything comparable in American commercial broadcasting—but it must be remembered that interest abroad in American literature is at its peak and that the audience for short-wave broadcasts is intellectually higher than average. If there is any better way of presenting America in all its colors than through the works of our greatest writers, I don't know what it is.

Interest in American art is surprisingly high in Europe. This has forced the State Department to broadcast a weekly program called "America in the World of Art." There is no tougher subject to put on the air. In fact our own broadcasters have never succeeded in doing it very well. The State Department, it seems to me, demonstrated conspicuous ingenuity in this series by dramatizing the aspects of the artist's life which made him paint as he did. The only one of these I have heard was an intense and bitter dramatization of the life of George Grosz—a rather unhappy choice since he was born and did his greatest work in Germany. The tragic aspects of Grosz's early life provided a grim and only too adequate explanation of the savage satire in Grosz's paintings and drawings. At the end of the story Grosz finds contentment and security in a Long Island suburb, in glaring contrast to his stormy life in Germany. It is, if you like, propaganda for this country; it is also quite true.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Union, Manchester, N. H.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Prospect of completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and hydroelectric-power development has been strengthened by the self-liquidation plan advanced by Senator VANDENBERG. Canada has accepted this plan, and it is expected that a bipartisan bill will soon be introduced in the Senate with State Department backing that will win prompt approval.

The prospect of the final carrying through of this project is highly gratifying. The St. Lawrence seaway and power development proposal has been under discussion for more than a decade. A treaty signed between Canada and the United States authorizing the project was presented to the United States Senate in 1934, but failed to obtain the necessary endorsement. Seven years later, the Roosevelt administration substituted an agreement for the treaty in the belief that a majority vote of the Houses could be obtained easier than the two-thirds vote in the Senate required for treaty confirmation, but once more the attempt failed.

The discussion seemed to be waiting for some self-liquidation program that would make the cost of the enterprise easier. That program, now being presented, seems likely to win support in the Senate sufficient to put the project over. Under this plan a schedule of tolls, power allotment rates, and other self-liquidation features would be worked out to make the seaway self-sustaining.

The advantages of the St. Lawrence development are now quite apparent. The power phase of the development contemplates a generating capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower to be divided equally between the United States and Canada. This supply of electric energy will furnish a vast new source of cheap power for industrialists desirous of coming into northern New York and northern New England that will increase the industrial capacity of the whole northeastern section of the country and raise the level of prosperity accordingly. Cheap power also will be made available to householders throughout this area, and for running the manifold aids now available to farmers that depend on electric energy for propulsion.

The deep-sea waterway moreover will open up to the American Middle West a broad waterway to the outside world which will

effect a great saving in carrying their exports and imports. Consumers within the range of the waterway throughout the East also will profit by cheaper prices for grain and other commodities coming from the Middle West, and by the increased purchases of products from the East made possible in Middle West markets.

The North American Continent has been waiting for centuries for a generation with vision enough to develop the gigantic possibilities inherent in this phenomenal waterway of rivers and great lakes that stretch into its very heart. Timid souls will raise objections, but men of vision will see the benefits that nature has put within our grasp and will reach out to use them. It is hoped that the prediction that the new self-liquidation approach to the project will assure prompt congressional approval is correct.

Appropriations Should Not Be Cut for Protection of Vitally Needed Forests—Statement Before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on forestry made by me before the Committee on Agriculture:

Mr. Chairman, the people of my State have expressed deep concern regarding the possibility of cuts in forestry appropriations.

As you know, considerable progress has been made in forestry, both by private timberland owners and on the national forests. Southern timberlands made an important contribution in the recent war when construction timber at home and abroad were in heavy demand for boxes, crates, etc. Huge quantities of southern pine timber went into kraft paper and container board for packaging. During this emergency, the State of Louisiana and her sister States produced 39 percent of the Nation's output of lumber and 48 percent of its pulpwood. Unfortunately, a large part of the normal cut, as well as most of the increased cut required for the war, was produced by operations that destroyed the future crop, leaving the land to be taken over by scrub species or with so little growing stock that the crop of new trees will be very small for many years in the future. Therefore, a new crop must be started by artificial planting. Forests are no less vital to the Nation's welfare in the postwar period than in the time of war.

Tree planting, timber-stand improvement, wildlife, and recreational development work remained at a standstill during the war emergency. Roads and improvements were maintained only at a minimum standard. Funds must now be provided to carry on all these things if we are to prevent the deterioration of our forests and protect our resources. Not alone the myriad uses of wood, but the contribution of the forest range to the Nation's supply, the watersheds that the forests protect, the rest, relaxation, and sport that people find in the forest—all are integral parts of a well-balanced peacetime economy. If the forests are to make their contributions to the Nation's welfare, it will be necessary to provide far better care and management than they have thus far received, and I respectfully urge that no reduction be made in appropriations for forestry work.

Slums on Wheels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time today to speak briefly about safety of railroad transportation. I have introduced a resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives to begin a full and complete investigation of the causes of and feasible methods of preventing accidents of all kinds occurring in the operation of carriers by railroad, subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

This investigation, should it be authorized, would include but not be limited to ascertainment of the causes of accidents resulting in death or injury to employees in all classes of service, or to passengers, or damage to property, the determination of what improvements are feasible through the utilization of safer installations and equipment, and the adoption of better safety practices and the formulation of proposals for additional legislation designed to reduce accidents and the risk of accidents.

I am not pointing a finger of suspicion at anybody in particular. My only interest is in promoting safety and in finding out the answers to some questions in the public interest.

The other day I noticed an interesting paragraph in the American Aviation Daily, of May 6, 1947. It read as follows:

AIR-LINE TRAVEL INCREASES 86 PERCENT WHILE RAILROAD TRAVEL DROPS 20 PERCENT

Scheduled domestic air lines increased their passenger-carrying record in January for the forty-fourth consecutive month, according to a tabulation by the Air Transport Association. "This constant improvement in volume and mileage has not been paralleled by the railroads," ATA said. Scheduled air lines' revenue passenger miles equaled 28.76 percent of the total Pullman revenue passenger miles in 1946, compared to 12.8 percent in 1945. This percentage had increased to 44.1 percent for the month of December. Revenue passenger miles showed an increase of 54,578,445 in January and number of passengers increased 105,875.

In 1946 the number of passengers carried by the domestic scheduled air lines increased by 5,662,552, a gain of 86.11 percent over 1945. During the same period, the class I railroads of the United States showed a decrease of 79,393,625 passengers, a loss of 20.6 percent as compared with 1945, according to Interstate Commerce Commission figures cited by ATA.

I am led to wonder to what extent the epidemic of train wrecks is reflected in the foregoing figures?

I have been reading some of the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They reveal startling information. The tragedies disclosed by these dry statistics add up to a monumental total.

Since 1936 an average of about 5,000 people have been killed annually in railroad acccidents of all kinds. Here are the figures for some more recent years:

	Killed	*Injured*
1940	4,612	29,590
1941	5,086	37,811
1942	5,233	48,108
1943	4,942	60,317
1944	4,781	61,227
1945	4,691	61,481

Complete casualty figures are not available yet for 1946. We do know that of those railroad accidents investigated by the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1946, and in which 5 or more persons were killed or 10 or more persons injured, there was a total of 43 accidents, with 123 killed and 2,682 injured.

So far in 1947, the Commission has investigated 15 accidents falling within the limitations of this classification. In these accidents 58 were killed and 746 injured. It is interesting to note, however, that in addition to these accidents this year there have been 14 other accidents, involving 21 deaths and 290 injured, on which the Commission has not issued a report of investigation. It is pertinent to inquire why the Commission is about 2 months behind in this work this year and why it is that 188 accidents, involving 2 killed and 656 injured, in 1946 were reported to the ICC but not investigated.

Accident Bulletin No. 114, of the calendar year 1945, by the ICC, reveals, on page 4, that casualties of employees in railway accidents have been on the increase from 1940 to 1944, and states as follows:

Although the number of total employee injuries declined slightly in 1945 from the 1944 total, the problem is far more serious than the totals seem to indicate.

On page 13 the same bulletin states:

The number of train accidents of all classes has increased steadily since 1938.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the railroads performed a great public service, under severe handicaps, during the war. Tax and other Government policies made it impossible for them to replace worn-out equipment. To hold the good will won by this wartime performance and prewar safety prestige, the railroads have a big job to do. I understand from the American Association of Railroads that they have over 2,000 passenger cars now on order which they cannot get because of the steel shortage. They have on order over 87,000 freight cars, and would be happy to get them at a rate of 10,000 per month, but are unable to do so. In the meantime, however, accidents continue to mount, and some of the causes are apparent to the naked eye.

Three years ago the Interstate Commerce Commission warned about the rising rate of accidents and urged carriers more stringently to enforce operating rules. Defects in equipment, improper track maintenance, and negligence of employees were cited by the Commission as causing the greatest increase in wrecks. High speed is also a factor.

The 1946 report of the Director of the Bureau of Safety to the ICC shows that last year 38,565 or 3.2 percent of the

freight cars inspected were defective from the safety standpoint. One thousand one hundred and fourteen passenger train cars or 4 percent were defective and 731 locomotives or 5.4 percent had defective safety appliances. Two hundred and twelve railroads reported a total of 70,355 instances of classes of excess service by employees. This strain and fatigue contributes to accidents and the vast annual slaughter of our citizens in these accidents.

We hear a great deal about new streamlined trains and all kinds of new and fancy gadgets to make the rail traveler think he is taking a journey on a flying carpet in some dream of Arabian nights. Some trains travel very fast, perhaps too fast, considering all of the elements involved, particularly the aged condition of equipment. Beautiful new trains, few though they are in number, are quite an improvement over matchbox cars of wood. Yet, someone ought to put in a word for the traveler who is not going across the country but is making a short trip and must still put up with poor accommodations. Aged railroad equipment is, since the war, being run faster in many cases than during the war. This, too, is a safety hazard.

If anyone wants to get a glimpse of life in a railway express car he has only to read an article on the subject in the May 1947 issue of the Railway Clerk, official magazine of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, largest railroad labor organization. This article makes the following charges supported by evidence: First, almost a third of all express cars are partly or entirely built of wood; second, half of the cars lack adequate lighting; third, half of the cars lack proper vestibuling which would make it safe to go from one car to another; fourth, three-fourths of the cars do not have safety kits accessible and a fifth have defective signal equipment; fifth, doors of over half the cars open with extreme difficulty; sixth, there are no ventilators in a fifth of the cars; where cars do have ventilators they are defective or insufficient in a third of the cases; seventh, half the cars in the country have inadequate drainage; eighth, more than half the cars have no water containers, and drinking water where supplied is unfit for use in a third of the cases; and ninth, over half the cars have no toilets, toilets where found are not enclosed in 75 percent of the cases, and most are too dirty for use in any case, and so forth. Inquiry, on my part, of the American Association of Railroads and of the Railway Express Agency reveals a blanket denial of these charges and no information about the number of new and improved express cars on order. The railroads, of course, furnish these "slums on wheels" and not the express agency. A request is pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the express car situation.

Indeed, this whole situation needs investigating with reference to the effect it has on safety in rail transportation. My resolution would make such investigation possible. House Resolution 153 which will be taken up by the House this week is a broader resolution with no specific reference to rail transportation but to the transportation industry generally. That resolution comes from my committee and I support it too. I hope for favorable action on one of these resolutions very soon. We have spent a lot of time and money on safety in air navigation. But, railroad safety is also important and is a matter of urgency to vast numbers of people who must depend on this means of transportation and livelihood.

Direct Election of President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Boston Herald, dealing with the amendment which I have offered, to eliminate the electoral college.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald of May 12, 1947]

PEOPLE'S PRESIDENTS

Senator LODGE proposes the scrapping of that ridiculous anachronism, the electoral college. He would substitute direct popular vote, without regard to States. For the reformation of a long-outmoded practice, his proposed constitutional amendment is wise; but there are implications.

The founding fathers intended the electoral college to be a group of elder statesmen better fitted to choose a President than either the people as a whole or the Congress. But after only three elections, the college ceased to be an exalted repository of independent judgment, and become instead a mere registering machine of party selections. Today we quadrennially go through the ponderous ceremony of electing electors who, long after everyone knows the results, go to their State capitols and cast, like automatons, their stipulated votes for President and Vice President.

Apart from the silly retention of a meaningless process, the system has various flaws. The States vote as a unit. If Massachusetts plumps for candidate A, then all who voted for candidate B are virtually disfranchised in the national election. It is quite possible, and has happened several times, that a candidate with a majority of the popular vote of the country will lose to a candidate with a majority of the electoral vote. In also happens that one vote in South Carolina is equal to 12 votes in Illinois or 10 in Massachusetts.

Under the Lodge plan, the States would report the vote for each candidate, and the Congress would count the totals and award the office to the one with the most votes. As simple as that.

But such an amendment may not be easily adopted. The small States, like South Carolina, gain too much by the unit system. And the vestiges of federalism remain strong even in other States, which may want to cling to this symbol of State rights.

Even more important is the effect of the form of voting on the presidency itself. We know pretty certainly that if the Constitution had placed the selection of the President in the Congress, the executive branch would have remained subordinate to the legislative, as it has in Switzerland. Instead, in the interesting rivalry for power, as recently recounted by Wilfred E. Binkley in President and Congress, the Executive, as more representative of the whole people, has increasingly come out tops over the legislative branch.

Now the Lodge proposal is to make the President even more completely representative of the whole people. No more would a Democratic President be able to slight the popular wishes of the solid South, knowing that the unit rule would keep it solid. He would have to recognize that every American citizen had a vote for him.

That would make him even more of a people's President, and would strengthen him in any rivalry with a sectionally minded Congress. That might be either good or bad. But it is an easily overlooked implication in the Lodge measure. Obviously, the founding fathers didn't want it that way.

Fifth Anniversary of the WAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast on May 11, 1947:

ANNOUNCER. On May 14, the members of the Women's Army Corps will observe their fifth anniversary. In the span of 5 years the WAC has proved that women have a definite place in the pattern for national security. Five years is a short time in our military history but the part that women have played in that history is significant and worthy of review. Five years ago the Hitler machine was rolling over Europe. Island after island, in the Pacific, had fallen into the Jap plan of war. Manpower and material were the only means to stem the tide that threatened to engulf the world. In the emergency of the times the Women's Army Corps was born. The legislation was presented to Congress by Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, veteran Congresswoman from Massachusetts. And folks, when I say "veteran Congresswoman," I think how appropriate the term is, for Mrs. ROGERS has served her State and Nation for 22 years and throughout her period of service, her deep, unchanging interest has been with the "veteran." Mrs. ROGERS' interest in the veteran has extended over World War I and II and will go on and on. Today she is chairman of the Veterans' Committee in the House of Representatives; and veterans know that they will never be forgotten heroes to her, but men and women who in the crisis saved the American way. Yes; the veterans truly have a staunch friend in Congresswoman ROGERS. Her untiring work in that field is another story, one that merits a time all its own. Today, I'd like to have Mrs. ROGERS tell us about the Women's Army Corps.

Mrs. ROGERS, just how did you happen to introduce the Women's Army Corps?

Mrs. ROGERS. First, let me thank you for telling about my work for the veterans. I think it is most important that veterans know that America is more than grateful for all that they have done and are doing today; that our appreciation is not mere lip service but an alert activity that will be permanent. Let's get back now to this other great interest of mine, the Women's Army Corps.

My interest in having a corps of women in noncombatant jobs was the result of first-hand experience. You see during World War I, I served overseas. There in the grim days of World War I, I saw the great need for manpower. During my time there I saw thousands of British women serving with the British armed forces. I found that American headquarters were borrowing British Wacs to meet their shortages of skilled technicians and clerical workers. I thought then that it would have been much better to have had American women for administrative channels and other noncombatant work. For things are very different in Allied armies. I realized then, even as I prayed that war would never come again, that if it did we would have to draw on every available skill to keep our manpower reservoir from being completely drained. I knew that womanpower was our only untapped source of personnel. The idea was born as I watched and served in World War I in England and France.

ANNOUNCER. Then, Mrs. Rogers, drawing on your exeperience, you drew up the bill creating the Women's Army Corps when it was needed.

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes; immediately after Pearl Harbor, I introduced a bill to the House and on May 14, 1942, the bill was signed and the WAAC came into being.

ANNOUNCER. I notice that you say WAAC. I recall that the first step was the Women's Auxiliary Army Corps, which was later changed to the Women's Army Corps. Can you tell us something of the cause for this change?

Mrs. ROGERS. It took about a year for the Army to realize that economy in personnel and administration would result if the Corps were actually in the Army, rather than an organization working with the Army. So, on July 1, 1943, Public Law 110 was signed by the President and the Auxiliary part of its name was dropped and the Women's Army Corps acquired greater responsibilities and certainly greater effectiveness.

ANNOUNCER. Mrs. ROGERS, we know that you have followed the WAC closely through its splendid history. I also know that you visited WAC installations during World War II, in Europe. Can you give us a highlight of your trip over there?

Mrs. ROGERS. During the height of the war, I visited Wacs in Europe and I want to emphasize how much these women helped in the victory that then seemed so far off. I was very much impressed with the fine way they were representing the American women. Eighteen percent of the Wacs had overseas service and did a fine job. In Italy I saw Wacs hard at work with the Fifth Army. From north Africa to the Italian surrender in the shadow of the Alps, these Wacs had followed the Fifth Army. One group, here, had charge of a mobile switchboard set up in a trailer. Through the mud of Italy they moved up bit by bit. They seemed mighty happy whenever moving day came for it meant another rung on the victory ladder.

ANNOUNCER. I've heard of the group of Fifth Army Wacs in Italy. Tell us, Mrs. ROGERS, of some of the other WAC installations you visited.

Mrs. ROGERS. During October of 1944 I visited the Wacs in France and Belgium. In Paris I saw the largest military message center and it was completely Wac staffed. The only trouble seemed to be that they did not have enough WAC personnel. Every place I visited had the same continuing request, "Send us more Wacs." WAC companies crossed the channel into France on D-day plus 38. These women never faltered; they worked side by side with the soldiers.

ANNOUNCER. But, Mrs. ROGERS, don't tell me they didn't gripe.

Mrs. ROGERS. Gripe? They certainly did, for they were real soldiers. And its an old Army custom for all good soldiers to gripe. But their one perpetual gripe, according to their officers, was, "Why don't they send us closer to the front?"

ANNOUNCER. I know that you visited many Wacs serving in the States. How about telling us something of this group of Wacs?

Mrs. ROGERS. I would like to say something about the equally fine work that the Wacs performed here at home. You know my great interest in Army hospitals and I want to mention here that 22,223 Wacs were recruited, trained and assigned to Army hospitals to supplement the work of the great Army medical department. Why, even today, almost 1,200 of these Wacs are still doing duty with Army general hospitals. You know their job didn't end with the VJ-day celebrations.

ANNOUNCER. Mrs. ROGERS, you have been most generous in giving us this time. Is there anything that you would like to say about the Wacs? I know that the Wacs in this area are tuned in to hear you and I'm sure there's no one they would rather hear give a birthday greeting than their good friend, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Mrs. ROGERS. Thank you. Every year I have had the joy of wishing the WAC a happy birthday. On this, their fifth birthday, I want to tell Colonel Hallaren and her 9,517 Wacs, who are still serving, how proud we all are of the work they have done during the past year. While the great bond of fighting a war made all anxious to have a part in that grim business, the women who are serving today are doing a job equally important, they are guaranteeing that the sacrifices of Bataan, Iwo Jima, Anzio, and Normandy were not in vain. I salute you, and a happy birthday to every one—those who have served and those who are serving.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you, Mrs. ROGERS. On this day, Mother's Day, I am sure everyone will agree with me that you may truly be called the Wac Mother.

For the Wacs I would like to render you a musical salute, a salute from all our wonderful women soldiers, to one who is truly another fine soldier: Morton Gould's American Salute.

(Transcription, American Salute, up to end.)

ANNOUNCER. I'm sure, that like the rest of us, every Wac is today thinking of a person that is closest in her heart, this being Mother's Day. I wanted to have a number here that would fit the day; and after going over and over all the musical scores that I could acquire, here is the score I finally selected—I hope you agree with me—for Sgt. Norman Clayton and the soldiers' chorus really do render it beautifully. It's the Lost Chord.

(Transcription, Lost Chord, up to end.)

ANNOUNCER. How about one of you fine looking Wacs stepping over this way? I'd like to have a word or two with you. O. K., how about you, Sergeant Richman. Folks, Staff Sgt. Jane Richman has been a Wac since the first day that training started at Fort Des Moines, Iowa. That was way back in July 1942. She comes all the way from Los Angeles, Calif. Jane, how about telling us something of your 5 years in the WAC?

Staff Sergeant RICHMAN. I was sent along with over 300 other women to Des Moines for the first Wac basic training for enlisted women. It's sure hot in Des Moines in July, and we were a wilted bunch of women when the Regular Army men assigned to train us met us at the train. I had a sad start in my army life, for I sprained my ankle and had to stop training for 2 weeks. This broke my heart; hot or not, I wanted to be in there marching.

ANNOUNCER. Well, apparently, sergeant, both your ankle and heart have healed. What duty did you do after you finished basic?

Staff Sergeant RICHMAN. I've sure seen a lot of America in the 5 years that I have worn this uniform. From basic, I went to Daytona Beach; here I trained Wacs in the art of swimming. In fact, I trained many hundred who were en route for overseas duty. It was quite important that these Wacs be good swimmers. Yes, sir; I trained hundreds of overseas Wacs but never got over myself. After I was transferred from Daytona I became a weather observer in Georgia.

ANNOUNCER. What are you doing now, sergeant? To what kind of a job do they have you assigned?

Staff Sergeant RICHMAN. A most interesting job. I'm a facsimile operator for the Air Weather Service. All the weather reports from all over the world come into our bureau here. In this way we have a world-wide weather picture. From the reports we receive, a master guide goes out so that flyers know the over-all weather picture; sort of a liaison with old Mother Nature herself.

ANNOUNCER. That surely must be an interesting job. Keeping track of the weather. How's things, today, in, let's say, Frankfurt, Germany?

Staff Sergeant RICHMAN. There's where I just can't let you catch me. This is my day off, but you may be sure that the Air Weather Service knows just how the clouds are stacking up over Frankfurt.

ANNOUNCER. Sergeant, you have been a Wac from the very beginning, can you tell us something about the future of the Women's Army Corps?

Staff Sergeant RICHMAN. Congress has been presented a bill asking that the Women's Army Corps be made a component of the Regular Army. It also will allow women to become members of the Organized Reserve Corps. If the bill receives approval I want to be a number one again. I want to be a member of the Regular Army. I sure like my job and I sure like the Army.

ANNOUNCER. Thanks a lot, Sergeant Richman. Let's get another of you fine Wacs up here. Come on, Corporal Hollis, let me have a few words with you. Folks, we had a bit of past Wac history. Let's see what Corp. Alice Hollis can tell us of the work of the Wacs today. Alice just returned from duty in Germany, where over 2,000 Wacs are on duty with the occupational forces. Just listen to her fine Southern drawl; she hails from Alabama and even after all the time spent in Europe—Italy and Germany, I believe—she still has her drawl. Must have done duty in southern Italy and Germany. Alice, can you tell us something of the Wacs in Germany today?

Corporal HOLLIS. Sure can * * * there are 17 installations in Germany and Austria where Wacs are on duty. The largest installation is at Frankfurt where more than 600 are assigned. Most of these Wacs are in key administrative jobs. They have all been * * * Army * * * for at least 2 years * * * most have longer records of service than that. They all know Army channels and do contribute much to the job of occupation.

ANNOUNCER. I've heard of the Wacs' work in the German youth movement * * * the steps taken to erase the deep-seated ideas of the teachings of Hitler and what they are doing to teach democracy to the young people of Germany. I suppose you have helped in this work?

Corporal HOLLIS. Yes; I have. There is quite a bit of this kind of work. It's not a WAC project but a project sponsored by the American women who are now in Germany. The American Women's Club opened a clubhouse for German girls between the ages of 10 and 18. Over 200 girls take courses in handcrafts, English, and discussion groups in the club I attended. There Americans' wives have the day classes and Wacs teach the night classes except on Wednesday night when the War Department civilian employees take over the responsibility. The whole project is to teach all German women through the young German women the benefits of the

American way. All through Germany similar projects are going full force. These gatherings resemble the typical Army talkfest where political and economic questions are discussed. Of course—since it's an all-woman discussion—clothes, movies, household gadgets, and even recipes get as much time, or more, than the questions of a social and cultural type.

ANNOUNCER. What's your duty station now, Corporal?

Corporal HOLLIS. I work in the Pentagon now—in the Military Personnel Procurement Division.

ANNOUNCER. Corporal, are you interested in becoming a member of the Regular Army? I mean if the Corps is made a permanent part of the Army.

Corporal HOLLIS. I'm more than interested. I was out of the Army for about 6 months and when the reentry program opened I was one of the first to return. If there is a Regular Army Women's Army Corps, I want to be a part of it.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you, Corporal Hollis, we salute you and all the Wacs for your fine patriotic feeling. We sincerely hope you all have a long, long military career.

Concerning Speech at Western High School, May 6, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the wide interest manifested recently in the remarks of Mrs. Shura Lewis on May 6 before a group of students at Western High School in the Nation's Capital which occasioned considerable controversy and was ventilated at length in the several Washington newspapers, I believe Congress is entitled to such information as has come to the attention of the District of Columbia Committee in response to an inquiry which I directed to the Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Hobart M. Corning, on May 7, 1947, and his reply of May 8, 1947.

The following two newspaper clippings from the Evening Star of May 8 and the Times-Herald of May 11 are explanatory:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1947.

Dr. HOBART M. CORNING,
Superintendent of Schools,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. CORNING: Will you kindly submit a full statement covering the happenings at the Western High School yesterday?

Sincerely yours,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Chairman.

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Washington, D. C., May 8, 1947.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia of the United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN DIRKSEN: It is quite natural that you should be interested in the very unfortunate occurrence at Western High School this week. I note by the press that you are directing a letter to me asking for an explanation. An explanation is certainly in order, and I am very happy to anticipate your request. The entire affair has shocked the whole school system. The reported utterances of the speaker at the Western High School assembly are repugnant to all who are working with youth in the Washington schools, and the unfortunate train of circumstances which brought about her appearance before students in that school is sincerely regretted by all of us. The entire affair was wholly contrary to the philosophy of education under which we operate.

Perhaps the most shocked and regretful person connected with the schools is the principal of Western High School, who made the arrangements for the appearance of Mrs. Lewis, but who had taken the precaution to advise her that she must not speak on political ideologies and issues. The sincere regret which Mr. Danowsky, principal of Western High School, feels is characteristic of and in tune with his 10 years of very faithful and loyal service in our schools. His was an error of judgment, for which he has been criticized by this office, but any censure of him is directed toward his mistaken judgment.

At the meeting of the Board of Education held yesterday I submitted a report to the Board of Education on this affair. I believe you will be interested in that statement, and for that reason I am sending you a copy herewith.

I shall, of course, be very glad to forward to you any additional information which I may gather as we proceed with a further study of this matter, and I shall be very glad to answer any inquiries concerning it which you may desire to make.

Sincerely yours,
HOBART M. CORNING,
Superintendent of Schools.

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1947.

To the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: At about 10 o'clock yesterday morning we received a telephone complaint from the mother of a student at the Western High School in which she reported that her daughter and two other girls had left the school assembly without permission because they had been displeased with the statements of the speaker which they said were unfavorable to the United States.

Mr. Danowsky, the principal of the school, in response to a request for an immediate report, stated that in January of this year he had heard Mrs. Shura Vozilova Lewis speak at a Saturday institute at the Wilson Teachers College on the subject I Lived in Russia. Because it seemed to him that her talk would be interesting to students in his school he invited her to appear at an assembly program to discuss the educational system under which she was brought up in Russia. The engagement was made for yesterday morning, and in her talk Mrs. Lewis shifted from a discussion of her personal experiences to a comparison of life in the Soviet with that in the United States, to the disparagement of the latter. She described the following areas in which she claimed conditions in Russia were favorable to those in the United States: Education, medical care, vacation privileges, entertainment, attitude of the press, religion and morals, security of employment, retirement privileges.

She also defended the Russian demands for reparations for war damages and stated in response to a question that the Russians are so busy with reconstruction that they do not want war. Mr. Danowsky, the two assistant principals, and eight teachers prepared and submitted a written report, summarizing their statements as follows:

"The speech may be construed as propaganda in favor of the Russian system pitched in terms such as would be expected of a person brought up under that system."

Mr. Danowsky stated orally that there was no disorder during the assembly program although it was obvious that the students resented the statements that were being made. During the morning and during the lunch period there was some demonstration including the carrying of hastily prepared placards against Russia. During the afternoon Mr. Danowsky prepared the following statement which was read to all students and all teachers in the school:

"I regret exceedingly that the speaker whom we invited to this morning's assembly digressed from her stated topic as previously announced in the bulletin to inject political issues which are at variance with the best American traditions.

"I wish to congratulate all Westerners however for their loyalty and fine spirit of cooperation in an exceedingly embarassing situation."

This statement was transmitted to the newspapers, to the press associations, and to the local radio stations by the central office. The following brief comment of my own endorsing Mr. Danowsky's statement was similarly distributed:

"I concur in Mr. Danowsky's statement because I consider the entire incident very regrettable, and I do think the students and faculty deserve great credit for their understanding and cooperative spirit in a very embarrassing situation."

The institute to which Mr. Danowsky referred was held at the Wilson Teachers College on Saturday, January 11, under the joint sponsorship of the Wilson Teachers College and the American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, Inc., on the subject, "What Teachers Should Know About Pacific Relations." Several of the speakers, including Mrs. Lewis, were arranged for by the Institute. Dr. Hager stated yesterday that at that meeting Mrs. Lewis confined her discussion to her own life in Russia, experiences with Russian people, and descriptions of the kinds of people that are in the country. She refused to answer any questions having political significance. The fact that she refused to discuss political matters then, but that with a younger audience yesterday engaged in definite propaganda, undeniably admits the conjecture that she may deliberately have taken advantage of an audience of more impressionable age.

The philosophy of education worked out by the teachers and officers of the Washington public schools presents as the ultimate aim an individual "who as a responsible citizen is ready for the enjoyments and duties of home, family, and community life, with an understanding and an appreciation of American ideals, principles, and purposes that will promote the progress of our own democracy and carry over into world citizenship." We believe that this aim is a direct responsibility of school personnel and that it is being strictly observed by them.

The assembly programs in the schools play an important part in our instructional program which they are intended to supplement and intensify. In the present instance the attempt to supplement the efforts of the school was unfortunate and undoubtedly should have been avoided. The regret of the principal is very deep and is in keeping with the fine record which he has established through 10 years of effective service in the schools of the District of Columbia. I am convinced that the error was one in judgment.

It must be borne in mind that hundreds of assembly programs are held in the schools at all levels each year and that for many of them outside speakers are engaged. The principals of the schools have chosen these speakers carefully, this being the first instance in many years of an objectionable

program. However, because of this happening, I am instructing each school principal hereafter to submit for the advance approval of this office any programs whch include outside speakers.

The Superintendent of Schools assures the Board and the public that the fine record of patriotic service, loyalty, and fundamental teaching of the American traditions will continue and that this unfortunate circumstance will tend to intensify our already well-established program of patriotic endeavor in the schools. We recognize it as our official duty and our great opportunity to teach and to lead youth along the lines of a very positive and active patriotism.

Respectfully submitted.

HOBART M. CORNING,
Superintendent of Schools.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 11, 1947]

WHAT SHE SAID

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Would you like to know exactly what that Russian propagandist said the other day to the students of Western High School? Would you like to read the full text of her remarks and make up your own mind as to her skill and purpose?

The Times-Herald is in possession of the full transcript of her speech, and furthermore of the original stenographic record.

You don't have to take anybody's word or opinion but your own, therefore, as to whether she is just a misguided little woman—and mighty pretty—or very well guided indeed.

Just write in and ask for a copy of the text, or call by. It will be sent you, free.

If you are the parent of a student who heard the lady and really want to go into the facts of the case with your youngster, here is another tip:

Write the office of Chairman DIRKSEN, of the House District of Columbia Committee, for a copy of Communism in Action.

That is the famous Government Printing Office best-seller on Russia prepared by the Library of Congress.

It sets forth the details in fully documented fashion, stating sources of information and even the reasons for accepting these sources.

In it you can get what you need to help judge how fairly the lady above mentioned was dealing with your child.

The lady, incidentally, is Mrs. Aleksandra Pavlovna Lewis, Russian wife of a student-veteran at George Washington University, who married her while he was a United States Embassy code clerk at Moscow and for that was asked to get out of the diplomatic service.

She is something of a beauty, also a very vocal Henry Wallace fan.

When Wallace made his celebrated speech at Madison Square Garden in New York that got him kicked out of the Truman Cabinet, Aleksandra Pavlovna hit the ceiling because most newspapers neglected to carry the full text. She waved her pretty hands and said:

"That's freedom of the press for you."

In that, at least, she was right. What she has not got through her blond head—or maybe she has—is this:

In America the press is free to print or not to print as it chooses.

In Russia the press is free to print as the Communist organization chooses.

No doubt any Communist would have chosen that Wallace's full text be printed the country over, for it was a speech giving real aid and comfort to Communists only.

But in the United States where people are free to pick and choose what they care to hear and care to print, Henry got only so much attention as individuals of their own will felt they wanted to give him.

Weird, no doubt, to anybody brought up under Communist influence.

Mrs. Lewis sounded off on another occasion in a very interesting way. On January 10, 1947, she made one of her little talks to the student body of the Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

In that talk she praised the Communist revolution of 1918 for having "killed only the right people," said that Russia of today is "perfect" and that all the people there lived in good homes before the war.

You may compare her ideas of perfection and good homes with what you will find in the above-mentioned Library of Congress report.

For a simple housewife who just wants to bring up her children, Mrs. Lewis is a busy little bee if there ever was one. For instance, the two speeches above mentioned were samples of the circuit-riding job she does for the East-West Association, whatever that is.

For each performance of which she gets a fee in loathesome United States capitalistic money.

She has spoken not only all around Washington since 1945, but in New York and generally around the East.

She teaches Russian at the Good Neighbor School, 922 Seventeenth Street NW., and in February of this year applied for and received an offer of a $6,000-a-year job with the United Nations organization.

What has delayed her taking that one?

It is worth knowing also that this demure little mother is a regular attendant at meetings of the Russian-American Club here, has frequent discussions of world affairs with Lawrence Todd, the Washington correspondent of Tass, the official Soviet news agency, and that her brother is or was a colonel in the Red Army.

A busy and talented lady, though not yet a citizen of the United States. Also, one whose comings and goings it is in the genuine public interest to know and record.

For by her actions she has moved herself out of the class of a private person and into that of public propagandist and agent in a highly controversial field of foreign affairs.

Let's all keep track of her.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 8, 1947]

MRS. LEWIS, DISTURBED BY "FUSS OVER NOTHING," DENIES ANY GUILT—HIGH-SCHOOL SPEAKER CLAIMS LOVE FOR UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

In a living room with American toys sprawled on the floor and a Russian doll perched atop a bookcase, Mrs. Shura Lewis pictured herself today as a woman who loved both her native and her adopted land.

The youthful-looking mother of two children, whose speech on Russia at Western High School has precipitated two congressional inquiries, said:

"I don't feel myself guilty at all. I am what I always was. I am upset only because it is not very good for both countries to make a fuss out of nothing."

But Mrs. Lewis was near tears when the telephone rang and a voice at the other end told Mrs. Lewis what the caller thought of Russian women.

"People are horrible," she shuddered.

SENDS BOYS TO DAY-CARE CENTERS

She excused herself long enough to button Eric, 5, and Raul, 3, into their coats and send them off to the public day-care center, for which the parents pay according to income and the District Government pays the rest. Then she answered questions readily enough.

No; she had not been a member of the Communist Party in Russia, she said. She was not a party member in this country. In fact, she didn't know any Communists, had never written for a Communist publication, and had never knowingly spoken for a Communist group.

She pulled from a desk drawer the outline of the speech she had given at Western. The outline began:

"In the Russia of today, there are no landlords or businessmen living on rents or on profits. The whole land is public property. The whole of industry is publicly owned and controlled. Every family must live on the earnings from work."

DISCUSSED COLLECTIVE FARMING

The outline, typewritten on a single sheet, went on to discuss collective farms, the elimination of unemployment through planning, equal rights for each nationality among the Soviet states, the emancipation of women, and planning not only for production but to increase the health and cultural level of the people.

Mrs. Lewis said she had used the same outline for more than a dozen speeches but always before there were "good relations" between audience and speaker. "I liked the people and they liked me."

She said she knew nothing about the Institute of Pacific Relations except that she had received a letter from the group asking her to speak to a group of teachers at Wilson Teachers College. The institute has been described by Representative MUNDT, acting chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, as a "very active pressure group in the field of foreign relations."

MADE SAME SPEECH AT WILSON

Mrs. Lewis made the speech at Wilson High School and there she met Nathaniel A. Danowsky, principal of Western. According to her story, Mr. Danowsky told her:

"The speech was very interesting because we never hear things like that. You really took us inside Russia."

Mr. Danowsky, according to Mrs. Lewis, asked her to make the same speech at Western. Mr. Danowsky subsequently has said he asked her to steer clear of political aspects, but Mrs. Lewis said she had never received such a request.

She said she had told him she had no permanent job and would want to be paid for the speech. The principal, she said, replied that he couldn't pay her much but offered $20. The payment, she said, came from a "friend of the school" and took the form of a cashier's check which she cashed in New York.

DID NOT MEAN TO GLORIFY RUSSIA

The speech she gave at Western, she said, was the same one she had given at Wilson.

"I kept close to personal opinion," she explained. "I didn't mean to glorify Russia."

Did she tell the Western students she never appreciated the life in Russia until she lived here?

"I told them I never realized before how every Russian citizen is taken care of by the Government," she replied. "I studied America in school but we never paid much attention that in a free enterprise everybody has to take care of himself."

Describing the speech afterward, Mr. Danowsky said Mrs. Lewis spoke favorably of the Russian system of planned economy, declared there was no insecurity there and stated a worker could retire at half pay after 25 years' service in the Government.

The principal quoted Mrs. Lewis as saying that in Russia right now people do not worry about today or tomorrow and never think they may lose their jobs suddenly.

SAW THREE GIRLS LEAVING

Mrs. Lewis said she noticed three girls leaving a few minutes before the end of her speech but paid no particular attention to their exit. After that, she was busy answering students' questions.

She recalled that one student asked if she believed friendship was possible between Russia and America. She said she told them "we all have to fight for peace."

Another student, she said, asked her if medical care really was free to everybody in Russia. She told them everyone got the same free medical care.

"It's true," she said. "It's not an exaggeration."

Mrs. Lewis said she was born in the Ural Mountains on the edge of Siberia and began to teach when she was 15.

"When I was 19 I went to Moscow to study," she said. "I said at the high school it didn't cost me a penny and that was true. If you work hard, the Government gives scholarships."

WANTS TO BECOME CITIZEN

She was married in 1939 and came to this country with her husband and young Eric in 1943. Since then, she has been making occasional speeches for the East and West Association, headed by Pearl Buck; teaching Russian at home and at classes in the Good Neighbor School.

Now stateless because she had to renounce her Russian citizenship, she wants to become an American citizen. She wants her sons to be American citizens.

Before she could continue, the telephone rang again. She listened and listened. Finally, she said into the telephone in a tired voice:

"We should get along and like each other—Russia and America—in spite of our shortcomings. The Russians don't want our system and we don't want theirs."

She listened another moment. Then she said:

"I just want peace, because I have two little boys. I don't want them killed in a war."

Equalization of Freight Rates

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision which marks the first step to give anything like a semblance of justice in freight rates to the people of the South and West.

Of all the dishonest discriminations to which the people south of the Ohio and the Potomac Rivers and west of the Mississippi have been subjected, it has been the discriminatory freight rate they have been compelled to pay.

This legalized robbery of the South and West has been going on for half a century or more. We now have about half the membership of the House and practically two-thirds of the Members of the Senate living in the punished area; and for the first time in history we have the President of the United States living in one of the States punished with these dishonest discriminations.

We are entitled to full and complete relief. This change is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. The people of the South and West want these unjust discriminations entirely eliminated.

If the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission are not willing to follow through and wipe out all of these vicious discriminations, then they ought to be removed and men put in their place who will do it.

Under the permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting the opinion of the Supreme Court upholding the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission granting partial relief from these discriminations. Anyone reading this opinion can readily see that the Court would have upheld this order just as willingly if it had wiped these dishonest discriminations out entirely.

The matter referred to follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States. Nos. 343, 344, and 345, October term, 1946. No. 343, *State of New York, State of Delaware, State of Indiana, et al., appellants,* v. *The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, State of Alabama, et al.* No. 344, *State of Maine, State of New Hampshire, State of Vermont, et al., appellants,* v. *The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission et al.* No. 345, *The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Beaver, Meade and Englewood Railroad Company, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company, et al., appellants,* v. *The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, State of Alabama, et al.* Appeals from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York.]

[May 12, 1947]

Mr. Justice Douglas delivered the opinion of the Court.

The orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which appellants seek to have set aside, resulted from two separate investigations instituted by the Commission on its own motion in 1939 to inquire into the lawfulness or unlawfulness of most of the then existing rate-making standards for interstate railroad class freight rates in the United States. One investigation related to classifications [1] under which commodities move by rail freight. The other related to class rates.[2] The two investigations were consolidated and were covered by one report, as the problems of classification and of class rates [3] are closely interrelated. The findings of the Commission as to classifications are not directly involved here. For the orders of the Commission under attack are interim orders which affect only class rates, increasing them in some areas and decreasing them in others. But a review and summary of the Commission's findings both on classifications and on class rates are essential for an understanding of the problem.

While there are three major classification territories, there are five major rate territories.[4] Official Territory, roughly speaking, lies east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers; it includes most of Virginia. Southern Territory lies south of Official Territory and east of the Mississippi. Western Trunk-Line Territory is located approximately between Official Territory and the Rocky Mountains. Southwestern Territory lies south of Western Trunk-Line Territory and west of the Mississippi and includes Arkansas, Texas, Oklahoma, and part of Louisiana. Mountain-Pacific Territory includes Montana and New Mexico and all territory west of the Rockies. Only Mountain-Pacific Territory is not involved in these cases.

The three major classifications are Official, Southern, and Western.[5] But there is great lack of uniformity in the classifications. The problem is one with which the Commission has long wrestled.[6] But prior to the present investigation its chief accomplishment in this field had been to establish classification uniformity within the separate territories. National classification uniformity was still in the main lacking. Many differences between classifications on a particular rating are matters of substance; others are matters of nomenclature. Moreover, there has been a tendency among carriers to work against the evolution of uniform classifications by making exceptions which remove commodities from the classifications for rate-making purposes.

Section 1 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (24 Stat. 379, 54 Stat. 899, 900, 49 U. S. C. § 1 (4)), provides that it shall be the duty of common carriers to establish just and reasonable classifications applicable to through freight rates and charges. Section 1 (6) prohibits every unjust and unreasonable classification. Section 3 (1) prohibits discrimination. And section 15 (1) empowers the Commission to prescribe just, fair, and reasonable classifications, after a

[1] Commodities are grouped into classes, those commodities in each class paying the same freight rate per 100 pounds. Frequently a commodity is in several classes depending upon whether carload or less-than-carload lots are involved, and upon the method of packaging. One class is called first-class or class 100 and each other class has been fixed as a percentage, or multiple, of first-class. Thus the freight classifications involved in these cases consist of lists containing descriptions of every commodity moving by freight and the class or classes to which it is assigned, i. e., its classification rating or ratings. See 262 I. C. C., pp. 465–472.

[2] The class rates are in the form of a schedule which shows the price per 100 pounds for moving first-class freight every possible distance it may be moved. The cost of shipment for a given commodity is determined by ascertaining its classification rating, the first-class rate per 100 pounds for the haul involved, and the percentage of the first-class rate to which the classification rating in question is subject. See 262 I. C. C., pp. 515–519.

[3] There are three other kinds of rates:

Exception rates are rates resulting from the transfer of a commodity out of its regularly assigned class in the classification and into another class.

Commodity rates are special rates established for particular commodities. For purposes of these rates a commodity is not given a classification rating; the result is that the commodity rates have no fixed percentage relationships to first-class rates.

Column rates are fixed as definite percentages of first-class rates but like commodity rates they apply only to particular commodities and are assigned no regular class.

See 262 I. C. C., p. 562.

[4] Some rate territories have subdivisions in which rate differentials are applicable which vary the class rates within the territory in question.

[5] The Official Classification applies within Official Territory and from Western Trunk-Line Territory to Official. The Southern Classification applies within Southern Territory, between Official and Southern, and from Western Trunk-Line to Southern. Western Classification includes Western Trunk-Line, Southwestern and Mountain Pacific rate territories. It applies within those three territories, between Southwestern and Official, between Southwestern and Southern, from Official to Western Trunk-Line, between Mountain Pacific and Official, from Southern to Western Trunk-Line, and between Mountain-Pacific and Southern.

[6] Western Classification, 25 I. C. C. 442; Consolidated Classification, 54 I. C. C. 1; Southern Class Rate Investigation, 100 I. C. C. 513; Consolidated Southwestern, 123 I. C. C. 203; Western Trunk-Line Class Rates, 164 I. C. C. 1; Eastern Class Rate Investigation, 164 I. C. C. 314.

finding that existing classifications are unlawful. The Commission found that the existing classifications are unlawful and will continue to be unlawful until there is national uniformity of classification. It found that differences in the applicable classifications affect the levels of the class rates as much as or more, in some instances, than the differences in the levels of the class rate scales themselves. It found that shippers in one territory pay more than shippers in another territory on the same article because of classification differences; that territorial boundaries separating classification territories are artificial and cause serious complications; that where geographic conditions produce divergent costs, revenue requirements, or other conditions requiring rate adjustments, the adjustments should be made not in the basic classification itself but in the rate levels or by the creation of legitimate exceptions to the classification; that amongst the classifications there was no real uniformity of classification ratings although the same classification principles are applicable throughout the Nation. It concluded that without such uniformity it is impossible to maintain just and reasonable relationships between class rates for competing commodities; that it is feasible for the carriers to establish a uniform classification. The Commission gave the railroads the opportunity to take the initiative in preparing the new uniform classification—an invitation which, we are advised, has been accepted.

Prior to this proceeding the Commission made four major class-rate investigations—one for each of the rate territories except Mountain-Pacific.[7] These established class-rate structures on a regional basis, i. e., they established some degree of uniformity in class rates within each territory or subdivision of a territory. But they did not deal with interterritorial class rates by harmonizing regional rate adjustments one with the other. As a result there are separate interterritorial rate structures applicable to freight traffic moving from one territory into another.

These territorial class-rate structures are exceedingly complicated. There is no basic uniformity amongst them, and they are computed by varying formulae.

The Commission found that class rates within Southern, Southwestern, and Western Trunk-Line Territories, and from those territories to Official Territory, were generally much higher, article for article, than the rates within Official Territory. It found that higher class rates have impeded the development and movement of class-rate freight within Southern, Southwestern, and Western Trunk-Line territories and from those territories to Official Territory. It concluded that neither the comparative costs of transportation service nor variations in the consists[8] and volume of traffic within the territories justified those differences in the class rates. The Commission also determined that equalization of class rates is not dependent on equalization of nonclass rates and that interterritorial rate problems can be solved only by establishing substantial uniformity in class ratings and rates.

Section 1 (4) and (5) (a) of the act require rates and charges to be just and reasonable. The Commission found that the intraterritorial class rates applicable to the territories in question and the interterritorial class rates between the territories violate those provisions.

Section 3 (1) of the act outlaws undue or unreasonable preferences or advantages to any region, district, or territory. The Commission found that the relation between the interterritorial class rates to Official Territory from the other territories in question and the intraterritorial class rates within official territory results in an unreasonable preference to Official Territory as a whole, and to shippers and receivers of freight located there, in violation of section 3 (1). The Commission, acting pursuant to its authority under section 15 (1) of the act, prescribed reasonable and nondiscriminatory class rates to cure the preference found to exist, the new rates to become applicable simultaneously with the new revised classification which, as we have noted, the Commission ordered to be established.

But time will be required to formulate a uniform classification. And the Commission concluded that pending completion of that undertaking certain interim readjustments in the existing basis of class rates, based on existing classifications, could be made—readjustments which would be just and reasonable, and which would reduce to a minimum the preferences and prejudices which the Commission found to be unlawful in the existing system. It determined that the several intraterritorial freight-rate structures should be brought closer to the same level and be constructed on the same pattern or scheme. It concluded that as many differences as possible between the interterritorial rates and the intraterritorial rates should be eliminated. It accordingly ordered that existing interstate class rates[9] applicable to freight traffic moving at the classification ratings within Southern, Southwestern, and Western Trunk-Line territories interterritorially between those territories, and interterritorially between each of those territories and Official Territory, be reduced 10 percent subject to qualifications not important here. It also ordered that interstate class rates for freight traffic moving at classification ratings within Official Territory be increased 10 percent, subject to qualifications not relevant to our problem. It found the new interim class rates just and reasonable (262 I. C. C. 447, supplemental report, 264 I. C. C. 41).

The new interim rates were ordered to become effective January 1, 1946. Prior to that date, New York and other Northern States, appellants in No. 343, filed their petition in the District Court to set aside the orders of the Commission. A statutory three judge court was convened and a temporary injunction was issued preventing the orders from going into effect (38 Stat. 208, 220, 28 U. S. C. § 47). The Governors of the six New England States (three of whose successors in office have been substituted as appellants in No. 344, 330 U. S. —) intervened on the side of the plaintiffs, as did most of the appellants in No. 345. The Commission and others[10] intervened on the side of the United States. Appellants in No. 345, including most of the western railroads, also filed their petition in the District Court seeking substantially the same relief as appellants in No. 343. The cases were consolidated and tried together, the District Court receiving additional evidence offered by the western railroads. The court sustained the orders of the Commission in all respects 65 F. Supp. 856), but continued the injunction pending appeal to this court.[11] Judicial Code § 210 (28 U. S. C. § 47 (a)).

First. The principal evil at which the Interstate Commerce Act was aimed was discrimination in its various manifestations. *Louisville & N. R. Co.* v. *United States*, (282 U. S. 740, 749–750). Until 1935, section 3 (1) of the act prohibited discrimination only against a "person, company, firm, corporation, or locality, or any particular description of traffic," (24 Stat. 379, 380). The question arose whether locality included a port insofar as the port was not a point of origin or destination but a gateway through which shipments were made. The Court held by a closely divided vote, and contrary to the ruling of the Commission, that it did not. *Texas & Pacific R. Co.* v. *United States* (289 U. S. 627). Thereafter Congress amended section 3 (1) so as to extend the prohibition against discrimination to include a "port, port district, gateway, transit point" (49 Stat. 607). And see *Albany Port District Commission* v. *Ahnapie & W. R. Co.*, (219 I. C. C. 151). That was in 1935. In 1940 Congress went further. By section 5 (b) of the Transportation Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 899, 902), known as the Ramspeck resolution, it authorized and directed the Commission to institute an investigation into rates on commodities between points in one classification territory and points in another territory and into like rates within territories for the purpose of determining whether those rates were "unjust and unreasonable or unlawful in any other respect in and of themselves or in their relation to each other, and to enter such orders as may be appropriate for the removal of any unlawfulness which may be found to exist * * *."[12] Congress also extended the prohibition against discriminations by adding to section 3 (1) the words region, district, territory.[13]

It is now asserted that the Commission has misunderstood its duties under these 1940 amendments. It is said that the Commission has construed this mandate of Congress

---

[7] Eastern Class Rate Investigation, 164 I. C. C. 314, 171 I. C. C. 481, 177 I. C. C. 156, 203 I. C. C. 357; Southern Class Rate Investigation, 100 I. C. C. 513, 109 I. C. C. 300, 113 I. C. C. 200, 128 I. C. C. 567; Western Trunk-Line Class Rates, 164 I. C. C. 1, 173 I. C. C. 637, 178 I. C. C. 619, 181 I. C. C. 301, 196 I. C. C. 494, 197 I. C. C. 57, 204 I. C. C. 595, 210 I. C. C. 312, 246 I. C. C. 119; Consolidated Southwestern Cases, 123 I. C. C. 203, 205 I. C. C. 601. See the discussion in 262 I. C. C. pp. 526 et seq.

[8] The consist of freight in a given territory is the totality of commodities carried in that territory.

[9] No change in intrastate class rates was made. Nor was any change made in existing exception, column or commodity rates. See note 3, supra.

[10] Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, the State Commissions of a number of these States, the Southern Governors' Conference, and the Southeastern Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners.

[11] We denied the motion of the United States to dissolve the injunction. 328 U. S. 824. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 62 (g).

[12] The Commission advised Congress that its investigations instituted in 1939 (the basis of the orders challenged in the present cases) would be carried out pursuant to this mandate. See 262 I. C. C., p. 689.

[13] Sec. 3 (1) now reads:

"It shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the provisions of this part to make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point, region, district, territory, or any particular description of traffic, in any respect whatsoever; or to subject any particular person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point, region, district, territory, or any particular description of traffic to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever: *Provided, however,* That this paragraph shall not be construed to apply to discrimination, prejudice, or disadvantage to the traffic of any other carrier of whatever description."

to mean that identical rates, mile for mile, should be established everywhere in the country, in face of a long standing practice of rate-making (which the legislative history of the 1940 amendments shows was not intended to be changed) that allowed differences in rates which were based on differences in the length of haul, character of the terrain, density of traffic, and other elements of the cost of service. Thus it is argued that the Commission runs afoul of *Ann Arbor R. Co.* v. *United States* (281 U. S. 658), which involved the construction of a joint resolution of Congress directing the Commission to make an investigation to determine whether existing rates and charges were unjust, unreasonable, or unjustly discriminatory so as to give undue advantage "as between the various localities and parts of the country * * *." (43 Stat. 801, 802). The Commission, relying on that mandate, condemned certain existing rates between California and eastern points. The Court set aside the order of the Commission, holding that the joint resolution did not purport to change the existing law but left the validity of rates to be determined by that law.

But the Commission in the present cases did not proceed on the assumption that the Ramspeck resolution changed the substantive law. As we read its report, the Commission took the resolution only as a directive to investigate and correct violations of substantive law as it deemed that law broadened by the amendment to section 3 (1). It said:

"By the amendment to the substantive antidiscrimination provisions of section 3 (1) all discriminations in the form of undue or unreasonable preference or advantage, or undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage, as between regions, districts, or territories, viewed as separate entities, were brought directly within the purview of the act along with all the other inhibitions previously included. We were then authorized and directed by the other provisions mentioned to remove any such discriminations found to exist in a proper proceeding. This means that such discriminations as those mentioned which result from differences in the methods of distributing the general rate burden in the several rate-making territories, or from any other cause, if not justified upon proper consideration of recognized elements of rate making applied in the light of the amended law are unlawful and should be corrected" (262 I. C. C., p. 692).

From this statement it is apparent that the Commission concluded that the 1940 amendment to section 3 (1) enlarged the scope of the section. The Commission, indeed, stated that "it is clear that the main purpose which Congress had in mind was to bring about a greater degree of equalization, harmony, and uniformity in the different regional or territorial rate structures of the country." Id. page 692. And see id. pages 688-691. But it is suggested that discriminations based on geographic factors were outlawed prior to the 1940 amendment to section 3 (1), as evidenced by its long-standing condemnation of "undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage" to any "locality" and, since 1935, to any "port, port district, gateway or transit point." [14]

[14] It is pointed out in this connection that *Texas & Pacific R. Co.* v. *United States, supra,* while holding that a port was not a "locality" when it was only a gateway through which shipments were made, recognized that a port was a "locality" when it was a point of origin or destination. (289 U. S., p. 638.)

It is, moreover, suggested that even the prohibition of discriminations against shippers was broad enough all along to ban discriminations based on the geographic location of the shippers. The contention is that without a change in the law the present orders were unwarranted; it is pointed out that the class rates now condemned had been found by the Commission itself to be just and reasonable in recent years. And it is asserted that the Commission did not take its present action on a showing of changed circumstances since those times. The conclusion, therefore, is that the present orders are not warranted by section 3 (1).

We need not determine whether, prior to the 1940 amendment, section 3 (1), by its ban on unlawful discriminations against a "locality," would have permitted the Commission to eradicate regional discriminations in class rates. For whatever doubt may have existed in the law was removed by the 1940 amendment which made abundantly clear that Congress thought that the problem of regional discriminations had been neglected and that if any such discriminations were found to be present, they should be eradicated.[15] But, as the Commission concedes, the addition of "region, district, territory" to section 3 (1) did not change the law respecting discrimination by authorizing uniform freight rates mile for mile, without regard to differing costs of the service. Congress, by adding those words, made plain the duty of the Commission in determining whether discriminatory practices exist to consider the interests of regions, districts, and territories, and to eliminate territorial rate differences which are not justified by differences in territorial conditions. In other words Congress did not introduce a new standard of discrimination by its amendment to section 3 (1); it merely made clear its purpose that regions, districts, and territories should be the beneficiaries of the law against discrimination.

Second. It is argued, however, that the finding of the Commission concerning regional discriminations in class rates are not supported by substantial evidence.

The great differences between territorial class rate levels are shown by the following table. It gives a comparison (in cents per 100 pounds) between the first-class rate scale within Official Territory and that within each of the other territories:

Distance	Eastern scale rate	Southern scale		Western trunk-line scale					
				Zone I		Zone II		Zone III	
		Rate	Percentage of Eastern	Rate	Percentage of Eastern	Rate	Percentage of Eastern	Rate	Percentage of Eastern
50 miles	47	57	-----	53	-----	61	-----	65	-----
100 miles	62	79	-----	73	-----	83	-----	90	-----
150 miles	73	96	-----	86	-----	98	-----	107	-----
200 miles	80	112	-----	97	-----	111	-----	123	-----
300 miles	90	134	-----	117	-----	134	-----	147	-----
400 miles	109	156	-----	136	-----	156	-----	172	-----
500 miles	122	173	-----	156	-----	178	-----	196	-----
600 miles	135	189	-----	176	-----	200	-----	220	-----
700 miles	149	206	-----	196	-----	222	-----	244	-----
800 miles	160	222	-----	210	-----	239	-----	263	-----
900 miles	171	235	-----	226	-----	256	-----	282	-----
1,000 miles	182	249	-----	240	-----	273	-----	300	-----
Average	----	----	137.7	----	129.6	----	144.4	----	159.4

These first-class intraterritorial rates are used as bases in formulating rates on other classes of freight in the respective territories.[16]

The following tables compiled by Government counsel show the first-class rates for interterritorial movements to Official Territory from each of the other territories as compared with intraterritorial movements for approximately equal distances within Official Territory:

SOUTHERN VERSUS OFFICIAL

From—	To—	Miles	First-class rates	Disadvantage of Southern Territory shipper compared with Official Territory shipper	
				In cents	In percent
Nashville, Tenn	Indianapolis, Ind	297	135		
Indianapolis, Ind	Kent, Ohio	296	96	39	41
Knoxville, Tenn	Columbus, Ohio	395	155		
Baltimore, Md	Warren, Ohio	392	103	52	50
Birmingham, Ala	Muncie, Ind	536	179		
Pittsburgh, Pa	Rockford, Ill	538	128	51	40
Chattanooga, Tenn	Chicago, Ill	594	187		
Philadelphia, Pa	Toledo, Ohio	595	135	52	39
Atlanta, Ga	Chicago, Ill	731	210		
Danville, Ill	Washington, D. C	733	151	59	39
Macon, Ga	Chicago, Ill	819	223		
Trenton, N. J	Danville, Ill	819	163	60	37

SOUTHWESTERN VERSUS OFFICIAL

Little Rock, Ark	Detroit, Mich	785	222		
Official Territory Point	do	785	160	62	39
Oklahoma City, Okla	Cincinnati, Ohio	882	244		
Official Territory Point	do	882	171	73	43
Shreveport, La	Cleveland, Ohio	1,013	264		
Official Territory Point	do	1,013	185	79	43
Dallas, Tex	Pittsburgh, Pa	1,224	304		
Official Territory Point	do	1,224	207	97	47

[15] Senator Wheeler, who had charge of the bill on the floor of the Senate, stated concerning the amendment to § 3 (1): "The previous provision with regard to 'discrimination' simply referred to discrimination as to 'locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point' without specifying the region, district, or territory. So we felt that by broadening the language we would at least take away that excuse, and we would provide expressly that the Commission should not discriminate in its rate structures." (84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5889.)

[16] See note 2, supra.

WESTERN TRUNK LINE VERSUS OFFICIAL

From—	To—	Miles	First-class rates	Disadvantage of Southern Territory shipper compared with Official Territory shipper	
				In cents	In percent
Des Moines, Iowa	Toledo, Ohio	558	142		
Official Territory Point	do	558	118	24	20
St. Paul, Minn	South Bend, Ind	491	138		
Official Territory Point	do	491	111	27	24
Lincoln, Nebr	Evansville, Ind	612	169		
Official Territory Point	do	612	125	44	35
Denver, Colo	Cleveland, Ohio	1,329	289		
Official Territory Point	do	1,329	200	89	45

The disadvantage to the southern or western shipper who attempts to market his product in Official Territory is obvious. Thus the first of these tables show that a Nashville shipper pays 39 cents more on each 100 pounds of freight moving to Indianapolis, Ind., than one who ships from Indianapolis to a point of substantially equal distance away (Kent, Ohio) in Official Territory. Similar disadvantages suffered by southern and western shippers are revealed in the other comparable interterritorial freight movements set forth in the tables.

That disadvantage is emphasized if the effects of classification differences on rates for identical commodities are considered. A comparison of rates in cents per 100 pounds for 200 miles shows that even though shippers in the South and West have the same or lower classification ratings for identical commodities they nevertheless on the whole pay higher charges than the shippers in Official Territory for equivalent service. Thus there are in class 100 (first class) for less-than-carload lots 2,092 items common to the 3 classifications. In Official classification all of these move at a rate of 80 cents per 100 pounds for a haul of 200 miles. In Southern, 2,076 of these items are classified 100 and move at a rate of $1.12. Of the remaining 17 items 5 are classified in Southern in class 85 with a rate of 95, 2 in class 7 with a rate of 78, 7 in class 55 with a rate of 62, 2 in class 45 with a rate of 50, 1 in class 40 with a rate of 45. In Western Trunk-Line Zone I, 2,076 of the 2,092 items are classified 100 with a rate of 97, 4 in 85 with a rate of 82, 10 in 70 with a rate of 68, 2 in 55 with a rate of 53.

In class 100 for carload lots there are 213 common items. In Official classification all of these move at a rate of 80 cents for a haul of 200 miles. In Southern, 199 of these items are classified 100 and move at a rate of $1.12 for 200 miles. Of the remaining 14, 7 are classified in Southern in class 85 with a rate of 95, 2 in 75 with a rate of 84, 5 in 70 with a rate of 78. In Western Trunk-Line Zone I, 202 of the 213 items are classified 100 with a rate of 97, 7 in 85 with a rate of 82, 3 in 70 with a rate of 67, 1 in 55 with a rate of 53. Additional illustrations are too numerous and detailed to include in this opinion. But the ones given are representative of the rest and show how disparities in the rate levels are aggravated when the effects of classification differences on rates are considered.

There is rather voluminous evidence in the record tendered to show the effect in concrete competitive situations of these class-rate inequalities. The instances were in the main reviewed by the Commission. They are attacked here on various grounds—that some of them involved rates other than class rates, that others were testified to by shippers who made no complaint of class rates, that others showed shippers paying higher rates yet maintaining their competitive positions and prospering. We do not stop to analyze them or discuss them beyond saying that some of the specific instances support what is plainly to be inferred from the figures we have summarized—that class rates within Southern, Southwestern, and Western Territories, and from those territories to Official Territory, are generally much higher, article for article, than the rates within Official Territory. That was the basic finding of the Commission; and it is abundantly supported by the evidence.

Thus discrimination in class rates in favor of Official Territory and against the Southern, Southwestern, and Western Trunk Line territories is established. But that is not the end of the matter. For "mere discrimination does not render a rate illegal under section 3." (*United States* v. *Illinois Central R. Co.* (263 U. S. 515, 521).) Section 3 condemns "any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage" and "any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage" to any territory. And, as we have said, the 1940 amendment to section 3, by its addition of "region, district, territory," did not change the prevailing rules respecting unlawful discrimination; it merely enlarged the reach of section 3. Hence we must determine from the pre-existing law whether a discrimination against a territory is obnoxious to section 3. The rule is stated in *United States* v. *Illinois Central R. Co., supra,* page 524, as follows:

"To bring a difference in rates within the prohibition of section 3, it must be shown that the discrimination practiced is unjust when measured by the transportation standard. In other words, the difference in rates cannot be held illegal, unless it is shown that it is not justified by the cost of the respective services, by their values, or by other transportation conditions."

It is on this principle that the findings of the Commission under section 3 are both defended and attacked.

Third. The Commission's findings under section 3 (1) are first challenged on the ground that there is no finding that the corresponding class rates are actually charged to or demanded of competing shippers in the several territories. That is to say, no unlawful discrimination in favor of a shipper in Official Territory and against a shipper in Southern Territory can be said to exist unless it is shown that the southern competitor is actually required to pay the higher interterritorial class rates. It is contended that the record negatives the existence of facts which could support such a finding and that no such finding was made. Reliance is placed on two circumstances. In the first place, reference is made to the effect of classification ratings on class rates which we briefly summarized above. It is noted, for example, that the southern shipper in some instances actually pays less for the shipment of the same commodity than the shipper in Official Territory, e. g., where the Southern Classification carries the commodity in a lower class, which in turn exacts a rate less than that required of the higher classification granted by Official. It is apparent from the illustrations we have given that such is true in some cases. But that is not the dominant pattern. In the vast majority of the instances the classification ratings, like the class rate structure, work to the benefit of Official Territory and against the others. But the greater reliance is placed on the second circumstance—that only a minor portion of freight moves by class rates and of that a greater percentage moves in Official Territory than in the others. This point requires a more extended answer.

The Commission, indeed, found that by reason of nonuse the class rates have become obsolete and no longer serve the purposes for which they were designed. They move a relatively small amount of freight. The following table indicates the percentages of carload traffic carried at class rates within and between territories in 1942:

From—	To—			
	Official	Southern	Southwestern	Western trunk-line
Official	5.8	12.6	22.5	12.3
Southern	.9	1.8	6.1	1.5
Southwestern	1.5	1.2	2.4	2.0
Western trunk-line	3.1	6.1	13.0	.6

In September 1940, for example, less-than-carload ratings on about 3,000 commodities were removed from the Southern Classification by classification exceptions. The great bulk of the freight moves on exception rates and commodity rates.[17] This trend, according to the Commission, has been the result of competitive forces. The creation of the exceptions has "shorn the ratings in the classifications of much of their usefulness and proper function" (262 I. C. C., p. 504). The record is replete with evidence supporting this finding of the Commission. And appellants seize on it as supporting their claim that since class rates have largely become paper rates, they are not the source of injury to shippers from the South and the West; that if the latter are prejudiced by the rate structure, the injury must flow from the exception rates and commodity rates not involved in this proceeding; and that in any event the case of unlawful discriminations in favor of Official Territory and against the other territories has not been founded on the actual use of disadvantageous class rates by shippers in the Southern, Southwestern, and Western Trunk-Line Territories.

But that takes too narrow a view of the problem confronting the Commission. We start, of course, with some showing of actual discrimination against shippers by reason of their use of class rates. But the main case of discrimination made out by the record is one against regions and territories. We assume that a case of unlawful discrimination against shippers by reason of their geographic location would be an unlawful discrimination against the regions where the shipments originate. But an unlawful discrimination against regions or territories is not dependent on such a showing. As we stated in *Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania R. Co.* (324 U. S. 439, 450), "Discriminatory rates are but one form of trade barriers." Their effect is not only to impede established industries but to prevent the establishment of new ones, to arrest the development of a State or region, to make it difficult for an agricultural economy to evolve into an industrial one. Nondiscriminatory class rates remove that barrier by offering that equality which the law was designed to afford. They insure prospective shippers not only that the rates are just and reasonable per se but that they are properly related to those of their competitors. Shippers are then not dependent on their ability to get exception rates or commodity rates after their industries are established and their shipments are ready to move. They have a basis for planning ahead by relying on a coherent-rate structure reflecting competitive factors.

[17] See note 3, supra.

If a showing of discrimination against a territory or region were dependent on a showing of actual discrimination against shippers located in these sections, the case could never be made out where discriminatory rates had proved to be such effective trade barriers as to prevent the establishment of industries in those outlying regions. If that were the test, then the 1940 amendment to section 3 (1) would not have achieved its purpose. We cannot attribute such futility to the effort made by Congress to make regions, districts, and territories, as well as shippers, the beneficiaries of its antidiscrimination policy expressed in section 3 (1).

So far as the remedy is concerned, the present cases might, of course, be different if the Commission had no power to prescribe classifications. But section 15 (1) of the act grants it full power, on finding that a classification is unjust or unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential or prejudicial, to determine and prescribe what classification will be just, fair, and reasonable. The Commission's over-all conclusion was that the classifications in force and the class rates computed from them harbor inequities which result in unlawful discriminations in favor of Official Territory and against the other territories. The fact that relatively small amounts of freight move by class rates proves, not that the regional and territorial discrimination is slight, but that the rate structure as constitued holds no promise of affording the various regions or territories that parity of treatment which territorial conditions warrant. The Commission in substance concluded that that result could not be achieved unless traffic was in the main moved on class rates. We will discuss later the appropriateness of the relief granted by the interim orders here challenged. It is sufficient here to note that the case of unlawful discrimination against these territories was chiefly founded on the absence of nondiscriminatory class rates and uniform classifications which would remove the features of existing rate structures prejudicial to Southern, Southwestern, and Western Trunk-Line Territories.

We are thus not primarily concerned with the adequacies of the Commission's findings showing discrimination against actual shippers located in a territory (cf. *Florida* v. *United States* (282 U. S. 194); *North Carolina* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 507); *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Mechling* (330 U. S. —)), but with prejudice to a territory as a whole.

Fourth. The inquiry of the Commission into the effect of class rates on the economic development of Southern, Southwestern, and Western Trunk-Line Territories took a wide range. It concluded that prejudice to the territories in question had been established. We think that finding is supported by substantial evidence.

It is, of course, obvious that the causal connection between rate discrimination and territorial injury is not always susceptible of conclusive proof. The extent of that causal relation cannot in any case be shown with mathematical exactness. It is a matter of inference from relevant data. The Commission recognized, for example, that the fact that the South has fewer industries than the East results from a complex of causes—that the industrial development of the East is due to many factors other than transportation services and costs, such as climate, soil, natural resources, available water power, supplies of natural gas and coal, and early settlements of population which antedated the building of the railroads (262 I. C. C. 619). It noted that in 1939 freight revenues on commodities in the manufactures and miscellaneous group were but 5.3 percent of the destination value of manufactured goods and that differences in freight charges resulting from differences in class-rate levels were only a small fraction of that figure. But it nevertheless concluded that "Nearness to markets and ability to ship to markets, on a basis fairly and reasonably related to the rates of competitors are nevertheless potent factors in the location of a manufacturing plant. In fact, rate relations are more important to the manufacturer and shipper than the levels of the rates" (262 I. C. C. 619–620).

The great advance in industrialization of Official Territory over the other territories need not be labored, for it is obvious. Some manifestations of that development may be illustrated by the following tables:

Territory	Land area, 1940	Gainful workers, 1930	Value of manufactured products, 1939	Value added by manufacture, 1939
Official	13.5	51.1	67.8	71.4
Southern	13.3	16.8	10.0	9.4
Western Trunk Line	20.9	13.5	9.9	8.7
Southwestern	14.2	9.3	4.5	3.3
Mountain Pacific	38.1	9.3	7.8	7.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Another measure of industrial growth is shown by the number of gainful workers and the manufacturing industries in the several territories:

Territory	Actual increase in total gainful workers from 1910 to 1930	Actual increase in value of products in all manufacturing industries from 1909 to 1939	Actual increase in value added by manufacture in all manufacturing industries from 1909 to 1939
Official	6,230,273	$23,561,190,000	$11,284,350,000
Southern	652,755	4,229,396,000	1,662,336,000
Western Trunk-Line	904,986	3,117,079,000	1,284,798,000
Southwestern	1,011,151	1,942,378,000	580,388,000
Mountain Pacific	1,863,419	3,320,930,000	1,341,785,000

The value added by manufacture in all industries from 1849 to 1939 is shown for all the territories by the chart on the following page (not printed).

From this chart it is apparent that Official Territory has maintained its commanding lead in spite of recent marked increases elsewhere, especially in the South. Similarly, for the period 1929 to 1939 the number of wage earners in manufacturing industries in the entire country decreased 11 percent; in Official Territory, 12 percent; while in the South there was an increase of 5 percent. For the same period, values of manufactured products increased 1 percent in the South, while they decreased 21 percent for the entire country and 25 percent in Official Territory. From 1930 to 1940, the number of gainfully occupied workers in manufacturing in Official Territory decreased from 70.5 percent to 69.4 percent of the Nation's total, while in the South there was an increase from 10 percent to 11.9 percent. A number of manufacturing activities have increased more rapidly in the South than in Official Territory, though the reverse has been true in other industries. But in spite of the growth in industrial activities in the South and West (which appellants stress heavily), the percentage comparisons are not particularly revealing because of the great disparity between the bases on which they are computed.

The fact remains that economic development in the South and West has lagged and still lags behind Official Territory. In 1940 the average annual dollar income per person employed in Official Territory was $1,988; in Southern, $940; in Southwestern, $1,177; in Western Trunk-line, $1,411. Official has 69 percent of all workers engaged in manufacturing in the United States and 29 percent of all workers in extractive industries. It has, for example, a high concentration in the manufacture of steel and copper products, though less than 4 percent of the iron ore reserves, and no reserves of metallic copper. The South and West furnish raw materials to Official and buy finished products back. They are also dependent to a great extent on the markets for their products in Official, which has over 48 percent of the population of the country, 76 percent of the national market for industrial machinery and raw materials, 64 percent for all goods and sources, 62 percent for consumer luxuries, and 53 percent for consumer necessities. Yet the South and West suffer rate handicaps when they seek to reach those markets.[18] One of the many illustrations will suffice. Cottonseed oil is a basic agricultural commodity. Class rates on it are 7 percent higher from Southern to Official Territory than they are within Official Territory. If the cottonseed oil is manufactured into oleomargarine, the rates from Southern to Official Territory are 35 percent higher than the rates within Official Territory.

It is said in reply, however, that the disparities which we have mentioned reflect only natural advantages which justify differences in rates. The great concentration of population in the East is said to show that its more favorable rates are justified by the fact that it has many more people to support the roads. The unfavorable income comparisons with the East are thought to establish one of the handicaps under which the roads in the South and West operate. It is pointed out that the heavy preponderance of the Nation's total natural resource of energy supply is located in Official Territory, 40 to 45 percent of the total bituminous and semibituminous coal supply, practically all of the anthracite resources; 60 percent of all electric energy originates there. It is said that Official Territory is the logical location for industries which use metals from other territories, since it has the natural supplies

[18] The Commission stated (262 I. C. C., pp. 695–696):

"Although manufacturing has grown in the South and Southwest and to a lesser extent in Western Trunk-Line Territory in the last decade, it is still vastly less in diversification and amount than in official territory. The increases in manufacturing in these territories has created a demand for rates which will at once permit the free movement of the manufactured articles, but because of the level of the intraterritorial and interterritorial class rates, such free movement has been impeded insofar as such commodities move at class rates. In most instances it has been necessary either to reduce the class-rate levels or to establish exception or commodity rates in order that the manufactured products may move freely, and this action has frequently been subject to long delays because of the failure of individual carriers or groups of carriers to agree upon a basis.

"Official Territory is the greatest consuming territory in the country, and is the market that nearly all manufacturers desire to reach, particularly where they have a surplus of their products to sell. In shipping to Official Territory, manufacturers in the other territories not only have the disadvantage of location, but are subjected to an additional burden in those instances where they must pay class rates on a much higher level than their competitors in Official Territory. This situation reacts to the disadvantage of manufacturers in the other territories, and to the advantage of those in Official Territory, tends to restrict the growth and expansion of the manufacturers in the other territories, and, to some extent, to prevent the establishment of new manufacturing plants in those territories."

of coal. It is also pointed out that the gross income from crops and livestock in Official Territory is the highest in the country, amounting to 31 percent of the total. From these and comparable data it is argued that the lower rates in Official Territory reflect only inherent advantages which the other territories do not enjoy. It is, therefore, argued that what the Commission has sought to do is to equalize economic advantages, to enter the field of economic planning, and to arrange a rate structure designed to relocate industries, cause a redistribution of population, and in other ways to offset the natural advantages which one territory has over another. It is asserted that such a program is unlawful under *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Diffenbaugh* (222 U. S. 42, 46), where the Court held that the act, in its condemnation of discrimination, does not attempt to equalize fortune, opportunities or abilities. And see *United States* v. *Illinois Central R. Co.* (*supra*, p. 524); *Texas & Pacific R. Co.* v. *United States* (*supra*, pp. 637-638).

We will revert to this matter when we come to consider whether territorial conditions justify the differences in rates. It is sufficient at this point to say that the record makes out a strong case for the inference that natural disadvantages alone are not responsible for the retarded development of the South and the West; that the discriminatory rate structure has also played a part. How much a part cannot be determined, for every effect is the result of many factors. But the inference of prejudice from the discriminatory rate structure is irresistible. If this discriminatory rate structure is not justified by territorial conditions, then its continued maintenance preserves not the natural advantages of one region but man-made trade barriers which have been imposed upon the country. Such a result cannot be reconciled with the great purposes of section 3 (1), as amended in 1940.

Fifth. The Commission found that conditions peculiar to the respective territories did not justify the differences in the territorial class-rate structures. In reaching that conclusion it first inquired whether the differences in the costs of furnishing the railroad service in the several rate territories justified the existing differences in the levels and patterns of the class-rate scales.[19] The basis of its inquiry was a cost study submitted by its staff. For cost-analysis purposes the United States is divided into areas roughly but not exactly approximating the classification territories. Thus, there are three districts—Eastern, Southern, and Western. Southern district is further divided into Pocahontas region and southern region. Eastern district plus Pocahontas region is substantially the equivalent of Official Territory.[20] In the cost study railroads were assigned to geographical areas; expenses for individual roads were divided into groups, each group being associated with appropriate service units, which included revenue car-miles, revenue gross-ton miles, and cars originated and terminated; unit costs were then obtained by dividing the aggregate of the territorial expenses in each group by the applicable territorial units; the costs of particular services were then built up from the unit costs. Costs were put into two classes—(1) out-of-pocket or variable expenses which vary directly with the kind of traffic handled; (2) constant or fixed costs not capable of assignment to particular kinds of tram costs[21] which normally must be borne by the various types of traffic in proportion to the ability of each to pay. The details of the cost study are too intricate and voluminous to relate here. They have been summarized by the Commission (262 I. C. C. 571-592). It should be noted, however, that allowances for return—computed at both 4 percent and 5¾ percent—were included among costs. The allowances for return were based on recommended rate-making values furnished by the Bureau of Valuation. The territorial cost comparisons were principally based on the 4-percent return figure, the Commission noting that the figure was relatively close to the return earned by the carriers in the year covered by the study, viz, 1939.

To summarize very briefly, the expenses of the carriers were first broken down and translated into territorial average unit costs of performing each of the kinds of services involved in moving a specific shipment or in furnishing a given amount of transportation service in each territory. These unit costs were then multiplied by the number of units of each of the services found to be employed in moving the specific shipment or furnishing the given amount of service in the territory. The process was repeated for a series of different shipments or services sufficient to make the result representative of territorial conditions. Once the average costs for each rate territory were computed, territorial average costs were compared. The principal comparisons were based on the year 1939, although supplementary studies were also made for the periods 1930-39, inclusive, 1937-41, inclusive, and 1941. The territorial cost comparisons showed, for example, the costs of hauling given weight loads in a certain type of car for given distances in each territory. They also showed the relative costs of handling the entire traffic consist of each territory. This was designed to eliminate the effects of any differences in consists of traffic between territories compared, by determining first the cost in the territory in which it actually moved and then the cost in each of the other territories. The cost study gave consideration to freight moving for various distances in all kinds of equipment—box, hopper, gondola, tank, stock, flat, and refrigerator cars. Costs were compared for identical loads hauled in the principal types of equipment. Standard loads were then taken. The average weight loads experienced in each territory for various types of equipment were also taken. The aim was to make adjustment for the different types of equipment used and the different average loads between territories. Likewise, comparisons were made of the cost of hauling the entire consist of the traffic of one territory, at the average loads and unit costs applicable in that territory, with the cost of hauling the identical traffic at the average loads and unit costs applicable to the other territories. Comparisons were also made (for the distances the traffic actually moved, by classes of equipment, and at actual average loads) of the relative cost of hauling the consist of traffic of the entire United States, and the costs of carrying the Eastern, Southern, and Western consists respectively in each of the several territories.

When it came to the Eastern district, computations were made which both excluded and included the Pocahontas region. That region, for purposes of the study, represented the operation of three railroads—Chesapeake & Ohio, Norfolk & Western, and the Virginian—about 84 percent of whose freight traffic is coal. For purposes of such a comparative study as this, the exclusion of Pocahontas is considered desirable, since its costs are low because of the very heavy coal tonnage.[22]

The Commission attached principal weight to the haul of 300 miles per shipment originated, as that distance most closely approximated the length of haul in each territory in 1939. Relative territorial[23] costs (fully distributed) for traffic moving that distance in boxcars and gondola cars were as follows:

[United States average=100]

	Boxcars		Gondola and hopper cars	
	Assumed 25-ton load	Actual average load	Assumed 50-ton load	Actual average load
Eastern (excluding Pocahontas)	102	103	100	100
Southern	96	97	99	102
Western	108	108	109	115

The Commission computed that on the foregoing analysis for 100, 300, and 500 miles, the fully distributed costs for the South are generally a little lower than for the East, Pocahontas excluded, while the fully distributed costs in the West exceed those of the East by from 6 to 15 percent. Similar cost comparisons were made for the several territories for stock-car, refrigerator-car, tank-car, and flatcar traffic. Based on the actual average loads experienced for each class of equipment, the Commission found the costs for the South lower than those for the East (Pocahontas excluded) for traffic moving in all those classes of equipment. The costs for the West are also lower than those for the East as to stock-car, refrigerator-car, and flatcar traffic, but higher for tank-car traffic.

A territorial comparison of fully distributed costs for carload traffic moving 300 miles in all classes of equipment shows the following:[24]

[United States average=100]

	Identical loads	Actual average loads
Eastern (excluding Pocahontas)	102	102
Pocahontas	67	67
Eastern including Pocahontas	95	95
Southern	98	101
Western	108	110

The fully distributed costs on identical loads in the South are 4 percent below those for

[19] In *Northern Pacific R. Co.* v. *North Dakota* (236 U. S. 585, 597), the Court stated, "The outlays that exclusively pertain to a given class of traffic must be assigned to that class, and the other expenses must be fairly apportioned. It may be difficult to make such an apportionment, but when conclusions are based on cost the entire cost must be taken into account."

[20] For description of exact boundaries, see 262 I. C. C. 605. For some cost purposes the United States is also divided into 11 cost territories, various combinations of which are equivalent to the rate territories. For definitions of these cost territories, and a collection of a substantial portion of the Commission's cost data, see S. Doc. No. 63, 78th Cong., 1st Sess.

[21] The sum of the out-of-pocket costs plus a pro rata distribution of the constant or fixed costs is referred to as fully distributed cost.

[22] 262 I. C. C., p. 578. Similar conditions call for the exclusion of Kentucky in considering figures for the Southern region. And see general commodity rate increases, 223 I. C. C. 657.

[23] Not including Pocahontas in eastern territory figures. Relative costs were not shown separately for Western Trunk-Line, Southwestern, and Mountain Pacific territories, the Commission noting that differences between costs for the total West and for each of those three rate territories were relatively small. 262 I. C. C., p. 578.

[24] Weighting given to the costs for each class of equipment was based on the volume of traffic handled in each type of equipment in the United States. Terminal costs for each class of equipment were weighted for the total United States traffic handled in each class of equipment as measured by tons originated plus tons terminated. Line-haul costs by classes of equipment were weighted for the ton-miles of traffic handled in each class of equipment.

the East, excluding Pocahontas. The same comparison shows the costs for the West 6 percent higher than those in the East, excluding Pocahontas. Costs in the South, based on the actual average loads are 1 percent below those for the East, excluding Pocahontas. In the West they are 8 percent higher than the latter.

Territorial comparisons based on average net ton-mile carload costs (1930–39) adjusted for differences in the length of haul and the consist of the traffic were made. They showed that the costs for the South are approximately 1 or 2 percent below those for the East, excluding Pocahontas. On the other hand, those costs for the West exceeded those of the East, excluding Pocahontas by from 5 to 7 percent.

Territorial comparisons of the less-than-carload costs were also prepared. They showed that those costs are lower in the South than in the East whether assumed identical loads or actual average loads are taken, and even if Pocahontas is included in the East. They are higher in the West than in the East. If Pocahontas is excluded from the East the following table shows the comparison for a 300-mile haul:

[United States average=100]

	Assumed identical load		Actual average load	
	Out of pocket	Out of pocket plus constant [1]	Out of pocket	Out of pocket plus constant [1]
Eastern (excluding Pocahontas)	105	101	94	93
Southern	89	87	88	86
Western	104	109	120	121

[1] Constant costs common to all traffic are not included

In all territories less-than-carload traffic (1939) was carried at a deficit, Southern making the best showing, Western the worst. That is revealed in the following table:

	Revenues	Costs [1]	Deficit
Eastern (excluding Pocahontas)	$107,155,756	$133,308,907	$26,153,151
Southern	46,635,725	47,451,184	815,459
Western	88,797,938	123,146,215	34,348,277

[1] Out-of-pocket cost plus total solely related expenses plus collection and delivery.

The Commission found that the difference in fully distributed costs for all traffic between the East and the West is largely in the constant or fixed expenses and the passenger and less-than-carload deficits. Out-of-pocket expenses in the South and West are freqeuntly as low as, or even lower than, the out-of-pocket costs in the East. The Commission further found that the increase in freight traffic volume received by the carriers subsequent to 1939 served to reduce the unit costs of transportation in the South and West in a proportionately greater degree than in the East. A somewhat larger percentage of out-of-pocket expenses in the East is variable with added traffic than is true of the South and West, due apparently to the fact that the East, with its higher traffic density, is closer to its maximum capacity than is true of the others. Thus the influence of added traffic in reducing average costs is greater in the West. On the other hand constant costs (proportionately larger in the South and West) do not increase with added traffic. As illustrative of those circumstances the Commission noted the effect of increases in 1941 of the ton-miles of revenue freight. They increased in 1941, as compared with 1939, 43 percent in the East, 27 percent in Pocahontas, 44 percent in southern, and 46 percent in western territory. The cost per revenue ton-mile decreased by only about 5 percent in the East and in Pocahontas, as compared with decreases in excess of 10 percent in the South and West.

The Commission summarized the results of the territorial cost comparisons as follows: There is little significant difference in the cost of furnishing transportation in the South as compared with the East, Pocahontas excluded. It is principally the low terminal costs in the South that account for its relatively low total costs. Based on the year 1939 and the period 1930–39, the costs in the South are equal to or a little lower than those in the East. Based on the period 1937–41, the costs in the South are substantially lower than those in the East.[25]

Based on the year 1939 and the period 1930–39, the cost of rendering transportation service in the West is between 5 and 10 percent higher than in the East, excluding Pocahontas. Based on 1941, that difference is reduced to 5 percent or less.[26]

The Commission recognized, of course, that carriers must obtain their revenue from the traffic which moves in their respective territories. Hence the revenue-producing or rate-bearing characteristics of the different commodities which compose the traffic of the several territories, i. e., the consists and volumes of traffic, are also important in determining whether territorial conditions justify differences in territorial rates.

The percentage distribution of total tons carried and revenue by commodity groups for 1939 is shown in the following table:

	Eastern district		Eastern (including Pocahontas)		Southern region		Western district	
	Percent of tonnage	Percent of revenue	Percent of tonnage	Percent of revenue	Percent of tonnage	Percent of revenue	Percent of tonnage	Percent of revenue
Group I: Products of agriculture	6.57	8.73	6.07	8.03	10.80	17.73	18.88	23.70
Group II: Animals and products	1.64	4.72	1.47	4.23	1.45	3.51	3.00	6.30
Group III: Products of mines	58.06	34.85	61.53	40.24	46.39	23.65	36.64	13.98
Group IV: Products of forests	2.43	2.74	2.43	2.69	11.40	9.45	10.59	9.31
Group V: Manufactures and miscellaneous	29.57	41.41	26.89	37.75	27.21	34.66	29.38	39.94
Total all carload traffic	98.27	92.45	98.39	92.94	97.25	89.00	98.49	93.23
All less-carload traffic	1.73	7.55	1.61	7.06	2.75	11.00	1.51	6.77

The Commission also considered the distribution of carload traffic based on revenue ton-miles for 1939 which it summarized as follows:

Item	Eastern district	Pocahontas region	Southern region	Western district
Products of agriculture	10.7	2.7	15.8	26.8
Animals and other products	3.8	.5	2.2	4.5
Products of mines	49.3	87.4	40.8	20.1
Products of forests	3.1	1.6	11.6	13.6
Manufactures and miscellaneous	33.1	7.8	29.6	35.0
Grand total, carload	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

And the contributions which the major classes of commodities (carload lots) make in excess of out-of-pocket costs (1939) appear as follows:

Item	Eastern district	Pocahontas region	Southern region	Western district	United States
Products of agriculture	4.2	3.1	15.8	18.0	10.8
Animals and products	1.5	1.1	3.4	4.3	2.7
Products of mines	38.0	73.4	21.2	13.9	29.7
Products of forests	2.8	2.8	9.4	8.1	5.7
Manufactures and miscellaneous	53.5	19.6	50.2	55.7	51.1
Grand total, carload	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

A large volume of all traffic moves across territorial boundaries and therefore becomes common to two or more territories. And as respects the balance, the Commission found striking similarity in the consists of the traffic so far as its revenue-producing characteristics are concerned. The manufactures and miscellaneous commodity group embraces traffic which moves at relatively high rates, i. e., rates which, ton-mile for ton-mile, make a substantially greater than average contribution to the constant costs. The percentages of the total tons carried in that group and the corresponding percentages for revenue produced by them are quite close to each other, particularly the East and the West.

The Commission stated that the revenue-producing qualities, or rate-bearing characteristics, of the commodities which compose the traffic in those several territories constituted "the governing factor" so far as the problem of the consists and volume of traffic was concerned (262 I. C. C. 694). It appraised the evidence we have related as meaning that "the differences that exist in the consists of traffic in these respective territories are not so substantial or of such character as to warrant the present differences in class rates" (id., p. 695).

The findings of the Commission both as to the consists of the freight and the costs of rendering the service in the respective territories are vigorously challenged, especially by the western roads.

As to the consists, it is said that the eastern roads have a much heavier percentage of freight of a kind that produces excess revenue to carry the general expenses. Findings of the Commission are relied upon as showing that the eastern roads' preponderance of high-grade traffic affords a greater source of revenue than does the high percentage of low-rate products carried by

[25] If Pocahontas is included in the East, the costs for the South, based on the year 1939, are between 3 and 6 percent above those for the East; for the years 1930–39, between 6 and 8 percent higher; for the years 1937–41, about the same.

[26] If Pocahontas is included in the East for 1930–39, the cost in the West is 18 percent higher; based on 1939, approximately 15 percent higher; based on 1941, about 10 percent higher.

the western roads.[27] These undisputed facts are said to disprove the Commission's finding that the consists of traffic in the respective territories do not warrant the present differences in class rates.

These facts, however, relate to density of traffic,[28] the effect of which is merged in the final cost figures. But the relation of the consist problem to the problem of rate structures is somewhat different. It is relevant in order to determine whether the consists of traffic are so different in the several territories that separate rate structures with different distributions of the transportation burden amongst commodities and classes of freight are necessary. It is apparent from the statistics which we have reviewed that, while there is a diversity in traffic moved in the several territories, the diversity largely disappears when commodity groups are considered. Then, also, the precentages of the total traffic in each territory which fall under the several commodity groups are not only very similar in the East, South, and West, but each group yields about the same percentage of the total revenues in each of the territories. The choice of groupings is plainly a specialized problem in transportation economics upon which the Commission is peculiarly competent to pass. Its judgment that the differences in consists between the territories do not justify the present differences in interterritorial class rates is indeed an expert judgment entitled to great weight. We could not disturb its findings on the facts of this record without invading the province reserved for the expert administrative body.

As to the cost study little need be said concerning the South. Once the integrity of the cost study is assumed,[29] the finding of the Commission that there is little significant difference in the cost of furnishing transportation in the South as compared with the East has support in the facts. Moreover, the data on rates of return and freight operating ratios, to which we will shortly refer, corroborate the conclusion reached from the cost study that the differences in class rates between the East and the South are not justified by territorial conditions. The finding that the discrimination against the South is unlawful under section 3 (1) is thus amply supported—a conclusion that the southern carriers do not challenge here.

The question is a closer one when we turn to the West. For, as we have seen, the costs in the West on the average run higher than those in the East. Based on the year 1939 and the period 1930–39, the cost of rendering transportation service in the West is between 5 and 10 percent higher than in the East, excluding Pocahontas. Based on 1941, that difference is reduced to 5 percent or less.

As we have seen, the class rate structure is discriminatory as between the East and the West. The level of class rates in the West is from 30 to 59 percent higher than that in the East. The problem of the Commission, therefore, was to determine whether that disparity is justified by territorial conditions. The Commission found that it was not so justified. The problem for us is whether the Commission had a basis for its conclusion.

While the western roads vigorously challenge the Commission's finding, their argument is in the main directed to the point that some disparity in rates between East and West is justified by differing territorial costs. No particular effort is made to prove that those costs are a fair measure of the existing rate differences.

We start, of course, from the premise that on a subject of transportation economics, such as this one, the Commission's judgment is entitled to great weight. The appraisal of cost figures is itself a task for experts, since these costs involve many estimates and assumptions and, unlike a problem in calculus, cannot be proved right or wrong. They are, indeed, only guides to judgment. Their weight and significance require expert appraisal.

The Commission has concluded that while cost studies are highly relevant to these rate problems they are not conclusive. It said in this case:

"Discretion and flexibility of judgment within reasonable limits have always attended the use of costs in the making of rates. Costs alone do not determine the maximum limits of rates. Neither do they control the contours of rate scales or fix the relations between rates or between rate scales. Other factors along with costs must be considered and given due weight in these aspects of rate making" (262 I. C. C. 693).

In appraising the cost figures relevant here, the Commission proceeded on the assumption that the 1941 traffic level is most likely to prevail in the postwar period. It, therefore, started with the assumption that the margin of difference between the costs in the West and those in the East was slight and not accurately measured by 1939 figures, and that if, as has been the fact,[30] the freight carried in the West increased above that level, the unit costs of transportation in the West would be reduced to a greater degree than those in the East, for reasons which we have already stated.

The Commission also had before it certain data relative to the financial condition of the various roads, data which we have not yet discussed. Thus comparative analyses of the rates of return of the roads in the several territories showed that while the western roads have had many lean years, the recent period has put them ahead of the roads in the East. The following table shows the rates of return in percentages based on the net railway operating income and the book investment, increased for cash, materials, and supplies:

	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943
Eastern district	2.67	2.27	1.26	2.34	2.66	3.62	4.9	4.32
Southern region	2.52	2.35	1.9	2.5	2.57	4.24	6.51	5.73
Pocahontas region	7.58	6.61	4.54	5.89	6.21	6.67	5.29	5.22
Western district	1.88	1.71	1.09	1.65	2.06	3.36	5.8	5.22

The Commission also considered the territorial freight operating ratios—the percent of operating revenues from freight absorbed by operating expenses attributed to the freight.[31] They are shown in the following table:

	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943
Eastern district	64.95	67.86	68.98	64.88	63.92	63.04	61.93	66.23
Southern region	65.38	67.77	66.73	64.99	65.34	61.07	56.84	59.41
Pocahontas region	47.04	50.63	53.59	50.71	49.77	48.12	49.62	52.86
Western district	65.07	66.93	67.13	65.01	63.63	60.98	55.79	59.47

In light of such data the Commission said: "Making due allowance for a substantial decline in traffic from the war peak and for the fact that in the decade preceding 1940 the earnings of the western rail respondents were relatively low, nevertheless, insofar as the prospects of traffic and revenues in the imemdiate future can be foreseen, there is no reason to conclude that the interim adjustment will have any serious effect upon those respondents" (264 I. C. C. 63–64).

The Commission went on to note that intrastate class rates generally in most of the Western States and many of the interstate class rates in western territory were already lower than those prescribed in the interim orders. It accordingly concluded that the territories were reconciled within a very close margin as appears from the following table:

Territory	Aggregate expenses, increased for a 4-percent return computed by applying costs to traffic handled (1939)	Actual expenses as reported by carriers increased for a 4-percent return (1939)	Ratio (percent) of computed expenses to actual expenses
Eastern	$1,426,950,260	$1,451,484,949	98.3
Pocahontas	183,076,590	185,387,990	98.8
Southern	450,448,155	449,001,663	100.3
Western	1,382,549,982	1,395,188,845	99.1
United States	3,443,024,987	3,481,063,447	98.9

The Commission stated, "Judging from the above table, whatever errors may exist in the * * * studies, they have not had the effect of overstating or understating the carriers' costs in the aggregate to any appreciable degree." 262 I. C. C. 587.

[27] It is pointed out, as the Commission found, that livestock is a commodity which cannot do more than pay its own way; that products of the forest are subject to freight rates below the higher brackets; that agricultural products carry a low rate. The western district roads originated 36.91 percent of the total tons of carload traffic originated in the United States (excluding Pocahontas) in 1941, while the eastern roads originated 47.40 percent. To that disparity is added the fact that of the total agricultural products originated in the country in 1941 the western district roads originated 68.82 percent as contrasted to 20.88 percent by the eastern carriers excluding Pocahontas. For manufacturers and miscellaneous tonnage the percentages were 28.06 percent and 60.66 percent, respectively. It is pointed out that while the difference between the percentage of agricultural products originated by the western carriers (68.82 percent) and the percentage of manufacturers and miscellaneous originated by the eastern carriers (60.66 percent) is only 8 percent, the eastern roads' tonnage of the latter group of commodities (which are high-grade traffic) is almost three times the tonnage of products of agriculture originated by the western carriers. Like comparisons are made between other groups of commodities carried by the eastern and western carriers, respectively. Of the total tons of animals and products originated in the country in 1941 (excluding Pocahontas), the western roads originated 63.03 percent, the eastern, 28.51 percent. Of the total tons of products of forests originated in 1941, the respective percentages were 58.73 percent and 7.52 percent. And for products of mines the percentages were 33.31 percent and 49.85 percent, respectively.

[28] The 1941 revenue ton-miles per mile of line were as follows:

Eastern district (excluding Pocahontas)	3,392,964
Pocahontas region	7,519,840
Western district	1,358,041

[29] Costs developed in the cost scales and the carriers' total known expenses by cost

[30] In the 12 months ended October 31, 1946, the revenue tons carried in the West were 26 percent higher than for the year 1941, and the revenue ton-miles were 43 percent higher than in 1941.

[31] See White, Analysis of Railroad Operations (1946) pp. 14–15, p. 69, et seq.; Locklin, Economics of Transportation (1938) p. 581; Miller, Inland Transportation (1933) pp. 500–502.

western roads "cannot consistently maintain these subnormal class rates and continue to maintain the relatively high basis of interstate class rates" (264 I. C. C. 64).

Moreover, as we have already noted, class rates have to a great extent fallen into disuse. This fact is relevant here in two respects. In the first place, the orders of the Commission affect class rates and class rates alone, the Commission not dealing with exception and commodity rates by the interim action which it has taken. So far as present freight movement is concerned, the orders affect a much smaller fraction of the traffic in the West than in the East. The Commission said:

"The record does not support the contention that the revenue needs of the western rail respondents with respect to their class-rate traffic are greater than those of the eastern rail respondents. From the carriers' reports to us for the years 1942, 1943, as shown in our original report, and 1944, it clearly appears that there is a greater need for revenue by rail carriers in the eastern district as compared with rail carriers in the western district or in the southern region. The report shows also that a much larger percentage of the total traffic in the eastern district moves on class rates than in the western district or in the southern region" (264 I. C. C. 64–65).

In the second place, the existing rate structure singles out the class rate traffic in the West for the payment of unusually high rates. The class rate traffic is largely that of small shippers, who do not have the ability to obtain the benefit of the lower exception or commodity rates.

We cannot, therefore, treat this case as if it were one where the Commission, in spite of a showing of some increased cost in the West, reduced all freight rates to a level of equality with the East. It is a case of determining whether the discrimination against one small class of traffic is warranted by the showing of some increased cost in the West. The earning power of the carriers, their freight operating ratios, their rates of return, the estimate of the volume of traffic in the future, the nature and amount of traffic presently involved in the class rate movements are all relevant to the finding of unlawful discrimination. We cannot say that these considerations do not counterbalance or outweigh the disparity in costs between East and West. The appraisal of these numerous factors is for transportation experts. They may err. But the error, if any, is not of the egregious type which is within our reach on judicial review

As we have noted, *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Diffenbaugh* (supra, p. 46) held that the act, in its condemnation of discrimination, does not attempt to equalize fortune, opportunities, or abilities. But the Commission made no such effort here. It eliminated inequalities in the class rates because it concluded that the differences in them were not warranted by territorial conditions. We think that the findings supporting that conclusion are based on adequate evidence.

It is argued that the comparison of rates of return and freight operating ratios overlooks the fact that both reflect the higher freight revenue level that prevails in the West. And it is urged that without the rate advantage which the western carriers now enjoy, any comparison which now appears to favor the western carriers would disappear. That argument assumes a constancy in freight traffic and on that assumption could be mathematically demonstrated. But we are dealing here with a problem of discrimination—a western rate structure which, as compared with the East, is not warranted by territorial conditions and which prejudices the growth and development of the West. It would be a large order to say that the removal of that trade barrier will have no effect in increasing traffic. The assumption on which the finding of prejudice is made, is indeed, to the contrary. Moreover, that argument would protect a discriminatory rate structure from the power of revision granted the Commission under section 3 (1) by the easy assumption that without discrimination the carriers would not thrive. But that flies in the face of history and is contrary to the Commission's expert judgment on these facts.

Sixth. An extended argument is made by the western roads, challenging the class-rate reduction on less-than-carload lots. The argument is twofold—first, that the case of unlawful discrimination has not been made out for this type of class-rate traffic; second, that the new less-than-carload class rates are confiscatory.

We have referred to some of the cost figures on less-than-carload lots. We have seen that those cost figures run higher in the West than in the East; that even when no constant costs common to all traffic are allocated to less-than-carload traffic, the deficit in the West is substantially higher than that in the East. The Commission noted that less-than-carload traffic as a whole is carried at a deficit in all territories, except possibly in the South. It also noted that in all territories it was not bearing its proper share of the costs of transportation; that, apart from wartime loading, it was not yielding, on the average, its out-of-pocket costs plus constant expenses solely related to less-than-carload traffic[32] plus the cost of collection and delivery, in any territory except possibly the southern (262 I. C. C. 697).

Little need be said concerning the argument that a case of unlawful discrimination has not been established in the case of less-than-carload traffic. The Commission concluded that if less-than-carload class rates were left unchanged while carload class rates in Southern, Southwestern and Western Trunk-Line Territories were reduced 10 percent, "the competitive relations between shippers shipping in less-than-carload quantities and those shipping in carloads" would be materially affected (264 I. C. C. 66). Less-than-carload traffic is less than 2 percent of total railroad freight tonnage, and much of that moves, not on class rates, but on exception rates and commodity rates. In Western Trunk-Line and Southwestern Territories many intrastate and interstate class rates are now voluntarily maintained on less-than-carload traffic which are lower than the corresponding reduced interstate class rates required by the interim orders. There are other circumstances, to which we will shortly advert, which reinforce the action of the Commission in reducing class rates on less-than-carload traffic. But the ones we have mentioned are adequate to support the Commission on the discrimination phase of the problem. The Commission was dealing not with discrimination against a particular commodity but with discrimination against entire regions. It was a complete rate structure that was subject to inquiry and revision. Once the Commission concluded that unlawful discrimination existed in the main features of that rate structure, it was justified in removing it. In eliminating the discrimination and establishing the uniformity required by the law, it was warranted in making minor collateral readjustments so that the Commission itself would not in turn create new discriminations. The adjustment of the less-than-carload class rates was permissible on that ground alone. The traffic affected was only a fraction of 2 percent of the total traffic. Without that readjustment that class of traffic would be prejudiced. With that readjustment the prejudice would be removed and the entire rate structure—intrastate and interstate—would be more nearly rationalized.

That does not, of course, answer the argument on confiscation. The latter requires more extended treatment.

The western roads in their petition for rehearing before the Commission raised the confiscation point. But in doing so they rested on the record before the Commission and tendered no additional evidence. In the district court, however, they presented further evidence which was received over objection and considered by that court.

This, therefore, is not a case like *Baltimore & Ohio R. Co.* v. *United States* (298 U. S. 349, 363, 371–372), where the Commission refused to receive evidence proffered on the point of confiscation. Here, as we have said, the Commission received all evidence that was offered; and when its order was announced and made known and the petition for rehearing was filed, the opportunity to tender additional evidence to bolster the confiscation point was not accepted. As stated in *Manufacturers R. Co.* v. *United States* (246 U. S. 457, 489–490), and in *St. Joseph Stock Yards Co.* v. *United States* (298 U. S. 38, 53–54), correct practice requires that, where the opportunity exists, all pertinent evidence bearing on the issues tendered the Commission should be submitted to it in the first instance and should not be received by the district court as though it were conducting a trial de novo. The reason is plain enough. These problems of transportation economics are complicated and involved. For example, the determination of transportation costs and their allocation among various types of traffic is not a mere mathematical exercise. Like other problems in cost accounting, it involves the exercise of judgment born of intimate knowledge of the particular activity and the making of adjustments and qualifications too subtle for the uninitiated.[33] Moreover, the impact of a particular order on revenues and the ability of the enterprise to thrive under it are matters for judgment on the part of those who know the conditions which create the revenues and the flexibility of managerial controls. For such reasons, we stated in *Board of Trade* v. *United States* (314 U. S. 534, 546):

"The process of rate making is essentially empiric. The stuff of the process is fluid and changing—the resultant of factors that must be valued as well as weighed. Congress has therefore delegated the enforcement of transportation policy to a permanent expert body and has charged it with the duty of being responsive to the dynamic character of transportation problems."

Thus we think that if the additional evidence was necessary to pass on the issue of confiscation, the cause should have been remanded to the Commission for a further preliminary appraisal of the facts which bear on that question. But we do not take that course here for reasons which will shortly appear.

The Commission explained its finding that less-than-carload traffic was being carried at large deficits and was not bearing its proper share of transportation costs. That finding was based on the operation of the roads in

[32] Constant costs solely related to less-than-carload traffic are those costs which do not vary with the volume of the traffic, but which could be eliminated if no less-than-carload traffic were handled.

[33] See Hamilton, Cost as a Standard for Price, 4 Law and Contemp. Prob., 321, 329:

"Now and then a hardy soul, equipped with simple faith and a calculating machine, essays the adventure of rates based upon the true costs of particular services. The feat is, of course, technically impossible, for value judgments or empirical rules are essential to the distribution of overhead. A calculation of the real cost of transporting cottonseed in less than carload lots from Lampasas, Tex., to Kankakee, Ill., is a stubborn exercise in imputation."

1939 when the average load per car of less-than-carload shipments amounted to only 4.3 tons in the West. Since 1939 there has been a substantial increase in the average loading of such shipments, which was brought about under wartime conditions and which has materially decreased the unit costs attributable to less-than-carload traffic. In the judgment of the Commission it was not shown that loadings in the immediate postwar period were likely to decline to 1939 levels. Moreover, the cost data on less-than-carload traffic related to such traffic as a whole and not solely to that moving on class rates. As we have noted, much of this traffic moves not on class rates but on exception rates and commodity rates. The class-rate traffic bears the highest rates. The past failure of this traffic, as a whole, to carry its proper share of the costs may well have been due in large measure to the maintenance of exception and commodity rates.

The western roads present elaborate analysis (based both on the Commission's cost figures and on costs as adjusted by the evidence introduced in the district court) which shows less-than-carload traffic largely carried at deficits irrespective of the class rate paid under the interim orders. They contend that the loading figure of 4.3 tons is the only reliable one to use in projecting the costs and revenues into the postwar period, since it was in fact the average loading prior to the war, and will be once more, as soon as the order of the Office of Defense Transportation which requires 10-ton loading is revoked. And computations are presented based on that figure which show deficits in less-than-carload traffic, deficits which are increased when the Commission's cost figures are adjusted to reflect cost increases to January 1, 1946. All of those computations include as constant costs only those which related to this traffic. And it is pointed out that if all constant costs were included, the computed deficits would substantially increase.

On the other hand the Commission shows that on the basis of the new interim rates this traffic in the West would produce revenues in excess of out-of-pocket expenses plus 4-percent return plus collection and delivery expenses plus loss and damage payments. That computation is based on a 10-ton loading figure. And on the basis of those types of costs, there is an excess of revenue even though the costs are increased to the January 1, 1946, level. The 1939 less-than-carload costs [34] in the West were 30 percent greater than revenues from all such traffic. If the class-rate portion of less-than-carload traffic is taken, the costs are 81 percent of the revenues, provided certain adjustments are made: (1) increased revenues from the increase in the minimum charge per shipment from 55 to 75 cents which the Commission authorized in this proceeding; (2) the elimination of less-than-carload traffic moving on exception, commodity, and intrastate rates; (3) a 10-ton load; and (4) a 2.47 percent rate of return, which was the actual rate of return of 1939.

We do not stop to analyze the various computations in order to ascertain the exact relation between revenues and costs of less-than-carload traffic. That, indeed, would not be feasible on this record. For even the Commission made no attempt to determine what share of all costs should fairly be allocated to less-than-carload traffic. Hence, if the Commission had spoken its final word, and if it were believed necessary as a matter of constitutional law, see *Northern Pacific R. Co.* v. *North Dakota* (236 U. S. 585); cf. *Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.* (320 U. S. 591, 602), to fix a less-than-carload class rate which produced a fair return on that particular traffic, the case would have to be remanded to the Commission for appropriate findings on this phase. The difficulty of treating the issue on the present record is illustrated in another way. Less-than-carload traffic, more than carload traffic, carries costs which to a degree are dependent on the carrier. Heavy or light loadings, speed of service, ratio of empty return cars, methods of loading freight so as to reduce damage claims, substitution of auxiliary truck service and the like turn on competitive conditions. Certainly rates need not compensate carriers for the most expensive way of handling less-than-carload service. Yet the present findings do not illuminate that problem nor provide the standard in terms of service for measuring the compensatory character of the less-than-carload class rates. And on such a problem the Commission's highest expert judgment would be called into play.

But the Commission has not finished with this problem. In the first place, as we point out hereafter, the Commission, subsequent to the issuance of these interim orders, granted a Nation-wide increase in freight rates, including an increase on less-than-carload rates. The temporary injunction has prevented the interim orders reducing class rates in the West by 10 percent from going into effect. When, therefore, the interim orders do go into effect, the actual rates chargeable presumably will be increased from the level fixed by the interim orders to the level prescribed by the recent order increasing all freight rates. Thus no loss has been suffered by the 10-percent reduction on less-than-carload class rates; and any loss which would have been suffered by that rate reduction has probably been at least lessened, if not eliminated, by the general rate increase. Though it is argued that such is not the case, the showing is too speculative on this record for us to decide what the precise effect of the revised class rates on less-than-carload traffic will be. In the second place, as we have noted, the Commission made the present interim adjustment of class rates on less-than-carload traffic as a consequence of its reduction in carload class rates so that less-than-carload shippers would not suffer a disadvantage from the removal of the major discrimination in the class rate structure. The interim or temporary nature of the adjustment was recognized by the Commission when it admonished the carriers "to give careful consideration to the rates maintained by them on less-than-carload traffic with a view to making readjustments in ratings or rates, as promptly as possible, which will insure that the rates on such traffic are on a compensatory level" (264 I. C. C. 66–67). And it recognized but left untouched the problem of determining what would be the proper share of transportation costs to be borne by less-than-carload traffic.

The justification the Commission had for leaving the problem in that condition at this stage of the proceedings is apparent. The carriers are now preparing the new uniform classification. They have it within their power to follow the lead suggested by the Commission and to propose classification differences between carload and less-than-carload traffic which will obviate any issue of confiscation respecting less-than-carload rates. And it has likewise left open the question of readjustment of the class rates on less-than-carload traffic when the total program, of which these interim orders are but a part, is put into effect.

Where the result of a rate order is not clearly shown to be confiscatory but its precise effect must await operations under it, the court has refused to set it aside despite grave doubts as to its consequences. See *Knoxville* v. *Knoxville Water Co.* (212 U. S. 1, 17–18). And see *Willcox* v. *Consolidated Gas Co.* (212 U. S. 19, 54–55); *Darnell* v. *Edwards* (244 U. S. 564, 570); *Brush Electric Co.* v. *Galveston* (262 U. S. 443, 446); *St. Joseph Stock Yards Co.* v. *United States* (*supra*, p. 69). The reasons for following a like course are equally impelling here. The Commission has not placed the western roads in a straitjacket. It has made an interim reduction on less-than-carload class rates as an incident to its removal of discriminations in carload class rates. It has indicated the course to be followed by the carriers, as a part of the over-all classification and class-rate problem, to make certain that these rates are compensatory. We are thus dealing with a problem which is in flux, an interim order made necessary as a result of a comprehensive revision of entire rate structures. Moreover, the conclusion to be drawn from the recent general increase in freight rates is too uncertain and speculative on this record for us to pass on the confiscation issue. See *Brush Electric Co.* v. *Galveston* (*supra*). The district court amply protected appellants when it overruled their claim that the interim rates are confiscatory without prejudice to another suit to challenge the legality of those rates if, after a fair test, they prove to be below the lowest reaches of a reasonable minimum or if the permanent rates do not meet that standard. See *Darnell* v. *Edwards* (*supra*, p. 570).

Seventh. It was held in *Texas & Pacific R. Co.* v. *United States* (*supra*, p. 650) that where the Commission makes an order under section 3 to remove an unlawful discrimination, the carriers must be afforded the opportunity to "abate the discrimination by raising one rate, lowering the other, or altering both." But that ruling was qualified by the statement that the Commission need not follow that course in case it acts under section 15 (1) (id., p. 650, note 39). Section 1 (5) (a) of the act provides that all charges for the transportation of property "shall be just and reasonable, and every unjust and unreasonable charge for such service or any part thereof is prohibited and declared to be unlawful." And see section 1 (4). Section 15 (1) provides that when the Commission finds that "any individual or joint rate, fare, or charge" of a common carrier is "unjust or unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential or prejudicial," the Commission may determine and prescribe "what will be the just and reasonable" rate. And see section 15 (3). The words "unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential or prejudicial" plainly refer to practices condemned by section 3 (1). A proper finding of unlawful discrimination under section 3 (1) thus enables the Commission not only to direct the carriers to eliminate the practice but also, pursuant to section 15, to prescribe the alternative. See *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 476). Thus the Commission in this type of situation, as in the case where intrastate commerce is involved, *Georgia Public Service Commission* v. *United States* (283 U. S. 765), may remove unlawful discriminations and prescribe new rates.

In *Texas & Pacific R. Co.* v. *United States* (*supra*, p. 650) it was also stated that, "A carrier or group of carriers must be the common source of the discrimination—must effectively participate in both rates—if an order for the correction of the disparity is to run against it or them." And it was held in *Central R. Co.* v. *United States* (257 U. S. 247, 259) that mere participation in joint rates does not make connecting carriers partners in discrimination; that they can be held responsible for unjust discrimination only if each carrier has participated in some way in the practice which causes the discrimination, "as where a lower joint rate is given to one locality than to another similarly situated." It is argued that the same rule applies in this case since, for example, the western carriers have no control of or participation in the lower Official intraterritorial rates, although they do participate in the joint or through interterritorial rates.

In reply it is said that carriers in Official Territory control rates within that area and

[34] Out-of-pocket costs plus solely related constant costs.

also control, jointly with the carriers in each of the other territories, the rates from each of them into Official. That common source of discrimination is said to be sufficient to sustain the Commission's action. See *St. Louis, Southwestern R. Co.* v. *United States* (245 U. S. 136); *Chicago I. & L. R. Co.* v. *United States* (270 U. S. 287). But we do not need to decide the question. For the principle announced in *Central R. Co.* v. *United States* and *Texas & Pacific R. Co.* v. *United States, supra,* is applicable only where the Commission is directing the carriers to remove the discrimination. Those cases hold that the Commission may not require carriers to do what they are powerless to perform. But the Court recognized in *Central R. Co.* v. *United States, supra,* page 257, that where the Commission acts pursuant to section 1 to require carriers to establish, in connection with through routes and joint rates, reasonable rules and regulations, that problem is not involved. For then the Commission corrects the unlawful discriminatory practice in the case of each carrier by prescribing the just and reasonable rate or practice. The same is true where, as here, the Commission in order to eliminate territorial discriminations proceeds under section 15 (1) to fix new reasonable rates. If the hands of the Commission are tied and it is powerless to protect regions and territories from discrimination unless all rates involved in the rate relationship are controlled by the same carriers, then the 1940 amendment to section 3 (1) fell far short of its goal. We do not believe Congress left the Commission so impotent.

It may not be said in this case, as it was held in *Texas & Pacific R. Co.* v. *United States, supra,* page 633, that there was no evidence of the unreasonableness of the rates, or that that question was not in issue. The Commission here found that the rates were unjust and unreasonable under section 1 and it proceeded to fix new rates under section 15 (1). The facts which establish that the differences in rates as between the several territories are not warranted by territorial conditions plainly sustain its findings under section 1.

As we have said, this proceeding pertains only to class rates, which move but a small percentage of the traffic. It is, therefore, argued that the Commission should not have made adjustments in those rates without bringing about some equalization of exception and commodity rates under which the bulk of the traffic is moved. But there is no reason in law why the Commission need tackle all evils in the rate structure or none. It may take one step at a time. Compare *United States* v. *Wabash R. Co.* (321 U. S. 403). The 10 percent interim rate order did not attempt to bring about complete elimination of the discriminatory features of the class rate structure. It was only an approximation of that result, the complete step awaiting the new uniform classification. But the reasons justifying that partial measure likewise support the action of the Commission in commencing with class rates when it tackled the problem of territorial discriminations.

Eighth. A different problem is presented when we turn to the 10-percent increase in class rates which the Commission prescribed for Official Territory. Appellants strenuously urge that this action of the Commission was unauthorized under the act, even if the other portions of its orders were justified.

The finding of the Commission on this phase of the case was that the present class rates in Official Territory were below a just and reasonable level and should be increased 10 percent as a part of the adjustment of the rate structure in order to remove the unlawfulness both as respects their unreasonable low level and their unduly preferential character (262 I. C. C. 700–701, 704–705; 264 I. C. C. 62). That finding is said to be without support in the record and to lack the preliminary findings necessary to support it.

It is argued that rates are not unreasonably low in violation of section 1 unless they are either noncompensatory or otherwise threaten harmful effects upon the revenues and transportation efficiency of the carriers in question or of their competitors. It is said, as is the fact, that no such findings were made by the Commission and that on this record there are no facts which could support such a finding.

If this were a case of determining whether existing rates passed below the lowest or above the highest reaches of reasonableness, the point might be well taken.[35] See *United States* v. *Chicago, M., St. P. & P. R. Co.* (294 U. S. 499, 506). But we do not have here such a revenue problem. This case presents problems in rate relationships; that is to say, problems of a discriminatory rate structure condemned by section 3 (1). The Commission may remove a discrimination effected by rates even when they are within the zone of reasonableness, if the discrimination is forbidden by section 3 (1). As Mr. Justice Brandeis stated in *United States* v. *Illinois Central R. Co., supra,* p. 524, the mere fact that one rate is "inherently reasonable and that the rate from competing points is not shown to be unreasonably low does not establish that the discrimination is just. Both rates may lie within the zone of reasonableness and yet result in undue prejudice." The Commission has the power to adjust the rates, upwards and downwards, within that zone, in order to eradicate the discrimination. That power is not unlimited; there are standards which control its exercise. But as we shall see, the Commission acted within permissible limits here.

Once the Commission has found rates to be "unjust or unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential or prejudicial," it is empowered to prescribe rates which are "just and reasonable" or "the maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum, to be charged. * * *" Section 15 (1). In *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *United States, supra,* the Commission, acting under section 15 (1), increased rail rates by prescribing what it found to be reasonable minimum rates. There was no finding that the existing lower rates were not compensatory. The finding of reasonableness was premised on the grounds that "lower rates would create undue discrimination against shippers in origin districts who cannot use the water-rail route and would tend to disrupt the rate structure and to destroy the proper differentials between various producing districts on shipments to Ohio destinations." Page 479. The Commission relied not only on evidence bearing upon the character of the service and cost but also on a comparison of other rates in the same or adjacent territory. The Court sustained the order saying, "The existing rate structure furnished support for the finding of reasonableness." Page 480. In *Scandrett* v. *United States* (32 F. Supp. 995, 996; affirmed 312 U. S. 661), the Commission had found that proposed reduced rates were "compensatory, considering all costs" but that they were below a minimum reasonable level and therefore unlawful. It took that action to prevent destructive competition between rail, water, and motor carriers. The Court sustained the order. And see *Jefferson Island Salt Min. Co.* v. *United States* (6 F. 2d 315).

These cases, to be sure, recognize the power of the Commission so to fix minimum rates as to keep in competitive balance the various types of carriers and to prevent ruinous rate wars between them. That plainly is one of the objectives of the act, and one of the reasons why the Commission was granted the power to fix minimum rates by the Transportation Act of 1920. (See H. Rept. No. 456, 66th Cong., 1st sess., p. 19. Cf. *Mississippi Valley Barge Co.* v. *United States,* 292 U. S. 282.) But the elimination of discrimination occupies an equally high place in the statutory scheme. And, as we have said, the power granted the Commission under section 15 (1) includes the power to prescribe rates which will substitute lawful for discriminatory rate structures. If the Commission were powerless to increase rates to a reasonable minimum in order to eliminate an unlawful discrimination, unless existing rates were shown to be noncompensatory or unless ruinous competition would result, it would in some cases be powerless to prescribe the remedy for unlawful practices. The present case is a good illustration. A 10 percent reduction of rates in the South and West would remove only part of the discrimination. On this record it is most doubtful that a full reduction of those rates to the level of Official Territory would be warranted. Yet if the rates in Official Territory may not be increased unless the present ones are shown to be noncompensatory, discrimination against the South and West and in favor of Official Territory would continue to thrive. For shippers in official territory would still have a preferred rate, as compared with shippers from the South and West, in reaching the great markets of the East—a preference not shown to be warranted by territorial conditions. The raising of rates to a reasonable minimum was, therefore, as relevant here as it was in *Youngstown* v. *United States, supra,* to the Commission's task of providing a rational rate structure.

The authority of the Commission to increase rates in order to remove discrimination, even though existing rates may be compensatory, is not unlimited. Section 15a (2) of the act provides:

"In the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates the Commission shall give due consideration, among other factors, to the effect of rates on the movement of traffic by the carrier or carriers for which the rates are prescribed; to the need, in the public interest, of adequate and efficient railway transportation service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service; and to the need of revenues sufficient to enable the carriers, under honest, economical, and efficient management, to provide such service."

The balancing and weighing of these interests is a delicate task. "Whether a discrimination in rates or services of a carrier is undue or unreasonable has always been regarded as peculiarly a question committed to the judgment of the administrative body, based upon an appreciation of all the facts and circumstances affecting the traffic." *Swayne & Hoyt, Ltd.* v. *United States* (300 U. S. 297, 304). And see *United States* v. *Chicago Heights Trucking Co.* (310 U. S. 344, 352–353); *Barringer & Co.* v. *United States* (319 U. S. 1, 6–7). We may assume, however, that if the rates of return of the eastern carriers were substantially above that for the South and the West, an increase of the rates for the former would not be permissible, even in order to remove a discrimination. But, as we have seen, the rate of return in recent

[35] The point might also be well taken if this were a proceeding under sec. 13 (4) to determine whether intrastate traffic was producing its fair share of the earnings required to meet maintenance and operating costs and to yield a fair return on the property devoted to interstate and intrastate transportation. *Florida* v. *United States, supra; United States* v. *Louisiana* (290 U. S. 70); *North Carolina* v. *United States, supra.*

years[36] has favored the southern and western carriers, as have the freight operating ratios. The Commission took those factors, as well as the others we have reviewed, into consideration in determining that an increase in rates in Official Territory was warranted (264 I. C. C. 61–62).

Revenue needs like costs of rendering the transportation service, are germane to the question whether differences in territorial rate structures are justified by territorial conditions. They are amongst the standards written into section 15a; they reflect the totality of conditions under which the carriers in the respective territories operate. Should the Commission fail to consider them in determining whether the discrimination inherent in the rate structures was unwarranted it would have not completed its task. There may be differences of opinion concerning the weight to be given those factors, especially the weight to be given the rate of return in the current years as opposed to that in the preceding decade. But their significance is for the Commission to determine; and, though we had doubts, we would usurp the administrative function of the Commission if we overruled it and substituted our own appraisal of these factors.

Ninth. After the present interim orders were issued, the Commission granted a nation-wide increase in all freight rates.[37] It is argued that this rate increase has rendered the interim orders with which we are here concerned obsolete and unenforceable. It is said that in making the general rate increase, the Commission found greatly different conditions affecting transportation rates from those it found in these proceedings; that the greater increases allowed in Official Territory[38] undo the uniformity policy on which the interim orders are framed, and that the enforcement of the interim orders in light of these changed conditions would produce results plainly not contemplated.

This is not a case where by reason of changed conditions the record is stale. The changed circumstances do not affect the issues here. (Cf. *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Jersey City*, 322 U. S. 503, 515; *United States* v. *Pierce Auto Lines*, 327 U. S. 515, 535.) To repeat, this is a proceeding to eliminate territorial rate differences not justified by territorial conditions. The general rate increase recently granted by the Commission was a revenue proceeding. Revenue adjustments can be and are superimposed on such rate structures as exist. The fact that revenue adjustments may produce lack of uniformity in rates is not inconsistent with the decision in the present case. As we said earlier, section 3 (1) does not dictate a policy of national uniformity in rates; it only requires that the lack of uniformity in rates among and between territories be justified by territorial conditions. The finding of the Commission, if supported by evidence, that the revenue needs of carriers in one territory demand a lower or a higher rate in that territory is a justification for a difference in rates as between that territory and other territories. The order of the Commission granting the general rate increase is not before us and we intimate no opinion on it. It is sufficient for our present purposes to say that it emphasizes the distinction between revenue and rate relationship cases and in no way impairs the finding in the present case that the existing class-rate structure that has prevailed in the several territories stands condemned under section 3 (1). Nor is there any inherent inconsistency between the interim orders reducing class rates and the recent order increasing all rates. The latter was based on conditions in a period subsequent to the discrimination proceedings. Whether the general rate increase will require adjustments in the new permanent uniform scale which awaits the new uniform classification is a question for the Commission when the new classification is ready.[39]

Other issues raised by appellants need not be discussed. The injunction staying the orders of the Commission is vacated and the judgment of the district court dismissing the petitions is affirmed.

[36] As we point out hereafter, after the present interim orders were issued, the Commission granted a general freight-rate increase. See Ex parte No. 162, note 37, *infra*. In that case it reviewed the rates of return of the roads in the several territories based on the rates in effect at the time, which of course did not include the 10-percent increase in class rates for Official Territory authorized in this proceeding but stayed by the district court. What the Commission said in Ex parte No. 162 corroborates its finding in the present case concerning the greater relative revenue needs of the roads in Official Territory:

"On the basis of the interim rates in effect since July 1, 1946, the rate of return for the eastern district will be considerably less for 1946 than in the Pocahontas region, the southern region, or the western district, even though an additional increase of 5 percent in certain rates in Official Territory was authorized and has been in effect since July 1, 1946. It also appears that even on the basis of the increases sought in Ex parte No. 162 and the railroads' estimates of revenue, the rate of return in the eastern district for 1946 will be less than the rate of return in the Pocahontas region, the southern region, or the western district." 266 I. C. C. 548.

The latter estimates of the rate of return in percent are as follows:

Eastern district	2.06
Pocahontas region	6.26
Southern region	4.01
Western district	3.31

[37] Ex parte No. 162, interim report 264 I. C. C. 695, final report December 5, 1946, 266 I. C. C. 537. This increased most basic freight rates by 15 to 25 percent. Rates on articles under the general commodity grouping of Manufactures and Miscellaneous, class rates and rates on less-than-carload and any-quantity traffic were increased 25 percent in Official Territory, 20 percent within and between other territories, and 22.5 percent between Official Territory and points in other territories. Express rates were increased October 28, 1946. Ex parte No. 163, 266 I. C. C. 369.

[38] See note 37, supra.

[39] That the order granting the general freight rate increase did not affect the orders in the present proceeding is made clear by the following provision:

"That outstanding unexpired orders in other proceedings are hereby modified so as to permit the increases in freight rates and charges herein authorized to be established: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not be construed to suspend or supersede or modify or affect the findings and order entered in Class Rate Investigation, 1939, docket No. 28300, the operation of which is stayed by court order. * * *"

See Ex parte No. 162, supra, note 37.

Republican Savings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "'Enemy' Arithmetic Says GOP's in Red," which appeared in the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1947:

"ENEMY" ARITHMETIC SAYS GOP'S IN RED

(By Robert C. Albright)

That economy ax, which cut down a hornet's nest instead of a forest, has netted Republican economizers $1,272,000,000 in "savings."

If you use "official" Republican figures, that is.

If you use Democratic figures, the ax just went "swoosh." And there weren't any savings.

For Democrats are keeping their own tally.

The two tables are strangely at variance on the first four departmental bills. These represent nearly 45 percent of the President's $37,500,000,000 budget.

Democrats are prepared to claim that the Republicans not only haven't cut the budget $1,272,000,000 to date, but have actually upped costs nearly $400,000,000.

Tennessee's ALBERT GORE, Democratic scorekeeper on economies to date, figures this way:

Instead of $897,000,000 of savings on the Treasury-Post Office bill, GORE allows only $97,000,000. He says the $800,000,000 balance was arbitrarily sliced from tax-refund reserves that must be paid back to the taxpayer in any event.

Instead of $79,000,000 cut from Labor-Federal Security, GORE concedes at most $29,000,000. He disallows a fifty-million-dollar cut for hospital and construction activities. A buried authorization for up to $150,000,000 for hospital construction more than erases the cut.

GORE agrees a full $134,000,000 was saved on the House-passed Interior bill, and another $162,393,000 on the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary bill just reported.

Thus on all four bills, GORE concedes a saving of just $422,893,000.

How does he show the Republicans nearly $400,000,000 in the red?

He simply turns to the House-passed Knutson bill, slashing taxes.

Under the Knutson bill, retroactive tax cuts for the first 6 months of this year would be refunded to taxpayers in 1948.

At rock-bottom, GORE figures these refunds would add another $757,000,000 to 1948 budget costs. Actually, they may run as high as $1,200,000,000.

If he's right that meat ax has a rubber blade.

Is Congress Antilabor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 13 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is Congress Antilabor?" from the magazine America for April 19, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS CONGRESS ANTILABOR?

Some sincere people have an honest doubt about the intentions of the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress with respect to labor unions. They are not sure whether the Congress aims to pass some corrective legislation, which they would favor, or whether it is intent on crippling organized labor. It may help such people to make up

their minds if they consider what the House of Representatives has just done to the Labor Department's budget for fiscal year 1948. The Department requested $103,000,000, of which $71,728,000 was earmarked for the State employment services. The total budget was slashed $13,000,000, but not a cent was cut from the $71,728,000 destined for State jobholders. The Bureau of Labor Statistics was cut 60 percent; the United States Conciliation Service lost 80 percent of its operating organization; the Wages and Hours Division was reduced 25 percent; the National Labor Relations Board, after a deep cut last year, was slashed another 10 percent. That last item is especially revelatory. The Wagner Act, which the NLRB administers, affords legal protection to the right of workers to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining. Its passage in 1935 indicated that the Congress was favorably disposed toward labor organizations and interested in strengthening them. In view of the fact that the Board has at the present time a backlog of more than 5,000 cases, that in January alone 1,145 new cases were presented to it, of which 72 percent were petitions for collective bargaining elections, any reduction now in its budget indicates that the Eightieth Congress is intent on reversing the stand of its predecessors; that, in short, it is unfavorably disposed toward labor unions and is determined to weaken them.

Reduction of Interior Department Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Tacoma Times on May 2, 1947:

CONGRESS NEEDS TO BE TOLD

The next few weeks of national legislative history as it is being written by the Eightieth Congress will tell the story of whether the Western States can compete with Greece and Turkey for Federal appropriations.

A House of Representatives determined to economize has hit the Western States a vicious blow in stripping down the Interior Department budget, and skeletonizing particularly those appropriations which most vitally concern the Pacific Northwest.

If there is hope for the Northwest region to regain the items most necessary to a continued forward development in population and industry, that hope must lie with the United States Senate.

The Senate expects to begin appropriation hearings within a week before its subcommittee; the West, especially the Northwest, will need every friend it can muster if the proper showing is to be made.

Worst feature of the whole situation lies in the fact that men who do not understand are at the controls. A few days ago the vice president of a great transcontinental railroad was in Tacoma and the power shortage was mentioned to him.

"I don't believe it." That was what he said; and that man has his office in Seattle, in the midst of the industrial region that supplies his railroad with vast quantities of freight—east and west hauls. The gentleman is uninformed. Perhaps we cannot too strongly condemn east coast Congressmen for ignorance of a situation that has so far failed to impress some of our most vitally concerned citizens right here at home.

The Northwest, seeking to expand its industrial economy, has for years urged the world to look at our unlimited hydroelectric power resources. We also have pointed with the other hand to our vast land reclamation possibilities. What we have not adequately shown even to ourselves is that reclamation and power development go hand in hand, throughout the Columbia River basin.

Neither have we adequately shown that power at this stage of regional development must come first, since reclamation is a slow process, and the power need is here now. Industry has moved in faster than agriculture.

But it needs to be understood both in Congress and at home that construction of dams and impounding of water for power purposes in big-scale projects is too costly unless other public service can be accomplished at the same time.

Congress has been given a picture of a vast program of land reclamation stretching over possibly another century; but the Lower House, at least, has not been impressed with the urgency of the present situation as an obligation of a Federal Government that has become the great bulk wholesaler of electric energy in this region.

Here lies our immediate task: To unite our own educational forces, set aside selfish economic and political interests and very speedily lay our regional case before the Senators.

There must be ample room in the over-fat Government machine for economies to be effected; but to stop the essential appropriations for Federal power service in this area, most damaging to private enterprise should be the last objective of any Congress bearing the responsibility.

Congress Should Continue Flood-Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, once again this past spring, as it has been every spring in our memory, the great Mississippi Valley has been ravaged by floods and the effects of floods. This problem is of national scope in that its effective solution can only be accomplished by a bold, comprehensive attack from a national point of view. Within my own congressional district, great expanses of our Nation's richest agricultural and industrial development are annually subjected to the danger of complete destruction from the mightiest of all rivers.

Flood control to the residents of the Twenty-second Congressional District is far removed from the pat description of "pork barrel" that some of its opponents describe it. This program of harnessing the flood waters of the Mississippi is as real to the people of the Mississippi Basin as their very existence. Our great Nation cannot disregard its responsibility in assuring that this menace be curbed.

I insert herewith under leave to revise and extend my remarks an appeal from the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois to the Congress to take action in this matter that is so important to the millions of people living in the Mississippi Valley.

The Illinois Assembly might well have included the counties of Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair.

House Joint Resolution 30

Whereas once again floods have inflicted heavy damage along the east bank of the Mississippi River, and particularly in Randolph County; and

Whereas this damage to crops could have been prevented had levees been constructed and completed according to the original plans of United States engineers: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we do hereby petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to provide for and require the construction and completion of the planned levee system so that future damage to crops and other property in this area will be prevented; that copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state immediately to every Illinois Member of Congress.

Adopted by the house, April 29, 1947.

HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House.

Concurred in by the senate, May 7, 1947.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

South Dakota Editor Discusses GI Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I desire to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of an editorial written by a friend of mine, Ellsworth J. Karrigan, associate editor of the Aberdeen American-News, published each day in Aberdeen, S. Dak. Mr. Karrigan had an honorable war record in World War II and his observations as a GI merit thoughtful consideration in these troubled times.

WHAT DOES DOUGHBOY THINK NOW?

Many a young American who survived the pain and horror of the 11 months of fighting in Europe from D-day until VE-day or who participated in any campaign of the deadly combat that reduced Hitler's war machine to a point of surrender was reflecting Thursday on his whereabouts and his thinking 2 years ago.

Whether he was patrolling the Elbe River on the alert for some gray-green-clad German soldier who had not learned the shooting was supposed to stop or whether he was herding Nazi prisoners of war in the Ruhr pocket, he was pretty certain that he and his country had things under control. He was pretty certain that the lessons he and his country had learned at the cost of thousands of lives and billions of dollars would assure steps toward a lasting peace.

This doughboy, elated that he had lived to see the end of the war in Europe and a

little proud too of the part he had played in keeping the world safe for democracy, vowed that the world would never get in another mess "as long as I have anything to say about it, and, believe me, I will have something to say about it."

He saw the breeding places of war in Europe, he realized the smallness of the world, and he put two and two together.

Unless these people in Europe can be shown the way toward peace, he knew, there would be one conflict after another and the United States couldn't help becoming involved.

This battle-weary doughboy who has seen so much wanton waste and destruction (that is war in its final analysis) was satisfied in his own mind that no cost would be too great in efforts to prevent another war and that the United States, safe, prosperous, and scar-free, would bear its share.

He thought sometimes out loud, "If only all our Congressmen and all Americans had seen what I have seen and knew what I know about war, a program for peace couldn't miss."

But even though America and the greater majority of her citizens didn't know what war was all about, this foot soldier, who had survived a thousand hells, was confident.

He said to himself and to his buddies who were of the same thought: "I will tell Americans, and they will believe me. I'll make them believe me. My son must never experience the things I have experienced."

What has happened to that doughboy these 2 years since he so sincerely and determinedly vowed that he would use his influence to see that America remembered the close call it had in World War II and the lessons it learned?

What has happened to that voice that on VE-day seemed so strong and confident?

Well, it may be sounding. Possibly it is sounding loud.

But too few persons hear it now or have heard it during these two short years.

Regardless of how loud that voice of the former doughboy is, expressing what (in the light of subsequent occurrences) must now seem a silly sentimentality, other sounds—louder ones—are drowning it out.

These other sounds fall generally in the classification of demands for greater profits, higher wages, lower taxes, and reduction of the armed forces.

And there are among the other sounds—and possibly louder—the veterans' demands about houses to live in and jobs that pay wages sufficient to raise families while buying furnishings and foods at inflationary prices.

The America that rolled up its sleeves, gave freely of its manpower, and spent billions of dollars to help win a war is now, despite an almost unanimous expression of belief in the "one world" theory, impressed by its self-sufficiency and swayed by the profit motive.

It is hedging on peace through the bickering of the leaders of its two major political parties.

They can't agree on needs for preparedness and defense. They differ over what should be our foreign policy.

They each try to embarrass the other on settlement of domestic issues.

Meanwhile that doughboy who knew war, that doughboy who 2 years ago had such great confidence in himself and in his country was wondering on the anniversary of VE-day what he could do to make his voice heard.

He was saying again, now in more of a spirit of hope than in confidence:

"If only all our Congressmen and all Americans had seen what I have seen and knew what I know about war."

Searches Without Warrants by Police Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Cumberland News, Cumberland, Md., May 12, 1947:

ASTOUNDING DECISION BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

A 5-to-4 decision by the Supreme Court of the United States holds that officers of the law arresting a man in his home may search it for instruments of a crime and may seize evidence to convict him of an entirely different crime if they happen to find it, regardless of the fact that they do not have a search warrant.

In support of this apparent license to rummage is the majority viewpoint that the search is justified as an incident to the arrest, that the evidence actually found showed a crime was being committed in the presence of the officers, and that it was immaterial that this evidence was unrelated to the arrest. Against this decision was that of the dissenters, who held that the ruling destroys the protection of the search-and-seizure provisions of the Constitution for any person arrested in his home and offers serious threats to basic liberties.

Article IV of the 10 original amendments, the so-called Bill of Rights, is entitled "Right of Search and Seizure Regulated" and reads as follows:

"That the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

The Supreme Court, to our way of thinking, stuck its foot through that particular part of the Bill of Rights, in its Harris decision several days ago. It was another of those one margin decisions, concerning which there probably will be much ado until the high court reverses itself.

Harris, a small-bore crook in Oklahoma City, was arrested on a charge of trying to defraud an oil company by a check forgery. FBI agents had an arrest warrant, but no search warrant. Nevertheless, they took custody of the man in his apartment, and proceeded to search the premises. For 5 hours they ransacked the place. They were looking for a couple of canceled checks for evidence. While they didn't find what they wanted, they did find in the bottom of a dresser drawer an envelope containing a number of draft cards and registration forms, possession of which is illegal under the Selective Service Act. It was on this latter crime that Harris was tried, convicted, and sentenced. The case was carried to the Supreme Court on the question of whether the fourth amendment had been violated.

For the majority, Chief Justice Vinson ruled that the search was not "unreasonable," since it was confined to the premises where the arrest occurred; and that the evidence was valid, since it was discovered in the course of that search, although it related to a crime at the time unsuspected by the arresting officers.

The four minority Justices denounced that end-justifies-the-means line of reasoning—and most of us will agree that what they said makes sense. As Justice Frankfurter, one of the dissenters, points out, "The Court's decision achieves the novel and startling result of making the scope of search without warrant broader than an authorized search." That hardly could have been the intention of the framers of the article.

The gist of the opinions of the other dissenters was that the arresting officers, if they had good reason to believe incriminating evidence was hidden in the man's apartment, could have gone before a judge and obtained a search warrant "particularly describing the place to be searched, and * * * things to be seized."

Not circumscribed by such due process, any arresting officer might feel free to ransack from cellar to attic any home, or to rifle all the desks and safes and files of any office, whenever an arrest is made—even though the arresting officer would be largely free to choose the premises to be searched, among all the places where the accused person might be found.

It could happen to a respectable citizen, instead of a penny-ante criminal like Harris, and if it should, we are sure that the majority Justices—Vinson, Burton, Reed, Black, and Douglas—would hold the search unreasonable. But before any such other test case reaches them, much damage is likely to be done.

Interpretations of the Constitution is a matter on which many great legal minds have differed. But the closeness of the vote in this case raises strong doubt as to the soundness of the majority's interpretation, and whether any great legal minds are included among it.

Unification of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the experience of World War II demonstrated that combined operations under unified command contributed greatly to the effectiveness of American and allied armed forces in all theaters; and

Whereas in consequence of combined operations under unified command, the United States will necessarily function in a single global theater of war as a single team, the effectiveness of which will depend on unity of command: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Twenty-fifth National Convention of the Disabled American Veterans in session at Portland, Oreg., this 5th day of September 1946, That in the interest of national security, Congress be urged to unify the armed services under a single Department of Common Defense, in which the Army, Navy, and Air Forces would be coequal;

Resolved, That the unified Department of Common Defense be headed by a single civilian secretary who would be a member of the President's Cabinet, with a secretary for the Army, a secretary for the Navy, and a secretary for the Air Forces responsible to him;

Resolved, That a Council of Common Defense be created, responsible to the President, to coordinate all military and related activities essential to the national security, and to consist of the Secretary of Common Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretaries for the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, and the Chairman of a National Resources Board;

Resolved, That under the Secretary of Common Defense, the three armed services be completely coordinated for planning, operations, research, intelligence, budgeting, and administration including personnel and supply, both for maximum effectiveness as a team and to prevent waste, duplication, overlapping of function, and unnecessary expenditure for the national security; and

Resolved, That every effort be made to obtain the enactment of a unification bill by the Eightieth Congress in conformity with this resolution.

What Russia Got—So Far

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

WHAT RUSSIA GOT—SO FAR

Here are some of the things that Russia and her puppet states have gotten out of the war. No doubt more will be revealed when our Government finally decides to take us into its full confidence.

Treaty with Italy: $100,000,000 to be paid to Russia; $125,000,000 to Yugoslavia; two-thirds of the Province of Venezia Giulia to Yugoslavia; Trieste converted into a free territory with a government under the United Nations.

Treaty with Hungary: $200,000,000 to be paid to Russia; $50,000,000 to Yugoslavia; $50,000,000 to Czechoslovakia; northern Transylvania ceded to Rumania.

Treaty with Rumania: $300,000,000 to be paid to Russia; northern Bukowina and Bessarabia ceded to Russia; southern Dobrudja ceded to Bulgaria.

Treaty with Bulgaria: $25,000,000 to be paid to Yugoslavia.

Treaty with Finland: $300,000,000 to be paid to Russia; her chief port of Petsamo ceded to Russia.

The Yalta agreement (Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt): The southern half of the Island of Sakhalin and all adjacent islands ceded to Russia. Port Arthur given to Russia as a naval base; the port of Dairen internationalized with interests of Russia made dominant; the Chinese Eastern Railroad and the South Manchurian Railroad to be jointly operated by a Russian-Chinese company; the Kurile Islands ceded to Russia. China was not consulted in making this agreement, but the President of the United States undertook to force Chiang Kai-shek to yield.

The Potsdam agreement (Stalin, Attlee, and Truman): Poland partitioned without the consent of the Polish Government—previously recognized by the Allies—a Russian puppet Polish Government installed and recognized; Russia given a free hand to seize as reparations anything in the Russian zone in Germany. In addition, Russia given as reparations 15 percent of metallurgical, chemical, and machine manufacturing industries located in the western zone occupied by Britain, France, and the United States; 10 percent of all other industrial capital equipment in the western zones which were considered "unnecessary for the German peace economy" to maintain German living standards, not exceeding those of other European countries; Russia's boundaries moved westward. The city of Koenigsberg and adjacent territory to be ceded to Russia. Millions of Germans moved out of the territories given to Poland and Russia; Britain and the United States surrender all claims to German assets in east Germany, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Rumania, and eastern Austria; Germany's merchant ships and fishing fleets to be divided, etc.

These are some of the things we have actually agreed to give Russia. In addition, Russia has seized territories with more than 80,000,000 people, and Mr. Roosevelt agreed that she could keep millions of German prisoners of war as slave laborers. Add, also, supplies by way of lend-lease totaling $11,260,343,603, much of which will be useful to Russia in peace as well as war.

It is true, of course, that Russia suffered more than any allied nation (although scarcely at all in her 1 week's war with Japan). However, if we were hard-headed and not soft-brained, we would recognize that Russia helped both Germany and Japan with nonaggression treaties—that Stalin and Molotov watched, with complete indifference, Hitler's conquest of western Europe, and probably would never have turned a hand if Hitler had not forced Stalin to fight.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

It's Up to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Washington News of May 12, 1947, which I think is quite appropriate at this time. Here it is:

IT'S UP TO CONGRESS

Unless this session of Congress acts on universal military training and Army-Navy unification, congressional lip service to the Truman-Vandenberg bipartisan foreign policy can be dismissed as so much eyewash.

We cannot have a strong foreign policy without the force to back it up. Brave talk alone will fool nobody but ourselves.

We neither have nor want a large professional Army. But the only adequate substitute is a trained civilian reserve which can be built up only by compulsory universal training.

Pearl Harbor demonstrated the mischief disunity can do in the armed services. We invite another such disaster by maintaining rival and jealous Army and Navy Establishments, each with its independent air force.

Congress is evading the training issue by waiting for the report of the President's advisory committee. The committee has been disappointingly slow. But that does not absolve Congress of its responsibility. It should face up to the issue now.

Even the excuse of a delayed committee report cannot be found for the reluctance to act on merger legislation. Exhaustive hearings have been held, and every Member of Congress has had time to familiarize himself with the provisions of the President's unification bill.

We have had enough talk. Let's have some action.

North Carolina College for Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am attaching an article which appeared in the Durham Herald-Sun, Durham, N. C., on the North Carolina College for Negroes and its president, Dr. James E. Shepard:

(By Tom MacCaughelty)

In a country where even Negroes are divided into two camps over techniques of raising the status of America's minorities, the North Carolina College at Durham stands as a living monument to a Negro who preaches and practices the philosophy that the minority group should emphasize its duties more than its rights.

This is not to say that Dr. James E. Shepard, founder and president of the college, is fully satisfied with the attainment of his race in North Carolina, nor that he has closed his eyes to the claims of discriminations against his people. It is to say that Dr. Shepard puts little faith in the efficacy of racial feuds in courts or elsewhere and much faith in the friendlier processes of democracy, which he describes as "that audacious belief of our people that in the most ordinary men there are resident the more extraordinary possibilities, and that if we keep the doors of opportunity open to them, they will amaze us with their achievements."

Symbolic of that definition of democracy, the college has become an open door to opportunity for countless Negroes, and both a producer of and a working place for men of achievement, as the following facts show: (1) Together with great numbers of needed but less outstanding workers in a wide variety of pursuits, the college has produced such men at A. T. Spaulding, the only Negro insurance actuary in the country, H. M. Michaux, head of the Union Insurance and Realty Co. of Durham, R. L. McDougald, vice president of the Mechanics and Farmers Bank, and J. L. Tilley, president of the Florida Normal and Industrial School; (2) out of its 43 faculty members teaching in the undergraduate school, 12 hold Ph. D. degrees: (3) the college is one of only four Negro colleges in the country that is approved by the Association of American Universities.

The college's history and growth offers one of the best arguments for its founder's philosophy of race relationships. And since one man, Dr. Shepard, is largely responsible for its inception, success, and prestige, the story of the college begins properly with him.

SON OF MINISTER

He was born the son of a minister on November 3, 1875. He attended Shaw University in Raleigh, receiving a Ph. D. from the department of pharmacy in 1894. That same year he opened a drug store in Durham. In 1898, he became comparer of deeds in the recorder's office, Washington, D. C., and

from 1899 to 1905 was deputy collector of United States internal revenue in Raleigh. Between 1899 and 1905 he traveled the country as field superintendent for the International Sunday School Association.

While working in this capacity he became convinced of the need for trained Negro ministers to act as leaders for the race, and soon afterward set about raising money to establish a training school. (In 1907, he was the only Negro speaker at the World's Sunday School Convention in Rome.)

The school, known as the National Religious Training School and Chautauqua, was established in 1910 on a 25-acre tract, forming part of the present site. The land was a gift largely of the white people of Durham. By January 1912, 10 buildings had been erected; two of which, Avery Auditorium and Childley Hall, still stand on the campus.

Those early years were characterized by a wealth of enthusiasm but a dearth of money. Private donations and student fees were the institution's only support, and the latter had to be kept low. Board and room cost $7 per month; tuition $1 for the same period. A teacher or professor earned $500 to $1,000 a year.

Designed as a college, it was found necessary to include a high-school course; so the institution, at first, combined a high school, 4-year college, training school for country ministers, commercial school, and home economics school. What was to become, after 37 years and four changes of name, the North Carolina College, at Durham, with approximately 1,100 students and over 100 staff members, began with a staff of 21 persons and 109 students.

ADDED MORE DEGREES

Dr. Shepard struggled to raise necessary funds and at the same time added more degrees to his name—D. D., Muskingum College, Ohio, 1912; A. M., Selma University, Ala., 1913. Nonetheless, in 1915 the financial difficulties became so great that the school had to be sold and reorganized. In this second stage of its development, the institution was known as the National Training School. Mrs. Russell Sage, of New York, came to the rescue by giving enough money for the property to be bought back.

The school had begun to attract the attention of observers throughout the South, when the First World War dumped it into another financial depression. To insure the survival of the school, two plans were considered. One was to turn over the control of the school to one of several interested denominational boards. The other plan, which was adopted, was to give the property to the State as a public institution. Accordingly, in 1923, the National Training School became the Durham State Normal School.

In 1925 the school experienced two important events. A fire destroyed three important buildings—the administration building, the classroom building, and men's dormitory. These were immediately replaced; but of more importance that same year, Dr. Shepard, with a brand new D. Lit. from Howard University, and others were successful in a legislative campaign to make of the school the first State-supported Negro liberal arts college. The school became the North Carolina College for Negroes.

Then came expansion of the plant, with B. N. Duke contributing $42,000, the citizens of Durham $8,000, and the State $100,000.

But a new crisis arose in 1929, when the legislature considered the consolidation of the North Carolina College for Negroes with A. T. and T. College at Greensboro. Protests from citizens of Durham resulted in the appointment by Gov. Max Gardner of a fact-finding commission, whose unanimous recommendation that the college be continued at Durham was adopted.

NEW BUILDINGS ADDED

The world-wide depression in the years following 1929 checked college enrollment, but at the same time indirectly made possible Federal and State building projects which added a library, three dormitories, six cottages for faculty members, a gymnasium, a laundry, a science building, and an auditorium. Worthy of note, in this connection, is the fact that Dr. Shepard was instrumental in getting Federal and State grants from Democratic administrations, although he was and is an outspoken Republican.

Today the North Carolina College at Durham (so named by the last State legislature) not only offers 26 undergraduate courses in subjects from art to zoology, but also includes a graduate school of arts and sciences, a school of hygiene and public health, a school of public health education, a school of library science, and a school of law.

The student body, about 60 percent women, represents nearly every State in the Nation, with a majority from North Carolina. Students represent all economic brackets.

There are accommodations for only about half the students to live on campus, the others rooming or living with relatives in town. All facilities are crowded, dormitories particularly, with four students often living in rooms designed for two occupants. Nonetheless, rigid scholastic standards are maintained, and graduating students have no trouble in entering graduate schools.

Being a State school, the college can't be highly selective in accepting students, but can and does bounce those who don't make the grade, once they have entered.

Dr. Shepard's fondest hope is for the college to become a university in the fullest sense. As might be expected, he doesn't expect this to be accomplished overnight. He hopes that a school of public health nursing will be established this fall, and looks forward to the establishment of a school of social work that will lead eventually to a school of medicine.

Milk Prices in Agriculture's Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last night the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, delivered an address before a testimonial dinner sponsored by the Schoharie County Democratic Committee, at Schoharie, N. Y. The address dealt with the very timely subject Milk Prices in Agriculture's Pattern. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am delighted to have this opportunity to come here. A long time ago I heard this region called the cradle of American agriculture, the breadbasket for the armies of George Washington. As at least a part-time farmer, I was immediately interested and I promised myself a visit with you some day.

Then, just a week or so ago, I heard another interesting fact about Schoharie County. This used to be a Democratic stronghold. In the election of 1896, Schoharie was the only rural county east of the Mississippi and north of the Mason-Dixon line to return a majority for the Great Commoner, William Jennings Bryan. I have an idea that next year this county may lead upState New York in a swing to the Democratic banner.

So as the Secretary of Agriculture, and as a Democrat, I am doubly glad to be here.

Looking around at this rich and beautiful countryside today, I could not help thinking of those early Schoharie farmers—those farmers who delivered wheat by oxcart, under the protection of American soldiers, to the continental armies. How proud they would be if they could see this section of New York State as it is in the spring of 1947. Here one senses a permanency of agriculture. I am told that some of your farms have been owned and tilled by the same families for seven or eight generations.

How good it feels to come again into an area of grasslands agriculture. Here there is a balance between what is taken from and what is put back into the soil. This type of balanced farming is not only well adapted to the needs of the land; it is also the kind of farming that produces the protective food our people especially require for a healthy diet—and best of all, it uses great quantities of a type of agricultural products—the cereals—that in the future might develop burdensome surpluses.

There are few signs here of the ravages of depression and war. Your herds grazing in the pastures are healthy and productive. Your fields are green. Your homes are well kept.

But was it always like this?

Has anyone forgotten how this county—like the whole country—a decade and a half ago passed through some of the most trying and sorrowful years in American history?

It is wise to remember those days, because only by remembering can we be reasonably sure not to repeat them.

There is an old saying: "Trouble is like hot weather. It sours milk and sweetens apples." Trouble mellowed Franklin Roosevelt at the same time that it called forth his magnificent courage. Trouble rallied farmers around the Democratic Party. But when the trouble clouds passed, some farmers forgot, and many agricultural States were the first in the Nation to turn politically against the best friend the farmer ever had.

Do you still remember that period from 1931 to 1933? Do you remember when milk was 90 cents a hundred? When chickens were 12 cents a pound? When eggs were a penny apiece?

I could recall for you some grim pictures. The slow-moving queues of homeless men outside the missions in the cities, waiting for a hand-out—a piece of bread, a bowl of soup. Out in the Middle West the smoke was rising from homes where farmers were burning corn for fuel. Everywhere farmers were losing their homes.

Back of that unhappy period was the struggle for the McNary-Haugen bill that was twice beaten in Congress before being passed in 1927. A Republican Congress passed it on the third try only after it was assured that President Coolidge would veto it.

Then came the Republican-sponsored Hawley-Smoot tariff bill which provided for a general increase in the tariff at a time when the farmer was desperately in need of restored foreign markets. Economists, consumers' organizations, and wise farm leaders joined in asking the President to veto it. But the bill became law and with it went the hopes of farmers for regaining lost foreign markets.

Do you remember those days?

In 1932 and early 1933, every 2 minutes on the average, day and night, 7 days a week, one American farm was knocked down on the auction block or signed over to a creditor. By January 1, 1933, the value of American farms had declined to about $36,000,000,000. But from March 4 on, the economic massacre of American agriculture was stopped, not by a fair-weather friend, but by one who was able in personal as well as political life to withstand the rigors of ad-

versity. Your State gave Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Nation, and the Nation will be forever grateful.

By January 1, 1942, the value of American farms had increased to forty-eight billions. In other words, for the first 9 years of the New Deal every time the sun set here in Schoharie County, the value of the Nation's farms went up $3,600,000.

And it kept on going up. From 1942 to January 1, 1947, the increase was even greater. I want you to remember how great it was, so I give it to you this way: In the 15 years of Democratic national control, day after day, good weather and bad, every time the sun has set on your rolling acres the value of American farms has risen that day almost $9,000,000—every day for 15 years. You farmers remember that.

Those are simple facts—facts to bring into the conversation when people talk about the farm record of political parties.

Tonight I want to talk about the record of political parties as it applies to the dairy situation of this section.

When I was invited to speak here—and to make part of my talk about milk—the voice of discretion warned, "A smart Secretary of Agriculture would stay out of the milk situation right now. That's a hot potato."

But another voice said, "Yes; that's a hot potato, but the way to handle it is to get it out where it will cool."

That's what I am going to do tonight—talk about the dairy situation as I see it. You may agree with me or you may disagree, according to your American privilege. But I believe that you want as a Secretary of Agriculture a man who respects you enough, who loves agriculture enough, to talk plainly to you and let the chips fall where they may.

Let's review some more history.

If we go back about 20 years to the period between 1925 and 1929, we find milk prices in New York relatively favorable. But in 1930 and 1931 they started on the toboggan and in 1932 they hit bottom with a sickening thud.

It was a terrifying situation. It demanded action. Under your Democratic administration, a State joint legislative committee made a comprehensive investigation and report on the New York milk industry. A State milk-control law was enacted. But no State in those days of world-wide depression could pull itself up by its own bootstraps. Some serious milk strikes developed not only here but in other sections of the country. We saw milk being poured out on highways in angry protest over low prices.

Sometimes tragedy does not seem very real when the moss of 15 years grows over it. Human memory coats over, too. So I want to quote from the testimony of one progressive dairy farmer in 1932. He operated a farm which had been in his family for nearly 60 years. He was a recognized authority, having been at one time a professor of soil investigations at the New York State College of Agriculture.

Here is part of what he told the legislative committee of this State in 1932:

"The dairy situation is deplorable." The average price "paid by the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association at Franklinville, New York * * * for the first 7 months of 1931 is 82 cents per hundredweight. My records, extending back to April 1901, show that the June price is the lowest I have received in 28 years with the single exception of a cheese factory check for April 1904.

"I know from recent conversations with neighbors," he went on, "that they do not know where the money for the payment of taxes will come from this year. I asked the chairman of the board of supervisors if 10 percent would be able to meet their taxes from this year's income. He said, 'No; less than that.'"

Then this progressive dairy farmer went on to tell the committee: "I could keep some 20 head of well-bred cattle in my herd, if I could buy some $360 worth of grain and retain the services of one man, now in my employ, at his present wages for the next 8 months. As it is, the feed man will miss that sale, one more man will be out of employment, and I shall regretfully part with young stock whose breeding has occupied 20 years of my time. I have already had to part with two men."

That's the record. That is one case history of what 1932 did to a highly intelligent and formerly prosperous dairy farmer. Multiply it by millions and then ask yourselves again whether you stand for the policies of the party in power during that period. You must answer that question and remember the answer if you are to keep the political record straight.

And then Franklin Roosevelt moved from the Governor's Mansion in Albany to the White House in Washington—the Franklin Roosevelt who had made some promises to farmers in a speech out in Topeka, Kans., on September 14, 1932. I want to refresh your memories on those promises.

"First," Mr. Roosevelt said, "I would reorganize the United States Department of Agriculture, looking toward the administrative machinery needed to build a program of national planning.

"Second, I favor a definite policy looking to the planned use of the land."

And with reference to another problem, Mr. Roosevelt said: "Within the past year many of our principal industrialists also have come to the conclusion that—since the great decline of our export trade—the chief hope for industrial rehabilitation lies in some workable and immediate method of dealing with farm surpluses."

But the real source of agriculture's troubles was the lack of parity. "If we would get to the root of the difficulty," Mr. Roosevelt said, "We shall find it in the present lack of equality for agriculture. Farming has not had an even break in our economic system. The things the farmers buy today cost 9 percent more than they did before the World War in 1914. The things they sell bring them 43 percent less than then."

Parity in prices and parity in income was thereby set up as a goal, and for the first time the Nation adopted a measure of economic equality for agriculture.

The Roosevelt administration got under way. Prices improved, but it was a long hard climb. In New York, State regulation of milk proved to be inadequate. It could not prevent cut-throat competition in milk moving from one State to another. Only Federal action covering a whole marketing area could to that. Therefore, under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and its amendments, the issuance of marketing agreements and licenses was authorized to govern the handling of milk on an interstate basis.

Here, for the first time, the dairy industry had the means by which it could establish orderly marketing procedures.

But the friends of American agriculture—the leaders of the Democratic Party—were not content merely with the start that had been made. They sought further to strengthen the legislation which made this program possible and to safeguard it against legalistic attacks.

And so in 1937 the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act was passed. Producers in the New York milkshed then requested consideration of a Federal marketing order under this legislation. They voted it in by an overwhelming majority, and the order became effective September 1, 1938. From that date to this, except for 5 months early in 1939, producers have operated under the Federal order, along with a complementary order under State law, as the means for fixing minimum prices for milk in the New York metropolitan area.

In that period of more than 9 years, milk producers in this region have prospered in a manner that would have seemed fantastic if anyone had ventured to predict it back in 1932.

The weighted average price for all milk in this area for the 12 months ending June 30 of this year is expected to be about $4.43 per hundredweight. For the 12 months ending June 30, 1946, the weighted average price was $4.07—a favorable difference this year of 36 cents. This is a comparison of 3.5 percent milk in the 200-mile zone from New York City and it includes dairy production payments made through June 1946 and general premiums over the order prices in the months of July, August, and October 1946. And right here I want to call your attention to the fact that the dairy industry itself rejected the idea of the subsidies which ended almost a year ago. Now returns to the farmer depend solely upon the price in the market.

In the light of all this, I am frankly puzzled about the criticism voiced by some dairy leaders concerning action fixing a class I price of $4.14 for May and June. This step measures up squarely with the provisions of the order voted in by the producers themselves and with the demands of sound long-range economics. It operates in the interest of the entire milk industry, and particularly of the producers.

During the war, we needed all the milk we could get. We took it whenever we could get it—and because production was so much cheaper in the spring, the disparity in the flow of milk between spring and fall got way out of line. But the war is over, and we cannot go on producing on the wartime pattern.

We must develop a new and balanced production pattern more in keeping with demand—else we shall have oceans of milk in the spring, with disastrous effects on producers—and severe shortages of milk in the fall, which would be equally serious for consumers.

Time and time again I have talked about a balanced pattern of production with dairy industry leaders. Always some say: "It's a good, sound idea. But this isn't the year for it. Let's not do it just yet."

We once had a line in our copybooks, "Never put off until tomorrow what you can do today."

Now is the time for readjustment. Now, when farmers have the money to make the change. Now, when the consuming public is in a mood to drink more milk than it ever drank before in peacetime.

If tomorrow means waiting for an emergency we don't want that kind of timing. We tried that once in this country with disastrous results.

Just as certainly as I stand before you tonight, the present high seasonal variation in production if continued long enough will break down milkshed lines by cut-throat competition for markets in flush periods, and the same kind of competition for supplies in periods of short production. And such a break-down could only be a menace to your valuable and hard-won marketing procedures and programs.

Look at it this way. In the war this country was engaged in a headlong race for survival. It was a case, as the Civil War general put it, of which side could "get there fustest with the mostest." That applied to meat and milk as well as men.

But now we are in another kind of race—a long-distance race in which the goal of national prosperity depends upon balance in every branch of the economy—balance between supply and demand.

Obviously, the most effective incentive for seasonally balanced production of milk is the price incentive. This was recognized by the producers in the formula for which they voted approval last fall. It is true that a somewhat abnormal situation developed this spring in the cost of feed and other commodities. We have taken account of that and have pegged the price higher than the formula provided.

Let me amplify that. You will recall that we had postponed until May 1 the seasonal drop of 1 cent due on April 1. Pegging the price at $4.14 for May saved the producers from taking another cent per quart reduction under the formula. Moreover, pegging the price for June at this same level should save producers a drop of one and a half cents in the price for that month. It seems to me that we in the Department of Agriculture have fully recognized current conditions in suspending the formula in favor of producers to the tune of 44 cents a hundredweight on class I milk in May and either 44 or 66 cents a hundredweight on class I milk in June. The suspension order saves producers more than $2,000,000, compared with what they would have gotten under the price formula in their milk marketing order.

As producers, surely you realize that the success of dairy operations does not depend upon showing a little profit every month, but upon having a substantial profit at the year's end. It could very well come about that $4.14 would be a low price in May, but a pretty good price in June, depending upon pasture conditions.

But I am well aware that all this to-do has not come from the rank and file of you producers. There are political overtones in this note of dissatisfaction that some people are sounding. A considerable political advantage might be brought to the State Republican administration if it could provide comparatively high prices in milksheds that operate solely under a State order. Temporarily, that might build up enough satisfaction in those milksheds, and enough discontent outside, to be reflected at the polls next year, even though, in the long run, it would surely kick back.

If I were operating the Federal milk marketing order for political purposes, I could find ways to match any Republican price. But we are not operating the Federal orders for political advantage. We are interested, wholly and completely, in the long-time welfare of farmers and consumers.

The time has come to say bluntly to the farmers of New York, no matter what their political affiliation, that there are always some people who will seize upon any straw in an endeavor to create unrest. It is mighty important to you milk producers to watch and weigh carefully, lest you find yourselves linked with interests that do not have the farmers' long-time advantage at heart.

New York producers demonstrated a sense of responsibility for the long-run considerations involved in selling milk during early days of the marketing agreement program when hearings on the Federal order were first begun in New York. At that time they pioneered in a proposal for formula prices based on the inescapable relationship between fluid and manufactured milk product prices. As a result, under the first order, the price of $2.45 per hundred paid farmers for fluid milk in September 1938, was arrived at through computation of the wholesale price of butter in New York City for a 60-day period. Thus New York producers are entitled to the credit for pioneering in this field but they also must take some responsibility for making it work.

I am proud of the fact that both of New York's milk marketing orders, State and Federal, were instituted under Democratic administrations. Time and time again the marketing orders have proved their worth. But I must protest against the brazen falsehood that the Government has cut milk prices for the producer. The type of regulation you now have came into existence only because it was voted in by more than two-thirds of the milk producers. It can be voted out by a simple majority.

I want to say very plainly that I resent the misrepresentations that have been printed in some of the rural papers of New York State. I resent editorials that say that in the effort to reduce prices the United States Department of Agriculture is starting with the dairy farmer and slashing his income. I resent the news stories that accuse the Department of Agriculture of ignoring evidence presented at the recent Utica and New York hearings and which say that the Government had already decided upon the $4.14 price for May and June.

I resent such stories because in the first place dairymen know that the hearings which the Department of Agriculture conducted were not for the purpose of settling the May and June price question, but rather to consider amendments to the existing order to go into effect July 1. Nevertheless, the evidence presented at those hearings was taken into consideration as shown by the fact that the scheduled price drop under the existing order did not take place in full.

The man who reported this so-called news must have known that, under the present formula, the establishment of a $4.14 price had no connection with the purpose of those hearings. It is dishonest journalism to tie them together in an attempt to fool the farmers of this State for political purposes.

To say that the Government slashed the price of milk to the producer is simply dishonest. The producers last fall voted the pricing plan that called for a cut in the price of milk effective this spring. Government, by suspending certain provisions of the order, prevented that cut from becoming fully effective. It is the producers who agree among themselves to establish a marketing agreement. The Federal Government enters in only when interstate milk is involved. In that case Government must administer the order to protect the public interest. Our presence is merely your convenience. You producers, by your own actions, by your own yardsticks, determine whether milk prices shall be raised or lowered. And how that is to be done is written into the order itself. Don't let some captive spokesman tell you otherwise.

The Department of Agriculture does not intend to encourage or promote any regulation in this milkshed contrary to your desire. But I would not be doing my duty if I did not remind you that there are many ways in which the New York orders operate to the advantage of producers. They provide for the quick adjustment of prices. They make possible a classified pricing plan and marketwide equalization through which all producers are paid the same minimum price for their milk regardless of the uses to which it is put by those who purchase it. Classified pricing and marketwide equalization are of inestimable worth in this greatest of all milksheds. I doubt if the orderly marketing of milk in New York could be achieved without them.

But some folks ask me: "If it was advisable to suspend part of the price drop why didn't you go the whole way and prevent any cut?" The answer is simply this: Because, in my best judgment—and I assure you it was not quickly arrived at—this would have injured your long-time interest. Edmund Burke, the English statesman, said many years ago that the people's representative owes them not only his industry but his judgment. I should betray, rather than serve you, if I did not seek to use that judgment in your final best interest.

This year should bring another huge grain harvest to add to the abundant supplies of last year. Wholesale prices of wheat feeds are now about $10 per ton below the peak prices reached the third week in March, and cottonseed and soybean oil meals are $15 and $20 per ton less. Labor should become more plentiful and supplies of feed supplements should increase.

Following the hearings held by the Department of Agriculture in this area this spring, amendments are being prepared which would bring operations under the order more nearly in line with our present needs. And I am happy to tell you tonight that present plans call for a seasonal upward revision of farm milk prices beginning July 1, and another upward revision beginning not later than October 1. These price adjustments are being planned to give more incentive for milk production during the months of normally short supply. The price increase for these months is just as important as the price decrease during the months of flush supply to encourage a more desirable pattern of production. It also encourages consumption when supplies are plentiful.

In recent weeks we have seen some fairly stiff attacks by press and radio upon farm prices, and upon governmental price-support policies. The cost of living, we are told, cannot be brought down because the Democratic administration is keeping food prices up. You know the maximum about people who live in glass houses. Those who stoned price control to death look ridiculous when they wring their hands and try to shift the blame for the rising cost of living.

But what about farm prices? Are they too high? First of all, the farmer receives only about half of the housewife's food dollar. It costs as much to bring the market basket to the table as it does to fill it on the farm.

Second, we are now supporting the prices of only three commodities: potatoes, eggs, and dried skim milk. Surely those three commodities do not add a great deal to the cost of living.

Third, if it were not for our price-support policy, which encourages abundant production, the food dollar would, in all probability, buy even less than in the wild inflation of 1919 and 1920.

We are producing food and fiber at a rate about one-third above peactime. We produced 15 percent more milk last year than in peacetime, 53 percent more eggs, 33 percent more beef, 40 percent more pork, 53 percent more chickens, 42 percent more corn, 52 percent more wheat. This year our production goals call for another all-out effort.

It is only because we have price support in the background that farmers dare produce the tremendous volume of food and fiber they are now turning out.

And finally, price protection to the American farmer is as much a cost of the war as the sums paid to manufacturers in settlement for contract terminations, or the carry-over tax refund to industry, or even certain of the veterans' benefits.

This attack upon farm prices is very much in keeping with the pattern after World War I. Then, too, the country was treated to a barrage of propaganda. Bring farm prices down. The farmer is doing too well. Cut food costs and everything else will follow.

And farm prices did come down—nearly 50 percent in the course of a few months. It all happened without the farmer having a chance to adjust to postwar conditions. And that was the start of the black clouds of depression and surpluses and tragically low prices which reached a climax in 1932. For 12 years the farmer was in the Republican doghouse.

To illustrate some facts about political parties and the farmers' interests, let's take a look at a fair-sized portion of American history. Parity starts with a 1910–14 base. So let us begin in 1910 and come right down to 1947. That should be fair. During those 37 years, the Republican Party had the political direction of the country for 15 years, and the Democratic Party for 22 years. The Republicans were in office during the normal period of 1910–12, during the boom years of the 1920's, and during the three early depression years.

The Democrats had a period of normalcy in 1912–14, and they had two war periods; but offsetting this were the seven long years of climbing back to prosperity from the depths of the Republican depression.

Under which party did the farmer attain parity? In the 15 years of Republican control, parity income would have given farmers $89,000,000,000. Actually, during these 15 years of Republican control, farm income was only $76,500,000,000. The deficit was $12,500,000,000—14 percent below parity.

But in the 22 years of Democratic control, parity income would have given farmers $136,000,000,000. Actually, they received one hundred and seventy-one billions. The surplus amounted to more than thirty-five billions—26 percent above parity.

You have in your programs the figures year by year. Take them home. Show them to your neighbor. Ask him what he thinks. Those are simply facts, without fanfare, without embellishment. But they are eloquent facts. Fourteen percent below parity on the one hand; 26 percent above parity on the other.

Here are additional facts. In 1932, a Republican year, the average farm operator had a net income from farming of 90 cents a day.

By 1941 the average farm operator's income had climbed to $3.30 a day. Last year it averaged $8.20 a day. You know what political party has been in power.

Interest in agriculture is not something new and different for the Democratic Party. The roots of our interest in the Nation's farms are deeply embedded in American history. Through adversity and prosperity alike, from Thomas Jefferson to Harry Truman, the importance of keeping the farmer solvent and productive has always been stressed in every Democratic administration.

Agriculture is prosperous today. It can retain its prosperity only by rigidly adhering to a policy of organized, sustained, and realistic abundance. Last fall I asked the Congress to begin hearings on long-range agricultural policy and programs. Hearings have started. I have presented my testimony. The Administration's position is on record. There is a rumor that the Republicans are not going to have a farm program until after the 1948 elections. But we are down in black and white. Before the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, I recommended a plan for continued agricultural progress. We need, it seems to me, to keep agriculture geared to developments in other segments of the economy. We need stability of prices at levels fair to producers and consumers. We need an over-all land program. We need to promote the social welfare of farm people, many of whom are still deprived of conveniences and comforts so necessary to twentieth century living. We need to push back even farther the frontiers of scientific knowledge about farming. And finally, we need a floor under consumption of farm products and a program to maintain stable supplies and prices across the peaks and valleys of the business chart.

In short, we need, and we are determined to have, agricultural abundance, because abundant production is the key to lasting prosperity.

We have built solidly these last 15 years. The foundation stones of a new agriculture have been laid in this country. The objective set forth a decade and a half ago by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that men and women should have a chance to engage in farming at a decent return, is in sight. We shall not cease our efforts, whether in prosperity or in adversity, until that objective is finally and completely achieved.

Harry Truman stands behind that goal of farm prosperity. We must, he has told the Congress and the Nation, "assure the people on the farms a fair share of the national income." We must "encourage an agricultural production pattern that is best fitted to the Nation's needs. * * * What we seek ultimately is a high level of food production and consumption that will provide good nutrition for everyone."

Those are our President's words. I like Presidents like Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman—Presidents who demonstrate that agriculture has an understanding friend in the White House. Good days are ahead for the farmer, if he keeps a watchful eye on his enemy and has a warm spot in his heart for his friend.

Farmers prosper under Democratic administrations

PARITY INCOME AND ACTUAL INCOME TO PERSONS ON FARMS FROM FARMING UNDER REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATIONS, UNITED STATES, 1910–46

Year	Republican: Estimated parity income	Republican: Income to persons on farms from farming	Year	Democratic: Estimated parity income	Democratic: Income to persons on farms from farming
	Mil. dol.	*Mil. dol.*		*Mil. dol.*	*Mil. dol.*
1910	4,266	4,450	1913	4,647	4,387
1911	4,142	3,915	1914	4,299	4,516
1912	4,284	4,335	1915	4,477	4,395
			1916	5,205	5,055
1921	6,289	3,795	1917	5,692	8,329
1922	6,255	4,850	1918	4,877	9,660
1923	6,473	5,608	1919	6,495	9,877
1924	6,687	5,560	1920	7,619	8,368
1925	6,875	6,866			
1926	7,226	6,617	1933	3,684	2,993
1927	6,788	6,314	1934	4,271	3,531
1928	6,883	6,687	1935	4,738	5,052
1929	7,253	6,741	1936	5,397	5,361
1930	6,335	5,114	1937	5,718	6,093
1931	5,061	3,482	1938	5,267	5,041
1932	3,785	2,285	1939	5,547	5,262
			1940	5,993	5,477
			1941	6,987	7,601
			1942	8,366	11,305
			1943	9,171	13,930
			1944	9,264	14,039
			1945	8,968	14,740
			1946[1]	9,304	16,278
Total	89,102	76,619	Total	135,996	171,290
Net deficit, parity minus actual $12,483			Net surplus, actual minus parity $35,294		

Parity income per person on farms as defined by sec. 301 (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 multiplied by farm population to obtain total parity income and net income to persons on farms from farming as estimated by Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

[1] Preliminary.

Special Privilege and the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Special Privilege and the Press," published on May 6, 1947, in the Arizona Daily Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL PRIVILEGE AND THE PRESS

Ever since the Supreme Court of the United States held that the Associated Press was a monopoly and must amend its by-laws to admit all applicants for its service, Colonel McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune, has headed a movement of a group of Associated Press members to ask Congress for legislation exempting mutual news-gathering organizations from the antitrust laws. This movement has now grown to the point where 800 publishers are backing the Mason bill in Congress to accomplish this basic purpose.

Because it believes this proposal to ask Congress for legal exemption is both unfortunate and wrong, the Arizona Daily Star wants to go on record as opposing it and asking for its defeat. Such a plea is unfortunate because it puts the American press on record as asking for a legal exemption, asking for special privilege, at a time when much of the press is asking for Congress to deny special privilege to anyone, including labor. To justify such a legal exemption on the ground of the freedom of th press is pretty farfetched.

The Court's decision has in no way affected the freedom of the press. Just to the contrary, the growth in Associated Press membership, the freedom of new papers to get the service, has, if anything, enhanced the freedom of the press.

Under the old rule, the Star had a monopoly of Associated Press news in the morning field in Tucson. Under the Court's decision, that monopoly no longer exists. A new paper can get the service in Tucson as well as in all other cities. Under the Mason bill that monopoly would be legally restored. The Star refuses to be a party to begging its Government for any such special privilege.

The proposal in the Mason bill is wrong, because it proposes to grant to the press a privilege which the Congress has held to be adverse to public policy, for anyone other than public utilities, to have. That special privilege is monopoly. While it may, with much truth, be argued that the availability of other news services does not give the Associated Press a monopoly, the Supreme Court has held otherwise. Good citizenship, the Star believes, calls for respect for this decision.

The Star believes that increased competition in all fields of endeavor will make for progress. Our Nation has been built by competition. Increased competition in newspaper publishing will be beneficial and will not affect the freedom of the press.

For a portion of the American press to go to Washington and, hat in hand, beg Congress to grant it special business protection it does not need, and should not have, sets a most deplorable precedent. The American press should be the last part of American life to ask Congress for anything.

The Star asks for the defeat of the Mason bill and any other legislation granting special privilege to anyone.

Stop the Federal Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial which is complimentary of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. The editorial was published in a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

Senator McCARRAN has introduced a bill that will be unpopular among Washington bureaucrats and in the ranks of those who are trying to make America a Socialist state. The Senator wants to call a halt on useless

Federal Government activities and to eliminate overlapping of Government functions.

Thoughtful citizens will applaud the aims of the McCarran bill. They have been disturbed for years over the tendency to concentrate power in Washington, leaving less and less for the State and local governments to do. The process is rapidly undermining the form of government established by the Constitution

Senator MCCARRAN proposes to eliminate overlapping functions of Federal agencies by defining which agency has jurisdiction when there is a conflict between two of them. He would also bar Federal agencies from taking jurisdiction in matters where States have undertaken active regulation.

The Senator concedes that the language of his bill may need modification or expansion. Certainly its provisions must be studied carefully by the Judiciary Committee. Hearings on the measure would serve to inform Americans on how far their Government already has gone on the road to statism.

Numerous duplications of activity by agencies of the National Government are symptoms of the trend. For example, regulation of alleged fraudulent practices is undertaken by the Federal Trade Commission, the Post Office Department, the Food and Drug Administration, and others. Enforcement of the antitrust laws is scattered among a dozen agencies.

Even more dangerous is the tendency of Congress to confer powers on a Federal agency, superseding the functions of State governments. Supreme Court decisions, since the New Deal arrived, have helped to complete the destruction of State government autonomy in many fields. Recently, for example, the Court held that the New York State labor board had no jurisdiction in a case that came before it because Congress was silent on the matter of such boards when it adopted the National Labor Relations Act.

"That means," said Senator MCCARRAN, "that we must either endow the National Labor Relations Board with sufficient funds to police the collective bargaining of the whole country, practically from top to bottom, or make some declaration that we do not intend to kill State functions when dealing with national problems."

Such a declaration would stop the shift of power from the States to the national bureaucracy. If the tendency is not stopped soon, the United States will be a Federal republic in name only.

Democracy in Degeneracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, last week, Mr. R. R. Young, chairman of the Federation for Railway Progress, addressed the National Press Club. In view of Mr. Young's appearance before the executive committee of the western caucus in connection with the hearings being held by that group on the inequitable distribution of box cars in the west, I have been requested by many people to place Mr. Young's Press Club speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Pursuant to such requests I set the same forth herein in full.

Here in the Capital of the world's champion democracy you favored few are witnessing events that arrest the attention of the world.

Indeed these events you are witnessing may end the world. In our youth, for that we had to look to God. Today one has only to look to Washington for anything.

Now Mr. Lindley did not ask me here to talk on world affairs. Neither one of us then know how many Mexican pesos there could be in it.

Besides, world affairs are in good hands—the same hands that have defended us all the way from Santiago to Constantinople. I am a great believer in supporting a management that has achieved a lot of errors, for that is the surest way to get the errors covered up—with one thing or another. You do not need to worry about errors if you have unity.

I can do little about our foreign affairs; but there is a lot you and I can do about the railroad industry. It typifies what is going on in Britain and all parts of the world, the persistent encroachment of nonowners upon the property rights of others. There is only one freedom that the state can give us, the freedom to enjoy our property in peace. If the state fails us there it has failed us in everything.

After two thumping world victories in our generation against isms overseas, it is Pyrrhic to find the same old dangerous ism, banker-lawyerism, more firmly entrenched than ever in our own country. If only our far-gazing Don Quixotes would coalesce on that issue.

I have a compilation which shows that 611, or 70 percent, of directors of some 70 class I railroads own a record less than $3,000 each of stock in the properties they direct. Now these men are not beggars. From the advice they have been giving their clients for 20 years, presumably, their own investments are in the motors and the air lines.

This infestation of pessimists in the railroads is not due to neglect by the owners. There are tens of thousands of bona fide rail investors who believe in the railroads and who would make excellent directors—owners are always the best husbanders. But membership in the railroad directors' club is harder to break into than is the most exclusive club on Park Avenue.

Why is it these nonowner directors will leave their homes sometimes for 3 days at a time—all for a $20 director's fee? Well, there was a time when security financing was the main reason; but C. & O. broke that one up.

High up among other reasons is the direct banking patronage. It is estimated that the railroads have on deposit over $1,100,000,000, mostly in a few New York banks. This huge sum of other people's money invested in Government securities involves a lot of hard labor for their clerks in clipping coupons—but the right set still have time to supervise the operation and to stop in at the club before dinner.

In addition there are the banking fees: for trustees of equipment issues, agents for stock transfer, payment of bond coupons—the most sought after of all banking emoluments. Railroads pay out annually nearly $3,000,000 for these services, again mostly to a few New York banks.

Now these are only the plums which account for the exclusive set's avidity for horticulture in other men's gardens. There are melons as well. The railroads buy steel, equipment, paint, lumber, coal, and other supplies to the vast sum of $2,000,000,000 a year; thus accounting for one-third of the heavy industry of America.

But fat railroad orders at careless prices and indifferent specifications are not the only influence "the set" can exert in thousands of companies outside the railroad field. As our economy has grown older and voting power of you, me, and Aunt Jane in our large corporations has tended to drift more and more into trusts, banks, insurance companies, investment companies, brokers, charitable foundations, and schools and colleges—all infested by members of the same "club".

Corporation managements are actually sensitive to this concentration of voting power and are amenable to it. They know that directors favored by the set are easily appeased—by patronage. Owner-directors on the other hand are troublesome—insist upon progress. Hence, top officers of great publicly held corporations, too, prefer that their boards consist of plum hunters.

To give you some further idea of the ramifications on the railroad lobby, it employs some 1,800 outside lawyers. If every political lawyer in the Nation is not a railroad lawyer, it can be safely said that he aspires to be.

Just as the top eastern banks have their vast system of correspondent banks throughout the country, so do the top eastern law firms have their country correspondents. That is why I am amused when Mr. Truman—needled about New York domination of our railroads—advocates that railroad directors should be selected from along the line. Strangely, these politicians never advocate the only honest remedy consistent with principles of private property, that railroad directors should be limited to owners without conflict. I would rather have an owner from Timbuktu to represent me than a nonowner from St. Louis.

The top Morgan law firm, Davis-Polk, in collaboration with lesser lawyers along the line, has collected millions of dollars in legal fees from no less than 15 recent railroad bankrupts. Mr. Davis, you will remember, was once Democratic Presidential nominee.

Do not believe that political lightning cannot strike twice in the same place. Who is to be our next Republican Secretary of State? Why, Mr. Dulles, of Sullivan & Cromwell, counsel to Kuhn-Loeb, Dillon-Read, and numerous railroad bankrupts or alleged bankrupts, including B. & O.

In the December Atlantic Monthly I characterized our 37 recent railroad reorganizations as the greatest financial fraud in history; perpetrated under section 77, an act of Congress intended to bring relief to millions of small investors, but callously reversed by clever Wall Street lawyers with the help of the ICC and RFC to do exactly the opposite, to "gyp" them—all for voting trusts and the melons that grow out of them. And, if you prefer, you can spell mellon with two "l's."

Now, I am not questioning Mr. Dulles' integrity, for he is chairman of the Federal Council of Churches, a burden he unselfishly assumed in that critical year abroad, 1937, on top of his duties as counsel to such harried foreign Governments as Poland, Belgium, and Britain. A man with all those responsibilities, including numerous Democratic foreign assignments, can hardly be expected to know what his left hand doeth.

I said in the article that this railroad lobby is stronger than the Government; that it dictates foreign and domestic policy. In further proof, examine with me the Georgia rate case. There, the railroads averred to the Supreme Court in their music-hall chorus that there could be no rate discrimination because the ICC fixed the rates and was above suspicion. Then, when the ICC succumbed to pressure and reduced class rates 10 percent in the South and West, and increased them 10 percent in the North, thus admitting discrimination, what happened? Did the railroads still support the Commission? No. Promptly 32 western railroads and the great State of New York enjoined the decision—and discrimination persists. A strange alliance in the rate controversy, don't you think, 32 western railroads lined up with New York State?

We can only guess how much Mr. Dulles had to do with this lightninglike cooperation between New York State and New York banker Harriman's western domain of 32 roads which the latter organized into the

tightest noncompetitive secret combine in history away back in 1932—a combine so tight that the member roads, among many other normal freedoms, were forbidden to advertise in newspapers.

Mr. Dulles used this same pronged lightning injunction technique against my Chesapeake-Alleghany merger away back in 1937 when I first began to talk up competitive bidding. In my case, it was:

1. The University of Pennsylvania, presided over by Thomas S. Gates, the former Morgan partner;

2. The Morgan satellite firm, Tricontinental Corp.; and

3. Certain officials of General Motors, on whose board Morgan partners sat.

It was this trio, which Mr. Dulles organized almost overnight, which set me back on my heels just about 5 years—just about as far back as he has set the South and West in the rate controversy.

It was Mr. Dulles' client, Earle Bailie, of Tricontinental, and Senator Taft's "along the line" partner, John Hollister, of Cincinnati, who Morgan-Guaranty selected in the following year (1938) to undertake against us the hottest proxy fight in all history. That fight continued for five long, bitter years, first through Judge Manton's court and then down through the C. & O., the Cincinnati Union Terminal, the St. Louis Union Terminal, the Erie, the Pennsylvania, and other sensational competitive-bidding engagements, and led finally to the SEC's public-utility rule, and later, grudgingly, to the ICC rule. Later when Judge Manton was tried, who do you think appeared as his character witness? John W. Davis.

Now in 1942 we tired of Mr. Hollister's company, and his contirued hobnobbing with the bankers to the injury of our railroad, and replaced him on the C. & O. board. Whereupon, he hurried down here to the Commission and readily persuaded them to bring action against us for taking illegal control of the C. & O. lines.

Under the intentions of Congress there could be no illegal control of our three C. & O. carriers, for the Commission itself had specifically approved their joint operation, and Mr. Kirby's and my joint directorships; furthermore, if we were now recapturing control in 1942, then Morgan-Guaranty must have first taken it from us illegally in 1938.

Nevertheless, the Commission persecuted us with lengthy proceedings filling 40 rooms of the Carlton Hotel in wartime with witnesses, and, as anyone familiar with Commission flexibility could have predicted, produced an examiner's report finding us guilty. Now, if you know anything about justice in a great democracy, you know that any finding of fact by one of its bureaus becomes sacrosanct when it gets into court—quite irrespective of the evidence. So our goose was cooked. Instead of going down in history as a champion of through travelers over hogs, Morgan had finally got us; and we were to be forced out of C. & O.

But we have not been given to quitting when Morgan, or his along-the-line men had our nose in the dust. With your help and others, the Commission was forced to yield to public opinion, agreeing most reluctantly to let us stay in C. & O. if we would deposit the voting power of Alleghany's other railroad stock with an approved bank.

Let us see just how solicitous the Commission really is of the public interest, when it comes to these interlocking railroad interests. Remember, Congress intended that the Commission should not prevent joint director relations between carriers in the same natural merger grouping, such as C. & O., Nickel Plate, Pere Marquette—or such as C. & O. and New York Central will be—but that they should zealously guard against the influence of dual interests in competing carriers, where ultimate grouping is not contemplated.

If there is any classical example of competing carriers, it is the Frisco on the one hand and the Missouri Pacific on the other, both serving the Southwest out of St. Louis—Mr. Truman's and Mr. Prendergast's home State. There are two septuagenarian political lawyers out there, partners and brothers: Guy Thompson and Frank Thompson, who have seen to the appointment of many Federal judges. Away back in 1933 Guy was appointed trustee of the Missouri Pacific by a Federal judge, and in 1943 Frank was appointed trustee of the Frisco.

The Republicans out in Missouri expect to get votes against this kind of a Democratic powerhouse, but since they, too, are lawyers, they cannot raise the issue.

If there was ever a better example of two competing carriers operating out of a single back room, I do not know where you could find it. Here are the absolute czars of two great properties as irresponsible to the owners of those properties as the Commission is to the public welfare. Yet, through all the months of the Commission's persecution of us in wartime, over the flimsiest of technicalities, it ignored our every reference to this insult to the intentions of Congress, and gross breach of the law.

In May 1946, our troubles behind us, we found time to institute a proceeding before the ICC against the Thompson brothers for violation of the Interstate Commerce Act. In December, finding no support from Mr. Truman and having a better way to spend our money than in an idle pantomime, we dropped the case—and so did the Commission.

But there the Thompson brothers sit—just as Mr. Harriman sits, immune to prosecution—and our self-styled statesmen have the crust to display the scales of justice on our public buildings.

If our new labor laws get the same kind of enforcement that our old laws get, I would not be too sanguine for the future.

I can cite instance after instance of insincere findings, actions, and inactions by the Commission detrimental to the public interest, all to curry favor of the railroad lobby, but there is not time today. I am talking now about things that if I had done, instead of they, there would have been a patrol wagon clanging outside my door the next morning.

If the Nation and you gentlemen want an end to rate discrimination, to the car shortage, to bankruptcy frauds, and to stubbornly continued railroad policies that seem designed to force passengers onto the air lines and highways, then let us put an end to plum hunting.

You can no more expect integrity in Government or competition in industry from multicliented bankers and lawyers engrossed in self-perpetuation than you can expect world disarmament from the only other aristocracy left in the world, the military.

Here at home are such obvious errors, so easily corrected—luxuries we dare no longer afford in this meteoric age.

The war clouds may rise higher and higher over the isles of Greece as we approach the next election, but let us not entirely neglect the spots of grease here at home.

Democratic Tax Stalling Pure Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edson B. Smith, financial editor of the Boston Herald, in the May 1 issue of that newspaper:

REPUBLICANS SHOULD FOLLOW WISHES OF PEOPLE

If one thinks the Republican majority in the House and Senate have been dilatory in passing labor-reform and tax-reduction legislation, contrast their attitude with that of the Democratic President and the Democratic leaders in Congress.

The official attitude of the Democratic Party has been opposition to any worth-while labor reform, opposition to any tax reduction. Much concern is expressed in Congress over the possibility of a Presidential veto of the labor-reform and tax-reduction measures. There are some Republicans who hold that it is better to temporize with principle and pass wishy-washy measures in the hope that the President will sign, than to pass strong bills which may be vetoed and which it is feared cannot be repassed over a veto.

If we may offer advice to the Republicans in Congress, it is to vote for what the American people desire, and if Mr. Truman wants to use his veto power to thwart the wishes of the voters, and thus cut his own political throat and wreck the Democratic Party, let him.

We are far from sure when it comes to a show-down he will veto either the labor bill or the tax-reduction bill. He will have some advisers who will be able to point to the irreparable damage that he will do to the Democratic cause by so doing.

FINALLY MOVING IN RIGHT DIRECTION

There was no doubt in the minds of skilled political observers last November that the American people wanted an end of labor tyranny, reduced Government expenditures, and lower taxes. They voted Republican at the last election because they thought the Republican Party more likely to accomplish these things than the Democrats.

And there is just as little doubt in the minds of careful political observers that what the American people wanted last fall they want today. The Republican leadership in Congress has been subjected to considerable criticism because of its fumbling with these issues. May is almost here and as yet there is no labor reform bill and no tax cut.

It is to be observed, however, that while the Republicans may be slow they are moving steadily in the right direction. The House, which has vastly better organization and leadership than the Senate, has already passed satisfactory labor and tax-reduction bills. The Senate is now considering these measures and probably will pass them next month in forms not too different from the House versions. It looks now as though the Senate would take the House tax-reduction bill more or less as is. The Senate version of the labor reform bill will probably be somewhat less stiff than the House version.

DEMOCRATIC TAX STALLING PURE POLITICS

It is unfortunate but apparently true that income tax reduction has fallen into the field of politics. The opposition of the Democrats to lower taxes now must be viewed in the light of the 1948 election. So for that matter must be the Republican insistence of a tax cut in 1947. If taxes are cut this year the Republicans will get all the credit. If the tax cut can be deferred until 1948, the initiative can be taken by the Democratic Party.

Many voters will be influenced at next year's election by what is done about taxes and who did it.

From the above it is possible to draw certain deductions. The first is that the Republican Congress is certain to pass a tax-reduction law this year. A measure calling for lower taxes will be deposited on President Truman's desk within a few weeks.

TRUE EFFECTS OF TAX REDUCTION IGNORED

President Truman and Secretary of the Treasury Snyder get a little snarled up in their mental processes on the subject of lower taxes. Within the last few days both have asserted that reducing taxes is inflationary. They reason, doubtless, that if a man pays smaller taxes to the Federal Government he has more of his income left to spend on himself, which means that he can buy more goods, which in turn increases the over-all demand for goods.

This is all right as far as it goes, but it only goes halfway. The other half of the story is that a reduction in taxes implies, per se, a reduction in Government expenditures. If the reduction in taxes is of the same amount as the reduction in Government expenditures, the over-all spending by the country as a whole neither is increased nor decreased.

Cutting taxes means that people can spend more of their own money while the Government can spend less of our money. Furthermore, if Government expenses are reduced by more than the amount taxes are cut, the balance being used to retire Government debt, the implication is not only inflationary, but actually deflationary, insomuch as reducing the Government debt held by commercial banks decreases the money supply.

So You Can't Get a Doctor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, So You Can't Get a Doctor! an article by Albert Q. Maisel in the May 7 issue of Collier's magazine, deals with a problem which affects all of us, particularly those of us who do not live in large cities.

The article demonstrates clearly that we need more doctors in the United States, and that we must encourage them to go into small towns and rural areas so as to give the half of our population who live outside of cities the benefits of good medical care, of which many of them are now deprived.

To make doctors ready to go into rural areas, and to train more doctors so that we shall have enough of them, will need National as well as State action.

Bills have already been introduced in a number of States to provide scholarships for medical students on the condition that these young men, after graduation, shall locate for 3 to 5 years in rural areas; but there is no use in compelling a well-trained young doctor to start his practice in a rural area unless the people of that area are able to support him after he is there. The only way that this will be possible, it seems to me, is through a Nation-wide health insurance system to which urban and rural people, everybody in fact who has any income, shall contribute regularly. Out of the national insurance fund, allocated to the States and to local areas throughout the country, doctors and hospitals can be paid; and the doctors and the hospitals in rural areas will be assured of income in proportion to the medical needs of the people of their areas. The doctors will no longer feel it necessary to concentrate in the cities where they can compete with other doctors for the care of the well-to-do.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks I include the article by Albert Q. Maisel:

SO YOU CAN'T GET A DOCTOR!

(By Albert Q. Maisel)

This country is up against a staggering shortage of physicians—a shortage which may jeopardize the health of every one of us for many years to come. Yet, though they have loudly warned us of this deficit, our medical colleges are now cutting down their production of physicians.

Instead of training more doctors than ever before, these colleges—and the American Medical Association which plays a major part in determining their policy—have embarked upon a cut-back program which can only increase our deficit of physicians and thus result in needless suffering, ill health, and often an all-too-early death for many Americans.

These are serious charges, and it is important that they be brought out into the open now, while there is still time to reverse and correct this disastrous policy. What is the basis for such charges?

The warnings of our growing deficit of physicians come not from alarmists and crackpots, but from the highest authorities of the American Medical Association. On May 1, 1945, Dr. Victor Johnson, secretary of the AMA council on medical education and hospitals, testified before he Senate Committee on Military Affairs:

"After the war we are going to require more physicians than before. * * * It is conservative to estimate we will need 35,000 more physicians. * * * We will graduate 40,000 men in a 6-year period, and in that period 24,000 physicians will die. The net result is that in 1948 we will have approximately 16,000 additional doctors in this country, and these 16,000 will have to provide for the estimated additional 35,000 that I have mentioned."

An editorial in the Journal of the American Medical Association of March 10, 1945, recognized the same set of facts and used it as an argument for the exemption of premedical students from the draft. Yet in the face of these warnings most of our medical schools have now clamped the lid down upon the doctor-training program.

With only a handful of exceptions, the 69 grade A medical schools approved by the American Medical Association have either dropped or are now dropping—for reasons that will be discussed—the accelerated program of medical education which during the war years provided us with 7,000 extra doctors.

DECREASES IN FRESHMAN CLASSES

The University of Indiana reduced its freshman class in a single year from 106 to 81. The University of Louisville dropped from 103 freshmen 2 years ago to 86 last year. The University of Maryland squeezed its enrollment down from 96 to 82. The University of Michigan dropped from 160 to 124. During the war, the University of Pennsylvania had classes as large as 137. Their next class, according to Dean Isaac Starr, will be down to 100.

These cold statistics strike home when we examine what the growing shortage of physicians actually means—already—in thousands of communities. Consider Kelleys Island, 4 miles off the shore of Lake Erie near Port Clinton, Ohio.

Kelleys Island had gone without a doctor all through the war. Then the islanders heard about all the returning physician-veterans. This was their chance, they though, to get some decent medical service. At meetings in the high school they worked out what they thought was a really sweet proposal. To any doctor who would join their community they would give a modern 9-room house—free and clear. To sugar the offer further, they would guarantee him $3,000 a year, above and beyond everything he collected in fees.

All last winter they pleaded futilely with State health officials, with the Red Cross, and the Ohio Medical Society. They got their Congressman, ALVIN F. WEICHEL, to pull wires in Washington. They told about the 6-year-old whose leg was fractured by a car—how the kid had suffered for three full days before they could get him across the frozen lake to a doctor.

They had old people on the island—and pregnant women—and babies. But they got no doctor. They could look across the short stretch of tumbled ice to the mainland. But when anyone fell ill—they were as isolated as any Eskimo village in Alaska.

SOUTH DAKOTA'S VANISHING MEDICOS

Kelleys Island is no unique exception. In South Dakota, for example, the number of physicians has fallen to only half what it was in 1910—while the population has grown. A survey recently completed by an official State health committee showed only 331 doctors in the entire State—and fully a third of these were over 65 years old. The average number of persons dependent upon each physician has risen from 913 in 1910 to 2,426 today.

Ten counties in South Dakota are today without a single physician. Eleven others have only 1 doctor per 5,000 or more residents.

From Campbell County comes this testimony: "We have been without a doctor for years. We have no hospital—no medical service at all. It is necessary to travel from 27 to 100 miles to secure proper treatment. In some instances it is almost a case of a patient getting well, being crippled, or dying all by himself."

And from Tripp County comes this sardonic comment: "We have a horse doctor in town. When a horse or hog is sick we telephone and he comes. But if a member of the family gets sick, we are just out of luck."

Nor is South Dakota unusual. In Nebraska there are four counties without a physician. In Florida there are five, in Virginia six. And in many another rural State the same vast blank spaces exist.

It has become the fashion among some medical society officials and medical school deans to discount these figures—to pretend that such conditions are the result of the war and are speedily being ended as doctors return from service. Yet the fact remains that in 1940—before the war—37 counties in the United States had not a single physician and 317 counties had more than 3,000 persons per active physician. One thousand persons per physician has been long considered by the American Medical Association and other authorities, a normal maximum patient-load.

Such shortages of physicians have prompted various explanations by medical educators. Typical is Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, dean of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons and chairman of the executive council of the Association of American Medical Colleges. "The problem associated with the supply of doctors for the country, Dr. Rappleye has stated, "is one not so much of initial supply as it is of distribution."

A quick glance at the statistics might seem to bear out this contention. It is true that there are more doctors, per thousand people, in cities than in the countryside. It is true that doctors have been migrating away from the wide-open spaces like South Dakota and clustering around the great population centers.

But is it true that city people generally have too many doctors? Or is it true—as the word "maldistribution" implies—that doctors can be redistributed by borrowing from the big cities to fill out the needs of the doctorless rural counties?

These questions were answered by the replies received to a wire addressed to the secretaries of the medical societies and to the health commissioners of the 15 largest cities in the country. Each was asked:

"Does your city have surplus physicians available for transfer elsewhere without substantial reduction of health standards?"

Not one affirmative answer was received. Dr. Herman Bundesen, president of Chicago's board of health, wired, "Do not believe Chicago has surplus physicians. Any appreciable reduction of physicians in Chicago would necessarily tend to reduce health standards."

Dr. Bruce H. Douglas, health commissioner of Detroit, wired, "No evidence of surplus physicians here." From Los Angeles, S. K. Cochems, executive secretary of the county medical society, telegraphed, "Our association knows of no surplus of doctors in this area." Frederic Fagler, of the Pittsburgh medical society, answered, "No evidence of maldistribution or surplus at present." James E. Bryan, of the medical society of New York County—where there is the greatest concentrations of physicians in the country—explained that, "These doctors serve large surrounding areas. Many also are engaged in research, teaching, and similar activities."

This is a far cry from the picture of cities crammed full of surplus, half-idle doctors. One has only to examine the statistics to discover how imaginary this city surplus actually is.

ANALYSIS OF AN ALLEGED SURPLUS

In Detroit there are 1,992 active physicians including those in military service. But 613 of these are full-time specialists; 762 more are part-time specialits; only 637 are general practitioners—the kind of doctors most people must rely on most of the time.

Swollen to nearly 2,000,000 population, Detroit is actually little better off than many a hard-pressed rural area. Each of its general practitioners and part-time specialists faces an average and overwhelming load of from 1,800 to 2,000 potential patients.

One effect of this growing shortage of physicians is to deny medical attention to those who need it most. We are developing great reservoirs of disease and infection that periodically overflow to spread contagion even to those of us who can afford and obtain all the doctoring we need. This is true over vast rural areas. With only a few, bright-spot exceptions, it applies to our Southern States as a whole. It can be seen at its very worst among our 13,000,000 Negroes.

The death rate among Negro babies is one and one-half times as high as that of white infants. In 1943, 51 Negro mothers out of every thousand died in childbirth—nearly two and one-half times the white rate. The general death rate among Negroes is 30 to 40 percent higher than among the whites.

Admittedly this state of all-pervading ill health has many causes. But no amount of talk about hereditary factors, lack of education or low economic status can offset the fact that in all the United States there are fewer than 4,000 Negro doctors. As against the wartime emergency ratio of 1 doctor for every 1,500 people, there is only 1 Negro physician for every 3,377 Negro individuals. In the South there is one Negro physician for every 4,913 colored people. In Mississippi there is one Negro physician for every 18,517 of the Negro population.

THE NORTH CAROLINA STORY

How tremendous can be the effect of even a small amount of medical attention—particularly of preventive medicine—has been demonstrated by the strange story of the North Carolina orphanages. This case came to light when Dr. Clarence Poe, chairman of the Governor's Commission on Hospital and Medical Care and editor of the Progressive Farmer, sent his youngest son off to Fort Bragg with a group of 53 other selectees. Thirty-five of these young men—about 66 percent—were turned down. Dr. Poe knew the background of this astoundingly high rejection rate for he and his commission had been confronted for months with the bitter facts of North Carolina's poverty of physicians and medical treatment facilities.

Then one day, Dr. I. G. Greer, director of a Baptist orphanage and member of the same Governor's commission, remarked to Dr. Poe, "We sent the Army 318 boys from our orphanage and we had only 3 rejections." Both men realized they had hit upon something. But they wanted to be certain. So they checked with all six of the orphanages in North Carolina and found:

A total of 1,138 young men who had spent their youth in these institutions had been accepted for service. Only 16 had been rejected—a mere 1.4 percent. And with 1,873 children in the 6 orphanages, there had been only 7 deaths in 5 years.

"These orphanages," Dr. Poe relates "are supported by poor people. The boys in them are not coddled, they are not given luxury But they are given reasonably adequate medical and hospital care. And what do we find? Whereas the State's percentage of Army rejections is 56.8 percent, a nonexpensive program for hospital and medical care provided for North Carolina's orphaned boys brings an Army acceptance of 98.6 percent. This proves what moderately good medical care could do to increase the health and efficiency of our people all over America."

North Carolina's aroused citizens, led by men like Dr. Poe and Kay Kyser, have not merely bewailed these conditions. Their legislature, responding to public pressure, has unanimously voted $48,000,000 for new hospitals and health facilities. But such new buildings will remain just brick and mortar unless the keymen—physicians—are available to operate them. And today, the doctor shortage is actually far greater than is apparent when one merely considers the number of practicing physicians.

The average age of all the doctors has been rising. These older physicians are naturally less active than more recent graduates. A study conducted by E. H. Pennell, of the United States Public Health Service, disclosed that physicians of 55 are capable of treating only 60 percent as many cases as men 20 years their junior. Men of 65—though they may be exceptionally experienced—can serve, on the average, little more than one-third as many patients as men in the 35-to-45 period of high productivity.

Yet these older men form an ever-increasing proportion of the remaining physicians in rural areas. Thus the Alabama State Planning Board discovered that, in one typical county, the number of physicians by 1940 had been reduced to only 58 percent of those in practice in 1920. When allowance was made for the increased age of the remaining physicians, the Planning Board found that their capacity to render service was only 37 percent of what the county had received 20 years before.

RISING TIDE OF SPECIALIZATION

Another cause of the increasing shortage of physicians is found in the mounting tendency for doctors to specialize. In 1940 there were 15,853 specialists in the United States certified by the approved Specialist Examining Boards. By 1946, certified specialists had risen in number to 26,108.

Of course, most of these specialists serve an extremely useful purpose. One good surgeon can free a dozen general practitioners for nonsurgical work, and do a far better job of surgery besides. But many of the specialists are in the luxury fields of medicine. The psychoanalyst who treats a single patient for 18 months or more may do an extremely worth-while job upon that one individual. But he can hardly be viewed as carrying his full weight in the task of preventing, or curing, the ill health of the vast number of sick people.

The growth of specialization has also served to aggravate the shortage of physicians in the medically depleted areas. Eye troubles, for example, are just as common in Kansas as in New York. But fully half of the Nation's certified ophthalmologists are located in five States: New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, and California. If these States have an adequate number of specialists in ophthalmology, it is obvious that most of the other States are far below par in this field. The same is the case with certified obstetricians. More than half of these have located in New York, Illinois, California, and Pennsylvania, while five other States have not a single certified obstetrical specialist.

The deans and the faculties of our great medical schools and the American Medical Association's council on medical education are all well aware of the conditions we have cited. They proved this when they repeatedly testified to the alarming shortage of physicians in the days during the war, when they feared that the drafting of premedical students might deplete their entering classes and even bankrupt some of their schools.

But now, when wartime pressures have been relieved and when the schools could expand, these same men—with a few exceptions—are cutting down the enrollment of their schools. Their explanations for this policy are many and various.

Dean Isaac Starr, of the Undergraduate Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania, for example, despite the testimony of such men as Dr. Victor Johnson, believes that "the alleged shortage exists only in country districts." Yet his fellow dean, Dr. William H. Perkins, of the Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, states that "even Philadelphia, with all its great medical resources, is none too well manned and has no surplus of physicians."

Unlike Dean Starr, most medical educators admit the existence of a shortage of physicians, but bring forth many reasons why they feel they cannot increase enrollments. One of the most common is an alleged "lack of qualified students."

"We can admit more students," they explain, "only by lowering our standards and taking in men who will not make first-rate doctors."

That raises the question whether our medical schools have always fully drained the pool of qualified applicants. Obviously, certain large groups of students, with high scholarship and ability, have been more or less excluded from consideration for reasons that have nothing to do with their potential quality as physicians.

One such group is the Negroes. Despite the tremendous need of our Negro citizens for medical care, our schools have been producing fewer and fewer Negro physicians. The reason for the shrinkage is easily found. There are two colleges—Howard University and Meharry Medical College—which are primarily for Negroes. Together they graduate between 80 and 110 doctors a year. Most of the 67 other medical schools bar Negroes entirely. This is true not only in the South. Many a northern and western college has not admitted a Negro student in more than a decade. Only 8 to 12 Negro students a year are admitted to all the medical colleges other than Howard and Meharry.

To a lesser degree, the same policy of discrimination has been applied by many of our best medical schools to other racial and religious groups. None of the colleges will admit that they so discriminate. Yet the record can hardly be misread. Some schools, which formerly admitted as high as 40 percent of Jewish students have—in recent years—reduced their proportion to as low as 5 or 7 percent of each entering class.

Most of our medical colleges have exercised a similar policy in regard to women. Over the years they have held down the enrollment of women students to approximately

5 percent of their total, graduating on the average only 250 women doctors a year.

To justify this policy the medical schools have a number of arguments. Dean Starr, for example, says, "We do not favor women in medicine because a large proportion do not practice very long and hence do not justify the investment involved in giving them a medical education." In this connection, however, Prof. Helen R. Downes, of Barnard College, last year published a study of the careers of women physicians who graduated in the 20 years before 1940. There were 100 from the University of Pennsylvania. In 1944, 93 of these women were still engaged in full-time medical work; 29 had qualified as specialists; 5 had become professors in medical schools.

THE CASE OF THE WOMAN STUDENT

American medical colleges also assert that very few women qualify for admission on a par with male graduates. That is best judged by examining a paragraph from the testimony of Col. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., chief liaison officer of the Selective Service System, before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. Dr. Keesling testified:

"So far as the women are concerned, Dr. Willard C. Rappleye (of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons) stated that his school, with 115 places for the freshman class, had 366 applications from women, out of which they have already signed up 30. He told an officer in our headquarters personally over the phone that all these women had good credentials, and that 100 had such similarly good credentials that they could not distinguish among them and consequently had to put their names in a hat and draw out the 30."

Within the last 2 years there seems to have been some lowering of the bars against women. In 1946 women medical students constituted 8 percent of the total admitted. For the current year the figure is believed to have risen toward 12 percent. All this has discounted the protestations of the colleges about a scarcity of qualified women students but it also makes one wonder whether 12 percent of women is a "natural" limit or merely the measure of the present degree of discrimination.

Among other arguments to support the present reduction in medical school enrollments is the alleged lack of teaching beds. By this they mean they have only limited facilities in hospitals affiliated with their schools and hence could not provide first-class bedside training for an enlarged number of students. No doubt in the case of many a southern and western college this plea is a weighty one.

In large cities, however, where most of the larger medical schools are located, some schools have managed to find more than enough "teaching beds." Dr. William H. Perkins, dean of the Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, for example, has solved the problem by granting medical-school affiliation to 14 outlying Philadelphia hospitals in addition to the one attached directly to his school. This not only increases the number of "teaching beds" available to Jefferson's students but also greatly improves the quality of treatment afforded by these outlying hospitals which now have the services of many of the top-flight physicians on the staff of Jefferson College.

Significantly, Jefferson is one of the colleges that has not cut down its enrollment since the war. Like many another dean, Dr. Perkins has felt that the hurry-up features of the wartime accelerated program produced superficial instruction. Hence he has returned his school to the old 4-year pattern. But in doing so, he has managed to keep his enrollments up to the high wartime level, admitting 160 freshmen in 1946 and planning for an equal number for the coming fall term—15 percent above prewar figures.

MORE USE COULD BE MADE OF LABS

Lack of laboratory facilities is often given as another reason for cutting back enrollments to the prewar level. But an examination of the teaching schedules of many of these schools shows that laboratories are in use for teaching purposes for as few as 6 hours a day. In seeking to avoid the defects of the wartime accelerated program, most of the schools have abandoned its advantages as well. Going back to a 33-week teaching year, they are leaving their laboratories and other facilities virtually idle for at least one-fourth of the time.

Most interesting, however, is the fact that a few medical schools have not joined the cut-back parade. Dr. Wilburt C. Davison, dean of Duke University Medical School—one of the finest in the country—has refused to abandon the accelerated schedule used universally as a wartime expedient. Even before the war, Duke permitted its students to give up summer vacations if they desired and thus shorten their medical training by a full year. By pursuing this policy now Duke is keeping its facilities—laboratories and "teaching beds"—at work the year round.

The University of Minnesota is, for the next few years at least, also continuing its accelerated program. A few other schools, while abandoning the accelerated program and returning to the 4-year course, have kept their enrollments high as a recognition of their public duty. The deans of these schools claim that they are able to maintain the quality of teaching at a high level despite a 10- or 15-percent increase in the size of each year's class.

A "shortage of competent instructors" is sometimes given as a reason for cut-backs in enrollment. It is true that some older schools have lost instructors to the four new and four recently enlarged colleges. Yet such shifts could hardly account for the Nation-wide reduction in the total number of new students admitted. And many a school that has reduced its enrollment has actually regained numerous instructors and professors who were on military leave during the war.

There is a final important angle to be considered. Many of our medical schools say they are financially unable to expand their student bodies. They point out that tuition fees cover only a fraction of the cost of a medical education—that the rest must be met, in the private institutions, from endowments and in State universities from the public appropriations. The other side of the coin is that most of the cost of running a medical school is overhead, and additional students can be accommodated with hardly any increase in expense.

When all of these arguments are reviewed and analyzed, is it an inevitable conclusion that our medical schools are failing to face up to the critical facts of the physician shortage?

LARGER ENROLLMENTS ADVOCATED

Men, like Dean Perkins of Jefferson, Dean Davison of Duke, and Dean Harold S. Diehl of Minnesota, have shown that enrollments can be maintained at the wartime level without a reduction in the quality of training. Thus the first step toward relieving the doctor shortage must be an immediate expansion of medical-school enrollments.

Simultaneously with this temporary expansion, plans must be made for the long pull. Here there is little hope of counting—as we did in the past—upon large private endowments. Ever since 1929 private giving by foundations and wealthy philanthropists has been diminishing.

According to Dr. Alan Gregg, of the Rockefeller Foundation, the income from medical school endowments has fallen by one-third in the last 15 years.

Thus the major source of funds for the enlargement of medical-training facilities seems to lie in the Government. At present, more than one-third of our medical colleges—those of the great State universities—are maintained primarily by Government funds. Even privately endowed colleges receive large Government subventions in the form of scholarships and exemptions from taxation.

In the last session of Congress, Senators MURRAY, PEPPER, and MORSE joined in sponsoring an Education Development bill. In the current session, they have introduced a revised version of this measure, designed to provide substantial Federal aid to the States for the maintenance of educational institutions and for construction of new institutions and for scholarships and fellowships.

The American Medical Association has given the bill almost no support. Though desperate for new funds, the schools are afraid to buck the AMA, which controls their very right to existence, through its ability to withdraw recognition. And the AMA is afraid that Federal scholarships and Federal support may prove an entering wedge for Federal health insurance.

Yet, if they allow the doctor shortage to grow ever more acute, they may actually bring upon the medical schools and the AMA the very Federal control of medicine they fear the most. For the schools and the AMA are only the trustees of the public health. They must act as trustees in the interest of the public rather than as a medical chamber of commerce arbitrarily limiting medical education to a selected few.

The Oath at the Elbe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Our Town of April 19, 1947:

THE OATH AT THE ELBE

Two years ago, April 25, 1945—the day of the opening of the first session of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco—six American soldiers crossed the Elbe River in a small boat, signalizing the military junction of two great Allies of the Second World War: The United States and the Soviet Union. The six American soldiers, members of a 28-man infantry patrol under the leadership of Lt. Albert Kotzebue, of Houston, Tex., having left the forward American lines west of the Elbe the previous afternoon with the mission of finding a common meeting ground with the Russian Army, thrust through the 30-mile no-man's land between the Russian and American lines. At 11:30 in the morning, April 25, Lieutenant Kotzebue's patrol—followed later in the day by two other American patrols—successfully contacted the forward Russian lines on the east bank of the Elbe. A half hour later, at noon, the river crossing by the six American soldiers heralded the link-up of Gen. Courtney H. Hodges' United States First Army and Marshal Ivan S. Koniev's First Ukranian Army, successfully consummating a great common American and Russian endeavor and unity of purpose and interest.

April 25, 1945, the historic day of the military junction of the two great Allies in Europe, the day of the opening of the first session of the United Nations in San Francisco, marked a high point in American-Russian relations. The 2 years which have elapsed

have seen a precipitous deterioration of relations between the two great wartime Allies. The disappointments and misunderstandings of the past 2 years have charged the atmosphere with distrust and recrimination. The remembrance of a happier day when, as trusting wartime Allies, they met on a common field of battle, met with hope and enthusiasm at a common conference to help set up the postwar structure, has been almost forgotten.

Unless some great positive and wholehearted demonstration of conciliation, trust, and confidence takes place in the near future, the issues which separate the nations will become irreconcilable. A great primary act of enthusiasm and confidence which can ease the present tension and reverse the present ruinous trend must come from the remembrance, celebration, and regeneration of the spirit of a spring day in 1945 when they met, with high expectation, as brothers at the Elbe and in San Francisco.

We must, all of us—Americans, Russians, and all other peace-loving peoples of the world—ardently hope that April 25 will be set up as a day of friendship and conciliation among nations, and that it be celebrated by all men and women of good will in all countries and areas.

On April 25, 1945, addressing the delegates meeting in session at the first United Nations Conference in San Francisco, President Harry S. Truman of the United States said:

"We approach our task humbly, but with united resolution. The prayers of the people of the world are with us. They are spoken in many tongues and in the words of many creeds. But they are as one voice rising from the tragedy and suffering of war, in prayer for lasting peace.

"Thus fortified, and with the guidance of Almighty God, we must and shall fulfill the purposes for which we have come together."

Approaching their task humbly, but with united resolution, the American and Russian soldiers grouped at the Elbe on April 25, 1945, were also attempting to fulfill the purpose for which they had come together.

On the evening of April 22, 1945, a last German engineer platoon, retreating in panic westward, had blown the span over the Elbe at Strela. A half hour later, a civilian wagon-train of some 200 old men, women, and children, streaming westward, and stopped by the blown bridge had encamped for the night, huddled in a 200-yard radius semicircle about the bridgehead. At 1 in the morning, April 23, the advancing Russians saw lights flickering at the bridgehead from a 2-mile range. Believing German military units were engaged for a last stand, they heavily bombarded the bridgehead with artillery and mortars. At dawn, the Russians fanned out north and south of Strela to mop up German remnants.

At 11:30 in the morning, April 25—2 days later—Lieutenant Kotzebue's patrol reached the west bank of the Elbe at Strela. Upon being recognized by the Russians on the east bank of the Elbe, they prepared for a crossing. The span over the Elbe was, of course, blown. The only means available for the crossing was an old wooden boat moored to the shore. The Elbe, flooded by spring rains, was a swift-running river. In order to avoid being swept downstream when making their crossing, the Americans moved the boat some hundred yards up the stream in order to be swept by the river into a 50-yard remnant of the bridge jutting out from the east bank of the Elbe. Achieving their objective, the six American infantrymen raced over the remains of the span jutting out from the east bank, crossed the river at noon and were greeted by the Russians.

The greetings took place in the midst of some 200 corpses of old men, women, and children. After the preliminary greetings, they, all of them—Americans and Russians—looked down at the bodies and fragments of bodies—especially the body of a child with blue eyes and long brown hair clutching play crayons in one hand and a doll in the other.

At this historic moment of the meeting of nations, all of the soldiers present—Americans and Russians—solemnly swore that they would do everything in their power to prevent such things from ever happening in the world again, and that the nations of the world would and must live at peace.

The time has come for the nations of the world to reaffirm that solemn oath at the Elbe.

As one of the six American infantrymen to make the boat crossing over the Elbe 2 years ago, as one of the American and Russian soldiers to take the oath at the Elbe, I believe I voice something of the thoughts and feelings of all of us in this critical hour.

I therefore call upon the nations of the world for a new birth of conciliation and friendship, that the oath sworn on that hallowed blood-soaked historic ground shall not have been taken in vain.

JOSEPH P. POLOWSKY.

APRIL 15, 1947.

Devotion to Mother a Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minden (La.) Herald of May 9, 1947:

DEVOTION TO MOTHER A TRADITION

The prominence given in the news recently to President Truman's dramatic visits to see his mother calls attention to a heart-warming historic fact—that down through the years the majority of our Presidents have been extremely devoted sons.

When Martha Ellen Truman's son made the headlines by flying in bad weather in order to spend holidays with his mother, he was, in fact, continuing a tradition of paternal devotion first established by George Washington.

Washington made a similar, if not as spectacular, visit to see his mother. While en route to take part in his inauguration ceremonies in New York City, our first President made a point of stopping off at Ferry Farm, the family homestead at Fredericksburg, Va., to spend time with his mother, Mary Bell Washington.

Washington's thoughtfulness in taking time to see his mother on this occasion was especially fortunate since it proved to be the last time he saw her alive.

The first mother to realize the ambition of actually seeing her son inaugurated was Ella Ballau Garfield, a widow who raised four children. President Garfield was, according to one biographer, "the most affectionate and devoted of sons." When mortally wounded by an assassin's bullet in 1881, he showed his affection for his mother by immediately sending her a note in which he made light of his wound.

Lincoln's deep respect for his mother inspired his now famous remark: "All that I am or hope to be I owe to my angel mother." In 1818, when Lincoln was 9 years old, he was at his mother's bedside to hear her last request which was, prophetically, "Be something, Abe."

Nelly Conway Madison, mother of our fourth President, bore 12 children, the eldest, James, serving two terms as President during her lifetime. In order that his mother might spend her last years in comfort and be near him, Madison built a mansion on his Montpelier estate for her. She died there at the remarkable age of 97.

One mother who didn't want her son to become President was Nancy Allison McKinley. It is said her ambition was to have one of her sons become a bishop. According to her grandchildren, that would have made her happier than having a son President. The relationship between President McKinley and his mother was so ideal and so admired by the public that she was given the title "Mother" McKinley. At McKinley's inauguration his predecessor, Grover Cleveland, is said to have commented upon McKinley's good fortune in having his mother present at the ceremonies.

It was during Cleveland's first term, in 1887, that a Kentucky school teacher originated the idea of setting aside a particular day in the year on which to pay tribute to American motherhood. The teacher, Mary Towles Sasseen, conducted special exercises in her Henderson, Ky., schoolroom which included recitations on the subject of mother given before the children's parents.

In 1890 Miss Sasseen was successful in having her idea introduced into the schools of Springfield, Ohio. However, it wasn't until 1908 that the idea caught nationally, and then through the efforts of Anna M. Jarvis, of Philadelphia.

Two years earlier, on the anniversary of her mother's death, Miss Jarvis had invited a few friends to spend the day with her to share reminiscences. The following year, church services in Mrs. Jarvis' memory were conducted at the Andrews Methodist Church of Grafton, W. Va., where she had taught Sunday school for a number of years.

Miss Jarvis then brought her idea to the attention of church people in her home city, Philadelphia, and from there it was adopted by other sections of the country. In 1914 President Wilson signed a congressional resolution setting aside the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day and authorizing Federal display of the flag. In time, the idea spread to 43 countries.

The thirty-third national observance of Mother's Day, May 11, will find mothers throughout the Nation honored by church and civic groups and by their sons and daughters personally with gifts and Mother's Day greetings.

Alien Property Disposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, though I have, during the last 4 years, repeatedly called the attention of the Congress to the vast properties of enemy aliens which have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian and Secretary of the Treasury under existing law and have pointed out over and over again the necessity of the Congress determining upon an American policy in respect to its disposition, the executive heads of the interested departments and agencies of the Government have repeatedly expressed their objection to the legislation I have offered, on the ground that, so they said, the time for legislative action had not yet arrived.

And in the intervening years, hundreds of American citizens who have suffered detriment as a consequence of enemy action remain to this late day uncompensated for their losses.

Two years or more have gone by since the Japanese, our one remaining foe, have laid down their arms—and still nothing has been done.

Billions upon billions of dollars of seized enemy property remains in the hands of our Government, hundreds of millions of dollars of enemy gold has been seized by our advancing troops, enemy properties of untold value have been surrendered to our arms and the country is still without a determined policy in respect to its disposition, and, manifestly, the Congress is making no effort to formulate one as thousands of innocent victims of ruthless enemy war action are left to shift for themselves, many pitifully impoverished to the point of starvation as the National Legislature, concerned with other problems, turns its back upon them.

Mr. Speaker, to prevent a repetition of the blunders which we were guilty of following World War I—blunders which let slip through our fingers hundreds of millions of dollars of seized enemy property as over a hundred million dollars of proven American claims went uncompensated—I have introduced a resolution which, if adopted by this Congress as a belated recognition of the urgency of this unhappy situation, will provide for the appointment of a joint subcommittee from the Ways and Means and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of the House to make a thoroughgoing investigation of the entire subject matter; to determine upon and recommend an American policy in respect to the disposition of all of our seized alien properties and cash assets and to suggest appropriate legislation for the presentation, proof, and payment of the claims of innocent American victims of ruthless enemy war action.

It is high time that the Congress and the American people know the truth in respect to our seizure of these alien-enemy properties and cash assets. The time for the determination of an American policy in respect to seized alien-enemy properties and for the providing of a procedure for the liquidation of American claims arising out of enemy war action is long overdue. The adoption of my resolution would constitute an initial step toward the ultimate and complete solution of this problem which has been long crying for attention. A further procrastination would be unpardonable, indefensible, as American claimants stand by empty-handed. Mr. Speaker, cannot action on this resolution be expedited?

Mr. Speaker, for the enlightenment of the membership and in accordance with permission heretofore granted me, I hand a copy of my resolution to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my instant remarks.

The following, Mr. Speaker, is the resolution to which I have just referred:

Whereas the United States of America is vested with property and assets in large amounts, formerly belonging to enemy governments and their nationals, acquired by civil seizure and military capture; and

Whereas many thousands of American nationals have suffered private war losses through enemy action in all parts of the world, including American prisoners of war and internees, for whom as yet no protection, representation or compensation has been provided; and

Whereas many other thousands of American nationals are the holders of defaulted obligations of enemy governments, their political subdivisions and corporations created thereby, for whose protection the Congress of the United States created the Corporation of Foreign Security Holders by Public Law No. 22 of the Seventy-third Congress, and by other action enjoined the making of foreign loans; and

Whereas the Congress has been importuned for aid and relief by others than American nationals, who have come to our shores and whose property has been confiscated by enemy governments; and

Whereas since the beginning of our Republic we have refrained from exercising the right to confiscate the private property of enemy nationals; and

Whereas the future development of foreign trade and commerce may be materially affected by our policy as to enemy property in time of war and a sound policy may prove a deterrent as to future wars; and

Whereas the disposition of enemy assets now in our possession involves intricate decisions with our allies and nonbelligerent nations as to reparations and indemnities and may raise important issues in the making of treaties of peace and commerce and moreover, important questions under our own constitutional law as well as international law and the powers derived therefrom; and

Whereas the Congress is the sole arbiter on all these matters and as to all property and assets affected is a trustee for the safety and benefit of the United States of America and its nationals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 10 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 5 of whom shall be selected from the Committee on Ways and Means and 5 from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In the case of each such committee not more than three of the Members selected from it shall be Members of the same political party. The Speaker shall designate one of the members of the committee as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study—

(a) Of the amount, nature, present location, custody, and control of properties, sequestered, seized, or captured, formerly belonging to enemy governments and their nationals.

(b) Of the disposition made of any such property no longer in the possession or ownership of the United States.

(c) Of the names and identity of known claimants with respect to private war losses suffered through enemy action by (1) citizens of the United States, or (2) aliens who served in the military or naval forces of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to September 3, 1945, or (3) aliens who on December 7, 1941, and for at least three of the five preceding years, were bona fide and lawful residents of the United States; and of the amount and nature of the claims, or (4) such other persons as have or claim to have a right in the distribution of enemy assets and to recover for private war losses.

(d) Of the agreements and commitments made with other governments and private individuals affecting the disposition of all such properties.

(e) Of the costs and expenses of seizure, control, and custody.

(f) Of the activities and accomplishments of the Corporation of Foreign Security Holders since 1933.

(g) Of all additional information needful to enable the Congress to determine what should be the policy of the United States, and what legislation is necessary, with respect to—

(1) enemy assets seized and captured in war;

(2) compensation for private war losses suffered by American nationals and others as the result of enemy action;

(3) defaulted foreign loans and future loans to foreign governments, their political subdivisions and their corporations;

(4) the continuance of the Corporation of Foreign Security Holders; and

(5) the division and distribution of enemy assets now held for the common benefit of the United States and its allies.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) on or before January 3, 1948, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Federal Aid to Schools Bill, One of Our Most Important Pieces of Must Legislation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1947

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement which I made before the Subcommittee on Education of the Education and Labor Committee in support of my bill, H. R. 2525, and of Federal aid to public elementary and high schools.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, on March 12, 1947, I introduced H. R. 2525, a bill to authorize Federal aid for the purpose of helping the States more nearly to equalize educational opportunity in the public schools of the Nation.

Briefly the bill does the following things: (1) it safeguards State control of educational policies which relate to school administration, personnel, the curriculum, the materials of instruction, and the methods of instruction. (2) The bill authorizes appropriations which begin with $218,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and reach a maximum of $375,000,000 for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1950. Thereafter the annual appropriation stabilizes at that figure. (3) It establishes a minimum level of education in the Nation equal to that which can be provided by an expenditure of not less than $50 per year per pupil in average daily attendance. (4) It apportions the money to the States on the basis of an objective formula in direct proportion to need and effort and in inverse ratio to the aggregate income of the citizens of each respective State. (5) The bill calls for a proper accounting of funds received for school support through audit by the State educational agency with annual reports on moneys received and how expended to the Congress. (6) The power of the State to define public education is specifically safeguarded. (7) Federal funds would be spent by the States according to the provisions of their own constitutions and statutes.

H. R. 2525 is in my judgment a sound measure. I have drawn freely upon the past experience of Federal Government in making grants to the States to supplement State and local support. I would like for the subcommittee to consider this bill in the course of its study of pending Federal aid bills. If it cannot be favorably reported by the subcommittee I express the hope that some similar measure such as H. R. 2953 will be recommended to the House for action.

The plight of our public schools today is without parallel in their history. Teachers have left their profession in vast numbers. The extent to which this has happened challenges comprehension. We have some 15,000 classrooms without teachers. There are some 60,000 other teaching positions that have been terminated because qualified instructors are not available. Beyond normal losses, more than 350,000 teachers quit the classrooms between Pearl Harbor and the beginning of the current school year last September. In lieu of qualified teachers we have filled thousands of classrooms—estimated at roughly 125,000—with men and women, some just out of high school, who cannot qualify for standard credentials. The training levels of the Nation's teachers has declined by one full year since World War II began.

I quote from a statement published in March 1946 by the Louisiana Teachers Association: "A recent survey by the Louisiana Teachers Association in 54 parish and city-school systems of this State reveals that 1,386 teachers quit the profession during the session 1943–44 as compared to 699 who quit during the session 1939–40. Of the 1,386 who left the profession during the session 1943–44, 532 left for a change of work. This same study reveals that the total number of students who completed their work at the teacher training institutions in this State in 1944 and who qualified themselves as teachers number 185. During the session 1939–40, 632 persons completed their work at our teacher training institutions and qualified themselves as teachers."

The conditions in my State of Louisiana do not result from any lack of interest in educating our children as thoroughly as we can. The fact of the matter is that Louisiana is not a State that relatively is well off. In 1943–44, for example, the Nation spent 1.5 percent of its income payments for public schools. Louisiana spent that year 1.6 percent of State income payments. That greater effort produced far less in school revenues per pupil than a much smaller effort in many of our wealthier States. In 1944–45 we spent $95.31 per pupil in average daily attendance as compared with $125.41 for the Nation, yet our effort exceeded that for the Nation.

It is lack of school revenues that, in the main, explains why we have 18.8 percent of our school-age children (5–17 years old, inclusive) out of school in Louisiana, as contrasted with 10.4 percent for the Nation. We lack the means to afford adequate school buildings, properly equipped. We do not have the means to enforce our compulsory school attendance program. The result is that a large proportion of our youth population is growing to adulthood without preparation for a constructive role in our society. Their economic competency is held at a minimum and their readiness to render national service in times of crisis is sacrificed.

The income per child (5–17 years old, inclusive) for Louisiana in 1945 was $3,167 as contrasted with $8,416 in New York and $7,403 in Nevada. Louisiana ranked fortieth from the top of the list of States in the order of income back of each child. New York ranked third, Nevada sixth. In percent of income used for schools, Louisiana's record was considerably better than the record of these two States. Despite that fact, half of the teachers in my State in 1945 received less than $1,515, as contrasted with a figure more than $400 higher for Nevada and more than $1,200 higher for New York. I cannot say whether Nevada and New York were spending as much for schools in 1945 as the importance of the education of their youth would have justified. I know that Louisiana was spending less than the importance of this enterprise would justify, yet Louisiana was making relatively a greater effort to provide good schools than the Nation at large.

Unless the Congress authorizes larger Federal expenditures to aid the States in financing our public schools, I am convinced that national preparedness will be to a significant degree inexcusably sacrificed. The primary strength of this Nation is not in its forests and streams and fields and its great mineral wealth but in its people. Our strength as a Nation will always be in some direct proportion to the extent to which the intelligence of our youth is cultivated. We are today living in an era when competition among the nations of the world depends upon a marshalling of the total rather than a fractional part of the resources of each nation. We will not ourselves be as successful as we ought to be if a large segment of our total population remains educationally handicapped.

The proposal that Federal Government should extend aid to the States to supplement State and local revenues for public schools is not new. We have had vocational aid since 1917 in our high schools. We have had aid on the level of higher education since 1862 when the land-grant college, or First Morrill Act, was passed. As a matter of fact, since 1802 Congress has been assisting the States in financing the education of our young people. I understand that Congress has enacted more than 150 Federal-aid-to-education measures. This means we have levied taxes for this purpose on the citizens of the United States and redistributed such revenues in order to assure benefits to the entire Nation which have been and are of national significance and for that reason justified. This is an old pattern or practice in our Federal Government and we know what market advantages have accrued from this practice in relation to highways, to airports, to agriculture, and to other areas of our national life. Federal funds for these purposes have not been apportioned to the States for the sole advantage of the States. They have been authorized and allotted in support of the general welfare. Our national interests required such action on the part of Congress. In the same way, the pressing need today is for Federal funds, to supplement State and local revenues, to be invested in the primary resource of our Republic, our children.

No generation of American youth has in the past faced problems as complex or more important than those we are passing on to our young people. Yet we are shamefully neglecting our young people at a time when the political and economic philosophies inimical to our way of life are being vigorously, even enthusiastically, strengthened to compete with, perhaps even to attempt to throw off balance and destroy, the principles upon which this Nation has grown great. The fact that some other powerful nations are reported to be spending relatively a great deal more for the education of their youth than we are for our own is a danger signal we would do well to heed. Every element in our national life must be cultivated to the highest possible degree, in terms of what we are all proud to call the American way of life, if our way of life is to have the powers of resistance to hostile faiths necessary to perpetuate and improve our own.

I know myself the objections that are raised to the purpose sought in the legislation before this committee. It is argued, for example, that Federal control inevitably follows Federal aid. History tells us that in the field of education this has not been true. It is argued that the States are capable of caring for their own educational needs without Federal assistance. This I know at least to my own satisfaction, is not in accord with the facts. There are other objections. These were raised, I understand, in practically every instance when the Congress considered legislation similar to the legislation now with your committee in the long sweep of more than 150 years. These arguments are no more valid today then they were when in 1787 the Northwest ordinance was enacted which set aside Federal lands for State school aid, or in 1833, and 1836, and 1841 when grants of Federal funds were made to the States. I want to urge most earnestly, Mr. Chairman, that you and the members of your subcommittee take note of the fact that while we spend time on old objections which have for a century and a half proved to be groundless the children of this country are suffering an educational depression that is without parallel, that is dangerous to our national well-being, and that cannot be wisely indulged. For that reason I express the hope that you will report a bill at the earliest possible moment, if not my own then your bill, Mr. Chairman, or some other measure that satisfies the subcommittee, in order that others of us in the House of Representatives may have a chance to register our support in defense of our country.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 13, 1947

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, our program of aid for Greece and Turkey brings to mind the critical and growing need for an up-to-date information service on the part of the United States, particularly in the field of short-wave broadcasting. Along with the help we propose to send to Greece and Turkey, at much sacrifice to ourselves, it is necessary that the full story of what we are doing be not misunderstood.

It would be foolish for the United States to permit Russia to continue her short-wave propaganda campaign of distortion of our aims with no effort on our part to tell the people of the world our own motives. It seems to me that the only way to get the true story across is through short-wave broadcast.

I am distressed to learn that the House Appropriations Committee has cut out

the appropriations for broadcasting to foreign countries this year, at a time when it is more necessary than ever before that the Voice of America be heard and understood.

Right now the voice of communism by short-wave is being broadcast from Moscow to the far corners of the earth. This voice ridicules America and everything American. It is incumbent upon the United States, through our State Department, to combat the voice of Moscow.

On Friday, April 11, the United Press reported from Moscow the first official Soviet reaction to the short-wave broadcasts of the Department of State's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. Soviet journalist Ilya Ehrenburg, who visited the United States last year, condemned the Voice of the United States of America in an article appearing in the current issue of Cultur and Life—a publication of the Communist Party Propaganda Committee. Ehrenburg struck out at the OIC broadcasts as being "not the voice of the American people but an echo of reactionary voices."

The Soviet writer classed the OIC radio staff with Goering, Goebbels, Rosenberg, and Ribbentrop, and claimed that the State Department broadcasts "glorify two people—Washington and Ford." By presenting Washington as a Virginia landowner, Ehrenburg said, the broadcasts "make him sound more like a Kulak from the Middle West than a revolutionary leader."

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to answer this attack on the State Department and on the American people. The charges contained therein are, in themselves, a refutation of the writer's claims. Ehrenburg was freely admitted to this country. He was free to observe. He chose to see only those things which, in his opinion, warranted censure. He chose not to see those things which, to Americans, deserve praise. The warped picture he presents of this Republic reveals only his lack of objectivity as a reporter. Facts confound him.

What Ehrenburg wrote, therefore, was not important in itself. The implications of his article, however, are vital and far-reaching. Ehrenburg has been in the past a mouthpiece of official Soviet policy. The publication in which his article appeared is a creation of one of the most powerful organizations within the Communist Party. These are clear indications that the Voice of the United States of America is being heard in the Soviet Union.

There are clear indications that the Voice of the United States of America is being heard in many other parts of the world, including the Balkan countries dominated by the Soviet Union. One of the strongest audience reactions came from Marshal Tito, ruler of Yugoslavia, after the closing of the United States library in Belgrade last September. When Ambassador Patterson protested the closing Tito was reported to have remarked, "Well, you still have your short-wave broadcasts, don't you?" and added, "I understand my people listen."

Despite this strong evidence from Russia and Yugoslavia that the OIC is getting America's story over abroad, there has been a strong pressure movement on Congress not only to cripple OIC by drastically cutting its funds, but also to abolish the State Department's cultural and informational program completely. I am convinced that the OIC is in real peril as the result of this carefully planned and executed propaganda barrage aimed at Members of Congress.

To my knowledge, no Member of either House prefers to be led by the nose by pressure groups, whether those groups exist outside or inside the Government. Yet, that condition exists, here, now.

Let us critically examine this concerted campaign to destroy OIC.

For exhibit A let us turn to a form letter, an open letter to Members of Congress, copy to Washington correspondents, written on the stationery of the Committee for Constitutional Government and signed by Willford I. King, whose name also appears on the letterhead as Dr. Willford I. King, chairman of the committee. This letter is dated March 11, 1947. I quote the last two paragraphs of the letter:

> While I was in Washington a day or so ago, I was talking with a man attached to our State Department. He tells me that that Department is planning to spend this year $100,000,000 on foreign information service. One of their special endeavors is to send radio broadcasts to the people of Russia. It appears, however, that the Russians have very few radio sets. I wonder whether any of the sets, except those at official headquarters, are constructed to receive American broadcasts, after they are sent out. My guess would be that, if one were discovered having such reception, the owner promptly would find himself in a concentration camp.
>
> It seems to me that the whole idea of spending $100,000,000 on a project to spread our views throughout the world, is extremely dubious. It might be worth while to risk $100,000,000 on the project but I fear that the bulk of the one hundred million will be wasted. I hope, therefore, that you can find time to look into this matter and see whether it is not possible to save most of this money for the American taxpayer.

My own doubts have been raised as to whether the 30 individuals whose names appear on the Partial List of Advisory Board printed on the letterhead of the Committee for Constitutional Government, on which Dr. King's letter was written, were ever aware that such a letter was written or was to be written. I doubt if they knew that this letter was to be used to propagandize Congress. I seriously doubt that if they had known they would have permitted the use of their names to lend effectiveness to what, at the best, is a misstatement of facts and what, at the worst, is an attempt to mislead Congress through deliberate falsehood.

I refer to the thrice-repeated figure $100,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge among the membership of both Houses of Congress that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended an appropriation of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948 for OIC. That figure has been made known to the American public through more than a score of reputable national magazines and in news stories and editorials in many hundreds of reputable American newspapers.

Dr. King might have learned this had he read the budget recommendations conveyed to the Congress in the President's annual budget message which was released to the press. Dr. King might also have checked with the House Appropriations subcommittee in charge of State Department appropriations or with the Department itself. Needless to say, when the life of a useful governmental organization is at stake, any person concerned with that organization, whether he be for it or against it, should stick to the facts.

The attachment to Dr. King's form letter I shall label "Exhibit B."

Exhibit B is a reprint of a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal, under the date of March 12, 1947. It is signed by Clarence B. Hewes of Washington, D. C. I quote the last paragraph of the Hewes letter:

> I am opposed in principle to any form of organized governmental propaganda, which seems to me to be a worthless and undignified performance, not merely negative in its results but positively harmful to our national interests. After all, the United States of America is a tremendous fact in the world and speaks for itself with a power and eloquence beyond the capacity of professional propagandists to emulate.

It is pertinent to observe that the Hewes letter was a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal—and only a letter. In the American free press, the Hewes letter could very well have been published in a newspaper which held an editorial viewpoint contrary to the spirit and content of the letter itself. It must also be remembered, in this connection, that a substantial majority of reputable American newspapers and magazines have given their editorial support to the State Department's international information and cultural program.

The Hewes letter was inserted in the RECORD of March 17 by the gentlewoman from New York, Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE.

Mr. Hewes deplores the methods of professional propagandists. He says the "United States of America speaks for itself." But, he does not carry his argument to its logical conclusion. He does not say how our country speaks. I contend that every citizen of this Republic speaks for his country. I contend the personnel of OIC are Americans and, as such, have the right and duty to speak for America.

My experience with professional propagandists leads me to believe that their usual method of procedure is, when they have determined to destroy a chosen objective, to strike at that objective when their propaganda would do the most damage. The professional propagandist tries to get his views widely circulated in the press. Then, he sees to it that the published material gets in the hands of those who have the power to destroy that which he wishes destroyed. Mr. Hewes deplores these methods. Yet, he uses them in his assault of OIC. He chose his time wisely. On March 12, the House Appropriations Subcommittee was just beginning its consideration of OIC's budgetary requests. He chose his newspaper wisely—a financial newspaper.

OIC's current problem was a financial one. A financial newspaper would carry weight. Finally, it is not conceivable that Mr. Hewes did not know well in advance that his letter would be used to propagandize Congress as an attachment to the letter of Dr. King which falsely stated that the State Department was asking Congress to appropriate $100,000,000 for "foreign information service."

Exhibit C in the powerful campaign to get Congress to wipe out OIC is a letter from Mr. E. F. McDonald, Jr., president of the Zenith Radio Corp., inserted in the RECORD of March 12 by the Senator from Illinois, Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS. I quote the last two paragraphs of the McDonald letter:

Both for the sake of economy and to give the rest of the world a true understanding of America, the State Department should be compelled to cease its present international broadcasting activities, and any proposal that the Government enter the broadcasting business should be defeated. The American broadcasting industry should be given an opportunity to expand in the field of commercial international broadcasting.

P. S.—So that there can be no misunderstanding of my position, I assure you that Zenith has no interest, direct or indirect, in any chain or international broadcasting station. The views I have expressed are based entirely on my lifetime experience in radio.

It is a high tribute to the sense of justice and fair dealing of the Senator from Illinois that he gave both sides, those who wished to preserve OIC, as well as those who were determined to destroy it, and equal hearing in the RECORD. In the RECORD of March 17, I read the following portions of an insertion by the Senator from Illinois:

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, a few days ago I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Commander McDonald in which he took a position opposing the Government entering the broadcasting business. At the request of Mr. Peter W. Denzer, of the Broadcasting magazine, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a statement by Mr. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, in regard to the matter I had inserted in the RECORD.

The following is from the Benton statement:

I have known for years of Commander McDonald's lifetime experience in radio. I have supplemented my own experience in private broadcasting by conferring with others who have devoted much of their lives to broadcasting—the broadcasters to whom Commander McDonald refers as those who pioneered our international short-wave stations. These are the private licensees whose facilities are now under contract to the State Department.

Commander McDonald shows lack of familiarity with certain aspects of the problem when he compares int rnational broadcasting to newspapers and magazines, and states, "There is no more reason for the Government to own and operate broadcasting stations than there is to publish newspapers and magazines."

As a matter of fact, the Government does publish one magazine for distribution abroad, the magazine Amerika, in Russian. This is the only magazine from the United States which the Russian Government will allow to circulate in Russia. The other 10 or 12 magazines which were published by the OWI and the OIAA I discontinued shortly after I joined the Government.

If I had similarly discontinued international broadcasting by the State Department, there would have been very little international voice broadcasting from the United States—nothing remotely comparable to the needs. The impact of such broadcasting as would have received private support or sponsorship would have been totally inadequate. Commander McDonald will find, if he inquires, that this fact is generally admitted by those who have studied the problem and are best informed about it.

Alone, the McDonald letter is one man's expression of opinion. Taken with Hewes' letter and the King letter, it becomes part of a pattern to punish OIC through training the guns of a carefully planned and executed publicity campaign on Congress.

Dates are important. The King letter was dated March 11. The Hewes letter was dated March 12. The McDonald letter was inserted in the March 12 RECORD. The House Subcommittee on State Department Appropriations was beginning its hearings on OIC budget requests during the week of March 12. The same type of gross misinformation appears in all the letters involved in the "Get Congress to Kill OIC" campaign.

This does not mean that the OIC is sacrosanct; that the Department's international informational and cultural program is, like Caesar's wife, above reproach. Honest criticism can only have the effect of improving the Department's efforts in this field. But, honest criticism—in this, as in all other instances—means "informed" criticism.

The attitude of Congress toward OIC in the past has been a matter of great personal pride to me. The Congressional approach has been weighted heavily on the side of "informed criticism."

Opposition in Congress to OIC has, for the most part, been nonpartisan in nature, just as the strong support for OIC in Congress has also been nonpartisan. I am thoroughly convinced that this congressional position has been taken because of the widespread awareness that OIC is the major vehicle for explaining our foreign policy to the individual citizens of those countries in which OIC operates or toward which it beams its broadcasts. The Members of Congress know that OIC is the major vehicle for explaining our foreign policy and, as such, it is vital to the efficient functioning of the nonpartisan foreign policy now being followed by this Government.

Just how important OIC is to the task of keeping the people of foreign countries correctly and fully informed about our foreign policy—its meaning and its aims as it applies to them—has been well brought out by Secretary of State George Marshall. He says:

It seems to me absolutely essential that from somewhere—in this case, the United States—we endeavor to cover the earth with the truth, the unadulterated, pure truth without any twist or turn or implication in the midst of this riot of propaganda.

Secretary Marshall's firm advocacy of the State Department's cultural and informational program, his strict adherence to truth, stands in stark contrast to the ingenious half-truths, the deliberate falsehoods, employed by outside influences to bolster the movement within Congress to cripple or to do away entirely with OIC.

An article by Frank Kelley in the Washington Post of April 13 tells of the necessity for giving the peoples of foreign countries a full and fair picture of our nonpartisan foreign policy.

In writing of the situation in the Near East, Mr. Kelley states:

It—

The OIC—

will use "straight news" about world events and American policy to combat a campaign of calumniation and vilification by Russia of American motives in helping Greece and Turkey and in maintaining oil concessions among the Arabian sands.

Ever since the Truman doctrine of bulwarking Greece, Turkey, and other free peoples against Communist infiltration tactics was announced a month ago, the Moscow radio has outdone itself in outraged short-wave screams.

The Soviet shrieks of annoyance are mingled with abuse and slander of the United States Government and its officials and of the free American press and its principal writers.

* * * It all appears to be part of a carefully calculated centrally directed Russian policy of impugning the motives of a friendly foreign government. Truman, Acheson, Clayton, Vandenberg, Eaton—all the American officials who have explained the program to the world and to Congress—are systematically attacked.

Mr. Kelley goes on to report the Soviet broadcasts monitored by the Central Intelligence Group. Here are a few of his findings:

Moscow tells Austria that the new American policy is "a combination of dollar policy with the policy of the truncheon," borrowed from Hitler.

Moscow tells the British that "the dollar, with clear designs on Greek independence, is to take Greek fascism under its protection."

Moscow tells the Italians that American aid for Italy is "a worn-out banner * * * hoisted by all the pretenders to world domination."

Moscow tells Japan that American interest in rebuilding China has the goal of "trying to make China a colony of the United States."

Moscow tells Turkey that Truman intends to "control Turkey's economy and army." With American help, Moscow asserts, "Turkey will lose her sovereignty." Yet, Moscow tells Hungary that Turkey gave "active support to the Fascist coalition" during the war.

The OIC has been given the task of telling the truth about our nonpartisan foreign policy in the face of this formidable opposition. The necessity for OIC's existence is more obvious now than ever before. The OIC needs informed congressional criticism based equally on justice and understanding. It would be manifestly unfair to the men and women entrusted with defending the good name of our Republic to surrender to a planned propaganda campaign, based upon deliberate misinformation and intentional lack of understanding.

To abandon OIC at this time would be, in effect, to hand over to foreign propaganda organizations the job of explaining our nonpartisan foreign policy. OIC's program now rank second, third,

and even fourth in some of the world's danger areas, because it is operating on modest appropriations. For Congress to cripple or kill OIC would mean that other nations would immediately rush in to misinterpret our intentions. It would mean an international field day for the Ilya Ehrenburgs.

Washington Correspondent Robert W. Ruth gives a compact portrayal of what OIC is doing in the realm of international short-wave broadcasting in the Baltimore Sun of April 1.

Mr. Ruth writes in part:

In the international contest to spread culture by radio, Communist Russia is far outdistancing the United States in the time she devotes to cultivating her neighbors on her European borders and the pivotal states in the Balkans and Middle East.

* * * this country is now broadcasting less than 29 hours a week to the "iron curtain" countries of Yugoslavia, Rumania, Poland, and Bulgaria, while our principal competitor blankets them 41 hours a week.

And to the world's newest trouble spots—Greece, Turkey, Iran, and the areas speaking Arabic dialects—Radio Moscow sends a 32-hour-a-week stream of propaganda. By comparison the State Department broadcasts nothing to these regions, although William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, is planning programs in Greek, Turkish, and Arabic.

* * * the Russians broadcast three times daily for a total of 1 hour to the estimated 45,000 receiving sets in Greece. Greece is also the target of Turkish, British, French, Yugoslav, and Bulgarian programs, the latter two tinged strongly with a Moscow line.

Radio Moscow devotes from 1½ to 2 hours a day on approximately ten frequencies to the 180,000 Turkish receivers, of which more than half are capable of short-wave reception.

* * * But in programs broadcast into Poland, Radio Moscow leads * * * with 14½ hours a week compared with 10½ by the British and less than 13 hours a week by the United States.

We devote 25 minutes a day to Rumania, but Moscow averages an hour. In addition, press and radio work in Rumania is handled through Arlus, a Rumanian Communist organization. * * *

In Yugoslavia, the American programs make a better showing, about 10 hours to Russia's 8 hours and 45 minutes a week, but, as in Rumania, the native Yugoslavia radio is under Russian influence.

And to Bulgaria, our State Department broadcasting, consumes only 25 minutes a day contrasted to an hour and one-half of Radio Moscow "news" and music.

The men and women of OIC, charged with meeting the challenge to our national integrity all over the world, have earned just consideration from Congress. We should encourage careful examination of factual evidence in all legislation pertaining to the OIC. I am confident that OIC would welcome informed congressional criticism. On the other hand, we must take a firm stand and not give way before the determined propaganda campaign which has for its goal the killing of OIC. This campaign, like the Ehrenburg article, manufactures its own evidence, relies upon flagrantly propagandistic methods and does not stop with intentional misrepresentation of fact.

Congress must act independently and courageously on the OIC if it is to justify its inclusion in the definition of government included by George Washington in his Farewell Address:

This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and support.

Expensive Penny-Pinching in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch on April 28, 1947, entitled "Expensive Penny-Pinching in Washington."

This editorial expresses much better than I was able to do the sentiments which I voiced on the floor of the House on yesterday in connection with the appropriation for the State Department.

The editorial follows:

EXPENSIVE PENNY-PINCHING IN WASHINGTON

The United States is about to embark on a program of global proportions, designed to halt the march of communism into new areas. One of the great weapons of the Soviet Union is propaganda, and vast sums are being spent by Moscow for the purpose. Yet at almost the very moment when our Senate was voting by approximately 3 to 1 to support the Truman plan for aid to Greece and Turkey, with all that this entails, a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee was quietly letting the economy ax fall on the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.

In other words, that subcommittee was trying to make it impossible for the Government of this country to answer the world-wide campaign of Communist propaganda with an intelligent and aggressive information service of our own. Thus, it handed the Kremlin the very advantage it most desires at this juncture. For the Soviet Union is in no position to fight this Nation now with guns and tanks and planes. It must be content to use the more subtle weapons at its disposal, chief among which is the weapon of propaganda.

Hence if action of the House subcommittee is allowed to stick, we shall be in the ludicrous position of having scrapped a $31,000,000 global-information program on behalf of democracy for reasons of economy while giving away hundreds of millions, if not billions, to Greece, Turkey, Korea, and other countries in an effort to further that same cause of democracy. The millions or billions will be given away in an effort to stop Soviet expansion, but we shall have no effective machinery with which to combat the ideological expansion which is today the most deadly, dangerous, and vital part of the Russian drive.

True, the State Department's Office of Information and Cultural Affairs has made mistakes, under its Director, William Benton, But it has been a helpful agency, on the whole, and it is needed far more right now than it has been needed since the war ended. This country simply must put its story across to the peoples of the world, many of whom get no news at all except the gross distortions which appear in their government-controlled newspapers.

The American programs broadcast via the Voice of America radio stations in Germany have obviously been reaching Russia lately in considerable volume, if one may judge from the howls emitted by Ilya Ehrenburg and the Kremlin's press officers. Are we to scrap this essential link between our civilization and the Soviet people at the very moment that it is being forged? Are we to abandon the effort to inform the Russian-dominated peoples of the Balkans, cut off, as they are, from news of the outside world? Shall we scrap the magazine Amerika, published in Russian and distributed in Russia by our State Department, in order to provide accurate news of this country's plans and intentions? We are selling 50,000 copies a month in Russia, and distributing 10,000 more free, with the Soviet Government's permission. It is estimated that each copy is read by 25 Russians.

All this will be brought to an end, if the House subcommittee has its way. It is incredible that this should be allowed to happen. The United States would be spending only a fraction of what Russia spends on propaganda if it doubled the proposed $31,000,000 appropriation, but some of our statesmen in Washington seem to think it makes sense to cut out the appropriation entirely. Just how such blind penny pinching can be made to harmonize with the evident willingness of Congress to embark on a multi-billion-dollar global program of bucking Russia remains to be explained.

Tax Laws Unfair to Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John R. Nicholson, of the Chicago bar, in the American Bar Association Journal for April 1947:

PENSIONS FOR PARTNERS: TAX LAWS ARE UNFAIR TO LAWYERS AND FIRMS

(By John R. Nicholson, of the Chicago bar)

Let us imagine the hypothetical case of twin brothers—Henry and Charles. They are alike in every way; they have the same intelligence, personality, likes and dislikes. They receive equal educational training.

By chance, Henry determines to pursue the profession of law, while Charles directs his activities toward manufacturing. Time goes by, and finds Henry as senior partner in his law firm. The clientele is substantial and the firm enjoys a splendid reputation in the community. Charles, too, has prospered. He is now president of the A Manufacturing Corp.

Both brothers receive substantial incomes. They work equally hard. If any difference is apparent, it would seem that Henry spends more time at the office than does Charles. During this same period each brother has become a family man, and, strangely enough, the parallel continues in the fact that each of them has three children. Their families live in similar surroundings and acquire much the same habits of life respecting living and educational expenses.

Finally, to complete the cycle, death claims both brothers—let us say, on the same day. The story comes to its natural end. One is

likely to remark, "Henry and Charles were alike as two peas in a pod. Their lives and fortunes were identical"; and so they were to the point of death. There all similarity ceased.

Under the wills of the two brothers, Henry's law firm undertook the administration of both estates. The assets appeared to be roughly equivalent. Henry and Charles each owned comparatively equal homes in the same town. Their bank balances were about the same. The face value of their respective life-insurance policies approximated the same sum. But Henry's estate would receive only his undistributed profits from the law firm, plus additional amounts under an accounting for his interest in the capital accounts, work in progress, and the like. This summed up Henry's financial matters.

Charles' family was in a much better position with regard to future income. There were social-security benefits from the Government. There were dividends on the stock of Charles' corporation—stock received by him under bonus plans in effect during his life. Finally, in point of mention but not importance, there were the death benefits payable to Charles' family under the corporation's pension plan.

THE LAWYER'S ESTATE IN AN UNFAVORABLE POSITION

The net effect of these final differences was that Charles' family was placed in a much sounder financial position than was Henry's. Charles left his family with a secure, comfortable future. Henry, while providing with some adequacy for the future, had done far less in this respect than his brother. The parallel of their lives had been brought to a sudden end by their deaths.

The foregoing drama serves to illustrate the position of the professional man engaged in private practice. It applies to all of them—lawyers, doctors, accountants, engineers, brokers—all men for that matter who are engaged in a business or calling in the form of a partnership or individual proprietorship. This article, while applying to the group as a whole, is primarily directed to problems of the lawyers.

The Federal Government has, over the last 20 years, given serious consideration to its responsibilities to the aged and needy. It is clearly established that each individual has an expectancy of only so many productive years. Thereafter he may be unable to support himself financially, but someone must do it. The Government has, for various reasons, assumed such an obligation.

In 1935 the Federal Government enacted social security legislation to provide some such support for aged and needy. Such assistance was given to all employees, whether employed by an individual, a partnership, or a corporation. Charles, as president of his corporation, came within its purview; Henry, and all other individuals engaged in a profession or partnership business, did not.

Congress also turned to employees' trusts as a method of furthering its efforts to carry out its social duties. It encouraged employers to establish such plans by offering them tax relief in the form of deductions in the amount of their contributions to the plans. Charles, as president of his corporation, became a beneficiary of his corporation's plan, albeit with certain restrictions; Henry, while he could establish such a plan for his employees, could not, nor could his other partners, become a beneficiary of such a plan.

OTHER DISPARITIES AGAINST A LAW PARTNER

Even if a law partner resigns himself to the fact that he cannot avail himself of the above-mentioned benefits, further obstacles to making adequate provisions for his family present themselves. The necessity that a law firm maintain an adequate bank balance is well known, whether it be for the payment of employees' salaries, for office supplies, or anything else. In setting aside such amounts to keep the business liquid, the partner is giving up the use of some of his income.

At the same time the Government collects income tax on the partner's entire distributive share, which includes the sums the partner never drew for personal use. Such a situation, coupled with living expenses and other like items, results in the average lawyer finding himself no younger and not much better off from a standpoint of savings or security for the future, than he was 10 or 20 years earlier when his income was much smaller.

NO SOUND REASON FOR EXCLUDING PARTNERS

The foregoing is not just griping by one of the profession. It is quite generally true that the average lawyer works as long and as hard as the average businessman or corporate executive, but has far less to show for it at the end of his active career. He spends a great deal of his time giving his corporate clients the benefit of his advice and legal knowledge. He guides them through periods of change and unrest, contributing as much to a corporation's success as do many of its top-flight executives. The unfairness of the situation is further pointed up when the corporate client calls upon the lawyer to establish a pension plan for the company. The lawyer sees and works with the plan, appreciates the benefits available to the participants, and then realizes that he and his partners cannot avail themselves and their families of such a plan.

There is no justification, apparent from an economic or social point of view, for excluding partners and individual proprietors from the benefits already discussed. If it is agreed that the reason for establishing such benefits stems from a feeling of social responsibility and a desire to make certain that everyone is assured of adequate income during his later years, why should certain individuals be prevented from attaining such security, solely by reason of the form of doing business they choose to adopt? When I say "choose to adopt," I am speaking of unincorporated associations in general. In the case of lawyers the situation is further aggravated by the fact that attorneys are prohibited from adopting the corporate form of doing business.

Under the law as it exists today, partner attorneys in private practice cannot participate in any of the benefits of either social security or pension plans. Any amounts set aside by a partner attorney to provide for his family's security after his death have to be accumulated in spite of high income taxes on all his net earnings over the years, in addition to his over-all living expenses. This method of forced savings is not only extremely difficult but at times impossible.

There is no reason apparent why partners should not be able to include themselves as beneficiaries, other than the fact that the applicable section of the Internal Revenue Code refers to plans of an employer for the exclusive benefit of his employees. Since, in dealing with the law, the authorities have difficulty in conceiving that a partner is an employee, the benefits are withheld. See for example I. T. 3350, 1940–1 C. B. 14 and I. T. 3268, 1939–1 C. B. 196.

That denial of equality to partners stems from theories of what constitutes a legal entity and what does not, further serves to point up the artificiality and arbitrary nature of the present situation. The lawyer who is at all familiar with the various problems involved in the law of partnerships realizes that under certain circumstances a partnership is deemed to be an entity separate and apart from the individual members constituting it. However, such fine legal reasoning should not be necessary in a matter of such broad and general interest as this one.

It is submitted that the law as it stands in present form is grossly unfair both from a social and from an economic point of view. The solution to the problems lies in legislative or administrative enactments or amendments to existing laws and regulations. Study of the problems and obtaining necessary governmental action is worthy of consideration by the entire profession.

Secrecy and Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 14 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in the Monday issue of the New York Times entitled "Secrecy and Science."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRECY AND SCIENCE

Late in 1945 the physicists of the country protested against the veil of military secrecy that had been drawn over research. The protest made some impression on Congress, for the McMahon Act, which creates the United States Atomic Energy Commission, calls for the dissemination of scientific information. Progress has come to mean scientific progress, and scientific progress is likely to be most rapid when there is freedom of publication. Nevertheless, we keep to ourselves not only much about atomic energy but also about geology, meteorology, and biology because of the advantage that secrecy gives us in our attempts to preserve the remnants of democracy and free enterprise in Europe. So we are faced with a dilemma. If we want rapid scientific progress and hence technologic progress, military secrecy is a handicap, and if we are convinced that military secrecy is of advantage to us in our dealing with other nations we must retard scientific progress.

Just what secrecy and censorship mean in science the public hardly realizes. For example, geodesists would like to determine the exact shape of the earth, which is known to be roughly that of an oblate spheroid. The determination can be made only by the cooperation of geodesists of all countries. Cooperation is impossible because the information to be pieced together would be of the greatest help to a power that might hurl rockets loaded with high explosives for great distances. The age of the earth cannot be more accurately measured than it has been because radioactive materials, the clocks used, can now be obtained only with the greatest difficulty from Government supplies. Energy can be released from lighter elements as well as from uranium, but the physicist who succeeded, even on a scale as infinitesimal as that which enabled Hahn and Strasmann in 1938 to show what could be done with uranium, would undoubtedly be kept silent.

The most formidable task that confronts the United States Atomic Energy Commission is that of safeguarding our national interest and at the same time stimulating scientific discovery

Ohio Opposes Gift of Lake Erie Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Ohio are opposed to giving its lands and waters in Lake Erie to an international commission having jurisdiction of lands and waters owned by the State of Ohio through a treaty negotiated by the State Department with England and I am including a resolution of the Honorable Fred Adams adopted by the Ohio Senate on April 23, 1947, expressing the opposition of the people of Ohio and memorializing the Senate of the United States to disapprove ratification of the convention relating to the treaty between England and the United States covering the fisheries of the Great Lakes and connecting waters, signed at Washington April 2, 1946, especially with reference to the opposition of the State of Ohio being included in such treaty.

The resolution follows:

Senate Resolution 30

Resolution memorializing the United States Senate to disapprove a convention between the United States of America and Canada, relating to fisheries of the Great Lakes and their connecting waters, signed at Washington April 2, 1946

Whereas a convention was negotiated and signed April 2, 1946, with the objective of providing for the development, protection, and conservation of the fisheries of the Great Lakes by joint action of governmental agencies of the United States and Canada; and

Whereas as a means for achieving such objective the convention creates an international commission for the Great Lakes fisheries; and

Whereas, if such convention becomes effective, Ohio and other States of the Union having responsibility and valuable interests in such fisheries will lose jurisdiction over the same; and

Whereas the inclusion of the waters of Lake Erie in the proposed international treaty delegates forever the sovereign rights of the United States and of the State of Ohio to an international governmental agency; and

Whereas the interests of the State of Ohio in these waters and fisheries will best be served if the convention is not ratified; and

Whereas the citizens of Ohio are very much opposed to the convention establishing an international authority over such fisheries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ohio Senate respectfully memorializes the Senate of the United States to disapprove ratification of the convention between the United States and Canada relating to fisheries of the Great Lakes and connecting waters signed at Washington, April 2, 1946; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Senate of the United States, to each Ohio Member of said Senate and to the Governors of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, and Illinois; and be it further

Resolved, That the attorney general of Ohio be directed to inform appropriate Federal authorities of the desire of the State of Ohio to intervene before the appropriate senatorial committee in opposition to the treaty creating such international commission.

Office of Technical Services of Department of Commerce Should Have More Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, very much in favor of reducing taxes and eliminating useless and needless Government expenditure. But there is one item in the present appropriation bill which has been too severely cut by the committee. This is the item which appropriates for the Office of Technical Services, an office that functions directly under the Secretary of Commerce.

The Office of Technical Services has been functioning for some 3 years. It performs services of vital importance to small businessmen and to the national defense.

First. It has been engaged in examining and making available for the use of American businessmen the valuable patents and technical information acquired by the United States Government from German and Japanese industry. Our experts were frankly amazed at the amazing technical progress of the German people when we went into Germany. From the German patents and German technical information alone American business will profitably learn a great deal and our position in the industrial world will be correspondingly enhanced.

The examination of this information and the making of it available to American business requires the resources of Government since the cost would be prohibitive from the standpoint of private parties. This information is legitimately the property of American business since it was one of the good fruits of war.

Second. This Office is engaged in the work of correlating and making available all known information on the technical processes of production, whether here or abroad. Lack of such correlated information cost the Government many hundreds of millions of dollars in the last war. There were many duplications in investigations into technical processes because hidden away in voluminous Government files a preceding investigation was buried. This was an indefensible situation. It not only cost the Nation money, but it cost it time, natural resources and slowed down technical developments which in turn resulted in a needless loss of life on the battle fronts.

The existence of such correlated information will be of inestimable value to the United States in any future wars. Hence, in this work, the Office of Technical Services is performing a task of the highest value to the Nation from a military standpoint.

Third. For many years small business in the United States has been starved, technologically speaking. Progress in technology has tended to become the exclusive property of big business which has acquired patent title to the greater part of improved technology. At the same time the Federal Government has for many years been spending many millions of dollars to promote the technological efficiency of the farmer. Only small business has been left to shift for itself in its quest for better tools and under existing conditions the handicaps have been too great for small business to succeed. Because of this condition the Office of Technical Services has worked out a plan for assisting the small businessman to better and improve his chances for business success through the medium of obtaining more efficient technology.

A small businessman who has developed an idea up to a point where his resources will not permit him to carry it further, has the opportunity to forward his incompleted work to the Office of Technical Services for examination. This Office then consults outstanding engineers and scientists, both in Government and in private business, and if the verdict is favorable the incompleted invention is then "farmed out" to a private-research laboratory. These laboratories operate under contract with the Office of Technical Services. The funds necessary to conduct the research are split between the Government and the private parties interested in the development of the invention. If the invention proves successful patents are issued to the interested parties, but the Government shares in the royalties until the part which it contributed to the perfection of the invention has been fully paid.

This kind of a system, it seems to me, is of paramount importance to small business. Our giant corporations have wonderful laboratories only for one reason. Numerous competitors were merged to make these giant corporations and naturally they have the money to spend on expensive laboratories. But as a consequence of their size we have had a great increase of monopoly in the economic system. The small businessman is still competitive business in the United States and if he has not merged with other competitors to form some giant combine which will destroy competition, we should do everything we can to preserve and promote his independent status.

One of the reasons why the small businessman is handicapped in the industrial struggle is that he has not been able to get efficient tools. The Federal Government has been more than generous with the farmer on this score. Every year thousands of agricultural agents make available to the farmer, entirely at Government expense, the latest and best information on scientific farming. Under the Office of Technical Services the small businessman is willing to pay the cost of making progress in technology. All he asks is that the Government temporarily advance the funds until new ideas can be perfected. I

do not think that the Congress can say "No" to the small businessman and "Yes" to the farmer. Such a position is glaringly inconsistent. If Government aid on technology is good for the farmer, it is certainly good for the small businessman, and particularly where the small businessman is willing to pay on a self-liquidating project basis.

Though the Office of Technical Services has only been in existence for 3 years, the numerous requests for scientific information coming to it, not only from small business, but from big business as well, indicates clearly the lack of coordinated scientific and engineering information about production. No library has the resources to do this job. No private agency could do it. The cost would be prohibitive to private enterprise.

To date nearly 88,000 requests for information have been received from American business by the Office of Technical Services. The present monthly average of requests is over 8,000. But remember, gentlemen, that the furnishing of this information to businessmen in peacetimes is not only an important and necessary service in that the dissemination of such information results in increased business efficiency and more production, but the coordination of such scientific and engineering information about production is a vital service to military preparedness. On the military side alone this service could easily be justified. Would any man in this House say that it is not worth $3,000,000 a year to know at any one moment where the military can put its hands on all information about any productive process?

Under the budget this office asked for $3,400,000. The Appropriations Committee slashed this to $1,700,000 and recommended that the functions of this office be scattered in other departments where effective coordination of this kind of work would be impossible. I hope the committee may restore the whole amount or that the House will sustain the Senate if that body grants an increase.

The value of the services of this Office is demonstrated by two letters which I have secured permission to include in the RECORD. They are:

MAY 14, 1947.

Congressman ESTES KEFAUVER.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am part owner and chief engineer of the Breco Manufacturing Co., Baltimore, and technical director of the B-R Engineering Co., the Baltimore Engineering & Chemical and the Medical Chemicals Co., all of Baltimore. It has been my duty to try to keep these manufacturers abreast with the latest technological developments relating to each of the above company's business. For the past 2 years I have depended to a very large degree upon technical know-how which I have obtained from the Office of Technical Service.

Let me cite two specific cases where information from OTS has materially reduced the cost to the consumer; one: we manufacture a water base coupling which costs the consumer $2.50. Data furnished by OTS enabled us to modify our production procedure so that at present the reduction in man-hours through the use of a new method of induction welding reduced the production cost. The sale price of this unit now is $1.80 despite the rise in both labor and material cost. The second case covers the preparation of cutting tools. By a new special blasting treatment we have been able to more than double the life of many of our cutting tools. The reduction in maintenance cost has been passed on to our customers.

Small business, particularly the small manufacturer, is in critical need of better technology and more efficient methods of production. The present Office of Technical Service is our only real source of aid at the present time. We don't ask for the service as a gift. Small business is willing to pay as we go and we sincerely hope that something can be done in Congress to continue this vital service.

Very truly yours,

C. E. EARLE.

DECEMBER 3, 1946.

Mr. J. C. WOODMAN,
United States Department of Commerce, Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. WOODMAN: After your visit here on November 28, Miss Hilligan, our research librarian, discussed the OPB reports with the men who most frequently use them, and the following statements indicate the value that we place on this information:

The main value of the OPB reports is, perhaps, that they are a means of determining the direction and extent of German research. Since this information is available, it is felt that it cannot be ignored. One report may conceivably justify any amount of investment of money and time. In some cases, as for example, the Reppe work, introduces new fields of chemistry.

Difficult as it is to estimate the dollars-and-cents value, it can be said that these reports were in part a determining factor for this company in deciding to enter the fatty-acid field to the extent of several million dollars. Had these reports not been available, it is very likely that the company would have had to send an investigator directly to Germany.

Very truly yours,

GENERAL MILLS, INC.,
RALPH H. MANLEY,
Director of Research.

Birthday of William J. Veitch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Veitch has been long an outstanding and distinguished citizen of Perrysburg, Ohio, and I want to add my tribute to those of his fellow townsmen and include the following item from the Messenger, published at Perrysburg, Ohio:

When you have lived in any town for 79 years it becomes really home to you. Our fellow townsman, Mr. W. J. Veitch, of 420 East Front Street, was born in Sandusky and came to Perrysburg at the age of three. His parents resided in a house at Fifth and Pine Streets and his father was engaged as an expert cooper in a stave factory owned by Mr. M. A. Trowbridge. At the age of 10 Mr. Veitch was taken on as a regular employee. He remained with this firm until he was 20. As he grew up, so did his family. Soon there were three girls and three boys. His father died when young William was 18, and it was indeed a task for this brave young man to keep that family well fed and properly clothed. But he never wavered. Finally the stave factory closed down for lack of wood and there were few things to do in this village. William worked on a farm for some time, then secured a position with Dow Snell, a wholesale firm in Toledo. He remained with them for many years.

When he was so busy keeping his family cared for, he admits, he very often dreamed of the time when he would fall in love and marry a lovely girl and settle down as many of his men friends had done.

One day, he saw a charming young girl walking down the street with his next door neighbor, Miss Wallace, and soon found that the new girl was a Miss Gertrude E. Easton, of Larwell, Ind., who had arrived to stay for a time with her grandparents, the Wallaces. Dan Cupid had little difficulty in making a love match between these young persons and in 1895 they were married. Soon after, Mr. Veitch decided he had been working for others long enough and tried out an experiment which proved very successful. He purchased a dry-goods stock in his present location and has been one of Perrysburg's substantial businessmen for the past 37 years.

He built a 9-room house, fully expecting to have every room filled. Only one child came to this fine pair, a son, Kenneth, who when he returned from World War I married and settled down in Perrysburg. When their son Stephen was 2½, Kenneth died in New Mexico, where he had gone seeking health. The grandson is now 18 and is in college fitting himself for a business career.

Mr. Veitch admits never going but to the seventh grade, but in the school of hard knocks, he graduated with great success.

He has held about every elective office in the town. Being mayor for 4 years. Member of school board for 4 years. Water commissioner for 4 years, member of Way library board for 4 years, township treasurer. He is a member of the I. O. O. F.

He is a Methodist for so many years he cannot recall when he was not a member of the Sunday school and church. He has taught a class of high school boys for over 30 years and has been a member of the church council for more than 50 years. And throughout the years he has taken great pride in his town and has always worked for the betterment of the community.

It was Mr. Veitch who was very influential in securing the handsome monument of Perry and his midshipmen which stands at the foot of Louisiana Avenue at the entrance to Hood Park.

When it was learned that the city of Cleveland was willing to give this wonderful monument to any town who would give it a fitting setting, he went to that city and with several other townsmen, secured this statuary for Perrysburg. Few men have lived longer in our town and made each moment count for its betterment than has Mr. William J. Veitch.

Mr. Veitch will celebrate his eighty-second birthday anniversary Friday. We suggest that all persons who appreciate this fine gentleman's efforts "say it with a card."

Hydroelectric Power for the Industrial Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out before on the floor of the

House, we should not overlook the fact that many of the public works' projects throughout the Nation are the lifeblood of our economy and in our enthusiasm for curtailing Government expenses we should not fail to make adequate appropriations to carry on these important works. This observation is particularly true with respect to hydroelectric power in the Columbia River Basin. The demands for this power are greater today than they were during the war. Many industrial activities have been using this power in converting from war to peace and are providing jobs for veterans and other civilian employees and unless the power program is continued disastrous results will follow in the Pacific Northwest. The power projects on the Columbia River are self-liquidating and are returning to the Federal Government every dollar expended on them with interest, and at the same time are richly aiding the people of the Northwest as well as the entire Nation.

I include as part of these remarks a timely and pertinent editorial which appeared in the New York Times in its issue of Sunday, May 11, 1947, entitled "The Industrial Northwest" which is as follows:

THE INDUSTRIAL NORTHWEST

In 5 years the Pacific Northwest, which means Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and western Montana, has been transformed by electric power. Where once the lumberman's ax rang and farmers raised crops on irrigated soil there are now huge plants that produce aluminum, magnesium, ferro-alloys, heavy chemicals, airplanes, ships and plutonium. It is safe to say that had it not been for Bonneville and Grand Coulee we could not have met the war demand for some of these materials. On the basis of energy deliveries the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system is the third largest in the country. Yet the Northwest is so hungry for power that it is clamoring for more. What this means, Ivan Bloch of the Bonneville Power Administration recently told the Chicago Electrochemical Society.

When it was first projected the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system was regarded as an enterprise that could hardly pay for itself in decades. There was some reason for this pessimism. By a stroke of good luck the more important power plants were ready by the time we were preparing to enter the war. Instead of falling off with the arrival of peace, the demand for aluminum, magnesium and ferro-alloys is actualy increasing, so that the Northwest is bound to grow industrially. The Niagara Falls plants cannot be expanded; TVA has about reached the limit of its hydro-power possibilities; the St. Lawrence project may not offer much relief because of the rapid expansion of nonindustrial power requirements of this State. As Mr. Bloch sees it, the West remains the one great source of hydroelectric energy.

It is gratifying to learn that the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system has been a profitable investment. As of June 30, 1946, the Bonneville Power Administration had returned to the United States Treasury some $80,000,000—about one-fourth of the investment so far made, including interest. This financial showing is all the more remarkable because the 36,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours sold since 1938 have averaged 2.55 mills per kilowatt-hour. Those who proclaim the dawn of a new industrial day, now that a uranium pile may be substituted for coal or oil, may well ponder these figures. Nuclear fission cannot compete with falling water, which costs nothing. Whatever may happen in other parts of the world, the Northwest will rely on the Columbia River and its tributaries. A potential of some 25,000,000 kilowatts remains to be developed. There is more gold in the water of the Columbia than there is in any of the hills of the Far West. Horace Greeley's advice to a young man is still good.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 13, 1947:

SAVING THE SOIL

A recent announcement from the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture emphasizes two important points. First, efforts to save the Nation's topsoil are making progress; second, we still have a considerable distance to go. The statistics of the past are sober reading. The Service estimates that between 1895 and 1930 a full million acres of topsoil were lost each year; that more than 50 percent of the country's farm lands have been damaged to some degree by wind or water erosion; that the cost has been about $4,000,000,000 annually.

Since 1930 the rate of damage has been slowed to approximately half a million acres per year. As the result of a recent survey, the SCS says that since 1750 we have ruined or badly damaged about 282,000,000 acres of crops and grazing land; some 775,000,000 acres are eroded to greater or lesser degree. The inventory shows 1,060,000,000 acres of farm land for the future. Of this figure, about 460,000,000 acres are classified as good cropland. The balance will serve best as grazing and timber-producing land.

A significant victory for the conservationists came in 1935 when the Congress passed the Soil Conservation Act and the Soil Conservation Service was made a permanent part of the Department of Agriculture. Since that date 1,650 soil-conservation districts have been organized. The districts are run by the participating farmers. Nearly 4,000,000 of the approximately 6,000,000 farms in the United States now belong to districts. Through cooperative arrangement farmers can hire machines for terracing, draining, and contouring. Soil Conservation Service experts and farmers plan strip-cropping, irrigation, cover cropping, gully planting, and restoration of eroded fields. The restoration of farm land is a world problem. Food is fundamental to a peaceful world. Efforts to save the soil must go forward to a successful conclusion.

Displaced Persons 80 Percent Christians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

[From the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., of February 11, 1947]

WHO ARE THE DISPLACED PERSONS?—A GREAT MAJORITY OF THE DP'S ARE NEITHER COMMUNISTS NOR JEWS, BUT PEOPLE LOOKING FOR A HOME

(By Barry Bingham)

Two big misconceptions block much American thinking on the displaced persons of Europe. One is that most of them are Communists. The other is that most of them are Jews. Let's explore the real facts, which give an utterly different answer.

Taking the Jewish question first, official records show that only about 20 percent of the DP's are Jews. The largest group among the 80 percent who are Christians belong to the Roman Catholic faith, followed by Protestants and Greek Orthodox.

The idea of communism among the DP's is even wider of the mark. Of all the displaced persons of Europe, more than half are Poles, another 20 percent Balts (from Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia), and 5 percent Yugoslavs. Why won't these people go back to their homes? For the simple reason that they are violently anti-Communist. The Poles face a government at Warsaw which is strongly under Soviet domination, the Yugoslavs feel they would get short shrift under Tito's regime at Belgrade. Both groups fear persecution, exile, and possibly death for their political beliefs if they should go back to their native lands.

LIFE WITHOUT HOPE IS GRIM

The case of the Balts is even more extreme. Their three small countries have been completely absorbed by the U. S. S. R. They would have to become Soviet citizens if they should ever move homeward. Much as they hate the sterile life of the DP camps, they cannot and will not accept the alternative of surrendering themselves to the tender mercies of the U. S. S. R.

There are roughly a million of these homeless people left in Europe, most of them crowded into the American and British zones of Germany and Austria. The two Allied powers have repatriated over 5,000,000 DP's since the end of the war. Those were people who wanted to go home, who had been dragged into Germany as slave laborers and who only lived to get back to their own countries. Small numbers are still heading homeward, but a hard core of about 850,000 DP's will be left. The great majority of them are Christians with anti-Communist records, who dread political persecution at home. The minority of not more than one-fifth are Jews who fear religious persecution in their homelands.

Figures are cold and impersonal things. It is valuable to know, however, that among the million-odd DP's, there are 572,000 Poles, 190,000 Balts, 51,000 Yugoslavs, 11,000 Czechs, and a smattering of a dozen more racial groups. It is well to remember, too, that 52 percent of these people are women and children, and that 17 percent are under 16 years of age.

CONFUSION COSTS US MONEY

Thinking of them still in terms of statistics, it is costing the United States Government about $300,000,000 a year to support those who are in our zones of Germany and Austria. We have about half of the total group. The money we are spending on them is doing nothing but keep them alive, which is a dubious favor on our part. Life without hope is a grim commodity.

One look at a displaced persons' camp has the uncomfortable effect of turning dead statistics into live human beings. These are not brute beasts who can be kept indefinitely in a corral, but men, women, and children

who want to live a normal life of their own. They have been marking time since the end of the war, nearly 2 years ago, living in slightly renovated concentration camps, waiting for a door to open to them somewhere in the world. They are a cross-section of humanity. Some are highly intellectual college professors, lawyers, doctors; many are artisans and small tradesmen; a large number are peasants whose knowledge and experience is on the land.

America is not going to force these people to go home, to what they believe would be persecution and death. If we adopted such a policy, it would be greeted by mass suicides. We surely are not going to let them stay on indefinitely in the camps, where they cannot produce their own livelihood and can only act as a continual drain on the American taxpayer.

[From the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., of Feb. 12, 1947]

HOW CAN WE DEAL WITH THE DP'S?—UNLESS WE DECIDE ON A COURSE OF ACTION, THE DP'S ARE GOING TO BE A COSTLY BURDEN ON OUR HANDS

(By Barry Bingham)

What are we going to do about the displaced persons of Europe? As cited in this space yesterday, there are about 850,000 of them who would literally rather die than go back to their native lands. About one-fifth of them are Jews, who fear religious persecution in Poland, where pogroms have recently occurred. Four-fifths are Christians, most of whom fear political persecution because they have anti-Communist records.

There are four courses which America might pursue in dealing with this human problem. One is to let the DP's stay forever in former concentration camps, at a cost of $300,000,000 a year to the American taxpayer. Another is to abandon them and let them starve. A third is to try to force them on other countries, while insisting that we ourselves can give shelter to none of them in the United States. The fourth is to take the lead in distributing them among various nations by offering to take a limited number into this country.

The first two solutions seem out of the question, as too expensive and too brutal. The third is the course we have been tacitly following, though we have never officially adopted it and it is not sanctioned by any of our responsible leaders. It has produced no results to date, for almost none of the DP's have been resettled in new countries.

REASON BATTLES WITH PREJUDICE

The fourth solution has both logic and humanity on its side, but it unfortunately creates an emotional block in many American minds. The Citizens' Committee on Displaced Persons has proposed admitting 400,000 DP's into the country in the next 4 years, and no agency has suggested a larger figure. There is no rational basis for dread that a nation of 145,000,000 people will be swamped by a mere 400,000, more than half of whom are women and children under eighteen.

The proposal seems less alarming, too, when we consider how little immigration we have had in the last few years. The United States has long had quotas on immigration, totaling about 153,000 a year from all foreign countries combined. During the period 1940–46, then, we were prepared to accept 1,071,000 people under our quotas, but only about 170,000 came. We had places for about 900,000 people we would have taken in during those years if they had presented themselves. Why should we not have the same places for at least half of them now?

General Marshall has requested legislation for entry of displaced persons into this country, a proposal which will soon come before Congress. We would go back and pick up part of the unused immigration quotas for the war years, and select some 400,000 refugees we are willing to admit. There would be no change in the basic quotas for the future. There would be the standard immigration restrictions against anarchists, persons who would overthrow our Government by violence, criminals, and all of known bad moral character. The screening would be much more efficient than under normal immigration, for American authorities have full records on the DP's and could readily exclude undesirable applicants.

Not a one of the DP's would become a charge upon the community. Organizations and individuals are already pledged to take financial responsibility for all those admitted. Many would become producers in this country, using their skills to create employment for American workers. The housing shortage would be little affected by their admission, as nearly all have relatives in this country who would take them into their own houses.

THE DP'S WOULD BE AN ASSET

The American Federation of Labor has recently endorsed the "recapturing" of wartime quotas for the use of displaced persons. Church groups are taking the same position. Organized labor shows that it does not fear the competition of these refugees, a large proportion of whom are farmers who would help to meet a shortage of farm labor.

There are eminently practical reasons for America to take the lead in placing the displaced persons. General McNarney, the commanding general of our military forces in Europe, has said that our occupation troops in Germany could be cut sharply if the DP's were moved out of the country. At present they are a dead expense on our hands.

The moral reasons for coming to their rescue hardly need recital. One of the proudest of American traditions lies in the fact that this country gave harbor to the victims of religious and political persecution. The Pilgrim Fathers came to our shores for those very reasons. The same impetus sent thousands of German families to America after the revolution of 1848, and this country has had few more useful citizens. America was built by refugees from foreign lands. Is it any wonder that the world looks to us today for an act of leadership?

Philippine-American Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, today Vice President Elpidio Quirino of the new Republic of the Philippines brought to the members of the National Press Club at luncheon a message of friendship from the Philippine people to all Americans. So that Members of Congress and readers of the RECORD may share in the message he has brought, I am placing his speech in the RECORD today.

In addition to his duties as Vice President of the Philippines, Mr. Quirino is also Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines where his long experience in government under the American flag in the Philippines is now serving him well. He is truly a friend of the United States, for during the war which so recently ravaged the Philippines, his wife and several of his children were killed by the Japanese because of his family's resistance of Japanese occupation.

His speech is as follows:

OUR BID FOR SURVIVAL

I have come before you to introduce the new Philippine Republic which is the first independent state to be launched after the Second World War. It was born under the cross-fire of powerful enemies, and it received the most cruel baptism for having sided stanchly with the United States and remaining loyal to her to the last. As a grateful and steadfast depository of all that is noble and great in American colonial policy, the Philippines of today is the new America of the East. We are proud to be the daughter republic of the United States of America, and our ambition is to make this new nation strong and enduring, a worthy example of America's work as a leader among nations.

I have come to this country in compliance with a national obligation to convey in person to President Truman and to the Government and people of the United States the deep appreciation of the Filipino people for the liberty and freedom granted us by the United States, and for America's continued concern to make this her handiwork a real blessing to 18,000,000 Filipinos.

It is very fortunate that the liberation of the Philippines occurred before August 5, 1945, otherwise our fate might have been worse. Certainly, it could have been worse. As you will remember, the Japanese made our homeland the south Pacific bulwark of their mainland. They had us in their grip for more than 3 long years. If they had held out as they proposed to do, and if our guerrillas had not continuously thwarted their every move to consolidate to strengthen their defenses, Manila could have been Hiroshima or Nagasaki. Who knows?

Nevertheless, if the Philippines did not suffer from the atomic bombs, the destruction wrought upon her by the invasion and enemy occupation and finally by the war of liberation was far more extensive and heavier than that suffered by Japan, or any other theater of war. So as a result of this great catastrophe to our land and people, we are today faced with the tremendous task of reconstruction and rehabilitation. The task involves the restoration of what has been taken away or destroyed. We know there is no power on earth that can restore the lives of over a million of our people—1,111,938 persons so far accounted for—that the enemy made us pay for his wanton cruelty and to which our civilian population was the heaviest contributor.

More than the task of reconstruction and rehabilitation, which will certainly take us years and years to achieve, our immediate problem is one of reorientation and national survival. We who are lucky enough to have outlived the inhumanities and brutalities of a bloodthirsty and power-drunk enemy, know only too well the years of heavy labor and hard-thinking required in order to heal the shattered spirit and shake off the hateful regimentation imposed upon our lives by threats and tortures.

The sad history of my sun-kissed land is that every successive invader tried to fashion it after his own. The Republic of the Philippines is, therefore, essentially the product of a singular evolution. Its beginnings date back to the time when adventurous sea rovers in the Pacific reached the islands' hospitable shores and thereon established their homes. They tilled the land and prospered. They built commerce and fostered cultural intercourse with neighboring peoples and with eastern powers and races. In 1521 Magellan brought to this corner of the then eastern isolated world western culture and civilization. From then on the blending of western and eastern cultures took place,

resulting in the establishment of Christianity and an enlightened social and political system, and, finally, under the American regime, in the birth of a true democracy, the first one to rise in the Far East.

It took no less than 400 years for the Filipino people to complete this process amidst throes and hardships which tested their every mettle to live or perish, such as the endeavors of the Spanish, the English, the Dutch, the Portuguese, the Japanese of the feudal era, the Chinese of Limahong, and lastly, the Americans in 1898, to subjugate them. Each nation tried to wipe out what the previous one had achieved or accomplished so as to establish a new order of things. However, despite the odds against them the Filipino people went through all these processes as a matter of evolutionary development, and if today they are faced with the problem of national survival as they never were so faced before in their lives, they know that from their own past they can draw sound and deep inspiration for the future.

Thus, the international character of their history makes the Filipino people feel almost akin to all the peoples of the world. While they always resisted every foreign invader and felt grievances against all and every one of the peoples who tried to dominate and subjugate them, they never entertained any lasting hatred against anyone because in the end their patience and endurance invariably won for them new strength, new courage, and even new friends.

With an abiding source of inspiration such as this, the Filipinos are trying today to establish the foundations of their Republic. But what would have been the material groundwork of this endeavor unfortunately was blasted away in the last war. The joint effort of the United States and the Philippines to build an enduring economic structure for an independent and democratic government in the Far East, a joint work of 48 years, is well-nigh obliterated. The work must be done all over again, if the newly established Republic is to become not a mere shell but the symbol of a vigorous state capable of maintaining its position among the nations of the world.

What this work means will perhaps be better understood if we make a brief recapitulation of the present devastation of Philippine economy. The total value of damages and losses in the Philippines resulting from the last World War, as of November 5, 1946, is estimated by American and Filipino experts at approximately $6,000,000,000.

The casualty loss, evaluated in terms of economic wealth, is estimated at 74.5 percent of the total damages.

The next item is damage to real estate improvements amounting to 5 percent of the total value and consisting of Government edifices, buildings for industrial, commercial and financial purposes, and private residential houses. The estimated prewar value of this item is $1,351,000,000. The damages actually sustained is $1,104,000,000, or 80 percent of the whole.

Japanese military notes, which were issued and circulated by the Japanese military government in payment for goods and services, rank third, representing 4.9 percent of the total losses.

The fourth item in the list of war damages and losses, described as industrial, commercial, financial, and public-utility properties and mining, excluding buildings, represents 4.8 percent of the total value. Our prewar shipping, which was valued at $75,000,000, sustained a loss of $70,000,000, thus 95 percent of the whole has been destroyed. Damage to agriculture amounted to $145,585,395.

The fifth item is made up of personal and household effects, representing 3.8 percent of the total losses. Then follow agricultural products and implements, public works, Government office furniture and fixtures, properties of Government corporations, and libraries, in the order named.

These figures vividly describe the material loss of the Philippines. The destruction of capital equipment and prewar industries and transportation facilities, and the shortage, if not absence, of capital to buy new machineries and equipment to replace them, are the principal deterrent factors in the immediate rehabilitation of Philippine economy.

Production, by this very reason, is at an extremely low level. The domestic and foreign trade of the country, which before the war was dependent upon the export crops, has greatly shrunk. The disruption of our transportation, communication, and port facilities is also contributing to the slow revival of business. While crops may be raised in many localities, they cannot be moved out on account of the high cost of transportation. The problem of distribution is accordingly acute.

With livestock, particularly work animals, depleted, many farms remain uncultivated. The sugar industry, depending largely on sugar mills, is slow in reviving because sugar centrals destroyed have not as yet been replaced. Mining is in the same predicament. The production of gold which came second to sugar in value of our exports before the war has not started due to lack of mining equipment and adequate capital.

Other industries, such as the lumber, cigar, furniture, and some household industries, have not recovered their prewar footing in Philippine economy.

Before the war, our pleadings with the Government of the United States were somewhat in the nature of demands for increased quotas in our shipments of sugar, Manila cigars, cordage and coconut oil to the American market, as Philippine economy had an excess of these commodities. Today, what a paradox. Our pleas are for a greater allocation of rice and sugar for consumption in the Philippines.

Again, before the war, we not only had balanced our yearly budgets, but succeeded in reducing our public indebtedness year after year. Our budget, like that of the United States, was an elaborate statement of income and expenditures. In fact, our statement of expected revenues was more impressive than the statement of expenditures.

Now, for the first time in our political experience our finances are strained, and we must explore all potential sources. There are many ways of borrowing money which are open to an independent government with undeveloped wealth and credit and with a good record of past performances. For the first time also in our national existence, we have come to realize that it is neither a disgrace nor a confession of national weakness to borrow when borrowing is justified by one's needs and ability to meet obligations.

The rehabilitation of our major industries at an early date must be accomplished. Our sugar industry, because of world shortage of sugar, has top priority. The procurement of a better variety of sugar seedlings, the restoration of transportation facilities, and the reconstruction of the mills, these are urgently needed to rehabilitate the sugar industry. Our gold mines, the source of an annual national income of over $40,000,000 before the war, must also receive immediate attention. The Philippine Government is definitely committed to a long-range program of rebuilding our economic structure on the prewar basis, and the groundwork for this undertaking has been laid. This program may not be as complete as the situation demands, but we have started it and we mean to press toward a speedy and successful end.

The people and Government of the United States have generously extended the initial help. The war damages voted by the United States Congress amounting to $400,000,000 will be paid in the course of 4 or 5 years to citizens of the Philippines and the United States who suffered property losses. In addition, the Philippine Government will receive approximately $120,000,000 for the reconstruction of roads and highways and the replacement of public buildings completely destroyed during the war. Likewise, American war surplus materials, some of which are usable for agricultural and industrial purposes, have been turned over to the Philippine Government.

Because the Philippine Government does not derive at present any revenues of consequence from taxation as a result of the impoverished condition of the Islands' major industries, we have obtained a loan of $75,000,000 from the United States to meet budgetary requirements of the national government this year.

The preferential trade agreement between the United States and the Philippines, which will continue for 28 years from 1946, is, in the considered opinion of experts on Philippine affairs, the most important single factor in our rehabilitation program.

Upon the initiative of President Roxas, there has recently been created the Philippine Rehabilitation Finance Corporation, capitalized at $150,000,000, so as to provide government agencies and private individuals with the necessary means with which to rebuild our homes or to finance or rehabilitate our ruined industries.

But when all these are said and done, there yet remains a wide gap toward the complete restoration of Philippine economy. Considered against the over-all background of real Philippine reconstruction and rehabilitation, these measures, I might say, are largely of a remedial nature. In a recent plebiscite held to amend the Constitution of the Philippines, the Filipino people voted to extend the same rights to American citizens as those enjoyed by them in the development of their natural resources and the operation of public utilities for a period of 28 years. They have done this fully realizing that the initial measures already undertaken alone cannot cope with the vast reconstruction program without the active participation of private capital and technical experience.

Let it not be understood that the Philippines is inspired only by self-interest. Much as she desires to have her economy reestablished and to see it working normally at this critical period, when nations are starving and suffering for lack of food and shelter, she knows that with the immediate rehabilitation of her industries, principally agriculture, lumber and mining, she can be of great help to a needy world. For example, because her coconut industry miraculously escaped war destruction, she was able soon after the close of the war to export large quantities of copra which partly supplied the world's acute needs for fats and oils. In a similar measure, she was able to provide the world with abaca and rope which had become critical materials during the 3 years in which the Philippines was under enemy occupation. Likewise, the early revival of the Philippine sugar industry can partly satisfy the present world shortage of this commodity, and the same thing can be said of the export of lumber, which industry is only awaiting the replacement of destroyed mills to resume the sale of its products abroad, particularly Philippine mahogany, which today is in great demand everywhere.

Not for a billion dollars or any amount of money in the world would we Filipinos barter our birthright. In granting equal rights to American citizens in the development of our resources and public utilities, we are fully certain that the Philippines can absorb any amount of American capital and still be able to reward it adequately because our resources are tremendously rich. And in

making such a particular offer to the citizens of the United States, our decision is not merely guided by our desire to enlist American financial assistance and technical guidance but by the conviction that we can offer, too, through this means, the best returns that American capital and technical knowledge can have anywhere in the world under the present circumstances. Where in the world today can Americans trade freely without being afraid of run-away inflation and bloc currencies? Our Philippine peso is tied by law to the American dollar at the ratio of 2 to 1.

Under the military base agreement recently approved by the Governments of the United States and the Philippines, the United States has shown its determination to provide both countries with mutual protection. The Philippines, too, on her own part, has assured the people of the United States of her willingness to share with them not only the use of her territory but of her manpower to help preserve the peace of the world and extend her aid to the United States whenever it is needed for the protection of her interests in the Far East. Under the provisions of this agreement these bases have also been made available to the United Nations. Security is thus insured under this joint guaranty not only for the safety of American life but also of American investments.

The two pacts, the trade agreement and the base agreement, providing for the economic and military security of the two countries, have brought them into closer relationships of mutual trust than was the case, I dare say, before the grant of Philippine independence.

To us Filipinos no factor can better strengthen the links that presently exist between the United States and the Philippines than the readiness with which the people of the United States will come to participate in the rebuilding of our industries and economic life in their critical state. After all, our present deplorable situation as a result of the Great War is not completely of our own making. At this juncture, may I recall also the great sacrifices of our people who fought and survived the war—the veterans and the widows and their families—whose sufferings have not yet ended and who expect but justice and generous assistance from this great Government of the United States. We ask American help not in terms of charity but in terms of mutual benefit. We want to be in a position, morally and materially, to discharge all our obligations to the United States and to share with the American people the benefits to be derived from sound and legitimate enterprise pursued in the spirit of partnership. We certainly need you, and we feel that you need us, too, in many ways. The strength of America today is the guaranty of our security, and a reinvigorated Philippines, drawing inspiration from your democratic teachings and ideals, will add to your power. Whatever investment you make in the Philippines, material or spiritual, will be an invaluable asset in America's leadership of the world.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as indicative of the fact that those who have demonstrated most intense interest in the success of the United Nations consider the Greek-Turkey aid bill which we have passed a necessary step toward world peace and the actual strengthening of the Organization itself, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of the policy committee of the Rochester United Nations Association, published in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle:

TRUMAN POLICY NECESSARY, ROCHESTER GROUP ADMITS—SUBSTANTIAL PORTION OF REPORT OF POLICY COMMITTEE TO MEMBERS OF ROCHESTER UN ASSOCIATION

Your policy committee feels that the members of the United Nations Association have a right to expect a statement on the President's program for action in Greece and Turkey.

One of the unfortunate consequences of the President's announcement was that it brought about a feeling on the part of thousands of our citizens that war was nearer. We do not want war and we may be sure that Russia wants it as little as we do. Our position of gigantic strength and power in this world forces leadership upon us.

We can say with unanimous and definite conviction that without this move Russia might well have maneuvered into a position of dominance in Europe and the Near East incompatible with lasting security to the rest of the world.

We can say that while the UN has made considerable advance in its many councils, very little progress has been made in giving it power in the military sense. Until the United Nations can be endowed with force that is superior to any nation we remain in an era of national power in which the balance can be maintained only through national action of various degrees and natures.

We recognize the grave dangers of such a situation. We recognize the questionable character of the precedent which we are setting both because it is on the line of national, rather than international, action and also because it obligates us to support types of government which are not, in the American sense of the word, democratic.

The committee, therefore, makes the following recommendations to its members:

1. That the Truman policy toward Greece and Turkey be supported if all its implications are directed toward strengthening the UN as the agent to secure peace.

2. That the members of the association recognize that this can be done if:

(a) The Vandenberg-Austin amendments, providing for the early assumption by the United Nations of responsibility for the situation in the Near East, not only are accepted but are made the objective of the program as it develops in the near future.

(b) Immediate attention be given to the promulgation of a strong program for the transfer of strong military forces under the UN and that urgent and immediate steps be taken to press this program to a successful conclusion.

3. That the United States move to accomplish the transfer of the problem to the UN at the earliest practical moment.

4. That the United States indicate that the policy shows the absolute necessity for strengthening the UN militarily and financially to the extent that it is able to give security to the world as a whole.

5. That the Truman policy be used as an implied warning to other nations that our unilateral action is inconsistent with long range planning for peace and will be carried out by the United Nations as the organization to maintain peace.

6. That we recognize that this move which we must make focuses attention upon this basic fact; it is only through the United Nations and its full and complete implementation that hope for permanent peace can develop.

7. That the United States grasp the leadership in putting under way the Food and Agriculture Organization rehabilitation program for Greece.

8. That the members of the association transmit these views to their Representatives in Congress.

Members of the policy committee of the Rochester Association for the United Nations are: Gregory Smith, chairman; Mrs. David M. Allyn, Dr. Sidney Barnes, Harry D. Goldman, Ann Hale, Julius Loos, the Reverend Justin W. Nixon, Edward M. Ogden, Dr. Dexter Perkins, Dr. Glyndon Van Deusen, and Mrs. Rex Wilsey.

Giving Away Our Great Lakes Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the State Department in its eagerness to do something for foreign governments has negotiated a treaty with England giving away control of our Great Lakes fisheries and jurisdiction over the lands owned by the several States. I am including herewith a resolution by Mr. Krueger adopted by the Ohio House of Representatives on May 8, 1947, memorializing the United States Senate to disapprove the action of the State Department:

House Resolution 73

Resolution memorializing the United States Senate to disapprove a convention between the United States of America and Canada, relating to fisheries of the Great Lakes and their connecting waters, signed at Washington April 2, 1946

Whereas a convention was negotiated and signed April 2, 1946, with the objective of providing for the development, protection, and conservation of the fisheries of the Great Lakes by joint action of governmental agencies of the United States and Canada; and

Whereas as a means for achieving such objective the convention creates an international commission for the Great Lakes fisheries; and

Whereas if such convention becomes effective, Ohio and other States of the Union having responsibility and valuable interests in such fisheries will lose jurisdiction over the same; and

Whereas the inclusion of the waters of Lake Erie in the proposed international treaty delegates forever the sovereign rights of the United States and of the State of Ohio to an international governmental agency; and

Whereas the interests of the State of Ohio in these waters and fisheries will best be served if the convention is not ratified; and

Whereas the citizens of Ohio are very much opposed to the convention establishing an international authority over such fisheries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ohio House respectfully memorializes the Senate of the United States to disapprove ratification of the convention between the United States and Canada relating to fisheries of the Great Lakes and connecting waters signed at Washington April 2, 1946; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Senate of the United States, to each Ohio Member of said

House, and to the Governors of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, and Illinois; and be it further

Resolved, That the Attorney General of Ohio be directed to inform appropriate Federal authorities of the desire of the State of Ohio to intervene before the appropriate senatorial committee in opposition to the treaty creating such international commission.

Adopted by the house of representatives May 8, 1947.

Attest:

CARL GUESS, *Clerk*.

Progress in Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N. C., which outlines the economic and cultural progress in race relations in North Carolina:

PROGRESS IN RACE RELATIONS

For a long time North Carolina unashamedly used its Negroes as stepping stones for the whites in their struggle for economic and cultural progress. This course of action has now been reversed and exchanged for a more humane, enlightened, democratic, and hopeful one. North Carolina is now doing much—maybe not all it possibly can but the State is unquestionably straining itself—to give its Negro citizens an education in order that they may make their economic and cultural contributions to the life of the State and the South.

Some of the things the State has done are summarized by Burke Davis in the Baltimore Evening Sun. For instance, this State invests more than $10,000,000 a year in Negro schools exclusive of higher education. No less than 11 of the Nation's 16 four-year Negro colleges are in North Carolina. Salaries for Negro teachers have been equalized with those for white teachers, with the rather startling result that the average Negro teacher now has slightly more college training than the average white teacher. Between 1923 and 1942 the number of Negro school children in the State rose from 4,700 to 32,000; the number of standard Negro schools from 11 to 180; the number of high-school graduates from 380 to 4,700; and the circulation of Negro libraries from nothing to more than 1,000,000 volumes. We do not have the statistics for the progress which was made between 1942 and the present, but it is considerable.

North Carolina's faith in democratic principles is having its effect not only within the State but throughout the South. As Dr. James E. Shepard, president of the North Carolina College at Durham, has pointed out, "the leaders in many other States watch carefully what is going on in North Carolina in the field of race relations. They consult the leaders of this State to find out what plans have been formulated, and how these plans are to be carried out. This is most significant when we consider the fact, unfortunate though it may be, that so many of the things that the better thinking people of the South know should be done for the Negro are not done because of some traditional fear of the results. These people are unwilling to follow the suggestion or leadership of any outside group, but if another Southern State can abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, if it can let down the bars of party primaries, if it can equalize teachers' salaries, and do all these things without any friction or strife and without undesirable results, then the arguments of the opposers in other States are destroyed, and the courage of those who favor these just measures is strengthened by the example of North Carolina."

There is no doubt, as one of the Regulators said with more of wisdom than grammar in the early days of our history, that "though there is a few men who have the gift or art of reasoning, yet every man has a feeling and knows when he has justice done him as well as the most learned." The continuous cultivation of such a feeling is the only substantial foundation which good race relations can rest on securely.

"Democracy," said President Shepard, "is that audacious belief of our people that in the most ordinary men there are resident the most extraordinary possibilities, and that if we keep the doors of opportunity open to them they will amaze us with their achievements." If there is a better definition of democracy, we haven't run across it.

We stand a good chance of continuing on our progressive course as long as we do not allow ourselves to be deflected from our goal and led astray by the will-o'-the-wisp of social equality into the swamps of semantics or against the cliffs of custom.

The white leadership of North Carolina should not be fearful of or apologetic for its course of conduct which is not only just and generous but which in the long run will work out for the benefit of all of us if our faith in democracy is worth its salt.

Control of Airport Control Towers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert in the RECORD the telegram which I have received from Mr. Allen Rubottom, who is manager of the municipal airport at Fort Worth, Tex. Mr. Rubottom expresses the best reasons why the Civil Aeronautics Administration should not relinquish its control of the airport control towers at the various municipal airports throughout the United States. The Federal Government regulates all commercial planes in flight and I see no reason why the Civil Aeronautics Administration should give over to the cities the regulation of the planes as they approach the fields. I am hoping the Congress will make sufficient appropriation for a continuation of this vital service. The telegram reads as follows:

The American Association of Airport Executives in annual convention at Chicago and as a special first order of business request that you present to the Congress immediately its unanimous and urgent protest against the elimination from CAA appropriations of funds for the operation of air-traffic control towers. This association composed of airport managers and executives of wide experience in aviation, and from localities with the heaviest volume of air traffic, are amazed at the elimination of funds for this key agency on which is dependent the safety of air commerce and the life of every pilot and air passenger on air-line or any other aircraft. Congress must reinstate funds for the Federal operations of air-traffic control towers or take the responsibility for the complete break-down of a system of flight control which has been proven the safest in the world.

ALLEN RUBOTTOM.

Western States Penalized by Interior Department Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Western States, where reclamation, irrigation, and hydroelectric-power projects are so badly needed to sustain and expand the economy of that area, are suffering a severe penalty by the extreme economy recommended by the Appropriations Committee in the Interior Department bill.

The development of the Central Valley water project, which was largely curtailed during the war years, is of vital importance not only to California but to the Nation.

The development of the Colorado River, which was also postponed during the war years, is of equal importance, and especially since we have now entered into a treaty with Mexico for a sustained flow of water from the Colorado and Rio Grande Rivers for use below the border.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution recently adopted by the board of commissioners of the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, which expresses the sentiment of the people of southern California on this important subject:

Resolution 949

Whereas the United States has invested some hundreds of millions of dollars in the partial construction of various authorized reclamation projects; and

Whereas until these projects are completed they cannot earn the revenues which were contemplated by the Congress as a basis of their authorization; and

Whereas a minimum regard for sound business principles requires that these projects be promptly completed and converted into operating, revenue-producing assets of the United States; and

Whereas the existing and immediately prospective market for electric power for domestic and industrial use must be met promptly, and the consumers cannot abide some more convenient time for the construction of hydroelectric projects by the United States; and

Whereas failure to install the necessary hydroelectric facilities will require that this demand be met by the annual consumption of tens of millions of barrels of fuel oil from our irreplaceable reserves; and

Whereas the natural hydroelectric resources of the United States should not

remain undeveloped at a time when the people have urgent need for the power; and

Whereas the prudent authorization and construction of reclamation projects must be preceded by years of study and planning; and

Whereas any period of curtailed construction should properly be a period of increased activity in the field of study and planning of potential projects; and

Whereas the sums proposed by the House of Representatives to be appropriated to the support of the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of Interior are wholly inadequate to achieve any of these results: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to increase the proposed appropriation to the support of the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of Interior to an extent at least sufficient:

1. To permit completion of all partially constructed units of reclamation projects as promptly as sound planning and orderly progress will permit;

2. To permit prompt construction and installation of hydroelectric facilities in every proper case in which the potential power demand justifies the investment, and particularly in every case in which the paramount interest of the United States in interstate commerce, navigation, flood control, and reclamation is such that any dam and reservoir constructed at that site should, in the opinion of Congress, be owned and controlled by the United States;

3. To permit an adequate and accelerated program research, study, and planning of potential reclamation projects.

General Vandegrift's Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dayton Herald:

The plea of General Vandegrift, Marine Corps Commandant, that the bill to unify the armed services be amended so as to assure the continuance of the corps revives in us the same thought we had when first we heard of the matter: The American people are unpleasantly surprised to hear that there is any doubt as to the future of the marines.

Surely, at this late date in its history there is no need to attempt to justify the existence of the corps.

The two amendments which General Vandegrift stressed in his plea before the Senate Armed Services Committee are simple ones. The Herald discussed them some time ago.

The first would define the functions of the branches of the armed services, including the marines. The second would expressly permit the naming of Marine officers to the joint bodies which the unification bill seeks to set up.

It is difficult to see what serious objections can be raised to these two amendments. One cannot conceive that they in any way would hinder the desired unification of the armed services. And they would assure the Marine Corps' future.

No one, of course, is urging openly that the Marine Corps be disbanded. But the framers of the unification bill have managed so to ignore the corps that the marine fears are wholly reasonable. The Vandegrift amendments would allay those fears.

Giving Away Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the executive side of the Government has been very eager to give away America, particularly with reference to a treaty President Truman signed with England giving away control of our Great Lakes fisheries and the jurisdiction over the lands owned by the several States. I am including the following thoughtful editorial covering the facts by Spencer Canary, editor of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio:

GIVING AWAY FISHERIES

The Ohio Legislature's resolution, presented by Senator Fred L. Adams, is in line with the speech made in the House of Representatives on December 20, 1945, by our Congressman, ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

At that time Mr. WEICHEL, a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, protested against the action of the President in carrying on secret negotiations with England on behalf of Canada, whereby the rights of the States bordering on the Great Lakes would be taken away by the Federal Government and given to a joint fishery commission composed of three Canadians and three Americans. Mr. WEICHEL at that time introduced a bill ordering the State Department to cease its efforts toward such a treaty.

Mr. WEICHEL at that time pointed out that nearly 80 percent of the fish resources and fish food production of the Great Lakes is produced by Americans in the waters of the various Great Lakes States. He also said that this proposed treaty would give control to such partly foreign commission not only to the lakes but also to the connecting waters, bays and component parts of each of the lakes.

Thus, it is not unlikely that in this section the Maumee River would be affected as well as the Portage and Toussaint and all other rivers that empty into the lakes. Nor is it an exaggeration to picture the drinking water supply of cities like Toledo and Cleveland that have cribs in lakes, would be subjects of controversy, for America knows from experience that treaties have some elasticity which a needy country tries to stretch almost, if not quite, to the breaking point.

Every school pupil knows that back in the early days of our country there was controversy over the boundary line between Canada and the United States. Especially was this true of the section including the present States of Washington and Oregon. This was due to the Canadian claim to the Columbia River because of the Hudson Bay Co.'s exploration there and by right of using it, while the United States based its claim on the Lewis and Clark Expedition and an earlier Spanish claim which was transferred to our Nation in the Louisiana Purchase of 1803 and in 1819, when Florida was sold to the United States.

So violent did the Northwest settlers become that the Oregon Territory threatened to secede if its claims were not adequately protected by the United States. Eventually the famous cry of "54–40 or fight" was raised; and for a time it looked in 1846 like war would have to settle the dispute. This meant that the boundary line was to extend to that latitude of 54°40'.

The treaty of 1818 with Great Britain had fixed the north boundary line west to the crest of the Rocky Mountains at 49 degrees; but it had left the land west and north of that open for 10 years for occupancy by both countries. Following this in 1824, Russia concluded a treaty with the United States acknowledging her southern boundary to be 54°40' north latitude. Finally, in 1846 a compromise treaty with Great Britain was ratified which established the present boundary at the forty-ninth parallel and the main channel through the Straits of Juan de Fuca. Then followed the century of peace with Canada which was celebrated June 15, 1946, especially in the Northwest.

Thus, the proposed treaty with reference to fisheries, which Congressman WEICHEL, Senator Adams, and the Ohio Legislature protest, would, in effect, change the boundary line which has stood for over 100 years, since it would acquire the same right over theirs, while the adjacent States would have nothing but arguments as to their interests. Let the Congress insist on keeping these interests.

Marine Corps Critics Should Speak Openly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dayton Journal:

The value of opposition even to worth while measures is being demonstrated today in the unification hearings before the Senate Armed Forces Committee. Were Senator ROBERTSON of Wyoming not a foe of unification, the charges that a plot is afoot to reduce the Marine Corps to impotence might never have been brought to light.

Now the Wyoming Senator is digging deeper. General Vandegrift, the Marine Commandant, told the committee a year ago in closed session that "for some time I have been aware that the very existence of the Marine Corps stood as a continuing affront to the War Department." Moreover, he stated that documents held by the Joint Chiefs of Staff bore out his claim.

Senator ROBERTSON wants a look at those documents. So does the public. If there is any intention to deemphasize such an integral part of our armed services set-up, the only branch that is continually alerted for instant service, the branch with the highest esprit de corps, then the public is entitled to know about it. More than that, the public is entitled to know why.

Public statements from the brass in other branches leads one to believe that the Marine Corps is held in the same esteem by the Army as it is by the American people. If this is not true, the public of this Nation, which now itself has a high percentage of veterans from all branches, needs to be informed on the reasons for such prejudice.

Let's have the story—the whole story. Let critics of the Marine Corps present the case at the bar of public opinion. Star chamber politics has no place in so vital a matter.

Proposed United States of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorials:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 11, 1947]

REPORTS AMERICANS SEEK UNITED EUROPE—COUDENHOVE-KALERGI SAYS PUBLIC OPINION IS FOR IT

PARIS, May 9.—American opinion, both public and official, strongly approves the formation of a United States of Europe, Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, president of the Pan-European Union, said here Friday.

Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, who has just returned to Europe from the United States, said "Americans simply can't understand why we on the Continent have tolerated anarchy and autarchy instead of uniting within the type of federal structure that has made the United States the richest nation in the world."

The count predicted that the first step in achieving the ideal of a federalized Europe would be a union between England and France, and that Belgium and Holland would soon follow suit.

[From the Chattanooga Times of May 7, 1947]

AN ANNIVERSARY

Tomorrow is the second anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. And yet the world is far from being in a formal state of peace.

No treaties have been arranged for the principal enemy, Germany, or for Austria. The peace treaties with Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Finland were finally signed on February 10, 1947, 1¾ years after hostilities ended in Europe. But even these treaties have not been ratified and hence have not gone into effect.

A certain amount of opposition has arisen in the United States to ratifying the Italian treaty without changes.

The stalemate on the treaty with Germany has meant that actual drafting has not yet begun. A little more, but not much, has been accomplished on the Austrian treaty; and 1¾ years after the surrender of Japan not even preliminary discussions have been held on the peace treaty with that country.

VE-day came 11 months and 2 days after D-day when British-American-Canadian forces landed in Normandy. Two days before Rome had been captured by the Allies, but thereafter the campaign in Italy bogged down.

Four days after D-day, the Soviet forces launched their final offensive against Finland. Seventeen days after D-day the Red armies began their offensive against the main eastern front which was to carry them to Berlin.

Almost 2 years after the victory we find Europe in danger of slipping into chaos. While Secretary Marshall counsels patience, many students of world problems come forward with a plan. It calls for a union of western European states, predominantly economic but also to some extent political, into what has begun to be known as the United States of Europe.

Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas; Senator THOMAS, Democrat, of Utah, and Representative BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, have introduced in Congress a resolution reading in full "that the Congress favors a creation of the United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

Aristide Briand, 10 times premier of France, proposed such a union after World War I and it is now supported by Mr. Winston Churchill.

In order to secure peace in Europe, such a union seems necessary.

[From the Peoria Journal-Transcript of May 6, 1947]

A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE?

Secretary of State Marshall told the people of the United States in his radio report that Europe is slipping into chaos while nothing is being accomplished toward drafting of a peace treaty for Germany.

He indicated that he believed some action must be taken without waiting for Russia to decide she is ready to agree upon a treaty. But he did not reveal what plan he had in mind, if any.

Whether or not our State Department has a plan we do not know. But many students of world problems, both in Europe and the United States, do have a plan, one that has been suggested before. It calls for a union of western European states, predominantly economic but also to some extent political, into what has come to be known as a United States of Europe.

Senators FULBRIGHT and THOMAS and Representative BOGGS have introduced in Congress a resolution reading in full:

That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

As we have said, the idea is not new. Disregarding such early advocates as Henry IV, William Penn, Immanuel Kant, and Victor Hugo, the proposal was pushed after World War I by so practical a statesman as Aristide Briand, 10 times Premier of France.

In fact, under Briand's instigation the 27 European states that were members of the League of Nations met in Geneva in 1930 to discuss ways and means of creating a United States of Europe. The conference got nowhere fast. The delegates praised the principle but disagreed violently on how to achieve it. Some objected that a body outside the League would weaken the League. Others disagreed with the Briand thesis that political should precede economic unification. Others saw an attempt at economic and financial rivalry with the United States.

The Soviet Union was not represented. Some of the delegates at Geneva in 1930 thought it futile to project a United States of Europe with the largest and most populous European state left outside. Others even saw in the 1930 conference another attempt to strengthen the existing "cordon sanitaire" against Moscow.

Any move to create a United States of Europe in 1947 would in effect be an anti-Soviet move. The great difference would be that in 1930 the Soviet Union was on the defensive, in 1947 it is on the offensive. The move today would be an attempt to avert the chaos which is threatened by the Soviet tactics in international affairs and which the Soviet Union is widely suspected of actually desiring. If objection is raised that a union of western Europe now would create two worlds instead of one world visualized by the United Nations Charter, the answer would be that in actuality Europe is already divided into two worlds.

Many Americans observe blithely: "If the 13 States could create a Federal union in 1789, why can't the countries of Europe, at least of western Europe, create their own united states in 1947?" But the problem isn't so simple as that.

In 1789 the former British colonies had recently been united in war and had much the same attitude toward all foreign nations. In the war recently ended, Italy, Germany, and Austria were on the losing side; Spain was pro-Axis; Portugal, Switzerland, and Sweden remained neutral; and certain of the western European states harbor pro-Soviet minorities which are powerful both politically and economically.

If a United States of Europe is to be the solution to Europe's ills, it has many obstacles to overcome before it becomes a reality. The chances for success do not appear very good. Some other solution will have to be found.

[From the Montana Standard, Butte, Mont., of May 6, 1947]

WILL IT BE A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE?

As Europe slips further and further into chaos, a condition which some observers suspect is being fostered by the delaying tactics of the Soviet Union, the age-old plan of forming a United States of Europe has come again into the limelight. The new plan calls for a union of western European states into a predominantly economic, but to some extent political, United States of Europe. Senators FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, and THOMAS, Democrat, of Utah, and Representative BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, have introduced a resolution in Congress reading as follows:

"That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations."

In the past the idea has been advanced by such notables as Henry IV, William Penn, Immanuel Kant, Victor Hugo, and former Senator B. K. Wheeler. The proposal was pushed after World War I by Aristide Briand, 10 times premier of France, and is now supported by Winston Churchill.

Under Briand's instigation the 27 European states that were members of the League of Nations met in Geneva in 1930 to discuss ways and means of creating a United States of Europe. The conference was a failure. While the delegates praised the principle, they disagreed violently on how to achieve it. Some objected that such a body outside the League would weaken the League. Others disagreed with the Briand thesis that political should precede economic unification. Others saw an attempt at economic and financial rivalry with the United States.

The Soviet Union was not represented at the conference and some of the delegates thought it would be futile to project a United States of Europe without including the Soviet Union in on the plans. Others saw in the proposal another attempt to strengthen the existing "cordon sanitaire" against Moscow.

It is most likely that any move to create a United States of Europe in 1947 would be considered an anti-Soviet move, but there would be one great difference between now and 1930. In 1930 the Soviet Union was on the defensive; it most definitely is on the offensive today. The move today would be an attempt to avert the chaos which is threatened by Soviet tactics in international affairs and which the Soviet Union is widely suspected of actually desiring.

If objection is raised that a union of western Europe now would create two worlds instead of the one world visualized by the United Nations, then the answer would be that in actuality Europe is already divided into two worlds.

Many observers argue that if the Thirteen Original States could create a Federal Union in 1789, why can't the countries of Europe, at least western Europe, create their own United States in 1947?

But the problem isn't that simple.

In 1789 the former British Colonies had recently been united in war and had a suspicious attitude of all foreign nations. In the war recently ended there is no similar solidifying element. Italy, Germany, and Austria were on the losing side. Spain was in effect pro-Axis. Portugal, Switzerland, and Sweden remained neutral. And, in addition, certain western European states harbor pro-Soviet minorities which are powerful both politically and economically.

Curb on Reckless Spending Requires Public Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of May 10, 1947:

CURB ON RECKLESS SPENDING REQUIRES PUBLIC SUPPORT

Saving public money isn't a very exciting subject for an editorial, but in these days, at least, it has the virtue of being different.

Other than the harassed taxpayer who is carrying an unprecedented burden of income, sales, real estate, and intangible levies on his weary back, few are raising their voices in protest against a reckless draining off of public funds.

World-saving politicians, 90 percent of the metropolitan press and, oddly enough, big business management, seem to think there is no limit to America's capacity to pay for every worthy project and endeavor that is suggested.

It is considered modern to sneer at economy and to brand as reactionary anyone who questions huge appropriations for nonessential functions of Government which could be deferred until our financial house is put in order.

Most of the "do-gooders" in Congress are well-intentioned and honorable people, but they haven't the faintest conception of fundamental economics. They support all legislation labeled progressive and enlightened, without the slightest regard for the ultimate cost.

To an alarming degree, the metropolitan press has abdicated its role as public defender, and smears Members of Congress as visionless, little men when they challenge foreign loans and swollen departmental budgets.

Along with the growing concentration of industry and the disappearance of individually owned firms, industrial management has become as careless about Government expenditures as it is cautious about its own.

Many a business executive who insists that lead pencils and typewriter ribbons must get the maximum use sees nothing inconsistent in howling his head off for Federal funds to finance his pet local project.

The prevailing delusion is that somewhere, somehow, the money can be found to reduce taxes, balance the budget, curtail the national debt and bail out distressed nations all over the world.

CRITICS HINDER ECONOMY FIGHT

An economy-minded Republican majority in Congress is now drawing the wrath of the press and Washington bureaucracy for attempting to do precisely what it was elected to do.

Granting that the House has at times been clumsy in method, sizable reductions in Federal expenditures can and should be made. Some of the proposed cuts are extreme, particularly in the Interior Department. National parks and public power are a part of our national wealth and should be developed, not retarded.

No intelligent person questions the necessity for adequate national defense or the newest developments in aviation safety devices.

But when the Secretary of Commerce, Averell Harriman, says, "The proposed cut would result in a dimout of the light that business and Government require to make sound decisions," he is talking through his hat.

Perhaps the Secretary could name a few business concerns which depend upon Department of Commerce statistics and assistance to guide them in their day-by-day competitive decisions.

Mr. Harriman's sole contribution to the relief of the publishing industry was to announce at a public meeting that his Department was convinced that a serious shortage of newsprint exists.

MUST AMERICA "SELL" FREEDOM?

The State Department finds that the proposed elimination of its Voice of America broadcasts to foreign countries is proving embarrassing.

These broadcasts are part of a governmental propaganda program designed to sell the American way of life to other nations. Does it need selling? Is their way of life more attractive?

One would not think so from reading of the low standards of living in regimented Russia, of England's scanty diet and near economic collapse, of France's black markets and political instability.

While the fight for reductions in Government spending does not represent a scientific approach to the problem, the meat-ax methods may serve to sever a sizable number of useless jobholders from the Federal pay roll.

Federal agencies have been placed on the defensive where they must justify their expanded activities.

On several occasions President Truman has exhorted businessmen to lower prices, so that production may be increased and the national economy maintained at a high level.

Yet he stubbornly refuses to look with favor upon tax reductions which would encourage incentive and increase purchasing power. It is expected, however, that his views on tax reductions will undergo some political adjustment in 1948.

Punitive taxes have brought more than one nation to the wailing wall. Why should we follow the example of England, where venture capital is practically nonexistent?

In the United States, which is the sole remaining major citadel of capitalism in the world, the press should encourage, not condemn, reductions in the cost of government.

It should discourage States and municipalities from leaning upon the Federal Government for support. Federal aid should come only after they have demonstrated the ability to conduct their own affairs completely and without waste.

The Ohio Chamber of Commerce reminds us that although chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations, and other business organizations are constantly demanding Federal budget cuts, too many of them are likewise asking for exceptions in the cutting where it affects their local community and area projects.

The Ohio chamber correctly observes that under such conditions, the average Congressman could, with understandable bewilderment, abandon his determination to curb an extravagant government, leaving the Federal spenders and bureaus free to continue almost unlimited squandering.

LOANS TO STRAIN UNITED STATES RESOURCES

With passage of the Greco-Turkish loan virtually a certainty and further extension of the Truman doctrine yet to come, the lending resources of the United States will be subjected to a terrific strain.

England has already used up nearly half of our $3,750,000,000 loan to keep her economy from disintegrating. There is no good reason to believe that any of this money will ever be repaid.

Sly suggestions have come from Stalin that Russia will be far more "cooperative" if she can get a billion or two from the United States.

Financial help for Korea will soon get its first test in Congress. A loan to Hungary and increased aid to Austria follow Korea on President Truman's foreign-aid timetable. France and Italy are next.

The eventual cost of the so-called Truman doctrine is placed somewhere between seventeen and twenty billions of dollars, a sum approximating our total national debt in 1932.

LET'S SELECT THE ESSENTIAL

It is high time that we came to a true realization of the financial perils that lie ahead and swung into action against waste in government, whether it be local, State, or National.

Let no one convince you that all of the desirable projects undertaken by Government are essential, or that all Federal employees are devoted public servants who save your money and protect your interests.

The waste and inefficiency in Government bureaus is appalling. Civil service protects the incompetent. A Member of Congress can make life uncomfortable for any conscientious administrator who fires an employee from the Congressman's district for any cause.

The lazy, shoddy methods used in many Washington agencies would, if known to the general public, start a clamor for a house cleaning that would be heard from one end of Pennsylvania Avenue to the other.

So, if your Senator or Representative in Congress believes there is some justification for cutting the costs of government and making your tax dollars go further, he is more nearly right than wrong.

As a wartime ex-bureaucrat, I know whereof I speak.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Aid to Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

HEARD 'ROUND THE WORLD

The bill passed by the House last Friday for aid to Greece and Turkey carries the amount asked by President Truman and complies substantially with his other requests. There are a few minor changes from the Senate measure which should be easily adjusted in conference. All radical and emasculatory amendments proposed from the floor were easily beaten. On final roll call majorities of both parties voted "aye" and only 107 Members—less than a fourth of the total House membership—cast opposing ballots.

The noise and vehemence of the opposition during the preceding debate probably cheered Moscow. Given full play in American newspapers, some Americans got the impression that the measure might be beaten or mutilated by a coalition of isolationism, politics, and Henry-Wallace-ism. But the result decisively revealed bipartisan unity in the House, as well as the Senate, on the issue directly and vitally involving the Nation's foreign policy. Congress agrees with the administration that the time has come to take a stand in support of the United Nations' obligation to small nations—and against their virtual subjugation and absorption through force and intrigue by aggressive and expansionist neighbors.

News of the congressional stand travels around the world. It will even penetrate the iron curtain. And no matter how it may be misrepresented or distorted by Moscow propagandists, some of the folks behind that curtain will grasp, we believe, the true import of its message. Some gains for freedom and democracy overseas already have accrued from the frank enunciation of the so-called Truman doctrine, which is in essence an affirmation of United Nations doctrine. Lovers of democracy abroad take fresh hope and courage from its vigorous support by an American Congress whose decision in turn has the strong support of the great majority of the American people.

Ernest Foster Marlatt: Soldier, Editor, Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin has lost one of its outstanding citizens in the passing of Ernest Foster Marlatt, editor of the Kenosha Evening News, Kenosha, Wis.

"Ernie" Marlatt, as he was affectionately known, by all the people in Kenosha, and especially by his comrades of World War I, made an invaluable contribution to public opinion in his city and State. He was at all times ready to serve the public interest. His city was his primary concern, but he always maintained an avid interest in national affairs.

I came to know him quite intimately since entering public life. He often discussed national and international questions and many times we were on opposite sides. He was always gracious enough to respect my views and I had a high regard for his opinions. He had a convincing faith that no matter what happened to upset the equilibrium of this country the good sense of our people would ultimately restore it. He believed that this country should remain strong. In his opinion a universal military bill is "must legislation." His final editorial effort was on this theme and it will live forever as a monument to his memory. He was indeed an outstanding soldier, editor, and patriot.

Mr. Speaker, I include, as part of my remarks, the editorial referred to:

ERNEST FOSTER MARLATT

Ernest F. Marlatt, working as usual this morning only a few hours before his sudden death from a heart attack, wrote the following editorials. He also contributed his daily column Sidelights as his final stint. Those works are carried below in respect to the memory of his many years of community service and leadership.

LEGION SPEAKS OUT

While many organizations and individuals by the thousands dodge the issue, the American Legion comes out courageously for universal military training for the young men of this land and sets forth clearly the reasons for its stand. The Kenosha Post, No. 21, of the Legion has supported the national organization in this movement and is actively engaged in urging Members of Congress to act favorably on this proposal.

Deep in their hearts many other organizations and the public generally must realize, to some extent at least, that universal military training holds the key for this Nation to avoid some of the pitfalls into which it has fallen in the past. It is a measure which, contrary to what its opponents say, is designed to maintain peace and to prevent war. A strong America will be respected and will not be attacked. A weak America invites attack and will lead to war.

This is not only theory; it is also fact. The history of our country for the past three decades has demonstrated it without any fear of successful refutation.

Universal military training is one of the important links in the chain of maintaining the potential military strength of our Nation at a standard which would prevent war.

The American Legion and other veteran organizations is made up of those who served in two wars to restore the blessings of peace when the world had been at war. They saw some of their comrades die because unpreparedness had failed to give them the training which they might have had and should have had. They have realized that this unpreparedness invited the wars until they could not be escaped. They do not want this to happen again.

They know, too, that if such training can be divorced from the dangers of war—and universal military training plans hold out that hope—this training will benefit the individual. Opponents of universal military training at times try to point out that such training will harm the individual but if we accept that thesis, all those millions of young men of the present generation who so bravely and courageously answered the call to the colors were spoiled thereby. That means your boy and my boy, your brother or your husband. But we know that this is not the case. We know that in the great majority of cases they were benefited by this training and more eager and better prepared to take up the careers which they are to follow.

It was war that brought the gold stars and the injuries. That is what we want to prevent, and universal military training holds the best chance of preventing war in the future.

The American Legion has sounded the tocsin on this needed measure. We feel obligated and are glad to support it in the best interests of our country and of its youth.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Labor Herald, a Wilmington, Del., newspaper.

This editorial is significant and timely. May I point out in particular the very high and justified compliment the editor directed to the National Guard in the closing words of his editorial:

To the community, the guard is a proud local asset. It represents public service of the highest order.

The editorial is as follows:

THE NATIONAL GUARD

One of George Washington's most famous statements was this: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual ways of preserving peace."

That should be remembered in the present troubled world. And it has an especial significance now that an aggressive effort is being made to build up the National Guard to its authorized strength of 682,000 men.

The Guard is a volunteer, civilian-soldier organization, and it has a long and distinguished record of service. It provides a priceless nucleus of trained men upon which an effective fighting force can be built in time of war. Units of the guard were among the first to see action in the last conflict, and they fought gallant delaying actions while we worked against time to create a gigantic Army. And war is not the only emergency which the guard is called upon to meet. In every great disaster, from the San Francisco fire in 1906 to the ghastly explosion at Texas City a short time ago, the guard has done a superb job as a protector of life and property.

To young men, the guard offers an opportunity to learn new skills, to improve old ones, and to acquire experience in organization and leadership. Each member draws a full day's Regular Army pay for 2 hours of spare-time training a week, and for each 15 days of field training a year. To the community, the guard is a proud local asset. It represents public service of the highest order.

Benefits Under the Social Security Act Should Be Liberalized and Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two bills today to liberalize and extend benefits under the Social Security Act.

The first bill reduces the eligible age limit from 65 years to 60 and provides for a 25-percent increase in benefits payable. Laboring people should not be required to struggle along on their jobs until they have reached age 65 in order to receive this pension. If the average person works until he is 60, he has devoted most of the fruitful years of his life to toil and he ought to be able to retire at that age and live comfortably on a pension for his remaining years. Moreover, the present benefit schedule has been entirely too low. As a matter of fact, it is ridiculously low under present high-cost living conditions. The 25 percent increase, provided in my bill, would put these pension benefits on a more fair and equitable basis.

Within the last week Congress voted an additional $400,000,000 to bail out bankrupt and decadent governments of foreign countries. Millions more in this direction are in prospect. I do not favor this kind of policy which is made without regard to our own financial security. Nevertheless, if we can afford to spend millions on people and governments of foreign lands, we certainly can afford to be a little more liberal with our own people. The old-age pensions in this country ought to enable our citizens to live a decent and respectable existence. They cannot do it on the present miserly rates.

STATE AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES

The second bill I have introduced would extend social-security benefits to

State, county, and municipal employees and to individuals who are self-employed.

In my judgment, there is no sound basis for denying social-security benefits to an individual merely because he happens to work for the State, county, city, or other municipality. These persons should have the right to make social-security contributions the same as persons in private employment and receive the same benefits when they reach retirement age.

Some of our States, counties, and municipalities have adequate existing retirement or pension systems. Most of them do not have any such program. It is not my intention to disrupt or interfere with State, county, or municipal retirement pension plans which adequately take care of the employees covered thereby. Rather it is my intention primarily to provide retirement pension coverage for those not now covered and, secondly, to permit those units of Government now having such plans to supplement it by Social Security Act benefits. Inasmuch as my amendment makes it optional for these governmental units to have their employees covered by the Social Security Act, those already adequately provided for by their own retirement laws can continue under their present system. But social-security benefits would not interfere or be a substitute for retirement pay because in most cases retirement pay is not sufficient to provide the individual with an adequate living. Then, too, these benefits under the Social Security Act would accrue to hundreds of thousands of city, county, and other municipal employees who do not at present have any retirement or other old-age benefits whatsoever. This is particularly true of the many small cities and other small municipal agencies throughout the Nation. These agencies are in most cases financially unable to provide any retirement assistance even in a small degree, no matter how much they would like to care for aged employees. So, if they are to be taken care of at all, it must and should be under the broad plan of Federal social security, the machinery and framework of which have already been created and established.

We have hundreds of thousands of State and municipal employees in this country who have given the better part of their lives to that particular service. It should not be expected that they should run the risk of giving up their present jobs to seek private employment in order to be eligible to receive social-security benefits.

SELF-EMPLOYED PERSONS

Likewise, there is a large group of self-employed persons in the country who would like to make social-security contributions and thus receive the benefits thereof at retirement age. These self-employed individuals in most cases are employers only in a technical sense. I say technical sense because as a practical matter a man with only one, two, or three employees is not considered an employer in common parlance or usage of the term. Furthermore, the average employer with only a few employees comes within the $3,000 per annum salary limitation which makes a person eligible for benefits under the act. When we consider that the over-all purpose of the Social Security Act was to provide financial security for the latter years of his life, to the so-called low-income-bracket worker, then we can find no reasonable or sensible basis for excluding the small employer. The barber, the plumber, the small merchant, the garage and gas-station operators, and hundreds of other small business and professional groups, too numerous to mention here, are at present denied the opportunity of availing themselves of the privileges of this law. They wonder why they are excluded and, to my knowledge, no one has been able to give them a satisfactory explanation. Actually there is no answer except that they have been arbitrarily discriminated against without justification.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, my bills are designed to accomplish two things. First, to take care of the hundreds of thousands of our people who are presently excluded from any form of social security, and second, to reduce the eligible age limit from 65 years to 60 and to increase all benefits payable 25 percent.

The St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Drive To Sink Vast Federal Fund in Part-Time St. Lawrence Waterway," published in the Mobile Register of May 10, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DRIVE TO SINK VAST FEDERAL FUND IN PART-TIME ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Off they go again on another campaign in Congress for the St. Lawrence seaway project. This time they have thought up a different approach—the collection of tolls to liquidate the cost of construction.

New legislation to authorize the controversial project was introduced Friday by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Republican of Michigan, acting for himself and 14 other Senators, 10 of them Republicans and 4 of them Democrats.

Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, Republican of Michigan, introduced a companion measure in the House.

This proposal is almost identical to earlier proposed legislation, except for the seaway toll proposition.

In explanation of the toll feature, Senator VANDENBERG said:

"The proposal to charge tolls on the St. Lawrence seaway does not apply to the present navigation facilities within the Great Lakes system.

"Specifically, it does not apply to the local domestic Great Lakes traffic of Canada and the United States that utilizes the 'Soo' locks and the Welland Canal. It will not apply also to the 14-foot Canadian canals on the St. Lawrence River. Trade and navigation that has adjusted itself to these navigation facilities will remain unaffected.

"Only the new deep water navigation facilities on the St. Lawrence River authorized by this resolution will be affected by the proposition to charge tolls."

How many years—or centuries—would elapse before the enormous St. Lawrence debt could be paid out of tolls collected on the basis outlined by Senator VANDENBERG?

And where is the justification, much less the necessity, for sinking untold millions of dollars into that project?

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, Democrat, of Louisiana, has laid before the Senate a big stack of letters from American ship operators and out of the whole business only one declares in favor of constructing the seaway.

Summarizing the objections to the project set out in that stack of letters, Senator OVERTON named as one that the seaway would be in use only 7 months a year due to ice conditions. It has long been cited that the seaway would be available to navigation only a part of each year because of severe weather.

And yet a fresh drive has been started to toss a vast sum into the project, and in this drive tolls are dangled before the eyes of Congress as a lure for support.

Meanwhile, the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway, a thoroughly sound and needed project to shorten the navigation distance between a wide area of the country and the Gulf of Mexico, still pleads for construction funds.

Voice of America Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 6, 1947:

TELLING OUR STORY

Secretary Marshall's conference with congressional leaders should have left no doubt as to how important he considers continuation of the Voice of America programs. Secretary Marshall has had first-hand experience with the distorted impressions of the United States cultivated by those who deprecate our way of life. The Secretary is a man who has no patience with idle effort. His remedy for inadequate propaganda is more propaganda. He recommends that the Voice of America broadcasts be continued and intensified, and he does this in the realization that these programs are our principal weapon in the world battle of ideas. If we expect to win this battle, we should be doing everything possible to see that the world knows the truth. For Congress to follow the lead of the House Appropriations Subcommittee in denying funds for the broadcasts would be to throw in the towel and admit that we're licked.

The objection that the broadcasts are propaganda and therefore unsuitable for Government supervision could be met in some degree by adoption of the proposal by the State Department to remove the programs from official State Department control. The bill would establish an International Broadcast Foundation. This would be administered by a board of trustees consisting of 13 "distinguished private citizens," with the Secretary of State serving in an advisory capacity as the fourteenth member. Funds for the Foundation, at least in the beginning, would have to come from the Government,

but the fact that private citizens were represented would eliminate some of the stigma in congressional minds of Government control.

The advantage of such an operation is that it would place on private broadcasting outlets much of the responsibility for seeing that people in other countries get a balanced view of the United States. This would remove the broadcasts from the political arena. At the same time, the State Department would have a check to insure that the national interest was being served. This sort of direction should make possible the maximum degree of coordination in use of our short-wave facilities. Obviously private outlets now are not in a position to bear the cost of an adequate program themselves. One reason we do not have more short-wave broadcasting is that it is not, as now constituted, a profitable commercial enterprise. But through a combined operation there is a good chance that ultimately sales of radio time and support by private foundations would lessen the cost to the Government.

As we embark on our plan to counter aggression and bolster free governments, it is of crucial importance that our motives be understood. Our detractors have long since started a campaign of misrepresentation. Their efforts are bound to take effect unless we make ourselves heard. If democracy is to survive as the goal of millions of people throughout the world, it cannot afford to keep silent while the totalitarians are broadening their attempts to vilify it. We are heartily in favor of Mr. Marshall's plan. It is of a piece with a foreign policy of affirmation and reconstruction which is the only one that can save our stricken world from degenerating into chaos.

Britain: When Wealth Evaporates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to authority granted, I include in the extension of my remarks the following article appearing in the Pathfinder of May 21, 1947, entitled "Britain: When Wealth Evaporates," as follows:

BRITAIN: WHEN WEALTH EVAPORATES

(By Felix Morley)

The British Labor Government, in office since July 1945, has been successful in achieving a more even distribution of the national wealth. It has been much less successful in stimulating that production without which there can be no wealth to distribute.

Fewer than 1,000 people in Great Britain, with a total population of about 49,000,000, now have a net income, after payment of income tax, above $16,000 a year. There are not 50 individuals whose net annual income remains over $24,000. The rich, as a class, have been wiped out, and spokesmen of the Labor Government are frank in saying that, while it holds power, this leveling process will continue.

Individual wealth is dissipated by two very efficient forms of taxation: On incomes and on inheritance. In the United States, with the war over, there is a tendency to ease these taxes for everybody. In Great Britain the Labor government is maintaining the income tax, in the higher brackets, at confiscatory wartime levels. And for the current fiscal year, beginning April 1, it is doubling already high death duties on all sizable estates.

Income-tax changes in the new budget illustrate the policy of favoring the poor while continuing the wartime penalization of individual accumulation. A married worker with earnings of $1,600 a year, having two dependent children, will this year pay an income tax of $20, as against $54 last year. A professional or businessman earning $16,000 a year, with the same family, will pay income tax of $7,255 in 1947, as compared with $7,471 in 1946. In the case of the rare executive who commands a nominal salary of $160,000 a year, and also has two dependent children, the tax saving provided by the new budget is trifling. The executive will pay income tax of $140,755 in 1947, as contrasted with $140,971 in 1946.

Thus the tax reduction in the new British budget, figured as a percentage of income, works out at 2⅛ percent for the poor man; at 1⅓ percent for the middle-class representative; at less than one-seventh of 1 percent for the rich man.

The British Socialist government, however, is not concerned only with dragging the rich down. It also seeks to raise the standard of living for the poor, primarily through an elaborate system of subsidies on basic foodstuffs, and to a lesser extent on what is called utility clothing and shoes. The amount of the taxpayers' money spent on these subsidies was in the neighborhood of $1,500,000,000 during the fiscal year ending March 31 and the appropriation for this purpose is increased to $1,700,000,000 in the current budget.

These cost-of-living subsidies, combined with efficient rationing and sales taxes to discourage the production of luxuries for the domestic market, have proved successful in holding down the price of most necessities, when obtainable. Indeed, the cost-of-living index, as figured for a working-class family, has scarcely increased since 1941 and is now only one-third higher than it was when England went to war, at the beginning of September 1939.

The theory is that the unions will not demand higher wages as long as the cost of living does not rise. Nevertheless, the Labor Party naturally favors high wages and actually the average weekly wage rate has mounted by two-thirds during the same period that the price index has gone up one-third.

In many other respects governmental policy favors the wage earner. A license must be obtained for any repair of dwellings, let alone new construction, and it is easier to get the necessary priorities if the applicant is a factory worker. That is why so many bomb-damaged mansions in the west end of London remain in a forlorn decay.

Moreover, all real estate, stock market, and legal transactions, in which the poor seldom indulge, are heavily taxed, with the rates in some cases doubled by the current budget. Only the staggering tobacco tax, which now raises the cost of a packet of 20 cigarettes to 70 cents, can be said to hit the poor relatively harder than those who once were well to do. But the primary purpose of this tax is admittedly to curtail the tobacco imports which have been rapidly using up a large proportion of the American loan to Britain.

The assumption of the Labor government has been that a fiscal policy which definitely favors the common man will automatically result in increased production. Unfortunately, in Great Britain, this assumption turns out to be unfounded.

In a few specialities, British production is up in volume from prewar. But in many important commodities it is sharply down. The most-advertised illustration is coal, where output is still 15 percent below the level of 1938. However, much the same decline is found in the manufacture of such diverse products as locomotives, automobiles, linoleum, blankets, hosiery.

This difficulty in restoring production to prewar levels was apparent long before the winter fuel crisis forced many factories to close. As a result of this mismanagement, output in many lines fell temporarily to almost nothing. The result is now apparent in a sharp drop in those exports which Britain must sell in order to import the food and raw materials which cannot be produced at home.

There is almost no involuntary unemployment in Great Britain. But this desirable situation, plus the Government's cradle-to-grave program of social security, has done nothing to animate production. On the other hand, the confiscatory taxes and the expanding program of Government ownership are keeping industry from a modernization of equipment which would have been overdue even without wartime deterioration.

Endless priorities, restrictions, regulations, and directives create more handicaps, helpful only to the ever-increasing army of Government employees. Thus, output diminishes, even when the will to work is present, in spite of a governmental promotion campaign which now frankly warns the British people, "We work—or want."

There is no doubt that the Labor government, carrying on where wartime socialism left off, has divided up British wealth more evenly than ever before. But it is no mere coincidence that simultaneously the production of wealth is drying up. The British people cannot live indefinitely on American and Canadian credits. And there are many of them who see no exaggeration whatever in Winston Churchill's recent gloomy prediction that, under present trends, "it will only be a question of time before we shall be unable to support our population."

Disability Security and National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to authority granted, I include in the extension of my remarks the following timely and thought-provoking article on disability security and national economy by Dr. Francis E. Townsend:

DISABILITY SECURITY AND NATIONAL ECONOMY

I have just read Ernest Haycox's article in the May number of Reader's Digest, Fear Is Out of Date. I wish I could agree with him. But I find fear wherever I turn. The one great fear just now is that we are headed for another depression. I have been listening within the hour to a group of men, every one of whom expressed fear that a depression of gigantic proportions seemed to be inevitable. The gist of their contentions was that we had learned nothing from our past experience of depressions that gave us even an inkling of what to do to prevent their recurrence.

Fear may be out of date but there is an overabundance of it still in the hearts and minds of men. But if we analyze modern fear we find it quite a different thing from the form that enthralled humanity in primeval days when fear was an essential to the business of existence; when just to stay alive required the building up of fear in every fiber of the human carcass. The fear that drives all of us half mad today is fear of our fellow men; fear that we may not be able to compete successfully with our fellows in acquiring our share of the good and necessary things of life; fear that some incapacity may overtake us that will unfit us for the struggle of life and leave us victims of poverty and want.

I am sure this modern fear is more nerve wracking, more devastating and cruel in its effects upon modern men than the mere physical fear that dominated the minds of our prehistoric ancestors. They could crawl into their treetops or their caves at night and sleep without being ridden with the dread of finding themselves out of a job on the morrow, or of facing a wage cut or a bank failure or an eviction for nonpayment of rent.

Those of us who were bread winners in the era of the bitter thirties know what real fear is, and we want no more of it, and most of us are bitterly aware that when World War II came along and ended that period of fear we designate as "depression" we had done nothing at all to insure ourselves against a recurrence of that terrible period; and now that the artificial prosperity engendered by the war is beginning to slip away from us and the specter of want in the form of sky-high prices and shortage of money is again hovering over us, nerve-shaking fear is beginning to drive great masses of us into a half panic of apprehension. Those of us who have lived long enough to have experienced the effect of an epidemic of sudden fear upon great masses of humanity are gripped with a nausea of foreboding for ourselves and our children. Ancient man feared for his physical self and for his little family group. Our fear today is multiplied into fear for the millions—for the collapse of civilization itself.

President Roosevelt once said that we Americans had nothing to fear but fear itself. That was one of the most thoughtless things that he ever said. The cause of this universal fear is so obscure to the most of us that we become panicked, like a man becoming suddenly stricken with blindness, when we think of the disaster that will follow if we go into another economic tailspin. This economic fear transcends all others that we have ever known in virulence; it is the crowning infamy of all human afflictions. Just now it is a worse threat to the world than the atomic bomb itself, for if we cannot conquer it, if we give another exhibition of the vulnerability of our Nation to its devastating results, there will be no possibility of our selling the American way of life to the other nations of the earth, and the conflict with Russia which we so dread will become inevitable.

The ideals of democracy are still virile and strong in American hearts, but the skillful practice of democracy has thus far eluded our efforts. We are wholehearted in our love for it, but halfhearted in our attempts to practice it. This causes us to be looked upon as hypocrites by the peoples of the earth who have only known autocratic rule. Shilly-shallying will no longer avail us, democracy must make good now, all citizens of our country must be made to realize that opportunity is open to all alike under the protection of law, discrimination because of race or religion must end, and the distribution of created wealth must be made with the clear understanding that since all honest labor is equally necessary for the well-being of humanity the rewards of labor must be such that poverty can no longer exist.

Our country has attained such facility in the production of wealth that there can be no excuse for the existence of poverty. The good things of life in the form of food, clothing, and shelter must be made available to all in profusion, since there is no limitation on our ability to produce. Our civilization will stand or fall as we decide upon this division of our abundance.

War has just now destroyed the greater part of the wealth of an entire continent. Whole peoples are reduced to beggary. Disease is rampant; actual starvation is common where a short time ago abundance was in evidence everywhere. This wholesale devastation has resulted from the application of science to the instruments of destruction. Is anyone so fatuous as to believe that we have reached the limit of destructiveness? Is not the most titanic of all destructive forces hanging by a thread over the heads of all nations? What shall we do before the thread breaks? My hands shake as I try to frame a reply. How can we insure the world against the destruction of our civilization?

Well, I place much faith in that word "insure." If we Americans will make a conscientious effort to insure that no one in this Nation shall suffer for want of the essential things of life, food, clothing, and shelter, the democratic exhibition of justice resulting will make us the envied of all nations. All nations will endeavor to emulate us by following our methods. America can become the guiding star for all the world.

Our procedure should be simple and along lines with which we are familiar. Let us insure ourselves abundance for all time by insuring each and every citizen his equitable share of our wealth as it is produced. How? By establishing a national mutual insurance for all American citizens against the hazards of life, so that when overtaken by any of these hazards the citizen will immediately begin to receive insurance in the form of monthly installments, to continue as long as the disability lasts. Disability payments should start immediately when competent civilian boards declare the citizen to be unemployable. This might result from sickness, crippling accidents, old age, or any other incapacity, to provide for himself. Old age should be declared by law to begin at an established birthday, say 60 or 65 years; any one of that age should be permitted to retire on his Government insurance, and all citizens receiving the insurance should be required to spend the money within 30 days of its receipt. The reason for this requirement lies in the fact that our industrial equipment of labor-saving machines has arrived at a stage where the production of the country has outgrown the market. We can produce faster than we can sell. But if the unemployables all become able to buy liberally, instead of being pauperized, their insurance money added to the wages and salaries of the employed would create and maintain a dependable market for all classes of goods.

The money for supporting this kind of insurance would cost the Nation nothing. It would be collected through a gross income tax levied against business and individuals alike, collected and paid out each 30 days, thus creating a circulating fund that would increase and diminish as business rose and fell. Exemptions of wages and salaries from the tax, up to a certain level, say, $2,400 per year, could be established so that business would carry the largest share of the tax. This, business should be willing to do for the reason that business actually passes all its taxes on down to the consumers and collects in the price exacted from the buyers. Wage and salary earners—those with fixed incomes—and their families are the great supporters of the market.

It is said that 90 percent of all business done depends upon the circulation of wage and salary money. Obviously then, if we want a dependable market capable of purchasing the full output of our factories and farms, equipped with the latest labor-saving machinery, it will be necesary for us to supplement the buying power of the wage earning groups with the buying power of those receiving insurance pay.

The gross income tax should become the sole method of taxation. The wage and salary people are compelled to pay on their gross income. They have no net on which to pay. They have nothing to sell that can be passed on down to someone else. They pay through the nose. They must buy everything at retail, and the retail price has in it all taxes, all interest, and all profits accruing from the transfers of ownership all along the line from the raw material to the retail sale. If it is fair to tax labor on his gross income, certainly business can stand a like tax.

Business could always thrive if all adult citizens were provided with liberal buying power. Unless this buying power can be fully established and maintained, the profit system will die for want of a market. The proportion of those engaged in production is constantly being diminished by the new automatic machines and labor-saving devices. The unemployables, because of these same forces, are increasing proportionately to the entire population. Unemployable people cannot buy liberally if at all. Something must be done to balance production and distribution or production will soon glut the market and factories will stop, transportation will fall off, farms will curtail output and nonbuyers will again ride the brake beams and curse us for our stupidity.

The gross income tax has been in use in the Hawaiian Islands since 1935. The islanders pronounce it the easiest collected and the most productive of revenue of any tax ever devised by man. It should be given a trial here and if effective on the small scale we have suggested as a means of raising the insurance money for the unemployables (3 percent), it could become the sole source of Government income and wipe out for good the hodgepodge excise and property taxes that are now undermining the morality and the patience of our citizenry. Let us act quickly. Let us cease to be afraid.

Dr. FRANCIS E. TOWNSEND.

The Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 15 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon before the Optimist Club in Topeka, Kans., on May 9, in which Mr. Landon discussed his views on the foreign situation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VE-day was 2 years ago yesterday.

Russia has been arrogantly and aggressively pushing us around since the first Moscow Conference in November 1943.

Other nations—awed and unnerved by this bullying spectacle—have reluctantly capitulated to the Russian combination of outside pressure and internal force exerted by a communistic minority acting under orders from Moscow. All this suddenly stopped when President Truman sent his challenging message to the Congress, stating with these ringing words:

"It must be the policy of the United States to support free people everywhere who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure."

The first foreign reaction to this frank and bold statement of policy was the stiffening in France to Communist pressure.

I have felt from the first that the Truman policy could be the ounce of prevention that might prevent a future war.

I opposed lend-lease because, to me, it could only mean war, and was being deceptively presented to the American people as the way to peaceful neutrality.

Therefore, I now deplore the tendency in the Senate debate and by members of the President's Cabinet to minimize the significance and the importance of the responsibilities we assume under the new foreign policies as outlined in the President's message to the Congress.

Hence, although I don't agree with their oppositions, I am glad to see the Republicans in the National House of Representatives frankly stating, without exaggeration, their apprehension of what the Truman policy means.

Secretary of State Marshall's talk to the Nation gave little real indication of a new policy. He made the same sort of negative and inconclusive remarks that have been our bane for years.

Of course the Secretary of State speaks under limitations. But there was little indication of a determined new policy for a torn and distracted Europe sinking into even greater depths of starvation and despair. And Europe as a whole is tremendously important.

Wordy protests and grandiloquent speeches won't do the job. Democracy—in order to live—has for once got to be tough. We have the power, and we have got to use it now.

I hope Stalin will not be fooled by the apparent reluctance of the American people to assume the burdens the Truman policy entails.

Hitler and Hirohito made that bad mistake—and before them the Kaiser.

In 1936 I said—"Specific pledges not to go to war under any condition, risk encouraging belligerents to attempted aggression which would, in fact, precipitate us into war." In 1940 I protested against our foreign policy of supplying Japan with war materials and financing China. We were helping both warring sides.

In other words, our prewar foreign policies were so deceptive that they fooled not only the American people, but Hirohito and Hitler into believing we would not fight—and thus made war certain.

The Kaiser was fooled the same way by Woodrow Wilson's—"He kept us out of War" campaign for reelection.

It is very plain that we have a critical decision to make, perhaps the most critical in our history. The decision is simply whether we assume the responsibilities of leadership in international affairs or let this leadership pass by default to Soviet Russia. There is no safe—no soft—middle ground alternative.

World War II shattered all the balances that made for stability in the world. It—plus our own unbalanced actions—left a vacuum in Europe. The British withdrawal is leaving another in the Near East. Our lack of any semblance of a sound, consistent and farsighted policy following VJ-day—for Manchuria and Korea created another one in the Far East. Wherever such an opening has occurred, Russia has moved in. That is the settled Soviet policy. If unchecked, Russia will occupy every vacuum that exists. Meanwhile the Soviets are proceeding to extend their power by infiltration and the promotion of chaos and disorder in other countries. By this process, if it goes unhindered, world leadership will become a Soviet possession.

Our new foreign policy provides a check. But so far in only one sector. Turkey and Greece are only part of what must be a whole policy. We have no guidepost as yet to the rest of that policy. But the alternatives permit of no half-way policy. Any hesitancy on the part of the administration—or the American people—undermines our position and encourages Russia. Until the United Nations organization becomes capable of handling international disputes—or until an association of European nations is formed to meet issues in that sphere—we shall have to close the gaps, wherever they appear.

If the President follows through on such a course courageously and skillfully—if the American people back him up without equivocation—I believe this new foreign policy will lead to peace, more successfully than the roads we have been following.

It will take care of the time that must elapse until the United Nations gathers strength and experience to deal with world problems. It serves notice that aggression has no place in the world of the twentieth century. It means that we have done with pussyfooting, and backing and filling, in our international relations. We tried this last course in 1930—and it got us into war. We tried it in 1915—and it got us into war. A firm, definite policy is far less likely to get us into another war. Don't overlook the fact that three-fourths of the trained and experienced reporters covering the Paris Conference last summer voted its outcome meant another war.

There is another reason why the Truman doctrine is less likely to lead to war. Actually we are the only first-class power in the world today. We demonstrated this fact when we successfully carried on a global war and armed and provisioned our associates at the same time. The Soviet leaders know this. They have no productive system comparable to ours. Furthermore, the forced labor of communism is close enough to human slavery to have a paralyzing effect on technological "know how." And modern war is mechanical, technical, and scientific. With these facts well known, here and abroad, I do not believe our course will be challenged. But if we wait too long they may fill their hand.

The Wallace charge that the Truman doctrine means the American people are seeking to rule the world is too silly to treat seriously. He would actually furnish them the means of aggression like we did the Japs prior to July 1941. Neither is it a negative policy as Stassen says. It is a positive statement that we are going to block Russian imperialist expansion by military assistance if necessary. It also means we are reversing Roosevelt's policies of active aid to Stalin—enabling the Russians to dominate the Balkans—part of Germany and parts of the Far East.

Perhaps that is about all we will have to do. Every people wants to let down after a war. Russia, although ruled by ruthlessness hardly comprehensible to American citizens, can be no exception. But we have got to be prepared to tell the Communist bullies where to get off. If we are serious and in earnest, that is clearly the way to get results. Otherwise, we shall be simply perpetuating a state of civil and international war. To finance resistance against Communist forces and ignore Communist general headquarters is fantastic. To ratify the Trieste treaty is ridiculous in the light of President Truman's message.

We should never have agreed to it in the first place. We are pouring money into Greece and Turkey to resist Russia; hence, to simultaneously ratify a treaty with Italy, under which we will be paying in part Italy's reparations to the Communist bloc, will have dangerous repercussions all over the world to the Truman doctrine.

It will anew create despair in the hearts of all our friends. If we are going to support democracy in Europe, Italy is far more important than Greece or Turkey.

If the Truman doctrine really means business we must not ratify the Italian treaty. We must make our own decent peace with Italy as we did with Germany in 1921.

That will enable us to work consistently for a rehabilitated and democratic Italy. That will encourage tremendously democratic forces all over the world.

Any policy may lead to war. Which way the new policy leads depends on just how it is implemented. If we are going simultaneously to finance and aid Greeks, Communist Yugoslavs, and others, and ignore the urgent necessity of a firm and emphatic attitude toward Moscow, it will, of course, lead to continuation and expansion of war. There is a parallel in the Chinese-Japanese war from 1937 to 1941, when we deliberately built up Japanese military and naval power by shipping her oil, scrap, and other means of aggression. We were not only supplying the Japanese, but also aiding the Chinese, whom the United States Treasury directly financed—first by silver purchases, then by outright increasing of subsidies and credits. We actually financed both sides until July 1941. Russia today is like Japan was when we were financing and supplying her prior to July 1941—more dependent on American cooperation than any other power with the exception of Britain and France.

A policy worthy of the noble traditions upon which this Republic was founded will not deal merely with the Greek or Turkish borders, but will set forth its aims to make all Europe a place devoid of fear, with liberty and economic security of the kind proposed for Germany by ex-President Hoover, and aiming at a United States of Europe based upon the concepts known to every American. We should be as firmly and resolutely devoted to the strengthening and expansion of democracy as Moscow is devoted to the strengthening and expansion of Communist power everywhere. This is the challenge that faces us today.

That would not mean war. The danger of war lies in the fact that Moscow has no respect for us—that they think we have no principles—that they think we will appease and compromise and chatter while they move ahead, and consolidate their position everywhere. Danger lies in the fact that that is their experience with us—that F. D. R. at Yalta actually signed away secretly to Stalin the rights of our Chinese allies to Manchuria, though these were already promised to Chiang Kai-shek. Stalin knows by experience that F. D. R. and his "statesmen" (or "statesboys") were completely unprincipled, and would sign away one ally to another—as we did in that case, as well as in the case of Poland, the first country actively to war against the invading German Army.

A policy for peace must be based upon knowing what we want, and standing firmly for it. We made a statesmanlike and generous offer with the Baruch plan—a plan for organized peace, which could be extended to more conventional armaments in turn. Moscow refused it—and we permitted them to refuse, though their obvious purpose in refusing and filibustering was and is to gain time to develop their own atomic armaments against us.

The Communists respect superior force. It is only through that respect for superior force that we can effectively approach the Communists. It is because of Communist respect for superior force that war is unnecessary. If and when we tell the Communists what we are going to do, and inform them simply and firmly that we are not going to await their atomic militarization—if and when we tell them that, with no mincing of words or bargaining, they will join in the organization of peace. But not before.

We must take the bold steps required in our new foreign policy for one final reason. We are the heirs of all that has been won in the long, hard struggle for human liberty. If we prize the rights and privileges of western civilization we must stand up for them. We must chart our course by the immortal words of Daniel Webster, "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it."

Proposed Reorganization of Executive Branch of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 15 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George E. Sokolsky, regarding a measure which Representative BROWN of Ohio and I have introduced for the reorganization of executive branch of the Government. The article was published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 1.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., and Representative CLARENCE BROWN have introduced a measure in Congress to reorganize the executive branch of the Government with the view to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities by limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions; eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions; consolidating or abolishing services, activities, and functions of a similar nature; and defining and limiting executive functions, services, and activities.

A commission is to be appointed which would make recommendations to Congress, consisting of 12 members, 4 each appointed by the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House, 2 from the particular branch of the Government, 2 from private life.

This has been an urgent question for many years and has never, in the past, been handled with any success, largely because the departments of Government seek to perpetuate themselves and use every type of political influence to achieve this end.

Politicians in Congress wish to protect their patronage; heads of departments seek to keep their departments as large as possible.

Actually, the Government of the United States is a wasteful, inefficient organization that does not provide a dollar of work for a dollar spent, that permits unconscionable duplication and that protects such featherbedding, time-wasting, and juggling of accounts as no private enterprise could tolerate, or as, to put it another way, the Government would not tolerate in any private enterprise.

Senator LODGE said that "there are actually 150 members of boards and commissions, 15 heads of departments and major agencies, 5 people in the Executive Office of the President, 7 people in the White House staff proper, 11 persons in those emergency agencies which are still functioning, and 3 persons pertaining to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who all have direct access to the President of the United States."

Actually, no corporation of any size could be operated on that basis. Senator FERGUSON added: "If they were reporting for a period of 30 minutes, it would take him (the President) 3 months."

Senator BYRD once stated: "It is inconceivable that the departments and old-line agencies extended to 777 component parts at the height of the war should now need to expand still further to require 920 principal component parts.

"There is no justification for having 1,200 field offices in New York, 1,000 in Chicago, and over 600 each in Philadelphia and Los Angeles, to mention only a few."

Senator LODGE quoted Representative WIGGLESWORTH as providing data that there are no less than 29 agencies lending Government funds, 3 agencies insuring deposits, 34 engaged in the acquisition of land, 16 engaged in wildlife preservation, 10 in Government construction, 9 in credit and finance, 12 in home and community planning, 10 in materials and construction, 28 in welfare matters, 14 engaged in forestry matters, 4 in bank examinations, and 65 agencies engaged in gathering statistics.

I think I have quoted enough to show that Senator LODGE has proposed a bill that should be passed. His commission idea is sound, because it includes the Executive, Congress, and the public in a joint effort. This will solve one of the major difficulties of the past.

The point is that the American Government is run without system or plan except within the broad lines laid out by the Constitution.

Several methods might be employed:

1. The hacksaw method of cutting off agencies without plan is as bad as creating agencies without plan. That will not produce greater efficiency; it may even result in increased confusion.

2. The method of making the suit fit the cloth is often suggested, by which, instead of allocating $6,000,000,000 to the Executive, another amount, say $5,000,000,000, would be voted, and the President would then have to deal with the problem as one of provident administration.

This is the method now generally being pursued and has virtue in the present state of administrative inflation.

3. Senator LODGE's method, which involves a systematic, scientific overhauling of the administration of government to achieve permanent improvement and increased efficiency.

Erratic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 13, 1947:

ERRATIC CONGRESS

The logical order of procedure has been reversed by the haste to cut taxes before Congress has agreed on the size or made sufficient headway in disposing of appropriation bills to determine the actual amount of savings in prospect.

We fail to see how Congress can act intelligently on the proposed tax legislation in face of these uncertainties. House and Senate are still deadlocked over the question of the size of the over-all cuts at which to shoot. Since there is slight chance that even the lower $4,500,000,000 savings goal set by the Senate will be reached, it probably makes little difference whether the two Houses settle their differences or agree to disagree. The only reason for urging prompt action is that it looks bad to pass a tax bill without first reaching a decision about spending objectives.

A much more serious objection to the erratic order of procedure has been raised by Senator GEORGE of the Finance Committee. Although voting to report out the tax-reduction bill, he has reserved the right to oppose it on the floor, unless assured that prospective cuts in appropriation bills will result in greater economies than have been effected to date. "On the basis of what is now apparent in the way of a surplus," Senator GEORGE cautions that "enactment of the tax-reduction bill would leave nothing for a payment of the $258,000,000,000 public debt."

Since the Senate has gone on record in favor of devoting at least $2,500,000,000 of an anticipated budget surplus to debt retirement, it seems to be the height of irresponsibility to ask it to vote on a tax-reduction program that would make heavy inroads on that surplus before debt reduction. Indeed, premature tax reduction based on guesses might even turn that surplus into a deficit if Congress fails to make good on its economy program, or if expenditures have to be increased in order to halt the march of communism and arrest the economic deterioration that threatens to set back world recovery and weaken our own resistance to the forces of depression.

There Is a Simple Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, to Congress are presented many plans and superplans to give first to the members of one group, then to another, everything that particular group desires, without, we are advised, injuring anyone.

None of the so-called panaceas which over the past 14 years have been adopted seems to be the complete answer.

From the Saturday Evening Post of May 17, 1947, comes the following editorial, which is at least a step in the right direction:

WE HATE TO PART WITH THE WAR BOOM

The basis of our current economic complications is that none of us wants to take the rap for the war. In that unprecedented conflict billions of dollars in goods and resources were destroyed. In some countries the destruction was obvious, but the United States was not physically blasted by the war and it was thus possible to disguise the war's destruction as a boom. Rationing and price control partially concealed the fact that we were blowing up our assets on the world's battlefields. One result of this widespread misconception is that we shudder at peace and plenty because money inflation made war and privation look attractive to all except the fighting men. We were even propagandized into believing that the war was being fought to bring about a "better world," the outward and visible sign of which was to be more and better commodities and gadgets which would flow to the consumer in an endless stream with very little effort on his part.

These illusions still persist. We still waste precious time battling to protect and increase inflated money incomes, and thereby to delay the return of increased production and a better standard of living. Workers, farmers, and businessmen alike hesitate to make the concesions which alone will halt the spiral. Labor leaders can hardly wait for the next set of price statistics before talking up new strike votes. Farmers are cool to a return to a free market in their products. Businessmen fear to offer goods at lower prices lest they find themselves stuck with commitments which rising costs may prevent them from meeting.

A specific example of the prevailing stagnation is the building-trades industry, which is all but paralyzed because nobody can afford to build houses at present costs. What keeps building costs up? There is still sand in the pits, wood in forests, everything necessary to the building of houses. The trouble is we have complicated the process of transmuting these simple materials in houses by surrounding the building business with regulations, restrictions, price agreements and featherbed labor rules which in many areas reduce the building business to the status of a racket. Employment of a steam fitter outside the charmed circle incurs the risk that a union-dominated city inspector will refuse to connect the house to the water mains. Whatever hope existed in prefabrication is dying through the imposition of rules and restrictions which nullify virtually all the advantages in buying a ready-made house. In some areas agreements between unions and material manufacturers compel the use of favored materials at a prohibitive price set by the combine. And the public is told that new housing could spring up in a week if some new commission with greater powers were set up by the Government.

It seems to us that the crisis against which we are warned every day could be averted if all parties would agree to stop yearning for the false boom of the war years and get on with the job of providing what people want at prices they can pay. As long as bricklayers sit around waiting to be paid $20 a day when there is plenty of work at $14, and as long as manufacturers delay putting goods on the market at a competitive price instead of waiting for some ironclad guaranty against losing a dollar, and as long as farmers look to the Government to put a floor under every hazard of their occupation, just so long shall we continue to lack the things we need.

Perhaps it is extravagant to hope that the American people will relate their activities as individuals to the welfare of the Nation, as the English people today endure austerity in the belief that, if they can sweat their way through this period of transition, the whole nation will reap benefits. Nevertheless one may still hope. The steel wage agreement is a hint of what can be done to step down the boom when men of good will put their backs into it. It seems to us that, more than leadership or a dynamic program, we need a widespread understanding that the boom on money is over and that we can have a boom in houses and goods if we want one. As Sydney Smith wrote in his famous letter to Lady Grey more than a century ago, "No eloquence! But apathy, selfishness, common sense, arithmetic!" Or, as Bernard M. Baruch put it just a few weeks ago, "We will find that work will solve many of the problems threatening security."

A way must be found to enable an industrialist to start something new without consulting all his competitors, for a worker to be, to quote Alf Landon, "A real competitor, not just a member of the herd." Every day that we waste waiting for a master plan, or in envy of somebody else who makes more money, or waiting for Congress to pass a law, is a day lost to the production of the goods which alone can reduce and stabilize the cost of living.

Industry-Wide Bargaining or Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. ROONEY Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Washington Post of May 14, 1947:

INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING OR CHAOS?

The issue: Industry knows no boundaries. It sprawls across the Nation. Thousands of employers are organized on an industry-wide basis. To meet industry as an equal, labor must bargain on an industry-wide scale. The real interests of the public, the workers, and the employers are identical. What they all need, what America needs, what the world needs, is labor-management peace and increased production.

You, the public, certainly have an interest. Wartime economic maladjustments brought on strikes. You resented this inconvenience. The NAM—National Association of Manufacturers—in an attempt to capitalize upon this resentment, has charged that industry-wide bargaining causes industry-wide strikes. This is not true. It is not the type of bargaining, whether local or national or industry-wide, that causes strikes. It is all too frequently the stubborn refusal of certain employers to give labor a fair break. In the last 10 months wage rates have risen only 9.5 percent. Wholesale prices spiraled 30 percent; retail prices were up 20 percent—and industrial profits were the greatest in 10 years.

Over 4,000,000 working people are now covered by industry-wide bargaining contracts. Thousands of employers prefer this method of bargaining. If industry-wide bargaining is banned, a major upheaval in thousands of companies will result. Hundreds of new strikes will be encouraged, many in industries which have had no strikes in generations. You will get industrial chaos—not industrial peace. Such unwise legislation will create the very conditions which it ostensibly seeks to abolish.

You, the workers, have a vital interest. Remember, if you work for a living, you're labor. Trade unions, by tremendous sacrifice and suffering on the part of their members, have raised the living standard of all Americans. Farmers, office workers, tradesmen, professional men—all have benefited. Industry-wide agreements have helped to achieve this high standard of living. To abolish industry-wide bargaining would open the door to a nation-wide attack on the wage scale of all working people by the low-pay employers who still bitterly oppose all union organization. Small unions would find it impossible to bargain equitably with gigantic corporations. Larger unions, forced to bargain on a restricted local basis, would find themselves broken into helpless fragments—and ever-expanding corporations could wipe them out one by one. The social benefits won for all workers during the last generation would be lost overnight.

You, the employer, have a definite interest, too. Employers, too, are members of the public—and many of them are friends of labor—as witnessed by the thousands of industry-wide bargaining contracts now in existence. Employers save themselves time, trouble and cutthroat competition by industry-wide contracts. Settlements are made for all employers through their association rather than on an individual employer-by-employer basis. Industrial peace and stability are achieved in one step. Industry-wide bargaining also prevents chiselers from competing unfairly with the large and ever-increasing number of employers who believe in playing fair with their workers.

But NAM has only a selfish interest—and it's not yours. Let's face it! There are employers who don't like labor unions. NAM—the National Association of Manufacturers—is their mouthpiece. They have fought and continue to fight every social and economic forward step America has taken in the past 35 years. The list of advances they were against in that period cover everything from the child-labor amendment to the 40-hour week. They want to get back to the "good old days," when they could pay a man anything they felt like paying, fire employees when and as they pleased and, in general, treat the labor of human beings with less regard than they do their well-oiled machines. Congressman HARTLEY said the purpose of the ban on industry-wide bargaining was to "* * * break the unions down to the local level." This follows NAM's doctrine of "divide and rule." First "bust" the unions—then "bust" the country—just as they did in 1929. That's the vicious strategy behind the NAM-inspired slave-labor bill.

For the good of America, this bill must not pass!

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic entitled "To the Point." This editorial sets forth in clear and explicit language some of the problems confronting the Congress in its proposed labor legislation. It expresses a viewpoint that is entirely logical and sound.

TO THE POINT—REFORM OR WRECK?

(By the Editor)

Is it possible to bring calm thinking and sound reasoning to bear on the country's labor problem, before misunderstanding, selfish propaganda, political considerations, personalities and plain stupidity run the country back into the swamp of social injustice from which it extricated itself with such difficulty? Out of the present confusion a pretty grim prospect is looming. A dozen State legislatures have passed bills outlawing the closed shop and have adopted other measures designed to weaken labor unions; the House of Representatives has voted for a bill embodying just about every proposal which the foes of the working man have been demanding; the Senate is grinding out a companion bill which, though somewhat milder than the House version, is still calculated to render the workers helpless to protect themselves against predatory employers; and while it is predicted that the President will veto so one-sided a measure as Congress seems bent on presenting to him, its advocates confidently predict that they can pass it over his veto.

What's back of all this? The antiunion forces make no secret of their belief that the

time has come to strip labor of the protection it has enjoyed under the Wagner Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act and other legislation adopted to correct the evils of the past. But surely all the legislators who are supporting today's antilabor proposals are not foes of the working man; most of them, indeed, while accepting at face value the smooth propaganda prepared by the National Association of Manufacturers, the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Hearst stable of Adam Smith economists, and other spokesmen for laissez-faire reaction, vehemently assert that they are friends of the worker. They say they must back these restrictive bills because the people were enraged by the strikes of the postwar years and demand that labor leaders be curbed; they say they were elected on pledges to do something about these strikes; they cite the Gallup polls as proof that the public wants action; some of them have circulated questionnaires among their constituents and claim that they are merely obeying the will of the majority when they join in the hue and cry which the foes of organized labor are leading.

All very hysterical, and specious, and shot through with false reasoning. The sharp answer to all such defensive pleas is that the first duty of legislators and of every other public official is to serve the public welfare. Gallup polls, questionnaires, the output of propaganda agencies and paid lobbies, even if they form a pile as high as the Rockies, don't create a single principle; they are no part of the American system of constitutional government. No line in the Constitution requires a Congressman to read the Gallup reports, or to take his own polls, or to listen to the spokesmen hired to testify before congressional committees on behalf of antiunion forces. A Congressman is elected to act for the people, and his most solemn duty is to satisfy his own conscience that any vote he casts is in their interest. If he wants to study arguments for and against any proposal, in order to inform himself, he shows that he is wise; but if he accepts the conclusions spelled out for him by those who argue for the current shackle-labor projects, he cannot escape having his sincerity or his power of discernment brought into question.

Yes; the public disliked the strikes which caused widespread inconvenience or hardship. Yes; there was plenty of growling that something should be done about them. The NAM gaily and glibly translates this feeling into a public demand that labor unions be weakened, labor leaders be deprived of power, the workers be stripped of the rights in which they are now protected by the Wagner Act. That is, the NAM sets up, without any proof whatever, the premise that the strikes were caused by the strength of the unions, the power of the union leaders, and the Wagner Act; whereas the strikes originated directly in the killing of price control and the refusal of employers to grant wage increases to meet the jump in the cost of living. The do-something mandate could far more reasonably be interpreted as calling for reestablishment of the OPA; that would be the obvious way to serve the public as a whole and to make strikes unnecessary. To attempt to shackle labor while leaving workers and the rest of the people exposed to exploitation by price profiteering is the rankest sort of injustice.

As to the polls and questionnaires; they are utterly worthless, since they asked stupid and misleading questions. A question suggesting a change in public policy should always state the alternative, and the whole thing can be put thus: "Do you favor depriving labor of the rights it is now guaranteed and thereby returning to the conditions that existed before 1932?" "Do you think strikes are worse than bread lines?" "Which year would you rather see repeated—1946, with all its labor disturbances, its record profits for industry, its high income for workers, and its widespread prosperity, or 1931, with its closed banks, its soup kitchens, its idle millions? The former had strong unions, powerful labor leaders and the Wagner Act; in 1931 there was no labor movement to speak of and no Wagner Act."

The alternatives make only one answer possible. And Congressmen who are reckless enough to vote the country back into pre-Wagner Act conditions can't expect the public to be satisfied with any claims that the NAM and Mr. Gallup told them it would be all right.

THREE-QUARTERS

One must admire the frankness of Senator TAFT's admission that the version of the antilabor legislation in the Senate which he is supporting represents about three-quarters of the matters "pressed on us very strenuously by employers." But such subservience to special interests cannot be admired.

SIDETRACKED

While Congress is consuming time and rousing bitterness on an ill-advised and totally unnecessary antilabor bill, legislation essential to the national welfare is languishing. This includes the appropriation to carry on some of the relief work abroad, formerly administered by the soon-to-expire UNRRA; the bill extending rent control; the long-range national housing bill (of which Senator TAFT is one of the sponsors); the national fair employment practices bill; the Federal aid to education bill. Some of these, it is now apparent, will not get the attention of Congress at this session at all.

A peculiar sense of values seems to prevail.

Increased Compensation for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss briefly the bill which I have introduced last week for the purpose of providing additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. I am sure that almost everyone will agree that the wage scales for Federal employees are entirely too low and that a wage adjustment is long overdue.

As you know, the basic law establishing wage and salary scales for Federal workers in the departmental and field services is the Classification Act of 1923. This act set the wage rates for all Federal employees with the exception of: (1) employees in the field service of the Post Office Department whose pay rates are fixed by Congress under separate laws; and (2) per diem workers in the navy yards, arsenals, and other industrial establishments whose pay rates are adjusted from time to time by wage boards or other administrative agencies.

Under the Classification Act of 1923, the median annual salary for Federal employees in 1941 was $1,620—the salary rate of a grade 3 clerk (CAF–3). The median annual salary for postal employees for the same year was $1,902. During the war Federal employees, including postal employees, received some wage increases. The Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 granted a 17-percent increase to Federal employees, and another increase was granted by Congress in 1946. The effect of these two increases brought the median average salary for Federal employees from the prewar level of $1,620 up to $2,168 per year. During the same war period, postal workers were granted increases which brought their median average salary up to approximately $2,700 per year.

Thus the total salary increase for the average Federal employee since prior to the war has been about $584—a 33.8-percent increase. During the same wartime period, the salary of the average postal worker was increased by about $800 per year—an increase of 42 percent.

Although such increases appear substantial, they were not sufficient to maintain the real wages of Federal employees against the rising cost of living. Neither did they correspond to the increase in wage levels in industry. I maintain that the Federal and postal employees should be given a wage increase at this time for the following economic reasons:

First. The cost of living has increased by 56 percent since 1939 while the salaries of Federal and postal employees have increased by only 33.8 percent and 42 percent respectively. A salary increase of at least $500 per year for all Federal and postal employees is necessary to bring wages in line with the increase in the cost of living and thus maintain the real wages and living standards of the employees of the Federal Government.

Second. Federal salaries must be adjusted upward in order to bring Government wage policy into balance with wage policies in industry. During the period that Federal employees were obtaining a 33.8-percent wage increase and the postal employees a 42-percent increase, wages in manufacturing industries were going up by approximately 76 percent. Wage increases in durable goods industries amounted to 61 percent for the same period. Moreover, the wage pattern for industry which is developing indicates that industrial workers are to realize another 15-percent increase during the next few weeks. Thus it seems that a salary increase for the employees of the Federal Government is necessary to provide equity and justice to the workers in the Federal services.

And third, an increase in Federal wage rates is in keeping with a sound Government program of full employment and prosperity. Let me remind you that business prosperity is dependent upon the maintenance of adequate purchasing power in the hands of the great majority of the people. To permit this volume of purchasing power to fall makes depression inevitable. To combat this danger it becomes mandatory to maintain wage levels to insure the purchasing power necessary to purchase the goods produced by industry. Thus the proposal to raise Federal salaries is based on sound economics, and is part of a policy of full employment and prosperity.

The bill that I have introduced is designed to provide the increase in the

salaries of Federal employees by granting a cost-of-living bonus of $500 per year to all Federal and postal employees. I feel that such an increase is most necessary in the light of the increased cost of living, the wage levels in industry, and the urgent need to maintain real wages and mass purchasing power. In justice to the thousands of people who are making a career of Government service, I feel that this proposal deserves serious consideration by the Congress.

Living in Dreamland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 6, 1947:

LIVING IN DREAMLAND

One sure road to a mood of utter discouragement is to pick up a newspaper and read these words from the House Appropriations Committee: "Our forebears planted on this soil the seed of liberty and freedom which, if properly nurtured, should outgrow our boundaries and reach out into the rest of the world, not through a centralized disseminating agency but through the force of its own dynamics."

Having delivered themselves of this, the committee members proceeded to kill the $31,000,000 appropriation for the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. Henceforth, so far as the committee is concerned, there will be no voice to carry the American story to those areas of the world where communism, with its propaganda of lies and distortions, is seeking to discredit and destroy democracy. The field would be left to the hostile philosophy, and if perchance the seed of liberty and freedom should not be able to reach out into the rest of the world through the force of its own dynamics it need expect no help from the Appropriations Committee.

This action has been taken in the face of an urgent plea in behalf of the program by Secretary of State Marshall and its vigorous indorsement by Lieutenant General Smith, our Ambassador to Russia. The country looks to these men, particularly to General Marshall, to lead us in this struggle with communism which will shape the future of the world. Presumably the country has confidence in General Marshall and his judgment. But the members of the committee, on the basis of an argument which would not carry weight with a school child, deprive him of a tool which he considers essential for the job. And this to save the relatively insignificant sum of $31,000,000.

These committee members are living in a dream world. If their words can be taken at face value, they are in the grip of an illusion which will lead us straight to disaster. Democracy cannot win this battle with pious hopes or platitudes. It is not enough to wait for some miracle that will get our story out into the world. We should do everything in our power to make certain that it gets there, and this program is one means to that end. The Senate most certainly should restore the necessary funds.

Civil Government in Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter by Mr. Richard H. Wels, as printed in the New York Times under date of May 13, 1947, concerning civil government in Guam:

CIVIL GOVERNMENT IN GUAM—HEARINGS SAID TO GIVE OPPORTUNITY FOR GUAMANIANS TO PRESENT CASE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Chairman FRED L. CRAWFORD of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Possessions of the House Public Lands Committee has scheduled hearings before his committee on the various bills which have been introduced in Congress with respect to Guam. The hearings will commence probably late this month.

The treaty of peace with Spain, which was entered into by the United States in 1898 and which was the instrument which brought Guam under the American flag, provided that "The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the Territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by Congress." Until July of 1946—some 48 years later—when Representative ROBERT A. GRANT, of Indiana, introduced a bill to make the Guamanians American citizens and to give them some form of democratic self-government, not a single step had been taken by Congress to redeem the obligations which had been assumed by the United States under solemn treaty.

The hearings which have been scheduled by Representative CRAWFORD will provide the first opportunity that the citizens of Guam have had to present their case to Congress and the American people. The committee will examine the merits of H. R. 3044, introduced by Representative GRANT, and H. R. 2753, introduced by Representative NORRIS POULSON, of California. Either bill would remedy the neglect and injustice which the Guamanians have sustained for half a century.

It is to be hoped that the State and Navy Departments will present recommendations to the committee consistent with the provisions of the United Nations Charter which specify that "Nations which have responsibilities for the administration of Territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these Territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost * * * the well-being of the inhabitants of those Territories, and, to this end: I, to insure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, and their protection against abuses; second, to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each Territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement."

RICHARD H. WELS.

NEW YORK, *May 12, 1947*.

An Open Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I place in the RECORD the following open letter I have written to President Truman:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 10, 1947*.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish you might have heard the debate in the House of Representatives on the bill to extend aid to Greece and Turkey. The printed RECORD can never convey the intensity of feeling that accompanied the words as Members voiced their deepest convictions about their country and the world picture.

Presiding as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the bill, I had an unusual opportunity to hear each word spoken during the 4 days and to observe how it was said and how it was received. And because the issues do run to the very existence of our country as a Nation and to the existence of a stable society in the world, I am venturing to write you about it. I do so in the sincere hope that it will prevent any misinterpretation of the rejection of practically all amendments and the very heavy majority on final passage.

1. There was no comfort for communism as a doctrine in the United States. The House froze when one Member (KERSTEN of Wisconsin) told that a group of Communists called on him that last morning to oppose the bill and, in response to his questions, admitted that if the issue arose, they would have to follow Moscow rather than the United States. And, it should be kept in mind that of those who did vote against final passage, many were men who have been most outspoken for years in their opposition to communism.

2. Very, very few spoke of the bill with enthusiasm. Support was reluctant. Argument was not "We like to do this" but rather "We have to do this." The situation was regarded as an accomplished fact. You had spoken to the world. The Senate had acted. At least 75 Members, I judge, would have voted against final passage, myself included, had it not been that we thought it would be like pulling the rug out from under you or Secretary of State Marshall in the positions you had taken at Moscow and would of necessity take until settlement is reached of many problems affecting the peace of the world today.

3. Even so, the bill would have had rougher sledding except for two provisions: (1) the condition that the aid to Greece and Turkey be "upon request of their governments" and (2) that the program will be stopped whenever the United Nations says that "the continuance of such assistance is unnecessary or undesirable" with respect to which finding the United States waives its veto power (the so-called Vandenberg amendment).

In other words, the House of Representatives in my opinion does not want to by-pass or weaken the United Nations. We, and the country, are committed to the idea of collective security. We do not want small nations used as pawns in a balance of big powers or even bolstered internally, without their consent. We believe that the only lasting peace rests upon government by consent of the governed.

4. Some Members were impressed by the talk about oil reserves in the Middle East.

I was not. The Secretary of the Interior tells me that the lignite fields of Montana, North Dakota and South Dakota offer a reserve of 530,000,000,000, barrels of synthetic gasoline as compared with proven reserves of 21,000,000,000 barrels of crude petroleum in the entire United States. (Middle East 13 to 18 billion.) The Bureau of Mines says German processes with brown coals make these reserves competitive with oil at $1.50 per barrel. Oil shales and waste coals increase this. More research and large-scale production will cut costs. It is clear we can lick our fuel problem a lot cheaper than by policing the Mediterranean and the Middle East.

5. A handful may have supported the measure as a step toward an inevitable war, but many times more opposed it on the ground that it would lead to war. Practically all who spoke on that point either said it would lead to war or was the only alternative. I do not think anyone could have heard the entire debate and have the idea that the Representatives believe the American people are ready for war or want it.

If this program leads to war and devastation and destruction sweep the earth and the seas and the air, as they would from what we call modern weapons, would the despair that followed mean more or less communism in the world? If the United States somehow survived, what would be the condition of our factories, our cities, our homes, our families, our form of government? And if this program leads us into World War III will those who administer it escape responsibility?

That places a very heavy burden upon you, as everyone must realize. The President determines when assistance should be supplied and where and how, under the terms of the act. And that is why I have ventured to write you this background of the passage in the House as I saw it.

6. And finally, may I say that I think the adoption of this program must be regarded as merely a stop-gap. The people of the United States are weary of government by crisis. Every man must realize that no country, ours or any other, is wise enough or rich enough or just plain big enough to run the rest of the world.

We must find a way for nations to live and let live. The bill to aid Greece and Turkey was passed by the House of Representatives, as nearly as I can sum it up, in the hope that it might give you a little help and a little time to get that job on its way.

Men spoke of their convictions during the debate as the result of "prayer at home alone." I think the bill was passed in that mood.

Earnestly and respectfully,

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative in Congress,
Second South Dakota District.

Adequate Funds for Antitrust Division Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that I have spoken in opposition to what I consider to be the short-sighted and irresponsible slashing of the budget. Such appropriation cuts which eliminate essential public services beneficial to the people, however, have no relationship to real government economy. Such a "penny-wise and pound-foolish" policy is one of false economy, and is just as detrimental to the national welfare as the reckless squandering of public funds.

In the time I am allotted it is impossible to survey all the items in this appropriation bill (H. R. 3311), and point out the many instances where there has been sacrified the well-being of the people and the interests of the Nation. I would, however, like to mention a few items in this bill which represent flagrant violations of the principles of sound public finance.

I have noticed that the Appropriations Committee has slashed $32,500,000 off the Budget Bureau's recommendations regarding the appropriation for the Federal-aid airport program. As my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY] pointed out on Tuesday, the effect of this cut will be felt in every State in the Union; hundreds of Federal airport projects must be discarded. In my State of Minnesota this appropriation reduction will mean that the proposed Federal airport projects at Duluth, Bemidji, Rochester, and Alexandria must be eliminated completely, and the Minneapolis project must be reduced by $375,000. Such a drastic slash will be a severe blow to our aviation industry and will tend to retard progress in the field of aviation.

Another glaring example of this short-sighted policy is found in the failure of the Appropriations Committee to give adequate funds to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. It is true that the committee's estimate is only $100,000 below the recommendations of the Budget Bureau. But it is also true that the Antitrust Division has always been understaffed and short of funds. Year after year this Division has been starved to death for lack of funds, while the task for which it is responsible—the checking of monopolies—has been getting bigger and bigger.

Let me remind the Members of the House that broad changes are taking place in the economic structure of the United States. The economic pattern of our society is changing, and this change is marked by the long-continued trend toward the concentration of economic power in the hands of fewer and larger corporations. This fact is borne out by the report of the Temporary National Economic Committee, and the 1946 report of the Kefauver committee. In this last report entitled "The United States Versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly," the following conclusions are set forth:

First. That 250 great corporations and trusts now hold approximately two-thirds of the Nation's usable manufacturing facilities.

Second. That the 250 largest corporations now have control of 70 percent of the new publicly financed war facilities.

Third. That eight banking houses now control 106 of the 200 largest corporations—the Du Pont, Mellon, and Rockefeller families alone control 11 percent of the 200 largest corporations.

Fourth. That this growth of economic concentration is slowly driving small business enterprises out of business; some 500,000 small businesses folded up during the war, and today there are 160,000 fewer small business units than in 1941.

In other words, the degree of concentration of economic power is fast approaching the point where the control of American economic life will be vested in the hands of a very few industrial giants and trusts. The effect of this monopolization of American industry is far-reaching and detrimental to the public welfare. As the committee report demonstrated:

First. Monopoly has meant high prices. In one case a company reduced the life of lamp bulbs and discouraged testing. Prices fall less in concentrated than in competitive industries. For example, from 1929 to 1932, prices fell only 4 percent on aluminum, a field in which the entire output was controlled by a single company. Prices in the highly competitive lumber industry dropped 36 percent.

Second. Monopoly has suppressed new products and restricted production. For instance, the introduction of fluorescent light bulbs was delayed because they would reduce the consumption of electricity. Similarly, the development of synthetic rubber was blocked before the war.

Third. Monopoly agreements with foreign cartels have interfered with United States trade. The report points a finger directly at three Federal Government agencies for promoting the growth of economic concentration, and indirectly at the Bureau of the Budget for starving the antitrust forces for funds.

The evils of monopoly control, however, are not limited to monopoly pricing, the exploitation of the consumer public, and the restriction of production. The growth of monopoly is a serious threat to our free enterprise system. As the industrial giants grow bigger, the area of business competition becomes smaller. Such competition is a basic principle of our free enterprise system, and to restrict said competition is to undermine the system. Our economic system can stand only so much of this sort of thing. Unless we act vigorously to prevent the great corporations and chain stores from crushing the life out of small business enterprises in America, our competitive system will surely be destroyed.

Yet what is the Government doing to check this trend toward industrial monopoly? The Sherman Act has been on the books since 1890, but only lip-service has been given to it. The law has remained a dead letter most of the time for the simple reason that the Antitrust Division has never had sufficient funds to maintain a staff needed to enforce the law.

On April 1, 1947, the total staff of the Antitrust Division consisted of only 333 persons, of which 143 were functioning as field units. About 190 lawyers

are employed along with 20 economists and experts. The remainder of the staff consists of clerical help.

It is obvious that such a small staff is unable to check the growth of industrial monopoly. The Antitrust Division receives, on the average, about 650 written complaints a year. Due to the lack of personnel, only about 50 cases are instituted a year—a ratio of 1 case to 13 complaints. There can be no doubt that there are many well-founded cases among the 600 regarding which no action is taken.

I am convinced that the Congress should be more liberal in making appropriations for the enforcement of the Sherman Act. I might say that during the last 6 years the Division has paid into the Treasury just under half of its own cost of operation in annual fines collected. But this is neither here nor there. In the face of this monopoly threat to our free enterprise system, the cost of enforcement of the Sherman Act is cheap at any price. Let us give the Antitrust Division the funds necessary to do its job and do it well.

East European Nations Desire Ties With West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, writing in the New York Times of Sunday, May 11, throws some light on the involved conditions in the neighboring countries of Russia, and particularly those countries which found themselves under the direct influence of the Russian Government.

There is evidence that these people, despite their geographical location, are kindly disposed toward western Europe and toward some of the philosophies as expressed by the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article written by Mr. C. L. Sulzberger in the Sunday, May 11, New York Times:

EAST EUROPEAN NATIONS DESIRE TIES WITH WEST—CZECHS AND POLES, THOUGH LEFTIST, HOPE TO RESTORE NEEDED TRADE

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PRAGUE, May 10.—That the United States and the Soviet Union should not be getting on as well as they ought to be is awkward, nerve-racking, and costly to the hundreds of millions of citizens of those two nations. But it is a positive tragedy to central and eastern European countries which lie along Europe's broken backbone.

These are the lands which traditionally suffer most when the continental equilibrium—and now global equilibrium—is upset. They are almost inevitably the first to be invaded and occupied in times of war. They are the last to be liberated. They can recover—and indeed exist—only in times of harmony. Since no such harmony has yet been established, they are miserable.

Poland and Czechoslovakia typify this unhappy condition. In each of these countries, geographical facts (their position between Russia and Germany) now force them to depend for their security upon Soviet Russia. But their traditions, culture, and trade have always looked westward rather than eastward. Now they are definitely under the Soviet wing and cut off from western Europe by an occupied, disorganized Germany which effectively serves as a barrier to keep them within the Muscovite orbit.

SOVIET RUSSIA UNPOPULAR

Outside of the ranks of the large Communist parties founded in the western Slavic states—Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia—Soviet Russia is definitely not popular.

One can hear all kinds of sarcastic political jokes muttered in bourgeois Prague or the shattered cafes of Warsaw. For example this from Prague:

Question: "Why do Russian dentists extract teeth through the nose?"

Answer: "Because nobody in the Soviet Union is allowed to open his mouth."

Or this from Warsaw:

Question: "What is the largest country in the world?"

Answer: "Poland. Its western frontier is on the Oder and the Neisse. Its capital is in Moscow. And most of its population is in Siberia."

Whether these people like it or not, geographical facts and great power deals have placed them in a position where it is difficult to see how they could have, at this moment, governments very different from those in office and foreign policies other than those they have adopted. That is not to say that these western Slav states are exactly similar in a political sense. Such is not the case.

The trend toward Marxist socialism is unmistakable in all these lands, and with it, a vastly increased reliance upon the great Slavic socialistic mother, Russia. But in Yugoslavia, where tough, independent-minded and politically immature peasants are essentially against any government, the revolution is being beaten into their reluctant brains and bodies.

In Poland, whose history of partitions, shifting frontiers and a prewar medieval, feudal land system made it a special case, the installation of socialism (although it has brought certain definite benefits to the people) is bitterly resented by a population prepared to hate anything Russian. The Catholic clergy's comments on Marxism add a sharp, strong flavor. Firmly as it is at present in the saddle, the Warsaw Government is detested.

CZECH SITUATION

In Czechoslovakia, socialism is coming about in a thoroughly bourgeois way. The Czechs are cast in what might be called a Platonically idealistic middle-class mold. Even the boss of their Communist Party looks and talks like the president of a rural agricultural bank. Socialism by evolution and not by revolution seems to be the motto of most politicians in Prague today, all the way from wily little Edouard Benes to the presidium of the Communist Party.

As a result, now that the normal legal system of trial by jury has been restored and it has been announced that there will be no further nationalizations for a long time to come, Czechoslovakia has more stability and more industrial and economic promise than either of the two other western Slavic lands.

But communism is having its troubles. These are based more on economic factors than on the dislike of governmental ideology which is deeply rooted in the landholding peasants of Poland, Yugoslavia, and Slovakia and the merchants and businessmen of Bohemia. The reason for this is that so far the Soviet Union has little to offer these cousins in the way of trade, and prosperity goes a long way toward swinging political sentiment.

Both Yugoslavia and Poland specialize in the export of raw materials—grain or coal, grapes, meat, etc. Czechoslovakia, with a more industrialized economy, thrives normally on the extensive trade of manufactured goods and special products.

Before the war—even before the advent of nazism—all three economies were linked closely to Germany and to the western nations. For example, only 3 percent of Czechoslovakia's prewar commerce was with Russia.

GERMAN ECONOMY

Now German economy is, of course, smashed. Western lands are wary of investing any money in countries where the nationalization bug is rampant and they are seeking elsewhere for markets.

The Soviet Union, sorely shattered and scarred by the war, needs everything central and eastern Europe can produce for it—either raw materials or finished goods. But so far it has little exchange. The governments of central Europe find they are building up sizable balances in the Soviet Union, but they are not getting anything like what they would want in the form of either of goods or free currency in exchange for their exports eastward.

That this situation will someday change is certain. Not only will the Soviet Union no longer require the same amounts of raw materials when its recovery has advanced—because its own economy produces these—but gradually it will be able to sell more and possibly better goods abroad.

But that will take a long time. What central European economists devoutly hope for is the reestablishment of better diplomatic relations between the East and West so that with a decrease of Occidental mistrust of the "iron curtain" region there will be an increase in markets.

Actually, the term "iron curtain" is a most inept one. In none of eastern Europe's lands is freedom as the Occident knows it so stifled as in the U. S. S. R. itself. The Yugoslav regime is probably roughest on the individual rights of any western Slavic land.

LACK OF CENSORSHIP

Incidentally, in contrast with the U. S. S. R., in none of those three countries is there censorship of foreign correspondents, although one feels an unfriendly reporter would not be permitted to remain forever in Yugoslavia. What, especially in Czechoslovakia and Poland, is hoped may develop when friendlier relationships are eventually established between Washington and Moscow, is a new type of European socialism. It would someday be sufficiently solidified to serve as a political and economic bridge between the strikingly different systems of the American and Russian continental masses—Eurasia being distinct from Europe.

There were many political philosophers before the last war who saw a chance of such a bridge—not a buffer—being created in eastern Europe. But these trends are now dead. The U. S. S. R. vigorously stamped out the independent peasant movement of the Balkans and is operating strongly on what is left of it in Poland.

BENES' VIEWS

Yet men like Benes think that the bridge can be created anyway on the basis of a socialism which would probably have more in common with that of London than of Moscow, even if it had to look for its political security to the latter. They envision the day when all of the Continent and not just eastern Europe could serve as such a bridge between the U. S. S. R. and the United States.

But those thoughts are for the future. Nothing so independent can be developed until the world's two great powers get friendlier. And in the interim this part of the world is nervous, unhappy, and worried lest its pocketbook get filled with wooden nickels made in the U. S. S. R.

Belated Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it was the poet Longfellow who sang:

Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small;
Though with patience He stands waiting, with exactness grinds He all.

No poet has ever spoken more truly, and the truth was evidenced in the fullest measure when the Congress passed the bill to restore the immortal name of Hoover to the great dam that impounds the mighty Colorado. Of those who partook in the ignoble conspiracy to belittle a great man, only a chattering old misanthrope remains, the others having gone to their reward, whatever that may be.

It has remained for the Columnist George E. Sokolsky to review the history of that discreditable episode in a manner that throws full light upon Mr. Hoover and his traducers. The article follows:

HOOVER DAM

(By George E. Sokolsky)

To a Quaker, personal honors can mean very little, for their way of life abhors the swelling of the individual's ego to an assumption of immortality because of public services. Yet it is nice to be remembered and it is warming to know that one's contemporaries seek for means to acknowledge one's worth.

And curiously in such matters Harry Truman is a nobler personality than his predecessor. Harry Truman is a good sport, a gentleman. He never went to Groton, but he undoubtedly learned at his mother's knee that vindictiveness and malice are not Christian traits. And so he signed the bill restoring Hoover Dam to its original name. It is not a world-curdling act. It is nothing that will make Herbert Hoover a greater man than he is. It will not make the dam more useful. But it is a nice and decent thing to do—a gesture in manners to which the truly well-mannered respond automatically. Harry Truman's mother must be a fine American woman: her son's normal responses are so wholesome.

The most important part of the program at the big dinner at the newspaper convention in New York a week ago was hardly noted in the press. Apparently the working reporters were too concerned with mimeographed hand-outs of a poor speech to catch the flavor of high drama. Yet it was there in a spontaneous tribute paid to Herbert Hoover—so spontaneous that he could not and did not respond to it except in an expression on his face that might have been the struggle to withhold a tear.

Mr. Hoover has been damned and blasted more than any contemporary in the most venomous smear campaign ever devised to pillory one individual for decades of economic fallacy for which he was not and could not be responsible. He did not make World War I and therefore could not have arranged the course of events which were born in it and have grown into such lusty demons in our age. The newspapers of this country have, in these many years since 1929, not been very kind to Mr. Hoover. Many of them have often blamed him for conduct which they excused in others. He became the whipping boy of a nation and whoever sought someone to lick, hit out at him. He has taken all that in his stride without malice, without fear, without ever bearing a grudge.

Yet, in his seventy-third year, he was presented to these assembled publishers and their friends and they rose and cheered him as the ballroom of the Waldorf Astoria had never heard cheers. And when the chairman suggested that they break their custom of toasting only the President of the United States, they toasted Mr. Hoover not as an ex-President, not as a partisan politician, not as a retired oldster but as a beloved servitor of his country and of mankind; as one who has, in his old age, traveled the world at the sacrifice of his health, to find a way to restore food and work and a modicum of happiness to the weary and heavy-laden.

And so it will again be Hoover Dam, God's water will flow over the dam into the valleys that it enriches and none of the little children playing in the fields and meadows will ever realize the deep hurt of having a name erased, even if it is later restored. Nor will they realize that there were once men in America who took history by the forelock and tried to assure themselves immortality by belittling their peers.

But history has its own way of determining where greatness truly is. And it takes its own time to weigh in the balance the virtues that are eternal These virtues are never in words or voice or beauty of person nor even in the acclaim of the moment. The sustaining virtues of history are always measured by the accomplishment of an individual in his services for bettering the life of his fellowmen. In that realm, Herbert Hoover stands a colossus in our age.

Crisis in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles:

CRISIS IN ITALY—PROBLEM FOR AMERICAN HELP

(By Sumner Welles)

Democracy is in grave danger in Italy. Unless remedial action is soon forthcoming, it may not survive.

The Christian Democrats are steadily losing ground. Charges of personal corruption have been brought against some of their leaders. But their loss of popular support is primarily due to Prime Minister de Gasperi's inability to better economic conditions or to lighten Italy's peace terms.

The left wing of the Socialist Party headed by Pietro Nenni has become a submissive captive of the Communists. Saragat's right-wing Socialists have failed since their break with Nenni to give any effective support to the Democrats in the Cabinet.

The influence of the Communist Party has simultaneously been growing rapidly.

Every Government department has its quota of Communists. Count Sforza, the Foreign Minister, nominally controls a foreign office whose administration is centered in the hands of a Communist undersecretary, Beale. The lion's share of patronage has been taken by the Communists. Their representatives occupy key positions throughout Italy.

The Communist Party is the only political organization which is well financed. It is in possession of Mussolini's secret deposits; of the loot seized by Italian Partisans during the final period of the German occupation, and of the Italian lire taken by Yugoslav Communists and now being sent back across the frontier. High officials of the Italian Government maintain that large sums also come directly from Moscow.

The Communist Party leader Togliatti is one of western Europe's shrewdest politicians. His party is well organized and increasingly well disciplined. In recent elections in Sicily, traditionally a conservative stronghold, the Communist campaign was lavishly financed. The propaganda was highly effective. The results were conclusive.

In Italy's greater cities, such as Genoa, Milan, Turin, and Florence, Communist headquarters have large quantities of arms at their disposal. It is not only a question of rifles and hand grenades. It is a question of machine guns and tanks. The National Government is practically helpless. It would be helpless in any concerted uprising, and such an uprising is today feasible. The police forces are replete with former Fascists who have now, like most of Mussolini's minor officials, gone over to the Communist Party. Only the carabinieri could be counted upon in a national emergency, and these, scattered throughout the country, number barely 65,000.

As the recent demonstration proved, the Communists can by a general strike shut down all industrial production and cut off all means of communication.

Since the announcement of the American policy of help to Greece and Turkey, the Soviet Union has been working overtime in Italy. If Italy becomes a Russian satellite, the independence of Greece, and presumably that of Turkey, would be doomed.

The French Communists would for the first time be able to count upon the cooperation of a neighboring government. The whole status of the Mediterranean would be radically transformed.

If conditions within Italy are permitted to drift further, the United States will be confronted with the most serious dilemma that it has faced since the end of the war.

The Democrats who still ostensibly control Italy's Government cannot counteract the impact of Communist money, pressure, and propaganda upon an impoverished, hopeless, and resentful population unless they are given material as well as moral support. If they are to preserve a liberal Italian democracy, such asistance must come from the United States.

Italy's agricultural exports to Central Europe represented 40 percent of her foreign trade. Those markets are now closed. She can no longer obtain in return German coal for her industry. The balance of the foreign exchange upon which Italy depended to pay for her imports of food and raw materials came from the tourist trade, from emigrants' remittances, and from her merchant shipping. All of these are drastically curtailed. Italy's national deficit next year will be at least half a billion dollars. And Italy will have neither foreign resources nor credit.

The relief which the Italians received from UNRRA is ended. Unless the United States is able to provide Italy with at least $120,000,000 of relief during the balance of this year, hunger and want will be acute. Communism will increase proportionately. Yet this is the moment the House has chosen to cut to $200,000,000 the $350,000,000 appropriated by the Senate for foreign relief. Unless the earlier amount is restored in conference, Italy cannot obtain the minimum amount required if increased popular unrest is to be averted.

The negotiations for an Export-Import Bank credit of $100,000,000 still drag on.

This credit would be devoted to such productive and self-liquidating projects as hydroelectric plants and new industrial enterprises. The use of this credit would consequently reduce unemployment and raise living standards.

If such help as this were immediately forthcoming, the hands of the democratic leaders would be strengthened, and popular confidence in the value of Italy's traditional ties with the West would be increased.

But what is equally imperative, especially if the pending peace treaty is ratified, is the categorical declaration by this Government that it cannot be indifferent to the fate of Italy, and that it will render the Italian people and their present government such assistance as may be needed to arrest all attempts to impose an alien political system upon the Italians against their will.

American foreign policy has rarely been more shortsighted and inefficient than in our course toward Italy since 1943. It has been a classic example of "too little and too late." But there is still a chance to prevent a sequence of events that may well end in major calamity if this Government now takes prompt and vigorous action.

The future of democracy in Europe is to no small extent contingent upon the fate of Italy. And the future of the United States is to no small extent contingent upon the fate of European democracy.

Guam and Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Harold L. Ickes on the subject of Guam and Samoa, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 14:

MAN TO MAN—CONGRESS SHOULD ASCERTAIN REAL FACTS AS TO GUAM AND SAMOA, WRITER HOLDS

(By Harold L. Ickes)

Secretary of the Navy Forrestal has had no luck in selecting expert whitewashers to put a smooth coat on the arbitrary rule that the Navy has imposed upon Guam and American Samoa for almost 50 years. First, he carefully selected a group of Washington newspaper correspondents to whom the Navy gave a free ride and exceptional entertainment all the way to these Pacific islands. But there was not a whitewash brush in the lot. Then he tried again, with a commission consisting of Dr. Ernest M. Hopkins, chairman; former Governor Tobin, of Massachusetts, and Dr. Knowles A. Ryerson.

This commission was liberal enough with its whitewash, but the effect was patchy and dauby, too thick in some places and not thick enough in others. It was one of the most self-revealing jobs of its kind that the writer has ever seen. The report was just too good to be true and not true enough to be good.

For instance, Secretary Forrestal's committee said: "Nowhere did our committee find any expression of desire to be removed from under the auspices of the Navy but on the contrary, whenever discussion of the matter came up, apprehension was expressed as to whether from any other department than the Navy, services so vital to them as those in their possession could be afforded."

CHALLENGES REPORT

The committee must have been more than circumspect not to find a single Guamanian who wanted to slough off the petty tyranny of the naval governors. Secretary Forrestal himself could have shown the members of the committee petitions unanimously adopted by the Guamanian Congress asking for citizenship and a bill of rights. None of the newspaper correspondents brought back such a story from Guam, and Representative POULSON, of California, who himself has visited the island, came back with an entirely different impression.

It simply is not true, as this language would seem to imply, that no Guamanian desires the ordinary freedoms that are the natural heritage of freemen. I challenge this statement and its deliberate implication as not being true within the customary and usual interpretations of the English langauge.

One learns also from this report that Guam and Samoa have civil government "basically under the control of the local people themselves and of (Guamanian) congress." This congress lacks all powers except to give advice. There can be no local civil government when the people are subject to arbitrary arrest and trial before a naval tribunal without a jury. People do not govern themselves when their homes can be entered and searched without a warrant and their property seized at will.

The committee further reports that "government does not cease to be civil government in the true sense of the term merely because the executive head and some of his assistants may sometimes wear a military uniform and be responsible to a department of the executive branch of our National Government which is primarily concerned with our national security and defense." In other words, the Navy is not military merely because its personnel wear uniforms and an administrative officer in a naval uniform is not a Navy man if, in his closet, perhaps back on the mainland, he possesses a civilian suit which he may occasionally wear. The committee is not on solid ground when it distorts or attempts to explain away incontrovertible facts.

PLEDGES VIOLATED

The United States has continuously violated pledges made to and accepted in good faith by its wards in Guam and Samoa. These subject peoples do not have even a vestige of a bill of rights. The tenets of the American Bill of Rights have been violated wilfully and persistently. These peoples have been dened due process of law. The Navy doubtless thinks that its rule in these islands has been beneficent, but it has violated every principle of democracy.

It is to be wondered whether Secretary Forrestal's committee, or the Secretary himself, has ever read the report of the joint committee under the chairmanship of former Senator Bingham, of Connecticut, which found, in 1930, on investigating conditions in American Samoa, that the rights of the American Samoans had been ignored and trampled upon by the Navy. That committee, set up by Congress, recommended full citizenship and an organic act, including a bill of rights.

Secretary Forrestal should be rebuked by Congress for arrogating to himself rights that belong to the Congress and constitute a congressional duty. Out of what funds were the expenses of this handpicked committee paid? Whether or not he could properly pay them out of public funds, Secretary Forrestal of the Navy could, with propriety, select an outside committee to investigate a Navy operation and pass upon charges that have been made against him, or his Department. The Congress should ascertain the real facts as to Guam and American Samoa.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I commend for your reading the following editorial from the New Orleans Item which in simple and direct language presents a clear analysis of the situation as it obtains in connection with necessary remedial labor and management legislation. May I add an appendix to this splendid editorial: "These are my sentiments."

LABOR BILL VETO

It is worth noting that those who most vehemently warn their fellows in Congress that the President will veto either of the pending labor bills—one the product of the House, the other of the Senate—are those who themselves have voted or will vote against them on the floor. They may have some sort of warrant for their predictions, or these may be wholly wishful. But the only source from which a statement as to the President's intentions could come with complete authority has been and still is silent on the subject. That is the President himself.

Of the two measures, the bill which was passed in the House is the more severe. It received a majority far in excess of that needed to override a Presidential veto. The almost innocuous measure reported to the Senate by its Labor Committee was promptly "toughened," as many knew it would be. Again the majorities were sufficient to override a veto, but the margin was slender, leaving room for the possibility that enough party-line votes could change to maintain Executive nullification of the measure.

Mr. Truman would doubtless like to keep Congress under the impression that he will veto the bill, so that the legislators might save him the undeniable embarrassment of having to do so, if it comes to that. But he has been careful not to let any White House spokesman say anything that could be interpreted as an official announcement, one way or another.

There can be no doubt, however, that the overwhelming majority of the American people wants reasonable but effective legislation enacted to curb those who might seek to return the country to the big labor excesses of 1946, which crippled national production and preceded—if they did not actually initiate—the upward sweep of living costs. There is no desire to hamstring labor organizations as such by enacting punitive laws. But there is a very real, deep-rooted demand for sound protection of the public interest, which was the principal victim of last year's labor-management struggle.

If the final House-Senate conference labor bill is such a measure President Truman will be running counter to the will of the American majority in swinging a veto ax on it. He will be saying to the Nation, in effect, that the only way to assure the enactment of legislation banning abuses of the current Wagner Act by extremists among labor leaders is to make a change in the White House. And that isn't the way candidates for public office, from the Presidency to the village constable level, ordinarily act on the eve of an election.

Merger Bill and the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Marine Corps League Bulletin in May 1947:

ALVAREZ BLASTS MERGER BILL AT NATIONAL STAFF MEETING

National Commandant Joseph Alvarez, welcoming the members of the national staff to the opening session, let go with both barrels on S. 758, the present bill before Congress to bring about a unification of the armed forces. The text of the national commandant's speech follows:

"Speaking as national commandant of the Marine Corps League, and for our 45,000 members and as the only vocal representative of the 600,000 marine veterans of two world wars—

"We of the Marine Corps League have studied this bill (S. 758) and have compared it with last year's bill. We do not perceive any major differences between the two bills—either in the principles advocated or the organizations and procedures set up by these bills.

"Some say a super Secretary can do less harm than a super Chief of Staff. But at the rate at which members of the Army General Staff are taking off their uniforms and being appointed to civilian positions of great importance in our Government—I do not consider it improbable that the President will appoint another member of the General Staff to the position of Secretary of National Defense—and a change of clothes won't make a civilian out of him, as far as the marines are concerned.

"Secretary Forrestal has reversed his course 180 degrees from last year. He is now willing for the office of Secretary of the Navy to be put out of the President's Cabinet. He says he could still go over the head of the supersecretary, to the President. But how long do you think he would hold his job? And now compare the chance of the Commandant of the Marine Corps ever getting an opportunity to present his case before the President or before the Congress.

"We old-time marines have seen a long and continuing fight in which the Army General Staff has attempted to reduce the Marine Corps to the job of guarding ships and guarding navy yards, and we marine veterans have heard too many Army men boast about taking over the Marine Corps after the merger goes through, if it does.

"General Vandegrift has, in all his speeches during the past year, repeated his firm stand against a single supersecretary running the armed forces. After the way the Navy has reversed course, every marine veteran in the country has been looking forward to the time when the Commandant of the Marine Corps would have an opportunity to speak his mind before a committee of Congress.

"We have read, with great concern, newspaper reports of the committee hearings in which every Navy witness has recited his approval of the merger bill. We have been looking forward to the testimony of those two great exponents of air and amphibious warfare—Admiral Radford and Admiral Turner, but they have not been called.

"In spite of the Navy's failure to place the Commandant of the Marine Corps on its original list of witnesses, we have been expecting that some Senator or Congressman would call for his opinion of the present merger bill. Then the Commandant could step forward and tell the committee, foursquare as a blunt marine, and as a citizen of the United States, that S. 758 has, in camouflaged form, the same objectionable features as last year's bill, that this bill would put a military clique in position to dominate, in time of peace, the national defense policy and foreign policy of the United States. We believe, as citizens of a democracy and as marines, that the control of our national defense and foreign policy belongs, not to the military, but to civilians—to the Congress and to the people of the United States.

"Many of us old-timers can remember after World War I when Champ Clark and other leaders in Congress exposed the War Department's attempt to put over the same type of legislation that is now before the country. It looks to us like the same old Army game—trying to slip some legal phrases into the law that will enable the General Staff to exercise the President's war powers in time of peace—through the medium of Executive orders prepared and submitted for his signature.

"As for an amendment to the present merger bill that will protect the Marine Corps, there are still many Members of Congress who are friendly to the marines but who do not believe that the marines are in danger, and I have received letters from Congressmen who haven't had the opportunity to study the bill, and who have asked me to point out how the Marine Corps or the Fleet Marine Force could be reduced if the proposed legislation becomes law. They are also anxious for proof that the General Staff has any intention of meddling with present roles and missions of the Marine Corps.

"We have heard the Commandant of the Marine Corps refer, in his speeches, to certain secret documents which contain proof of the General Staff's intentions concerning the Marine Corps. If these documents can be brought before a committee there is no doubt but what the Congress would amend the present bill with a concise definition of the functions of the Marine Corps.

"However, any amendment that is flexible, as recommended by General Eisenhower, is flexible for one reason—for the ultimate destruction of the Fleet Marine Force. Any amendment that leaves any of the functions of the Marine Corps subject to Presidential discretion will leave the way open for the future ruination of the Marine Corps—through General Staff pressure.

"Ambitious Navy men, like Admiral Sherman, may consider it is safe to 'play ball' with the Army. We do not. It is becoming apparent that the Commandant of the Marine Corps and his 100,000 marines have been ordered to stand at ease. They will obey this order just as they have carried out other orders: 'Take Belleau Wood,' 'Take Tarawa,' 'Take Iwo Jima.'

"But their old buddies now in civilian life cannot be gagged. If the present merger bill, or any merger bill, does not set forth the roles and missions of the Marine Corps, free from all executive and administrative meddling the marine veterans of two world wars stand ready to carry on the fight, and if necessary, to the Halls of Congress."

Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview between Mr. Henry L. Nunn, a Milwaukee industrial leader, and Attorney David Keyser:

Mr. KEYSER. Mr. Nunn, your company, in its 35 years of existence, has never had a strike. What is your opinion of the cause of so many strikes throughout the country?

Mr. NUNN. We all wonder about that, especially when we know that there is usually good will and intelligence on both sides—both on the part of management and on the part of labor—and still there are strikes. It seems to me that there is a general misunderstanding as to the cause of strikes. Even the newspapers talk about how many years it will take the workers to make up the wages they lost through strikes. Wages are not the only cause. The fundamental things that the worker wants are security and recognition. It is the lack of this security or recognition which is the primary cause of strikes. The worker may not express this fact when he strikes—he may not have the idea clearly in his own mind, but, nevertheless, it is this basic lack which creates a frame of mind in the worker so that he can be influenced to strike.

Management-labor relations is not primarily an economic problem. It is also a social and psychological problem. A worker strikes for the same reason one man hits another man. The worker is mad at the boss and he wants to hurt him. And the only way he knows how is to strike. It is just a way of telling the boss to go to h—.

Mr. KEYSER. You believe you have never had a strike at your plant because your workers have both security and recognition?

Mr. NUNN. Yes; I think that's true. But that is not exceptional. There are thousands of companies througnout the country which have never had any labor trouble. After all, a man never gets his name in the papers until he beats up his wife. Small companies especially are usually free of labor trouble. And why? Because in a small plant the boss usually knows all the employees personally, knows about their background and their family; the employee is recognized and he has a greater margin of security than in a large factory. Our company was that way when it first started, 35 years ago.

Now we have over a thousand employees. At first, I did all the hiring and firing, knew each man personally. When we began to get a little larger, I called in the men and said: "We are working here together to produce shoes. From now on the management will consult you on any changes of any kind, even to the discharge of an employee. We will both get together, talk it over, and agree what to do. And in any case if we can't agree, we will call in an outsider to arbitrate the matter. Is that agreed?" And they said it was agreed. And it has worked that way ever since. We have never had to call in any outsider to arbitrate our disputes. We haven't always agreed, but before we ever had to submit it to arbitration, either one side or the other side has backed down. Sometimes I backed down. Sometimes they backed down. Sometimes we have compromised.

Some managements talk so much about their so-called sacred prerogatives. They say, "This is my business and I am going to run it as I please." They want to dictate to labor. Such an attitude merely begets a similar attitude on the part of labor. And soon the manager who wants to dictate to labor will find labor dictating to him. Workers are pretty much the same everywhere. If you treat them fairly they will treat you fairly. There is little difference in labor groups. There is no difference in dollars. It is the management of a company which makes the biggest difference between one concern and another. When we started in business there were 21 shoe factories in

Milwaukee. Today only three of them are still in business.

Mr. KEYSER. I see that under your system the workmen have achieved recognition. How about security?

Mr. NUNN. Anyone who has worked more than 2 years at our plant becomes a part of the share-production group, so that his wages will be proportional to the total production. Also, 70 to 80 percent of the production workers are guaranteed against layoffs. The number guaranteed is limited to 595, and a worker cannot become a part of this group until someone else leaves or dies. Right now, however, anyone who finishes the 2-year probationary period can enter the guaranteed group immediately, since it is now under 595. However, any worker who starts working for us after he is 45 is not eligible for the guaranteed group.

In 1935 we began our annual wage system. We took a look at our books and we discovered that over a 10-year period the percentage amount we paid out each year for direct labor varied little, even though those years covered both boom years and depression years. During those 10 years our direct labor costs varied from about 19 percent to 21 percent of our total sales. So it was a simple matter to gage our labor cost for the year, estimate an employee's yearly income and divide it by 52. As the year progresses the weekly check can be adjusted slightly, if necessary. I don't know where the hourly wage idea came from, but it must have been invented by the devil. Nobody lives by the hour. Why should his work be figured by the hour? A person can get $25 an hour and what good is it if there is no multiplier?

Another thing. Wages should be kept proportional to prices. This is almost impossible under a standard hourly wage system, but is easily done under a wage system that is geared to prices as an annual wage system can be. In our plant, if the price of shoes goes up the wages also go up simultaneously, since the wages are always a certain fraction of the total sales value. Under an hourly wage system wages always lag behind in an inflationary period and lag behind again in a deflationary period. In the first case they are too low and the worker's dollar loses its buying power, and in the other case wages are too high and business is forced to close down.

When the depression came on in 1930 we boasted that we would be the last to lower our wage rates. And perhaps we lived up to that boast, but we did it only by cutting some of the men's wages down to zero—we laid them off. Now I see how mistaken that policy was. We should have kept producing and have kept lowering our prices until the people started buying our shoes—just as a retail merchant does. In the process, of course, we would continue to lower wages proportionately, but if we kept the wages geared to the prices, our workers would still be receiving a wage which bore the same ratio to the price of our shoes. Producers should take a cue from the retail merchant. A retail merchant continues to slash his price until the stock moves off the shelf. Likewise a producer should regard his productive ability as goods on the shelf which must be moved, instead of closing down when he can't get his price. Production, not price, is the key to continued prosperity.

Mr. KEYSER. Would you say that your attitude toward labor is paternalistic?

Mr. NUNN. By no means. We treat the workers like men, as they are, on a basis of equality. I know that some concerns do have a paternalistic attitude toward labor. Small companies are often that way. They may sincerely like their workers but sometimes it may be a cloak to prevent organization. But a workman has an unerring instinct for being able to tell whether you are sincere or not. I remember one manufacturer who said to me, "You know, we tried all that once. We put on a big picnic for all the men. Our company furnished all the beer and food and everything. And you know what those fellows did at the picnic—they started to organize a union."

I suppose some manufacturers would say that we have thrown away all the prerogatives of management at our plant. But I'll wager we have more influence in our plant by reason of respect than they have in theirs by reason of power. In the first place, we keep everyone informed. Each day we post figures and charts in the plant showing our daily production, our orders on hand, and our schedules. Everyone is interested, of course, since the over-all production ultimately is reflected in their wages. Each morning at 10 o'clock we have a meeting at which all the workers and departments are represented, and anything can be brought up for discussion. Thus everyone knows what is going on.

Then we confer with the union representatives on everything we plan. We even have a union representative on our board of directors. No one is hired, fired, transferred, or promoted without conferring with the union. We do the same before changing the price of our shoes, and did recently when we decided to expand our plant. A worker has a right to know what is going on in the business and have some say about it. It is just common sense.

Mr. KEYSER. But what about the rights of the stockholders?

The responsibility of management is as much to the employees as to the stockholders. After all, the employee has a risk as well as the stockholder. He has his whole life tied up in his job—his risk in the success of the company is even greater than the average stockholder's. And so likewise he should share in the prosperity of the company for the risk that he takes, over and above what he gets in wages for the work he performs. When you get right down to the truth, management is perhaps the largest factor in producing profits, and perhaps the management ought to be rewarded proportionately. I'm not speaking now of those self-perpetuating managements who always vote themselves good fat salaries. Often the managers who cry so loudly that they must protect the stockholders' interests are the very ones who violate the stockholders' rights themselves, by withholding earnings from them beyond the needs of conservatism and using the money to expand the business without even consulting the stockholder. By right, they should really distribute most of the earnings and then ask the stockholders if they want to reinvest in expanding the business. But that's getting off onto another subject.

Mr. KEYSER. What kind of union do you have at your plant?

Mr. NUNN. It is an independent union. I know that is always looked upon with suspicion, but that is the way the men want it. One time the AFL came in and wanted to organize the plant. We told them to go ahead and even told them they could use our hall if they wanted it. But they didn't get to first base. Personally I can't see this business where organized labor gathers together all the plant unions on one side and then the trade organizations of employers gather all the companies together on the other side and they array themselves against each other—in battle formation. It really should be cut up, so that each company and each union is working together in each plant to produce the goods, in competition with other plants, and with wages geared to production and price, so that the wages are stable in relation to prices, and proportional to productivity.

Mr. KEYSER. This shoe industry is a comparatively stable industry. Do you think your methods could work successfully in other industries?

Mr. NUNN. Yes, I do. Some industries could not work as steadily. But workers can only earn a share of production and their income could be paid weekly, regardless of how a man works. He has to live on his annual income and he is better off to receive the same pay check each week rather than a widely variable one based on the hours he works each week.

But there is no formula or plan which will solve the basic management-labor difficulties. What is necessary is a completely new viewpoint—a broader understanding of the fundamental relationship which should exist between management and labor. Without this change in viewpoint no mere plan will succeed.

New Radar Instrument for Airplanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 1, 1947:

SIXTEEN POUND, $130 RADAR PROTECTS AIR LINER IN TEST BY HUGHES—HE CALLS IT FIRST PRACTICAL COMMERCIAL USE—TWA TO PUT IT ON ALL PLANES

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

CULVER CITY, CALIF., May 1.—Howard Hughes announced today the development of a new radar instrument for airplanes which instantly warns a pilot of his approach to a mountain, a building, or another aircraft in any kind of weather.

The instrument both sounds and flashes a warning signal in ample time for a pilot to take corrective measures. These, in most cases, will consist of immediately putting an aircraft into a climb while simultaneously executing a 180° turn. Mr. Hughes said he was certain that the device will act to eliminate crashes into mountains in fog, and such accidents as flying into high buildings in fog, as has happened twice in New York City in recent years.

The new warning indicator was displayed today by Mr. Hughes to a group of newspaper observers in the *Star of the Adriatic*, a Trans-World Airline Constellation. Then, with the observers aboard, Mr. Hughes entered the pilot's cockpit and took off from the airport of the Hughes Aircraft Co. here on a series of flight tests above the Topatopa Mountains to the northwest.

The equipment installed on the *Star of the Adriatic* sounds a warning signal when the plane is 2,000 feet from an obstacle, and a second signal at 500 feet. In addition to the horn signal, the long-range warning flashes an amber light, while at 500 feet a red light flashes. The instrument was set for these distances after discussion with pilots and personal tests by Mr. Hughes, but the settings can be changed.

The device picks up obstacles ahead, to the sides and directly downward, Mr. Hughes explained.

Development work was undertaken by the Hughes company after TWA recently concluded a year's research program on the use of radar in air-transport operations.

During today's tests Mr. Hughes put the *Star of the Adriatic* through all maneuvers

suggested by his guests as a test of the ability of the device to locate obstacles. It picked up foothills and mountain peaks within the limits of its range setting, and Mr. Hughes then demonstrated the corrective maneuvers. A bridge and a ship were picked up in flights over water.

Ye Shall Know the Truth About Greece and Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, gradually the American people will be told the truth underlying President Truman's new foreign policy. As part of my remarks, I am including herewith an article by Mr. Philip J. Allen which appeared in the May 14 issue of the Christian Century. Mr. Allen served as a chaplain in the recent war and was stationed in the European and Mediterranean areas. He worked in and out of Rome in the Air Transport Command, and his duties required him to visit the airfields at Trapani, Erakleion, Araxes, and Athens. He is now teaching sociology at the University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn. Members of the House will, I am sure, be interested to get the very valuable information contained in Mr. Allen's following article:

LET'S GET THE TRUTH ON GREECE

(By Philip J. Allen)

Congress, as I write, is on the point of rushing through its endorsement of President Truman's policy of "containing" Russia by extending aid to Greece and Turkey. The President presented this as a means of dealing with a totally unforeseen crisis. Suddenly, without any warning, Britain had served notice that it would have to pull out of Greece. Just as suddenly, the United States had to decide whether it would move in to keep the Russians out. And just as suddenly, Congress must act to implement that decision. Any disposition Congress may have had to secure more factual information before committing the Nation to a course that may prove disastrous has been swept aside by the demand for speed. This was a bolt out of the blue, and we must counter it by unloosing another lightning bolt.

But was it a bolt out of the blue? Was it a totally unexpected emergency? Or is this entry of the United States into the struggle for control of the eastern end of the Mediterranean something that someone high in authority in this country has seen coming for a long time, planned for and worked toward? Has the United States actually been preparing to intervene in Greece ever since the end of the war? And is the pressure now being put on Congress only a method of regularizing and financing a policy which was agreed on and started long ago?

THINGS CONGRESS SHOULD KNOW

Of course, I do not know the answers to such questions. But I have seen enough in Greece with my own eyes to make me ask such questions. And what I know, of my own personal knowledge, suggests certain things that any Congress with an appreciation of its responsibilities should be finding out. I believe that Congress should be asking why new military installations were constructed in this strategic eastern Mediterranean area by the United States Army long after need for them had passed.

Congress should investigate why two American airfields were built on the Greek mainland, at Athens and Araxes, after the war was over. It should find out why another field was built on Crete, at Erakleion, and another on Sicily, at Trapani, after the fighting was over. I am not talking about the laying out of landing strips only, but the erection of concrete structures for permanent living quarters. And I speak of only four of these air bases, although I have heard of others, because these four I personally know were built after the German surrender.

I was in Crete in December 1945, fully 7 months after the war in Europe had ended. The airfield at Erakleion had just been completed, except for the minor finishing touches which were still being applied. A skeleton crew of a captain with a dozen GI's were keeping things going, aided by about a dozen natives. I cannot imagine what military value the field could have had at that time. A cargo plane, C–47, went there from the Athens headquarters twice a week, simply to carry mail and other supplies.

In the same month, both the airfields at Araxes and Athens were in process of completion. United States Army engineers were working frantically to get the job done. By February 1946, the majority of the concrete structures, including a beautiful permanent chapel, were about finished at Athens. Much speculation circulated on the reasons for building such permanent structures at American cost in that foreign country after the war had ended. But questions were discouraged, and the work went on.

WHY WERE AIR BASES BUILT?

The airfield at Trapani, Sicily, was completed late in the fall of 1945. When I last visited there in January 1946, it was being maintained by an officer, a half dozen GI's and a group of natives. Only one plane a week visited Trapani, a C–47 from the Rome headquarters, sent for the purpose of carrying a few parcels of mail and "orders from higher headquarters." The Trapani GI's obtained their food and other supplies from our Navy installation at Palermo, 100 miles away. That airfield at Trapani could not possibly have had any military value at that time. It had even less value than the fields at Araxes or Erakleion. Just why were these airfields built and maintained by the United States Army, after the war had ended?

It may, of course, have been that orders from higher headquarters, issued months or even a year and more earlier, had decreed that such airfields should be constructed, and that those orders were never rescinded, even after the war had ended. It would not be the first time orders had been carried out in the Army long after reason for them had expired. Other factors, too, may have entered the picture. It was charged by some that a number of high-ranking officers in the Air Transport Command were also top civilian air-line officials. We were, therefore, building these airfields for the later benefit of American civilian air lines. The amount of truth in this allegation can be ascertained only by careful investigation.

WAS IT TO BOLSTER STATUS?

Another possibility suggests itself as an explanation for the building of these airfields. They may have been needed to enhance somebody's status. It is the commanded who give status to the commanders, and the more of the former, the higher the status of the latter. Hence the never ending cry for more men sent up by commanders to echelons above them. And when more men do arrive, cries are sent up for more material facilities with which to meet the needs of the men in this command and to accomplish the mission.

It is possible, therefore, that the unnecessary construction of military installations overseas after the war ended may be explained partly by the desire of local commanders to entrench themselves or to enhance their status. The status and prestige of the commanders under whom the airfields at Athens, Araxes, Erakleion, and Trapani were built would certainly be enhanced. This would especialy be true if upon their completion, the cry for more men to maintain them and accomplish the mission found a responsive ear.

One or more of the above reasons may explain the building of these airfields. But since the President proclaimed his new foreign policy, to start with our rushing to the aid of Greece, I have thought a lot about those postwar airfields that puzzled us who watched their building so much. What relation do these installations have to the containment of Russia? Is it possible that the new policy existed in the minds of persons in high places as early as 1945? It is at least something Congress should look into.

RECENT OIL DEALS

Finally, consider the recent colossal oil deals in the Middle East involving the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Standard Oil of California and the Texas Oil Co. Did the Persian plum offered to Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum by the British betray a fear that England felt no longer able to ward off the Russian bear unaided? Or could the ripping of oil pipe lines by Jews who charge Britain with favoring Arabs in exchange for Persian oil have been an additional reason why the British Government-controlled Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. has turned to the United States for badly needed help? All along, Britain seems to have worked on the theory that if she could succeed in attracting American investors, official help would also be forthcoming from this side of the Atlantic. And her calculations appear to have been correct.

Admittedly, private American investments in the Middle East are now heavy. The Arabian American Oil Co. is said to have a quarter of a billion dollars invested in Saudi Arabia. In addition, a huge pipe line, two-and-a-half feet in diameter, spanning a thousand miles of Arabian desert, has been contracted for. The Geneva works of the United States Steel Corp. and the Consolidated Steel Corp. of Los Angeles are to do the pipe-fabricating job.

Exactly how long these recently hatched American oil deals in the Middle East were in process of incubation I do not know. But is it possible that the eastern Mediterranean airfields I have spoken of were constructed by the United States Army after the war was over in full knowledge of the impending oil transactions? Also, is it possible that the airfields were built without the knowledge of Congress? If so, Congress should set out to dig for the facts, for only so can we avoid pursuing a blundering, costly course. What is more important, the American public should be let in on the facts and help decide the course to pursue. For when the die is cast, the policy and course is ours, not the President's, not the oil companies', and certainly not Britain's. We pay the bills. We do the dying. We should know.

Time for Action Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. POTTS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith for inclusion in the Appendix a copy of an editorial in the Brooklyn Tablet of May 3, 1947, with respect to communism. I concur entirely in the thoughts as therein expressed. It follows:

TIME FOR ACTION IS NOW

Amidst the misery of millions of people in the stricken nations of Europe, the Balkans, and Baltic states and the pessimistic outlook for the future, there is one fact that stands out. It is that the world has no hope for peace unless and until Russia withdraws her forces of aggression, her agents striving for the destruction of Christian civilization, and ceases her plottings. Whether it is in Poland, Germany, Austria, Finland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, or Rumania, the cry heard on all sides is: There is no peace, no liberty, no chance for freedom as long as Russia is here. Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and eastern Poland have been liquidated by Russia; Greece and Turkey must be protected against Russia; France and Italy are threatened by Russia; China and Korea are in the throes of civil conflict because of Russia's machinations.

In his message delivered Monday evening Secretary of State Marshall stated the Moscow Conference failed because of Russia and in his specific report on the inability to make progress in Austria, Germany, and elsewhere he blamed the Soviet. Two years after the end of the war peace still has not come and millions of people are in a desperate condition because one powerful nation endeavors to promote and maintain chaos in order to bring about communism. The objectives of the war have been almost completely lost.

The time is opportune for the United States to take a consistent, sincere, firm, united stand in its dealings with Russia and with communism, for otherwise not only will we be untrue to civilization and the guarantors of world enslavement, but we will insure more depredations and future warfare. The stand we must take—and it should have been taken years ago—is twofold.

First, we must do everything in our power to prevent the totalitarian Soviet state from enslaving additional nations abroad and we must strive to unite with mankind everywhere to restore liberty to those nations now suffering under the dictatorship of a minority ruled and directed by Russia. This means we should give every possible kind of support to the victimized and should not help in any way the puppet tyrants who were installed by and are directed from Moscow.

Secondly, the time has come for President Truman to translate into action the position he recently announced on Communists in the United States Government. Not only should we spend the money asked to protect Greece and Turkey from Red fascism, but the President must prove his sincerity by banning all material contributions to the Soviet state and by throwing out of office, and refusing to appoint again, the Communists and Communist stooges in the State and other Federal departments and in the employ of the American Government in foreign countries, who owe their first allegiance to Moscow. They have not only hampered and sabotaged the American program abroad, making our professed war aims ridiculous, but they are actually selling into slavery and slaughter countless Christians whose one crime has been their opposition to the Red dictatorship.

The people of the world, including the United States, have placed their hopes in President Truman. They witness, and in many cases suffer, far worse miseries under the Communists than they did under the Nazis. For this reason they want no treaties, whether in Italy or elsewhere, which will give Stalin or his stooges the opportunity to conquer and destroy nations, but instead they want clear-cut support to those who fight for freedom and national existence. And at home they will insist the President and Congress throw out the Communists in key positions who have abused the authority entrusted to them to further Russian rather than American objectives. The hour is late and the President must act rather than talk.

H. R. 3285

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 3285, providing an immediate $500-a-year pay increase for all Federal employees, because they need it to regain their prewar levels of income and because our economy needs the support of the market for consumer goods which such an increase will give.

Fairness to the million and a half Federal employees, comprising about 2.5 percent of the Nation's working force, requires such an increase. It is overdue. Federal workers' median salary increased from $1,620 in January 1941 to $2,148 in February 1947, an increase of only 33.8 percent, while during the same period the average wage in manufacturing rose from $1,385 to $2,433 a year, an increase of 76 percent. The increase in the durable-goods industries for the same period was from $1,585 to $2,557, an increase of 61 percent.

The economic squeeze has been particularly severe for Federal workers between January 1946 and March 1947, when the cost of living rose steeply with no salary increase whatever. As against the 33.8 percent increase in Federal salaries, the cost of living has jumped 61 percent since January 1941.

This is too rugged. It is unnecessary and shameful sweating of our civil servants, particularly in view of an expected surplus this year and of private corporation profits after taxes running at the rate of $17,000,000,000 for the current year. It is out of line with last year's 18.5 cents an hour wage increase pattern in private industry and the present 15-cent-an-hour pattern.

My bill is based on the assumption that it is not in the national interest to force employees out of Federal employment in order to earn a decent living. I assume that these workers perform useful and essential public services. This assumption may seem a little old-fashioned, in view of the slurs and abuse heaped upon them day after day by some of the Members of Congress.

The flat $500 increase is admittedly an emergency measure. But it is fairer than a percentage increase which would give most to those who need it least and least to those most in need. Later a careful adjustment of salaries for all grades and classifications can be made.

Federal employees are also consumers and would consume more if they were paid more nearly decent wages. An increase such as this bill proposes would immediately flow almost 100 percent into the market for consumer and durable goods, thereby toning up the faltering demand which is already alarming economists and businessmen who fear the piling up of inventories until they become top-heavy and topple over into a recession.

I know that Federal employees will be advised to wait and make the best of their present salaries until prices and the whole cost of living falls as supply catches up with and passed demand. This is the old NAM line. It will be offered by industrialists whose corporations are piling up record-breaking profits after taxes, and by Members of Congress who recently voted themselves flat salary increases of $5,000 a year—10 times the amount this bill proposes for the rank and file of Federal employees. The advice simply will not wash.

Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a report of the Resolutions Committee of the Sixteenth Annual Encampment of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Department of Massachusetts, on May 4, 1947, at the Copley Plaza Hotel, Boston, Mass. In my opinion this report contains a great deal of information in which we as Members of Congress are interested. I know that the members of this committee, all of whom are highly respected in their various professions, have given much of their time and study to these various problems which affect not only the people of our own United States but peoples of other nations. I feel certain that this report is of such importance that it should be read by each and every Member of Congress from Maine to California.

As we convene we look back upon almost 2 years since the cessation of hostilities in a struggle which gave promise of solution of problems, some inherent and more artificially created by dictators but which in the main have yet to be solved.

Principally among them may be listed:

I. DISPLACED PERSONS

The plight of homeless, stateless persons of all creeds to whom the end of hostilities

has brought no peace nor resting place. These persons total almost 1,000,000 souls. Among them are Catholics, Protestants, Jews and some of other faiths. It has been estimated that of these unfortunate people some 40 percent or more are of the Catholic faith, 30 percent Protestants and 30 percent Jewish and others. Their plight should be the concern of the entire world. Certainly their plight and the solution of their problems should be the prime concern of the United States of America upon whom has been thrust the leadership in any movement of alleviation. This problem is so far uppermost in the minds of all thinking people that your committee has been virtually deluged with written resolutions in varying terms but meaning the same thing, giving expression to those things about which we know all too well, the plight and condition of these displaced persons all seeking some means of aid to the unfortunates.

We therefore report the concensus of these resolutions: That the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of the Department of Massachusetts in convention assembled on the 4th day of May 1947—

(a) Favors the immediate admission to the United States of America of 100,000 displaced persons without regard to race, creed or color and without regard to origin.

(b) The enactment of legislation now pending in Congress under the so-called Stratton bill and favored by the Honorable Earl Harrison to permit a total immigration to the United States of America of 400,000 displaced persons over a period of 4 years, using up the so-called unused quota of immigration accumulated during the war years.

II. PALESTINE

There have been presented to your committee a great number of resolutions on the subject of Palestine.

(a) The Jewish War Veterans of the United States nationally has previously indicated its position with respect to this matter. We of the Department of Massachusetts now reaffirm the stand taken by the national organization favoring the establishment of a free and independent state in Palestine for the Jewish people. We favor the establishment of such a state without prolonged further investigation. We particularly call attention to the need for the immediate admission to Palestine of 100,000 Jews—a demand four times made by President Truman and a position taken by the Commission appointed by Great Britain and the United States without dissent. We believe that further study of this particular problem is no longer needed.

(b) With further regard to Palestine, we urge upon the United Nations the wisdom and the practicality of seating within the conference of the United Nations Committee the delegates of Jewry to represent Jewry in Jewish problems.

(c) The Jewish War Veterans of the United States, like all other veterans who have fought and have seen combat, abhor war and violence as a solution of world problems. We urge the United Nations to recognize the need for and to undertake immediate and final action designed to remove the causes which have aroused violence in Palestine.

(d) We do not favor the attempt to solve the Palestinian problem by force, violence, or terrorism. We are, however, deeply conscious of the plight of a people which arouses emotions which lead to force. We advocate the further study of conditions in Palestine seeking for the removal of impelling conduct on the part of mandatory powers, including breach of supposedly faithful promises, particularly the breach of that solemn promise contained in the Balfour Declaration.

(e) We particularly urge upon the United Nations the necessity for the removal of partisan troops of any single nation from Palestine.

III. CONDITIONS AT HOME

Hate organizations

Your committee has been presented with a number of resolutions bearing upon conditions within the borders of our own United States. Among these are the continued and renewed hate movements as evidenced by the organization of the Columbians, the activities of the Ku Klux Klan, and numerous other organizations of that ilk.

We favor legislation designed to destroy combinations which act to foster or spread hate and which act to arouse disunity within and among the people of America and to pit race against race and creed against creed. In line with such legislation, we favor legislation outlawing the use of the mails by such organizations, combinations or persons for such purposes.

We favor the denial of the franking privilege when used to spread insidious hate propaganda.

Dies committee

The Jewish war veterans of the United States are convinced that our country can be an agency to bring peace to the world only by adhering to the democratic principles laid down by our Constitution. We are opposed to any and all ideologies, foreign or domestic, which are alien and opposed to the system of Government as established by our founding fathers. And we therefore oppose ideologies such as communism, nazism, and fascism. Under our Constitution which guarantees freedom of speech, necessarily including freedom of thought, we oppose any nation or state activity through the setting up of governmental bodies which have the power by its method of procedure and investigation to detract from those rights so guaranteed. However, freedom of speech and of thought do not mean abuse, but words, literature or any other means which tend to incite race against race, religion against religion, or color against color. We therefore favor Federal legislation outlawing propaganda in any form which is designed to or has the effect of the creation of hates and incitements.

We view with some concern a trend to question the thinking of American citizenry. We are fearful of any trend which might result in the ultimate establishment of a thought police. We therefore favor the abolition nationally or in States of commissions or bodies of inquiry such as the so-called Dies committee.

We in America are fully and aptly implemented under our Constitution and laws to deal with treason. The event of our recent world war has neither diminished nor enlarged our legal machinery for that purpose.

We cannot help but recall the dangers which accompany the fear to express one's views. We recall with positiveness the oft-repeated assertion that within the framework of our own laws there lies the means of peaceful solution of our problems through legislation. Such solution can only be the result of interchange of ideas. We do not favor the process of witch hunting. This in no way conflicts with our stand to destroy hate organizations. We recognize the right of persons to freedom of speech—written or oral—but we also recognize the difference between orderly conduct, slander, libel, and the incitement to violence.

We urge the promotion of Brotherhood Week and any program designed to foster the idea of friendship among all races, creeds, and colors, recognizing that understanding and friendship among individuals are the very foundation of universal peace.

National FEPC and education

We favor the national enactment of the so-called Fair Employment Practices Act.

We urge upon nonsectarian institutions of learning the recognition of our free principles of democracy and to abolish where there exists, without legislation, any so-called quota system for admission requirements.

We urge the support of the Brandeis University at Waltham, Mass., sponsored by Jewry and open to all races, creeds, and colors without the establishment of a quota system.

Veterans' rights under GI bill

Our educational facilities and institutions are taxed to their limit and many war veterans cannot enter. Recognizing the fact that many veterans because of economic necessity, age, or previous educational attainments cannot and do not desire at this time to take advantage of the GI bill of rights, so far as education is concerned, the Jewish War Veterans feel that this clause was meant to be taken advantage of by all veterans who so desire. We feel that the educational benefits so conferred is a property right which ought to be permitted to be assigned by veterans to one of their children so far as tuition only is concerned.

Veterans' housing

We favor the legislative attempt at a solution of the housing problem for veterans, specifically the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill now pending in Congress.

Whereas the Massachusetts Department of Jewish War Veterans has participated in the organization and development of the Massachusetts Allied Veterans' Housing Council;

Resolved, That this convention endorses the purposes and activities of the Massachusetts Allied Veterans' Housing Council and urges intensified effort in its program of a united attack by all veterans' organizations of the housing problem in order to achieve effective action by private enterprise, and by Federal, State, and local governments; and this convention urges all posts to join local allied veterans' housing councils and to support Massachusetts Housing Week, May 9 to May 15, 1947.

National defense

We strongly urge upon the Congress and upon the President of the United States the maintenance of an adequate protective armed force, implemented, if necessary, by universal military training, until such time as the United Nations has been implemented and until such time as international security against aggression has been assured.

Antilynching laws

We advocate national legislation designed to abolish the vicious practice of lynching by whomever and wherever practiced.

Review of certain courts-martial cases

We urge the further consideration and review of the cases of Michael DeBartolo, of Squantum, Mass., and Frank A. Barbato, of Tomkinsville, N. Y., with a view to ascertain with finality whether or not complete justice was done in their cases.

Education for armed services

Since American forces will remain in foreign occupied territory for some time to come, and since contingents of American troops will be included in the United Nations military force, we recommend that the United States Army and Navy provide to all men and women in our armed services a compulsory course of education and orientation of the advantages of our democratic form of government over totalitarian forms of government. The history of aggression of former enemies.

IV. UNITED NATIONS

Many resolutions have been presented to your committee dealing with the question of the United Nations. It is the consensus of opinion—

(a) That the United Nations be recognized as the first step for world unity.

(b) That the underlying principles of a United Nations be remembered and maintained.

(c) That all actions designed to further world unity through the United Nations be fostered and promoted.

(d) That all means to implement the purpose and ideals of the United Nations be quickly advanced.

(e) We recognize and approve the wish of the vast majority of the people of Massachusetts seeking the strength and the support of the organization of the United Nations.

(f) We urge the full recognition of the Jewish Agency as the legally representative group before the full assembly of the United Nations with full power to make representation on Palestinian problems.

V. PUBLIC WELFARE

That the Jewish War Veterans go on record and urge Congress by nonexclusive legislation to expedite research work on cancer and heart disease by—

(a) Appropriation of sufficient funds to cover all research work that can be expected to produce useful information or results.

(b) Scholarship and fellowship grants to universities and colleges to prepare personnel for this specialized work and guarantee jobs to successful scholars at completion of formal training.

(c) Establish an all-out research program that will utilize the facilities of our great industrial laboratories, as well as hospital and university equipment.

(d) Organize an education and information program for the general public to make them research conscious.

VI. CERTIFICATE OF MERIT TO ARTURO TOSCANINI

We recommend to our national organization the award of the certificate of merit to Arturo Toscanini for his unselfish labors and devotion to the cause of humanity in general and for his great efforts on behalf of refugees in particular.

VII. HENRY MONSKY, IN MEMORIAM

On Friday, May 2, 1947, Henry Monsky of Omaha, Nebr., president of the supreme lodge of B'nai B'rith, passed away.

His life was one of exemplary and unselfish devotion to the highest ideals of Americanism and Judaism. The causes for which he drove himself unsparingly to his untimely death were for humanity at its highest level, without regard to race or creed or color.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, department of Massachusetts, in convention assembled in Boston, Mass., on May 4, 1947, joins his world of friends in mournful tribute to his memory and expresses its deep-felt loss of a true son of Israel and a good American.

And be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the organization of B'nai B'rith and to the members of his family.

Committee on resolutions: Joseph H. Cinamon, chairman; Milton Cook, Jackson J. Holtz, Oscar J. Toye, Lewis Weinstein, David Lasker, Jack B. Herman, Lawrence Fisher, Saul B. Levitan, Meyer Rubin, William Gilman, Jack Kaplan, Arthur J. Swett.

The foregoing report was read to the convention in regular session. Each item as read was debated by the delegates. The foregoing report contains all the resolutions passed by vote of the assembly.

After the passage of the foregoing as the resolutions adopted by the convention, it was regularly moved, seconded, and unanimously passed that these resolutions shall be the basis of department and post activities during the coming administrative year and that regular reports of progress be required at each monthly meeting of the council of administration.

Ways to Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, last evening the Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor, delivered an address entitled "Ways to Industrial Peace" before the National Textile Seminar, Shawnee-on-Delaware, Pa. The address dealt with legislation relating to labor relations, now pending in conference in the Congress.

I believe that his very timely remarks should receive the widest possible circulation, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since this is a National Textile Seminar, I am going to encroach upon your time by reviewing a little not-so-ancient history. No doubt many of you are more familiar with these events than I am, for your industry was so directly concerned in them.

I have in mind the first industry committee and first wage order issued under the Fair Labor Standards Act, which established a minimum wage of 32½ cents an hour for covered employees in the textile industry. This rate became effective on October 24, 1939—the same date on which the general minimum under the Fair Labor Standards Act increased from 25 to 30 cents an hour.

Perhaps some of you here tonight served on that first industry committee or appeared during the extended hearings which began in October 1938 and terminated on May 22, 1939. In any event, the chairman of that committee would need no introduction, for he was Donald M. Nelson, who later became Chairman of the War Production Board. He, with six other public representatives, seven employer representatives of the textile industry and seven representatives of labor, made up the full committee.

The situation which they faced is well described in the report and recommendation filed by the committee. I quote:

"The task which confronted the committee was not an easy one. For almost two decades the textile industry has been recognized as a distressed industry. It has been beset with a fluctuating price structure which throws the industry rapidly from profit to loss. Overcapacity, competition with products of low-wage countries, and increasing competition from substitute fibers and materials are some of the factors that make for instability in the industry. The committee recognizes that wages in the textile industry have been for a long time among the lowest paid by the major manufacturing industries of the Nation, and that the textile industry's instability may well be attributable in part to the regrettable tendency of some of its members to depress its chronically low-wage standards. The committee has reason to believe that its recommendation of a minimum wage of 32½ cents an hour will tend to give greater stability and general improvement to the industry."

In case any of you are growing restive, let me hasten to say that I do not intend to review the work of that first industry committee. Nor do I want to leave the impression that I am singling out the textile industry for special mention. When the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed we had many low-wage areas in our economy and they were not confined to the textile industry.

That is why the first general minimum under the act was set at 25 cents an hour. A few years earlier, in July 1933, figures on average hourly earnings in the southern branch of the cotton-textile industry showed that an appreciable number of workers—3.8 percent—earned less than 10 cents an hour. More than 13 percent earned less than 12½ cents an hour.

When the Textile Industry Committee began its task, wages in cotton textiles averaged 36.6 cents an hour in the South and 44.6 in the northern area. It was estimated that the new minimum would bring wage increases for 120,000 workers and add less than 4 percent to manufacturing costs.

Yet, with the conditions which existed then, the committee was properly concerned over the recommendation it should make. One other excerpt from the report illustrates this rather well. Again I quote:

"To illustrate the effect on total cost, let us take a well-known print cloth; 39 inches 80/80, 4.00, used in vast quantities in the house-dress field. It is now selling (below cost) at about 6 cents per yard. The estimated increase in production cost, due to a 32½-cent minimum, would, we believe, be about one-quarter of a cent for the gray goods manufacturer."

I am not going to question the propriety of that wage order or the caution which the committee displayed. Back in 1938 we were less clear about the contribution that mass purchasing power can make in a soundly balanced economy. We had scarcely begun to glimpse the immense productive capacity that would open out under the impact of total war.

But I do want to remind you that industrial relations, like all other economic and social relationships, do not take place in a vacuum. They mirror past prejudices and fears no less than they reflect current pressures and anxieties. Neither collective bargaining nor any other phase of employer-employee relationships can be separated from a much broader background. A background which often includes the whole economic environment. This was obviously true of the reconversion period after VJ-day.

During those anxious and uncertain months we carried out the most tremendous industrial and military demobilization in the Nation's history. We also relaxed or lifted completely a wide range of wartime controls which had affected or governed much of the Nation's manpower, facilities for production, and economic life in general. To a very large extent, these controls limited or replaced the normal processes of collective bargaining.

Moreover, and this is very important, many of these wartime controls served to interrupt collective bargaining in just those areas of the economy where labor and management were new to collective bargaining, where the scars of recent strife were still plainly visible. I need not tell this gathering that real collective bargaining calls for the display of collective wisdom, understanding and restraint. It calls for mutual trust and respect, just as any successful human relationship does.

All too often in the months that followed VJ-day, these essential ingredients were lacking from the industrial scene. Fortunately, they are much more prevalent today. And it is my belief that we can expect much smoother sailing along the industrial front—provided we maintain a sound economic balance.

Without in any way minimizing the seriousness and heavy cost of the industrial

disputes that came after World War II, I do want to point out that the path which we chose, and chose deliberately, was to abandon war controls and restore the free pattern of life. With storm clouds darkening the industrial front, that was not an easy choice. But surely events have shown that it was a wise course—the only course for the people of a free nation.

A very recent report by the Labor Committee of the Twentieth Century Fund puts this so clearly that I would like to quote it briefly:

"The fact of the matter is that our system of industrial production, of which we are certainly not ashamed, is now based upon a broad foundation of successful collective bargaining. The failures of collective bargaining, relatively few in number, are news; the successes are volume production. There is probably much more to be learned from an adequate study of the causes of industrial peace than from any consideration of the causes of industrial war. From this fact we are entitled to take heart for the future of collective bargaining; and it justifies continued confidence in and support of those processes. * * *

"The sound conclusion to be drawn from the Nation's undoubted preference for genuine collective bargaining and free enterprise, and from the fact that free enterprise as it exists in this country today has been built up on generally successful, even though immature collective bargaining is this: A basic criterion of the value of any proposed legislation is that it should be helpful to genuine collective bargaining, not harmful; that the legislation should be calculated to build up creative conditions of labor peace on the foundations of industrial self-government."

Both as Secretary of Labor and as an American citizen I endorse that approach to labor relations and labor laws. Moreover, I feel very sure that the great majority of our people favor such an approach. Nor do I imagine there would be much disapproval among members of this audience.

By the same token, I feel confident that you will agree with me on the controlling importance of over-all economic conditions. We need to establish an economic balance which will encourage full, sustained production and distribution, with its essential corollary, a broad base of real mass purchasing power. Within that healthy framework there will be ample room to turn collective bargaining into collective wisdom—to substitute economic facts for economic force. By contrast, a limping economy beset with unemployment and uncertain profits leaves little room for reasonable or free adjustments. It is my belief, and certainly the history of labor relations in the textile industry bears this out, that the very lack of sustained economic stability has been one of the chief barriers to successful collective bargaining.

Granted that the most fundamental task before us is to gain an economic balance and stability which will promote the wise use of all our vast resources in men, materials and machines; and granted that the decisions which we reach and the programs which we adopt must fit the patterns of a free society—how then shall we appraise some of the current bills which affect labor and collective bargaining?

Before I attempt to answer that question, I want to jog your memories once again. From the first beginnings of the American labor movement the things which unions asked for, including the right to organize, always met strong resistance—they were denounced in many quarters. Then, after each gain had been won, historians and people generally looked back and agreed that labor's so-called demands were justified and necessary, that they brought a new element of strength and stability to our way of life. But quite naturally, perhaps, it is much easier to recognize such things in retrospect.

Now it is common knowledge that many of the legislative proposals which are before Congress today were offered as a means of curbing labor and restoring equality at the bargaining table. I ask you in all earnestness, are such curbs needed to give us a better economic balance? Is there a real danger that labor, through the process of collective bargaining, will demand and get too large a share of the national income? A share so large that industry could not do its part in maintaining the flow of goods and services?

Figures dealing with the current distribution of the national income do not indicate anything of the sort. They indicate a downward trend in labor's share. This is a difficult and complicated subject, for by and large, the wage-price-profit relationship is the three-legged stool on which our economy rests. That very fact imposes a great and joint responsibility upon both management and labor. It is beyond my province to equate these factors, but a recent statement of President Truman's is pertinent. He said:

"Profits in the aggregate are breaking all records, although profit margins vary greatly in individual cases. In 1946, corporate profits after taxes were 33 percent higher than in 1945. In the first quarter of 1947, they ran even higher. These figures are total figures and do not, of course, apply to every industry or every business."

In commenting on labor's position, the President said that a counsel of moderation has generally been followed by wage earners and their leaders.

Thus I do not feel that I am engaged in special pleading when I question the wisdom of legislative proposals which confessedly are designed to weaken labor's position at the bargaining table.

One set of proposals seeks to prevent industry-wide bargaining and provide other restrictions which will limit the scope of a given union agreement within an industry. The textile industry, and more particularly the men's and women's clothing industry, has had considerable experience in this field. You know how flexible such contracts are and what a wide range of problems and conditions they are capable of meeting. Do you not share my belief that these bargaining systems have brought more stable industrial relations? Just as the wage-and-hour law did much to eliminate the wage-cut, price-cut cycle which plagued so much of industry a decade ago.

The declared purpose of restrictions on the scope of bargaining is twofold. The first seeks to prevent complete or widespread shut-downs caused by a labor-management dispute; the other seeks to protect employers within an industry from the economic pressure which unions might otherwise be able to exert.

Regarding the first purpose, I can find no reason to believe that a ban on industry-wide bargaining will accomplish it. Look, for example, at the steel industry—there was no industry-wide contract when output was sharply reduced early in 1946. There is the further fact that this sort of curb would offer no solution to the problems raised by stoppages affecting local public utilities or transportation systems.

A recent study made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows the important industries which now bargain on a national or industry-wide scale, those which bargain by geographic or regional areas and those bargaining within a city, county, or metropolitan area.

The study shows quite clearly that proposals which would narrow the scope of bargaining, either within an industry or a geographic area, would also dislocate established procedures in such industries as glass and hardware, dyeing and finishing textiles, hosiery, lumber, rubber, maritime, metal mining, and paper and pulp. The list could be extended, but it is already long enough to indicate the disruptive character of these limiting proposals.

As for their second purpose—to cut down the economic power of unions at the bargaining table—I do not see how this could promote a better economic balance or improve the industrial climate. On the contrary, I fear the opposite result.

Now let us examine another group of proposals aimed at the closed shop and kindred forms of union security. By banning any contract which links union membership and employment, these bills would forbid the closed shop and seriously impede or block the union shop, maintenance of membership, and preferential hiring.

In other words, the status of about 11,000,000 union workers would be altered or open to question. As of last April, here are the figures, by type of agreement:

	Percent
Closed shop	30
Union shop	15
Maintenance of membership	29
Preferential hiring	3

Coming at the very moment when other restrictive measures are directed against labor, it is plain that such curbs would open a veritable Pandora's box of labor troubles. Union contracts are bread-and-butter contracts, and union security is an essential ingredient. In far too many cases these security provisions were obtained only after prolonged and bitter opposition from employers and employer groups. Given this historical background and the latent hostility toward unions which still exists in some quarters, I am confident that restrictions on union security would be an open invitation to widespread industrial strife.

There is one particular aspect of this matter which deserves your closest scrutiny. That is the vital question of handling grievances—the day-to-day disputes and inevitable frictions that arise when men work together. To the best of my knowledge, every authority in the field of industrial relations favors the inclusion of grievance machinery in union contracts. There is a strong and growing trend toward the creation of better grievance machinery by means of union-contract provisions.

Yet, it is quite possible that through a ban on union security a considerable number of employees in a given establishment would fall outside the union which has done the bargaining and helped to operate the grievance machinery. Where this happened it would wipe out or bypass one of the most important advances that have been made in industrial relations. Surely the industrialist who is seeking better employee relationships will think twice before he abandons a well-tried prescription in favor of a very dangerous cure-all.

Right here I should like to say a word or two about the question of democracy in unions. Certainly, union affairs should be conducted democratically—and not all of them follow this pattern. Yet, here, as in every other phase of human relations, the decisive factor must be the preponderance of evidence. My own experience and a good deal of close observation lead me to conclude that union rules and union practices are not behind other segments of American life in the practice of democracy.

If some union bosses are not attentive to the real needs of their members, it is easy to find their counterparts in political bosses, regardless of party. According to Mr. Edward

G. Flynn, who writes on political bosses and machines in the current issue of Atlantic Monthly, "As long as we have a two-party system of government, we shall have machines."

I would like to remind you that the rank and file of union members are much closer to union affairs than are the electors of most cities. Union members have a much more direct interest and a more direct voice in the way their unions are run than most citizens have in the affairs of their city, where the latter are allowed to vote.

As for the conduct of corporate affairs—well, the average stockholder in a big concern votes by proxy, when he votes at all. Indeed, I know of at least one concern where nonvoting common stock customarily sells above voting shares, though the dividends are the same.

Democracy in unions is not perfect, but it does compare very favorably with its counterpart in other kinds of civic activity. In fact, I thoroughly agree with Joel Seidman, whose book, Union Rights and Union Duties, was published in 1943. I quote:

"The democracy that trade-unionism introduces into industrial life is a vital contribution to the social welfare of the country, second only to the economic gains that collective bargaining brings to workers with relatively low economic standards."

By all means let us encourage democratic procedures in unions. It is particularly gratifying when this urge comes from certain management quarters where a very different attitude prevailed 10 years ago. Frankly, and just between ourselves, I wonder a little bit as I watch some of these people hit the sawdust trail—leaving the Chowderhead Cohens and labor spies behind them.

Before resuming my discussion of labor legislation, I wish to make one point perfectly clear. I have never taken the position that I oppose every bill which attempts to restrict the activities of labor unions. I have said repeatedly, and I say again, that neither employers nor the public should be penalized by the inability of labor unions to agree over jurisdictional matters. Organized labor should be compelled to use the Wagner Act and to accept the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, not only in reference to disputes between employers and workers, but also in reference to disputes between the various branches of organized labor. Particularly, as President Truman's state of the Union message pointed out, labor should not be permitted to use the secondary boycott as a device to thwart the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board. Legislation now before the Congress goes far beyond this, however—it is like cutting off a man's hand because he has a splinter in his thumb.

Concerning union finances, I think that their transactions should be made public. As a matter of fact, most unions do this already—make it compulsory if you like.

I fully agree that unions should be made subject to suit for breach of contract. Actually, in 35 of our 48 States, unions now are subject to such suits, both in the State courts and the Federal courts. My only objection to legislative proposals on this point is that they would set labor unions apart from everyone else and from every kind of organization in the country. This is accomplished by allowing suits in Federal court, regardless of the amount in controversy and in defiance of the constitutional provisions that jurisdiction of such private suits in Federal courts shall be limited to those controversies in which there is a diversity of citizenship between the parties.

Concerning the vital subject of mediation, I am definitely against the creation of a mediation board because I do not believe that device will promote industrial peace. Here are some of the reasons for my conclusion:

The creation of such a board is bound to interfere with and disrupt not only the voluntary mediation of the Conciliation Service, but a much larger area of successful collective bargaining between management and labor. This would tend to undermine that broad foundation which the Twentieth Century Fund report finds so essential for our economic well-being and for the cause of industrial peace.

Given a mediation board, both sides would tend to carry important issues straight to the board without making any real effort to reach a voluntary agreement among themselves. We saw this perfectly natural human tendency at work during the war. Time and time again, real negotiations between the parties practically came to a standstill, while the principals got ready for the big show in Washington.

Those who know the work of the Conciliation Service realize that last year our Commissioners aided in the peaceful settlement of 13,000 industrial disputes. What's more, in 9 cases out of 10 where Commissioners were called in before work had halted, no stoppage occurred. Last year our conciliators also helped to settle 3,400 strikes. Nearly two-thirds of these had begun before either side called upon the Conciliation Service.

In my view, we would be very ill-advised to upset or bypass this highly useful machinery through the establishment of a mediation board.

And now a word or two about compulsory arbitration. To a good many people this looks like an easy answer to the strike problem. But they overlook the fact that if compulsory arbitration is to succeed in eliminating walk-outs and lock-outs, it must at the same time abolish or restrict the right to contract.

Thus the principle of compulsory arbitration does violence to our whole Anglo-Saxon concept of law. For it must be realized that if an arbitrator writes a contract which through a wage increase or any other provision increases the cost to the employer, it will then become necessary for the arbitrator or some Government agency to look into or determine what the manufacturer may charge for his product. There is no escaping this chain of events.

That is why both labor and management are so opposed to such controls. They know that we cannot preserve our free economy if Government is to dictate the terms of labor-management agreements. Such a process does not lend itself to a little compulsion—it forecasts the end of freedom to contract.

Ten years have passed since the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Wagner Act. During that period the ranks of organized labor have increased very rapidly—management attitudes have changed and are still changing. Since the Wagner Act was passed, in 1935, a great body of law has developed in interpreting the act and its meaning. To a considerable degree the provisions of this act have influenced the course of collective bargaining itself, as well as the pattern of union recruitment. Thus it is very difficult to know just how extensive or destructive any given change might prove to be.

For that reason I have repeatedly urged the Congress to make this matter the subject of a special study by a commission, as President Truman recommended in his state of the Union message.

And I would strongly recommend that such a study concern itself with the basic causes of labor disputes and industrial peace. Naturally I would recommend the kind of approach that is geared to today's reality and tomorrow's potentiality. I would look forward to the goal which the people of this Nation seek—secure abundance in a world at peace.

Soldiers' Cemeteries Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Visits to Our Dead," published in today's Washington Post. The editorial deals with the situation in regard to our cemeteries overseas.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VISITS TO OUR DEAD

There is something sacrilegious, almost ghoulish, about the practice now going on of disinterring our war dead and shipping them back to this country for reburial. We are glad that President Truman has suggested an alternative to this painful process in the form of overseas pilgrimages for next of kin. The President's proposal is similar to the procedure advocated editorially by this newspaper on March 13. Mr. Truman expressed aptly the essentially humanitarian and equalitarian considerations involved. "I feel sure," he said, "that if they could see for themselves the care which is devoted to the graves of those who died in the First World War, and to the temporary cemeteries in which their own dead lie buried today, many of the next of kin would prefer that their loved ones should rest forever in the countries where they fell."

Congress has appropriated $210,000,000, or approximately $710 per body, for return of war dead to the United States. We do not advocate repeal of this measure, since the process is already under way. Possibly there are some families to whom the move would be comforting though the renewed grief adds a masochistic note. We do think, however, that from the standpoint of their own eventual satisfaction, next of kin ought to be permitted the alternative of an overseas visit to the graves. We hope, therefore, that Congress will adopt a plan similar to that contained in a bill introduced by Representative ST. GEORGE to make such pilgrimages possible, much in the same way that Government aid was provided for such trips after World War I. Indeed, it is too bad that relatives cannot first make the trips to the neat and inspiring cemeteries where our war dead rest with their comrades, and then decide whether they wish the bodies returned. If this were the case, we are confident that the overwhelming sentiment would be for leaving the graves undesecrated.

The Senator Who Walks Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Senator Who Walks

Alone," written by Robert W. Akers, editor of the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, and published in the Enterprise of the issue of May 9, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATOR WHO WALKS ALONE

(By Robert W. Akers, editor, the Enterprise)

The Texans in Washington stick together—Congressmen, newspaper correspondents, Government officials. Any gathering that calls for the presence of the Lone Star delegation finds them all there, all, that is, except W. LEE O'DANIEL.

The Capital Texas colony now takes this situation for granted. To a visitor who inquires, as I did last month, "Where's Senator O'DANIEL?" the reply is a shrug, a hastily spoken, "Oh, he never comes to these things," a change of subject.

Just when this situation started, I don't know, but I judged it must not have been long after the junior United States Senator arrived in Washington in 1941. It appears the rest of the Texans in Congress quickly concluded he didn't care to "play ball" with them, politically speaking.

It also appears outwardly that this interpretation is all right with Mr. O'DANIEL. He goes his own way and votes his own way. In a large proportion of instances his vote is not cast with that of the Democratic regulars, those who go along with the administration leadership.

These differences of opinion have put O'DANIEL on the back row as far as Federal appointments in the State are concerned. And that, in turn, has led to the recently exhibited antagonism between O'DANIEL and Senator CONNALLY, long-time party wheelhorse, who gets first choice in patronage decisions.

It also means that when delegations come to Washington seeking assistance on Federal matters they head for Senator CONNALLY'S office. The senior Senator's long and loyal service as a Democratic Member of Congress has made him a man of great influence.

In 1948 O'DANIEL will ask reelection and that campaign is likely to be the most critical test ever faced by this unorthodox politician, who has never yet lost a vote contest.

O'DANIEL'S political career has been contradictory. He goes after votes on a mass appeal basis—music, entertainment, shirtsleeved appearances before the crowd, demands for benefits for the old folks, fiery denunciations that bring the familiar cry, "Pour it on 'em, Pappy."

In the Senate, however, he votes like a sound, conservative businessman—which is what he is, in fact. His legislative decisions have obviously been made on a basis of personal conviction and not on party regularity. Because he is a conservative businessman, by background, those personal convictions have been, time after time, contrary to Democratic, especially New Deal, policies. He is with the Republicans on many an issue.

A great many Texas businessmen, lifelong Democrats though they are, will say unhesitatingly, "O'DANIEL'S doing a good job up there. He has a common-sense attitude and he votes his personal beliefs."

So 1948 will bring a dramatic show-down. Will Texans, traditionally insistent upon Democratic regularity, return for another 6 years a Senator who has paid scant attention to party policies? An O'Daniel victory would be not only a tribute to his personal popularity but an acceptance of senatorial representation that deviates from the strict party line.

Opposing the junior Senator are expected to be Coke Stevenson, also an economic conservative, and LYNDON JOHNSON, who came within a hair's breadth of defeating O'DANIEL in a special senatorial election in 1941. JOHNSON, who represents the Austin district in Congress, has strengthened his Statewide political fences since his return from war service and obviously hopes to move forward.

State-wide polls indicate that O'DANIEL has lost much strength since he won by a comfortable margin over James V. Allred in the regular election of 1942.

The Senator says he is not worried by straw votes; that he is confident of reelection when the balloting really counts, and he continues to be the Senator who walks alone. He is out of the Republican councils, because he is a Democrat, and he is out of the Democratic councils because of an aggressively independent attitude.

Do I think he'll be reelected in 1948? I wouldn't even guess now. But, just on a basis of his perfect election-winning record, I certainly wouldn't bet against him.

The Palestine Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, at the recent special session of the United Nations General Assembly called to consider the Palestine problem, three splendid statements were made by the spokesmen for the Jewish people.

These arguments, presented by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, of Cleveland, president of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine; by Mr. Moshe Shertok, head of the political department of the agency; and by Mr. David Ben-Gurion, the chairman of the executive committee of the Jewish Agency, set forth fully the historic right and justification of the Jewish people to establish a homeland and a Jewish state in Palestine.

The three statements comprise a magnificent presentation of the Jewish case and a splendid review of the historic American support of this great cause.

I commend these statements to the attention of all fair-minded people interested in a just solution of one of the world's most pressing problems, and I request their publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Congress and the country.

Inasmuch as the statements are greater in extent than is permitted under the rule, I have secured from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing them, which will be $426.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER, MAY 8, 1947

I should like to say at the outset that were Mr. David Ben-Gurion, chairman of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, here this morning, he would be making this statement. Unfortunately, the arrival of Mr. Ben-Gurion has been delayed. He will be here tomorrow, and I hope that in the course of the deliberations he will have an opportunity to participate here.

Permit me to thank the Assembly of the United Nations for granting the Jewish Agency for Palestine a hearing on the question which is before this committee. We are grateful for the opportunity to take counsel with you in the matter of constituting and instructing a special committee of this body, which is to study the problem of Palestine and to bring in recommendations for the future government of that country. We trust that our participation in these deliberations will be helpful and will prove to be a contribution to the just solution of this grave international problem which this international community is now earnestly seeking.

Such a successful solution will prove a blessing not only to Palestine and to all its inhabitants, to the Jewish people, to the cause of world peace, but it will also enhance the moral authority and prestige of this great organization for world justice and peace upon which so many high hopes of mankind now rest.

PLEASED OVER OUTLOOK

We are pleased that the Palestine problem will now be reviewed by an international body and that the thought and conscience of mankind will now be brought to bear on a situation which heretofore, and for some years now, has been made extremely difficult by unilateral action and by decisions made, presumably within the terms of a mandatory trust, but actually without the sanction or supervision of the international body which established that trust and which defined both its limits and its purposes.

The administration of Palestine has, since the outbreak of the war, been conducted by the mandatory powers as if it were vested with the sovereignty of Palestine; whereas it is assumed to administer that country, of which it was not the sovereign, as a trustee for carrying out the purposes of the mandate, which clearly defined its rights and its obligations.

The problem of Palestine is, of course, of paramount importance to the Jewish people and that fact, I take it, motivated the General Assembly of the United Nations to extend an invitation to the Jewish Agency of Palestine to present its views. We thank all those who so warmly urged our admission for their good will and their gallant action. The Jewish Agency, you will recall, is recognized in the mandate for Palestine as a public body authorized to speak and act on behalf of the Jewish people in and out of Palestine in matters affecting the establishment of the Jewish national home.

It is the only recognized public body in the mandate. It is recognized as such, to quote article 4, "* * * for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the administration of Palestine in such economic, social, and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine and, subject always to the control of the administration, to assist and take part in the development of the country."

Under article 6, the Jewish Agency is entitled further to cooperate with the administration in permitting "* * * close settlement by Jews on the land"; and, by article 11, it is given a preferred status in respect to the construction and operation of public works and the development of the natural resources of the country.

The Jewish Agency, which we have the honor to represent, therefore, speaks not merely for the organized Jewish community of Palestine, the democratically elected National Council of Palestine Jews, who are today the pioneering vanguard in the building of the Jewish national home; it speaks also for the Jewish people of the world, who are devoted to this historic ideal, for it was charged, by the same article 4 of the mandate, "* * * to secure the cooperation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home."

I have spoken of "the Jewish people" and "the Jewish national home." In defining the terms of reference of the committee of inquiry which you are to appoint, and in all the committee's future investigations, these, in my judgment, should be regarded as key terms and basic concepts. They were the key terms and the basic concepts of the Balfour Declaration and of the mandate under which Palestine is, or should be, administered today.

To proceed without relation to them would be to detour into a political wilderness as far as Palestine is concerned. To treat the Palestine problem as if it were one of merely reconciling the differences between two sections of the population presently inhabiting the country, or of finding a haven for a certain number of refugees and displaced persons, would only contribute to confusion.

BALFOUR DECLARATION CITED

The Balfour Declaration, which was issued by His Majesty's Government as a "* * * declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspiration," declares:

"His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."

The mandate, in its preamble, recognizes "* * * the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine" and "* * * the grounds for reconstituting"—I call your attention to the word "reconstituting"—"their national home in that country."

Those international commitments of a quarter of a century ago, which flowed from the recognition of historic rights and present needs, and upon which so much has already been built in Palestine by the Jewish people, cannot now be erased. You cannot turn back the hands of the clock of history.

Certainly, the United Nations, guided by its great principle, proclaimed in its Charter, "to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained," can never sanction the violation of treaties and of international law.

Having this and similar situations in mind, a specific provision, you will recall, was written into the chapter of the Charter of the United Nations which deals with territories which might become trusteeship territories, and which is therefore especially applicable to territories now under mandate. This is article 80 of the Charter, which reads:

"Except as may be agreed upon in individual trusteeship agreements, made under articles 77, 79, and 81, placing each territory under the trusteeship system, and until such agreements have been concluded, nothing in this chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments, to which members of the United Nations may respectively be parties."

It is the perspective of your committee of inquiry on the entire problem which, in our judgment, will prove decisive. It will give direction and will greatly expedite its work, and its conclusions will prove of constructive significance, if it will keep the proper perspective always in view.

A generation ago the international community of the world, of which the United Nations today is the political and spiritual heir, decreed that the Jewish people should be given the right, long denied, and the opportunity to reconstitute their national home in Palestine. That national home is still in the making: it has not yet been fully established. No international community has canceled or even questioned that right. The mandatory power, which was entrusted with the obligation to safeguard the opportunity for the continuous growth and development of the Jewish national home, has unfortunately in recent years grievously interfered with and circumscribed it. That opportunity must now be fully restored.

When will the Jewish national home be an accomplished fact? The answer to that question may well be given by the man who was Prime Minister of Great Britain at the time when the Balfour Declaration was issued. I am quoting the testimony of Mr. Lloyd George, given before the Palestine Royal Commission in 1937:

"There would be no doubt," he said, "as to what the Cabinet then had in their minds. It was not their idea that a Jewish state should be set up immediately by the peace treaty. On the other hand, it was contemplated that, when the time arrived for according representative institutions to Palestine, if the Jews had meanwhile responded to the opportunity afforded them and had become a definite majority of the inhabitants, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish commonwealth."

"The notion that Jewish immigration," he continued, "would have to be artificially restricted in order to insure that the Jews would be a permanent minority, never entered into the head of anyone engaged in framing the policy. That would have been regarded as unjust and as a fraud on the people to whom we were appealing."

This same answer could also be given by Mr. Winston Churchill, who was an important member of the Government which issued the Balfour Declaration; by General Smuts, who was a member of the Imperial War Cabinet at the time and who foretold an increasing stream of Jewish immigration into Palestine and "in generations to come, a great Jewish state rising there once more"; by Lord Robert Cecil, and by many others.

QUOTES WOODROW WILSON

American statesmen shared this view of the Jewish national home. Thus, President Wilson, on March 3, 1919, stated: "I am persuaded that the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth."

That the Government of the United States does not now consider the Jewish national home as already established is clearly stated in the letter of President Truman to King Ibn Saud, of Saudi Arabia, dated October 29, 1946. He wrote:

"The Government and people of the United States have given support to the concept of the Jewish national home in Palestine ever since the termination of the First World War, which resulted in the freeing of a large area of the Near East, including Palestine, and the establishment of a number of independent States which are now members of the United Nations."

"The United States," wrote President Truman, "which contributed its blood and resources to the winning of that war, could not divest itself of a certain responsibility for the manner in which the freed territories were disposed of or for the fate of the peoples liberated at that time. It took the position, to which it still adheres, that these people should be prepared for self-government, and also that a national home for the Jewish people should be established in Palestine.

"I am happy to note, declared the President, "that most of the liberated peoples are now citizens of independent countries. The Jewish national home, however, has not as yet been fully developed."

It should, of course, be clear—and I regret that statements made by certain representatives in recent days have tended to confuse what should be clear—that when we speak of a Jewish state, we do not have in mind any racial state or any theocratic state, but one which will be based upon full equality and rights for all inhabitants without distinction of religion or race and without domination or subjugation. What we have in mind by the Jewish state is most succinctly stated in a resolution adopted by the British Labor Party in 1945—now represented by the present Government of the United Kingdom, which requested this special session of the United Nations. I am quoting:

"Here we halted halfway, irresolutely between conflicting policies. But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war, and there is an irresistible case for it now."

When your committee of inquiry will come to consider proposals for the future government of Palestine, this inescapable and irreducible factor—the international obligation to insure the continuous development of the Jewish national home—should be kept, in our judgment, constantly in mind. I believe it would be extremely helpful to the committee of inquiry if the mandatory government would present the account of its stewardship of the Palestine mandate to it rather than wait for the next assembly of the United Nations. It would assist the committee in thinking through the problem and at arriving at helpful recommendations for the future government of Palestine.

It is illogical, I fear, to ask the committee of inquiry to consider the future government of Palestine without first making a thorough study of the present government to discover what was faulty in the present administration, what neglect and what deviations occurred to have brought about a condition so dangerous and explosive as to necessitate the convoking of a special session of the United Nations to deal with it.

I believe that the committee of inquiry should most certainly visit Palestine. Written documents are important, but infinitely more instructive are the living documents, the visible testimony of creative effort and achievement. In Palestine they will see what the Jewish people, inspired by the hope of reconstituting this national home after the long weary centuries of their homelessness, and relying upon the honor and the pledged word of the world community, has achieved in a few short years against great odds and seemingly insurmountable handicaps.

The task was enormous—untrained hands, inadequate means, overwhelming difficulties. The land was stripped and poor, neglected through the centuries. And the period of building took place between two disastrous world wars when European Jewry was shattered and impoverished. Nevertheless, the record of pioneering achievement of the Jewish people in Palestine has received the acclaim of the entire world. And what was built there with social vision and high human idealism has proved a blessing, we believe, not only to the Jews of Palestine but to the Arabs and to other non-Jewish communities as well.

That the return of the Jews to Palestine would prove a blessing not only to themselves but also to their Arab neighbors was envisaged by the Emir Feisal, who was a great leader of the Arab peoples, at the Peace Conference following the First World War. On March 3, 1919, he wrote:

"We Arabs look with the deepest sympathy on the Zionist movement. Our deputation here in Paris is fully acquainted with the proposals submitted yesterday by the Zionist organization to the Peace Conference, and we regard them as moderate and proper. We will do our best, insofar as we are concerned, to help them through. We will wish the

Jews a most hearty welcome home. I look forward, and my people with me look forward, to a future in which we will help you, and you will help us, so that the countries in which we are mutually interested may once again take their places in the community of civilized peoples of the world."

Your committee of inquiry will conclude, we are confident, that if allowed to develop uninterruptedly the standards of life which have been developed in Palestine, the concepts of social justice and the modern scientific method will serve as a great stimulus to the rebirth and progress of the entire Near East with which Palestine and with which the destinies of the Jewish national home are naturally bound up.

Your committee of inquiry should also consider the potentialities of the country, which, if properly developed, can, according to the expert testimony of those most qualified to speak on the subject, sustain a population much greater than the present one. Many more projects which will result in great economic and social improvement, not alone in Palestine but in all the neighboring countries, are awaiting development pending a satisfactory political solution.

WOULD INVESTIGATE VIOLENCE

The committee of inquiry should, while in Palestine, also look into the real, the fundamental causes of the tragic unrest and violence which today mar the life of the Holy Land to which our Jewish pioneers came, not with weapons but with tools. They will inquire, I am sure, why a peace-loving community, whose sole interest was in building a peaceful home and future for themselves and their children, is being driven to the pitch of resentment and tension and lamentably driving some of its members to actions which we all deplore.

They will ask themselves, I am sure, why shiploads of helpless Jewish refugees—men, women, and children who have been through all the hells of Nazi Europe—are being driven away from the shores of the Jewish national home by a mandatory government which assumed, as its prime obligation, to facilitate Jewish immigration into that country.

They will also investigate, I hope, how the mandatory government is carrying out another of its obligations, which was to encourage also settlement of the Jews on the land, when, in actual practice, it is today severely restricting free Jewish settlement to an area less than 6 percent of that tiny country, and is enforcing today in the Jewish national home discriminatory racial laws which the mandate, as well as the Charter of the United Nations, severely condemns.

By way of digression let it be said—if it need be said at all—that we are not engaged nor shall we be engaged in any criticism or condemnation of the people of the United Kingdom. We have no quarrel with them. On the contrary, we have the highest regard and admiration for that people and for its monumental contributions to democratic civilization; and we shall never forget that it was the United Kingdom which, first among the nations, gave recognition to the national aspirations of the Jewish people. It is only a wrong and unjustifiable policy which contradicts and tends to defeat the far-visioned British statesmanship of earlier years which we condemn.

We hope most earnestly that the Committee of Inquiry will also visit the displaced persons camps in Europe and see with their own eyes the appalling human tragedy which mankind is permitting to continue unabated 2 years—it is exactly 2 years today since VE-day—after the close of the war in which the Jewish people was the greatest sufferer.

While committees of investigation and study are reporting on their sad plight, and while intergovernmental discussions and negotiations are going on, these war-ravaged men and women are languishing in their misery, still waiting for salvation. They ask for the bread of escape and hope; they are given the stone of inquiries and investigations. Their morale is slumping terribly. A spiritual deterioration, I am afraid, is setting in among them. It is only the hope that tomorrow — perhaps tomorrow — redemption may come that keeps their spirit from breaking utterly.

Most of them are desperately eager to go to the Jewish national home. I hope that the conscience of mankind, speaking through you and through your committee or inquiry will make it possible for these weary men and women to find peace at last and healing in the land of their fondest hopes, and that their liberation will not be delayed until the report of the committee is finally made and the action of the Assembly is finally taken, but that, pending ultimate decisions and implementations, these unfortunate people will be permitted forthwith to migrate in substantial numbers to Palestine.

There is a desperate urgency about this tragic human problem my friends, which brooks no delay. An immediate relaxation of the restrictive measures on immigration into Palestine and a return to the status which prevailed before the white paper policy of 1939 was imposed will not only be a boon to these suffering humans, but will greatly relieve the present menacing tensions in Palestine, will wash out much of the bitterness and will enable the deliberations of your committee of inquiry and of the next Assembly to be carried on in a calmer spirit, in an atmosphere of moderation and good will. We are all eager for peace. We must all make a contribution to achieve it. But the decisive contribution can only be made by the mandatory government.

I hope that I have not abused your patience, Mr. Chairman, and the patience of the representatives of the United Nations here assembled. Permit me to conclude with this observation:

The Jewish people place great hope upon the outcome of the deliberations of this great body. It has faith in its collective sense of justice and fairness and in the high ideals which inspire it. We are an ancient people, and though we have often, on the long, hard road which we have traveled, been disillusioned, we have never been disheartened. We have never lost faith in the sovereignty and the ultimate triumph of great moral principles.

In these last tragic years, when the whole household of Israel became one great hostelry of pain, we could not have built what we did build had we not preserved our unshakable trust in the victory of truth. It is in that strong faith and hope that we wish to cooperate with you in this task which you have undertaken.

The Jewish people belongs in this society of nations. Surely the Jewish people is no less deserving than other peoples whose national freedom and independence have been established and whose representatives are now seated here. The Jewish people were your allies in the war and joined their sacrifices to yours to achieve a common victory. The representatives of the Jewish people of Palestine should sit in your midst. The representatives of the people and of the land which gave to mankind spiritual and ethical values inspiring human personalities and sacred texts which are your treasured possessions—we hope that that people, now rebuilding again its national life in its ancient homeland, will be welcomed before long by you to this noble fellowship of the United Nations.

STATEMENT BY MOSHE SHERTOK, MAY 12, 1947

I am here to reply to the questions which were put to Dr. Silver after the conclusion of his address to the committee. In so doing, I hope I may be permitted also to clear up some of the underlying issues, in order to bring out the meaning of my replies a little more clearly.

I would begin with a question asked by the representative of Poland as to the organization, composition, and functions of the Jewish Agency for Palestine. In the mandate, it was the Zionist organization which was recognized as the Jewish agency, with powers to advise and cooperate with the mandatory administration in matters concerning the Jewish national home and to take part in the country's development.

At the time, the World Zionist Organization, founded 50 years ago, was already 25 years old. Subsequently, certain non-Zionist groups joined in forming an enlarged Jewish agency, but the Zionist organization has remained the main driving force. The World Zionist Organization has today local organizations in more than 60 countries—with a few exceptions, in every country where Jews live.

Within the Zionist movement, as in any democratically organized society, there are parties: the labor party and other labor groups, the center or general Zionists, the Mizrachi or the orthodox religious Zionists, and the revisionists. This party division is reflected in our congresses, which are held once in every 2 years after a general election in all countries. The congress elects our executive, the present executive was elected by the 360 delegates to the twenty-second Zionist congress in Basle last December, who, in turn, were elected by nearly 2,000,000 Zionist voters throughout the world. The executive has headquarters in Jerusalem and branches with resident members in New York, London, and Paris.

AGENCY'S DUTIES OUTLINED

Two things must be stressed. First, the agency is the spokesman, not merely of Jews already settled in Palestine but of all Jews throughout the world who are devoted to the idea of the Jewish national home. The entire Jewish people, I might say, hold the Jewish agency responsible for the success of that great enterprise. Secondly, the agency is not merely an organ of national representation, but an instrument of nation-building, an institution of immigration, development, and settlement. It mobilizes the energies and resources of our people for national reconstruction, and in Palestine it directs large-scale practical development work.

It has been responsible for bringing hundreds of thousands of Jews to Palestine and settling them there. It has carried out an extensive program of settlement on the land. It has stimulated major industrial development. It has supplied guidance and coordination to the vast volume of free initiative and enterprise in the work of Jewish settlement. Our Jerusalem headquarters is divided into departments: political, financial, immigration, agricultural settlement, trade and industry, labor, etc.

During the war the Jewish agency acted, in a way, as a recruiting authority. It mobilized the Jewish war effort in Palestine in the cause of the United Nations. It has supplied 33,000 volunteers for armed service within the British forces. They defended Palestine, served in most middle eastern countries and fought in the campaigns of Africa and Europe. All industrial, technical, and scientific resources of Jewish Palestine were harnessed to the war effort.

So much for the Jewish agency as such. Politically, its primary function has been to uphold and defend Jewish rights under the mandate. Immigration is the crux of the problem and several of the questions put to Dr. Silver bear on that issue. In answering these questions, I must make one basic point clear by way of background.

If it is granted that the Jewish people are in Palestine as of right, then all the implications and corollaries of that premise must be accepted. The foremost is that Jews must be allowed to resettle in Palestine in unlimited numbers, provided only they do not displace or worsen the lot of the existing inhabitants who are also there as of right. If that basic premise is not granted, then there is very little to discuss.

It may sound quite plausible to argue that if the right of the Jews to return to Palestine is admitted on the grounds of ancient history, then the whole map of the world would have to be remade and chaos would ensue. But does the question really arise? Do the descendants of the Romans, for example, claim entry into England? Do they need England? Does their future, their very existence, depend on settling there? Or do the Arabs, for that matter, press to return to Andalusia in Spain? Is it a matter of life and death for them? The analogy is fallacious and misleading.

JEWISH POSITION UNIQUE

The great historic phenomenon of the Jewish return to Palestine is unique because the position of the Jewish people as a homeless people, and yet attached with an unbreakable tenacity to its birthplace, is unique. It is that phenomenon that has made the problem of Palestine an issue in international affairs, and no similar issue has ever arisen.

Were it not for the presence in Palestine today of over 600,000 Jews who refuse to be left in the minority position under Arab domination; were it not for the urge to settle in Palestine, of hundreds of thousands of homeless and uprooted Jews in Europe, in the Orient, and elsewhere; were it not for the hopes and efforts of millions of Jews throughout the world to reestablish their national home and build it up into a Jewish state, then the United Nations would not be faced with the problem of Palestine as it is now. The problem is real and pressing. It cannot be made to disappear by conjuring up nonexistent difficulties alleged to be involved in its solution.

When the distinguished representative from India asks how many Jews from outside there were in Palestine at certain dates—the operating words being "from outside"—I must confess I am somewhat baffled. I can give him the round figures for the Jewish population in those years—50,000 in 1900, 165,000 in 1930, 475,000 in 1939. Now it is about 630,000. Incidentally, there are more Jews in Palestine today than there were Arabs at the end of the First World War. But as to "Jews from outside," I cannot say. In a way, they are all from outside; they are practically all immigrants.

There was but a tiny Jewish community in Palestine prior to 1880. In the early 1880's, the return started, almost simultaneously from Russia and Rumania, from Morocco and southern Arabia, and since then it has been practically continuous. It started because the Jews had always believed it to be their inalienable right to resettle Palestine. That right was subsequently internationally recognized and enshrined in the mandate. But quite apart from the mandate, nothing will eradicate, from the hearts of Jews, the conviction that it is their right to return. So, in that deeper sense, they are not from outside at all, but sons of the country.

By the way, my Arab countrymen make much of the fact that Palestine has already taken in so many immigrants. These immigrants, they said, were received by the Arabs. We are very sorry, but we cannot concede them that credit. Conversely, they say that the Jews have settled in Palestine at the expense of the Arabs. That debit item, too, we cannot admit. There has been no receiving of Jewish immigrants by Arabs nor any settlement of Jews at the expense of the Arabs.

The Jews did not come as guests of anyone. They came in their own right. They received themselves and their brothers; and they did so by their own efforts and at the expense of no one else. Every acre of land we tilled was bought and had to be wrested from wilderness and desolation. Nothing was taken away—not one house, not one job. A tremendous amount of work, wealth, and well-being was presented to the Arab population.

The honorable representative from India also asked what was the age of the Jewish communities in Europe; and whether, since the Hitler regime had been crushed, the Jewish displaced persons would not be better advised to stay in Germany.

As to the age of European Jewry, it is on the whole quite venerable, but age has not made for security. Three-quarters of that Jewry—6,000,000 people—are no more. But let us go back into the past. Jews had lived in Spain for a whole millennium when, in 1492, they were dispoiled and expelled, and only those who gave up their Jewish identity and became Christians were allowed to remain. Jews have lived in Poland since the eleventh or twelfth century, but in the seventeeth they were the victims of ferocious massacres. Then there were pogroms under the Russian czars in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; and in the last war, as we have just heard, came the final catastrophe. Nearly all of Polish Jewry—3,000,000 men, women, and children—were wiped out by the Nazis.

In Germany, the beginnings of Jewish settlement are traced back to the fourth century. But just six centuries ago, most of the Jews in Germany were destroyed in a wave of frenzied persecution which swept Europe. Then, by the twentieth century, German Jews had reached the pinnacle of emancipation and were largely assimilated. Yet they were hurled down into the abyss of degradation and death. Even converts to Christianity were not spared.

ANTI-SEMITISM SURVIVES HITLER

It is true that Hitler is gone now, but not anti-Semitism. He was the product, not the source, of German Jew-hatred. Anti-Semitism in Germany and in many other parts of Europe is as rife as ever and potentially militant and fierce. Some governments tried their best to keep it down, but they have a very hard job in doing so. The very age of European Jewry serves only to accentuate the basic historic insecurity of Jewish life in the dispersion.

The honorable representative of India has also asked whether the Jewish displaced persons would be assimilable in Palestine. The answer is "Yes." They would be perfectly assimilable in the Jewish community there—the one Jewish community in the world with a self-contained economic system and an independent cultural life which is eager and able to receive and absorb them. He asked whether they would not be better assimilable in Germany. The answer is "No." You cannot settle in a graveyard, nor can you build a dwelling out of heaps of rubble.

Actually, most of the Jewish displaced persons are not from Germany itself, but from other countries. They are today in camps, or they otherwise continue as refugees because they cannot be resettled in Europe. They have now waited for 2 years, and in all this time no one has come forward with a solution to their problem. The clear recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee have remained on paper, and, to them, they have proved a mockery.

No one has offered an alternative to Palestine. But even if there were an alternative, they refused to be treated as mere chattels. They appeal to the world to realize that they form part of a people which has a national will of its own. They want to go to the only country where they will feel at home, both individually and collectively. Their problem is inseparable from the problem of Palestine. It is the problem of Palestine.

To treat the issue of Palestine in isolation from the immigration issue would make as much sense as to study the beating of a heart in disregard of blood circulation. A solution for the problem of Palestine which would ignore the Jewish claim and the need for immigration would solve nothing. Whoever undertook to implement such a solution would be driven back by the sheer impact of reality to face the problem of immigration.

I may perhaps interpose here an answer to the question put by the honorable representative of the Union of South Africa. He asked whether we wanted the question of the DP's in Europe examined solely in connection with Palestine, or in its general aspect. Our answer is that we believe that only in Palestine can the problem of these people be permanently and constructively solved, for only there can their lives be rebuilt on secure foundations and their homes become part of the home of the entire people.

The immigration issue is not confined to that of the Jewish displaced persons and unsettled refugees in Europe. Various Jewish communities in Europe are involved, as well as the Jews of the Arab and oriental countries. With regard to these, members of the United Nations have heard during the present session idyllic accounts of the conditions of complete equality and true brotherhood under which they live. The Jewish agency is naturally very intimately acquainted with the position, and the picture as we know it is totally different.

In most of these countries Jews are treated as second- or third-rate citizens. They live in perpetual fear of eruptions of fierce fanaticism, of which there have been tragic examples both in recent years and in the more remote past. Their lot ranges from precarious sufferance to active persecution. All formal statements under duress notwithstanding, their hopes and dreams are centered on Zion, and their youth has no other idea but to join its builders.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNITIES URGED

We very strongly urge that the position of these communities should form a part of the committee's investigations. But the most urgent problem is, of course, that of the displaced persons in Europe who are now on the brink of despair.

The present political crisis in Palestine is nothing but a clash between the dire needs of Jewish immigration and the current anti-immigration policy of the mandatory power. We were asked by the representative of India why public servants of the British Government in Palestine are today the victims of terrorist activity. The answer is because the white paper of 1939 is still in force. Terrorism is a pernicious outgrowth of a disastrous policy.

The Jewish agency has unreservedly condemned terrorist bloodshed, and in that attitude it is supported by the large majority of the organized Jewish community. Its harm to the Jews and to the Jewish future is far graver than to the government and people of the United Kingdom. But Jewish efforts to resist and check terrorism are continually frustrated because government action, in pursuance of the white paper, adds fuel to the fire. Our efforts will continue, but the representative of India will no doubt agree that Palestine is not the only country which has been afflicted with this most hateful disease.

Another question was why, in contradiction to the Emir Feisal's (Arab leader at 1919 peace conference) attitude, the Palestine Arabs were now opposed to Jewish immigration. Since that question was put, we have heard a very able exposition of the Palestine-

Arab case which fully covered the point. All I would add is that the uncompromising opposition to immigration now voiced does not invalidate the broader conception and bolder vision expressed in the Feisal-Weizmann agreement, which indicated a way of harmonizing Jewish and Arab aspirations within a wider framework, fully taking into account the independence then promised and now achieved by the Arabs in vast territories.

While I am on the point of promises, may I be permitted to recall that Sir Henry McMahon (British High Commissioner in Egypt during World War I) himself stated that Palestine was never included in the promises made by him to the Arabs, and that this was well understood at the time by the late King Hussein (King Hussein of Hedjaz, Sherif of Mecca in 1915); also that Trans-Jordan, which was originally included in the Balfour Declaration, is today an Arab state.

Finally, the distinguished representative of India asked whether we recognized the distinction between a Jewish state and a Jewish national home. The answer is that we do, but perhaps not quite in the sense in which the question was meant. The establishment of the Jewish national home is a process. The setting up of a Jewish state is its consummation. That such consummation had been intended by the authors of the Jewish national home policy and that a way was definitely left open for its achievement was conclusively proved by the Palestine Royal Commission. The point was fully understood by those responsible for the 1944 statement on Palestine of the British Labor Party executive.

The Indian representative drew attention to the use in that statement of the term "Jewish national home" and not "Jewish state." But may I recall the words of Mr. Hugh Dalton, the present Chancelor of the Exchequer, when reporting on that statement of the executive to the Labor Party Conference. He urged common support, in consultation with the United States and Soviet Governments—and now I quote—"for a policy which will give us a happy, free, and prosperous Jewish state in Palestine." That was only 2 years ago.

The matter has a most vital bearing on the question of Palestine's independence. Unlike other mandates of category A, the declared object of which was to prepare the country for independence, the Palestine mandate has no such clause. Its primary purpose, in the words of the Royal Commission, is the establishment of the Jewish national home. But, of course, the ultimate goal must be independence and the mandate must be terminated.

So if, upon the termination of the Palestine mandate, its original purpose is to be fulfilled, if the future of the Jewish National Home is to be permanently secured, if the national interest of the Jewish people is to be harmonized with other interests and not sacrificed for their sake, then a Jewish state must come into being. A home, in the words of a British statesman, in the debate on the white paper for Palestine, is a place to which one is always free to come back. How is the national home to fulfill its primary functions of being open to Jews in need of it, if it is to remain forever subjected to non-Jewish sovereignty?

WOULD SECURE ARAB MINORITY

An Arab minority in a Jewish state will be secure, if for no other reason, because the state will forever remain surrounded by Arab countries with which it will be most vitally interested to be at peace; also because there will always be Jewish minorities in other lands.

But a Jewish minority in an Arab state will have no such security at all. It will be at the mercy of the Arab majority, which would be free from all restraints. To provide boldly, if I may put it that way, for the independence of Palestine as a country, without placing an equal emphasis on safeguarding the independence of the Jews as a people, is to tear the problem out of its real context and load the dice heavily against the Jews. The whole issue is likely to be vitiated in advance by such an approach.

The question of our living with the Arab peoples and the relationship of a Jewish state with them is, of course, the dominant question of the future. The distinguished representative of Poland has asked, in his second question, whether there have been attempts at collaboration between Jews and Arabs. The answer is, yes, there have been, on both sides. Arabs and Jews have cooperated and are cooperating successfully in the wide and varied fields of municipal, commercial, and labor affairs.

Arabic is taught in all Jewish secondary schools and in a large number of primary schools. The Jewish agency is particularly active in spreading knowledge of Arabic in the Jewish settlements and promoting friendly relations between them and their Arab neighbors. From personal observation and direct experience accumulated over a period of 41 years' residence in Palestine, I can affirm that there is nothing inherent in the nature of either the native Arab or the immigrant Jew which prevents friendly cooperation. On the contrary, considering the admitted great difference of background, they mix remarkably well.

By mixing I do not mean assimilation, for the Jew does not come to Palestine to assimilate to the Arab, but to develop his own distinctive individuality. Nor does he expect the Arab to assimilate to himself. What I mean is cooperation between a self-respecting Jew and a self-respecting Arab, and between the two communities.

Today the issue is overshadowed and practical cooperation is hampered by the political conflict over the country's future. The present official leaders of the Arab states, having achieved practically all they wanted with so little sacrifice, refuse to admit the legitimacy of the national aspirations of another people. At the head of the Arab Higher Committee of Palestine stands a man who, apart from other well-known aspects of his activity, was directly involved during the war in the Nazi policy of extermination of the European Jews.

Nevertheless, the Jews do not lose heart. They come to Palestine not to fight the Arab world, but to live at peace with it. They are not an outpost of any foreign domination. Their ambition is to integrate themselves into the modern structure of reviving Asia. They are an old Asiatic people returning to their home. At the same time, they are anxious to make their contribution to the great work of bridge building between modern Asia and the rest of the world.

PARTNERSHIP OF EQUALITY ASKED

Their intense experience in development within the narrow confines of Palestine is yielding results which may be of value to all who are interested in social and economic progress in the Middle East and beyond. But their true partnership with their neighbors can only be based upon equality of status and mutual respect. They claim what is the natural right of any people on the face of the earth—that as many of them as possible should live together in their own country, freely develop their civilization, make their contribution to the common stock of humanity, and be self-governing and independent. They cannot possibly surrender that claim, and for its attainment they appeal for the assistance of the entire family of nations.

In conclusion, may I answer the question of the distinguished delegation from Colombia on our views regarding the composition of the special committee. We would not differentiate between big and small powers, nor would we suggest the exclusion of any government merely because it happens to have or may develop a policy on Palestine. Having a policy does not necessarily mean being directly concerned as an interested party. But we believe that parties directly concerned should not serve on the committee. That should exclude the United Kingdom, for reasons put, if I may say so, with unanswerable cogency by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom himself. We would also definitely exclude the Arab states, unless it were agreed that the committee should contain one Arab and one Jewish member.

STATEMENT BY BEN-GURION, MAY 12, 1947

I am grateful for the opportunity afforded to me to make a few supplementary remarks to the statement made by my colleague, Dr. Silver, on behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

First of all, I would like to try to clarify further the nature of the problem which the mandatory power has placed before the United Nations, as this is essential for defining properly the terms of reference of the special committee. Last Friday, the representative of the United Kingdom, on behalf of his Government, declared that they tried for years to settle the problem of Palestine and had failed. They have, therefore, brought the problem to you in the hope that the United Nations would find a just solution.

This statement is open to misunderstanding. The mandatory power was not charged with discovering a solution to the Palestine problem and its failure was not in its inability to find the right solution. The mandatory power was charged by the League of Nations with the carrying out of a definite settlement. That settlement was set out and determined originally by the United Kingdom herself and subsequently confirmed by all the Allies and associated powers in the First World War, as well as by the Arabs through Emir Feisal and the Syrian Arab Committee. It was later embodied in the mandate approved by 52 nations and made international law.

The terms of that settlement, as decreed by the conscience and the law of nations, are common knowledge. It is the restoration of Palestine to the Jewish people.

At the time the United Kingdom took over the mandate, the problem of Palestine had been clearly adjudicated and settled. The failure of the mandatory government, as admitted by the British representative, was a failure to carry out the settlement agreed upon and entrusted to it by the nations of the world. The failure became manifest with the introduction of a policy set forth in the white paper of 1939, which violated the most essential terms of the mandate and vitiated its entire purpose.

The white-paper policy, as you know, was condemned by the permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations as incompatible with the mandate and with the pledges repeatedly given by the mandatory government itself. It was also denounced by the most eminent political leaders of the United Kingdom itself, including all the prominent members of the present Government of the United Kingdom, as a breach of faith. Only recently the white paper was again unanimously condemned by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. The white-paper policy is responsible for the misery and deaths of a large number of Jews and for cruel acts of expulsion of Jewish refugees.

It is responsible for establishing in Palestine a police state without parallel in the civilized world. It is responsible for the introduction in Palestine of racial discrimination against Jews in land legislation. This is the real nature of the failure of the mandatory power.

Therefore, I venture to suggest that the first problem facing the United Nations is how to set right that failure and to insure that international obligations toward the Jewish population in Palestine are faithfully fulfilled.

The second point to which I would like to invite the attention of your committee is the fact that in Palestine you are faced not merely with a large and growing number of Jews, but with a distinct Jewish nation. There are Jews and Jewish communities in many countries, but in Palestine there is a new and unique phenomenon—a Jewish nation, with all the attributes, characteristic resources, and aspirations of nationhood. This nationhood springs from a long history and an uninterrupted connection for 3,500 years with its ancestral soil.

CANNOT ARREST PROGRESS

Palestine, which for the Jewish people has always been and will always remain the Land of Israel, was in the course of centuries conquered and invaded by many alien peoples, but none of them ever identified its national faith with Palestine. The Jewish nation in Palestine is rooted not only in past history but in a great living work of reconstruction and rebuilding, both of a country and of a people.

The growth of this nation and its work of reconstruction must not and cannot be arrested—and this, for two reasons. One is the existence of large numbers of homeless Jews for whom there is no other salvation in the future except in their own national home. The second is that more than two-thirds of the land in Palestine is still wasteland, uncultivated, unsettled, and believed by the Arabs to be uncultivatable. The history of our settlement in the last 70 years has shown that this land can be and is being cultivated by us.

This is not because we are more skilled or more capable than others, but because this is the only soil in the world which we call our own. We are not, like our Arab neighbors in possession of vast underpopulated territories, like Iraq, Syria, Arabia, etc. We must therefore make use of every bit of free land in our country, even desert land.

Another observation is this: We are told that the Arabs are not responsible for the persecution of the Jews in Europe, nor is it their obligation to relieve their plight. I wish to make it quite clear that it never entered our minds to charge the Arabs with solving the Jewish problem, or to ask Arab countries to accept Jewish refugees. We are bringing our homeless and persecuted Jews to our own country and settling them in Jewish towns and villages. There are Arab towns and villages in Palestine—Nablus, Jenin, Ramleh, Narnucka, Libia, Terschicha. You will not find a single Jewish refugee in any of them. The Jews who have returned to their country are settled in Petah Tiqva, Rishon le Zion, Tel Aviv, Haifa, Jerusalem, Dagania, the Negev, and other Jewish towns and villages built by us.

The return of the Jews to their country is a work of self-liberation and self-reconstruction, which is contributing to the reconstruction and liberation of the country as a whole.

My fourth and last remark is this. We have no conflict with the Arab people. On the contrary, it is our deep conviction that historically the interests and aspirations of the Jewish and Arab peoples are compatible and complementary. What we are doing in our country, in Palestine, is reclaiming the land, increasing the yield of the soil, developing modern agriculture and industry, science, and art, raising the dignity of labor, insuring women's status of equality, increasing men's mastery over nature, and working out a new civilization based on human equality, freedom and cooperation in a world which we believe is as necessary and beneficial for our Arab neighbors as for ourselves.

A Jewish-Arab partnership, based on equality and mutual assistance, will help to bring about the regeneration of the entire Middle East. We Jews understand and deeply sympathize with the urge of the Arab people for unity, independence, and progress, and our Arab neighbors, I hope, will realize that the Jews, in their own historic homeland, can under no conditions be made to remain a subordinate, dependent minority as they are in all other countries in the Diaspora. The Jewish nation in its own country must become a free and independent state with a membership in the United Nations. It is eager to cooperate with its free Arab neighbors to promote economic development, social progress, and real independence of all the Semitic countries in the Middle East.

I most earnestly suggest to your committee that the real, just, and lasting solution of the problem before you is a Jewish state and a Jewish-Arab alliance.

The Situation in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stealing a March," published in this morning's Washington Post. The editorial deals with recent developments in Palestine and the Soviet attitude.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEALING A MARCH

It is ironical that while the State Department has been counseling neutrality about Palestine the Soviet should have come out with a clear expression of its policy. It is a policy of alternatives. If a dual, democratic Arab-Jewish state proves impossible to bring about, then, says Mr. Gromyko, Russia would back a partition of Palestine between Arab and Jew. This was, of course, the conclusion of the famous British Peel report of 1937, and we ourselves have seen no plan that could improve upon it. Discarded at the time by the British, the report has gained more weight as time has gone on, particularly in view of the intervening Arab-Jew bitterness. Certainly there could be no settlement along the lines of the cantonization of Palestine heading up to a British Raj which was fathered by Britain's Mr. Morrison and our Mr. Grady. The British no less than the Americans must have been stunned by Mr. Gromyko's desertion of the sidelines.

Neutrality has hitherto been commended on the grounds that nothing must be done to injure the susceptibilities of the Arabs lest we thrust them into the arms of Russia. The whisperers in Whitehall and the State Department have been working overtime on this theme. If the Arabs were left enraged, it is said, they would promptly embrace communism, and the Russians at a stroke would extend their sway even to the Moslems of India. The case wasn't even plausible. A united Arab world is more of an invention than a fact, even about Palestine, with the Lebanese stranger to the Saudi Arabians than to New Yorkers. Besides, they are run by pashas, landlords, and feudalists who would shudder at the thought of leaning on Moscow. They know more about the Russians than their apologists. If Russia were to bestride the Middle East, the men who are now running the Arab League would be the first to be liquidated, perhaps on the ground that they had taken the place of the old Zionists as British agents. Mr. Gromyko exposes the hollowness of these whispered warnings of Arab-Soviet flirtations.

Actually the Russians in recent years have felt they had more in common with the Palestinian Jews. This is natural enough. In the first place, it is obvious now that the Zionists are no longer what the old Bolshevists used to charge, viz, "the lackeys of British imperialists." Secondly, the advanced and progressive Jews of Palestine hold out much more promise to the Soviet Government than the backward Arabs controlled by the feudal cliques of kings and effendis. Moscow cannot forget the contribution that Jewish Palestine made to the war effort of the Allies. It was an invaluable workshop and Russia has a profound respect for the kind of technician that manned it.

But, aside from the fruits of Palestine industry, Palestine occupies a position of singular strategic importance. It is the virtual link between the three continents, lying on the Mediterranean within close touch of the Suez Canal, and it serves as the outlet and inlet for the trade of that area, chiefly Arabia's oil. Moreover, Zionist leadership is predominantly Russian in national origin. It seems to us, therefore, that there is nothing surprising in the Russian gambit at Flushing Meadow. Aside from discomfiting America and Britain, Russia may be disclosing where her interests really lie. At any rate, it is the kind of affirmativeness that long ago should have been forthcoming out of the State Department.

Resignation From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, on May 6 last, I was honored by my fellow townsmen of the great historic city of Baltimore by being elected their mayor. As I am to be inaugurated next Tuesday, I, therefore, arise to tender my resignation as a Member of Congress, in which distinguished body I have had the honor to serve since 1938. Last November the voters of the Third Congressional District of Maryland elected me for the fifth consecutive time by an overwhelming majority. Naturally, I am deeply grateful to them, as I am to the men and women of Baltimore who have chosen me to serve as their chief executive for the next 4 years.

Baltimore is a historic city filled with a rich heritage and a lofty tradition which entwines and threads about the Nation's early history. It is a thriving, prosperous municipality of more than 1,000,000 inhabitants. Situated on the Patapsco River, with the commanding Chesapeake Bay right off the city, a figurative stone's throw from Washington, the Nation's Capital, it is the gateway between the North and South. It has had a glorious past in the realm of culture, business, education, and patriotism. With the

realization of the planned improvements scheduled during the next 4 years, I am confident that it will have a wonderful future. In the character of its people—and I know it well—there is no room for prejudice, bigotry, hatred, or malice. There is, however, a fierce pride in the glory and achievements of the matchless contributions which many of its sons and daughters have made in the formation, preservation, and future greatness of our country.

My native city of Baltimore was incorporated in 1797, a decade after our founding fathers struck off at Philadelphia that immortal document—the Constitution; a little more than two decades after the immortal Jefferson was inspired to write the Declaration of Independence, and George Washington set forth as the head of the Continental Army to wrest independence for 4,000,000 people who were destined 171 years later to assume the leadership of the world. Now, I propose to return to my native city, humble in spirit, fully appreciating the magnitude of the task in this postwar era, but determined with strong resolution to devote all my time and talents to help make Baltimore one of the preeminent cities of the Nation.

It has been my pleasure, while a Member of Congress, to serve under two great Presidents, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman; and three eminent Speakers, Messrs. Bankhead, Rayburn, and Martin. I have been the recipient of much kindness at their hands. I shall always cherish to my dying day the strongest sentiments of deep and abiding friendship made while a Member of this body. Since I have been a Member of this distinguished body, I can truly say that I have never questioned the motives or integrity of any Member who may have differed with me on any political, economic, or social question of the day. And I can say, in all candor, that I have never favored any colleague except with gladness nor have I ever opposed any except with sadness.

As I leave here, I think of the critical problems which face our country in this hour. Our Nation, the guardian of democracy, is ascending the watchtower of the world in order to be prepared to safeguard the rights of free peoples. Two opposing philosophies are battling for the souls of modern man, democracy versus communism. This communistic assault upon mankind would chain, bind, and strap the bodies, minds, and souls of men and women while the forces of democracy, as we practice it, would give dignity to the human personality, endow it with rights which no government can take away, because God and not a human institution has bestowed them.

Sumner Welles, a fellow Marylander of mine, recently said:

> The American people have entered the Valley of Decision. If the United States makes full use of the opportunity afforded by its position, its power, and its resources, it can determine the destinies of humanity. It can save western civilization.

With all my heart, I am convinced that divine providence has shaped our destiny so that we can become the liberator of mankind. It is no easy task. It is an uphill struggle. I am sure that wise leadership here in Congress, in the State Department, and in the White House will bring about the high destiny that America must fulfill. It would be helpful if every American were to daily recall the words of Thomas Jefferson:

> I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the minds of men.

And now I close with the fervent wish that we shall never give away the secrets of our atomic bomb until and unless security for us and the world is established. It was the product of the genius of our scientists, our engineers, our industrialists. We must be the guardians of its safety if we and our children are to live in this world. The future of the world and of ourselves lies within our grasp. We can defeat the much-discussed recession which economists so glibly talk about. We can do it by work, by production; for the more we produce, the less will be the cost of living; the more things we can buy, the easier will be the building of our reserves—spiritual, financial, and physical.

Fellow Congressmen, I return to my city of Baltimore enriched by my service and experience in this Chamber. I leave the pyramid of government to return to its base—the city. When the base, or the city, is strong, sound, and durable, the government at the top will be stable and enduring. There, in Baltimore, the metropolis city of Maryland, I shall labor in the interests of its people, confident that you will labor with vision and courage to set our Nation's problems aright.

The Persistent Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 16 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Persistent Dream," which appeared in the Washington Star on Friday, May 16, 1947. I think it is one of the best editorials on the subject of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations that has been written, that has come to my attention, this year.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PERSISTENT DREAM

It is not a new idea that Winston Churchill preaches in calling for a United States of Europe. His latest address, formally launching a campaign in Britain to that end, is simply an eloquent affirmation of faith in an ancient dream. More important, it is a somber warning that the time is at hand when the peace of the Continent and the world demands that the dream take on substance; that it be translated into reality; that action be started on it now; not 10 years from now, or a century from now.

Nothing could be easier, of course, than to raise the usual realistic objections to this dream. It has had great and brilliant sponsors, off and on, for centuries past, but still the nations of Europe have seemed to cling more jealously than ever to their separate sovereignties. Politically, economically, historically, they have developed among themselves such rivalries, such antagonisms, such hates that the thought of uniting them has the appearance sometimes of being a wholly unattainable ideal for practical men in a hard and perverse world.

Yet it is a fact that the dream is persistent and that the movement to realize it is stronger today, and more widespread, than at any time in history. Mr. Churchill is not the only voice crying in the wilderness of unconnected and clashing sovereignties. His successor, Prime Minister Attlee, is on record as warning that the Continent must federate or perish. In France, in Italy, in the Lowlands, and elsewhere the same note is being sounded in mounting volume. The Government of Russia may be flatly against the idea, but Europeans are for it in ever-increasing numbers. Indeed, even in the New World, here in our own country, there is a great and growing sentiment for it, a sentiment summed up in the pending Fulbright-Boggs resolution to have Congress declare for a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

This dream persists for a good reason. In Mr. Churchill's words, divided Europe, because of its fragmentation into lands pulling against each other instead of together, has led itself and much of the outside world "into the pit of squalor, slaughter, and ruin." Today, as never before, there is a compulsion to unite, politically and economically, for common survival. The realistic objections are, in fact, unrealistic; worse, they add up to a defeatist invitation to catastrophe. A federated continent may be long in the making, but men with faith, every friend of a civilized and lasting peace, will keep on striving for it against all odds.

Democracy's Western Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer by Ralph J. Donaldson. Mr. Donaldson was a member of the first party of newspaper editors and publishers to visit the Far East on a tour conducted by the War Department. He is an associate editor of the Plain Dealer and has been a member of its reportorial and editorial staffs for more than 25 years. His articles will be inserted in the RECORD in the order in which they appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

UNITED STATES STRUGGLES TO SET UP DEMOCRATIC BAR TO COMMUNISM IN ORIENT

(Article 1)

What is perhaps the most stupendous program of social, economic, and political reform in the history of the world has been undertaken by the United States in the Far East as an aftermath of World War II and as an antidote to Russian aggression and the spread of communism.

Today the western frontiers of democracy are in Japan, where a defeated nation of 78,000,000 people is in the process of being

liberated from feudalistic bondage and is being taught the principles of democracy and freedom by its conquerors.

The frontiers are in the southern half of Korea, below the thirty-eighth parallel, where 19,000,000 former subjects of Japan have become, in effect, the confused and bewildered wards of the American Government.

And they are in the Philippines, where a nation of 18,000,000 people has achieved full independence as a republic after 49 years of American tutelage.

AMERICANS BEAR COST

The program in Japan and Korea is costing the American taxpayers millions of dollars. And we still have a moral obligation to assist the infant Philippine Republic to attain full stature among the free nations of the world.

But our interest in the Far East is not entirely altruistic. On the contrary, we have a terribly practical reason for giving moral and financial backing to the Philippine Republic and for attempting to establish democracy and freedom in Japan and southern Korea.

The blunt fact is that these countries now stand as ideological barriers against the spread of communism.

If democracy flourishes where its seeds have been planted, these countries will become an example to the teeming millions of Asia of the benefits and advantages of a free way of life and an inspiration to seek a similar goal.

RED THREAT IS EVERYWHERE

But if democracy should fail, it would be replaced by communism. There is no doubt about that. The threat of it looms ominously everywhere in the Far East. And where communism dominates, the iron curtain shuts out not only ideas and information, but also commerce with the rest of the world.

Consequently, if we intend to develop a profitable foreign trade with the Far East, which has vast possibilities for the future, it is to our interest to keep that part of the world on this side of the iron curtain.

The same logic applies equally to China. But we do not have the kind of responsibilities in China that we have in Japan, southern Korea, and the Philippines.

The story of what we are doing in Japan and Korea is fascinating and amazing. It has never been completely told to the American people, largely because the economic and social changes that are taking place in these countries have been overshadowed by the day-to-day political developments and reports on the progress of military occupation.

As a member of a party of newspaper publishers and editors who were invited by Secretary of War Robert Patterson to make a tour of the Far East, I have had an exceptional opportunity to see at first hand what is going on in that part of the world and to talk with some of those who are responsible for carrying out the reform program and who are affected by it.

Our party of nine newspapermen and two conducting officers left Washington, January 21. We returned February 25, after flying more than 25,000 miles in a special C–54 plane of the Air Transport Command.

ALL DATA REVEALED

On orders from General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, GHQ in Tokyo opened the book and let us look through it. Information of all kinds was made available for background purposes, regardless of previous military restrictions.

We each had personal conferences with General MacArthur and we were given what amounted to classroom lectures by the heads of the various sections of GHQ regarding their activities. In the Army they call this "briefing." But there was nothing brief about it. It was complete and thorough and supplemented by various charts and documents.

Later we toured Japan on the special train maintained by Lieut. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, commander of the Eighth Army occupation forces. We went from Tokyo to Hiroshima, where we talked with survivors of the atomic bomb, stopping en route at Kobe, Osaka, and Kyoto.

KOREA FOUND IN TURMOIL

After 16 days in Japan, we flew to Seoul, Korea, where we spent 3 days in conference with Lt. Gen. John R. Hodge and members of his staff and interviewing and being interviewed by Koreans who are unhappy and resentful because their country is split in two parts and because they have not yet been granted the independence they had been promised.

From Seoul we flew to Nanking, China, for an off-the-record conference with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. Then came a day in Shanghai, and a brief look at one of the world's most amazing and crowded cities, where millions of people are engaged in an intense and apparently frenzied daily struggle just to exist.

From Shanghai we flew to Manila, which still bears ghastly scars of savage fighting. And then we headed for home by way of Guam, Kwajalein and Honolulu. It will be my purpose in subsequent articles to describe what we saw and learned on this trip.

Globe-Girdling Gas Bag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1947

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which was published in the Daily Times, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., April 18, 1947, entitled "Globe-Girdling Gas Bag":

GLOBE-GIRDLING GAS BAG

At first glance, the curious spectacle of a former Vice President of the United States barnstorming through Europe in jaundiced opposition to the policies of the President in whose Cabinet he recently sat would seem to be extremely dangerous to this country's best interests. There is possible danger that foreign audiences may not realize the degree to which Mr. Wallace and the remnants of the New Deal have been discredited over here, both at the polls and in the White House.

Yet it would be entirely contrary to our doctrines of free speech and free travel for our citizens to revoke Wallace's passport. That would be to play directly into Wallace's hands and make him the martyr he would like to consider himself. Let's not dramatize the gentleman any more than he has himself done. For he thrives upon headlines.

Perhaps the common sense thing to do is to give Wallace all the bombastic rope he wishes, trusting that those who shape public opinion in foreign countries are sufficiently well informed not to prove gullible. Already we have witnessed this gratifying result in British newspapers and it is likely the same opinion will be reflected in other nations excepting Russia. There, we may be sure, Mr. Wallace will be played for all he is worth by the Communist-dominated press and radio. But the rest of the world already is so keenly aware of misrepresentation of truth from these sources that the propaganda can be discounted in advance.

While that attitude seems to take care of the foreign repercussions of Wallace's self-exploited one-man crusade, the effect here at home may be of a more positive and of a more concrete nature. At the least, it can only arouse sympathy for President Truman that, beset as he is by momentous problems, he must also suffer, like the Ancient Mariner, from the vagaries of this wandering albatross.

As a matter of fact, we are inclined to the view that Henry Wallace, despite contrary intent, may actually build support here and abroad for President Truman's foreign policies. It would not be the first time that a President was admired for the enemies he had made. For so transparent is Wallace's strategy, so well known is the cause for his personal jealousy, that his attack may prove not only a boomerang upon himself but a potent weapon for Truman in 1948.

We are not among those who cry out that this man is giving aid and comfort to a very potential enemy and that in this aspect his appeal for opposition to American principles borders closely upon the treasonable. Rather, we are convinced that this incident will enhance abroad the good opinion of America, as a country so great it can look with indifference upon a former high official striking with all his might against a policy highly approved by a large majority of our citizenry. That proves surely that we are indeed a democratic Nation sworn to preservation of individual liberties.

And, we repeat, as for the effect here at home, so likely is this junket of Wallace's to prove of political benefit to the man he attacks that we really think President Truman should personally pay all expenses. Wallace, if he keeps on as he is now going, can easily prove to be the best political asset Mr. Truman possesses.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Graduating Class of National Service Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday it was my pleasure to deliver an address before the tenth graduating class of national service officers conducted by the Disabled American Veterans and other veterans' organizations in the American University. I ask that the text of my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE NATION

I am grateful for this opportunity to be with you at this inspiring and unforgettable moment in your lives.

One of the real pleasures here tonight is to meet so many of my old friends connected with the American University, with the Veterans' Administration, the Disabled American Veterans, and other veterans' organizations.

MEANING OF THIS OCCASION

These exercises, as you know, mark the culmination of the 10 classes of academic

training for national service officers conducted by the veterans' organizations and the Veterans' Administration with the aid of this splendid educational institution. You gentlemen, comprising a group of 70 graduates, are the last of some 400 men in 10 classes which have had this wonderful training to prepare yourselves in the service of our Nation's veterans.

I am thrilled to be with you here tonight for many reasons.

My primary reason is that it gives me the opportunity to extend my warmest congratulations to all those who have participated in this grand project. They have sown well and they have reaped well.

FELICITATION OF DAV

I want to first congratulate the officers and members of the DAV—the Disabled American Veterans—which inaugurated and initiated this program nearly 3 years ago and which sponsored so many of the trainees.

Some time ago in the United States Senate it was my pleasure to deliver an address on behalf of the $10,000,000 national service fund of the DAV. It is this fund which was designed to maintain the payment of the national service officers. The need for adequate funds for this purpose is as great today as ever, and I am sure that the warm heart of the American people will continue to support this fund in ever greater amount.

Here is an opportunity to use money for a great mission serving those who gave their finest effort for America on far-flung battlefields.

I am reminded of the inscription on a sign which was paraded in Washington after the Civil War. The sign read: "The only national debt that America can repay is the debt that we owe to our ex-servicemen."

I am reminded, too, of Calvin Coolidge's words: "The nation which forgets its defenders will itself be forgotten."

PRAISE OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Yes; I want to congratulate the DAV and AMVETS. I want also to congratulate the Veterans' Administration under the able leadership of Gen. Omar Bradley. It required initiative, enterprise, and sound planning to design and execute this program. These qualities the Veterans' Administration supplied in abundant measure. May I invite particular attention to the work of my fine friend, Guy Birdsall, who, as you know, did such yeoman work in helping to draft Public Law 16, under which this program operates.

UNIVERSITY'S FINE WORK

Next I want to add a word of sincerest congratulation to the American University and its distinguished president, Dr. Paul Douglass, whom I am privileged to count as friend. Here in this project, as in many others, Dr. Douglass has shown his ability to utilize a great university for the up-to-the-minute needs of America in this age.

THE GRADUATES' ACCOMPLISHMENT

Last, but not least, I want to congratulate all of the current graduates and all those who have preceded you in this course. All of you, as required under Public Law 16, are service-handicapped veterans who have dedicated your lives to the service of your buddies.

Your courage is proved not only by your outstanding wartime records and by this peacetime activity, but by the fact, I understand, that a number of those who have taken this course have gotten married during the training period. Perhaps the greatest sign of courage is that a number of them have also become fathers during this period or are papas-to-be. Lawd, there ain't nothing you and I can't do.

WHY THIS OCCASION IS INSPIRING

I have said that this is a thrilling and inspiring occasion for me, too, and I should like to cite some of the reasons why it is such.

THE VICTORY OVER DISABILITY

1. You men are demonstrating that a physical disability can be not only overcome but indeed rendered meaningless by a triumphant spirit or a noble mission. We recall the words of the Good Book: "Be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind; that we may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God."

You men have transformed yourselves, and you are going out to transform others. I recall the other words of the Good Book: "Cease ye from man whose breath is in his nostrils." Cease ye from man who feels physical limitations, who feels mortal sickness, who feels discouragement, and rise to the man of unlimited spirit, unlimited power. What a job—not only to transform self, but to transfer that power and vision to others.

You men are demonstrating the exultation of growth and freedom. I recall a verse:

"Today I am free—and why?
Because I laid away the shell of yesterday,
and with tomorrow's sunrise I hope
To lay away the shell I grow today.
New sky lines burst upon my view—
I know it is the law of life to grow.

"So open wide, ye windows of my soul.
I fear no more—the quest is on,
A hunter for the spiritual goal,
The glory of a God enraptured man.
Gone are the gods of yesterday—
Narrow creed, superstition, hate and woe!
Gone, with other dreams that limit me.
Today, today I am free!"

You remember the Persian proverb: "I was common clay until rosebuds were planted in me."

You are following the inspiring steps of countless others who have demonstrated that physical handicaps can be rendered meaningless. We recall Thomas Alva Edison, the immortal inventor, who suffered the handicap of deafness.

You are following the example of Helen Keller, or of the other great inventor, Steinmetz, the little hunchback, who, were he attempting to enter the United States today as an immigrant, would not even be allowed to be admitted because of his physical impairment.

You men are being transformed by the renewing of your minds and you will transform others. I have seen this happen in the United States Senate too, and in the House of Representatives. I have seen blind legislators and crippled legislators, men without use of their legs or their arms or their sight, who have tapped the invisible source of all power and have emerged triumphantly in the service of their Nation. With Browning, they "counted life just the stuff to try the soul and strength on." Verily, you are called unto a high calling as leaders of men to inspire, to enthuse, and give rebirth to your fellow men.

THE GRADUATES' BUILDING OF OTHERS

I am thrilled, too, for another reason, and that is that you gentlemen are builders and sustainers of the Nation. You not only fought for it, you continue to sustain it.

In your jobs, you are going to make sure that veterans receive the full benefits to which they are legally entitled and which they might otherwise lose because of lack of information or misinformation or technical faults of their claims. With these benefits, the veterans will be better able to serve themselves and their Nation.

In the job of placement officers, you are going to build lives, to locate men in positions which fit their capacities and utilize their every available talent. In so doing, you will be adding productive workers to the economic bloodstream of our country.

THE HANDICAPPED VETERAN IN INDUSTRY

We know that 30 to 40 percent of handicapped veterans have had no previous job experience at all. One hundred percent have had no recent job experience. Thus, adequate training is necessary to bring them up to the starting line, so to speak, where they will have a relatively fair opportunity to show their talents alongside other workers.

Less than 10 percent of our disabled veterans are totally disabled. That means 90 percent are in a position, given the appropriate conditions, to do gainful work.

The handicapped veteran has more than proved himself in American industry, whenever he has been given the opportunity. We know that statistics show that the handicapped veteran, when adequately placed in employment, has a finer production record and a smaller record of disabilities than the average worker. Why? Because he has been psychologically conditioned to practices of safety; yes, because he is anxious to show his stuff in the factory or in the office, just as he showed his stuff on the battlefield. He is eager to cooperate, to learn, yes, to support himself.

You and I know this incontestable truth: that the American disabled veteran wants opportunities, the chance to work, remunerative, appropriate employment, rather than to become a mere recipient of any dole. The disabled veteran wants to live and grow in the American way—through gainful work. What greater service can we perform for any man than to help him, like the Good Samaritan, to help himself, displacing fear with fearlessness, doubt with courage, sadness with joy, dejection with exultation? That is what you men are doing, you builders of men.

IMPLEMENTING CONGRESS' WORK

But you are doing something else also in which I take great inspiration. You are going out in this new profession as combination attorney in fact, special advocate, missionary, preacher, teacher, public relations expert, doctor, fulfilling the mission of the United States Congress in insuring the welfare of our Nation's ex-servicemen. In so doing I know you will be adequate to the responsibility of inspiring faith in our Nation's highest legislature among any men whom you meet who may have been poisoned by doubts about the work of the Congress.

I know that the Congress wants to and will in fact be true to its trust to America's veterans. My own Judiciary Committee, for example, is considering codification of all United States laws, including veterans' laws, as a step toward streamlining the law and making it more understandable. I know that Congress will insure adequate funds for veterans' medical services—the finest medical service in the world for the finest young men in the world, the cream of our youth. I know that Congress is going to assure adequate physical and vocational rehabilitation for America's disabled veterans, assuring the most scientific appliances, and the most up-to-the-minute training.

SECOND-INJURY LEGISLATION

I know Congress is going to encourage American industry to give abundant opportunity to handicapped ex-servicemen. I am proud indeed that my own State of Wisconsin has some of the most advanced legislation on the statute books for veterans' welfare. I refer, for instance, to Wisconsin's so-called Second Injury Law. It has set up a public fund which is drawn upon in those instances where an employer has hired a handicapped veteran and where that veteran has suffered a new injury which was aggravated by his old injury. This fund, by its very existence, encourages employers to hire handicapped men. Actually, statistics show that it has been drawn upon only in an infinitestimal amount and has thus constituted a great aid, at insignificant expense, to the people.

One of your great champions in the House of Representatives, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, has introduced H. R. 2713 at the DAV's request, to assure Federal reimbursement "to any employer, insurer or fund of amounts of workmen's compensation" paid on account of injury suffered by service-disabled veterans. I am going to introduce companion legislation in the Senate.

CONCLUSION

My friends, I have said that this occasion is one for congratulations of all those, particularly the DAV, the Legion, the VFW, AMVETS, the Veterans' Administration, the university, who have participated in planning and executing this program, principally of congratulations to you men. You are going out to transform others as you yourselves have been transformed, to build and sustain the great values of America, to dedicate yourselves in selfless activity on behalf of your buddies.

Seeing you men here tonight gives me renewed courage that America can transform itself so that it too can be adequate to its responsibilities to its veterans, to all of its citizens, and to its own destiny in our time and in time to come.

You are raising a standard for all to see and follow; for you know that "life means to transform in light and flame all that we are or meet with."

Good luck and God bless you.

Josephus Daniels—An American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Drew Pearson entitled "Josephus Daniels—An American" which appeared in Sunday's newspapers.

Mr. Daniels served with distinction as Secretary of the Navy for 8 years throughout the Woodrow Wilson administration, and made a great record as American Ambassador to Mexico during the Roosevelt administration. This article is in commemoration of his eighty-fifth birthday and pays just tribute to a great American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOSEPHUS DANIELS—AN AMERICAN

(By Drew Pearson)

When the last surviving member of the Woodrow Wilson Cabinet achieves the lusty age of 85, and when on that birthday he still writes a daily editorial and keeps his sense of humor and his same sane philosophy on life, and when he is just as great an inspiration to his neighbors and to his family and the Nation as Josephus Daniels—that's news. And it's more important news than anything I could dig out of a Cabinet meeting or salvage from the back door of a congressional committee room.

So today, on his eighty-fifth birthday, I'm going to write about Josephus Daniels.

One reason I like Josephus Daniels is because, though he's held high position, has "walked with kings," been flattered by admirals, been taken up on the mountain, he's never lost the common touch. He has remained just the same.

His story is a story which perhaps could happen only in America. His father died when Josephus was 2, and his mother opened a millinery store to support her three sons. From this, Josephus Daniels rose to become Navy Secretary in World War I and to hold that post longer than any other man in history.

The years between had not been easy. Later his mother was appointed postmistress at Wilson, N. C., and put Josephus and his brothers to work in the post office. His job was to light the fires, clean out the building, and distribute mail. Finally he got permission to set up a little newsstand in one corner of the post-office lobby, and at the age of 18 he branched out as editor of the Wilson (N. C.) Advance. From then until this day Josephus Daniels has been, first and last, a newspaperman.

BALL CLUB MANAGER

This was one of the taunts hurled at him when he was Navy Secretary. Daniels had riled the admirals by proposing revolutionary reforms. He had banned wine and liquor from the officers' mess. He insisted on promotion from the ranks and inaugurated the practice of making 100 enlisted men eligible each year for the Naval Academy. He also pushed education for enlisted men.

In fact, Daniels was such an enemy of the brass hats that finally they stirred up charges that he was a meddling Sunday school teacher and political hack whom Wilson was rewarding for past favors. Today, however, fair-minded naval officers who look back on the Daniels regime admit that on the whole he probably did more for the Navy than almost anyone prior to Franklin Roosevelt.

Josephus has said, with that boyish grin of his, that, as Secretary of the Navy, he achieved two of his greatest ambitions: to be manager of a big baseball team and to hear a brass band play every day. The Navy gave him a number of service teams and brass bands galore.

It is significant that Daniels, Sunday school teacher that he was, was far ahead of his time when it came to the airplane and to the unification of the Army and Navy. As early as 1926, when Douglas MacArthur had helped convict Gen. Billy Mitchell of insubordination in advocating air power, Daniels defended him.

"Mitchell," he said, "was sincere in his desire to promote aviation, and perhaps hit no harder than was necessary, to wake up the country."

A few years later, Josephus uttered these prophetic words which, of course, his old friends in the Navy didn't like at all:

"The real need in preparedness is to abolish the offices of Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy and substitute a Secretary for National Defense with subsecretaries in charge of each department. That would synchronize defense operation under one head and would have the advantage of preventing a great deal of duplication and inefficiency which prevails under the present system."

It took more than 15 years for others to come around to this view in the present Army-Navy merger now before Congress.

FIRST LOVE LAST

When Josephus Daniels finally resigned as American Ambassador, as he neared the age of 80, most people would have considered him entitled to rest. He had seen his country go through virtually four wars—the Civil War, which was raging when he was born; the Spanish War, the First World War, in which he played a vital part, and the Second World War, which was just beginning.

Instead, Josephus went back to work—back to his first love, newspapering. And every day of the week, Josephus gets up at 5 or 6 in the morning, bats out his daily column or editorial, comes home for a short rest after lunch and then sits down in the afternoon to work on his book.

I saw him not long ago at the funeral of another great North Carolinian, Max Gardner, and Josephus looked as sprightly as any youngster there.

In this impatient and intolerant world, Josephus Daniels has contributed fourscore years of serene and unselfish service. And his friends hope that he will be batting out those wholesome editorials and doing these same thoughtful things for his neighbors for many more years to come.

President Alemán's Visit to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, some days past I made a short address in the Senate with reference to the visit of President Alemán, of Mexico. I have received a letter from the Ambassador of Mexico to the United States and one from the Honorable Josephus Daniels. I ask unanimous consent that the two letters may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the two letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMBAJADA DE MEXICO,
Washington, May 13, 1947.

The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senator for the State of New Mexico,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: On pages 4569 and 4570 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Tuesday, May 6, I had the pleasure of reading the timely statement you made in connection with the recent visit of His Excellency Miguel Alemán, President of Mexico, to the United States.

While I was not at all surprised, for, indeed, you are well known throughout both our countries as the great humanist who loves and understands the people of both nations and constantly labors for their mutual understanding and cooperation, this excellent statement of yours records for the future, in the minutes of the Congress, the great importance of the visits of President Truman to Mexico and President Alemán to the United States as an important demonstration of the intimate relationship that happily exists between our respective Governments, the genuine representatives of the two peoples.

Accept, my dear Senator CHAVEZ, my congratulations for your brilliant statement and my sincere appreciation of the kind concepts enunciated therein.

Very cordially yours,

ANTONIO ESPINOSA DE LOS MONTEROS,
Ambassador of Mexico.

THE NEWS AND OBSERVER,
Raleigh, N. C., May 14, 1947.

The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: Your cordial words of commendation of my service in Mexico was another evidence of your friendship which you

know I fully reciprocate. I thank you for sending me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing it.

Among the happiest days of our stay in Mexico was when you and Mrs. CHAVEZ came down. My wife held your beloved in sincere friendship, and so do I.

With an abrazo to her and affectionate regards to you,

Faithfully,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Nomination of Philip Perlman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from last Saturday's Baltimore Sun, pertaining to the nominee for Solicitor General of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. PERLMAN SHOULD BE CONFIRMED BY THE UNITED STATES SENATE

In an ideal world, perhaps, men who will take part in public affairs would have no interest whatever in private affairs. Specifically, Mr. Philip Perlman, the Baltimore lawyer whose nomination for Solicitor General of the United States is now before the Senate for confirmation, would have had no private clients. His extraordinary legal reputation would have been made solely on the basis of his disinterested and gratuitous advice to mayors, governors, and public officials generally.

But thoughtful people know that, in the real world, the man who devotes himself to the public service still has to have a private source of income. If he is a competent lawyer, his talents will be sought out by important corporate interests. Inevitably such corporate interests will have dealings with officials and legislative bodies. On occasion, such a lawyer will find himself facing a conflict of loyalties. Of course, it is not only lawyers who have such conflicts. Nearly every man who concerns himself, however indirectly, with public affairs, has to face such a conflict at one time or another.

The specific criticism made of Mr. Perlman before the Senate subcommittee now considering his appointment is that, while he was acting as adviser to Governor Lane at the last session of the general assembly, he was also representing the Baltimore Transit Co., which opposed certain measures up for passage. These measures were passed by the assembly but vetoed by Governor Lane. The inference is that Mr. Perlman improperly used his influence with the governor and that his client, the transit company, thus benefited at the public expense.

The Sun is in a reasonably good position to comment on this criticism because it argued before the legislature in favor of the measures which the transit company opposed and later urged, however unsuccessfully, that Governor Lane sign them.

The important factor here is that there was no secrecy about what was going on. Mr. Perlman was openly representing the transit company in this matter. He and his clients had a case and, to many honest and disinterested citizens of the community, it was a good case. Punitive taxes on our public transport system could well harm all of us. The basic issue was whether the city be given larger taxing powers over the transit company or its powers should be limited. The Sun argued in favor of a greater measure of power for the city. The Governor decided in favor of restriction, presumably because Mr. Perlman and his clients presented a more convincing case.

It so happens that we still regard our position as the sounder one. But it is certainly no reflection on Mr. Perlman, nor on the Baltimore Transit Co., nor on the Governor, that their conclusion was different. Some United States Senators, coming from communities where the public utilities are still in the rapacious stage and where corruption is automatically suspected, may take another view. Undoubtedly some people in Maryland, too, suspect everyone who touches utilities. But our observation is that, in general, the local utilities are straightforward, lay their proposals frankly before the public, and abide by the decision reached. The community is reasonably certain that all concerned have acted in good faith.

Clearly that is the view entertained by the whole Maryland delegation in the Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, all of whom have testified to Mr. Perlman's character, as well as to his professional ability. It is our belief that the Department of Justice will be fortunate to command the services of so distinguished a lawyer.

Nomination of Jed Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Rotten Business," which was published in the Washington Evening Star of May 12, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A ROTTEN BUSINESS

A Senate judiciary subcommittee has opened up a chapter in the official career of Harold Ickes which smells to high heaven.

Mr. Ickes, who yields to no man in the breast-beating school of liberals, found himself with a problem on his hands back in the spring of 1945. Jed Johnson, then a Representative from Oklahoma, was slashing into Interior Department appropriations. If Mr. Ickes is to be believed, Mr. Johnson was doing this for the highly improper purpose of coercing the Interior Department to do his bidding. So Mr. Ickes, who is nothing if not resourceful, hit upon the idea of enticing Mr. Johnson out of Congress with an offer of appointment to the Federal bench. There was, of course, the consideration that if Mr. Johnson was not worthy of being a Representative, he was still less worthy of a place on the judiciary. But Mr. Ickes, in the best tradition of his own peculiar brand of liberalism, was able to rise above this obstacle to his scheme. He went to the late President Roosevelt, stated that he did not consider Mr. Johnson qualified to serve on the bench, and then proceeded to persuade the President to make the appointment.

That particular deal fell through because Mr. Johnson was not ready to leave Congress, and he stayed on until the voters retired him. Now, however, someone has induced Mr. Truman to send his name to the Senate for another judicial post, and we find Mr. Ickes, recast in the role of good citizen, virtuously opposing his confirmation.

This is more than an incident which reflects a disdain amounting to contempt on the part of all concerned for the proper place and function of the Federal judiciary. It is, in fact, as thoroughly rotten a piece of business as has come to light in many a day.

Housing Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Americans Without Homes," published in the New York Times of May 13, 1947, urging the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS WITHOUT HOMES

New York City needs between 75,000 and 100,000 new homes. That is to say that many families need homes. The national need is a good deal more than a million, but that figure was set early this year by President Truman, Housing Expediter Creedon and National Housing Administrator Foley as desirable and attainable in 1947. The first claimants on these non-existent homes are veterans. A Census Bureau survey made last summer, announced last March, showed that between 30 and 40 percent of married veterans are living in rented rooms or "doubled up" with relatives. The situation is growing worse instead of better. Over the week-end the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that the number of new dwellings started in this city had dropped from 2,650 in April, 1946, to 650 in April, 1947. Figures for other cities cannot be much different. Translated into human terms, as they should be, they stand for broken promises, broken families and frustrated lives.

A good part of this lag is due to the inability of builders to produce houses at prices the buyer or renter can afford to pay; and a good part of that inability comes from archaic methods in the housing industry, plus an increase in building trade wages with no increase, and even a decrease, in man-hour productivity. If housing were organized on a permanent footing, with a long-term program, these difficulties might be ironed out. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (a revision of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which passed the Senate last year but died in a House committee) is intended to do this. It cannot do it this year, even if passed before Congress again adjourns. But it offers hope for the future.

The bill is not socialistic. Out of a hoped-for 10-year total of 15,000,000 American homes it contemplates the erection of 500,000 in 4 years with the aid of Federal subsidies. These subsidies would rise to a maximum of

$150,000,000 in 5 years. They would be supplemented by State and city subsidies or tax abatements. The bulk of this vast program would be achieved by private enterprise, with Federal cooperation to provide loans, credit and technical information.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill does not have priority in Congress. It will need support from people who believe in the American home—as who does not when the statement is made in that form? The Citizens' Housing Council yesterday made public a list of 100 community organizations in New York City, representing all religions and many interests, which are behind it. Behind such organizations in the Nation are millions of people, many of them tormented by the absolute impossibility of a decent home under present conditions. Surely Congress should listen to these voices.

MacArthur Plans for 1,000 Years and Vast United States-Far East Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer by Ralph J. Donaldson:

MACARTHUR PLANS FOR 1,000 YEARS AND VAST UNITED STATES-FAR EAST TRADE

(Article 3)

The dominating personality of the occupation and rehabilitation of Japan is General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. He is the real ruler of Japan, as everyone knows, including the Japanese.

Sometimes visitors who have had the privilege of talking with General MacArthur and listening to him tell of his plans for the future of Japan come away with the impression that they have had an audience with a chief of state, a benevolent ruler more powerful than the Emperor ever was before the occupation.

In some respects they are not far wrong. But to explain how this impression is created it is necessary to understand that MacArthur, as the saying goes in the Army, wears three hats.

First of all, he is CINCFE, an abbreviation which stands for Commander in Chief of All American Forces in the Far East. When he is wearing this hat his major commands include the American Eighth Army, the ground force which is occupying Japan; the United States Naval Forces in the Far East (NAVFE); the Far East Air Forces of the United States Army (FEAF); the United States Army Forces in Korea (USAFIK); the Philippines-Ryukyus Command (PHILRYCOM); and the Marianas-Bonins Command (MARBO).

Then he puts on another hat and becomes SCAP—supreme commander for the Allied Powers in Tokyo. In this capacity he not only bosses the Allied land, sea, and air forces which are occupying Japan, but he issues directives to the Japanese Government and sees that his orders are carried out.

Finally, in relations between Japan and other governments, MacArthur represents IJG—the Imperial Japanese Government. He is the government, in other words. Diplomatic missions from other countries are accredited to him, rather than to the Japanese Government, which is not permitted to have diplomatic relations with other governments. All communications between the Japanese Government and other nations pass through SCAP.

Someone said jokingly that MacArthur ought to send a diplomatic mission to Washington to establish closer liaison between SCAP and the American Government. It might not be a bad idea, at that.

Thus, it is necessary, when talking with MacArthur, to know which hat he is wearing. If he uses the personal pronoun in discussing the necessity or desirability of negotiating a loan or arranging for food imports from the United States, he is speaking in his capacity as the actual ruler of Japan, rather than as the commander of a military occupation force.

When he talks of his program for the future of Japan, he is speaking as the supreme commander for the Allied Powers who is charged with the duty of instigating economic, political, and social reforms which will make Japan self-sufficient economically, give her a stable and representative government, and establish the rights and dignity of the individual Japanese citizen.

But regardless of which hat he is wearing, MacArthur does not fail to impress his visitors and to cast a spell over them. He has the same boundless optimism for the future and the same supreme confidence in his own ability to perform miracles that he had in the darkest days of the war.

HIS VICTORY PLAN WON

When the Japs were threatening Port Moresby and Australia was under air attack, other generals were thinking only of defense. But MacArthur was thinking only in terms of attack, and the plans that he formulated in those days were later carried out as soon as he had the men and equipment to do the job.

Today MacArthur is thinking in terms of the future—not the next 3 or 4 years or the next decade, but the next 1,000 years.

He sees Japan today as a nation which is ripe for inculcation in the democratic way of life and the principles of Christianity. Today he believes the Japanese people are the most pacifistic on the face of the earth.

They were oppressed by their own war lords in peacetime as well as during the war. Today they are battered and beaten and disillusioned, but they have had a glimpse of what freedom can be like, and they are determined to have it permanently.

In the Japan that MacArthur is building for the future the people will control their own government, there will be no expensive military establishment to drain away the resources of the country, workmen will be paid fair wages so that they can live decently and their products will not compete unfairly with those of other countries, and the rights of individuals will be respected.

In such a Japan, MacArthur believes, the opportunities for trade with the United States and mutual profit are virtually unlimited. Horace Greeley advised the adventurous and pioneering youth of America to go west. MacArthur advises them to keep on going in the same direction until they come to the Far East. There lies the future of America, he believes.

If we establish a real democracy in Japan and encourage the spread of democracy in the rest of Asia, MacArthur sees the time coming when the principal trade routes of the world will be across the Pacific, with the raw materials of Asia being transported to America to be processed into finished products and being returned for sale to the people of the Far East.

It is against the background of this vision of the future that the events now taking place in Japan must be interpreted.

Old Stuff (and Nonsense)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Old Stuff (and Nonsense)," which appeared in the Washington News of May 1, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD STUFF (AND NONSENSE)

Labor-union leaders aren't too smart in screaming that legislation they oppose would bring on chaos, disorder, depression, regimentation, and slavery.

And they aren't at all original.

Down through the ages, the beneficiaries of status quo and special privilege have always raised just such cries against proposals for change.

In our own country, it wasn't so long ago that workers who wanted protection for their right to organize unions were denounced by employers as anarchists plotting to undermine the foundations of society.

Plenty of statesmen, and even preachers, defended chattel slavery as an institution ordained by God for the uplifting of inferior races.

The Government-owned postal system—many businessmen thought—would mean the beginning of the end for private ownership of property.

Pure food and drug laws were sure to wreck businesses and starve our people. Pasteurized milk was an assault on the freedom and the very existence of dairy farmers.

Regulation of railroads and public utilities was certain to destroy free enterprise. Antitrust laws would spell stagnation for industry and permanent unemployment for millions.

Equal suffrage threatened our noble womanhood with degradation. Laws against child labor would deprive parents of the direction of their children and wipe out the incomes of widowed mothers.

Federal regulation of stock exchanges and security issues was an open invitation to national disaster. And only recently the National Association of Manufacturers saw in Government control of atomic energy a dark plot to socialize patents and stifle invention.

All this doesn't mean that Congress can afford to ignore the danger of going too far in writing labor legislation. It does justify belief that legislation can be written to regulate unionism in the public interest with no such disastrous consequences as the union politicians are predicting.

This on the basis of past experience. For all this old hokum about chaos, disorder, etc., has been used before. And the things that were going to bring destruction became law and were accepted, while the dire prophecies that greeted them are almost forgotten.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Echoing Richard Whitney," which was published in the Washington News of May 19, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECHOING RICHARD WHITNEY

Bill Green, Phil Murray, and other union bosses are denouncing the Hartley and Taft labor bills with equal vehemence. Though the measures are in many ways dissimilar, both are called vicious proposals to enslave labor.

Such language is all too reminiscent of what we heard 13 years ago from Richard Whitney, then president of the New York Stock Exchange, about the truth-in-securities and the stock-exchange control bills.

"Those measures," said Mr. Whitney, "were a matter of grave concern to every owner of real estate or securities." They were a "new menace to national recovery." All businessmen should "acquaint themselves with some of these vicious provisions." And more—

These powers are so extensive that the Federal Trade Commission might dominate and actually control the management of each listed corporation. * * * Other provisions * * * will affect listed corporations * * * by destroying the market for their securities.

Yet Congress, in its wisdom, passed that legislation to curb the abuses of Mr. Whitney's Wall Street crowd. His lamentations to the contrary, America went right on doing business in the American way.

So, too, this new Congress, in its wisdom, will pass legislation to check the abuses of the labor bosses. And free American workers will continue to work, or refrain from working, in the old American way.

Land Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Monday, May 19, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAND MONOPOLY

Repeal of the acreage-limitation provision of the reclamation laws, advocated by the Senators from California in respect of Central Valley, would work far more than a mere local injury. It would undermine a long-established principle of land distribution. We have avoided the development of a landed aristocracy in this country because, from colonial days, when Thomas Jefferson first persuaded the Virginia Legislature to abolish the legal devices of entail and primogeniture, American laws have been fashioned to encourage widespread independent family farming. Thanks to such laws, we have escaped the kind of peasantry so prevalent in Europe, and it is not too much to say that independent farming has been the backbone of rural democracy in the United States.

What the homestead laws of the mid-nineteenth century did with respect to unappropriated public lands, the reclamation laws, first enacted in 1902, did with respect to private lands made arable as a result of public improvements. In order to prevent monopoly and its twin evil, speculation, the reclamation laws place a ceiling on the amount of water, developed at public cost for private benefit, which may be made available to any single landowner. The maximum is the amount of water necessary to irrigate 160 acres, or 320 acres for man and wife. Large landowners who want the benefit of irrigation water made available by public works are required to sell their holdings in excess of this amount at valuations held to be reasonable by local boards.

Prof. Paul S. Taylor of the University of California has estimated that the water to be provided as a result of Federal construction of dams in the Central Valley will give the holder of 320 acres an annual subsidy ranging in value from $3,200 to $8,000, depending upon the amount of water he requires. But in Tulare and Kern Counties, Calif., he says, some 20 landowners own about 360,000 acres and the value of assistance conferred upon them if the acreage limitation were repealed might run as high as $8,000,000 a year. Furthermore, the sales value of their land would be multiplied. It would be, in our judgment, altogether improper to utilize a Federal project, paid for out of tax revenues from the entire country, for the enrichment of a few fortunate individuals.

Even more urgent, however, is the consideration that land reclaimed through the reclamation laws should be used to give independent families, veterans' families especially, a stake in agriculture. The great Federal undertaking in the Central Valley should benefit not a few but many families.

The Howl for Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Los Angeles Daily News of May 7, 1947, by Ralph E. G. Harris, who points out that the present housing shortage in California is estimated to be 743,568 units and calls for modernization of the so-called housing industry and for immediate passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

The editorial follows:

THE HOWL FOR HOUSING

Despite the play given other news, housing refuses to take a back seat. The reason this is so, as everyone knows, is that millions of Americans (including at least a million Californians) desperately need a place to live. And when people need something desperately that something shapes into a persistent, nagging issue no glut of other events can push aside.

This week, for example, the O'Gara report has found its way into print. Meanwhile, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has reported out favorably (by a narrow 7–6 vote) the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. Thus, on both State and National levels, housing is carrying on and reviving itself as perhaps the primary domestic postwar issue.

The O'Gara report is recent stuff. It has been compiled by the joint senate-assembly committee, headed by Senator Gerald J. O'Gara, of San Francisco, as the result of hearings conducted throughout the State since mid-February of this year. What it offers is a trenchant recapitulation of a Statewide disaster toll—the toll inadequate housing has taken in juvenile delinquency, public health, welfare, morals, and, most of all, unhappiness in the lives of thousands of individuals. What the O'Gara report says to all citizens is that California's housing crisis should make them sick. It should make them sick that this great Commonwealth and this great Nation, with their immense resources and wealth, should bow down before selfish lobbies or give way to ennui and indifference, while masses of simple, decent citizens are deprived of the minimum benefit our vaunted technological progress and know-how can and should make possible—the benefit of a roof over their heads.

But the O'Gara report also says there is no single or simple cause for the State housing shortage—estimated at 743,568 units—and therefore certainly no simple or single solution. As nearly as a single cause can be assigned, however, the so-called building industry must share major blame. Actually we have had no building industry, as we Americans are accustomed to understand the noun "industry." We have had, instead, a collection of unorganized, primitive hammer-and-hand-saw trades, fouled up in a scarcity labor market they have made for themselves. As an industry, house building is both undercapitalized and hamstrung by woefully inefficient methods. In short, for a nation which but a short time ago had tanks and planes and ships pouring out of its ears, house building is a hold-over from the primitive past.

The way out of primitivism and into modernism is either by evolution or revolution.

Frankly, what needs to be said plainly and understood plainly these days is that revolution is the only way out for housing. If we sit around waiting for evolution, the homeless may as well start building sod houses or igloos.

Today, with millions unable to find decent shelter, with families increasing faster than low-cost housing can be built or financed by the old methods, there's only one road open: the road to a total revolution in residential construction and community development.

This is precisely what the old fogeys in the housing and real-estate business fear. Knowing their time-tested procedures will produce profits for a few and houses for a few in a snug little scarcity market, they measure the future by their fears and label as socialistic any attempt to meet the problem on a heroic scale.

The National Housing Commission Act, reintroduced at this session of Congress by Senators TAFT, ELLENDER, and WAGNER, is an attempt to deal with a big problem in a big way. Essentially, the bill has a dual aim: to encourage maximum building by private enterprise (through a variety of inducements

to individual investors), and to provide Government-financed low-rent housing not attractive to private investment.

The maximum cost of the T-E-W program is estimated at $150,000,000 per year.

The O'Gara report recognizes California's housing disaster is the result of national factors. It stresses the need of Federal assistance.

Soon, the T-E-W bill will reach the floor of the Senate. Its fate there will depend upon how many Americans—including, it is to be hoped, a host of home-seeking Californians—get up on their hind legs and howl.

There are still housing and real estate lobbyists who are howling that no Federal housing program is needed. Can the voice of the people drown them out?—R. E. G. H.

Political Contrast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on May 15. It seems to me after reading this editorial that somebody is indeed very, very small. It follows:

POLITICAL CONTRAST

President Truman, Democrat, repairs old slight to a predecessor, Herbert Hoover, by signing bill to rename Boulder Dam in honor of former Republican President with whom that great public work is identified, and Republican-controlled Missouri House banishes to a committee that rarely meets a resolution calling for acquisition of a portrait of Mr. Truman for the State capitol.

Somebody is mighty small and that somebody is not the Missourian in the White House.

Pastor Niemoeller's Farewell Message to the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 29, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from Pastor Martin Niemoeller to Rev. Frederick J. Forell, of New York City.

God-fearing Americans of every faith will be deeply impressed by Pastor Niemoeller's sobering appeal.

The letter follows:

NEW YORK, *May 8, 1947.*

REV. F. J. FORELL,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR BROTHER FORELL: Some months ago I came to the United States at the invitation of the Federal Council of Churches, as you know, and I am profoundly grateful to them for all the opportunities afforded to Mrs. Niemoeller and myself of fellowship with the Christians and Christian churches in this country; and we hope that our visit may have strengthened the feeling of Christian solidarity.

Now we are preparing to return to Germany, and in this moment it is a great encouragement, indeed, to learn that Christian friends here have formed the Emergency Committee for German Protestantism. More than once I have been asked to give a farewell message to the American people; now it seems most appropriate to convey this earnest word to you and through you as secretary of this new and important committee.

Certainly I have met with astonishing interest in the fate of central Europe and with real concern about what happens to the people in Germany today, but, on the other hand, I have met also with such an extraordinary amount of indifference and even vindictiveness, and with so many misleading statements on the present state of the spiritual as well as the physical conditions in Germany, that I feel rather at a loss what to do.

Thus, I thought it best to write you and to ask you that you might give this letter, or its contents, to such pastors and Christians in this country who really care. There is no sense in stirring the press, but there may be, after all, some sense in stirring the hearts, for the one hope which I brought to this country and which has not been shaken, but strengthened, is hope in the love of Christian fellowship.

And, once more, this does not mean the same thing that it was to me 5 months ago. I have learned a great deal about the difficulties in this country connected with church cooperation and Christian organization. But I, myself, will never break with a fundamentalist because he believes in things in which I do not believe, and I never will separate from a liberal because he does not believe in things in which I do believe. But I shall stay a brother to everybody who puts his only trust and hope in my Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and I am sure that the rest will be taken care of by God's Holy Spirit, according to the promise of Christ. I must say a similar thing with respect to political convictions.

I can't deny anybody being a Christian because he is opposed to my political or economic views, and I cannot even dissociate myself from radicals on both sides, for whom I feel responsible as fellow human beings, on whose behalf Christ died, as He did for me.

I have met lots of Christian people of all sorts of creeds and denominations, of all sorts of political and economic views, who really are concerned about what is happening in the world today and who wish to do everything to help make good what has been destroyed by men's greed of power and by men's self-righteousness. It is to such people that I appeal.

All Europe today is in a state of complete break-down; with few exceptions the nations suffer from hunger and obvious starvation, aggravated by the consequences of the worst winter for nearly 150 years. As far as I can see, there is no country in whole Europe today, where the situation is more discouraging than in Germany itself.

The winter in Berlin has been the very worst since 1799. You have heard that in Berlin during the last months more than 2,000 people have frozen to death, according to the reliable report of Bishop Dibelius. I have similar reports even from the Ruhr, where people died from cold right on top of one of the world's most productive coal supplies. My own daughter-in-law spent this winter on her sickbed, only a few miles from the Ruhr, the temperature never exceeding 5° below freezing point.

Who will answer for this misery? God knows. But, who will help to overcome it? That responsibility is ours.

And even now, the despair is growing. When I left Germany in the beginning of December, the food ration was nominally 1,500 calories—that is, three-fifths of a normal minimum; but actually it was only 1,200. Today it is once more 1,550, but according to a report of the Associated Press, published in Staatszeitung of May 4, many people in the British zone received, during the last weeks, only 900, and for this week, only 700 calories. That means less than the lowest ration ever heard of in a Nazi concentration camp, and I guess that even the normal plain breakfast in this country contains considerably more than that amount.

In any case, 700 calories are only a quarter of the normal British food ration, which is blamed to be absolutely insufficient in an article of New York Times of May 7. This situation means starvation in the strict sense, but yet it means more.

Since the end of hostilities and the unconditional surrender of the German nation to America and her allies, at least 6,000,000 Germans have disappeared. During the Moscow Conference it was reported that only some 800,000 to 900,000 German prisoners of war are left in Russia, instead of the estimated number of about three and one-half to four millions; and according to a member of the Hoover delegation, instead of 10,000,000 evacuees from the eastern provinces and countries, taken over by Poles and Czechs, only five and one-half to six millions have arrived in the western zones.

People who know these facts and are facing now the general starvation in the western zones can't help thinking that this whole development is nothing else than the Morgenthau plan put into action, with the tendency to exterminate a whole nation to its very roots. It is impossible that out of this seed of renewed hatred anything good can result. People have hoped that, with "unconditional surrender," the victorious nations would take the responsibility for those who gave themselves away into their mercy. In fact, the responsibility rests with the victors, but only little hope is left that this responsibility may be realized.

In the judgment of my suffering people, my trip to America will appear as a failure, and I shall have to answer for it, when they will ask me: "Is that all you spent 5 months abroad for—that we are starving now on 700 calories instead of 1,550 as at your departure?" What shall I tell them?

But I must speak a word to my Christian friends and brethren, and to this end I am writing you this letter. I know that it will be impossible to overcome the European disaster just by Christian relief work, in spite of all efforts. Unless there will be a change in international policy, nothing of real effect can be achieved. These are facts, and it is of no value to argue about them. And yet, there is one thing that can be done, and one need which might be overcome, if only Christians will begin to see the issue and to do what they really can do.

People who are suffering today and who are facing the death of starvation—and that means many people in Asia and in central Europe, and practically the whole of Germany's population—are not only facing physical death. In a way we have done so all the time Hitler was in power, when every sense of security had gone because of the Gestapo's rule of terror.

But people are being convinced now that the whole propaganda for democracy has been an illusion, worse even than Hitler's propaganda. For everybody knew or soon came to know that Hitler personally did not admit any authority superior to himself; but the Western Powers propagated human and Christian principles, and asserted that they were fighting for the validity of these principles. This faith has been utterly shattered, and, what is even worse, with this faith the trust in any truth and humanity has been

destroyed. The result is Nihilism, and the dying people today die cursing God and man.

According to the understanding of people maddened by unparalleled suffering, all contributions of the victorious powers to keep the food supply on a level of about 1,500 calories, are made only in order to hide the actual extermination of millions behind the screen of insufficient help. Thus, it is not only their body that dies; it is their soul which becomes ruined and lost; for they starve in hatred and vindictiveness with a last unspoken curse in their hearts. It is this terrible distress that makes me speak and cry for help from my Christian brethren in this country.

I am pleading: send personal parcels with food and personal letters to everybody you know. Maybe, you may save lives in doing so; but that is not even my main concern. You may bring a last glimmer of hope into a soul in despair; you may help one man or woman to cease cursing and regain faith in God and man; you may become God's messenger of Christ's love and help people to die at least in peace, reconciled with earthly suffering and grief.

As soon as I shall be back in Europe I shall send over hundreds and hundreds of addresses and have them distributed through my friends to parish pastors, who will hand them over to all who wish to help.

May God bless you, dear Brother Forell, and all you do in order to mitigate the suffering of people who have paid more than eye for eye and tooth for tooth for their credulity in a new "savior" and may our one and only Saviour have mercy upon us.

Yours in His service,

MARTIN NIEMOELLER.

Time Is Running Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I respectfully submit a copy of an editorial from the New York Times of date May 9, 1947, as follows:

TIME IS RUNNING OUT

Congress seems to think it has a good excuse not to consider universal military training at this session in the failure thus far of the President's committee to report to him its conclusions. The President's assurance that the report will soon be made and that he will again try to obtain congressional action indicates that this excuse soon will be shot out from under our national legislature.

We hope that the President's announcement will stir the committee to some action soon. As Paul H. Griffin, national commander of the American Legion, noted yesterday in urging the President to call the attention of Congress to this legislation, even a preliminary report by the committee would be preferable to further delay. After hearing 200 witnesses at 14 meetings, the committee must have some idea of what its report will be.

The question is too important to be permitted to go by default, even if the committee does not immediately report to the President. Universal training is one of the legs of the three-legged stool on which our national security depends, as General Marshall pointed out in his last report as Chief of Staff, in October 1945. It is the democratic way to prepare for national defense, it is the efficient way, it is the necessary way. The Eightieth Congress has no more important duty than to frame, to consider, and to enact some system of military training of America's young men. Time is one element that once lost never can be recovered.

The Greek Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 19 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Greek Program," which appeared in the Washington News of May 19, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREEK PROGRAM

The $300,000,000 the United States will spend in Greece under the Truman program will be divided equally between civilian and military outlays. Civilian expenditures will be apportioned thus:

For consumer goods and to control inflation, $80,000,000; for roads, railways, and docks, $50,000,000; for seeds, fertilizer, pesticides and farm equipment, $20,000,000.

This is at least half the answer to Henry A. Wallace's assertion that we should be sending trucks and tractors to Greece, instead of guns and bombs.

Yet, without troubling to correct false impressions he previously has created, Mr. Wallace, at Austin, Tex., again denounced the Truman doctrine, saying:

"The people of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden want tractors, plows, fertilizer, and power equipment, not bombers and fighters to use against a friendly neighbor."

Of course, no one has offered to send the Scandinavian countries bombers or fighters to use against anyone. And they haven't asked us for farm equipment. But if they want it they can get it, and on most favorable terms. Mr. Wallace, who should know this, misrepresents the situation to further his pro-Soviet propaganda.

Half of the American fund for Greece is allocated for military defense measures. But for defense against whom? Against the Yugoslavs, Albanians, and Bulgarians, who are conducting an undeclared border war against the Greeks at the behest of Mr. Wallace's friends in Moscow.

The entire $300,000,000 could be devoted to the economic rehabilitation of Greece if the Slav-Communists, whom Mr. Wallace defends, would call off their dogs of war.

Robert Kirkland Henry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ROBERT KIRKLAND HENRY, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, our acquaintance and association with the late Representative ROBERT K. HENRY, of Wisconsin, was entirely too brief. One term in Congress is not usually long enough to take the measure of a Member, but BOB HENRY was an exceptional man. He was personable and to know him was to like him. He had plenty of ability, plus excellent judgment. He was in the prime of life when he came to the Seventy-ninth Congress. With a splendid background of public service, he had the know-how that qualified him to render effective service to his country, his district, and his constituents, and he never overlooked any of them.

BOB HENRY was a favorite with his colleagues on every committee on which he served. He always did his task well. It is just too bad that so promising a career should have been so abruptly terminated. We were all not only shocked, but grieved, when we heard of his passing. I became well acquainted with him upon his entry into Congress because of a mutual friend who had resided in my district, and who knew BOB HENRY well.

The country can ill afford to lose men of his type, especially at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay this slight tribute to the life and character of a distinguished public servant. He has left a splendid heritage, and we sorrow with his family.

William James Gallagher

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM JAMES GALLAGHER, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, no man who has been a Representative in Congress, within my memory, has come from more humble circumstances than our late departed friend, WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, who represented Minnesota's Third Congressional District from January 3, 1945, until his untimely death last September.

At the time he was elected he was a $25.48 a month city pensioner in Minneapolis, having arrived at an age when most persons quit active work. He was elected by 2,112 votes and came to Congress in January 1945.

He was unique in that he made very few speeches while here, but those that he did deliver attracted widespread attention and were given front-page spreads by newspapers over the entire Nation.

Mr. GALLAGHER was born in North Minneapolis in 1875 and attended the Franklin, Hawthorne, and Lowell grade schools and was graduated from North High School in 1894. In 1895 and 1896 he was an editorial employee and proofreader for the National Single Taxer, a magazine then published in Minneapolis. He remained a firm disciple of Henry George, the single-taxer, and held his single-tax views to the last.

From 1897 to 1899 he was employed by the Freeman's Labor Journal in Spokane, Wash., before returning to Minneapolis, and it was on this paper that he acquired his prolabor viewpoints, which he also held until his death.

Later he worked as a trucker and clerk in Minneapolis for various railroads and for a while contributed to the Iron Trail, a monthly pulp-fiction magazine for railroad workers.

In 1919 he became a street worker for Hennepin County and adopted the same line of work for the city of Minneapolis in 1927, retiring on his moderate pension in 1942.

While holding these humble jobs, he several times filed for office, and in 1930 was nominated as a Democrat for Congress from the old Tenth District of Minnesota, but withdrew in favor of the Farmer-Labor Party nominee, Erling Swenson. In 1922 he ran for State representative from the Thirty-fifth District and lost by 101 votes, and he also failed in his race for the same office in 1924 and 1926.

To those few who sometimes foolishly derided his humble workingman background, Mr. GALLAGHER retorted: "A workingman is just as capable of doing a first-class job in Congress as a Member of any other group."

He won his membership in this House in the 1944 primary and general election campaigns with an expenditure of "less than $200" which he earned working part time as a janitor. He was married in 1936 to Mrs. Mabel Pearson and is survived by her and her two daughters, Mrs. Theodore Newman and Mrs. Russell Thomson, all of Minneapolis.

All of us who served with him from Minnesota recognized his fearless championship of the causes in which he believed and his utter devotion to the rights of the working people of Minnesota and the Nation. He truly had the common touch, was proud of his humble beginning and his humble occupations and really and sincerely was a "friend of man."

We mourn his loss, but his brief and meteoric career goes to show that in America, the opportunity to serve is available even to those in the humblest walks of life.

Robert Kirkland Henry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ROBERT KIRKLAND HENRY, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last November ROBERT K. HENRY was overwhelmingly reelected from the Second District of Wisconsin to the Eightieth Congress. He had made a brilliant record in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Only a few days after his triumph, the angel of death visited him. As another year rolls around none of us now knows how many will receive that same visit. Let us all hope that when that time comes we will have the same spirit, courage, and excellence of earthly record that BOB HENRY had.

William Bernard Barry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BERNARD BARRY, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the 11 years in which WILLIAM B. BARRY served the Fourth Congressional District of New York, he served ably and diligently. His passing, at the age of 44, was a loss to all of us.

It had been my good fortune to know him well, to know the perception and intelligence he brought to his congressional work and to know his sympathetic approach to the problems of his constituents. Many a time we talked about the issues on the floor of the House and I remember well how he searched for the answer, how he considered the will of his constituents and how carefully he examined each question as it arose.

His training before he came to the House of Representatives stood him in good stead. As member of the New York State Bar, member of the district attorney's staff in Queens County, special United States attorney, member of the Democratic executive committee of Queens County, he acquired invaluable experience which equipped him to meet the demands his congressional duties placed upon him.

BILL was a hard worker and as such gained the respect of all. BILL was warm and kind and as such gained the affection of all. He was too young to die, but the years of his life were fruitful. We are grateful that he did once walk among us.

We extend to Mrs. Barry and her children, Jane and Brian, our keenest sympathies and offer the good name that was and is his for the consolation it must bring.

Fred Barthold Norman

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRED BARTHOLD NORMAN, late a Representative from the State of Washington

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement concerning the Honorable FRED NORMAN, Member of Congress, who died April 18, 1947:

FRED NORMAN

The death of FRED NORMAN has deprived the Pacific Northwest of the services of a man who long was active in political, commercial, fraternal, and social affairs. He was not a native of Washington, but he came to this State so early in life that he never was allegiant to any other part of the country. Mr. NORMAN moved to western Washington from the Middle West 46 years ago, and established his residence in Pacific County. For years he worked as a farmer, logger, mill hand and ship builder, thus acquiring intimate knowledge of the problems confronting the men who perform some of the most arduous tasks in the State. Becoming interested in politics as a young man, he campaigned for a position with the Raymond City Council in 1916 and was elected. Subsequently he was elected to the State legislature, first as representative and then as senator. He energetically supported legislation benefiting labor, agriculture, war veterans, and senior citizens, and he devoted his attention to the improvement of roads. Mr. NORMAN was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1942, and was sent back to Congress last year by the voters of the Third Congressional District. He died less than 4 months after he was sworn in as a Member of the Eightieth Congress.

Representative NORMAN did not often appear as a speaker on the floor of the House, but he earned the reputation of an industrious and efficient member of all committees to which he was assigned. He personally attended to thousands of requests received from the residents of nine counties. Congressman NORMAN was familiar with conditions throughout the district he represented, and he strove constantly to protect the interests of all areas, and to obtain Federal assistance whenever he deemed it necessary. FRED NORMAN, a man of high principles, was genuinely respected by his colleagues in Washington, D. C., regardless of their party affiliations, and his constituents regarded him as the most conscientious delegate ever sent to the National Capital.

Fred Barthold Norman

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRED BARTHOLD NORMAN, late a Representative from the State of Washington

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps but natural on this Memorial Day that we look for and appraise the lives of our departed colleagues in terms of what they meant in the society in which they moved.

I think each of the five whose memory we observe today spells out one of the most glorious portions of any definition of America. None of them could have been called career statesmen. All of them rose from the ranks, so to speak, and became recognized in their local and regional society, and eventually found their way to the Halls of Congress, there to represent their friends and neighbors in the business of protecting and promoting a progressive America.

Certainly this was true of Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. BARRY, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. GERLACH. Particularly it was true of Mr. NORMAN, a member of our Washington State delegation.

Perhaps we would say that FRED was quiet, reserved, and sincere. Certainly we would say that he was extremely honest, and perhaps again note in passing that his tireless industry was his most outstanding characteristic.

He was born in rural Illinois, came West at an early age, and as one of the leading newspapers in his district editorially noted, his life story was typically American.

The Aberdeen (Wash.) Daily World goes on to say:

He came up the hard way, as the saying is. He was a logger in the woods, a worker in a shingle mill at Union, and he became a carpenter—he held a card in the carpenter's union to the day of his death. With his savings as a worker and his own energy as his capital, he became a businessman and a successful one. But his real love and his real life were centered in government. His great ambition was to go to Congress. He worked mainly for that purpose, and years before his first entry as a candidate he put money aside to defray his campaign expenses, so, as he once expressed it, he would be under no financial obligation to anyone should the voters approve his ambition by their votes.

FRED and our other four colleagues are gone, but I think it eminently fitting that we today review and appraise their contribution to America, for they do exemplify the spirit of our Republic.

It was David Starr Jordan who once said that Rome endured so long as there were Romans. America will endure as long as there are Americans in spirit and in fact.

Today as we pay our last tribute to our departed colleagues, we should be able, through looking back, to look forward with reassurance.

William Joseph Gallagher

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM JOSEPH GALLAGHER, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, by custom and by legislative act, today has been designated as Memorial Day for our deceased colleagues who have passed to the Great Beyond since our last memorial services.

I first became acquainted with WILLIAM JOSEPH GALLAGHER at the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress. His election attracted a great deal of attention in Minnesota, and it exemplified the democracy of a great Republic. His biography in the Congressional Directory read as follows:

WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, Democrat, of Minneapolis, Minn.; born in Minneapolis, Minn., May 13, 1875; high-school graduate; workingman; married; elected to the Seventy-ninth Congress on November 7, 1944.

The succinctness of this statement fails to indicate the kindliness and warmth of feeling which he had for his fellowman. Those who knew him during his brief service in Congress liked him and affectionately called him BILL.

In the closing days of the session it was obvious that his health was failing. His friends urged him to seek rest and medical attention but he insisted—as do many Members in similar condition—that he must stay on the job while important legislation was under consideration in the Congress. His concern was for his country and for those who are oftentimes referred to as the "little people."

I am sure I speak for the membership of the Seventy-ninth Congress when I say sincerely that our associations and memories of that Congress are richer and more human for having known BILL GALLAGHER.

Robert Kirkland Henry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ROBERT KIRKLAND HENRY, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join with my associates in paying tribute to the memory of our departed friend and colleague from Wisconsin, ROBERT K. HENRY, who was taken by death after the completion of one term in the House and before he was privileged to serve the second term to which he was successfully elected last November.

I am sure that I express the sentiments of everyone when I say that Wisconsin has lost one of her most distinguished sons and America one of her most loyal citizens. Those of us who worked with him knew of his utter disregard for his physical limitations in his endeavors to conscientiously serve his district, State, and Nation.

No higher tribute can be paid to ROBERT K. HENRY than to say that he was one of Wisconsin's most highly respected public servants.

Those of us in the Wisconsin congressional delegation and his many other friends here in the House of Representatives will long remember him as a true friend and able colleague. Our sincerest sympathy goes out to his bereaved wife, to whom he was deeply devoted and who contributed so much to his success in his public career.

Robert Kirkland Henry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ROBERT KIRKLAND HENRY, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sadness that I learned of the death on November 20, 1946, of my good friend, ROBERT KIRKLAND HENRY. He served in the Seventy-ninth Congress and died shortly following his reelection to the Eightieth Congress.

In the 2 years he served in the House of Representatives he endeared himself to the Members and was recognized as a conscientious, courageous and sound, practical legislator. BOB had a fine mind and was accustomed to approach any problem on an unbiased plane and to obtain all the facts before arriving at a judgment. When his opinion was formed, he had unlimited courage in backing it up. He was always courteous, helpful, and sincere in his relationship with his fellow Members, and he gave his constituents as able and conscientious service as any congressional district could possibly have.

His death was a great shock to me and to his legion of friends. His passing is a loss not only to his friends but to his country as well.

William Joseph Gallagher

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM JOSEPH GALLAGHER, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, we are meeting here today to honor the memory of our departed colleagues—to listen to the roll call of those who have been taken from us during the last year. I am sure that the House will grant me the indulgence of this moment to pay tribute to a great American and beloved friend, the late WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, who represented the Third Congressional District of Minnesota in the Seventy-ninth Congress. His untimely death on August 13, 1946, was a great loss to his Nation, his State, and the district which he so ably represented.

WILLIAM GALLAGHER knew the problems of the common people intimately and from first-hand experience. He was born on May 13, 1875, the son of a workingman. He was a worker all his life, first as a newspaperman and later as a manual laborer on the railroad and

on the staff of the Minneapolis street-maintenance department, from which he retired in 1943. In 1944 he was drafted by the Democratic-Farmer Labor Party to make the race for Congress, and his party's choice was upheld by the people. After a life of toil as a common workingman, WILLIAM GALLAGHER thus reached the highest legislative council of his Nation in keeping with the cherished American tradition. As a Congressman he spoke for the common people—his philosophy reflected their desires and aspirations.

WILLIAM GALLAGHER was loved and respected by all who had the privilege of knowing and working with him. His quiet devotion to duty, his firm adherence to principle, his passionate desire for social justice, and his love for mankind evoked admiration from everyone. On the occasion of his death a great national weekly said:

> WILLIAM GALLAGHER had about him a quality of humility and back street sense that compelled respect and even a warm feeling of unreasonable affection from his fellow Congressmen and plain citizens alike.

I can think of no greater tribute.

We shall miss him greatly in the days ahead, and remember him for his honesty, sincerity, and human kindness. My deepest sympathy is extended to his family.

Robert Kirkland Henry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ROBERT KIRKLAND HENRY, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished predecessor from Wisconsin's Second District, the Honorable ROBERT K. HENRY, was a man who earned success in every field he entered—as a banker, as a State administrator, and as a Congressman. It was my good fortune to have known him as a friend.

It was with a deep sense of humility and full appreciation of his abilities that I came to Washington to carry on for him. In the short time I have been in the House of Representatives, everything I have heard about him has served to strengthen the high opinion that people of Wisconsin's capital district held of ROBERT K. HENRY. On every side here in Washington, I have been told he was a sincere public servant, a man of honest convictions, and a gentleman of courtesy and friendliness. We are glad that you too came to know ROBERT K. HENRY in his 2 years in Washington as we knew him in his lifetime back home.

Many things went into the making of the character of ROBERT K. HENRY, but chief influence was his close contact with people in all walks of life. As a young man, he labored alongside workingmen. In later years, he was the confidant and counselor of farmers, businessmen, and industrialists. In public office, he came to know municipal, State, and Federal administrators. From this exchange of many viewpoints, from this varied experience, he charted his course as a Member of Congress.

Pressure groups soon learned that this man was not one easily influenced; they discovered he had a mind of his own, and his convictions were not based on shallow reasoning. He once expressed it this way, and I quote:

> Most voters don't belong to pressure groups. I think a Congressman should use his own good judgment when voting, and if this judgment is no good, the voters have a chance to replace him at the end of 2 years.

That ROBERT K. HENRY acquitted himself well in public office, is shown by the fact that he was never a one-termer in any position he filled. For five successive terms he was city clerk of Jefferson, Wis. For two terms, he was treasurer of the State of Wisconsin. He was appointed to the State banking commission, and reappointed in 1941, resigning from that office to become Congressman from the Second Wisconsin District. He was reelected to a second term just 2 weeks before his unexpected and untimely death. The people had examined his record as a public servant, found it good, and endorsed it by their support at the polls.

When his death ended his exemplary career as a spokesman for our people, newspapers of our State were unanimous in their eulogy of ROBERT K. HENRY. In closing, I would like to include part of an editorial from the Waukesha (Wis.) Daily Freeman, which was typical of the editorial comment upon his passing:

> The death in Madison of Congressman ROBERT K. HENRY is a great loss to the second congressional district. BOB HENRY was one of us, he talked our language and he consistently acted in our best interests. But his untimely death means more than that. It means the House of Representatives has lost one of its most able Members and the Nation one of the greatest exponents of American democracy ever sent to Washington from the Middle West. He was a man of integrity and sound judgment, patriotic and sincere * * *. He was a servant of the people who had dedicated the last 30 years of his life to doing the work which must be done in the public interest.

William Bernard Barry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BERNARD BARRY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the life, character, and congressional record of WILLIAM B. BARRY, who passed away on October 20, 1946.

I had the privilege of becoming well acquainted with BILL BARRY shortly after I came to the House in 1939. He was a capable legislator. He gave much and intelligent study to the many governmental problems which came before the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which he was a member. He was always forthright and courageous in presenting his viewpoint regardless of the political consequences. BILL BARRY was a young man in the prime of life and the Nation suffered a great loss with his passing.

Fred Barthold Norman

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRED BARTHOLD NORMAN, late a Representative from the State of Washington

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that we of Congress should set aside this occasion to honor the memory of those with whom we have served and whose contributions to this body and its function are impossible of true evaluation.

It is an occasion of particular significance to me, for it provides an opportunity to express, in some slight measure, my affection and esteem for my late colleague, the Honorable FRED BARTHOLD NORMAN, of the Third District of Washington.

Four and one-half months ago, FRED NORMAN and I came to Congress together, I as a freshman Member and he with the knowledge and experience garnered through a previous term as a Representative of the people of our State. FRED NORMAN was not oblivious to the difficulties involved in my lack of experience, and in a hundred kindly ways assisted and counseled me.

That was just one of his attributes—consideration for his friends and colleagues.

This fine and desirable quality would be expected of a man like FRED NORMAN, however. His entire lifetime was spent in considering and studying the thinking of the other fellow, particularly those whom he represented here and on other occasions when he served his friends and neighbors in elective office.

It was my good fortune to know FRED NORMAN over a period of many years. We were associates when he held the position of State senator some 20 years ago. We were affiliated and active in the Republican Party together when he held office in his county. And I was familiar with and interested in his accomplishments when previously he served as United States Representative from his district.

FRED NORMAN was a quiet and unassuming man who almost bordered on shyness. He cared nothing for pomp and ceremony, lived an almost Spartan-like existence, and devoted his full time and energies to the interests and needs of his constituents.

That he should attain the position of Congressman was natural to his friends and close associates. It was his goal and ambition many years and a position for which he prepared himself by study of his people, study of his district, and study of the organization, functions, and history of Congress.

It has been said by the newspapers in his district that few men have known more of the people and the area he represented. And few have enjoyed the trust and faith placed in him by his neighbors, because they knew, above all else, that he was a sincere and honest man, devoted to their problems and needs.

Many men were more adroit politicians than FRED NORMAN. Many were much more adept at evading issues and carrying political water on both shoulders. Few could match his forthrightness and courage or his unyielding determination to abide by his convictions.

There are among us many Members more skilled at oratory than was FRED NORMAN. But there are few who could equal him in sincerity and constant effort to work for and accomplish those things he deemed right and just.

I know the people of my State and my colleagues of the Washington delegation feel keenly the loss of FRED NORMAN. This Congress and this Nation need men of his caliber and qualities. And so, with sorrowing hearts and warmest personal recollections, we bid him today an official and affectionate farewell.

William Bernard Barry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BERNARD BARRY, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, when the news of the death of my good friend and pal, BILL BARRY, was received, it came as a great shock.

I have very pleasant memories of the many years of friendship which existed between Bill and myself, and it brought real sadness to me when I heard of his sudden departure. Of course, death is no respecter of persons, young or old. He cuts ruthlessly and indiscriminately through our ranks, and some of our best men and women fall before his merciless sword.

It is fitting and proper that we should pause in the midst of our arduous labors and exacting duties to acknowledge our respect and affection for men of the type of BILL BARRY. Little attention will be paid to what we say here, but none can forget the patriotic spirit—the fine spirit exemplified by Bill for his bereaved widow and his two lovely children. On these three the burden has fallen heaviest, but I am sure that God will in His own way take care of them.

At the funeral services in Queens County the affection and love of the many attending the requiem mass was evidenced by both their presence and devout manner. Real sorrow and regret was painted on every face, and I know that deep in their hearts they felt they had lost a good and true friend.

BILL BARRY was no political accident because he served for many years in the House of Representatives, and that was a real test of his true worth. It is difficult to be elected to the House of Representatives and much more difficult to return and remain a Member. Rarely do weak men enter these portals, and only those who are capable and conscientious can remain very long. Here the true measure of a man is justly and unmistakably taken.

While BILL BARRY has gone to a better home and his trials and tribulations of this wearisome world are through, still his memory will always remain fresh in the minds of those who were closely associated with him both in his home and in the Halls of Congress.

I am sure that the good Lord will take care of him and will keep a watchful eye on those who were so abruptly deprived of his fatherly care and devotion.

L'ENVOI

When Earth's last picture is painted, and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest, and, faith, we shall need it—lie down for an eon or two,
Till the Master of all good workmen shall set us to work anew.

And those that were good shall be happy: they shall sit in a golden chair;
They shall splash at a 10-league canvas with brushes of comets' hair;
They shall find real saints to draw from—Magdalene, Peter, and Paul;
They shall work for an age at a sitting and never be tired at all.

And only the Master shall praise us, and only the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame;
But each for the joy of the working, and each, in his separate star
Shall draw the thing as he sees it for the good of things as they are.

We miss you Bill, but we will not forget you.

Robert Kirkland Henry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ROBERT KIRKLAND HENRY, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, ROBERT KIRKLAND HENRY came here with a background of clear thinking and real effective and well-balanced legal ability.

He had courage and character and was devoted to his work and to his country. No man, in the short period that he was permitted to serve in Congress, made a more favorable impression upon the membership of the House.

In his committee work and on the floor what he said was given the earnest attention of our membership, and his thinking was so clear that his influence was widespread in the Congress.

We all will miss him, but we are glad that a man of such fine character was able to be with us.

William Bernard Barry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BERNARD BARRY, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of our late respected colleague, Representative WILLIAM B. BARRY, of Queens County, N. Y., brought not only passing sadness but genuine grief to all of us. Regardless of political affiliations, he had the admiration and respect of all who knew him, and particularly of the Members of Congress from the State of New York who were so intimately associated with him. He was intensely devoted to the interest of the people he represented and possessed a most unusual knowledge and grasp of the problems of his congressional district and State.

BILL BARRY leaves to those who mourn him the record of a distinguished legislator and the memory of a lovable character. I learned on countless occasions the true warmth of his heart and the kindliness of his spirit. It was an honor and privilege to have known him. To his good wife, who was his constant companion, professional associate, and helpmate for so many years, and to his children, I offer my sympathy.

His district, and the Nation have sustained a great loss, and I as a friend shall miss him and treasure forever my friendship and association with him.

Carter Glass

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. STANLEY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CARTER GLASS, late a Senator from the State of Virginia

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1946, the Honorable CARTER GLASS departed this life and thus was ended the long and distinguished career of a great man and true American statesman. The

Commonwealth of Virginia and the Nation honor the memory of a noble public servant.

Born at Lynchburg, on January 4, 1858, in the great Piedmont section of his beloved Commonwealth of Virginia, Senator GLASS was destined from young manhood to become an outstanding public figure. Educated in private and public schools and in the newspaper business, he was elected to the Virginia Senate, 1899–1903, and the Virginia Constitutional Convention, 1901–02; the United States House of Representatives for 10 terms; served as Secretary of the Treasury in President Wilson's Cabinet; and in the United States Senate from 1920 until his death.

Among many notable achievements, Senator GLASS excelled in the field of finance. He maintained a lifelong interest in fiscal problems and was recognized as an expert in monetary affairs. His speech in support of the Federal Reserve Act will go down in history as a masterly analysis of a most difficult and intricate subject. His work in behalf of the Federal Reserve System gained for him the title "Father and Defender of the Federal Reserve" and won everlasting praise from his warm personal friend, Woodrow Wilson, who appointed him as Secretary of the Treasury on February 2, 1920.

American agriculture owes much to the able work of the beloved Senator GLASS in support of the Federal Farm Loan Bank System.

In politics, Senator GLASS was a stanch party man and fought valiantly for the Democratic Party. He was a delegate to every National Convention since 1892. He paid strict allegiance to his party's principles and was a true Jeffersonian Democrat. His brave and courageous fight for the Presidential ticket in 1928 was typical of many notable contributions to his party's cause.

Although Senator GLASS was not privileged to attend college, he was awarded honorary degrees by Lafayette College, Washington and Lee University, the University of North Carolina, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, William and Mary, Wesleyan, Tufts, Columbia, Hamilton, New York University, and Lynchburg College. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa of William and Mary College and served for 8 years as a member of the board of visitors of the University of Virginia.

In the United States Senate, his keen intellect, sound judgment, unimpeachable character, great courage, colorful personality, and high qualities of statesmanship, were manifested time and time again throughout his long and notable career as a Member of that body. He filled many important posts in the Senate, and served as chairman of the great Committees on Appropriations, and Banking and Currency. He was elected as President pro tempore of the Senate on June 10, 1941, and held that high honor until January 6, 1945.

It was a great privilege and honor to have known Senator GLASS and to have been one of his many friends. I pay sincere tribute to his memory and am proud of his wonderful record of honest, courageous, and able public service.

Fred Barthold Norman

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRED BARTHOLD NORMAN, late a Representative from the State of Washington

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in common with my colleagues, I was grieved and shocked when the news reached me that our colleague, FRED NORMAN, of the Third Congressional District of Washington, had gone to his reward.

The district of our late colleague lies just across the Columbia River from my congressional district. It was my privilege to have known him intimately during his service in the Seventy-eighth Congress and recently while he was a Member of the Eightieth Congress. Many of our problems of the Northwest were mutual, particularly the development of this great waterway for reclamation, irrigation, navigation, and hydroelectric power. FRED NORMAN was a good legislator, faithful to the trust imposed upon him and ever mindful of the people of his district. He was an exceptionally hard worker and could always be found at his post of duty while the Congress was in session. I always found him ready and willing to cooperate in all questions having to do with the welfare of the people of the Northwest, as well as the entire Union.

FRED BARTHOLD NORMAN was born and reared on a farm in Clark County, Ill., the son of Dr. A. Howard and Pauline Barthold Norman. He migrated to Pacific County in Washington in 1901 where he had varied experience as a farm worker, in logging camps, sawmills, and in the shipyards. The people of his district early recognized his ability and dependability for public service. He was elected as president of the Southwest Washington Good Roads Association, director of the White Pass Cross State Highway Association, and also a member of the Shingle Weavers Union and United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners; at one time he was president of the A. F. of L. Central Labor Union of Wallapa Harbor, which office he occupied for 10 years. He was also a member of the West Union Farmers Grange with over 20 years' service and belonged to many social and fraternal organizations. He was elected to the Seventy-eighth and Eightieth Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, I know I express the sentiments of all of our Members who were privileged to know our late colleague, FRED NORMAN, when I say that he occupied a high place in our respect. We will miss him in our deliberations. His own State of Washington and the Northwest and the Nation at large will miss a loyal public official. I extend to his widow and children my personal heartfelt sympathy in his passing.

William Bernard Barry

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM BERNARD BARRY, late a Representative from the State of New York

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the sorrowful news of the death of our colleague, Hon. WILLIAM BERNARD BARRY, on October 20, 1946, made many hearts heavy. The House of Representatives and the State of New York have lost a respected public official. I have lost a good friend.

By his splendid record of service, his sterling character, ability, and courage, BILLY BARRY has left a fine heritage to his gracious wife and lovely children.

May it assuage their grief to know the high esteem in which he was held by his colleagues, and how deeply we feel his loss.

Address of Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, before a gathering at the Rice Hotel in Houston, Tex., and broadcast over the stations of the Mutual Broadcasting System on Saturday evening, May 17, 1947:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

It is a very great privilege to come before this large and enthusiastic gathering of Texans who are interested in the preservation of the vital ideals of Americanism. I have always heard since I was a boy that when Texans are interested in anything, they demand action. Well, we've got to have action for Americanism—and plenty of it is needed for Americanism in our Nation today. Certainly there is no State in the Union whose history and tradition cause their people to have a deeper and more earnest devotion to Americanism—and to do more about it—than the people of the Lone Star State.

As one honored by being entrusted with the post of Speaker of the House of Representatives, I want, on this occasion, to pay a sincere tribute to those two able, distinguished, and patriotic sons of Texas, John Nance Garner, and SAM RAYBURN. Each in his turn served with fidelity and devotion the public welfare in the Speakership. It has been my high privilege to serve under both of these great Americans.

I do not come to Texas to attempt an eloquent oration, nor to make a partisan address. My mission is to promote in whatever degree I may a better understanding between two great parts of the United States. Through friendship and closer association,

your section and mine may become more fully aware of, and sympathetic with, the aims and aspirations of the other.

You Texans always do things in a big way. That has to be so, for you have the biggest State in the Union. You have the biggest ranches.

You have the most magnificent distances.

You have the deepest oil wells.

I understand the only reason you don't have towns bigger than New York is because you don't want to clutter up the view.

Bigness—that's Texas.

We need all the drive, and enthusiasm, and grit, and determination you've got in Texas to help in a big way to put our country back on the track of American progress and keep her there.

There is still under way, and undercover, a determined drive to destroy our American system of free constitutional government, free economy and free society. There are those who would attempt to overthrow our whole grand American system at the first opportunity. They will do it by persuasion if possible; they would do it by force, if persuasion fails. By hook or crook, if they can, they will destroy our American governmental, economic and social system. Texas will help us see they don't.

These subversionists are constantly claiming our American system is too slow and cumbersome. In a modern world, they argue, we are unable to hold our own. They insist we must have some form of statism, or a dictatorship of the proletariat. That kind of propaganda actually fools some people.

Let's look at our America of today and see what our system has produced in peace and in war.

The American people have always been a peaceful people. We have in 170 years, under our American system, achieved the greatest progress of any people, in any period of time, anywhere on the globe. Other nations have had a 1,000 or 5,000 years in which to accomplish the progress we have attained in America in 170 years. The reason we did it and they didn't, is because of our American system of government by consent of the governed. Ours is a free, competitive economy in which small business is the foundation upon which rest big business and mass production.

Ours is a free agriculture. We protect the right of men to own and cultivate their own land. Thereby, we have maintained the foundations of an independent electorate. Who is more independent in his views than a farmer? Religious and political freedom, and a free press—for the greater part small press—have been the bulwarks against any successful encroachments, in the past, by those who would rule us instead of serve us.

American youth is today standing at the threshold of literally a new world of adventure and riches in the realms of chemistry, mechanics, and statesmanship in the rebuilding of a shattered world. What a challenge. What an opportunity.

And American boys and girls will go forth eagerly to meet it.

When the First World War came on, we were unprepared because we had no hostile intentions against any people anywhere in the world. But when we finally had to get into it, we were able to do it in a hurry, and made ourselves the decisive factor in that First World War. During and after that war, many billions of American dollars in goods, and services, and energy poured out of this country to help the rest of the world.

When the Second World War came on, we were again unprepared because we are a peaceful people.

Under our peaceful policies, we had achieved in America the highest living levels, the highest wages, the best working conditions known. We enjoyed the greatest individual comforts, the greatest degree of individual liberty and opportunity ever attained on this globe. Nothing comparable was ever achieved by any other people.

Previous to the war just ended Japan had prepared for war for 40 years. Italy had been driven by Mussolini for 20 years. Russia was getting ready for the struggle for 20 years. Germany had been driven by Hitler for 12 years preparing for the conflict they knew was to come. What happened when America had to get in?

We had to fight two wars, one in the Atlantic and one in the Pacific; the latter almost lone-handed and unaided. We poured scores of billions of dollars' worth of machines and munitions of war into Europe to aid our allies, including eleven billions to Russia. We sent millions of men and women to help them. At the same time, we poured other millions of troops and scores of billions of dollars' worth of war machines and munitions into the Pacific struggle. All this was done by cooperation under free enterprise, by free labor and free agriculture and free citizens in the United States. In 3 years we had overtaken the preparations of our enemies, and allies, and were fighting an offensive war, as we marched down the road to victory. In that period we had a national election without disturbing our war efforts in the least.

For a time the American people yielded up some of their constitutional liberties to facilitate the war effort. But when the war was over they promptly voted, last November 5, to return to our traditional American system. They demanded an end to waste and bureaucratic regimentation. They called for the restoration of every factor of government to the control of the people. That demand is being met; that desire is being fulfilled by the Eightieth Congress today. And we Republicans are being helped by sturdy American Democrats who are thinking first of the welfare of their country.

After the war was over America was besieged, and is still being besieged, by every country in the world for help to feed their starving peoples, and for money to rebuild their shattered agriculture and industries. We have poured out more than $9,000,000,000 in loans to 58 different countries. We are still generously aiding in saving the world from chaos by feeding starving millions.

That is the incomparable record of America. If other governmental systems are so much better, I would like to ask, why do they have to come to the United States to rescue them from the aggressions of despots; to finance and help fight their wars; and then to help feed them and rebuild their countries afterward?

When anybody tries to say our American system isn't the best system in the world, incomparable and unsurpassed, he simply disregards the plain facts.

We who are proud of our citizenship in this, the greatest nation the sun ever shone upon, must realize—and I believe we do—that greater than our loyalty to any single section of the country, or to any particular party, must be our loyalty to the Nation itself. The high resolve of every true American is and always must be "My first concern my country's welfare."

Events which have transpired in the world since the first and second global wars have placed upon America the responsibility of world leadership. Our resources, combined with our military and economic strength, have given us an unequaled opportunity to direct the future of the world. This great responsibility to all humanity must be wisely discharged.

We must build a better and stronger America, so we may do our full part in helping humanity to achieve a better world.

I want to take this opportunity, if I may, to dispel some of the fog and clear up some of the misrepresentations which designing propagandists have deliberately sent through the press and over the radio.

The Eightieth Congress had barely been organized—in fact, some of the Members had not even received their office assignments—before the propagandists in Washington began to chant about the failure of the Congress to do something. Some of the propagandists forgot what every real newspaperman knows should be the true objective of every press or radio reporter; that is to distribute the facts fairly, and honestly, and impartially. Only through a zealous guardianship of those ideals of a free press and a free radio can we maintain in America an independent, honest press and an independent, honest radio qualified and capable of constructively criticizing the Government.

These propagandists, some of them desirous of destroying our American constitutional system of checks and balances, knew well enough we were organizing the Eightieth Congress under a completely new system. That reorganization plan, of necessity, had to be studied, and its working parts carefully adjusted.

These propagandists knew that in reducing the committees of the House from 49 to 19, a complete restaffing of those consolidated committees would be necessary. They knew every committee had to have a new chairman. They knew every committee had to be set up with new personnel. They knew this would require time. But they neglected to present these facts. I am proud to say the Eightieth Congress met its severe test with dispatch. It was actually functioning on a schedule as fast, if not faster, than some previous Congresses which did not have to labor under the additional difficulties of a new reorganization plan.

Of course, we knew some of these propagandists were trying to drive us into hasty action in the hope we would slip into unwise action. We refused to do this. The Eightieth Congress simply would not be stampeded. The Nation was still in peril. Grave problems, an aftermath of a destructive war, were before us. It was an hour fraught with grave dangers for the whole world. We resolved to give every proposal careful and searching consideration. That we are doing, and will continue to do. Our purpose will be to do that which is best for our country and the world regardless of political consequences.

We knew it was natural enough for some of the New Dealers to remain blind to the fact a new day had dawned in America. They had long been accustomed to having legislation prepared by some of the inside clique downtown and passed by a subservient Congress without any changes. They found it difficult to realize that on November 5, 1946, the American people voted to return to our traditional system of government in which the Congress is a co-equal, coordinate branch.

The New Dealers mistook for delay what actually was an orderly return by the Eightieth Congress to our traditional system of governmental functioning—committee hearings, debates, amendments, the only system by which, in a republic, right decisions may be reached.

I have been asked to again define the objectives and achievements of the new House of Representatives. Let me outline some of them briefly:

We Republicans promised last fall we would drive the Communists out of their key positions in the Government. We are keeping our promise. The Communists in this country are hunting cover. They will be driven out of those posts in Government where they can bore from within, and operate effectively to destroy the foundations

of our American system. When that job is completed, the Congress must be given the major credit.

You and I can recall how last year responsible administration officials emphatically denied there were any Communists in the Government at all. Now the President wants $25,000,000 to use in driving them out. There must have been an awful lot of Communists in the Government, and they must be firmly entrenched, if anybody believes they need that much money to oust them. No such amount of money is needed, of course. To spend such a sum would simply put a lot more people on the Government pay rolls to waste more tax money, and keep up the tax rates on the people. We are reducing governmental pay rolls. We are reducing the tax burden. Let us turn the job of ousting these Communists in the Government over to J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. Give him complete charge, and we can get the job done without spending this great sum of money. He is the man who can, and will do, this job if given a free rein.

Let me say something to you right at this point. We Republicans do not want the Communists or their fellow travelers to campaign next year for the Republican ticket. We do not want to be under any obligations to them. They will get no invitation from us.

We intend vigorously to do what we can to remove them from the Government, from the labor union, the schools, and other places of advantage where they have entrenched themselves to destroy real Americanism. These people must not be left in positions of advantage where they can destroy our economy, our prosperity, our freedom, and our progress.

We promised the American people a reduction in Government spending. That meant there would have to be deep cuts in the waste and extravagance of an overswollen political bureaucracy permitted to grow before and during the war into unprecedented proportions. The Appropriations Committee of the House is proceeding to cut those wasteful bureaucrats off at the pocketbook.

There will be keen disappointment and much wailing by many people who will not want to see ended their happy days of power, spending, and extravagance. But the job must be done if we are to protect the savings of the thrifty people of this country; it must be done if we are to maintain the obligations of pensions and allowances to our veterans; it must be done if we are to keep faith with the social-security holders and the retired employees; it must be done if we are to curb inflation; it must be done if we are to have an America which is alert and able to go forward to an expanding prosperity and better days for all our people.

In the face of a national debt of $258,000,000,000 and certain fixed charges which cannot be reduced, drastic cuts must be made in the regular appropriation measures if we are to restore the fiscal policies of this Nation to a sound basis. The House has shown its determination to maintain the solvency of the country by the cuts it has made in the appropriation bills already passed. The figures speak for themselves. Reductions made by the House below administration requests include the following: 45.3 percent in the Interior appropriation bill; 5.3 percent in the Labor-Federal Security bill; 21.8 percent in the Treasury-Post Office bill; 22.2 percent in a deficiency appropriation bill for 1947; and 23.3 percent in the bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments and the Judiciary. This can be done without injuring any necessary services.

We Republicans promised a substantial cut in withholding and other income tax. The House has passed the bill in the form that certainly fulfills that Republican promise.

It will be passed in the Senate, and if it becomes a law, it will aid in preventing a severe depression. No people can long endure in peacetime staggering under the confiscating wartime taxes. Now is the time to remove this barrier to business expansion, more jobs, and more of the good things of life for all the people.

Another promise was the enactment of a labor-relations bill to insure real collective bargaining and give fair play and justice to all. It is our intention and desire to protect the right to work as well as the right to strike. We believe both of these rights are essential to real Americanism. Another objective in the labor bill is to safeguard the interests of the public against irresponsible actions, and to end the highly dangerous racketeering of the New Deal labor political combine. It certainly has been an unholy alliance which threatened the recovery of the country. Both branches of Congress have acted. The final draft will be hammered out in conference.

We want to see every worker in America has a good job at good wages and the right to enjoy industrial peace, which is essential to progress and prosperity for all the people.

Congress has also passed a bill outlawing billions of dollars in portal-to-portal suits, which could have plunged the economy of this country into chaos and disaster.

Before the Eightieth Congress has become history, you will see every promise made by the Republicans and approved by the voters translated into legislation, and presented to the President.

The quality rather than the number of laws passed by Congress will determine whether or not the Congress is performing its duties to the Nation in a satisfactory manner.

Let me say to you there is one very great danger which perhaps overshadows all other dangers and problems which confront us at this time. The subversionists who are intent upon wrecking our American system of government, economy, and society have not ceased their attempts to destroy your confidence in your Congress.

The Congress is the people's special instrument of control over their Government. So long as the people maintain their faith in their Congress and send men of high character to it, just so long will the Congress maintain its power and authority to legislate the people's will into law and action. Just so long as the checks and balances devised by the wise founding fathers are maintained in America, just so long will we successfully resist all attempts to destroy our American system, desecrate our American way, and reduce us to serfdom under some alien despot.

Anyone who knows anything about the history of Texas knows that before the day ever comes when Americans will bend the knee and bow their heads to the rule of a despot, the plains of this magnificent State will run red with the blood of patriots who would rather die free than live in slavery.

In conclusion, let me say to you our American system will never be overthrown so long as we maintain the vigilance which has always been alert in Texas to preserve our liberties, and to keep unimpaired and untarnished for our posterity the priceless heritage of freedom and plenty our forebears sacrificed so much to leave to us.

This has been a grand visit to a grand State, "deep in the heart of Texas." I shall always remember with real pleasure your gracious and unstinted hospitality.

I go back to Washington with my heart warmed in the knowledge we are working under God's guidance as one people for your America, my America—our America.

Army and Navy Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial entitled "The Militarists," published in the Chicago Tribune of the edition of Saturday, May 17. The editorial refers to and discusses statements by Representative NORBLAD, of Oregon, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] concerning the bill providing for the merger of the armed forces which is now being considered by committees of the two Houses.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILITARISTS

Congress at last seems to have noticed the dangerous campaign of the military and naval hierarchy to build up an empire within the United States coequal, if not superior, to the civil government. In the last few days two Republicans, Representative NORBLAD, of Oregon, and Senator ROBERTSON, of Wyoming, have challenged the ambitions of the militarists. Mr. NORBLAD emphasized the grossly inflated officer establishment of the services and their arms, and Senator ROBERTSON pointed out some of the more dangerous implications of the Army-Navy merger bill.

Maj. Gen. Willard S. Paul, Army director of personnel and administration, was compelled by Mr. NORBLAD to admit that the ratio of officers to enlisted men is now 1 to 8, whereas it was 1 to 16 during the war. The general had not expected to have to defend the perpetuation of rank when he came before the Armed Services Committee. He was there to ask for something more—the right of the Army to retire regular officers at the highest rank they held during the war, rather than to pay them retirement allowances according to the grades to which they would revert. He argued that if this were not done, many men who held the wartime rank of major generals would be retired with the pay of colonels or less.

"The trouble," rejoined Mr. NORBLAD, "is that the colonels and lieutenant colonels are still major generals. Reductions in rank have been few."

General Paul could not argue the statement. The Army has 556 generals—168 more than the entire number in World War I. It has 35,554 field officers and 99,556 junior officers. The Navy is keeping up with the General Joneses by maintaining 263 admirals and 47 commodores, 15,163 senior officers of the rank of lieutenant commander through captain, and 33,972 officers in the grades of ensign through lieutenant. The Marine Corps is holding on to 51 of its 72 wartime generals, and the Coast Guard to 14 of its 23 admirals, although before the war no Coast Guard commander ever achieved the rank of admiral.

The pay of the officer establishment of the Army and Navy alone is acknowledged to be $934,000,000. With special pay, the total would exceed a billion dollars. The addition of the Marine and Coast Guard officer pay roll would put the figure at a billion and a quarter.

These figures demonstrate that the Army and Navy brass are beyond all conscience. There appear to be 10 times as many general and flag officers as can be justified. It would be interesting to have a list of the admirals who ever came within airplane range of the Japs and of the generals who were under German or Japanese fire. A compilation of this kind might prove that the fighting at sea was largely done by aviators and submarine sailors below the rank of captain, and that the land fighting was largely directed by temporary officers and reservists who did not reach high rank.

Congress could also determine, with profit, how many officers with prestige rank are now detailed to quasi-diplomatic duty. They are all preeminently expendable. Cocktail-drinking soldiers in various capitals deserve no recognition whatever from the country.

Flagrantly grasping as are the proclivities of the services in hanging onto the prerogatives of the big brass, the Army and Navy are not content. Senator ROBERTSON has charged that the service-merger bill carries the seeds of military dictatorship. It would establish a single department of military forces under a single, all-powerful super-secretary. It would establish a permanent staff corps of militarists, suspiciously like its authoritarian prototypes, according to the Senator. It would provide for the eventual domination by professional militarists of all civilian agencies of government in the event of war. Its provisions for a central intelligence agency set no limits to the authority or functions of the agency either at home or abroad.

This is the barest outline of the vast and vague powers which would be conferred by this bill. It is plain that the scheme must be subjected to the most searching public examination. "The military continually seeks to extend its influence," Senator ROBERTSON has remarked, "and to take unto itself many of the prerogatives of the executive and legislative branches of our Government." If the country wants to avoid handing over its management to a military politburo, it will firmly impress upon the militarists the fact that the services are an adjunct of government, not the masters of government.

Americans Must Keep Informed on World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of this country has there been such an urgent need for information and historical knowledge concerning world affairs. America has been thrust into a position of world leadership. It has become her destiny to capture the minds of the people throughout the universe and lead them into the paths of democratic freedoms. Failure to accept this responsibility can result only in a victory for those forces which are advocating totalitarianism.

Like all Congressmen, I receive literature from many sources setting forth the viewpoints of one group or another relative to international affairs. These reports are usually highly colored and cannot be depended upon from the standpoint of objective analysis.

The other day I had occasion to read a report, published periodically, called American World Intelligence, edited by Dr. Christopher Norborg. Dr. Norborg is a well-known author and university professor, and formerly on the staff of the University of Minnesota. During World War II he was associated with the Office of Strategic Services and was considered an outstanding expert on European affairs. He was chief of the northern European section of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, during 1944 and 1945.

His forthcoming book Operation Moscow is destined to arouse wide discussion. It is Dr. Norborg's opinion that the next 12 months will tell the history of international reconstruction or of man's doom. The atomic age permits no folly.

Because I feel that Dr. Norborg's logic is so well founded, I take this opportunity to pass along some of his comments:

Stalin's flat rejection of Secretary Marshall's earnest plea for cooperation is comparable only to Molotov's 1939 deal with Hitler and Ribbentrop.

Moscow 1947 is about to duplicate Moscow 1939. In the fateful fall of that year Moscow rejected any alliance with the west. In spite of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, Moscow is once more rejecting the cooperation of the victorious west. Stalinist geopolitics still holds: He who dominates Germany rules Europe.

A few weeks ago Moscow published a revised Stalin biography in which the Russians are told that the Soviets could have won World War II without the assistance of England or America.

The Kremlin has long since informed its citizens that it was the Soviet Army which crushed Japan. And now Soviet Prof. Eugen Tarle warns that if the western powers do not behave, the Soviet armies will move to occupy all Europe.

What is behind all this? The Soviets have 44 fully equipped divisions in Europe, ready to march. They are counting upon a Communist underground army throughout Europe, estimated at a minimum of 2,000,000 partisans, to rise in Red revolution. The Soviets possess vastly improved V-1 weapons of enormous range. They are far advanced in bacteriological warfare. In fact, had it not been for the atom bomb, the Soviet armies would have marched to the Atlantic and the Mediterranean.

The Soviet rulers are ruthless gamblers. At present their own homeland is an economic and industrial vacuum. They will, therefore, have to live on other nations for some years. Sweden, Iceland, and Switzerland have already rushed to the Kremlin's assistance. The other west European peoples have suffered and lost too much to be of much immediate help. Their own reconstruction programs are tremendous. Their dislike of dictatorship is deep.

The leader of Soviet foreign policy is Molotov. The men behind the scene are Beria and Lozovsky. With a secret service system of 200,000 agents outside the Russian borders, the Kremlin is today the best informed empire seat in the world.

Do not, however, overlook the fact that the Soviets are uncritical, dogmatic, and self-assured to a fanatic degree. This Soviet psychosis is the supreme danger to the rest of the world.

Moscow may be exceedingly well informed. Its judgment is notoriously poor. The Soviets are, therefore, apt to overrate their own strength. World War III may become the inevitable result.

The Nazi dictator threatened that if he went down, he would drag all Europe with him in the abyss. The nihilists of the Politburo seem intent upon making that threat good. That is, if the Christian nations let them. Precisely for these nations, the true meaning of the recent Moscow Conference is that an issue has been drawn. It is now up to the United States and the other democratic nations together to follow a policy which is moral, strong, and consistent enough to build a powerful peace.

SPITZBERGEN FEARS

With summer coming to the Arctic, the dispute between Norway and the Soviet Union with regard to joint military safeguard of that strategic island may again break into the open. The fact that Moscow last season prevented Norwegian seal hunting expeditions from entering the White Sea revealed that the Soviets are aware of the strategic significance of the Arctic in this atomic day and age. If the Norwegians intended to send military patrols to Spitzbergen this summer, they were not talking.

THE SOVIETS LEAVING THE UN?

Informed observers expect to see the Soviets leave the United Nations by September, if not before. The Soviet move will probably not come in the form of any official break with the UN. It is thought more likely that Moscow will order Mr. Gromyko to stage a dramatic walking out to be followed by the announcement that the Soviet UN delegate has been called home for consultation.

Such a tactic would serve the Kremlin well, since the Politburo could insist that the Soviet Union was still a member. As a veto power, the Soviet Union would claim that the UN Security Council could not operate in Russia's absence.

When this incident happens, the other nations will have to make up their minds whether the United Nations shall get down to real work. The prospects for a constructive and tough attitude on behalf of all non-Soviet nations as to making UN work are growing better.

KOREAN DISASTER

A well placed native intelligence observer writes concerning the situation in Soviet-occupied northern Korea:

"The people in the north have been suffering and starving since the very day of liberation on August 15, 1945. This has been three or four times worse than anything that happened before.

"The Soviet soldiers came into Korea from the Manchurian front. They have lived off the land. They take food, clothing, musical instruments, watches, pens, and money. The Russians are moving all Korean machinery to Russia.

"It is like a battlefield here. No one can tell of tomorrow. Danger comes at any moment. There are riots and strikes by the Communists in southern Korea. You can never believe anybody because even your brother can be a Communist. As soon as you are discovered by somebody as being against the Russians or against the native Communists you are arrested and you don't know where you are going. Morality is broken. Ideas are confused. We in Korea may have to have a civil war between the left and the right.

"However, in Pyeng Yang, the capital city in Northern Korea, all churches are full of Christians. The more the Communists persecute, the stronger the Christians become."

When Secretary Marshall recently reopened the Korean issue in Moscow, he may well have called the signals for an intense battle in the Far East. Korea is a potential Ruhr. It flanks the Sea of Japan. Its fisheries are immensely rich. Korea bids fair to become a dangerous bone of contention between China and the Soviet Union.

The 1943 Cairo Declaration found Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek calling for the liberation and eventual independence of Korea. In 1945 the world forgot to look when the Twenty-fifth Red Army moved into Korea, down to the 38° latitude. Another incredible, and perhaps fatal, concession had secretly been made to Moscow.

In spite of the 1945 Moscow agreement on Korea, all cooperation between United States and Soviet occupation authorities has been broken since May 8, 1946. North Korea is stripped. The Communist leader, Kim-Il-Sung, reigns supreme as Moscow's agent. Even in American-occupied Seoul the Communist paper, Dok-Lip-Sinpo, is propagandizing for Moscow. Inflation and unrest stalk the land.

The Koreans are fiercely nationalistic. They demand independence immediately. They are not inclined to wait another 36 months. Their leaders, Syngman Rhee, Mansik Cho, Kynsik Kim, Kim Koo, Yongjeung Kim, and others insist that Korea needs neither American nor Soviet soldiers.

Mr. Molotov has accepted the American invitation to seek a settlement on Korea. When the Soviet delegates meet with the Americans (and Koreans?) the world will see whether the Kremlin is more cooperative in Seoul than in Moscow.

Individual Rights Are Supreme in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Paul E. Belcher:

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS ARE SUPREME IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Paul E. Belcher)

What American wants to be told what he may eat? We insist upon and have available a wide selection of foods. Most of us choose our calories with care and discrimination. As a people we enjoy varied and palatable meals. Even they whose very lives are known to depend upon adherence to a strict diet frequently refuse to follow the advice of their physicians. Yet, in many parts of the world, black bread and a thin potato soup must be eaten regularly. In much of the Orient every day's fare consists of rice or nothing.

What American wants to be told what goods he may buy? With us the right is final to buy what we like and to decline everything else. We need state no reason for our action. No superior power can force us to purchase our assigned share of something because that something has been produced for our use. Everyone over here who makes or has goods for sale assumes the risk of loss which will surely occur if the public cannot be voluntarily persuaded to acquire those goods.

What American wants to be told where he shall live? If we like country life, we live in the country. If the city is appealing, we establish ourselves in some urban community. No one tells us where to live any longer than it takes us to find a place that suits us better. In much of the world the people must live where their respective governments allow them to live or where their economic status compels them to exist.

What American wants to be told where he can go? Occasionally, we consign our neighbors to Hades in a figurative sense, but, in fact, we regard the entire country and all of its territory as part of our back yard. We go and come in peacetime where and when we please. We answer to no one. Even our borders can be crossed with ease. As Americans, most of us believe that we have a moral right to visit any part of this globe at any reasonable time. Some even contemplate a trip in outer space. What Russian in his homeland is accorded similar privileges? A single one would be a novelty.

What American wants to be told where he shall work? Forced labor is limited to penal institutions in the United States. Not even in wartime has an American civilian ever been required by law to work anywhere if he did not wish to do so. We induce the individual to work with high pay and other emoluments. Millions of people in other parts of this world would never have the faintest dream that they could refuse to work where they were told to labor or that they could quit when they felt like it.

What American wants to be told what his recreation shall be? We consider our free time as our own. Each can follow his own dictates. We reserve the right to accept or reject every proffered amusement. We decry censorship. We call the umpire a bum on the ground that we dislike a decision he makes. Entertainment provided by our employers may be safely passed up. But not so in many other countries.

What American wants to be told what he shall do with his money? Our money is our own and we can do with it practically what we please. We were not required by law to buy Government securities before, during, or after the war. We can handle our funds in accordance with approved commercial usage or carry an accumulation of greenbacks in our pockets. We can save our earnings for tomorrow or spend them all today. We can keep our property intact or dispose of it unhampered by autocratic paternalism. The state is not our sole heir.

What American wants to be told that he has no economic future? Those would be fighting words. Every one of us has the right to better his position if he can do so. Opportunity is open to all. There are no closed contests. Whether we are laborers or merchants, professional men, or anything else, is largely our own choice. Within the limits of our respective abilities we can move from one class into another, either up or down the economic scale. This right could hardly be said to be applicable in many other nations.

What American wants to be told that he must do anything affecting his economic life? The answer is both immediate and positive: There is no such American. None exists because our heritage has been the individual economic freedom inherent in our system of free enterprise.

What other economic system anywhere, at any time, has ever provided the people within its jurisdiction with similar economic freedom? We exalt every human being. His right of selection, in the economic sense, is absolute. All must yield to his voluntary choice. He, collectively, governs every economic trend. Under what other kind of economic system has the individual, as such, ever been considered of the slightest importance?

Work of the Last Session of the New York Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered over NBC on Thursday evening, May 8, 1947, by the Honorable Paul E. Fitzpatrick, chairman of the Democratic State committee of New York, in reply to a recent speech by Governor Dewey, on the subject of the last session of the New York State Legislature.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, thank you for letting me into your homes tonight. Your invitation, I know, is impelled by a great American custom—that of hearing the other side of a strictly partisan story. You want to give yourselves a chance to get the true facts before making up your minds. That fairness is what makes America great. That's why I welcome this opportunity to tell you what really happened in Albany at the last legislative session.

Governor Dewey recently gave you his views on what he considered the achievements of the last legislative session. Tonight in the time allowed me I shall voice the views of the Democratic Party about what was done and what was not done. When I refer to the Governor's actions and his policies on legislative matters I do so advisedly because never before in our history have we seen such a complete abdication of the legislature's functions at the dictation of a governor. This abject surrender of the legislature has been gradual over a period of several years, but it has finally reached the point where the Republican majority is merely a rubber stamp for the Governor's will. Issues of vital importance to all the people were decided under what amounted to gag rule. If you have listened to the Governor's recent speeches you will see why he did not trust the members of his own party to expound his views in the legislature.

In one speech the Governor sought to explain the reasons for a near-break-down in our educational system due to the notorious underpayment of our teaching staff. In a separate speech the Governor sought to justify an antistrike bill so punitive in character that it justifies the epithet "yellow-dog legislation." Tonight I shall bring these two issues into their proper relation of cause and effect.

The Democratic Party first began to urge the legitimate claims of teachers for higher pay more than 3 years ago. But how did Mr. Dewey meet this pressing problem—the problem of a living wage for our teachers? Following his usual technique, simply delaying tactics, the Governor appointed another committee.

So, after the lapse of several years during which the teachers suffered from notoriously inadequate pay while the distinguished committee deliberated leisurely, the committee brought forth a conclusion which the Governor grudgingly admits was correct, namely "that the school teachers had real ground for dissatisfaction with their pay." But to cover up the delay and the

admission of injustice to the teachers, their pay raise was integrated into a promotional system. On the merits of this plan I shall defer to the opinion of the public-school superintendents. At the New York University Educational Conference on April 18, 1947, the system for merit-rating public-school teachers adopted at the Governor's dictation was called impracticable and unworkable by a three-fourths majority. More than half of them opposed the law even in principle.

These teachers suffered a great injustice. The Governor gives a glowing account of what was belatedly done to rectify this situation, but tomorrow's pennies will not buy bread for yesterday. Glib talk about complicated formulas for merit rating, morale, and the benefits of education generally will not obscure the fact that a faithful body of civil servants was treated shamefully. Finding no hope of decent and fair treatment the school teachers in Buffalo went on strike for a decent living wage. In anger and retaliation against the teachers, and acting on the principle that you must never forgive those you have injured, the Governor dictated the vengeful Condon Wadlin Act.

Before I discuss this particular example of the Governor's spite, may I stress the fact that the Democratic Party completely disavows the right to strike on the part of public employees whose activities are intimately associated with the health and safety of the people. President Roosevelt, President Truman, Mayor O'Dwyer, and other great Democratic spokesmen have consistently and forthrightly voiced these principles. These principles were in the law before the Condon-Wadlin bill was enacted. This the Governor was forced to admit and when pressed for a reason for the new legislation he said that unless the law was restated "we should go on to an increasingly chaotic condition."

The previous law had never proved deficient before the Governor's own administration of it. There had never been a strike of public employees under a Democratic administration. The reasons why the Governor failed in his own administration of the law is best seen in the teachers' strike in Buffalo. Instead of dealing promptly and forthrightly with the ever-increasing injustice of a less-than-living wage for the teachers, the Governor passed the problem on to his committee—which pondered over it several years, while the teachers waited in vain for a decent living wage to which, on the Governor's own admission, they were entitled.

If the principle of no right to strike was, as Dewey admits, already in the law, we may well ask what was the reason for the enactment of the Condon-Wadlin law.

The motives are twofold:

1. New and punitive penalties were added, which surpass in severity anything since labor fought its way out of the "yellow dog" contract humiliation.

2. The Governor put himself in competition with Senator TAFT for the extreme reactionary delegates to the Republican National Convention in 1948.

The law does nothing to eliminate the causes which produce strikes. It provides no machinery for hearing grievances. It was not constructive. It was punitive only.

In his speech, the Governor used the words "chaotic condition" in speaking of the labor situation. If he had in mind the strikes in Buffalo and Rochester I would remind him that those cities have Republican administrations. I would also remind him that the city of New York employs 185,000 and there has never been a strike on the part of the public employees of New York City.

The words "chaotic condition" could, with more truth, be applied to the Governor's fiscal policies. As we have seen, these fiscal policies have put the local governments in a strait jacket, and the Buffalo and Rochester strikes were primarily due to the inability of the local governments to provide living wages for their civil-service employees.

You will remember that when Herbert Lehman retired as governor he left to his successor a fiscal plan and tax system which produced the greatest surplus in the history of any State in the Union. During the war years and thereafter, the sources of the State's revenues expanded. This was not true of the sources of local revenue, chiefly the real-estate tax. As a result, the local governments were not able to increase the pay envelopes of public employees commensurately with the rise in living costs. The Democratic Party suggested an equitable sharing of the State's surplus with the municipalities, but the Governor insisted that the surplus was a "trust fund" for returning veterans. Of the betrayal of that trust, I shall speak later.

The problem of the municipalities was dealt with in true Dewey fashion. After years of delay, with inadequate pay for civil-service employees, the local governments were empowered at the last session of the legislature to levy new and burdensome sales and nuisance taxes. Business and corporate taxes had been reduced. So the way was laid for increasing taxes on those least able to pay, when the cost of living of the wage-earner was already too high. And this at a time when corporate and business reports showed record earnings for all time. An effective method of State collection of taxes has been abandoned and the local governments will be forced into new and untried methods of tax collection.

The county executive of Westchester, a Republican, by the way, criticized the new scheme as follows, "This would be a completely new function to county government and necessitate the establishment of a tax-collection bureau, if the provisions of the law were to be carried out effectively. * * * Education is a State function. If additional funds are required in any county, the State is the proper agency to collect and distribute such funds through State departments and agencies already organized and existing."

Now, why was a new and untried system of tax collection foisted upon the local governments at a time when the State had decreased taxes on those best able to pay? Only because the Governor would rob Peter to pay Paul so as to be able to say before the Republican National Convention meets, "I have reduced taxes." But you, the taxpayer, will pay more taxes. You will pay these special Dewey taxes every time you buy clothing and every time you go to the movies or a ball game. Dewey did not reduce taxes. He shifted them to the wage earner.

The State surplus was referred to by Dewey as a trust fund for veterans. Had the entire surplus of $600,000,000 been devoted to housing for the veterans it would have been the best war memorial that the State of New York could devise. As it is, a small fraction of the surplus has been devoted to emergency housing. The fact is that more than 90 percent of the cost of all veterans' emergency housing has been provided by the Federal Government. And it is also a fact that not one single permanent housing project has been erected in New York State which was not planned and initiated by either Governor Lehman or the Federal Government. The Governor's response to the crying needs of the veterans for housing has been tragic. A major part of the surplus has been allocated to a luxury boulevard, which will compete with veterans' housing for materials and labor. Why? Because road building up-State is the source of the Republican campaign war chest.

So far as the veterans' bonus is concerned, it will be paid for largely by the veterans themselves out of increased cigarette taxes and increased income taxes. With characteristic contempt, he has, in effect, said: "If they want a bonus, let them pay for it themselves." And this at a time when business and corporate taxes have been substantially reduced.

So far as the proposal of the Democratic Party for a great State university is concerned, it has been referred by the Governor to another commission. And the ambitions of thousands of your boys and girls for professional education, medical, dental, and so forth, must be denied, and this, in the richest State in the Union.

In these ways the problems of labor, the veteran, and the taxpayer have been harnessed to the overweening ambition of one man to be President. The craft of the Governor's scheme is best illustrated in one instance which may have escaped general notice. During the last session of the legislature a special law was passed giving the Governor the right to appoint a United States Senator until the election of 1948, if one of the incumbents should die in office. The Governor wanted to make sure that no rival to his own ambitions could be elected in 1947. Any embarrassment to the present United States Senators, one of whom was seriously ill at the time, was ruthlessly disregarded.

In another instance of personal law-making in quest for personal power, the Governor in the closing hours of the legislative session arrogated to himself, in the person of his budget director, powers formerly vested in the commissioner of public works. The Democratic Party—the people's party—opposes the ending of representative government in New York by the Dewey administration. We are opposed to his personal legislation, to his tax policies which increase the cost of living to the wage earner. In his maneuvering for political advantage he wished to say he had reduced taxes, so he strangled the local governments, denied their civil servants a living wage, provoked conditions which goaded them to strike, and then covered up his mistake by foisting the State's responsibility for taxes upon the localities and struck at labor with yellow-dog legislation.

The legislative session of 1947 might well be called Dewey's price for the Presidency—and the price to be paid is the State of New York.

Reorganization of the Executive Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Handicap to Economy," which appeared in the Press, of Evansville, Ind. The editorial relates to the joint resolution which I have introduced in the Senate and which Representative BROWN of Ohio has introduced in the House, providing for the making of a study leading to a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANDICAP TO ECONOMY

It is possible that, in some cases, congressional pruning of the Federal budget will go harmfully too far.

But the Government costs so much more than it should that reckless economy is a lesser danger than reckless extravagance. And the heads of Federal departments and agencies of their own accord never will make such savings as are possible and necessary.

So we aren't impressed by the Washington spenders' anguished cries of "woodsman spare that tree!" each time the economy ax touches a bureaucratic bough. Most agencies, we think, can finance their really essential activities with many fewer dollars from the taxpayers.

Yet Congress should know more about what it is trying to do. A good deal of the cutting shows little evidence of accurate information and careful thought. Thanks to the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act, the appropriations committees now have more experts and investigators than ever before, and they should be equipped to do a better job in the future.

We believe, though, Congress always will be handicapped in economy efforts unless the huge, sprawling Federal bureaucracy is simplified and its methods brought up to date. The machinery of the Government's executive branch is so complex that the people can't understand it, the President can't supervise it properly and Congress can't control it. It is a baffling maze of duplicated effort, overlapped authority, waste, and inefficiency.

Two Republicans—Senator LODGE of Massachusetts and Representative BROWN of Ohio—have proposed a hopeful remedy. They suggest a thorough study of the executive branch by a bipartisan commission, including six private citizens recognized as autorities on management. The President and Congress would join in naming the commission. It would report in January 1949 on how to substitute modern management methods for the present bureaucratic disorder.

This Lodge-Brown plan, we believe, promptly should be authorized by Congress. The proposed commission's task will be long and difficult, and the sooner it gets started the better.

Once a Water Boy, Always a Water Boy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I was called upon to address a group of Boy Scouts and their friends. I was requested to base my talk upon an actual experience of my boyhood, which would illustrate the importance of obedience to the orders given by our seniors and those in authority. They wanted my narration to emphasize the fact that young people are frequently put to the test when they are not aware of it, and that the way in which youth responds to such tests frequently enables an employer or the one giving the orders to determine the character of the boy. Hence I chose an actual experience from my own life with a moral that I considered most wholesome. I spoke to those boys on the subject Once a Water Boy, Always a Water Boy? The following is what I said on this subject:

Were you ever a water boy? Have you ever had some menial task to perform, which was not altogether to your liking? During our youth, I dare say the majority of us have been called upon to perform some tedious or irksome act which we, for the moment, considered nonessential, unimportant to us or our superiors.

In the summer of 1908 the director of admissions of one of the largest State fairs in the Middle West, after I had consummated a business transaction with him, asked me how I would like to sell admission tickets at the State fair that fall. I assured him I would appreciate the opportunity. He informed me that all of the ticket sellers were men who had worked in a bank. They were tellers in the larger banks or officers in small country banks. At any rate they were supposed to have had considerable experience in handling money, making change, and the like.

At that time I had been in college 4 years and I thought the association and experience would be beneficial to me. I considered it somewhat of an honor, as well as a privilege, since I had never worked in a bank, to be associated with such men and put on a level with them. Truly, I felt flattered, and it is not so difficult to flatter youth, and particularly college students, who have come to think that they really know enough to take a position by the side of experienced and seasoned men. Later they come to realize that their scholastic attainments alone do not qualify them for many positions for which they had hitherto considered themselves eminently fitted.

I appeared on the opening day of the fair, and went immediately to the administration building where the director who had promised me the job had his headquarters. He greeted me cordially, but told me he was too busy just then to talk to me, and requested me to see him an hour later. When I returned to his office, he said he would like for me to rustle some galvanized buckets and tin cups and see that a cup and bucket were placed in each ticket-selling booth, and that I should get some ice and fill the buckets with water and keep them filled for the ticket salesmen and money changers. About 2 hours later I returned, and, in answer to his question as to how I had gotten along, I told him that I had all of the men supplied with ice water. He expressed approval and remarked that it was rather warm in those booths and that he wanted me to see that the men were kept supplied with ice water all day. At the close of that day's work, he ordered me to report at 7 o'clock the next morning. Upon my arrival, he directed me to continue my services as water boy the second day. At the close of the second day's work, the director asked me how I liked my job. To be sure I wanted to say that I didn't like it, but I had been trained from earliest childhood to do the tasks that had been assigned me, and do them well, without complaining. Hence, I replied: "It is all right. But, of course, it is not what I thought I was going to do when I came over here. Nevertheless, I am willing to do whatever you want me to, since I am already on the ground." His only remark was: "Very well. You see that the boys all have ice water again this morning and come back to the office when you shall have supplied them on your first round." Again, I obeyed orders.

Upon my return to the administration building, the director gave me a badge to pin on my coat lapel, which read "Collector of admissions," and told me in very few words that he was placing me in charge of all the ticket sellers at the fair. He explained that I would be responsible for seeing that the salesmen had tickets, the money changers ample change, and that I would be provided with a conveyance to transport me from one ticket-selling booth to the other and to the office, with two plain-clothes policemen and a private detective who would accompany me everywhere I went.

We had twenty-odd ticket salesmen at the entrance gates and the grandstand. These men were all my seniors, and for fear they might resent my occupying a position superior to theirs the director cautioned me not to disclose to any of them the fact that I had never worked in a bank. It was my duty to give out the tickets to the salesmen, take their receipts therefor, collect the cash from them every hour during the day and bring it to the administration building and turn it over to the treasurer of the fair, and at the close each evening require the return of the tickets that had been distributed, or the balance of the cash therefor. A horse show was scheduled for that night, and the director told me that I would be in charge of the admissions to the horse show and to manage for ticket salesmen at the gates and doors.

Nothing more was said to me about supplying the men with drinking water. But I quickly observed that a substitute had been provided to render that service. When the fair officially closed the director of admissions asked me to approve the time for all of the men who were working under me and wait until they received their money, before filling out my voucher. He then handed me a voucher to sign for the full period of the fair, at the rate of $7.50 per day, whereas the ticket salesmen were paid only $5 per day, which he had promised me the summer before. As he handed me the voucher he said: "How did you like being water boy at the fair?" I merely smiled. He said, "I wanted to see what kind of stuff you had in you, whether or not you would obey orders, submit to discipline, and be willing to do any little task that was to be done. You satisfied my curiosity in that respect, and I was convinced by the thoroughness with which you performed the duties of water boy that you would make good anywhere I placed you. For that reason I put you in charge of the ticket salesmen. I would like for you to be with us next season in the same position."

This incident cannot be appreciated fully, without knowing something of the character of that director of the State fair in charge of admissions. He was a man past middle age, very active. A positive character with a commanding personality, unassuming, but serious-minded, and considered an excellent judge of human nature. He had held public office one or two terms in his home county. He owned or controlled a string of 10 or 12 country banks in his part of the State. He was a practical farmer, owned more than 1,000 acres of the most fertile land in the Mississippi River Valley, and an island in the Mississippi River of some 800 acres. He was a livestock and grain farmer on a large scale and an astute businessman, who enjoyed the confidence and respect of all who knew him. He was eminently fair and of mild and placid manner, but determined to win against all odds, when he considered his position proper and tenable. He had very little scholastic training, but was well educated in the "University of Hard Knocks." He was a man of comparatively few words, but when he spoke, all who knew him understood that he meant what he said.

Again, I was flattered. I left the fairgrounds that closing night feeling more important than I have ever felt since. But I had had a lesson. Fortunately, I had followed my early training, of doing cheerfully, or at least without complaining, whatever was to be done. I had been taught to adapt and adjust myself to the circumstances, and make the best of them, with the faith that eventually we may be rewarded for doing well the little things that need to be done, although they are not altogether just what we might prefer to do.

It was indelibly impressed upon my mind, then and there, that being a water boy once does not necessarily mean that one must continue always to be a water boy. Often it is a step to greater possibilities. The biographies of most great people witness this fact.

Frequently our employers, especially the older generation, in dealing with the younger, use such methods as a test to determine our character, our attitude, and our faith. In some instances we are prone to become impatient and intolerant, which leads to our own undoing. Ordinarily youth does not realize at the time that in such cases he is being put to the test. Occasionally he will revolt, and, without his knowing it, such revolt is the cause of his not being promoted, and ultimately of his losing his position and finding it ever more difficult to obtain another chance. I have known instances where employers have said, after it was too late, if you had not acted as you did, I would not have discharged you, for I had in mind, if you went ahead and did well whatever work was assigned to you, that I would promote you to a position of greater responsibility, carrying more substantial emoluments. We have all known of occasional instances of melancholy and discouragement which follow in the wake of such experiences. Youth is prone to give up too quickly. We are inclined to underestimate the value and importance of such tests of humbleness. After all, in many instances, the little things of life are the ones that count most. Small services well performed, although they may appear to us insignificant and unimportant, frequently convince the employer that eventually the employee will capably and faithfully perform the larger tasks when the responsibility is his to shoulder.

Of course, no one, with ambition, wants to be a water boy always. Much less does one who has had several years of college training feel that he would like to be a mere water boy at a State fair when he thought he was to be and had been promised that he would be put on a level with experienced bank clerks and officers. His vanity shrinks. He is humiliated. But humbleness and swallowed pride, with a determination to make good at whatever task is assigned him, will almost always be followed by a promotion to a position of responsibility that will call forth the greatest possibilities of which one is capable.

Hence, once a water boy always a water boy? No. Not necessarily so. It depends upon the individual, his early training—his breeding, if you please. The answer to the question depends largely upon the individual's own reaction. The future is generally measured by the attitude and disposition with which we go about the performance of any duty that lies before us, the thoroughness and determination with which we attack the problems which confront us in everyday life, be they large or small, and the faith within us that we are measuring up to the responsibilities of our positions. The future is, after all, just about what we make it for ourselves. After having run the gamut of human experiences, will we not have to admit we have been to a very large extent the authors of our own destinies?

Usually we cannot appreciate fully our opportunities until it is too late. In retrospect, we are inclined to think and say that if we had, or had not, done thus and so, things would have been different. We are all good at making excuses for our failures. It does seem at times that fate prevents our advancement, and there are external influences which play a liberal role in molding our futures. But, by and large, he who is faithful in the performance of the smaller tasks of life is undoubtedly better qualified to perform the larger responsibilities, and in no other way can one expect to become successful in the greater spheres of activity. The Great Teacher once said, "* * * he that shall humble himself shall be exalted"; again, in the parable of the talents, "Thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many things"; and, on another occasion: "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much."

Now for His Epitaph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, May 18, 1947:

NOW FOR HIS EPITAPH

The day when an ancient debt which the world owes to a champion of freedom, whose daring in behalf of liberty made him not only a notable martyr, but lifted him beyond the boundaries of his own land to enshrine him a fighter for freedom all admire, is beginning to dawn.

Some years hence, the dying wish of Robert Emmet, 25-year-old Irish patriot, expressed as he stood in the dock in Dublin, condemned to die because he led an abortive revolt for justice in his little land, will be fulfilled. His simple yet stirring appeal for someone to write his epitaph will be answered.

Every student of eloquence knows the classic peroration of his address to the dooming bench, which was in fact his own funeral oration: "Let no man write my epitaph; for as no man who knows my motives dares now vindicate them, let not prejudice or ignorance disperse them * * * when my country takes its place among the nations of the earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written."

Come September, it will be a lapse of 144 years in mankind's upward march to freedom since Robert Emmet was publicly beheaded in the streets of Dublin. And last Thursday, in Boston, the drive for a United Ireland was launched again—a campaign to wipe out the unnatural division of the little nation and join all the 32 counties into a solid political and economic unit.

Captain Ireland of Northern Ireland gave impetus to the project which should have much support here in America—an America which so recently fought to free the peoples of Europe from similar dividing tactics as practiced by the Hitlerian dictatorship.

It was by the merest chance, yet it was also an auspicious coincidence that Captain Ireland chose Thursday last for his Boston visit to stir public opinion to right a wrong which is patently contrary to the letter and spirit of the Atlantic Charter which not only Americans, Englishmen, Frenchmen, Hollanders, Belgians and others, but 350,000 sons of Eire bearing arms in British uniforms inscribed in blood on imperishable tablets.

For 100 years ago last Thursday there passed away in Genoa, perhaps the greatest orator that ever lived since the time of Demosthenes, that eloquent Irishman, Daniel O'Connell, scholar and counselor, whose words fired the soul of a conquered but unsubdued people to break century-old shackles of galling and preposterous bondage.

On the part of some Americans of Irish ancestry or other ancestries, there may be misgivings and doubts that Eire at this time should raise the question of the elimination of partition because of timid fears that strife again will be stirred and blood once more will flow in a land which is loved by them for its ruins more than for its rights.

Yet, common sense would indicate that wiping out the artificial barrier between people essentially the same, so that Ireland may become one and thereby stronger to meet the onrush of communism sweeping Europe, should be achieved easily around a council table in a similar manner to the effort now being made to bring long-delayed justice to Palestine.

The English Government, now extending freedom to India and Burma, can hardly argue that nearer-to-home people must be kept apart who were once united. Too recently she engaged in a war to check the divide-and-conquer policy of a foreign government which threatened by such a system to slice up and overwhelm the world.

The English Government now in power, which publicly sets such a store by its championship of the common man and lesser peoples, has an outstanding opportunity to right an ancient wrong with a minimum of dispute and win many friends. If it seizes the opportunity, another contribution will be made to world peace, and the dust of Emmet and O'Connell will rest easier. So will the dust of those other universal champions of human rights, Samuel Adams and Abraham Lincoln, who were akin to them in patriotism because they loved mankind.

Industrial Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, two great forces are at work in the United States today to destroy the principle of free enterprise. This Congress has recently passed legislation dealing with monopolistic tendencies of labor, and labor itself will be the beneficiary of that legislation, although the leadership is rebelling against it vigorously at this moment. Time will prove conclusively that Congress acted in the spirit of justice and wisdom in the passage of this legislation and labor—at least the rank and file of labor—will come to recognize that this bill is an emancipation bill taking labor itself out from under the heel of its domineering leadership.

On the other hand we have another force equally dangerous to the free enterprise system and that is the question of financial monopolies. Each succeeding month we see the resources of the Nation concentrate more and more into the hands of a limited number of people. The door is gradually closing on free enterprise. The small businessman is suffering at the hands of labor on one side and at the hands of large capital groups on the other side. It seems to me it is the duty of Congress to deal with monopoly groups in the same manner in which we have dealt with monopoly labor groups.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith the following speech made by the Honorable Robert E. Freer, member of the Federal Trade Commission, dealing with the question of monopoly as we see it in the United States today:

INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS AND THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

I

In the opinion of the average citizen the proper relationship of Government to business is one in which the Government exercises a minimum regulatory control compatible with protecting the public interest, and at the same time exerts a maximum effort

to encourage the general conditions which promote the best interests of agriculture, labor, investors, management, and public generally. To the average citizen, "the enforcement of free competition is the least regulation business can expect," but he wants the respective roles of government and business to be one of cooperation. While enduring wartime shortages he looked forward to days of plenty under a resumption of competitive selling, the resurgence of free enterprise and the relaxation of wartime controls.

To Americans it is a truism that competition fosters self-reliance, independent thinking, initiative, and ingenuity. Free enterprise is the road to business growth. Somehow business decisions made by the many impart resilience and toughness to an economic system.

We meet today on the common ground that our country needs small business; that our country cannot afford monopoly; and that facts indicative of a trend toward economic concentration and consequent lessening of competition should be carefully examined and weighed.

II

More than 1,800 formerly independent manufacturing and mining concerns have been swallowed up through merger and acquisition since 1940. Their combined asset value was $4,100,000,000, or nearly 5 percent of the total asset value of all manufacturing concerns in 1943. Moreover, it was the larger corporations each having assets of over $5,000,000 (in many instances achieved through earlier acquisitions) that accounted for some three-fourths of these recent 1,800 acquisitions.

The war contributed powerfully to the trend of concentration. Government purchases and Government financing of productive facilities were channeled predominantly into the hand of corporations which already occupied positions of dominance. Surplus profits created by such channeling have given a strong impetus to the trend by providing funds for additional wartime and postwar expansion through acquisition of former competitors. Out of $175,000,000,000 of Government-contract awards between June 1940 and September 1944, $107,000,000,000, or 61 percent, went to only 100 of the more than 18,000 corporations receiving such awards. During the war, 68 corporations received two-thirds of the $1,000,000,000 appropriated by the Government for research and development purposes in industrial laboratories.

The level of industrial concentration apparently has been raised by the disposal of surplus war facilities. Six large corporations alone, which had less than 10 percent of all manufacturing facilities in 1939, had acquired 48 percent of the value of the war plants sold as of June 30, 1946.

The most recent information on the wartime growth of concentration available from the Bureau of Internal Revenue shows that the larger manufacturing corporations, those with assets of $50,000,000 or more each, increased their share of total assets from 42 percent in 1939 to 52 percent in 1943.

An even more precipitous increase in concentration took place in the metal products industries—the field most vitally affected by the war. In these industries, corporations with $50,000,000 or more in assets increased their share of total assets from 49 percent in 1939 to 59 percent in 1943, and their proportion of gross sales from 38 to 51 percent.

The effect of war contract awards upon concentration was forecast in 1941 by the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee. That report had warned that "It is quite conceivable that the democracies might obtain a military victory over the aggressors only to find themselves under the domination of economic authority far more concentrated and influential than that which existed prior to the war" (final report, p. 3). What another war would do to extend and entrench such domination by a few over the many needs no comment.

The degree of prewar concentration in the economy as a whole and in manufacturing industries in particular was stated in the report of the Senate Small Business Committee, submitted in January 1946:

The 200 largest nonfinancial corporations owned about 55 percent of all the assets of all the nonfinancial corporations of the country.

One-tenth of 1 percent of all the corporations owned 52 percent of the total corporate assets.

Less than 4 percent of all the manufacturing corporations earned 84 percent of all the net profits of all manufacturing corporations.

More than 57 percent of the total value of manufactured products was produced under conditions where the four largest producers of each product turned out over 50 percent of the total United States output.

One-tenth of 1 percent of all the firms in the country in 1939 employed 500 or more workers and accounted for 40 percent of all the nonagricultural employment in the country.

One-third of the industrial research personnel was employed by 13 companies.

More mergers and acquisitions in the manufacturing and mining industries took place in 1946 than in any of the previous 15 years. In 1946, the number of mergers was 26 percent above the number in 1945, and 225 percent above the annual average of the years, 1940–41. Years of greatest business activity and high-price levels are the years in which the greatest number of mergers take place. In 1920, the number of mergers increased more than six times over the number during 1919. It may not be irrelevant to note that it was in March 1920 that the Supreme Court handed down its decision upholding the legality of the United States Steel Corp.'s numerous corporate acquisitions and mergers.

Beginning in 1926 the number of mergers substantially surpassed the number for 1920 and increased each year thereafter until 1929 when it reached a record figure. Again it may not be irrelevant to note that it was in November 1926 that the Supreme Court handed down its decision curtailing the power of the Federal Trade Commission to order the divestiture of stock unlawfully acquired whenever the merger was completed by an acquisition of physical assets, even though such assets were acquired as a result of the use of power obtained through unlawful stock acquisitions. In 1943 there began a new wave of mergers, which is still continuing.

The stock-market crash of 1929 which heralded the onset of the great depression was preceded by a great wave of corporate mergers and a wild speculation in their securities. Today speculation in the future of merged concerns, supported by war-swollen profits, is again operating as one of the important causes of the present upward trend in merger activity. This speculation, which stems from the expectation of greater profits resulting from the elimination of formerly competing concerns, leads inexorably to the elimination of our competitive economy and thus to the elimination of the possibility of legitimate speculation.

III

The factual diagnosis showing the relation of such presently unrestrainable corporate mergers to concentration is quite complete. Today's choice is one between legislative action recommended for many years by the Federal Trade Commission to plug this loophole in the present laws against such mergers and inviting a continued concentration leading to a frustration of our declared public policy.

In the present Congress are pending bills to amend the Clayton Act as recommended by the Commission so that acquisition by a corporation engaged in interstate commerce of the assets of a competing corporation also engaged in interstate commerce be made unlawful where the result tends to monopoly. Presently only stock (not asset) acquisitions so tending are unlawful under that act and legal actions against even such unlawful acquisitions easily may be defeated.

IV

In exploring my next point, I feel that it is desirable to make some remarks in passing concerning the Commission's general nature and current work. The Commission was established in 1914, to detect and eliminate illegal trade restraints in their incipiency. Among the restraints of trade, price fixing continues to be the most frequently recurring charge. Others falling in this category are conspiracy to boycott or threats to boycott, coercive agreements, collusive bidding, control and limitation of supply, misuse of patents and licensing agreements for monopolistic purposes, and various forms of basing point, delivered price, and zoning systems designed to eliminate price competition. In essence they are repugnant to our national policy because they are autorestraints on the commercial freedom of the parties to the detriment of the consuming public.

The basic legislative intent is that competition by individual traders must be fair as well as free. Congress wished to preserve and foster legitimate competition, but at the same time to outlaw all jungle-type excesses inherent in the struggle to get business. These laws, therefore, aim to rid our economy of evil effects flowing from individual caprice and excess of competitive zeal as well as unlawful group activities. This approach to the problem was reflected in section 2 of the Clayton Act, which proscribes discriminations in price between customers entitled to the same general treatment if such discrimination injures, prevents, or destroys competition with the grantor or the recipient, or the effect may be to lessen competition or create a monopoly. The payment or receipt of brokerage by or to the other party to the transaction is made unlawful, as is the granting of allowances or facilities on terms not proportionally equal. Other practices unlawful under the Clayton Act, which emphasize the individual approach to the end that competition be fair and free of restraints, are reflected in the banning of full line forcing and tying contracts.

The Commission is also directed to eliminate deceptive acts and practices. Deception is harmful to the best interests of both consumers and scrupulous business. In this field of the Commission's work are matters involving false and misleading advertising of commodities through misrepresentation pertaining to composition, quality, purity, origin, or attributes. The Wheeler-Lea amendments to the Federal Trade Commission Act empower the Commission to eliminate the dissemination of false advertisements for foods, drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices. The Wool Products Labeling Act, popularly known as the "truth in fabrics law," requiring informative labeling of certain fabrics also is administered by the Commission.

In the Commission there is machinery under which Government and business can cooperatively evaluate and discuss commercial practices. During the past 2 decades more than 150 industries have participated in trade practice conferences, and this phase of the Commission's work presently is receiving greater emphasis. To the greatest possible extent consistent with the public interest, the aim is to avoid the necessity of a multiplicity of formal legal proceedings. This cooperative method of wholesale prevention and elimination of practices which involve the theme of unfairness without resort to the mandatory remedies against in-

dividuals, will implement a broader program of formal proceedings to prevent monopoly and to eliminate group restraints on competitive freedom. Investigations into complaints of unlawful conduct will be made increasingly on an industry-wide basis and the aim will be to eliminate all unfair trade practices and illegal restraints of trade found in any such industry simultaneously wherever possible and under either procedure on an industry-wide basis. It is hoped that the results will inspire further confidence in the Commission's effectiveness in both fields.

V

One of the most pressing problems confronting industry and government at the present time is the matter of the present high price level. This is a subject which has received the earnest consideration of the President and of the Congress to an increasing degree in recent months. It is an elementary proposition that if price levels remain artificially high, the net result is a restriction of the real purchasing power of the consumer. The ideal situation, of course, is one in which wages and incomes remain at the highest possible level and prices at the lowest level consistent with the ability to pay high wages and earn high income. It is also a maxim of economics that under free competition and under the inexorable pressure of the law of supply and demand an artificially high price structure must in time fall of its own weight through failure of purchasing power to keep up with prices.

In the earlier days of our American economy of free enterprise, prices were highly sensitive to slight fluctuations in purchasing power and very few lines of commerce were dominated by enterprises sufficiently large as to have the ability to control and manage price levels. To illustrate, in an industry having 25 small manufacturers, all approximately of equal size, no one of them was sufficiently powerful to maintain an artificial and uneconomic price level, hence prices necessarily rose and fell with and accurately reflected purchasing power among consumers.

I have mentioned to you some of the problems which confront the American public as a result of the accelerating increase in corporate mergers. I feel very strongly that one result of this increase in corporate mergers and the concentration in fewer and fewer corporate hands of market controls has been to remove prices of many products from the arena of free competition.

The same result, namely, the removal of prices from the free play of competition, is obtained when members of an industry agree together to manage the market through restrictive contracts, patent licensing policies, or outright understandings to fix prices. A good many situations of this type can now be reached under the antitrust laws by the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice. The Commission has had numerous cases in the past few years involving this type of combination to control markets.

It has always struck me as a phenomenon of the business world that perfectly respectable men of the highest integrity and character have no hesitation about entering into a gentleman's understanding with their competitors to avoid the free play of competition in one form or another With few exceptions, these men are representative of the highest type of our citizenry, and they would be the first ones to complain bitterly about any unwarranted Government regulation of their business. And without exception these men are against monopoly and the fixing of prices as an abstract proposition of law or economics.

I appreciate full well that competition is very often a ruthless process which appears to work many individual hardships, particularly when there is a buyer's rather than a seller's market. Yet I know of no force which can be substituted for the free play of just this competition to regulate business in the public interest. Certainly all experiments looking toward permitting business to regulate itself in the sense of establishing private or even semipublic code organizations to control prices, markets, and all phases of business enterprise have failed. Nor has the Government demonstrated great ability to do that type of job. The plain truth about the matter is that men, either in government or business, have human limitations which make for inevitable serious mistakes in judgment about managed pricing which would not be made if the production and prices in that business or industry had been subject to "regulation" by the forces of free and open competition. American business is so complex and so inextricably interwoven and interlaced that there is, in my opinion, no body of men sufficiently wise or skilled to plan in advance the varied decisions that the economic necessities of free and fair competition produce naturally and with sufficient flexibility to meet any unexpected changes in market conditions.

We saw several phenomena in the great depression which indicated the inflexibility of those segments of basic industry which either by concentration of production in a few hands or by gentleman's agreement among the major producers were able to maintain the high boom price levels in a period of economic distress. These industries suffered at least as much as those in which competition forced distressed prices, and the fact that they elected to curtail production and employment rather than to reduce prices contributed directly to delaying the swing of the economic pendulum by further curtailing not only the aggregate power to consume all products but also by discouraging potential buyers from consuming their goods.

Now we are on the other side of the mountain. There are present indications that prices have outrun purchasing power. Those industries and businesses which are sensitive to the play of free and open competition will have their prices adjusted to the market as an inevitable matter. However, in those industries in which concentration has led to a managed market or where understandings to restrict or prevent competition are employed, prices may or may not adjust themselves, depending on the personal judgment of the market managers. To the extent that they elect not to reduce artificially high prices, a human blunder may be made by a few which can cause a great deal of economic suffering to the many.

I do not believe in or encourage the philosophy that it would be proper in these inflexible industries to regulate them and thereby to force price reductions by Government fiat. I do not believe that the human beings in the Government are any better equipped mentally to make such decisions of managerial discretion than are the human beings in business. The only advantage suggested for the Government making such decisions rather than private monopolists is that presumably the motivating force in the decision would be the interest of the public as a whole rather than any private or selfish interest.

If any of you think it strange that I should be resisting the principle of over-all Government regulation of business, I remind you that the basic concept of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as well as of the antitrust laws in general, is that there should be a minimum of regulation of business, and a maximum of individual freedom to compete under simple rules designed to keep competition clean and prevent artificial and monopolistic restraints or collusive agreements which suppress and eliminate the natural regulatory forces of competition.

VI

I am personally convinced that the most pressing problem facing the public today is the preservation of free and fair competition as the primary regulatory force in business. Unless businessmen themselves help to halt the forces tending toward monopoly and the vesting of control in a few hands, they will find themselves inevitably heading away from the free enterprise system which is the keystone of our American way of life. Free and fair competition is the alternative to either domination and regulation by private groups of capital or that of a paternalistic state similar to those which have arisen abroad as a substitute for the forces of the free market.

As I mentioned earlier, most businessmen will agree with this statement of mine as an abstract proposition. Yet many of them see nothing inconsistent between this proposition and their own gentleman's agreement with their competitor allocating territories in which they each will have exclusive privileges or territories or a tacit understanding that neither will raise or lower prices without consultation. To preserve competition as a primary regulatory force in America requires something more than this sort of lip service. The requirements are not too complex. They appear to be that the laws against unfair and monopolistic practices must be universally observed in letter and in spirit and that the obvious deficiencies which hamper adequate enforcement of those laws must be corrected by legislative action.

Final Passage of H. R. 3020, Hartley Labor Bill, Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from a prominent citizen of Guthrie, Okla., not in my congressional district, expressing in no uncertain terms his views and what appears to be the prevailing sentiment of the people in Oklahoma with reference to the Hartley labor bill, H. R. 3020, recently passed by the House by an overwhelming majority.

It will be noted in this letter that the author says that many members of the labor unions have expressed their approval of this bill and their hope that it will be passed in the Senate and signed by the President.

Undoubtedly, the general public is strongly in favor of the passage of this measure, and its final passage is urged, notwithstanding the fact that the President may veto the bill.

It will be remembered that the bill passed the House by a majority of more than sufficient to override the veto of the President, if the President should see fit to veto the measure. There were more democrats who voted for the measure than there were democrats who voted against it. The same was true with reference to the republican Members of the House who voted on this bill.

The letter referred to is as follows:

GUTHRIE, OKLA., *April 23, 1947.*

Hon. GEORGE SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to compliment you on voting for H. R. 3020, which is the labor regulatory law recently passed by the House. I

am in touch with quite a number of communities of Oklahoma and assure you that your action in this matter met with almost the universal approval of all voters in these districts. As a matter of fact, I have had many members of labor unions express their approval of this bill, and their hope that it will be passed in the Senate and signed by the President.

I presume from the newspaper reports that the President will veto this bill if it goes to him in the present form, and I assure you that those whom I have discussed this matter with—and they are many—are strongly of the opinion that Congress should override the veto.

There is no doubt but what many of the labor-union leaders are communistic, and also entirely antagonistic toward the form of Government we have in the United States. These leaders should not be permitted to head organizations that wield as much power as the labor unions have had during the past several years. Legislation such as is contained in H. R. 3020 should be placed on our legislative books as soon as possible.

Again thanking you for your stand recently taken in this matter, and trusting that you continue to support this bill, even though it is necessary to override the President's veto, if this should come.

Address at Memphis Cotton Carnival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during May of each year there is held in Memphis, Tenn., the Memphis Cotton Carnival. It is truly a week of pleasure combined with the very real recognition of the part that cotton plays in the economy of the Nation. Hon. Hugo Dixon, a highly successful businessman, was selected to reign as king. His queen was the very charming Betty Crump, daughter of Mr. and Mrs E. H. Crump, Jr., and the granddaughter of our most distinguished citizen, Mr. Crump, Sr.

The carnival has attained national prominence. While there is a profound dignity in connection with the large royal court and its functions, it is so democratic that the people from the Midsouth join with Memphians in active participation in all of its many-varied activities and events.

Following an annual custom, all of the luncheon clubs combine their weekly meeting into one large luncheon during this festive celebration. This year the Gavel Club, which sponsors the city-wide luncheon, honored me by an invitation to deliver the annual address. Many kind friends have requested a copy of my speech, and under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is reproduced as follows:

Twenty-five years ago I made my first appearance before a luncheon club in my city. Almost annually since I have had the honor to speak to each of your clubs. In all of that period of time none of you has ever seen me refer to notes. Today, however, stations WREC and WMC have generously made their facilities available to the Gavel Club and to the Cotton Carnival Association. My time is, therefore, restricted. To cover a wide area of thought, precise and minimum language is required. I shall not be able to tell some stories which many friends have requested.

I assure you that no courtesy which has ever been extended to me is more appreciated than this invitation to speak to such a representative group of my fellow citizens, which has not only filled this adequate room to capacity but which has overflowed it.

Particularly happy am I to be at home during Cotton Carnival Week, when the people of the Midsouth take time to recognize the very definite part that cotton plays in the economic structure of the Nation.

This is a time we review historically the efforts of the past, mingle in good fellowship with our neighbors from throughout the Midsouth, count our many blessings, and in the springtime make plans for another summer, autumn, and winter.

I join with you in greeting their majesties, the king and queen of the Cotton Carnival. It seems but yesterday that this beautiful, charming, and truly representative young southern woman, the daughter of a gracious mother and an able father, came to add another star to the influence and usefulness of both maternal and paternal grandparents. I know that her grandfather, our most distinguished citizen, Mr. Crump, is justifiably happy to see one he loves so deeply so beautifully honored by the city for which he has given his very best.

And to his majesty, the king, we pay tribute to one of our newer citizens. By his splendid character, his love for country, and his quiet zeal for the development of industry, commerce, and good citizenship, he has quietly and yet indelibly made for himself and his family a very warm place in our hearts.

We are living in the greatest, the strongest, the richest, and the most effective Nation in the world. Two years after VE-day we find in Memphis an unconquerable spirit to build a still greater city in this strategic location. One has to travel but little to recognize in Memphis all the qualities and resources on which to realize this civic goal.

During the horrible war through which we have just passed we made our substantial contribution to its successful conclusion. We sent more than 50,000 of our men and women into the active service of our Government. On the fields of battle, and in administrative places of tremendous responsibility, we had our active participants. Many failed to return.

In Memphis we built airplane parts, stored and distributed supplies of every type and character to all parts of the world. We conditioned and flew fighter aircraft to every theater of war. We produced at one time more than one-half of the smokeless gun powder needs of our allies, as well as our own.

We were the headquarters for the Second Army which trained thousands of fighting men. The Navy selected Memphis for one of its most efficient and best recognized training facilities. We cared for the sick and the injured.

We built tents, tent poles, and naval craft, and manufactured life rafts; and, for that matter gave some direct or indirect support to almost every phase of the war. Today those facilities still exist in time of peace to maintain in part, or in full, our armed services.

Our transportation facilities are superior. Our climate is excellent. We are surrounded by rich agricultural lands. Almost half of the world's minerals are found within the territory covered by the 16 Southern States.

Under the wise leadership of the carefully selected and able administrators, Hon. E. W. Hale and Mayor James Pleasants, and their colleagues, the honesty, the efficiency, and the excellence of our city and county governments are known in every part of the country.

We are proud of our plentiful supply of good water, the ownership of our public utilities, and the advantageous arrangement we have on all tax matters. We know what the third bridge over the Mississippi means to us as a gateway.

We shall not stop until our harbor development adds hundreds of acres of industrial sites to our front door. We have a clean city, a beautiful city, a city of homes and of character, a city of sound business and good government, a city of fine people motivated by high impulses and with lives dedicated to the common good. We are surrounded by neighbors with equally high ideals and inspired by the same high motives.

So then, let us turn to a brief review of our Southland generally, and then to our world responsibility as a Nation.

Up to 1810, the South led the country in manufacturing. Virginia mined the first coal ever produced in this country. Washington's father was a miner of iron ore, which he hauled to a neighboring furnace. Washington, Jefferson, and others in their day, were earnest advocates of industrial development and many of them were actively interested in industrial enterprise.

It is from the pioneer industrialists of those days that many people of the South have inherited their technical trend of thought and managerial ability.

History tells us the struggle we were caused to make upward from the devastating effects of civil war. But the furnace fires were relit. The rebuilding of the South's cotton mills and the diversification of agriculture were begun.

In 1900 the value of the South's manufactured products totaled a billion and a half dollars. By that time its manufacturing industry had displaced agriculture in leadership.

By 1945 the value of manufactured products had risen to twenty and one-half billion dollars. In manufacturing growth the South has shown a 1,200-percent gain, while the rest of the country was showing 900 percent.

Meanwhile, the products of southern agriculture. so necessary to successful industry, had grown in value from $1,000,000,000 in 1900 to $6,000,000,000. This was due mainly to the diversification of farm crops, the increase in livestock on Southern farms, and the better grades of that stock.

The demand made upon Southern farms for raw materials for the chemical industry is destined to make the South the center of chemical manufacturing.

The southern farm is a part of the South's development, by no means to be overlooked in any discussion of the Nation's future economy.

In fact, almost every day we find some new discovery from southern farm byproducts that is proving indispensable to industry through the magic of science.

In many cases private plants have been showing the way in research. Producers are now taking their problems to scientists who are making two blades of grass grow where there was only one before, and sometimes none.

However. too little thought has been given to cotton research. At this very moment the House Committee on Appropriations is considering a plea for additional funds for the establishment of adequate laboratories to study new uses for cotton. The National Cotton Council of America, with its headquarters in Memphis, is doing a perfectly splendid job in presenting this matter to the National Legislature.

I shudder to think that rayon and paper have invaded the cotton field to such an extent that paper went into two and one-half million pounds of bags, towels, gun tape, facial tissue, napkins, and spun products in 1945 in competition with cotton.

Thirty-one additional uses removed another four and a half million bales from our cotton markets. This has been caused by industrial research.

There is no foreseeable limit to the losses cotton will suffer if the disparity continues. As long as cotton lags behind in technology, the cotton farmer will be wrestling with this fundamental handicap which will weaken his competitive position, eat away his markets, and depress his income.

In time of war, cotton contributed substantially to the military strength of the Nation. We know today that it is the most useful fiber in existence.

Resources of all southern banks, trust companies, and savings institutions have increased $20,000,000,000 since 1940. Our banks today are eager and prepared to advance money for the furtherance of enterprise. No longer is the South mainly dependent upon northern capital.

Construction is expected to break all previous records. Contracts already awarded in the South during the first 3 months of 1947 totaled $341,000,000.

The Blue Book of Southern Progress reveals that the South manufactures 22 percent of the Nation's goods. It produces 48 percent of the Nation's wealth. It cuts 45 percent of the Nation's lumber. The South produces 38 percent of the total electricity used in the country.

The South produces three times as much natural gas as all the other States combined. We have in the South one of the most modern tin smelters in the world.

A home industry started in the South to make bedspreads has now become a multimillion-dollar business. Hunko, Bruce Flooring, Plough Chemical, and Hunter Fans are multimillion dollar businesses. The Memphis Firestone Co. is the largest plant under one roof in the world manufacturing automobile tires.

There are approximately 40,000 manufacturing plants in the South today. Most of the raw materials for these products come from our own area.

In spite of this, however, many raw materials and farm products are still shipped outside the South for processing. Even more important, most of its presently processed products are shipped elsewhere to be manufactured into finished articles.

There is no reason why airplanes, automobiles, electric motors, steam engines, radios, and precision tools should not be completely finished in our own territory. The South is now ready to adopt and nourish enterprise of this kind.

Our social structure is now ripe for the development of industry which will convert into finished products all of our natural resources.

There is growing discontent of the manufacturers in the overcrowded areas of the North and East. This dissatisfaction stems from many causes, not the least of which are subversive labor influences, work stoppages, high taxes, and discriminatory State legislation.

The South offers advantages to industry that cannot be equaled in other sections of the country. It has the raw materials, a favorable climate, an abundant supply of loyal, intelligent labor, a diversified economy in both agricultural pursuits and industrial enterprises, ample electric power and transportation facilities—and, above all, an increasing desire to capitalize on these assets.

Now, what of conditions in Europe?

Two years after VE-day and its liberation the wasted continent bewails its insecurity. Political quarrels divide its leaders. Economic evils beset its peoples. War has ended, but there is no peace.

Yet, on the outer edges and the back reaches there are signs of recovery.

Much of the prolonged convalescence from war sickness has been due to elemental shortages—shortages of food, clothing, and shelter. These have been supplied in the main from the United States.

Europe will be strong again when it can, for the most part, feed, clothe, and house itself. Signs of recovery, by that formula, first appear in the farms, fields, and forests.

The recital of the troubles of Europe's peoples—the woes of the little man—from north to south and east to west differs only in the language in which it is spoken.

Britain, its coal supplies shorter this year than ever before, its rations cut below wartime levels, its housing inadequate to serve millions now out of uniform, grumbles most noisily.

The scene is definitely optimistic in Yugoslavia. Here the people have spent 2 postwar years in an all-out fight for reconstruction.

Denmark does well by comparison—as do the other Scandinavian countries. Bread is rationed. The shop windows are full, but the goods appear to be of inferior quality.

Sweden was rocking along in its usual plump fashion until a dollar crisis forced an import shut down. Now, the Swedes seem confused.

Norway has made a remarkable come-back. Across the Odor and Neisse, the Poles, like the Yugoslavs, are busy rebuilding homes, industry, and farms. Through UNRRA, and other outside aid, they have avoided a food crisis. Inflation still grips the cities.

Political disagreement is rife and Poles are waiting to see just how many of their liberties are insured by the new constitution now being drafted. On foreign affairs the Poles are united in a demand that Germany be forever kept impotent and the southern boundaries of the New Poland remain unchanged.

France, in typical French fashion, is a tempest In the cities the black market is the most important factor. Against it, the Government is bringing its weight to bear slowly, but steadily. Dealings in foreign currency are becoming less and less lucrative. Prices ostensibly have been lowered 10 percent, but there is a definite inflation. Politics is the spice of life.

Italy is bitter about her fate. Despite her eleventh-hour switch over to the Allies, Italy knows the taste of defeat in the loss of colonies, territory, naval might, and reparations. She is still host to American and British soldiers—and wishes they would go home.

Germany is vastly unhappy. For most of the war the German lived well, so he feels the hunger and misery today most sharply. He is preoccupied in a search for clothes, shoes, and shelter.

Few Germans feel like working hard because their wages, virtually worthless, buy little and are slashed deeply by taxes. In the cities the ruins stand grim and foreboding. The Great Powers let the months go by without agreement on his future, and the German tends to forget that Hitler and the Nazis were responsible. Today he blames the democracies for his troubles.

Russians feel politically better because of the stature their nation has assumed in world councils.

Unemployment is unknown in the land of the Soviets. Encouraged by the successful, though costly, results of the war, the country remains under the domination of about 3 percent of its population. Under this socialistic and highly communistic state, there is no real proprietorship, no home ownership, no freedom, nor individual initiative. In all of the public utterances of its leaders, we have grave forewarnings of their deep-rooted ideology. All too well do we know how thoroughly their agents have sought and are now trying to indoctrinate communism in our own great country. I wish time permitted a more thorough treatment of Russia and our relations.

So it is 2 years after this horrible war. We find noisy complaints in the crowded cities across the whole of Europe. We still have general discomfort and privation for millions. Yet men closest to the soil and the sea have high hopes. The little man works and waits for a peaceful security.

Today we are entering an area in which we in the United States, whatever we might wish, find ourselves in a new position and with a new role in the community of nations. That position is the position of the most powerful nation on earth. That role is a role of service and leadership—the only role that befits a leading player on a world stage.

The tragedies of history are the tragedies for the misuse of power, and historians never tire of pointing out that the decline of nations and civilization inevitably and logically fall from the fatal possession of great power without the exercise of great leadership.

Through the wise use of power we can—we must—profit by the lessons of history. We must not for a moment relax our vision. Power must not for a moment be left idle like money in an old sock. It must be used constantly and wisely to fortify the friends of peace everywhere in the world, and thereby to fortify ourselves.

We must be willing to face hard, cold, disagreeable facts. We can afford to and must hold our idealism and our principles high, but we must keep our feet firmly planted on the ground and not be afraid to recognize facts. This is no time for moral anesthesia. The lessons of history must not be too soon forgotten.

It is high time that America paused for a moment to take stock, to ask ourselves whither our folly is leading us; and, most importantly, to count our many blessings. The race of selfishness is on, and it is being run at breath-taking, neck-breaking speed. The dust it has stirred up seems to have blinded us to the reality that of all the peoples in the world we are the most fortunate. But are we humble and grateful? The answer is a tragic, but emphatic "No."

Instead of prayerfully thanking the Great Provider who has seen fit to make this a land of plenty, we thoughtlessly cram our garbage cans daily with food for which the dying plead, but in vain. America should take heed. We are not immune to drought. Nature has not endowed us with a positive guaranty against famine. And "Willful waste, depend upon it, brings almost always woeful want" may be words more true than poetry.

Pressure groups are on the march. Those who possess an unfair advantage over others fight to keep what they have and strive to acquire more. We have more food than any other country on earth and more money than we know how to use wisely. But we are not satisfied. Instead of realizing our good fortune and being thankful for it, we fight each other for more.

We contrive black markets to circumvent fair prices, oblivious to their awful consequences in the destruction of character and the disrespect for law and order which they engender.

I know of no time, since you elected me to represent you in Congress, when the Members were more studious in approaching the Nation's problems.

After the war those who think at all recognized that the cost of government had to be reduced and the reduction had to be made quickly. The President himself took more than $5,000,000,000 out of current budget demands before submitting it to the Congress. Many in the House think that it can be reduced by an additional six billion. The Senate has suggested a reduction of four and one-half billion.

It is not easy to reduce the national budget. Two out of every three dollars to be spent in the next fiscal year, under the budget submitted by the President, will be necessary to do only three things: (1) Support our armed forces, (2) to pay the interest alone on the public debt, which provides no reduction in the debt itself, and (3) to take care of promised assistance to veterans of all of our wars. The rest of that budget must pay for all other Government services.

Democrats and Republicans alike have long come to expect many of these services from their Government. Some of the services are more economical in the long run than would be their elimination from our national life.

In the next 60 days it must be decided whether the country will have tax reduction alone, or tax reduction with debt retirement. If we get tax reduction without taking it from Government spending, or if we get it without some corresponding curtailment in the huge $250,000,000,000 national debt, I think we will be open to the charge of unsound fiscal policy.

Budget cutting will be necessary to cover one or both of these steps.

If we had the same efficiency and expert planning in our Federal Government which we have in our city and county governments in Memphis, thousands of unnecessary employees might be released, services combined and concentrated, and still other services discontinued.

We must put the house of our National Government in order with sound business principles of economy and efficiency.

It is to be hoped that during this session we will be able to see a substantial payment on our debt and at the same time afford some tax relief.

Much depends on the total national income at the end of this fiscal year and the prospects for its continuance into the next fiscal year.

John L. Lewis has been a national figure for many years. He blazed an unfair trail for the honest working man. Lewis has committed an almost irreparable injury to labor, and of course industry and the people of America have suffered. Unfortunately, other high ranking labor leaders have followed on through with him. The people are demanding some correction. The great majority of Congress recognizes this fully. The pendulum went too far. It is bound to swing back, and I hope eventually this swing will be fair both to labor and to management.

We must find some way to recognize the nobility and dignity of labor, the necessity and the importance of capital and management, and, in a sense of justice and fair play, seek the way to get along with each other.

We must have production if we are to build homes for the veterans, house the millions of others who are without shelter, and construct factories and plants to provide employment.

We cannot be an isolated Nation. To maintain our own strength, our ideals, and our way of life, we must have a firm and fixed foreign policy. We must leave in the corners of our fields something to be gleaned and distributed to the starving peoples of the world.

It is a profound necessity that we aid our allies who are struggling to their feet. We must help our friends in their fight against communism.

No longer in the country should we permit community-property tax assessments in nine of our States and deny that formula to the rest of us.

We must tax cooperatives on the same basis that we now tax other recognized businesses. Cooperatives have a rightful place in our economy. The present inequitable and preferred position they now have must be removed.

Surely, there is much to be done. I feel, as you do, that our country has the character, the intelligence, the resources, and the genius to ever remain great. But, in closing, we must be reminded that our country has been strong because we have been a Christian nation.

Some years ago on an Easter morning, I took my younger son and one of his pals, an English boy temporarily residing in this country, to a sunrise meeting at Arlington National Cemetery. As we sat there in that beautiful amphitheater among some 35,000 people, we watched the beautiful sun break over the horizon in the east.

The services were about to begin. In the distance, the Knights Templar were marching to their places behind a military band which was playing softly "Onward Christian Soldiers."

Almost instantly, there appeared at the box immediately to the right of the speaker's stand an old man in uniform, on the arm of a handsome young military aide. The old gentleman's overcoat, so seldom used, was much too large to protect the frail body on which it hung. Without a spoken word, every man, woman, and child in that vast audience rose quietly to their feet.

This great old soldier stood erect and cast his eyes from left to right and, almost in painful silence, minutes seem to pass as he stood looking over that throng of people. He sat down. I could not help but think that he was acknowledging humbly the quiet recognition of his fellow countrymen for his marvelous leadership in the last war.

I said to these two boys: "You have been privileged to participate in a most dramatic scene. That was Gen. John J. Pershing, the General of the Armies. We just stood in recognition of our admiration, respect, and love for a great soldier. In a moment we shall stand again, but this time in recognition of the great Prince of Peace."

My friends, in deep humility and with earnest sincerity, we must—as individuals—and as a nation—stand up for the great teachings brought us by the Saviour of the World.

We must have the heart and the vision and the will to build our country greater upon the fundamental teachings of the one who gave us the two great commandments: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind."

When Will Congress Put Teeth in Federal Mine Inspection Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago a great tragedy shocked the Nation—111 coal miners lost their lives in an explosion in Mine No. 5 at Centralia, Ill.

A great wave of indignation swept the country over circumstances that led up to the disaster. Congress, rightfully, was disturbed. So much that in those first few days following the tragedy one would be led to believe that it would act with unusual rapidity to put teeth into the Federal Mine Inspection Law—correcting an error of omission of a few years previous when it deleted enforcement provision at the time of the passage of the law.

I am not going into the details—the whys and the wherefores for the deleting of the most important provision of an act of such a nature. It is enough to comment that the Congress seemed to recognize its error on the morning after the Centralia disaster. We are 2 months away from mine No. 5—yet no action has been taken on recommendations that the Federal Government be given the authority to properly enforce the provisions of the Federal Mine Inspection Law.

On April 1, 1947, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] introduced H. R. 2907, a bill to amend the act relating to safety in coal mines. This legislation would put the teeth back in the Federal Mine Inspection Law.

One would have thought this bill would be granted the right-of-way and would have the earliest possible consideration of the Congress.

I understand the bill has been referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor and is awaiting hearings. What hearings are necessary in the light of years of study on this matter and in the light of many disasters which have occurred in our Nation's mines for the lack of such legislation? Personally, I feel that what the coal miners desire to see in this instance is less hearings and more action.

I cannot urge upon the Members of Congress too strongly the necessity for immediate action in this matter. It isn't like considering a question suddenly thrown upon us—this is a matter which the majority of us believe should have been settled long ago.

While we plead for prompt action in Congress, we also recognize the great responsibility of the States. In this connection, I include with my remarks these four recommendations of the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch to make mines safe:

First. Take inspectors out of politics.

Second. Outlaw political contributions by coal companies and all other corporations.

Third. Make failure to comply with State safety laws a felony.

Fourth. Bring the guilty to justice.

And, in further connection with the subject of attempting to place responsibility for mine disasters, I also include an editorial from the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times of May 19, 1947. It follows:

NO REAL FAULT TO FIND?

Except for possibilities inherent in two indictments suppressed pending arrests, it begins to look as if the Centralia mine disaster—which killed 111 men—may be written off as just one of those unfortunate things for which nobody really is to be seriously brought to task.

Sitting in Nashville, Ill., the Washington County grand jury yesterday returned four indictments—the two which were suppressed and two others in which the Centralia Coal Co. was accused of neglecting to comply with the State mine safety code. In case of conviction, the latter two might result in fines of quite as much as $500 each.

Will public indignation tolerate such an ending of a case whose every aspect is surcharged with the odor of scandal? If men could be sent to prison in connection with an accidental circus tent fire a few years ago, will not punishment be demanded in a case in which expert testimony has shown violations of responsibility to have been so much more flagrant?

Has nobody been moved by the vain pleas of the doomed miners to Governor Green to save their lives? Has nobody been impressed by the testimony of State and Federal mine inspectors as to the gross neglect of safety provisions in Centralia No. 5? Has nobody been moved by the story that inspectors were asked to solicit funds for the Illinois Republican political machine?

It was bad enough that the Republican majority members of an Illinois legislative investigating committee should undertake to wield the whitewash brush even when its Democratic members walked out in protest. Illinois politicians are callous, but one had hoped that the machinery of the law would work for an accounting from those whom political togas were ready to cover up. It is not known what manner of evidence was presented to the grand jurors—but in view of what already is in the public record about the Centralia tragedy, the indictments are a bitter disappointment. On the face of things, justice will stand side-tracked if no more intensive effort is made to place responsibility where it belongs.

Nor will such a failure be forgotten—at least not by the miners. If in the future they balk sullenly, it will be in good part because the official community has shown such indifference to what happened in mine No. 5. The seeds of resentment will be planted deep. And their growth will be speeded by water used to wash guilty hands.

Postal Service Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, the brazen efforts of some postmasters to discredit this Congress have been mentioned several times in the House, but I think it well that such efforts on the part of civil-service employees of the Government be given all practicable publicity. I believe also that the quick grasp of the real situation by our newspaper editors should be given due publicity, for it is only by recognizing the true value of the press, and by acknowledging our appreciation therefor, that we can expect such understanding of our efforts as is set forth in the following articles from the two largest newspapers of Long Beach, Calif.:

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of May 9, 1947]

POSTAL SERVICE POLITICS

Fifty-eight substitute postal clerks and 34 substitute carriers have been dropped from service in Long Beach.

Working hours of 80 clerks have been reduced from 8 to 4 daily.

The post office will be closed Saturday, and there will be no Saturday mail deliveries.

A population of more than a quarter of a million is deprived of adequate postal service. The clerks and carriers laid off were needed to handle efficiently the enormously increased volume of Long Beach mail, up 30 percent above the estimates for this year.

The local curtailment of postal service followed the Post Office Department's reply to the request for an additional $30,000 to maintain full service here that the Long Beach office must operate on funds already allotted. The postmaster here had no alternative. Other cities of the country are similarly affected.

When the public asks why it is deprived of the service to which it is entitled by the failure to retain a sufficient postal force in Long Beach, the answer given is "politics."

It is politics.

But whose politics?

An effort is being made to pin on the Republican Congress the responsibility for cutting down the postal service. The propaganda is that the GOP majority in Congress forced the curtailment by failing to appropriate enough money to run the post office properly.

Congressman BRADLEY, of Long Beach, makes known the facts of the case. The deficiency appropriation needs for postal service had not been submitted to Congress prior to reduction of the postal force here, although the President yesterday did ask for an additional $10,924,000 to operate the Post Office Department until June 30.

Neither Post Office Department nor Budget Bureau, an agency working under the President, had made requests for deficiency post-office appropriations in time to prevent the cutting down of service in Long Beach.

The Post Office Department at Washington is responsible for the partial break-down of local postal service. Apparently it preferred to wait for the exhaustion of the fund, in order to play politics with the situation by charging Congress with false economy, rather than to take whatever action was necessary to carry on efficient service.

It is pertinent to remark that Postmaster General Hannegan also is chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent of May 11, 1947]

CURTAILED POSTAL SERVICE

A favorite trick of bureaucratic government is for a department to curtail some vital service to the people so as to amass public opinion in favor of giving that department more money. When the department is called upon to curtail expenses and cut down personnel, it is the more important services the public is told must be curtailed. No effort is made to cut down nonessential expenses so as to cut down the tax burden on the people. An example of this pressure method was demonstrated here by the postmaster telling the people postal service must be drastically curtailed.

The inference was that Congress had refused to provide funds to pay the cost of greatly increased service to a growing population. It is apparent no request had been made for these funds to Congress. But strangely enough postmasters in separate sections of the country put on this pressure simultaneously at a time when the Post Office Department was about to make its plea for additional funds.

The postal service has always operated at a loss due to the subsidies it grants newspapers, magazines, catalogs and hundreds of other types of mail carried at second-, third-, and fourth-class rates. But the losses are probably much greater than necessary due to the fact that postmasters are strictly political appointees chosen for party loyalty rather than for their executive ability. The Postmaster General is usually the political boss of the party in power. The postmaster jobs are usually his payoff for party loyalty in each community.

The recent announcement of postmasters throughout the country that service must be curtailed because of a lack of funds is an example of political expediency. The Post Office budget is about to be passed. Fearing a cut in funds, it appears the people were to be shocked into demanding that the Post Office Department be given all the money for which it asked. It is perfectly timed. But it is almost too obvious to be convincing.

Each department of government is jealous of its powers. To cut off employees reduces the power of executives and the political favoritism that builds machines. We are told requests for additional funds here have been refused, so many services must be curtailed. At the same time our Congressman WILLIS BRADLEY and Senator BRIDGES point out that no request for additional funds had been made. But 2 days later the President did ask for additional funds. It appears the local postmasters were to put on the pressure at the psychological time.

The people, who are called on for more taxes to pay its deficit, have a right to expect a thorough investigation of these pressure methods. It has occurred in other Government departments seeking to maintain expensive services and staffs. It is the natural tendency of bureaucratic government which if allowed to go unchallenged will bankrupt even a rich nation. Private business is finding it necessary to curtail its expenses because the economic system is stabilizing. Government agencies must do likewise because the people cannot continue paying high taxes and maintain high purchasing power.

Meantime Long Beach with its increased population must have increased postal personnel. But the increased population means proportionately increased income. Thus the post office department is at fault if it fails to provide adequate funds. The local postmaster would have had much more sympathy from the public had his sudden curtailment not been announced simultaneously with blasts from over the Nation, some of which came from localities that have not had the population increase we have had. The public cannot help but feel that it was a well-planned campaign to pressure Congress into granting budget increases sought by the Post Office Department.—L. A. C.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent of May 8, 1947]

CHAMBER DEMANDS POST OFFICE INQUIRY

A congressional investigation of post office department activities was demanded last night by the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce following a drastic curtailment of local postal service by Postmaster Howard K. Goodwin.

A telegram sent by the chamber to Congressman WILLIS W. BRADLEY charged the curtailment was "political shenanigans" and urged the Representative to ask a complete investigation.

Goodwin announced Wednesday that Saturday carrier service was being discontinued and that the main office and all branches would be closed on that day because of the lay-off of 92 substitute carriers and clerks.

FUND REQUEST REFUSED

The discharges were necessary, the postmaster said, because a request for an additional $30,000 to operate the local office until July 1, the end of the fiscal year, had been refused by the Post Office Department.

In an earlier telegram, Congressman BRADLEY wired his local office that curtailment of postal service was a "move to discredit Congress."

Goodwin said he had "no comment" to make on BRADLEY's telegram. He could not be reached after the chamber communication had been made public.

BRADLEY said that Congress was not involved in the shortage because "the administration has not requested deficiency appropriations to cover supposed needs." (President Truman later asked Congress to appropriate $10,924,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year, however.)

LESS THAN 1 PERCENT

The local Congressman also pointed out that the 1948 post office appropriation bill passed by the House was cut less than 1 percent, the smallest of any yet passed.

The chamber telegram, signed by Manager D. W. Campbell, also charged that in addition to the Saturday shut-down, "no second-, third-, or fourth-class mail is being delivered."

"Just talked with Postmaster Goodwin," Campbell continued, "who states 'through lack of funds it has been necessary for me to curtail mail service in this city.' I asked

if he had requested additional funds, but he did not answer."

Goodwin previously told reporters his request had been turned down.

The 92 carriers and clerks, mostly veterans, were discharged this week, the postmaster said.

Battleship "Oklahoma"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, recently the dismantled battleship *Oklahoma* took its final plunge in the Pacific. It was on its way from Pearl Harbor to the Pacific coast to be salvaged. Those of us who live in Oklahoma deeply mourn its loss.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times under date of May 19, 1947, entitled "Farewell to the *Oklahoma*":

FAREWELL TO THE "OKLAHOMA"

The plunge of the dismantled *Oklahoma* into the ocean deeps marks the last ripple from the churned and bloody waters of Pearl Harbor. If it was a kind of second death for the old battleship it was at least free from the cruel slaughter that darkened her first.

The *Oklahoma* was launched under an unlucky star. That was way back in 1914, on the eve of the First World War. She and her sister ship, the *Nevada*, were then the pride of the American Navy. Both were superdreadnaughts which had everything, the most powerful arms and armor the time could supply. Both survived two wars, the *Nevada* after fearful punishment to close a glorious career at Bikini, but the *Oklahoma* only as a tragic cripple. She never fired a shot in anger. The only brush she ever had with another vessel was with a railroad barge in Bremerton harbor. Under the surprise attack at Pearl Harbor she went down in 11 minutes, her hull pierced by five Japanese torpedoes. Many of her crew fell at their battle stations or drowned in their bunks. The Navy was determined to raise her and did, but it was too late to refit her for a war in which she had become hopelessly obsolete.

Perhaps it is better for the battered hulk to drowse forever in lonely waters than to be pecked to pieces on the scrap-heap. Poets and old warships themselves seem to think so. Britain's famous fighter, the *Warspite*, and our *Oklahoma*, both on their way to the breaking yards, appeared bent on dying at sea. In the 31 years since she was commissioned the *Oklahoma* trained many thousands to avenge her from other decks. All who are left alive will mourn the ship that never had a chance.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters and telegram all supporting Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill:

THE AMERICAN
VETERANS COMMITTEE, INC.,
Cambridge, Mass., May 17, 1947.

Congressman JOHN KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KENNEDY: The Cambridge Chapter of the American Veterans Committee has voted unanimously to reiterate its stand in favor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and to oppose the Wolcott bill in the House of Representatives.

Our chapter is grateful to you for the deep concern you have shown in the disaster proportions of the present housing emergency, and for the courage to suggest doing something about it. We hope that there will ultimately be enough of like mind to constitute a majority, and we hope, somewhat more apprehensively, that this occurs before it is too late.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. CONLEY,
Chairman, Housing Committee.

CAMBRIDGE VETERANS HOUSING COUNCIL,
Cambridge, Mass., May 15, 1947.

Congressman JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KENNEDY: The Cambridge Veterans Housing Council wishes to express its appreciation of your interest in and understanding of the critical nature of the housing emergency, as evidenced by your attending the MAVHC rally of May 11, 1947.

Our Council, composed of Posts of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jewish War Veterans, AMVETS, and AVC, is strongly in favor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and opposed to the Wolcott bill. We wish to be so recorded and to urge your continued efforts in our behalf.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. JOSEPH,
Chairman.

Representative JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Cambridge AMVETS Post, No. 33, strongly supports Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing bill.

FRANCIS L. MCCANN,
Adjutant.

Army Waste Charges Confirmed by Servicemen on the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I charged that we had entirely too many civilian employees in the War Department and that there is and has been a tremendous amount of waste in the armed forces, even since the cessation of hostilities. Apparently what I said, and it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, met with some approval in the Pacific area. The following is a clipping from the Pacific Stars and Stripes of April 9, 1947. Several of these clippings have been sent me by boys in the service at Tokyo and other places in Japan. Some of these are War Department civilian employees and some of them are military personnel.

SCHWABE CHARGES TAXPAYER MONEY WASTED BY ARMY—REPUBLICAN OF OKLAHOMA HITS ARMY FOR USELESS SWIVEL-CHAIR OPERATORS

WASHINGTON, April 9.—Representative GEORGE SCHWABE, Republican, of Oklahoma, said today there are "thousands of swivel-chair operators" in the Army who are not needed.

"If they are not dropped, and if this waste and extravagance is not eliminated by our armed forces," he said in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, "it is the duty of Members of Congress to see that they are eliminated as fast as such conditions come to the attention of Congress."

SCHWABE contended that extravagance by the armed services continues at an inexcusable rate even to this late day.

He quoted a letter from a lawyer friend saying he was employed by the War Department to be an attorney in the Philippine Islands or Japan.

SCHWABE said that upon reaching Manila the attorney was immediately declared surplus and told to return to the United States. Several other lawyers, he said he was told, also made the trip, only to be informed they were not needed.

"If the public could only begin to realize, and if the taxpayers were only made aware of the typical extravagance of the War Department such as was narrated in the letters from my friend, I think the people would change their minds and insist that their representatives in Congress take steps to eliminate many forms of waste and extravagance now indulged in by the Department," SCHWABE said.

The following is a letter from a War Department civilian employee in Tokyo, who sent me the above clipping, and it shows how some of them feel about the waste and extravange that is altogether too apparent there. I quote:

Note enclosed clipping from local papers. I'm surprised they printed it here.

May I wish you every success in stamping out this waste and inefficiency. I am a War Department civilian employee here and the waste and bungling are, I feel, far in excess of normal and reasonable. Top-rank visitors over here don't see the junk piles and storage depots and lots full of damaged, unidentifiable, abandoned, and misused stuff left to rot while many units are in want and more is ordered for replacement.

Hence, I think I am justified in saying that the Army waste charges have been confirmed by men on the job.

The Oath at the Elbe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, what has happened to our country?

It was such a short time ago, just 2 years, that our newspapers were filled with blazing headlines as the Allied armies swept victoriously through France and the Lowlands into Germany, while from the east our Russian allies came across the Polish plains, through the Carpathian Mountains, and up through the Danube Valley and squeezed

our Nazi enemies as we squeezed from the west.

Who now remembers the meeting at the Elbe?

I do for one; and I am proud to say that a resident of my congressional district is Joseph P. Polowsky, who on April 25, 1945, was one of the six American soldiers to cross the Elbe River in a small boat to meet our allies, the Russians, on the eastern shore.

Mr. Polowsky has written touchingly and intelligently of that meeting under the title of The Oath at the Elbe. His story is a stirring plea for peace and understanding.

Under consent granted me, I insert his article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and urge the Members, who are now so forgetful of the exaltation of victory, to read it and bring back some of that great spirit we seem to have lost:

THE OATH AT THE ELBE

Two years ago, April 25, 1945—the day of the opening of the first session of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco—six American soldiers crossed the Elbe River in a small boat, signalizing the military junction of two great allies of the Second World War: the United States and the Soviet Union. The 6 American soldiers, members of a 28-man infantry patrol under the leadership of Lt. Albert Kotzebue, of Houston, Tex., having left the forward American lines west of the Elbe the previous afternoon with the mission of finding a common meeting ground with the Russian Army, thrust through the 30-mile no-man's land between the Russian and American lines. At 11:30 in the morning, April 25, Lieutenant Kotzebue's patrol—followed later in the day by two other American patrols—successfully contacted the forward Russian lines on the east bank of the Elbe. A half hour later, at noon, the river crossing by the six American soldiers heralded the link-up of Gen. Courtney H. Hodges' United States First Army and Marshal Ivan S. Koniev's First Ukranian Army, successfully consummating a great common American and Russian endeavor and unity of purpose and interest.

April 25, 1945, the historic day of the military junction of the two great allies in Europe, the day of the opening of the first session of the United Nations in San Francisco, marked a high point in American-Russian relations. The 2 years which have elapsed have seen a precipitous deterioration of relations between the two great wartime allies. The disappointments and misunderstandings of the past 2 years have charged the atmosphere with distrust and recrimination. The remembrance of a happier day when, as trusting wartime allies, they met on a common field of battle, met with hope and enthusiasm at a common conference to help set up the postwar structure, has been almost forgotten.

Unless some great positive and wholehearted demonstration of conciliation, trust and confidence takes place in the near future, the issues which separate the nations will become irreconcilable. A great primary act of enthusiasm and confidence which can ease the present tension and reverse the present ruinous trend must come from the remembrance, celebration and regeneration of the spirit of a spring day in 1945 when they met, with high expectation, as brothers at the Elbe and in San Francisco.

We must, all of us—Americans, Russians, and all other peace-loving peoples of the world—ardently hope that April 25 will be set up as a day of friendship and conciliation among nations, and that it be celebrated by all men and women of good will in all countries and areas.

On April 25, 1945, addressing the delegates meeting in session at the first United Nations Conference in San Francisco, President Harry S. Truman of the United States said:

"We approach our task humbly, but with united resolution. The prayers of the people of the world are with us. They are spoken in many tongues and in the words of many creeds. But they are as one voice, rising from the tragedy and suffering of war, in prayer for lasting peace.

"Thus, fortified, and with the guidance of Almighty God, we must and shall fulfill the purpose for which we have come together."

Approaching their task humbly but with united resolution, the American and Russian soldiers grouped at the Elbe on April 25, 1945, were also attempting to fulfill the purpose for which they had come together.

On the evening of April 22, 1945, a last German engineer platoon, retreating in panic westward, had blown the span over the Elbe at Strela. A half hour later a civilian wagon train of some 200 old men, women, and children, streaming westward, and stopped by the blown bridge, had encamped for the night, huddled in a 200-yard radius semicircle about the bridgehead. At 1 in the morning, April 23, the advancing Russians saw lights flickering at the bridgehead from a 2-mile range. Believing German military units were engaged for a last stand, they heavily bombarded the bridgehead with artillery and mortars. At dawn the Russians fanned out north and south of Strela to mop up German remnants.

At 11:30 in the morning, April 25—2 days later—Lieutenant Kotzebue's patrol reached the west bank of the Elbe at Strela. Upon being recognized by the Russians on the east bank of the Elbe, they prepared for a crossing. The span over the Elbe was, of course, blown. The only means available for the crossing was an old wooden boat moored to the shore. The Elbe, flooded by spring rains, was a swift-running river. In order to avoid being swept downstream when making their crossing, the Americans moved the boat some hundred yards up the stream in order to be swept by the river into a 50-yard remnant of the bridge jutting out from the east bank of the Elbe. Achieving their objective, the six American infantrymen raced over the remains of the span jutting out from the east bank, crossed the river at noon, and were greeted by the Russians.

The greetings took place in the midst of some 200 corpses of old men, women, and children. After the preliminary greetings, they, all of them—Americans and Russians—looked down at the bodies and fragments of bodies—especially the body of a child with blue eyes and long brown hair clutching play crayons in one hand and a doll in the other.

At this historic moment of the meeting of nations, all of the soldiers present—Americans and Russians—solemnly swore that they would do everything in their power to prevent such things from ever happening in the world again, and that the nations of the world would and must live at peace.

The time has come for the nations of the world to reaffirm that solemn oath at the Elbe.

As one of the six American infantrymen to make the boat crossing over the Elbe 2 years ago, as one of the American and Russian soldiers to take the oath at the Elbe, I believe I voice something of the thoughts and feelings of all of us in this critical hour.

I therefore call upon the nations of the world for a new birth of conciliation and friendship, that the oath sworn on that hallowed blood-soaked ground shall not have been taken in vain.

JOSEPH P. POLOWSKY.

April 15, 1947.

The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include in my remarks the following editorial entitled "The American Way" which appeared in yesterday's New York Post:

THE AMERICAN WAY

Wherever American GI's went in Burma, England, France, Iran, and even Germany, one sight never failed to stop them and turn their minds from war—a ragged, hungry, wandering child. GI Joe emptied his pockets, gave away his K ration, handed over his spare undershirt.

He was doing what comes naturally to tough young Americans unspoiled by soft living. Right out there in the wreckage, where the mines had just been cleared to the shoulders of the roads, GI Joe knew he'd find a way to feed and clothe himself, just as he'd dodge those snipers. He knew, too, that the child huddled against the wall couldn't. It was just as simple as that.

Those children are an awfully long way from Washington. In the lobbies of the Senate and the House, impressive with marble, mahogany, and plush, decorous with polite page boys and low voices, it could have been easy to forget.

Somehow or other, some echo of the spirit of GI Joe did get there, though. The conference committee voted 9 to 1 to appropriate the full $350,000,000 that President Truman asked for relief and earmarked $40,000,000 of it for the United Nations international children's emergency fund. Now all that's needed is a final vote of Congress. Then the help to 20,000,000 kids can begin.

Congress, however, has a long way to go before the Members can go home satisfied that they've done as good a job in their field as GI Joe did in his. There are many objectives to be taken and positions to be consolidated. And the only death or injury the Representatives and Senators need fear as punishment for failure is political.

Right now in Europe are 850,000 people who are living in camps of jerry-built wooden barracks, Nissen huts or patched-up houses behind barbed wire. They're called "displaced persons."

Some of our legislators in Washington think they know a great deal about them, and most of it just isn't so.

Some think most of these people don't want to go home because they like living in comparative idleness in these camps, eating mass-cooked food, wearing clothes that don't fit, surrounded by a hostile population, with no family life worth mentioning and no future. Those who stay cannot face religious, racial, or political hate. They want free air to breathe, just as did the fathers and grandfathers of many of us who now are called not displaced persons but Americans.

Others think these camp dwellers are Communists or criminals. That is not so. Soviet Russia and her satellites fought in the Refugee Committee of the United Nations a year ago to force most of these men and women to return to Soviet-dominated or conquered areas. Many, far from being criminals, have records of having fought for years against the darkest criminal organization of history—the Nazi organization.

Still others believe that only displaced persons from northern Europe can be of

any use elsewhere. That, of course, is the Nazi doctrine, and the record of every community in America refutes it.

Least sensible of all, some of our legislators think this country has no need for our share of these people, they who are farmers, heavy workers, skilled artisans, domestic servants, anxious and eager to tackle hard and dangerous tasks, just as immigrants to this country have done for generations.

For a long time now we have been asking Congress to open the doors to some of these people. We have urged Congress to get the United Nations International Refugee Organization going and, as our part, pass the Stratton bill to admit 400,000 immigrants—less than half the number of Europeans who could have entered under the quota system if Hitler's war hadn't blocked the way. Recently, the Herald Tribune, in a powerful and irrefutable series of editorials, has called for this simple act of justice.

Now, on June 4, the House Judiciary Committee has scheduled a hearing on the bill. Every organization that has faith in our country's traditions of freedom and opportunity should insist upon being heard in favor of this bill. That's the American way.

Footnote on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House to two interesting and informative dispatches by the Associated Press. These two stories appeared on the same day and on the same page of the Washington Post issue for Sunday, May 18.

The first article is as follows:

NET INCOME OF 322 FIRMS AVERAGES 112.9 PERCENT OVER 1946

NEW YORK, May 17.—Net income averaging 112.9 percent above that of the like 1946 period has been reported for the first quarter of 1947 by 322 of the companies having common stock listed on the New York Stock Exchange, a compilation in the exchange's monthly publication disclosed today.

This improvement was shared by 261 of the reporting companies. Of the remainder, 48 showed some profit while not performing as well as a year ago, and 13 reported no profit.

The publication pointed out that the results cover only about one-third of the total of listed corporations on the exchange.

The second article is as follows:

ACTIVE STOCKS DROP TO NEW 2-YEAR LOWS

NEW YORK, May 17.—The stock market today emerged from its heaviest losing week since last September with a further nosedive to a new average low for better than 2 years on the broadest and most active Saturday dealings in 15 months.

As in the Friday relapse, and preceding downward sessions, selling was attributed mainly to growing apprehension regarding a possible substantial business recession later in 1947. Other liquidating factors included skepticism over wage-price problems, labor legislation, tax relief, and international affairs. Good dividends and earnings virtually were ignored in the majority of cases.

Today's losses, running to 2 or more points, were shaded here and there at the close by a little short covering and a bargain-buying and a handful of pivotals managed to show modest advances. Dealings were lively throughout. Transfers of 980,000 shares compared with 240,000 a week ago and were a top for a 2-hour stretch since February 16, 1946. The week's total of 6,138,045 shares was the largest since the period concluded April 19. Last week's figure was 3,702,771.

The Associated Press 60-stock composite was off 0.8 of a point, at 58.5, a low since January 25, 1945. It was the widest Saturday dip since last January 11. The week's loss of 3.6 points was the most severe since the first week in September. It was the broadest brief session since February 8.

Mr. Speaker, briefly, if comment is necessary, it seems that all is not gold that glitters in today's profit picture. Swollen inflationary profits, too, can be bad for the long run safe operation of our profit system.

Sale of Government-Owned Merchant Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous consent given me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two excerpts from H. R. 1425, introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, "to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes," together with a recent newspaper editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner, entitled "A Maritime Debacle," I include them herewith.

I invite the attention of Members of Congress to the subsections from H. R. 1425 because they indicate the policy of the United States Maritime Commission under the administration of Admiral Land when he was Chairman of the Commission, a policy which is being continued now, to the everlasting detriment of the American merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, because of my association with merchant-marine matters, I was appointed by the President to be a representative of this country at the international maritime conference held in Seattle a year ago. I was a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for 20 years and have a high regard for the chairman and members of that committee with whom I served for many of those years. Nothing I may say at this time is to be considered a criticism of that committee or any member of it, for it has worked hard throughout the years.

Following World War I we virtually destroyed the American merchant marine by disposing of ships to foreign competing nations without regard to our own requirements. The result was investigation and scandal of conditions obtaining in administration of our merchant-marine policies, negative as they were. Finally Congress passed a Merchant Marine Act designed to restore the American merchant marine to the important place it requires in our national economy and national defense. World War II began before that policy could be fully implemented, and the result was the spending of billions of dollars in the mad race to build ships—billions that were far greater than they would have been with a proper development of our international merchant shipping in peacetime.

Following the cessation of hostilities in World War II we follow the same disastrous policies that came into effect after World War I. We fail to heed the lesson taught us by that bitter experience. First, the Maritime Commission under Admiral Land prepared the draft of H. R. 1425 which would have actually given American ships in some circumstances to foreign nations in competition with American shipping. In all other instances foreign purchasers could have bought the ships at a lower price than American purchasers could. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries rejected this proposal, yet almost the same effect is being produced by the policies still being followed by our State Department and the Maritime Commission.

Section 3 (d) of H. R. 1425, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, provided as follows:

> The purchaser of a vessel under this section shall, subject to the provisions of the act, pay to the Commission if the vessel is purchased on the basis of prewar foreign cost not less than 25 percent of the purchase price of such vessel or if the vessel is purchased on the basis of prewar domestic cost not less than 12½ percent of said purchase price. The balance, if any, of such purchase price shall be payable within not more than 20 years under amortization provisions satisfactory to the Commission requiring periodic payments (but not more favorable to the purchaser than 20 annual equal installments), with interest at 3½ percent secured by a preferred mortgage on the vessels sold and otherwise as the Commission may determine.

Section 4 (e) of the same bill, as recommended by the Maritime Commission, reads as follows:

> Payment of the sales price for vessels sold under this section shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the Commission with the approval of the President shall prescribe. In connection with sales to noncitizens, the Commission is authorized to avail itself of the services of any other agency of the United States Government with duties or powers in respect of extension of credit or financing services, and any such agency is authorized to extend such facilities and services to the Commission or to the purchaser for the purposes hereof.

Notwithstanding the rejections of those proposals by the Merchant Marine Committee of the House of Representatives, the following newspaper editorial clearly shows that the Maritime Commission continues to follow policies inimical to our merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, at the International Maritime Conference held in Seattle last year we endeavored to elevate the standards of foreign nations in their merchant-

marine operations to a comparable basis with those maintained in our merchant marine. We were wholly unsuccessful. Now we are disposing of our ships to those nations who opposed elevating their standards simply because such increased costs of operation thus entailed would take away from them the unfair advantage they now hold over American shipping. When we sell our ships to them at any price, their low operating costs put those ships into unfair competition with the best ships we can produce. It must be stopped for it is the same principle that was laid down in H. R. 1425 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which, I repeat, was recommended by the Maritime Commission at a time when it was completely dominated by Admiral Land.

The article from the San Francisco Examiner of May 9, 1947, follows:

A MARITIME DEBACLE

Possessed of the largest and finest merchant fleet in the history of the world at the end of the recent war, the United States is permitting it to fall into disuse and decay in large part, and is disposing of it to competing foreign maritime nations in much of the remaining part.

It is a dismal picture, as Maritime Commissioner Raymond S. McKeough reports, and one which illustrates an amazing incapacity of American Government and particularly American bureaucracy to learn from experience.

The United States permitted the same maritime debacle to occur after the First World War, and foreign nations virtually monopolized world trade in consequence of our governmental and bureaucratic bungling.

Now it is happening again, says Mr. McKeough, in the same way and for the same reasons.

The only major maritime activity in which the United States is presently engaged, he charges, is that of transporting relief to destitute countries, a transient enterprise at best and of dubious advantage to American shipping interests.

"Right now 1,400 American ships are engaged principally in transporting relief cargoes," the Commissioner states.

"This, however, is a short-lived trade.

"As the needy countries recover, they will meet their own needs or use their own ships.

"This is not far off.

"We will not be able to recapture this commerce.

"As the foreign countries complete new ships they will throw the ships they have bought from us on the world market.

"This will further lower tonnage rates, and it is already impossible for us to meet the rates they offer."

The deterioration of the American merchant marine is strikingly emphasized by the record of foreign purchases.

Out of a total of 950 American ships offered for sale on March 1 of this year, 620 went under foreign flags.

Since then, foreign operators have bought an additional 363 Liberty ships in the United States, and 85 Victory ships, and 50 tankers and 122 smaller vessels.

"We have created maritime nations where none existed before," bitterly asserts Mr. McKeough, ironically citing the example of land bound little Switzerland which is now operating 10 cargo carriers in ocean trade in competition with America.

"Australia, South Africa, and China are now operating their own ships and rapidly expanding," he discloses.

"The Argentine has become an active competitor, as has Brazil.

"Colombia, Peru, and Mexico will transport their own freights.

"Panama has grown to be the sixth ranking world maritime power."

The impending American maritime debacle is a national disgrace and is becoming a national scandal—and if it is not dealt with adequately and immediately, it may eventually prove to be a national disaster.

Can We Bail Out Europe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have referred to the blank checks to be drawn on our taxpayers to supply the black market of Europe and Asia. Why fatten the standing armies of foreign countries to the impoverishment of and danger to our own people? It is time for the Congress to come to its senses and legislate for the United States. Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an editorial and an article, both of which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 20, 1947, as follows:

HELP OR IMPOVERISHMENT?

Elsewhere on this page Mr. Chamberlin writes under the heading "Can We Bail Out Europe?" What he says seems to us to deserve emphasis, particularly at a time when foreign policy is being studied and planned.

The various loans and grants that this country is making to other nations are expressed in terms of dollars. But those dollars are a call on American goods and commodities. They are then a contribution to high prices. To continue lending and giving on the scale of $5,000,000,000 a year is to furnish sustenance for an inflation, to be followed by a bust.

A depression in America would be a blow, not only to America but to the rest of the world. It is precisely this development which the rulers of Russia and their Communist allies in other countries are expecting and on which they are counting. If it comes there will be nothing to oppose them. Unless it comes, they will be a bewildered lot of people; already the picture of a prosperous America contrasted with conditions in Russia is causing even her closest satellites to wonder if they have not tied themselves to a poorhouse.

The American foreign policy can be no stronger than America. The greatest asset we can have abroad is the picture of prosperity at home.

This year the world, by its own labors, will pay for only a little more than half of what it receives from the United States. And that contribution has supported only a very low standard of living. To suppose that this country can continue contributing on such a scale is fantastic. To suppose that it cannot only continue but increase its contribution to a point where starving, ill-clothed people can, by that means alone, be raised to some standard of security is fantastic to a degree.

We are not proposing, nor does Mr. Chamberlin, that American contributions be suddenly stopped. But they must be made on a selective basis. They must go to those things which will enable people of other countries to find employment, to produce, to trade, and so to support themselves.

On such a basis this country can raise the well-being of other nations as well as its own. By indiscriminately pouring out its goods it will impoverish all.

CAN WE BAIL OUT EUROPE?—DOLLARS CAN HELP ONLY TEMPORARILY, BUT PERMANENT CURE FOR CONTINENT LIES IN SELF-HELP AND SELF-RELIANCE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Simultaneously with the acceptance of the Greco-Turkish aid bill there is a growing volume of suggestions that the United States will soon be called on to adopt an emergency peacetime lend-lease system for Europe. Our foreign-trade balance is abnormally and unhealthily favorable, running at the rate of about $16,000,000,000 of exports against about $8,000,000,000 of imports.

At this rate European countries will soon run out of depleted dollar and gold reserves. Then, so the argument goes, in order to save our foreign trade and in order to stave off political and economic collapse in Europe, we should step into the breach with new grants for Europe, perhaps to the amount of $5,000,000,000 a year.

The first part of this argument deserves very short shrift indeed. To make our own taxpayers finance exports to foreign countries (either directly through taxes or indirectly through an increased burden of Government debt) is bad economics. It is a road not to prosperity but to national impoverishment and ultimately perhaps to national bankruptcy.

One of the silliest and most inaccurate statements sometimes made by hostile or envious foreigners is that America enriched itself out of the last war. We are, to be sure, richer in paper money; but no one in his right mind thinks of this as a source of wealth. We are very much poorer in solid and permanent national assets, in high-grade iron ores, in lead, in oil, in vast stands of timber in the South and West.

Our ideal in foreign trade should be to sell abroad, in goods and services approximately the equivalent of what we may take from abroad in goods, services, and investments. Far from rejoicing in the present huge favorable balance of trade, we should regard it as a danger signal. If we cannot bridge the gap between exports and imports by purchasing more foreign products we should not object if foreign countries cut down their purchases here. The present boom in exports is a strong contributory cause of high prices (especially of farm products) and inflationary maladjustments.

While there is no rational case whatever for taxing ourselves in order to send surplus exports to foreign countries, there is a strong case for doing whatever may be feasible to bail Europe out of its present sorry plight. Since the war, with the fearful ruin and devastation which it wrought, the European Continent has been haunted by two spectres. There has been the possibility that the Soviet Union, by a mixture of military force, propaganda, and fifth-column infiltration, might bring the whole European Continent under its domination. In such an eventuality we should be exactly where we would have been if Hitler had won the war in 1940 or 1941.

There has also been the possibility that the part of Europe which remains outside the sphere of Soviet control would sink into a permanent state of destitution, misery, hunger, and low productivity. To combat the prospect of either a Communist Europe or a broken-down Europe is certainly a proper, indeed an imperative, goal of American statesmanship.

RELIEF FOR PUMP PRIMING

But the writing of an annual $5,000,000,000 lend-lease check is not a hopeful method of achieving this objective. What Europe needs more than anything else is self-help and self-reliance. These qualities will not be cultivated by the assurance of a large-scale permanent American dole.

Most probably some loans and some outright grants for relief and emergency pump-priming purposes will be required. But first

of all every effort should be made to develop and utilize European resources which are lying fallow because of nationalist short-sightedness, unwise economic policies, and vindictive peace arrangements.

Consider the European coal situation. Before the war there were practically no American coal exports to Europe. Last year European countries bought 20,000,000 tons of American coal at the uneconomic price of $22 a ton. During the current year these purchases may run as high as 30,000,000 tons. This heavy drain of dollar reserves could be eliminated by a substantial upturn in Ruhr coal output.

Such an upturn could take place if there were a serious attempt to revive the German nonmilitary industries. Up to the present time there has been much talk, but little practical work in connection with such a revival. The benefits of the fusion of the American and British occupation zones have been nullified by sterile bickerings between the American and British military government authorities. Red tape multiplies and hunger and low production continue.

What is needed in Germany, as everywhere, is more reliance on individual initiative. A military government, however ably staffed, is not, by its nature, a suitable agency for reviving production and foreign trade. If denazification persecution of businessmen, industrial managers, and engineers (apart from legal prosecution of the few who may have been individually guilty of specific acts of brutality) could be promptly and completely quashed, if established German firms, instead of being treated as public enemies, were given an opportunity to resume trade contacts in Sweden, Switzerland, and other countries, the German and the European economic picture could be changed immensely for the better within a short period of time.

FRENCH WHEAT SITUATION

Consider again the peculiar French wheat situation. France is normally a self-sufficient country in wheat. It scarcely seems fair or reasonable to expect the United States to underwrite indefinitely the failure of successive French governments to work out price and distribution policies which will encourage French farmers to grow wheat as they did before the war.

American public opinion should remain alert to the many storm signals in Europe. But it should not be stampeded into the false belief that this country can or should write out blank checks to make up for every failure of collectivist economics in Europe and for the impossibly high cost of making vengeance, not general European recovery, the leading characteristic of the peace settlement. American aid to Europe should be careful and discriminating (there should be no woolly subsidizing of hostile Communist-dominated regimes) and should go hand in hand with practical programs for revising the many follies of the Potsdam and level-of-industry agreements and for encouraging European countries to practice every means of self-help before turning to Uncle Sam as the unfailing horn of plenty.

Your Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over radio station WJR, Detroit, Mich., on last Saturday night, May 17, 1947:

In approaching the microphone tonight to say good evening to the people of Michigan, especially in the Detroit area and the Fourteenth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent, I am indeed grateful for the opportunity to participate in the Your Congress program. I wish to speak to you on a number of related subjects, particularly the high cost of living and to tell you some of the things that are being done by the present Congress to lower prices. I also want to tell you about some of the actions of the present administration that have resulted in permitting the cost of living to get entirely out of hand.

I am serving my first term in Congress. In Washington they say a first termer comes fresh from the people. I want always to have that approach—from the people's viewpoint rather than from the Washington viewpoint of looking out to the people and trying to plan their lives for them. The collective wisdom of all our people is far greater than the knowledge possessed by any small group, no matter how highly placed they may be in our Government. It is the voice of the people that counts.

Right now the voice of America says to the Government at Washington:

Do something about the high cost of living.

Reduce the high price of government.

Lighten the tax burden.

Enact into law fair labor legislation to diminish industrial strife.

Toss out of the Truman administration Communists and other alien-minded radicals.

And the voice of America says to Washington: Apply the principles upon which the United States was established to dealings with foreign countries so that we can have lasting peace.

In one way or another all of these demands by the American people have a bearing upon the cost of living.

Let us consider them in more detail. First, the high price of government. The Federal Government's annual budget was only $4,500,000,000 when the Democrats were voted into power in 1932. They increased it to an average before the war of $10,000,000,000. The President last January, when we were again at peace, submitted to Congress a budget calling for expenditure of $37,500,000,000 during the fiscal year beginning July 1.

During the depression years of the early thirties, the people were led to believe that the Government at Washington could remedy all of their ills.

That, of course, is not true. Actually, the Government is a pauper. Uncle Sam goes around with hat in hand seeking donations from the people. When he spends more than he receives he must borrow just like an individual has to do. And that adds to the public debt and to the interest charges, which the people must pay.

During the war it was necessary to spend and spend and spend. We did not stop to count the cost. But I have no doubt that a lot of money was wasted. Congressional committees are now trying to find where money was wasted and to check charges of fraud and graft. These committees and the investigators are stymied at every turn by the Truman administration.

Through these years of huge expenditures, prior to the war and during the conflict, there developed in our country a spending psychology. I interpret last November's general election as notice by the people that they wanted to stop that psychology.

Reduction in taxes logically follows. When the Government takes less money from the people to maintain necessary governmental agencies and by virtue of termination of unnecessary bureaucracies, the need for revenue shrinks.

That is why the Congress is passing a tax reduction bill. As the measure is now shaping up, it is a fair bill. It gives the largest percentage of relief to the little fellows with small incomes and without undue hardship to those in the higher brackets.

The people know that during the last 14 years there has been an increase in Federal taxes nearly every year. Taxes have gone up by leaps and bounds. The present Congress proposes to reverse that trend. It proposes to reduce the total of Federal taxes about $4,000,000,000.

I do not need to stress the point that with the enactment of this reduction into law, workers will have more take-home pay and will be better able to meet their cost of living.

It is also axiomatic that a lowering of taxes will free initiative to invest in business enterprises and thereby help produce goods.

It is my considered judgment that our present tax structure is punitive in character. Under it, business initiative by little fellows has been stifled. Venture capital has all but vanished. Economists say that our present tax structure channels business into monopolies.

So we must have tax reduction—a lightening of the present back-breaking burden.

Now regarding labor legislation. The American people served notice last election day that they had had enough of the industrial warfare that is rapidly wrecking our national economy. They know instinctively that another year of strikes and sky-rocketing prices must end in a disastrous depression.

We must bring order and sense out of chaos in labor-management relations. When the Wagner Act was passed we were told that it would diminish industrial strife.

But there were three times as many strikes in the first 10 years under the act as in the 10 years prior to its enactment. In 1946 there were more strikes than ever before. Surely it cannot be logically contended that the Wagner Act diminished labor disputes that ended in work stoppages; that caused halts in production.

We want no punitive labor legislation. What the people want is a bill of rights under which the public interest, all of the people, is paramount.

You perhaps will recall the campaign of 1946 when the Republican Party, of which I am a member, promised, among other things in its platform, the enactment of a labor-relations bill, a bill to insure real collective bargaining; to protect the right to work as well as to strike; to safeguard the interests of the public, and to end the racketeering of the New Deal-labor leader combine.

In adopting the Hartley bill by a 3-to-1 vote, the House passed just such a bill, and I am proud to say that I was one of the 308 Members who voted for it. I stated publicly in defense of that vote that I would not retract an inch on my policy on labor and after the un-American demonstration last month by a minority of CIO pirates who picketed my home here in Detroit, I further stated that I would vote to override a Presidential veto of the labor bill.

It is very significant to me that the loud outcry against the Hartley bill comes from so-called labor leaders, and not from the rank and file of union members. Public opinion polls which I have read and my own congressional mail indicate a very strong support of union members for labor legislation designed to eliminate dictatorial and arbitrary control over union policies and practices as now exercised by some of these alleged labor leaders.

I do not agree with anyone who says that labor unions in order to present their case must be aided by violence, coercion, and intimidation. Labor unions with just causes do not have to resort to violence. Enlightened labor leaders know that is true.

Nor do employers with a just cause need aid from spies and intimidators to obtain justice.

The fact is, my friends, that in direct ratio to the degree of power available, Republican campaign promises have been, and are being, kept. Because there is a large working majority in the House, and because House rules are conducive to a greater degree of party control, the House has acted more promptly than the Senate. Indeed, with the exception of a few individual appropriation bills which have not yet been reported, the House today has approved legislation covering almost every detail of the legislative program approved by the people last November.

Because of the smaller Republican majority in the Senate, and also because that body operates under different rules, and moreover has been preoccupied with other essential subjects during most of the weeks it has been in session, progress toward the enactment of the party program there has been slower. But, in no single instance has the Senate rejected any part of the party program, and there is no reason for believing that it will do so. Every step it has taken with respect to that program has been in the right direction. There is no reason to doubt that when the present session of Congress adjourns, both the Senate and the House will have taken every step in their power to keep the promises made to the people.

It is, of course, possible that some of the efforts of the Republican Congress may be defeated temporarily by a Presidential veto. Republicans do not have control of the Presidency because that was not at stake last fall. Nor do they have the two-thirds majorities in Congress required to enact legislation over a Presidential veto.

Hence, if parts of the Republican congressional program should be defeated by the vetoes of a Democrat President, that is something which can be corrected only by the voters next year.

It is quite natural for the Democrats to seek partisan advantage from the fact that a Republican Congress, faced with a Democrat President and a hostile entrenched bureaucracy, experiences some difficulty and some unavoidable delay in translating its program into law. Moreover, the Democrats still have control of the vast propaganda machine entrenched in the executive departments and bureaus. They are using that machine in every possible way to discredit the activities of Republicans.

It is quite understandable that they should do this. They are fighting a last-ditch struggle to retain their places on the Federal pay roll.

In the last analysis, the welfare of all the people is at stake. The need is very urgent—the resort to veto power to please the clamoring minorities would be a vicious blow to what the people generally are demanding—a reduction in the cost of living.

My concluding thought and hope tonight is that peace and tranquillity in this great country of ours will again prevail and bring happiness to those whom we love and cherish.

Gold Star Pilgrimage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF, May 17, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, President Truman recently called for approval of the provisions of the gold-star pilgrimage bill which I introduced in the House in January 1945, and which I am once again proposing to Congress.

The Hall measure reads as follows: "A bill to provide for pilgrimages of gold-star mothers, sisters, and wives to the graves of their sons, brothers, and husbands, who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States during World War II and who are buried in foreign lands.

"Be it enacted, etc., That there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for, as soon as possible, and to pay the necessary expenses of, pilgrimages of mothers, sisters and wives of servicemen who died during World War II and were buried in foreign lands, to their sons', brothers', and husbands' graves."

Every Gold Star Mother, sister, and wife of the recent war should be given the chance to visit the grave of her loved one, if it is at all practicable and possible.

The practice of bringing home remains of veterans who fell in battle is now being followed to some extent in accordance with the wishes of the individual family. But most people seem to prefer that graves of the fallen be left unopened. Many would rather the sorrow, brought on by death, be locked within the mound of earth on that far-off shore instead of renewing its pangs by the return of mortal clay.

It is logical and natural that those nearest and dearest to the deceased should want to make a pilgrimage to the place, however remote, yet hallowed, where he fell fighting for his flag and his country.

After the First World War several thousand Gold Star Mothers visited their sons' graves in France at Uncle Sam's expense. They set the precedent which ought to be observed at the present. I hope Congress will not hesitate in providing funds and the authority with which to make similar pilgrimages possible in the near future.

I feel sure that all veterans' organizations in America along with their auxiliaries will be strongly in favor of the plan as outlined in my bill. The Gold Star Mothers, sisters, and wives ought to be considered and included in any mass pilgrimage which finally takes place.

How soon action is to be forthcoming in this regard will depend upon the sincerity of all who give lip service to the relatives of these dead heroes. Let us then arouse ourselve to our duty. The Hall bill provides for these pilgrimages of Gold Star mothers, sisters, and wives to the graves of their closest ones, who died in service during World War II, and are now buried in foreign lands. There should be no delay in our making such a measure the law of the land.

During the week Congress has talked a lot about voting money for American broadcasts to foreign countries. These broadcasts are known as the Voice of America and call for large outlays of public funds to broadcast messages to Russia, and other European nations in native languages.

The idea of forwarding America to other nations is excellent. Any way these broadcasts can build up American form of government and our high standard of living and lofty ideals of citizenship, I am for.

But I was informed that uncomplimentary references to our country are being made in such broadcasts. Making Americans out gangsters, ready to shoot each other on sight, gives us a black eye abroad. Such tactics must stop before I will vote any more funds for the Voice of America.

Thank you.

Comments on the State Department's Informational and Cultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting herewith a newspaper article entitled "House With an Ax" which was published in the Washington Post of Saturday, May 17, and which has to do with the fine qualities which the Honorable William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, has, and which I believe should answer the attacks which have been made on him in carrying out of the State Department's information and cultural program. I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that the five signatories are all members of the Committee of Economic Development and have intimate knowledge of Mr. Benton, his ideas and his abilities. I am also inserting a letter received just this morning from the American Legion as well as a copy of resolution 97, passed by the national executive committee of that body which met in session in Indianapolis, Ind., in the first part of May of this year. As the House knows, intensive hearings are now being carried on by the Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the bill, H. R. 3342, introduced by Hon. CARL MUNDT, of South Dakota. This is a bill to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

Mr. Speaker, I think the carrying on of this program is vitally important to this country in these precarious times. I feel also that while mistakes have been made, the kinks will be ironed out as the program establishes itself. I am further of the opinion that all things considered, Bill Benton in his 20 months as Director of the Service has done an outstanding job in laying the ground work for the telling of America's story to the entire world.

We must have some means to oppose the discriminatory and unfair statements which are being put out over the air by other countries against us and, in my opinion, the only feasible means at the present time that we can use to counteract this is the continuation of the program now under way under the

capable and sound leadership of Assistant Secretary of State, Bill Benton.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting the above-mentioned article and also a news story carried in this morning's Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of May 17, 1947]

HOUSE WITH AN AX

Your editorial of May 7, House With an Ax, ends as follows: "Refusal to reinstate the information program of the State Department also had less to do with economy than with policy. The objection seems to have less to do with the idea than with the man responsible for its execution, Assistant Secretary Benton. We hope that Secretary Marshall will take the hint, and then renew his request. The program's the thing, not the man."

We are five of the men who have worked most closely with Bill Benton in various civic activities. We have, of course, followed his career since he has been in Government.

His record of merging and amalgamating three wartime Government agencies—those headed by Messrs. Nelson Rockefeller, Archibald MacLeish and Elmer Davis—and reducing personnel from roughly 11,000 to 3,000 in the space of a few months—is an achievement in administration of which the State Department can well be proud.

The kind of criticism that is now being leveled at Bill Benton is the kind of thing that keeps responsible and able people from going into Government work. It may be an effort to "save face" on the part of those who questioned the need for the OIC. The sudden decision that the operation is important, but that there must be something the matter with Benton, is an old and familiar pattern in government, and one that we protest in this case. Benton's record as a businessman and an administrator is well known to those in the business community.

He is one of the most successful independent businessmen in the United States; one of us can speak with special authority on this subject because Mr. Hoffman serves as a member of the board of directors of the Encyclopedia Britannica and of Britannica Films and knows of the extraordinary progress these companies made under Benton's leadership in the last 5 years.

He combines with this business experience a background in education (8 years as vice president of the University of Chicago), in broadcasting, in publishing, and in educational motion pictures. He has experience, skill, and enthusiam, and he has an Americanism rooted in boyhood in Minnesota and Montana that has found expression in every phase of his thinking and his career.

Bill Benton is the top man in the country for this job. It would be difficult indeed to find anyone who matches his initial qualifications for administering America's international information and cultural program. And it would be tragic, for the sake of a political maneuver, to waste the 20 months of experience he has acquired in mastering an assignment that is as new and unfamiliar to our country as it is necessary.

PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
President, Studebaker Corp.
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
United States Senate.
ERIC A. JOHNSTON,
President, Motion Picture Association.
WALTER D. FULLER,
President, Curtis Publishing Co.
MARION B. FOLSOM,
Treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co.

WASHINGTON.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1947.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: The American Legion at the meeting of the national executive committee, held May 5–7, 1947, at Indianapolis, Ind., considered the situation relative to the dissemination of American information to countries overseas.

Appreciating the seriousness of the situation and efforts of the State Department to remedy this, they adopted the attached resolution which I am enclosing for your information with a request that it be included in your record of hearings as the established position of the American Legion on this vital subject.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

[Enclosure]

CONTINUED WORLD-WIDE DISSEMINATION OF THE OPERATION AND PROGRESS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Whereas it is vitally necessary that the peoples of the world be fully and constantly informed of the operation and progress of American democracy and of the unselfish aims and purposes of the United States of America in opposing the encroachment of tyrannical and totalitarian ideologies by some nations beyond their own boundaries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the continuation of world-wide dissemination by our Government, through international radio, motion pictures and otherwise, of the fundamental facts of the American form of government and way of life and of the basic character and objectives of our foreign policy.

[From the Washington Post of May 20, 1947]

UNIVERSITIES, LEGION BACK "VOICE" PLAN

The American Legion and the heads of 10 American universities let President Truman know yesterday that they are behind the State Department's Voice of America broadcast program.

The educators wrote:

"As educators interested in intercultural relations as the foundation of world peace, and as Americans concerned to have a fair picture of our country presented abroad, we strongly endorse the program of William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, and urge that he and this program receive your full support."

The signers were Harry Woodburn Chase, chancelor, New York University; Arthur R. Compton, chancelor, Washington University; John Dickey, president, Dartmouth College; Father Robert I. Gannon, president, Fordham University; R. G. Gustavson, chancelor, University of Nebraska; Rufus C. Harris, president, Tulane University; Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor, University of Chicago; Charles S. Johnson, president, Fisk University; Alexander G. Ruthven, president, University of Michigan; and George Stoddard, president, University of Illinois.

In a letter to the House Foreign Affairs Committee the Legion urged Congress to authorize "continuation of world-wide dissemination by our Government * * * of the fundamental facts of the American form of government and way of life."

I Am an American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein the following resolution adopted by the Peoria County Bar Association, reaffirming faith in Americanism, as a part of the program urged by the Illinois State Bar Association for the observance of I Am an American Day:

Whereas the Illinois State Bar Association has suggested to the various bar associations of Illinois that May 18, 1947, should be observed as I Am An American Day in order to combat the insidious influence of those in our midst who preach foreign ideologies and doctrines and to reaffirm our faith in and loyalty to the Government of the United States; and

Whereas we have fought and vanquished nazism and fascism only to be confronted by an even more sinister foe of American principles and institutions under the red banner of communism; and

Whereas this alien ideology by fifth-column tactics has infiltrated many of our colleges, schools, and churches and has undertaken to mislead both age and youth by deceptively presenting itself in the guise of organizations to promote peace, brotherhood, and the general welfare of mankind; and

Whereas wherever communism is found, there too we find misery, brutality, slavery, despotism, Godlessness, and the sacrilegious desecration and defilement of all religious institutions, and the secret police rather than the secret ballot is the chief instrument of authority; and

Whereas we must not lose by lack of courage and failure to speak out in this crisis the precious heritage that wise and God-fearing leaders of the past have vouchsafed for us to enjoy and treasure and pass on unsullied to posterity; and

Whereas it rightfully has been our proudest boast to be privileged to proclaim to the world, I am an American; and

Whereas this privilege connotes the solemn duty of unwavering loyalty to the United States, its traditions, interests, and ideals and the obligation to perpetuate what Abraham Lincoln aptly described as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and

Whereas under the American system of government the people of the United States have realized a greater degree of justice, liberty, equality, and opportunity with higher standards of living, education, culture, religious spirit, and industrial and agricultural development than has blessed the peoples of other nations and forms of government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Peoria Bar Association heartily and unequivocally endorses the patriotic suggestion to celebrate May 18, 1947, as I Am an American Day; and be it further

Resolved, That we, as an organization and as lawyers, now renew our pledge of love and loyalty for American institutions and call upon other organizations and individuals to hold high the standard of Americanism and that we assert our vigorous opposition to all ideologies that would undermine and weaken and finally destroy the structure that shelters the American way of life and to scourge from our temple of democracy as Christ scourged its defilers from the Temple of God all advocates, supporters, and sympathizers of communism and other subversive doctrines; and be it further

Resolved, That this solemn and binding resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Peoria Bar Association and copies furnished to all county and city officers, the superintendent and principals of our public schools, the pastors of all churches in the Peoria area, and to the newspapers for the information of the general public.

Adopted May 8, 1947.

VICTOR P. MICHEL,
President.

Attest:

THEODORE B. DURFEE,
Secretary.

Freight-Rate Equality for the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial recently appearing in the Nashville Tennesseean, which is published by Mr. Silliman Evans, concerning the recent Supreme Court decision effecting freight-rate equality for the South. The editorial is as follows:

LOOK AWAY IN DIXIE LAND

Dixie Land moved closer to the day of freedom from its colonial status yesterday when the Supreme Court by a 7 to 2 decision upheld the ICC order lowering freight rates in the South.

Equality in the national transportation picture is not yet a reality. The ICC order raised official territory rates 10 percent and lowered southern and western rates by the same amount. This does not yet wipe out all of the estimated 39 percent discrimination under which the South has so long labored. But the principle has been confirmed. We look confidently to the future when class goods can move freely in and out of the South without any tariff discrimination.

Southern manufacturers, one and all, be they producers of shoes, breakfast cereals, candy, platform trucks, or the most highly finished steel goods, have long been up against the iron wall of class rates which permitted northern producers to deliver goods to comparable destinations at lower rates.

The most vicious aspect of this condition has been the inability even to start manufacturing of highly finished goods, the kind of manufacturing that adds most to the value of the original raw materials and most to the pockets of workers and owners. Meanwhile, our raw materials have moved out of the region where they should be processed to the North at rates decidedly favorable to the have-not industrial regions. For the raw materials we get pennies. For the finished goods we would have got dollars.

We have abundant labor in the South. We have abundant raw materials—agricultural, mineral, and forest. We have abundant power—coal, water power, gas, oil. We have a great and growing market. One-half of the farmers of the Nation, for example, live in this region. Why should not tractors and other farm machinery be made on the ground with our coal, iron, gas, and other supplies and by our adaptable labor? Many factors have worked against this development. One of the biggest has been the class-rate discrimination. This victory, incidentally, emphasizes the importance of keeping the Sherman anti-trust law pointed at the railroads, a situation over which the carriers are unhappy and are trying to escape from by a law making them an exemption.

It may be added that the railroads serving the South will benefit in the long run from the Supreme Court decision along with the whole region. The development of a balanced industrial-agricultural economy in this nature-favored part of the Nation will mean more business and more prosperity for all.

Address of Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge, President General of the Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this city of the Nation's Capital is being honored at this time by the convention of one of the most patriotic organizations the world has ever known, the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The members of this organization are probably doing more for the preservation of American institutions than any other group of its size throughout the entire length and breadth of the land.

Last night I listened with patriotic pride to the address of Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge, president general of the DAR. A finer expression of American patriotism never fell from human lips.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting that splendid address, which I trust every Member of this House, and everyone else who scans this RECORD, will take the time to read.

The address referred to follows:

I greet you tonight in Constitution Hall—our own Constitution Hall—planned and built, and paid for by the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Every delegate and alternate, every officer who is here tonight feels the inspiration of this occasion. I can see, reflected in your faces, the joy that is in my own heart and the thrill that is in my soul, to see the doors of Constitution Hall open wide once again to welcome a Continental Congress.

This is the first full-sized gathering of our members at national headquarters since before the war. It is a record gathering, for in addition to the full complements of delegates and alternates, many, many members have come to Washington.

Our welcome, therefore, is all the more cordial to those who are our distinguished guests this evening and to all who are taking part in this opening session.

To many of us, however, that joy is tempered by the loss of one of our beloved members, yes, one of our most faithful members, who was so unexpectedly taken from us only a little over a month ago. She is not with us tonight. Divine providence ruled otherwise. But she will live in our hearts and the record of her devoted service to the Daughters of the American Revolution will shine like gold on the pages of our history. I speak of Mrs. John Logan Marshall. I know you join me in paying her tribute tonight.

Yesterday a most fitting prelude to our Fifty-sixth Congress was held at historic Valley Forge, Pa., made immortal by George Washington and his faithful soldiers during the dark days of the struggle of the American Colonies for liberty and freedom.

There, on the Sabbath Day, we reverently dedicated the Memorial Bell Tower. I know those who made the pilgrimage will always remember the event. We returned to Washington, last night, tired but happy in the realization that the stately Memorial Bell Tower will soon be constructed. It will be another of the many lasting monuments erected by our national society.

The keynote of this congress is Americanism. If our country ever needed to put its accent on Americanism, it needs to now. And so I have chosen as the title of this address—The Eagle's Wings. The American eagle is the symbol of our strength, of our protection, of our courage, of our ability to soar high and surmount any obstacle, any crisis.

The United States of America, the domain of the American eagle, has become the greatest nation in the world. That is an actual fact. We, however, are just beginning to grasp the full significance of what this means and have not yet sensed the responsibilities which this place in the sun entails.

Our own national society, likewise, has grown in strength and in power, more so than most of us realize. We now have over 156,000 members. Our membership is steadily increasing, and as our society grows, its responsibilities increase.

Thus this Fifty-sixth Continental Congress is a very important gathering. We have many serious problems to consider. There is much to review and there is much to plan in advance. A new administration will be elected.

Will the policies which have carried our society high on wings of achievement in the past, even through the strife of the dark war years, endure? Will we continue to march forward in unity, a proud, fearless and true organization?

Your answer to that resounded to the rafters of Convention Hall in Atlantic City a year ago when we met there. Your answer, I trust, is still as emphatic this very minute in Constitution Hall.

The National Society Daughters of the American Revolution will endure as a vigorous, forceful organization only so long as it remains true to the ideals on which it was founded. It will disintegrate if it becomes a house divided. We must always be prepared to meet with complete unity the forces who oppose us. It is necessary to remember this, because war brought a spirit of unrest not only to nations, but to individuals. The world is in a state of irritation. And nations, and individuals, when irritated are apt to become quarrelsome. Peace for America has not meant serenity under the eagle's wings.

This administration, born during the war, was never one of appeasement. We had seen, only too clearly, the terrible consequences of such a course. We substituted another word for appeasement, action.

Neither did we adopt a policy of silence in the face of criticism. We have been quick to reply to those who attacked our society. We have been frank and we have been honest in meeting any situation either external or internal which demanded clear, wide-open explanation or exposition. Daylight never harmed anyone.

We have never departed from the objects of our society as set forth in our constitution and bylaws. Now, perhaps, more than at any other time in the 56 years of the existence of the Daughters of the American Revolution, we should devote ourselves in particular to the third objective in our constitution:

"To cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom, to foster true patriotism and love of country, and to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty."

This Nation of ours is really at a crossroads. Decisions now in the making will govern the course of our great country in the years to come. Millions of people are oppressed and millions of others suffer hunger and distress. Right now human beings are being killed in strife and in warfare in a world supposedly at peace.

America is a strong country because it has many resources, tremendous productive capacity, and because its citizens enjoy the highest standards of living. Because we are strong we are called upon to help other nations less fortunate than ourselves.

The spreading wings of the American eagle cover much of the suffering in the world and protect many of the oppressed who cry in agony for help. And the American eagle has flown far overseas to bring relief to the weak. Can we grasp the full significance of those outstretched wings which we see upon the silver pieces of our currency, together with the word "liberty" and the message, "In God we trust"?

These wings are emblematic not only of power and of might. During the war they were extended upward until they formed a V—the V for victory which came at last when we were prepared and were able to turn our screaming eagle loose upon the dictator war lords. Now they are spread widely to shield suffering humanity.

This afternoon many of us learned once again the lesson of preparedness as brought out at the National Defense Committee mass meeting. I need not enlarge upon this except to say the Daughters of the American Revolution will always stand for a defense adequate to protect us from attacks from any nation whatsoever in the world.

We must keep the wings of the eagle strong and be ever watchful against any weakening of our naval or of our military strength. It is our best insurance for peace. It is actually the best insurance for peace in the entire world.

Our society has consistently advocated adequate national defense throughout the years. We have seen the evil effects of disarmament. We have seen treaties violated and we have been attacked because we were unprepared. Therefore, we look with suspicion upon suggestions no matter from what source, which would whittle down our armed strength below the safety level.

Our stand on national defense and the preservation of our system of Government is one of the reasons Communists oppose the DAR. I assure you this feeling is mutual.

Our organization should stand behind every movement by our Federal and State legislatures to outlaw communism. We should tolerate no one in public office who is secretly working to overthrow our Government and substitute the totalitarian system of a foreign power. The spread of communism in this country must be stopped. It can be stopped if we emphasize that the only ism in this land is Americanism.

Every Daughter of the American Revolution should constitute herself a committee of one to oppose by every means within her power the infiltration of communistic teachers in our schools and colleges and to combat the spreading of communistic poison in the minds of our young students.

During the past year our national society has been the target of only a few feeble attacks by communists, fellow travelers, and those who oppose our society because of political or publicity advantage. Can it be that at long last they have learned that we not only can take it but we can give it back?

One of the best ways to combat subversive activities is to build a better citizenship, especially among those of the rising generation. That has always been one of the main objectives of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Let us give youth a chance. The least we can do for our young people of today is to provide every educational advantage for them. Let us equip them with the tools with which they can work.

We can point with pride to the approved schools program of the DAR society. This program has grown steadily until it is now one of the most important of the society's projects. Our two DAR schools in the southern mountains, Tamassee and Kate Duncan Smith, entirely supported by DAR funds, have enabled hundreds of underprivileged boys and girls to secure an education. There is where the eagle flies high, for these mountain boys and girls are sturdy Americans.

We should carry our educational program, however, into every city and town in the country. Let us do something when opportunity presents itself, to help the girl and the boy around our own corner.

If our young people stray into the ranks of communism, if they become radicals, if they stray from the rugged path of American citizenship, we have but ourselves to blame. Let us not condemn every juvenile delinquent as bad. In many cases the girl or boy only needs guidance.

Youth faces today a world of confusion, a world falling apart. We must provide opportunities for our young men and young women to make a decent living, to have good homes and to live in security and peace. If we fail in this, we are not keeping the eagle's wings strong. We are not demonstrating Americanism.

Our society emerged from World War conditions stronger than ever before. It is as though the fires of war tempered our great organization and welded it more solidly. How shall we use our strength, our vigor? What should be our chief activity?

The national society is working to build a better citizenship. Our whole program of activities is geared to this for we have national committees covering the fields of education, of Americanism, naturalization, conservation, homemaking, and others. Through these programs we can keep our eagle flying high.

To do this we must have solidarity. We must devote ourselves to our chapter activities. A chain is no stronger than its weakest link. Our national society is no stronger than its chapters. The chapter is the unit, and the worth of our society is judged by the service rendered in the community by our more than 2,500 chapters.

After all, what is the Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution? Is it a patriotic society operating from buildings of white marble located in the Nation's Capital? It is more than that.

Is it an organization to promote social gatherings? It is not that at all.

The Daughters of the American Revolution is an army of women citizens of all walks of life working to preserve and protect our cherished institutions in order to make this a better country in which to live and in which to find security.

With all the uncertainty about us, we must stress Americanism; we need a great spiritual awakening. We need faith. Faith in our country, faith in our national society, and faith in ourselves will enable us to demonstrate the type of citizenship so much needed in our everyday life today.

And when I say faith I mean a fighting faith, a faith based upon the determination to stand for what we know to be right. The faith which inspired the immortal John Paul Jones, who with wounded men and a sinking ship, sent back the defiant answer when asked to surrender: "Surrender? I have not yet begun to fight."

Let this be a fruitful meeting. May we plan wisely and well. May we remain true to our ideals. May we be proud of the American eagle in the knowledge that we are doing our part to keep the eagle's wings great and strong.

These past 3 years have been eventful. Without your unfailing support I would have been in the valley of despair many, many times. But your abiding faith gave me the strength to rise above all of the trials and troubles and to stand with head held high even against unwarranted attacks.

Out of all the tempest we have emerged stronger than ever before. We pass the torch to another bearer, knowing that it will be carried to greater heights and that the circle of its light of Americanism will ever expand.

And so I come to the close of my final keynote message to you as your President General. I am grateful for all you have done in behalf of this administration. I appreciate the great privilege I have enjoyed in being surrounded by such a splendid group of officers, committee chairmen and workers.

More than everything else, I cherish the real friendship so many of you have shown for me as the weeks and months passed by. That friendship has not been written in the sands, but is engraved in our hearts.

It is as enduring as the inscription carved in the stone above the entrance of this Constitution Hall. It was uttered by George Washington at the Constitutional Convention of 1787. I quote it:

"Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair.
The event is in the hands of God."

The time has come to say—not farewell—but thank you from my heart.

Western States Need Boxcars Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the postwar development of the West is being jeopardized by the continuing shortage of available boxcars for shipping at the western railroad terminals. This shortage, aggravated by lack of new cars and inadequacy of old equipment, has become critical in California and other Western States, and perishable agricultural crops are endangered because of this lack of shipping facilities, crops which are necessary to the well-being of the Nation.

This situation has been brought to the attention of the Interstate Commerce Commission repeatedly, and western industry and agriculture have pleaded for relief. While a boxcar shortage does exist at this time and new cars are not available, relief could be provided for western shippers if the Interstate Commerce Commission would act to bring boxcars now owned by western railroad companies back to the west coast for use.

Instead of taking some action which would require that these cars be returned to the railroad companies which own them, eastern railroad companies are permitted by the ICC to keep these boxcars and use them for shipping freight back and forth throughout the Eastern States for a nominal rental for each car of $1.15 per day.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has the power to act in this crisis. The Commission can adjust the rental rate on boxcars belonging to western railroad companies which are being used by eastern companies to the extent that it will no longer be profitable for an eastern company to retain such cars for their own use.

The present situation is unfair and discriminatory to western railroads and to western shippers. Western mills and manufacturers are producing merchandise that is needed in every part of the Nation, and it is ridiculous for the ICC to deny them shipping facilities by its indifference to the situation.

Statistics show that most of the eastern railroads have a percentage of boxcars on their lines equaling the total number of such cars owned by them plus an additional number which are being held on their lines but are owned by the western railroads.

Of the western railroads only one line, the Southern Pacific, has a percentage of boxcars on its lines equal to the number of such cars owned. The other lines such as the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, Santa Fe, Union Pacific, and Burlington have a lower percentage of boxcars on their lines than the total number of cars which they own.

The present strangulation of western industry and agriculture due to lack of boxcars at the western railroad terminals must stop. The Interstate Commerce Commission is empowered to act and can bring immediate relief by adjusting the rental rate on freight cars, making it more profitable for eastern companies to return the cars to the West for reloading instead of bottling them up on the eastern lines.

The consumer goods produced in the West is needed in every State in the Union. Many products are still in short supply, and western manufacturers want to send their products out to the national market on equal terms with eastern producers.

If the Interstate Commerce Commission refuses to act in this matter, then I believe it is time for Congress to take some action to prevent further discrimination against western industry and agriculture.

The World After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I seriously question the justice and advisability of ratification of the Italian Treaty. I think any fair-minded American will concede that this proposal with its indefensible vicious Trieste and reparations provisions was executed by our former Secretary of State solely in order to appease the Soviet Union. It should not be acted upon at least until the terms of the settlement of the German and Austrian problems are agreed upon with the Kremlin.

The Italian populace, that suffered such undeserved misfortunes under the dictatorship of Mussolini, is in plain justice entitled to the sympathy and moral support of the American people. This proposed treaty leaves the Italian people—including their innocent women and children, who had no part in the war—impoverished, bereft of valuable territory, and incapable of resisting the aggressions of Communist-dominated Yugoslavia.

If we are sincere in our efforts to prevent the spread of communism, we should seriously consider the dangerous situation in Italy. She must have substantial help at this time. The following article entitled "Italian Reds Work Toward Day They Can Take Over Country," by Constantine Brown, published in the Brooklyn Eagle of May 17, 1947, accurately portrays the present dilemma of the Italian people:

THE WORLD AFTER THE WAR
(By Constantine Brown)
ITALIAN REDS WORK TOWARD DAY THEY CAN TAKE OVER COUNTRY

The Italian Cabinet crisis deeply concerns not only the Italian people, but the whole Western World.

The problem goes deeper than the apparent cause—the desperate economic and financial situation. It is the beginning of a struggle which may lead to violence between the so-called nationalist forces—rightists and moderates—and the Communists, supported by the left-wing radicals.

The American Government is following the troubled situation with greater interest than it displayed when France's Premier Paul Ramadier decided to reshuffle his cabinet and rule without the support of the Communists.

Both Houses of Congress have approved the $400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey. This loan was dictated more by strategic than economic considerations. A major crisis in Italy, which would bring about civil strife sooner or later and permit Palmiro Togliatti's Communists to take over the Government, might jeopardize plans for improving our strategic position in the eastern Mediterranean.

Italy is situated in the center of that sea and so long as she maintains a liberal form of government the danger of war as the result of Slavic expansion to the west will be small. But if the Italian Communists are able to establish themselves in the Italian Government, the situation will become precarious.

The Italian people will rally around a strong man. Unfortunately, only elder statesmen, important figures in the period of World War I, are being mentioned as possible heads of the government. Ivanoe Bonomi and Francesco Nitti were able men in an entirely different world from that of today.

The political methods of these two former leaders are those of other generations, when the world was not confronted with the complicated problems of today. They withdrew into their shells when Benito Mussolini came to power on the strength of a brand of totalitarianism which was mild compared to that which has developed in Europe since the end of World War II.

The Italian Communists are not yet prepared to take over the reins of government, and their activities will be handicapped by the continued presence of Allied forces in Italy. Mr. Togliatti is said to be relying on his former Comintern colleague, Marshal Tito, to make Italy Moscow's No. 1 satellite in western Europe. And so long as the Allied forces are stationed on the eastern borders of Italy no effective contact with Yugoslavia can be made.

The policy of Mr. Togliatti is to be as active as possible and swell the ranks of his party. He aims to prevent Italy's economic and financial rehabilitation, either by his participation in the government or through the action of the C mmunist members of the National Assembly. He intends, however, to wait until after the Americans leave Italy to achieve his avowed aim of rising to power.

Mr. Togliatti is aware that his strength will prevent any Italian politician, and particularly those aged leaders now mentioned for the premiership, from correcting Italy's economic chaos.

Current Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the remark is often heard these days that the labor bill now pending in Congress is the most important piece of legislation before us at the present time. Surely all would agree it ranks very high on the list of pending bills.

The effects of labor legislation on our domestic economy are indeed far reaching. The greater portion of the cost price of commodities purchased by farmers, and townsmen alike, is labor. The farmer who buys some steel fencing must pay more for the fencing if wages are increased; or if he purchases lumber the greater portion of the cost price consists of labor. In today's issue of a Washington newspaper I read that some bricklayers in Washington are receiving as high as $23 per day during the week and $38 on Saturday. Of course, a prospective home purchaser balks when the real-estate man quotes the price of a new house.

Labor-management relations are extremely involved and controversial; naturally they would be, having to do with human relationships. Citizens have been demanding labor legislation quite some while. Strikes have been more pronounced year by year. Abuses such as jurisdictional strikes, boycotts, and mass picketing have been put up with until the public demands relief, and above all, the public dislikes so much power to reside in one man such as John L. Lewis that would enable him to suddenly, without warning, shut down an entire industry, thus paralyzing the Nation and tying our economy into a knot.

There are those who thought all we needed to do was for the new Congress to meet and some Member of Congress make a motion from the floor that a labor bill be passed but it is not quite so simple to pass a piece of major legislation. Hearings were held by the House Committee lasting 2 months, more than 2,000,000 words of testimony was heard from witnesses from all parts of the country. Rank and file union members desired relief from dominating labor bosses. Employers demanded freedom of speech and freedom to hire whomsoever they chose, without regard to union

membership. A similar process of holding hearings and determining what would be the wise course has taken place before a Senate Committee and now both Houses have passed their bills.

Next in order will be for a conference committee consisting of ranking members from the Committees on Labor of the Senate and House to get together and iron out the differences between the bills of their respective bodies. The principal item in controversy has to do with industry-wide bargaining, which is specifically outlawed by the House bill but which was omitted in the Senate bill by a vote of 44 to 43. The outcome of this particular item will decide whether Mr. John L. Lewis will retain power to bargain for all his miners in a Nation-wide or union-wide fashion. The House bill provides that each employer shall bargain with his own employees. Such a provision would break up the tremendous power now in the hands of Mr. Lewis.

The ban on industry-wide bargaining is the one thing that puts a crimp into Mr. Lewis; it is the one thing that he cannot overcome. All other provisions of the bill he could get around one way or another, but the ban on industry-wide bargaining breaks the strangle hold or monopoly enjoyed by his powerful organization.

Many employers and many industrialists enjoy industry-wide bargaining for they, too, have a monopoly but it is the fundamental duty of the Government to break up monopoly whenever and wherever it is to be found, whether in industry or labor.

Competition could be more fully restored by bargaining on the plant or shop level but it is a step in the right direction to place it on an employer-employee basis. It is pretty well agreed that such an arrangement would be fair both to management and to labor and would not allow a decided advantage to either.

To my way of thinking a bad feature of the Senate bill is their dependence on court injunctions as a method of settling strikes in vital industries. When we resort to injunctions, Executive seizure, or compulsory arbitration, we end up with governmental determination of wages, which is arbitrary, inefficient, and authoritarian, or totalitarian in principle. It should be fundamental in our thinking that we rely on natural economic laws such as keen competition and the rule of supply and demand as a method of arriving at a fair wage. No governmental board or agency has yet found a way to determine what is a fair wage. Political determination of wages will mean a return to governmental fixation of commodity prices. Surely we do not want to bring back the vicious OPA. The only safe and sound course is to break up industry-wide bargaining.

Any scientific approach to a labor-management relations bill that would promote harmonious industrial relations should be one which would cause sustained production and an ever-increasing standard of living for our people. The only way individuals can enjoy the use of more commodities is for a greater over-all production of those goods and supplies. Industry-wide bargaining is inefficient in that marginal producers are subsidized while efficient producers are allowed excessive profits. Today we find such unevenness and such injustices existing; actually we are experiencing many businesses folding up and quitting while others are making huge excessive profits. What is a fair wage in one part of the country may be an excessive wage in another. Only by accident do we happen to have what approximates a fair wage in some instances. Also, bargaining Nation-wide takes little or no account of technological progress and it does not properly reward individual or group effort. A damper is put on initiative and self-enterprise. A national wage pattern means less rather than more production. Therefore it tends to further scarcity and high prices. It does little good to appeal to business to lower prices while at the same time we continue such an uneconomic practice as industry-wide bargaining.

As unions have developed the last few years and become more and more powerful through the closed shop, the union shop, maintenance of membership, the check-off, and other forms of union security, there has been a tendency for strikes not only to occur repeatedly, but for these strikes to be more and more paralyzing to the Nation as a whole. Finally we have come to an impasse where various labor barons can speak for their entire industries. We agree something must be done about it, that we cannot leave it to the house of labor to correct its own abuses. Our people are looking to the House of Representatives and the Senate and the President. We say the public interest overshadows the interest of any one industry. For example, the welfare of 140,000,000 people is more important than an increase of wages for less than half a million miners, and so we sanction Executive seizure and Government operation of the mines. We permit court injunctions to make the miners work, and last summer, if you will recall, the President asked the Congress for permission to draft railroad workers into the armed forces to make them work, but all these things are no permanent solution. There is one thing which overshadows the public interest and that is individual or private interest. Our individual liberty and freedom is more important even than the public safety and convenience. The only way and the best method for safeguarding both public and private well-being; for labor, capital, and management to share equitably and fairly the fruits of an ever expanding, dynamic economy, is to place our reliance on economic forces rather than political forces for determination of wages, hours, and working conditions. Therefore, I contend that the Senate has made a mistake by strengthening the provision allowing for court injunctions and deleting the item in the House bill which places a ban on industry-wide bargaining. The latter method would restore competition which is the keystone of our free-enterprise system and, after all, the best regulator of prices, both of wages and commodities, the world has ever known.

MacArthur Is Revered as Once Was Hirohito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer by Ralph J. Donaldson:

MACARTHUR IS REVERED AS ONCE WAS HIROHITO

(Article 4)

Volumes have been written about the intricate workings of the Japanese mind to explain the attitude of the Japanese people toward General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. In a word, they worship and revere him practically to the same extent that they did Hirohito. If there were to be a contest in Japan today over the election of an emperor, MacArthur could run for it and win, hands down.

The explanation is very simple. Suppose you got into an argument with Mahatma Gandhi and he knocked you cold with a stiff blow of passive resistance. You wouldn't be very proud of that, would you? But suppose you picked a fight with Joe Louis and got knocked out. You wouldn't have anything to be ashamed of. In fact, after you recovered consciousness you probably would go around bragging about it and showing the place on your jaw where the blow landed.

As far as the Japanese people are concerned, MacArthur is the Joe Louis among generals. As a matter of fact, the bigger they build him up in their own minds, the less of a disgrace it seems to them to have been beaten by him. They have now just about reached the point of bragging about how MacArthur defeated them.

HERO BUILD-UP PAYS

There has been some criticism of MacArthur in Army circles because the communiques issued from his headquarters during the war told what he had done, without giving credit to the generals under him who commanded the combat divisions. I do not pretend to know whether these omissions were deliberate or inadvertent. But MacArthur began to learn about the Japanese when he was a young officer, serving as aide to his father, who was an American observer during the Russo-Japanese War. If he deliberately enhanced his own reputation during the war at the cost of slighting others, the result could not have been more fortunate as far as the success of the occupation is concerned.

By the time the war ended, everyone in Japan knew who MacArthur was and was prepared to obey his slightest command. There is not the slightest doubt that his personality and reputation have vastly simplified the problems of occupation. Moreover, the Japanese are grateful to him because he did not inflict on them the punishments and retribution they had every right to expect.

MacArthur leads an austere life in Tokyo. He lives in the American Embassy and drives every morning to his office in the Dai Ichi Building, accompanied only by a chauffeur. He refuses to have guards or escorts, because that might be an indication he was afraid of something, and he is not afraid of anything.

He drives back to the Embassy for lunch, which is generally in the middle of the after-

noon, returns to the Dai Ichi Building and remains there until 7, 8, or 9 in the evening, sometimes later. He has the same routine every day of the year, including Sundays and holidays.

The Japanese know when to expect him, and a crowd gathers in front of the Dai Ichi Building whenever his car with the five-star plate is parked in front of it. This happens four times a day. The people just want to look at the man who is their ruler.

The military police form a lane through which he walks, looking neither to the right nor left. He wears a plain GI uniform with no ribbons or braid and not a single brass button on it. The only insignia is a small circlet of five stars on each shoulder.

When MacArthur first came to Japan, some members of his staff suggested that he summon the Emperor to come and see him. The purpose would have been to humiliate the Emperor in the eyes of his people. But MacArthur refused.

PRESTIGE STRATEGY WORKS

"Let him alone and he'll come of his own volition," he said. That is what happened. Word came from the Japanese Government asking MacArthur whether he would receive the Emperor. The general agreed to do so and the meeting took place.

One of MacArthur's staff begged he be allowed to accompany the general when he returned the Emperor's call. MacArthur replied there would be no opportunity for that.

"If I return that call," he said, "he'll think he is my equal and he is not."

That incident made a profound impression on the Japanese people. The Emperor plays but a small role in the lives of the people of Japan today. But MacArthur plays a very big part. He is the one man the Japanese respect.

In the Diet Building there is a space which somewhat resembles Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol. There are four pedestals in this hall, but only three are adorned with the statues of Japanese national heroes. It is common talk among the Japanese that the fourth pedestal is reserved for a statue of General MacArthur. This may be a subtle form of Japanese humor. Nevertheless it could happen in Japan.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, of May 15, 1947:

APPROVE THE T-E-W BILL

Housing Expediter Frank R. Creedon's latest order relaxing controls on the building of larger houses is designed to lift the construction slump. The order was issued at the behest of builders, and will no doubt bring them some temporary gain. But for the twenty or so million Americans living in crowded or substandard dwellings it means little.

America has not kept faith on the matter of housing—especially with veterans. With $6,000 homes now selling for $10,000 and and $11,000, "homes for vets," a rallying cry during the war, has become a tragic mockery. The final blow came recently when the Government scrapped the last shred of veterans' priority. Speculative builders now—in a rather hypocritical deference to our wartime pledges—are required to give veterans priority on only one house of an entire development.

The trouble with postwar housing in America, as everyone knows, is that it is too expensive. Immediately following the war, builders told us this was because of Government restrictions. You can't, they said, tinker with the inexorable laws of supply and demand. Therefore, Government controls, for all practical purposes, were removed, and Wilson Wyatt was kicked out of office.

Now, 5 months later, prices of basic materials in the construction industry have risen to match what were black-market levels when price controls were on. In the face of an unprecedented boom the construction industry has priced itself out of the market and is now experiencing a slump which could very well precipitate an economic recession—with consequent unemployment—throughout the Nation.

Labor rates in the building trades—a chief cause of the high costs—are at fabulous levels. But despite this, and despite the fact that workers are being laid off because of the building slump, some of the unions are asking for more money, fewer hours, or both.

The pity is that while labor and capital in the construction industry fumble around, nothing is done to remedy the problem of the Nation's homeless and near-homeless. There is now, as there has been for the past many months, only one decent solution. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (a revision of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill which died in a House committee last year) would give the construction industry a positive and long-range program. In place of the haphazard building now prevalent, the T-E-W bill would provide necessary incentive for the construction of from twelve to fifteen million housing units within the next 10 years. Under such a program builder, worker, and buyer would benefit.

The builders call the T-E-W bill socialistic. But this is only a charge, and a false one at that. Congress should ignore those who hold personal interests above the general welfare and physical well-being of the Nation as a whole by passing the T-E-W bill at this session.

Seasonal Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star:

SEASONAL NONSENSE

In the spring, when the fancy of young men is said to turn to thoughts of love, there will be few to envy the lot of men like Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee. For Mr. Reece, whatever his personal inclinations, must bow to the stern call of duty and think, not of love, but of politics.

Evidently this does something to a man. His thought processes apparently become warped somewhere along the line. He loses the ability to think clearly and arrive at logical conclusions. In fact, whether it be attributable to the season or to something else, he seems to stray off into flights of fancy with respect to politics that are very similar to the flights of fancy that bedevil a young man who has fallen in love.

If there are those who doubt this, what other reason can be put forward to explain Mr. Reece's latest attack on the Truman administration? Here is a man, a hardened veteran of the political ring, who would have us believe that Mr. Truman, who is no novice in that field himself, plans to seek reelection on a platform of higher prices. The theory of this seems to be that Mr. Truman will bid for votes by gouging the people and blaming the Republicans.

It is comforting to have Mr. Reece's assurance that "it is inconceivable that the voters will be fooled." He is talking, of course, about the plot that he sees building up in the Truman mind. He might have broadened his statement, however, to say that it is inconceivable that the voters will be fooled by any of this seasonal nonsense.

Address of Dean Alfange to the United Zionists-Revisionists of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dean Alfange at the dinner of the United Zionists-Revisionists of America, Hotel Biltmore, Sunday, May 11:

I told a friend this is the fifth speech on Palestine I am delivering since Monday, and he asked me, "When do you sleep?" I replied that he could find the answer in verse 4, psalm 121, of the Old Testament: "Behold, He that keepeth Israel doth neither slumber nor sleep."

I should be living under the Union Jack, where the sun is always shining. It was revealed that the sun never sets on the British Empire because God will not trust her in the dark.

In his introductory remarks your chairman referred to me as a liberal. Frankly, I am beginning to entertain some very grave misgivings about the meaning of that term. A liberal, as I understand it, is a person who rejects imperialism of every type and totalitarianism of every shade.

A liberal is a person who rejects the double standard of political morality, which impugns the motives of one's own country while condoning those of another. The great need of the moment is for leaders who would meet these tests of political morality and intellectual responsibility. These are no times for political opportunism and political mediocrity.

The decisions we make, the orientations and outlooks we develop during the next few years, will determine our success or failure in the mighty struggle for democratic survival.

Let's now apply these principles to Palestine and the Jewish people.

The public policy of the United States with regard to Palestine has been established by a long line of congressional resolutions and Presidential declarations beginning with the administration of Woodrow Wilson. By the terms of these public pronouncements, our Government stands irrevocably committed to the development of Palestine as a national Jewish home with its concomitant of free and unrestricted Jewish immigration.

Well, if that is our policy—and no one can deny that it is—why do we shirk our responsibility in this most crucial hour in the history of Israel? Why do we hem and haw, duck and dodge and skate around the periphery of the question? If that is our policy, why don't we adhere to it?

If the United States of America would boldly take the leadership in the fight for a free Palestine, Palestine would soon be established as a Jewish state without the pompous mockery of commissions of inquiry and the useless spilling of precious blood. But, why don't we do it? Is it petroleum again? Are we emulating the British imperial practice of subordinating human rights to the rights of private property? Could it be that we have made unsavory commitments to protect our new multi-billion-dollar private oil empire in Saudi Arabia? Or, could it be that those pro-Arab ninnies in our State Department have deliberately misled Mr. Truman and Mr. Marshall? For when the Secretary of State wrote the other day to 30 Members of Congress that "It would be premature for this Government to develop its policy with regard to the substance of this question," he demonstrated an appalling ignorance of the fixed and long-established policy of the United States. It might be well, Senator PEPPER, to call for a senatorial investigation to expose the pro-Arab antecedents of those men in our State Department who head the Division of Near Eastern Affairs, and to determine their fitness to remain in office.

It is about time we stopped kidding the Jewish people with empty promises and fake platform commitments that are never kept. It is a pretty brutal thing to kid a people with their back against the wall. I told Dr. Abba Hillel Silver the other day that if I were a Jew and the spokesman of organized Zionism, I would tell President Truman to fish or cut bait on Palestine—and we all understand what that means in terms of 1948.

I have no faith in a United Nations solution of the Palestine question unless our Government undertakes militantly to advocate the Jewish cause. The United Nations Commission will be the 19th committee of inquiry on Palestine since the Balfour Declaration; and like its predecessors, is not intended to accomplish anything except delay.

The whole proceeding is therefore a sham and a mockery—a mere plea in abatement to allow a faithless guardian to continue the exploitation of his ward; and our acquiescence in this trickery is a confession of moral and intellectual bankruptcy.

There is only one solution to the problem of Palestine—bloodshed, rebellion, resistance, and boycott.

The underground resistance movement is the major front in the battle for a free Palestine. The heroes of the Jewish resistance movement are no different from the American colonists who staged the Boston Tea Party and the Irish Rebels of the 1920's.

Those valiant warriors of the underground are counteracting anti-Semitism throughout the world by portraying the Jew, for the first time in modern history, as a fierce fighter for individual liberty and national freedom.

Let's not apologize for their deeds of heroism and self-sacrifice. Let us encourage them and help them in every way we can.

The second front in the fight for a free Jewish Palestine is the direct and indirect boycott. Let us face the facts. Great Britain is waging an illegal and immoral war of economic and political aggression against the Jewish people.

In the light of this reality, the Jewish people and their friends are fully justified in resorting to a powerful retaliatory measure in the form of a boycott upon all British goods and services.

In view of Britain's betrayal of the Jewish people, why do the Jews continue to support British trade, buy British scotch, travel on British planes and ships, attend British-made movies, and patronize British insurance companies?

I propose that the Jewish people organize an effective boycott upon British goods and services of every type and description. Britain's Achilles' heel is her economic vulnerability. Dart your arrow in that direction and she may yield sooner than you suspect.

The third front in the fight is forced mass immigration into Palestine. Such immigration is not illegal. Only British resistance to it is illegal.

I am speaking as a Christian and as a liberal. Palestine is not only a Jewish issue. It is a world-wide political issue that impinges directly upon the whole problem of democratic self-determination and survival.

We are about to spend $400,000,000 a year to buttress democracy in Greece and Turkey. Why then do we reject an opportunity to make Palestine the greatest bastion of democracy in the Middle East? By supporting the Zionist cause, America could build a mighty fortress of freedom in that critical nerve center of the world without spending a single dollar of our taxpayers' money.

Why don't we do it? Is the Truman doctrine a matter of ideology or is it power politics? Is it because aggression in Greece stems from the east, while aggression in Palestine stems from the west?

I ask. I want to know.

I believe in the Truman doctrine if it truly aims to protect our western way of life from the encroachments of imperialism and the totalitarian ideology. If that be the aim of this new departure in our foreign policy, then the creation of a free Jewish Palestine would be a perfect implementation of the Truman doctrine. I therefore charge that our failure, militantly to support the Zionist cause, is a reflection on the validity of the Truman doctrine and on the sincerity of its sponsors. Frankly, I am beginning to wonder if Mr. Truman himself knows what the Truman doctrine really implies.

The great contest of our times is the struggle of social democracy against the forces of imperialism and totalitarianism.

The feudal lords of the Arab league, who not long ago were shouting their heads off for Adolf Hitler, are not interested in democracy. They are interested only in keeping their subjects in a state of peonage for their own private profit; and their fear of the Jew is a fear of progress, freedom, and enlightenment.

Now, I think it is self-evident that the fate of democracy in the Middle East is inextricably interwoven with the fate of Palestine. But, there is yet another deeper reason why Christian liberals should rally to the Zionist cause.

Anti-Semitism is the breeder of fascism and a menace to freedom. If now that the Fascist tyranny has been crushed, there shall remain in the soil of the earth those seeds and those roots which grow and blossom into bigotry, and hatred, and oppression of man by man and nation by nation, our victory shall be a tragic mockery of all the death and devastation that preceded it. We therefore owe it to the dead and to our own self-interest to eradicate the filthy weed of anti-Semitism from the soil of democracy; and the only way it can be done—mark my word—is by conferring upon the Jewish people the dignity of statehood. So long as the Jews remain without a home, without political status, without a calling card, and an official address, so long shall they be considered the tramp race of the world, an easy prey to the demagogues looking for scapegoats upon whom to saddle their failures and frustrations.

America must assert its great moral authority to bring about just solutions of the great international problems that confront the world; but America must clean its own house first. America to which the world looks for guidance is internally saturated with a bigotry that nullifies its preachments of equality and freedom. There are too many people born in America in whom America was never born.

The practice of restricted hotels, of restricted resorts, and of restrictive covenants upon the use of land is as shameful and odious as the most vicious of the Nazi "verbotens." Anti-Semitism is the syphilis of democracy and must be rooted out in the interest of democratic survival.

I am beginning to despair of the efficacy of the church and the school as eradicators of bigotry. I sometimes feel we should be bold enough and brave enough to try two remedies that were never fully tried before—freedom and Christianity.

The recurrent waves of anti-Semitism, the world-wide apathy to the awful plight of the homeless Jews of Europe, and the failure of our own country to fulfill its moral and legal obligations with regard to Palestine, are by no means the sole concern of the Jewish people. They are the vital concern of every decent man and woman, of every liberal-minded person throughout the world, for they indicate—and all too clearly—that the dead have died in vain; that those lofty ideals for which men fought and died on the battlefields of the world are now yielding, under pressure, to the brutal forces of imperialism and power politics.

So, let us try freedom and Christianity. Let us not press another crown of thorns upon the brow of Israel in His hour of agony and bereavement. Let us apply those elemental principles of justice, morality and fair play to the problems of the Jewish people. We owe it not only to the Jews; we owe it to ourselves, for it is we, the non-Jews of the world, who have created these problems of which the Jews are now merely the victims.

America must take the leadership in the fight for a free Jewish Palestine. It is a challenge to freedom, and a challenge to Christianity. It is a challenge that ought to stir the hearts and souls of men of action. Will we accept that challenge?

Labor and the Closed Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. JOHN S. WOOD, Thursday, May 15, 1947:

In my opinion many of the evils present in labor's current attitude toward the public and toward its own members stem from compulsory unionism and its attendant abuse.

Time does not permit me to go into all the ramifications of legislation necessary to correct the many abuses which existing law has permitted to be practiced by certain abritrary labor leaders, but I shall try to cover briefly the problems presented by the closed shop, the jurisdictional dispute between rival union leaders, the secondary boycott and the complete injustice that arises from a labor leader's right to break his collective-bargaining contract with impunity.

Of all of these evils, the closed shop, in my opinion, is the worst.

It is, indeed a sad commentary upon a free democracy for its citizens to suddenly come face to face with the realization that the closed shop, in conjunction with the closed

union, is more powerful than your Government.

Your Government cannot take away from any individual his right to work unless he has been duly convicted of a crime by a jury of his peers. Even then, your Government assumes the responsibility of his keep. But when the leader of a closed shop union becomes displeased with one of his members, the employer of that member must automatically discharge him, and such ex-employee must then find employment outside a labor union or starve.

I regret that the current versions of labor legislation now being considered by your Congress do not end the evils of the closed shop to my satisfaction.

As you know, these provisions permit what is known as a union shop, upon a majority vote of all the employees in a given plant. This means that a new employee must agree to join the labor union within 30 days after his name is entered on the pay roll.

From then on, he is subjected to the whims and dictates of the union leader.

I admit that the Hartley bill goes far to restore other basic freedoms to the worker. Under the bill, it has been argued that the worker no longer has to go to the labor leader to get a job. For my own part, I see little difference between the closed and the union shop from the point of view of the average worker. Sooner or later he must relinquish his freedom to do and say what he pleases in accordance with the desires of a labor leader he has no hand in selecting. Both involve the principle of coercion, which is repugnant to every conception I have of a free democracy.

Let me tell you what I consider to be some of the crimes that have been committed as a direct result of the closed shop and of attempts to force the closed shop on unwilling employees.

Out in Oakland, Calif., a young man by the name of Donald M. Gibson ran a small paint-manufacturing concern with three employees.

The Gibson Paint Co. is typical of the small businesses that make up the backbone of the American economy. This company occupied a room about twice as large as your living room. In the back of the room they manufactured paint; in the front, they sold it. They had no salesmen, no dealers, no delivery truck. Donald Gibson just made and sold paint.

For 10 years, Paint Makers Local, No. 1101, of the giant American Federation of Labor had been trying to organize all three employees of the Gibson Paint Co. They refused to join, although they were told repeatedly by the owners that they were free to do so if they wanted to.

Last fall the paint makers local tried another approach. Their business agent requested the company to fire the three employees, and the union would send three new ones, all good union men. And thus the closed shop would be established. One of the old employees had been working for the Gibson Paint Co. for 20 years, another 6 years, and the third, a returned veteran, just under a year.

The Gibson Paint Co. rejected the demand.

This was the company's first mistake. You see, it felt it had a right to conduct its own business; it felt its employees had an equal right to join or not to join a union.

Now, of course, the company was right.

But we must remember we're talking about labor relations where what is right has nothing to do with what happens.

An A. F. of L. picket was placed in front of this small one-room manufacturing concern. Deliveries of raw materials ceased. The factory closed in 5 days.

In this situation there are no laws to protect the company, there are no laws to protect the workers, and Federal courts are expressly forbidden jurisdiction.

The three workers admitted their defeat and reluctantly consented to join the union.

The business agent brought around a closed-shop agreement which the company signed. The employees paid $75 initiation and business was resumed for 3 weeks.

Then they were called out on strike. Now here are the facts:

1. The employees were satisfied with their earnings and working conditions.
2. There was no labor dispute.
3. No collective bargaining took place.
4. None of the employees wanted to strike.

Yet that small manufacturing plant was put out of business, and this is typical of thousand of cases all over the land.

Let's look at another angle of the closed-shop issue. The ultimate goal of all labor leaders is to get a closed union. This is a labor organization which limits membership in some way, or makes it difficult for new members to get in.

Today, for example, a worker trying to get into the printing trades may find it impossible because in many cases the union has closed its books. A skilled worker trying to get a job in the building trades may be told to get on a waiting list, if he doesn't already belong to the union.

It is this kind of restriction which creates the labor monopolies that deny jobs to many deserving workers.

In Chicago, right after the war, a veteran returned to his old job in his uncle's motion-picture theater. He had operated the projection machine there for 11 years, but while he was away the union had bludgeoned the uncle into a closed-shop contract. The union refused to accept the returned veteran as a member, and his old job was occupied by a good union man. So there he was, out of a job, while his uncle was being sued by the Government for violation of the job-guaranty provisions of the Selective Service Act.

Is there any wonder that we are hearing from all over this Nation an ever louder demand for the abolition of the closed shop and all that it implies?

It is my sincere conviction that a legal prohibition against the closed shop will result in better and stronger unions.

I know this may sound strange to those radio listeners whose ears have been bombarded during the past weeks by the propaganda outpourings of those who desire to perpetuate this specie of labor racketeering. Nevertheless, let us look at the record:

America is the strongest Nation on earth today. In the brief time of its existence its progress and prosperity has no parallel in history. It is built on the principle that every man has a voice in the selection of his leaders, that every citizen may criticize the action taken by his elected representatives, may work for the defeat of those public officials whose actions are unsatisfactory.

No other government can begin to compete with ours in what has been done to better the lot of the individual.

Now, may I ask, What is wrong with applying this same system to the labor unions? A man should be given the right, if he desires, to join a labor union, because he feels it is in his best interests to do so, not from fear, not from want, not just to get a job. And he should have the right to remain a member of that union only because he is satisfied with the way its affairs are directed. He should have the right to support the leaders of his union, or, if he so chooses, to work for such leader's defeat in a fair and impartial election. In short, if a labor union is so impotent as to be unable to furnish to its members sufficient benefits as to attract them into its ranks without coercion, it has, in good morals, no excuse for existence.

This applies the principles that have made America the envy of all the world.

Can anyone in all fairness suggest a sounder base upon which to build strong labor unions?

I would like to talk for a minute about another form of labor racketeering that has grown up under the Wagner Act.

This is known as the secondary boycott.

The secondary boycott is a form of concerted labor activity on the part of one group of workers for the purpose of increasing the power or membership of another union. It consists of a refusal by a group of workers to handle goods produced by another group, either because they belong to no union, or to the wrong union, or perhaps to the wrong local of their own union.

Workers engaging in a secondary boycott seek to coerce their own employer, with whom they have no dispute, to withdraw or withhold patronage from another employer and his workers.

For example, one of the witnesses before the House Labor Committee told of a boycott of prefabricated homes for veterans by the Carpenters' Union of the American Federation of Labor. The reason for the boycott was that the company making prefabricated homes had a collective-bargaining agreement with the CIO.

You see, therefore, the dispute was not with their employers, but with the workers in another State who joined a rival CIO union. As a result the housing shortage in that particular area was intensified.

Let me show you how the secondary boycott operates to raise prices. We have been hearing a lot about high prices recently.

The Westinghouse Electric Manufacturing Co. submitted a bid for $56,000 for panel boards and switchboards for a low-cost housing project in New York. The Westinghouse bid was, by far, the lowest. But Westinghouse has a collective-bargaining contract with the CIO. Yet no electrical products may be installed in New York City which do not carry the union label of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. As a result, the contract went to a local manufacturer charging almost twice the $56,000 specified in the Westinghouse bid.

This Congress must pass legislation to prohibit the secondary boycott. The Hartley bill contains an effective prohibition against this type of labor monopoly, and carries strong penalties for those who violate the law. In addition, protection of the National Labor Relations Act is withdrawn from those workers participating in secondary boycotts, and persons injured may sue for recovery of damages.

These provisions are not antilabor. Just as I am convinced that the abolition of the closed shop will strengthen legitimate labor activities, I am equally convinced that prohibition of the secondary boycott will remove the source of much of the labor-management strife of the Nation.

To the arguments that the secondary boycott is a legitimate and necessary union activity, I say that today there is no justification to resort to the boycott.

Today, unions have legal protection and great power. Prohibition of the secondary boycott will not weaken unions in the pursuit of their legitimate objectives. Such legislation will, however, give the public the protection which it should have. If we fail to outlaw the secondary boycott, we will make a mockery of our belief in a free competitive economy.

Another of the completely unjustified abuses by unions is called the jurisdictional strike. This results from an argument between the leaders of two unions as to which shall have authority over particular workers.

This is the type of dispute which finds the employer completely helpless. If he makes a decision in favor of one union leader, the other union strikes, and vice versa.

This is the type of dispute that has tied up the film-producing industry in Hollywood for almost 2 years. This is the type of dispute that has meant a return of the gangster methods of Capone in the Pittsburgh beer war.

Let's look at the facts behind this particular jurisdictional dispute.

For more than 40 years, 15 brewers in western Pennsylvania have had labor agreements with the International Brotherhood

of Brewery Workers. As a result of continuing difficulties with the A. F. of L.'s teamsters, the brewery workers' union withdrew from the American Federation of Labor, and after a period as an independent organization, affiliated with the CIO.

Almost immediately the teamsters' union went into action. They wanted jurisdiction over those workers who bottled beer. Let me repeat that. The teamsters wanted jurisdiction over those people whose entire job was made up of putting beer in bottles.

These particular workers refused, and rightly so. Since then, the campaign of violence and terrorism which has plagued the city of Pittsburgh is almost beyond belief. Drivers of trucks hauling products made by the offending brewers were waylayed by roving gangs of thugs. Following this rather gentle activity, the teamsters brought out a new type of fire bomb.

You might be interested in knowing how the teamster's fire bomb is made. First, you take a 200-watt bulb, cut off the top, fill it with high-test gasoline, and stuff surgical gauze in the opening. To use, you light the stopper and let it go.

I want to emphasize in connection with the Pittsburgh beer war that there is absolutely no relief under existing statutes. The Hartley bill contains ample remedy, and will, in my opinion, effectively prevent jurisdictional disputes.

Let me go into another matter that points up the glaring inequality of law in dealing with labor unions.

It is fundamental to a stable society that agreements entered into in good faith by the parties must be lived up to by both, or, in case of default, that the party defaulting must be suable in the courts. This is the basic assumption upon which business relationships are built.

It is also fundamental common law that the employer is responsible for his contract, and he may be sued in State or Federal court and held to account.

Yet the right to sue unions for breach of contract is utterly lacking in our Federal statutes, and industry has been singularly unsuccessful in attempting to hold unions to the contracts which they have made.

We all know of hundreds of instances where unions have struck in violation of a contract, have forced employers to increase wages by threatening to strike, regardless of bona fide labor-union contracts with several months to run before expiration.

I am aware that the suability of unions was affected by a court decision several decades ago where a judgment was levied against individual union members so as to create unreasonable hardship. I would like to point out that the Hartley bill does not make it possible for another occurrence of this character. What we provide in the Hartley bill is that the union as an organization is liable for the actions of its members to the extent of its treasury.

The restoration of the common-law principle that holds a person responsible for his own acts in the matter of labor-management relations will go a long way toward preventing irresponsible activities on the part of labor leaders.

In conclusion, I want to warn you against the current highly financed propaganda campaign of the labor czars who have been accorded unprecedented special privilege and arbitrary power under existing law, which enables them to enslave the working masses and penalize the American people.

If you have, by any chance, been listening to their broadcasts, or have seen their paid advertisements, you will realize that they have been unable to make a legitimate attack against any of the provisions of the labor legislation now being considered by your Congress.

Instead, they have resorted to smear tactics unworthy, in my opinion, of an American institution.

In a recent ad, they claimed that your Congress was attempting to make freemen work against their will.

This is not only untrue but the exact opposite is true.

The House labor bill denies illegitimate power and authority to labor leaders, but denies no legitimate right of labor.

I am not advocating antilabor legislation. Rather, I am attacking what are, in my opinion, the worst of the antilabor activities engaged in by organized labor. Without question, labor today ignores the public and acts for a chosen few.

The time has come for your Congress to act.

And I am certain that the action we are now taking is in labor's interest and in the interest of the American people.

Leprosy Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item:

AN OPPORTUNITY AND AN OBLIGATION

At its convention here this week, the Louisiana State Medical Society adopted a resolution urging that all treatment and research involving infectious cases of leprosy be confined, as at present, to Carville, site of this country's only leprosarium.

This stand runs directly counter to that of Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the United States. Earlier this month, Dr. Parran announced that a treatment center for early cases of leprosy would soon be established at Marine Hospital here. Dr. G. H. Faget, until recently director of Carville, has been named to take charge of the center. Dr. Mason V. Hargett, of the United States Public Health Service, has been assigned to the State health department staff, to direct a research program.

What, then, lies behind opposition to the plans of the Nation's public health chief?

From Biblical times on down, leprosy cursed its victims not only with prolonged physical suffering, but with complete social ostracism. Crying "unclean, unclean!" the leper's fellow man has driven him from his sight.

For ages, medical science has sought to discover curative treatments for the disease. The Public Health Service has engaged in this quest at Carville, where patients come voluntarily but must remain until released. Within the past 5 years, gratifying results have been obtained from the use of sulfa drugs. During 1946, 43 patients were discharged from Carville, their leprosy pronounced arrested or cured. In the words of Dr. Parran, "for the first time in the history of mankind we feel that we can now say to persons who have leprosy 'There is hope.'"

If that is the case, what is there to prevent eradication of the disease in this country? The answer lies in the fact that the leper still bears a terrible social stigma. Consequently, he is most reluctant to seek out treatment. Moreover, the disease is extremely difficult to diagnose in its early stages, and very few physicians are fully acquainted with the symptoms. Thus, those who enter Carville have often had the disease 4 or 5 years. This inevitably diminishes the effectiveness of treatment.

For several months now, a national advisory committee has worked with Dr. Parran on this problem. It was the committee's unanimous decision to seek the establishment of special treatment centers in California, Texas, Florida, and Louisiana, the four States in which leprosy is endemic. The center at Marine Hospital, as well as Dr. Hargett's research work, are designed as testing grounds for the larger plan. The aim: earliest possible diagnosis for a disease which is now susceptible of successful treatment.

Dr. Parran is best known to Americans for his relentless and victorious battle against the public ignorance and prejudice which surrounded syphilis. Through persistence and reason, he enlisted the support of the Nation's press in his crusade against a ridiculous taboo. Today, syphilis has taken its proper place along with cancer or tuberculosis, as a disease to be treated as quickly and sensibly as medical science can do the job.

We are on the eve of a similar war against the taboos surrounding leprosy. The disease is less contagious than either syphilis or tuberculosis. Its victims are much fewer in number than those of any other common disease. An effective treatment has been devised. Yet the pall of ignorance still darkens the leper's path.

The task of lifting that pall falls naturally to the press, in close cooperation with medical authorities. Much has already been accomplished in the past few months. Recently the Times-Picayune published an excellent series of articles on the subject. Other newspapers elsewhere have picked up the challenge, and in all likelihood this trend will be accelerated. A great opportunity exists for all citizens, and for the medical profession in particular, to come to the aid of a sound, just, and humane cause.

Pay Terminal-Leave Bonds in Cash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the House of Representatives, I have been hoping for an opportunity to vote for any one of a number of bills which have been introduced in the Congress providing for the cash payment of terminal-leave bonds to enlisted men on the same basis as officers. This session of this Congress is said to be more than one-half over and as yet none of these bills have been reported to the House for consideration. I am informed that the House Committee on Armed Services has not even scheduled hearings on any of these bills, including H. R. 3, the Rogers bill, which would authorize the cash payment of these bonds or make the bonds negotiable so that veterans could sell them to anyone who might be interested in holding these securities as an investment. There has been a concerted effort by many Members of this Congress to bring this measure to the floor of the House, and in order to do so it has been necessary for Members interested in the passage of this legislation to petition the committee to discharge the bill and thus bring it on the floor for consideration.

As of today, 100 names of Members of the House appear on this petition. The Members who have signed the petition

include both Democrats and Republicans. All other Members who intend to do so should sign the petition immediately. Cash payment of terminal-leave bonds received bipartisan support in the last Congress and this principle should be adopted by the present Congress. Authority for a veteran to cash any terminal-leave bond which he may hold should be authorized in order that the veteran may have funds to buy a home or to start in business or for investment purposes. The payment of these bonds represents a national obligation for patriotic service performed. Upon separation from the service, officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps were provided with a cash payment for their accumulated terminal leave, and it is only just and fair and right that the same treatment should be accorded enlisted men separated from the service I am informed that when Members of the House agreed in the last days of the Seventy-ninth Congress to accept the pay-in-bonds amendment made in the Senate that it was assumed and expected that the Eightieth Congress would have time to give consideration to legislation authorizing the cash payment of these bonds. Certainly, under the circumstances, hearings should be held as evidence can be presented which would justify favorable action by the Congress in this connection. The paying off of the terminal-leave bonds at this time would effect a reduction in the national debt and also effect a saving of the 2½-percent interest which these bonds draw and which interest over a period of years would accumulate into a further increased and substantial national debt.

The matter of equalizing the rights of enlisted men with officers in this regard represents fair play among our servicemen and is an obligation which the Nation should discharge. Some of our enlisted men may not care to cash their bonds at this time yet many others are presently in need of this money for numerous purposes as indicated and I deem it proper that the Congress effect immediate consideration of a settlement of this obligation. The measure should not only be considered it must be passed and enacted into law.

Destruction of Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. POTTS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand a picture appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, May 18, 1947, showing a mountain of potatoes in an Alabama field. There are two workers standing on top of the pile and from their size you can get a pretty good picture of the enormous amount of potatoes in the pile. It is said that these two workers are from the Agriculture Department's Production and Marketing Administration and that kerosene was poured over the potatoes to make them unfit for consumption. More than 50 tons were dumped.

Mr. Speaker, this was in Foley, Ala. The same thing has been happening out in Long Island, New York State, for longer than the past year. I understand that it also happens in Maine, and I would not be surprised if it also happens in a number of other places.

In today's market potatoes range all the way from 6 cents a pound to 10 cents a pound. Ask any housewife, and she will tell you that even at those prices the best potatoes are not available. They are either spongy or spotted. People are inquiring as to why prices are so high. The answer from the foregoing is apparent. The administration, which seeks great measures of governmental control over our economy sees fit to destroy tremendous quantities of produce which if put on the market would reduce the cost of living. Potatoes would not then be selling from 6 to 10 cents a pound.

Unification of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of May 16, 1947:

MERGER DISGUISED

There are some features in the proposed merger legislation which have great merit. These are the establishing by law of:

1. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, whose job it is to determine the over-all strategy of the Nation's armed forces.

2. A National Security Council, the function of which would be to coordinate the military and foreign policies of the Government and to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power in the interest of national security.

3. A National Security Resources Board, the purpose of which is to coordinate military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, and to unify all of the policies of the Federal agencies, departments, and bureaus in time of war.

4. The Munitions Board which will operate to coordinate the military aspects of industrial mobilization, and to determine the relative priorities in connection with the military procurement programs.

5. A Research and Development Board, the prime purpose of which is to prepare and conduct an integrated program of research and development for military purposes.

6. A Central Intelligence Agency, the function of which is to obtain, appraise, and disseminate valuable information, not only to the Nation as a whole but for the military forces as well.

These are features which are obviously constructive and should be enacted into law. However, it is not necessary for this Nation to gain these advantages through a disguised merger bill, or to pass an over-all military reform bill, such as this proposed merger bill represents, dressed up as a National Security Act of 1947.

We do not need in the United States a military dictator in the form of the Secretary of National Defense. We do not need a separate independent Department of Air when the whole direction of air warfare is toward closer and more detailed operational integration with both the Army and the Navy. We can get along without military control of the country.

During these days when the Nation is trying to save the people's money by cutting down the expenses of government and the establishing of an over-all economic program, it seems far wiser to make more efficient the military organization now composed of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Reserve forces, and National Guard units of the respective States, all of which have stood the test of war, than to create a huge new independent Department of Air, the necessity of which is most doubtful, and which in the end will cost several billion dollars every year just to maintain on an independent basis.

This is not merger and it is not unification which means just about exactly the same thing. If an independent Department of Air were ever to be created, and that is a highly debatable question, the time it should have been created was about 1920, for it was during the war just ended that such an independent Department of Air would have reached its maximum value to the country from the viewpoint of piloted aircraft for strategic bombing purposes. By the time the next war arrives this method of striking the enemy will be obsolete. In fact, it is just about obsolete at the present time.

We strongly feel, after giving no little thought to the matter, that this commonly known merger bill, referred to in dress circles by the brass as the unification bill, and officially disguised as the National Security Act of 1947, should be defeated. It is, oddly enough, a rather complete copy of Hitler's military machine. It is patterned on the old German military dictatorial organization. In our studied opinion it is not worthy of the support of any Senator or Congressman.

We feel, too, that the morale of the Navy and the Marine Corps would be irreparably shattered; that the efficiency of these fighting units would be reduced to a futile minimum, and that the esprit de corps, such as was so notably demonstrated by the marines during the recent war, would be sadly lacking.

Any legislation which deals with the Military Establishment of the United States actually reaches into every home in our land. While all of us want to see our armed forces progress and advance in every manner and way possible, there is no urgency in America for military reform of this drastic and potentially highly dangerous nature. Thousands of ex-servicemen in both the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps are strenuously objecting to this proposed military reform bill. Professional officers and men in both the Army and the Navy would object publicly and violently if they were given an opportunity to do so without swift reprisal and jeopardy of their careers. Nonetheless, such as General Vandegrift and General Edson of the Marine Corps have registered their strong opposition to this bill. In view of the importance of this legislation and the tremendous detriment it could and probably would place upon the Nation, if enacted, the Sun respectfully requests all Members of Congress to think twice and count 10 before placing themselves in favor of such an ill-conceived military reform bill, talked of as a merger, and disguised as the National Security Act of 1947.

We might conclude by briefly referring to our casual meeting only this week with a Purple Heart veteran of both World Wars, a man with considerable Army rank. Talk eventually turned to the merger, and we asked his opinion of it.

"Well," he replied, "if this merger bill had been passed while the war was on, we would still be fighting instead of at peace."

Letter From President of District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Regarding Navy Department Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include the following letter dated May 19, 1947, addressed to the Members of the House by Mr. N. P. Alifas, president of District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, concerning the appropriation bill for the Navy Department which we are about to consider:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1947.

To the Members of the House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: District No. 44 of the International Association of Machinists, organizations affiliated with the A. F. of L., and the railroad brotherhoods, are deeply disturbed by the action taken by the Appropriations Committee of the House in eliminating from the pending naval appropriation bill, H. R. 3493, a piece of labor legislation of long standing, prohibiting elemental stop-watch time study and the premium-bonus system of payment, and substituting therefor ineffectual language.

The language substituted merely prohibits contracts being let for the purpose of installing the objectionable elemental stopwatch time-study practices; and would therefore permit the employment of swarms of time-study men, so-called efficiency experts, job evaluation experts, and other supernumeraries with book knowledge but little practical experience, to introduce some drastic system of shop management. It would also permit existing supervisors and managements to do the same thing.

The evils (from the workmen's point of view) attendant upon the elemental time-study practices and the premium-bonus system of payment which goes with it, have been so clearly presented to Congress, in bygone years, that restatement of the case should not be necessary.

Suffice it to say that this language, which the Appropriations Committee proposes to eliminate from the bill, has been contained in the Army and Navy appropriation bills, annually, since 1915 during both Republican and Democratic administrations. Former Congressman Irvin S. Pepper, Democrat, of Iowa, started the fight against the introduction of the Taylor and similar systems of shop management in the Government service in 1912.

Congressman Harry E. Hull, Republican, of Iowa, and Congressman Frederick W. Dallinger, Republican, of Massachusetts, successfully took up the cudgel in labor's behalf for several years. Senator William E. Borah, Republican, of Idaho, sponsored this legislation in 1913, and presented to the Senate an excoriating report from the Senate Committee on Education and Labor against the practices involved in the stop-watch time-study technique and the premium-bonus system of pay as a means of handling workmen.

In 1945 and 1946 Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington, Senator William Langer, Republican, of North Dakota, and Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., led a successful fight in the Senate which restored this language eliminated or made innocuous by action of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

We sincerely hope, therefore, that you will support a motion to strike out the new language contained in the pending naval appropriation bill, H. R. 3493, which is found on page 28 beginning in line 7 with the word "No" and ending with the word "employee" in line 11, and substitute the language which has been in the bill annually for 32 years.

Whatever may be said pro and con on the merits of the contention that the Congress received a mandate at the last election to curb labor unions and labor-union bosses, we submit that it would take farfetched reasoning to also contend that a mandate exists to destroy this particular piece of labor legislation.

In private industry, labor unions, through collective bargaining, are in a position to curb or minimize harsh shop practices. In the Federal service employees have no such power.

Government employees neither desire to strike, assert the right to strike, nor have the legal right to strike against abuses of this kind. While there are unions in the Federal service, they are democratically operated. The membership decides upon policy and program, and their representatives attempt to carry them out. There are no union bosses in the labor unions covering members employed in the Federal service. Such labor representatives possess only the right to petition Congress and to employ such powers of persuasion as they might possess, as per this communication.

The prohibition against elemental stopwatch time study and the premium-bonus system of payment applies only to the Navy and War Departments, because these two Departments are the only ones that have indicated a desire to introduce these objectionable practices.

Apparently, from time to time, societies of engineers appear to have sold these two Departments a bill of goods, probably with a view to create some jobs for their members.

Other departments of the Government appear to feel that operating under the per diem rate of pay or upon an annual salary basis, and at times piecework, produces the best results in their establishments.

As a matter of fact, the naval industrial establishments and the arsenals under the War Department, are primarily engaged in repairs and modernization of existing military equipment, a process which does not lend itself to the elemental stop-watch time-study practices and the premium-bonus system of pay.

Managements have told representatives of labor repeatedly that it is impracticable to operate a plant under two or three systems of pay in the same shop, due to the resultant bickering among workmen, and the consequent lowering of morale.

We beg humbly to suggest that if the Congress really wants to do something to improve the efficiency of its military industrial establishments, it would do well to modify some of the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944, under which, from now on, disabled veterans will be at the top of all employment eligible lists, and the preference which all types of veterans receive for retention purposes is gradually forcing out of the Federal service its highly skilled mechanics and other personnel which has the know-how because such discharged employees have had no military service.

Such a move would also make available to the Federal service the other 120,000,000 Americans banned by veterans' preference, among them the skill of our most outstanding mechanics and production workers in the United States; and would give the oncoming generation (practically all of whom are effectively barred from employment through the operation of the above-referred-to Veterans' Preference Act) an opportunity to work for the Federal Government.

Trusting this will receive your favorable consideration and your support for the proposed restoration of the labor legislation eliminated by the Appropriations Committee, I remain

Very respectfully yours,
N. P. ALIFAS,
President, District No. 44,
International Association of Machinists.

Make Our Money Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no better delineation of the relationship between foreign loans and Interior appropriations and development has been made than this editorial from the Washington News.

Under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include it:

MAKE OUR MONEY WORK

Chairman BRIDGES, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, demands that Congress be told how much foreign spending is planned instead of being asked for money in dribs and drabs. His request makes sense.

The administration is seeking $200,000,000 in economic aid for Korea. Italy wants more money. Britain may ask another loan. These and other countries genuinely need help, but we will invite disaster if we go on pouring out millions and billions to meet recurring crises.

Months ago Bernard M. Baruch urged that we inventory our resources and find out how far we are able to go with foreign aid. That should be done now. Beyond that, we must realize that emergency loans to buy food and other necessities will not, of themselves, solve the complex financial problems of Europe and Asia. The hungry must be fed, certainly, but people must get back to work and normal trade must be revived.

We can contribute to world recovery by buying as well as selling on the world market—by exchanging our food and manufactured goods for raw materials to be used by American industry or stock piled for national defense.

We have used up three-fourths of our domestic supply of bauxite, source of aluminum. We need more than 40,000 tons of tin a year, and produce only a few tons. We mine no nickel in the United States, and only about four-fifths as much zinc as we use. Our reserves of chromite, manganese, platinum, mercury, and tungsten are too small for safety. Most of these vital metals are produced by nations in the British Empire, or by others that need our industrial products. Almost every country in the world can supply nonperishable raw materials that we can use.

We can afford to buy and store such materials. We can get them at a fair price by absorbing surpluses not readily salable elsewhere. They will be like money in the bank. As world demand increases for products made from such materials we will be prepared to meet it.

If people are to live, production must be stepped up throughout the world. That can be done by breaking down trade barriers and putting money into circulation—not to be lost on shot-in-the-arm relief financing but to work and earn expanding returns.

Let Idaho Show the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. JONES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Idaho Statesman:

LET IDAHO SHOW THE WAY

Since the end of the war and the obvious reduction in governmental costs we have all believed that Federal budgets could be reduced, Federal pay rolls trimmed, budgets balanced, taxes lowered, and progress made on the payment of our enormous public debt. The last election, which the Republicans won mainly on the above idea, gave evidence that the public wanted to get back on a normal basis of Government finance.

The Republican Congress convened and heard President Truman's budget request and promptly termed it too high. There was a great deal of speculation over how much the budget could be reduced, and it finally appeared that the Republicans would keep their promises and make a substantial cut in the costs of Government and eventually lower taxes, especially for the smaller-income groups.

Into this budget-reduction picture came the reclamation program and the many projects planned over a period of years but dormant in the time of war. These projects in Idaho are scattered over the different sections of the State, and it was obvious that some of them would be eliminated from the budget if the Federal Government was to make economies. This has been the case. Idaho has lost many reclamation projects it requested, although there is no fair reason for Idahoans to complain if they are serious in their demands for lower public debt and lower taxes.

Governor Robins has joined a group of Northwest governors who have formed a bloc to demand that we receive more reclamation money than the present appropriations give us. We think the Governor, and the rest of the reclamation people in Idaho, should be a little more consistent. There is need for sensible reasoning in the demands for Federal funds for new projects. There is a definite need, in the Governor's case, for his recalling his campaign promises of good government and economy. It is impossible for Idaho or Idaho's Governor or Idaho's reclamation officials to pressure for higher funds and, at the same time, expect reduction in Federal taxes and the Federal budget.

Boise has a reclamation office with an annual pay roll of more than a quarter of a million dollars—$284,930.30 to be exact. To us this seems absurd; and before Governor Robins starts out to secure for Idaho more Federal funds for this agency he should investigate whether or not this Boise office costs is now necessary—whether in the face of the great need for economy with Federal money it might be possible to trim this bureau down. Idaho might set an example in this direction. And Idaho reclamationists might also let the public know what this $284,930.30 pays for. And also, if the Interior Department budget stands as it is now before Congress, and Idaho reclamation funds are reduced, how many of the bureau employees will be eliminated to bring the administrative costs in line?

The Interior Department budget reductions are not too drastic as far as Idaho is concerned. In fact, this State is quite well off, compared to other States. Our congressional delegation apparently has done well in keeping needed projects in the budget and agreeing to the elimination of unnecessary projects at this time. We should let well enough alone and hope that the Senate approves the present budget. And when that is done we should reduce the operating costs of the Reclamation Department in Idaho accordingly in order that the funds coming into the State will be spent for the building of the projects rather than for excess pay rolls.

The Statesman has long opposed an all-out reclamation program in Idaho, opposed it despite the contention of reclamationists that we do not want the State to expand and grow. We continue to oppose the expenditure of Federal funds for reclamation projects on a blanket basis. We are for the orderly development of Idaho land—for development that is sound and can pay back its cost—for development that will not create surpluses to cause future and new Government subsidies—for development that will not soon add to surpluses of the type that caused the 1932 depression. But most of all we are opposed to waste in any agency, and this includes reclamation, and we are also opposed to State selfishness, to State belief that we want the Federal budget cut but we also want everything we asked for.

Let's let Idaho show the way. Let's face the truth. Let's admit that the Interior Department budget is acceptable and so notify Congress, and thereby not run the risk of losing what we have been offered through protesting and demanding more and thereby endangering what we now see possible. Let's set a pace in getting a bureau started on the road to economy. Let's follow the tradition of the first reclamationists in Idaho and come down out of the clouds.

Jewish National Home in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution from the Minneapolis Post, No. 166, of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. These veterans who have valiantly served their country in time of war call upon the United States Government to take the initiative in behalf of the establishment of that Jewish national home in Palestine, which has so long been promised to the Jewish people.

MAY 5, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE E. MACKINNON,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the British Government has repeatedly violated its obligations as the mandatory of Palestine by repudiating the solemn pledges expressed in the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate with regard to the facilitation of Jewish immigration into Palestine and the continued development of the Jewish national homes; and

Whereas the seizure and mass deportation to Cyprus of so-called illegal Jewish immigrants constitute a brutal campaign against helpless men, women, and children, completely inconsistent with the principles of the Atlantic Charter; and

Whereas such immigrants embark for the Holy Land as of their legal right, since the white paper of 1939, which bars their entry, was repudiated by the permanent mandates commission of the League of Nations as inconsistent with Palestine mandate—thus making illegal the policy pursued by the British Administration; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, through the passage of resolutions in both Houses of Congress, and through planks in the platforms of both major political parties, is pledged to free Jewish immigration into the Holy Land and the establishment in Palestine of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully call upon the Government of the United States to take the initiative during the forthcoming special meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations, in vigorously championing the program for Palestine which it has repeatedly reaffirmed, thereby defeating the British Government's attempt to employ the United Nations session as a maneuver to retain its present Palestine policy; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the Government of the United States to insist that the Jewish people, as the party most directly concerned, be accorded full representation in all deliberations regarding Palestine within the United Nations through the Jewish agency for Palestine, the internationally recognized body authorized to speak for the Jewish people; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution go forward to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, the American delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, and Members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

Unanimously passed this 5th day of May 1947, by Minneapolis Post, No. 166, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Minneapolis, Minn.

BENJAMIN B. BELFER,
Commander.

Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the ranking domestic problems confronting the Eightieth Congress is the matter of tax legislation. A noble start has been made with H. R. 1 in regard to individual income taxes. However, a great many other tax problems need now be considered. Among these, perhaps of first import, is the consideration of corporate taxation. The corporate entity in the system of free enterprise is almost human, and its relation to our system and our people is inseparable. I should like to see some constructive, equitable law presented and passed to lessen excessive tax burden on small business enterprise, and to equalize taxes throughout the business world.

In recent weeks, I have discussed this matter with a very reputable organization which represents a large segment of our Nation's small businesses, the National Small Businessmen's Association, Inc. In a letter from Mr. A. W. Kimball, director of the Washington office of this

organization, dated April 18, 1947, the problem has been presented, and a solution offered. I should like to present their suggestion to the Congress for its immediate consideration and study. I include this letter from the National Small Businessmen's Association, Inc.:

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1947.

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: A great many members of our association are quite concerned regarding the unfairness of the so-called notch tax and urge that Congress amend the Federal tax on corporate income under the Revenue Act of 1945 so as to do away with the inequities resulting from the notch tax.

The particular phase of this taxing schedule with which we are concerned is that portion on net earnings between $25,000 and $50,000 which is the usual range for small- and medium-sized corporations. The normal tax of 31 percent plus the surtax of 22 percent, or a total of 53 percent, is out of line with the total tax up to $25,000 and the tax on net earnings over $50,000.

The so-called normal tax on corporation net income under the Revenue Act of 1945 is 15 percent for the first $5,000, 17 percent for the net income from $5,000 to $20,000, 19 percent for the net income from $20,000 to $25,000, and 31 percent for the net income from $25,000 to $50,000, and then drops back to 24 percent for net income over $50,000. The surtax on the first $25,000 is 6 percent, and on the portion of net income from $25,000 to $50,000 is 22 percent; and on all net income over $50,000 drops back to 14 percent.

The sum total of the two taxes is 21 percent on net income from 0 to $5,000, 23 percent on net income from $5,000 to $20,000, 25 percent on net income from $20,000 to $25,000, 53 percent on net income from $25,000 to $50,000.

After the net income passes $50,000 the tax drops back to 38 percent and remains at that rate for all net income over $50,000.

Although the 53-percent bracket to which we object applies on all tax returns where the net income reaches or exceeds this bracket, this 53-percent rate nevertheless places a disproportionately heavy burden on the small corporations which have net profits of between $25,000 and $50,000.

In other words, if a corporation has net income of $500,000 the fact that it has to pay 53 percent in the $25,000 to $50,000 bracket doesn't mean much. On the other hand, paying 53 percent in this bracket does mean a great deal to a corporation with net income of $45,000.

It is the opinion of our association that the 53-percent bracket could be made more equitable by placing the corporation tax on a graduation basis in the same manner as income tax. We suggest the following schedule be given consideration: 15 percent for the first $5,000, 17 percent for the net income from $5,000 to $20,000, 19 percent for the net income from $20,000 to $35,000, 24 percent for the net income of $35,000 and over.

We also suggest that the surtax on net income be changed from 6 percent on the first $25,000 to 6 percent on the first $35,000, 8 percent from $35,000 to $50,000, and 14 percent on net income over $50,000, with the total of the two taxes being 21 percent on net income from 0 to $5,000, 23 percent on net income from $5,000 to $20,000, 25 percent on net income from $20,000 to $35,000, 32 percent on net income from $35,000 to $50,000, 38 percent on net income of $50,000 and over.

This suggested schedule would not penalize anyone and would certainly place firms in the $25,000 to $50,000 bracket on a much fairer position than they now hold.

We solicit your study and consideration of this phase of the tax question, and sincerely hope that something can be done to correct this particular situation.

Sincerely,

A. W. KIMBALL,
Director, Washington Office.

J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I have known J. Edgar Hoover, the very capable Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, since 1924, when he assumed the responsibilities of that position. His record has been an amazingly successful one. Prior to Mr. Hoover's appointment, there had been frequent changes in the directorship. These changes were made presumably either because of politics or dissatisfaction with the way those responsibilities had been discharged by the directors. It is a most significant fact that there has been no change during the past 23 years. During this time the Department has been greatly enlarged and the efficiency thereof has been above criticism. As a matter of fact, the FBI has acquired a standing among the law-enforcement agencies of the world such as no other has equaled. The people of the United States are fortunate indeed to have had the services of this fine public official. There have been times when elements of our society have undertaken to bring about Mr. Hoover's replacement, but, notwithstanding these efforts, he has retained the confidence and the support of each administration since his appointment.

Mr. Speaker, recently I read an article in the New York Post written by Mr. Victor Riesel. Evidently this very able writer thinks as highly of Mr. Hoover as I and he sets forth certain things and activities concerning the FBI which should be interesting to everyone with any regard for efficient administration and law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of these remarks the article referred to:

[From the New York Post of May 13, 1947]

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

I'll always be grateful to those high school and college athletes who cracked my nose and hospitalized me by ripping my sides with their muddy cleats on the football field. This sandlotting took up so many hours I couldn't find the time to become an intellectual.

Because I got to know so little and didn't have time to develop my mind, I found when I took to the typewriter to earn my daily bread that I'd neglected to lease an ivory tower and had to go out and look at things before I could write about them.

So while I traveled I kept up with the latest in crusades by reading my more intellectual colleagues, especially those professional liberals who never went anyplace but who knew just what was right for the world, the working class, and humanity.

There are lots of ways to earn a living, and the ivory tower specialists can work their corner any way they see fit. But I'm exceedingly wearied by the professional liberal who sees as Fascist all who disagree with his thesis that our country, right or wrong, is wrong.

I'm weary, for example, of those who now are trying to smear the FBI as a secret political police because the Bureau will check the loyalty of all Federal workers. I wonder if it has ever occurred to that professional "our country can't be right" crowd to climb down from the stars and learn what the FBI is, before they try to smear it as an antilabor, anti-liberal-thought policy agency.

Why don't they go and look? They'd find, for example, that the $35,000,000 which the Government spends on the FBI nets it about $68,500,000 a year in fines, savings, and recoveries.

There were 169 convictions for white slavery in 1946 on the basis of FBI evidence. Since 1941, there have been 41 convictions of seditionists and last year three Axis spies were jailed, while recoveries of funds came to $3,650,000 from this crowd.

And if these men who crusade in the name of the working stiffs, whether said stiffs like it or not, aren't interested in the seditionists, their great hearts should glow over the fact that the FBI made 15 election fraud investigations this year and sent 45 persons to jail for tampering with the democratic process. And what about the 145 convictions for antitrust violations which resulted in $405,700 fines and recoveries of $31,248,000?

As for this dreadful secret police's suppression of labor, last year it participated in the conviction of nine union men who violated the War Labor Disputes Act and were sentenced to a total of 6 months and fined all of $2,340.

I wish those professional liberals would lease their ivory towers to the apartment-hungry crowds and go and see for themselves. And it would make better copy, too.

Commission on Christian Social Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include certain statements and resolutions:

DIOCESE OF NEW YORK,
New York, May 16, 1947.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
The House Office Building,
Washington. D. C.

DEAR SIR: I hereby certify that the enclosed statements and resolutions, entitled 1. "Displaced Persons and United States Immigration Policy"; 2. "The Taft-Ellender-Wagner Federal Housing bill;" 3. "Social Security for Lay Employees of the Church" were presented to the annual convention of the diocese of New York, held in the synod house of the Cathedral Chuch of St. John the Divine, New York City on Tuesday, May 13, 1947. Each of these, separately, was adopted by a unanimous vote of the convention.

Respectfully yours,

Rev. R. A. D. BEATY,
Secretary of Convention.

COMMISSION ON
CHRISTIAN SOCIAL RELATIONS,
DIOCESE OF NEW YORK.

STATEMENTS AND RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO DIOCESAN CONVENTION, MAY 13, 1947

1. Displaced persons and United States immigration policy.
2. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner Federal housing bill.
3. Social security for lay employees of the church.

Rev. HAROLD F. HOHLY,
Chairman.
Rev. LELAND B. HENRY,
Executive Director.

DISPLACED PERSONS AND UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION POLICY

Two years after the war there are at least 850,000 persons in detention camps in Europe who do not wish to return to their native lands for fear of oppression for religious, racial or political reasons. They represent all religions—80 percent Christians of various denominations, 20 percent Jews. The United States could easily absorb some of these people, especially since during the years 1940–1946 only 15 percent of our total world quota (of immigrants) was used. A fair share of displaced persons (estimated by experts) would be 400,000—less than half of the number that were not admitted during the war years.

No displaced person entering the United States could become a public charge as every individual corporation or agency sponsoring a displaced person must furnish an affidavit to that effect. They would be housed by friends, relatives and organizations responsible. They are workers: agricultural, housemaids, skilled workers, business and professional.

RESOLUTION

Believing in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Diocese of New York, in convention assembled, approve the plan to admit up to 400,000 displaced persons by reopening unused immigration quotas back to 1940 and allowing quotas to be transferable, this to be done over a period of 4 years, through the regular channels of the United States Government, and further be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, to the Senators from the State of New York and to the Representatives whose districts lie wholly or in part within the boundaries of the diocese.

THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER FEDERAL HOUSING BILL

THE NEED

The National Housing Agency estimates the present housing shortage at not less than 4,300,000 family units, not including any construction for the replacement of an additional 7,000,000 substandard dwellings, many of which are definitely unfit for human occupancy.

THE HUMAN COST

The housing shortage is the most serious single social problem facing the American people today. Several million families are living in inadequate quarters doubled-up with in-laws or friends, in quonset huts, in Army barracks, and in trailer camps. The social, moral and spiritual results are reflected in broken homes, juvenile delinquency, ill-health, and increasing social tensions. The feeling of disillusionment and frustration on the part of millions of veterans who return from military service to find the country and social order they fought to defend unable to supply them with the ordinary decencies of life constitutes an increasingly serious problem.

The welfare of the family has always been a concern of the Christian church. The welfare of the family requires a home. Therefore, the housing shortage is a legitimate interest of the church.

PRESENT CONSTRUCTION

In New York City (where the current shortage is 150,000 family units, not including the replacement of any substandard dwellings) during 1946 8,926 units were demolished and 4,578 new dwellings completed. Against a need of 150,000 units we have a net loss of 4,348 units. During the first 3 months of 1947 home building by private industry in New York City is 53 percent below the same period of 1946. So far as private construction is concerned, we are actually losing ground.

A FOUR-POINT PLAN

Due to the cost of construction, housing authorities are generally agreed that the provision of new housing requires a fourfold approach.

1. The needs of the lowest income group, able to pay not more than $30 per month, can be met only by public housing, with both tax exemption and subsidy. (For example, East River houses.)

2. The needs of the group able to pay from $35 to $50 per month can be met by public housing with tax exemption but without subsidy. (No local example.)

3. The needs of the group able to pay from $55 to $80 per month can be met by various forms of institutional investment, and by private, limited-dividend housing. This requires no subsidy, but does require temporary, limited tax exemption. (For example, Stuyvesant Town and Knickerbocker Village.)

4. The needs of the group able to pay over $80 per month can be met by unaided private industry.

TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

A comprehensive approach to the entire problem, with special emphasis upon the needs of the lower middle-income group, is provided by legislation now pending in Congress. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill (S. 866), and its companion bill in the House (H. R. 2523) have been introduced with bipartisan support after extended hearings in the Senate.

This bill has the support of the Federal Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Council, the National Council of Jewish Women, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the United States Conference of Mayors, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans' Committee, the Citizens Housing Council and literally hundreds of civic groups. The bill has been drawn to cover every aspect of the housing problem with a well-planned, long-range approach. In the opinion of qualified experts in the field it is the most comprehensive housing bill ever presented.

The Commission on Christian Social Relations therefore offers the following resolution:

Whereas the church in common with all social-minded individuals and groups, is keenly aware of the gravity of the present housing shortage, with its tragic affects upon family stability, juvenile delinquency, health, and the social, moral, and spiritual welfare of hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Diocese of New York, in convention assembled, urge the enactment by the Congress of the United States of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Federal Housing bill (S. 866, H. R. 2523); and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, to the Senators from the State of New York and to the Representatives whose districts lie wholly or in part within the boundaries of the diocese.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR LAY EMPLOYEES OF THE CHURCH

A RESOLUTION

Whereas lay employees of religious organizations are not included among those covered under the provision of the Federal laws providing for Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits; and

Whereas the persons not so covered by reason of such employment are deprived of substantial rights and benefits, which are enjoyed by the vast majority of their fellow-citizens; and

Whereas the public interest and welfare require that such benefits should be made available to persons not now covered under the Federal law so as to bring a measure of security to them in their old age, and also to their dependent survivors; and

Whereas it is in the interest of the church to have at least a portion of the responsibility for the old age of her lay employees covered by the benefits made available under the Federal law: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the diocese of New York, in convention assembled, hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to bring within the coverage of the Federal laws providing for Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits, lay employees of religious organizations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Senators from the State of New York, and to the Representatives whose districts lie wholly or in part within the boundaries of the diocese.

Amendment to Wool Bill, S. 814

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an amendment to the wool bill, S. 814, which will be offered when that measure comes before the House for consideration.

The amendment will be offered as a substitute for section 4 which is a committee amendment inserted by the House Committee on Agriculture. The new amendment makes wool one of the commodities to which section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act is applicable. It provides further that as to wool "no limitation shall be imposed on the total quantities of wool or products thereof which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption." The new matter added to section 22 is that which is in italic:

(a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any one or more articles *are being, or are practically certain to be, imported into the United States under such conditions and in sufficient quantities as*

to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any commodity subject to and with respect to which any program is in operation, under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, *or the Wool Act of 1947*, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigations shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees on, or such limitations on the total quantities of, any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary to prescribe in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or will not reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any commodity subject to and with respect to which any program is in operation, under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, *or the Wool Act of 1947:* Provided, that no limitation shall be imposed on the total quantity of any article which may be imported from any country which reduces such permissible total quantity to less than 50 percent of the average annual quantity of such article which was imported from such country during the period from January 1, 1929, to December 31, 1933, both dates inclusive: *And provided further*, That no limitation shall be imposed on the total quantities of wool or products thereof which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption.

Low-Cost Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this Nation needs progressive and enlightened leadership from both management and labor. There are signs that a new generation is arising in American business which is aware of its responsibilities and which has the imagination not merely to talk about the need for enlightened leadership, but to provide it.

One of these leaders is Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros. Mr. Luckman has recently delivered a series of remarkable speeches, in each one of which he has advocated a program designed really to make democracy work. In a speech which he made at the University of Illinois last Thursday, Mr. Luckman advocated a round-table program for labor and management to be financed by a voluntary round-table fund of a million dollars. He has offered on behalf of his company to contribute $100,000 of this. It is Mr. Luckman's belief, as he has said in several of his speeches, that both labor and management must realize that their battles are not a private war; that they influence the entire people of the United States—and even of the world; and he proposes that the ranking junior leaders of both labor and management should engage in a joint educational program in which they consider not merely their own private problems but the problems of the entire Nation. I commend his speech to the consideration of the Members of the House:

LOW-COST PEACE

I am not here to be sentimental about our university's past. It is my privilege to join other voices here in doing honor to the man who will lead it into the future.

If someone should compile a set of ideal qualifications for the president of a great State university, these would surely include a distinguished teaching record, outstanding experience as an administrator, service in high public office, wide knowledge of the world through travel and observation, and an international reputation. There is no man in American education today in whom these qualifications are more ideally combined than in Dr. George Dinsmore Stoddard.

Last year he remarked to an alumni group: "The University of Illinois is not only a great university now, but it can become the greatest of all State universities."

On his own distinguished record as a scientist and a teacher, we understand Dr. Stoddard's prophecy to mean this: The greatness of the University of Illinois will be measured by the greatness of its service to the people of this State, this Nation, and this world.

It has already rendered a great service to thousands of young men and women. The 4 years I spent here as a student of architecture endowed me with a basic formula for studying, analyzing, and thinking problems through to their logical, though not necessarily obvious, conclusions. Those who participated in my education passed on to me a way of life, not merely a means of livelihood.

In the years which have ensued, I have been blessed with much—a large part of which resulted from my having been the beneficiary of the education afforded by this University. It is, therefore, only natural that I have a deep and abiding sense of obligation to do my utmost to help make it possible for millions of other young men to be given the same opportunity.

Once again, this is more than a mere conventional acknowledgment. The scope of this self-imposed obligation is both staggering and frightening. The future of the world is at stake in the race between education and catastrophe. In 1914, catastrophe won. Again in 1939 catastrophe won. These two lost races cost the world 120,000,000 casualties and $3,337,000,000,000.

Have we not already paid a disastrous price to give living significance to one of the United Nations preambles which states:

"Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be established."

We cannot act upon this self-evident proposition, unless we are willing to forego a few of our luxuries to pay for the training and cultivation of our national intellect. For too many years we have measured the wealth of nations by their natural resources, not reckoning that the greatest resource possessed by any country is the capacity of its people to be educated. In the development of our education, we Americans now spend no more than $3,000,000,000 annually, which represents only 1½ percent of our national income.

This simply is not enough in a world threatened by imperial communism. It is not enough when the Soviet Union spends 8 percent of its income, or $7,500,000,000 a year, to make big Marxists out of little ones. If we truly want our children to believe in the Bill of Rights, in the freedom and dignity of the individual, and in the political ideals of Jefferson and Lincoln, then we will have to spend, and spend, and spend.

In this troubled era, any nation is insane to worry about appropriations big enough for parity of physical armaments, while failing to make appropriations which will assure a parity of intellectual armaments.

This is particularly true of a nation which has grown soft with good living, and which has counted the training of its young as less important than liquor for its gullet, or paints and perfumes for the adornment of its women.

If our country can afford to spend $20,000,000,000 a year on recreation, tobacco, alcohol, soap, and beauty preparations, it can afford to ante up an additional $3,000,000,000 for the knowledge and understanding so vital to the perpetuation of our democratic way of life. It is written in Ecclesiastes that "wisdom is better than weapons of war"—a thought echoed 2,000 years later by Edmund Burke when he so wisely said: "Education is the cheap defense of nations."

If we can't afford this cheapest of defenses, then we should cut down on the consumption of our comforts and luxuries. As a manufacturer, I say to you that I would rather sell 15 percent less of these comforts, which include my own products, if this must be the price for providing the youth of our country with a passport to a good education.

Democracy is postulated upon the existence of an intelligent electorate. It cannot flourish half educated and half illiterate. "It is by education," said Aristotle, that "I learn to do by choice what other men do by the constraint of fear." How well are we progressing in the endeavor to make education common to all, to the end that we may do by choice what other men do by constraint of fear? Rather poorly. It is a shocking fact that today over 3,000,000 American children of school age are not in school. On top of that tragic fact, we must also remember that there is an additional 2,000,000 children who are in schools where they are receiving an inadequate, substandard education. Thus, one child out of every six school-age youngsters is being disenfranchised by our apathy and selfishness. This condition is of vital significance to the colleges of our Nation because the future of higher education is inextricably tied to the quantity and quality of the cross-road schools.

These schools have given us a present college enrollment of 2,100,000 students, with an additional half million young men and women knocking at the doors—only to be turned away.

I hasten to point out that among these half-million educationally displaced persons, there are over 350,000 GI's. They have already sacrificed 5 years of their lives. Shall we now deny them the opportunity to benefit from the kind of life which they fought and bled to protect?

How dare we Americans gamble $5,000,000,000 a year on horse races while veterans of our armed forces are unable to gain admission to college because of lack of facilities? Or do we expect to ride the wave of the future on the back of our favorite gelding at 2-to-1 odds?

Why are we making educationally displaced persons out of 5,500,000 American youngsters?

Is it not about time for us to make another historic declaration of war—this time on ignorance?

The most common answer to these questions seems to be that our physical facilities for education are inadequate to bear a heavier load.

An inventory of our plant facilities for education reveals that we now have about 209,000 primary schools, 29,000 secondary schools and 1,750 colleges serving approximately 30,000,000 young people between elementary and college ages. We also know that room is needed for approximately 4,000,000 more. In other words, our present plant capacity is capable of serving only 30 students out of 34 applicants.

So, I think we can agree that the immediate problem is to find s me kind of housing for our educational machinery—and to get its wheels, however creaky, in motion so that millions of students shall not lose irretrievable time while we are repairing the consequences of our own neglect.

I think a production executive would try to accomplish this objective by recognizing at the outset that he was dealing with a crisis, and that he could not overcome it by using niminy-piminy methods. He would further recognize, as he did during the war, that plant equipment is one problem, and the necessary personnel to operate it, quite another. He would, therefore, tackle these problems singly. Turning first to the problem of physical plant, he would ask himself: "How much equipment have I to work with, and how much of the time is it now being used?"

In analyzing the facts, he would discover that the Nation's primary and secondary school equipment is generally operated only 9½ months, or 42 weeks a year. He would then say to himself: "By operating that equipment 52 weeks a year, instead of 42, I could process 20 to 25 percent more students and thereby solve my problem. What then is there to prevent the year-round use of this equipment?" Nothing. We can eliminate the century-old habit of long summer vacations by admitting their probable value to the younger children, but by admitting also that for the older children they could be shortened and staggered throughout the year.

This idea of year-round education is literally a revolutionary one, although, in this context, the word carries a historical rather than a radical connotation. New England in the early eighteenth century contributed some of the greatest personalities our country has ever known. Under the discipline of an all-year-round school system, they created our birthright of freedom and democracy. As a temporary measure, to solve a temporary crisis, we could do worse than emulate our forebears. By sacrificing playtime, we can secure an equality of learning time for the children who will further our American civilization in the years to come.

Before turning away from the ancient and well-encrusted tradition of a long summer hiatus, a word should be said about those badly overworked teachers who may be troubled by the prospect of any further reduction in their vacation time. A solution to this problem has been suggested by that learned educator, Dr. Alvin Johnson, who says:

"The biggest reason for overworked teachers is paper work, which consumes almost a third of their time and, in the main, is of no earthly use. What we need is a thorough overhauling of educational techniques to simplify teaching methods. This would permit teachers to devote less time to bookkeeping and more time to teaching."

This same type of urgent thinking must also be applied to college plant equipment problems. Here the situation is a much more complicated one because it involves not only classroom and study accommodations but housing and recreational space as well. With respect to classrooms, libraries, and study halls, I believe the emergency accommodation of surplus students could be handled by a combination of two different adjustments:

First, by operating our college plants 6 days a week, 52 weeks a year.

Second, by scheduling classes on a three-shift basis during the 15 hours each day between 8 a. m. and 11 p. m.

Under this three-shift plan students would carry their normal schedules of 15 lecture hours per week during either a morning, afternoon, or evening shift, with appropriate staggered vacations spread out over a 12 months' period. We ran our industrial plants in round-the-clock operations for 5 years to win the war on fascism. We certainly should be able to run our educational plants halfway round the clock to win the war on ignorance.

So, let's do a little simple arithmetic. Our college plants are presently operating 5½ days a week, 43 weeks a year, 9 hours a day, 50 hours a week—a total of 2,150 hours per year. The three-shift plan would utilize plant facilities 4,680 hours a year, an increase of 117.9 percent in the usage of our present plant facilities.

With respect to housing and recreational facilities, I believe that a little of our wartime imagination, team work, and resourcefulness could be of great help during this period of crisis. None of us will ever forget that during the war the standard training mission for the Seabees was to construct—in 30 hours—a city for 1,000 men.

So let's call in our armed forces. If living facilities constitute the first beachhead in the battle of education, let them build student cities for peace as they built cities of occupation for war—complete with barracks, Quonset huts, kitchens, dining halls, medical and hospital facilities, and recreational equipment. This may seem a gigantic undertaking, but the armed forces have had enough practice to be just about perfect. Let us simply apply the bold methods which won the war on fascism to the strategic planning of our war on ignorance.

As a permanent, long-term solution, I am convinced that with an intelligent 3-year program of school building and repair, which would involve only 80 percent of the money we intend to spend on roads in the immediate future, we could ultimately return to a less drastic program. But, in the meantime our temporary solution would insure the cost of the present emergency being borne by the whole community, and not by 5,500,000 helpless youngsters.

Their neglect would be a stain on our national honor. Their ignorance would be a mighty obstacle in the path of our future progress. We dare not persist in being blind to our obligations and to their rights.

The second phase of the educational problem turns on the twofold question of getting enough teachers, with proper qualifications, to staff our national educational plant. This emphasis on proper qualifications cannot be too great.

The facts are that we have a predictable immediate need for a minimum of 1,100,000 teachers. We will have approximately 675,000 to meet that requirement. We are, thus, clearly headed for a disastrous teacher-power shortage of not less than 425,000 within the next 3 years.

Bad economics and bad human relations are the primary reasons why our communities are threatened with this disaster. At this moment, we, the employers of these teachers, are guilty of an economic exploitation which, by comparison, makes the industrial sweatshops of 30 years ago look like a Sunday-school picnic. On top of economic exploitation of the most pernicious variety, we have heaped personal indignities upon these men and women with a sickening degree of narrow-minded self-righteousness.

Now, these are very serious charges, and the supporting facts should be carefully examined. To start with, let's ask ourselves what are the requirements we impose upon individuals before we are willing to entrust them with the care and training of our children.

Dr. Ralph McDonald has analyzed this question. He concludes that the teachers of our young must be strong and vigorous, keen of intellect, balanced in outlook, superior in personality traits, deep-rooted in their spiritual foundations. They must have a passionate devotion to human freedom and be anchored to an abiding faith in the improvability of man. To such an outstanding personality must be added education and training in the heritage of the human race, in the knowledge of the world today, in a loving understanding of human growth and development, in the precepts of democracy, in the lore of the school, and in the skills of teaching.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is quite a job description. But, I think it is an accurate portrayal of the kind of people most of us expect our children's teachers to be. It is not the job description that is amazing. What is amazing is the fact that 200,000 of our teachers earn less than $25 a week. What is even more amazing is our apparent belief that this kind of talent and years of training can be procured for the average salary earned by all teachers in America, namely, $37.02 a week. We are so naive that we actually expect to command the services of this type of intellect at a salary which is lower than our starting wage for the youngsters who are just beginning to work in the factories of Lever Bros. Co.

No educational system in the world could be expected to survive in the face of such absurd economic thinking.

If we want capable teachers for tomorrow's citizen we cannot afford to hire any teacher for less than $3,000 a year. Plainly the people of our country are in basic agreement. Look to the Gallup poll of March 1947, which clearly indicates that a substantial majority of the American public believes that teachers' salaries are too low. More importantly, they are willing to pay higher taxes in order to raise salaries.

Now this readiness on the part of the little guys who are America, to respond to the needs of our educational system, plainly leaves the next move up to American business. We would be patently false to deny our responsibility, for there are 261,000 of us businessmen who today serve on school boards throughout the Nation. We therefore constitute 76 percent of the total membership of the Nation's school boards. Recognizing our self-imposed duty, there are two things we can do to remedy the bad economic thinking which now paralyzes our educational system.

First of all, we can see to it that industrial real-estate property assessments are not held down, but on the contrary are held up, because the revenue from these assessments is the foundation of the local school support in our industrial areas. I make this suggestion with a full awareness of the fact that Lever Bros Co. owns very substantial quantities of real estate throughout the United States. But I have no other alternative, for when we depress assessments, we depress our children—and I submit this is malodorous business, selfish parenthood, and a frightfully short-sighted brand of citizenship.

The second step we can take—and this applies not only to businessmen but to every voter within reach of these thoughts—is to make our voices heard in the Halls of Congress that our legislators may know we approve of Federal aid to education. We know that educational opportunity cannot be equally distributed without Federal assistance.

But let us also remember that money is not the only root of the problem. In addition to a reasonable starting salary, we must provide for a progressive and modern personnel

system for teachers which will place particular emphasis upon tenure of position and a fair opportunity for promotion based on demonstrated ability and length of service.

It is now generally recognized in all fields that social recognition and status have a great deal to do with job satisfaction. In spite of this, as one authority on school boards has pointed out, there are sections of this country where some folks have such a bad case of critical smugitis that the teachers are forced into dark corners if they want to live like modern people. They can't dance, smoke, have dates, use cosmetics, ride horses (except side saddle), attend social affairs, correct little Johnny or Mary, or act like human beings without being subjected to criticism and the potent likelihood of losing their jobs.

What is so badly needed today is an intelligent set of professional standards for teachers, suitable for Nation-wide distribution and endorsement, which will give them a full measure of the sense of personal freedom and dignity which we expect them, in turn, to impart to our children.

Surely, a nation does not progress by diminishing the respect so properly due those who mold its thinking.

That our thinking needs molding by higher education is evidenced by the fact that today our country is rocked with debate over proposed legislative corrections of the labor problem.

I do not minimize the importance of a sound legislative framework for the control of excesses on both sides. I believe in laws. But I also believe that labor-management peace will be created—not by trying to legislate a point of view—but my more understanding among men. This mutual understanding is being retarded by egomaniacs on both sides who conceal their ignorance by hurling abuse at one another, until the very air we breathe becomes poisonous with never-ending taunts, such as reactionary and radical. We need to do a gigantic job of air-conditioning in labor relations. We need to sweep from our minds the cobwebs of ignorance. For we cannot get mutual understanding without mutual knowledge. We cannot get mutual knowledge without mutual education.

The need for mutual understanding has been dimly sensed by business, which now annually appropriates millions upon millions of dollars for that form of persuasion in a top hat, sometimes called public relations. Yet, strangely enough, it has not occurred to any of us to use education on a large scale to help correct our No. 1 public-relations headache—the labor-management problem.

Before too long, those of us today who are the leaders of management and of labor will be turning the reins over to the young people who are now the junior executives in business, and the local and district representatives of organized labor. We in business could make no greater contribution to the long-term solution of this vexing labor-management problem than by effectuating a plan to broaden, through education, the concepts of those who must strive for the mutual understanding of labor and management.

It has taken us 20 years to get labor and management to sit down together at the bargaining table. So far, that table has been a square one. It has a side for management and it has a side for labor. We need to eliminate the sides from our national bargaining table. We must substitute in its place a round table, around which the unity and togetherness of all elements in our economy can be allowed to function properly for the benefit of all the people. Consider, then, how American business could justify a real claim to constructive leadership by creating an annual "round table fund" of $1,000,000.

The purpose of the round table fund would be the joint education of tomorrow's leaders of labor and management. Let labor nominate 500 of its promising young leaders; let management nominate 500 of its promising young leaders. Let these 1,000 young men and women spend 1 year in college together, studying the most enlightened methods for making our economy produce a higher standard of living for all.

Every American business would consider it an honor, as well as an opportunity, to have one of its men or women selected to be part of such a far-reaching undertaking; and consequently, would unhesitatingly furlough the selected students with full pay for the year. The fund would enable the colleges to provide the ablest teachers and the best research facilities and would also defray each student's tuition and special expenses.

In 10 years this plan would produce 10,000 thoroughly trained young labor and management leaders equipped with a keen knowledge and true understanding of each other's problems.

Think of the immeasurable value of having representatives of labor and management studying together, eating together, and living together. The result would be that, for the first time in American history, labor and management would be working together toward the same objective—a higher standard of living for our people. Since this procedure would involve every phase of our complicated industrial economy, the curriculum would necessarily cover a wide variety of subjects; for example, Methods of Increasing Productivity and Wages; Interrelationship of Wages, Prices, and Profits; Problems of the Guaranteed Wage; Basic Principles of our National Labor Legislation; Protection of the Rights of the Public; the Correlation of Government, Labor, and Management; and, the Standard of Living. And finally, I might suggest a "quickie" course on how to eliminate name-calling as a prerequisite to labor negotiations.

The final nomination of all students, both labor and management, would be made by the Round Table Commission, composed of the presidents of the American Council on Education, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and other major labor groups. The round-table commission would have the additional responsibility of authorizing the training courses and of selecting recognized institutions headed by farsighted academic authorities.

Since this is a program which deeply affects the commerce of our Nation, it would be highly appropriate for the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. W. Averell Harriman, to be asked to assume, for the first formative year, the chairmanship of the round-table commission. Thereafter the chairmanship would rotate by election among the members of the commission. The chairman of the commission could proceed with the assurance that Lever Bros. would consider itself privileged to contribute $100,000 for the implementation of this round-table program for unity through education.

In another age and at another time, it might appear to be a seven-league step from vast national and world problems to this inaugural ceremony which brings us together. But not in this inventive age. Jet propulsion has narrowed with frightening speed the distances between the nations of the world. We are only hours apart from peoples about whom we have relatively little knowledge or understanding—and who do not understand us. Therefore, education can no longer be regarded as a mere vehicle for national enlightenment. The future of mankind demands that we recognize its full potentiality as an instrument for international peace.

History, in its usual harsh way, has given us only these two alternatives: Either to wage another mighty war, or to make a mighty effort to educate the peoples of the world as to the truth about each other—knowing that only through world-wide knowledge can we achieve world-wide understanding, the first prerequisite to world peace and freedom.

Let us use the key of education to unlock the doors of our ignorance to flood our darkness with the light of truth. In the words of St. John, the beloved Disciple: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Fred Barthold Norman

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. HAL HOLMES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRED BARTHOLD NORMAN, late a Representative from the State of Washington

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, in the death of FRED NORMAN, the State of Washington and the Third Congressional District, in particular, lost an able, industrious, and conscientious public servant. His coming to Congress represented the fruition of a lifetime ambition, and I like to think that his wish when the call came would have been to pass on while performing in the public service, as he was. In life he was a tireless worker who had fitted himself through his studies to know parliamentary procedure and to acquire by diligent efforts the qualifications necessary to make him a good Representative for the people of the district who elected him to office.

Mr. NORMAN'S story aptly confirms the American concept, as expressed by Henry Ward Beecher: "The real democratic American idea is, not that every man shall be on a level with every other, but that everyone shall have liberty, without hindrance, to be what God made him."

Mr. NORMAN was a poor boy, but he was endowed with an indomitable spirit. He hitched his wagon to the star of faithful public service. He worked as a farmer, logger, mill hand, and shipbuilder, but never lost sight of his objective. During these days he prepared himself and worked toward his great ambition—that of becoming a Member of Congress. On the way he campaigned for and was elected a city councilman, then a State representative, then a State senator, and finally climaxed a successful career by election to the United States House of Representatives.

He earned the reputation as a hard-working, industrious Member, who was familiar with conditions throughout the district he represented, keeping constantly in mind the needs and welfare of all the people in his district and personally attending to many requests. The Third Congressional District of the State of Washington, the State, and the Nation have lost a tried and loyal friend, interested in the welfare of his country, his State, and his constituents. The goal he attained rests on a high plane that not only demonstrates what one may accomplish in this great land of opportunities, but also sets a worthy example for oncoming generations. We miss him, but take pride in his attainments.

William J. Gallagher

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it affords me great pleasure to honor one of the most useful, interesting, and worthy characters with whom I have served in more than 40 years as a Member of this honorable body—the late WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER. I like to think of our deceased friend as he described himself, namely, a workingman.

We all well remember the fidelity with which he served here, his perfect regularity in attendance, the attention he gave to all matters before the House, despite imperfection of health, and his excellent voting record.

His frequent criticism on the floor of the House of false, publicity-seeking fears of communism, and his pitiless exposition of those who selfishly opposed the aspirations of labor will long endear him to those who believe in giving fair and adequate opportunity for the creation and maintenance of peaceful international relations and a realization of the merited longings of toilers for a more equitable share of life's goods.

Our friend did not rend this Hall with ear-splitting, gustatory, desk-pounding oratory, and try to hide sophistry with gusts of meaningless words. He had no penchant for artificiality and superficiality. He knew little about the wiles of logic and Demosthenesan oratory, because practically all of his life he was a simple workingman dreaming of the sun that would dry the mud. He had no occasion to master any of the artifices and refinements of rhetorical effort. He did not need them in his work, inasmuch as his whole life and soul had but one objective, namely, making this world a more comfortable place for simple men and women of his kind; and he depended upon accurate knowledge and inspiration as a means of intelligible communication.

Looking into the crystalline depths of his beautiful soul, methinks I behold it in all its greatness. One of his cardinal virtues was simple earnestness. Methinks I can see the honest indignation with which that soul would be stirred by the very shadow of a sham or pretense.

He had an abiding hatred of dishonesty, be its form what it may.

He could but ill disguise his loathing of him with the two face, or of him of the fawning ways, or of the cowardly character devoid of the courage of his convictions. I read therein the well nigh perfect manhood, scorning all pettiness and subterfuge, and strong and fearless in right-doing.

As we memoralize this useful and beneficient life, let us remember its lessons and admonitions. First, it proves to all that America is a place where one of only native ability and good character may by intelligent and persistent effort break birth's invidious bar and rise to reward and renown.

Secondly, it shows inspiringly that loyal and disinterested service of even a workingman for the public weal still has an abiding place in the affections of the American people.

Thirdly, this peace-loving life admonishes us that without assiduous, intelligent, right-minded endeavor we may not attain enduring success for the national good, but with it and without high scholastic training few things are without range of accomplishment in our blessed land.

William J. Gallagher

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, which is our memorial day for Members of Congress who have passed to their final reward, I would like to add a few remarks about my predecessor from the Third Congressional District of Minnesota, who passed to his final reward on August 13, 1946, after he had been renominated by his party without any personal campaign on his part.

WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER was plain "BILL" GALLAGHER to everyone who knew him. In the hearts and minds of many in Minnesota and elsewhere he is symbolic of that opportunity which is peculiarly American and which is nowhere more available than in our democratic form of government.

His rise in the political world was meteoric. His election and subsequent career in public life captured the imagination of millions of our people because of his deep understanding of mankind and his unique ability to express the root sentiment of the honest, hard working, everyday American.

After winning his party's nomination for Congress in the 1944 primary from Charles Munn, former Speaker of the Minnesota House of Representatives and also a former member of the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission, he went on to win the seat in a closely contested election. Subsequently, he selected Charles Munn, his former opponent, to serve as his congressional secretary. The two formed a fine cooperative team in Washington. I recount this incident because this magnanimity was typical of "BILL" GALLAGHER. There was no malice in his heart His heart encompassed all mankind, friend and foe alike. He was a fine American. His passing is deeply mourned.

Address by the Chief Justice at Presentation of International Humanitarian Award to James F. Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the distinguished Chief Justice of the United States on the occasion of the presentation to our former distinguished Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, of the Variety Clubs International's humanitarian award in recognition of Mr. Byrnes' faithful services toward the establishment of world peace. I also ask that a newspaper article relating to the same matter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President of the Variety Clubs International, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to participate in the bestowal of the annual humanitarian award of the Variety Clubs International.

On Thanksgiving Day 1928, a broken-hearted mother left a month's old babe in a Pittsburgh theater. Pinned to the thin, worn garment of the infant, there was a badly scribbled note stating that she could not afford to keep the child as she had six others; that she had heard of the goodness of heart of show people; and "with a prayer to God that you will take care of her," she signed "A heart-broken mother."

The 11 members of the first Variety Club, formed the year before in Pittsburgh, cared for little Catherine. And the distracted mother's abandonment of her baby gave birth to the generous, charitable activities of the Variety Clubs International, now grown to 28 clubs, which have touched and helped hundreds of thousands of youngsters in 19 years of humanitarian service. Last year, more than 100,000 children were blessed and bettered in the expenditure of more than a million dollars in humanitarian service by Variety Clubs International.

In 1937, they initiated the annual humanitarian award honoring some man or woman who, by sacrifices and deeds, had helped to make this world a better world. The annual recipient of this honor is selected by a committee of some 70 newspaper and magazine editors and publishers, radio commentators, and playwrights, in a secret ballot to determine the most outstanding humanitarian of the year, and award to him or her a special citation, an honorarium, and a silver plaque as a permanent recording of humanitarian service.

Thus far, this humanitarian award has gone to Father Flanagan, the founder of Boys Town; the late Martha Berry, founder of the Berry Schools in Georgia; the late Dr. George Washington Carver, eminent scientist of Tuskegee Institute in Alabama; Sister Elizabeth Kenney of Australia, founder of the Kenney System for the treatment of infantile paralysis; the Honorable Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State; Dr. and Sir Alexander Fleming of London, England, the discoverer of penicillin; and for 1945 the award was given to Gen. Evangeline Booth, directing head of the Salvation Army.

It is interesting to note that in two successive years the recipients of the humanitarian awards have also been awarded the Nobel prize and the Pulitzer prize—the Honorable Cordell Hull and Sir Alexander Fleming.

Now to the performance of a most pleasant task—the announcement and presentation of the humanitarian award for the year 1946. It goes to Hon. James Francis Byrnes, former Secretary of State of the United States of America.

Mr. Byrnes knew the seamy side of life. Yet he has risen to the heights. He has occupied many official positions. As a young man he was a court reporter, and then became State solicitor, Representative in Congress, United States Senator, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Economic Stabilization Director, War Mobilization and Reconversion Director, and Secretary of State. Versatile, with great skill and facility, rare ability, and great devotion to any role he played—he possesses a great quality, never disguised or concealed, and always revealing the man, Jimmy Byrnes. That quality is his friendliness—his liking for common folks.

A moment ago I mentioned that he had served his country as Economic Stabilization Director and War Mobilization and Reconversion Director, positions reminiscent of the state of war. He performed herculean service. Then he stepped upon the world stage as an advocate of and worker for peace. The very first day he became Secretary of State he stated: "There can be no doubt that the peoples of this war-ravaged earth want to live in a free and peaceful world. But the supreme task of statesmanship the world over is to help them understand that they can have peace and freedom only if they tolerate and respect the rights of others to opinions, feelings, and ways of life which they do not and cannot share." That was the task to which he dedicated himself.

For 2 years, as Secretary of State, he worked selflessly, 7 days and 7 nights a week, to build peace, a peace which would make this world safe for all of us; a world in which all people, with their varied beliefs, kinships, and customs may live and let live. He has made people in all parts of the world realize the supreme importance of that task as they have never done before. He has made all of us realize that peace cannot be achieved by wishful thinking or by imposing our will on others, or by letting others impose their will upon us. He has taught us the wisdom of firmness and patience in the pursuit of peace and the well-being of common folks.

It is a personal pleasure for one who has worked with Jimmy Byrnes for a long, long time to present him the Variety Clubs award of 1946 in recognition of his faithful services toward the establishment of world peace. The inscription on the plaque depicts the donors' feeling toward this distinguished American—"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

TOO MUCH WAR TALK, TOO LITTLE OF PEACE, BYRNES DECLARES

James F. Byrnes, former Secretary of State, said last night "there is too much talk about war and too little talk about peace" in both the United States and Russia.

"If war should come," he declared, "it will not be because the people want it, but because of the incapacity of those who control the governments of the world.

"I do not believe there exists such bankruptcy of statesmanship," he said in encouragement. "I deny that conflict is inevitable. I believe we can make the peace and we can keep the peace."

Byrnes' speech, released last night, was recorded here Wednesday on sound film for a showing in Hollywood to delegates of the Variety Clubs, which had bestowed on him the humanitarian award for 1946. It was the first major foreign policy speech since he left the State Department.

"We have made clear to the Soviet Union that it cannot dictate the terms of peace," said Byrnes. "We must also realize that the United States cannot dictate the terms of peace. There can be such dictation only to a defeated enemy state or a defenseless state."

He called upon Allied Nations to negotiate with each other on terms of equality and the people of the United States to not demand perfectionism in our peacemaking.

"In this imperfect world there is no perfect peace," declared Byrnes.

Byrnes resigned as Secretary of State on January 7 because of ill health and has returned to law work here.

He accepted the Clubs' citation and a silver plaque but turned over its accompanying $1,000 honorarium to the Washington Variety Club. He stipulated that the money be given through the club to the Washington City-Wide Ladies of Charity Milk Fund.

The award cited Byrnes in recognition of his faithful efforts toward the establishment of world-wide peace.

It was officially presented by Chief Justice Fred Vinson, who declared of the recipient: "He has taught us the wisdom of firmness and patience in the pursuit of peace and the well-being of common folks."

Selection of the winner of the annual award is made by secret ballot of a committee of 70 leading newspaper and magazine editors and publishers, radio commentators, and playwrights.

The Republican Party Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of an address delivered by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], on Monday, May 19, 1947, over radio station WPRO, in Providence, R. I. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, in American politics, under our system of free speech, there is no legal penalty for insulting the intelligence of the American people. Any politician who thinks he sees some advantage in doing so is free to try it at any time. But this tactic usually fails. It boomerangs because no man can reflect in his speech a low opinion of his fellow countrymen without at the same time exposing himself.

Here in Rhode Island, we recently listened to a political spokesman taking it upon himself to insult the intelligence of the whole American electorate. I hardly need add that I refer to an address given by the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Reece. What he said would not be worthy of comment if it merely represented his own views. What he said was important because, as chairman of its national committee he was speaking for the Republican Party and his address revealed the line of argument which the Republican Party will use in its attempt to win the Presidential election of 1948.

That line of argument is essentially, first, that the Republican victory in the election last November was not conclusive; second, that the Democratic Party in the next election will have the support of the working people of this Nation and; third, that because of this fact the Democratic Party is dangerous, communistic, Moscow-dominated, and a threat to our American way of life in the future—as Mr. Reece puts it—"for the next hundred years."

I agree with the Republicans when they predict the Democratic Party will have the support of labor. It will have the support not only of organized and unorganized labor but also of America's small-salaried office helpers, America's small farmers, America's small businessmen—of America's "little people," her wage earners, everywhere. And there are very good reasons—reasons to be found in the record of performance of the Democratic Party, and also of the Republican Party—why that support will be given the Democrats.

But when a political spokesman attempts to sell this Nation the idea that the support of labor means communism, that politician not only casts a slur on the patriotism and loyalty of the wage earners of our country; he delivers a slap in the face of our entire body politic.

I have no idea how the Republican Party justifies its charges. I have not heard the Republican chairman reconcile his wild-eyed warnings against Moscow influence with the Truman doctrine of halting Communist aggression throughout the world. The leaders of the Republican Party themselves support that doctrine. And I submit that the Republican chairman endangers bipartisan support of American foreign policy by his unscrupulous efforts to arouse and keep alive in this country the lie of collaboration by one of our two great political parties with Soviet Communists.

I have not heard how the Republican chairman reconciles his charge of communism against the Democratic administration, with that administration's proposal to free our Government of every last vestige of Communist influence and its program to free our economy of the chaos on which communism lives and thrives.

Last Thursday morning I was amused to read in a Washington paper the news under a Providence date line that Chairman Reece had attacked President Truman for "a thoroughgoing mobilization of radical votes on his behalf." By a coincidence this Associated Press dispatch was immediately followed by a United Press dispatch under a Minneapolis date line that Henry Wallace had "denounced President Truman's loyalty test for governmental employees as a $25,000,000 witch hunt." Chairman Reece and Mr. Wallace seem to be fellow travelers along the anti-Truman route though not very congenial ones.

Chairman Reece divides the Democratic Party into three groups. The obvious intention is to prove that there is no unity of purpose in the party and, therefore, that it cannot be depended upon to accomplish anything worth while. He must have been supplied this curious idea right here in Rhode Island, because one of the leading Republican candidates in the campaign last fall divided the Democratic Party into three groups in the same way and drew a similar inference quite plainly. As a matter of fact, while there are divisions in the Democratic Party as to various matters especially of local interest, they are bound together by the common belief in certain fundamental principles. The most fundamental of all, and

one which distinguishes the Democratic Party from the Republican Party, which is similarly divided into groups, is that the Democratic Party founded by Thomas Jefferson continues to seek primarily the welfare and prosperity of all the people as distinguished from certain classes. The Republican Party on the contrary is united in the common belief that the Government should favor certain special classes, set apart either by wealth, or social position, or big business, from the masses of the common people. It believes in giving special privileges to those privileged classes, and tries to persuade their fellow citizens, the underprivileged especially, that whatever prosperity accrues to their betters will somehow seep down and be shared by their inferiors, the common people. Although most Republicans see public problems from this point of view, yet there are some who, far from being reactionary, are what one of them called himself the other evening in New York, "a Jeffersonian Republican."

It does not seem to me that Mr. Reece was quite frank in his speeches and interviews here in Rhode Island. He neglected to tell his Rhode Island audience whether the Republican National Committee would solicit funds from non-Rhode Islanders to be used in the 1948 campaign in Rhode Island as it did in 1946. He further neglected to tell his Rhode Island audience who it was that solicited this money for the 1946 campaign from the Du Pont family, the Pew family, and other non-Rhode Islanders in an unsuccessful effort to elect Republican candidates in this State last fall.

He also neglected to state, when he praised the antilabor bill, that the man who succeeded him as Representative from the First Congressional District of Tennessee, Representative DAYTON E. PHILLIPS, voted against the drastic Hartley labor bill when it was passed by the House of Representatives and had previously voted for a motion to recommit the same bill. Maybe Mr. Reece did not want these industrialists of Rhode Island, who are so active in the Republican cause, to know that the man who on his recommendation had succeeded him in Congress did not follow the Republican leadership in the House in passing this un-American Hartley antilabor bill.

The Republican program is open sabotage of American democracy. Sitting in the Senate I have seen a Republican-dominated Congress move toward that goal.

All of us have seen it force upon the country a dangerous inflation of prices. That inflation has swelled corporation profits and threatened the standard of living of millions of American families.

We have seen this Congress, under Republican domination, plan to break rent control as it broke price control. This means a further retreat from the living standard of the American workman and war veteran and their families.

We have seen this Republican Congress cripple every agency of Government which functions to protect the underprivileged and those who have little to live on, from exploitation by those who have much.

And while it has acted in favor of the big corporations we have seen the Republican Congress move to deprive American labor of its wage security and its right of collective bargaining. We have seen it enact measures to water down or nullify the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Anti-Injunction Act, the Wagner Act, and other hard-won rights in the long struggle of America's working people for economic protection and a decent living standard.

We have seen this Republican Congress cynically break faith with the people by refusing to return a budget report for the coming year's income and outgo. Before Congress can possibly know how much money to appropriate for our Government and by how much it can safely reduce our taxes, it must fix upon a budget figure. That is its duty by law and its moral obligation to the people.

The President has laid before it a budget of $37,500,000,000. One branch of this Republican Congress, the House of Representatives, recklessly voted to reduce that budget by $6,000,000,000. The other branch, the Senate, voted for a reduction of $4,500,000,000. Both figures were mere guesses and both Houses have refused to try to resolve their difference. Therefore, the people of the United States are, to this day, without an approved budget for the coming year. We do not know where we stand. Yet, in its headlong desire to create a windfall for the wealthy minority, the Republican Congress has proposed a tax reduction—heavily weighted in favor of the few with large fortunes—amounting to nearly $4,000,000,000. Until we know what our budget is, we have no way of knowing whether we can afford a tax reduction of four billions, or one of half that size or of any size. Yet, when a colleague of mine in the Senate stood up and pointed out the recklessness of this order of procedure, when he pleaded for sanity and asked of the Senate why some kind of budget report had not been made, there was no answer.

The people of America are reflecting on the price they must pay to live, or searching in vain for a roof over their heads, or wondering why no postwar program to meet other pressing needs has been enacted by Congress. They are restless as they experience only legislation giving more to those who need no more. The Republican Party, aware of the criticism based on these solid facts, has grown sensitive. Mr. Reece, in his address here, attempted a defense, but his apology was lame. It limped on five crutches which Mr. Reece enumerated as the achievements of the Republican majority in the nearly 6 months of its control. If you will examine these five enactments closely, you will find that each of them is negative—a process not of doing but undoing.

Until the Republican Party can and will adopt a positive program for America—something it has lacked for half a century—this will continue to be so. And the Nation—and its people—will continue to pay the price of do-nothing government so long as these men and their party remain in power. Today that cost comes high, but what we have paid to date in terms of social and economic set-backs is only the beginning.

The time to stop this corroding process is now. The date for beginning our fight for a Democratic victory at the next election is today. Day by day and hour by hour, it becomes a fight more worth the making—not for ourselves, not for our party, but for America.

What Labor Wants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD the very fine article entitled "What Labor Wants" written by a distinguished labor leader in my State, Mr. Dave Beck, for the American Legion magazine, at the invitation of the editors.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT LABOR WANTS

(By Dave Beck)

If you would believe the newspaper headlines of the past year, there is today no common ground on which labor and management can meet. If that is true it is enough to scare anybody, for then the public is doomed to be caught in the middle of a struggle which will end only when either labor or management has been utterly victorious over the other in a fight to control American industry.

I am going to say that this is absurd, for there is a common meeting ground. But first I want to point out that I am not dreaming up an argument. Many people in America, some of them frightened and others determined, are saying we must have a fight to the finish before we will have industrial peace. It is ironic, and may some day seem funny, that the biggest boosters of such a war between all Americans are (a) the Communists, who will settle for nothing less than the total domination of America by the worker, and (b) the extremists in industry, who want labor suppressed for once and for all. Strange bedfellows indeed—yet bedfellows they are in their desire to line you up in a war against the fellow next door. Probably neither of these groups would have much influence today if the other weren't present as a bogey man. But each is frightening new members into its ranks daily by pointing at the other, and if they have their way we may yet see an entirely unnecessary internal struggle between each man and his neighbor. We mustn't let that happen. It is possible for America to produce enough for all, and for American democracy to solve our differences.

As one of many labor union officials who claim a keen interest in the public welfare, I must speak out against the sentiment in some quarters that labor ought to be deprived of its right to strike. Many Americans share the view that the right to strike must be curtailed, but I wonder if they are not unduly alarmed by newspaper scareheads.

Industrial peace, like all much-wanted things, is easier to destroy than to create. It is always easier to talk about wrong ideas, wrong methods, and wrong policies than it is accurately to suggest right ideas, right methods, and right policies.

Labor and management today are feeling the pains of reconverting. During the war the members of American Federation of Labor unions observed their strike pledges and piled up a production record unequalled in world history. They deserve no special praise for this. Plainly it was their duty.

When the war ended, capital and labor, who, in spite of the Communists, are more inherently friendly than otherwise, became involved in a long series of disputes which have seriously disturbed the public. We of the labor unions are trying to readjust our people from war to peace. Industry is trying to do the same thing. Both are having difficulties. In my opinion these difficulties are about what should have been expected in the situation. However, labor and management have an equal stake in the solution of the difficulties and must work out their problems as co-custodians of American prosperity.

What strikes me forcibly is that so many people feel that out of punishing and vindictive legislation against labor will come a solution to the reconversion problems of

labor and management and an impetus to the welfare of the country. Nothing could be further from the truth. The strife of the past year has been, in the main, part of the postwar disjointedness of the entire country. Will not vindictive laws permanently wound labor for its part in a painful postwar adjustment to which no activities in the country were immune? Will not such laws help insure that the postwar difficulties between labor and management become a permanent breach? I think so. Certainly any other solution had better be tried first, and time must be allowed for judgment. In the entire Congress today one man votes the Communist Party line. Certainly labor, without whose votes many Congressmen could not hold office, has shown its faith in the Congress and will receive some faith in return.

I can hold no brief for the extremes some labor unions and labor leaders have been accused of following, nor deny the accusations levelled at the selfishness of certain employers and corporations in quickly proclaiming they were definitely through with collective bargaining.

Both labor and capital should be doing the kind of job together which won the war. But they are not. Each is every bit as guilty as the other in failing to work out a practical blueprint of progress, and the public cannot be blamed for wanting a quick solution.

The headlined strikes of the last year do not, as any sensible reader would know, represent the general picture of labor-management relations in this country—nor do they show that there is an insuperable breach between labor and management. Those were the hot cases, the sorest points of postwar difficulty. Not in the headlines are the men who work quietly for harmony in industry.

We have in America the finest leadership of capital and labor in the world. It is overwhelmingly against the socialization of industry and opposed to communism. Though some leaders in industry oppose any form of recognition for organized labor, a great many other men in influential business positions have grown practical. They have advanced with the times. They have learned that new techniques are necessary in this modern world.

The problems of readjustment are serious and I do not wish to minimize the difficulties to be overcome. Neither do I wish to magnify the difficulties. It is a hard, tough fight to bring about understanding of one another here in America, but it can be done in an American way, for that is the way we all wish to follow.

Industrial peace will not be brought about by politicians, or labor, or capital shouting at one another and seeking out ways to cripple or undermine one another. Nor by a blaze of propaganda in a large section of the press which, with the thought of muzzling labor by punitive legislation, falls far short of the insight it should be displaying at this time of crisis.

The vast majority of labor unions are aware that power brings responsibility and that we must measure up to that responsibility. Those unions are working quietly with management today for better things—and getting few headlines. Not long ago I spoke before members of the teamsters unions of 11 Western States and said: "I do not say, nor do I believe, that all our strikes will be, or can be, prevented. I merely say that to prevent strikes should be our goal, and that we should strive to reach this goal intelligently. There will be strikes from time to time, for there will be instances where nothing but strikes can bring labor and management together and clear the air so understanding can be reached.

"This is true because we, of labor, are human and prone to misjudgment, and so are the humans who comprise management, and who own capital."

I would hate, as would many other labor leaders who have voiced similar sentiments, to have to swallow those words, to go before the rank and file of our unions and report that all-out war had been declared against us, that we should stop seeking peace and start fighting.

But there are those who would punish the many good with the few bad, who seek to smash at all labor by class and discriminatory statutes, which would set back the fundamental cause of organized labor to a status of 20 and more years ago. Their excuse for this is that certain unions are acting in a high-handed and dictatorial manner endangering the very position of the United States.

Perhaps some unions have acted in the manner described. So have many unscrupulous industrialists, and during wartime. It is certainly foolhardy in the long run to draw a general conclusion of the use of a thing by its abuse.

We cannot bring about industrial peace by legislation. There are no sudden solutions to our economic problems. Vindictive laws will not increase production or efficiency, both of which are essential to capital, labor, and the public.

What, then, can possibly be done?

First of all capital, labor, and the public have to be educated to the understanding of industrial peace as an art, to be studied like counterpoint and practiced as scientifically as nuclear fission.

We must learn wherein lie the most serious threats to our economy, and wherein lies its strength. Vindictive labor laws in the guise of promoting industrial peace are a far more serious threat to our American system of free enterprise than all the Communists and crackpots combined—the growth of whose power depends on a widening breach between capital and labor. Whatever undermines the faith of the American worker in the honesty and fairness of his Congress and his Government cannot help but provide fertile ground for the growth of alien philosophies hostile to our way of life.

While labor must learn to use the power to strike judiciously, the right to strike must not be infringed. Industrialists with vision must realize that they owe a historical debt to the strike. Labor fought hard for equal rights in court and under the law. Long ago the sweatshop and the company-store peonage racket disappeared under the pressure of strikes, and when workers began to earn more money and more leisure, fighting and striking almost every inch of the way in many industries, a golden age opened up for industry, because labor became industry's best customer. The mass market that placed American industry at the top of the heap during the first 40 years of this century was a labor market, labor that had fought its way up from the poverty of the slag-heaps and suddenly began buying automobiles, radios, refrigerators rugs, vacuum cleaners, decent homes, and electric power.

Today any men who call in one breath for increased production and in the next for curtailment of the right to strike, want to have their cake and eat it too. The right to strike, on the part of labor, is all that assures industry that labor will be able to afford the products of industry.

No; the cure for industrial disturbance is not to be found in semislave laws intended to take away the hard-earned rights of working people and tie toilers to their jobs against their will.

It is to be found only in understanding between men of good will in industry and labor, and in public support for honest men.

Honest Americans today want industrial peace: they do not want strife and disorder. Honest men also know that such industrial peace cannot be established by law or by edict. Men, not laws, make peace—and war. Industrial peace must come through the process of equitable dealing by honorable men in both capital and labor.

If those who cry loudest for laws to curb labor were sincerely desirous of industrial peace, rather than selfish and unwarranted advantage, they would explore the tried and proven ways. They would tackle the problem by the use of the only successful formula: better, closer relationships, confidence, and mutual understanding between those who speak for labor and capital.

There is no doubt, nor do we deny, that labor has at times had leaders who proved to be without vision, or who were incompetent and arrogantly selfish, and even dishonest. Business and industry, even the honored professions, have had similar men. There have always been men, in every type of endeavor—even in the church—who have proved disloyal and unworthy of their trust. Responsible unions are as impatient of such individuals as is the public.

One group of Congressmen proposes publicity for labor's finances, as if labor had something to hide. The plain fact is that unions today furnish frequent financial statements to their members and often publish them in printed forms, for all who may be interested. Labor's financial statements are easy to understand; they are not like the complicated compilations of figures issued by corporations.

I am not afraid of publication of labor's finances. I believe, however, that if labor should be required to publish its financial matters employers should be required to do likewise. That is only being fair and honest about it. Whatever information may be required of unions should also be required of employers. I am not averse to making public all the incomes of both labor and capital, their employees and administrators.

I would go further than mere financial statements. If industry will agree, I would be willing to have both sides submit all of the facts about earnings, wages, expenses of all kinds, as well as profits, upon entering into collective bargaining conferences. Let us also require the corporations to furnish sworn statements of their capital structures, showing actual, honest investment. I would agree that if either the union or the employer failed or refused to submit all financial facts, then a Government regulatory agency should step in, examine the books and records, and furnish the data—and make it public.

So, in the end, we come right back to the fundamental principle that peace in industry, like peace between nations, is based on good will, understanding, and mutual respect. Peace can be maintained in industry only if labor and capital, each respecting the rights of the other, are willing to cooperate to find peaceful means for the settlement of differences.

Labor has its responsibilities. It must not retard but encourage the introduction of labor-saving machinery and processes. Labor must not interfere with the mechanization of industry and must encourage greater production and resultant lower consumer costs.

In the end labor will not progress through the public operation of industry because labor can only progress under free enterprise and competitive business, by means of collective bargaining.

Let me give you a specific instance of how industrial peace can be maintained.

In Oakland, Calif., a 3-day general strike had tied up the city. The teamsters refused to participate, because of their belief that a general strike actually is revolution, and in a short time the strike was dissipated. Similarly, in Los Angeles, we refused to participate in general-strike plans. The strike did not come off.

Again, in Los Angeles, we refused to cooperate in a food-store tie-up because the union primarily involved had not exhausted all of

the democratic processes established by the A. F. of L. for the mutual protection of the international unions and the contracting employers.

This demonstrates that there is weak leadership at times in labor. But it also shows there is responsible and experienced leadership.

This type of responsible leadership should be sought out and encouraged by capital. Since unions are here today as a vital stratum of our economy, management should help build a high type of union leadership and discipline which will help our Nation in the long run.

In that way, gradually capital will be dealing only with those who have experience and a sense of fairness. Even then there will be disagreements. That is America. That is democracy. That is our way of working things out.

It comes down to this: Labor unions are here to stay. Capital can have a share in building responsible labor leaders and rank-and-files. This can never be done by legislation which hits at all labor unions.

To do this, capital must have the guts and the vision, in its own set-up, to cooperate rather than destroy.

Both capital and labor must recognize that John Public has a vital interest in both organizations.

Capital and labor must cease placing the public in the middle. The way to do this is plainly the conference table. And leave the professional labor haters out as advisors to the employers. This will cut down to a minimum the possibilities of a strike. This will increase the possibilities of arbitration and conciliation.

When all is said and done you will find that the heart of American industry is not unlike the heart of the American Legion. The Legion relies for its strength, its integrity, and its sureness that it is right, in what it calls "the grass roots." On the top are the executives who fight the big battles and make the speeches, receive the insults and hew to the line. But down in the communities are the posts, whose members, working with the everyday problems of community life as it is actually lived, are in truth the life and the directing force of the American Legion. They and their neighbors are America. They direct the flow of events and they are the strength and the balance of the Legion.

And so it is with labor and management. Down at the grass roots, far removed from the mighty sphere of politicians testing each wind, are the men—laborers and managers—who work together every day of their lives; who, by the millions, conduct themselves to the same ultimate end, the good of their communities and of their way of life. They will solve their differences to the best good of all—if allowed to do so.

The broad, common ground on which labor and management can meet is there; it is our mutual interest in the welfare of America. Let us tighten, not sever, the bonds that hold us together.

The West in Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "The West in Revolt," published in the News and Observer, of Raleigh, N. C., on May 10, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEST IN REVOLT

"Sixteen years for the winning of the West—and 16 weeks to lose it," groaned one western Republican as the Republican Congress slashed legislation to develop western resources. (Roscoe Fleming in the Washington Post.)

In the early nineties, when agriculture was nearly prostrate because Republican policies had enriched protected industry at the expense of the tillers of the soil, the farmers of Kansas and Nebraska and most other agricultural States either joined the Populist Party or compelled one of the old parties to promise relief.

In 1896 they supported Bryan in the belief that his and their faith that the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, reduction of big tariff favors at their expense, and the destruction of monopoly would end farm prostration. They did not win the election, but did compel some changes, and were fed up with promises that did not materialize. And later the majority returned to the Republican Party in the hope it would keep some of its promises.

What happened? The good things all went to exploiters and eastern industries, and in 1929–33 agriculture was again prostrated. Republican subservience to big business had impoverished agriculture. Farmers were getting prices for their products less than the cost of cultivation, and farmers were being evicted from their farms. A rich country was prostrate. In their extremity the farmers voted almost en masse for Roosevelt, and New Deal legislation restored agriculture to a prosperous era. And then, like Jeshurun of the Bible, listening to the siren voice of Republican spellbinders they waxed fat and kicked and in the election of 1946 western farmers joined reactionaries and elected a Republican Congress. It was mainly the farm voters who made possible the election of Republican Senators and a number of Representatives in California, Washington, Montana, Utah, Idaho, and Nevada. They and other agricultural States also provided most of the Republican gains in Congress in 1938 and 1942.

If the farmers had not bit the hand that fed them the Republicans could not have controlled the present Congress. Its record has been shaped by eastern big business. Mr. Fleming truly says that there is a deep roar of protest from the 17 States west of the Missouri. They feel "like a national stepchild, a hewer of wood and drawer of water in the national household."

As proof that farmers are the forgotten men of this Congress, the contemptuous remark of Chairman TABER, of New York, that farm criticism is "only the squeal of a stuck pig," Mr. Fleming says "most westerners believe that eastern industrial-financial-political domination prefers to keep the West as a raw-materials supplier and as a market for eastern manufactured goods." And the same attitude is held as to the agricultural South. These interests wish to cut off anything that would lure industries away from the Northeast to the South, as they have done in every way for 50 years by freight-rate discrimination, tariff favors to the East, and other special privileges.

Mr. Fleming names the western resources seriously injured by the cuts in the bills affecting mining, water power, agriculture, and needed raw materials. These cuts produced such reaction as to cause western Republicans "to feel that a western Democratic upsurge will be difficult to head off in 1948."

Historically, and as true now as formerly, the Democratic Party from Jefferson to Roosevelt has been the party under whose policies agriculture has prospered. In 1912, and as in 1896, 1932, 1936, and 1940, the western Republican farmers walked out of the Republican Party to support Theodore Roosevelt, William Jennings Bryan, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. And then, when better days came, enough western farmers voted to return the eastern-dominated Republican Party to power and reaped depression, distress, and disaster.

We are told the burnt child dreads the fire. If that is true of children, older grown, the western farmers will join the southern farmers and the workers of the East in administering a sweeping defeat to the Republicans in 1948. To be sure, the Democratic Party is not perfect, but it is the only hope to prevent the West, the South, and the workers in industry from being the serving maids of the rich eastern reactionaries who control the Republican Party and who will name one of their own as candidate for President on the Republican ticket in 1948.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the subcommittee on agriculture will submit its appropriation bill next Monday. I do not know, of course, what is contained in that bill, but I do hope that the budget for soil conservation, rural electrification, and the other vital agricultural features of our economy are not cut.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I make, as part of my remarks, the annual report of the Washington County soil conservation district of Fayetteville, Ark. The board of supervisors of that district are Mr. Walter D. Ramey, chairman, Winslow, Ark.; M. G. Lewis, secretary, Farmington, Ark.; Mr. C. D. Griscon, Lincoln, Ark.; and Mr. Roy E. Spears, of Summers, Ark.

I think this is a wonderful report and shows something of the fine character of work which this agency is doing. These men are to be commended for the work which they have done.

The report follows:

WASHINGTON COUNTY DISTRICT SUPERVISORS ANNUAL REPORT, 1946

We supervisors have been able to have 10 meetings during the calendar year of 1946 with a quorum of board members present. There were two meetings where a quorum of supervisors was not present. At the board meetings with less than a quorum in attendance only that business which can be undertaken by individual members is cleared.

There were two supervisors who attended the Eureka Springs meeting on October 23 and 24. Reports of such meetings were made to other board members at the first opportunity and we are happy to report at other places these profitable meetings. Three board members attended the meeting at Russellville, Ark., from July 30 to August 1, inclusive. Only one member was able to attend the meeting of supervisors at Little Rock followed by the Friends of the Land meeting. This was considered a very interesting, profitable, and worth-while meeting for the supervisors. One supervisor was able to visit the Gaines Creek soil-conservation

district at McAlester, Okla., on December 20. This also was considered a very profitable meeting as the study of establishing Bermuda grass by seeding was reviewed on many farms. The supervisors hope that a few test plots may be established during the coming year in our district. We realize that we are in a much colder area but at the same time have lands much more suitable than the land in the Gaines Creek district of Oklahoma.

The fourth annual soil-conservation day at Lake Wedington project was sponsored jointly by the Benton County and Washington County districts on July 24 at which time tours and demonstrations and conservation talks were given. There were 550 people in attendance at this conservation day meeting. These annual soil-conservation days cost the respective districts some money but we believe we are getting enthusiasm, interest, and information over to a large group of cooperators, conservation leaders, and other supervisors as well as business interests that is bearing fruit. This year a tour of pasture development and forestry work was made with demonstrations in the elimination of brush from our lands for better and proper land use. The methods used were both mechanical and chemical. Mechanical saws, heavy-duty mowers pulled by tractors, Ammate, and the 2-4-D chemical were demonstrated. We appreciate the fact that these chemicals are not yet satisfactory or practical from a farmer's viewpoint but we are interesting farmers to keep on the alert and have some knowledge of the possibility of chemicals in the elimination of unsatisfactory vegetation from our lands.

We supervisors are aware to some extent of the tremendous responsibility, the advantages and the opportunities which we have in our position. We also realize that soil erosion in our respective districts did not all happen overnight or in a very short time and that it will take constant effort, the advice and the counsel of all individual farmers and businesses which we can encourage to give us assistance to hasten the consciousness of the severe erosion problem on all our farms. Our health, happiness, and future welfare depend on the curtailment of the ravages of erosion much more than any other agricultural problem that we know of today. All firms, businesses, and farmers realize, and must realize, that the cost of production and the products for sale hinge on the percent of profit they can make by producing the articles as cheaply as possible. If we could but get more and more agriculture-minded people to acknowledge that conservation farming is responsible for high yields and quality of products more than any other single benefit, we might hasten the application of conservation practices on the farms of the district.

The supervisors with the assistance of technical agencies held a conservation leaders training day on February 28, 1946, at which time all conservation leaders and many other individuals were invited by the supervisors to this training day where conservation talks were made, conservation pictures were shown, and at noon the conservation leaders were guests of the supervisors at lunch. We are hoping that we may continue holding these conservation-training days bringing information and enthusiasm to all conservation leaders and to many other individuals who will continue in the battle against erosion. We believe these meetings are of value.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE DISTRICT

During the past year 267 more farms were placed under the district program with 26,084 acres passing under the governing board of supervisors for approval. This brings to date (December 31, 1946) a total of 872 farms covering 91,972 acres which are applying conservation practices to their farms according to the district program.

There is a problem which is receiving consideration from the supervisors, conservation leaders and the technical personnel assisting and cooperating with the district. This problem is the change of land ownership either from sale of the farm or by death of the owner. During the past year 87 farms containing 7,695 acres were canceled through sale of the farm or death of the owner. Up to the present date, December 31, 1946, there have been 200 farms covering 17,907 acres which have been canceled. This means that 32.58 percent of the farms that were planned during the year were canceled by the above methods and 29.5 percent of the acreage was canceled during the year. Over the period of the operation of the district 18.65 percent of the farms have been canceled from sale or death and 16.29 percent of the acreage.

The severe drought during the summer and fall months of the past year was hurtful in getting some practices applied on the land and beneficial in getting others. As an illustration, the drought accentuated the needs for pasture water and during the past year we were able to apply 75 ponds measuring up to district specifications on the farms under agreement. This brings to a total 114 ponds meeting district specifications which have been built on the 872 farms now under plan with the district.

CONTOUR PLANTING

We planned during this period under proper land use 11,635 acres for contour operations. This brings to date a total of 29,792 acres. There were established during the past year 4,408 acres of contour cultivation which brings a total of 11,573 acres to date. Contour lines and terrace lines had to be run on these individual farms with careful explanation to the cooperators of the best methods of contour plowing and farming of their land and parallel farming with their terraces.

One of the largest land uses in the district is pasture development due to the steepness, erosion or lack of drainage. During the past year 13,154 acres were planned for pasture which brings to date a total of 39,541 acres to receive systematic pasture development. During the past year we were able to secure 8,800 acres of pasture development which consists in many instances of brushing of the land, preparation of the land, fertilizing of the land, and seeding or sodding of the land. This brings to a total 15,551 acres established to date.

We refer you to exhibit A to further study the statistical records and reports of the standing of the district.

REVIEW OF 1946 WORK

(By M. G. Lewis, secretary-treasurer, board of supervisors)

A review of the work of the Washington County soil-conservation district and its efforts to promote the soil conservation program during the year of 1946 brings to mind many interesting features as well as a number of questions.

Three members of the board of supervisors attended the short course for conservation district supervisors held at Russellville, Ark., on July 30, 31, and August 1, 1946. We came back very enthusiastically with much good information to be given out to our community leaders, but the question "how" arises. In October, northwest Arkansas districts held a meeting at Eureka Springs. Two of our board members attended. Again we received a shot of enthusiasm.

A trip to McAlester, Okla., was made on December 20 to study some Bermuda grass seeding methods and results. Only one member of the board of supervisors was able to go on this tour.

On each of these trips we gathered valuable information that should be given to every farmer in the district. The question "how" comes up again. Everything is fine as far as we have gone but we have to stop too soon. A board member cannot afford to lose his time to attend these meetings and then furnish his car and time to visit the farmers in order to give him this valuable information—information that he should have and we want him to have. I believe that if there could be some provision made whereby the board members could receive expenses for a maximum of 2 days per month in order to visit farmers and community leaders where perplexing problems arise, a great many of our problems could be solved.

It is my opinion that more trips like the one to Oklahoma would be very stimulating. Being the board member who made that trip, I have been asked to make a report. We left Fayetteville at 6 a. m. Each man carried his lunch. We drove all day and got home at 9:30 p. m. From 10 a. m. until 4 p. m. we were in the field or en route from one field to another for review of what was going on under the district program. The Gaines Creek district was stressing the sowing of Bermuda grass seed and has done a wonderful job. If there is a section in Oklahoma that needs to be seeded to Bermuda, that is it. All day I was thinking and wishing I could ask one question, "Where are your green cover crops?" Of all the thousands of acres we saw, I do not remember seeing as much cover crop as one would see on most any 40 acres of cultivated land in Washington district. So we learned much about seeding Bermuda; they need to know about our winter cover crops.

Every county, every community, every farm has different problems that must be met or overcome in different ways. I believe that we have the right kind of a set-up and the most efficient one for getting this great job done. We hear rumors of merger with other set-ups to economize. Now is a poor time to talk economy when our very existence is at stake. If floods are stopped, water must be held where it falls; if we keep our land, we must hold the soil where it is and not let it choke our rivers and fill our flood-control reservoirs while our farms become more nonproductive each year.

Conservation is doing a wonderful work in Washington County. Hundreds of farmers will verify this, but the problem is so big that the farmer alone cannot get the job done as fast as it should be done. The average farm in the Washington district has been in cultivation probably 100 years. The present owners cannot overcome all the mistakes and negligence of the farmer owners in just a few years. He must make a living and meet his obligations as well. He needs some help in the way of heavy machinery. The district does not have sufficient money to buy the necessary equipment, and I do not believe that is the best way if the money were available. If the county could get the machinery, maintain it, and do the farmers' terracing, waterways, gully control work, drainage, etc., when the machinery was not in use on the roads, and charge a fair price, the work could be carried on satisfactorily. Sorry, but the county judge does not have the equipment at present.

February 26, 1947, is set for our regular meeting of the supervisors with the community conservation leaders. This day should be given exclusively to the conservation leaders, and encouragement should be given them to present their problems and make any suggestions which would be profitable in getting more conservation practices applied on the land.

SOME NEEDS OF THE DISTRICT

(By C. D. Griscom, supervisor)

Most of the farmers in our district seem to be much interested in soil-conservation work. However, we need to do more educational work all over the county. Even when we think a farmer knows about the need for conservation practices to hold and improve our soil it is sometimes good to talk more about it with him. It helps to impress the need on him, and if we tell him of the accomplishments of others along these lines it gives him inspiration to go ahead with the job he is doing on his farm.

Our greatest need in this district now is for labor and heavy machinery. It would certainly be a wonderful help if the Government could get some heavy machinery and let farmers use it for building terraces and waterways. The ordinary farmer cannot do this kind of work with the equipment he has, and he cannot afford to buy heavy equipment with the little money that he makes. The labor problem is a great one, too. It is scarce, and it is high. Some few large landowners and operators, like some of those down near Lincoln, can hire labor the year round and then have it available all the time. But most farmers cannot afford to do that and cannot find the extra labor to hire just when he needs it.

It seems to me that there is more application on the land in the last 6 months than ever before. Yet there is a lot more to do. Some have not done as much as they ought to do on farming on the contour to hold the water and keep the land from washing. Our pastures need a lot more brushing and seeding. Terraces need to be constructed, but terraces need to be properly constructed or they can do more harm than good. Years ago, before the beginning of the soil-conservation district, I had some terraces constructed which did not empty right and nearly ruined my place.

DRAINAGE ON B. F. STRAIN'S FARM

Mr. B. F. Strain of the Strain community estimates that the yields on his farm have doubled as a result of carrying out his conservation plan with the Washington County soil-conservation district. A soil conservation service technician assisted Mr. Strain in developing his conservation plans which included adequate drainage, farming on the contour, the use of legumes adapted to his particular type of soil and the application of phosphate and lime.

On 13 acres of drained land Mr. Strain estimated a production of 400 bushels of corn which he says is twice what he would have expected before draining the land. The drainage system was laid out by the Soil Conservation Service technicians assisting the Washington County soil conservation district. The system was built by Vernon Strain, Mr. B. F. Strain's son, with horses, plow, and V-type drag.

The main drainage channel or waterway was constructed along the north side of the field. The length of the channel is approximately 1,500 feet. The channel is 35 feet wide and 2½ feet deep at the lower end. Three lateral channels across the field have already been constructed and one more, to be built later, will complete the drainage system. The entire field of 55 acres is benefited by the drainage system.

In addition to draining the land, each lateral channel across the field acts as a terrace in interrupting the water from washing across the field and also as a guide in cultivating on the contour. All of the channels are V-type and can be crossed easily with farm machinery. Each channel is seeded to rye grass and lespedeza to prevent scouring.

Drainage is only a part of the conservation work being carried out on this farm. Twelve acres have been seeded to rye grass and lespedeza for pasture. Four acres have been seeded to red top and 4 acres to Alsike clover. Two hundred pounds of phosphate per acre was applied on the entire farm last year. All tillage operations are on the contour.

Mr. Strain has farmed on this farm for the past 50 years and says that the crops are planted on the farm 1 month earlier than ever before due to drainage, and his yields have practically doubled. He expects to increase his yields still more by using legumes and phosphate.

G. F. JOHNSON'S ALFALFA LAND PAYS OFF

Three and one-half acres of first-year alfalfa on Mr. G. F. Johnson's farm in the Walnut Corner community produced 12 loads of good hay. The first cutting produced seven loads of oats and alfalfa mixed, the second cutting produced three loads, and the third cutting produced two loads, easily curing out 2½ tons per acre.

This land was prepared by first applying 2 tons of crushed limestone and 200 pounds of superphosphate per acre. Alfalfa and oats were seeded together in the fall of 1945. The seed, the preparation of the land, the fertilizer, and limestone cost approximately $25 per acre.

Mr. Johnson plans on cultivating this field with a spring-tooth harrow in the spring after the first cutting is made. Just before this cultivation 200 pounds of superphosphate will be applied per acre.

Mr. Johnson has recently purchased the adjoining farm, consisting of 180 acres, which now makes him 300 acres under the district program. He is developing 113 acres of open land to pasture, 97 acres of woodland, and 88 acres to cropland. Contour cultivation, cover crops, and fertilization were recently established on the cultivated acres. Approximately 20 acres of cultivated land have had terraces laid out, and work is being done on them at present. A large stock and fish pond was completed last year in his pasture development. His conservation program was worked out in cooperation with the technicians assisting and cooperating with the Washington County soil conservation district.

Mr. Johnson seems very proud of the progress of the program which is being applied on his farm.

CLAUDE BLEW'S ALFALFA PAYS OFF

"In actual value my field of alfalfa was worth $90 per acre this past year," Claude Blew, conservation leader of the White Rock community, reported at a meeting recently. "This 15 acres of alfalfa meadow was planted in the fall of 1942. I planted 30 pounds of seed per acre following soybean stubble as instructed by the technicians assisting and cooperating with the Washington County soil-conservation district. I have applied 200 pounds of phosphate each year on my alfalfa and in addition last year I added 100 truck loads of egg shells from the local egg drying and processing plant in Fayetteville. I made three successful cuttings this year averaging 1 ton per acre, leaving ample growth for transposition of plant food from the tops to the roots for the following year, as instructed by the technicians assisting the district."

Mr. Blew has been conservation minded many years and had two vegetated waterways that he had built long before his farm was placed under the Washington County soil conservation district program.

"I hope soon" Mr. Blew, continued, "to have my conservation plan completed on my farm."

Mr. Blew's farm consists of 72 acres with 27 acres in cultivation which he has completed. His terraces empty into these fine vegetated waterways which he had already established when the farm was planned. He has a 5-acre forest which he is protecting from fire and grazing and from which he secures his fuel and fence posts. Three acres are in farmstead where he has truck crops planted on the contour. Thirty-seven acres are in pasture development. He is a conservation leader and is doing a grand job on his farm and in his community.

EXHIBIT A—*Washington County soil-conservation district, Fayetteville, Ark., Jan. 1–Dec. 31, 1946*

FARM AND RANCH CONSERVATION PLANS AND TREATMENT

Conservation plans	Number		Acres	
	This period	To date	This period	To date
Applications received	174	860	20,286	107,103
Active applications	xxx	452	xxx	56,380
Plans prepared and signed	267	1,072	26,084	109,918
Plans canceled (−)	87	200	7,695	17,906
Amended plans (+ or − acres)	0	1	0	−40
Active conservation plans	xxx	872	xxx	91,972
Combined treatment	xxx	xxx	15,311	32,521
Plans on maintenance	11	224	94	531

MAJOR SOIL- AND WATER-CONSERVATION PRACTICES, FARM AND RANCH PLANS

Practices	Unit	Planned		Established	
		This period	To date	This period	To date
Contour planting	Acre	11,635	29,792	4,408	11,537
Cover crops	do	6,527	31,279	6,970	25,450
Crop-residue management	do	3,274	31,101	8,495	27,472
Strip cropping	do	0	15	0	0
Range properly stocked	do	11,196	34,203	4,788	23,369
Seeding range and pasture	do	13,154	39,541	8,800	15,551
Farm and ranch ponds	Number	133	357	75	114
Field and gully planting	Acre	0	6	0	0
Woodland improvement and harvest cutting	do	4,176	16,152	55	847
Terracing	Mile	360.85	1,409.4	6.81	167.96
Diversions	Linear foot	41,377	209,449	3,225	20,622
Individual farm drains	Acre	860.6	1,895.05	498	584
Water facilities installed, improved, or repaired	Number	128	207	31	34
Plans on which one or more practices have been established				397	893

Annual report of educational activities, Washington County soil-conservation district, Fayetteville, Ark., Jan. 1–Dec. 31, 1946

Activity	This period	To date
Educational meetings:		
Number	12	152
Attendance	331	3,616
Tours:		
Number	1	16
Attendance	550	1,047
Demonstrations:		
Number	2	36
Attendance	13	652
Training-school meetings:		
Number	1	33
Attendance	21	675
Exhibits: Number	1	39
Radio talks: Number	0	9
News articles: Number	37	137

Annual report of receipts and expenditures, Washington County soil-conservation district, Fayetteville, Ark., Jan. 1, 1946, to Jan. 1, 1947

Receipts (by source):	
Balance brought forward	$3,379.45
Sale of Government-granted equipment	1,268.10
Return of funds from Lake Wedington Livestock Grazing Association	480.12
Sale of Fresno	13.00
Benton County's share of fourth annual soil-conservation day	21.56
Total	5,162.23
Expenditures (classified):	
Check to Lake Wedington Livestock Grazing Association	$3,680.20
Cost of War Assets tractor	480.12
Cost of fourth annual soil conservation day at Lake Wedington	21.98
Cost of conservation group leader's day	21.67
Other expenses, stamps, stationery, etc	36.40
Total	4,240.37
Balance carried forward	921.86

The 1947 Position of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Oscar B. Smith, of Frankfort, Ind., has expressed his views concerning agriculture in an article entitled "The 1947 Position of Agriculture," which he has asked me to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In compliance with Mr. Smith's request I respectfully ask leave to insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Smith's article follows:

[From the Farmers Guild News]

THE 1947 POSITION OF AGRICULTURE

(By Oscar B. Smith)

An accurate appraisal of United States agricultural needs for 1947 requires first that its present position be determined. There is considerable jumping at the conclusion that it is in the same relative position following World War I. There are many factual premises that lead to this conclusion such as high prices for farm land, fluctuations in the futures markets, sound banks, a high level of employment, and an expansion of production in both agriculture and industry.

Now, as then, the farm problem is not one of production, it is that of price; and from all these viewpoints the agricultural position is indeed similar to that following World War I. However, there are many other factors to be considered before we can say there is any similarity between present day economic conditions and those of 1919, or that there is any similarity between forces that govern prices in Europe and here. Conditions are decidedly different today; not in mere details of similarity but in the shift of fundamentals.

A NEW POLICEMAN

An instance of the shifting of fundamentals can be noted in the fact that for centuries England was "mistress of the seas and policeman of the world." Since 1898 this fundamental has been undergoing a gradual shift, and I will give you three guesses to name the cop now.

A direct effect of this is seen in our peacetime military and naval budgets as the burden is shifted from the British to the American taxpayer. Note also the increase of military minds in administrative capacities.

Another significant change noted is that highly organized industrial labor has brought about high wage rates. This has effectually subsidized the foreign worker by putting their production costs far below our own, and promoted a factory building boom in South America, thereby forcing our industries to locate in lower-cost rural areas.

BRITISH FINANCIAL CHANGES

Another change affecting our agriculture is the international financial structure. After 1918 the pound sterling of England was a fairly stable unit. In 1931 England departed from the gold standard and through a lowered price for the pound sterling there was created an international price war that brought a collapse in our economic and financial system. From 1931 to 1934 an ounce of gold would buy 1.35 times as much in London and 1.55 times as much in British colonies and Argentina as it would in the United States.

With much of the world's currencies tied to the pound sterling our dollar became too costly and we lost one world market after another. We experienced the so-called flight of the dollar or the assault of Europe on our banking system. In the last 4 months of 1931 we experienced a net loss of about $552,000,000 in gold and an additional net loss of about $556,000,000 in gold in the first 6 months of 1932. American industry and agriculture became paralyzed.

BLOCKED STERLING INFLUENCE

Today many countries possess billions in pound sterling which England cannot possibly redeem at the present artificial level of $4.03. England is aware of this and there is no evidence that she wants to redeem at that level. At every monetary conference England has refused to stabilize the pound sterling.

The United States State Department argues that England under the American loan agreed that all blocked sterling would be freely converted to any currency so holders might spend it anywhere. Under England's new agreement with Argentina, conditions are imposed on Argentina that all released block sterling must be spent only in the British sterling area or trade empire, reciprocal trade agreements with other countries notwithstanding. Recent press reports relate that huge amounts of Argentine gold are leaving New York by airplane. Calling Peron a Fascist does not help matters one bit. As always money talks. Thus the parroting of an "ever expanding farm market abroad" and a "free access to the raw materials of the world" becomes just plain idle talk.

INFLATION IN ENGLAND

All this adds up to the fact that nationalistic self-interests, self-sufficiency, and self-preservation are uppermost in the thoughts of European and Asiatic statesmen. The manipulation of the pound sterling means that inflation is coming to England unless Uncle Sam wants to pour in more "margin" money.

We being the richest creditor Nation are not supposed to engage in a currency war. Instead the cry is for us to lower our tariffs and allow the debtor nations to flood our markets with their goods so that other nations can get enough dollars to buy food and supplies.

With this international financial situation confronting us our national position approximates that of 1931. It is the international financial structure that determines the economic outlook, and not wishful thinking on the home front.

THE FAKE AGRICULTURAL PARITY

In the period following 1918 our farmers had the semblance of a free market governed somewhat by supply and demand. In 1947 the agricultural market is burdened with the unholy yoke of a fake and bogus parity pricing system. This was originally intended to place the farmer in the same position he held from 1909–14, and in that respect it has been a howling success. From it you can take your choice whether his position is as of 1909 or whether it is 1934 when the parity concept got under way.

Parity as such is supposed to give farmers purchasing power from the sale of a specified commodity that will buy the same quantity of goods as it would during some specified base period which in this instance is 1904–14. Why that period is wholly dishonest is perhaps most clearly shown by a bulletin, Current Surveys of Business, published by the Department of Commerce in June 1939.

THE GREAT DISPARITY

On page 8 of that bulletin it is shown that the per capita contribution to national income in 1909 was $294. The next column is farms, $156. In other words, in 1909 there was $294 available for the entire population if it had been equally distributed, but farmers only received $156, or 53 percent as much as other people. This ratio follows through the entire base period and is called parity. It certainly does not place the farmer on a par with the rest of the country. It is not an honest parity much less being a true parity.

The United States Department of Agriculture gives figures even worse than these and shows that farmers only received about 28 percent as much as other people. Can parity on that basis ever bring relief to agriculture? Can parity on that basis ever create national prosperity where the farm purchasing power is only 53 percent or where it is only 28 percent of everyody else?

PARITY PERCENTAGES

It does not take much stretch of the imagination to see where the farmer is placed if certain laws limit his income to 55 percent of parity, or 85 percent of parity, or 90 percent of parity, or 110 percent of parity. It takes no stretch of the imagination to see that a parity income leaves the farmer worse off than a parity price.

The parity concept as now applied is either a colossal blunder or a deliberate fraud. No other business would permit itself to be saddled with such a pricing system.

REVISION IS NECESSARY

To save agriculture from the throes of another depression, either the present parity formula must be scrapped or else it must be revised whereby it will place agriculture on an absolute par with the rest of the Nation. If our statesmen, economists, educators, and major farm spokesmen prefer parity because it has been so long advocated and accepted that it would be more expedient to continue our agricultural economy on a parity basis, then let them define its formula to stand for what the farmers expect of it.

Let it embody the principles which would place agriculture on a true par with industrial and business concerns which show a profit from their operations. Let the parity formula reflect our year-to-year national average cost of producing a farm crop plus a reasonable profit. Unless and until the parity formula reflects farming costs plus a profit above operations, agriculture is not on a par with industry and commerce. By any other definition the parity concept is unsound and un-American.

THE CORRECT PROCEDURE

A simpler and more honest procedure would be to admit that parity as it is now constituted is a failure and replace it with the enactment of the cost-of-production bill, H. R. 794, now before Congress. By placing agriculture on a business basis under this proposal, there would be no quibbling over terms or what should be in our definitions.

Having done that, then let us accord it the same experimental patience we have given parity for, lo, these many years. One thing is certain; it could not be more unworkable than the present parity concept.

A NATURAL QUESTION

A natural question arises that if our Nation's farmers have never received their cost of production, how does it happen that they are still in business? Why have they not been forced out of business?

That is best illustrated by using the case of the two brothers who possessed about the same amount of ability and intelligence plus $25,000. One became a manufacturer and the other a farmer. The manufacturer grossed an annual volume of $200,000 and the farmer one of $4,000, which is about the average experience from such an investment. In addition, each had an annual loss of 10 percent on their volume. The manufacturer would sustain an operating loss for the year of $20,000 and the farmer one of $400. About 1 year would be required to drive the manufacturer from business, while the farmer might struggle along for 20 or 30 years, or as long as he had sufficient capital left to operate to some extent.

He could stay in business by gradually depleting his capital, by neglecting certain items of family recreation, comfort, and progress, by denial of a higher education to his children, and repairing his implements from the junk yard. All this because some group wants cheap food, while the great agricultural customer of industry is thrown overboard for a spectral foreign trade of uncertain permanency.

AVERAGE AGRICULTURE

Bear in mind that I am speaking of the Nation's average agriculture and not isolated instances where some farmers have benefited by an inheritance or have been aided by engaging in other activities.

What are the chances today for newly married farm couples to make a success of farming by starting from scratch? Carrying it further, how many of the more prosperous farmers could completely re-stock and re-tool their farms overnight?

IMPLEMENTING A PROGRAM

Anyone would probably say that they would be in favor of true parity prices or would be in favor of cost of production prices for farm products but the test of our sincerity and the proof of our courage is whether or not we are in favor of implementing such a program whereby the farmers would receive such prices in the cash markets. We might favor a true parity formula or we might favor a cost of production formula, but it takes more than a formula to make it effective.

To implement such a program requires an agricultural tariff to support those prices. Industry has such a tariff; agriculture has not. A tariff does not and never has made a price; it merely supports it. In our agricultural markets there is no such thing as an American price for American tariffs to support. Witness wheat in 1932 which sold for 30 cents a bushel when we had a 42-cent-per-bushel tariff merely against the importation of foreign wheat. That 30-cent price on wheat was due to a Government protected marketing system that originated in 1865 as an outgrowth of the War Between the States, and known then as the LaSalle Street game of "puts" and "calls."

FUTURES TRADING

Today in essentials, the system still operates as then but under the name of futures trading. The 30-cent wheat price of 1932 came from the futures market ticker tape, and will return again unless futures gambling is stopped. The pitiful part of it is that all other American farm commodities respond in sympathy with it.

The futures market is not concerned with the American tariff, American wage scales, or anything else that is American. It is un-American and anti-American. It does not pretend to quote American prices. It cares nothing for American farm production costs, and faced with world-wide famine it cares nothing for laws of supply and demand. It is only gambling under the forms of trade. Not even the cooperative selling by farmers has been able to overcome the obstacle of futures though encouraged by the policy of law.

ABOLISH FUTURES

The futures markets must be abolished. They cause much of the instability in agriculture. Futures markets are an evil for the following reasons:

1. The futures contract is not a warehouse receipt for a commodity but only a lottery ticket with no assets back of it.

2. Those who buy a futures contract deal only in price differences.

3. A futures contract does not permit the naming of grades.

4. A buyer of a futures contract, when delivery is made, has nothing to say about the kind or grade he shall receive.

5. The determination of kind or grade to be delivered under a futures contract is at the option of the seller, usually resulting in the delivery of dog-tail cotton or skin-grade wheat.

6. Deliveries of wheat under a futures contract are negligible—not more than one-third of 1 percent of the total volume of futures trading.

7. Those who buy specified grades of a commodity for spot delivery or for delivery-to-arrive do so in the cash markets and not in the futures markets.

8. The volume of futures trading always exceeds by many times the production of a commodity.

9. The selling of futures contracts is merely betting that the commodity price will go lower and has come to be regarded as an actual sale of a commodity and has the same effects on the cash markets as large-scale dumping.

10. From false propaganda, educators, economists, farmers, legislators, etc., have been duped into thinking that the farm price problem is insoluble except for the Government to give subsidies to farmers.

The foregoing facts have never been refuted or challenged by the most ardent defenders of futures trading, therefore how can the practice of gambling under the forms of trade be considered as an economically productive occupation.

The summation of my arguments may be stated simply: Remove from agriculture the fraudulent parity pricing system replacing it with an adequately implemented cost-plus program; take away the racketeering from its markets that exists in futures trading thereby placing farmers in the modern age of 1947 and there will be prosperity in these United States that is commensurate with our ideal of freedom.

The House and Senate Labor Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an analysis of the House and Senate labor bills, by Donald R. Richberg, published in the May 15, 1947, issue of the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOUSE AND SENATE LABOR BILLS

(By Donald R. Richberg)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Richberg has devoted a lifetime of study to labor-management problems. He was author of the Railway Labor Act and section 7A of the NRA Act—two trail-blazing measures in establishing labor's rights. As an attorney he has represented labor unions in more important litigation perhaps than any other American lawyer. He has made this analysis of the pending House and Senate labor bills at the request of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. The views Mr. Richberg expresses are his own. In some respects our views differ. We publish Mr. Richberg's analysis in the belief that it will contribute to public understanding of the issues.)

The House and Senate labor bills are children of the same parents. They are surprisingly alike in fundamental purpose and structure. They differ in a great many details which may seem to be more important than they actually are.

Both bills are needlessly complex and confusing because of a prevailing desire among legislators of both parties in both Houses to avoid saying exactly what they wanted to say and doing exactly what they wanted to do. This political tactic does not fool the opponents, but it always bewilders the friends of reform.

SIMILARITIES

It may clear away some fog if, first, we summarize the substantial changes in the existing law which are made in both bills:

1. Both bills amend the Wagner Act and (1) establish a new board in place of the present National Labor Relations Board; (2) prohibit unfair practices by labor as well as by management; (3) require labor as well as management to bargain collectively; (4) outlaw the closed shop but permit a union shop agreement; (5) exclude supervisors from

privileges and protections granted to employees; (6) reestablish the right of free speech for employers; and (7) authorize either employees or employer to have a labor representation issue decided by the board.

(NOTE.—Other Wagner Act amendments, where the bills are similar in object but different in method, must be described separately.)

2. Both bills establish a conciliation (mediation) service independent of the Department of Labor. This service has no compulsory power, but its aid may be offered or may be invoked by a disputant, and, in serious disputes, its efforts cannot be ignored.

(NOTE.—Impartial observers all agree that a genuine, reliable conciliation service cannot be maintained in the Labor Department, which is made by the law creating it a partisan of labor. The Senate bill gives the Government conciliators more effective influence than does the House bill, by definitely requiring disputants to listen to them before starting a fight.)

3. Both bills endeavor to prevent strikes which imperil public health and safety; but both avoid the use of compulsory arbitration. Both bills authorize the Attorney General to enjoin such strikes, not permanently but long enough to permit (1) conciliators to try to bring about a settlement, and (2) (in the House bill) an advisory board to recommend a settlement; and (in both bills) a secret ballot of employees to decide whether to accept a proposed settlement or to strike.

(NOTE.—Both bills try by complicated processes to create public pressures that will induce a voluntary agreement, and to avoid creating any prospect of compulsory arbitration, which might impair or discourage collective bargaining. There is no provision in either bill to insure continuous service even of public utilities, in case public pressures fail to bring a voluntary settlement. Evidently the Congress is not yet convinced that labor should also accept the obligations of public service which have been imposed for decades on the owners and managers of public utilities.)

4. Both bills make unlawful some of the monopolistic practices of labor unions, including particularly secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes.

(NOTE.—The House bill goes further in removing the exemption of labor unions from prosecution for conspiracies clearly in restraint of trade.)

5. Both bills require financial and other reports from labor unions to their members, and to the Secretary of Labor, primarily for the protection and information of the members.

(NOTE.—The House bill also defines coercion of members, discrimination against them, and other union abuses as unfair labor practices, which are made unlawful.)

6. Both bills authorize suits by and against labor unions, but provide that any money judgment shall be enforced only against the union and its assets and not against its members.

(NOTE.—It is difficult to justify the opposition of labor to suits for violation of contract. Of what value is collective bargaining if the resulting contract cannot be enforced?)

7. Both bills provide new methods of enforcing legal obligations imposed on labor unions, (1) by orders of the reorganized Labor Relations Board, and (2) by injunctions which, because of amendment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Government will be able to obtain and enforce against both employers and labor unions.

(NOTE.—There may be a reasonable objection to injunction suits by private employers in view of former abuses of judicial power. But the Government should be able to enforce a law by all judicial powers available under the Constitution.)

8. Both bills prohibit payments by employers into welfare funds controlled solely by the union.

(NOTE.—This is essentially to end a growing labor practice that is usually an indefensible racket.)

DIFFERENCES

Now let us review some of the principal differences between the House and Senate bills:

1. The House bill prohibits political contributions by unions, and makes strikes of Government employees unlawful.

(NOTE.—Both desirable provisions.)

2. The Senate bill would establish a joint congressional committee to study and report on the entire field of labor-management relations by February 15, 1948.

(NOTE.—A dilatory, wasteful procedure promising no useful product.)

3. In amending the Wagner Act—

(a) House bill creates (in place of the present NLRB) a Labor-Management Relations Board of three members as a judicial body to hear and decide complaints of unfair labor practices, and an administrator as an independent official to prosecute such complaints.

(aa) Senate bill creates a new National Labor Relations Board of seven members.

(NOTE.—The House bill wisely separates the prosecutor from the judge in an effort to transform the board from a partisan aid to labor unions into an impartial guardian of public interests.)

(b) House bill defines "collective bargaining" so as to require that in any labor dispute the parties must exchange proposals and confer at length and, if unable to agree, make public statements of their positions, and engage in no strike or lock-out until after, in a secret ballot, a majority of the employees have voted to reject the employer's last offer and to strike.

(bb) Senate bill defines "collective bargaining" broadly, but goes beyond the House bill indefinitely requiring employers and unions to exhaust peaceful methods by negotiating and utilizing mediation before changing contractual relations or striking.

(NOTE.—If a conference committee of both Houses would give due consideration to the long-accepted language and established procedures of the Railway Labor Act, it could redraft these confusing and complicated requirements of the two bills into one clear, harmonious and enforceable obligation to make a reasonable effort to preserve the peace before starting an industrial war.)

(c) House bill outlaws industry-wide bargaining by prohibiting one labor union from representing the employees of competing employers unless they are less than 100 in number and working in plants less than 50 miles apart.

(cc) Senate bill makes no such provision.

(NOTE.—This important difference is discussed hereafter.)

(d) House bill makes "feather-bedding" an unfair labor practice—that is, compelling an employer to employ needless help, or to pay for useless work, or to restrict production in various ways.

(dd) Senate bill makes no such provision.

(e) House bill defines as unlawful—

(1) Strikes conducted with violence, intimidation, obstruction, and mass picketing;

(2) Picketing where there is no labor dispute with the employer;

(3) Sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes, monopolistic strikes, illegal boycotts, sit-down strikes, and similar interferences;

(4) Strikes to enforce "feather-bedding";

(5) Strikes to compel recognition of an uncertified representative, or to remedy practices for which a legal remedy is provided, or to compel an employer to violate a legal requirement.

All these strikes make offenders subject to suits and damages regardless of Norris-LaGuardia Act.

(ee) Senate bill has no comparable provisions except as to secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes.

There are many other differences in the House and Senate bills which are written into amendments of the Wagner Act, some of which intense partisans regard as very important. But the foregoing summaries present the major issues on which public opinion may be clearly defined and made effective in the drafting of the final bill in conference. There is one of these major issues on which it is particularly important to focus public attention—that is: Should industry-wide bargaining be prohibited?

There is no doubt that industry-wide bargaining is a powerful instrument of monopoly and a perennial menace to that continuous and increased production upon which our national prosperity and strength depend. On the other hand, industry-wide bargaining has many friends in management as well as labor. There are far-reaching relationships, long established, that would be disorganized by any attempt to reestablish local variations and actual competition in wage payments and working conditions within every industry.

Theoretically, industry-wide labor unions, and industry-wide employer associations, which are permitted to make monopolistic agreements will eventually destroy a free economy. And when they disagree, they are likely to force Government intervention that will be equally destructive of a competitive system.

Practically, the American people, including many strong industrialists, do not yet appreciate the fact that labor monopolies and labor-management monopolies move us toward socialism even more rapidly than the business monopolies which the Marxians count on to drive us into a state control of industry. Therefore, a flat prohibition of industry-wide bargaining may be unwise at this time.

If, however, the House and Senate bills can be welded together in a simplified measure which will obtain and merit strong nonpartisan support, the people of the United States will have made real progress toward preserving the productive strength of a free economy and the power of a democratic Government to protect the general welfare. In this effort it is necessary to make sure that, regardless of vociferous minorities, there is an active and dominant public opinion that will support the passage and enforcement of a law that will seriousy affect the lives of millions of our people.

Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial from the Boston Post entitled "Why Food Stays High," which gives some telling reasons for the high cost of living insofar as food is concerned.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY FOOD STAYS HIGH

The price of lard has finally dropped below the OPA ceiling price fixed last year before the OPA was terminated. This, it is true, is only one item, although an important one, and the people generally are dissatisfied because the predictions made by many opponents of OPA that in a natural, uncontrolled market, prices would soon fall to a more normal level have not been fulfilled.

Prices, instead of going down, have gone up until the average food price level is about the highest ever recorded. Even though it may be fairly explained that the OPA ceiling prices were merely theoretical, and that, as everybody knew, actual prices last year were away above OPA ceilings, the people compare present actual prices with last year's OPA ceilings and complain there has been a big advance.

Why, it may be asked, have prices failed to fall when the crops last year were so bountiful? President Truman recently, when challenging business to lower prices if the country was to be saved from going into an industrial slump, declared that the Government policy of supporting food prices was not responsible for the present high prices, because, he said, the "support levels" were far below the actual prices and therefore were not effective at the present time in keeping prices high.

But this is only technically true. Mr. Truman apparently loses sight of the fact that all food prices are interrelated, and that if you cause scarcity in one kind of food you increase the demand for another kind, and that this increases the price. It may be recalled that a few months ago the newspapers printed pictures showing mountains of potatoes bought by the Government last year to keep up the price, and these mountain-high piles of potatoes were allowed to rot. The Government would not permit the poor people to buy these "surplus" potatoes even though the retail price was 65 cents a peck.

Now our Government is sending some 400,000 tons of grain to Germany each month to keep the Germans from starving. Potatoes have always formed a large part of the German diet. Out of 1,550 calories now being allotted to them by our military government, ordinarily more than 200 calories would be in potatoes. If then some of the 20,000,000 bushels of potatoes which were destroyed last year to keep the price high had been shipped to Germany we should now need to send less precious grain. But, after that horrible mistake, has the Government dropped its foolish potato policy? No.

Instead, they are buying the new crop down in Florida this year and pouring kerosene on the potatoes so that they may not be fit for food.

One of the largest chain grocery store companies in the country has issued a statement about food prices. It shows that this company during the last 5 years averaged only 1 cent profit on each dollar of sales, and that if all its profits were donated to the public it would mean only 4 cents a day for the average family. The big packing companies that produce the great bulk of the country's meat supplies operate on a profit of only a little over 2 cents on the dollar, so that it is obvious that the food processors and the retailers are not gouging the people.

The two main factors in keeping prices high are, first, the enormous amounts of food going out all over the world for relief purposes, and second, the Government policy of enormous subsidies for farmers and destroying good food to arbitrarily keep prices high. The relief program must be continued, rather than let other peoples starve, but it would seem we might follow a saner policy than destroying food to keep prices high when they are already at the highest level in our history.

Juvenile Delinquency: Its Cause and Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 21 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend to the attention of the Members of the Senate, a speech on Juvenile Delinquency: Its Cause and Cure, by Herbert Garrett, Jr., of Woodruff, S. C., which recently won first prize in the South Carolina speech contest of the Knights of Pythias. I think these remarks by one of the outstanding high-school students of my State and of the Nation are especially worth the consideration of us older citizens who are so vitally concerned with this problem.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY: ITS CAUSE AND CURE

(By Herbert Garrett, Jr.)

In these postwar years, when America is trying to lead the world in the writing of a just and lasting peace, we are eager to increase our influence as a world power. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that we must strengthen the home base if we would enlarge our powers abroad. With an eye to the future, we must give special attention to our young people. We have all heard the old adage that boys will be boys, but may I remind you that boys will be men, and our young people of today must prepare to take their places of responsibility in the not too far distant future.

In recent years we've heard a great deal about juvenile delinquency. People have moaned about its increase, but, as Will Rogers said about the weather, it's something nobody does anything about. Now, there are some people who belittle this situation on the grounds that there has always been a certain amount of juvenile crime; usually there is a cause for everything a person does.

What causes an innocent child to become a juvenile delinquent? John Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, says: "Crime flourishes where a child is not given the opportunity to live a normal, wholesome existence. It will be found where the ties of home are not strong; where the family unity has been weakened by divorce, the desertion of a parent, or the ignorance, indifference, or inaptitude of the father or mother. Failing to receive affection, guidance, and discipline at home, a child will inevitably seek happiness elsewhere. Left all alone, inexperienced youth has a good chance of going wrong."

With the weakening of the home, the child drifts and begins to spend more of his time outside of the home; seeking companionship and recreation, he soon finds himself going with a group of drifters, who are left to plan their own recreation. With this new freedom and the youngster's love for thrills and excitement, he is led to join the activities of a group of young people who are directed by the boy who has proved himself to be the most apt leader. When little things which at first proved thrilling become dull, the boys look for new excitement. The line between horse play and petty crime disappears, and the boy becomes a juvenile delinquent. Soon his school becomes uninteresting; the privilege of a good education is of no interest to him. Gradually he begins hanging around public places where he becomes acquainted with the bad literature, obscene pictures, and the seemingly pleasant effects of alcohol. Idle hands and bad companions are bound to lead him eventually to his first crime. Thus in three easy slips the good boy who followed the crowds and played hooky has become a criminal.

How are we to combat this increase in juvenile delinquency? First and foremost something must be done to improve the home life and family conditions. A home should be a happy place where each member can return after a day's activity, and find peace and comfort. The housing shortage must be met so as to give each family a home, a suitable apartment, or some place where they can live unhampered by relatives or friends.

The war is over: mothers who do not have to work any more can take their children off the streets and make a home for them. To give them food and clothes is not enough; they should guide them, plan recreation for them, and teach them to choose their friends wisely.

Even though parents have the main responsibility, there are many who are not going to live up to it. In that case the community must step in and plan a well-supervised program of recreation.

To have a gym, a public playground, and a youth canteen is not enough. We must have trained leaders in our schools, churches, and recreation programs who will accept the responsibility of guiding our boys and girls.

We as young people have seen so little of life that we have a tendency to rush out and meet the future with open arms. This does not mean that we are naturally bad; instead it merely means that we are enthusiastic about those things nearest to us. This eagerness in accepting those things close by makes it very important for us to have a good environment, and leaders who will understand our mistakes, and guide us in the correction of them.

The school is an important factor in every young person's life. Children coming from dull surroundings should get information and inspiration that would help them to improve the environment out of which they have come.

I feel that too often our schools have a tendency to make the under-privileged children feel out of place. This tends to make the child want to play hooky. The school should be the bright spot of the day for the child who comes from the wrong side of the tracks. It should lend glamour and color to a dull existence. It should make learning and experience as thrilling as a street fight in the slums. The end of each school day should find the youngsters impatient for tomorrow when they can come again to school and find sympathetic understanding while they learn to live together.

In other words, our schools must be institutions that meet the needs of the boys and girls. Such a system will lend to keep the pupils in school where they will be safe from the influences that would pull them down. To assist the school in its work of saving the boys and girls from delinquency and crime, we in South Carolina need a stricter attendance law, which will not allow even occasional hooky, for such days tend to create interests that lead away from school.

As I see it, juvenile delinquency is caused by neglect—neglect first in the home by parents who allow other things to seem more important than the rearing of their children. Those neglected in the home become problems in schools, in the churches, and public-recreation places. We allow ourselves to forget the importance of every individual, so we are glad to be rid of him when he drops out of school and quits attending the places of supervised recreation. When left with other boys of his own type he gets into small

difficulties. These are excused by the law and he continues to grow worse until finally he commits a crime for which he is arrested and sent to jail. There he is associated with hardened criminals who influence him still further, in the wrong direction. We need more schools like Father Flanagan's Boys' Town where first offenders can be corrected, not jails where those who have made their first mistake can be kept under lock and key.

Yes, delinquent young people are the result of neglect by the home, by the schools, by the churches, and by other social agencies. If this be true then the cure is simple: since the young people of today will make up the America of tomorrow we must become more concerned about these problem children, who will be the criminals of our generation.

If you would make America powerful in international affairs in the years that lie out ahead, you must understand and guide the youth of today. Make our homes happy places where we are loved and understood; make our schools places where we are inspired to live up to the ideals of our glorious history.

Give us supervised recreation for idle hours which will consume our extra energy and teach us to respect the rights of others, give us institutions where we can be corrected when we make our first mistakes, and give us the knowledge of Almighty God who created us in His own image and our generation finding new strength at home will lead the way in helping the world to find a lasting peace.

Pennsylvania Leads the Nation in Building a Postwar Naval Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation, from May 18 to May 25, the Navy Department is observing Operation Naval Reserve Week and has launched a program designed to recruit over a million naval reserves. This operation is under the command of Rear Adm. John E. Gingrich, Director of Naval Reserve, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

The mission of organizing the postwar Reserve began last spring, and already there are over 700,000 members of the Volunteer Reserve, 60 percent of whom are enlisted men. In the Organized Reserves about 100,000 members are training one night every week at their armories. More than 7,000 of this number have had their annual 2 weeks' cruise at sea or training period ashore.

The 800,000 members of the Naval Reserve represent an enthusiastic group, ready to perform its mission for the defense of our country, whenever or wherever needed.

Pennsylvania leads the Nation in making its contribution to this ever-growing Naval Reserve. Units are functioning in 16 separate cities in the Keystone State, and, as of May 1, 1947, the majority of the units have exceeded their assigned personnel strength. The following table discloses the progress being made by Pennsylvania in furthering the building of our postwar Naval Reserve.

The U. S. Naval Reserve in May 1947
PENNSYLVANIA

City	Personnel	
	Assigned	Enrolled by May 1
Allentown	420	491
Altoona	420	455
Chester	210	204
Erie	420	318
Harrisburg	630	568
Hazelton	210	213
Johnstown	420	598
Lancaster	420	531
McKeesport	420	421
Philadelphia	3,990	2,142
Pittsburgh	1,890	965
Reading	630	513
Scranton	630	646
Williamsport	210	193
Wilkes-Barre	630	656
York	210	304

It Must Have a Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Evening Gazette, of Worcester, Mass., Monday, May 12, 1947. This is a most appropriate tribute to Edgar Monsanto Queeny and the splendid men and women associated with him.

IT MUST HAVE A SOUL

Just how "soulless" the Monsanto Chemical Co. is—all corporations being presumed to be soulless—must be left to those who are psychic in such matters. We can only point to some of the things it did when on April 16 sudden death and destruction struck Texas City, where one of its great plants was destroyed and many of its workers killed and injured.

Aside from the routine organization acts for opening communications and establishing relief centers, the corporation did certain other things. Executives, who might have been excused for spending a lot of time going over the destruction of the company's property and making plans for salvage, spent days visiting hospitals and relief centers, sympathizing with and encouraging victims and discovering what the company could do to help their personal distress.

The morning after the fire the company began at once paying $1,000 to the family of each deceased employee. It paid out group insurance benefits 48 hours after the blast. It set aside $500,000 and announced that the company would pay all hospital bills of injured employees. It began at once to pay all salaried employees at full rates and employees who worked on time basis at the normal earning rate until April 27, at which time those who were able and were not employed in restoration were given additional wage payments.

It guaranteed full wages to all employees who were injured, during disability. It paid for all wire communications with employees' relatives; made emergency repairs to houses, and moved all widows and families who wished to leave Texas City. When grief and hopelessness of the future hung over the people of Texas City like a cloud the company announced that it would rebuild the Monsanto plant as soon as possible.

There were many other things, including a four-page printed report to the stockholders, stated in frank and human terms so that the human responsibilities of the company would be made clear, and what actions were being taken to meet them.

There is much that cannot be recorded. The fellowship that made all this possible, and the response of human hearts; these are memories that have been etched into lives forever. Those who hold them will not want to hear much about soulless corporations. They know they are made up of people.

Buying on Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of May 21, 1947, on consumer credit.

The House Banking and Currency Committee will shortly begin hearings on our credit policies concerning Regulations T, U, V, and W of the Federal Reserve System.

BUYING ON CREDIT

At the end of March the outstanding volume of consumer credit—i. e., installment credit, service credit, single-payment loans, and charge accounts—reached a record total of $10,000,000,000. That is an increase of 44 percent for the year and double the amount of consumer credit outstanding in mid-1944. Despite this great expansion, however, the Department of Commerce points out that the volume of consumer credit is still far below what might be expected on the basis of prewar relationships to income.

There are a good many reasons for the rapid growth of installment loans and charge accounts during the past year. Relaxation of the Federal Reserve Board's consumer credit regulations has had some effect in encouraging expansion. Another important reason for the recent rise in consumer credit is the increasing supplies of durable goods, such as automobiles and household equipment, that are usually bought on time. Finally, the public is running out of surplus cash acquired during the war years when prices were controlled and there were fewer goods for civilians to buy.

The last-named cause of the upturn in the volume of consumer credit is currently attracting a good deal of notice. Some observers are inclined to view the trend with alarm as indicative of a buying slump ahead, with a subsequent decline in business activity. At any rate, there is considerable evidence to support the view that the country is returning to a prewar pattern of consumer buying, with credit rather than savings being used to bolster up buying demands. The sharp rise in living costs since the end of price control has made inroads on current incomes and earnings, thereby reducing the savings capacity of the people. For instance, in 1940 the average family saved about 10 percent of its net income. In the last war year, 1945, nearly 24 percent of family income was saved. Since then the rate of savings has declined until it is estimated to be back at the prewar 10-percent-average level. Furthermore, the lower income groups have been especially hard hit by the rise in prices, with the result that their capacity to save—never great—

has doubtless been seriously impaired, and in some cases destroyed.

Thus while the volume of consumer credit is still limited in relation to the total net income of the buying public, danger signals are being hoisted. For the rise in consumer credits, coupled with evidence of increasing consumer resistance to high prices, indicates that we cannot rely upon hoarded or current savings to support a business boom at the inflated price levels now prevailing.

The rise in consumer credits also emphasizes the need for caution in extending loans for purchases of nonproductive consumer goods, and underlines the desirability of legislation that would provide for permanent consumer credit control by the Federal Reserve system. At present such controls rest on an Executive order of 1941. It is reported that the Federal Reserve Board is preparing to recommend the immediate dropping of all remaining controls if Congress adjourns without enacting permanent legislation to extend its regulatory powers in the consumer credit field.

It is to be hoped that the board's repeated request for congressional action will be heeded. For control over consumer credits can help to check unsound expansion of this type of lending and can be used either to restrain consumer spending in boom periods by tightening restrictions or to stimulate buying in periods of depression by a relaxation of restrictions. As stated in the Federal Reserve Bulletin some time ago, consumer credit regulation, "along with more fundamental measures for promoting economic stability, continues to be a form of governmental action that serves an important public purpose."

World Trade Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Secretary of Commerce W. Averell Harriman on World Trade Week:

Secretary of Commerce W. Averell Harriman today issued the following statement on the observance of World Trade Week beginning May 19, 1947:

"The observance of World Trade Week this year is particularly appropriate. Annually since 1935 this observance has been of notable importance in emphasizing to Americans the relationship between expanding world trade and the economic well-being of this country and of all nations. The need for general understanding of this relationship is now more important than ever.

"The devastations of war and the dislocations caused by war have disrupted the lives of people in vast areas of the world. Some countries for a time will continue to need help from others. Millions of people are still living in hunger. They need relief before further steps in economic reconstruction can be taken.

"During the reconstruction period, to a considerable degree, it will be through loans and credits that foreign countries can make purchases in our markets of needed capital equipment and other products. But in the long run, people abroad must sell goods in the United States if they are going to be able to pay for what they buy. An expansion of multilateral trade among all countries is indispensable to their long run recovery.

"America, as the leading economic nation in the world today, has a vital stake in two-way world trade. Exports will provide more jobs and prosperity for us. During the war we tremendously expanded our industrial and agricultural production, and we now need permanent and expanding world markets for the product of our factories and farms. We are the one great Nation which can give a good life to all of its people, and at the same time help others to help themselves.

"On the other side of the ledger, we will also benefit from increased imports. With a high level of employment and prosperity in this country, we will require increasing quantities of raw materials from abroad to sustain our production. Without injury to our own industrial welfare, we can import products which will add to the standard of living of our people. Larger imports will make dollar credits available to our customers abroad who want to buy our products and will enable us to develop a better balanced system of trade relations with the rest of the world.

"We all have a personal stake in expanding world commerce not only in terms of prosperity, but also in terms of peace. Economic and political considerations are inextricably interwined in the modern world. It has become crystal-clear that there can be no political stability without a reasonable degree of economic stability. The hopes we share with all mankind for peace cannot prosper in a hungry, impoverished, discontented world. Our fullfledged participation in world reconstruction and expanded trade will be of great assistance in organizing a stable peace.

"We are the standard bearer for those nations which believe in freedom and individual dignity. The people of all free countries look to us for example and leadership in finding a way out of their profound material and spiritual difficulties. In our own interest as well as theirs we must maintain a high level of prosperity and a healthy democracy here, and we must do all in our power to revive trade and help others to help themselves.

"To date we can be proud of the role we have assumed in international efforts to reduce the obstructions and barriers to trade among nations. Delegates from 18 nations are now meeting in Geneva to negotiate tariff reductions and to discuss the proposal for an International Trade Organization for the purpose of increasing trade and ending discriminations. American leadership in this work has become a symbol to the rest of the world of our acceptance of responsibilities commensurate with our strength and position.

"Others have watched with encouragement the development of our international political policies and our strong support of the United Nations. They know that our participation in postwar international settlements is essential in the development of a just peace and in the protection of the interests of all.

"They are encouraged by the fact that our international political policies have the support of the people of this country on a bipartisan basis. But there remains concern that we may not pursue a consistent policy of support to the expansion of world trade. They remember all too well what happened in this respect after the First World War and during the depression of the thirties.

"It is of the greatest importance that we do not dash the hopes of our friends in other countries by actions that will appear to be a withdrawal from leadership. We must come to the fullest recognition that we as a nation are the first among the family of nations, and whatever we do will inevitably have world-wide ramifications.

"World Trade Week calls the attention of all of us to our responsibilities and opportunities in world commerce. It should be an event of personal meaning to all Americans."

No Tariff Reduction for Glassware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 9, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to include the following statement that I have made before the Committee on Ways and Means covering the manufacture of handmade glassware in my district being jeopardized by lowering the tariffs on cheaply made foreign glassware:

Mr. Chairman, the so-called reciprocal trade agreements have been a continual cut in the tariff without regard to American industry and the effect on American workmen. The lowering of tariffs is forcing the American workers to compete with the low-wage products of Europe and eventually lowering the standard of living for the American workman. Much of this has been done on the plea that we must assist the foreign countries to restore their economy. I question this especially with reference to the glassware industry. Evidently it is doing very well in Europe and I include herewith for the committee photostatic copies of the Czechoslovak Glass Review, volume I, discussing the Prague Sample Fair of September 1946, and the Czechoslovak Comment, which calls attention to the fact that the glass industry in Czechoslovakia is flooded with orders, before, during, and after the official dates of the fair, customers from the rich overseas countries were in search of luxury goods and the more expensive lines, particularly cut and table glass, and that big business was concluded with the United States. In addition, I include a copy of a communication addressed to the State Department by the glassware industry. I am sure an examination of this matter will disclose that there should be no further reduction in the glassware industry under the so-called reciprocal trade agreements.

"CZECHOSLOVAK COMMENT

"(By Zdeněk Bárta, export director of the National Corporation of Czechoslovak Glassworks)

"Reply to an article which appeared in the American Glass Review of June 22, 1946, entitled 'Lack of Skilled Craftsmen Real Reason for Czech Glassware Industry Falling Below Expectations.'

"It was a great surprise to us to read information about the Czechoslovak glass industry in the above-mentioned article which did not actually conform to the facts.

"Details were given which were completely wrong, as for instance: 'It was estimated when the war ended, that production of Czechoslovakian glassware would soon reach prewar levels, particularly by this time. The estimate, however, has been revised sharply downward, and this has been done on the basis of official reports from American representatives there.

" 'Now, indications show that the production of glassware in that country for this year will amount to about 10 or 20 percent.'

"There was also a statement to the effect that there was little prospect for any genuine improvement unless a change occurred in Czechoslovakia.

"In answer to this we need only to point out that the total export of Czechoslovak glass between January 1 and September 30, 1946, amounted to Kčs 830,504,000—. Of this figure, Kčs 327,396,000— went to the United States of America, i. e., the export of Czechoslovak glassware reached its full prewar level. As glass exports are on the increase and a steady rise can be noted every

month, it is perfectly obvious that the export of glassware from Czechoslovakia will be much bigger this year than in any prewar year. It is, therefore, entirely wrong to state that Czechoslovak production of glassware will amount only to about 10 or 20 percent of its prewar level, and it seems, therefore, probable that the article in the American Glass Review was written by a person who had been absolutely misinformed.

"This is not all, however. Reading a little further, we learn, under the heading 'Craftsmen leaving country' that 'About 300,000 German families, with generations of glassworking behind them, constituted the backbone of the Czechoslovak glass industry. The industry was able to produce merchandise of a quality that could withstand competition in the markets of the world, both in price and quality, because of these German craftsmen. Now, as the Germans return to their homeland en masse, this asset to the Czech glassware industry has been severely curtailed.'

"From such a paragraph any uninformed person would immediately imagine that tens of thousands of skilled craftsmen left the Czechoslovak glass industry and that the departure of these workers undermined the whole Czechoslovak glass industry. The article goes on to point out that this is really the case, and that it will take years before new skilled workers are trained. The author of the article states expressly:

"'Until something definite is done, the production of glassware in Czechoslovakia will continue in a small way only, and it is felt that its quality will generally be substandard.'

"We consider it necessary to correct these false impressions. It is true that a certain number of German skilled men has left the Czechoslovak glassworks and the Czechoslovak Jablonec industry, but hardly more than 8,000 people are involved—a number which, compared to the total figure of workers in the trade, is small. Besides this, the figure of 8,000 also included unskilled workers. Approximately the same number of German workers will be left in the Czechoslovak glass industry, and these are for the most part highly qualified personnel. Although some German labor has been lost, it will hardly cause any serious change in the glass industry, either in total capacity or in output, and it should be noted that a training glassworks has been brought into existence. Here young people are being systematically trained mainly for manufacturing hand-made glassware, but for machine-made glassware also, so that in the near future the decrease of workers will be completely made good.

"Nor is it a negligible fact that thousands of our foreign clients have had the possibility to convince themselves in the last months that not only is our glassware of high quality and exactly the same artistic value as in prewar days, but also that deliveries are being carried out precisely and in rotation, even although we have permanently to struggle with a serious lack of the railway wagons needed for carrying the necessary raw materials and finished goods, and permanently to combat the fact that so far the direct transport of goods via Hamburg—our natural port—is impossible, and we are forced to use the very expensive and far-away connections via Antwerp, Rotterdam, and Amsterdam, facts which make our goods extraordinarily dear and hold up deliveries. There are also a whole number of technical obstacles which can only be removed gradually. That this is happening can be seen from the constantly increasing export figures.

"We feel that the whole of this article which appeared in the American Glass Review was probably inspired by some of the buying agents of large American firms who came to Czechoslovakia to conclude business in order to get ahead of their competitors, by discouraging them from going to Czechoslovakia.

"In the meantime we have been able to welcome a great many of our old business friends from the United States of America and Canada in our country, and they were able to see for themselves that our works are working at full pitch, that the quality of Czechoslovak glass is as high as ever, and that we are able to fulfill all demands in this respect. It is only natural, however, that many glassworks have completely exhausted their stocks of finished goods, while demands are flowing in at such a rate that it is not possible to have them all executed at one time. Unfortunately it really is not possible to execute all our orders as quickly as our customers would desire because the majority of our glassworks have orders sufficient for many months ahead. Nevertheless orders are executed comparatively swiftly. It is a fact too that there are only very few complaints and that our monthly export is much greater than in prewar days and is constantly increasing.

"We hope that this survey will correct the erroneous information given in the American Glass Review.

"It only remains to add that we are always willing to give our customers every information concerning the purchase of Czechoslovak glassware and to put them in touch with the glassworks which are manufacturing the lines desired. We are also always ready to give precise information about production possibilities, forwarding, etc., and will be very glad if our old business friends will, as they have done before, approach us with full confidence. We shall certainly not fail them."

"Mississippi: The Land of Opportunity"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, we Mississippians have long been aware of the fact that our State is the land of opportunity, and during the past 10 years Mississippi has developed her resources further than any other State in the Union, in spite of the handicaps which she had to overcome through ridicule and vilification by hostile newspapers and selfish leaders in other parts of the country, as well as the present unfair discriminatory freight rates which have hog-tied her industry.

It is indeed refreshing, as well as unusual, to hear from someone in a high position of responsibility the truth about Mississippi and her opportunities. I was indeed pleased the other day to find an article about Honorable Robert R. Young, millionaire railroad man and industrialist, which was printed in the June 1947 issue of the magazine Pageant, which article quotes Mr. Young as follows:

I mention Mississippi because of the tremendous development going on there as a result of the high productivity of the land. They are just discovering this productivity because the Delta has just ceased being a one-crop country. I am informed that the land is more fertile than the Nile Valley, and that Jackson, Miss., is expected to grow from 95,000 to 250,000 in the next 10 years. The same thing happened, of course in Houston. It is happening in Florida today for different reasons.

I think there are opportunities on the West Coast but it has attracted so many people for climatic reasons that the competition there is pretty keen. The crowd hasn't heard about Mississippi yet.

As a Mississippian, I wish to thank this learned gentleman for his kind expressions of faith in Mississippi: America's land of opportunity.

Italian Treaty Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I questioned the justice and advisability of ratification of the Italian peace treaty and pointed out that this indefensible proposal was signed by former Secretary of State Byrnes solely in order to appease the Soviet Union. We must take immediate steps to prevent the spread of communism in Italy, not to assist it. The following newspaper article by William Philip Simms which appears in today's Washington Daily News points out how Russia would be the big beneficiary from the proposed Italian treaty:

ITALIAN TREATY DANGER
(By William Philip Simms)

Information from Italy all seems to point to the conclusion that as soon as allied troops pull out the Communists will take over—or at least try with an excellent chance of succeeding.

This is widely regarded as one good reason for delaying ratification of the Italian peace treaty. That document stipulates the earliest possible withdrawal of occupation forces, in any case not later than 90 days after the treaty comes into force.

The treaty will leave Italy practically unarmed. But her Communists are known to be comparatively well equipped with arms, including tanks and machine guns, and to have ample funds. They can get more of everything, including plans, from Marshal Tito, Moscow's puppet in Yugoslavia. Compact, fanatically minded, iron-disciplined, it is said the Italian Communists could put at least three fighters in the field to the Government's one. By means of the general strike, they could paralyze the country.

Russia would be the big beneficiary from the Italian treaty. She and her satellites would collect most of the indemnities which, in the end, American taxpayers would have to put up in the form of aid to the prostrate people. The so-called Free City of Trieste would be almost surrounded by Yugoslavia. If Italy turned Red, Trieste's freedom would not last long; our aid to Greece and Turkey would be like water down a rathole; the Adriatic would be a Soviet lake and the Mediterranean would be cut in two. The whole of the Middle East would be isolated.

Here in Washington the treaty has been voted out of committee and is before the Senate for ratification. Leaders have expressed themselves against delay. Russia, though, has used every means to delay general ratification of peace with Austria despite her pledges to the contrary. Also, she is

blocking the economic merger of the Saar with France. All of the Big Four, save Russia, favor immediate merger to facilitate French recovery by the use of the Saar's coal in her industries.

There is little or no opposition to ratification in the Senate. There is, elsewhere, however, a growing feeling that it would be shortsighted to rush ratification to the almost certain disadvantage of the United States.

Well-founded reports are that the Italian people feel the United States has "let them down." To this, some Senate Members reply impatiently: "So what? They fought us, didn't they?" But the Italians can make a good case for themselves.

Again and again President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill promised that they would make things easier for the Italians if they would throw their dictators out. On June 4, 1944, the President broadcast a message on the fall of Rome. He recalled that many nations had contributed to the victory and, he added: "The Italians, too, forswearing a partnership in the Axis which they never desired, have sent their troops to join us in our battles against the German trespassers on their soil."

Again, in the following October, in a Columbus Day address he said: "To the people of Italy we have pledged our help and we will keep the faith." On the same program Attorney General Biddle reinforced the President's promise. Said he: "It is the settled determination of the President to bring the provisions of the Atlantic Charter to bear upon Italy's problems."

United States Liberates Japs From Feudal Bondage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer by Ralph J. Donaldson:

In all the history of the wars between nations, there is no precedent for the treatment which the defeated Japanese are being accorded by the victorious Americans.

Instead of exterminating or enslaving them, in retaliation for the sneak attack at Pearl Harbor and the cost in blood and treasure that it took to defeat them, we have given them the blessing of freedom.

Today there is no doubt about it—the Japanese are a liberated people. Their cities are in ruins, a large percentage of their industrial plants have been smashed and burned out, they are cold and hungry, and there is a scarcity of all the things that make for comfortable living, but they are free, for the first time in their lives.

FREED FROM MILITARISTS

They have been freed from the domination of the police and the militarists; they have been freed from the superstitious belief in the divinity of the Emperor; they have been freed from the vainglorious belief in their racial superiority (it was thoroughly knocked out of them); and they have been shown the way toward political and economic freedom.

We have given them a democratic constitution which makes the Emperor a figurehead and renounces war as an instrument of national policy and prohibits the establishment of armed forces.

We have instituted a program of land reform which releases the tenant farmers from virtual slavery; we are proposing to abolish the fishing concessions which kept whole villages in bondage; we have instituted economic reforms abolishing the system under which a few ruling families, the Zaibatsu, were able to control Japanese finance and industry; we are ministering to the health of the Japanese people and directing their education along democratic lines; we have tried to give them a free press, although this effort so far has not been entirely successful; and we have encouraged the organization of labor unions and have given them the right to strike, provided such activities do not interfere with occupation policies.

Her army has been completely disarmed and demobilized. Her air forces have been totally destroyed. In the entire empire there is not even a single Japanese commercial plane left. For 3 months after the occupation a few Japanese cargo and passenger planes were allowed to remain operational to assist the occupation authorities. But no Japanese pilot has been in the air since December 1, 1945.

JAPANESE AIRCRAFT SCRAPPED

When the occupation forces arrived there were 11,500 Japanese aircraft of all classifications in the islands. They caused the American authorities some apprehension. Most of them were capable of one suicide mission.

The problem was how to disable them all at once, so as to prevent a few hot-headed pilots from making a final suicide attack. This was done by the simple expedient of ordering the Japs to line up their planes on their airfields, remove the propellers and lay them on the ground in front of each plane. American fighter planes flew over the airfields and were prepared to shoot up any Jap plane which still had a propeller on it. But the order had been obeyed and there was no shooting.

Overnight the propellers rusted and the Japanese Air Force became permanently inoperational. Then the bulldozers went to work and today there is nothing left of the Japanese air forces but huge mountains of scrap.

A similar job is under way with respect to what was left of the Japanese navy at the end of the war. Five hundred midget submarines were scrapped. One hundred and six conventional submarines have been towed out to sea and sunk. The warship scrapping program is 40-percent complete.

The eventual disposition of the Japanese destroyer and escort fleet has not yet been determined by the Allied Powers, but these ships eventually will be scrapped or distributed among other nations as part of the reparations program.

The Japanese war industries which were not destroyed in the B–29 bombing raids are being systematically dismantled and removed. Under the direction of the occupation authorities, stores of munitions are being blown up.

SELF-SUPPORT IS GOAL

Through these and other measures we are attempting to rehabilitate Japanese economy so that Japan at the earliest possible moment will become self-sufficient on a peacetime basis and will no longer require financial aid from the United States to alleviate hunger and privation.

All this is being done under policies laid down by the United States and its allies, as stated in a document prepared by SWNCC—the State, War, and Navy Departments Coordinating Committee.

The ultimate objectives as stated in this document were (a) to insure that Japan will not again become a menace to the United States or to the peace and security of the world, and (b) to bring about the eventual establishment of a peaceful and democratic government which will respect the rights of other states and will support the objectives of the United States as reflected in the ideals and principles of the charter of the United Nations.

PROGRAM IS OUTLINED

These objectives were to be obtained, the document stated, (1) by limiting Japanese sovereignty, (2) by a complete disarmament and demilitarization of Japan, (3) by encouraging the Japanese people to "develop a desire for individual liberties and respect for fundamental human rights, particularly the freedoms of religion, assembly, speech, and the press," and (4) by affording the Japanese people an opportunity to develop for themselves an economy which will permit the peacetime requirements of the population to be met.

The first objective of the occupation already has been attained. Never again can Japan become a military threat to the United States or to peace of the world except through American indifference or approval.

One of the most interesting operations is being conducted in the British commonwealth forces occupation zone where tons of poison-gas bombs and shells were discovered. These are being loaded in the holds of old ships by Japanese laborers and towed out to sea. Then the ships are sunk.

Other supplies accumulated by the Japanese war lords have been seized and disposed of by the occupation authorities. Thus, medical supplies were distributed to Japanese civilian hospitals and doctors through the Japanese home ministry.

RELIEF SUPPLIES DISTRIBUTED

Three million tons of food, 1,500,000 tons of coal, 85,000,000 articles of clothing and 7,000,000 blankets were distributed to the civilian population in the form of relief supplies.

Today you see thousands of Japanese men wearing army uniforms or parts of uniforms. Some of them may be former soldiers who are wearing their old uniforms because they have no other clothing. But others may have been civilians who received this clothing under the relief program.

We could have seized all the food, clothing, fuel, and medical supplies and sent them to the United States if we had wanted to. That is standard practice in the Russian occupied areas. But it would not have been to our interest to have done so because eventually we would have had to replace them with other supplies to aid the Japanese civilian economy, in accordance with our program of helping the Japanese to become self-sufficient as soon as possible.

Thus it is obvious that under present conditions Japan could never fight another war without our permission or connivance, because she has nothing left with which to fight.

The Limits and Uses of Our Relief Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of May 20, 1947:

IN THE NATION—THE LIMITS AND USES OF OUR RELIEF FUNDS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—The searching debate in Congress on the bill to appropriate grants-in-aid to Greece and Turkey, despite

the attempt of the administration to limit it with a mandatory "dead line" of March 31, has already proved its value. Various official steps are being taken to determine the approximate costs of the Truman doctrine, of which the Greek-Turkish bill was the first expression, and our national capacity to meet them. And Congress is giving attention to suggestions how the use of our future funds for rehabilitation and relief can be more effectively supervised.

These moves, though belated, are new. For months that mounted up to years B. M. Baruch demanded that a national "balance sheet" of our assets and proposed liabilities be drawn up before the Government set out on any postwar plan of grants and loans, such as is envisaged in the Truman doctrine. In the same period Joseph P. Kennedy and Senator HARRY F. BYRD made similar proposals. But no evidence appeared that Congress or the executive department were giving these any consideration until the Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, made his recent speech in the Mississippi Delta.

In this speech the administration offered its first authoritative approach to a definite calculation of the probable annual costs of the Truman doctrine, by that time reshaped into an economic, nonemergency, civilian prescription to rebuild the shattered democratic systems of peoples who wanted to retain them. In the course of the debate in Congress the original stress given in the President's message of March 12 to the ideological and military bases of the doctrine had been swept away.

Also, many persons apparently had concluded with Mr. Kennedy that "global communism cannot be defeated with just dollars," but only by their effective use, and with his proviso that in any event the economy of the United States must be kept sound and strong. Implicit in this conclusion was the fact that our national economy cannot be kept sound and strong, and exported dollars cannot be used effectively, if this government does not relate the amount to its resources.

A REVISED PROSPECTUS

Mr. Kennedy got very few recruits for his other counsel—that Europe be permitted to try out communism if it desired, because only then could be demonstrated the inability of communism to make good its claims of superiority to capitalism. But he offered that advice on the text of the President's Message of March 12, which was a very different prospectus from that given in the speech by Mr. Acheson.

Since the latter is now generally accepted as the intended, long-range program, it was inevitable that any government in its right mind would accept the balance-sheet proposal, and that the legislative branch of that government would show deepening interest in methods to supervise the use of the dollars available for such purposes. Several plans have been offered. But one which is attracting considerable attention from the Republican leaders is the work of former Representative Charles S. Dewey, who has been an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and financial adviser to the prewar Government of Poland.

In a memorandum Mr. Dewey pointed out that the National Advisory Council, which coordinates the foreign loan policy of the Export-Import Bank and other Government agencies, and in developing plans for the sale in this market of obligations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, has no such powers over advances to foreign countries through grants-in-aid by Congress. But he said, since testimony in connection with the Greek-Turkish aid measure "reveals that it is accepted policy to provide American supervision" for these appropriations, there should be an extension of this coordination.

THE DEWEY PLAN

"The personnel of such a supervisory group [he wrote] should be individuals who in the past have had actual experience in supervision and management of economic foreign loans and in the construction and development of foreign public utilities. Subsequent grants-in-aid for reconstruction and development of any countries should include * * * a supervisory council * * * appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate to carry out the policy of nonpartisanship in international affairs."

In choosing the members of this Council—with a Cabinet member as chairman—special emphasis should be given, Mr. Dewey urged, to seven listed brands of experience, including familiarity with foreign agriculture, transportation, central banking, and national budgeting. Quarterly reports to the President, Congress, and the National Advisory Council should be made from the field. All costs should be charged against the grant-in-aid or credit which is being supervised. But, above all, he advised:

"It is desirable to coordinate plans of the grants-in-aid * * * with similar plans being considered by the International Bank, in order that the taxpayers of the United States may be relieved as soon as possible and that the grant-in-aid countries can in due course seek future assistance through International Bank loans."

Senator VANDENBERG has hinted that no more foreign relief requests will be passed at this session of Congress. It is even more certain that orderly supervision of their use, alined with the present NAC system, as Mr. Dewey has suggested, will be linked with them when they are approved.

Paul Robeson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Westwood Hills Press of May 15, 1947:

HONEST CHOICE

Paul Robeson announced after completing two singing engagements at Albany a few days ago that he could afford to leave the concert stage for 2 years to go on speaking tours to advocate the political ideas in which he believes.

His speaking engagements will be handled by the Progressive Citizens of America. He has said he will supplement his talks with songs: probably not operatic selections or folk songs, but the marching and fighting songs of Soviet Russia and the Spanish resistance movement.

Robeson had been booked to give a concert in an Albany school auditorium at a fee of $2,000, of which $300 had been paid in advance. Then the mayor and school board, having heard of his pro-Soviet interpolations between songs in other cities forbade his use of the school auditorium. A court order permitted the concert to proceed, minus the propaganda. A second concert was arranged by Negro organizations in Albany, with nothing barred.

The decision to take a vacation from concert work and make speeches under the banner of the PCA is an honest one. Music lovers have been paying their money to hear a great baritone sing, not to have their ears troubled by aspersions on the Truman doctrine and the general foreign policy of the United States, and by indirect praise of Soviet aims.

Those who pay to hear Robeson make what he will call anti-Fascist speeches will get what they want to hear. Those who usually string along with Uncle Sam can stay away, unless they think it might be interesting to hear what he has to say for communism.

It will undoubtedly be interesting. Not even Henry Wallace is so great a zealot in opposing the efforts of the Government of the United States to maintain its ideas of democracy around the world.

Horace C. Carlisle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as is known to most of the Members of both Houses of Congress, Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, an employee in the office of the Architect of the Capitol, has been for more than 20 years, a frequent verse contributor to the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Carlisle's contributions to the RECORD, because of the many encouraging reports that have been constantly coming from all parts of the country, are very gratifying to him, as well as to the large number of both Senators and Representatives who have been pleased to favor him by requesting unanimous consent to have his poems printed in the RECORD, a number of which have been read on the floors of both Houses of Congress.

These poems which have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, now numbering 150, altogether, if printed in a separate volume, would make a unique addition to Mr. Carlisle's group of 15 other manuscripts, now practically ready for the press.

Deeply appreciative of the helpful interest manifested by many of the Members who have in this way acquainted the country with his poetic creations, Mr. Carlisle has addressed a brief communication to the Members of both the House and the Senate, which at his request, I ask to insert at this point, as a part of my remarks:

To the Congress of the Country:

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the Members of both Houses of Congress for the privilege afforded me of having printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many of my poetic creations, which seem to have met with more or less appreciation throughout the country.

Since by unanimous consent these poems, 150 in all, have appeared in the RECORD, it might appeal to the Congress to have them printed collectively as a public document, and make them available to the American people as a historic, poetic picture of an awful, yet glorious, time through which the Nation for the past quarter of a century has been feverishly struggling that freedom might not perish from the earth.

Both Republicans and Democrats from the four great sections of our common country, many of them, have been very gracious in their words of commendation, as is recorded at the beginning of each of these poems which the RECORD has carried from time to time on its widely read pages.

It is with pleasure inexpressible that I propose to present herewith this collection of poems for the purpose mentioned, as a token of my appreciation for the opportunity afforded me to serve my day and generation and those that are to follow, in such a way as this.

HORACE C. CARLISLE.

Hearst Annual Oratorical Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to bring to the attention of this body and to the Nation as a whole, the excellent training and inspiration afforded American youth through the medium of the Hearst annual oratorical contest.

Each year the life of some famous American historical leader is selected for the subject of these orations and shortly thereafter, students in high schools, junior colleges, and colleges all over the country begin weeks of study, composition, and training. Contests are then held in the schools, in various districts, regionally and nationally until finally, through the process of elimination, winners are declared on each school level.

This national winner is provided a free trip to the scene of his subject's former activities and thus is given an even closer insight into this man's inspirational life.

I find these contests highly commendable for the originality they inspire, for the spirit of competition they engender and for the training in the neglected art of public speaking they provide. It is my conviction that all of these traits need to be cultivated today as never before.

The national collegiate champion this year was Mr. Edmund F. Penney, a 20-year-old freshman at the University of Southern California. As a fine example of the value of these contests, I submit herewith the winning oration of Mr. Penney on the life of Patrick Henry:

PATRICK HENRY WINNING ORATION—EDMUND PENNEY OF UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GIVES INSPIRING PICTURE OF FAMOUS PATRIOT

(Here is the winning oration of Edmund Penney, of the University of Southern California, second from his school and third from Los Angeles, to take the national championship in the Hearst newspapers oratorical awards, in the 4 years of competition. The speech, produced by a splendid young American, who was coached by the famous Allan Nicholls, of the University of Southern California speech department, brings a vivid picture of Patrick Henry, statesman and patriot, to the hearers and readers of this modern age.)

PATRICK HENRY

"Fire! Fire!"

The awesome cry fills the night and echoes from end to end of a small Virginia village. Gowns and nightcaps appear at windows. Men rush into the street. All can see a red glow burning upon the horizon. The home of a young merchant is in flames. The men form a bucket brigade and start passing pails of water. But it is too late for bucket brigades. The fire has gained too much headway. There is no stopping it now. So the villagers stand about, helplessly, watching the red flames.

"Look at that blaze!" one man cries, "they shouldn't have allowed it to get out of control."

"It's too bad," another remarks, "he loses all he has in business and now his house burns down."

Somewhat apart from the others stands a young man. An immense futility overcomes him as he watches the flames destroy the last vestiges of his earthly wealth. He mumbles to himself, "If only I had discovered it sooner, before it got out of control, I could have stopped it; I know I could have."

The villagers have returned to their houses; but the young man still stands, gazing into the embers. Reflectively he reviews his early endeavors. Farmer. Merchant. These too went up in smoke. "That's the trouble," he cries, "these failures are like this fire. As a farmer I've let the land lie waste and become hard and unfertile. As a merchant, instead of stopping to work out my financial problems, I've plunged more deeply into debt. I've let my troubles gain too much headway and, like this fire, they too were soon out of control. Next time I shall stop the flames before they gain headway. I've failed as a farmer and as a merchant, but I shall not fail again."

Immersed in thought, he walks away from the scene of the fire. So he does not notice a new and more menacing red glow just beginning to burn upon the horizon. For across the Atlantic, the British Parliament is beginning to debate taxation without representation.

The next day after the fire the young man—Patrick Henry—turns to the study of law. The Parsons case has scarcely established his reputation as a lawyer when the Stamp Act is passed and circulated among the Colonies. Beneath the clever, involved wordings of this act Patrick Henry discerns that it is the beginning of a plan of foreign oppression against his people. He realizes that this plan is much like a simple fire—it has only just begun. It must be stopped now. So Patrick Henry opposes this Stamp Act. Opposes its tyrannical decrees with all the hatred of a freeman who has fought and struggled bitterly for his personal liberty, individualism, and independence. He passes seven resolutions in the House of Burgesses against this act. Passes them through the persuasive force of a brave, challenging speech. "Caesar his Brutus, Charles the First his Cromwell, George the Third treason. Make the most of it." Aroused by these fighting words the House of Burgesses reassembles and elects Patrick Henry and six others as the delegation to the First Continental Congress in Philadelphia.

At the Congress, Patrick Henry demands immediate defense of the Colonies. Others seek to delay matters and charge him with furthering only the cause of Virginia. Patrick Henry replies to his antagonists with the brilliant sentence "I am not a Virginian, I am an American."

Returning to his home town he does not long remain idle, for the red glow is becoming brighter. He organizes the Virginia Convention and, disgusted with the Nation's complacency toward the growing menace of conflagration, he rises in his seat at the convention and with stirring eloquence calls the colonists to arms, knowing full well that if his cause fails he has signed his own death warrant. "The battle is not for the strong alone. It is for the vigilant, the active, the brave * * * life so dear * * * peace so sweet * * * to be purchased by chains and slavery * * * liberty or death."

This speech reechoes through the Colonies. It becomes the battle cry for freedom. Under the spell of these burning words the Government now authorizes the training and arming of companies of artillery, cavalry and infantry, and the Nation rises to revolt against foreign tyranny and oppression.

Today we realize what Patrick Henry and those early Americans did. But are we aware of the conflagration of world terror that is spreading in our own day? The time to act is now, before the fire gains too much headway. We must have the courage to fight these elements of foreign tyranny. Like Patrick Henry, we must be ready to stop the fire of impending disaster. In this world of the atom and cosmic crises we, too, may have to rise to action. For once again, far across the Atlantic, an ominous, red glow burns upon the horizon.

Unrestricted Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of the Congress to three United States Navy public relations ventures which have me a little confused as to their intent and somewhat puzzled as to their purposes.

The first of these is an article in the May 3, 1947, issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Let's Not Civilize These Happy People." This article is authored by a rear admiral on active duty with the Navy on the island of Guam as an aide for civil administration to the naval governor of Guam. This admiral writes about the Micronesian peoples of the Pacific Islands with an air of authority and supreme finality.

In his article he attacks private citizens and Government officials as missionaries of modernism, bureaucrats, sentimentalists, and busybody-do-gooders. It is his thesis that only the Navy is capable of governing these island peoples—administration of their affairs by any other agency of the Government would ruin their culture, wreck their economy, and cause them to fall into a state of utter degeneracy and depravity. Although it is quite true that the article to which I refer carries a routine disclaimer in fine print by which the opinions in the article are said to be those of the admiral himself and not those of the naval service, I would be interested in knowing the full purpose of the article.

The second and somewhat related matter also has me puzzled to its intent.

I see by the papers that the Secretary of the Navy has released to the press a report on the governments of Guam and American Samoa which was submitted to him by a so-called special civilian committee. This committee was appointed by the Secretary on January 8, 1947, to study the naval administration of Guam and American Samoa and to prepare a report embodying recommendations thereon. It was transported to the far Pacific and back in Naval Air Transport planes; naval civilian and service personnel gave many days of work to the committee, and naval quarters and messing

facilities were made available to its members. I do not know what salaries and travel allowances the committee members received, but no doubt these also were paid by the Navy from appropriated funds—from the taxpayers' money.

The Secretary's committee assembled in Washington on February 15 and then went on out into the Pacific and by way of San Francisco and Honolulu. On March 16 they returned to Honolulu where they lingered a few days before returning to the United States to prepare their report. They thereafter returned to Washington, submitted their report, and presumably have now returned to their normal pursuits.

I, for one, would like to have someone tell me why it is necessary for the Secretary of the Navy to hire a so-called Special Civilian Committee to study the governments being administered by naval personnel on active duty in Guam and American Samoa. Can it be that the Secretary is so distrustful of the naval officers who run insular affairs for him that he cannot believe their reports and must appoint civilian committees to investigate for him? No, that committee was not created and sent out to investigate and report on the delinquencies of naval personnel. It was a publicity move. It was another attempt to allay public criticism of naval administration of the affairs of Guam and American Samoa. It was a move to develop public opinion in favor of continued naval administration of the affairs of the civilian populations of Guam and American Samoa. Was it not a planned and studied attempt to arouse public opinion and bring it to bear on the Congress on the question of civil government for Guam and American Samoa?

It has been charged in the press that the Secretary's civilian committee was a "whitewash" committee designed to cover up an uncomplimentary situation in Guam and Samoa. It has also been said that it was a face-saving committee on whose findings the Secretary might gracefully navigate to certain reasonable reforms while still retaining control essentially intact in naval hands. It has also been said that it was a mere publicity scheme by which the Secretary hoped to counteract the unfavorable publicity and criticism which he has been receiving for many months on the matter of naval government of civilian populations in time of peace. I have also heard it said that the committee was just another delaying device by which the Secretary hoped to delay action for the present in order that the whole thing might be cooled off and delayed until the Congress adjourns.

Be that as it may, the report was promptly released to the press. Why? Why is the Secretary of the Navy trying to develop public interest in matters bearing on the form of government of Guam and American Samoa?

There are several bills before this Congress at this very moment which have as their purpose the establishment of civil governments in Guam and American Samoa under the cognizance of a civil agency of the Government. Can it be that the Secretary of the Navy is desirous of arousing public opinion with respect to these bills? If that is the case, I fear he has lost sight of the fact that he is in the executive and not the legislative branch of the Government. It is his job to execute the laws of the United States and not to make them.

I submit that investigation of the charges of malpractice of the Navy in the islands was the function of Congress and that Congress even yet might properly ascertain for itself conditions existing there. Under what authority has the Secretary of the Navy assumed such functions?

There is still another and somewhat related matter which unlike the other two does not puzzle me in the slightest. For some months now the Navy has been taking groups of west coast businessmen on trips to Hawaii and return on naval vessels. While in Hawaii, recently, I learned from reputable sources that a group had been taken to Hawaii and returned to the mainland on the U. S. S. *Boxer*. En route and in Hawaii they had been royally entertained by the Navy. I know for a fact that more west coast businessmen and influential citizens were taken to Hawaii on the U. S. S. *Shangri La*. They, likewise, were heavily entertained en route and while in Hawaii.

Again, I ask why? Why are groups of influential citizens and businessmen taken on pleasure cruises on public vessels of the United States and wined and dined at Government expense? This time I know the answer. I have just received a letter from one of the men who were on such a trip. I should like to quote from this letter which I received from the Los Angeles manager of one of the Nation's large industrial firms:

> As a guest of the Secretary of the Navy, it was my privilege and pleasure to make the cruise on the U. S. S. *Shangri La* from San Diego to Pearl Harbor. As a civilian I now have a much better knowledge of our Navy—our first line of defense—and of its need for manpower and funds to maintain a strong Navy as long as the world is in such a turmoil and until world peace is assured. I can commend our Nation on the very fine calibre of men making up the officers and crew who man our Navy ships.
>
> As my Representative in Congress, I wish to make a strong appeal to you for adequate appropriations so that we may maintain a strong peacetime force. Despite the need for economy, I sincerely trust we will not again curtail our Navy as we did before World Wars I and II. Preparedness is our best assurance for maintaining the peace for which we have so dearly paid.

Why are these men being taken on such trips if not to lobby Congress in favor of naval appropriations? To me, this is as pretty a picture of high-powered lobbying with the taxpayers' own money as you will ever see.

There are three good examples of the manner in which public moneys and official positions are being used by public officials to put pressure on the Congress of the United States. I, for one, would like to see the Congress—this Congress—put an end to such practices.

Since we are requiring all other lobbyists to make detailed reports to Congress, why should we not ask for reports from some of the heads of our governmental agencies such as the Navy and others?

Now I should like to give you my answer to the letter which I have already quoted:

> My Dear Mr. ———: In reply to your letter of May 7 concerning adequate appropriations to maintain a strong Army and Navy, I should like to tell you that I, too, am in favor of this but it should be realized that unless we scrutinize the budgets of the various departments, they will, regardless of their fine intent, become careless and even reckless in their expenditures. Both the Army and the Navy are guilty in this respect.
>
> I am in favor of a strong preparatory program, but I maintain that some measure of economy must be practiced. I am sure, however, that whatever cuts may be made in the Navy budget will not be of a nature to hinder this program.
>
> As a businessman you know that it is good management to be checked carefully, and you know also that economy can be effected when necessary.
>
> I appreciate your interest, but on every side we hear and see propaganda put out by the Administration against all economies and find also that businessmen who seek a reduction in both taxes and expenses will ask that we do not cut their special friends. If you are aware of the opposition of this type which we must face I am sure that you would understand why we must be brutally frank about this problem.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> Norris Poulson.

Relief Assistance to People of Countries Devastated by War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money to feed the hungry and starving people of other lands, we must think about preserving our own economy. For our own welfare and that of the world, we must see that we do not kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.

We cannot avoid our humanitarian responsibilities, but another vital need is that the food produced by our farmers should find its way to the consumer and that crops should be saved, processed, and distributed to the hungry. The scandalous loss and waste of money and nourishment that occurred when thousands of tons of potatoes were allowed to rot or are being destroyed, is a type of tragedy that must be avoided if we are to continue to feed a large part of the world's population. At present there are danger warnings in our own economy. The large surpluses on hand in some branches of the canned and frozen food industries is such an indication.

Based on the returns of the Department of Commerce as of March 1 of this year, there were in storage 203,554,000 cases of canned goods, 67,571,000 cases more than a year ago. The percentage of last year's pack remaining unsold is very high, in some items 100 percent or more.

In a standard item such as corn, the amount of the 1946 pack unsold as of March 1 was 52 percent. In addition to the surplus of canned corn, there is a frozen food stock equivalent to 1,783,000 cases of canned goods that adds to the surplus. Unsold canned beets amounted to 76 percent of the 1946 pack; leafy greens 89 percent and spinach 43 percent. Snap beans were bogged down with 53 percent of last year's pack unsold and the equivalent of 1,088,750 cases in frozen food stocks; peas were 50 percent unsold with the equivalent of 4,714,200 frozen cases, in addition. And so it goes.

With this situation confronting us, the Government is purchasing for shipment abroad foods which are in extremely short supply, such as grains, flour, fats and dry beans. This tends to hold domestic food costs at a high level while the administration calls for lower prices. I hope these new funds we are appropriating for relief can be so spent that they will help us at home as well as abroad.

Unless the canned and processed foods are moved to clear the warehouses and markets for the disposal of this year's crop, a disastrous chain of events will follow. The farmers have planted and will produce a large crop of perishable vegetables and fruits. If the canners and processors dare not operate on a large scale because of huge unsold stocks, much of these crops will be wasted while large sections of the world go hungry. The farmers will suffer as a matter of course.

The character of foods shipped abroad for relief purposes should be selected from the American point of view as to what is expedient to send and not entirely on the grounds of what is desired by the beneficiaries or what at first blush may seem cheaper commodities.

Canned foods are compact, easily distributed, and do not necessarily have to be cooked. In countries where fuel is as scarce or scarcer than food, this last factor is of real importance.

It is necessary for all branches of the Government to keep in mind the overall importance of promoting domestic economy, if we are to succeed abroad. We must put our own house in order, if we are to continue to feed a large part of the world. Let us therefore ship abroad foods that will ease rather than tighten our domestic markets and production.

Senate Labor Bill Preferable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of the House who some weeks ago voted for the Hartley bill, H. R. 3020, did so because they believed it was the wish of the people generally as well as a great many of the rank and file of labor that this Congress should pass legislation that would bring about a greater degree of industrial peace, redefine and clarify the rights of labor, the rights of business, and the rights of the general public. They felt that certain abuses had grown up in the labor movement and that certain labor leaders were exerting too great power over the economy of the country and the rank and file of labor as well. They supported this legislation, feeling certain some of the provisions of the bill would be modified by amendments in the Senate.

I stated on the floor of the House that I felt the bill went too far in its provisions in its restrictions in regard to pensions, health, and welfare funds which have been practiced for many years between employees and employers.

I also stated that I thought the bill went too far in attempting to outlaw industry-wide bargaining. I still believe that in certain instances industry-wide bargaining is absolutely necessary, particularly in the coal-mining industry.

The Senate has wisely stricken out the provision against industry-wide bargaining, and the provision barring the establishing and the administration of welfare funds. These and other changes make the bill more acceptable.

It is my firm belief that the conferees of the House should agree to the position taken with reference to these two matters by the Senate.

There are other provisions of the two bills which are not of such great importance where compromises can be made. It is important that out of the provisions of these two bills there is reported back, to the House and Senate, a bill which is fair to labor, fair to business, and which will protect so far as is possible the general public welfare and the economy of the Nation. With such a bill enacted into law, many disputes between capital and labor can be prevented, and the country can go forward with a greater degree of industrial peace than we have known in the past numbers of years; and with greater production, which is so necessary to the people of our Nation and to the world. All of us want labor steadily employed at high wage levels under good working conditions. The proper kind of legislation fair to all will help labor as much or more than any other group of our citizens.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony by me before the House Subcommittee on Education in favor of Federal aid to education:

There are several important points which I would like to emphasize as we consider Federal Aid to Education without Federal control. My bill, H. R. 1870, is a companion bill of the Senate bill 472 which was introduced by Senaters TAFT, HILL, and others. It is very similar to Congressman MCCOWEN'S bill which is being considered at the present time. These bills are based on the need of our people in the United States for assistance in education. It represents an urgent minimum of help to needy States which is necessary to resurrect our public school systems throughout the Nation. H. R. 1870 would cost the Federal Government $250,000,000 per year and no one is capable of estimating the returns on this investment which seem unlimited. The poorest schools in the poorest districts of the poorest States may yield the richest leadership for world peace.

1. THE PUBLIC SCHOOL CRISIS IN THE UNITED STATES

(a) The spotlight has been necessarily focused in recent years on war and industrial activities. During an international crisis it is understandable how intolerable conditions which exist in the public school systems of the United States could be overlooked and neglected. However, the time has come now when we can no longer afford to neglect any portion of our young people in the Nation, all of whom should be equipped to cope more successfully than we have with national and international problems.

There is hardly a paper or magazine these days which does not point out in some way the neglect of our schools, of our teachers, and the neglect of many of our people in their educational opportunities. In the past few years we have driven professional talent out of school work in wholesale quantities and have discouraged promising young men and women to the extent that only one-third as many people want to make this their life profession today as compared with the early 20's. I am told that about 25,000 teachers in America were paid less than $600 a year in 1945–46. The average teacher's salary over the entire country in 1944 was $1,755. Janitors and charwomen received more consideration. Is there any wonder our teachers are going to more lucrative fields of endeavor? Yet could there be anything more important for all of us than to give mental sustenance and guidance to the youth of our land—the hope of tomorrow? During the period of 1941 to December 1946, the salaries of all other working people were raised 79 percent while the teachers' salaries were raised 31 percent. During this same period, the cost of living went up 55.5 percent and teachers throughout the Nation were already living on substandard salaries. There is not a State in the Union which does not have substandard schools within its boundaries. I understand there are still districts in the rich State of Ohio where teachers are paid $100 per month and often do not receive even this amount on time. We must realize there is a crisis in our public schools of the United States when we see that perhaps 20 to 25 States would come under the provisions of my bill which establishes the need for assistance at only the very, very low standard of $40 annually per child. In harder times perhaps 40 States would fall below this low standard.

It is reported that Great Britain spends twice as much and Russia five times as much of their respective national incomes for education as does the United States, the richest Nation in the world. Can our children of democratic America compete successfully in world affairs with fewer educational opportunities than their neighbors?

(b) A critical point has been reached in the teaching profession. In some cases our educators have felt it necessary to strike to get a livable wage. Are we not to blame for forcing the people of such a basic and noble profession to put their services on a commercial basis in order to force the public to give them enough money on which to live? I contend that we must not force an atmosphere of industrial strife upon the profession which is largely responsible for training and educating our future generation.

2. IS THIS A NATIONAL PROBLEM OR A LOCAL PROBLEM?

(a) We all realize that there is a national as well as a State responsibility of citizenship. It is to our selfish interest to make it possible for young people to meet these requirements so they can be an asset instead of a liability to the Nation.

It was not necessary for me to be engaged in World War II very long to realize that education is a national problem. I could soon see that our success would depend to a large degree upon the knowledge of our civilian army and the quick conversion of their knowledge and skills into a war machine. Is it a national problem when 350,000 young men who registered for the draft could not sign their own names? There is no doubt that at such a time of international crisis we pay a penalty for ignorance. During the past war we rejected almost as many people for educational reasons as we had combat troops in the Pacific. Some 20 divisions with about 15,000 men in each division were rejected, and I have been told that General MacArthur had 22 divisions of combat troops at his disposal in the Pacific. Is it a national problem when this country in 1940 had 10,000,000 illiterates who could not read or write as well as a fourth-grade child? If there was ever a time when education and understanding among the peoples of the world were needed, they are doubly needed in this atomic age to prevent an incalculable catastrophe to civilization.

(b) Do we not all realize that this is a national problem when we consider the great mobility of our people in these United States? As everyone knows, there is an enormous shift in population from our farms to our towns, and from our rural regions to urban regions. I have one State in mind whose greatest export crop is its people—including many students and teachers. This State has exported about 10,000 persons every year for the last 20 years. This will give you an indication of the extreme mobility of our population.

(c) In the past some have objected to similar bills on the grounds that our richer States would receive less in return for their tax dollar than the poorer States. Actually at the present time the richer States without realizing it are getting the better end of the bargain. Most of the population which is shifting to the richer regions are in their productive years, have completed at least high-school educations, and usually have additional occupational training. Consequently it is easy to see that while these richer sections now pay nothing for the education of these people, they gain the benefit of their work and services. Also, many of these richer States make a profit from the natural resources of the poorer States through absentee ownership. Should not the children of both States benefit from the wealth created by the use of capital from one State and resources from another State? In my own district we have a greater share of the State's wealth than most of the other districts and pay taxes in proportion. However, we realize that it would be a very short-sighted policy to build up a few superschools in our district and leave other school systems in the State impoverished. Many States throughout the Nation now operate on the principle of sharing the tax wealth to produce equality in educational opportunities in public schools throughout the State. The same reasoning should hold true for the country as a whole.

(d) If modern transportation and communication have made this one world, then we in the United States live in each other's back yard. We are interdependent in everything we do. One section of the country cannot lag behind another section without dragging the whole country down. This is true in the field of industry and trade and it is even more true in the field of education. The transmission and exchange of ideas and cultural achievements is the greatest source of wealth of this or any other nation. I firmly believe that the relatively small investment which is involved in this bill will yield the greatest dividends ever known to the United States of America. As great reservoirs of mental ingenuity are developed in our poorer States, they will begin to carry their own financial load and will eventually contribute a surplus to the Nation's wealth. I know of no one who has studied this situation who is doubtful about the returns of this investment.

(e) Federal aid to education is not an innovation in American history. We have benefited from more than 150 Federal aid bills during the past 160 years. During the period between 1785 and 1945 there were 31 major educational enactments. One of the latest is the GI bill of rights which was made a part of the law of the land in 1944. In looking back over this Nation's history, one cannot place a value on our land-grant colleges, our vocational education program, the GI bill of rights, or the other enactments mentioned above. Even the material value is too great to be measured. Actually, H. R. 1870 fits into this great traditional pattern of education in the United States.

3. FEDERAL AID AND STATES' RIGHTS

(a) This bill has very zealously guarded the rights of our individual States. Although we have a general over-all pattern of education, still each State has grown up with its own traditions and has a peculiar contribution to make to the culture and security of the Nation. This bill states specically that the Federal Government shall not "seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, or authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or control in any manner, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction, nor shall any provision of this act be interpreted or construed to imply or require any change in any State constitution prerequisite to any State sharing the benefits of this act."

(b) This bill is so worded as to encourage the initiative of individual States and provides for an element of comparison and competition with other States in educational achievements. There are three paramount factors involved in the distribution of the funds which will go to the individual States. First is the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17, second is the effort that each State makes, and third is the ability of the individual State to provide for educational opportunities. The normal effort of any given State is judged to be 2.2 percent of its total income for educational purposes. Incidentally, the average effort for the States at the present time is 1.1 percent of total income for educational purposes, so you see the individual States are stimulated to make a greater effort on their own. According to the provisions of this bill, if any State falls below 2.2 percent then the amount of money coming from the Federal Government is reduced proportionally. Consequently, the penalty for dropping below the normal effort is designed to encourage State initiative. This is as it should be in my opinion. It was interesting to note an article in the Washington Post recently by Walter Lippmann in which he was pointing out that the poorer States that have the lowest educational standards are in the highest bracket of effort—that is, the highest proportion of their tax dollar goes for educational purposes.

(c) I believe that we can dispel our fears about the Federal Government usurping State powers in this field of activity when we study our vocational-training program for adults which receives Federal aid. I have never heard a complaint about the Federal Government misusing its powers gained from the appropriations of money to be used for vocational training in individual States. If this bill did not have what I consider adequate safeguards for State control over the spending of this money and the administration of its own educational program I would be against the entire bill. However, I am not worried about this bill on this score in the least. I believe our States' rights are adequately protected. Also, I have faith in the professional integrity of our educators and faith in each of our States to do a good job.

4. H. R. 1870 AS A DEFICIENCY BILL

In summary, let me say that in my opinion this bill, H. R. 1870, should be classed as a deficiency bill. To me it seems like it is something we have been owing to the people of the United States for a long time and have not paid them. To me it seems like a bipartisan responsibility to alleviate the intolerable conditions in the field of education which exist today. The fact that 14 such bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives and 5 such bills with multiple sponsors have been introduced in the Senate indicates the magnitude of this problem. It is so important, there is so much at stake, and the yield promises to be so great that I sincerely believe it behooves us to act favorably upon this or a similar Federal aid-to-education bill. Our national security in time of war, our economic prosperity, our capacity to lead the world to peace—these draw no State lines.

Navaho Indian Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the RECORD a portion of a letter sent to me from Mr. Philip Johnston, of 2335 Norwalk Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. Mr. Johnston is most interested in the problems of the Navahos which are after all the problems of the Federal Government. I do not believe that if we give careful consideration to the story as it is presented in this letter alone, we can fail to agree that some prompt and definite action should not be taken by the Members of this Congress. I quote herewith from this letter:

Washington's record of treaty observance with foreign governments has been exemplary, but you may be surprised and shocked to learn that Washington has blandly disregarded the most vital part of a treaty concluded with the Navaho Nation in 1868. Article VI of this covenant promises that the Government will provide one school and a teacher for every 30 Navaho children between the ages of 6 and 16 years. After a lapse of nearly eight decades, the facilities set up for this purpose accommodate only 5,500 of the 20,000 children of school age.

Results of our Government's failure to fulfill this promise have been tragic, and today the Navahos find themselves in a desperate situation. The tribe numbers 55,000 and is increasing at the rate of 1,000 each year. Four-fifths of these people are illiterate and utterly incapable of securing employment at decent wages. The reservation is for the most part a barren wasteland, restricted by nature to stock raising and very little agriculture. The Government undertook a com-

pulsory stock-reduction program without making any provision for substitute vocations. Most Navahos are sick, hungry, and miserably housed. In 1940 the average per capita income was $80.89, as compared with a national average of $861 for that year. Even including the value of home-grown products, food consumed was only about $1 per week per capita, which comprised less than 1,200 calories. The Navaho Reservation has become "America's black spot"—and the blame for this condition rests squarely upon the shoulders of Washington. The time has come for a show-down. We intend to find out, definitely, if a treaty entered into by the United States is worth the paper it is written upon.

I am speaking for a large group of Navaho marines who were trained under my direction for secret communication in their native tongue—a service that materially shortened our war against Japan, saved thousands of American lives, and billions of American dollars. Many of those Navaho marines made the supreme sacrifice on the battlefield to uphold the principles of international morality and impartial justice. The survivors have returned home to find conditions on the reservation even worse than they were when they entered the service, and they know that the sole blame rests with the United States Government. At the same time, they see our Government pointing a finger of scorn at other nations who violate treaties. Is it not entirely logical for them to reach a bitter conclusion that Uncle Sam is a plain, unvarnished hypocrite?

Prompt and decisive action by Congress on the Navaho problem is imperative. There must be no further economy at the expense of covenants entered into by Washington. Preliminary estimates show that an expenditure of more than $50,000,000 will be required to establish the school facilities promised by the treaty of 1868. Disaster to this outstanding nation of first Americans must be averted by a comprehensive program of development for their reservation. To be sure it will be costly—but America has always been lavish with her gifts to the "needy" in every quarter of the globe. However, in this case, we are not appealing for generosity. We are insisting, Mr. POULSON, that the United States Government live up to its treaty obligations.

World Trade Week—Statement of Secretary of State Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Honorable George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, on the occasion of the observance of World Trade Week, May 18–24, 1947:

The keynote of World Trade Week in 1947 is World Trade Unites Nations; a theme particularly appropriate for a time when the need for unity among peoples is more vital than ever before in history. National leaders are urgently seeking unity in all the fields of international relations—political, security, and economic. Economic conflict and trade wars invariably set the stage for political disunity.

Representatives of 18 trading nations are meeting now in Geneva in a concerted effort to achieve unity through expansion of world trade and the resulting increases in production, employment, and improvement of living standards in all countries.

Although the United States Government has taken a leading part in bringing about this meeting, a successful conclusion can only be realized through the cooperation of all participating nations. At Geneva these countries are seeking to lower excessive trade barriers and are engaged in drafting a charter for an International Trade Organization, to insure international cooperation in commerce. Agreement on this charter will mark a great step toward economic stability and the common security.

Farm Income Must Be Kept High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from a Midwestern State, I often wonder, during the few moments of relaxation which a Congressman has, where do we go from here?

The war is over, but the promised postwar peace for which many of our young men gave their lives is still in the distant future. The recent demand of the President for financial and even military aid to Greece, the prospective demand of other nations for similar aid, and other factors, such as our own national debt of $260,000,000,000, indicate that there are many problems ahead.

I am not one of those who feel that all is lost. I have an abundant faith in our American system of government and our potential resources from which to repay the national debt while at the same time having a period of prosperity and full employment.

The United States has 6 percent of the population of the world but our efficiency and natural resources make it possible for us to produce and consume 25 percent of the world's production of physical goods. This, in terms of production and price, represents roughly 47 percent of the world's dollar business. Last year our Nation had a national income of $165,000,000,000, enough to balance the budget and maintain the highest standard of living in terms of goods ever enjoyed by any people. To obtain this huge production we spent less than 5 percent of our national income for imports of products to supplement our own natural resources. With such abundance it would appear that there is no need to fear the future if we operate the United States in a businesslike manner.

To me that means a program along economic lines, and fiscal policies which will make it possible for our annual production of goods and services to create a national income large enough for prosperity and a solvent national budget. It is up to us Members of Congress to initiate such a program. Surely it does not make sense to those whom we represent or to the citizens of other nations for the United States to have a depression. With the resources to produce 95 percent of everything we need within our own Nation ours is a problem of business management.

We all remember the depression of the thirties and many of us remember the depression in 1920–21. A repetition of those depressions must be avoided at all costs.

We also remember the days of the so-called New Deal or the lend-spend program with all its fallacies and ideologies, many of which are not yet extinct.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion we are still in a state of confusion and should take the time out to get our bearings in order that we may return to the basic principles upon which our Nation was founded.

Benjamin Franklin, one of those immortals who guided this Nation in its early history, once said approximately that a nation can become wealthy in one of three ways:

First. By war or by taking away the wealth that other nations possess.

Second. By trade, which to make a profit requires cheating.

Third. By the development of agriculture or the planting of seeds which create new wealth as if by a miracle.

With the United States having the finest form of government in the world and resources which have given us the highest standard of living known to man we should avoid the first method.

In my opinion, our present course, that of trying to expand our trade with other nations, is one fraught with many pitfalls and danger of financial losses. I agree with Franklin in regard to becoming a wealthy nation through trade. I, for one, do not wish to have the United States to become rich by exploiting other nations. Trade is essentially the exchange of goods, and if we give and receive equal value there is no profit. We can, of course, trade for things which we need, but in doing so we should not expect to take in exchange the goods produced by slave labor or by international investors bent on exploiting other nations.

Our course should be to expand and develop our agricultural resources, the greatest of any nation in the world, thus bringing about an ever-recurring cycle of new wealth with each new crop. That was the foundation upon which the United States grew and prospered. If we carry through on our present attempts to expand our foreign trade we must take in exchange farm products from a world that is hungry.

Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of the economy of the rest of the world is based on production of farm products. Expansion of foreign trade, therefore, must take place at the expense of our own agricultural industry. In displacing our own agriculture we will destroy the very source of wealth which we need to remain a prosperous nation. To do so will mean financial ruin and economic chaos for the United States.

My reasons for this conclusion are definite and factual. In 1941, testimony was presented before a committee of Congress, in which it was pointed out that in the United States we have $7 of national income for each $1 of gross farm income; and that if we didn't have the initial dollar of farm income we

would not have the $7 of national income. To me the reading of this testimony was revolutionary in its approach to our economic problems. Since that time the Raw Materials National Council of Sioux City, Iowa, has continuously reiterated the ratio of approximately 1 to 7. Others have taken it up and Tom Linder, Secretary of Agriculture from the great State of Georgia, has used it in his market bulletin. To my knowledge the relationship has never been refuted. I have attended several meetings at which Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst for the Sioux City organization, has presented a detailed analysis of the formula. It not only sounds logical but seems to be supported by the facts. I have personally checked the records of the United States and find that this seven-times turn of our farm income has been in existence for the 25-year period 1921–46. During this period we have had prosperity, depression, and war. And, in spite of all special legislation for labor, agriculture, and the lend-spend program, the ratio of $1 of gross farm income and $7 of national income has continued without interruption.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who ask the question, Does the farm income come first? To me that question is academic. The growing of crops and livestock must precede the operation of approximately 70 percent of our economy engaged in the production, processing, and distribution of the annual products of our soil. Suppose we were to discontinue agriculture in the United States. Our Nation would soon be a land of hunger and want.

A few days ago, I received a copy of a statement presented to the House Committee on Agriculture by Mr. Wilken. In his statement he offered, in conjunction with Dr. John Lee Coulter, to appear before any committee of Congress with detailed data as to the importance of agriculture in our economy. Dr. John Lee Coulter is considered one of the leading factual economists in the United States and has a record of which any man might be proud. In my opinion, these two men have carried on the most complete study of our economy that has ever been made. I feel that the people of the United States need their help and as Members of Congress I feel that we should avail ourselves of the information which they can give us. To me the ratio of $1 of gross farm income and $7 of national income will clear away our economic confusion and open up a new era of prosperity for ourselves and the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, with this positive ratio in existence proper prices for our agricultural production become a must measure. A prosperous agriculture will mean a prosperous United States as a foundation for the reorganization of the economy of the rest of the world. It ought to be self-evident that we cannot bring about permanent recovery for the world by giving our goods away or making loans which will never be repaid. We must help the rest of the world to help itself. With 85 percent of the rest of the world dependent on agriculture the first step must be proper agricultural prices so that they may earn the income to expand their production. This will require many years, but with a steady and constant income from agriculture a war-torn world can rebuild a new era upon the wreckage of war and exploitation. The ratio of our own agricultural income to national income can be used as the yardstick to measure the economy of every nation. Instead of economic confusion we can rebuild the world with arithmetic as a guide and economics will become a science instead of conflicting theories based on greed and wishful thinking.

With 80 percent of our labor force engaged in other work than agriculture they think in terms of cheap food. The seven-times turn of gross farm income proves to me that there is no such thing as cheap food. As farm prices decline because of the seven-times turn of the farm dollar all incomes decrease in ratio, and the cost of living when measured in terms of per capita incomes does not decrease with lower farm prices. For example, I have the record of food expenditures for 3 years on the basis of percentage of national income. In 1929 the American people spent $19,000,000,000 for food, or 22.8 percent of our national income of $83,300,000,000. In 1932, the low point of farm prices during the depression, we spent $12,100,000,000 for food, or 30.3 percent of the national income of $39,900,000,000. In 1945 we spent $31,800,000,000 for food, or 19.7 percent of the national income of $161,000,000,000. All of these figures are from the United States Department of Commerce.

To me they prove the accuracy of the seven-times turn of the farm dollar and the precedence of farm income for national prosperity. As farm prices go up we create the national income with which to buy the food and the additional income for durable goods and services. With low farm prices we approach an existence standard of living. This fact is clearly proved throughout the world. With agricultural prices in the Far East and China creating an income of less than 20 cents per day there can be nothing else than hunger and starvation.

Mr. Speaker, the trade turn of the farm dollar clearly proves the fallacy of our foreign economic policy. The State Department is making every effort to reduce our tariffs, which will in turn reduce our farm prices to world levels. The result will eventually be another depression because of a reduced farm income. Our loss in national income will be in a sevenfold ratio to the reduction in our farm price level as a result of the competition of an existence standard of living in other nations. Then we will become fertile soil for the ideologies of communism. It might be well for the Members of Congress to realize that the Communists believe that free trade is the road to communism. For the information of the Members of Congress I would like to point out that Karl Marx in a speech at Brussels in the nineteenth century favored free trade. Not, however, to promote world peace. Marx favored free trade because he felt that the destructive results of such a policy would hasten the day of the economic revolution. The bankruptcy and poverty in the rest of the world would indicate that Marx was right.

At the present time we are concerned about the spread of communism. The best weapon against this ideology is the economic leadership which will bring about prosperity. Prosperity will destroy communism and in my opinion it is the only means other than force of arms to combat the disease.

The growth of the United States has put us in a position of world leadership. It should be our goal to teach the benefits of our system of free enterprise to the rest of the world. To achieve this goal our foreign economic policy should be one in which we maintain our price level and with it as a yardstick reorganize world economy on a price level equal to our own. Then the rest of the world can have the prosperity which we have indirectly promised them in the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. Speaker, the seven-times turn of the farm dollar proves to me that we have a foreign economic policy which is just the opposite of what it ought to be.

Therefore let me say again, I think it is time that we get at the facts in order that we may chart a steady course based on arithmetic rather than theory.

Instead of our present program of reducing our farm prices to world levels, let us send out a message that will ring around the world. A message which will open up the full resources of production and at a price that will permit the higher standard of living that we talk about and must bring into being.

Instead of fears of surplus and continuous predictions of lower prices from our Department of Agriculture, let us tell the world that the way to prosperity is work and production priced at a level which will permit consumption. Then and not until then will we have started on the road to prosperity as an example for the world to follow.

MEMORANDUM

A FEW PERTINENT FACTS

Ninety-five percent of our national income is spent within the United States. Five percent is spent for imports to supplement our domestic production.

Eighty-five percent of the economy of the rest of the world is agriculture.

To expand our foreign trade above the natural level of need we must either give away our exports or we must accept farm products in payment.

The propaganda that the trade agreements will increase our exports of farm products is an insult to our intelligence.

But, in our economy each $1.00 farm income creates $7.00 of national income.

Reduction of tariffs on farm products will mean lower farm prices, a lower national income and a reduction in our standard of living.

Karl Marx favored "free trade" because he believed it would create the economic chaos which would hasten the day of the economic revolution.

CARL H. WILKEN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 11, 1947.*

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am very much concerned about the seemingly organized drive by the administration and industry to reduce price levels and especially the price of raw materials.

All the research work of the Raw Materials National Council of Sioux City, Iowa, over a period of 10 years points clearly to the im-

portance of raw material income. The record of the United States for 25 years proves that farm income is the governing factor in our economy in a ratio of 1–7. In other words, that each $1 of gross farm income will generate $7 of national income.

We find also that the combined farm and mineral income or the income from new wealth production constitutes the profit of our annual economic cycle.

In other words, this drive to reduce raw-material prices means a reduction in our national income and a reduction in our annual profit on all capital investment.

As you know, we have a national debt of $260,000,000,000. If this debt is to be serviced and repaid it must be from the production of new wealth from our natural resources. At the present time the Federal budget requires approximately 20 percent of each dollar of national income.

If our national income is reduced to $100,000,000,000 we will have to pay 33 percent of each dollar of national income to meet the Federal budget. Such a condition is unthinkable and we would find ourselves in a state of financial chaos.

In some way or other the Members of Congress from our raw-material producing States must organize to prevent a repetition of the 1920 cry "we must come back to normalcy" which brought on the drop in farm prices and the closing of many of our banks in the Midwest and other raw-material producing States. The Members of Congress from the Midwest, South, and West must join together to stop this move before another depression is upon us.

Farm prices and the price of other raw-material products must remain high if we are to have the national income to meet our national debt and maintain our standard of living. Not until our national debt has been materially reduced should we think in terms of lower prices.

I feel that the attitude of those who wish lower prices is the result of the economic fallacy that living costs are too high. This is not the case. Higher farm prices ratio into increased per capita income and on the basis of our buying power today, we have a lower percentage of our national income going for food than in either 1929 or 1932. The actual figures are as follows:

1929: 22.8 percent of the national income was spent for food.

1932: 20.3 percent of the national income was spent for food.

1945: 19.7 percent of the national income was spent for food.

Lower raw-material prices will mean a lower national income and a surplus from underconsumption, a depression and the collapse of our system of free enterprise.

As a Member of Congress you can point out the danger to those whom you represent and also to those who are responsible for the demand for lower prices, the road to a depression.

Yours,

CARL H. WILKEN,
Economic Analyst, Raw Materials National Council, Sioux City, Iowa.

Will the Conferees Nullify Labor Legislation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, during the days and weeks in which I was using my best efforts to help write labor-management relations legislation, I did not concern myself with attempting to write legislation which President Truman would sign or one for which certain Members of the other body would vote, in order to override a veto. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in three basic objectives.

First, I was interested in the workers themselves—in seeing that they were dignified and given some individuality and in helping to protect them from exploitation by certain unscrupulous labor leaders as well as to protect them from being used as chattels by certain unscrupulous industrialists.

Secondly, I was interested in protecting an innocent public of 125,000,000 Americans, who belong to no trade-unions but who have been punished and caused to suffer many times because of pig-headedness of both labor leaders and industrialists; and

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I was interested in seeing that both labor and management were given equal rights and opportunities under the law in defining unfair labor practices.

Mr. Speaker, I was and still am positive in my own mind that if we give to the individual worker the right, without fear of coercion or intimidation, to express himself freely and openly without fear of losing his job or being discriminated against in some other way, as well as permit him to hear both sides of the question, that the rank-and-file workers themselves will correct many of the evils which undoubtedly now exist between labor and management. In an effort to do just that for the working men and women we wrote into the House bill 18 provisions which we termed "a bill of rights for the workingman." To me, Mr. Speaker, this provision is the heart of the bill and primarily the provision which caused me to support the House bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we retain those rights for the individual worker, the second objective which I had in mind, namely, of protecting an innocent public, will automatically be achieved or accomplished. So far as my third objective was concerned, namely, between labor leaders and industrialists, if they are given equal rights to sit down and bargain collectively across a table, I have no fear that either one of them will be pushed around very much. I am confident that both of them are quite capable of taking care of themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that a person cannot believe everything which he reads in the papers, but in Sunday's paper, Monday's paper, and yesterday's paper I noted wherein certain of the House conferees on the pending labor legislation have stated that they were willing to concede the bill of rights, which is contained in the House bill. Mr. Speaker, I based my entire argument for supporting this bill on that bill of rights. I mailed out 71,000 speeches stating the 18 basic fundamental rights which were accorded to the rank-and-file workers. I received back two postal cards and one letter disagreeing with my position. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the people of America do not give very much of a hoot for any national or international labor leader and are almost equally indifferent toward certain overlord industrialists. I am also convinced that they, like myself, are interested in the underdog. Those folks who many times are called out on strike, receive decreased pay checks, are forced and compelled to walk picket lines, contrary to their own best judgment, but who because of the fear of being penalized or punished by their leaders go along meekly and calmly.

Mr. Speaker, each of us owes a responsibility to the folks back home—to the folks of America whom we are honestly and conscientiously trying to serve, at least we have taken an oath to serve them to the best of our ability. We are not being true to those folks or true to our oath or obligations if in writing any legislation we bring in the argument as to whether or not it will be acceptable to the President of the United States or to some Member of the other body, or to some labor leader or to some industrialist. The question which we must ask ourselves is, Will this legislation protect the American public and those who are responsible for production in order that the public may not be punished, or their safety and interest jeopardized I, for one, am perfectly willing to assume my full responsibility and to vote for a bill which in my humble opinion will accomplish these things which are most certainly needed, and the testimony which our Labor Committee received proved is needed, than I would to vote for a gesture of a bill just for fear the President might veto it or one or two Members of the other body, who seem to take delight in running off the reservation, would not support. That is their responsibility and not mine, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are not going to protect the workers from paying exorbitant initiation fees, as much as $1,500 in some instances, as well as exorbitant union dues; if we are going to permit mass picketing and violence; if we are not going to protect the individual worker and his family from intimidation, coercion, yes, and even from assault; if we are not going to give the worker the right to go to and from his work without being molested in that journey; in other words, Mr. Speaker, if we are still going to permit the worker to be exploited by certain of his leaders and used as a chattel by certain industrialists, just what have we done in this bill except to appease certain leaders and certain industrialists. Mr. Speaker, I, for one, am opposed to any program of appeasement for anyone; either a thing is right or it is wrong and I, for one, have always taken a stand one way or the other and have avoided appeasement. I trust that I may always continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we give the power of injunction to the Federal courts wherein we state that if and when conditions arise which seem to jeopardize or interfere with the public, health, safety, and interest, that the President may do so-and-so. Now, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has that power

already given to him in the Constitution, if and when any condition arises which seems to jeopardize the welfare of the Nation, to step in and take appropriate action. He does not need any power of injunction from this Congress to do those things which on their face quite evidently are not for the best interest of the Nation. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced, as previously stated, that if the same rights of free speech are accorded to management as is accorded to labor leaders; namely that they can appear before their workers and state their side of the question, just as labor leaders state their side, and that the workers are then free by secret ballot to vote without fear of reprisal from either management or labor, that we will get along mighty well in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to accomplish the objective or the purpose which we had in mind by attempting to pass legislation which will punish certain labor leaders. We have seen that tried in the past—we saw it in Pittsburgh, where the leader was arrested and put in jail. Did that solve anything? It did not; it simply caused thousands of workers to walk off the job and to stay off the job in protest because their leader had been arrested. I am convinced that thousands of those who walked off the job did so involuntarily simply because they feared the consequences if they spoke up or continued to work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if certain articles which I have seen in the paper are true, it would appear that certain members of the conferees are attempting to arrive at a solution or produce a bill which will please the President of the United States, which will please two or three wild mustangs in the other body, which will not be too repulsive to labor leaders, and which will pacify certain industrialists. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is to be the objective of the conferees they are not going to accomplish anything worth while, so far as settling labor-management differences are concerned. Even if the President would sign it, and even though certain labor leaders and industrialists were apparently appeased, nothing would be settled and the arguments would go on as before, with the public holding the bag.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say positively that I will not support the report of the conferees if the bill of rights for the working men and women is stricken from the bill, but I do say in all sincerity that it will be mighty hard for me to support it if this provision is stricken. It would certainly put me in a most embarrassing position to base everything upon the fact that something had been done for the workers which, if granted, would, in my opinion, protect the public, and then to have that provision stricken from the bill and still expect me to go along with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are not pleasing either labor leaders or management; if we are not granting constitutional rights to the workers; and if a long-suffering public is not being granted relief under this proposed legislation, then just for whom are we attempting to legislate?

Mr. Speaker, it may be that the papers are not correct in their quotes; at least I do not intend to definitely commit myself until I have read the report and analyzed the bill which comes from the conferees. However, again I say that if the bill of rights is stricken from the House bill it will be mighty hard for me to support the conference report unless it does more to help settle labor-management relations problems than I believe will be accomplished if this provision is stricken from the House bill by the conferees.

Since the Fulton Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there are many problems confronting the American people, today; the same will be true on tomorrow. It appears that many of the utterances of the past, when compared with the more recent statements, cause much speculation, and, in some respects, much confusion. A very interesting article appeared in the Washington Post, of recent date, by Walter Lippmann, relating to some of these statements which may be of immediate interest to many, which I am extending as a part of my remarks herein.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the article to which reference is made, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

SINCE THE FULTON SPEECH

Nearly a year ago, at the end of June, the Prime Minister of South Africa, Field Marshal Smuts, delivered an address at the Pilgrim's dinner in London. Little attention was paid to it at the time, but a short news report to the New York Times said that he had pictured "the world of tomorrow as divided into two great power groups, with the British group between them," and that he had said that it was the task of the British Empire to interpret "the one to the other, thus preventing war."

The significance of that statement was not appreciated either by the State Department or by the American public, though a statement of that sort would not have been made idly by an Empire statesman at a Pilgrim's dinner.

Prime Minister Smuts was speaking only a few months after Mr. Churchill's speech at Fulton and shortly after Secretary Byrnes had been converted to the thesis of the Fulton speech and had begun to act on the idea of an Anglo-American front throughout the world against the Soviet Union. The policy of the Smuts speech was so radically different from that of the Fulton speech that few Americans at the time were willing to believe that it was more than a vagrant expression of a personal opinion.

Most of those who professed to speak with knowledge and authority about British affairs have kept on insisting that only a few back benchers of the left and some "crypto-Communists" and fellow travelers take the view Smuts stated—that the interest of Britain is not to aline itself with the United States against the Soviet Union but to take an independent line.

So they felt sure that the so-called Truman doctrine, which descends directly from the Fulton speech, would be received with enthusiasm in Great Britain. It should have been if the fashionable and official estimate of Britain was correct. But in fact the Truman doctrine has had a generally unfavorable reception in Britain, as it has almost everywhere else in Europe, though for reason of expediency rather than of conviction, the expression of the unfavorable opinion has been restrained, and indirect, except, of course, on the far left.

Now, however, events are beginning to show that the Smuts speech of last June, rather than the Fulton speech and the Truman doctrine, indicate the direction in which British policy is evolving. There has been the royal visit to South Africa, where Smuts is Prime Minister. There is the recession of Britain from Greece, Turkey, Egypt, and Palestine. There is the economic agreement with Poland, and the British negotiations with the Soviet Union. There is Mr. Churchill's speech last week wherein, as he advocated a united Europe, he spoke of "we Europeans," and asked the dominions and the United States to give their blessing to Britain's new role, which is "to play her full part as a member of the European family."

These are portents which we shall ignore, or explain away, only if we are determined not to know what is going on in the world. The royal family did not go to South Africa in order to escape the cold weather in England but to mark and to promote the change in the Empire and the revolution in imperial strategy. In South Africa, which is an immensely rich and undeveloped land, Britain may find the means of becoming, despite the liquidation of the Indian and Near Eastern Empires, an independent great power in the world. The British people have been great too long to accept passively the role which was assigned to them in the Fulton speech, and is implicit in the Truman doctrine, that of the little brother in a fraternal association with us.

As they withdraw from the old imperial positions, they are looking for new ones. They are withdrawing from Asia into Africa as regards their overseas empire. They are moving forward into Europe as regards the British Isles. They are drawing closer to France. They are not allowing the iron curtain to shut them, as we have allowed it to shut us, out of Poland. They will not abandon, and they will probably strengthen and renew, their alliance with the Soviet Union.

None of this means, I need hardly say, that they are divorcing themselves from the United States. But it does mean that they are not accepting the ideological pattern and the political consequences, which Mr. Churchill laid down at Fulton and President Truman adopted a year later. I think it is fair to suppose that they regard the Truman doctrine as a wrong way to do a right thing, and in its reckless overtones an aberration, due to inexperience, which this country, as it reflects upon it, will replace by a much more constructive policy based on the actualities of the world.

I have no doubt myself that this is what is going to happen, as we reexamine and reassess our position, the general commitments which have been made for us so rhetorically, and the enormous responsibilities and burdens which we shall soon have to meet.

President Should Also Be Concerned Over Problem of Surplus Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Monday, May 19, edition of the Mobile (Ala.) Register:

PRESIDENT SHOULD ALSO BE CONCERNED OVER PROBLEM OF SURPLUS POTATOES

President Truman says he is deeply concerned over the recent rise in farm land prices.

At his request Secretary of Agriculture Anderson has called a conference for June 9 which the President hopes will bring "a specific program of methods of discouraging further inflation in farm real-estate prices and unwise expansion of farm debts."

Department of Agriculture figures show an increase of 92 percent in farm land prices over the 1935–39 level, of which 12 percent occurred during the past year.

President Truman's concern may be quite justified. A wild boom and terrific crash in farm land prices could leave many American farmers in distress, an experience which came to many after the First World War.

However, if the President is concerned about farm land prices, he should also be concerned about another farm problem—the potato surplus. The dumping and destroying of a large quantity of potatoes—an estimated 50 tons—in Baldwin County the past week underscores the potato surplus problem.

Secretary of Agriculture Anderson spoke at a dinner in up-State New York last week. Among other things he said: "In recent weeks, we have seen some fairly stiff attacks by press and radio upon farm prices and upon governmental price-support policies. We are now supporting the prices of only three commodities: potatoes, eggs, and dried skim milk. Surely those three commodities do not add a great deal to the cost of livin. * * * It is only because we have price support in the background that farmers dare produce the tremendous volume of food and fiber they are now turning out."

At all events, surplus potatoes produced under a price-support program are being dumped at a time when food is acutely needed in various foreign countries and when this country is apparently getting ready to spend $350,000,000 more in foreign relief, apart from the $400,000,000 for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

We wonder if this state of affairs adds up to much businesslike sense in the mind of the average taxpayer.

Representative PAUL W. SHAFER, Republican, Michigan, is pushing a resolution for a study of the potato-surplus problem.

He said the other day "the Department of Agriculture still is following a 'plow-'em under' policy on potatoes," that the potato surplus this year is 100,000,000 bushels, "a large part of which went to waste."

Mr. Shafer spoke also of the cost of potato price-support: "This year we are spending $80,000,000 on potato-support prices because of a 100,000,000 bushel potato surplus. Now, $80,000,000 may seem like chicken feed in these days of billions for loans, grants, and gifts to other nations, but it is still a very imposing sum to most Americans and if we could cut out this expense without hurting the potato farmer we would be doing the Nation a great service."

Finally he asked this question: "Why talk about price reduction when we waste 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes, pay out $80,000,000 in subsidies, ship out 500,000,000 bushels of grain, causing our own flour and bread prices to go up?"

Since Mr. SHAFER did not do it, we invite the Truman administration to answer this question in the timely campaign it is conducting for lower prices.

I Am an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, the welfare of our country demands that the American people be ever mindful of the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship.

A relentless conflict of ideologies, seeking to gain mastery over the minds of men, rages in the arena of world thought and action. It has never been more true than now that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

The spirit and purpose of I Am an American Day should not be permitted to subside with the conclusion of a formal celebration. The force, power, efficacy, and virtue of democracy as a dynamic living force at work, at home and abroad, must be America's answer to every antithetical concept or philosophy which seeks to overthrow our system and supplant our way of life.

Our obligations and responsibilities as Americans, the fundamental principles upon which they rest and through which our system must endure, were graphically analyzed and eloquently proclaimed in a sound, forceful, and able address delivered by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable TOM PICKETT, of Texas, May 18, 1947, at Roanoke, Va., on the occasion of the celebration of I Am an American Day.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. PICKETT'S address I Am an American:

The phrase "I Am an American" has a connotation of its own and a meaning distinct to every individual who gives voice to it. Nevertheless, when we speak those words and realize the meaning of the phrase there comes to every individual a feeling that within their concept are certain fundamental principles and inalienable rights that we possess, as citizens of these United States, separate and apart from those of any other nation.

It would not be news to you for me to relate the details of the spontaneous origin of I Am an American Day set aside as the outgrowth of scattered celebrations in various parts of the Nation, beginning as long ago as the year 1915. It is of no moment in the full meaning of the phrase that it was first observed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in 1939; or that on May 3, 1940, the third Sunday in May of each year was set aside officially by resolution of the Congress and Presidential proclamation as I Am an American Day. It would serve no purpose to review fully in these brief moments the constitutional guaranties of citizenship, with all of the implied rights and privileges, both to the native-born and to those who possess such citizenship by naturalization. Notwithstanding, articles I and II, together with the fourteenth amendment, in their respective sections and clauses, express the intent and purpose of the framers of the Constitution and those responsible for the amendments in that regard. Similarly, it is of no great consequence that the first Naturalization Act was passed March 26, 1790. Numerous other acts were passed shortly thereafter, and they have been amended from time to time.

It does become worthy of note to reflect upon the benefits bestowed on the citizenship of this Nation, native born or naturalized, by reason of the extension of that privilege to every individual. But in the consideration of those rights and privileges, we must not forget that every right has its corresponding duty and every privilege has its concomitant responsibility.

A small group of men, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, Robert R. Livingston, and the incomparable Thomas Jefferson, to whom is ascribed the authorship of the document, in whose hands was entrusted the task of drafting and phrasing the Declaration of Independence, had that principle in mind throughout the disposition of their labors. That fact becomes self-evident from the reading of the document itself. The second sentence reads, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." When read in connection with the last sentence, "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor," we discover a direct recognition of that principle. It is an acknowledgment that the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness carry with them the duty on the part of all individuals to maintain those rights with our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

The Constitution, composed of the original seven articles, bespeaks that same principle commencing with the preamble: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." The first 10 amendments to that constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, specify by their delegation of and their restriction on the powers therein referred to the principle which we are discussing. Each succeeding amendment, becoming a part of our Constitution from time to time by its ratification in the prescribed manner, continues to enunciate the principle, both directly and indirectly.

An effort to discuss in full the rights enumerated and reciprocal duties attendant, the privileges bestowed and corresponding responsibilities implied by the whole document would be an herculean task, requiring more of your time than discretion dictates should be taken. Perhaps a less monumental undertaking more in keeping with your preference will serve the purpose of imparting to you some of the meaning to me of the phrase "I Am an American."

With what are we endowed by the guaranties of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? And what are our own obligations

in respect to our possession and maintenance of that endowment?

None is so naive to believe that our greatest bounty, life itself, is bestowed on us by other than the great Giver from above, or that its perpetuity is a creation of man. We do, however, in these United States hold most dear life's safeguards provided within the scope and by the concept of our institutions. Constitutional and statutory guaranties make it certain that the privilege of living and living unconfined is preserved, save only that it may be denied as a result of proper proceedings upon a judgment legally found for commission of defined transgressions willfully committed against the society of which we are a part. No man may be so free in the exercise of his privileges of citizenship as to commit unrestricted violence on his neighbor. Having been apprehended, however, in violation of those principles so plainly engraved in the thoughts of honest citizens that they need no elucidation in the statutes of this country, though they are there for all to see, it may become obligatory in the course of extraction of justice to require that the transgressor's life or freedom be taken in forfeit. If such be the case, we know it was the result of a considered judgment by a jury of our peers and not because of the arbitrary whim of a reigning despot. It is incumbent upon us to defend our right to live. It is equally imperative that we be as ardent defenders of that same right of our neighbor.

We do not guarantee the perpetuation of life, because that is a matter for the hand of God only, but He helps him who helps himself. In the course of our national evolution, from the earliest days of the Republic until the present, we now stand astride the world with the most potent of all institutions for scientific research and development. Those who have toiled in them have searched again and again through almost insurmountable difficulties to find the answers for a successful combating of the diseases which have wreaked their havoc on mankind since before the dawn of history. As a result of the God-given talents and tireless efforts of those who have enjoyed the privileges of citizenship in this country, among them a number not native born, there has arisen many an aid to the extension of life's span beyond the normal scope in other spheres. Today citizenship on this soil carries with it insurance of the longest life expectancy in the world. It, therefore, becomes our obligation to nurture, foster, and assist in every way possible by our own contributions the preservation and extension of that privilege to humanity.

What liberties do we possess and what obligations do we own for their continued maintenance? We are entitled to the free prosecution of any religious belief dictated by the individual conscience. Whether we be Protestant or Catholic, Jew or gentile, sectarian or nonsectarian, no man may proscribe our religious belief and avid practice of our belief. One of the basic tenets of a good American is the partnership of God and man. No citizen can be a good American who fails to pay homage to God for the bounties He has bestowed on this Nation individually and collectively. That is as true as that no citizen can be a good American who abjures the principles of the Constitution. Devotion to the laws of God and the laws of the United States is both separate and inseparable; devotion to the two is concomitant to being a good American. You and I, who may follow our religious conscience at will, must respect the same privilege for our fellow man and accord him the same freedom we choose to demand for ourselves without an effort to suppress that of another.

Again, we exercise the privileges of free speech and are allowed an unrestricted press, save only for treasonable utterances, slanders and libels. We may differ with an executive, with a legislator, or a judicial officer in the performance of his duty. We may criticize him for a failure of performance. We may find fault with our neighbor and be assured that it is one of the privileges we enjoy as American citizens. In turn, we have the duty to preserve for our fellow men the same prerogatives we accept for ourselves.

We are a democracy within a republic. Titles of nobility are prohibited under our system. That is true whether the title be one of hereditary origin or one conferred by our Government. We recognize neither prince nor kingdom, overlord nor serf. Our ancestry is of no consequence. It is what we are that matters. No significance is attached to whence we come; it matters only whither we go. We as citizens can seek the highest or the lowest office in the land and be successful in our efforts, if it is the will of the constituency to whom we make our appeal. That right is prohibited none only in that article I of the Constitution provides, "No person except a natural-born citizen, or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President." We may be Senator, a Congressman, a member of the United States Supreme Court, a governor, a clerk or a recorder, an enforcement officer or any one of a hundred other cogs in the wheel of governmental progress, if we are favored by the electorate. If we do not choose to seek the office, we have the right to aid in choosing him who may hold the office; if we comply with the regulations properly invoked, prescribing the privilege to vote. That is our great American system of selecting those who shall administer the affairs of state, both national and local. That right to serve in public office or aid in the selection of him who does serve, places on our shoulders the responsibility of selecting one who exercises the most careful and candid judgment in keeping with American ideals in order that we may preserve the institutions which have lived so long and prospered so well on this continent.

Within the limits of our own talents, energy, initiative, and ability, we may pursue with success a chosen profession or occupation. There is no more exemption from unremitting toil here than there is in any other country; no more surcease from the struggles and heartbreaking disappointments common to mankind on these shores than elsewhere. There is the assurance we can wage the battle. There is no guaranty that prosperity will ensue from our efforts, but there is the guaranty that we may make the effort. We must, therefore, maintain for those who will come after us the right to toil, earn, and accumulate without paying toll and tribute save of our own volition.

We may become educated or remain illiterate; we may travel even to the extent of becoming nomads or remain at home; we may work or we may idle; we may exercise our own will in many things; we may not prohibit to others those things we choose for ourselves, nor may we enforce upon others the responsibilities we are not willing to accept. These and many other things are our liberties which we are bound to preserve with integrity for the benefit of others who may seek to do likewise. To exercise our rights and shoulder our responsibilities is a duty upon every citizen. To do otherwise would be but to put in reverse one of the basic tenets of good government, that "the people should support the Government—not the Government support the people."

In the pursuit of happiness, which is founded upon the right to life and liberty, we are bound only by the restrictions that we shall not invade and transgress upon those who seek to do likewise or violate the general welfare. No man can enjoy life or liberty on these shores without some happiness ensuing; nor can he be happy without the right to life and liberty.

The ultimate of happiness may be achieved only if we have faith in America; faith in its institutions; faith in its future; faith in Americanism. In the course of human events, in the course of internal and international relationships, it has been necessary too many times for the sons of this Nation to take up arms to preserve the privileges of citizenship in a free America. No words of mine can adequately portray the glories of the accomplishments of those who have given so much in life and life's blood to that task. Just 2 years ago the armed might of our country brought to a successful conclusion the most costly and destructive of all wars. Those who went forth to do battle for preservation of the guaranties of citizenship which we, at times, accept so lightly, had faith. Many have not come back. We can be grateful that those who have returned did so with renewed faith in the full knowledge that the future of this Nation lies in the future; that there is no happiness if we dwell in the glories of the past, decry the decadence of the present, and express hopelessness of the future.

We cannot accept the benefits the young men and women have bestowed upon us by the victory they have won without assuming the responsibility for carrying on with them shoulder to shoulder the current struggle to resist other isms seeking the overthrow of the fundamental of all Americanism. We, the new citizens of this Nation, by our oath of allegiance, expressed during the naturalization proceedings or implied when we reached man's estate, have forsaken allegiance to all beliefs and institutions save those upon which this Nation was founded and prospered. There is no place in America for fascism, nazism, communism. There is no place in America for the hyphenated American; the German-American, Polish-American, French-American, Italian-American, Chinese-American. We can be Americans or non-Americans; we cannot divide our allegiance and be both for there is no middle ground. We are either Americans or we are not. There is a place only for Americanism. We owe the duty to maintain with our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor the future of America wherein this happiness may be found.

All those things have been constructed, maintained and will be preserved to our posterity if we sustain the spirit of liberty. That is the spirit which brought all our forefathers to these shores and now has brought you. This spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who centuries ago attempted to teach mankind a lesson which it has never learned, but a lesson it has never quite forgotten; it is the spirit of America, which has never been and which may never be, which never will be except as the courage and conscience of American citizens create and preserve it; the spirit that lies concealed in some form in the hopes and aspirations of all; the spirit which, fostered and nurtured, continues to grow for the future. It is in that spirit I ask you again to repeat in silence to yourselves the pledge of allegiance, with full appreciation of its meaning to the man who can say with pride, "I am an American."

Unification of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of May 15, 1947:

MERGER DISGUISED

One of the most important pieces of legislation to the people of this country at the present time is the proposed National Security Act of 1947. This is commonly known as the armed services merger bill. It is now being considered by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House.

The Truman administration is exerting every effort and trying every political trick to force this legislation out of the committees and enact it during this session of Congress. It is President Truman's bill. It is the most important bill he has yet sent to Congress, and in all likelihood the most important he will introduce during the remainder of his term of office.

On the whole, this merger bill is opposed by at least 90 percent of the professional Navy and Naval Reserve officers as well as a goodly percentage of the Army and Army Reserve officers. It is presented to Congress and the American people as a plan desired by both the Army and the Navy. Nothing could be further from the whole truth. It is mainly desired only by a few military men at the top who believe that they can achieve a few selfish ends and gain in power and personal prestige through some such organization as is demanded in this bill. Some want to control the whole military organization and through that control actually then control the country.

There is no question but what the policy of the Navy Department and the policy of the War Department is that of supporting this bill, and it is widely publicized that this bill represents an agreement between the War and Navy Departments, but let's look behind this agreement.

In the first place, if there ever was a "shotgun marriage," this is it. The President has used his power to force his Secretaries of Navy and War to resolve their respective differences and agree on some kind of a plan. They have been told to do this or else—

On January 16 they sent a letter to the President stating that they had made this agreement; however, about all they did then was agree to agree and had worked out a general outline of agreement. This National Security Act of 1947, the result of this agreement, certainly is not agreed to by the vast majority of the men in the Navy, plus a goodly number in the Army and Army Air Corps. Furthermore, and this is important, neither the Navy Department nor the War Department has made any effort whatsoever to find out how the professional officers as well as the Reserve officers feel about this matter; instead they have boldly announced this merger as the policy of the Navy and War Departments.

In fact this policy represents only two or three men at the top, while the thousands and thousands of men who have to shoulder the responsibility of making any defense plan operate efficiently and smoothly have had absolutely nothing to say regarding this proposed bill. This is clearly wrong and should not be tolerated, and the Congress should be the first to realize it is wrong and the Congress should act accordingly.

This merger bill calls for the creation of a Secretary of National Defense who has absolute power over all of the Military Establishment of the United States, as well as all industry and all manpower in time of war. If established, this Secretary of National Defense would have the power to be a military dictator of the Nation.

We have never experienced or tolerated in this country the granting of such power. The powers of this proposed Secretary of National Defense are tremendous and very far-reaching. And it is highly questionable whether the creation of such a powerful person in the military organization would give to the United States the best possible military policy. In time of war he would control the Nation.

Another questionable feature of this proposed legislation is the establishment of an independent Department of Air. In other words, this bill is said to be a merger bill but instead of merging, it actually is in a sense expanding the military forces from two departments to three departments. Again it is very debatable whether or not the establishment of an independent Department of Air is the best policy for the defense, and the offense of the country in time of war.

It is well known, and it has been well illustrated by the recent war that air power must be closely integrated in every way and in every detail with the operation of the Army and the Navy if it is to be most effective. To make air power independent so that it does not need to take orders except from its own commanders and can ignore requests of other service commanders seems to be a step in the wrong direction consistent with a well-integrated military policy.

It is well to consider this situation from the viewpoint of 10 years, 15 years, or 20 years in the future. You may be assured by this time there will be no such thing as piloted aircraft in warfare. The striking power of the strategic air force of the last war just ended was great bomber fleets. In the future war it appears that this striking power will be completely accomplished through the use of rockets, directed missiles, fly bombs of all types, homing projectiles, flight torpedoes, pilotless aircraft, and other forms of radio-directed weapons and electronics. In the short space of 10 years, it is quite possible there will be no need whatsoever for a separate Department of Air in the National Military Establishment.

All air weapons are weapons used not only to force destruction upon the enemy but to reduce resistance to the point that the ground and surface forces may take over the enemies' territory. As a result it is most necessary that these air weapons be under the complete control of the Army and Navy, however they choose to use them.

No service should be limited in the use of any weapon. Neither the Navy nor the Army should be restricted in any way in the employment of weapons used by the other service. Neither should be restricted in any way to the area of operations of the other service. Both should give the utmost assistance possible to the other service in the successful performance of their assignments just as they did in the last war where we even found the Navy assisting in the crossing of the Rhine.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Approve Continuation of State Department's Informational and Cultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter from National Commander in Chief Louis E. Starr, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, to the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, chairman of the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee, expressing the approval of his organization of H. R. 3342 to continue the State Department's cultural and informational program.

The VFW endorsement of this program, along with that previously expressed by the American Legion puts these two great veterans' organizations on record in behalf of this vital and necessary project. It is my hope that the House will consider the wishes of these two outstanding organizations and accord its approval to H. R. 3342 so that the Voice of America will not be silenced but will continue to give to the world the true picture of our country, our institutions, and our ideals.

MAY 20, 1947.

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
Chairman, Subcommittee of House Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Re H. R. 3342.

MY DEAR MR. MUNDT: This is to express the interest and approval of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States with respect to a bill introduced by you and identified as H. R. 3342.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars strongly approved and supported the organization and charter of the United Nations and it was my privilege to represent our organization as consultant to the American delegation in San Francisco, Calif. In my opinion adherence to the purposes of the United Nations and its charter requires a participating nation to establish and maintain a cultural relations program. Therefore, it would seem to be not only good judgment but an obligation for the Congress of the United States to establish a valid basis for the development and continuation of a cultural relations program which includes explanatory broadcasts by this Government concerning its ideals and way of life.

It was my privilege and pleasure to issue a statement in support of President Truman's proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey, which proposal has been approved by the Congress and is sometimes referred to as the Truman plan. In my opinion, if the so-called Truman plan is worthy and deserving of the support of the Congress and the American people then, by the same token, there should be established and maintained a program of cultural relations with the necessary authority and appropriations to broadcast explanations of how and why we do certain things in the United States.

I am hopeful that your committee will favorably report H. R. 3342 and that it will eventually be approved by the Congress and signed by the President.

Respectfully yours,

LOUIS E. STARR,
Commander in Chief.

Copy to Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, Member of Congress.

Why Not Another Bond Drive—This One for Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago a very interesting article appeared in the Washington News written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. I have

read and reread it a dozen times, and each time I am more impressed with the suggestion—$250,000,000,000 to win the war; why not ten billions to win the peace? There is a small minority in the United States that can only think in terms of war, but I know that the overwhelming mass of American people are praying and thinking in terms of peace. Some of our people are thinking only in terms of rebuilding Germany and looking forward to reaping millions of dollars worth of profit out of the investments that they shall make in German industry. Of course, they will be able to hire labor at slave wages; likewise they will not be subject to the heavy income taxes in the United States. It is a grand and golden opportunity to make millions of dollars in profits for a short while. Europe is so devastated and the market is unlimited, but in 10 or 15 years from now there will come another German leader who will rally his people to kick out the American exploiters. By that time Germany will be powerful and even stronger than she was before World War II. She will have the advantage of all the advanced American methods of production.

Yes; then will come another Hitler, Kaiser, Bismarck, or Frederick the Great. Another German leader will arise to expel the British and American investors, and take over the new and powerful rebuilt Germany. Then will come World War III.

Where will we look for allies? Who will be with us? Can we expect the support of the nations who were the victims of Nazi aggression? We must give those nations who were our allies an opportunity to rebuild their economy now. They should not be made to depend upon German industry again. They will never understand why the United States had forsaken them for Germany.

I am very much disturbed and fearful over our present policy. It seems to me that the only result of this policy will be a flock of American "Made in Germany" millionaires, and the pay-off will be the enmity of Europe, and another German war in 20 years from now.

The article follows:

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK, Thursday.—In my mail yesterday I found a letter which the writer told me he was sending to several people in the Government, and I can't help thinking that it makes sense, so I publish it here:

"This is John Q. Public talking—talking about the price of peace.

"Like millions of other Johns, I bought Defense bonds because I didn't want to see war come to us.

"And then like millions of other Johns, I bought war bonds because I wanted to end the war as quickly as possible.

"Those billions of dollars helped doctor a sick world, but the ravages of that illness are still with us. The distress, the suffering, the famine, the fear of millions of Johns and their families in Europe and elsewhere is almost beyond the comprehension of the Johns of the still fabulously rich United States.

"Since distress, suffering, famine, fear is the mixture that creates the Hitlers of history, obviously the ravages of World War II are the festering grounds for World War III, or the great holocaust. Obviously, too, the pattern will be repeated and we will have defense bonds and war bonds.

"Why wait? Why wait for defense bonds and war bond drives for World War III? Why wait and blow our bond money into the faces of our brothers in other parts of the world? Why not have a peace bond drive now and blow our bond money into the mouths, the hands, the living hearts of the people in distress?

"Are the glories of war so great that we would more willingly buy bonds to win a war than buy bonds to buy a peace? They say it will take $10,000,000,000 to straighten out the economics and straighten up the backs of the distressed nations of the world. That's only the price of a few days of World War III.

"Let's have a peace bond drive now and raise that $10,000,000,000. Let the 'arsenal of democracy' demonstrate its love for peace as well as its strength for war. Peace bond drive now—or war bond drives later. Is there a John Q. Public anywhere who would hesitate in his choice?"

The suggestion made by Henry Wallace in Paris that a loan to the U. S. S. R. might be made through the International Bank under given conditions does not seem to me such a foolish idea, for certainly the U. S. S. R. is a much devastated country and must need a loan as much as any other country.

However, I can't help feeling that we really ought to make a loan, not of money but of men as well. Our best and brightest young executives in every field should be picked by their superiors who know their ability. They should be made responsible for producing results through a comprehensive loan which would really begin to rehabilitate the world.

It is a tremendous dream, but I think the time calls for more imagination and for dreaming on a vaster scale than we have ever had before. It's men with energy and ability backed by the resources which they know this country has, who can swing a gigantic economic program such as we face today in the world as a whole.

Nine Hundred Thousand Elks Fight Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report by Algird Kazemekas, exalted ruler, Naugatuck, Conn., Lodge, No. 967, BPOE:

NINE HUNDRED THOUSAND ELKS FIGHT UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES ON SEVENTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY; GREAT PATRIOTIC ORDER DECLARES WAR ON SUBVERSIVE GROUPS

In every part of the United States, from Hawaii to Georgia, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, celebrating its seventy-ninth anniversary this month, is fighting against communism, the Ku Klux Klan, and all other groups of malcontents who are bent on destroying our form of government. The campaign is making considerable progress, according to a statement from Grand Exalted Ruler Charles E. Broughton attending an Elk conference in St. Louis and received this week by Algird Kazemekas, exalted ruler of Elk Lodge, No. 967, in Naugatuck.

"We have here the greatest and happiest country in the world, with the highest standard of living ever known," said Mr. Broughton, Wisconsin newspaperman. "It is up to all of us to protect what we have so painstakingly built and the 900,000 members of this great patriotic body are doing just that in a vigorous campaign reaching into every corner of the country.

"We have already caused the revocation of the charter of the Ku Klux Klan in Wisconsin and Georgia and we are working toward similar action in all other States where this un-American organization has raised its head. The Indiana Legislature has unanimously gone on record favoring the outlawing of any organization like the Klan based on hatred and prejudice.

"One of the spots where the Communists are most aggressively trying to seize control is Hawaii, perhaps because that is our great bastion nearest to Russia, the home of communism, which kills the spirit and enslaves the individual. In Honolulu, the Elks lodge, 1,900 strong, has gone into a relentless battle to save our American institutions, appropriating $10,000 from its treasury and enlisting the active support of every civic, religious, fraternal group and club in the islands. Elsewhere other Elk lodges are fighting the subversive elements just as grimly and vigorously."

From every platform where Mr. Broughton has spoken in his swings around the country he has spread the warning of America's danger and the gospel of patriotism as against a doctrine of hatred. "It is very pleasing to note the cordial reception I have received at the hands of the press in all parts of the country in this campaign to bring government closer to the people and to maintain the freedoms for which so many have given their lives," he stated.

"Created on February 16, 1868, by 15 New York actors as a social and mutual assistance organization, the Order of Elks has become one of the greatest patriotic bodies in the history of our country, fast approaching the million mark in membership and maintaining lodges in 1,450 cities in every State and Territory in the Union.

"The history of the Elks is a stupendous story of good will and good acts. Without any religious, political, or commercial angles, the Elks have gone quietly about their work of enhancing the welfare of their fellow man in a manner which has saved countless lives and brought cheer and happiness to millions of unfortunate people. One of the smallest of the Elks' contributions to American welfare has been the raising among their own membership of $70,000,000 which they have given, without any strings attached, to people in need of help.

"During World War II their work was priceless in maintaining 155 fraternal centers near military camps where they entertained, fed, and housed millions of service people, in addition to their work of enlisting 97,000 Navy Seabees, 36,000 Army engineers, and thousands of nurses and air cadets. The order is now cooperating with the United States Army in a national campaign to encourage enlistments in our new land forces. As part of their peacetime program the Elks are taking care of sick and wounded war veterans in 300 hospitals and will continue to do so as long as there is a single veteran in a hospital.

"The work the Elks did during the war is one of the reasons the order has grown from 490,000 in 1941 to more than 900,000, including thousands of World War II veterans."

Buying on Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

wish to include an editorial, Buying on Credit, which appeared in the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., on May 21, 1947:

BUYING ON CREDIT

At the end of March the oustanding volume of consumer credit—i. e., installment credit, service credit, single payment loans, and charge accounts—reached a record total of $10,000,000,000. That is an increase of 44 percent for the year and double the amount of consumer credit outstanding in mid-1944. Despite this great expansion, however, the Department of Commerce points out that the volume of consumer credit is still far below what might be expected on the basis of prewar relationships to income.

There are a good many reasons for the rapid growth of installment loans and charge accounts during the past year. Relaxation of the Federal Reserve Board's consumer credit regulations has had some effect in encouraging expansion. Another important reason for the recent rise in consumer credit is the increasing supplies of durable goods, such as automobiles and household equipment, that are usually bought on time. Finally, the public is running out of surplus cash acquired during the war years when prices were controlled and there were fewer goods for civilians to buy.

The last named cause of the upturn in the volume of consumer credit is currently attracting a good deal of notice. Some observers are inclined to view the trend with alarm as indicative of a buying slump ahead, with a subsequent decline in business activity. At any rate, there is considerable evidence to support the view that the country is returning to a prewar pattern of consumer buying, with credit rather than savings being used to bolster up buying demands. The sharp rise in living costs since the end of price control has made inroads on current incomes and earnings, thereby reducing the savings capacity of the people. For instance, in 1940 the average family saved about 10 percent of its net income. In the last war year, 1945, nearly 24 percent of family income was saved. Since then the rate of savings has declined until it is estimated to be back at the prewar 10 percent average level. Furthermore, the lower income groups have been especially hard hit by the rise in prices, with the result that their capacity to save—never great—has doubtless been seriously impaired, and in some cases destroyed.

Thus while the volume of consumer credit is still limited in relation to the total net income of the buying public, danger signals are being hoisted. For the rise in consumer credits, coupled with evidence of increasing consumer resistance to high prices, indicates that we canont rely upon hoarded or current savings to support a business boom at the inflated price levels now prevailing.

The rise in consumer credits also emphasizes the need for caution in extending loans for purchases of nonproductive consumer goods, and underlines the desirability of legislation that would provide for permanent consumer-credit control by the Federal Reserve System. At present such controls rest on an Executive order of 1941. It is reported that the Federal Reserve Board is preparing to recommend the immediate dropping of all remaining controls if Congress adjourns without enacting permanent legislation to extend its regulatory powers in the consumer-credit field.

It is to be hoped that the Board's repeated request for congressional action will be heeded. For control over consumer credits can help to check unsound expansion of this type of lending and can be used either to restrain consumer spending in boom periods by tightening restrictions or to stimulate buying in periods of depression by a relaxation of restrictions. As stated in the Federal Reserve Bulletin some time ago, consumer-credit regulation, "along with more fundamental measures for promoting economic stability, continues to be a form of governmental action that serves an important public purpose."

Resolution Adopted by Board of Aldermen, Chelsea, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen, Chelsea, Mass., in which they endorse the movement of the Massachusetts Allied Veteran Housing Council for the immediate alleviation of the housing shortage:

Resolutions endorsing the movement of the Massachusetts Allied Veterans' Housing Council for the immediate alleviation of the housing shortage

Whereas the crisis of not having proper American homes, not only for the civilians but also for the veterans and their widows and children; and

Whereas there seems to be no need of the bottleneck caused by the nonmovement of necessary materials to construct homes for the people of the United States, except for the apparent jockeying of various political leaders; and

Whereas recently there was formed in our State the Massachusetts Allied Veterans' Housing Council, which is attempting to bring together the American Veterans' Committee, the American Veterans of World War II, the Disabled American Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, the Marine Corps League, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and

Whereas the national office of the American Legion has declined to join the local council because of their national policy and not because they are opposed to the aims of the local council; and

Whereas the Massachusetts council is approaching the solution of the shortage of homes

First: By the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which would make probably ten million low-cost housing units at the rate of one million a year, and

Second: Construction of veteran housing projects by municipalities as authorized by the legislature.

Therefore the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., endorses the aims of the Massachusetts Allied Veterans' Housing Council.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, His Excellency Governor Bradford, Senate President Nicholson, House Speaker Willis, Senators Lodge and Saltonstall, Congressman Lane, State Senator Melley, and our Representatives Kamens and Cronin, and the Massachusetts Allied Veterans' Housing Council.

JAMES A. HANLON.

We Must Tell Our Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial in the Atlanta Constitution on Sunday, May 18, 1947, entitled "We Must Tell Our Story."

I concur heartily in what Mr. McGill has to say and believe that we should by all means maintain our program of information to let the world know the facts of life about our American way of life.

WE MUST TELL OUR STORY

(By Ralph McGill)

Last year one soap company in this country spent $30,000,000, mostly on the radio, to sell soap to the women of this country.

I offer no objection.

But, I do offer objection, not as a Democrat or Republican, but as an American, to the proposal that this country shall not be allowed to spend as much money on a program of information—not propaganda—which lets the people of the world who do not have access to our newspapers and domestic radio know the facts of life about this country.

I want them to know that we are not a nation of imperialists, militarists, gangsters, and boors, as the Russian propaganda service daily informs Europe and South America. I want them to know we are not a nation of Hollywood divorcees; that our daily fair is not race riots and strikes.

I want them to know those things when they occur, but I also want them to know we are a nation where dams are built, where wheat is grown, where children are fed milk; that we have artists, musicians, orchestras, writers, and good well-meaning people who want peace and have a way of life they believe is best productive of a good standard of living and peace.

Who is on my side?

Secretary of State Marshall, speaking out of his personal experience in China, Russia, and other parts of the world, says it is vital.

Secretary of Commerce Harriman, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and the Court of St. James's, declares it necessary.

General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, out of their own experience, view as imperative the need for better understanding abroad.

Present Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Bedell Smith, puts it first on his priority list.

It is ridiculous to assume these men would declare vital anything which was "leftist" or unnecessary.

It has been said it does not reach an audience.

Who says so?

Not a single person who knows.

The Russians say they are hearing it. Marshall Tito publicly and officially has commented on the fact his people were listening. Thousands of letters, commenting on the program, asking for further information about America, seeking information about missing relatives, have been received.

About 84 percent of almost half a million such letters asked to be put on the mailing list for schedules. In the first 4 months of this year almost 80,000 such letters have been received in 14 languages. Keep in mind it is difficult to write such letters from many countries.

WIRE SERVICES

It is argued our news associations can do it. That is preposterous.

They send a schedule of news. But editors who receive it select what will sell their papers. Tommy Manville's tenth marriage gets a play. So do lynchings in Georgia and the exposé of the latest Hollywood love nest.

In a trip around the world in 1945 I saw the children and adults of Turkey, China, India, Egypt, Australia, Iran, and of European countries flocking to see educational movies of our farms, steel mills, factories, and home life; flocking to see our books, magazines, and pictures. It is true, too, in South America.

I saw it again last year in Germany, Italy, and Greece.

A short while ago I had a letter from independent and incorruptible newsmen who were amazed to see in Peiping, Singapore, Rangoon, and Saigon how eagerly the people were devouring facts, not propaganda, about the United States. All over the world the hunger for American books and information is great. Shall they receive only books from Russia and other nations?

There has been so much of pettiness in opposition to this program of information.

Those who disliked OWE transferred their dislike to this service. It is not the same. OWE and OWIAA had about 11,000 personnel in the last year of the war, OIC has 3,000 and I submit the responsibilities are as great.

FAIR PLAY

I believe in fair play. Yet, some of the opponents of this service which Secretary of State George Marshall declares to be vital, attack its director, William Benton, because, of all things, he was a partner of Chester Bowles 12 long years ago. As far as I am concerned Chester Bowles is looking better every day as a prophet, but he has nothing to do with William Benton or the OIC.

They attack a selection of pictures from modern American art. I don't know how good it was and neither do the chief critics. The answer seems to be that in Czechoslovakia, where it currently is being shown, great crowds have seen it and a request has been made for an extension of its stay.

There is petty and unfair criticism of its programs.

The critics made this error. They forget the fact the programs are aimed, not at Americans who know about their country, but at peoples ir other lands who don't. The programs must be keyed to that fact.

That there have been errors and inefficient acts I am sure is true. The personnel is human.

During the war this country spoke with a loud voice.

In peace it is even more important that her real story be made known and she speaks loudly, but factually, so that in all the confusion and clamor of ideologies there may be one sure voice speaking out for the American ideal and way of life, letting the world know the light still burns in the torch of liberty and freedom for the individual man.

Price Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial, A Promise Unfulfilled, which appeared in the Winston-Salem Journal, Winston-Salem, N. C., on May 20, 1947:

A PROMISE UNFULFILLED

Republican leaders who fought so hard to abolish OPA, and finally succeeded, assured the people that prices would come down as a result of higher production, once all Government control of prices was discontinued.

The record proves, however, that this is another promise that the Republicans in Congress have failed to keep. Statistics show that on May 10, this year, the general level of wholesale prices was no less than 30.2 percent higher than on June 30, 1946, when the old OPA act was permitted to expire. By groups of commodities the wholesale price increases have been as follows during this period:

	Percent
Farm products	25.7
Foods	42.1
Hides and leather goods	34.7
Textile products	27.2
Fuel and lighting	18.9
Metals and metal goods	26.1
Building materials	37.1
Chemicals, allied goods	33.6
House furnishings	16.2
Miscellaneous	21.5

The big increases came last year in farm products, foods, and textiles, while this year the largest price increases have been in metals and metal goods and building materials.

It was promised that building construction would be stimulated if industry were given full and free play. So far in 1947, however, building has declined, and present predictions are that 1947 will see the accomplishment of only about two-thirds of the program set earlier for this year. Producers and the public alike have been deterred from going ahead by high prices, of labor as well as of materials.

According to F. W. Dodge Corp., construction contracts awarded in 37 States east of the Rocky Mountains in April dropped 18 percent below the volume reported for the corresponding month last year.

The Necessity of Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago I had the pleasure of attending a banquet given by the adult farmers of one of the fine agricultural communities of my district. The banquet was attended by a large number of men and women who depend upon the arts of agriculture for their livelihood and who know at least a little something about the mysteries of the good earth.

At this banquet I had the privilege of hearing one of the best speeches I have ever had the pleasure of hearing on the necessity of soil conservation. The speech was delivered by a 14-year-old freshman from the Youngsville High School, Franklin County, N. C.—Wiley Mitchell, Jr. His delivery was magnificent. The young man spoke with all the poise and ease of an experienced orator. In fact, the speech was more impressive because it was delivered by a very manly young man who was still a youth of tender age. As he spoke to his adult audience, the thought came to me: "A little child shall lead them," for, in fact, a little child not only led but ably discussed one of the most important problems which at this time faces the people of our great Nation.

I commend to you, the Members of Congress, and to the country the able discussion by my young constituent, Wiley Mitchell, Jr., of the subject The Necessity of Soil Conservation:

It has been said that all mankind is within 8 inches of starvation. This means that only the top 8 inches of the soil is fertile enough to be productive. Is not this ample proof that if good health is our No. 1 need, then soil conservation is surely our No. 2 need. Two of the main objectives of the good-health program are a sufficient, well-balanced diet for every man, woman, and child in the United States, and the proper maintenance of a healthy body by periodical medical treatment. The same is true of our soil. To be productive it, too, must have not only a sufficient amount of plant food, but also the economical maintenance of a fertile, well-kept soil, by proper treatment and conservation.

In communities or sections where soil conservation is practiced, you will find progressive and prosperous farmers, whose families live comfortably in attractive, well-kept homes. This is made possible by profits derived from luxuriant crops growing upon fertile, well-kept soil. It is in such communities that you will find good schools and churches, a high community spirit, and a still higher standard of living. Why, you ask? Because these farmers have availed themselves of the vast store of knowledge on soil improvement furnished by their Federal, State, and county departments of agriculture. They have put this knowledge to work and have found that the more they do for the soil, the more it will do for them.

But despite all this wealth of knowledge to be had for the asking, there are still far too many sections where the soil is abused, misused, and robbed of its fertility. A reconnaissance erosion survey in North Carolina in 1934 showed that more than three-fourths of the land area of this State had lost about one-fourth of its original fertility. By practicing the known methods of conservation, this could have been prevented.

Conservation measures are of three types: Work on the land to protect it against erosion; improvement of the land by crop rotation, diversification, and other treatments; and use of the land in accordance with its needs and adaptabilities, as well as its physical capabilities.

There are two main types of soil erosion. In one the soil is washed away. This type is known as water erosion. An example of this form of erosion would be the Blue Ridge Mountains. Once these mountains stood 30,000 feet high; now they are less than one-third that height. The soil has been worn away, carried to the ocean by numerous streams and rivers. The same is done on all our soil; piedmont, mountainous, and even our coastal plains are affected. About 38,000,000 million acres of once-productive farm land in the South has been so badly eroded and wasted that it is now unfit for cultivation. If we are to live and prosper, if mankind is to exist, this must be stopped.

Sheet erosion, our second type, is caused by wind and water. This type may be illustrated by the dust storms of our Middle Western States. This illustration is not typical of most forms of sheet erosion, however. In most cases the soil is moved a little at a time. That is why it is not noticed until it is too late. Forest projects or some close-growing crop will not only serve to prevent erosion, but will also put the otherwise idle land into production.

The South contains 28 percent of the country's area. It is a region with an abundance of natural resources. It has a mild climate, suited to growing crops, and a large population. Yet the South is known as the poorest region in the United States. Why? Because we have failed to control two of our deadliest enemies, erosion and depletion. If we wish to raise our low rating in the Nation we must put to work every known method of reducing wastefulness.

Improvement of the soil is an important step in the conservation program. This may be done by crop rotation, diversification, and other treatments.

What is meant by crop rotation? This means that the crops follow each other in systematic succession from year to year rather than in irregular order. For example, a common rotation in many parts of the corn belt is corn, wheat, and clover, the crops following each other regularly in the order named. Each crop grows on a given field once in 3 years. Crop rotation has numerous advantages, one of which is that the different crops take different amounts of the various plant foods and organic matter from the soil. The change of crops prevents the using up entirely of any one element in the soil. Other advantages are that insects, plant diseases, and weeds are more easily controlled, equipment is used more efficiently, and man and animal labor is more evenly distributed, as well as more effectively used.

There are certain rules that must be followed in successful crop rotation, however. The first to consider is to use crops best suited to the soil, climate, and market conditions. And most important of all, crops that have an even distribution of labor throughout the different periods of the year. We must grow plants that will give to the soil rather than take away, and crops that have the highest yields for the least amount of labor.

Crop rotation and crop diversification are almost synonymous, as the latter means the growing of a variety of crops instead of only one or two, while the former means "to vary in succession." Diversification means, in other words, that instead of planting on the "one crop system," a farmer should have several more crops on which he can depend in case his money crop fails. These varied crops not only give the farmer a better chance of making a profit, but also aid in enriching the soil. Therefore, diversification is rotation. If a farmer is carrying out the principles of rotation, he will naturally have more than one crop planted on his farm. Then, he is more able to adjust his crops to meet consumer demand.

The relationship between land and people is inevitable. Poor land means poor people. The whole social and economic status of the South and of the Nation is influenced by this relationship. There are enough farmers in the South who have kept their farms in first-class shape to show the possibilities of all southern farmers, if they are willing to work. On farms where yields bring hardly enough to pay for the cost of production, what else can we expect but poverty, disease, and ruin? If we are to raise our southern standard of living, something must be done about these poor conditions.

Facts show that more than one-tenth of our southern cropland, or 12,500,000 acres, should be taken out of cultivation, because it is too steep and too erodible for cultivation on safe terms. This land could be made profitable by adopting a forest or permanent pasture project. Both are cheap means of accomplishing two main objectives of every farmer; preventing erosion and putting otherwise idle land into production. A good crop of timber may be grown in about 20 to 25 years, while a well-developed pasture can be used indefinitely.

There are 6,275,769 acres of land in the South that have soil-conserving treatments, but 16 times as much land remains untreated. In round figures, of the 100,000,000 acres of farm land in the South, only about 6,500,000 acres have soil treatment. This means approximately 95 percent of the farm land in the South is not being properly used, cultivated, or preserved. What does this do to our standard of living? What will this mean to future farmers?

Our natural resources are our second line of defense in our country. Our great efforts today to safeguard our hard-won liberty and to preserve the rights and privileges for which our country has fought call for large amounts of equipment and supplies. This means that there is a greater demand for our natural resources and most of all, food. During these critical times of readjustment and rehabilitation, when America feeds not only herself, but the countries of Europe and Asia as well, the draw on these supplies is tremendous.

America can meet the ever-growing demands upon her only if she to a man puts into practice all the wealth of knowledge available to her. We can get the most out of the Nation only by putting the best efforts and practices to work in it to try to realize the greatest gains. Can this be accomplished when 95 percent of our southern farm land is rapidly becoming a depleted delapidated waste? We must not only think of our present-day needs, but of future generations that will have to pay for our thoughtlessness. The future of the South and of the Nation is in the hands of the present-day farmer. To make this future bright he must wage a constant war upon his deadliest enemies—soil erosion and depletion. Let America, heretofore known as the world's most wasteful nation, set the example for all nations by becoming the world's most conservative nation. Thus only will America reap the fullest benefits from her land; and thus only can she hope to remain the world's foremost nation.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Seaway Bill," published in the News-Tribune of Duluth, Minn., for May 12, and an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Plan Chances Improve," published in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle for May 14, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Duluth (Minn.) News-Tribune of May 12, 1947]

THE SEAWAY BILL

Once again there is a St. Lawrence waterway bill before Congress. It means another battle in the long, long war to win this improvement for North America.

Several things about the newest measure seem likely to improve its chances of passage. The opposition is powerful, however, and we have learned from long experience that it is extremely skillful.

To begin with, the measure is introduced by Senator VANDENBERG, whose growth in statesmanlike stature and prestige has been conceded by observers in both parties. Associated with him are Senator FERGUSON, the other Senator from Michigan, and the Senators from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and North Dakota—States with a long-time interest in the waterway. Another Republican, Senator WILSON, of Iowa, also represents the section which thinks of the waterway as a means of improving its transportation facilities.

The New England Republicans, Senators AIKEN, of Vermont, and TOBEY, of New Hampshire, represent a section of the country which is vitally interested in the hydroelectric power the waterway would produce. That interest has been greatly stimulated by the activities of John L. Lewis. Thoughtful New Englanders would like to be sure that their industries were less dependent upon coal for their power.

With them are four Democrats, Senators THOMAS, of Utah; JOHNSTON, of South Carolina; BARKLEY, of Kentucky; and TAYLOR, of Idaho. They prove again that this is a bipartisan measure of interest to the country as a whole, as well as to the sections which can see direct benefits for themselves and to those which, mistakenly, we think, fear that the waterway would injure them.

Representative DONDERO, of Michigan, chairman of the Public Works Committee, has introduced the same measure in the House.

The measure provides for tolls which would be used to pay the cost of the improvement.

Several other factors should improve the bill's chances of passage. It is plainfully apparent that we have not yet entered an era of unthreatened peace. The waterway would do much to increase our military effectiveness. Without it we deliberately weaken ourselves.

Then, too, we find ourselves in an era when the world's hopes are pinned on a revival of international trade. Anything that makes it easier for us to trade with other nations will strengthen their commerce and bolster their living standards, and make it easier for the world to advance along the paths of peace.

It is extremely important that this measure succeed at this session of Congress. It deserves all the support any American can give it.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of May 14, 1947]

ST. LAWRENCE PLAN CHANCES IMPROVE

(By James B. Hutchinson)

WASHINGTON.—Once again the seemingly perennial St. Lawrence seaway and power project is up for congressional consideration.

Practicability of the St. Lawrence seaway has been discussed in Washington for the past 50 years.

Every President, from the late Woodrow Wilson to Harry S. Truman, has recommended favorable congressional action to build the project. So have governors of many Eastern and Western States.

Both Republican and Democratic Parties, at various times, have included a pro-St. Lawrence plank in their national campaign platforms.

Every Senator and Congressman who has held office for more than one term has become familiar with the arguments for and against the seaway.

Without rehashing all the parliamentary details, Congress on several past occasions has debated measures to authorize the St. Lawrence project. But the legislation never has been passed in final form.

Newly introduced St. Lawrence resolutions in House and Senate this year appear to have a far better chance of favorable action than ever before.

Reason is that something new has been added to the St. Lawrence picture:

1. For the first time, the seaway and proposed hydroelectric power station near

Massena, N. Y., are emerging as vital necessities to national defense. Secretary of State George C. Marshall and the Army-Navy Combined Chiefs of Staff assert the seaway and St. Lawrence power will be needed to provide adequate industrial and transportation facilities in any future war.

2. The seaway is needed for shipment of iron ores from the vast new Central Labrador deposits to the Midwest's heavy industries and steel plants, to fill the gap caused by near-exhaustion of Minnesota's Mesabi iron-ore range. The military command fears that without the seaway, the new Laborador ores naturally will go to industries along the Atlantic coast.

3. For the first time, new seaway legislation provides for self-liquidation of the project by a maximum toll charge of $1.25 a ton on shipping. St. Lawrence proponents say this meets with the new economy program of Congress, as it avoids outright payment for the project by the Federal Government. They also assert it defeats opposition arguments that a federally financed seaway would be "subsidized" competition for the railroads.

The plan is to remove remaining obstructions to deep water navigation so the Great Lakes will be open to oceangoing ships, through the St. Lawrence River. In addition, dams would connect Barnhart Island, near Massena, N. Y., to the American and Canadian mainlands. These would develop 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power—virtually equal to output of the Tennessee Valley Authority and produce at a lower rate than any plant in the United States, with possible exception of Niagara.

Of the over-all seaway project, Canada already has built the Welland Canal, connecting Lakes Ontario and Erie.

The United States has built MacArthur lock at Sault Ste. Marie, connecting Lakes Superior and Huron. This country also has done considerable dredging in channels connecting the Lakes, and the channels now are 25 feet deep. Proposed work would make these channels connecting Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, and Erie 27 feet deep.

The High Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, recently there came to my attention an editorial which appeared in Columbia, the national magazine of the Knights of Columbus. I shall ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD, because it is one which all of us should read. It begins by saying:

The people on our street have some ideas about the way things are going.

Later in the editorial it is stated that—

They—

The people on our street—

are convinced that someone is trimming them too close around the ears and they do not like it. They were told, not so very long ago, that the devil was Government controls as administered by the late OPA. Then the story was that the inept OPA was driving goods into the black market. But now there is no OPA and Joe Doakes wants to know why he should have to pay black-market prices for over-the-counter merchandise. He would also like to know when that good old "free competition" is going to start making his week's pay last a whole week. It's only a detail, of course, but it bothers him.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial in its entirety be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The people on our street have some ideas about the way things are going. They are by no means chronic "whiners" but they are unhappy about the prices they have to pay for food and clothing and everything else, about the extreme difficulty of getting and keeping decent living quarters, about the feeling of tension, cantankerousness and uncertainty in the air they breathe. They are confused because they are getting so many different explanations of these matters that they are unable to tell which, if any, is the right one.

They ask you to consider, for example, the innocent citizen who remembers away back when the automobile manufacturers printed the f. o. b. price of their vehicles in their national advertising. He gets a notion that he would like to buy himself a modest little wagon—nothing de luxe, you understand—just a simple boiler of the least costly make and model, so that he can take the wife and children out for a spin Sunday after mass to let them get the 3-room-and-bath kinks out of their frames. Assuming that the miracle happens and he actually gets a car, he also gets a collection of "extras," which are by no means optional, and he pays roughly twice as much as he did before the war.

We leave this discontented brother to cool himself with little squirts of water from that windshield gadget that seems to be the principal postwar contribution of a great industry to its eager customers. He is less to be pitied than the breadwinner who goes out to buy the family shoes and shirts and bacon and eggs and beans and such. After all, you can live without a hydrochloromatic clutch but you do have to eat and, in these latitudes, wear clothes. What the aforesaid breadwinner is asking is why he has to pay $68 and some change for a suit that looks suspiciously like the prewar $40 job; why the price of eggs goes up at the same time that eggs become more plentiful in the market.

The wonderment of the people on our street about these things is rapidly turning into resentment. During the war, they were told to put the blame on the shortages of many consumer items that naturally and unavoidably occurred and they took the explanation, for the most part, with good grace. They do not believe that, at this date, shortages are the cause of the high prices. They are convinced that someone is trimming them too close around the ears and they do not like it. They were told, not so very long ago, that the devil was government controls as administered by the late OPA. Then the story was that the inept OPA was driving goods into the black market. But now there is no OPA and Joe Doakes wants to know why he should have to pay black-market prices for over-the-counter merchandise. He would also like to know when that good old free competition is going to start making his week's pay last a whole week. It's only a detail, of course, but it bothers him.

Some poorly informed captains of industry and commerce, the neighbors say, must be under the impression that during the war all their customers somehow became rich, that their mattresses are still lumpy with fat rolls of hundred-dollar bills, and that the present price scale is just what they need to sustain a healthy pride in their hoard of war bonds. The only trouble with this idea is that it's not so. We'll grant that some citizens did themselves well—and did so legitimately—during the war. But there aren't enough of them to wear all the two-dollar shirts that are being offered at three-ninety-five, and the sooner this is understood the better it will be for all concerned.

When the neighbors get together nowadays, these are the topics of their conversation. They are in a mood to really pour it on, if they could with certainty identify the villain. That's the catch—everybody has an alibi. The corner storekeeper claims he has to pay high prices for his stock; the jobber says the same about the wholesaler; the wholesaler blames the manufacturer; the manufacturer blames the producer of the raw materials and, of course, labor. The producer of raw materials blames—you guessed it—labor.

It seems that labor is getting all the money (although our street gets little mail from Palm Beach), and if labor would stop being annoying and demanding everything would be hunky-dory. In spite of the persuasively written statements in newspaper advertising space, which are a feature of all sizable present-day differences between labor and management, we doubt that this is quite the full story. And the fact that some labor leaders have made serious mistakes or have even committed crimes, doesn't add up in our book to a valid reason for throwing a workingman's claims and aspirations out of court.

Organized labor at present is getting a bad press. In itself, this is no novelty; but there is a danger in the situation that is new—the danger that if the propaganda has its apparently intended effect on Congress the country will almost certainly suffer serious harm. Stripped of the pious protestations of concern for free enterprise and the right of every man to be his own Alger-book hero, etc., the objective of the drive is to bat the unions' ears off—to "cut them down to size," as the saying goes. We would have no sympathy with such a project at any time, and this is the most inopportune moment in recent history for anyone to be engaged in it.

This time of growing crisis, when the future of freedom and the "good life" in the world depends so directly upon a strong and united American people, is emphatically not the time for a knock-down-and-drag-out battle between capital and labor. Such a brawl would bring joy only to the Communists here and to their bosses in the Kremlin. There would be no winner but Dictator Stalin, who, you may be sure, would lose little time in the event of an American domestic smash-up in taking over the rest of Europe.

As an essential preliminary to a reasonable settlement of honest differences, we recommend to labor leaders abandonment of the truculence that too often leads them to conclude their remarks with the phrase "or else." And to the negotiators on the other side of the table we recommend discard of the high eyebrow and the "how dare you, my good man" attitude. Neither side should expect to gain any public sympathy by the exchange of epithetic statements dreamed up by some publicity man who fancies himself as a smart phrase maker. In fact, it has become smart not to be smart, and the great, tired, word-weary public that sits uncomfortably in the middle of these jams reserves wreaths of laurel for the man who will speak the truth.

That's what the people on our street are interested in—a reasonably decent portion of straight talk and square treatment. They are not violently interested, at the moment, in what Gromyko said to Austin, because they have enough common sense to know that Gromyko is singing for his supper and has all the importance of Charlie McCarthy as an international figure. They are, however, fed up with and resentful of the modern propaganda which is designed, as J. J. Gilbert, of the NCWC News Service says, "to make one uncertain about the principles, or uncertain about acting on those principles once they are clearly seen."

It may be, of course, that we do not meet the right people, but these are the gripes we hear. We think they are well-founded gripes, but they are not sour. They can be cured by the exercise, in the proper places, of some restraint, generosity, and good will—especially good will. What the country needs, even more than a good 5-cent cigar, is a dash of the wartime spirit of unitedness in a common cause. If what we have was worth the lives of the many thousands of young soldiers and sailors who died in the war, we ought to be able to keep it without bitter wrangling, name calling, and plain selfishness. That's what the people on our street think.

Progressive Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, all through the years men and women have studied the arts of progressive farming, but today even the youth of America realizes, as never before, that "the farmer is the backbone of the world."

A few weeks ago I had the pleasure of hearing an able discussion of the subject Progressive Farming by a high-school student in one of the fine high schools in a progressive farming community in my district. Calvin Ayscue, Franklin County, N. C., spoke with earnestness and zeal in addressing a banquet attended by a large number of farm men and women in the community in which he was born. He spoke with great poise and persuasion, and he impressed his audience with his great sincerity and with the fact that he was proud to be a part of the agriculture of his community and of his country.

Because of the importance of the subject he so ably discussed, and especially because of his effective and forceful presentation, I commend to you this able discussion of the subject Progressive Farming:

Since the beginning of time the farmer has been an important figure in the development of all nations. His importance to the progress and well-being of the human race is exemplified through his efforts to feed, clothe, and shelter the peoples of the earth, and to produce the raw materials for our major industries. Yes; it is a true statement—true, indeed, when we say, "The farmer is the backbone of the world."

When we accept this great truth, we cannot avoid its reality. We, as clear-minded American citizens, cannot deny the foregone conclusion that any progress made by farmers or any improvements brought forth in the realm of agriculture are nothing more than milestones along the highway of human progress or the uplifting of the society of the known world.

There are many stones to be turned in order to clear the way for the American farmer to reach his own. To use the modern expression, "There are many bottlenecks to break before the farmer can be elevated to the level which he rightly deserves and which his Creator intended for him to have."

The first handicap or bottleneck lies within the hands of the farmers themselves. That is for each farmer to realize; that there is a great deal of scientific information available for him that should be put into practice. This help comes in many ways, such as our newspapers, farm magazines, United States Department of Agriculture bulletins, experiment-station releases, farm agents, agriculture teachers, etc.

The second trouble is that there are too many people on the streets who seem to think that the farmers are the underprivileged class and that they don't even deserve fair prices for farm commodities. The American public should be made to realize the importance of the farmer and should give him his rightful place in our society.

The third bottleneck has to do with that all-important matter of marketing. It is high time for the producer of raw materials to follow his produce from the soil to its ultimate consumer. If this was done, we could plainly see that too many groups of profiteers are getting too much cream from the fruits of the farmer's toil. The answer to this is cooperative marketing associations plus improved methods of processing on the farm.

The fourth and final handicap deals with mechanized farming. This field has just begun to open in the fullest sense. The modern farmer cannot afford to be content with old, inefficient, laborious methods of production. Times, so to speak, are changing and changing fast. The farmer must reduce man labor to a minimum and increase the use of efficient machines to the maximum.

When these problems are removed from the planters' pathway, it will be like the time of old when Moses led his people to the mountainside where they could behold the promised land. The land of opportunity, freedom, and happiness. You may say that Moses was not permitted to enter. True, indeed, but the younger generation did enter. So it is with us. We can lead the way to this new era in agriculture, and the younger farmers can enter into the fruits thereof.

As I look into the valley of the promised land; the valley which holds the future of farming, I can plainly see beautiful highways leading from farm to market. On either side of this highway I can see lovely country homes. The types that are decorated with the mysteries of nature—white barns, green pastures, fat cattle, plant life, and fertile fields. The inhabitants of this land are second to none financially, socially, or morally.

I don't propose the illusion of hope that another George Washington might appear on the horizon to lead us. Nor do I propose a vast sit-down strike in the field of agriculture until a permanent farm policy is thrust upon us by our National Government. Not a few, endowed with the qualities of Washington, can solve our problems, but rather all of us, cooperating and dedicating ourselves to the principles set forth by our first and greatest of farmers.

Perhaps the idea I wish to leave with you is best expressed in the creed of the Future Farmers of America:

"I believe in leadership from ourselves and respect from others. I believe in our ability to work efficiently and think clearly with such knowledge and skill as I can secure."

This same thought, so well exemplified by Washington, thus making him first in agriculture, should serve as a guidepost in the solution of our problems today.

And so, when we stop to regard the founder of our occupation in America, we must realize that we have a heritage of which we can be proud. When we are obsessed in the plans of politicians, or envy the ease of our city friends, or get discouraged by the hard work and discomforts of farm life, let us ask ourselves, "What would painstaking, methodical, hard-working George Washington do under these circumstances?" The answer would be, "Carry on, strive for improvement, and farm intelligently."

Changes are necessary in any progressive movement, but changes alone are not sufficient in progressive farming. The modern progressive farmer must be on the alert at all times, after proper adjustments in his program have been made. He must possess a keen sense of values in selecting crop varieties, breeding stock, and implements of production. He should also understand the economic forces which will determine the price structure in both buying and selling. In order to be progressive in any endeavor, one must possess ideas and ideals above and beyond the average. The farmer is no exception. He should know what fertile soil is—how to make it fertile—and should appreciate the fruits thereof.

Yes, the modern progressive farmer is one who rejoices in seeing nothing short of the best, one who gets a real satisfaction out of living because his heart and soul are set on producing the best through his own effort.

There Will Be a Third Sugar Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, changing details of the sugar situation are a matter of great importance in my district. My district is one of the leading fruit-producing areas, and it happens that sugar is the single biggest factor, in its availability for processing and home canning, in the successful marketing of that fruit.

Because of the lack of sufficient sugar for home canning last year thousands of bushels of top-quality fruit were dumped or left on trees in the peach and apple orchards of my district. Without sugar there simply was no market for this fruit. The dollar loss to the growers was terrific.

The situation this year should, of course, be greatly improved. It is probable that rationing may be eliminated by fall, which is precisely what we all want. In any event rationing of sugar must end on October 31, the date on which the present Sugar Control Act expires, insofar as its rationing provisions are concerned.

Assuming the worst, that rationing continues to October 31, it should be repeated that our people have been promised not less than 35 pounds per ration book in the period from January 1 to October 31. They were told that in addition to the first stamp for 5 pounds three other 10-pound stamps would be issued, one on April 1, one on July 1, and the last probably on October 1. The April 1 stamp came along on schedule, and the July 1 stamp, according to a Sugar Rationing Administration announcement of May 13, will become valid 30 days early, on June 1 instead of July 1. To quote the actual announcement, it was phrased this way:

A second 10-pound stamp for consumers (No. 12) will be validated June 1 instead of July 1, but must still last until October 31.

Those final words, "but must still last until October 31," proved puzzling, to say the least, since they carried the implication that the October 1 stamp might

not be issued. A Member of the other body earlier this week took the announcement at face value, as he was entitled to do, and urged immediate decontrol of sugar, claiming a breach of faith on the part of the Sugar Rationing Administration.

I am as anxious as any, and more anxious than most, to see complete decontrol just as soon as it can be assured that there will be an adequate supply at a fair price for the little user as well as the big one. I hope these supplies now being built up will be sufficient to bring decontrol in July or August.

But however that works out, I am sure we want no talk of reneging on any of the sugar commitments made to date. The present schedule should not be upset excepting by better arrangements. In short, I want to hear no talk about doing away with the October 1 stamp, unless it be replaced by another of earlier date or by discontinuing rationing entirely.

When I saw the debate on this question as it came up in the Senate Tuesday, May 20, I got in touch with the Sugar Rationing Administration and asked for an authentic statement in regard to its May 13 release saying the June 1 stamp would have to "last until October 31."

I was informed the wording of the May 13 statement was "unfortunate." I was told officially there would be a third 10-pound stamp on or before October 1, unless decontrol intervened. The Department said the wording of its May 13 statement merely meant to imply that the No. 12 stamp, good on June 1, would expire on October 31; that there was no change whatever in plans to issue a third 10-pound stamp on or before October 1. Unofficially, if we do not have complete decontrol before then, I believe it is safe to say the third stamp is likely to come about September 1.

As far as home-canning operations are concerned, September 1 will be a better date than October 1. If we cannot have decontrol by then, I hope it will at least be possible to hold to the September 1 date for the third stamp. I hope too our sugar ration authorities will keep uppermost in mind Secretary of Agriculture Anderson's promise that any further increases in supply, during the short period remaining for rationing, will go first to home users.

Interior Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 22 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Interior Waterways," published in the May 10, 1947, issue of the Evansville Courier. The editorial is in reference to the proposed connecting link between the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers and New York Harbor, and improvements along the Allegheny River.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERIOR WATERWAYS

With the big wars apparently over for a while, at least, it is natural for the constructive forces of the Nation to turn again toward the rich interior of the Nation and bring it to more fruitful use along many lines. One of the most obvious and long-planned projects is the joining of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers with New York Harbor for productive use on a big scale, and improvements along the Allegheny River. According to Yates Catlin, executive secretary of the Upper Allegheny Improvement:

"Our association supports a cause which is also your cause. We seek to tie in the New York Barge Canal and the New York Harbor with the vast Mississippi waterway system, by completing the Allegheny River waterway and by rebuilding the old Genesee Canal in western New York State."

The long-needed St. Lawrence seaway is being discussed again. Perhaps this time it can be built.

Forgotten Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly today on behalf of a group of "forgotten men." They are the veterans who, during World War II, suffered atrocities of confinement in enemy prison camps as prisoners of war, and as such, were entitled, by military regulation upon their return to United States control, to automatic promotions in rank or rating and commensurate increases in pay but who, through no fault of their own, were discharged from service without receiving these benefits.

In many instances, this error occurred because of the loss of service records. In other cases, men were separated from their original companies because of hospitalization, and failed to receive proper recommendation for promotion. Many commanding officers failed to receive information as to regulations governing the promotion of repatriated personnel. Also, men otherwise qualified for discharge upon their repatriation were sent immediately to separation centers prior to the time their service records were received so that their discharges would not be delayed.

I am, therefore, introducing a bill providing that those in this category who were returned to an area under United States control from a status of prisoner of war, internee, missing in action, or evading capture in enemy-held territory, may apply for the promotion in rank or rating which is legally theirs, with pay retroactive to the time that such promotion should have been effective. I submit to you that this is the least we can do for our men who suffered the hardships of enemy concentration camps.

It is nothing more than simple justice.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of the bill:

A bill to provide that persons separated from the armed forces of the United States before receiving promotions to which they were entitled upon their return from prisoner of war or similar status shall be held and considered to have been granted such promotions and the pay and allowances connected therewith

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) any person who (1) while serving as an officer or enlisted man in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, was entitled, under existing regulations, to promotion upon his return to an area under United States control from a status of prisoner of war, internee, missing in action, or evading capture in enemy-held territory, and (2) did not receive such promotion prior to his separation from the armed forces or his release from active duty therein, shall be held and considered to have been granted such promotion on the earliest day on which, under existing regulations and the facts surrounding his particular return, he could have received such promotion.

(b) Any person held and considered to have been promoted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be paid in a lump sum such additional pay and allowances as he would have received had he in fact been promoted on the day specified in such subsection.

The National Federation of Small Business Supports H. R. 1671

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the results of a poll taken by the National Federation of Small Business on H. R. 1671. This bill, sponsored by myself, would compel sellers to disclose to any customer their complete line of discounts at any time upon request from such customer.

The Robinson-Patman Act was intended to strengthen the antitrust laws at a point of vital importance to small business. Discriminatory discounts have caused the death of legions of independent businessmen. The Robinson-Patman Act made such discounts thoroughly illegal and greatly strengthened the law on this point. H. R. 1671 proposes to further strengthen this law. Under the existing situation the Government has encountered great difficulty in discovering discriminatory discounts. It has had to rely largely on tips from customers who thought, or had reason to believe, that discriminatory discounts were being given to their competitors. H. R. 1671 would make it possible for any customer, at any time, to demand of a seller that he reveal to him his complete line of discounts to any and all customers. I think such a provision is vitally necessary to strengthen and im-

prove the effective operation of the Robinson-Patman Act, and I note with real pleasure the endorsement given it by the membership of the National Federation of Small Business.

The poll of the national federation shows that 77 percent favored the passage of H. R. 1671, 21 percent were opposed, and only 2 percent did not vote.

The National Federation of Small Business has thousands of members scattered over the Nation. It is reported to have the largest individual membership of any business organization in the United States, and I am gratified by the support which they have given H. R. 1671.

Veterans' Efforts for a National Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I gave on housing Sunday, May 11, 1947, over Station WORC, Worcester, Mass.:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to come up here this afternoon in response to several veterans' organizations and speak to you on the housing problem. Also, I like to come back home, as often as I possibly can so that the people who cannot afford to go down to Washington can see me and present their problems personally. As Thomas Jefferson once said: "When a man assumes a public trust, he must consider himself public property." I was elected to Congress by all of you people and I intend to do the best I can for each and every one.

Today the current topic in Worcester, as you know, is the open forum on housing, sponsored by the Worcester Veterans Council, taking place at our Worcester Auditorium tomorrow evening, in which nearly 50 of our local veterans' organizations are taking part.

About a month ago I was interviewed over the radio in Washington on the housing situation, and while the problem, especially with respect to the availability of homes is concerned, has not changed, Federal legislation has advanced a little since then.

In my Washington interview I was asked to discuss the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which, I believe, provides the most far-reaching provisions for aid in the solution of the general housing problem. At that time S. 866—the so-called Taft bill—was pending in committee, and just recently it was favorably reported out of committee, by the narrow margin of 7 to 6, despite a great deal of lobbying against it.

The most recent action in the House was on the Wolcott rent-control bill, which was passed on May 1 by a narrow margin. There isn't sufficient time here to outline the whole Wolcott bill, but to my mind it repeals in substances the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act; it eliminates all controls on building materials; cuts down the time privilege of veterans to buy or rent newly constructed homes; removes rent controls of newly constructed housing; removes eviction causes and throws such cases to local control. I am convinced that its adoption into law would bring about more confusion, discrimination, injustice, and unrest in the housing situation than we have today.

The debate on this bill in the House extended over 4 hours, which may seem long to you, but I feel more time could profitably have been given to its full discussion. Several amendments were offered to the bill, but most of them were voted down. In my opinion, without the remedial amendments, which were offered and defeated, the essential defects of its over-all provisions far outweigh the few advantages it contains, and, as the Wolcott bill was finally presented and passed, I voted against it.

Since I have been asked about the present status of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, I can tell you that this bill is now out of committee and ready for presentation to the Senate for action. Senator TAFT has stated that it is No. 4 on the Senate schedule, being preceded by labor legislation, foreign relief, and tax reduction. Therefore, it probably will be quite some time before the Senate discusses it. However, Chairman WOLCOTT, of the House Banking Committee, has announced that there is virtually no chance that his committee will consider any long-range housing legislation this session, even though the Senate should pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner measure. I personally feel that the housing emergency is the most critical problem that we face here in the United States today, and I believe it should be acted upon as an emergency as soon as possible.

To refer again to the essential rent-control features of current legislation, I might mention that there is a bill in the Senate similar to the Wolcott bill, introduced by Senator BUCK, of Delaware, which was approved by the Senate Banking Committee on March 31, and still awaits Senate floor action. It is not certain yet whether the Senate will take action on this measure or on the Wolcott bill.

A brief comparison of the important provisions of each of these bills would be interesting to you, I think. The Senate bill would set up advisory boards in each of the 600-odd rental areas of the country, with power to increase rents or remove controls locally. The House bill gives local governments absolute authority over controls. The Senate version which transfers rent control authority to the Housing Expediter, would permit the Expediter to overrule local boards.

Both bills eliminate most priority and allocation controls from housing. The Senate bill would continue rent controls until March 1, 1948—the House bill would continue controls over rents until December 31, 1947, and authorizes the President to extend them 3 months beyond that date. Under the House bill, landlords and tenants would be permitted to agree on 15-percent increases in rentals, provided the increases were continued in leases that do not expire before December 31, 1948.

With respect to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, I believe that by its passage Congress would recognize and declare that there is still a grave housing shortage and that the general welfare and security of our Nation requires a production of residential construction and related community development to remedy this housing shortage. This bill is also designed to eliminate slum areas and to realize, as soon as feasible, the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.

It would help local communties with their housing problems by giving financial assistance to the cities and towns which can estimate their own needs for housing, and can demonstrate that these needs cannot be met entirely through reliance upon private enterprise and by local and State revenues.

It further provides that the National Housing Administrator shall engage in technical research and afford technical advice and guidance to communities for local housing studies, surveys, and planning. I regard this research provision as a very important part of the bill.

As I interpret the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, it would provide assistance to home owners, to those who want to build homes, and to the construction industry which will build them.

There has been much confusion about this housing problem. Morgan L. Fitch, president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, has keynoted a drive to try and convince homeless America that the housing shortage isn't really so severe after all. He recently stated that the city housing shortage can be solved by building about one million and a half units. Yet, at the same time, Government surveys indicate that more than 3,000,000 families are living doubled up or in thoroughly inadequate quarters. Exhaustive studies by the National Housing Agency and congressional committees have shown the need of at least 12,600,000 new city homes in the next 10 years.

Six million of these units would replace substandard dwellings in which so many of our people now live and six and a half million units would be for newly formed families and families now doubled up. It becomes increasingly obvious that the real-estate interests do not choose to concern themselves with the 3,000,000 nonfarm homes that lack private baths and proper sanitary facilities * * * the 3,000,000 units that lack even running water, and the 3,000,000 units that need major repairs and modern plumbing.

The substandard dwellings constitute 38 percent of all the Nation's nonfarm housing. Regardless of their disrepair, these hovels are today being rented for high prices. With decent homes, reasonably priced, on the market, they would be a liability to their owners.

Can this account for the big campaign now under way to try and sell the Nation the story that the housing shortage is pretty much of a matter of imagination—and rent control?

The Government has assumed an obligation to the veteran and the rest of the people in this matter of housing. It is estimated that at the beginning of 1947 more than 2,500,000 families were in the market for homes and that 250,000 additional families will be looking for homes during the year 1947.

Here in the city of Worcester, at the beginning of 1947, there were about 20,000 veterans. Of these, 45 percent are married, and about 71 percent are gainfully employed. The average income of these veterans is $37 per week. Of the married veterans, 36 percent are either living in rented rooms or doubling up with their parents and relatives. I think that picture prevails in every other community in New England and the Nation.

A recent survey shows that two-thirds of the veterans are more interested in renting than buying—probably because prices today are far beyond their means. What they need most now is an opportunity to rent decent living quarters at reasonable rates of $30 to $40 a month. With the slow-down of private home building—I have been giving this matter considerable study lately—I hope that some plan may be worked out by which the Government, private capital, and the banks can cooperate together in financing the immediate construction of moderate rental units for veterans.

In conclusion I should like to say this—we cannot delude and blind ourselves any longer about this housing problem. There is one and its a serious national emergency. The building industry has not, so far, come out with a national program of their own to cope with it. It is worthy of mention that the housing issue was big enough in England to influence a significant change in the English Government, and I don't think we want such changes here, so we better do something about it. The fact is that American families want decent homes and they want them by the

millions. Decent people everywhere recognize the growing menace of child delinquency, increasing divorce, and broken homes attendant in good measure upon our disgraceful housing conditions.

I urge every church, labor, civic and welfare society to get behind the veterans' organization in its efforts to promote a national housing program, with provisions for public housing for the low-income group. The American Government, the American building industry, the American public and the American veteran by their combined work can lick this housing shortage—and you may be assured of my full cooperation in this fight for a decent home for every American family.

Our Soft-Fiber Industry Deserves Government Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest units of the jute industry in the United States is located in the Second District of Massachusetts. It is the most important industry in the thriving town of Ludlow. Since this industry has been so closely interwoven with the lives of several generations of families in my district, they are greatly concerned over the action which may be taken in the near future by our Federal administration on the question of reduction in existing tariffs at the Geneva Conference of the International Trade Organization which is now in session.

Few Americans have any considerable knowledge of the jute industry in the United States and the important part which it played in the success of the Allies in the Second World War. When it no longer became possible for our people to secure imports either in the form of manila rope or as fibers from the Philippines, the jute industry came to the rescue of our Navy and merchant marine. They provided the ropes, both heavy and light, which were essential to the proper employment of our warships and our merchant vessels. For their splendid achievements during the war they have been highly praised by both the Army and the Navy.

It is now most important that this industry be kept alive in peacetime as a standby for the manufacture of ropes and other war items in case of future trouble. Because jute products are essential in many industries which contribute heavily to the success of American industry and provide employment for thousands of our citizens, it is of the utmost importance that no change be made in the tariffs on jute and jute products in the negotiation of trade agreements with other countries at this time.

A fine presentation of the importance of the soft-fiber industry to the people of the United States has been made by Mr. Joseph C. Mahoney, of Boston, Mass. He is chairman of the tariff committee of the Soft Fibre Manufacturers Institute and, in business life, is the treasurer of the Ludlow Manufacturing & Sales Co., the largest unit of this industry. I urge the Members of Congress to read his remarks as presented to the Committee for Reciprocity Information and as set forth herewith:

TESTIMONY OF MR. JOSEPH C. MAHONEY, OF BOSTON, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

My name is Joseph C. Mahoney, of Boston, Mass. The tariff committee, of the Soft Fibre Manufactures' Institute, of which I am chairman, has asked me to tell this committee briefly of the direct threat to the future of this industry and its employees from any reduction in existing tariffs, and to ask your help in our particular and probably unique situation.

Our industry is called the soft-fiber industry both because of the type of machinery we use and the products we manufacture. We make jute, flax and hemp yarns, twines, threads, also flax woven goods. Many of you are familiar with these products, such as the ball of jute or hemp twine, and the flax or hemp threads with which your shoes are sewn. Other of our products are essential but not too familiar to the consumer. For example, probably all of the carpets in this room are founded on jute carpet yarn; other yarns made by this industry are used in the manufacture of electric cables.

These products are spun from fibers of jute, flax, and hemp on specialized machinery called soft-fiber machinery. This machinery is different from that used for cotton or wool on the one hand, and different from the coarser hard-fiber machinery used to manufacture rope from Manila and other so-called hard fibers. I ask the committee to note this unique type of machinery which we use because it is important to one of the points I should like to make.

The soft-fiber industry has been established in the United States for over 100 years. It is a typical American industry. Its factories are located in Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Ohio, Kentucky, Delaware, Maryland, and Oregon. Approximately 9,000 workers have developed the skills required, and are employed in this industry. They, and those who have invested their savings, believe that they have a right to more consideration than appears to have been given to them up to the present time in connection with the reciprocal trade agreement program.

This industry is not opposed to foreign trade, and, as a matter of fact, its existence depends on substantial importations from foreign countries—notably Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and India—of jute, flax, and hemp fibers.

On behalf of the Soft Fibre Manufacturers' Institute, I made a statement before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which contained considerable detailed information in regard to the soft-fiber industry, and which I believe you will find useful. I, therefore, request your permission to file a copy of that statement with your committee.

In briefly outlining our particular situation to the committee, I believe it will be helpful to discuss jute, flax, and hemp separately. Let us look first at jute. Because the bulk of all the jute in the world is grown in India, that country has a monopoly position in the sale of raw jute. It has taken advantage of this monopoly by establishing export taxes on jute and jute goods. The interest of the Indian Government in the manufacture of jute goods in India can be highlighted by a recent event of immediate relation to the present problem. After the invitation to India to participate in the proposed International Trade Organization, and with the present trade treaty negotiations in prospect, the Indian Government on October 23, 1946, disproportionately increased these export taxes. It raised the export taxes on raw jute very greatly, but raised the export taxes on Indian-manufactured jute goods far less. The plain objective was to penalize the consumers of raw jute in other countries and give a subvention to manufacturers in India.

This interest is not theoretical. The greatest concentration of machinery for the production of jute goods is in Bengal, India. Any reduction in the tariffs on jute goods, as anyone in this industry knows, will mean the destruction of the American industry and the transfer of manufacture to India. Why this is so I will demonstrate in a moment. But, first, the committee should note that India, largely because of its heavy exports of certain types of jute goods, such as burlap, as well as of raw jute, has regularly exported more to the United States than it has imported from this country. India, therefore, does not and will not lack dollars to purchase substantially more United States goods than it has in the past. Reductions in tariffs on jute goods will not result in any direct increase in what India buys from the United States. Any reduction in such tariffs will, in the final analysis, benefit only India.

The key factor is the matter of wage rates. According to an official report published by the Government of India, which appeared late last year, and contains data through 1945, over 60 percent of all of the workers in Indian jute mills were receiving between $1.20 and $2.11 for a 54-hour week. The highest-paid group, comprising only about 5 percent of all the workers, received somewhat over $3 per week. To pick a key occupation, this same official Indian Government study shows that spinners received a maximum of 4.4 cents and a minimum of 2.5 cents per hour.[1]

It is estimated that at the present time the average hourly wage in Indian jute mills is less than 7 cents.

The soft-fiber industry in the United States is efficient and progressive, but it cannot hope to compete with any such wage rates and at the same time give its employees hourly wages justified by American standards of living. Wholly apart from overtime, social-security benefits, and the like, the average American wage rates, comparable to those in this Indian Government report, are over 92 cents per hour. It is therefore not surprising that during 1946 over $84,000,000 worth of jute goods were imported into the United States as compared with $12,000,000 of imported jute fiber.

The committee should also note that practically all United States duties on jute goods are at specific rates, such as 4 cents per pound on 14-pound jute yarn. These rates have remained unchanged since 1922. It is obvious to anyone who reviews the situation that a rate such as this, that was established in 1922 based on the comparative wage levels at that time, must be wholly inadequate today. The enormous increases which have occurred in United States wage rates since 1922, as compared with Indian rates which have increased only a few cents per hour, justify substantial increased protection to the American industry rather than decreases which are now proposed. This inadequate protection has already resulted in the elimination of considerable employment in this country through the loss to India of substantial production.

Let me give you just two examples. At one time all of the United States requirements for jute upholsterers' webbing were produced in this country. This jute webbing is now imported from India. Likewise, the production of jute bale covering for covering the

[1] Report on an Enquiry Into Conditions of Labour in the Jute Mill Industry in India. Labour Investigation Committee, Government of India. Government of India Press, Simla, 1946. Table VIII and appendix VII.

United States cotton crop is also rapidly being transferred to India.

Before leaving this point I should like to tell the committee that these tremendous cost advantages are not theoretical. One of the principal jute products now being manufactured in this country is yarn used in carpet manufacture. The company with which I am associated has filed figures with the Committee for Reciprocity Information, showing that this jute yarn can be landed in the United States and the duty paid for an amount which is less than the United States costs. The obvious result, of course, is that jute yarn for carpet manufacturing is being imported in substantial quantities even at present tariff rates.

In the production of flax and hemp products, the situation is similar.

Historically, these two fibers antedate jute, at least in Europe and America, and their cultivation and preparation by handicraft methods came to this country with the first settlers. Colonial homespun fabrics were made from American hemp and flax. The transfer of such manufacture to machinery came early to our industrial history, and since then our industry has regularly produced threads, twines, and the coarser varieties of woven fabrics. Full protection against low foreign wages has never been given, and as a result all of the finer sizes of yarns and fabrics are imported. Even in the range of sizes which the industry regards as its normal output, imports now represent a substantial part of the quantity consumed in this country.

Hemp and flax are high-grade fibers, and their proper preparation and manufacture call for substantial amounts of skilled and semiskilled labor. The upward course of wage rates in the United States has, therefore, diminished the effectiveness of the established tariff; but in spite of this, the industry's protection was reduced substantially in 1939 in the United Kingdom trade agreement, entered into under the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The outbreak of war in Europe postponed for a time the full effects of the reduction in protection, and the industry was able to meet the substantial demand which the war developed for its products. As soon as the war finished, however, heavy importations of foreign flax and hemp yarns and threads were immediately resumed; and even some domestic spinners found it advantageous to use imported yarns in the making of certain products. This is scarcely surprising when it is remembered that these imported products are supplied principally by the United Kingdom and countries in continental Europe. Even in the United Kingdom, which is generally considered to have the highest wage level of any part of Europe, the wages paid to workers in the important occupations of the flax industry are about one-quarter of those paid in this country. Wages paid in the important continental flax and hemp-manufacturing centers are lower still.

The extent to which foreign competition has captured the United States market for flax and hemp finished goods may, to some extent, be appreciated from the fact that during 1946 $32,500,000 foreign value of flax and hemp finished goods were imported into the United States, whereas the total importations of the raw fiber amounted to only $3,200,000.

You have heard a great deal in regard to how necessary every industry is in time of war. It is, therefore, difficult to indicate to you the exceptional situation in regard to the necessity that there be in existence, in time of war, an American soft-fiber industry.

This country is dependent on foreign countries for its supply of cordage and rope fibers, such as manila from the Philippines, sisal from Africa, and jute from India. Both the Navy and the merchant marine are dependent upon cordage. Without rope, farming cannot continue. And as shown by the necessary Government action in allocating cordage, there are many industrial activities dependent upon cordage and rope or upon steel cables, most of which require a fiber center.

In time of war foreign sources of manila, sisal, and other hard fibers are largely cut off. It is then necessary to drastically expand the production of hemp in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky, as was done during the recent war. It is obvious that the expanded production of hemp can serve no useful purpose, unless there is in existence in this country an industry which can convert this fiber into cordage and rope. It is necessary, also, that there be an American industry with supplies of the foreign fibers available for conversion into products, at least until such time as the American hemp can be grown and made available as a substitute.

Only the soft-fiber industry has the unique machinery to convert both the American hemp tow and line into rope and other essential products. Our experience in the last war shows how extremely necessary these inventories of fiber are for all the products manufactured by our industry, but particularly for rope, which in wartime has top priority. The procurement officers of the armed forces will unquestionably substantiate the statement that the importance of the American soft-fiber industry was second to none during the war.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been described by many of its advocates as a means not only of expanding foreign trade but also of reducing unemployment in this country. There are provisions in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for increasing as well as decreasing tariffs. Apparently, little or no attention has been given to the necessity of making increases in order to protect American industry that is subject to competition from extremely low wage rates of foreign competitors.

The soft-fiber-manufacturing industry is actually furnishing less employment today, and it is likely to furnish even less in the future unless serious attention is given to providing it with tariff protection which will tend to equalize the difference between domestic and foreign wage rates. If the State Department, at the Geneva Conference, should reduce tariffs on the products of this industry, it is my opinion that this will result in the eventual complete liquidation of the American soft-fiber industry. It is not my belief that Congress intended, when enacting the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1934, to bring about the liquidation of a long-established American industry with resulting unemployment to American workers, who have for many years been acquiring the skills required by this industry.

The high American standard of living was established during years of adequate tariff protection for American industry, and at least insofar as the soft-fiber industry is concerned, I am thoroughly convinced that a reversal of that policy will tend to bring about business recessions and unemployment. Congress will then most certainly be called upon by the American people to reestablish adequate tariffs. Our contention is that by now adopting a more realistic view than this trial and error method, subsequent unemployment can be avoided.

In this reference to unemployment I touch on a most important consideration, which far transcends the soft-fiber industry. It is agreed generally, I think, that world stability depends on the maintenance of this country upon an even keel, economically speaking. Indiscriminate tariff reductions will reduce the number of industries in the United States. Such a reduction in the number of industries, which form the base of our employment, will intensify unemployment in periods of recession. I am sure that you will agree that it is most desirable to spread employment over a large number of healthy industries, which should result in greater employment stability.

The presentation of these facts to the State Department has resulted regularly in reference to the so-called "escape clause." This escape clause is simply another trial-and-error method. It provides for a review after the damage has been done, and even then it does not guarantee relief, even though the need for it is fully demonstrated to the satisfaction of all concerned.

It is scarcely necessary to point out that once an established industry has been seriously damaged by unwise tariff changes, its capital impaired, its skilled workers dispersed, and its management discouraged, it cannot be quickly resuscitated by a Government inquiry, regardless of whether or not relief is then given. No post-mortem inquiry ever revived a corpse.

We are confident that our situation warrants the most careful congressional inquiry. It raises pointed questions as to how this trade agreement program is to operate and what its objectives and effects are to be. It raises directly the issue whether an American industry, which is old, established, and technically efficient, which basically produces a large volume of foreign trade and enjoys no special advantage over its foreign competitors, is to be destroyed solely because it pays its workers wages necessary under the American standard of living. It presents a situation where cause and effect are not a matter of theory, but where important products made for a long time in the United States have already been lost to India and where detailed comparative costs and presently increasing imports show beyond argument that any reduction in present tariffs will have an immediate and drastic effect. Finally, it raises the issue whether any respect is to be paid to the provisions of the act authorizing increases when necessary to protect an American industry from extremely low foreign wage rates.

We leave our case to you, confident that you will recommend not only that no existing rate on any domestically produced jute, flax, or hemp manufacturers be reduced, but that steps be taken immediately to reestablish tariffs which will permit this industry to continue to pay its employees American wage rates, maintain domestic manufacture of these essential products, and afford in a unique area an element of national security which the recent war demonstrated to be essential.

Oil and Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, we are traveling on a slippery road—a strange international highway—a highway strewn with human corpses. We have been traveling this road for some 30 years. We are permitting a few internationalists, one-worlders, to lead us into World War III. It was this same gang that got us into World Wars I and II.

In World War I we suffered 360,300 casualties, and spent some $44,000,000,000 in making the world safe for democracy. In World War II, the American people suffered 1,134,380 casualties, and spent and gave to other nations

$440,000,000,000. This for the "four freedoms" that we did not get. In addition, as a result of these two wars, hundreds of thousands and millions are suffering physical and mental agony today. Yet these same loud-mouthed, stay-at-home superpatriots did not then, nor do they today, offer to risk their lives, limbs, or health on foreign battlefields.

It is for the purpose of awakening the American conscience, before it is too late, that I take the liberty of inserting the following article from La Follette's Progressive, written by Carleton Beals, entitled "Oil and Blood." The article speaks for itself:

OIL AND BLOOD

(By Carleton Beals)

When I went to my general files to get my folders on oil, I discovered that the next folder was labeled "Peace." This was real irony. It is conceivable that oil, which, in spite of the new promise of an atomic age, is still the major source of energy and power for modern man, could become the handmaiden of peace and promote the welfare of the world. As it is, the attempt to monopolize the world's oil remains the greatest single cause of world disorder and war.

Near Eastern oil was part of the American booty in the First World War. The State Department was used to force England and France into line; American naval and military force was used blatantly to secure that oil. The fleet, even as today, was sent arrogantly into Turkish waters. American admirals and high Government officials served as agents for the oil companies, and the whole weight of American military power and the governmental machinery was used to back up the notorious Chester concession in Turkey and to get a share of the war booty for the American oil companies.

Thus the pattern was already set for World War II, but in this war the goal has been not to gain a share of the oil in the region, but to grab all remaining oil exclusively.

President Roosevelt had set as the ideal: the free access of all peoples, "victor or vanquished"—"access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for economic prosperity." This was magnificent hyprocisy.

Actually, in the Near East, Roosevelt, the Government, and private interests, were laying their plans, under the shadow of war and death, to grab the key raw material right under the noses of the Russians and everybody else.

Oil company agents, operating as naval officers, Army officers, Government technicians and procurement officials, as special cultural diplomats and so on, traveled freely about while other decent people on legitimate or necessary business could not even get passports.

Such was the setting for the struggle in Iran. There behind the flag, with the stench of Stalingrad in their nostrils, American oil agents tried to grab off all the oil in Iran, including the traditional Russian sphere. Previously the Soviets had renounced all imperialism and rights in this area. This was in the days when the Soviets still sought to protect the rights of small nations and subject peoples.

Their move was not meant, I presume, merely to vacate the region for the sake of bigger and better imperialism by others. With the behind-the-battle doublecross, the Soviets, quite lacking the finesse of the western democracies, used the only tactics they apparently know, rough-shod bullying, and sat tight, creating one of the first of the great, serious impasses between the hitherto loving allies. They got out of Iran only when all oil concessions were denied to everybody.

But the American grab was complete in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Ethiopia. In Saudi Arabia several American companies had pooled their interests and slipped in to gain exclusive concessions in violation of the nobler spirit of "share the loot," which had featured the demands of our Navy and State Departments after World War I. We had progressed greatly between wars. Our motto had become not "part of the loot" but "all the loot." Obviously this was in direct opposition to Mr. Roosevelt's noble "equal access" idealism.

The risks of this policy were to be underwritten, and are being underwritten, by the United States Government and the money of the American taxpayer. The profits go to private companies.

While Mr. Roosevelt was emitting his noble platitudes, he greased the dictator of Saudi Arabia to the tune of $20,000,000 in lend-lease and an Import-Export loan of $10,000,000. Actually a lot of other costly aid went into the undertaking: the costs being disguised by the regular overheads of Army, Navy, State Department, OWI, OSS, and various other special wartime agencies. Out of what budget came Roosevelt's expansive personal gifts to Ibn-Saud, automobiles and so on, I do not know.

Mr. Roosevelt personally conceived the Petroleum Reserves Corporations to win oil around the world, without due regard for equal access or the rights or interests of subject peoples or other wartime allies.

The proposal in the case of Saudi Arabia was to build a United States Government pipe line at a cost of $165,000,000 or so to aid the private companies. Other lend-lease materials and loans to other Near Eastern countries were fitted into the jig-saw puzzle. The United States Government was to get a 25-percent reduction in the cost of oil up to a billion barrels over a 50-year period, and to have control of all sales from the Mediterranean and to foreign governments and nationals. Strategic storage depots were to be set up in Ethiopia, Egypt, and other places.

Behind-scenes diplomatic conferences were held in Egypt. Roosevelt met the various heads of state aboard an American battleship off the Egyptian coast.

Arrangements were made for the United States to send missions to carry out various undertakings, the construction of ports, the building of an oil city of 70,000 on the Persian Gulf, the building of airfields to police the pipe line across the barren wastes, and the sending of a military mission to Saudi Arabia. The pipe-line project as a Government enterprise fell through, but the military mission is now in Saudi Arabia, and airports are being constructed.

President Truman soon revealed that he intended to back up Near Eastern oil imperialism. Roosevelt's conference with Ibn-Saud occurred in February 1945. President Truman's Army Day address on April 6, 1946, told of the vast natural resources of the Near East and said that rivalry in that area might suddenly erupt into conflict.

His words foreshadowed the diplomatic, financial, and military support that was to be forthcoming for the oil interests and the aid to Greece and Turkey, which was suddenly demanded in the name of "an emergency," although the plans for this aid were being made long before it became an issue, the ground being carefully studied, the fleet being dispatched on flamboyant tours as after World War I.

The oil companies got the green light for a bigger corporate arrangement, which all told would include American companies of the Standard empire, with total assets of more than $4,000,000,000, and a gross turnover of nearly $2,000,000,000. It is worth while comparing this sum and the power in world affairs which it represents with the amount the world is willing to spend on making the United Nations a success.

Certainly the Near East oil venture has already cost the American taxpayer plenty and may cost incredible sums in the future. And during the war, the United States Government, thanks to oil company officials in control of Navy procurement as Government officials, had to pay nearly three times as much for its Near Eastern oil as did England.

Oil imperialism will lead us right into war and then help the enemy once that war has started. Near Eastern oil was one of the chief goals of German war strategy. It will be the goal of any other war, and an attempt to monopolize it, rather than to seek the proper world agreement, means that we are asking for war and are leading for it with our chins out.

Already this quest for monopoly has led us to flout the United Nations, just as oil, among other things, led us to follow a unilateral policy toward Argentina and to junk the inter-American system and the good-neighbor policy. It might be well for the American people to recall that the downfall of Japan and Italy began when those two powers flouted the League of Nations. It is somewhat shameful that in the preparations for World War III, it is now the United States that pursues the fatal policy of the Axis Powers in handling world affairs and in destroying the UN; and one may be sure that world opinion will gradually rise against us and perhaps overwhelm us.

Put the shoe on the other foot.

The oil fields of Mexico and the potential field of Peten, Guatemala, are about the same distance from New Orleans as the respective Near Eastern fields, British and American, are from the frontiers of the Soviet Union. Imagine the Soviets making enormous gifts and loans to Mexico and Guatemala, sending in swarms of technicians, training Mexican and Guatemalan armies, building new ports and cities, constructing airfields. Mr. Stalin journeys to the Gulf of Mexico and meets the various Presidents aboard a battleship. Periodically the Soviet Fleet maneuvers off the entrance of the Panama Canal. Then to buttress up this shaky nonsensical policy, he moves into Cuba and the Dominican Republic with hundreds of millions of dollars, technical experts, army personnel, army equipment.

The answer? We would go to war overnight. If the Soviets have not gone to war with us it is merely because they still feel themselves too weak and because Mr. Stalin by his brutal methods can keep the Soviet people in ignorance and prevent their fear and anger from bursting forth.

The Soviets have other preliminary weapons. Despite our millions and technicians, Soviet geographic proximity and influence make it possible for them to keep the neighboring areas churned up and in an explosive popular state. Very shortly, the costly American oil imperialism in the Near East is going to be confronted with new Arab unity, Arab economic nationalism, or maybe even a mass uprising of the Arab peoples. Will we go to war against the Arab people? That certainly would mean World War III.

The question is not whether United States oil imperialism in the Near East will be successful, but merely how much it is going to cost the American public for the sake of fabulous private profits, and how long it is going to last before the house of cards comes tumbling down in revolution, war, and disaster.

No one dislikes the Soviet system worse than I do. I have only one hope as a writer from any such system: The firing squad. I am appalled by its mass murders; its concentration camps, its brutal disregard for human rights and decencies. I detest its greedy ter-

ritorial expansion, its blundering old-style imperialism, its rule-or-ruin policies, its iron curtain, its lying propaganda.

Furthermore, I would say that the United States has just as much right to support brutal undemocratic governments in Greece and Turkey as the Soviet Union has in Yugoslavia and Poland. We have as much right to destroy human freedom and democracy in southern Korea as the Soviets have in northern Korea. We have just as much right to support the ferocious dictatorships of the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Paraguay as the Soviets have in Bulgaria and Rumania. We have just as much right to grab oil or the other resources of most of the world as the Soviets have.

The answer to this whole process, of course, is war, and it is silly to expect anything else.

The first League of Nations accomplished many fine things, but it was stricken with a moral sickness as a warped product of World War I. That moral sickness was not the failure of the United States to join it, which was a serious drawback, but chiefly the fact that it was a league of victors intent on using the organization as a cat's paw for holding on to the booty of war and the false and treacherous boundaries of war.

The United Nations is even sicker, for it does not even represent a league of victors. A UN police force is a patent absurdity. The UN is concerning itself with outmoded political and territorial disputes on a narrow basis of nineteenth-century nationalism. The salvation of the United Nations and the peace of the world can only come if the organization is able to face and handle the great economic empires, the real superstates of the modern world.

The Roosevelt dictum (which he himself flouted) of equal access to resources and trade, is the only possible answer to Soviet and United States imperialism and the power struggle heading toward war. Unless the United Nations can convert itself from a sterile debating society over petty frontier issues into a force for controlling the proper distribution of resources and for human welfare it will soon be a dead duck.

Shortly after World War I, in a piece for Scribner's magazine, I pointed out that the only possible way of avoiding World War II was to set about the rationalization and proper international control of the great strategic resources of the world and the elimination or control of international monopoly in these fields.

Unless the great international monopolies can be brought under some sort of world control, and be divorced from the present process of betrayal of backward peoples, and be made to serve the needs of the world and its peoples, then the United Nations will be merely a futile gesture to keep the peoples blindfolded till a new struggle breaks out. This economic effort is more important even than atomic energy control, in my judgment.

Unless we wish merely to fight blindly over Near Eastern oil like a dog over a bone, as we are now preparing to do with all we have, at the cost of a million American lives or so, we should begin setting up an international system for proper control and operation and distribution of Near Eastern oil.

When we were the "outs" in the region, we favored the British to come across with a share. We should not wait until we are forced one of these days to lose Near Eastern oil entirely or be forced to cede a share.

Such international control should take cognizance of the following principles:

1. Welfare of the workers in the industry.
2. The national and social welfare of the nations where the oil is produced.
3. Quotas on production to prevent price-fluctuations and improper exhaustion of any given field.
4. Equitable distribution of the oil to all countries of the world on the basis of present and potential needs.

Such controls in key troubled areas would do much to ease tensions and pave the way for economic and political peace. Such an arrangement for the Near East could be used to force international agreement on Rumanian oil and thus bring it back into the lifeblood flow of world trade. It would pave the way eventually for a world-over rationalization of the industry for the benefit of the peoples of the world.

The alternative is war and defeat for everybody.

Research and Development Spells National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Nutt, director of aircraft engineering, manager, Toledo plant of the Packard Motor Car Co.:

Two world wars have come and gone, both within a generation. Each of them was the result of turmoil and envy starting in the European Theater and spreading cancerously the world over. The United States of America was drawn into these wars inevitably and now finds herself in the position of a world power saddled with too much responsibility for international affairs. Her geographic isolation from the European and far Pacific areas has been largely responsible for her position. The civilian population of this country has been through these two major wars without seeing combat, without knowing the terrible consequences of a war-torn countryside, without experiencing the ravages of an invading enemy. In fact, war has brought high wages and false prosperity although not an abundant life.

Perhaps the most significant factor in this last terrible war was the appreciation of the effect that aviation has had on the art of making war. During World War I the airplane was a feeble youngster raising its head in an almost futile attempt to obtain recognition. Airplane speeds little over 100 miles an hour were normal during those early years and only through the foresight and faith of the few aviation-minded military men in the services did military aviation survive and grow even though it was not an important factor in winning World War I. Those of us who went through the postwar period of World War I know the stagnation which took place in the aviation industry and the lack of technical progress because of the inevitable economy wave that follows a war. We hope history will not repeat itself in this respect.

Only 10 years ago Russia had fighter airplanes in production which were more modern and had higher top speed than any airplanes in production in this country at that time. This is not only a matter of record but also a matter of personal observation both in this country and in Russia. Fortunately aviation was still small, airplanes were small and small engines relatively were required. Therefore, it was possible to develop experimental airplanes and engines at a fraction of the present cost. The aviation industry struggled along through the years both in the military and commercial fields and at the outset of World War II we found ourselves with better equipment than after World War I, but still inferior equipment. A considerable spurt in activity in the industry came as a result of orders from European powers shortly before our entrance into the Second World War although our equipment was not outstanding at that time. The only fighter in production was the Curtiss P-40 airplane with a top speed around 350 miles per hour; and a prototype bombardment airplane, the Boeing Flying Fortress, was in the development stage. There were other experimental ships under design or construction, among which were the famed B-29 Super Fortress, the North American P-51 Mustang fighter, and the Lockheed P-38 twin-engined fighter. None of these new ships was in production in quantity.

It is significant that the military airplanes and engines which helped win this last war were developed in peacetime. It is true that improved models of basic types were developed during the war, but time was not available to develop new types such as the jet-projelled fighters and bombers. At the close of the war we began to see a few P-80 Shooting Star jet-propelled fighters but they did not get into combat or into production in quantity during the war. A new form of propulsion, the jet engine, was responsible for raising the speed of our fighter airplanes approximately 100 miles per hour almost overnight, although too late for use in the war. The Germans were using several new jet-propelled fighters in combat before the end of the war. Both the Germans and the English were years ahead of us on the development of jet engines and they are ahead of us by several years at this time. Both of the above-mentioned nations started the development of jet engines over 15 years ago while in this country no money was available for this development until after we were in the recent war. The aircraft engine companies who had been in business for years were too busy on war production and were not permitted to engage in jet engine development. As a result the war ended with one American jet engine in experimental airplanes and this engine was a "blown up" copy of an English engine.

The importance of the turbine type jet engine to the future of this country cannot be overemphasized. Aviation has shrunk this world to the point where oceans can be spanned easier than the English Channel a generation ago. No longer are we safe against invasion. The enemy actually touched our shores during this war. The next war will see destruction and havoc hit us without warning. There will be no time to convert our factories to wartime operation. We have had two wars which were expected to end all wars; and the third war may end all wars, but probably at the expense of ending all civilization. There are still those skeptics who do not believe the possibility of remote-controlled bombs. Nevertheless they are an actuality. Only 2 years ago in this country the idea of flight near and above the speed of sound, transonic and supersonic flight, was being ridiculed by many; and yet, concurrent with this kind of thinking, the Germans were launching V-2 flying bombs which had a speed of 3,500 miles per hour and of such colossal size and power that they required fuel pumps of 600 horsepower. Even today we have nothing to compare with this weapon which was developed under the handicap of dictatorial power where men feared to report the mistakes and blunders of their colleagues and their political dictators.

The atomic bomb is here and the jet-propelled aircraft, the jet-propelled guided missile, and rocket power are our only protection against this awful force. It is futile to hope that the Albert Einsteins can educate the world in the immediate future so that the threat of war no longer hangs over us. The world has progressed infinitesimally toward real civilization in the last 2,000 years and we can use no head-hiding-in-the-sand process to provide national security. We must face the fact that other nations will discover the detailed secrets of the atomic

bomb and we can no longer sit back complacently as a superior world power. Time and lethargy has a way of leveling off relative military power. We must consider seriously what other large powers would do if they had the atomic bomb. Our military forces have had a 90-percent reduction in combat strength since the end of the war. Under present peacetime policies these forces will never regain their strength, and only the impetus of war will restore them.

Very definite steps can be taken, however, to provide the potential energy needed to keep this country at least partially prepared for a national emergency. The first step is to provide sufficient funds for research and development in the aircraft industry. The $147,000,000 to which the War Department budget was cut from the $347,000,000 required to carry on an adequate program will not provide sufficient funds to even keep abreast of developments in the world. We are now several years behind England in the development of jet engines and we cannot catch up to say nothing of surpassing them unless funds are made available. Sufficient funds should also be made available as a second step for limited production of airplanes, engines, and equipment to keep personnel trained in the manufacture and the operation of aircraft and its component parts. Equipment on paper and no operating experience does not spell national security.

In the face of public resentment of too much spending by Government agencies, the request for more funds may appear unreasonable. However, funds should be provided for research and development at the expense of other less important projects. We have spent and are apparently planning the spending of millions if not billions of dollars for relief and loans all over the world. If history repeats itself these loans to a large degree will never be paid and the money will help many of the nations to divert their energy toward the building of their military strength while we continue to fall further and further behind in our research and development program in this country. Self-preservation is a great force but no force is effective without the necessary financial support.

Billions of dollars are being spent by Government agencies today and only a fraction of saving in the various agencies and bureaus would provide the $347,000,000 needed to carry on an adequate research and development program in this country.

Only the Congress can make available the necessary funds for research and development and also for sufficient production to maintain a strong and healthy aircraft industry prepared at all times to develop and provide airplanes, engines, and equipment for our national security.

Soviet Fallacy in Atom Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a timely editorial from the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, May 21, 1947, dealing with the Soviet double-talk of Andrei Gromyko in his radio address to the American people. It follows:

SOVIET FALLACY IN ATOM CONTROL

The fallacy in Russia's notions about the atomic bomb, as eloquently propounded by Andrei Gromyko in his radio address to the American people, is that while they are labeled "international control" they are actually national self-restraint.

Mr. Gromyko declares that control of the bomb can be achieved by prohibiting its use. The trouble is that prohibition is worthless without enforcement. The people of the United States found that out in such relatively minor—but absolutely unpleasant—ways as the eighteenth amendment. The whole world found it out, if not before, in World War II, which was prohibited by the Kellogg-Briand Pact and by other international commitments.

It is an unfortunate illustration which Mr. Gromyko chooses in an effort to prove his point—and understandably so, since there are no fortunate ones. He says poison gas was not used in World War II because the nations had outlawed it. That is piffle in the first degree, and Mr. Gromyko ought to be one of the first to know it. Poison gas was not used because neither side could figure out that it would gain any advantage by using it. If either side could have anticipated a decided advantage through the use of poison gas, it would have been used.

There can be no international control of atomic energy, without unlimited inspection and international monopoly of raw materials. Russia, in short, rejects international control in all but name, and proposes national self-restraint. It is not enough.

Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Benefit Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a number of inequities in the present social-security law have been brought to my attention and have been the subject of considerable study. None of them, I believe, are covered by any of the legislation now pending to amend this law.

I have, therefore, today introduced a bill to amend various subsections of section 202 of the act entitled "Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Benefit Payments." In order that the Members may be familiar with the effect of these amendments, I should like to review briefly their purpose.

Nearly all of the changes result from communications I have received or talks I have had with constituents who have pointed out these apparent inequities in the present law.

It is now necessary for one to have been employed in a covered occupation for the equivalent of 10 years to draw old-age insurance payments. Therefore, if a man becomes disabled from working before he has completed these 10 years, he loses what he has paid in by way of deductions from his pay envelope, without any benefit. Probably some minimum working time should be provided, but it seems to me that if a man has worked 5 years in covered employment and then becomes permanently disabled from performing any gainful occupation and, therefore, from completing the time for making his payments, he should not be deprived of the benefits afforded by the social-security law.

The first amendment in this bill takes care of such a situation and protects an individual who suffers such a permanent disability during the period of his employment, provided he has fulfilled the other requisites to secure insurance benefits. The bill provides that, for the purpose of reckoning his average monthly wage, required by the statute, it shall be assumed that he received, for the time he was prevented from working by his disability, the average wage of the last year when he did work.

The second situation dealt with by this amendment to the existing law is to cover a case where a man has worked at least 5 years but has left his covered employment for some other reason; for instance, as often happens, he may not be able to show permanent disability to perform any work, but he may be unable, physically, to continue with the strenuous work of the covered occupation. He may be able to sell newspapers or do comparatively light work in the corner grocery store, but he may not be able to do the heavy lifting involved in his covered occupation. In such a case, although he does not require the extent of protection afforded by way of waiver of payments to one who has become totally and permanently disabled, he should have the privilege, if he wishes, to continue his payments or, if he can raise the money, make a lump-sum payment which will assure him of the benefits of the social-security law which he would have derived if he had remained in the covered employment for a 10-year period. This bill would give him, under such circumstances, two options.

He could either pay the full amount which both his employer and he would have paid if he had continued in his regular employment and receive, thereby, the full benefits afforded by the social-security law at age 65, a very economical type of insurance, or he can pay simply the proportion which he would have paid as an employee for the balance of the 10-year period and receive the proportionate benefits. To illustrate the latter option, if he had worked 8 years and was then forced to leave his employment, he could pay in the amount which he would otherwise have paid during the remaining 2 years without the matching sum paid by the employer and become entitled, therefore, to 80 percent, plus half of 20 percent, or a total of 90 percent of the benefits otherwise derivable.

Such changes in the law require corresponding changes in the benefits for widows, children, or parents in the ensuing sections of the Social Security Law.

With regard to children, a special situation has been called to my attention by the specific case presented by one of my constituents. Under existing law, the only child who can benefit is an unmarried child under 18 who is dependent upon the insured individual. A widower who has worked hard all his life and is facing retirement in the near future, has a daughter in her twenties, who is totally blind and completely dependent upon him for support. He faces the prospect

of having made substantial payments which can never benefit any member of his family because his wife is not living and his daughter is over 18 years of age.

It seems to me only simple justice that a child whose unfortunate physical disability makes him or her dependent upon the parent for support should receive the same consideration as one whose dependency is based on an arbitrary age limit. This bill would correct such a situation by affording equivalent benefits to one under 18 and one over 18 who is totally dependent upon the insured individual by reason of physical or mental disability.

It is only natural that cases would arise in the administration of the social-security law which were not envisioned when it was enacted. As these become apparent they should be the subject of remedial treatment. Within the necessary limits of a sound economy, without which our system of free enterprise will collapse and, along with it, the benefits afforded by such a law will vanish, we should endeavor to make adequate and fair provision for those who have contributed and whose employers have likewise contributed, to ensure that in the evenings of their lives they will have the benefit of a modest income and will not be compelled to become objects of the charity of family, friends, or the State.

One of the important factors, I believe, in the development and maintenance of a well-rounded and sound domestic economy, is the removal from those who work and produce, of the ever present and stifling fear that when their productive days are over, they will become objects of charity. It is imperative in the perpetuation of a system of free opportunity, whose cause most of us stoutly and fervently espouse, that we solve directly and adequately this important problem. As one step in that direction, this measure has been introduced. I am told the cost of this extension of benefits would be extremely modest. I hope it may have an early hearing and favorable consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means and that it will commend itself to the membership of the House.

Japs Really Going for Democracy, Editors Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article that appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer by Mr. Ralph J. Donaldson:

JAPS REALLY GOING FOR DEMOCRACY, EDITORS SAY

(Article 5)

Are the Japs putting on an act? Are they pretending to like MacArthur and appearing to accept the occupation with good grace, but actually biding their time until they get another opportunity to stab us in the back?

This is the question most frequently asked of persons who have traveled in Japan. The best answer I can give is that all of the editors who recently visited Japan were convinced that a real revolution has taken place in the minds of the Japanese people, that the seeds of democracy have been planted in fertile soil and that they will grow and flourish, provided we stay there long enough to nurture and guide their development.

There are, of course, some Japanese who are bitterly resentful of the occupation and whose only regret is that they lost the war. These include the war criminals; the members of the 11 princely families who have been reduced to the status of commoners; the members of the Zaibatsu and other families who controlled Japan's finance and industry and have had 85 percent of their wealth confiscated through capital levy taxes; the wealthy landowners who have been required to sell all but 7.35 acres of their holdings to the tenant farmers; the officer class, which has been abolished; and those responsible for planning the war, who have been excluded from holding positions of trust by the purge.

FORMER MASTERS UNMASKED

These, however, are in the minority. The vast majority of the Japanese are resentful not against the Americans but against their former masters who deceived and browbeat them and who led them into the disaster of war.

Take the testimony of former Prime Minister Baron Shidehara, who told the group of visiting American newspapermen that the Japanese people are less oppressed today under the occupation than they would have been by their own rulers had Japan won the war.

Then there is the testimony of Lt. Ethel Weed, of the information and education section of SCAP, a former member of the Plain Dealer staff, who is said to have a wider acquaintance among the Japanese than any other member of the occupation force. She has traveled throughout Japan, addressing meetings of women and explaining to them their rights under the new constitution, telling them how to vote, and giving them a picture of emancipation about which they never before had even dreamed.

Lieutenant Weed tells of instances where women have started at 3 o'clock in the morning to trudge through 15 or 20 miles of snow to attend her meetings. They have sat all day in cold, drafty auditoriums to hear her talk, to ask questions, and to discuss among themselves the possibilities of the new freedom.

There are the tenant farmers, who formerly paid an average of 50 percent of their production to the landlords and who are now looking forward eagerly to purchasing their own land.

There are the labor unions, whose members have discovered they possess vast economic and political power, although they are not quite sure yet what to do with it. Then there are the political parties, 268 of which entered candidates for the Diet at the last election, with 30 parties represented among those who were elected.

These people are not willingly going back to the old way of life. A vision of something better lies before them. And, with free elections, they will choose members of the Diet who reflect their views and who will not permit any tendency toward a revival of militarism and feudalistic slavery.

SEE UNITED STATES AID NEEDED

At a conference our group had with the speaker of the Diet and representatives of the five largest parties, there was general agreement on the following propositions:

That the Japanese harbor no ill feeling against the United States;

That they recognize the need for American help and believe that the occupation policies have been wise;

That they would like Japan again to become an independent nation, but that they realize the attitude of Russia toward Japan will be a factor in determining the length of occupation;

That even after the occupation army is withdrawn it would be desirable to have a token force of Americans remain to insure the maintenance of order;

That Japan's only hope for the future lies in the full acceptance and practice of democracy;

That this goal cannot be achieved overnight; but that democracy will be firmly established when the boys and girls who are now being taught its principles in school grow to manhood and womanhood and provide the leadership of the future.

Admission of Jews Into Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Post of May 21, 1947:

THE BRITISH PROTEST

The British Government is reported to have protested to ours against the activities of certain groups that want Jews admitted to Palestine.

Lord Inverchapel, the British Ambassador, according to the New York Times, objected to the raising of funds for armed resistance to British forces. He also called attention to a recent advertisement by Ben Hecht as an example of encouragement to violence.

The Ambassador, however, did not ask for suppression of such activities. Instead, he questioned the right of the organizations, identified by the Times as the Bergson groups, to tax exemptions for their funds.

As a result, the whole situation in regard to these organizations is said to be under review.

The British Government's representation is not a protest but merely a querulous complaint. The suggestion that our tax officials crack down on these organizations is an attempt, by indirection, to reduce but not stop their activities by the use of force. It is on a par with British tactics in Palestine itself.

This newspaper always has opposed the use of force for political purposes. It has never condoned the blood and killing in Palestine. Nevertheless, anyone who has studied the history of injustice knows that men and women, if pressed far enough, will strike out, perhaps foolishly, against what they believe to be intolerable conditions.

In Palestine, the conditions that Jews who have taken to bloodshed consider intolerable are a compound of many factors. The British Government, in 1939, issued a white paper which cut immigration to a trickle and sharply restricted purchase of land by Jews on any terms. A League of Nations commission denounced this policy as a clear violation of the mandate to provide a Jewish national home in Palestine. At that time Hitler's slaughter of Jews in Europe was increasing in fury. Notwithstanding, the Jews provided 30,000 young men for the British Army during the war. They expected that Britain, relieved of the Nazi threat, would restore their rights after the war. Not only did the policy continue, but more than 14,000 Jews who did attempt to enter Palestine were forcibly deported to barbed-wire enclosures in Cyprus.

A year ago, the Anglo-American Inquiry Commission recommended a plan for admission of 100,000 immigrants to Palestine, abolition of the restrictive land laws, and reorganization of the government. The United States and British Governments disagreed over the political provisions.

During the months that passed, President Truman, Prime Minister Attlee, and others on both sides of the Atlantic talked about Palestine. The hopes of Jews rose with each statement and were dashed with each deportation. Even at the United Nations nothing was done to relieve the actual, day-to-day plight of these people and to change the conditions that made the pressure dangerous.

This latest act of the British Government is a glaring revelation of the fault of which that Government and our own are guilty. It illustrates a resort to police power, rather than an honest attempt to find a real solution, not a paper solution, good for a thousand years, but a solution to put an end to the intolerable conditions of today.

Such is the proposal that many people had hoped would be made before the United Nations—immediate admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine, leaving the political settlement for a later and less violent time. Failing that, many hoped that the British Government, with support from our own, would at least begin the admission of much larger quotas while the UN Commission made its investigation looking toward a plan for a final settlement.

If the problem of Palestine were to be raised by the United States Government or by the British, the subject for discussion should have been something of that kind—not a sly use of tax laws to check committees, however mistaken they may be.

Care Must Be Exercised in Revising Court-Martial Systems of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from Mr. Will Leach, of Scranton, Pa., which appeared in the New York Times contains some interesting facts to be remembered in revising the court-martial system, and I feel that every Member of Congress should read the timely observations in Mr. Leach's communication:

THE COURT-MARTIAL SYSTEM—ITS REVISION BY LAWYERS WITHOUT MILITARY EXPERIENCE IS OPPOSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Having spent the last 47 years as lawyer, judge, and enlisted man in the Army, I think that the lawyers who are trying to take the court-martial system away from the officers have no idea of what they are doing.

Lawyers who make such a revision should have been members of the armed forces and spent considerable time in the enlisted service. Then they would know that the military officer's job is to train men to get their murder implements speedily in place to kill the enemy before the enemy kills them. His men must be drilled to automatic obedience to orders. It is the only way to save their lives, because they cannot outrun a bullet.

It may be the officer's duty to send men to great danger to save the rest. There must be no suspicion that he shields favorites. Each man under his command should be kept at the same distance so that he has no preference for anyone.

This "caste" system of the "brass hats" seems un-American and contrary to our idea that every officer is a public servant with the duty of being pleasant to everyone he meets.

Woe to the military officer who gives his men the idea that he is trying to please them instead of trying to train them. His popularity will not last 3 weeks. Each morning 100 men will have 93 different ideas of what the officer should do to please them. At night 3 will be pleased and 90 sore because he did not follow their ideas. When he talks with 1 man 99 will think "that sucker has an advantage over me" and be sore.

I was an enlisted man in a detached command in World War I and was sent to several camps and was under several officers. I found that every officer who aimed to please was heartily disliked. The men complained that he had "suckers." Each man had a different complaint on some unfair thing that the officer had done.

The stern disciplinarian was hated at first. He announced to the men that it was their job to learn to soldier, and he meant to see that they did it. He rode his men so hard he was called "Old Iron Bottom." In 6 weeks' time "Old Iron Bottom" was rated "tough" and "square." He had no "suckers." He stood for no foolishness. He saw that the cook and everybody else was on their toes, and men got what was coming to them. The men were proud of him and their outfit. Instinctively, his men knew the officer was trying to do what was right.

The lawyer, trained to question and take every possible exception to the ruling of the judge, has no business revising the court-martial system unless he has considerable military experience.

A politician is a man who trades favors for votes. The Congressmen should not let the Russians sell them the idea that the Russians discarded. That idea was that the officers should be responsible to politicians in the ranks.

WILL LEACH.

SCRANTON, PA., *April 23, 1947.*

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a resolution adopted by the fifth district of the Iowa Department of the American Legion urging favorable consideration of legislation for universal military training:

IOWA DEPARTMENT,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Oskaloosa, Iowa.

Be it resolved, That the Legionnaires of the old fighting fifth district hereby respectfully petition the two United States Senators and the eight United States Congressmen from Iowa to not only favorably support the universal military training legislation now pending, namely, S. 651 and H. R. 1988, but also to aggressively work for its immediate passage.

Dated at Ottumwa, Iowa, May 15, 1947.

ROY C. GILLETT,
Fifth District Commander,
American Legion, Department of Iowa.

Resolutions of the Thirty-seventh Annual Convention, National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolutions adopted by the thirty-seventh annual convention, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, May 2 and 3, 1947, Washington, D. C., to wit:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Last January the President, in his message to the Congress on the state of the Union, said:

"In our responsibility to promote the general welfare of the people we have always to consider the natural resources of our country. They are the foundation of our life. In the development of the great river systems of America there is a major opportunity of our generation to contribute to the increase of the national wealth. This program is already well along; it should be pushed with full vigor."

We believe that no better statement could be made in behalf of the interests of this Congress and believe that it is especially fitting for the Chief Executive, in these times, when international matters threaten to monopolize the attention of our statesmen, to stress the importance of this opportunity to do good in our own land. We, accordingly, urge that the Congress of the United States consider carefully the status of flood control, navigation, reclamation and allied works, give full recognition to their importance to the national economy, and promote their prosecution at a vigorous rate so as to avoid the waste of spasmodic construction programs that require alternate disruption and rebuilding of administrative and construction organizations.

PRODUCTIVE CHARACTER OF PUBLIC WORKS

We voice our earnest conviction that the great public works projects, not only of our Federal agencies, but of our State and local governments, are among the important wealth-producing resources of our country; that the protection of our fertile valleys and industrial centers from flood disasters adds untold wealth annually to the Nation's income from farm, mine, and factory; that the economical and efficient transportation provided by the Nation's network of inland waterways and its excellent coastal harbors makes possible the cheap distribution of our agricultural and industrial products, not only within our own boundaries, but throughout the world; that the reclamation projects of the West have created a vast agricultural empire where once were barren and arid lands; and that the incidental benefits in recreation, drainage, health, and power, not only have added to our national income and wealth, but have made this a better land in which to live. All these benefits, we submit, afford abundant confirmation of the productive character of public works for improving our natural water resources, for flood control, navigation, reclamation, power development and allied purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS

We commend to the careful and thorough deliberation of the Congress of the United

States the need for adequate appropriations for all phases of our national resources development program. We believe the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget for public works appropriations are inadequate to meet the great need of the times. We appeal to the Congress of the United States not to be swayed by the hysterical and verbose cries of advocates of a false economy which would deprive great sections of our Nation of funds for protection from devastating floods; would deny the necessary moneys to keep open important arteries of commerce, and would fail to provide the funds which would keep the arid lands of our country from returning to dust and desolation. We submit that the public works projects of the Federal Government are the most important wealth-producing items in our economy and that to neglect or discard them not only robs our National Treasury of substantial revenues but materially reduces, for a great mass of our population, the high standard of living so vital to the maintenance of our national economy.

POWER POLICY

The primary objective of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress is to promote the sound and orderly development of our national water and land resources; and

Many projects for the development of such resources involve the production of incidental hydroelectric power necessary for the economic development of such projects; and

Tremendous confusion now exists relative to policies concerning the sales and disposition of excess power from multiple-purpose dams as evidenced by the several bills presently before the Congress proposing, among other things, to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

It is obvious that the enactment of any of such amendments will fall far short of establishing a fully effective policy in the matter of the disposition of excess power.

It is the firm conviction of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress that the question is of such importance, magnitude, and complexity that it should be the subject of a thorough study made with the view of formulating a workable and sound national power policy.

We urge that wherever economically feasible, as recommended by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, that multiple-purpose-type dams be constructed and that the maximum hydroelectric possibilities be developed at such sites consistent with full operation of the dams for their primary purposes, that is, flood control, navigation, and irrigation.

VALLEY AUTHORITIES

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress reaffirms its long-standing opposition to the extension or creation of river valley authorities. Two Senate subcommittees only last year, after exhaustive hearings, found no justification for a Missouri Valley Authority. A new MVA bill recently was introduced in the Senate. We still see no justification for its passage.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND REFORESTATION

We believe that Federal planning, execution, operation, and maintenance of public improvements relating to the prevention of soil erosion and to reforestation, including such investigations and estimates of runoff and water-flow retardation in the various watersheds concerned as are considered to have useful or practical values, should continue under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

RECLAMATION

The population of the 17 Western States continues to increase and the national food requirements continue to grow. The Secretary of Agriculture has recently proposed a policy calling for the utilization of all potential, available, productive acres to supply the domestic and foreign needs of agricultural produce.

The development of the arid and semiarid lands by irrigation in the 17 Western States is recognized as the most beneficial use of water and will materially aid in meeting agricultural production goals.

We therefore endorse the construction program of the Bureau of Reclamation and ask Congress to provide adequate funds to carry the Reclamation program forward in the most economic and beneficial manner.

IRRIGATION

We recommend that Federal planning, execution, operation, and maintenance of public improvements relating solely to the distribution of water for irrigation should continue under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department. We commend the energy and efficiency of the Bureau of Reclamation in the execution of its program. We believe that the present cooperation between the permanent agencies of the Government with respect to multiple-purpose projects affords the most economical and efficient executive management of such projects.

PLANNING FUNDS

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress requests the Congress of the United States to provide advanced planning funds for fiscal year 1948 for those rivers, harbors, and flood control projects which have been authorized by the Congress and are recommended by the United States engineers as eligible for advanced planning.

IMPROVEMENTS OF OUR WATER RESOURCES FOR NAVIGATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND ALLIED PURPOSES

We reaffirm our conviction that all planning and execution of public improvements of our water resources for navigation, flood control, and allied purposes, including beach and shore protection, continue as in the past to be under the jurisdiction of the War Department as a function of the Corps of Engineers. We reaffirm our faith and confidence in the Corps of Engineers whose devotion to this Nation and loyalty to the Chief Executive have made possible the orderly and efficient development of the greatest waterway and flood control projects on earth. In their many years of experience, during peace and war, they have met many emergencies and have never failed to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number of people in a manner most advantageous to the Government and to the people. Furthermore we believe that only through the plans developed by the Corps of Engineers can we obtain a consistent and coordinated improvement of our water resources.

Migrant Influx Worries Officials in Kern County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1947

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, there are evidences of a renewed serious migrant problem in California.

There are practically no decent facilities for migrant workers today in California.

The enclosed clipping points out that once again counties and local communities are passing migrants along from one community to another. Reports from California indicate the possibility of this situation growing more acute. We should be thinking in terms of a renewed Federal-aid program such as took place during the days of the Federal Transient Service in 1933–35.

Local communities, and even States, should not be asked to bear the whole burden, a burden that is so palpably interstate in nature.

It seems safe to predict that this is a problem that within a year is going to demand concrete thought and action.

The clipping follows:

MIGRANT INFLUX WORRIES OFFICIALS IN KERN COUNTY

BAKERSFIELD (Kern County), May 3.—John Lott, farm placement manager, declared today Kern County faces the most serious migrant labor problem since before the war because of an unprecedented influx of farm workers from all parts of the country.

Lott said the county's current crops cannot provide work for all the newcomers and even at the harvest peak there will not be sufficient jobs.

He said about 3,500 persons are employed in the potato fields at the present time and about 9,500 will be needed later.

Lee Sumner, chief deputy sanitarian, declared approximately 1,400 migrant families have come here so far hoping to work in the 1947 harvest, and another 1,100 are expected.

POSES SERIOUS PROBLEM

The influx, Sumner asserted, poses a serious health problem because there is not enough proper housing to care for the migrants. As a result, he said, they are living in tents, shacks, and other crude shelters where there are no sanitary facilities and, in many cases, no water.

Three hundred such families have been ordered by Dr. William C. Buss, county health officer, to vacate their temporary quarters in the Edison district where one case of diphtheria and several cases of dysentery have been reported.

These families, numbering between 1,400 and 1,500 persons, have been advised, Sumner said, to "go north," in order to get ahead of the harvest in the northern counties.

Sumner blamed the situation here on two factors: The discontinuance of government-operated mobile camps, and the policy of most farmers in dealing with labor contractors who do not undertake to provide housing.

CAMPS DISCONTINUED

In the war years, Sumner pointed out, mobile camps took care of the workers as they moved from field to field with the change of crops.

"Now," Sumner continued, "there are no such camps. Coupled with that, most of the farmers who used to have to guarantee housing in order to get workers, now have their crops harvested on a contract basis.

"The contractors seldom provide living quarters, and the workers have to shift for themselves."

Sumner said efforts are being made through the Farm Bureau and other organizations to remedy the housing situation. He declared the Mexican consul is attempting to arrange living quarters for laborers from Mexico.

TULARE HAS PROBLEM

VISALIA (Tulare County), May 3.— Dr. C. S. Ambrose, Tulare County health officer, declared today he does not know whether any

of the 300 families to be evacuated from unsanitary camps in Kern County will come here, but asserted Tulare has a serious camp problem of its own.

Dr. Ambrose said four camps in the county have been abated within recent weeks because of inadequate sewage facilities and other unsanitary conditions.

"All that we ask," he said, "is that persons who live in camps conform with the ordinary standards of sanitation, but many of them allow filth to accumulate in such a way as to endanger not only their own health but that of others."

He declared the migration of families, mostly from the Middle West, is increasing and most of them are living in tents.

FRESNO COUNTY PREPARES

Dr. W. F. Stein, Fresno County health officer, today asserted the county health department insists on the maintenance of proper sanitation facilities for residents of the area.

"If these migratory workers come to Fresno County the department will require the maintenance of sanitary living accommodations wherever they settle," he declared.

"It is the duty of the health department to insist on sanitation to preclude the possibility of any district becoming a breeding place for communicable diseases and dysentery."

A survey made by the Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley last week indicated the supply of labor now in Fresno County is completely adequate for cotton chopping, the only agricultural operation in progress in the area.

Most farmers in the county use their year around help for irrigating and other duties which precede the opening of the harvest season.

"The Great Magician's Dead"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Charles McGlue, which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News on Sunday, April 20, 1947:

"THE GREAT MAGICIAN'S DEAD

"We announce in our paper of today, we confess with no great regret, the death of that far-famed and ill-begotten monster the gerrymander. This 'delicate monster' has been pining ever since last November, when he terribly strained himself in attempting to swallow one of his parents. But regardless of the consequences of that wicked and injudicious attempt, he yesterday made another most desperate effort to swallow three of his nearest relations, and immediately expired in the most 'agonizing struggles'—a loud warning to all his relations in this and the neighboring States."

The above article appeared in the Salem Gazette on April 6, 1813, celebrating the great victory of the Federalists over the Republicans on April 5, in the disputed Essex County senatorial district, which was carried by the Federalists by a vote of 2,909 to 2,730, or a Federalist majority of 170 votes.

HISTORY ALWAYS REPEATS

So, "The Great Magician's Dead" was good for a big headline story 134 years ago in Ye Olde Salem in Ye Olde Essex County. That century-and-one-third-old story had to do with the demise of the so-called political dragon or monster, christened the "Gerrymander," but which could be readily and most appropriately named the "Gerry-monster."

Just think how many, many magicians have stopped doing fancy mystifying and devious tricks since 1812! Let's see, there was the sensational Harry Houdini, the great Thurston, Sir Oliver Lodge, Dr. Watson (Get-the-Needle) and his sidekick, Sir Conan Doyle, not to mention Mandrake the Great, and hundreds of other seers, soothsayers, spiritualistic mediums, voodoo doctors, medicine men, clairvoyants and fortune tellers, all of whom passed this way but once. All these great exponents of chicanery, trickery, sleight-of-hand, now-you-see-it-now-you-don't, and legerdemain, couldn't fool "Old Man Time," but "Old Man Gerrymander," "he just keeps rolling, he just keeps rolling along." And every 10 years "Old Gerrymander" does his stuff in Massachusetts and he never, never forgets to pay a visit and leave his business card and his trade-mark at his old birthplace, Ye Olde Essex County.

"BRIGADOON" A REPEATER?

A few weeks ago there appeared in Boston a play called Brigadoon, which was billed as a new musical, with book and lyrics by Alan Jay Lerner. The play critics panned it gently, or praised it ever so highly. After a brief Boston sojourn, Brigadoon hied itself to New York City, and there on Old Broadway, it became an overnight hit. The plot of the play has to do with a town in the Scottish Highlands, called Brigadoon, which disappears for 100 years at a time. Precisely at the end of every century, without fail, Brigadoon comes to life, and for one glorious day lives again in all its pristine glory, with a Scottish sword dance in MacConnachy Square, accompanied by weird Scottish bagpipes, and the finale, touched off by a wonderfully portrayed wedding ballet.

GEISSELMAN?—GERRYMANDER?

The New York success of Brigadoon naturally aroused considerable curiosity as to how author Alan Lerner could produce such an imaginative story out of nowhere. But, according to a good research worker with a good memory, Miss Beck, in a recent communication in the New York Times, writer and lyricist Lerner must have been studying up on his German recently. Miss Beck claims that there was a certain German playwright, by the name of Herr Geisselman (1806–62), who, a century ago, wrote a story whose plot is practically identical with that of Brigadoon except the locale has been relocated from Germany to Scotland.

So, it is possible that Brigadoon may be a repeater, too. And I may be an iconoclast in the bargain for bringing the comparison up. At any rate, whether it be Geisselman and his story, or Lerner and his Brigadoon, you may always rely on the adage, "That history always repeats itself."

INTRIGUING SUBJECT

However, the tale of the reappearance of the town of Brigadoon every 100 years intrigues me. It also intrigues me when I think of Governor Gerry and his hoary crew who return to life in Massachusetts every 10 years and proceed to scuttle our democratic processes of equitable and constitutional opportunity of representative districts, and to make the plot more binding they use the same technique, same dialogue, same stage settings, and the very same plot, as they did way back when the War of 1812 between England and the United States was raging.

With this difference. There isn't any fantasy about it. The ghostly group returns on its decennial rounds and demolishes our democratic structure and cracks wide open our Constitution, and the damage, dents, and destruction last for another decade. They then return to their political graveyard until 10 years later the old Constitution bell calls them together again. They take the oath of allegiance to Gerry and then these partisan wraiths, under the telepathic guidance of the great magician, who was supposed to die in 1812, again get out their scalpels, machetes, and broadaxes and again perform their mysterious, behind-the-scene rites. (Pronounced "rights" but does not mean it. Look up "rituals.")

These rites are legalistically known as redistricting, but in actual political practice they are better named gerrymandering. While the rites are being performed the GOP'ers generally "wake" (Irish connotation) the Democratic Party while its leaders slumber on their rights.

HISTORY OF GERRYMANDER

The Massachusetts State election on the first Monday of April 1811 resulted in a complete triumph of the Democratic or, as they styled themselves, the Republican Party. The Governor, Elbridge Gerry, was of that party, as well as a majority of both the senate and house of representatives. Hon. Samuel Dana, of Middlesex County, was chosen president of the senate, and Hon. Joseph Story, of Salem, was chosen speaker of the house. The winter session of legislature began Wednesday, January 8, 1812. Speaker Story, having been appointed a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, resigned his office as speaker on January 18, and Eleazer W. Ripley, of Waterville, Maine, was chosen in his place. You see the State of Maine was then a part of Massachusetts.

In 1811 both branches of legislature and the Governor were, with the exception of a single year, for the first time Republican, but their tenure of office was extremely precarious.

On January 22, 1812, an order passed the senate, and on January 23, 1812, an order passed the house appointing a committee to consider the subject of a new law to alter the districts now established ior the choice of counselors and senators and to determine what alterations may be necessary therein. The committee consisted of Messrs. Seth Sprague, Jonas Kendall, and Francis Carr, of the senate, and Benjamin W. Crowninshield, of Salem; Mathew Cobb, of Portland, Maine; Jonathan Smith, of West Springfield; and Eliakim Phelps, of Belchertown, of the house. Mr. Kendall, of the senate, and Mr. Phelps, of the house, were Federalists. The rest were Republicans.

The committee reported a bill which was considered by the senate on February 4, 1812. Various amendments were offered by the Federalists, but were all voted down.

BROOKED NO OPPOSITION

The Republican majority divided the counties of Essex and Worcester in a manner which showed that all considerations were disregarded, and that the only object was to form a Republican district from each of those Federal counties.

The outer Essex district was to choose three senators, and the inner Essex district was to form a Republican district from each of those Federal counties.

The outer Essex district was to choose three senators, and the inner Essex district was to choose two senators.

The bill passed that day without amendment by a vote of yeas 19, nays 18, and went to the house on February 5 and was passed on February 7, by a vote of yeas 278, nays 231.

On Thursday, February 20, 1812, in the house, a protest signed by 224 Members was read by William Sullivan and is entered in full with the names in an appendix to the journal. Eight pages of the house journal was necessary to print all the protestants. The Boston Weekly Messenger, Nathan Hale, publisher, published a map of Essex County showing the gerrymander on March 6, 1812, and said:

"The Gerry-mander did not disappoint the expectations of its fond parents."

"In 1812, the election of State senators took place under the Gerry-mander law and the result was that 29 Republicans and only 11 Federal senators were chosen. On the same day, the Federal candidate for Governor was chosen by a handsome majority; and what is more remarkable, such was the malignant influence of the animal of which we are giving the history, that it required fewer Republican votes to choose the 29 Republican senators than were actually given to the Federal candidates of whom only 11 were chosen."

The whole number of votes given for senators was 101,930, of which 51,766 were given to the Federal candidates and 50,164 for the Republican candidates, making a Federal majority of 1,602 votes. Yet the Republican minority, with the help of the gerrymander, outvoted the Federal majority, almost 3 to 1—29 Republicans to 11 Federalists.

NATHAN HALE VERSION

New England Historical and Genealogical Register, October 1873, page 421, stated:

"The map of the county of Essex, designating the boundary of the senatorial districts, was drawn by Nathan Hale, who with Henry Sedgwick were editors of the Weekly Messenger. It was printed in that paper March 6, 1812. The extraordinary division of the county of Essex, taking a single line of towns from the outside of the county and adding Chelsea from the county of Suffolk, in order to secure a Republican majority in the senate, was such a piece of political management as to produce a general outcry. The map was copied into some of the other newspapers, and at a dinner party at the house of Mr. Thorndike, an eminent merchant of that day in Boston, it was exhibited by Mr. Cogswell, afterwards librarian of the Astor Library. The form of the district was a subject of remark, and it was said that it resembled some horrible animal and only wanted wings to make a frightful political dragon. Mr. Tisdale took his pencil and sketched the wings, and there was a discussion about the name, some suggesting that of salamander. Mr. Alsop proposed that of gerrymander, which was adopted."

A DIFFERENT VERSION

Joseph T. Buckingham, in his Specimens of Newspaper Literature (1850), gives this account:

"In 1811, when Mr. Gerry was Governor of the Commonwealth, the legislature made a new division of the senatorial districts. Both branches had then a Republican majority. For the purpose of securing a Republican representative, an absurd and singular arrangement of towns in the county of Essex was made to compose a district. Russell took a map of the county and designated by a particular coloring the towns thus selected.

"He then hung the map on the wall of his editorial closet. One day Gilbert Stuart, the celebrated painter, looked at the map and said the towns which Russell had thus distinguished formed a picture resembling some monstrous animal. He took a pencil and with a few touches added what might be supposed to represent claws. 'There,' said Stuart, 'that will do for a salamander.' Russell, who was busy with his pen, looked up at the hideous figure and exclaimed, 'Salamander! Call it gerrymander.' The word became a proverb and for many years was in popular use among the Federalists as a term of reproach to the Republican legislature which had distinguished itself by this act of political turpitude."

Gilbert L. Streeter in his Account of Newspapers and Periodicals, published in Salem (1856), page 36, also attributed the drawing to Gilbert Stuart and the name to Major Russell.

MIGHT BE PROPA-GANDER

On April 2, 1812, the Independent Chronicle, an opposition newspaper, said: "The Federalists of Boston lately drew an accurate likeness of themselves and sent it out to their country brethren in the Gazette and Repository, hoping that it would inspire sentiments of respect and admiration. They misnamed it the Gerrymander; it should have been the Federal-Gander, for none but geese would ever have resorted to such a paltry and foolish expedient. The mathematicians who planned and the limners who executed the sublime specimen of Federal ingenuity drew their own portrait without intending it. They exposed at one view all their malignant, venomous, and lizardlike qualities."

WHO WAS THE FATHER?

Extract from communication on the Gerrymander in the Columbian Centinel, May 23, 1812, shows that Salem judge Story, of the United States Supreme Court, was at that time suspected by his political opponents of being the originator of the scheme. "It would be well, however, if we could so ascertain beyond a doubt the real father of this unnatural monster, that we might hold him up to everlasting scorn and contempt. He must and he shall be found out and exposed—and it shall be left to an impartial public to judge of this most wicked story."

GOVERNOR ELBRIDGE GERRY

Elbridge Gerry was Governor of Massachusetts from 1810 to 1812. He was born in Marblehead on July 17, 1744, and died in Washington, D. C., on November 23, 1814, at which time he was Vice President of the United States.

He graduated from Harvard College in 1762.

Governor Gerry had a very distinguished political career.

He was one of the original signers of the Declaration of Independence.

He was a member of the United States Constitutional Convention.

He served for several terms as a Member of Congress.

In April of 1812, Governor Gerry was defeated for reelection by the Honorable Caleb Strong, Federalist.

STRANGE OMISSIONS

In November of 1812, Governor Gerry was chosen as the Vice President of the United States, but strangely enough his own native State of Massachusetts, of which he had just completed a term as its Governor, did not see fit to give him the electoral vote of Massachusetts in that national election. However, the other States of the former American Colonies gave him sufficient electoral votes to insure his choice.

Another rather strange omission relative to the career of Gov. Elbridge Gerry appears in the Manual for the Use of the General Court, which is prepared annually under section 11 of chapter 5 of the General Laws of Massachusetts.

In this manual is the listing of the Governors and United States Senators who have served Massachusetts, together with the dates of their terms of office.

No mention is made in the Massachusetts State Manual of the fact that Governor Gerry was subsequently elected Vice President of the United States in 1812, although in the same manual reference is made to the fact that Calvin Coolidge was Vice President of the United States from 1921 to 1923, and that subsequently Calvin Coolidge was President of the United States from August 3, 1923, to March 4, 1929.

Then again the Massachusetts Manual makes mention of the fact that United States Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, was elected Vice President of the United States in 1872, while serving Massachusetts as United States Senator.

Maybe Governor Gerry is being punished for his part in the infamous gerrymander of 1812 which now bears his name, and which has become such a descriptive word in our national political dictionary.

It will be noticed in the 1812 picture that lines forming western boundaries of Andover, Middleton, and Lynnfield form the profile of a man's face. It is said to be that of Governor Gerry.

The New England History and Genealogical Society has copy of original gerrymander picture in flash color and profile shows eye, nose, and mouth. (Natural and Political History of the Gerrymander (1823).)

By the way, the reference in the opening paragraph of this article to the "delicate" monster who terribly strained himself trying to swallow one of his parents meant obviously that Governor Gerry was one of the parents and referred to Governor Gerry's defeat for Governor in November of 1812.

The reference to the monster's attempt to "swallow three of his nearest relations" meant the defeat of the gerrymanderers to carry their three senatorial candidates who at that time were to be elected in three's in the outer Essex senatorial district. Defeat took place on April 5, 1813.

Well, whether it be a gerrymander, a Federal-gander, or mere propa-gander, if you want to get a good constitutional look at the Essex County house districts as they should be redistricted, take a good "gander" at this column next Sunday. See you then.

CHARLES MCGLUE.

"Voice of America" Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of May 22, 1947:

VOICE OF WHAT?

"Conducted by a group of pro-Communist fellow travelers and muddleheads, they fill the ether with tons of material favorable to the Soviet Union and the Communists, or just plain twaddle."

The quotation is from a recent speech in the House by Representative FRED E. BUSBEY, Republican, of Illinois, about the Voice of America.

This alleged American voice is the State Department's radio set-up, under Assistant Secretary of State William Benton, for the broadcasting of United States promotion stuff to other countries, including Russia.

When the State Department asked recently for thirty-one-million-and-some-odd dollars to keep the voice prattling for another year, the House cut the request by exactly 100 percent.

Representative KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, is now backing a bill to let the voice go on talking, but on a reduced budget and under a management from which the FBI would have carefully sifted out all Communists, fellow travelers, and other subversives.

When you consider that these broadcasts reach few if any people in gagged and earplugged Soviet Russia, the whole project seems pretty futile, even though Generals Eisenhower and Marshall and various other prominent persons think it is a fine thing.

If we must have the "voice," though, it certainly should be Edgar Bergened by Americans whose loyalty is unquestionable. That has not been happening under the Benton management to date.

Benton's three top assistants in charge of the "Voice of America" broadcasts have been Messrs. William T. Stone, Haldore E. Hanson, and Charles A. Thomson.

Stone is an ex-member of the editorial board of Amerasia magazine, which has printed large amounts of pro-Russian copy. Hanson was for long a soldier of fortune in China, where his best friends and confidants were Chinese Communists. He was shifted hurriedly to another State Department niche when the congressional heat was turned on the "voice." Thomson has had considerable to do with production of pro-Communist movies, and is on record with some loud praises of the Communists' activities in the Spanish civil war.

Many of Benton's lesser helpers were inherited from Archibald MacLeish's and Elmer Davis' old Office of War Information, which was notorious for its high percentage of Red and fellow traveler employees.

Benton says he was unfamiliar with most of the "voice" program contents. The answer to that is, we would say: Then what are the taxpayers paying Benton his $10,000 a year for? To sit around and look pretty?

We would suggest, urgently, that if Congress keeps the "Voice of America" alive at all, it at least insist on a personnel clean-up from top to bottom; and if it wants to start with Benton himself we don't expect to object.

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell from the Washington Times-Herald of May 22, 1947:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

If the distinguished Members of Congress have any doubt that the Roosevelt Reds in the State Department are doing some slick and snide lobbying to get their hands on the thirty-odd-million dollars they want for propaganda broadcasts, we commend their attention to the extremely interesting and "highly confidential" State Department memo we now print.

This memo is written by State Department's William Treadwell Stone, described in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. 5296) as "top-flight assistant to Assistant Secretary William Benton, Director of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs."

It is addressed to John Howe, whose letter to us of yesterday describes himself as "special assistant to Mr. Benton." In addition to Howe, the memo was addressed to Messrs. Luther Reid and Bill Bourne, both of whom, the State Department assures us, are at present on the Department's pay roll in Benton's cultural and information headquarters.

The memo is a highly interesting document because it illustrates (a) the cold-blooded manner in which the hangovers of the Roosevelt New Deal go in for dark trickery to double-cross Congress and the taxpayers and (b) the slippery fashion by which the fellow travelers and Roosevelt pinks have wormed their way into high posts.

In the memo the boys in the cultural headquarters are urged to save the Voice of America by trying to put pressure on Bernard Baruch and even band leader Benny Goodman. The memo being tossed off about the time that the Communist Daily Worker was announcing the mission to Moscow of the maestro of swing.

Also important is the tie-up in this handling of national affairs with the references to the wives of one-time Roosevelt financial wizards. The memo mentions a fund-raising organization "headed by Mrs. Wayne Coy and Mrs. Bell." Wayne Coy and Daniel Bell were all-powerful Roosevelt spokesmen in the Bureau of the Budget and potent officers in the palace guard of the Harry Hopkins era.

The record of the memo's author, William Treadwell Stone, as described by Representative FRED E. BUSBEY, Republican, of Illinois, to the House last week is this:

"Members of the editorial board of Amerasia from 1937 through November 1941. Chairman of this board was William Vanderbilt Field, now a regular columnist for the Daily Worker. Managing editor was Philip Jacob Jaffee, indicted and fined for possession of confidential documents, charged by Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, Republican, of Michigan, with being in close touch with Earl Browder, recently head of the Communist Party, United States of America, and with Tung Pi Wu, Chinese Communist delegate to the San Francisco convention."

The memo follows:

"Confidential

"Memorandum for John Howe, Luther Reid, Bill Bourne:

"Re action and recommendations of New York 'alumni' committee.

"At a luncheon meeting April 29 called by Louis Cowan with Norman Cousins, Lim Linen, Harold Guinzburg, Mike Bessie, and Miss Singer present, the following recommendations were made:

"1. The committee will distribute copies of our clip sheet to key people throughout the country for use in the press, radio, etc.

"John Howe should send 150–200 copies to Miss Singer as secretary. We should also send 12–15 copies to the House committee hearings the moment they are available. The hearings will be used by the committee, columnists, editorial writers, etc.

"Harold Guinzburg or Mike Bessie will talk to Liebling about an article in the New Yorker. (Memoirs of Hecate County article by Henning in Chicago Tribune using Ehrenburg to show Voice of America ineffectual, art program, etc.)

"2. The committee agreed to contribute and receive funds up to $1,000 for the Washington organization headed by Mrs. Wayne Coy and Mrs. Bell. Funds for this purpose should be sent to Louis Cowan.

"3. The group favored a news story rather than an advertisement in the Washington Post to publicize the high caliber of people supporting the information program. The consensus that a paid ad would be less effective than a general news story. The ad would look like part of a costly organized lobbying campaign.

"4. It was suggested that Barney Baruch could be very helpful with top leaders in Congress. John Howe should follow up with Louis Cowan to determine the best approach to Baruch. Baruch has influence with VANDENBERG, TAFT, JOE MARTIN, and many other top leaders.

"5. It was suggested that General Marshall cable personally to the heads of the important missions abroad requesting them to report to him on the effect of killing OIC.

"6. The Greek broadcast should be publicized.

"7. Benny Goodman has offered to help in any way possible. He will be in New York next Tuesday. The group agreed that there is not much that Goodman can do in Washington, but that he should be urged to get support from top people in the show business. Thayer will see him when he arrives in New York.

"WILLIAM T. STONE.

"Copies to Howland Sergeant, Stew Brown."

The law of the land has a provision which might crack down on the enthusiastic and extra-curricular activities of the worthy hangers-on in the distinguished State Department. We quote section 201, title 18, Criminal Code:

"No part of the money appropriated by any act shall in the absence of express authorization by Congress be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation—* * * penalty misdemeanor, fine not more than $500, or by imprisonment of not more than 1 year or both.

"JULY 11, 1919."

Harbor Facilities at Long Beach, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I invite attention to an article from the magazine Long Beach Business of May 1947, which sets forth the remarkable development of commercial facilities in the harbor of Long Beach, Calif. It is to be noted that the facilities offered there are as modern as any which are to be found in the ports of the world.

The article follows:

NEW TRANSIT SHED AND COAL LOADER

Visitors to Long Beach, including well-informed shipping men, are often amazed at what they see in our modern harbor. It may not be the largest on the Pacific coast but there can be no disputing the fact that in the excellence of its cargo-handling facilities it has no rival anywhere. Among the two that are the envy of other ports are the new transit shed now nearing completion on pier A and the bulk-loading equipment at berths 33 and 34.

The transit shed, which will be the scene of the Port-O-Trade national manufacturers' exposition June 13 to 22, is unique in that the roof is entirely supported from the walls and there is not a single column to interrupt the clearance throughout its entire length of 608 feet. The width of the steel and concrete building is 120 feet, affording more than 70,000 square feet of exhibit space for the trade show, being sponsored by the Long Beach Junior Chamber of Commerce.

When completed, the transit shed will be the most modern structure of its kind in the entire world. It is designed especially for handling cargoes by mechanical devices and accordingly the doors are unusually wide and high so that a tractor can carry a load direct from a freight car and stack it within the building. With two tracks between the shed and the ship and two more on the landward side there is ample room for freight cars.

The bulk cargo handler is the best facility of its kind on the Pacific coast, which gives Long Beach a big advantage in handling such shipments as coal, cement, gravel, potash, sand, and sulfur. Besides the actual machinery for loading the cargo there are tracks

for 150 freight cars adjacent to the pier so that there is no delay caused by a shortage of coal or other product to load. The rapidity with which coal may be taken aboard a ship was shown recently when 300,000 tons of Utah coal destined for Italy was loaded at the rate of 250 tons an hour, or a shipload every two and a half days, compared with a week or 2 weeks at other ports on the Pacific that have no such modern equipment.

The new shed and the loader will be open to visitors to the harbor during the celebration of World Trade Week, May 18 to 24.

Procedure for Disposition of Surplus Agricultural Lands Is Depriving Veterans of Farming Opportunities—Only 11 Percent of Acreage Disposed of by War Assets Administration Has Gone to Veterans—Legislation Required To Correct This Condition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are familiar with the fact that hundreds of thousands of veterans are seeking opportunities on the farm. Vocational training under the GI bill of rights is equipping these veterans for farm pursuits, but opportunities are greatly restricted by present policies with reference to farm credit and other facilities related to their chosen vocation. Congress has evidenced in many ways a sympathetic interest in farm youth, but additional steps need to be taken.

I find that the War Assets Administration had made available for disposition by the Farm Credit Administration 604,800 acres of agricultural land, and that approximately 243,300 acres have been disposed of by that agency. It is estimated that there will be a total of 3,000,000 acres to be disposed of under the Surplus Property Act of 1944. Of the land already disposed of under the terms of this act, only 11 percent has gone to the veterans. The veteran is in fifth position in determining priority. Others ahead of him are: Federal agencies, which have acquired 6 percent of the land; State and local agencies with 10 percent; former owners, 58 percent; and former tenants, 2 percent. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Congress should take a look at the 16 percent that has been acquired by Federal and State agencies to determine if the uses to which this land is to be applied come within the purvue of the Surplus Property Act. I believe that it would be generally agreed that the priority of former owners should not be disturbed, but the retention of agricultural land in public ownership whether in the hands of Federal or State agencies is not in line with Federal policy generally and in some instances such acquisition should be discouraged. In an effort to benefit as many veterans as possible, particularly those with a farm background, I have introduced H. R. 2658 which is being considered by the Committee on Expenditures; and this measure, if enacted, will meet some of the criticisms to which I have alluded.

The Democratic Traditions of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article published by an outstanding Scottish newspaper, the Edinburgh Evening News, on the occasion of Poland's Constitution Day in commemoration of this anniversary.

A few days ago this House devoted much of its time in commemoration of this great day for Poland. I know how very much our thoughtfulness was appreciated by the many hundred thousands of Poles dispersed all over the world who are still able to breathe free air after Poland's independence was destroyed by the Soviet occupants of that unhappy country.

The article follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC TRADITIONS OF POLAND
(By Zygmunt Nagorski)

Many people in this country have never learned about Poland at school. Many, too, thought Poland was a new country created after the last war by the Versailles Treaty.

Only a few are aware of the fact that Poland is one of the oldest countries in Europe, with a 10-centuries-old Christian tradition and an attachment to democratic principles firmly rooted in the minds of its people and statesmen. Their attachment to such principles explains why May 3 is Polish National Day.

It is not the anniversary of a battle; it does not commemorate any great national hero or any victory over an enemy. It is the birthday of the Polish Constitution which was passed in 1791 by the Polish Parliament, when two neighboring powers—Russia and Prussia—both ruled by autocratic governments, were in alliance against Poland.

Neither of these countries could allow a parliamentary system and the seeds of the French Revolution to grow in eastern Europe, which modern historians would describe as their "sphere of influence." And, unhappily for Poland, her progressive and democratic constitution was one of the main reasons why, a year later, Russian troops marched into Poland.

EQUAL RIGHTS TO ALL

But what was this constitution which made such fundamental changes in the inner system of Polish politics and in the essential structure of the Polish Commonwealth, as Poland was then called? The constitution gave equal rights to all men and women. It gave an equal start to newcomers to Poland and to those already living there. * * * "We declare absolute freedom for all those who are newcomers to the country and those who, having left the country, now wish to return. * * * Every man, from the moment when he steps on Polish soil, is absolutely free to apply his industry wherever and in whatever manner he may please."

Peasants, the class which at that time had, in many European countries, no protection whatsoever, were, by this constitution, brought under the protection of the law. * * * "The people on the land—from whose hands come the sources of the bounteous riches in the country, who form the major part of the population and thus build the greatest strength of the nation—for the sake of justice, humanity, and as our Christian duty, and for the sake of our own well-considered interests, we take under the protection of the law and the government."

BORN OUT OF THE PEOPLE

The religious intolerance which made people flee from their countries of origin was unknown in Poland, and the constitution says: "To all men of whatever denomination, peace in their faith and protection we owe; we guarantee to all religious denominations freedom in Polish lands in accordance with Polish laws." The Polish Parliament was to consist of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, thus applying the system already long established in the British Isles.

This constitution was the fruit of the work of the Polish King and his various Polish and foreign advisers. But the main structure of the constitution was born in the minds of the people, who pressed for reform, who wanted privileges till then confined to the gentry to be extended to others, particularly the middle classes and the peasants. The rights of man were, then, for the first time brought to light by this constitution, and this alarmed those who in neighboring countries were fighting against this very principle.

WILL BE FREE AGAIN

Soon afterward, Poland disappeared from the map of Europe, divided between Austria, Russia, and Prussia. She remained, kept in political, economic, and educational backwardness, in serfdom until 1918. Then, again, a short spell of freedom gave her a little time to recover. But out of the constitution of May 3 was born the solidarity among all classes of Poles—peasants, workers, townspeople, Polish Jews, and other minorities—who all felt their attachment to the Polish Nation.

They fought for independence for Poland from the first insurrection under Kosciuszko in 1794 until the last battle of Warsaw in August and September 1944. The same people, united, will build a new, free Poland when circumstances give them a chance.

The Polish National Day, celebrated in 1947 in exile by so many Poles, will be one more reminder to all friends of freedom and democracy that Polish democratic traditions are strong and alive. Given a chance for proper development and time for constructive work, they will undoubtedly produce a Poland truly free, genuinely democratic in the sense in which these terms are understood by western minds.

Conservation Measures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from the

Minnesota Game Protective League, opposing H. R. 2617 and H. R. 2472:

ST. PAUL, *May 14, 1947.*

The Honorable GEORGE MACKINNON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have been instructed by the president to address you and record with you the opposition of the league to the passage of bills H. R. 2617 and H. R. 2472.

H. R. 2617 is the bill which proposes to raise the cost of the migratory bird hunting stamp from $1 to $2. Our members would not object to paying the extra dollar if we thought the money would be used to good advantage for the benefit of migratory waterfowl, but, having in mind the manner in which the Fish and Wildlife Service have spent their money in our own State for useless refuges and the administration of those refuges, we feel the appropriations allowed them by Congress have been adequate except in one respect; their appropriations for law enforcement has probably been less than half of what it should be.

We might be in favor of the section of H. R. 2617 which proposes to open 25 percent of the already established refuges if this were a compulsory condition, but, in view of the past actions of the Fish and Wildlife Service, we believe they are offering this as a sugar coating to get the sportsmen to swallow the rest of the bill, and that they will be very reluctant to open any part of a refuge unless they are forced to.

We oppose H. R. 2472 because we see no necessity for the proposed addition of a corps of so-called expert technicians to advise regarding the handling of land and water in the interest of wildlife. At best, this corps would be simply duplicating the work already under way by nearly all State governments. This bill looks to us like just another proposal for the professional conservationists to supply their kind with a means of livelihood at the public's expense.

We trust that you will do all you can to defeat bills H. R. 2617 and H. R. 2472.

Yours very truly,

MINNESOTA GAME PROTECTIVE LEAGUE.
TOM WANN,
Second Vice President.

Msgr. John Dunphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Rev. Frederick D. Tyner, rector of St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Minneapolis, Minn., which appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, May 18, 1947. This article describes some of the many admirable characteristics that have so endeared Monsignor Dunphy to the people in Minneapolis from all walks of life and of all faiths. Reverend Tyner and Monsignor Dunphy are two outstanding examples of the tremendous influence for good that members of the clergy can have upon the community through their interest in the sports. Reverend Tyner is a keen golf enthusiast and Monsignor Dunphy has for years been one of the active sponsors in Minnesota of all forms of all athletic endeavor. These men of the cloth have found that the principles of Christianity can be learned on the playing fields and that when they are learned there they are not soon forgotten. Monsignor Dunphy and Reverend Tyner are performing an outstanding service to mankind through their active interest in sports and athletics.

The article follows:

WHAT'S YOUR SCORE?

(By Frederick D. Tyner, rector of St. Luke's Episcopal Church)

The Right Reverend John Dunphy (he was elevated to the rank of monsignor on Easter Sunday last) hasn't boxed for many years. But he still is in the ring as a pastor, as an inspiration for young and old, and as an all-around citizen.

While in school, boxing was Father John's favorite sport. As he grew older, he discovered his boxing had taught him some of the fundamental principles of living with people, a factor every man has to learn to be even reasonably successful—how to give and take, a proper respect for your opponent or competitor, and the penalty for hitting below the belt. It also taught him a good temper is an asset if properly curbed and kept under control.

The pastor of the Ascension Church takes the keenest interest in his gymnasium, one of the finest in the Northwest. You will find him hovering around with a suggestion here and a correction there, and always with a word of encouragement for the anxious, or the timid. * * * Father Dunphy always is quick to spot any sign of unfairness and never stands on ceremony in pointing it out. His athletic club always has a fine corps of boxers in the big Golden Glove tournament, and he himself is a member of the advisory committee of that outstanding organization.

But boxing isn't the only sport in which Monsignor Dunphy is interested. He is a keen baseball fan and on the golf links still wields a wicked niblick.

Father Dunphy's philosophy of life is simple and to the point: Keep a sound mind in a sound body; be loyal to your church and your God; be loyal to your neighbor; be loyal to the highest ideals and to yourself, and life will have that glow that makes life worth living.

His motto might well be: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life."

What's your score?

Motor Vehicle Service, Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to make a brief statement relative to a situation which I believe is eminently unfair to one group of Federal employees and which I have taken steps to correct through the introduction of H. R. 3331.

This bill will remedy an inequality in the act of July 6, 1945, Public Law 134, pertaining to certain employees of the motor vehicle service of the Post Office Department. I am glad to credit Mr. Paul M. Castiglioni, legislative representative of the National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, with first calling this discriminatory situation to my attention.

My bill will provide that all employees of the Motor Vehicle Service below the grades considered supervisory shall be accorded uniform treatment under law. Unless this bill is enacted, men employed in the Motor Vehicle Service of the Post Office Department in such classifications as mechanics in charge, special mechanics, and garagemen-drivers may devote a lifetime of service to the Government and yet be denied any opportunity to share in the rewards provided for faithful and meritorious service.

Certainly no one can take issue with the principle involved, for it cannot be deemed fair to reward one or two classifications of employees in a particular service for continuous faithful and meritorious service, and deny these rewards to others who work with them side by side. We cannot expect the employee discriminated against to display the proper amount of initiative desirable for efficient conduct of their duties.

This bill also recognizes the value and special qualifications of that group of the Motor Vehicle Service employees classified as dispatchers in that it will place them in the same category as special mechanics. At present the dispatchers are in a lower salary category with driver-mechanics and general mechanics, notwithstanding the fact their responsibilities are much greater and their promotion to the position of dispatcher came only after passing an additional appropriate higher civil-service examination.

I am confident that after considering the provisions of this bill and the present inequalities of the law the gentlemen of the Congress will share with me and with the National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees the opinion that all employees of this group are entitled to the same general benefits.

McGregor Will Hold Conferences in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my policy to keep in constant contact with the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District, whom I represent in Congress. I am anxious to learn what the folks back home are thinking about. In order to follow this policy I have attempted to make myself available to my constituents so they might discuss with me their views relative to national issues and also to give me the opportunity to be of service to them as their Congressman.

In accordance with my annual procedure—during the period of our official congressional recess—I plan to visit the six counties of the district. I have made arrangements to be at the courtroom of the county courthouses from 9 a. m. to

5 p. m. and have set forth the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, August 4 and 5, Ashland, Ashland County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 6 and 7, Mansfield, Richland County.

Friday and Saturday, August 8 and 9, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday and Tuesday, August 11 and 12, Delaware, Delaware County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 13 and 14, Newark, Licking County.

Friday and Saturday, August 15 and 16, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

I have been most gratified with the results obtained in the past and the interest shown by the number of constituents who have availed themselves of our conference plan.

No appointments are necessary, and I look forward to meeting a greater number this year, as I am certain we all have problems of personal and national interest to discuss, which will be of mutual benefit. I urge my constituents to confer with me on the date most convenient to them so that I may have their views, which will aid me in representing them in Congress.

Excerpts From Address Delivered by Hon. Katharine St. George Before the Panhellenic Societies in Washington, D. C., on May 17, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address delivered by me before the Panhellenic Societies in Washington, D. C., on May 17, 1947:

The time is long overdue to talk about the facts of national and international politics in these United States. And not because I expect any poor words of mine to have any lasting effect on these vast world trends that will doubtless go their way as they always have, but simply to clear the whole matter in my own mind and perhaps to clear it in the minds of that large minority with which I have always affiliated myself, I am putting these observations down, and in the brief time allotted me I shall try to express them to you.

Ever since our entry into World War I the most important question before the American people has been foreign affairs. It is the question about which they knew the least and also the question on which their leaders certainly knew the least.

There was only one way of changing the American policy based on the Monroe Doctrine, and that was to get the United States into a European war.

This was done; in both wars the same technique was used. The sentimentality of our people, which is very great, was played on by experts to the queen's taste.

Now within 2 years of the close of World War II a new enemy has been found, our quondam ally Soviet Russia. There was probably more perfect nonsense fed the American people to give them the idea of Russia as an ally in the cause of democracy than has ever been put over before. It is a tribute to the unparalleled ignorance of our people that that propaganda was completely successful. The picture of Russia as the crusading Galahad fighting to save the free nations of Europe is laughable if it were not tragic.

Russia in the first place never fought for anything but herself. Russia had nothing but men and would have been beaten to a standstill if she had not been equipped and bolstered by the colossal resources and technical knowledge of the United States. This fact was proved by the wretched performance of the Russian Army against the Finns in their first attempt to conquer that country, when they did not have any aid or comfort from the West.

Russia has never stood for freedom of any kind, and at least has had the honesty never to pretend to. She is an oriental despotism and the doctrine of spreading communism by the fire and sword is the age-old oriental doctrine. It was practiced by the Persians against the Greeks, by Genghis Khan who conquered and held more territory than any other man has ever conquered and held before, or since, and then by Mahomet's followers when they swept westward to spread their religion all over the world and to place the crescent in Europe, where they were finally stopped by Charles Martel on the field at Tours.

Now as a result of two World Wars within 50 years the British Empire has lost her world leadership and in spite of Mr. Churchill's proud boast that he would not preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, he has done exactly that.

As a result of these two wars and the collapse of the British Empire we find the United States assuming the role of empire and picking up the scepter that Britain has been forced to lay down. We find our country ceasing to be a republic and becoming an empire, and doing both with the consent and support of the majority.

So now we stand on the threshold of empire and how well equipped are we for this new venture? It must be admitted that we are poorly equipped for it. England trained her younger sons to be empire builders and sent them out when they were still young to distant lands where they spent their lives, but always kept their allegiance and their duty to England. Why was this? Because the English, like all Europeans, are patriots first, last, and always.

The modern American is not a patriot. If you look among your friends and acquaintances you will be surprised, if you analyze them dispassionately and fairly, how little real patriotism there really is in this country today. There is more in the Middle West than in any part of the country, but even there most people are a little ashamed of feeling or displaying patriotism. Some may take exception to this but, let them open their eyes to the raids on the Treasury by every little pressure group in the country. Everyone is looking for a Government handout.

There is a far cry from this modern America to the days when Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death." No; that would sound very hysterical and theatrical today to those who consider the people a mob to be cajoled and bribed by bread and circuses.

Now if we are indeed to assume the purple robe of empire, it is to be devoutly hoped that we will acquit ourselves well.

Our people have little relish and absolutely no training for world leadership. We lack the basic patriotism that is a necessity in anyone who assumes authority over other nationalities outside his own country; only intense patriotism will make him keep up his morale and his morals away from home and surrounded by subservient and conquered peoples.

From the first-hand information coming from our occupied zones in central Europe, we have not shown much morale and very little morals since the cessation of hostilities. We have sent over a lot of troops who never saw any fighting and they have brought our country into great disrepute all over Europe.

An American told me that after seeing and hearing of the conduct of the American army of occupation in Europe she thought the best thing that could happen would be to withdraw them all and pay England to do the job.

An eminent Catholic priest said recently after returning from our occupied zone in Germany, that when he saw the type of officers that had been sent over after the war to police our area, he said, and I quote: "Under what stones could they have found such creatures?" All this augurs ill for our future, and instead of indulging in mutual admiration, it might be well to remove the beam from our own eye before going after the mote that is in our brother's.

The game of empire is a great game. It cannot be played by any but the patriot and the man of assurance and courage. As one who never wanted to see my country become an empire, but who realizes now that it is too late for her to be anything else, I want her to be one of the great empires, and if it is possible, one of the good.

Interior Department Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter, sent to the editor of the Washington Post by Hon. Mon C. Wallgren, Governor of the State of Washington, presenting the case of the West and the Northwest against the sharp and unnecessary reductions in the estimates of President Truman made by the Republican-controlled committees and the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, appearing in the issue of the Washington Post of May 22, 1947, under the heading, "Interior Department Cuts":

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT CUT

It is regrettable indeed to learn that the Post has supported drastic budget slashes voted for western power and reclamation projects. The Post editorial of April 25, entitled "Interior Department Cut," was cited with approval on the floor of Congress by congressional proponents of western stagnation.

People of the West wonder whether the House action was motivated by ignorance or by hostility on the part of eastern interests. Because I have always regarded the Post as an alert and aggressive newspaper with a high-caliber editorial page, I prefer to think that your newspaper is neither ignorant nor hostile but, rather, that it has been sold a bill of goods in a weak moment.

I say this because your editorial approval of the House committee action has a familiar ring. It contains the old, hackneyed arguments that were used for many years by the enemies of Grand Coulee and other western projects.

Your editorial said:

"Utopian plans for making the wilderness blossom by a forcing process are a dream of the future."

Fourteen years ago similar statements were made about the foolhardiness of building hydroelectric plants and storage dams in the wilderness, where only jackrabbits and sagebrush grew.

Had those wise Federal investments not been made a decade ago, would we have survived the delay in building the B–17 and the B–29? It was fortunate, indeed, that the "dream of the future" had become a reality in time to supply the power for vast wartime aluminum production—power crucial for victory—which private companies admittedly could not supply.

Your editorial writer regards the economic development of this region—scheduled during these last 14 years—as a "forcing process." Apparently he approves a forcing process by pinchpenny zealots to slow the march of western economy. He cites with approval the House committee opinion that "deferral of certain developmental construction projects to a more propitious time" can save many millions of dollars.

Rivers that run idly to the sea instead of supplying power for industry and water for veterans' farms represent millions of dollars saved only to those who profit by a declining economy and a smaller amount of national goods and services. This is a barren economic philosophy which simply fails to take account of the wealth-creating, self-liquidating character of these western projects.

Did your editorial writer give any thought to the land-hungry veterans anxiously waiting for Columbia Basin farms? Did he think of them when he said developmental work should await a more propitious time? These veterans, having applied in war the massed might of the greatest industrial nation in the world, will be surprised to hear that capital outlays for developing new farms now are beyond the taxable capacity of the people.

Thoughtful persons understand that systematic development of the West is not a hand-out saddling taxpayers with special burdens. They know it to be a profitable public investment in America's future. Those who want to stifle this development reject the principle that the Nation's resources shall be wisely and constructively employed for the benefit of all the people.

Secretary Krug, as a public servant intrusted with the supervision of the Nation's resources, has shown an understanding of the integral role that the West must play in a prosperous, expanding economy. The prejudiced criticism that swept into your editorial does no justice to the Secretary's stand. The editorial reflects the sentiments of House committee members who butchered the Interior appropriation requests and then tried to slip the knife into the Secretary's hand by charging him with failure to cooperate.

The Governors of 10 Western States have met with me to take common counsel and action against the threat to western welfare. If we succeed in dispelling ignorance and hostility regarding the West, the needs of the whole Nation will be more clearly understood and its welfare more surely advanced.

MON C. WALLGREN,
Governor of Washington.

OLYMPIA, WASH.

Address of Hon. Fred Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by my colleague the Honorable FRED BRADLEY, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This speech was made before the Propeller Club of the United States at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York, May 21, and is of great interest on a most important subject, the future of the American merchant marine.

I am informed that the speech will again be delivered tonight at the National Maritime dinner in Washington, under the auspices of the Propeller Club of the United States, port of Washington.

I commend it to the attention of the Congress and to the public generally. It follows:

I have been serving on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee for the past 8 years and this year I was fortunate to be honored with the chairmanship, succeeding one of the most loyal friends that the American Merchant Marine has ever had, the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, who had been chairman for the past 16 years. The judge has not been a well man this year and during the short time I have served as chairman and undergone the added responsibilities of that job, I can well appreciate why he has been under the doctor's care. I am glad to report to you, however, that he is well on the mend and will soon be back in our committee deliberations and on the floor.

This is National Maritime Week and I want to pay tribute to all those splendid young men, regardless of race, creed, or color, who were our wartime merchant marine and without whose heroic service we could not have won this last great war. All America, and indeed the entire peace-loving world, owes them an undying debt of gratitude.

I am asked tonight to tell you where I think our merchant marine is headed in the future. We have one of two roads to travel; one, a road of lack of unity, lack of teamwork and lack of efficiency. This road leads us to disaster and will pile the merchant marine on the rocks. The other road is one of unity and efficiency. If we do use our collective heads, join hands and all put our shoulders to the wheel—by that I mean Government, ship operators, and the men who man the vessels—we will indeed have the finest merchant marine in the world, and that we must have!

In developing that fine merchant marine, I would recommend an increased speed in turn-around. By that I mean we have to unload our ships faster; we have to load them faster and the stay in port must be drastically shortened. I would suggest that we even consider the matter of incentive pay. For instance, I believe that our tug men down here on the water front, and I believe that the pilots who bring these ships in, could help to turn them around a little bit faster if it were made worth while, and then I believe our longshoremen could do a much better job if there were some incentive.

Now I know that, perhaps, some of our friends among the longshoremen may object to such a program on the face of it because they fear a loss of income. What I want to do is to advocate a program that will increase their income by the very reason of their greater productivity. America has been built on production and that means all of us have to increase our production in the face of this extreme international competition with which we are faced. In other words, instead of spending a week loading and a week unloading one ship, why should not we put in much less time with mechanical aids in loading or unloading five ships in the same length of time and at the same time receive a higher wage scale for doing it?

If we are to meet this increased and terrific international competition—operating as they are with their own native crews at about 50 percent of our cost, or with Lascar crews at 30 percent of our wage scales and with their tremendously lower safety standards, their much lower numbers of crew members and low feeding costs—with these disadvantages we must remember this: That the only possible way we can defeat that competition and overcome these handicaps is by everyone turning to and ever improving the efficiency of our American merchant marine. The Government is attacking this problem in a constructive way through our maritime-training programs. We are training our unlicensed officers to become ever more efficient and are up-grading them, and at Kings Point, N. Y., we have the finest maritime academy in the world. When those boys graduated from Kings Point, they not only know the theory, but they have had a good start on learning the practical application of the theories they have learned, because they put 1 year of total actual service on at least four types of ships sailing the seven seas and acquire the requisites of their duties as ships officers.

I have known of many veteran officers out on the Great Lakes and, indeed, on the oceans who have come up, as we call it, the hard way; but I have yet to find one of them who has actually checked into the training at Kings Point who does not wish he had had that same training in his youth, because he feels down in his heart that he would be a better officer. Again in travel to foreign ports these well-trained officers will make fine emissaries of good will between this Nation and the rest of the world, to whom we have to look for return cargoes if we are to engage in successful competition with the maritime nations of the world.

In order to maintain an adequate, efficient, and profitable merchant marine it is necessary to secure cargoes. How shall we go about securing these cargoes? It seems to be no secret that this country is slowly devoiding itself of natural resources. The problem that now confronts all of us is whether or not we should continue the excessive use of our own limited resources or save something for an emergency—and by emergency I mean if we are attacked some years hence by foreign enemies. If we use all our resources, naturally, we will be in the same shoes that Germany, France, or England were in during the last war. They had to depend upon outside sources. If we save some of these resources for a rainy day—and I hope that rainy day never comes—we should import some of these resources from foreign lands. That will accomplish two things: One, protect our own resources and, two, give us return cargoes. Now in order to buy these imports, it should not be necessary to use the usual medium of exchange, namely, money, and thereby create an overbalance of credits which, of course, these prostrated countries cannot finance; instead, we should trade our commodities for our imports.

You know, we could have excess of foodstuffs—such as grains, meats, etc.—clothing, heavy-duty goods, locomotives, automobiles, bath tubs, and other commodities we can think of and thereby have cargoes going over. It is not necessary for me as a layman to tell you practical operators that a merchant marine will be only successful if you carry cargoes both ways; and in addition to that turn them around quickly in the ports, because you cannot make money with any steamship tied to the dock nor laying at anchor.

Since being in Congress, I have read many, many times statements from recognized economists that if we could export 10 percent of our commodities it would mean the difference between depressions and prosperity; and there are many who think that we should strive to do this.

Now in the carrying of these cargoes and operating the ships, we have another part of the operation that American companies

should participate in and by that I mean cargo insurance. It has long been the practice of foreign countries when purchasing goods in this country that they stipulate the goods be carried in their bottoms and their underwriters insure the cargoes. If we could work out a system whereby we could control some of the underwriting it would help business in the underwriting field and, of course, help millions of people interested in these insurance companies.

Therefore, you will see that not only is our committee interested in the building and placing the American ships in the proper hands for operation but we are also interested in assisting to keep these fine efficient plants in operation and in that we must interest ourselves in helping that goods be sold abroad, which will give work and income to the entire Nation.

Last but not least, I favor a ship subsidy to those few operators who are operating ships on routes that cannot be made to be profitable but still we must have them for the benefit of the merchant marine and the Nation.

With respect to our overseas passenger service, we must permit our merchant marine to engage in overseas air transport along the lines it is presently operating with surface carriers. Those of us who advocate this program seek no special favor for the shipping lines; we just ask they be given the same rights as anyone else who is an American citizen who participates in overseas transportation. They have the facilities, they have the know-how, and they have the finances to operate overseas airways parallel to their surface lines; and it is up to the Congress to force the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant them that privilege to stand on their own feet and be given licenses for convenience and necessity if, as and when they ask for them. I have so testified before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has this very important matter before it today. Secondly, I would advocate, as a layman, that we not go in for too many superliners for the express purpose of carrying passengers. It seems to me that we will be more successful in the operation of ships, which will meet our rigid safety requirements, which will be fast, which will carry, perhaps, 200 passengers and carry some 10,000 tons of freight.

In conclusion, I repeat that if we are to maintain the American flag paramount on the high seas—and that is the responsibility of our committee—we have to have the utmost cooperation from all. We must have less individual selfishness on pulling at cross-purposes for their own selfish interests. We must have greater economy in our operation mechanically. We must have greater efficiency on the deck and in the engine room and on the dock; and we must have a cooperating spirit among the operators, the officers, and the seamen, and recognize the terrific international competition with which we are faced, which we must overcome to attain our goal.

Impoverished by Land Erosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any of us feel that our Nation can remain great if we allow our most valuable asset, our productive land, to become depleted by erosion. Mr. B. F. Vance, State Director of Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, at College Station, Tex., recently announced the progress made on the 1947 agricultural conservation program in Texas. Fifteen million dollars has been obligated by our county committees for assistance to perform conservation measures so far this year. Texas originally received $19,788,000 for this program which means that about 77 percent of the program funds have been used during the first 4 months of this year.

It is conservatively estimated that another $20,000,000 will be required to meet the demands of farmers and ranchers to participate in the conservation program. I sincerely hope that those who desire to participate in conserving our greatest resource will not be denied the necessary assistance from the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following careful study of land erosion by Glynn Mitchell Johnston, of Corsicana, Tex., which appeared in the Texas Professional Engineer magazine:

IMPOVERISHED BY LAND EROSION

(By Glynn Mitchell Johnston)

Out of a total Texas land area of approximately 169,000,000 acres, there were 33,000,000 acres in cultivation and fallow lands according to the census of 1940. It has been estimated that a total area of cultivatable lands of Texas is approximately 50,000,000 acres. This is about 30 percent of the total land area of the State and about 36 percent of the total area of 137,638,372 acres in farms. This area is made up of many different kinds of soils which vary in productive capacity and crop adaptations. While Texas does have a great variety of soils, some very fertile, the fact remains that consistent soil conservation practices must be maintained if our soils are going to be kept from impoverishment by erosion.

Several years ago a survey by the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture revealed that nearly all the crop and pasture lands of Texas have suffered in some way from erosion and depletion. About 11,000,000 acres were classed as badly damaged, while more than 50,000 acres were classed as having lost approximately 25 percent of top soil due to erosion caused by wind and water. In the black land agricultural counties of central Texas, a study of the 1940 United States census will show a decrease in the population—a marked decrease in some places—in the period from 1920. This decrease is due in a measure to a wearing away of the soil. History proves that civilization perishes with the soil. Let us take a look into the past to see what has happened.

W. C. Lowdermilk, Assistant Chief, Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., made a survey of southern Europe, north Africa, and the Near East in 1938 and 1939, for the purpose of securing beneficial information for United States farmers and stockmen and the country as a whole in our national program to save our soils from soil erosion. Dr. Lowdermilk cites specific examples in Babylon, the ancient forests of the Cedars of Lebanon, and Palestine to prove that a general condition of neglect and of wasted lands, underused lands, and misused lands has caused a decline and virtual death of once proud civilization.

In Babylon, proud ancient empire, where 2,600 years ago lived 30,000,000 people enjoying the fruits of a great civilization, we now find a heap of salty desolation and less than 4,000,000 people in Iraq, including ancient Mesopotamia with its two rivers, Tigris and Euphrates, running full of water, with the same climate, same soils. In times past the chief problem was control of silt. Silted-up canals can be seen all through the area. One irrigation project, Kut Barrage, has diverted the waters of the Tigris over an area of more than 500,000 acres; but there are few farmers in this country, which has one of the greatest possibilities for supporting people of any portion of that part of the world. With modern irrigation structures and machinery to dig canals and keep them clean, Willcocks, the great British irrigation authority, says it will be possible to support a population of 50,000,000 in Iraq. This ancient civilization perished from the effects of soil erosion and the resultant silt.

Another area is that of the forests of the Cedars of Lebanon, where King Solomon got timber for the temple in Jerusalem, and which covered an area of about 2,000 square miles. Today we find only four small groves, the principal one being the Tripoli grove which has about 400 trees in it. At one time this grove was reduced to 44 trees because goats were allowed to range there. A stone wall was built to keep out the goats, seed from old trees began to grow up into a fine forest. This proves that the goats, not change if climate, were responsible for the disappearance of the forest, and also that it would be possible to restore this forest over most of the area it once covered, especially in those areas where the soil had not been completely washed away. This forest was despoiled by overpasturing and soil erosion.

Another area of particular interest is Palestine, which is today a sorry commentary on man's occupation and exploitation of a once fruitful country. Decadent native populations and political and social decay are the usual offspring of landscapes impoverished by erosion. Barren, rocky hills, gullies, goats, poverty, and low standards of living present a dreary picture brightened only by the work of the Jews in reclaiming lands. Dr. Lowdermilk reading from a Government report says, "The urge of Jewish people to build a national home in Palestine is an outstanding and fascinating phenomenon of our times. Agricultural colonization in Palestine is the most remarkable devotion to and reclamation of land that I have seen in any country in the New or Old World."

Such serious damage has been done to lands of Palestine that they can never be brought back to their original condition; but judging from what has already been done by the Jewish colonists, it is evident that with capital this land will be able to support a much larger population. This will be a costly venture, but it will pay in the redemption of the land and the redemption of the people, because after all we are concerned in the conservation of soils and waters because we are concerned with the conservation of human values and human people.

The question arises, What is the absorptive capacity of Palestine? This is based upon food production. Food is primary. It must be produced first by the land within the borders of the country, and then imported in exchange for manufactured articles. Dr. Lowdermilk says in Palestine about 1,800,000 in addition to the present population can be fed from within if his suggested project is carried out; however, if industry is increased and products are available from buying food from outsiders, Iraq for example, there is practically no upper limit. It will depend upon the genius and the extent of development of industry within Palestine.

Speaking as a conservationist who likes to see the resources of the earth put to their highest use in the interest of making them work, Dr. Lowdermilk suggests the possibility of an irrigation and power system in Palestine that is unique in the world, and which he calls the Jordan Valley Authority, which would include the drainage of the Jordan,

both Palestine and Trans-Jordan. The narrow valley of the Jordan River, with the Dead Sea 1,300 feet below sea level, is only a short distance from the Mediterranean Sea. A canal could be put in from the Mediterranean and the water dropped into the Dead Sea, thereby producing power. Water for irrigation would come from the fresh waters of the Jordan. It would be possible to develop power for all sorts of industries. The Dead Sea contains some of earth's richest minerals. As industries develop, food may be supplied from Iraq, if that country is developed. Palestine is strategically located at the crossroads of three continents; raw materials may be brought in; transportation by steamship, railroad, and airplane is possible. But, such a project requires manpower. There are not enough people in Palestine now to do it. Considering the 550,000 Jews already there, Dr. Lowdermilk thinks it not too much to say that an additional 5,000,000 people can be absorbed by the country.

The great Mayan civilization in Central America became decadent and disappeared because of impoverishment of its lands due to soil erosion.

Here in the United States we need an attachment to and love for our soil. We must have it if we are to save our country from destruction and the wastage it is undergoing now. "Land is not an economic commodity," says Dr. Lowdermilk, "it is a part of the Nation." It is "the film of life," says Russell Lord. From the Atlantic to the Pacific our soil is getting away from us. In a few years weather can remove soils that have been centuries in building. "Man through recklessness or ignorance removes natural curbs and lets erosion get out of hand." Stuart Chase says, "The skin of America has been laid open. * * * Geological erosion tends to be static, for soil builds as fast or a little faster than water carries it away. Man-made erosion is dynamic and cumulative and has no end save complete destruction unless it is controlled."

H. H. Bennett, Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service, estimates rates of soil formation; for example, he says, "I would not be in the least surprised if it turned out that not less than 1,000 years at least are required to build an inch of good rich, Piedmont topsoil." This good soil has been ruined in 200 or 300 years and in some places as little as 20 or 40 years. We are told that at least 3,000,000,000 tons of solid soil materials are washed out of fields and pastures of the United States each year by water erosion alone. Bennett estimates that the United States has 610,000,000 acres of tilled or tillable soil. On the basis of this country's first erosion-reconnaissance survey started by the Soil Conservation Service in 1934, Mr. Bennett adds:

"Approximately 50,000,000 acres of once fertile land in this country have been essentially ruined for practical cultivation by erosion. Another 50,000,000 are in a condition almost as serious.

"About 100,000,000 acres still in cultivation have been seriously impoverished by loss of soil; and about 100,000,000 acres of cultivated land are being depleted of productive soil at an alarming rate."

Mr. Lord reminds us that 100,000,000 acres is as much land as there is in all of Illinois, Ohio, North Carolina, and Maryland together—enough to provide 1,250,000 families with 80-acre farms.

I am glad to be able to say that Texas farmers have not been, and are not going to be, the victims of complacency. After several years of intensive effort by farm leaders, there was enacted in 1939 the Texas State soil-conservation law. Under this law there have been set up in Texas 116 soil-conservation districts, including two-thirds of the State's area and four-fifths of its farms and ranches.

Because these districts do not have taxing powers, although otherwise they are true legal subdivisions of the State, their elected supervisors may extend to their landowners only such aid and assistance as are furnished gratis by the Federal and local governments, mainly the former.

Our Foreign-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun, Baltimore, Md., of May 22, 1947:

WE MUST KNOW THE DIMENSIONS OF OUR FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM

Secretary Marshall, in his press conference on Tuesday, stated that there will be no more appropriation requests, for the time being, comparable to the $400,000,000 program to aid Greece and Turkey and the $350,000,000 program of general foreign relief. But the important thing to note is the qualification for the time being. Mr. Marshall coupled his statement with the reminder that the State Department has already established a planning board (it was established before Secretary Marshall went to Moscow) that has for its task a full study of the role which American aid, whether by loans or by grants, may be called upon to play in our foreign policy.

Such a study is of the utmost importance. When President Truman anounced what has come to be called "the Truman doctrine," he stated it in such broad terms that its dimensions, in terms of American aid, could not even be charted. In his generalizations, he went far beyond the immediate subject, which was the case for providing assistance to Greece and Turkey only.

Obviously, the role played by American aid is going to be enormous. We have already loaned billions to Great Britain, and it is conceivable that more millions will have to follow them. We have made substantial loans to France and other countries. We carried the major load in the cost of UNRRA. We are following up UNRRA with our own foreign-relief program plus a large share of the cost of the IRO. We have earmarked $500,000,000 for China, to be used if and when China begins to put her house in order. The Greek-Turkish bill has been passed. Korea will require assistance. And these only touch the high spots of aid already granted or within view.

The reason for this outpouring is obvious. During the war the United States was a vast arsenal for the Allies. In terms of productive ability, the United States gained, rather than lost, during the war. The productive ability of much of the world, by contrast, has been shattered—by physical destruction and by economic and political dislocations. We are now, in a sense, playing the part of an arsenal of peace. We are compelled to pour forth assistance not for merely sentimental reasons but because there can be no real hope of a peaceful and stable world community until the unbalance between our immense productiveness and the rest of the world's needs stands corrected—until the shattered nations which look to us with mingled hope, envy, and skepticism can stand on their feet again. The role of arsenal of peace is as inescapable as the role of arsenal of war.

The fact remains that our capacity for aid is not limitless, but finite. When we speak of aid we tend to think of it as a matter of writing checks—of pouring out money. In fact, we pour out goods and services, not money. And there is a point beyond which this cannot be done without severe strain to the producing mechanism.

Hence the importance of the inquiry now undertaken by the State Department's planning board. We should now, insofar as it is possible to, know what will be required of us, so that these requirements may be equated with our capacity. It is not enough to be told that the demands on us are "tremendous." We need to know with a good deal more precision the scale of the demands and how they may be met.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waukesha (Wis.) Daily Freeman, of May 19, 1947:

DAVIS SUPPORTS DISPLACED PERSONS MEASURE

We are pleased to learn from Washington that Congressman GLENN R. DAVIS, of Waukesha, is actively supporting and will vote for emergency legislation to admit 400,000 displaced persons of Europe to America in the next 4 years. During his campaign for Second District Congressman, DAVIS went on record in favor of the bill, introduced by Representative WILLIAM G. STRATTON, JR., Republican, from Illinois, and the support he received may be an indication of the esteem in which the measure is held in this area.

This emergency legislation does not request special privileges for the despairing, homeless, persecuted individuals. During the past 9 years more than twice 400,000 could have come to America except for the war. Their quotas disappeared in the smoke of battle. The bill merely asks for temporary legal machinery so that these men and women—and the children—without a country may find a home here. And they won't take urgent housing from anyone because they will live with relatives and those without relatives will be settled by welfare groups in rural areas where housing is available on farms for agricultural workers.

Who are these people? More than 75 percent of them are victims of one or another of European dictators, no matter under what cause or name the dictator flourished—Communist or Fascist. Eighty percent are of the Christian faith, a good many of them Polish and Baltic refugees. Another portion of them, by far the smallest number, is of the Jewish faith. Some of them are political exiles, and since fascism is nominally dead in Europe today, this means that some of them are exiles from countries now controlled by communism.

Our Statue of Liberty, standing majestically above the waters of New York City's upper bay, carries at its base a famous quatrain: "Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me!"

Congressman STRATTON's bill would at least abolish the hypocrisy of this invitation which, under our present laws, means so little since the "homeless, tempest-tossed" are at present barred from entry here.

The Texas City Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following letter entitled "The Texas City Disaster" by Edgar Queeny:

THE TEXAS CITY DISASTER

To Monsanto Stockholders, Employees, and Friends:

As soon as we learned of the crushing misfortune that overtook Texas City, Mr. Rand and I, who were in the East, flew to the scene. Before landing, we circled the holocaust. You have heard it described in the press and over your radio. The reporters did not exaggerate. Exaggeration would have been impossible; our language is too inadequate.

The French liner *Grandcamp*, burdened with 2,500 tons of ammonium nitrate, was berthed at a quay immediately opposite our own. More ammonium nitrate, which has an explosive power about one-half as great as TNT, was on the dock at which she was loading. About half past 8 on the morning of April 16 fire was noticed on the *Grandcamp*. Soon after her crew abandoned her, and the nitrate exploded, subjecting portions of our plant to an impact we believe to be equivalent to 250 five-ton block-busters exploding simultaneously. Because the atomic bombs were exploded high above Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the blast beneath them we believe may have been less severe than that suffered by parts of our plant.

Our warehouse—a steel and brick structure—was flattened; not a splinter remained upright. The main power plant was similarly crushed. As the blast fanned out, walls of manufacturing buildings fell, windows of the plant office and laboratories shattered, roofs were ripped off, and pipe lines carrying inflammable liquids were torn apart. A huge wave, rushing in from the basin where the ship had rested, inundated the area while the explosion's heat ignited the benzol, propane, and ethyl benzene pouring out of the ruptured pipes and storage tanks. Savage and cruel fires, feeding on these inflammable liquids, scalded those who had survived the blast and were fleeing to safety; they cremated those who had fallen, and melted and twisted steel supports and girders.

Preventing effective rescue, these fires raged 2 days, sending up a mile-high Vesuvian wick which joined the titanic smoke columns arising from the near-by storage tanks of oil refineries, forming a pitchy umbra over the racked and grief-laden community.

Because our pay roll records were kept in the plant and were scattered by the blast, we are without an accurate list of those on duty at the time. We employed 658 persons in this plant. After most careful checking, we believe that 451 were on duty at the time. Of this number, 154 were either killed or are missing and believed dead; more than 200 required hospitalization; and 95 of the more seriously injured are still in hospitals. Some of them are not expected to survive. While there were many miraculous escapes from death, few escaped without the proverbial scratch. Almost all those not requiring hospitalization needed some medical aid.

In addition to our own casualties, 123 employees of outside contractors were engaged on construction in our plant. As most of them were working in areas of greatest exposure, their ratio of death and severe injury was greater than our own. Of the combined forces in our plant, the dead, missing, and believed dead total 227—more than one-third of the whole area's total.

While fate usually plays no favorites, our technical staff suffered the heaviest proportion of casualties. J. R. Mares, general manager of our Texas division, was fortunate; he did not reach the plant until a few minutes after the *Grandcamp* exploded. But glass was blown into the brain of H. K. Eckert, our plant manager. Although he remained for a few days in a critical condition, he is expected to recover. Charles Comstock, the division's technical director; B. F. Merriam, chief plant engineer; R. E. Boudinot, production manager; R. D. Southerland, safety engineer; and F. A. Ruecker, chief power plant engineer, and all his staff are dead. Robert Morris, assistant plant manager survived, although the plant jeep in which he was riding, seeking a tug to pull the *Grandcamp* into the bay, was hurled high in the air and overturned. He was saved by the giant wave which covered him. With punctured eardrums and painful bruises, he rescued many trapped office workers.

Of 17 young and promising chemists who were supervising production in different departments, 16 perished, leaving behind many young widows and families of tiny ones. To this list may be added other technical men who are still in critical condition.

Several other company officials came to Texas City to help, organize, and plan. Among the first arrivals were Dr. Emmet Kelly, our medical director, and some of his staff. A plane load of nurses and medical supplies was also flown in.

Friday Mr. Rand and I accompanied Dr. Kelly on his round of the hospitals. As we visited with our own stricken and saw the conditions of others, it was impossible for us to contain emotions. But we heard not one word of recrimination nor any attempt to fix blame. Each accepted his anguish stoically as the lot which fate had cast for him. We attempted to solace wives sitting beside husbands whose lives were in the balance. Their manner was brave but their eyes betrayed the torment of their souls.

A young girl—shattered and barely conscious—who had been in charge of pay-roll records, seemed to be worried only about the loss of her records. Another girl, bandage-swathed and disfigured forever by flying glass, touched us to the quick by saying softly, "Oh, I'm so sorry for Monsanto, losing so many fine men." Many evidences of unselfishness, heroism, pluck, and courage were unveiled to us.

By Friday morning, except for the benzol storage tanks which continued to burn, most fires in our plant had subsided. We visited the ruins. Fires still raged in both Humble and Republic Oil Co.'s nearby tanks, raising a huge Bikini-like pillar of pall 3,000 feet into an otherwise clear sky, where it was joined by the gray of our own benzol. There both plumed and stratified, forming a gloomy awning of darkness which drifted on southerly winds. Monsanto pilots flying to St. Louis that afternoon reported that these clouds stretched to Missouri's southern border.

The smoldering rubble in our plant still hissed as fireboats played streams upon it. Squads of Red Cross men were engaged in the dangerous work of removing bodies. Bulldozers had cleared pathways through the rubble, along which we passed stretcher after stretcher bearing the charred organic remains of employees. It was heartbreaking and gruesome; memories of it will haunt us forever.

Attempts to assuage the grief of the victims of such a disaster are ineffective, this being within the province of time alone. But Mr. Rand and I believed that our stockholders would approve alleviating the financial problems attending the changed circumstances of so many of our employees. Hence, we offered immediate payments of $1,000 in case of each death to each widow or nearest dependent. Almost all employees of over 3 months' Monsanto employment were covered by our group-insurance plan, and, as accidental death doubles the payment, the beneficiary of an insured hourly employee will receive $6,000 to $8,000 in insurance. Since insurance payments increase in ratio to salary, the widow of a man who earned $7,500, for instance, will receive $17,500. Our treasurer and a representative of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. began making payments 48 hours after the blast.

In addition, Texas law requires in such fatality cases the payment to the widow or beneficiary of $20 a week for 360 weeks—$7,200. Our legal liability in this respect is covered by Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., who will make the payments.

We requested all cases of special hardship to make known their needs to our Texas City personnel officer, who was granted authority to deal liberally with them.

We also announced that hospitalization costs of our employees and their dependents who were injured, not covered by the employees' Blue Cross scheme, would be borne by the company and that full base salaries and wages would be guaranteed to them during both hospitalization and convalescence; and, further, that all who suffered permanent injuries preventing reemployment would receive individual and liberal consideration beyond compensation for which we are legally liable.

Our hastily established housing group has made temporary repairs to the homes of 148 employees, and more are being cared for as rapidly as material becomes available. We are surveying all housing damage and other losses suffered by our people, and our Texas division officers are instructed to do all possible to alleviate hardship.

We arranged to pay for the transportation of the remains of employees whom we had moved into the area and for the transportation of their families and household goods to their former homes, if they desired. We also guaranteed widows of those we had moved into Texas City against any loss of the equities they had acquired in their homes, in the event they desired to move away.

Hourly employees who are able to work were guaranteed their wages through April 27. Thereafter, we hope to find employment for most of them in the work of clearing the site and reconstruction.

To provide for the cost of these payments which are beyond our legal liabilities and to reward outstanding cases of heroism, our board of directors has appropriated $500,000. All of our legal liabilities will be discharged by our insurance companies. We hope our shareholders will approve the use of this part of their profits to alleviate the misfortunes of the men, women, and bereaved families of those who worked for them.

But the contribution Monsanto as a company is offering is not the whole story. Monsanto employees are also showing their feeling for the sufferers in the disaster area. Various Monsanto plants have started voluntary collections, a spontaneous personal expression of their sympathy.

At Oak Ridge, where Monsanto operates the Clinton Laboratories, a number of the employees are giving the equivalent to a day's pay. At Trenton, Mich., donations have been coming in with cooperation of the union. Seattle and Vancouver employees of Monsanto's western division are contributing. The phosphate division sales office at Birmingham, Ala., the western division sales office at San Francisco, Calif., the main office at St. Louis, Mo., and the central research laboratories at Dayton, Ohio, all sent in generous

donations. At Carondelet, Mo., and Anniston, Ala., plans are under way to assist employees of the stricken plant. By no means can this be the entire story for it will be weeks before all the facts are known, all the stories told of sacrifice, sympathy, and understanding of the multitude who gave in the time of need.

Due to the magnitude of the disaster and the anxiety for news, some erroneous statements were circulated. We should like to correct some of them.

The ammonium nitrate aboard the *Grandcamp* did not originate in any Monsanto plant; Monsanto does not manufacture ammonium nitrate. Nor was it being loaded at our dock, nor was it destined for any of our plants. We do not use it.

Our Texas City plant did not use or manufacture any explosives. Several inflammable products such as benzol and propane constituted its raw materials. It manufactured monomeric styrene and polystyrene; the former is inflammable but the latter will only support combustion like wood—the distinction between an explosive and an inflammable material being that the former can be detonated on impact and the latter bursts into flame when ignited.

There were no major explosions in our Texas City plant. None of the minor ones, described by our surviving staff as puffs, was great enough to cause any damage outside our plant area. The main fires in our plant were in the storage tanks and tank cars of benzol, propane, and ethyl benzene, an intermediate in the manufacture of styrene.

Our Texas City operation was not considered a hazardous one—no more so than oil refining, which it resembled. It carried the same insurance rates as oil refineries.

An irresponsible criticism of the plant's design by an employee of a contractor who had been engaged in its construction received wide publicity. Unfortunately, a repudiation of his statement by the president of that company was not widely publicized. There were no construction faults accountable for even a part of the disaster. In rebuilding, we expect to utilize the same type of construction. No manufacturing plant is designed as a fortress, nor could many fortresses withstand a blast such as came from the *Grandcamp*. The plant also contained fire protection approved by our insurance companies; it was adequate to cope with any foreseeable contingency.

There were rumors in financial circles that our insurance coverage was inadequate. The plant and contents were insured for $14,750,000, which covered the plant inventory of approximately $1,000,000 and the depreciated value of its buildings, machinery, and equipment on a 90-percent coinsurance clause. As we have no estimates of reconstruction costs, we do not know how far our insurance receipts will fall short of them. In addition, the plant was covered by $7,500,000 of use and occupancy insurance and $2,500,000 of public liability insurance.

Of course the loss of such an important unit will have an adverse effect on future profits, although use and occupancy insurance will compensate during the coming 12 months in large degree. But the greatest loss will be in the potential profits from several derivatives of styrene which we planned to manufacture and which must now await either the rebuilding of the Texas City plant or supplies of styrene monomer from other sources. We are actively exploring every avenue. We are hopeful of securing a substantial supply but it is not likely that we can purchase enough to carry on with our recent program.

Our plant was the first to produce styrene for the manufacture of synthetic rubber so desperately needed after Pearl Harbor. It is now gone and with it many of the men—chemists and engineers who contribute to perfecting the processes in the laboratory and in the pilot plant stages. Working literally day and night in the dark days of 1942, their ideas and designs took shape in the mass of pipes, apparatus, columns, mortar and bricks at Texas City. The physical part of the men and the plant have gone, but not the products of their minds. This will live on. Based on their contributions and that of others, we will build again at Texas City on their foundations. The results of their work will continue to serve their fellowmen.

The company has many friends. Hundreds of messages of sympathy and offers of assistance poured into our offices from customers, competitors, individuals, and suppliers. Many came from far corners of the earth. All were comforting and appreciated.

I should like to pay tribute to the splendid work of those remarkable organizations, the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, the Volunteers of America, the Boy Scouts of America, the United States Army's medical staff, the staffs of the hospitals in the area, and the officials of both the State of Texas and the city of Texas City, for the way in which they responded to the challenge of the emergency. The manner in which the Monsanto staff overcame the initial shock and established an effective organization to command a most difficult situation, then immediately planned the future, was gratifying in the highest degree.

Sometimes it takes a tragedy to bring forth the better qualities of human beings. Our visit to Texas City made us proud to be Americans and especially so to belong to the exceptionally able group of them making up Monsanto.

EDGAR M. QUEENY.

APRIL 30, 1947.

England's Experiment in Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Felix Morley from Human Events for April 30, 1947:

SHARING THE WEALTH IN BRITAIN

(By Felix Morley)

Those who would estimate the political future in Great Britain, as a primary determinant of the future of Europe, should be sure at the outset that they appreciate the major political asset of the British Labor Party. Criticism of Prime Minister Attlee's government has greatly increased during the past 3 months. But it is probable that a majority of the electorate would still indorse the "attack on privilege" as it is called, behind which all elements in the Labor party are united.

This attack takes the form of a leveling policy, both financial and social, which can be and is described as democratic. It is facilitated by wartime necessities and precedents, many of which are now regarded in England as permanent. The underlying issue is one of social revolution, both broader and deeper than that nationalization of key industries on which public attention has been disposed to focus.

The effects of the democratic trend on an essentially aristocratic national tradition are apparent to the casual observer. They can be seen throughout the countryside, where scarcely any of the great estates of England's spacious days now remain in private hands. They can be seen in the west end of London, where the big town houses of the gentry are being requisitioned by local government for conversion into flats, or taken over for the ever-growing network of official bureaus.

Statistics, however, frame the visual picture helpfully. And some very cogent figures are to be found in an admirable analysis on National Income and Expenditure of the United Kingdom (Cmd. 7099) released by the wholly nonpolitical Central Statistical Office early this month.

In the fiscal year ending March 31, 1939, the last full year before the outbreak of the recent war, 7,000 British taxpayers retained a net income of £6,000 and over after the payment of income tax. In the fiscal year ending March 31, 1946, the number of individuals retaining net income upward of £6,000 ($24,000 at present exchange) had fallen to 45.

The decline remains precipitous in the case of the number of British taxpayers retaining a net income of £4,000 and over, being from 19,000 to 885 in this case. From this bracket comes most of the investment necessary to make the capitalist system work. And the figures do not represent the whole loss, because in 1939 the purchasing power of the pound was at least one-third above that of the postwar period.

II

Final returns for the fiscal year which ended March 31, 1947, will also show the number of Britishers retaining a net income of over $24,000 at fewer than 50, out of a total population of nearly 50,000,000. And for the current fiscal year the results will be the same.

The budget presented to the House of Commons by the Chancelor of the Exchequer (Dr. Hugh Dalton) on April 15 provides a considerable tax saving for those in the lower income brackets. It continues unaltered the policy of confiscating, by sharply graduated taxation, all individual income, from whatever source, which would leave the recipient a net of more than $24,000 per annum. The coming of peace has made no difference to the Labor Party policy of soak the rich.

There was a time when the British regarded taxation as a scientific method for raising the revenue required by government. That principle has been repudiated by the Labor Party, which frankly regards the income tax as a device for securing a more equitable—or democratic—distribution of individual purchasing power. In the official white paper, already cited, the attention of the reader is called to the change in the distribution of income brought about by taxation.

As significant as the elimination of the wealthy is the temporary improvement in the position of those at the bottom of the income scale. Everyone agrees, with enthusiasm or with reservations, that the unskilled laborer in Britain is better off today than was the case 10 years ago. Here again statistics reinforce the results of observation and inquiry.

In the fiscal year 1939 a total of 2,270,000 Britishers had net incomes, after payment of income tax, of from £250 to £1,000 per annum. In the fiscal year 1946 the number in this class had increased to 5,877,000. Although the taxable basis is now being narrowed the numbers receiving incomes of from $1,000 to $4,000 is still climbing, partly because many of the very poor have been raised to the bottom of this bracket and partly be-

cause many of the middle class are being pressed down into its top.

In nearly 2 years of office the labor government has cut the imposition of the income tax on the poor by from 50 to 100 percent, while purposefully keeping its incidence on the rich at wartime levels. And taxation is not the only agency by which a uniform living standard is being enforced in a country where there was once sharp demarcation between upper, middle, and lower classes.

III

As important as taxation, in the leveling process, are the cost-of-living subsidies which are being progressively stepped up by the labor government. Like the confiscatory income tax, these subsidies were a wartime emergency development which the labor party now endorses as permanent policy. The subsidy is applied to food products of universal consumption, such as bread, tea, eggs, and meat, but to some extent also to utility clothing and shoes. In the fiscal year ending April 1 they cost the taxpayers the huge sum of nearly £400,000,000 and in the current budget they are estimated at £25,000,000 ($1,700,000,000), out of a total anticipated expenditure of £3,181,367,000.

In other words, almost 14 cents of every British tax dollar is being spent to provide essential food and clothing at less than cost. The benefits of the subsidy apply to all, of course. But since most subsidized articles are strictly rationed the effect is to make the Englishman with higher earning capacity pay not only for the Government subvention which he receives, but for that of the relatively untaxed poor as well.

The subsidy policy is credited, along with the rigorous governmental controls, for having kept the working-class cost-of-living index very stable. This index is now only 132, on a basis where costs on September 1, 1939, are measured as 100. But stable prices have restrained, rather than prevented, wages from rising. The latter have moved up an average of 65 percent during the period that the cost of living has increased half that amount.

So there are, to recapitulate, three major lines along which Great Britain is being socialized. They are (1) an income tax policy which is confiscatory for the rich while simultaneously lenient to the poor; (2) a subsidization policy which, combined with strict rationing, provides the bare essentials of life at low cost while insuring that the well-to-do, so far as any remain, can find no outlets for extravagant living; (3) a policy of permitting—though not encouraging—wage increases while constantly stepping up (as in the current budget) the almost numberless sales, profits, transactional and inheritance taxes.

There is no question that the calculated result of all this is a development of social democracy. There is equally no question that this development is strangling the capitalist system in Great Britain.

As the sources of venture capital are drained dry by a socialistic government the average businessman, tied hand and foot by priorities, controls, regulations, and shortages, becomes increasingly pessimistic about the future of free enterprise. He advises his son not to carry on the family undertaking but to get into the civil service, where he may enjoy the curious pleasure of issuing countless governmental directives, as opposed to the ceaseless misery of trying to fulfill them.

IV

The catch, now becoming unconcealably apparent, is that an ever-increasing bureaucracy, pouring out more and more directives, can do little or nothing to meet Britain's primary need of increased production.

The somewhat belated anxiety of the Socialist government in regard to production is exemplified by the publicity campaign planned to stir the workers to greater output. Posters are to be placed in 90,000 places of employment and at 13,000 centers where they will attract a maximum of public attention. They are of striking design, with two constantly repeated slogans: "We're up against it" and "We work—or want."

The Chancelor of the Exchequer summarized the situation equally grimly in his recent budget speech, telling the House of Commons: "We must export or we shall expire." A huge volume of exports is, of course, essential to Great Britain, to obtain funds to purchase food necessary to supplement its limited agricultural output and to buy many essential raw materials. Pending the commercial development of atomic energy, coal remains the only natural resource which Great Britain possesses in really abundant quantity.

There is no doubt that the relative failure of coal production, during the past hard winter, has severely shaken public confidence and seriously frightened Prime Minister Attlee and his Cabinet. Concentrated attention is now being given to the problem of stimulating output, but the fallacy of emphasizing distribution before production still continues. A high official in the Ministry of Fuel told me that he looks forward with grave apprehension to May 1, when the 5-day week becomes mandatory in the nationalized coal mines. Production, now about 15 percent below the 1938 level, may then decline even further.

The magnitude of the production problem, of which coal is only an outstanding instance, will be considered in a subsequent analysis. It is causing many British Socialists to reconsider doctriniare ideas. For the situation no longer permits them to laugh off such warnings as that issued by Winston Churchill on April 18, when he said:

"The prolongation of the present system of denying rewards and sharing miseries will break the mainspring of the country, and, if it is continued, it will only be a question of time before we shall be unable to support our population."

We Can't Feed Europe Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, former President Herbert Hoover has proved to be a prophet. Way back in 1919, as relief director for Europe, he reported that the United States could not meet Europe's economic needs indefinitely. Only a few weeks ago he again restated his previous position which holds good for today.

Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I include the following Associated Press story on this subject which appeared in the Evening Star:

HOOVER'S 1919 REPORT WARNED UNITED STATES COULDN'T AID EUROPE FOREVER

A 28-year-old statement by Herbert Hoover that the Western Hemisphere could not meet Europe's economic needs indefinitely was published last night by the State Department in the latest of a series of historical documents.

Mr. Hoover, then relief director, gave his estimate of the European economic situation in the wake of World War I in a report to the Supreme Economic Council of the Allied and Associated Powers.

"During some short period, it may be possible for the Western Hemisphere, which has retained and even increased its productivity, to supply the deficiencies of Europe," Mr. Hoover advised on July 3, 1919.

"Such deficiencies would have to be supplied in large degree upon credits, but, aside from this, the entire surplus productivity of the Western Hemisphere is totally incapable of meeting the present deficiency in European production if it is long continued.

"CREDITS MUST BE TEMPORARY

"Nor, as a practical fact, could credits be mobilized for this purpose for more than a short period, because all credits must necessarily be simply an advance against the return of commodities in exchange, and credits will break down the instant that the return of commodities become improbable.

"Further, if such credits be obtained in more than temporary purposes, it would result in economic slavery of Europe to the Western Hemisphere, and the ultimate end would be war again.

"The solution, therefore, of the problem, except in purely temporary aspects, does not lie in a stream of commodities on credit from the Western Hemisphere, but lies in a vigorous realization of the actual situation in each country of Europe and a resolute statesmanship based on such a realization.

"The populations of Europe must be brought to a realization that productivity must be instantly increased."

NO ROOM FOR EXPERIMENTS

Mr. Hoover said further that "whatever the economic theory or political cry, it must embrace the maximum individual effort, for there is no margin of surplus productivity in Europe to risk revolutionary experimentation.

"No economic policy will bring food to those stomachs or fuel to those hearths that does not secure the maximum production," he added.

Mr. Hoover's report was contained in a volume on foreign relations of the United States covering the 1919 Peace Conference.

Does the War Department Want the Reserve?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is essential that we maintain an active reserve program within our national defense system in order to properly maintain our national security. Those reservists who before 1941 were active in maintaining their military proficiency proved to be the backbone of the tremendous fighting forces we were able to muster and send to foreign battlefields. They, along with the other elements and components of our armed services, played an important part in winning World War II.

I sincerely hope that during these postwar years the War Department and the Reservists will cooperate in formulating a

policy which will provide this country with the security it so sorely needs. I believe a frank discussion of their differences will result in the reserve component being used to the proper advantage in our national defense program.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Reserve officers' magazine of May 1947 entitled "Does the War Department Want the Reserve?":

DOES THE WAR DEPARTMENT WANT THE RESERVE?

"We just don't give a damn!"

This remark, unvarnished as it is, was made by a representative of the War Department during a recess of a congressional committee weighing the proposed retirement bill for civilian components. The officer had reference to War Department position in standing alone in face of the combined agreement of the Navy Department, the Reserve Officers Association, National Guard Association, and other reserve organizations on a retirement system for reservists. The statement of this officer unconsciously reflected the War Department attitude, long standing, toward the reserve component. It is worthy of comment, to say the least; and ROA is more than ready—and willing—to lead the discussion.

For many years the relationship of the War Department with the Reserve has been that similar to a foster father in a confused state attempting to arrive at a decision as to whether the child is worthy of adoption. From all outward appearances this has been one of an attitude of mind. On countless occasions, especially during the active-duty days of World War II, this frame of mind as reflected by the Regular officer proved anything but encouraging to the civilian soldier.

It seems opportune in this day and age that a definite conclusion be attained by the War Department as to whether the Reserve is necessary to national security. If so, some constructive action along with some revised thinking should be the order of the day.

Since its reactivation a main project for ROA has been a battle for the establishment of an effective and functioning organized reserve of value to the Nation and national security. The Reserve has found it necessary to push its own program with little assistance from sidelines, and until the War Department revises its present trend of thinking there is no questioning the present and future impotency of the ORC.

For the record it will be stated that the Reserve stands ready, willing, and able on any occasion to assist the War Department in obtaining whatever is necessary for national security. No expression of appreciation is asked or expected for what is acknowledged as a patriotic duty. However, if the War Department recognizes the Reserve as a vital cog in the wheel of security, it must take immediate steps to advance the training and equipment program of the civilian component.

To bring the case down to bed rock let's get at some facts:

1. Excuses emanating from the War Department concerning the plight of appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 have run rampant. Records, meanwhile, indicate that the amount appropriated to the Reserve ($56,000,000) will not be utilized during the current fiscal year. Furthermore, of a War Department budget of $6,765,507,100 for 1948 the amount originally earmarked for ORC training was the same unsatisfactory amount (8/10ths of 1 percent) as that of 1947. Now, to add insult to injury the WD has, with full disregard of the Reserve, proposed to transfer $30,000,000 from the total ORC appropriation ($56,000,000) to "Finance service, Army" for Regular Army pay purposes. This amount has been frozen by the WD, no part being spent for the Reserve during the fiscal year, with the net result that the $56,000,000 appropriated by Congress last year has in effect been cut by the WD to $26,000,000. It is interesting to note that the total amount proposed to be transferred from present appropriations by the WD amounts to approximately 10 percent of the $8,458,357,150, the WD figure for 1947, while the cut in the Reserve portion of this appropriation is close to 54 percent. Assuming all this money is expended for training purposes during the coming fiscal year, the percentage of Reserves to receive training compared with the total number eligible is infinitesimal.

2. Lack of farsighted planning has resulted in a release of many military installations which could have been utilized profitably for Reserve training and the storage of equipment.

3. To date no promotion policy for inactive Reservists has been announced by the War Department and conspicuous by its absence is a policy with reference to the requirements for an officer to remain active.

4. Treatment accorded Reserve officers appearing before Army retiring boards has resulted in a bitterness and resentment against the War Department not soon to be forgotten. Officers suffering from wounds or sickness and appearing before these military tribunals have without hesitation compared the boards similar in attitude and procedure with that of a general court martial. This is not only supported by documentary evidence but with sworn testimony of Reserve officers unfortunate enough to be assigned as board members with Regulars.

5. While the law specifically states that both retired Regular and retired Reserve officers are in all respects entitled to receive the same compensations, the War Department has consistently refused the retired Reserve officer the right and privilege of purchasing at a post exchange or commissary, which is contrary to the spirit of the law and the intent of Congress.

6. In several instances Organized Reserve Corps headquarters have been moved from central locations to outlying areas without regard for the convenience and necessities of Reserve personnel. This action has proved detrimental to those officers contributing time and effort to maintaining their status in the ORC.

Now the time is at hand when the War Department must give more than lip service to the Reserve. It must recognize that in all wars in which this Nation has been engaged a civilian army with a sprinkling of Regulars has been required to obtain a military victory. Should this country become embroiled in another war, it would again require the civilian-soldier to carry the burden in combat.

Only through the adoption of a more realistic and cooperative attitude toward the problems of the Reserve can the War Department meet its responsibility for maintaining national security. Meanwhile, ROA is moved in a spirit of responsible citizenship to air a situation that is redolent with national danger.

Reorganization of the Chinese Government—China's Liberals Get Their Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an illuminating article on the recent reorganization of the Chinese Government written by one of the very best informed and soundest students of China. Dr. Price was born in China and has taught there more than 20 years. He speaks the language perfectly, knows personally and in many instances intimately most of the leaders of China of all parties.

So much of what has come out of China in the last few years has been superficial, primarily journalistic, or inspired propaganda with a purpose, that it is a pleasure to read something from one who knows what he is talking about.

The following article is from the Christian Century of May 14, 1947:

CHINA'S LIBERALS GET THEIR CHANCE

(By Frank Wilson Price)

China's liberals are moving into a key position. They have won strong representation in the new coalition government at Nanking. Their influence as a middle-of-the-road progressive group between the extreme conservatives of the Kuomintang and the Communist insurgents is steadily growing. They are working for a unified, democratic, modernized, and prosperous China, independent in its foreign policy but cooperating fully with the United Nations.

It was to the liberals in the various political parties and without party ties that General Marshall appealed so earnestly when he left China last January. "The solution of the situation, as I see it," he said, "would be the assumption of leadership by the liberals in the Government and minority parties, a splendid group of men, but who as yet lack the political power to exercise a controlling influence. Successful action on their part under the leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek would, I believe, lead to unity through good government."

THE LIBERALS ARE CHINA'S HOPE

General Marshall's mission to China is commonly described as a failure. It is true that he failed to achieve his immediate objective of mediation between the National Government and the Communists. But his success in strengthening the liberal and democratic forces outside the Communist Party has not been fully appreciated. The liberals are the men and women who will ultimately bring about a Chinese solution of China's problems. The question is whether they have enough power and influence at present to effect much-needed political reforms to avert a serious collapse in the national economy, to inspire a tired national government with new ideas and fresh morale, and to provide a positive, constructive answer to the Communist challenge. That they have been given a new chance to try cannot be denied.

The past 6 months have been in some ways the most discouraging period for China since VJ-day. After nearly 3 years of Kuomintang-Communist negotiations, a complete break occurred. Hopes raised in the early months of American mediation were shattered. On January 24 the national government made its final peace offer to the Communists. Only when this was flatly turned down with counterdemands which General Marshall, himself, said, "The Government could not be expected to accept," and the Communists declared that "there is no more mediation; the only way out is to fight"—only then did Nanking send the Communist representatives back to Yenan and reluctantly order an all-out military campaign. On March 19 national troops captured the Communist capital and the armed struggle continues fiercely in those regions of north China—about one-fifth the area of all China—where the Government is trying to restore railway communications and to dislodge the rebels. The Government believes that victory is es-

sential to recovery and a satisfactory agreement with the Communists; the Communists hope to prolong the conflict by guerrilla warfare until the National Government collapses economically or the international situation turns in their favor.

AMERICAN PRESTIGE GOES DOWN AND UP

Within 6 months American prestige in China reached a new low, owing to widespread anti-American agitation fanned by leftist elements over the marine rape case in Peiping and in opposition to the continued presence of 10,000 marines in north China. Since the job of repatriating 3,000,000 Japanese was done and the truce teams were only marking time, the United States Government wisely announced on January 29 that it would withdraw all American troops within 90 days and discontinue its futile peace efforts. This move, together with the departure of Communist leaders from national territory, has effectively silenced much critism against America and has restored considerably the prestige which the American Government enjoyed at the end of the war.

Paralleling the loss of American influence in China was a sharp decline in the prestige of the Chinese National Government in this country, owing to unfavorable reports from China, the wide sale of Thunder Out of China (a brilliantly written but far from objective record of China's part in the war), and leftist attacks on Chiang Kai-shek's China's Destiny. Henry Wallace's phrase, "Selective use of the truth that is the last word in propaganda," well describes some recent American writing about the situation in China.

Although changes in China must ordinarily be measured over years and decades rather than weeks and months, there have been many indications in the half-year just gone of new and more hopeful trends. This sounds paradoxical in view of the discouragement mentioned, but it will not be surprising to those who have studied undercurrents as well as surface storms in China. In this dark period China has made real progress on the painful road to political unification, constitutional democracy, better government and social welfare. For this she can thank her courageous liberals, public opinion and also President Chiang Kai-shek.

THE NEW GOVERNMENT

The newly organized transition government does not include Communists or representatives of the Democratic League, both these groups refusing to join. (The Democratic League, however, has just announced that it will present candidates for the autumn election.) But it does include members of the Kuomintang, the Young China party and the Democratic Socialist party, together with a number of eminent non-partisans. The highest organ of the state, the state council, now has 29 members, of whom 17 are Kuomintang, 8 are members of the two other political parties and 4 are independents. President Chiang is responsible to this council. Originally a state council of 40 was planned, in which the Communists were to have 9 seats and the Democratic League 4. The Communists last October demanded 10 seats so that they and the leftist Democratic League together might have 14 and therefore wield a veto power in the council. The government refused. This is an example of the many technical points on which negotiations broke down.

STATE COUNCIL IS PROGRESSIVE

Not only is this the first multi-party government since the Kuomintang came to power, but the composition of the new state council is definitely liberal. The Kuomintang has contributed its outstanding progressives. The two minor parties have furnished schclarly and respected men, who, however, have as yet had little political experience. Among the independents are 2 men of superior attainments and unimpeachable character: Wang Yun-wu, former manager of the Commercial Press, and K. P. Chen, a banker who was highly praised by Dr. Lauchlin Currie, economic adviser to President Roosevelt.

The new cabinet is made up of 15 Kuomintang ministers and 9 ministers representing minor political parties and nonpartisan groups. The important posts of economic affairs and agriculture-forestry are held by Young China Party leaders. The liberal trend is evident also in the cabinet. Only three of the Kuomintang ministers probably belong to the C. C. clique, the reactionary group led by the two Chen brothers. Wang Shih-chieh, Minister of Foreign Affairs, O. K. Yui, of Finance, Pai Chung-hsi, of National Defense, and Y. T. Tsur, of Health—to mention only a few—are the finest type of public servants in China, thoroughly capable and honest. Neither of the Chen brothers is on the state council or in the cabinet. Gen. Ho Yin-ching, former Minister of War and for many years a bitter enemy of the Communists, is on a trip to the United States. Dr. H. H. Kung has retired from public life.

PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, PREMIER

At the head of the coalition government are President Chiang Kai-shek, Vice President Sun Fo (son of Dr. Sun Yat-sen and author of China Looks Forward), and the new president of the executive yuan, or Premier, Chang Chun. These are all Progressives and, as it happens, all Christians. Chang Chun, although an early military associate of Chiang Kai-shek, has been a civilian official for 20 years. His administration of Szechwan Province during the war was distinguished by wise judgment, steady reforms, and absolute integrity. Sun Fo's critical attitude to many government policies and liberal outlook are well known. He has been an ardent advocate of Sino-Soviet friendship and of conciliatory measures toward the Chinese Communists.

Chiang Kai-shek has been pictured so often by his enemies as a ruthless dictator that the truth about him has a hard time in some quarters. The fact is that President Chiang led the fight of Kuomintang liberals and minor party liberals for constitutional democracy. I know his liberalism from personal acquaintance with him for nearly 20 years and careful study of all his speeches and writings. A notable comment on Chiang Kai-shek's progressive outlook was made by Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, who saw the generalissimo hundreds of times during the war: "I had frequent, practically daily, contacts with him under the most trying conditions. I can attest to his unselfish devotion to the Chinese people and his earnest desire to promote a democratic way of life within China."

The Kuomintang has filled a need in China during the difficult transition from old empire to modern republic. It led the revolution against the Manchu dynasty and brought about the overthrow of the warlords in 1927. It guided the nation through a decade of growing national unity and strength and then through 8 years of bitter resistance against Japanese aggression. The notable achievements of the Kuomintang must be placed alongside its weaknesses and failures. Today, after 20 years of power—a briefer period than the rule of the Communist Party in Russia—it is voluntarily relinquishing its control to a coalition of all but Communist Parties. Its own liberals are now showing a surprising new vitality and adaptability to changed conditions.

This does not mean that the political and military reactionaries are dead. Now that the Kuomintang must seek its own support and go into the political arena with other parties, the reactionaries will fight all the harder for their vested interests. Narrow-minded conservatives who have been kept out of the coalition government are moving into the inner councils of the party. But I am convinced that the progressive wing of the Kuomintang is ready to fight as hard as ever for its principles, even if it has to break away and form a new party.

THE NEW CONSTITUTION

The present government is an interim one until the new constitution goes into effect on December 25 of this year and a new government is elected. Is this constitution, adopted last December by all groups except the Communists, a democratic instrument? Of the 1,744 delegates to the national assembly 48 percent were independents, 42 percent Kuomintang, and 10 percent representatives of minor parties. By a tremendous majority, Lincoln's phrase, "Government of, by and for the people," was included in the constitution's preamble along with Dr. Sun Yat-sen's San Min Chu I, or "three principles of the people." Unqualified support of the United Nations is written into the constitution Civil rights are guaranteed. The national assembly, elected on the basis of territorial and professional representation, is to be the supreme organ of the people and will elect the president, who cannot serve more than two 6-year terms. The legislative yuan, elected also by the people for 3 years, will be the legislative body. Many significant changes were made in the prewar draft constitution, based largely upon proposals from the Political Consultative Council of February 1946 in which the Communists were represented. Dr. Hu Shih, China's illustrious scholar-liberal and former ambassador at Washington, led the fight of the liberals for these changes and was backed strongly by President Chiang Kai-shek.

General Marshall called the new constitution a "democratic constitution which in all major respects is in accordance with the principles laid down by the all-party conference." Ambassador J. Leighton Stuart described it as a "most democratic instrument" ushering in the birth of a new China. Only time can tell how well it will work Amendments will no doubt be made, but it is a good beginning and a foundation upon which to build. Critics will watch to see how the elections for the National Assembly and the Legislative Yuan are conducted this autumn and how well the government that takes over on December 25 will function. Present indications are that an even more liberal government than the interim one will be elected.

SECRET POLICE DISBANDED

The coalition government has promised to protect civil rights guaranteed in the constitution and has already dissolved several secret-service organizations. This is vital to the success of the liberal cause, since both during and after the war special service bands and gangsters instigated by reactionary elements made inexcusable attacks upon the lives of several prominent progressives simply because they were suspected of being pro-Communist or antireactionary. The appointment of Dr. Hollington Tong as director of the government bureau of information with ministerial rank augurs well for a liberal censorship. Wartime foreign correspondents in Chungking all paid high tributes to "Holly" Tong, who as vice minister of information in the Kuomintang was their chief contact man with the Government. His present position gives him much larger influence since the information bureau is no longer under Kuomintang control but is a department of the coalition government.

Will the new government have the strength and the courage to root corruption out of public service? Graft, corruption and nepotism are evils with a long history in China. Ambassador Stuart declared at a Washington birthday dinner in China this year, "The real enemies of China are illiteracy, poverty, disease, the exploitation of public office for private gain, and narrow, ruthless, partisan

bigotry." His Chinese listeners accepted this as true. War-made inflation, soaring prices, economic insecurity have intensified the temptations for public officials, most of whom are badly underpaid. Often a man at the head of a government agency is honest, but overlooks graft and favoritism among his subordinates. We must admit all these facts and yet be careful also to check on exaggerated reports of graft from biased sources and to give full credit for reforms already achieved. For example, many stories of graft in the use of UNRRA funds and supplies have been denied by responsible officials and neutral observers but continue to be circulated.

GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY IMPROVING

My own impression is that government administration on all levels, from central government down to "hsien" government and village administration, is now vastly superior to what it was in the warlord years between 1911 and 1927, and that slow but steady advance has been made in the 20 years of national government administration. The light of the press and of public opinion beats with increasing fierceness on men in public life. Criticism of the administration of Formosa brought about a thorough investigation by the national government, and a new governor, Dr. Wei Tao-ming, recently Chinese ambassador to the United States, has just been appointed. Sweeping changes are called for in some other provinces and government agencies. The number of outstanding administrators is growing. I have in mind men like Mayor K. C. Wu, of Shanghai, Gov. Chang Chih-chung, of Sinkiang province; Director Liu Kung-yun of the alien property administration, and many others. Better county magistrates are being appointed. Methods of accounting and auditing have been improved. It is increasingly difficult for an official to embezzle public funds. The ways of squeeze are legion but the liberals will, I am confident, make a determined effort to combat the evil.

Even President Chiang's severest critics admit that he has been personally incorruptible in financial matters. But he has often lacked the wholehearted support of the men about him in carrying out reform measures. Today, he has that support in much greater measure from his state council and cabinet, and an elected legislature within a year will certainly demand stricter enforcement of the anticorruption law and more severe prosecution of grafters. Unless the national government can win the confidence of the people by a fair, efficient, and honest administration, or a resolute effort to establish such an administration, its days are numbered.

China's liberals now have a chance, a unique chance, to build a new political democracy and a cooperative economic order upon past foundations—traditional village self-government, the strain of liberal thought in China's cultural history, a casteless social democracy that in many ways puts American society to shame, and the lessons learned in the struggles, the successes, and failures of recent decades. If they can lead China forward now the whole world will breathe more easily. If they fail, because of unresolved internal strife or because of international developments, the whole world will suffer.

The Guam Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article from the December 1946 issue of the pamphlet Pacific Affairs, as written by Roy E. James, and entitled "The Guam Congress."

I feel that this article contains much data that is useful and informative in the consideration of several bills now pending before the Congress and having to do with the granting of a government for Guam, as Commander Roy E. James, U. S. N. R., now Acting Chief of the Pacific Branch, Division of Territories of the Department of the Interior, has had vast experience in the administration of the naval government of Guam. During his service in the Navy he was judge of the military government of the Summary Provost Court and also was associate justice of the court of appeals which is the highest court in the island of Guam. I believe that this article is valuable in providing the historical background and the present effectiveness of the Congress of Guam.

The article follows:

THE GUAM CONGRESS

The United States wishes to be regarded as a champion of the economic, social and political welfare of dependent peoples.[1] United States leadership at San Francisco was largely responsible for the establishment of the United Nations trusteeship system. Similarly, American leadership played a large part in the adoption of the Declaration Regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories (ch. XI of the United Nations Charter) and the resolution of the General Assembly in London reaffirming the obligations of member nations to peoples of non-self-governing territories. The obvious conclusion has been that the United States is proud of its record in the administration of is territories and possessions and is offering that record to world scrutiny as an example to other nations.

The record in respect to Guam has evoked charges of autocracy, neglect, discrimination and persecution as well as of stringent political repression.[2] Any of these charges is serious, but considerations of space restrict the scope of the present note to an examination of the last one, namely, the charge that the United States naval government has restrained political development in Guam.

At the close of the Spanish-American War the island of Guam was ceded to the United States by the Treaty of Paris, 1898. In order to establish and maintain law and order in the new possession until such time as Congress should provide a form of local government, President McKinley, by Executive order dated December 23, 1898, directed the Navy to govern the island. To this date Congress has failed to provide a form of government for Guam, with the result that for almost 50 years the civilian population of Guam—Chamorros, Americans and foreigners—has been governed by officers of the United States Navy.

The naval governors, left largely to their own devices and unrestricted by legislative enactment or Executive order, have administered the affairs of the island in a manner reflecting their naval training and experience. The early governors faced their task with a determination to maintain law and order ("discipline") as they understood it, and at the same time strove to reduce the poverty of the people. While they did not consider the people qualified to participate in their own government, the governors nevertheless relied on the advice and counsel of local elders. For many years a native priest, Padre Jose Palomo, advised the governors in civil affairs and thus became unofficially the people's voice in their government.

In 1917[3] the naval governor of Guam, Capt. Roy C. Smith, United States Navy, created the First Guam Congress and empowered it to consider and recommend to the governor measures for the improvement of the island and the welfare of its inhabitants. The congress contained both Guamanians and Americans. It was composed of the various commissioners, deputy commissioners, and other prominent men of the districts appointed by the governor. Certain naval and Marine Corps officers were appointed members ex officio and attended the meetings as representatives of the governor. The congress elected its chairman. Members held office during the pleasure of the governor and were subject to removal at his will. They served without compensation.

The First Guam Congress was not a legislative body. It could initiate discussion on any matter raised by the members and, if so minded, could make recommendations to the governor, but the actual legislation was prepared and promulgated by the governor. The congress functioned as a sort of advisory council on such matters as the governor might care to submit to it for consideration. It had no authority whatever with respect to taxation or the appropriation and expenditure of local tax and customs receipts. It was indeed nothing more than a gathering of local personages, selected and appointed by the governor, who met on the first Saturday of each month to discuss matters of local interest.

The idea of the congress was, nevertheless, well received by the people. Although in the past they had at times been called together to receive orders from the Spanish or American governors, it had never been the practice to allow discussion and debate on political or economic matters related to local government. Neither the Spanish nor the American governors had been greatly concerned with the views of the people. The first few sessions of the congress discussed many matters and, according to Governor Smith, "made some valuable recommendations."[4] Later governors found the congress of material assistance in acquainting them with popular attitudes toward subjects of local interest. A number of recommendations of the congress were adopted by governors and promulgated as law; but many others were overruled, ignored, or made the occasion for a stern rebuke.

In the following years the congress found it increasingly difficult to consider and make recommendations on the larger matters affecting the economic and social progress of the island. As it gradually became apparent that initiative on matters of government above the village level—for example, civil liberties, budgets, taxes, etc.—was not desired, the congress tended to act only on matters pleasing to the governor, thus confining its discussions to village matters. During the late 1920's certain governors disregarded

[1] The opinions and assertions contained in the following note are those of the author and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or the naval service at large.

[2] Harold L. Ickes, The Navy at Its Worst, Collier's, August 31, 1946. See also the editorial Pacific Islands, New York Times, September 3, 1946.

[3] The first session of the Guam Congress convened in Agaña, the capital of Guam, on February 3, 1917. Meetings were held thereafter on the first Saturday of each month.

[4] In par. 184 of his report to the Secretary of the Navy for the fiscal year 1917, Governor Smith, in commenting on the Guam Congress, wrote as follows: "The idea has been well received by the inhabitants. They meet and discuss with interest all matters affecting the island and have made some valuable recommendations. It makes them feel that they are taking a part in their own government and stimulates interest in public affairs. It promises to be of value in promoting discussion and spreading knowledge of the needs of the island and awakening interest in its improvement."

the congress entirely. By 1930, when it had completely lost its value, Gov. Willis W. Bradley, Jr., captain, United States Navy, decided to reorganize the congress and to place it on a representative basis in accordance with the general scheme of the Congress of the United States. Thus the first Guam congress came to an end.

A general election, the first in the history of Guam, was held on March 7, 1931. The people elected 16 members to a house of council for 4-year terms and 27 members to a house of assembly for 2-year terms. Although this was an entirely new experience for the people, it was carried out without disorder or confusion. They took great interest in all matters pertaining to the registration and the election. In the words of Capt. Edmund S. Root, United States Navy, Governor Bradley's successor: "The people demonstrated that they may be depended upon to investigate quite thoroughly the qualifications of candidates and to vote in accordance with their personal convictions."

The second Guam Congress met in Agaña on April 4, 1931. The 27 members of the house of assembly elected a chairman from their membership. The chairman of the house of council was elected by the members from outside their membership and served a 4-year term. Ad interim vacancies in the membership of both houses were filled by appointment of the Governor. Appointed members served until the next regular biennial election. As in the case of the first Guam Congress, the members received no compensation for their services. They were immune from arrest during attendance at a session of the congress and were guaranteed immunity for remarks made in either house.

This second Guam Congress, like its predecessor, was not vested with legislative powers. It was an advisory body of elected representatives of the people, empowered to consider questions pertaining to the welfare of Guam. It could recommend to the Governor such measures as it deemed desirable, but the Governor's action on such recommendations was final. There was no appeal to higher authority and no means of securing reconsideration in the event of a veto.

The Governor maintained contact with the congress through an executive committee of six members, three from each house, which sat with him in conference once a month for the purpose of laying before him the recommendations of the congress. Very often the Governor acted at once on the recommendation, approving, disapproving, or returning it for further consideration. If his decision was favorable, a governor's order was promulgated, thus enacting a new law.

The Governor levied taxes, prescribed customs duties, and fixed license fees. He determined the time, the place, and the manner of payment of taxes, fees, and all public levies. He prescribed the penalties for nonpayment, granted waivers, and issued exemptions at will. He exercised complete control over the moneys in the treasury of the naval government of Guam.[5] In his annual report to the Secretary of the Navy he reported the amounts spent and indicated the purposes for which such expenditures had been made, but there was no check as to the propriety of the purposes for which local revenues had been used.

Under military government, which lasted from August 12, 1944, after the recapture of the island from the Japanese, until May 30, 1946, the people of Guam were denied the right of assembly.[6] Meetings were allowed only for certain religious purposes, including baptisms, weddings, and funerals, but processions and parades were prohibited, and it was a punishable offense to promote or attend any public meeting, theatrical, moving picture, or other representation or performance, any public assembly or other public gathering, whether indoors or out, or any parade or demonstration for which a permit had not been granted by the military government. In the process of outlawing gatherings of any kind, this order also abolished the Guam Congress.

With the end of the Pacific war, military government gradually relaxed its enforcement of the no-assembly order, but it was not until May 1, 1946, that the Guam Congress was again permitted to meet. At its first meeting a member delivered a strongly worded speech calling for a satisfactory determination of the civil rights and political status of the people of Guam as provided for in the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898.[7] A bill of rights was read to the congress by another member and appended to the record as an exhibit.

By order of the Naval Governor of Guam, an election was held on July 15, 1946. A new Guam Congress, comprising 13 members of the house of council, one from each municipality, and 33 members of the house of assembly, one for each 1,000 inhabitants of the island, was elected from the different districts. All citizens of the island, male and female, 21 years of age and over, were eligible for participation in the voting upon registering in their respective communities. Registration boards composed entirely of Guamanians sat in the various municipalities and handled the registration free from supervision by the naval government. Election boards, also composed entirely of Guamanians, counted the ballots and certified the results together with the ballots to the Governor.

Although there were no political parties or burning issues, there was intense rivalry, particularly between the young and the old. There was much discussion of the Governor's declaration that "the Guam Congress shall play a more important role in the determining of the laws, economic development, and welfare of Guam and its citizens than ever before." Candidates and voters realized that the Governor had not promised them local self-government. He had held out to them a hope for a greater share in local government, and they were anxious to show him and the other Americans on Guam that they could hold an election in the American manner.

The new congress, like those preceding it, serves as an advisory body. When the Governor has legislation under consideration, he may consult the congress or not, as he sees fit; if he does so, he may accept or disregard its recommendations. The Governor remains the legislative power in Guam; he alone can prescribe, amend, or revoke laws. In this respect he functions practically without restraint from any quarter and can make his legislation retroactive, ex post facto, or in the nature of an attainder, if he so desires.

And yet, the naval governors have placed Guam on the road to self-government. They have at times accepted the advice of the people of Guam on matters of civil administration, much as they accept the advice of their naval subordinates, but they have not delegated to either the responsibility for governing Guam. In their desire to give the people of Guam a voice but not a real part in the government of Guam, the governors have striven vainly to achieve an impossibility—a democratic government in which the governed do not participate. They have, however, taught the Guamanians how to conduct elections in a democratic manner and how to meet in congress for discussion of local economic, political, and social matters. Many who know Guam feel that the people have received adequate training and are now ready to play a more active role.

ROY E. JAMES.

WASHINGTON, *September 1946.*

[5] In 1920 a governor, finding the treasury empty, established a budget system. Some later governors utilized a budget board, comprising mostly naval officers, to assist in the preparation of the annual budget. The various government departments, including the congress, submitted their estimates to the board, which then set up a budget for the governor's approval.

[6] U. S. Navy Military Government of Guam Proclamation No. 3, art. IV.

[7] The second paragraph of art. IX of the Treaty of Paris, ratified by the United States on February 6, 1899, reads in full as follows: "The civil rights and the political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress."

Conemaugh Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been urging the Committee on Appropriations to give favorable consideration to the allotment of the full funds requested by the Army engineers for the continuation of the construction of the Conemaugh Dam. I am impelled to do this by my knowledge of what has happened through the years to the people who live on the shores of the Conemaugh River, which borders my district, Westmoreland County, Pa.

In recent weeks I have had many petitions and letters from the people living along the ravaged shores of these streams who have suffered the loss of their property, their positions, their business, and who have lost members of their families in the heavy floods in years past. Those floods took their toll, too, in the destruction of mines and mills. They all urge most emphatically that the Congress and the Appropriations Committee look with favor on this proposed relief.

I am not speaking now of the Pittsburgh area which has suffered enormous loss, but for my own people. I do not know how this Government can afford to overlook the urgency of this request. The engineers have asked for $5,212,475 to carry on the project in the next fiscal year. Much work has already been done and much money expended, and now is no time to relinquish the job. I am hopeful that when all the facts are presented to the Appropriations Committee the necessity for the continuation of this work will be evident.

Industry-Wide Bargaining Curtails Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, while the other body is insisting that there shall

be industry-wide bargaining and that employers and employees, bargaining through their representatives, shall not be permitted to enter into a contract which will enable them to meet competition, instances continue to pile up which show how workingmen throughout the country in the smaller cities are being sold by international unions into what Lewis, Green, and Murray so oratorically term involuntary servitude.

Typical of the situation is the following letter just received.

WEST PENN MACHINE SHOPS, INC.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., May 20, 1947.

Representative C. E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOFFMAN: I would like to tell you a story which will illustrate our reasons for favoring the Ball amendment requiring the National Labor Relations Board to certify the local unions as bargaining agents under the National Labor Relations Act rather than an international organization.

Our shop has been organized by the United Steelworkers of America since June 1943, at which time the union won an election by vote which showed a small majority in their favor. We subsequently signed an agreement with this union for a 1-year period with a 30-day notice required for reopening of that agreement at the expiration of 1 year.

The agreement was to run until March 31, 1946. However, it was canceled by the United Steelworkers and they called the steel strike on January 21, 1946. During this steel strike we attempted to negotiate with the United Steelworkers on a plant level basis but were continually informed by the international representatives that they had no authority to settle with any fabricator or anyone else having a United Steelworker contract on any terms other than those in the "big steel" agreement. In fact, the district director of District 17 of the United Steelworkers went so far as to tell the writer that our company would either grant an 18½ cent per hour wage increase or go out of business.

Due to the fact that we had a considerable amount of temporary business on hand on which we wished to continue working overtime, our shop had been working on a 55-hour week schedule with 62½ hours' pay continuously from the end of the war to the time the steel strike was called on January 21, 1946, rather than employ a number of new people on a temporary basis.

With this thought in mind we offered the union an agreement calling for 15 cents per hour wage increase with a 48-hour week, giving them 52 hours' pay, with a guaranty that they would receive the other 3½ cents per hour when and if we reduced our schedule to a 40-hour week. The international representatives refused to accept this settlement, even though a great majority of the members of the union were in favor of this settlement.

After the strike had continued for 6 weeks we were finally forced to agree to the 18½ cents and returned to work on a 40-hour-week basis.

In December 1946, when the discussions began of renegotiating with Big Steel, the local union committee in our plant requested that we start negotiations in an effort to avert any work stoppage in 1947; a request to which the company readily agreed, and arranged to start negotiations in January 1947, although our agreement at that time was not scheduled to expire until March 1, 1947.

At the beginning we were informed by the international representatives of the United Steelworkers that we were not allowed to negotiate an agreement until after a "pattern" had been established in the basic steel industry. We objected very much to this, because we felt that the wishes of the majority of employees within our own plant should have some bearing on the relationship between the company and the international union.

We also objected to being included in the same category as Big Steel, since we do not make any steel at all. We are a machine shop and are caught in the middle on increases of this kind inasmuch as we have to pay the increased prices of steel and other equipment which we fabricate and at the same time pay a comparable increase in our own labor cost and attempt to sell our products in a competitive market.

After some time, however, we were "permitted" by the international union to negotiate on a new agreement.

Soon after the consummation of the Big Steel agreement we reached an agreement which was satisfactory to the local committee and to our own employees. This agreement, however, was not approved by the international office and this action by them made such an impression on the local committee that they went to the local press and complained bitterly about the international's action in overruling their desires and those of the employees in the plant. This story appeared on page 5 of the Pittsburgh Press on Sunday, May 11, 1947.

On Monday, May 12, 1947, the local committee polled the employees of our shop on the question and the results showed 137 votes in favor of settling on that agreement, with 10 opposed. The 5 members of the local committee had previously indicated that they were also in favor of the settlement, making a total of 142 in favor and 10 opposed to the settlement offered by the company.

Following this action, the international representatives agreed that they would approve the settlement provided the company included a union-shop clause. Inasmuch as our shop had been on an open-shop basis in the past and our relationships with the international union officers in our particular district had been such that we felt it extremely undesirable to sign an agreement of this kind, we declined their proposal.

Last Friday about 4:30 in the afternoon, the district office advised us that they had scheduled a strike at our plant on Monday, May 19; this in spite of the fact that the local committee had expressed themselves as opposed to a strike and it is our firm belief that 100 percent of our employees were also opposed to striking. This was indicated by the fact that this morning at 7 o'clock when our shop was scheduled to begin work, we found the entrance barred by "outside pickets" under the direction of the staff representative from the district office. These pickets first barred anyone from entering the plant. However, after some discussion, they agreed to allow the shop superintendent and assistant with two maintenance men and the switchboard operator to enter the plant. They refused admittance to all other officials, to all office employees and to the officials and employees of four other companies and corporations who operate on the same premises as ourselves.

We, of course, are "small potatoes" and fully realize the futility of attempting to fight an organization as large and powerful as the United Steelworkers, especially when they seem to have so much support in the Government. However, we are sincere in our belief that there are certain principles in which the American people believe and we bitterly protest the conditions which allow such high-handed operations by the United Steelworkers or any other organization, whether it be business, labor, or what not.

We will greatly appreciate any services you may render in Washington which will illustrate to the American people, and especially to the small groups of workers who are organized throughout the country in the little plants who are being overridden by the larger organizations, the intention of the Congress to render justice to the meek and lowly on an equal basis with the large and powerful organizations of all types.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. RUSSELL,
Personnel Director.

Mr. Speaker, to my untrained mind, it would appear that, when Congress passes legislation such as the Wagner Act, which makes possible the actions referred to, which makes possible extortion and racketeering by gangsters who infiltrate into unions, we morally share the guilt of those indulging in these reprehensible practices.

Pending Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the talk that I am to deliver at 4 o'clock today over the ABC national network, on the subject A Pro-American Labor Law.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, I am grateful to the American Broadcasting Co. for the opportunity to speak to you this afternoon about the labor bill now pending before the Congress.

My purpose at this time is to submit to you the facts regarding this legislation. I hope to throw some light on this subject. I have faith that the American people are eager to have facts, to have the light. We recall the motto, "Give light, and the people will find their own way."

The American people are finding their own way to a just and equitable labor law, I believe, a law in the interest of labor and all others concerned with this problem. Labor is entitled to a fair law. Honest labor is the salvation of America. We recall the words of the Book of Books, "To rejoice in one's labor, this is the gift of God."

NEED TO CONSIDER ISSUES

Unfortunately, in connection with this bill, there has been a considerable amount of name-calling, of unfounded accusations, of smears in recent days. As usual, the great mass of the American people has given no weight to this discussion of personalities, but are more concerned with the issues involved.

Let us, therefore, now discuss the issues. Let us without citing personalities, without discussing individuals, consider the facts.

As you know, the House of Representatives passed the labor bill by a resounding vote of 308 to 107. The Senate passed a slightly different version of the same bill by a vote of 68 to 24. Because of the difference between the two versions, the bill went to conference for ironing out of the differences. Then the legislation is to return to both

Houses for final approval and submission to the President.

WHY THIS LEGISLATION IS PRO-AMERICAN

I want to present to you, as the American jury, the reasons why I regard this legislation as pro-American, propublic. It is up to you to decide in the court of public opinion.

There is nothing in this bill, I beleve, that any honest union man should fear. This bill is designed to protect the honest rank and file of American labor—the 99 percent of sound, law-abiding, hard-working, American working people. It is designed to protect them against the racketeering abuses of bad men who would use labor for their own selfish purposes, dictatorial labor bosses, communistic-inclined labor chiefs, and others, who would crucify the public interest and the interests of labor and management.

RESULTS OF STRIKE CHAOS

Already we have seen the results of their activities. We have had a railway strike, coal strikes, a steel strike, auto strike, electrical strike, telephone strike, and every other sort of strike. Production of goods has fallen and the menace of inflation has come closer, with prices rising, cutting down the value of the working man's dollar and every other citizen's dollar. Whole communities have been ripped asunder by strikes. Vital public services have been paralyzed. National defense has been threatened.

The laboring man has lost countless pay envelopes in needless work stoppages. Management has lost profits. Investors have lost dividends. The public has lost the economic current of production as well as the peace of mind of countless communities.

FAILURE OF LABOR TO MAKE SUGGESTIONS

We in Congress implored the leaders of labor to come forward with their constructive suggestions. We asked them to cite specific ways and means by which they would correct these conditions. They offered no suggestions, only a stand-pat negative policy. All they could do was to denounce every effort toward constructive labor legislation as antilabor.

Now we have prepared this pro-American bill in order to remedy the situation. Let me ask you the following questions. From the answers you can come to your own conclusions as to the merits of this legislation.

PROVISIONS OF BILL

First. Do you believe that a union should have the right to break its contract and cause untold harm without being liable to damages? If you believe that unions should respect their contracts and should be held liable for violations, the same as you and I, then you should support this bill, for that is one of its provisions.

Second. Do you believe that labor should be free to use all sorts of intimidation, assault, "goon-squad" tactics without violating the law? If you believe that labor's unfair practices should be defined just as management's unfair practices are presently defined, then you should support this bill, for that is another of the bill's provisions.

Third. Do you believe that the Attorney General of the United States should have the right to seek a Federal court injunction to prevent strikes that peril the national health or safety? If you believe that our Government should have the right to appeal to our courts to prevent such ruinous strikes, then you should support this bill.

UNION'S REPORTS

Fourth. Do you believe that America's unions which each year collect hundreds of millions of dollars from working men and women should be required to file a detailed report, listing their officers and their compensation as well as other financial details? If you believe that the spotlight of publicity and adequate information should be on unions just as they are on corporations, then you should support this bill. We know of countless instances where labor has been bled by crooked union bosses who make rackets of unions. That condition must be corrected.

Fifth. Do you believe that a union should have the right to boycott an employer simply because he uses materials produced in part by another union? Do you believe that a union should be able to close down an employer's plant simply because the union has a dispute with a rival union about which one has jurisdiction? If you believe that these so-called secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes should be outlawed, then you should support this bill.

Sixth. Do you believe that the functions of the Government's National Labor Relations Board should be divided so that it does not serve as both the prosecutor and the jury at the same time? If you believe in this basic American principle of prosecution by one party and judgment by another, then you should support this bill.

FREEDOM OF WORK

Seventh. Do you believe that any American who wants to earn his daily bread should be required to pay an outrageous toll, without his consent, before he can even enter upon a job? If you believe that every American should have his Constitutional freedom to work protected, then you should support this bill.

Eighth. Do you believe in a separate Federal mediation service to help assist labor and management in their relations? If so, you should support this bill because that is another of its provisions.

Ninth. Do you believe that an employer should have the right of free speech with his employees so long as his words are free from threats? If you do believe in the Constitutional rights of American employers, as well as the rights of his employees, then you should support this bill.

Tenth. Do you believe in limitations placed on labor welfare funds to prevent their abuse? If so, you have still another reason for endorsing this bill.

I have cited some of the basic problems that the provisions in this bill will help solve. I believe that every American who has the interests of his country at heart can answer all the questions that I have asked in a manner that will permit him to support this legislation.

A TIME FOR DECISION

You remember the words of Shakespeare about "the tide in human affairs which taken, leads on to fortune, omitted binds all our lives to shallows and miseries." We are at this turn of the tide now in our labor, management, and public problem.

If we can have this legislation enacted into law, with or without the approval of the President, then America can open up a new era of harmonious industrial relations. She can set a standard for the world of peace in her industry, with labor, management, and the public benefiting therefrom.

I stated at the outset that this is a bill for the American public—not for American management, not against the American labor, but for the American public—the group which is hurt most by unlawful strikes, which is hurt most by racketeering and hurt most by communistic infiltration into unions.

As a member of the American public, I believe that each of my listeners, whether you are a working man or woman, a housewife, a farmer, a businessman, small or large, a student—can support this measure wholeheartedly, can urge your Congressmen to back it up, and urge the President to sign it.

CONCLUSION

This, as I have indicated, is another hour of decision. Industrial peace or industrial chaos depend on the outcome of this bill. We saw what happened when the President vetoed the Case bill; America was plunged into chaos. Let that not happen again. This bill is not a panacea for all labor problems, but it is a big step in the right direction.

God grant that we are strong enough and wise enough to take the road toward industrial peace and abundance by enacting this pro-American labor bill.

America's Interest in a Just and Final Settlement of the Palestine Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following address delivered by Sumner Welles on Monday, May 19, 1947, at a dinner of the American Jewish Congress, Boston, Mass.:

I am grateful to Mr. Silberman and his associates for the privilege they have afforded me of addressing this great dinner held under the auspices of the American Jewish Congress.

I know of no organization whose members have devoted themselves more unselfishly and more effectively, not only to the relief of human suffering, but also to the task of making our democracy a system which will, in truth, be based upon the observance of that essential principle of the equality of right and of opportunity of every citizen, upon which the liberties of the people of the United States have in part been founded.

The problems with which you have resolved to deal were never more urgent. No American citizen who believes in our democracy or who is moved by compassion for the hundreds of thousands of wholly innocent men, women, and children who have suffered, and who are still suffering, the effects of the cruelest tragedy of which we can conceive, could fail to express to you his hope that you will achieve the utmost measure of success in your present endeavors, and do that which lives within his power to be of service to the cause to which you are dedicated.

I do not believe you have asked me to come to speak to you merely in order that I limit myself to generalities or to mere expressions of sympathy and of support. The times in which we live are far too critical, and the objectives which we all are seeking are far too pressing in their immediate significance for that to be permissible. The safety of our country's institutions, the ultimate salvation of great numbers of human beings overseas who are presently homeless and destitute, and the welfare and future peace of the peoples of the world are to no slight extent dependent upon the just and rapid solution of the problems which are uppermost in the minds of all of us here tonight.

It is, therefore, inconceivable to me that this should be a moment for evasion or for the attempted palliation of fundamental issues.

We know that in some parts of this country of ours discrimination against some of America's ablest, most loyal, and most useful citizens is not only being practiced assiduously, but is unfortunately still increasing. We

know equally that there are individuals in the United States who are sedulously spreading those doctrines of anti-Semitism which have poisoned the body politic of so many of the countries of the Old World. Some close friends of mine who are members of the Jewish faith, and for whose judgment I have long since had a very high regard, have said to me that it is inexpedient to speak openly upon this subject since to do so would only arouse further and more bitter feeling and would tend to accentuate, rather than allay, the antagonisms which already exist. I cannot share that view.

It seems to me that here in the United States the surest corrective for this insidious evil that is already demonstrating its corrosive influence in so many of our communities, is to bring it out whenever it is perceived into the full sunlight of public opinion. It may well be that certain forms of legislative enactment may be required in order to insure the observance of standards by which unjust discrimination in such fields as those of employment may be immediately prevented. But from the larger viewpoint, it will only be the salutary force of American public opinion itself that can permanently eradicate this iniquitous anomaly from our American policy. For, thank God, it is un-American in every aspect. It has its origins in the evil and discredited past of an older civilization. It was revived at the behest of a criminal paranoiac who, as an individual, was responsible for the greatest calamity which the modern world has known. I, for one, have not the slightest doubt that, if they are given the opportunity to know by chapter and verse what is now going on in certain parts of this country, and to familiarize themselves with the nature and sinister character of the individuals and organizations that are spreading these doctrines of hate, an overwhelming majority of the American people would of their own initiative take prompt action in each community to find an American antidote for this poison before it spreads further. But public opinion will not be aroused until the danger is brought home to the American people, until they perceive the menace inherent in it to the individual liberties of every one of them, and before the press and radio report, consistently and with full detail, and whenever they occur, all evidences of those forms of discrimination which are a disgrace to our free traditions and the very negation of our American life.

It has been truly said that our generation is a tragic generation. We have suffered directly in our intimate personal lives from the results of the two world wars through which most of us have lived. There has been perhaps no more deplorable consequence than the fact that, because of the continuing deterioration in the moral structure of our civilization, the spiritual values and the humanitarian standards by which our western peoples had been so often guided seem to have well nigh vanished. It is only a few generations ago, because of the atrocities inflicted by Turkish despotism upon the minorities in Bulgaria that Gladstone raised the conscience of the British people to a fever of white heat, and the course of British policy was wholly changed. Little more than a decade later the Armenian massacres profoundly shocked the American as well as the British peoples. The wave of indignation which rapidly spread throughout western civilization at least saved the lives of many who would otherwise have been slaughtered.

Within the past 10 years we have witnessed the greatest mass murders which the world has ever known. We have seen the atrocious liquidation in cold blood of nearly 6,000,000 defenseless men, women, and children. The bestial horror of it all staggers the imagination. But far too often the voices that were raised before the war, or during the earlier years of the war, to tell the American people of the crimes that were being perpetrated were heard with apathy or incredulity. Yet today, when the scope of these atrocities has been officially disclosed, when those chiefly responsible have at length been justly punished, even when photographic evidence has been widely distributed, there are but few signs of that popular moral revulsion from which alone can spring the assurance that the American people will, in fact, never again permit such things to occur.

It was not long ago, when I was in a city of our own Middle West where documentary films showing a small part of what had actually taken place had been presented, that I was met by the assertion on the part of several of the leading citizens of that community that this was all largely propaganda and that it was well known that the true facts had been deliberately and grossly distorted. Assertions such as these are almost identical with those reported to have been made by the many Germans to whom the same proofs had been disclosed.

And it is, unfortunately, in a like spirit of individual aloofness that so many of us here in the United States today are viewing the continued confinement in the concentration camps for displaced persons in central Europe of the survivors of Hitler's mass liquidations. More than a quarter of a million men, women, and children, all that are now left of those persons of the Jewish faith, who had proved themselves to be such valuable citizens of Germany and Austria, have now been confined for more than 2 years. There are several hundreds of thousands of others who are living in constant fear and in utter destitution in eastern Europe. In their vast majority they are unwilling to return to the homes of their origin. Who can blame them for not wishing to go back to scenes of the most bitter tragedy? It is easy for us to say that the world of the future which we, as a nation, have fought to create, must guarantee to every individual a life secure from fear and free from any form of discrimination. Yet you and I realize that these refugees know that it will be long before the virus of antisemitism is eradicated from the mentality of a majority of the populations in central and eastern Europe, and that these survivors would have scant likelihood during their lifetime of finding peace or happiness or economic security in the countries where they were born.

It would have seem logical that the peoples of the western democracies, and particularly the people of the United States, would have felt it a primary obligation to provide these unhappy survivors with an immediate opportunity to obtain new homes in lands across the seas where they would be assured of liberty and of physical and of economic security, and that every step should have been taken to speed the process for their removal. Yet most of the unfortunates are still immured. They are increasingly uncertain as to whether they will have even enough food and clothing to see them through the coming months. But, what is worst of all, they are becoming bereft of all hope that new and safe homes will ever be made available to them. The plight of these Jewish refugees is a blot upon the conscience of this Nation. Their fate must become a matter of immediate concern to the people of the United States. We, as a nation, should never permit ourselves to forget, any more than the peoples of the other western democracies should permit themselves to forget, that we all bear our common share of responsibility for having permitted the development of conditions in the so-called civilized world as a result of which these people are homeless and hopeless today, and as a result of which the great majority of their fellows died at the hands of Hitler's executioners.

There can be no sound reconstruction of Europe and no creation of a new world order founded on equity until a full measure of justice has been dealt to this pitiful remnant of a sorrowful and afflicted people.

Is it not long since time that the Government of the United States should assert the leadership which is inherent in its world position, and recur to that idealism which has so often in the past marked our people? However much his detractors and his traducers may attempt to defame the resplendent memory of the great dead, you and I know that, were Franklin Roosevelt alive today, his voice would not only have long since been eloquently raised in behalf of this cause, because of our moral obligation, as well as because of its intrinsic justice, but that the effective impact of this Government's influence would have been felt so that this act of reparation might by now have been accomplished.

For what has been needed has not been only official expressions of sympathy, official suggestions that a relatively small proportion of the refugees be enabled to emigrate to the home of their fathers, or even the measures of material relief enacted for the benefit of those confined in the displaced persons camps. What was infinitely more necessary was the persistent day-in, day-out exercise of the influence of our Government, and a willingness on the part of the United States to share, if necessary, in the burdens and responsibilities involved, in order that Great Britain should be compelled to comply with her obligations under the mandate and permit the immigration into Palestine of a majority of the European refugees, and so that the remainder might find new homes in the Western Hemisphere and in other suitable regions of the world.

We have every reason to remember that the ideal of the National Jewish Homeland first came within the bounds of realization because of the Balfour Declaration, and because of the willingness of an earlier British Government to assume a mandate over Palestine. We have every reason to remember the incentive given in those first years to the miraculous progress made by the Jewish settlers by many humane and devoted administrators sent to Palestine by the British Government.

But we have equally every reason to condemn unsparingly the policies which Britain has pursued in Palestine during the past 10 years. For it is a record which is marked by injustice, by inhumanity, and by ineptitude, and by a flagrant disregard for the legitimate rights of the Jewish people, as well as for Great Britain's international obligations. The white paper of 1939, which is redolent of the fetid atmosphere of the appeasement era and which restricted immigration into Palestine to a bare handful each year, cost during the war the lives of untold thousands of refugees from eastern Europe and from the Balkans who otherwise could have obtained a haven of safety in Palestine.

Nevertheless, the loyalty and the valor of the Jewish contingents throughout the war could not have been more superb. Yet that same white paper, notwithstanding the control of the present British Government by the Labor Party which has long professed its support for the aspirations of so many of the Jewish people with regard to Palestine, is still retained in force. The unanimous recommendations of the Commission appointed by the British and American Governments which, had they been carried out, would have to some degree alleviated the condition of the displaced persons in Europe, and corrected some the injustices from which the Jewish residents of Palestine are suffering, were ignored or rejected by the British Cabinet. After weary months of futile discussions, the British Government sponsored a proposal for a form of partition of Pales-

tine—in the concoction of which I regret to say representatives of this Government participated—which was one of the sorriest travesties of a just solution which can well be imagined. Such a project would not only have rendered it altogether impossible for the Jewish people in Palestine ever to offer new homes there to the refugees of Europe, would not only have prevented them from ever establishing any independent or autonomous government, or of ever developing any prosperous economy, but it would have subordinated them for all time to come to whatever policies future British governments might decide to adopt. And since this project was rejected, and later officially disclaimed in Washington, we have seen the constant gowth of repression and of terrorism in Palestine. We cannot extenuate the crimes of the terrorists. But crimes such as theirs are bred by rank injustice, by martial law, and by military retaliation, and by the execution in the sacred name of justice of men who are struggling to be free, and to secure liberty and safety for the persecuted members of their race.

Now, after 2 years of sterile procrastination, the British Government has at last been compelled to submit the problem of Palestine to the United Nations.

The United States is once more given the opportunity for leadership in a righteous cause. It cannot only now regain to a very considerable extent the prestige which it has sacrificed by the course which it has pursued with respect to Palestine during the past 2 years, but it can vastly enhance the authority of the United Nations itself, if it will only take the steps which it can take to make certain that, when the recommendations of the special committee appointed by the United Nations are presented to the General Assembly in its regular session next autumn, those recommendations represent a plan for a just and permanent settlement, and that final action be taken upon them by the Assembly before the end of that session.

We cannot afford to let this year of 1947 come to its end without a final settlement. We cannot agree that the British Government should once more refuse to acquiesce in the decisions which may be reached. For the problem of Palestine, we must recognize, is no longer merely a question of justice to the Jews. It has also become a question fraught with grave consequences to the maintenance of world peace. For however much Mr. Bevin may lightheartedly brush to one side the possibility that a continuation of existing conditions in Palestine would endanger world peace, there are few objective observers of the international scene of today who can share his levity in that regard.

The bitterness of spirit which British policy has engendered, the opportunities for the growth of a blind and exaggerated form of Arab nationalism which British evasions and procrastinations have afforded, the refusal of our own Government to play any responsible or authoritative part in the shaping of events during the past year and a half, have all contributed to making it improbable that that kind of a solution for Palestine which, from the broader perspective, would have been most likely to redound to the common benefit of the Jewish people as well as of all the peoples of the Near East, can now be achieved.

I, myself, however reluctantly, am forced to the belief that the only kind of solution which today is practicable, which will to some extent recognize the legitimate aspirations of the Jewish residents of Palestine, and which can afford the immediate hope of resettlement to the refugees in Europe, is some form of partition.

But no form of partition would be acceptable, or even conceivable, unless it allotted to the Jews an area within Palestine amply sufficient to provide homes for all of the Jewish people in Europe who wish to go there; unless the areas to be placed under Jewish sovereignty were contiguous, rather than gerrymandered, as in the iniquitous partition proposal of last autumn; unless such territory comprised the major extension of the sea coast, and unless it contained the whole of the Negev, so that such development projects as that of Dr. Lowdermilk for the creation of a Jordan Valley Authority could be carried out,.

That is clearly the minimum objective. But in event that is achieved, the present and future residents of the Jewish Commonwealth of Palestine would be given the opportunity to create their own democratic government, to control immigration as they themselves might determine, and to build up with the same amazing success which marked the efforts of the earlier settlers a prosperous national economy through which the living standards of the whole region would soon be raised. We would then have every reason to hope that, after the stresses of the moment had passed, some form of commercial and financial collaboration, and some form of cooperation in the development of the natural resources of the entire Near Eastern area might be found between the new Jewish state of Palestine and the surrounding countries of the Arab world.

If such a solution is found for the Palestine problem by the United Nations next autumn, the contention will presumably be advanced by Great Britain that she is no longer in a position to accept the financial and military burdens which that solution would impose upon her. Should that prove to be the case, you may remember that the provisions of article 106 of the United Nations Charter are sufficiently ample in their scope to make it possible for these responsibilities and burdens to be jointly shared by the major powers, for so long a time as it may be necessary to insure the peace and security of all of the inhabitants of Palestine, or until such time as the United Nations itself is competent to take over these obligations.

It is for all of these reasons that I believe the need to find a just, a constructive, and a permanent solution of the Palestine problem has become an urgent challenge to the American people and to the capacity of their Government for enlightened leadership.

If such a solution can be found this year, we will be justified in the belief that we may yet avert a spiritual and physical break-down of the inmates of the displaced persons camps. For to them it would mean that a sure salvation was at last at hand. If such a solution is found we must be realistic enough to recognize that it will be more probable that the bars to immigration in the countries of the Western Hemisphere, and in others of the less densely populated regions of the earth, will be more rapidly let down, and that the narrowly selfish fears with which communities are obsessed when they are confronted with the possibility of having to give shelter to great numbers of destitute persons will thereby be dissipated.

But in the broader sense, if such a solution is found, it must necessarily prove to be a bulwark for our own democracy. For, if the future safety and welfare of our own Nation depends, as it must, upon the creation of an international order instinct with the spirit of justice, and through which freedom of religion, freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom of expression are in reality guaranteed to all peoples, justice must at last be done to the Jewish people who, above all others, have been the most bitterly afflicted in the history of mankind.

The people of the United States, by a renewed consecration of themselves to the preservation in their own land of those human liberties which have made of this country the hope of humanity, and by an unfaltering determination to see that justice and freedom are now at last given to those who have long been oppressed and who have greatly suffered, can hasten the reign of peace and help to bring to pass that free world order for which they believe their victory was won.

Statement by Senator Myers on Interior Department Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations regarding H. R. 3123, the Interior Department appropriation bill, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I know of your desire to make drastic cuts in Federal expenditures, but I also know that none of the members of this subcommittee would consciously seek to make those economies at the risk of our national economy or of lives or health or safety of our people or of the fundamental obligation of any government—particularly our Government—which is to encourage, insofar as possible, the raising of the standards of all citizens.

That is why I am here today. I am hopeful the committee will not sustain cuts merely for the sake of economy and with complete disregard of the functions of government affected by such cuts.

In passing, for I am not here to testify today on this aspect of the bill, I would like to say that I am in sympathy with the efforts of Senators and governors and citizens generally of the great western areas of the country in seeking to maintain efficient speed of operation of their reclamation projects, and if this committee takes action, as I hope it will, to restore funds for this purpose, I can assure you of my support on the Senate floor. Much as I and my constituents in Pennsylvania desire reduction in Government costs, we do not want this accomplished at the expense of the self-liquidating, wealth-producing projects of reclamation which, by increasing national wealth, income, and opportunity, help all America and thus help Pennsylvania too.

My main purpose here today, however, is to discuss H. R. 3123 in terms of what it means directly to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to the industries of Pennsylvania, to the people of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania has a direct and sizable stake in the enactment of an appropriation bill adequate to meet the needs of the Interior Department. In that respect, it is vital to the entire country, which depends upon Pennsylvania for many of the most basic of industrial products, that Pennsylvania industry be enabled to operate efficiently and with whatever assistance is necessary from the Federal Government in research and in other fields.

I don't think this committee would for a moment look favorably upon Government

"economy" which would put hobbles on production of Pennsylvania's steel or coal or coke or oil or alloys or other basic commodities vital to the entire economy of the United States. And yet, a review of some of the functions which would be affected were this bill to become law in its present form, as it was adopted by the House, convinces me the economy of H. R. 3123 would be a serious blow to the economy of Pennsylvania, and, therefore, of the whole Nation, because of Pennsylvania's status as perhaps the dominant source of essential industrial needs.

As I want to point out in greater detail, not all of the functions of the Interior Department in which the State of Pennsylvania has a vital interest actually occur in Pennsylvania, but many of them do. For instance, although the Interior Department is carrying on few activities in Pittsburgh directly related to steel production—there are some, and they are very important—what the Interior Department discovers concerning coking coals and iron ore reserves in other parts of the country, for instance, are of urgent interest and importance to Pittsburgh and to Pittsburgh's steel industry.

Similarly research in oil recovery, in Pennsylvania or anywhere in the United States, is vitally important to that region of Pennsylvania and of nearby States which produce the best lubricating oil in the world, 100 percent pure Pennsylvania oil. This bill sharply curtails such research, including that at Franklin, Pa., where a small staff which has been doing magnificent work would have its budget cut about in half. This is indeed false economy, because America needs the oil this research can bring out of the ground.

False economy is evident, too, in the House action in eliminating the Ground Water Branch of the Geological Survey. I venture the Government saves enough in water costs over a period of years at just one installation in Pennsylvania, the Philadelphia Navy Yard, as a result of functions of this agency, to more than pay for the entire cost of this ground water program nationally. What it means in dollars and cents to industry is incalculable.

Now I want to take up some items of the bill in specific detail, particularly from Pennsylvania standpoints.

ANTHRACITE LABORATORY

There is one matter in this bill relating to an activity exclusively in Pennsylvania which I want to take up now. It is covered by title II of the bill on page 79 as the bill was passed by the House and is entitled "Surplus Appropriation Rescission." I am asking to have that entire title stricken from the bill.

It recaptures an appropriation of $450,000 made last year by the Congress and approved by the President for the construction and equipment of an Anthracite Research Laboratory under the Bureau of Mines. As the bill now stands, this appropriation would be covered into the Treasury.

If that provision is retained in the bill, the Anthracite Research Laboratory authorized by Congress in Public Law 812, Seventy-seventh Congress, in December 1942, and held up during the war, would be abandoned. This would be one of the most shameful repudiations of a solemn obligation which it would be possible for the Congress to make.

I never thought when this modest appropriation sailed through the Congress last year without controversy of any kind and with little questioning or debate that I would find myself at this time forced to appear before a congressional committee to justify it. There is even now no controversy over the need for the laboratory. Instead, a comedy of errors in the House—a comedy of errors with more tragedy than comedy connected with it—resulted in the complete elimination of the project following an attempt by a member of the House Appropirations Committee to have the project located within his own district.

Briefly, the background story is this: In the 1930's the anthracite industry of Pennsylvania—and it is an industry to all practical purposes confined to Pennsylvania—was a very, very sick industry. Unemployment in the northeastern area of Pennsylvania where anthracite coal deposits are located was far above the national average. So desperate for work were the skilled deep-mine coal miners of this area that they took matters into their own hands and began their own little coal holes which they worked singly or in groups.

Coal bootlegging—unauthorized mining of coal on land owned by or claimed by the coal companies and in back yards and in any likely spot where a seam of coal might be reasonably close to the surface—became a major, if illegal, industry in the anthracite area. This coal was peddled for whatever it would bring and although helping to sustain body and soul for the miner and his family, it also contributed to a further deterioration of the market for the legitimate coal mine operators. A vicious circle developed, with the mines being forced to lay off more and more of their employees because of two factors: the depression level of purchases and also the strong competition of the coal bootleggers.

The men that were laid off at the mines thereupon in many cases themselves turned to bootlegging and this added production cut further into the market of the regular mines, which were then forced to lay off more miners and thus this circle continued and got more vicious. Bootleg production reached a staggering production of 6,000,000 tons a year.

Efforts to end bootlegging by legal or forceful methods failed because there was little sentiment among law enforcement officials or juries to punish a man for doing the only thing he knew how to do in order to buy food for his family. The only thing the skilled miner knew how to do or had an opportunity to do in those days was to mine coal.

The plight of the anthracite region of Pennsylvania became so dramatic that President Roosevelt early in his administration, at the suggestion of Congress, appointed a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite areas. One of the recommendations of this commission was the establishment of a laboratory to develop and investigate new and extended uses for anthracite, and to aid the industry in creation of better techniques of mining anthracite so as to bring down the cost of the fuel and aid it to retain and even expand its markets.

I might point out here that anthracite, although once one of the major sources of all fuel in the United States and important in many industrial processes, is now almost exclusively a domestic fuel for heating purposes. But even so, eastern Pennsylvania and much of the eastern seaboard are dependent upon this fuel. Washington homes and apartment houses and public buildings, for instance, were provided with this fuel all during the war when there were periodic crises in the supply of many other fuels. There was no crisis in hard-coal supply.

The war, of course, brought a great revival in the level of economic conditions in the anthracite industry because of the tremendous demand for fuel. But anthracite, on which more than a million Pennsylvanians depend directly or indirectly for their economic future, may again become a sick industry unless its own efforts, which are substantial, are augmented by the modest assistance of the Federal Government as represented in this small appropriation.

As I said, the appropriation sailed through the Congress last year. It provided, as specified in the enabling legislation, that the laboratory be built in the anthracite area of Pennsylvania. Naturally, there was great competition among the various areas which extend over 10 counties for the location of the laboratory. It was left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to select a site. Numerous sites were not only suggested by individual localities, but were, in fact, offered free of charge to the Government. A committee of three representing the coal companies, the United Mine Workers Union, and the public, the latter representative being a faculty member of the University of Pennsylvania, finally recommended the laboratory be built in Hazleton, Pa., presumably because it was just about in the geographical center of the anthracite area. Numerous other sites were, of course, considered suitable. Acting on the recommendation of this special committee, however, the Secretary designated Hazleton as the site.

Immediately there was a great uproar on the part of other districts which also had suitable sites available.

According to the transcript of the House hearings into this matter, the Department of the Interior was immediately notified by a Congressman who had just become a member of the House Appropriations Committee that it had better not obligate any of the money for the laboratory until the House Appropriations Committee investigated the circumstances of the location of the laboratory. Since this Congressman is a member of the Interior Department subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, his warning, of course, would warrant more than passing consideration. I understand there was a further warning to the same effect from Chairman TABER. As a result I understand no work was done on the laboratory under the coercive nature of these warnings coming from Members of Congress in exceedingly strategic positions insofar as the Bureau of Mines and the Interior Department are concerned.

The hearings of the House disclosed exceptional energy on the part of one of the subcommittee members in seeking to establish some sort of political plot to locate the laboratory in a district other than his. If politics were involved, I have no knowledge of it. As the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, and as one of only six Democrats in the Congress from Pennsylvania, I should think that if politics had been involved in this location, I would have known something about it.

Several attempts were made last year by chambers of commerce and other groups in the anthracite area to enlist my aid in having the laboratory established in one or another specific location, but I can truthfully say that I did not bend a finger to aid any political or economic or sectional group in having this laboratory located.

All I am concerned about is that there be a laboratory and that it be located in the anthracite area of Pennsylvania.

In any event, in order to run interference for a fellow member in this contest, the House Appropriations Committee this year rescinded last year's appropriation and then reappropriated the same amount of money with the specification that the laboratory be built at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.

Naturally, this evoked a storm of protest from the area previously designated as the site. Although the appropriation was subject to a point of order, the Appropriations Committee of the House persuaded the Rules Committee to waive points of order in the rule on the bill and persuaded the House to uphold that rule in a vote on the floor.

The resulting floor fight raised such confusion and chaos over this appropriation that a surprise amendment to eliminate the appropriation entirely was suddenly approved.

This would have been all right had the House also struck out the rescission feature of title II of the bill, but it refused to do so, and thus last year's appropriation has been recaptured at a supposed saving of $450,000—one of the worst examples of false

economy I have seen in Congress for some time.

I should like to read you a statement made by the Federal Anthracite Coal Commission in its report of April 1942:

"Since 1933, $169,238,000 has been spent for Work Projects Administration and $142,434,000 for other types of public assistance in the five important anthracite counties. This amounts over the period to $268 per capita, as compared with only $183 per capita for the rest of Pennsylvania and $142 per capita for the United States as a whole. In December 1941, 10.7 percent of the population of these counties was on public assistance or Work Projects Administration as compared with 5.8 percent for the rest of Pennsylvania. Together with Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration funds, total relief expenditures since 1933 approach one-third of a billion dollars. The Federal Government has a major interest in reducing these disproportionate relief costs in the anthracite area by a positive long-term approach to the economic and social rehabilitation of the area. This would be far less costly than supporting a large permanent population on relief."

I have before me a telegram from Martin P. Kennedy, president of the Scranton Chamber of Commerce at Scranton, Pa., urging restoration of this laboratory and reporting that there are now 50,000 unemployed in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania. Gentlemen, this is an astounding total. It represents the contraction of the anthracite industry over a period of years, and foreshadows vast unemployment and suffering—and expense to State and national funds—unless this area can be revived.

Now I want to make clear that the people of the anthracite area of Pennsylvania are not listlessly and unconcernedly sitting by and waiting for the Federal Government or the State government to come to their rescue. They are doing something—something dramatic—about their economic position.

Communities throughout the area are making determined efforts to diversify their industrial pattern, bring in new businesses and new industries, provide and stimulate employment, and otherwise contribute to better economic conditions. The people of Scranton and vicinity, for instance—particularly the chamber of commerce, whose president I have just quoted—raised thousands and thousands of dollars locally from rich and poor alike to buy surplus war plants from the Federal Government and sell or rent them—at a loss if necessary—to industries which would use them in peacetime.

I have here a copy of the Plain Speaker, newspaper, of Hazleton, Pa., in another county, showing what the people of that community have done and are doing in economic self-help. Nearly three solid pages of small type are devoted to listing the names of Hazleton-area residents who contributed sums ranging from 10 cents to $20,000 each to a fund to bring new industry to the community. Its first great achievement was to "land" the location in that area of an Electric Auto-Lite Co. This is a remarkable example of real Americans courageously attacking the problems of their own economic future with hard-earned dollars and great determination.

The anthracite industry itself, meanwhile, is budgeting a good share of its income to research in the development of new automatic burning equipment for anthracite and has great hopes in the success of this project, which should help to put anthracite on a competitive level from the so-called convenience of use standpoint with any other fuel.

There is one point I want to make about this anthracite area which I believe requires making. That is that labor and industry in the anthracite area have learned over many years to get along together. While nearly all the other mines of the Nation are now under Government control and operation, the anthracite mines remain completely free enterprise because management and labor were able to agree on working contracts without the need for Government intervention. Management and labor together in the anthracite area realize the need for cooperation for their own survival.

The best witness to this would be a coal-industry official. The Shenandoah General Mine Board, at Shenandoah, Pa., recently sent me this statement:

"Anthracite mine workers are aware of the problems facing the hard-coal industry, they have a splendid working record as far as suspensions are concerned, losing only 43 days over a 20-year period, and are under good leadership of the United Mine Workers of America in districts 1, 7, and 9. That's the opinion of C. M. Dodson, president of C. M. Dodson Coal Co., of Bethlehem, as expressed in the firm's weekly bulletin to the trade.

"The following appeared in a recent issue which is self-explanatory:

"'A story which needs badly to be told in behalf of anthracite developed in the course of a conversation in our offices the other afternoon. We were discussing a variety of things, including the recent 17-day bituminous suspension, and our visitor, a local newspaper editor, asked this question:

"'"Exactly what is the record of strikes in anthracite? I recall the suspension of 8 or 9 days last June and a 2- or 3-day lay-off in 1945," he said, "but tell me the hard-coal facts about strikes prior to that."

"'Well, that was a poser. We hemmed a bit and hawed some more and said we'd better consult the record, although our impression was there had been trouble every 2 or 3 years over a long period of time. Here's what we found:

"'We discovered there had been a total of only 43 days lost through industry-wide strikes or suspensions in the last 20 years—an average of slightly more than 2 days a year since 1926. Further study of the records revealed that this "time off" was more than made up by the anthracite miners having given up their vacations throughout all the war years and in 1946, and having worked all 29 days in February 1944.

"'The two decades prior to 1926 reveal a quite different story, it is true, for from 1906 to 1926 a total of 442 days were lost through industry-wide strikes, or an average of 22 days' production per year. But the fact remains that anthracite's record in more recent times has been unusually good.

"'This is something, we think, which retailers and others in the industry should know and which the general public most definitely should be told. Anthracite, being coal, has suffered in consumer estimation, and the best friends of anthracite—those of us in the business—fail to impress the public with the really good record of our industry in the labor field. (How many other industries have a better record?)

"'We, for one, are pleased that the anthracite miners were not emotionally stampeded into sympathy action in the recent bituminous suspension. Under good leadership in districts 1, 7, and 9 of the United Mine Workers, hard-coal miners went about their business, except for a brief flare-up by a small minority.

"'There seems to be a growing realization among anthracite miners that the industry faces serious competition, that production must be maintained, and that the men themselves have considerable responsibility in helping protect the industry and its market. We believe anthracite miners are doing some serious thinking about their future. The rest of us in the industry, including retail dealers who are in direct contact with the consuming public, might do well do realize more consciously that anthracite has been the dependable fuel in more ways than are contemplated by reference to its burning qualities.

"'C. M. DODSON, *President.*'

"SHENANDOAH GENERAL MINE BOARD,
"JOSEPH MACHULSKY, *President.*
"WALTER ZEMBER, *Secretary.*"

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

On this item, I am undoubtedly going to surprise some of my colleagues in the Senate who are members of this subcommittee by stating flatly that I do not now intend to oppose the $2,000,000 cut enforced by the House in this Bureau of Mines activity. Some of my friends on the subcommittee have accused me from time to time of resisting any and all budget cuts merely on principle. That is not a fair accusation. I have stated many times that I am agreeable to cutting the budget wherever it is safe to do so, and apparently this seems to be such an instance.

I am not sure of that fact, but at least I have been unable to obtain from the Department data sufficient to compel me to oppose this cut. The cut seems to be of a technical nature, involving contract authorization, but I have no direct evidence of immediate damage to the long-range program of synthetic liquid fuel development. I hope that is correct. If I am wrong—if the House was wrong in making this cut—then the results should show themselves reasonably soon and it will be time to demand correction.

I am, however, vitally interested in the success of this program of research in synthetic liquid fuels, particularly because of developments in connection with it within my State. The Bureau of Mines is developing a laboratory in, and a pilot plant near, Pittsburgh for production of synthetic liquid fuels from Pennsylvania coals, using two different processes. There is work also being done by the Bureau both at Pittsburgh and at Morgantown, W. Va., on gasification of coal. These are very significant programs for the future of coal—and for the future of the gas and gasoline supply. So successful have researchers been in producing gas and liquid fuels from coal that the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. is now launched on a great commercial venture into this same field, having announced its intention of building a pilot plant at Library, Pa., with the intention of establishing a $120,000,000 plant later also in western Pennsylvania. This indicates great things for coal's future. The process the private concern will use is one on which the Bureau of Mines has long been engaged in research, and much of the Bureau's work on catalysts, reaction conditions, and on the nature of the products has been made available to private industry to assist in developing the commercial processes. I think that is one of the fundamental purposes of Federal research.

As I said, I have not been convinced that the $2,000,000 cut by the House will be serious. It may well be. Deficiency appropriations may be required to keep the work going. I hope the subcommittee will draw out the Bureau in complete detail on this matter so that we can all be sure about this cut. It seems to mean largely a juggling of the Bureau's funds and the elimination of emergency reserves. But I am assured the essential features of the program, at Pittsburgh and elsewhere, will continue, and on that assurance I do not now oppose the reduction.

However, in making this $2,000,000 cut, the House reduced from $140,000 to $100,000 the amount available for this program in the home office—in headquarters—in the District of Columbia, for personal services here in coordinating the national program, and I think that is a big mistake. This small sum may well mean the difference between success and failure of a multi-million dollar program because the staff of technical experts needed for effective direction will be materially reduced when it

should instead be strengthened. I urge restoration of this comparatively picayune amount.

OIL AND GAS INVESTIGATIONS

This item in the Bureau of Mines budget was reduced by the House by $327,000 or more than a third, leaving $579,000. This means, specifically, in Pennsylvania, a cut in the budget of the Franklin, Pa., research center of the Bureau from $89,000 to about $38,500. In the present fiscal year, this office has had $81,000 to spend.

It is money it has been spending well. I mentioned earlier the accepted leadership of Pennsylvania crude among all lubricating oils. It is the best oil in the world. It came from the first oil field to be discovered in America and this field has given hundreds of millions of barrels of oil to America for her industry, her military establishment, her economy.

Unfortunately, many years ago the oil from this field was so accessible as well as valuable that, like many other natural resources, it was exploited with little regard for the future. The gusher production from these wells was drawn off and then well after well was abandoned with millions of barrels of oil left unrecovered in the earth.

We know better now and we are going back to that abandoned oil and coaxing it out of the earth. We are finding there was more oil left in those abandoned wells than was originally removed from them.

The oil, as I said, must largely be coaxed out of the earth now in Pennsylvania and adjoining fields and the only way to get it out is by scientific application of secondary recovery methods. The Bureau's petroleum field office at Franklin is providing the help the operators—and they are largely small operators—need to get this oil out of the ground.

More than 15,000 small operators produce oil from 34,000 wells on approximately 1,500,000 acres in this region. There are few big fellows in the group.

In the 5 years the petroleum field office has operated at Franklin, the small staff, originally of six engineers but expanded this year to nine engineers, has produced tangible results far in excess of the modest cost, results incalculable in terms of the added oil they have helped to provide us with during the war. Although Congress last year authorized employment of 14 engineers on this project, and although the Bureau is trying to find sufficient qualified men to bring it up to full strength, the cut made by the House in this bill would mean a reduction of force, I am informed, to six engineers and one clerk.

Is that sensible economy? I might point out to this committee that the one person in the entire Congress who over the years became perhaps the best known exponent of economy, Congressman RICH, appeared before the House committee to urge, not a cut in this item, but allowance of the complete budget amount.

The Bureau had hoped to establish a subfield office at Bradford, Pa., to engage in secondary recovery studies of water-flooding operations. However, should this House cut stand—and I am sure this committee would not allow it to stand—this suboffice cannot be opened.

One of the Bureau's accomplishments in Pennsylvania within the past few years was a new technique developed with the aid of local oil producers in gas drive operations, involving the flowing of oil from stripper wells. Originally intended only to replace pumping equipment, which was scarce during the war, it is now showing promise of producing more oil than was formerly produced by pumping.

One lease in Venango County was on the verge of being abandoned 2 years ago, but because of the aid of the Bureau's Franklin office in providing scientific know-how on the new principle, the production rate has advanced substantially, operating costs have been reduced, and the operator is now drilling about 20 more wells on this same lease. As of now, there are more than 200 wells in nearby areas, I am informed, using this flowing principle of recovery. Operators in this and other fields are daily requesting the Bureau's help in changing over to the new method.

When we recall that in 1925 the remaining proved reserves of crude oil in the Pennsylvania-New York-West Virginia area were estimated at 150,000,000 barrels, whereas 488,000,000 barrels have actually been taken out of the ground there since then, with 209,000,000 barrels of proved reserves now remaining, we can readily see that technological progress, provided largely by the Mines Bureau, has given us more than a half billion barrels of oil we never thought we had 20 years ago. It is known now that perhaps another billion barrels exist in the Appalachian region.

Research has given us that extra oil.

Can we, then, ignore the value of research in this field when we in the United States and, as a matter of fact, all nations, are on a world-wide search for more and more oil?

In the same way that the oil-recovery program of the Bureau brings wealth—and oil—to Pennsylvania and the Nation, so the natural-gas investigations of the Bureau are also important to my State and to all States. Pennsylvania produces even today tremendous quantities of natural gas, and this gas is vitally needed in the steel and related industries of the western part of Pennsylvania. I want to see the Mines Bureau permitted to continue its natural-gas investigations because we do not produce as much gas in Pennsylvania as we need. The shortage last winter, as a matter of fact, was acute, despite large shipments of the fuel from other States. This bill as it now stands would, I am afraid, curtail if not kill off entirely some of these important investigations.

OIL AND GAS DIVISION

The Oil and Gas Division, in the Secretary's Office, has also been cut by the House, in this case from $463,900 to $124,000.

I think this is the poorest kind of economy, because it means throwing overboard the compilation of vital statistics and the coordination of America's petroleum industry into a cohesive pattern. The Oil and Gas Division, which is the only agency we have for the establishment of a unified national petroleum policy, must be provided with the funds with which to operate. To give this agency merely a small portion of the amount it actually needs even to police the "Hot Oil" Act and to amputate all of its other functions would be, I believe, an irresponsible abuse of the appropriating power without regard to our economy or to our national defense. I ask the amount be restored.

MINE SAFETY

I am very pleased that the House committee made no slashes into this important work and I hope the Senate committee will similarly not seek to reduce these vital appropriations. Along the same lines, I might note the fact that $105,000 for anthracite investigations proposed by the Budget has weathered the economy storm in the House and will do likewise, I hope, in the Senate. This fund finances the construction and testing of new mechanical mining equipment, including a novel coal planer discovered originally in Germany. Flood-prevention-control studies under this appropriation have disclosed billions of gallons of water in 125 pools separated by barriers from the mines. The Bureau is seeking to determine if these barriers are adequate to prevent future disaster.

TESTING FUELS

The cut in this item was from $595,000 to $302,285. It doesn't sound very important or very urgent. But the seeming unimportance of the item is misleading, especially if we are considering true economy. One of the purposes of this fund is for research in lowering the costs to the Federal Government of the operation, maintenance and replacement of Federal boiler-plant equipment. This work protects over $750,000,000 of Government heating and power equipment. How much does this modest appropriation save us, as taxpayers? I cannot get exact figures, but estimates run as high as $10,000,000 a year. Even a tiny fraction of that would justify the entire appropriation. Not only the Government, but industry, too, shares in the dividends from this research, and it is only a part of the Bureau's activities under this heading.

Yet the House cut would mean a one-third cut in this work.

The only new item included by the Budget Bureau's request for testing fuels is a vitally important function for Pennsylvania steel, but it would not go through if this cut is not restored. This item was for $25,000 for research on improvement of coking practices, and the work was to have been done in Pittsburgh. The House bill kills this program aborning.

I am informed that the lignite gasification pilot plant at Grand Forks, N. Dak., will have to close if the amount for testing fuels is not restored. This plant, in developing high hydrogen gas from lignite, could help materially, I am informed, in the development of processes for making lower-grade iron ore suitable for steel use to replace the high-grade ores we are rapidly depleting in the Minnesota range. Faced as we are with the prospect of the exhausting of our high-grade ores in 20 years or so, I think it vitally important not only to Pennsylvania but to the Nation that we plan ahead and develop a substitute material.

METALLURGICAL RESEARCH AND PILOT PLANT

Along the same lines, I want to point out some of the effects of a cut of $1,000,000—from $1,600,000 to $600,000—in metallurgical research. The Bureau has under way an extensive program for the use of off-grade ores which could supplant present ores if the need arose, thus preventing geographic and technical reorganization of the iron and steel industry.

As one example of this work, it initiated its sponge-iron program in the ferrometallurgical laboratory at Pittsburgh and pilot plant tests were conducted at Johnstown, Pa., Raleigh, N. C., and Laramie, Wyo. The Laramie and Raleigh plants would have to close down under this appropriation cut, and the Pittsburgh work on fundamental studies would be seriously curtailed. This, I believe, is poor economy indeed. America has been blessed for so many years with such an abundance of natural resources that I am afraid too many Americans, and some Members of Congress, take these things for granted and refuse to recognize the danger of depletion.

The Bureau is operating pilot plants for the production from domestic ores of such vitally needed, but unfortunately scarce, alloying materials as nickel, chromium, vanadium, tungsten, cobalt, titanium, and so on. The House bill would close down completely the vanadium, tungsten, and antimony plants and seriously curtail those producing nickel, cobalt, and titanium. Can we afford that?

The question might be asked here: Is the Bureau competing with private enterprise in these fields? The answer is "No." The Bureau, under this program which would now be curtailed so drastically, began in 1943 to produce experimentally electrolytic manganese, a material capable of being substituted for nickel in a variety of steels and which can be produced from low-grade ores. The plant was so successful, a commercial plant was erected at Knoxville, Tenn., which has now an estimated capacity of 4,000,000

pounds per year. Steel producers in Pennsylvania, I might say, take a greater portion of the output of this plant than do those of any other State. Once its work was shown to be commercially practical and useful, the Bureau withdrew from its manganese metal production and it is turning to new problems—that is, if Congress will let it do so.

INVESTIGATION OF DOMESTIC MINERAL DEPOSITS

If the Senate of the United States is willing to allow a 50-percent curtailment in mineral explorations in the United States at this stage of our history, following the terrific rate at which we used up our minerals during the war, I will be, indeed, surprised and amazed. Yet that is about what the House has proposed in its cut in this item from $1,600,000 to $800,000.

I am sure I do not have to go into detail in this matter before this subcommittee, composed as it is of so many Senators vitally concerned with our future metal needs. Suffice it to say, however, that in Pennsylvania, alone, the Bureau had intended drilling in four counties for lead and zinc, which we know is critical, and in another county for copper. As for copper, we all recall a few weeks ago, when the copper tariff moratorium bill was before us, how industries throughout our States deluged us with requests for passage of this measure in the hopes it would encourage marketing here of foreign copper. Time will tell whether this expedient will bring substantial relief. But in the meantime, any efforts to find more copper in the United States should certainly be encouraged.

The Pennsylvania copper drilling project, which would probably be abandoned under this fund cut, was scheduled to take place in Montgomery County. Lead and zinc explorations are under way in Lancaster County and were supposed to start in Chester, Bucks, and Blair Counties, where these metals previously were mined many years ago. The Lancaster operation will probably be limited substantially and the other three, I am informed, will be abandoned unless sufficient funds are made available.

PITTSBURGH STATION, BUREAU OF MINES

The House cut here of 25 percent from $200,000 to $150,000 hits at one of the most important coal research centers of the world. Its work deals with fundamentals of coal composition and production, mining methods and safety, coal cleaning and preparation, coal carbonization, utilization efficiency and so on.

It has been doing outstanding work on smoke abatement and on coal technology generally. It is now seeking methods of providing the steel industry with suitable coking coal from Greene County and elsewhere now that the Pittsburgh bed in Fayette and Westmoreland Counties, the greatest source of coking coal in the world, is becoming depleted.

I ask the restoration of this $50,000 cut and I know western Pennsylvania industry joins me in that request.

ECONOMICS OF MINERAL INDUSTRIES

I am sure the mining industry will be able to put up a sufficiently convincing argument to show this committee the need for restoration of the cut made by the House of $678,000 representing the elimination completely of bituminous-coal statistics gathering and compilation. This cut would end a function which has been carried on for 10 years and which has, I can testify, saved this country immeasurable hardship and dislocation in the past. It is not only the mining industry, but all industry which uses coal, and thus, the Nation generally, which benefit from this work. To know where our coal is, and what kind of coal and how much is available is vital to an industrial Nation like ours which depends upon that coal.

Coal is still a critical material, I might say, particularly in view of the needs of suffering millions abroad whose needs will require us to ship sizable amounts of this fuel for relief purposes and for the restoration of economies wrecked by long years of war.

It is vital, I repeat, that we know at all times how much coal is on hand and where it is located and what qualities are represented. The Bureau of Mines is the only agency, public or private, which can compile that data in useful and accurate form.

GROUND-WATER INVESTIGATIONS, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Stopping this activity, as proposed by the House, at a so-called saving of $845,000 is another example of irresponsible "economy" at the expense of normal, traditional, necessary functions of Government. The House committee, in its wisdom, has proclaimed that this work is "not justified" and should be done by the States.

Mr. Chairman, shall we leave weather forecasting to the States? This proposal is no less nonsensical.

The Geological Survey has the trained manpower—which the States do not—and the equipment—which the States do not—to do a vast research job with little expense. In Pennsylvania, for instance, this function costs the Federal Government only about $15,000 a year—I do not have the exact figure before me—but the State matches it dollar for dollar and together this sum represents the total working capital on a job which saves the Federal Government untold thousands of dollars in water costs at the Philadelphia Navy Yard alone.

In addition, the service provides Pennsylvania cities and industries with scientific data on underground water which is of vital importance.

Stopping the program now would bring to an abrupt end studies which have been going on since 1931 on water-level fluctuations in observation wells, studies essential in predicting future availability of ground water. In recent years the service has aided numerous communities in Pennsylvania to obtain essential data on their own groundwater supplies. A major cooperative program is now under way with Philadelphia and another with Pittsburgh. Both would stop.

The Philadelphia Planning Commission has urged me to enlist the committee's aid in restoring the appropriation, pointing out that without the essential data the city would be handicapped enormously in completion of plans for the industrial development of Philadelphia and its metropolitan area. The study now under way, this commission informs me, will be extremely valuable to industries seeking locations in or near Philadelphia, industries which require ground water for numerous reasons, chiefly involving chemical content of the water.

Should this work end now, the Philadelphia commission reports, the money the city has already spent in behalf of the work would be money thrown away since no other agency exists to do the technical work.

The members of this subcommittee, I am sure, already know of the importance of the ground-water work of their own States, and, I think, will agree with me on the necessity for restoration of this very modest appropriation, modest in terms of the valuable services it brings to all of our people, and particularly to industry and to tax-supported agencies.

May I say in conclusion, after this very lengthy presentation, that I was amazed to find, in looking into the matters in this bill which I have discussed, how very diverse and important are many little-known functions of the Government in our own States.

The action of the House committee in cutting the Interior Department funds so substantially has brought home to me, and I think to many Senators, the real service we do receive from a host of Federal agencies providing technical and research assistance, agencies which go about their work quietly and unostentatiously and which we seldom appreciate until we are on the verge of having their functions eliminated.

Speech of T. Russ Hill at Banquet of Southern States Industrial Council, Washington, D. C., April 30, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address, which I commend to attention of the Congress and the country:

THE SOUTH AS I KNOW IT

(By T. Russ Hill)

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Southern States Industrial Council, ladies, and gentlemen: It would be relatively easy to spend all of the allotted time reciting statistics to prove how well the South has done on her own since she was left absolutely destitute some eighty-odd years ago. Not only was she destitute, she was oppressed. Her accomplishments in that short period of time are a glorious chapter in the Nation's history. When the attitude of today's prostrate nations of Europe are considered, the story of the South's rise takes on new luster. The European nations are dazedly begging crumbs from others' tables. The South in her darkest hour never begged or winced. She has come far under her own power. The spirit that made that possible cannot be put on a statistical chart. She has done well and will do better, and she has the brains and courage with which to do it on her own. Many who are so busily engaged in trying to pass laws to regulate the South into salvation should drink deeply from her reservoirs of Americanism and courage and gain strength thereby to bolster the Nation against a lot of sophisticated nonsense that threatens its verities and, therefore, its existence.

The beauty, charm, hospitality, gentleness, and valor of the South are known throughout the world. Its share croppers, gunpowder tempers, and illiteracy ratings are almost as well known. The South means this and more to almost everyone, but there are other characteristics of the South which are more important to the Nation at this disturbing moment. Because of what these elements represent, they mean more to national security than anything else that belongs to the South that is known to me. This is increasingly true in the light of current conditions.

Since the war the Nation has experienced a discord beyond a normal expectancy for such a period. The people have turned from fighting their enemies to quarreling among themselves and with their friends. The heroism of sacrifice which characterized the war effort has been choked out by the grasping of greed. The workers who were fused by fear are engaged in conflicts of hate. There are ample evidences of the abuse of power by labor and by management, while power politics has reached a new high or a new low according to the point of view. Wages and prices have played an exaggerated game of leap frog, spiraling into a war of nerves under the threat of economic revolution.

These and other eruptions of the period have jangled the people into a sense of insecurity, and filled them with forebodings for

their futures. In many important quarters a "what's the use" attitude prevails. This uneasiness is fanned by the evident agreement of the leading economists that we are in a boom spiral which will turn into a depression by middle or late summer. Buyers' strikes, heavy inventories, industry's pricing responsibilities, large profits, labor demands, budgets, and taxation are 2-inch, front page headline news frightening in their implications and, therefore, devastating in the reaction upon the morale of the people. So much so that constructive action is hampered. In such an atmosphere it is difficult to estimate and correct the basic causes of surface eruptions. The proper emphasis is not given to hidden elements of security, bulwarks against the avalanche of ruin which some forecasters hear roaring down upon the people carrying varying degrees of injury for all.

Too many present conditions must only be considered as paralleling those of 1920. On this premise there must be a 1921, if not a 1929, somewhere in the future. It is inconceivable to others that the country could allow its spirits to again ebb to the level of this belief. The Nation pulled up stakes and ran for the caves in 1929 when just such roars as are now being heard echoed through the land. Courage instead of ghost hunting would have reversed the trend then as it will in 1947–48. Even completely discounting the favorable condition of Government bonds, private debt, savings accounts, and money in circulation in the Nation today, not to mention the world's needs now as compared to the late teens—forgetting all these plus factors would not justify a damaging recession in our economy. Only a recession of spirit can permit it to happen. Certainly a strengthening of spirit, a difficult process because of the contrary selling being done, will prevent it.

There is no clearer example of this defeatist attitude than the fact that is found necessary to defend the American system at home and abroad. The fact this Nation pulled the world through two wars in 30 years, financially and industrially, is evidently overlooked. Being the only solvent world power today, and in the process of underwriting and actively manning the rehabilitation of that world, is not considered as basic evidence for our system—rather an invitation for much of the world to take a shot at democracy. Until late years people have continuously come to this country to get away from their systems of government and to get a chance to carve out their own destinies. They are now coming to tell us how good those same systems are and to ask us to adopt them. Some among us who sponsor the cause of those foreign systems are good sounding boards for their doctrines here as well as abroad. Such go lecturing to those people on the fallacies of America and her leaders. Naturally many abroad are susceptible to such preachments. Being stripped to the bone it is something of a consolation to find that a land they regarded as so fortunate could be in such danger of going to pieces. Thus they draw away from us if not actually lining up against us.

If her people get the facts America will be too shrewd, too sensible to come up with the wrong answer on collectivism under any name. Such systems are moon bayings as far as material worth or spiritual benefit to man is concerned. They cannot match ours in a single department. There is nothing new in or to them. Their leading exponent cannot even put her stolen machine tools into successful operation because of the poor management that always characterizes such governments. For the same reason poverty and some hunger stalk her lands in spite of lend-lease equipment and materials forwarded to offset such conditions. America has no need for such a system. She has one that has taken her on the fastest run of accomplishment in the world's history. It may need a new bearing here and there or some other slight overhauling, but it is still the best government ever conceived by man. Recent history strengthens that fact.

When the people stop listening to the rattles, mechanical and vocal, and get to their causes, the jitters of the day will give way to hard thinking and constructive action. Laws and policies of expediency will be superseded by those based upon facts. Modern man is not as brilliant as he pretends. His spontaneous and crisis judgment is, therefore, not good nor conducive to the continued smooth performance of the democracy to which he belongs; America needs to revalue her tap roots and then take the offensive. She is entitled on her record to do so. A defensive role does not benefit her or belong to her. Neither is such an attitude good for one world no matter what the boundaries. Reducing America to the political status of other world powers would mean the end of hope for all mankind everywhere. She cannot continue to back up under appeasements' press or because of false conceptions of free speech. To do so will hasten the destruction of those things she seeks to save. There will then be no consolation in measuring the extent of the losses or in nursing regrets.

To be sure, there are many underlying economic causes for the distorted condition in the Nation. The chief ones lie deeper than wages, prices, production or controls. Because such are not obvious they are often overlooked, particularly by the average citizens, which are most of us. The correction is not too difficult. The will to correct is something else. Both can only be superficially discussed here.

One of these underlying causes, it seems to me, is taxation. The basic question cannot be whether to have more or less taxation. The purpose for which the tax is levied and what the money will accomplish for the Nation when spent for that purpose is the important thing. Taxation of any successful individual or business to provide for the unsuccessful is a basic plank in the platform of the advocates of an alteration of our way of life; that is natural, because that practice will destroy it. It is a two-edged knife of annihilation because it destroys ambition in one and encourages indigence in the other. The answer is all indigence, all wards of the State, which by the process has been deprived of its milk for succor. That is what Alexander Dumas was warning against when he wrote long ago, "If we are to submit absolutely to the level of equality, we had better choose the level of nobility. I like equality that elevates, and not that which lowers mankind." Taxing the automobile business at the beginning of the century to keep the buggy and wagon plants going would have been today's theories in operation then, stopping the progress and development of the Nation. When taxation is for the essential functions of government only, without the extras, democracy will be relieved of its spasms.

Another is money manipulation; selling bonds, printing money, taking it, and spending it. Such processes push the money supply ahead of the merchandise it can buy. We have reached that stage here. With a money supply now of $163,200,000,000, highest in our history by almost $100,000,000,000, it is past time to stop the printing presses and start paying the debt. That illustrious son of the South, the late O. Max Gardner, cried out against this practice. "Three words," said he, "taxes, borrowing, and spending stand as silent monuments to mark the fall and decline of character, credit, and governmental stability in every hamlet, city, and State throughout the length and breadth of this Nation."

A third is monopoly of labor which forces laborers out of their jobs at the whim of an industry-wide union czar. Why do the workers strike when the call goes out from headquarters? Because they know they cannot work again if they do not. Why cannot apprentices get started in many trades? Because competition in labor is not welcomed by the oldsters. These conditions stiffle progress and therefore destroy jobs. It is the steel band of an organized minority, forged in the furnace of greed for power and tempered in the laws written primarily in the same spirit. The freeing of labor and the holding of its despoilers, within and without, to strict accountability is the third of the fundamental economic adjustments required to relieve the Nation of its present nausea. The "closed shop," and the same thing by another name, the "union shop," (crucifiers of human liberties) and the right of promiscuous striking must be weighed in that light and not the light of who loves or hates labor or industry.

Laws alone will not suffice. Our Congress has been much concerned about a labor law. "Tough" and "wild" are the 2 types mentioned. No labor law alone can solve this problem any more than prohibition and controls solved those problems. England has laws forbidding strikes against the government, laws against secondary strikes and boycotts, against wildcat strikes and mass picketing, against political contributions by unions, and laws requiring financial reports by unions. What did these do for England? The will of the people, not law, is the remedy. There is no one here who does not know what that will is in labor matters as well as the other 2 needed basic corrections. Probably the people have not expressed that will strongly enough to secure proper conduct. They will and action will come, but probably not until the plums of '48 have been gathered and that could be a bit late.

In this battle to increase the spirit of the people, look to the South. She has the requisites, still undiluted, for citizenship of force and character. That is what the South means to me, and I am grateful to the Omnipotent that she stands at this particular time just as she is—solid. Whether she is an economic disgrace or an economic opportunity is unimportant in the battle before us. Her zeal for the elementary tenets of the democratic way of life is much more important. The contributions of southerners during the past 15 years to the continuance of our way of life will not be completely evaluated in our day. The South's ratings may be low in some categories, but not in the particular requirements of democratic citizenship.

Her irresponsibles may resort to lynchings, a form of savagery which may be lower or higher than the political death-beating in New York of a worker at the polls or an ambush slaying in Peoria of a president of a railroad. It is popular in some so-called more enlightened centers to point the finger of scorn at the South. One day even these centers may see the sunrise of a revitalized democracy. The glow will be from the South. There, possibly to a greater extent than in any section of our land, are the ingredients of the lost cord in the fabric of our democracy. It is the lack of that cord which is largely contributing to the breakdown of the spirit of our people. That failing spirit is spawning the "What's the use" attitude.

Three of the vital cords in our democratic fabric are strong and easily recognized. There is the crimson cord of glory, spun on our battlefields, against which there can be no indictment. The crosses of victory on the breasts of many lands and many men attest that. The silver cord of culture, outlined in the establishment of colleges and libraries, research and extension courses, lectures and radio, art, music and drama, is an equally vivid monument. The golden cord of industry, the wonder of the world, needs no statistical support or eulogistic treatment. It is

enough to state that it paid for the first two. But the platinum cord of character, particularly in human relations, is not so clearly defined. It is almost invisible. Its weakness endangers the entire fabric of democracy. The South, as I know her, embodies the elements for restoring that invisible cord. The three cardinal elements necessary to produce that cord are basic with her people.

The southern people almost universally practice a belief in God, the cornerstone of democracy, and the chief element in the weaving of the lost cord of our way of life. Freedom of speech cannot be found where freedom of worship does not exist. In fact, no freedom exists without this belief on the part of the people. All America needs to hear and heed what my friend Fred Zeder, of Chrysler, told a group of scientists in this city recently—that the Master Mechanic is needed. The vast majority of the people of the South believe that, and take it seriously. When the same percentage of the rest of the Nation believe that and defend it without flinching against the blitzkrieg of ism, atheism from any quarter, within or without, the lost cord of character will begin to take shape and peace will begin to settle over our land and then the world. Long ago a historian wrote that God could not see the South lose with Stonewall Jackson praying for it so He had to take Jackson. The South still prays to the same God who never let Jackson lose a battle and who cradled him in peace in the thick of the battlefield. A peace that enabled him to mutter with his last breath, "Let us cross over the river and rest under the shade of the trees." That is characteristic of the South as I know it. The fires of worship burn on her millions of altars—enough to start the furnaces for tempering the metal of character throughout the Nation.

The southern people blindly love the flag, another required element for the reclamation of the lost cord of the American way. In the South is the only county in the Nation from which not a man was drafted in the first war—every eligible male volunteered. Travel the South and question people in all stations and activities. You will not find one native who supports or believes in any other form of government. He may be in rags, but the flag still covers him. He may know nothing of the Constitution, the bill of rights, the budget, or one world, but he does know the stars and stripes of the flag and will fight for it at the drop of a hat. He belongs to the "what's right with America" group and refuses to listen to the "what's wrong with America" destructionists.

The South puts heavy emphasis upon the home, basic in the character of a nation. She is often assailed for living in the past, for being reactionary, for clinging too long to the odor of jasmine, lavender, and old lace. However, no face-lifting has been able to pull her away from the cornerstone of society, the home. That far overshadows the ridicule often thrown at hoop skirts or Prince-Albert-coat ways, especially in this day of 30-percent divorce rates and spiraling juvenile delinquencies. The latter are eating away at the Nation's platinum cord. Nevertheless nothing very serious will happen to this Nation internally as long as man's castle is his home and so regarded. The South is the bulwark of this philosophy.

From the pages of history countless other southerners, so schooled, step to portray the South as I know it far better than I could ever do. Their challenge is still the South's challenge today. It rings from the plains of Texas to the heart of Maryland. From the depths of hearts stimulated by justifiable pride in their accomplishments and humbled by divine solicitude, they cry: "Leave us our freedom that we may continue to carve out our own destinies; that we may make even greater contributions to the continuance of this greatest Nation on earth."

Overseas Scrap Essential to United States Steel Mills so Farm Equipment Can Be Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I come from Minnesota, the State that supplies the steel industry of this Nation with about 80 percent of its iron ore.

The last two wars have been a terrific strain on ore resources, and we must anticipate the day when the supply of high-grade ore will be gone. For that reason every possible effort should be made to conserve scrap iron.

There are millions of tons of scrap iron scattered throughout Europe, Asia, and in the south Pacific. The United States has plenty of shipping which could be used to bring back this scrap iron to be used in the steel industries. The Navy Department is in process of investigating the ways and means of returning at least a part of this scrap to the United States. Their efforts should receive the support of every citizen interested in the future welfare of this Nation.

Following is an editorial from the Daily Metal Reporter of May 15, 1947, which graphically portrays the need for effective action in connection with the return of scrap iron to the United States:

OVERSEAS SCRAP ESSENTIAL FOR UNITED STATES STEEL MILLS

Charity should begin at home, especially as far as scrap iron is concerned.

The Philippine Government recently announced that it will sell 1,000,000 tons of scrap iron and steel to the highest bidder in any part of the world.

The United States was to deliver to Manila, presumably as a gift, surplus war goods valued at $100,000,000, but either through mishandling or pilferage these have shrunk to a value of about $75,000,000, so that our Treasury may be asked to fork over an additional $25,000,000 to the new republic.

What is the connection between these three seemingly unrelated items? Simply this. At a time when our own steel mills and foundries are in urgent need of scrap, when automobile manufacturers and other industries are unable to operate at capacity because of a steel shortage, our Government is disposing of vast tonnages of war surplus scrap iron and steel, either directly or indirectly, to countries in Europe and Asia which in turn are reselling them.

Under the circumstances it is not surprising that Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN recently declared in the House: "I was amazed recently to discover that our Government is doing little or nothing toward returning to this country the scrap steel resulting from the war. This is the scrap which our steel mills desperately need if they are to reach full production." He went on to say that "Present stocks of iron and steel scrap are the lowest on record. They're even lower than back in the war years when we were conducting scrap drives. Yet in Europe and on the Pacific islands there are millions of tons of scrap in the form of out-of-date or damaged war equipment, bombed bridges, buildings, and so on."

There has been a great deal of talk about returning the Government-owned scrap from the Pacific and from the European theaters of war, but thus far it has been chiefly talk and little action. In the meantime, our steel mills, unable to get an adequate supply of scrap, are using more pig iron which of course means greater use of iron ore, coal, and coke, the precious natural resources on which depend the future prosperity of the Nation.

If the steel mills maintain their present rate of operations this country will be short of scrap for a long time to come, and the reason is quite obvious. During the years 1941 through 1945 the United States production of steel amounted to about 427,000,000 tons. It has been estimated that 33⅓ percent of this total left the United States in the form of ships, tanks, guns, ammunition, and other war matériel. Others estimate that about 50 percent was shipped abroad. A good portion of this tremendous tonnage is probably in Davey Jones' locker, never to be returned. The remaining tonnages have been scattered throughout the four corners of the world, wherever there was a likelihood of the implements of war being needed with which to fight the enemy. The country has therefore lost anywhere between 142,000,000 and 218,000,000 tons of potential scrap, scrap which will never be returned to the United States. To that extent we are so much the poorer and will have to draw on our natural resources to make up the deficiency.

Of course the United States is a rich nation. That is why all foreign nations are coming to us for loans. But we will remain rich only so long as our natural resources hold out and are capable of supplying our vast industrial machinery with the raw materials they need in their operations. These natural resources have been intrusted to us for future generations and we would be violating that trust and also endangering the future safety of the Nation if we dissipated these reserves.

All the more reason, therefore, for bringing back to the United States the scrap iron and steel, estimated at several million tons, that are located in different parts of the world and which are still owned by the United States. The longer they are left there, the less will there be to bring back either as a result of pilferage or deterioration.

The steel industry is the backbone of our economy. There is hardly an industry that is not dependent on it. The steel mills are in urgent need of scrap and unless they get it, it will prove difficult to maintain their present rate of operations.

It's all right for Uncle Sam to be generous and to make gifts and loans. But he mustn't overlook the needs at home. We need the scrap iron that would have been available in this country had it not been for the fact that the war forced the United States to ship so much of its steel in various forms to all parts of the world.

Now is the time to bring back as much overseas scrap as possible.

American Liberalism Faces the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "American Liberalism Faces the

Future," which I delivered at the annual dinner of the Liberal Party of New York State, in Brooklyn, N. Y., on May 21, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is a real privilege and an honor to join with my friends of the Liberal Party on this occasion for a discussion of the labor legislation now pending in the Congress.

The grave problems which confront us today arise more immediately out of the dislocations of the war and the widespread devastation and bankruptcy which has affected the whole world. In America, while we were not invaded by armies, our economy nonetheless has suffered serious consequences which will trouble us for many years in the future.

We must not overlook the fact that the problems besetting us are not altogether new. For many years, our economy has been undergoing serious changes in basic economic and political principles. For 50 years, we have been witnessing a rapid concentration of ownership in business and industry with excessive prices and profits causing recurring periods of deflation and unemployment. There can no longer be any doubt but that our economy is controlled and manipulated in the interest of the few and at the expense of the many. Our people are becoming more disturbed and restless. Our system of free enterprise is losing its appeal to many disillusioned citizens.

The depression which followed the Wall Street crash of 1929 was a serious threat to the continuance of our economic system in its then badly battered condition. We were able only to provide temporary solutions through Government control and regulation of banks, stock exchanges, utilities holding companies and other segments of our economy, along with the creation of huge Government loaning agencies and programs of relief, public works, and other such alleviating measures. But even the prodigious program of the New Deal in the early thirties, while correcting many of its serious evils, failed to overcome its fundamental evils and reestablish our economy on secure footing. We were blocked in our efforts for fundamental reforms, and it was not until the outbreak of World War II, when the need for a huge program of national defense developed, that we were able to provide employment for the millions of our workers who were receiving Government relief.

While for years prior to World War II we were witnessing a rapid concentration of industry and expansion of monopoly, we had hoped that the trend towards collectivism would be checked and genuine free enterprise would be restored. But so far we have been disappointed in these hopes. During the war and since the war, concentration has proceeded apace and no efforts are being made to check it by new legislation or by an effective enforcement of existing laws.

We have no definite program other than the antimonopoly laws before the country today which would bring about a solution of these basic problems. And now, in the face of this growth of monopoly, high profits, and lowered purchasing power, our workers are confronted with a program of drastic and vindictive labor legislation designed to break down the strength of labor unions. This legislation is based on the notion that labor has become a monopoly and that it, instead of industry, is the cause of all our economic misfortunes and dislocations.

Of course, every intelligent person must know that the real heart of our present danger lies not in any labor monopoly, but in the lack of balance between wages, prices, and profits, and the resulting maldistribution of the national income. Since the destruction of price control and other stabilization controls in 1946, the cost of living has risen faster than wages and salaries. The result is that the workers of the Nation have fallen further behind in purchasing power and consequently our markets are breaking down. Prices have gone up with great rapidity but profits have gone up still faster. These conditions necessarily have created a difficult problem in adjusting wages to meet existing conditions.

We are now undergoing a stage of inflation which, it is feared, will develop into a real recession and large-scale unemployment. Already we have considerable unemployment in many sections of the Nation. In some places unemployment compensation has been exhausted for thousands of unemployed workers. This, not labor, is the real problem before the country—the problem of meeting these conditions intelligently and preventing a run-away depression.

Unfortunately, common sense and statesmanship have departed from the high places where we should expect them. We find a reactionary Republican Party undertaking to blame all these economic consequences on labor, whereas the correct course should be to provide an intelligent program for the development of mutual forbearance and cooperation between management and labor while we work to uncover and remedy the underlying causes. This certainly should be the correct course if we are to avoid confusion and chaos in the field of labor-management relations which may seriously threaten the future of free enterprise. We will never get industrial peace in this country through punitive legislation. Vindictive laws will not increase production or efficiency, both of which are essential to national prosperity. But instead of statesmanship, which recognizes these principles, we find a reactionary group in Congress, backed and abetted by reactionary groups in our economy, seeking to lay all the blame for our economic troubles on labor because of labor's insistence on increased wages to meet the high cost of living.

The basic problem is, as I have already stated, the imbalance between wages, prices, and profits, and the unfair distribution of national income. Congress, instead of addressing itself to the study and solution of this problem, has set out on a wild crusade to crush labor as the culprit causing all our economic troubles.

And so we have the Taft-Ball bill in the Senate and the Hartley bill in the House, both designed to curb labor and break what they call "the labor monopoly." The question which disturbs liberal-minded people is whether we can have labor-management peace in this country through the operation of mutual trust and cooperation between men and management or whether there is to be inaugurated a system of punitive laws designed to weaken and embitter labor and make it amenable to the power and dictation of arbitrary management.

At the hearings we were warned against adopting the latter course by able witnesses who appeared before us. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, however, adopted the course that drastic legislation must be enacted to break the so-called labor monopoly. The bills which came out of both the House and Senate were well designed to accomplish the purpose of weakening labor. During the course of the debate, the Senate bill, through amendments, was made much more severe and drastic, and, as it now stands, can only result in one end, and that is the creation of bitter discord, dissatisfaction, and confusion in the field of labor-management relations, and further undermining our free enterprise system. The same is true of the House bill.

This effort to hamper and weaken labor is just another episode in the long and tragic conflict between labor and management, starting in the period when labor was regarded as a mere commodity to be exploited just as any other commodity in the country. It was that policy and that creed which, more than anything else in our history, has marred the great record of American democracy.

But now, as another period of deflation and unemployment approaches, which may well threaten our whole democratic system, we find ourselves engaged, not in efforts to truthfully and honestly correct the real ills and wrongs which beset our economic system, but we find ourselves involved in another desperate move on the part of a reactionary Congress to break down labor so that big business may continue its dangerous course toward collectivism.

Millions of citizens in our country today are viewing this exhibition of reactionary power politics in the Congress with unconcealed apprehension. Even in the ranks of business many forward-looking, progressive-minded American businessmen are recognizing that the Congress is pursuing a course which can only lead to ruin. Speakers before the Association of American Managers at a convention in Chicago not long ago publicly declared that business was "muffing the ball" in the present economic situation. Many of the most intelligent businessmen in the Nation recognize that our modern, high-speed, mass-production economy cannot operate, much less maintain high living standards, without the clear cooperation of all groups—workers, farmers, businessmen, and Government. There is not a citizen in the country today who possesses a true understanding of national and international economic conditions who does not dread the result of this struggle between labor and management.

It has become unmistakably clear that the Republican leadership has waged its campaign on the basis of a set of slogans—"the people have given us a mandate"; "labor has become too strong"; "labor must be put in its place." These slogans have been widely and persuasively "sold" to the public. But in the end they will never succeed in convincing the average American citizen who is awake to our times that only American labor is corrupt. The truth is that trade-unionism in our country is the bulwark of our democratic system and our strongest defense against communism. No amount of propaganda can convert a false issue into a true one. I predict that this maneuvering for political advantage in this most dangerous period of our history, to put the President on the "spot," will ultimately prove to be the greatest mistake the Republican Party has made in its history.

We cannot approach the problem from the standpoint of what the individual labor leader may desire, or what the individual industrialist may prefer, or what any particular group may demand. There can only be one honest approach to this problem which goes to the very root of our democratic and economic structure, and that approach is the common good—the welfare of the whole American people. From that sound approach our first objective should be to maintain our American industrial system on the basis of equal justice to every worker and every employer.

We remember only too well the long, lean, and bitter years of the last depression. We remember the brief inflationary boom of 1929 and the prolonged bust of the early 30's, and we have hoped that such conditions would never return.

It seems to me that if the American people gave this Congress any mandate it was to avoid those mistakes; it was to prevent the return of breadlines and apple stands. Yet today we are beginning to dig economic storm cellars against a serious recession which many regard as inevitable. The American people see the cost of living still rising—still rising, I may say, despite the solemn assurances of the Republican leadership and

the NAM that the destruction of OPA would be the best safeguard against inflation. They see wholesale prices more swollen than ever, while many merchants are finding themselves unable to move their stock of goods and are taking losses. They see that their neighbors on fixed incomes are being forced to tighten their belts.

Do you think the American people will blame picketing, boycotts, the closed shop, or jurisdictional strikes for these ominous recession developments? Who would dare to suggest that the American people as a whole have permitted themselves to become so befuddled by NAM advertising propaganda? They know that we have never been "picketed" into a depression, or "struck" into a recession, or "boycotted" into an economic crisis. No, the real fact of history is—and the American people know it full well from bitter experience—that we are "speculated" into panics, we are "profiteered" into depressions, we are "priced" out of prosperous markets. When they see the ever-widening gap between prices and purchasing power, when they see corporate profits at heights never reached before, when they see monopoly power at its zenith in American history, then their mandate must be directed to the cure and not the aggravation of these basic causes of economic confusion and chaos.

Corporate profits after taxes increased from 1945 to 1946 by $3,000,000,000, from a total of $9,000,000,000 in 1945 to twelve billion in 1946. In the last quarter of 1946, profits attained an annual rate of fifteen billion. Salaries and wages at the same time declined from $111,000,000,000 to one hundred and six billion, a drop of $5,000,000,000.

This disparity between wages on the one hand and prices and profits on the other is widening in 1947. The share of labor in the total national income, even though the ranks of labor have been swelled by millions of returned veterans, will be smaller than it was in 1945, while profits continue to soar. The reduction of the purchasing power of working people is a danger signal we dare not ignore. Already relief rolls throughout the Nation are lengthening.

We are at a truly critical stage in our economic history. A prolongation of the gap between purchasing power and prices, between wages and profits, can only spell disaster for our economy. Yet at this critical stage the Republican Party is sponsoring legislation which will not only foster industrial misunderstanding and strife but will widen that gap between wages and prices which already endangers our prosperity. They seem to have forgotten 1929, when a reactionary national government and the weakened labor unions of that period gave the monopolists and speculators a free hand that took us into the costliest depression in our history.

We cannot promote industrial peace, prosperity, and employment by harassing and weakening labor unions. Our entire labor history is testimony to that fact. To insure free and wholesome collective bargaining in the public interest, we must have strong, free unions which can bargain with employers on equal terms—unions which have sufficient security so that their leaders can devote most of their time to improving working conditions, settling grievances, and promoting productive efficiency instead of having to worry continuously about how to preserve the union organization from hostile attacks. We shall secure and maintain industrial peace not by destroying the legislative pattern which has been built up so painfully during the past dozen or more years, but by correcting and preventing the economic ills which lead to labor conflict—inflation, unemployment, substandard wage levels, and needless suspicion between labor and management.

The supporters of this pending legislation contend that it will contribute to industrial stability and efficiency—as well as to industrial peace. Again, they misread the lessons of our industrial-relations history. You do not attain stability and efficiency in industry by weakening unions. Labor-management cooperation in the railroad industry came not during the period of union weakness (that was the era of the great violent railroad strikes) but when the railroad unions had become strong. Labor-management cooperation in the garment industry was not possible when employers could rely upon wage cutting as the chief means of making profits. It came only after the unions were sufficiently strong to prevent this device from shielding the weaknesses and inefficiencies of poor management. Similar stories can be told in industry after industry—construction, glass, pottery, paper and pulp, hosiery, and many others.

Unfortunately, the contribution which strong and effective unions have made and are making to industrial stability and efficiency are not adequately known and appreciated by the American public. The newspapers headline the strikes but they rarely mention even on their back pages the quiet accomplishments in thousands of American shops and factories of union-management cooperation. It is ironical and disturbing that in a nation which so strongly desires industrial peace and stability, we find that strife and conflict are considered the most newsworthy subjects. But it is one thing to put the exceptional occurrence into the headlines; it is quite another thing to make it the basis of general legislation which affects the innocent 99.9 percent of workingmen.

Strong unions are essential not only to preserve the high standards which have been won by our American workers but also to lead the way to still further achievements. Steady jobs at good wages for a full work year, the raising of the present inadequate minimum wage levels, the extension and improvement of our social-security programs, the provision of adequate safety conditions—these and many other laudable goals which are essential to continued industrial peace and stability can be secured only if we have strong unions striving for them. By weakening and harassing unions, these bills will accomplish the opposite effect.

The sponsors of this labor legislation loudly protests that they seek only to restore the balance between the power of labor and the power of management, to restore the equality of the parties. They protest too much. The inequality of bargaining power between workers and employers does not result from legislation, and equality cannot be effected by legislation in a free enterprise economy. The inferior bargaining position of labor arises from the economic relationships that necessarily exist between workers and employers in a free-enterprise economy. The Clayton, Norris-LaGuardia, and Wagner Acts recognized this basic inequality and sought to strengthen the position of the workingman in the interest of a more democratic and fairer economy. But as we have seen, labor has not yet achieved equality with management, it has been unable to protect itself against inflation, for example, as effectively as have corporations. The pending legislation, therefore, cannot restore a balance which never existed but is designed merely to give management a freer and stronger hand than it now enjoys.

After all, the test of power at the bargaining table is the results achieved. True, labor is now able to make its voice heard at the bargaining table and to achieve more of its objectives than it was able to in the '20's. But certainly no one will seriously argue in the face of the economic facts I have already cited that labor enjoys a bargaining position equal to that of organized employers. I maintain that the essential premise of the Clayton, Norris-LaGuardia, and Wagner Acts, namely, that the bargaining position of labor is not equal to that of management, is still valid and the essential premise of the pending legislation is false.

Let me call your attention to the provisions of these bills which reveal them nakedly as weapons to be used against labor, rather than a sound legislative program to promote the general public interest.

It is unthinkable that the President can approve legislation as repressive as the Taft-Hartley proposals. Even though the Taft-Ball measure which passed the Senate is not worsened in conference, it goes far beyond the careful and studied views of the President expressed in vetoing the Case bill in 1946 and his recent state of the Union message of January 1947.

These measures unquestionably strike a body blow at basic liberties. Freedom of contract is repealed by banning the closed shop, restricting the union shop, and limiting the check-off. The freedom of working men and women to join trade-unions is diluted by a variety of provisions weakening the Wagner Act and its administration. Freedom from "government by injunction" is discarded by allowing Federal courts again to issue injunctions (contrary to the Norris-LaGuardia Act) in many cases.

The administration of labor laws is weakened by removing the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor; a step disapproved by industry and trade-unions alike. Company-dominated unions are now to be allowed to appear on the ballot in Government elections. The internal discipline of unions is weakened by allowing expulsion of members only for nonpayment of dues.

The bill enormously increases the Federal Establishment handling labor laws; ballots are required on union security issues and on whether a strike shall take place, in addition to those now conducted. The Federal courts are brought into every grievance case by allowing suits for violation of contracts. The process of collective bargaining is rigorously defined rather than left to the free desires of the parties. Unions must file burdensome and detailed reports with the Secretary of Labor on matters which are already, with few exceptions, public knowledge.

After careful study I presented a bill embodying the President's program which was, in my judgment, fair, constructive, and acceptable to management, labor, and the public. I regret to say that the representatives of the majority party were so little interested that they threatened for a time not to allow the bill to come to a vote; a dramatic illustration of the temper in which this legislation has been drafted and passed.

In the event it becomes law, industry, labor, and the public will regret the Taft-Hartley bill far more than they did the Smith-Connally Act. In many respects this bill is like the British Trade Unions Act of 1926, another repressive piece of legislation, which did nothing to check strikes but preceded the establishment of the labor government in England.

This bill is an answer to nothing. It means more and extended litigation, uncertainty, and labor difficulty. Our labor situation now is healthy; recent contracts in most basic industries give promise of labor peace—if not unsettled by legislation—for a long period to come. We should address ourselves to high prices and diminishing purchasing power, with their ominous threat of another depression. We cannot fritter the country's time away in an effort to punish a few people and thereby weaken the bargaining and consuming power of the great mass of the people which constitutes the lifeblood of our entire economic system.

At this critical stage in our history, the true tests for any labor legislation must be: Does it perfect the great collective-bargaining developments in America or does it disrupt them? Does it enhance the legitimate

security requirements of trade-unions or does it undermine security and promote irresponsibility? Does it strengthen the power and freedom of organized labor which helped to make this Nation the mightiest industrial power in the world, or does it weaken that power? By these tests the Republican labor program must be rejected—not merely as unfair to labor but as harmful to the whole American economy and the American people.

Now let me emphasize one point—abuses have developed in labor relations. Those abuses should be remedied. I am already on record in the minority report of the committee as being in favor of legislation to remedy those abuses, and I have introduced such legislation and voted for sound regulatory provisions, but I am opposed to the type of punitive legislation now before us which strikes at the legitimate rights of our working people and renders them helpless to resist the drive of a few giant corporations for even greater power than they now enjoy in running our economy. One of the last reports of the Senate Small Business Committee showed that a mere 250 corporations—less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all American corporations—control fully 67 percent of all our industrial assets. That report shows the rapid acceleration with which control of our economy is passing into fewer and fewer hands.

For over half a century the American people have tried to fight the rapacious trusts and monopolies which threatened their economic liberties and security. But monopoly which the people have sought to control through the Sherman Antitrust Act passed by Congress over 50 years ago has become even more powerfully entrenched in the American economy, and more dangerous to its welfare than ever before. We know today that monopolistic development in the American economy after World War I was an important factor in the boom and bust of the 1920's. We remember the antilabor open-shop drive which preceded the 1929 boom and bust and we recognize similar forces at work again.

Is this then the time to cripple the power of labor unions which constitute the only protection of the living standards of our people? Not if we want to maintain a free and prosperous economy in which independent small business and independent workers can retain their rights. Not if we want to avoid a repetition of bread lines and bonus marches. Not if we want the anxious, confused, and struggling world to turn to America—an America of triumphant democracy and stable prosperity.

Statesmanship in Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 23, 1947:

STATESMANSHIP IN STEEL

A year ago steel production was held up for 4 weeks because the union and the employers could not agree on a wage increase. This year President Philip Murray, of the CIO, and also of the United Steelworkers Union reached a 2-year agreement with the steel companies. At Atlantic City this week his 41-member executive board unanimously accepted his statement that this contract must be kept and that there must be no work stoppage during its period.

To emphasize this point, Mr. Murray quoted again from the first section of the United States Steel agreement: "The company and the union encourage the highest possible degree of friendly, cooperative relationships between their respective representatives at all levels and with and between all employees. * * * They believe that proper attitudes must be based on full understanding of and regard for the respective rights and responsibilities of both the company and the union."

Steel is basic in our economy. Two years of peace in this industry will make for peace and prosperity in other industries. But the spirit of this agreement, and the spirit in which Mr. Murray cites it, are even more important. Men who sell their labor and men who hire labor may differ to the end of time as to prices and conditions. But if they are able to compromise the differences and achieve "friendly, cooperative relationships" the public will call down blessings on both their houses. In steel, if not yet in coal and some other major fields, there has been notable—and one hopes lasting—progress toward this ideal.

Small Business Supports H. R. 1672

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the results of a poll taken by the National Federation of Small Business among its members on H. R. 1672. I am the sponsor of this bill and I believe its passage to be vital to the interests of small business.

It is a very wrong situation indeed, when large chain corporations can operate many of their retail outlets at a loss for the purpose of destroying independent competitors and then deduct the losses incurred on such stores, operated below cost, from their income-tax payments to the Government. Operating such stores at a net loss in order to liquidate independent business is, of course, a manifest and flagrant form of unfair competition. To permit, however, users of this practice to deduct losses deliberately incurred for such an unfair and illegal purpose from their just income-tax payments to the Government is adding insult to injury.

I note, therefore, with great satisfaction, that the numerous members of the National Federation of Small Business have given H. R. 1672 their overwhelming endorsement. In the poll, 94 percent of the members favored the passage of H. R. 1672. Only 5 percent were opposed, and only 1 percent of the entire membership of the Federation did not vote.

The National Federation of Small Business is reported to have the largest individual business membership of any organization in America and I am indeed heartened by their enthusiastic support of H. R. 1672.

New Deal Cannot Keep on Fooling People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the governmental bureaucrats who have been confronted with budget cuts have been conducting a vicious campaign to discredit the present Congress. As part of my remarks, I am including herewith an editorial which appeared in the Janesville Gazette, Janesville Wis., on May 16. This editorial is evidence of the fact that the people are beginning to catch on to the New Deal propaganda line. This element is not interested in cutting expenses but its true concern is keeping faithful followers on the Government pay rolls.

WHAT KIND OF DEAL IS THIS?

Mr. Plain Taxpayer is being given a double deal in Washington by the spenders of his hard-earned dollars. Many, it is true, are sincere in their desire and effort to provide service to the American people. Others, however, are straining every fiber to preserve what they have and to expand where they can.

The double deal comes about through the methods being used to prevent any budget cutting by Representatives and Senators. For this time, the gentlemen who have been the New Deal and war babies, established in bureaus no longer essential or through the vast expansion of Government alphabetical agencies called for by the New Deal's protracted "emergency"—this time they appreciate the seriousness of Congress.

Those methods are not all on the level. For example, one Government department after another has threatened wholesale firings, especially in the home districts of unfriendly legislators. Interested pressure groups are being told that the cut will kill their pet projects and threatens to end services essential to the public welfare.

The classic case is that of the Customs Commissioner, W. R. Johnson, a bureaucrat since 1920 who sent notices to his field offices to fire upward of 1,500 customs inspectors and assistants because the House had cut his appropriations. The Senate had not even considered the matter then, and there was no such necessity.

The public, of course, was astounded and wrote to Congressmen demanding to know what kind of economy was this, cutting out port and border patrols. Then Johnson took it back—his story had been "misleading," he admitted.

The fact is that the Customs Bureau's $47,000,000 was as much as it got last year. The public is easily misled by spenders like Johnson.

Any cut in the proposed Truman budget, no matter how small, was publicized by the offices concerned as a veritable blitz, so devastating as to cut off essential public services.

Along with others the post offices have been warned that any cuts will mean "cut in essential services"—reduction in postal service to the public.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has undertaken a sort of Gallup poll in an effort to show Congress how much the Bureau's work is appreciated and demanded by the public.

Actually, most of these agencies have mushroomed during the last administration and during the war to cover crises and war-

time demands which are now past, and the taxpayer knows it. He is tired of paying for waste in Washington. He has demanded economy, and he is beginning to resent the kind of tricks being foisted today to justify wartime-high budgets.

Few critics have been more specific in their comments on the President's budget than Prof. Fred R. Fairchild, of Yale University.

"I am convinced," he said, "that the supposed benefits of Government spending are an illusion. Government has no magic power to raise the standard of living by spending money. What it gives to some, it takes from others; and in so doing it tends to impair some of the finest attributes of our American character and our free economy.

"Now, nobody wants to limit the Government's spending power to the extent of preventing the performance of its essential functions. But I am certain that very substantial cuts could be made without producing any such results."

It is clear that tax rates, forced up by the war, are too high for peacetime expansion. They should come down as soon as inflation no longer threatens. A shift in that picture is almost here. Building construction has sloughed off and other signs point to some recession and a leveling of prices.

The proposed tax load is nearly seven times the amount of revenue raised in 1940, the year next preceding the war.

It is seven times that raised in 1921 and nearly ten times that of 1922.

Why should it cost the Government in 1948 four times as much as in 1939 to perform its essential functions?

Excluding the British loan and interest on the public debt, why should cost of the Treasury Department be ten times as much in 1948 as in 1939?

Why should we pay six times as much for our Department of Commerce in 1948 as in 1939? And for the Department of Labor seven times as much?

Another area for cutting of Government expense is in the more than 40 Government corporations, where Professor Fairchild says, "There is at least flagrant lack of fiscal control by Congress and strong presumption of unnecessary and wasteful expenditures of public money."

Yet the Washington bureaucrats tell us they cannot cut expenses without the public's suffering loss of essential services.

President Truman promised he would fight these cuts. Fight against one of the two real demands made by public in the elections last year.

If the public wants to pay less in taxes it is up to taxpayers to write our Congressmen and Senators and tell them so.

Taxes can be cut and payments on the debt can be made at the same time.

The Answer to the NAM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. HOLIFIELD Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address entitled "The Answer to the NAM" by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, broadcast over the Mutual network:

I appreciate this opportunity of debating the pending antilabor legislation with the president of the National Association of Manufacturers because that organization—the NAM—is the real sponsor of the slave-labor provisions in the Taft-Hartley bill.

What is the NAM? It is an organization dominated by the most reactionary, labor-hating interests in America. In support of that charge, let me cite a few major black spots in the NAM's record.

The NAM opposed the child-labor amendment, because by taking children out of school and putting them to work in factories, certain employers can cut wage costs. Isn't that a noble position?

The NAM opposed social security, bank-deposit insurance, the Wage-Hour Act, and the whole body of social-justice legislation intended to make life a little better and safer for the great masses of the American people.

Less than a year ago the NAM promised that prices would be reduced if only price controls were killed—and then its members proceeded to make a killing at the expense of the American people.

Today the NAM opposes legislation to provide millions of new homes for veterans and workers, and instead it demands the abolition of rent control, a step which would subject every family living in a rented house or apartment to the mercies of profiteering landlords.

This organization—the NAM—that has consistently fought in the past against every decent measure to protect the public welfare and is still battling against such measures, now has the effrontery to claim that the antilabor legislation which it actively sponsors will serve the public welfare.

In view of the record, I think the American people have a right to view with suspicion anything that the NAM stands for.

Mr. Bunting, the President of the NAM, has challenged me to answer two questions in this debate and I am more than glad to do so.

Question No. 1: First, he asks, "Is one legitimate gain of labor denied in the proposed legislation?"

The answer: "My dear Mr. Bunting, that question is almost childish. Congressman HARTLEY admits that his bill virtually repeals the National Labor Relations Act, which is labor's Magna Carta. Senator TAFT admits that his bill has rewritten the National Labor Relations Act from beginning to end. These provisions alone distort and destroy the whole basis of free collective bargaining. For instance, Senator TAFT's bill permits employers to say "No" and keep on saying "No" to all union proposals instead of requiring them to sit down and try to reach a friendly and cooperative agreement with the representatives of their workers. How could collective bargaining operate on such a basis?

"Further than that, the Taft-Hartley program is aimed at destroying union security. It opens the doors wide to a flood of damage suits in the courts against unions. This would make it impossible for them to function effectively. It provides for a return of Government by injunction. That would compel free American citizens to work against their will for private employers or face imprisonment. If these and many other provisions do not destroy the legitimate and basic right of labor, as well as its recent gains, I would like to know what would."

Question No. 2: Secondly, Mr. Bunting asks: "Do the proposals in this legislation serve the public welfare?"

The answer: "Emphatically, they do not. Many years ago Abraham Lincoln said, 'Whatever hurts labor hurts the Nation.' That wise statement is just as true today. Everyone who works for a living is labor. Whatever hurts labor, hurts them. The transparent attempt to separate the identity of labor and the public, which is fostered by the NAM's propaganda campaign, is designed to hoodwink the American people. Organized labor represents directly some 15,000,000 union members and their families. Indirectly, it represents and speaks for another 45,000,000 workers as yet unorganized. You can't hurt 60,000,000 Americans with punitive legislation without striking a damaging blow against the public welfare."

The whole purpose and intent of this legislation, regardless of the pious claims made for it, is to weaken the labor movement and make it impossible for unions to function. The effect would be to undermine and destroy the wage standards established by unions. In turn this would force all wages down, because union standards set the pace for all other workers. The result would be a slash in mass purchasing power and far lower production, because people would not have the money to buy what they need. Factories would be forced to shut down and millions of workers would lose their jobs. If that happens, America would find itself buried deep in another disastrous depression.

The Taft-Hartley bill paves the road to such a depression. Labor would not be the only one compelled to travel that road. Merchants, farmers, professional people, and the public as a whole would suffer.

Mr. Bunting, in a speech on May 16, said labor leaders insist "no legislation is necessary." I challenge that statement. We have asked Congress to enact necessary and constructive laws, but Congress has failed to do anything about them. I am talking about laws to provide health insurance for the American people—to widen social-security benefits—a higher minimum wage and decent housing. Such laws are obviously in the public interest, but the National Association of Manufacturers bitterly opposes them. God help America when the NAM is to be the final judge of what constitutes the public welfare.

The Right Answer—Terminal Leave Pay Bonds of Ex-Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on the question of making terminal leave pay bonds negotiable so that the veteran may get cash on these bonds, I include an editorial from the Tennesseean, of Nashville, Tenn., dated May 19, 1947, discussing the feasibility and righteousness of this plan:

THE RIGHT ANSWER

Representative ROGERS of Florida has come up with what seems at first glance to be the right answer to the problem of getting terminal leave cash into the hands of enlisted veterans who need it.

Much of the country has had an uneasy conscience about the difference between officer and enlisted terminal leave payments ever since we began to demobilize men from the service. The officers automatically received payment for leaves during the war which they were unable to take because of overseas duty.

Unfortunately, there was no such provision for enlisted personnel. After most of the men in service had been demobilized we partially assuaged our consciences by providing for terminal leave payments to enlisted men in bonds, cashable at the end of 5 years.

This still left considerable injustice toward enlisted personnel, many of whom needed the money to help them squeak through this era of rising prices.

A substantial move has been afoot for some time to change the law and let the servicemen have their pay at once. It has been resisted not only by the antiveteran and economy blocks in Congress but also by many level-headed legislators who feared the sudden flood of cash all over the country might be the final ingredient to set off a wild and uncontrollable explosion of inflation.

Representative ROGERS' proposal meets all the valid objections to the immediate cash proposal merely by providing that the veterans may sell their bonds to private investors not below face value plus accrued interest to date.

The economy bloc likes the idea, because it calls for no immediate Government expenditure while they are at the ticklish task of balancing the Budget and reducing the national debt and taxes.

Also the fact that the budget is in balance cuts off the Government's need for the private investors' funds that would go to the veterans.

The move will not be in the least inflationary, as it will remove as much money from circulation as it puts into the hands of veterans.

At present security prices the veterans' bonds are such a sound investment that there is little likelihood of any veteran who needs cash for bonds failing to find a purchaser.

Another good feature of the proposal is that it will allow the veterans who desire it to remain investors at good interest rate instead of forcing them to cash the bonds—and at the same time those who have to have the cash can get it.

Representative ROGERS is a Democrat, but the Republicans who have been somewhat embarrassed by their failure thus far to do anything to please the big bloc of veteran voters are likely to jump to support the measure.

Location of Atomic Energy Laboratory in Du Page County, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois:

House Resolution 61

Whereas it is proposed to locate an atomic-energy laboratory engaged in research for the development of all phases of the energy, including military, in Du Page County on approximately 4,000 acres of land now occupied by homes, farms, and forest preserve; and

Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission did not hold a public hearing on this matter, thus depriving interested citizens of an opportunity to be heard; and

Whereas the Department of Conservation of the State of Illinois has advised that the location of the laboratory would be a severe hardship on the residents of this area in that the laboratory would require millions of gallons of water from an area which is already in danger of a water shortage due to the rapidly receding water level; and

Whereas the dispossession of residents of the land to be taken over would add an extreme hardship through increasing the already serious housing emergency already existing in the county; and

Whereas the acquisition of the Du Page tract is entirely unnecessary because of the existence of a far more suitable location in nearby Elwood, Ill., on some 40,000 acres of Government-owned land formerly used as an ordnance plant and equipped with highways, water system, railroads, electricity, housing and hospital facilities; and

Whereas the location of such a plant in a more remote Government-owned area would provide a margin of safety not possible at the Du Page location and would result in saving millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we respectfully petition and urge the Congress of the United States to investigate the obvious advantages of locating the proposed laboratory in some Government-owned area in the hope that the Atomic Energy Commission may consider the desirability of using such a Government-owned or Government-controlled site; that a copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Illinois Member of Congress at Washington.

Adopted by the house, May 14, 1947.

HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House.

Jews in American Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from an article in the Jewish Veteran, the national publication of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, by J. George Fredman, former national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States and Louis A. Falk, member of the national executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans.

The excerpt follows:

JEWS IN AMERICAN WARS

The story of Jewish participation in all the wars of our country, beginning with Asser Levy, the Dutch Jew, who in 1654 fought for the right to stand guard with his fellow burghers in Niew Amsterdam, down through World War II, with its Sgt. Meyer Levin, Corp. Barney Ross, Lt. Raymond Sussman and Gen. Maurice Rose, is told in this book.

* * * * *

It is hard to single out any special chapter or section of the book for particular mention. Some may derive a special pleasure from the antiquity of the stories of the early Colonials who fought with George Washington, such as Francis Salvador, who won the sobriquet of the Southern Paul Revere; others may be more interested to learn of Commodore Uriah P. Levy, a colorful naval hero, who did so much to abolish corporal punishment in the Navy; or that some ten thousand Jews fought on both sides with equal bravery in the War Between the States, seven of whom were decorated with the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Still others, interested in the present rather than the past, will thrill to the exploits of Sgt. Meyer Levin, the bombardier who made history, in the early stages of the war, with Capt. Colin Kelly; with the story of the poignant and dramatic message of Irving Strobing of Brooklyn, the last message heard from Corregidor before General Wainwright and his gallant men surrendered to the Japs; the story of that great athlete, Barney Ross, and his heroic efforts at Guadalcanal; or of Corp. LeRoy Diamond, who with Private Schmidt killed 200 Japs on the Solomons; or the story of how Lt. Raymond Sussman, 26-year-old shipping clerk, won the Congressional Medal of Honor, for killing 17 Nazis and capturing 32 in what was practically a one-man war.

There are also stories of the roles played in the higher echelons by Jewish generals and admirals. There is, of course, the story of how Maj. Gen. Maurice Rose, commander of the Third Armored Division, was killed in action in the last days of the war, as he was racing through Germany in a brilliant final drive to victory. Other high-ranking Jewish officers mentioned include: Brig. Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, general manager of the New York Times, who saw service in both World Wars; Admiral Ben Moreel, highest ranking Jewish officer in Navy history, who, as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, organized and commanded the famous Seabees, which achieved such engineering wonders for the Navy; Brig. Gen. Edward S. Greenbaum, who also served in World War I, and won the Distinguished Service Medal in World War II, as executive assistant to the then Under Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson; Rear Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, who served as special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy and is now a member of the United States Atomic Commission; Rear Adm. Joseph Greenspan, a career man in the Coast Guard; Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, the chief executive of the Radio Corporation of America, whose knowledge of communications proved invaluable; and others.

Several pages are devoted to the 211 Jewish chaplains who volunteered and served on all fronts, and the large percentage of Jewish doctors who served.

The authors have included two pages of statistics covering respectively World Wars I and II. For World War II, they show that more than 550,000 Jews served in all branches of service, that 11,000 were killed in action while 40,000 were wounded. Of those in service, 80 percent served in the Army, 17 percent in the Navy, 2 percent in the Marine Corps, and 1 percent in the Coast Guard. The Air Corps had the largest percentage of those in the Army with 33½ percent, the infantry was next with 16¾ percent. About 60 percent of all Jewish physicians in the United States under 45 years of age were in service.

American Jews received a total of 52,000 decorations, citations and awards. The Silver Star was awarded to 1,600 Jews, the Distinguished Service Medal and Cross and Navy Cross was awarded to 157, and Lieutenant Sussman received the Congresisonal Medal of Honor.

A Chance To Revive an Old Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 21, 1947

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the sad plight of 850,000 displaced persons in camps in Europe will be given consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary

when hearings scheduled for June 4 are conducted on H. R. 2910. The merits of this bill are discussed in the column by Anne O'Hare McCormick, appearing in the New York Times May 19, titled "Abroad," which follows:

ABROAD—A CHANCE TO REVIVE AN OLD TRADITION

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

Americans are vehemently critical of the British administration for its refusal to open the gates of Palestine at once to 100,000 Jewish refugees and of the Arabs for their opposition to further immigration into that bitterly contested land. At the same time, according to reports from Washington, a stiff fight is developing in Congress against the Stratton bill, introduced by a Republican Representative from Illinois to help solve the problem of displaced persons in Europe by permitting 400,000 to come to the United States during the next 4 years.

The inconsistency between what we demand of others and what we are willing to do ourselves is highlighted by a comparison of the number of immigrants allowed to enter Palestine legally right now and the number received in this country under the quota system. Under the restrictions of the hated white paper, still in operation, 18,000 Jews are permitted to settle annually in the Holy Land, a tiny and barren country with a population around 2,000,000. The average annual immigration into the United States since 1929 is hardly more than twice as much, 40,000, and this includes people of all nationalities and denominations who scatter over a territory of continental extent, vast resources, and many thinly settled areas.

PORT OF THE HOMELESS

Our present immigration quotas, small as they are, have been unfilled for years. From the open-door policy of the last century, which populated and developed this country, we have reverted to the restrictive attitude of Canada and Australia, which has left them small powers in spite of their size and potentialities. The United States is a great power because of the number and energy, the mixed blood and varied skills of its people. Out of this blend developed a human ferment and a pattern of society that made us the most productive and therefore the richest nation on earth.

Many arguments on practical grounds could be advanced for increasing the present quotas, or at least for filling them up. There was a time when other arguments appealed, when we thrilled to think of this country as the port of the homeless, the land of opportunity for the adventurous and the ambitious; above all, as the haven of the oppressed. Perhaps this idea is not dead. Representative FELLOWS, of Maine, chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee which will conduct hearings on the Stratton bill, complains that there is "a very definite propaganda from all over the country" in support of the measure. He suspects it is the work of a strong, well-paid lobby, but one prefers to believe it is just the old American spirit asserting itself. Maybe the country is not as scared to absorb a dribble of new blood as some of its representatives imagine it is.

But this is a larger theme. The Stratton bill has nothing to do with permanent immigration policy. It is a simple emergency measure, limited to a 4-year period, to enable the United States to do its share in relieving a condition which is more shameful than other problems because it is small and easily dealt with. It proposes that 400,000 of the 850,000 displaced persons in camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy shall be admitted outside the regular quota system but subject to all the immigration requirements. Instead of costing money, the plan will save the funds spent for their support in camps. Relatives, friends, church and civic organizations have agreed to pay all expenses and provide shelter. The immigrants will be distributed in various parts of the country and help relieve shortages in farm and domestic labor.

OUR GREAT TRADITION

Most of the displaced persons are Poles, refugees from the Baltic States, Yugoslavs and Czecholovaks. Less than 20 percent are Jews, the majority of whom desire to go to Palestine; half are women and children, and all are stateless in the sense that they refuse to stay in Germany or go back to the lands absorbed by Russia or dominated by Communists. At present the charge of the Army and UNRRA, they will presumably become the responsibility of the International Refugee Organization when and if that body begins to operate. Progress in setting it up is slow, and it might be observed in passing that Congress should exercise care lest the constitution as finally ratified contains provisions such as discrimination against all persons of German ethnic origin, wherever they come from and whatever they have endured, and prohibition of propaganda against repatriation.

At best, IRO is only another temporary expedient. These people cannot be kept in camps forever. For the most part they are the kind of citizens who would be an asset to any community—determined to be free, desperately eager to work and to take root in a new world. They are the fit who have survived the hardest tests to which human beings have ever been subjected. With plenty of room, plenty of bread, plenty of work to do, America, of all countries, owes it to the displaced to make place for them.

But principally we owe it to ourselves—to our great tradition, to the investment in people that has made us what we are, to our peace of mind in an hour when the public conscience has to be stimulated by the private conscience. If America does not give the example in this work of rescue, who will? Who will heed the "Voice of America" if it speaks in one sense and acts in another? And if we do act, it is certain our purposes will be clearer in this action than in anything else we can do in Europe.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 22, 1947:

HOLC PROGRESS

The latest figures on activities of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation are an impressive testimonial to the thrift and determination of the American people as well as proof that not all of the New Deal's economic ventures were costly failures.

When the HOLC was created at the pit of the depression in 1933 it was expected that it would suffer losses. It took over distressed mortgages totaling $3,492,000,000 on the homes of 1,017,821 citizens.

Now John H. Fahey, head of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, announces that HOLC has a net profit of $21,600,000 to show for last year and that its ultimate liquidation will be accomplished with a profit to the Government. The original investment has been reduced by about 82 percent.

The HOLC did more than give hard-pressed citizens new hope and an opportunity to save their homes. It also bailed out savings banks, mortgage companies, and insurance companies faced with bankruptcy.

At a time of great economic distress, when the financial structure of the Nation was threatened, the Government stepped into the picture with vision and courage. This governmental departure from tradition has been fully justified, economically as well as sociologically. It shows that Government can be useful in the preservation of private enterprise.

Colonel Hallaren, Director of Women's Army Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Lt. Col. Mary A. Hallaren, Lowell, Mass., as Director of the Women's Army Corps was announced by the War Department on May 7. Lowell and Massachusetts take great pride in this promotion of Lieutenant Colonel Hallaren.

The new Director was simultaneously promoted to the grade of colonel. Officiating at the ceremony was Maj. Gen. W. S. Paul, Director of Personnel and Administration.

Colonel Hallaren has been Acting Director since March 11, 1947, when Col. Westray Battle Boyce retired for reason of physical disability. The third Director of the Corps has had wide experience in Army administration. A graduate of the first WAAC officer candidate school, she was sent to the United Kingdom in July 1943, as commanding officer of the first battalion of Wacs sent to England for duty with the Eighth Air Force. Later when thousands of Wacs were assigned to the European Theater of Operations, she was appointed Staff Director for the Air Forces.

Under her guidance the Wacs in England weathered the "little blitz," the V–1 and V–2 rocket bombs, and later hazardous crossings into Normandy.

In 1944 I saw at first hand the superlatively fine work of Colonel Hallaren in England and France.

The "Little Colonel"—she stands tall to make the 5-foot height requirement—was named WAC Staff Director for the entire European theater in July 1945 and served in that capacity until March 1946 when she was appointed Chief of the Civilian Employee Relations Section, G–1, by General McNarney, theater commander. Returning to the States in June 1946 she was appointed Deputy Director, WAC, and named Acting Director on March 11, 1947.

In recognition of her outstanding military service, she has been awarded the Legion of Merit with an Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal, and Croix de Guerre with gold stars. She also wears the WAC ribbon, the European theater ribbon, the Victory Medal, the American

theater ribbon, the occupation ribbon, and the Army commendation ribbon.

Colonel Hallaren attended Lowell State Teachers College and Boston University. After graduation she taught in Lowell and Lexington, Mass.

Colonel Hallaren has great knowledge of her own country and of foreign countries. She spent her vacations traveling on foot through the great Northwest with a 15-pound pack on her back, and a determination to see the rural beauties of her native land. Later she lived in Paris and other European capitals in peacetime, tramped through mountain regions in Yugoslavia. One walking tour found her crossing the Andes on foot. She has lectured on her many travel experiences and written several articles on the customs and traditions of the countries where she has lived.

She is ideally fitted for her position. She has the confidence of the War Department and she inspires loyalty and enthusiasm in the Wacs. She typifies the kind of service which the Wacs gave. At the fifth birthday celebration of the WAC, Wac after Wac said to me, "Thank you and the Congress for our opportunity to serve our country."

Italian Peace Treaty Is Cruel and Stupid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 20, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dorothy Thompson recently summed up the objections to the Italian peace treaty now pending in the Senate. I agree wholly with her views. I include as part of my remarks the article which appeared in the Star:

ITALIAN PEACE TREATY HELD CRUEL AND STUPID—PACT AWAITING ACTION BY SENATE SEEN VIOLATING PROMISES

(By Dorothy Thompson)

"Practical people" want the Senate immediately to ratify the Italian "peace" treaty. None of its apologists thinks it a good or even decent treaty. They merely argue that it was the best we could "get," that Italy will be better off with it than hanging fire, that until it is signed we cannot enter into peaceful intercourse with Italy.

Why not? After the last war we made peace with Germany, but we did not sign the Treaty of Versailles.

If our Senate has to accept this treaty what is the good of giving its Members constitutional power to accept or reject? The logical end of the argument is that once a Secretary of State has "negotiated" a treaty, the Senate must rubber-stamp it. What then becomes of the constitutional system?

Since the middle of the war, the American people have been rubber-stamping. A few men have decided between them matters affecting the lives of millions. They have not even found it necessary to explain their acts nor justify them in reason or morality, and we are already seeing the terrible results of those "bargains."

DON'T OUR LEADERS LISTEN?

All of them consist of giving away other people's property, rights, and lives. This wretched document takes from Italy territory culturally Italian from the dawn of history, agrees to the evacuation of the Italian-speaking population, rewards Yugoslavia's dictator with essential Italian resources, creates an "internationalized" Trieste cut off from rail communications, electric power, and its agricultural hinterland. We are pledged to defend this city, in which Tito's agents are actively conspiring, while we renounce defending Italy herself.

The same newspapers which announce State Department urgings to ratify quote the State Department as warning Americans against visiting Yugoslavia because it is not safe. The inhabitants of Venezia Giulia are, however, to be permanently turned over without any safeguards to this same Yugoslavia. Don't our leaders listen even to themselves? Why must we aid and defend Greece against the same regime to which we open Italy? Is it because the Government of Greece is more democratic than that of today's Italy? If we pass this treaty, there will not long be a government either democratic or friendly to us in Italy.

We are told that if we do not ratify the Italian treaty, the Soviets will reject the Hungarian and Romanian. They will not leave Austria, nor come to terms about Germany.

But we have been unable to get an Austrian agreement; Russian troops guard the communication lines in Hungary and Rumania, and their presence aids local agents to liquidate the opposition. Does anyone doubt they will remain until they accomplish their purpose?

UNJUST, STUPID, AND CRUEL

I would be against the Italian treaty even if there were a democratic and humane regime in Yugoslavia because the treaty is unjust, stupid, cruel, dangerous, and in violation of solemn promises.

Of one thing we can be certain. This is no way to stop communism. Communism is the final haven for those who have lost all faith in God and freedom and turn to anonymous bitter collective force. We shall not stop communism by thinking we can buy off human despairs with less than the cost of a bomber fleet or restore human faith without sacrifice.

Communism can be halted only by alleviating human despairs of soul and body, through the vision and practice of a moral order. The people not only have to eat; they have to believe there is such a thing in the world as righteousness and love.

All this is not practical; but with the world as it is, after practical men have so made it, there is no reason whatever for thinking they are right.

Strike Has Become Public Enemy No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted me, I include herewith a radio address delivered recently by W. Earl Hall, editor of the Mason City Globe Gazette, Mason City, Iowa:

STRIKE HAS BECOME PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1

Every American capable of sober, intelligent thought ought to sit down by himself, or herself, and give about a half hour of thoughtful consideration to that blunderbuss weapon of the industrial world known as the strike.

It isn't necessary to surround one's self with books. No opinion of the experts is needed. The question need only be:

"What are strikes doing to me and my country?"

No matter who's doing the thinking, the conclusion—the answer—to that question can only be one thing:

"Strikes are bad business for everybody—the worker, the employer, and most important, to the general public."

Now would be a most appropriate time for the thing I'm suggesting for the reason that the telephone strike, which affected everybody in America to some degree, is so fresh in the memory of all.

What is true with respect to this telephone strike in a conspicuous and well-nigh indisputable way is true of nearly every strike in our modern society. And what is that truth?

It's that nobody is the winner, everybody is the loser. Whatever is gained by striking, granting that there is such a thing as a gain, could be had by use of the civilized rules of law which prevail in other areas of democratic society.

Let's take a brief look at that telephone strike.

After a month's stoppage, in which telephone service for the public was crippled in varying degrees, depending on the local situation, the controversy was resolved.

And that's the significant point about all strikes. They're always settled. The fact that they're settled after the strike suggests—if indeed it doesn't prove—that they could be settled before the strike.

Employees are now back on the job, receiving an average of somewhere around $4 a week more than when they left their posts. This is materially less than workers in several other fields have obtained by negotiation, without striking.

It's a notable fact that the demand set by union leaders in advance of the strike was $12 a week, across-the-board. Refusal of management to meet that demand precipitated the walk-out.

After a month off the job—with no paychecks coming in—the strikers agreed to return to work for an increase which was approximately only a third of their leaders' demand.

The question arises therefore whether by setting up such an unreasonable condition for averting the strike, the union leaders themselves didn't preclude any possibility or basis for reaching a settlement without strike.

This isn't a question pondered alone in my mind. It's a question that's being asked by those who in blind faith followed their leaders' orders.

In the cold dawn of the morning after they're reflecting on the fact that while engaging in a distasteful picketing duty, they went payless for a full month. Their leaders didn't, it's to be assumed, but they did.

Even if it be assumed that none of the increase which came to them could have been had without the walkout, it will take months to make up what was lost.

But no telephone worker is gullible enough to believe that it was necessary to strike to gain a salary adjustment. Numerous pay increases in recent years have been given to them on their employers' own motion.

An assumption with ever so much more plausibility is that an increase of more than has been received by striking could have been had by realistic and skillful negotiation on the part of their chosen leaders.

Somewhere along the line, workers who take the rap when a strike is called are going to ask for an accounting from their policy-makers who are obsessed with just one idea—to strike—when there's a controversy with management.

So much for the telephone strike.

Now let's get back to the main theme of my visit with you, the stupidity of strikes in general.

Of course, as I've already suggested, if there could be an application of intelligent self-interest by every citizen of America to the problem, it would be solved almost overnight.

There would be universal acceptance of the fact that a strike in our industrial economy is no more defensible than a war between nations. Both are bad business. Both are relics of our uncivilized past.

But I'm not optimistic enough to believe that what I'm saying here is going to come to pass at once. Progress is slow in a democracy.

In the situation as it exists, the most important step that can be taken is to have it established that strikes in areas where the health and welfare, even the lives, of the public are involved shall be illegal.

"But you can't do that in a free country," some will say. And I suggest he say it to some young man who was jerked out of his civilian lifework to risk his life on the battlefield in defense of his country. This may not be democracy in itself, but it's the way to preserve democracy.

It's more than a guess that Josef Stalin is expecting ultimately to take over in our country, because our Government is so weak that it can't discipline our people even to the extent of perpetuating our way of life.

Outlawing strikes in public-service areas is no more than an extension of the rule of the good of the many, long ago recognized and applied, in scores of other fields of our society.

When a lad enters the army, he knows that he can't strike. When a nurse enters her profession, she is obligating herself first of all to bring relief to the suffering. Despite occasional lapses, this is an accepted condition of employment for police, postal workers, and many other Government employees.

If in its extension there is any compromise with the basic concepts of democracy, the alternative must be faced. And that grim alternative is the death of democracy. So this step, it seems to me, is both justified and realistic.

What I'm saying here is, I assure you, in no wise predicated upon an opposition to the principles of labor organization or collective bargaining. Unions accepting responsibility along with benefits can exercise a constructive influence in our industrial economy.

The ultimate answer to the kind of industrial strife we've been witnessing in our country—unless voluntarily we pursue the course of common sense and refuse longer to be led by demagogs—lies in the direction of giving legal status to industrial disputes and providing laws and courts for their adjudication.

This is a subject to which I've addressed my commentaries several times in the past. On this occasion, therefore, I'm not going to go into detail.

Justice through laws administered by courts did not spring fullflowered in our country or in the world. In the stone age, right was always on the side of the caveman with the biggest spear—or whatever their weapon may have been.

Gradually down through the centuries the idea of supplanting force with laws has gained a roothold. Today our court system is accepted by all. When two people, or two companies, have a difference they can't resolve, they resort to the courts—not to their guns.

Nobody—I least of all—believes that our system of justice is perfect. It isn't. But not many oppose the basic idea of a court system. More and more our freedom has tended to become a freedom under law. Law and order have become the principal ingredients of civilization's advance.

More and more, too, the public's welfare is being given primacy. Under early day American concept, outdoor plumbing could have been defended as the right of an individual. But that right was curbed and eliminated when it was found that one person exercising his right was imperiling the health of his neighbors.

It is this principle that must prevail under the system of labor-dispute courts which are as certain for America as tomorrow's sun. The rules will be laid down and interpreted by qualified judges as they affect labor and management.

But, even more important, there is going to be a regard for the public's stake in industrial controversy which has been shamefully passed over in the dog-eat-dog doctrine too prevalent in the past as labor and management contended for their advantages.

Impartial courts applying fair and intelligent laws can bring to the industrial economy the same boon they have brought to all other segments of American life. Why they have been so long delayed, and why there is so much resistance to them from both labor and management, is something beyond my understanding.

Justification offered for all strikes of recent years in America has been the claim that existent worker income wasn't sufficient to cope with mounting living costs. That's a proper diagnosis. But the remedy chosen has been wrong to the point of absolute stupidity.

Living costs are high and mounting. But why? For the simple reason that there have been more dollars than goods—more demand than supply—more need than means for meeting the need.

What am I leading up to? I think you know. But before I tell you let me call for the testimony of an expert witness, Bernard Baruch, who by a lifetime of distinguished public service without financial reward qualifies for designation as "America's elder statesman."

"Work," says Mr. Baruch, "will halt inflation, produce homes, provide food for the world, and bring economic stability to the United States, thereby discouraging our strongest enemies.

"One by one our allies are—or think they are—exhausted. That means they stop work. But usually we find that exhaustion is the result of stopping work, and not the other way around.

"That can happen here. Don't let us be sucked into the maelstrom.

"Be sure of this: Today we are on the brink of an engulfing inflation. There is only one way out. That is by work.

"The more we produce, the less will be the cost of living; the more things we can buy, the easier will be the building of our reserves—physical, financial, and spiritual—for we shall be free of worry, the absence of which is a sense of security."

All right, what happens when men strike? They quit work. Production in their particular field ceases. Ultimately, at a higher wage, they come back to work. That means an addition to the Nation's supply of dollars.

But—and this is the fundamental fact which must be driven home—it doesn't mean there is more goods to be purchased with those additional dollars, to the exact contrary it means there are more dollars competing with each other for the already too reduced supply of commodities or services.

This is the condition which has set the well-known spiral of inflation into being. The very condition which seems to justify a strike today will create the justification for another strike 6 months or a year from now.

In short, our economy is enmeshed in a vicious cycle.

Either we quit striking and produce more, individually and collectively, or we're heading toward the kind of bust that overtook us—and for the same reasons—back in 1929.

It doesn't take any economist to tell us about this plight we're inviting for ourselves as matters stand. Everybody can—and should—think it through for himself.

Statement of Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by 87 leading American liberals, setting forth what they consider to be a standard of political conduct for those who believe in liberalism or progressivism as a middle way between the extremes of reaction and communism—the true highway toward the fullest achievement of American democracy.

This statement of liberalism accuses the American Communist Party and its sympathizers of an un-American lack of forthrightness, and announces the refusal to associate with American Communists as a proper and reasonable requirement for anyone who is to be of practical help to the cause of liberalism in the United States. The statement of these 87 liberal leaders draws a proper distinction between association with American Communists and their sympathizers, on the one hand, and, on the other, an objective attitude toward the problems of Russia and a hope for peaceful relations with that country. These liberal leaders point out that "failure to reckon with the above distinction occasions the grave present-day plight of the liberal-progressive cause."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The future of our country and the world may easily turn on the preservation of a reasonable solidarity among those liberal and progressive Americans who today possess the balance of power in national affairs. Liberalism or progressivism, being a middle way between the extremes of reaction and communism, is subject to accusations from both extremes. It is important therefore to point out the sharp distinction which must be made between partiality for the American Communist Party and its sympathizers on the one hand and an objective attitude toward U. S. S. R. and a desire for friendly relations between our two countries on the other.

The American Communist group—registered party members, together with their more or less unofficial adherents—has its roots in a foreign land, and the record shows that it follows the behests of a foreign government. It carries on its activities and exerts its influence with an un-American lack of forthrightness. An announced refusal to associate politically, either as an individual or as a member of a group, with this American Communist entity, registers the conviction that the highest service to our own country and the world implies working wholly through American channels and so with unquestioned loyalty to our own people and their Government. It is not unreasonable therefore to expect that those with whom we associate politically so declare themselves. To deny this is intellectual escapism and may be politically disastrous.

Contrariwise, it is unreasonable and against the public welfare to bring accusations against an American citizen either because he evidences interest in the U. S. S. R. and a measure of sympathy with some of the

things going on there or criticizes certain current practices and attitudes in that country.

The failure to reckon with the above distinction occasions the grave present-day plight of the liberal-progressive cause. Until this impasse is resolved, the partisan and nonpartisan forces which have increasingly guided the United States of America in recent years will remain divided and wellnigh impotent.

Signed by the following:

Melvin D. Hildreth, lawyer, member National Progressive Committee 1932 to 1944.

Raymond Swing, commentator, chairman of the board of United World Federation.

Louis Bromfield, author, farmer.

Henry Chapin, author, New Hope, Pa.

Stuart Chase, author, lecturer, accountant.

Morris L. Cooke, consulting engineer.

David Cushman Coyle, author, engineer.

Michael M. Davis, doctor, public health.

Samuel S. Fels, philanthropist, president Fels Naphtha Soap.

Frederick P. Gruenberg, social worker.

William Draper Lewis, director, Law Institute.

Russell Lord, author, editor of The Land.

Howard W. Odum, sociologist, University of North Carolina.

George Biddle, painter, author.

O. C. Merrill, engineer, former Executive Director, Federal Power Commission.

Cyril G. Fox, industrialist, Philadelphia, Pa.

James G. Patton, president, Farmers' Union.

Harold Evans, lawyer, Philadelphia, Pa.

Struthers Burt, author, editor.

Abe Fortas, lawyer, formerly Under Secretary, Interior Department.

Watson Davis, director, Science Service.

Robert D. Kohn, architect, formerly president A. I. A.

Stuart Mudd, M. D., biochemist, University of Pennsylvania.

Henry S. Graves, forester, formerly dean Yale Forestry School.

Robert P. Brecht, professor of industry, University of Pennsylvania.

Arthur Upham Pope, authority on Persian art, director Russian Institute.

Thurman Arnold, lawyer, formerly head Antitrust Division, Department of Justice.

Harold J. T. Horan, Time magazine.

Henry St. George Tucker, recently presiding bishop Protestant Episcopal Church.

Jacob Billikopf, authority on industrial relations, Philadelphia.

Richard B. Scandrett, Jr., lawyer, president Survey Associates.

Ordway Tead, chairman, board of directors, New York City School of Higher Education.

Harold S. Buttenheim, publisher, the American City.

John Bauer, economist, New York City.

Edward L. Bernays, public relations, New York City.

McAlister Coleman, author.

Jerome Nathanson, director, Ethical Cultural Society.

Paul H. Appleby, head Maxwell School, Syracuse University.

John A. Lapp, authority on industrial relations, Chicago.

William H. Fineshriber, D. D., Rabbi, Philadelphia.

Wayne Coy, Washington Post.

Percy S. Brown, executive director Filene Goodwill Fund, Boston.

Harry Elmer Barnes, historian, columnist.

Melvyn Douglas, actor.

Baker Brownell, professor of philosophy, North Western University.

Gilbert E. Dean, dean of engineering, Lehigh University.

William L. White, author, New York City.

Arthur Garfield Hays, lawyer, authority on civil liberties.

Henry Seidel Canby, Saturday Review of Literature.

William Templeton Johnson, architect, San Diego.

Vida D. Scudder, sociologist, Wellesley College.

Ernest S. Bradford, economist, College City of New York.

Francis J. McConnell, Methodist Episcopal Bishop.

Benjamin H. Kizer, banker, Spokane.

Robert R. R. Brooks, economist, Williams College.

Earl G. Harrison, dean law school, University of Pennsylvania.

Clinton S. Golden, labor leader.

A. L. James, Jr., United States Army retired, Charlotte, N. C.

Charles F. Jenkins, publisher, Farm Journal.

Christian Gauss, Princeton, N. J.

Arthur W. Macmahon, political scientist, Columbia University.

Max Radin, professor of law, University of California.

John A. Fitch, sociologist, New York School Social Science.

Edward A. Ross, sociologist, University of Wisconsin.

Eduard C. Lindeman, sociologist, N. Y. C.

Margaret Causey, widow of James H. Causey, National Progressive Committee, 1932–40.

Joseph Schlossberg, labor leader.

John W. Edelman, labor leader.

Leon C. Marshall, dean graduate school, American University.

Judson C. Dickerman, engineer, formerly with Federal Trade Commission.

M. F. Ashley Montagu, anthropologist, Hahnemann Medical College.

Paul F. Brissenden, industrial relations, Columbia University.

William H. Davis, chairman, transportation board, New York City (formerly chairman, War Labor Board).

Hazel Bazett, scientist, University of Pennsylvania.

Bart J. Bok, professor astronomy, Harvard University.

Dorothy Kenyon, lawyer, New York City.

Harold D. Lasswell, Yale Law School.

Edwin M. Borchard, Yale University.

William F. Ogburn, economist, University of Chicago.

Malcolm Ross, author, recently Director, FEPC.

Otto T. Mallery, author, Philadelphia, Pa.

Maurice B. Visscher, scientist, University of Minnesota, president American Association Scientific Workers.

Frank P. Graham, president, University North Carolina.

Max Lerner, editor PM, economist, Williams College.

Florence J. Harriman, author, formerly Ambassador to Norway.

Alexander Hamilton Frey, law school, University of Pennsylvania.

Allan M. Butler, pediatrician, Harvard Medical School.

Upstream Aspects of the Missouri Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 23 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by John W. Spencer, regional forester, United States Forest Service, Denver, Colo., made before the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee at Cheyenne, Wyo., on January 16, 1947.

This statement contains the very important observations of an eminent United States Forestry Officer, who points out in a concise and objective manner certain long-neglected aspects of regional development programs for the Missouri Basin. In presenting these problems to the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee the author points out that not only is the volume and character of water subject to human control to a considerable degree, but that upstream conditions in the Missouri River Basin will determine in large measure the nature of the problems of control and use downstream.

While this paper was not written to support any particular bill, its facts give strong proof for the need of an overall, unified program under single, responsible control in order to insure a proper balance between all the special interests in the vast area of the Missouri River Basin. For that reason it is important that the Congress be given access to this statement through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPSTREAM ASPECTS OF THE MISSOURI BASIN

Down through the ages from the very dawn of civilization man has hoped and struggled for the day when he could harness the untamed forces of nature.

Presumptuous, selfish perhaps, but withal admirable for its very audacity, man's plan is to bend these gigantic forces to serve his own ends.

Today, in the concept of the Missouri Basin development, we see such a plan taking shape and form. Tangible, ponderable, physical, materialization of things that have existed only in the minds of men.

It is breath-taking in its daring, this plan which involves the taming of a mighty river system.

When you see the rolling waters of the Missouri impounded behind the massive dams of the Army and Reclamation engineers, safe from the threat of floods, and then released and again reimpounded when, where, and as the engineers see fit, you just begin to realize what this plan really means. These same waters, as they are released, will bring life and prosperity to the reclamation projects along their course. Even the very act of releasing these waters produces the light, heat, and power so vitally necessary to the economy of the basin. Lastly, the natural rainfall and the little surface waters will, through soil conservation practices, bring the blessings of full-crop production without the hazards of erosion. In the culmination of this plan we will see a tremendous river system from its furthest sources to its mouth, tamed to the will of man. Its powers for destruction and ruin will be controlled and converted to the useful service of society.

The Forest Service is proud to have a share in this program, even if it is an inconspicuous one, along with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service, and other agencies. Just where does the Forest Service come into this picture? Upstream. Way back up along the Continental Divide where the melting snows of the Rockies produce the water which creates the normal stream flow of the upper Missouri. This is the very same water which will be

stored behind the engineers' dams and used for power and to satisfy the thirsty lands of the reclamation projects.

It should be apparent that the maintenance of this upstream water supply, both as to volume and usability, is essential to the fullest use and benefits of the downstream developments.

It is also apparent that if the volume of usable water produced regularly each year can be measurably increased, then the scope and value of the basin plan will be correspondingly widened.

These statements imply that, from a given source area, the volume and character of water is, in a degree, subject to human control. This, gentlemen, is precisely the point which this paper attempts to bring to your attention.

All through human history peoples in arid and semiarid lands have attempted to supplement or replace natural rainfall by using irrigation water. These people, both ancient and modern, found irrigation water more dependable as to quantity and distribution than on-the-spot precipitation. They also had faith that somewhere else—at the source area of their water—precipitation would be adequate and all other factors such that water would be available for the arid lands when needed. Many extensive irrigation works were built and maintained successfully for long periods of time and then gradually dwindled in use and finally disappeared. Historical evidence does not indicate any profound changes in climate cycles sufficient to explain these failures. On the contrary, the physical evidence on the ground quite clearly indicates that the treatment of the water-source areas was responsible for the failure of the water crop upon which these people depended.

Very well, if human abuse of a source area can ruin its water yield, is it not reasonable to expect that proper treatment of the source area would, at least, perpetuate its water crop? This, of course, is an inferential conclusion, but modern research indicates affirmatively that proper treatment of a watershed is reflected in increased water yields. I will come back to this later.

Let us look now at the principal water-source areas of the Missouri Basin.

These are the mountainous rim of high, rough, wild lands along the western boundary of the basin, plus a few isolated mountain masses such as the Black Hills of South Dakota, the Bighorns of Wyoming, and the Absarokas of Montana.

This mountain-rim area is divided by climate into several zones. The most important as a water source is the high-elevation belt of heavily forested land which lies along the backbone of the Rockies. Here precipitation so exceeds local consumption of water that water yields available for irrigation use reach 12 inches or more per year.

This is a zone of dense forests, interspersed with mountain meadows and with smaller areas of open range land above timber line. The high range is used for summer grazing by sheep, while the lower meadows are mostly used by cattle. With their large yield of water, these lands have a capital value for water alone of $50 to $100 per acre, aside from their value as timber and forage producers and for recreational use.

Precipitation on this high-altitude zone is largely in the form of deeply accumulating snow which melts through a prolonged spring period ending in late June or July—well into the crop-growing season of lower elevations. Summer rainfall consists mostly of light and frequent showers. In general, there is a relatively low risk of floods and erosion.

Lying below this zone of high water production is a long belt of mountainous land which yields some water for downstream use, but of smaller amounts and with higher hazards of erosion. Precipitation is less and evaporation higher, so that timber is more sparse and grasslands extensive. The soils are commonly erodible on these lower slopes, and heavy rainstorms are abundant. With these sensitive conditions, very serious erosion and sedimentation have been caused by timber cutting, fire, road construction, and especially grazing. The effect of this erosion on the water resource is further aggravated by the fact that rivers flowing from the zone of high water production must pass through this belt, picking up a heavy load of sediment on their way to the populated valleys below.

Adjacent to the mountains is another climatic and vegetational zone on which downstream water developments are dependent for full success and longevity. This is the rolling area of grass and sage land lying below the principal water-yielding slopes. It yields little annual stream flow but may give origin to enormous volumes of silt brought into streams by brief but intense summer rains, wherever the protective mantle of vegetation has been greatly reduced by overgrazing. That such overgrazing has been the case with resultant deterioration and erosion, is attested by the silting of the Guernsey Reservoir, where over 30 percent of the capacity has already been lost. Another instance of excessive erosion from this land zone is the silt load of the Big Horn River, estimated to carry nearly 13,000 acre-feet of silt per year—the highest contribution by any of the Missouri tributaries.

In the January issue of Harper's, Bernard DeVoto, writing about the results of watershed erosion, states:

"The economic effects are obvious. The range becomes less productive; it will feed fewer sheep and cattle; the exhaustion of the best remaining portions is hastened. Stock owners sink into debt, go bankrupt, give up. The yield of farmland declines; ruined land will produce no crops at all, impaired land produces constantly smaller crops. Real-estate values drop steadily; the cost of maintaining irrigation systems and the cost of fertilizing land rise even more sharply. The standard of living declines. People begin to move away and find their land unsalable. People who were intending to move in decide not to do so. Relief rolls increase. Communities begin to die."

He also brings out the far-reaching effects of watershed deterioration in his statement:

"The effects of watershed erosion may be felt hundreds or even thousands of miles from the areas where the damage is done. Children may drown near Kansas City this year because a cattle baron had too many steers along the Big Horn before 1890."

And again:

"You have seen the Missouri River at Kansas City, an opaque stream half-saturated with silt. A great part of that silt gets into it from the Yellowstone River, above whose mouth the Missouri is comparatively clear. The Yellowstone is fed by many streams, of which those from the south carry the most silt, the Tongue, the Rosebud, especially Powder River, and most especially the Big Horn. Above the mouth of the Big Horn the Yellowstone is comparatively clear. These plains rivers are depressing and rather sinister to look at, and they always have been helping to carry the mountains to the sea. But one reads with amazement descriptions of them written before the Civil War. They were comparatively clear streams, streams whose gradual, geological erosion of the land had not been accelerated—as it was when the cattle business came to Wyoming and Montana."

This erosion belt which contributes its unwelcome silt load to the Missouri River is composed of vast areas of Federal, State, and private lands. It is not the purpose of this paper to cover the erosion problem and its causes in detail. It is mentioned here merely to call attention to its magnitude and to predict that unless it is effectively stopped, the operating life and efficiency of the downstream developments will be greatly impaired.

The high-altitude mountain lands, previously mentioned, are the heavy water-yielding areas and supply, by far, the greatest portion of the usable water to the upper basin. These water-producing lands are, for the most part, embraced within the boundaries of some 16 national forests.

Throughout the entire period of its administration of these forest lands the Forest Service has endeavored to follow an integrated form of management. Every effort has been and is being made to develop and conserve, through wise use, all of the natural resources within these forests. The water crop, the timber crop, the production of forage for domestic stock and for wild game, and the development of human uses and recreation have been the dominant values and the basic considerations of management.

The Forest Service has always been keenly appreciative of the great value and importance of the water crop. However, as time goes on and developments such as the Missouri Basin plan are projected, this water crop takes on new and added significance.

It is now becoming apparent that we need to amplify and expand our technical knowledge relating to watershed management. We have uncovered some striking and important leads which should be explored and developed without delay.

Up to the present, a limited but highly significant program of research in upstream watershed management has been carried on by the Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station with headquarters at Fort Collins, Colo. Of the two other Forest Service experiment stations in the Missouri Basin, the Lake States station at St. Paul, Minn., has had a very small program of forest influences research, and the Northern Rocky Mountain Station at Missoula, Mont., has been able to give attention to watershed problems only through its research on timber and range management.

As a part of research by the Rocky Mountain station, studies of logging practices have shown how erosion induced by timber cutting operations may be kept to a minimum. Other studies have resulted in guiding principles for logging road location and construction so that erosion channels are not created. In the front range of Colorado have been demonstrated methods of drainage and road-bank treatment by vegetation applicable to roads and highways.

Experiments in controlled but commercially practical grazing by cattle have shown how the maintenance of a good protective cover of vegetation on range land is compatible with profitable livestock production. In fact, land depleted by long-continued overgrazing to the point of heavy erosion can be restored to good watershed condition by proper grazing controls and reseeding of the worst areas.

Recently strong experimental evidence has been accumulated to show that the forester may be able to do much more than mere protection as his share in watershed development in the Missouri Basin. Research of the past few years by the Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station has indicated that properly managed timber cutting on high-altitude watersheds may result in a very substantial increase in stream flow, while at the same time meeting the requirements of erosion protection and maximum production of timber. In a lodgepole pine forest typical of the mountain country at the head of the Missouri Basin, the removal of commercially salable timber increased the amount of water available for stream flow by about 3¼ inches, or about 30 percent over that ordinarily available from a virgin forest of this type. Erosion has been negligible in the 6 years since this cutting

was done and the site is in good condition for the growth of a new timber stand. Experiments now under way in the spruce-fir forest type have yielded preliminary results of a similar nature.

Within the past year, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Reclamation have entered into a cooperative agreement for expanded research into the aspects of water yields from high-altitude watersheds. Winter snow accumulation and factors involved in snow melt and evaporation are being studied in their relation to resultant stream-flow, with the primary object of improving water allocations to the betterment of planning by consumers.

Past and present research pertinent to watershed protection and to increasing water yields have been largely on a sample-plot basis and confined to a few combinations of topography, soil, and vegetation. Water yield studies, for example, are at present limited to a series of sample plots and two small watersheds, all located on a minor tributary of the Colorado River. These watersheds are undergoing a period of calibration, following which one of the pair will be cut over according to careful plan. The resultant effect on water yields, observed over a number of years, will be the test of our sample plot results for that locality and set of conditions.

The experiments and needs just described apply with certainty only to the central Rocky Mountain region. In contrast, specific facts and knowledge are almost wholly lacking for the various watersheds composing the northern end of the Missouri headwaters. The need for such knowledge is especially urgent in Montana: First, because of the gigantic river development plans already started; second, because little or no research has been done to determine specifically the influence of varied management practices in combination with physical factors on upstream drainages. General principles developed elsewhere no doubt apply, but it is now essential to know "how much." Sound planning of Missouri River basin developments require that these influences be known more specifically and taken fully into account from the beginning. Otherwise, mistakes and wasted effort may result.

Knowledge is needed now to show the interrelationship of varied local climatic, geologic, soil, and land-use factors of Montana watersheds on water yields, distribution and quality. Information from other regions—Colorado, Utah, and California—is useful but cannot be safely accepted as being fully applicable to Montana conditions.

For all parts of the Missouri headwaters, including the territory to be studied by both western experiment stations, a number of fundamental questions still need to be answered. A few of these questions on which research is required are listed below:

1. How can forest cutting and utilization practices be varied to minimize water losses, to increase the timely yield of water from snow melt or rainfall on different slopes and elevations without incurring accelerated erosion?

2. What degree of range utilization and what standard of distribution of cattle and sheep can be practiced without unwarranted impairment of soil stability? Under what conditions can grazing use be manipulated to influence water yields desired?

3. To what extent may cover types on varied slopes and soils be manipulated or changed—by clearing, fire, cultivation, etc., without excessive sacrifice in watershed value?

4. How can soil deterioration and erosion already incurred be remedied most quickly and cheaply?

5. How can recreational, fish, and wildlife resources be managed and developed in harmony with watershed values and other resources?

6. How can range and forest and wild-land management practices be modified to minimize the long-time expense of water storage by structures through delay run-off, reduced siltation and flood crests?

These questions are not complete. They merely illustrate the scope of specific new knowledge needed as a factual basis for sound basin developments.

The resources and condition of the upper watershed lands constitute the basis for the successful development and life of irrigation and water power downstream, and expanded research is essential to guide the successful management of these upstream lands. Such expansion would largely consist of carrying current lines of investigation into new territory and environments. In our water-yield studies, for example, we need to set up several pairs of triplicates of small watersheds within the high-altitude zone of the Missouri Basin. Such watersheds, chosen to sample different forest types and topographic factors, would be used to test our sample plot results and would provide the broad base necessary to calculate the benefits in water yield to be derived from purposeful, managed timber cutting. Since the timber resource itself is of great importance, we must learn for a variety of conditions the best methods of cutting to insure maximum permanent timber harvests. Furthermore, in order to insure the harvesting by private operators of the timber which would be removed for watershed-management benefits, we need to learn and demostrate efficient logging, processing, and marketing methods so that production will be profitable.

As regards domestic stock grazing, we need to extend our present research to cover representative areas within the Missouri Basin so that methods of providing adequate watershed protection, as well as optimum returns from livestock production, can be learned and demonstrated.

Along with research in these upstream lands, some studies need to be added on the management of the grazing lands of the high plains. Such research should include active grazing management, methods for rehabilitating deteriorated lands, and studies of the relative value of various native forage plants in erosion control.

In addition to the studies themselves, we need more accurate information covering the physical features of these vast upstream watersheds. To begin with, we should complete the Forest Service mapping program without delay. We should have topographic and planimetric maps based upon aerial photography following current Federal standards for the entire watershed area.

Given such maps, it will be possible to delineate the most important water-yielding lands, to outline the major timber types and to pick out the specific areas where erosion is present or threatened. With such maps and surveys we can translate research results into an administrative-action program that will intelligently and effectively protect the water source areas.

This rather sketchily describes the way in which the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture fits into the pattern of the Missouri Basin plan.

Yours is the gigantic job of building the massive dams, the huge power plants, and the diversion and reclamation works.

Yours is the task of developing the physical structures. The Soil Conservation Service and others have the great responsibility for establishing the treatment and use of the basic soil resources, and all of us together are working for a better, more practical and permanent economy.

The Missouri Basin is the heart of the Nation's bread basket, and its wise, orderly, and permanent development will, in large measure, determine our country's prosperity and future welfare.

But, through all of this, let's keep in mind the threat imposed by the destructive forces of nature. Erosion and flood prevention, it is true, are properly uppermost in our immediate basin planning.

However, let's not forget the example of those ancient nations whose physical works and dreams of greatness are now buried beneath desert sands.

Neglect and abuse of the water-source areas can injure or wreck our own plans just as completely as happened in the dimly recorded past.

The laws of nature are eternal.

This paper was prepared by the Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Fort Collins, Colo., and John W. Spencer, regional forester, region 2, United States Forest Service, Denver, Colo.

Delivered by Regional Forester Spencer at Cheyenne, Wyo., January 16, 1947.

Ratification of Treaties With Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester Times-Union dealing with the ratification of the treaties with Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

In view of the stalemate reached at Moscow, no adequate reason has been advanced, in my opinion, for any speed in the ratification of these treaties, filled as they are with so many important one-sided concessions.

FUTILE RATIFICATION

Peace being indivisible, there is no rush about ratifying the fringe treaties with Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Peace hangs on what is done with Germany and Austria. Without peace in Central Europe it is meaningless to have peace around the edges.

Ratifying these treaties will not forward the principle aim of a general peace but it can damage that aim.

Ratification would mean that we could begin paying reparations to Russia—through Italian relief.

It would mean we would withdraw from a strategic area in Europe—from which we can guard our lines to Austria, Germany, Greece and Turkey—without corresponding withdrawals by Russia. The Soviet Union hangs any withdrawals from eastern Europe on the Austrian treaty, which she steadfastly blocks.

Ratification would disarm Italy at the doorstep of the defiant, belligerent and expansionist Russian puppet, Tito. He has killed American airmen, defied the United Nations and he wants Trieste. Does anybody honestly suppose that he will take seriously a United Nations police force there?

Peace can spread to the fringe rapidly enough when the powers are ready to make peace at the center. But such a peace as is proposed for the fringes opens the way for incidents which would make peace impossible at the center.

The Meaning of Liberty in Industry-Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Meaning of Liberty in Industry-Labor Relations," which I delivered incident to the inauguration of Dr. Raymond Bernard Allen as president of the University of Washington, at Seattle, Wash., on May 22, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Regardless of what happens tomorrow we are now finishing what might be termed another noble experiment in our industry-labor relations. For some time now our country has found itself in the midst of agitation which can be termed an attack upon labor organizations, wherein a demand is made that protections be removed from the organizational processes and the processes of collective bargaining. To one who has believed that we were on the right track in preserving liberty and freedom in our industry-labor relations, I cannot help but feel that constant agitation on the part of those who, for the last generation, have fought labor on the score that labor organization denied men their freedom of action are using freedom only as a cloak to cover their attempts to destroy freedom and liberty for the working men and women of America.

Now let me say this by way of preface, and also by way of conclusion, for it is my conception of the meaning of liberty in our industry-labor relations, trite as it may seem, that there can be no liberty without respect for others. There can be no freedom without respect for the public welfare. There are no rights unless those rights are linked with duties and responsibilities. No better definition can be given for liberty and for freedom, in a political sense or in a labor sense, than the one expressed so often by Jefferson, that one can be free to do only so long as that which he does does not interfere with another.

There are no absolutes in freedom. When Rousseau stated that all men are born free but everywhere they are in chains, I am sure that he never meant that the babe at birth had any chance of survival if it were left free to survive, nor did he assume that all of the chains that bind men to their social responsibilities are of a degrading or slave-confining nature. Liberty and freedom in any phase of life depend upon all of the circumstances of that life. Man is free to eat if he has bread. Man is free to breath if he has air. Man is free to come and go if he has strength to move. Can there then, under any circumstances, be freedom or liberty for anyone only as that freedom or liberty is made?

We now have had about 50 years in the development of the freeman in industry under Supreme Court definition and the expansion of legal rights in the growth and development of those definitions. Before that time man's right to seek freedom through organization was interpreted in law as conspiracy. It was in a Utah case, I think, one which my own father had something to do with because he was in the legislature at the time the law was passed, where man's freedom in the modern industrial sense had its start. There had been a great disaster in one of our coal mines and scores of men lost their lives. This made our society thoughtful about conditions under which those men worked. The whole country had passed through troubles of the depression of the nineties, the labor troubles incident to that depression and the political reactions to both. But, at this time, there dawned in the minds of certain men that tired miners, overworked miners, were a menace to their fellows and, therefore, to society, and the 8-hour law in the mines was the result.

Of course, there was the sordid aspect to this great reform. The workingman was charged with advantage taking and industry was charged with attempting to exploit and overwork laborers. But the idealist accepted the thesis I have advanced and when the law was challenged in the courts the opposers to the law also took the idealistic approach. Suit was brought in the name of one of the miners who said he had a right to work as long as he wanted to work, that depriving him of working 12 hours a day was a destruction of his liberty and an infringement of freedom of contract. Strange as it may seem, but nevertheless it was true, and it occurred a few months before Mr. Dewey made his profound pronouncement that he did not know whether the Constitution followed the flag or not, but he was sure the Supreme Court followed the election returns. This is what the Court decided. It denied that there was any freedom for the employee because it said the "proprietors lay down the rules and the laborers are practically constrained to obey them" (*Holden* v. *Hardy* (169 U. S. 366, 397)).

This case is important in at least three ways and it has a bearing upon our present-day situation. First, the State stepped in, showing a public interest. Second, the Court denied that there was any freedom for the worker under the conditions regulating his work because the employer prescribed the conditions and he had to submit. Therefore, there was no freedom of contract because the employer had the absolute right to hire and fire. And, third, it showed definitely that if the individual employee was to enjoy any freedom he must gain it by alining himself with other employees in the seeking, by united action, of a right for all to work at the pleasure of all.

Note how a later interpreter of our law in the Supreme Court followed this reasoning, for, in sustaining the constitutionality of the National Labor Relations Act, the Supreme Court said: "A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer; that union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on an equality with their employer" (*National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation* (301 U. S. 1, 33)). Thus, as a new freedom was born through the act of the Utah Legislature and the decision of the Supreme Court just before the turn of the century, so it was confirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in the middle of the last decade and the theory of liberty in industry-labor relations as defined under what is spoken of as the period of the New Deal had its birth and start, its evolution. The Supreme Court sustained the new theory of collective bargaining and for 10 years it became the recognized practice of our land.

Another development had taken place. Federal rights in the field of labor had become recognized and the old pronouncement that manufacturing, mining, and agriculture were of purely local concern ceased to exist. The public's welfare today in industry-labor relations is as broad as our Constitution itself, and industry and labor, as they affect commerce in the United States, must seek their rights under the theory that they are of common or national concern.

The theory that was accepted in the Utah case that for the good of the State the hours of miners' labor per day could be limited has expanded into the theory of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This act bears my name. It became one of my responsibilities when I became chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, and I was chairman of the conference that reported the conference report. This act, too, has been challenged as a result of the portal-to-portal pay legislation. Thus upon these two acts, the cornerstones of what I have termed above, New Deal industry-labor relations legislation rests, but there is still another.

The third cornerstone, what I hope will constitute the firm basis of sound industry-labor relations, is the cornerstone which grew out of the industry-labor conference called immediately after Pearl Harbor, over which President Roosevelt appointed me to preside and out of which came my motion. This motion was simple in its effect, simple in its wording. It was meant not to refer just to wartime, but to become a basic principle for a new labor-industry relations constitution. The motion which was passed read:

1. There shall be no strikes or lock-outs.
2. All disputes shall be settled by peaceful means.
3. The President shall set up a proper war labor board to handle these disputes.

I repeat it was a simple one. There shall be no strikes and no lock-outs and all disputes shall be settled by peaceful means. In rapid succession the War Labor Board was set up, then the Executive order defining the meaning of the workweek, then pay for extra hours which had the effect of extending provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to thousands of new workers. This maintained the high standards of that act at a time when war pressures and war demands might have destroyed the laborer's enjoyment of his rights under that act. Thus three corners of the basis for decent industry-labor relations were laid down and dedicated to the American laboring man.

There is still a fourth corner which remains to be filled. That corner is greater than all of the rest. It is the freedom from war-free, repressive, and disruptive legislation which would destroy the rights and freedom and liberty that rest upon the other three stones.

There were attempts to extend the Selective Service Act to all labor. There were attempts to force service in the Army for punitive purposes. There were attempts to force the laborer to stay on the job, work where he was told to work. And there were attempts to draft certain fields of labor. But all of these failed, failed primarily because the American people in their judgment and in their thinking saw that, while the state had the inherent right to call men to service in the defense of their state on a selective basis, a right which was developed in law from a mathematical theory that the whole is greater than any of its parts, the state must maintain proper limitations. Therefore, this theory should not be made to apply and the state restrained itself from becoming completely totalitarian and refused to move into the fields of industry and labor.

In the development of these great cornerstones to freedom and liberty for the laborer the state has built its theory upon the political concept that the majority shall rule. Thus I repeat, it has turned its back upon the notion that liberty and freedom are absolute. The rights of the minority are maintained in a true democracy by a concept of common consent and a recognition of the notion that the minority must be protected

and thus, politically speaking, the genius of the American Government rests not so much upon the fact that the majority rule, as it does upon the fact that the minority shall be respected. But, just as in our political conception of majority rule, the minority maintains its respect and its right and its freedom by recognizing the right of the majority rather than eternally contesting it. Just so in its labor relations, the minority must be satisfied with enjoying a right, a privilege, and an advantage that majority rule gives and must not attempt to destroy the freedom of all, both majority and minority, by interfering with the majority's right to speak for all. That in substance is what bids fair to be destroyed as a result of the labor legislation which is now being considered. Just as American democracy could become so unstable that it would surely totter to a fall as the majority's right to lay down the policy is continuously and everlastingly questioned and interfered with and challenged, so the laboring man will lose all his rights if he individually persists in individual freedom to bargain for himself, to contract for himself, to act for himself without the support and help of his fellows. Industry-labor relations in America will revert to the day of considering organization as conspiracy if we again in law allow the advantage taker to promote objection to the majority and sustain the advantage taker on the thesis of protecting individual right and individual freedom. Thus industry and labor both have liberty and freedom only so far as they are willing to submit to the will of the majority in the protection of and working out of that liberty and freedom.

To assume that there is such a thing as an absolute right to strike would likely destroy all decent relationships between employees and industry, and probably would result in the destruction of the basic elements which hold society itself together. No law can provide any right at all, unless it is linked up with certain duties and responsibilities. When a man becomes an employee, he assumes some duties and some responsibilities. For him to interpret his right to strike as being an absolute right, entitling him to quit work while the water is turned on in the plant for instance, thus destroying the employer's property, or for him to interpret the right to strike as permitting him to quit work while leaving in a mine certain equipment in such a way as to result in costly destruction, would obviously be most improper. No person has a right to do such things. No one has a right to act against society. No one has a right to destroy it.

All our liberties depend upon our being free only to the extent that we do not interfere with the freedom of others. Any other kind of liberty will eventually mean no liberty at all.

Another great historical event which should form the basis of a new educational approach to better industrial labor relations at home and the advancement of peace throughout the earth was the establishment of the International Labor Organization, based upon the simple theory that the raising of the standards of the people of the world is the only sure way to the peace of the world. In the wake of such philosophy has come all of the aspirations of the common people of the earth. Never has the world seen that which has taken place today among the common people of the whole world. World War II was called the people's war in more places than in America. Study contemporary art, drama, and literature and see how simple concepts laid down in the basic theory behind the International Labor Organization have become the aspiration of literally millions of people on the earth.

As a result of intolerable conditions in those nations ruled by single-will tyrants, thousands of refugees, dubbed intellectuals, have come to America. The effect of the thinking and working of these men is not yet apparent. I predict a greater intellectual renaissance in this glorious land of ours, a renaissance which will affect the whole world, a renaissance of scientific thinking and political idealism which will be pointed out by future generations and which will make the last half of the twentieth century a century of inspiration such as the world had in the sixth century B. C. and the first century A. D. We are living in mighty times; times which will result in universal acceptance as significant in the history of ideals as were the democratic ideals of the gospel of Buddha and the antiaristocratic ideals of the Confucian philosophy based upon the training of man, whose nature is good; as great even in its lasting significance as was the greatest of all contributions in the development of democracy, the discovery by Jesus of the individual and of that individual's worth in the eternal scheme of things. There will be no single concept quite as great as that given the world by Jesus. But in the renaissance every idea developed will be complementary to those of the sixth century B. C. and the first century A. D. And that the ideas will be lasting is assured because they will be developed under the auspices of that government which has evolved upon the theories of our founding fathers.

I repeat, the very acme of decent industry-labor relations in the United States and the one on which we should have based all of our industry-labor actions since its inception was the industry-labor conference held in Washington in 1941. A new thing happened in industry-labor relations at that time when the representatives of industry and of labor unanimously accepted my motion that there should be no strikes and no lock-outs but that all disputes should be settled by peaceful means. That is the foundation upon which to build. Make your industry-labor techniques rest upon that constitution and you will have industry-labor peace in America. Whoever was responsible for a different approach and for the belittling of the great action taken in 1941 is responsible for much of the industry-labor suffering we have had in the last few years. Whoever is responsible for not living up to the principles of that great promise made is responsible for keeping back the peaceful evolution of our industry-labor relations for a whole generation.

You cannot do away with the evils incident to the stoppage of pay, the idleness of strikes, the slipping back into poverty and debt, the keeping of kiddies from schools, and the actual killings which have sometimes resulted by law. This is the lesson of our times. I repeat, a guaranty of labor technique in law will not make for peace. A recognition of the broad objectives for which all should strive in our society is the key to final labor peace—higher standards, decent schools, honest hours, protected savings, and equal opportunity for each to move into the field of his great aspiration and into the sphere of his potential capacity.

What is the great fear in America today that underlies the threatening industry-labor unrest? Despite our Full Employment Act and despite our prayers, the unconscious juggling for position in our present-time industry-labor strife is a fear of future unemployment. We may be in for it; I do not know. But when we again come face to face with this problem let us recognize it. It is a religious undertaking and will be attained only through zeal amounting to a religion. Who today in the United States will defend some of the practices we proved in our civil-liberties investigation?

The constitution of decent industry-labor relations is the motion accepted by industry and labor in 1941. That did not destroy any rights. That merely said that we will turn to the techniques of peace rather than the techniques of war for the settlement of our disputes and for the attainments of our objectives. That should be fundamental in America. Our courts do not always pronounce absolute justice, but no one would like to see disputes between Americans or between Americans and their Government settled by direct action.

I am a product of the American public school system. I went to kindergarten and I finished with a Ph. D. It took a long time, and I did other things, but during every minute of my education I was exposed to American ideals. If there is a rule of history to which I can turn now as a guide, it would be the 150 years struggle in our own country to make a political concept work and become universally accepted. The founding fathers worked out the Federal system on the simple idea of allowing those things which are of purely local concern to be settled locally, but those which are of common concern to be handled by representatives delegated to speak for all. We builded bigger than we thought. That governmental technique is the basis of our political liberty. It is the key not only to national peace in a Nation made up of 48 States, but also it is a key to a theory which can become world-wide. Thus we have created, as a result of American experience, a conception of government which can produce world organization and give us world unity. As a result of the creation of the Russian Soviet system, Russia furnishes a technique which can expand into a world organization. And the British Commonwealth of Nations idea gives us another pattern.

While men have dreamed of peace since the beginning of time, they did not invent a form of government which might become world-wide and, therefore, insure the peace. No longer is the concept of world government merely theory. No longer is it based upon prayer and aspiration. The way of peace is in the world. Whether the world will tread the path of peace remains to be seen. It can only do so if it understands where it is going. Education is a process of leading. The new world needs leadership. We shall succeed or we shall fail, therefore, on the basis of the character of that leadership. The kind of leadership the world needs today is leadership growing out of deliberations of trained deliberators, using as a basis for argument the knowledge of history, the facts of society, the understanding of man and his nature. That is the democratic way and by no means the easy way. Will you deal with biased partisan strife, the unquestioned will of a leader, or will you deal with fundamentals. Your children and your children's children have an interest in the answer which you give to that question.

My prayer is that you will all say that American democracy, American freedom, and American liberty all center in a single concept: individualism with a social conscience and a sense of responsibility; and, when American democracy works and reaches its conclusions, it is understood by all that that which it does it does by common consent.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Raising of American Flag in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address delivered by me and also an address delivered by Hon.

Joseph J. Lawler, Third Assistant Postmaster General, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on October 16, 1946, on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the raising of the American flag in the Territory of New Mexico.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ AT SANTA FE, N. MEX., ON OCTOBER 16, 1946

One hundred years ago Gen. Stephen Watts Kearny raised the flag of freedom over the Palace of the Governors. Today this distinguished assembly has gathered to commemorate the event and our Nation is honoring him by the issuance of a memorial stamp.

The New Mexico Kearny found was in every way unlike the America which he knew—the people, the language, the customs—everything was different. Yet in 100 years the same people with the same customs, and in most instances the same language, are Americans in every sense of the word. The problem of minorities, which has caused so many of Europe's wars, does not exist in New Mexico. There are differences, it is true, but thanks to the tolerance and decency of most people in New Mexico we have gone far toward their amelioration.

When Gen. Manuel Armijo chose not to fight at Glorieta, New Mexico embraced the American flag with all its heart. Whenever our country has been in danger our sons have been the first to answer the call of duty.

In the Civil War native New Mexicans fought on both sides. In the war with Spain Armijos and Oteros joined Teddy Roosevelt. After the First World War the French Ambassador came to Albuquerque to bestow the Croix de Guerre on Nick Lucero.

When General Kearny invited the New Mexicans to be American citizens he could not have envisioned the glorious role which our gallant Two Hundredth Regiment was to play in Bataan.

Native New Mexicans appreciate the true meaning of the flag which General Kearny raised 100 years ago. They have fought and died for that flag. We owe a great debt to the heroes of Bataan. We owe a debt to Joe Martinez, who gave his life on Attu. His family received our country's highest award, but we are not worthy of calling ourselves American if we forget what he did and not live up to what Americanism really means.

Early in the war, a marine colonel told me about a young man from New Mexico named Garcia who on Tulagi singlehandedly charged and captured a Japanese dugout on the top of a hill. The colonel told me he had seen many acts of bravery, but none to equal Garcia's.

New Mexico knows what it means to live under the American flag. We want to make Americanism work. We are making it work. In this gathering today the postmaster, the mayor, the sheriff are native New Mexicans. The next judge of this district will be a native New Mexican. New Mexico realizes that such conditions would not be possible if the swastika flew over this city.

There are a few minor differences, but, on the whole, New Mexico has developed real tolerance and understanding. We have set an example for the world to follow. There are a few amongst us who do not like the mayor of Santa Fe because his name is Lujan. Such men are more to be pitied than condemned. Their intolerance is based on ignorance and most of us feel sorry for them because they are not Americans.

General Kearny raised no ordinary flag 100 years ago. General Kearny raised the flag of freedom, of liberty, of opportunity. We love that flag. We respect what it represents, and we will always fight for that flag.

In doing honor to the man who brought it to New Mexico, we also honor the men who have given their lives to protect it. We are mindful of our obligation to make Americanism work. Above all, in this city of holy faith, we should thank God that we live under the Star-Spangled Banner.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH J. LAWLER, THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, SANTA FE, N. MEX., OCTOBER 16, 1946

It is indeed a genuine pleasure and a great honor for me to be here in New Mexico today participating in these ceremonies commemorating the centennial of the entry of Gen. Stephen Watts Kearny and his gallant army into this beautiful city of Santa Fe in 1846.

On behalf of the Post Office Department, I bring the most cordial greetings of the Postmaster General, Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, who has given concrete evidence of the esteem in which he holds the good people of this region by approving the issuance of this special stamp.

The issuance of a commemorative stamp is a rare and unique honor to any State, to any celebrity, to any great cause, or historical event. Requests for such stamps are countless. There are hundreds of deserving categories, and the selection of the occasion or subject to be honored is most exacting and difficult. It requires not only substantial background and great worth, but it takes as well the most skillful and powerful presentation. But despite the fact there is great competition for this rare recognition, you can thank Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ for having pleaded so vigorously and so brilliantly that the case for the Gen. Stephen Watts Kearny stamp was given the hearty approval of the Post Office Department.

The design for the new stamp, which is being first placed on sale here in Santa Fe exclusively today, is in my judgment one of the most beautiful and appropriate that could be issued. It is in the 3-cent denomination, the most useful and popular category. The design was submitted to the Department by Senator CHAVEZ. It is a reproduction of a painting entitled "The Captive of Santa Fe." The artists, the designers, and the engravers have well performed their tasks. If one but studies this minute masterpiece, which measures but 1.44 inches in length and 0.84 of an inch in width, he will discover an almost unbelievable development of exact detail. The central design reproduces the full painting depicting the raising of the American flag before the governor's palace here in Santa Fe, in 1846. In the background rises your noble mountains. At attention on his steed is General Kearny accompanied by his trusty aides and faced by his stalwart dragoons atop and before the palace in that thrilling moment when Old Glory fluttered to the breeze for the first time above that historic mansion. This scene represents the culmination of an outstanding military accomplishment in the annexation of this great center of a vast empire without the firing of a single shot or the shedding of a drop of blood. In rugged outline is the pillared governor's palace. Supplementing all this fine pictorial detail are the inscriptions that identify this stamp with this particular commemoration. In the upper left-hand corner is the wording "Stephen Watts Kearny Expedition" in three lines of dark Gothic lettering. Centered below the vignette in the same style of lettering and numerals is "1846 Entry Into Santa Fe 1946." On the extreme right in a shaded vertical panel appears "U. S. Postage" in dark-face Gothic, and below this wording in the same panel is the denomination "3¢" in white-face Gothic. The predominating color is a selected maroon. Truly a masterpiece in engraving and printing by master craftsmen of the United States Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

It would be presumptuous of me to dwell at any great length upon the gallant exploits of General Kearny. He is dear to the hearts of all Americans, but more particularly to people of the great Southwest, to whose people his career is well known. Still, while his story is familiar to all of you, I would be remiss if I did not recount briefly upon this occasion the impression his life and career have made upon me.

General Kearny was a striking military man, a true pioneer—a great American as evidenced by his career as a lieutenant in the War of 1812 and down through his explorations and trail blazing through the vast West to 1846 and beyond until his untimely death in 1848.

Yet he was more than a soldier. He was a great statesman, a great humanitarian, a great administrator, and, to my mind, one of the greatest marks of his genius was the address he made to the people of Santa Fe at the time he took possession in the name of the United States, at which time he stated among other things: "We have come with peaceable intentions and kind feelings toward you all. We come as friends to better your condition and make you a part of the Republic of the United States. We mean not to murder or to rob you of your property. Your families shall be free from molestation; your women secure from violence. My soldiers shall take nothing from you but that they shall pay for. We do not mean to take away from you your religion * * *. Every man has a right to serve God according to his heart. * * * In our Government, all men are equal. We esteem the most peaceable man, the best man. I advise you to attend to your domestic pursuits, cultivate industry, be placable and obedient to the laws. * * * I do hereby proclaim my intention to establish in this department a civil government on a republican basis, similar to those of our own States. It is also my intention to continue in office those by whom you have been governed, except the governor. I am your governor—henceforth look to me for protection."

And on that day there was born a new era for New Mexico, for the Southwest, and for the United States of America, for as much as you have gained by this change in allegation, you have given back through your loyalty and effort, and with other progressive and freedom-loving people of all other sections have made this Nation what it now is, in greater measures, the United States of America.

It is most fitting then that the greatest tie which binds these States—the Post Office Establishment—be the instrument through which the achievement of Stephen Watts Kearny and this new alliance be commemorated by the issuance of this beautiful stamp in this your centennial year. It is fitting, too, that this stamp be issued in Santa Fe exclusively today and that the sheet of its first run be presented to an outstanding citizen of the United States, a leader of the Southwest, Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, United States Senator from New Mexico and chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Post Roads.

Senator CHAVEZ, I take great pleasure in presenting to you this album appropriately autographed by your good friend, Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, Postmaster General of the United States.

Timely Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

by Arthur V. Burrowes, editor of the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

When we were in the East last month we got just a little put out at gentle gibes about how many Missourians Harry S. Truman has put on the Federal pay roll. We were with Congressman WILLIAM C. COLE one night, and the conversation veered to that. One of us mentioned that New York did not fare so badly under Franklin Roosevelt. That led our publisher to suggest to Congressman COLE that he have someone dig in and find out just how the two Presidents compare on native State appointments. Congressman COLE's investigations have borne fruit.

The research section of the Library of Congress has prepared for the News-Press a list of all Senate-confirmed appointments of both Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. Even taking into consideration that Mr. Truman has been President slightly over 2 years and Mr. Roosevelt was President more than 12 years, the Truman Missouri-longing is less evident than his predecessor's penchant for finding worthy New Yorkers for Federal positions.

From April 12, 1945, to May 1, 1947, the United States Senate confirmed 14 Missourians whose names Mr. Truman sent in. To this must be added one nomination not yet confirmed, that is of Judge John C. Collet to the United States Court of Appeals. That is seven Missourians a year. Now how about Mr. Roosevelt? From March 4, 1933, to April 12, 1945, the day he died, Mr. Roosevelt had 153 New Yorkers confirmed by the United States Senate. That is an average of better than 12 New Yorkers a year named to a post so high that the Senate must confirm.

The Senate-confirmed names do not tell the whole story. Three men close to the President had been Missourians, for instance, Clark Gifford, special counsel to the President; Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, military aide to the President; and Charles G. Ross, secretary to the President. They are not included in that total of 14 mentioned in the paragraph above.

But for every one of these not listed from Missouri in the Library of Congress citation requested for us by Congressman COLE, there are two or more from New York in that same category. Nowhere in that list of Senate confirmations will you find the name of Thomas Corcoran, of New York State, the witty Tommy the Cork, whose antics so delighted the late chief. You will not find the name of the astute and brilliant Ben Cohen, who with Corcoran was about as close to the throne in those early New Deal days as anyone could get. Cohen was from New York.

Nowhere in that official list will we find the late New Yorker Louie Howe, devoted friend and worshiper of Franklin Roosevelt, Governor of New York. F. D. R. took Howe from Albany to Washington in 1933 as his secretary. Nor do we find the name of Raymond Moley, also of New York. No man carried more prestige, no man had more influence with F. D. R. at a certain period than Mr. Raymond Moley of the State of New York. After the break came Mr. Moley became a special writer for Newsweek and is still on the staff of that magazine.

It is true that some of Truman's Missouri appointments were given great publicity. Leading the list like Abou ben Adhem is Robert E. Hannegan, Postmaster General. We defend that appointment. Good grief, if you cannot reward the fellow who got you your job you are a heel indeed. Other Missouri appointments that attracted much attention were John Snyder as Secretary of the Treasury, Stuart Symington as Assistant Secretary of War, and James K. Vardaman to the Federal Reserve Board. Attracting less attention was Bennett Clark, two-term Missouri Senator, named to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

But for Truman's Hannegan there was Roosevelt's Jim Farley. We won't go into the respective merits of the two Postmasters General, we are just saying F. D. R. went to New York for his man. Mr. Roosevelt got Rex Tugwell, Harry Hopkins, Frances Perkins, all from New York. But in fairness to the memory of the dead President let it be recorded that on the list of New York eminents called to the service by Roosevelt we find the names of Robert Patterson, Robert Jackson, James V. Forrestal, Nelson Rockefeller, Henry Morgenthau, Henry L. Stimson, Claude Bowers, Ferdinand Pecora, Nathan Straus, and Joseph P. Kennedy.

We could argue this thing from all angles, even to the quality of Roosevelt-picked New Yorkers against Truman-picked Missourians. That is a matter of opinion. Leaving out lesser men, also all the kitchen cabinet members of both Presidents, what do we find as to official advisers? That means the Cabinet of the President. Mr. Truman named two Missourians, a Postmaster General, and a Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Roosevelt named seven from his own State of New York, a Secretary of Commerce, an Attorney General, a Secretary of the Navy, a Secretary of the Treasury, a Secretary of War, a Postmaster General. About the principal conclusion we draw from these observations is that Presidents go home to ask their friends to come surround them.

Mothers, Boys, and Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 26, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of May 24, 1947, as follows:

MOTHERS, BOYS, AND UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Congressmen to whom we've talked about universal military training say much of the opposition comes from mothers. Mothers oppose it, they say, because they didn't raise their boys to be soldiers. They sent their oldest sons off to Germany and Japan, and they want to keep the younger ones at home. That's easy to understand.

But universal military training will not make them soldiers. They will remain civilians, under the control of a civilian commission of which no member can be a soldier. They will not be members of the Military establishment; the Army and Navy will be run just as they always have been run.

Universal military training is precisely that—training. It is a long-range program to teach each boy for 1 year, whenever he can best spare the time between his seventeenth and twentieth birthdays, just what will be required of him if his country ever has to go to war again and he is drafted to fight.

While in training, he will not be subject to the Articles of War. Instead, he will live under a special Code of Conduct, drawn up by a committee of civilians. For minor offenses, trainees will try each other.

He will not be sent overseas. He will not be liable for any future military service unless there is war. If war comes, he can be drafted. But he would be drafted anyway.

The War Department's plan is simply to prepare each young American for an emergency it hopes will never come—an emergency which his training—and the training of millions like him—may well prevent.

Mothers would want their boys—if world events force them to become soldiers—to be able to defend themselves. And that is what universal military training means. General Eisenhower says it has been his experience that a trained soldier has a three times better chance to survive than a man who goes into combat without experience, or with only that training permitted by a rapid wartime mobilization.

Elimination of Discrimination in Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD questions and answers prepared by me in connection with Senate bill 984, having to do with the elimination of discrimination in employment.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, because of increasing inquiries about the provisions of S. 984, a bill introduced by the junior Senator from New York for himself and Senators SALTONSTALL, SMITH, MORSE, DOWNEY, MURRAY, MYERS, and myself, as the time for the beginning of Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee hearings approaches (June 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20), I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a set of questions and answers dealing with the principal points of interest in S. 984.

1. Question. What does the bill provide?

Answer. It will prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry (sec. 5). It creates a permanent national commission against discrimination in employment to prevent such discrimination (sec. 6).

2. Question. Why should we outlaw discrimination in employment?

Answer. It is un-American. It results in low income for minority groups, thus limiting the market for goods and employment opportunities generally. It leads to interracial conflict. It creates a supply of strikebreakers. It forces minority groups into substandard conditions of living, detrimental to the community. It depresses wage levels. It decreases the Nation's capacities for full production, stable prosperity, and security (sec. 2a). It injures our standing with the United Nations (sec. 2c).

3. Question. What groups are forbidden to discriminate by the bill?

Answer. Agencies of the Federal Government; employers of 50 or more persons whose operations affect interstate or foreign commerce; Federal contractors and subcontractors who employ 50 or more persons; labor unions whose practices affect interstate commerce (sec. 3).

4. Question. What types of discrimination are forbidden by the bill?

Answer. Only discrimination in employment or union membership, i. e., hiring, discharge, wages, seniority, transfers, demotions, upgrading, union auxiliaries, etc. (sec. 5). The bill does not apply to discrimination in education, transportation, recreation, voting, or places of public accommodation.

5. Question. What principal minority groups are protected by the bill?

Answer. Thirteen million Negroes, 5,000,000 Jews, 20,000,000 Catholics, 3,000,000 Americans of Mexican and Hispanic origin, 11,000,000 persons of foreign birth.

6. Question. How will the Commission be constituted?

Answer. It will be a permanent salaried Commission of seven members, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, for 7-year terms (sec. 6). The size of its staff will depend upon the amount of money Congress appropriates for it.

7. Question. How will the Commission determine whether an employer or union has discriminated?

Answer. By careful and thorough investigation of the complainant's charge, the employer's or union's explanation, and the surrounding circumstances. The burden of proof will be on the complainant, not the party accused. If the Commission believes the charge has merit it will seek to adjust it by informed and voluntary methods. A new feature of this bill provides for the setting up of regional, State, and local conciliation councils to promote fair employment practices by information, education, and conciliation. Where settlement is not possible by conciliation, the Commission will conduct a full and fair hearing in which the party charged has the right by counsel to present his version of the facts and to cross-examine witnesses. After the hearing, the Commission will issue a decision and order (sec. 7). If the order is not complied with, the Commission will appeal to the Federal Circuit Court to enforce it. Defiance of the court will subject the accused party to penalties for contempt of court. The Commission's administrative procedure is like that of ICC, FTC, SEC, FPC, FCC, and other administrative agencies (sec. 8).

8. Question. How can discrimination be proved?

Answer. The acts or statements of a party charged are used to prove discrimination. In many cases discrimination is flagrant and revealed by newspaper advertisements, discriminatory orders to employment agencies, pay-roll records, or contracts between unions and employers. In other cases, an employer's pattern of rejections or statements made by personnel officers often indicate discrimination. Weak complaints will be dismissed by the Commission without even the necessity of a hearing.

9. Question. What penalties are provided for violators?

Answer. No criminal or civil penalties, except (1) a penalty of from $100 to $500 for refusal to post notices regarding the act in work places, and (sec. 11) (2) a fine of up to $500 and imprisonment up to 1 year for forcibly interfering with a member or employee of the Commission in the performance of his duties (sec. 14). The Commission may merely petition a Federal court to compel obedience to its orders. Violation of a court decree is punishable as a contempt of court. The Commission's orders are enforcible only by the courts after full hearing.

10. Question. What is the penalty when a Government official or agency discriminates?

Answer. The Commission may request the President to compel obedience to its orders (sec. 10).

11. Question. Does the bill require an employer to hire Negroes, Jews, Mexicans, or other minorities?

Answer. No. An employer may hire or reject anyone he pleases, on any basis and for any reason, so long as a needed and qualified person is not rejected because of his race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry (sec. 5).

12. Question. Does the bill require an employer to hire a particular percentage or quota of Negroes or of any other minority group?

Answer. Definitely not. The bill provides only that employees shall be selected on the basis of their qualifications (sec. 5). A quota plan makes hiring dependent upon nonoccupational qualifications and is, therefore, itself discriminatory.

13. Question. Will the courts be able to review the decisions of the Commission?

Answer. An employer or union aggrieved by the Commission order may appeal to the courts. A court will review all questions of law. On questions of fact, the findings of the Commission will have to be supported by substantial evidence (sec. 8). This is the customary procedure for judicial review of administrative agencies and has been approved by the Supreme Court. Orders against Federal agencies are not subject to review.

14. Question. Does the bill apply to State or municipal employees?

Answer. No; nor does it apply to any State agency.

15. Question. Does the bill apply to small retail stores or domestic servants?

Answer. No. It applies only to those employers who are engaged in interstate commerce or operations affecting such commerce and who employ 50 or more persons (sec. 3).

16. Question. Are religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian nonprofit corporations or associations subject to the bill?

Answer. No (sec. 4). But labor organizations are included (secs. 3 and 5).

17. Question. Will the bill make possible racketeering, blackmail, or groundless suits?

Answer. No; because the Commission will dismiss all groundless charges on its own initiative, without formal proceedings and before there is any contact with the accused employer (sec. 7a). The wartime Fair Employment Practice Commission dismissed two-thirds of all the complaints filed with it. It thus served as a necessary safety valve for people who thought they were discriminated against. The Commission, likewise, would fill this need.

18. Question. What guaranties are there that the Commission will not itself be biased and unfair?

Answer. The members of the Commission will be appointed by the President of the United States and will have to be approved by the United States Senate (sec. 6a). That is the best guaranty of a fair-minded Commission. In addition, the orders of the Commission can be enforced only by the courts (sec. 8). The Administrative Procedures Act of 1946 and the Supreme Court require a fair hearing before an administrative agency.

19. Question. What supervision will Congress exercise over the Commission?

Answer. Congress will pass upon its annual request for an appropriation. Congress also may, by concurrent resolution, amend or cancel any regulation of the Commission (sec. 13). Congress can at any time investigate the conduct of any administrative agency.

20. Question. Is there enough discrimination in employment to justify a Federal bill?

Answer. The wartime FEPC received almost 7,000 complaints since it was created in July 1943, and it had jurisdiction only over war industries or Government agencies. Many of these complaints involved thousands of workers or an entire industry. In its final report, FEPC included a postwar study of employment practices in 11 American cities and found discrimination increasing. The report's final recommendation was for permanent legislation against discrimination in employment. "No device will solve the problem short of the enactment by Congress of Federal fair employment legislation" (p. XVI).

Bills have been introduced in 20 States proposing the elimination of discrimination. This indicates how widespread the problem is. Only one-quarter of the wartime FEPC's cases originated in the South.

21. Question. Is this a new idea in Federal legislation?

Answer. No. The United States Constitution forbids discrimination by the Government; this bill extends the principle to employers and trade-unions. In the last 10 years Congress has enacted 23 laws which forbid discrimination in their enforcement.

22. Question. Is the bill constitutional?

Answer. Certainly. The United States Supreme Court has repeatedly condemned discriminatory employment practices. A New York law forbidding discrimination by trade-unions was recently upheld as constitutional.

23. Question. Does the bill prohibit prejudice?

Answer. No. Prejudice is a state of mind. The bill prevents the act of discrimination which affects pay envelopes. Discrimination can be eliminated or at least greatly reduced by a firm national policy. This law will protect those who do not discriminate.

24. Question. But discrimination is based on prejudice; prejudice is an attitude of mind; is there any more chance of changing this attitude than there was of the prohibition law changing the drinking attitudes of the Nation?

Answer. This law has nothing to do with prejudice itself; it merely seeks to prevent one person's manifestations of prejudice from inflicting themselves upon the economic life of another, within the limits of Federal jurisdiction in employment.

This bill is related to prejudice only as laws forbidding driving while drunk are related to drinking.

25. Question. Can the bill be enforced effectively?

Answer. No law ever receives 100 percent obedience, but the great majority of employers and trade-unions are law abiding. The small minority will have to conform. Even the wartime FEPC without sanctions and with a small staff was able to stop a great deal of discrimination. And today State laws in New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts are actually working successfully. This bill is identical with them in purpose and method. A similar bill has just been passed in Connecticut.

26. Question. Isn't this bill class legislation? Does the bill confer special privileges on minorities?

Answer. No. No special privilege is granted any group. It merely assures equality of opportunity and equality of treatment. It requires that persons shall be hired on the basis of their qualifications and not rejected because of the immaterial fact of their color or religion or place of birth.

27. Question. Does this bill impair or conflict with existing State laws?

Answer. No. It dovetails with State laws. It does not invade States' rights.

28. Question. Cannot this problem be handled by the States themselves?

Answer. Only four States—New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut have comprehensive and effective laws forbidding discrimination in employment. Federal action is needed to protect States having such laws against unfair competition in other States that do not have such laws. Federal action is also needed because most large employers or trade-unions have plants or locals scattered throughout the country in every State. Finally, Federal employees can be protected only by a Federal act and uniform standards and enforcement. The Federal Government can most effectively enforce the Federal Constitution.

29. Question. Does this bill promote social equality?

Answer. The bill has nothing to do with personal or social relationships. It is concerned only with equality of job opportunity.

30. Question. Will such a law cause riots or bloodshed?

Answer. On the contrary, it will lessen the danger of such violence because orderly governmental procedure will be substituted for mob action. After the last war there were

26 major race riots. A repetition must be avoided. If enacted, this bill will do that job.

31. Question. Cannot this problem be handled by education alone?

Answer. No. Education is desirable, but as a supplement, not an alternative, to Federal legislation. There are always a few employers or unions who cannot be relied upon for voluntary cooperation. Legislation itself is a most effective form of education. The problem is so urgent it requires immediate action, without waiting for the slow, uncertain processes of education. Education alone in the last 80 years has not proved effective.

32. Question. Is not the Supreme Court decision in the Negro fireman's case adequate to eliminate discrimination?

Answer. The decision in *Steele* v. *Louisville Railroad*, decided December 18, 1944, applies only to discrimination arising from a contract between an employer and a labor union. It leaves untouched all the varying forms of discrimination engaged in by employers acting alone. There are no Federal statutes today which forbid racial or religious discrimination in employment.

33. Question. Wouldn't this bill destroy the American system of free enterprise?

Answer. Free enterprise does not mean unlimited license. The basis of Anglo-American jurisprudence is the realization that every man owns and operates his property and business subject to the requirements of the public welfare. In the long run, his survival and prosperity depend upon the publice welfare. If there were no impartial governmental referee continually on guard, the free-enterprise system would soon destroy itself. Besides, there is no truly free enterprise as long as work opportunities are arbitrarily denied certain groups regardless of ability, character, aptitude, and training.

34. Question. Doesn't this bill create another regulatory body when business is already burdened with regulations?

Answer. Scores of laws safeguard the property and other rights of business. Human rights are no less important than property rights, and equally deserve the protection of law.

35. Question. Doesn't this bill restrict the rights of an employer in employee selection and take away his right to manage his own business?

Answer. No restriction is placed on the employer's right to employ or to up-grade an employee on the basis of his own judgment of the candidate's traning, experience, ability, personality, or whatever standards he may choose to set. Nor does the law force business to hire any person or refrain from firing any specific person. On the contrary, it protects the employer in his right to choose the best candidate without regard to race, religion, color, or national origin.

36. Question. The law provides for conciliation to work out such problems. Is it fair to insist that an employer hire members of a minority group if his other employees refuse to work with them? Won't this induce friction between the workers themselves and between workers and management?

Answer. The law applies to unions as well as to management, or it would be discriminatory in itself, and the industries where the law would apply are for the most part unionized. Besides, it has been the experience of the overwhelming majority of employers who have (many of them for the first time during the war) employed minority-group workers that their fears of employee friction were not realized, once management had taken a firm, clear-cut position.

37. Question. Wouldn't an employer be forced to hire a complainant, even though the employer has no vacancy and would have to fire an employee to take the complainant?

Answer. The Commission would have no authority to compel an employer to hire when no vacancy exists or to fire an employee to create a vacancy for anyone.

38. Question. Won't enforcement of such a law add to the businessman's cost of running his business?

Answer. On the contrary, it will protect him in his right to hire the best man for the job. It will help also to eliminate unfair price cutting by competitors who pay lower wages to members of minority groups. It will promote smooth working relationships, reduce labor turn-over and interruptions, and thereby promote efficient production at lower unit costs.

39. Question. Has the Federal government the right to interfere with the way in which a man conducts his business?

Answer. It is the legitimate concern of a community that industry within its environs should employ all available labor, without regard to race, religion, color, or national origin. The short-sighted employer who limits the materials he can produce and sell because he refuses to hire minority-group workers not only keeps down his own profits; he also keeps down the income of the entire community. Raising the living standards of the most depressed group in a community automatically results in raising the standards of all other groups. The corner grocer, the dry goods merchant, the public utilities, all prosper when the workingman has a job and decent wages. Establishing fair employment will add, in the case of Negro wage-earners alone, a new domestic purchasing power and market of about $10,000,000,000 a year, according to estimates by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

40. Question. Why shouldn't the Federal courts handle this problem instead of a new administrative agency?

Answer. An administrative agency is necessary—

(a) To prevent the flooding of courts and the clogging of their calendars to the detriment of their other work;

(b) To screen out worthless complaints which otherwise would harass innocent employers or unions. A respondent has to defend every suit filed in court, but most administrative agencies dismiss from two-thirds to three-fourths of all charges submitted;

(c) To protect the rights of employees without compelling them to hire their own lawyers;

(d) To insure speedy action and avoid delays and excessive costs in the courts;

(e) To insure uniformity by having one agency interpret the bill, subject to supervision and correction by Congress, instead of 94 Federal district courts;

(f) To permit a commission of experts to devote full time to the problem;

(g) To avoid the necessity of criminal penalties which juries hesitate to impose.

41. Question. Why does not the bill allow an accused party a jury trial?

Answer. Except for refusal to post notices and interferences with Commission offenses in their duties, the bill imposes no criminal or civil penalties, nor should it in this type of legislation. The only sanction the bill provides is a cease-and-desist order, carrying no penalties. A jury trial (used in criminal cases or private suits to settle private differences) is inapplicable. Society has a stake in eliminating discrimination and should therefore assume the responsibility and costs of such enforcement, rather than leave it to private parties to hire their own lawyers and enforce the national policy. Such enforcement by private suit is haphazard and means long-drawn, complicated, expensive litigation.

42. Question. Does this bill repeal or impair veterans' preferences?

Answer. No. All veterans' preferences are explicitly continued in effect (sec. 12). The bill forbids discrimination only because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry. It does not forbid discrimination because of war service.

43. Question. Who introduced the bill?

Answer. S. 984 was introduced March 27, 1947, by Senator IVES for himself and for Senators SALTONSTALL, SMITH, MORSE, CHAVEZ, DOWNEY, MURRAY, and MYERS. On the same day the identical bill (H. R. 2824) was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman FULTON. Since then other Representatives joined in cosponsoring the bill. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has named a subcommittee to hold hearings on S. 984 and to make a report and recommendation to the full committee. The members of this subcommittee are: Senators FORREST C. DONNELL, Missouri, chairman; IVES, New York; SMITH, New Jersey; ELLENDER, Louisiana; and MURRAY, Montana.

44. Question. What national groups are supporting this legislation?

Answer. The following is an incomplete list:

Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority.
American Association of University Women.
American Civil Liberties Union.
American Federation of Labor.
American Friends Service Committee.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
American Unitarian Association.
American Unitarian Youth.
B'nai B'rith.
Catholic Interracial Council.
Central Conference of American Rabbis.
Common Council for American Unity.
Congregational Christian Churches (Council for Social Action).
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.
Evangelical and Reformed Church, General Synod.
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in America.
Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World.
International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters (A. F. of L.).
International Ladies Garment Workers Union of America (A. F. of L.).
Iota Phi Lambda Sorority.
Jewish Labor Committee.
Jewish War Veterans of the United States.
League of United Latin-American Citizens.
March on Washington Movement.
Methodist Church, General Conference.
Methodist Ministers' Union.
National Alliance of Postal Employees.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses.
National Bar Association.
National Community Relations Advisory Council.
National Conference of Christians and Jews.
National Consumers League.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Council of Student Christian Associations.
National Council for a Permanent FEPC.
National Farmers Union.
National League of Women Shoppers.
National Negro Insurance Association.
National Urban League.
National Women's Trade Union League of America.
Negro Newspaper Publishers Association.
Postwar World Council.
Presbyterian General Assembly.
Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority.
National Farm Labor Union (A. F. of L.).
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Americans for Democratic Action.
United Council of Church Women.

Upholsterers International Union of North America (A. F. of L.).
Women's Division of Christian Service, Methodist Church.
Women's Division of the American Jewish Congress.
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
Workers Defense League.
Young Men's Christian Association, National Board.
Young Women's Christian Association, National Board.

Problems of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me recently at the State convention of the Alabama Educational Association at Birmingham, Ala.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

President Hulbert, members of Kappa Phi Kappa, and guests, I am honored to be with you today and to discuss with you some of the problems facing this country in its efforts to improve the schools and thereby raise educational standards.

I am aware that a group of this kind, leaders in your chosen work, know the situation regarding serious issues of your profession. Schools today are facing a crisis—a crisis that has not appeared suddenly on the horizon, but has developed over the past 8 or 10 years, and has been unheeded by the general public despite the warnings of many educational leaders and a few laymen.

The teacher situation is tragic. Even prior to 1940 over 50,000 inexperienced teachers entered the profession annually; each year about 4,000 with substandard training were given certificates to teach; and the average annual salary (classroom teachers and administrators) was only $1,441. Since the outbreak of World War II, conditions have grown steadily worse. More than 350,000, over a third of the competent teachers in 1940–41, have left the profession. Only one-half of the teachers employed in 1940–41 are still teaching today. Fifty thousand men have left the profession since 1940 and few will return. Only about 15 percent of all elementary and high-school teachers are men. It is important that we take necessary steps to induce more men to enter the teaching profession. We do not have too many women teachers, but we certainly do not have enough men, particularly young men in the profession.

According to estimates of the United States Office of Education, there were 109,000 emergency teachers in 1945–46. A few of these would do a good job, but the great majority are unqualified. Despite the increase in enrollment, we have today about 860,000 teachers, or 60,000 fewer than we had in 1940–41. It is estimated there are 75,000 unfilled positions. Some who left the profession were serving in the armed forces, but the great majority have gone into better-paying positions in business, Government service, and industry. I fear that most of them will be permanently lost to the profession. In a study made by the New York Times it is stated that the average teacher in the United States today has had 1 year less education than she had in 1939, and 60,000 have only high-school education or less.

The tragedy of this picture is not alone in the inadequate schooling received by at least a fourth of our children. Fewer students are training to be teachers than ever before. In 1920, 22 percent of all college students attended teachers' colleges, only about 7 percent of all college students attend teachers' colleges today. While it is realized that all students who attend teachers' colleges do not enter teaching, the ratio of those attending teachers' colleges and of those entering the teaching profession is about the same. Very few veterans are preparing to teach, and only about 20,000 of the 1,000,000 veterans in American colleges and universities are in teachers' colleges. In 1946 only 3,757 students completed preparation for elementary teaching compared to 10,182 in 1941; 4,954 completed preparation for high-school teaching in 1946, compared to 9,327 in 1941. Young people did not prepare for the teaching profession in adequate numbers during the war, and they are not doing so now. Primary reason is the wage differential as compared with salaries in other fields.

In the February 15, 1947, issue of Business Week some estimates are presented to show which occupational groups have benefited most from the war and postwar boom. The estimates compute how much more or less on the average certain occupational groups are now receiving in real income as compared with 1939. The results will interest you. Farmers have an increase in average spendable income, in terms of 1939 dollars, of 155 percent, coal miners of 61 percent, business and professional men of 25 percent, while school teachers are at the bottom of the list with a 20-percent drop in real income. These estimates are based on average and do not reflect the experience of any single individual. The farmers, coal miners, and businessmen do not have too much income, but it is startling that we have permitted conditions to develop which enable some wage-earning groups to gain in purchasing power over teachers to suffer a 20-percent loss. If we continue to pay our teachers, who have spent much time and money in preparation, less than the local building custodian, less than the collector of the street garbage, or less than any position requiring little or no education, we shall kill all incentive to enter your profession.

As we observe how few young people are in and are entering the teaching profession today, we have cause to wonder what the situation will be 15 or 20 years from now. The result will be even less adequately staffed schools than we have today unless a remedy is effected. There will be waste of the greatest resource we have in this country—human resources. Surely we all want a program of conservation of our national resources, but at the top of the list there must come our boys and girls. And if this aim is to be accomplished we have to have teachers adequately trained. What America will pay tomorrow for neglecting its human resources today will be tenfold the cost of financing a sound educational program now. We must give more pay to the teachers of our 30,000,000 American children and young people, we must help to create more pride in the teaching profession, we must be sensible in the personal liberties we allow our teachers before criticizing them; in short, we must make the teaching positions so attractive that the most intelligent young folks of this country will vie with each other for an opportunity to enter this profession. This condition should exist for rural and urban schools alike. Situations should not exist that permit the rural teacher to receive only 60 or 70 percent of the pay received by urban teachers. It appears unlikely that an equal quality of teaching can be had at these extremes of compensation. More than half the children of this country are born in rural areas. Thus we can assume that the greater number of pupils is receiving the poorer instruction. The seedbed of our population should have equal opportunities with other areas.

There is a direct relationship between the qualifications of the teachers and the educational growth of our children. While many classrooms do have inadequate equipment, and thousands of school buildings are in a dilapidated condition, the biggest single factor in the decline of good training for our youth is the teacher crisis facing us today, and I say this with full knowledge that the parents of many homes fail to assume their proper responsibility in rearing and training children. Five million youths of school age are not in school; 2,000,000 more will suffer a major impairment because of poor teachers. The 1940 census showed that the average citizen of 20 years of age had attended school only 9 years. This is not sufficient education to enable voters to weigh adequately fundamental problems pertinent to the survival of our Government. Thirteen and one-half percent of our total population over 25 years of age have not completed more than 4 years of school, and over 10,000,000 of our citizens are functionally illiterate. We all know about the tremendous loss of manpower during the war, militarily and otherwise, due to neglect of our schools and inadequate instruction during the past years.

The story could continue endlessly. Not only is the over-all picture ugly, but the inequalities in opportunities within the States individually and collectively will frighten anyone as to the fate of this country who will take the time to acquaint himself with existing conditions. The total money spent on schools has been increased during the war years, but remember that purchasing power of the dollar has declined, and our buying strength as compared with 1939 has decreased.

In 1944–45 the average expenditure per child in the United States was $125.41, with New Jersey heading the list at $198.33. Mississippi was last with an expenditure of $44.80. Alabama spent $56.90. The highest State spent four and one-half times the lowest, yet the lowest spent a greater percentage of its income than the highest, about 3½ percent to 2½ percent.

There are two factors that play forcefully against any effort to lift education to the desired and equitable national level. One is the difference in per capita income, the other is the difference in birth rate in different parts of the country. In 1945 the national average per capita income was $1,150—ranging from a high of $1,595 in New York to a low of $556 in Mississippi. Alabama per capita income was $700. The number of school children 5 to 17 years of age per 1,000 population ranges from 296 in South Carolina to 178 in California. Alabama has 282. More children to educate and less money—far less—with which to do it. Figures also show that the cost per classroom unit range from a high of about $6,000 to a low of about $100 per year, a corresponding difference exists between the highest and lowest of teacher's salaries. The situation may be summed up as follows:

Some States are rich in wealth, poor in children, generous in expenditures for education, low in financial effort to provide generous expenditures, and fortunate in their educational results. Other States which are rich in numbers of children, but poor in ability to pay for their education, provide only meager expenditures for their schools and get inferior educational results, on tax rates which are high as compared with the country as a whole.

Obviously one of the remedies for our present desperate plight is more financial aid, on a local, State, and National scale. In this brief talk I want to treat this subject largely on a national level, but I do want to emphasize as strongly as I know how that it is imperative that we not wait for Federal aid to schools to cure our financial and educational ills. We must do more on a local and

State level than even before, and I have been pleased to read in the Alabama newspapers of recent weeks that you and your State leaders propose to do just that. Too, it is encouraging to note that many local school systems are endeavoring to expand and improve their educational facilities. Gadsden with its proposed new building program and Montgomery with its 15-percent raise given teachers are just two examples of sound local effort.

The Federal Government for many years has provided funds for education services. In 1785 and again in 1787 financial help was given to promote education in the Northwest Territory. During his administration James Monroe vetoed Federal aid for internal improvement, but during the first half of the nineteenth century many colleges and universities, including the University of Alabama, were given grants of land. The Land Grant Act of 1862 (sponsored by Mr. Morrill, of Vermont) brought into being colleges of the type of Auburn, thereby giving greater impetus to agricultural, engineering, and experimental services. The Smith-Lever, Smith-Hughes, and George-Dean laws provided and extended vocational aids. More recently a law sponsored by Senators GEORGE, PEPPER, and HILL more than double vocational funds. We all recall the school buildings erected through WPA and PWA moneys, and the schooling provided for boys and girls through NYA. The veterans' training program gives aid to public schools today. The school-lunch program is a most worthy expenditure which I shall do all in my power to help continue. All in all, more than 150 bills have been passed in the history of Congress to provide Federal aid for education.

The help so far, however, while greatly needed, has been more or less of a specialized nature. The matter in which you and I are tremendously interested now is that of general Federal aid to education—aid to the public elementary and high schools. As early as the 1880's it was realized that, due to the ravages of war and the loss of property and wealth during the reconstruction days, the South needed aid to educate its children. Senator Blair, of Maryland, proposed that a certain percentage of the money derived from tariff be given to the South. Later, in the early twentieth century, Dr. John W. Abercrombie, of Alabama, while Congressman at large, exerted effort to secure general Federal aid to education. In 1915 the Sheppard-Townes bill proposed general Federal aid to education and also a Secretary of Education in the President's Cabinet. During recent years Senator HILL, of Alabama, has assumed the lead in ardent efforts to secure Federal aid for the public elementary and secondary schools.

In 1936 when I first campaigned for election to Congress I advocated, among other things, Federal aid to education without Federal control. I have been for such a program ever since, and am a member of the bipartisan steering committee which was organized to assist in getting this legislation passed. It seems now that the bill (S. 472) by Senators HILL, TAFT, and others, has the best chance of becoming law. As you know, this bill would provide for a Federal expenditure of $250,000,000 annually by 1950 (beginning with $150,000,000 in 1948 and $200,000,000 in 1949) with absolutely no Federal controls. Alabama would receive about $19,000,000 annually.

We would be optimists indeed if we expected no opposition to Federal aid for schools. Alabama and the South would be immediate beneficiaries. And yet I realize that a request for this legislation cannot be justified on a purely local or sectional basis. I believe it would work to the good of the whole Nation and to the preservation and strengthening of our democracy. The South's inability to meet the efforts of the wealthier States has been shown, and yet our endeavors are greater than in the richer sections of the country.

Perhaps these conditions alone do not present sufficient justification for asking for Federal aid to solve our school problem in the States of low educational opportunity. If every child grew up and remained in the State of his birth, we might not be warranted in asking for help. Fortunately, however, we do not have barriers in the United States to prevent migration among the States of the Union. A great part of this migration is not the school children but the adult who has or has not received adequate educational training. His productive capacity in the State to which he moved will depend upon his previous training. Thus it seems that the States which receive these migrants would be willing, even if selfishly so, to help train them. It would be advantageous to do so, since thereby would be had a producer of better quality and greater capacity. You gentlemen know that according to the 1940 census about 27,000,000 people lived in States other than in which they were born. Of the 12 States having the largest number of residents born in other States, only 1 is in the Southeast and two are in the Southwest. The other 9 are in the Northeast, the middle region, or the far West. I think it is right, as I am sure you do, that the Nation as a whole bear the cost or part of the cost of educating these people. It is a disadvantage to the States which receive them to acquire ill-trained men and women.

Our national debt today is about $260,000,000,000. It will take wealth to pay this debt. There is a direct relationship between the income of individuals and their educational advancement as measured in terms of years of schooling. On the average, the more years spent in school, the greater is the adult income. It is just as true that there is a direct relationship between the school expenditure per child and the per-capita income; the larger the school expenditure per child, the greater the per-capita income. These findings, and others equally forceful, were established through a study of the United States Chamber of Commerce. This study shows conclusively that more and more wealth can be created if this Nation will provide sufficient and effectual training to its youth. This newly created wealth can be used to pay our huge debt and our rich States will profit thereby from their contributions to Federal aid.

We risk a tremendous danger to our national welfare to permit a large segment of our population to suffer inadequate schooling. We are all citizens of one Nation, we are Federal citizens. When our well-being is threatened because of war or some other calamity, the whole Nation is called on to meet the menace, the rich States the same as the poor. If millions of our citizens are unable to answer the next call to duty, under circumstances through which we have just passed, whether they are physically or mentally handicapped or both, the existence of our country as we know it will terminate.

Your fraternity is one of leaders, and thus you occupy an enviable position. Leadership is needed not only on a national scale, but to provide for equal opportunities within our own State, cities, and counties. Alabama has been and is a leader in this regard, but there is more to be done. The more achievement you can show, the stronger our argument in the national Congress for Federal aid. Guidance from you can jolt the American people into acute awareness that the scale of teachers' salaries is too low, and into the realization that unless effective remedial measures are taken the grave conditions which now exist will continue to deteriorate.

During recent months another ominous warning has come to us from many parts of the country. Teachers have torn a leaf from industry. They have seen the power of the strike and in some instances they have used the power of that weapon. I do not wish to be understood as advocating striking by teachers. In fact, I am greatly disturbed that they are taking this means of showing their discontent. True their desperate financial plight has encouraged this action, and because of this state of affairs teachers' strikes have met with public toleration and even sympathy. But teachers are not working with mere commodities. They are molding the citizenship of tomorrow. It seems to me that once one has assumed this great responsibility, he should remain at his post of duty until the end of the school term at least. Yet we may as well be realistic to acceptance of the fact that teachers are human, and that inevitably they are going to use whatever means may be available to them to better their position in a highly competitive race in which they are fast being left behind. Because teachers are shaping the very destiny of tomorrow, we must recognize the obligation we owe them to correct this situation.

Leadership from groups such as yours can be utilized on a Nation-wide basis to prove to our people we can afford to pay for effectual education. For example, the aid of businessmen should be enlisted. It can be regarded as a form of enlightened selfishness for businessmen to want more and better schools. We know the more education people have, the higher salaries they earn and the more goods they buy. Large consumption of manufactured and farm products adds up to a better national way of life and more comfortable and happier living.

Recently an editorial pointed out that Great Britain plans to spend some 6 to 7 percent of its annual national income, and that Russia plans to spend some 17 to 20 percent of its annual national income on all phases of education. Grant that they need it more right now, but look ahead to the next 15 to 50 years, if we continue to spend a mere 2 percent. We must drive home the truth that the only hope for the future lies in giving each succeeding generation superior training. The question is not: "Can we afford more?" The fact is we must.

Your position carries with it a responsibility which I am sure you will not evade. If you can help to make America a land of opportunity in fact as well as in name, if you can help to convince our people that when we neglect our children we are playing with destiny, if you can help to provide means whereby our youth will advance as rapidly and as soundly in democratic sociological and political sciences as we have in physical sciences, you will have done much to save this Nation. In this jet-propelled, supersonic, and atomic world we cannot afford less.

Sermon by Very Rev. Ignatius Smith During Tribute to the War Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, on the occasion of the ninth annual military memorial mass, held in the Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery on Sunday, May 25, 1947, the sermon was delivered by the Very Reverend Ignatius Smith, of the Catholic University of America. This annual mass, in tribute to the war dead, was sponsored by the Washington general assembly, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, in cooperation with the National Committee of Catholic

Societies. The pontificant of the Mass was His Excellency Most Rev. Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, the Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

In his sermon Father Smith points out very strongly that while godless government seeks totalitarian empire, we continue to be a great Nation in God's judgment because we are not too proud or too powerful to acknowledge Him publicly as the Author of our freedoms and the Master of our destiny.

On the eve of Memorial Day, which we celebrate next Friday, I ask that this great sermon, paying tribute to the heroes who died that we may live, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We assemble in this silent city of the dead to do honor to those who are buried here and to honor at the same time all the dead who once wore the uniforms of the armed forces of our country. We honor them because they and their uniforms are the symbols of a great nation always dedicated to peace but never too indifferent to fight in the defense of our land, our liberty, and honor.

We assemble to express our heartfelt gratitude to our departed service men and service women for their dedication to this Nation. Some of them died in battle, many more of them fought valiantly and lived on; all of them showed their willingness to keep this Nation prepared for the defense of our Republic. They paid what, in the name of patriotic justice, is due to our democracy for the advantages it has extended to us. They paid the debt of citizenship with hallowed service that meant the sacrifice of time, of liberty, of comfort, of health, and even of life itself. And that we are able to live on in the enjoyment of our democratic freedoms we owe in no small measure to them. We offer today this religious memorial service as a token of our gratitude and to let them in another world know that we are neither forgetful nor ungrateful.

We give honor and thanks to our departed service men and service women, we also pray God on this day of consecrated memory to be merciful to them who have not yet entered into eternal happiness. It is our privilege, in the name of honor and gratitude, to help with our prayers those who, in purgatorial watchfulness, cannot help themselves. Of this privilege this illustrious gathering avails itself this memorial day of 1947, by offering to Almighty God the supreme act of our Catholic religion, the holy sacrifice of the mass.

The most important personage at this memorial service is the Omnipotent Son of God, Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of mankind. It is He who is offered to God in this holy sacrifice of the mass for the repose of the souls of our departed servicemen and servicewomen. And what more fitting offering could be made? On Calvary Jesus gave up His life for the salvation of mankind. In this continuation of the sacrifice of Calvary that same Savior is offered to God for the eternal rest of those who offered themselves for the greatness and security of the United States of America.

The greatness of this Nation is better understood by those who have met their God in judgment than by many who have been left behind. The glory of this country before the other nations of the world and the determination to keep that glorious greatness undiminished was the motive of their service. The preservation of this same national greatness devolves upon us who are left behind them. In what does this national greatness consist? We might be called great because of our tremendous natural resources and our national wealth. That is only a partial reason for our grandeur. We might be called great because of our spirit of industry or our inventive genius or our devotion to popular education. Of these we are proud but they do not sufficiently explain our eminence. We might be called great because of our military air and naval power. Of this we are proud and for this we pray undiminished strength, but in this is not found the complete explanation of our right to glory. We could be called great because we have provided sanctuary for the persecuted and underprivileged peoples of the world and because we have given them opportunity to develop their personalities and to raise their families.

In this too we glory; but even this is not the full cause of our greatness. We should be called great because we have achieved so high a standard of living for all our people and because we are determined that underprivilege and distress shall be wiped out. But this does not explain sufficiently our greatness. We ought to be considered a great Nation because of our recognition of the dignity of human personality and of the rights of individuals and nations. Even in such exalted humanitarianism is not discovered the secret of our grandeur. The explanation of our greatness cannot be given without reference to the Almighty Creator and Judge before whom our deceased friends have passed in judgment. Would that these departed souls would rise up and speak to us of what they have learned from God in another world about the greatness of our country.

Would they not remind us that from the very beginning the founding fathers recognized the sovereignty of God over men and nations while other nations were declaring war on the Almighty? Would not the souls of the departed recall to us that the charters of our freedom acknowledge that our democratic rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are unalienable because they come from the God whom no nation has the right to bar from the boulevards of political and social life? Would they not retell to us the constant rededication of our Nation by our Chief Executives, for 171 years, in time of war and of peace, to the Providence of the Deity? Would not our departed servicemen and women, whom we honor today, ask of us to remember how often the sovereignty of God has been recognized officially in all these years when we have been asked as a people to ask God's pardon for our national crimes, to thank Him for the blessings He has bestowed on us and to beg Him for a continued protection of our country. Despite the neglect of God by so many millions of our people, could not the departed heroes tell us that they have learned that our greatness rests on the fact of our American alliance with our Creator? In this alliance we are pledged to protect divine rights everywhere and God seems to have pledged us special power and life because of our godliness. American democracy separates church from state but it never intended to divorce God from either government or the lives of our people. On this Memorial Day when godless government seeks totalitarian empire we are a great Nation in God's judgment because we are not too proud or power mad to acknowledge Him publicly as the author of our freedoms and the Master of our destiny.

It is well for us, if we can learn from the dead whom we memorialize, that God is the secret of our power, the source of our grandeur and the end of all our living. God and His rights can never be a mere incident in our national life if our greatness is to endure. The existence, the personality, and the worship of God can never be repudiated if the glory of this Nation is to be perpetuated. When the rights of God are ignored the rights of men are in jeopardy. The sanctity of individual human nature, the basic concept of our democracy, will never be respected where the sanctity of God is denied. History teaches that the death knell of a nation is sounded when totalitarian government seeks the death of God and where nations attempt to forbid God to His people. People are really slaves when the worship of God has to be bootlegged in secrecy instead of being openly practiced, as we do today, for the solace of our dead, for the grandeur of our Republic and for the honor and glory of the God of men and of nations.

The lives of the deceased defenders of our Nation's honor and freedoms teaches us that our love for our country must be demonstrated by our service of the Nation, in time of peace as well as in time of war. Our love of God must likewise be evidenced by the service of worship of His Infinity and by obedience to His laws. Our country and our God are closely allied. Our love of our Nation, our patriotism, is intimately connected with our religion. We love and worship our Maker because of these acts we owe God as a matter of just debts that must be paid here or hereafter. We love and serve our Nation because we are indebted to it for so much and because our debt must be paid. Our patriotism is not built on a desire for world conquest. It is not fired by hatred of other peoples. Our patriotic devotion to our Nation rests on our appreciation of what this country has done for God and for all of us without exception and on our conscientious determination to keep our country great and godly. We are traitors to our God when we are traitors to our Nation. We fail our Nation when we fail our God. That patriotism we could be taught from another world by the men and women whom we honor, for whom we pray and to whom we are grateful today.

They challenge us to carry on in the defense and the diffusion of the freedoms which are the foundation of our American and democratic way of life. These freedoms have been won and preserved only at the cost of great sacrifice. Every one of them has been baptized by the blood of fighting and victorious American patriots. The freedom of our homes, the freedom of assembly, the freedom of worship, the freedom of speech and other means of communication, the freedom of election, the freedom of labor and of property, the freedom of education and of recreation, the freedom of trial by jury—these are liberties for whose preservation we must continue to work and pray. Ours is the task to pass these American freedoms down to future generations despite the subversive threat to them from within or outside the Nation. Ours is the task to keep the Nation attentive to the rights which God has given to humanity and alert in its efforts to enable our people to enjoy their God-given liberties.

This is the message preached to us under this starry flag by these silent graves and tombs. This is the responsibility placed on us by God and by the spirits of our deceased service men and women. To be indifferent to such a message and such responsibility would savor of criminal ingratitude totally alien to genuine Americanism. We pledge to them and our God endless memory of their services to us. We pledge faith and service to God and our Nation's heroes and heroines. Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and may perpetual light shine upon them. May their souls and the souls of all the faithful departed rest in peace. Amen.

World Communists Total 20,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that

the Communists in Greece number 75,000, according to an article which appears in the Washington Daily News of Monday, May 26, 1947. In view of the fact that the United States is credited with 70,000 Communists, it may be necessary to call upon Greece to aid us in ridding this country of Communists.

The fact that there are only 5,000 more Communists in Greece than in the United States makes the recent appropriation of $400,000,000 seem a little out of proportion to the necessity aroused by the propaganda of the administration.

According to the following article, written by Harrison Salisbury, which I am inserting in the RECORD, under leave to extend, Turkey is not listed among the countries which have communism.

PARTY MEMBERS IN UNITED STATES

(By Harrison Salisbury)

There are slightly more than 20,000,000 active members of the Communist Party in the 46 principal countries of the world, a United Press survey revealed today.

Eighty-five percent of the Communist Party membership is concentrated in Europe and Russia, with almost twice as large a membership in other European countries as in the Soviet Union itself.

On a membership basis, the overwhelming percentage of Communist strength is concentrated in Europe. In no other geographical area with the exception of China do the statistics disclose large Communist Party membership.

ON-THE-SPOT CHECKS

The statistics on Communist Party membership were obtained in all but a few instances by on-the-spot checks by UP correspondents. They were obtained from Communist Party estimates and official reports. In cases where there was reason to doubt these estimates the UP correspondents made independent checks to determine the approximate membership.

The survey shows the following geographical distribution:

Russia	6,000,000
Europe (exclusive of Russia)	11,304,525
China (estimate)	2,000,000
Asia (exclusive of China, Russia, and Asia Minor)	301,000
Near East	13,700
North America	141,000
South America	340,000
Total	20,101,225

The survey covered 21 countries of Europe, 9 in Asia, 6 in the Near East, 4 in North America, and 6 in South America.

The UP survey placed Communist Party membership about 1,500,000 higher than the 18,592,300 reported at an official Communist Party conclave in London last March. The party's own membership survey covered 66 countries compared with the 46 in the UP survey.

The 20 additional countries included in the Communists' own survey all were small and accounted for only a few thousand members.

CHINA QUESTION MARK

The UP figures were believed to be accurate in all cases except for China. The 2,000,000 Chinese Communist Party ownership is that claimed by the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party.

However, Walter Rundle, UP staff correspondent at Shanghai, commented: "Neutral observers place the actual figure nearer 200,000."

On either basis—200,000 or 2,000,000—the Chinese Communist Party is still the largest outside of Russia and Europe. It's only rival for size is the now suppressed Communist Party of Brazil, which claimed a membership of about 200,000.

Outside Russia the largest Communist Party membership is concentrated in Germany, where it is estimated to total 2,221,125 members, including the SED—the leading party of the Russian zone, formed by merger of the Social Democrats and the Communists.

FRANCE, ITALY NEXT

Next in size come the Communist Parties of France and Italy each with an estimated strength of approximately 2,000,000. They are closely followed by the Czechoslovak Party numbering 1,700,000 The Yugoslav party presumably is about the same size as that in Czechoslovakia. However, no membership figure could be obtained and Yugoslavia is not included in the survey.

All of the other countries of eastern Europe have comparatively large Communist Parties. The largest membership is claimed by Bulgaria with 850,000, followed by Hungary with 650,000, Poland with 600,000 which includes merged Socialists and Romania with an estimated 500,000.

Only a handful of Communist members are reported in the Near East, where the party is illegal in most countries except Palestine and Lebanon. Lebanon is regarded as the ideological center of the Middle East movement. There are estimated to be about 5,000 members in Lebanon and an equal number in Syria.

The situation is much the same in Asia outside of China. The largest Communist membership is estimated for Indonesia with 100,000, but the movement there is split among a number of local leaders, including several individualists who appear to have skimpy ideological contacts with regular Communist Party doctrine.

The largest Communist membership in North America is that of the United States with about 70,000 followed by Cuba with 40,000, and Canada with 23,000. In South America, Chile ranks second to Brazil with 50,000 followed by Peru with 35,000, Argentina with 30,000 and Venezuela with 20,000.

The country-by-country break-down follows:

Europe

Russia	6,000,000
Austria	175,000
Belgium	100,000
Britain	43,000
Bulgaria	850,000
Czechoslovakia	1,700,000
Denmark	60,000
Finland	40,000
France	2,000,000
Germany (including SED)	2,221,125
Greece	75,000
Hungary [1]	650,000
Iceland [1]	1,000
Italy	2,000,000
Netherlands	60,000
Norway	34,000
Poland (including Socialists)	600,000
Rumania	500,000
Spain (police estimate)	400
Sweden	156,000
Switzerland	25,000
Total	17,304,525

[1] Unchecked official Communist Party estimate. Yugoslavia is not included due to lack of official figures.

Near East

Palestine	1,000
Lebanon	5,000
Syria	5,000
Egypt	500
Iraq	200
Iran	----------

Asia

China [1]	2,000,000
Japan	70,000
India	63,000
Indonesia	100,000
Siam	2,000
Malaya	10,000
Indo-China	2,000
Burma [1]	4,000
Korea	50,000
Total	2,301,000

[1] Unchecked official Communist Party estimate.

North America

United States	70,000
Canada	23,000
Mexico	8,000
Cuba	40,000
Total	141,000

South America

Brazil	200,000
Chile	50,000
Argentina	30,000
Colombia	5,000
Venezuela	20,000
Peru	35,000
Total	340,000

Senator Lodge's Views on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Springfield (Mass.) Union regarding the speech which I made on foreign policy here last week.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR LODGE'S FOREIGN POLICY

In a recent address Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., outlined a foreign policy that should help us win the peace, which we seem to be losing after winning the war, because we have not achieved any of our positive aims. We put out the fire in our neighbor's house without gaining assurances for the benefit or peace of the world while we were in position to do so, and now we are providing materials and labor to rebuild the house under our neighbor's direction.

We made dreadful mistakes when the shooting stopped, as we made mistakes, concessions, and mistaken promises during hostilities. To avoid these mistakes in the future we must have a practical, realistic, and constructive foreign policy, based on experience and the actualities of the world, administered by modern-minded personnel.

This personnel must be specially trained to deal with designing men brought up on the language of force and must be backed by a strong America, with faith in its own doctrines and way of life. "We need," says Senator LODGE, "an infusion of new blood or of new spirit or both into our representation abroad which, excellent though it is in many individual cases, still in certain quarters regards it as outside its province to come aggressively to grips with the forces in the world which so closely affect American destiny."

We must give particular care to selection of personnel in the administration of general relief abroad, including aid to Greece and Turkey. And that is not the end. We must back able men in making it clear through a comprehensive foreign policy that we will aid

only governments which carry out their commitments to the United States and have taken fundamental steps to change their situation permanently for the better. Subsidizing hold-up games and last-minute rescue parties is pouring money down a rat hole.

Our resources are not limitless. We must make expenditures solely in pursuance of an intelligent plan whereby in exchange for our outlays these foreign peoples become self-supporting and thereby enable us to achieve those concrete things which need to be done. It is to our advantage to get these nations back on a self-supporting basis. But in exchange for our aid these nations should strive to "integrate themselves into an economic arrangement which has the possibility of life and growth. It is sickening after each war to reconstruct the same old European crazy-quilt."

"We should work out our raw-materials program as a part of our foreign policy," says Senator LODGE, "for we are short of many very important commodities. We must deal in realities in terms of human freedom, first stabilizing political and military conditions, so that Europe can again become a sound economic risk. So long as the American people think they are getting nothing out of our foreign policy they will complain about granting millions of dollars to foreign governments while we do nothing to ease the high cost of living and the housing shortage here.

"We must," concludes the Senator, "make American democracy an article of export," though he does not name the Voice of America specifically. The Christian concept of the dignity of man "is the strongest revolutionary force in the world," yet "we have allowed the brutal verbiage of communism to gain a greater export currency than our own belief, which springs from external sources and can never run dry."

This means an outlay of time, intelligence, energy and money to present our view and to give compelling demonstration of its worth. "It is the essential first step that we believe in ourselves. Without such belief nothing can be done, and all expenditures are mere waste."

Our foreign policy calls for a strong America—strong in its economic life, strong in its enthusiastic faith in its own institutions and strong in its armed forces. Without these things behind it no foreign policy will amount to anything.

Let's Economize on the Plasma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Temple (Tex.) Telegram:

LET'S ECONOMIZE ON THE PLASMA

Cutting the funds for United States soil-conservation work is like trying to economize on the blood plasma that is keeping a wounded man alive.

Representative W. R. POAGE, of this district, recognized nationally as one of the stanchest and best-informed friends of conservation, is exactly right in his heated protests against the short-sighted economy cuts in the Agriculture Department proposed by the Republican majority in Congress.

Soil conservation is one Federal project that has resulted in a tremendous profit to the Nation. Even if it were a dead loss, we would still have to have it, because without it our soil gradually will become unable to support our growing population. But every dollar spent on soil conservation has returned multiplied in crop yields, present and future.

It is extremely doubtful if the United States could have met its wartime crop goals without the soil-conservation work started in 1933 by the Federal Government. That work has been well done, and is still progressing. In fact, we are just now beginning to come in sight of the goal. At least 20 years more of intensive conservation is desperately needed.

Any central Texan not convinced of the benefits of soil conservation has only to drive out in the country and look at conservation-treated land, then recall what was happening to the same land 15 years ago. It was running down the creeks and rivers, being lost forever—and a lot of it still is.

And while we're on the subject of conservation, the movement to transfer it from the Soil Conservation Service to the Extension Service is completely wrong and foolish. The SCS has built up a force of experts in conservation, is an efficient, going operation. It has done more to conserve our soil than any other agency has ever done. It is doing that now. It has the technical knowledge—the "know how"—to get the job done, if the "economy" boys don't kill the goose that is laying the golden eggs.

The Extension Service is not equipped or staffed to handle our national conservation problem, and there is no reason at all to believe that it could do a better job than the SCS if it were. So where is the sense in taking the conservation movement out of the hands of the agency that has succeeded at it, and handing it over to another agency that would have to undertake an extensive—and expensive—job of organization and expansion before it could even equal what the SCS is doing now?

Of course, there are those who figure the Extension Service would be more susceptible to politics than the SCS, and there are those who think that if the Extension Service controls conservation and they control the Extension Service they will virtually have control of United States agriculture.

But these motives must be apparent to Congressmen, even to the economy bloc, which seems determined that we are going to have economy even if it kills us all. Congressmen who do not understand the score can get it quickly from Mr. POAGE, who knows it from A to Z and is explaining it fully.

A Tribute to Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, Deputy Commander, United States Air Forces, Upon His Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 15, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pleasure that I am able to hand to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which this day's proceedings are recorded, a most timely article in high and well-deserved tribute to the extraordinary service to his country of Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, deputy commander, United States Army Air Forces, who, heavily burdened with the good wishes of those who know and love him and rich in the honors which, with lavish hand, a grateful Republic has bestowed upon him, is soon to retire from the public service.

Not only do I find pleasure in offering this splendid article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it contains a well-merited tribute to a warm personal friend whom I hold in high esteem, but in the article there is much to remind me of others for whom my admiration and affection is also very, very great.

First. It comes from the facile and always interesting pen of Col. Beirne Lay, Jr., a great air soldier in his own right of the war days, an outstanding figure in the literary world of the moment, a gentleman of the first order with whom I have spent many happy hours in congenial association "above the clouds" in flight, and about the banquet tables when the inclinations of men turn to lighter things.

Second. I have clipped it from the columns of the United States Air Services, for a generation and more, the leading periodical within its classification, whose editor is none other than Maj. Earl N. Findley, whose personal charm and enduring good fellowship has endeared him to the thousands upon thousands who know him well and count him friend, especially among those who haunt the inner sanctums of Washington's exclusive Army and Navy Club.

Then, and I recall this with gratitude, it was my good friend Col. Benjamin F. Castle, the father of the immortal Brig. Gen. Frederick Walker Castle, in the honor of whose memory the great airfield at Merced, Calif., is named, who called my attention to the printing which has inspired this grossly inadequate effusion.

This splendid article to which I have just referred, a well-deserved tribute to a great soldier of renown and an outstanding citizen of the Republic, Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, United States Air Forces, is, Mr. Speaker, the following:

EAKER—MAN WITH A PLAN

(By Beirne Lay, Jr.[1])

Adolf Hitler might still be in power had he succeeded in permanently blocking the gate to the Cintro Airport, outside of Lisbon, at 5 o'clock in the morning on February 20, 1942. Two taxies, containing seven American officers in civilian clothes, because of Portugal's neutrality, honked their horns repeatedly at the barred gate, but no sentry appeared. The officers grew impatient. An icy wind fluttered a nearby windsock, but there was no other sound in the blackness.

Then a stocky figure left the second car, strode to the gate, unfastened the cross bar, swung it up with a hard shove, and marched back to his car.

"Go ahead," he told the driver. "We've got to catch a plane." An hour later a DC-3 of the Dutch KLM Lines took off carrying the seed of the giant oak that later crashed on Hitler from the air. When the plane landed in England the civilians changed into uniforms, one of which belonged to Brig. Gen. Ira C. Eaker. The mighty Eighth Air Force

[1] Colonel Lay served on General Eaker's staff when the Eighth Bomber Command was being organized in London, and he is the author of I Wanted Wings and I've Had It, both published by Harper & Bros.; also has appeared in numerous magazines of the first rank. He is devoting his life to writing, and lives at 5017 Ambrose Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.

of the future then consisted of a piece of secret paper in his pocket.

The small incident of Eaker at the gate in Lisbon was not only prophetic but typical of the man who all his life has opened gates while others sat and waited for something to happen. And always, before entering the gate, he has had a plan.

Because of the violent loyalties and scattered antipathies Eaker has inspired during an ambitious career, because of persistent reports that he would become the next commanding general of the Army Air Forces, if Spaatz retired to run for public office, and because as head of the AAF he would play a kingpin role in the determination of national-security policies amidst the pitfalls of the air-atomic age, Eaker has long been a subject of current interest.

The man who built the Eighth Air Force in a year and a half took 25 years, literally, to build a special self. The record shows that he set up a goal and deliberately began cultivating the personal qualifications that would make possible its attainment, an idea not as unique as Eaker's success in living it.

Because of a high percentage of flyers and wives from the Lone Star State before the war, Texas was known as the father, and San Antonio as the mother-in-law, of the Air Corps. Eaker got off to a flying start in 1896 by getting himself born at Field Creek, Tex.—good initial planning. His eventual goal did not crystallize early, for instead of going to West Point, he topped off his civilian education at Southeastern State Teachers College, Durant, Okla., in 1917.

A classmate of the future pioneer military flyer recalls Eaker (pronounced Ayker, not Eeker) as a quiet, serious student, brilliant in the classroom rather than in athletics. He shone as a debater. Because of a habit of getting the facts and digesting them before he talked, he became an unobtrusive leader in student affairs. The others found he usually guessed right.

The serious young man from Texas joined the infantry late in 1917 as a second lieutenant, Reserve. He was drilling with his battalion at El Paso when fate took a hand. An Army airplane, unable to climb over the mountains, landed on the parade ground. Being the nearest officer, Eaker walked over, chatted with the pilot and examined the flying machine. He noticed a loose spark-plug lead, connected it and helped the pilot to start his engine.

"You seem to know more about this than I do," said the pilot. "Why don't you get into flying?"

"How?" asked Eaker.

"Fill out this blank," the pilot said.

Soon Eaker was on his way to an Army flying school at Austin and he's been flying ever since. Pure chance gave Eaker the first shove. He took it from there.

As a pilot in the Regular Army he had embarked on a climb that was to take him to the ceiling of his profession. To go all the way he recognized early the importance of certain obvious essentials—obvious but seldom practiced—health, professional competence plus recognition, broad interests, a plan of action and willingness to mobilize every waking hour toward its accomplishment.

To safeguard health, he became a bug on physical fitness, exercising regularly and hard. Pilots in fighter squadrons Eaker has commanded on maneuvers discovered that the boss wasn't kidding when he routed them out of the sack at 5:30 a. m. for a half hour of groaning calisthenics, a 1-mile run, and a plunge into the icy river before breakfast each morning. Even as a commanding general in England he was a strenuous daily patron of volley ball, tennis, or golf, his wind apparently unimpaired by heavy consumption of cigars—as much of a facial fixture with him as his nose. Reputed to have been at one time a durable drinking companion, he has not pulled at the beaker for years since a flight surgeon called him back for a recheck on his eyes after a convivial evening. He saw in liquor a potential threat to his fitness for flying and limited himself thereafter to a glass of sherry.

The basis of professional excellence in the Air Corps during the twenties and thirties was flying proficiency. Eaker made the cockpit of a single-seater his second home, logging more hours each month than most Army pilots, regardless of the demands of other duties on the ground. During peacetime Distinguished Fying Crosses were doled out like Hope diamonds, but he won the decoration twice—as a pilot on the Pan-American Flight which completed a good-will trip around South America under primitive conditions in 1927, and in 1929 as chief pilot of the *Question Mark*, under command of Maj. Carl Spaatz, which set a world record for endurance by refueling in the air. He joined the Caterpillar Club when forced to bail out of an airplane which developed an uncontrollable spin during a test flight at Bolling Field.

Eaker's determination to keep abreast in flying was best illustrated just before the war, when he held a punishing desk job as executive to the Chief of Air Corps in Washington. Many chair-borne officers got in the minimum required hours and some high-rankers were content to ride in the copilot's seat of large airplanes. In spite of staff duties, Eaker chalked up his customary 30 to 40 hours a month in the newest type fighter planes, his first love. It often meant flying all night and hitting his desk without a wink of sleep. On the first transcontinental flight completed solely on instruments, he flew under the hood in a sensitive P-12 fighter instead of a stable transport plane. As a squadron commander at March Field and later a group commander at Hamilton Field he left no doubt in the minds of his youngest and hottest fighter pilots about who was boss. His method was simple. He outflew them, any time in any weather.

He could be resourceful as a commando and unforgiving as Captain Bligh. At Hamilton Field a civilian contractor was extending the runways. Eaker saw a truck driver cross a runway directly in the path of one of his new boys coming in for his first landing in a P-40. The youngster staggered up over the truck, retracted his wheels and flaps, regained flying speed, and went around for another try. Eaker, white around the nostrils, told the driver, "You nearly killed one of my pilots. Keep off the runway when a ship is coming in."

"I ain't in the Army," the driver shot back. "And I ain't taking no orders from you." Unable, as commanding officer, to involve himself in a physical clash with a civilian, Eaker returned to his office, summoned a big, tough noncom, told him what had happened, and pointed out the offending truck.

"Sergeant," he concluded, "I don't want to see anything happen to that driver."

"No, sir!" said the sergeant grimly. He saluted and left. The pilots had no more trouble with the truck drivers, one of whom had become conspicuously cautious about runways.

Leading a squadron of P-40's on a cross-country flight in foul weather, Eaker was forced down on a muddy emergency strip in a driving rain. All of his pilots landed safely behind him but one. Blinded by mud and water on the windshield, the boy nosed over on his back. It took 10 minutes for Eaker and the others to pry open the jammed canopy of the gasoline-soaked airplane and free of the pilot. A single spark could have exploded the wreck. Eaker immediately transferred the boy out of his group, a severe punishment for any pilot. His reason? Not that the boy had cracked up but that he had violated orders when he shot an emergency landing with a closed canopy, forcing eight men to jeopardize their lives in saving one.

A pattern of deliberate design becomes visible in Eaker's development when it is recalled that few officers combine skill at staff work with the extrovert qualities of the active commander. A pronounced extrovert in his addiction to hunting, fishing, poker, and commanding fighter units, Eaker balanced his personal program with intensive study, not only of the military profession but of civilian fields.

His conviction that most military men were narrow in their interests, and that this handicap became severe as they rose to higher responsibilities, revealed itself while he was a lieutenant in the Philippines. Instead of absorbing beer at the Officers' Club, he absorbed law at the university. In 1924, while on duty at Mitchel Field, he attended night classes at Columbia University in business law. Already facile at expressing himself in conversation, he complemented this talent in 1933 by taking a course in journalism at the University of Southern California. Since then three successful books and numerous published articles have come from his typewriter. Familiarity with the power of the written word aroused his interest in public relations. No Army officer now understands the media of public opinion better than Eaker. He talks the newsman's language.

Excellence as a pilot, as a commander, and as a professional writer with many other civilian attainments might have given Eaker enough versatility in themselves to take him a long way. But he got in his hardest licks as a staff officer. Twice he fought the "battle of Washington" in the chief's office. As a young captain and assistant executive under Maj. Gen. James E. Fechet, he was exposed to the big picture.

From a ringside seat, and sometimes from inside the ring, he learned the nature of the headaches that bedeviled the Chief of Air Corps; the struggles for money with the Military Affairs Committees up on the Hill; the far-reaching consequences of top decisions about new airplanes, engines, tactics, and organization; and the perplexities of the ceaseless tug of war between strong personalities which focussed at the top. He watched the demands on a high commander for sublime patience, political dexterity, quick and enormous grasp of technical data, dynamic energy, cool calculation, and prompt decisions, right or wrong. All these were tools he would need. Eaker sharpened the cutting edge of his own set as the months slipped by.

When he returned, years later, to Washington as executive to his old friend and new chief, Hap Arnold, Eaker had graduated from the Air Corps Tactical School and the Command and General Staff School. More important, he had graduated from his own private school of self-cultivation. It was already noticeable that he had the courage of his convictions and would fight an issue all the way to the top, if necessary. Arnold and Spaatz were the two driving pistons and Eaker the main bearing of an engine harnessed to a terrible load—the preparation of the tiny Air Corps for an explosive expansion under the threat of war.

Often gray with fatigue from studying reports until the small hours, Eaker sat at his desk talking to aviation leaders, industrialists, engineers, crackpots, and ax grinders, while constantly on the phone, answering Arnold's buzzer, checking a mass of outgoing orders, and dictating letters.

It was now a routine habit with him to hang up from a long telephone call and resume dictation in the middle of a sentence without prompting. Even of voice and temper, he juggled a hatful of mental oranges all day long. Officers who had come to him with perplexing problems were repeatedly puzzled when he interrupted them with the right answer before they'd even warmed up.

This was no stunt. He already knew the problem, or recognized it as an old one in fancy dress.

Any doubts Arnold and Spaatz may have had about Eaker's capacity to run a big show had disappeared when Eaker left Washington in 1940, after 3 years of top-speed efficiency in the chief's office, to assume, command of the Twentieth Fighter Group. He was a marked man. War was still a year away, but when it came, Lieutenant Colonel Eaker, aged 44, would be ready—ready to play in the first-team backfield against the Nazis.

Like any strong personality, he had made enemies. His most unforgivable offense had been a consistent habit of making the competition look bad. In the slow tempo of peace years, he was a wheel turning faster than the wheels around him. Many puzzled intimates had found Eaker an enigma. Detractors wrote him off as a slave to ambition, a heartless machine, whose every move was sparked by self-interest. Officers who had known him longer believed that he was a slave to excellence, that his nature compelled him to an all-out effort in every undertaking, and that he never subordinated loyalty to self-advancement. Nobody denied that he was a formidable opponent—a born competitor who didn't believe in losing.

That is the kind of man Hap Arnold needed in January 1942, when he was confronted with setting up an American bomber command in England. The only way to stop Herman Goering was to send an American over there who could lick him. Unquestionably Arnold knew that he was making one of the most critically important appointments of the war when he summoned Brig. Gen. Ira Clarence Eaker to his office and offered him the job.

"But I'm not a bombardment man," said Eaker. "I've spent all my life with fighters."

"I know that," said Arnold, "and I want this bomber command run by a man with a fighter pilot's temperament."

Some day a long book will be written about Eaker's achievement in England, but even a short summary is impressive. When he arrived in London on February 20, 1942, there was not a single American bomber station, supply and repair depot, combat airplane, pilot or mechanic in the British Isles.

Less than 6 months later, on August 17, the first formation of B–17's dropped bombs on Hitler's Europe.

Between these two dates, Eaker made decisions which, had they been different, might seriously have prolonged the war in Europe—or lost it. The first was in his relations with the British, on which the entire success or failure of the American effort depended. Although determined to leave no stone unturned in cooperating with the war-wise leaders of the RAF, he stoutly upheld the untested American concept of daylight strategic bombing, and, like Pershing in World War I, insisted on an autonomous American force. This was not as easy nor as inevitable as it sounds.

In many minds Germany's failure to bomb England out of the war had discredited strategic bombing. The RAF, which had undergone a sad experience with a few B–17's, lacked faith both in the airplane and in daylight precision bombing. They wanted American crews sent over as replacements in British squadrons. Their arguments in favor of night saturation bombing were persuasive and reinforced by experience versus theory. They had won over influential American officers in London to the notion of training American crews with the RAF.

To top everything, a board of 21 experts, British and American, met in Liverpool shortly after Eaker's arrival to appraise the B–17E. Their report damned the B–17E as unsuitable for operations over western Europe and shook the confidence of Eaker's staff—but not Eaker.

"They're wrong," he said. "In any case, the B–17 is the best we can get. We'll have to do the most with the least." B–24's, also under consideration, were not expected to be in quantity production soon enough and they were heavily committed to other theaters.

In retrospect, it is disquieting to speculate on the consequences had Eaker thrown his weight the other way. Final responsibility, of course, was Arnold's but the man on the spot carries great weight. A commander with less judgment and boldness than Eaker might have doomed the bombing offensive at the outset. Vacillation, or basic compromise with opposing views by him at this critical early juncture would inevitably have delivered a still-born infant. Midwife Eaker's judgment that the B-17 could live in Hitler's daylight skies was the slap on the bottom that kept the baby air program breathing. German leaders who later described the grown child as the decisive factor in their defeat must now regret that they did not send every airplane in the Reich over High Wycombe, Bucks, in the spring of 1942 to obliterate Ira Eaker and his headquarters.

Retaining the good will of his opposite number, Air Marshal "Butch" Harris of the RAF Bomber Command, Air Chief Marshal Portal and Winston Churchill, Eaker kept his controversial program skilfully on the rails. Whole areas were allotted for American bases. Eaker protected future morale when he successfully opposed proposals to feed our men with British rations and to put them under canvas, instead of permanent construction, in the bitter English climate. He insisted on having his own combat intelligence organization rather than relying on the admittedly excellent RAF intelligence.

Only a man of exceptionally well-rounded outlook, tact and sharp understanding of public relations could have trod without mishap through the treacherous minefields of the early months. Typical of Eaker's approach was his 8-second speech in reply to a half-hour oration by the Mayor of High Wycombe before a capacity crowd of dignitaries gathered to welcome the Americans.

"I don't believe," he said in answer, "that we should do much talking until we've done more fighting. We hope that when we leave you'll be glad that we came." Then he sat down.

Breadth of mind was reflected in Eaker's selection of the staff he took to England, and which could have made or broken him. West Pointers in London at first referred to "Eaker's amateurs," because he had filled key positions with men straight from civilian life. There were two reasons for this. First, the enormous new AAF bucket contained only a drop of experienced officers. Second, Eaker believed that an able civilian could learn the Army faster than many Army professionals could learn ability. For years he had cocked a weather eye at young friends who were making a mark in civilian life and had jotted down a mental note: "There's a fellow I can use if I ever go to war."

He stopped one such prospect in a hallway shortly before going overseas.

"Want to go with me?" he asked.

"Yes, sir," was the prompt reply. Eaker strode on down the hall. Not until afterward did the prospect learn that Eaker was going to England and why. But 2 weeks later he was aboard the clipper which took off with Eaker and his staff.

It was that kind of loyalty and unquestioning faith in the Old Man that moved mountains in building the foundations of the original VIII Bomber Command. Eaker's amateurs didn't let him down. The early B–17 missions, led by Col. Frank A. Armstrong, Jr., and his Ninety-seventh Bomb group, were a success which stunned the RAF. Many pessimists had expected 75 percent to 100 percent losses. Because of political pressure at home to divert heavy bomber production to other fronts, notably Japan, because of skepticism about the feasibility of operations from weather-bound England and because of intense opposition to the basic plan from many high quarters in our own Government, everything hinged on a promising beginning. A first-night turkey would have resulted in abandonment of the whole program.

Overcoming one black disappointment after another, when promised airplanes, crews, and equipment were committed to other fronts, Eaker faced a second crucial test at Casablanca, where he had to sell the still unconvinced Churchill on continuance of the independent American daylight effort, which had not had time to pay real dividends.

The Old Man, aged 46, moved on to command of the Eighth Air Force, which he turned over as a going concern to Jimmy Doolittle in January 1944, before assuming command of the Mediterranean Allied Air Forces, a higher assignment. Before leaving, he was knighted by King George VI, which gives him the honorary title of Sir Ira Eaker, K. C. B. Churchill paid him high tribute in a farewell speech, a reflection of the rare esteem in which Eaker was held by his English friends on all sides. Our own Government gave him a D. S. M. whose citation was notably short on bouquets and long on accuracy:

"For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility as Commander of the United States Air Forces in the United Kingdom and the Eighth Air Force from December 1942 to 7 January 1944. Upon assuming command of this unit, General Eaker devoted himself to building a formidable air force; largely by his individual efforts and in a minimum of time he overcame shortages then existing with respect to competent and trained personnel and combat equipment of all types. Tactics for large-scale daylight bombing had not been developed; however, General Eaker's brilliant assessment of enemy strengths and intentions, together with his outstanding resourcefulness, led to sound decisions and the ultimate in operational performance. His personality, ability, and untiring effort won the respect and admiration of our British allies with whom he was in constant contact, thus enhancing our prestige and establishing a firm foundation of mutual confidence for future operations. General Eaker, by his noteworthy achievement as an organizer, unlimited display of initiative, energy, outstanding leadership, and his untiring devotion to duty, together with his penetrating analysis of the military situation, made an invaluable contribution to the success of air operations over Europe."

If Eaker needed any finishing touches in diplomacy, he got them in Italy as boss of MAAF, a conglomeration of Allied air forces under one nightmarish roof in a military House of All Nations. Well versed in untangling formidable problems by his experience in England, Eaker achieved unity of effort among the diverse elements of his new Allied command, which was further complicated by shuttle missions to Russian bases and close interservice relations with the United States Navy. An air-power man to the core, and certainly no lover of battleships, Eaker got along well with the sailors. The Navy Department later cited him for "a keen appreciation of the requirements of interservice cooperation," and for "superb handling of air support" during the amphibious landings at Anzio and in southern France.

After 3 years overseas, during which he flew on combat missions from both England and Italy, Eaker returned to Washington in April 1945 to accept the greatest responsibility, and opportunity, of his career. Arnold appointed him Chief of Air Staff and Deputy Chief of the Army Air Forces, the position he now holds.

His health impaired by overwork, Arnold was frequently absent during the ensuing months. Spaatz, at first, was still in the

Pacific. Thus Eaker accumulated considerable first-pilot time at the controls of the AAF through the turbulence of redeployment, demobilization, and the foggy weather of the struggle for a coequal Air Force under a unified department of defense.

The boy from Field Creek, Tex., who faithfully adhered to a program of developing to a maximum his latent personal powers, reached his goal.

To his intimates he acknowledges the lure of the temptation to step out into civilian life. On June 15 he will do so. Eaker has become a powerful engine requiring the fuel of big jobs to run at all—a victim of his own enormous capacity. Civilian or military, his future role, on past form, will be a dynamic one, for few men in the country can duplicate the scope of his experience as an executive.

You sense this when you enter his office in the Pentagon. The man who greets you looks younger than his 51 years, in spite of hard lines around the mouth. Those lines were engraved during periods of months on end when he worked an 18-hour day under fearful pressure in England. Success stories invariably refer to the "inexhaustible energy" of their subjects. Many officers who served with Eaker overseas believe that the pace he held would have reduced most men to talking to themselves while they molded mud pies. The evidence of the ordeal is there on his face, but it gives the impression of strength rather than fatigue.

He speaks so quietly that you are often straining to hear. The strain is worth it. Eaker, whose vocabulary is a well-stocked larder of precision words, has never been accused of uttering a dull remark. He has a habit of saying "I visualize that," instead of "I think that." When he gets through, you realize that he really does visualize what he's talking about.

Instead of offering you a plain cigar, he may give you one that came from Herman Goering's private car on a siding at Berchtesgaden, a small illustration of his addiction to novel possessions, ideas, and people. He has collected celebrities, titles, Prime Ministers, and royalty among his friends. But his friendship with Jock Whitney, for instance, who served on his staff overseas, arose not from a weakness for socialities, but as a natural result of his congeniality with all kinds of people, humble or prominent. He sees no more reason to exclude the latter than the former. In his personal mail, letters from old GI friends outnumber all others 5 to 1. He appreciates the luxury of nice things and fine living, but not as much as roughing it in the outdoors.

His uniform always scrupulously neat, shoes sparkling, he looks the part of the thorough-going soldier he is. On only two professional grounds has he been particularly criticized. Many subordinates believe that his unshakable loyalty to old friends has constrained him to keep more than one unsuited officer in an important position, to his own detriment. But even if true, this has never stopped Eaker from getting results, the final test.

Another alleged fault, which likewise stems from a virtue, is the extent to which he has concerned himself with the details of any show he was running. He has never breezily delegated carte blanche authority to subordinates. Admirers believe that because of his abnormal power of concentration Eaker can grasp far more than most commanders, hence can afford to exercise greater personal control.

Concentration may explain why Eaker is a legend wherever poker players bunch over their cards until the small hours. With a hawk's eye for the sequence of exposed cards, and quick perception of shifting odds, he can probably name 70 percent of the hands against him at a given time. He wins big pots as casually with a pair of threes as with four aces.

Some of those who have been on the receiving end of Eaker's wrath think him cold-blooded. Without losing his temper, but with a chill in his eyes, he can cut a man to ribbons with razor-strokes of the tongue, as an officer of the day who got drunk on duty once found out. But the same eyes can betray the warmth that comes from deep understanding.

Earl Findley, editor of United States Air Services, will never forget what Eaker did for him. Mrs. Findley had suffered a sudden illness from which she never recovered. In the first week of her helplessness, Eaker called at Findley's apartment. For many years Mrs. Findley had made a mince pie for Eaker at Christmas.

"How is the next number of the magazine coming along?" inquired Eaker.

"I haven't thought about the magazine," said Findley, "nor do I intend to go to the office until I can find out more about this illness of my wife."

In a quiet way Eaker made three suggestions for articles, volunteered that he would write one of them as an editorial, another to be signed by the Chief of Air Corps, Arnold, and a book review he said he would like to do under his own name. In the April 1940 issue of United States Air Services these articles appeared. They broke the back of the magazine, relieved the editor of any anxiety on that score. And when the articles were ready, Eaker phoned to say they would be given to a messenger if he would call at his office at 10 a. m. next day.

The articles consisted of an editorial emphasizing General Marshall's love for flying, and how he as Chief of Staff always went by air when he could; a long article answering the question most often propounded by manufacturers of airplanes, under a title which meant What Kind of Airplanes Does the Chief of Air Corps Want? The book reviewed by Eaker was Up and At 'Em by the late Col. Harold E. Hartney.

What impressed Findley most about this act of Eaker's was that, instead of telling him that he must keep his chin up, Eaker sensed the psychological need of the man who could not think of his magazine at the moment, and proceeded to take over Findley's responsibilities on the publication, with brilliant results.

Eaker has been fortunate in retaining the life-long friendship and confidence of Arnold and Spaatz, but he has not ridden to the top clinging to their coattails. On the contrary, Arnold and Spaatz admit that Eaker has carried more than his share of the load all the way. Both pronounce him the kind of blocking back that ball carriers dream about.

He worked to inject more democracy into the AAF. He would have abolished saluting, authorized identical uniforms for officers and enlisted men, except for insignia of rank; introduced two-way efficiency reports, with subordinates reporting on superiors as well as vice versa.

He hammered on four cardinal points for future national security: (1) To entice the best men into our State Department and strive to negotiate international differences so that the soldier will never have to take up the burden. (2) Create an intelligence service that will keep us informed of what is going on in every corner of the world. (3) Retain our military power in being, ready for instant action. (4) Lay all possible emphasis on scientific preeminence.

Married twice, he lives now at Fort Myer, Va., with his wife Ruth, whose picture has appeared with ample justification on the Beauty of the Week page of a Washington paper. They have no children, but their life together will never be empty. A man like Eaker will find some new world to conquer and the smart money will be against the new world. No doubt he already has the course charted in accordance with his dictum: "Most people lack a plan. That's why the fellow with a plan is hard to beat."

He ought to know.

The President Pro Tempore of the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very apt article written by Gould Lincoln, dealing with the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, published in the Washington Star of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GAVEL OF THE SENATE IS IN EFFICIENT HANDS—VANDENBERG PERFORMS EXPERTLY IN ROLE HE WANTED—VETERAN ATTACHÉS SAY HIS RECORD ONE OF THE BEST

(By Gould Lincoln)

Riding herd on the fractious Members of the United States Senate, each of whom believes he enjoys almost regal prerogatives within that august Chamber, is a full-time job.

For nearly 5 months Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, has been the Senate's Presiding Officer. Elected President pro tempore at the opening of the present session, he has a remarkable record. Not one of his decisions on a parliamentary question has been challenged by an "appeal from the decision of the Chair."

By his fairness to Democrats and Republicans alike (he is a Republican), he has gained the confidence of the entire body. By his tact, his thorough knowledge of the rules and of parliamentary procedure, he has been able to speed the business of the Senate.

FILLS ROLE OF VICE PRESIDENT

In fact, to observers and to older employees of the Senate, Mr. VANDENBERG stands out as the Senate's ablest Presiding Officer in two-score years.

Under the terms of the Constitution of the United States the Vice President is "President of the Senate." Then, that document continues: "The Senate shall choose their other officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he (the Vice President) shall exercise the office of the President of the United States." Since Harry Truman, elected Vice President in 1944, is now "exercising the office of President of the United States," Senator VANDENBERG is, so far as the Senate is concerned, doing everything that a Vice President can do—and he receives the pay of Vice President, the office room of the Vice President, and the automobile provided for the Vice President.

The Michigan Senator is entitled to all he receives in the way of emolument. For the job of presiding over the Senate is an added burden for the already overworked chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. VANDENBERG, however, is a glutton for work and thoroughly enjoys presiding in the Senate, even though it demands long hours.

MANY JURISDICTIONAL MATTERS

The task of presiding in the Senate was immensely increased in scope at the opening of the present Congress because of the new Reorganization Act—the La Follette-Monroney Act which reduced the number of standing committees of the Senate to 15 (there had been 33) and which changed the rules of the Senate in other respects.

It left Mr. VANDENBERG much in the position of a presiding judge who suddenly finds the precedents and the laws changed over night. He has been compelled to institute

a whole new series of precedents by his decisions, and by his interpretations of the changed rules. By the Reorganization Act, the jurisdiction of the Senate standing committees—the subjects which they are directed to handle—was greatly changed.

"Jurisdictional strikes" by labor unions pale into insignificance when it comes to jurisdictional disputes between chairmen of Senate standing committees. The President pro tempore of the Senate has had to devote much study to these jurisdictional troubles. Indeed, Mr. VANDENBERG has had to study hard at night on the jurisdictional cases coming up the next day. Each Senate chairman is jealous of the prerogatives of his own committee.

HIS MERGER RULING STUCK

Take, for example, the case of the Army-Navy merger bill. Under the reorganization terms, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is directed to have charge of all "reorganizations" in the departments. At the same time the act provides that the Armed Services Committee (the new combined Committee on Military and Naval Affairs) shall have jurisdiction over legislation having to do with the "common defense generally" and with matters relating to the Army and the Navy.

Senator AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, put in a claim for the so-called merger bill as soon as it was introduced. He put it in writing. In the House the same bill was referred to the corresponding Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Senator GURNEY, Republican, of South Dakota, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, demanded that the bill go to his committee.

So the issue was joined. Mr. VANDENBERG wrote a clear and succinct decision in the case, giving the bill to the Armed Services Committee. He pointed out that under the language of the Reorganization Act, the bill could have been sent to either of the two committees. However, he held that, since in the last Congress the question of a merger of the War and Navy Departments had been considered by the Military Affairs Committee—and by the Naval Affairs Committee—it would be entirely fitting to send the measure to the Armed Services Committee. Also, he held that the subject matter was one with which the Armed Services Committee must necessarily be engaged, if it was to care for the national defense.

MEETS THE QUALIFICATIONS

Although Mr. VANDENBERG, in his opinion, invited the Senate to decide the matter itself, there was no appeal from his decision. Another example of jurisdictional mix-up over a major piece of legislation involved the bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority, patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority. In this case three committees, Agriculture, Public Lands, and Public Works, all might have properly claimed jurisdiction. Under the Vandenberg ruling, the Committee on Public Works got the bill. Here again, there was no appeal.

There are two—perhaps three—rules that must govern a Presiding Officer of the Senate if he is to be a success. The first is to obtain the confidence of all Senators, whether of the majority or minority party; that the rulings made by the Presiding Officer will be fair and free from partisan bias. Second, the Presiding Officer must be fast with his decisions. Any faltering, any apparent unsureness on the part of a Presiding Officer, and the Senate is off to the fair, with a bad hour or two ahead of the Chair. And third, a Presiding Officer must be able to preserve order in the Chamber, largely through his own sureness and personal authority.

Mr. VANDENBERG possesses all three of these qualifications. He has the confidence of Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, minority floor leader of the Democrats, and even of the Republican mavericks, like WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. Second, by never hesitating, he gives the impression always that he knows the rules, that he knows what he is talking about. He never decides in favor of the majority party merely because he belongs to that party.

FILLED IN FOR DAWES

When it comes to keeping order, Mr. VANDENBERG is an excellent performer. He rarely wields the gavel. His "Senators, will you please be seated," uttered in his far-reaching voice, is enough to bring order in itself.

Mr. VANDENBERG'S earliest experience in presiding over a Senate session came just 20 minutes after he had taken the oath as Senator, at the opening of his first term of service in 1928. Former Vice President Charles G. Dawes, who was in the chair as President of the Senate, called the newcomer from Michigan to substitute for him. Mr. VANDENBERG, it happened, had often been in Washington while a newspaper publisher in Grand Rapids and as a friend of the late Senator William Alden Smith. He knew many of the older Senators, and in a good natured way, they started to give him a going-over. He acquitted himself well.

REED GOT QUICK REVENGE

Presidents and Presidents pro tempore of the Senate during the last 40 years have been many and varied. Vice President Dawes immediately after he was sworn in in March 1925 proceeded to give the Senate a lecture. The burden of his song was that, while it was a great thing to have free and open discussion, no Senator should be allowed by his single objection or long-windedness to hamstring and prevent the enactment of important legislation, including the necessary appropriation bills.

As that is one of the powers which Senators jealously guard, never knowing when they may wish to exercise it—or to join with others in a filibuster—feelings were considerably ruffled by the speech of the new Vice President. Especially caustic was the late Senator "Jim" Reed, Democrat, of Missouri, who had been one of the bitter-enders in the fight to prevent the ratification of the League of Nations Covenant a few years earlier. Mr. Reed found almost immediately an opportunity to get back at Dawes, through some flaw in the swearing in of the newly elected Senators—a proceeding which Mr. Dawes had rushed through.

VICE PRESIDENT NAPPING

It was Mr. Dawes, too, who had perhaps the most embarrassing experience ever to befall a Presiding Officer of the Senate. It, too, occurred soon after he had become Vice President. The then President Calvin Coolidge had sent to the Senate the appointment of Charles Beecher Warren, of Michigan, to be Attorney General in his Cabinet. Mr. Warren, who had long been prominent in Republican politics, was the object of a bitter attack by Democratic Senators and by several of the so-called Progressive Republican Senators of those days.

A Vice President can vote in the Senate only to break a tie. When the vote came on Mr. Warren's nomination, it stood 40 to 40—with Mr. Dawes napping at his hotel. He was summoned hastily by Senate attachés, but did not reach the Senate until after the voting was over. Warren's nomination was defeated as the result of a tie vote.

Veterans of the Senate say that Mr. Dawes, before leaving the Senate that afternoon, had been assured by both the Republican leader, the late Charles Curtis, of Kansas, and by the Democratic leader, the late "Joe" Robinson, of Arkansas, that there was no chance of reaching a vote on the Warren appointment before the adjournment hour and it was safe for him to be away. As happens sometimes in the Senate, debate stopped suddenly, and there was nothing left to do but call the roll. This unfortunate experience—which prevented the confirmation of President Coolidge's appointee for Attorney General—coming right on the heels almost of Mr. Dawes' lecture to Senators, was rolled over senatorial tongues with considerable glee.

COOLIDGE HAD TROUBLE

Vice President Marshall, who served 8 years as President of the Senate in the administration of Woodrow Wilson, had a dry humor which helped him over difficult situations. He was a strong partisan, however, and he ruled with the Democratic majority whenever a question arose, and his rulings were in some cases contradicting. It was Marshall who commented, while he was Vice President, that what the country really needed was "a good 5-cent cigar." When he was finally retiring from office, in his farewell address to the Senate, Mr. Marshall described himself as "the greatest listener since the Sphinx sat himself down in the Libyan Desert." He had 8 years of presiding over the Senate.

Calvin Coolidge served as Vice President and President of the Senate for the best part of 2 years and when President Harding died, moved to the White House. Mr. Coolidge had been Governor of Massachusetts and a member of the Massachusetts Legislature. He was not, however, an apt Presiding Officer for the Senate. His slowness to speak—which clung to him almost always—got him into hot water frequently. He could have settled an issue of procedure without difficulty by making a quick decision—but he allowed things to run along. The late Senator Pat Harrison, Democrat, of Mississippi, a great wag, used to take delight in giving the slow-spoken Yankee a tough time by raising all kind of parliamentary questions and demanding that Mr. Coolidge rule on them.

WALLACE WAS IN AND OUT

Henry A. Wallace, as Vice President in Franklin D. Roosevelt's third term, had his dose of presiding over the Senate. He took the job seriously and studied up on parliamentary procedure. However, he spent a great deal of time away from the Senate, presiding over or sitting as a member in several war agencies to which President Roosevelt had assigned him. A 100 percent New Dealer, Mr. Wallace's rulings did not overlook the progressive side. "Jack" Garner, of Texas, Vice President during Roosevelt's first two terms, was a conservative Democrat. But he was a Democrat first and last, as President of the Senate. Having been Speaker of the House before he was Vice President, he tried to run the Senate to the House rules, and, of course, failed.

Charles Curtis, Vice President with President Herbert Hoover, had long experience in the Senate before he became its President. He knew the rules and parliamentary procedure and was a great "gaveler"—pounding away in an effort to get order.

Mr. VANDENBERG demanded the office of President pro tempore of the Senate as well as that of chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. There were protests from a few of the Republican Senators at the opening of the session that this was too much honor for one man, and that he should settle for one of the two jobs. He was determined, however, and got his way. There was precedent for this. The late Senator Key Pitman of Nevada had been both chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and President pro tempore.

One of the problems which Mr. VANDENBERG may have to rule on some day is whether a majority vote or a two-thirds vote will be required to bar Senator-elect BILBO, Democrat, of Mississippi, if and when Mr. BILBO presents himself. Mr. VANDENBERG has already decided this question—but he is not making any announcement of his decision now.

Hirohito Virtually Deposed—Emperor Now a Figurehead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Mr. Ralph J. Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

HIROHITO VIRTUALLY DEPOSED—EMPEROR NOW A FIGUREHEAD

(Article 6)

When Japan surrendered unconditionally on August 14, 1945, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, as supreme commander for the Allied Powers, was given full authority to determine the future status of Emperor Hirohito. It can now be revealed that the original plans for the occupation were based on the assumption that Hirohito would be deposed.

However, after MacArthur had conferred with the Japanese surrender emissaries in Manila, he became convinced that problems of the occupation would be greatly simplified if Hirohito retained his throne, at least until the occupation forces were firmly established in Japan. The Emperor was represented as being willing to issue any orders required by the supreme commander to implement the surrender. This insured full acceptance of the surrender terms by the Japanese Army commanders and precluded any last ditch stand or suicide attack.

DOCILELY OBEYS

There was no deal made between MacArthur and the Japanese Government that guaranteed Hirohito any imperial prerogatives. In fact, it was stated explicitly that his authority to rule would be subject to the decision of the supreme commander. But it was obvious to all concerned that the Emperor's tenure in office depended on his good behavior. And he has in fact docilely obeyed every directive and suggestion of the occupation authorities.

There has been some criticism, particularly among leftists, because General MacArthur has allowed Hirohito to retain his throne. What these critics overlook, however, is that the Emperor already has been virtually deposed. He has been shorn of all his power, he has renounced the myth of his divinity and most of his wealth has been confiscated. Today he is a mere figurehead.

Japan's new constitution, which goes into effect May 3, relegates the Emperor to this position. It provides that he shall be the symbol of the state, deriving his position from the sovereign will of the people, that all of his acts in matters of state shall be subject to the approval of the Cabinet, and that he shall never have powers related to government.

There is an interesting story behind the drafting of this constitution. MacArthur ordered the Japanese Government to prepare such a document for submission to a vote of the people. But the government fumbled and stalled. The mental attitude of reverence toward the Emperor was so deeply instilled that no member of the Cabinet dared put down on paper any language which would deprive the Emperor of power.

Moroever, the Japanese were so accustomed to the practices of dictatorship, that whenever they drafted a phrase granting some right, they invariably qualified it by adding, "except as otherwise provided by law."

MAC ARTHUR WROTE ORIGINAL?

MacArthur finally became impatient. It is commonly supposed in Tokyo that he himself wrote the original draft of the constitution. The Emperor and the Cabinet promptly approved it. Then it went to the Diet, where 23 amendments were made, 1 section was deleted, and 4 were added. The final draft, which was approved by the voters, contains what is probably the most explicit and comprehensive statement of individual rights and liberties ever made in a similar document. It is far more advanced and up to date in this respect than our own Bill of Rights.

The 85-percent capital levy tax will strip the Emperor of most of his wealth. It is estimated this will leave him with only 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 yen. This would amount to approximately $266,000 under the artificial exchange rate of 15 yen to the dollar,[1] but only $40,000 if computed on the basis of the real value of the yen, which is about 100 to the dollar. In addition, he will be allowed to keep his clothes, art objects, books, and laboratory.

Hirohito himself renounced the myth of his divinity when he told his people in a radio address that the ties between them "are not predicated on the false conception that the Emperor is divine and that the Japanese people are superior to other races and fated to rule the world."

Address of Mr. Ramsey S. Black, State Treasurer of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I recently attended a meeting of the Democratic committee of Bucks County, Pa. I was surprised and impressed by the enthusiasm and size of the meeting. The chairman of the committee is a young man 31 years old named John T. Welsh. He is not only giving to that organization an outstanding job of leadership but is infusing it with enthusiasm and energy.

Mr. Ramsey S. Black, the State treasurer of Pennsylvania, delivered a speech on this occasion which I introduce into the RECORD:

My fellow Democrats, in the past few months we have witnessed an amazing—in fact almost unprecedented—reversal of public opinion.

Last November the Democratic Party was soundly beaten, all over the country. Only a few candidates survived the Republican landslide, most of them in traditional Democratic strongholds.

The size of the vote left no doubt that the people were dissatisfied. No candidate's personal popularity, no campaign strategy, no amount of political organization, could have changed the result.

The people wanted a change, and they got it. Election day of last year was low tide for the Democratic Party. Both the straw polls and the actual ballots demonstrated that it was weaker than it has ever been in the last 20 years.

Today, less than 6 months later, we are witnessing a revival, a resurgence, a rebirth of Democratic strength. Every index shows it, every straw poll confirms it. Steadily, month by month Democratic popularity is rising. From a low of 45 percent last fall, it has risen so rapidly in these few months that today it shows the majority of the American people again behind it.

Interpreters have attempted to find reasons for this rapid reversal of sentiment. Some of them attribute it to the position the President has taken on current issues. Some of them blame the confusion and demoralization of the Republican majorities in Congress. Every political analyst, every commentator, every columnist, has his own explanation.

This failure to identify the basic reasons for the trend back to the Democratic Party is significant. The lack of any clear and easily identified reason for the change dramatizes the most important fact of all—the fact that there was no deep-seated or basic reason behind the American people's sudden reversal of their party allegiance in the first place.

The trend to the Republican Party was not a movement, not a political development based upon changes in basic beliefs.

It was a stampede.

The reasons for it are fairly clear. America was just emerging from a great war. It had lost a great leader, and it had not yet assured itself of the stature of his successor. It was weary of war, tired of sacrifice and hardship, impatient of restraints and controls, starved for automobiles and electric refrigerators. War savings were burning a hole in its pockets, and the spending frenzy was reflected in an irresistible pressure to break down price controls. Yet the same people who smashed the anti-inflation line bitterly resented the strike wave that resulted. Many people looked upon the fight to raise prices as a crusade for free enterprise; at the same time they viewed the corresponding battle for higher wages as subversive, radical, Communist-inspired, un-American.

The shortages which were the end result of years of war production could not be remedied overnight, but the party in power had to take the political consequences. The Republican leadership, as we all remember, crystallized the public irritations in a simple slogan—"Had enough?" It appealed to those who wanted consumer goods at any price. It appealed equally to those who were already feeling the pinch of inflation. It appealed to the profiteers and black marketers, and it appealed to their customers as well. Even the workers, suffering from production cut-backs and industry's sit-down strikes against controls, felt that "a little inflation" might prime the pump for renewed high-level production.

The result was an extremely confused "mandate" to the Republican Party. The various Republican factions are still fighting about it, with the consequence that its congressional majority is paralyzed and its achievements to date have been microscopic.

Yet there was a mandate. The people wanted, and still want, more meat, more building materials, more automobiles, more of everything that they had to sacrifice during the war. The people wanted industrial strife ended, so that maximum production might bring them the goods and materials they needed. It is a reasonable assumption also that they wanted these articles at prices they could afford to pay.

It would be unreasonable to assume, however—as so many Old Guard conservatives immediately did assume—that the people who had overwhelmingly elected Franklin D. Roosevelt four times suddenly desired to sweep aside the reforms of the Roosevelt era.

It seems clear that they wanted production bottlenecks broken and strikes ended, and in their impatience and irritation turned the job over to the Republican Party when their Democratic administration did not seem to

[1] The official exchange rate has since been made 50 yen to the dollar.

be moving fast enough. There is no evidence that they intended either repudiation of the Roosevelt program or a punitive invasion of the hard-won rights of labor.

The straw polls now indicate that they have reconsidered their decision, made in irritation and impatience, to put their second team into the game. They have found that a confused and divided Republican leadership, lacking a program or even an agreement upon fundamental principles, has been a handicap rather than a stimulus to reconversion. They have seen for themselves that the Republicans, like the Democrats, have no magic formula to satisfy, overnight, a demand for automobiles and bathtubs that has been developing for 5 years.

As Democrats, we took the view that our National administration should be supported to the limit in its difficult task of guiding us safely through the immediate postwar era. The electorate, instead, has given the Republican Party the responsibility for shaping national policy. The Truman administration has been left with no responsibility except that of administering the policies prescribed by the Republican majority in Congress. This places the burden squarely upon the Republican leadership. It can no longer blame Roosevelt. It can no longer blame Truman. It must justify itself by positive, constructive action. For years it sat comfortably on the sidelines, criticizing, complaining, blockading. Now it must act. It must prove to the American people that it has principles and policies worthy of public support, capable of meeting the needs of the times.

Normally, the responsibility of leadership would not have been entrusted to it, if at all, before the next Presidential election. Instead, to its own surprise, that task has been thrust upon it prematurely. As a result, it is not safely entrenched behind a 4-year mandate, secure in control of the Presidency as well as the Congress. Instead it must give a preview performance. It must demonstrate, in these 2 years, that it is capable of handling the job. If it fails, its prospects for 1948 fail too.

The signs of that failure are evident even now. It is reflected in the rising popularity of the Truman administration. It is shown in the public dissatisfaction with the fumblings of Congress. It is implicit in Republican National Chairman Reece's desperate appeal for party unity.

Republican victory next year is no longer viewed as a foregone conclusion. Many experienced observers are gradually adopting the view, instead, that it is a forlorn hope. Possibly it is too early to judge. The Republican high command may yet develop, and demonstrate, unsuspected qualities of real leadership. It may, under pressure of urgent and compelling necessity, even emerge with a program, and possibly an agreement upon a few basic principles. But it is no longer leading an irresistible movement; it is no longer secure in public confidence and support. The honeymoon is over.

There are sound reasons for this sudden reversal of public sentiment. The public quickly realized that the Republican Party was a dead-end street. Progress passed it by long ago, yet its leadership still dreams of the good old days, the days of high tariffs, the days before labor unions, the days of isolationism. In an atomic age, the Republican leadership still puts its trust in the cavalry charge and the drawn saber. Rising young leaders within the party have fought against this inertia, but one by one they have been cast out by the dominant old guard.

Ironically, it becomes more evident every day that the one thing which assures a Democratic victory in 1948 is the Republican victory of 1946.

Yet the Democratic Party cannot sit back and wait for the people to throw out the Republicans next year, as they threw out the Democrats last year. The Democratic Party does not win its battles by default. It wins on its positive, constructive measures for the public welfare. Today, when the United States is waging a battle for the peace of the world, it has a solemn responsibility. It is the spokesman for the ideals of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. It represents the America of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. In a world where democracy is, in truth, the last, best hope of the world, it is the champion of the people. In or out of office, it bears that responsibility, in State and Nation, in borough and township, in city and county.

All of us, as Democrats, have a duty to organize for victory. We may find it there for the grasping, as a result of Republican failure, but we must be prepared and ready to grasp it. We know that Pennsylvania, basically, is Democratic ground. Its traditional Republicanism was not the result of Republican strength, but of Democratic weakness, a lack of organization capable of translating public sentiment into Democratic votes on election day. We have seen the myth of Republican impregnability exploded time after time, in election after election, when our people were aroused and conscious of the issues. The sentiment is there, but it must be marshaled and organized into effective voting strength. Otherwise, we lose by default.

The test of our basic strength will come this fall, when the major issues of national policy will be subordinated to the local problems of our municipal campaigns. We should be thinking now, and working now, to make those local campaigns successful. We should be preparing now to demonstrate, when fall comes, that the Democratic Party is alert, alive, aggressive, ready, and able to translate public sentiment into victory at the polls. In the old days, a Democratic vote was a vote of protest, a wasted vote for candidates who could not win. That day is over. There is hardly a community in Pennsylvania that has not been carried by the Democratic Party at some time in recent years. There is hardly a community that could not be carried again. But the groundwork must be done now. If we are to have a triumphant Democratic Party next year, we must have a vigorous, courageous, active Democratic Party contesting every office in this year's local elections.

Last year the Republican leadership, for a brief moment, captured the allegiance of the American people. The very brevity of that departure, even though its extent made possible an overwhelming Republican victory, is proof of the enduring nature of the Democratic Party's strength. It is proof that the next election can be as much of a Democratic landslide as the last was a Republican landslide. It's our job, by work, by organization, by carrying the issues to the people, to make that possibility an actuality. The opportunity is there. We have only to grasp it.

Interior Department Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 26 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I appeared this morning before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations considering the Interior Department appropriation bill, and spoke regarding reclamation and western projects. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS OF HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON

I appear before this committee today realizing full well the heavy responsibility you carry in finding some means of reducing Federal expenditures in line with the declared policy of the Senate. It certainly is no easy task to pare appropriations and at the same time avoid crippling programs and services vital to the welfare of the Nation.

I appear here today to urge upon you full restoration of certain funds cut by the House in the Department of the Interior budget. I will speak directly to specific items in that budget later in my remarks.

The fact that I concentrate on a few specific items does not indicate in any way that by silence I approve the cuts made by the House in comparable items in other States or in other parts of the Department budget.

First, may I make a few general observations. It has been asserted by some witnesses appearing before your committee that the cuts made by the House were not motivated by any East-West competition for industrial development, nor by any political considerations, nor as the result of pressures exerted upon the House committee and the Congress by the private power interests. I sincerely hope this is true—because, considered on the merits alone, considered on a purely economic and social basis, I am convinced this committee will reach a conclusion satisfactory to the Nation as a whole, and that your conclusion will be restoration of the funds cut by the House, particularly in the Bureau of Reclamation.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The House administered a 40-percent cut in the funds requested by the Bureau of Reclamation for construction of projects in the West. In round numbers, the Bureau requested $175,000,000 of new funds; the House cut this to $105,000,000.

I gather the distinct impression from perusal of the House hearings, from the debate on the floor of the House, and from conversation with certain House Members, that the House committee intended to give the Bureau approximately $141,000,000 unencumbered funds for its 1948 program. On the floor about $5,000,000 was added. Because of the confusion, however, over unexpended and unobligated funds, the House actually provided only $105,000,000—$70,000,000 less than the budget request and $41,000,000 less than the House apparently thought it was providing.

Because this distinction between unexpended and unobligated funds is so important, I wish to dwell on the point for a moment.

The House adopted the attitude that, because a substantial part of the 1947 appropriation would be spent in 1948, the budget request for 1948 could logically be reduced by an amount equal to this expenditure. This, of course, is fallacious reasoning. It is always true of big construction jobs such as the Columbia Basin that obligations for materials and services created in the year 1947, for example, are actually spent in part in 1948, some in 1949, and perhaps even some in 1950. In this respect, Columbia Basin is like any going business concern. A going business is not able to close out all of its accounts receivable, accounts payable, and inventories on January 1. Accounts payable created in 1946 for merchandise to be delivered in 1947 represent a contractual obligation which the company must meet, and

to the extent of such obligations its funds are not available for new enterprises or activities. The mere fact that there will be an unexpended balance in the Bonneville and Coulee appropriations on July 1 does not mean that these funds are available to the Bureau of Reclamation or Bonneville Power Administration for new construction, purchase of equipment, or services. If the work on these projects is to go forward in a smooth and economic manner, the Congress must provide the appropriations sufficiently far in advance of the date the equipment is to be delivered, services are to be performed, and contracts are to be let to permit the agency in charge to carry forward on a planned basis. To do otherwise is to deny the agency in charge the opportunity to perform the efficient job we would expect of a going business concern. I am sure the committee realizes the fallacy in the House reasoning in this regard.

To summarize my testimony on this point: The House thought it was making $146,000,000 of unencumbered funds available to the Bureau for construction purposes in 1948. Because of the confusion over unexpended and unobligated balances, however, it actually provided only $105,000,000. To carry out the apparent intent of the House, therefore, inadequate as it is, your committee must raise the Bureau's over-all appropriation $41,000,000.

RATE OF PROGRESS ON RIVER PROJECTS

I would like now to discuss briefly the rate at which we, as a Nation, should proceed in reclaiming the lands and harnessing the rivers of the West. I regret, Mr. Chairman, that I haven't been able to attend all of these hearings personally—as I think them among the most important that will be held this session. I have adopted the next best alternative, however—having a member of my staff sit in for me From time to time throughout the hearings, the question of rate of progress has been raised.

I understand that on Wednesday this question received considerable attention, and that the chairman, referring to a wall chart, pointed out that up to 1934 approximately $200,000,000 had been spent by the Federal Government on western reclamation projects, whereas between 1934 and 1947 this was increased to about $1,000,000,000. The chairman and members of the committee were rightfully proud of this outstanding progress. I'm sure the committee will not accuse me of bringing politics into this discussion if I point out that this does represent an outstanding achievement—of the present minority in the Congress—ably assisted, of course, by the present majority.

Speaking specifically to the rate of progress—I think we can proceed too slowly with the construction of these western developments, just as we could proceed too fast. The great danger, however, is on the side of proceeding too slowly. Once a project is authorized by the Congress and construction begins, it is false economy to delay completion provided men, machines, and materials are available to do the work. It is false economy, first, because interest on the funds invested continues to accrue and must be paid by the Federal Government; second, repayment to the Federal Treasury of principal and interest is delayed; third, income to users of water and power is lost; fourth, the market for consumer and capital goods created by this income is not provided; and fifth, the additional taxes on the wealth created are lost to local, State, and Federal governments. In addition, there are hidden losses sustained on the jobs themselves through deterioration of work in progress and the loss of momentum if it becomes necessary, through inadequate appropriations, to slow down contractors or to cancel contracts entirely.

There is an optimum rate at which projects under construction should be carried forward. It seems to me that this committee must rely heavily upon the expert testimony of the Bureau of Reclamation in determining what that optimum rate is. These men know construction work, they know the sectional needs for power and water, and they are—and I think this important for us to remember—they are a part of the same Government of the United States in which you and I as Senators are privileged to serve.

Now, as to new projects authorized by the Congress but not yet under construction: In my mind these projects fall into two categories—those which are an integral part of a development already constructed or under construction and upon which the latter are immediately dependent for the realization of their full potential, and those which though a part of a broad-gage development are not immediately required to supplement existing works.

In the first category, I would place the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana. Immediate construction of that dam is essential not only to meet power demands in Montana but also to increase firm power at Grand Coulee and Bonneville dams. Here again, I think the committee must rely heavily upon experts in the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, and experts it may employ, to get reliable answers to the question: "Is this power needed now?" and "Is this the best way to meet that need?" My own strong conviction is that the need for power in the Northwest is critical, that the Bureau's program, including construction of transmission lines and substations, is the best way to get it, and that the need must be met on schedule.

PAY-OUT PERIOD—FEASIBILITY OF PROJECTS

Many times during the course of your hearings the question has been raised: Shouldn't we postpone these projects because of the increase in construction costs which has occurred since 1940? To my mind the answer to this question is to be found in the answer to another question, namely: Even with these additional construction costs is the project still feasible? In other words, will the investment of the Federal Government be returned to the Federal Treasury by water and power users? To the best of my knowledge, present power rates charged by the Bonneville Power Administration and the payments allocated to water users will amortize the entire investment by the year 2017 and in addition will create a surplus of approximately $70,000,000—taking into account increased costs. This then should be the controlling factor in any question of postponing construction and installation of facilities.

The pay-out period on these projects extends over a span of 50 years. Some of those years will undoubtedly be lean, but it's the average level of prosperity that determines the final answer to financial feasibility.

Apropos of this argument, I think the committee and the Congress can obtain some useful comparisons by examining what businessmen in the Nation are doing by way of investment during this period of high prices. Business, like Government, must consider the financial feasibility of the projects it undertakes. May I give you a few figures which indicate that business is not postponing sound investments because of present costs. I can assure the committee that the figures I now quote are thoroughly reliable because they were cited in hearings on the tax bill by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee—the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. In 1938, earnings plowed back by businessmen totaled $11,000,000,000; in 1941, $19,000,000,000; in 1945, $9,100,000,000; but in 1946, $32,100,000,000. I do not know how much of this staggering total was invested in capital goods and construction, but certainly a substantial portion of it. The point is, this committee will not be too severely criticized if it follows that lead by investing adequate appropriations in western self-liquidating and wealth-creating projects.

FORCE ACCOUNT

Just a few words about funds for force account. Numerous witnesses have testified to the imperative nature of such funds. I merely wish to express the hope that this committee will remove the shackles placed upon the Bureau of Reclamation and upon Bonneville Power Administration by the House when it wrote into the bill prohibition against the use of funds for this purpose.

TRANSFER OF PROJECT APPROPRIATIONS FROM THE RECLAMATION TO THE GENERAL FUND

The House transferred the appropriations for numerous projects from the general to the reclamation fund. Your committee has already heard ample testimony on this point. I simply want to remind you again that there are not sufficient moneys in the reclamation fund to meet the obligations against it created by this appropriation bill—particularly will this be true in the light of the restorations which I'm sure this committee will insist upon making.

The West asks no preferential treatment in requesting that Federal investments be made in projects which create new wealth and pay their bills in full.

Recent analysis shows how much Federal public power is expanding the Nation's taxable wealth. For instance, power development on the Columbia River not only is paying its own way and subsidizing irrigation through power revenues, but already it had resulted in contributions in taxes in excess of the total power investment of $280,000,000 by the end of 1946.

Turn to water resources, and our history shows that the Federal Government has invested some $5,500,000,000 in projects across the Nation. Approximately 4,000,000,000 of this amount was invested in the States east of the Mississippi River, without interest and without obligation for repayment.

Western States have received about $1,500,000,000 in like funds, about one billion of which must be fully repaid, a substantial part of that with interest.

Definite time schedules have been set up on authorized projects. It is imperative that they be adhered to, unless investment is to be written off as waste.

The action of the administration in placing a freeze order on reclamation funds appropriated for the current fiscal year undoubtedly raised questions in the minds of members of the Appropriations Committee both in the House and Senate.

It could logically be asked whether this was not clear indication that more money had been approved for the work than it was necessary to spend. Your committee has gone into this exhaustively, as I think it properly should.

In consequence, two facts should be eminently clear. Insofar as the unobligated balance in the Reclamation Bureau's construction fund is concerned—and I am now speaking as it affects the State of Washington—the total unobligated balance is $1,084,000, as shown by the estimates at this time.

Secondly, it should be kept in mind that we now are confronted with the necessity of adequate appropriation for the fiscal year ahead. Any question whether administrative action will interrupt these calculations must have been aswered to your satisfaction by the Chief Executive. I refer to the letter from the President to the chairman of this subcommittee, giving assurance that there

would be no necessity for imposing restrictions on funds for reclamation projects during the fiscal year ahead.

Failure to appropriate funds sufficient to meet the minimum schedules means that the time lost in bringing projects into production cannot be recovered. Work which has been started, such as on canals in the Columbia Basin, must be continued to avoid deterioration. Should men and the heavy equipment committed to those projects be dispersed, they can be reassembled only at additional cost. Meanwhile, the products which would have been produced are lost, and the taxable wealth in the period of delay is lost.

I assume that the members of this committee know that we have a power shortage in the Pacific Northwest. The effect on industry already is manifest.

I believe there is no question but that industry fully realizes the implications, and an expression to that effect recently was attributed to Mr. Earl Bunting, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, who was quoted in one of our newspapers as stating there should be restoration of the drastic cuts in Bonneville and Grand Coulee power projects. Mr. Bunting was quoted as stating that, since Government financing of power plants has shut off development of similar projects by private enterprise, the least the Government now can do is to see that they are completed. He went on to say, and I quote, "While the National Association of Manufacturers is clamoring for economy in Government expenditures, we believe that best can be accomplished by cutting down on spending for things that have gone forever. We are not opposing funds for such things as these dams."

I do not believe it is lost upon responsible newspapers either. Somewhat apart from the NAM statement, but driving directly toward the same objective, was an editorial of recent date in a Seattle daily newspaper pointing out that shortly before it had quoted a publication called the Electrical World. The latter publication was quoted as suggesting that, if Congress starved Federal power developments, private power companies would then be in a good position to come forward and take over these operations.

The Seattle publication went on to cite a current issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly as giving an even more detailed explanation of current tactics. The public utilities paper had pointed out that the plan of the House provides that the functions of the Power Division of the Interior Department would be wiped out entirely, and added that objections were made that this was using an appropriations bill to make changes in legislative policy. The public utilities paper went on to say that House leadership justifies its tactics thus:

"Assuming that the economy cuts throw out certain bureaus or divisions, that is the only way the present popularly elected majority in Congress can enforce its will against a Presidential veto supported by a close division in the somewhat less popularly representative Senate. In other words, specific legislation to wipe out such bureaus or provisions, as the majority of Congress might view as unnecessary or unjustified, would get nowhere as long as it is faced with a White House veto. But the President cannot veto an appropriation bill."

The Seattle newspaper summed up by stating, "This doesn't require any diagrams to make the purpose clear. There is a word for the type of warfare that hides and skulks because it is afraid to risk coming out into the open. Its name is sabotage." The emphasis on the word sabotage was theirs. If there is any quarrel with this interpretation, it should be pointed out that they are inclined to speak in plain terms, not unconscious that public utility districts have some 57,000 users or connections.

Nor is western newspaper sentiment isolated. An editorial in the New York Times for May 11 expressed gratification that the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system has been a profitable investment. It said that whatever may happen elsewhere in the world, the Northwest and the Nation will rely on the Columbia River and its tributaries where a potential of some 25,000,000 kilowatts remains to be developed. "There is more gold in the water of the Columbia than there is in any of the hills of the far West."

I do not wish to dwell on any comparison between western and eastern investment, but I cannot neglect to remind you that the Federal investment in the northeastern section of the United States in war plants alone totaled more than $10,000,000,000.

Reverting once again to the West, I find it equally unnecessary to underline the significance of the Tacoma agreement expressing the mutual conviction of private enterprise and public power. You are fully familiar with that and the fact that we have come a long way in the West.

National security reasons in themselves would make it incumbent upon us to assure that there is at all times a sufficient power reserve to meet emergencies. There is no need to dwell on the situation at the time of Pearl Harbor, other than to say that without our reserve of power in the Northwest, the history of the war in the Pacific would have been far different. The planes, ships, plutonium, and other matériel made possible by that grid of hydroelectric power contributed to an extent which can never be fully assessed.

This committee has been advised that the proposed funds were carefully trimmed to the essence before the requests reached the Congress. There is no doubt in my mind that in exercising its vital responsibility in examining the requests, this committee will be fully cognizant of the impending effect of a 45-percent reduction on the immediate economy of the 17 Western States and the proportionately disastrous loss to the Nation in its long-range results.

This committee is interested in itemized expenditures. That is as it should be. In my remaining time, I wish to highlight some of these results as they affect one of those States; my State of Washington.

The Columbia Basin construction program is spread over a 9-year period. The project would take an additional 30 years under the rate imposed by the House reduction. It would be the longest extension of any project, in total years, with the single exception of the 32-unit program for the Missouri Basin, which affects the States of Montana, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Wyoming.

The budget estimate for the project was $27,500,000. The amount approved by the House was $11,435,000. The reduction will bring the project to a halt. Hundreds of thousands of dollars will be completely wasted in expenditures for curtailing the work and making the necessary contractual adjustments. No irrigation water would be available and no new farms could be occupied by veteran-settlers for some 20 years. In addition, the reduced appropriations will delay the installation of generators at Grand Coulee Dam. Those generators are needed now to supply the existing market demand for power. Through delay, the Government will lose several millions of dollars in income from power revenues.

The estimate provided for planning work on seven projects in the State of Washington. The reduction in the item of general investigations would suspend all of these programs and would close the planning field office at Walla Walla. This would end the hopes of development of irrigated areas needed to balance the State's industrial growth and provide for an expanded population brought there by the war.

At Pullman, Wash., all of the pilot-plant activities of the Bureau of Mines would halt. Reduction in the experiment stations appropriation will reduce coal research at the Seattle experiment station to the small amount that can be done on $15,000 a year; an amount completely inadequate for research affecting the coal fields of the Pacific Northwest and Alaska.

We would be affected by funds insufficient to explore more than 25 of the 200 potential desposits of strategic metal ores now under consideration.

Extensive mapping programs in the Columbia and Missouri River basins would be curtailed to the point of ineffectiveness because of a cut of nearly 50 percent in geological survey.

In a period when more than 21,000,000 visitors are expected to visit the national parks, the park service would have one-half of the funds needed for trails and roads. It could not properly provide protection for parks and park monuments.

To withhold an item of $92,000 needed for determining the effect of impoundments on the salmon of the Columbia and Sacramento Rivers would endanger an industry with commercial value running into millions of dollars.

If the salmon are lost, there is grave danger that there may be no possible salvage from that destruction. I submit that this is a legacy that belongs to the Nation, and not to the State or region. This is one of the extractive industries we have leaned on so heavily in our Western progress.

Many sections of the Nation have exacted a tremendous toll from their extractive industries. We in the West have turned of necessity to these resources which are inexhaustible, and to the techniques necessary to develop them.

Reduction of $6,342,000 in funds for the Bonneville Power Administration would retard the construction program for 12 months at least, except for construction power for Federal dam sites.

This delay would hit homes, businesses, and industries on a wide area. Several millions of dollars already invested in equipment on order and planned for would remain dormant during the year which was to bring installation. This involves equipment for construction of major substations at Columbia, Snohomish, Chehalis, Olympia, Shelton, Port Angeles, and Cosmopolis, in the State of Washington.

The requirements of at least 30 priority and industrial customers could not be met because the funds were eliminated. This is in addition to substation equipment for some 10 preferred customers which could not be installed at all.

The time of the committee does not permit a more detailed accounting of the disruption in prospect under the terms of the curtailment of funds for the Department.

One section of our State proudly made payment—final and full payment—on a Federal loan that made possible the start of irrigation of 24,000 arid acres near Yakima. The project started 42 years ago and the final payment was made recently.

In little more than three decades that land produced an abundant crop worth $160,000,000, 44 times the amount of the loan for construction.

The West believes that is good business for all of the people of the Nation.

Since the committee is interested in specifics, I wish to conclude my statement by

enumerating specific appropriations for projects in the State of Washington which should be incorporated by your committee.

The figures I read to you now reflect the status of funds for Columbia Basin and Bonneville projects for 1947; the amount they spent last year, the amount provided by House action, the commitments under contract for 1948 and the amount which, in my judgment, the committee should restore.

The figures will also clarify some of the misunderstanding as to the availability of funds previously appropriated and carried over. (See estimates below.)

We believe the present request is justified as a business proposition. We shall be content if the committee views it solely in that light.

I have attempted to confine this to exact terms in the interests of brevity and your time. In conclusion, however, I wish to emphasize my conviction that we are dealing with more than an appropriation measure as such. By that, I mean that there is a broad issue at stake, and that it must be resolved by a determination of policy in shaping the economy of this Nation. I am impressed, as I think you must have been, by a letter written to Senator WHERRY by Dr. Wilson Compton, president of the State College of Washington, on May 15 of this year. He stated he is not in politics and that he has no financial interest in any public utility; that he is simply a university president with a background, as you know, of considerable business experience and a better-than-ordinary opportunity to appraise the regional and national significance of the West's reclamation development. I refer to him as an eminent American of whom we are proud. He put the issue in eloquent terms, and I wish to quote these words.

"You have been told," he wrote, "that the present power production on the Columbia River of about 1,500,000 kilowatts compares to the 3,000,000 kilowatts determined to be required by 1952 and about 25,000,000 kilowatts as the ultimate potential power, economically recoverable from the entire Columbia River system, a potential which, if realized, will eventually convert the Pacific Northwest into a gateway to the Orient comparable to our Northeastern and New England States as the familiar principal American gateway to Europe. This will happen probably 100 years after you and I are off the scene. But it will happen, and if you believe in the possibility or even the hope of permanent peace in the Pacific, you will want it to happen and will want to help it to happen.

"I am not taking your time or mine to recite the facts which from the standpoint of Federal finance warrant the statement that these power developments, with their corollaries of irrigation and inland navigation, will pay their own way. I am familiar with these facts, and I know that there is no way of impeaching the general assertion that these projects will 'pay out.' As to the extent of national public financial gain in the accompanying increase in industry, commerce, and employment, there is, of course, greater room for difference of opinion."

And Dr. Compton goes on to say, "My own opinion—and I am classed as a conservative optimist—is that under favorable circumstances, based on power development ahead of the need, not lagging behind it, the Pacific Northwest in my lifetime will have a population of between ten and fifteen million; and if you are in as good health as you were the last time I saw you, my guess is that you, too, will see it.

"But that depends on what Congress does, beginning now, and that depends a great deal more on what you do than on what I say. I hope you and your colleagues are able to take a long view as well as a short one."

Estimates of requirements for Bureau of Reclamation construction program (Columbia Basin project, State of Washington) for 1948, compared to amounts provided in House bill

Unexpended balance, June 30, 1947	$6,701,700
Accounts due and payable for work prior to June 30, 1947	5,617,700
Unobligated balance, July 1, 1947	1,084,000
President's request for fiscal 1948	27,500,000
House appropriation	11,435,000
Total available if House action stands	[1] 12,519,000
Commitments under contract for fiscal 1948	[2] 25,000,000
Spent last year	29,100,000
Total available if all funds restored	28,584,000

[1] House contends $17,052,700.

[2] This figure indicates that if the House figure prevails, the Bureau will lack $12,500,000 of being able to meet commitments for 1948 already made.

Estimates of construction requirements for 1948 (Bonneville Power Administration, State of Washington), compared to amounts provided in House bill

Total unexpended balance, June 30, 1947	$11,492,149
Total unobligated balance, June 30, 1947	None
House allowance	3,049,800
Amount spent, 1947	5,152,580
Amount needed, 1948 [1]	17,086,100
Amount recommended, 1948 [1]	17,086,100

[1] Budgeted on obligation basis, not on cash expenditure basis.

Jefferson Day Address by Harold E. Stassen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on May 21, 1947, at the city of Jefferson, Iowa, former Gov. Harold Stassen, of Minnesota, delivered an address at the annual community celebration, sponsored by the American Legion. The address was also broadcast over a Midwest radio network. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Excellency Governor Blue, Commander Halden, fellow Legionnaires, friends of Iowa, it is a thrilling and invigorating experience to drive down through the green growing fields and neat farmsteads of Iowa in this month of May. I bring you a friendly salute from your Minnesota neighbors to the north. I also bring you warm personal greetings as a fellow mid-westerner who will never forget his boyhood on the farm.

My recent observations abroad move me to comment that we must be certain that the farms of America in the years ahead continue to be privately owned on a family-sized basis, privately owned by their actual operators to the greatest possible extent, and that we avoid both the evils of Government-ownership and the evils of huge, centralized private ownership of the agricultural territories of America.

I commend the American Legion of Jefferson and the people of this community for this outstanding annual community celebration and for your colorful emphasis upon the United Nations in your excellent parade. I respond with pleasure to your invitation to meet with you and to speak to you. Let us discuss very frankly some of the great issues of our time, the decisions on which will directly affect the future happiness and well-being of every farm in Iowa, of every home in America.

Our joint objectives in America are clear. We seek for ourselves and for our children future well-being, and individual liberty and peace. We recognize the dangers of economic crashes and the dangers of international conflict.

We want never again to experience the black days of agriculture of the 1930's with 18-cent corn, 3-cent hogs, 32-cent wheat, and with every courthouse step a stage for the sad scenes of mortgage foreclosures.

We want never again the long lines of unemployed shuffling to the relief windows for a subsistence grocery order.

We want never again a multitude of businessmen closing their doors dejectedly meeting their creditors in bankruptcy court.

And above all we want never again to see millions of our young men leave our farms and homes to face, and to fall before, the bullets and bombs of war.

Clearly on these objectives we are united in solid strength. But when we come to consider the measures and means by which we shall attain our united objectives, we hear many diverse proposals. We also note a considerable silence and evasion. But out of an open discussion constructively carried on before the people as a whole, I am confident that we will arrive at better answers than any one man or small group of men can propose. We will demonstrate once again the value of a representative government of free citizens.

It is in this spirit that I talk with you tonight. I do not say here are the final answers, but I submit some of my thinking upon the subject, that out of the differing and amending we might stimulate a fruitful search for the best course for America to follow in the years immediately ahead.

Everyone in America now realizes that we are not concerned with two separate sets of policies, the one foreign and the other domestic, that we do not have two compartmentalized problems, the one—our world relationships and the other our internal success—but rather that the two are completely interwoven and constitute one interrelated problem for decision. If anyone had any doubt of this it would certainly be dispelled if he went abroad and heard over there the persistent searchings and questions as to our internal American economic future by leaders in many countries of many different viewpoints and forms of government—from Russia's Stalin and from England's Churchill, from Czechoslovakia's Benes and from France's Ramadier. Equally is this interlocking of domestic and foreign policy clear when we confer with the business leadership in America and note the degree to which analysis hereof conditions abroad affects plans at home for production and employment, for building and investment.

In considering these future policy decisions of ours in America I believe we can best understand each other if we sharpen up our discussion on a basis most easily understood. There are two extremes advocated in

America as to all major phases of our interrelated foreign and domestic policy. And with reference to the foreign policy phases in particular, one extreme of policy is currently advocated with greatest attention by Mr. Henry Wallace, now the editor of the New Republic magazine. The other extreme is persistently presented most powerfully by Mr. Robert McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune. One is a Democrat, the other a Republican. I refer to them specifically not to personally attack them, for they both have and must have the complete right to speak and publish their views and I give each of them and their supporters full credit for sincerity. But if we are to consider these questions of vital and far-reaching importance we must clearly characterize our positions in a manner that all may understand.

Thus, at this early stage of my address, I say distinctly and definitely that I reject for America both the Wallace doctrine and the McCormick doctrine. I reject both extremes.

As I see it, the Wallace doctrine would make of America a nation of fellow travelers going down the wrong road. It would place America hand in hand with those elements in Europe who would decrease individual economic freedom and would subsequently dim other human liberties. It would dissipate our domestic assets, centralize our economic authority in America, and bring about lower and lower production at home. It would repeat the errors of appeasement of the 1930's. It would discourage in other lands the stalwart believers in true liberty and take us away from the vigorous and dynamic quality of a people's capitalism. America should never adopt the Wallace doctrine.

The McCormick doctrine, on the other hand, would make of America a nation of cold-hearted misers passing by on the other side. It, too, in its isolation, would lead to tragic results for our country. It would make us hated around the globe. It would set the world against us. It would lead us to boom and to bust and finally to a defensive war. It would make us a temporary pleasure ship in the path of a storm of despair. America should never adopt the McCormick doctrine.

There is a natural attempt of those who follow either one of these two doctrines to attempt to throw all who disagree with them over in the extreme opposite camp under the opposing banner. But it is tremendously important that we realize that the choice is not between these extremes.

In between is a very broad area in which I am optimistic that we can find the course of a strong and wise and humanitarian world policy. It must be a policy that seeks peace and plenty and freedom for ourselves and for others. We must become a nation of courageous pioneers blazing the postwar world trail toward peace and plenty and freedom. We must recognize that these three—peace and plenty and freedom—are indivisible.

You cannot have lasting peace if you have shortages, scarcities, and want. You cannot have lasting peace when men are oppressed and subjugated and enslaved.

You cannot have plenty unless you have the very high production that stems from individual freedom—economic, social, and political—and from the resourcefulness that arises with personal initiative, and from broad practices of open trade.

You cannot have plenty when your resources and your production are dissipated by war.

And equally, you cannot have freedom—individual fredom—of men and women—economic, social, political, and religious—unless you have peace. You cannot have individual human freedom under conditions of war, or of destitution, or of want.

Some will say that if these three are tied together they constitute a hopeless circle and progress is impossible. These are the same people who repeat the insidious whispers that war is inevitable, that economic crashes are unavoidable. They are the distant descendants of those who said in 1620 that it was inevitable that the good ship *Mayflower* would never get across the Atlantic Ocean. They are the remote echoes of those who said in 1787 that the Thirteen American Colonies would never succeed as a United States. They are the disciples of gloom who are present in every generation and who always must be rebuked if there is to be progress in human welfare.

These three goals, far from being a hopeless circle, present the necessity and opportunity of a joint and balanced and constructive movement, admittedly against great obstacles, for a measure of achievement of all three.

I would not attempt to present a complete and final program of the immediate steps to be taken toward these three goals, and to avoid both of the extremes. The specifications of such a program, which our people can understand and will support in unity, should be established by an outstanding volunteer commission of men, representing both political parties, and including leaders of business and labor and agriculture and education and science, appointed by the President with the advice of the Senate, joining together in extensive discussion and analysis.

Above all our entire approach to the world-wide and domestic situation now after the war must be constructive and not negative. We must seek to build up and not merely to block or contain or oppose. We must also think in big terms for the winning of this postwar struggle for peace and plenty and freedom, in terms just as big as those in which we thought when we faced the task of winning a world war on the opposite sides of the two great oceans.

I believe that for the next 10 years we should devote 10 percent of our total national production of goods and food (not of our gross national product) to building for world-wide peace and plenty and freedom. It should not be a sharpster lending program. It should not be a light-headed, give-away program. It should be a practical, sound, long-visioned, businesslike approach to the situation that exists in the world today, and to what we can foresee in the years ahead.

We should request the views of the Economic Council of the United Nations as to the manner in which we conduct this production and should welcome their continuing advice. But we must ourselves, on a bipartisan basis actually administer the program and control the rate and type of production supplied, so as to safeguard against inflationary effects at home or diversion from our purposes abroad.

We should also require that each government that joins with us gives steady and unwavering support to the United Nations organization and its high objectives.

This production should not be scattered, or in fits and starts and hand-outs to those who cry "wolf" or "Communist" the loudest. It should be based on a careful, world-wide evaluation of the best long-term basis on which we can rebuild after the war. We should not expect repayment in dollars or in manufactured goods, because the rest of the world cannot repay in either one of them, and we do not need either one of them.

We should expect repayments of the kinds and types that the rest of the world is capable of giving and that we need. We should expect long-term agreements for the fair access to raw materials in other parts of the world and a current availability of major quantities of those minerals and other raw materials so that we do not further dissipate our own natural resources in this tremendous productive effort.

We should expect agreements that the governments with which we work will not move farther away from individual economic freedom and will not go down the sad trail of increasing nationalization or socialization or government ownership, which would result in lower production for them, would negative the constructive efforts we are making, and would make more difficult our own free economic future.

We should expect that our governmental representatives, our private citizens, and our press and radio without censorship, should be able to visit any area that is participating in our production for peace program.

We should expect that they will not discriminate in any way against our citizens and that they will not tax our private capital at a rate discriminatory in comparison to domestic capital and will not expropriate without just compensation.

We should expect that others in the program will not indulge in a practice of exploitation of dependent peoples that would run directly contra to our basic long-term objectives.

We will also need to develop a code of the standard of conduct for our own private capital when it is invested abroad, based upon the best records of American capital in past years. We must not follow the pattern of some of the old instances of grasping imperialism.

We must likewise make it clear that we do approve of the correction of the evils in a free economy and in private capitalism, of the initiation of land reforms where there are great concentrations of land, of restrictions against monopolies and trusts and cartels, of minimum wages for workers, of the rights of free workmen, and of the decentralization of power both private and governmental. We must also emphasize the need of stability in representative party government and of serious weakness of the fragmentation of political action in multiple parties with a government that precariously perches for its continuity on the day-to-day whim of a number of small minority groups.

We must not impose our programs upon others; it must not be what we say should be done but what both agree is for the sound economic future of their countries, and ours, and the world.

Such a program should not include under any circumstances arms or munitions for others. Any exceptional instances, and they should be rare, of limited supply of minimum arms for stability of other nations, should be separately considered with complete individual debate in Congress and should not be injected into the production-for-peace program.

Such a program should not be directed against anyone. Its whole emphasis should be positive and affirmative with the objectives of progress of all mankind and of our own future peace and prosperity.

Coupled with the maintenance of a modern American defense force, and with sound domestic measures, including a new national labor policy, economy in the domestic activities of government and encouragement to small new business at home, we can well afford such a program. In fact we cannot afford not to engage in such a program.

Properly carried out it would be one of the greatest single assurances against depression or economic crises in America. Properly carried out it would be one of the greatest safeguards against a descending spiral of regimented economy, lower production, want and misery and suffering around the globe.

It must have its priority list of projects carefully worked out. I believe that No. 1 on that priority list would need to be the redevelopment of the Ruhr area in Germany

to get more coal out of the ground so as to make it possible for the industries of the rest of Europe to get under way. Without coal, factories closed, schools closed, churches closed, and the people half froze throughout Europe this past desperate winter. This coal production is now inexcusably low, at only about 40 percent of prewar. It is a problem that is not caused by any failure to agree on the over-all peace treaty for all of Germany. It rests entirely within the scope of agreements between the British and ourselves and the proper use of our own productive resources. Ruhr coal is the keystone to a healthy Europe. The Ruhr should be redeveloped under private ownership without monopolies or cartels. It should not be socialized. Former Nazis should be barred from ownership. Provision must be made for incentives to produce for workers and managers and owners. Capital from other countries should be permitted, but strict limitations must be placed upon its extent and its terms. The long-term governmental supervision should be provided by the United Nations through its Economic and Social Council, which acts without vetoes, and without complete detachment from Germany.

Second in priority should be the encouragement of the Belgian, Netherlands, and Luxemburg customs and economic union to accelerate this determined and desirable development of a free economy for 18,000,000 industrious people.

Third in priority should be the agreement with England of the necessary steps and agreements for their long-term sound future as a free economy. We should not postpone a frank and friendly analysis with England of both the emergency and long-term aspects of their situation arising from the extreme sacrifices and losses in the war.

A dozen other projects should follow, the order determined by careful study by the outstanding men of our country on a bipartisan open basis.

These are sweeping proposals that I have made this evening. I have made them not as Republican proposals, but rather in a desire to see a truly American doctrine developed after this war that is worthy of the strength and inspiration of the dynamic ideas, the powerful position, and the great stake of America.

I am convinced that the people of our country know we are facing a situation that cannot be met by small programs, nor by extreme impractical measures, nor by drifting. The people want to know how their leadership appraises the world situation, and after frank discussion, the people will decide.

I welcome disagreement and criticism openly expressed. I suggest that it take the form of including definite counter proposals for the future long-term policy of America.

Let me make it crystal clear that I recognize in full the tremendous difficulties in the postwar world. I do not underestimate the clash of ideologies, the depth of misunderstandings, the thickness of suspicion, the bitterness of hatreds. I realize the size of the task of obtaining agreement and action on so broad a program in America. But what I propose is not vague or hazily idealistic or a dream. It is a practical, hardheaded, businesslike, sound approach to the situation in which we find ourselves. The long-term cost will be less than the alternative cost of the negative current patchwork and partially misdirected loan approach with huge armaments and unemployment and economic instability.

The obstacles are not grounds for dismay and inaction. This is not a time for timidity, or evasion, or delay. This is a time for courage, for frankness, for action.

I have great faith. I have great faith in the people of America. I have great faith that we can win a future of peace and of plenty and of freedom for America and for mankind.

In Memory of Hon. Fred Bradley

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANKLIN J. MALONEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1947

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, for the few months that I was privileged to know the Honorable FRED BRADLEY, as one of his committee members, I came in almost daily contact with him and soon learned that he had all the qualities of a great chairman. His intimate knowledge of the committee's problems appeared limitless. His entire life was devoted to the United States merchant marine, and his great desire was to see our merchant marine second to none. In spite of the long hours spent in the committee work, he was always willing to speak on merchant-marine subjects at any function. He supported his views courageously and with true sincerity, and all shipping men with whom he came in contact held him in the highest esteem.

His entire committee was devoted to him and was impressed with his fairness. He was more than a chairman of a committee; he was really a friend of each member. He was ready to listen to suggestions and often encouraged the members to follow through with their suggestions.

Words are inadequate to express my feelings on the passing of this real friend, and I shall ever cherish the memory of my happy associations with him.

The Disposition of Surplus Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, by strange coincidence just at the time the Congress began the consideration of the Agriculture appropriations bill there appeared a series of articles and pictures all over the country condemning the potato-disposal program. This publicity was so presented as to give the very definite impression that farmers were charging consumers unfair prices and that the Department of Agriculture was conniving with farmers to keep needed food away from hungry people. These implications simply are not true. The facts are that the American people at the beginning of 1947 spent only 19 percent of their income for food, whereas 20 years ago they spent 50 percent more of their income for the same food. The facts are that these potatoes are available to any charity or relief organization—absolutely free.

The facts are that American farmers are supplying more food for American urban dwellers, in return for less hours of work on the part of the urban citizens than was ever done in any country in all the history of the world.

Had it not been for the circumstance of timing and the continued repetition of these articles, I would have dismissed them as a part of the continuing program of abuse of farmers, but coming at the time they do I cannot but feel that they are intended to influence the action of the House on the pending appropriation bill. I have, therefore, sought to secure the facts about the potato program. I submit them for the record that all may know. I do not contend that the program is ideal. On the contrary, I hope they will be able to develop a better program but, until we do, I think it is but fair that we know all the facts before we criticize the present program.

I have today been advised by the Department of Agriculture that any citizen of the United States can buy potatoes similar to the ones that were destroyed in Alabama for the total price of $5 per carload f. o. b. if he will but give adequate assurance that the potatoes will be used for production of starch or alcohol.

If he will agree to export the potatoes he can have them at 4 cents per hundredweight. If he wants to use them for relief or for charitable purposes there will be absolutely no charge. The trouble is that the potatoes are actually not worth shipping either to the starving people of Europe or to the processing plants of the United States. The Department of Agriculture has tried to sell or give away these potatoes without success. To keep them longer but adds to the storage costs. To try to ship them to Europe now that the warm weather has set in will require refrigeration, and the cost per unit of food will be greater with free potatoes than it will with wheat at $3 per bushel.

I here and now offer these potatoes at the afore-mentioned price to all who are disposed to charge that they are being wasted.

Under what is known as the Steagall amendment, farmers are promised price support on many important agricultural commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity for two full calendar years after the formal declaration of the end of hostilities. Potatoes are one of the Steagall commodities.

Following 1945, when there was considerable difficulty in disposing of the third largest potato crop on record, the Department in 1946 ran into full-scale problems in handling an even larger crop, despite efforts to keep the crop within the bounds of effective demand. Disposal efforts—after all measures had been taken to handle the crop in regular distribution channels—included distribution through the school-lunch program, special export programs, diversion to livestock feed and industrial use. Even though every conceivable step was taken by the Department to find use for the surplus potatoes, the result of overproduction was waste of a portion of the crop and consequent cost to the Government. Following is a summary of the various steps taken to handle the 1946 crop.

Despite lowered production goals for 1946, a combination of many factors—the use of better seed, the employment of new and improved insecticides, and ideal growing conditions throughout the Nation—produced a record potato crop of nearly 475,000,000 bushels. This was estimated to be from nearly ninety to one hundred million bushels in excess of the 378,000,000-bushel production goal and 50,000,000 bushels above the large 1945 output of 425,000,000 bushels.

The Department of Agriculture recognized early in the year that a bumper crop would be harvested and made immediate preparations to assist all branches of the distributive food trades in moving these potatoes through normal channels of distribution into human consumption. From the outset of the problem in 1946, the Department cooperated fully with the food industry in moving potatoes. This industry-Government cooperation is estimated to have resulted in a substantial increase in consumption of potatoes during at least part of the year.

But as the potato harvest progressed northward from the early producing Southern States, it became impossible for normal food-distribution channels to handle the enormous potato supplies. The Department followed an aggressive and continuing program of moving potatoes into its school-lunch program and to charitable institutions. To these outlets potatoes were furnished free, as in past years. During the last year, nearly 3,000,000 bushels of potatoes were so utilized.

Every effort was made to get these potatoes to hungry people abroad. They were offered at nearly token prices—as low as 4 cents per 100 pounds—for relief feeding abroad. In addition, a subsidy program was set up under which private exporters were able to send potatoes to South America and the Philippines, as well as other countries. By May of 1947 about 10,500,000 bushels—which was more than 10 percent of the total surplus—had been exported to points as widely separated as Italy and Korea, Germany, and China.

When outlets to human consumption became clogged, the Department pressed a program of diverting surplus potatoes to livestock feed, so that the potatoes would eventually take their place in the form of meat and milk in the human diet. Potatoes for use as livestock feed, for feeding dairy cattle, and for fattening beef cattle and hogs were made available at prices that ranged from 20 cents per hundredweight f. o. b. at country shipping points to a penny a hundredweight. Through this program the Department moved approximately 11,000,000 bushels of potatoes.

The Department, in its efforts to find a practical utilization for the potatoes, also made another estimated 10,500,000 bushels available to starch mills manufacturing starch for use both in the United States and abroad.

The greatest diversion of potatoes that otherwise would have been completely wasted was to the distillers of beverage and industrial alcohol. Into these outlets the Department moved around 30,000,000 bushels of potatoes.

Thus, by exploiting diversion outlets to the fullest possible extent, the Department was able to find effective use for nearly 65,000,000 bushels of the approximately ninety-to-one-hundred-million-bushel surplus.

The Department believes, according to preliminary figures, that in the course of handling this all-time record crop of potatoes there was a resulting waste of something like 22,000,000 bushels. Roughly, this is about what Department officials had estimated earlier as a probable figure on waste and shrinkage. In view of the size of the crop, it was believed that no practical use could be found for some 20 percent of the surplus potatoes. Every effort was made, however, to keep this waste and shrinkage to a minimum and to confine it to low-grade and inferior-quality potatoes, which customarily would encounter difficulties in finding a market.

The over-all cost to the Government under the mandatory support program has been estimated at $100,000,000. Of this amount the Department will recover about $20,000,000, leaving a net cost to the Government of approximately $80,000,000.

Recognizing that a combination of better cultural practices and a pronounced shift of potato acreage from low- to high-producing areas promised continued high yields per acre, the Department tightened its potato program for 1947.

The program called for a reduction in national acreage from 2,669,800 to 2,517,000 acres and set up acreage quotas within which potato growers must remain in order to be eligible for price support. This was done after a study of data that revealed yields per acre has been increasing at a more rapid rate than had been earlier estimated—at a time when potato acreage has been declining nationally. The 1947 goal in production is 375,000,000 bushels.

Another significant factor is that per capita consumption of potatoes has been declining as national food habits turned from heavy breakfasts and the potato at other meals competed with other vegetables readily made available both through better transportation facilities and the avenue of processed foods.

The 1947 potato price-support program emphasizes further that removal of potatoes from food channels will be limited insofar as possible to the lower-grade and inferior quality potatoes which growers have historically found difficulty in marketing. This will be accomplished by Government purchase of lower grades, and through marketing agreements and orders, and will result in the consumer obtaining better quality potatoes.

As distribution in commercial channels fails to handle all marketable potatoes, the Department will continue, under the 1947 program, to make available for school lunch, for charitable institutions and organizations, all the potatoes these outlets can handle. These potatoes will be furnished free.

Export operations will also continue to the extent that supplies warrant such operations, as will diversion to stock feed and manufacturing plants.

Farmers generally seem to be staying within their 1947 acreage goals, according to reports up to this time. It is anticipated that there may be, however, some local surpluses in the early and intermediate potato-producing areas, due to adverse spring weather. Because of delaying weather, potato harvests in these areas may tend to "bunch up" and overlap this year, instead of coming on in an orderly area-by-area manner.

One such circumstance has been encountered this month in Alabama. There a supply of about 28,500 bushels of early potatoes beyond usual needs developed. Of this amount, 21,000 bushels were distributed to school lunch and institutions. For the others, No. 2 and B grade potatoes, every avenue of possible practical use was explored. It was determined that there were no dehydration facilities available and that farmers with good pasture did not wish to experiment with feeding these potatoes to their livestock. The potatoes are thin-skinned and of such high water content that export was not feasible. Freight charges precluded sending these potatoes north for use in starch plants. Alcohol plants were not interested in so small an amount of potatoes—their use of potatoes is predicated upon a continuing supply.

All avenues of practical disposition having been explored and no practical use being found for the 7,500 bushels of potatoes remaining, there was no recourse but to dump them. This ultimate, and seemingly wasteful, disposition of the smaller portion of the local surplus of Alabama potatoes is a practice historically followed by all potato producers. When the producer finds his market glutted, he ordinarily brings to market his best potatoes and abandons the lower grades, frequently leaving them in the ground to save the labor cost.

In other areas, as in Alabama, every effort will be made to get 1947 crop potatoes into human consumption. Following that, every avenue through which the potatoes may be put to some practical use, for stock feed or manufactured products, will be explored before a single bushel of potatoes is dumped. The only potatoes that will be so disposed of, if that is the only recourse, will be potatoes of low grade and inferior quality which would not ordinarily appear in food channels.

Of course, all of us wish that it were possible to hold the farmers' price up to a fair level and at the same time to let the consumer buy his potatoes at less than cost, but so far no one has been able to suggest any way of doing this except for the Government to take all the loss—in other words, for the Government to subsidize the consumers. Actually the consumer is today getting his potatoes for less than parity—the support price is only 90 percent of what has been recognized as a fair price. Surely, it will not be contended that the Government should subsidize the price to a lower level, or that the consumer is entitled to get his food at less than 90 percent of a fair price. But that is what would result if the price of potatoes were allowed to fall, and, of course, everyone knows

that without a further subsidy which this Congress is not going to pay, that is what would happen if these surplus potatoes were put into the channels of trade.

All farmers ask is a living wage. This program gives him 90 percent of a living wage. Even the most violent anti-labor partisans admit that a man has a right to quit work when he does not get a living wage. The farmer has already performed his labor. Now, if his product is not sold it has the same effect on our economy as does the refusal of the miners' union to dig coal, or the refusal of the automobile workers to make automobiles. None of us like strikes, but who would criticize if workers struck for the minimum wage fixed by law. These potato farmers are now only getting 90 percent of the living price of farmers' minimum wage fixed by the same Government.

By all means, let us try to work out a better plan for handling farm surpluses, but until we do let us at least carry out the promises Congress made when we passed the Steagall amendment. Let us make good our word, the word of our Government. Let us stop this weasel talk every time it comes to carrying out our promises to support farm prices. If you do not like the way the Department is supporting prices, change the law—you wrote the law under which the Department acts and you prescribed the method of supporting prices. I do not care how you do it—but I do want it done. I do not have a bushel of potatoes grown for marketing in my district, but the whole question of the good faith of our Government is at stake; and as for those who say that the Department should use these potatoes for various purposes, the opportunity is yours. If you really believe that somebody can use them, why do you not try? I repeat the offer—$5 per carload for industrial purposes.

I would like to respectfully suggest, as we would say in Texas, "Put up or shut up."

Feed Shortage in Dairy Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving telegrams from dairymen in the district which I have the honor to represent, calling attention to the low price they are receiving for milk and the high price of feed for the dairy cattle.

It is obvious that the vast volume of grain which has already been shipped to foreign countries and the volume to be allocated for export is causing food for both cattle and humans to be reduced to the danger point. The high price paid by the Government for wheat became so scandalously high that the Government shifted to the purchased of flour to divert the attention of the public from the price paid for wheat.

There are more cattle on the hoof in France now than before the war. It is not to the hungry or starving to which much of our grain goes, but rather to feed foreign livestock and to supply the black markets abroad. Much of the food shipped supposedly to feed the civilian population overseas goes to fatten large foreign standing armies.

The time is long overdue for those who represent the United States to give thought to the welfare of our own people. It is high time to take an inventory of our own stock of foods, actual and potential, before making wild and reckless commitments to foreign countries. It was only a short time ago that the administration was selling powdered eggs at $30 a carload for fertilizer. Now, last year's crop of potatoes has been destroyed, and the early potato crop grown so far this year in the deep South is being put to the torch by Government agents. I shall not be surprised if the Agriculture Department should decide to burn this year's crop of grain in the field.

I am inserting, under leave to extend my remarks, the volume of grain shipments abroad.

These figures include shipments to Europe, Latin-American countries, and the Philippines, as well as the Pacific theater:

From July 1, 1946, through April 30, 1947—in long tons, 2,240 pounds: Corn, 1,566,000; wheat grain, 4,648,000; wheat flour, in terms of grain, 3,762,000; corn products, in terms of grain, 178,000; oat grain, 242,000; oat milled, in terms of grain, 47,000; barley grain, 155,000; barley malt, 70,000; grain sorghums, 320,000; rye, 5,000; total, 10,943,000. Flour milled in bond in the United States from Canadian wheat, 155,000 long tons. Grand total, 11,098,000.

Above are actual export figures through April 30, 1947.

Total allocations for the 12-month period starting July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1947, including everything shipped plus allocations to July 1, 1947—these are constantly changing, but present contemplated figures follow: Wheat as grain, 5,315,000 long tons; flour, in terms of grain, 5,380,000; corn, includes corn products, 3,038,000; oats, 346,000; barley, 349,000; grain sorghums, 434,000; rye, 5,000. Total, 14,867,000.

Grain exports from July 1, 1946, through April 30, 1947, for European countries, including occupied zones in Germany, in terms of long tons: Wheat, 3,091,000; flour, 2,076,000; corn, 1,256,000; corn grits and meal, 100,000; oats, 202,000; oatmeal 12,000; barley, 30,000; malt, 2,000; grain sorghums, 18,000; rye, 5,000. Total, 6,792,000. Canadian flour milled in bond, 7,000. Grand total, 6,799,000.

Through June 30, 1947: Wheat, 3,645,000; flour, 3,258,000; corn, 2,413,000; oats, 266,000; barley, 117,000; grain sorghums, 18,000; rye, 5,000. Total, 9,714,000.

News Censorship Shrouds Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, though the fortunes of 160,000,000 of American citizen may turn upon the outcome of the Geneva International Trade Conference, a news black-out has been clamped down on the deliberation of the conferees that finds no parallel in modern history. Anxious American businessmen, farmers, manufacturers, and labor representatives, a melancholy audience indeed, sit before the silken curtains, denied even the slightest inkling of that which is transpiring behind their folds, though financial destruction may be the consequence of it all.

But let that famed columnist and newspaper commentator, Mr. George Rothwell Brown, an accurate observer of wide experience, reveal the sordid story. That the American people may know where, if not how, their rights can be bartered away, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two of his Geneva dispatches, both of which will be revealing to the Congress and the people, I am quite sure.

The articles, Mr. Speaker, to which I have just referred, are the following:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

GENEVA, May 14.—There is something tragically ironical in the fact that in the palace of Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations, dedicated to pitiless publicity and open covenants of peace openly arrived at, the trade relations of the postwar world should be determined in secrecy behind the most complete news black-out in the history of international conferences.

The censorship that has been imposed here on the newspapers of the world is admittedly without a parallel.

One reason for this probably is that the two conferences of particular interest to American business and industry, and to the Congress in Washington, dealing with the adoption of new tariff schedules and the establishment of a new charter for international trade and world employment, are being conducted by bureaucratic subordinates.

ULTIMATE AUTHORITY

Bureaucracy tends to protective secretiveness when its vast powers are not coupled with authority. The ultimate authority is not in Geneva but in Washington, London, and Paris.

Restrictions have been placed on the press here that were undreamed of at the San Francisco Conference, at which the United Nations organization was created and established.

At San Francisco, news correspondents had daily official contacts with top-flight delegates of the highest rank, and daily unofficial and confidential contacts.

In Geneva the Conference delegates are surrounded with an exclusion such as former Secretary of State Byrnes, or Senator Vandenberg, or Senator Connally never sought at Lake Success or at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria in New York.

PRESS NOT SOLE VICTIM

But the press is not the sole victim of the bureaucratic negotiations under way here which will affect American invested capital perhaps for years to come.

Keenly aware of the importance of the issues at stake, many representatives of American industry have come to Geneva. They have been denied all official or unofficial contacts with the conference.

Their presence in Geneva is not officially admitted, the official public relations representatives of the United Nations, under which all the negotiations here are proceeding, are not allowed to inform the press who these representatives of business and industry are.

FROM UNITED STATES CONTROL

The tariff-making power lodged by the American Constitution in the Congress of the United States, and delegated by Congress to the President, has passed from American control into the hands of an international organization.

No information is available as to the commodities upon which further American tariff concessions are to be made, and which are now under consideration.

The naive explanation is that to make this knowledge public would be to bring pressure groups to bear upon the deliberations.

In other words, publicity would enable industries that may be adversely affected, or even ruined, to defend and protect themselves before the deed is accomplished.

When Congress unwisely delegated the tariff-making power to the President, it had no such black-out as this in mind.

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

GENEVA, May 22.—The ground work has been laid at Lake Success for a World Congress on the Freedom of the Press, with Geneva or Prague among the cities suggested as the place of the meeting.

It would be interesting indeed if such a conference were to be held in Geneva at this time, for it would counter a restriction upon the liberty of the press through the suppression of news at the source that threatens to wreck the International Trade Conferference unless the censorship is lifted.

Even the drastic restrictions upon access to news sources cannot survive the inevitable clash of national interests that will become more and more acute as the tariff discussions reach the bargaining state. Disagreements will find their way into the press, perhaps with disastrous consequences that might have been avoided by adherence here in Geneva, the European capital of the United Nations, to the splendid, if as yet academic, principals enunciated at Lake Success.

This is proved by the fact that the wool crisis between the United States and the British Dominions, which all but wrecked the international conference and might do so yet, broke down the barriers of censorship as soon as it became advantageous to one party in the dispute to take its case to the public of its own country.

It is probable that the bill now before the House of Representatives in Washington, imposing a 50-percent import fee on foreign wool, would have caused Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa to bolt the conference but for the sympathetic understanding by the Dominions of Great Britain's acute position and their desire not to cause embarrassment to the government at London.

Failure of the State Department experts in Geneva to understand that this was a Truman administration bill, and attempts to bottle up the facts, must have caused Assistant Secretary of State Clayton extreme embarrassment.

British delegates here, failing to appreciate fully that President Truman is obliged to work with a Republican Congress elected in November in a revolt against New Deal policies, of which the Hull-Roosevelt reciprocal tariff policy is an important one, have been inclined privately to accuse the United States of bad faith.

This, of course, is not the case at all. The British are asking not only for the defeat of elimination of the proposed 50-percent import fee on wool but for a 50-percent cut in the existing wool tariff of 34 cents per pound. They will compromise, according to present indications, on the elimination of the fee and the acceptance of a lesser reduction in the tariff.

The fate of the conference depends on a compromise of substantial character, without which the Dominions will not abandon the Empire preference system, and the proposed international trade organization, which is the basis of the Truman economic policy, cannot be established outside the Empire preference system.

The situation is delicate and demands open covenants of world trade openly arrived at.

The Truth and America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Truth and America" taken from my home town newspaper, the Daily Missoulian, of Thursday, May 22, 1947.

As you know the State Department information program has been unanimously reported out by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and is now before the Rules Committee, from which body I think a favorable report will be forthcoming soon. It is well to realize that this information program is tremendously important at the present time in conveying to the people of all the world just what America is—not in the form of distorted propaganda but in the form of truth, because truth is the best propaganda.

I wish also at this time to commend to the House the fine work by and large which has been done by the Assistant Secretary of State, William Benton, in carrying out this program under the most difficult circumstances. I feel that the importance of this project cannot be overestimated and I am extremely hopeful that when the measure is brought before this body, in the very near future, we will give it an overwhelming vote of confidence.

The editorial follows:

THE TRUTH AND AMERICA

The State Department's war-born information program, intended to convey the facts about American plan and purpose of all other nations, should be retained as a part of our national defense and of our campaign to protect ourselves—and much of the rest of the world—from the plague of communism. We can think of no more effective way to meet the "red" infiltration that threatens every country in the world not already in the Communist sphere, of no better means by which to bring understanding of America's benevolent purposes, to make clear our lack of imperialistic desire, to outline vividly our passion for peace. Call it propaganda if you will, it still is good for America and for all of the world.

Secretary of State Marshall argued cogently for continuing the program when he told Members of Congress that American aims are misrepresented "to a tremendous degree" in some foreign countries and that this Nation "must devise some method of spreading the truth. No Nation has been more generous than the United States and yet I rather believe that no nation has received less credit for that generosity. As long as propaganda is engaged in by other countries, we must take some action."

William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State and director of the program, also told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the State Department intends to "mirror" American life to the world rather than to present a "showcase." "Mirror," he explained, "is presenting an actual picture of life in this country, while 'showcase' is turning out onesided and strictly favorable types of information." In other words, the program is intended to be honestly frank, in the logical belief that such procedure would win in the long run over the "showcase" style of Russia.

General Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, also expressed his approval of the plan to bring information about America to all of the world and thus foster general understanding of American democracy. And General Eisenhower also is for an utterly honest program, to be based "on truth and only truth, because anything else will recoil and bring defeat."

The Bible says, "The truth shall make you free." In a new application it might save the world from itself.

Air Power in the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Navy Making Radical Changes by Conversion to Air Power," by Ansel E. Talbert, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 27, 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY MAKING RADICAL CHANGES BY CONVERSION TO AIR POWER—BATTLESHIP ADMIRAL ADMITS FLEET NOW EXISTS ONLY TO SUPPORT AVIATION; ALL NEW PLANE DESIGNS CALL FOR PROPULSION BY JET OR ROCKET ENGINES

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

NORFOLK, VA., April 26.—The most radical step in American naval affairs since the days of John Paul Jones is under way today. This is the conversion to an air Navy employing

carrier-borne jet and rocket aircraft of speeds approaching that of sound.

The change-over stems directly from lessons of the recent war, which according to Rear Adm. Leslie C. Stevens and other naval strategists relegated the guns of warships to a distinctly secondary place. Rear Adm. Frank D. Wagner, who commanded the aircraft of the Seventh Fleet during a series of attacks executed in the Pacific, recently told this correspondent in Pensacola, Fla.: "The modern Navy is air power."

These men recall that even the last year of the war saw the Navy attain the status of a true air force at sea through the operation of large numbers of fast carriers and their auxiliaries. A few days ago John N. Brown, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, was told by one of the Navy's most famous battleship admirals:

"The Navy doesn't exist now for support of the 16-inch guns of battleships, but to support aviation. We all realize that the rest of us are in effect backing up the Navy air."

TRAINING AT ANNAPOLIS

The United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Md., is making it mandatory that every midshipman before graduation be completely indoctrinated in all aspects of naval aviation, Rear Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., the Superintendent, revealed. When appropriations are available, the Navy plans to construct an air training base at Sandy Point which will be an integral part of the Academy.

No new naval plane designs have been laid down since the end of World War II which do not call for either jet or rocket power plants, it was learned here. The Navy's new Douglas D-558 Skystreak, a scarlet jet-propelled aircraft polished to mirror-like smoothness for flights in the transsonic region of around 760 miles an hours, is about to begin initial warm-up flights.

This aircraft's powerful turbojet engine built by General Electric has a thrust at high altitudes approximately equal to that of the four engines of a B-29 superfortress.

Another Navy jet aircraft, the McDonnell Phantom, completed extensive tests aboard Navy carriers, while still another, the Chance Vought Pirate, now is being test-flown at Muroc Lake, Calif. Martin has built a bomber employing jet propulsion for the Navy, and it is reported that chiefs of the Navy air arm may bring about the importation of several jet aircraft engine types from England, which has a lead on the United States in this field. These would be built here under license.

TO USE GERMAN WIND TUNNEL

A rocket engine developed by the Navy was turned over to the Army Air Forces for use in the Bell XS-1, with which it is hoped to break through the transsonic barrier this summer for the first time in history. To obtain knowledge regarding what may be expected when aircraft fly faster than sound, the Navy has assembled at White Oak, Md., a supersonic wind tunnel shipped from Peenemunde, Germany. At the Naval Air Experimental Station in Philadelphia, model airplanes which approach transsonic speeds during dives are being dropped daily from specially designed mother ships. Instruments inside record various data regarding aerodynamic characteristics under these conditions.

The Navy already has developed a pilot-ejection capsule for removing safely the pilot and crew of a supersonic airplane in the event of an accident. Air-cooling systems have been installed in cockpits to combat temperatures expected to climb precipitously at high speeds. Tests by Navy volunteers in a pressure chamber at Pensacola determined that men could be conditioned gradually to live in altitudes of higher than 29,000 feet.

All of the Navy's moves are for the purpose of implementing Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King's directive that the Navy should "establish an overseas line of defense thousands of miles from the American mainland." In the opinion of Naval strategists, this can be done through the medium of fast carriers and submarines capable of launching high-speed aircraft and guided missiles—probably containing atomic warheads—against points of danger.

The Navy's opinion is that the huge long-range bombing plane of World War II is virtually obsolete. In the future, it is believed, this type will not be a reliable means of delivering either explosives or atomic bombs against a strong and alert enemy.

It is felt that the big bomber is too vulnerable to guided missiles and rockets equipped with proximity fuses, as well as to the guns of jet and rocket propelled interceptors. Navy strategists point out that jet propulsion in its present stage of development requires large fuel consumption. It is adaptable to short-range interceptors but not to long-range bombers, which would have to carry fuel rather than bombs on long missions.

During the last few days the Navy's new 10-passenger tandem helicopter—the world's largest—lifted a jeep weighing more than a ton and also demonstrated an ability to ferry troops almost anywhere. The aircraft was built for the Navy, which wanted one capable of carrying considerable payloads, by the Piasecki Corp. at Sharon Hill, Pa. Gen. Jacob Devers, commanding the Army Ground Forces, who expressed great interest in the Navy aircraft, advanced the opinion that the helicopter may be the answer to the problem of transporting troops "with their firepower" where they are most needed.

Confusion and Insecurity Peril United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph P. Kennedy:

[From the Detroit Sunday Times of May 25, 1947]

CONFUSION, INSECURITY PERIL UNITED STATES, SAYS KENNEDY

(By Joseph P. Kennedy, former United States Ambassador to Great Britain)

The American people, once described as "a magnificent spectacle of human happiness," are today confused and restless.

The cause of their discontent and the cure for it ought to be the chief consideration of everyone interested in preserving our standard of living and our way of life, for communism thrives upon discontent.

With savings of over $34,000,000,000 in 1945 reduced to $19,000,000,000 in 1946, people complain that they "haven't as many nickels to rub together as formerly." Yet nineteen billions of savings is a tremendous amount.

With 1946 corporate earnings at new high records, and earnings per share of many standard American business corporations 33 to 50 percent of their selling price, no one wants to buy stocks, and highest grade common stocks with long dividend records sell at prices to yield four times as much as bonds. Confidence is declining.

With a national income in excess of $175,000,000,000, over twice the income of the "boom" 1929 year, economists have regularly been forecasting depression each quarter since VJ-day, 20 months ago.

In what has been aptly termed "an era of economic idiocy," administration economists have become politicians, and statesmen pose as economists. The net result is a very sickening and discouraging political economic philosophy which has given the Nation a case of first-degree jitters.

And if a modicum of common sense isn't injected into the situation very quickly, I greatly fear the quack Cassandras will prove correct in their forebodings. Because troubles grow bigger by nursing; and with a babel of specialists diagnosing economic symptoms and no one prescribing for the over-all condition, I am afraid the patient will die of "successful operations" and local cures.

As an ordinary American businessman of more than ordinary experience in public life, I submit that nothing aggravates discontent among the people more than the dawdling of public officials; nothing foments insecurity among the masses of our people quicker than discontent, and nothing leads more certainly to totalitarianism, socialism, or communism than a feeling of insecurity among a people.

A recent survey revealed that whereas only 22 percent of our people fear actual war, 45 percent expect depression within 10 years, most of them looking for it by 1951.

In consequence of these worries concerning our foreign and domestic outlook 48 percent of our young men are rated as unwilling to take any chances in business, preferring security and low income to any risk. Only 23 percent were willing to take more than a 50–50 chance for the possibility of maximum reward.

Translating this discontent and yearning for security into economic trends, one of our leading industrialists, Gwilym Price, of Westinghouse, fears it has the earmarks of a definite drift toward communism; on the general theory, I assume, that communism breeds discontent and fear.

In pleading recently for the preservation of America as "the pinpoint of light shining for the individual," Mr. Price stated that recent surveys show that, in spite of all the blessings with which Americans are endowed, and in spite of a standard of living unobtainable elsewhere, "we do not appreciate our freedoms and are ready to throw them overboard."

Surveys reveal that 24 percent of our population believed they would get more for their money if all property were owned and operated by the Government, and 9 percent felt they would get just as much under Government ownership and control.

"That means," concluded Mr. Price, "that one-third of our population has swallowed the Communist line and doesn't know it."

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING VITAL

I believe that the problem is so important there is no subject of pending legislation so sacred as to be above public discussion, including our Government's foreign policy.

We are supposed to be at peace—God save the mark—and it is only during times of war that criticism of our Government stops at the water's edge. For, as a well-known political and international newspaper correspondent, James Reston, of the New York Times, has said, "The economic peace is inseparable from the political peace and this country cannot be politically international and economically national."

It is because our recently proclaimed international politics—financing war upon communism abroad—is inseparable from our domestic problem that I feel free to discuss the so-called Truman doctrine of aid to Greece and Turkey.

At the outset, let me say that if it could be demonstrated that giving dollars to stop the spread of communism in the Balkans could accomplish that objective, I would make no

comment—especially if it can be shown that the United States can afford it. But it is obvious to anyone with even limited experience in world politics that a few hundred million dollars is but a beginning.

We may continue in the reckless spending to which our people have been accustomed in the past 15 years, during which the national debt—which was, by the way, $1,000,000,000 before World War I—doubled and then increased fivefold, from $55,000,000,000 to $270,000,000,000, in the war period.

But we just cannot go on increasing this national debt, the maintenance of which even now has imposed a bitter destiny on several entire generations of our people. Indeed, it has been competently estimated that total aid by United States capital to the rest of the world will amount to about $21,000,000,000 in the next 3 years, over $16,000,000,000 of which will be in the form of public loans and grants.

WHERE WILL MONEY COME FROM?

I insist that, when public officials advocate the policy of underwriting the salvation of the rest of the world from communism, they are morally bound to show the American people just where the money can come from—out of the pocket of the American taxpayer. Especially since such a policy may actually so weaken the economy of our country as to necessitate a degree of state control of the activities of our normal life not far removed from communism itself.

A year ago I ventured to outline (Life, March 18, 1946) the framework of a realistic foreign policy for the United States, insisting at that time upon a tough attitude toward Moscow that would dispose immediately of the perpetual United Nations debates and leave us free to concentrate upon domestic problems.

Today, bewildered as we are by the continuing subterfuges and obstructive tactics of diplomats, I venture to suggest a realistic domestic policy for the United States into which our Government's foreign policy must be made to fit.

I think we should recognize at once the inseparable relation between the State Department's foreign policy and our own domestic economy and permit nothing in foreign trade or foreign politics that will destroy our chance for domestic prosperity.

We have been doing things in the wrong order. Let us for once try to find foreign peace as the end purpose of domestic prosperity.

Up to now we have sought world peace first, expecting prosperity to follow. Unfortunately, we have neither.

Yet I am convinced that America with its matchless resources, its skills and abilities has merely to continue to be the land of free enterprise which our forefathers made it in order to attain a lasting prosperity inspiring to the dejected peoples of other nations who are striving to escape political serfdom and attain national independence.

FOUR HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS MORE FOR BRITAIN

We have gone quite far along the road of an extravagant foreign policy which is bound to burden our domestic economy with additional crushing taxes.

The initial amount pledged by America to the Bretton Woods international bank is $6,000,000,000. More than $3,000,000,000 has been "loaned" to Great Britain (a "loan" which has already embittered England toward us).

The initial appropriation for Greece and Turkey so that England may shift its burden to us is $400,000,000.

Approximately $10,000,000,000 is thus the staggering price we are paying for the dubious privilege of taking up the "white man's burden" now that England has slipped from its prewar world stature.

Why? England followed this policy for years in order to build the empire—now England says she is broke. We have no imperialistic ambitions, but if, in an exuberance of good neighborliness, we essay the role of financing the ambitions of other nations, we can end up just where England is today—in economic misery.

Therefore I suggest that our statesmen read something of modern history before going all out for saving the world.

I shall not discuss the political propriety of this policy, or why America is called upon to take up where England has seen fit to leave off. It takes a good deal of imagination to find reasons why the Monroe Doctrine imposes any obligation on us to assume a police power in the rest of the world.

Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe argued that the reason we had the right to prevent others from meddling in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere was that America had no intention of meddling in the affairs of Europe.

THEY'LL STOP IT SOME DAY

I shall confine any discussion to the effect of this never-ending financial obligation upon our own economy because I am confident that sooner or later the American people will call a halt to such extravagance and the day they do you may expect that our dearly bought allies will turn from us and flock to the orbit of their oppressor.

With nations, as with individuals, the ally you have to buy will not stay bought.

Whether it is the socialism of Britain or the communism of Russia with which the individualism of America has to contend, all radical thinkers hate our system of society, and they will make this plain as soon as we—in self-defense—put an end to world spending to save our own economy.

These aspects of current problems are very grave, and to deal with them effectively something should be done to allay the unrest among our people.

I am not greatly concerned with the military or political aspects of aid to Greece or Turkey. I suspect that the Russian people resent that as our people would resent Russian aid to Mexican Pancho Villa or a Communist adventurer in Cuba. The dangers at home are far more real to me.

Concretely I regard as dangerous a public policy which rushes headlong into tax burdening expenditures abroad and does nothing to bring about tax relief at home, making no provision to sustain a rate of industrial activity essential to the collection of the increased revenue needed.

It is baseless optimism to expect that our economy will always be geared to a national income of one hundred and seventy-five billions. We must evolve an incentive tax policy to prepare for a more normal rate.

TOKEN REDUCTIONS NO ANSWER

No solution of the present problem is to be found in token price reductions. The portion of our economy in which prices can be substantially reduced is too small to cure the fundamental weakness. If you wrap a piece of band-aid around your wrist, expecting it to cure a broken arm, it won't.

When food costs and rent costs, still under Government control, are eliminated from the consumer's cost of living, only 30 percent of the expense remains. And these cannot be reduced sufficiently to affect materially the total cost of living.

Neither does a reduction in the profits of business contribute materially to a solution of our problems. Even in the record year 1946, profits amounted only to 6 percent of gross sales so that even if most of that margin of profit were eliminated, inflationary cost would still be with us.

I suggest that we look for a cure to the methods responsible for the growth and development of our economy to its present magnitude—the ways and means of obtaining increased production. That remedy, we have a right to believe from 100 years' experience, will relieve our people of their fears and doubts and restore their confidence in themselves and in their country.

WHERE PROSPERITY ORIGINATES

The output of America in 1944, reports the Twentieth Century Fund, was 27 times greater than that of 1850, turned out by a labor force only 9 times greater, which worked only 43 hours a week, as against 70 hours, the prevailing workweek in the 1850's. And during that period the income per person rose from $270 to $1,140, better than a fourfold increase.

What made that possible? The reinvestment of capital, of earnings of wealth, by the American businessman in the tools and machinery and mechanical power with which America backs up her workers. Today, when an American workman works 1 hour he produces more than a worker anywhere else on earth ever produced.

That vast production, the production of more wealth by the investment of existing wealth, is the only sure cure in sight today for the things which the politicians-turned-economists say are at the root of existing evils—high prices.

Encouraged in the future, as it always was encouraged prior to the confiscatory tax periods of the thirties, American business will, by capital expenditure, so expand the production of goods that competition will thrive, the small businessman will be able to compete in his industry, inflationary perils will disappear, and talk of depression cease.

INVESTMENTS SHARPLY REDUCED

But American businessmen have had to sizably reduce their capital investment per worker in recent years. Unless they reinvest in their employees, their technical superiority is endangered, which makes the American worker the best on earth and makes America the strongest Nation.

For instance, in 1937 the American workman had better tools than any other workman as shown by the figures of horsepower per worker: United States of America, 4.86; Germany, 2.61; Britain, 2.56; Canada, 2.17.

But whereas prior to 1932 (the beginning of the confiscatory period) American business invested $8,640 per employee (in order to buy tools, equipment, etc.), by 1941, even with a war-stimulated activity, the expenditure was $5,937.

The greatly reduced expenditure was plainly due to the fact that so large a proportion of the earnings of business is taken for taxes that the employer hasn't enough left to equip his plant as formerly.

When industrial progress is blocked by a tax system that limits production and the output of goods demanded by an ever-increasing population is choked, shortage and high pricing follow, the marginal manufacturer (the little fellow) cannot meet the ever-rising wage costs, monopoly privilege is developed for big business, and then come inflationary trends and reckless expansion with ever-recurring booms and depressions.

CAN AMERICA KEEP IT UP?

It is estimated that the needs of the American people by 1950 (based upon 1944 prices) will approximate $200,000,000,000—14 percent higher than anything demanded during the last war. The physical machinery necessary to meet that volume of production cannot be provided unless business is allowed to retain for reinvestment a larger share of earnings than is now left afte. wages and taxes.

If we aggravate our domestic needs by a perpetual subsidy of European needs, obviously the chance to provide security and prosperity for our own people—now disturbed by their economic prospects—is slight.

Another example.

When Henry Ford died, recently, most newspapers had editorials pointing out that in no other country in the world could Mr. Ford have developed his magnificent empire. But Mr. Ford could not do that **today** even

in this country under existing tax assessments. It is not possible for any individual to save enough of his total income after income-tax requirements to accumulate the capital necessary to finance expansion and growth in his business.

The Ford business was started with $28,000 of borrowed money. It grew by reinvestment in the business of a substantial portion of each year's earnings. Today most of the annual earnings go to the Government in tax payments.

To me that is the fatal defect in our present economy and is the chief reason for unrest and discontent. There can be no more Henry Fords.

Indeed, a young man in business today, even if a well-paid top executive, can hardly meet living costs, much less save anything for a rainy day. And it is impossible for him to save after taxes enough to provide an estate for his family. Only a life-insurance policy stands between his family and destitution in the event of his untimely death.

I hold no brief for the rich man as such. I am grateful for the opportunity that this country gave me to accumulate something of the world's goods. But unless we alter our tax laws and regulate our Government savings so that the incidence of taxes is lightened, the invaluable function which the rich man performs will cease—investing his accumulated savings in business to provide for expansion and increased production.

We will have not only inflation in this country, but also stagnation.

REAL ECONOMISTS NEEDED

As a partial remedy for these defects, I suggest the formation of a Council of Economic Advisers, quasi governmental in prestige, which would pass upon Government political policy as it affects our domestic and economic structure. I suggest that such a committee be authorized to study the various methods of relief suggested for our tax system, such as the elimination of double taxation, either by omitting excess-profits taxes or foregoing taxes of distributed dividends.

We need such advice to bring about comprehensive tax reforms. Above all, counsel is needed on expenditures abroad and foreign-trade commitments.

Men of experience acquired during the more fortunate years of American industrial life should contribute of that experience in an effort to find a way, not only to stop the spread of communism abroad—that is incidental—but to keep it away from our shores.

And especially counsel should be sought from such men in an effort to reform our economy and permit the restoration of the virtues of thrift, incentive, and enterprise.

Canada has seen fit to reduce income taxes substantially, and even a socialistic English Government has reformed taxes in the interest of encouraging spending for permanent benefits and limiting personal extravagance. Are Americans alone to be tax-ridden for the world's benefit?

I know that when one dares to ask proof that our dollars spent abroad can stop the spread of communism—even if we cannot afford it—the cry of isolationist is raised. If one asks for a fundamental change in our domestic economy—a tax system so revised that it would facilitate the financing of these foreign ambitions and the protection of American life—the charge of helping the rich comes instantly.

SMALL PROFIT IN MEDDLING

Bearing in mind the historical fact that meddling in European affairs has got us exactly nowhere, it is not difficult to understand the impatience of a man of no little public experience who recently asked:

"Well, what's the matter with isolationism? We have never really tried it. Intervention hasn't settled anything."

And in view of the remarkable strides in our economic life, the continuous betterment of the standards of living of all classes of our people during the last 50 years, due to the reinvestment of savings and capital by wealthy men in the expansion of their business (the function of the rich man), one can understand why many men ask: "What's the matter with advocating lower taxes?"

The highest tax rate in history finds us, in the opinion of the President, on the threshold of inflation and threatened with depression.

Forgetting name calling, let us isolate our people from contagious germs of communism by avoiding never-ending commitments abroad beyond capacity of a prudent government to finance.

Let us regulate our domestic economy by rescuing it from the dead hand of confiscatory taxes which keep our vitality so low we are constantly allergic to inflation, depression, and insecurity.

Make America once more a magnificent spectacle of human happiness.

The Truman Doctrine Proposes To Bribe Europe—Will They Stay "Bought"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter to the Wall Street Journal by Sam Green, of Nashville, Tenn. The questions raised by Mr. Green are in many peoples' minds. Perhaps the most intriguing question he raises is concerning the habit-forming results of hand-outs.

Perhaps someone can furnish a satisfactory example of a nation that stayed bought by one hand-out or loan. If so, that illustration would be in order now. Mr. Green's complete letter follows:

BRIBING EUROPE

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Those of us who have limited understanding for soulful politics probably should be quiet, but the desire for knowledge is as sharp as filed steel. If we admit we do not understand, we do not therefore say that we are too thickskulled for an idea to penetrate. And so could we make an observation on what seems to this writer a bit crass? It may be worse than that, but this writer is not expressing his opinion so much as he is crying for light.

The thing that is worrying us right now is the vague idea which is called the Truman doctrine. What is it, anyway? There is a widespread idea that we are alarmed over the prospective spread of communism—a virulent social poison. Any nation that quaffs a few quaffs of communism is a wreck. So we, with our superior understanding, are warning all of those mentally obtuse nations of ragged Europe that the Bolsheviks are all wrong. But we are not going to rely on simply telling these people not to jump off the bridge—we are going to bribe them with our bright glittering billions not to do it.

If we are compelled to give these benighted people our pants in order to persuade them not to commit suicide it might be interesting to know what the deluded Russians can offer them in return for this prospective trip to perdition. Is poverty, hunger, disease and ignorance so alluring to the bumble-wits of Europe that we Americans must suffer from malnutrition in order to save them from ruin? Suppose we do save them now? Then what? Will these Europeans say to themselves, "these uncouth, long-eared, blear-witted Americans can't get along without somebody to save so let's keep on threatening to jump off the bridge if we don't get bigger and bigger rewards"?

To me, our policy of bribing Europe sounds about as impressive as offering a prospective suicide the Empire State Building if he will just restrain his inclination to jump off the tower. If that policy were to be seriously undertaken every building on Manhattan Island would have a nit-wit on top of it threatening to jump to destruction unless he is given a title to the building for preserving his life. That's what the Truman policy is sure to mean. All countries will quickly decide that we are a rich Nation—a rich and gullible Nation. All the scheming Europeans need to do is to scream out, Hey, you Americans, how much are you going to pay me not to plunge into bolshevism? My idea is that we should resolutely reply—jump you so and so. See if we give a tinker's toot.

SAM GREEN.

NASHVILLE, TENN.

Definition of Agricultural Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a memorandum dealing with the present conference on the House and Senate labor bills.

This specifically deals with the definition of agricultural labor, and I offer it as a contribution to a clarification of this troublesome fact when applied to agricultural labor.

DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL LABOR

Wenatchee-Beebe Orchard Co. and James M. Wade, two of the country's largest apple growers, are very much concerned about a relatively minor difference in the Senate and House drafts of the current labor bills (S. 1126 and H. R. 3020), which difference is believed to be of great significance to agriculture generally. The definition of "employee" as it relates to individuals employed in agriculture is the problem.

The House bill adopts at section 2 (3) the definition of agricultural labor employed at section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code. That is a definition with which all employers are required to be familiar for the purpose of tax withholding, social security, and other such purposes. The use of a different definition in other Federal legislation tends to confuse those who are required to comply with such legislation.

The Internal Revenue Code agricultural labor definition is explicit and well understood. It avoids, for example, the following type of anomalous situation actually existing now under current Federal labor legislation: A person engaged in wrapping fruit preparatory to shipment to market, if working in a building located on a farm, is an agricultural laborer; whereas one employed simultane-

ously in identical work at a warehouse or shipping station around the corner is not.

Furthermore, at present the same employee may be an agricultural worker under a Federal labor statute and not an agricultural worker under the Federal tax laws.

The definition of agriculture at section 2 (3) of the Senate bill adopts an artificial test, location, as the determinant of whether a given activity is agricultural, the test being in some instances whether or not the activity in question takes place on a farm. Where in the unbroken operation of growing, harvesting, and preparing fruit for market some fruit is wrapped on a farm and other fruit from the same crop, and as an incident to the same farming operation, is wrapped simultaneously at another point near a farm, logically each activity should be classified the same and each should be regarded as agricultural. That is the effect of the definition of agricultural labor proposed by the House.

The House definition should be adopted.

Hon. Fred Bradley

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 26, 1947

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak a few words of tribute to my friend FRED BRADLEY. I served with him on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries through the Seventy-ninth Congress. He was a most conscientious member of that committee, though even then his health handicapped him.

When the chairmanship of the committee came to him at the beginning of the present Congress, he felt his responsibilities very keenly. Although I had left the committee, I talked with him a good deal about various matters in connection with the organization of the committee and the work of the session. No one who saw him during that period can doubt that he felt so keenly the weight of his responsibilities that he broke down under it. He gave his life to the performance of his duty, and, from things he said to his friends, I feel sure that he foresaw what was to come.

A few weeks ago FRED BRADLEY made some remarks about the social responsibilities of Members of Congress and the social demands upon them. In some quarters what he said was not taken seriously and in others it was misconstrued. But he said only what was true, and subsequent events have shown how strongly he must have felt the truth of what he said when he said it.

The death rate in this body bespeaks the tensions under which its Members work. Men like FRED BRADLEY and CHARLES GERLACH were far too young to die. They probably would not have died if they had not given their lives so devotedly to the public service. For their labors and their sacrifice they deserve all honor. I had come to have a strong affection for FRED BRADLEY and I shall miss him.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF on May 24, 1947:

Dear friends of the triple cities and my congressional district, several days ago, I took the floor of the House and delivered the following speech: "Mr. Speaker, if we are to believe what we read in the papers we can come to but one conclusion, that the warehouses of this country are bulging with sugar, just as the granaries of the ancient Pharaohs were bursting with stored wheat, corn, and barley.

"This food should be made available to our housewives so that the American diet may be improved. Cakes, preserved fruits, pies, bread, and all the other edibles that have been common to the American table for a century before the recent war ought to be prepared once again in home ovens. People are unable to maintain our usually high standard of living unless more sugar is distributed per capita. You will remember how Joseph in the Bible opened the granaries of ancient Egypt when the people hungered. It is time a modern Joseph came forward and opened the warehouses of sugar so that the American family may have an adequate supply for which we have all hungered for so long."

The dangers besetting our economic front at the present time are many and hazardous. Whether we realize it or not, our whole system is on the spot and only an early solution to the problems of threatening inflation, lowering wages, unemployment, and related subjects will guarantee a permanent continuation of the status quo.

Those seeking to overthrow America and place anarchy where order has existed are itching for inflation, praying for hunger and want which invariably follow high prices, and hoping the country will be thrown into chaos by millions of citizens out of work.

The hue and cry against communism, being voiced exceedingly late, would prove more effective with the declaration by those who make the wheels go round of a studied policy to reduce the high prices we now pay for the necessities of life. Let's map a course of action that really solves forever the misery of the unemployed.

Some people listen to subversive propaganda which tells us communism has no unemployment. They are right.

There is no unemployment in Communist nations today because the people are forced at the point of the bayonet to work. The state pays them as much or as little as it sees fit. If they don't like it, they get the firing squad.

But unfortunately some Americans fall for that line of argument. We hear them say they are disgusted with unsavory conditions in America, not realizing that if they cast off our system of government they say goodbye to freedom and liberty which today exists only in the United States.

Nevertheless, those of us who want the American way of life to work must be willing to take whatever action is necessary to keep our standard of living the highest in the world. We can't do it by allowing prices to go higher, and jobs to become scarcer.

To offer a solution to the headaches of the future, one must immediately be challenged by the cynics who never believe in trying anything new and who scoff at everything different.

Personally, I think it is possible to prevent the depressions and inflationary periods our economic system has suffered from for so long. Many people laughed when I suggested we could attain a sound, stable economy, not for just a month or a year but permanently by making the American dollar inflation-proof and depression-proof. In other words, we could make our Nation and the world prosperous all the time by permitting ourselves the use of a dollar that is worth 100 cents instead of 59 cents.

We can obliterate communism, stop worrying about inflation, enjoy lucrative jobs, abolish unemployment by taking a few fundamental steps that are as simple as ABC. These steps are not revolutionary and call for no new financial set-up.

Give the American people a dollar that will buy a dollar's worth of the better things of life and you will keep happiness, satisfaction, and peace to the United States and the whole world.

Thank you.

Changes in Federal Security Law Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, at the start of this session of Congress H. R. 16 was introduced. This bill seeks to secure for the aged people of the United States a fair and adequate hearing on their request for an overhauling of the present inadequate and inequitable social-security program of the Federal Government. Today, when hundreds of millions of dollars of our people's money are being sent overseas as food, clothing, and shelter for war victims in foreign lands, tens of thousands of aged Americans are being neglected here at home. Too much ridicule and too little careful consideration of their welfare have been granted to our aged people in recent Congresses. I urge that the Ways and Means Committee provide adequate hearings for legislation in their behalf at the earliest possible date.

Chief of Police, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, because of an apparent confusion respecting the selection of a chief of police for the city of Washington, D. C., some very interesting newspaper articles and editorials have been published upon that subject. Herewith, I desire to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two of those articles. Therefore I ask unanimous

consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD two of those published articles, one from the Washington Daily News and the other from the Washington Post, which are as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 23, 1947]

NOW IT CAN BE TOLD—PRESIDENT ENTERS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE FIGHT

(By John T. Burch)

Commissioner John Russell Young's mysterious April 9 summons to the White House was for the purpose of letting President Truman get his oar into the Washington battle over appointment of a new chief of police, the News learned today.

At the time of the visit, Mr. Young told reporters it was "just routine." At a press conference later, President Truman said he didn't want to discuss the visit.

This, however, is what happened.

The White House, disturbed by rumors that a new chief of police would be named and under pressure in behalf of a particular candidate, wanted to caution Mr. Young not to make any appointment not approved by the President.

HE ASSENTS

Dutifully, Mr. Young, who already had made up his mind about the successor to ailing Maj. Harvey Callahan, said he would make no appointment without clearing with the President.

Later, the White House told Mr. Young that he could appoint anyone he wanted—as long as it was a Police Department career man.

Mr. Young sighed with relief and went ahead with his plans to appoint Inspector Robert J. Barrett, now chief of detectives, to succeed Major Callahan, who is ill.

INDISCREET

Mr. Young made the mistake, however, of revealing to a number of people his intentions to appoint Mr. Barrett. A torrent of protest followed the announcement.

Yesterday Commissioner Young, in a move that would give the impending appointment the air of a considered decision, launched a "study" of the records of eight police officers eligible for the No. 1 job.

The eight are: Inspector Walter Thomas, acting chief; Inspector Oscar Letterman, former vice-squad chief; Inspector Clarence Talley, supervisor of the second district; Inspector Arthur E. Miller, traffic division; Inspector John Fowler, head of police school; Capt. John Fondahl, head of the eleventh precinct; Capt. Floyd Truscott, head of the thirteenth precinct and one of the department's outstanding detectives; and Inspector Barrett.

MR. BARRETT'S PAST

High spots of Inspector Barrett's career include four trial-board appearances for brutality toward prisoners—not guilty each time—and his conviction in 1931 of beating a prisoner. The conviction was reversed on a technicality and the second trial ended in a hung jury. The charge then was nolle prossed.

Last year, it was brought out that Lieutenant Barrett had become Captain Barrett without taking the customary civil-service examination. It was done by a White House Executive order at the request of Barrett's uncle, the late Col. Edward J. Kelly.

Wednesday evening, Detective Chief Barrett entered Providence Hospital for treatment for the grippe, in the official explanation—coincidental with charges in the Kelly murder case that defendants were beaten by detectives to obtain confessions.

[From the Washington Post of May 24, 1947]

POLICE HEAD

The Commissioners have not acted too soon in considering the selection of a new police superintendent. The long illness of Supt. Harvey G. Callahan has forced them to act, for they see that the Police Department is losing morale. Superintendent Callahan says that he has no intention to retire and expects to return to his desk no later than July 1. Undoubtedly the Commissioners as well as the public sincerely hope that he will be able to do so. But in case he is not, the Commissioners must be be prepared to act. No organization whose efficiency is peculiarly geared to its morale can long operate effectively without an authoritative chief whose position is unassailable.

A few days ago Commissioner J. Russell Young began studying the records of eight top-flight men in the Police Department. Yesterday he asked for the records of seven more. It is reasonable to assume that not all of these men are under consideration for the superintendency of police; some are doubtless under investigation for replacement of the man who may be advanced to the top job. The strong implication is, however, that if it becomes necessary to select a new head of the police, he will be picked from this group. This is good policy. There are a number of able men of long experience in the department—men who are fully capable of taking over the top position. We think the community will be relieved by this indication that the superintendent will continue to be a Police Department man.

By thus narrowing the range of their possible choice, however, the Commissioners have by no means solved their problem. While a good police force is likely to thrive on promotions from within, they cannot be routine promotions. Nor can the Commissioners afford to take any one particular officer merely because he pulls the most wires in his own behalf. What is needed is obviously a conscientious analysis of the record of each candidate, with the object of letting the best man come to the top. And this means the best man to head the department. A police officer may have a brilliant record in solving crimes and yet be completely unfitted for the executive position of police superintendent. First of all, the policeman shifted into this key position must have the full confidence and respect of his men. Second, he must have the confidence of the public. A brilliant record that is spotted with charges, suspicions, and controversies will not inspire such confidence, especially when those charges relate to the attitude of an officer toward the public. We hope that the Commissioners will feel their responsibility in this matter as keenly as if they had been elected by the people whom they serve.

Labor-Industry School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following newspaper story describing the labor-industry school of the Botany Worsted Mills, in Passaic, N. J., which today graduates its first class of 400 students. The account appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, May 25, 1947:

LABOR-INDUSTRY SCHOOL IN JERSEY ENDS FIRST TERM—BOTANY PROJECT, STARTED IN SEPTEMBER, HELPS MILL'S ACTIVITY, BOTH SIDES AGREE

A school in labor-management relations in which union-shop stewards and supervisors study side by side with company foremen and with management officials will hold its first graduation exercises Tuesday at Botany Worsted Mills, Passaic, N. J.

Believed by its founder to be the first comprehensive plan of its kind in the country, the school is conducted jointly by the Textile Workers' Union of America, a Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliate, and Botany Mills, one of the country's largest textile manufacturers. Classes were begun last September to promote better mutual understanding between the labor and management officials who handle the company's labor problems.

In a course operated according to standard academic procedures, student foremen and stewards study the letter of their contract and of labor laws, the precedents of grievance procedures and the broader aims on which company and union agree. According to George Baldanzi, vice president of the national union, it offers to "labor a real opportunity to sit down and talk things over with management."

In the same vein, the president of the company, Charles F. H. Johnson, says he considers that one of the school's greatest assets is that it provides a chance "for all concerned to get to know one another and to know each other's problems."

The school was started within a year of the company's signing of its first union contract, in 1945, which provides for a union shop. The company had had several brushes with the National Labor Relations Board, but since the union has been recognized Mr. Johnson says he has come to believe that cooperation is the best way of achieving the "joint goal of continuous and efficient production."

In September 1946, Mr. Johnson; Mr. Baldanzi; C. F. H. Johnson, Jr., general manager; Maj. Gen. Irving M. Phillipson, United States Army (retired), director of industrial relations; and others discussed the need for the school. It was agreed that there was a lack of special training for those directly concerned with labor disputes—foremen are likely to be promoted for their industrial skill and union leaders elected for their activities outside of the shop, while neither is necessarily a specialist in human relationships.

To meet the situation the school was organized to help resolve complaints and grievances as closely as possible to the point of origin—directly between foremen and shop stewards when possible. Both sides are taught that the great majority of individual complaints arise from such human variables as health, temperament and social problems outside of the concern. The students are continually reminded that "workers don't leave their personalities behind when they punch the time clock."

The course consists of 20 1-hour classes, held on company time three times a day to accommodate different shifts. Less than 20 students make up an average class. The teachers are from the ranks of both labor and management and the curriculum is agreed upon by both parties.

Since there was no precedent for setting up the school, the procedure has had to develop as it goes along. There is as yet no textbook for the course, but the lectures and exercises given this winter have been consolidated and will soon be published, Mr. Johnson said.

About 400 students will be graduated from the first session on Tuesday, said Mr. Johnson, and a number of industrialists from several parts of the country, interested in adopting the plan, will attend the ceremony at 6:30 p. m. at the plant. Because of the large turn-over of labor in the mill—which, with 5,600 workers, is the largest single employer in Passaic—the course will be continuous and will train new foremen and stewards as they are appointed or elected.

So far Mr. Johnson and Mr. Baldanzi are enthusiastic about their plan. Since the school began the record shows a decrease in top-level disputes, a lower incidence of absenteeism, and increased production.

Agriculture Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 25, 1947.*
Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers deeply shocked at several recommendations of House Appropriations Committee on Agriculture Appropriations. Our organization offered sincere aggressive support for real constructive economy by eliminating unnecessary personnel, excessive expenditures and duplication of services. But we asked committee not to cut heart out of farm program. Instead committee made most of savings at expense of farmers and vital farm program and failed to require reduction in many badly overstaffed agencies. Farmers are especially indignant over cut in 1947; $300,000,000 AAA conservation program specifically approved by Congress last year to $165,000,000, thereby breaking faith with millions of farmers and also complete elimination of program in 1948. Reduction of administrative expenses to $15,000,000 will make it impossible for State and county PMA officers to carry out this program successfully and to handle commodity loans and other price support functions vital to millions of farmers. Farmers in every section are alarmed over complete elimination of section 32 funds for surplus disposal which Congress has approved as permanent appropriations. Farmers also greatly concerned over failure to provide even first year's allotment of research funds approved under Hope-Flannagan Act which passed almost unanimously last year. We favor strict economy but strongly protest foregoing actions as false economy and breaking faith with farmers. These vital programs were adopted by bipartisan votes in Congress. Millions of farmers are looking to you to rectify these injustices and keep faith with farmers above party by providing these vitally needed funds.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
EDWARD A. O'NEAL, *President.*

Labor Law Symposium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, the Duke University Law School, of which I am an alumnus, publishes a quarterly known as Law and Contemporary Problems. Each issue of this publication is devoted to a symposium presenting legal and other social-science aspects of a vital current problem. This journal, founded in 1933 by Prof. David F. Cavers, now of the Harvard Law School, has attained a position of distinction among legal periodicals—a unique distinction, since it is the only one which systematically correlates the legal approaches to the solution of problems with the enlightenment which can be gained by reference to the contributions of the other social sciences.

The spring 1947 issue of Law and Contemporary Problems is devoted to a symposium on labor-dispute settlement, edited by Prof. Brainerd Currie, editor of the journal, and Mr. Paul H. Sanders, formerly of the Duke Law School faculty and now of the Atlanta bar. The symposium consists of 11 articles by people of varying backgrounds and shades of opinions, discussing the problem of labor-dispute settlement from the legal standpoint, from the standpoint of the economist, from the standpoint of the psychological and sociological problems of personnel administration, and from the standpoint of the public interest. Some of the articles were prepared by labor leaders, some by representatives of management, and others by observers of industrial relations who have no affiliation with either side. The symposium as a whole is a balanced, well-rounded and sincere attempt to explore the problems of labor-dispute settlement in a scholarly manner.

The settlement of labor disputes is justly termed America's most serious postwar domestic problem. Because of the timeliness of this symposium, which presents a significant cross section of opinion at a time when the Congress has under consideration a major legislative program for labor, it seems to me that a copy should be placed on the desk of every Member of Congress. I have arranged with the publishers for a complimentary copy to be sent to each Member of the House and Senate. The Duke University Law School and the editors of Law and Contemporary Problems are glad to make this distribution as a public service; they are concerned only that there be no misinterpretation of their motives in doing so. Law and Contemporary Problems is a nonprofit professional publication. It is not a crusading journal, and has no propaganda objectives. The views expressed in the articles published in the periodical are to be attributed to their authors alone and not to the periodical, its editors, or Duke University. In making copies of this symposium available to Members of Congress the publishers have no intention of attempting to influence congressional action on labor legislation. Indeed, the opinions expressed by the various authors are so diverse and frequently conflicting that it would be impossible to reconcile them for the purpose of any partisan thesis.

The Congress has not permitted itself to be stampeded by industrial conflicts into the hasty enactment of unwise labor legislation. In spite of the pressure of developments, it has taken the time to consider the issues fully and dispassionately, and to consider the long-range implications of proposed remedies for the American way of life. It is in this same spirit, hoping to perform a public service, that the publishers of Law and Contemporary Problems have made available to the Members of Congress this important collection of studies of a problem with which we must be so deeply concerned.

British Plan New Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of May 25, 1947, by Constantine Brown, entitled "British Plan New Empire." I sincerely hope that our Department of State is not oblivious to this situation.

The editorial follows:

BRITISH PLAN NEW EMPIRE—SOUTH AFRICA VITAL IN COME-BACK STRUGGLE

(By Constantine Brown)

Officially inspired reports from London that Great Britain will cease to be the policeman of the Mediterranean and that the United States is expected to assume that role come as no surprise to Washington official quarters.

Britain is now attempting to organize a new empire in Africa. It has been known since last October that the London government was preparing to abandon its military obligations in the Mediterranean and was hoping that America would assume them.

Ever since the British Government decided to abandon its empire in the Far East by giving India unconditional freedom, it has been obvious that she would no longer be interested in the eastern Mediterranean, which in the past she considered her lifeline. Last October the State Department received definite information that British troops would be withdrawn from Greece. Later Britain displayed slackening interest in the question of the Dardanelles.

UNITED STATES LACKS BASES

Whether the United States will be able to replace Britain as the Mediterranean policeman is a moot question. One of the most serious physical handicaps is the fact that we have neither naval nor air bases in that area, and it seems doubtful that we could avail ourselves of the important bases at Malta or Cyprus.

Britain cannot survive even as a second-rate power without a colonial empire. It is a poor country, lacking almost all kinds of raw materials, except coal. Her population is overwhelmingly industrial. The recent food shortages, 2 years after the end of the war in Europe, reveal that she still relies almost exclusively on imported food. Adequate food supplies cannot be brought to the United Kingdom without a favorable export balance.

The British workman suffers more than the capitalist from abandonment of the Asiatic empire. This is fully realized by the Labor government and by a majority of the House of Commons. The British need an empire, not for the sake of the capitalists, who can always find an outlet for their money elsewhere, but for the sake of millions of workers.

SOME SEE DEAL WITH FRANCE

The Government believes it has found the answer. It is planning to move the imperial activities to an area which can be more easily policed and which does not lend itself to international conflict—Africa, south of the Equator, with Kenya Province in the north as its chief base.

Some more ambitious Britishers, such as representatives of the Conservative Party, believe that some agreement might possibly be reached with France for joint exploitation of the entire African continent, which contains many little-developed raw materials. Except for North Africa, where the Arabs comprise a pretty solid block, the rich areas in Central Africa are populated by people who still lack any feeling of national unity. It is in such areas where imperialism can be developed and proven beneficial for those who dominate and are dominated.

Negotiations toward the creation of such an empire are being carried out at present by the governments of Britain and South Africa on the one hand and Belgium and France, which control the Congo and a portion of West Africa, on the other.

EMPIRE IS SHRINKING

The British decision to move out of Asia was taken after deliberate discussion and planning. The chief reason was that all the British politicians have become fully aware of the fact that Britain is no longer a world power. Her only hope of taking a more limited position as one of the world leaders rests in the possibility of organizing a new empire in Africa south of the Equator. This will require her to enter a partnership not only with France, Belgium, and Portugal, but also the Union of South Africa, which only last month received the royal family.

The British Government abandoned India and is ready to abandon all other possessions in the Indian Ocean, including Malaya. It has no longer the means to control them, particularly since Russia has emerged as a world power of the first order and has shown clearly that it does not intend to tolerate Britain in her backyard.

According to reports from reliable sources, the whole matter of Britain moving out of Asia politically and militarily was submitted last December to Prime Minister Stalin by Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery, chief of the British imperial staff. Lord Montgomery paid a visit to Moscow, where he was received with more pomp than any other western Allied military leader has been accorded.

MONTGOMERY OUTLINED POLICY

The abstemious Scot was dined and wined in true Russian fashion. He visited Russian military establishments and was presented with a sable-lined coat. But above everything else, he had a long conversation with Prime Minister Stalin, during which he is said to have expounded Britain's new policy of avoiding a clash with the U. S. S. R.

This policy is said, by those who later reported on it, to have included among other things the British plan to move politically out of Asia in order to avoid the age-old contest with Russia in that area. In exchange for that liquidation of Britain's entanglements in the Middle East and in the Indian Ocean, the chief of the British imperial staff wanted to know whether he could report to his superiors that the Soviet Government would be willing to respect British oil interests in the Middle East.

Lord Montgomery is said to have informed Stalin that Britain was sincere in her offer to abandon her political interests in the areas so dear to the Russian heart and that she contemplated establishing a new empire in Africa, south of Egypt. This, he said, could by no stretch of the imagination be construed as conflicting with Russia's policies. Prime Minister Stalin is said to have agreed.

NEW ALLIANCE REPORTED

The indorsement of the British plan was reported by Lord Montgomery on his return to London early last January. He called on King George VI immediately after his arrival. He also had a 2-hour session with the cabinet.

The immediate sequel of that conversation was the disclosure of a tripartite alliance between Britain, France, and Russia. For the present this alliance is not in effect. Such historic developments are subject to much bargaining and haggling. But the handful of American official observers who have followed the new trend believe they have now received at least partial confirmation of the reports of Britain's new orientation.

London has now admitted that it has sold Russia a number of jet planes. The price will be paid in Russian raw materials. But Washington has received definite information that besides these jet planes the British since January have been selling the Russians plexiglass, plastics essential in the mass production of jet planes, and a number of other inventions developed in the United Kingdom during the war.

Whatever atomic energy formula Russia possesses today came from the persons who betrayed secrets to the Soviets, as was made clear in the Canadian spy case. But the British Government's willingness to provide the Soviet Government with materials needed for modern warfare is regarded as an indication of trends in the United Kingdom.

Let's Not Civilize These Happy People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I read the honest, straightforward report of Rear Adm. Carleton H. Wright, United States Navy, concerning our new island possessions in the old Japanese mandates of the Marianas, Carolines, and Marshalls. This article appeared in the May 3, 1947, issue of the Saturday Evening Post and I recommend it wholeheartedly to the Members of Congress for a good understanding of the problem which confronts us and also for a good report of conditions as they actually exist in that part of the world.

I might say to the Members that Admiral Wright has visited practically every one of our new islands, sometimes under the greatest of difficulties, and he thoroughly knows and understands what he is talking about. I can attest personally to the fact that the natives in the islands think a great deal of Admiral Wright and that in return he is tolerant, understanding, and sympathetic towards their needs. I congratulate the Navy on having such a man as Admiral Wright as general inspector for the United States Navy of the Pacific Ocean area, and I want to congratulate him for the fine job he has done to keep alive the spirit of America in his understanding and sympathy for the people who comprise the population of the former mandated islands.

It is my impression, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time the Navy Department is the only qualified agency who can handle these new possessions and certainly it must be admitted that they are fully aware of the difficulties and complexities of the job of administering which has been thrust upon them. The Navy military government officials, who have been sent out to look after the needs of the natives in the former mandates, are doing a splendid job by and large and the course of training being given by the Navy school of military government at Stanford University is outstanding in every respect. The Navy students, volunteers all, who are undertaking the necessary courses before being sent to the Pacific Islands, are being intensively trained for their duties by an excellent staff and the results gained by my personal experience with them indicate that they are doing an extremely good job. I do think that sometime in the future it may be both wise and necessary that some sort of civilian control be inaugurated over these island possessions but I do not think on the basis of personal experience that at the present time there is an agency more capable or more interested in administering these new possessions of ours.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting the article by Admiral Wright which appeared in the May 3 issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

LET'S NOT CIVILIZE THESE HAPPY PEOPLE

(By Rear Adm. Carleton H. Wright, United States Navy)

Twenty-eight years ago, with short-lived foresight, the United States protested Japan's acquisition of Yap. The Government's case was not helped any by the isolationist press, which thought that the Pacific island's name was just too funny, and made of Yap a symbol to ridicule the first fumbling American efforts for a system of exterior security.

Today Yap is ours. We hold it by right of conquest, together with some hundreds of other inhabited Pacific islands scattered over nearly 5,000,000 square miles of ocean. Our Government has asked the United Nations to confirm the United States as trustee, with sovereign rights, for these former Japanese mandates from the defunct League of Nations. It is tentatively proposed, subject to the ultimate authority of Congress, to develop a few of the most adaptable and strategically situated islands as defensive bases against aggression upon the peace of the United States, which is to say, of course, the peace of the world.

Meanwhile we are the guardians of some 50,000 native inhabitants of lands that come very close to realizing the ecstatic mythology of the ancient Greeks' Islands of the Blessed. A very important question we shall soon have to answer is, What shall we do with these people? What shall we do for them?

And I say, for mercy's sake let them alone in their happiness.

As general inspector for the United States Navy of the Pacific Ocean area I have visited every one of the hundreds of inhabited islands. I have sat for days with the island chiefs and the headmen of each community, discussing and studying their wants and needs, which are few and simple. And I have as industriously studied the sources of their tranquillity and good cheer for my own benefit, to arrive at the conviction that their serenity is derived from a minimum of gov-

ernment, a simple economy, and an environment that is as close to the Garden of Eden's as exists anywhere.

But heaven help them. What a temptation they offer to the brisk missionaries of modernism, the bureaucrats, the sentimentalists and the busybody do-gooders.

At present the government of the area is administered by naval personnel, volunteers all, and all intensively trained for their duties in the School of Military Government at Stanford University. It is government by the remotest possible system of control, which concerns itself almost exclusively with these responsibilities:

To restore property and facilities damaged in the war; to improve health and sanitation; to encourage the earliest establishment of self-governing communities regulated by local customs, not alien-imposed ideas; to initiate an educational program adapted to native capabilities and to local environments to these ends, and to teach the natives to achieve the maximum benefits offered by their environment. And all that that latter clause means is to teach these amiable, happy-go-lucky Micronesians how to help bountiful Mother Nature just a little bit, and that mainly is the easy art of conservation.

We cannot do much less, because most of that simple program is designed to remedy ills that the occidental races—directly or at second-hand through the Japanese—inflicted upon the islanders. The worst of their diseases were introduced by whalers, traders, missionaries, and military expeditions. German and Japanese conquerors and exploiters disrupted social and economic balances achieved through centuries of uncontaminated self-development. Since the white man—and yellow—came to the islands, the native population has declined as much as 90 percent, and whole nations have become extinct, their only monuments such awe-inspiring works of engineering as the Matalanin ruins in Ponape.

The lesson I have unforgettably learned is that the islanders' enviable happiness, contentment, and self-sufficiency are in inverse ratio to their exposure to occidental standards of civilization. If civilization means flush toilets, ice cubes, machine guns, and sewing machines, then these people are savages. If civilization means an economic system in which there is no relative poverty, but an adequacy of food, shelter, and security, and a social system in which all participate equally and actively in the material and the aesthetic aspects of community life, then they are civilized and we have much to learn from them.

But the impulse, of course, will be to uplift them, and may God help them—and forgive us—if the effort is made. The perimeter islands of the Pacific are studded with horrible examples of what happened when nineteenth-century European-American standards of economy, politics, and morality were imposed upon Polynesians and Micronesians. There you will find squalor, discontent, endemic diseases not only of the body but of mind and spirit, and at best only a poor imitation of the Anglo-Saxon and Hispanic civilizations we superior races, in our self-righteousness, forced upon peoples who had made a much more advantageous bargain with nature than we can hope to achieve.

Being contented and happy, the islanders will passively resist our attempts to make Iowans or Californians or Virginians out of them if we try it. Let me give you an example by returning this narrative to Yap, 5,000 miles southwesterly from San Francisco, 458 miles southwest of Guam, 800 miles east of the southern Philippines. Most of us, forgetting that the international agitation over the disposition of Yap in 1919 was because of its strategic position, do remember it as the island of stone money. Yap is a happy land where an hour's work a day is ample for a man to keep his family well fed and adequately sheltered, where the climate is kindly and grass skirts are still the mode. But at last it was ours.

So we went to Yap and told them so. We told them, also, that hereafter Japanese money was worthless. They took the news without blinking. We told them they would have to exchange their yen for dollars. They smilingly acquiesced. We told them how many yen they would have to give up for a dollar. They did not demur or haggle. They treated it as a big joke. That, I thought, was no way to regard the most powerful unit of currency on earth. In civilized Europe, I knew, people were parting with everything from precious heirlooms to their virtue for an American dollar to two.

Most powerful unit of currency on earth? Almighty dollar? The Yap chiefs strove politely to conceal their derision.

It took much patient inquiry to learn what they really thought—the most stable unit of currency on earth is the bead, shell, and stone money of Yap, and they could prove it.

A long time ago, I was told, the Spaniards came to Yap. They said the only good money was that of Spain. For so much work, so many sacks of copra, a certain number of Spanish reals would be paid, which could be exchanged for certain lengths of cotton cloth or a quantity of needles or tobacco.

The Yaplanders shrugged their shoulders. In the transactions with the Spaniards they used reals, but among themselves they remained true to their own currency—in ascending value, strings of glasslike native beads, longer strings of polished shell disks interspersed with polished red stone and finished off with toggles of sea-cow ivory, and, finally, the huge pierced disks of imported stone. These latter, some of which weigh several tons, are symbols of wealth rather than negotiable currency, for it takes 50 men to move one.

Anyhow, years later the Germans arrived and said thereafter marks, not reals, would be the standard currency. So the Yaplanders did business with the white man in marks, and among themselves with shell and stone. Thirty years passed, and the Japanese moved in. Now the mark was no good. Only yen were money. The people of Yap said whatever passes for O. K. in their dialect, and good-humoredly indulged the third set of foreigners in their financial whimsey.

"Now the Americans come," I was told. "You say now yen no good, only dollar, just like Japanese say mark no good, Germans say real no good. But all the time, all the time, Yap money always good. Yap money best in the world." And they were right—in their world.

Yap money, primitive as it seems to us whose economy is based on tons of gold buried in Fort Knox, represents a fairly sophisticated finance compared with most of the islands, where most property is communal and barter is the medium for such exchange as exists.

Let me say right here that it is dangerous to make generalizations about the people of the Marshall and Caroline archipelagoes. I shall, of inexorable necessity, be guilty of violating that rule myself in a narrative of this dimension. So I make no apology for the preceding generalization, or for this one: that, except where superficial respect is paid to alien forms of government, the internal administration of most of the islands is by hereditary chieftainship.

Now, I know, too, that by our standards the islands' economic and political systems are all wrong. The first smacks of communism and the latter of royalism. I can foresee, with no small horror, efforts undertaken to provide the islanders with a sound financial system, including mortgages, sight drafts, traveler's checks—for they are great travelers, these people—and compound interest. I can see, as in a nightmare, the paid apostles of democracy coming into the Pacific to educate the islanders in the privilege of the franchise and teaching them how to hold nominating primaries, party conventions, conduct electoral campaigns, and to exercise the initiative, referendum, and recall.

It will be about as practicable and progressive as to try to make dairymen out of them because they now have no cows, or to inaugurate a good-roads program because they must now travel on foot or in outrigger canoes. I still say, let them alone in their enviable simplicity. Keep out the do-gooders and the disciplinarians.

Island chiefs attain rule by a complicated system of heredity which traces descent through the female line.

In theory, the chief is all-powerful. In practice, any attempt at despotism or lesser malfeasance or misfeasance is a short cut to deposal, if not disposal. If ever governments derive their just rights from the consent of the governed, it is in the primitively organized islands. Theoretically, everything in the domain belongs to the chief; practicably, everything is equitably divided, be it a haul of fish or the use of the one sailmaker's needle on the atoll. By native standards it is right and proper that the chief should have the best of everything, for he has a full-time job, and no one else is thus burdened. But there is small difference between the best and the worst in an environment where the staple foods are fish, turtle, breadfruit, and taro, where the weather is so ideal that the need for clothing is reduced to something soft to sit on, and both food and clothing are to be had in surfeit for the taking, plus a few minutes of simple preparation.

The whole system of government is inextricably involved with the complicated—and sensible, withal—code of taboos, and that, in turn, is blended into religion. Again risking generalization, I find most of the islanders, even those who had not seen white men before the arrival of my Navy party, are at least nominally Christians. Some of the missionaries, especially the most recent ones, contributed marvelously to the welfare of their flocks with small disturbance to the ancient codes. The ethics of Christianity were easily adaptable to the indigenous philosophy of an inherently gentle and generous folk. They learned eagerly about, and believed readily in, the Christ who was Himself an artisan, whose greatest friend was Peter, a fisherman. From the same teachers they learned the rudiments of sanitation and husbandry. Most of the occidental missionaries were forced to leave during the Japanese regime, but their teachings were not only not forgotten, they were carried to the remoter islands by these natives who think nothing of 1,000-mile journeys in outrigger canoes. I was told almost everywhere that the islanders want those missionaries, or others like them, to return and live among them.

Unfortunately, some of the missionaries, especially the grimly puritanical kind that the nineteenth century produced, carried to the islands some of the hair-shirt brand of dogmatic theology widely accepted in American religious circles at the time.

When those ideas were brought to the islands by missionaries themselves willing to die in their defense, the results were, to say the least, not good.

The natives docilely donned clothing when they were told that their seminudity would be punished after death with eternal torment, and with the voluminous New England costumes they also acquired tuberculosis and other respiratory diseases and diseases of the skin. They did not die like flies; they died like the inhabitants of Hiroshima,

only a little more slowly. To a people who dance and sing much more naturally than you or I or our kind, whose songs are, in fact, an only means of perpetuating tribal history much in the manner of the old Icelandic sagas, the imported prohibition on any song except the dolorous and to them meaningless hymns not only killed their spirits but deprived us of much ancient lore that would go far toward satisfying our curiosity about the origins and ancestry of the island peoples.

When we recall how radically our own ideas of the essentials of Christian conduct have changed in a single generation, we should at least be aware of the possibility that many customs and procedures which we now accept as highly desirable and normal will appear absurd to our successors. That observation applies not only to religious conduct but to all social practices. The islanders, who are involuntary if however acquiescent wards of our Government, are entitled to protection from enthusiasts who would change their ways to those which at the moment seem good to us. And that means protection from the military autocrat and the ideology-ridden bureaucrat as well as from the theological dogmatist.

The ills which beset the islanders are mostly of foreign introduction, and one of the contributions we can sensibly make is access to modern medication and the education in sanitation and hygiene without which recourse to medicine is only a palliative. A disease called yaws is peculiarly prevalent. It causes great, shallow, disfiguring ulcers. Yaws is a tropical disease which girdles the earth. It is scientifically interesting because it is caused and transmitted by a spirochete, the same kind of germ that causes syphilis, and it responds to the same kind of medical treatment. But yaws is not a venereal disease. It is infectiously transmitted through any wound, cut or abrasion.

In the short time since the Navy assumed postwar guardianship of the islands, the physicians and pharmacists of the Medical Corps have made great progress in arresting the disease among the afflicted. A part of the program we have charted for the islands is to train native practitioners—a 4-year course in simple medical education, half that time for resident nurses—who will return to their home islands to maintain the public health under periodic visits of inspection by the Navy doctors.

The islanders possess no native metals. Their only lumber comes from the breadfruit tree, which also supplies them with a dietary staple. The timber is painfully felled and hewed by tedious chiseling, and the whittled planks are literally sewed together with cords of hand-twisted coconut fiber, to make canoes which, under sails of handwoven pandanus leaves—lahalla mats—can and do make voyages of thousands of miles. All interisland intercourse is by means of these frail-looking, hand-made vessels, and upon these fragile fleets the islanders depend also for their main article of diet, fish.

As I said, I am no sentimentalist intent upon preserving the picturesque for its own sake and at sacrifice of use and comfort, so I think we should enable the islanders to obtain carpenters' tools, lumber and nails, bolts, cordage, and sailcloth. In identical inspiration I believe they should be given access to corrugated sheet metal for roofing. I freely admit that an outrigger studded with nailheads standing out to sea under patched canvas will not be as pretty as the stitched and carved canoes with the rush sails. I confess without remorse that a native house with a corrugated-tin roof will be downright ugly compared with thatch. But the islanders won't think so, and, after all, they are the ones to be pleased. We shall see them only in newsreels and travelogues, but they have to risk their lives day after day in sewn boats with sails of dried leaves, and all the fresh water they have for drinking or cooking is the rain that drips from the eaves of their houses. A tin roof will keep the inside of their homes drier and give them more and cleaner water than the insect-ridden, musty thatching.

We should teach them, too, not to want radios and juke boxes or button shoes, but to make better use of the materials nature has made so richly available to them. I would teach them elementary tree surgery so the all-important breadfruit trees would bear more lavishly and suffer less from decay. I would teach them how to make their own soap from the abundant vegetable fats and wood-ash lye, instead of encouraging them to buy cheap, scented traders' soap at outrageous prices.

I would give them schools with native teachers, trained not to impose an alien culture upon their charges, but to perfect their own. And in these schools I would have basic English taught as a second language, for there are as many dialects as there are islands, and nine vocabularies so distinct from one another that a native who speaks one cannot understand the others. Some missionaries and mission-trained native teachers have reduced a few of the more widely spoken dialects to writing. But some languages are spoken by only 100 people or so, and all nine vary so much in island-to-island and village-to-village dialect that it would be a futile task to attempt standardization. But the 800 words or so of basic English could, and should, be introduced, if only to permit the people of Ponape to converse with voyagers from Yap or Ulithi. Thank goodness the hideous burlesque "pidgin English" has practically disappeared—one, and maybe the only, good effect of the Japanese occupation.

And that's about all. That sort of education will not disturb their social, economic, or aesthetic standards, which are adequate to them and in many ways enviable to us. Let them alone, I say. Keep out the amateur disciplinarians, do-gooders, and self-righteous reformers; and as for the professional apostles of discipline and virtue by the standards of Ohio or Vermont or the District of Columbia, we would be kinder to the islanders if we exposed them to smallpox instead.

As I said before, some of the most strategically placed and physically adaptable islands will be developed as bases, either in the scheme of world security against aggressive war or, more immediately, as way stations on the earth-girdling routes of aerial transportation. Discussion of that aspect of the Pacific islands is not my privilege or my province. It must seem reasonably certain to any casual observer that the United States, which acquired domain over the area at hideous cost in the war against Japan, will have at least a dominating influence in its administration, either as trustees with the rights of complete sovereignty under the aegis of the United Nations, or, eventually, as a member of a committee of international administrators. Whatever external influence is brought to bear on the islanders will almost certainly be predominantly American.

That influence can either be one of mild benevolence, as I have outlined and to the establishment of which I am dedicated, or it can be anything else from the fatuous to the despotic. We should put within the islanders' reach the tools and techniques of self-help and self-development, to employ according to their needs and abilities. That, I believe, is the beginning and the end of our contribution. Additionally, I believe, it is our duty to protect the islanders from the evils we have been too prone to visit upon indigenous peoples in our past, beginning with the American Indian—subjection to the iron whim and idiosyncrasy of the casually appointed military governor, the pork-barrel political bureaucrat, or the grinning do-gooder for a salary.

The islanders are, for how little or how long I can't foretell, our responsibility. We have acquired, with small deliberation on our part and none at all on their own, control over 50,000 well-fed, happy, cheerful, amiable people, and our responsibility should be so discharged as to leave them at least as happy and amiable as we found them, even after 35 years of Japanese rule. Who knows but what, if the dire predictions of intercontinental atomic warfare we read about come true, these people may be the meek who, as the Bible prophesied, shall inherit the earth?

Stilling the Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of May 10, 1947:

STILLING THE VOICE OF AMERICA

(By Barnet Nover)

In the course of a week recently, a not untypical week, the people of Europe and Asia were fed the following facts about the United States:

That the aim of the United States is to capture key political and strategic positions in Europe.

That the United States is launching a race in armaments.

That the Turkish Army is secretly being run by American and British agents.

That General Marshall, in his recent radio address, did not tell the truth about the Moscow Conference.

And also that the United States is making a colony out of the Philippines.

That the income of American workers has declined by 50 percent and that thousands of American families are "dwelling in old wagons and deserted military billets."

That "American policy in the Far East is one of world conquest."

That the United States is heading directly into a severe depression.

That the presence of American warships in the Mediterranean means that "the United States has decided to resort to threats of violence."

That the great majority of Americans are strongly opposed to the Truman policy with respect to Greece and Turkey.

That American policy in Germany aims to bring about "an imperialist peace based on the enslavement of nations."

This is the picture of America which the people of Europe and Asia got if they listened to radio broadcasts from Russia and Russian-dominated areas in eastern Europe in the course of 1 week.

It is the picture, with variations, which they have been getting of America over a period of many months. The purpose, obviously, is to denigrate the United States, arouse suspicion as to this country's motives, create fears as to its aims.

Can we afford to be complacent about this anti-American propagandist campaign, sit back and assume that the untruths, half truths, and exaggerations will do no harm since we know they are so wide of the mark?

That seems to be the attitude of a large number in the House of Representatives, judging by the action that has been taken in wiping out the appropriation needed to continue the State Department's overseas information program.

We have spent billions in relief for foreign countries. The House itself has just approved, as the Senate did earlier, an appropriation of $400,000,000 to aid Greece and Turkey.

It is in defiance of all logic and common sense to appropriate that money and at the same time cut out the small appropriation needed to present to the world a true picture of America.

Such an information program is needed not merely to combat the vicious anti-American propaganda with which so many ears are being assailed in so many countries of the world. It is even more needed to hold up to the world an undistorted mirror of American events, American thought, American policies.

To some slight extent this essential task is being done by private agencies and individuals. But there is a vast area which private enterprise cannot and does not reach in this battle for men's minds. It is at this point that the Government must step in and do the job that so badly needs being done, a job which, incidentally, the State Department, despite its critics, has done extremely well.

Throughout the world there is a great hunger for news of America, for facts about our institutions, our history, our culture.

This eagerness to know more about the United States does not primarily arise out of sentimental inclinations toward this country. It is the product of a very intense realization of the vastly important role the United States is playing in world affairs.

If this country does not itself explain what it is doing, it will be done by somebody else and neither to our liking nor to our interest. Indeed, the distorted picture the world would then get of America's role might seriously undermine the great efforts we are making on behalf of the democratic ideal and the peaceful way of life.

The best antidote for the kind of anti-American propaganda which is filling the air waves of Europe and Asia is the simple and unadulterated truth.

To cut off the State Department's information program, including the Voice of America broadcasts, would give this country's rivals and enemies a free field. No policy could be more stupid and self-destructive.

Resolution of New York Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

NEW YORK YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB,
New York, N. Y., May 23, 1947.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAVITS: The following resolution was submitted by the foreign affairs committee of the New York Young Republican Club and unanimously adopted by the board of governors of the club at its meeting on May 20. It is submitted to you herewith for your serious consideration.

"Whereas the conduct by the United States Government of broadcasts to the world explaining the position of the American people in matters of domestic and foreign affairs is a vital adjunct of United States foreign policy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of governors of the New York Young Republican Club strongly endorse the appropriation by Congress of adequate funds for the continuation of such broadcasts."

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN E. HEUTCHY, *President.*

United States Policy Must Be Clarified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain, recently stated that if domestic and foreign problems were to be approached satisfactorily it would be necessary for our Government to arrive at a policy where business could expand. He is opposed to piecemeal solution of the problem. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article which appeared recently in the New York Times, written by Thomas F. Conroy:

UNITED STATES POLICY MUST BE CLARIFIED
(By Thomas F. Conroy)

American business vitally needs a clear-cut statement by Government of its plans to meet domestic and world difficulties and should get it as soon as possible, Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain, declared in an interview here yesterday.

Attempts at piecemeal solutions of international and domestic problems are serving only to confuse industry and trade and may well result in bringing about greater unsettlement than now exists, he warned.

Mr. Kennedy, who has just returned from a Midwest business trip, said the thing which impressed him most was the bewildered reaction of businessmen to current economic and political developments. His family owns the Merchandise Mart in Chicago, which houses the largest cross section of business anywhere in the world.

SEES GREAT DISLOCATION

Describing present business conditions in the United States as involving " a great dislocation rather than an over-all recession," Mr. Kennedy said that uncertainty caused by lack of a clear-cut Government program is undoubtedly a major contributing factor. He noted that business in soft goods lines is slow, while activity continues strong in the durable goods field.

"One must admit," he said, "that the businessman still looks at the stock market and when he sees the ratio of earnings to selling prices so high, he begins to exaggerate his own difficulties and unsettlement results.

"But it is now clear that the Government must honestly tell the people pretty soon what the over-all cost of stopping communism abroad is likely to be. As long as that is uncertain, businessmen will instinctively believe the worst.

"Moreover, the Government should formulate and make public in specific terms as soon as possible what plans it has to cure inflation, maintain good business and keep employment at high wages.

"If business can see these two over-all plans, it will know what it has to do, what the plans will cost, and people generally will be able to make intelligent decisions.

"Today, I find the businessman worrying about the attitude of the buying public, which is setting itself to wait, not until the $7 white shirt is marked down to $5, but until it is marked down to a level it just isn't ever going to reach.

"I find the businessman reading the columnist and listening to the commentator and trying to figure out just how the unholy mess the world is in can be straightened out so business can be normal again. The problems are so great and so involved that it is no wonder that their confidence is shaken.

"I remember talking once with Montagu Norman in England when he was head of the Bank of England. He had just dropped into the Embassy in London one morning and said: 'I see that you folks in the United States are contemplating industrial mobilization. Who's going to run it? God Almighty?'

"That's about the way the businessmen I met feel about the many problems of today. He need a blueprint of action, so that he may chart his course. He is accustomed to getting specifications in business. That's what he wants to be rid of, his uncertainties. The little businessman wants to know whether he can survive price cuts, high taxes, and competition from the big fellow with his large resources.

EFFORTS TO STEM COMMUNISM

"The American public, through development of the great power of advertising, has come to be strongly influenced by words. The big words today are: Communism and what that will do to us; depression, and its effect upon us; and prices, what they will do to our economy.

"Personally, as I have said before, I believe our efforts to stem communism in Europe with dollars will eventually prove an overwhelming tax on our resources that will seriously affect the economic well-being of our country.

"Each businessman appears to have his own ideas of the solution for each of these economic questions, depending upon whether his interests lie in home trade or the foreign market.

"It can be said that the American businessman is getting ready to face competition and is sharpening his pencil with one eye on the Government and the other on his competition."

Commenting on current economic dislocations, Mr. Kennedy said that the Government campaign urging lower prices has made consumers conscious that prices appear very high and has resulted in increased sales resistance, whether justified or not.

"All this means is that the customer has decided to wait a while before buying, and the volume of trade that should be done at legitimate prices is not being done," Mr. Kennedy said. "Producers do not know yet how far they can afford to cut prices because of the uncertainty of basic material quotations, and consumers do not know at what prices they can buy satisfactorily.

"As an instance in point, a leading Midwest store had marked difficulty in obtaining a certain home appliance it wished to sell in one of its annual events. The store wanted 2,000 of the appliances. Its jobber source, having orders from all over the country for 50,000, could only supply 900. Yet the public only bought 200 of the appliances, which were priced most attractively. In other words, there was consumer sales resistance

to a legitimately priced article in the belief that prices would go lower.

"Many businessmen made money in the years just past and they realize they will now have to become competitive if they are to stay in business. This, I believe, will take care of the price situation, as it always has. But because of the present confusion a longer time may be required for establishment of a sound competitive basis. Some may become panicky if goods do not move. If this happens, it will be further evidence that a piecemeal solution of economic problems does more harm than good."

Mr. Kennedy said that the fall market week to be held in July at the Merchandise Mart will afford an index of what is going to happen in buying for the second half of this year.

"Business lines showing there are among the foremost in this country," he said. "They have survived business difficulties before and have made America the envy of the world. I believe they can do so again."

Public Welfare Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, known as the Public Welfare Act of 1947, which, like a similar bill I introduced in the last Congress, provides for the development of the welfare aspects of the Social Security Act along the lines recommended by those who administer assistance and other welfare programs at all levels of government. An identical bill is being introduced in the other body by a Republican. This proposal is nonpartisan and represents the cooperative thinking of the State and local public-welfare agencies and workers of all sections of the country acting through their own organization, the American Public Welfare Association. At the same time it incorporates the welfare recommendations of the Social Security Administration, including the Children's Bureau, and of the National Commission on Children and Youth on which are represented both public and nongovernmental leaders in the field of children's services.

I am pleased once again to present to the Congress a bill which incorporates the recommendations of those best qualified by experience and knowledge to advise us in this important area of public service. In this present bill I have made some technical modifications and clarifications to meet certain questions raised last year but in its general provisions and objectives this bill is similar to that which enlisted such broad support in hearings before the Ways and Means Committee last year.

No governmental achievement of the past 12 years has received more universal acceptance than the social-security program. People have faith in their ability to achieve protection against the risks and complexities of modern economic life through governmental action. But if that faith is to be justified we cannot afford to sit back in complacent pride for our achievements to date. We must now, acting on the experience of twelve years' operation, move forward. We have had notable success in achieving an increasing measure of security on a piecemeal basis. But now the time has come when we should move on to security for all our people, not just those favored groups in certain occupations and age brackets, through universal insurance coverage against the average predictable hazards of modern life and a comprehensive welfare program to provide for those particular needs which must be met through more individualized programs.

The bill which I have today introduced deals with the second phase of the social-security program. It deals with an area in which administrative responsibility rests with the States and localities, namely assistance on an individual basis to the needy and welfare services, including child-welfare services. But the fact that these highly individualized services are quite properly administered by State and local governments in no way relieves the Federal Government of its responsibility to extend the leadership of a Nation-wide program supported by Federal financial aid. We are one Nation, one economy, and one people. We must find, through measures like this one, the means to meet the needs of all our people without loss of the values of decentralized administration.

We must, moreover, show the good judgment and foresight to act in behalf of universal social-security provisions in time of comparative prosperity in order that we may at once minimize the possibility of any economic recession and preclude the necessity of hasty emergency measures should such a decline occur. Real social security, both in terms of universal social insurance and a comprehensive welfare program, safeguard not only the individual and his family but also the successful functioning of our social and economic life.

It is imperative that we act now when a high level of national income and employment give us both the time and the means to develop a constructive well-thought-out program. Last year the Congress extended temporary aid to meet, in part, the problem created for assistance recipients by the rising cost of living. This year, on the basis of the overwhelming evidence before it in terms of studies, recommendations from expert sources, platform commitments of both parties, and popular interest expressed through a wide variety of organizational channels, the Congress should be prepared to act on a long-time comprehensive basis.

I am glad to put before you this proposal for a comprehensive program of grants-in-aid to the State public-welfare departments for assistance to the needy and welfare services. This bill recognizes the fact that the need for assistance should decline as insurance protection, full employment, and expanding programs of medical care, mental hygiene, and the like serve to reduce dependency to a minimum. The role of public welfare should itself be increasingly preventive, and public-welfare departments throughout the country are emphasizing this phase of their work. Public welfare is the means through which an increasingly complex and frequently impersonal government approaches the special needs of particular adults, families, and children on an individual basis. Assistance places a floor under need, and welfare services help to prevent need, assist people to meet their own problems, and extend protection and aid to children. This bill proposes a comprehensive program of assistance and welfare service with equalizing Federal aid proportionate to the fiscal ability of the State. Specifically, it proposes a new title XIV to the Social Security Act which would replace the present assistance and child-welfare provisions with the following:

First. Federal financial aid would be available not only for the aged, blind, and dependent children as at present but for all needy persons.

Second. Welfare services for adults, families, and children could be included in the public-welfare program, and child-welfare services could include foster care, temporary institutional care, and services needed to supplement home care.

Third. Federal financial aid would be extended to the States on a basis ranging from 50 to 75 percent of total costs, depending on the relative per capita income of the States.

Fourth. Standards of assistance would be determined by the State on a basis of individual need and resources but in such a way as to assure equitable treatment to persons in similar circumstances throughout the State. Standards of assistance would be left to the States without maximum limitations specified in the Federal act.

Fifth. Persons requiring medical care would be able voluntarily to enter public medical institutions, other than those for tuberculosis or mental illness, without loss of assistance if the institutions met standards established by the State.

Sixth. Welfare agencies would be authorized to make payment for medical care rendered assistance recipients and other needy persons, directly to the individual or institution furnishing such care.

Seventh. Residence requirements and required transfer of property to the State during the lifetime of an assistance recipient would be prohibited.

Eighth. Administration through a single agency at each level of government would be required.

The bill follows:

A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable States to establish more adequate public-welfare programs, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Public Welfare Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1947, the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XIV—COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAM

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 1401. (a) The Congress finds and declares that a public-welfare program is an essential part of the social-security system in promoting the security and welfare of the people of the United States.

"(b) The purpose of this title is to enable each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to develop a comprehensive public-welfare program of assistance and welfare services for families, adults, and children; to make assistance available to all needy individuals in the State whose resources are not sufficient to enable them to maintain a minimum standard of economic security, with due recognition given to the special needs of the aged, the blind, the children, and handicapped individuals; and to make welfare services available in order to promote personal well-being and a maximum degree of self-help.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 1402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for each fiscal year thereafter, sums sufficient (a) for making payments to each State which has submitted a State public-welfare plan and had it approved by the Federal Security Agency, hereinafter referred to as the Agency; and (b) for expenditure directly by the Agency for the training of personnel for public-welfare work and for demonstration projects in cooperation with State agencies administering approved public-welfare plans.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 1403. As used in this title—

"(a) the term 'public welfare' means assistance and, where the State plan so provides, welfare services.

"(b) The term 'assistance' means—

"(1) money payments to needy individuals who have attained the age of 18 years and are not living in a public institution except as patients in a medical institution, and, with respect to needy individuals under the age of 18 years, money payments to parents, or to relatives or other individuals assuming responsibility for parental care and support of such children, who maintain a family home for them; provided, that such needy individuals are not patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases, or in any medical institution following diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis; and

"(2) where the State plan so provides, and where not otherwise available, medical services for needy individuals, provided through payments to persons, agencies, or institutions furnishing or procuring such services, but does not include medical services for individuals living in a public institution except as patients in a medical institution, or for patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases, or in a medical institution following a diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis.

"(c) the term 'welfare services' means family and adult welfare services and child welfare services, including (1), with respect to family and adult welfare services, social services designed to help families and individuals to become self-supporting, to meet individual or family social problems, and to make use of community resources and to contribute to community life; and (2) with respect to child welfare services, social services designed to assure the welfare of children and to help them overcome problems resulting from parental neglect or other circumstances likely to result in dependency, neglect, or juvenile delinquency, and care necessary to provide for children without parental care and supervision and children requiring temporary care outside their own homes, such care to be given in foster family homes, temporary homes, or other facilities needed to supplement home care.

"STATE PUBLIC WELFARE FUNDS

"SEC. 1404. (a) A State public-welfare plan must—

"(1) provide for the establishment or designation of (A) a single State agency to administer or to supervise the administration of the plan, and (B) not more than one agency of a local subdivision of the State to administer the plan within such subdivision;

"(2) provide, (A), with respect to assistance, that the plan shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and if administered by them, be mandatory on them, and (B) with respect to welfare services, for the progressive development of a State-wide program as rapidly as trained personnel can be secured to administer it;

"(3) provide for financial participation by the State in all parts of the State plan, and for such distribution of funds for assistance and its administration as to assure equitable treatment of needy individuals in similar circumstances, wherever they may live in the State;

"(4) provide for the establishment and application through the State of standards necessary to the operation of the plan, including standards directed toward enabling each recipient to secure the essentials of living through assistance and his other income and resources, which standards shall include provision that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any income and resources of an individual claiming assistance;

"(5) if assistance is administered by categories, provide for a reasonable basis for establishing such categories, such as age or blindness;

"(6) provide that all individuals wishing to make application for assistance shall have opportunity to do so, and that assistance shall be furnished promptly to all eligible individuals;

"(7) provide for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any individual, whose claim for assistance or welfare services included in the State plan is denied or is not acted upon;

"(8) provide that the assistance and welfare services included in the State plan shall be available without discrimination because of race, creed, or color;

"(9) provide such methods of administration as are found by the Agency to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan, including (A) methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personal standards on a merit basis, except that the Agency shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods; and (B) a training program for the personnel necessary to the administration of the plan;

"(10) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the plan;

"(11) provide, after July 1, 1951, if the plan includes assistance to individuals in private or public institutions, for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for such types of institutions; and

"(12) provide that the State agency shall make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Agency may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Agency may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Federal Security Administrator or head of the appropriate constituent unit or units of the Agency, duly authorized by him to do so, shall approve any public welfare plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that he shall not approve any plan which imposes as a condition of eligibility for assistance or welfare services (1) any citizenship or residence requirement, (2) any requirement that individuals must accept any other assistance or welfare services under the plan, or (3) any requirement that an applicant or recipient must, during his lifetime, transfer to the State title or control to any property which such individual may own.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 1405. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved public-welfare plan, for each period after June 30, 1947, an amount, which shall be used exclusively for carrying out the State plan, equal to the Federal percentage for such State, as determined in accordance with section 1405, of the total of the sums expended during such period under the State plan, not counting so much of such total expenditures by the State as are included in any other State plan aided by Federal funds.

"(b) The method of computing and paying such amounts shall be as follows:

"(1) The agency shall, prior to the beginning of each period for which a payment is to be made to the State under subsection (a), estimate the amount to be paid to such State for such period under the provisions of subsection (a), such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such period in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such period, and if the sum of such amount and the estimated Federal grant to be paid the State under subsection (a) is less than the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source from which the difference is expected to be derived, and (B) such other data as to such estimated expenditures and such other investigation as the agency may find necessary.

"(2) The Agency shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated by the Agency, (A) reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State under subsection (a) for such period; and (B) reduced by a sum equivalent to the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Agency, of the net amount recovered during any prior period by the State or any political subdivision thereof under the State plan; except that such increases or reductions shall not be made to the extent that such sums have been applied to make the amount certified for any prior period greater or less than the amount estimated by the Agency for such prior period; *Provided:* That any part of the amount recovered from the estate of a deceased recipient which is not in excess of the amount expended by the State or any political subdivision thereof for the funeral expenses of the deceased shall not be considered as a basis for reduction under clause (B) of this paragraph.

"(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Agency, the amount so certified.

"(4) The period for which estimates and certifications are made under this section shall be a calendar quarter, except that, upon application by a State, the Agency may extend the period for such State to not more than four calendar quarters.

"FEDERAL GRANT PERCENTAGES

"SEC. 1406. (a) The Federal percentage for any State shall not be less than 50 per centum and not more than 75 per centum. The Federal percentage for the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii, and for each State whose per capita income is greater than or equal

to the per capita income of the continental United States, shall be 50 per centum. The Federal percentage for each State, whose per capita income is less than the per capita income of the continental United States, shall be 50 per centum plus one-half of the percentage by which the per capita income of the State is below the per capita income of the continental United States, except that such percentage for each such State shall not exceed 75 per centum and shall be rounded to the nearest whole per centum: provided, that the Federal percentage for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 75 per centum.

"(b) The Federal percentage for each State shall be promulgated by the Agency between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average per capita income of each State and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall for purposes of this section be conclusive for each of the eight quarters in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: provided, that the Agency shall promulgate such percentages as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, which promulgation shall be conclusive for the purposes of this section for each of the eight quarters in the period beginning July 1, 1947, and ending June 30, 1949.

"OPERATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 1407. In the case of any State public-welfare plan which has been approved by the Agency, if the Agency, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, finds—

"(a) that the plan has been so changed as to impose any requirement prohibited by section 1404 (b), or that in the administration of the plan any such prohibited requirement is imposed, with the knowledge of such State agency, in a substantial number of cases; or

"(b) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 1404 (a) to be included in the plan;

the Agency shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State under such plan or, in its discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for activities in which there is such failure, until the Agency is satisfied that such prohibited requirement is no longer imposed or that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until it is so satisfied, it shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State, or shall limit payment to activities in which there is no such failure."

SEC. 3. Section 1101 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read, as follows:

"(1) The term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia, and when used in titles V and XIV of such act, includes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands."

SEC. 4. No payment shall be made to a State under title I, IV, or X of the Social Security Act for any period for which funds are made available to such State under title XIV of such Act and for any period thereafter, or under part 3 of title V of such Act, for any period for which funds for child welfare services are made available to such State under title XIV of such Act; and in any event, for any period after June 30, 1949.

SEC. 5. In the case of a State which has a plan approved under title XIV of the Social Security Act, adjustments, which have not previously been made with respect to overpayments or underpayments under titles I, IV, or X, or under part 3 of title V of such Act, shall be made in connection with payments to such State under title XIV of such Act.

National Defense Establishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—FOR BETTER COMMANDERS IN CHIEF

(By Walter Lippmann)

Of the bill (S. 758) for a national-defense establishment, it may be said that this is now the best possible bill because it has been agreed to by the civilians, the soldiers, sailors, and airmen who will have to live under it and make it work. This is no shotgun marriage. Nor is it a marriage arranged by the fond parents who may think they know better than the bride and groom. It is no scheme which is to be imposed upon the armed forces by outside efficiency experts or blueprint makers. Nor is it a scheme invented by the military politicians of one branch of the armed forces.

It is the product of prolonged debate by our proven military leaders. The debate has ended in an agreement. The fact that the War Department and the Navy Department, that Patterson and Forrestal, Eisenhower and Nimitz and Spaatz are agreed that this is the bill they want is a compelling reason for favoring this bill. There is no use passing another bill, even if someone prefers it, that they do not all agree to. For the whole object of the legislation is to increase the harmony of the various arms. The fact that they have harmonized themselves and are agreed on this bill is the best practical reason for believing that the bill will promote harmony.

The reason that they have been brought to agreement is that they succeeded in thinking out clearly what is the real issue. It is that in peace and in war the President, as Commander in Chief, must of necessity unify the armed forces. The question is not whether they shall be unified. It is whether the President is to be enabled to know what he is doing when he acts as Commander in Chief.

This bill is in essence a bill to make the President a more effective Commander in Chief. It is not a bill about how the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Corps, the infantry, the armored divisions, the medical services, and what not, are to be composed, equipped, recruited, trained, officered, paid, fed, clothed. It is in the last analysis a bill about how the President in the White House is to make the decisions which as President and Commander in Chief he must make about the whole complicated business of national defense.

The bill creates a Secretary of National Defense, who is in substance the President's deputy in the whole field of military affairs. Below the deputy there are a Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and a Secretary of the Air Force. The President's deputy does what the President now has to do—he promotes agreements and decides differences among the various branches. He gives his whole time to this task whereas the President can, of course, give only a little of his time to it. He is supposed to be a man of eminence in his own right. Probably he will be. For this particular appointment will be scrutinized very carefully by Congress, the armed forces, the veterans, and the general public.

Yet the decisions of the deputy are not final. The three Secretaries under him, each normally the special advocate and guardian of his own service, have the right to appeal from the decisions of the deputy to the President. But in deciding the appeal the President will be, so to speak, the supreme court and not the court of first instance. Thus the appeals will reach him in a form where the real issues have been elucidated.

The bill does not, therefore, as some may think or fear, merge into one featureless mass all the fighting men whose traditions are distinct because they have become distinguished in glorious actions over so long a time. That kind of merger would in the name of economic efficiency destroy that military efficiency which depends finally in the martial spirit of a fighting organization.

Nor does the bill submerge any of the branches and the specialties, each of which has, of course, its own pleaders, its zealots, and even its fanatics. On the contrary, this bill is designed to enable the President to judge as wisely as systematic combined advice makes possible, how the demands of each service and branch can be balanced against the national supply of money and materials and men, and made to fit the political and strategic interests of the Nation.

The President now has to make all these decisions anyway. The Constitution requires him to make them. The practical administration of Government compels him to make them.

But as things are now he has no systematic and orderly way of knowing whether he has heard all the facts, has interpreted and weighed them fairly and wisely. So his decisions are spasmodic, are improvised, are casual, are guesswork, and may be amateurish.

It is this weakness at the very top of the chain of command that the bill is meant to correct. It might therefore be described not as a merger, which it certainly is not, or as a unification bill, a term which begs the question, but as a bill to equip the Commander in Chief to do his job.

Resolution of the Independent Petroleum Association of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at the seventeenth annual meeting of the Independent Petroleum Association of America at Fort Worth, Tex., October 28, 29, and 30, 1946:

Whereas at the annual meeting of the Independent Petroleum Association of America on October 11, 1944, held at Dallas, Tex., a resolution was adopted opposing the ratification of the Anglo-American oil agreement then pending before the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas at the annual meeting of the Independent Petroleum Association of America held in October 1945, at Tulsa, Okla., a resolution was adopted endorsing a renegotiated proposed Anglo-American Oil Treaty, signed by representatives of the United States and of Great Britain on the 25th day of September 1945; and

Whereas members of the Independent Petroleum Association of America who aided in the negotiation of said treaty of September 25, 1945, are not satisfied with the construction placed upon the provisions of said

treaty by representatives of the State Department and the Government of the United States; and

Whereas because of the interpretation placed upon the provisions of said proposed treaty by Government representatives of both signatory nations, in recent expressions of said representatives, it is apparent that the representatives of the oil industry and those of said Governments, as to the meaning of said treaty, are at complete variance; and

Whereas it is now the considered opinion of this association that there is no necessity or justification for any treaty between the United States and any foreign nation relating to the production and distribution of crude petroleum and/or its derivatives; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of this association that the proposed treaty will provide the means and vehicle for the control and regulation of the oil industry by the Federal Government and by an international commission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Independent Petroleum Association of America, at its annual meeting in Fort Worth, Tex., on October 30, 1946, desires to place itself of record as opposing the provisions of said proposed Anglo-American Oil Treaty and as opposing the ratification of said treaty by the Senate of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Senate of the United States.

Acheson and the Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an interesting article which appeared in the Chicago Journal of Commerce, by Mr. Wilbur J. Brons:

THE ROUND TABLE

(By Wilbur J. Brons)

MR. ACHESON SHEDS REVEALING LIGHT ON TRUMAN DOCTRINE

The Truman doctrine about which we hear so much these days is based on the administration's conviction that if we don't help the European nations now in distress, they will turn to Russia. We are told that if aid is not forthcoming in substantial amounts, a large part of the world will collapse within the next few months with disastrous consequences to the United States.

Thus far, however, no one seems to have any very clear idea of how much this assistance will cost or how much of the cost may be recovered. Secretary of State Marshall has ordered a study of foreign needs to see if some sort of an answer can be given for the guidance of Congress and the public to which it is responsible. That some such study is needed is clear enough. What isn't clear is why it wasn't begun before the Truman doctrine was given to the world.

The reaction of the average businessman to the Truman program is fairly simple. He just doesn't believe that loans and credits for guns and tanks will stop the advance of Russian ideology and he doesn't believe that gifts of food will be more than a stopgap.

In short, it's hard to convince businessmen, especially in the Central West, that catch-as-catch-can relief is going to keep Europeans from going Communist. To put the average conviction in a few words, it is simply that aid to Europe which doesn't help her to help herself is no aid at all.

While Secretary Marshall's men are making their survey, there are some Department of Commerce figures which suggest what they are likely to find. Under Secretary Dean Acheson used some of these figures in the statements he made recently at Cleveland, Miss.

For the current calendar year, according to the Commerce Department, we will supply about $16,200,000,000 of goods and services to the rest of the world. Where will these dollars come from? The Department estimates that imports will account for some $6,700,000,000, which will be a gain of $1,600,000,000 over last year.

The gap of $9,500,000,000 will be narrowed by gold shipments from abroad. These, the Department's statisticians believe, probably will run to $1,400,000,000. Private gifts and remittances by Americans may amount to $500,000,000. Outright Government gifts will come to $1,900,000,000 and Government loans, most of which probably will turn out to be gifts, will total $3,400,000,000.

From these figures, Mr. Acheson concludes that this year we will export about $5,300,000,000 of goods and services for which we will receive no commercially balancing return. He apparently wonders how long we can continue giving and lending money to Europe to take care of annual balances of that size. Many businessmen and bankers who understand that trade must be a two-way street share his curiosity.

Destruction of Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing much over the radio, and reading a great deal in the press, concerning what is represented to be the wanton destruction of valuable food in Baldwin County, Ala. News pictures have appeared in the press showing a pile of Irish potatoes being destroyed by kerosene drenching. This is most unfortunate. I regret that the destroying of surplus low-grade potatoes has become accepted as the least of the evils involved in disposing of them.

The potatoes destroyed were those for which no useful outlet could be found. They represent, at this time, approximately 10 percent of the Alabama crop. The top-grade potatoes are selling fairly well. The Government, through its support program, has been purchasing a large part of the low-grade potatoes. Some of these potatoes are finding their way into commercial channels properly and satisfactorily. Some of those that the Government is buying are being given to eleemosynary institutions in various sections of the country. They are also being given free of charge to the schools for use in connection with the school-lunch program. These two outlets have been supplied to the point of saturation, yet the supply of these small size low-grade potatoes increases from day to day. The problem is one which has existed since the development of transportation facilities has permitted the movement of perishable crops to distant markets. Only in exceptional years have these low-grade potatoes found a satisfactory market.

When I protested the drenching with kerosene of these potatoes to the Government officials, I learned that it had been done by a person in the field on his own initiative. It has been the practice of the Department of Agriculture to render these dumped potatoes unsalable by discoloring them with dye. The man handling the program in Baldwin County happened not to have any dye and he used kerosene instead. Orders have been issued that it not be done again.

It has been found advisable, in order to protect all parties involved, including the consumer, to take steps to prevent the salvage and dubious sale of these dumped potatoes in competition with established channels of trade. Some cases of theft and cut-throat sale of potatoes have occurred in the past. The Department of Agriculture endeavors to prevent that. Thus the discoloration, or otherwise rendering them unfit for sale. The dye is harmless to man or beast.

Merchandising practices and consumer preferences work against the marketing of low-grade potatoes. Their value for export is of small importance because they do not ship well, being a perishable product, and statistics show that the small quantity that is exported is about offset by the importation of potatoes for seed and other purposes from other countries.

The value of potatoes in the manufacturing industry is of slight importance comparatively. They go into starch and alcohol to some extent. The distilleries use potatoes only when grains that they can handle more advantageously are not available. The demand for Irish potatoes in industry is very limited. Some efforts have been made to find an outlet for these low-grade potatoes in connection with the cattle industry. Cows will eat them, but cattle owners, for some reason, have not taken to the use of potatoes to any extent for cow feed. Hogs will eat them if cooked. They are being offered to cattle owners by the Government now at 20 cents per hundred pounds.

In 1946, there were no acreage or yield controls on Irish potatoes. As one result of this, we had the greatest yield of all time in the United States. There were produced, roughly, 475,000,000 bushels. The latest compiled average production, based on a 5-year period, is 370,000,000 bushels annually. The 1946 production caused a very large carry-over, which has interfered with the successful marketing of the low-grade potatoes this year, to even a greater extent than usual. All of these things have conspired to build up this annual problem, a problem which increases daily: What shall be done with these surplus low-grade potatoes?

In endeavoring to find useful outlets and thus avoid destroying them, we sought to interest the Canadian Government. Canada has an embargo against our small potatoes. We tried to get this embargo lifted, but the Canadian Government refused to modify its embargo at this time.

It might be of interest to know that the human consumption of Irish potatoes in this country has been progressively and substantially reduced. Figures show that along about 1910 there was an annual consumption of approximately 192 pounds of potatoes per person. The latest figures on this made in 1945 show a per capita consumption of only 127 pounds.

Every possible effort has been made to dispose of these potatoes in useful ways.

It is easy to calculate from the information and figures given above that it is natural to expect an annual surplus. Of last year's crop it was found necessary to dispose of, by other than useful means, 22,000,000 bushels. The recent destruction of potatoes which caused the present Nation-wide interest in the subject, totalled about 40,000 bushels.

Special efforts are continuing to find useful outlets for all potatoes produced. It is one of the best basic foods grown.

I know that I echo the sentiment of all men when I say that a way should be found to put to constructive use every ounce of food that we can produce in this country. Special efforts are continuing to be made to that end.

American Policy Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Wanted: American Policy Statement":

WANTED: AMERICAN POLICY STATEMENT

(By Erwin D. Canham)

Today President Truman, in Kansas City, signed the bill for aid to Greece and Turkey and the machinery for putting the program into action rolled into high gear.

But it is not clear just how far American policy is going. Conflicting statements have come from high State Department officials. Secretary Marshall recently said that no new demands for aid were coming in the near future. And yet, the Secretary himself also recently pointed out the desperate condition of most of Europe.

The need to bolster up Korea as another bulwark against Communist penetration is well known. Dean Acheson said in his last official speech that something like $5,000,000,000 would be needed in each of the next 2 years.

The American people need to know just where we stand. We need to have assurances and guaranties that our money—especially the $400,000,000 in the bill the President signed today—is not going down the drain. Money is not enough. It must be put to uses that will be constructive, and that will end, in time, the need for more money.

President Truman took note of this underlying feeling of the people when he said: "We intend to make sure that the aid we extend will benefit all the peoples of Greece and Turkey, not any particular group or faction." It will not be easy for him to make good on that intention. The Nation needs to know more about the Greek Government, and the Turkish Government. Americans would like to see these nations start more effectively on the road to real democracy.

There is no assurance at all that the American missions which have left for Greece and Turkey in the last few days are in any way capable of seeing that our money is well spent. The United States will feel better when an administrator is named for the Greek program. The President has not yet been able to secure the right man.

Here we meet one of the hardest phases of postwar government. It is not easy to get good men to go into public service.

It is well known that any major American Ambassador—in fact, almost any top American administrator—must have large private funds he is willing to spend during his time on the Government job. That is a terrible situation for a democracy to face. We cannot get and keep the best men in the jobs which need doing in peacetime just as badly as they did in war.

There are only two remedies: To pay higher Government salaries and make sure we get our money's worth in really able men, or to persuade these men that they must make a patriotic sacrifice.

For weeks now it has been impossible for the President to persuade the men he wanted for this vital Greek job to make the sacrifice. I don't have to tell you that good men are of highest importance in carrying out all these policies. So the Greek program marks time, to a degree, while the President of the United States shops around and tries to do a selling job on various Americans.

In Britain this week, on the eve of the annual convention of the Labor Party, where a number of rebels are waiting to attack the Attlee-Bevin policies of firmness to Russia and dependence upon the United States, a realistic and frank explanation has been issued. It is the kind of statement that should be prepared in Washington on American policy.

The British document says Russia, in its effort to get postwar security, turned down the offer of an alliance with Great Britain, and chose instead a drive to eliminate Britain as a European and Middle Eastern power.

In the face of what it calls this "sustained, violent offensive against Britain by her Russian ally," the Labor leadership says it held firm, patiently refused to be driven back, but never swung over to implacable hostility to Russia as a result. Thus, if Russia behaves any better in the future, Britain will at once respond. The international purpose of this pamphlet is, therefore, a bid to Russia to give up its anti-British drive.

The British paper gets down to brass tacks in these outstanding points: "We have resisted every temptation to regard Russian policy as final. In particular, where the Tories have continually pressed us to recognize a permanent incompatibility of the Communist and Democratic systems, to make final decisions about the frontiers of each and to build up an entirely independent Western bloc, we have fought doggedly to prevent the crystallization of zones of influence behind rigid ideological barriers."

And then come these significant words: "The aim of Anglo-American understanding is to prevent war by proving to Russia that an aggressive anti-British policy is doomed to frustration. Every historical precedent suggests that no government will continue to pursue a policy whose failure is known to be certain. Our hope is that sooner or later the Russians will realize that the policy they have pursued since 1945 is both impracticable and unnecessary."

With how much of that does Washington agree? In many ways, it seems to be a fair statement of American policy, but let's have from Washington our own independent, realistic declaration of up-to-date policy. It's about time.

Reduction of the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT M. COLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Journal of Commerce of May 20, 1947:

TEN BILLION A YEAR

Representative ALBERT M. COLE, Kansas, Republican, has proposed a statute reserving $10,000,000,000 of income each year to the payment of the interest and principal of our national debt. He computes that the $257,728,056,541 owed by Uncle Sam could thus be cut in half in 20 years.

The idea is basically sound. Whether it is practical to enact the policy into law and whether $10,000,000,000 is the optimum figure is a matter for fiscal experts to ponder. But there is good sense in an announced resolve to earmark $10,000,000,000 a year for debt servicing and reduction.

There is no essential conflict between debt reduction and tax relief. More than once, reduced tax rates have brought about increased revenues, resulting from the stimulus to enterprise which the removal of incentive-deadening taxation brings about.

If our national income continues at last year's level of $164,000,000,000, or better, and if Uncle Sam can learn to live on $25,000,000,000 per annum, as many businessmen feel he can do without impairment of essential service, then the Cole proposal may prove feasible even with appreciably lower tax rates.

There is a school of thought that believes the national debt is just a harmless jumble of digits that may be disregarded—except for the little matter of $5,000,000,000 a year interest. These gentry blandly neglect the depressive effect this huge sum has upon commercial inferest rates and the inflationary impact upon the economy.

A huge national debt is not a piece of old furniture to be stored in the attic and forgotten. It is an everpresent, strength-sapping burden, which must be reduced and swiftly. That is the challenge before Congress today and every day.

United States Loan Fails To Ease Fears of Greek People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, Mr. E. R. Noderer, correspondent for CTPS, writing from Bern, Switzerland, sets forth most clearly and concisely the thoughts and arguments which some of us had and expressed during the debate on the Greek-Turkish military aid bill.

Mr. Noderer is writing from on the spot and expressing the facts as they actually exist, and in my opinion, offers concrete evidence that those of us who opposed this legislation were not so far

afield as some of the proponents tried to make out. Mr. Noderer says:

The $300,000,000 Truman loan to Greece, far from laying the groundwork for a peaceful settlement of that unhappy country's problems, has added fuel to the flames of terror and anarchy which are sweeping the land.

The primary emotion of the people today is fear—fear of the ruthless bands of red raiders killing and looting in the north, the south, and in islands; fear of imprisonment, deportation, or death at the hands of the government authorities, and fear of being plundered and murdered by right-wing bands operating outside of, but safe from, the law.

BEATEN BY BOTH SIDES

The merciless lust for power by leaders of the left and right leaves room for no middle ground and the hapless peasant frequently finds himself beaten up by both sides.

American intervention, welcomed by the 3,000 ruling families in Athens who hope to profit from it, has added another worry to the country's ordinary people.

They are afraid they will again become involved in the quarrels of the big powers and that their country will once more become a battlefield. "We don't want to become the agents of an offensive policy directed against another people, particularly if we are to be used as a paid military striking force," a Greek explained to this correspondent.

TERRORISM INCREASES

Meanwhile, terrorism by both sides has increased since President Truman's speech of March 12 asking for financial aid to Greece and Turkey. The government right-wing coalition took the speech as an indorsement of its policies and stepped up its emergency measures against the left.

Every day between midnight and 5 a. m., people are snatched from their homes and deported to barren Aegean islands, jailed, or executed after being court-martialed. Often the charge is being related to known guerrillas, recruiting for the guerrillas, or being suspected of leftist tendencies. Civil rights have virtually been suspended except in such larger centers as Athens and Salonika, the "show windows of Greece."

REDS BURN VILLAGES

Meanwhile, in the name of self-defense, the Communist-led bands burn villages, blow up bridges, shoot up trains, cut telegraph and telephone wires, and commit highway robbery on a grand scale.

This explains the fear psychosis which grips Greek public opinion.

In the face of this confusion farmers are leaving the land and whole villages are being abandoned, with a consequent decrease in food production.

Many Greeks believe their problem is an internal one but that it is being exploited by outsiders—the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union.

Wool Tariff Versus Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from the Washington Post of May 26, 1947:

WOOL TARIFF VERSUS FOREIGN TRADE

(By Mark Sullivan)

WHAT IS OUR POLICY?

The House last week passed a measure which does two things, both about wool. It provides for an import fee on wool from abroad under certain conditions, in effect the same as a tariff increase. And it provides that the Government shall support the price of wool in America, that whenever the price falls below 41½ cents a pound the Government shall buy wool. That is, the price of wool is to be supported in the same way that the prices of potatoes, eggs, and some other farm products are already supported.

Rarely were the incongruities of coincidence so many and so glaring as those which accompanied the House passage of this two-timed bill. There were separate sets of incongruities for each time.

About Government support of the prices of farm products and food, there was an uproar of condemnation in Congress and the country. There had emerged during the week news that the Government, in order to keep up the price of potatoes, was buying quantities of them and making them inedible—the current Time contained a photograph of a pile of potatoes in Alabama upon which kerosene had been poured. About this, indignation had been expressed by Members of Congress and others, in the press and over the radio. Yet here was the House adding wool to the list of farm products the prices of which are to be supported by Government purchases.

As another incongruity, the House Committee on Agriculture had made a cut of some 32 percent in the appropriation for the Agriculture Department. The purpose of this cut, in addition to the broad purpose of reducing Government expenditures, was a frankly expressed determination to limit what the House committee described as a paternalistic policy of the Department of Agriculture. A main feature of this policy is regulation of the size of crops, and support of the prices of some farm products by Government purchase of them or in other ways. Yet on the same day that the House Committee on Agriculture took this step, the House as a whole added wool to the list of farm products the prices of which are to be supported by Government purchases.

Broadest of all was the incongruity between a bill providing that the Government shall keep up the price of wool, and the frequent pleas of President Truman that prices gennerally be reduced. The President's exhortations have already been made vulnerable by the fact that the Government itself prevents reduction of prices of some farm products. And now the House proposes that the area of Government support of prices be increased by addition of wool.

A separate set of incongruities accompanies the provision in the House bill which calls for an increased tariff on wool under certain conditions. At this moment the administration is earnest, almost to the point of being justifiably frantic, in the purpose of making it possible for other countries to sell more goods to us. Only by this can we carry out policies of indispensable importance—the policies of selling more goods abroad, of granting funds and credits for the restoration of European countries, of restoring international trade in order to prevent both European collapse and world-wide collapse. These purposes are indispensably inherent in the highest level of the administration's foreign policy as a whole. As Mr. Dean Acheson said just before he retired recently as Under Secretary of State: "There can never be any stability of security in the world for any of us until foreign countries are able to pay in commodities * * * for what they need to import."

In this condition the House bill serves notice on the world that it cannot rely on us to facilitate sales of goods to us. Little wonder if the State Department is almost in despair.

Why did the House do it? One reason was preoccupation with the many other matters that press upon Congress, less than half the members voted. As earnest Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, said after he grasped the bill and opposed it, "Frankly I must confess that I did not appreciate fully the importance of the subject." There was some politics, deference to Western States in which wool growing is an important industry. There is some surmise that President Truman may veto the bill.

Control of Production of Dangerously Flammable Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, that injury and death caused by flammable fabrics are increasing is emphasized in the following letter I have just received from Mr. John C. Hazen, of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, Washington, D. C., an organization seeking remedial action by the Congress:

NATIONAL RETAIL DRY GOODS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1947.

Congressman GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: I was glad to see in Wednesday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that you are still concerned over the fact that legislation to control the production of dangerous flammable textiles has not been acted upon.

As you know, the hearings held in March before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce indicated that certain interests opposed any legislation on this subject in the belief that correction of this problem could be secured through voluntary action. Although this problem has been with us for several years, nothing has been done to date voluntarily, and the needless killing and maiming of our citizens by flammable textiles continues. One of the bills introduced on this subject provided for certain standards to be set up under established procedures of the Bureau of Standards. In order for these standards to become effective it is necessary for them to be accepted by some 60 percent of those affected by the standards, such as producers, finishers, cutters up, and retailers. I have learned that because of the opposition of some groups these standards are now stymied, and the House committee has withheld action until an acceptable standard is produced. So, you see, we are at an impasse and unless something is done, and frankly I am at a loss to know what it would be, I do not think we are going to get any action from the committee.

You have certainly done your part, having sounded the warning early, and repeated it on occasions. The problem is not lessening, but growing worse. We are now subscribing to a Nation-wide press clipping service, and during the month of April the record of clothing fires that resulted in either serious injury or death ran to better than one a day. I agree with you most heartily, we have taken care of the starving and suffering, we assist the Greeks and Turks, while at the same time several thousand Americans die each year, most of them needlessly, because they are innocent purchasers of flammable garments.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. HAZEN.

Mr. Hazen also submits the following press clippings:

[From the Atlantic City (N. J.) Press of April 6, 1947]

CHILD BADLY SEARED PLAYING NEAR STOVE

A 5-year-old Pleasantville girl was badly burned early yesterday afternoon as she played near a stove and her clothing caught fire.

She is Deborah Everett, of 601 Park Avenue, suffering second degree burns of the body and legs and reported in fair condition at the Atlantic City Hospital where she was taken in the Pleasantville police ambulance.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Register of April 13, 1947]

SKIN OF FATALLY BURNED TWIN SAVES LIFE OF PHOENIX GIRL

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—The made-to-order circumstances of identical twins was credited by the Rev. Emmett McLoughlin, O. F. M., superintendent of St. Monica's Hospital, with saving the life of 2-year-old Nancy Irene Robles, a victim of horrible burns.

Nancy is romping and playing just like any other healthy youngster, but only because her twin sister, Mary, died a week after both suffered extensive burns December 11.

The little girls were critically burned when their clothing caught fire from a smoldering stump of wood that tumbled from a stove in their Phoenix home.

Mary's death provided the one thing needed to save Nancy's life—skin. Not even skin from the mother would have saved Mary's life, since it must be of identical tissue structure to "hold."

[From the Bemidji (Minn.) Pioneer of April 14, 1947]

BEMIDJI CHILD FATALLY BURNED WHEN CLOTHING IS IGNITED BY WOOD FIRE

Tragedy struck with lightning swiftness at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Smith, 514 Fourth Street, Bemidji, Saturday, when clothing worn by Carol, the 2½-year-old daughter of the couple, caught fire to engulf the child in flames, causing her death several hours later.

According to her own account of the accident, Mrs. Smith stepped out of the family residence to get a bucket of water, leaving Carol and an 8-month-old baby alone in the 2-room home.

Although she was gone but a few moments, she returned to find the child's clothing burning fiercely and the youngster screaming with pain. Mrs. Smith tore the clothing from her daughter, then rushed to a neighbor's home for aid. The child was taken to Lutheran Hospital, where she was treated for third degree burns. More than 85 percent of her body was badly burned and she died at 4:30 p. m.

Mrs. Smith told the Daily Pioneer Monday that the child evidently brushed against a wood heater and ignited her clothing.

[From the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil of April 10, 1947]

GAS FUMES FATAL

BAGLEY.—Mrs. Vinal Prescott, 40, farm housewife near here, died of gas fumes and burns Wednesday when her clothing blazed up, County Coroner Harold Hill said. Her husband and four children were in town at the time.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Informer of April 5, 1947]

BURNS TO DEATH

NEW ORLEANS.—When she attempted to light a fire in her room last Sunday evening, Miss Daisy Mae Lee, 28, 714 Dryades Street, was burned to death as flames engulfed her clothing, police reported.

[From the Paris (Tex.) News of April 4, 1947]

CHILD FATALLY BURNED

LLANO.—Two-year-old Caroline Haynes, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Howard Haynes, died Thursday of burns received Wednesday after matches, with which she was playing, ignited her clothing.

[From the Roseburg (Oreg.) News-Review of March 31, 1947]

TEACHER, SON SINGED BY FIRE FROM GAS STOVE

MEDFORD, OREG.—Mrs. James Mullins, high-school teacher, and her 5-year-old son, James, were singed today and their clothes burned by a sudden flare-up of a gas stove in their home, but both escaped serious injury.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Post of April 2, 1947]

CHILD, 2, BURNED AS DRESS IGNITES

Barbara Gore, 2, of 950 Carr Street, was in serious condition Tuesday at General Hospital from body and arm burns. Police said her dress was ignited while she was stuffing paper into a stove at her home Monday night.

[From the Cohoes (N. Y.) American of April 4, 1947]

MOTHER'S KISS FOR DYING CHILD

Just before she died of burns received when her clothing caught fire from a bonfire, 6-year-old Patsy Ann Sye is kissed by her mother at San Pedro, Calif., hospital.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Rocky Mountain News of April 6, 1947]

HAPPY LOS ANGELES GIRL CAN WALK AGAIN—WINS OVER BURNS

LOS ANGELES, April 5.—Little Donna Slack, 4 years old, was the happiest girl in Los Angeles today because she walked, all by herself. Ten months ago her clothing caught fire while she was playing in the back yard of her home in Hawthorne, and more than half her body was burned. Dr. Barbara Dittman, of Children's Hospital, said Donna's was the worst burn case on record there for a recovery.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune of April 2, 1947]

DANCER

HOLLYWOOD, April 2.—Ballet Dancer Milada Miadova Wednesday was treating minor burns suffered when her flimsy costume caught fire on a movie set in Hollywood. Actor Dennis O'Keefe beat out the flames with a piece of drapery after an electric fan sent fire from a flame pot shooting across the Atlantis set.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of April 5, 1947]

BURNS ARE FATAL TO HOUSEWIFE, 41

Funeral arrangements were completed Saturday for Mrs. Catherine Thomas, 41, of 81½ South Garfield Avenue, who died Friday in St. Francis Hospital of burns suffered when her clothing caught fire from a stove in her home as she was preparing breakfast Friday morning.

Public Lobbies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Parsons (Kans.) Sun. This hits the nail on the head in condemning the pernicious activity of bureaucracy in its effort to block legislation for the elimination of waste and nonessential spending by Government agencies.

The editorial follows:

PUBLIC LOBBIES

Activities of various departments of the Government in lobbying for their own interests before Congress have become universal, particularly in recent weeks when Congress has been engaged in an economy campaign.

A widely known political writer takes cognizance of the situation and says "never in all congressional history has there been such a concerted effort by persons in the executive departments to block legislation."

He goes on to declare that "President Truman has sat idly by while lobbies of his own personnel in the Government departments have used funds unlawfully to try to defeat economy measures.

"When the whole story comes out, Mr. Truman's record will be vulnerable, for it was within his power to stop the intrigue and lobbying that was carried on in an attempt to hold appropriations at high levels."

It is significant of something or other that the most active lobbies attempting to defeat congressional economy moves have been those of various agencies who are working in a wholly selfish purpose.

It is the old story of a highly organized minority getting what it wants, while the slow-moving, unorganized majority watches helplessly from the sidelines. The people of this country presumably want economy in Government. At least most of them have expressed themselves in favor of lower taxes, and only through economy can lower taxes be brought about. It looks like it's time for the public at large to move on the economy question, eliminating those whose only interests are in jobs on the public payroll.

Address of Hon. John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mrs. St. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech delivered in my district,

at Middletown, N. Y., by the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to be with you here this evening in this beautiful spot. I am grateful to my brilliant, distinguished, and attractive colleague, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, who is giving you such exceptional representation in Congress, for including me in this gathering as a guest speaker. I welcome this opportunity also because during these difficult days I think it important that you should know what is going on in your Congress and because I know that it is vital for us in Congress to have your support and assistance.

American women will, as in the past, shoulder their full share of civic responsibility in meeting the great and continuing challenge which confronts the Congress and the Nation. The women of America play a dual role in politics. In the first place it is to them that we all look to maintain the home. Now the home is the most important political unit of all It was so regarded by the Greeks and the Romans, and we know that it was so regarded by the Russians after the Revolution in 1917. One of the first measures passed by the new Communist government was to attempt to abolish the family. It was realized that political groups of all kinds, and particularly the political unit of the family, were a menace to the sovereignty of the Communist Party. Nothing that we can do in Washington will matter if the American home disintegrates. The laws that we pass and the treaties that we sign will avail us little if America is destroyed from behind through our children—the men and women of the future. In fact, I would go further and say that the influence of the home has a greater educational significance than any other single factor, and while the men of America must do what they can, the burden of domesticity falls primarily on the women.

The second aspect of this duality of which I speak is best illustrated by the gathering here tonight. In my first campaign for public office last fall I came to appreciate what a vital part the women of my district play in politics. In the first place, women are apt to be more patient with details than men. Accustomed to the never-ending work of maintaining a home, they are willing to undertake all manner of political chores which are as essential to victory as they are lacking in glamor.

In the second place women bring into politics a much-needed idealism. They bring it not only in their own status as politicians, but also through their influence with men. The very qualities of sympathy and tenderness which make for a happy home make also for a more rounded and better balanced national political life.

And lastly, ladies and gentlemen, may I remind you that in the United States today there are 1,172,000 more women of voting age than there are men, and that approximately 80 percent of the wealth of this Nation is controlled by women. Accordingly, you not only hold the balance of voting power, you are the power. Already in hundreds of communities from coast to coast women have taken the lead in throwing cynical political machines out of office. You are in a position to protect the great heritage of America not only in the home but with the ballot.

That is why I am going to talk to you tonight straight from the shoulder. I maintained throughout my campaign that the challenge to the American electorate last November was essentially a nonpartisan challenge but that this challenge could be met only through the Republican Party. If this appears to you to be a paradox, let me explain. We have two major parties in this country. If we had less than two, we would have a dictatorship, and our Constitution and Bill of Rights would vanish. If we had more than two major parties, we would probably have confusion such as was the case notably in France prior to the war. Accordingly, I favor the two-party system, and I believe that this system offers the most practical means of expressing the will of the people in a constitutional democracy such as ours. Now I do not pretend that the Republican Party possesses the final answers to the complex questions which trouble us today. I do not always agree with many of my Republican friends in the Congress. But the fact remains that the essential challenge, both domestic and foreign, as it affects the American people, can best be met by the Republican Party. The Democratic Party is tired, torn, and tattered. It has become the party of reaction. The Republican Party, with all its imperfections, is the only vehicle we have with which to release the unparalleled productive power of our free system, provide a better life for all, and work effectively for a more lasting peace.

Since I am a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I should like to discuss this problem of partisanship in connection with the determination of an American foreign policy.

We have for some time now had what is commonly referred to as a bipartisan foreign policy. Indeed, it could be pointed out that the Republican Party has shown commendable statesmanship in its unwillingness to treat our foreign relations as a political football. Surely partisanship should stop at the water's edge. But I want to suggest to you tonight that nonpartisanship in our foreign affairs has not always meant bipartisanship, has tended to oversimplify the basic problems, and has, in certain instances, drawn a curtain over these portentous issues before they have been properly examined and discussed. Certainly there is no reason why, simply because I am a Republican, I should be denied the privilege of disagreeing with some phases of the administration's foreign policy. Many Democrats have been known to disagree and still disagree with the foreign policy of the administration. Assuredly if it is in our best interests not to inject partisanship into foreign affairs, it is also to our advantage that foreign affairs should be freely ventilated and exposed to the salutary and purifying winds of public opinion. This cannot be done if the Republicans decide that it is their obligation, nay, their duty, to follow the administration's policy without a murmur. Nonpartisan we can always strive to be. But bipartisan we can be only if we are consulted, only if we are included in the formulation of foreign policy. The Republican Party must stop emulating the husband who said: "My marriage is based on compromise; we compromise by doing what my wife pleases." Bipartisanship must be more than nonpartisanship; it must be a two-way street.

Moreover the administration does not even follow its own foreign policy. At one time it was the administration's foreign policy to support the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations. I still believe in that policy in spite of the betrayal of Poland at Yalta, the betrayal of Mihailovich in Yugoslavia, and the appeasement of Russia through UNRRA and other Government agencies. I adhere to the administration's policy in spite of the President's insistence that the Italian and Hungarian peace treaties should be ratified. I am opposed to the ratification of these treaties for many reasons, not the least of which is that they run counter to the administration's declared foreign policy as proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter and more recently as expounded by the President of the United States to the joint session of Congress on March 12 of this year. The Italian peace treaty provides, among other things, for the defortification of the Italian frontiers, the dispersal of the Italian Navy, the reduction of the Italian Army to 165,000 men, and the withdrawal of the American and British troops. Thus, in demanding Senate ratification of the Italian treaty, the administration proposes to assist Yugoslav agression in Italy while demanding $300,000,000 to resist Yugoslav aggression in Greece. I suggest to you that a successful foreign policy cannot be predicated upon a plan which calls for running with the hare in Italy while we are hunting with the hounds in Greece. And I say to you further that, at the risk of being accused of partisanship, I will not support such an attitude. Rather will I endeavor to persuade the administration to hew to its own policy which, as I understand it, is no longer the policy of appeasement.

I shall use my best efforts to hold the feet of the administration to the fire of its own policy in the patient and determined hope that we may bring the elements of our power and the details of our plans in line with our foreign policy and provide the vigorous consistency and forthright leadership which is so sorely needed. This, I submit, is the type of nonpartisan contribution which the Republican Party must make in order to participate effectively in the creation of a bipartisan foreign policy. If we who are in control of Congress abdicate our prerogatives, if we fail to discharge these responsibilities, America may soon become an island of freedom in a sea of tyranny.

We must not seek refuge from these troublesome problems in a bipartisanship which consists of an apathetic acceptance of a foreign policy which, on those rare occasions when its outlines are at all discernible, seems confused and dangerously inconsistent. We must shoulder the burden and give to these grave issues the mental travail and noble purpose which alone can lead to a happy solution. For it remains wonderfully true that in spite of recent spectacular developments in the scientific machinery of war and peace, the motive power of human conflicts resides, as always, in the mind of man. As we think, so shall we act. Our equipment is manmade; it came from the mind of man as the Goddess Athena sprang from the brow of Jupiter. Man can control his own creations if he wills it. Even the atom bomb, ladies and gentlemen, will move to the measure of men's thoughts. Even the atom bomb is but an extension of yesterday's weapons and of today's conflicts. Even the atom bomb cannot alter or diminish the validity of those timeless truths on which our Nation was founded. The atom bomb does not change the challenge; it merely punctuates and underlines it and gives it a terrible urgency which before it did not seem to have. We are still faced with the problem of self-control rather than atomic control, and we can develop our self-control far better under our free system than under the imposed disciplines of stateism. The challenge is still ineluctably a moral challenge, and in that challenge the women of America can and will play a predominant part. It is still a challenge to us to give a vigorous demonstration that our private-property, competitive economy can continue to bring a higher standard of living and more freedom to more people than any other system yet devised by man.

This brings me to the challenge on the domestic front. Here the choice is not between an absolutely planned economy and the laissez faire philosophy of many years ago. We are no longer an agricultural community—there are many accommodations which Government can and must make to our modern industrial needs. We must not raise our hands in horror at the mere mention of social legislation. We have had social legislation for years in one form or

another, social legislation such as child labor laws, workmen's compensation laws, and others. We must be alert and progressive in making these changes within the pattern of our system. The Government should take action where our private property system does not reach. Having admitted this, however, the fact remains that there is a running fight all over the world between those who believe in the Government and those who believe in the people as the source of a more abundant life. We in the Republican Party believe in the people.

The Republican Party was founded in 1854 to fight intolerance and slavery. The greatest American of us all was its greatest statesman and prime inspiration. We can assume, I think, that he would be opposed, as we are, to the Bilbo influence in the Democratic Party. Abraham Lincoln believed profoundly in the dignity of the individual man, in the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, in the freedom not merely of workers, or farmers, or managers, but in the freedom of the individual. He believed that the individual was the complex heart of society.

To that individual must be given two things: The greatest possible degree of political and economic freedom consistent with the freedoms of other individuals and equality of opportunity for every individual before fate and before law. Lincoln believed in the human soul.

Those are the principles upon which the Republican Party was founded, and those are the principles upon which it has always acted in its moments of greatness. Under Lincoln it fought and saved the Nation and gave a new birth of freedom to an enslaved people. Under the rallying cry of freedom, it made the Nation a kindly refuge for the hunted peoples of many foreign lands. Under Theodore Roosevelt it curbed the excesses of powerful men who threatened to destroy the freedom of the people. Under its great Chief Justices it evolved a system of law designed to safeguard those freedoms. We in the Eightieth Congress are attempting to provide legislation which will protect the people against other excesses which have arisen during the past 14 years. The problem of government is to safeguard minority interests while protecting the majority from minority control.

It has been the fashion for some years now to forget these achievements of the Republican Party. It is fashionable to picture the elephant as a corpulent old gentleman with a cigar in his mouth and a roll of bills protruding from his hip pocket. Actually the Republican Party, being the party of freedom, has been, and is today, the party of the people.

It is not an easy fight. The individual, being without spokesman, often seems at a loss in the face of the howling propaganda enthusiastically hurled by the proprietors of vested interest. It is difficult to fight the battle for the individual. It is even difficult, sometimes, to see wherein his freedom lies. It is often easier to listen to the blandishments of the propaganda Lorelei.

That is where I believe sometimes the Republicans in the past have failed. Sometimes through ignorance, pompousness, and lack of integrity—ah, yes, Republicans have been guilty of all that—they have failed to penetrate through the web of vested interests to the freedom of the individual. Wherever you find failure written on the record of the Republican Party, you will find that for the moment it has deserted the principles of Lincoln. It has lost contact with the human soul.

The Republican Party must have no room for anyone who will put the welfare of any organized group, no matter how large or powerful, ahead of the welfare of the people. The Republican Party has no place for complacent reactionaries, for purveyors of intolerance, for sowers of confusion and discord. The Republican Party is the party of true liberalism; it is the party of progress, of intellectual ferment—the party of freedom. We are the young Turks, the insurgents, and we must understand the enormous implications of the challenge which we face at this time.

The only true definition of a liberal that I know of is that a liberal believes with Lincoln in freedom for the individual. That, I know, is what the Republican Party should, and will, stand for.

One result of being a liberal is that you must be constantly on guard against tyranny and authoritarianism wherever they show their heads. There is no compromise in the age-old struggle against tyranny and human freedom. That is why we liberals in the Republican Party hated fascism and nazism. Though we sought and strove for peace, we knew that an evil peace was not to be preferred to a good war. That is why we fought and won World War II.

And that, my friends, is also why we Liberals in the Republican Party hate communism. How much freedom for the individual, may I ask, is there in a political system which keeps 18 million out of 180 million people in concentration camps, which depends for its security on secret police, firing squads, mock trials, and the obliteration of all minorities with bullets? How much freedom for the individual will there be if Russian communism, as seems to be its intent and goal, is able to spread its bloody wings over all the world. How much freedom for the individual is there in the tragic lands behind the iron curtain—in Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary?

To state the fact of our hatred for communism is not synonymous with our saying that war is inevitable. Just the opposite. I firmly believe that it is the only way to keep the peace. The way of the appeasers, their lack of faith, their essential isolationism, is the sure way to national and international disaster. We saw that before. We remember Munich. In disunity and moral weakness, there is no defense against tyranny. The only protection is an insistence upon our beliefs in freedom, a carrying-out of the pledges we have given to the small nations of the world, an application of wise statesmanship based on morality which can and will distinguish between international right and international wrong, and above all a highly developed sense of individual responsibility.

The American people are still willing and eager to assume the risks of being free. That is why they voted overwhelmingly for the Republican candidates last November. That is why this Republican Congress is laboring steadfastly and successfully in an attempt to correct the many evils which have arisen during the past few years. That is why we Republicans must be relentless in our efforts to restore America to the free institutions under which Americans can continue to strive for the real security of individual accomplishment instead of bending under the bogus security of Government hand-outs. This is a difficult job in which many obstacles are recklessly thrown across our path by those who have lost faith not only in the American system but in the American people.

There are many suffering peoples in the world who also are willing to assume the risks of being free. We cannot turn our backs on their yearnings. Just as the Republican Party is the best hope of America, so is America the best hope of the world. That is why I say that we can no longer be partisan in our thinking. We must think in terms of our obligations as well as our rights; we must appreciate our duties more than our privileges; we must discharge our responsibilities in order to retain our liberties. We must somehow distill out of our dilemma the high moral tone without which we cannot stem the onward tide of barbarism.

If we fail to meet this vibrant challenge, the magnitude of our failure will be commensurate with the greatness of our opportunity. We 140,000,000 Americans are the happy few who can now shape the course of world history for many years to come. The survival of western civilization depends upon the wisdom and the courage which we can muster in this trembling hour. That is the real challenge of the peace; that is the challenge to the Republican Party; that is the challenge to America.

Resolution of Assyrian Central Committee of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a letter from Rev. Paul S. Newey, president of the Assyrian Central Committee of Chicago. This letter calls attention to the atrocious treatment of Christian Assyrians in Iran. I have submitted a copy of this letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It follows:

ASSYRIAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., May 23, 1947.

Hon. ROBERT TWYMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have authoritative proof that 24 Assyrian villages were looted and burned, many men tortured and killed in cold blood, and countless numbers of women, young girls, and children assaulted and raped under the very eyes of the Iran military forces in the Azerbaijan district of Iran, December 1946–February 1947.

We, the Assyrian Central Committee of Chicago, Ill., composed of church units and organizations and societies of American citizens of Assyrian ancestry—in support of the petition in behalf of the Assyrians in Iran dated March 13, 1947, filed with the United Nations by his Holiness Mar Eshai Shimun XXIII Catholicos patriarch of the east and of the Assyrians CXIX and the temporal head of the Assyrian Nation, do urge your honor to bring this matter to the immediate attention of our Government and our delegates to the United Nations, with a view of bringing pressure upon the Iranian Government to stop such atrocities against Christian Assyrians in Iran and to provide temporary relief measures until a final solution is found to their problem by the United Nations, and that an impartial commission be appointed to investigate the matter on the spot.

Respectfully yours,
Rev. PAUL S. NEWEY,
President.

Federal Tort Claims Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the adoption during the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress—1946—consti-

tuted, as Mr. Harold Aron, eminent advocate and legal scholar of the New York bar, points out in a very interesting article which he recently contributed to the American Bar Association Journal, a stupendous break with a very ancient past, one which in its implications may lead to startling and completely unanticipated results.

Because of the myriad questions which this unprecedented legislation forces upon the attention of the bar, the Congress, and the country, the unforeseen complications which may flow from its administration. I am sure that that which that eminent lawyer and publicist has had to say on this involved subject should find its place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the columns of which contemporary events of historical importance are recorded.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harold Aron's most interesting and very able article, the article to which I have just referred, is the following:

FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT: COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR PRACTICING LAWYERS

(By Harold G. Aron)

Professor Borchard's paper seems to me to make a valiant attempt to cover a broad field of subjects which are not cognate in origin, theory or practice. To treat them together seems to me to leave a blurred picture where his outstanding legal scholarship would have been of great value in etching what is a dramatically far-reaching development in Anglo-Saxon Law—comparable in significance, in the light of the trend of political economy, with the abandonment of trial by ordeal.

The barrier which precludes treating together the subjects of "tort claims against * * * municipal, State and Federal Governments" is the varying type of political sovereignty, if it may be so called, which is involved when one deals with wrongs wrought by the United States of America, by the several States of the Union, and by municipal corporations. Under our Constitution, the United States is a sovereign in an extremely limited sense, as far as municipal law is concerned; and none of its Courts have any inherent jurisdiction. The States, on the other hand, subject only to specific limitations of their own acceptance under the Federal Constitution, are truly sovereign in their domains; and their Courts possess inherently all of the judicial powers which have accumulated and vested over the centuries of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. Municipal corporations, as mere creatures of the State, have of course no sovereignty; they possess only such arbitrary powers as the State may again within its own constitutional limitations, delegate. The transitions and developments with which Professor Borchard deals stem from the hardships which grew out of the concept, expressed in the maxim, "The King can do no wrong," but their rationale is quite independent and different.

The enactment by the Seventy-ninth Congress of the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601), coupled with the very recent official statement by the Lord Chancelor of England that the Crown is about to give up its legal immunity from suits in tort and contract, marks a historic milestone in the Anglo-Saxon law and reveals again the graceful flexibility of Our Lady of the Common Law in meeting changed conditions through the centuries. Withal, it is a strange compound which lies behind this far-reaching change in the two countries; and the fact that they are contemporaneous is not a historical accident, if such there ever be. To the Lord Chancelor, the doctrine that "The King can do no wrong" is a "survival that should be swept away"; and the Senate committee which reported the Federal tort claims bill said, cogently and succinctly and more to the point (S. Rept. 1400), as to the Government's exemption from actions "with respect to any common law tort," that "its only justification seems historical."

HISTORY OF PRIVATE LAWS AS TO CLAIMS

Some future historian, if he digs deep enough, may opine that the proximate cause of the Federal Tort Claims Act was the long-existing and troublesome practice of private laws, relief bills, and committees on claims, which the act abolishes, although in practice this abolition has merely resulted thus far, that relief measures are routed to the Judiciary Committee of the House and to the Finance and other standing committees of the Senate which have survived the Reorganization Act. A careful reading of the Federal Tort Claims Act will reveal adequate escape clauses to preserve, when needed, all the prior prerogatives of the Congress as to relief bills, private laws, and claims against the United States, and that what Congress really did, and wisely, was to dump a load of troubles on the Federal courts, without surrendering any of the powers it had when the first relief bill was introduced and became a private law in 1790.

Presidents since the days of Adams and statesmen since the time of Senator Brodhead have railed against the practice of relief bills and private laws; but it was not until 1855 that the Court of Claims was created, with its powers somewhat broadened 20 years later. At no time until President Truman affixed his signature last August 2 to the act to reorganize the Congress could an American citizen sue his Government for its wrongdoing, if it went beyond a breach of contract or some specific act of Congress. Yet as long ago as 1884, the United States Supreme Court, in *Langford* v. *United States* (101 U. S. 342), had said, as to the doctrine that "The King can do no wrong" and was immune from suit, that "neither in reference to the Government of the United States or the several States, or any of their officers, the English maxim has an existence in this country."

Nevertheless every Congress, before and since that decision, has been burdened and cursed—as many conscientious members have felt, and there have been many—with thousands of relief bills seeking sanction as private laws, because the United States could not be sued for its wrongdoing, even when a negligently driven mail truck permanently injured an innocent child or killed the breadwinner of a household. In the last 12 Congresses, approximately 16,000 relief bills on behalf of such private claims have been introduced, of which about 1 in 10 has been enacted into a private law. Not a few of them have been extremely private.

NEW STATUTE MEANS A VAST VOLUME OF LITIGATION

The sheer volume of new litigation which the Federal Tort Claims Act will generate and force upon the Courts of the United States, their judges, and the law officers of Government, puts a duty squarely upon the shoulders of the legal profession; and it seems to me regrettable that the New York State Bar Association should have seen fit to publish an attack on its provisions limiting the fees of attorneys, under the caption "Enchaining the Lawyer" (letter No. 113; October 30, 1946). In debates on the floor of the House of Representatives, when previous attempts were made to pass this salutary legislation, bitter things have been said against the bar, as, for example, that:

"We must remember that the American Bar Association is composed of lawyers and that lawyers are prosecuting claims, and that lawyers want to get the law into the position where they can most readily and practically represent their clients. It is urged as a conclusive argument in favor of it, that the bar associations of the United States are behind this bill. Of course they are. The bill opens up a tremendous new field of litigation. When the bill passes, the actions against the Federal Government will be multiplied by tens of thousands. The bill ought to be labeled a bill for the relief of lawyers in general and ambulance-chasing lawyers in particular. Everyone who stumbles on the post-office steps or who slips or falls in this Capitol Building or who is injured, in any way, in the national parks or the national forests, is going to run to his lawyer and bring an action against the Government. I make a prediction that in addition to its being an invitation to ambulance-chasing lawyers, it will be a direct invitation to district attorneys and their deputy district attorneys to make easy settlements in favor of those whom they owe some political obligation." [1]

MANY NEW PROBLEMS ARE CREATED FOR PRACTITIONERS

Whenever the law breaks with the past by positive legislative action, no resulting statute springs "full-armed from the brain of Jove." The Federal Tort Claims Act has flaws, ineptitudes, and ambiguities which can be troublesome. It is to be hoped that the bar will show a degree of self-discipline which will negate and stultify such accusations as those I have quoted.

The new law is a stupendous break with a very ancient past, due, chiefly and realistically, to the fact that, as was said by the Senate committee which reported it (supra): "With the expansion of Government activities in recent years, it becomes especially important to grant private individuals the right to sue the Government in respect of such torts as negligence in the operation of vehicles." This is a classic of understatement, of oversimplification, and of using language to conceal thought. It would have been more disingenuous to have said: "On account of Marxian socialism, the New Deal and the results of incipient communism," and to have recognized the fact that the range of the new statute is as wide as the substantive law; that the procedural questions which it raises are as far-flung as the adjective law, and that the problems of proof as intricate as any aspect of the probative law.

For example, practitioners are already wandering in terra incognita, not even certain as to how to designate the United States as a defendant. One action already begun describes the defendant as a sovereign corporation, a combination of only two words that will excite the mind of any legal scholar and perhaps prompt dozens of law-review contributions.

PRACTICAL QUESTIONS UNDER THE NEW ACT

To mention a few of the problems already being faced in litigation begun or about to be begun under this new Federal Tort Claims Act are admissions against interest by Presidents, generals of the armies, members of the Cabinet, and lesser Government officials, competent evidence in proving a claim where the rights of the inventor of the long-distance telephone was sold to France by the United States Government, without his knowledge or consent or compensation to him? Are statements of Secretaries of State, Ambassadors, and other foreign envoys admissible, where an American exporter was swindled by the Imperial German Government and the negligence of the Government of the United States? Are statements made by official American agents before mixed claims tribunals eligible as evidence, where an old lady lost her all by failing to leave attached to her German bonds the coupons, when she presented her

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 12, 1940; pp. 12016–12027.

claim against Germany under the Settlement of War Claims Act after the last war?

Au contraire, are the self-serving declarations of officials and bureaucrats of the United States Government admissible against a plaintiff who sues under the Federal Tort Claims Act? Can there be, as against the United States, an examination before trial or its equivalent? Has any district court jurisdiction under the act, where it is proper or necessary to join a Cabinet officer or other public official, or does the old rule apply that all such actions must be brought in the District of Columbia? Then too, there is this magnificent question which arises in litigation already on its way to the courts: Does a breach of trust, express or constructive, such as arose on the part of the United States under the Settlement of the War Claims Act, as to unpaid holders of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission (United States and Germany), sound in tort under the new law as it does basically and philosophically?

IS THE REMEDY UNDER THE NEW ACT EXCLUSIVE?

Again: Is the remedy under this act exclusive, despite its language, where the wrong sued for emanates from the operative effect of an act of Congress, or is there also a remedy in the Court of Claims under the Tucker Act, despite the fact that the action originates ex delicto? When does the statute of limitations prescribed in the Federal Tort Claims Act begin to run, where the tort is, as it may be and is in some pending litigation, conversion and fraud? Does the doctine of res ipsa loquitur apply, under this new law, and to what extent does the settled substantive law of principal and agent apply to a defendant (the United States) with 2,000,000 employees? Naturally, as in any initial legislation, covering so broad a field, the language of the new act is inadequate, when it comes to its saving clauses and exceptions.

YEARS OF LITIGATION TO DEFINE MAJOR QUESTIONS

There are major questions raised by the language of the act which can be delimited and defined only after years of litigation and judicial decision. What, in the sweeping language of the act, are the rights of a citizen in the United States court sitting without a jury and with power to adjudicate "any claim against the United States, for money only * * * on account of damages to or loss of property or on account of personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office under circumstances where the United States if a private person would be liable to the claimant for such damage, loss or injury or death in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred" (sec. 410, Public Law 601). If the distinguished editor in chief of the Journal runs out of material in the next 5 or 10 years, he will find plenty of "copy" in seeking to bring within accepted legal meanings this pregnant recital of the scope of the Federal Tort Claims Act and the phrases used in connection therewith or contained therein, such as "common law tort" (are there others?), "fiscal operations of the Treasury," "regulation of the monetary system," "interference with contract rights," "combatant activities of the military and naval forces," "claims arising in a foreign country," etc.

Some years ago the Chancelor of what then was Hungary, speaking in this country, said of the administration of the law in general: "I say we are trying. We are having great difficulty, either not fully comprehending what justice, equity, and established law mean, or in shaping a course of public and private action in accord with them and the ideals they express." Mutatis mutandis, much the same may be said of the new Federal Tort Claims Act.

We shall better understand this new law, if we look back a few hundred years. For, as Matthew Arnold said: "The largest part of that history which we commonly call ancient is practically modern, as it describes society in a stage analogous to that which it now is, while, on the other hand, most of what is called modern is practically ancient, as it relates to a state of things that has passed away."

The maxim that "the King can do no wrong" has passed away. History is stubborn, yields slowly and painfully, as one is aware in looking over the scores of volumes of learned dissertations in the Congressional Library on the subject of the divine right of kings, from which this maxim emanates. The implications of the abandonment of this doctrine in the United States and England are too great to deal with adequately within the confines of a monthly journal, however outstanding the writer may be, as is Professor Borchard, for the subject goes back a very long way.

Shortly after James I came to the throne of England in 1603, he announced that "the state of monarchy is the supremest thing on earth"; and his royalist followers, while some of our ancestors were planning to make the great pilgrimage to Plymouth, agreed that "monarchs are divinely sanctioned to rule, deriving all authority from the Deity and none from the governed." Consonant with this doctrine was the generally accepted view that the King was the fountainhead of all justice, and out of that grew what we now call courts of equity, as distinguished from courts of law, and a quite independent system of jurisprudence which put the King's conscience above the law and gave rise to the great powers of what is today the highest judicial position in the world, the Lord Chancelorship of England. With these concepts of royal and indisputable power and righteousness, there developed the maxim that "the King can do no wrong."

HOW FAR HAS THE UNITED STATES GONE?

And now we of the bar and our austere and distinguished brethren on the bench must ask ourselves whether, in the Federal Tort Claims Act, the United States has gone, to the extent of its sovereignty, the full distance of agreeing to shed its imperial robes, step down off its throne, and submit itself to the normal processes of the administration of Anglo-Saxon justice? One would think that the framers of the Federal Tort Claims Act had never heard of the time when the throne of England called in its janitor, for such is the origin of the word "chancelor," and told him to lessen the hardships of the law courts and thus created equity jurisprudence. Law in its generic sense consists of more than actions ex contractu and ex delicto. Does the Federal Tort Claims Act cover such cases, of which there are many, where the Federal Government, in its old- and new-sprung powers, has caused loss and ruin, but within the technical mandates of the law; or does the new statute mean what was pretty well said in the Illinois statute, accepting its liability for wrongdoing to its citizens 30 years ago by establishing a court of claims with jurisdiction to hear all claims, both legal and equitable, "which the State as a sovereign Commonwealth should in equity and good conscience discharge"?

It is not a simple thing to activate accurately and justly this new Federal Tort Claims Act and radiate its rationale to State and municipal government. It seems to me to need a John Marshall to construe and interpret it, with the sympathetic aid of a bar that has not forgotten that ancient legal ethic of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, quoted by Gilbert in these words:

"But a counselor cannot have this or any other action (against his client) to obtain pecuniary consideration for his advice; the law of England concurring on this point with the delicacy of the Roman law, in not permitting a price to be affixed to the performance of this honorable duty in which so many and arduous questions must arise, where the spontaneous acknowledgment of the client can alone be adequate."

History of Terminal Leave Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following history of terminal leave legislation:

Mr. Speaker, on September 13, 1945, I introduced H. R. 4051, providing for lump-sum cash payment for unused terminal leave for the enlisted men of the armed forces. The bill gives enlisted men of World War II the same benefits, privileges, and rights that had been given the officers serving in World War II.

This bill unanimously passed the House on June 11, 1946, by a vote of 379 to 0. When the bill reached the Senate, it was amended by providing 5-year bonds bearing interest at 2½ percent per annum in lieu of a lump-sum cash payment, and further provided that "such bonds are to be nonnegotiable and shall not be transferable by sale, exchange, assignment, pledge, hypothecation, or otherwise." In the conference between the two Houses right at the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the House was forced to accept the bond-payment plan or pass no legislation at all along this line, and rather than pass no legislation at all the House adopted the report of the conferees accepting the 5-year bond payment. However, at the time of the adoption of the conference report, both myself and various Members of the House insisted that the enlisted men should be paid in cash in the same way and manner that the officers had been paid in cash, and I think that it is fair to say that the conference report, accepting the bonds, was agreed to upon condition that at the Eightieth Congress a bill would be passed providing that the bonds should be redeemable in cash. As author of H. R. 4051, I made the statement on the floor of the House, in the discussion of the conference report, that the first bill that I would introduce during the Eightieth Congress would be one providing for the redemption of the terminal-leave bonds in cash.

Upon the convening of the Eightieth Congress on January 3, 1947, I did, in compliance with the statement made on the floor of the House during the Seventy-ninth Congress, introduce H. R. 3, which provides that bonds issued under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 shall be redeemable in cash at the option of the holder of said bonds upon application being duly made therefor.

My bill, H. R. 3, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services on January 3, 1947, and on January 22, 1947, I addressed a letter to the chairman and

each member of said committee, requesting that they hold a hearing on this bill and that the same be reported out for the consideration of the House. A copy of this letter is as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1947.

Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDREWS: On September 13, 1945, I introduced H. R. 4051, providing for terminal-leave pay to the enlisted personnel of the armed forces. After much delay and circuitous route this bill was passed by the House on June 11, 1946. When the bill was sent to the Senate, that body amended it by providing that 5-year bonds be used as payment for terminal leave instead of a lump-sum cash payment which my bill, 4051 provided. It appeared that the House had to accept the Senate amendment in order to pass this legislation during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

As author of the bill, when the conference report was discussed, I stated on the floor of the House on July 31, 1946, that the first bill that I would introduce in the Eightieth Congress would be one to make the bonds payable or redeemable in cash. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the House, July 31, 1946, p. 10588.) I immediately got in touch with Hon. South Trimble, the then Clerk of the House, and requested bill No. 1 of the Eightieth Congress. Mr. Trimble had already promised bill No. 1, but he assigned to me bill No. 2, which he confirmed by a letter.

When the Eightieth Congress convened I endeavored to get bill No. 2 assigned to me, but Mr. Andrews, the new Clerk, said he had promised bill No. 2 to some other party but would give me bill No. 3; therefore, my bill No. 3 providing for cash payment on these bonds was introduced in the Eightieth Congress. There have been a number of bills introduced providing for redemption in cash of these terminal-leave pay bonds. I am, therefore, writing the members of the Armed Services Committee that in view of my previous work and interest in connection with the original bill, H. R. 4051, that the members of the committee give my bill, H. R. 3, the right-of-way. I do not think I am asking anything that is not fair and just in making this request. Some of the members of your committee know the persistent work that I did in getting H. R. 4051 passed.

I would like to have the honor of completing the work of the bill which I originally started and I respectfully ask the members of your committee to give consideration to my bill, H. R. 3, and to recommend it for passage.

Most respectfully,

DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

The committee having taken no action on this bill, I did, on March 4, 1947, file a petition with the Clerk of the House of Representatives to discharge the committee from the further consideration of H. R. 3, under the rule of the House which provides that should a committee fail to act on a bill within 30 legislative days, then the introducer of said bill had the right and privilege to file such a petition—this is the identical procedure that was used in getting H. R. 4051, providing for terminal-leave pay, on the floor of the House for consideration during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

This petition, which is known as petition No. 1, has been on the Clerk's desk since March 4, 1947, and it appears that the petition is getting nowhere fast. It seems to be difficult to get a committee report on this bill or to get 218 Members to sign the petition which is to bring the bill before the House for consideration.

Whereupon, in order to get some relief for the holders of bonds who are in dire need of cash for assisting in building homes, buying furniture, and other necessary needs, I did, on May 19, 1947, introduce a bill providing that bonds issued under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 shall be negotiable.

The text of H. R. 3521 follows:

A bill to provide that bonds issued under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 shall be negotiable, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, bonds issued under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 prior to, on, or after the date of the enactment of this act shall be negotiable in the same manner and to the same extent as negotiable instruments payable to bearer; but no person in possession of such a bond shall be considered to be a holder for valuable consideration unless he took it in consideration of the payment of an amount not less than the sum of the principal of such bond plus the interest accrued on such bond to the last day of the month in which the bond was delivered to him.

SEC. 2. Section 6 (a) (2) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "except as provided in subsection (d), such bonds shall be nonnegotiable and shall not be transferable by sale, exchange, assignment, pledge, hypothecation, or otherwise."

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill would only make it possible that these bonds be negotiable so that the holder of the terminal-leave-pay bond can sell it, transfer it, and obtain the cash, and the purchaser of the bond would be a holder for valuable consideration by paying the full amount of the bond plus accrued interest to the last day of the month in which the bond was delivered to the said purchaser.

This would not in any way cost the Government a single penny, nor would it disturb the cash position of the Treasury.

As a matter of fact, the terminal-leave bondholder would make a little since the bonds are such good investment that they probably will sell at a premium as the Treasury bonds are now doing bearing only 2 percent interest. There are many banks and other investors anxious to acquire such sound securities at 2½ percent interest. This will not make any difference financially to the Government since it has to pay the bonds together with accrued interest at the expiration of 5 years anyhow.

H. R. 3521 repeals that harsh section in H. R. 4051 which provides that "such bonds shall not be negotiable and shall not be transferred by sale, exchange, assignment, pledge, hypothecation, or otherwise," thus making the holder of the terminal-leave-pay bonds powerless to use these bonds for 5 years which is like giving a soldier a gun without ammunition, or an old rusty musket whose trigger will not work. This prohibition against the use of the bonds for a period of 5 years is a distinct and flagrant discrimination against the veteran holding terminal-leave-pay bonds for the reason that there is no other bond issued by the Government that the owner cannot obtain cash on within 60 days to 6 months. I can see no valid reason why the terminal-leave-pay bonds cannot be used by the holder thereof. The withholding of the cash on these bonds from the veteran is a continuation of that discrimination which H. R. 4051 was intended to correct, and H. R. 3521 will wipe out and destroy this discrimination. Let us hope that the Members of this Congress will give their cooperation in the passage of this measure.

A Generous, Uniform, American Pension for Our Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to print granted today, I hereby extend a speech I made before pension clubs in Chicago on Sunday, May 25. The speech was as follows:

Mr. Eakins, to the State representatives, officers, and members, and guests of the American Pension Clubs of Illinois and Indiana, and especially to this worthy veteran, William Dick, of Naperville, I extend greetings. I have been greatly impressed with the words of our gray-haired veteran here on the platform who has worked so long in this cause. As I listened to him and saw so many others like him in this hall who have been leaders in this movement, I thought of the words of Daniel Webster at the laying of the cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument in 1825. A statement used by Webster then seems almost appropriate now.

There had gathered in that ceremony on the brow of Bunker Hill, in 1825, exactly 50 years after the battle of Bunker Hill, a little band of gray-haired veterans of the Revolutionary War—among them being the French patriot, Lafayette. It was only a handful of the veterans who had survived the battle and the 50 years following it to be present on that occasion. Mr. Webster said, "Venerable men, you have come down to us from a former generation. Heaven has bounteously lengthened out your lives that you might behold this joyous day." It was indeed a joyous day for that little band of survivors who had offered their lives in battle and had lived to see their country freed and a Republic established. Especially was it a joyous day for them when they remembered that some of their gallant leaders, like Dr. Warren, had died on that battle day, as Webster said, "Pouring out his blood like water before he knew whether it would enrich a land of freedom or of bondage."

As I listened to the venerable Mr. Dick, and looked about the audience where I see other men and women with hair as white as snow, I thought of Webster's words. You are venerable men and women who have survived many vicissitudes and have come now to the possibility of a glorious day. No; it is not yet a glorious day, but it approaches a glorious day in possibility. Webster said to the veterans of Bunker Hill, "Late may you arrive in heaven." So I say to you, "Late may you arrive in Heaven," but not until you have seen substantial justice provided by generous government for all who have helped to build in this marvelous land and create this goodly country.

I am most happy to be with you in Chicago today. I have been in this great metropolis of the heart of America on many occasions. I always marvel at the magnificence of this, which is, in so many respects,

the leader of all cities. I am glad, too, for this occasion, as it permits me again to express myself on a matter that has been dear to my heart for many years. A generous, uniform, American pension for all our senior citizens constitutes one of the most important legislative objectives that confronts the American Congress. I am aware of the great number and the magnitude of our national and international problems, and do not minimize them. These, many of them, affect our national life, and must have priority of consideration by Congress. The gravity of many of these problems cannot be overestimated. The Congress has faced, and is facing, these problems. We are happy that, even though many times the way does appear dark, and it is difficult to be sure just what is right and what is wrong, in due time we do surmount our obstacles and the ship of state plows through the troublous waters and we emerge into the serenity of an open sea again.

I think you probably would like to know something about me, myself, and what has been my relation to various proposals for old-age benefits and pensions. I came to Congress in the Seventy-fifth and began service in January 1937. That means I was a candidate for election to Congress in 1936. During the campaign of 1936 several elderly men, prominent in the Townsend movement, came to me and urged that I support the Townsend cause. They pointed out their numerical strength in Arizona and said they had sufficient votes to guarantee my election. I explained to them that day I did not know too much about the Townsend movement; that I thought a pension of $200 a month was fantastic and that for the sake of gaining votes I would not promise even to attempt to pass a bill guaranteeing such payments. These were neighbors of mine and they knew me. My life in that community had been an open book, and they knew that I meant it when I said to them, "I believe in pensions for our worthy senior citizens, and I shall work for something like the Townsend bill or any other pension proposal which seems to deal justly by such elderly citizens."

On coming to Congress, especially in the Seventy-fifth and the Seventy-sixth Congresses, I found various versions of the Townsend bill introduced. Early in the Seventy-sixth Congress, when the Ways and Means Committee did not report out the Townsend bill, a discharge petition was placed on the Speaker's desk to bring the bill to the floor of the House without committee action. Such a discharge petition requires 218 names, and I signed it along with 217 other Members of the House. I did not sign it merely as a political gesture with any thought that there probably would never be 218 signatures obtained, for I signed it that the bill might be brought out for free and full discussion so all could examine its merit.

On June 1, 1939, the bill was brought to the House and the first and last and only roll call vote on the direct issue of considering that Townsend bill was had that day in the House of Representatives. On roll call vote, 97 present voted "yea" and more than 300 voted "nay." It happens that 4 absent Members were paired to vote "yea." The 97 voting "yea" and the 4 absent who would have voted "yea" brings the total to 101 who dared to stand up and be counted, and some of you will remember that the Townsend organization honored these by calling them the 101 immortals. I got a certificate to the effect that I am one of the 101 immortals, and I also got plenty of adverse criticism from the State of Arizona because I had sincerely wished to have the merits of this general proposition fully debated and considered, at least in the Senate even if too little consideration had been given it in the House.

That vote occurred before the recent terrible war. Have I now deserted the Townsend organization? I feel that there is now little hope of getting any of the so-called Townsend bills enacted into law under the changed conditions of today. There are three similar bills before Congress now, two having been introduced by Republicans and one by a Democrat, which may be referred to as the Townsend bill. It is because I feel that there is so little hope of any of these elaborate measures being successfully passed that I have joined with Congressman LANDIS, of Indiana, and others, in sponsoring a simple, direct, and reasonable pension bill such as H. R. 781. A group of us met in Congressman LANDIS' office and talked the matter over before this bill was introduced. Since the Eigthieth Congress is Republican in control in both Houses, I felt that Congressman LANDIS should introduce the bill, and since the rules of the House do not permit two or more names on a single bill, although that is permitted in the Senate, we should call this the Landis bill and the rest of us supporters of it.

Some explanation should be made why I give preference to this particular legislative proposal over the various other proposals relating to the same subject matter. In general I believe that some such bill as H. R. 781 has a better chance of enactment now than some of the more elaborate proposals of preceding Congresses, or even of the present Congress. We must be practical and realistic and try in this good cause to approach fairness and justice for all in doing the best we can.

During recent years various Townsend bills have been introduced, and as I have already indicated I favored them in principle and have worked and hoped to get at least one of them to the floor of the House or Senate for full debate that it might have its day in court and be shaped in its terms according to the best judgment that Congress could bring to bear on it. All legislation in which there is controversy involved must be a matter of compromise and I naturally expect H. R. 781 or the Townsend bill or any other proposal, if passed, to be modified in the give and take of legislative formulation.

This bill which I shall call the Landis bill does not repeal all the social-security legislation but simply amends it by this one provision concerning old-age benefits. Now, I favor the general social-security legislation as far as it goes but it doesn't go far enough. It was enacted 2 years before I reached Congress in 1937 and I can see certain shortcomings, but as a Democrat I am proud that my party wrote the legislation on the statute books in the beginning and set up a goal of humanitarian legislation toward which we ought to work. I recognize that my party, while in power, will be jealous of its initial social-security legislation and will be cautious about amending it, although we want to broaden it and improve it. The party of Franklin D. Roosevelt will naturally resist any and all efforts to repeal the legislation or to destroy it. Our H. R. 781 has a view of improving the legislation—and I favor broadening it and bettering it in other respects as well—so I favor this special old-age provision represented in the Landis bill.

How do I regard the special features of the Landis bill and why do I favor it? First, it provides for a uniform national pension. If we are going to have any old-age benefit payments, which I certainly indorse, I can see great merit and justice in having such payments uniform throughout the Nation. Under the present social-security plan of Federal and State joint participation there is a great deal of difficulty in administering the law and the possibility of delay and injustice where the fault cannot be accurately placed. At this moment thousands of old-age pensioners in my State are very uneasy and have suffered inconvenience because of a misunderstanding on somebody's part at Phoenix or Washington, and it appears likely that my State may have to have a special session of the legislature to straighten out the matter. Of course, it is also true that thousands of these old-age pensioners in my State suffered embarrassment and delay because their checks were held up a few weeks ago because the Congress was slow in passing an appropriation measure. A uniform national pension might not avoid this second difficulty but I believe that such a uniform Federal system would cut the possibility of delay and the expense of administration by at least 50 percent. What we want in addition to adequacy and justice in such a law is simplicity and economy of administration.

One fault with the general social-security set-up is the cost of overhead. I want to work in the direction of simplicity and economy. I think we could write this pension law with such simple terms of eligibility—and I want those terms to be as nearly just as the human mind can conceive—but simple and clear so that once an individual is eligible that individual remains eligible and receives payment without question. I would eliminate inspectors and examiners and get it down on a basis that there can be little possibility of chiseling or fraud, and such could be handled by the ordinary courts of the land. I would do away with the "pauper's oath" or the "means test" or any measure of a person's need or financial condition other than official records, for I want those payments made not as a matter of charity but as a matter of right.

Parenthetically, while the Landis bill provides as a point of eligibility that one must not have paid an income tax the preceding year, I don't know but that it would be just as well to make the pension payment to the eligible individual, even if his income was great enough to be taxed. To my mind, such payments might just as well be made on application and determining of eligibility whether the individual be a millionaire or a day laborer.

The Landis bill provides that to be eligible at 60 for this pension a man or woman must be an American citizen and must have resided continuously in the United States for 10 years preceding the application. For my own part I would be willing to double that residence requirement. There may be, too, other requirements which should be written in. While it probably is too much to require applicants to prove a pension "earned," we do not propose this benefit as a "hand-out" to throngs of foreigners who might flock to this country to enjoy old-age benefits. The whole philosophy of this proposal is based on the assumption that a man or woman having reached the age of 60 and spent a substantial period of years of mature life as a good citizen productively in this country has helped to build the national wealth, and is therefore entitled to what might be called a special dividend in declining years.

Naturally I wish that we might have a more searching and accurate measure of an individual's contribution to the Nation's present wealth and prosperity more than a mere 10 or 20 years of residence in this country. However, I fear an attempt to set up an elaborate program and complex schedule of eligibility would make the whole plan unworkable and would open the way for what could amount to misjudgments and injustices.

Why did the authors write $60 per month as the amount? Well, that's something to aim at, and since my own State by joint plan with the Federal Government under social security now has a maximum of $50 per month, in counsel with Mr. Landis and others I agreed to make it tentatively somewhat larger than presently prevails in some of the more liberal States. What circumstances ought to be considered in determining what the amount shall be in such a bill? Several things must be carefully considered. What amount can the economy of the Nation provide for such payment? This is a deep and involved economic problem calling for profound study by broad-minded statesmen.

Another question. How would $60 a month to oldsters compare relatively with pensions and other benefit payments to other classes of citizens? For instance, we now have many millions of former members of the armed services and their dependents who are either receiving pensions or some form of Federal payments because of their past services. Of course, this cannot be measured accurately by what the country owes them. The soldier fought to preserve our country and he is properly rewarded for having done so. The elderly citizen should be pensioned because he or she helped to create our country, and a delicate question is raised as to relative contributions. I wish we knew which is the greater service, to help create America or to help preserve America? Of course, that cannot be adequately answered by finite minds, but benefit payments of one class must not be out of line or manifestly unjust in comparison with benefit payments to the other class. Neither can be paid what their services were worth.

Again, what limit in morality or justice, as well as economic feasibility, should enter into consideration of the amount of old-age benefits? If citizens retire at 60 and—I would not have compulsory retirement written into the law—if they retire from active work, the burden of economic support falls upon the remaining population. No one could ever justify throwing a large group of elderly citizens, living in comparative ease and luxury, as a burden upon the backs of the younger generation to the extent of lowering the latter's standard of living. This system of old-age-benefit payments must not be a crushing burden upon the oncoming generation. It need not be. If properly enacted, the legislation could be a blessing to the younger generation of workers, second only to the older generation who are the recipients.

Is it possible for our economic system to bear the burden of paying such pensions suggested in any of the bills now before the Congress? I haven't the least doubt but that it is possible for American economy to support the program of the Landis bill. In the closing hours of the Seventy-ninth Congress we passed what has usually been called the full employment bill, but which ought rightfully and legally to be called the Maximum Employment Act. The politico-economic die-hards said that idea was fantastic and could never be carried out. If they seize and hold political power, nothing may ever come of it. But some of the best brains of America feel that that is a good law and that it is capable of being implemented by government and carried out in effect by agriculture, business, industry, and labor.

For 2 years I sat on the special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning during the war, and we had before us the greatest leaders in industry, Government, and labor. The voluminous hearings were held during the period of the war, indicating what America could have and ought to have after the war. They occupy thousands of pages in print and we heard the greatest minds in Government, in industry, in business, and in labor picture our economic possibilities. Unfortunately we have not yet seen any of these pictures coming true, but surely so many, many practical men could not be wrong. America can do it when motivated for peace as she was motivated for war.

Many textbooks have been written on economics, while libraries embody the thought of our economists, but in all this study the major share of the thought has been given in more recent years to the phase of production—that is, the production of wealth. Now the production of wealth is only one of the fields or the divisions of the science of economics. Too little thought has been paid to an equally important part of economics and that is the consumption of wealth. Production and consumption are really opposite sides of the same thing, but this significant fact apparently has not dawned fully enough upon American businessmen. Our economic society has arrived now, through the use of power, and with the technology and American know-how, to a point so that we can vastly increase the output of material things enough to satisfy to a greater degree than ever before most human wants. However, our economic machine often comes to a slow down, if not a dead stop, because there periodically occurs too little purchasing power to take our abundant production.

How to create that purchasing power to keep our industry and productive equipment working to capacity is our modern problem. We go to great extremes to create markets abroad—and I am not minimizing the importance of foreign trade—but meanwhile we overlook the basic fact that the greatest of all markets is our American home market, with purchasing power in the hands of the masses of our people. I believe that this measure, H. R. 781, enacted into law would go a long way toward providing that purchasing power and at the same time it would deal justly by a class of our citizens who deserve to share in the benefits of that which they have helped to create.

Farmers Will Suffer Unless Soil Conservation Appropriation Is Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter my protest against the cut made by the Appropriations Committee from the Department of Agriculture's request for $301,720,000 for soil-conservation benefits and the elimination of the authorization for the $200,000,000 program for the 1948 crops.

Benefits from soil conservation are many. First, our productive soil is kept from washing away. It is kept permanently productive for our children's children—in fact, under scientific, acre-by-acre treatment of the farm conservation plan, the fertility of a farm actually increases over the years. This is the kind of soil and water conservation which Louisiana farmers are putting into effect in their own voted and managed soil conservation districts over the greater part of the State. In addition, our whole State and society benefits—business, professions, schools, and churches; local, State, and National Governments—through increased farm incomes and taxable wealth and higher revenues.

The bankers of Louisiana give us a good example here in our own State of how business groups recognize the importance of a productive agriculture for the economic stability of our State. They know from actual experience with their customers that fertile topsoil is the basis for agricultural productivity and that once the topsoil is gone, only the inferior subsoil is left. For this reason, the bankers have encouraged the widespread use of soil- and water-conservation practices. Last fall, for example, they requested the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture to conduct a forum in their behalf. Representatives from 28 banking institutions attended the conference at Alexandria, La., on November 18 and 19, 1946.

Of this forum, an editorial in a Louisiana newspaper read:

> Here is realization of the interdependence of farmer and banker. When Louisiana farmers prosper so do most Louisiana communities. * * * For promoting farming and soil conservation in the State the Louisiana Bankers' Association has been cited three times in as many years by the American Bankers' Association. Financiers have charted a course many another business group could wisely follow.

More than 90 percent of the entire State is now in the 24 farmer-voted and farmer-managed soil-conservation districts. That is an outstanding accomplishment in the less than 10 years since the Louisiana district enabling act was passed.

Working through their supervisors and with the help of Soil Conservation Service technicians, these farmers have planned the acre-by-acre conservation treatment for more than 2,320,000 acres. Of this, more than 1,248,000 acres have received conservation treatment. This conservation application includes such items as 394,000 acres of contour cultivation, 94,000 acres of strip cropping, nearly 81,000 acres of farm drainage, 630,000 acres of properly stocked range, and nearly 149,000 acres of range and pasture seeding. This is an excellent beginning in conserving our soil resources.

There still remains a tremendous job ahead. A conservation-needs survey made by the Soil Conservation Service in 1945 shows that Louisiana's farms need more conservation work, including 1,731,000 acres of contour planting, 1,822,000 acres of strip cropping, 1,088,000 acres of farm drainage improvement work, 1,469,000 acres of terracing, and about 2,349,000 acres of pasture seeding.

After careful consideration of the cuts made by the Committee on Appropriations from the Department of Agriculture's budget request, it is my unalterable conviction that the farmers would suffer a great burden if this proposal were carried out which would eventually lead to destruction of the entire farm program. As a Representative of the State of Louisiana, with its vast specialized agricultural interests, I am vitally interested in a program that would help our farmers. Louisiana is a great producer of strawberries, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, sugar, rice, peaches, peanuts, cotton, and commercial spring vegetables.

Agriculture is a basic industry in Louisiana. The State's 130,669 farms cover over 10,000,000 acres. Its 853,949 farm people make up 36.1 percent of its population. Including people in small towns, whose welfare depends a good deal on agriculture, the rural population is 1,383,441, or 58.6 percent of the total. Twenty-two commercial fruit and vegetable canneries operated in the State in 1946, seven of them established in 1945 and 1946. Their output amounts to about a million cases a year. Okra, snap

beans, sweetpotatoes, spinach, beans, beets, and other vegetables are canned. Sweetpotatoes make up about 60.5 percent of the pack, according to an economic study by the university, and the canning of sweetpotatoes gained over 83 percent in 5 years. One of the methods recommended for increasing the output of canned goods is to draw products from a wider area.

Dehydration of sweetpotatoes, developed by the agricultural engineers, has resulted in production of $1,450,000 worth of stock feed, on a basis of comparison with corn. Thirty new dehydrators were installed in 1946. Improved sweetpotato-digging machinery last year saved the farmers 3,000,000 bushels, worth a million and a half dollars. The cost of land drainage can be greatly reduced by use of machinery developed by the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and the experiment station.

I cannot vote against the agricultural interests of the State of Louisiana and the Congress should realize that the farmers must get the help and consideration to which they are justly entitled.

I urge that the soil-conservation item in the Agriculture appropriation bill be restored to the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the President.

Address by Senator Chavez Before Society of Natives of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me in Washington on Saturday, May 24, 1947, before the Society of Natives of the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President and members of the Society of Natives of the District of Columbia, I wish to thank the members of the society for the opportunity of addressing you this evening. It is always a great pleasure to appear before persons who are interested in the place of their origin. We feel the same way in New Mexico.

This gathering brings to mind the people from whom most of you spring, the founders of this Nation, the pioneers who contributed so much towards its greatness. To the pioneers of America I dedicate my brief talk this evening.

It is unnecessary for me to recount the history of the United States. You have all been familiar with it since childhood—the coming of the Pilgrims to Massachusetts; the settlement at Jamestown, in Virginia; the colony on the Savannah River; the Dutch settlements in New York and New Jersey; the Huguenots of the Carolinas. This story is a familiar one. The people who accomplished all this were magnificent and visionary, but practical hard workers and realistic. They left their abode in Europe for many reasons. Generally it was to escape political or religious persecutions or to seek better economic conditions for their families. They left their homes and broke forever their family ties, and we who are the beneficiaries of their ambitions and efforts must always be grateful.

The colonization of our eastern coast constitutes one of the greatest migrations in the annals of the human race. Our history books tell us of the various settlements by white Europeans and the relentless drive of their descendents to the west. These pioneers carried with them many precious personal belongings, but more valuable than any personal property was their heritage of liberty, freedom, and their desire for an economic security for their children.

Thousands upon thousands pushed west from the New England States, from Pennsylvania, and from Virginia. Countless families crossed the Cumberland Pass and went on into what is now Kentucky and Tennessee, then a part of the Virginia Colony.

These pioneers were noted for their integrity, for their frugality, for their courage, and for their devotion to religion. They had all of the qualities we now hold dear, but above all they possessed one trait in common for which their descendants owe them much. They never forgot education. The instruction of their children went hand in hand with the improvement of the family lot.

A family reached a clearing in what is now Kentucky or Louisiana. The husband built a home by cutting logs, hewing them into shape, and making a cabin; but as he built his home he joined with others who had come west with him and built a schoolhouse. When the first log schoolhouse was constructed the initial step was taken toward establishing what is now our American public school system.

While this was taking place, 2,000 miles away in what is now the southwestern part of the United States, a different pioneering effort had long since been underway. Many years before the English colonist reached America another group of Europeans were living in what is now continental United States. The Spanish had firmly established towns, ranches, schools, and missions in New Mexico.

These were the followers of Isabela la Catolica and Ferdinand of Spain, the sovereigns under whom Spain had conquered the last Moorish territory, the kingdom of Boabdil, Granada. Under their leadership the fierce energy of a restless and warlike people was canalized and directed toward the last of the crusades against the Mussulmans, and when the crescent had been expelled forever from Spain, Isabela turned her thoughts to the oceans of the west and provided the means by which Columbus opened up two vast continents for Christendom.

It is only natural that in America where the basic language is English and whose principal colonizers were English that our history books should concentrate on those things done by the English settlers. Our children in the classrooms hear of William Penn, of Lord Calvert, and of Captain Smith and Pocahontas. But I will warrant you that they seldom hear that 85 years before Plymouth Rock white Europeans had reached New Mexico.

I would like to dwell a few moments on the European pioneers in New Mexico where my ancestors have lived for hundreds of years. Visualize please the geographical location of the State I represent. New Mexico is thousands of miles from the ocean and before the advent of the airplane and the automobile travel was either on foot, on horseback, or by wagons. To reach New Mexico in those days one had to travel overland the vast distance from Old Mexico.

It seems particularly fitting that the Society of Natives of the District of Columbia, an organization which takes pride in the fact that its members and their ancestors originated in Washington, should be familiar with the fact that elsewhere in our great country in New Mexico live a people whose pride of lineage and love of their homeland matches that of your society. And though their history and culture is different from yours, still in the great amalgum of America they also are good Americans and their patriotism is second to none. I mention this because I am convinced that much can be done toward overcoming racial and religious intolerance which we all admit should form no part in American life. Bigotry is based on ignorance and tends to disappear with knowledge. Understanding and appreciating the role played by various peoples in the settling, the founding, and preserving our race will further this end. I bring this up with the hope that out of knowledge and understanding will come mutual respect and tolerance—in one word a step toward a better America.

The first knowledge of New Mexico came about in a strange and romantic way. In 1526 Panfilo de Narvaez was the Spanish Governor of Cuba, and having been authorized by the King of Spain to explore what is now the State of Florida, he outfitted an expedition which set sail in 1527. It reached Florida in 1528 and after numerous disasters the expedition was shipwrecked off the coast of Florida, and a mere handful reached the mainland. Six hundred men started out with that expedition and of these only four survived to tell the story.

The treasurer of the expedition was one of these. His name was Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, a native of Alcala de Los Henares in Spain. Incidently, this little village was also the birthplace of Cervantes, the contemporary of Shakespeare, and the author of that monumental work of European letters Don Quixote. I might add here that 1947 marks the four-hundredth anniversary of the death of both Cervantes and Shakespeare.

The four survivors of the expedition were 6 years in reaching their fellowmen in Mexico during which time they had visited what is now Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and after being shipwrecked through Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and down to the Spanish colony of Culiacan on the western coast of Mexico. The survivors were Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, Del Castillo, Dorantes, and a Barbary Negro named Estevan. Imagine the surprise of that Spanish colony in 1535 when these four strange men with long beards arrived with their fantastic tales of vast continents and strange peoples to the north.

Their stories spread like wildfire through Mexico, and it was largely due to this that lead to a series of expeditions into what is now the State of New Mexico.

Today it is no small feat to drive from Washington to Albuquerque or from Mexico City to Santa Fe. The distance is about 2,000 miles either way; but what would such a trip have meant if made 406 years ago, when Coronado came to New Mexico?

In 1940 we celebrated the fourth centennial of Coronado's entry into New Mexico. His men discovered the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, and he himself went as far as Kansas and Nebraska. These were real men—travelers possessing patience, energy, and courage unequaled in any era. How different from those of us today who become annoyed when an airplane is grounded for a few hours.

In New Mexico, near Gallup, some 150 miles west of Albuquerque, we have a famous national monument called El Morro. In English it is referred to as Inscription Rock. It is a huge flat-faced monolith rising some 200 feet above the surrounding plain. On its face is carved the following inscription: "Paso por aqui" and other words, which translated into English mean "Passed by here the Adelantado Don Juan de Oñate, from the

discovery of the Sea of the South, the 16th of April of 1605."

The history of New Mexico is inscribed on El Morro. Oñate's inscription, dated 1605, is the oldest on El Morro. General De Vargas, who reconquered New Mexico after the Pueblo uprising, left an inscription in 1692. Various Governors of New Mexico have left their names. In 1849 Lt. J. H. Simpson, of the United States Army, visited El Morro and left his name, as did Archbishop Lamy, whom Willa Cather immortalized in her novel, Death Comes to the Archbishop. Perhaps one day some of you will be planning a trip abroad. If you do so, give some thought to first seeing the wonders and beauties of our own country. I recommend that you see El Morro National Monument in New Mexico.

To return to the pioneers, New Mexico was settled in the latter part of the sixteenth century and was colonized by men and women from Spain who brought cattle, horses, sheep, poultry, swine, and seedlings of apples, figs, and olives, but along with that they brought their coats of mail and their swords and lances, for theirs was to be unrelenting warfare with the predatory Indians of the West. For 300 years, in fact, until the last of the Apache chiefs were subdued by the United States Army and the New Mexico volunteers in 1898, the settlers in New Mexico were constantly engaged in warfare and in defense of their homes and properties.

New Mexico remained under Spanish and Mexican rule until 1846, when pioneers of another race appeared on the scene.

Last year on October 16 the Post Office Department issued a special stamp commemorating the one-hundredth anniversary of the raising of the American flag over the Governor's Palace at Santa Fe. Gen. Philip Watts Kearny commanded the Army of the West, composed of Missouri troops, which had marched from Independence, Mo., the home of President Truman, overland to Santa Fe. From the balcony of the ancient Palace of Governors at Santa Fe Kearny read the proclamation by which New Mexico formally became a part of the United States.

Since 1846 New Mexico, with its varied population, ancient cultures, and amazing history, has been an integral part of this country.

Three peoples live there in peace and harmony. Each group is justly proud of its culture and lineage, but each is even more vehemently proud of the heritage they share in common as Americans. The Indians, the oldest of the three peoples and the original possessors of the land, are found there enjoying their lands and preserving their customs and language as their ancestors did hundreds of years ago, but with opportunities of learning all that American education can furnish today; the descendants of the Spanish living on lands inherited from their ancestors and speaking the same language as their forefathers did in a manner which philologist tells us is reminiscent of the sixteenth century; and the third group, the English-speaking Americans, who have come there since 1846.

Each group strives to live in harmony with the other and to respect American ideals and traditions. Each group accepts the duties and responsibilities of citizenship in times of peace and in times of war. The record of each group in volunteer enlistments during this past war is something that any similar group in other parts of the Nation could envy. They are Americans all.

Our problems in New Mexico are basically the same as those in Washington, D. C. We want you to understand and appreciate our situation and we share with you the firm conviction that the United States is the best place in the world to live, and we seek with you to make it an even better place.

Address by Edward Keating Before Colorado Mining Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some time ago in the city of Denver, Colo., there was delivered before the Colorado Mining Association a most interesting address entitled "Have We a Labor Problem?" The address was delivered by Edward Keating, editor of Labor. I deemed it proper to insert this address in the RECORD, because many who are interested in this great subject should have access to it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE WE A LABOR PROBLEM?

It is most unusual for a group of more or less militant employers to ask the editor of a more or less militant labor paper to address them on the highly controversial labor problem.

I think it is a good idea. Why not have more of it? Why shouldn't labor unions invite spokesmen for the employers to appear before their conventions, let down their back hair and state their grievances against the way the unions are conducted? Why shouldn't the unions return the compliment, and at the invitation of the leaders of industry, send their spokesmen to business men's conventions to frankly present their side of the story as emphatically as the occasion warrants?

The result would probably be some extremely explosive debates, but they might clear the atmosphere. At least the men who spoke for each side would understand the business at hand, and the situation would not be messed up by a lot of outsiders—politicians and experts—who frequently know precious little about the realities of the workaday world.

In discussing the theme assigned me, I hope I will exercise the fine tolerance you displayed when you invited me to talk to you.

I went to work on the Denver Republican in this city when I was 14 years old. I joined a union before I was old enough to vote. I have been a union man ever since, but, strangely enough, most of the time I have been on the employer's side of the table.

In this city, on the old Rocky Mountain News, I had a chance to see the labor problem from the employer's point of view. When I owned a daily paper, I had many an argument with union representatives.

As manager and editor of the railroad workers' national weekly in Washington, Labor—and, by the way, it has the largest paid circulation of any labor weekly fn this country, reaching into every city, town, and hamlet in the United States and Canada—I am constantly dealing with six or seven unions.

We don't always agree the moment we sit down. That isn't the way to conduct genuine collective bargaining. We have even found it necessary to submit certain points to arbitration. That's the logical thing to do when employer and employee can't reach an understanding. But we always get together and we have never had anything resembling a strike.

To me, there is nothing mysterious or sinister about the labor movement. It's the most natural thing in the world for workers in the same craft to organize unions for the purpose of dealing with their employers. In 99 percent of the cases, it is a good thing for the employer, as well as for the worker.

Farmers have their cooperatives; lawyers have their bar associations; businessmen have their trade associations; doctors have their medical societies. Why not labor unions for workers?

But, you say, bar associations, medical societies, trade associations, farm cooperatives, are quite different from labor unions. Not as much as some people may imagine.

The closed shop will supply an example of what I have in mind.

There are many States where, if a lawyer doesn't pay his dues to the State bar association, he can't practice law. (No labor union, so far as I have been able to ascertain, has ever asked a legislature to pass a law compelling members of a particular craft to pay their dues or cease practicing their skill.)

I am not criticizing this lawyers' union. I am just calling attention to it, so the next time you hear a lawyer talking about the restrictive practices of trade unions, you may ask him about what the lawyers call the integrated bar, which is being pushed right now before a number of legislatures and which has already been adopted and enforced in Michigan and many other States. It isn't so very long ago that 200 or 300 lawyers were disbarred in 1 day in Michigan for failure to pay their dues to the bar association.

It is true we have closed shops in the labor movement. Every newspaper in the city of Denver has had the closed shop in all branches of its mechanical department for the last 60 years. The arrangement means that in the mechanical departments of those newspaper offices only union men may be employed, but it doesn't mean that nonunion printers and stereotypers and pressmen cannot practice at their trade. All they have to do is to go and find a nonunion shop, and there are a good many of them, perhaps not in Denver, but throughout the country. So, you see, we haven't gone as far as the lawyers propose in their integrated bar.

All unions do not demand the closed shop. For example, the standard railroad labor organizations, with which I have the honor to be associated, have hundreds of contracts on the railroads in this country and Canada. Not one of those contracts provides for the closed shop, and yet at least 95 percent of the railroad workers of the United States and Canada are loyal members of these great unions.

On the other hand, the printing trades and the building trades operated on the closed-shop principle from the beginning. The coal miners and other unions have gone a step further. They not only ask the closed shop, but the employer, under the check-off system, collects the union dues.

The differences within the unions on this one issue of the closed shop reveal what a great many people overlook—that trade-unionism in this country has been an evolutionary movement. Practically every union has its own peculiar technique, involving practices and customs not found in other unions.

To discard these practices and to insist that every industry shall proceed according to some plan evolved by a politician in Washington or an expert somewhere else would create chaos. This is recognized even by some of the gentlemen who have been introducing antilabor bills in Congress. One of

these antilabor Senators said the other day that the adoption of his proposals would probably cause a certain amount of chaos, but that the experiment was worth the cost.

From the point of view of one who has had some experience in labor matters, this particular legislator has some quaint ideas. He is like a small boy playing with matches. He may set fire to the house. For example, he is constantly talking about jurisdictional disputes and their devastating effect on industry. However, the Labor Department comes along and points out that of the time lost because of strikes during the first year following VJ-day, only four-tenths of 1 percent was traceable to jurisdictional disputes.

At this moment, in the House and Senate of the Congress of the United States, jurisdictional disputes are causing all kinds of trouble. These jurisdictional disputes are not caused by labor unions. They are caused by clashes between various committees of the House and Senate. Just a few months ago Congress passed a reorganization bill, cut down the number of committees, and rearranged the duties of the committees that were retained. Now some of the eminent gentlemen who passed that legislation are battling each other in the fiercest fashion because they can't agree as to what the law means.

And just a short distance from Washington the authorities of the State of Maryland and of the State of Virginia are actually shooting at each other. The issue is a jurisdictional squabble over the oyster beds of Chesapeake Bay.

Now, if the Congress of the United States and the two great Commonwealths of Maryland and Virginia—Commonwealths which have produced some of our most eminent statesmen—can't avoid jurisdictional disputes, why in heaven's name should we be so disturbed when two labor unions get into an occasional squabble over who shall do this or that job?

No labor leader likes jurisdictional disputes. They are extremely vexatious, but you can't dispose of them by passing a law. More of these antilabor lawmakers are talking about abolishing industry-wide collective bargaining. A more absurd proposal was never advanced by sane men. If it goes through, and a serious attempt is made to enforce it, the resultant trouble will be incalculable.

Take your own case right here in Colorado. You wish to put new life into the mining industry. I think most of you will agree with me that one of the first steps in that direction should be the establishment of decent labor relations. If the leaders of the labor unions and the leaders of the mining industry are sensible, they will go into a room, lock the door, and sit down around a table to figure out how the problem of resuscitating mining may be solved. If possible, they will do it on an industry-wide basis—at least on a State-wide basis. If you don't do that you will have a squabble on every property because of varying wage schedules and working conditions. In transportation and other industries Nation-wide negotiations have proven most beneficial all around. Why wreck a good system just to experiment with something new?

I don't like labor wars. Frequently they are precipitated by stubborn men who magnify the importance of some trivial matter.

I have seen three State-wide, devastating strikes in this State. All were in the mining industry. The first was when I was just a boy. It centered at Cripple Creek, but spread to other camps. The mine owners had an army, privately paid and privately equipped. The miners were camped on Bull Hill. Gov. Davis H. Waite sent in the militia, with instructions to get in between the conflicting forces and head off any hostile clash.

What happened? The mine owners entered the Antlers Hotel in Colorado Springs, seized the adjutant general of the State, and subjected him to a coat of tar and feathers. What did they gain by that? Not a thing in the world. The controversy finally petered out and Cripple Creek became a roaring union camp.

Then came the great strikes of 1903 and 1904, during the administration of Governor Peabody. This time the militia went in on the side of the mine owners. The miners were loaded on boxcars, taken to the Kansas border, and literally driven into the wilderness. Nonunion men were brought in by the hundreds to take the miners' places, but I think I am safe in saying that Cripple Creek never recovered from that blow.

In 1913 and 1914, when I had the honor to represent this State in Congress, we had the bloodiest of all our strikes in the Rockefeller properties in southern Colorado. No man knows how many were killed on both sides during that conflict.

At my request, President Woodrow Wilson pleaded with the Rockefellers to meet with the representatives of their men. The proposal was turned down. Then followed what has come to be known as the Massacre of Ludlow. To head off civil war in this State, Federal troops were sent in. When the smoke of battle cleared away, practically every man in Rockefeller mines belonged to the union, although the Rockefellers didn't recognize the union. But they didn't antagonize the union because they didn't desire another strike.

The loss to Colorado, caused by these terrible conflicts, was very great and, of course, affected almost every citizen. With the greatest candor, I say to you that the issues involved in those three strikes could have been settled over a conference table within 48 hours. What were those issues? They were very simple. The right of men to join the union of their choice and an inconsequential increase in wages.

Please do not imagine that I am arguing that the labor union is always right and that the employers are always wrong. I wouldn't insult your intelligence by pressing such an argument.

There are 15,000,000 trade-unionists in the United States. With the members of their families and close relatives, they undoubtedly represent at least a fifth, and possibly a fourth, of our population. Of course, there are many short-sighted, selfish, even dishonest, men among them. If that were not true, then the labor movement of America would constitute the greatest miracle witnessed by human beings since our Lord left His sepulchre on the third day and gave His disciples concrete evidence of His divinity.

But, my friends, the last time I visited a Federal penitentiary, I found that some of the inmates were bankers. I have known realtors whose word was not always good, and at this moment, the paper I have the honor to edit is conducting a little crusade to head off the sale of worthless Canadian mining stock in this country. Furthermore, I know two distinguished newspaper publishers who were sent to prison for cheating Uncle Sam.

Because some go wrong, shall we condemn all bankers, all newspaper publishers, all realtors, all mining promoters? It all supports the contention of the poet that there is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us that it ill becomes any of us to be throwing rocks at the rest of us.

This labor movement of ours is as American as the Washington Monument or the Lincoln Memorial. Of course, it is constantly fighting to improve the condition of its members, and it will continue to do so; but it is not led by thieves and grafters, but by honorable men, whose records in private and public life will bear comparison with the records of the leaders of any other group in American life.

For almost 25 years I have been associated with the standard railroad labor organizations. As I have said, they represent 1,500,000 men on the railroads of this country and Canada, and they represent almost 1,000,000 more outside the railroad industry.

During all those years, I have known the leaders of those unions so intimately that none of them could be even accused of a dishonest act without the accusation coming to my knowledge. In only one instance, were any of the leaders of any of these unions accused of wrongdoing. That had nothing to do with the labor movement. Two or three of them had become mixed up with businessmen and bankers and had become directors of a bank. The authorities proceeded against all the directors because of some irregularity. Everyone concerned was acquitted, so I take it for granted that all were innocent.

However, the fact remains that the only time any of our chiefs found themselves in serious trouble was when they got tangled up with bankers. Furthermore, these railroad unions have thousands of contracts. During the 25 years I have been associated with them, they have not broken a single one of those contracts. You can't beat that record.

But, someone says, the railroad boys are different. Well, I think they are pretty fine, but how about the other unions? If you go over the attacks on labor unions, you will find that only a handful of unions are charged directly with improper practice but, on the strength of their alleged misdeeds, an effort is made to smear all the others.

A distinguished Senator some time ago told me about his sweet, old grandmother who, in her youth, walked more than a thousand miles from the Missouri River to her husband's western claim. There wasn't sufficient room in the covered wagon for all their belongings, so some of the more precious were placed in a two-wheeled cart, and this gentle girl pushed the cart a third of the way across the continent, sustained by hope and love and faith in God. In the evening of life, when her children and her children's children gathered about her and related their triumphs and disasters, sometimes placing great emphasis on the disasters, the dear old lady would smilingly admonish: "Don't forget to count your blessings."

Today those of us who are fortunate enough to be Americans should count our blessings and ignore those who are telling us that our country is "going to hell in a hand basket."

I am a member of the National Press Club in Washington. Once a year the club arranges a dinner for the President of the United States. A few weeks ago the 1947 dinner was held. There was only one speech, and that was short and off the record. There was much entertainment. There was a scene from Duffy's Tavern. Perhaps some of you are familiar with that classic. The barkeeper had the floor, and he said at least one thing worth remembering. It ran something like this:

"They say that America is a melting pot. Perhaps it is. But there isn't another nation in all the world which wouldn't give everything it possesses to get just one leg of that pot."

In other words, this America of ours is the most fortunate country in all the world. It you don't believe that, try to persuade those who do not agree with the barkeeper in Duffy's Tavern to go to the country or countries they favor most.

We have just won the greatest war in the history of mankind. Our boys, on the land, on the sea, and in the air, did that job, but they had to have weapons, and ships and airplanes, and food and clothes and 10,000 other things. How were those supplies produced? By men and women on

the home front—farmers and industrial workers. Once in a while there was a strike, but the fact remains that, from the beginning to the end of the war, there was never a single occasion when our men on a battle front were deprived of something vital because of something the workers did on the home front. No one can challenge that statement. It is sustained by every official report.

Judge Charles M. Hay, who was chief counsel for the War Mobilization Board, once said at a congressional hearing, that time lost by strikes during the war was so inconsequential that it might be said not to exceed the time required by war workers to blow their noses an extra time each day.

No responsible labor leader condoned wartime strikes, however inconsequential they might be. However, the workers were not entirely to blame. You will perhaps recall that at the very beginning of the war big business refused to budge until tax laws were adjusted to its satisfaction and it was assured other valuable privileges.

I have no desire to resurrect the dead past, but when anyone endeavors to disparage the work of trade-unionists during the war, trade-unionists may reply with the greatest assurance: "We are quite willing to compare our record with that of any other group."

What about the industrial conflicts which developed after the shooting was over? There are at least two answers to that question. One is that you can't expect to wage a global war for years and then return to a peacetime status in a few days. Naturally, the workers were apprehensive. Hundreds of thousands were being separated from their jobs. Prices were soaring. Those who remained on the job were losing overtime pay. Tens of thousands were groping their way back to their old homes from shipyards and munitions plants.

Many observers believed we were drifting toward another world depression. Trade-union leaders said the only solution was to sustain buying power by raising "take-home" pay.

Naturally, some employers didn't like that. Negotiations dragged on for months, largely because Congress had so arranged the tax laws that many of the big employers could secure tax refunds to cover strike losses. Fortunately, that situation is behind us. It was never as bad as it was painted. At the peak of postwar labor troubles, we never had more than 4 out of 100 on strike, and then for only a brief period.

Today we have 57,000,000 men and women employed and the number out on strike is scarcely worth mentioning. So we are in comparatively placid waters and should be able to view the future without hysteria and above all we should refuse to listen to demagogs who urge us to rock the boat.

My friends, we have another blessing to count. Only in this country and in Canada can you find a labor movement which is not tainted by some "ism" which threatens the safety of the kind of democracy we have known. Ninety-nine percent of American trade-unionists are not Socialists or Communists or Fascists.

The Communists, in particular. have made desperate efforts to secure a foothold in the American labor movement. Up to date they have failed utterly. They have never succeeded in penetrating the standard railroad labor organizations. They have been practically eliminated from the American Federation of Labor. They are making their last stand in a few so-called independents and in some CIO unions, but the hand of American labor is against them and will continue to be against them.

Of course, that doesn't mean that American labor feels that every phase of our political and economic system is perfect. American labor is too intelligent for that. But American trade-unionism is not a revolutionary movement. I like to think of it as an evolutionary movement—constantly progressing and always holding the ground it has won.

I am not apprehensive concerning the future of the American labor movement. I do not believe the efforts now being made to cripple or destroy it will succeed. I feel that such efforts are unwise, but I am also convinced they will be futile.

All I am seeking to do today is to say to you, as employers of labor: "Extend the hand of fellowship to your workers. Recognize their right to organize unions which suit their needs. Don't be shocked when differences develop. Devise machinery to handle those differences, with a minimum of governmental or other outside interference."

If you do that in good faith, you will find that American trade-unionists will meet you at least half way. That's all you have a right to expect, and that is all the trade-union movement should concede.

I think there is a trinity in economics, as there is in religion. The trinity in economics is made up of agriculture, labor, business. They are so closely affiliated that if one is injured, the others are bound to suffer.

Impoverish the farmer, and the industrial worker will find himself without a job, and the businessman will look in vain for a market for his wares. Treat business unfairly, and labor and farmer will discover the door of opportunity is closing. Deny a just wage to the worker, and business and agriculture cannot escape the disastrous consequences.

So, my friends, we are all in the same boat. In heaven's name, let's develop sense enough to pull together.

Wool and Reciprocity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star there appeared an excellent editorial entitled "Wool and Reciprocity." The editorial relates to some of the problems with which the wool growers are confronted. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOOL AND RECIPROCITY

If the Senate accepts the House version of the wool support bill, President Truman will have good reason to resort to a veto. As originally passed by the Senate, the measure—though designed to keep prices up—could be defended as an expedient to save the Nation's sheep raisers from serious losses. But the House has attached to it what amounts to a tariff-boosting amendment—an action that has stymied progress at the Geneva Trade Conference and cast grave doubt on the whole American-led effort to promote freer world commerce as one of the pillars of peace.

The situation has come to a head largely as a result of the huge stock pile of wool—a critical war material—built up in this country since 1943. It was built up through purchases by the Commodity Credit Corporation at about 42 cents a pound. If this were now unloaded on the market without measures protecting sheep raisers, the sheep raisers would suffer severely from a price nose dive. Accordingly, under the Senate bill, the Department of Agriculture would continue to support the 42-cent level for domestic wool, and the CCC would be authorized to sell the stock pile at a figure competitive with foreign-raised wool. Carrying the protection to an extreme, however, the House has added to this a provision that would have the effect of obliging the President to raise the tariff on the commodity.

Since our domestic production has never been enough to meet our needs, we have been importing foreign wool—particularly in recent years—in very large quantities. At present, although the tariff on it is 34 cents a pound, it sells in the United States at approximately 38 cents a pound. It represents 95 percent of Australia's dutiable exports to us, and it figures largely in our trade with New Zealand and South Africa as well. To place an even higher tariff on it now would be to strike a hard economic blow to these important members of the British Commonwealth at a time when the Commonwealth is in need of dollars to pay for imports from us. Moreover, according to the State Department, the House bill would run counter to our existing agreements with other countries, and reports from Geneva make clear that its approval could wreck current efforts to promote world peace by promoting reciprocal trade. Certainly, should the measure become effective, governments abroad would be justified in fearing it as the forerunner of similar measures to give high protection to numerous other American commodities. Against such fear, little progress could be expected toward a mutual lowering of tariff barriers in general.

The United States has taken the initiative in driving for a freer flow of international commerce to create economic conditions essential to sound peace. But now, as Under Secretary of State Clayton has warned, the House wool-support bill would raise new trade barriers making a mockery of our leadership in this respect. The Senate ought not to concur. If it does, a Presidential veto will be in order. We can hardly expect the rest of the world to pay serious attention to our reciprocity views if we violate them even as we preach them.

Small Business Needs Reconstruction Finance Corporation More Than Ever Before—RFC Doing Excellent Job for Small Business in Cooperation With Local Banks—Failure To Extend RFC or To Cripple Its Small Business Activities Would Be Devastating Blow to Our Private Enterprise System and a Boon to Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has done a wonderful job for small business which has been very helpful to the entire national economy.

Since VJ-day the RFC has been engaged in liquidating its wartime activities and once more turning to normal

peacetime operations. During such a period of national reconversion, increased attention must be paid to the maintenance of a stable economy that provides maximum earning power for the maximum number of persons that can be gainfully occupied. With the public debt approximating $260,000,000,000, this phase of the peacetime objective assumes unprecedented importance since national income must be maintained at the highest possible level to provide an adequate tax base.

Impartial observers agree that the single most important element in a successful stable economy in the United States is a strong, healthy segment of small business. This is based on two fundamental measurable facts: First, small business enterprises number in excess of 3,000,000 scattered throughout the Nation; and second, they provide a source of income for roughly 60 percent of all persons gainfully occupied in the United States.

Small business must be accepted as an important stabilizing element in the national economy if for no other reasons than size, diversity of type, diversity of geographic location, and the readiness with which newcomers step in with their capital and their skills to fill the empty places that occur. The latter reason is by far the most important, viewed from the standpoint of national interest. Nothing should be permitted to stifle that typically American readiness to assume the risks of modern business enterprise.

Readily available credit, when needed and in the amounts needed, on reasonable terms and conditions is the inevitable required concomitant of a strong, healty small business segment in the national economy. The record clearly indicates that the RFC has not neglected the credit needs of small business. In 1946 the Corporation made 11,148 loans to small business which was 91 percent of the 12,247 loans made to business enterprises of all sizes in that year. From 1932 through April 30, 1947, 40,118 loans totaling $3,776,954,848 were made to business enterprises of which 36,174 involving $337,915,021 were for $100,000 or less—typical business loans. In other words, since its inception, 90.2 of all loans made by the Corporation to business enterprises were made to small businessmen.

The RFC cannot make loans of this nature unless the applicants can demonstrate that the credits sought were not available from private sources. It is therefore a relatively safe assumption that few, if any, of the above enumerated loans would have been made at all if the applicants had been forced to depend solely on private sources of credit. Later, some very significant figures will be presented showing what these loans meant in terms of gainful occupation of labor.

The record also shows that the small borrower is accorded liberal consideration by the RFC. Recently, the Corporation made a study of 1,039 representative borrowers to determine the relationship between assets owned by them and the loans made to them. The results are shown in the table below comparing for seven groups of borrowers the size of their assets with the average amount of loan obtained:

Size groups of assets	Number of borrowers	Average assets per borrower	Average size of loan	Dollars of loan per dollar of assets
$5,000 or less	21	$3,725	$4,421	$1.19
$5,001 to $10,000	55	7,764	11,601	1.40
$10,001 to $25,000	179	17,519	13,476	.77
$25,001 to $50,000	231	36,079	22,893	.63
$50,001 to $100,000	213	69,177	36,943	.53
$100,001 to $200,000	155	137,654	53,719	.39
Over $200,000	185	506,909	120,949	.24
All borrowers	1,039	136,502	45,238	.33

This does not mean that the smaller borrowers were granted loans in excess of the collateral values they had to offer. It does mean, however, that the Corporation recognized and used collateral values which the banks could not or would not recognize since in all instances they had the first opportunity to make these 1,039 loans. Again, these loans would not have been made at all if the borrowers had had to rely exclusively on the banks.

In another recent study of 1,156 representative loans to business enterprises, it was found that the number of dollars of loan required per man-year of employment thereby afforded did not vary unduly as between small business generally and large business. This is set forth in the following table which compares man-years of employment afforded with the total authorized amounts of the loans granted for seven size groups of loans, of which the first five comprise all loans up to $100,000, commonly regarded as small business loans:

Size groups of loans	Number studied	Man-years of employment	Amount of loans authorized	Dollars of loan per man-year
$5,000 or less	572	3,048	$1,459,675	$478.89
$5,001 to $10,000	184	2,442	1,383,089	566.38
$10,001 to $25,000	125	8,066	2,096,810	259.96
$25,001 to $50,000	70	7,713	2,734,147	354.53
$50,001 to $100,000	36	6,971	2,448,900	351.29
Average for small business loans	987	28,240	10,122,621	358.45
$100,001 to $1,000,000	72	159,045	19,336,704	121.58
Over $1,000,000	97	886,661	341,686,221	385.36
Average for large business loans	169	1,045,706	361,022,925	345.24
Average for all business loans	1,156	1,073,946	371,145,546	345.59

The RFC's operations through the years illustrate three fundamental facts in attempting to maintain a stable economy, namely: First, small business loans require less dollars per man-year of employment afforded than do other methods; second, the public eventually gets its money back without loss; and third, a more nearly proper ratio between small business and large business is maintained, which ameliorates the extreme centralization of population, productive facilities, and capital ownership that always accompany the growth of large business at the expense of small business, none of which running unchecked are good for the economic body as a whole.

In all of the foregoing the RFC stands revealed as a substantial source of credit for small business, both directly and in participation with banks. The blanket participation agreement with banks was an important factor in the greatly increased number of loans made to small business enterprises in 1946. Through December 31, 1946, the Corporation had entered into agreements with 5,216 banks, or 36 percent of all the banks in the United States. Of these 5,216, 49.5 percent were located in towns of less than 5,000 population, 76.7 percent were in towns of less than 25,000. In the future, this type of loan will be continued in effect in somewhat modified form designated as small-loan participations to accommodate fully and rapidly the greatly increased volume of applications for loans, including those from veterans.

This type of loan fills a long-felt need not heretofore satisfied by private credit sources.

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAVID M. POTTS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of public interest is manifesting itself in connection with the Panama Canal, which comes within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, of which I am chairman, of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House. I submit herewith for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of May 27, 1947, giving a good picture of the problems which the Congress will in the near future be called upon to deal with:

BIG DITCH DEBATE—NAVY FAVORS THIRD LOCK AT PANAMA; BUT ARMY WANTS SEA-LEVEL CANAL—LATTER PROJECT HELD DEFENSE AID; BUT $2,700,000,000 COST; ATOM THREAT MAY DEFEAT IT—SECOND CANAL IS SIDETRACKED

(By S. H. Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—A multi-million-dollar ditch-digging program is being drawn up in secret parleys here.

Rival plans for expanding and improving the Panama Canal are under discussion in these sessions. Participants include Washington's top military, atomic, naval, and congressional authorities.

The Canal was taxed to the limit during the late war. Army-Navy officials are joining with private shipping interests in asking that the big ditch be modernized. Three

possibilities have been considered: (1) Building new locks; (2) dredging a sea-level canal without locks or dams; (3) digging an entirely new canal, perhaps in Nicaragua, Mexico or some other Central-American country.

The last of these possibilities has been discarded as being impractical at this time, though 20 possible routes were studied. The other 2 suggestions are being hotly debated.

The military governor of the Canal, Brig. Gen. J. C. Mehaffey, and a board of 6 consulting engineers are expected to ask Congress to approve a mammoth dredging project to make the Canal a sea-level channel. The cost is estimated at $2,700,000,000. Engineers say such an undertaking would require from 12 to 2 years. The Army favors this plan because a sea-level canal would be the easiest kind to defend; there would be no mechanical gadgets which could be put out of operation by a single bomb explosion.

A sea-level canal across the Isthmus is not a new idea. A company of private French nationals tackled such a project in 1879. About the same time, American interests started digging a lock canal in Nicaragua. Both efforts failed. Finally, the American Government in 1904 started a lock-type canal in Panama along the same route which the French had started. By 1913, the United States had 57,000 workers in the Canal Zone. After spending $506,000,000, the Government opened the Canal to the first steamer in 1914. Today 6,000 American and 18,000 natives of Panama work for the United States in the Canal Zone.

NAVY FAVORS THIRD SET OF LOCKS

Naval experts oppose a sea-level canal. They are more concerned with the canal's operational problems, and favor the building of a third set of locks to supplement the two sets now in existence.

The Navy plan also calls for a new terminal lake where ships could drop anchor while waiting for fogs to clear. The man-made lake would cost a mere $500,000,000, and the new locks, $554,000,000.

Congress took its first step toward dealing with the inadequacy of the Panama Canal back in 1939, when it authorized $277,000,000 for construction of a third set of locks. This project had to be abandoned in 1942 because of wartime shortages of labor and materials. Since the project got no further than excavation, it gave the United States nothing more that a $77,000,000 hole in the ground. Construction costs have doubled since 1939, and the experts figure the new locks would now cost $554,000,000

The matter bobbed up again in 1945. Legislators in the Seventy-ninth Congress, noting a record of 1,036 Canal accidents in the 20-year period that ended in July of 1942, passed Public Law No. 280. This measure authorized the Governor of the Canal "to make a comprehensive review * * * of the means for increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal to meet future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense, including restudy of the construction of additional facilities for the Panama Canal authorized by the act approved August 11, 1939." The 1945 legislation also directed the Governor to look into the possibility of building an entirely new canal at another location.

General Mehaffey and his staff are now in Washington and have been holding confidential conferences with members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Panama Canal Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine Committee, and with Capt. Miles P. Duval, whom the Navy Department has appointed to assemble its ideas on canal improvements.

The Navy is running special tests of a sea-level canal at the Taylor Model Testing Basin at Carderock, Md., just outside the Capital. Congressional subcommittee members recently came back from a trip to the Canal Zone where they got a first-hand view of the problems involved.

DISAGREES ON DEFENSE FACTOR

Army and Navy authorities are at odds over how to tackle the Canal's modernization because they see the problem from opposing points of view. The Navy is interested chiefly in the technical difficulties of getting ships across the Isthmus of Panama. It brushes aside questions of protection and defense with the pessimistic argument that no kind of canal, whether with locks or a sea-level channel, could be adequately defended in atomic warfare.

The Army contends, however, that it must at least make an attempt to defend the waterway, and that a sea-level canal would make the job easier.

General Mehaffey and his consultants have now decided to go to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for an opinion on the relative vulnerability of the sea-level and lock types of canal. The ultimate decision will be up to Congress.

Congressmen say they can't make up their minds until they see the general's completed study. One influential legislator comments, however, "It's going to take an awful lot of facts to justify a $2,700,000,000 expenditure." He's concerned that an atomic-bomb attack would make the Canal waters so radio-active that they'd no longer be navigable. Unless General Mehaffey can prove otherwise, this Congressman and several of his fellow legislators favor the Navy plan.

When the Mehaffey study is completed, the congressional subcommittee plans another trip to the Canal Zone. Members will start hearings on the report as soon as they return. Though the Congressmen say they expect to get the report by November 1, General Mehaffey says it will not be ready until the end of December. The law requires its completion by that date.

Regardless of what the Mehaffey board recommends, Captain Duval and other Navy Department spokesmen are prepared to fight for their third set of locks and a terminal lake. If we can win their battle for the locks, the board probably will go along with the terminal-lake proposal. Rear Adm. John J. Manning, a member of the Mehaffey board, who is said to favor the Army plan, told a Navy Department meeting, "Should the study of the board indicate a lock canal best satisfied the requirements, * * * any development of a new canal or alterations of the existing lock canal would incorporate terminal lakes at both Atlantic and Pacific sides of the canal."

No man-made terminal lake would be needed on the Atlantic side, since Gatun Lake already exists there. Creation of a sea-level canal would call for draining Gatun Lake, however.

BONANZA FOR DREDGING COMPANIES

Adoption of the sea-level plan would be good news for United States dredging companies. Experts say they would advocate a combine of about 25 companies to handle the job. According to Admiral Manning, "there would have to be special equipment developed for the deep dredging * * * we are planning on 30-cubic-yard dippers on these shovels—electric-driven shovels."

Tides would be one of the big problems in making a sea-level canal. There is a tidal range of 20 feet on the Pacific side and 2 feet on the Atlantic side. This would cause alternating current running as high as 4.5 knots (5 miles per hour).

According to Captain Duval, "the tidal current makes it necessary to consider the sea-level canal problem under two headings—one is an open strait or lockless canal in which you would get heavy currents and the other is a canal with tidal locks in which there would be controlled currents. In the canal without tidal locks * * * there would still be accidents and vessels would have to anchor in emergencies. * * * When vessels anchor in a current, they have to swing, and they have to swing clear of the banks. Stern anchors, in the opinion of the Chief of Naval Operations, would not be satisfactory." Captain Duval estimated that there must be a width of 1,200 to 1,500 feet for unrestricted two-way traffic, but he added that "the definitive answer will depend upon the results of the marine experience, accident records, and the Carderock tests."

The third-locks and terminal-lakes plan would make use of the excavation at the Canal which was stopped in 1942. These proposed new locks would be large enough to accommodate the United States aircraft carriers—the *Midway, Coral Sea,* and the *Franklin D. Roosevelt*—which now are too large to go through the Canal. New locks also would mean that the Canal could handle more ships in a given time.

Marshal Tito May Be Preparing To Penetrate Italy After Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Evening Star of May 26, 1947:

MARSHAL TITO MAY BE PREPARING TO PENETRATE ITALY AFTER TREATY

(By Constantine Brown)

Suspicions of some American observers that Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, may decide to penetrate into Italy under some pretext, when and if the Italian Peace Treaty is ratified by the Senate and American troops withdrawn, were increased last week.

On May 20 the Italian press received a strongly worded statement issued by a Yugoslav diplomat attacking the United States and Great Britain for their failure to surrender to Marshal Tito "Yugoslav traitors and war criminals whose escape has been facilitated by the authorities and who are now living undisturbed in various places in Italy."

The statement, which caused considerable anxiety in Italian political quarters and is said to have contributed to the difficulties of forming a new Italian Government ends with this ominous sentence: "It is clear that this situation is in contradition with the fundamental principles of justice and humanity and in contradiction with the decisions of the United Nations."

THIRTY THOUSAND YUGOSLAVS INVOLVED

The leaders of Italian political parties—except for the Communists—fear that soon after ratification of the peace treaty Marshal Tito will demand officially that some 30,000 Yugoslavs, who escaped into Italy after the collapse of Gen. Draja Mihailovich's resistance to Tito, be handed over to the Yugoslav Government.

For the present Marshal Tito has no right to ask the Italian Government for the surrender of these victims. He has asked the American and British representatives who are sifting the evidence against alleged war criminals in Italy to turn over to Yugoslavia those named in a list prepared by his government. However, only 50 persons who actually cooperated with the Germans have been extradited in the last 4 months.

The attitude adopted by Washington and London is that those who opposed Tito and escaped from Yugoslavia cannot be described as war criminals, in accordance with the rules laid down in London which guided the trial at Nuremberg and elsewhere.

Article 44 of the peace treaty provides, however, that the signatories are entitled to

demand from Italy all persons directly accused by any of the victorious governments as war criminals, as well as the material witnesses involved. Some 30,000 Yugoslav refugees fall into this category.

MANY REFUGEES ARE HIDING

There is little reason to believe that the Italian Government would hesitate to comply with Marshal Tito's demands after the peace treaty has been signed. But there are many refugees in Italy who entered without papers and are hiding throughout the country. There are no records on these aliens and it is unlikely that the Italian police could comply in full with Yugoslav demands made directly to the Italian Government.

Those who have followed this situation fear that as soon as Italy is bound by the peace treaty the Belgrade government will demand the immediate surrender of every Yugoslav who is wanted by the OZNA, the Yugoslav secret police, and any delay in complying with this request will impel the Yugoslav Government to send a police force to enforce its demands.

This may be the signal for Palmiro Togliatti, chief of the Italian Communist Party and Marshal Tito's former colleague in the Comintern, to make himself head of the Italian Government, thus establishing a physical link between Moscow and Paris by way of northern Italy.

Been to Heaven Lately?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an advertisement being run in a national magazine by the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune on the merits and delights of living in Minnesota:

BEEN TO HEAVEN LATELY?

It's just down the road and over the hill from home. There's a pine-fringed stream where you tread carefully over mossy rocks while the fast, cold water lashes around your ankles. Under that rock is a trout who hates you—and he'll fight you every inch of the way, from the first lunge at the fly to the last flop in the creel.

At least a million Minnesotans are dreaming about that trout and his big brothers. These lucky people are now heading for their own fisherman's heaven which may be as close as next door, or as far as you'd drive for a Sunday picnic. That's what makes this Minnesota way of life so appealing. You live in a fine city or a lovely small town with every convenience and cultural advantage you'd want. And yet, only minutes away from home and work you find the unspoiled wilderness your greatgrandfathers knew.

What does all this mean to you, in terms of your life and your interests? Our Minnesota way of life has attracted and held an unusual race of people, high in intelligence and literacy, in skill and stability. Perhaps Minnesota is where you belong, too.

Especially if you are a manufacturer. Because Minnesota breeds a race of workers who are smart and able and industrious. They know how to make everything from massive locomotive cranes, like those manufactured by the American Hoist and Derrick Co. of St. Paul, to famous household products like Soilax, Lan-O-Sheen and Mrs. Stewart's Bluing. One well-known engineering firm says, "The great asset of Minnesota is the unique skill and intelligence of its people."

More than a million of these surprising Minnesotans live in the Twin Cities and Duluth. New industries thrive in towns and villages all over the State, because people like to work where they like to live.

Want to know more about Minnesota? Then drop a line to that trout. * * * He's waiting, and he's fighting mad.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following opening remarks of Ivan Bowen, Minneapolis, Minn., chairman of the labor relations committee, given at the labor relations session of the annual meeting of the National Association of Motor Bus Operators in Chicago on Wednesday, May 21, 1947:

The present widespread demand for reform in labor laws of this country, which is evidenced by the activities of Congress and State legislatures, comes as no surprise to those who have witnessed the administration of the National Labor Relations Act, commonly called the Wagner Act, since its enactment July 5, 1935.

It was class legislation, whose purpose was to force workers of the United States into national and international unions and destroy the independence of employees. Any student of civics could have foreseen that such a program, backed by administrative power, was bound to create a political dictatorship which ultimately would be in a position to defy governmental authority. When any single group in a republic obtains commanding power, Government is so weakened, it loses its authority and its administrators become puppets.

It took a decade for the Wagner Act to demonstrate its possibilities of destruction of our form of government and to permit development of labor organizations and rise of leaders to positions where they felt politically safe in defying constituted authority.

However, one thing that the American citizen has repeatedly demonstrated is that he wants no political boss or dictator. He has been taught that he is boss—at least at election time. Let anyone try to demonstrate otherwise, and he comes out of his corner swinging. Witness the recent activities in Washington and the State capitols in connection with labor legislation.

Permit me shortly to trace the trend of developments under the Wagner Act from the annual reports of our own association. The first reference to repercussions of the Wagner Act was in our 1937 legislative report. It was there said:

"There has been widespread demand in industry for extensive amendments to the so-called Wagner law. It is contended that the law is 'lopsided' and that there is no protection to the employee or employer against unfair labor practices by labor organizations. * * * However, if amendment of the act should come it will be because of the failure of the law to protect the rights of the individual worker given in section 7, and because of the demand of the public generally to be relieved from the burdens of labor strife which have grown in violence and economic distress during the period the law has been in operation."

In the 1939 report it was stated:

"A special House committee was authorized for the purpose of investigating the National Labor Relations Board. This investigation promises to be thorough and with a view to not only correcting inequities in the act but also the unfair and partisan policy of its administration. * * * There is well-grounded sentiment in this country that the act should be amended and the administrative policy changed, especially the latter. If the act is to accomplish its purpose, the fairness of its administration will have to be established by public confidence."

In 1943, we said:

"The enactment of the War Labor Disputes Act over the President's veto marked the first success of legislative attempts to regulate organized labor by the Federal Government. That there has been a growing resentment on the part of the public, including rank and file of organized labor, against the misuse of their power by labor officials, is indicated by increase in the number of States which have set up administrative machinery to deal with strikes and labor disputes. It, however, required the grim reality of war to arouse Congress sufficiently to overcome the reluctance of the administration to deal with a situation which threatened the very life of industry, and the Nation. * * * While the provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act are operative for the term of the war emergency only, it is the initial legislative recognition of the necessity for governmental regulation of uncontrolled use of the power of organized labor officials to deprive workers and management of constitutional protection of their rights in industry that is significant. That the provisions of the law afford but slight protection to such rights does not argue against the temper of the public sentiment which forced its enactment."

In 1946 the following observation was made:

"It would be superfluous for me to orate on the break-down in industry which has progressively become worse during the past year. It is apparent to anyone who listens or reads that a revolution is going on in our industrial economy. * * * Prior to the passage of the Wagner Act, I know of no organized strikes interfering with the service to the public of an intercity bus company. The object of that law as stated in its preamble was 'to eliminate the causes of substantial obstruction to the free flow of commerce * * * by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association.' I need not quote the statistics of the Department of Labor to prove that the objective has been and is a failure. The reading of any daily newspaper or the news broadcast of radio demonstrates the fact. * * *

"Modern industry and society is so organized and developed today that upon the throwing of a switch, the turning of a petcock or the setting of an air-brake, thousands—yes millions—of citizens can be frozen, starved, and marooned without the means wherewith to sustain life and health. That is no idle figure of speech. Such action has been initiated in the past year and it lay within the discretion of a single or several labor leaders to squeeze tighter on the blood stream of the people and make them bow to the dictatorial will.

"It is not only the employer and the citizen at large who is the victim of organized strikes in public utilities. The millions of unorganized and organized workers, having no interest in the particular labor dispute, have their livelihood shut off without a voice in the issues when a union calls a strike in the public utility service."

Finally, the American voter said in unmistakable terms: "This thing has gone far enough."

Then, the administration and the courts came to life and it was declared by the highest judicial tribunal in the land that "the course taken by the union carried with it such a serious threat to orderly constitutional government, and to the economic and social welfare of the Nation, that a fine of substantial size is required in order to emphasize the gravity of the offense of which the union was found guilty. * * * Loyalty in responding to the orders of their leader may, in some minds, minimize the gravity of the miners' conduct; but we cannot ignore the effect of their action upon the rights of other citizens, or the effect of their action upon our system of government. The gains, social and economic, which the miners and other citizens have realized in the past, are ultimately due to the fact that they enjoy the rights of freemen under our system of government. Upon the maintenance of that system depends all future progress to which they may justly aspire. In our complex society, there is a great variety of limited loyalties, but the overriding loyalty of all is to our country and to the institutions under which a particular interest may be pursued." *U. S. v. United Mine Workers of America*, Supreme Court, March 6, 1947.

Only recognition of an aroused public opinion registered at the polls in the last election could have nurtured a congressional report such as accompanied the labor-management bill of 1947 from the House committee. It recited:

"During the 6 years preceding the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, the United States had an average of 753 strikes a year, involving an average of 297,000 workers; during the next 6 years, 2,541 strikes per year involving an average of 1,181,000 workers; and during the next 5 years—that is, through 1944—3,514 strikes a year involving an average of 1,508,000 workers.

"In 1945 approximately 38,000,000 man-days of labor were lost as a result of strikes. And that total was trebled in 1946, when there were 116,000,000 man-days lost and the number of strikes hit a new high of 4,985. The resulting loss in national wealth is staggering.

"The above figures do not take into account the man-days lost as a result of the indirect effects of these strikes."

The committee report pointed its accusing finger at the Wagner Act and the National Labor Relations Board in the following shameful recital:

"For the last 14 years, as a result of labor laws, ill-conceived and disastrously executed, the American workingman has been deprived of his dignity as an individual. He has been cajoled, coerced, intimidated, and on many occasions beaten up, in the name of the splendid aims set forth in section 1 of the National Labor Relations Act. His whole economic life has been subject to the complete domination and control of unregulated monopolists. He has on many occasions had to pay them tribute to get a job. He has been forced into labor organizations against his will. At other times when he has desired to join a particular labor organization he has been prevented from doing so and forced to join another one. He has been compelled to contribute to causes and candidates for public office to which he was opposed. He has been prohibited from expressing his own mind on public issues. He has been denied any voice in arranging the terms of his own employment. He has frequently, against his will, been called out on strikes which have resulted in wage losses representing years of his savings. In many cases his economic life has been ruled by Communists and other subversive influences. In short, his mind, his soul, and his very life have been subject to a tyranny more despotic than one could think possible in a free country.

"The employer's plight has likewise not been happy. He has witnessed the productive efficiency in his plants sink to alarmingly low levels. He has been required to employ or reinstate individuals who have destroyed his property and assaulted other employees. When he has tried to discharge Communists he has been prevented from doing so by a board which called this valid reason for the discharge a mere pretext. He has seen the loyalty of his supervisors undermined by the compulsory unionism imposed upon them by the National Labor Relations Board. He has been required by law to bargain over matters to which it was economically impossible for him to accede, and when he refused to accede, has been accused of failing to bargain in good faith. He has been compelled to bargain with the same union that bargains with his competitors and thus to reveal to his competitors the secrets of his business. He has had to stand helplessly by while employees desiring to enter his plant to work have been obstructed by violence, mass picketing, and general rowdyism. He has had to stand mute while irresponsible detractors slandered, abused, and vilified him.

"His business on occasions has been virtually brought to a standstill by disputes to which he himself was not a party and in which he himself had no interest. And finally, he has been compelled by the laws of the greatest democratic country in the world—or at least by their administrators—to treat his employees as if they belonged to a different class or caste of society.

"This sordid story was unfolded before the committee in its hearings."

I shall not attempt to analyze the bill reported and passed, as it is covered in the legislative report to this convention; but I do wish to point out that the National Labor Relations Board was the first object of the congressional committee's righteous indignation, when it indicated:

"It (the bill) abolishes the existing discredited National Labor Relations Board and creates in lieu thereof a new board of fair-minded members to exercise quasi-judicial functions only."

Those of us who have been treated by the Board under its autocratic power as deprived of constitutional rights, alike the depressed minorities in Europe by their late unlamented rulers, can be excused from observing—

"Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small."

One other reference to labor legislation by Congress: In our 1942 and subsequent reports attention was called to the partisanship of the United States Conciliation Service under the law creating the Department of Labor, which provides:

"The purpose of the Department of Labor shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States * * *."

Both the Senate and the House were in accord in correcting the inequitable situation which prevailed through having the United States Conciliation Service within the Department of Labor. Both recommended that the Conciliation Service be set up independently of the Department.

The new congressional labor enactments do not correct all of the evils created by the Wagner Act, but they go a long way toward removing some of the legal obstacles to sound collective bargaining. However, so long as Federal laws restrict the police powers of the States in a field primarily of a local nature, such as labor disputes, without affording governmental protection to property and the unmolested pursuit of industry by both labor and management, we will still have organized interference with the lawful right to work and carry on private business. There is no more reason why a citizen should not have entry to the courts to enjoin violation of law in a labor dispute than he should be deprived of that protection in his domestic relations.

Consolidation of United States International Air Transport Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the following newspapers on the subject of consolidating the United States International Air Transport Operations: Wenatchee (Wash.) World of May 7, 1947; The Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., of May 8, 1947; Chicago Daily Tribune of May 13, 1947; St. Paul Pioneer Press of May 17, 1947; Chicago Daily News of May 19, 1947:

[From the Wenatchee (Wash.) World of May 7, 1947]

THE NEW MONOPOLY AVIATION BILL

A new monopoly aviation bill was introduced recently in Washington which, if passed, would jeopardize development of new international routes by domestic air carriers, such as Northwest Airlines, which have been granted certificates to operate in the foreign field.

The so-called flag-line bill—also referred to as the Pan-American bill or chosen-instrument bill—was introduced in the House by Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican, of New Jersey, and in the Senate by Senator OWEN BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine. Hearings have just been started in Washington, D. C., by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Sponsors of the measure make their proposal on the grounds that it is necessary to avoid destructive rivalries between American companies abroad and to present a united American front against the competition of foreign air monopoly.

On the other hand, opponents of the bill, the domestic air lines with international certificates, such as Northwest Airlines holds, are pointing out, in leading their opposition, that the bill would mean a death blow to the plans for the future which mean so much to cities and areas such as Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, Spokane, Wenatchee, and the entire Pacific Northwest.

The President's air-coordinating committee, composed of officials of the Departments of State, War, Navy, Commerce, and the Post Office and the Civil Aeronautics Board, has recommended against the bill.

They contend that the present system of multiline competition in international air transportation should be continued.

Croll Hunter, president and general manager of Northwest Airlines and one of the leaders of the committee representing 17 air lines which led the fight 2 or 3 years ago against the so-called chosen-instrument aviation program, will appear as a witness before the committee in Washington and will oppose the measure.

Wenatchee has an important stake in this fight. The bill's passage, according to Northwest Airlines officials, would rob the community of the new international service proposed by Northwest Airlines.

[From the Spokesman-Review (Spokane, Wash.) of May 8, 1947]

AIR LINE MONOPOLY IS NO SOLUTION

To consolidate all United States international air transport operations by law into a

single "chosen instrument" of the Government, as is now proposed in a bill before Congress, we believe is highly undesirable.

The bill provides for the creation of a single corporation to carry on all of our international air commerce. It provides for four major subsidies to be paid out of the Federal Treasury to maintain that single air line in its global operations. It requires the withdrawal of present lines from international routes.

We cannot see that our private operators have not rendered excellent service in the international field. We cannot see why the stimulus of competition should not continue to be a spur to progress in pioneering new routes, furnishing better service, and developing modern equipment. We cannot, therefore, see that the enforced surrender of independently developed routes and services to a single, monopolistic creation of the Federal Government, conceived on the basis of its being a continuing charge against public funds, is in the national interest.

Many foreign countries subsidize their air lines in order that they may compete with the service rendered by private American operators in international air commerce. To the extent that we are familiar with those operations, they are far from satisfactory to the nations that maintain them. They are expensive luxuries, supported for prestige purposes. We seem to be inviting ourselves into a subsidy race with foreign countries when we have many well-equipped air lines willing and eager to take part in international air trade at their own hazard.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 13, 1947]

GLOBAL AIR LINE

The Socialist Government of Britain confessed its inability to operate any nationalized service at a profit when it proposed to the International Civil Aviation Organization at Montreal that all of the nations agree to joint ownership of main line air routes throughout the world. British overseas aviation is in the hands of the Government. It is getting competition from American overseas carriers, and will get a great deal more of it. It has no stomach for competition with our privately-owned lines.

The British propose, therefore, that competition be abandoned. This amounts to a proposal, first, that American carriers supply the managerial and technical brains for world aviation while Britain dips in for a generous share of the profits; and, second, that the United States take the first step in abandoning the free enterprise system in order to conform to the sterile pattern of collectivism which the Socialist politicians presently ascendant in Britain have saddled upon that country. They can't climb up to our level of economic well-being, but, if we can be induced to adopt their dead-end methods, we can easily lower ourselves into their company.

Britain has never been deterred from advancing any self-serving proposal with a straight face and unabashed composure. There is always the chance, considering the preponderance of mental flyweights in official position among us, that a fast one can be slipped over. This time, however, the British have exceeded themselves. The answer is "No, thanks."

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press of May 17, 1947]

CROIL HUNTER'S QUESTION

The House Committee on Foreign Commerce is being told that the United States must imitate foreign governments as a means of meeting their competition in civil aviation. The proposition is to create a monopolistic "chosen instrument," supported by a variety of heavy government subsidies, to carry the American flag on the international air routes.

Croil Hunter, president of Northwest Airlines, testified this week against the proposal. There are a number of objections. But one seems fundamental. It should go without saying that America ought to proceed on the usual basis of private competition unless there is overwhelming proof that this principle is a practical failure for international air commerce. Mr. Hunter asked, "Where in the entire world—in any phase of air transportation—is a United States flag carrier not putting up effective competition against all foreign carriers?"

Unless the answer to that question is unfavorable to the American lines, the answer to this proposal for a Government-subsidized monopoly must be unfavorable to it.

Mr. Hunter's answer is, "There is not one route, one schedule, one type of equipment, one operating procedure, one safety record, one comfort or service in the whole world where the United States carrier today isn't superior to its foreign competitor."

That would seem conclusive.

[From the Chicago Daily News of May 19, 1947]

NO AIR MONOPOLY

Congress is considering legislation to combine international air carriers into a single company. This is a revival of the earlier "chosen instrument" monopoly advanced by Pan American Airways. It should be defeated.

The case made by sponsors of the bills is that foreign carriers, aided by subsidies from their governments, are building strong international lines against which independent United States carriers cannot compete successfully.

The supreme importance of having efficient United States air routes to every part of the world is too obvious to need argument. We require them as an instrument to bolster our trade; to stimulate aircraft development; as an aid to our diplomacy and our prestige; to add to our backlog of ships available in war, should the need come; to insure that our pilots are familiar with world flying conditions.

The only question, therefore, is whether the United States air lines can prosper without the subsidies envisioned in the monopoly legislation and meet the competition of each other and foreign lines.

The air lines in the field, with the notable exception of Pan American, believe they can. It is their money that they want to risk, and we believe they should be encouraged to do so.

Every interested agency of the Government has expressed opposition to the "chosen instrument" policy. In prewar days this policy prevailed with respect to South American routes, and many dissatisfactions developed.

It does appear that foreign carriers made appreciable inroads into the supremacy which United States lines have enjoyed in trans-Atlantic travel. CAA figures indicate that in the last 6 months of 1946 foreign lines carried 22 percent of the passengers as against 5 percent in the first 6 months.

But the air-line executives should be the best judges of their ability to stem this trend. Neither TWA, Chicago & Southern, nor American Overseas Airlines has expressed discouragement over the initial losses sustained in their international operations. The fact remains that of the 44 Atlantic flights a week, 33 are operated by three American lines, 11 by the 5 foreign lines.

Historically, we have found that competition spurs technical development and exerts constant pressure for lower costs and better service. There is no reason at this stage to believe that experience would be otherwise in international aviation. If competition should fail, we can turn to Government-sponsored monopoly. If the monopoly were voted now and failed, it would be considerably more difficult to reinstate a competitive system.

The complaint that low wages and cheaper foreign aircraft will place American lines at a disadvantage is not convincing. American planes are still standard on foreign lines, and lower costs achieved at the price of lower safety standards will send more travelers to American lines than they will drive away.

In advocating free competition, we extend this principle to the steamship companies, which have long been fighting for the right to operate scheduled air service in connection with their ship lines. They have the organization, the know-how, and the resources to add greatly to American air service, and they should not be denied the opportunity.

The incentive of competition has worked well in the development of domestic airways system. It has given us preeminence in international routes. There is no reason to change.

Irving H. Saypol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following citation for certificate of commendation to Irving H. Saypol, chief assistant to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York received from the New York City director of the Selective Service System. Mr. Saypol is a distinguished member of the New York bar and has been serving most creditably in his present capacity in the United States attorney's office under John F. X. McGohey of the southern district of New York.

SELECTIVE SERVICE,
NEW YORK CITY HEADQUARTERS,
New York City, May 7, 1947.

CITATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF COMMENDATION TO IRVING H. SAYPOL

Irving H. Saypol, chief assistant to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, supervised and conducted investigation on matters concerning reemployment rights as well as delinquency of registrants under the jurisdiction of this headquarters. Whenever these cases warranted such step, he presented them to the courts. In the handling of these matters he at all times demonstrated a remarkable ability to interpret and apply the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act. His ability and understanding of the problems together with his energetic and enthusiastic giving of advice to the New York City headquarters have, to a large extent, contributed to the successful operation and the prestige of the selective service system in no wise limited to this community.

NEW YORK CITY DIRECTOR.

Arfa Girls Chorus of Passaic, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Arfa Girls Chorus, of Passaic, N. J., a group of Polish descent, who came to Washington on May 3, Polish Constitution Day, to sing the songs of America and Poland, will long be remembered on Capitol Hill.

Led by their director, Mr. Edmund Sennert, the chorus, accompanied by a number of members of the Polish American Congress, were my guests in the Speaker's dining room in the House wing of the Capitol. In the presence of Speaker MARTIN, Representatives SADLAK, GORSKI, and OWENS, and Mr. Andrews, Clerk of the House, and others, the girls' harmony was piped through the corridors of the Capitol, and attracted the attention of scores of Members, clerks, and attachés. Today, 3 weeks later, the presentation is still a subject of conversation.

After a visit to the White House, following the breakfast, the chorus visited the General Pulaski shrine at Thirteenth and E Streets NW., and sang before a throng composed of Government workers, sightseeing visitors, and members of the Washington Polish Club. A national parks guard commented on the neat and attractive appearance of the group and added, "I have never heard a finer program."

Representative GORDON, of Illinois, who had to miss the event, said he had read an account of the day's program of the chorus in Chicago papers. The girls, he said, "had won national renown." Their record over a period of years, topped by this year's May 3 celebration, bear out this statement.

Passaic and sister communities have cause to be proud of the Arfa girls.

Members of the chorus are as follows: Sophie Wacyra, president, 115 Tenth street, Passaic; Julia Wojcik, vice president, 25 Louise Street, Garfield; Blanche Szewczyk, secretary, 49 Fifth Street, Passaic; Helena Sudol, corresponding secretary, 136 Maple Street, Wallington; Bertha Kobylarz, 280 Carlton Avenue, East Rutherford; Regina Jacukiewicz, 240 Van Houten Avenue, Passaic; Veronica Kobylarz, 280 Carlton Avenue, East Rutherford; Josephine Malecki, 1087 East Twenty-fourth Street, Paterson; Henrietta Jacukiewicz, 240 Van Houten Avenue, Passaic; Bernice Taras, 56 Jackson Street, Passaic; Clementine Pokrywka, 62 Passaic Street, Passaic; Helen Pojanowski, 370 Howe Avenue, Passaic; Anne Potoczak, 78 Pacific Avenue, Garfield; Claire Wiatrak, 96 Wood Street, Garfield; Irene Wojcik, 25 Louise Street, Garfield; Janet Sadowski, 914 York Street, East Rutherford; Proxeda Kwasniewska, 194 Ninth Street, Passaic; Sophie Tecza, 189 Ninth Street, Passaic; Jean Ziemska, 184 Harrison Street, Passaic; Stasia Waksmundzki, 226 Fourth Street, Passaic; Stella Kaczmarski, 134 Fifth Avenue, Paterson; Casimira Olender, 42 Reservoir Avenue, Wallington; Lottie Olender, 42 Reservoir Avenue, Wallington; Anne Wolak, 106 Trimble Avenue, Clifton; Ruth Ankiewicz, 21 Market Street, Passaic; and Natalie Rycharski, 426 Graham Avenue, Paterson.

Understanding Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New York Times of April 22, 1947:

UNDERSTANDING RUSSIA—EDUCATOR ADVOCATES ITS FURTHERANCE IN EXPLAINING RECENT STATEMENTS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Times of April 9 carried a report of an address I gave before the American Catholic Educational Association in Boston. The account is on the whole factual, but I regret that the headline attributed to me a degree of bellicosity which on this occasion at least I lacked.

Perhaps you will permit me to say that what I recommended was not an endeavor to "hit communism" but rather to arrive at some kind of understanding with Russia. The situation is, of course, very bad. But I am still sanguine enough to believe that if one repeated, with every means at one's disposal, that war is abhorrent to all of us, that the integrity of the Russian state will be guaranteed by the United Nations, that the world needs the vitality, loyalty, and creative ability of the Russian people, and that, on the other hand, Russia could derive immense benefit from cultural association with the West, provided only that it assented to a measure of freedom of discussion as well as of religious practice and really cut off the existing Communist Parties to fend for themselves as independent radical leftist parties operating inside a democratic pattern, one might eventually convince the Russians that all these things make sense.

I recommended at Boston that Catholics take the initiative in creating an organization which would say these things constantly, at every level of the European population and with every available means, even while strengthening their own leadership in terms of a free Christian culture. I believe (or rather I hope) that such an organization has a chance to succeed, and thus to open the way for cordial participation by the Russians in the work of UNESCO. It would not be a combat organization but rather one on the offensive, having drive, zeal, and intelligence.

I think everybody in the Western World who is anxious to do everything possible to prevent our race from slipping into endless night might find this program worthy of support. It is a Catholic program because in western Europe there is no other group which could conceivably take the lead. Before us who advocate is the example of the Jesuits of the seventeenth century. And before us also is the fear of what must inevitably occur if the fateful difference between the East and West cannot be mitigated through debate and a sort of treaty of intellectual and moral peace.

GEORGE N. SHUSTER.

NEW YORK, *April 10, 1947.*

Conservation, a Necessary National Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by David C. Warner, water conservation consultant in the Ohio Department of Public Works:

CONSERVATION, A NECESSARY NATIONAL INVESTMENT

Nature has a way of intervention with man's plans and set customs which at times seems almost providential for impressing people with the necessity for mass action by creating natural phenomena, as acts of God, that destroy property and lives. These catastrophes arouse and educate the people; and our leaders try to provide the proper remedies, that will prevent the recurrence of these disasters which can be eliminated.

Floods are one of those purely local disasters and those who do not live in communities that are menaced by the constant danger of being flooded every time it rains on the watershed, do not comprehend or share the responsibility of doing something to help prevent the recurrence of such catastrophes.

If one has never seen a major flood, has never tried to help rescue the victims of a great raging torrent of muddy water, it is perfectly natural that one would not feel any responsibility to help prevent such a disaster in distant parts of the country. But when it happens in his own home community and State then his sympathies and understandings change, and he becomes the solicitor for help and demands the cooperation of his fellow citizens and lawmakers to bring to pass the remedies that will mitigate the menacing disasters.

Such has been the repeated history of flood control and water conservation in the United States Congress and certain State legislatures. The Members of Congress who live in the valleys of our great rivers understand and are alert and active in trying to develop the necessary investment of public works capital for the prevention of loss by floods and droughts.

For over 100 years the Mississippi River has been the cause of greatest attention, because of the magnitude of the annual floods that keep that section of the country active to develop methods to prevent the regular occurrence of destruction of property.

April 5 to 8, 1947, in the State of Michigan the rains came and the grand old man of Detroit (Henry Ford) died in the midst of the greatest flood that ever struck many Michigan cities.

When the new Congress was reorganized in January 1947, the new Public Works Committee acquired a chairman in the person of Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO, from Detroit, who has now become personally acquainted with destructive floods in his own State and cities.

It is strange how events have a way of happening to educate humanity and especially the right man in high places to prepare one to understand the needs and desires of the other fellow, who has troubles too, and wants cooperation for help to create a national investment that will save billions of dollars from further loss by floods.

It is a marvelous coincidence that the end came for one of the world's richest men in an isolated, unheated, coal-oil lamplighted home. There was no telephone in

service at the Ford estate, Farelane, cut off from the outside world by the flooding of River Rouge, when he had worked all day to prevent some of the disaster.

The high waters of the flooding River Rouge had extinguished the fires of his powerhouse, toppled the telephone poles, and torn electric power from his home, so that old-fashioned kerosene lamps filled the bedroom with the same odor and the same uncertain light that was in his mother's room, on a farm not far distant, when he was born on July 30, 1863.

It reminds us of another coincidence that happened away back in 1913, when Hon. Ross Reed was chairman of the first conservation committee of the Ohio House of Representatives. In January 1913, he desired to introduce a bill we had helped him prepare for the organization of conservation districts in accordance with article 2, section 36 of the new Ohio constitution, adopted September 3, 1912.

We took the bill to Gov. James M. Cox for his support, and he said to Mr. REED, "Now Ross, conservation of water and flood control are all right and one of the progressive ideas of the new constitution, but it is not on my program this time, so I can't support you."

But, the flood came on March 23 that same year (1913) and Governor Cox lost over $100,000 in his printing plant at Dayton, Ohio, and he let it be known that he was going to call a special session of the Ohio Assembly and pass a law that would prevent floods in Dayton. The result was that he signed the Ohio Conservancy District Law February 17, 1914.

Great men do change their minds, when disaster strikes at home. They then understand what the other fellow is talking about, when he asks for an investment of community funds for insurance against further loss.

With these Michigan floods, a coincidental act of God, and the United States Army Engineers' criteria for the how to help prevent future floods in the Nation, it is to be hoped that Congressman DONDERO will comprehend better now why there is a great need for a real conservation investment in all parts of the Nation for natural resources public works rehabilitation, like flood control, reforestation, reclamation, navigation, and soil conservation.

Teddy Roosevelt, Pinchot, Newlands, George Maxwell, and Hoover pioneered this frugal idea of the conservation and the reclamation of our natural resources.

A properly distributed investment of just $2,000,000,000 a year for the next 20 years will pay great dividends to this and coming generations and help to liquidate the great war debt.

Such a Federal investment, when spent in cooperation with a coordinated plan of local community and State improvements, which will participate to the limit of their ability to develop, protect, and save their natural resources, will go a long way to redeem, prevent or rebuild the losses sustained by the floods, war, and other common recurring disasters.

Knowledge comes from hearing and reading about calamities in the news, but wisdom is acquired only by actual personal experiences.

While we are donating billions for the rehabilitation and protection of foreign countries, we ought to make a few investments at home to prevent known losses in lives and property.

We call them grants-in-aid; no, these investments of taxpayers' money are the peoples' investment in hard-earned dollars to conserve that part of our natural resources which can be saved and will pay dividends to both the present and future generations.

We of this generation cannot afford to neglect our duty to save our own property and keep it in proper repair and usefulness. We must maintain our high standard of existence so that we can help other nations.

While we are spending billions of dollars in foreign lands, we must keep our home capital investment intact and invest a few billions of real capital on known necessary improvements and developments that will keep this "bread basket" in shape to feed ourselves, so that we can afford to be charitable, when charity is needed anywhere.

If we neglect our national investments at home we will soon cease to be able to feed the needy at home or abroad, who are counting on our bountiful charity.

America knows how to fight in a world war when necessary, so why not use some of that wisdom and intestinal fortitude to fight the battle of our natural uncontrolled elements of waste and destruction at home?

Our renewable natural resources, like flood control, soil conservation, reclamation, reforestation, rehabilitation, pollution prevention, groundwater restoration, industrial and domestic water supplies, with recreation and navigation as by-products of multiple-purpose reservoirs, are included in a proper national conservation investment, as our necessary maintenance obligations of this God-given inheritance.

These natural resources have made this country great and have characterized our people as the most generous nation on earth. But we dare not waste our inheritance by neglecting to maintain every part of it in proper repair by wise development.

"We are our brother's keeper." We can help "that other fellow" and at the same time help ourselves only by cooperating with our neighbor states to maintain that which belongs to all of us in general, so that we can be fully prepared when the emergency arises.

We congratulate our statesmen for their attempt and success in trying to stop some of our national extravagant, wartime organized, bureaucratic waste in spending for spending's sake. But this same wartime waste and neglect is causing losses by our profligacy and procrastination in the conservation of our renewable natural resources, that must be conserved not as charity to our citizens, but as self-liquidating investments of that part of our income, that must be spent for the future prosperity of the Nation, and necessary preparedness for any emergency.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVID C. WARNER,
Water Conservation Consultant in the Ohio Department of Public Works.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter appearing in the May 27 issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

I believe the author of this letter is absolutely correct when he refers to the last Republican landslide being accounted for by the support from the rank and file of union labor and aroused citizenry in all walks of life. Our party has shown its willingness to sit down and work out compromises which result in sound, constructive programs for the benefit of the great majority. Our leadership respects the views of others and therefore the Republican party should appeal to those who love our institutions of free government. We are not involved in bargaining public offices for the support of minority groups which lead to the betrayal of the majority.

The letter follows:

THE LABOR BILL—IT IS SEEN AS NEITHER UNFAIR NOR DRASTIC

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

There would seem to be considerable fear that President Truman, under the urging of Secretary Schwellenbach and others, may veto the new labor bill which Congress is now in the throes of enacting. Let us hope that, before he allows himself to be so persuaded, the President will consider the matter from several important angles:

(1) The so-called drastic House bill actually contains no less than 18 clauses specifically designed to reestablish the rights of individual union members as against dictatorial union bosses. Many of these rights of workers were lost under the Wagner Act and its interpretation by the labor administration.

(2) The bill which will reach the President will not be in the least drastic, as hysterical labor leaders are claiming, but actually will be designed simply to undo the gross unfairness—to employers, to white-collar workers and to individual union members themselves—of the Wagner Act, which has actually done far more to cause strikes, management-labor troubles and business dislocations than any other law ever enacted in this country.

(3) Such figures as those cited by Secretary Schwellenbach in his speech last week before the National Textile Seminar on the record-breaking profits of corporations actually, when analyzed, show nothing of the sort. Thus he stated: "In 1946 profits, after taxes, were 33 percent higher than in 1945," while calmly ignoring the fact that 38 percent of corporations filing returns showed net losses in 1945.

(4) The 1946 Republican landslide could not possibly have happened without tremendous Republican support from the rank and file of union labor, as well as from an aroused citizenry in all walks of life. Thus it was, in effect, an actual mandate for a fair deal in labor relations to supplant the radically labor-slanted laws of the New Deal.

Whether the President considers the labor bill from the viewpoint of the good of the country, from a purely political angle, or from both points of view, he can surely realize that to veto Congress's carefully evolved labor bill would be most unwise. It would, in fact, be tantamount to writing finis on Democratic hopes for 1948 as well as to be actually betraying labor in favor of labor bosses.

HOWARD R. MULFORD.

CRANFORD, N. J., *May 18, 1947.*

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Henry W. Woolley, legislative representative of the Brotherhood of

Railway and Steamship Clerks, R. S. Beatty Lodge, No. 910, Buffalo, N. Y., expressing opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS, FREIGHT HANDLERS, EXPRESS AND STATION EMPLOYEES, R. S. BEATTY LODGE, No. 910,
Buffalo, N. Y., May 1947.

Hon. JOHN C. BUTLER,
United States Congressman.

SIR: Considering the fact of the high cost of living and the unbearable taxes which have been foisted upon the people since the close of the war, it is inconceivable that Congress would consider for one moment saddling the huge additional monstrous tax emanating from the construction of the impractical seaway project. That it is not a practical venture is demonstrated by the fact that it would be out of commission 6 months every year and that in case of another war a few bombs placed advantageously by an enemy country could destroy in a short space of time this project which it would take years to construct and which would cost, as at present estimated, $400,000,000, which I believe is a conservative estimate when you take into consideration that dredging of harbors to accommodate the huge oceangoing steamships would swell the amount to a billion dollars. The tax rate on real estate would be again increased to pay the cost of government and our local economy would be disturbed, and it is reliably estimated that upward of 15,000 marine workers would be thrown out of employment in the Buffalo area alone, and the diversion of lake traffic and grain reshipment would play havoc with the railroads whereby Buffalo became great commercially through the huge trunk lines, attracted to center in our great city in order to secure the handling of the immense grain, flour, and merchandise traffic coming through our lake port. Summing up the dire calamity resulting from the passage by Congress of the infernal St. Lawrence seaway project and the resultant economical misery following in its wake, let me picture the disastrous results ensuing as a consequence of its passage.

The St. Lawrence project is not only inimical to the best interests of Buffalo but also to the railroads and their employees, to the longshoremen, and the vast network of huge elevators and warehouses which have made Buffalo famous as the greatest inland seaport in the world. No greater calamity could occur, no greater blow could be directed at the commercial supremacy of Buffalo, than this contemplated measure which is gathering headway in Washington, as indicated through constant press dispatches of attempts of early action in Congress urging passage of this nefarious measure. Dry rot and stagnation will result, our lake trade will be diverted to the Canadian Welland Canal, our huge elevators and warehouses will disappear from the lake front, leaving consternation, despair, misery, and want in its wake, through the loss of work by thousands of dock workers and railway employees, and the net loss in tonnage and revenue by the railways, tugs, elevators, and warehouses will be stupendous. We are depending on your assistance as our Representatives in Congress to do everything humanly possible to avert this dreadful nightmare hanging over our heads threatening a catastrophe of portentous evil, ominous, and foreshadowing dire calamity to our beautiful city. Violent opposition to passage of this measure has poured in from all quarters of the Nation, not only from New York City and Buffalo but as far south as New Orleans. The New Orleans Record said, and I quote, "It would create additional economic problems in the South, which is already the national problem No. 1. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Treaty is hostile in every way to the economic needs of the Mississippi Valley and does not assure full development of the economic value of the Great Lakes to either Canada or the United States. Endorsement of this legislation would throttle the very life of the South, which would create a national crisis. We can't afford it. The whole country is staggering under the enormous national burden and can ill afford additional costly experiments."

When this damnable seaway bill was before the Senate in 1934 the hearings before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941 demonstrated that opposition is Nation-wide, and, notwithstanding, proponents of passage still persist in bringing it before the House and Senate year in and year out. The Niagara Frontier and 59 Buffalo organizations representing business, labor, and civic groups, have given their unqualified disapproval of this uneconomic measure. The officers and members of the above organizations will anxiously await your reply as they are vitally interested in the defeat of this measure. If you wish the abiding friendship of your constituents in Buffalo, Erie County, and the State of New York, vote and work against the passage of this offensive, unpopular, proposed bill.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY W. WOOLLEY,
Legislative Representative.

Terminal-Leave-Pay Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., on Monday, May 19, 1947, under the column, Pass in Review:

PASS IN REVIEW—CONGRESSMAN ROGERS' NEW GI BILL

Representative DWIGHT ROGERS' bill to make terminal pay bonds, issued to former enlisted men, negotiable instruments, appears to be an excellent way to provide veterans with the cash they are entitled to without disturbing the plans of Republican leaders for balancing the budget and putting through a tax cut program.

Representative ROGERS declared Saturday he would introduce his new bill in the House today and that he was confident enough support would be forthcoming to insure its early passage.

Basically, ROGERS' bill would do this: It would enable veterans to sell their bonds to any purchaser willing to pay the face value of the bonds plus the accrued interest at 2½ percent. The purchasers would buy the bonds strictly as an investment, since under the bill's provisions the 5-year maturity date on the bonds would remain unchanged.

Under this bill the Government would not be forced to pay a single penny until the bonds matured. Veterans, however, many of whom are badly in need of cash, would be able to realize their equity in the bonds now instead of waiting the full 5-year period.

Since it would cost the Government nothing, Representative ROGERS believes the bill has an excellent chance of passage. He declared Saturday that the Budget Bureau had objected to his earlier plan for making the bonds immediately payable in cash and because of this there was little chance that Congress would take action on this score at an earlier date.

The new bill, said ROGERS, should not draw any opposition from the Budget Bureau. "As I see it," he said, "everybody will gain. The GI who needs his cash will be able to get it, plus whatever interest is due; the new purchaser will receive a gilt-edged security at interest better than can be obtained anywhere else, and the Government doesn't lose anything."

To safeguard the veterans from being forced to take a loss to turn their bonds into cash a clause in ROGERS' proposed bill provides that anyone purchasing a bond before maturity must pay the interest accrued up to the last day of the month in which it is sold. The new purchaser then draws the regular interest rate for the remaining time.

"In this manner," the Broward representative explained, "the man selling his bond won't lose anything. As a matter of fact, he probably will make a little, since the bonds are such good investments that they probably will sell at a premium. There are many banks and other investors anxious to acquire such securities at 2½ percent interest. It won't make any difference to the Government, since it has to pay the interest anyhow."

ROGERS' plan is a sensible solution to the terminal pay problem. Thousands of veterans are now in acute need of the money represented by these bonds. As it stands now they are useless except for paying premiums on Government life insurance.

To make these bonds immediately payable in cash might conceivably put too much of a load on the Treasury now. ROGERS' plan would get around this by transferring the load to private investors who would be only too glad to put up the necessary cash at the interest rates the bonds draw.

It sounds like an excellent suggestion and one in full keeping with the clear thinking and broad-minded attitude our Broward representative has constantly displayed in representing the veterans' and our own interests in Washington.

Who Owns Alaska?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to call attention of the Congress to a thoughtful editorial written by my friend, Bob Atwood, editor and publisher of the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times. The editorial, Who Owns Alaska? appeared in the Times for May 22:

WHO OWNS ALASKA?

Concern over the designs that Russia may have on Alaska is widespread. It is expressed in the Halls of Congress from time to time. It is discussed privately among officials and citizens alike.

Just yesterday, Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin, called the Nation's attention to this problem when he cited on the floor of the lower House the need for military defense, greater population and local autonomy in Alaska.

It is well known that Russia has cast aspersions on the legality of the sale of "Russian America" to the United States in 1867, contending the "sale" was executed by a corrupt and unscrupulous czar who exceeded his powers in disposing of part of the nation.

It is also well-known that Russia is speeding colonization and development of eastern

Siberia, opposite the western tip of Alaska. Population of this peninsula has been reported as high as 2,000,000 with the largest city of 150,000 souls.

Meanwhile, the United States sits complacent in the belief that it holds secure title to this strategic area. This title is based upon a treaty, signed by Edouard de Stoecki, that says, "His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias agrees to cede to the United States * * * all the territory and dominion now possessed by his said Majesty on the continent of America and in the adjacent islands."

Whether this complacency is well-founded is a matter of conjecture. The world has come to know that treaties with live governments are not often worth the paper they are written on. The value of an 80-year-old treaty with the government of a dead czar may be highly speculative.

Russia has raised the question: Who owns Alaska? It is a timely question for discussion. The answer is vital to the United States, Russia, and perhaps other nations.

History shows that Spain laid first claims to the northwest coast of America through explorations, and at one time claimed sole right to navigate the waters of the North Pacific. But these claims were not pressed, perhaps due to disputes on her hands in other parts of the world.

Russia made claims on the area now known as Alaska as a result of explorations by Girosdeff, Bering, and Chirikov. In 1821 Russia attempted by ukase to exclude navigators from the Bering Sea and Pacific coast of her possessions. This brought a protest from the United States and Great Britain, with the result that a treaty was made defining the boundaries of the Russian possessions in the north.

Russia found the governing of a territory 5,000 miles from the seat of her government no small problem. Excesses committed by private traders and companies, who robbed, massacred, and hideously abused the native Indians, caused the Russian Government in 1799 to adopt a policy of monopoly. The Russian American Company for about 60 years held the exclusive right to exploit what was to become Alaska, and during that time furnished whatever government the area was to have.

This was the condition that prevailed when the sale was made to the United States. The Russians had developed little or nothing in the vast northland. Exploitation had marked the era of Russian rule—ruthless exploitation that did not bring any permanent development.

The first 80 years of American ownership of Alaska has been marked by neglect on the part of the Federal Government. Instead of having the seat of government 5,000 miles away, Washington was only 3,000 miles from Alaska. The problem of distance was changed but little from the time of Russian ownership.

Not knowing what to do with Alaska, and not understanding the problems unique to the northland, the Congress has been consistent only in its policy of neglect. Only once have the problems of Alaska been properly aired before the only body of authority to handle them. That was in connection with the enactment of the Organic Act of 1912, granting Alaska the only measure of self-government in its history.

In essence, no nation can really own a territory that it does not actually occupy, develop and improve. Real ownership is not a legal concept, to be based on a treaty with a czar who is not only dead but his regime is banished and his authority challenged. Real ownership is based on fruit of use. There is no permanency in it without the element of full use.

The United States Government recognizes this in its homestead laws. It requires that a man to acquire title to the land must not only occupy it but develop and use it. He must build a habitable house and cultivate an acre.

Applying the same yardstick to Alaska, the United States has failed to homestead the territory. After 80 years, more than 99 percent of it is still undeveloped, unused. There has been no great in-rush of people to settle here. Restrictions laid over the abundant resources of the territory in ignorance and misunderstanding, have impeded, delayed and even precluded the development and use that would eliminate all question of ownership.

The San Francisco Chronicle, in an editorial accounting for American ownership of California despite conflicting claims of Spaniards, Mexicans, and British, commented:

"California is essentially an American land. For it was the Americans who developed it, made her deserts bloom, opened its roads, dredged its harbors, erected its factories, founded its schools, libraries, parks and in effect created it as an economic and cultural region.

"And that form of ownership is ours until we shall have forfeited it through the inertia of disuse, the complacency of illusory security, or, most dangerous of all, failure to protect the rights and liberties which, regulated justly among ourselves, made possible our peace and prosperity."

All in all, it appears that the United States has a long road to follow to any ownership beyond the legal concept that comes with the signing of a treaty and mere occupancy. The inertia of disuse, which has set in so solidly during 80 years of neglect, must be replaced by the constructive activity that will build it into the economic and cultural region that comes with development and full use.

United States Sales Methods Can Boost Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harold W. Sweatt, from the Minneapolis Star of May 20, 1947:

[From the Minneapolis Star of May 20, 1947]

UNITED STATES SALES METHODS CAN BOOST IMPORTS

(By Harold W. Sweatt, president, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.)

World trade is a two-way street; it needs a flow of traffic both ways or it will fail.

Trading with foreign nations is like tilling the soil. We can plant seeds and reap harvests for just so long, and then the fields become exhausted. But if we continually replenish the soil, we can take from it harvests year after year in an increasing bounty of strong, premium grain.

This is World Trade Week. Here in our country we are apt to think of foreign trade only in terms of exporting, not importing.

All over the world the products of American industry and labor are so desirable that we have no problem in expanding our exports, except one—how can our customers overseas make payment?

Ideally, foreign trade transactions should balance out. The people of foreign countries should send us goods that are desirable and salable here and receive, in return, cash with which to pay for American-made goods they want.

But it has been a long time since such an ideal state of affairs was possible, due largely to the rapid development of American industry which made our products more desirable not only abroad, but here at home too.

Even before markets abroad were hit by the aftermath of World War II, American export trade had been stimulated to an increasing extent by loans of American money to foreign nations. Today this expedient is again being used and the sums are vastly greater. But we cannot ignore the fact that this practice is essentially artificial stimulation of our export trade.

The need for a more practical and more permanent underpinning for two-way foreign trade is universally recognized. In what direction can we look for a solution to this world-wide problem which not only will affect the economic health of all nations, but will also exert powerful influence upon political conditions and the peace?

American business has realized the importance of sending abroad the best people available to develop the opportunities for sales of American products in foreign countries.

If it is now to show the same interest in developing in this country profitable sales of certain foreign-made products, the first and most important step is to send forth a corps of equally able merchandising experts. Their job would be to comb foreign countries for goods which could be sold profitably here under prevailing conditions.

Their companies would then create sales plans for these foreign products and put behind them all the selling drive they have used so long and so successfully in marketing their own products.

Such an importing effort would certainly receive the full cooperation of foreign nations. The dollar balances thus created abroad would be available to purchase American products. Foreign trade would thus be on its way to becoming a broad thoroughfare with room for ample traffic in both directions.

In the decade before the war, the United States exported $2,500,000,000 worth of goods a year and imported $2,000,000,000. In recent years, American farmers have been exporting about $3,000,000,000 worth of food alone, which represents an average of $500 added to the income of every farm family.

Today, we are contemplating an export trade of between $10,000,000,000 and $15,000,000,000 a year which must be matched by a comparable flow of imports. In such an undertaking, the new approach suggested would mean little if undertaken by only one American company or a handful. Yet if several hundred importing operations were inaugurated within the next few years, the gross business would have a positive effect on foreign trade.

If we are able to import at the same profit rate that we export—and there is no reason why we cannot if the energy and knowledge available is put to the task—we can go a long way toward eliminating a festering cancer which time and again has broken out into war.

Reduction of Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the people throughout our country are de-

manding that the cost and expense of our Government be reduced in every possible manner, and this demand comes from a great majority of the people. The Eightieth Congress has set about to comply with the wish and the will of the people. The people know, of course, that it is far easier to increase personnel and to increase costs, and to give some special privilege to some particular group, than it is to reduce personnel and costs, and to take away some special privilege which has been enjoyed for some period of time. When the day of reckoning comes, and when some particular activity is abolished and the personnel in that agency have to leave the Federal pay roll, there is always a loud clamor against that action. Those affected take exceptions to any reduction in their agency—but it is all right to make a reduction in any other agency. That same result is found to exist in every group in our country. Many of our people want to reduce the cost and expense of our Government, and they want cuts made in the appropriations for every activity, except that which might affect them either directly or remotely.

Mr. Speaker, it has been fully ascertained that when the Congress reduces the cost and expense of our Government, and when reductions are made in the appropriation bills, there can be no favorites—in other words, the reductions must be made all of the way across the board. May I say that it is frightful to behold, that before the present administration came into power, in 1932, we were operating our government upon an annual outlay of approximately $3,500,000,000. This cost and expense has skyrocketed to the point at which reductions are necessary. The people cannot withstand the tremendous outlays demanded from them, and they cannot pay the tremendously high taxes which are imposed to maintain our Government. The present budget, for the fiscal year 1948—which begins on July 1, 1947, and ends on June 30, 1948—calls for the enormous sum for $37,500,000,000. That is far beyond the essential cost of our Government, and that large and excessive sum, contained in the budget, must be reduced. We are at peace—the war is over. The people must realize, in the end, that we must keep our Nation sound and strong—we must be kept strong financially—in order to take our proper place in this reconversion era, and in order to go forward as a great nation into the future.

Mr. Speaker, the days of excessive and unnecessary Federal spending must come to an end. Our duty as American citizens demands that we terminate that spending policy, and make a firm resolve to again operate our government upon a businesslike basis, for the benefit of all of our people.

Mr. Speaker, a very sound and timely editorial appeared in the Indianapolis Star, of Indianapolis, Ind., of very recent date—which analyzes the present situation quite well—for which I ask unanimous consent of the members that the same may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD that all may read it; the editorial follows:

KEEP CUTTING, CONGRESSMEN

Republican Congressmen are deservedly irritated by the anguished howls of Government agency heads over cuts in their appropriations. A quick look at some comparative figures might strengthen their resolve to disregard the dire predictions of these calamity howlers and keep right on cutting them down.

They might compare Government expenses today with those of 1938, the last year before the war and the highest Federal budget year in peacetime history, until then. Government payrolls in 1938 cost the taxpayers $1,570,283,000. In 1947 they are costing more than $7,500,000,000. We have on Government pay rolls now more than twice as many as we had in 1938, and they are costing us nearly five times as much. Are these agencies performing any more essential services now than they did in 1938?

The Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1938 provided us with competent service for $784,000. During the war it expanded and its budget ran as high as $5,500,000. The House cut this to a fat $2,300,000—almost three times as much as in 1938. Yet these bureaucrats cry that they must abandon basic services unless they get more.

The Customs Bureau asked for $53,000,000 in President Truman's tight budget. The House trimmed it to $47,000,000. Customs officials waved the distress signal and almost at once 1,500 people were fired. In one locality 400 were fired and rehired a few days later. Obviously this was propaganda to convince Congressmen that they were ruining the Customs Bureau. And the strange thing is that the $47,000,000 to which the House trimmed the Customs budget is exactly the same amount as last year. It was not even cut at all.

There is hardly a department, bureau, agency or board among the 1,100 now in existence that couldn't stand a substantial cut and still operate efficiently. There are probably many of them that could be eliminated. There are nine housing agencies regulating housing right now.

This country cannot afford to continue the extravagant waste of the people's money now going on in the Federal Government. Not only does it contribute to inflation, it also keeps our taxes up and prevents us from paying off our debt. We have enough expenses that must be met—veterans' benefits, military costs, interest on the public debt, and foreign loans—without adding to the burden we now bear with wasteful and unnecessary appropriations. Republicans in Congress will do well to keep up the good work.

Remarks by Congressman Lane in Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech I delivered during memorial services for sailor dead conducted by the Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, O'Leary Bridge, Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, May 25, 1947:

We in New England are a seafaring breed. It is this courageous spirit of adventure that has made us great. From the days when the Pilgrims set forth in their frail vessels, daring the dangers of the unknown to make a free beginning in a new land, the young men of New England have heard the call of the sea. They have left the farms and the factories to roam the seven seas, before settling down to the humdrum tasks of life.

In times of peace they have ventured forth in clipper ships or oil-burning freighters to bring commerce to, and from, the most distant ports on earth. They have helped to feed our industries with the raw materials that build wealth. And, in the process, they have brought back knowledge of other peoples and other lands, that has helped us toward that understanding of one another that must come if the human race is to go forward in peace.

There are times, however, when the way of life we are building here is challenged from outside by those who would seize our riches without trying to earn them in the manner that we have done. It is then that our men go down to the sea with grim purpose in their hearts, and in the fight for survival some never return.

In World War II, 37,000 American sailors lost their lives, and some of them came from greater Lawrence.

They died to protect us. Conscious of our never-ending debt to them, we come together in this memorial service by the banks of the river they knew so well, to bow our heads in prayer and in tribute.

We strive in spirit to come closer to these men and to the hopes and ideals which inspired them, so that we may be worthy, in their name, to go forward toward that goal for which they sacrificed all the possibilities of their young lives. May we go from this memorial service aware of the great responsibility which these dead have left with us. For we are the trustees of the new world for which they fought and died. With unswerving purpose we must dedicate ourselves to the building of a better way of life. Only in this way can we measure up to their sacrifice and feel that we have carried some part of the load.

This is a solemn occasion. The world sorely needs the new vision and the high courage which was lost with these men. In many homes there are mothers and wives and children who will miss their affection. their comradeship, and their strength.

These are the Nation's wounds which we, the unbereaved, must tend with merciful care. Let this great country of ours never forget that the immediate families of those who died also gave. In every material way, let us ease the burden of their loss. There is room for economy in Government, but never at the expense of those to whom we are indebted. On this day of memory, let us pledge ourselves anew to the service of the gold-star mothers, and wives, and children, who gave beyond all financial reckoning. May God grant that we never lose sight of our obligation to them. A grateful Nation must make certain that they never suffer from material want.

Though grief casts a reverent spell over this day of memorial service, it is mixed with a sober pride in the dead who have set before us such a high standard of devotion to duty.

These men belonged to a great navy, without which the liberties which we enjoy might have perished from the earth. Our men did not glory in war, but they knew that, in the present imperfect stage of human development, with no system of international law and no agency to enforce it, gangster nations become aggressive, and war is the only recourse to stop them.

We were fortunate that we had a good Navy, and good men to man the fighting ships, for it was the biggest naval and maritime war in which fleets ever have engaged. From India to the Arctic Circle, from the Mediterranean to the China Seas, our Navy fought to open and extend the routes of supply, so that the huge numbers of men and the vast quantities of material needed to win might reach their objectives. With the help of the Navy, our armies made numerous landings which the enemy considered impossible, and they did this with a minimum of loss, and the war was brought to an early and successful conclusion.

Our men fought so well because they wanted a world fit for human beings and not a world of slaves. They fought for the dignity of the individual and for the freedom of their homes. Near every bunk and hammock, on every ship, in all the far corners of the world, you saw the clean and hopeful pictures of the mothers, wives, and sweethearts of American sailors, the individual shrines from which they drew that supreme courage to face the deadly tasks ahead.

In the houses of old Salem and Newburyport you will see glassed-in rooms built above the roofs, where the women watched for weeks and months on end—looking out over the ocean for some sign of a returning ship with a precious cargo of loved ones, coming back after a long and dangerous voyage to the Orient.

Sometimes the ships did not return.

That was in the old days.

But the women of 1941–45 also sent their men down to the sea in ships, knowing the loneliness of waiting for news from them—knowing the cost that must be paid for a job that must be done.

Our enemies thought that our young men and women were spoiled, and that they would crack under the brutal assault of war. But our men fought and our women worked in the war factories, and the bond of faith and love that each had in the other helped both of them.

This was the pioneering womanhood of America. The primitive things that were in them had returned to them in their hour of need, and it helped their men to win through. Many ships and many men went down—carrying with them the pictures of mothers, wives, and sweethearts—spiritual partners even in death.

On this day which is consecrated to the memory of the Navy dead of all wars, we become aware of the human fellowship which is the core of our American life. This is the value which we must cherish and develop, in peace as well as war. Unfortunately, it comes to its finest expression only when danger threatens us. Would that we could experience it through the days of our lives.

This day brings to mind the torpedoing and sinking of an American ship during the recent war. Three clergymen stood on the deck, giving their lifebelts to others. One of these clergymen was a Protestant chaplain, another was a Catholic chaplain, another was a Jewish chaplain. They stood and prayed as one, and went down with the ship.

As we think of our Navy dead, we sense the beginnings of that brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God which the world must come to learn and practice. The strong ties which sent love and strength from American homes to our men on the ships, the unselfish comradeship of men in battle, and their belief that we who inherit their hopes will work for a better world, from these we the living derive strength and purpose for the job that lies ahead.

By the waters of this river they played as boys. At the old swimming holes they learned to love the water which finally claimed them. A few miles from here the Merrimack empties into the sea, there to join with ocean currents which girdle the earth. Perhaps some particle of this home river was near them as the ocean covered them with sleep.

As we spread these tender flowers of memory over the current of the Merrimack, may they merge with the water and some day reach the unmarked graves of those who rest in the bosom of the ocean—the mystic communion of the living with the dead. And as the sun draws vapor from the ocean's surface, forming clouds that move and join and break in gentle rain, may the circuit be complete, from them to us, may we be nourished to give to the needs of peace and, in doing so, find ourselves, and them.

From the heroic dead may we draw inspiration to work for the common welfare of humanity.

The naval dead, of all wars, have done more than their share of the community effort to save those values from which a greater civilization must develop.

The other, and unfinished part of the job, is up to us.

With their lives they have given us, the living, another chance.

May we be worthy of their faith in us, and go forward from this ceremony clear in mind and strong in heart to redeem the sacrifices which they have made.

Let us be their living memorial.

A Constructive Editorial on Pending Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, one of the great weekly newspapers in America is the Kansas City Call. While it is circulated principally among the Negro citizens of the Midwest, it is widely read and universally respected for its influence and for its forthright editorial policy and intelligent presentation of the news. Not long ago when Kansas City was without a daily newspaper because of an outlaw strike, lasting for 17 days, the Call marshaled all of its resources and facilities and published a daily newspaper during this period as a service to the people of Kansas City. It has been very generally commended, and properly so, for its acceptance of public responsibility in this critical situation.

I have said that its editorial policy is forthright. More than that, it has demonstrated that it is intelligent and constructive with respect to the difficult problems confronting the country in these trying days of readjustment. In its issue of May 16 appeared an editorial on the reaction to labor legislation pending in the Congress, which was so cogent and keenly analytical that I commend it to the thoughtful reading of all Members of the House. It was as follows:

MUCH NOISE, LITTLE LIGHT ON LABOR LEGISLATION

The will of the people being the highest law in this land, the minority no less than the majority is duty bound to help make the legislation which the public wants. Labor will do well to remember that.

There is no denying that the 1946 election was a clear-cut mandate to the opposition party to take over Congress and amend the National Labor Relations Act. As it then stood, it was deemed too one-sided. Labor had had its way. The laws it made had been given extended test. A change was ordered.

The common sense of the situation is for labor to obey the mandate and cooperate in formulating the new law. Instead of that, it has condemned legislators and declared proposed changes outrageous attacks on labor's rights. Its intemperate speech has lost it all chance of convincing the public that it wants only a square deal.

It is a waste of time to restate the facts and logic which led to the Republicans being mandated to amend the Wagner Act. The problem now is to get that done which the election ordered, the same problem that faced a Congress in 1935. Then in doing what it thought best, a new deal was set up that imposed new taxes and forced extra expense. Management went along. Labor, the minority now, should do likewise, especially since there is a disposition on the part of this Congress to keep whatever good there is in the Wagner Act.

To labor the Wagner Act is the one law so perfect that any change in it is resisted. That's neither good thinking nor sound practice. It could have told Congress that a ban on utility, jurisdictional, and sympathy strikes, that penalties for unauthorized strikes and for Communist union officials, and that reports on union finances would be acceptable. No; drunk with power, labor dares Congress to carry out the people's mandate. That threat violates the democratic principle. As a result, no progress in labor relations, and industry is handicapped.

This country has been different from others, because over here social changes have been by evolution, rather than by revolution. The minority has accepted election results. For labor now to defend all it has done and condemn all changes proposed especially when its talk is surcharged with bitterness, is not playing the game. Others dance when it is chosen to call the tune. So must it. If the sector of the American people for whom this paper speaks can go along with the majority, as the faster way to its objective, labor certainly can.

Mr. C. A. Franklin, editor and publisher of the Call, and Mrs. Lucille Bluford, its managing editor, and the members of their staff are to be congratulated and complimented upon the courageous position which they have taken, and upon the position and recognition achieved by the Call in the newspaper world.

H. R. 99—A Simple, Effective Plan To Reduce the Public Debt, Strengthen the Free-Enterprise System, and Get Government Out of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the Seventy-ninth Congress and again in the Eightieth Congress, I introduced H. R. 99, the text of which is hereinafter set forth.

It is short and simple in procedure.

It authorizes Government agencies to offerer for sale, the notes, debentures, and obligations which they own, to any private person or firm who tenders the amount invested therein by the Government.

Reasonable public notice shall be given from time to time as well as reasonable information with respect to the notes and obligations which are held by Government.

All rights of the person who is obligated to the Government under such notes and obligations is fully protected.

Recently, I appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and testified on this proposal.

First let me set out at length the text of H. R. 99.

[H. R. 99, 80th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain United States notes and obligations to private persons, firms, associations, or corporations

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to encourage and promote private enterprise and remove the Government from business where its intervention or continued participation is not necessary, each officer of the United States and each corporation owned and controlled by the United States is authorized and directed to sell any notes or other obligations, or evidence of indebtedness held by such officer or corporation, and transfer the same to any private person, firm, association, or corporation tendering the full amount invested therein for such note, obligation, or other evidence of indebtedness.

SEC. 2. Each such officer or corporation is authorized and directed to give reasonable public notice from time to time of the holding of notes, obligations, and other evidences of indebtedness, and to supply reasonable information with respect to them to prospective purchasers, and to make reasonable regulations for the sale of such assets.

SEC. 3. When, as, and if such notes, obligations, and other evidences of indebtedness are sold, the same shall be transferred in a manner so that the obligor shall be fully protected in his contract rights in accordance with the note, obligation, and other evidence of indebtedness held by the Government or Government corporation.

SEC. 4. Each officer of the Government and each corporation owned or controlled by the Government holding such notes, obligations, or evidences of indebtedness shall report to the Congress at least annually, or incorporate in their annual report to Congress a statement of the amount of such obligations held, a statement of the regulations made for the sale of such assets, and a statement with respect to negotiations for the sale of the same, and for the amount sold.

AMENDMENT

I would suggest the following amendment to H. R. 99.

Its immediate effect would be a reduction of the public debt.

As obligations held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Farmer's Home Administration, and other agencies and corporations are sold, the proceeds would be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the public debt.

During the last 15 years, Government became the greatest lender in the world. It ventured deeply in the lending field to meet an emergency. It has remained in that field. The emergency is over and many of these lending operations are now definitely commercial in character.

It is time to reverse the process, to bail Government out of this field, to diminish its holdings of securities and apply the proceeds to the public debt. Thus, the contingent obligations of the Government on this paper as well as the public debt would be reduced.

Page 2, line 16, after the period insert the following sentence:

All proceeds from the sale of notes or other obligations, or evidences of indebtedness, pursuant to this act shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury to the credit of a special fund which shall be used exclusively for the reduction of the public debt.

TESTIMONY

The testimony presented to the Committee on Ways and Means may be of interest and it is therefore reproduced in full.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 99 was introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress and it has been reintroduced in the Eightieth Congress. While it is a very short bill and very simple, I think its significance is out of all proportion to its brevity.

As you will note from a reading of the bill, what it provides is simply this: That in the case of all agencies of Government that are holding notes and obligations and debentures today, those shall be made available to any person or any firm or any corporation who comes in and tenders the Government the amount that it has invested, if they agree to continue the obligations that are contrived under such a note or such a debenture.

This bill, represents a very definite effort to get the Government out of business and at the same time implement private enterprise and give it an opportunity to do the job that it is expected to do.

We have a lot of money invested in all forms of notes which might very well be handled by private enterprise today. For instance, we have the so-called rural electrification set-up under which Federal funds are advanced to cooperatives; and at the present time there is invested in the notes that are given by the cooperatives to the Rural Electrification Administration in turn for money that is borrowed from the RFC and from the Treasury, about $74,000,000 as of the most current reporting date.

We have a program, for advancing money to prospective farm-tenant purchasers and our investment here at the present time is about $250,000,000.

For a long time, under the Farm Credit Administration, we had been carrying on a program of advancing money for feed, seed, and general emergency farm operation purposes. That has finally been transferred from the Farm Credit Administration to the Farmers Home Administration and there is involved there at the present time about $120,000,000 of which, oddly enough, over $114,000,000 of which is delinquent, because it was a long-term program, particularly in the distressed areas.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you use the word "delinquent"?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. How delinquent is it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some of those are delinquent for years, and a great many of those items are marked distinctly uncollectable right now.

The CHAIRMAN. Those were feed and seed loans, for instance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now we have a rural rehabilitation program which has been carried on under the old Farm Security Administration and which has now been transferred under the Farmers Home Administration Act to the new Farmers Home Administration. Those so-called rehabilitation loans, as of the last reporting date, aggregated about $200,000,000.

There is the Federal Land Bank System, and the aggregate of balances now through the 12 regional Federal land banks is about $1,000,000,000. You will remember that some years ago we also authorized the Federal Land Bank System to make make loans on both first and second mortgages where they could not get enough money under the regular Federal land bank establishment. So we set up what are known as commissioner loans and as of the last reporting date we had invested there some $309,000,000.

Then we set up still another organization, known as the Production Credit Corporations and the Production Credit Associations. They make loans to farmers for a variety of production purposes and the investment as of now is about $266,000,000.

In addition thereto we set up 12 intermediate credit banks to make loans to cooperatives and their investment as of the last reporting date is about $346,000,000.

Now, in addition thereto—and I do not have the figures for the RFC—but the RFC has made very extensive loans and in addition has served as a sort of a rediscount bank for the old Federal Works Agency and the old Public Works Administration, whereby advances were made to cities to install sewers and light plants and that sort of thing. The paper was in many cases held by the RFC.

Then, in addition thereto, we have the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. You may recall that I made a determined effort to secure its liquidation some years ago, and I partially succeeded in the House, but, unfortunately, I could not persuade the Senate committee to go along in its entirety with the proposal that I had in mind.

But here you had an agency of the Government which was created in an emergency period and which finally made 1,000,000 loans aggregating about $3,375,000,000. They borrowed money from the Treasury at 1 percent and reloaned it at 4½ percent. In addition thereto, of course, they could put levies and impositions upon home owners to whom they made these loans, and this thing has been going on now for more than 12 years. They have not made any new loans for 6 or 7 years.

But here you have a great aggregate of Federal agencies that are in the business of making a type of loan that is essentially commercial, and now it seems to me that sort of thing ought to be turned back to private enterprise, wherever it can be done.

Here are some reasons why I think it could be done and should be done. In the first place, you gentlemen know so well that there is an available bank credit in the country today; the banks are fairly bursting with money.

The second reason is that in proportion as those are turned back to private enterprise it is going to siphon off to a good deal of the inflationary pressure as a result of the tremendous deposits in the banks.

The third reason is that it would simply take the Government out of what I regard as a type of commercial business.

The fourth reason is that it would siphon that money back and replenish the Treasury to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars, and it could aggregate several billion dollars.

The fifth reason is that it would reduce the contingent debt of the country.

The sixth reason is that the borrower would not be disadvantaged by this action, because the bill provides that when, for instance, a Federal agency, like the Farmers' Home Administration, sells to a bank in X town, in Y State, somewhere, one of these loans, the obligation must be preserved as to its maturity, its terms, etc., so that the borrower is not in any worse circumstance than if he were a direct borrower and a continuing borrower from the Federal Government.

The seventh reason is that it would diminish heavy administrative costs for collections and servicing and regulation. We are putting

out millions and millions of dollars today to service these loans, and to collect them, to run after the delinquents. Of course, we have got thousands of people on the Federal pay roll who are doing this kind of work, so that there would be a very definite reduction in the number of Federal personnel.

The next reason is that, in my judgment, it would reenergize the whole private credit system of the country. The fact of the matter is that we have had a good deal of testimony on it in years gone by before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations that Federal agencies, through their personnel, go out and solicit loans in competition with private enterprise—banks in small towns, who would only too gladly make these loans at an appropriate rate of interest if they had a chance, but with the Federal Government in the field, and bearing down, the Government becomes a direct competitor, and obviously it is going to get a very good share of this business.

The next reason is that it would diminish competition with private enterprise from the Government. And then probably—and more important than all else—it would reverse this very paternal trend under which we set up so many agencies to make loans of all character and description to people in all walks of life and for all purposes. Sooner or later that trend is going to have to be reversed if we are not going to head in the direction of complete paternalism.

Finally, it seems to me that this is purely a local function. If a farmer wants money for production on his farm, if some prospective farm-tenant purchaser wants money with which to buy a farm, first he ought to go to a local source of credit. Of course, the Government is in this business now and the only thing I see as an out at the moment is simply to say to Government agencies: "Now, look. You give reasonable notice to anybody who may be interested as to the number and amount of loans that you have and then you make available on some given day an opportunity for any person, any thrift institution, any bank, any private enterprise set-up, to come in and say, 'Look! You have got so much invested in so many loans, to buy farms, or to rural electrical cooperatives, or for some other purpose. We will buy them. We will buy them at what you have invested in them and we will agree in writing to carry out the terms that are set forth in the note or in the debenture. We will preserve the maturity; we will preserve the interest rate.'"

And so it becomes possible then to siphon off some of this great well of money and credit that is existing in the banks and the thrift institutions of the country today.

The fact of the matter is, when you set up Government in so many lines of business and lend billions and billions of dollars for local purposes, the very natural thing that is going to happen is that Government is going to get the best loans and you are going to leave private enterprise, the little banks in the country towns and elsewhere, hold the sack. Manifestly it is unfair and if we are going to give something more than lip service to this so-called free enterprise system, that is expected to provide jobs and to reduce prices, and hike up production, and that sort of thing, then let us give them a fair break.

In an emergency period, of course, one can see the reason for the Government going into this line of business. But we have got to make a distinction between where the emergency ends and where strictly commercial operation begins. And I think this bill to supplement what we have already done in the Byrd-Butler Act in developing budgetary and accounting procedures by every Government corporation before the Appropriations Committee, is going to go a long way toward restoring this country to the sound road of the dependable free enterprise system.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair has read the bill, but is rather apprehensive that unless very complete safeguards are thrown about any transactions for the protection of the Government, it may very easily lead to collusion and a scandal that would rock the Republic from coast to coast. I think the gentleman understands my point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe I do.

The CHAIRMAN. You are proposing that these securities and obligations held by the Government be disposed of whenever you or someone else makes application to buy them. You mentioned the REA, the RFC, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and others. It could conceivably lead to a riot of corruption and connivance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In what respect, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That could be done very easily. You know, when they liquidated banks, invariably someone got the inside track and bought up the odds and ends. I have in mind a transaction in the old Capital National Bank of St. Paul, where a man made over a million dollars buying the odds and ends of that bank which closed back in the early thirties.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can see no opportunity here for any process of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I am not a lawyer; I do not want to get into an argument. But it did seem to me that proper safeguards should be thrown around this. I am in thorough sympathy with your objective.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should point out this: For instance, in section 2, where, for instance, an agency has these loans, it must give reasonable public notice from time to time. In other words, it publishes the fact to all the wide world that we have so much Federal money invested in so many loans, aggregating so many dollars and if anybody is interested, all right; you come in. And in addition thereto, they must give reasonable information. Then in addition thereto, section 4 requires that a report be made to Congress—that is an annual report. As a matter of fact, it could be made a quarterly report, if that is desirable. But it would be conducted entirely in the open. That is the purport of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. It would seem to me that there should be some supervisory body set up to see that the Government receives somewhere near what these things are worth; not merely what the Government has invested in them necessarily, but simply what they are worth. If the note is not worth anything, that is one thing. But we should see to it that the Government gets every penny possible out of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To that I agree. And, Mr. Chairman, there would be no objection, in consideration of this measure, to so modify it or put in such safeguards and such administrative directions as may be necessary to give it effect.

Now, I see what you have in mind. I remember, when Mr. Jones, of the RFC, told me that when the Chicago school district was trying to float an issue of bonds out there and could not find a market in Chicago, he finally bought them and a few weeks later he sold them to a bank in Chicago and made a profit of $258,000. Those were worth a premium. And if any of this paper is worth a premium, nobody would quarrel with the Government getting just as much as it can possibly get. If some additional language is necessary in order to effectuate that objective, there would be no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will call for a report from the Treasury. Of course, this is something to which we would probably have to give a whole day or more. We would have to have the Secretary of the Treasury up and perhaps some representative from the RFC and others.

Mr. COOPER. The RFC was the first venture of this sort and it was urged and recommended by our friend and distinguished former President, Mr. Hoover. I recall the conversation I had with my good friend and our former distinguished colleague, John Garner. He was not very keen on the idea and in the discussion of the matter the point came up about 30 years, and he said, "My God Almighty, I thought this was a temporary measure." That got us into this swell.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Your observation gives point to what I think is the crux of this matter. There has to be a distinction between the Government embracing an emergency, and moving in this way in an emergency period, and a situation where it goes on year after year and year after year until finally it fans out into the whole field of commercial operations. Once these emergency operations are established, of course, they can go on and on, as they are doing today. And we have not bothered to make that distinction.

Mr. COOPER. Practically all of these agencies did come into existence during an emergency?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. And now it is high time that either we take the Government out of that kind of business, give the enterprise system a chance to move in, and get rid of these accumulated funds to the banks and the thrift institutions, because it does involve that general inflationary pressure that is at the bottom, and that might threaten to blow the lid off sometime.

Mr. JENKINS. You appreciate, Mr. DIRKSEN, of course, that this committee had no jurisdiction over the legislation that set up any of these institutions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. And that is a very significant fact, I think. We did not set up any of them through our committee. And still this bill is brought to us now. Of course, the basis of our jurisdiction over this bill is that this paper now belongs to the Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. So, of course, we do have jurisdiction.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you not think, instead of compelling these people to sell their best paper and have left a lot of ragtags, it would be better to go back to the committee that set up these institutions and ask them to terminate their authority and to liquidate them some way under the Treasury? In that way they could be liquidated in a more orderly fashion.

But if you compel any institution to sell its best stuff, you are bound to have left only the ragtags, and you would have the same old personnel with the same old expense, necessary to carry on.

I agree with you about these activities. Practically all of these organizations ought to go out of business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. JENKINS, I would make three responses to that. The first one is, no matter whether the Government keeps the so-called tail ends and bad loans or not, its losses will be exactly the same. In other words, it does not make any difference whether the bad paper shows up 20 years after or not.

Mr. JENKINS. But there is this situation. The people who set up an organization, if they are honest and sincere, can liquidate it more advantageously than someone else, because if you take out the best paper and leave the worst, you still have the personnel and the overhead to take care of, the rent, and so forth, and it will not work out as well

Mr. DIRKSEN. In response to that, this does not propose to liquidate these corporations. That would be a tremendous task and might require years. And with respect to the personnel I might point out that at the peak, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation had about 30,000. Then, of course, that number came down progressively as the number of loans diminished and the numbr of properties were sold. So, when you diminish the number of loans obviously you are going to diminish the necessity for servicing and col-

lection and supervisory charges and you are going to diminish the total number of your Federal personnel in proportion.

Mr. JENKINS. It is more difficult to get rid of personnel than anything else.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation reduced from 30,000 to about 3,700 as I remember the figure. The number came down progressively and it would in this case, also.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think we should be concerned about the ragtag ends of these investments, because they are bad, anyhow. I am interested to see that we get what we should for the good loans. In this case at St. Paul that I was telling you about, our State bank examiner resigned and his successor turned around and sold him the assets from this bank. They made over a million dollars. That is the sort of thing we want to guard against here, that sort of collusion.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I was going to say that as I understand it, under this bill, the Government would sell the obligations not at a loss.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, definitely not.

Mr. REED. The Government is not going to lose anything by this sale.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. The Government inevitably will come out whole.

Mr. REED. It is safeguarded every step of the way.

Mr. HOLMES. May I ask, Mr. Dirksen, who would buy these obligations?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Thrift institutions, banks, building and loan companies, trust companies.

Mr. HOLMES. Would they qualify? Would the paper qualify to come under the program of these various institutions?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The best answer I can give to that, Mr. Holmes, is that when I had in view the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, people came to Washington from all over the United States to buy these obligations, or get their order in. In the case of Ohio, for instance, a number of trust companies pooled their resources and said, "We are ready to buy $50,000,000 worth right now." And in every section of the country that I visited there was a tremendous interest, because that paper does qualify under the regulations, and the constitution and the bylaws and the State requirements under which they operate.

Mr. HOLMES. Then my next question is, Would it be advisable to unload this paper on that kind of an institution, could it be done without experiencing an impact on the economy of the country if something should happen to the character of the paper?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Funds are available in such quantities that it would be absorbed almost like a snowflake falling into a lake.

Mr. REED. Many of these obligations are more or less tax exempt, which would make them attractive; is not that true?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. REED. That is why they would be anxious to get them.

Mr. HOLMES. I should not think that any of them would be tax exempt.

Japs Get 7 Centuries' Progress in 16 Months

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article by Mr. Ralph J. Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

JAPS GET 7 CENTURIES' PROGRESS IN 16 MONTHS

(Article 7)

Talk about your new deals. The New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt fades into insignificance when compared with the political, social, and economic revolution that has taken place in Japan under the occupation.

Women have been granted the right to vote. Political parties have been freed from state domination. Labor has been granted the right to organize and to strike. Tenant farmers have been granted the right to buy the land they till. Police surveillance of the individual from birth until death has been abolished. State support of any religion has been prohibited.

Freedom of speech, of thought, of assembly, of religion, of the press, and of communication has been decreed by law. Discrimination on account of sex, color, race, or creed has been banned by law. Hereditary titles and emoluments have been abolished.

The fact is that virtually all the progress made by the English-speaking people in the establishment of the rights of the individual from the time the English forced King John to accept Magna Carta until the American Congress passed the Wagner Act has been enacted into law in Japan in the short space of 16 months.

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur was not exaggerating when he said that, since the occupation, the Japanese Government has a record for instituting reforms which has never been surpassed in any comparable period of history.

This does not mean that all the reforms are understood or accepted by the Japanese people. The feudal system has been abolished by law, but the habits of feudalism cannot be uprooted overnight. A Japanese woman may be told that she has been emancipated, but she will not eat until her husband has been served and she will still walk four or five paces respectfully behind him. The constitution may say that child labor is prohibited, but parents will continue to sell their children into industrial bondage.

Our party of visiting newspapermen inspected a silk factory near Kobe which now employees several hundred boys and girls. They live in a compound on the factory grounds and work about 10 hours a day.

The company takes great pride in the fact that it maintains a school for its employees and that it gives them religious instruction to attain "perfection of their characters" each morning and evening and even on the four holidays a month they are allowed to have.

Obviously it will take considerable education and instruction, if not prosecution, before the system of child labor and industrial slavery is abolished in Japan.

SHINTO PRESSURE PERSISTS

Likewise, the withdrawal of state support of Shintoism does not mean that the Shinto religion has been abolished. The Japanese language newspapers contain frequent appeals from the Shinto priests for financial aid from the public.

An individual may be reluctant to contribute, but if the sentiment in his neighborhood association[1] is strongly in favor of it, he does not dare to refuse, because if he did refuse to contribute his neighbors would "talk about him" and he would "lose face." This may be coercion of a kind, but it is in accordance with the freedom of religion.

In spite of these and other obstacles, the legal framework for the reform program is a fact. The task now is to educate the Japanese to an appreciation of their new rights and responsibilities in a democratic form of government.

[1] Since this was written neighborhood associations have been ordered abolished, but apparently they still continue to function for the distribution of rationed food.

Navy Worries About Officer Resignations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John G. Norris from the Washington Post:

NAVY WORRIES ABOUT OFFICER RESIGNATIONS

(By John G. Norris)

A recent heavy surge of resignations among the "cream" of young officers of the fleet has aroused deep concern among Navy leaders.

Vice Adm. W. M. Fechteler, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Personnel, disclosed that resignations of Regular Navy officers have been running 200 a month.

While a crop of resignations has followed every past war, this time the losses have cut far deeper than expected, Fechteler told the Post.

BEST ONES LEAVING

They have totaled 1,627 in the past 8 months.

"I'm afraid we are heading for a Navy of second-raters," he stated. "If it were the duds that are quitting, we wouldn't care. But ship captain after ship captain has come in to complain that his best young officers are getting out.

"It is not a question of the next decade or so. We've got plenty of good people in the middle ranks now. But if war comes in 15 to 20 years, we're going to find ourselves with a lower standard of officers than we have today."

About half of those quitting are line officers, Fechteler said, with the remainder largely doctors and dentists. Loss of the latter is causing a serious shortage. This situation already has been called to the attention of Congress, and legislation is pending to help correct it.

Two-thirds of the line officers resigning, Fechteler said, are young Naval Academy graduates with less than 5 years' service—war-tested youngsters of ability.

"I had an analysis made of the reasons given for their resignations," the Navy personnel official said. "Few of them kicked about their present pay. They believed their future prospects were better on the outside."

He attributed the latter to two factors:

1. The congressional drive to cut down the "top brass," causing young officers to feel there would be too few openings at the top.

2. The comparatively low pay of such top jobs compared with industry. A rear admiral's pay has been increased only 11 percent in 40 years, Fechteler said, during which time civilian pay and the scale in the lower ranks of the Navy has been boosted many times.

POLL SHOWS TREND

Chiefs of the Atlantic Fleet expressed the same concern over the increasing number of resignations. A poll recently taken by mail among members of the Naval Academy class of 1942 showed that 58 percent plan to resign.

Already, 112 members of the class of 1946—which was graduated in 1945 before the end of the war—have resigned, the Navy said. They have just become eligible to leave the Navy.

Present policy is to accept resignations after 2 years of commissioned service, unless an officer has been given some highly specialized graduate training.

Address of Hon. W. Kingsland Macy, of New York, Before the National Republican Club, in New York City, May 27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address that I made last evening in New York City upon the occasion of my reelection as president of the National Republican Club:

Officers and members of the National Republican Club, I wish to express my gratitude this evening to the members who returned me to office as president of the National Republican Club, for their recent demonstration of loyalty to the club, and exhibition of extreme activity in its best and highest interests. In spite of minor differences within the recent past, I am sure we will enjoy functional harmony in this, our sixty-eighth year, and can look forward to a fruitful period of continued activity and accomplishment. Our ever-growing membership rolls bespeak widening influence which will, I am confident, further guarantee the full performance of our traditional role on the Republican scene. Our efforts must equal our interest. Never before have men in public life had greater need of perception and vision, and not within my recollection has there been in public life in the United States a man who has demonstrated the qualities of statesmanship, courage, and executive efficiency, in so marked a degree as our own Governor Dewey.

Today a large part of the world is more or less openly engaged in ideological-economic warfare between Communist and non-Communist systems. Since political ideologies in the final analysis are merely instruments of economic theories growing out of group concepts of rights, and since man fights to acquire or hold, we have offensive and defensive wars. While the winner is not always able to force the refinements of his particular ideology upon the vanquished, the thumbscrews of economic pressure are sure to be turned. In earlier days it was slaves and ransom, indemnities, and the scrapping of navies. Today it is the altering of national economies and their allocation to zones of influence.

Today we are participating in a haphazard way in mapping and stabilizing such zones. We are lending money to non-Communist nations—and, by the way, if we referred to countries that are not democracies, or are at best pseudo-democracies, as non-Communist nations, we would be doing a semantic service and probably gaining a point. We are trying to keep the old nationalistic balance of power and at the same time make transfers to a new scale. Under the duress of war, we enacted emergency legislation with required despatch, but I see a grave threat to our foreign policy if we continue to consider crises abroad singly as unrelated incidents.

Today many eyes are turned to America, and the needs and greeds and hungers of many countries, factions, and races take on meaning for us. If we raise their living level, will we lower our own? How will their changing standards affect the free-enterprise system if we, as do-gooders, drag ourselves into Government-ringed morasses and dissipate our substance improvidently in impractical largesse? How long will American taxpayers be willing to contribute their dollars to the Treasury in Washington, to be doled out to the benighted in the "foreign-mission field" of economics?

In the spirit of frankness which should characterize this gathering and this occasion, I feel impelled to state that I voted for the Greco-Turkish relief bill with many misgivings, nor were these misgivings decreased by the editorial comment of the New York Times, characterizing the payments to be made pursuant to the provisions of this bill as "token payments." The Times says wisely and convincingly that large though the amount may be in some aspects, such a provision will not be sufficient to prove the wisdom of a policy, because the military aid for Greece thus supplied will not be great enough to give defense against a major power, nor is the economic aid possible under this bill sufficient to restore prosperity even in one small country.

The editor of the Herald-Tribune comments dramatically that the so-called "Truman Doctrine" as adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives "comprises only the raw materials of a policy."

We must all hope earnestly, to quote from the editorial last referred to, that the national administration will "employ those funds and the legitimate influence that goes with them in such a manner as to achieve as efficiently and completely as possible, the goals embodied in the bill."

Perhaps the provision for Turkey and Greece should not be thought of in terms of charity or philanthropy, but only as retarding the spread of Communism in eastern Europe, which would, of course, be highly detrimental to the interests of democratic governments everywhere.

However this may be, we recently had in New York City a magnificient application of the doctrine that charity begins at home—this in the revelations concerning the operations of the department of welfare in the City of New York, the effect of which will, I fear, be widespread and demoralizing, tending to impair public morale and to render New York City an object of ridicule and contempt and its taxpayers objects of commiseration throughout the land. This is an unfortunate demonstration at this particular time, coming simultaneously with the additional press stories of ultra-sensational character, casting suspicion upon the conduct of the New York City Department of Marine and Aviation.

I do not hesitate to say that the cumulative effect of these incidents places the government of the city of New York squarely on the defensive at this time, both in respect of things that have happened and as involving dereliction in not having discovered delinquencies sooner than disclosure has come.

Waste such as I have indicated brings us to the problem of wastefulness in a broader sense. Should we not ask ourselves: How much longer may we be profligate with our great natural resources? Inventoried today for the inherent qualities of great nationhood, we would rank first; inventoried for tangible assets and national resources we would be second to none. Of these things we are pridefully aware but it would be well for us to pause now and think what assets will be transferable to the next generation.

The fact is our storehouse of wealth underground is rapidly being depleted. The great Mesabi Range is running low on iron ore, copper reserves are petering out and many once high-grade mines yield only low-grade ore. Certain scientists say we have only enough oil for 20 years. These things give the entire Nation cause for alarm, and scientific survey should be made with thought for husbanding our resources. Since minerals are the sinews of a modern power, we cannot afford to find ourselves a "have not" nation, particularly since Russia with its fabulous potential, is hard at work with 10,000 geologists assaying mineral possibilities and boasting of what its airborne detectors have located.

Now as to our resources above the ground, we should not omit consideration of our agricultural wealth. Agronomists tell us that our farmers could double production and there is no question about our ability to feed ourselves. However, while we think of ourselves as the great bread-basket of the world, actually from 1925 to 1942 our imports of foodstuffs of the sort produced here exceeded our exports — and this during the years we were killing piglets and plowing under crops. I cite this not only as an example of economic imbalance but as a precedent established by the New Dealers for a practice apparently continuing as a hangover from their administration. Last week bushels of the new Virginia potato crop were made inedible by saturating with kerosene. Last month and during the first 3 weeks of this month we imported some 600,000 pounds of potatoes from Canada and Canadian potatoes were selling in Richmond, Va., 30 miles from the kerosene-soaked potatoes, for 7½ cents a pound. Early last summer when piles of potatoes started to mount in the fields of my own great potato-growing county of Suffolk, the third largest potato-producing county in the country, I made public protest against this proof of "half-planning." In a seaboard county like Suffolk, with bottoms galore available, surely there should have been a way of finding some sort of bateau to bring alongside these mounds of potatoes and ferry them to the starving in Europe or elsewhere. If starvation is so rife as those in the Administration and others would have us believe, our big bombing planes, now idling in reserve for defense, could well cargo these potatoes and drop them by parachute like manna from heaven to save many a life. Doubtless there will be those to call these suggestions fantastic and impractical, but I submit that there is more merit in them than allowing good edible food to waste when the hungry are starving.

While taking stock we must also consider the ways and means by which our agricultural and industrial civilization is maintained, and it might be appropriate to talk of taxes. I might say here that one of the first lessons a Congressman learns is that while everyone wants taxes cut, everyone and his brother want public finance in aid of projects which affect them personally. We Republicans, determined as we are to reduce taxes, certainly deserve the fullest support. The public should realize careful pruning of so fantastic a growth as the Jack-and-the-Beanstalk vine the Democrats permitted national expenditures to become, is no easy task. The fact we are committed by principle and promise to careful stewardship and are doing our deliberate and considered best to further it, should surely win us, if not respect, the grudging commendation of those who have become accustomed to rush legislation.

To those who are worrying about our "drastic slashing" of expenditures I would say that while I am not for niggardly saving at the cost of civic effectiveness, they might reflect on the fact there is such a thing as national bankruptcy and as long as we Republicans are in power we have no intention whatsoever of permitting it. We have taken the position Justice Holmes assumed when reminded by a litigant that "the power to tax involves the

power to destroy" and he answered grimly, "Not while this court sits."

Pressure groups are a mounting threat and a menace and I believe I was one of the first publicly to decry them. These factions represent "special interest" whether they be in labor, ideas, agriculture, or any one of a dozen things, and immediately they organize they set out in avid pursuit of selfish advantage. We may find ourselves organizing to the point of complete disorganization. Often claiming benevolent intent, they attempt to undermine and influence the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government. My personal belief is they consider themselves a fourth branch.

There was a time when special interests acted as principals and engaged lobbyists to circulate subversively and wheedle from addleheaded or venal legislators what their principals wanted. Today the principals themselves are in the forefront—demanding, demanding. It looks as though the whole country were becoming pressure-minded and along with the deathless lobbyists, hundreds of groups, concerned not at all with the overall welfare but overmuch with their own, are out to force privilege legislation by cajolery, by intimidation and by the very iteration and reiteration of their conflicting requests. Men in public positions justifiably trusted not to give special consideration to individuals, are confidently expected to cater to these pressurers whose disregard of the broader civic objectives is offset only by the copiousness of their literature and the rich nomenclature of their titles and letterheads. The sooner every member of our three branches of government learns to ignore this would-be fourth branch, the sooner will these pressure groups learn the ballot box is their constitutional and rightful medium.

Sooner or later the American people will be as tired of this pressuring as they were of paralyzing strikes. The House of Representatives has passed the Hartley bill which has been called a Bill of Rights, a name that held interest for me since on Memorial Day of last year I called publicly for a Bill of Rights for Labor and Management. I voted for the Hartley bill as a measure intended to serve as a corrective to the one-sided Wagner Act and a deterrent to union outrages too long tolerated. I do not consider it "open sesame" to management nor is it a door slammed in the face of labor. To my way of thinking it is remedial legislation only and no panacea to cure all ills.

Pride in craftsmanship was the motivating factor in the organization of guilds and unions. Men liked the phrase "dignity of labor" but many present-day unions minimize these things while concentrating on the pay-check. Those of us who remember we were without coal last Winter and without telephones this Spring, might take time to think a bit about the fact the CIO and AFL have succeeded in unionizing more than 10,000 workers in the atom bomb town of Oak Ridge. How significant is it that the voice of labor itself has not been heard crying out against injustices in the unions themselves? Has labor silently sanctioned racketeering outrages as a means to the procurement of an end? Its reaction to and performance under the labor bill this Congress will pass will tell the story.

The final determinant in labor relations where the human factor is so great an influence, must be the clarification of personal and property rights. Before we can hope for industrial harmony we must be agreed on what is justifiable and what is allowable in the labor-management relations field. As I said last year no strict diagonal divides labor and capital and actually the entire public is a composite of the two. Management has millions annually for technical research but little for study of the employer-employee angle. Resistance to negotiating instead of bargaining is the greatest of management's sins. Labor has its sin too and cardinal is the deliberate slow-down in productivity per man-hour. No step-up in technocracy can counter-balance the nation's loss in citizen integrity when a man's values drop so low that he will not give "a day's work for a day's pay."

The question which I am most frequently asked, and the same is true of my distinguished associates in the House and the other branch of the National Legislature, is what will President Truman do with the labor bill soon to be presented for his signature.

I am not going to prophesy tonight, mindful of the adage that "A prophet is not without honor save in his own country," nor have I the gift of prophecy vouchsafed to my learned and brilliant friend Drew Pearson, nor the assurance which leads me to hazard predictions as freely as does he.

So what I am going to say is not a prediction at all, but it is only the summarization of what seems to me the most plausible and rational things I have heard in Washington.

It is this: Assuming that a bill resembling fairly closely the present Taft bill will be submitted to the President, what seems to be the best guess I have heard is that the President will sign it, in spite of the vigorous and violent opposition of the so-called leaders of labor who characterize the proposed bill as "slave labor" legislation, intended to destroy the labor unions. By signing the bill, the President will solidify the support of many thousands, whom a veto would estrange. By so doing, the President will also eliminate, for the time being, from controversy between the major political parties, the principal domestic issue (the principal international issues having also been eliminated by bi-partisan cooperation). In this connection the President will probably feel that, so far as labor is concerned, he can, between now and the beginning of the national campaign next year, woo and win the favor of organized labor, who will in any event accept him in preference to the candidate of the Republican Party.

Let us not forget that a President in the White House, anticipating or in the course of the campaign next year, can play many "trump cards" to take last minute "tricks" to win popular favor and support; and this is especially true at a time when international conditions are strained and unsettled, with a widespread and aroused public sentiment in this country, willing to oppose by force of arms if necessary, the encroachments of Communism and of the Soviet ideology.

This leads me to the final note of my address to you this evening, which is a warning against the danger of over-confidence in the ranks of the Republican Party, as affecting the national campaign in 1948.

In fact it is my desire to conclude my brief and informal remarks this evening by sounding a note of warning to the Republican Party throughout the nation, lest there shall be over-confidence now or hereafter, concerning the result of the 1948 Presidential election. It is apparent that President Truman's political aides and that the chairmen and members of Democratic political committees everywhere are already setting the stage for what they hope will be a successful Presidential campaign next year. President Truman and his advisers are not letting any grass grow under their feet in this respect.

The President himself has been playing shrewder politics than it was originally thought he was capable of; and while I have no doubt that if the national election were to be held this year, the Republican candidate would receive a substantial majority of the electoral votes, that is quite beside the point. And let me admonish that the Republican Party should not be over-confident, even though former Vice President Henry Wallace heads a third party next year, as I personally believe to be highly probable. I have heard it said in Washington that a Wallace third party would render certain the defeat of the national Democratic ticket, but let us not rely upon this assertion. To defeat the Democratic national nominees, Truman and Marshall, as I declared a year ago the ticket would be, will require the strongest candidates we Republicans can name. At the head of our ticket many are now asserting that there should be selected Thomas E. Dewey of New York. Even conceding the probability of the Wallace third ticket, we must all work hard, and it is not too soon to begin to work now, to lay the foundation for a solid and successful national campaign in the fateful year of 1948. It was Shakespeare who warned against overconfidence in the striking lines found in the drama Henry the VIII, which you may all remember, and with which I will end my remarks this evening:

"We may outrun, by violent swiftness, that which we run at, and lose by overrunning."

I thank you.

Short-Wave Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *May 23, 1947.*

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EBERHARTER: I understand that the House will shortly consider the Mundt bill to authorize the State Department to continue its short-wave broadcasts and I have been advised that the heads of all the short-wave broadcasting companies, with the exception of Mr. Walter Lemmon of Station WRUL, have urged the vital need of continuing the State Department program and have pointed out the impossibility of carrying on an adequate program by individual or corporate contributions.

Having been, I believe, the largest individual contributor to Station WRUL during 1940 and 1941, I wish to state that I completely disagree with the position which I have been advised was taken by Mr. Lemmon that an adequate program could be financed by private contributions. The following memorandum from direct personal experience illustrates, I believe, the important effect of even very limited and rather amateurish short-wave broadcasts and at the same time demonstrates the impossibility of securing by popular subscription even a minute fraction of the money necessary to combat the 30 Soviet short-wave stations.

When we organized the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies in May 1940, some of us discussed the desirability of a short-wave broadcast to Italy in the hope of developing sufficient sentiment against an Italian attack on France. In the early part of 1940, I believe the only short-wave broadcast to Europe was one in Norwegian from WRUL, which also had short-wave broadcasts to Latin America, as did a number of other stations.

I understand that this Norwegian broadcast was 15 minutes, 5 days a week, and was listened to by many members of the Norwegian merchant marine, some of whom sent in small contributions from $1 up. When the Nazis invaded Norway, they ordered the quislings to broadcast to Norwegian ships

to return at once to Norwegian ports, but when the sailors tuned in on the old WRUL broadcast in which they had confidence, they were convinced of what had happened in Norway. It is reported that thousands of tons of Norwegian shipping were saved for Allied use because of this.

In May 1940, I asked Mr. Lemmon if he could put on a short-wave program to Italy and he advised that the station could not undertake this itself but that if I would contribute $300 per month, he would provide 15 minutes broadcasting time 5 days a week. I arranged for an Italian newspaperman in New York to prepare the scripts which were mailed to Boston, where Professor Salvimini and others of the Italian Department of Harvard delivered the broadcasts over WRUL.

After Italy invaded France, I discontinued the Italian broadcasts and arranged for a French newspaperman in New York to mail scripts to Boston where members of the French Department of Harvard broadcast them to France, as a means of helping morale and resistance. Letters and direct personal reports from people who heard the broadcasts in France or North Africa demonstrated their influence in those dark days. When Mussolini began to experience some reverses in the fall of 1940, I arranged for a resumption of the Italian broadcasts in addition to the French.

In late 1940, the French script writer brought to me Mr. Stanislav Petrovich, who had broadcast to Yugoslavia from Paris and London, and who asked if I would provide an opportunity for him to broadcast over WRUL. Mr. Petrovich pointed out the stategic importance of encouraging resistance to Yugoslav collaboration if Hitler made a Balkan drive in the spring of 1941. I inquired of friends who had been in Yugoslavia as to how many short-wave sets were there and learned that while the number was limited, there was one in almost every cafe and that it was a great country for grapevine. I accordingly arranged for three 15-minute broadcasts per week, Mr. Petrovich making recordings at the Asch Recording Studios at New York, which were mailed to Boston and played over WRUL.

When the revolt against the collaborationist Yugoslav Government took place in the spring of 1941, I arranged with Mr. Lemmon for Mr. Petrovich to go to Boston at once and broadcast three times a day. At this time, the only other short-wave broadcasts going into Yugoslavia to combat the Nazi broadcasts were some from the British BBC, which the Germans were jamming. I understand that, when communications were cut in Yugoslavia, in many cases the only means by which people in one section could learn of what was going on in other sections was from Mr. Petrovich's broadcasts.

The American Minister in Belgrade later made public statements about the important influence of these broadcasts on the revolt and Mr. Petrovich has described this in detail in his book Free Yugoslavia Calling. While Yugoslavia was overrun in a comparatively short time, Yugoslav resistance delayed Hitler's timetable about six weeks and brought him to the gates of Moscow at the beginning of winter instead of October 1.

Shortly before January 1, 1941, Hans Jacob, a former German Army officer, who had broadcast against Hitler as the Voice of Strasbourg, came to see me. I also made arrangements for him to broadcast recordings being made in New York and mailed to WRUL.

Many more broadcasts were needed but my financial burden had become quite heavy and Mr. Lemmon seemed to be having great difficulty in fund raising. I accordingly interested some friends in giving a luncheon at a club in one of our larger cities at which Mr. Lemmon and I spoke. Although 30 to 40 business leaders were present, having a net personal worth of probably in excess of $100,000,000, I believe that only about $2,500 in contributions was secured.

It is tragic that, while the Nazis were reported to be spending $200,000,000 for world propaganda in 1941, such comparatively insignificant amounts were available for short-wave broadcasting from this country. In 1941, when the Nazis were blanketing the Near East with broadcasts in the various Arab dialects, I asked Mr. Lemmon if he could not arrange for a broadcast in Arabic, but he advised that he knew of no suitable person. I appealed to a diplomatic friend, who located a Syrian rug salesman who had been educated in Beirut and who offered, if his moving expenses were paid to Boston, that he would broadcast without charge and support himself by rug selling. With the Nazis jamming BBC, it was tragic that this should have been the only voice opposing the Nazi Middle East propaganda in 1941.

We are fundamentally engaged in a war of ideas and it will be fatal if we throw away our weapons just because a few errors have been made in a large program. Unless we get the truth to the Russian people, how can we expect them to oppose any aggressive plans which their heirarchy may develop? Today apparently the only way we can get over the Iron Curtain is by the State Department Voice of America short-wave program and other educational activities.

We must also bring the truth to the other peoples in the world whose minds are being poisoned by Soviet propaganda. It is reported that the Soviet has over 1,400 branch headquarters in France alone. The British, in spite of their terrible financial problems, are reported to be spending about twice as much as our Voice of America program and Chile approximately 40 percent as much.

There is ample evidence of the great value of the Voice of America program throughout the world. As one illustration, when the Soviet officials arrested the leader of the Small Landowners' Party in Hungary, and the United States protested, the Soviet prevented the Hungarian papers from publishing the protest. The Voice of America broadcast, however, carried the news of our protest over the Iron Curtain into Hungary, and within a few days the American Embassy in Budapest received over 10,000 requests for information on our protest. The attacks by Ilya Ehrenburg and other Communists on the Voice of America program is another illustration of its effect and importance.

If ideas sell themselves spontaneously, as some have declared, then the billions of dollars being spent by American business on advertising is being wasted. But we know that the truth must come to men before the truth can make them free.

What would we think of a business enterprise which refused to spend one-tenth of 1 percent of its budget for public relations, which is approximately the ratio of the cost of the State Department Voice of America program to the total Federal budget. This $31,000,000 per year is equal to our cost of only a few hours of the Second World War, yet in the last analysis it may be the most important means of preventing a third world war.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK C. MCKEE.

Sugar Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harold L. Ickes from the Washington Star:

MAN TO MAN—HOUSEWIVES SHOULD ORGANIZE SUGAR MARCH ON AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

(By Harold L. Ickes)

All over the country fruits and berries are now or soon will be ripening. Housewives are washing up their home canning equipment. They might better be organizing a broom brigade for a march on the Agriculture Department.

A storm may be expected to arise when the housewives discover that they are not going to get any extra sugar for canning this year. Agriculture undoubtedly is perfecting excuses which will quiet the lowering storm. Its arguments will be that sugar is still in short supply, and that transportation is in a state. As a last resort it will make the appeal that anyway the sugar-rationing program was invented by the OPA, and hence is a vestigial remnant which ought to be preserved in a museum.

To meet the expected complaints the sugar officials have granted each person at least 35 pounds of sugar this year, an increase of 10 pounds over last year. But the joker in the proceeding lies in the lack of an extra allowance during the period when fruit is ripening.

COMPLAINTS OF "FAST ONE"

It was persistent complaints about the rationing of sugar that hastened the demise of the OPA and resulted in the present increased allotment to domestic civilian users. But by increasing the yearly allotment the Government has not softened the bitterness arising out of the unpleasant fact that, whereas last summer there was an allowance of an extra 10 pounds for canning, this summer the housewife has been promised a coupon for only 10 pounds of sugar which must last to September 30. It is no wonder that complaints have arisen that the Government has put over a fast one on the home canners for the benefit of the hand-me-down products.

The complaints have come chiefly from the women of the country, largely farm or suburban, who were unable to get sugar for canning last year and, as a result, were compelled to spend high prices for ready-made jellies and preserves. Certainly the complaints that I have received were from those who were thrifty enough to do their own canning and had the means to do so—all except the sugar. Home canning ought to be encouraged. It not only means a lower cost of living, it makes for the well-being of the family. Moreover, there are those who think that home-made jellies and jams generally speaking, are to be preferred to those made in factories.

Restricting the home on sugar is wonderful for the canning factory. When the housewife cannot can her own fruit, she is compelled to buy the factory's product at an inflated price, and because the housewife cannot can her own fruit, there is more fruit available for the commercial canneries at a deflated price. Moreover, regardless of price, the suburbanite or the farmer who produces small quantities of fruits for his own use is not equipped to pick and market that fruit. So it simply rots on the ground.

DEFENSE OF RATIONING

In defense of its rationing of sugar, Agriculture says that there is only so much sugar and that the industrial users have been cut as well as everyone else. What they do not say is that industrial users are now employing more sirups, as they are equipped to do, as a substitute for sugar. The production of corn sirup has doubled; that of cane refiners' sirup is up eight times over prewar production. These are not rationed. And most of this increased production is going to industrial and commercial users of sugar. Further, there is no scarcity—at least such

a scarcity as we have been asked to believe. In fact, the Cuban sugar crop this year is expected to be nearly a million tons greater than last year.

The American housewives would be willing to adjust themselves to a scarcity in supply. The substance of their complaint is that the sugar-rationing program has been used to change the buying habits of the Nation to the profit of the industrial users of sugar. They maintain that they have been short-changed on sugar so as to be compelled to buy manufactured products at high prices instead of using their home canning and baking facilities.

They feel that had it not been for the determined forcing of home canners into the market for manufactured products, the prices would have fallen long ago.

Our Government can do curious things at times. And so can our businessmen. They are all for a competitive market, they are for competition and individual initiative—or pretend to be—except when the competition and the individual initiative are real.

Fruit and Vegetable Market News Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, since 1915 the Fruit and Vegetable Market News Division of the United States Department of Agriculture has conducted a service for the benefit of growers and various trade groups concerned with the marketing of fruits and vegetables. At the present time this agency operates year-round offices in 22 of the larger terminal markets. In addition, throughout the course of a year approximately 40 seasonal field offices are operated during the active harvesting and marketing seasons in major producing areas. Through an interchange of information over the market news leased wire system these offices have kept growers, shippers, and other factors informed as to supplies, market conditions, and prices in important producing areas and in major terminal markets. This has made possible more effective distribution of the available supplies, so as to obtain the best returns. This system of daily reporting, with dissemination on a national basis, has also made it possible for growers and shippers to maintain a close check on returns being received.

An example of the seasonal field offices is the one which has been operated at Spartanburg, S. C., in my own district, for the past two summers during the peach season. Last year South Carolina topped all States in the shipment of fresh peaches, and Spartanburg County topped all counties in the Nation.

When South Carolina became a major peach-producing State producers and shippers realized they were at a disadvantage in not having complete market information available during the shipping season, so in response to urgent requests from growers and shippers in that area the Spartanburg office was opened in the summer of 1945. Last season the active mailing list of the Spartanburg office carried over 900 who received daily mailed reports. Most were South Carolina growers and shippers, although many reports were sent to distributors in terminal markets or producers in other nearby areas. The Spartanburg Herald and Spartanburg Journal and radio stations WSPA and WORD gave daily publicity to market reports furnished by the Spartanburg office. Through these various means of market news dissemination all interested parties were kept currently advised as to market conditions and prices in the South Carolina peach crop. I have been informed that the Department of Agriculture has received numerous favorable comments on the work done by this office at Spartanburg and I, myself, have received letters from the peach growers expressing their appreciation for the fine market news service furnished them by that office.

The cost to the Government of the Spartanburg office is slightly over $1,000 per season. The State of South Carolina, through the Clemson College extension service, cooperates to the extent of about $300. The Spartanburg office operates normally during a period of about 6 weeks. That office is of a type similar to about 80 percent of the seasonal offices and more than half of the terminal market offices, in that it is operated with one technical marketing specialist and one clerk. Because of the small personnel involved in the operation of such offices it is virtually impossible to reduce the cost of operation since the work cannot be handled by one individual. In view of this, any extensive reduction in funds could be absorbed only by the closing of certain offices, since the cost of operation has always been at a minimum level.

The important role played by the Spartanburg office is clearly indicated by the following statistics: Total rail shipments of peaches from South Carolina during the 1946 season were 9,396 carlots, as compared with 6,791 cars from Georgia and a United States total of 31,805 cars. In addition to rail movement, there was a fairly heavy truck movement from all the major peach-shipping areas. As compared with the 10-year average, the production of most States during the 1946 season was little changed. The one exception, however, was South Carolina, as this State's estimated production in 1946 was nearly three times as large as the 10-year average. No other State even doubled the production of the 10-year average period 1935–44. During the 1946 season South Carolina peaches were shipped to 33 States, the District of Columbia, Canada, and Cuba.

On the basis of statistics reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, South Carolina has another large peach crop in prospect for the forthcoming season. The April 10 crop report shows the condition of the South Carolina peach crop on April 1 at 85 percent of normal, which is three points higher than last year.

In view of the indispensable service of the Market News Division to the farmers and fruit growers and the consumers throughout the Nation, it is hoped that this agency may be continued at its present level of operation.

Danger Signals for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, at the time when we are considering the agricultural appropriation bill for the next fiscal year it seems appropriate that we consider some basic factors underlying our agricultural economy which are disturbing because they can lead to serious trouble if ignored.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Chester D. Tripp, published in January 1947:

People are fairly complacent about the agricultural price situation. The well-being of the people is high, consumption is high, crops are bountiful, the world needs our food, and will for some time. In addition to this, a beneficent Government has guaranteed parity prices on 20 of our important crops. So why worry? Between an assured big demand, an assured adequate price, and an assured large consumption it would seem as though time might be put in to better advantage than trying to look for trouble. It is generally a thankless job to be a dike inspector when the water is low. The inhabitants are usually complacent about the condition of the dike under such circumstances. Experience tells us that a timely survey of some of the salient points in the dike that might develop points of weakness are often warranted.

A discussion of the agricultural situation, with this in mind, might be interesting. We have data covering a very long period of agricultural prices and, strange as it may seem, these data disclose devastating maladjustments in the agricultural price structure in the years following great wars. History accounts for these upsets in different ways. In the great upset after the Napoleonic War, the literature indicates that agricultural prices went to pieces because the expansion of world shipping opened up great new sources of supply. After the Civil War we experienced another upset, which the commentators of the day felt was due to the opening of the West, which brought in a superabundance of supplies. The record indicates that after a short waiting period agricultural prices were nearly cut in two after World War I. It seems more logical to simply say that all great wars interfere with production and distribution than to try to give some definite reason for the occurrence. War, as such, brings great numbers of people to the verge of starvation. As a result, prices and production are increased wherever possible. As the world returns to normalcy and production and distribution improve, the weight of competition weighs heavily on the artificial price structure created by the war. In each important war of which we have record the price of agricultural products increased enormously during the war and then fell precipitately a short time after the war.

We have lately finished another war, during which prices advanced enormously, thus completing the first lap of the cycle; in fact, ceilings, quotas, incentives in one form or another were tried, but to no avail. The price structure of agricultural products is higher today than it has ever been in the memory of man.

Under such conditions, it does not seem as though one was going far afield to look for trouble, or, to put it another way, to look for repetition of the standard pattern. One outstanding thing is the well-known

fact that consumption of agricultural products is one of the most inflexible factors in all our economy. Well-being can be increased substantially without any great change in quantity of consumption. Abundant means increases the demand for quality goods, but the demand for calories is relatively inflexible. A ditch digger may acquire a million dollars but he does not change his food consumption in proportion by so doing. We are obviously dealing with a rigidity in consumption, and, for this reason, it is interesting to note what drastic price changes are necessary to cut production.

Production of agricultural items is surprisingly stable. There is the time lag of a crop year involved in most production. Many crops, such as fruits, are planned years in advance: They have to be marketed regardless of price at the time of their maturity. With this in mind, it is interesting to see what a drastic drop in prices took place in 1920 and what a relatively small effect this had on production.

Again, the decline in prices that started in 1929, went on for several years before average production was cut as much as 10 percent. We further note that at the present time, the volume of agricultural production is almost at its high point and the price range is at a new high.

The per capita domestic consumption is now at the high figure for all time, and agricultural exports for the year are very high. If either of these factors should decline, even slightly, on the record we face a set of facts that might lead to disturbing results. There is no reason to believe that the export demand will stay at this high point unless we are prepared to give food away. For economic reasons, we are getting more cautious in our giving and time is working against us, as around the world production is slowly being re-established. As far as the domestic situation is concerned, our population is consuming about 16 percent more food per capita than it ever did before, and it is not likely to increase that amount greatly.

To be sure we have another bulwark back of the price structure, and that is the parity arrangements with the Government. Prices are now on an average of 124 percent of parity, and, in theory, prices could drop to 90 percent of the parity figure without unduly reducing the purchasing power of the agricultural areas. Many of our requirements are priced well above parity but some prices are beginning to recede so that great quantities of material might be tendered to the Government under the guaranty. As an illustration, the enormous corn crop is just on a parity point and any further drop in the corn price might load the Government with an enormous amount of corn, because, under the law, the Government stands ready to pay parity to the grower for his product. Corn, on the other hand, is largely consumed in producing beef cattle and hogs. Both cattle and hog prices are well above parity. If, however, there should be a drop in these prices below parity, the principal market for corn would rest with the Government. We would then immediately be faced with storage problems, or arrangements for further donations, or long-term sales that might weigh heavily on balancing the budget.

The law covering agricultural parity only deals with twenty commodities out of some hundred that are recognized on the commodity list. Among these unrecognized commodities are a number of important crops that are very important in certain agricultural areas and to large groups of the population. Take, for example, the citrus fruit situation. Citrus fruits have no parity. Yet, their culture is of paramount interest in Florida, Texas, and California. It has enjoyed 3 years of excellent prices which have encouraged intensive cultivation and substantial new plantings. Now, as the result of good crops and the backing up of demand, we face a surplus of supply. The price dropped from $40 a ton to about $10 a ton. This new price is unrewarding to the grower. Grapefruit juice, based on this price, is literally as cheap as spring water. It is quite a question whether this drop in price will increase consumption as much as 10 percent. This break in price is slowly filtering through to retail channels. Juice canners find that their inventory has seriously backed up on their shelves. A number of plants are closed because they do not dare face the commercial risks involved in further manufacturing and, as a result, a demoralization is taking hold in these fruit-raising territories which is beginning to show itself in the spending habits of these communities.

Another example of oversupply that has already come to the surface, is the potato situation. I have personally seen tens of thousands of bushels of graded and sacked potatoes going to waste in the fields because there is no place to store them nor a market to put them on. Yet, there certainly are many people in the big cities who are eating low-grade potatoes at prices fully up to the parity figure. Obviously, the Government is in an embarrassing position. If potatoes are offered at great discounts to consumers, the market of the whole industry would become demoralized. Literally, we are facing an economic waste that is reminiscent of the days in Brazil when coffee was used for firing boilers. Although weakness has broken out only in a few spots, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the situation has been bolstered by great exports and that domestic consumption is at the highest figure it has ever been. These factors are alarming in themselves. When taken into consideration in the long-time record, however, the pattern without exception shows agricultural price demoralization after every great war. One is warranted in stopping and thinking before the trouble even starts.

I am not predicting a demoralization of agricultural prices. I am supplying some facts and figures which to my mind are thoroughly disturbing. Our price structure is out of line with the rest of the world on many items. The rest of the world's production is beginning to increase again, and I think we should be mentally prepared for something of an upset in our exports. The laws governing parity prices may help for a minute but if these parity prices are too high to limit production, they only develop further complications such as added donations, or congested storage, or actual destruction of food. Parts of the world have gone through a period of 5 years without having enough to eat. We are not going into a period where there is too much to eat, but we may be facing a period where there is more than we can eat and more than the other fellow can pay for.

Agriculture is not an industry unto itself. Its well-being has profound psychological effects, in that the problems this industry faces in regard to prices may easily be reflected in the affairs of other economic groups.

CHESTER D. TRIPP.

The Late Reverend Edward T. Dunne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following inspiring eulogy in tribute to the exemplary piety of Rev. Father Edward T. Dunne, which was delivered by Rev. Father Cornelius Sherlock, diocesan superintendent of schools, Boston, at the funeral mass at St. Patrick's Church, South Lawrence, Mass., on Saturday, May 24, 1947:

"He that shall do and teach, he shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven." Matthew 5: 19.

Right Reverend Monsignori, Reverend Fathers, Reverend Brothers and Sisters, relatives and friends of Father Dunne, the emotions that weigh upon our hearts this morning are many. Probably the most assertive is a feeling of loss that one so loved and so revered has left our earthly paths to walk the streets of another world. And so we do well to express our sympathy to one another and to pray that the pain of this bereavement may not be too great for our all too human hearts to bear. To Father Dunne's mother, and to his brothers and sisters we promise our prayers that God may lighten the burden of their sorrow and console them by their excellence of his now completed priestly life. To the priests with whom he lived and worked we express our sorrow for the loss they have sustained. We, the companions of his student days, who prepared with him for the life in God's vineyard, tell to each other our mutual sadness that one whom we admired and loved has left us. To the sisters and the children we hesitate to put in words our feelings for their great loss. They had too great a share of his interest and devoted care. To his friends, the faithful of Saint Patrick's, and that other multitude who knew and loved him at other times and in other places we extend our condolence at the loss of their priestly friend.

But if the thoughts of sympathy and sorrow seem to be uppermost in our minds they are not the most important truths of which we should be conscious. The Church, still mindful of the sadness of deserted friends, would remind us that death is really the vestibule of heaven, that, after all, Catholics are always preparing for their last day on earth as a time when the cares and heartaches, the trials and disappointments of life are shuffled off. She would drive home to our minds the fact that death is a gateway through which those who have served God well move into an eternity of endless, or infinite happiness. The truth is that Father Dunne, deep and intense as his love for us really is, would not return from the joys of Heaven. He would rather tell us that time is at most a passing instant and that, if we will but follow the commandments and counsels of our Lord, we will join him in his happiness in God's own good time. Laughter and tears have a way of being strangely mixed in this uneven life of ours but for Catholics, even in such deep sadness as this, the fact of our eternal destiny transcends our sorrow and make today rich in the reality of a priest's ineffable reward as he enters into the heavenly home an all-loving Father has prepared for him.

Father Dunne was on the point of completing his nineteenth year as a priest in the archdiocese of Boston. Actually he and I had arranged to have dinner together tomorrow evening to observe the anniversary of our ordination to review a little the 19 years that have passed and to plan ahead for priestly work in the future. But such plans are always, at most, tentative. Quite clearly, man proposes, but God disposes.

Ordained on the 25th of May 1928, Father Dunne was assigned to the parish in Ayer for the summer. When autumn came he was transferred to Saint Paul's in Wellesley where his long and deep friendship with Monsignor Daly began. Eight years in Wellesley were followed by a shorter assignment to the parish of the Immaculate Conception in Newburyport. He then came here

to Saint Patrick's to spend the last eight years of his life working again with Monsignor Daly, but now for the people of South Lawrence.

If he had a characteristic which stood out above all others, it was his intense devotion to children. In his earlier priesthood in Wellesley there was no parish school but there two important groups of young people found in him a zealous friend and prudent guide. It was there that he developed with great succees his work with Catholic Boy Scouts. I remember well the eagerness with which he outlined plans for his charges and the satisfaction he reflected with each succeeding achievement. This activity developed, in more recent years, into his extensive work for Scouting in this area. His interest and ability were widely recognized and, as you know, he served as commissioner for the Catholic Boy Scouts of Essex County.

He was concerned too, in those earlier years, with the problems of Catholic students in non-Catholic colleges and carried on, with great expenditure of time and energy a very successful program among the Catholic students at Wellesley College. From time to time in later years the evidence of the excellence of this work appeared in the letters he received from far places of the world, from former students to whom his guidance was still proving a compass in perplexity or an anchor in some stormy reach of life.

When he came here to South Lawrence the opportunity for which he seemed most fitted presented itself. Here was an excellent parish school. With the encouragement of his pastor and friend, he entered into school work with high purpose and unbounded energy. Despite the exactions of busy parish life he studiously prepared himself for school work. He became interested in every educational problem that appeared and left no stone unturned to help boys and girls in their quest for happiness. The Sisters came to know him as a generous, sound and realistic friend who worked tirelessly with them in every way that would assure success for the educational program. Their loss in him will not be easily forgotten.

Through all his activity there appeared a constantly reiterated philosophy that reduced itself to the irrefutable question, "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul." Teaching with him was to make children happy and in his scheme of things even temporal happiness and success must be so attained that it will lead his children inevitably to heaven.

I remember well a week we passed together in Maine in which much of our time was spent in studying some smaller forms of marine life in the great tide pools at the rocky edge of the sea. One day while we were wondering at the beautiful complexities and obvious purpose of some tiny organisms, he said, almost wistfully, "If we could only hold classes here on this magnificent coast, how much more effectively we could explain to children the power and wonder of God." That night he left for South Lawrence bringing back with him great water jars of sea life that his teachers, and later the children, might examine these marvelous creatures and understand more clearly some truths of science and envision more fully the power of God who created such wonders of the sea.

But he saw the growth of children in mind and soul as a problem much broader than the school and so it was that he took particular delight in his work with the Holy Family Sodality. "Children," he would say, "are so largely the products of their homes." He could say this with a natural logic for he himself illustrated in his life the wondrous influence of his own parents, parents whose teaching and example gave two priests to God and a daughter to His service. Through the mothers and future mothers of Lawrence he still worked valiantly for the welfare of children. The broader aspects of community life also claimed his attention. Non-Catholic and Catholic alike knew him as one concerned about community affairs. He worked willingly with any group that aimed at community improvement. The ultimate reason again was that his children would one day be adults in this community and his continuing love for children was a compelling force that made him work for an even better society in which they might live.

Father Dunne had no personal ambitions, no thirst for fame, no quest for honors. In fact, in regard to himself, he was singularly reticent. All he desired was the opportunity to work, to bring God to others in the mass and the sacraments, to teach, to teach others to use God's graces, to teach his boys and girls to be happy here and happy for eternity. He didn't seek, not even expect thanks for his work but like the exiled patriarch of Patmos sought "no greater grace than this, to see all his children walk in the way of truth."—3 John 1: 4.

We who are gathered here today cannot view this occasion as one of unalloyed sorrow. Ours is not a ceremony of farewell but rather one of brief separation from one whom we shall later join in unending heavenly joy. The sacrifice with which we mark his going is not an offering ending in death but rather a sacrifice that renews life, a life of the souls of men, a life that will never end. This moment is, in reality, a time of congratulation that one who served God well, beyond the usual measure of men, now faces our Lord to hear the ancient commendation: "Well done * * * enter into the joy of the Lord."

Father Dunne has been a doer of the word of God and a teacher of His truth. It is of such that the Lord said: "He that shall do and teach shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven."—Matthew 5: 19.

Newsweek Presents Remarkable Survey—What Communists Are Up To: Intrigue and Infiltration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities I desire to call attention to an article from the June 2 issue of Newsweek magazine. This is indeed a remarkable and a noteworthy article. It is a comprehensive, carefully detailed analysis of Communist activities and influences in the United States. It names names, cites cases, and identifies the media relied upon by Red Fascists to spread the atheistic doctrine of communism. It should be read and thoughtfully studied by all Americans.

The article follows:

WHAT COMMUNISTS ARE UP TO: INTRIGUE AND INFILTRATION—ENEMY WITHIN THE GATES

In a Federal court in the Nation's Capital last week, a small wisp of a man named Carl Aldo Marbani stood with clenched hands and blanching face listening to the reading of the verdict on each of 11 charges against him. The charges intoned by the jury foreman, all involving concealment of Communist affiliations while in Government employ, were not new to the Italian-born Marbani; in the course of his 11-day trial he had heard them many times. But now the dread word "guilty" uttered after each and every one of them sent him white.

Small wonder that Marbani's conviction brought joy to the Department of Justice; although every high official in Washington has long known that Communist penetration into the Government has attained serious proportions, this trial was the first of its kind. To Attorney General Tom C. Clark, the door was wide open to press the administration's $25,000,000 program to eliminate Communists from the Federal pay roll.

How far? What not a few Americans asked was, If Marbani, a Communist Party member under the name of "Tony Whales," could insinuate himself into a wartime job in the highly secret Office of Strategic Services (he picked targets for the Doolittle raid on Tokyo) and could later enjoy a $7,175-a-year State Department position, how far had Communists been able to penetrate other phases of American life where surveillance of key figures could not begin to match the Government's screening of its employees?

To close students of the Communist conspiracy, like David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, "No organization in American life has been immune from Communist penetration. * * * Labor unions have been their special target * * * [but] obedient to centralized direction, Communists have bored within church bodies, educational institutions, women's clubs, scientific groups, and, believe it or not, businessmen's associations."

If most Americans, natively nonconspirational in the first place, found it difficult to believe that a small band of zealots, numbering not more than 70,000 party members and a half million or so fellow travelers, could wield the power of a potential "fifth column," it was not to be wondered at. Nevertheless, the evidence, if examined with reasonable patience, could not be denied.

1. FRONTS AND BACKERS

When the anti-Communist movement of the twenties was at its zenith, the party went underground. Today its tactic is different. Party members, blatant during the war, are making themselves inconspicuous, but are laboring more furiously than ever through fellow travelers and innocent liberals who have never grasped the fact that the Communist Party's policies and strategy are guided solely by Soviet interests.

Consequently, the Communists work through fronts—innocent-appearing outfits with idealistic-sounding names, organized for specific purposes. These groups often succeed in attracting many non-Communist liberals, and occasionally even stanch conservatives.

Often, the Communists move into already established liberal organizations and seize control. They did this with the American Labor Party in New York. The Communist-controlled ALP has been quite successful. It has elected one member to Congress, Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, and two New York City Councilmen, Michael Quill and Eugene Connolly, who work hand-in-glove with two councilmen elected on the Communist Party ticket, Benjamin Davis, Jr., and Robert Cacchione.

Change here for Moscow: The case of the Progressive Citizens of America is characteristic of the way Communists can infiltrate liberal organizations and make them soap boxes for Communist propaganda.

The Independent Voters Committee, later renamed the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and the National Citizens Political Action Committee, now merged in the PCA, started out in 1944 for one purpose—to reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt. Although the Communist Party later openly boasted that it had done much to build up the Independent Citizens Committee, both the ICC and the NCPAC at

first were relatively straightforward New Deal outfits.

After the election, however, they started veering more and more from concern with domestic reform to propaganda for the Soviet Union. The change-over was complete by last December, when the merger into the PCA took place.

Jo Davidson is cochairman, but the real boss is Hannah Dorner, executive vice chairman. Miss Dorner denies that she is pro-Communist but she has traveled for years in pro-Communist circles. Among the PCA vice chairmen are Paul Robeson, Van Wyck Brooks, Lillian Hellman, and Clark Foreman—all of whom have been identified for years with Communist fronts.

Current PCA heroes are Henry A. Wallace and Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, and the principal PCA activities consist of issuing manifestoes against the Truman doctrine and staging pro-Soviet rallies in Madison Square Garden, with all the carefully planned theatrics which once characterized the Nazi rallies at Nuremberg.

Other Communist-front organizations currently engaging in political activities include:

The National Committee to Win the Peace. This was organized in April 1946, with the blessings of two Senators, PEPPER and GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho; 20 Representatives, and the NCPAC. It set up shop in New York, under control of the remnants of the American Peace Mobilization, which had broken up after Hitler attacked Russia. The national director is Abbott Simon, former member of the Young Communist League, who helped to found the American Peace Mobilization. Cochairmen are Marine Col. Evans F. Carlson and Paul Robeson. Robert W. Kenny, who recently was praised by Pravda, is a vice president. The organization devotes itself to attacking American foreign policy, but has grown less active since the Progressive Citizens of America was formed.

Civil Rights Congress: This was an official merger of the International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party, which Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, of New York, headed, and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which the Communists organized after the American Civil Liberties Union voted to ban them. The group is currently engaged in defending Gerhart Eisler, the Soviet agent.

The National Veterans Committee: Communists were drafted into the Army like anyone else, so there are several thousand veterans in the party. Under the name of the National Veterans Committee, many recently went to Washington to demonstrate against the Truman doctrine.

Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee: This organization gained considerable respectability during the war, harvesting the names of many good people who opposed nazism and fascism and wanted to help their victims. Since the war, however, it has been devoting its attentions to professional Communists, among them, Eisler.

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship: Ever since the Communist Party was established, it has kept one front or another in operation to promote sympathy for the Soviet Government. Usually the principal sponsor has been Corliss Lamont. No front ever amounted to much until Russia became an ally during the war. Then, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship suddenly blossomed with conservative, respectable names like those of Senators ARTHUR CAPPER and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and Judge Learned Hand. Since the war, the council has driven away the conservatives, as well as many New Dealers such as ex-Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, by its constant attacks on the United States' foreign policy, and especially the Baruch plan for international atomic control.

2. INFILTRATION IN THE CIO

Paradoxically, the man who brought the Communist Party into the CIO and the man who shelters it there are both bitterly anti-Communist. Although John L. Lewis has always kept the door closed to Communists in his own union—the United Mine Workers of America—nevertheless, when he was starting the CIO he put Communists by the score on the organization's pay roll.

Lewis needed skilled organizers, and he didn't care where he found them. And when David Dubinsky, the nimble-witted president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, warned him that he was banking trouble, the massive Lewis, who towers over Dubinsky, haughtily rumbled:

"Dave, who gets the bird—the hunter or the dog?"

Years passed. Lewis's unyielding isolationism and his opposition to Franklin D. Roosevelt caused the mine leader and the CIO to part company. Adolf Hitler's double-cross of Joseph Stalin changed the Communists from isolationists and partisans of Lewis to war mongers and avowed enemies of their former favorite labor leader. Dubinsky met Lewis in Washington.

"John," he said, "who gets the bird—the hunter or the dog?"

Lewis confessed that Dubinsky had been right, and he, wrong. Once the Communists had been let into the CIO, it was almost impossible to get them out.

Under Philip Murray, numerous attempts to oust the Communists have been made. Not all the anti-Communists in the CIO are right-wingers. Some, like Walter Reuther, the youthful redhead who runs the United Auto Workers, are old-time Socialists. In spite of the newspaper headlines, they have failed to shake the Communist grip appreciably. A devout Catholic, who takes guidance from priests sympathetic to labor, Murray has consistently encouraged the anti-Communist bloc. But just as consistently, the CIO president has inconsistently kept them from taking drastic action.

In the heirarchy: Murray's right-hand man is still Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO, who follows the Communist Party line. The editor of the official CIO weekly, the CIO News, is still Len De Caux. An indication of whose orders De Caux follows and where his sympathies lie can be gained from the way he treats stories about Communists in the CIO. In the CIO News, the CIO resolution of last November decrying Communist Party activities was headlined: "CIO reaffirms Americanism." In the CIO publication, Steel Labor, which is run by Murray, the headline was: "CIO warns Communists: Don't meddle in unions."

The consequence is that Communists and fellow travelers now control CIO unions totaling 25 percent of the organization's membership of 5,600,000.

Murray's solicitude for the Communists springs from the fact that every serious attempt to oust them has materially weakened the CIO. When fellow traveler Morris Muster finally broke with the Communists and resigned as president of the United Furniture Workers of America, at the same time blasting the secret Communist Party rule, the union nearly disintegrated. Several locals quit and joined the AFL.

Similarly, the attempts of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists to shake the Communist control of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, and the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers have succeeded in weakening not the Communists but the unions themselves.

In all, there are now 15 CIO unions controlled by the Communists or fellow travelers:

United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers (membership, 600,000): Albert J. Fitzgerald is the president and non-Communist front man. The real power is wielded by Julius Emspak, general secretary-treasurer, and James J. Matles, organization director. Both are smart, able, tireless, and effective. And both have long records as fellow travelers. During the early thirties they were identified with the Trade Union Unity League, the Communist party's now-defunct dual trade-union movement. During the Hitler-Stalin pact, Emspak was listed on the letterhead of the American Peace Mobilization, the Communist Yanks-Aren't-Coming outfit, as national council member. As far back as 1933, the Communist Daily Worker quoted Matles: "Only the Communist party, as the party of the working class, represents the interests of the entire working population."

Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers (membership, 125,000): The president is Maurice E. Travis, who succeeded party-liner Reid Robinson in March, when the latter was forced out by anti-Communists. Travis had previously been expelled from the United Steel Workers, Murray's own union, for spending union funds on Communist-party activities.

The Fur and Leather Workers (membership, 100,000): President Ben Gold is that rarity, an open Communist Party member.

National Maritime Union (membership, 100,000): After studiously following the Communist-party line for 10 years, President Joseph Curran, an ex-seaman himself, finally broke with the Communists. Curran claims there are only 500 party members in the NMU. Nevertheless, he admits that "107 of the 150 elected officials * * * are Communists."

Farm Equipment and Metal Workers (membership, 75,000): Grant W. Oakes is the rugged-faced, aggressive president of this union, which has no appreciable opposition to its consistent pro-Communist line.

Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers (membership, 75,000): The president is Donald Henderson, onetime economics instructor at Rutgers and Columbia. Neither Henderson nor his union has ever wavered from the party line.

United Office and Professional Workers of America (membership, 50,000): Until recently, President Lewis Merrill was contributing editor of the Communist New Masses and taught at the Communist Jefferson School in New York. After the CIO's anti-Communist policy statement, he resigned both posts. However, when the Daily Worker attacked Merrill for this, his UOPWA immediately took pains to emphasize that it had not turned anti-Communist. Within the CIO, the UOPWA is considered so pro-Communist that office workers in the employ of the national organization, though clearly within the UOPWA's jurisdiction, nevertheless have formed their own independent union.

Transport Workers Union (membership, 50,000): This is the property of Michael J. Quill, who is also New York City councilman. The membership of the union is predominantly Catholic and predominantly of Irish extraction. Quill himself is that paradox: A practicing Catholic, he also follows the Communist Party line. After Germany attacked Russia, Quill had trouble in his union: His anti-British membership could not understand his switch to interventionism. This problem no longer bothers him.

American Communications Association (membership, 25,000): Joseph Selly is the Communist-line president of this union.

United Public Workers of America (membership, 50,000): The UPWA was formed in amalgamation of the State, County, and Municipal Workers and the Federal Workers of America. The president is Abram Flaxer, who had been president of the former; the secretary-treasurer is Eleanor Nelson, who had been president of the latter. Flaxer and Miss Nelson both are inveterate party-liners.

Characteristically, at its organizing convention, the union denounced all forms of imperialism—except the Russian.

United Furniture Workers of America (membership, 50,000): Since Munster's resignation as president, the Communists have made their grip on the union even tighter. Party-liner Morris Pizer is the president now.

Inland Boatmen's Union of the Pacific (membership 5,000), National Marine Cooks' and Stewards' Association (membership 10,000), International Union of Fishermen and Allied Workers of America (membership 10,000), and International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (membership 50,000): Harry Bridges is president of the longshoremen's union and dominates the other three west coast maritime organizations. A crafty, smooth operator, Bridges at one time also dominated the entire CIO on the west coast, but Murray stripped him of that power.

The Communist Party has devoted particular attention to waterfront unions. Although it has never been able to gain complete domination over American shipping, it nevertheless has always had grandiose ideas. The most recent was Bridges's plan for welding all longshoremen's and seamen's unions into one Committee for Maritime Unity. The plan foundered when Joseph Curran, realizing that it would push him into the background in his own union, broke with the Communists.

But, even without the Committee for Maritime Unity, the Communists have managed to gain control of many of the men who load and man the Nation's merchant ships. In the event of war, Bridges' longshoremen's union could tie up shipping on the west coast, while the National Maritime Union could cripple it seriously in the Atlantic. And Selly's American Communications Association, which mans ship radios, could disrupt American communications at sea. With Communists or fellow travelers dominating unions representing 25 percent of the CIO membership, the havoc they could inflict on industry generally in the opening weeks of a war would be difficult to calculate.

3. INROADS IN THE AFL

"We don't have any Communists in the American Federation of Labor," aging President William Green declared last September. The statement was only half true. The Communists have not been as successful in the AFL as they have in the CIO. Nevertheless, they and their fellow travelers do considerably influence several AFL unions:

The Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers: This is the only AFL union represented in the World Federation of Trade Unions, which the AFL itself refused to join because Russia dominates it. The majority of the brotherhood is non-Communist, but several of the officials are devoted party liners. The secretary-treasurer of the New York local is Louis Weinstock, an open member of the party. In the Midwest, the union is headed by Courtney D. Ward of Cleveland, who denies membership in the party but follows the party line.

The Conference of Studio Union: This consists of about 10 Hollywood locals. One of the leaders is Herbert F. Sorrell, who unquestionably is pro-Communist.

The Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance: Here, again, the Communists have made inroads. The New York local, which has between 30,000 and 40,000 members, is controlled by them.

The Bakery and Confectionery Workers Union: The Communists are especialy strong in the New York and Chicago locals.

For years, the Communists have been openly dissatisfied with the small progress they have made in the AFL, as compared with their power in the CIO. According to J. Edgar Hoover, there recently has been agitation in the party to reorganize to influence the AFL.

Hoover's information: "A party functionary said it was imperative that 3,000 party members be infiltrated in the AFL without publicizing this fact."

4. MINORITY REPORT

The Communists have always paid especial attention to minority groups—Jews, Negroes, and immigrants—and for obvious reasons. Theoretically, they should be fertile ground for Communist propaganda. Many of them are extremely poor; many, like the Negroes, have long-standing grievances. The Jews, realizing that anti-Semitism exists in the United States and remembering always what happened in Germany, naturally are insecure. Moreover, since Hitler was anti-Red, the Communists can argue that anyone who denounces communism must be sympathetic to nazism. The assertion, is not precisely logical, nevertheless is occasionally effective.

The immigrants sometimes have sentimental memories of their homelands, and if those lands are now in the Soviet orbit, the Communists can attempt to convert the memories into attachment for Russia.

Foreign fronts: The most important pro-Communist group working among minorities, the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, covers all minority groups except the Jews and Negroes. Among its major activities is protecting foreign-born Communists from deportation.

In addition, there are individual front groups for almost every foreign-language group: The American Slav Congress, which supports Russian grabs in eastern Europe; American Relief for Greek Democracy, meaning the guerrillas; and the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, meaning Tito. The most recent front is the American Society for Cultural Relations With Italy, meaning the Italian Communists.

Among Negroes, the principal front is the National Negro Congress, whose Communist ties are so clear that President Philip Murray has forbidden CIO unions to affiliate with it. Others include the Council on African Affairs and the United Negro and Allied Veterans of America. None has made appreciable progress, and the Communists have therefore begun to move into the old-line National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The major Jewish organization is the American Jewish Labor Council, frequently confused with the militantly anti-Communist Jewish Labor Committee. Its principal accomplishment recently was in getting sober, extensive treatment in some unsuspecting newspapers of a report from a delegation which recently visited Poland. For members of a Communist-front group, the delegates reached a conclusion that was hardly surprising. They declared Poland was "democratic."

5. THE LINE IN THE CHURCHES

As practicing Marxists, the Communists naturally oppose all religion. As practical men, they keep as quiet as possible about it. Instead, they seek to work inside the churches; denying what Marx and Lenin constantly affirmed—that communism is the deadly enemy of religion—and representing themselves as striving for the same earthly, if not spiritual, goals as the church. They have made no progress whatever among Catholic priests, who actively fight them, and very little among Jewish rabbis. But they have enlisted several valuable allies in the Protestant churches:

Dr. Harry F. Ward, professor emeritus at Union Theological Seminary, has long been associated with communism. A one-time chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union, he resigned when the board voted to ban Communists. Ward frequently has spoken at Communist rallies in praise of the Soviet Union, and he lectures occasionally at the Red-sponsored Jefferson School.

Until recently, the Reverend Stephen H. Fritchman was director of the Unitarian Youth Activities and editor of the Christian Register, official Unitarian monthly. Constantly under fire on charges of using both positions to promote communism, he resigned from the former and 2 weeks ago was ousted from the latter. He has written for the New Masses, and sponsored no less than 22 pro-Soviet organizations, including the "Yanks Are Not Coming" movement and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

The Reverend William Howard Melish is associate rector of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Holy Trinity in Brooklyn. He is chairman of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Melish has long denied being pro-Communist, but 2 years ago he wrote a eulogy of communism for the Churchman, an Episcopal magazine, which the Daily Worker reproduced in full.

The Protestant, despite its pretensions, is not affiliated with any official Protestant group, but its editor, Kenneth Leslie, nevertheless, has managed to attract the support of many prominent Protestant ministers, including the Reverend Louie D. Newton, president of the Southern Baptist Convention. Like the Communists, it turned overnight from isolationism to interventionism when Hitler attacked Russia. Currently it follows the party in support of Henry Wallace and in opposition to the Baruch plan for atomic control and to the Truman doctrine.

6. PARTY IN PRINT

The Communist Party is crowded with writers and would-be writers, second-raters mostly, but prolific, nevertheless, and from Communist presses flows an unending stream of newspapers, magazines, books, and pamphlets. Some are officially Communist, written by and for Communist Party members in the party's strange, multisyllabic jargon. Others are designed to gain mass circulation; consequently they sugar-coat their propaganda.

The principal official Communist publication is the Daily Worker (circulation 23,000) and its Sunday edition (circulation 67,000). In New York, which has an enormous Jewish population, the party also publishes the Yiddish-language daily, Freiheit (circulation 21,000). The weekly New Masses provides Communists with their major cultural fare; and Political Affairs, a monthly, contains theoretical articles for the heavier thinkers among the faithful.

The People's World, published in San Francisco, could be called the west-coast edition of the Daily Worker. The New World, published in Seattle, is not officially Communist. But as the mouthpiece of Hugh De Lacy, a party-liner and former University of Washington instructor, who once managed to get elected to Congress, its editorials can hardly be distinguished from those in the Worker itself.

A relatively new arrival in Detroit, the Michigan Herald clearly speaks for the party there. The Chicago Star is the Communist Party organ for that part of the Midwest. Its featured columnist is Howard Fast, of the New Masses staff.

Pocket propaganda: Easily the most successful of the publications which, though denying any connection with the party, nevertheless doggedly follow the party line, are In Fact and Reader's Scope. In Fact, whose circulation runs to around 176,000, is especially popular among professionals, including university professors. In four small pages, issued weekly, it purports to give the low-down on the news, which it maintains is kept from readers of the daily newspapers by corrupt, reactionary publishers.

George Seldes, who publishes In Fact, customarily replies to charges of being pro-Communist with loud denials and threats of suit for libel. Nevertheless his staff has invariably had Communists and fellow travelers

on it, and In Fact continues to echo faithfully the editorials in the Daily Worker.

Reader's Scope is published by Leverett Gleason, who also was publisher of the now-defunct party-line magazine Friday, and who founded Salute. Gleason no longer publishes Salute, which nevertheless still contains several Communists and fellow travelers in its stable of former Yank and Stars and Stripes writers. Among them are DeWitt Gilpin, well-known Communist editor and organizer; Len Zinberg, who has written for the Daily Worker; and James Dugan, formerly an editor of the New Masses.

Bait and dope: Reader's Scope attempts to compete with the Reader's Digest and, indeed, looks very much like it. Many of its articles could well appear in the Digest; they are light reading, devoid of political message. They are only bait.

Scattered among them are less frivolous articles. Each issue contains eight pages of so-called inside dope about Washington and world affairs, which invariably read like the month's output of Daily Worker editorials, boiled down and recast. And each issue also contains two or three pieces by Communist favorites. Reader's Scope, for example, reprinted Fast's "The American." It also reprinted excerpts from Elliott Roosevelt's "As He Saw It," which is the way the Communists happen to see it now.

The editor of Reader's Scope is party-liner E. A. Piller. Until recently the foreign editor was another party-liner, Johannes Steel. And Gleason, himself was recently accused in court of having at one time joined the Communist Party under the pseudonym of Alexander Lev.

The left-wingers have a favorite book club, the Book Find Club, which claims more than 75,000 subscribers. Among its policy-makers have been Isidor Schneider, avowed Communist and member of the New Masses staff, and another pro-Communist, Vivian Sharp.

The Book Find Club at times distributes the books of anti-Communists; for example Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr.'s Age of Jackson. But most of its selections are either the work of party members or else are on themes which chance to coincide with the party line of the moment. In February 1945 it listed some "close friends." They were: William Gropper, New Masses associate editor; Alfred Kreymborg, New Masses contributing editor; Howard Fast, New Masses associate editor; Henrietta Buckmaster, New Masses writer; E. Louise Mally, instructor at the Communist Jefferson School, and William Mandel, author of the pro-Soviet Guide to the Soviet Union.

Not all the fellow-traveling writers and editors work in pro-Communist organizations, however. Many are employed by reputable publishers and publications, where they occasionally manage to influence editorial policy. Daniel S. Gillmor, who helped Gleason found Friday, is now associate editor centering on development at the Survey Graphic. Richard O. Boyer writes for the New Yorker. Other prominent writers who have aided the Communists include Dashiell Hammett, Louis Adamic, Albert Maltz, Donald Ogden Stewart, Langston Hughes, Clifford Odets, Dorothy Parker, Lillian Hellman, and Ruth McKenney, who has been expelled from the party but still announces herself as pro-Communist.

In New York, center of the publishing business in the United States, the Communists have long controlled the Newspaper Guild, which has contracts with newspapers and magazines and claims a membership in the New York writing profession of 8,100.

7. IN BRIGHT LIGHTS

Just why so many Hollywood and Broadway celebrities have joined Communist fronts in recent years would be difficult to say. The fact remains, however, that many of the fronts now dazzle with their names. Some of the celebrities are clearly pro-Communist. Paul Robeson, the singer, for example, makes no secret of his sympathy for the party. Others, like Dashiell Hammett, the writer, are obviously not innocents either. Still others, however, appear merely to have been caught in the Communist swirl.

For the Communists, the value of the celebrities is hard to overestimate. Most of them know little or nothing about politics. But their mere presence on committees and at rallies is certain to attract other people. Among those persistently found in Communist fronts are Edward G. Robinson, Orson Welles, Norman Corwin, Fredric March, Canada Lee, Earl Robinson, Herman Shumlin, Olivia De Havilland, John Garfield, and Lionel Stander.

Although fellow travelers are numerous in Hollywood, they have not exercised as great an influence on the movies as they wish. Communists frequently have boasted that they were able to get a few propaganda lines in this or that production. On Broadway, however, the pro-Communist influence is greater. In writing for the stage, authors with leftiest sympathies can be more outspoken.

On the air: At one time or another, party liners and fellow travelers have managed to get on the radio as commentators. The party's two favorites, Johannes Steel and William S. Gailmor, recently lost their jobs, but J. Raymond Walsh, nimble-tongued research director of the Progressive Citizens of America, still broadcasts daily over station WMCA.

The major Communist attempt to spread propaganda by radio was balked when the Federal Communications Commission recently denied the application of the People's Radio Foundation for an FM station. The sponsors of the foundation included some of the best-known names in Communist and fellow-traveler circles: Frederick V. Field, wealthy backer of Communist enterprises; Norman Corwin; Howard Fast, novelist; William Grooper, cartoonist for the Communist press; Leverett Gleason, publisher of Reader's Scope; Rockwell Kent, artist; Max Yergan, secretary of the Communist-controlled Council on African Affairs; Charlie Chaplin; and A. A. Heller, Communist "angel."

TYPEWRITER FIGHTERS

There were Justice Department men at the first underground convention at which the Communist Party was organized in 1922, and the FBI has steadfastly kept an eye on its activities ever since. Department files bulge with data on individual Communists and fellow travelers, with reports on secret meetings, and even with recordings of secret conversations.

The Department has always preferred not to publicize its findings, because doing so would hamstring its work by warning the individuals that were being watched. But newspapermen and writers have not been under any such handicap. Five men stand out as relentless pioneers in the fight to expose Communist infiltration:

Isaac Don Levine: Dean of the anti-Communists, Levine served abroad for The Chicago Daily News and later, the Hearst newspapers. Among his books are: The Russian Revolution, The Man Lenin, The Road to Oblivion, and Red Smoke. Recently he started a new magazine, Plain Talk, a monthly devoted to baring Communist and other totalitarian activities.

Max Eastman: A onetime radical, Eastman was editor of The Masses during the First World War. He now is a roving editor of The Reader's Digest. His books include: Since Lenin Died, Leon Trotsky, Marxism: Is It Science, Stalin's Russia and the Crisis in Socialism, and The End of Socialism in Russia.

William Henry Chamberlin: A newspaperman since 1917, Chamberlin covered Russia and later the Far East for The Christian Science Monitor. He is the author of Soviet Russia, The Soviet Planned Economic Order, Russia's Iron Age, The Russian Revolution, and Collectivism—a False Utopia. He is now a columnist on The New Leader and a correspondent and columnist for The Wall Street Journal.

Eugene Lyons: After working for The Soviet Russia Pictorial and Tass, the official Soviet news agency, Lyons went to Moscow in 1928 as correspondent for the United Press. While there, he got the first interview with Stalin after the latter's rise to power. More recently Lyons has been editor of The American Mercury and Pageant. His books include: Moscow Carrousel, Assignment in Utopia, Stalin, Czar of All the Russias, and The Red Decade.

Frederick Woltman: Winner of the 1946 Pulitzer prize for reporting for his exposés of Communist-front activities. Woltman has been with the New York World-Telegram for 18 years. It was he who identified Gerhart Eisler as the mysterious Hans Berger, reputed head of Communist activities in the United States. His disclosure of the pro-Soviet propaganda of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship led to mass resignations from the organization.

Communism in America today is under the heaviest fire it has ever experienced. The Truman doctrine for containment of Soviet expansion, the Government's anti-Communist domestic policy, and the movement of American liberals to drive Communists out of their ranks have stirred the public to a new awareness. Compared with the hysterical anti-Bolshevik drive which followed the First World War, the present movement is a far more realistic and intelligent effort to combat Communists. The main gimmick: The possibility that the public—as it did after the last war—may weary of the anti-Communist fight, leaving the door open once more to the masters of political and economic infiltration.

Department of Agriculture Appropriations, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, hailing from an agricultural section as I do and believing in the agricultural program established by this Congress, I naturally regret the attempted meat-ax destruction of that program by the Republican members of the Appropriations Committee. I am confident that no Democratic member voted for such destruction.

It is deplorable for agricultural research to stop and equally so for farmers to lose the protection they have been so justly receiving as the result of section 32 funds. This morning one of my Republican friends referred to these funds as having been a gravy train for certain segments of agriculture. Gravy train or not, whether desirable or not, whether worth while or not, having been set aside for this purpose by this Congress, the Republican-controlled Appropriations Committee has no right to unconscionably withdraw these funds as has occurred.

In fact, regrettable though it is for the progress of agriculture to be hampered and the production of food and

fiber to be reduced, as will result from this Republican attack, I am possibly even more disturbed by the attempt to cause this Congress to fail to meet its obligations—to carry out its promises. I am a great believer in integrity and straight shooting. I never indulge in a commitment unless reasonably sure that I can carry it out. In line with this policy, I rarely accept invitations to speak immediately, but consider them carefully before replying. When I do reply that I will be present, such will be the case unless something very unforseen occurs. Similarly I never indulge in promises relative to patronage until ready to make the appointment. By the same token, I expect others to keep their promises to me. It is no more necessary, however, for individuals to keep their commitments than for nations. Commitments such as these can be kept by our Nation only through action of this body.

As I understand it, practically all the funds this Republican attack attempts to eliminate have been directly authorized or promised to agriculture by this Congress. For instance, the AAA program. Funds for it will be by this act reduced from $300,000,000 to $165,000,000. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] proved unequivocably yesterday that this $300,000,000 was very definitely authorized last year in plain language when the motion from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to do so was approved 62 to 19. That, my colleagues, was a promise to the farmers of America that $300,000,000 would be available to them for soil improvement, provided they spent $600,000,000 of their own money for this purpose. They have had every reason to take this Congress at its word—spend this money of their own and earn this $135,000,000 which is eliminated. They have done so, and now are we to say to them by permitting this action to stand, "Your confidence in the parliament of your country is unjustified. It is true that when another party was in control you were definitely promised $300,000,000, provided you earned it. It is true that you have earned it. Unfortunately, however, the Republican Party has gained control of the Congress—a party which is so determined to reduce the tax burden of the rich that it is willing to violate the pledge of the Congress to you and attempt to destroy, not only your well-established farm program but your confidence in the parliament of your country"?

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to so betray my country by violating its pledged word. Consequently, I shall vote to restore not only this item, but every other one which has been promised to the farmers of America. I implore you honest, fair-minded ladies and gentlemen to do likewise.

Let it be understood by all that the Democrats are not responsible for whatever loss of confidence may result. On the other hand, it is directly traceable to the determination of our Republican Members to cut appropriations, in order to try to make a showing by indulging in sufficient false economy to save funds for tax reduction. Does anyone doubt that they particularly have in mind the reduction of the taxes of those who hold the huge money bags and indulge in the tremendous contributions to Republican campaign funds? For this we must pay in school-lunch funds, farm tenant funds; yes, in all these funds so worthwhile to the future of our country. This is one of the results of Republican control of the Congress.

Department of Agriculture Appropriations, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, we folks in Utah are always interested in any legislation or appropriation that in any way affects the agriculture of our State. So the recent appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, as recommended by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives is of particular interest in Utah.

One of the important items in that bill is the provision for funds to carry on the agricultural-conservation program, administered by local elected farmer-committeemen in our State and in all the other States of the country.

The agricultural-conservation program is the program under which the majority of farms and ranches in Utah have carried on soil- and water-conservation practices. These practices have included such things as revision of irrigation systems, leveling of land for irrigation, improved grazing practices on the range, development of range stockwater, and many other similar practices to maintain and improve the productivity of our agriculture.

I want to point out, in this talk, three very serious ways in which the program will be affected if the appropriations bill is finally enacted in the form reported by the House Appropriations Committee. These ways are: First, funds for this year's program would be cut about in half—and I shall show how this cut would affect the 1947 farm program as it operates in Utah; second, the program would be completely eliminated after 1947; and third, funds for administration are cut so low that it would just about wipe out the farmer-committeemen system of administering the triple-A conservation program.

Let us take these points up, one by one:

First. Funds for the 1947 program of "conservation and use" would be cut about in half. The budget request for the program was almost $302,000,000; the committee report recommends an appropriation of around $166,000,000. Results of such a reduction would be immediate.

Farmers feel that they have been working under a definite promise in carrying out 1947 conservation practices. Since farmers work with the season, the program year starts around January, and by this time of the year many farmers have already under way or have completed some program practices. It, therefore, has been customary for the appropriations acts to include, each year, first, appropriations for the program already in operation; and, second, authorization for a conservation program to be developed for the next year within the limits of a specified amount of funds.

When the appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture was enacted last June it included the following language:

Provided further, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1947 programs (amounting to $300,000,000, including administration) of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The situation was clearly explained to the Congress, and the Members were urged to consider most carefully whether or not they wanted to authorize the full amount of $300,000,000 for the crop year 1947. They were asked to decide at that time whether they wanted to reduce the amount of the authorization, and not to wait until a year later, after plans of the Department and of farmers had already been completed and in many cases put into operation.

The authorization was not rejected. It was not reduced. Instead the amount of $300,000,000 was approved by an overwhelming majority. And the Republican Party a year ago was not deprived of its vote—Members could then, as now, express their opinions on bills and vote as they saw fit. It is easy to understand why farmers feel that they have been working for 6 months or more under a definite promise from the Government in carrying out 1947 conservation practices.

The proposed reduction in the appropriation for 1947 would—theoretically—make funds available for payments of about 55 cents on the dollar of what farmers thought was a commitment. But actually it would be almost impossible to work out payments on any such average basis.

For one thing, many farmers have already completed conservation practices for this year. With an appropriation of the size reported to the House, two courses of action would be possible: First, to make payments for practices already completed—which would be very unfair because it would penalize those farmers who intended carrying out seasonal practices which must be accomplished later in the year; or, second, to try to collect from farmers part of the assistance they have already received, and this no doubt would mean that many farmers would be put on the debt register of the Government. That would be only the beginning of many serious difficulties.

Now, how would this proposed reduction of funds affect the operation of the agricultural conservation program in our own State?

The cut in ACP funds would reduce Utah's intended allocation for 1947 from $1,221,000 to approximately $610,500, as nearly as present estimates can be made.

If farmers who have not already carried out their plans for conservation practices were to receive any benefit from the program, under the proposed cut, rates of payment would have to be reduced for individual practices in order to spread the available funds thinly over all the practices, both completed and planned.

In Utah the average size of farms run considerably under the average of Western States as a whole. Income is resultingly smaller and conservation payments even more important as an incentive and an aid to farmers in carrying out measures to conserve and improve their soil resources.

Because of favorable weather and early announcement of the 1947 agricultural conservation program—made possible by the congressional authorization last year of the $300,000,000 program this year—conservation work in Utah is considerably ahead of preceding years. Except for practices which can be performed either in the spring or fall—such as leveling, reorganization of irrigation systems, and construction of livestock water developments which had been planned by operators for this fall—conservation practices in Utah are started, and many are completed. Nontechnical assistance to operators by county office employees in laying out construction practices has expanded a great deal in Utah this spring and has been an important factor in the progress already made with this year's program.

An estimated 6,000 Utah farmers have indicated they would apply superphosphate fertilizer to their land under provisions of the 1947 program, which allows an ACP payment covering approximately 70 percent of the cost of the fertilizer when applied to such soil-building crops as legumes and grasses.

The average farmer in Utah will apply two tons of superphosphate under provisions of the program, which in 1947 would cost a total of $58.20. The 1947 program promised him an ACP practice payment of $36 for the two tons. On the basis of the recommended reduction in ACP funds, he would get only $18 in program payments, and his two tons of superphosphate will now cost him $40 of his own money, nearly twice as much as the $22 it would have cost him under the authorized program.

Since practically all of this phosphate has been applied, and much of it was bought under the purchase-order plan, the average Utah farmer would have to pay back about $20 to his conservation association to make up the reduction in his payment, or else he would be put on a register of indebtedness to pay back the amount later. It is safe to assume that much of the superphosphate not obtained under the purchase-order plan and not yet applied would then go on soil-depleting crops, and the conservation aims of the phosphate practice would go "by the board" as a result of the low reimbursement made available under the proposed reduced appropriations.

Irrigation is important in Utah, and the Agricultural Conservation Program has been extremely helpful to irrigation farmers in reorganizing their systems of irrigation so as to conserve water and increase the production from their land. Now, how would the reduced appropriations affect this type of farmer? Under the original $300,000,000 authorization, a farmer with 10 acres of land to level would plan on a total cost of $300, of which $80 would be reimbursed by his ACP payment. His own contribution would amount to $220. With the reduced appropriation, he could expect a practice payment of only $40, increasing his own expense to $260 for the project.

In some cases where the farmer has had the work done by contract, a purchase order similar to that used in the phosphate program has already been issued to the earth-moving contractor. If the appropriations cut stands, it will be necessary for the farmer to pay out additional cash to make up for the reduction in payment or else be placed on the register of indebtedness.

Much of the earth moving is being done by enterprising contractors, many of them ex-GI's, who have bought expensive equipment to do this work adequately on the basis of the encouragement the agricultural conservation program gave to such work. The Department of Agriculture has already been forced by the implications of the Appropriations Committee's report to suspend all purchase orders outstanding for earth-moving work.

If the reduced appropriations stand, these contractors will find much of their business "gone with the wind."

How about our Utah rancher? How would reduced appropriations for the 1947 program affect him? Here's how:

A Utah rancher planning to construct a 1,200 cubic-yard stock-water dam to improve the distribution of grazing on his ranch up to now has expected a $120 ACP payment to help him with the estimated total cost of $240. Under the recommended reduction in appropriations, the ACP payment would be reduced to $60 and the farmer's contribution increased to $180.

This brings me to point 2 in summarizing the ways the cuts in funds recommended by the House Appropriations Committee would affect the farmers' conservation program:

The second way a reduction in the appropriation for the agricultural conservation program would affect farmers would be that the program would be completely eliminated after 1947.

The conservation practices which are coordinated and financed under the ACP program have been developed and approved through years of experimental and educational work by State and Federal agricultural agencies. The gains made under the program toward preventing depletion of the Nation's soil fertility would in many cases be completely nullified, because farmers could not afford to do themselves anything like what needs to be done.

And very definite gains have been made. Proof of this statement is on all sides. The change in the Dust Bowl alone has been almost miraculous—within the last 10 years it has been transformed from a desertlike, arid region of heaped-up mounds of gray dust to a lush, green, fertile area.

The third result of reduced appropriations for the triple-A program would be the wiping out of the elected farmer-committeeman system, which has a vital part in administering the program.

The budget request was for about $9,000,000 for State and national administrative expenses in carrying out the program; the House committee has cut this $9,000,000 figure down to $1,950,000. The budget request was for around $24,000,000 for county administrative expenses. The House committee has cut this figure down almost half—to about $13,000,000.

These local committees, elected in a nonpartisan way by their fellow farmers, have been generally acclaimed as an example of democratic government at its best. They insure that the farm programs shall be workable and adapted to the needs of the country. They do this by giving farmers themselves a direct voice in formulating and in administering the programs.

The farmer committees provide a direct chain of communication between Government and producers—without this direct means of reaching individual farmers, the Nation would have experienced great difficulty in translating national war-production needs into individual farm terms. Without this direct means of reaching farmers, the country could easily lapse into the unfortunate conditions of the early thirties—where surpluses of certain crops became entirely unmanageable because farmers had no way of knowing how much national markets would take.

Of course, the only reason why a congressional committee dares to suggest the elimination of a program which reaches down to every farm into the Nation is that, on the whole, the farm economy is just now on a fairly even keel. But I wonder how many people realize the part the national farm program plays in keeping the farm and national economy stable? Remove the farmers' means of cooperating to serve the Nation's present needs and to preserve its future soil fertility, and conditions might soon revert to those of the disastrous days of every farmer for himself.

The committees have been responsible, not only for administering the conservation programs, but for many other programs made available to farmers by the Congress—commodity loans, production goals, surplus removal, distribution, and others.

Loss of this administrative machinery would seriously weaken the price-support program, which was largely expanded for the war and postwar periods in order to tide farmers over their difficult transition from war to peacetime production.

Since conservation practices both protect the Nation's soil resources and insure its food supply, the public has an interest and a responsibility in the improvements which farmers make on the land which they in effect hold in trust for future generations.

And besides the direct investment aspects, expenditures of public funds for assistance with conservation practices constitute an incentive to operators to carry out practices as an evidence of

public interest and thus encourage operators to perform practices which they otherwise would never start. If payment rates were reduced by half, as it is estimated the recommended appropriation reduction could require, much of the incentive would be removed, and conservation practices can be expected to fall off markedly.

Department of Agriculture Appropriations, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed in regard to the amount of $5,300,000 appropriated for forest highways on page 44 of the agricultural appropriation bill, as it does not adequately provide for absolutely necessary connecting links or sections of our Federal highway program that are within national forests.

The Congress has authorized for this purpose for each of the three postwar years $25,000,000. Last year $4,500,000 was appropriated under this authorization, and $9,000,000 was appropriated under earlier authorizations.

Under this bill we propose to appropriate $5,300,000 for forest highways, which under the rule generally followed would make available for these necessary connecting links in the State of Montana just $450,000. This would limit construction to 1 project, and there are 10 projects planned for the season.

There are no frozen funds or former appropriations available to add to the $5,300,000. We, therefore, have less than half available for this year's construction program of what we had last year.

I realize the necessity for economy and am in full accord with the program, but I would invite the attention of this committee to the fact that these funds are used on short stretches of highway within national forests, to connect Federal-aid highways that come up to the boundaries of the national forests. Ordinarily these stretches of road are in high mountain country, where a bad road is exceedingly dangerous. It would therefore seem to me, even in view of the high cost of construction, that some increase should be made in this particular appropriation. I realize that the Committee cut this fund to the present figure because of lack of materials and labor and also because of the exceedingly high cost of construction. I believe that wherever possible construction should be postponed until more can be had for a construction dollar. However, in this instance it appears to me that an addition to the $5,300,000 granted in spite of the above consideration would be justified.

I sincerely hope this committee can see its way clear to grant a raise in this appropriation.

Department of Agriculture Appropriations, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. M. COMBS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which has been offered to raise the appropriation for REA to $250,000,000 merely proposes to put back the $25,000,000 which the Appropriations Committee cut out of the President's budget estimate. I want to call your attention to the testimony of the Administrator, Mr. Claude R. Wickard, as shown in the printed proceedings of the hearing on this bill, wherein he testified that loan applications had far exceeded available funds; that the backlog of applications on June 30 of this year are expected to be about $270,000,000. This, he states, reflects the strong demand there is for electric power by millions of our rural population. He says further that—

We regard the request for $250,000,000—

The amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget—

as the minimum amount necessary to enable borrowers to enter into the contractual obligations for continuing their progress in extending this essential service to rural people in the most orderly and economical manner.

The simple fact is that about 2,500,000 rural homes of this Nation are without electric service. I know of no program fostered by this Government which has brought more benefit to the rural people and the Nation than the rural electric program. It enables the farmers and the rural dwellers to modernize their homes, to have electric lights, water systems, and the small power machines that lighten the load of the farm work and render their farms more productive. It enables the housewife on the farm to have her electric washer, running water in the house, and electric refrigerator and the other conveniences which we have come to consider as essential to the standard of living of the people of our country.

The enormous backlog of applications for loans evidences the interest of the rural people of America in getting the blessings of electric service. Down in my own district I have attended a number of the stockholders meetings of the rural electric co-ops which serve the 11 counties of our district. I must confess that I was amazed to see the interest of those people and the time and effort, and I may say the intelligence, which they put into making this great program operate. These subscribers for electric service read their own meters, keep watch upon their electric lines, and report to their central office the locations of breaks in the lines. The boards of directors serve without pay and, in short, they are helping themselves to the great modern conveniences of electricity. It is in this way alone that they can bring this service to the sparsely settled rural areas at a cost they can afford.

In traveling over our district I have been amazed at the development rural electrification has brought to the rural areas of deep east Texas. Along a highway in the northern section of our district last summer I counted 27 modern country homes built within the space of about 15 miles within the last 4 or 5 years, every one of them equipped with electric service and the modern conveniences that go with it. Rural electrification has brought about a back-to-the-farm movement not thought possible a few years ago. The reason is simple. With the conveniences that electricity provides the farm home becomes as comfortable, or in many respects more comfortable, than the city home. With modern highways and rural mail delivery, plus the conveniences of electricity, country life is made truly attractive, and the longing of our people to get back to the soil is drawing many thousands of them back on the farm.

These people are the real independent Americans—the very backbone of the independence and intiative that we love to feel is characteristic of all Americans.

Yet, the cut in the appropriations for this great work will prevent thousands of the rural people of our Nation getting the electric service they so much desire. I cannot understand the attitude of the Appropriations Committee in making this cut. It is true we need economies in Government spending, but how on earth can we of the Congress justify this refusal to make the loans that our farm people need, and which will be fully repaid, when we in the same Congress vote many millions of dollars of loans to foreign countries—many of which loans may never be repaid? It is true we are fighting a battle of survival of democratic institutions all over the world, and I, along with the majority of you, have supported that program, and intend to continue to support it, but I am saying to you that the development of our own country should be our first concern. Until recent years our farm people have had mighty little consideration from our Government. In fact, I know of no part of our population which has asked less and deserved more. I do think this amendment ought to be adopted and the farm people of America given the consideration they are so justly entitled to receive at the hands of the Congress.

Department of Agriculture Appropriations, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the farmers in my district are interested primarily in the price they will get for the products they raise, and in the price they must pay for the machinery and other things they must buy.

It does seem that this Congress should establish a parity or support price on all

agricultural products which will guarantee the farmer a fair and equitable return for the products he produces. Farmers have a real stake in our Nation's financial security. I firmly believe the prosperity of our Nation depends upon the well-being of agriculture.

The farmers are not interested in building up a huge bureaucratic Agriculture Department. At present, its employees number more than 70,000. When J. Sterling Morton, of Nebraska, was Secretary of Agriculture, the employees were less than 1,000 and the budget $3,000,000. Today, the request from the Department amounts to more than $1,000,000,000.

I have received a number of wires relative to the cut given REA. I have always been a stanch supporter of the extension of REA. I do find that the bill authorizes loans up to $225,000,000 for rural electrification for the next fiscal year. Instead of borrowing from the RFC as at present, after June 30, 1947, these loans will come directly from the United States Treasury. It would seem that borrowing directly from the Treasury will not only save three-fourths of 1 percent interest now paid to RFC, but will eliminate red tape necessary by going through another agency. Reductions of $1,550,000 for administrative expenses should reduce the number of field men and inspectors. I am certain this Congress will do nothing to cripple the normal expansion of REA.

The REA will have on hand by July 1 some $550,000,000, of which $325,000,000 has been allocated, but because there is a scarcity of transformers, wire, and other equipment it has not been possible to energize homes desiring electricity.

Moneys lent to these REA districts is being paid back with interest. It is a good investment and so different from the billions of dollars in loans and gifts to foreign countries, much of which will never be returned.

In looking over the bill, I feel that there are some places where further cuts in personnel could and should be made. There just seems to be too many on the pay roll in the Department of Agriculture. I expect to support those amendments which will further reduce this top-heavy pay roll.

In general, the Agriculture bill as reported, calling for $831,000,000 for 1 year, seems to meet the needs of agriculture. The committee has given it careful consideration. I expect to support the committee amendments and the bill.

The Challenge to Alabama Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I prepared for delivery before the Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs, Mobile, Ala., May 8, 1947. Because of important business before the Senate I was unable to be present, and in my absence the address was delivered for me by the Hon. Albert J. Tully, United States District Attorney for the Southern District of Alabama.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the beginning men have said that "woman's place is in the home."

To the honor and credit of American women, it may be said that they have never accepted the idea that their only mission was in the home.

Woman's place is in the midst of affairs. Whether housewife, businesswoman, or professional worker—she must take her place as an active citizen.

During the 27 years that women have been able to take part directly in political affairs, through the ballot, they have taken the lead in initiating and supporting progressive laws.

Among one of their earliest major achievements was the Sheppard-Towner Act for the "public protection of maternity and infancy," which halted the disgraceful death toll of mothers and babies.

Theirs was the major influence in the enactment of child-labor laws to stop exploitation of children in factories; food and drug laws to protect the consumer; laws to provide decent hours of work for women in industry; development of the merit system in city, State, and Federal service; and the establishment of a social-security system.

The women of Alabama have been a prime influence in helping Alabama, among the States, blaze the trail in child-welfare work and in carrying the public-health service to every county in Alabama. Under the leadership of Julia Tutwiler, Alabama was in the vanguard in providing coeducation of men and women in Alabama schools and colleges.

This troubled world needs more than ever today the enlightened and active participation of women in public affairs.

Many of the problems we Alabamians face today begin with our children. They involve the education, the health, and the recreation of the child; the house and the home he knows. Together they fashion the kind of world the child lives in. And out of their pattern emerges the child's character and his preparation for life.

What of the education of our children? Today education in America is at a crisis. Thousands of teachers have left the schoolroom. A distinguished educator, after a Nation-wide survey for the New York Times, declares that "although the schools of the United States did not suffer a single air raid during the war, they are being wrecked as surely as though they had been blasted by heavy bombers."

We know how critical conditions are in Alabama schools. Classrooms are terribly overcrowded. Equipment in many schools is old, dilapidated and inadequate. There are still about 1,400 1-room schoolhouses in use in the State. The average salary for Alabama school teachers is now $1,300 a year. Janitors and charwomen in public buildings are paid more. Is it surprising that one-third of the State's teachers hold only emergency certificates and are not properly trained and prepared for their work?

What this means is that the children of Alabama are being denied their American birthright. They are being denied that education which will best help them grow up to be good citizens and earn a decent living.

Poorly educated American children are the whole country's problem. The Federal Government must share the responsibility to equalize educational opportunity. But persuading the Federal Government to accept this responsibility is a long, hard struggle—in the face of powerful opposition from many forces over this Nation.

As we press the fight for Federal aid to education, we remember the 72-year battle for woman's suffrage, the long struggle to get children out of the factories, and many other weary struggles for social progress.

We have come far in the fight from the days when even many educators did not see the need or the fundamental justice of Federal aid for education. I shall continue the fight with every power at my command. Tonight the cause of education calls to you to give your active, your militant support to Federal aid, and also make certain that the State fully meets its prime responsibility for public education and do all it can to give our children the opportunity for an adequate education.

We know that a nation can be strong only if its people are healthy.

Alabama, we are proud to say, is far ahead of many of its southern neighbors in its public-health service. But much remains to be done. The experience of the selective service in wartime is a sharp reminder of the job ahead. Two out of every five of Alabama's young men were rejected as unfit for military service.

Health protection must start with the child. Yet thousands of Alabama children have physical defects—faulty vision or hearing or teeth—that can be corrected.

Child health can be most efficiently and economically guarded through programs integrated with our schools. The weakness of such programs today is that they are inadequately financed and provide only casual and infrequent checks upon the child's physical condition.

The Federal Government has recognized the efficiency and economy of coordinating education and health in the school-lunch program. I am happy to tell you that only a few days ago we appropriated in Congress the necessary additional funds to carry on the program.

The lack of medical facilities in Alabama is indeed disturbing. The State has a serious shortage of doctors, dentists, and nurses. You and I know too well that Alabama does not have nearly enough hospitals and health centers to give our people adequate care. This is especially true in the rural areas, where 29 counties have no registered hospital.

We can have doctors, dentists, and nurses only as we have hospitals and health centers. We are gratified that more hospitals and health centers are being planned under the Hospital Construction and Survey Act passed by Congress last year, which I had the honor of sponsoring. This act provides that the Federal Government will pay one-third of the cost of each hospital and health center constructed, if the remaining two-thirds is provided from other public or from private sources. Under the act, Alabama will get some $15,000,000 of Federal funds over the 5-year period, which in proportion to population is approximately twice as much as the wealthier States will get.

The Federal Government is ready to give this aid, but it is up to us as Alabamians to make certain that Alabama provides her share of the money so that we can go forward with the construction of hospitals and health centers in our State.

Alabama cannot ignore juvenile delinquency and its alarming increase throughout the country.

The vast majority of delinquent children come from poor and underprivileged families—where the child often does not have proper food and clothing or decent housing, where the economic position of the entire family is so insecure that the child feels insecure and turns his resentment first against more fortunate children and then against society.

Government must not contribute to delinquency by failure to meet its responsibil-

ity. I want you to know that Senator JOHN SPARKMAN and I have introduced in the Senate a bill which will substantially increase Federal aid to State and local welfare departments for dependent children in low-income States such as Alabama.

Slums and substandard housing are breeding grounds for delinquency. The Federal Government and certainly some of the local governments are derelict today in their failure to meet the obligation to assure low-cost housing.

With schools, health and recreation programs, and decent housing, we can wipe out the causes of delinquency and build a strong, healthy, intelligent American youth.

We cannot quarantine delinquency. The virus can reach to your child and my child. If we do not move now to correct the economic and social conditions which breed juvenile delinquency, our State and our Nation will pay a tragic price in the years ahead.

Alabama needs your help—as individuals and as members of one of the State's most active and influential organizations—in striving to meet her problems. But above and beyond your service to Alabama, lies the great task of our generation—the building of lasting peace for the world.

Let us look honestly at the chances for peace.

The war ends with two mighty nations on this earth—the United States with her democracy, Russia with her communism. If we are to have peace, these two nations must learn to live together.

Yet Russia has put her own expansion—her design for power and domain—ahead of building the peace. Russia has relentlessly pushed her sphere of influence far beyond her historic borders and drawn a line of satellite nations from the Baltic to the Mediterranean. The three Baltic States, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Albania, are but puppet states for the Kremlin.

During the past year Russia has exercised the veto in the Security Council of the United Nations 11 different times and Russia refuses agreement on the international control of atomic energy, on the establishment of an international police force under the United Nations, on international trade, and on practically every major measure vital to the building of the peace.

Of the eight subsidiary organizations of the United Nations, Russia has joined only one—the World Health Organization. Russia has refused to become a member of the United Nations organizations dealing with refugees, education and science, food and agriculture, aviation, labor, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Monetary Fund.

At Paris, at London, at New York, Secretary Byrnes and the representatives of Britain and France sat around the table with Russia's representative, Molotov, seeking agreement—striving to begin the building of the peace of the world. Each time Molotov made success impossible and frustrated the efforts for agreement.

Secretary Marshall has just returned from a fourth conference at Moscow where he too failed to get agreement from Russia. The Russians made no genuine effort to reach agreement at Moscow. Instead Molotov merely repeated previous demands which already had been rejected.

As we know, the first step in the building of the peace is agreement on a sustaining German economy and a government for Germany. The terms which Russia demanded at Moscow as the price for agreement on Germany are:

1. Billions of dollars in reparations from Germany, which would actually be paid largely from the United States Treasury. Russia would drain Germany of her current production, delay German economic recovery, and force the United States to continue the costly financial burden of supporting the German inhabitants in the zone of American occupation.

2. A centralized government for Germany under which a dangerous concentration of power could easily fall into totalitarian hands—hands which even now Russia is contriving to make communistic.

3. Control of Austrian industry and finance which would make Austria another Russian puppet state.

Russia has no qualms about delaying the terms of peace. She sees advantage for herself and her communism in delay.

Delay enables her to keep troops in Hungary and Rumania. Russian troops in these countries keep them under Russian domination. This means Russian pressure on Italy, Greece, and Turkey, carrying Soviet influence to the Dardanelles and the Mediterranean.

But the biggest stake in Russia's waiting game is the hope for the economic and social collapse of Europe, which would create chaos and make fertile the soil for communism.

The people of war-shattered Europe even now are hungry and miserable. If the democratic nations do not prevent collapse, the people of Europe may well feel forced to turn to communism—to trade freedom for bread.

Russia thwarts peace, hoping either for the social and economic collapse of Europe, or that the United States, tired and disillusioned, will give in to Soviet demands.

At Moscow, America matched patience and endurance with the Kremlin, while in Washington America took action to meet the threat of Russian expansion. The United States proclaimed the Truman doctrine of aid to Greece and Turkey to help them maintain their independence. The United States said to Russia, "This far you have gone, but no further."

The lessons of "too little and too late" are still vivid in the minds of Americans who have just fought a war. They remember too well the world's indifference to Japan's seizure of Manchuria; Mussolini's rape of Ethiopia; the Fascist dress rehearsal for war in Spain; and Hitler's military occupation of the Rhineland, first of his many acts of international aggression which finally engulfed the world in flame.

America has let the shattered nations of Europe know that she will help them get their fields and factories back into production, relieve their hunger and suffering, and give their people opportunity for productive work.

As Mr. Sumner Welles predicted, Russia has accused the United States of seeking to destroy the United Nations. This is not true. This is typical Russian propaganda.

The United States among all the nations is the great rock upon which the United Nations stands.

There could be no better way to destroy the United Nations than to give it a task beyond its powers, a task in which it is foredoomed to failure. If we did this, we would play into the hands of predatory and reactionary forces over the world. We cannot afford to founder the vessel with too heavy a cargo.

As one of the original framers of the Senate resolution of March 1943—known as the B_2H_2 resolution—which paved the way for organization of the United Nations, let me reaffirm my faith in the United Nations. Our ultimate hope for peace lies in the United Nations. And through the United Nations we shall substitute the rule of law and reason for force and violence.

We must seize every opportunity and continue to use every power at our command to reach an understanding with Russia.

The United States must command Russia's respect if we are to reach such an understanding. And we know after months of negotiation that Russia respects strength. We must keep America strong—not only in military preparedness, not only in determination to withstand delay and pressure, but strong in her domestic economy. America in another depression might well forfeit her leadership for the peace of the world. She might drag down the rest of the world with her.

There are signs today of danger to our economy: Spasmodic efforts to reduce dizzy prices. A cost of living which increased during the past year more than five times as much as the total rise under war controls. The highest profits in history. Reduced purchasing power. And efforts to provide tax reductions which would hand a bonus to those with big incomes and leave the salaried man, the farmer, and the wage earner hard pressed by higher prices.

We must take heed of these storm signals in time.

In giving help to Europe America must insist that Europe be rebuilt on a basis that will remove as far as possible the causes and conditions out of which have grown so many of the wars of the past.

In 1940, before the United States entered the last war, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch placed its finger on the heart of Europe's fundamental weakness when it said:

"What are the historical forces whose ferment has brought Europe into a great war for the second time in a quarter century? * * * This area is divided into many separate nations, each with its own illogical tariff barriers, which keep it from exporting its surplus commodities to its neighbors or receiving from them the goods in which it is deficient. * * * To carve a continent into a crazy quilt of small nations creates irresistible economic pressures. Recurrent explosions are inevitable until some machinery to relieve these pressures is devised."

We must strive to relieve these pressures, to prevent these recurrent explosions through some machinery under the United Nations. The UN Charter provides for regional development of political and economic systems within the United Nations. We should build this machinery, through the United Nations, in a United States of Europe modeled upon our own Union of sovereign States.

A peaceful and united Europe would strengthen the United Nations and ease its difficult tasks. It would reduce the recurrent pleas for American support and lessen the drain on America in loans and aid. It would strengthen democracy and fortify the peace of the world.

A united Europe is not a new idea. It has been the goal of enlightened men since the Middle Ages. It was the "great design" of Henry IV, of France, in the seventeenth century. Victor Hugo pleaded for union at the International Peace Congress in 1849. After the First World War Aristide Briand, of France, and Gustave Stresemann, the German democratic leader, tried in vain to implant this vision in the minds of the treaty makers.

Today men speak out once more for a united Europe. Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain has said: "Europe must federate or perish." Winston Churchill has spoken eloquently of a "new structure of peace which no one will dare challenge." And at this moment the Congress of the United States has before it a resolution calling for approval of the "creation of a United States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations."

Built upon a constitution such as ours, guaranteeing the fundamental freedoms to every man, a united Europe can join hands with the United States of America, with peace-loving peoples everywhere, for the fulfillment of the words of Victor Hugo:

"Clearing the earth, peopling the deserts, improving creation under the eye of the Creator and uniting, for the good of all, these two irresistible and infinite powers, the fraternity of man and the power of God."

Peace is the great task of the Twentieth Century. It challenges the courage, the imagination, and the patriotism of every American. For the burden rests finally upon us. Britain is old and weary. Russia, vigorous and hungry for new domain, has put her own bid for world power ahead of building the peace.

I have faith that we can reach understanding and agreement with Russia and avoid an atomic war. But it cannot be through appeasement and compromise of principle. We must be patient but firm, strong but understanding.

We have at this moment our opportunity to lead mankind forward and upward over a new frontier and into a new era. We failed to grasp such an opportunity at the end of the First World War. Destiny has now blessed us by giving us a second chance. It may be the last. We cannot count on a third.

We shall need our prayers and our faith. And with God's help, we will build a lasting peace, with freedom and justice for all men.

Margarine and the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Margarine and the Consumer," which was published in the South Carolina Farmer, official journal of the South Carolina Farm Bureau, under date of May 1947. This article was written by Mrs. Corrie T. Plyler, of Columbia, S. C., secretary to the Honorable J. Roy Jones, commissioner of agriculture for the State of South Carolina. Mrs. Plyler is a former president of the Business and Professional Women's Club of South Carolina, and an ardent student of the question of discriminatory taxes on margarine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARGARINE AND THE CONSUMER

(By Corrie T. Plyler, Columbia, S. C.)

The farmer traditionally has been called provider of the Nation's food; therefore too frequently we forget that the farmer is also a consumer. No matter how varied a crop he produces, he cannot satisfy all his needs from the produce of his farm but, like every other citizen, must buy at the village store or in the neighboring market town or city. He benefits or suffers from whatever aids or injures consumers in general.

During the recent war emergency many a United States consumer became aware for the first time of the severe burden which falls upon his dinner table by reason of harsh and unjustified taxes and restrictions imposed upon a pure-food product. Unable to buy butter, which became as scarce as the proverbial hen's teeth, many an American consumer found to his amazement that margarine which he would have liked to spread on his bread could not be bought in the yellow color he had come to like for his table fat, or else was not available to him at all.

If he was curious enough to inquire, he learned, perhaps, that his State imposed so heavy an excise tax on margarine that none at all found its way into the State in peace or normal times. If he lived in Pennsylvania or Ohio, for example, he learned that his State prohibited the sale or use of yellow margarine entirely. If he lived in Wisconsin, he learned that his State imposed a 15-cents-per-pound tax on every pound of margarine sold within its borders, as well as license fees of $25, $500, and $1,000 on retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers of the product, respectively. Furthermore, the Wisconsin consumer discovered that if he wished to buy margarine outside the State in order to avoid the 15 cents excise tax, he must then pay a use tax of 6 cents a pound, to say nothing of taking out a consumer's license at the cost of $1 a year. And all these, only samples of various State taxes, to be sure, are in addition to the Federal taxes and license fees listed in a recent article entitled "Margarine and the Farmer."

As a result, margarine is very unequally distributed among the population. Consumers in neighborhoods of small grocers, who cannot afford the margarine licenses, must either go out of their way or do without the product; they are thus denied the right to buy a pure American food for no reason except that it is held to compete with another American food. In a State where the tax restrictions on margarine are as stringent as in Wisconsin, consumers are completely denied the opportunity to buy the product. They may justifiably question whether it was any part of the intention of the fathers of our country thus to discriminate between the people of various parts of the Federal Union. In eight different referendums consumers have registered a denial that the laws against margarine express the will of the people. But such spontaneous recordings of public opinion have gone unheeded.

Indeed, the consumer too often is not audible. Not only does he discover that he is not able to buy margarine, but—and this he usually does not know—he is unable to buy butter at a price which reflects the true condition of demand and supply in the market. Unquestionably, to shop on this basis should be every consumer's right. The retail price of milk and of all other dairy products is determined not by the open market, nor usually by public authority, but by compromise with these artificially high prices. However, many in the industry would turn around and fight a competitor by demanding a handicap in the form of a tax, which ultimately falls on the consumer. Instead of reaping his share of the gains of economic activity, in this case the consumer bears the brunt; he is caught between high prices of one producing group, set by an artificial market, and high prices of another group, forced up by tax legislation. Such taxes, the Tax Institute has justly observed, "distort competitive relationships without bringing compensation benefits to the general public."

High prices have reached into all our pockets with insidious fingers these last several months. Our left-over pennies have dwindled and dwindled, and we have wondered when prices would halt their skyward flight. Some consumers have already begun to curtail their purchases, either from necessity or from a patriotic desire to bring prices down. The United States Government tells us that during the second half of 1947 a decrease in demand for consumer goods and services grows quite likely.

The decrease in purchases, it is anticipated, will be greater for dairy products than for consumer goods in general. During the war, and up to the present, the consumption of dairy products rose to unusual heights, largely because of an increase in the income of low-income families. But now supplies of other consumer goods are increasing. Consumer purchasing power is expected to decrease, especially among the low-income groups. The United States Department of Agriculture is confident that these developments will divert some spending away from dairy products—clear evidence that the low-income consumer does not in normal times have enough money to buy all the dairy products he needs and would like to have. For optimum nutrition, we need to consume at least as much fluid milk as during these recent years. These years have made it clear, also, that in order to continue to use these greater quantities of fluid milk, we cannot eat as much butter as we did prior to the war. We are fortunate in possessing, therefore, an entirely satisfactory substitute in margarine, a product of cottonseed and soybean oils and other crops of American farms.

But, say some short-sighted butter producers and distributors, "You shall not buy margarine on the same basis as you buy butter. You shall pay tax for eating margarine instead of butter."

The situation is no less absurd than if a manufacturer of silks were to appeal to Congress and the legislatures in this wise: "We cannot produce enough silk goods at a price low enough for every American. We cannot weave even enough for those who can afford this luxury material. Therefore you must impose a special tax of 10 cents on every yard of rayon material; furthermore, every department store selling rayon goods must be forced to pay a special license fee of, say, $1,000 a year. Then the public will know that the store is selling yard goods which is not silk. If you don't do this, more rayon will be sold, and our silk business will be ruined." It is impossible to believe that any silk manufacturer ever seriously thought of making such a demand.

But commercial butter interests do not hesitate to demand that taxes, license fees, and other needless restrictions be placed upon margarine, in spite of the fact that they cannot make available enough butter and fluid milk at the same time for a healthful diet for all Americans.

No one who has taken the trouble to investigate any longer questions the nutritive value of margarine. Scientific authorities in the field of nutrition, physiology, public health, and medicine have attested its purity, wholesomeness, energy value, and equivalence to butter in all the nutritive essentials.

Countless consumers have found, during the recent shortages of butter, that margarine tastes good and that it pleases both as a table and cooking fat. They have been frankly perplexed when they remembered, some of them, their long-standing prejudice against the product.

Wherein, then, they have asked, lies any defensible reason for taxing margarines off the tables of the Nation's families? If the consumer cannot afford butter—and there are many in this class—can there be any conceivable defense, in a free enterprise democracy, for denying him the right to buy margarine, an entirely satisfactory substitute, as easily and on the same terms as the more expensive product?

Some claim the need of the restrictions on margarine as a way of preventing fraudulent sales. For such, let us point to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act which controls all foods, and the various State pure-food laws, as well as the Federal margarine regulations. Any possibility of fraud in the sale of margarine belongs to the "horse and buggy" era.

A tax on food has been recognized for centuries as a regressive burden, bearing most heavily on the low-income groups. Lawmakers, social workers, political scientists,

and economists, have consequently frowned on this type of tax—even when it might conceivably benefit some other group in the population. But, as shown in the article "Margarine and the Farmer," the margarine taxes benefit nobody.

If a day should come when, by reason of taxes repealed, consumers could buy all the margarine they wanted—and in the yellow color which they like for their table fat (a great part of commercial butter is artificially colored, without any requirement that it be so labeled)—the forces of supply and demand in the market would serve to distribute margarine to those who want it and at a price they can afford to pay, and butter to those who can afford to pay for the higher-priced product.

Then Americans would be able to drink more fluid milk, since less milk would be diverted to butter. Fluid milk, moreover, brings the dairy farmer a higher price than milk destined to become butter or cheese or any other dairy product. Such a consequence would, in the long run, garner more regards for the dairy farmer than legislation directed against margarine.

It bears repeating that every farmer is a consumer as well as a producer. While his interest in outlets for the produce of his farm guides his activity to a large extent, his interest in getting a fair deal as a consumer should be no less impelling. For of what avail are good crops and good markets with the profits they reap if he cannot spend his money to fill his daily needs in a profitable way?

RFC's Small Business Loan Activities—RFC Does Not Make Loans That Banks Will Make; Banks Given Chance To Participate in All Loans—Impressive Tables Disclose Valuable Service Rendered Small Business by RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the RFC Act expires June 30, 1947. The question of its extension is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. It is my opinion that this agency is needed now to assist small business more than ever before. It will be needed in the readjustment period ahead. The proposal advanced by the Federal Reserve Board is not sufficient to take the place of RFC, and besides the RFC has so well demonstrated its ability to properly make these loans in a satisfactory manner that no change should be made.

During the calendar year ending December 31, 1946, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made 12,247 loans to business enterprises involving $563,743,000. This was five times the number of such loans made in 1945 and eight times the number made in 1944. It also represents 33.3 percent of all loans made to business enterprises by the Corporation since its inception in 1932.

This performance reflects the Corporation's desire to fulfill its obligations to the small businessman because 91 percent of the 12,247 loans mentioned above were for $100,000 or less—typical small-business loans. The following table indicates the statistical base from which the foregoing summary statements were drawn:

RFC loans to business enterprises

Period	Number of loans	Percent of cumulative total	Amount, RFC and banks	Percent of cumulative total
1932 through Dec. 31, 1946	36,794	100.0	$3,670,289,000	100.0
1944	1,533	4.2	372,180,000	10.1
1945	2,437	6.6	436,888,000	11.9
1946*	12,247	33.3	563,743,000	15.4
*To small business	[1] 11,148	30.3	[2] 246,302,000	6.7

[1] 91 percent of 1946 total.
[2] 43.6 percent of 1946 total.

The upward trend in business loans which developed in 1946 has carried over into 1947, as the following will show. The monthly average of business loans made in 1946 was 1,021 loans whereas during the first 4 months of 1947 the monthly average of business loans approved in the field was 1,048. Since no loans are made by the Corporation unless the credit sought is unobtainable elsewhere, this would indicate a rising demand for RFC funds in 1947 over and above 1946.

Much significance attaches to another break-down of these 12,247 loans to business enterprises in 1946, keeping well in mind the fact that 91 percent of them were made to small businessmen. A very large proportion of the 1946 loans were made in participation with banks, namely 8,597—or 70.2 percent—involving $480,582,000 of which the banks took $129,310,000. Only 29.8 percent of the 1946 loans, involving $83,164,000, were made without bank participation.

The favorable bank participation trend established in 1946 has not carried over into 1947. During the first 4 months of 1947, 4,193 loans to business enterprises were approved in the field, of which 1,802, or 42.9 percent, had to be made without bank participation. The following figures indicate the rapidly rising bank trend away from participation in RFC loans:

RFC loans to business enterprises in 1947

Year 1947	Bank participations		RFC direct loans		Total
	Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	
January	885	85.7	148	14.3	1,033
February	688	60.8	444	39.2	1,132
March	469	41.8	652	58.2	1,121
April	349	38.5	558	61.5	907
Total	2,391	57.1	1,802	42.9	4,193

It is of some significance that in the month of smallest-loan activity as shown above, RFC also obtained the smallest proportion of bank participations.

Since in every instance the banks are given first opportunity to make the loans that RFC eventually makes, or to participate in them, it is of more than passing interest to discover why the banks do not make the loans originally requested of them, or participate in them when made by RFC. To this end a study was made of 1,339 direct loans authorized by the Corporation in the last half of 1946, representing approximately 85 percent of the total number of direct loans made in that period. The results are shown below, the reasons being arranged in order of numerical importance except "Miscellaneous." Where two or more reasons were advanced, the refusal was classified according to the principal reason:

Reasons why banks declined	Business loans	Veterans' loans	Total loans
Policy of not handling GI loans	-------	278	278
Unacceptable type of collateral offered	74	173	247
Maturity requested was too long	74	100	174
Insufficient down payments made on equipment	3	114	117
Applicant entering upon a new enterprise	39	31	70
Insufficient collateral offered	21	35	56
Banks were extending current credit but did not want to undertake long-term loans	34	10	44
Applicants were outside areas serviced	13	29	42
Banks "do not make this type of loan"	15	26	41
Banks do not make capital loans	28	5	33
Amounts requested were beyond legal limits	16	10	26
Interest rate too low for maturities asked	3	15	18
Banks did not care to participate with RFC	17	-------	17
Applicants' ventures were speculative and financial success was not assured	8	7	15
No reasons given by banks	4	11	15
Miscellaneous reasons	45	101	146
Total	394	945	1,339

No application for a loan from RFC is considered until the applicant has demonstrated his inability to secure the required financing from a bank or other private source of credit. Then his problem is carefully studied to see if it can be made attractive to a bank. In the 12-month period from May 1, 1946, to April 30, 1947, the banks made loans to 2,204 out of 13,693 such cases referred to them after RFC study. If a bank will not make a loan or participate in it, the Corporation then tries to work out a direct loan.

The purposes for which business enterprises borrow funds from RFC fall into certain general classifications as shown in column 1 of the table below, which excludes mining loans, Smaller War Plants Corporation loans, and loans made in participation with banks under the blanket-participation agreement. Column 2 shows the dollar volume of the various classifications with percentage proportions of the total for the last 6 months of 1946. Column 3 similarly covers the period from 1932 to November 30, 1941. The war period is eliminated from column 3 because of its distortions from normal trends. Only the last 6 months of 1946 are considered in column 2 because the distorting effect of

reconversion financing was felt well into the middle of 1946.

Purposes for which proceeds of authorized business loans were to be used (excluding BPA, mining, and SWPC loans)

Purpose	July 1, 1946, through Dec. 31, 1946		1932 through Nov. 30, 1941	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Total	$57,734,000	100.0	$463,978,000	100.0
Machinery and equipment	10,152,000	17.6	35,595,000	7.7
Real estate and construction	11,197,000	19.4	58,216,000	12.5
Working capital	31,064,000	53.8	212,513,000	45.8
Debt payments	5,279,000	9.1	121,178,000	26.1
Other purposes	42,000	.1	36,476,000	7.9

It is immediately apparent that larger proportions of the Corporation's loans to business enterprises are going into working capital and fixed assets than formerly was the case, and considerably less is being used for debt payments and other purposes. The somewhat increased proportion shown as going into fixed assets is accounted for largely by the need for replacing or revamping buildings and equipment worn out by war uses or rendered inadequate by new technical developments and requirements.

Conscience of America Demands Justice to the Jew in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, May 27, 1947, the Camden United Citizens Committee, composed of distinguished citizens of Camden, N. J., and vicinity, recognizing the obligation of this Nation to promote and support the cause of Jews in their effort to establish a free and independent nation in Palestine, to provide for their immediate admittance therein, and to protest the inhumanities under which Jews now suffer in their effort to protect and advance their rights in Palestine, held a mass meeting of citizens in the auditorium of the Camden High School.

At the conclusion of the meeting the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas the British Government has repeatedly violated its obligations as the mandatory of Palestine by repudiating the solemn pledges expressed in the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine mandate with regard to the facilitation of Jewish immigration into Palestine and the continued development of the Jewish national home; and

Whereas the plight of the Jewish survivors in Europe is steadily worsening, making it imperative that they leave that hostile continent at the earliest moment; and

Whereas the seizure and mass deportation to Cyprus of so-called illegal Jewish immigrants constitute a brutal campaign against helpless men, women, and children, completely inconsistent with the principles of the Atlantic Charter; and

Whereas such immigrants embark for the Holy Land as of their legal right, since the white paper of 1939, which bars their entry, was repudiated by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations as inconsistent with the Palestine mandate, thus making illegal the policy pursued by the mandatory power; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, through the passage of resolutions in both Houses of Congress, and through public statements of policy enunciated by every President for over 30 years, is committed to the free upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national homeland, and through planks in the platforms of both major political parties is pledged to free Jewish immigration into the Holy Land and the establishment in Palestine of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the citizens of Camden County and surrounding area respectfully call upon the Government of the United States to take the initiative during the fall meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in vigorously championing the program for Palestine, which it has repeatedly reaffirmed; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the Government of the United States to insist that the Jewish people, as the party most directly concerned, be accorded full representation in all deliberations regarding Palestine within the United Nations through the Jewish agency, the internationally recognized body authorized to speak for the Jewish people in respect of Palestine; and be it further

Resolved, That pending a final settlement of the Palestine question by the United Nations, the great weight of the United States Government should be brought to bear on the mandatory government to the end that an interim policy based upon the existing mandate be set into motion at once providing for immediate large-scale Jewish immigration into Palestine and the removal forthwith of the discriminatory land restrictions in the Jewish national home; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution go forward to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, the American delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, and Members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

Files of the Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. WOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

USE MADE OF THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND VARIOUS GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS, JANUARY 22–MAY 27, 1947

During the period January 22 to May 27, 1947, inclusive, a total of 512 visits were made to the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities by persons who made their own check through records and publications of the committee. The total number of names on which they checked was 8,529. These callers were employees of congressional committees or individual Members of Congress or employees of various agencies in the executive branch of the Government, namely, the Departments of Commerce, Interior, Justice, Labor, Navy, State, Treasury, and War, the United States Civil Service Commission, and the Veterans' Administration.

A break-down of the total number of visits made and the total number of names checked by the visitors for each month of the present year shows:

Month	Number of callers	Number of names checked
Jan. 22-31, 1947	48	975
Feb. 1-28, 1947	92	1,462
Mar. 1-31, 1947	128	2,128
Apr. 1-30, 1947	132	2,450
May 1-27, 1947	112	1,514
Total	512	8,529

In addition, the commitee staff assisted these callers in cases where they were unable to find information which was known to be available or in cases where they needed to consult source material contained in the files. Sixty-six requests of this kind were filled by members of the committee staff covering information on 47 individual names and 65 organizations.

During the same period of time, Members of Congress made 313 separate requests for information from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities. In answering these requests, committee employees made a search of files, records, and publications of the committee and furnished Members of Congress with written reports containing the information which was available on the 602 individual names and 236 organizations listed in these requests. In many cases it was necessary to check the names of the officers and sponsors of an organization through all sources in order to make a report on the organization, and no record has been kept of the number of names checked in such cases.

The following figures will show the monthly totals for this year of the number of requests received from Members of Congress, and the number of individual names of persons or organizations involved:

Month	Requests from Members of Congress	Individual names listed in requests	Organizations listed in requests
Jan. 22-31, 1947	13	18	7
Feb. 1-28, 1947	53	118	21
Mar. 1-13, 1947	71	167	66
Apr. 1-30, 1947	104	140	46
May 1-28, 1947	72	159	96
Total	313	602	236

Irrigation and Reclamation Developments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interest-

ing editorial published in the Walla Walla Bulletin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POOR CAMPAIGN STRATEGY

Republicans in the Pacific Northwest are largely responsible for the public land development program and hydroelectric power impetus which bore fruit under a New Deal administration. The attitude of a few importantly placed Republicans in Congress with respect to the future of reclamation and power development by Federal funds is such as to offend a large and influential segment in their party.

The use of Federal money in bringing thousands of acres of western arid lands into high production was inspired by and realized through efforts of Republican Senators and Congressmen from the States of this region. Washington, Oregon, and Idaho began submitting feasible programs nearly a half century ago. The Columbia Basin, McNary Dam, and numerous other projects now about to be weighed in the balance at Washington as a result of a middle western Republican's position of power, were born in the minds of community and district leaders, preponderently Republican.

If now the Republican Party permits the development of the Pacific Northwest to go by the boards, after what the opposition did to further the region's progress, it may be difficult for the GOP to count on such support as its ticket received at the polls in 1946. The solid South has taken its crumbs from the table of the Democratic Party and, with one exception, stayed solid. The Pacific Northwest is not politically so devoted and, while there are large numbers of Republicans who would prefer to see their party in power, their loyalty nationally may be tested severely unless the present attitude in influential spots at Washington, D. C., is moderated considerably with respect to our economic future.

Proposed Second-Class Postal Rate Raise Poor Example to Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, from all parts of the Nation come protests against the proposed raise on second-class postal rates.

We all know that the administration, backed up by the Republican Congress, recently asked for lower prices in order to stop the rising spiral of inflation.

Now comes the United States Post Office Department, supported by a portion of the membership of Congress, asking for increases in the most necessary service the Government renders—increases which will put many newspapers and magazines out of business—and will seriously cripple the free press of America, so necessary to our American way of life.

David Lawrence in his column dated May 20, which is published in many large papers throughout the country, very ably presented this inconsistency in an article entitled "Proposed Postal Rate Rise Sets Poor Example to Business."

Mr. Lawrence wrote in part as follows:

The Government itself is setting a poor example to businessmen. After all the hullabaloo about the necessity of price reduction, Newburyport plans and meetings of left-wing economists to argue for voluntary price reductions, the Government, which operates one of the biggest businesses in America—the postal service—decides on an increase in prices to the public.

The Post Office Department, whose directing manager is still a member of the President's Cabinet, has recommended that rates be increased to yield $173,000,000 more, while the House Post Office Committee now favors rates what will yield about an additional $110,000,000 a year.

Both the members of the House committee and Post Office officials seem to overlook the advice so often given by the CIO that wages can be increased and deficits can be absorbed from profits. Here the Government has been increasing wages and is about to end the fiscal year with a surplus or profit of $2,000,000,000 or more, and yet the self-same Government increases prices to the public. One suspects that the Government officials have not been reading carefully all the economic advice they have been getting from left-wing quarters.

Certainly this is no time for the Government itself to be raising prices and to be arguing that it must overcome a deficit in some particular department. There are other departments of the Government operating at a deficit—as, for instance, the Agriculture Department which serves the Farmers and the Labor Department which serves the labor unions. One wonders why the service by the Post Office Department cannot be charged up, as all other services are, to the taxes paid by the people as a whole.

Curiously enough, the postal rates will operate as an increased tax on many companies which already pay heavy taxes to the Government. As for newspapers and periodicals, the new tax in the form of postal-rate revision upward will cause the more successful companies to ship in bulk by express and mail their publications from distribution centers from local zones or counties where the rates are low. Smaller companies will be penalized and the advantage will go, as usual, to the bigger businesses.

Statistics have already been furnished Congress showing that the Government will lose revenues by reason of changes in methods of distribution and that the price increase will be a boomerang. It remains to be seen whether the experiment in price raising will work out to reduce or increase the so-called postal deficit.

The trouble with the Post Office Department is that it isn't operated as efficiently as is private business. The post-office system is honeycombed with politics and affected by political considerations. Most of the mail that now goes free should be paid for—the post-office business then would have not only a balanced budget but a profit besides.

If ever there was a need for lower rates and the stimulus of larger volume, it is in a business like the postal service. If the rates were reduced, more mail would be sent, especially by business houses which now spend a huge proportion of the money expended for postage. Lower rates would increase volume and at no proportionate increase in cost of carrying it or delivering it. Experience with air mail, which recently went from 6 to 8 cents an ounce, showed the public is sensitive to price changes. It was changed to 5 cents and revenue increased.

There ought to be a commission to study the efficiency of the Post Office Department and the impact of postal rates on mail volume before new rates are legislated.

Marine General Carlson Died Disillusioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news item entitled "Marine General Carlson Died Disillusioned."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARINE GENERAL CARLSON DIED DISILLUSIONED

PORTLAND, OREG., May 28.—Brig. Gen. Evans F. Carlson, famous leader of Carlson's Marine Raiders, died a disillusioned man because he feared that un-American interference in Greece and China was starting the United States on the road to another war, his widow believed today.

When he donned his uniform in World War II after an earlier retirement, he was convinced he would be fighting in the final world conflict, she said.

"When he died," Mrs. Carlson added, "he was no longer sure."

Mrs. Peggy Whyte Carlson was at the bedside of her husband at Emanuel Hospital when he died yesterday morning of coronary occlusion.

She said her husband, hero of the Makin and Guadalcanal campaigns, will be buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

Following World War II, General Carlson became a vice chairman of the Progressive Citizens of America, of which Henry A. Wallace is principal spokesman.

Mr. Wallace traveled from Portland to Brightwood, Oreg., last Sunday to see General Carlson. Mrs. Carlson said Mr. Wallace and her husband discussed what the general thought was un-American interference in Greece and China.

"My husband's views were that there should be no barrier between peoples of good faith. He believed that between them, Russia and the United States could save and insure world peace. * * * He couldn't understand how America could, with a clear conscience, dictate the internal affairs of other countries," Mrs. Carlson said.

Thefts From Starving Austria Reveal Bad Faith of Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of May 28, 1947:

THEFTS FROM STARVING AUSTRIA REVEAL BAD FAITH OF SOVIET

Moscow's light regard for solemn pledges is, of course, a notorious weakness of the Soviet regime. It becomes a particularly reprehensible weakness when it involves the imposition of hardship upon a nation already

deep in distress and struggling desperately to survive.

Austria is such a nation. Its economy is disrupted; its resources are exhausted; its industry is destroyed, and its people are hungry. Yet Soviet Russia has not hesitated to ravage the land, or at least the area which its troops have occupied, removing industrial equipment and food and in other ways making more acute the crisis of the people.

This charge is made in frank, forthright terms by Gen. Mark W. Clark, who has just returned from Austria in an angry mood. He directs at the Soviet Government a shameful indictment—that of having failed to cooperate with the other occupying powers "in accordance with the solemn pledge all of us made to the world for its future peace and prosperity."

General Clark charges far more serious derelictions than simple failure to cooperate. He alleges specifically that the Russians seized Austrian livestock and other resources, notwithstanding that it had been agreed that the occupying forces would not subsist off the land, and that they exported surpluses above their own needs.

These commodities, of course, were taken from a starving people, with no hope of subsistence other than their own products. They were taken from a fundamentally decent people, a nation which was just as much a victim of Hitler's aggression as were Poland, Greece, and the other invaded countries.

The treachery and duplicity of the Russians did not, however, end with the looting of the land. For the encouragement of communism and in violation of the pledge to aid in the recreation of a sovereign, independent, and democratic country, the Soviet authorities gave "extra food, higher wages, and better rations" to Austrians who would join the Communist Party.

This whole story, of course, has a familiar tone and content. It provides added reasons for firm policies in dealing with the Russians and resisting the direct and subtle aggressions through which the Communist cause is carried forward.

Stop, Look, and Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, many think we are traveling a dangerous route in the attempts of this administration to raise the standard of living throughout the world by depleting our own resources.

It is only common sense to say that there is a limitation beyond which we cannot safely go in the lending and giving of our finances and resources to other countries and their citizens. We have only a given amount of resources. In the dispensation of our charity, as individuals, I dare say that we first attempt to determine how much we can afford to donate and not leave ourselves impoverished. The same principle holds true with the economy of nations. The best minds definitely agree that an early determination should be made of just how far we can go in raising the standard of living of other people, without impoverishing our own people and destroying our economy.

It behooves us to stop, look, and listen.

I am pleased to submit for the consideration of my colleagues and of the public generally certain statistical information which has recently been compiled by one of the great economists of this country. These facts and figures should challenge the attention of all who have the welfare of the present and future generations of this country at heart. This analysis, although based on prewar figures very largely, should be revealing. It shows the dangerous route which we are now following and where the projection and continuation of the national administration's program will inevitably lead. It is a dangerous course for us to pursue.

The following shows the relative economic position of the United States and the remainder of the world:

As nearly as we can estimate on the basis of very detailed calculations first made by us in 1930, the wealth and income of the United States before the outbreak of the present war compared substantially as follows, in round numbers, with the wealth and income of the remainder of the world:

1. Population: World total, latest estimates (1938–39), around 2,145,000,000; United States (corresponding date), around 130,000,000 (present, around 134,000,000); percent of world total, around 6 percent.

2. Wealth: World total, around $1,100,000,000,000; United States, around $330,000,000,000; percent of world total, around 30 percent. (Around 1930 the wealth of the United States was estimated to be from 33 to 35 percent of the world total.)

3. Income: World total, around $210,000,000,000; United States (1940) $72,000,000,000–$75,000,000,000; percent of world total, 34–36 percent. (In 1929 the United States income was estimated at 41–42 percent of the world total.)

It is significant that the relative position of the United States gradually deteriorated during the decade of the thirties, due to the fact that recovery in other leading countries was much more rapid than in the United States.

To make the problem as simple as possible, the United States, with 36 percent of the world's income and 6 percent of the population, has a living standard per capita equivalent to 6 units of income (36 divided by 6). The rest of the world, with 64 percent of the income and 94 percent of the population, has a per capita standard equal to two-thirds unit of income, or on the average one-ninth of that of the United States.

In order to establish "equality" throughout the world, the United States must retain only her per capita share of the total world income, i. e., she must reduce her income to 6 percent of the total, and must give away the remaining 30 percent of the world income which she now holds, so that 94 percent of the population outside the United States will also receive 94 percent of the world income. This operation would theoretically raise the rest of the world to an average per capita income of 1 unit—which is a theoretical gain of 50 percent from the present average. But the average citizen of the United States would, in the process, lose five-sixths of his income.

In other words, if there were no economic loss in this process of "redistribution," and if the rest of the people of the world who receive our "gifts" would continue to work as hard as they do now to produce their own sustenance, we would reach a theoretical equilibrium with all people in the world (including the United States) having a standard of living one-sixth as high as that now prevailing in the United States.

In actual dollars this would mean roughly a distribution of a little more than $60,000,000,000 to something over 2,000,000,000 people. The average man outside the United States would have his income increased by a little more than $30 per year. This might be a fortune for a Chinaman or a heathen dweller in the tropics—but purchased at a price which would mean the utter degradation of the people of the United States.

Further, in view of our well-known experience with the Negro in the South, and the observed reactions of the most backward people throughout the world, it is probable that, if this country should redistribute its income in the manner indicated, the great bulk of the recipients thereof, who are already existing on two-thirds of a unit of income, would merely work half as hard as before in order to support themselves, and would thus maintain their income at the old two-thirds unit level by earning only one-third themselves, and bringing up the balance with the one-third unit which we contribute. Also, under the conditions outlined, productivity in the United States would rapidly decline.

That the foregoing is no idle analysis is shown by the following quotation from the bulletin of the United States State Department, under date of December 27, 1941, page 589:

"Lend-lease countries cover two-thirds of the earth's surface and contain nearly two-thirds of the population of the world. Up to the present time, the defense of 33 countries, including the British Empire, has been declared vital to the defense of the United States, and steps are being taken to strengthen the defenses of these countries."

Already most of the world outside the United States and the countries dominated by Germany, Italy, and Japan are covered by a plan which commits the United States to the indefinite extension of credit and shipment of all kinds of commodities, without any hope of repayment. It is further the announced policy of our Government to supply our resources in order to rehabilitate even the Axis countries after they shall have been defeated. That completes the present program for world redistribution of our wealth and income.

Creation of a World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Adventure for Peace," written by Malvina Lindsay. The editorial has to do with the efforts of approximately 400 citizens of Norwalk, Conn., in securing 18,000 signatures to a petition calling for the creation of a world government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVENTURE FOR PEACE

(By Malvina Lindsay)

TOWN TACKLES MARS

Symbol of a new, more robust attitude in this country toward future perils is the

peace project of the stalwart citizens of Norwalk, Conn.

One thousand residents of Norwalk—population 45,000—will shortly come to Washington to present to President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall a petition with 18,000 names. It calls on the United States delegation to seek to strengthen the United Nations so that no nation can back out, no nation can defy it, no nation can make atom bombs.

Self-styled practical men, now struggling futilely to settle the war they failed to prevent, are of course calling these people "visionaries." But there is a chance the names of Norwalk leaders will live in the history books. For they are dramatizing a new spirit abroad in the world, one that, though small on the surface, has strong roots. It is a turning from fear, war mongering, retreat, inaction, and can't-be-done defeatism to a bold program for combating the terrors now threatening the world.

Back of the Norwalk petition lie many significant happenings—a conversation on the state of the world by a few persons who suddenly decided the time had come to do more than talk; a meeting in the high school to hear Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, tell what he had seen the atom bomb do at Bikini, and a housewife's rising to ask what one woman could do about the bomb; an appeal to a group of civic volunteers to dedicate 4 months of work to the project of helping citizens speak their minds by petition, and a reminder that this inconvenience was far less than what they would suffer from an atomic war or from surviving in a community full of diseased victims, who might give birth to abnormal children.

The 400 men and women who went from door to door, or met the trains, petition in hand, did not always find their task easy. They met the usual name calling—"Communist," "imperialist," "reactionary," "radical," "visionary," "stooge of Britain." But most citizens gave eager support. Most welcomed the chance at last to do something tangible about world affairs, to ease the guilt and frustration they felt over their passive citizenship.

Meanwhile in Asheville, N. C., major world government organizations of this country merged into United World Federalists devoted to strengthening the United Nations into a limited world government to prevent war. A European branch is in the making. Federalist groups exist in every country in Europe outside the Soviet sphere. Some advocate European union, some union of the democracies, some universal world federation.

What will come of all this brave setting out for what "realists" of power politics regard as a Utopia at least 500 years distant? Leaders of this mental wagon train are certain more will come than many people expect. This, they say, is something more than the enthusiasm that flowered so brightly for the League of Nations, then wilted so quickly before congressional frost, and was buried under distractions and isolationism of the 1920's.

The movement for world government, they point out, is a hardier plant. It sprouted out of necessity—the weakness of the United Nations in its present form. And it has no alternative save a world armed with atom bombs, disease germs, cosmic rays.

Chief question put to federalists is: "How will you make the Soviet Union join?" The answer invariable is that not being citizens of the Soviet Union, they cannot make it do anything. Their job is to see that this country takes the lead in the only possible movement to save humanity. They hope the Soviet Union will be realistic enough to come in. If it does not, this Nation should strengthen itself by belonging to a four-fifths world movement which should continue to keep the door open for Russia.

International Civil Aviation Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Garrison Norton, Assistant Secretary of State and chairman of the United States delegation, at the opening plenary meeting of the first assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization on May 6, 1947, at Montreal, Canada:

Mr. President and delegates, this first session of the assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization is an occasion which we from the United States view with special gratification. The fact that the International Convention on Civil Aviation has come into full force and effect in considerably less than the 3 years originally contemplated is a demonstration that the 52 delegations at Chicago built well and successfully.

We can now proceed with certainty to establish the Organization on a permanent basis. I do not minimize the important achievements of the interim period. I am sure that there has never been another provisional international organization which sought as fully as this one to measure up to all phases of the job to be done. The record is one of great accomplishment.

The United States Government, perhaps not alone, has at times been left breathless by the pace of Council meetings, committee meetings, division meetings, regional meetings, and special meetings. Aviation is not a business on which matters can be left to wait forever, nor one in which the problems disappear if simply left unattended.

First and foremost, the Organization is devoted to the formulation of international standards on all matters affecting the safety, regularity, and efficiency of air navigation. By ratifying the Convention, every member state has accepted a solemn treaty obligation to collaborate not only in preparing but also in carrying out the international standards. This obligation must be fulfilled.

It is fortunate that the productive work initiated at Chicago on these standards has been carried forward through two successive revisions. It will be possible for the new Council, when it is elected a few days hence, to act immediately upon the whole code of standards already developed. I believe that one of the first actions of the new Council should be to adopt the standards which are ready. We can all then leave this Assembly with the knowledge that the standards have been officially submitted to the member States and may be expected to come into effect 3 months later under the procedure established by the Convention.

The coming into effect of these standards throughout a large part of the world can be a major contribution to safety of life in the air and will be if we all take seriously our obligations.

The agenda for Commission II contains few items which will excite vigorous debate in the plenary sessions of the Assembly. We should regard this as a tribute to the organizational pattern and procedure which has been developed for handling technical matters in the divisions, the Air Navigation Committee and the Council.

A second field of fruitful work envisaged at Chicago lies in the general area of Commission III of this Assembly. Here we shall be concerned with the economic, commercial and political problems of international air transport.

These problems are no less demanding than those in the technical field, but our progress has understandably been slower and more difficult. It is the view of the United States that there are at least five types of activity in the economic field among which we should distinguish in planning the work of the Organization.

One is the collection, compilation, and publication of factual information. We cannot emphasize too much the fundamental importance of these activities, in which every nation should assist by carrying its share of the load.

The second is the activity of the Secretariat in analytical study. It takes the form not only of dissecting the issues for detailed examination, but also of arranging all of the known facts in relation to the issues. The United States supports fully the ideal of thorough-going staff work by a competent international staff which will assist committee deliberation on proposals as to policy.

Still another type of activity of the Organization in the economic field consists of the formulation of recommendations for national action. The principal examples so far are the proposals for a standard form of bilateral agreement formulated at Chicago and the recommended practices for facilitation of international air transport. In general, and particularly in Commission III, the United States believes it well worth while to work through recommendations to the member States. We regard this as a means of initiating progressive action and of exploring the ground before more decisive forms of international action are attempted.

The fourth type of activity, when it is possible, is undoubtedly the most satisfying form of international collaboration. It consists of decisive international action through the adoption of standards or the acceptance of agreements or treaties. This form of action is always the most difficult. Every government is reluctant to support or enter into binding commitments without full study of the prospective consequences. Nevertheless, we can look forward hopefully to a constant enlargement of the area of such action. The United States will continue to support such endeavors.

The final type of activity in the economic field relates to the administration of international agreements once they have been concluded. The implementation of every important new agreement will be the subject of discussion in this Assembly, and in the council and its committees as we search for a common understanding of our mutual obligations. In some cases it will be necessary to provide specifically for the arbitration of disagreements and disputes. In such cases the United States believes the Organization can be helpful in establishing and maintaining the machinery of arbitration. However, the Organization itself should not be vested with arbitral duties.

In dealing with all of the items on the agenda for Commission III, the United States will seek to apply the general principles which I have just outlined. In this statement I wish to comment further on only one item of the Commission III agenda, namely, the proposed multilateral agreement on commercial rights in international air transport.

It is the view of the United States that our efforts to produce a multilateral agreement on air commerce at Chicago and since have suffered from the lack of experience and of tested information. We still do not have adequate primary statistical data bearing on some of the major problems involved in the draft. Such data are greatly needed. Nevertheless, the present draft represents considerable progress beyond anything we have had before.

The United States intends to work hard in the hope that a treaty agreement can be reached at this Assembly on many of the principles applicable to international air commerce.

Our specific proposals for revision of the draft proposed by the Air Transport Committee will be presented in Commission III. We hope that agreement will prove possible with respect to principles on capacity, rates, unfair practices, the facilitation of international air services, and the arbitration of disagreements. We further believe that the first two freedoms, those of transit and of nontraffic stop, have already received such general acceptance that they should now be put forward in permanent form as part of the proposed treaty. We do not believe that it is practicable to include a general exchange of commercial rights in the proposed treaty at this time. We do believe that the treaty should include suitable provisions to outlaw discriminatory practices in operations under such treaties.

In our negotiations, let us not neglect the "forgotten man"—the individual traveler of any State who wants to go somewhere at a time and in aircraft of his own choosing.

In commenting on the work of the Organization in the technical and economic fields, I have dealt with the two main substantive fields we had under consideration at Chicago.

Another field, the breadth of which was not fully forseen at Chicago, and in our opinion not yet fully forseeable, is that which is entrusted at this Assembly to the Commission on Legal Questions.

In this field, two draft conventions are before the Assembly. The first is known as the Draft Convention concerning the recording of rights in rem in aircraft.

This convention provides for the recording and recognition of property rights in aircraft. It will facilitate the necessary financing as aircraft fleets are rebuilt and expanded. Such a convention is greatly needed. The present draft is the best we have ever had. It provides a basis on which we can hope to complete action this year.

The Draft Convention on the legal status of the aircraft commander is also before the Assembly. Here, too, it is possible that a final text will be prepared and opened for signature.

The CITEJA, which originated the study of these conventions, has had a long and useful background of study and accomplishment. We look forward at this Assembly to participating in making appropriate arrangements to continue the work of CITEJA within the Aviation Organization.

In the other main substantive field of the organization, that of establishing policies for financial and technical aid through the organization under chapter XV of the convention, there has been little precedent. The United States hopes the Commission VI, as well as all others, will realize that our organization, for all its accomplishments, is still young. There has been little time to collect and analyze the basic data that will lead to intelligent decisions. We are all anxious to make decisions to improve the safety, efficiency, and economy of international air transport. Yet, we must recognize that decisions made without facts may hamper more than help our objectives. In all fields the United States urges the accumulation of facts. It appears that the documentation prepared for this field of joint support allows for the establishment of flexible policies and full exploration of the facts. The United States, under its national policy of support of the United Nations, views with great satisfaction the completion of negotiations on the draft agreement of relationship between the Aviation Organization and the United Nations. Final approval by the United Nations is, however, subject to compliance by ICAO with the resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 12, 1946, recommending that Franco Spain be debarred from membership in international agencies brought into relationship with the United Nations.

In accordance with this fundamental policy of support of the United Nations, the United States believes it is essential that the relationship agreement between the United Nations and ICAO be brought into force. The retention of Franco Spain as a member of ICAO would mean that the agreement of relationship could not come into operation. The United States delegation accordingly will propose that the Assembly of ICAO adopt an amendment to the Convention which will comply with the United Nations resolution.

Support of the recommendations of the United Nations General Assembly is more important to the United States Government than is the technical advantage of having one country continue as a member of this Organization. We hope that all members share our views on this subject.

There are several other decisions of a general nature to be made by this Assembly. It is to be hoped that the Council will be elected as soon as practicable in order that it may organize before Commission V completes its work. The new Council will then be able to obtain any necessary clarification of the organizational policies established by that Commission.

During this Assembly it appears desirable that a decision be reached on the location of our next convening. The United States favors a suitable location outside of North America.

It is hoped that the next Assembly agenda can be more limited than the one upon which we are now to embark. Perhaps two out of every three Assemblies could be confined to administrative matters and urgent items, a thorough review being held only every third year.

The United States believes that the strength of this Organization lies in a competent continuing Council, its Committees, and the Secretariat. We should build upon our experience to make them even more effective in the future.

In closing we recall with pleasure the cordial reception afforded us last year. The United States extends to the Canadian Government and people of Canada its sincere appreciation for their hospitality to the Organization during this, its First Assembly. Although this year's agenda is heavier than that of last year, the documentation has been so carefully and well prepared that it should be possible to complete our work in a considerably shorter time than was the case last year.

Operation Naval Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 29 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on last Sunday afternoon Mr. John Nicholas Brown, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, delivered an admirable address entitled "Operation Naval Reserve," at Roger Williams Park, in Providence, R. I. His address is most stimulating and informative in regard to the Naval Reserve, and I think it will be of general interest. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since joining the Navy Department in November, I have traveled 25,000 miles, from Montreal to Trinidad, from Boston to the western tip of California. Everywhere I have been, I have found Rhode Island men serving in the Navy; on ships, in planes, in under-sea craft, in shore-based establishments dedicated to research and development of modern weapons. Beyond this, I have met thousands of naval personnel from other parts of the country who have served in Rhode Island at some time in their career. Many of these look back upon this State as their second home. A surprising number have bought property here, and look forward to becoming Rhode Islanders on their retirement. To us, all this may not seem remarkable; but to the statistician, the historian, and the geographer, it would seem extraordinary that the smallest State in the Union, a mere 1,214 square miles, one-eighth of which is water, should be so deeply and ubiquitously involved in the largest maritime force in the world and, indeed, in the history of the world. Ladies and gentlemen, we know the answer—there is probably not a man or woman in this audience a member of whose family has not served at some time or another in the United States Navy. There is not a man or woman here, I am sure, whose Rhode Island ancestors have not included at least one seafaring man. It is not accidental that this smallest State of all has carried her commerce in her own ships at some time or other to every port of the known world, and that this commerce was, from its founding, the lifeblood of this colony, nor is it extraordinary that, in order to protect and defend their commerce, the men of Rhode Island armed themselves and engaged in naval warfare against their enemies long before the United States Navy came into being. Their naval history does not begin with the Revolution. More than 80 commissions or letters of marque to capture vessels and merchandise of the enemies of the King of England were issued by Rhode Island in King George's War, between 1739 and 1748, and more than 60 in the French and Indian War, between 1756 and 1763. The first naval action of the Revolution was a fight between the Rhode Island ship *Katy*, under Captain Whipple, and a British vessel off Conanicut Point on the 16th of June 1775, the day before the Battle of Bunker Hill.

It is only natural that when the newly constituted Federal Government turned to the creation of a navy for the defense of America it should look to Rhode Island for leadership, both in ships and in men. Commodore Esek Hopkins was the United States Navy's first flag officer. In 1801 the first American man-of-war to carry the Stars and Stripes into the harbor of Constantinople was the ship *General Washington*, built and launched at India Point in Providence. Some years later it was Oliver Hazard Perry, of Bristol, who won the Battle of Lake Erie and his brother Mathew, the commodore, who opened the Empire of Japan to intercourse with the outside world. The ultimate effects of this action cannot be gaged accurately yet, not even by those of you who fought to conquer that Empire.

During the last war, this small State was bristling with naval establishments. Our harbors were netted, our inland and coastal waters seamed and pocketed with restricted areas, where missiles fired from land and air and under the sea were constantly being tested for range and accuracy. Such names as Quonset Point, Davisville, Melville, Price's Neck, Charlestown, Coddington Point, Brown University, the naval training station, the Newport Torpedo Station, became household words to Rhode Islanders, representing as they did a vast immigration of young men from all parts of America to be trained here as experts in naval warfare. Some brought

their families with them. Many of these stayed and became permanent residents of the community upon which they were cast by the mammoth tide of war.

Now this tide has receded. Demobilization has sent the major portion of these young men back to their homes and civilian occupations, but the citizen of this State who believes that the United States Navy is, has ever been, or will ever be thoroughly washed out of Rhode Island in peacetime is under a grave misapprehension.

I wish that I might take each one of you over this State by plane and let you see from the air how deeply the Navy is involved in Rhode Island, and, consequently, Rhode Island in the Navy. Their destinies, so long united, have become by now inseparable. Flying in from the west, we see on our right hand submarines from the New London base operating around the waters of Block Island, while on our left, fighting planes take off and land at Charlestown on the mainland, still actively participating in the training of Navy fliers. In a few minutes we are over Narragansett Bay, where from the mouth of Newport Harbor clear to the tip of Quonset Point we see anchored ships of the Atlantic Fleet, which recently have left their wartime base in Maine to return to their home waters in Rhode Island. Over Newport we look down upon the United States Naval War College, the first of its kind in the world, through which virtually all the great naval commanders of this country during the past 75 years have passed. It was there that Admiral Mahan taught his famous theories on the influence of sea power on history, which were to change the naval strategy of the continent of Europe even before they were fully appreciated in his own country. Adjoining the war college and projecting its buildings to the tip of Coddington Point we see the new postgraduate school for line officers on the site of the old training station, where 525 junior officers are taking an intensive course.

Close aboard, the United States naval hospital, greatly expanded during the war, is still filled to capacity with war casualties undergoing special treatment, as well as the routine medical cases of peacetime operation. Looking behind us, we notice that the gunnery range at Sachusett Point is still active. Moving up the bay, we look down upon Melville, once the training site of the renowned "expendables" and their comrades of the PT squadrons, and now a fueling depot, as well as the principal fleet recreation area.

Across the bay on the other side we begin to notice unusual air activity. Planes are taking off and landing at frequent intervals, while great carriers lie alongside the piers below. This is Quonset, the Navy's most important Rhode Island installation, and one of the great world centers of naval aviation. Its own air activity personifies the heart and core of the modern Navy, for today airplanes are the striking power of the fleet. Quonset Point is the home port for four of our big carriers. Narragansett Bay also constitutes the home waters of all the light cruisers in the Atlantic Fleet—the *Houston*, the *Manchester*, the *Little Rock*, the *Portsmouth*, the *Wilkes-Barre*, the *Dayton*, the *Fargo*, the *Huntington*, and our own U. S. S. *Providence* which returned from the Mediterranean only a few days ago. In addition, 35 of the Atlantic Fleet destroyers make their home port here. This is more than half of the total number which are now active in the Atlantic Fleet. It is routine for all of these ships to be in their home ports except when on distant service or in fleet exercises. This, of course, does not mean that we shall see all of them at anchor at one time here in Rhode Island, but it does mean that in the course of a year all of them will have been with us for a more or less extended period, as will, either temporarily or permanently, the families, comprising around 20,000 persons, of the officers and men involved. This presents a difficult housing problem, with which I know you are familiar, but the files of the Navy Department contain much correspondence which indicates the willingness of our chambers of commerce and other public organizations to assist in this tedious problem in order that the families who would like to come here while the ships are in port will have some place to live.

So now, just as in the days of old, ships are going forth from Narragansett Bay and carrying the name of Rhode Island to all parts of the world, and with them something of our tradition and our heritage. It is to me inspiring as a citizen of this State to think that the aircraft carrier *Leyte*, with Rhode Island as her home, was the ship that made a courtesy call just a few days ago at Constantinople, and is now anchored in the Bay of Naples. Once again it is a Rhode Island ship that carries the American flag into Turkish waters, just as the *General Washington* had done before her in 1801. I am also inspired by the fact that the carrier *Philippine Sea* sailed out of Narragansett Bay to join Admiral Byrd for exploration in the Antarctic, and that she has just brought back from this exceptional voyage a much broader knowledge of air operations in polar regions.

Two other carriers—the *Kearsarge* and the *Randolph*—are now anchored down the bay. These ships will soon sail for ports in northern Europe with midshipmen from the Naval Academy.

All of these expeditions not only serve the very useful purpose of showing our flag around the world and insuring the safety and welfare of our people wherever they may be, they are also extremely broadening to the men on board who are able to see and realize the conditions under which the other peoples of the world live. They bring back with them a better knowledge and ability to assist in carrying out our desire to maintain the peace of the world. I know that you will be interested in the reactions of these young men, and I suggest that while home from these cruises you talk with them about these things.

In my association with the Navy both in Washington and on numerous trips aboard ship and to naval installations throughout the country, it has been borne in upon me that the United States Navy is the greatest engineering organization in the world. Regardless of the actual number of men involved, whether 3,000,000 as was the case at the end of the war, or scarcely a tenth of that, the number of men is small in proportion to their effectiveness since, like all men with high skill, they have control of vastly complicated mechanisms, the resulting power of which cannot be measured by any yardstick of manpower.

This Navy is our country's first line of defense. This should be clearly borne in mind at all times. It would seem a reasonable policy for the country in general, and this State in particular, always to back its Navy, because, whatever the cost, the Navy is still the cheapest insurance in terms of manpower and in terms of that manpower's effectiveness that this country can buy. But because the Navy is small, it must rely for support and for its expansion in time of trouble upon a wide group, to be in readiness with special skills and special training to fill out the peacetime framework. To provide this essential backing by the people, the Navy is asking you to join the Reserve—to show here in Rhode Island that you stand ready in peace—as you were in war—to lend a hand in maintaining our naval power so that the United States may continue strong—and by this strength to maintain the peace.

There are two kinds of civilian Reserves. The Organized Reserves have a close and regular association through drills, cruises, and occasional duty at a naval station. Through these they receive instruction in many things useful not only for future service in the Navy, but also often for their own civilian purposes. For the drill time and lesson time they are paid. There is a slogan which says "Earn while you learn." However, the Organized Reserve alone is not a broad enough foundation on which to build a wartime Navy. There has therefore been created a Volunteer Reserve to provide a means by which those men who cannot attend regular drills may help as much as possible. This group is paid only for the time actually spent on some specific Navy assignment. But its members definitely belong to the Naval Reserve, and through study and association may develop great usefulness to the Navy—and to themselves. In time of emergency when the Navy must expand rapidly, these men will constitute a very potent nucleus and they will be invaluable in assisting in the mobilization of the large numbers of untrained men necessary to man a wartime Navy should we ever again be faced with that terrible need.

It seems to me wholly admirable that the modern Navy, based as it is upon the most advanced of scientific equipment, assured of the mastery of the seven seas by means of those floating airfields which we call aircraft carriers, as well as all of the vessels that support and protect them, stands ready to transport and escort our troops to the lands of our enemies whoever and wherever they may be, protecting our commerce and denying access to our shores. It seems to me wholly desirable that this modern, up-to-date, alert defense of our country should be as modern and up to date in the development of the principles which deal with human beings as it is with the scientific weapons they must employ. The advantages which the modern Navy gives its men, the opportunity for steady improvement as well as recreation and fellowship, are unsurpassed. With our age-old tradition of seamanship, of hospitality, of responsibility to the Navy, I believe that in this day you will come forward and create a Reserve force that will be staunch and ready to carry on—as Rhode Islanders have always done—in peace—or in war.

Work of Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much comment among the people regarding the work of the Members of Congress. Very little is generally known of the hours they serve, and of the service they render, to the people of their respective districts. However, in passing it is sufficient for me to say that practically every Senator and Representative spend long and unusual hours in their offices, working upon departmental matters, holding conferences with other Members, sitting upon committee hearings where much evidence is submitted and heard, or serving in the executive sessions of the committees upon which they serve, reading and giving careful study to the many and various bills which are submitted for consideration, reading and studying the printed hearings upon these bills, going

to the many and various departments of Government to consult the officers relative to important matters of their constituents, and all the while receiving and answering the great stacks of mail coming from the people of their respective districts. Of course, the United States Senators receive the mail from people all over their State. Both the Senators and the Representatives have the same character of work to do. They are a busy group of men. All of their time is consumed, and each night in the office buildings in which their offices are located practically every office is found to be going strong, trying to complete the work of the day. Many days are filled from early dawn to late at night with hard work. There is no limitation of time, and there is no limitation of the hours of work. Their work determines the number of hours they are required to continue their effort. All of this is in addition to the study of the measures which are in debate, and in the preparation to participate in the debate on the floor of the House and Senate. And may I say here that it is highly important for every Senator and Representatives to be well prepared and in full possession of the facts when he takes part in the debate of these highly controversial issues which come before these great legislative bodies, because there are many others who have studied and prepared for the debate and they are familiar with every issue involved.

Mr. Speaker, a very illuminating editorial was written by Mr. Stewart Riley, publisher of the Bedford Daily Times-Mail, of Bedford, Ind., upon this same subject. He has had the experience of visiting with Representative EARL WILSON, of Bedford, and Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, and he found both of these public servants extremely busy. That same condition faces every Member of both the Senate and House from our great Hoosier State. The things Mr. Riley saw he carried back to Indiana with him, and he wrote the fine editorial to which I desire to refer herein.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak too highly of the daily efforts of two Members of Congress—Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER and Representative EARL WILSON. Mr. Riley has analyzed, in his well-written editorial, their daily problems. When he analyzed the problems of the two gentlemen, above mentioned, he referred to the problems of every Member of the Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the editorial to which I have referred, and which appeared in the Bedford Daily Times-Mail, of Bedford, Ind., of date May 7, 1947, which illustrates the work of a Congressman, which editorial is as follows:

CONGRESSMEN AND SENATORS WORK HARD

A few days in Washington convinces even the casual visitor that Congressmen and Senators put in more than a 40-hour week serving their constituents, and this Ninth District has two of the hardest-working men in Congress—Senator WILLIAM JENNER and Congressman EARL WILSON.

In 4 days in Washington we saw quite a bit of Nyle Jackson, EARL WILSON'S secretary. Mr. WILSON was busy with conferences and roll calls.

Five-year old Billy Jenner has started on a successful business career selling magazines. To date, he has amassed 30 cents, but that is the first step. Young Bill says he wants to make a million dollars, so he can give his daddy half of it, so daddy won't have to work so hard, and can stay home and play with his son.

Father Bill, the Senator, was appointed on the Labor and Education Committee of the Senate. For six straight weeks that group met nearly every day from 10 a. m. to 6 p. m., and evenings were consumed in studying the other problems of the Senate. Mrs. Jenner says she doesn't see as much of her husband as she did when he was campaigning for office. Bill himself says, "I didn't realize what a job this is. I was down here for a few weeks before, but that was the end of a session, and most of the work had been done. No fooling, I'm tired." He looked it.

EARL WILSON starts his day with conference at 8 o'clock in the morning. Then he takes out a little time to answer correspondence. By midmorning he is either in committee work or on the House floor. With so many very important roll calls he must constantly be available. What little afternoon time he has is spent in studying legislation or trying to perform services for the people of the Ninth District.

We had lunch with Mr. WILSON in the House restaurant the day President Alemán spoke before Congress. Mr. WILSON stands very well with his fellow Congressmen. Almost every Member who came into the restaurant said, "Hello, Earl," or waved. It was quite evident from the manner of the greeting that the salutation was sincere, respectful, and genuine. EARL WILSON stands very well among the Members of Congress. Of course, Members of the opposition try to belittle him, but that is politics. The reorganization bill probably pushed Mr. WILSON out of chairmanship of the Flood Control Committee, but he is a ranking Member of the House Committee on Public Works, which is made up of the old Committees on Public Buildings and Grounds and Flood Control. We met Congressman DONDERO, chairman of the Public Works Committee, and he said, "We think a lot of Mr. WILSON down here." It was quite obvious from his tone that he meant what he said, and was not just giving Earl a build-up before one of his constituents. The people of the Ninth District can well be proud of the type of men they have sent to Washington.

Both Senator JENNER and Congressman WILSON look tired. They were kind enough to ask us out for dinner. The WILSONS were to call at our hotel at 6:30. At 6:45 Mr. WILSON telephoned to say that he was held up for a roll call on the rent control bill, and for us to go on out to JENNER'S. He would join us later if possible. He did arrive about 8:30. That made it a 12½-hour day. The party broke up about 10:45, as both Bill and Earl wanted to go home to bed.

A study of the men present at the joint session of Congress addressed by President Alemán showed most of the men on the floor looking a little weary from hard work and confining attention to their jobs. As a sidelight on this joint session, probably the most outstanding man in the room was Secretary of State Marshall. He came in leading the members of the Cabinet. He is an outstanding personality. He just radiates strength of character. He didn't say a word, as the honors went to the Mexican President, but from the comments of the other folks in the galleries, our admiration of the former Chief of Staff was shared by most of the audience. Mr. Marshall looked tired, too. This business of working for the Government is no easy job for men who are really interested in serving their country.

Our respect for all Members of Congress, and especially the two men from Bedford, was tremendously enhanced by seeing them in Washington. They are splendid, hard-working men.

Tax Exemption and Co-ops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, following are two recent editorials from Indiana newspapers on the competitive advantages of tax-exempt co-ops.

The first, from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, reads as follows:

PLEA FOR TAX EQUALITY

A resolution of the Indiana General Assembly memoralizes Congress to amend Federal revenue legislation to withdraw from tax-exemption benefits cooperative associations and organizations or industries operated in a similar manner.

Usually when the subject of such exemption arises, there is an inclination to becloud the issue by arguing whether cooperatives are a good thing.

There is much to be said on both sides of the question; the merits or demerits of cooperatives may be laid aside now as having nothing to do with the taxation issue involved.

Farm interests weigh heavily in the cooperative movement. It is interesting, therefore, to recall that farm organizations were in the vanguard of the campaign for a law requiring that religious, charitable, and educational organizations pay property tax on real estate used for income purposes. Such a law was passed and upheld by the courts.

But what of the payment of Federal net income taxes? Ah, but that is different, the Farm Bureau cooperatives and other cooperatives contend.

How is it different?

What is the difference between the principle of equality in tax payment as applied to religious organizations on property levies and Federal income tax payment as applied to cooperatives?

The cooperative spokesmen carefully refer to their profits by another name and speak voluminously of dividends returned to their members. Some of them point out that cooperatives in certain instances do pay Federal income taxes without advancing a logical reason why all should not pay.

Has anyone heard the cooperatives ever claim they could not stay in business without what virtually amounts to a Government subsidy? Indeed, has any authentic spokesman denied that their business could be operated profitably while paying the taxes their competitors are obliged to pay?

Thoughtful citizens regard this not as a personal problem in which an honest decision should be made when the facts are understood.

The resolution referred to, it should be pointed out, is aimed only at cooperatives which are business organizations; purely farm-membership associations are not affected.

To the reminder that there are inequalities in many taxing fields, this newspaper would reply with a reminder of its own: That it has argued for their elimination. An example is our current testimonial to the

need of ironing out inequities in real-estate valuations.

Interestingly enough, a number of the co-op leaders themselves agree that cooperatives need no soft cushion of special privileges.

If our system of free enterprise is to mean anything at all, such concerns will have earned their place in the economic field when they run the same course as their competitors in private business.

The other, from the Zionsville Times, is as follows:

We joined with the Indiana Farm Bureau and other State-wide organizations first to pass and then successfully to take through the courts the law of 1937, which said that all real estate used for income purposes, whether owned by religious, charitable, or educational organizations, should pay property tax. Although such organizations' receipts from these rental properties were used for worthy purposes, nevertheless we all agreed—and the legislature agreed—that they should pay their share of property tax the same as other competing properties. The courts upheld this.

We see no difference between this principle as applied to property tax and the issue of whether or not all types of co-ops, whether farm bureau or others, should pay Federal net income tax. The fact that they call their profits something else, and thus escape this Federal tax, in no way changes the situation. Neither does their claim that some co-ops do pay Federal incomes taxes make a logical reason why all should not pay. We have never heard the co-ops claim they could not stay in business without this Federal subsidy.

We have refused to consider this issue in any way a personal one, but rather one on which the people will make a decision when they understand the facts. These resolutions will affect only cooperatives which are business organizations and in no way affect any purely farm membership associations, such as the Farm Bureau.

We have refused to permit the issue to be complicated by red-herring tactics of debating whether or not co-ops are a good thing; we don't believe this has anything to do with the taxation issue involved.

We realize there is inequality in every field of taxation, and a continuous effort must be made toward equality.

We agree with a large number of co-op leaders—and even a large number of Hoosier farmers—that co-ops need no special privileges and should pay all taxes the same as any other business, and that once they do, they will take their rightful position in the economic field.

Americans for Democratic Action Program Submitted Deserves Consideration by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter to the Honorable JESSE WOLCOTT asking consideration by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the program of ADA. The letter is as follows:

MAY 22, 1947.

Hon. JESSE WOLCOTT,
Vice Chairman, Joint Committee on the Economic Report,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOLCOTT: The primary concern of the Congress is the health and stability of the national economy. This great responsibility was emphasized and underlined by the passage of the Employment Act of 1946, which established a joint committee of both Houses to advise the Congress and its committees on major matters of economic policy.

As Members of Congress, we are increasingly concerned over the rapidly mounting price level and the attendant decline in purchasing power which, taken together with other factors, in the opinion of competent observers and experts, portends a recession or slackening of economic activity in the near future. The Council of Economic Advisers and the President have issued a warning on this subject. More recently, a committee of 11 leading economists and former Government officials, including Chester Bowles as chairman, William H. Davis, Leon Henderson, Paul Porter, Professor Seymour Harris, under the sponsorship of Americans for Democratic Action, have issued an analysis of the dangers in the present economic situation and recommendations for remedial action which they say should be adopted within the next 60 days in order to curb and cushion the anticipated recession.

If the conclusions reached by this group and by other business and Government spokesmen are correct, there is no more important problem before the Congress and the Nation. We know that, if the Congress lives up to its responsibility, it is not necessary for this country to go through the old and tragic cycle of boom and bust. We believe that a serious recession at this time would not only create widespread suffering and serious dislocations here at home, but may well jeopardize our position in the world, and our hope for world recovery and reconstruction. We believe that the time to take action against the threatened recession is before it occurs. The issue clearly lies before this session of Congress.

Although this report does not profess to have all the answers, its recommendations present a concrete program of legislation and executive action which merits prompt and earnest consideration by the Congress.

As Members of the House of Representatives, we respectfully request you as vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, to place this report before that committee and to urge immediate hearings on it and other proposals, and the formulation of definite recommendations for timely action.

We do not make this appeal as a partisan measure. The issue of economic stability transcends political lines. To fail to deal with the most important problem before the country today would be an evasion of our duties as elected Representatives of the people.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington; CECIL R. KING, California; FRANCK R. HAVENNER, California; WALTER K. GRANGER, Utah; JOHN A. CARROLL, Colorado; J. PERCY PRIEST, Tennessee; WALTER B. HUBER, Ohio; ALBERT GORE, Tennessee; FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania; FRANK BUCHANAN, Pennsylvania; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania; MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; JAMES W. TRIMBLE, Arkansas; JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island; AIME J. FORAND, Rhode Island; JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan; PRINCE H. PRESTON, Jr., Georgia; HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, California; WILBUR MILLS, Arkansas; JOHN LYLE, Texas; JOHN FOLGER, North Carolina; ANTONIO FERNANDEZ, New Mexico; HERBERT BONNER, North Carolina; GEORGIA LUSK, New Mexico; MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana; JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts; GEORGE SMATHERS, Florida; WILLIAM DAWSON, Illinois; MARTIN GORSKI, Illinois; FRANK KARSTEN, Missouri; OLIN E. TEAGUE, Texas; PORTER HARDY, Jr., Virginia; BROOKS HAYS, Arkansas; CHET HOLIFIELD, California; MELVIN PRICE, Illinois; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana; HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia; MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Ohio; MARY T. NORTON, New Jersey; JOHN R. MURDOCK, Arizona; CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma; JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Massachusetts; CHARLES B. DEANE, North Carolina; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee; HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Massachusetts; ARTHUR G. KLEIN, New York; RAY J. MADDEN, Indiana; RICHARD F. HARLESS, Arkansas; GEORGE P. MILLER, California.

Self-Perpetuation of Government Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress I have often heard it said that the danger of establishing any particular office or agency in the Government is that you never seem to get rid of them. In most cases there seems to be an attempt at self-perpetuation to provide employment for those in that office. The United States Spruce Corporation of World War I, which took 25 years to liquidate, is an example.

In other cases it seems that they hang on because care and maintenance of the old files provides the necessity or, should we say, the excuse.

I have recently checked to determine whether or not the ghost of that famous old bird, the Blue Eagle of 1934, was still in existence. To my surprise, I find that the NRA is still with us 12 years after the termination of its brief but hectic existence. This agency, as you will recall, lived but a year or two, and in June of 1935, by act of Congress, it presumedly ended. A few months later the President, by Executive Order No. 7252, administered the final rites, and for all intents and purposes that was the last of our famed Blue Eagle.

We now find that in 1947 there is still one full-time employee and one half-time employee engaged in working on the files of the NRA. They contend that as late as this spring some businessman in this country requested an application to file under and comply with the terms of the NRA.

Certainly the cost of the present employees of this short-lived agency are not of any great consequence, but it does confirm the fact that once established

a Government office never seems to completely die. Considering the large number of agencies which were set up subsequent to the alleged demise of the NRA, and particularly those of World War II, we have just cause to wonder if most of those agencies presumedly in the process of liquidation will not still be hovering over us like the ghost of the Blue Eagle when my son, now in the second grade, shall have become the possessor of a long gray beard.

Ives-Fulton Bill Against Discrimination in Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, because I have been receiving many requests for a summary and analysis of the provisions of H. R. 2824, known as the Ives-Fulton bill, I am explaining the main features of the legislation for the RECORD.

This bill was introduced in the House on March 27, 1947, and on the same date in the Senate, S. 984, by Senator IVES, of New York. The cosponsors of the bill in the Senate are Senator IVES, of New York, Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, Senator MORSE, of Oregon, Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, Senator MURRAY, of Montana, and Senator MYERS, of Pennsylvania.

The Ives-Fulton bill is essentially a compromise bill based on principles of the successful statute now in effect in the State of New York. H. R. 2824 sets up a system of local, State, and regional advisory and conciliation councils to enable localities to settle on a voluntary basis questions of discrimination in employment. The bill also provides for an approach at settlement by conference, conciliation, and persuasion, before resorting to steps leading to orders by governmental authority.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

First. Practices prohibited: The bill forbids discrimination in hiring, firing, or conditions of employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry by an employer of 50 or more engaged in interstate commerce and also forbids him to utilize any employment agency or other placement service which discriminates—section 5a. The bill forbids a labor organization having 50 members in the employ of one or more subject to the act to discriminate against any individual or to segregate or limit its membership in any way which adversely affects his employment opportunities—section 5b. The bill forbids employers and labor organizations to discriminate against any person for having opposed an unlawful employment practice.

Second. Exemptions: The bill exempts State or municipal—but not Federal—agencies as well as nonprofit religious, charitable, fraternal, social, and educational associations, other than labor organizations—section 4.

Third. Who enforces act: The bill creates a National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment composed of seven members at an annual salary of $10,000 each, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for overlapping 7-year terms—section 6.

Fourth. Powers of Commission: The bill authorizes the Commission to investigate charges, attempt to eliminate discrimination by conference, conciliation, and persuasion, issue complaints, hold hearings, subpena witnesses, make findings of fact, issue cease-and-desist orders, order reinstatement or hiring, with or without back pay, and seek enforcement of its orders in court—section 7.

Fifth. Sanctions: Violation of a court-enforced order of the Commission may be punishable as a contempt of court—section 8. Wilful resistance to Commission representatives is a misdemeanor—section 14—punishable by a fine of not more than $500 and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year.

Sixth. Administrative procedure: The charges may be filed by or on behalf of an aggrieved person or by any member of the Commission. The commissioner who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing or trial thereof. Three members of the Commission hear the parties argue the case, but after the hearing, the entire Commission—three members constituting a quorum—must decide it. Procedure is in conformity with the Administrative Procedure Act—section 7 and section 8.

Seventh. Judicial review: Review is had in circuit court of appeals in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act. An order may be set aside if arbitrary or capricious or not supported by substantial evidence—section 8.

Eighth. Government agencies and Government contracts: Commission orders against a Federal agency may be enforced by the President and not by the courts. The President may also issue regulations to prevent unlawful employment practices on any Federal contract employing 50 or more persons. Such regulations are enforced by the Commission—section 10.

Ninth. Notices: Every employer or union subject to act must post notices about act approved by Commission; a willful failure to post is punishable by a fine of from $100 to $500—section 11.

Tenth. Other provisions:

(a) The act is to be known as the "National Act Against Discrimination in Employment"—section 1.

(b) The declaration of policy cities the constitutional and moral justifications for the act, including the Charter of the United Nations. The right to employment without discrimination is made a Federal civil right—section 2.

(c) A trial examiner who presides at a Commission hearing must be a resident of the Federal judicial circuit in which the alleged unlawful practice took place—section 6f.

(d) At the request of an employer whose employees refuse to cooperate with the act, the Commission may offer remedial action—section 6g.

(e) The Commission may create State or regional advisory or conciliation councils and may empower them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment—section 6g.

(f) Complaints must be filed within 1 year after discrimination has been committed—section 7h.

(g) The act does not affect in any way veterans' preferences laws—section 12.

(h) Regulations of the Commission may be set aside by a concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress—section 13.

For further information I would advise the interested citizen to write to the National Council for a Permanent FEPC at 930 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C.

The Ives-Fulton bill provides specifically as follows:

A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Act Against Discrimination in Employment."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the practice of discriminating in employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is contrary to the American principles of liberty and of equality of opportunity, is incompatible with the Constitution, forces large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States.

(b) The right to employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right of all the people of the United States.

(c) This act has also been enacted as a step toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations upon the United States as a signatory thereof to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

(d) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to protect the right recognized and declared in subdivision (b) hereof and to eliminate all such discrimination to the fullest extent permitted by the Constitution. This act shall be construed to effectuate such policy.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act:

(a) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, or any organized group of persons and any agency or instrumentality of the United States or of any Territory or possession thereof.

(b) The term "employer" means a person engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in this employ 50 or more individuals; any agency or instrumentality of the United States or of any Territory or possession thereof; and any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly.

(c) The term "labor organization" means any organization, having 50 or more members employed by any employer or employers, which exist for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, terms or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

(d) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or com-

munication among the several States; or between any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any Territory; or between points in the same State but through any point outside thereof.

(e) The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

(f) The term "Commission" means the National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment, created by section 6 hereof.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 4. This act shall not apply to any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or to any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, not organized for profit, other than labor organizations.

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; and

(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any labor organization to discriminate against any individual or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive such individual of employment opportunities, or would limit his employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee or as an applicant for employment, or adversely affect his wages, hours, or employment conditions, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby created a commission to be known as the National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment, which shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, one for a term of 5 years, one for a term of 6 years, and one for a term of 7 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 7 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members thereof shall constitute a quorum.

(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all individuals in its employ and the moneys it has disbursed, and shall make such further reports on the cause of and means of eliminating discrimination and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $10,000 a year.

(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet or exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. Any such agent designated to conduct a proceeding or a hearing shall be a resident of the Federal judicial circuit, as defined in sections 116 and 308 of the Judicial Code as amended (U. S. C. Annotated, title 28, secs. 211 and 450), within which the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred.

(g) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint such agents and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions;

(2) to cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies;

(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States;

(4) to furnish to persons subject to this act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this act or any order issued thereunder;

(5) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action;

(6) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies; and

(7) to create such local, State, or regional advisory and conciliations councils as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this act, and the Commission may empower them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendation to the Commission for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and conciliation councils shall be composed of representative citizens residents of the area for which they are appointed, serving without pay, but with reimbursement for actual and necessary traveling expenses; and the Commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance.

PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 7. (a) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission, that any person subject to the act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall investigate such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Nothing said or done during such endeavors may be used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding.

(b) If the Commission fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful employment practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this act, or in advance thereof if circumstances so warrant, it shall cause a copy of such written charge to be served upon such person who has allegedly committed any unlawful employment practice, hereinafter called the respondent, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than 10 days after the service of such charge.

(c) The member of the Commission who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon or in a trial thereof.

(d) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission the entire record thereof shall be transferred to the Commission, which shall designate three of its qualified members to sit as the Commission and to hear on such record the parties at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice.

(e) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

(f) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such written charge and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

(g) The Commission or the member or designated agent conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any written charge, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

(h) Any written charge filed pursuant to this section must be filed within 1 year after the commission of the alleged unlawful employment practice.

(i) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that any person named in the written charge has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring him to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of the act. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that no person named in the written charge has engaged or is engaging in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

(j) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

(k) The proceedings held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, Public Law 404, Seventy-ninth Congress, June 11, 1946.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia) or, if the circuit court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court of the United States (including the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia) within any circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the

proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by sections 10c and 10e, of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(b) Upon such filing, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

(c) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member or agent, shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

(d) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there was reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member or agent, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member or agent, and to be made a part of the transcript.

(e) The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

(f) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals, if application was made to the district court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, secs. 346 and 347).

(g) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court of appeals of the United States in the circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person transacts business, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsection (a), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the petitioner or the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part, the order of the Commission.

(h) Upon such filing by a person aggrieved the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by sections 10a and 10b of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(i) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (a) or (g) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or any member thereof, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(b) Any member of the Commission, or any agent designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

(c) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(d) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this act, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission, its member, or agent, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(e) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matters, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The immunity herein provided shall extend only to natural persons so compelled to testify.

ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 10. The provision of section 8 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof, or any officer or employee thereof. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders. The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of rules and regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of any Territory or possession of the United States, which contract requires the employment of at least 50 individuals. Such rules and regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

NOTICES TO BE POSTED

SEC. 11. (a) Every employer and labor organization shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of the act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the act.

(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 or more than $500 for each separate offense.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC. 12. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify any Federal or State law creating special rights or preferences for veterans.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 13. (a) The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this act. If at any time after the issuance of any such regulation or any amendment or rescission thereof, there is passed a concurrent resolution to the two Houses of the Congress stating in substance that the Congress disapproves such regulation, amendment, or rescission, such disapproved regulation, amendment, or rescission shall not be effective after the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution, nor shall any regulation or amendment having the same effect as that concerning which the concurrent resolution was passed be issued thereafter by the Commission.

(b) Regulations issued under this section shall be in conformity to the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

FORCIBLY RESISTING THE COMMISSION OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 14. Whoever shall forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission while engaged in the performance of duties under this act, or because of such performance, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 15. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

COMPARISON OF H. R. 2232, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, AND IVES-FULTON BILL, H. R. 2824, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—GENERAL STATEMENT

H. R. 2232 was selected for comparison because it was prepared by the Labor Committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress and was the only bill of its kind in that Congress to be reported by the committee.

Briefly the principal points of difference in the two bills are as follows:

H. R. 2232 makes the act applicable to labor unions of 6 or more persons and to employers of 6 or more persons, whereas H. R. 2824 sets the figure at 50 in each case.

H. R. 2824 provides for local, State, and regional advisory and conciliation councils to enable localities to voluntarily settle questions of discrimination in employment. It also requires an approach at settlement by conference, conciliation, and persuasion before resorting to steps leading to a cease-and-desist order or dismissal of the complaint. H. R. 2232 does not have these provisions.

H. R. 2824 permits Congress to disapprove a Commission regulation at any time after issuance thereof. H. R. 2232 limits congressional disapproval to 60 days after issuance of the regulation.

H. R. 2232 requires that antidiscrimination clauses be included in Government contracts.

H. R. 2824 omits this provision.

H. R. 2824 exempts from operation of the act State and local governments and certain nonprofit organizations. H. R. 2232 has no such provision.

H. R. 2824 offers aggrieved parties additional opportunities for judicial review pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act (Public Law 404, 79th Cong.).

Section by section comparison

Section	H. R. 2232, 79th Cong.	H. R. 2824, 80th Cong.
Sec. 1: Short title	"Fair Employment Practice Act"	"National Act Against Discrimination in Employment."
Sec. 2: Findings and declaration of policy	Sets forth the underlying factual basis and policy for the regulation provided by the bill. The Congress finds that discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry (1) leads to domestic and industrial strife and unrest, (2) forces large segments of our population permanently into substandard conditions of living, (3) creates a drain upon the resources of the Nation, (4) causes a diminution of employment and wages which disrupts the market for goods in commerce, all of which (5) burden, hinder, and obstruct commerce.	Sets forth the underlying factual basis and policy for the regulation provided by the bill. The Congress finds that discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry (1) is contrary to the American principles of liberty and equality of opportunity, (2) is incompatible with the Constitution, (3) forces large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, (4) foments industrial and domestic strife, (5) deprives the United States of full productive capacities, (6) endangers the national security and general welfare, and (7) adversely affects domestic and foreign commerce.
	No similar provision.	Cites act as a step toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations upon the United States as a signatory thereof to promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."
Sec. 3: Definitions	Defines in ordinary terms the words, "person, labor union, commerce, affecting commerce," and "Commission." "Employer" excludes all employers of less than 6 individuals. A "labor union" excludes organizations having less than 6 members.	Defines in ordinary terms the words, "person, employer, labor organization, commerce, affecting commerce," and "Commission." "Employer" excludes employers of less than 50 individuals. "Labor organization" excludes organizations having less than 50 members.
Sec. 4: Right to freedom from discrimination in employment.	Declares that the right to work free from discrimination is an "immunity" of citizens of the United States, which shall not be abridged by any Federal or State agency.	Declares right to employment without discrimination to be a civil right of all the people of the United States.
Exemptions	No provision.	Exempts from operation of the act any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, or other nonprofit corporations or associations, except labor organizations.
Sec. 5: Unfair (unlawful in H. R. 2824) employment practices defined.	Declares as an unfair employment practice (1) by an employer the refusal to hire, the discharge of, or the discrimination against, any person because of race, color, creed, religion, national origin or ancestry, or limitation of recruitment on that basis; (2) by a labor union the refusal of or expulsion from membership or the discrimination against any employee, employer or member for the foregoing reasons; and (3) the discrimination by an employer or labor union against any person because he has opposed practices forbidden by this act.	Declares as an unlawful employment practice (1) by an employer the refusal to hire, the discharge of, or the discrimination against an individual because of his race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry, or the utilization of recruitment agencies which practice discrimination; (2) by a labor organization the limitation, segregation, or classification of its membership in any way which would deprive or limit any individuals' employment opportunities; and (3) the discrimination against any person by an employer or labor organization because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice.
Sec. 6: Fair Employment Practice Commission.	Creates the Fair Employment Practice Commission composed of 5 members appointed by the President for 5-year terms ($10,000 a year) with the advice and consent of the Senate (original members would serve for terms ranging from 1 to 5 years).	
	The Commission would replace the Committee on Fair Employment Practice established by Executive Order 9346 of May 27, 1943, and which was terminated on June 30, 1946, by the act of July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 473).	No provision.
The National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment.		Creates the National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment composed of 7 members appointed by the President for 7-year terms ($10,000 a year) with the advice and consent of the Senate (original members would serve for terms ranging from 1 to 7 years).
	No provision.	Provides for creation of local, State, or regional advisory conciliation councils to enable localities to voluntarily settle disputes, and empowers the Commission, upon request of an employer whose employees refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating this act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action.
Sec. 7: Prevention of unfair (unlawful in H. R. 2824) employment practices.	Empowers the Commission to prevent unfair employment practices by the issuance of cease-and-desist orders. Procedure calls for filing of charges with the Commission, the holding of hearings before it, the making of findings of fact, and the issuance of cease-and-desist orders or dismissal of the complaint.	Empowers the Commission to prevent unlawful employment practices by the issuance of cease-and-desist orders. First, however, the Commission shall investigate the written charges of persons claiming to be aggrieved and shall endeavor to eliminate the practice complained of by conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Cease-and-desist orders are to be issued only after efforts to obtain voluntary compliance with the act have failed and hearings have been held before the Commission on the practices complained of. Proceedings shall be conducted in accordance with secs. 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act (Public Law 404, 79th Cong.).
Sec. 8: Judicial review	Incorporates, by reference, the procedure for judicial review and enforcement of the Commission's orders which is now applicable to orders of the National Labor Relations Board (U. S. C. 29: 160 (e), (f), (g)).	Same as H. R. 2232 (provisions are written into bill) except that additional provisions are included to provide for conducting of further proceedings by the reviewing court in accordance with section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act (Public Law 404, 79th Cong). where (a) the Commission files petition for enforcement of an order or for appropriate temporary relief, or (b) a person aggrieved by the Commission's final order files petition for review.
Sec. 9: Investigatory powers	Confers upon the Commission the customary powers of subpena and administration of oaths.	Same as H. R. 2232 except that the provision making failure to obey a court order to appear and testify before the Commission punishable as a contempt of court is omitted in H. R. 2824.
Sec. 10 (H. R. 2232). Sec. 13 (H. R. 2824). Rules and regulations.	Empowers the Commission to issue regulations necessary to carry out the act, but provides that Congress may disapprove any regulation by the adoption of a concurrent resolution within 60 days after issuance of such regulation. After adoption of such a resolution the Commission would be barred from issuing another regulation having the same effect as the one disapproved.	Same as H. R. 2232 except that Congressional disapproval of a regulation may occur at any time after issuance.
Sec. 11 (H. R. 2232): Inclusion of antidiscrimination clause in Government contracts.	Requires that every contract to which the Government is a party shall include an antidiscrimination clause.	No similar provision.
(H. R. 2824): Notices to be posted	No similar provision.	Requires every employer and labor organization to post in conspicuous places upon its premises notices prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth relevant information deemed appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act. Fixes a $100 to $500 penalty for each violation.
Sec. 12 (H. R. 2232). Sec. 10 (H. R. 2824). Enforcement of orders directed to Government agencies.	Provides for a means of enforcing the Commission's orders against Federal agencies or their officers who have been guilty of discriminatory employment practices. The Commission may request the President to take any action deemed appropriate to obtain compliance with an order. The President may discharge summarily any Federal employee who has willfully failed to obey an order of the Commission.	Similar to H. R. 2232 except that it does not specifically include authority for President to summarily discharge a Federal employee for noncompliance with an order but gives the President power to establish rules and regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of an unlawful employment practice by any person who makes a contract with any Federal agency or instrumentality which contract requires the employment of at least 50 individuals.
(H. R. 2824): Veteran's preference	No provision.	Specifies that this act shall not repeal or modify Federal or State laws creating special rights or preferences for veterans.
Sec. 13 (H. R. 2232). Sec. 14 (H. R. 2824): Interference with the Commission or its agents.	Prescribes penalty of $5,000 fine and/or 1 year's imprisonment for willfully resisting, interfering, etc.	Prescribes penalty of $500 fine and/or 1 year's imprisonment for forcibly resisting, interfering, etc.
Sec. 14 (H. R. 2232). Sec. 15 (H. R. 2824): Separability clause.	The usual separability provision.	Same.

Friends of the University of Salzburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by the Reverend Dr. Joseph B. McAllister, S. S., of the Catholic University of America, at a meeting of the Friends of the University of Salzburg, held at the Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., Monday, May 11, 1947:

Friends of the University of Salzburg, we are gathered here to take another step forward in organizing an effective plan to help reestablish and to develop the Austrian University of Salzburg.

This seat of learning has survived the vicissitudes of centuries of political unrest. Its foundation may be as early as 700 A. D., when, according to one account, a group of Irish monks founded the monastery of St. Peter. From that early beginning down right to the present day there has been an unbroken religious life in the monastery. Wars have come and gone with their terrible wastefulness, but the continuity of worship has not been broken in this most Latin of all German-speaking towns.

As an intellectual foundation the University of Salzburg has had an uneven history. The Benedictine Fathers took over the administration in the early part of the seventeenth century and entered upon a program of development, to bring the institution to the ranks of a full university, offering the usual liberal courses of such an institution. But this program went into eclipse in 1810, when the university ceased to be a university in fact and was restricted largely to theological studies. At the turn of the century there was again new life injected into the ancient foundation.

For a long time there had been felt a great need for a new university in Austria. Salzburg was an obvious choice, not only for its honorable religious and academic traditions, but also because of its natural beauty and geographical location. Salzburg stands at a cultural crossroads, where the culture of the Mediterranean basin meets that of the Germanic lands. Plans were laid and funds were collected—only to have the entire scheme crushed by World War I.

But like the storied Phoenix the university of Salzburg rose to the challenge of reconstruction. Under the leadership of illustrious rectors and the inspiration of Msgr. Ignaz Seipel, the heroic Chancelor of Austria and a former professor at the university, Salzburg gathered together the remnants of the past to prosecute its progress toward full university stature. The Holy See seconded the movement by establishing a philosophical institute, endowed with the right of conferring the doctorate in philosophy. Other institutes were founded, for historical research, liturgical studies, folklore, history, geography, and science. The impressive Collegium Benedictinum was built. In this development the United States of America had its share by reason of the contributions which Benedictine houses in this country made to their sister institution in Salzburg.

The picture was brightening for a great Christian university geared to meet the needs of a postwar Austria and Germany. In 1930 new impetus was given to the plan and in 1931 steps were taken in the International Catholic University Weeks, to make Salzburg an intellectual center. The success of these "weeks" as well as other ventures of the university raised high hopes for the immediate future of the University of Salzburg—only again to have the hopes and aspirations and years of work and building and saving struck down by World War II.

The academic life and organization of Salzburg of course suffered. Yet with the cessation of hostilities little damage to the buildings of the university was revealed. They stand today, along with a respectable library, ready to serve as the cornerstone for another attempt to make Salzburg a flourishing and complete university.

Today men of good will everywhere want to see Europe rise from the debris of war. And now, today, more than even a few months ago, men of good will realize that it must be a new Europe renewed and revivified with the life of traditional truth and truly democratic ideals.

There are threats in the German and Austrian scene of hunger and misery, of multitudes without homes and shelter, of ruined industry and unemployment and idle mines and dislocated commerce, along with the terrible threats of cold and plague and disease. These are real and in no sense to be minimized.

Yet as the spirit is truly an integral part of man, so should its needs have a voice in the general appeal for help to war-torn Europe. I need not mention, much less stress, the blanket of materialism which is spreading over those parts of the world which Russia possesses or indirectly controls.

It is imperative that a counter force be mustered and put into operation. Certainly a factor in those forces must be a strong center of Christian thought.

For such a center Salzburg has many things in its favor. It has a long and honorable history. Though stretching back into a dim past, it is alive to the needs of the present. It has the nucleus of the physical requirements for an institution of learning. It has to some extent also the basis of the academic needs. It is today functioning in a modest, courageous way. It has a naturally beautiful location and geographical convenience. Though Austria is 90 percent Catholic, Salzburg cuts across political and religious and racial lines in its world-wide reputation as a musical and cultural center. Above all, it lies in that part of Austria apportioned to the United States of America.

In founding the Friends of the University of Salzburg, one of our first moves was to lay the matter before the proper Government officials. The State Department grasped at once the significance of our aims and gave the necessary authorization for us to try to contribute something toward building up Salzburg as a great university.

The present Holy Father, following the precedent of Pius XI, has expressed his pleasure in the movement and has conferred his blessing upon all who join the association, as well as upon their families. The Archbishop of Salzburg is deeply interested and grateful for what we may be able to do. Likewise, the organization has been warmly received by many members of the hierarchy in the United States and has found patrons in prominent laymen and institutions of higher learning.

In general the purpose of the Friends of the University of Salzburg is to render financial help to the university for its rehabilitation and for its development. The association will try to make contact with friendly persons and organizations with a view to obtaining their interest and support. Furthermore, it will strive to have the studies at the university organized along truly Christian and democratic ideals and principles. For this purpose it will aid in building up the resident faculty and encouraging the exchange of professors with this country. Schools in theology and philosophy, law, medicine, science, literature and journalism, social and economic studies, music and art, all, it is hoped, eventually will find a place in the broad ambit of Salzburg. Its work will be implemented by appropriate arrangements for exchanging academic credits, so that students from this country can follow courses in Salzburg without sacrificing the time from their regular college work. As a result, Salzburg should become a lively source of mutual good will between the Continent and the United States and a power to promote a better understanding among the various peoples.

The importance of these aims, I may suggest, is vindicated by the move on the part of the Harvard Student Council. It will conduct a seminar in American civilization this summer, in Salzburg, July 15 to August 31. To defray the cost of sending 80 students and professors to the seminar the council is raising $23,000.

In conclusion let me repeat that there is not functioning today in Germany or in Austria a single full-fledged university devoted to Christian ideals of thought and living. Secondly, there is the engulfing tide of anti-Christian ideologies sweeping east and west and south across Europe, threatening conflagration on all sides. Thirdly, the physical needs of war-torn Germany and Austria are great. But amidst the urgency of these needs the call of man's higher aspirations should not be allowed to go unheard. Rather the decisive challenge of the time is to meet the threat of these ideologies with the only weapon able to subdue them. They are in fact a political and economic and philosophical and social revolution. Their rise in Europe can well be, as Father Edmund Walsh, S. J., is reported to have said, comparable to the fall of the Roman Empire. Be it so. Then let us take from history the transcendent fact, that in the ruins of the mighty empire which was Rome, Christianity did not perish. It met the threats of the invaders and of the new order and with the weapon of eternal truth not only salvaged western Europe but eventually gave the world a new civilization.

Fred Came Home Today by Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, late last evening I returned by plane from Rogers City, Mich., where I had attended the funeral of our late beloved colleague the Honorable Fred Bradley, Representative from the Eleventh District of Michigan.

Yesterday's Rogers City newspaper, the Presque Isle County Advance, carried in eloquent terms a short front-page tribute to their neighbor and friend, Fred Bradley. Those who were nearest to Fred can best appreciate the value of the following story:

FRED CAME HOME TODAY BY PLANE

Yes, that is what Rogers City folks said, Fred came home by plane. They remembered how Fred, not Congressman Bradley, used to buzz the local housetops with his first little plane until we local folks cussed him out, just as he would do when we incurred his displeasure.

They remembered how he liked to come down Rogers City's short main street, where traffic moves leisurely, dressed in rough tweeds, jaunty cap and even coveralls, yelling

across at whoever he might see. "How's fishing out on Trout River since we put in the dam?," or "Has the duck flight started yet?" "Hello you son-of-a-gun, what's going on tonight?"

Washington, yes and Detroit, and London, and Moscow, all will call attention to his passing. He was the fellow who put the small town, here the train backs in, on the map of the world. They too will tell, but in others words, that Fred came home to Rogers City, and by his favorite transportation, by air.

How did he vote on a certain piece of legislation? Maybe folks don't remember. But they do remember that the boys he appointed to the Government Academies from the Eleventh District of Michigan were never appointed for political reasons.

Was he a prewar isolationist? We forgot long ago, but he was 100-percent American and he always voted that way, regardless of party.

Today at 2 o'clock the town was quiet. Window shades on the town's little stores were drawn and the main street was deserted. Fred had come home by plane and the local folks were down at the church on the corner seeing Fred off on his last flight. They were not thinking about Congressman Bradley, his political record, or his faults. Those things we know, better than the folks in Washington or elsewhere.

They were paying their last respects to Fred, the fellow who mingled with, and liked, his fellowmen, in all walks of life. It might have been said that he was born with a silver spoon in his mouth, to quote the old adage, but that never changed him.

Happy landing, Fred.

Continuation of Rent Controls Means Continuation of Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from a gentleman in Oklahoma City who offers some very convincing arguments to the effect that the longer we have rent controls in effect, the longer our housing shortage will continue. I quote the following letter:

HON. GEORGE SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: You are going to vote soon on action to extend or kill rent control, and let me say that the longer time goes on the more clear it is that the very thing you are holding onto—rent control—is what is causing the housing shortage in the country today, the same as it caused the shortage in everything else as long as controls were held on them. There is no meat shortage now, and beefsteak is not $1 per pound either, in fact on many meat cuts the price is less than the old OPA ceilings, and so it is with most everything else, even automobiles. You can buy a new car of nearly any make you want, maybe not from a dealer but from a used car lot; the price is higher but not more in proportion than wages to the unions have gone up, so what is unfair about that? We do not have to buy them if they are too high.

There is no housing shortage today that could not be taken care of by using the present housing we have to the maximum, as it should be. What could be more silly than to build thousands of houses that will not be used in a few years, and will stand vacant. If the thousands of apartments and houses were occupied today by the number of tenants that was intended for them to be occupied by, there would be no housing shortage, and add to that the thousands of houses that are being built and where are you? When rent on a good 4-room brick duplex is frozen at $22.50 per month, and is occupied by a single man, or single girl, why should they want to share it with anyone? If the rent was $45, as it should be in order to compensate the owner for owning it, then these single people would double up as they always have in the past, and the housing situation would be solved.

Freeing the new units from rent control will help some, but it will not solve it. Nobody in his right mind is going to build new apartments now unless he is willing to make a deal of some kind to get the rents fixed at a high rate, and then he cannot tell for sure how much he will have to pay for that right. Some new rent director may hike the ante and take away all his chance to even break even because he gets mad at him. Let me give you an illustration. We manage 24 units in the 1200 block on West Fourth and Fifth Streets. As those units become vacant we have been furnishing them, and then reregistering them in accordance with the regulations. These apartments are all identical, and the furniture is about alike in all of them. In March one of them went vacant and we furnished it and rented it at $50 per month, with water and garbage paid, which is more than it would bring on the free market, but which we could get due to an OPA-created shortage. We failed to register it until 2 days after the 30-day period was passed due to an oversight in our office, and the rent director reduced the rent to $25 per month and ordered us to refund 3 months' rent. The owner is so mad at this injustice that he has ordered us to hold every apartment vacant in the future. Here is the reason: The apartment across the hall from this one has a rent ceiling set by the rent director at $37.50 per month. When we received notice of their intention to reduce the rent we called this to their attention, but it made no difference.

There are thousands of units here like that, and hundreds of them are vacant at this time. Add these to the hundreds of houses that are vacant because they are for sale and the owners could not get possession of them because of rent control if they rented them. In most cases the rent is frozen at a level that is so low it just about pays the taxes. For instance, a six-room brick bungalow in a good location with a rent ceiling of $27.50 per month, and we have several like that now that we can show you.

I have been in the management business in Oklahoma City since 1924, and it is my firm conviction that if rent control is not extended beyond June 30 that by September 1, 1947, there will be no housing shortage, and that rents will not be higher to the average tenant than they are now. The rent on the bungalow above will go up, of course, but the so-called black-market rents will come down enough to more than make up for the difference, and you are supposed to represent all of the people. There are thousands of units here on which rents are fixed by the rent director at more than they would bring on the open market. I have in mind some new duplexes just east of North Eastern Street, about Twenty-eighth Street, on which the rent is set at $75 per month. They are small three-room apartments, which would fit into the living room and dining room of the house I mentioned above. Can anyone say that is fair?

The answer is up to you; please be fair; let rent control die on June 30; and let's return to the American way of life. If rents go too high there are builders enough in the country who have money enough to build enough units—and will on a free market—to control rents. Nobody can be hurt in the few months it takes to build.

Very truly yours,

OSCAR BIESER.

Spend and Elect, GOP Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of May 29, 1947:

SPEND AND ELECT, GOP VERSION

Leaning is leaning, anyway you figure it.

Whether it's on a shovel by the roadside or a set of clippers in the sheep pasture makes little difference to the public purse, which gets nicked heavily either way.

But it makes considerable difference whether the shovel leaner or the sheep owner gets the money.

A Republican Congress was elected last November on a wave of impatience with New Deal extravagance and nosing into private business.

It was the New Deal that subsidized the shovel leaners when depression lay heavily on the land. Jobs were few and children hungry. Leaf raking and other forms of made work were unsound. But there was some justification for them on the grounds of emergency human needs.

What aroused the country was a tendency to carry the system over into more prosperous times, to expand Government subsidy and control and tie up voters to Government hand-outs.

Now a faction of Republicans, including many who were most indignant at New Deal extravagances, is attempting a return to its own pet hand-out system, identified in the good old days by the names of Fordney-McCumber and Smoot-Hawley.

It happens that the trick first comes to attention in the case of wool, already heavily subsidized. The plan is to increase both Government subsidies and tariffs. The subsidies come directly out of the taxpayers in high tax rates, the tariffs indirectly in high prices. If you've shopped for a woolen suit lately you know what we're talking about.

Wool comes first on the new grab list, but by no means last. This is a system for appeasing special minority groups—wool growers, in this case, instead of reliefers—for winning friends and influence votes with public funds.

It is more brazen, less excusable than shovel leaning, because there is no emergency need. The wool growers are doing all right.

This scheme should be understood for exactly what it is, and its advocates exposed for exactly what they are.

They are of the same school of practical politicians, so roundly damned in the New Deal, the spend-and-spend, elect-and-elect boys.

They were not, it is obvious, so outraged at the squandering of public money for political purposes. It was just that the wrong people were spending the money and the wrong politicians getting elected.

We believe President Truman also is opposed and will veto this wool grab bill and help to knock this new spend-elect system in the head.

Direct Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD a letter from a personal friend who was born and reared in Austria, migrated to the United States, and subsequently became a citizen. He is now with the American Government on foreign assignment in Austria and writes me the following letter from which I have, of course, eliminated all names:

MAY 17, 1947.

DEAR NORRIS: Thank you very much for your letter of April 24; I am gladly accepting your invitation to comment on the events over here. Our mail is not subject to any censorship, and you may evaluate my information as you will. If you want more details or more specific news whenever you have any doubts as to the veracity of any statement, please let me know, and I will make a closer check.

The failure of the Moscow Conference has had a very bad effect on the morale of the Austrians. An increasing majority accepts it as a fact that things will continue as they are, "not enough to live on but too much to die." The common Austrian does not feel that the question of German property concerns him greatly. All he knows is that he cannot take any initiative in the economic sphere until the troops have left this country. The farmer in lower Austria does not want to raise potatoes as long as he is not sure that he will harvest them, that he will not be ordered to deliver the fruits of his harvest to the Russian mess sergeant. The economic reconstruction is not possible as long as the ownership of the largest enterprises in eastern Austria is not established beyond any doubt. During this period of waiting, certain anti-Democratic trends may develop based on disillusion and hunger, and for this reason many Austrians felt that a bad state treaty would be better than none at all. I wonder whether you know that the Austrian delegates in Moscow were ready to accept the proposals made by the Soviets (though both of the delegates belonged to the Conservative People's Party) and that only the insistence of General Clark and Lord Hood prevented the final settlement there. I feel that Clark's opposition was fully justified and that he rendered Austria's independence a great service. The real issue is not whether the former German enterprises would become Soviet property or not if the Soviets were ready to acknowledge that these enterprises would be subject to Austrian sovereignty. Russia wants these factories to be exempt from any legislation, taxes, etc. What that would mean was shown in the recent hunger demonstrations which were staged by the Communist Party in Vienna.

The food distribution is in the hands of a poorly qualified Austrian Government which fails to enforce the laws requiring the Austrian farmers to deliver a great part of their harvest. The farmers prefer to divert their surplus to the black market, to the export market, and to the provisioning of holiday makers, etc. Secondly, the Government fails to control the distribution of the harvest delivered to them. Thirdly, the Government publishes the weekly rations in spite of their knowledge that the food on hand does not permit such rations. There is considerable discontent in the population which does not find any outlet as the three parties are equally responsible for the coalition government. On May 5, the Communists, however, decided to call a strike. All Russian-owned factories in Vienna closed and the workers marched into the city where their speakers asked both for larger rations and for an orientation to the east. On the next day the workers in the Russian factories wanted to continue the strike, while the workers in all of the other plants went back to their work. The Russian managers told them that they could stay away from work only if they would march and demonstrate in the city. "Either you work for Russia or you demonstrate for Russia." Austria bordering on three Russian-dominated countries (Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary), could not remain independent if 100,000 of workers, technicians, employees would be economically and politically dependent from Russia.

On the food situation any visitor coming to Vienna will be surprised to see the flower shops well-stocked and flowers on sale everywhere. At the same time it is impossible to purchase any lettuce or other vegetables. There is not a sign of victory gardening anywhere. The Viennese feel that they earn more by selling flowers than by growing vegetables—and the Allies should get the necessary foodstuffs in. As a former Austrian I am ashamed to confess that the Austrians have made it a habit since World War I to ask the world for subsidies, which they consider due to them because Schubert and Beethoven were Austrians. On May 21 the Socialists will arrange a mass demonstration with the particular slogans: We want the end of occupation; we want a larger share in the world's food distribution scheme. Certainly both demands are very popular but it is difficult to understand how one can at the same time turn against the occupants and still ask them for more relief. Besides flowers the American visitor will be surprised at the quantities of junk which the Austrian manufacturers are producing now—wood carvings of the poorest quality for export purposes—while in all of Vienna you cannot buy a wooden spoon.

I think that the American authorities should have concentrated upon directing the Austrians how to help themselves rather than promising them more and more relief. We have and, mainly, have had a number of quite capable officers and civilians here but most of them are here because they could not get a job at the same pay (or even half of the same pay) at home. I cannot give you the names of those most recently arrived but I do want to give you one example. John Doe is an amiable fellow, and I do like him very much as far as the social life is concerned. Once he was a lawyer in Florida although it is a mystery to me how he ever passed the bar examination. Then he was employed with OPA. When OPA closed down he was given overseas employment in our office, in the legal division, with a civil-service rating of P–6 as an expert on international law. With his 25 percent overseas pay, he makes about $7,500 a year and no one, not even John himself, will claim that he has any slightest knowledge of international law. The standard of our legal division is not only below the standard of the British (it is an accepted fact that the British have the best experts in any field but then they have had the most experience in administration of foreign countries) but it is also below that of the Soviets.

We have failed in the problem of denazification. The Government, I understand, now considers it a closed chapter, which was a mistake. Everyone knows that the Communists and not the Nazis are the most dangerous elements to our country. Nevertheless we should have been the most vigorous in the denazification move. People all over the world should know that we are determined to carry out whatever policy we start. There are still many Nazis—our policy encourages them to cling together—and because they might turn in a body against us, we are breeding a potential enemy force. These Nazis might turn Communist as their country formed the alliance of September 1939 with Russia. In addition to all of these factors, we have the disappointed young democratic element in this country who would have become our future associates in any conflict. It would have been far better to have alienated the Nazis than to shove these people into the ready embrace of the Russians and their fellow travelers. Our denazification policy was very limited. It aimed only at firing people from the jobs they held during the Nazi regime. The following joke is typical of the public reaction to our policy:

A passer-by addresses a street sweeper who is doing a very clumsy job: "Have you always been a street cleaner, my man?" "No," replied the street cleaner, "I have not. Before the war I was a professor at the university but I was a Nazi and I am not, therefore, permitted to teach any longer—so I am now a street cleaner."

"But what are you, sir," asked the street cleaner of the passer-by.

"Oh," said the passer-by, "I am a university professor. Earlier I was a street cleaner, but you see, I, too, was a Nazi and I am, therefore, not permitted to clean the streets any longer."

It would have been much more important to start on an educational program. In about 2 weeks 25 young Austrians will leave for Denmark where they will undergo a 2 months' training period at the College of Askov. This was my own idea and I worked it out with the assistance of some of my Danish friends. For the time being I am trying to get the Army to provide transportation while the Danish friends of mine will take care of all other expenses incurred. This method, I feel, is a far more constructive densification program than the one presently being carried on. These young people should learn in Denmark how democracy works in practice and how it benefits a small country. Perhaps they will learn there also the well-developed methods of economic reconstruction.

If the United States would support such plans, it would help to develop here in the heart of Europe a truly democratic community of friends for America. Perhaps you could take this matter up with the right people, but so far Americans show much more interest in propaganda than in education.

One of the most expensive and least profitable agencies is the Information Service Branch. The majority of Austrians are at a loss to understand why America maintains this organization 2 years after the conclusion of hostilities. ISB occupies in Vienna three or four large hotels while there is not a single hotel available for tourists or businessmen. I believe there are about 50 Americans and numerous Austrians employed by this agency. You Congressmen should look at their displays with the eyes of a hungry, disillusioned Austrian. On large posters you see pictures of Independence, Mo., the President's home, of homes in Hollywood, of new car models, etc., etc. All that might be most interesting in America to Americans, but the Austrians feel that it is an ill-timed exhibition of American wealth.

The editorial language of the American-controlled dailies is anti-Russian, but there is no need for anti-Russian propaganda in a country where hundreds of thousands of women and girls have been raped by the Russians, where the Russians for the second year retain tens of thousands of prisoners of war. While there is a definite danger of communism in France and Italy, and while eastern Europe is totally controlled by the Russian forces, there is no Communist danger in Austria unless it should be from an invasion by a neighboring country. I feel that all of the money spent for ISB and

similar agencies could be saved—or at least a part of it could be saved and the remainder diverted to educational projects where indigenous teachers could work in cooperation with American, Scandinavian, and other democratic teachers preferably in private schools and colleges.

I do hope that you will one day make a visit to Vienna but in the meantime, please let me know if you want me to ferret out any information you might need.

With best regards to your family and to yourself,

Most sincerely yours,

——— ———.

If You Keep Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by the late Lt. Jack E. Spear, Third Army, Infantry, United States Army, killed in action December 29, 1944, in the Rundstedt offensive and buried in United States military cemetery, Hamm, Luxembourg; also an article on Hamm Cemetery:

IF YOU KEEP FAITH

(By Lt. Jack E. Spear)

If you keep faith with me you need not weep
If I am killed, for I will not complain
Of any death if by it others gain
The things I think are worth my life to keep;
The right to have, to know, to love, to speak.
If all win these I will endure my pain,
And on the battlefront, where I have lain,
Will find an honored place in which to sleep.
But if when peace returns to you once more
You break the word you gave humanity
By keeping not the pledge to which you swore,
Then carve in stone this epitaph for me:
"Here lies a fool who placed his hope in war
And gave his faith to insincerity."

SOME THOUGHTS ON HAMM CEMETERY

The American military cemetery at Hamm is considered by many to be the most beautiful of any over which our starry banner keeps watch and ward. Some 8,400 of our bravest and finest sleep here in an atmosphere fragrant with the love and affection of the tiny nation for which they laid down their lives. A large proportion of these men gave their lives within a short period of time and within an area very close to the spot where they now lie in sure and certain hope of a glorious resurrection. Not one is a stranger to others sleeping there. Each has beloved comrades who entered into glory a few hours or days before him or after him, and from the same area. The soil which they moistened with their precious blood was dear to them even during the short period while they fought for it, and the people whom they have redeemed by their supreme sacrifice are filled with devoted recognition of the price of their ransom.

The first ceremony to be held at Hamm Cemetery was on Memorial Day 1945 when with the Sovereign, Her Consort, the Grand Ducal Government, and mighty warriors of our own Army, we paid tribute to the heroes who laid down their lives that freedom might live. I have visited Hamm at every season of the year and still do not know at what time it is most poignantly beautiful. I have been there "when spring with dewy fingers cold bedecked with flowers the hallowed mould"; I have been there in the prime of glorious summer when earth and forest and sky in radiant beauty have united in praise and thanksgiving, and I have found that in the fullness of mellow autumn the symphony of colors from flaming copper beeches to the deeper green and almost purple of perennials, first have made me think that Hamm is then most beautiful, but later, one day when accompanied by His Royal Highness, General Prince Felix, who wished to pay us special tribute in his own royal person on All Souls Day, I thought the cemetery whose graves were wrapped in a white down comforter of spotless snow as if warmly tucked in for winter's sleep was the most beautiful of all.

In the democracy of death all men are equal, and it is good to note that the white crosses and stars of David which mark our heroes' graves at Hamm are all the same. The graves of General Patton and General Betts are no different from the graves of their comrades in death who may be an unknown soldier on one side and a private soldier on the other. I have never been in Hamm Cemetery when Luxemburgers were not there bringing flowers or meditating by some grave which their love and care have adopted, and how faithful they are in visiting these graves and decorating them with the fairest flowers of the revolving seasons. The tremendous numbers of visitors bear eloquent if silent witness thereto. I do not think any man of good will can visit Hamm Cemetery without being heartened and edified by the experience. Face to face with the eternal verities of life and death and heroism, one is enriched and purified by meditation on many things and feels the everlasting truth of that exultant message 2,500 years ago when the prophet said: "But the souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seem to have died and their departure to be attended with utter destruction, but they are at peace."

GEORGE PLATT WALLER,
United States Chargé d'Affaires
ad Interim, Luxemburg.

FEBRUARY 1, 1947.

How To Identify an American Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from Look magazine of March 4, 1947:

HOW TO IDENTIFY AN AMERICAN COMMUNIST

(Adapted from material prepared by Friends of Democracy, Inc.)

There is no simple definition of an American Communist. However, certain general classifications can be set up. And if either a person or an organization falls within most of these classifications, that person or organization can be said to be following the Communists' lead.

These identifying classifications include:

1. The belief that the war waged by Great Britain and her allies during the period from August 1939 to June 1941 (the period of the war before Russia was invaded), was an imperialistic war and a game of power politics.

2. The support of a foreign policy which agrees always with that followed by Soviet Russia, and which changes as the U. S. S. R. policy changes.

3. The argument that any foreign or domestic policy which does not fit the Communist plan is advanced for ulterior motives and is not in the best interests of either the people or of world peace.

4. The practice of criticizing only American, British, and Chinese policies, and never criticizing Soviet policies.

5. Continually receiving favorable publicity in such Communist publications as the Daily Worker and the New Masses.

6. Continually appearing as sponsor or coworker of such known Communist-front groups as the Committee To Win the Peace, the Civil Rights Congress, the National Negro Congress, and other groups which can be described as Communist-inspired because they fall within the classifications set forth here.

7. Continually charging critics with being Fascists, no matter whether the criticism comes from liberals, conservatives, reactionaries, or those who really are Fascists.

8. Arguing for a class society by pitting one group against another; and putting special privileges ahead of community needs, as, for example, claiming that labor has privileges but has no responsibilities in dealing with management.

9. Declaring that capitalism and democracy are "decadent" because some injustices exist under those systems.

Of course, actual membership in the Communist Party is 100 percent proof, but this kind of proof is difficult to obtain.

How To Recognize an American Pro-Fascist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Friends of Democracy, Inc.:

HOW TO RECOGNIZE AN AMERICAN PRO-FASCIST

There are very few in the United States who admit being Fascists. Those who do fit into what might be termed "the Fascist pattern," invariably proclaim they are anti-Fascist, anti-Nazi, and anti-Communist.

Huey Long undoubtedly was right when he declared that if fascism comes to America it will come in the guise of an anti-Fascist movement.

Followers of the Fascist line in this country call themselves such names as Christian Nationalists; they identify themselves as 100-percent Americans and incorporate such words as "constitutionalism," "Americanism," etc., in the titles of their organizations.

The pattern they follow is important, not the names they give themselves.

The following are characteristics of those who fit into the American Fascist pattern:

1. Racism is common to all groups, individuals, and publications following the pro-Fascist line in America. In fact, it is a cornerstone of the pro-Fascist movement everywhere. In this country it takes the form of "white supremacy," in which white people are regarded as the master race, while Negroes, orientals, and other colored people are viewed as inferior persons.

2. Anti-Semitism is a common denominator of all pro-Fascist and "100-percent American" groups. Anti-Catholicism sometimes is substituted for anti-Semitism in predominantly Protestant areas, but the demogogs

and rabble rousers have found anti-Semitism to be the most effective political weapon, due in part to the tremendous impact of the Nazi propaganda on the people of the United States.

3. Antialienism, antirefugeeism, and anti-everything foreign is a major characteristic of the American-Fascist pattern. Indeed, fascism all over the world professes a strong "nativism" and invariably is opposed to "foreigners" and people of other nations.

4. Nationalism is always associated with fascism in every country. The extreme nationalist claims that his own country is "the Master Country," just as he asserts that his own people are "the Master Race."

5. Isolationism is a distinct part of the pro-Fascist pattern. The extreme isolationists seek to isolate themselves from the rest of the world. They feel self-sufficient, and in the United States, have taken the position that this country is safe behind the "impregnability" of two great oceans.

6. Anti-internationalism (in the same sense that internationalism is a voluntary association of equal peoples) is also part of the Fascist pattern. The "100-percent American" believes this country can live apart from the rest of the world. This anti-internationalism includes opposition to the United Nations and all other efforts to arrive at international understanding and cooperation for peace.

7. Red baiting invariably is a part of fascism, which indiscriminately labels all of its opponents as Communists and Bolsheviks. Communism is used as a bugaboo to frighten people into accepting fascism. All liberals and progressives, Jews, international bankers and foreigners are described as Communists or "fellow-travelers" by the pro-Fascists. In fact, anyone who is not a "100-percent American" and an extreme nationalist, is apt to be dubbed a Communist.

8. Antilabor, particularly antiorganized labor, is a predominant characteristic of fascism everywhere. Good and bad labor leaders, and all labor unions, are lumped together by the Fascist-minded as "revolutionary" and "communistic."

9. Sympathy for other Fascists is common among the pro-Fascists. In pre-Pearl Harbor days, this sympathy included a defense of Hitler and Mussolini as "the great bulwarks" against communism. During the war, it was directed to sympathy for Petain and his Vichy Government. Now it takes the shape of sympathy and defense of the Franco regime in Spain, and Argentina's Peron Government.

10. Antidemocracy is another of the great common denominators of the Fascist-minded. "Democracy is decadent," Fascists everywhere declare. In the United States, the favorite theme among the pro-Fascists is that our country is a "Republic," not a "democracy." Democracy, the "anti's" say, is "mobocracy," the rule of the mob. A "Republic" is the rule of the elite, while democracy, according to their definition, is a synonym for communism.

11. The glorification of war, force, and violence is a major belief of the extreme Nationalists and Fascist-minded. They say that war is the greatest creative activity of man, and military heroes are glorified. One of the pro-Fascist slogans, which has been exploited in this country, is that "Life is struggle, struggle is war, war is life."

12. The one-party system is a distinct feature of the Fascist pattern. In most Fascist countries, it has meant the suppression of all opposition parties. In the United States, the Fascist-minded assume the position that theirs is the only true American party, and that all other parties are treasonable and un-American. One of the principal slogans of Fascists everywhere has been: "One people, one party, one State."

Editorial From Columbia Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the magazine Columbia:

The people on our street have some ideas about the way things are going. They are by no means chronic whiners, but they are unhappy about the prices they have to pay for food and clothing and everything else, about the extreme difficulty of getting and keeping decent living quarters, about the feeling of tension, cantankerousness, and uncertainty in the air they breathe. They are confused because they are getting so many different explanations of these matters that they are unable to tell which, if any, is the right one.

They ask you to consider, for example, the innocent citizen who remembers away back when the automobile manufacturers printed the f. o. b. price of their vehicles in their national advertising. He gets a notion that he would like to buy himself a modest little wagon—nothing de luxe, you understand—just a simple boiler of the least costly make and model, so that he can take the wife and children out for a spin Sunday after mass to let them get the three-room-and-bath kinks out of their frames. Assuming that the miracle happens and he actually gets a car, he also gets a collection of extras, which are by no means optional, and he pays roughly twice as much as he did before the war.

We leave this discontented brother to cool himself with little squirts of water from that windshield gadget that seems to be the principal postwar contribution of a great industry to its eager customers. He is less to be pitied than the breadwinner who goes out to buy the family shoes and shirts and bacon and eggs and beans and such. After all, you can live without a hydromatic clutch, but you do have to eat and in these latitudes wear clothes. What the aforesaid breadwinner is asking is why he has to pay $68 and some change for a suit that looks suspiciously like the prewar $40 job; why the price of eggs goes up at the same time that eggs become more plentiful in the market.

The wonderment of the people on our street about these things is rapidly turning into resentment. During the war they were told to put the blame on the shortages of many consumer items that naturally and unavoidably occurred and they took the explanation, for the most part, with good grace. They do not believe that, at this date, shortages are the cause of the high prices. They are convinced that someone is trimming them too close around the ears and they do not like it. They were told, not so very long ago, that the devil was Government controls as administered by the late OPA. Then the story was that the inept OPA was driving goods into the black market. But now there is no OPA and Joe Doakes wants to know why he should have to pay black-market prices for over-the-counter merchandise. He would also like to know when that good old free competition is going to start making his week's pay last a whole week. It's only a detail, of course, but it bothers him.

Some poorly informed captains of industry and commerce, the neighbors say, must be under the impression that during the war all their customers somehow became rich, that their mattresses are still lumpy with fat rolls of hundred-dollar bills, and that the present price scale is just what they need to sustain a healthy pride in their hoard of war bonds. The only trouble with this idea is that it's not so. We'll grant that some citizens did themselves well—and did so legitimately—during the war. But there aren't enough of them to wear all the $2 shirts are are being offered at $3.95, and the sooner this is understood the better it will be for all concerned.

When the neighbors get together nowadays, these are the topics of their conversation. They are in a mood to really pour it on, if they could with certainty identify the villain. That's the catch—everybody has an alibi. The corner storekeeper claims he has to pay high prices for his stock; the jobber says the same about the wholesaler; the wholesaler blames the manufacturer; the manufacturer blames the producer of the raw materials and, of course, labor. The producer of raw materials blames—you guessed it—labor.

It seems that labor is getting all the money (although our street gets little mail from Palm Beach) and, if labor would stop being annoying and demanding, everything would be hunky-dory. In spite of the persuasively written statements in newspaper advertising space, which are a feature of all sizable present-day differences between labor and management, we doubt that this is quite the full story. And the fact that some labor leaders have made serious mistakes, or have even committed crimes, doesn't add up in our book to a valid reason for throwing a workingman's claims and aspirations out of court. Organized labor at present is getting a bad press. In itself, this is no novelty; but there is a danger in the situation that is new—the danger that if the propaganda has its apparently intended effect on Congress the country will almost certainly suffer serious harm. Stripped of the pious protestations of concern for free enterprise and the right of every man to be his own Algerbook hero, etc., etc., the objective of the drive is to bat the unions' ears off—to "cut them down to size," as the saying goes. We would have no sympathy with such a project at any time and this is the most inopportune moment in recent history for anyone to be engaged in it.

This time of growing crisis, when the future of freedom and the good life in the world depends so directly upon a strong and united American people, is emphatically not the time for a knock-down-and-drag-out battle between capital and labor. Such a brawl would bring joy only to the Communists here and to their bosses in the Kremlin. There would be no winner but Dictator Stalin, who, you may be sure, would lose little time, in the event of an American domestic smashup, in taking over the rest of Europe.

As an essential preliminary to a reasonable settlement of honest differences, we recommend to labor leaders abandonment of the truculence that too often leads them to conclude their remarks with the phrase "or else." And to the negotiators on the other side of the table we recommend discard of the high eyebrow and the how-dare-you-my-good-man attitude. Neither side should expect to gain any public sympathy by the exchange of epithetic statements dreamed up by some publicity man who fancies himself as a smart phrasemaker. In fact, it has become smart not to be smart and the great, tired, word-weary public that sits uncomfortably in the middle of these jams reserves wreaths of laurel for the man who will speak the truth.

That's what the people on our street are interested in—a reasonably decent portion of straight talk and square treatment. They are not violently interested, at the moment, in what Gromyko said to Austin, because

they have enough common sense to know that Gromyko is singing for his supper and has all the importance of Charlie McCarthy as an international figure. They are, however, fed up with and resentful of the modern propaganda which is designed, as J. J. Gilbert, of the NCWC News Service says, "to make one uncertain about the principles, or uncertain about acting on those principles once they are clearly seen."

It may be, of course, that we do not meet the right people, but these are the gripes we hear. We think they are well-founded gripes, but they are not sour. They can be cured by the exercise, in the proper places, of some restraint, generosity, and good will—especially good will. What the country needs, even more than a good 50-cent cigar, is a dash of the wartime spirit of unitedness in a common cause. If what we have was worth the lives of the many thousands of young soldiers and sailors who died in the war, we ought to be able to keep it without bitter wrangling, name-calling, and plain selfishness. That's what the people on our street think.

Address of Hon. James Forrestal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on May 26 last, 1,300 members of the Democratic Party of New York State gathered together at the Hotel Commodore, New York City. The occasion was the dinner tendered by the New York State Democratic Committee to that outstanding and distinguished American, General William O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, and was presided over by the Democratic State chairman, Hon. Paul J. Fitzpatrick as toastmaster.

The guest speaker was the Honorable James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, and under the unanimous consent granted me I take pleasure in including his remarks. Secretary Forrestal's address follows:

It is a high privilege to share tonight in paying honor to the mayor of New York City.

His life is the answer to questions about the vitality of American democracy. You ar all familiar with his progress from deck-hand to policeman. You know that his education was self-achieved; that it culminated in graduation from Fordham Law School. You have watched his career as lawyer, district attorney, and judge and his distinguished service in the Army. Now he is the mayor and chief magistrate of the largest city in the world, with a daily task of infinite complexity and responsibility.

This history of a man is moving testimony not only to the tenacity and the stubborn purpose of Bill O'Dwyer but also to the health and vigor of American institutions. His career is living proof of our belief that there is no ceiling on achievement, no limit on opportunity. He is our answer to the question whether in a competitive and individualistic society a man of humble birth can rise to distinction.

There are Bill O'Dwyers in every city and town and county of the United States. And it is the good fortune of America that we can continue to draw upon the services of such men.

Character, intelligence and hard work are the American criteria of public recognition. That is our creed. The life of the mayor gives us confidence and new faith in that creed as did the life of another great New Yorker and a great American, Alfred E. Smith.

Against the background of the mayor's career, I propose to make a few observations upon this American system which has provided the opportunity for his public service.

Do not be dismayed that I am about to start upon a long talk. I recall that in other days, before the invention of radio and the synthetic speech, in the days when every New Yorker wanted to emulate those giants of oratory—Bourke Cockran, Tom Grady, and Al Smith—Tammany Hall had a most effective method of dealing with long-winded beginners in public speaking.

Neophytes in the art of making friends and influencing people to vote the right way were driven through the streets of their assigned district in a horse-drawn cart. Their platform was the rear of the wagon, and the driver had instructions to watch the crowd. At the first sign of boredom he was to whack his one-horsepower locomotive and drive away.

That was a practical and effective method of making it clear to all would-be orators that the first requirement in dialectics is to hold the interest of an audience. Such a dinner as this, under restraints of politeness and limited exits, does not permit that procedure. I can only promise that when I detect the unmistakable signs of boredom, the somnolent visage and the glazed eyeball, I shall apply that old Tammany rule to myself and drive off into the night.

This country, both in terms of its past growth and its present influence and power rests upon certain foundations, political, social, economic, and spiritual. Each has been essential in the development of our free society which has as its objectives security, equal opportunity, and individual freedom. Among these foundations are our system of government and politics, business and commerce, labor, and agriculture.

The rooftree and foundation is, of course, government, through which we obtain our objectives of liberty, of justice, and of equality, under laws of our own making. Government by itself cannot create a prosperous nation, but it provides the essential framework within which industry and agriculture, labor and management, banking and trade, the arts and sciences, and education make their effective contribution. It is the framework these elements of our society must have for the free functioning, under law, of their activities.

Representative government means politics, and I want to pay my respects to politicians.

It is sometimes fashionable to speak slightingly of politics and politicians—as if politics could ever be divorced from government without substituting either anarchy or autarchy, chaos, or despotism. Politics is the essence of government. It is an honorable profession; it is hard and honorable work. It means membership in political organizations; it means running for office, getting out the vote, and all the other tedious chores of practical politics. To hold politics, honestly practiced, in contempt is to be contemptuous of democracy itself and of our relationship to government as its master, not its servant.

May I say at this point, that from my own experience I know of the honesty, the patriotism, and the good intent of the people of both parties who serve in our National Congress, and I can assure you that they are a splendid group of men and women, of far higher quality and caliber than the general public is led to believe.

Claude Bowers, our present Ambassador to Chile, once wrote a piece for the Virginia Quarterly entitled "In Defense of Politicians." I was impressed by his argument that one of the first objectives of a would-be dictator is to achieve disparagement of professional politicians and thereby to exploit the weaknesses of democracy. In Germany and Italy the dictator-to-be undertook by intimidation and ridicule to dominate leaders in business, labor, and politics. When that was accomplished, the autocrats took over. When politicians go, Hitlers arrive.

I have some knowledge, from personal experience, of the drudgery anyone assumes when he takes a practical interest in public affairs. My father was always active in the Democratic Party. As a boy I was an unwilling assistant in his activities. I had to help canvass his election district, to get the voters first to register and then to vote. It took a lot of the little time I had available for baseball and other cultural pursuits.

I pointed out that fact to my father, and his rejoinder always took the form of an essay on the duties of a citizen. I wound up working to preserve the Republic at the then bitter cost of never becoming a good first baseman. Jim Farley did better, both in politics and baseball.

By that experience of long ago I became aware of the hours which district and precinct workers put in on the sometimes unappreciated task of building and maintaining a political organization. That is why, in paying tribute to Mayor O'Dwyer, I also pay tribute to all those of you who have had the discipline and unselfish patriotism to maintain a continuing interest in party affairs.

For three quarters of a century the powers of government in the United States have been exercised by one of two great parties—the Republicans or the Democrats. Broadly speaking, that has proved to be a sound system, as, under different party labels, it has been in our sister democracies of Canada and Great Britain.

Governments deriving from more than two or three parties have proved incapable of providing strong and continuing federal systems. Thus, proportional representation, while attractive in theory, seems to be unsound in application. It is government by fractions, the beginning of government by veto, without responsibility. In Germany that system gave Hitler his opening.

My own inherited Democratic membership was cemented by my admiration for two of its greatest leaders—Woodrow Wilson and Alfred E. Smith, for whom I know Franklin Roosevelt had the same admiration and respect. Their names, with those of Jefferson, Monroe, Madison, Grover Cleveland and Newton Baker illustrate the diversity of appeal and the variety of thought which attracted men to this party.

The charge has sometimes been made that the Democratic Party embraces too many diverging and conflicting schools of economic and social thought. The conservatism of the South and the radicalism of the great cities of the North are said to make poor teammates—granted that we accept the unsubstantial evidence that all Southern Democrats are reactionary and all Northern urban Democrats are radicals—which I do not. Even if one accepts the existence of these differences of opinion, I hold the fact to be an asset and not a liability. The essence of democratic government is to provide every group in our system a fair chance for expression.

That is what I regard as the genius of President Truman's administration. By voice and deed he has demonstrated his deep belief in the right of every man to express his opinions. It is a distinguishing feature of his relations with his Cabinet and with the present majority party in the House and Senate. There is no political subtlety or smartness in the President's effort to cooperate with the Republican Congress. He knows that the problems of the world are too deep and too serious to be dealt with on the level of domestic partisan politics.

When he bespeaks cooperation he means just that, and I know he has done his best to carry out his part of the pledge.

I want now to talk a little about business and the American economic system.

This great industrial, agricultural, and trading community which is the United States, was built under a social and economic philosophy which we may call democratic capitalism. It is a system dedicated to the idea that the welfare of the country is better secured through the exercise of individual initiative and effort than it could be by a state-owned economy administered through a vast and complex bureaucracy.

With that belief I hold deeply and strongly.

During the war I saw what a complicated job it is to operate the national economy with Federal controls. Some were necessary to achieve the cooperation required for total war. But their continuance in peacetime would wreck the country and in my judgment destroy its capabilities for service to the world. There is no one man or committee of men with sufficient knowledge, wisdom, and capacity to manage an economy as hugely productive as ours—an economy which poured out the weapons and men to achieve victory in the war and which since has poured out billions to help restore a deeply injured world society.

This economy of ours is a delicately balanced machine. Its driving force is incentive, not merely the incentive of profits or wages but the incentive of service. The production of goods in quantity is its mainspring and it is that quantity production which provides the real wages of labor.

Socialistic advocates in Britain have found that underproduction can and does produce unemployment; that high wages which cannot buy goods cease to provide the incentive to work just as businessmen find that high prices destroy markets.

Business and commerce are effective forces for peace and stability in the world. Businessmen are always on the side of peace because they need it to provide the conditions under which their ventures can be pursued with confidence. Businessmen are by nature radical optimists—if they were not, few could continue against the appalling obstacles that today hinder the free exercise of their energies throughout the world.

No governmental planning or supervision or control can take the place of business initiative in maintaining that high production of goods and services which made this Nation great and which the world will require from us for many years to come.

All nations and states in the world today are based upon capitalism, the difference being merely between state capitalism and individual capitalism. Our system finances productive enterprise from the savings of individuals, deposited in banks and insurance companies, rather than collected by Government levy. The savings of our people are channeled into new ventures and into the extension of existing enterprises through commercial and investment banking.

The alternative is for government to collect all the people's earnings above subsistence needs, to channel those savings as it wills and ultimately to own the instruments of production. Inevitably that means that government must ultimately own and control and direct labor.

I am in violent disagreement with every and any aspect of such a system.

But let us not forget that it can and does offer a hard and ruthless competition, for elsewhere it bids for the minds of men and women surviving in despair and poverty, in the ruins left by war, with promises of a future worldly paradise.

Such an appeal Hitler made to the unhappy German people. That he and his satellites perished with his mad dreams can be of little solace to the grey shadows of human beings who walk today in the rubble and ruin of Berlin.

I want to talk about another great stone in the foundation of American society. No group in our community has a greater share in meeting and overcoming the great difficulties of the postwar world than American labor. At the moment the tide of popular sentiment seems to be running somewhat against labor and particularly against the leaders of labor. I would like to recall to businessmen that a little over a decade ago the tide was running sharply against business and its leaders.

As a nation we are apt to make black-and-white assessment of blame when we are troubled. That is an understandable and human weakness but the temptation to put on labor all the blame for industrial difficulties and high prices is as unjust as it is to saddle all business with that blame.

I came to know a good many labor leaders during the war. I saw a good deal of labor itself and I can testify to the great participation of the American workingman in victory. Most leaders of labor are neither Communists nor Socialists. Many of them realize the need of adjustments to rectify existing imbalances in labor laws. Bitterness against all labor and all labor leaders as a group is just as dangerous, just as unfair as the tendency 15 years ago to smear all business and all management. Indicting fellow Americans by groups is the negation of democracy, for ours is a classless society in fact, not by empty boast.

It would be inappropriate for me not to make some mention here of another great foundation stone of our Nation—the Armed Services. The Army and the Navy, the Marines and the Air Forces, during the war constituted the greatest fighting forces on earth. Now, let there be no misunderstanding, they are dedicated to keeping the peace. They exist not to impose the will of the United States upon other people but to guard us against attack, to defend the United States; in due course, to take their part in securing world peace through the policing functions of the United Nations, and, finally to make clear to the world that we do not again intend to succumb to the fallacy that you can secure peace by stripping yourself of the means and of the power to make war.

Let me utilize this reference to the Army and Navy to draw a rough parallel between them and our American society.

During the war we developed and used the greatest military combination of men and machines that history has known.

Army Ground Forces, trained at great speed, magnificently equipped, smashed their way across Africa and Europe in extraordinary military achievement.

The Air Forces of the Army, almost from a standing start, within 3 years achieved mastery of Germany's air power.

The United States Navy swept the seas of two hemispheres clear of the enemy, transported and supplied our forces overseas, and extinguished Japan as a naval power.

No one of these services could have done the job alone. It needed all three, working as a team, to win.

There is no room for group ego in the military services, and there is no place for it in our national society. Government cannot do the job alone. Invested capital cannot run factories without labor, nor can labor produce goods without that imponderable which has been so spectacularly developed in this country—the genius and skill of management.

We are all members of a common national team. We are all workers in the final analysis. We are all consumers. We are all investors, not merely in real estate and securities but in the future of America. Labor, without the partnership of private capital, must wind up as the corporate property of the state. Conversely, capital has a vital interest in a busy and prosperous America. There is no haven in which capital can be immune from depression.

The success of the American system is the greatest guarantor of its continuance. In addition to the exports of American credit and food and goods to a stricken world we must also send the spiritual message which is our real and greatest answer to the preachers of the doctrine of the economic and soulless man. I know of no better expression of such a faith than a quotation which I read last week from a hitherto unpublished essay of Woodrow Wilson:

"There is one thing I have a great enthusiasm about, I might almost say a reckless enthusiasm, and that is human liberty. The individual is indispensably the original, the first fact, of liberty. There is no such thing as corporate liberty. Liberty belongs to the individual or it does not exist."

That is the spiritual message which America, with God's help, must transmit not merely for its own preservation but for the salvation of the world. That is the faith of our community which we must export along with our capital, our foodstuffs, our machines, and our charity. It is the true essence of what we fought for in two wars. It is, I say again, personified in the career and service of Mayor O'Dwyer. It was because he came to a great free community that he had the opportunity to rise. It is because of his own deep devotion to liberty that he continues to serve the people.

National Science Foundation Should Be Established

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a National Science Foundation is of the utmost importance to the United States, and this Congress should pass legislation for the creation of this Foundation.

We are living in the scientific age, and must recognize the importance of scientific research and development. The war brought with it the discovery of atomic energy and American scientists developed the atomic bomb which stunned the world and enforced immediate peace.

Science opened the door to atomic warfare. What we have already seen of the destructive force of this new weapon is but the smallest part of its potential. Atomic energy coupled with the principle of the guided missile directed by television presents a demolition force so powerful that the destruction of an entire nation would not be improbable through its use. Atomic bombs small enough to be planted by saboteurs and detonated through the use of radio waves at the discretion of an enemy power are no longer mere fictional fantasy, but a possible danger which must be reckoned with for national safety.

There is only one answer to the problems which face us with the advent of atomic energy and atomic warfare. That answer is scientific research carried on by the best scientific minds this Nation can produce. Through such research we

may find methods to counteract the destructive power of atomic energy and learn how to harness it for peacetime use for the benefit of all our people.

We need a National Science Foundation to coordinate the efforts of all the branches of science in research which will convert and confine atomic energy to peacetime utility. Atomic energy must be harnessed to produce power, and we cannot envision the extent to which this new force may revolutionize industry, transportation, and every phase of daily living. Our scientists can do the job, but they must have the tools with which to work, laboratory equipment, and men and women who are specialists in science to assist them and carry on the work of scientific research.

Before the last war, Europe had many centers of science, and the United States could draw upon these reservoirs of scientific knowledge for the development of new methods and new materials in medical research, biological science, and chemistry and physics. These European centers have been destroyed, and the United States must now develop its own scientific centers or be bypassed by the scientific development of other nations, such as the U. S. S. R. which has made available almost $1,000,000,000 for scientific research this year.

We must seek out the most promising material among our youth and provide scholarships so that boys and girls with special adaptability in the field of science can receive adequate training. Upon completion of their work, these young scientists can enter the field of research, and their accomplishments will benefit the Nation.

The future safety and prosperity of the United States may well depend upon the advancement of scientific research. We need a National Science Foundation, and I believe its establishment is of equal importance with any other issue before the Eightieth Congress The Senate has already approved S. 526, a bill which creates a National Science Foundation. I urge the Members of the House to pass this legislation, which will insure the maximum progress of scientific research and discovery in the United States.

Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an illuminating article in the New York Herald Tribune of May 28 by Walter Kerr on the Voice of America program:

WHY THE RUSSIANS TUNE IN—VOICE OF AMERICA PROVIDES ONLY FACTUAL PICTURE OF UNITED STATES

(By Walter Kerr)

Recent attempts in Congress to smother the State Department's Voice of America broadcasts to foreign lands are both alarming and astonishing to an American citizen returning to this country from the Soviet Union.

The explanation is simple. In the nightly programs beamed from the United States he found the only information available to Russians in their own language of American affairs as Americans see them. Opposing them were the carefully edited Soviet press and radio, painstakingly critical of American opinion and American action, presenting one over-all picture which may be summarized as follows:

That the United States is a fumbling, confused, grasping country that grew rich during the war and now hopes to enslave the world economically and politically—the whole controlled by a group of powerful industrialists, bankers, and politicians who prefer war to peace, social strife to social order, and fascism to civil liberties.

The only contrary view that a Russian can hear comes from the Voice of America. Yet this voice came close to being silenced by congressional action a short time ago. The arguments against it claimed that it was unauthorized, mismanaged and a waste of money.

The first two objections apparently will be taken care of by a new bill which was approved last week by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and which, if it becomes law, will continue the broadcasts in the new fiscal year beginning July 1. The third—that it is a waste of money—is more difficult to answer, since there is no way of evaluating in terms of money the benefits of accurate information.

Americans in Moscow, however, contend that the programs are listened to by Russians, and their only suggestions consist of recommendations for improving the broadcasts.

As evidence of listener interest, besides individual Russians whom they know, they cite the recent attack on the Voice of America by Ilya Ehrenburg, the Soviet propagandist, whose skill with the pen most certainly would not have been employed if no one bothered to listen to what the Voice was saying. They also point to a recent cartoon in the magazine Krokadil, which pictured a department store display of short-wave receiving sets made in the shape of ducks. The duck sets were advertised as being useful for hearing the "quack, quack" broadcasts of the Voice of America.

Joseph Newman, the New York Herald Tribune correspondent in Moscow, reports that only a limited and spotty reaction has been noted since the programs were started last February. There is reason to believe, he says, that the broadcasts are heard mostly by higher-income groups, since they include men and women who can afford to buy short-wave sets. These sell for 1,500 rubles each, or more than the monthly income of a highly skilled and productive worker in a Moscow factory.

Among listeners he mentions doctors, lawyers, teachers, newspapermen, writers, actors, artists, dancers, scientists, army and naval officers, factory directors, engineers, and more important Government officials.

He says that the number of persons who hear the programs is not known by anyone and there is no basis for an intelligent guess. It is estimated, on the other hand, that there are about 1,000,000 sets in the Soviet Union, a majority of them built for short-wave reception.

He adds that without publicity of any kind Russians know the transmission time (9 p. m. to 10 p. m. daily) and frequencies (11,870 and 7,290 kilocycles). They have found out by playing with their own sets or by word of mouth.

The most serious criticism of the programs was poor reception, but this has been improved recently, although not sufficiently to put them on a par with broadcasts of the British Broadcasting Corp. Soviet seven-tube sets, however, pick them up easily.

Of the material itself the most common complaint from Russians and Americans alike is that a 1-hour transmission is too long. It has been proposed to change over to three half-hour programs. It has been said that the treatment of scientific subjects is too technical for anyone except a scientist. One listener finds the jazz music too hot and another says he can hear all the classical music he wants over Soviet stations.

The top suggestion is that the programs be made even more factual than they are. Listeners apparently would prefer to hear discussions of problems confronting America rather than efforts to picture the United States as a paradise which they suspect it is not. Such suggestions are passed on to Americans in Moscow, who in turn report them to the State Department. They take a real interest in the Voice of America.

Rice Leaders Rap Controls as Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a newspaper article from the Lake Charles American Press, as follows:

RICE LEADERS RAP CONTROLS AS UNFAIR—DECLINE IN PRODUCTION, INCREASE IN MARKETS CITED AT CONVENTION

GALVESTON, TEX., May 24.—Rice dealers, brokers, and jobbers attending the Rice Millers Association convention here today said that possible continuation of controls on rice after the expiration date June 30 were unfair and unnecessary.

W. M. Reid, New Orleans, association executive vice president, said the 400 persons attending the convention were opposed to any extension of price controls.

"If controls continue, it will hurt the domestic rice market 100 percent," Reid said, "since 40 percent of the rice crop will be shipped out of the United States. The part of the rice crop allowed to remain in this country, under present regulations, will remain under fixed prices.

"It is unfavorable to the industry for controls to remain," Reid declared, "because there is no reason for one product to be under Government regulations when it is unnecessary."

PRODUCTION DROPS

Rice declined in production 25 percent in 1946 while markets for foods showed an increase of 43 percent in production over the prewar level, Reid said.

Unless price controls are lifted and rice is allowed to be sold on the domestic market, the consumer will be weaned away from the use of rice by its prohibitive costs and limited production, he said.

George Smith, Dewitt, Ark., vice president, said growers believed continued governmental controls would cripple their business.

Watson Rogers, Washington, D. C., president of the National Food Brokers Association, told the convention that members of the rice industry must strengthen their sales and merchandising programs if rice is to recapture its place in the American diet.

BUYING POWER

Fred J. Rossiter, of the United States Department of Agriculture, said in an address that he is concerned over the world's buying power.

"Before we become too optimistic about the heavy demand for rice," he said, "we must weigh the world's buying capacity."

He said several food experts have pointed out that the need for rice today is much greater than that of the prewar demand.

"Authorities estimate," he continued, "that the rice-eating population has increased from 5 to 10 percent during the past 10 years. This indicates that the need for rice will be far above the available supply."

Organized Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a news article by Mr. Constantine Brown, wherein he points out that there is anything but order in Europe today. It should be of interest to all Members of the House.

THIS CHANGING WORLD—ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL SITUATION IN EUROPE CALLED ORGANIZED CHAOS

(By Constantine Brown)

Herbert Hoover, who because of his realistic and nonpartisan approach to world affairs ranks as America's elder statesman, informed the House Appropriations Committee that our present policies in Germany and Japan are forcing the American taxpayer to carry the burden of those countries' reparations.

Those who have kept abreast of developments in Europe and Asia concur with Mr. Hoover's conclusions, which are based on long study of conditions and several investigations undertaken at the request of President Truman. The Chief Executive himself is reported to share most of Mr. Hoover's contentions.

The economic and political situation in Europe can be described as the most perfectly organized condition of chaos the world has ever known. There are several points of economic vacuum in Europe, as well as in Asia, and American resources are being sucked into them in such quantities that if the flow continues, they will be drained off in the foreseeable future.

RUSSIAN POLICY BLAMED

We cannot afford to let the world starve. This is an American axiom which no political party in this country can change. However, present chaotic conditions will never be corrected as long as Russia has her way, which is to mulct certain parts of Europe of their substance while generating chaos in others.

For the last 2 years we have been pouring money and raw and manufactured materials into Europe while Russia transferred to her own territory whole industrial plants from the occupied areas. She also has taken many raw materials native to the countries behind the iron curtain, much private loot from private individuals and subsistence from the land for her armies of occupation.

All agreements reached at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam which were not 100 percent in favor of the U. S. S. R. have been violated by Moscow. Our efforts to conclude a peace treaty with the Germans have failed so far because Russia was refused more than her share. The only peace treaties we have been able to conclude have been those with Italy and the Balkan satellites, which were on Germany's side during the war and are now dominated by Soviet generals.

The essence of these treaties is in their retention of Russia's present satellites behind the iron curtain. The treaty with Italy, where there is no Russian army of occupation, makes it possible that within 2 years after ratification America will be called on to provide Italy with the means to pay war indemnities to Russia and Yugoslavia.

TREATIES BEFORE THE SENATE

Thus, while no progress is made to provide Germany and Japan with a peace treaty, enabling them to get back on their feet economically, the United States Senate has before it five other treaties. They have been approved by the U. S. S. R., either because they place some of these former Nazi satellites completely in Russian power, or because, as in the case of Italy, they permit a continued drain on American resources.

In his letter to Representative TABER, Mr. Hoover voiced the feeling of a number of officials when he suggested that separate peace treaties be concluded immediately with Germany and Japan, regardless of whether Russia joins the effort to restore peace or not.

The attitude of some State Department officials that we must proceed cautiously lest we offend Russia is no longer valid, in the opinion of the former President. The American Government has shown itself more than cooperative and has not hesitated to draw on the purses and resources of its citizens to help create a better world.

But those efforts have not been successful, obviously, because of the handicaps raised by our wartime ally. Hence, if the next foreign ministers' conference in London proves as fruitless as that in Moscow, there will be no other solution than to conclude a separate peace with the principal former enemy countries.

Alaska and the Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week I discussed the necessity for establishing adequate protective measures for Alaska and the Panama Canal Zone. As a result of that speech I have received many letters of commendation. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including herewith copies of two letters received which are very pertinent to the problem. I have deliberately withheld the names of the people who have written the letters but if any Members of the House should desire that information I shall be glad to furnish it.

MAY 22, 1947.

Representative L. H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed newspaper will explain, in part, why I am writing you this letter.

I arrived home this week from 7 weeks in the Canal Zone. Ever since my arrival in the zone I have wondered to whom I could write that would be interested in hearing what I found to be facts during my stay down there.

I am not an alarmist but to me, watching those numerous ships and freighters with their precious loads of needed cargo, going and coming through that Canal, I can feel only that one of the greatest and most important key spots is United States possession of that Canal. That isn't all, I talked with dozens of GI's and a few officers, without one exception I found them to be not only uneasy but alarmed and in most cases very bitter over the neglect of our (and their) Government in the protection of a spot more vital than Pearl Harbor.

On Army Day I saw 36 pitiful planes do their best to put on an Army Day show. I walked up to one young GI standing in front of the post office, I had never seen him before, and asked him if that's all the planes there were on the zone. He said bitterly, "Every one and we had a hell of a time to get all of those together, to put on this show today, I hope all those poor devils come back."

My son-in-law is a master sergeant at Howard Field. I couldn't get him to tell me anything (he was a first lieutenant during the war, bombardier, so learned never to talk) so I went out and talked to just any lad I met and most of them were willing to talk, especially those alone down there and for whom no quarters have been given for their wives to join them. You are 1,000 percent right, security should begin at home and the Canal Zone is ripe for any enemy bomb which is dropped there, there could be no retaliation except from a few ground artillery scattered around over the zone.

I don't pretend to know all the military secrets of the zone but a blind person with ears, need only listen, to learn of the helplessness of a less than skeleton force now stationed on the zone.

Please do all you can to strengthen that Canal Zone for the safety and protection of these United States. To whom can I write further or are my efforts futile? It does seem so important to me.

Had the Japs struck at that Canal we might have lost the war.

Russia won't be so stupid.

Respectfully.

MAY 22, 1947.

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: With much interest we read your statements regarding Alaska and the Canal Zone and wish to commend you warmly for setting forth these facts. You fellows might ask Mr. Marshall what he was doing at Yalta when that magnanimous character, Roosevelt, gave the Kurile Islands to Russia. Maybe he was out for a canter at the moment and left that important business to the very able Ben Cohen! And who is this Ben Cohen that he is forever at the elbow of Marshall? Don't bother to answer that one!

Not long ago a boatload of "fishermen" plus a pregnant woman got shipwrecked off our northwest coastline. The ladies aid from that part of our Nation rushed like mad to buy gifts for the new Red baby and the poor mother, the men folk received new suits, etc.—the story was, they were "scientists" digging around in the ocean for something the Russians dropped there many, many years ago! I hope they had their fingers crossed when they unfolded that one. Now we have more "scientists" galloping around these parts. I heard them: They say they want to find out how we raise citrus fruit, yet from what I gathered, they have tried and already knew the climate there does not favor the growth. Well, I do hope they were shown all the other wonders we have in southern California—such as the aircraft factories, etc., etc. Of course that would be dull stuff for Russian botanists—but all Russians love boats and San Pedro is a very fascinating harbor. Of course Americans aren't allowed in—not even Americans like this family whose forebears pioneered to build this Republic. One day we drove near there, inadvertently, and I thought sure they'd shoot us before we could drive out. My husband spotted a Marine—regular service—and called "Hi, remember General

Smedley Butler—I'm his cousin"—I honestly believe that saved our lives! Maybe, in fact I feel so certain from the way things're going—we'd do well to carry a hammer and sickle—just in case! Drop around to the Russian outfit known as the American Russian Institute and learn about the wonderful work these fine people are doing—if there isn't one in Washington, let me know, and I'll send you some literature which you will find most enlightening. And, do you know that one "Bill Wolff" of the People's Educational Center (they call 'em different names in different cities)—see the Tenny Report (Senator, Cal.) 1947 for his record—is going to teach at the University of Wisconsin this summer? Would you like to know more—and would you help us oust him? He and his mob have already been turnd out of L. A. City College.

We are grateful for men like you in Washington. These are times more frightening than the average dumb American realizes.

Sincerely.

Golden Gate Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the opening of the Golden Gate Bridge, I invited the attention of the House to this great wonder of the modern world.

This morning I have received an editorial which has appeared in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin entitled "A Key to Progress." Under the unanimous consent granted to me, that editorial is as follows:

A KEY TO PROGRESS—GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE ANNIVERSARY IS REMINDER OF JOB AHEAD TO INSURE FUTURE ACHIEVEMENT

Tomorrow is the tenth birthday of a great San Francisco symbol.

It is not in a class with the ferries, the cable cars, or any of the quaint relices and reminders of an amiable past.

Probably it is more famous, certainly more important, and most assuredly more in step with modernity.

We speak of that masterpiece of human endeavor—the Golden Gate Bridge, first opened to public use May 27, 1937.

More than any other landmark, this should be our symbol today.

This is the bridge that "couldn't be built."

This is the fulfillment of a dream which took official form as long ago as 1918, when RICHARD J. WELCH, now a Congressman, and then a supervisor, introduced and obtained unanimous passage by the board of supervisors of a resolution which called for a survey to determine the practicality of such a bridge.

And as the bridge is a symbol, so Mr. WELCH's dogged and dauntless fight to bring about its completion is a splendid example of what foresight and determination can accomplish.

As a supervisor, as a bridge director, as a Member of Congress he has battled, successfully, to overcome Army obduracy, selfish opposition, and just plain, dumb unimaginativeness, even as he fought successfully for the San Francisco-Oakland bridge and is fighting now for a new crossing, so badly needed, which will bring the trains to San Francisco.

The Golden Gate Bridge is a beautiful monument to the imagination and the enterprise and the courage of San Francisco and her sister counties who were associated with her in the project, a monument not only to what has been done but what can be done.

The bridge district, itself a gesture to the communion among bay area counties, has made steady progress, financially, through the decade of the span's existence.

As great as it is, though, the achievement, and its benefits so far, are but a beginning.

The potential resources of the great area to the north—the Redwood Empire—linked to us by the bridge, are a long way from being fully exploited.

It remains for all of us to realize and to act upon the possibilities of the future.

It remains for the State to cooperate in the development of the region served by the bridge. Important roads which serve as key traffic connections between this area and the rest of the State—the Sears Point road and Black Point cutoff, for example—should be improved to an extent which not only would match the present need, and remedy present defects and hazards, but which would fulfill the needs of the future.

Indeed, the Golden Gate Bridge is more than just a monument. It is a key to immeasurable progress.

Expenses Are Being Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following interesting news article by Mr. David Lawrence on the subject of cutting expenses and just what the Republicans have done about it:

FEDERAL EXPENSE CUTS ATTEST TO COURAGE OF GOP LAWMAKERS

(By David Lawrence)

Nothing so unspectacular as cutting Government expenses gets any cheers from the spectators—in fact, all one has heard thus far has been jeers. Yet the Republican majority in Congress is doing a job that hasn't been done for many years—certainly not since the Democratic Party came into power in 1933, when, after having promised during the 1932 campaign a 25-percent decrease in the Federal budget, expenses were deliberately increased.

The Republicans are cutting deep. Hence the cries of distress from the bureaucrats from coast to coast. In Washington, where the habit has been to spend and spend and elect and elect—as the saying went in New Deal days—the criticism of the Republicans is severe. Naturally those affected by the cut in expenses don't like it.

But what is surprising is that the taxpayers far and wide do not seem to appreciate what is being done in their behalf in the National Capital. All they read in the press is that this or that important item has been cut and that the Republicans are going to get punished by this or that section of the electorate for having reduced certain expenditures.

ATTEST TO COURAGE

Few things attest more to the courage of the Republicans than their readiness to cut agricultural and reclamation appropriations when these mean votes in Western and Middle Western States that are predominantly Republican. The Democrats just can't understand it—they think their Republican brethren are committing political suicide.

When the House of Representatives, under the leadership of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Representative JOHN TABER, of New York, promised to make substantial cuts, the critics scoffed. Before Mr. TABER could get the details arranged, they jeered again and said he couldn't possibly bring in any substantial cuts. But the House of Representatives has already cut about $2,300,000,000 toward the $4,500,000,000 set by the Senate as its goal, and the House plans further cuts on the War Department and the bill covering independent offices and agencies.

It was then rumored that the Senate would restore virtually all the cuts and that economy would come to naught. But the Senate, in passing the Treasury, Justice, and Labor Department bills, didn't make any material change from the House cuts.

When the critics are not arguing that the Republicans just can't make any big cuts, they are saying that the reductions are phony or paper cuts. All this merely spurs the Republican leadership on to prove their sincerity. The result has been the most drastic cuts in appropriations that have been made in a dozen years.

Now unquestionably some of the cuts are too severe and some things should not be eliminated, but experience teaches the legislators that they never can find out what is vital and what is superfluous unless they force a shake-out. The only way to do it is to cut and put the bureaucrats on the defensive. Usually those agencies which are cut come up with some way of managing to get along without as much money as before.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES

It should be borne in mind that most of the figures used in the press dispatches relate to actual appropriations. This is a different thing from actual expenditures in a budget because the Treasury often spends money made available under the appropriation laws of previous years. There is, as a matter of fact, a lot of loose money around in the Government—unexpended balances—that can be saved. The Republican majority, through its committees, is going through the Government's finances this year with a fine-tooth comb. It is a salutary development.

Much more economizing can be done. If, after the 1948 election, the Republicans continue in power, they will do even more cutting. For if they can reduce expenses as much as they have in the face of an approaching national election, they certainly will not hesitate to go further when they win public approval at the polls.

The United States Government has needed an economy wave for a long time. Extravagances grow with the years and soon items that were appropriated for a purpose a decade ago are listed as essential. The belief that the Government owes special favors with public funds is deeply ingrained and the thought that certain sums can be spent permanently, irrespective of the plight of the taxpayer, is widely held in bureaucratic circles.

The Republicans have been wise in proposing tax reduction. Without that urge they couldn't have cut the budget. Unfortunately, the Democrats have done everything they could to hamper the economy program. But the Republicans will emerge successful in their legislative battle and by July 1, when the next fiscal year begins, they will have lopped off a bigger percentage from the budget than any Congress ever cut from the budgets of a predecessor Congress.

John Hollis Bankhead 2d

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD 2D, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1946, an all-wise providence saw fit to remove from our midst Hon. JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD 2D, of Alabama.

His passing brought to a close the service in Congress of one of the most illustrious names in American history. For over 50 years there was a Bankhead in the Congress of the United States.

The illustrious father, John Hollis Bankhead, Sr., was for many years a Member of the House of Representatives, climaxing his long and distinguished service as a Member of the United States Senate. William Brockman Bankhead served as a Member of the House of Representatives from 1917 until his death in 1940, serving the last 4 years of his life as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Senator BANKHEAD was born on a farm in Lamar County, Ala., on July 8, 1872, and received his early educational training in a little country school of the period. He graduated from the University of Alabama and received his law degree from Georgetown University. Immediately upon admission to the Alabama bar he entered the active practice of law in Jasper, Ala., as a member of the firm of Coleman and Bankhead. Later he formed a partnership with his brother, William Brockman Bankhead, which continued until the latter's election to Congress. In 1920 his son, Walter Will Bankhead, became a member of the firm. Senator BANKHEAD was president of the Bankhead Coal Co. from 1911 until 1925 and in his dealings with his employees he gained the reputation of being fair and progressive. He was appointed to the board of trustees of the University of Alabama in 1917 and was a member of the board until the time of his death.

Senator BANKHEAD was an eminent lawyer and when elected to the Senate in 1930, he gave up one of the largest law practices in the South.

In 1933, thousands and thousands of farmers were losing their farms as a result of mortgage foreclosures and tax liens. The price of agricultural commodities in most instances would not pay for the actual cost of production to say nothing of the payment for the long hours of toil of the farmer and his family. Huge surpluses of agricultural commodities were piling up in the warehouses throughout the Nation further depressing the price of these products. Senator BANKHEAD took the lead in writing legislation to correct the economic plight of our great farm population. A large part of the agricultural program was put into effect as a result of legislation drawn by Senator BANKHEAD. Among the most important legislative acts in which he played the leading part were the tenant purchase program, the agricultural adjustment program, the agricultural marketing program, the price support program, and the Soil Conservation Service. All of these programs were not only humanitarian but were also economically sound.

During the war years, Senator BANKHEAD'S legislative tasks were doubly arduous. He was a member of the Appropriations Committee, which supplied the funds for our great war effort, a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, which handled many war measures, including price control, and was a member of the Committee on Agriculture. Any one of these committees required more strength than the average man has, yet Senator BANKHEAD was an active and effective member of all three of them. Last year many of his friends tried to get him to go home and rest for a little while, but he said he had two more bills for the American farmers that he wanted to finish before he took a much-needed rest. It can be truthfully said that he was a martyr to the cause of the farmers whom he loved so well.

In the death of JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD 2D, the Nation lost a profound statesman. A more distinguished service was never rendered in the legislative field than was rendered by this great man. His life was dedicated to the service of the public. He carved a place in the hearts of the American farmers that time will never erase. He fathered more constructive legislation for the benefit of the farmers of our Nation than any other man in the long legislative history of this country. The result of his untiring efforts improved the lot of the lowliest tenant farmers and sharecroppers in the remotest parts of our great country. The various Bankhead farm bills raised the economic level of all the farmers and in doing so raised the economic level of all Americans. The Nation can ill afford to lose men of the intelligence and integrity which Senator BANKHEAD possessed.

Citizenship, an Organic Act, and Civilian Administration for the People of Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD the statement made by Dr. Laura Thompson in behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, at hearings on Guam bills before the Public Lands Committee, on May 28. Dr. Thompson is not only an eminent anthropologist but is the author of the book, Guam and Its People, and is a recognized authority on the subject of that island.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am testifying in behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, a national organization devoted to the safeguarding and effectuation of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States. The Civil Liberties Union strongly recommends, for the people of Guam, citizenship, an organic act, and government by a civilian agency.

As an anthropologist with a special interest in Oceania, I have worked and written on Fiji, New Guinea, Hawaii, and the Marianas Islands, which include Guam. My testimony is based on scientific research regarding the people of Guam, their habits, customs, government, economy, social life, history, and archeology. This research, commenced in 1929, has continued off and on for 18 years. It included field work in Guam in 1938-39 at the invitation and under the auspices of the naval government of Guam and under the further auspices of the University of Hawaii, the Social Science Research Council, and the Institute of Pacific Relations. Out of this study of Guam have emerged several monographs, articles, and books on the archeology, native culture, and modern life of the Marianas area; among these being Guam and Its People, used extensively by the Navy as a source book on the island.

Before proceeding, I wish to state that it took me several years of intensive research to grasp the extent to which the naval government of Guam is, and has been since its inception in 1899, unprecedented in the annals of American history (with the exception of Navy-governed American Samoa). It took me a long while fully to grasp the extent to which the personal power of its military governor is unchecked either by statute law or by superior authority. The pattern of the administration by the United States Navy in Guam is so far outside the experience of the average American that it cannot be compared to anything that we are personally familiar with, and, indeed, I doubt whether there has been anything comparable to it in Anglo-Saxon history since the Magna Carta. If, therefore, my testimony may sound extreme, it will be because the facts are extreme.

The naval government of Guam is today, and has been since it was turned over temporarily to the Navy Department by Executive order of the President in 1899, a rapidly rotating personal dictatorship. I use the term "personal dictatorship" advisedly. For in the short-term naval Governor there is vested not only the executive function of government but also the legislative function and the judicial function. The functions—the three branches of government—are not separated, each operating as a check on the others, according to American principles of government. They are all under the personal control of the naval Governor. In other words, the naval Governor not only executes and administers the government over the civilian population, but he makes and unmakes the laws of the island at will through executive orders, proclamations, and the promulgation of temporary codes; and he controls the courts and sits as the supreme judge beyond whom there is no appeal.

There is not time to discuss how this absolutism by decree grew up under the American flag. Suffice it to point out that precedents set by the first naval Governor of Guam have been followed and elaborated through the near half century of naval rule.

But one fact of history should be fully noted. At the time of the Spanish-American War, the Guamanians had been full-fledged citizens of Spain, on a basis of legal equality with all Spanish subjects, for over 200 years. Soon after the arrival of the first permanent mission in 1668, Spanish citizenship, the laws of the Indies, and the right of appeal to the intermediate court at Manila and the Supreme Court at Madrid, were extended to the natives of the Marianas. A form of indirect administration was initiated, by which the natives were given a measure of self-government. A system then developed of the election of local officials through the electorate of the natives.

When the American Navy took over in Guam, the natives lost their Spanish citizenship, their rule under statute law, their right of appeal to a supreme court beyond the Island, their municipal elections, and the limited self-rule they had attained under Spain. And thereafter, and until now, in spite of the pledge in Article IX of the Treaty of Paris (that Congress would define their status and rights), the Guamanians have not been granted American citizenship, a legal system which could not be abrogated at the will of the rotating governors, or any legally guaranteed civil rights whatsoever.

Instead, was inaugurated, and perpetuated until now, the centralized, personalized absolutism by decree of rotating naval governors over civilians.

Here it should be observed, that although the naval government of Guam resembles in structure the navy yard or battleship type of regime which is its prototype, it differs therefrom in one crucial item. An American navy yard or battleship is governed under military law whereunder the individual, though he may not claim the protection of the requirement of grand jury indictment or of jury trial, yet has certain protections. The judge's decisions are subject to automatic review by higher authority. In Guam, on the other hand, the individual is denied not only the right of trial by jury and the protection of grand jury indictment, but also is denied any appeal or review whatsoever beyond the Island and its naval governor. In Guam, therefore, the military absolutism over civilians, having dispensed with all the usual checks and balances, even those of martial law, is unlimited and complete. In the naval government of Guam, law, and legally guaranteed civil rights, as these are known to the average American, do not exist. The naval Governor of Guam has actually more power, on that island, than any other individual or institution under the American flag—more even than the President, or Congress, or both of them together, within areas governed by the Constitution.

Under such conditions, it is easy to see that the office of naval Governor of Guam might be a considerable burden to an American citizen, whether or not he be a naval officer. He is sent to Guam as its Governor by the President as Commander in Chief, through the Secretary of the Navy. He, a Navy career man, trained and experienced in the complexities of the science of naval warfare, must assume the responsibilities of his new and briefly held office with little or no prior training or experience in the administration of civilian populations, and little or no knowledge of the people over whom his rule is the law. But note: Not merely must he, thus proceeding under orders, thus assume the anomalous role of Governor of Guam, for which he is ill-prepared and which is far from his sphere of major concentration and interest, but he must assume that role on a part-time basis. For the Governor of Guam is also commandant of the naval station of Guam, since the last war a major naval Pacific base; and recently his military duties have been expanded, so that now he holds the important assignment of commandant of the Marianas, Carolines, and Marshalls.

Bearing all of these facts in mind, is it any wonder that the naval government of Guam is not only arbitrary and capricious but also uneconomic and inefficient as well? That it is uneconomic is revealed by the Hopkins committee report. According to that committee, the appropriation estimate for the fiscal year 1948, exclusive of rehabilitation costs, payment of war-damage claims, and compensation for lands taken, is $2,037,754, or $88 per capita for every Guamanian man, woman, and child. That per capita cost of government is higher than the per capita cost of any State in the Union, higher than the cost of the United States Indian Service, three and a half times higher than the per capita cost of the government of Puerto Rico. The naval government of Guam is, therefore, one of the most expensive governments in the United States.

On this matter of comparative costs of government, I think that your committee may be interested in certain parallel data from another group of Pacific islands, Western Samoa, which is governed by New Zealand.

In Western Samoa, the elementary schools are supplied by mission societies, the intermediate and higher schools by the government. One of the most efficient and productive health services in the world is supplied by the government. All the other usual services of government are provided. The total cost, for the 68,000 Western Samoans, in the year of 1945–46, was 234,169 pounds, or about $936,000. The per capita cost of government and all its services was $14.

Let us compare Guam and Western Samoan results, in terms of reduced death rates and increase of population. In 40 years, from 1901 through 1940, the Guam population increased about 130 percent, an average rate of increase of 3.25 percent. In Western Samoa, from 1924 through 1945, the population increased 94 percent, an average rate of increase of 4.5 percent. In Western Samoa, between 1925 and 1946, the deaths per 1,000 of live births, of children under one year of age, were reduced from 186 to 53.8. The over-all death rate in Guam is 13.9 per 1,000; in Western Samoa it is 13. The Samoan health service contains 18 trained Europeans, 161 trained Samoans, and 1 Chinese. This Western Samoa data is taken from the report of New Zealand to the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, dated July 2, 1946. Guam's per capita cost of government, $88; Western Samoa's per capita cost of government, $14. Western Samoa's government is a civilian government.

That the naval government of Guam is inefficient as well as very costly is shown by the record both present and past. Time does not permit a detailed presentation of the long record of governmental inefficiencies on Guam. For this record I would refer your committee to my detailed study of Guam government in the revised third edition of Guam and Its People, Princeton University Press, 1947. A few examples will have to suffice. The naval government's health record on Guam, often cited by the Navy Department as having been outstanding, shows a surprising laxness.

For example, during all of the two decades prior to the World War not a single physician specializing in public health had ever been assigned to Guam. Except for leprosy, there was no isolation ward for communicable diseases, not even for tuberculosis. And the water supply of the city of Agana, wherein dwelt not only over half of the prewar population of islanders, but also a large proportion of the naval colony, was not chlorinated until 1941, 43 years after American occupation, despite the fact that its contamination was responsible for an annual epidemic of dysentery, which brought debilitation and death. Even within the naval compound, where I lived, dysentery was rife in 1939; and why? The water which patients, nurses, and doctors were drinking, after being thoroughly boiled, was then poured over contaminated ice in the hospital kitchen.

The naval government's arbitrariness and inefficiency in settling Guamanian claims—claims authorized by Congress—and in rehabilitating the Guamanians, or even letting them rehabilitate themselves, right now, almost 3 years after the American bombardment which rendered more than half the population homeless, is well documented in the Hopkins committee report. This report calls attention, among many other things, to the impracticability of the naval government's elaborate plan for the rebuilding of Agana, which to this day remains a grass patch, its former inhabitants living in temporary camps and improvised shacks a year and a half after Congress has appropriated $6,000,000 for the rebuilding of Guam's towns. The fact that the naval government-controlled Bank of Guam, the only bank on the island, refuses to lend money on the basis of claims, when these claims are all that most of Guam's bombed-out, displaced persons have to offer as collateral, is not merely inefficient from the viewpoint of native welfare and the reestablishment of native economy, but also is indicative of the lack of confidence which the naval government itself has in its own ability or intention to settle such claims in the near future except, perhaps, in the words of the Hopkins committee report, "for a mere pittance."

The record, which could be amplified at length, is the more surprising when we turn our attention to the people of Guam themselves. It should not be forgotten that the Guamanians are actually the only civilian population within the United States domain who were subjected to enemy occupation during the recent war, and whose loyalty to the American flag has thus been tested and found true by the supreme tests of torture and death. The Guamanians have shown themselves to be people of maturity and stability, impervious to face-to-face enticements of the enemy, intensely loyal to the United States. Highly disciplined but not subservient, they are bred from the cradle to lawfulness and social responsibility. They have a great capacity to endure frustration and suffering, and can and have endured much, but they are also a fun-loving, charming, witty, and gay people. But besides all this, the Guamanians have shown themselves to be, as far as our record extends into the past, a people of intelligence and ingenuity. For example, the ancient Marianas' culture was outstanding in the whole Pacific area for its remarkable asymmetrical sailing canoe, the famous flying prao which was the marvel of early navigators. The Marianas' stonework, pottery, rice culture, and social organization also were highly developed. This cultural heritage has been enriched through the past four centuries by contacts with Spaniards, Mexicans, Filipinos, Japanese, Americans, and others. Guamanians are very far from being a primitive people. They have long been in contact both with western civilization and the Orient, as well as the neighboring Pacific islands, and as a result they are surprisingly wise in the ways of people—mature and sophisticated in the best sense of that term. Nor are they illiterate. Since 1675, when Guam's schooling was started by the Jesuits, there have been schools for both boys and girls in the principal villages of Guam, and during the American regime, a few years of schooling has been compulsory for every child. Practically all Guamanians are bilingual; those below the age of 45 speaking Chamorro and English, those above, Chamorro and Spanish. Many of them understand other languages, such as Filipino and Japanese.

In short, these people, whom once you have known you can never forget, have proved themselves to be an asset to the United States by their quiet but intense loyalty, deep sense of responsibility, lawfulness, poise, and intelligence, both during the long years of American naval rule and in the years under enemy occupation. Now that we know the score, we Americans, with our strong sense of fair play, can no longer consent to deny them the citizenship, the organic act, and the civilian government which they have earned.

I do not believe that anyone suggests that civilian government in place of naval government will be a cure-all, an instant solution of all problems. But short of civilian

government, there can be no cure and no solution of problems. There is not time now to discuss the details of how civilian government would function, would throw self-help responsibility on those people who are ready for it, and would economically bring to the Guamanians the various resources of our American Government which they need. I do offer for the record, on account of its possible interest to your committee, a brief discussion of certain tried and proved techniques which are proving highly successful in another of the dependency-administration areas of the United States.

I conclude by stating for the American Civil Liberties Union that among the several bills before your committee the one introduced by Mr. POULSON is considered to be the most adequate, and the most fully in line with the historical experience—a long one—of the United States in moving Territories and dependencies toward increased self-government and increased participation in our national life. I mention and endorse particularly two provisions in the Poulson bill—I believe they are contained in the Grant bill, too—going beyond the three fundamentals of citizenship, organic act, and civilian administration. These are the provisions making jury trial in criminal cases optional with the defendant and with the judge; and the provision that Guam shall have a resident commissioner at Washington. This last-named provision is a most essential one, I suggest.

I am appreciative of your committee's courtesy in allowing me thus to testify.

Cashing Terminal-Leave Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Boston Post, Monday, May 19, 1947, endorsing the proposed bill providing that terminal-leave bonds be made negotiable:

CASHING THE BONDS

Congressman DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Florida, who was a coauthor last year of the bill that paid off the GI's for their accumulated furloughs in nonnegotiable 5-year bonds, has come up with what appears a sensible plan for letting the GI's cash their bonds and still keep them away from the Treasury until maturity. He proposes to make the bonds negotiable, but not redeemable by the Treasury until they have matured.

Under this plan the GI's who need it can sell their bonds for cash; banks or anyone else interested in Government short-term 2½-percent bonds can buy them; and the Treasury won't have to pay out any more, or any sooner, than was provided in the original bill. Mr. ROGERS thinks the bonds would command a premium and that would be a profit to help offset the veterans' loss of interest if they were to sell their bonds. Mr. ROGERS needs more backing for his proposal to get it on the floor for debate, so here's the veterans' chance if they feel that his is a good idea.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under date of May 27, 1947, there was published in the Home News, the local paper of Bronx County, N. Y., an editorial entitled "Displaced Persons" which I think aptly describes the present situation in this country.

Under the unanimous consent granted me, I take pleasure in including this splendid editorial which follows:

DISPLACED PERSONS

Item: New York City's displaced persons on relief may be transferred to Ellis Island for lack of other housing.

Item: Hearings begin June 4 on Congressman WILLIAM G. STRATTON'S bill to admit 400,000 displaced persons to the United States in a 4-year period.

Item: The United Nations inquiry commission will report next fall on Palestine, the effect of the British white paper cutting off immigration, and the status of Europe's homeless Jews.

Item: This Congress has definitely decided against action on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill.

Item: Mounting unemployment here swells relief rolls.

Had enough?

Item: Instead of adding the $40,000,000 needed to support the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund, Congress in conference deducted it from the $350,000,000 Foreign Relief bill, leaving only $295,000,000 for relief in Greece, Italy, Trieste, Austria, Hungary, and Poland.

Item: General Mark Clark charges that Russia has stripped Austria of every means of self sustenance, including food factories and materials.

Item: Congress torpedoes the International Trade Conference at Geneva by a House provision permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the import tariff on wool by as much as 50 percent.

Item: Republican Congress insists taxes must be cut now.

Had enough?

Item: Bankruptcy petitions for small business almost keep pace with the rising dividend rates for large business.

Item: Federal appropriations for school lunches, farm electrification, and the production and marketing administration have been sharply cut, or hamstrung.

Item: Food shortages in western Europe and Great Britain continue acute.

That's enough. It isn't all but it's plenty.

A curious kind of schizophrenia has seized hold of us.

In the same breath, we declare our intention of rescuing the world and ourselves from the perils of hunger, while angrily insisting that if it costs money we'll have none of it.

We are disturbed, and frightened, at Europe's famine-made skeleton figures, beckoning a bony-fingered invitation to red fascism, but our attention is really on the nice fat figures represented by national tax cuts and State dollar surpluses.

The sad part of it is, we really know better. We're not that dumb, we're just a little lazy, and growing a little selfish; we're assuming the characteristics of the cartooned figure of the richest man in town. Nations, too, get a little purse-proud, a little intolerant, a little greedy, and a little lazy.

We're acting like the fat man who cleans out the icebox, downs the last piece of chocolate cake and then orders his family on a diet, complaining that food is getting scarce.

We know, for instance, that tax cuts are hardly going to solve a growing relief problem. People on relief don't pay taxes, for one thing. And those of us who aren't on relief can afford it—if just to keep ourselves off the relief rolls.

We know that there aren't too many people—but that there are rather too few houses, we know that tax funds can help cut costs in housing * * * not only so that workers and veterans' families can participate in the American dream—but so that carpenters can go back to work.

We know that steel and lumber and paint and glass and home furnishings and gadgets must find homes to fill—or that production in these lines, too, slows down—and still more workers join the jobless and the unproductive.

We know that if we, the richest and strongest country on earth, will not open our borders to Europe's homeless, no other country really can—or will.

We know that we must buy as well as sell, or there will soon be none to sell to * * * that if Australian sheep can't leap over our tariff walls, American goods can't be sold to Australian sheep farmers.

We know that hunger is the great revolutionary general of all the ages.

The next whistle you hear should not be mistaken for the quitting siren, or the curfew. Instead, it's the start of the second half. We can still win even if the team is a little out of condition. But we've simply got to quit getting our signals mixed.

GOP Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting as a part of my remarks an article by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Evening Star on May 29, 1947:

GOP CONGRESS LIVES UP TO PARTY PROMISES—RECORD FOR SPEED IS BEING SET ON TAX AND LABOR BILLS

(By Gould Lincoln)

The Republican Congress has lived up to the party pledges made in the 1946 campaign—to cut Government expenditures, to cut taxes, and to pass a bill amending the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and to otherwise equalize labor and management before the law. It was only a short time ago that critics were holding up the Congress to ridicule as the "do-nothing Congress." As a matter of fact, however, this Congress, under Republican leadership, has established a record for speed in dealing with legislative matters of the highest importance, including taxes, labor, portal-to-portal pay, and foreign loans to Greece and Turkey—a measure of far-reaching importance in the foreign affairs of the country. All in less than 5 months' time. It also put through a constitutional amendment proposed limiting a President to two terms.

It now remains to see how the executive branch of the Government, in the person of

President Truman, will perform. The President has, of course, approved the Greek-Turkey loan. It was his proposal and spark-plugged the new Truman doctrine. He has, with some reluctance, approved the portal-to-portal pay bill. Neither the labor bill nor the tax bill has yet reached him. There have been ominous predictions from Democratic sources that he will veto both the labor bill and the tax bill. The decision, however, lies finally with the President—and he has shown on occasion remarkable independence in important decisions.

If he vetoes the labor bill—and leaves the country with no remedial labor legislation—Mr. Truman will be playing a dangerous game. He will also be taking long chances of losing the support of many independent-minded persons for the sake of retaining the support of radical labor leaders—support which could and would not go anywhere else.

BILL'S CHANCES ARE BRIGHT

Even if the President vetoes the labor bill, its chances of becoming a law are still bright. Both the Senate and the House passed the bill by more than a two-thirds majority. If the Members stick to their original position, the measure will pass notwithstanding Mr. Truman's disapproval. In the House the vote for the bill was almost 3 to 1. In the Senate it was closer—68 to 24.

A tax reduction bill is a ticklish thing for any President to kill. The tax bill as it passed the House and then the Senate, cuts personal income taxes from 10.5 percent to 30 percent with the higher cuts on the lowest incomes. The chief difference between the bills is that the House measure proposed to make the cut retroactive to last January 1, while the Senate's starts the cut as of July 1. It is expected the House will finally yield on this issue, and that the bill as it will go to the White House will start the tax reductions as of July 1. If it is in that form, it cuts the ground from under the most plausible arguments the President could use in vetoing the bill.

Whether the tax bill could be passed over a Presidential veto is extremely doubtful. The House voted 273 to 137 for the measure—one vote short of a two-thirds majority. In the Senate the vote stood 52 to 34. The plea of Mr. Truman and Democratic leaders in Congress is for a reduction of the national debt with the surplus which the Treasury will have at the close of this fiscal year, July 1, and with the receipts in excess of Government expenditures for the next 6 months.

TOO MUCH PARTY POLITICS

To the man in the street, however, it looks as though too much party politics is involved. First, the determination of the Democrats to prevent the Republicans from keeping their pledge to reduce income taxes by 20 percent. And second a desire on the part of the administration to present a tax reduction measure of its own next year, just in advance of the national election.

Ever since the Democrats took over the Federal Government in 1933 there has been a constant increase in Federal taxes—up to the 1945 act passed right after the end of the war. Starting in 1934, each year saw a new tax bill—except in 1941—and all of them exacted heavier tax payments from the people. But when the war ended a measure of relief was extended—with the abolition of excess-profits taxes, capital-stock taxes, and a reduction of the corporate tax, and also a cut in personal income taxes. The total tax reduction was between four and five billions of dollars, of which some billion and a half to two billions was in personal incomes taxes. Indeed, the bill was written so as to relieve 12,000,000 of the lowest-income groups from payment of income taxes.

The personal income tax, however, remains tremendously heavy. It is an item, along with the increased costs of living, which makes it difficult for millions of men and women to make ends meet. The Republicans are intent on reducing this burden. A tax-bill veto will not be popular.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address which I delivered on May 30, 1947, at the Memorial Day exercises conducted in Battleground Cemetery here in Washington.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LIVING MEMORIAL TO THE LIVING DEAD

I am grateful to be with you today on this hallowed ground and on this holy occasion to participate with you again in these memory-recalling ceremonies. From boyhood, Memorial Day—Decoration Day—has been a day apart, a day of flowers, of martial music, of veterans in uniforms. Three years ago it was my pleasure to comrade with you on this spot and take part in these beautiful observances.

It is good to return to your midst for many reasons. They are largely the reasons that we are all here today.

1. THIS HALLOWED GROUND

My first reason is that this, of course, is hallowed ground to all who hold the Union dear. We recall that it was at this point that the ramparts of Washington were almost breached by General Early that fateful period in June 1864. He and his horsemen and swift-moving troops had arrived practically at the very spot at which we are now standing. Every able-bodied man in Washington—yes, even those who were not able—followed the call to the colors.

You will recall that Gen. Ulysses S. Grant was at that time fighting before Richmond when he received word of the danger. He immediately dispatched the Sixth Corps down the historic James River and up the Potomac. President Lincoln, who had been out at this spot in the morning, drove to the Seventh Street wharves to meet the Sixth Corps and welcome them. How warmly he greeted those troops. Then the corps marched to reinforce the defenders on the firing line. They marched up Seventh Street, past the Smithsonian Institution, the Patent Office, and the post office. We know the result of their valiant action. Washington was saved by the noble men of that generation, and within a year victory came and Lincoln was martyred.

To the men who gave their mortal lives in this very area we recite the words of a poem:

"Nor shall your story be forgot,
While Fame her record keeps,
Or Honor points the hallowed spot
Where Valor proudly sleeps."

Here in this silent city we pay homage to those for whom the last human roll call has been sounded, but whose spirits are carrying on valiantly and fearlessly just as they did when they dwelt on earth.

2. HONOR TO CIVIL WAR HEROES

In paying tribute to those who fell in the defense of Washington, we honor, secondly, all those who fought in the War Between the States, the men of honest conviction on both sides who made the supreme sacrifice for their views.

We recall the verse:

"Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the Judgment Day;
Love and tears for the Blue,
Tears and love for the Gray."

3. HONOR OF ALL UNITED STATES WAR HEROES

Memories of Antietam, of Gettysburg, of Shiloh, of Vicksburg, of the Wilderness flood back into our mind's eye. But we see, too, the American heroes who fought in all of America's wars for the land they loved so dearly and the land for which they were willing to give the last full measure of devotion.

They loved the emblem of our freedom—Old Glory. Yes; the flag that floats from the flagpole today is really the same flag over which the men in the blue and the gray fought. It is the same flag that flew with Washington's troops, when blood stained the snow at Valley Forge; the same flag that went with Jackson to New Orleans. To be sure, it had fewer stars then, but it was the same Stars and Stripes. It was the same flag that went with Taylor and Scott to Mexico; the same flag that Grant raised at Appomattox. It is the flag that Dewey and Schley and Sampson flew over the Spanish possessions in 1898, and the same flag that "Blackjack" Pershing carried to the shores of the Rhine.

This is the flag that the Marines raised on Iwo Jima, and the flag that went with Eisenhower to north Africa, to Normandy, and then across the Rhine, the flag that MacArthur raised again over the Philippines and which now flies in Japan. It has flown on all the seas of the earth and all the continents thereof, and with the help of God it will fly high forever over our land, signifying to our own and to all peoples of earth that freedom shall never die.

4. RECOVENANTING OURSELVES

You and I know the fourth reason why we are here today is to recovenant ourselves to the cause which our soldiers and sailors and marines so nobly advanced.

We recall the words of Lincoln on November 15, 1863, uttered on a Pennsylvania battlefield:

"It is for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Those words of the Great Emancipator have greater meaning today than ever before, with so many of the earth's peoples still living in bondage, but groping for freedom.

1944 MESSAGE

I should like to briefly recall some words I stated to you in 1944. The skies of Europe and Asia were then filled with war clouds and nations were in the full clutch of war. I said:

"Peace will come. It must come without rancor or hatred as peace came to the men who made their last earthly bivouac here. It must come without compromise to the

sacred cause of freedom as it came here to these guardians of faith.

"A righteous victory will be ours. A just peace will be ours. For them we acknowledge our dependence on divine providence. For them we renew to those living and dead our pledge that we will hold high the torch. We will keep faith. And we of this generation pledge we will transmit to those who come after us the liberties of America, unimpaired.

"And with the peace will come added responsibility—the responsibility to rebuild bleeding, suffering humanity and make a repetition of this holocaust impossible. We are dedicated to fulfill this task.

"May God be with us then, to guide the leaders and the people of this Nation, so that the wisdom of the Most High and the heritage of America for all time to come will be ours."

PROBLEMS OF 1947

Those were my thoughts in 1944. Now that the battle is over, we are still seeking for that peace of which I spoke. We can't be discouraged. We have so much for which to be grateful when we compare the lot of our beloved America and ourselves with that of the world, that we cannot let discouragement creep in.

Rather, we have to strengthen the sinews of our wills and our minds, and recognize that we have been precipitated to a new position in the world and that humbly we must go forth to meet the challenges which present themselves. It would seem that we have been set apart—yes; as a chosen people—to meet not again in blood and war, but in an aid to the needy, so that they may rebuild their economy and their lives, and to demonstrate to the war-weary peoples of earth the vitality of freedom's way under the Republic.

CHALLENGES OF ATOMIC AGE

What, then, of the challenges of 1947? On Memorial Day, 1947, for us to dedicate ourselves to the cause "which they so nobly advanced" means to prepare ourselves and our beloved country against any emergency that may be before us in this atomic age. It also means to continue to strive nobly and with great mission for true international understanding among the nations.

America, as I have said, has been called to the highest of all callings—a position of leadership in the atomic age, a leadership that is economic, political, and social.

But while we make our supreme effort to arrive at true international friendship, and while we dedicate our will and purpose for a just and lasting peace, we recognize still that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." In this day and age, when time and space have been rendered meaningless by man's inventions, vigilance is necessary on every front.

It is necessary in the field of diplomacy, in the field of arms, and in the spiritual field. We must be prepared mentally, knowing that the peoples of the world are still living on different strata of development; that we and foreign nations see things through different eyes; that our past has been one of devotion to peace, while the past of peoples of other countries has been marred by invasion, by hatred, and by war.

These are the realities of Memorial Day 1947. We must open up our eyes "that we may see," in the words of the Good Book, and in so doing we will be paying tribute to those who stood guard for us in the darkest days of the Republic, and who saw the battle through to success.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY

You remember the words from the immortal poem:

"Take up our quarrel with the foe!
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields."

If we break faith, if we fail to fight the foe of international misunderstanding, of international envy and jealousy and hatred, then the dead will not sleep in Flanders nor in battleground, nor in Gettysburg, nor elsewhere. I know, however, that we will be adequate.

CONCLUSIONS

My friends, it has been a pleasure to comrade with you here today. We have briefly reviewed the inspiring past, surveyed the challenges of the present, and peered beyond the veil into the future.

From this gathering and other gatherings throughout the land, Americans will indeed take renewed faith and courage to march forward to the future, holding the flag aloft, boldly, fearlessly, successfully, as did those of 1861–65 and all the other heroes of America's unforgettable conflicts.

In this spirit of hope and of faith I say again "thank you" and Godspeed on our American mission.

Economic Effects of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting article prepared by Harry Daniels, of 1426 Twenty-first Street NW., Washington, D. C., dealing with the economic effects of unemployment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is unfortunate that it took a long, costly, and bloody war—World War II—to provide work, security, and a decent standard of living for our people.

In the peacetime 1930's private enterprise and industry failed again to provide work and security for the common people and the result was not only world-wide depression but also the spread of Hitlerism and communism. We were caught in a great depression with more than 14,000,000 jobless, and half the Nation hungry and poorly clad and drifting fast toward an economic crisis which might have produced a dictatorship here had it not been for that great and immortal statesman and Democrat, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who, like a kindly shepherd, fed and clothed the needy all over the Nation as well as provided employment for the jobless.

Today, if our political leaders will take advantage of the opportunity, we once more have a chance—a good chance—to maintain full employment. We know that full employment is possible. Our present task is to maintain full employment in peace as well as in war. Every American knows now that there is no longer any excuse for poverty, insecurity, and joblessness. We are headed, however, for positive economic danger. Already from coast to coast, unemployment is definitely on the increase because we have failed again to use the dynamics of our productive machine to prevent that marvelous machine from turning on us and causing national disaster and ruin.

I am not in accord with the monopolists who say that no important social change is necessary to maintain full employment and improvements in living standards. I take this means to solemnly warn both Republicans and Democrats that, unless free private enterprise is denied unlimited license, we will lose our present opportunity to maintain full employment and a decent standard of living and will, moreover, become slaves to a horrible monopolistic economic system. We can and must solve our economic problems and save the common people from unemployment and its attendant miseries. In order to preserve our society against chaos and collapse, I propose an economic bill of rights. By assuring fundamental economic rights to the common people we not only can solve our economic problems, but also can prevent our Government from failing again into the hands of the monopolists.

HARRY DANIELS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 27, 1947.*

Application of Community-Property Principle to Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not a Lost Cause," published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of May 29, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT A LOST CAUSE

The Senate refused an amendment, offered by Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, to the tax reduction bill, that would have extended the benefits of the community-property principle to the people of all the States. Senator MCCLELLAN made a good fight in a worthy cause, which is by no manner of means a lost one.

The Senate's rejection of Senator MCCLELLAN's proposal was based on a feeling that it was not wise to complicate further the pending measure, and not on any widespread feeling that his ideas lacked justice and usefulness. Chairman MILLIKIN, of the Senate Finance Committee, though he led the fight against the amendment, said the proposition had top rating among matters to be considered in a general tax-revision bill.

Senator MCCLELLAN may be depended on to continue his campaign for tax equality, and if the people of some 39 States wake up to what he has in hand, his drive will soon be successful.

There are 9 States of the 48 that operate under the community-property law. In these nine States the theory is that husband and wife make equal contributions to family income. On that basis, the family income may be divided for income-tax purposes, with husband and wife each reporting a half. The benefits are considerable in any case, and increase with the amount of taxable income.

The community-property principle was incorporated in the basic law of most of the States that have it, but one or more have taken action to apply the idea. As matters now stand, authorities on laws and taxes believe action by Congress is necessary if the principle is extended. Married people ought to concern themselves especially with seeing that equality is established, and in general no such state of unbalance should be permitted.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, yesterday the Baltimore Sunday Sun published a forceful editorial in regard to the tax reduction program now before the Congress. Although this important newspaper had previously expressed its editorial policy against tax reduction at this time, in its editorial yesterday its former position was reversed and in the light of the improved fiscal situation in the country it now supports unqualifiedly the tax bill passed several days ago by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of this editorial appearing yesterday, Sunday, June 1, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sometime this week, probably as early as Tuesday, President Truman will have to make one of the major decisions of his administration. The Senate and House conferees have agreed on the tax bill which they will pass. It provides for a reduction in individual income taxes ranging from 30 percent for small taxpayers to about 10 percent for those in the upper brackets. The President must decide whether he will affix his signature or veto the bill.

The decision will not be a simple one for him. When, last January, he sent his budget message to the Congress, he foresaw a deficit in the present fiscal year and a bare balancing of the Government's income and outgo in 1948. Believing that his own estimate of expenditures could not be reduced, he argued strongly against a tax cut.

At that time the Sun followed the President's lead. The vast debt and the long series of unbalanced budgets made it seem rational to arrange the fiscal responsibilities of Congress in this order. First, balance the budget and effect all feasible economies; second, provide for retirement of some part of the debt, however small; third, and only third, reduce taxes. Under the new organization of Congress this seemed to be not only a desirable program but a possible one as well.

The whole economic picture of the country has changed since the President took his position in January. In addition, the fiscal situation has altered radically and very much for the better. The Congress can take very little credit for the change, for its members have followed neither law nor logic in their deliberations. Nevertheless, the change is there and, unless we are to be doctrinaire in our discussion, we must admit it.

The change in the fiscal situation has already been admitted, in part at least, by the Administration. When the President presented his calculation in January, his expectation was for a deficit in the fiscal year 1947, which ends June 30 next. That expectation has now been abandoned. The official estimate still standing admits a surplus of 1.25 billions, and it is common knowledge that this will be exceeded. As responsible a fiscal authority as Mr. John W. Hanes, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, has estimated that the surplus will be between three and four billions. So, fiscally, we are that much ahead of the game.

But that is the smaller part of the improved outlook for Government finances. The President's own figures, in his budget as presented in January, showed a prospective surplus for the fiscal year ending June, 1948, of one and eight-tenths billions. It was this small prospective surplus which brought the President to argue against tax reduction. But since then the congressional economizers have been at work. It is true that they have not yet and probably will not manage to make the cut of six billions which they so blithely promised. But the cuts so far achieved add up to about two billions and will probably go to three billions. This sum can properly be added to the surplus for 1948 estimated by the President. Call the total a conservative three billions and add it to the lower of Mr. Hanes' figures for the current (1947) surplus and the aggregate is six billions. That is, we have taken or are about to take from the taxpayers six billions more than we plan to spend.

So much for the fiscal situation. Now for the outlook as it affects business and industry, the small taxpayer and the large one. It is not only in governmental affairs that the outlook has changed, as we all know. The cost of living, held down by artificial means during the war and for a while thereafter, bounded up in the first part of this year. The rise touched off by a new series of wage demands. Some of these have been granted. Others are still under negotiation. But there is a general admission that with reference to some goods a gap between wages and prices exists. Industrial hesitation has begun to manifest itself. In some lines producers are uncertain of their markets; in others there is no doubt about the resistance of the consumers to present prices. We have, in brief, some of the conditions which in the past have brought about a new turn in the inflationary spiral. The difficulty is that we do not know whether the new turn will be up or down.

In an economy in which Government takes as large a share of the national income as our Government takes, the role of taxes cannot be ignored. High taxes reduce general purchasing power, of course, but they have other effects as well. In the middle brackets, they act as a brake on enterprise, as every small businessman knows. In the upper brackets, their chief adverse effect is to reduce the funds that are called risk capital. Risk capital is the money available for the establishment of new businesses, new industries and, inevitably, new jobs.

So here we have, for the current year and the one coming, a prospective nest egg of some six billions and, if things go well, much more. The Congress, for all the foolish talk from some of its members, and for all its failure to consider its problems in an orderly manner, has grasped this significant fact. It has proposed, as the proper course, to use some two-thirds of this surplus (half this calendar year and half next) for tax reduction. The remainder would automatically go toward reducing the debt.

The proposal is admittedly not a perfect one. The Republican leaders have all agreed that they will have to begin all over again when they reassemble after the recess. Some of the more thoughtful ones have said that the whole tax structure should be rebuilt, a suggestion which makes sense when we remember how quickly and, on occasion, how thoughtlessly the present wartime edifice was put up.

This, then, is approximately the situation the President will face when the tax bill is laid on his desk. He can choose to veto it, recalling his warnings of last January and ignoring the changes which have come about since that time. Or he can admit the shortcomings of the estimates his experts provided, admit also the changed economic picture of the country and sign the bill.

To be sure, if he does sign it, he will be giving his Republican opponents something to crow about. But Mr. Truman, as the country is beginning to understand, is not a devious or calculating man. So far, in most of the issues which have faced him he has been simple, straightforward, and courageous. Politically he has been most effective when he has brushed aside the advice of the political necromancers and acted in accordance with his own decent instincts.

We hope that, with a similar disregard of the soothsayers, he will decide this tax question with relation to the general welfare. The general welfare calls for tax reduction.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Phony Charges," published in the Washington Daily News of May 31, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHONY CHARGES

For the next 2 weeks you will hear from union leaders a crescendo of charges that the Taft-Hartley labor bill is "slave legislation"—that it means "involuntary servitude"—that it would "compel men to work against their will."

These charges, we believe, are completely phony.

The bill says specifically that no individual employee shall be required to work without his consent; and that it shall not be illegal for any individual employee to quit work.

So it could not compel anybody to work against his will.

When a number of employees stop work by mutual understanding, for the purpose of enforcing demands upon an employer or protesting against the actions of an employer, that is a strike.

The bill does say, as the late President Roosevelt said, that Federal Government employees have no right to strike. It requires that they be discharged from their jobs if they do strike. But it does not compel any individual to work for the Government.

President Truman has said that jurisdictional strikes, wars between unions at the expense of employers and the public, are indefensible. The bill does make jurisdictional strikes illegal. It also outlaws strikes to force employers to pay for work not done, or to recognize unions contrary to, or in the absence of, certification from the National Labor Relations Board. It authorizes the NLRB to obtain Federal court injunctions against such strikes, but it says that no injunction shall require any individual to work without his consent.

The bill does authorize the President, acting through the Attorney General, to obtain Federal injunctions for the purpose of delaying key-industry strikes that would endanger national health or safety. Such injunctions could remain in force not longer than 80 days. If Government efforts to settle a dispute failed, and if at the end of 80 days the employees voted to reject their employer's final offer, they would be free to strike. And, at all times, they would be individually free to quit their jobs.

Where national health and safety are not at stake, the bill puts no limitation on the right of employees in private industry to strike for such basic economic reasons as wages, hours, and working conditions.

What union leaders really mean, when they shout about "slave legislation," is that they

want no restriction whatever on the power to strike for any reason at any time. We cannot agree with them. The strike, as this country has learned, can be a deadly weapon, destructive to the rights of employers, workers, and the public. The American people want their Government to make fair rules to preserve its proper uses and prevent its abuse. That, we think, is what Congress has done in the Taft-Hartley bill.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lagging Federal Aid Bill," published in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of May 31, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAGGING FEDERAL-AID BILL

With several bills for Federal aid to education lagging in committees, it might be well to remind the Members of Congress that in the present conflict for survival between communism and democracy, which may well continue throughout the present century, an educated American citizenship will be no less important in swinging the balance in our favor than the rehabilitation of non-Communist countries.

The children now in kindergarten will wage the final contest of ideas and wits to determine whether our western civilization is to emerge victorious over the eastern civilization that is bent upon destroying it.

Russia has realized the importance of this battle of ideas and is spending 8 percent of its national income on education. We in America apparently have not realized it, because we are spending only 3.5 percent of our income for the same purpose. On that basis the next generation of Russians stand a chance of having what may be a determining advantage over the Americans pledged to preserve our western system.

Whether the intellectual preparation of our future citizens for that struggle is the business of the States or of the Federal Government, or both, should be decided by the answers to these questions:

Is not the citizen of North Carolina and of Alabama also a citizen of the United States on an equal footing with the resident of New Jersey or California?

As such, is he not entitled to the same training in citizenship as his fellow American of New Jersey or California?

Both of these questions, we submit, must be answered in the affirmative. Since the North Carolina or the Alabama child will, on coming of age, hold a dual citizenship, State and Federal, it is the business of both the State and the Federal governments to see that he is properly trained in the responsibilities that will devolve upon him in both categories.

If, however, the whole responsibility for this training is left to the States, the child fortunate enough to be born in New Jersey or California will have almost twice the training for citizenship as the child born in North Carolina or Alabama.

That discrepancy is no stigma on the States that spend the smallest amount in actual money on education, for those very States are the ones that work hardest at educating their children. Income payments to individuals in New Jersey in 1945 averaged $1,373; in North Carolina the average was $732. In California in 1945 the average income of individuals was $1,480; in Alabama $700.

Hence, North Carolina and Alabama were spending a larger percentage of their income on education, making greater sacrifices to provide their children with schools, than were New Jersey and California, though they spend in actual money less than half as much as the two richer States.

The American citizen living in North Carolina has the same responsibilities to his country as the American citizen living in New Jersey; he should have the same training to meet them. If the State is not rich enough to give him the same training, it seems obvious that the Federal Government should make up the difference, just as the State makes up the difference between its richer and poorer counties.

Federal aid to education is nothing new or revolutionary. Since 1787 more than 150 bills for Federal aid to education, in one form or another, have been passed by Congress—one for nearly every year of the country's life—and they do not include the large sums spent by PWA on buildings and equipment, by NYA, and through the GI bill of rights.

Under the bill introduced by Senators TAFT, HILL, and others—S. 472—States' rights would be adequately safeguarded because this bill prohibits Federal intervention in the local administration of the schools.

We have seen, therefore, that our system of dual citizenship entails dual responsibilities on the part of both citizen and Government. The citizen has his responsibilities to both the State and the Federal Governments, and they, in turn, have the joint obligation to train the citizen in the discharge of his duties.

The cost of Federal aid under S. 472 would reach a maximum of $250,000,000 annually by 1950—a little more than half of what we have just voted to stop the penetration of communism into Greece and Turkey. But as a weapon against communism an educated American citizenship will be worth 10 times as much as any grants we may make to foreign countries.

We cannot, however, win this battle of ideas as long as the average American 20 years of age never gets beyond the ninth grade in school.

Veterans' Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two articles which recently appeared in the Washington Post describing the circumstances under which veterans are receiving their education at the University of Minnesota. Statistics show that the University of Minnesota has more veterans in attendance than any other college or university in America. The situations described in the following articles, thus represent a true cross section of current problems with respect to veterans' education:

VETERANS IN COLLEGE

(By Marquis Childs)

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—Here on the campus of the University of Minnesota, you get some idea of what mass education means. There has never been anything like it, even in this country where a college education has been fairly accessible to most groups.

Minnesota, by latest count, is the second largest university in the land. Those who compile the figures say that the University of California, at Berkeley, is the largest.

It is hard to believe that there is anything bigger than this bursting institution. The enrollment last fall was more than 27,000 students. The figure today is something more than 25,000.

But the real push begins next fall, and President James L. Morrill is beginning now to get ready for it. The expectation is that in September more than 30,000 students will enroll.

The Veterans' Administration in Washington estimates that the school year 1947–48 will be the peak in the educational boom. But it will be perhaps as long as 3 years before there is any substantial reduction in the record crowds beneath the college elms on every campus.

The reason, of course, is Public Law 346, better known as the GI bill of rights. The student veteran under this bill gets his tuition and his books paid for and, in addition, $65 a month if he is unmarried and $90 a month if he is married.

It is hard to get a break-down of VA figures on education. As of May 1, 5,636,637 veterans' applications for institutional and job training had been approved. Something more than 4,000,000 applied for institutional training.

But these institutions include everything from dance academies to cooking schools. A recent release of the Veterans of Foreign Wars put the number of veterans in "educational endeavors of some kind" at 2,000,000. The best guess is that about 1,200,000 veterans are in colleges.

Here on the Minnesota campus 61 percent of all students are veterans. The average, however, is 90 percent in the schools of business administration and engineering.

This has given rise to some interesting speculation on just what it is the veteran wants out of college. Is he merely after a degree which will be a license entitling him to earn a larger income than he might otherwise have earned? Or is he interested in the clash of ideas in a world that is changing so swiftly?

You get varying answers to these questions. But of one thing there can be no doubt. That is the seriousness, the earnestness, of the overwhelming majority of the students, men and women, on this thronging campus.

Current musical comedy to the contrary, very little of the Joe College atmosphere has survived the invasion of the men out of the war. Whether it is a better foothold in the American system or whether it is ideas and learning in the broader sense, these young people are out for something pretty definite. And they have only a limited time for play.

To see an economic lecturer facing a class of 900 with a microphone in the lapel of his coat is to get some idea of what mass means. There are few dreamers in this class. Heads are bent over and the rustle of note taking can be heard beneath the professor's amplified voice.

In general, President Morrill and his staff seem to have done a good job of adjusting to the unprecedented expansion. Buildings that look like a cross between a barn and a barracks are still going up to provide more space for classrooms, in anticipation of the grand rush next fall. These buildings come from the Federal Government.

For those interested in ideas, there is a constant procession of lecturers from outside. Henry Wallace spoke to more than 2,000 students who jammed the main ballroom of the Memorial Union to hear him. In the student paper, which sets a high standard, an editorial the following day

keenly analyzed the weaknesses of Wallace's position and accused him of double dealing.

On a thousand campuses an experiment is going on almost unnoticed. It is an experiment in mass education, and while we may not be aware of it now, it is bound to have a far-reaching influence on our future.

VETERANS' STRUGGLE FOR EDUCATION

(By Marquis Childs)

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—The cost of a college degree can be very high. For many of the 15,000 veterans here at the University of Minesota, it is high in terms of sacrifice and even privation.

With a total enrollment of 25,000 students, the problem of finding a place to live is acute. Young couples with children find it especially difficult. They are suffering under the wicked squeeze of the inflation that bedevils us.

To help out, the university established University Village on a 10-acre site. It is also called Fertile Acres, and you understand why when you see the procession of baby buggies and the innumerable toddlers. You can duplicate University Village on almost any large campus in the country as educators try to cope with mass education.

To be eligible to live in University Village, you must be a married veteran with a child or a child soon to be born. In 214 trailers, 96 prefabs, 100 quonset huts, and 124 barracks, there are 534 families.

You move from the waiting list into a trailer. The trailers have no running water. There are community bath houses for men and women. Cooking is done on a small kerosene stove.

If you're lucky, you will move after a few months from a trailer to half a quonset hut, or to a family unit in one of the barracks with running water and plumbing.

Take a typical family in University Village. Let's call them the Bill Smiths. Bill is 25. He was in his second year of engineering when he was drafted into the Army, where he served nearly 5 years in almost every theater of the war. He was discharged with the rank of major.

Bill and his wife, Betty, are one of the lucky families in half a quonset hut. They have a daughter two and a half and another child on the way.

Making ends meet is tough, very tough. Bill has his $90 a month under the GI bill. He makes about $90 more as a night watchman on the shift from midnight to 3:30 a. m. In the winter, when fires have to be tended, that is no easy job.

Because Bill's income is over $120 a month, the university charges him $44 a month for his half of a quonset. Right at the start that takes a big bite out of the family income. Bill and Betty are trying to save up money for the new baby. They estimate the cost will be a minimum of $150, and that means leaving the hospital for the quonset hut as soon as the doctor permits.

I asked Bill when he found time to study. Third-year engineering isn't a pipe course. Grinning at this question, he said that study had to be sandwiched in at any and all hours. The couple next door, he pointed out, are both taking full courses, the husband in the daytime and the wife at night.

Both Betty and Bill are feeling the burden. The doctor tells Bill he must slow up. Betty, who is pretty and delicate looking, is not well.

There is no play center, nothing but the dusty, cinder-covered street. The youngster is a constant source of anxiety. Since the beginning of spring, a dozen children have strayed away and frantic mothers have had to appeal to the police for help.

The university is trying to find a surplus building that could be used as a child-care center and as a recreation hall for the grown-ups. But that will cost, Bill has been told, $40,000 to $60,000 to equip and maybe it won't be possible. Certainly it is badly needed, as is also a health clinic.

Yet Bill and Betty do not complain. They are remarkably patient. Bill says:

"Well, I guess they're trying to do the best they can for us. And after all, it's an education."

That's one of the extraordinary things about the army of veterans that has come back. Contrary to the dire talk we heard while they were away, they have become part of the normal life of the country with very little dislocation.

The test will come, it seems to me, when Bill and the millions like him finish this educational grind. If they step out into a job that pays a fair salary, then all will be well. But if the jobs aren't there, then I think we will hear from the men who have adjusted so readily to the pursuits of peace.

Sermon by Very Rev. Daniel W. Driscoll, O. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a most eloquent and inspiring sermon delivered by the Very Reverend Daniel W. Driscoll, pastor of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church of Lawrence, Mass., at the annual memorial mass offered in memory of the dead of the parish, which took place in the Immaculate Conception Cemetery on Memorial Day. Father Driscoll was celebrant of the Gregorian requiem mass and was assisted by Rev. William V. Donovan, O. S. A., as deacon, Rev. Edward J. Carney, O. S. A., as subdeacon, and Rev. Charles F. Hart, O. S. A., as master of ceremonies.

The sermon follows:

My dear friends, another year has passed away since last we met here on this hallowed ground where rest the last mortal vestiges of those we loved in life. Many things have happened since we last assembled here, many important things, while the steady and unremitting beat of time tore off the hours of each day, and this morning we know that many who were with us then paying tribute to our honored dead now also rest beside them 'neath the sod, and from their silent graves look up to us to carry on, to enrich our own souls by the actions of a worthy life, and to help them, by our prayer, on their journey to their God.

This is the sixth consecutive Memorial Day that I, as pastor of St. Mary's and guardian of this cemetery, have come here to honor the memory of our dead; to offer up with you the holy sacrifice of the mass, the greatest sacrifice that man can offer to his Creator, because the victim, the oblation, is the most worthy oblation that can be offered in sacrifice. It is the same victim that was offered on Calvary "the lamb that washed away the sins of the world." A divine victim that was worthy of appeasing the eternal God, and sufficient to redeem mankind. We have come to offer up that sacrifice, and in the charity of our hearts to apply whatever merits we may obtain, to the souls of our dead, especially, those souls whose mortal remains now lie at rest in this consecrated ground. I came not to decorate with flowers, nor to place a fitting monument over their heads. Too often do we decorate with flowers, and fail to remember the souls of those whose bodies lie below. Yes; we may heap all kinds of beautiful flowers; place costly monuments and stately tombstones upon their resting places; but that will not help the immortal soul that has traveled on. That will satisfy only ourselves and, perhaps, deceive our fellow men into believing that we still think of our dead. The living may appreciate flowers, but the dead do not. Give roses and orchids to the living, but give rosaries and prayers to the dead. Those are the flowers that will not die or become rubbish and debris for the caretaker to clear away a few days after our Decoration Day is over. Those are the flowers that will live on forever.

As I go back in memory over the last 6 years, as I gave toward yonder veterans' lot, I see it as it used to be, and as it is today. It has become larger, and many more rows of whitened headstones rise above the grassy green. Time by itself was capable of producing this result, but the ravages of another war has stimulated much, the certain hand of time. On the lot over the graves of our heroes, beneath the flag a cannon stood, the symbol of war. We removed that cannon but we kept the flag, because we hate all that the cannon stands for, while we love all that the flag represents. The cannon stands for war, for power and might, a force that gets out of control and brings with it devastation, suffering, and slaughter. We removed that cannon and put in its place a symbol of peace, of love, of hope; a statue of Christ the King. It represents a power that is always controllable, a power that is righteousness and justice itself; the power of God. You who think the atomic bomb to be powerful, stop and gaze upon that statue. See the world in His hand, and try to imagine what would happen if Christ your King would cease to hold it up. Look upon that gentle hand, and you, in your amazement, will say: "Oh, what power is there in the hand of God." "Let not the wrath of the Lord strike me."

Meditate upon that statue and you will realize how insignificant is all other power compared to it. There at the point of the cemetery it stands, facing the east; the beginning of a new day, facing St. Mary's. Here from which I stand, looking toward the statue, I can see the spire of St. Mary's reaching toward heaven, looking down upon the city like a loving mother watching over her children. Oh, spire of St. Mary's, the first to reflect the tender rays of the rosy dawn peeping over the hills of the eastern horizon, the last to be kissed goodnight by the golden glow of the setting sun sinking behind the shadows of Tower Hill. Oh, spire of St. Mary's, for many years you have borne the cross aloft while your sons and daughters have borne their cross below. From your lofty portals have come the silvery tones of your mellow chimes. Sometimes in the joyous strains of the wedding march, as the blushing bride and bashful groom kneel before your altar; sometimes, in more solemn tones, sounding the funeral knell as the last remains of some departed soul is borne to its final resting place; sometimes in the cold chill of winter, piercing the midnight air of Christmas with the Adeste Fidelis; sometimes, more mellowed with the warmth of spring, sounding the joyous Easter alleluias. O spire of St. Mary's, long may you stand as a beacon of light to protect and guide the freedom and destinies of your children.

And now coming back to this city of the dead, let's pause for a moment at the entrance and meditate upon the crucifixion group. What food for spiritual thought do we find there. See the lifeless body of our Lord, the sorrowful Mother, St. John, and Mary Magdalene. Realize that the object on the cross died that we might live, and when you enter between these massive pillars,

bearing in funeral procession the last remains of your loved ones to the grave; when the world seems dark and brightness has gone out of life, do not languish in unavailing grief as those who have no hope, but look upon the crucifix, know that your Savior also was placed in the tomb but rose again, triumphant, from the grave. Know that He is the resurrection and the life, and that if we believe in Him, even though we be dead, we shall rise again. What solace that is. What encouragement it gives us. What consolation to feel that love and friendship go beyond the grave. Our very nature forbids us to believe that they lead only to the grave. Our instinct compels us to look beyond death's shadow into another world and to brighten by the hope of a future meeting the sorrow that the death of those we love has cast upon us.

But even the thought that love and friendship might bloom again in a brighter land is not sufficient to satisfy the heart; our very affections prompt us to seek a means to bind together the world in which we still remain and that mysterious world beyond the grave where the dead have gone. Our faith confirms the affections of the heart by assuring us that love and friendship can reach beyond the grave and that charity should not cease because one soul still remains in the flesh and the other departed to the unseen land. Faith tells us that there are two worlds, the world of matter and the world of spirit—the world about us, which we see, and the world to come, to which we all must go. She tells us that just as in this world there are different states, so, too, there are different states in the world to come, and that our condition or state in the next world shall depend wholly upon the condition of our soul when it leaves the body. If the soul, at death, be in the state of mortal sin, it is lost forever, no hope may spring in any heart, no prayer may go before the throne of God. But for those who die in the state of grace, salvation is secure. Their fight through life, their combat with the world and the Devil, has ended in victory, and for them is an eternal crown of glory. But as nothing can enter into the beatific presence of God with the slightest stain upon it, and as we know that few can hope to pass without defilement from this world of sin, there must be some place where the soul is completely purified before it can enter into the beatific presence of God. We know that though mortal sin may be remitted as to its guilt and as to its eternal punishment, yet there remains a temporal punishment. And where do those souls go who have passed from this life without having done sufficient penance to satisfy for the temporal debt? Surely they cannot enter into the glorious presence of God, for they are not yet purified. Shall they, then, be cast into everlasting fire? No; for God is faithful to His word, and only to deadly sin has He attached the awful punishment of hell. Where, then, shall such souls go? The church, borne out by reason as well as revelation, teaches us that they shall go into a place of temporary punishment, where they may have their venial sins wiped out and may pay the debt they owe to the infinite justice of God, and such a place, my friends, is that which we know as purgatory.

There lie the holy souls, looking with longing eyes to heaven, awaiting the hour of their release, enduring a punishment so keen that some saints have not hesitated to say that the pains of purgatory are no less than those of hell, only one is temporal, and the other eternal. On their bed of pain they can only suffer; their intense longing for the sight of God brings with it such anguish that every moment seems like ages. Their cries are useless there, and their tears excite no pity. For themselves they can do nothing but endure their pains. Their friends on earth could help them if they would, but their friends, perhaps have long forgotten them. Those friends on earth, who loved them once, and whom they also loved, have ceased to think of them. Yes, we have at times intense sorrow for the dead, but it is not lasting. How many of us have knelt beside the deathbed of a dear friend, a relative, perhaps a member of our own family, and have thought that our sorrow could never be forgotten. How many have watched, through the mist of tear-flooded eyes, a loving mother sink into death's mysterious sleep and have thought that this earth could never be bright for them again, and then, after a few short years, forget the dearest friend they ever had. But such is often the case, my friends, such is the boastful memory that was to survive the grave, such is the affection that was to be eternal, and today from the depths of purgatory many a forsaken soul sadly sends forth the mournful cry, "Have pity on me, have pity on me, at least you, my friends, for the hand of the Lord hath touched me."

Think of these things, my friends, and try not to grow careless in your rememberence of the dead. Do not remember them only in November on All Souls' Day; do not wait until Memorial Day comes around again to remember the souls of our gallant heroes who have given their lives for their country. Remember them often in your prayers, in your morning and evening prayers; when you attend the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; when you receive Holy Communion. Then when your time shall come, those souls whom you, perhaps, have liberated by your prayers, will remember you; they will intercede before the throne of God for you, and your friends on earth will not forget you.

Expediting Rental Homes Off the Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a letter to me from Pearl M. Schendell, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, also photostatic copies of two letters to her from the OPA rent-control office at Omaha, Nebr.

This is just one more of the thousands of reasons why rent control should have been outlawed long ago so homes for rent would be more plentiful at fair rates.

The letters follow:

COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA, *May 27, 1947.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On February 25, 1947, I wrote you regarding rent control and received a very satisfactory letter from you. I am still after their hide and am continuing to obtain evidence that they are doing more harm than good the way they administer rent control. Instead of being the Office of Housing Expediter, as they now call themselves, they are expediting rental units off of the market. (I have three vacant apartments. One vacant since October 1, 1946, and two vacant since the latter part of March 1947).

The proponents of rent control in its present form, without any general increase, stress the fact that any landlord who has a hardship due to increased operating expenses can obtain an increase in rent. The inclosed photostatic copy of a letter to me dated March 26, 1947, will prove to the most optimistic that this is untrue.

Even though my rents are above top of the rental range, the accountants find that I have a hardship condition. However, my rents are higher than they were on March 1, 1942, on account of improvements made. If the cost of those improvements had all been figured in as operating expense, my hardship would have been greater. However, as you know, most improvements are listed in the income-tax reports for depreciation.

Mr. Mattson had the gall to insinuate that perhaps my loss was due to inefficient operation. However inefficient I may be, I have paid for this $3,000 house, $3,000 worth of improvements and more than $1,000 worth of furniture in less than 4 years. However, my beauty business was not under rent control.

Everyone who rents furnished apartments has incurred increased operating expenses by way of maintenance, repairs, and hired help, if they have made any attempt to maintain the apartments in the same condition, etc., as they were on March 1, 1942. However, no one who is receiving rents comparable to March 1, 1942, may receive a rent increase, so it follows that very few receive it.

Yes, they can file a hardship petition, and the accountants will draw the taxpayers' money while they go painstakingly over all your rent receipts, checks, bills, social security reports, and income-tax reports, etc., when they know beforehand that you will receive nothing if your rents are comparable to those of comparable units on March 1, 1942. One of the accountants told me that if I was losing $1,000 per year I would receive no increase and would have to obtain permission from the rent control office to evict the tenants upon that ground.

Yes, the accountants went through all this farce, when all that was necessary was to determine whether my rents were comparable. What was done after they submitted their report that a hardship condition existed, the same man who inspects the apartments, came around and checked them, and possibly a few others in the neighborhood, and went back to the files and found that my rents were above top of the rental range and said what they could just as well said in the beginning, "No increase granted." This is what is happening all over the country and yet no decrease in the income-tax rate is necessary.

The other photostatic copy is of an order denying a rental increase for an improvement installed after the apartment was placed at the top of the rental range. This would indicate that there was also a top of the range of conveniences to which a tenant might aspire. If this is true, then it is dictatorship, to let a third disinterested party determine what conveniences another citizen may have in his home.

One of my tenants receives $16.35 per day and his wife $4. Yet Mr. Mattson had the gall to state that they did not need a wall switch in their apartment, which they have occupied almost 5 years; although he had refused me permission to remove wall switches and electrical service outlets from two other apartments on the ground that they were necessary to living in the premises, and were services which the tenants could not be reasonably expected to supply. Incidentally, I was not granted a rental increase for these said switches and outlets.

Later, the city electrician demanded a service outlet in each apartment, and threatened to disconnect the electrical service unless such installation was made, Mr. Mattson refused to give me an advance statement of the rental increase which such installations would be granted until I flatly refused to make the installations on the ground that it was neither repairs nor maintenance. Then he gave me a statement in

writing that I would receive 10 cents per week increase for each apartment. I wrote to him that if he could find an electrician who would do the work and furnish the material for 10 cents per week for each apartment to send him over, and if it was against the rent regulations for the tenants to make the installations themselves to send me the proper papers to vacate the apartments. To date, I have heard nothing further from him. The city electrician will probably shut off the electrical service and the tenants will be looking for apartments.

If rent regulation permits such dictatorship, then it is very un-American and should be discarded or changed.

I would also like to know where to take the matter up to learn why the rent-control office here in Omaha refuses to give me an advance statement of what rental increase, if any, I am to receive for the remodeling of a kitchenette in one of the apartments which has been vacant for more than 2 months. Mr. Mattson told me (but not in writing) to send him an estimate of the cost of such remodeling and that he would send me a statement. He refuses to do so, although he knows the apartment cannot be rented in its present condition and that the walls are already torn out. He also refuses to allow the prospective tenants admittance to his office when they go over there to learn why he does not give me this statement so I can go ahead with the work. I am quite positive that he does not intend to allow any rental increase for the remodeling although it will cost $91 and will greatly improve the apartment. My reason for thinking this is the fact that last year I spent $50 installing a separate entrance in one apartment while it was vacant, and although I was not granted an increase in rent for it I was later refused permission to close it on the ground that it was a service reasonably necessary to living in the premises and which the tenant could not reasonably be expected to supply.

There are other instances where I have not received a rental increase for equipment and yet have been refused to remove same. I can furnish copies of all orders showing that I was not allowed the increases and yet was refused the permission to remove same.

In all our correspondence regarding the remodeling of the kitchenette, he has been very careful not to mention the fact that I have requested a statement or that he promised it, as one of the prospective tenants told the office girl that I was making photostatic copies of all their letters and orders and sending them to Congress. But I have written a registered letter and received the return receipt, demanding the statement or the reason why I am not entitled to it, and I may receive a direct reply. At least they can't deny receiving it.

They do not want to commit themselves on paper so that I can have definite proof, and although it is keeping tenants in the street looking for homes, they make it so I either have to rent the apartments at just what they say or lose out altogether. Well, someone has to do something to show them up, and I can afford to do it better than same widow who has no other income. And there are many landlords in this country who simply have to rent for just what they can get or starve.

Another thing, this outfit in Omaha seldom allows adequate rental increases for improvements. They put out literature to the effect that your investment will be protected by the rents granted, but I have a letter in answer to my protests that it would take the rental increase from 8 to 12 years to pay for certain improvements, that rental increases are not based upon the cost of the improvements. If this is actually a ruling of the head office, it is very unjust, especially as they will not give an advance opinion as to what rent you may expect for a certain improvement.

I installed an automatic hot-water heater for the use of my beauty shop. It was not a replacement nor repairs. It cost $85 and heats 40 gallons of water. The apartments have been allowed the use of this service rent free until just recently. I requested permission to remove the heater from the service to the apartments and was refused permission to do so. However, I was allowed 10 cents per week per apartment for this service. The gas company stated that it costs 10 cents to heat 40 gallons of water. Seven apartments would probably use double 40 gallons in a day as, with the water running out of the faucet, the tenants would use more than they would if they had to heat it on the stove. So I am furnishing the hot water for less than cost with nothing to pay for the heater, which, when worn out, will have to be replaced.

These are the reasons why so many apartments and houses are being withheld from the market and why so many persons are offering to pay bonuses for homes. One day I had eight prospective tenants, and five offered to pay whatever I asked. Some even offer to pay the amount above ceiling for a full year in advance or until June 30, 1948. This would be a real hardship on some tenants, but they are having to do it to obtain homes, as it is the only way the landlord could be certain of getting it. For instance, the tenant can promise anything, but once the tenant moves in, he can refuse to pay more than ceiling and cannot be evicted. If the proponents of rent control think that it is really working in favor of the tenants, let them pick up the newspapers and read how many tenants are offering "rewards" and the statement "We can get together." Let them run an ad of that kind and see how many answers they receive, then they may have an idea of how many apartments are being held vacant.

I had some experience with this. I have an apartment which is hardly suitable for two but in which the OPA had raised the rate on the second occupant from 50 cents per week to $1.25 per week without a request from me. The girl said she would take it. However, she had a "reward" ad in the paper, and she found a larger apartment and took it. I do not blame her. I have one other apartment which could have accommodated them very easily, but the OPA persistently refuses to raise the rate on the second occupant from 50 cents per week to $1, although they know I never allow the second occupant in the room at that rate. Mr. Mattson even went so far as to state that if he did anything, that he would lower the rate for the first occupant. I have this statement in writing. So the room is vacant.

One of the prospective tenants who tried to see Mr. Mattson told the office girl that she had two children and that she could move in here if I was allowed the rent I wanted, but that I had refused to accept the balance as a gift. The girl told her that if she paid more than ceiling that she would be breaking the law. The law of self-preservation, I guess, as she has to have a place for her babies and will eventually find someone who will accept the gift.

It may look unjust to charge more rent where there are babies and small children, but the utilities are higher on account of more laundry, and decorating costs run higher as little fingers will mark up the wallpaper, and the rent control insists that the rooms be maintained properly.

I have written a lengthy letter, but you can't fight rent control without direct evidence of how it works, and I can certainly produce the evidence of the inequalities and dictatorship of rent control as it is administered by this office in Omaha.

If some of these practices are against rent regulations, as I have reason to believe, having a copy of rent regulations in my possession, and the necessary legal training to understand same, I would appreciate any information you may give me where I may write to obtain justice. I have written to the head office of the rent control in Chicago weeks ago and received no answer. I presume the matter was referred back to Omaha, and there it was dropped.

If you can use the photostatic copies of the other letters and orders, I will gladly send them. I am writing to Senator KENNETH WHERRY, of Nebraska, as he is also against rent control and this office is in his area.

Yours truly,

PEARL M. SCHENDELL.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF TEMPORARY CONTROLS,
Omaha, Nebr., March 26, 1947.

In re apartments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7,
615 Mynster Street, Council Bluffs, Iowa.
Mrs. PEARL SCHENDELL,
Council Bluffs, Iowa.

DEAR MADAM: Your hardship petition on the above units has been processed and the findings are reflected in the enclosed orders.

The accountant's report makes the finding that there has been a hardship condition established. Under Federal rent regulations, in processing petitions of this nature, it is required that when a hardship condition has been established the maximum rent shall then be adjusted to a point which does not exceed the top of the rental range for similar units as rented on March 1, 1942.

A careful review of comparable units in Council Bluffs finds that apartments 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 are now renting not only at the top of the range but above the top of the range. Therefore no adjustment on the basis of hardship for these apartments can be made. However, there has been an increased service in that an automatic water heater has been added since the maximum rent date, which increases the rental value 10 cents per week per apartment. Orders reflecting this are among those attached.

On apartments 4 and 5 the increases as allowed and as shown in the attached orders have been placed at the top of the rental range plus 10 cents per week for the added service of the automatic water heater.

Yours very truly,

C. L. MATTSON,
Rent Examiner.

P. S.—For your convenience a consolidated order is also attached to your copy of the registration.

OFFICE OF HOUSING EXPEDITER—OFFICE OF RENT CONTROL—ORDER DENYING PETITION OR TERMINATING PROCEEDINGS

OMAHA AREA RENT OFFICE,
Omaha, Nebr.

PEARL M. SCHENDELL,
Council Bluffs, Iowa:

The Rent Director has carefully considered your petition and, after due investigation of the matter, finds that the facts in your case do not entitle you to the relief requested under section 5 (a) (3) of the rent regulation. It is therefore ordered that said petition be, and it hereby is, denied. This order of denial is without prejudice to the filing of another petition if other facts can be shown which entitle you to relief under the rent regulation. Rent to remain $4.35 (1) person and $5.60 (2) persons per week.

Issued and effective May 20, 1947. This order is now in effect and will remain in effect until changed by the Office of Housing Expediter.

On March 26, 1947, rent was adjusted to the top of the rental range. A wardrobe replacing a clothes pole does not affect the rental value.

W. S. WINGERD,
Rent Director.

Men and Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I am inserting a news story from the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., covering the sad but outstanding contribution to our country of Beta Delta chapter of Sigma Chi fraternity of Montana State University. Beta Delta lost more of its membership than any other chapter of Sigma Chi. It was my privilege and honor to know every single one of these fine men, many as students of mine at Montana State University—all as friends.

Their contribution was made in an effort to keep alive the American ideals of fair play, tolerance, and understanding. Let us, as Members of Congress, try to do for our country the things which they fought for, and in so doing, laid down their lives. I will miss each and every one of them as true friends but I shall take courage from their sacrifice and try, in the troublous days ahead, to keep alive the democratic ideals they died for.

The news article follows:

SIGMA CHI IS TO HONOR 24 WAR DEAD

Honoring the memory of 24 members of Beta Delta chapter of Sigma Chi fraternity who lost their lives in World War II, a memorial will be dedicated in a ceremony at 2:30 Sunday afternoon at the chapter house at 1110 Gerald Avenue. Dr. E. O. Holland, president-emeritus of Washington State College, is to come from Pullman to be the principal speaker for the affair.

The project was conceived a year ago and the task of finding out how many members had given their lives was begun. After national and local records had been checked it became evident that the local chapter had lost more than any chapter in the entire Nation, according to Edmund C. O'Brien of Bigfork, committee chairman.

To honor the 24 men it was decided to turn the library of the chapter house into a memorial and to build a memorial fireplace in the yard. Both of these ideas were accomplished.

Large photographs of the men were secured, framed and mounted in the library along with brief accounts of their service to the country. Fluorescent lighting was installed above them and the entire room was done over. The two projects were made possible through the cooperation and financial support of more than 175 persons. Numerous books were presented to the library.

Those in whose memory the memorial was created were: James H. Blair, Forsyth; Jack Brazelton, Helena; Dana Bradford, Townsend; George J. Dignan, Glasgow; George Dykstra, Helena; Kenneth E. Faxon, Billings; Lionel J. Emswiler, Ekalaka; Robert S. Felt, Billings; Walter P. Fitzmaurice, Anaconda; Delbert Halsey, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; William M. Holt, Great Falls; H. Clarke Irvine, Stevensville; Randall P. Jarvis, Stevensville; Stanley H. Koch, Missoula; John Marsh, Billings; James A. McNally, Butte; William Quaintance, Boulder; Thomas F. Sharp, Fort Benton; Richard C. Smiley, Bozeman; Malcolm R. Stotts, Hamilton; Norman Streit, Jr., Missoula; B. Franklin Thrailkill, Missoula; Donald T. Tilzey, Missoula, and Sidney F. Wharton, Jr., Missoula.

Address of Hon. Thomas D'Alesandro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following inaugural address delivered by our recent colleague, the Honorable Thomas D'Alesandro, upon the occasion of his assuming his new office as mayor of the city of Baltimore:

Today a new administration of the affairs of Baltimore's government begins, and today a new municipal charter or form of government goes into effect. We believe that this is a happy coincidence.

The old charter, with the amendments adopted from time to time, served Baltimore well. But it became evident, in recent years, that parts of it had become outdated and obsolete, and that the best interests of the people required a complete revision. So that has been done.

The parts of the charter which have stood the test of experience and time have been retained, and the new provisions, designed to meet current needs, have been so woven into those retained that we have created a new document, strong and clear and certain.

HOPES TO PROVE WORTHY

The new administration hopes to prove worthy of the new charter, and to so administer the government, exercising the powers granted and discharging the duties imposed, that the people of our city will give us their sincere and warm-hearted approval.

It is now our task to discard the obsolete, inefficient, and wasteful procedures of the municipal administration and to replace them with operations designed to obtain the best results, conducted by officials qualified to give Baltimore unsurpassed services.

The work done to produce the new charter will have been done in vain if those who hold office under it fail to exercise the authority granted by it wisely, or neglect to perform the duties outlined by it fully and faithfully. The charter is the law by which we are to be guided. The path we take is to be of our own choosing. And we choose to go forward.

TURN TO DEMOCRATS

The Republican administration of the municipal government has come to an end. Once more the voters of Baltimore have turned to the Democratic Party. This time they have elected a completely Democratic administration, both in the executive and legislative branches.

During this term there will be no division of responsibility. If we are successful the credit will belong to the Democratic Party, and if we fail the Democratic Party in Baltimore city cannot escape responsibility.

I do not make this statement in any partisan spirit, because I believe that political party principles are not of overwhelming importance and do not have any great application to municipal affairs and problems.

RESULTS INTEREST

The people of Baltimore, as in other great cities, are bound to be more interested in the results, in the degree of efficiency attained, than in any particular adherence to a political organization whose principles have less application on municipal levels than where the State or the National Government is concerned. It seems to be true, whatever the reason, that Baltimore has received its best administrations at the hands of the Democratic Party, and this administration will be no exception to the rule.

It is not my intention to restate here the problems which are faced by the government of Baltimore City. Those problems were discussed in detail during the campaign which terminated in the election of the Democratic candidates. At that same election, the voters approved some of the loans proposed by the last administration, and rejected others. It is our duty to make the authorized expenditures when they can be made economically and under circumstances which will provide all of the facilities contemplated.

TO IMPROVE SCHOOLS

We now have the financial means to provide a modern school plant, and we shall also provide adequate salaries for the teaching staff. The improvement of the educational system was one of my most important pledges, and it shall be kept. I mention this activity because of its paramount importance to all of our people, and because of the great responsibility involved in the expenditure of $22,000,000 in new school loans, and $9,000,000 previously authorized, a total of $31,000,000.

Our efforts to improve the condition of the streets will undoubtedly be handicapped by reason of the failure of the $10,000,000 paving loan, but we expect to have, beginning July 1, additional highway revenues from the State and we shall do whatever is possible to better existing conditions.

I am happy that I shall have the benefit of the advice and active cooperation of Mr. C. Markland Kelly, who is continued in office as president of the city council, and of Mr. J. Neil McCardell, who has been elected comptroller.

I have already begun to consider possibilities for the offices of chief engineer and city solicitor, the other two key positions in the city government, and I hope, in the near future, to get advice on those appointments from the groups indicated during the campaign.

BUDGET TO INCREASE

The city budget, already of monumental proportions, is certain to be much larger for the next fiscal year, due to the increased cost of materials and to the increases in pay, some imposed by acts of the general assembly, and others by municipal action, without considering the expenditures for capital improvements approved at the last election.

Whatever happens, I shall not try to shift or dodge the responsibility. I knew what the conditions were or were likely to be when I was a candidate, and I intend to handle each problem as it comes before me according to the best judgment of which I am capable, and with full publicity and information to the people of Baltimore.

I am deeply grateful for the great opportunity which is mine. The voters of Baltimore have selected me to be their chief executive during the next four years. I approach the task humbly, but with an ambition and a determination to promote the health, happiness, and welfare of the people who have honored me so highly. I believe I shall receive complete cooperation in this endeavor from all the members of our Democratic city council. All of us welcome advice and suggestions. We intend to gather around us the finest public servants we can find, encouraging to better performances the many fine men and women already in the public service.

CITES EXPERIENCE

I bring to my new office the experience I have had as a member of the city council, the

House of Delegates of the General Assembly of Maryland, and as as a Member of the Congress of the United States. I bring to it the enthusiasm of one who knows that the opportunities given to honest, hard-working people in this great country of ours are without limit.

I bring to it the confidence of one who belives in the great destiny of our city, State, and Nation. With the help of Divine Providence and the cooperation of all citizens, regardless of party affiliations, we shall reach that high destiny which we believe Baltimore is ordained to achieve.

I am now ready to enter upon my duties as mayor of Baltimore City.

State Department's Left Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alfred Kohlberg from the May 1947 issue of the publication Plain Talk:

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S LEFT HAND

(By Alfred Kohlberg)

Why is it that what is good enough for Greece and Turkey, two countries in which we never had a primary interest, is not good enough for China, our ally against Japan long before Pearl Harbor?

The answer to the question will be found by probing into the case of John Carter Vincent, Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs and chief figure in the pro-Soviet China clique in the State Department. A scrutiny of his record should provide the key to the major puzzle of America's foreign policy today.

Our Nation has been maneuvered into a course directly opposite to that which was ours in the critical days preceding Pearl Harbor. It was on November 26, 1941, that Secretary of State Cordell Hull handed his historic note to Ambassador Nomura in which was laid down our irreducible minimum basis for peace with Japan. The most important point in Secretary Hull's note read:

"The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will not support—militarily, politically, economically—any government or regime in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China with capital temporarily at Chungking."

Eleven days later Japan went to war with us because of her refusal to accept our terms. For the last 3 years we have officially taken the position of not supporting the National Government of China.

This has been made crystal clear upon the promulgation of the Truman doctrine. We have offered loans to Greece and Turkey while we deny a long earmarked loan to China. We have proposed to furnish military aid to Greece and Turkey while belaboring China for lacking parliamentary government. And we have undertaken to fight communism in the eastern Mediterranean while we have been consistently seeking to foist it upon China.

These differences are too striking to escape general notice. But what remains to be established is how it all came to be. Whose hand reversed our foreign policy in the most vital area of our national defense?

If you would know how it happened that America's traditional policy of the open door in China had been scrapped in favor of Soviet appeasement, look at the record of John Carter Vincent, who, according to the Washington Daily News, has been "putting a 'for Communists only' sign on the open door."

Probably few Americans are even familiar with the name of John Carter Vincent, who has been described authoritatively as being, to all practical purposes, "secretary of state for China."

Last January, President Truman transmitted to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Vincent, among others, to the rank of Minister Plenipotentiary at Large. Since then the grapevine in Washington has had it that Vincent is slated to become United States Ambassador to China. With the return of Secretary Marshall from the fiasco of the Moscow Conference, and the emergence of the Korean problem to the forefront, the Vincent case becomes one of national concern.

Perhaps that is the reason why the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been withholding confirmation of his promotion pending an exhaustive inquiry.

It was not very long before President Truman's proposal to loan $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey had been advanced that John Carter Vincent made a formal address before the National Foreign Trade Council and enunciated his own doctrine in these startling words: "I believe it is unsound to invest private or public capital in countries where * * * a government is wasting its substance on excessive armament, where the threat or fact of civil war exists, where tendencies toward government monopolization exclude American business, or where undemocratic concepts of government are controlling."

Here was a policy which does fit the case of the Soviet Union. But Mr. Vincent would never apply it to Communist Russia. It is a policy which might very well be interpreted as fitting Greece and Turkey. But Mr. Vincent was speaking of China, and what he had in mind, as the Scripps-Howard newspapers pointed out editorially, was the Chinese Government's wasting its substance on excessive armament. Against whom? Against Communist rebels and not a foreign foe—which is the reason why Mr. Vincent has opposed the granting of the $500,000,000 credit earmarked for China unless Chiang Kai-shek forms a coalition with the Communists.

There was really nothing new about Mr. Vincent's promotion of the Communist cause in the Far East. It came into the open early in September 1946, when General MacArthur issued a warning against the danger of communism in Japan. On September 4, 1946, the New York Herald Tribune quoted Vincent as charging MacArthur with launching an anti-Soviet campaign in violation of State Department directives, which have never been disclosed, to use Japan for "building a bridge of friendship to the Soviet Union."

There followed a storm of criticism, whereupon the State Department repudiated the Vincent rebuke of MacArthur. But Marshall Field's PM, the authoritative tabloid in matters pro-Soviet, reported on September 10 that the MacArthur warning was "deeply resented by a number of important State Department officials, one of whom was John Carter Vincent, chief of the Far Eastern Division. Other officials in the Department agreed with Vincent that MacArthur's statement was unnecessarily damaging to Soviet-American relations."

Without specifically mentioning John Carter Vincent, the Washington Daily News expressed prevailing opinion when it declared: "The incident again points the finger at Moscow apologists in the State Department who are working to defeat American policy wherever there is a clash of interests between the United States and the Soviet Union. Until the Department is purged of such influences none of our missions overseas will be protected against such attacks. If the Department fails to clean its own house, the problem is one demanding the attention of Congress."

Even more shocking than the public slap at MacArthur was Mr. Vincent's official conduct in the Dairen incident last December. An American naval vessel was summarily ordered out of the Chinese port of Dairen by the commander of the Soviet occupation forces. This was a flagrant violation by Soviet authorities of the Yalta pact and of all international customs. Moreover, the Sino-Soviet pact of 1945 had clearly provided that Dairen be turned over to the Chinese as soon as it ceased to be a zone of active hostilities.

Mr. Vincent, director of our far eastern affairs, did not hesitate to authorize a spokesman to inform the public that the Russians were acting within their rights. That alone should have sufficed, in other days, to have a subordinate like Mr. Vincent dropped from the diplomatic service or demoted to the rank of clerk in a New Zealand consulate. However, nothing of the kind happened. Once more the State Department repudiated its own spokesman, but it found a face-saving recipe.

On January 6, 1947, it dispatched a note to both the Chinese and Soviet Governments asking them to get together and make a new agreement on Dairen. This meant that Russia, in a new deal, should "sell the same horse over again," as Secretary Marshall characterized such Molotovian diplomacy in Moscow. The previous day the Communist Daily Worker devoted an entire page to prove that it had first laid down the line which the State Department had dutifully followed.

This was not the first time that the Daily Worker had strangely anticipated important moves in our foreign policy. The decision of the State Department to withdraw our troops from China had been preceded by a worldwide Communist campaign, from Moscow to Shanghai to New York, waged during 1946. And that in turn had been presaged by a significant pronouncement made by William Z. Foster before the National Committee of the Communist Party on November 18, 1945, a pronouncement which Mr. John Carter Vincent may or may not have found necessary to read. For those who would explore the devious ways of American policy in the Far East, Foster's declaration, as reported in the Daily Worker for December 2, 1945, is worth recalling:

"On the international scale, the key task as emphasized in Comrade Dennis's report, is to stop American intervention in China. * * * The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front and it is here, above all else, where we have to deal the hardest blow to reaction. * * * On the question of China, which is our key concentration, as Comrade Dennis pointed out, we want to hold 500 meetings all over the country to mobilize all the forces of the people that we can reach to put a stop to the intervention in China. Our party must use every ounce of its strength and skill and organizational ability to make these 500 meetings a success."

In the State Department, Mr. Vincent did his share to contribute to the success of Soviet policy in China and to "deal the hardest blow to reaction." Was he not a progressive, according to the Daily Worker vocabulary?

Within a week after the announcement of the withdrawal of our armed detachments from China, Mr. Vincent attained the high-water mark of his singular career in an address at Cornell University on January 21, 1947. He deprecated the view that it would

be "advantageous for our defense to throw our weight or influence on the side of the status quo" in China.

What a neat diplomatic way of saying the preservation of the National Government of China, the cornerstone of our policy which led to Pearl Harbor, was no longer our concern! Indeed, by that declaration the "Secretary of State for China" repudiated the solemn wartime pledges of President Roosevelt at Cairo and Yalta. But in whose favor had it been done?

As reported in the New York Times, Mr. Vincent was out to encourage "progressive" elements in China. Some Americans might have remembered that these "progressives" were ambushing United States Marines in their peaceful pursuits at that very time.

Who is John Carter Vincent? A fairly obscure diplomat for some 20 years, he rose to the pinnacle of "Secretary of State for China" following the ousting of Under Secretary Joseph Grew by the so-called China bloc centering around Amerasia. It will be recalled that the chief protagonist of the Amerasia case, better known as the State Department Espionage Case, (see Plain Talk, October 1946) Mr. Philip Jaffe, had boasted after his arrest and conviction, "anyhow, we got Grew out."

It was in the State Department reorganization which followed, that John Carter Vincent, until then head of the Division of Chinese Affairs, was elevated to the position of Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs.

There is little that is noteworthy about Mr. Vincent's beginnings in the diplomatic service. It was undoubtedly a coincidence that he happened to be American consul at Mukden in September, 1931, when the Mukden incident set off Japan's encroachment on China until it had blazed into a full-scale undeclared war. It was surely a coincidence that Mr. Vincent was transferred to Europe to be attached to the staff of the American delegation of the International Labor Office at Geneva, a body which the Canadian spy case had revealed to be saturated with Soviet agents. And certainly there was nothing remarkable about the close friendship which sprang up in Europe between Mr. Vincent and the leftist-liberal correspondent, William L. Shirer.

Early in 1941, Mr. Vincent took up the post of consul at Shanghai, becoming a few months later, under Ambassador Clarence Gauss, counselor of the Embassy of Chungking. During the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact, between September 1939, and June 1941, Mr. Vincent is known to have expressed admiration and a certain sympathy for Soviet ideas, a hatred for the Japanese, and to have felt that the war did not represent a threat to American security and that therefore we should keep out of it.

While in Chungking in August, 1941, Mr. Vincent came in close contact with Owen Lattimore, one of the best informed Americans on the far places of China, who had been sent by President Roosevelt to act as political advisor to Chiang Kai-shek. Mr. Lattimore will be remembered as the leading propagandist of the doctrine that the Chinese Communists are not real Communists but true democrats who are merely innocuous reformers. This was, of course, before the Chinese Communist leaders began to denounce America as an imperialist enemy worse than the Japanese.

There is no record that John Carter Vincent or any other State Department officials of the Lattimore school had ever taken the trouble to become familiar with the massive evidence of the unbroken relations between the Chinese Communist Party with the Communist International, or of the repeated professions by the Chinese Communist leaders of their 100-percent loyalty to the line of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism.

When Lattimore returned to America to become director of the Pacific bureau of the OWI (Office of War Information), he saw to it that no Chinese favorable to the National Government of China be employed in his division. He is on record as having urged that Chinese employees should be obtained from the newly started Chinese language Communist daily in New York, the New China Daily News. Mr. Vincent followed his master to Washington to become chief of the Chinese Division of the State Department.

It was not long afterward that Lt. Andrew Roth, of the Naval Intelligence, who was attached to Vincent's section and who was arrested and charged with espionage in the Amerasia affairs, dropped a significant remark to his colleague, E. S. Larsen. "I ran into Lieutenant Roth on the street," Larsen narrates, "and he told me that John Carter Vincent, head of the China section, suspected me of being too close to the Chiang Kai-shek crowd."

Actually the boys of the Lattimore school had changed their tune about Chiang Kai-shek in the summer of 1943, following Moscow's turnabout in the spring of that year. During the first 2 years of the conflict between Stalin and Hitler, the Communist line toward Chiang Kai-shek was one of apparent conciliation. Then suddenly the National Government which had fought valiantly all alone Russia's and America's enemy, Japan, for nearly 6 years, became a target of denunciation as a feudal and reactionary regime.

At that time students of Chinese affairs were puzzled by the Communist switch. Did not Russia still want to use China to keep Japan from attacking Siberia?

Only in 1946 was the key to this puzzle found. It came out at the Nuremberg trial. Evidence was offered, but ruled out, that Hitler had proposed a separate peace to Stalin in the spring of 1943, after Stalingrad. Stalin received the proposal favorably and stated his terms, but the terms were too stiff for Hitler and negotiations broke down. News of these negotiations leaked to the Japs, and Stalin felt sure that they would no longer attack him to bolster a German ally already willing to quit. Russia needed China no more, so her legions of open and secret propagandists were put to work to weaken the national government and to plan postwar chaos and the Communist seizure of power.

These same methods were used on our European allies, Poland and Yugoslavia. That they did not work as well in China was due to Chiang Kai-shek's firm stand and not to our State Department which followed the Soviet line even more closely in the Far East than in eastern Europe.

The turning point in American far-eastern policy came with the memorable mission of Henry A. Wallace to China in the summer of 1944. His guides and advisers on the trip were Owen Lattimore, John Carter Vincent, and John Hazard who had been prepared for this role by 5 years of study in the Soviet Union. Vice President Wallace, who had not yet been scrapped by the Democratic Convention, made his report which remains secret to this day. It is, however, known that the high point of Wallace's study was that the government of Chiang Kai-shek would collapse within 90 days. That was in July 1944.

A hint of the authorship of the Wallace state paper may be found in an article in the April 1, 1947, issue of World Report, in which private sources in the Far Eastern Office of the State Department (believed none other than John Carter Vincent himself) are quoted as expecting "the fall of Chiang and his government." Among recommendations made by Wallace to President Roosevelt were the proposal that the United States back Mao Tse-tung, leader of the Chinese Communists, as the "Tito" of China and the plan that we arm the Chinese Communists, a policy later taken up by General Stilwell under the influence of pro-Soviet advisers.

It was on the issue of arming the Communists that the conflict between Ambassador Hurley and the Vincent clique developed. One of Vincent's comrades, Johr S. Service, who figured unenviably in the State Department espionage case, who acted as Stilwell's political mentor, submitted in October, 1944, a report to Washington which cut the ground from under Ambassador Hurley. That report, Hurley later testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was "a general statement of how to let fall the government I was sent over there to sustain. The report was circulated among the Communists I was trying to harmonize with the Chiang Kai-shek government."

Some months later, while Ambassador Hurley was in Washington on official business, Vincent's career men back in China utilized the occasion to undermine Hurley's policy. On February 28, 1945, they sent a message to Washington in which they "specifically recommended that we furnish lend-lease arms and equipment to the belligerent Communist armed party in China."

This sabotage by the staff allied with Vincent finally caused Ambassador Hurley to offer his resignation in November 1945. Secretary Byrnes persuaded him to remain on certain conditions. These were embodied in a set of instructions which were dictated to a stenographer in the presence of Byrnes. When Hurley returned the following morning to receive the signed instructions, he found that important points had been deleted. He tried to see the Secretary and was told that he was out. Proceeding to the office of the far eastern division, he learned that the changes had been made by John Carter Vincent. He then resigned.

The mysterious American policy in China, which has made many a Senator and Congressman wonder why the Truman doctrine of stemming communism is not being applied in the Far East, is largely the handiwork of the pro-Soviet bloc headed by John Carter Vincent. He and his associates helped shape the shameful secret Yalta deal by which we had delivered a loyal and tested ally, the National Government of China, without its knowledge, to Stalin's new imperialism. This Red "cell," as the Scripps-Howard press had editorially characterized it, has been "found fronting for the Soviet viewpoint on every issue. * * * The Department's far eastern division is notoriously leftist in its views, and its operations distort the American position in all areas under its direction."

A thorough-going investigation by the Senate of the operations of the State Department's left hand is long overdue. An accounting must be rendered the American people before the nomination of John Carter Vincent to the high rank of Minister Plenipotentiary is even given serious consideration.

America and Russia—Dangers and Hopes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following article which appeared

in the New York Times Magazine of June 1, 1947, entitled "America and Russia—Dangers and Hopes," by Brooks Atkinson:

AMERICA AND RUSSIA—DANGERS AND HOPES

(By Brooks Atkinson)

Between the United States and Soviet Russia political relations are obviously serious and possibly grave. But despite the bitterness apparent on every level, they are not dangerous now. Although the pure logic of our relations has pointed toward war for at least 2 years, war is impossible now and by no means inevitable eventually.

We are going through a period of armed truce. Strict Marxians believe that communism and capitalism will have to fight a war eventually, and thousands of nondoctrinaire Americans, with a shrug of their shoulders, have for years expressed the same opinion. But Soviet and American political interests have not clashed yet and need never clash if the Soviets remain within the orbit we formally acknowledged 18 months ago as their legitimate sphere of influence—that is, along their own borders.

Whether or not our relations descend from grave to dangerous depends upon the experience both have in trying to maintain the peace over the next 5 years, upon the stability of France, the control of Germany's recovery by all the Allies and, most of all, upon the strength of democratic life inside the United States.

At present neither the Soviet Union nor the United States is prepared to fight a major war against a powerful opponent, or, specifically, against the other. In view of the present condition of the Soviet Union, Russia unaided could not fight an aggressive war against a modern army for three reasons:

First, socialism in Russia has not yet succeeded in bringing a backward country so far forward. Even before the war life was meager and hard and the needs of the Russian people were much greater than Russian production possibly could satisfy.

Second, the destruction by the invading Nazi armies was calamitous. At least 7,000,000 people were killed, and probably many more than that. Millions more were displaced and driven away from homes, farms, and factories. The destruction of plants in the Ukraine and Byelorussia was overwhelming; factories, railroads, public buildings, mines, collective farms, and homes were wrecked, made unusable or uninhabitable. The Soviet Union is enormous; it has great capacities, its recuperative powers are remarkable, and its people are hardy, vigorous, and good-hearted. But no country can absorb so much destruction and at the same time fight a powerful opponent.

Third, Russia has been suffering for several months from a serious shortage of food. Although growing conditions may be good this year, the shortage of agricultural machinery, fertilizers, and animals will continue and limit the size of the harvest. Before Russia can fight a war against a major opponent it will have to solve some of its most critical internal conditions, which intimately affect the morale and strength of the people.

There is another factor—less tangible but real—that weighs against war. The Russian people love peace as passionately as any in the world. Having suffered deeply during the war, they sacrificed so much to win, they would be dejected by the prospect of another war against a country which, there is reason to believe, they are inclined to like. Just as Americans believe that the Soviet people, taken apart from their tyrannical Government, are a good people at heart, so Soviet people think that Americans are good people at heart, but misguided by vicious and imperialistic capitalists bent on destroying the Soviet Union.

At the moment the Soviet Government, which is congenitally nervous and suspicious, is taking all measures short of war to secure itself against aggression and promote its influence. Ultimately it expects to be the inspiration and source of power for the world. It expects capitalism to collapse; and the economic and political paralysis of western Europe and the poverty of England seem to the Russians to confirm the Marxian doctrines. Despite the truculence and delusions of the Soviet Government, the Russian people are not aggressive; and if there is anything they do not want, it is another major war piled on top of the misery and suffering they are still going through.

Nor, is the attitude of the United States warlike. In respect to food and productive plant, we are in the strongest position of any country in the world. But the people of America do not want a war, never did and never will. The rapidity with which we have permitted our military strength to disintegrate is the true measure of our peaceful intentions. No one who knows anything about warfare can talk complacently about going to war in cold blood, as though all that were needed would be the mechanical process of dropping a few atomic bombs.

Furthermore, it is doubtful that so large and loosely organized a country as Russia could be conquered in that mechanical fashion. With our tight economic and cultural system, which exists by infinite interdependence, America would be more vulnerable to atomic warfare; and since an atomic bomb attack would be not a remote Pearl Harbor but a surprise attack at the heart of our country, we would lose the element of time that in the past has made it possible to prepare defenses.

Since no other country has a stock pile of these terrible weapons an attack on the United States is not possible now. But an attack by the United States is possible in fact; that is, we have the weapons. But it could scarcely succeed on the easy terms many people envision. What is certain is that the deliberate use of atom bombs on a recent ally would, in the first place, leave the vast majority of the Russian people unharmed, build up undying hatred and resistance in the hearts of a patriotic people and also in sympathetic people in other countries; and, in the third place, it would negate before the world every spiritual value we maintain that we stand for.

Some people talk very big in this country—as big as the bellwethers of the Russian Communist Party. But the facts of our current military position hardly bear out the belligerence of our idle conversation. For America's distaste for military service amounts to a passion. Remember 2 years ago? The minute the shooting war was over the boys everywhere wanted to drop their guns and hurry home, and the folks at home could hardly wait for the Army to be disbanded. America's enthusiasm for leaving a war is like the enthusiasm of students for the end of the school year—joyful and disorderly. As an American general once bitterly declared, we have only two speeds—five miles an hour and a hundred miles an hour.

Compulsory military service has now lapsed because Americans dislike it, although the world is still unsettled and our interests are far from secure. It has been impossible to keep experienced armies of occupation in Germany and Japan. The Army we have now has a minimum of training and service, and man for man could not stand against trained Russian soldiers in Europe. Never has a meagerly trained American Army cost so much and yielded so little in military effectiveness. If no other country succeeds in manufacturing atomic bombs and we have 12 or 14 months of leeway we could build another army on the cadres from the last. But despite some eloquent broadsides by voluble patriots in mufti we are not prepared for war today.

War between the United States and Soviet Russia would be the ultimate catastrophe. Neither side could win. The destruction of human life would be harrowing. The world could not recover for generations. Let's not talk so casually about war.

I. HOPE FOR PEACE

For the next 5 years, and probably longer, war is not an immediate danger. Continued association within the United Nations may avert war indefinitely. Unless the Soviets withdraw from the only world organization, both of us will have a wholesome opportunity to test each other's strength and sincerity, and we may also find out whether their political and economic system or ours is going to meet the needs of the world or whether various systems, like the American, the Russian, the English, the Swedish, and others can coexist. Meager as the accomplishments of the UN have been, the American and Soviet statesmen have continued to meet in public, there to discuss vital problems and have dealt with each other on more subjects than before or during the war.

Since the stakes are higher, it is difficult to understand why the Soviets so recklessly endanger the security of the UN by sabotaging so much of its vital business. The stakes are the peace of the world. The awful menace that hangs over the world, despite basic good intentions, is the atomic bomb. We have proposed to turn the bomb over to international control on terms that most nations regard as rational, since we do not want the exclusive responsibility of controlling such a frightful weapon. But the Soviet Union has specifically blocked the plan for international control of atomic energy, which shows either a surprising trust in our peaceful intentions, a reckless disregard of realties, or surprising progress in the manufacture of the bomb. In this respect they risk more than we do, unless they can make the bomb, which is highly unlikely.

Apart from the bomb, the Soviet Union has blocked most of the activities of the UN by a paralyzing use of the veto and by boycotting most of the UN's subordinate activities, on which the world is counting for progress and security. The Soviet delegation does not participate in the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, UNESCO, the International Labor Organization, Food and Agricultural Organization, relief, Civil Aeronautical Organization, and the International Trade Organization. Nothing could go much further toward the effective creation of two hostile worlds than the negative attitude of the Soviet Union toward the UN.

Curiously enough, this does not correspond to the attitude of the Government toward the UN in Russian internal propaganda. For the UN has been systematically described to the Russian people as a world organization that grew logically out of the war collaboration of the Big Three, which was very popular in Russia. To the Russian people the UN has been portrayed as a progressive step toward world peace.

Although the Soviet Government is a dictatorship, it does take public opinion into consideration, and its attitudes are sometimes apparent in what it prints in the Russian newspapers and says over the Russian radio. The expression of public opinion is narrowly confined and little of it filters through to the newspapers or magazines, or at any rate, on fundamental policy, which is the Politburo's exclusive province. But the Communist Party and the security police are in positions to sample public opinion through the innumerable associations they have with the workers and peasants; and it seems certain that ultimately the Kremlin receives a digest of what the people are saying. Accordingly, the Government would not make any radical decision, like going to war or withdrawing from the UN, without first conditioning public opinion by propaganda.

If the Soviet Union decided now to withdraw from the UN a great sigh of despair would sweep over the Soviet Union. In present circumstances that would be an unpopular decision and might endanger the security of the Government. But the Soviet Government could very swiftly change that attitude by use of its powerful and ingenious propaganda machine.

The current violent attacks on the integrity of the United States might be construed as deliberate action by the Government in that direction, although violent talk is normal in the Russian press. Master of propaganda, the Government controls public opinion, and it can persuade the people that the United States, in both the UN and the Foreign Ministers Council, is threatening the security of the Soviet Union and plotting world hegemony by sinister means. Since the Russians have a passionate love of their own country, at least equivalent to our love for America, that propaganda line would appeal to a vital national emotion, help to unify the people, and strengthen their resistance. In short, the Soviet Government could quickly reverse itself about the UN with at least a large measure of public opinion at home.

As long as the Soviet delegation remains in the UN the hope for world peace also remains, and there is still a margin of time in which some of the world's worst crises can be solved. But there is reason to believe that the Soviet Government never really shared America's buoyant enthusiasm for the UN as outlined at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco. Although the UN makes a good speaker's platform from which the Soviet Government can address the world, the Soviet Government cannot accomplish much else against such consistent opposition. For neither its ideas nor its attitudes are popular. Although the Soviets like to have friends abroad they have lost friends as a result of their slow, artful, and unyielding procedures. There are circumstances in which the Soviet Government might consider further participation in the UN a political liability.

Part of the trouble in the UN derives from the nature of the Soviet Government. It is not organized for collaboration by means of conferences, meetings, negotiations, and agreements. By nature it is a dictatorship. In its working technique it is a conspiracy, for it has never recovered from the conspiratorial methods it used to win the revolution.

Under the doctrine that the end justifies the means, the technique of conspiracy has a certain moral value to the Soviet leaders and their adherents, for it has generally succeeded. It has put the Bolsheviks in power; it retains control of the Soviet Union and ultimately it expects to dominate the world by Marxian logic pushed along by political action.

The methods of conspiracy are outlined in the statutes of the Comintern which have been published. Since the Soviet Government is no doubt sincerely acting for what it regards as the best interests of Russia, the elaborate and cumbersome conspiratorial methods it uses at home—that is, secrecy and the police—seem to an outsider to be superfluous, anarchonistic, and a little comic. Unless there is more opposition to the Government than is generally supposed, the technique is no longer necessary there and in time might be superseded by a more efficient and less fearful national organization.

No one except the leaders of the Communist Party knows the extent of Soviet planning for the world revolution. Although the Comintern was publicly disbanded in 1943, the foreign Communist Parties continue as before with propaganda and conspiracy. As in the case of conspiracies in general, there is little concrete evidence to go on, and the public statements of the leaders are designed for tactical effectiveness rather than foreign enlightenment. It does not really change the situation when Stalin makes a benevolent speech or Molotov makes a fighting one, for the methods and objectives of doctrinaire Communists are always the same.

Whatever the source of the conspiratorial technique may be, the organization of the Soviet dictatorship is not by nature geared to collaborate with the rest of the world. Concerned with the development of power and the control of outside states, it cannot comfortably participate in a UN which is based on the self-determination of people and designed to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Nothing in the spirit of Russian communism accepts the principle of the political and intellectual freedom of the human mind. In the circumstances, it is highly probable that our relations will for a long time continue to be much as they are now—unpleasant, strained, rancorous, bitter, sullen, resentful. There is no general solution that we can afford to make, for we cannot compromise on freedom and the rights of man. We cannot abandon our national convictions.

II. AMERICA'S ASSETS

Since our differences cannot be reconciled in the reckonable future, we have to look to ourselves for security. If the members of the Politburo are right when they say that Russia's strength is her only security, the same applies to us, for our situation in respect to them is the same as theirs in respect to us. During this period of an armed truce, which may lead either to war or world peace, we must be certain that we do not fail at home. For the peace of the world depends less on the truculence and force of the Soviet Government than on our ability here to fulfill the promises of democracy—which are freedom for individuals, individual opportunity, and a progressively high standard of living.

We emerge from the war with more industrial plants than we have ever known. With about 6 percent of the world's population we can produce 20 percent of the world's goods. During the war new industrial techniques have been perfected and new materials invented. With more skilled workers than we have ever had before, the potentialities of American life are tremendous if our economic and social life can be organized on some stable basis. We enter a period of great material possibilities with many great human problems completely unsolved.

The Marxists expect us to fail. They consider our freedoms as pure matters of form, like voting for candidates selected by political machines. It is a cardinal principle of Marxianism that capitalism will exploit the workers beyond their capacity for endurance, try desperately to capture world markets, imperialistically, to compensate for dwindling markets at home, and finally die a violent death in a bloody political revolution.

Being doctrinaire Marxists, the Soviet leaders by and large believe what they say about us. By dogmatically shutting their eyes to the wholesome aspects of American life they find abundant evidence in our current affairs to bear out the scientific prophecy of a capitalistic catastrophe in America. That may be one reason why they are not in a hurry to make peace with Austria, Germany, and Korea. They think that our bargaining influence will dwindle as our economy goes to pieces, perhaps within the next few months. If we slip into another period of economic paralysis, with staggering unemployment, we shall suffer not only at home but abroad where millions of people are looking to us not only for food and goods but for some moral concept of freedom.

What happens here now has world significance. The lack of stability in our society strengthens the hands of parties and groups that are hoping to capitalize on our failure. The inflation that is threatening the American standard of living and consuming savings, the antagonisms of capital and labor, the parochialism of ownership and management, the inefficiency of labor, the race prejudice that destroys national unity, the crisis in education, the cupidity of pressure groups in politics, the inadequate housing for a growing population—these are the sort of things that have an immediate bearing on the rest of the world and that weaken our hand in dealing with a nation that distrusts our system and stands to profit by our failure. As a matter of fact, our economic system has not been in sound condition for 20 years. The recovery from the long depression was based on the abnormality of war production. We spend considerable time in smug praise of a system that is still shaky.

Since capitalism has given America its material abundance, no appreciable part of the American population wants to see the system changed. But we are entering a world era that is more or less socialistic. Although we are the world's greatest source of food and goods, we will have to trade with countries that must trade on a national basis. In other words, we are moving into a world influenced by planned economies—which, incidentally, derive from a Soviet Russian idea.

Although we won the war with a planned economy achieved through general cooperation of Government, industry and civilians, that is a word that frightens many Americans, for like the Russians we also have our shibboleths. But circumstances have driven us into limited forms of planned economy without our acknowledging it and have produced controls that we hardly notice, since they are so logical and basic.

Although we still talk of free enterprise as though the nineteenth century were the ideal, our limited forms of planned economy include TVA, the other big dams, the soil-conservation program, the conservation of forests, and social-security legislation; and the controls of the free enterprise system include such deep-seated devices as the Federal Reserve Act, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Securities and Exchange regulations. Since the trend of the world is toward rather than away from planned economy it is likely that the capitalism of America will have to conform.

Last autumn a House Subcommittee on Small Business studied the disposition of the sale of Government-owned war plants. Seventy percent of the plants had been bought by what the committee described as "giant corporation." The report said that if 250 large corporations took up their options on Government plants they would own 65 percent of the Nation's productive facilities; and other of the published facts show a strong trend toward the centralization of capital and power. That is one type of planned economy, although not necessarily in the interest of the Nation as a whole. From the social and political point of view it might be alarming if the Nation did not have the power to establish the necessary controls.

What our position in the world requires is an economy of abundance—the peacetime equivalent for our wartime achievement. Since private industry has developed the enterprise and the techniques that have always given our economy its impetus, it would be ideal if private industry and labor could voluntarily provide the planning that would make the most efficient use of our resources and plant and distribute the profits in the form of a constantly rising standard of living and a constantly widening field of individual opportunity.

But if private industry and labor cannot make our system work efficiently, the people will have to provide the planning through the National Government, which might be the road to collectivization—something that Americans apparently do not want. For

planned economies by Government order are dangerous, and may lead to totalitarianism which substitutes force for the democracy and enterprise that we are trying to preserve. No one is forgetting that the success the Russians have had with a planned economy has been at the expense of freedom, and the Labor Party in England has not yet demonstrated that it can plan economy and preserve English liberties simultaneously.

By virtue of many circumstances we have the margin of a few years to develop a democracy, which has already had a long record of achievement, into a democracy that promotes human happiness by widening individual opportunities and deepening individual security. In the current crisis the contest is not between capitalism and socialism or communism. The economy is not the point at issue. What we cannot tolerate is a world dominated by a tyranny that murders dissenters, deals with human beings in the mass rather than as individuals, ruthlessly moves large masses of people around from one place to another, dumps them into concentration camps and remains impervious to human misery.

But we cannot resist it with angry words and hatred. Confronted with a myriad of political choices, we have to keep in mind the human being who stands in the middle everywhere—the unwitting victim of power politics from both sides in the United States as well as in Greece, Turkey, China, and other countries. In view of the bold statement of our credo in the Atlantic Charter, the burden of the proof is on us. To increase food and industrial production, to achieve national stability, to raise the standard of living, to enrich the spirit of man, by general freedom—those are our assets. If we use them wisely, we can prevent another world war.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on May 31, 1947:

Dear friends of the triple cities and my congressional district, this radio program is nearly 8 years old. Almost as soon as you folks sent me to Congress the first time in 1939, I began to send you these messages and have continued practically without a break.

It is nice to receive your friendly letters expressing approval of my radio talks. I try to make them informal and to the point.

The people back home have every right to know where their Congressman stands and how he feels on important questions. As you listen to my voice each week, you get a pretty good idea about my sentiments, and by the same token I want to have your slant on things. That can be done best by writing to me.

Naturally, I'm always glad to see you when I am home. Feel free to call on me any day then at the Federal Post Office Building in Binghamton, where my home office is located.

But Congress is in session so much that a great deal of my time has to be spent in Washington. Therefore, if I'm not available, pick up a pen or pencil and drop me a few lines.

Moreover, I've had some complaints lately that letters written by citizens to bureaus and departments of the Federal Government are unanswered. This means that bureaucrats feel too superior to the average person to reply to his letters.

To me, that's an outrage. Who are these swivel-chair giants that are too pompous and lordly to answer letters the taxpayers write them? Who pays their fat salaries? How come they don't answer their mail?

Every man and woman in the United States, no matter how rich or poor, regardless of race or religion, if they are citizens, have the right to ask a Government official for a favor. And they have the right to expect an answer, too.

But some big shots in Government consider themselves above the common herd. For that matter, they consider themselves above the Congressmen the people elect and who vote the salaries they are paid. They're so inflated, you could only bring them down by pin-pricking their ego.

In these remarks I don't want you to think that I am indicting all Federal officials. Not all of them are bureaucrats. Many are honest, conscientious and painstaking and believe in giving the Government a full day's work.

But there are too many the other way. Too many are ignoring the fact that they work for the American people and should conduct themselves accordingly.

Congress ought to crack down on these slothful servants who don't consider themselves servants at all. Congress ought to put them in their place.

So far as I go, I hope you'll let me know the time you write a department of the United States Government and don't get a reply. I want you to tell me if they ignore your letters.

If you can't get an answer out of these fellows, call on me. I'll go to bat for you, gladly. I'll guarantee a letter back to you, and fast.

After all, have you and I asked for anything unreasonable? This Government was set up by the people, to serve the people. The Constitution defines all departments of Government as agencies dedicated to public service. This public service is not limited to just a favored few. It is for everybody!

So be sure to get in touch with me if you don't receive satisfaction when you request something. I welcome your letters. You know I'll answer right off the bat. You know they'll answer sooner after they've heard from me.

This goes for you veterans who may be anxious to get word through to the Nation's Capital. This goes for you farm folks who want to find out something about agriculture. And you young people who are students in our schools and write me so often about research work. Also it goes for the great rank and file of working folks of the Triple Cities who are asking many questions of official Washington nowadays.

All of you are citizens. Your names may not be enrolled on some social list like the ones you see in Washington, but that makes no difference. The truth is, you're paying the shot, and every public servant is answerable to you.

Officialdom must realize this. Otherwise we will cease to be America. There are dictator nations whose headmen make it a practice of pushing people around. They live off the fat of the land while the masses barely exist in chill penury.

We just fought a war to get rid of such an unbearable attitude in human relationships. We sent our sons to fight those who were determined to make the people slaves of a few. We must not tolerate a similar condition in our own affairs.

Hard-working, efficient public officials are the only satisfactory ones worth their salt. Let's keep them and throw out the rest.

Thank you.

Plea for Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address which I broadcast over Station WBAL, Baltimore, Md., on Decoration Day, May 30:

Today, all over the country and, in fact, all over the world, Americans and those friendly to America have gathered to pay tribute to our gallant dead of many wars. A few hours ago, in nearby Arlington, many of our Nation's leaders gathered for this purpose at the Memorial Amphitheater and Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Today, in all parts of the land, in great cities and rural graveyards, the citizens of the United States have held memorial services for those who fell in their country's service. Similar homage has been, or is being, paid in the far-flung military cemeteries, large and small, where Americans sleep on foreign fields, from Iceland to Japan. The sun never sets on the little white markers of our war dead.

As we think of the members of the armed forces who have given their lives in our country's service, it should be remembered that peace also exacts its sacrifices and takes its toll of gallant Americans. This week Washingtonians, and particularly colleagues in the Congress, have mourned the untimely death of the Honorable Fred Bradley, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on which I serve.

He was a patriot and gave unreservedly of his energy and strength to the public service. He will be greatly missed.

There is no doubt that we owe a great debt to our warrior dead and to our Fred Bradleys, to carry on their work and to maintain a strong, free America, and a world of peace and good will.

But we, a people devoted to peace, as perhaps no other nation ever has been, have on all too many occasions been called upon to sacrifice not only our wealth but our most precious citizenry on the altars of the gods of war.

In reporting from Washington on this particular day, the questions of management and labor, tax reduction, elimination of Government extravagance, partisan politics, and other vital matters seem vital only as they bear on the urgent duty which faces us to see that "these dead shall not have died in vain."

As Lincoln said in the greatest of all memorial speeches, "It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here thus far so nobly advanced."

We are in grave danger of failing to meet our responsibilities. The danger is not immediate and is therefore obscured by a host of other problems. It will not reach the crisis for 10, 20, perhaps 50 years which seems remote now. But this crisis almost certainly will come and the outcome will be dependent on what action we take now and in the near future.

The threat is nothing new. It is fostered by unpreparedness. We hope that this time we have finally won a war to end wars. The U. N. has been organized for the primary purpose of preventing wars. Plans are in the making for international control of atomic energy and we hope we are on the threshold of an era of peace and international good will.

We hope this is true. However, the record of past experience is all to the contrary.

Even if we assume that, unlike the League of Nations, the U. N. has come to stay, the odds are still overwhelmingly in favor of a third world war, to test the new world organization and its efficacy in preserving peace. Before we can confidently confide our national safety to the new superstate, it must demonstrate that it can meet the pragmatic test. It will have to ride out a storm. Our own Constitution had to be bathed in the blood of the War Between the States before its solidity was assured. If this were true with respect to our small group of neighboring states with similar populations, traditions and ideologies, a test by fire will almost certainly be required before an organization comprising nearly all the nations of the earth can be assumed to be firmly established. Surely we should do all in our power to prevent the Gettysburgs and the marches through Georgia of such a titanic struggle from occurring on American soil.

To do so we must establish a sound and ever ready system of national preparedness. We must lay the foundations at once and it should have top priority now. Not after the next election or at some other convenient or politically expedient time but right now and always, it should be kept in the public eye. Of course strikes, controls, governmental extravagance, taxes, and other domestic problems are of great importance and have an almost daily impact on our lives. The prompt and proper solution of these questions is important to our comfort and security. But they should not distract our attention from preparedness.

We have survived many strikes, financial panics, and depressions, unpleasant though they were. On the other hand history has demonstrated twice within the past 30 years that unpreparedness jeopardizes our all. We have heard repeated warnings from our military leaders. Even without their expert opinions it is obvious to the average citizen that modern scientific developments are constantly adding to the dangers of a surprise attack. Speed, range, and devastating power of weapons, old and new, are ever on the increase. Each new discovery adds to the danger. With the passing of time, the suddenness, scope, and demoralizing effect of any such blow become potentially more serious.

The next big attack would be aimed logically at the industrial areas of the United States. Our wealth and production lines, which have twice saved freedom for the world, are likely to be the first objectives, not Belgium, not the Maginot line, not Pearl Harbor. Even if we have allies who fight as did the Russians at Stalingrad, the British at Dunkirk, the French at Verdun, we cannot count on their giving us the precious time to prepare and deploy as was the case in the last two wars. Not if we are the first objective.

In the past we have finished with mighty impressiveness but we have not looked well in the early rounds. Remember Pearl Harbor, the U-boat carnage, Bull Run, and Bladensburg? In the last two wars, God and our allies gave us the necessary time to mobilize our strength. Both times we paid a shocking price in blood and treasure for our unreadiness, but our friends were able to hold long enough to cover our frantic periods of arming and drafting. If there is a next time we must be strong before the crisis. We dare not rely on any time next time. One of the surest ways of postponing or preventing a third world war is for use to be ever ready for the worst.

We must profit from the errors and experience of the past. In a democracy each citizen shares responsibility for the national welfare. We should all be vigilant to insure that our leaders do not procrastinate with respect to so vital a matter. At first blush the ordinary citizen may not see why he should be required to worry about plans for national defense. He expects the generals and the admirals, the professional experts, to make the plans. They have won our wars in the past and should be trusted to look after the future.

Leaving it to the generals and the admirals might be sufficient in a totalitarian state but the past has proved that it does not work in our democracy. Ultimately, ours is a government based on public opinion. No matter how skillfully a plan is drawn, it will not be fully carried out unless it has popular support. Belief in the soundness and necessity of the plan must be translated by popular will to the Halls of Congress. It must have solid nonpartisan backing and be immune to the ebb and flow and expediencies of party politics. It must not be endangered by local interests, economy drives, or reforms. In other words, our plan for national defense must be more than blueprints devised and approved by the War and Navy Departments, or the new unified command. The plan must also represent the considered will of a substantal majority of the voters of our country. It will not function long without this fundamental support because any sound plan will be expensive and objectionable to strong minority groups.

After World War I a well-conceived plan of national defense was drawn up and enacted into law with the backing of General Pershing and the War Department. It was starved for lack of funds and when World War II arrived it was discredited and scrapped to a large extent. Like the League of Nations, it never had a fair test because of insufficient popular support. This present Congress, although economy-minded and determined to enforce necessary savings, will not deprive the armed services of needed funds. But what about future Congresses after the lessons of this war are not so fresh in the minds of the people?

The generals and the admirals can devise several different plans each of which, properly implemented, would give us protection and enable us to last out the early rounds of a future struggle and gain the time needed to develop our full strength. But the plan they select must have popular backing. Public opposition or even indifference will impair or defeat its success. The past has shown our generals and admirals much less skilled and successful in coping with politicians and voters than they have been with foreign enemies.

They need to know, for example, what support they can expect from the voters for some form of compulsory military service in time of peace. This question should be settled at once. If we are not to have a form of peacetime draft the whole structure will have to be radically different from what is apparently now contemplated. Every item of sound plan is dependent on the other items that go to make up the whole. The size of an adequate Regular Army is directly affected by the strength and quality of the National Guard and Reserves actually available. The quality of all arms and services is influenced by the funds, equipment, and time provided for training. And so it goes.

Our Government should lay an approved plan in basic outline before the American people. Fundamental questions should be settled with utmost dispatch. To win popular backing the plan should have full publicity and the people told frankly what it will cost.

These and similar questions should be fully and promptly discussed so that popular support of some sound plan can be crystalized. The public voice should be raised so that not only the present Congress, but future Congresses, will be in a position to know what basic type of national defense the majority of the people will support. Then, and only then, can the generals and the admirals work out the details with any confidence in the results.

There are bills now pending before the House and Senate that call for compulsory military training for all able bodied young men after they pass the age of 17. The idea of a perpetual draft is objectionable to large segments of our population. As a nation, we prefer a volunteer system. It cannot be denied that compulsory service is a form of regimentation and most Americans abhor being regimented, particularly in time of peace.

Our Constitution calls for religious freedom and many citizens are opposed to forced military training on conscientious grounds. We cannot escape the fact that some individual liberties, some freedom of education will be lost if we go in for compulsory military service.

However, our British cousins extended their wartime draft for another 5 years on May 22, a departure from their peacetime tradition. The cost of an adequate Army and Navy manned principally by professionals may be prohibitive. We are faced by unpleasant alternatives. The problem is an unhappy one, but it is of fundamental importance. If we are to keep faith with those whose memory we honor today, we must settle this issue fearlessly and without undue delay so that our leaders can plan intelligently and start building for the future and for eventual peace on earth. Our preparedness policy must be decided by the people—not by the Eightieth Congress—not by the War and Navy Departments. It should be a nonpartisan or at least a bi-partisan policy and once decided upon receive the loyal backing of all the people—else it and we may fail.

Veterans' Memorial Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, emphasizing that the end of the state is really liberty, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] urged an audience attending memorial services in Rochester, N. Y., Sunday evening, May 25, to remember our heroic dead by keeping America strong and "living our devotion to liberty." The Congressman indulged in a special salute to one in the audience who 5 days later took part in Rochester's Memorial Day parade as its lone surviving Civil War veteran, James A. Hard, who will be 105 years of age next month.

Mr. KEATING's address follows:

Mr. Chairman, comrades, and guests, it is a high privilege to join with you this evening as you do honor to our grand old comrade, James A. Hard, whom God has spared to walk among us as a symbol of the patriotic devotion of the brave soldiers of the Civil War. Here, too, in this gathering are veterans of the Spanish-American War, of the First World War, and you younger veterans of the last titanic struggle, to all of whom our Nation, by custom, acknowledges its great debt at this season of the year.

But we are gathered here in this annual service primarily to pay honor and tribute to the memory of those who in the wars of this country gave their last full measure of devotion to the defense of their beloved land.

Those men—and women—who rest beneath the grassy mounds marked, as they will be on the 30th day of this month, by

flower-decked stones, died for liberty. They gave their lives for Americanism. If their sacrifices are not to have been in vain, then we who are privileged to live must live as devotedly for liberty and Americanism as those departed ones died devotedly for liberty and Americanism.

The lowly Nazarene once said: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." That text is not only the essence of living; not only is it the complete statement of spiritual salvation; it is a principle to which Americanism conforms completely because in a Government such as ours—a Government of, by, and for the people—it is the liberty of the people to know the truth that makes them free.

The wars in which America has participated have been conflicts begun by totalitarian governments. The American people have always been a peaceful people. They have never been prepared for war when war came because they were motived by good will toward their fellow men—not by any lust for power over other people; nor by any greed for the territory or possessions of other people. Whenever the manhood of America has marched, as you men and your comrades marched, to do battle for your country, the motive and purpose of America always has been to extend freedom—to extend the truth of government which sets men free to know that liberty which we wrote into our Constitution in the Bill of Rights.

No one can deny nor dispute that record and that impelling motive on the part of America. History sustains it completely. Our record in the Philippines, our record in Cuba, our record in every case where we have rescued subjugated peoples from the clutch of the despot has been to prepare them for self-government and then help them to set up their own government.

Today, after the last great struggle, America remains the outstanding bulwark of liberty left upon this planet. Across the world two conflicting concepts of government clash. With the world of the future in between, the United States and the Soviet Union face each other with conflicting ideological doctrines and governmental policies. Now that we have been by force of circumstances impelled into the position of world leadership, as well as being compelled to become the world's banker, and the world's Samaritan of mercy, there has arisen an imperative necessity that we face facts realistically and no longer bemuse ourselves by wishful thinking.

Our whole doctrine and concept of government is to live at peace with our neighbors; to permit self-determination by peoples within our own orbit of influence; to promote self-determination by peoples everywhere else in the world—in short, to permit the peoples of every nation to choose their own form of government. All we asked in the First World War in return for the millions of men, the rivers of blood, and the billions of money we spent was world peace between all the nations. We did not get that world peace.

When we became embroiled in the Second World War our course was perfectly clear to every informed person in the world; we were again going into war, we were again preparing to contribute millions of men and unprecedented billions of dollars that the world might have peace and security, that small, weak nations might be made free of the fear of being overrun, despoiled, destroyed, and enslaved by stronger neighbor powers. In the course of that struggle we not only had to pour millions of fighting forces and billions of dollars of munitions and supplies of war into the European theater, but at the same time we had to pour other torrents of blood and other billions of dollars into a war in the Pacific which we fought alone with practically no aid from any of our allies. Such a feat of waging war directed toward freedom and motivated by a desire that all men might be free and secure has never been witnessed in the history of mankind.

This Sunday evening seems a peculiarly appropriate time to reaffirm our passionate yearning to live at peace with all the world and also to analyze with you why it is that our concept and practice of government by consent of the governed has difficulty to live in amity on this globe with the concept of a dictatorship of the proletariat. America believes in the kind of government which grants men the freedom to worship God as their own conscience may dictate. We believe in political freedom, a free press, a free radio, free schools, and the liberty of the individual to seek his progress in his own way, secure from unjust interference by his government. We believe, and we have demonstrated, that people living under such a government, that individuals enjoying such liberty and equality of opportunity, do not have to and will not bow their heads to any dictatorship; they do not have to and will not take upon their shoulders the yoke of any despotic oppressor; they do not have to and will not look into the dust as they live out a weary life of toil and torture. Freemen under our American concept may lift their eyes to search for their destiny among the stars. Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

Open to all the world, America is a land to which anyone may come, observe and criticize if he chooses. Everyone may know how we live, how we work, how we play, and they may know, too, how we reverently worship the God of our fathers.

Why, then, is there an iron curtain around Russia and all the unfortunate satellite countries she has drawn within her circle? Fellow Americans, veterans who have offered to give your all for liberty, the reason, and you know it as well as I, is because the Russian rulers dare not let their people see how men and women live under the blessings of free government. The Russian rulers dare not permit their people to learn that the humblest laborer in America is better off in every way than the most-favored worker in Russia.

The term "communism" has always been employed to represent the Russian concept of government, just as Americanism has always been employed to represent our system of government. The word communism is misleading as applied to the Russian Government. Russia is not a communism where men share and share alike. There is no such thing in Russia as equality of opportunity. There is no such thing in Russia as a labor union. There is no such thing in Russia as a free newspaper or an independent radio station. Russia, instead of being a communism, is a tight, cruel, ruthless despotism that enslaves its own people. It is a despotism which believes it must have an insulating wall of satellite nations about it in order that the Russian people may not learn how men and women live richly under free government, and how completely and miserably enslaved the Russian people are under their despots. That is the real reason why, in spite of a long history of effort at conciliation on the part of the United States, the Russian representatives have resisted every effort by America to bring about an agreement that will lead to world peace.

You are being told by a small cult of subversionists in this country that America is archaic; that Americanism is outmoded; that your government by consent of the governed is not as efficient as government under communism or socialism or some other alien ism. Let's see about that:

The other nations of the world have had anywhere from a thousand to more than 5,000 years in which to achieve everything we have achieved in America in 170 years. They did not succeed. We did. Now, since our forefathers came from those very countries which failed to reach the heights we have scaled in America, by what magic did they build the foundations upon which in 170 years—a brief and fleeting period in the life of nations—we erected the greatest nation mankind has ever known?

Friends, veterans, it was the magic of our government by consent of the governed; it was the magic of our Constitution in which we bound ourselves under an organic law to restrain ourselves, to refrain from oppression of minorities in moments of passion and vehemence and, perhaps hysteria, on the part of the majority. It was the magic, if you please, of the Bill of Rights—the right to worship God as each should choose; the right to know what his Government does and to criticize it if he sees fit; the right of petition and peaceful assembly; the right to seek work or to go into business or to enter a profession if he chose; the right to exercise individual freedom in orderly liberty under the law to the fullest extent possible without interfering with a like right on the part of his neighbors. That is a government of laws and not a government by men. It was the magic of that concept and that system of government that has brought us in 170 years to the highest standard of living, the highest wages, the best working conditions, the best schools, the best communication and transportation systems, the greatest technique for mass production.

The subversionists would tell you that Americanism is inefficient and has failed in a modern world. Let's see about that:

After Japan had prepared for 40 years for war; after Stalin in Russia had prepared for 20 years for war; after Hitler had driven the German people by lash and spur for 12 years getting ready for war, what happened in America when we were forced into the struggle? Under a free government, a free citizenry, a free agriculture, a free labor, a free industry, all cooperated to put us, in the short space of 3 years, on an offensive war basis and the road to victory. In 3 years, mark you, we in America overcame the decades of preparation in those totalitarian countries. In 3 years we were in sight of victory in two wars, on two oceans, while we were pouring out billions upon billions of dollars' worth of war machines and material to sustain not only our millions of fighting forces in Europe and the Far East but to sustain our allies as well. During that same war, we had a national election without impeding our efforts in the least. That, veterans, is the kind of an America that you fought for. That is the kind of an America your comrades died for. That is the kind of an America we must live for. That is the kind of America that the subversionists say has failed.

Let's look a little further:

After the war was over, after we had proved to be the deciding factor in the two wars, all the other nations of the world turned to us to feed them; to clothe them; to give them the money by which to rebuild their shattered factories and their war-blasted agriculture. In this very hour, every nation in the world is looking to us for help. If there is any other nation in the world that is better than America; if there is any other governmental system in the world that is within cannon shot of our American system; if there is any other concept of government in the world remotely comparable in benevolence and efficiency, where is it? The subversionists, who prosper under the hospitality of this country and who then seek to destroy the very system that makes this Nation all it is, cannot answer that question. They close their eyes willfully to every fact of history.

Fellow citizens and veterans, we know that these forces are at work in this Nation today to overturn our American system. We know that many of the assaults upon the Congress are planned assaults designed to break down and destroy the confidence of the American people in their special instrument of control over their Government and their governors—because the legislative

branch of the Government is just that—the people's special instrument of control over their Government and their governors.

There can be no question in the mind of anyone who is intellectually honest that men may find spiritual progress only under a government which leaves them free to worship God in their own way and to exercise their talents in orderly liberty under the law.

I would like to read to you now what I consider one of the best definitions of government ever voiced by man, and it was written by that great philosopher, Baruch Spinoza, in the 1600's. He described Americanism as completely and succinctly as it could be done. Listen to his words:

"The last end of the state is not to dominate men, nor to restrain them by fear; rather it is so to free each man from fear that he may live and act with full security and without injury to himself or his neighbor. The end of the state, I repeat, is not to make rational beings into brute beasts and machines. It is to enable their bodies and their minds to function safely. It is to lead men to live by, and to exercise, a free reason; that they may not waste their strength in hatred, anger or guile, nor act unfairly toward one another. Thus the end of the state is really liberty."

We all hope and pray that war may never again come to this world. We know that war, instead of being a heroic, chivalrous adventure under flying banners and to the noise of blaring trumpets, is a cold, scientific, efficient method of mass destruction of men and factories, of cities and farms. We know that war has reached such scientific advances that it will be mass suicide if it comes again.

The Teacher of Galilee once said:

"What profiteth a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" In the utmost reverence may I paraphrase that truism and ask, "What profiteth men if they slay the whole world and lose their own lives?" How can war profit mankind? It is not possible. And yet we must stand on guard on the ramparts of liberty to see that some lust for power does not motivate men somewhere to seek the conquest of their neighbors for sheer love of exercising that lust for power.

We want peace with all the world—and I cannot imagine anyone wanting it more devoutly than you veterans do.

So, then, on this Sabbath Day, as we are gathered here to pay tribute to our heroic dead, we must remember that the peace of the world and the safety of our liberty lie in eternal vigilance. We must remember that in the state of the world today America must maintain a national defense sufficiently strong and efficient that no nation bent on aggression will be invited to direct an attack upon us. Above all, my fellow citizens, we must give our common devotion to our common country just as those who today sleep beneath the grassy mounds gave their common devotion. They died in their devotion to liberty. We must live our devotion to liberty if they are not to have died in vain.

God give us the strength, the wisdom, and the courage to live to perpetuate Americanism. In the words of the Master: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Highway to Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by Richard Neuberger which appeared in the New York Times of May 4, 1947. The story of the Alcan Highway could not have a greater authority to tell it than Dick Neuberger who worked on it, traveled over it, and knows it as few men do.

I commend the reading of this article to all Members of the Congress because of its lucidity and also in the hope that it may stimulate interest in our northwestern and Alaskan areas. To Dick Neuberger I extend my congratulations for a fine article that needed to be written.

A NEW HIGHROAD TO ADVENTURE—ALASKA MILITARY HIGHWAY, NOW OPEN FOR PLEASURE DRIVING, CALLS THE MOTORIST TO A NEW AND VAST WILDERNESS

VANCOUVER, B. C.—For the first time in history the American motorist will be able this summer to travel overland to Alaska. If his car is "roadworthy" and if he has equipment and supplies for the long journey ahead, the Canadian Government will admit him onto the Alaska Military Highway, the fabulous 1,519-mile wilderness road constructed during the war as an emergency route to the American Army's bases in the far North.

Last year the Alaska Highway was closed to general traffic, despite thousands of inquiries from every land in the Western Hemisphere. There were no facilities along the famous road for repairing cars, selling food and providing other services. Now, however, no less than 15 stopping places dot the twisting roadway which extends from Dawson Creek, on the British Columbia plains, to Fairbanks, in the "Golden Heart" of Alaska.

Red-coated mounties patrol the more remote stretches, looking for wayfarers in trouble. It is 200 miles from the inn at Watson Lake to the fuel, food, and overnight accommodations available where the highway arches across the Teslin River on a high steel bridge. This is equivalent to driving on U. S. No. 1 from New York and Boston without seeing a wayside shack or gasoline pump.

Many other stopping places on the Alaska Highway are considerably more than 100 miles apart. For this reason cars must be in good condition. Nearly all the stopping places have gasoline, food, and bunks. Major repairs can be made at Dawson Creek, Fort St. John, Fort Nelson, Watson Lake, Whitehorse, and Fairbanks. These settlements are also the location of airfields, and at most of them medical care is available.

CUT IN WILDERNESS

The Alaska Highway, according to its builder, Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, is "the longest stretch of wilderness road constructed since the development of the automobile." Whitehorse is the only community of more than 250 people between the road's terminals.

Traveling the highway is an adventure. The road starts on the high plains of British Columbia. It crosses three mountain ranges, including the Canadian Rockies. It clings for several hundred miles to the outlying ramparts of the St. Elias Mountains, loftiest range in the Dominion. It spans 100 major rivers and many smaller ones. It begins in the Peace River agricultural belt and ends a few miles from the Arctic Circle.

Recent travelers from Alaska report the 1,519-mile route in excellent condition. During the Seattle maritime strike a convoy of 18 big trucks rushed emergency supplies to Fairbanks in record time. Although temperatures were often 50 below, the drivers experienced no difficulties, averaging 300 miles a day.

Pioneered by United States Army Engineer troops, and then later widened and improved by the Public Roads Administration, the highway cost $134,500,000. It is heavily graveled with well-banked curves. Its average width is 26 feet. Most of the bridges are of steel construction. The 2,130-foot suspension span across the Peace River is one of the great bridges on the North American Continent. Another long suspension bridge over the Liard River in the heart of the Rockies contrasts vividly with the primitive domain which it breaches.

HOT AND COLD

In the summer months the temperature on the road often touches 85 degrees. The highway also passes through the remote Yukon Territory settlement of Snag, where in February a temperature of 83 degrees below zero was recorded, the lowest in the weather annals of the North American Continent. From Whitehorse northward, there are comparatively few hours of summer darkness. The midnight sun illuminates the road. In winter the aurora borealis throws a spectacle of sinuous lights across the heavens.

The Canadian Army still exercises control over highway travelers, and although travel restrictions have been relaxed, travel permits must still be obtained from the Alaska Military Highway Traffic Control Board, whose headquarters are in Edmonton. W. J. Eveleigh of the control board recently announced that permits would be granted to "all applicants who are sufficiently self-contained." This means case and personal equipment must be adequate to the undertaking; apparently most Alaskan travelers are, for Mr. Eveleigh also reported that "all applicants for permits to travel have been accommodated, and it is intended to continue this policy."

Equipment should include a roll of mosquito netting to ward off the insect plague from nearby muskeg swamps. Mackinaws, long underwear, and heavy clothes are advised. Even in May and June a film of ice forms on springs and brooks after the sun has passed its noonday height. Although some cars can hold enough fuel in their tanks to cover the gap between all stopping points, a spare drum of gasoline will save worry on the longer jumps.

Probably the most spectacular scenery on the wilderness road is where it clings to the timbered shores of Kluane Lake, 140 miles beyond Whitehorse. This is in the heart of the Canadian solitudes. Moose, bear, and caribou inhabit the fastnesses. Grayling and trout fill the creeks and rivers. Ptarmigan flutter across the road, and now and then a wolf mingles his sinister howl with the throb of trucks and sedans.

Any fisherman who drives the Alaska Highway will be disappointed if he does not bring along his tackle. However, mounties and trappers insist the story is true of the motorist who stopped at Muncho Lake without rod and reel and caught a dozen lake trout with a roll of heavy twine and several bent pins.

Nearest large city to the southern end of the highway is Edmonton, capital of the Province of Alberta. It is 400 miles away via either a twisting prairie road or the Northern Alberta Railway. Edmonton itself is on the main line of the Canadian National Railway. Highways lead to this area from across the international boundary near Sweetgrass, Mont. Most of the roads to Edmonton funnel through the Alberta city of Calgary.

TRAVEL COSTS

The North Pacific planning project, organized by the United States State Department, estimates that it will cost two people $914 to drive from Chicago to Fairbanks and return. For four travelers the expense is put at $1,365. This includes all upkeep on the automobile as well as depreciation for 8,000

miles added to the speedometer. Such a trip would require approximately 35 days, allowing for brief stop-overs at Edmonton, Whitehorse, and Fairbanks.

Travel expenses on the Alaska section of the road are considerably higher than in Canada but four-fifths of the highway is on Canadian soil. Eggs in Fairbanks are $1.50 a dozen, beer 60 cents a bottle, and apples 25 cents each. But at Canadian wayside stations a caribou-steak dinner costs only $1 and ham and eggs and hashed-brown potatoes can be purchased for 35 cents. Gasoline prices frequently reverse this situation. On the Alaskan side of the border a United States gallon costs 55 cents. Some of the Canadian stopping places charge 80 cents for an imperial gallon, slightly larger than its American counterpart.

Pan-Pacific of Seattle has created an Alaska Highway tour that offers a 22- or 28-day round-trip on the romantic road which includes visits to Anchorage, Fairbanks, Mount McKinley Park, Seattle, Victoria, Vancouver, Lake Louise, Banff, and Edmonton. All-expense, conducted trips are scheduled for June 25, July 23, and August 20, each tour being restricted to 20 persons. The 22-day tour, returning by air, costs $689.19; the 28-day tour, returning by bus and railroad, is $665.50, not including meals on the return trip.

The wayfarer who reaches the distant end of the Alaska Highway will find that Alaska qualifies for the Indian description of The Great Land. The road ends in the Fairbanks area. Off toward the south is Mount McKinley, monarch of North America. This 20,300-foot peak towers higher above its immediate base than does even Mount Everest.

TO MOUNT M'KINLEY

Mount McKinley is reached from Fairbanks over the picturesque Alaska Railroad. Fares are expensive, approximately 10 cents a mile. McKinley Park Hotel, used as a rest camp for Alaska Army garrisons during the war, is in the shadow of the great Alaskan Range. The area abounds in big game, although, as in other national parks, hunting is forbidden. The fishing, however, is of the customary Alaska variety—bountiful.

Motorists can swing off toward the seacoast on the Richardson Highway, only major automobile road within the Territory. A spur of this highway extends to Anchorage, largest city in Alaska, with nearly 13,000 inhabitants. It also is the headquarters of the Army's Alaska Department. Hotel rooms in Fairbanks and Anchorage, extremely scarce now, will cost in the neighborhood of $5 a day. The traveler should count on spending $1 for breakfast, $1.50 for lunch, and $2 or more for dinner.

TRAVEL BY BOAT

Should the traveler leave the Alaska Highway at Whitehorse, he can journey to Skagway over the narrow-gage White Pass Railway. From Skagway boats of the Canadian Pacific serve southeastern Alaska, with its vast fiords and limitless spruce forests. Juneau, capital of the Territory, is the principal city. Behind Juneau, in the mountains, are numerous lakes reached by pontoon planes.

If the tourist prepares his own meals, he had better bring along an ample wallet. Grocery prices in Alaska average 50 percent higher than Seattle, one of the most costly American communities. Even before the present spurt in food costs, a bowl of soup was 30 cents in Juneau and a chocolate sundae 50 cents. Housing accommodations in Alaska are even more crowded than in continental United States, largely because of the many ex-soldiers and others who have come to Alaska in the past year in search of opportunity and settlement.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

Russia Expands Its Anti-American Radio Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will take up for action the so-called Mundt bill—H. R. 3342—which proposes to establish a United States information service abroad and to equip our Government to offset the libelous falsehoods now being disseminated about the United States in various sections of the world. In that connection, the following United Press news dispatch is of more than passing interest.

You will notice in reading the news dispatch accompanying these remarks, Mr. Speaker, that the Russians have very recently added a new voice to their short-wave radio programs which are being beamed to the United States and to people throughout the world who speak the English language. Albert Warner of the Mutual Broadcasting System has deemed this new female Russian broadcaster as Moscow Mary. The connotations of that title seem to make it an appropriate name.

As a nation we Americans are not addicted to short-wave listening so I suppose few people hear Moscow Mary. We are uniquely fortunate in this country in having a highly developed radio industry offering the public a variety of programs so Americans have little occasion to tune in on foreign broadcasts. In other countries, however, conditions are vastly different. Where the Government controls the broadcasting programs as it does in England and throughout Europe and where countries are small in size, listening to short-wave programs is the usual practice. Only by such listening habits do the auditors get variety in their programs and in many areas it is only by listening to short-wave programs from a variety of sources that people can hear the various sides of a story and thus have access to factors which enable them to arrive at the truth. Thus throughout Europe and those portions of the world outside of the United States and Canada listening to short-wave radio programs is the established custom.

Moscow Mary will not be able to deceive or disturb very many Americans, Mr. Speaker, but it is easy to visualize the possibilities of her counterparts in other languages in influencing and effecting listeners in other countries. For example, a Moscow Gretchen broadcasting in German and projecting falsehoods about the United States can make our occupation tasks in defeated Germany increasingly difficult. A Moscow Annette speaking in French and steadily maligning the United States would be certain to create ill will for America among the people of France unless we do something to counteract it.

The United States requires as large an area of good will and friendly attitudes as possible, Mr. Speaker, if we are to exercise our effective world leadership in the fields of international cooperation and permanent peace. We cannot afford to black out the light of freedom as it shines from America and we cannot afford to silence the voice of America as it is beamed abroad by short-wave to tell the world the truth about our American concepts and our American way of life.

GUESS WHO? MOSCOW MARY TALKS ON RADIO

The appearance of a female propagandist on Radio Moscow has given Americans a chance to enter a guessing game.

Moscow Mary, as she is called by Albert Warner of the Mutual Broadcasting System, who discovered her, may be an American. She has either a British or a "cultured" American accent. The poor reception from Moscow makes it difficult to determine which.

Warner said last night that perhaps some listeners will recognize Moscow Mary as a former high school playmate and give a clue to her identity. He pointed out that Americans managed to identify the voices of several Axis propagandists during the war. So he is recording her broadcasts and playing parts of them to Mutual listeners.

SHE DOESN'T LIKE US

Moscow Mary can never hope to compete with Japan's Tokyo Rose in popularity, Warner thinks. Her talks are aimed not at entertaining Americans, but at educating them to Moscow's way of thinking. She denounces "monopolistic Americans." She characterizes the United States as a hot bed of "grabbing imperialists out to take the wealth and freedom of other countries."

She has charged that American newspapermen wrote "preconceived lies" about the recent Moscow conference at the insistence of their "monopolistic newspaper proprietors."

STUMBLES OVER WORDS

She also insisted that the Russian press gives the truth to its people through censorship, while the American press is designed to withhold all truths from the American public.

Moscow Mary showed a tendency in her broadcasts to stumble over words occasionally, but this could be due to reading and not to language difficulties, Warner said.

Conference Report on Tax Reduction Leaves No Alternative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for the conference report on H. R. 1 when it comes before us today.

I opposed H. R. 1 when it was originally before us. I have not changed my views on it. I do not think it is the proper approach to tax reduction. I believe as strongly as ever that the only fair plan would be to increase family exemptions. The Knutson 20-percent-straight-across-the-board proposal was rankly unfair to those in the low-income group, and hence to the welfare of the country as a whole. The present conference report, calling for approximately a 30-, 20-, 10-percent tax reduction, is only

a slight improvement. Out of the $3,840,000,000 involved in the reduction, the 4 percent of taxpayers at the top will get $1,441,000,000 or 37 percent of the reduction; the middle 43 percent of taxpayers will get $1,378,000,000 or 36 percent of the reduction, while the bottom 53 percent of our taxpayers will get $877,000,000 or only 27 percent of the reduction. That tells the story.

I likewise opposed the Knutson bill because I first wanted to see what our revenue situation would be; how far Congress would go in cutting appropriations and how much of an increase we would get this year in Federal income. I wanted no blind reduction. It is evident now that a tax reduction is justified both on the basis of increased revenues and on the basis of savings being made.

It is a question now of the tax reduction contained in the conference report on H. R. 1, or no tax reduction at all. Under the circumstances I am voting for the conference report. Those of us who opposed the Knutson bill can have the satisfaction, slight though it be, of knowing our efforts were successful at least to the extent of modifying the original straight - 20 - percent - across - the board proposal and in getting the effective date set for July 1 instead of retroactively to January 1, 1947. The July 1 date is far sounder from the point of view of national fiscal policy.

All Japan Being Policed by Less Than 2,500 Yanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herewith an article published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer recently by Mr. Ralph J. Donaldson:

ALL JAPAN BEING POLICED BY LESS THAN 2,500 YANKS

The policy of the occupation authorities is to let the Japanese work out their problems in their own way to the greatest possible degree. SCAP (the supreme commander for the Allied Powers) will issue a directive to the Japanese Government saying that it wants certain things done, such as the passage of a law, a purge of individuals or the arrest of certain criminals. Then it is up to the Japanese themselves to carry out the orders.

Thus we have no military government in Japan in the sense that we have military government in southern Korea and the American zone in Germany.

But we do have military-government teams stationed in each prefecture in Japan. Their job is to advise and assist the local Japanese authorities in the implementation of the laws and reforms enacted by the Japanese Government in accordance with SCAP directives.

Most of these teams consist of 7 officers and 25 enlisted men, plus from 3 to 6 civilians, although some are larger. In all of Japan there are 46 prefectural teams and 8 regional teams. These are the only members of the occupation force who come into direct daily contact with the Japanese and who exercise surveillance over SCAP directives.

In other words, we are policing Japan today with a force of less than 2,500 men.

COOPERATION IS EVIDENT

This in itself is an indication of the way the Japanese authorities cooperate with the Americans. And as an indication of the popularity of the Americans among the Japanese, whenever a military-government team is withdrawn from one locality or village, there invariably comes to SCAP headquarters a petition signed by all the residents asking that the Americans be sent back.

It may well be asked what the rest of the American troops are doing in Japan if it takes only 2,500 men to police the entire Empire.

First of all, there is the brain trust at general headquarters. These are the people who make studies of the Japanese economy, who search the records for war criminals, who are seeking loot stolen from other countries, who plan the educational program, who trace the financial ramifications of the Zaibatsu, who plan for the rehabilitation of Japanese industry, who make surveys for reparations, and who compile various reports and recommendations on which SCAP directives are based.

Then there are those engaged in the maintenance of communication and supply lines. Unlike the Russians who live off the resources of the countries they occupy, we bring in all the food and other supplies needed by our military and civilian occupation forces.

In addition, there are the special services which operate the post exchanges, maintain 33 rest hotels in Japan for soldiers on leave, run 900 motion-picture theaters, and supervise various libraries.

One of the important service activities is the maintenance of schools for soldiers. This is under the direction of R. B. Patin, educational adviser to the Eighth Army, who is the former principal of Shaker Heights High School.

He supervises 135 civilian teachers who are conducting 25 schools throughout Japan, in which courses ranging from typing to abnormal psychology are offered. The largest school is in Tokyo, which has an enrollment of 2,400. Yokohama is next with 900.

One-tenth of the soldiers in Japan have enrolled in the Army educational program, and so far 67 percent of those who enrolled have completed their courses.

Patin tries to impress on each of the boys with whom he comes in contact that every soldier is in effect an American ambassador in a foreign country and that his individual conduct will have an important bearing on the future relations between Japan and the United States.

Finally, there are the combat troops who are stationed in various camps strategically located throughout the Empire. Their function ostensibly is to provide a show of force in the event of any resistance on the part of the Japanese to American orders. Actually they are needed to discourage any foreign power which might get a notion to attack or invade Japan. We are not taking any chances on Russia moving in.

The Late Honorable Fred Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 27, 1947

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, before the untimely passing of the Honorable Fred Bradley, of Michigan, he prepared a radio broadcast for release on June 2.

Inasmuch as his remarks pay a high tribute to our United States Coast Guard, members of his staff felt they should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I am only too happy to comply with that request.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD CUTTER "MACKINAW"

(By Hon. Fred Bradley)

"Yes, our ship came in today." In these words our neighbor Al Weber back on January 4, 1945, announced the arrival of the United States Coast Guard cutter *Mackinaw* at her home port of Cheboygan. "Our ship" is exactly what I whisper to myself every time that my eyes view that pride of the Coast Guard on the Great Lakes. I wonder how many of our district's citizenry truly appreciate what the world's mightiest ice breaker means to us in the Northland. Mother Nature has ordained that Lake Superior in particular be ice covered for at least 3 months every year but from stories told me, and from accounts carried by our newspapers and Great Lakes periodicals, this year she seemingly was on a warpath. Instead of the ice in the upper lakes breaking up to permit passage of our freighters by early April, our ore-carrying freighters were still battling ice the early days of May. On April 26, after almost 5 weeks of constant ice-breaking duty the *Mackinaw* returned to her home port for but 1 day with the intention of proceeding on to Bay City for fuel and further orders. Instead, she received another S O S and had to return north to rescue additional freighters which became icebound. Were it not for this champion of the Lakes, our 1947 navigation season, in all probability, would not have opened up until May 1.

The *Mackinaw* is, of course, much more than an ice breaker and has many equally important duties to perform as a Coast Guard cutter. She engages in rescue work 12 months out of the year, services lighthouses, puts out and picks up other aids to navigation, such as heavy buoys; and during certain weeks in the summer she serves as a training ship to give actual seagoing training to the graduating class of the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn At this point I might also mention that she participates in civic festivals which various of our larger cities schedule during the summer months, but this only when participation does not interfere with her operational commitments.

I keep a scrapbook on the *Mackinaw* because somehow I feel more or less paternalistic about her, if one can be pardoned for using that term in connection with a vessel. Having sponsored the legislation which made possible her construction, I like to closely follow her work in our midst and the efforts of her splendid officers and crew. Let me give you just a brief resume of my 1946 clippings—these show you exactly what she means to Great Lakes interests. The very first one in January records the splendid leader chosen to be the new icebreaker captain—Commander C. H. Stober, who, incidentally, holds a splendid war record as in fact do many of his crew. "Icebreaker *Mackinaw* off to busy season," and under this caption we learn that in the first 3 days of the 1946 season's icebreaking, she went to the assistance of seven ships; then two train ferries became stuck in the ice off Mackinaw City—the *Mackinaw* set them free. The February 11, 1946, issue of the Cheboygan Tribune records the *Mackinaw's* assistance to the icebreaker *Ste. Marie* when she was stopped by a heavy windrow of ice. And then the Republican News, in an editorial headed "Performances of *Mackinaw* reas-

sured skeptics, if any," told its readers that this vessel in 1 month of 1946 had already proven her value. And here in their order are some other of the clippings on the *Mackinaw's* activities: "Three icebound craft released; *Mackinaw* goes to assist," this records the rescue of the fishing tub *Liberty* of Charlevoix and two lifeboats. "Coast Guard to survey straits ice," "The *Mackinaw* sails to fuel lighthouses"; "Icebreaker opens Soo locks Monday," and that clipping is dated March 20, 1946. "*Mackinaw* aids first carriers start season"; "Cutter tows in disabled fish tug"; and then we have numerous clippings on the Coast Guard Academy cadets who explored the wonders of our Great Lakes region aboard the *Mackinaw*; and how she was welcomed by hundreds at visits to various of our Lakes ports. During the 1946 winter season the *Mackinaw* assisted more than $15,000,000 worth of shipping which was icebound—and the records of the 1947 winter and spring seasons, from all indications, will be even more glorious.

I recognize, my listeners, that quite a few of you are well aware of the foregoing but some of you possibly are not. The United States Coast Guard—Uncle Sam's first Navy—has, and is, performing excellent work in our midst and I believe that each of us, who is privileged to live in our marvelous Great Lakes region, and is familiar with the activities of the Coast Guard, is outspoken in his praise and thanks to those able servants of the public whose efforts have so frequently gone seemingly unnoticed.

I was extremely grateful for a letter which was written to me April 25, 1947, by Capt. T. Howard Saunders, chairman on navigation-legislation, International Shipmasters Association of the Great Lakes. Aboard the steamer *Henry G. Dalton* he wrote me thus:

"I would like to take this opportunity to drop a few lines on a subject you have been most interested in, namely, the ice breaker *Mackinaw*, which is now successfully opening navigation on the Great Lakes, and surely as night follows day is doing a whale of a job living up to every expectation of her.

"I have had a chance to observe the operation at first hand; as being master of one of our bigger ships, I have made a trip to Lake Superior and back with iron ore. I locked up at the Soo on April 13 and entered the ice field which extended 100 miles west of the Soo—the ice in Whitefish Bay, which you well know, was 15 to 30 inches, besides being windrowed in places up to 20 feet. I don't have to remind you, Congressman, that conditions like that are just too much for our freighters to get through—they have to have help like that given by the *Mackinaw* to get through.

"As the economy of this country is tied up in the operation of shipping on the Great Lakes, it is important that navigation get started as soon as possible. As a master with 40 years experience, 25 of them sailing a boat, it is my considerate judgment that without the ice breaker *Mackinaw* navigation through Lake Superior would not be a possibility until May 1, or 20 days later. Not only that, but boats trying to force their way through alone would sustain untold damage which is impossible to calculate, and no doubt in my mind force a lot of ships to be drydocked.

"Yes, Congressman, all your efforts in behalf of the *Mackinaw* are paying dividends today, and you should feel pretty good about it all. The breaker is being expertly handled by Commander Stober and his staff. He is efficient, courteous, and very helpful. You know, breaking ice and getting ships moving is not the easiest task in the world, but the commander has been very gracious about it all.

"The Shipmasters Association, whom I represent, wish to express our heartfelt approval of it all to you and through you to all—a hearty thank you."

That letter was unsolicited, my listeners, and it is a tribute to the valiant men of the United States Coast Guard who 24 hours of the day do their duty well and many times "above and beyond the call of duty."

Under date of May 7, Mr. John T. Hutchinson, president of Lake Carriers' Association, Cleveland, directed a letter of thanks to Admiral Joseph F. Farley, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, reading thus:

"The Lake Carriers' Association and all its member companies desire to express their appreciation of the invaluable assistance rendered this spring by the Coast Guard to shipping on the Great Lakes. Ice conditions have been so unusually severe that the opening of navigation would have been greatly delayed without the ice-breaking operations carried on by the Coast Guard.

"The Commander, Ninth Coast Guard District, Commodore James A. Hirshfield, and his Chief of Staff, Commander E. J. Roland, have met frequently with representatives of the Association to review the ice situation and to plan operations. Their cooperative spirit, their knowledge of localities and conditions, and their ability to plan and carry out necessary operations have been outstanding.

"Commodore Hirshfield has used his forces with efficiency to the fullest extent. The cutters *Mackinaw, Woodrush, Tupelo, Acacia, Sundew* and *Tahoma* have all been employed in ice breaking and have rendered yeoman service. The Association extends its thanks to the commanding officers and crew of all these vessels for their accomplishments under arduous conditions.

"While all the vessels performed exceptionally well, the work of the *Mackinaw* has been oustanding because of the inherent qualities of the vessel. Capt. C. O. Rydholm, chairman of the shore captains' committee of the association, was aboard this vessel for several weeks as an observer. He has expressed high praise for the ability of the commanding officer, Commander C. H. Stober, and for the efficiency of the other officers and the members of the crew. Captain Rydholm's hope that Commander Stober may remain on the *Mackinaw* so that his experience and knowledge may be available another year is seconded by the association.

"Commander T. A. Dahlburg at the Soo has been, as always, extremely cooperative and able in supervising operations at that critical point.

"I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Commodore Hirshfield, Commander Roland, Commander Dahlburg, and the commanding officer of each cutter, in order, that they may know the very great appreciation shipping interests on the Great Lakes have of their highly successful icebreaking operations that hastened the opening of navigation on the Great Lakes in spite of unusually severe ice conditions."

It is letters of commendation such as I have just quoted which warm the hearts of public servants and inspire continued faithful service.

The present Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral Joseph F. Farley, a man most highly respected, is an inspiration to the men under his command. He graduated from the Coast Guard Academy in 1912; served on various cutters and destroyers; was signal officer on the cutter *Yamacraw* on convoy duty off Gibraltar during World War I and has to his credit over 30 years of meritorious service as an officer of the United States Coast Guard. I want to say that ever since I have been in Washington I have treasured my associations with the men who pilot this splendid military service of our country—I think each one has indelibly inscribed on his mind the mission of the United States Coast Guard Academy—"to graduate young men with sound bodies, stout hearts, and alert minds, with a liking for the sea and its lore, and with that high sense of honor, loyalty, and obedience which goes with trained initiative and leadership; well-grounded in seamanship, the sciences, and the amenities, and strong in the resolve to be worthy of the traditions of commissioned officers in the United States Coast Guard in the service of their country and humanity."

To Admiral Farley, to his associates whether in headquarters here or out in district offices and field stations, to the men under his command, I want to pay tribute at this time—all of you in this postwar period are faithfully fulfilling every demand made of you, just as you did during World War II and in fact as have those who have gone before you since the Coast Guard was founded in August 1790. "Semper Paratus"—Always Ready. You have been, and are, living up to your motto.

Let Us Avail Ourselves of the 7-Mill-Per-Kilowatt-Hour Electric Power Now on Hand—Let Our Endless Supply of Cheap, Never-Failing Alabama Power Attract More Industries to Our State, Modernize Our Rural Homes, and Light Up Every Farm in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, in my long service in this House there is probably no bill to which my colleagues—without regard to sectionalism or party differences—annually give a greater measure of thought, time, study, and effort than they bestow upon the matter of electrifying the farm homes in these United States.

I have given wholehearted support to every appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration that has ever come before this House. I am desirous of again joining hands with my colleagues. I want to place at the disposal of the Rural Electrification Administrator every last dollar he needs to enable him economically, efficiently and with dispatch to distribute the wonderous magic of electric power to all the people on our farms.

Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a telegram pertinent to increasing the amount budgeted by the President for the uses of REA this coming fiscal year.

President Truman recommended an appropriation in the amount of $250,000,000 for expanding the rural electrification program for 1948. Additionally thereto was the sum of $5,600,000 for this year's administration, making a total of $255,600,000.

The bill before the House provides $225,000,000 and the further sum of $4,000,000 for administration, making a total of $229,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and I am also in favor of the substitute amendment to be offered by that great exponent of governmentally distributed power by the TVA and REA, our own beloved gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] provides:

On page 61, line 3, strike out "$4,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,600,000" and on page 61, line 6, strike out "$225,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000,000."

The substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], provides:

On page 61, line 3, strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$5,600,000," and in line 6 strike out "$225,000,000" and insert "$300,000,000."

Mr. Speaker, I want my collegues to know I am supporting both the original and the substitute amendments thereto but I want the RECORD to show that I am far more favorable to the Rankin substitute—providing for a $300,000,000 appropriation for REA rather than the $225,000,000 as carried in the Agricultural appropriations bill as reported from out of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I want my collegaues to join me in the support of an appropriation for rural electrification of every last dollar needful and necessary to carry that program forward on the greatest possible scale within the coming fiscal year.

The telegram to which I have hitherto referred came to me from some of the most distinguished rural electrification managers that we have in the State of Alabama. These are men known for their devotion and zeal to this program not alone in my State but throughout the United States of America.

These telegrams are short. I am going to read them to you. They are as follows:

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

At a conference of the Alabama REA managers held at Montgomery, Ala., today they unanimously adopted a resolution, requesting said resolution be sent to each Alabama Representative strenuously urging the loan fund for the fiscal year 1948 cut by the House Committee be increased to $361,000,000.

This amount is considered imperative to meet current commitments in this area. Also urge that the administrative budget be increased to assure the necessary service to cooperatives.

BASIL THOMPSON,
B. L. WOODHAM,
J. A. DAVIDSON,
A. B. ROBERTSON.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Washington, D. C.:

This REA cooperative has signed applications pending since 1944 requiring 242 miles of line, urge your support on appropriation in amount of $361,000,000 for fiscal year 1948 to insure sufficient funds for rural electfication. Farmers getting impatient in delays.

W. C. WINGARD,
Manager, Central Alabama Electric Cooperative, Prattville, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, I urge upon you and every colleague in this House to give due thought and consideration to the requests made by these gentlemen. I am confident that they are grounded in sincerity of purpose and in truth. They were sent to this body in order to extend the benefits of the REA Act established by this House.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to know that very shortly will go to the President's desk—and for his signature—a bill which passed this House by an overwhelming vote some 6 weeks ago, a bill which reduces the cost of the operation of the Government in this fiscal year by some three to five billion dollars, a bill which is going to prove the equivalent of giving at least a 5 percent raise in pay to every wage earner, not alone in Alabama but in these United States, beginning July 1.

These savings to the American people will be effected by virtue of reducing the amount of the withholding and income taxes now deducted from the weekly or monthly pay envelopes or the pay checks handed to the workers at regular pay periods.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriation by this House for rural electrification does not primarily come in the category of governmental expense except with respect to a small percentage of the total annually allotted for the administration of the act.

Every dollar which we appropriate is put out to our farmers on an interest-bearing basis.

The farmers of America in the full dignity of their integrity, their character, and their ability, back the notes and other guaranties which they hand the Rural Electrification Administrator as security for every last dollar of appropriation made their co-op out of the appropriations made by this Congress.

Thus the Rural Electrification program is a sustaining program. The money borrowed is all paid back to the Government—and with interest.

The history of defaults by rural electrification co-ops are microscopic. Never in the long history of finance—public or private—has such a minima of loss attended the advancement of funds now totaling upwards of a billion dollars.

The Congress of these United States can be justly proud of the Rural Electrification Act, the funds of which fostered and enriched this magnificent Nationwide project to light up the farm homes of America.

Mr. Speaker, upon receipt of the telegrams from the good people of Alabama I sought out the report that came from the Appropriations Committee of the House to this, the Committee of the Whole House.

Particularly did I concern myself with a study of the report made by the Honorable EVERETT DIRKSEN, chairman, and his subcommittee on the REA appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN and his committee deserve the unstinted praise and unanimous vote of thanks from this body for the splendid work which they have been carrying on day after day, week after week, month after month, and frequently into the long hours of the night, on their committee assignment and in our behalf.

The records of the hearing by that committee covers upward of 3,000 pages of closely written testimony. They pictorialize the calm judicial procedure which the committee followed in their fact-finding studies and in their interrogations of hundreds of witnesses charged with the administration of these funds.

The records exhibit the kindness, the understanding, the tolerance, the frankness, yes, and even firmness of the chairman and his fellow committeemen in their endeavor to discover ways and means by virtue of which every last vestige of waste, of inefficiency, or unnecessary expenditures, could be cured, corrected, or abated by way of the appropriation of funds.

The chairman pointed out to the Rural Electrification Administrator, while he was testifying, some of the many pitfalls which might well be avoided in order to retain to the farmers of our country the benefits of rural electrification as declared by Congress to be its purpose in enacting enabling legislation.

The reports of this hearing disclose that Mr. DIRKSEN, in addressing Mr. Wickard to these pitfalls, spoke in part as follows:

Now, I think the one force that could destroy and impair the Rural Electrification Administration more than anything else, would be administrative incapacity and administrative ineptitude. In other words, a person does not have the qualifications that are requisite to discharge the responsibilities that are his, and I think it is very appropriate, since you are asking us here for $250,000,000, plus $5,000,000 plus for administrative expenses—to take a look at your personnel.

What followed was a free, frank, candid, and honest discussion with respect to the salaries of many officials in the administration—currently paid as much as $10,000 a year for work done for the Rural Electrification Administration.

Then followed further remarks appropriate to the following subjects: The Availability of Material, Available Costs of Installation Per Mile of Line, the Extent of Responsibility of the Rural Electrification Administration After the Completion of the Project, the Requirements for Additions to Existing Lines, the Number of Employees in Rural Electrification Administration, the Consideration of Political Activities in Rural Electrification Administration, the Qualifications of Certain Personnel, the Total Amount of Funds Allotted Since Inception, the Amount of Uncollectible Loans, Questionable Accounts, and the Construction of Power Plants, and so forth.

Page upon page of these records give true report of every word spoken in the long hearings held during the last 3 months. They bespeak the endless hours spent in the hearings as well as in the preparation of the reports made to this, the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker, the question of the construction of power plants was a question of seemingly great interest to Mr. Dirksen's committee. What follows are but few of the high lights extracted from the questions and answers which passed between the Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN, Representative to the Congress from the First District of Minnesota, and Mr. Claude R. Wickard, Rural Electrification Administrator, while the latter was testifying before the committee:

Mr. ANDERSEN. I would like, Mr. Wickard, to add to the points which the chairman stated as possible points which might injure the Rural Electrification Administration in the future one more point, and that is unnecessary competition with private business.

I am getting back into the very same subject we discussed last year, and I wish you would give me, for the record, your attitude toward constructing power plants. Just how closely do you pass upon the need for these particular plants? You do pass upon the feasibility of any proposal for any such plant; do you not?

Mr. WICKARD. We not only pass on the feasibility, Mr. Congressman, we pass upon the desirability from the standpoint of improving the service or giving a cheaper cost of service to the people who will get electricity from that plant. Of course, we always have in mind that we never have enough money for distribution lines. Therefore, we prefer to put our funds in distribution lines, but whenever it is necessary to get power, as it is in so many cases, in order to give adequate service or to build further distribution lines, we then consider putting in a generation plant.

In a number of instances, we have put them in because the power costs of the commercial power suppliers seemed to be unnecessarily high. In a great number of instances all we had to do was to talk about putting in a generation plant, and that enabled the cooperatives to get a much more favorable rate, better quantities of delivery, and more satisfactory service from the power companies.

The project to which you refer was turned down, as I recall, because we found that we could buy the power there as cheaply as we could erect the plant, and whenever we find that we can buy it as cheap, and get an adequate source of power, we do not make the loan.

Mr. ANDERSEN. I think you did perfectly right in that particular case. But, generalizing, you do not approve any generating plant where you can obtain, or, rather where that association can obtain, from private power sources, the energy they need at a reasonable price?

Mr. WICKARD. No, sir.

Mr. ANDERSEN. You are very careful on that point?

Mr. WICKARD. Yes, sir. And we have been criticized, as you may know, by some of the cooperatives and some of the farm people, because we have not made more loans for generation, but we are trying——

Mr. ANDERSEN. On that point, Mr. Wickard, I think the committee realizes that it is up to this committee, in some cases, to save some of these Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives from their overenthusiasm.

Mr. WICKARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDERSEN. But if they can obtain, at a reasonable price, the energy from private sources, you do not, and would not, approve any such applications for a generating plant?

Mr. WICKARD. No; we do not.

Mr. ANDERSEN. But in the meantime, we are using up millions of dollars of loan authorization money that, in my opinion, could be much better—every cent of it—applied to regions where thousands of farmers are begging for extensions and for which funds are not available.

I am just bringing out this situation, gentlemen, as an example of what, in my opinion, should not be permitted anywhere throughout the United States. I do not think that any of the loan funds should be permitted to be allocated to do other than what the basic act is supposed to do, and that is to bring electric energy to the farmer who has not before this had it. This is my contention.

Gentlemen, I may state here that my own farm, which is my home, in Minnesota, is served by the Rural Electrification Administration, and certainly I feel that it is of immense benefit to agriculture.

It is because of that belief I am personally trying to keep, as is Mr. DIRKSEN, the Rural Electrification Administration from going down tangents, perhaps, and roads, perhaps, along which it has no business going. I want to see this money spent where it is supposed to be spent, and I would like your assurance that that is what you are working toward, Mr. Wickard.

Mr. WICKARD. It is.

Mr. Speaker, there are many of us here in this House who have been critical of Administrator Wickard's attitude toward the use of funds for building generating stations. I want you to note that Mr. Wickard stated in no ambiguous terms—when testifying before Mr. DIRKSEN'S committee—that he is going to live within the act with respect to the building of generating stations in areas in which there are ample quantities of reasonable priced power available. Mr. Speaker, in the southern part of Alabama the rate for power is now but 7 mills—less than three-quarters of a cent—per kilowatt-hour.

The question of building generating plants in such areas where ample quantities of "business-managed public power" is available has been a very moot problem in my own State of Alabama.

The Alabama delegation to Congress have heard a great deal of criticism levied with respect to the idea of building a generating plant in the last several months.

I am happy to note that the question of urging the building of power plants, where not necessary, is not altogether confined to the State of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally in favor of building such generating plants in any area where there is not sufficient power available, or where there is no existent source of central public power, or where the local farmers cannot secure reasonable rates for their power requirements from business-managed public power companies, but I am compelled to feel that we should live within the law as it is written on the books.

Furthermore, I feel that this House must give serious and weighty consideration to the recommendations made by the Committee on Rural Electrification, wherein they reported:

A condition is arising in the rural-electrification field which merits the attention of Congress, and particularly the legislative committee which has jurisdiction over REA matters. It relates to the construction of generating facilities in those areas where an adequate power supply now exists.

If REA undertakes to duplicate such facilities, it is likely to develop a condition under which the cooperatives which obligate themselves for such facilities, as well as the private utilities operating in the same field, may experience difficulty in operating on a pay-in basis, and no good purpose could be served by such a condition.

The committee wishes to point out that if a duplication of unnecessary facilities should develop it will affect the real payment capacity of cooperatives as well as the return to existing utilities on capital investment and might ultimately produce the same condition which developed in the transportation industry resulting in tremendous losses to innocent holders of securities.

Mr. Speaker, we in Alabama do not need any new generating plants. What we do want is a plentitude of funds that will light up our farm homes in Alabama.

It is a sad commentary on our State that with worlds of power available to us from the great Tennessee Valley Authority on the north, that with vast quantities of power available from lines entering our State from the Gulf Power Co. on the south, that with our own Alabama Power Co., for want of new consumers, 13 times as much power as would be required to service our co-ops in Alabama is now being exported across State lines into 5 neighboring States.

Mr. Speaker, what we in Alabama need is not more generating stations, what we need is to build more REA co-op pole lines; string more wires through our counties, install more switches, more transformers, and distribute the amazing quantities of cheap Alabama power, now available, to every rural town, factory, and farm in our State.

The Late Honorable Fred Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, along with Members of the House I attended the funeral of our beloved colleague, Fred Bradley, a most distinguished Member of the House. At such a time words fail to express our feelings, but I want to include the thought from the Presque Isle County Advance of Rogers City, Mich., of those who knew him best:

FRED CAME HOME TODAY BY PLANE

Yes, that is what Rogers City folks said, Fred came home by plane. They remembered how Fred, not Congressman Bradley, used to buzz the local housetops with his first little plane until we local folks cussed him out, just as he would do when we incurred his displeasure.

They remembered how he liked to come down Rogers City's short main street, where traffic moves leisurely, dressed in rough tweeds, jaunty cap and even coveralls, yelling across at whoever he might see, "How's fishing out on Trout River since we put in the dam?" or "Has the duck flight started yet?" "Hello, you son-of-a-gun, what's going on tonight?"

Washington, yes and Detroit, and London, and Moscow, all will call attention to his passing. He was the fellow who put the small town, where the train backs in, on the map of the world. They too will tell, but in their other words, that Fred came home to Rogers City, and by his favorite transportation, by air.

How did he vote on a certain piece of legislation? Maybe folks don't remember. But they do remember that the boys he appointed to the Government Academies from the Eleventh District of Michigan were never appointed for political reasons.

Was he a prewar isolationist? We forgot long ago, but he was 100-percent American and he always voted that way, regardless of party.

Today at 2 o'clock the town was quiet. Window shades on the town's little stores were drawn and the main street was deserted. Fred had come by plane and the local folks were down at the church on the corner seeing Fred off on his last flight. They were not thinking about Congressman Bradley, his

political record, or his faults. Those things we know, better than the folks in Washington or elsewhere.

They were paying their last respects to Fred, the fellow who mingled with, and liked his fellow men in all walks of life. It might have been said that he was born with a silver spoon in his mouth, to quote that old adage, but that never changed him.

Happy landing, Fred.

It is only fair to say that the above is not our own.

It is an expression of another, and as we read it over we wonder if it might not well come, not from one individual in our community, but from a good many of us who might, if we had the opportunity, say just about the same thing. It seems typical of how many a chap in Rogers City might feel at this time when Fred Bradley has passed from among us.

FUNERAL SERVICES HELD WEDNESDAY AT WESTMINSTER—REPRESENTATIVES OF DISTRICT, STATE, AND NATION WERE HERE TO ATTEND LAST RITES

Congressman Fred Bradley died unexpectedly at New London, Conn., late Saturday afternoon. He suffered a heart attack while visiting the Coast Guard Academy as a member of a congressional committee, becoming ill in an officers' room and died a short time later in the infirmary.

Word of his death reached Rogers City a short time after his passing when a dispatch came to the Advance and the radio carried an announcement of his death early in the evening. His death, at the age of 49, came as a shock to many of his friends here.

Mrs. Bradley was at Norfolk, Va., in company with Mrs. Karl LeCompte and Mrs. Alvin Freeland, attending the launching of the new steamship *Ulysses*, largest tanker afloat, at the time of Mr. Bradley's death. News of his death did not reach her until late in the evening, after which the party drove all night to her home in Washington.

Mr. Bradley was, of course, well known to all of us. He was serving his fifth term in Congress and had reached a position of influence which probably no Representative of the Eleventh District had ever attained. He was chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, one of the most important committees, especially to this district, in Congress.

Frederick Van Ness Bradley was born in Chicago April 12, 1898. He came here with his father, Carl D. Bradley, about 1911, when the elder Mr. Bradley assumed the presidency of the Michigan Limestone & Chemical Co. His father was an executive of unusual ability and a man who took a great personal interest in Rogers City and Rogers City people. His memory is revered by all who knew him.

Fred grew up in ideal surroundings. He attended the public schools and later went to the Montclair Academy in New Jersey, and was graduated from Cornell with a bachelor of arts degree. He was married to Marie Hillage, of Front Royal, Va., in 1922, and Mr. and Mrs. Bradley came to Rogers City to make their home, Mr. Bradley being employed as purchasing agent for the Michigan Limestone & Chemical Co. and the Bradley Transportation Co.

Following his father's death, he resigned and ran for Congress. His youth, ability, and dynamic campaign appealed to the voters. He was intensely interested in air travel and campaigned the big district with his plane. He was well to do, a fact often a handicap to a candidate, but he disdained any camouflage, inspired a Republican organization at low ebb, and was elected in November of 1938 over a New Deal candidate.

He was a veteran of World War I. Prior to World War II he opposed some preparedness measures, although he aided materially in building up the air forces.

He urged the development of Great Lakes waterways, and, when war came, worked to enlarge the wartime shipping industry on the Great Lakes, contending that greater protection existed on the Great Lakes than in ocean ports. He waged a vigorous campaign for the fortification of the Soo locks, terming them America's No. 1 air target. It was due to his efforts that the locks were given protection.

He had an almost complete anti-New Deal record during the Roosevelt administration and was, before the war, considered an isolationist, although strong for national defense.

Despite his staunch Republican stand on most issues, Mr. Bradley once took General Motors Corp. to task for making a whipping boy out of OPA, and blamed the corporation for boosting its car prices in 1945.

In recent labor-relations debates in the House, he took the view that the Government should get out of the business of settling strikes and leave labor disputes to union and employers.

Fred owned his own plane for a number of years but later turned his attention more to his work in connection with the Lakes. He had his own yacht and spent a good deal of the summer in Rogers City and at Munising. Mr. and Mrs. Bradley also owned a summer home at Grand Lake. Recently he sold his home in Rogers City but had planned, on retirement, to return to Rogers City and build a home on the site of the Bradley farm.

Congressman Bradley was laid to rest Wednesday afternoon in the Rogers City Memorial Park beside the body of his only son. Mr. and Mrs. Bradley had but one child. The little one, named after his grandfather Carl D., died in 1933 at the age of 2 years.

Mr. Bradley was a member of the board of visitors of the United States Coast Guard Academy and Coast Guard planes provided transportation in connection with the funeral. His body was flown to Alpena Tuesday. With him were Mrs. Bradley, her sister Mrs. A. D. Cone and Mr. Cone, her brother H. G. Hillage, of Front Royal, Va., House Sergeant at Arms Wm. Russell, Admiral Jos. Farley of the United States Coast Guard, Comdr. C. D. Olson and Lt. Comdr. Bender, of New London.

Another plane brought the congressional delegation, Congressmen JOHN D. DINGELL, BARTEL J. JONKMAN, and PAUL SHAFER, of Michigan, and Congressmen GEORGE W. GILLIE and ROBERT GRANT, of Indiana. They were accompanied by Assistant Sergeant at Arms Zeak Johnson. Wednesday morning this congressional delegation was joined by Congressman AL WEICHEL, of Ohio, ranking member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

The planes were met at Alpena by I. L. Clymer, president of the Michigan Limestone & Chemical Co. and a delegation of Rogers City citizens. An Alpena delegation and an honorary guard of State police were at the airport. Mr. Bradley's body was brought to Rogers City to the chapel of the Shirtum-Ruggles funeral home to remain until the services.

The House, out of respect to Mr. Bradley's memory, met and adjourned Monday without transacting any business.

A prayer service at the Shirtum-Ruggles funeral chapel at 2 o'clock Wednesday afternoon was followed by a church service at 2:30 at the Westminster Community Church. Rev. J. L. Kennedy, of Mount Clemens, former Rogers City pastor, assisted by Rev. William Lichau, officiated at the services. The Westminster Presbyterian Community Church was built during the lifetime of Mr. Bradley's father and largely through his efforts and with his financial assistance, and stands as a monument to the members of the Bradley family.

With flags at half-mast, all business places and the schools closed during the hours of the funeral service. The plant of the Michigan Limestone & Chemical Co. closed at noon until 5 o'clock to allow employees, many of whom were close friends of Mr. Bradley, to attend the services.

The Coast Guard ice breaker *Mackinaw* reported at Calcite at 4 o'clock and remained until Wednesday evening while personnel from the ship attended the services.

Governor Sigler, unable to be present because of a conference with Canadian officials in Sarnia, sent his personal secretary, George W. Averill, as his representative.

Among family members and close personal friends were Mr. Bradley's brother, Ballard Bradley and Mrs. Bradley, of Chicago; John G. Munson, former president of the M. L. & C. Co. and now vice president of United States Steel Corp.; J. M. Crans, of Buffalo; Mr. and Mrs. Lee Hinslea, of Cleveland; and Guy LaBounty, who lately has been associated with Mr. Bradley in Washington.

Mrs. Ann Cook and Al Christopherson, Mr. Bradley's secretaries, arrived from Washington late Tuesday. Elbert Brenner, of Kalamazoo; Rice Fowler, of Charlotte; Merl K. Hopper, vice commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Michigan department, arrived Wednesday morning.

Planes were to leave Lansing Wednesday morning bringing Floyd Evans; Representative Hugo Nelson, of Indian River; and Representative Emil Peltz, Representative George Knox, of the Soo; and Representative George Gerbach, of the UP; together with Governor Sigler's personal secretary, George Averill. All planes were grounded Wednesday morning, so the men left with State police escort and arrived here in time for the afternoon services.

Many friends and associates of Mr. Bradley from surrounding sections, particularly in this congressional district, and local friends and residents, filled the church beyond capacity. Amid beautiful floral tributes and in the presence of his friends, Fred Bradley was carried to his last resting place. His pallbearers were Harold Terry, Roy Dueltgen, Charles Hoffman, Capt. F. F. Pearse, A. D. Cone, and Guy LaBounty.

Honorary pallbearers were Admiral Joseph Farley, Commodore J. A. Hirchfield, Commander Carl B. Olsen, and Commander Chester Bender.

Checking Hollywood's Termite Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Los Angeles Times on June 1. In view of the pending investigation of Communist infiltration in the film industry I believe that this editorial by Kyle Palmer, Times political editor, is most timely and constructive. The editorial follows:

CHECKING HOLLYWOOD'S TERMITE TROUBLE

(By Kyle Palmer)

The job of exposing Communists occupying positions of influence in the motion-picture industry—as contemplated by the House Un-American Activities Committee—is overdue. It should have the wholehearted support of all good citizens inside and outside the picture business.

It is a job, nevertheless, to be undertaken not only with zeal and thoroughness but also with intelligence and integrity.

Results from the undertaking should be judged on the basis of actual Reds identified and exposed rather than from the standpoint of the furore which the search inspires.

THE WRONG WAY

Taking Hollywood apart to see what makes it tick or knocking around a lot of famous film noggins as a diversion incidental to a congressional inquiry will serve no good purpose and, in the end, will harm the innocent and find the industry's genuine subversives undismayed and snugly undisturbed.

Obviously, if the real enemies of our governmental forms are to be brought to book, results of the committee's investigations should not wind up either as a whitewash of the guilty few or as a smear of the guiltless many.

Communists among actors, directors, writers, and others responsible for the content of motion pictures represent an active menace. Also they represent a minority in the motion-picture business.

THE IMPORTANT TASK

And these foes of American conceptions of liberty and justice have, according to individual aptitude, opportunity, and inclination, used or attempted to use motion pictures as a medium for the promulgation of doctrines inimical to the people of the United States and designed to be helpful to the purposes of communism.

Caught in such enterprises during the strains and stresses of war, these persons could be convicted of treason. They are not less traitorous in an era of peace which embraces some of the aspects of military conflict.

Discovering what the home-grown Reds may have accomplished in the way of subverting the films is important, but far more important is the task and the obligation of pinning the Communist label on those who should be made to wear it.

Hearsay, innuendo, suspicion, and even circumstantial evidence will have little effect in disclosing the real intent or in revealing the actual practices of men and women whose only hope of success as Communist agents has depended upon their skill in concealment, duplicity, and anonymity.

WHERE THE FACTS ARE

Cold, hard, inescapable, and incontrovertible facts should—and will—determine the issue in each case.

The facts are available.

In the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are reliable and carefully scrutinized records which set forth the precise status of American citizens and aliens who are members of the Communist Party in the United States, who supply the party with funds, who associate with Communists, and who by one means or another manage to give aid and comfort to the Communist cause.

Such records can be made available to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Doubtless the personal testimony of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover would be enlightening, profitable, and conclusive in a majority of instances.

In addition, the congressional investigators will be confronted with mountains of prejudiced or unverifiable or trivial or wholly mischievous declarations and affirmations.

NO ROMAN HOLIDAY

Too much is at stake here to permit this situation to degenerate into a Roman holiday.

A motion-picture personality is a lodestone which draws the attention of the curious, the envious, the hero-worshiper, and the character assassin. And no screen drama will stir more interest or arouse greater clamor for front-row seats than a parade of such personalities before a congressional inquisitorial body.

The committee should entertain no qualms in exposing Communist affiliations of the most glamorous star; should have no hesitancy in pillorying the Red proclivities of writer or actor— provided the facts justify the procedure. And by the same measure of dispassionate judgment it should protect both itself and those it scrutinizes from the injustice of hasty or biased or ill-considered conclusions.

ADVICE TO COMMITTEE

In undertaking to single out individuals who have become, in fact, the enemies of this country, the House committee has assumed a heavy responsibility which should not in any respect become involved in politics or partisanship.

From start to finish every committee session, every comment by committee members, every word uttered by witnesses, every written statement submitted, will be challenged and derided by the Communist claque.

Fully realizing the consequences of a sound and substantial exposé of Communists and Communistic scheming in the film industry, Red leaders will extend themselves to misrepresent the committee's motives and to discredit the committee's findings.

Inevitably there will be hot competition for favorable press reaction and for the eventual and final decision of popular opinion.

Members of the House serving on this committee should exercise the greatest care in avoiding any act or utterance which can or could be twisted or turned to the Reds' advantage.

JOHNSTON'S PROMISE

Generally speaking, non-Communist members of the motion picture industry will regard the prospect of an ordeal. But this issue of Red influence in the films has gone too far and aroused too much uncertainty and downright anxiety. The motion picture household should be renovated and the atmosphere of filmland should be cleared.

Most of the responsible leaders of the industry are prepared to see the matter through to its logical conclusion.

As spokesman for the studios, Eric Johnston, president of the Association of Motion Picture Producers and Distributors, acknowledges the presence of Communists in the industry, "as in other American industries," and promising full cooperation in efforts of Congress to learn the facts, asks only that the investigation be fair, dignified, and objective.

In other words, what Johnston requests for his people—and what he and they are entitled to—is a bona fide Red hunt and not a political witch hunt.

SEEKING MOTIVES

Perhaps, among other things, a sincere and capable probing of Red influences and Red projects in one of the Nation's most important economic, cultural, and artistic activities may throw some light on why an actor or a writer or a director receiving anywhere from $1,000 to $5,000 a week is hellbent to destroy the system that places him in such a favored position.

My own theory has been and is in a few specific instances that he, or she, may possess skills and artistic capacities that are unrelated to intellectual maturity. Such as these are Alices in a Red Wonderland, blissfully associating with the Mad Hatters, the March Hares, the Walruses and other denizens of the topsy-turvy land of communism with no comprehension of reality.

This specimen of Red sympathizer is dangerous only to the extent of his or her secondary value, represented usually in fronting for Communist objectives or supplying finances.

THE ULTIMATE HOPE

There are others, of course, who are fully aware both of their sinister affiliations and of the destructive goals toward which they strive. Not by accident, delusion or betrayal are these real enemies of our system persuaded to engage in their subversive roles.

Political expediency which dictated the policies of the national Democratic administration until fairly recent times prevented an honest and an effective drive on Communists in Government, in labor unions and in the motion-picture industry.

It may be that a new concept of political expediency now prompts the administration to throw that policy into reverse.

But the House Un-American Activities Committee, being controlled by a Republican majority, is not subject to such influences, pro or con. The committee has a grave duty and a great opportunity. It should hew to the line of that duty and fully measure up to that opportunity.

In any event one may pardonably indulge a hope that the praiseworthy efforts of the Congressmen to rid the industry of a few termites won't prompt the inquisitors to set a torch to the entire establishment.

Equality for Veterans—Terminal-Leave Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Herald, Grand Rapids, Mich., of May 26, 1947, endorsing the proposed bill providing that terminal-leave bonds be made negotiable:

EQUALITY FOR VETERANS

A proposal to make veterans' terminal leave pay bonds negotiable, under conditions which would protect the veterans' interests, has been made by Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS of Florida. As he has outlined his plan, it seems to have a great deal of merit and no objectionable features.

Even though the terminal leave pay bill adjusted some of the inequities, it still discriminated against the enlisted men and women who were unable to use up their furlough time while on active duty. Had they taken it they would have been paid in cash. Under the law as it now stands they hold bonds which are not negotiable, may not be cashed for 5 years after discharge, and bear 2½ percent interest. In the long run, the holders of these bonds cannot lose and actually gain a fair rate of interest.

The bill was unfair only in that one group, the enlisted men and women who were paid in cash when they took their furloughs, and the officers who received their accrued-leave pay at separation centers, was treated in one way, and the other group of enlisted personnel was treated in another way.

Budget difficulties, however, made it impracticable for the Government to pay all of them a lump sum.

Representative ROGERS' plan gets around that. He would permit the veterans to sell their bonds, for not less than face value plus accrued interest. The Government would not cash them until they mature. Banks and other investors, he believes, would be glad to buy them, possibly at a premium. They are a good investment.

It is to be hoped that veterans now holding the bonds will look long and hard at their gilt-edged investments before cashing them for frivolous spending. But at least they should have the option of using their money when they want to and as they want to.

Split Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 31, 1947, entitled "Split Income Taxes," and an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of June 1, 1947, entitled "Saving Us Money."

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of May 31, 1947]

SPLIT INCOME TAXES

The State senate has passed a bill aimed at reducing the amount of income taxes married couples in the higher income brackets would have to pay to the Federal Government.

This bill, if it becomes law, will give Pennsylvania married couples the same tax advantages enjoyed by families in nine other States and the Territory of Hawaii, where community property acts have long been sustained by the courts as a State's right.

Under these acts, family income is treated as belonging to and indivisible between husband and wife, even though the entire income is earned by only one of them. In filing Federal tax returns, husband and wife file for only half the total income. Such a division keeps the income out of a high percentage bracket. Where the family income is around $3,000 or less there is no appreciable difference between the taxes on a joint return or on separate husband and wife returns. In the higher income brackets, however, this law can mean a considerable saving to taxpayers.

It is only reasonable for the taxpayers of Pennsylvania, or any other noncommunity-property State, to seek the same tax advantages as those enjoyed by the residents of Arizona, California, Idaho, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Washington, and Hawaii. Until Congress eliminates this inequality, still other States probably will seek legislation such as that approved by the Pennsylvania senate on Tuesday.

Unfortunately, Congress isn't yet ready to equalize this situation. On Tuesday the Senate beat by a decisive vote an amendment to the tax-reduction bill which would have permitted married couples in all States to split their income for tax purposes.

Apparently there will be no action before next year, when Congress considers the next general tax revision bill. That means another year of unfair burden. Meanwhile, the action of the Pennsylvania senate points up the necessity for a uniform law. While Congress procrastinates, other States probably will seek community property laws.

Congress must do one of two things. It must permit married couples in all States to split their incomes for tax purposes, or make joint returns mandatory, as requested several times by the Treasury Department.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of June 1, 1947]

"SAVING" US MONEY

By a straight-party vote, the State senate has passed a bill which would make Pennsylvania a community-property State.

That means that whatever a husband's income, his wife would hold legal title to half of it.

The purpose of the bill is obvious—and admitted by its sponsors. It would save Pennsylvania residents millions of dollars in their annual income-tax payments to the Federal Government.

Since half a man's income would belong to his wife, she would be required to pay an income tax on it. This would mean twice as much paperwork in a family. But it would mean a large saving in a family's income-tax payment, particularly in case of substantial incomes.

The savings in tax payments would come about because splitting the income-tax returns would put both taxpayers (husband and wife) in lower brackets.

Democratic members of the senate unanimously were against the bill, sponsored by Senator John W. Lord, a Philadelphia lawyer.

Senator John H. Dent, the Democratic leader, offered this pertinent objection to the bill:

"We can't keep sniping at Federal income, ask for more services, and then want Federal tax reductions. This legislation comes with bad grace from a State which is raising its own taxes."

Senator Dent's remarks are well taken.

The community-property system, as applied to Federal income taxes, is unfair. It saves money for taxpayers in the community-property States. But the effect of it is to make other taxpayers pay more.

The effect of community-property laws on Federal income taxes is the fault of Congress, not the States which have enacted these laws.

Already, nine States have such laws. They have been in effect for many years in Arizona, California, Idaho, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Washington.

In these States, married taxpayers save millions of dollars. Taxpayers in other States make up this loss of revenue to the Federal Government.

But if it is fair in these nine States, why isn't it fair in Pennsylvania? And in the 38 other States.

Congress ought to write the tax laws so they apply equally to all taxpayers, whether they live in community-property States or not.

Every time this has been suggested, however, the lawmakers in Congress from the community-property States have raised such a howl that Congress shied away from the idea.

O. K., then, Congress. If you won't fix up the loophole in the law, why shouldn't the rest of us take advantage of it? Maybe if the house of representatives in Harrisburg will pass the senate bill, Congress will wake up and do something about this invidious situation.

Golden Gate Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of San Francisco not only realize the importance of the Golden Gate Bridge to the national security and the Pacific coast, but also to our national peacetime economy.

The Golden Gate Bridge is far more than just another bridge spanning a stretch of water. It is an artery in the life flow of commerce between the great international seaport city of San Francisco, the huge Central Valley, the redwood empire and the great Northwest. During a national emergency, as was proven in the recent war, it is an artery of supreme importance to national defense.

Mr. Speaker, under permission extended to me, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco News, commemorating the tenth anniversary of the opening of that world-famous bridge:

TWO BRIDGE BUILDERS

The tenth anniversary of the Golden Gate Bridge should not pass without full recognition of the contribution two citizens made to its successful completion—Congressman RICHARD J. WELCH and Engineer Joseph B. Strauss.

Originally, as city supervisor of San Francisco, Mr. WELCH introduced the resolution that started the great project on its way—a way that led through a long and arduous maze of legislative, judicial, and executive authorities to the final go signal. DICK WELCH fought doggedly and with real statesmanship to carry the dream to reality in that respect.

The engineering dream was in the ingenious mind of Joe Strauss. Against strong technical opposition he insisted the structure could be built successfully. And build it he did by rising triumphantly above every obstacle. The majestic span ever will stand as a magnificent monument to his daring and imagination.

These two men, above all others—the first still serving his district and his country, the second now gone to his just reward—these two men deserve the highest credit for undertaking and completing what many of their fellow citizens said was the impossible.

The Potato Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday this body passed House Resolutions 166 authorizing and directing the Committee on Agriculture to undertake an investigation of the potato surplus, also to study the feasibility of encouraging the manufacture of potatoes into potato flour and culture with the thought that it could be used in the production of bread and other bakery products. This is a program with which I am thoroughly in accord. I have had a personal experience over a number of years with using potato flour in making bread and have found that by substituting 4 percent potato flour for the same amount of wheat flour, a better-keeping loaf of bread, better flavored, and more nutritious bread is produced. The better-keeping quality cuts down the amount of stale returns to the commercial baker, and, I believe, proves a real saving to the consumer. Through the proper appeal to the baking industry and the people throughout the United States, urging their assistance in this program, I am convinced that there would be a great market for potato flour which would lend to using the surplus potatoes in a beneficial way.

It has appeared that during the last number of years the policy of the Federal

Government has been to support, destroy, and waste farm products in a futile effort to bring about prosperity. It has tried to regulate production and govern the amount of crops grown. This can never be done successfully as there are unpredictable factors of Mother Nature which are constantly changing the output over successive years. It is time that Americans learn that prosperity can never be attained through waste of essential foods while people in our own country are starving and other countries are looking to us for world leadership and support.

Consequently, I am thoroughly opposed to having the Federal Government subsidize this advertising and manufacturing program for use of potato flour, for I believe it can safely be said that in many instances when the Federal Government has undertaken the operation of private enterprise the expected result has been unsatisfactory. It would seem to me to be more pertinent to encourage the now-operating potato-flour manufacturers to expand their present facilities through Federal Government lending agencies, if need be, to meet the necessary expansion demands.

Another extremely important reason for private enterprise to undertake such a program is that, because they operate on a profit basis, no great surplus of flour will be built up with future waste inevitable. Private manufacturers would employ proper advertising means to popularize the use of potato flour, thus insuring an increase in food for hungry people and cutting the waste of surplus potatoes. On the other hand, if the Federal Govern undertakes the manufacture of potato flour, it will merely be converting surplus potatoes into surplus potato flour at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers, and, having no available market without an effective program of advertising, it will find that over a period of years we will have substituted a surplus stock of potato flour for a surplus of potatoes, which again will bring about a great waste and loss to our Government.

Address at Twenty-fourth Anniversary Convention, Associated Polish Clubs of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me at Gardner, Mass., on June 1, 1947:

I am very much honored and highly privileged today to join with the Associated Polish Clubs of Massachusetts in this twenty-fourth anniversary convention.

Throughout the many years of your existence it is noteworthy that you have maintained the high ideals and standards and purposes of your organization, and I am very happy to compliment your officers and members on this occasion and to offer my hearty congratulations for your many achievements in behalf of your own people, our Commonwealth, and Nation.

I hardly think it is necessary for me to tell you of the warm feelings of friendship and admiration which I hold for the Polish people, both at home and abroad. I am sure there is not a single racial group in America that has been more faithful and loyal to the country, that has offered us better citizenship than our citizens of Polish extraction. In every crisis, our Polish-American sons have been in the vanguard of our fighting forces in every war in which our country was involved and their gallantry and valiant service has been second to none I may well add that the contributions of the Polish-Americans during peacetime have invariably been marked by the same fidelity and high order of patriotism. There is no braver, stronger, or more courageous American than the Polish-American either in peace or in war. You can be proud indeed of your heritage and contributions to America.

Because I know that your membership is vitally interested in the cause of the Polish Nation and the welfare of the Polish people overseas, I desire briefly to touch upon that great human question—that great question of human freedom. How can we possibly reconcile the present slave status of Poland with the express language of the Atlantic Charter and with the exalted phrases of the four freedoms? Here is a nation with a tradition of freedom and love of liberty running back for hundreds of years, a nation which has fought desperately throughout its whole history for its right to be free and independent. No nation and no people in the recent war sacrificed more or suffered more than the Polish Nation and the Polish people who were the first and the most pitiable victims of cruel Nazi tyranny and persecution. No nation or people was more loyal to the cause of the allies.

Is slavery to be the reward of these century-old struggles, these heroic sacrifices for our common war effort? As Americans we can never believe so, because we have faith in the sense of justice of the American people and belief in the fair-mindedness of the American Government. One of the saddest facts of the situation now confronting Poland is that our own Government consented to the arrangements, political and otherwise, which made it possible for Stalin to set up dictatorship over the Polish Nation and thus destroy the liberties of the Polish people. It is true that these commitments were made principally during the war but they were nevertheless illegal, unconstitutional, contrary to our war aims, and, therefore, not binding in any sense upon our Government.

I am convinced that these commitments are not only disapproved but deeply resented by an overwhelming majority of the American people, and I demand now once again in your presence while this convention is assembled, as I have demanded so many times before in the Congress of the United States, that the executive department of our Government, that our State Department and our Congress take immediate joint action to release the Polish people from bondage, to arrange for truly free elections which will enable them to erase the results of the scandalous, trumped-up, Russian-dictated elections that were recently held, and which would permit the Polish people to recapture their hard-won freedom. As believers in freedom ourselves, that is the very least we can do for them, and in my opinion, that is the very least that the American people should do for them, to insure absolute justice in adjudicating their claims for self-determination and national autonomy.

The situation is not encouraging at present, to be sure, and we are meeting with many obstacles in our efforts to free Poland. But the whole history of the struggle for human liberty is one of obstacles and obstruction, one of disappointments and discouragements. Let us not be dismayed and let us never give up the fight, because we are fighting for the right and in the end by God's grace and our own perseverance the right will triumph and Poland will again take her place among the nations of the earth free, independent, and democratic, her loyal, devoted, and liberty-loving people able once again to fulfill the great destiny which history has in store for them.

I want to assure you that I will continue to labor with all my heart for this cause and the cause of the oppressed and enslaved peoples throughout the world. I know that this fine organization will never cease its efforts until victory is ours, and I also know that your members will continue to embrace, defend, and sustain our American institutions and our own great nation as you have done in the past.

Armed Services Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 26, 1947:

MUCH MORE THAN A "MERGER" BILL

The so-called merger bill is turning out under close inspection to be something quite different—something much broader and more far-reaching. To put it differently: There is another, less obvious side of the bill which is neither being headlined nor discussed. And it is time the American people are told what this measure really means.

This bill does more than draw a blueprint of unified direction and better teamwork for the military and naval services. Of much deeper significance, it is a piece of basic legislation which establishes how and by whom national policy and the civilian economy shall be controlled in any prospect of war.

We have supported the general provisions of the merger, particularly coordination of foreign policy, military policy, and industrial potential. But because this bill originated in the thinking of military men, the power it assigns or permits to the military over national policy and civilian affairs is very great—much greater, we think, than the American people would knowingly choose.

Here are some of the provisions of the National Security Act which we question in this regard:

1. On the National Security Council, which should not only coordinate but also keep in balance foreign policy, military policy, and national production and resources, the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board face not only the Secretary of National Defense, but also the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The ratio thus is weighted 4 to 2 in favor of the armed forces.

2. The National Security Resources Board, an independent agency, is charged with advisory duties only and concerned with broad preparedness policy. The Munitions Board, however, is placed wholly within the Department of National Defense and staffed with top officials of the three military departments. This board is given the kind of functions which could mean actual control and direction of the civilian economy by the military in case of war, to determine

priorities, to supervise subordinate agencies, and to make recommendations to regroup, combine, or dissolve existing interservice agencies operating in the fields of procurement, production, and distribution.

3. The wording of the act not only permits, but actually encourages, interlocking directors as regards the Munitions Board, the Resources Board, and a third, the Resources and Development Board. Representatives, and perhaps the same representatives, of the military departments could dominate all three.

4. The act permits, in fact suggests, that the director of the Central Intelligence agency serving the State as well as the Defense Departments, be an officer of one of the armed forces rather than a civilian.

5. In somewhat oblique but nonetheless definite language the act perpetuates certain of the war powers of the President "notwithstanding" the expiration provisions in the laws which established them. It hands over to the Secretary of National Defense the blanket authority to assign duties, functions, and powers among the several armed services, an authority which hitherto in peacetime has traditionally rested with Congress.

We do not impute to the generals and admirals any "plot" to set up a military dictatorship. Their training and professional experience have simply made them pattern this legislation by military standards.

But if history teaches anything at all, it teaches that the military do not understand the workings of industry nor the needs of civilian economy. It teaches that the direction of top national policy must be wholly free from military domination.

What to do about this Security Act of 1947? The essential basis of the merger compromises between the armed services, perhaps should not be disturbed. But the broader objectives of the bill need study and public discussion before anything becomes law.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter received from Joseph J. Forrester, high secretary-treasurer of the Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters, enclosing a splendid and affirmative resolution adopted recently by the delegates to the sixty-seventh annual session of the order:

HIGH STANDING COMMITTEE OF
THE MASSACHUSETTS CATHOLIC
ORDER OF FORESTERS,
Boston, Mass., May 29, 1947.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: The enclosed resolution on communism was unanimously adopted by the delegates at the sixty-seventh annual session of the Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters, held May 19 and 20, 1947, at Swampscott, Mass.

The Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters is a mutual benefit society incorporated under chapter 176 of the General Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and has a membership of 38,000 composed of both men and women.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH J. FORRESTER,
High Secretary-Treasurer.

COMMUNISM

Whereas the leaders of America have at last awakened to the serious threat that Communism offers to the American way of life; and

Whereas communism is the avowed advocate of atheism and the implacable foe of religion; and

Whereas it has been clearly revealed that Communists have penetrated into all ranks of political life, of industry, and of labor; and

Whereas no union of the red fascism of Russia is possible with the democratic practices and ideals of the America we reverence and love; and

Whereas the Communist practice of infiltration has already reached an alarming stage in this our beloved country: Be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates to the sixty-seventh annual convention of the Massachusetts Catholic Order of Foresters commend our President Harry S. Truman for his forthright condemnation of Communist propaganda in our own country and in other lands; and be it further

Resolved, That we pledge to our President and to all who are allied with him in the crusade against communism, our support in every effort root out this plague which has attached itself to public and private enterprise with the intent of destroying our national unity and our democratic, American way of life; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our President Harry S. Truman and to our Senators and Representatives in Washington.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of May 31, 1947:

THE EXPERTS IN CONGRESS KNOW THEIR PUBLIC

There is no percentage in starting an argument about what the American people think about this question or that. Nobody knows for sure, including Dr. Gallup. However, this is a time when the measurement of public sentiment is supposed to be an exact science and those who trade on the swings of popular whim and fancy have to be within a small percentage of right. Otherwise they sell no iceboxes or get no votes.

Therefore it is a considerable mystery to us why so many people, on both sides of the ideological fence, seem to think Congress was flying in the face of public opinion when it passed strong labor-reform bills as opposed to weak ones. PM for example, went into a terrific dither as to why it was that, with 15,000,000 trade-union members in the country, there have been protests only from trade-union leaders. Where was the spontaneous outburst of feeling and will in every American community that would have made the Tafts and the Hartleys and their cohorts in Congress too scared ever to go back again to the folks at home? The same idea actuated conservative Senators who wanted a tough bill, but weren't so sure the country would take one.

What happened, of course, was that the Members of Congress had a pretty fair idea of how their constituents felt about curbing the power of labor leaders. Massachusetts, where the citizens of the highly unionized industrial cities voted for the Barnes bill in spite of a terrific drive by union leaders to defeat it, is not so different from the other States. The point missed by PM—and one that would not have been missed if recent polls had been studied—is that many union members have come to regard union leaders as nuisances who keep them from work. To dismiss this sentiment as NAM propaganda implies a pretty hard judgment on the intelligence of union members. Our own view is that Congress put several things into the law which might better have been left to free negotiation between the parties, and that a few amendments to the Wagner Act designed to even the balance between employer and union agent would have been preferable to this attempt to take care of so many matters by legislation. That, however, has nothing to do with the people's attitude. They back tough legislation because of their experience with strikes.

We are naive enough to think that one American is pretty much like another, and that selling a union membership in the long run isn't so different from selling a vacuum cleaner. The purchaser may keep up the payments, once he has signed the agreement, but he expects some service. If union leaders use their power to police the private opinions of their members, keep them out on the picket line when they would rather be earning full pay, and block incentive schemes which would enable members to add to their earnings, then that union is just a vacuum cleaner that won't work. The man who is compelled to belong to such an outfit will vote against such compulsion any time he gets a chance.

Anyway, this analysis seems simpler and more realistic than the left-wing view that Members of Congress have suddenly taken leave of their senses, ignored the opinions of their constituents and invited a ruthless group of labor-baiting employers to write labor laws for them. The Senators and Representatives have something to sell, too—namely, the idea of another term. The thing that was itching them was what that spontaneous outburst of feeling and will from the folks back home would do to them if they didn't do something to clip the wings of the Lewises and Petrillos. Even if it turns out that they have set up a field day for lawyers, it can't be said that they ignored public sentiment.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram of May 31, 1947:

PHONY CHARGES

For the next 2 weeks you will hear from union leaders a crescendo of charges that the Taft-Hartley labor bill is slave legislation—that it means involuntary servitude—that it would compel men to work against their will.

These charges, we believe, are completely phony.

The bill says specifically that no individual employee shall be required to work without his consent, and that it shall not be illegal for any individual to quit work.

So it could not compel anybody to work against his will.

When a number of employees stop work by mutual understanding, for the purpose of enforcing demands or protesting against the actions of an employer, that is a strike.

The bill does say—as the late President Roosevelt said—that Federal Government employees have no right to strike. It requires that they be discharged from their jobs if they do strike. But it does not compel any individual to work for the Government.

President Truman has said that jurisdictional strikes—wars between unions at the expense of employers and the public—are indefensible. The bill does make jurisdictional strikes illegal. It also outlaws strikes to force employers to pay for work not done, or to recognize unions contrary to, or in the absence of, certification from the National Labor Relations Board. It authorizes the NLRB to obtain Federal court injunctions against such strikes, but it says that no injunction shall require any individual to work without his consent.

The bill does authorize the President, acting through the Attorney General, to obtain Federal injunctions for the purpose of delaying key-industry strikes that would endanger national health or safety. Such injunctions could remain in force not longer than 80 days. If Government efforts to settle a dispute failed, and if at the end of 80 days the employees voted to reject their employer's final offer, they would be free to strike. And, at all times, they would be individually free to quit their jobs.

Where national health and safety are not at stake, the bill puts no limitation on the right of employees in private industry to strike for such basic economic reasons as wages, hours, and working conditions.

What union leaders really mean when they shout about slave legislation, is that they want no restriction whatever on the power to strike for any reason at any time. We cannot agree with them. The strike, as this country has learned, can be a deadly weapon, destructive to the rights of employers, workers, and the public. The American people want their Government to make fair rules to preserve its proper uses and prevent its abuse. That, we think, is what Congress has done in the Taft-Hartley bill.

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, in order that the ideas of the late chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House—the Honorable Fred Bradley, of Michigan—concerning the Panama Canal may be made a matter of record for future reference, it is my purpose to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD his radio broadcasts on that subject dated for release on March 24, 1947, and March 31, 1947, and his press release on the same subject dated April 10, 1947.

The broadcast of March 31 and the press release of April 10 will be published in subsequent issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That of March 24, 1947, follows:

On Thursday of this week, members of our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee's Subcommittee No. 4 on the Panama Canal, as well as other committee members, including myself, are leaving New York on the steamship *Panama* for the Canal Zone for purposes of making an official inspection of conditions down there. We will return to Washington on April 9. I believe I have previously mentioned to you that our committee has the responsibility of studying and acting on all legislation affecting the Panama Canal, and in order that our subcommittee and as many of the total membership as possible may have a first-hand knowledge of existing conditions to enable our legislating wisely, I have arranged for this inspection trip. To prepare ourselves for our visit down there and in order to familiarize ourselves particularly with the locks proper, we went to the Navy Department on Friday morning, the 14th, to look over the models of the proposed new canal and listen to an hour's lecture of indoctrination, and this past Friday we made a trip to the Navy's model basin at Carderock outside of Washington.

I believe many of you will be interested in having me give you some little history and information on the Canal proper, and outline in some detail our country's future construction program in the Zone.

The Panama Canal is a great hydraulic machine—great in the simplicity of its basic concept and in its magnitude. Although it was the dream of the ages almost from the time of Columbus, it remained for a distinguished French engineer, Adolphe Godin de Lepinay, at the Paris Congress of 1879, to propound a practical plan for building a waterway across the mountains of the Isthmus of Panama.

With the simplicity characteristic of genius, he exclaimed at the Paris Congress: "Build a dam at Gatun and another at Miraflores as near the seas as the configuration of the land permits. Let the waters rise to form two lakes about 80 feet high. The solution then becomes the joining of the lakes thus formed by cutting across the mountains and connecting the lakes with the seas by locks." That was substantially the plan for the present Canal finally adopted in 1906 when the great decision in building the high-level, lock-type canal was made. Completed in 1914, the Panama Canal remains one of the greatest works of man—a monument of constructive achievement.

The major part of the Panama Canal is a waterway 85 feet above the sea, formed by impounding the waters of the Chagres River Valley, to form the summit level which extends from Gatun locks southward across the continental divide to Pedro Miguel locks. On the Atlantic side of the divide there is Gatun Lake, 163.4 square miles in area and watershed of 1,320 square miles.

Gaillard Cut, extending from Gamboa to Pedro Miguel, joins this lake with the Pacific locks at Pedro Miguel. The Pacific end of the Canal differs radically from the Atlantic end. At the Atlantic end all locks are at Gatun in structures of three continuous lifts. The part of Gatun Lake near the Gatun locks supplies a summit level anchorage adequate for the flexible operation of these locks.

At the Pacific end there are two sets of locks separated by a small intermediate level lake 54 feet high. The Pedro Miguel lock is a single-lift lock located at the end of Gaillard cut. A two-lift lock is located at Miraflores.

Thus the canal as completed embodied an arrangement that was not symmetrical. At the time the Canal was built there was no marine operating experience upon which to base the planning. Now there is a vast storehouse of marine operating experience upon which to draw. This operating experience points unerringly to the benefits of the superiority of the arrangements at Gatun over that at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores, the locks at the Pacific end.

The traffic of the Panama Canal about 1970 will approach its present capacity. Naval vessels have become larger. The Canal is entering an era of decision. Like everything else becomes outmoded as time goes on, so, naturally, has our present lock system across the isthmus.

The question is what should be done. There is the further question of whether recent developments in warfare make the conversion of the Panama Canal to sea level mandatory. Present studies indicate that any canal wherever or however built would be vulnerable to the newest weapons of modern war. We were, indeed, fortunate during the past war that no accident or bombing took place which put those locks out of commission. Since the sole purpose of a canal is to transport vessels, the primary problem thus becomes one of securing the best canal for transiting or transporting ships. This demands a most careful analysis of the marine operating problems heretofore disclosed in navigating the present Canal.

Let me enumerate for you some of the marine operational problems facing our Government. A study of the transiting of vessels through the Panama Canal has conclusively established that the present Canal has seven principal marine operational problems which ought to be overcome in any plan for its improvement. They are:

The dangerous traffic bottleneck at the Pedro Miguel locks.

The double handling of vessels at the Pacific locks and the resulting lock accidents and loss of transit time.

The effect of fog on Canal capacity and operation.

The lockage surges in Gaillard cut caused by the operation of Pedro Miguel locks.

The present limited operating range of the Gatun Lake level (82 to 87 feet).

The navigational hazards caused by the bends and restricted channels, mainly in Galliard cut (300 feet).

To the foregoing problems, we could add others affecting marine operations, such as the regulation of the Miraflores Lake level, the control of traffic, and silting in the Pedro Miguel locks.

When speaking of the dangerous bottleneck at the Pedro Miguel locks, we recognize that the basic cause for this problem is the location of these locks squarely across the south end of a narrow cut. We have learned from experience that the location of these locks was a serious error in original design because it has created a series of operational problems; the principal of which is that we are prevented from using the Miraflores Lake as a traffic reservoir; and unsymmetrical operating conditions were created between the Atlantic and Pacific ends of the Canal, resulting in traffic-control difficulties. And so that you will appreciate to some measure why it is now imperative that our locks system at Panama be changed, I'll briefly name some additional present operational factors which contribute to the formation of this dangerous bottleneck at the Pedro Miguel locks.

The present arrangement causes a double handling of vessels at the double Pacific locks, increases the number of accidents to vessels transiting the Pacific locks, and increases the time of transit.

It endangers Pacific-bound vessels by forcing them to slow down in the Gaillard cut at a point where they are subject to cross winds and maximum surges. It causes Pacific-bound traffic to jam in a restricted channel between rocky banks when traffic schedules have become disarranged. It causes our Atlantic-bound vessels to enter Gaillard cut under adverse conditions for maneuvering. And further, it impairs the operation and reduces the capacity of the Canal during fog periods in Gaillard cut and during periods limited to one-way traffic in the cut.

I should also, at this point, acquaint you with the fact that we have been experiencing quite a number of accidents because of the dangerous nature of these Pedro Miguel locks. From January 13, 1922, to July 12,

1942—some 20 years—we had 152 accidents at the Gatun; 138 at the Pedro Miguel, and 103 accidents at the Miraflores; a total of 393. That is some 19 accidents in a year; not a very good record.

As I mentioned previously, the double handling of vessels at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores is a serious operational difficulty which is emphasized during the transit of each vessel. During the last war this factor was of special military significance because the armor plate above the gate machinery at Pedro Miguel constituted a serious hazard for aircraft carriers with extended superstructures. Not only is there grave danger of lock accidents at this lock but there is also the danger of grounding in Miraflores Lake south of the lock and then striking the banks of Gaillard cut north of it.

Then, also, the separation of the Pacific locks into two sets requires one additional approach, lockage and departure by vessels during each transit of the Pacific end of the Canal. These approaches and departures have to be conducted under unfavorable maneuvering conditions in a narrow gorge or in a small lake with shoals on both sides of the channel, which requires a more studied and cautious approach and is, therefore, more time consuming. The time lost per transit approximates 1 hour—for small vessels it is naturally less, and for larger ones, more.

The climate in this area is hot, muggy, and rainy, with the result that in this tropical climate we experience fog problems. Consequently, Gaillard cut is subject to fogs of the land-radiation type which occur about one night in three with a duration varying from 1 to 11 hours. At times they are light and at other times very dense. They, of course, are of greatest frequency and duration in the wet season and least in the dry. In 1942 there were a total of 118 fog nights reported, 8 in the dry season and 110 in the wet. Gatun locks and the adjoining anchorage in Gatun Lake are fog free, which makes it possible for our Atlantic locks to operate on a 24-hour schedule when necessary. At the Pacific end of the Canal, Miraflores locks and Lake are fog free. The southern limits of fog in Gaillard cut are in the vicinity of the Pedro Miguel locks. Hence, a vessel from the Pacific can reach these locks but when there is a fog in Gaillard cut it can go no farther. Because of the dangers of navigation in a restricted channel with rock banks, fog in this cut is a serious matter. Vessels—since they cannot enter Gaillard cut during fog, assemble either in Balboa Harbor or in Gatun Lake until the fog clears. The capacity of the Panama Canal is thus reduced from its rated capacity of 27 ships per lock per day to the capacity of the Pedro Miguel locks during favorable weather in Gaillard cut.

I have not the time to go into any detail with reference to the operational problems brought about by the lockage surges in Gaillard cut nor the limited operating range of the present Gatun Lake level, nor the navigation hazards caused by the bends and restricted channels which exist mainly in Gaillard cut, which is the part of the Canal most feared by all mariners and dreaded by most pilots.

Public Law 280 of the last Congress authorized an extensive investigation of the Panama Canal for means of increasing its capacity and security and that investigation is now in progress under the direction of the Governor of the Panama Canal and the supervision of the Secretary of War. A report to Congress is required by December 31, 1947. This investigation is a major undertaking with international implications involving all maritime nations. The issue is the type of the future canal. To be sound, any canal plan decided upon must solve the operating problems which I mentioned in this broadcast.

I am sure that, from what I have given you briefly in this broadcast, you can appreciate why those of us who have the responsibility in Congress of studying and handling legislation on the Panama Canal, must have some basic knowledge of the Canal so that we can legislate for the best future interests of the United States. You can also appreciate that our trip down there is not a pleasure junket but is for educational purposes.

Kansas City Again—Stealing an Election—Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I include the following editorial, Kansas City Again, which appeared in the Joplin Globe, Friday, May 30, 1947:

KANSAS CITY AGAIN

After holding for 11 days the spotlight of public attention as the Nation's temporary capital while President Harry Truman watched and waited at the bedside of his aged mother, Kansas City continues to hold a prominent place in news headlines because of something entirely different—the brazen theft of grand jury evidence from the vaults of the election board.

A grand jury had been studying the evidence of fraud in last summer's primary election in Kansas City for 8 weeks and had turned in a courageous and startling report, a part of which was expression of the belief that Roger C. Slaughter, Democratic candidate for renomination to Congress, had been elected in fact, though shown defeated on the face of the returns.

There is no dimness about the situation. Investigation of the primary ballots by the grand jury had disclosed ample evidence of fraud and at least some of the guilty were scheduled to go to jail. But justice was not to have such an easy inning. Some of the guilty either hired skilled burglars to break into the vaults of the election board and steal the evidence, or committed the deed themselves.

It seems unbelievable that such a theft could find opportunity for commission. Obviously, after the grand jury's report, the ballots they had investigated were of great importance, yet they were unguarded, for all practical purposes, and the vaults in which they were placed offered no serious obstacle to the skilled artisans of crime who accepted the job of rifling them.

Now, at last, the FBI is to have full charge of the effort to punish the criminals who have been making a mockery of democracy in this city Tom Pendergast made famous for crime only a few years back. It is a job that calls for the utmost efforts of J. Edgar Hoover's experts, who should have been put energetically on the job months ago. If they had been, this latest shocking outrage would never have taken place.

It appears Attorney General Tom Clark had been reluctant to take over a case which involved the home city of the President of the United States, presumably fearful of political consequences. In the face of this latest development, continued failure of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to act with the greatest possible energy and efficiency will react against the President and his administration in no uncertain manner.

Stealing an Election, which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Thursday, May 29, 1947:

STEALING AN ELECTION

A revealing post mortem on a stolen election is now being conducted in Kansas City, Mo. And the facts which are being uncovered should be of more than passing interest to the American people.

The story had its beginning last July when President Truman announced his support in the Fifth Missouri Congressional District of a man named Axtell. (His first name was Enos, but the President could not remember it at the moment.) Also supporting Mr. Axtell was the malodorous Pendergast machine and the Political Action Committee of the CIO, which is against political machines in places like Virginia and Tennessee, but which is not above making common cause with them in places like Kansas City.

With this impressive array of backers, Mr. Axtell defeated the incumbent Representative Roger Slaughter in the Democratic primary. In the general election, however, Mr. Axtell was defeated by the Republican candidate.

The seeming triumph in the primary brought from Democratic Chairman Hannegan the comment that the voters of Missouri, aware of Mr. Slaughter's opposition to many of the policies of President Truman and the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, had relegated him to the political ash can. But a newspaper, the Kansas City Star, was struck by such remarkable pro-Axtell and anti-Slaughter precinct votes as 88–0, 69–0, and 145–1. The newspaper investigated and turned up convincing evidence of fraud.

The Department of Justice, looking into this mess with something less than crusading enthusiasm, found no violations of Federal law. But a Kansas City grand jury, going into the matter more thoroughly, concluded that Mr. Slaughter had been robbed in the Democratic primary by a deliberate, calculated, and premeditated plan to miscount and otherwise steal votes. The grand jury returned 81 indictments against 71 suspects in the voting fraud. And now comes the credulity-taxing announcement that professional thieves have looted the vaults of the Kansas City Election Commission and stolen the ballots upon which the grand jury's findings of fraud were based.

This leaves unravelled a scandal which reaches from the Pendergast machine, through the CIO-PAC, to Washington itself. It may be that the theft of the incriminating ballots precludes any final fixing of responsibility for what happened in the Democratic primary in Missouri's Fifth District. But the least that can be done by the President and his Attorney General is to exhaust every means at their command to get to the bottom of Missouri's stolen election.

Capitol Stuff, by John O'Donnell, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald Friday, May 30, 1947:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Governor Dewey, of New York, must have been born with a couple of GOP horseshoes clutched in his chubby little hands.

The outstanding and as of today most powerful contender for the Republican nomination for the Presidency now finds himself, thanks to no efforts by himself, in a position where he can knock the political brains out of his Truman opposition by reverting to his ancient role of gang-busting Mr. District Attorney, which the voters love.

The ever-loving political pals of President Truman back in the Kansas City bailiwick of the Pendergast machine have just pulled the all-time boner of this generation. At least, it measures up in political importance (and consequences) to our last White House scandal. That was when Warren Gamaliel Harding, without personal gain, let himself be sold down the river by such loving pals

and crooks as the Ohio gang, the contemptible Secretary of Interior Fall, and our all-time disgrace to the Federal judiciary, the Honorable Harry Daugherty, one-time Attorney General of the United States of America.

Politically, the President, in all innocence, is in a very hot spot indeed so far as his political fortunes are concerned. When the imported petermen with soup and jimmy cracked the safe in the office of the Kansas City board of elections and stole the grand jury evidence which would prove felony in the primary victory of a Truman-backed candidate for Congress, they probably saved the necks of local political gangsters.

But they put President Truman, as a candidate for the Presidency next year, and his Attorney General Tom Clark, on the political gallows. And a gallows platform is no place to be when an opponent like Tom Dewey is waiting to spring the trap.

To make things simple, here's what happened. Harry Truman was a political protégé of the old Pendergast machine and came to the United States Senate thanks to its aid. The Pendergast machine in Kansas City was tougher and cruder than either Tammany in New York or Kelly in Chicago ever thought of being, and the big boss Pendergast went into the Federal hoosegow during the Roosevelt regime.

Truman's political position improved and he was loyal. As a Senator he turned thumbs down on the Federal attorney who sent old Tom Pendergast to jail, made a point of leaving Washington to attend old Pendergast's funeral, and has been political pals with young Jim Pendergast. And that was all explained as political loyalty and friendship and common decency.

Then last August there came a primary battle in the Democratic ranks in the Missouri Fifth District which cuts into Kansas City. President Truman unwisely jumped right into the middle of the fight. Democratic Congressman Roger Slaughter wanted to be renominated by the Democrats, but he didn't like the Pendergast mob and said so. And furthermore Slaughter wasn't on very good terms with Bob Hannegan, a fellow Missourian picked by President Truman to head the Democratic National Committee.

So Hannegan and young Jim Pendergast blew the whistle on Slaughter and last July picked a relative unknown by the name of Enos Axtell to run in the Democratic race against Slaughter. Then they sucked Truman and the White House prestige into the battle. And so, at a White House press conference July 18 last, President Truman said that he was going out to his native Missouri to vote in the primaries and was against Representative Slaughter because "if Slaughter is right I must be wrong."

The President followed this up by announcing that he was backing Slaughter's opponent, Axtell, because he had known Axtell all his life and that Axtell was an old neighbor.

One of the rude boys asked the President at this point if he could tell the reporters the full name of his old friend and neighbor, Axtell, whom he had known all his life. The President couldn't. Kansas City Star correspondent Duke Shoop cut short an embarrassing moment by suggesting to the President that the first name of the President's old friend was Enos.

Then on August 5 came the Missouri primary with President Truman back in his native State for the fight. When the count came in it appeared that Truman-championed Axtell had won, defeating his fellow-Democrat, Representative Slaughter, but by a narrow margin.

Then, on the analysis of the votes from the Democratic battlefields in the heart of the Pendergast-Truman bailiwick there came some interesting facts. In certain Kansas City precincts where the Pendergast power rules, candidate Axtell was reported as licking Representative Slaughter by such lusty margins as 88–0, 69–0, and 145–1.

The victorious Democrat Axtell was soundly licked by the Republican opponent in November. But the outraged and defeated Representative Slaughter was also back here and howling for vengeance.

Congress moved into the picture—but gingerly. And the Department of Justice naturally didn't bubble over with zeal at the prospect of investigating an election fraud which was smack on the doorstep of the boss in the White House.

And here a newspaper did a good job. The Kansas City Star under Editor Roy Roberts, veteran Washington correspondent, ripped into the picture. Evidence and leads that the paper gathered and supplied to a Missouri grand jury brought 81 indictments against 71 suspects in the voting fraud. The evidence was placed in the vaults of the board of elections. Meanwhile the Department of Justice had shyly retreated from the red-hot case. Then came the fantastic cracking of the official vaults and the looting of the red-hot evidence against the political supporters of President Truman.

Yes, Mr. District Attorney, gang-busting Governor of New York Thomas E. Dewey is sitting very pretty, thank you. We understand he's heading West shortly and will be passing through Missouri. What he says may be interesting.

Mr. Speaker, these editorials require no comment from me, or anyone else. They merely reveal the feeling of all decent citizens back in Missouri, in our Nation's Capital, and, I believe, throughout the entire Nation. The only issue is, Will this Nation be governed by law or ruled by outlaws?

The Rent Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 31, 1947, entitled "Voluntary Rent Increases":

VOLUNTARY RENT INCREASES

The Senate has voted, in effect, to jack up the Nation's rents a flat 15 percent. All the talk about agreements entered into "voluntarily and in good faith" between landlord and tenant is rank pettifoggery.

There won't be anything voluntary about the 15-percent increase if this measure becomes law.

The landlord could go to the tenant with this argument: Either sign a lease calling now for a 15-percent rent boost extending beyond December 31, 1948, or risk an unlimited rent increase when rent control expires within a matter of months.

Given this sorry choice, the tenant will inevitably accept the immediate 15-percent increase as the lesser of two evils.

The only decent solution to the rent problem is to retain controls for so long as they are necessary, granting individual rent increases on the present adequate basis.

Those who argue that the poor landlord is being victimized need refer only to the regional rent control office for some interesting figures.

Under recently liberalized provisions, landlords are obtaining rent increases wholesale on the basis of "substantial hardship" petitions.

Rent increases ranging from $5 to $7.50 a month for 1,325 western Pennsylvania tenants have been approved during the last 2 months alone. Over a period of years increases granted in 1946 will total more than $200,000. And at the accelerated rate at which increases are being granted the figure will be must greater in 1947.

Passage of the rent bill in its present form will only add to the hardship of thousands of families already having difficulty making ends meet in the face of fantastic prices. Apparently Congress is going to fool around now with rent control just as it did a year ago with OPA, coming up at the last moment before expiration of rent control on June 30 with something preposterous which the President will have to approve rather than have no legislation at all.

Wool Against the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of May 26, 1947:

WOOL AGAINST THE PEOPLE

It is nothing new in the Congress of the United States for a small group of self-interested people to put all of the 140,000,000 residents of this country over a barrel and beat the economic daylights out of them. The handful of silver Senators have been doing this for years. They did it so successfully in early New Deal days that, in the interest of fostering the use of silver, they committed this country to policies which drove the few great remaining silver currency countries away from silver. That kind of government, rule by a greedy minority, can only lead to economic ruin, and hold the American system of Government up to ridicule in the eyes of the world.

But last Friday the House of Representatives put over a steal that will not only add appreciably to the cost of woolen goods to every American citizen, but could very easily wreck the Geneva trade conference and put the United States back on the road of economic isolationism.

The thing was done so slyly in the House Agriculture Committee, which brought the measure to the floor, that Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina Democrat, admitted to his colleagues afterwards that he didn't realize what he had done until later when he read some newspaper accounts of the implications of the committee action. Now the House, blinded with isolationist wool in its eyes, has accepted the committee measure and it goes to conference with the Senate, which passed a less objectionable version of the same bill.

The House bill provides that the Government must not only continue to support wool by direct subsidy at the artificial price of 42 cents per pound, but on top of the continued United States wool tariff to add an import fee to make up any other differential in price between domestic and foreign wool prices which the Tariff Commission should find. The wool growers call 42 cents a starvation price, while the wool manufacturers claim that a price of 37 or 38 cents would be profitable. After all, most wool is sold in the United States as a byproduct of meat production.

Not only does the House bill threaten to add to the price of the clothes all of us wear; but its principle of placing an arbitrary tariff

(the import fee) on top of a support price consistent with our domestic agricultural support system, flies in the face of our country's foreign policy. Right now our negotiators are virtually deadlocked at the Geneva trade conference because Australia and the United Kingdom got the jitters from watching Congress act on wool. Under-S :retary of State William L. Clayton, who came back from the Geneva Conference to deal with the wool crisis, said that the House bill's ultimate approval would convict the Nation of insincerity.

What is at stake in the selfish action of the wood growers? Clearly, not very much. Of all wool-growing States, only Wyoming grows enough to account for more than 2 percent of a State's total income (3.2 percent of Wyoming) Most of the wool we wear comes from Australia and it would be much cheaper if it were not for the tariff protection we afford our own producers. Is this the kind of a stake worth the wrecking of vital foreign policy?

We hope the conference committee will save us from this shame.

Lincoln and Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, today when the politicians and the political demagogues, in their search for votes, are going so far afield on the Negro question, it might be well to take cognizance of the fact that the greatest real friend the Negro ever had, the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, at no time entertained such wild-eyed views as are now being advocated in some quarters.

In substantiation of that, Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a timely editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, under the caption "Lincoln and Negroes":

LINCOLN AND NEGROES

Perhaps no important figure in American history has been thoroughly misunderstood or misquoted concerning his attitude on the Negro question than Abraham Lincoln.

Although he issued a proclamation freeing the slaves, Abraham Lincoln did not, at any time, favor social equality between the races.

During his famous debates with Stephen A. Douglas in 1858 Lincoln made an address at Charleston, Ill., on September 18 of that year, in which he used these words:

"While I was at the hotel today an elderly gentleman called upon me to know whether I was really in favor of producing a perfect equality between the Negroes and white people. While I had not proposed to myself on this occasion to say much on that subject, yet as the question was asked me, I thought I would occupy perhaps 5 minutes in saying something in regard to it. I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say, in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.

"I say upon this occasion: I do not perceive that because the white man is to have the superior position the Negro should be denied everything. I do not understand that because I do not want a Negro woman for a slave I must necessarily want her for a wife. [Cheers and laughter.] My understanding is that I can just let her alone. I am now in my fiftieth year, and I certainly never have had a black woman for either a slave or a wife. So it seems to me quite possible for us to get along without making either slaves or wives of Negroes. I will add to this that I have never seen, to my knowledge, a man, woman, or child who was in favor of producing a perfect equality, social or political, between Negroes and white men. I recollect of but one distinguished instance that I ever heard of so frequently as to be entirely satisfied of its correctness, and that is the case of Judge Douglas's old friend Col. Richard M. Johnson. [Laughter and cheers.]

"I will also add to the remarks I have made (for I am not going to enter at large upon this subject), that I have never had the least apprehension that I or my friends would marry Negroes if there was no law to keep them from it [roars of laughter] but as Judge Douglas and his friends seem to be in great apprehension that they might, if there were no law to keep them from it [laughter] I give him the most solemn pledge that I will, to the very last, stand by the law of this State, which forbids the marrying of white people with Negroes."

The above paragraphs ought to be read over and over again by misguided Negro leaders in Northern States who are clamoring so vociferously for social equality.

Universal Military Training Imperative for United States, President's Commission Advises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD under previous authority, I beg to include herein a newspaper article from the Washington Post of this date written by Marshall Andrews, Post reporter, on the subject of universal military training. The article is as follows:

UNIVERSAL TRAINING IMPERATIVE FOR UNITED STATES, COMMISSION ADVISES—SURVEY GROUP TELLS TRUMAN SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY CALL FOR ADOPTION

(By Marshall Andrews)

President Truman's Universal Training Advisory Commission yesterday recommended adoption of universal military training as an essential element of national security and foreign policy.

"We recommend the adoption of universal training," the Commission reported, "because we are convinced that weakness on our part not only involves our country in grave risks but also weakens the United Nations, on which rests our hopes for lasting peace. A weak and irresolute America is an invitation to failure. A strong and resolute America is the best guaranty for our safety and for the success of the United Nations."

OBLIGATION FOR YOUTH

It should be the obligation, the Commission said, of every young man on reaching 18 or completing high school to undergo a period of training which would fit him for service to the Nation in time of any future crisis.

Such service, it said, should include 6 months of basic training in camp or aboard ship under Army or Navy supervision and an additional unspecified period of supplementary service. This latter would include service in a civilian component of one of the forces, or special training for appointment as an officer for technical proficiency.

For practical reasons the Commission excluded training of women at this stage. It suggested that the possibility of including women should be studied by a Commission set up to administer the program. It recommended in turn that this Commission should consist of two civilians and one military representative, reporting directly to the President.

WOULD USE DRAFT BOARDS

Dr. Karl T. Compton, chairman, told a White House news conference immediately after delivery of the report to Mr. Truman that it was estimated the program would cost $1,500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 a year. He said it could be started approximately 1 year after Congress legislated it into being.

Dr. Compton said he believed the Selective System, including local boards, should be revived to screen young men for service. This system, the Commission itself pointed out, would then be available in case of war.

As for the obligation of young men to serve their country, the Commission agreed that no loopholes should be left, or opportunities for evasion.

"For each youth who is physically and mentally qualified therefor," it said, "such training should be of a predominantly military character and specifically designed to prepare him for service in one of the armed forces. For those who are unfitted for training of this nature, the program should be preparatory service to the Nation. Only those young men would be relieved of the obligation to train in one way or another who could not perform any useful form of service in time of crisis for which preparatory training would be of any value."

The Commission said it was in unanimous agreement on all points and gave three basic reasons for its conclusions. They were:

1. That the belief of other nations that the United States was stripping itself of strength was a deterrent to the effectiveness of the United Nations and adoption of universal military training would reassure those nations.

2. That universal military training was the only alternative to a huge and expensive professional military establishment for the maintenance of essential security.

3. That the atomic bomb had eliminated all former concepts of zones of safety in any attack on this country and had added to the need for trained men in every city and town.

In connection with the atom bomb attack, the Commission considered and discarded the argument most frequently put forward that the atomic bomb has rendered armies useless.

"We reject this conclusion," it said, "because our analysis of the possible types and conditions of future warfare convinces us that increased, rather than decreased, numbers of trained troops would be quickly required for home defense for effective counterattack, and for complete victory."

Dr. Compton supplemented this view in his White House news conference.

"Although the first part of the book may seem a little lurid," he said, referring to that part of the report dealing with the nature of possible future warfare, "we wanted to con-

sider the worst that could possibly happen and be prepared for that. Anything less would be worthless."

"We do not wish, however," the Commission added in its report, "to exaggerate the benefits that would be derived from the establishment of a universal training program. It offers no cheap or easy ticket to security. Only when combined with the other elements that enter into a balanced security system would it provide the measure of strength necessary to deter an aggressor from taking up arms against us or from violating the rights of less powerful nations."

EIGHT-POINT PLAN GIVEN

The Commission outlined an eight-point plan without which it said no program for national security would be complete. (See accompanying outline of the eight points).

Although the Commission throughout its report employed the euphemism "universal training" suggested by Mr. Truman, it left no doubt it was recommending universal military training, with emphasis on the military phase and for reasons of military security.

"Military necessity must be its principal emphasis and concern," it said at one point. "This does not mean that there cannot and should not be substantial accommodations in the interest of other values. But no program which fails to provide the necessary military benefits would be warranted."

"Moreover," it said at another point, "any attempt to convert a military program into general training would inevitably impair its military advantages."

TWELVE SUPPORTING REASONS

Suggestions had been made during public discussion of universal military training that health or physical education or citizenship be made the primary objective of the program if adopted, with military training secondary. It had even been suggested that a free high school year be given to all young people.

The Commission gave 12 specific reasons why universal military training would benefit the Nation. They were:

1. It would shorten the time in which an effective fighting force could be mobilized in case of war.

2. It would give young men the essentials of training which would, in the event of war, result in saving lives.

3. It would make possible an effective National Guard and Organized Reserve capable of rapid absorption into the fighting forces in case of war.

4. It would improve the efficiency, quality, and alertness of the Regular forces in peacetime.

5. It would help produce qualified Reserve officers in sufficient numbers to meet immediate requirements in a crisis.

6. It would present additional opportunities for inculcating spiritual and moral ideals in support of the American democracy.

7. It would establish a pool of young, physically fit, and trained reserves.

8. It would provide a large trained element in every community capable of withstanding and dealing with the problems of civilian defense and disaster resulting from bombing attacks.

9. It would provide a mechanism that could be converted immediately into a wartime selective service system with a continuing inventory of useful skills.

10. It would help to channel qualified young men into programs of scientific and vocational training in fields important to national defense.

11. It would bring together young Americans from all parts of the country to share a common experience and fulfill a common obligation to their country, thus contributing to national unity.

12. It would give greater military strength at less cost than would be provided by a large standing military force.

The Commission prefaced its recommendations with an exhaustive study not only of the problems and procedures of universal training itself but of the national and international factors which entered into its conclusions. It included also studies of universal training in other countries. The 448-page document may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents for 75 cents.

In addition to Dr. Compton, members of the Commission were Joseph E. Davies, former Ambassador to Russia; Dr. Daniel Poling, editor of the Christian Herald; Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, of New York; Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, industrial relations counsel; Truman K. Gibson, Jr., lawyer and former aide to the Secretary of War; Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University; the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University; and Charles E. Wilson, president of the General Electric Co.

The Commission was appointed December 19, 1946, and shortly thereafter began its study, during which it heard some 200 witnesses "representing every shade and variety of opinion." It also reported that it had studied previous testimony on the subject and published opinions which were available and had held many private interviews throughout the country.

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNITED STATES SECURITY PROGRAM

Following are high lights of the recommendations released last night by President Truman's Advisory Commission on Universal Training:

"In the light of the conditions that exist in the world today, no program for national security would be complete unless it encompassed all of the following ingredients:

"1. A strong, united, healthy, and informed nation: This is our No. 1 security requirement. It is the bedrock on which all our military preparations depend. The vigor and vitality of our democracy, as expressed in improved health, education, productivity, and morale of the American people, are of paramount importance, not only for ourselves but also for millions subject to the deception of totalitarian philosophies abroad.

"2. A coordinated intelligence service: Only through the most diligent collection and the most exhaustive analysis of every scrap of data that might shed light on the war plans of a potential enemy or the extension of his sphere of influence can we hope to make up for the cushion of time that has been taken away from us by the deadly speed of air and atomic attacks.

"3. Scientific research and development: No lesson of World War II was more convincing to the American people than the effectiveness of science in providing potent new instrumentalities of warfare. We strongly endorse continued interest in and support of both basic and applied research by the armed forces, and specifically add our recommendation in favor of legislation to establish a national science foundation.

"4. Industrial mobilization: The development of new weapons will be of no value unless our scientific progress is matched by industrial readiness for the problems of war that may come without warning at supersonic speeds. Weapons that were not in being and in the possession of our troops when an aggressor struck would be worthless in inflicting swift retribution upon him or in preventing his approach to our shores. Because of the danger that production centers would be demolished in the first days of war, a start should be made now toward decentralizing the most vital plants and, in some cases, toward building underground or otherwise adequately protected facilities. Critical war materials must be stock piled now and in the future.

"5. A striking air force: Spearhead of our professional armed services, this force would be charged with the crucial mission of 'defense by attack.' Its job would be to stop the enemy's first onslaught and to hit back at him with crushing force. We believe that an aggressor's reluctance to start a war, and his handicap in prosecuting it successfully if he did start, would be in direct proportion to the power and readiness of our mobile striking force. Its personnel would have to be highly trained and its equipment would have to be the most advanced in the world.

"6. Other elements of the Regular Army, Navy, Air Forces, Marine Corps, and merchant marine: Long-range operations of great destructive power and control of strategic bases might be decisive elements in determining the outcome of a war. Since we could not under our Constitution and would not under our conception of international morality launch a surprise attack against any country without an open declaration of war, the enemy would have the advantage of surprise. Replacements would have to be available speedily in large numbers. Maintenance of planes, mechanized equipment, and the host of highly technical weapons and devices developed by science increases the need for specialists, supply troops, and unbreakable supply lines.

"7. Unification of the armed forces: There can be no realistic planning or preparation for the kind of defensive and offensive strategy required for modern war without unity of command.

"8. Universal training: For reasons discussed at length in our report we unanimously recommend the adoption of universal training. We do not believe there is any other way of guaranteeing that the armed forces will be able to count on a sufficiently speedy flow of trained men to win a war if large-scale fighting for bases or invasion of the enemy homeland are required. These pretrained young men would be ready to cope with the unprecedented problems of internal security that atomic warfare would bring—problems of such magnitude that our failure to meet them at once, wherever they developed, might lose us the war overnight."

A Weakening Bulwark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial taken from the May 25 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "A Weakening Bulwark." This editorial contains a solemn warning against subtle elements and methods that operate to break down our system of free speech and education; and the separation of church and state, so essential to free government. It reads as follows:

A WEAKENING BULWARK

U. S. Grant is rightly remembered as the military genius who won Lincoln's war to preserve the Union. He deserves to be remembered also as a stalwart champion of the public school and a guardian of that great American institution against encroachment and compromise.

Addressing the Des Moines reunion of the Army of the Tennessee in 1875, Grant said as President:

"Let us all labor to add all needful guarantees for the security of free thought, free speech, a free press, pure morals, unfettered religious sentiments, and of equal rights and

privileges to all men, irrespective of nationality, color, or religion.

"Encourage free schools and resolve that not one dollar appropriated for their support shall be appropriated to the support of any sectarian schools. Resolve that either the State or the Nation, or both combined, shall support institutions of learning sufficient to afford every child growing up in the land the opportunity of a good common school education, unmixed with sectarian, pagan, or atheistical dogmas.

"Leave the matter of religion to the family circle, the church, and the private school supported entirely by private contributions. Keep the church and state forever separate."

Americans need to take Grant's sound advice to heart today. They are forgetting the basic principle of separation of church and state which James Madison and his wise associates wrote into the Constitution as article I of the Bill of Rights.

Anyone who doubts this needs only review the evidence compiled by V. T. Thayer in his new book, Religion in Public Education. Ten States have laws which allow public school pupils to be dismissed from class to receive religious instruction in school or elsewhere. Twelve States require the Bible to be read in public schools. Sixteen States provide transportation for pupils in parochial schools, and so on.

Some of these laws have been promoted by the Ku Klux Klan. Others have been advocated by Catholic and Lutheran groups. Still others have had the support of Protestant denominations. They all add up to a slow, steady, almost unseen crumbling away of the wall which has kept church and state apart in the United States.

But it is not only locally and in the States that this breach is being made. There are now pending in Congress bills which would greatly widen it on a national scale. These are the many bills for Federal aid for education sponsored by Senators TAFT, AIKEN, HILL, ELLENDER, COOPER, CHAVEZ, TOBEY, and THOMAS of Utah, and Representatives WELCH of California and WHITTEN of Mississippi, and others.

Though provisions in these bills vary, all would either authorize funds for nonpublic schools or nonprofit educational institutions or leave it to the State to distribute large sums to parochial and other private schools. Senator AIKEN, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, says frankly that he favors "a substantial measure of Federal aid for private schools, for such purposes as transportation of pupils, health programs and purchase of nonreligious instructional supplies and equipment." This, says the Vermont Senator, would enable such schools, "with their own funds, to strengthen their teaching staffs and their general educational position."

Credit Senator AIKEN with good intent, his thinking is nonetheless fallacious. An appropriation for private or religious schools is a subsidy for them. It makes no difference how many sets of books the schools keep. What matters is that tax funds are used to make it easier to teach doctrines which many citizens either do not believe or frankly reject or even oppose.

Shall tax funds be used to support schools for the Jehovah's Witnesses who have religious scruples against saluting the flag? Shall tax funds be used to maintain schools for Christian Scientists who object to student health programs? Shall tax funds set up schools for the children of radical thinkers who desire to revolutionize the present organization of our society?

These questions answer themselves. The Federal-aid bills have much to commend them as meeting a vital need, but before they are even to be considered they should be freed of all provisions which would authorize Federal funds for nonpublic schools.

Justice Rutledge, in his monumental dissent last February in the 5-to-4 New Jersey school-transportation case, said that one breach would be followed by a second and the second by a third and the third by a fourth until "with time the most solid freedom gives way before continuing corrosive decision."

What a tragic paradox it would be for Americans to be so busy defending democracy over the world that they failed to see one of its stanchest bulwarks weaken and give way at home.

Small Businessmen Must Become Intolerant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 28, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by J. Raymond Tiffany, general counsel, Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., National Small Business Men's Association, before the Economic Club of Detroit, Monday, May 5, 1947, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich.:

Mr. Kane, President Crow, members of the Economic Club of Detroit, and guests, it is indeed a great honor for me to have the privilege of your forum, and I trust that in return you will find the time you spent here today has been worth while.

A salesman for a woolen company said to the lady of the house as she opened the door, "Madam, would you be interested in some rough yarns?" To which she replied, "Indeed I would; come in. I haven't heard a good story in weeks." So you will agree that the same words may connote entirely different ideas in the mind of a speaker and his audience, which leads me to say:

The first thing we should do is attempt to define our terms.

Let us take the word "democracy," for instance. Woodrow Wilson made the words, "The world must be made safe for democracy" a household phrase—a rallying cry for unstinted action in behalf of freedom of the peoples of the world. While the Atlantic Charter does not mention democracy, Generalissimo Stalin, in 1941, spoke of the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for independence and democratic liberty. Then at Tehran, Potsdam, Yalta, and Moscow the word "democratic" was used by all participants, but unfortunately not with the same ideas in mind. The Russian definition of "democracy" involves state ownership of the means of production obtained through revolutionary and dictatorial methods, while we think of democracy more in the light of the definition of Dr. Elwood, of Duke University, as found in the Encyclopedia Americana, "a form of social control in which the opinion and will of every adult member of the group enters into the determination of group behavior."

The greatest stumbling block to world peace today is confusion of ideas among the peoples of the world—the lack of understanding of the hopes, ambitions, desires, and aspirations of peoples of other lands. We hear or read words and place our own constructions thereon—constructions all too frequently based on our own ineptitude in the science of semantics, our own ignorance of all the facts, our prejudices, our selfish, materialistic impulses, and an almost complete lack of appreciation of the need for a spiritual concept in evaluating human relationships.

Permit me to use a story or two to clarify my point:

While talking with the pastor of my church, in his study, after services recently, his telephone rang and, after the conversation was ended, he said: "This will amuse you. Mrs. Smith just phoned and asked me the exact text of the morning sermon. She explained that she and Mr. Smith had been out on a party last night and did not feel well enough to attend church this morning; that they sent their young son, Johnnie, to church (which, unfortunately is becoming more and more the great American habit—permitting the children to look after our spiritual welfare of the family). On Johnnie's return home his mother was suspicious of his damp hair and questioned him as to his attendance at church and finally asked the text of the sermon, to which Johnnie replied, 'The text was: "Keep your shirt on and you will get a blanket."' Mrs. Smith, then convinced that the boy had not gone to church, called to check the text. I told her, as you know, that I hoped all my listeners had as good a version of my sermon as Johnnie. The text was not exactly 'Keep your shirt on and you will get a blanket,' but rather 'Be patient for the Comforter will come.'"

A couple of years ago we had a very disastrous hurricane on the east coast. The damage was enormous, and one little church up on Cape Cod suffered the loss of one of its three mosaic stained-glass windows. The ruling body of the church convened in special session and voted to replace the window at once. John Jones volunteered to go to New York City and arrange for the replacement. The board, mindful of Jones' propensity to "bending the elbow," warned him to be careful and to arrange so that the window would arrive at the church in condition for immediate placement, that the text be identical with that on the destroyed window, and the coloring in harmony with the remaining windows. After assurances by Jones that all would be well, he left for Providence, where he took the train for New York. After getting on the train he wandered into the lounge car and there shortly found himself with his relaxing formula mixed and in process of consumption. In the course of the 4-hour trip Jones had several of these relaxing formulas, and finally when he arrived at the Grand Central Station he was a bit fuzzy in the head, could not remember what he had done with his memoranda as to the window measurements, text, and color. So, after some difficult concentration, he decided to phone his good wife and ask her to help him out of his predicament. She spoke her mind quite freely at first, but finally agreed to obtain the information and wire it to him in care of the Western Union office, at Grand Central Station, in New York City. John went into the motion-picture theater, killed some time, and finally went back to the telegraph office, and said to the little blonde attendant, "Have you a telegram for Mr. John Jones?" She looked at him and smiled as only a girl of that kind can, and said, "No, Mr. Jones; I am sorry we haven't, but wait a moment. Something is coming in on the machine now." She sat down and began to type, when suddenly her eyes seemed to pop, her face paled, and she dropped off her chair in a faint. Jones, very much astonished, ran around the counter, picked her up, set her on her fanny, got her straightened out, and then looked at the message to see what had caused her to swoon. There he read: "John Jones, care of Western Union, Grand Central Station, New York. Unto us a Son is born, 6 feet long and 3 feet wide, predominating colors blue and green. Signed Mary."

You see, the little fellow at the church construed a profound text within the elevation of his limited observation, and the little telegraph girl read the words, but being wholly unfamiliar with the background against which they were written, just could not take it.

That misunderstanding and prejudices exist in the world is understandable, when you consider the mental, or, should we say, lack of mental development of the great majority of our people.

Recently, a professor of literature of one of our great universities, told me that in his opinion all literature should be rewritten, using only words within the vocabulary of an 8-year-old, inasmuch as that was the average intelligence of our people.

Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the New York Times, speaking of the ignorance and apathy of the public of this Nation, said recently, "Informed public opinion in the United States now depends on a group that consists of only 20 to 25 percent of the Nation's population." Said he, "This is the way it might be worked out mathematically: 20 percent of the population belongs to what I would call the definitely moronic class, another 20 percent is ignorant and entirely unwilling to learn, another 40 percent is ignorant but willing to learn provided that, of course, the lessons are made pretty simple. That leaves a 20 percent segment of the well informed."

Another student of human affairs has stated that 80 percent of all people do not have the capacity to save or preserve anything; approximately 80 percent of all people do not have the capacity to successfully conduct organized human endeavors; probably less than one-half of 1 percent of all people are given the talent to be natural leaders of the remaining 99½ percent.

Then let us not be unmindful of the fact that in every 1,000 persons there are several natural-born thieves, several congenital liars, several abnormally selfish individuals, some of whom possess great capabilities as leaders, some finding their way into labor and others into business.

One other break-down seems to me to be pregnant with meaning. A management consultant in New York states that as a result of a study made by his concern they estimated that 5 percent of our people are factually dishonest thinkers, 15 percent are easily controlled by these 5 percent factually dishonest thinkers, 60 percent of our people will follow the leader in thinking, 5 percent are factually honest thinkers, and 15 percent lean to the views of the 5 percent factually honest thinkers. I am sure you will agree that the task of the factually honest thinkers is first to reach and, may I say, convert the adjacent and susceptible 15 percent, and then endeavor to inculcate in the minds of the 60 percent follow-the-leader group—the great mass of our people—sound American ideologies. If this is not done, and done intelligently and very quickly, we may well find that the great majority of our people will follow the factually dishonest thinkers in evaluating and supporting positions having to do with not only our domestic affairs but with our international policies and relations as well. Indeed, we know all too well from bitter experience that the great masses of our people, unable to think a question through for themselves, take and act on the smooth mouthings of the glib who promise something for nothing; security—cradle to the grave; work less; produce less; have more—some pseudo Americans, posing under the guise of statesmen, politicians, commentators, pulpit orators, columnists, some labor leaders, and now a dismissed Cabinet member.

The economic experience of a great number of our present adult population is foreign to that which you would expect in a country whose people have lived under and been bounteously blessed by the democratic way of life.

The National Industrial Conference Board declares that, as of January 1, 1947, 77 percent, or 110,800,000 individuals in the United States had no adult experience with World War I; 63.3 percent, or 90,300,000 individuals have had no adult experience with the 1929 crisis; 58.4 percent, or 83,400,000 individuals have had—now mind you this—no adult experience under a Republican administration; that 48.2 percent, or 68,700,000 individuals have had no adult experience with a peacetime economy; and 44.4 percent, or 63,400,000 individuals have had no previous experience with a free market for cars, homes, clothing, etc.

Now I ask you very sincerely: Is it not amazing indeed that we in the United States have done so well in our advancement of human relations? Is it not understandable that we have been so susceptible to the medicine-doctor tactics of the bushy-eyed demagogues and the starry-eyed pedagogues who have been foisted upon us and placed in high authority in our poltical, economic, and social life?

I am not a proponent of the belief that formal education necessarily makes one intelligent. In my opinion, excellence of character, a good personality reflecting high spiritual qualities of the soul, are as essential to proper human relations, understanding, and good will, as is a good mind. Yes, I believe more so, and without those essential attributes one cannot be truly a well-educated person.

With these thoughts in mind, let us turn our attention to other peoples with whom we are neighbors and whose problems must be of concern to us. Wendell Willkie, shortly after his return from Russia, spoke profoundly and prophetically, when he stated that the problems of the people of the Far East are of as much concern to the people of the United States as are the problems of the people of California to the people of New York. Our thinking, said he, must be global.

The great French scientist, Lecomte du Noüy, in his recent and most interesting book, Human Destiny, says that it is the scale of observation which creates phenomena. One's scale of observation depends on the individual. It is he who creates it. Du Noüy explains this by saying: "Let us suppose that we have at our disposal two powders—one white (flour) and the other black (finely crushed charcoal or soot). If we mix them we will obtain a gray powder which will be lighter in color if it contains more flour and darker if it contains more soot. If the mixture is perfect, on our scale of observation (that is, without the help of a microscope) the phenomenon studied will always be a gray powder. But let us suppose that an insect of the size of the grains of flour or of soot moves around in this powder. For him there will be no gray powder, but only black and white boulders. On his scale of observation the phenomenon, 'gray powder'; does not exist." Dr. Du Noüy goes on to say that on our scale of human observation the razor's edge is a straight line; on the microscope scale it is a broken but solid line of hills and valleys; on the chemical scale, it is of atoms of iron and carbon; and on the subatomic scale, electrons in perpetual motion attaining a rate of speed of thousands of miles per second. All these phenomena are in reality the manifestations of the same basic phenomena, the motions of the electron. The only difference which exists between them is the scale of observation.

Never before in history has there been such a desperate need for human beings everywhere to raise the scales of their observation. Let us look for a few moments at some of the essential factors which are often omitted from the opinion-forming processes of many people because they are unaware of them.

India, China, Russia are in the news every day. In these countries forces are at work which will eventually shape the economical, political, social, and spiritual future of millions of people throughout the world and play a ponderous part in our own destiny.

Has it occurred to you that India may well emerge from this war and take her place as one of the great nations of the world, just as Russia did after World War I?

India, with over 389,000,000 people, occupies an area of one-half the size of the United States. She has great natural resources; her people speak 11 major languages, and we find not less than 220 distinct dialects; riches and poverty, side by side. More ethnic groups live in India than in any other country in the world. Famine and starvation abound; an average of 246 persons live within the square mile; filiteracy remains completely static—the 1921 census showed only 7 percent literate, leaving 93 percent illiterate in the sense that they cannot read and write a letter in their own vernacular language. Rate of birth was 33.44 per 1,000; rate of deaths, 25.56 per 1,000, one-fifth of the mortality being infants under 1 year old. In years of epidemics the ratio of death is higher, as in 1918, when the ratio was 62.46 per 1,000.

A great people heretofore not permitted to raise themselves within the potentialities of their great agricultural and industrial resources. They like us but do not understand us. One prominent Indian said to me, "Why do you not help us in our quest for freedom—we helped you to liberty." I said, "You helped us to liberty? That's not the way I read it." "Ah," said he, "that's the difficulty with your school system—you do not teach history too well in the United States. Look, when your forefathers rebelled against King George III the British were confronted with a real problem—India was giving plenty of trouble to Britain in the early 1770's and the policy-makers for the King had to determine whether to subdue the Indian situation and retain my country's vast wealth among their possessions or to deflect a large portion of her military strength toward quelling the American Colonies. The British decided to devote much of their strength to India and as a result your forefathers had a much weaker British force to fight. It is true that the French began their hostilities against the British in 1778; however, the First Mahratta and the First Mysore Wars gave your people much aid by drawing off England's might."

Yes, India is a great country, having given the world a great culture and contributed mightily to education. Her problems are our problems.

Then there is India's neighbor, China, about which an American Secretary of State said nearly 50 years ago: "The world's peace rests with China and whoever understands China holds the key to world policies during the next five centuries." The truth of this observation by John Hay is manifest today. Over 450,000,000 souls, with a density of population of 104.8 persons to the square mile, illiteracy and famine rampant—a nation in revolution, the victim of interference of other well-meaning nations all too often selfishly inclined, now struggling between the philosophies of the modern and ancient Chinese as to governmental policies and human rights; 450,000,000 who believe in high moral standards—a people whose culture is founded upon the eight virtues—loyalty, filial piety, benevolence, love, faithfulness, righteousness, peace, and harmony; a people whose state rests upon four great principles—righteousness, propriety, modesty, and honor.

I bring these attributes to your attention because, in my opinion, they are fundamental not only to the Chinese but to the peace of the world.

China, rich in natural resources, with great contributions to the culture of the world, must continue in her want and poverty because the rest of the world does not yet understand her or realize that here is an essential key to peace.

And, finally, Russia with her 202,000,000 existing in 174 nations or tribes in a land larger than all of North America and four times the area of India, with a density of population of only 23.1 to the square mile, more nationalities and ethnic groups than

any other nation in the world except India; 125 language or dialects; over 40 different religions.

In 1913, illiteracy was 70 to 80 percent—fewer than 8,000,000 pupils in primary and secondary schools, fewer than 300,000 in technical and higher institutions. In 1928, illiteracy, had been reduced by 44 percent—enrollments had risen in the primary and secondary schools to more than 11,000,000 and to over 600,000 in the technical and higher institutions. By 1941 there were over 35,000,000 pupils—illiteracy had dropped to less than 20 percent. A country rich in natural resources, practically self-sufficient.

Here in these three lands—India, China, and Russia—we have almost one-half of the world's population of two and a quarter billion souls.

Oh, yes, we in the United States have about 140,000,000 people living with a density of 46 to the square mile. The entire Western Hemisphere has less than 300,000,000 people with a population density of about 18 to the square mile. In numbers we do not compare with the seething Far East.

While I was at the United Nations Conference at San Francisco in the spring of 1945, I found a rather sad situation. There were congregated many groups, all ostensibly to aid in assuring an enduring peace. Let me observe, however, that never before did a group of public officials labor under such heartbreaking assaults in an atmosphere made heavy by the forces of greed, selfishness, prejudice, and passion. Of course, everybody wanted peace, provided the way of peace protected their selfish interests. Certain labor forces were there working for peace, plus their particular ideas for the advancement of the rights of international labor; the Jew was there for peace but—take care of the Jewish interest in Palestine. The anti-British were there for peace but—fix up that Indian situation. Our colored friends were there for peace but—look after the rights of the colored people for they must be advanced. The anti-Russians—the isolationists—were there, working day and night for peace, plus their own interests, shouting "Peace, peace, provided we get our particular schemes advanced or attached to the peace."

The scale of observation of the unofficial groups was indeed on a very low plane and great credit is due to the delegates of our country and of the other nations for the splendid, constructive and far-visioned contribution they made in the creation of the United Nations Organization.

So far we have discussed our rather disappointing level of intelligence and the need for raising our scales of observation. We have taken a quick view of conditions affecting one-half the population of the world and are mindful of the effect they may have on our own future.

So, let us look at the small businessman. Who is he? For what does he account and where does he fit in the picture?

We consider a plant with 1,000 employees or less as small business; also wholesale establishments with retail sales of $1,000,000 or less; retail stores and service etablishments, etc., with annual net sales of less than $100,000 in volume.

There are about 500,000 small corporations throughout the land not listed on the New York Stock Exchange, and about 1,400,000 individual owners of business houses in the United States. More than 150,000 of the 210,000 industrial plants in the United States are in the category of small business. Ninety-six percent of small businessmen earn less than $25,000 annually.

Total United States employment in trade and industry, according to figures submitted to me for 1939, which were the latest available, showed employment of 18,684,136, with large establishments employing 5,727,370 or 30.7 percent, and small business as the employer of 12,956,766 or 69.3 percent.

In manufacturing establishments only, 29.9 percent of the wage earners were employed in plants of 100 or less; plants with 101 to 250 employees hired 18.7 percent; 251 to 500 employees, 16.1 percent; and 501 to 1,000 employees, 13 percent; or a total of 77.7 percent of wage earners in 1939 were engaged in plants employing 1,000 or less persons, and only 22.3 percent in plants employing over 1,000 persons.

In the final analysis the small businessman is indeed the very backbone of our country and, may I say, that not until the National Small Business Men's Association was founded in 1937, with DeWitt Emery as its president, was this fact recognized or appreciated to the extent that anything was done to protect and crystallize this potent force for the preservation of the public welfare and the advancement of the American way of life.

The small businessman is the major employer of our country; the director of our public-school systems upon which the future of our country depends; the molder of popular opinion in his community; the supporter of the churches, hospitals, fraternal organizations, and other community activities. He provides the necessities for the community, he finances political organizations at the local level. Without him—the small businessman—whether he employs one or a thousand, there would be no America. He has a real responsibility. Down through the years he has been more or less content to accept that which came his way, but that day is gone. The small businessman has not only come to realize that he is important; in fact, essential, but he is more determined to discharge the responsibility which always attends those who occupy positions of power.

The small businessman knows the truth of that which a recent Pope declared, when he said, "The causes of war are five:

"1. The hatred of nation for nation.

"2. The adversity to work.

"3. The contempt of authority.

"4. The thirst for pleasure.

"5. An almost complete repudiation of spiritual ideals."

He knows that we now live in a materialistically selfish world—a despiritualized world. He sees the evidence in the shocking increase in juvenile delinquency, in the increasing crime wave with some kind of a crime committed somewhere in the United States every 20 seconds, with someone raped, feloniously assaulted, or slain every 6 minutes. He feels the impact of the destruction of family life through the ever-increasing percentage of divorce. He experiences the greed and selfishness of certain types of labor leaders, of certain sharp practices by some large and some small competitors. He knows the distrust of the people of other nations for the Americans. He senses the loss of the dignity of our courts through their divided judgments and personal bickerings. He sees the church compromising with principles. He sees compromise and surrender of the unalienable rights of man under force of government edict. He knows that in recent years in high places in government we have had men who have been talkers—not doers—men with ideologies diametrically opposed to the principles which have made us a great people.

The small businessman is deeply conscious of the fundamental teachings of his God and he knows all too well how far afield from those teachings many have departed in these latter years. He recalls that it was the Great Teacher who said to one as they walked beside the Lake of Galilee, discussing the problems of their day, that the first commandment was to love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, but that there was a second commandment as great as the first, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The force of that great commandment comes home to the small businessman now with the realization that he is indeed a neighbor of all peoples everywhere, that through the advancement of science the world has shrunk, that in fact we are but hours from any part of the world, that the commandment is not limited to loving neighbors of his own social strata but involves his neighbors in China, India, Russia, Burma, South America, and in all parts of the world.

The small businessman knows the soundness of the statement of Mr. Attlee, recently made in Parliament, when he said, "The greatest task that faces us today is to bring home to all people, before it is too late, that our civilization can only survive by the accepted practice in international relations and in our national life of the Christian principle, we are members of one another." The small businessman recalls that our own President Woodrow Wilson, in speaking at Swarthmore, Pa., said, "Do not forget as you walk these classic places that you are here to enrich the world; forget that errand and you impoverish yourself."

The small businessman knows that in all the civilizations recorded throughout the history of the world there has come a time in each when, because the people became overmaterialistic, became despiritualized, became unmindful of His teachings, they passed into oblivion and became but a page in history. The small businessman is determined that the civilization of our day, purchased by the lifeblood of our youth in two of the greatest and most devastating wars of history, both within our generation, shall not pass from the earth.

Had we, the American people, been intolerant of what happened at Nurenberg, the course of the world would have been altered; had we been intolerant of the action of the Japanese in going into China, Mussolini's rape of Ethiopia, Hitler's foulness in Poland, millions now dead would have been alive today. Had we refused to tolerate the now admittedly bad interpretations of the Wagner Act—to say nothing of its original enactment; had we become intolerant of the compromises and appeasements of the so-called bargaining table, the so-called conciliators and mediators; had we become intolerant of the abuses of the workingman, of the assaults on management, of the wasteful extravagance of local, State, and National Governments and their agencies, as well as the incompetence therein, the moral and financial burdens inflicted on coming generations would be lessened and the dignity of man heightened.

It's time to become intolerant—to become intolerant of the practice of bearing false witness in business, labor, politics, in all human relations.

It's time to become intolerant of the practices which lower the dignity of man by indoctrinating him with concepts of human relations which can lead but to his degredation and continuous war.

It's time to become intolerant of the surrender, through incompetence or design, whether for purposes of political or personal expediency or otherwise, of the great principles upon which our country has been built.

It's time to become intolerant of all efforts, at home or abroad, to undermine, weaken, and destroy our form of government.

It's time to become intolerant of intolerance in all but matters affecting the fundamental principles governing human behavior and human relations.

It's time to become intolerant of attempts to destroy our faith in God.

Small businessmen—men in the upper 20-percent strata of our people—in the one-half of 1 percent where we find leadership—should lead the way, should become intoler-

ant of the apathy and ignorance of the people; intolerant of the forces which make for hatred, misunderstanding, and ill will; intolerant of lowered scales of observation affecting human relations and behavior.

"Isn't it strange
That princes and kings, and even clowns
Who cavort about in sawdust rings,
And commonfolks like you and me
Are builders of eternity?

To each is given a book of rules
A shapeless mass and a kit of tools,
And each will make, ere life has flown,
A stumbling block or stepping stone."

Tolerating through ignorance or apathy the things which should be intolerable is but placing stumbling blocks where stepping stones should be.

Thank you.

City of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the mission San Juan Bautista will celebrate on Sunday, June 29, 1947, the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the mission, the largest in California.

The celebration will feature a fiesta-rodeo at the historic Mission Plaza and new arena directly below the El Camino Real overlooking the beautiful San Juan Valley.

The celebration featured Sunday, June 29, 1947, is known as Fiesta-Rodeo de San Juan Bautista.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a fine thing that the little City of History, San Juan Bautista, is commemorating such a historic event. Nestled in the beautiful San Juan valley at the foot of famous Fremont Peak, where Gen. John C. Fremont first raised the American flag and defied the Mexicans below, this occasion will again recall the stirring and epic days of early California.

The citizens of San Juan Bautista and San Benito County are to be congratulated.

Helicopters and the Changes They Require in Aviation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a little over a month ago I had the pleasure of listening to an extremely able and highly informative address delivered by Mr. L. Welch Pogue, president of the National Aeronautic Association, member of the committee on aeronautical law of the American Bar Association, and member of the law firm of Pogue and Neal, which is counsel for the Helicopter Council of the Aircraft Industries Association. Mr. Pogue, as most of the Members of this body know, is a former Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The subject of his address was helicopters and the changes they require in aviation law.

The address was delivered at a luncheon of the Aviation Law Institute, honoring Carl B. Rix, president of the American Bar Association. The luncheon, which was sponsored by the Milwaukee Bar Association in cooperation with the committee on aeronautical law of the American Bar Association, was held in Milwaukee on April 25, 1947.

I have myself been interested, for a number of years, in the subject of helicopters. I am not a prophet, but I am convinced in my own mind that helicopters will prove feasible and practicable, and that in the near future we shall see a great deal of activity in that field.

Consideration of the many new problems which will be created by widespread use of helicopters is a fascinating subject, and one which I am sure will interest many Members of this body. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the address to which I have referred, delivered by Mr. Pogue, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the address will make two and three-quarter pages of the RECORD, and that the cost of printing will be $195.25.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELICOPTERS AND THE CHANGES THEY REQUIRE IN AVIATION LAW

(By L. Welch Pogue)

As the title of this talk indicates, the helicopter requires numerous changes in aviation law. By aviation law, I mean, for the most part, statute law—Federal, State, and municipal—including rules and regulations made pursuant thereto by administrative agencies. A large body of aviation law has been developed over the past 30 years. It has been enacted for the purpose of regulating the conventional fixed-wing type of aircraft. Now comes the helicopter, which finds, at the very beginning of its development, that it is subject to all of this body of aviation law, although such law was designed for a different vehicle.

Before it can be understood why changes are required in aviation law to fit the helicopter, it is essential to understand how the helicopter operates in contrast to the ordinary airplane we have come to know, and to have an appreciation of its potential usefulness to the public, and of the extent to which it may become a transportation vehicle widely owned by the average man. Accordingly I shall proceed by first describing some of the more significant and distinguished characteristics of the helicopter and its place in our economy and will refer to some of the changes in aviation law which the helicopter would seem to require in order to permit it to perform its natural functions.

When the age-old desire to shake off the earth and fly entered the twentieth century with perennial hope, it found success, but success with limitations. Flight in the fixed-wing type airplane, requiring lateral movement for support in the air, brought speed, and is bringing in a new epoch in military, political, economic, and social concepts. But during the first half of the century it had not yet reached the common man extensively in his private uses. Now, the helicopter comes along at a comparatively late date with only moderate speeds of from 80 to 100 miles per hour, but with a utility, with operational and safety characteristics, and with mass-production possibilities which give it the promise of the real fulfillment of that age-old desire to fly which the millions of individual world citizens have had. This is for them. It is for them soon.

In the light of the very considerable advance in the art of flight and the science of aeronautics, it is surprising that the helicopter with its wide range of useful possibilities was not developed earlier. Of course, many attempts to do so are recorded in the history of aviation. It is well known that the famous Leonardo da Vinci pioneered the art of flight on paper. It is interesting to note that one of his designs shows a machine consisting of a lifting screw driven about a vertical axis—a helicopter.[1] But the practical helicopter has only recently been created. When you hear anyone raising questions about the helicopter on the ground that it is complicated or costly, just bear in mind that we should give it a little time before judging it under standards calling for the perfect vehicle—as we had to give time for the perfection of nearly every other valuable discovery before it could be expected to achieve its maximum usefulness and acceptance.

In order to understand the helicopter and its future utility, to recognize that it is sui generis, that is, in a class by itself and not an airplane at all in the usual sense, and to appreciate the need for freeing the helicopter from certain laws, rules, and regulations intended for a quite different type of vehicle (that is, the fixed wing airplane), it is essential to have in mind some of the facts about helicopter performance. The necessity of having the facts—all of the facts and the accurate facts—is familiar ground to lawyers. What then are the distinguishing operational characteristics of the helicopter which set it apart from all other kinds of aircraft and render unncessary its conformity with many existing aviation laws, rules, and regulations?

These distinguishing operational characteristics are almost as striking as the art of flight itself was originally. The moving wing, that is, the power-driven rotor, has for the first time given flight a hummingbird omnidirectional agility. I shall mention here the most outstanding only of the special facts concerning helicopter operation which, I believe, will show a compelling need for certain changes in aviation law.

1. Vertical ascent and descent: The moving power-driven wing, or the rotor as it is called, is the remarkable achievement which has freed the helicopter from the limitation, applicable to all fixed-wing type airplanes, which requires that they must maintain a minimum forward speed (that is, in excess of the "stall speed") in order to stay in the air. The helicopter can ascend and descend vertically or at any desired angle. It is more economical to ascend and descend at an angle although it is not in any sense required that the angle be comparable to that required for fixed-wing types.

2. Hovering: The helicopter can hover in mid-air for an indefinite period. This again is made possible by the power-driven rotor. Never before has any aircraft been able to stay in the air without forward speed.

3. Speed may be anything from zero to maximum: The helicopter shares with the automobile the ability to travel at any speed from zero miles per hour to its maximum rate. It has no critical stall speed in the usual sense and can, therefore, slow down at will.

4. Quick stopping in mid-air: The helicopter can stop from a forward cruising speed in a very short distance. From a forward speed of approximately 70 or 80 miles per

[1] See American Helicopter, vol. V, No. III, p. 13, February 1947.

hour at sea level, types now in commercial use can, under emergency conditions, arrest their speed and acquire a hovering stationary position in approximately 75 feet of forward advance from the time the emergency stop is undertaken. Not even an automobile can stop from such a speed in such a short distance.

5. Adjustment to traffic conditions: The helicopter can fly sidewise, backwards or in any direction at adjustable speeds. This characteristic coupled with its ability to hover, to ascend or descend either vertically or at any angle, and to stop quickly, places in the hands of the helicopter pilot an ability to meet traffic conditions which probably exceeds that of an operator of any other known vehicle, including the automobile. As an automobile driver must slow down because of traffic conditions, or fog, or the condition of the highway, so a helicopter pilot can adjust his speed or attain a hovering position in order to meet traffic or weather conditions or surface problems.

6. Parking-lot landings: The helicopter can operate in and out of a space of very limited area. If necessary it can land in an area very little larger than the diameter of its rotor, with or without power.

7. Landing in event of power failure: In the event of power failure, the rotor automatically disengages from the engine and, pursuant to the principle of autorotation, continues to rotate in such a manner as to permit the helicopter to make a relatively safe landing in a few feet of area. This is a complete revolution in the art of flight. Open lots and spaces, suitable for emergency helicopter power-off landings, can be found scattered throughout almost every town and city.

8. Freedom from runways and conventional traffic patterns: The helicopter needs no runways, should never use them, should avoid entry into conventional air-traffic patterns—should be permitted to fly under them in certain cases—and should, so far as possible, stay below or outside the line of flight of conventional aircraft.

9. Noise: Unlike propellers, rotors do not produce an offending noise. If the engines are effectively muffled—as they must be—the helicopter can pass through the air with the greatest of ease without offending the nervous or agitating the fearful.

Thus we see that the helicopter is not an airplane in the conventional sense. Generally speaking, its operational characteristics distinguish it completely from all other vehicles, including airplanes, and establish it as a new and distinct type of vehicle.

One of the early uses of the helicopter will be to carry the mail between suburban areas and between them and central forwarding points in metropolitan communities. The Post Office Department has been a pioneer in this field, as it was in the case of the airplane in the early days.[2] The Post Office conducted experimental tests for the carriage of mail by helicopters in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York. Los Angeles will probably be the first of these areas where regular mail service by helicopter will be authorized by a Civil Aeronautics Board certificate. Under the law no one can carry mail by air without a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the CAB after a public hearing.[3]

The possibilities for time savings in mail deliveries are very great. W. H. Ackerman, postal inspector, has traced two air-mail letters across the country, one using helicopter service at both ends, and the other going by the present method. He finds the elapsed time between mailing and delivery to be 18½ hours where the helicopter is used, and 37 hours where it is not. This is merely illustrative of what can be done.

Next, extensive uses for helicopters in commercial operations will develop; in all probability, develop before there is a widespread private ownership of these vehicles. I will list a few of the uses in which interest has already developed. Rescue work, particularly at sea and in inaccessible places; crop dusting, including orchard spraying and dusting; suburban delivery; pipe-line inspection; power-line inspection (in one case a helicopter did in 1 hour what normally would have required 15 men 5 hours to do, or a total of 75 man-hours); mineral survey; hauling chicle out of the jungle in Central America; exploration of natural resources in undeveloped areas; forest-fire patrol; timber appraisal; aerial photography; traffic control; coast patrol; ship-to-shore operations; lighthouse supply; air express delivery; cattle supervision and animal census; wire laying; and so on.

One category of use deserving special mention is too broad to be developed here. It relates to the military application of this marvelous invention. You can see at a glance that in military rescue work, emergency delivery work, artillery spotting, reconnaissance, and the like, the helicopter offers many possibilities to the military services.

Beyond the experimental uses for mail and specialized commercial uses will come taxi, commuting, and regular local common carrier service. And somewhere along the line the average man will claim the helicopter as his own, somewhat as he claimed the automobile. It is only a question of when—not if. And when that time arrives, helicopters will be counted in very large numbers.

In view of this predicted future wide use, one naturally asks about the subject of nuisance legislation. Nuisance and safety regulation should not be confused. All sorts of weird results and impossible tangles in jurisdiction can and will follow if nuisance regulation masquerades under the name of safety.

Nuisance regulation, whether in the form of statutes, regulations, or ordinances, made under the police power of the States may, but I believe need not, develop into anything of importance in the regulation of helicopters. Intelligent, aggressive self-policing by this new helicopter industry can avoid a mass of nuisance regulation which, if enacted, could smother the use and development of this very promising vehicle for many years. One of the problems is engine noise. As I have indicated, the rotor is not a noise problem as is the propeller in the conventional-type airplane. The engine exhaust can be, and I believe is being, successfully muffled. Other possible nuisance problems can be eliminated by conservative flying, respect for the sensibilities of others both on the ground and in the air, and careful preparation and selection of landing areas so as to avoid unnecessary dust and rotor air wash. Fortunately, good progress is being made in the direction of effective self-policing. Manufacturers are alert to the problem and are not only insisting on thorough careful training of pilots but are prepared to cooperate in a program of indoctrination of both operators and pilots to the end that each operator and pilot should realize that he is representing an important new industry when he operates his helicopter and that he should conduct himself at all times and under all circumstances in such a manner as to avoid endangering its future promising growth and development.

In summary, nuisance legislation need not develop if proper action is taken by those having control of the causes of this problem.

One of the places where change is required is in those provisions of aviation law relating to airports, their establishment and operation. If helicopters do not use landing runways and if they stay out of the traffic patterns of conventional fixed-wing types (as they should do), where are they to land? They should be permitted the maximum freedom consistent with safety in the establishment of helicopter-landing areas. Obviously the helicopter should be permitted to land and take off freely in the country and in the thinly settled districts. If an owner of property wants to permit his helicopter-driving friend to visit him, there should be no law against it, if the operation conforms to all safety rules, any more than there is against your neighbor visiting you by automobile. Of course, I am assuming that the engines will be muffled, as are automobile engines, with comparable results. The same freedom should exist with respect to the individual helicopter owner who desires to base his vehicle at home.

But what about a helicopter landing and take-off area used for regularly scheduled operations or by the miscellaneous public? Several types of landing areas for these purposes will probably be established if sufficient latitude is accorded by governmental authorities. Among these types will be:

1. Privately owned and serviced landing areas open to one or more of the following: (a) Helicopter common carriers of mail, persons, or property; (b) the public generally; (c) individual helicopter owners who have contracted for the landing privilege.

2. Governmentally owned, and either publicly or privately serviced landing areas open to the public.

3. Governmentally owned areas open to use by a helicopter service operated for the Government, such as a helicopter service for the Post Office Department landing in the Government-owned lot near post-office buildings or on post-office rooftops.

Petroleum companies should be very much interested in helicopter landing areas because of the fueling and servicing possibilities. This offers promise of having these facilities operated on a strictly business basis with all of the accompanying benefits resulting from competition. This one possibility might well lead toward placing a minimum amount of emphasis on the need for the municipality to provide them.

It is, of course, clear that zoning laws might prevent the development in a zoned area of a busy helicopter mart (like a garage), servicing and storing helicopters. This type of zoning ordinance is a well-known device to preserve the character of the neighborhood. But beyond this point, it is submitted that the best interest of communities (large and small) do not require licensing by any governmental agency, Federal, State, or municipal, but only that all rules for safe operation be observed scrupulously at all times. If this is to be the result, it is obvious that numerous existing Federal regulations, and State and municipal laws and ordinances, should be adjusted to permit the free establishment of such helicopter landing areas.

This brings us to the major field of laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations relating to safety where certain changes in aviation law are essential. Take, for example, the requirement that an aircraft cannot fly contact unless it has at least 1-mile visibility. This is required for fixed-wing high-speed aircraft in order to avoid the hazard of collision. With the helicopter which can slow down to any desired rate of speed or, if necessary, "stand still" in the air, that is, hover, it is clear that there is a strong case for permitting helicopters to fly at less than 1-mile visibility. This, of course, assumes that the helicopters in so traveling are required to be outside of airport control zones and in a layer of air constituting the first 700 feet above the ground which is not occupied by fixed-wing aircraft operating on instruments.

---

[2] See An Air-Minded Government's Contribution to Civil Aviation, delivered by L. Welch Pogue before the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Southwest Aviation Conference, Wichita, Kans., on April 25, 1941, reprinted in the Technology Review, November 1941.

[3] Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, sec. 401.

Another provision requiring a change is the one providing that except when necessary for landing or taking off no aircraft shall be flown over congested areas of cities, towns, or settlements at less than 1,000 feet above the highest obstacle within a radius of 2,000 feet from the aircraft. This is required for fixed-wing aircraft in order to avoid the hazard of collision with structures on the ground or of having insufficient altitude in the event of power failure to glide to a place where an emergency landing can be made without undue hazard to persons and property in the congested area. With the ability of the helicopter to land safely in very small areas, to hover to proceed at a reduced speed, to stop quickly in midair and thus to adjust itself to any traffic or other conditions, and with the desirability of helicopters staying below the flight path of fixed-wing aircraft, it seems clear that, so far as safety is concerned, a change in aviation law is indicated here so as to eliminate this requirement which is unnnecessary insofar as helcopters are concerned.

In the field of safety regulation it is probable that we must evolve new techniques in the daily operation of our Federal-State-municipal system. Since 1789 our experiment in making the Federal-State relationship work has called for adjustments here and there to meet new factual conditions—all, however, in harmony with the farsighted, fundamentally sound concept of this dual form of government. Thanks to the rapid discovery and growth of new forms of communication and transportation, the basic problem of making the Federal-State relationship work would probably be easier today (if it were to be tried for the first time now) than it was originally. But we still have adaptations to work out; and the regulation of the helicopter is one of them.

Briefly stated, the intelligent regulation of the helicopter calls for a new, high level of cooperation in rule making between the Federal, State, and municipal authorities—all three.

Admittedly some safety regulations applicable to helicopters will be required. As a long-range matter, who should make them? Clearly the Federal Government, in the interest of the safety of interstate air commerce, will continue to regulate helicopter flights in the designated airways and otherwise as necessary. This is because theoretically anyone in the air is potentially a hazard to interstate flight. He actually becomes such in case he is in interstate flight or does not stay clear of interstate flights or gets lost or is careless. It has been held that under existing law the Civil Aeronautics Board has power to provide by regulations that no person shall pilot a civil aircraft in the United States without valid Federal pilot and airworthiness certificates.[4]

It is well recognized that in a field where the Federal Government has the proper constitutional authority and the proper enabling Federal legislation its duly promulgated regulations are controlling and take precedence over inconsistent State and local laws and regulations. It is, of course, entirely possible to have valid State and local laws and regulations which are not inconsistent with the Federal regulations. These State and local laws and regulations are based upon the so-called police power of the States. Because of the fact that the helicopter is a slow-flying, low-flying, essentially short-range vehicle it may well be held that it falls within the police power referred to. Let us suppose that is the case and that we have many differing State laws and many more differing municipal ordinance which, while not inconsistent with the Federal regulations, have to be observed by all helicopter operators.

[4] *United States of America* v. *Andrew D. Drumm, Jr. and Luscombe Airplane No. NC 37066* (50 F. Supp. 451 (U. S. D. C., D. of Nev., 1944)).

In such a state of affairs, the first problem is to face the fact that when a multitude of local regulations are made by many different people, none of whom are experienced in helicopter operation or familiar with its operating characteristics, the results are certainly going to be little less than chaotic. In the second place, a much more serious concern will be that a helicopter pilot contemplating a trip across the country on which he will be visiting several States and many municipalities, will have the almost impossible task of reading all the varying State and municipal laws, rules, and regulations before he starts his trip; but he can't read them without first obtaining them. Does he write to each separate State and each separate municipality and wait for a reply? When does he know that he has the most recent amendments of ordinances and laws? Or is he obliged to subscribe to some very expensive loose-leaf service and read in as many different places as he intends to visit the separate rules and regulations applicable in that particular area? In any event, if each of these jurisdictions is to make its own independent regulations, the helicopter pilot must remember which ordinance, law, or regulation applies to each particular town when he arrives there. The impossibility of keeping a mass of differing information clearly in mind is obvious. With the best of intentions, it would take something more than a Philadelphia lawyer to master such an assignment. Without further illustration, it can be seen that chaos will develop unless some means can be devised to provide the helicopter pilot with the means of learning his rules and regulations from one source, in the most simplified manner and with a minimum of duplication.

Theoretically, it would seem that country-wide helicopter rules designed primarily for the protection of interstate-commerce flights of all types of aircraft, supplemented by any necessary State and local rules designed to meet special local conditions, should all be made around a common council table with Federal, State, and local authorities, all represented and under arrangements which would make available at one source all of the regulations needed. Although our constitutional governmental organization may not entirely meet this theoretical need, it is believed that substantially the same results can be obtained through cooperation between the Federal Government and the States and municipalities.[5] This, however, not only requires cooperation between the Federal Government on the one hand and the States and municipalities on the other, but it also requires cooperation between the States and the municipalities.

Take, for example, the development of a standard helicopter traffic pattern for operations within municipalities. The laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations establishing them and providing for their enforcement would be extremely complex if completely different traffic patterns and theories of traffic distribution were adopted for different municipalities. As much uniformity as possible becomes essential here if a helicopter pilot traveling from one city to another is to stay out of the traffic jail. Shall the helicopter traffic go in a clockwise or counterclockwise direction around some central marker in the municipality? Shall the cardinal directions of the compass be used as major helicopter traffic one-way streets? Shall the municipality be zoned so that out-of-town helicopter traffic coming to or departing from the center of the city should come in or go out at a higher altitude than that destined to or coming from a more outlying zone? A new level of Federal-State-municipal cooperation is required to develop satisfactorily the laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations which will control this important problem.

Numerous changes are required in aviation law. The Federal Government, States, communities, and the people would be acting in their own self-interest if they would subscribe to the following program:

1. Regard the helicopter as a distinct type of vehicle and let it be subject to Federal safety regulations only to the extent and in the manner required by its operating characteristics.

2. In order to permit the helicopter to serve to the full extent of its usefulness, be prepared to modify State and municipal laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations as necessary to permit the helicopter the freedom which its safe operating characteristics will permit.

3. Avoid the enactment of nuisance laws under the mask of safety.

4. Permit helicopter landing areas to be established freely under our competitive system, subject to full observance of all safety laws and, in the case of landing areas to be open to the public or regularly scheduled operations, to zoning restrictions enacted for the purpose of preserving the character of the neighborhood; and modify existing laws as necessary to permit the foregoing to be done.

5. Develop a new, high level of cooperation between Federal-State-municipal regulatory authorities so that:

a. The views of all can be developed in a public record.

b. Uniform regulatory measures can be achieved.

c. The regulations a pilot needs to know can be reduced to a simplified minimum obtainable all in one place.

[5] In this connection, section 205 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, appearing in Title II—Organization of Authority and under a heading entitled "General Powers and Duties of the Authority" and a subheading entitled "Cooperation With State Aeronautical Agencies," provides as follows:

"The Authority is empowered to confer with or to hold joint hearings with any State aeronautical agency, or other State agency, in connection with any matter arising under this act, and to avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of such State agencies as fully as may be practicable in the administration and enforcement of this act."

The word "Authority" includes both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

Truman Policy Set-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Walter Lippmann, in his daily column in the Washington Post for today, points out the weakness of the Truman doctrine as applied to Greece and Turkey. He says that this doctrine was superimposed unnecessarily and most unwisely upon the problem of supporting Greece and Turkey, with the result that Russia can now exploit the Hungarian situation. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article by Mr. Lippmann:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

A SERIOUS SET-BACK

The Kremlin has also been making plans, and the first installment of them is now being

applied. The overt act is the seizure of power in Hungary by the Communists. This was preceded by Mr. Molotov's insistence at the Moscow Conference upon terms for Austria which it was impossible to agree to. The terms were meant to be impossible to agree to. For if there had been an Austrian peace treaty, the Red army would have had no license for remaining in Hungary, after the Senate ratified the Hungarian peace treaty. It was in order to stay in Hungary and then to seize power that Mr. Molotov prevented agreement on Austria at the Moscow Conference.

The seizure of power in Hungary has far-reaching strategical importance. It means that Rumania is surrounded. It means that Czechoslovakia now has a long common frontier with a completely Soviet-dominated state. It means that Tito's Yugoslavia has behind it this same Soviet-dominated state. It means that the pressure on the northern frontier of Greece can be intensified because there is now no gap in the Soviet network of communication down through the Balkans. But most important of all the Soviet network of communications to the southwest has been completed just as the situation in Italy is mounting to a crisis. The coup in Hungary is timed perfectly to enable the Soviet Government to get at Italy from Yugoslavia and Albania and to make the most of its opportunities there.

It is not entirely clear at this distance whether the Communists deliberately provoked Prime Minister de Gasperi to exclude them and the main Socialist Party from the government, or whether the initiative came from his own party and from those who believe the time has come for a show-down with communism. In any event the fact is that the new Italian Government does not represent the majority in the legislature. The Communists and the bulk of the Socialists are not only on the outside, but in open opposition, and on the verge of rebellion.

There are ominous but credible reports that an Italian guerrilla movement against the government is forming. The main strength of the guerrillas, or partisans as they are called, would, of course, be in the northern industrial centers of Italy, in the valley of the Po and the plains of Lombardy, which back up upon the Yugoslav frontier. Thus Italian guerrilla actions and a Communist-Socialist rebellion against the government in Rome can now be supported directly overland from Hungary through Yugoslavia.

We have here the Russian strategical counteroffensive to the Truman doctrine, or rather the first phase of the counteroffensive. The pressure on Greece continues, but at the same time the Soviets have opened up a new avenue of influence and power into northern Italy and the central Mediterranean.

The Truman policy has been to try to contain the Soviets by small measures at all the weak spots on the periphery, and if not to encourage, at least not to discourage, the view in all the threatened countries that we favor show-downs with the Communists everywhere and are prepared and able to support those who bring about a show-down. This policy has now been struck a sharp blow.

The plain and bitter truth is that the Russians are better prepared for a show-down than we are. They are operating near to the sources of their own power. We are operating at a great distance. They are organized inside the critical countries. We have not even made the plan, much less appropriated the money, for the reconstruction of Europe which would, we hope and believe, rally the masses of the people against submission to the kind of thing that has just happened in Hungary. It takes only a few weeks to prepare and only a few days to carry out the seizure of power, and it costs almost nothing. It takes months and months to plan recovery, months and months to debate the plan, and years to make the plan work.

Under the circumstances it cannot have been wise to invite, or even to let the world think we were inviting, a general show-down all along the line. In diplomacy as in war a premature show-down is the way to get a bloody nose.

The Truman doctrine, which was superimposed unnecessarily and most unwisely upon the concrete problem of supporting Greece and Turkey, has got us into a position which the Russians can exploit in Hungary, in Italy, perhaps later in France. The great big hot words which Mr. Truman uttered so eloquently cannot at this time be made good by effective deeds. It would, therefore, have been better not to utter them.

The set-back to our diplomacy and our prestige, which we have now suffered, is serious. But it is not final and fatal, and we are quite strong enough to recognize that we have had a set-back and to profit by it, and in the end to reverse it. But we must face up to the fact that this contest can be won only by very large measures of political construction and of economic aid, that the time for planning and acting is shorter than we have assumed, and that we can indulge in no more diplomacy by doctrines, slogans, and attitudes if we are to retrieve successfully the important ground which has been lost.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Should There Be Federal Aid to Education? broadcast by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Monday, April 21, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, I want to talk to you about America's children, your child and my child. I want to talk to you about the future of our children.

Did you know that this year 5,000,000 children will receive an inferior education? Two million others will suffer a serious impairment in their schooling. And 75,000 unfortunate children will receive no education of any kind.

All over the United States the people are talking about a crisis in education. A distinguished educator, in a Nation-wide survey for the New York Times, described it this way: "Although the schools of the United States did not suffer from a single air raid during the war, they are being wrecked as surely as though they had been blasted by heavy bombers."

Classrooms are terribly overcrowded. Often more than one class is taught in the same room. Many school buildings are poorly heated and poorly lighted. Equipment is old and inadequate.

We entrust the minds and characters of our most precious resource—our children—to the teacher for many hours in the day. We look to the teacher to mold the child for the responsibilities of manhood and womanhood.

And yet, janitors and charwomen in public buildings are paid more than the average school teacher. Some teachers get less than $600 for a whole year's work. Is it any wonder that since 1939 more than one-third of the Nation's teachers have quit the schoolroom for other jobs? Thousands of today's teachers hold only emergency certificates, and are not adequately trained and prepared for their work.

We talk of a crisis.

What we are really saying, my friends, is that your child and mine are being denied their American birthright. They are being denied that education which will best help them grow up to be good citizens and earn a decent living.

The better your child's education, the better his chance for a good income, the stronger he will be as a defender of our country in time of national danger, and the greater contribution he can make as a citizen to the moral and economic power of our country and to the peace of the world.

We can no longer neglect the education of our children. Neglect means the loss of precious golden minutes which our children can never replace. Your child and my child can never go back and pick up the lost years.

You and I must act.

We must act in our school districts on problems which we can solve by local action.

We must get the States to do all they can.

And then there is a third indispensable step. The Federal Government must act. The problem of poorly educated American children is the whole country's problem. Some of the States, the low-income States, simply do not have the income to give their children an adequate education.

For example, Mississippi makes a greater effort than New York to educate her children. Yet New York spends an average of some $200 on each school child per year, while Mississippi—paying more of its income for education—can spend only $44.80 on each child.

Of course, you can expect arguments against Federal aid to education. In the early days there were arguments against all public education.

You will be told that the Federal Government, with its public debt, cannot afford to aid the State school systems.

This is penny wise and pound foolish. Money invested in education brings our Nation its richest returns in national security, in national prosperity, and in the happiness and well-being of our people.

You will hear that Federal aid will replace State effort for education.

The Federal aid bill requires State effort and provides incentive by increasing Federal aid as State effort increases.

You will be warned that Federal aid means the Federal Government will take over the public schools.

That is not true. The bill which I have joined in sponsoring has strong and effective safeguards against any Federal interference with the control of the schools. Control of the public schools stays where it has always been—in the hands of the States.

There is nothing new about Federal aid for education. We have had Federal aid for years for vocational education in our high schools and trade schools, for the land-grant colleges of the States, and for many State educational enterprises. We have it for our school-lunch program. And it has always left the control entirely with the States.

The bill in the present Congress, sponsored by the National Education Association, was jointly introduced by four Democrats and four Republicans. This is important. It means that neither major political party can disclaim responsibility for the urgent need to educate our children and to see that America's teachers are paid decent salaries.

We have at this moment an opportunity to lead mankind over a new frontier and into a new era. The world is looking to the United States for leadership. We failed to grasp such an opportunity after the First

World War. We now have a second chance. We cannot count on a third.

We must prepare our children for the building of the peace of the world. America's children must be educated, and this can be done only with Federal aid.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article in support of the St. Lawrence seaway which appeared in the Denver Post of May 25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AGAIN IN PUBLIC EYE

(By Roscoe Fleming)

Soon one of the great proposed American public works of all time will be back in the news—Congress will be asked once again to approve plans for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, and provide funds for its construction.

By a new plan, backed by Senators VANDENBERG and BARKLEY, among others, the whole project would be designed to pay for itself. Tolls would be charged on ships to pay for the navigation features. Formerly no toll was planned. The project would develop 1,650,000 kilowatts of electric power. This would pay for itself—at wholesale rates even lower than those of Bonneville, the continent's cheapest water power up to this time.

Canada, our partner in the gigantic venture, is said to be receptive to the idea of charging tolls for ship passage. The prospect for the seaway, fought over for many years, appears more favorable.

CHANNEL MAIN ITEM

What is the St. Lawrence seaway? Briefly, it is proposed to build a 27-foot-deep channel to admit mid-sized oceangoing ships up the route of the mighty St. Lawrence River which drains the Great Lakes.

Here is a 2,700-mile deep waterway stretching from the Atlantic, past the East's ocean ports, right into the heart of the continent. There is now fairly deep water everywhere, save for one 50-mile stretch of rapids along northern New York.

There is a 14-foot channel now. But, loaded, only ships 250 feet long or less, and 1,500 tons displacement or less, can use it.

The new channel would be 27 feet deep with an effective depth of 25 feet (ships sink 6 inches deeper in fresh water; and at least 18 inches of water between the keel and the bottom are favored by careful shipowners).

AN ENGINEER'S DREAM

It would permit ships of 10,000 tons or more, such as the Liberty or Victory type, to moor at Chicago, Duluth, Milwaukee. These great cities would become ports of the seven seas, though not for the very biggest ships.

The St. Lawrence is an electrical engineer's dream. The Missouri in flood flows 70 times as much water as at its dryest period. The St. Lawrence drains five inland seas with a total water surface as large as Colorado. It never flows less than 50 percent of its maximum.

The power plants would develop their 1,650,000 kilowatts—twice as much as Hoover Dam now develops—so efficiently that the cost of the power would be only about one-tenth of a cent per kilowatt-hour.

The cost of the whole project at 1940 prices was estimated at about $285,000,000. It might run to $400,000,000 at present prices. Canada would bear half the remaining cost—she has already done useful work worth about $140,000,000.

The State of New York stands ready to pay $93,000,000 in consideration of getting half for power—Canada gets half—for distribution through the New York State Power Authority. (One of the Nation's pools of high-cost power is in lower New York.)

RAILROADS OPPOSED

What has held up the seaway so far? Once the Senate voted in favor of it, but it was presented as a treaty with Canada, and did not get the necessary two-thirds. Since then it has been stymied by various blockades.

Chief among its most effective opponents have been the national railroad lobby, and the national private power company lobby. The latter doesn't want any more low-cost public-power developments, as exemplified in its fight to cut the Interior Department's throat in the House.

But, you say, surely, the railroads springing off the Great Lakes, like the Burlington, Great Northern, Northern Pacific, Union Pacific, Northwestern, Milwaukee, would profit?

Yes, and up until 1934, according to Julius Barnes, of Duluth, Herbert Hoover's great friend who has fought so long for the waterway, they were for it.

In that year, says Mr. Barnes, they came under the domination of the eastern railroads via the American Association of Railroads. And they began to fight the waterway against their own interest and that of their patrons. Here is another count in the charge being built up that the eastern railroads and eastern financiers dominate the United States railroad scene to the West's detriment.

FARMERS WOULD BENEFIT

Arguments pro and con for the waterway:

1. It would greatly reduce the freight costs of shipping upper Missouri Basin farm products, due to the approach of low-cost water rates as near as Duluth. This would mean more money for farmers clear out to Wyoming and Colorado.

2. It would reduce freight costs on manufactured goods for the same reasons, both for export and import. Some opponents of the seaway have painted it as placing both farmers and manufacturers more at the mercy of cheap imports. Tell that to New York City. How hard she is fighting the seaway to retain her present status of being ruined by cheap imports and exports.

It would open up channels to heavy raw materials, like the immense iron deposits of Newfoundland, when our own near exhaustion.

Opponents say that the waterway would be shut by ice 5 months of the year anyway. But the Great Lakes, in 7 months of the year, carry the world's greatest tonnage of heavy materials. They are an indispensable link in our economy, very nearly its heart.

Opponents say the waterway isn't needed, and no one would use it. In the same breath they say it would ruin eastern ports like Boston and New York and Baltimore, by bypassing them. They can't have their argument and eat it, too.

Lastly they say it is socialistic to build another great public power plant and save the mighty energy that now goes drifting uselessly out of the St. Lawrence with the tide.

What effect would the seaway have on the Western part of the Rocky Mountain Empire? Probably not much directly. The wave of cheaper freight rates might smooth out before it reached here. But it would provide an enormous stimulus for growth, population and prosperity in the Eastern part of the Empire, all the way west through the Dakotas and Nebraska.

We should certainly get the reflex of this—more visitors in summer and winter, more buyers in our stores, more livestock moving through our markets, more customers for our industrial products.

TWENTY STATES AFFECTED

According to proponents of the seaway—and the Government's studies of it—people in 20 States would receive large or small benefits. They include Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming—besides Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Wisconsin.

Actually what helps one helps all, contrary to the current economic and political attitude that one region or community can grow rich or stay rich only by keeping others poor.

The Rocky Mountain Empire's economic growth has been stunted and blighted by eastern opposition and jealousy. There's another backward region neighboring the St. Lawrence—all the way from New York State up beyond Maine. Release that enormous cheap-power possibility on the St. Lawrence, touch the region with ocean navigation, and watch the story of TVA repeat itself in a different setting.

And the Nation will have added another dispersed self-sufficient industrial area, in protection against the atomic age.

So far as the record shows, Colorado Senators have voted only once on this. That time they voted not to attach a seaway bill to the 1945 rivers and harbors bill. Parliamentary considerations may have influenced their votes, rather than the merits of the measure.

American Relief for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address made by the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, a former distinguished Member of the House, on the occasion of the launching of the Connecticut drive for $500,000 for American relief to Poland, at the Bushnell Memorial in Hartford, Conn., on May 28, 1947. Mrs. Luce is chairman of the drive in the State of Connecticut.

Connecticut's quota for Polish relief is $500,000. This is to be raised by voluntary contributions throughout the month of June. It will be collected in money, food, and clothing. We have just heard our newly appointed Ambassador and fellow Nutmegger, Mr. Stanton Griffis, urge us to go over the top with our share. His forceful words will bring hope to the Polish people and enthusiasm to the many friends of Poland in our State.

Now let me read you a letter. It was written to me by another distinguished public servant, the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane. Mr. Lane is our recently retired Ambassador to Poland. You all know why Mr. Lane asked President Truman to relieve him of his Warsaw post. He wanted to talk frankly and freely to the American people about the Polish situation. He saw, after 2 years in his post, that this is the most tragic human situation and dangerous political situation

we have to face. This is the letter of a man whose patriotism is not to be questioned, since he renounced all personal ambition and preference in order to serve better the interests of America:

"DEAR MRS. LUCE: In connection with the meeting at Hartford to mark the opening of the campaign to raise funds to support the work of the American relief for Poland, I should like to say a few words on behalf of this organization which has done such splendid work in Poland.

"While I was Ambassador in Poland I was greatly impressed by the efficient and wholehearted efforts of the organization, and I was especially gratified to note that the supplies were distributed in Poland without regard to political, religious or racial considerations.

"As you well know, I do not approve of the present Communist-controlled Polish Government nor of its policies to dominate the people of Poland without regard to the Government's commitment to hold free and unfettered elections. I feel, however, that it would be an appalling injustice if the Polish people, which has already suffered from Nazi occupation and now from Communist domination, should be punished because of the misdeeds of its rulers.

"By contributing to the American Relief for Poland, American citizens will not only be rendering assistance but we shall be doing something even more important—demonstrating to the Polish people that the American people are still thinking of them during their unhappy time.

"The Polish question is of such importance to the United States in its greater international implications that it concerns all Americans whether of Polish descent or otherwise. It is to be hoped, therefore, that all Americans sympathetic with democratic principles will support the splendid work of the American Relief for Poland.

"Sincerely yours,

"ARTHUR BLISS LANE."

The previous speakers on this program, Dean Francis Swietlik, Mr. Chester Bowles, Dr. S. L. Smykowski, Ambassador Griffis, have all said in effect the same thing. A charitable regard for the sufferings of the Polish people, combined with a patriotic commonsense regard for our American world position, is the motive which brought us together tonight. And these additional words, coming from such a disinterested and authoritative source as Ambassador Lane, must dispell any remaining doubt in your minds that the help you give to Poland will be used to aid the forces of tyranny.

They will be used, in his words, "without regard to political, religious, or racial considerations." Here is democratic action: Your funds will not only keep life in the bodies of men, women, and children who will otherwise die; they will fan the fire of freedom in hearts that will otherwise despair.

And now I speak for myself. Like you, I am proud of my country. It is more than the truth to say that American is today, as yesterday, the last best hope of men on earth. I have no patience with the people who never have anything good to say of Uncle Sam. The cynics and sourpusses who call him Uncle Sap and Uncle Shylock; the ostriches who call him Uncle Butinsky, and the butinskies who call him Uncle Ostrich. And I despise the saboteurs who traipse around inciting hatred against us by telling other nations that Uncle Sam is a money-mad, power-hungry, war-minded imperialist itching to chuck an atomic bomb at anyone who gets in his way. When you think about the demands that our taxpayers have met and are still meeting for military aid, financial, political, and charitable aid—well, we are not boasting when we say once in a while a few kind words for Uncle Sam.

But no nation—as no individual—is above all reproach. Besides, when free Americans stop finding fault with their own conduct, and the conduct of their Government—beware. That day we will be a hard-hearted people and a short-sighted people. And that day we will be a people ripe for the plucking by dictators at home or abroad.

It is in this spirit that I say any American who has not lost all sense of his country's honor must look upon America's conduct to Poland since Yalta as the most shameful chapter in American history.

Let's take a brief look at that history.

In 1939 a free, independent Poland was brutally attacked by Hitler. Attacked because it would not give in to Nazi demands, as far stronger countries had.

I was in Poland on the eve of that attack. I saw Polish people preparing to lead their little army into battle against German tanks, on cavalry horses. Oh, the Poles knew that to meet Hitler's iron hordes on horseback meant slaughter, destruction, and defeat. They met them. God knows where they found the courage. It seemed such folly. And so it was: The folly of the Cross. And when Stalin shook hands with Hitler on the Nazi-Soviet pact, Poland was crucified—between two thieves.

Then Poland lived under a reign of double terror, the like of which the world has never seen. Wherever Brown hands, or Red hands could be laid on Polish patriots and leaders they were liquidated, put at forced labor, thrown into concentration camps, sent into Siberian exile. Three and one-half million Jews were cremated. Then thieves fell out: Hitler attacked Russia. Only then were the Polish men and leaders, who had not already been exterminated by the Reds, freed by Russia to form an anti-Nazi army. But Poles don't have to be free to fight. In the very heart of Hitler-held Poland, General Bor-Koromoski formed an underground army. On a prearranged signal with Russia and ourselves, General Bor launched an uprising in Warsaw. But the Red Army that then stood at Warsaw's gates, and had smoothly promised to come to his aid, never showed. No; it never showed at all. And Warsaw was reduced, block by block, house by house, to a city of rubble and mud, blood and corpses.

All during these days, America looked upon the suffering of Poland and wept. And promised. Promised, in the name of the Atlantic Charter, that at war's end both Germany and Russia would leave Polish soil. Promised that Poland would again be free. Day long during the war, the American radio blared these promises by short wave to Poland. These promises had the sanction of a President, a Secretary of State, the Congress, and—is it not so?—the whole American people.

Were these crocodile tears Americans wept? Were we giants in our promises; pygmies in our performance?

A free American people must judge. Yalta was the measure of our promises. Yalta sanctioned the fifth partitioning of Poland. And Potsdam confirmed it.

The week that the hush-hush news of Yalta leaked to the Allied Armies, I happened to be visiting General Anders' army, fighting under General Mark Clark's gallant United States Fifth on the Italian front. That was the army recruited in Russian-held Poland, and Russia after Hitler had two-timed Mr. Stalin. General Anders had marched his men thousands of miles through Russia and the Near East to join our forces in the African campaign. His men had fought six long years. They knew neither leave nor rotation. Their homes lay ahead of them in enemy hands. And so did their replacements. In that week of Yalta I found it hard to look in the hurt, accusing eyes of General Anders' soldiers. I shall never forget how ashamed I was that day to be an American.

For any army but a Polish army that betrayal by its strongest ally—the one that had wept most and promised loudest—would have been the signal to quit. To quit in hate and despair. General Anders' army did not quit. Why? Said General Anders to me: "We fought all the way out to keep our country free. We will fight all the way in to make it free. If we don't fight, who in all the world will fight for us now?"

You know the rest: The slow, mealy-mouthed acceptance by our leaders of Soviet expansion in Poland, our double-talk betrayal of Poland's real democratic leaders, the hypocritical countenancing by our Government of that disgraceful farce—the recent "free and unfettered" elections in Poland. Some may call this conduct prudence, others power politics. Still others impeach it softly, as appeasement. In plain words, it is either stupidity or cowardice. Neither is it worthy of our Uncle Sam.

Does all this sound political or somehow partisan? Then shall Americans tremble to be called a partisan of freedom? Shall we blush to be found partisans of our country's honor? Shall we apologize to be branded partisans of America's interests?

Oh, sure, I wish there were no need to speak this way tonight. How fine if we could put Poland's case on the sole grounds of democratic bounty and Christian charity. But we are honest men and women. Poland's misery does more than twist our hearts; it taunts our consciences. And we are freemen, living in a free country. We are mixed up beyond dispute, in the mistakes our leaders have made in our name. We have not inflicted the wounds that Poland suffers. But we have let them widen. We have broken no heads in Poland. But we have helped to break Polish hearts.

Let me tell you, in closing, a Polish story. I suppose you would call it a Polish joke. It is a joke that is very popular among Polish peasants just now, particularly among the ones who were hurled into jail for refusing to vote as told in those recent "free, unfettered elections."

God, it seems, wanted an angelic estimate of how things were going on His earth. So He sent the angel Gabriel to make a survey. Gabriel returned with this report, "I visited America," he said, "and in America the people were talking of war. But they had cut down their armies, destroyed their air forces, and done away with all rationing. So I visited Russia. In Russia, their leaders were all talking of peace. But they were keeping a vast army, building big air forces, and rigidly controlling all foodstuffs. I came back by way of Poland. Poland was dominated and even occupied by an alien power. The people had no shelter, no clothing, no food, no army, and no air force. But the Poles were all talking of victory and freedom!" Then God shook His head and smiled. "Those Poles," He said, "they always did count on Me."

It is said that God helps those who help themselves. But when a people is so sick and hungry and homeless that they can no longer help themselves, maybe God will help those who help them.

No citizens have ever been more generous in the past than the citizens of Connecticut, when the sufferings of others challenged their help. Let us, in this campaign surpass all our previous generosity.

Let us dig deep in our purses, raid our larders, ransack our attics for Poland.

Let us give to this cause—not in charity, but in gratitude. For if the freemen of the world won't all be Poles together—we'll end up poles apart.

Niech zyje wolna Polska!

A Yankee Trick?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every patriotic American will be shocked to hear that the character of Abraham Lincoln has been assassinated by an unreconstructed rebel. I believe the character of the Great Emancipator and savior of our Republic will survive the attack of Dr. Charles C. Tansill.

I suggest that the doctor take time to read the speech made by the Honorable Alexander H. Stephens, of the State of Georgia, in which he urged the southern hotheads bent on a war of rebellion to abandon their treasonable and ruinous course.

I insert the eloquent appeal of the Honorable Alexander H. Stephens to his colleagues in an effort to cool their tempers and thus lessen their zeal for rebellion:

Mr. President, this step of secession, once taken, can never be recalled; and all the baleful and withering consequences that must follow, will rest on the convention for all coming time. When we and our posterity shall see our lovely South desolated by the demon of war, which this act of yours will inevitably invite and call forth; when our green fields of waving harvest shall be trodden down by the murderous soldiery and fiery car of war sweeping over our land; our temples of justice laid in ashes; all the horrors and desolations of war upon us; who but this convention will be held responsible for it? And who but him who shall have given his vote for this unwise and ill-timed measure, as I honestly think and believe, shall be held to strict account for this suicidal act by the present generation, and probably cursed and execrated by posterity for all coming time, for the wide and desolating ruin that will inevitably follow this act you now propose to perpetrate? Pause, I entreat you, and consider for a moment what reasons you can give, that will even satisfy yourselves in calmer moments—what reason you can give to your fellow sufferers in the calamity that it will bring upon us. What reasons can you give to the nations of the earth to justify it? They will be the calm and deliberate judges in the case; and what cause or one overt act can you name or point, on which to rest the plea of justification? What right has the North assailed? What interest of the South has been invaded? What justice has been denied? And what claim founded in justice and right has been withheld? Can either of you, today, name one governmental act of wrong, deliberately and purposely done by the Government of Washington, of which the South has a right to complain? I challenge the answer. While on the other hand, let me show the facts (and believe me, gentlemen, I am not here the advocate of the North; but I am here the friend, the firm friend, and lover of the South, and her institutions, and for this reason I speak thus plainly and faithfully for yours, mine, and every other man's interest, the words of truth and soberness), of which I wish you to judge, and I will only state facts which are clear and undeniable, and which now stand as records authentic in the history of our country. When we of the South demanded the slave-trade, or the importation of Africans for the cultivation of our lands, did they not yield the right for 20 years? When we asked a three-fifths representation in Congress for our slaves, was it not granted? When we asked and demanded the return of any fugitive from justice, or the recovery of those persons owing labor or allegiance, was it not incorporated in the Constitution, and again ratified and strengthened by the fugitive slave law of 1850? But do you reply that in many instances they have violated this compact, and have not been faithful to their engagements? As individual and local communities, they may have done so; but not by the sanction of government; for that has always been true to southern interests. Again, gentlemen, look at another act; when we have asked that more territory should be added, that we might spread the institution of slavery, have they not yielded to our demands in giving us Louisiana, Florida, and Texas, out of which 4 States have been carved, and ample territory for 4 more to be added in due time, if you, by this unwise and impolitic act, do not destroy this hope, and, perhaps, by it lose all, and have your last slave wrenched from you by stern military rule, as South America and Mexico were; or by the vindicative decree of a universal emancipation, which may reasonably be expected to follow.

But, again, gentlemen, what have we to gain by this proposed change of our relation to the General Government? We have always had the control of it, and can yet, if we remain in it, and are as united as we have been. We have had a majority of the Presidents chosen from the South, as well as the control and management of most of those chosen from the North. We have had 60 years of Southern Presidents to their 24, thus controlling the executive department. So of the judges of the Supreme Court, we have had 18 from the South, and but 11 from the North; although nearly four-fifths of the judicial business has arisen in the free States, yet a majority of the Court has always been from the South. This we have required so as to guard against any interpretation of the Constitution unfavorable to us. In like manner we have been equally watchful to guard our interests in the legislative branch of Government. In choosing the presiding presidents (pro tempore) of the Senate, we have had 24 to their 11. Speakers of the House we have had 23 and they 12. While the majority of the Representatives, from their greater population, have always been from the North, yet we have so generally secured the Speaker, because he, or to a great extent, shapes and controls the legislation of the country. Nor have we had less control in every other department of the General Government. Attorney generals we have had 14, while the North have had but 5. Foreign ministers we have had 86, and they but 54. While three-fourths of the business which demands diplomatic agents abroad is clearly from the free States, from their greater commercial interest, yet we have had the principal embassies, so as to secure the world markets for our cotton, tobacco, and sugar on the best possible terms. We have had a vast majority of the higher offices of both Army and Navy, while a larger proportion of the soldiers and sailors were drawn from the North. Equally so of clerks, auditors, and comptrollers filling the executive department; the records show, for the last 50 years, that of the 3,000 thus employed, we have had more than two-thirds of the same, while we have but one-third of the white population of the Republic.

Again, look at another item, and one, be assured, in which we have a great and vital interest; it is that of revenue, or means of supporting government. From official documents, we learn that a fraction over three-fourths of the revenue collected for the support of the Government has uniformly been raised from the North.

Pause now while you can, gentlemen, and contemplate carefully and candidly these important items. Look at another necessary branch of Government, and learn from stern statistical facts how matters stand in that department. I mean the mail and post-office privileges that we now enjoy under the General Government as it has been for years past. The expense for the transportation of the mail in the free States was, by the report of the Postmaster General for the year 1860, a little over $13,000,000, while the income was $19,000,000. But in the slave States the transportation of the mail was $14,716,000, while the revenue for the same was $8,001,026, leaving a deficit of $6,704,974, to be supplied by the North, for our accommodation, and without it, we must have been entirely cut off from this most essential branch of Government.

Leaving out of view for the present, the countless millions of dollars you must expend in a war with the North; with tens of thousands of your sons and brothers slain in battle, and offered up as sacrifices upon the altar of your ambition—and for what, we ask again? Is it for the overthrow of the American Government, established by our common ancestry, cemented and built up by their sweat and blood, and founded on the broad principles of right, justice, and humanity? And as such, I must declare here, as I have often done before, and which has been repeated by the greatest and wisest of statesmen and patriots, in this and other lands, that it is the best and freest Government—the most equal in its rights, the most just in its decisions, the most lenient in its measures, and the most aspiring in its principles, to elevate the race of men, that the sun of heaven ever shown upon. Now, for you to attempt to overthrow such a Government as this under which we have lived for more than three-quarters of a century—in which we have gained our wealth, our standing as a nation, our domestic safety, while the elements of peril are around us, with peace and tranquillity accompanied with unbounded prosperity and rights unassailed—is the height of madness, folly, and wickedness, to which I neither lend my sanction nor my vote.

The Washington Post of June 3, 1947, carries a story, Just a Yankee Trick, which has caused the insertion of the speech of the Honorable Alexander H. Stephens:

JUST A YANKEE TRICK—LINCOLN CAUSED SOUTH TO OPEN CIVIL WAR, HISTORIAN ASSERTS

(By Walter T. Pulliam)

Abraham Lincoln was charged yesterday with tricking the South into starting the Civil War.

That allegation echoed through hallways of the United States Capitol yesterday as nearly 100 loyal children of the Confederacy gathered to pay homage to Jefferson Davis.

The speaker was Dr. Charles C. Tansill, a Georgetown University history professor.

He accused the Great Emancipator, in language reminiscent of Johnny Reb of dubious intrigue before the 1861 opening gunfire at Fort Sumter.

"The responsibility for the Civil War," he declared, "rests securely upon only one pair of shoulders—and those shoulders belonged to Abraham Lincoln."

Of Fort Sumter, he charged Lincoln "played fast and loose" with southerners in order to trick them into a bombardment of the famous fort, and make them appear the aggressors.

Tansill was principal speaker at a wreath-laying at a statue of Jefferson Davis in the Capitol's Statuary Hall. The service was part of a 3-day observance of the Confederate

President's one hundred and thirty-ninth birthday anniversary.

The United Daughters of the Confederacy, Children of the Confederacy, and the Sons of Confederate Veterans took part in the service, but the commander in chief of the last-mentioned organization, Fred P. Myers, disavowed Tansill's speech as representing the sentiments of the SCV.

"I think he went too far," Myers said. "I don't think he should have made such an attack on Lincoln. Several others present expressed concern over it."

Mrs. John M. Wilcox, president-general of the UDC, also disavowed the speech.

"His allusions to Mr. Lincoln," she said, "do not reflect our views. We think it rather untimely that those remarks were made. We don't care to start up a controversy."

Lincoln's election in 1860, Tansill charged, killed the Federal Union Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson had worked for, and he added the President-elect "did not have the decency to give it a polite burial."

He charged Lincoln did nothing following his 1860 election "to quiet the growing friction that pointed to war" between the States, and he said that as the 1860 crisis deepened the "Sphinx of Springfield remained eloquently silent."

He praised Jefferson Davis as an ideal for freedom-seeking peoples.

"On January 10, 1861, Jefferson Davis," he declared, "clearly saw the futility of any further moves toward erecting a bridge of understanding between the North and the South.

"Like Horatius of old, Lincoln stood at the northern end of such a bridge and he would permit no messenger of peace to pass through his careful guard."

Thirty-five UDC and SCV members, including Mrs. Wilcox, were received by Mrs. Truman at the White House after the Capitol ceremony.

The high light of the birthday celebration will come this afternoon at 2 p. m., when the Confederate organizations unveil the eastern terminal marker of the Jefferson Davis Highway. The marker is on the Virginia side of the Highway Bridge. Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY (Democrat, Kentucky) will speak.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, when I appeared recently before the House Subcommittee on Education to testify in behalf of Federal aid to education, considerable discussion followed my statement that both Great Britain and Russia spend more of their national income for education than does the United States.

I desire to submit the following information in support of that statement: First an excerpt from an article appearing in the New York Times on February 12, 1947, in which Benjamin Fine reported on the state of American public education.

This article, one of a series of twelve, was the basis for a statement by the Honorable William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, before the American Association of School Administrators, March 3, 1947, at Atlantic City, N. J.

To me the most interesting and significant statement in Dr. Fine's report—

Said Mr. Benton—

is the following: The United States is spending 1.5 percent of its national income for its schools; Great Britain is spending 3 percent; the Soviet Union is spending 7.5 percent. Every major power except the United States is sharply increasing its budget for education. The contrast between the United States and the Soviet Union applies to absolute figures as well as to percentages.

A portion of Dr. Fine's February 12 article follows:

[From the New York Times of February 12, 1947]

LOW PAY COMPELS TEACHERS TO QUIT

(By Benjamin Fine)

The United States spends less of its per capita income for education than does Great Britain or the Soviet Union. During the past year this country spent about $2,500,000,000 for public-school education, or approximately 1.5 percent of the estimated income.

For the same period, Great Britain, with its tremendously improved school program, is estimated to have spent close to 3 percent. The Soviet Union, sky-rocketing its support for schools and colleges, averages around 8 percent of its total income.

Frankly conceding that education is an important part of its 5-year plan, the Russian Government increased its 1946–47 educational budget over the preceding year by 52 percent. Its new budget, recently announced, calls for an appropriation of $7,500,000,000 for education.

LACK OF SUPPORT CRITICIZED

Many educators are concerned at the lack of financial support that education is receiving in this country. They say that if Russia can spend seven and one-half billion dollars for education to insure the continuation of its communistic form of government, the United States can do no less to spread knowledge of democracy among the youths of the land.

At present the money spent for the support of education in this country is far less than that spent for liquor or tobacco. In 1945 the United States spent $7,700,000,000 for alcoholic beverages, or $55.65 per capita of population. At the same time, we spent about $2,500,000,000 for elementary and secondary schools, or $17.76 per capita.

Tobacco, too, came out ahead of the support for public schools. In 1945 we spent $3,000,000,000 for tobacco, or $21.49 per capita of population. It is probably much higher today. Beauty- and barber-shop services, together with toilet preparations, came to just about the figure we spend for schools.

The following tables indicate the importance attached to education in Russia:

TABLE 1.—*State budget of the U. S. S. R. for 1946 and 1947—expenditures on defense, education, and social services*

	1946 actual		1947 planned		1947 as percentage of 1946
	Billions of rubles	Percent of total	Billions of rubles	Percent of total	
Total expenditures	304.1	100.0	371.6	100.0	122.2
Armed forces	72.6	23.9	67.1	18.1	92.3
Social and cultural expenses	72.6	23.9	107.1	28.8	147.5
Education	38.1	12.6	52.4	14.6	142.3
Health and physical culture	13.8	4.5	18.9	5.1	137.0
Social security, veterans	17.6	5.8	20.6	5.5	117.0
Aid to mothers	3.6	1.2	5.9	1.5	163.0
Social insurance	7.3	2.4	9.3	2.5	127.4

Source: Soviet press, Feb. 21–26, 1947.

TABLE 2.—*School attendance in the U. S. S. R.*

[Thousands]

	1940	1946	1947
Primary and secondary	32,900	----------	31,300
Higher educational institutions	541	605	696
Technical schools	746	945	1,064
Trade schools	----------	1,300	1,900

Source: Soviet press, Feb. 21–26, 1947.

Analysis of the New Wagner-Ellender-Taft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an analysis of the housing bill, commonly referred to as the new Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which bears the official title of Senate 866 and which is styled "National Housing Commission Act."

This summary and analysis was prepared by Mr. Morton D. Bodfish, chairman of the executive committee of the United States Savings and Loan League, and Mr. Abner Ferguson, former Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. Bodfish is a highly respected citizen of Chicago, who has served as a member of the Chicago Planning Commission and as chairman of the city planning advisory board. He is a former professor of economics, real estate, and real-estate management, and has

served with distinction on the faculties of three of our outstanding universities. He has been complimented with the presidency of the International Union of Building Societies and Savings and Loan Associations, which is an international organization devoted to the extension and development of individual thrift and home ownership. During World War II he rendered highly important service to the Navy Department and also in the Office of Strategic Services and has served without compensation, other than reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses.

Mr. Abner Ferguson, who cooperated in the preparation of this analysis, has had long experience in the housing field in the Federal Government, and has over the years been assigned to many positions of trust and responsibility, and was finally designated as Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration in the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration. In this capacity he was the active and directing head of the Federal Government's activities in the field of insured mortgages as provided in the Federal Housing Act, and achieved singular success in this field. This analysis, therefore, has behind it wide experience and expert knowledge in the home-building and finance field and should prove of extraordinary interest.

Both of these gentlemen have had long experience in the housing field and have been moved by the single purpose of making the maximum of housing facilities available to the American people on a basis which is most effective and in the best American manner. The United States Savings and Loan League has a long and distinguished record of achievement in the field of thrift and housing and home ownership and is unsurpassed by any group or organization in or out of Government in seeking to provide for the American people adequate housing developed at the local level on a sound fiancial basis.

SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN 1946 AND 1947 HOUSING BILLS

The important differences between the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, S. 1592, which was before the Congress in 1946, and the new Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill, S. 866, introduced in the Senate on March 10, 1947, are as follows:

Organization: Under the 1947 bill, as was the case in the 1946 bill, the Home Loan Bank Board is legislated out of existence and all its functions are turned over to the present Federal Home Loan Bank Administrator (or Commissioner). The new bill proposes to set up a National Housing Commission composed of a National Housing Administrator, a Coordinating Council, and an administrative staff, but a careful reading of the title provides convincing proof that all the power, authority, and functions of the set-up are lodged in the National Housing Administrator and, although it is done through the devious method of creating councils and commissions, it is not substantially different in its final results from the National Housing Administration provided for in the 1946 bill.

The Coordinating Council is composed of the National Housing Administrator, a position created by the act with a salary of $15,000 a year; the Federal Home Loan Bank Administrator; the Federal Housing Administrator; the Federal Public Housing Administrator, the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Agiculture, Administator of Veterans' Affairs, and the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. But when we come to the functions of the organization, we find that the Coordinating Council only has authority to advise and assist and that all the functions of making decisions are placed under the Administrator.

As was the case in the 1946 measure, the Administrator has broad and complete authority in connection with all features of housing research, including building techniques, development of materials, city planning, appraisal and credit techniques, as well as housing statistics, estimates of housing needs, and economic studies. In addition, he is also given the authority to conduct studies in technical research and the application of new and improved techniques and materials. In a word, there is nothing about housing that he cannot look into.

Insofar as the organization question is concerned, it can certainly be said that the 1947 version is no improvement over the 1946 version. The United States Housing Authority is succeeded by the Federal Public Housing Authority, headed by a Federal Public Housing Administrator with a salary of $12,000 per year. This legalizes the status which was created by the Executive Order 9070 of February 24, 1942. The bill expressly terminates this Executive order.

Title V of the 1947 bill undertakes to provide a number of amendments to the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act, and title IV of the National Housing Act, which are of interest to savings and loan associations.

An amendment to subsection (c) of section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act would give Federal savings and loan associations the authority to invest their funds in obligations of the Federal home-loan banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. This provision was not in the 1946 bill, but other provisions in that measure authorizing Federal savings and loan associations to invest a portion of their funds, without regard to type of improvement, location, or amount of individual loan, in rental housing projects and loans insured under title VII of the National Housing Act, are not in the 1947 bill. On the other hand, there is a provision in the 1947 bill which was not in the 1946 measure authorizing Federal savings and loan associations to invest their funds in loans insured under the National Housing Act or insured or guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

The new bill also gives authority to Federal savings and loan associations to convert into State associations "subject to approval, by regulations or otherwise, by the Board of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration and by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation." It is also provided that, if the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation shall elect to terminate its insurance with respect to a converted institution, it shall be allowed to do so concurrently with such conversion. Under a provision of this sort, which requires the approval of both the bank administrator and the insurance corporation, it is difficult to conceive of many conversions being made from Federal to State institutions.

The 1946 bill contained no conversion provision.

Other provisions, which appear in both the 1946 and 1947 bills, authorize the home-loan banks to make advances to their members on the security of loans insured under the National Housing Act and loans insured or guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to the extent of 90 percent of the unpaid principal of such obligations; make 25-year loans eligible for loans at home-loan banks, instead of the present maturity of 20 years, and change the present provision which requires semiannual examinations to annual examinations.

Another section deals with the so-called criminal provisions, an amendment similar to legislation proposed by the United States League repeatedly in the past. There was no such provision in the 1946 bill.

There is another provision to the effect that the dividends on the stock of the Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which is owned by the HOLC shall be changed from the present rate which is a rate equal to the interest rate on the bonds put up by the Corporation to a rate equal to the average interest rate currently being paid on bonds of the HOLC. This provision is precisely the same as that contained in the first section of the so-called Spence bill, which passed Congress last August and was vetoed by the President. This provision was not in the 1946 bill.

It is significant to note that the second section of the Spence bill, which reduced the premium rate on insurance from one-eighth to one-twelfth of 1 percent, which was a feature of the 1946 bill, is omitted altogether from the 1947 bill.

There is another section which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase obligations of the Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation up to three times the aggregate amount of outstanding capital stock, reserves, and surplus of the Corporation. This is a provision that has been in many bills before Congress during the last 4 or 5 years and was included in the 1946 measure.

The amendments to the National Housing Act are substantially the same as those of the 1946 bill.

In addition to the purely technical amendments, they are as follows:

Title I is made permanent and the maturity of title I loans is increased from 3 to 5 years, the amount of insurance which may be granted for repair or improvement of hotels, apartment houses, hospitals, orphanages, colleges, and schools is increased to $10,000.

Authority is given to the Administrator to increase the amount of a mortgage up to $1,000 when he finds that, because of temporarily higher costs, it is not feasible to construct dwellings within the limits of the maximum mortgage amounts provided for in section 203 (b) (2).

Authority is also given to the Federal Housing Administrator to extend the period of mortgages up to 3 years when he finds that in view of possible unemployment, economic conditions, or misfortune, the mortgagor is not able to meet his monthly payments. The Administrator is also given authority to extend the period of mortgages made by veterans for a period equal to the amount of time they were in the service.

The Administrator is also authorized to insure apartment-house loans under section 207 up to $250,000 without retaining control of rents, charges, etc. The maximum amount of any loan under section 207 of the National Housing Act is limited to $5,000,000, except a mortgage made by Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporations, or limited-dividend, or redevelopment corporations restricted by Federal or State laws as to rents, charges, and capital structure, in which case the limit of any mortgage is $50,000,000.

In the 1947 bill, the maximum maturity for the 95-percent mortgage insured by FHA is 30 years, while under the 1946 bill it was 32 years.

The FHA is also authorized under section 207 of the National Housing Act to insure loans on apartment houses up to 90 percent for families of low income in metropolitan areas, or in case of mortgages of mutual-housing corporations or nonprofit-housing

corporations. These mortgages may have a maturity of 40 years, with interest not to exceed 4 percent.

The yield-insurance provision is retained in the 1947 bill in exactly the same form as in the 1946 bill.

Title VIII is represented as setting up a plan under which slum areas may be reclaimed and redeveloped primarily by private enterprise with Federal and State governmental assistance. This is what is claimed for the plan, but, in fact, it is not a private-enterprise plan at all but a plan through which public, subsidized housing comes into the economic structure through the back door. Although in the new bill, this title is much simplified in language and is much more nearly understandable, yet there is substantially no difference in meaning between the 1947 bill and that of last year. They both pretend to cater to private enterprise but both are so written as really to prevent the participation of private enterprise on any practical or attractive basis.

The National Housing Administrator under the title is given a borrowing power of $500,000,000 with which to make loans for the purchase of land and preparing it for redevelopment. It is provided that two-thirds of this total expense of land shall be provided by the United States and one-third by the State, county, or city. And in this respect, it must be said that there is not quite so much water in the local participation portion as in the 1946 bill. The title expressly provides that these loans by the Administrator can only be made to local public agencies (which is the new name for local housing authorities), and final definitive financing can only be made to a lessee of the land. This would prohibit a private investor from buying one of these projects and developing it because of the provision which says that loans can only be made to a lessee. This, in turn, means that the Government permanently owns the land.

In addition to the loans which the Administrator is authorized to make, the title provides for annual contributions over a period of 45 years amounting to $900,000,000 for this title alone. These annual contributions or subsidies will, of course, be used to pay back the money which the Administrator has loaned in the first place, and not one penny of this money is ever repaid to the Government.

S. 866 goes a step further than the 1946 bill in also providing that the Administrator may make loans to local public agencies for the purpose of making studies, surveys, and plans in preparation for a program of projects. This provision was not in the 1946 bill.

One significant thing about this title VIII that should be pointed out is that the National Housing Administrator is designated to administer the title. This puts the Administrator right in the middle of the administration of housing and gives him substantially the same power as he had under the old bill. Instead of getting rid of the NHA, this bill makes it as permanent as the Treasury Department.

Title IX is the public-housing title of the 1947 bill. It is substantially the same as title VII of the previous bill. The only substantial difference between the two is that S. 866 raises the permitted construction cost from $1,000 to $1,250 per room in cities under 500,000 population, and in cities exceeding that figure the room cost is increased from $1,250 to $1,500 per room. In Alaska the permitted cost per room is increased from $1,750 to $2,200. The title provides for the building under the United States Housing Act, of 500,000 publicly owned and financed housing units and authorizes the payment of annual contributions to finance these houses totaling $4,752,000,000 to be paid over 45 years.

Title X of S. 866, which is title VIII of the 1946 bill, provides for Government financing of farm housing. There is no substantial difference between the two titles. Under this farm program, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make annual contributions in the amount of $115,000,000 over a period of 10 years.

Title XI of the 1947 bill, which is a part of title VIII of the 1946 measure, deals with nonfarm houses in rural areas. This really means houses and apartments in small towns, under the definition made in the bill of the term "rural areas." Under the bill this phase is defined as meaning all areas other than those designated as urban by the Bureau of the Census, and the Census Bureau has defined as "rural areas" all unincorporated towns and all incorporated towns with less than 2,500 population. This title is admittedly a public-housing title and annual contributions in the amount of $1,125,000,000 are authorized to be paid, over a period of 45 years, in connection with its operation.

Title XII of the bill in effect authorizes the FPHA to turn all livable war houses over to the local public agencies for use as low-rent housing for families of low income. This provision is in direct violation of the provisions of the so-called Lanham Act, under which these war houses were built. That act expressly prohibits the utilization of these war houses as public housing after the war and expressly directs that within 2 years after the war, they shall be sold to private enterprise, but that no part of them can be turned over to local public-housing authorities. These houses have a very substantial money value and there is not any reason in the world why the Government should not realize the value of them through sale just as other surplus war property is being sold.

As a matter of fact, the local public-housing authorities are not paying anything at all for these houses because the bill provides that "the Federal Public Housing Authority may, in lieu of any other method prescribed by law for the disposal of such projects, sell any such project for use as low-rent housing to a local public agency for a consideration which consists of the payment to the Authority during the useful life of the project (as defined in the contract of sale) of all the net income from the project." It can readily be seen from this that if there is no net income derived, the Government will get no payments, and can anyone doubt that this small detail will be taken care of?

In brief, the 1947 bill, S. 866, known as the National Housing Commission bill, is a public-housing measure from start to finish. In addition to this, it proposes to set up a new administrative bureau in Washington at a large annual expense to the Government and further, it destroys the Home Loan Bank Board, which successfully directed the reserve system for the savings and loan associations of this country for many years before it was done away with by Executive Order No. 9070, issued on February 24, 1942, as a war measure, and which is essential to the successful and efficient operation of this important segment of our financial structure. The bill runs counter to all economic measures, which are supposed to be the prime objective of our Government at this time. It not only continues all of the annual contributions, or subsidies, which are contained in the 1946 bill, but it actually increases those subsidies in the amount of $792,000,000.

To sum up, the annual contributions, or subsidies, provided for in S. 866 are as follows:

Land assembly and preparation for redevelopment, title VII	$900,000,000
Public housing, title IX	4,752,000,000
Farm housing, title X	115,000,000
Rural nonfarm housing, title XI	1,125,000,000
Total	6,892,000,000

Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, today we observe memorial of our war dead in the South, and I am reminded on this anniversary of Jefferson Davis that this great soldier and leader was honored by one of the parishes (county) in my district by naming their parish in honor of Jefferson Davis. Jennings is the parish seat and is the location of the first discovery of oil in Louisiana in 1901. The original (Jennings) oil field has produced and is still producing millions of barrels of oil as well as natural gas. The parish is one of the largest rice producing centers of Louisiana and the people are progressive and patriotic. While at this period we are honoring our war heroes, I think it appropriate to include a short biography of the great leader of the South:

JEFFERSON DAVIS

Davis, Jefferson, American statesman: Born in Christian County, Ky., June 3, 1808; died, New Orleans, La., December 6, 1889. A year or two after the birth of Davis the family removed to Wilkinson County, Miss., a new and prosperous cotton region. Young Davis was sent to various private schools in Mississippi and Kentucky before he became a student at Transylvania University in 1822. From Transylvania he went as a cadet to West Point in 1824, where Robert E. Lee, Albert Sidney Johnston, and Joseph E. Johnston were his friends or classmates. After his graduation, in 1828, Davis served 7 years as an officer in the United States Army along the Northwestern frontier; that is, in Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Col. Zachary Taylor was for a part of this period his commander. In 1835 he was married to Miss Taylor, and the same year he resigned from the Army and settled as a cotton planter in Warren County, Miss., where he quickly rose to the position of a wealthy and influential citizen and owner of slaves. An older brother, a leading public man of the State, contributed much to this easy success and was in considerable measure responsible for the entry of Jefferson Davis into politics, 1843, as a candidate for a seat in the house of representatives. Meanwhile, the first Mrs. Davis had died, and he married Miss Varina Howell, a daughter of a well-to-do planter of the State. Hence, the connections and social ties of the young political aspirant were such as to advance him rapidly. The issue which drew him into public affairs was the proposed repudiation of a great debt which the State of Mississippi had contracted with Nicholas Biddle, the Philadelphia capitalist. The older counties, those along the Mississippi River, were prevailingly Whig and opposed to repudiation on both moral and political grounds. Davis was a Democrat who broke with his party on the issue and offered himself as candidate for the legislature with the purpose of preventing the Democrats from carrying out their plans. Although he was defeated, he became an elector on the Polk ticket in 1844. As such he canvassed the State and became widely known as an effective speaker and ardent expansionist. The next year he was elected a Member of Congress, but he resigned to take command of a regiment of Mississippi volunteers in 1846.

He played a conspicuous part under Gen. Zachary Taylor at Monterey and Buena Vista, for which his name became familiar to the whole country. On his return from Mexico in 1847 he was appointed by the Governor of Mississippi to a vacancy in the United States Senate. When the legislature met he was unanimously chosen for a full term. When he appeared in Congress he was promptly made chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and as such he labored constantly for a larger Army and for the conquest and retention of that part of Mexico which borders on the Gulf of Mexico. To the disgust of Davis, John C. Calhoun lent his influence to the party of opposition, and the extreme expansionists were defeated. Nevertheless, Davis was an avowed follower of Calhoun, and upon the death of the latter he became the accepted leader of the South in national affairs. In the critical struggle of 1850, when there was imminent danger of a disruption of the Union, Davis was an extremist who urged secession on the part of the South rather than submission to the compromise measure which allowed California to enter the Union as a free State. He demanded the extension of the Missouri compromise line to the Pacific, which would have made southern California a slave State and left New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah open to slave colonization. Failing to secure the adoption of his plan, he signed, with most of the other southern delegates in Congress, a protest against the compromise, resigned his seat in the Senate, and went home to lead a party of protest there. He retired to his plantation, but he soon began to take an active part in public discussions, and when his friend, Franklin Pierce, was nominated for the Presidency by the Democrats in 1852, he made an active canvass in his behalf both in Mississippi and Louisiana. After the election of Pierce, Davis was asked to become a member of the Cabinet. The offer was declined, but the President-elect prevailed on him finally to enter the administration as Secretary of War. Although the avowed purpose of the Democrats was never to disturb the compromise of 1850, Davis, the bitterest opponent of that measure 2 years before, was now one of the first advisers of the administration. There was uneasiness in the country, but Davis had changed his mind. He never again urged the South to secede but insisted on fighting for the South and slavery within the Union. As Secretary of War, Davis was a vigorous and resolute reorganizer. He undertook to reform and enlarge the Military Academy at West Point; he enlarged the Army and tried to abolish the rule of seniority which he considered a handicap to any military organization; and he brought camels from Arabia to be used as carriers on the dusty plains of the far West. But his greatest work was the survey of the Rocky Mountain region with a view to building a Pacific railroad.

When Pierce's term closed, Davis returned to the Senate where he continued to represent and press Southern interests upon Congress and the country. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise in 1854, which he had favored, had set the sections to fighting each other as fiercely as before 1850. He now took the view that Kansas should be kept open to slavery and he saw in the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court full justification for his contention. The new President, Buchanan, was not in the beginning in sympathy with the extreme pro-slavery demand and he sent Robert J. Walker, whom Davis and most other leading Southerners distrusted, as Governor to Kansas. When the Lecompton constitution was defeated in Kansas, Davis denounced Walker as a traitor to the South. Buchanan removed Walker in obedience to the entreaties of Davis and others. Stephen A. Douglas, the Northern leader of the Democratic party, denounced the President for his treatment of Walker and for his acceptance of the Lecompton constitution. Douglas immediately regained the popularity he had lost in 1854. The issue was joined and Davis became the irreconcilable opponent of Douglas and of his candidacy. The Senate was made the scene of their maneuvers. Douglas was "read" out of the party by Davis which only added to the followers of the former at the North. Davis procured the adoption of a series of resolutions in April which was made the platform of the reactionary or Southern element in the convention which was about to meet in Charleston. Davis gave instructions to the national committee while the convention was in session. Douglas directed the conduct of the majority of the delegates. The unyielding attitude of the two leaders caused the break-up of the convention and the nomination of two Democratic candidates, Breckinridge and Douglas. But when it became increasingly clear that Abraham Lincoln, the candidate of the Republicans, would be elected, Davis, who had remained in Washington all summer, endeavored, in September 1860, to bring about a reconciliation between the angry sections of the party. Unable to find a leader who could unite the followers of Douglas and Breckenridge, he gave up and let events take their own course. He was in Mississippi when the election of Lincoln was announced and his opinion was at once sought by secession and anti-secession men. He wrote the Charleston Mercury on November 10 that he was opposed to breaking up the Union and advised that Mississippi would probably not follow South Carolina. Later the Governor of Mississippi called a conference of the State's delegation in Congress in which Davis again advised against secession. * * * But the shaping of events had already passed beyond the control of the leaders. South Carolina was almost a unit in favor of immediate secession. The cause had long been a popular one in that State. And if South Carolina left the Union and should then be coerced by the Federal Government nothing could prevent the secession of the other Southern States. South Carolina seceded. Davis, again in Washington, urged Buchanan to recognize the act as the right of any State. Buchanan refused to follow this advice and when Mississippi withdrew Davis gave up his place in the Senate with the greatest reluctance. He returned to Mississippi warning the people along the way that there would be a long and bitter struggle. Insofar as he had any plans for the new regime, he wished to become the commander of an army in the field. But his election to the presidency of the Confederacy on February 9, 1861, placed him at the head of the movement which he had, to be sure, favored in the beginning but which he had certainly not urged in recent years. He now endeavored to reconcile all elements of the South. * * * Seeking to enlist the conservatives of the South on his side, he also sought to conciliate the conservatives of the North and thus isolate the radical Republicans who urged the prompt coercion of the seceded States. To this end Davis labored consistenly to prevent bloodshed at Charleston where a Southern army was gathering to compel the surrender of Fort Sumter. William H. Seward, the most influential man of the North before the inauguration of Lincoln, likewise endeavored to prevent an outbreak. The policy of conciliation was so publicly and openly cultivated that Southern leaders of the radical type insisted that there would be no war, that Davis and Seward had an understanding between them whereby the Union was to be restored. * * * The firing on Major Anderson on the night of April 12, 1861, stirred the martial spirit of the whole South, as well as of the North, and the border States of Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas joined the Confederacy. Davis became the President of all the seceded States and the capital was removed from Montgomery to Richmond. The constitution of the new group of commonwealths was in many respects the work of Davis and the moderate attitude of the Confederacy toward the foreign slave trade and the tariff was due to his influence. Although presidents of republics are not held rigidly to the strict letters of constitutions, Davis was most careful not to overstep the bounds set him save in the gravest emergencies. He set aside the writ of habeas corpus only in rare instances and then for limited districts and for limited periods. He allowed the greatest freedom of the press, even when most of the leading papers insisted upon denouncing him every day. * * * Zeal and energy characterized his administration from the start and the positive blunders of serious magnitude of which he was guilty were few. With a population of less than 7,000,000 white people, the Confederacy raised armies which numbered near a million men and it required the work of 2,000,000 soldiers and 4 years of time to suppress them. But the pressure of the blockade which President Lincoln increased with every month and the failure of every European power to recognize the Confederacy finally brought Davis and his generals to expect defeat. Moreover, the railroads wore out; rolling stock failed and the plentiful supplies in the country districts could not be transported to the armies or the centers of population. * * * He [Davis] was captured at Irwinsville, Ga., on the 10th of May, following, and he was promptly imprisoned at Fort Monroe. There he remained until May 15, 1867, when he was released on bail signed by Horace Greeley and other lifelong opponents. Broken in body and fortune, he visted New Orleans, his former home near Vicksburg, England, and France; but settled down to work as the president of a life insurance company in Memphis in 1870. The panic of 1873 caused the business to fail. He then endeavored to promote some large commercial enterprises in New Orleans but these never materialized and he took up his residence at Beauvoir in 1878, a pretty home on the Gulf coast which was presented to him by a friend, where he spent the remainder of his life. He died in New Orleans where he had gone on a business journey. His remains were buried there, but removed to Richmond in 1893.

(Source: The Encyclopedia Americana, vol. 8, 1944 ed., pp. 509–511.)

The Wool Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from today's Washington Post:

WOOL BILL—FACTORS IN THE PRESIDENT'S DILEMMA

(By Mark Sullivan)

It is not merely two major bills that face President Truman for signature or veto, it is three. The two that everybody is watching—the tax bill and the labor bill—are as important as common talk says they are. But the so-called wool bill contains even more headaches for President Truman.

Mr. Truman's decisions about the tax bill and labor bill are a matter of balancing one

set of considerations against another. But in the case of the wool bill there are considerations which bear upon Mr. Truman with peculiar and paramount force.

The wool bill does two things, both containing dynamite. First, it supports the price of wool at the present figure, which was already fixed by Government and is very high, 42 cents a pound. Second, the bill provides for increasing the tariff on wool. That is already high, averaging about 17 cents a pound. On top of that the bill places an import fee—a semantic term for a tariff increase—whenever imports interfere with keeping the price of domestic wool up to 42 cents a pound. To keep up the price of wool is the purpose which the bill seeks.

That Mr. Truman should, by an affirmative action of his own, keep up the price of an important commodity in practically universal use, would run counter to a consideration which one would expect to weigh strongly with him. For several months Mr. Truman has earnestly advocated a lower level of prices. Partly because of his exhortations, and concretely because of the burden of high prices on the public, the country is in a mood which calls strongly for what Mr. Truman has urged. The country wants lower prices.

Another consideration must have strong force with Mr. Truman. When he weighs whether to sign the wool bill or veto it he weighs more than the price of wool. He has proclaimed for America a momentous policy. It has passed into the talk of the world as the Truman doctrine. The purpose of the Truman doctrine is to restore the world to economic health, and the principal means of restoration is increase of trade between nations. To this end Mr. Truman has said it is necessary for "the other nations of the world to join us in reducing barriers to trade. * * * We have proposed negotiations toward the reduction of tariffs."

At the moment when the wool bill was being considered in Congress there was under way a conference of nations at Geneva to set up international machinery for reducing barriers to trade. We had a representative at the conference, Under Secretary of State Will Clayton, and he flew hurriedly back to America to try to prevent passage of the wool bill. Said he: "If we at this time, when we are actually negotiating with other countries at Geneva for the lowering of trade barriers, raise new barriers as this bill proposes, we stand convicted of insincerity."

Increase of our tariff on wool would be peculiarly deadly to Mr. Truman's foreign-trade policy, for the reason that to us wool is a small matter. It is less than one-half of 1 percent of our agricultural production. But to some other countries, especially Australia, wool is the most important crop, and opportunity to sell it to us is the principal means of buying from us. Increase by us of our tariff on wool would alarm the world over the possibility of increases on other products. The hope of world-wide tariff reductions would vanish. Signing of the wool bill by President Truman would amount to saying, "I hereby abandon the Truman policy about international trade."

There is one consideration which makes the problem complex and deprives the wool bill of being solely a deference to a small number of wool raisers, chiefly in Western States. Wool is in wartime a military necessity; the Army has called it a strategic material. For that reason it is desirable that our wool-raising industry be kept alive. How to accomplish this, but at the same time not increase the tariff on wool, and not raise the price of wool to private consumers is the problem. A proposed answer is that the Government pay to each wool grower an amount of money which will enable him to sell his crop to private purchasers in competition with foreign producers.

Amount Spent for Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of our country are greatly concerned over the constant demand for money, machinery, supplies and food for some foreign country. These demands began immediately after World War II was over, and the actual shooting stopped. They have continued since that time, and they will still continue—under the guidance of the President, and his crowd—unless enough of the Members of Congress stand up and wage the fight to do something for our own people, and for our own country. The people will not forget, I am certain, the taxpayers of this Nation have already contributed the staggering sum of $17,500,000,000 for postwar aid and relief. It has been estimated by those entirely familiar with this entire situation that such sum represents a sum equal to $125 for every man, woman and child in our country. Most of that money has been absorbed and used in the payment of high salaries to those in charge of administering the fund, and the rest of it has gone down the European drain. This is a very pathetic and sordid story, but it is nevertheless true.

Mr. Speaker, our national debt is approximately $260,000,000,000. This debt must be paid. Our Government has many other commitments, the exact amount of which has not yet been ascertained. We must balance our budget, and we must reduce our taxes. Our people cannot withstand the terrific burden of their present taxes, and maintain their business operations. We must reduce taxes and give the people a chance—a chance to work and to make jobs for the workers, and a chance to pay their debts and go forward as real Americans. We must get back to normal again—or as nearly so as it is possible to accomplish under the stress of the heavy burdens which are now upon us.

A very enlightening editorial appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, of recent date, upon this same subject. I herewith insert this editorial with my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, upon the granting of my unanimous consent therefor, all of which I ask.

This editorial to which reference is made reads as follows:

GOOD NEWS FOR JAPAN, ANYWAY

As far as we've been able to figure out, we Americans have gotten mighty little in exchange for our past 2 years as Europe's official Santa Claus, except a lot of high-class abuse. On Mondays our ex-allies in Europe denounce Uncle Sam as a decadent, reactionary old capitalist. And regularly on Tuesdays Sam gets demands for more dollars, locomotives, machinery, and groceries; also some more cigarettes.

So far we unhappy taxpayers have anteed up $17,500,000,000 for postwar aid and relief, which amounts to about $125 for every American man, woman, and child. Most of this has gone down the European drain.

Prospects are that this gloomy business may continue indefinitely, or anyway until we approach national bankruptcy ourselves, and our European wards are forced to rustle their own grub and makings, or else.

But we note with considerable pleasure that things aren't quite so glum in our Far East sector; Gen. Douglas MacArthur, proprietor. Japan and adjacent islands, in fact, are not only comparatively low-cost projects now, but may soon be getting around to paying us some reparations.

According to the Far Eastern Commission, allied governing board for Japan, MacArthur has been doing O. K.

The Japs, it seems, are eating regularly, and believe that MacArthur has been treating them fairly. They are working and, as stated, will soon be able to pay honorable war reparations from current production of silk, food, etc.

NOTHING FOR UNITED STATES

Such reparations, it has been decided, will be divided among the 11 allies who fought Japan in the Pacific. Each share will be in accordance with "each country's contribution to the cause of the defeat of Japan, including the extent and duration of its resistance to Japanese aggression." Which may or may not be a crack at Russia, which didn't see fit to come into this war until 48 hours after we had "atomized" Hiroshima.

The United States will probably be entitled to about half the total reparations. We, however, have said unofficially that we won't keep any for ourselves.

Instead, our share will be handed over to the Philippines, Korea, and perhaps some other hard-hit nations. This gesture on our part will mean that Japanese workmen and raw materials, rather than American, will feed and rebuild the Philippines and other friendly countries.

RUSSIAN WAR LOOT

Also, as the wily MacArthur knows well, a generous offer of this sort is the best possible propaganda for us in the Pacific. The Reds, in the course of their looting in Manchuria and northern Korea, have pulled a considerable quantity of machinery up by the roots, and have made few friends in so doing. By contrast, MacArthur's tough but fair dealing has astonished them, and has even caused a few enthusiastic Japs to insist that he must be God.

Our Russian friends, of course, don't like Mac's success in Pacific economics, and frequently have so remarked.

They don't like his success in setting up and advertising democracy, either. One of MacArthur's guest advisers in this department has been Roger N. Baldwin, director of the American Civil Liberties Union.

A lot of Americans were astonished when MacArthur requested the assistance of Baldwin. He and his organization have often been termed extremely left wing.

REALISM ABOUT REDS

But actually, as MacArthur knew, Baldwin was and is a single-track and fanatic exponent of democratic liberties and free speech. And he knew the Communists well, so well as to have no illusions about any Commie doubletalk concerning democracy, free speech, or plain, everyday truthfulness.

Just to round out his democratic team, MacArthur also asked and got the services of Father Edward Flanagan, of Boy's Town. Father Flanagan, like Baldwin, likes democracy and hates communism. And he too is an expert in the technique of booting them out, and taking no guff.

So, as we have remarked, there is good news in Japan, though it hasn't been getting the attention and publicity which is accorded our expensive fumblings in Europe.

As for MacArthur—well, there used to be some lively arguments about who licked the Japs, also why did Doug have to wear all those gold scrambled eggs on his hat? But we have a hunch that we won't be hearing many more cracks about Mac's military haberdashery. As an administrator, he seems to be winning us a good hunk of peace, and that's what our taxpayers are most interested in right now.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Spencer, Mass., on Memorial Day:

I am very much honored as your Congressman to join with you today in these very impressive exercises which your able committee has arranged in commemoration of Memorial Day.

Since the Civil War the American people have dedicated this day to pay tribute to the memory of departed heroes of our various wars and also to join together in the fellowship of remembrance of our honored dead and the dear ones who have left us for that land from whose bourne no traveler ever returns. This beautiful custom, born of the carnage and slaughter of a fierce domestic struggle between the States, has grown and developed with the passing years until it embraces the entire Nation.

On this day of fond devotion and grateful remembrance of the departed, the Blue and the Gray who sleep side by side in their silent hero bivouac are again united with all our departed in the spirit of brotherhood and our people congregate in gatherings like this all over the Nation to render homage to the gallantry and sacrifice of the brave men whose precious blood has saturated the battlefields of the Nation and the world in order that men and women might continue to breathe the air of freedom.

As Americans, as proud citizens of this great Nation, it is only fitting that we should pause today to do honor to those who have done honor to themselves and to our beloved country. In accordance with the cherished custom of our forefathers, we tenderly lay garlands of the beautiful flowers of spring upon the graves of our departed heroes, and we place again over their last resting places the flag for which they fought.

The Nation will never cease to express the profound gratitude which moves our people of every class, race, and creed for the loyal service and matchless sacrifice of our gallant veterans of every American war. It is beyond the province of the human mind, indeed it is beyond the capacity of the Nation, rich and powerful as it is, ever to recompense in a material sense those who have given so much for the preservation of American rights and liberties. Their deeds will be inscribed in the most glorious chapters of American history. Their gallantry, devotion to duty, loyalty to American institutions, dauntless courage in the face of great danger, their indomitable spirit which finally overwhelmed the power-crazed tyrants seeking the destruction of our Nation—all their noble achievements comprise an illustrious record in the history of the human race. No words could possibly measure this contribution.

And so today, my friends, as we also honor the memory of all those who have gone, and thank God for the bravery of our noble sons, we may well find inspiration in their deeds and sacrifices, and constructive lives. At this critical juncture in the affairs of our Nation and the world, we may well ask ourselves what they fought, bled and died for, why they were willing to leave everything that was dear and precious to them and us, and pay the supreme sacrifice, if necessary, so willingly and unselfishly upon the sacred altar of American patriotism.

These young heroes did not fight and die for monarchy or for any other kind of dictatorship. They did not fight and die for a world of chaos and confusion, nor for fascism, nor for godless communism with its blighting tyranny over the minds and souls of men and women. They did not fight and die to bring to pass in Europe and the Orient, as it now unfolds, the infamous creed, doctrine, and practice of the radical totalitarian superstate in order to subject millions of peoples in foreign lands to an abominable form of slavery under the sway of Soviet domination. These fine young sons of ours did not fight and die to make possible the destruction of free, unfettered religious faith and worship, the suppression of democratic government, the sinister and evil realities of the communistic system of mass serfdom with its antagonism to God and hatred of the ordinary civil rights which men and women enjoy under free democratic systems of government, particularly in our own fair land.

These brave and noble sons, if their great sacrifices were not made in vain, fought for our right to be free. They fought for liberty, for American liberty, if you will, the greatest kind of liberty that the world has ever known. They fought, so they were told and so they believed, for the principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter which guaranteed freedom to all nations. They fought to sustain our own priceless Constitution and our own cherished democracy.

If we would be true to the principles and objects for which our honored dead suffered, struggled, and died, we of this generation must courageously accept the living testament which they have bequeathed to us. First, we must resolve, notwithstanding obstacles and obstructions, to strive with every ounce of our energy and strength to establish and preserve the kind of world peace based on justice for all to which they dedicated their lives—a peace that will make it impossible ever again for American mothers' sons to be fed as cannon fodder into the welter of greed, aggrandizement, imperialism, and power politics which in the past has periodically been responsible for the terrible scourge of war, with its waste of material resources, its heartaches, its mad destruction and death. Our statesmen must earnestly seek some better way of settling the problems of nations than by periodic slaughter of the finest flower of youth. A policy designed to this end must be just, firm, and unflinching. It cannot be predicated on vacillation or compromise of basic principles.

Let it be known that we are ready to promote the cause of humanity and the prevention of war in a wholehearted spirit of cooperation. We will seek friendship and amity with all nations. At the same time let us serve notice upon nations pursuing territorial and political ambitions and expansionist policies, upon nations who are conspiring and working against free institutions, spreading undemocratic concepts throughout the world by force, by stealth and other equally obnoxious methods, that we do not propose to stand by and see our war aim scrapped, small helpless nations overrun, American democracy challenged, freedom everywhere threatened with extinction.

Let us make it manifest to all leaders of aggression, whether they be found in Russia or anywhere else, that this great Nation of ours, conceived in and dedicated to purposes of freedom, desiring to be animated always by the promptings of fundamental justice secured by democratic methods, does not intend to be ridiculed throughout the world, does not intend to stand by in silence and submission while onslaughts are made against the freedoms we believe in, while challenges are directed against our own security, and while all the aims and objectives our sons fought and suffered for are brazenly violated. If a separate peace treaty is necessary because of the obstruction of totalitarian nations, let us not hesitate to negotiate it.

Americans are not warmongers, and we are not militaristic. We have no designs on other peoples or other territories. But we are determined to stand for and by the ideals and principles of our own Nation and will never abandon or compromise them because of those, either at home or abroad, who are working to destroy our democracy and the business, social and economic systems which have contributed so vitally to the prosperity and happiness of our own people and the welfare of the human race.

America must be strong and secure against aggression, military and ideological. America must be ready to meet every contingency. Our armed might, reinforced and sustained always by the loyalty and determination of our people and our great productive strength, must be maintained until we are able to prevail upon other nations to accept universal disarmament and judicial settlement of international disputes as a substitute for the horrors of war.

Let me come to another vital question. As I have pointed out so many times before in the Congress and in public utterances, our own country is gravely beset by threats of subversive movements. Organized communistic activities are still infiltrating into many segments of American life. This process has been going on for years despite solemn treaty agreements and has been very greatly increased during and since the war. Subtle attacks by propaganda and campaigns designed to undermine the faith of our people in most of our basic institutions are being directed against our form of government, our economic and business system, our educational system, our civil liberties and our social and family life. Our Congress and public servants are constantly held up to bitter and unwarranted scorn and ridicule, our leaders are unjustly attacked in the hope of arousing class hatred, our democracy is deplored and denounced, our shortcomings and mistakes are magnified, while our social gains, the virtues of the American way of life, our free opportunities are obscured and our remarkable achievements as a free nation are belittled. Even the home and the family unit—the very basis of our American social structure—is being assailed by those who aim to nationalize and regiment our families and children just as they would nationalize and regiment our industrial and economic structure and stifle our liberties.

These same radical groups are endeavoring through various means to spread discontent and rebellion among our veterans; but here again their efforts are doomed to failure. Those who fought for America in war will protect and preserve America in peace. Moreover, they will assume the vigorous civil leadership in our communities which is necessary to combat the activities and baneful influences of subversive groups. Our veterans can be depended on to wage unceasing opposition to left-wing movements because they, above all others, having sacrified so much for liberty, dearly appraise its true value. They know that once liberty is lost, it may never again be regained.

By the same token, it is the duty of Congress and of the Nation to strengthen and perfect our laws in the interest of the veteran and his dependents. The improvement

of our hospital and medical facilities so as to insure the best care and treatment for the wounded, the sick, and the disabled of all our wars is a vital necessity. There must be adequate compensation and pensions for those who are entitled to receive them, as well as full and broad educational advantages, decent subsistence allowances, housing, and most generous opportunities for all veterans to make up for the material and educational losses they sustained by reason of their service and to prepare themselves for careers in business, the professions, and other fields of leadership in the America of the future.

The Government cannot longer be lax in the rehabilitation of the veteran. The promises which the Nation made to him must be kept and failures in the administration of laws passed for his benefit must be promptly exposed and corrected. The veteran is entitled not only to the most sympathetic consideration but also speedy adjudication of his claims; and petty bureaucrats cannot be permitted to block, hinder, or delay the settlement of these claims on the most generous basis provided by law.

Let us remember always, and especially on this day dedicated to sacred memories, the great debt which we owe to those who have done so much for us and the cause of our country.

Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the statement by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, made before the House Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Possessions on June 2, during hearings being conducted on various bills introduced to grant a form of government to Guam.

In this statement which Mr. Ickes made before the Public Lands Subcommittee, I believe that he definitely hit at the core of this problem. I recommend that it be read carefully.

STATEMENT BY HAROLD L. ICKES

This committee is, I hope, about to recommend that we do justice to the people of Guam and American Samoa—a justice that has been too long delayed.

We took Guam from Spain in 1896. By the Treaty of Paris we obligated ourselves to establish, by act of Congress, the civil rights and political status of the people of Guam. With words of great promise, President McKinley launched the naval government of the island. That government, President McKinley proclaimed, would "insure that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples"; it would prove to the Guamanians that "the mission of the United States is one of benevolent assimilation, substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule."

This was our promise, but what has been our performance? Within 1 year of the date of this pious utterance by President McKinley, the naval government had abolished all of the very considerable home rule which Guam had enjoyed under Spain. By the year 1902, the Guamanians were petitioning for those civil rights and that congressionally defined political status which the Treaty of Paris had promised them. They are petitioning still, after nearly half a century, although the Navy has never permitted itself to know about it and Secretary Forestal's most recent expedition headed by Dr. Ernest M. Hopkins, undoubtedly after the most diligent and extensive search, was not able to find a single Guamanian who wanted civil rule. In fact, we are asked to believe by the Hopkins' report that the ever-present fear of the Guamanians was that the Navy should no longer be in the position of a benevolent despot—and sometimes not too benevolent at that.

A year or two before the war these people, out of their own meager resources, sent two representatives to Washington to beg our democratic government to lift the dictatorial hand of the American Navy from off of Guam and to place its jurisdiction within the Department of the Interior.

And yet, Secretary Forrestal's committee of three reported: "Nowhere did your committee find any expression of desire to be removed from under the auspices of the Navy * * *." A good word that "auspices."

I wonder if the committee could hear the thunder roll when the tropical storms came.

Let us take a look at Samoan history. The Samoans came voluntarily under United States sovereignty in 1899, on the basis of an express understanding that they would be given civil status and a rule of law. From 1899, up to and including today, Samoan life has been lived under naval absolutism. But the Samoans are a less patient folk than the Guamanians, and in the early 1920's their petitioning for their denied rights became an uproar, although without physical violence. Thereupon their leaders were seized by the naval government and charged with conspiracy. They were thrown into jail and kept there for a number of years. But news of the outrage reached Washington, so that in 1930 President Hoover, pursuant to a resolution of the Congress, appointed a joint commission to study the Samoan situation. The commission was headed by Senator Hiram Bingham, of Connecticut, and it went to Samoa to do its work on the ground.

The commission unanimously concluded that the Samoans ought to be given American citizenship, a bill of rights, and an organic act. It announced its findings to the assembled Samoans, came home, and pressed for the promised legislation. The Senate passed an appropriate bill and the Navy (backed, I regret to have to say, by the Department of State) succeeded in having it killed in the House.

Through all of the succeeding years we have been in default of our promises to the peoples of Guam and American Samoa.

Exactly a year ago this week, I stated these and other facts in a speech before the Institute of Ethnic Affairs and the Institute of Pacific Relations here in Washington. The Secretary of the Navy lost no time in charging me with "irresponsible" criticism in a long communication to the New York Times over his own signature, a communication that refuted no single fact.

When Secretary Forrestal's charge of "irresponsible criticism" proved to be the dud that it was, he hastily arranged a dress parade tour of the Pacific islands for a carefully selected group of newspaper correspondents who were given the hospitality for which the Navy is famous.

However, the hoped-for whitewash by the correspondents failed to materialize. The Navy's guests wrote stories pretty much in the same vein as that of Mr. Roland Sawyer, staff writer of the Christian Science Monitor, who said in part: "The paramount impression which the trip across the Pacific left with this correspondent, reflected in the attitude of various commands from Hawaii to China, is the naval determination to retain sole authority and autonomy in the Western Pacific, whether the challenge comes from the United Nations or from the Federal Government."

I hope that the Secretary, and the members of this committee, have read carefully the report of the Special Civilian Committee appointed by Mr. Forrestal. That report fully supports the most important allegations which I made, of (1) wage discrimination against the Guamanians; (2) extreme dilatoriness in the disposal of war damage claims; (3) laxity in performing the work of rehabilitation; (4) failure to pay Guamanian owners for lands seized; (5) seizure by the Navy of the Guamanian bus system; (6) that Guam and American Samoa are governed by men, and not by laws; and (7) that civil rights exist if, as, and when the Navy graciously permits them to exist.

I hope, for their sakes, that Messrs. Hopkins, Ryerson, and Tobin will not be charged with "irresponsible criticism" by the Secretary of the Navy, for having made the same allegations which I made 12 months ago.

Having made these accusations, what does the Committee of Three conclude? It concludes that no person, no institution, no policy or lack of policy, and, by repeated affirmation, certainly not the Navy, is responsible for the conditions. No one, and certainly not the Navy, is to blame; vaguely, our Government is to blame, but never the Navy. Whereupon the Committee recommends that for an indefinite future, if not forever, the Navy shall continue to rule Guam, American Samoa, and Micronesia.

What are the Committee's grounds for this recommendation? They are sketchily stated and consist of arbitrary assertions without supporting facts, some of the assertions being a flat contradiction of the Committee's findings of fact. For example, the report says:

"This [continued Navy rule] would certainly be more economical, both in dollars and manpower, so that the National Treasury would benefit by such retention [of rule by the Navy]." Please note that no alternative possibility is considered, nor are the Navy's expenditures for the government of the islands analyzed. The budget of the island government of Guam for the fiscal year 1948 is $2,037,754, apart from all rehabilitation expenditures, war-damage payments, and compensation for Guamanian properties taken. The $2,037,754 are $88.43 per capita. The United States Indian Service in the United States and Alaska will spend $75 per capita in the fiscal year of 1948, and its services are much more comprehensive than those of the naval government of Guam, because the Indian Service provides schooling, including the expense of 13,000 children in boarding schools; hospitals; field medical and nursing service; agricultural extension; the costs of a large forest service and of conservation work and rehabilitation on millions of acres of range land; law enforcement and a court system; and large irrigation construction and maintenance.

The per capita cost of the Territorial government of Alaska, including its schools and health service, is about $55 per year.

Puerto Rico nearly doubled its disbursements from the fiscal year 1940 to the fiscal year 1944. In this peak year the total disbursements were $53,733,800, including $12,332,607 for work relief and direct relief; all public debt service; costs of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches; education, health, highways, agriculture, commerce, labor, public safety, etc. That total cost was $25 per capita for the population, compared to the Navy's $88.43 per capita for Guam.

The District of Columbia, for all governmental purposes, including all educational and social services, water and sewer systems, fire protection and highways, etc., spent, in the fiscal year 1946, $69,815,413, or $74 per capita.

The Navy's administration of Guam tops this list.

Continuing, the committee reasons:

"It [continued naval rule] would also serve for a more efficient and capable administration, since the Navy has a pool of trained officers, Regular and Reserve." This statement, if you will refer to the report, prefaces the findings of fact as to the fantastic inefficiencies of naval rule on Guam, and goes along with the committee's characterization of the Navy rulers as untrained in government and as being on short tours of duty which handicap their naval careers.

"The islands are now dependent on the Navy for health service, communications, transport, supply, and public works," says the report. The fact is evident but constitutes, of course, no argument. It merely emphasizes that the status quo exists, and it overlooks the obvious fact that the Navy could go right on providing communications and transportation, and health service, if desirable, through joint arrangement with whatever agency might be given jurisdiction over the islands. The committee had before it an exact, detailed statement of how naval service might be effectively and economically integrated with the services of a civilian agency. Apparently, this statement was not given attention.

Again I quote from the committee's report:

"In addition, on Guam, the Navy is in the midst of the difficult and complex problem of relief and rehabilitation. No other agency exists which can step into the Navy's place in these matters, or in the general and special civil administration of the local populace." This is from a foreword to the committee's detailed findings as to the inefficient and even brutal handling, by the Navy, of the rehabilitation and compensation and war damage tasks. As for its assertion that "no other agency exists," has the committee ever heard of the Security Agency and its various Bureaus and Divisions? It has heard of the Interior Department, because it states: "To the best of our knowledge there exists no conflict (of opinion as to naval versus civilian rule of the islands)" between the Departments of the Interior and Navy. Yet several weeks before the committee wrote its report, Secretary Krug, of the Interior Department, after inspection of the islands, had stated publicly that the islands ought to be placed under civilian rule. Here we have another admirable instance of the three wise monkeys being able to "hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil" so far as the Navy is concerned.

The above, as quoted from the report, actually is the extent of the committee's argument to support its recommendation of continued naval rule.

But only four pages further on in its report the committee confuses both its recommendation and its argument, by saying: "We believe that a separate independent agency may very well be the best place in which to lodge general supervision over all Pacific areas, excepting Hawaii and Alaska, under the sovereignty of the United States." However, this is a recommendation for some indefinite future time. What does the committee really recommend? It throws prominently to the fore its recommendation of continued naval rule and its reasons for that recommendation, as quoted above. Then it seeks to save its intellectual integrity by obscurely recommending the opposite. The practical effect, of course, is to serve the Navy's strategy of delay, a strategy which is based upon the hope that public interest will fade and that the Navy's influence in the Congress may prevent action in the future as it has done during the past 47 years.

Let us look briefly at the affirmative recommendations of the committee of three. Unequivocally and strongly it recommends citizenship for the islanders at once, and organic acts for both American Samoa and Guam.

Equal pay for equal work is recommended, but not in a hurry, for the island's economy must not be disrupted. Yet the committee finds that the cost of living for the Guamanians is just as high as for the non-Guamanians. The only disruption of island economy which would follow from an equalization of wages would be a disruption of the domestic economies of those whites who now hire the Guamanians at the depressed wages decreed by the Navy.

The committee recommends that war damage claims up to $10,000 be allowed to be settled locally on the island, without Washington review; and that those Guamanians who, in their desperate need for some ready cash, have slashed their own claims in order to get more prompt payment, be allowed to reinstate their claims at their rightful figure.

The committee, as already quoted, attacks the Navy's regulation which forces down to a mere fraction of its present value or reproduction cost the appraisals of Guamanian property destroyed or taken, and forces down to a pittance the value placed on Guamanian lives.

The committee calls for quick and enormous simplification of the Navy's regulation governing procedures, etc., in the settlement of claims, compensation for property seized, etc. Its figures show that up to March 25 last, 16 months after Congress passed the Guam Claims Act, only 5.8 percent of the estimated value of the claims on file have been processed. At this rate, the settlement of the claims will not be completed for more than 20 years.

This portion of the committee's report is lengthy and very specific. Having read it, one wonders afresh how it was possible for the committee to say, categorically, that no other agency of the United States could replace the Navy for a more efficient handling of Guam claims and rehabilitation. In this connection I quote the following, which is not a characterization by some irresponsible critic of the Navy, but the sober words of the committee of three:

"Under the (Navy's) regulations injury and death claims require an involved computation of future installments of compensation under the regulations governing the administration of the United States Employees Compensation Act of 1916, and an over-all ceiling on the amount of the lump sum is fixed at $4,000. This involves an elaborate and difficult computation. For example, assume a claim involving a guardian and three minor children whose father was beheaded by the Japanese. The Commission must first ascertain the date of the death, and the birthday of each child, and the fact that their guardian was duly appointed. Then they must ascertain the average monthly income of the deceased father during 1941. The computation is divided into two parts, that which accrued on the date of the settlement and that which would accrue until each child reaches 18 years, this latter sum then being commuted into a lump sum by deducting 4 percent compounded annually. (The committee proceeds to describe yet further complications required by the regulations.) When the calculation is finally completed, the amount awarded is often a mere pittance." Such a pittance may be observed by referring to claim No. 21 transmitted to Congress on April 5 last; the life of the man who was beaten to death by the Japanese because of his loyalty to the United States was capitalized at precisely $665, with 10 cents thrown in for good measure.

Such procedures, and such shameful results as above, have not been forced upon the Navy by Congress or the President or the Budget or by anyone. They are exclusively the Navy's own, and throw a strong light on the Navy's high regard for human life.

Secretary Forrestal in transmitting the report of the committee of three to the State, War, and Navy coordinating committee (an agency dominated by Navy and War) concurs in the recommendation for citizenship and organic acts for the two islands. So far, good. But what of the proposed organic acts?

The proposed drafts would provide for bills of rights, except a guaranty of the right of trial by jury. The reason for the omission, as set forth by the committee, is that: Trial by jury has not existed in the past, does not exist now, and therefore should not exist. If the Congress had followed this theory, there would never have been a Federal Reserve System, a Social Security Act, or even a Constitution of the United States.

The drafts provide for a governor of each island, who may be a civilian or may be a naval officer, according to the President's discretion. This means that he would be a naval officer, just as Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands at times have been havens for superannuated brass hats. They provide for the full use of naval personnel in the island's governments. They establish island legislatures whose lawmaking is subject to the Governor's veto but the veto may be overridden by a two-thirds vote which will prevail if sustained by the President. In addition to United States citizenship, they provide island citizenship, an excellent proposal. There would be island courts, with an appeal to the United States courts, via Hawaii. In general, as described, these drafts of bills are about as adequate as they can be made within the assumption of continuing naval rule. They are defective in that they do not propose for the islands resident delegates at Washington. The existing organic act for the Virgin Islands has the same deficiency, but the omission is less serious in that case because the Virgin Islands are much nearer to Washington as compared with the far Pacific islands. As the result of this omission, the Navy would remain the Washington spokesman for the islanders.

In summary then, the committee has supplied some fuller details than were known before, has corroborated the principal allegation made against naval rule in the islands, has recommended citizenship, and organic acts, subject to naval rule.

In short, it has thrown its weight, if not its facts, behind continued naval rule.

For one, I am not too much impressed by the report of this committee of three. I recall that it was appointed by the Secretary of the Navy to investigate the procedures of the Department of the Navy. It is no great shock to find that the resulting "whitewash" is generous, even if somewhat splotchy.

One of the members of your committee before which I appear today, has, very properly I think, suggested that the function of "investigation" is one of the most important vested in the Congress. An investigation by a department of itself is not a proper investigation at all. Generally speaking its purpose is to cover up and the remarkable thing about the report of the Hopkins committee is that there were so many skeletal remains bleaching in the hot tropical sun that could not be covered up.

I do not know where the Secretary of the Navy got the funds, or the authority, for such an investigation as has been conducted. Perhaps you do. But I submit that it is the duty of the Congress to determine for itself the validity of the report, and the true situation in Guam and Samoa, and to enact such remedial legislation as may be indicated.

There is another matter in which I think that the Congress may be interested in order to determine the facts. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Interior made a report some time ago to the White House

on his trip a few months ago to Guam and Samoa. However, this report has not been made public. The failure to give out the report excites my curiosity. Is it possible that the report contains opinions and recommendations which are in conflict with the desires and purposes of the Navy Department?

Perhaps you know that on February 27 of this year, the Honolulu Advertiser quoted Mr. Krug as saying: "I feel strongly that the basic principle of our Government is civilian government for civilian people. That is why I am for statehood for Hawaii and civilian administration of Pacific islands."

On the same date, the same paper carried the following: "The towering head of the Interior Department strongly endorsed the substitution of civilian administration for military government of these islands (Guam and Samoa) and said he advocated such a change soon. He said such a change could be accomplished in areas which the military has labeled strategic."

The committee surely will agree that this is forthright and unqualified endorsement of civil rule. I believe that the people are entitled to the information in Secretary Krug's report. Undoubtedly he went to Guam and Samoa in an official capacity and there can be no gainsaying the fact that the considerable expenses to pay for this trip came out of the Federal Treasury.

I also raise the point whether the administration has not sent a Paul Revere, in the person of Admiral Leahy or General Vaughan, galloping to the various Secretaries to demand silence and submission to the Navy's will. Perhaps we are witnessing another instance of the administration's willingness to tell even Cabinet officers what they are to think and what they may or may not say. If this is the case, I can imagine how embarrassing it might be for Secretary Krug to produce his report here if it recommends civilian government for these islands as he so sturdily recommended it on his return through Honolulu.

However, it is within the power of this subcommittee to solve the mystery of the undisclosed report if it has the interest to do so.

So far I have read from a statement that I had prepared several days in advance of the appearance before you of Secretary of the Interior Krug and Under Secretary of the Navy Sullivan. They came, and, in full harmony, sang a duet. The harmony was further emphasized by the fact that Mr. Krug read half of the statement and Mr. Sullivan the other half, a performance that must have impressed you. It is also new in my experience for a Cabinet officer to be required by the President to reverse views that had already been made public. As has already been shown, Secretary Krug said, in Honolulu on February 27, that he was for civilian administration of the Pacific islands, and he advocated such a change soon. But the tune that he sang before this subcommittee to the accompaniment of Navy brass was quite different. I am more curious than ever now to know whether Secretary Krug's report to the President recommended immediate civilian rule for Guam and Samoa, as I suspect that it did. If so, the suppression of the report is easy to understand.

In any event the two gentlemen in question, with the approval of the State and War Departments, recommended that "at the earliest practicable date the administrative supervision of Guam should be performed by a civilian agency rather than a military agency of the Government."

Strangely enough, nowhere in their statement did they mention Samoa. I wonder why. This was a significant omission, which can only be explained on the supposition that Samoa, to which we are also under a solemn obligation to bestow civilian rule, is to continue indefinitely under the domination of the Navy.

There is another highly important sentence in the Krug-Sullivan statement which I want to quote:

"It is recommended, therefore, that the timing of the transfer and the designation of the agency to which the transfer is made, be delegated to the President * * *."

In leaving to the discretion of the President "The timing of the transfer and the designation of the agency," does one find the word "civilian" used?

Not at all.

Mr. Krug and Mr. Sullivan have very carefully refrained from recommending that the President designate a "civilian" agency. And if the committee will scrutinize the language of the bill jointly introduced by Messrs. Krug and Sullivan, it will find that the bill does not require that the President designate a "civilian" agency. As a matter of fact, there is no requirement in the bill that the President ever transfer Guam to any other agency. He could permit it to remain under naval absolutism for another 50 years or even twice that length of time, or he could transfer it to the Army. That the Army and Navy should make such a shabby recommendation is understandable, but what I must view with the deepest regret, is that the Departments of State and Interior should join in such a recommendation, especially in view of the Secretary of the Interior's statement—"I feel strongly that the basic principle of our government is civilian government for civilian people. That is why I am for * * * civilian administration of Pacific islands * * *."

The Congress will not be taken in by this tricky language, as the State, War and Interior Departments have been. This is one of the Navy's famous delaying actions, a strategy that may be appropriate in battle, but not when human liberties are at stake.

I hope that this committee will examine closely the structure of the civil government which the Navy bill would provide. Under it, the President would appoint the governor of the island with the advice and consent of the Senate. And then, in the very next sentence there is language to the effect that a naval officer, on active or reserve duty, may be appointed. In view of this, how can it be said that this is a bill for civil administration? It is the very negation of that. The word "may" might just as well be changed to "must," because if passed, that is the interpretation that the Navy would insist upon as it would have warrant in doing under well-established legal precedents.

With mellifluous voices, Navy and Interior started to chant a duet exalting civil rule, but their voices became brassy when they handed you a bill which would legalize the tyranny of continued naval rule. Under the bill, all heads of the local government of Guam would be appointed by the governor, without the approval of the legislature. This language would permit the people of Guam to be governed without their consent, in defiance of the fundamental principle of democracy. And by the same token, Naval officers could, and, I predict, would be appointed to administer the departments of the local government.

I hold it to be most unbecoming, that one member of the duet, the one who unequivocally spoke out for civilian rule in Honolulu, should have endorsed this Navy-inspired bill. I hold it to be equally unbecoming that the second gentleman should appear here to speak empty words in behalf of civilian rule, and then offer a bill that would legalize the naval rule that was imposed upon the Guamanians in violation of President McKinley's sincere promise and maintained for almost 50 years.

The gentlemen ask you to believe that the problems of rehabilitation and reconstruction and revitalization of the island and its economy must be resolved by the Navy before it can hand the government over to civilian authority. This is the purest hokum. I submit that the measure of the Navy's concern over these matters is the lack of progress that it has made in its rehabilitation program.

I further submit that it is time that the Department of State ceased to be beguiled by the pleasant tinkle of brass and the luster of gold braid, and pledge itself to democracy for all areas within the jurisdiction of the United States. Then, with better face it could urge the blessings of American democracy upon other peoples.

The record shows that the Navy cannot be trusted to rule civilian populations. It is not necessary, in the interest of military security to make a mockery of the human welfare and the civil rights of the peoples of such areas as we have been considering. If there is any merit in the claim of the Navy that it be permitted to keep its fetters upon the civilian populations of Guam and Samoa, then by a parity of reasoning, civil rights should be struck down in the Aleutian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

If we require naval absolutism for reasons of military security in such places as these, then there is no logical reason why we should not hand over to its benign rule such vital continental regions as Boston, New York Harbor, Charleston, San Diego, San Francisco, and Seattle.

This subcommittee has before it for consideration, several bills relating to the problems of Guam and Samoa. Their authorship is unimportant. The only thing of importance is that Guam and Samoa be granted the civil rule that they have petitioned for, and that, at long last, America's word be kept.

You will do well to remember, however, that the Congress can pass organic acts for these islands every day of the session, and still if those acts are administered by an agency in which arbitrary personal rule is as deeply ingrained as it is in the Navy, you will have failed to accomplish your purpose.

Almost 50 years ago, America made a pledge to Guam and Samoa to "insure that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples."

This Congress should consider it a privilege to redeem that pledge.

Japan Gets Labor Ills Along With New Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith an article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

From the standpoint of conferring rights upon individuals, releasing them from economic and feudalistic bondage and giving them political freedom, General MacArthur's new deal for the Japanese has been an outstanding success. But there are some weaknesses in it. One of these is the labor policy in Japan.

An observer in Tokyo quickly reaches the conclusion that we are importing some of America's bad habits to Japan, along with the good.

It is all very well to give Japanese labor the right to organize, to bargain collectively, and to strike. That is part of the new free-

dom for Japan. But strikes are a luxury which only prosperous countries can afford. It doesn't make sense to encourage strikes in a nation which is plagued by shortages of every kind, which cannot sustain itself, and which needs help from the outside to prevent starvation.

That outside help is coming only from one place—the United States. Consequently, to the extent that strikes and demonstrations cut down production in Japan, the bill will be paid by the American taxpayers.

There are some high-ranking officers in the army of occupation who are not in sympathy with the labor policies we are pursuing. They claim that Communist sympathizers have had a hand in formulating our labor policies and that some branches of the occupation force are actually encouraging strikes. Other officers at general headquarters say that the Communists who infiltrated headquarters at the beginning of the occupation were weeded out long ago.

The storm center of the controversy is Anthony Costantino, former major, who had an excellent combat record with the First Cavalry Division. He is now civilian chief of the labor relations branch of the labor division at supreme headquarters.

I went to see him after hearing a number of officers complain about his activities. He said that his home was in Dunkirk, N. Y.; that he was a college graduate and lawyer and that he had been an organizer for the CIO Steelworkers Union and for District 50 of the United Mine Workers Union. He said that he was not now and never had been a member of the Communist Party.

COMMISSION POLICY CITED

Costantino then produced a policy decision of the Far Eastern Commission, which sits in Washington, outlining principles for Japanese trade-unions. It was made December 6, 1946, and announced December 24.

Among other things, this decision stated that trade-unions should be encouraged to negotiate with employers, that strikes and other work stoppages should be prohibited only when the occupation authorities consider that such stoppages would directly prejudice the objectives or needs of the occupation, that trade-unions should be allowed to take part in political activities and to support political parties and that Japanese workers should be free to organize on a craft, industry, company, factory, or territorial basis.

The decision also ruled against organizations with "militaristic, ultra-nationalistic, Fascist, or other totalitarian aims" but did not mention Communists by name. (Incidentally, the Communists are very active in the Japanese trade-union movement.)

ORDERS ARE FULFILLED

Costantino said he merely had been carrying out the policy thus laid down by the Far Eastern Commission. He also said a remark he had made about "production control," a maneuver under which Japanese workers seize possession of a factory and operate it themselves, had been misinterpreted in the Japanese press as an indorsement of this tactic. In proof of this he produced clippings of a statement in which he said that a person whose property had been seized in this manner could seek redress in the courts under Japanese law.

Gen. MacArthur is not worried about the possibility of Communists acquiring control of the Japanese labor movement. The occupation authorities make no effort to interfere with the demonstrations on the Imperial Palace grounds and the parades through the streets of Tokyo.

The newspapers estimated that 400,000 people took part in one such demonstration while our party was in Tokyo. The demonstrators were orderly and in good spirit. They halted obediently whenever a Japanese policeman held up his hand to allow traffic to pass. Red flags predominated, but not all of them indicated Communist affiliations, observers said.

This particular demonstration and parade was in support of a general strike of government workers, scheduled for February 1. The workers were demanding higher pay and the overthrow of the Yoshida cabinet. About half of the organized workers in Japan were planning to walk out at the same time in sympathy with the government employees.

Vigorous efforts were made by SCAP headquarters to get the government to settle the controversy and to persuade the unions to call off the strike voluntarily. But those efforts failed. Finally, 9 hours before the strike was scheduled to begin, MacArthur himself had to step into the controversy and prohibit the walk-out. The union leaders promptly obeyed and called off the strike.

But what would have happened if they had taken a page from the book of John L. Lewis and had refused?

Under existing conditions in Japan, the result would have been the same. The workers would have obeyed MacArthur's order not to strike and the union leaders would have lost face. But conditions may not always be the same.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, at an early date the Congress will be called upon to vote on the question of the conference on the labor bill. Perhaps not in the last 50 years has so much pressure been brought to bear upon the Congress as has been the case in connection with this labor legislation. Every phase of American labor has brought to bear every conceivable means to induce both the President and the Congress not to pass this legislation.

In an overzealousness on the part of the Congress to pass legislation that a labor-conscious President will probably sign, the Congress of the United States—in my personal judgment—has yielded very important measures that should become law. It is a sad commentary when we come face to face with a situation that has paralyzed the country on two or three occasions that we seem to lack the fortitude essential to protect the interests of the vast majority of the American people.

David Lawrence, an accomplished author, syndicated writer, and a student above question, writes intelligently on the compromises that have been made in order to draft a bill in conference that might avert the veto of the President whose sole ambition, if he does veto it, is to forsake the welfare of the people of the Nation to win labor votes in the next election. Under unanimous consent, I include herewith the following article written by David Lawrence taken from the Evening Star of June 2, 1947:

LITTLE REASON IS SEEN FOR TRUMAN TO VETO WEAKENED LABOR BILL

(By David Lawrence)

Analysis of the bill on labor-management relations agreed upon by the Joint Conference Committee of the House and Senate shows that not only did the House give up the heart of its proposals but that the bill passed recently by the Senate—generally considered a mild measure—has been adulterated and weakened.

Just why President Truman should now hesitate to sign such a milk-and-water version of labor legislation is unexplainable unless he merely wants to placate the labor-union chieftains who do not want to see any legislation whatever enacted.

The sabotaging of the Senate bill—which certainly cannot be blamed on the House conferees—will not lose any votes for it in the Senate. A Presidential veto, if it comes, will be easily overridden now in both Houses.

The fact remains, however, that with the exception of a few abuses that now are corrected, the new labor bill is just as ambiguous, if not more so, than the original Wagner Act, and gives the present National Labor Relations Board far more power over employers than it ever had before and some innocuous powers over labor unions to which any reasonable labor leader ought not to object—for these clauses are easily circumvented by legal devices provided in the new bill itself.

UNION SHOP STRENGTHENED

Thus, for example, there has been much hullabaloo about outlawing the closed shop. A certain form of closed shop has been prohibited but another form of closed shop, known as the union shop, has been given added strength.

An employer, under the new bill, can be compelled by a successful strike to sign a contract which provides that he must fire any worker who has not joined the union after 30 days of employment. This 30-day provision has been hailed as restoring the employer's right to hire whom he pleases. But in a separate section of the new bill, the unions are granted the right to make whatever terms or rules of admission to membership they please. This means that, if unions say a man must serve as an apprentice for 3 years or measure up to any other tests prescribed by the union before he is permitted to join, he can be barred. The only requirement is that all applicants must be treated alike, which is easy to comply with. The employer's right to hire, therefore, is subject to ratification after all under the union shop clause.

The important provision of the Senate bill, moreover, making it an unfair practice to violate a collective bargaining contract, has been omitted from the conference bill and, instead, such violations can only be the subject of civil suits to get redress. Experience under the Smith-Connally law shows how reluctant employers are to file damage suits because unions can stay out on strike until an employer agrees to withdraw his suit. This problem should have been left to the labor board to handle, as the Senate bill provided.

FREE-SPEECH CLAUSE MEANINGLESS

The so-called free-speech clause in the conference bill is meaningless and merely confirms the whimsical and arbitrary interpretations made by the present Labor Board in a variety of cases. The new language says it is not an unfair labor practice to express an opinion—and "express" means not only orally but in writing. There must, however, be no threat or promise of benefit. An employer, now as before, cannot discuss his problems freely with his own workers individually or in a group without risking a lawsuit to find out what is meant by "benefit" or "reprisals." The present Labor Board majority must be chuckling at how this was put over on both the Senate and House conferees.

There are a number of provisions in the new bill which were not in the original Wagner Act. But the key to their significance is

in the penalties which are in most instances ineffective. Even the hue and cry about injunctions vanishes when it is apparent that, under the new bill, injunctions must be terminated in 60 days and neither side is required to agree to any proposal or concession or arbitration. The so-called injunction clause for national emergencies might act as a cooling-off device, but the chances are it will operate as did the same type of clause in the Smith-Connally law—merely to postpone by 60 days the effective date of the strike and Nation-wide paralysis of industry.

Since some Republican Senators have played politics to placate certain elements of the labor vote, possibly there will be less criticism now of President Truman for doing the same thing if he vetoes the bill.

Expediency is the watchword of the politicians nowadays. Expediency has caused abandonment of principle and has postponed indefinitely the show-down in America between collectivism in the form of a supergovernment by labor unions and the right of the individual to work and keep his job without being compelled to join a labor union. In this respect the conference bill is the biggest victory the labor-union lobbyists have won since the Wagner Act was passed in 1935. They ought to be very happy.

Safety Development in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States have been shocked by the tragedies of two recent airplane crashes. Air transportation has become an indispensable thing in the lives of the American people. It is imperative then that certain important improvements be made that will add to the safety of transportation by air.

Howard Hughes makes the public announcement of a lightweight, inexpensive radar collision warning device for pilots, and is rightly considered one of the most important aviation news stories of recent date. Under unanimous consent, I include herewith the following article entitled "A Hughes-TWA Achievement" from the Aviation News of May 12, 1947:

A HUGHES-TWA ACHIEVEMENT

Public announcement by Howard Hughes of a lightweight, inexpensive radar collision warning device for pilots is probably the most important aviation news story so far this year. This is one radar air safety development that is ready to operate today—not 5 years hence.

We have no doubt that the Hughes unit will bear the brunt of some narrow-minded criticism because it fails to do everything that our best technicians know is possible—5 years hence. But at least Howard Hughes and TWA are doing something about collisions, and doing it now.

For a long time the public has been baffled because airplanes continued to hit mountains. Fortunately, the number of collisions with other aircraft has been amazingly small, but increasing air traffic will tend inevitably to increase this hazard. The public simply could not understand why wartime radar could not be utilized in some way for air-line safety. The air-transport industry now has one of the best public-relations talking points since it started work on the complicated instrument approach and landing systems.

The Hughes unit was demonstrated to newsmen on the West Coast, including two experienced staff members of Aviation News, Scholer Bangs and Robert Hotz. Its performance was impressive. Mr. Hotz reports that it recorded individual ocean swells which probably were less than 5 feet in height. The unit costs less than $150, and its weight is under 20 pounds. Thus, for the first time we have a major radar instrument that does not represent an economic strain because of weight, original cost, or maintenance. It requires no personnel training. It warns of an obstruction both visually and audibly, in time for the pilot to maneuver even the fastest transports. The warning continues steadily until the course is clear. There is no additional load on the already busy pilot because there is no scope or instrument to read or interpret at any time. In short, it appears that the Hughes unit will enable TWA pilots to do what the public thinks—rightly or wrongly—all pilots should have been equipped to do for a long time—use radar to prevent many crashes.

Although the Hughes unit may be found eventually to have a few shortcomings—as most man-made inventions possess—this new collision warning indicator is an important step forward. Mr. Hughes has ordered its installation on every TWA transport within 6 weeks and this work is already well underway. (This, thanks be, is one vital aid that need not await unrolling of Government red tape for its use.)

Mr. Hughes has said he will sell the indicator to other air lines at cost. This is an outstanding public and industry service, and we cannot imagine how any other air line can refuse to utilize it for the safety of its passengers.

ROBERT H. WOOD.

No Time for Political Bickering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bedford (Ind.) Daily Times-Mail:

NO TIME FOR POLITICAL BICKERING

Lawrence county farmers are likely to get a few thousand dollars less in governmental aid next year if recommendations of the House Appropriations Committee for drastic reductions in the Department of Agriculture's budget are voted into law by Congress.

But the reduction in governmental handouts for this or that, will be reflected in savings to farmers and all other taxpayers in reduced income taxes. And more than that, the reductions may well pave the way for retirement of a small portion of the national debt. And retirement of any part of the debt means less interest on the debt and further savings to the taxpayers in years to come.

But all of that is beside the point of this article. It is the desire of the writer to put the people on guard against political maneuvers, by some Washington lawmakers who would scuttle the Nation for a handful of votes of misled citizens.

We are referring to a charge by Representative CANNON, of Missouri, who declared Saturday that the farmers "have been tossed to the lions by the Republicans." He said that the USDA budget proposal is "the worst bill of its kind ever sent to the House floor." CANNON is a Democrat.

CANNON speaks a partial truth. It probably is the "worst" bill from the standpoint of cut-backs in agricultural spending. It is always more difficult to cut governmental expenditures than to increase them.

Governmental action was necessary to save many farmers during the depression. Now it appears that action in the opposite direction is needed to save the Government.

This isn't to say that a full agricultural budget wouldn't be a good thing. The field of agricultural promotion is virtually unlimited. It would be fine to devote the entire Federal budget to that end. But that can't be.

The Agriculture Department is not alone in proposed reductions. Congress seems to be striving for what may be termed an "across the board" cut in Federal spending. To exempt certain departments from the cuts would only cause confusion and would defeat the effort.

One thing we must remember that if the Nation goes down from economic or any other cause, we all go down together.

Most of the Nation's taxpayers will agree that governmental spending must be cut to the bone. If it is necessary during these lush times of prosperity to pour out millions to assist one particular group or another, then we may as well accept the fact that we are heading into socialism.

Of course, Federal aid is sometimes essential to repair the hole in the hulk of a sinking ship. But our ship is not sinking now. That is the economic ship from the individual's standpoint. More in danger of sinking is the national ship which is about to be washed under by the overwhelming national debt.

It's a real struggle and particular groups who will be directly affected by governmental economies must remember that this is a genuine effort on the part of Congress to take advantage of good times to cut governmental expenditures and the national debt and taxes while such reductions are possible.

The No. 1 need of the Nation at this time seems to be to effect as much economy in Government as is humanly possible. High prices for all types of goods and a high level of employment should make it possible for the Government to bow out of a lot of relief activities. Our armed forces must be kept strong and a lot of money will be needed for relief abroad. So cuts must be made elsewhere.

Playing politics in this financial emergency is like playing with fire at the end of a dynamite fuze. Unless we play our cards right, we stand to lose all.

The people are still the captain of the ship of state—but if the ship sinks, there will be no further need for the captain.

Income Tax Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 29, 1947

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Avondale Sun, of Sylacauga, Ala., Mr. J. Craig Smith writes a very interesting editorial entitled "Old and Rank Discrimination Should End." This editorial points up very clearly the discrimination in our tax laws against those States which are not community-prop-

erty States. I suggest this editorial as interesting reading for all Members of Congress. It follows:

OLD AND RANK DISCRIMINATION SHOULD END

Does every citizen of the United States earning the same income and with the same exemptions pay the same Federal income tax? If your answer is "Yes," you are wrong. Let's look at the situation of a Congressman from Alabama and a Congressman from California. Assume both are married, with no dependent children and no income other than their salaries. They both live in Washington, perhaps in the same apartment house, and both have the same heavy living expense. They, of course, maintain their respective legal citizenship in the State which they represent. The Congressman from Alabama pays an annual Federal income tax of $655.50 more than the Congressman from California. Why? California and eight other States are known as community-property States. Consequently citizens from these States are allowed to divide the family income equally between husband and wife and then pay taxes on the two halves separately. This procedure is rank and gross discrimination against Alabama and the other 38 States which do not have community-property laws. The discrimination has existed since the first Federal income tax became effective 34 years ago and has amounted to literally hundreds of millions of dollars. Why we have allowed it to continue through all these years surpasses understanding.

Oklahoma has recently solved the problem for her citizens by becoming a community-property State. Alabama might do likewise, but Congress should not encourage such tax evasion. Congress should end the present discrimination by extending the privilege now enjoyed by the community-property States to all States. Marriage is supposed to be, and usually is, the perfect partnership. The wife contributes her full part whether she brings home a pay check or not. Our tax laws should recognize this truth and should recognize it in 48 States.—J. C. S.

Address by Rev. Bernard W. Dempsey, S. J., Before Mortgage Bankers Association of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a thoughtful and stimulating address on the present basic trend of American business, delivered by Bernard W. Dempsey, S. J., regent, School of Commerce and Finance, St. Louis University, before the members of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, Mortgage Clinic, Hotel President, Kansas City, Mo., May 8, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of man's special blessings is his capacity for adjustment. When we are confronted with genuine difficulties, which in prospect we were certain we could not bear, we sometimes astound ourselves by the resources we can call up in the crisis. This capacity for adjustment is a work of the healthy organism and we are going to need all of it that we have because there are some real adjustments to be made.

Like all virtues and good qualities, capacity for adjustment can be overdone. Man can get used to situations and habits that he should not allow himself to tolerate. He gets into a situation he knows is bad and he intends to do something about it but he doesn't and he soon finds himself living comfortably in circumstances he would have called unnecessary and inexcusable.

This happens to a nation in wartime. War imposes direct and immediate adjustments on everybody, and most obviously on the boy in uniform but in one form or other on everybody. You find yourself eating oleomargarine, walking to work, and wearing a green shirt, and not minding it one-tenth as much as you expected. That's a good thing, but we transfer it to the more important things that war involves. We get just as accustomed to casualty lists and wartime morals as we do to oleomargarine. And worst of all, we adjust ourselves to the crude fact of war itself—the fact that nations have found no better way of adapting themselves than killing each other off—and we learn to live in the same world with that monstrosity without reflecting on it at all.

This fact makes it necessary for me to make a statement that will sound like, and should be an absurdity: Do not forget, in talking about the trend of American business today, that we have just been through a war—the most disruptive war in history. When I say this, I do not really think that you are going to forget 1941–45. I mean that you do not realize how well you have adjusted yourselves to the abnormal. You do not realize because 5 years have made you accustomed to things that cannot endure. Never forget that the adjustments that now confront us are the product of one of history's major upheavals. Do not be deceived into blaming our problems on the Jews, or the monopolies or some local circumstance when we have just moved out from under one of the blackest clouds that ever settled on mankind.

And when you remember that we were in a war, remember that war is a boom, and a boom precedes a bust. War not only inevitably dislocates production but furnishes the one set of circumstances in which inflation can be made to look respectable. And we have had both in large doses—dislocation and inflation.

The first trend in American business that we should look for is a price collapse just like we had in 1920. The average index of wholesale prices for 1920 was 154, for 1921, 97; hides, for example, dropped from 267 in 1919 to 89 in 1921. Prices received by farmers went from 211 in 1920 to 125 in 1921 and the purchasing power of a dollar rose from 52 in 1920 to 82 in 1921. All of the basic reasons for that collapse are certainly present now in extreme degree. Yet economists did not expect it and it has not happened. Why not? There seem to be two principal reasons.

Our part in the last war was brief and during it inflation was uncontrolled either at its source or in its effects. Inflationary pressure developed quickly and strongly and showed itself in the price level. What this would have done in a long war is not pleasant to think of. Our recent war was long; inflation at the source was even stronger and less courageously and intelligently handled than in 1918. But noneconomic means were used to prevent the huge inflationary pressure from finding its normal expression in prices. Costs were permitted to rise; dollar incomes were inflated but the consumer paid in the form of quality lost and in some curtailment of the range of choice. The result of this is that, unlike 1920, quoted prices rose less but the tensions within the price structure are much greater than 1920. By tensions within the price structure, I mean first, inconsistencies, that is one price allowed to rise while a related price is held down, and second, inflationary pressure from high incomes causing the price structure not to rise in quoted prices but to bulge out sideways in bootleg markets, or in hidden considerations not shown in dollars. Furthermore, the inflationary pressure was so great that the American people came out of the war with a huge wad of disposable savings, roughly equivalent to a full good year's income. We have been saved thus far from a collapse like 1920 by the fact quoted prices had not risen as far as in the earlier period and people spent their accumulated free savings at a rate both faster and steadier than was expected.

Granted then that there are good reasons why we do not get a simple repetition of the 1920 sequence, what can we expect? In economic terms war is a shift in demand. One day we have no need of torpedoes and the next day we will pay anything for them. One day men's ties are of all colors and within a few months, 12,000,000 men are wearing only khaki or black. This abrupt shift in the relative value of different goods reflects itself in productive capacity and we twist our productive capacity all out of shape to meet the new demand. This is costly in itself and the need for speed makes the process doubly costly. With the shift in productive capacity goes the shift of manpower. The population movements within the United States during the war constitute a social earthquake if the war had had no other effect. We spend our resources to meet the war demand without regard for present or future cost and finally get running a war economy.

Then the day comes when the demand for war goods disappears in an instant and demand for peace goods arises in the same instant. And there is even less time for adjustment to the demand than there was at the beginning of the war. It takes the enemy time to organize an attack but consumers with dollars can move in on an hour's notice. Therefore, we must not forget the size of the war from which we have just emerged. Three huge tasks had to be accomplished before industry could handle the rush of consumers:

1. Demobilization—military and industrial.
2. Reconversion—mechanical and personal.
3. Elimination of controls, priorities, rationing.

II

These things have now largely been done with one conspicuous exception of which you are all aware. What then are the factors which will govern the future?

They are basically two:

(a) Labor-management relations.

(b) Inflation.

Though economic in their expression and effect both are strongly conditioned by Government policy.

During the war, American production was the marvel of the world and America won two wars on two world fronts across two oceans because her men were constantly supplied with an endless stream of high-grade materials. The source of that material was not merely our natural resources; they are necessary and important but passive. The source of that power was cooperation from the drawing board to delivery at the front. With a very few very sordid exceptions, Americans submerged their personal advantage for the sake of the common good. The result of that cooperation was the greatest flood of output in economic history even though 12,000,000 of the most capable producers were withdrawn from production and were in direct military service.

The lesson of this is pretty obvious. You get goods when and only when you get cooperation on the job. This department

must supply that department. From the front office to the delivery platform there must be teamwork or there are no goods. And if anybody is dragging his feet, to just that extent you get less goods.

During the war, labor became accustomed to high money wages. Hourly rates rose but overtime rose even more. In many families, persons usually at home went into war plants, and family income rose still more. The money wages bought less than they would have before the war but real income for many people greatly increased during the war. Labor came out of the war determined to hold that level of income and we have had two waves of serious strikes aimed at that goal. These strikes have gravely hampered production and prevented the production for which the consumer was clamoring and to that extent have aided in keeping prices up. How seriously they have hampered production is hard to estimate statistically, but one does not need to be a statistician to know that basic industries and services like coal, steel, motors, railroads, and telephones cannot be interrupted one after the other and production still be maintained.

Why does labor adopt such a policy of cutting its own throat? Because labor is interested in dollars and jobs, not goods. A thousand-dollar bill can't be eaten or worn and the multiplication of jobs that don't result in the output of goods is not going to give a pay check that will buy very much no matter how big the figure written on the check.

This is clearly a foolish policy. Why then is it followed? It is followed because American labor whether or not Socialist or Communist, operates on Karl Marx's theory of class conflict. Because they accept this theory, they act as though there were a well defined capitalist class from whom it is possible to wring definite permanent gains. This operates on the theory, the more there is for me the less there is for you; as though the economic pie was of a definite and fixed size. Actually the size of that pie varies enormously and usually the share of labor and the other shares go up and down together But labor operates on the basis for being able to get something from capital regardless of what labor produces and Karl Marx leads them in quest of money and jobs at capital's expense and deprives them of goods at their own expense. And the result is less goods coming off the end of the assembly line for labor to buy.

If this error of Karl Marx is so obvious and so wrong, how does labor fall into it? They have had plenty of bad examples in high places. That idea was not original with Karl Marx; he got it admittedly and explicitly from the early Victorian economists of England—Ricardo, Malthus, Mill. These men accepted the idea of class and class conflict and made it part of their system and Marx took it from them and used it to very different purposes in his system. The applications were different but the practice was the same. Labor and capital have been educated to a fictitious opposition of interest and "capital" whatever that may mean in a society like ours believed that labor had to be kept in its place and that the more there was for labor the less there was for capital. Let it be said to the credit of the late Henry Ford that he was one of the first influential Americans to realize the falsity of this division. These ideas of Ricardo, Malthus, and Mill are exactly what many people regard as the "old fundamentals" that we have to get back to. They are just as false in their respectable classical form as they are in their aggressive Marxian form. They are not fundamental to anything except disorder and low output.

Nineteenth century British economics, wholly out of tune with American facts, had sufficiently wide acceptance so that it was built into some of the labor legislation of the 1930's. NRA and the National Labor Relations Act, however useful in some of their provisions were sources of trouble because they assumed that the interests of employer and employee were opposed.

So labor has had plenty of very respectable precedent for its error, but that is no reason for maintaining it.

The radical error has become more important in the last 10 years because we have had a change in the type of so-called liberal leadership. The old-style American liberal was a midwestern commoner, a La Follette, Borah, or Norris. Whether you liked them or not, you had to admit they were home-grown. The so-called liberal today is a follower of Marx, or at least a man who is scared to death to hint that Russia is not the most democratic country in the world, or he is a follower of the late Lord Keynes, a recent British economist whose doctrines are described as rendering Marx unnecessary. He is not a man who thinks Americans have any good ideas or that we have traveled a long way on the road to a classless society without liquidating the opposition.

These may not be the sort of things you expected in a talk on the trend of American business, but that is the basic trend—the imposition on our American economy of a set of theories that are false in themselves and peculiarly and conspicuously false when applied to American conditions. Yet these theories affect production right now, and they are behind the difficulties that confront Congress on labor legislation right now. Congress is willing to pass a fair and sensible labor bill if labor will tell them how. If class-conscious labor condemns any legislation whatever, labor will get a class-conscious punitive law.

Now this trend underlies much American business today. Production is restricted, not only by monopolists but by unions. Union policy is not concerned with producing a large volume of goods to raise the standard of living, but they are concerned with the multiplication of jobs at high pay regardless of output. That leads to high hourly rates, low annual incomes, high prices, poor buying power, and unemployment.

This is still the dominant trend. The building trades seem to have set their prices so high that building is falling off sharply in the face of terrific demand. There are signs that the recent settlements indicate a willingness to call it quits for a while. But only for a while. Owner managers and workers alike are still thinking in terms of class conflict and squabbling over the division of a dwindling product, when the most elementary cooperation could give us the greatest output ever known, abundance for ourselves, and plenty for the victims of war abroad.

III

The other big factor in present trends is the fact of inflation. This is not a possibility or a danger; it is a reality. If there is any question of this in anyone's mind, let us look at the figures. Back in the twenties the American people did business with between three and four billion dollars of legal money. This is the nickels, dimes, quarters, the five's and ten's that are constantly moving in and out of pockets, purses, cash registers, and tellers windows. In 1933 that figures was $7,500,000,000; in 1944 it was $25,000,000,000. Today it is $28,000,000,000. Nothing has happened since the twenties to require us to have about seven times as much money as we used then.

What has happened to legal money has happened to deposits—the total sum for which Americans could write checks if they all did it at once. In June 1929 there were $55,000,000,000 in deposits, regarded as a dangerously high figure as events showed it was. By 1933 that fell to $43,000,000,000. In 1937 it was up to 57, in 1939 to 64, in 1941 to 78, in 1942 to 110, in 1944 to 150, and in 1945 to 175. The end of the war brought an end to the extreme inflationary movement and loans by banks to industry instead of Government has not taken up all of the slack. At the moment the figure stands at about $167,000,000,000, with no indication that it will go lower. Do you know any reason why the American people need three times as much money to do business with as they needed in 1929? Do you know what happens when money is long and goods are short? Money declines in value, which is just a roundabout way of saying that prices rise.

If money makes prices rise, why have not our prices risen further? The rise has been substantial but it has not been nearly as great as the increase in the volume of money. The answer lies in the way the money is used. The price structure that a given volume of money can support depends on the way the money is used, chiefly the speed at which on the average a dollar goes from hand to hand. When business is brisk a dollar moves rapidly. An average velocity for an American dollar in normal times is about 13. That is, on the average, currency changes hands in about 13 transactions a year. In recent years that velocity has been down below 9. An increase from 9 to 13 is almost 50 percent. Without any further increase in the volume of money we could furnish the basis for a 50 percent price increase if it were not offset by an enormous output of goods.

One does not need a college course in economics to know that when prices are rising we try to get rid of money. Goods are increasing in value and money is declining. so businessmen prefer goods to money. At such times velocity increases. In extreme inflation, this velocity becomes visible. At the height of the collapse of Germany's currency, on pay day the member of the family that could run the fastest met father at the factory gate and ran to the grocery store where mother was waiting in order to spend the money as quickly as possible before it declined further in value.

It is worth noting that our inflationary problem is related to class consciousness I mentioned Lord Keynes a moment ago, whose ideas ruled Washington from 1934 to 1941. Keynes based his ideas on considerations which may have some validity for England's peculiar and grave problems but do not apply here. It is peculiar that Keynes' ideas were adopted by self-styled liberals and by labor unions when the crux of the system was to lower wages. The first axiom of his system was that when prices fall, the unions will not accept cuts in hourly wage rates to bring labor costs in line with other costs. Since you can't cut wages directly, the only way to reduce wages is by raising prices and the way to raise prices is by inflation.

The second step in his system was based on the idea that investment was slow because the concentration of wealth (in England) gave big investors too much money and enabled them perhaps unconsciously to have too great an effect on the economy. The remedy for this was to beat down the rate of interest by making money so plentiful that those who wished to hoard cash could hoard all they wanted and there would still be plenty to circulate. This meant that Government had to take over the function of maintaining investment. This meant Government spending, this meant Government borrowing; Government borrowing as actually conducted meant inflation. This when combined with the tax system was defended as improving the distribution of income. And in the thirties, the ideal of the system seemed to be a better and better

distribution of a smaller and smaller product, till we reached the ideal of an absolutely equal distribution of absolutely nothing.

IV

The elements that make up the present basic trend of American business, then, are these:

1. The policy of unions and corporations.
2. Inflation.
3. Special price situations.
4. Government policy on 1 and 2.

As to the first, there is reason to believe that the worst of the adjustment is over, that labor is anxious to go back to work. There will be continued agitation by Russian controlled unions, or unions with strong Russian sympathizers. Their policy will be to damn all legislation concerning labor as antilabor and to make as much noise as possible, cut production as much as possible, and maintain an atmosphere of uncertainty. Most American labor leaders realize that the public sympathy labor enjoyed until recently is largely exhausted and people are beginning to get impatient for that postwar output that they were led to expect.

As to the second factor, inflation, the volume of money is there traveling at a low velocity. The inevitable drop associated with war financing apparently has taken place and ordinary bank lending to business has begun to take up the slack. Therefore, there is no monetary factor making for an abrupt price decline.

There are, in particular commodities and industries, price situations which are definitely out of line and subject to some adjustment. Conspicuous examples of these are building materials, farm and food products, hides, leather and their products. Some of these are subject to special circumstances growing out of the war. The paint industries, for example, use materials that come out of the Orient from areas that have long been shut off from us where the actual physical source of supply or of processing has been physically damaged and the paint and varnish industry has been selling at high prices an unsatisfactory product made out of costly synthetics. As the natural sources of their supplies are rehabilitated, a substantial drop in price as well as a rise in quantity are indicated. Cotton goods were one thing which consumers sought to buy with their wartime incomes which resulted in high prices especially after the release of controls. There seems to be no reason to expect that these prices can be maintained at their present levels. Building material has been high because of low record of residential building during the thirties and there was a certain distress market for persons settling down after the war. Once this imperative demand had been met, the person who wants a new home but has some place to live now has decided to wait it out, and there is no reason to suppose the building costs can be maintained at their present high levels.

At the beginning of this year, there was general agreement among economists that the peak of the postwar rise should occur in the second quarter of 1947. But the general movement of prices having passed their peak, there would be a general downward drop, with no general break in prices but with erratic and spectacular exceptions. Even though we are reaching the end of the second quarter that still looks like a good prediction, but I must repeat that obviously no discussion of prices can ignore output and no economist can predict prices or output as long as owners, workers, and Government proceed on a falacious class-conflict basis that prevents people from getting together and promoting the common good by the production of goods which everybody needs.

In Reply to Hon. John Phillips, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 17, I extended in the Appendix to the RECORD some remarks, and included excerpts from an editorial by Dr. Francis E. Townsend which was published in Townsend National Weekly, issue of February 15, 1947, entitled "Free Enterprise Versus Communism."

I charged Dr. Townsend, and his so-called leading liberal newspaper, with selling free enterprise short and catering to communism.

Under date of April 20, 1947, there was an attempt to defend Dr. Townsend and his leading liberal newspaper extended in the Appendix of the RECORD by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS.] The gentleman admitted that he too had been worried in the past over the communistic leanings of this paper. He states, however, that since a change of editors the policy of the paper has now returned to normal. He also points out ably that I have used only certain portions of the editorial, and have left out other parts, which, when taken together, make the meaning of this editorial different. He also makes it clear that he feels it is very unfair to draw conclusions from mere extracted parts of an editorial, and indicates that I have been unfair to Dr. Townsend. Now to make the record complete, I desire, Mr. Speaker, to insert at this point in the RECORD the entire editorial in question. I do not wish to take any advantage of anyone, and we shall let the editorial speak for itself:

FREE ENTERPRISE VERSUS COMMUNISM
(By Dr. Francis E. Townsend)

It seems that the entire world is concentrating its attention upon the controversy as to which is the better system of government: The free enterprise or the communistic nobody-free system regulated from the top.

It begins to look as if the people of the world are so nearly equally divided on the subject that nothing but a contest of fighting strength can settle the question.

If either side had a vast preponderance of strength, the other side would give way without resorting to armed conflict.

So it looks to a casual observer as if there must be pretty strong argument for, as well as against, both sides.

Naturally, we who live under the free-enterprise system think ours is the better, or shall we say, the lesser evil of the two; for it is apparent that neither is anywhere near perfect.

Perhaps if we are firmly enough convinced of the rightness of our system to be willing to fight the rest of the world to maintain it, we had better analyze both systems and see just how logical the advocates of both systems are. We think both sides are claiming virtues they do not possess.

There is this to be said for a communistic system: a dictatorial system under a benevolent and all-wise manager would probably be the most nearly efficient of any conceivable system. A ruler who loved humanity and was determined to do everything possible for the betterment and advancement of his people could, without doubt, do more for a people than they could ever do for themselves. Too many people under any governmental system are too much like "dumb, driven cattle" to know what is best for them.

Unfortunately for humanity the all-wise, wholly unselfish and all-benevolent ruler has never yet presented himself. And if he ever does, and expects to rule the world, he will have to come equipped with the strongest armed force in the world, and use it ruthlessly in order to establish himself.

Blood-bathed benevolence is never likely to become popular. Hence we think it safe to assume that communism developed by force will never long prevail in a world that is rapidly becoming enlightened by science.

But how about an enlightened voluntary democratic communism? The type of economy which used to be called socialism and which already is working so well in our own United States in the fields of public power, of postoffices, and of street lighting in every community. Would an extension of this system to other fields be practical? We believe it might.

Now let us see just what the free-enterprise system is and what its chances are for world domination. Free-enterprise system, price system, profit system—these titles are synonymous. This we must concede. So as to be understood by all, let us talk about the profit system. What does it mean? It means that all those who take raw materials from the earth and convert them into usable materials; all those who grow foodstuffs or raw material for fabrics do so with but one motive, profit.

It will be conceded that there is nothing benevolent about profit. In its very essence it is a selfish motive that prompts us to take profit. Oh, many will say that in taking profit they give back in service or improved quality full value for what they take, but the evident truth is that without the profit their benevolence ceases at once.

So here is the bald, unlovely truth about profit-taking. Whether we manufacture and sell, buy and sell, or grow and sell, we expect to get more for what we handle than the article costs us. And those of us who live by profit hate mightily to be restricted by rules as to the amount of profit we can take in a transaction.

We want free enterprise—and let the buyer beware. As a result the biggest and fastest profit-takers become powerful and able to extract profits from the many who must sell what they have in order to live.

Big profiteers are never satisfied with reasonable profits. The more they get the more they want. Perhaps they are driven to this attitude by competition but, whatever the reason, the results are the same—the weak suffer and the strong become stronger and more calloused.

The free-enterprise system as it exists today cannot last, for it is rapidly strangling itself to death for want of a market; so there is little use of our advocating its spread to the rest of the world.

Any system that produces goods with a speed out of all proportion to the ability of the population to buy and use is bound to collapse.

Shortly the machines will be manned entirely by the young and vigorous, those below the age of 45 years. All the rest, the old (above 45), the children, the sick, the blind, the crippled, etc., will live precariously if at all and their combined buying power will be insufficient to absorb the output of the machines.

What shall we do? Free enterprise will not look so free to a pauperized majority. It will look like slavery to them. Let us not mince words. Free enterprise means freedom to exploit—freedom to rob legally. It is as un-American as anything that ever came out of Europe; and far indeed from the conception of a government as envisioned by those who gave us our Constitution.

Can free enterprise be made to work? No. The enterprise of exploitation must be restricted and restriction is the very antithesis of freedom. Free enterprise must be replaced by a system of cooperation in which all will benefit proportionately from the activities of all.

The profit system as we have known it is near its end. Profit, in the near future, will mean profit for all, not aggrandizement of the few at the expense of the many.

Let us make the transition as quickly as possible and avoid a total coNapse of industry and a condition of chaos. The first step? National insurance for all citizens a la the Townsend plan.

That ends the editorial. It is now complete. Let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, and particularly, let me ask the gentleman from California just this one question. When a believing reader reads that editorial, will it make him a better advocate of our free enterprise system? I might ask also will such a reader be more proud of his country. Will it increase his faith in America, or will it cause him to doubt and add to his confusion? What effect would it have on you?

Permit me to return now to the matter of this change of editors of this so-called leading liberal newspaper. I understand there was a change of editors just about 1 year ago. However, I find that it was merely a change of one editor for another and with no noticeable change of policy. The same radical left-wing headlines, pictures, editorials. No, Mr. Speaker, my friend should know, and if he has read this paper, he certainly does know, that the policy of this paper has not been changed since it was committed to the policy of left-wing radicalism.

It is a favorite trick of these leftists and fellow travelers to change personnel when they come under surveillance or question in order to throw off suspicion. Sometimes they even clean up their propaganda sheets for a time and publish some good issues. All of this, Mr. Speaker, is merely a trick that has been used so consistently by this Moscow party line that it is well known to many of us. As Dr. Townsend frequently has said, "In the medical world, if a patient balks on his medicine we simply sugar-coat it so he tastes one thing while he is actually taking something else." In other words they undertake to dress up their real ideology in some cloak of respectability. They will use beautiful American words and phrases—liberalism, security, democracy. Yes, they go to every known length to accomplish their ends. But when we follow them, we soon find that they are back to a well-recognized pattern. That pattern is to criticize, discredit, and smear everything, Mr. Speaker, that is American. I ask my colleague to go back over all the issues of this so-called leading liberal newspaper for the past year or more. Look at their glaring headlines, observe the cartoons and pictures. What will he find?

They attack our political party system.
They attack the Congress.
They attack our profit system.
They attack banks and big business.
They attack property rights.
They attack the President.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they attack and attack, everything that is American. But, they do not attack one thing, they never attack communism, the Soviet Union, or anything that would even hint of an unfriendly attitude existing on the part of this paper toward Russia. And yet they so cloak their subversive propaganda that when it comes under question, they run along and emphasize all of the nice words with which they have sugar-coated this unholy medicine. I have said, and I say again, that any newspaper or periodical published in this country that will cause its readers, the citizens of this country, to even think less of our country and our flag, is, to say the least, rendering a disservice to the cause of freemen, and should be barred from the mails.

Mr. Speaker, I charge that Townsend National Weekly is such a paper. Let him who doubts my statement simply read its issues. Note the glaring headlines, observe the cartoons and pictures, and then ask these question: "Will the reader of this paper be caused to love or hate his country? Are these nice sounding words and phrases real, or are they merely sugar-coated communism?"

Veterans' Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD three articles from the Miami Daily News of May 18, 19, and 20, 1947, each of which goes into detail showing the failure of the veterans' housing program. There is no question in the minds of the veterans, and I believe there is no question in the minds of the people generally, that the biggest domestic problem we have facing us today is that of housing. Just why the leaders of this Congress do not do anything about it and do not undertake to at least assist the veterans in finding homes is beyond my comprehension. I am certain from an examination of these articles, each of which is specific and well-written, that all of us will get some better idea as to what the situation really is and the urgency for doing something about it.

The articles follow:

[From the Miami Daily News of May 18, 1947]

LOOPHOLES WRECK VET HOUSING HERE—FORMER SERVICEMEN ARE PRICED RIGHT OUT OF PLACE TO LIVE

(By S. W. Matthews)

Biggest joke in Miami today—except it isn't funny—is the so-called veterans' housing program.

Basically, the program's failure is due to the simple fact the veteran has come back from a war to find housing costs doubled since he went away. He has been priced out of a place to live.

This is recognized in an FHA order of February 11 which permits anyone to buy a home in a veterans' housing project. The builder of such a project is required now to reserve only one unit of the total for a veteran, and he must reserve that one unit for only 30 days. Then he can sell it, too, along with the others.

On rental projects the story is quite similar. The veteran is supposed to have preference in rental of a house or apartment constructed under veterans' priority. There is nothing, however, which requires the landlord to show to whom he rents or for how much.

EXAMPLE OF FUTILITY

In off-the-record talks, nearly any official connected with any phase of the veterans' housing program here will admit its complete breakdown. And in those same conversations it becomes apparent that drastic steps from top to bottom of the housing program must be taken at once if any progress is to be made.

Of all governmental agencies, veterans' housing, born malformed and smothered in red tape, is probably the outstanding example of futility. Yet it is impossible to point the finger of blame to any one person for the failure, miserable as it is, of the program.

Housing regulations, as written and handed down from Washington, have loopholes which apparently make enforcement, even were there adequate enforcement staffs, impossible. As an example, exactly two violations have been brought to trial in Federal court to date. Both of these resulted in hung juries.

The scores of additional complaints filed with Federal agencies here have yet to see the light of a courtroom. Some apparently still are gathering dust in pigeonholes in Atlanta.

Yet one official who at least is in a position to know, estimates that of the 8,000 residential units constructed here under the veterans' program probably not more than 500 are occupied by veterans.

Building is going on rapidly in Greater Miami, and although the average veteran can't afford to buy or rent, there is a glimmer of hope for him that some day the law of supply and demand will swing around and do him some good.

Houses are for sale, new ones constructed under the veterans' program. A current but by no means complete check shows one firm has 12 homes, ready for buyers at $8,500 each; another has 19 ranging between $7,500 and $8,000; a third firm has 8 ready for buyers at $9,000.

SELLS 34 HOMES

One builder has sold 34 homes to nonveterans in the last three weeks, the price ranging between $9,000 and $10,000.

There is a belief construction costs will drop in the next several months if the line is held against commercial building projects, although this of course is nothing more than the opinion of a number of men in close touch with the building trade.

Despite a recent survey released in New York showing certain building materials are commanding prices equal to those of the wide-open black-market days, some dealers say privately they expect decreases soon.

Builders also are finding labor prices dropping, they say. A year ago, for example, builders were happy to send trucks to pick up men and pay them regular wages for riding to and from work. They likewise felt themselves lucky, so they say, if they could obtain 50 percent of a prewar day's work from the 1946 worker.

Now, with jobs scarcer, the laborer isn't quite so independent. He's more willing to work, knowing he can't walk away and take his choice of a dozen other offers.

These conditions are working, slowly, it is true, to the veterans' advantage. Apparently they are his only hope. Bureaucracy's efforts to house him, he has learned, mean nothing.

[From the Miami Daily News of May 19, 1947]

"OUR BOYS" GOT CHEERS, BUT LITTLE OR NO HOUSING—PRESENT PROGRAM AMOUNTS TO SUBSIDY OF BLACK MARKET IN BUILDING MATERIALS

(By S. W. Matthews)

Amid a fanfare of patriotic bugles, a waving of flags and benign words to "our boys back from the war," the veterans' housing program was launched in Washington some 15 months ago. To date the only practical accomplishment of the program has been a governmental subsidized black market.

"Our boys" who had a tent to sleep in if they were lucky overseas, a foxhole if they weren't, still are lucky if they get a tent now that the shooting is over.

Most of the people who design a budget for your daily living agree that 20 percent is the maximum which the average worker can pay for shelter. Most economists likewise will agree the average returning veteran is drawing considerably less than $300 a month, here in Miami. Therefore, he can't afford to pay, if he makes $300 a month, more than $60 a month for rent.

But where, in the new housing projects built under the veterans' program, can a one-bedroom apartment be found for $60 a month? Older buildings, caught under the rent ceiling, are being held very firmly by the people who had them during the war. Advertise for an apartment, or house, and offer less than $100 a month, and you won't get an answer; yet to be able to afford a $100-a-month rent, you should be making a minimum of $500 a month.

Ceilings? Yes, there are ceilings on rentals under the veterans' housing program. This is the way they work.

A builder obtains a priority under veterans' housing with which to erect a 16-unit apartment, his cost is estimated and he's given a shelter rent ceiling of $52 a month. He builds the apartment, comes back in to show the estimated cost was much too low (because he had to buy on the black market) and is given an adjustment on his shelter ceiling of $65.

Next, and all this is legal, he can make a "service charge" of $3 per room for mowing the lawn and cleaning the halls once a week. That makes $12 a month more for a living room, bedroom, bath, and kitchen. Now his legitimate ceiling is $77 a month.

On top of this, the builder decides to furnish the apartment. He is permitted to charge 2 percent a month for the cost of the furniture. How does this work out? Here are some actual figures, taken from the records of the unofficial veterans' housing committee:

A builder constructed an eight-unit apartment. Before he started, he was given a shelter rent ceiling of $52.50 for one-bedroom apartments and $57.50 for the two-bedroom units.

PLEA OF HARDSHIP

He then went out on the black market (obviously) and paid black market prices to get scarce materials. Back he comes, pleading hardship, and the obliging housing officials grant him an increase to $81.50 and $89.50. Next, the builder furnished the apartments and their ceiling today is $123.50 and $149.50.

Naturally, these rentals are far out of reach of the average veteran.

But suppose, in desperation, the veteran agrees to rent such an apartment. Does he get it? The answer is "No." He is supposed to have first choice for 30 days after completion, but the builder never has it quite completed when the veteran calls. He doesn't have to inform anyone when it is completed. In actual practice, he rents it to a winter visitor for a bonus of $500 for the season.

He takes that $500 in cash. There is no way to prosecute him. The winter visitor grumbles about the high cost of a vacation in Miami, the veteran finds its useless to complain and the black market, recognized and subsidized by the Government in granting hardship ceiling increases, goes merrily on.

Does the veteran wish to build a home, rather than rent? He takes his priorities in one hand, his borrowed money in the other and starts looking for materials. He finds that through legitimate channels he must wait at least 3 months for this item, 6 months for something else, and can get no estimate on another.

He finds, however, that by contracting on the black market, these scarce materials suddenly become available, for a price. But he can't buy them, because he can't go back and appeal for a hardship increase in his loan. The housing program doesn't recognize that kind of a hardship. So he has to rent.

Is there no enforcement machinery to stop such practices? There is not. One builder got priorities to erect 18 single and duplex units last year in Miami. He built, instead, four eight-unit apartments. Why? Because there is no ceiling on the sale price of multiple-unit buildings, multiple being construed as more than two. So he built his 32 units. The case was reported in September. Nothing has been done.

Another builder constructed a 12-unit building and told several veterans they were only for seasonal rentals. That case likewise was reported last September. Still, nothing has been done.

[From the Miami Daily News of May 20, 1947]

VETS WADE HIP DEEP IN HOUSING COMPLAINTS; PROGRAM IS TERMED FAILURE BECAUSE OF VAGUE RULES AND CHANGING BUREAUS

(By S. W. Matthews)

If ever a Federal program needed concise and clear rules upon which to work, and fearless and adequate enforcement for a chance of success, that program has been veterans' housing.

A combination between organized labor and contractors, even before the war, was blamed for high building costs which kept adequate housing out of reach of many Americans. Then the war, with its orgy of "plus 10 percent" contracts and labor scarcity, sent construction prices beyond the budgets of 90 percent of the people.

Knowing veterans' housing would meet almost insurmountable troubles in the natural course of events, it would seem those responsible for the program could have given a minimum of thought to the machinery which would power it through the stormy seas ahead.

Instead, the program was launched under vague rules in a mumbo-jumbo of legal jargon, split authority, and changing bureaus which would have made even an easy job difficult of accomplishment. Insofar as Greater Miami is concerned, veterans' housing is not taken as seriously as the State law requiring motorists to come to a full stop at every railroad crossing—bus drivers at least, observe that law.

As conceived originally, veterans were to get priorities on scarce materials with which to build homes. As it worked in actual practice, few veterans were lucky enough to obtain scarce items under their priorities although anyone, with enough cash, could purchase those materials on the black market.

PLUMBING AN EXAMPLE

Plumbing materials, to take an actual case on the files here, show how this worked. A veteran with a priority could not find materials with which to build a bathroom. He did find, however, a plumber who would contract both to obtain and install the bathroom. The only catch was the plumber wanted $1,500 to do this job, or about three times the normal price.

Priorities also were issued to builders under the condition they give preference to veterans in selling or renting houses and apartments to be constructed, 30 days preference on rental projects, 60 on sales.

No provision was made, however, to require the builder to report completion of his project. It was up to the veteran to watch homes and apartments under construction, come around when they were completed, and buy or rent. Many veterans did this, only to be informed an apparently completed house really wasn't complete at all. Knobs still had to be installed on the back door, for instance.

Could the veteran complain at this subterfuge? He could, and many of them did. He might as well have been baying at the moon. You can wade around hip deep in complaints in the enforcement office, but you can find only two cases which have been brought to trial, neither successfully.

POSSIBLE SOLUTION

What is the answer? There is, of course, no answer to the high cost of building unless the Government starts spending money for displaced persons in the United States as well as throughout other parts of the world.

The veterans' program, however, could be assisted by a thorough overhauling, starting in Washington and extending down to the smallest office. The entire program should be placed under one office instead of being separated; with enforcement knowing nothing of priorities issuance, and the issuing office entirely in ignorance of what enforcement is doing.

So-called hardship cases should be eliminated, the hardship cases being increases granted in ceiling rentals or sales prices due to unexpected expenses encountered in construction, or, in plain words, black-market buying.

Preference should be given veterans in renting and buying new houses, if the program is to be called a veterans' housing program. This could be accomplished by requiring builders to list, with the housing office, each unit for rent or sale as it is completed. This list could be advertised, and kept available at the housing office, for veterans.

PREFERENCE ASSURED

Provision should be made for a running file on permits to build and expected date of completion. Any delays in completion should be investigated and the builder required to explain. Thus the veteran would be assured of his preference in renting or buying.

Shipment of building materials, from the source of production to the retailer, should be of record. Any dealer, wholesaler, retailer, or manufacturer should be required, on demand, to show disposition of materials sold. Housing offices should be kept informed of materials shipped into their areas, and dealers be required to show priorities for sale in fact as well as theory.

Such a program would entail more expense, because it would mean employment of more inspectors, clerks, and prosecutors, but it should not be prohibitive. With such a set-up in action and a few of the violators successfully prosecuted, both civilly and criminally, homes for veterans might become something more than a hollow phrase.

Patent Office Fees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Patents, Trade Marks, and Copyrights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary has been conducting hearings on H. R. 2520 which proposes substantial increases in Patent Office fees.

Although there was a time when this Office was self-sustaining, since 1923, except for 5 years, it has operated at a loss. The annual deficit for the last 4 years has averaged a little over $1,000,000. This situation, we are told, is likely not to improve. Probably as the applications mount and the Office is faced with increasing complexity, due to the need for examination of more and more possibly conflicting claims, the spread between income and outgo will widen.

The representative of the Patent Office informed us that when its proposed budget was presented to the Committee on Appropriations, request was very properly made that they prepare an estimate of the increase in Patent Office fees which would be required to wipe out the prospective deficit in their operations. H. R. 2520 was the result.

The principal objection to the bill which we have had under consideration, as voiced by the witnesses and by voluminous correspondence received by the members of the subcommittee from all over the country, has been that the increase in the fees for filing application for patent from $30 to $50 and for issuance, also, from $30 to $50, or a total increase from $60 to $100, would discourage individual inventors and work a definite financial hardship on them. It has been pointed out to us that whereas applicants financed by large corporate interests would have no difficulty in meeting these increased payments, inventors, as a class, are inclined toward the side of impecuniosity, that they now have a hard time in many cases to raise the filing fee, and that often the additional $40 contemplated by this bill would impose a burden of really serious proportions. I find myself very sympathetic with, and quite convinced by, the representations which have been made to us in this regard.

In an effort to strike a fair and just balance between two worthy objectives—to increase the income of this Office and endeavor to put it on a self-sustaining basis and, in so doing, to prevent individual inventors from incurring expense in making their applications which would result in great hardship and a possible deterrent to inventive initiative—I am today introducing a bill which approaches the problem from a new point of view. Under its provisions, the fees for filing the original application and for issuance remain as they are, but it is then provided that at the expiration of the fifth year of the patent a maintenance fee of $50 shall be payable, and at the expiration of the tenth year of the patent a further fee of $75. The merit of this approach is that the threat of discouragement to inventors is removed, while at the same time provision for increasing the revenue of the Office is made, arising out of fees payable after the holder of the patent has had an opportunity to test the public acceptance of his product and determine whether it is worth while to keep the patent in force. At the end of the fifth or tenth year he can either pay the fee, which, if his product has been well accepted, should then appear to him modest, or he can decide that it is not in his interest to invest any further funds in his invention and let the patent lapse for nonpayment of fees.

A somewhat similar system has been in force for many years in England and France and has met with general favor.

During the last 5 years the average number of patent applications filed annually was 58,000, of which the average number granted was 30,000. Assuming this average for the future, under the scheduled increase of $20 on filing the application and on issuance, the additional revenue envisioned in H. R. 2520 would be $1,160,000 on applications filed and $600,000 on patents granted, making a total of $1,760,000 per annum.

It is estimated, based on the British experience, that about 60 percent of those to whom patents are granted would pay a maintenance fee at the end of 5 years. If this fee were $50 the amount collected would be $900,000. It is further estimated that about 30 percent would pay another maintenance fee at the end of 10 years, which, at $75, would amount to $675,000, totaling, therefore, an increased revenue of $1,575,000, or approximately half as much again as the present annual deficit.

The bill which I am today introducing is presented primarily for the purpose of permitting a thorough study of the desirability of adopting this admittedly radical departure from precedent in the administration of the Patent Office, and not with any contention for finality in this suggested manner of meeting the problem before us. It is hoped, however, that, if the proposal has merit, its novelty will not spell its death knell.

Possibilities for amendment, it seems to me, should be considered by the committee. One would be, as a further spur to inventors and aid to them at a time when they most need help, actually to decrease the application and issuance fees by $5, which would cause an estimated reduction of the above figure of $1,575,000 to $1,135,000, still well in excess of the present annual deficit. Another suggestion would be to decrease the application fee by $10 but increase the issuance fee at the time when an inventor is assured that his labors will result in receiving a patent, also by $10, which would mean a net reduction of the $1,575,000 estimate by $280,000, or an annual increase in Patent Office income of about $1,295,000.

It is certainly arguable that either of these suggestions might result in sufficient encouragement to inventors that the number of additional applications filed would partially or, perhaps, completely narrow the gap and restore the full amount of additional revenue of $1,575,000, or nearly so.

There are further changes in this bill for a comprehensive alteration in the schedule of Patent Office fees which would increase the income of the Office and constitute a more equitable burden of spreading the cost of administration.

For instance, under existing law, when one files an application for a design patent, he must decide whether he will seek such a patent for 3½, 7, or 14 years. The fees for each are, respectively, $10, $15, and $30. It is contemplated to double these in H. R. 2520. My bill provides that all design patents shall be issued initially for a term of 15 years at a fee of $20, subject to the payment of maintenance fees of $25 at the end of 5 years and another $25 at the end of 10 years. A rough calculation would indicate that this should increase the income of the Patent Office by some $30,000, at the same time removing from the design patentee the hazard of being required to decide, before he has had an opportunity to exploit his design, whether its life should be short, medium, or long.

Section 4 of this proposed measure provides that the act shall take effect on January 1, 1948, and apply to all patents which have not, by that date, reached their tenth anniversary. Here, again, a debatable question arises, whether attempt should be made to put this new plan of operation immediately into effect, or whether it should only apply to patents which are actually issued after next January 1. In the latter event, the increased revenue contemplated by the bill would, of course, not begin to take effect for 5 years, except for the rather minor increases in incidental fees. The bill, as drawn, provides that the Commissioner shall send a notice of the requirement for payment of a maintenance fee at least 3 months before the fee is due, and that one who fails to pay this additional sum to keep his existing patent alive shall not be entitled to procure an injunction until the fee is paid, nor to recover any damages accruing for infringement during the period between the date when the fee was due and the date when it was actually paid. It is believed that the imposition of this additional charge on existing patents, in order to give the holder the complete exercise of all his rights, infringes no constitutional guarantee.

Again, let me emphasize that I have no pride of authorship in the particular provisions of this legislation, but submit it for careful scrutiny and consideration in the earnest belief that it may furnish the solution to a difficult problem and result in greater encouragement to inventors, increased income in the Patent Office to the point of self-sustenance, and greater equity in the spread of the burden of fees imposed for the services rendered by that Office.

Analysis of Taft-Hartley Bill as Reported by Conference Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following analysis prepared by Lee Pressman of the Taft-Hartley bill as reported by the conference committee:

ANALYSIS OF TAFT-HARTLEY BILL AS REPORTED BY CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

The Senate and House conferees have now reached agreement and made their report on the proposed antilabor legislation. The bill which they have agreed upon is in all likelihood the bill which will be sent to the President of the United States. He will now have to decide whether he is prepared to veto or accept this bill.

The bill as approved by the conference committee should now set at rest once and for all any possible doubt as to whether the President will be offered a vindictive and reactionary piece of legislation. The bill, as now approved by the conference committee, revises the Wagner Act and turns it into an antilabor weapon. It substantially upsets the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act and even goes further by putting the Government itself in the business of getting antistrike injunctions for the employer. It offers a hitherto unknown series of regulations and restrictions on the right to organize, to bargain, to strike and to conduct in freedom the affairs of voluntary associations.

The bill as reported by the conference committee covers a total of some 73 printed pages. It is not possible in a short space to outline all of its details. The following summarizes some of its major features:

I. ABOLITION OF UNION SECURITY

A. The closed shop is prohibited (sec. 8 (a) (3)).

B. The bill pretends to permit other forms of union security such as union maintenance, union shop, etc. But:

1. In order to be able to secure such a clause a union must not only have won an election and been certified as the collective bargaining representative (as the law now provides), but—

2. Must in addition request and secure from the Board another and special vote on the union's authority to make an agreement with an employer containing a union security clause; and

3. In order to receive such authorization the union must secure an affirmative vote of a majority, not merely of those who participate in the vote but of all the employees in the entire unit (including those who fail to turn out to vote); and

4. In any event the union is prevented even from having such a vote taken if it cannot prove that it has filed all required financial and other reports with the Secretary of Labor and has furnished copies of such reports to all its members (not merely the employees of the particular employer), and it must also show, not only that it itself has complied with this requirement, but that its international union has complied with the requirement with respect to all members of the international through the Nation; and

5. In any event a union will not be permitted to have a vote to authorize it to have a union-security clause unless not only all of the officers of the local but all of the officers of the international file with the Board affidavits that they are not members of or affiliated with the Communist Party; and

6. Even after having succeeded in securing such a ballot and having succeeded in receiving the necessary vote and even if the union can secure the employer's agreement to grant a union-security clause, the clause cannot be enforced against any employee expelled from the union for disruption, dishonesty, acting as a company spy, or any other reason except the nonpayment of dues; and

7. If the union is lucky enough to secure such a clause, it subjects itself to regulation by the Board as to whether its initiation fees are, in the Board's judgment, excessive (secs. 8 (a) (3), 8 (b) (5), 9 (e), 9 (f), 9 (g), 9 (h)).

C. Even this slight pretense of preserving some forms of union security is completely thrown in the ash heap if you happen to be in one of the dozen or more States which have now passed laws outlawing any and all forms of union security. Although normally State laws are supposed to give way to Federal laws, the drafters of this bill want to make sure that if the State law is worse than the Federal law, the State law will apply. Therefore, they inserted a special section specifically sanctifying any State law which goes further than the Federal law (sec. 13 (b)).

D. Even after the union has cleared all of the preceding hurdles, won all the necessary elections, and signed a contract, then at any time after 1 year has elapsed from the ballot on the union's authorization, a minority group of 30 percent of the employees can secure a new ballot to take away the right to unior security (sec. 9 (e) (2))

E. Regardless of any vote and regardless of any contract requirement, there may be no check-off for payment to the union of any items other than union dues; and even with respect to union dues there may be no check-off except on the basis of individual written assignments from each employee. In other words, even though a majority or unanimous vote may have authorized the collective bargaining representative to negotiate a check-off, the collective representation must be broken down into individual assignments.

II. PREVENTION OF RECOGNITION AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The bill hypocritically retains some of the language in the statement of policy attached to the present Wagner Act recognizing that public policy requires encouragement of collective bargaining. The statement of policy specifically points out that refusal of employers to accept the procedure of collective bargaining has led to industrial strife. The bill itself, however, proceeds to free the employer in a number of ways to prevent his employees from organizing and to commit acts which would otherwise be unfair labor practices. In addition the bill creates a large number of new devices by which an employer can evade collective-bargaining obligations and refuse to bargain even after his employees have selected their representative.

The following are a few samples:

A. While the employees are attempting to organize, if the employer engages in a campaign of coercion, intimidation, or discriminatory discharges, the following are a few of the special techniques which the new bill offers to help the employer avoid any responsibility for violating the law:

1. If supervisors go around making threats and doing all the other things which employers are forbidden to do under the law, the employer can deny any responsibility for the actions of his foremen, superintendents, etc., simply by denying that these people are technically his "agents" for these purposes. The law has been amended by the new bill so as to make it necessary to prove that the person making the threats and committing the unfair labor practices was in a technical legal sense an "agent" of the employer. In the law as it has been up to now it was sufficient to prove that the person making the threat was acting "in the interest of" the employer. This also gives a free hand to employer associations to escape responsibility for their destruction of unions in behalf of an employer (sec. 2 (2)).

2. Even if it be proven that an employer committee the unfair-labor practice of a discriminatory discharge, nevertheless the discharged man will be denied reinstatement if the employer can show that the discharge was for cause. It has been a standard practice of employers, when they wished to fire a man for union activities, to wait until they could discover some trifle of violation or deficiency for which they would never have fired any other person. It has been the law up till now that if the employer discovered some cause for discharge, but if it is proven that he was actually discriminating and would not have fired another man for the same cause, then, since there had been a violation of the law, the discharged man would be entitled to return to his job. Under the proposed bill the employer's activities may be as viciously discriminatory as he chooses, he may apply his rule vigorously to discharge union men while condoning the violations by nonunion members. He may, in short, engage in clear unfair labor practices. Nevertheless, the new bill would prevent reinstatement for the victim (sec. 10 (c)).

3. While the union is engaged in organizing, the employer will now be able to go to the NLRB with the charge that the union is restraining or coercing employees in their rights of self-organization. This will be a charge which will not be used where any actual force or violence can be proved, since if there were any force or violence used the employer would of course call the police rather than use the slow procedures of the Board. The Board machinery and the unfair-labor-practice charge will be used by the employer in any case of peaceful organizational activities as a means of confusing the campaign, disrupting the organization, and smearing the union (sec. 8 (b) (1)).

B. Even if the employees succeed in organizing themselves, the bill discovers new ways of preventing them from achieving collective bargaining rights. Here are a few samples.

1. While the employees are engaged in organizing, they will be denied any collective bargaining rights unless and until they succeed in organizing as large a unit as the Board may deem appropriate. Up to now, where employees succeeded in organizing themselves in some reasonable and appropriate subdivision such as an entire division or department or building or other reasonable unit of the employer's establishment, it was possible for the employees so organized to secure for themselves the right to engage in bargaining with the employer without having to wait for what might be an impossible task or a task of many years, namely the organizing of many thousands of employees in other divisions or buildings. The Board has held that employees in such a case may be certified for a reasonable unit representing the extent to which organization has already gone. The new bill, anxious to prevent collective bargaining wherever possible, declares that the extent of organization may never be considered controlling in deciding an appropriate unit. Even if all the employees in a department or building or other reasonable unit wish to bargain collectively with their

employer, they must be denied that right unless and until there is organization throughout the entire plant or all of the plants which the Board may consider an appropriate unit (sec. 9 (c) (5)).

2. Even if a majority or all of the employees clearly indicate their desire to be represented by a union the employees will not be permitted to have an election or even to have the Board investigate the question of representation if the particular organization in question has not satisfied all technicalities established by the Secretary of Labor with respect to the filing of the constitution and bylaws of the organization, reports on its officers and employees and their compensation and allowances, their election and appointment, the dues and fees, the total finances for the current year, and has not distributed to all members copies of such financial report. And this must be shown not only for the local union but for the international with which it is affiliated. An employer may evade any obligation to bargain with a union representing any or all of his employees if he can show that among all the members of the international union throughout the country there may have been one member who did not receive the required financial report. As a matter of fact, under the bill, the employer would not even have the burden of proving this because the burden is on the union to "show" that it has "furnished to all of the members" such a report (secs. 9 (f) and 9 (g)).

3. Even if all of the employer's employees have selected a labor organization as their representative, certification may not be issued and the employer is free to refuse to bargain collectively if he can discover even one officer, either of the local union involved or the national union with which it is affiliated, who has not filed with the Board, within the previous 12 months, an affidavit stating that he is not a "member of or affiliated with" the Communist Party. Under the proposed bill, once any officer or a national union anywhere in the country has failed to file such an affidavit, all collective bargaining with all locals of that national union throughout the country may break down. Those favoring and those opposed to the individual officer in question suffer equally. The officer in question may represent a majority group; he may represent a minority group; he may have been elected by national ballot or a territorial subdivision. Under any and all circumstances all employers dealing with any local union throughout the country are free to refuse to engage in collective bargaining and certification may be denied. In those few unions where one or more avowed members of the Communist Party have been elected to leadership, the members are thus penalized under this section for exercising their free right of democratic choice. And all members are thus penalized regardless of how they voted. Moreover, even with respect to those unions in which there are no leaders who are members of or affiliated with the Communist Party, every officer called upon to sign and file such an affidavit is to be compelled to do so with full knowledge that its probable result may be to transfer the smear tactics to the criminal courtroom. In other words, the same kind of tactics which labeled as "Communists" those whose names appeared on mailing lists or those who were members of organizations condemned by Martin Dies or the FBI are now to be available as a device for jailing union leaders. Hereafter if a jury can be gotten to hold that membership in certain organizations or support for certain principles or even support for the New Deal constitutes "affiliation" with the Communist Party, a labor leader belonging to such an organization may be jailed. If labor leaders seek to protect themselves by refusing to file such affidavits, collective bargaining breaks down throughout the entire industry. If they do sign such affidavits, the door may be open to sweeping criminal witchhunts throughout the labor movement. It would seem quite obvious that such a proposal could come only from such forces which were willing to use every possible device either to prevent collective bargaining from taking place or to throttle the labor movement (sec. 9 (h)).

III. BREAKING UP OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNITS

While erecting the elaborate scheme described above to prevent unions from getting recognized at all and to prevent any collective bargaining from taking place, the proposed bill also takes steps to make sure that if collective bargaining does occur it will be on a carved-up basis least beneficial to the employees.

It is ironic and typical of the bill that it insists on breaking up units where collective bargaining is to take place but it refuses to allow a small unit to be determined upon if that might permit collective bargaining where there would otherwise be no bargaining. Thus, where a large unit is not completely organized, the Board forbids certification of a small unit as has been heretofore possible when the Board certified to the extent that organization had taken place. This the new bill forbids (sec. 9 (c) (5)). But where there is a possibility of collective bargaining occurring in a large and strong unit, the new bill throws its weight on the side of breaking up such units.

A. In some industries, notably newspaper publishing, years of experience have established collective bargaining on the basis of a single unit covering so-called professional and all other employees as a single group. The new bill would require that so-called professional employees vote separately in all Board elections (secs. 9 (b) (1) and 2 (12)).

B. For approximately 12 years the National Labor Relations Board has been engaged in the process of analyzing and determining the unit most appropriate for collective bargaining in the many industries of the United States. In many of the mass-production industries it has been perfectly clear that only organization on an industrial basis, combining into a single unit all the employees of the plant or employer, is practical and can produce the kind of employee organization capable of bargaining with the employer and dealing with the problems of the establishment as a whole. Without rhyme or reason the proposed bill declares that all of the body of Board experience and decision must be disregarded and may be given no consideration in the event of any efforts by isolated, splinter, craft groups in these mass-production industries to separate themselves off from the main unit of the employees (sec. 9 (b) (2)).

C. Plant guards will be permitted to organize only if their bargaining unit is completely separate and, further, if the union is not affiliated with any organization of other employees (sec. 9 (b)).

IV. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RESTRICTED

Even if a union is able to secure certification, is able to secure recognition, and collective bargaining becomes possible, the bill sets up certain matters on which the parties are prohibited from reaching agreement.

A. If the employer and the union representing the employees wish to agree on a union security clause, they are prohibited and restricted by the provisions outlined under heading No. 1 above.

B. If the employer and the union representing a majority of his employees wish to agree on a provision whereby the employer gives to his employees the convenience of the check-off as a means of payment of dues instead of requiring extensive, disorganized, and frequently wasteful efforts at collection in the plant or outside, they are forbidden to arrive at such an agreement except by getting separate assignments from each of the thousands of employees who may be involved.

C. If the employer and the union representing the majority of his employees wish to reach an agreement whereby a welfare fund will be established, to be financed by the employer but to be administered by the union, the proposed bill would prohibit such an agreement. Many employers have been quite willing to finance health and other insurance funds but have been reluctant to assume the responsibility of participating in the administration of such programs and have therefore agreed that it be left in the hands of the union. Many industries consist of large numbers of employees, each operating a small unit, each of whom alone could not establish such a fund. In such industries the union is the only means of providing a single central fund to which the employers can contribute and over the years has developed such a fund. Such an arrangement is made illegal under the proposed bill. The conferees virtually admitted the complete dishonesty of this entire section by providing that all such arrangements may continue in existence if they were established before January 1, 1946. Only new ones are to be forbidden. In other words, the conferees admitted that where such arrangements have been in existence they are justified and have worked well. Normally, laws are passed to forbid activities which have been proven to be evil or dangerous. In the present instance apparently something which is admitted to be a good idea meriting preservation is nevertheless to be forbidden unless the union has already gotten it (sec. 302).

V. INTERFERENCE WITH THE RIGHT TO STRIKE—REVIVAL OF ANTILABOR INJUNCTION

In a number of different ways the bill aims very direct blows at the right of workers to strike. In some instances it does this by setting aside the Norris-LaGuardia act to permit the issuance of court injunctions. In other instances it empowers the Government even more directly acting through the National Labor Relations Board to issue restraining orders equivalent to antilabor injunctions. In still other instances the right to strike is attacked by making even peaceful strike activity the subject of damage suits by employers. In some instances the attack on the right to strike is contained in an open and blunt prohibition of certain strikes. In other instances there is a general restriction on union activity which can and may be expected to be interpreted to include a prohibition on strike action.

The following are a few examples:

A. Where the Attorney General decides that a strike affects "an entire industry or a substantial part thereof" and may "imperil the national health or safety," he can appoint a board of inquiry and thereafter can disregard the Norris-LaGuardia Act and apply to the courts for a strike-breaking injunction. Such an injunction may remain in operation for at least 75 days. After 60 days, and before a strike may take place, the National Labor Relations Board is required to take a secret ballot of the employees of each employer to vote on whether they will accept the last offer made by the employer (title II, secs. 206 to 210).

B. In any strike the strikers who have been replaced would under the bill be denied the right to vote in National Labor Relations Board elections. If the employer can replace enough of the strikers, he or the strike-breakers would then be able to call for a vote and cancel the union's collective-bargaining rights.

C. Where workers refuse to handle scab products or products made under sweatshop conditions, or where workers refuse to work for an employer who is helping another em-

ployer to break a strike, such activity is made an "unfair labor practice" for which the Board may issue a restraining order (sec. 8 (b) (4)). In addition, even before hearings to decide whether to issue an order, the Board may apply to the Federal courts for an injunction (sec. 10 (1)). Furthermore, the union involved may be sued by the employer for damages (title III, sec. 303).

D. Amidst much talk about "featherbedding" the conferees inserted into the bill a provision which actually threatens any union which seeks call-in pay or allowed time or adequate safety crews. It is made an unfair labor practice for a union to "cause" an employer to pay "for services which are not performed or not to be performed." In the many contract clauses under which an employer agrees that once a worker is permitted to report on a regularly scheduled day, he must receive a certain number of hours of pay, it is quite possible that the worker will thus be paid "for services which are not performed." Similarly, in the case of work under excessive heat or similar conditions requiring periods of rest or in work requiring appropriate relief periods for safety purposes, it is quite possible that employees may be paid for "services which are not performed." While the bill apparently leaves the employer free out of the goodness of his heart to grant such arrangements, it is made an unfair labor practice for the union to do anything to "cause" the employer to agree to such an arrangement. This apparently forbids the union even to ask for it.

E. It is made an unfair labor practice for a union to "refuse to bargain" (sec. 8 (b) (3)). It is also made an unfair labor practice for a union to "restrain or coerce" employees in connection with the union membership. These are words which have a very definite meaning in themselves and as spelled out in decisions during the past 10 years as applied to employers. Employers, before the Wagner Act, had regularly refused to bargain with the representatives of the employees, insisting on dealing only with individual employees. Employers had regularly used their power over the workers' jobs as a means of restraining and coercing the workers into rejecting union membership. As applied to unions, however, these words either have no meaning or may be interpreted to affect a wide variety of thoroughly legitimate activity. It is an unfair labor practice, for example, for an employer to offer higher wages if his employees will stay out of the union. Is it now to be an unfair labor practice for a union to promise a drive for wage increases if the workers join the union?

If an employer engages in a "refusal to bargain," all that the Board can do in most cases is to order the employer to bargain. If, on the other hand, the Board should disapprove of the bargaining tactics of a union, will it have the power solely to order the union to bargain or will the Board also have the power to order the termination of any strike which may be in progress? All these problems indicate that the language of many sections of this bill can serve as devices for attacking legitimate union activity.

F. The newly established Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is encouraged and directed not merely to conciliate and mediate but to attempt strike breaking. The conferees came up with a provision which was not in either the House bill or the Senate bill. They eliminated the usual suggestion that, among other things, the Director of Conciliation should urge the parties to submit their disputes to arbitration. Instead they make it the duty of the Director of Conciliation to urge that the employer's last offer of settlement be submitted to the employees in a secret ballot. This is typical of the entire attempt of the bill to set aside the collective-bargaining agency and break up the collective-representation principle. There is, of course, no suggestion that the Director of Conciliation should urge the parties to submit the union's last offer to a vote of the stockholders (sec. 203 (c)).

G. It is made unlawful for Government employees to participate in any strike. Those who do will be subject to immediate discharge, forfeiture of civil-service status, and be ineligible for reemployment for 3 years by the United States (sec. 305 (f)).

VI. ADDITIONAL GROUPS OF EMPLOYEES EXCLUDED FROM COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING RIGHTS

While obstructing collective bargaining and making collective-bargaining rights extremely difficult to obtain for all employees, the bill goes further as to certain groups and makes it impossible for them ever to engage in collective bargaining with their employers.

A. Supervisors are denied any right to certification for collective bargaining and any protection against unfair labor practices (sec. 2 (3) and 2 (11)). To make sure that no State law will give them collective-bargaining status, any such law is declared contrary to Federal policy (sec. 14).

B. Employees in agriculture are excluded from any rights to certification or from any protection against employer unfair labor practices (sec. 2 (3)). Under the present law and practice, only an agricultural laborer is excluded and this has been defined in decisions over the years so that collective bargaining is permitted by those who are employed by large employers in industrial-type operations. The conference committee dropped from the bill any definition of agriculture.

C. Employees of nonprofit hospitals are denied collective-bargaining rights and protection against unfair labor practices (sec. 2 (2)).

D. In addition to Government employees who are already denied collective-bargaining rights under the present law, employees of wholly owned Government corporations and of Federal Reserve banks are also to be denied protection or rights under the law (sec. 2 (2)).

VII. OBSTRUCTION AND INTERFERENCE WITH NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD OPERATION

A. The Board membership is packed and made unwieldy and cumbersome by raising the number of members from three to five (sec. 3 (a)). In addition the Board's integrated operation is upset and a complex and not very clear separation of powers and functions is made between it and its own general counsel. The general counsel, instead of being appointed by the Board, is to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for a term of 4 years. The general counsel, instead of the Board, is given the power of supervision over all Board attorneys and all regional officers. He is also given final authority over the investigation of charges, issuance of complaints and prosecution of complaints before the Board. He is also to have such other duties as the Board may prescribe.

B. At the same time the Board is forbidden to retain its present staff of review attorneys who analyze voluminous records for the Board. The bill would require each member separately or his secretary or legal assistant to analyze the hundreds of thousands of pages of record which come before the Board (sec. 4 (a)). The Board is now 6 months to a year behind in its docket.

C. The Board is forbidden to hire economic analysts whose services are needed to study company records and statistical data in order to help analyze charges of discriminatory practices, or in order to help compute back-pay obligations (sec. 4 (a)).

D. The Board is forbidden to take action on any charges which are filed more than 6 months after the unfair labor practice occurred. Thus if an employer sets up a company union or otherwise interferes with the self-organization of his employees and his violations do not come to the attention of a bona fide labor organization or his employees are not advised of their rights for 6 months, the company union and the employer are free from any effort to undo the illegal act (sec. 10 (b)).

E. One of the means by which the Board has attempted to speed up its proceedings has been the procedure of holding elections even before waiting for hearings where only one union is involved and where there is no serious issue to be litigated. The conference bill appears to prohibit any such prehearing selections (secs. 9 (c) (1), 9 (c) (4)).

F. To make sure that the Board may become bogged down in technicalities and red tape, the new bill would require, contrary to the provisions of any other piece of legislation covering an administrative agency, that in hearings before the Board the technical rules of evidence which normally apply in the United States courts must be followed.

VIII. THE BILL ENCOURAGES RAIDS ON UNION TREASURIES

Under the guise of permitting suits against labor organizations (an action for which no legislation is needed since such suits may be brought in State courts), the bill permits employers to sue unions in Federal courts, not only in the district where the union has its principal office but in any district in which it has any officers or agents. Thus a national union may be harassed by lawsuits brought against it in any part of the country where it may have a local union (sec. 301). Such suits may be brought not only for alleged violations of contract (sec. 301), but even for any damages resulting to the employer from a perfectly peaceful and otherwise lawful strike resulting from a refusal of employees to work on scab products, products manufactured under substandard conditions, etc. This provision moreover permits suits under all collective-bargaining contracts to be brought into the Federal courts regardless of the normal jurisdictional requirements that would otherwise apply to any attempt to sue in the Federal courts under any other type of contract. This provision is unnecessary for any legitimate reason since there is a perfect right to sue under these contracts or any other contracts in the State courts. It is intended to and will have the effect of encouraging employers to draw collective-bargaining enforcement into the red tape of court litigation. Moreover the section eliminates the present rule of law under which a union may be held responsible only for activities which it has authorized or ratified. Under the proposed bill the union may be held responsible for the act of any member if the court should decide that the member, however unauthorized his activity, was acting as an agent of the union. The union is also to be considered as having been brought into court even if the papers were not served on its officers but on some member whom the court may term to be an agent of the union.

IX. POLITICAL EXPENDITURES FORBIDDEN

The law up to this time has forbidden only political contributions by unions and has operated only with respect to general elections. This has at least left unions free to participate in primaries and also has permitted a union to make known its views through its own publications and other activities such as meetings, etc., so long as such activity did not take the form of financial contribution to the campaign. The proposed bill would forbid not only contribution but also expenditures and would apply not only to general elections but to primaries, conventions, caucuses, etc.

LEE PRESSMAN,
General Counsel.

JUNE 2, 1947.

The Republican Ax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert an editorial from the Miami Daily News of May 31. I think this editorial states in a few words that it is not wise to base our economy cuts on imagination, wish, or guess; that cuts based on such factors are demoralizing, not only to Federal employees, many of whom are extremely efficient and have devoted most of their lives to Government service, but also to the average citizen.

THE REPUBLICAN AX

To the Congressmen marking their tally sheets as each appropriations bill comes before the House and is slashed, the score now stands at about $2,500,000,000; they have not yet reached the halfway mark in the $6,000,000,000 retrenchment in President Truman's budget.

Meanwhile, in other parts of Washington, the score is being kept in different units. The law requires that Government employees cannot be dismissed without a 30-day notice, and the executive departments, unable to forecast the Senate's action, have to be prepared to translate into employees and Government programs the dollars lopped off with every stroke of the Republican economy ax.

Jerry Kluttz, veteran Washington Post reporter covering the executive departments, has assembled the various scores on dismissal notices now prepared. The War Department has little pink slips for 45,000 employees, and will prepare 25,000 more if the House Appropriations Committee goes through with a projected cut of $800,000,000. Agriculture will dismiss between 15,000 and 25,000; State will get out notices for 4,000, including every one of the 3,100 employed in its Office of Information and Cultural Affairs. Navy, Commerce, Treasury, the Veterans' Administration, WAA, and the office of the Housing Expediter have from 2,000 to 8,000 each. Interior and Labor have already fired thousands, and 3,000 more employees of Interior will get their notices this week.

There would be nothing wrong with these figures, even though they total around 100,000 if they represented even a halfway systematic study of the needs of the Government service. But when we realize that they are only the rough translation of dollar figures which are themselves plucked from the thin air, they are nothing short of demoralizing.

Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today marks the one hundred and thirty-ninth anniversary of the birth of the greatest of all Mississippians—and one of the greatest of all Americans—Jefferson Davis, the president of the Confederate States of America.

Davis will be remembered by Americans for all time to come, not only because he led the Southern States in their valiant struggle for independence, but also for his historic contributions to the preservation of American democracy as a Member of both Houses of Congress, as a member of the President's Cabinet, and as a soldier.

Jefferson Davis was a great man in every sense of the word, and nothing could be more exemplary of his ability and character than his farewell address to Mississippians, delivered to the Mississippi Legislature on March 10, 1884, which I ask leave to include herewith:

Friends and brothers of Mississippi, in the briefest terms, but with the deepest feeling, permit me to return my thanks for the unexpected honor you have conferred upon me. A waif on the political sea, I have in my secluded home by the seashore observed with intense interest all passing events affecting the interest or honor of Mississippi, and I have rejoiced to see in the diversification of labor and the development of our new sources of prosperity and the increased facilities of public education, reason to hope for a future to our State more prosperous than any preceding era. The safety and honor of a republic must rest upon the morality, intelligence, and patriotism of the community.

We are now in a transition state, which is always a bad one, both in society and nature. What is to be the result of the changes which may be anticipated, it is not possible to forecast, but our people have shown such fortitude and have risen so grandly from the deep depression inflicted upon them that it is fair to entertain bright hopes for the future.

Sectional hate, concentrating itself upon my devoted head, deprives me of the privilege accorded to others in the sweeping expression of "without distinction of race, color, or previous condition," but it cannot deprive me of that which is nearest and dearest to my heart, the right to be a Mississippian; and it is with deep gratification that I received this emphatic recognition of that right by the representatives of our people. Reared on the soil of Mississippi, the ambition of my boyhood was to do something which would redound to the honor and welfare of the State. The weight of many years admonishes me that my day for actual service has passed, yet the desire remains undiminished to see the people of Mississippi prosperous and happy and her fame not unlike the past, but gradually growing wider and brighter as years roll by.

It has been said that I should apply for pardon. But as repentance must needs precede pardon, I have no complaint to make that pardon has not been granted to me. Remembering as I must all which has been suffered, all which has been lost, disappointed hopes and crushed aspirations, yet I deliberately say, if it were to do over again, I would again do just as I did in April 1861. No one is the arbiter of his own fate. The people of the Confederate States did more in proportion to their numbers and means than was ever achieved by any people in the world's history. Fate decreed that they should be unsuccessful in the effort to maintain their claims to resume the grants made to the Federal Government. Our people have accepted the decree; it therefore behooves them, as they may, to promote the welfare of the Union, to show to the world that hereafter, as heretofore, the patriotism of our people is not measured by lines of latitude and longitude, but is as broad as the obligations they have assumed and embrace the whole of our ocean-bound domain. Let them leave to their children and children's children the grand example of never swerving from the path of duty, and preferring to return good for evil rather than to cherish the unmanly feeling of revenge. But never question or teach your children to desecrate the memory of the dead by admitting that their brothers were wrong in the effort to maintain the sovereignty, freedom, and independence which was their inalienable birthright, remembering that the coming generations are the children of the heroic mothers whose devotion to our cause in its darkest hour sustained the strong and strengthened the weak. I cannot believe that the cause for which our sacrifices were made can ever be lost, but rather hope that those who now deny the justice of our asserted claims will learn from experience that the fathers builded wisely and the Constitution should be construed according to the commentaries of the men who made it.

It having been previously understood that I would not attempt to do more than to return my thanks which are far deeper than it would be possible for me to express, I will now, Senators and Representatives, and to you, ladies and gentlemen, who have honored me by your attendance, bid you an affectionate, and it may be a last, farewell.

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I present here the second of the radio broadcasts on the Panama Canal made by our late colleague, the Honorable Fred Bradley, then chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

In my broadcast of last week, I went into some little detail with respect to the operational problems facing us down at the Panama Canal. As authorized by the Congress in Public Law 280 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, an intensive investigation of the Panama Canal has been undertaken under the direction of the Governor of the Panama Canal and the supervision of the Secretary of War, which investigation is to be reported to the Congress by December 31 of this year. There is no doubt but reconstruction of the Canal to improve its operation and increase its capacity is imperative.

The specific remedies for the major marine operational problems about which I told you last week consist generally in removing the causes:

Since the basic cause of most of these problems is the location of Pedro Miguel locks on the Pacific side squarely across the south end of Gaillard cut where it forms a bottleneck, the physical removal of these locks is definitely indicated.

Because the separation of the Pacific locks into two sets of locks was an obvious error in operational design, it is felt this defect can be corrected by constructing all Pacific locks in continuous lifts near Miraflores at the place where the excavation for the third locks project was made.

Operational studies indicate that the effect of fog on Canal capacity and operation can be mitigated by the formation of a high-level lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the Canal to match the lake anchorage at Gatun on the Atlantic side. This would also increase the normal operation capacity of the Pacific end of the Canal and place it on a par with the Atlantic end.

The creation of this high-level lake between the Pacific locks and Gaillard Cut would supply a surge damping reservoir that would reduce lockage surges from a maximum amplitude of 3 feet to less than 1 inch.

It is felt the raising of the Gatun Lake level and the elimination of the surge factor of 1.5 feet will increase the water-level operating range materially and improve navigation accordingly, and that it will supply more water for lockages and greater depths for navigation during both the wet and dry seasons.

The hazards of the restricted channels of Gaillard Cut can be reduced by the widening, straightening, and other improvements. The raising of the water level to 90 feet will also widen the channel through the cut.

The limitations caused by the narrow width of the present locks (110 feet) can be overcome by the construction of a set of larger locks of such dimensions as may be deemed adequate.

A study of the topography at the Pacific end of the canal indicates that the hills surrounding the present Miraflores Lake form a suitable impounding perimeter for creating a high-level lake between Miraflores and the south end of Gaillard cut. Geological investigations near Miraflores indicate that there are ample foundations suitable for heavy-lock structures. It is the conclusion of those who have studied this problem that the solution of the principal marine operation problems consists of, first, the elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks; second, the construction of all Pacific locks in continuous lifts near Miraflores; third, the creation of a high-level lake at the Pacific end of the Canal between Miraflores locks and the south end of Gaillard cut for use as an anchorage basin for ships transiting the Canal to match the anchorage at the Atlantic end at Gatun; and, fourth, the elevation of Gatun Lake to optimum level of approximately 90 feet.

There has been so much discussion of the so-called sea-level canal as an assumption in the planning of the evolution of the ultimate Panama Canal that an examination of this proposal is essential before focusing attention on the fundamental marine problems that should be solved and which I related to you earlier. The idea is not new. It has been an alluring dream of all mariners since the age of discovery along the Isthmus of Panama. The alluring prospect of the Strait of Panama is an ancient historical conception that has had great public appeal. This idea has even been symbolized in the Canal Zone seal which shows a Spanish galleon sailing through Culebra Cut into the waters of the Pacific.

The first question of prime navigational importance in estimating the sea-level canal idea is that of tides. At the Atlantic end of the Canal, there is a maximum tidal range of approximately 2 feet; on the Pacific the maximum tidal range is 20 feet. In any tidal canal without means of controlling the flow of the tide between the oceans, currents with a maximum strength estimated at 4.6 knots or more would be caused. This is a strong current especially when considered with reference to low-powered vessels and tows.

Due to these circumstances, we are told that any tidal canal must be considered under two general headings: First, an open strait or lockless canal and, second, a tidal lock canal. In the first of these would be strong currents; in the second, the current would not be so great. Navigation in a long narrow rocky gorge with strong currents and navigation in a similar gorge with less current are different problems.

Ths critical situations which most frequently require vessels to anchor during transit of the Panama Canal are—steering gear failures and to break a dangerous sheer in Gaillard cut. Other emergencies which have required the use of anchors are fog, wind, and blinding rain. Relatively few incidents have resulted in damages of serious proportions to vessels, but, as I mentioned last week, there have been some. Vessels have struck the rock sides of Gaillard cut, have ruptured their plates, and have sunk in the cut.

The primary reason for the relatively safe operation of the canal is believed to be the absence of strong currents in the hazardous part of the channel and excellent pilots. Vessels in difficulty are thus free to maneuver unhampered except by the narrow channel.

Navigational experience indicates that the following minimum channel widths are essential for sound marine operational planning depending upon the strength of the currents.

1. Open strait (lockless canal)—a width that will permit safe swinging of the larger vessels when anchoring in emergency.

2. Tidal lock canal—a width that will enable unrestricted two-way traffic with the degree of safety now afforded in the wide channels in Gatun Lake.

We are told that in the open strait, or lockless canal, the width should be twice the sum of the length of the vessel and the scope of chain, with a factor of safety to clear the bank. This would probably be about 1 mile. A project of that magnitude would be of such vastness as to eliminate it as an economically feasible solution.

In the tidal level lock canal, the channel width, so we have been told, can be somewhat less; but there should still be space for unrestricted two-way traffic with a safety comparable to the Gatun Lake channels—estimated at 1,200–1,500 feet. Any decision as to this width will depend upon the result of the restricted channel model tests now in progress at the Taylor Model Basin, and navigational experience of canal pilots. This also represents a project of vast proportions.

The published project for the "sea level" canal contemplated in previous studies consists of a 500-foot channel with its characteristics approximating the present channel with one tidal lock at the Pacific end of the canal.

According to studies made to date, the evidence seems to be overwhelming that the high-level lake canal modified to include a terminal lake at the Pacific end is vastly superior for transiting ships over the tidal lock canal.

You probably wonder why these fundamental ideas were not presented in years past. The answer is that they were, but they were presented differently and by men without marine operational experience. For example, in recent years Mr. Ralph Z. Kirkpatrick, former Chief of Surveys of the Panama Canal, saw the weakness in the present canal arrangement and submitted suggestions. His main purpose seemingly was to combine the Pacific locks into one structure and his plans, not being backed by operating experience, were not adopted.

Before Mr. Kirkpatrick there was the late Maj. Gen. W. L. Sibert, the builder of the Gatun locks. He wanted to place all Pacific locks between Cerro Cocoli and Cerro Miraflores in one structure as at Gatun. While he seemingly had an excellent understanding of the needs for traffic, his main thesis was economy of construction. A board investigated his plan and reported favorably thereon and the report was referred to the President of the United States, who decided against adopting the change in the Canal plan because the Pacific locks had then been started; because it would have meant a delay in completion date; and because any modification would have given the enemies of the Canal an opportunity to seize it as an evidence of weakness in the lock-type canal at a time when a political attack would very well have endangered the completion of the Canal.

The Panama Canal is, indeed, again in an era of decision. A great store of operating experience, not available to the early Canal builders, is available for guidance. When the Canal was constructed engineering considerations were the chief bases for decisions. Now marine operational requirements rather than engineering problems are the factors that will undoubtedly govern decisions. There is no doubt, from my limited study of this major problem, that the time has come for us to eliminate the Pedro Miguel locks and dam and concentrate all Pacific locks near Miraflores to form a high-level Miraflores Lake. The plan finally adopted for changing our present Panama Canal system should equip the Canal for ages to come. Those who bring about the reconstruction will truly bestow a tremendous service on the United States naval forces and on the shipping of all maritime nations.

Those who bring about the modernization of the Panama Canal will achieve the rare distinction that will rank them with its builders.

Chances We Had

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, in southern California, the Long Beach Independent is one of our clear-thinking newspapers. In view of this, I take pleasure in inserting the following editorial from the edition of May 21, 1947, in which the editor gives full support to the policy of this Congress in its efforts to stop further Russian aggression in eastern Europe:

CHANCES WE HAD

As we listened to Henry Wallace it sounded like an old story often told. We had heard it with slight variations for the 10 years before our smugness was crushed out of us at Pearl Harbor. It did not seem possible men were again urging that we appease dictators and aggressors. It recalls the march of Japan into Manchuria in 1931. We protested, not too loudly, and were told that this kind of arrogant aggression would lead to world war. But none of us wanted war, and besides, Manchuria was a long way off, as was Japan. It is doubtful if a bomber force could have made it to Japan in less than several months at that time. Today it could be there in a few days, as could a Russian bomber force from Siberia or the northern Japanese islands be here.

We let Japan get by with this bit of aggression and occupation of the territory of another nation. It was the signal for other aggressors to make their plans. While the little German children were starting to heil Hitler as they goosestepped through the streets, another dictator in Rome decided to defy the League of Nations and ourselves. It was then the black-shirted Fascists moved against weak and backward Ethiopia in 1935. Mussolini thumbed his nose at all who cried out in protest. There were millions of words of protest. But no military force opposed him. From all facts now known, any one of the big three, France, Britain or the United States, could have easily stopped him. Instead, they appeased him and thereby asked for further aggressive moves from Mussolini or any other dictator.

As the world daily heard and saw pictures of the military machines being built in Japan, Italy and Germany, yes, and in Russia, we refused to be disturbed. Everything we knew of history and of the acts of dictators

told us these machines were being built for action. And yet we remained complacent. We refused to fortify Guam because it would hurt the feelings of the Japs. Instead, we shipped them billions of gallons of fuel oil, gasoline and other products for making war. Daily during this period ships left our harbors loaded with scrap iron that even the loitering dock watcher said would come back to us in the form of shrapnel. We got a lot of it back at Pearl Harbor.

Only a few years after Mussolini got by with his rape of little Ethiopia, the sword-rattling Nazis moved in and took over Austria. They demanded Czechoslovakia, then the most democratic country in the Balkans. It was then Chamberlain met Hitler at Munich. We were absent. Again an aggressor was appeased, and Hitler marched into Czechoslovakia and immediately started preparations for his march on Poland. At Munich we had our chance to stop Hitler and probably have peace in our time, as the poor deluded Chamberlain expressed it.

In 1939 Hitler and Stalin reached an agreement for the dividing of Poland. Twenty-four hours after that agreement was signed Hitler marched into Poland. Stalin moved in a few days later. It was then France and Britain came to life and decided to stop the march of aggressors. But we made no move; we still appeased. We still shipped scrap iron and gasoline to Japan, who had taken advantage of the situation to conquer most of China. Japan had even sunk a gunboat of ours. But we still refused to throw our strength against the march of aggressors. Only when they struck us at Pearl Harbor did we come to life.

Since the end of the war Russia has marched into most of the Balkan countries, where she rules with an iron hand through puppets. The issue now is: Shall she be allowed to move into Greece and Turkey? There is little difference between the issue now and the issue when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, Mussolini invaded Ethiopia in 1935, and Hitler invaded Austria in 1938. Our problem is to make a decision based on past experience. We either stop this kind of aggression while the aggressors are comparatively weak and we are comparatively strong, or we suffer the consequences we have seen in two world wars. There is no issue between us and Russia that would not be solved if Russia would stay within her own borders. There can be no lasting peace if Russia or any other nation is allowed to cross the borders of other countries by forceful methods.

The Henry Wallaces and all the other communist apologists or appeasers should remember how other appeasers kept us weak and vacillating while the dictators crushed all that stood in their way. With Russia we must appease or we must stand firm. We have one more chance to stop an aggressor before he is well started. We may never have another chance.—L. A. C.

Charles Oscar Andrews

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES OSCAR ANDREWS, late a Senator from the State of Florida

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, few men enjoyed a more complete life, or contributed more to their fellow man in constructive service, than CHARLES O. ANDREWS. And he passed on to eternal glory at the threshold of the Biblical three score and ten, secure in the affection and high esteem of his State and his Nation.

CHARLES O. ANDREWS was born in Holmes County, in historic old West Florida. He came from that sound pioneer stock which did so much to shape the traditions and the ideals of this Nation, and which even today provides the bedrock of good judgment that preserves its balance. His people are respected leaders in community after community throughout Florida.

As a young man just starting out in the world he taught in a one-room school at Crestview, my home town. When he came back some 30 years later to ask for a place in the United States Senate, he already had achieved prominence far beyond that given to most men. The confidence he inspired in one small community as one of its first school teachers had grown until it was State-wide. After his election to the United States Senate in 1936 the justification for that early confidence was quickly shown. For his stature grew steadily, and the respect for his sound judgment increased in each succeeding year.

Senator ANDREWS provided the sound, solid balance that a community, a State, and a Nation need. He was neither radical nor reactionary. His creed was Americanism, love of God, and love of country. And his works and his memory are indelibly etched on the scrolls which record the story of good and great Americans.

Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederacy—Address of Bishop Charles B. Galloway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and thirty-ninth anniversary of the birth of Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederacy, one of the noblest men who ever lived in the tide of time, and Mississippi's greatest contribution to the world's list of illustrious men.

On June 3, 1908, Bishop Charles B. Galloway, of my State, delivered an address before the student body of the University of Mississippi on the life and character of Jefferson Davis which is regarded as the greatest speech ever delivered on the life and character of this immortal American.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting Bishop Galloway's address at this point.

The matter referred to follows:

ADDRESS OF BISHOP CHARLES B. GALLOWAY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI ON THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF JEFFERSON DAVIS

With unaffected distrust of my ability to meet the demands of such a great hour as this, I rejoice to be again on the beautiful campus of my alma mater and have the opportunity of bringing a message to the young men of my country. And as this commencement day chances to be the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Jefferson Davis, the most illustrious citizen whose name ever adorned and enriched the annals of Mississippi, I have had the temerity to select his life and times as the theme of this hour's discussion. To paint, with skillful hand, the full-length portrait of that majestic man, or adequately portray the qualities that gave him greatness and the virtues that make him immortal, I cannot; but, with you, I can reverently sit at his feet and listen to a story that will stir within us many a noble aspiration and cause us to seek more diligently the old paths of manly honor and high endeavor. My purpose is not to indulge in extravagant or indiscriminate eulogy but, if possible, give a judicial estimate of a great man who was the most commanding figure in a fierce and eventful national crisis. It shall be alike removed from unreasoning censure and unreasonable praise. We need not deify Mr. Davis, or disproportionately exalt the pedestal on which the Genius of History will surely place him, in order to show adequate appreciation of his noble character and splendid genius. On the other hand, the use of bitter invective and lurid superlatives about this man of destiny may evidence literary ingenuity and partisan malignity, but can never any more command the respect of patriotic, thoughtful students of our national history.

The days of malignant vituperation are gone, and the time of judicial interpretation has come. It is not necessary now to measure all facts by considerations of latitude and longitude. The character and life work of Jefferson Davis were never so diligently and dispassionately studied as today. War passions have sufficiently cooled, and war clouds have so floated from our national skies that even the most ardent and sentimental nationalist can study the man and his times in a clear, white light. A citizen whose moral and religious ideals were the most exalted, and whose daily conduct was sought to be modeled after the Man of Galilee, and whose life has in it as little to explain, or apologize for, as any leader in American politics, can never be caricatured as a monster or condemned as a traitor, and have anybody really believe it.

The unanswered question in England for 240 years was, "Shall Cromwell have a statue?" It required nearly two and one-half centuries for public opinion to reach a just estimate of the most colossal figure in English history. The great lord protector died at Whitehall and was laid to rest, with royal honors, in Westminster Abbey. But when the monarchy was restored, and Charles II ascended the throne, his body was disinterred, gibbeted at Tyburn Hill, and buried under the gallows, the head being placed on Westminster Hall. Now a magnificent statue of the great Oliver stands opposite where his head was exposed to the jeers of every passer-by—England's sane and final estimate of the mightiest man who ever led her legions to victory or guided the course of her civil history. In the New World, events move faster, popular passion cools quicker, and calm judgment more speedily reascends its sacred throne. After 40 years since the Civil War, the Nation's estimate of Jefferson Davis—the Oliver Cromwell of our constitutional crisis—has almost entirely changed, and points to the not far-off day when no place in our Federal Capital will be too conspicuous for his heroic statue. Mr. Davis can no more be understood by reading the heated columns of the political newspapers and historical writers of the days immediately succeeding the Civil War than Oliver Cromwell could be judicially interpreted by the obsequious literature of the reign of Charles II.

Mr. Davis had his limitations and was not without his measure of human faults and frailties; but he also had extraordinary gifts and radiant virtues and a brilliant genius that rank him among the mightiest men of the centuries. He made mistakes because he was mortal, and he excited antagonisms because his convictions were stronger than his tactful graces; but no one who knew him, and no dispassionate student of his history, ever doubted the sincerity of his great soul or the absolute integrity of his imperial purpose. Let us, on his anniversary day, learn some patriotic lessons from the life history of this greatest Mississippian, replight our faith to the unalterable principles of constitutional liberty to which he was passionately devoted, and renew our fealty to the flag of our reunited country, which he never ceased to love.

I have read of a peculiar notion entertained by the ancient Norsemen. They supposed that, beside the soul of the dead, a ghost survived, haunting for a while the scenes of his earthly labors. Though at first vivid and lifelike, it slowly waned and faded, until at length it vanished, leaving behind no trace or memory of its spectral presence. I am glad that the ghosts of old sectional issues are vanishing and soon will cease to haunt and mock the fears of the most anxious and nervous of American patriots. It is a grateful fact, in which all rejoice, that this Nation is more united in heart and purpose today than ever in its history.

While I would not needlessly stir the embers of settled strife or reopen the grave of buried issues or, by a word, revive the bitter memories of a stormy past, it is due the truth of history that the fundamental principles for which our fathers contended should be often reiterated, in order that the purpose which inspired them may be correctly estimated and the purity of their motives be abundantly vindicated.

If the condition of affairs in 1860 be thoroughly understood, and one has a clear and accurate knowledge of the nature and character of the Federal Government, together with the rights of the States under the Constitution, we need not fear the judgments that may be formed and the conclusions that will be reached. But unfortunately for the truth of history, up to recent years, we have been confronted by dogmas which are substituted for principles by preconceived opinions which are claimed to be historical verities, and by sentimentality which closes the avenues of the mind against logic and demonstration.

But before studying the lessons of a great cause, a great leader, and a great era, I call attention to a rather singular historic fact. The most illogical and unreasoning sentiment—which yet lingers, but is fast fading—a sentiment universal in the North and more or less entertained in the South—is that which has persistently discriminated against Mr. Davis, holding him to vindictive account for the ever-to-be-lamented war and all its terrible consequences, while others have been acquitted of blame, and many applauded as patriots and heroes. Upon his weary shoulders have been piled the sins of the South, and he has been execrated as the arch traitor of American politics. Those who thus judge have taken counsel of their prejudices, and evidence an almost criminal ignorance of the facts of history. Was Mr. Davis more a sinner than Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson, that he should be condemned and they so universally praised? Did he follow any flag for which they did not draw their swords? Did he advocate any doctrine to which they did not subscribe, and write their names in blood? Did he avow allegiance to any government to which they did not pledge life and sacred honor? And yet, in some sections of our country, he has been gibbeted, and they have been applauded.

I know there is a certain glamour that gathers about a military hero which commands admiration and calls for extravagant laudation. One who braves the shout of battle and wins the chaplet of victory is unconsciously invested with a halo more brilliant than the crown of any civilian, however marvelous his gifts or magnificent his achievements or immortal the results of his public labors. People will applaud the returning conqueror while they forget the founder of an empire or the author of a nation's constitution. By virtue of his exalted position, first as the trusted political leader of a great party, and then as the President of a storm-cradled nation, Mr. Davis invited antagonisms and could not escape the sharpest criticism. Having to deal with the rivalries of political leaders, the jealousies of military aspirants, the bitterness of the disappointed, the selfishness of the discontented, and indeed all classes, in every department of the civil and military service, he had to hear every lament and patiently bear every complaint. In the North he was charged with everything, from the sin of secession to the "horrors of Andersonville" and the assassination of Mr. Lincoln. In the South he was held accountable for everything, from the failure to capture Washington after the first battle of Manassas, to the unsuccessful return of the peace commission and the surrender of Lee's tattered legions at Appomattox.

As this discussion will be more the study of an epochal man and his times, rather than the recital of personal history, I shall not repeat in detail the well-known facts of an eventful career. The son of a gallant Revolutionary soldier, and with the finest strain of Welsh blood flowing in his generous veins, Jefferson Davis was born in the State of Kentucky. In infancy he was brought by his father to Mississippi, and here his entire life was spent. At the county school he was prepared for Transylvania College, from which, at the age of 16, he passed to the United States Military Academy at West Point. In that institution he was distinguished as a student and a gentleman, and in due time was graduated with high honor.

Jefferson Davis began life well. He had a clean boyhood, with no tendency to vice or immorality. That was the universal testimony of neighbors, teachers, and fellow students. He grew up a stranger to deceit and a lover of the truth. He formed no evil habits that he had to correct, and forged upon himself no chains that he had to break. His nature was as transparent as the light that shone about him; his heart was as open as the soft skies that bent in benediction over his country home; and his temper as sweet and cheery as the limpid stream that made music in its flow through the neighboring fields and forests.

Graduating from West Point in 1828, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Regular Army, and spent 7 laborious years in the military service, chiefly in the middle Northwest, and had some conspicuous part in the Black Hawk War. In 1835, Lieutenant Davis resigned from the Regular Army, married the charming daughter of Gen. Zachary Taylor, and settled on his Mississippi plantation, to follow the luxurious, literary life of a cultured southern gentleman. But the untimely death, in a few short months, of his fair young bride, crushed his radiant hopes and disappointed all his life plans. After 7 years, spent mostly in agricultural pursuits, and in literary study, especially the study of political philosophy and constitutional history, he entered public life, and almost immediately rose to trusted and conspicuous leadership.

In 1844 Mr. Davis was elected to Congress, and ever thereafter, up to the fall of the Confederate Government, was in some distinguished capacity or other connected with the public service of his country. When he entered the Halls of Congress, the Oregon question, the reannexation of Texas, and the revision of the tariff were the stormy issues that divided the Nation into two hostile camps. The scholarly young Representative from Mississippi soon appeared in the lists, and by his thorough mastery of the questions involved attracted national attention. The venerable ex-President, John Quincy Adams, the "old man eloquent," at that time a Member of the House, was greatly impressed with his extraordinary ability and predicted his brilliant parliamentary career. Referring to his first set speech in Congress, a recent biographer makes this just and suggestive observation: "He manifests here, in his early efforts as a legislator, some of the larger views of national life and development which have been so persistently ignored by those who have chronicled his career."

In that first great speech, which had all the marks and carried all the credentials of the profoundest statesmanship, Mr. Davis made this broad declaration, from the principle of which he never receded: "The extent of our Union has never been to me the cause of apprehension; its cohesion can only be disturbed by violation of the compact which cements it."

Believing as he did in the righteousness of the conflict with Mexico, Mr. Davis earnestly advocated the most liberal supply of means and men to prosecute the war, and announced himself as ready, should his services be needed, to take his place in the tented field. In June 1846 a regiment of Mississippi volunteers was organized at Vicksburg, and Jefferson Davis was elected its colonel. He accordingly resigned his seat in Congress, hastened to join his regiment, which he overtook at New Orleans, and reported for duty to General Taylor on the Mexican border. At Monterey and Buena Vista, crucial positions of the war, his command rendered conspicuously heroic service. Our American knighthood was in fairest flower that day, especially on the plains of Buena Vista, when Colonel Davis, against overwhelming numbers, snatched victory from almost certain defeat, and won immortal fame for himself and his gallant Mississippi Rifles. By a brilliant tactical movement he broke the strength of the Mexican army and sent General Santa Anna southward with only half the force of the day before. Though severely wounded he remained in his saddle, refusing to quit the field until the day of glorious triumph was complete. General Zachary Taylor, commander in chief of the American forces, paid this eloquent tribute to the soldierly courage and genius of the distinguished Mississippian: "Napoleon never had a marshal who behaved more superbly than did Colonel Davis today."

Returning from Mexico, having won the highest honors of war, Colonel Davis and the brave remnant of his magnificent regiment were everywhere welcomed with boundless enthusiasm. He was tendered the position of brigadier general of volunteers by President Polk, but declined, on constitutional grounds, holding that such appointment inhered only in the State.

Within 2 months after his return from Mexico, crowned with immortal honor, Mr. Davis was appointed by the Governor to represent Mississippi in the United States Senate, a vacancy having occurred by the death of Senator Speight. When the legislature met he was elected unanimously for the remainder of the unexpired term, all party lines having disappeared in a universal desire to honor the brilliant young colonel of the Mississippi Rifles. That was a position most congenial to his tastes and ambitions, and there his superb abilities shone with a splendor rarely equaled in the parliamentary history of America. He was an ideal Senator, dignified, self-mastered, serious, dispassionate, always bent on the great things that concerned the welfare of the Nation. He

was never flippant—never toyed with trifles—and never trifled with the destiny of his people. His was the skill and strength to bend the mighty bow of Ulysses.

When Jefferson Davis entered the United States Senate the glory of that upper Chamber was at its height. Possibly never at one time had so many illustrious men sat in the highest council of the Nation. There were giants in those days. There sat John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina; Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts; Henry Clay, of Kentucky; Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri; Lewis Cass, of Michigan; Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio; Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, and other men of lesser fame. In that company of giants Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi, at once took rank among the greatest, "eloquent among the most eloquent in debate," and worthy to be the premier at any council table of American statesmen. The historian Prescott pronounced him "the most accomplished" Member of the body.

One who spoke by the authority of large experience with the upper Chamber thus correctly characterized our brilliant and accomplished young Senator: "It is but simple justice to say that in ripe scholarship, wide and accurate information on all subjects coming before the body, native ability, readiness as a debater, true honor, and stainless character, Jefferson Davis stood in the very first rank, and did as much to influence legislation and leave his mark on the Senate and the country as any other who served in his day."

Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, afterward spoke of him as "the clear-headed, practical, dominating Davis."

That which preeminently signalized the public character and parliamentary career of Jefferson Davis was his sincere, unwavering devotion to the doctrine of State sovereignty, and all the practical questions that flowed therefrom. He held with unrelaxing grasp to the fundamental fact that the Union was composed of separate, independent, sovereign States, and that all Federal power was delegated, specifically limited, and clearly defined. The titanic struggles of his entire public life were over this one vital issue, with all that it logically involved for the weal or woe of his beloved country. The Articles of Confederation declared, in express terms, that "each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled," and that principle was transferred intact to the Constitution itself. And as one function of sovereignty was the right to withdraw from a compact, if occasion demanded, he planted himself squarely upon that doctrine, and never wavered in its able and fearless advocacy—a doctrine, by the way, that was never questioned by any jurist or statesman for 40 years after the Constitution was adopted.

Having read and reread, with great diligence and no less delight, the whole history of the fierce controversies that culminated in the War between the States, including the ablest speeches of our profoundest statesmen on both sides, and with all my genuine pride in a restored Union, I am bound to say that the southern position was never shaken, and that the overwhelming weight of argument was on the side of John C. Calhoun and Jefferson Davis. And further, it was by surrendering the constitutional argument and resorting to what was denominated "the higher law" of political conduct and conscience that the North found apology or defense for its attitude toward the inalienable rights of the Southern States.

In order that you may appreciate the grounds of my confident assertion, I quote a few paragraphs from what seems to me an absolutely unanswerable argument by John C. Calhoun, the greatest logician and profoundest political philosopher in the Nation: "In that character they formed the old confederation, and when it was proposed to supersede the Articles of the Confederation by the present Constitution, they met in convention as States, acted and voted as States, and the Constitution, when formed, was submitted for ratification to the people of the several States. It was ratified by them as States, each State for itself; each, by its ratification, binding its own citizens; the parts thus separately binding themselves, and not the whole, the parts; and it is declared in the preamble of the Constitution to be ordained by the people of the United States, and in the article of ratification, when ratified, to be binding between the States so ratifying. The conclusion is inevitable that the Constitution is the work of the people of the States, considered as separate and independent political communities; that they are its authors—their power created it, their voice clothed it with authority; that the Government formed is in reality their agent; and that the Union, of which the Constitution is the bond, is a Union of States and not of individuals."

And it is an interesting and suggestive fact that the latest historians and writers on constitutional government sustain the fundamental contention of southern statesmen.

The Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, the accomplished scholar and distinguished Senator of Massachusetts, in his Life of Daniel Webster, makes this candid statement: "When the Constitution was adopted by the votes of the States at Philadelphia and accepted by votes of States in popular conventions, it was safe to say there was not a man in the country, from Washington to Hamilton on the one side, to George Clinton and George Mason on the other, who regarded the new system as anything but an experiment entered upon by the States, and from which each and every State had the right to peacefully withdraw—a right that was very likely to be exercised."

And in a recent illuminating address, the Honorable Charles Francis Adams, abundantly and absolutely vindicates the contention of Mr. Davis and other southern leaders, in this noble utterance: "To which side did the weight of argument incline during the great debate which culminated in our Civil War? The answer necessarily turns on the abstract right of what we term a sovereign State to secede from the Union at such time and for such cause as may seem to that State proper and sufficient. The issue is settled; irrevocably and for all time decided; it was settled 40 years ago, and the settlement since reached has been the result not of reason based on historical evidence but of events and of force." And Mr. Adams further added: "The principles enunciated by South Carolina on the 20th of December 1860 were enunciated by the Kentucky resolutions, November 16, 1798."

The position of Jefferson Davis, though by his enemies often denied and persistently obscured, was this—that while consistently and unanswerably defending the right of a State to secede, he never urged it as a policy, and deplored it as a possible necessity. Or to use the language of the resolution adopted by the States' rights convention of Mississippi in June 1851, drawn by his own hand, "Secession was the last alternative, the final remedy, and should not be resorted to under existing circumstances."

It may be interesting in this connection to inquire when the exercise of a State's right to secede had its first and most threatening assertion. Alexander H. Stevens affirms that the right of a State to withdraw from the Union was never denied or questioned by any jurist, publicist, or statesman of character and standing "until Kent's Commentaries appeared in 1826, nearly 40 years after the Government had gone into operation." And it is historic truth to state that the first threat to exercise this right, universally recognized in the early days of the Republic, was not heard in the South; "it first sprang up in the North." Not only so, but from 1795 to 1815, and again in 1845, there was an influential party in New England who favored and threatened the formation of a northern confederacy. Roger Griswold, a Representative in Congress from the State of Connecticut in 1804, declared that he was in favor of the New England States forming a republic by themselves and seceding from the Union. Joseph Story, when in Congress, afterward a Justice of the Supreme Court and commentator on the Constitution, said: "It was a prevalent opinion then in Massachusetts * * * of a separation of the Eastern States from the Union."

In a famous speech delivered by Josiah Quincy, in Congress, January 14, 1811, against the admission of Louisiana into the Union as a State, these sentiments were defiantly uttered: "I am compelled to declare it as my deliberate opinion that if this bill passes, the bonds of this Union are virtually dissolved; that the States which compose it are free from their moral obligation, and that, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, to prepare definitely for a separation, amicably, if they can, violently if they must." It must not be forgotten that these are not the words of Jefferson Davis. When he defended the doctrine of a State's right to sever its relation with the Union, he was denounced as a conspirator against the life of the Nation.

On December 15, 1814, the Hartford Convention assembled, composed of delegates from all the New England States, to protest against the war then in progress between the United States and England. They had suffered immense loss by the destruction of their commerce and fisheries, and rather than endure more for the Nation's account, they preferred to withdraw from the Union. The report, adopted unanimously by the convention, contains this language: "In case of deliberate, dangerous, and palpable infractions of the Constitution, affecting the sovereignty of a State, and the liberties of the people, it is not only the right, but the duty of such a State to interpose its authority for their protection, in the manner best calculated to secure that end. When emergencies occur, which are either beyond the reach of judicial tribunals, or too pressing to admit of the delay incident to their forms, States which have no common umpire, must be their own judges and execute their own decisions."

While that threat was never carried into execution—the Treaty of Ghent having been signed in the meantime—there is the solemn assertion on the part of these New England delegates of their sovereign right to withdraw from the Union if occasion seemed to demand. I make no comment upon the fact that while New England was meditating withdrawal from the Federal compact Gen. Andrew Jackson and his heroic legions in the battle at New Orleans were shedding their blood for the honor of our national flag. But I venture to ask this question, Is there anything in the lapse of a few years to make the utterances of Roger Griswold and Rufus King and Joseph Story and Josiah Quincy and the Hartford Convention less disloyal than the calm, philosophic reasoning of John C. Calhoun and Jefferson Davis? And yet no one ever hears of New England as "the hotbed of secession" and her political leaders as conspirators against the life of the Nation. No fair-minded student of history can acquit Josiah Quincy and find fault with Jefferson Davis.

The Legislature of Massachusetts in 1809 declared the embargo law "not legally binding on the citizens of the State." Now, in New England that was simply the assertion of inalienable rights. If in South Carolina, it would have been, and was, denounced as the vilest nullification.

Now I come to the conditions and questions that immediately preceded, if they did not

precipitate, the dismemberment of the Union. Slavery, which existed in all but 1 of the States when the Union was formed, and in 15 of them when the war began, was the occasion but not the cause of the lamented conflict. But as Mr. Davis well said. "In the later controversies * * * its effect in operating as a lever upon the passions, prejudices, or sympathies of mankind was so potent that it has been spread like a thick cloud over the whole horizon of historic truth."

The right or wrong of slavery we need not discuss, or attempt to determine who was most responsible therefor. The institution is dead beyond the possibility of resurrection, and the whole Nation is glad. The later geographical limitations of slavery in the United States were determined not by conscience but by climate. It was climate in the North and the cotton gin in the South that regulated the distribution of slave labor. I have scant respect for a conscience too sensitive to own certain property because it is immoral, but without compunction will sell the same to another at full market value. Had the slave holders of the North manumitted their slaves and not sold them because their labor ceased to be profitable, there would have been more regard for the subsequent abolition zeal. It is a matter of pride with us that no Southern Colony or State ever had a vessel engaged in the slave trade. And several of the Southern States were the first to pass stringent laws against the importation of African slaves.

But apart from the ethical question involved, as we now see it, slave property was recognized by the Constitution and existed in every State but one when the Union was formed. And a clear mandate of the Constitution required slaves to be delivered up to their owners when escaping into another State. Congress passed laws to enforce the same, and their constitutionality was sustained by the Supreme Court in the famous Dred Scott decision. Daniel Webster, too great to be provincial, and too broad to be a narrow partisan, in a noble speech at Capon Springs, Va., in 1851, made this emphatic declaration:

"I have not hesitated to say, and I repeat, that if the Northern States refuse, willfully and deliberately, to carry into effect that part of the Constitution which respects the restoration of fugitive slaves, and Congress provide no remedy, the South would no longer be bound to observe the compact. A bargain cannot be broken on one side and still bind the other side. I say to you, gentlemen in Virginia, as I said on the shores of Lake Erie and in the city of Boston, as I may say again, that you of the South have as much right to receive your fugitive slaves as the North has to any of its rights and privileges of navigation and commerce."

And yet Charles Sumner, speaking for a great party growing in strength and dominance with the rising sun of every day, said the North could not and would not obey the law. William H. Seward declared that there was "a higher law" than the Constitution which would be the rule of their political conduct.

Now, the insistence of Mr. Davis and his compatriots was that the Constitution and laws should be obeyed—that the individual, sovereign States must regulate their own domestic affairs without Federal interference, and that their property, of whatever kind, must be respected and protected. They resisted any invasion of the State's right to control its own internal affairs as a violation of the sacred Federal compact. Over that one fundamental question an "irrepressible conflict" was waged for many stormy years. The advocates of State sovereignty were charged with disloyalty to the Union, while the Federalists were denounced as enemies of the Constitution and usurpers of the rights of the States.

And by the way, our present-day political discussions are eloquently vindicating the patriotic jealousy of Mr. Davis for the rights of the States. The most significant fact of these strenuous times is the solemn warnings, in endless iteration and from both political parties, against the ominous encroachments of Federal authority. More and more the Nation is seeing that Jefferson Davis was not an alarmist or an academical theorist but a practical, sagacious, far-seeing statesman when he contended so persistently for the rights and unconstrained functions of each member of the Federal Union.

Sectional agitation and alienation continued, with slight interruption and increasing violence, for many weary years. Every lover of the Union deplored it, and every patriotic American sought some common ground on which all could stand, and the rights of each be preserved. But with every congressional debate and political convention and Supreme Court decision, this animosity was kindled into fiercer flame. On both sides the bitterness was intense. Political differences ripened into personal hates and hostilities. Encounters between Congressmen over sectional issues were a daily dread in Washington. One Senator said: "I believe every man in both Houses is armed with a revolver." Fourteen of the Northern States passed so-called personal liberty laws, designed to nullify the Constitution, and encourage the people to disregard the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court. State officers were prohibited from assisting in the arrest of fugitive slaves, while State's attorneys were required to defend them, and provision made for paying the fugitive's expenses out of the State treasury. Charles Sumner openly declared that the North would not obey the fugitive-slave laws. William H. Seward, it was said, contributed money to John Brown which was used for pillage and murder. John Brown's midnight raid on Harpers Ferry was applauded to the echo throughout the North. And when the old assassin was executed, according to law, bells were tolled in many places, cannon were fired, and prayers offered for him as if he were the saintliest of martyrs. By fervid orators he was placed on the same canonized roll with Paul and Silas.

On the other hand the South was equally intolerant and aflame with intense excitement. Commercial conventions in Charleston, Montgomery, Memphis, and elsewhere adopted retaliatory measures against the aggressions of the North. Southerners declared that nonintercourse in business was "the one prescription for Northern fanaticism and political villainy." Southern parents were condemned for patronizing Northern colleges, and urged to enlarge and equip their own institutions and to use only Southern textbooks. "If our schools are not good enough," they said, "let them be improved by a more hearty support; if this is not enough, let them patronize the universities of Europe rather than aid and abet in any way the bitter enemies of the Southland."

And as further evidence that northern leaders had determined no longer to uphold the Constitution and give to the South what she considered her rights and equality in the Union, we have only to reread the extreme and inflamed utterances of their chief men. What could the Nation hope for when men in authority declared that the Constitution under which we lived is no longer of binding force, and that there is a higher law for the guidance of a citizen's conduct and conscience? William H. Seward, the acknowledged head of the Republican Party, and the author of that doctrine, uttered these words: "There is a higher law than the Constitution which regulates our authority over the domain. Slavery must be abolished, and we must do it."

Horace Greeley, a most potential voice in the councils of his party, did not hesitate to say: "I have no doubt but the free and slave States ought to be separated—the Union is not worth supporting in connection with the South."

William Lloyd Garrison, at first derided as a fanatic, but afterward followed as the voice of an apostle, thus advocated the cause of disunion: "The Union is a lie. The American Union is an imposture, a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell. We are for its overthrow. Up with the flag of disunion, that we may have a free and glorious republic of our own."

Wendell Phillips, the most eloquent orator in New England, and whose leadership was commanding, fed the flames of sectional animosity with speeches such as this: "There is merit in the Republican Party. It is this: It is the first sectional party ever organized in this country—it's not national; it is sectional. It is the North against the South. The first crack in the iceberg is visible, you will yet hear it go with a crack through the center."

The New York Tribune, for many years the acknowledged and most influential organ of Republican opinion in the United States, thus bade the South a respectful adieu: "The time is fast approaching when the cry will become too overpowering to resist. Rather than tolerate national slavery as it now exists, let the Union be dissolved at once."

With such utterances and the applauding echoes of a party flushed with political victory ringing in their ears, the South had little occasion to hope for aggressions to cease and conditions to improve. But through all the years this storm was fiercely raging, the cool, sagacious Jefferson Davis never lost the clearness of his vision or allowed himself to be swept from his political moorings. He fought with all his superb skill and herculean strength for the rights of the States and warned his opponents that continued Federal invasion might drive them from the Union, but at the same time he reiterated his undying love for the whole country and its organic law, and prayed that the day of disunion would never dawn.

In an eloquent speech delivered at Portland, Maine, in 1858, Mr. Davis strikingly demonstrated the fact that State pride and devotion to State integrity strengthened rather than weakened our attachment to the Federal Union; that the larger love we have for our national flag is fed by the passionate devotion we manifest in the welfare of an individual State. He said: "No one more than myself recognizes the binding force of the allegiance which the citizen owes to the State of his citizenship, but the State being a party to our compact, a member of the Union, fealty to the Federal Constitution is not in opposition to but flows from the allegiance due to one of the United States. Washington was not less a Virginian when he commanded at Boston, nor did Gates and Green weaken the bonds which bound them to their several States by their campaigns in the South. In proportion as a citizen loves his own State will he strive to honor her by preserving her name and her fame free from the tarnish of having failed to observe her obligations and to fulfill her duties to her sister States. Do not our whole people—interior and seaboard, north, south, east, and west—alike feel proud of the Yankee sailor, who has borne our flag as far as the ocean bears its foam, and caused the name and character of the United States to be known and respected where there is wealth enough to woo commerce and intelligence to honor merit? So long as we preserve and appreciate the achievements of Jefferson and Adams, of Franklin and Madison, of Hamilton, of Hancock, and of Rutledge—men who labored for the whole country and lived for mankind—we cannot sink to the petty strife which saps the foundations and destroys the political fabric our fathers erected and bequeathed as an inheritance to our posterity forever."

And a few weeks thereafter, when on a visit to Boston, addressing a great audience

in Faneuil Hall, and speaking not only for himself but for the entire South as well, he uttered sentiments as broadly and loyally national as were ever spoken by Thomas Jefferson or sung in the battle hymns of the Republic. "As we have shared in the toils," said he, "so we have gloried in the triumphs of our country. In our hearts, as in our history, are mingled the names of Concord, and Camden, and Saratoga, and Lexington, and Plattsburg, and Chippewa, and Erie, and Moultrie, and New Orleans, and Yorktown, and Bunker Hill. Grouped all together they form a record of the triumphs of our cause, a monument of the common glory of our Union. What southern man would wish it less by one of the northern names of which it is composed? Or where is he who, gazing on the obelisk that rises from the ground made sacred by the blood of Warren, would feel his patriot's pride suppressed by local jealousy?"

As late as December 20, 1860, after the Presidential election and when events were hastening to a crisis, on the floor of the United States Senate, Mr. Davis reannounced his passionate love for the Union and pathetically plead for a spirit of conciliation that would make unnecessary the withdrawal of the South from their national fraternity. He said: "The Union is dear to me as a union of fraternal States. It would lose its value if I had to regard it as a union held together by physical force. I would be happy to know that every State now felt that fraternity which made this Union possible, and, if that evidence could go out, if evidence satisfactory to the people of the South could be given that that feeling existed in the hearts of the northern people, you might burn your statute books and we would cling to the Union still."

Instead of conspiring to disrupt the Union, as has been charged, Mr. Davis loved this great Republic with passionate ardor and sealed that devotion with his richest blood. He served his country with a conscientious fidelity that knew no flagging. He went out at last in obedience to what he felt was imperative necessity, and the going almost broke his great heart. So reluctant was he to sever relations with the Union that some more ardent friends became impatient with his hesitation and almost suspected his loyalty. Despairing of any fair and final adjustment of issues that had agitated the Nation for more than a half century, and believing that the election of Mr. Lincoln would embolden his party to great aggressions upon the constitutional rights of the Southern States, he at length, with many a heartache, yielded to the inevitable and joined his people in the establishment of a separate civil government.

On January 20, in a letter to his special friend ex-President Franklin Pierce, he thus expressed the grief of his patriotic heart: "I have often and sadly turned my thoughts to you during the troublous times through which we have been passing, and now I come to the hard task of announcing to you that the hour is at hand which closes my connection with the United States, for the independence and union of which my father bled, and in the service of which I have sought to emulate the example he set for my guidance."

As Mr. Blaine justly said of L. Q. C. Lamar, so will history say of Jefferson Davis: "He stood firmly by his State in accordance with the political creed in which he was reared; but looked back with tender regret to the Union whose destiny he had wished to share, and under the protection of whose broader nationality he had hoped to live and die."

And so consistent was his entire public career, and so conspicuous the unstained purity of his motives, that when nearing the close of his eventful life, he could challenge the world and triumphantly say: "The history of my public life bears evidence that I did all in my power to prevent the war; that I did nothing to precipitate collision; that I did not seek the post of Chief Executive, but advised my friends that I preferred not to fill it."

Long after Yancy and Rhett and Toombs and others had thrown hesitancy to the winds Mr. Davis still wrought with all his great ability and influence to preserve the Union. He favored and earnestly advocated the "Crittenden Resolutions" on condition that the Republican Members accept them. Had they not stubbornly refused—and they did it on the advice of Mr. Lincoln—war would have been averted and the dissolution of the Union prevented or postponed. All the undoubted facts go to prove that Jefferson Davis, at the peril of sacrificing the confidence of his people, exhausted all resources consistent with sacred honor and the rights of the States to stay the fatal dismemberment of the Union.

Jefferson Davis' farewell to the United States Senate, in which he had so long towered as a commanding figure and where he had rendered his country such distinguished service, was one of the most dramatic and memorable scenes in the life of that historic Chamber. Mississippi, by solemn ordinance and in the exercise of her sovereign right, had severed her relation with the Union, and he, as her representative, must make official announcement of the fact, surrender his high commission, and return home to await the further orders of his devoted people. It was a supreme—a fateful hour—in our country's history. The hush of death fell upon the Chamber when Jefferson Davis arose. The trusted leader and authoritative voice of the South was about to speak, and an anxious Nation was eager to hear. Every Senator was in his seat, Members of the House stood in every available place, and the galleries were thronged with those whose faces expressed the alternating hopes and fears of their patriotic hearts. The fate of a nation seemed to hang upon that awful hour.

Pale, sad of countenance, weak in body from patriotic grief and loss of sleep, evidently under the strain of sacred, suppressed emotion, and yet with the calmness of fixed determination and settled conviction, the majestic Senator of Mississippi stood, hesitant for a moment, in painful silence. The natural melancholy in his face had a deeper tinge "as if the shadow of his country's sorrow had been cast upon it." His good wife, who witnessed the fateful scene, and felt the oppressive burden that almost crushed the brave heart of her great husband, said that "Had he been bending over his bleeding father, needlessly slain by his countrymen, he could not have been more pathetic and inconsolable." At first there was a slight tremor in his speech, but as he proceeded his voice recovered its full, flutelike tones, and rang through the Chamber with its old-time clearness and confident strength. But there was in it no note of defiance, and he spoke no word of bitterness or reproach. He was listened to in profound silence. Hearts were too sad for words and hands too heavy for applause. Many eyes, unused to weeping, were dimmed with tears. And when he closed with these solemn words, there was a sense of unutterable sorrow in the entire assembly: "Mr. President and Senators, having made the announcement which the occasion seemed to me to require, it only remains for me to bid you a final adieu." Senators moved softly out of the Chamber, as though they were turning away from a new-made grave in which were laid their dearest hopes. Mrs. Davis says that the night after this memorable day brought no sleep to his eyelids, and all through its restless hours she could hear the oft-reiterated prayer: "May God have us in His holy keeping, and grant that before it is too late peaceful councils may prevail."

In this open, manly, but painful way, the Southern States withdrew, with never a suggestion of conspiracy against anything or anybody. The men of the South wore no disguises, held no secret councils, concealed no plans, concocted no sinister schemes, organized no conclaves, and adopted no dark-lantern methods. They spoke out their honest convictions, made their pathetic pleas for justice, and openly announced their final, lamented purpose if all efforts at a peaceful adjustment should fail. And at length, whether wisely or unwisely, feeling that nothing else would avail, they determined to take the final step and fling defiance to the face of what they considered an aggressive, overbearing, tyrannous majority.

As Alexander H. Stephens admirably and correctly says, the real object of those who resorted to secession "was not to overthrow the Government of the United States, but to perpetuate the principles upon which it was founded. The object in quitting the Union was not to destroy but to save the principles of the Constitution." And it is a significant fact, that the historic instrument, in almost its exact language, became the organic law of the Confederate Government. The Southern States withdrew from the Union for the very reason that induced them at first to enter into it; that is, for their own better protection and security.

Secession was not a war measure; it was intended to be a peace measure. It was a deeply regretted effort on the part of the South to flee from continued strife, feeling that "peace with two governments was better than a union of discordant States." Hence Greely himself said: "If the Cotton States shall decide that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace." And, while fearing the direful possibility, the Southern States seceded without the slightest preparation for war. As Dr. J. L. M. Curry said: "Not a gun, not an establishment for their manufacture or repair, nor a soldier, nor a vessel had been provided as preparation for war, offensive or defensive. On the contrary, they desired to live in peace and friendship with their late confederates and took all the necessary steps to secure that desired result. There was no appeal to the arbitrament of arms nor any provocation to war. They desired and earnestly sought to make a fair and equitable settlement of common interests and disputed questions." And the very first act of the Confederate Government was to appoint commissioners to Washington to make terms of peace and establish relations of amity between the sections.

Some days after his farewell to the Senate Mr. Davis returned to his home in Mississippi to await results and render any service to which his country might call him. He did not, however, desire the leadership of the Confederacy that was in process of organization. But the people who knew his preeminent abilities and trusted his leadership declined to release him. By a unanimous and enthusiastic vote he was elected to the Presidency of the young republic, and felt compelled to accept responsibilities from which he hoped to escape. It was the thought of his countrymen, voiced by the eloquent William L. Yancey, that "the man and the hour have met." He could well say, therefore, in his inaugural address, delivered a few days after, that "It is joyous in the midst of perilous times to look around upon a people united in heart, when one purpose of high resolve animates and actuates the whole; when the sacrifices to be made are not weighed in the balance against honor and right and liberty and equality." His address was conservative and dispassionate, but strong and resolute, not unequal to the luminous and lofty utterance of Thomas Jefferson. If others failed to measure the awful import of that epochal hour, not so the serious and far-seeing man about to assume high office, who was at once an educated and trained soldier and a great statesman of long experience and extraordinary genius.

To rehearse in detail the well-known story of carnage and struggle is not within the

purpose of this discussion. Nor is it necessary to consider at length the many and perplexing problems which signalized the administration of the young nation's first and only President. It is sufficient to say that he conducted the affairs of the stormy government with consummate wisdom, meeting the sternest responsibilities, awed by no reverses, discouraged by no disaster and cherishing an unshaken faith that a cause could not fail which was "sanctified by its justice and sustained by a virtuous people." Even after Richmond was evacuated and the sun of Appomattox was about to go down amid blood and tears, a final appeal was issued in which he said: "Let us not despair, my countrymen, but meet the foe with fresh defiance and with unconquered and unconquerable hearts."

Mr. Davis was a great President. In administering the affairs of the Confederate Government he displayed remarkable constructive and executive genius. Considering the resources at his command, all the southern ports blockaded, and without the recognition of any foreign nation, with no opportunity to sell cotton abroad and import supplies in return, having to rely entirely upon the fields and strong arms of the homeland, and constantly menaced by one of the greatest armies of the world, it was remarkable that the young nation could have survived a few months, instead of four memorable years. And much of that wonderful history is due to its Chief Executive. In answer to one who sought General Lee's estimate of Mr. Davis as the head of the Government, he thus replied: "If my opinion is worth anything, you can always say that few people could have done better than Mr. Davis. I know of none that could have done as well."

And on the other side harsh criticism is giving way to generous and discriminating judgment. The Honorable Charles Francis Adams, in a recent review of the latest Life of Jefferson Davis, which has issued from the press, pays fitting tribute to the extraordinary ability displayed by the Confederacy's great President: "No fatal mistake," says he, "either of administration or strategy, was made which can fairly be laid to his account. * * * He did the best that was possible with the means that he had at command. Merely the opposing forces were too many and too strong for him. Of his austerity, earnestness, and fidelity it seems to me there can be no more question than can be entertained of his capacity."

Mr. Davis has been charged with cruelty to prisoners, and on his shoulders have been laid the so-called horrors of Andersonville, a charge as utterly baseless as it is despicably mean. No more humane or gentle spirit ever walked this earth than Jefferson Davis. As a matter of fact, there was no deliberate purpose on either side to maltreat prisoners of war or fail to make proper provision for their care. The sufferings endured were only the exigencies of the awful days when great armies were in the death struggle for mastery. All that humanity could suggest and the meager resources of the South could provide were freely given for the brave men captured in battle. Mr. Davis said they were given exactly the same rations "in quantity and quality as those served out to our gallant soldiers in the field, which has been found sufficient to support them in their arduous campaigns." On the contrary, goaded doubtless by false reports from the South, the United States War Department, on April 20, 1864, reduced by 20 percent the rations issued to Confederate prisoners.

"With 60,000 more Federal prisoners in the South," said Senator Daniel, "than there were Confederate prisoners in the North, 4,000 more Confederates than Federals died in prison." If those figures are correct the very repetition of the charge is an insult to intelligence and blasphemy against the truth. The real reason for so much suffering and mortality among the men in southern prisons was that the Federal Government refused to observe the cartel agreed upon for the exchange of prisoners. And General Grant boldly assumed the responsibility for such refusal in these words: "It is hard on our men in southern prisons not to exchange them, but it is humanity to those left in the ranks to fight our battles. If we commence a system of exchanges which liberates all prisoners taken, we will have to fight on until the whole South is exterminated. If we hold those caught they amount to no more than dead men. At this particular time to release all rebel prisoners North would insure Sherman's defeat and compromise our own safety here."

If any unfortunate prisoner was not comfortably provided for, it was not because the South would be cruel to a brother but on account of her exhausted source of supply. During the last year of the war General Lee had meat only twice a week, and his usual dinner was "a head of cabbage boiled in salt water, sweetpotatoes, and a pone of corn bread." If the peerless commander in chief of the Confederate armies was reduced to such scanty fare, the government could not well provide very liberally for the gallant men in the ranks or behind prison doors.

Now, with this very imperfect sketch of a most remarkable career I shall briefly refer to some of the qualities that made this heroic history a sublime possibility.

He was an accomplished orator and a magnificent debater. Having always complete mastery of himself and of the subject in hand, he became a veritable master of assemblies. He met Sargent S. Prentiss in debate, that inspired wizard of persuasive and powerful speech, and his friends had no occasion to regret the contest. Stephen A. Douglas found in him the mightiest champion with whom he ever shivered a lance. During the exciting discussion in 1850, Henry Clay turned to the Mississippi Senator and announced his purpose, at some future day, to debate with him a certain great question. "Now is the moment," was the prompt reply of the brilliant southern leader, whose intrepid courage and diligent student habits kept him fully armed for the issues of any hour.

"He was an archer regal
Who laid the mighty low,
But his arrows were fledged by the eagle
And sought not a fallen foe."

One of Mr. Davis' biographers, well acquainted with his parliamentary career, who knew his mastery in debate and his superb power as a statesman and an orator, and who witnessed his brilliant gladiatorial combat in the Senate with Stephen A. Douglas, gives this discriminating estimate of the great Mississippian:

"In nearly all of Mr. Davis' speeches is recognized the pervasion of intellect, which is preserved even in his most impassioned passages. He goes to the very foundations of jurisprudence, illustrates by historical example, and throws upon his subject the full radiance of that light which is shed by diligent inquiry into the abstract truths of political and moral science. Strength, animation, energy without vehemence, classical elegance, and a luminous simplicity are features in Davis' oratory which rendered him one of the most finished, logical, and effective of contemporary parliamentary speakers. * * * He had less of the characteristics of Mirabeau than of that higher type of eloquence, of which Cicero, Burke, and George Canning were representatives, and which is pervaded by passion, subordinated to the severe tribunal of intellect."

His sensitiveness to personal and official honor, and his exceeding conscientiousness in the discharge of public duties were among the chief characteristics of this serious and stainless man. "Great politicians," said Voltaire, "ought always to deceive the people." But such was not the sacred creed of Jefferson Davis, who held that public men should invariably and scrupulously be honest with the people, having no confidences from which they are excluded and no policies in which they were not invited to share. Free from conscious sophistry and the very soul of candor, he never sought to conceal or obscure, but to make the truth so luminous that he who ran could read. His own eloquent characterization of President Franklin Pierce might be fittingly applied to Jefferson Davis himself: "If treachery had come near him it would have stood abashed in the presence of his truth, his manliness, and his confiding simplicity."

In official life he knew no word but duty. When in Congress a river and harbor bill was pending on one occasion, and seeing that combinations had been formed to secure certain local, trivial appropriations, he opposed the measure with characteristic vigor. In the course of the debate he was asked if he did not favor appropriations for Mississippi, in response to which he retorted sharply and concluded: "I feel, sir, that I am incapable of sectional distinctions upon such a subject. I abhor and reject all interested combinations."

He was the very soul of chivalry. No plumed knight of the Middle Ages ever had higher regard for the virtue of woman or the integrity of man or the sacredness of a cause. Sensitive to wrong, cherishing above measure his stainless honor, he never in the least betrayed it nor allowed another to impugn it. Had he remained in the military service I doubt not that he would have been on the tented field what Sir Henry Havelock became to the chivalry of England.

His was a proud but a noble and affectionate nature. Some have thought him a cold, austere, severe man, lacking in the gentler elements and sympathies of a generous soul. But nothing could be further from the fact. His affections were most ardent, his friendships partook of the pathetic, and the tenderness of his heart often dimmed his eyes with tears. And he was at all times most approachable. No citizen was so poor, no soldier so humble, no man so obscure, as not to have ready access to his presence and sympathetic attention.

Mr. Davis was a statesman, with neither taste nor ability for mere political manipulation. He relied upon high argument, and not political management, to achieve the great ends for which his party stood, and for which this young Republic was called into being. It was impossible for him to resort to questionable methods and demagogical appeal in order to win elections and carry out party or governmental policies.

He was a profound, philosophical statesman, with a thoroughly trained intellect and an exalted sense of moral responsibility. In his logical processes he quite resembled the illustrious John C. Calhoun, whose genius he greatly admired and with whose political creed he was in substantial accord. And when Mr. Calhoun passed away, amid the lamentations of the whole Nation, the great party he had led with such consummate skill turned instinctively to Jefferson Davis as incomparably the ablest exponent of the basic principles for which they fearlessly stood. His superb and commanding leadership vindicated their generous confidence and vastly enlarged the strength and measure of his national influence.

As Secretary of War in the Cabinet of Franklin Pierce, and by common consent he was the premier in that body of statesmen; it is no disparagement of others to say that no abler or more accomplished Secretary ever sat at the council table of an American President.

Providence designed him for leadership and amply endowed him with gifts to meet its repeated exigencies and imperial responsibilities. And in every position to which he was summoned the results of his labors and

the splendor of his achievements gave eloquent attention to the prescience of his statesmanship and the grandeur of his character. The verdict of history will be, notwithstanding the fall of the Confederate Government, that he was preeminently the man for a crisis. His genius was most resplendent when the clouds were darkest and the tension was greatest and the danger was nearest. When passion swayed the hour, he was in most perfect command of his highest powers and seemed to exercise the coolest judgment. He was cautious without timidity, intrepid without rashness, courteous with condescension, pious without pretense.

And no public man ever had more loyal support and a more enthusiastic following. The Tenth Legion of Caesar and the Old Guard of Napoleon never followed their leaders with more perfect assurance or thrilling ardor than did the friends of the superb chieftain whose one hundredth anniversary we celebrate today.

"Courage that could dare and do,
Steadfast faith and honesty,
Were the only craft he knew
And his sole diplomacy."

Mr. Davis was a devout believer in the fundamental verities of our Christian faith, and sought to make them the inspiring rule of his daily life. He was acquainted with the Scriptures from a child, and knew the place and power of prayer. His unshaken faith gave him sublime courage for duty, a serene fortitude in calamity, softened the rigor of the cruel prison, and made radiant the evening skies of life's long stormy day. His intimate friend, the eloquent Senator Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia, paid this heart tribute to the beauty and consistency of his Christian character:

"I know Jefferson Davis as I know few men. I have been near him in his public duties. I have seen him by his private fireside; I have witnessed his humble Christian devotions, and I challenge the judgment of history when I say no people were ever led through the fiery struggle for liberty by a nobler, truer patriot, while the carnage of war and the trials of public life never revealed a purer and more beautiful Christian character."

When, after their capture, his friend, the Honorable John H. Reagan, the postmaster general of the Confederacy, was separated from him to be sent to a northern prison, while he remained at Fortress Monroe, Mr. Davis said: "My old friend read frequently the Twenty-sixth Psalm; it has often given me the surest consolation." While enduring in agony and chains his imprisonment at Fortress Monroe, a cruelty that will ever be a blot upon our country's fair fame, he wrote thus cheerfully to his anxious and devoted wife: "Tarry there the Lord's leisure, be strong and He will comfort thy heart. Every day, twice or oftener, I repeat the prayer of St. Chrysostom." Again, from the dungeon he wrote to a friend: "Separated from my friends of this world, my Heavenly Father has drawn nearer to me."

And when his two pitiless years of imprisonment were ended, broken in health but unbroken in spirit, and when the short court proceedings were concluded in Richmond, which restored him to liberty and the bosom of his family, and a party of friends had joined Mr. Davis at the hotel, the venerable chief of the lost cause turned to his old pastor and said: "Mr. Minnegarode, you have been with me in my sufferings and comforted and strengthened me with your prayers; is it not right that we now once more should kneel together and return thanks?"

After his release, in shattered health and poverty, his fortune having gone with the cause he served and for which he suffered, but rich in the affectionate devotion of the people, who vied with each other in doing him honor, he returned to his beloved Mississippi and here spent the remnant of his heroic years. Out of fire and tempest and baptism of blood he came with an unfaltering purpose and an unclouded sky. There is something strangely beautiful in the old age of a great and good man. No sun sweeping through the opening gates of the morning has ever the radiant glory of its calm setting. Beautiful and buoyant as is the springtime, it fades before the color and splendor of the autumn. And so there is a sweet serenity and chastened beauty about the evening of a cheerful, well-spent life that far exceeds the brightness and bloom of its fair young morning.

The last days of Jefferson Davis were peaceful and beautiful. They were spent in dignified retirement, cultivating the sweet companionship of books, enjoying the association of friends, and in writing a masterly exposition of the great principles of government that had been the creed of his political faith and the ground of his people's hopes. This was his last will and testament to those "who have glorified a fallen cause by the simple manhood of their lives, the patient endurance of suffering, and the heroism of death."

Though never an indifferent observer of passing events, he wisely took no part in public affairs and rarely ever appeared on public occasions. When occasionally one of the numerous invitations with which he was overwhelmed was accepted, it was to speak words of encouragement and hope to his people, urging them, with stout hearts and strong hands, to labor for the largest good of our reunited country.

In a notable address before the Legislature of Mississippi in 1884, when in age and feebleness extreme, standing in the old hall where in the days of his splendid prime he swayed enraptured audiences as with the wand of a mighty magician, he thus spoke to the people who had ever held the highest place in his affectionate heart: "Reared on the soil of Mississippi, the ambition of my boyhood was to do something which would redound to the honor and welfare of the State. The weight of many years admonishes me that my day of actual services has passed, yet the desire remains undiminished to see the people of Mississippi prosperous and happy, and her fame not unlike the past, but gradually growing wider and brighter as the years roll away. * * * Fate decreed that we should be unsuccessful in the effort to maintain and resume the grants made to the Federal Government. Our people have accepted the decree; it therefore behooves them to promote the general welfare to the Union, to show to the world that hereafter, as heretofore, the patriotism of our people is not measured by lines of latitude and longitude, but is as broad as the obligations they have assumed and embraces the whole of our ocean-broad domain."

And now, young men of our reunited country, sons of heroic sires, proud of the flag that floats over us, and jealous of its increasing and unfading glory, glad that there is a star on it that answers to the name of Mississippi, I commend to your emulation the words of solemn counsel and patriotic encouragement with which Mr. Davis concluded his masterly and monumental work. The rise and fall of the Confederate Government: "In asserting the right of secession it has not been my wish to incite to its exercise. I recognize the fact that the war showed it to be impracticable, but this did not prove that it was wrong, and now, that it may not be again attempted, and the Union may promote the general welfare, it is needful that the truth, the whole truth, should be known, so that crimination and recrimination may forever cease, and then, on the basis of fraternity and faithful regard for the rights of the States, there may be written on the arch of the Union, 'Esto perpetua.'"

By the sacred political convictions which had inspired his every public and patriotic service, he consistently lived to the end, and went down to his grave without laying any sacrifice of repentence upon the altar of his conscience or his country. Without compromise or modification, and with never a suggestion of contrition or concession, he died in the accepted faith of his fathers. And for that fearless and unshaken fidelity to his honest conception of truth and duty the South will continue to adore him, the world will never cease to admire him, and with a wreath of unfading glory the genius of history will not fail to crown him. For the future he had no fear. In the last public paper that emanated from his pen, representing himself and his countrymen, he calmly reiterated his unfaltering faith in these words: "We do not fear the verdict of posterity on the purity of our motives or the sincerity of our belief, which our sacrifices and our career sufficiently attested."

Had he ever recanted or even receded, had he ever apostatized or even compromised, had he shown in any way that his often reiterated doctrines were not the undying convictions of his sincere soul, had he ever plead for pardon on the ground that he had misconceived the truth and misguided his people—the South would have spurned him, the North would have execrated him, and the verdict of history would have deservedly and eternally condemned him. But, in the calm consciousness of having done what sacred duty and the cause of constitutional liberty seemed to demand, to the end of his days he walked with a steady step that knew no variableness or shadow of turning. The banner under which he fought went down in blood and tears but was never furled by his hands.

And for us to be honestly and absolutely loyal to the whole country and our glorious flag, we need not and will not forget or cease to venerate the exalted character and splendid virtues and unsullied patriotism of Jefferson Davis and his compeers.

"Time cannot teach forgetfulness
When grief's full heart is fed by fame."

Over the portico of the Pantheon in Paris are these words in large letters: "To great men, the grateful Fatherland." Fellow Mississippians, I cannot repress the painful regret that it is not the proud privilege of Mississippi to be "the grateful fatherland" of the greatest Mississippian and to keep holy watch and ward over the sacred dust of her most illustrious son. He was great to those who knew him best—those who were nearest to him in intimate, confidential companionship—and he will grow greater with the growing years. Caleb Cushing, in introducing him to a vast audience in Faneuil Hall, said he was "eloquent among the most eloquent in debate, wise amongst the wisest in council, and brave among the bravest in battle." Senator Reagon, of Texas, the Postmaster General of the Confederate Government, said: "He was a man of great labor, of great learning, of great integrity, of great purity." The great-hearted and marvelously eloquent Senator, Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia, said: "I declare to you that he was the most honest, the truest, gentlest, bravest, tenderest, manliest man I ever knew."

Greatest of Mississippians, the leader of our armies, the defender of our liberties, the expounder of our political creeds, the authoritative voice of our hopes and fears, the sufferer for our sins, if sins they were, and the willing martyr to our sacred cause, we shall ever speak his name with reverence and cherish with patriotic pride the story of his matchless deeds. He died without citizenship here, but he has become a fellow citizen with the heroes of the skies.

Marvelous, many-sided, masterful man, his virtues will grow brighter and his name be writ larger with each passing century. Soldier, hero, statesman, gentleman, American—a prince of Christian chivalry, the uncrowned chief of an invisible republic of loving and loyal hearts—when another hundred years have passed, no intelligent voice

will fail to praise him and no patriotic hand will refuse to place a laurel wreath upon his radiant brow.

"Nothing need cover his high fame but heaven,
No pyramid set off his memories
But the eternal substance of his greatness,
To which I leave him."

Legislation, Progress, and the Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the House Committee on Public Works:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Committee on Public Works, I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to appear before you to discuss H. R. 3036. Before touching upon the bill under consideration, I deem it necessary to establish the physical and legislative background in order that the point of view of the people in the Northwest can be thoroughly understood.

GREATNESS OF COLUMBIA'S POTENTIALITIES RECOGNIZED EARLY

Nearly a century and a half ago, Thomas Jefferson had a vision "of a great empire on the Columbia River." Accordingly, he sent his secretary, Capt. Meriweather Lewis, and Capt. William Clark to claim and survey the Columbia country. The actions of this committee and its predecessors in the last 20 years have made the vision of Thomas Jefferson a reality. The development of the river judged by results only, therefore, has been built upon a solid basis. I appear to urge that the past constructive work be continued and that nonapplicable legislation be eliminated.

The Pacific Northwest, which covers the Columbia Basin, is a fuelless region and because of this deficiency it became necessary for the people of this region to turn to the development of hydro power to secure economic security. The quality and quantity of hydro power existing in the Northwest are far better and much different from the usual type of hydro power encountered on the majority of torrential streams in other sections. Consequently, policy which would be applicable to secondary producers will be destructive to the development of such a mighty stream as the Columbia.

SCENE OF GREAT STRIDES IN APPRECIATION OF BASIC FUNDAMENTALS IN OVER-ALL RIVER DEVELOPMENT

For over half a century the people of the Northwest have been thoroughly grounded in the fundamentals of a correct development. This region pioneered the large-scale and high-head hydroelectric development. It also pioneered in high-voltage transmission in rural electrification, in low rates, and in sound financing. It also pioneered in mass production at the lowest possible rates in order to encourage the widest use. Consequently, since the turn of the century, the Northwest has had the lowest rates and the largest per capita consumption in the country. Mass production was initiated in the Northwest a few years before Henry Ford applied this concept to the automobile industry. Therefore, because of necesssity, the people of the region have long been thoroughly grounded in what constitutes the correct and sound development of hydro power. Because of this long experience, both in politics and in sound power operation, our people are able to immediately recognize what is beneficial and what is not. Only recently have the contents of H. R. 3036 become publicly known in the Northwest and as a result I have had numerous letters and wires from the full cross section of our electorate to appear and discuss this bill. It is these requests that lead to a detailed analysis on my part. I therefore approach this discussion after a full and fair consideration.

JURISDICTION OVER THE COLUMBIA

I have appeared before the former Rivers and Harbors Committee on several occasions and discussed the characteristics of this stream and the legislative background in connection with the Foster Creek authorization. At this time it is essential that this legislative background, as well as the physical characteristics of the Columbia, be thoroughly understood before an adequate approach can be made on the application of H. R. 3036.

THE YEAR 1925 SAW FIRST ATTEMPTS TO PROBE FULL MEANING OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER

From my investigation I find that the first legislative direction applying to the Columbia River came with the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1925, which is known as Public Law 585, Sixty-eighth Congress, approved March 3, 1925. This act directed the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, acting through the Secretary of War, to prepare and submit to the Congress an estimate covering the cost of surveys of navigable streams and their tributaries where power development appeared to be feasible. The purpose of this survey enactment was to outline general plans for the multi-purpose improvement of feasible and constitutional streams, including navigation, flood control, irrigation, and the sound, economical development of hydro power.

SECRETARY OF WAR REPORTS

Following this authorization, the Secretary of War, on April 12, 1926, submitted his report to the Congress. This report was printed as House Document No. 308, first session, Sixty-ninth Congress. This report naturally included the Columbia River and its principal tributaries. Following the publication of the 308 reports, the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1927 directed the Secretary of War, through the Chief of Engineers, to make the necessary investigations, surveys, and plans in accordance with the recommendations of the 308 reports.

Under the authorization of the 1927 Rivers and Harbors Act, the Chief of Engineers proceeded with the necessary surveys, examinations, investigations, plans, and sketches which would lay the foundation for a general plan for the most effective multi-purpose development of the Columbia River. This final report covering all the purposes of the previous legislation was submitted to the Congress on March 29, 1932, and was published as House Document No. 103, first session, Seventy-third Congress.

I have studied the 103 reports in considerable detail and, therefore, feel that I am qualified to state that these reports are perhaps the most comprehensive and practical documents that have yet appeared on over-all river development. These 103 reports forcibly brought out the outstanding characteristics of the Columbia River and the potentialities which existed and were capable of being developed into the greatest and lowest-cost prime hydroelectric power system on this continent. The 103 reports of the Army engineers were so thorough and complete that it was taken as the foundation of the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects when the allotments were made by the President in 1933 pursuant to the NRA Act of that year.

OUTLINE OF COLUMBIA RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The 103 reports also laid the foundation for the full development of the Columbia River and cited the outstanding benefits that could be derived by "step by step development of the river". The outlined ultimate plan consisted of a series of 10 dams covering the stretch of the river from the Canadian border to tidewater. Two of these great projects have been completed except for additional generator installations and reclamation features at Grand Coulee.

When the public works allotments list was made public in 1933, both Grand Coulee and Bonneville were included. Also included was the Parker Dam on the Colorado River between Arizona and California. The Parker Dam project led to a controversy between States. This controversy was carried to the United States Supreme Court as the court of original jurisdiction. In the Parker Dam decision, the Supreme Court held that constitutionally authorization could come only from Congress under the authority of the commerce clause of the Constitution. Consequently, as a result of this decision, the former Rivers and Harbors Committee again took up the consideration of the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and authorized both of these projects in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill of 1935.

SUPREME COURT ASSERTS VALIDITY OF COMMERCE CLAUSE WITH REFERENCE TO COLUMBIA AND OTHER INTERSTATE RIVERS—NECESSITATES ACTION BY CONGRESS

In 1936 the Rivers and Harbors Committee considered the matter as basic policy legislation applying to the Bonneville project. The quick adjournment of Congress prevented a conference on the 1936 bills passing both Houses and as a result of the Seventy-fifth Congress continued the consideration of the control policy, and passed the act of August 20, 1937, which also originated in the former Rivers and Harbors Committee. The act of August 20, 1937, was not a party matter, although the Democrats at that time were in control of all the branches of the Government. The outstanding men on both sides of the aisle in both houses contributed to the passage of this act, known as the McNary-Mansfield Act.

RESULTS, FINALLY, IN BASIC ACT OF AUGUST 20, 1937—GREAT RESULTS FROM THIS ACT

The wise provisions of the 1937 act have resulted in the great industrial and economical developments in the Pacific Northwest and the outstanding war contributions that the early development of this power made possible. The remarkable contribution made under this act was the principle providing for actual and potential markets. This policy directed heavy industry to the Columbia Basin, which was capable of absorbing large quantities of power-producing pay rolls. Nearly 40 percent of the metal which went into our wartime air program as well as the atomic bomb was made possible through the act of 1937. This development consequently has turned out to be the keystone in our defense system. Without the proper future utilization of this power the foundation of our defense system can be transferred to foreign lands. We hear a great deal about the preservation of the secrets of the atomic bomb. However, we stop and realize that if unwise legislation is passed without such full consideration we can undermine our defense structure to the point that would be equivalent to giving away the secrets of the atomic bomb.

WAR CONTRIBUTIONS

Provisions embraced in the early enactments coming from the predecessor committee produced the tools of victory in the

recent war. At the outset of the war in Europe, it became increasingly evident that this country was ill-prepared to fight a modern war because of the lack of electrochemical and electrometallurgical industrial plant capacity. Such defense capacity required large volumes of low-cost power. The Columbia River power during the war worked around the clock 365 days a year in the war effort. It produced the light and strong metals that made the national air program possible.

GREAT RESULTS CONTINUED

During the last 12 months of the war, the Columbia River hydroplants produced over 503,000,000 pounds of aluminum annually, which was the equivalent of 10,000 B–29's or 145,000 fighter planes. In addition it was the low-cost hydropower from these two plants which made the Hanford atomic-bomb plant possible. Also the power from the two Columbia plants was used to weld together a substantial part of our maritime and Navy construction. During fiscal year 1945, Columbia River power produced 181 ships in northwestern shipyards. The war industries served directly by these two Columbia River plants during this fiscal year consumed over 5,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power. This amount of power is more than was used in Greater New York and is over 50 percent of the greatest output of the largest private power system in this country. Therefore, it is evident from this background that we must approach the application of H. R. 3036 with considerable caution.

EFFECT OF 3036 ON THIS PROGRESS NEEDS CLARIFICATION

Paragraph 1 (b) of H. R. 3036 states "that nothing in this act shall change the provision of the Bonneville Act." However, a close examination of H. R. 3036 brings out that the provisions of H. R. 3036 certainly do unwittingly change the provisions of the Bonneville Act and destroy the sound foundations constructed by this act. The region has had 10 years of operating experience under this act and although it is recognized that further perfecting is needed in the direction of equitable distribution of benefits, it is apparent that the all-wise policy inclusions included in the act of 1937 should not be nullified.

THE INTENT AND MEANING OF H. R. 3036 ON "UNDEFINED" TERM—EFFECT OF "UNDEFINED" TERM ON REGIONAL CLARIFICATION IN PROGRESS AT PRESENT TIME

The intent of this bill is to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, known as Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress. However, in the use of the undefined term "reservoir projects under control of the War Department," the scope of H. R. 3036 is extended beyond amending the Flood Control Act of 1944. Only last January all the private-power interests and all the operators of the public municipal plants in the Northwest got together and reached agreements. These interests have appeared before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees advocating the further development of the Columbia along the lines of the act of 1937. Naturally there was some controversy in the submitted joint recommendations by these interests, but these were of minor consequence.

NEED OF CLARIFICATION—BUT 3036 A STEP TO THE REAR

The evident intent of H. R. 3036 was to prevent the destruction of private investments. The Tacoma accord of January 22, 1947, demonstrated that public development could continue without in any way destroying private investment provided the policy provisions of the 1937 act were strictly followed. H. R. 3036 makes fundamental changes in Federal power policy and the reaction in the Pacific Northwest is that these changes will have a far-reaching effect on the economy of the region. There is general agreement that the function of Congress is to perfect established policies and modify existing laws, but in so doing Congress should be fully advised as to the effects which are bound to flow from such changes. Admittedly, there exists an opportunity for clarification and simplification of Federal power policy. However, the feeling exists in my section that H. R. 3036 would overthrow many of the beneficial policies which have developed in Congress during the last 50 years. H. R. 3036 in the opinion of our people would confuse the issues rather than clarify policy.

ARMY ENGINEERS HAVE NO DESIRES TO BECOME MARKETING AGENCY—O. K. BPA AS SUCH

During the hearings before the Senate Appropriations Commttee one of the staunchest friends of the Army engineers on that committee stated publicly that the Army engineers did not wish the transfer of power-marketing activities to their organization. It follows, therefore, that the Army engineers considered the workings of the Bonneville Act as the proper type of management setup, which preserves to the Army engineers their long-established public works functions.

COLUMBIA RIVER PROJECT

H. R. 3036 requires the transfer of certain activities from existing agencies directly to the War Department and indirectly to the Federal Power Commission. The division of operating responsibilities between two agencies makes for imperfect management, and so divides responsibility that the most efficient results cannot be obtained. I will cover this in fuller detail in what follows.

H. R. 3036 SUGGESTS UNWANTED TRANSFERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE POWER

Before H. R. 3036 can adequately be appraised, we must know what projects have been authorized and what legislation applies to these authorized projects.

NEED FOR MORE SPECIFIC LANGUAGE IN 3036 TO COMPLETELY CLARIFY BONNEVILLE EXEMPTION MENTIONED IN 3036

McNary Dam, which is now under construction, was authorized in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1945. Likewise the lower Snake projects were authorized in this same act. According to the 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act, the operation of McNary and the lower Snake projects were specified to be covered under the Bonneville Act of 1937. The Bonneville project is specifically exempted from the provisions of H. R. 3036, but this latter bill doesn't mention the exclusion of McNary and the lower Snake River projects. Although H. R. 3036 is proposed as an amendment to section 5 of the Flood Control Act, the bill language applying to "reservoir projects" is so broad as to lead to confusion as to what is included in the term "reservoir projects." How reservoir projects authorized under rivers and harbors acts are to be handled is uncertan.

NEED CONTINUED

The Columbia Basin project, the Hungry Horse project and the upper Snake River projects have all been authorized under the reclamation law and inferentially it can be concluded that these reclamation projects would not be directly affected by H. R. 3036. In these cases we have different handling in the same region. However, the Willamette Basin projects which include Detroit, Lookout Point, and Quartz Creek have all been authorized under previous flood-control legislation. Foster Creek project was authorized under the last Rivers and Harbors Act and is a reservoir project under the terms of this bill but not under interpretation as an amendment to section 5 of the act of December 22, 1944. H. R. 3036 leaves open the marketing of Foster Creek power.

H. R. 3036 WOULD COMPLICATE AUTHORITIES

The Bonneville Power Administration is now marketing the power from the Bonneville and Columbia Basin projects under the terms of the act of 1937 and the Reclamation Act of 1939. This agency is also the designated marketing agency for the power to be produced at Hungry Horse, McNary, and the lower Snake River projects. As a result of the 1937 act the Bonneville marketing administration has a transmission system of over 3,000 circuit miles. This transmission system is capable of being used to market the power from all the Columbia Basin projests under the terms of existing legislation, but nevertheless H. R. 3036 would evidently transfer part of these facilities to another policy. This would result in endless confusion and a nonworkable physical set-up. Because of this physical situation a number of ambiguous questions can and will arise as a result of enactment of H. R. 3036 as written. Unless this ambiguity is cleared up, H. R. 3036 will result in nullifying a number of beneficial and workable congressional policies which have been established over a long period. H. R. 3036 is not needed in the Columbia Basin and if enacted in the form as written will seriously upset the economic foundation of a large section of the country.

H. R. 3036 NOT COMPOSED FOR SUCH STREAMS AS COLUMBIA

H. R. 3036 is evidently written to fit a certain class of torrential streams, and cannot be used on such a stream as the Columbia, with high, steady flows, high waterfalls, and a large proportion of firm power. The Columbia power does not require steam standby whereas H. R. 3036 is written to cover those types of torrential streams which are largely secondary producers requiring steam standby. Nature does not standardize its water courses or its waterfalls and when we attempt to legislate standardization, such as is covered in H. R. 3036, we are bound to run into conflict with natural laws.

PAY-OUT—BUS-BAR LIMITATION A THREAT TO SOUNDNESS OF PAY-OUT PROGRAM

In order to demonstrate the financial soundness of the Columbia River projects, I initiated 2 years ago the pay-out procedure. I will not take your time to repeat the method used in standardizing pay-out demonstrations, as I have fully covered this subject in various speeches on the floor. Last year and this year full pay-out reports have been submitted to both Appropriations Committees. These pay-out tests were founded upon independent audits made by a nationally known firm of public accountants who are handling such work for the largest private power systems in America. The soundness of the conclusions reached in the submitted pay-out tests has never been challenged. Therefore, I can state that the Columbia River projects are fully reimbursable and will not constitute a burden upon the taxpayers.

All the power available from the Columbia River plants has been sold and the area is now encountering a power shortage. Thus, according to the Tacoma agreement between public and private interests a market exists for more Federal capacity than is available. Furthermore, there is no major controversial issue before the Congress on Columbia power. Those that do exist, according to recent testimony, are of minor consequence and can be corrected without doing violence to the fundamentals responsible for the development of the great Northwest. All Federal facilities built on or in connection with the Columbia River projects are now loaded to the maximum obtainable capacities. Foster Creek, when it is brought in, will have a ready market and this market should not be handicapped by the policy provision contained in H. R. 3036.

PUBLIC PREFERENCE AND BUS-BAR SALES

H. R. 3036 states "preference in the sale of power shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives either directly or through the

resale by the purchasers." The stated policy of the bill is to continue the preference to public bodies which has become a congressional policy starting with the Lincoln land laws. Nevertheless, the operation of H. R. 3036 would make the distribution of these benefits impossible.

BUS-BAR PROVISION CONTRARY TO HISTORIC POLICIES

This bill directs the Secretary of War to dispose of power at the bus bar. Bus-bar sales as a general proposition are distinctly a step backward, nullifying all preferential power legislation starting with the Reclamation Act of 1906 and continuing through the Raker, TVA, Bonneville, and Fort Peck Acts. Bus-bar sales mean sales to a single company on the company's terms. The net effect would be the creation of a monopoly and placing such a monopoly between the people and the dams built with taxpayers' funds. Consequently only one private utility could be benefited by H. R. 3036.

Bus-bar sales according to the thinking of the majority of the people of the Northwest would soon eliminate all prospective purchases save a few monopolies. The result would be a reduction in revenues to the Federal Government and an impairment of the pay-out under existing statutes. A policy of bus-bar sales covering one set of Federal projects and transmission sales from other Federal projects in the same area is bound to produce chaos.

Since the initial authorization of 1906, permitting the sale of power from reclamation projects, Congress has always granted preference and priority to public agencies. There is not a single power act passed within the last half century that does not contain public preference provisions. Furthermore, the reclamation laws authorize transmission construction. H. R. 3036 states a preference and then through operating functions turns arcund and limits the preference to such an extent as to nullify a long-established congressional policy. The preference as written into H. R. 3036 is granted provided it is consistent with the full development of power. This constitutes an invitation to private groups to initiate such economic action as will wash out the stated preference. This is tantamount to an open request addressed to private interests to demand the full output of a plant to the complete exclusion of all types of public bodies and cooperatives.

In places where feasible hydro developments are removed from load centers, public bodies and cooperatives will be unable to finance the construction of necessary transmission lines and facilities to connect the Federal generating sources with the existing markets. Under H. R. 3036 only very large private consumers can operate. If the sponsors of H. R. 3036 would consider the type of load and the hours of use of such a load, they would find that H. R. 3036 would operate against public bodies. In the final analysis, the nonprofit public distributors would have no real opportunities under H. R. 3036.

PRESENT POLICY

The long-existing congressional policy is to dispose of power in such a manner as to encourage the widest possible use and to prevent monopolization of taxpayers' investment by limited groups.

BASIS OF PRESENT POLICIES

This policy was specifically approved in numerous laws such as the TVA Act of 1933, the REA Act of 1936, the Bonneville Act of 1937, the Fort Peck Act of 1938, the Flood Control Act of 1944, and the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1945. A universal rule of bus-bar sales would be totally inconsistent with these authorized policies. It is possible to go back even further and cite the Raker Act of 1913 and the Reclamation Act of 1906. Such Federal projects and the constitutional power generated therefrom are the property of all the people. If all the people are to benefit from these Federal investments, power must be brought to the people at the point where they can use it through agencies created by democratic processes.

PRESENT POLICIES ENDORSED BY COLUMBIA RIVER PEOPLE

The people of my State over a long period, by referendums, have consistently voted down any proposals that limited power benefits. The most recent example was the overwhelming defeat of Referendum No. 166 in the last November election. The State of Washington voted Republican in this election, and overwhelmingly defeated the cited referendum. Major utilities in the States of Washington and Oregon both public and private agreed to the following Tacoma agreement language that stated that power from the Government dams should be carried by Government transmission lines to the load centers: "Inasmuch as these Federal plants are located at a considerable distance from the region's load centers and inasmuch as present transmission facilities of the Bonneville Power Administration are already approaching conditions of full load, it is agreed as essential that appropriations for backbone transmission facilities be made available to the Bonneville Power Administration on an annual and continuing basis adequate to provide means for the delivery of power to load centers."

In the consideration of H. R. 3036 we must remember that we are dealing with major constitutional policies and that these policies, such as included in the Bonneville Act, have been affirmed by recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

MANAGEMENT

Under H. R. 3036 we find a mixture of operating and quasijudicial functions tied together. The Federal Power Commission is a quasijudicial agency which under the Water Power Act of 1920 is charged with the responsibility of regulating private companies engaged in interstate commerce. Nevertheless H. R. 3036 adds additional functions to the Federal Power Commission. As I interpret H. R. 3036 it runs counter to the concept of separation of powers contained in the Federal Constitution. Under the Federal Constitution there is a significant difference in the grants of authority to the three separate branches of Government. The principle of separation of powers provides that no one of these three branches of Government can encroach upon the functions of another. In addition, the Constitution further provides that dangerous concentration of power must be avoided and that respective powers be delegated in such a manner that the authorization can be exercised within the limits of separation of powers.

DANGER IN TOO MUCH POWER FOR FPC

The abuses which follow from the concentration and nonseparation of functions were brought out in the Couzens investigation covering the Federal Power Commission. It was this abuse that led to large investment losses during the late depression. Furthermore when the Bonneville Act was under consideration in 1936 and 1937, an attempt was made to give the Federal Power Commission operating functions in the Bonneville Project Act. This attempt was rejected for the reasons that I have just given.

Division of responsibility never results in sound management. H. R. 3036 would require the Federal Power Commission to approve every power contract. This is an unnecessary and unworkable restriction which was discarded when the Bonneville Act was passed.

O. K. OF CONTRACTS WOULD CREATE UNNECESSARY DELAYS

As far as I have been able to determine this concept of contract approval is not a part of utility regulation. Such a provision would create delays in marketing power. From inquiries I find that this experience was encountered during the war years. During this period, under a Presidential directive, the Power Commission was required to approve power contracts entered into by Government and their principal governmental contractors. A review of this wartime experience shows that delays resulted which in some instances extended over months and months, and even years.

FPC PROPERLY A QUASI-JUDICIAL BODY—NOT A MANAGEMENT BODY

The Federal Power Commission as a quasi-judicial agency has necessary functions which should be fully used in the consideration of any power marketing set-up. The Federal Power Commission consequently should have full authority to allocate investment costs and to check and approve power rates so that any executive market agency could be subject to all possible checks and balances. Negotiation of contracts is not a judicial function. Furthermore, the responsible operator of a marketing agency must have sufficient flexibility to meet requests for immediate power deliveries and to meet the various situations that accrue in the best operating set-ups, as well as to meet all the requirements inherent in national security and common defense.

NULLIFIES AND CONFUSES 15 YEARS OF PROGRESS IN MARKETING OF POWER FROM FEDERAL GENERATING HYDRO PLANTS

H. R. 3036 also nullifies recent congressional procedures aimed to improve administration and promote efficiency. Up to the last 15 years there was no congressional policy covering the designation of a marketing agency for power generated at rivers and harbors and flood-control projects. The Bonneville Act was one of the first large project acts covering marketing from rivers and harbors projects. A separate act was enacted for the Bonneville project for the reason that the Columbia River was in a different category from most streams. Since 1937 the Bonneville Act has been amended twice, but these amendments in no way changed the basic policy, and are confined to minor housekeeping provisions. The Fort Peck Act was enacted shortly after the Bonneville Act and is patterned after the Bonneville Act in designating a departmental agency to market the power, in this case the Bureau of Reclamation.

In the early part of the last war, the Denison and Norfork projects were brought to a generating stage, and in the absence of any statute covering administrative and marketing machinery, the President, under the authority of the First Water Powers Act, placed the marketing of power from these two dams in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior. As a result the Southwestern Power Administration was established to carry out the marketing functions applying to the two Southwest dams.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 initially established general marketing policy and designated the Secretary of the Interior as the marketing agent for reservoir projects under the construction jurisdiction of the War Department. H. R. 3036 would abandon the Congressional policy of fixing responsibility which is contained in the 1944 Flood Control Act. Thus, H. R. 3036 makes a change by a division of responsibility. Such a division would result in personnel and facility duplications and would create competition between established Federal agencies in same area and conflicts over marketing policies. Furthermore the bill now under consideration would prevent adequate planning and timing of new generating facilities and the accompanying marketing requirements. From this standpoint H. R. 3036 would result in waste and inefficiency.

Hydro power projects in the same region and covering the same marketing area should be operated as a unit. Unit operation achieves a greater supply of firm power over what would be possible through separate isolated and independent operations, providing unit operation is made to conform strictly to pay-out feasibility. The incremental increase of the number of kilowatts of firm power by transmission integration on the Columbia amounts to more capacity than could be obtained in the Southwest. Furthermore, unit operation encourages industrial growth, whereas isolated operation will prevent resource development. H. R. 3036 attempts such coordination but the provisions are ambiguous and vague, and no application is provided for projects not under jurisdiction of the War Department. Isolated or multiple marketing agencies will constitute a barrier to regional development. Separate policies and separate agencies within the same region would result in duplicating personnel and facilities and will result in waste and inadequate service, all of which affect net return on the investment.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons I have stated H. R. 3036 needs extensive revisions. The bill as drafted proposes far-reaching changes in power policy. The changes represent a backward movement. These changes could not be classified as good government, efficient administration or good business. If changes are to be made, such changes should reflect the public interest and provide for more efficient administration. If this bill must be reported favorably, it should be amended to exclude the entire Columbia Basin, rather than the brief citation of exclusion in section (b) of the bill. It is apparent that the changes contemplated are so extensive as to warrant exhaustive hearings. I appreciate and respect the intent to deal fairly with private interests. Therefore, I repeat that this can be accomplished without sacrificing long-standing fundamentals.

Shortages of Petroleum Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, NATIONAL OIL MARKETERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas during the past winter many sections of the country have suffered from fuel-oil shortages far more severe than any experienced during the war, which shortages were caused to a considerable extent by manipulation of supply and transportation; and

Whereas the panic thus caused among consumers and jobbers has been further heightened by repeated statements of many individuals and organizations subservient to the major oil companies to the effect that critical shortages of petroleum products will occur in the future; and

Whereas total stocks of crude oil and refining capacity are larger than at any time in recent years; and

Whereas many refiners, jobbers, and distributors of petroleum products are having difficulty in securing proper amounts thereof; and

Whereas many independent refiners have been removed from the competitive market; and

Whereas the controls being exercised over the production, refining, transportation, and distribution of petroleum products by the major oil companies appears to be the result of illegal combinations and agreements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the National Oil Marketers Association in meeting at the Morris Hotel, Chicago, Ill., this 21st day of May 1947, That the Attorney General of the United States be requested to impanel a grand jury or grand juries to the end that a thorough investigation be made to determine if monopolistic practices or activities otherwise in violation of the Federal antitrust laws exist in the petroleum industry and if such conditions be found to exist that those responsible therefor be prosecuted; and

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Attorney General of the United States and to such others as may be of assistance in enforcing the antitrust laws.

The Importance of the Merchant Marine to the Mississippi Valley and the Midcontinent Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mr. Solon B. Turman, executive vice president, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., in St. Louis, Mo., on National Maritime Day:

It is indeed gratifying to a shipping man to be invited into the deep interior of our country on National Maritime Day to talk about our merchant marine.

I was especially gratified that my invitation came from the foreign-trade bureau of the chamber of commerce, the Export Managers Club and the Propeller Club of the United States, port of St. Louis, for the very existence of such organizations, almost at the geographical center of the United States, symbolizes the great interest being taken today in foreign trade and all it stands for economically and as an influence in the development of more cordial international relations. That interest indicates the world-wide vision of those in whose hands lies the future development of our great valley and midcontinent areas.

Ships and foreign trade are so interdependent that it is impossible to discuss one without referring to the other. Neither can live alone. Ships cannot exist without foreign trade, and foreign trade can only be carried on if ships be available to handle it. Both are essential to our economic and national existence.

It was on May 20, 1933, that Congress first took cognizance of the fact that, on May 22, 1819, the American steamship *Savannah* sailed from Savannah, Ga., on the first transoceanic voyage under steam propulsion and requested the President to call for the annual observation of May 22 as National Maritime Day.

When the *Savannah* made its voyage the American merchant marine was well embarked upon one of the most glorious phases of its long and eventful history. At that time, and during the decades immediately following, American merchant ships established standards of speed and safety of transportation which were seldom equaled and not surpassed by those of any other maritime nation. Our accomplishments at sea during the "clipper ship" era which immediately preceded the Civil War are so well known that they need not be repeated here. We were oceanic carriers for the world, and our national wealth and strength increased accordingly.

Our early American merchant marine went into a decline after the Civil War from which it never fully recovered, except to meet the emergencies of World Wars I and II. Probably the chief reason for this was that Americans turned their backs to the sea in the post-Civil War period to concentrate on developing our country's interior.

This was a period of great domestic expansion and our internal needs and opportunities were so great that many Americans lost interest in foreign trade and in our merchant marine. Between 1870 and 1914, approximately 90 percent of our foreign trade, in value, was carried in foreign vessels and, in the year 1910, ships flying the American flag carried only 8.7 percent of our foreign trade, in value, the lowest since the days of our famed clipper ships.

When we had few ships, and none in operation to many countries, foreign flag shipping combines closed many markets to us and, in times when their own national needs were paramount, we were deprived of the use of a considerable part of the shipping transportation upon which we were dependent to reach our markets and to bring essential materials and supplies to us.

The *Savannah* made her notable crossing of the Atlantic nearly 130 years ago. At that time our country was, in many respects, much more self-sufficient than it is today. The progress of science and invention has brought with it definite and Nation-wide need for many products which were, at that time, not considered necessary to our economic life—or were, in fact, unknown. We then, for example, did not require the rubber which now is so important in our automobile, electrical, and other industries, nor did we need the manganese and other ores which now come to us from other parts of the world and are necessary in our metallurgical industries—while the greater number of our people got along very well without coffee, tea, sugar, and many other imported things which now are classed as necessities. Nor had we then developed our industrial, agricultural and mineral resources to the extent which makes it essential, as it is today, that we export a substantial part of our production in order to provide stable livelihood for our people.

Our need today for adequate and always-available oceanic transportation is greater than ever before. And that need will intensify with passage of time. Only a fleet under the American flag will assure dependable service to American importers and exporters and give them regular and frequent service to their markets and sources of supply overseas. Only a fleet under our own flag can give us transport essential in war.

When the United States entered World War I, we were without ships to carry our troops and supplies to France. Captured enemy and friendly foreign vessels did a limited job for us, while a hastily organized shipbuilding effort went forward. This program, costing about $3,000,000,000, produced a good number of ships. But many of them were not delivered until actual hostilities had ended. However, those ships enabled us to handle a substantial part of our postwar foreign commerce—which reached unprecedented volume. In 1920, we carried 43 percent of that commerce in our American ships and, in that year, our exports and imports amounted to more than $13,000,000,000—400 percent greater than the volume in 1912. But the fleet of American vessels which contributed so materially to that result was, in large part, obsolete and unable, for long, efficiently to compete with more modern foreign tonnage. The volume of American tonnage engaged in our foreign trades steadily

declined and, by the end of 1935, we had in active service less than one-half the tonnage of 1920.

Speaking before the Merchant Marine Committee of the House of Representatives in March 1935, Senator WALLACE WHITE, of Maine, a former chairman of the committee and an eminent authority on the merchant marine, stated that in 10 years, 1922–32, we had paid $6,000,000,000 to foreign vessels in freight moneys and passenger fares.

Realizing that we were losing ground in world trade and were slipping into an alarming state of unpreparedness for national emergency, the Congress was aroused and passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This was a new deal for American shipping. Instead of Government operation of the greater part of our fleet, which followed World War I, private ownership, with Government cooperation, was made possible and a long-range policy for building new ships of improved types and operating them in regular service upon essential trade routes was adopted.

World War II found us more fully prepared to meet its early demands and, at the same time, to keep open available trade lanes than we were when World War I was thrust upon us. But, again, we had to pay for years of indifference and neglect of our merchant fleet and were forced to resort to a program of frenzied ship building at constantly rising costs. However, I believe military authorities are agreed that, except for our ability to meet the first impact of the war with the ships which had been built following passage of the act of 1936, the war would have been dangerously prolonged and might not have been won.

If we are to have future benefit from the billions of dollars spent for emergency shipbuilding during World War II, which has left us with ships having a deadweight capacity of more than 50,000,000 tons, many of them very fine vessels, and if we are to assert ourselves as a powerful force in world affairs, through international trade, we must have a merchant fleet fully adequate for both trade and defense under a program that will permit the consistent replacement of over-age ships with vessels of the most efficient type. To attain this objective, the American merchant marine must receive the support of American exporters and importers. We cannot give our trade to foreign ships and expect to keep a merchant fleet strong enough to maintain our economic freedom in times of peace and our military security in time of emergency or war.

At this time our ships are as good as, or better than, any in the world; our seamen are the best treated and the highest paid and our operating organizations are capable and strong. The American merchant marine generally is, as to cargo ships, in position to give American exporters and importers service of such character and efficiency as fully to deserve their support.

Our war-built fleet was, however, constructed primarily for the carrying of cargo and troops and we now find ourselves short of passenger vessels and of combination passenger-and-freight vessels which are necessary to balance our merchant marine and fully adapt it to efficient commercial use. These needs are receiving current attention. The President of the United States recently appointed a special committee of five outstanding businessmen to investigate the critical problems of the merchant marine. The Maritime Commission and members of its staff already have appeared before this committee; and shippers, ship owners, and others will be heard in due course. The men on this committee are of high caliber and the President should receive sound and constructive advice which, no doubt, will be passed along to Congress for such legislative action as may be appropriate.

The merchant marine is an industry necessary to our national defense and to the flow of the lifeblood of our business. Like any other commercial enterprise, it must, in order to survive and to provide continued service and employment, return a profit to its owners. And, with American ships and American crews, they must meet the competition of the world.

Other countries build ships more cheaply than we can and, because of the lower-than-American living standards of their people—with consequent lower wages for seamen and shore personnel and lower cost of supplies and upkeep—can operate them more cheaply than we can.

To make it possible for American ships to cope with such competition, our government authorized, through the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, the payment of subsidies to offset our higher-than-foreign construction and operating costs. Closely regulated and with provision for recapture by the Government of excess profits, these so-called subsidies actually do no more than make it possible for an American ship owner to purchase ships for what it would cost to build them abroad and reimburse him, in part, for the higher-than-foreign American wage, subsistence, maintenance, repair and insurance costs to which he is subjected through giving employment to American labor, both ashore and afloat, and by purchasing American materials and supplies, rather than foreign.

These equalizing aids are the price we pay to keep alive an industry which is an important instrument in international relations and a vital arm of our national defense and economic life.

Experience has proved that the price is not a very big one.

As a matter of fact, recapture provisions in the operating contracts may require the return to the Government of the full amount of operating subsidy paid to each subsidy contract holder; such provisions require that one-half of the profits in excess of 10 percent of the capital necessarily employed in the business, over a 10-year period, must be refunded to the Government. The first settlement period under this arrangement is nearly ended and the amount to be recaptured by the Government is almost equal to the total operating subsidy payments made during the 10-year period. The actual net outlay of Government funds in operating aids over the current 10-year period probably will amount to substantially less than $3,000,000 a year.

Compare this with the tremendous costs of emergency construction which have been forced upon us twice in one generation—consider the economic and national security benefits which the operation and existence of our vessels bring to us—and we find the Government is paying a very small insurance premium for an always valuable—and, in time of war, priceless—protection.

The Department of Commerce has estimated the United States will furnish about $16,200,000,000 in goods and services to other nations this year—an increase of $900,000,000 over 1946. It is estimated other countries will provide about $9,000,000,000 in goods and services to this country. Our combined exports and imports for 1947 will probably be 17 percent more than those of 1946.

I firmly believe the greater part of our foreign trade in the future will be with the Midcontinent and Gulf area of the United States.

Agricultural products have always represented a very substantial portion of our exports. In 1945, more than 61 percent of the national income from farm marketings originated in this area.

Manufacturing is definitely moving to the Midwest and South Central States—this area, to 1939, consistently showing an increase in its production of national manufacturers, while the entire Atlantic coast area reflected a decline.

During World War II, industrial facilities costing almost $10,000,000,000 were constructed by the Federal Government in the midcontinent and Gulf States. This was approximately 59 percent of all Government industrial facility contracts as against 28 percent in the Atlantic coast area and 13 percent in the Pacific mountain area.

After the war, private capital was invited to purchase or lease these properties for conversion to peacetime use. To March 31, 1947, property located in the midcontinent-south central area, originally costing more than $1,700,000,000, had been disposed of to private interests. This was 64 percent of the original cost of all plants sold or leased in all sections of the country to that time. Sales and leases in the Atlantic coast area, to the same date, were only 19 percent of the total taken over by private interests, while the Pacific mountain area absorbed only 17 percent. Pipe lines and sales of property to schools and public bodies for nonindustrial uses are not included in these percentages. This plainly shows that the natural drift of manufacturing to the midcontinent area of the United States, which had been taking place up to 1939, was greatly accelerated during the war and that the transfer of so many of these facilities to private industry since the cessation of hostilities portends much for the future productivity of this section.

In addition to these war-built plants, many millions of dollars have been invested or are being spent at the present time for new manufacturing facilities and plant expansion in this area—far more, I believe, than in any other section of the country.

Postwar surveys have shown that industrial employment in Omaha, St. Louis, Evansville, Kansas City, Memphis, and many other points in the Middle Western and Southern States greatly exceeds that of 1940.

The actual statistics on manufacturers have not been available since 1939, but I am confident an accurate survey made at this time would show that a substantially greater part of national manufacturing is today in the midcontinent-south central area.

I am also confident that the future development of this area will be greater, relatively, than that of any other portion of our country because, in addition to the great natural advantage and the abilities of its people, the area is one having benefits of protection afforded by the mountains paralleling our eastern and western coasts and it reasonably may be anticipated that our industries of national importance will be, for the most part, located within it. The development of our agricultural and mineral resources will similarly be accelerated.

This will tend to increase the volume of foreign trade through the Gulf ports, which are the logical gateways for much of the traffic that will originate, or terminate, in the Middle West.

Before World War I, when there were no dependable American-flag services at the Gulf ports—except a few to nearby Central American countries—the shipper in St. Louis or other midwestern points was at a competitive disadvantage with shippers nearer the eastern seaboard. If he required ocean service, he frequently had to ship via an Atlantic port or overland to the Pacific.

Today much of this handicap has been materially reduced by the maintenance of dependable American-flag services now available between Gulf ports and practically all ports of the world. During the 15-year period—1931 through 1946—the total tonnage of the port of New Orleans increased 100 percent, a larger increase by far than that shown by all the other ports of the United States. Exports showed a gain of 93 percent.

Coastwise tonnage was up 124 percent, and river traffic chalked up a gain of 349 percent.

To be prepared for the clearly evident demand of the future, the port of New Orleans is now proposing the construction of a supplementary outlet to the sea, known as the New Orleans tidewater seaway, which will supplement the present river channel to the Gulf with a more direct and quicker route and, at the same time, will make possible the extension of present berthing space for vessels and the installation of the most modern and efficient facilities for handling cargo and providing shipside storage, with ample and convenient car-handling facilities which should make available economies equal to those offered by any other port in the world.

The present wharf space at New Orleans now is operating close to the limit of its economic utility but the tidewater seaway, if authorized and constructed as recommended by the division engineer of the United States Army, will meet this situation and give access to ample space for extensions.

New Orleans is fully alive to the requirements of the great future of the midcontinent-so ıth central area and, with other Gulf ports, has taken definite action to insure the economical and expeditious handling of the traffic moving from and ipto that area.

And now for a concluding word on the outlook and future prospects for the American merchant marine.

Our wartime construction program brought us to the end of hostilities with a very large fleet. Many of the ships were of desirable type; others, built primarily for war service and to meet wartime needs, are not too well suited for commercial operation in the face of competition. Congress, in the Merchant Sales Act of 1946, set forth the formula by which the Maritime Commission is to dispose of the war-built vessels. Since the enactment of that act, the Commission has disposed of most, if not all, of the most desirable long-range vessels of the C types. In addition, a substantial number of liberty and other type ships have been sold.

Nearly all of the C type vessels have been purchased by American operators—although some, and a substantial number of the liberty-type vessels, have been sold to our allies of the war.

The American shipping industry generally feels that no further sales of war-built vessels should be made to foreigners since it is obvious that, should our Government continue to sell them additional vessels, it will only be a year or two before certain of the foreign governments will possess merchant fleets of an aggregate greater tonnage than they possessed in 1939, prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Europe. It is the feeling of the industry that our Government has fully satisfied any obligation it had to assist its allies in this direction.

For itself, the American shipping industry asks no undue consideration or concessions.

With continued and fair administration of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the industry will provide service second to none and, providing it, will keep in being an American fleet of modern, fast ships with continuous employment for experienced crews and operating personnel, shipyard, and other shore workers—ready for service in any national emergency.

The Mississippi Valley midcontinent area is destined, I firmly believe, to become the greatest productive and consuming area of our country. Its well-being will depend—in the future to greater extent than in the past—upon the shipping services which will convey its products to market and bring to it the materials which must come from across the seas.

Those services, in the interests of the area and of the Nation, which are inseparable, can best—and will most consistently—be supplied by American ships.

Memorial Day Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses at the services on the occasion of Memorial Day, Friday, May 30, 1947, at the twenty-eighth annual memorial services of the Richard J. McNally Post, No. 263, American Legion, New York City:

ADDRESS BY SAMUEL DAVIS, POST COMMANDER, CHAIRMAN

Friends and neighbors of the Richard J. McNally Post, American Legion, we are assembled here this afternoon to pay our humble tribute to the hallowed memory of the men and women of our armed forces of our country who gave their lives and made the supreme sacrifice in the service of our great Nation.

Their sacrifices have served not only to shield our Nation but the entire democratic peoples of the world.

By this humble tribute, we again avail ourselves of the honored privileged of rededicating ourselves to the service of these United States, and what it stands for and represents: Freedom, justice, liberty, and democracy.

It is an historical fact, that the human race has from time immemorial fought for liberty and freedom.

It was in these United States, however, that the greatest victory was achieved. Our Constitution, our principles of democracy, our democratic form of government, represent the greatest achievement in the struggle for liberty and freedom.

Here, in America, have come the persecuted peoples of every race and creed and from every nation in every corner of the world, to be fused into one people, and have emerged—the greatest miracle of the world—Americans.

The skeptics never believed it possible that from this melting pot would merge a great people, the people of these United States.

Think well, my fellow Americans in what a wonderful country we are privileged to live.

Remember, my friends that this Nation of ours can only survive by tolerence to your fellow Americans, be he of a different faith, or of a different color.

Ponder well, that this Nation can only survive, by justice and equal opportunity to all, be he Jew, or Gentile, be he black or white.

You live in the freest country of this universe. It is your solemn duty, both to yourself and to your children to see that these principles are adhered to.

The people of this Nation have a solemn obligation to perpetuate the principles of justice and equality for all.

You and I have the solemn duty to combat foreign ideologies that are inimical to our liberty and freedom as practiced in the United States. You must combat these ideologies to protect our democratic way of life.

The system of our American Government is our great heritage. The democratic spirit is our sacred inheritance. It must be cherished and preserved.

With these principles in our hearts, let us never forget that our hallowed comrades died, so that justice, freedom, liberty and democracy may survive.

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR HEYMAN, POST COMMANDER

Today we remember all our martial yesterdays. We honor those who gave up their tomorrows to guarantee ours. And we search for hope that our tomorrows will be different from our yesterdays and that no new generation of American youth will have to rewrite the guarantee.

Once again today's parade was a spectacle to kindle local pride. Riverside Drive again beheld the pagentry of uniformed thousands. Not a house along the route of march failed to fly the flag; not an onlooker who failed to thrill to the bugles and drums. The city of New York was proud of itself and prouder of the Nation. America was, is and always will be worth fighting for. Americanism is a pattern of life worth dying for.

But what of those who did die for it so that we the living might enjoy its fruits and freedoms.

Oratory is easy. Rhetoric is cheap. It is sacrifice that is hard, and total sacrifice was the price they paid for the security we have. But to show real appreciation of these sacrifices we must make every day a remembrance day. When the heroes we honor gave their lives for us, they also gave us a solemn obligation. That was to carry on the task for which they died. That task was to keep America safe and always American.

That is an every day assignment—a continuous job.

It calls for making America strong both for her own security and for her leadership toward enduring peace, to rid the world forever of bombs, bullies, and bigots.

It calls for a rebirth of old-fashioned Americanism to preserve the tried and tested virtues of democracy, justice, equality, and freedom of opportunity.

It calls for vigilance because that still remains the price of liberty.

Only in this way can we keep the faith with those who gave their last full measure of devotion to God and country.

By keeping this faith we shall make certain that our hero dead did not die in vain, that others shall not have to die to hold what has been paid for in the past with so much blood and treasure.

ADDRESS BY SAM E. DRIBBEN, POST ADJUTANT

We assemble here this afternoon to bow our heads in respectful memory of those brave men and women who gave their lives in defense of their country in times of war. They gave their lives because of love for their country; they gave their lives because of their belief in our form of government; they gave their lives because they believed in American traditions and ideals. Let us never forget the debt we owe them.

Our Government, instituted 170 years ago, has stood the acid test of time. It has been the symbol for all people who believe in freedom, opportunity, and tolerance. On two occasions, when the civilized world has cried out to save it from ruthless dictators, whose purpose it was to enslave others, America has responded to its plea and saved the world at a tremendous cost in the lives of young American men and women.

World War II is now history, but the world itself is in a rather unsettled frame of mind, and it is extremely unfortunate to see some who call themselves Americans, and who received their opportunities as Americans, criticizing the American way of life.

What a far cry it is from living conditions here in the United States and those of other countries. We do not deceive ourselves into believing that everything is perfect; that we have reached the end of the road to progress. We realize it is human to err; we understand that human nature sometimes is weak and that those to whom we have entrusted our affairs at times misplaced that trust, but recognizing all of our own shortcomings, all of our weaknesses as a nation, we still hold that conditions in America are a thousand times better than in other parts of the world; indeed, better than anywhere else in the

world. Here every citizen may worship God in his or her own way; here every child is guaranteed an education; here the poorest boy may rise to be the President of the United States; no citizen is too poor to have his or her own day in court; nowhere else in the world is the standard of living so high; nowhere is home life so comfortable or the pursuit of peace and happiness so secure. Compare these conditions to the conditions in other places and you will thank God you are an American citizen. It was because of that which I have just presented to you, and to protect and safeguard our American way of life, that the men and women whose memory we pay tribute to today gave their lives, and because of them let us rededicate ourselves to America and to the ideals of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Roosevelt; let us make America safe for only those who believe in the American way of life. Long live the United States of America.

Just a word or two on a subject I have touched upon in this community for many years past. It is the debt we owe to our less fortunate comrades in the hospitals; to the wounded, sick, and disabled; to their families and to the widowed and orphaned; for them the war is not yet over. Let us pledge ourselves to do all within our power to help lighten their burdens, to make their days on hospital cots cheerful and bright, and to see to it that they receive every recompense and comfort that we, a grateful people, can give them. Let this day of national observance and recognition be the occasion of our national rededication to those things which we prize and which we bequeath to the youth of America as a continuing heritage.

ADDRESS BY HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

Mr. Chairman and Commander Heyman, fellow veterans and friends and neighbors, we are gathered here today in a solemn service of memory, respect, and dedication for our neighbors and fellow Americans who have given the "last full measure of devotion" in World Wars I and II. What would they who are in the special heaven reserved for heroes ask us to speak of at such a time? Would they ask us to recount the days of their lives? Or would they rather that we considered that state of man and the world which caused them to be cut off in the flower of their youth in a foreign land and what we are doing and plan to do to eliminate the scourge of wars? I should rather think that what they whom we memorialize today have endured would make of them such loving philosophers that they would be entirely concerned with our plans for peace beyond all else.

For as our heroes look down from the Valhalla they see strewn all about us the wreckage—physical, spiritual, and moral—of a world; the sufferings of millions from hunger, depression, and fear; or, as martyred DP's and refugees in Europe, still in concentration camps, at the limit of despair. They see millions of others bewildered by the march of international events. They see the two greatest powers on earth engaged principally in baring their teeth at each other. How our heroes must wonder whether we shall in these circumstances avoid yet another war.

All of you have often been told that we live in the most challenging hour of mankind's destiny and that what we do now will determine the fate of the world for a thousand years. All of you have read so many newspapers and magazines about the destructive powers of the new atomic weapons that I am sure I need not torture you more with the gruesome details. We are all, I am sure, agreed that another war is indeed too terrible to contemplate; too terrible in a totally new sense because it promises the most awful destruction right here in our own country despite our geographic distance from those with whom we might fight.

There are, however, hopeful signs, too. First and foremost is the existence of the United Nations, a parliament of man where at the very least the nations of the world can discuss their differences and permit the impact of world opinion to operate upon them. Then there is the profound conviction in which all nations join—of the awful destructiveness of another war. And, finally, there are the growing ties of economic interdependence and of closer links in communications, transportation, and information which make the peoples of the world infinitely better acquainted with each other and truly, as a great American phrased it "one world."

But where, our heroes may ask, in all this is the individual, the citizen; and it is of the individual and the citizen that we should speak today. For it is in our minds and hearts that the memory of those who died in wars must generate a new spirit, a new understanding, and a new determination.

The spirit must be one of reverence for those who have suffered and died, and of dedication to the service which will seek to prevent its happening again. The understanding requires that the citizen shall know what is going on in the world which affects the cause of peace; the struggle with outworn social and economic ideas in China, India, and Indonesia; the struggle of freedom against the forces of reaction—whether of the left or the right—in countries like Greece; the struggle against feudalism in the Arab lands of the Middle East, and finally the heroic struggle of the Jewish people for justice in Palestine. All of these take study; great pains to acquire information and even greater pains in communicating it again to friends, neighbors, and associates who need to know what is going on.

And last is determination—the determination of the citizen that the informed public opinion so characteristic of our country shall truly rule its relations with the world. So, for example, occurs the crying need for our support of the part of the United States in world economic reconstruction; the recognition that with over 60 percent of the world's productive resources we must carry the responsibility for a major share of the world's postwar rehabilitation; the recognition of the fact that an expanding and prosperous United States is only possible in an expanding and prosperous world and that when we help world rehabilitation today, we are helping ourselves tomorrow. For desperate and hungry people without hope are easily made ripe for new-made adventures of war. We cannot hope to be healthy in a world sick with the contagion of hunger and despair; therefore our resources must be used for the relief of the hungry and the oppressed. So, too, we must support international justice under the United Nations and respect for international treaties and covenants, rather than the tyranny of men—even famous men—if we would have peace. In the final analysis, whether the millions we extend in aid to other nations will bear fruit in prosperity and good will must depend on our own administration of these millions, and that in turn will depend upon the continuous impact of an informed and enlightened public opinion in our own country on our own Government.

I want to emphasize that I am fully aware of our problems at home such, for example, as the No. 1 domestic problem of housing. The productive resources with which we came out of the war, however, are great enough to enable us to do our job effectively in the United States as well as in the world. After all we have two objectives—domestic prosperity and peace—one is to be found at home and the other abroad.

The fate of the world lies in the hands of all of you and of the other 140,000,000 Americans. It lies in our spirit and understanding, and our determination that as our heroes look down upon us today from above we dedicate ourselves to the full and joyous discharge of our responsibility for the fate of mankind as a duty beyond our jobs, our home, and our very lives. Let us pray together that this be so.

Veteran Preference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am including with my remarks an informative article that recently appeared in the magazine Foreign Service. The article is entitled "Veteran Preference—Now You See It, Now You Don't," and is written by the Honorable Omar B. Ketchum, director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars national legislative service. I commend the reading of this article:

With economy being stressed at every turn and the Federal Government launching a major scaling down of operations, the issue of veteran preference in civil service, long an administrative headache and economic conflict, is again in the spotlight and more acute than ever.

The peak of Federal civil employment within the continental limits of the United States was reached in June 1943, with 3,022,453 persons on the pay roll, while outside the continental limits the peak was reached in June of 1945, with 854,170 civilians drawing Federal checks.

The United States Civil Service Commission estimates the total number of Federal jobholders will be reduced to 2,100,000 by the end of June 1947, and by June 1948, the total will be further reduced to around 1,800,000. Upon comparing these 1947 and 1948 estimates with the peak load in June 1943 and 1945, it is understandable that a scramble for the remaining jobs is under way.

The percentage of veterans among Federal employees has risen from 16 percent in 1945 to approximately 42 percent at the present writing. The increase in the percentage of veterans is due in part to the sharp reduction in force among Federal employees and the application of veteran preference, although a substantial increase in the total number of veterans employed cannot be denied. From now on, however, the clash of economic interests will be much sharper and veterans hard put to hold the upper hand.

In April 1942, the United States Civil Service Commission, through Executive order, froze all permanent appointments in civil service and declared all future employment to be war-service appointments for the war duration and 6 months thereafter. This action was taken to preserve competitive civil-service opportunities for the millions of persons going in the armed forces. In February 1946 war-service appointments were discontinued and temporary, indefinite appointments were established while the change-over machinery, from war service to probationary appointments leading to permanent status, was put in motion.

In the change-over, all jobs held under war service appointments are either to be eliminated or subjected to competitive examination, requiring the temporary jobholder (veteran or nonveteran) to compete with other

veteran or nonveteran applicants for Government employment. The change-over has been slow and tedious, with a rising volume of complaints against permitting the temporary jobholders to hang on without competitive examinations.

In an effort to speed up the change-over and place war service jobs under competition, the United States Civil Service Commission has adopted a decentralized program, permitting certain Government agencies to set up their own boards of examiners, give examinations, grade papers, establish registers, and make appointments. Approximately 750 such boards of examiners and separate registers will be created under the decentralization program.

Vigorous objection was immediately raised by spokesmen of the major veteran organizations against the decentralization program on the grounds that it would minimize the value of veteran preference and lessen the opportunities of veterans to use their preference in competing for available jobs. Instead of their preference operating simultaneously from a few registers among the many agencies, veterans are now largely limited to jobs in a given agency unless they make applications, take examinations, and qualify on the several of the 750 separate registers.

It was pointed out by veteran spokesmen that even in one area, where several Government agencies operate, the veteran, to obtain maximum consideration, must apply at all the agencies, take several examinations, perhaps for the same type of job, and get on the various job registers. An example was cited by VFW Civil Service Officer George L. MacElroy, where a veteran applied at two different agencies for the same type of job, took two separate examinations, was qualified by one agency, and disqualified by the other.

The Civil Service Commission justifies the decentralization program on the grounds of economy and speed-up of the change-over from war service to permanent appointments. The Commission insists that decentralization is necessary where Congress will not appropriate sufficient funds to operate a centralized control, and that it will keep a close check and control on the individual agency operations to preserve veteran preference and assure maintenance of civil service rules and standards. Veteran spokesmen reply by admitting that decentralization will speed up the change-over, but that the over-all cost to the Federal Government will be more than if handled by the Commission under a central program, and that veterans will be the victims by reason of minimized opportunities to compete for available jobs. Chairman Ed Rees, of the House Civil Service Committee, expressed apprehension that decentralization might cause a reversion to the old spoils system.

In the meantime, the reduction-in-force program and the change-over are developing headaches for veteran organization civil service officers, uncovering absurdities and inequalities, as well as revealing some glaring weaknesses in the Veterans' Preference Act. Unsympathetic agency officials and personnel directors are seizing upon loopholes in the law to evade the clear intent and purpose of the act. Veterans, with excellent service and combat records, holding war service jobs, are being forced to yield their jobs to other veterans who can establish some degree of service-connected disability, even though the former made a high earned examination rating while the latter was barely able to get a passing grade by adding his 10 points to his earned grade, after which he automatically floats to the top of the list of applicants.

Chief among the headaches, giving rise to veteran appeal cases, is the policy of the Navy Department, in shipyards and installations, to seize upon a few words in the Veterans' Preference Act, "to promote the efficiency of the service," and interpret said language to mean that unless a veteran employee is better qualified than a nonveteran the efficiency of the service is promoted by demoting or terminating the veteran and retaining the nonveteran.

As a result of this Navy policy a demotion program applied in conjunction with reduction in force has thrown hundreds of veterans out of supervisory positions in navy yards while nonveterans, reduced from a higher level, retain the jobs vacated by veterans who were performing satisfactory service with efficiency ratings of good or better. Hard-nosed Navy spokesmen, prodded by nonveteran supervisory organizations, profess respect for veterans but insist that it would be contrary to efficiency to retain a satisfactory veteran when there is a better qualified nonveteran available. Navy is somewhat vague on how the better qualified determination is made.

Another trick, frequently employed, to bypass or evade veteran preference is downgrading veterans in efficiency ratings below the level of good and thereby removing them from under the protection of preference. Not infrequently, a veteran, who for years has been receiving efficiency ratings of good or better, suddenly is confronted with a rating of less than good and finds himself on the way out. Although an appeal from the rating is open to the veteran, it is usually a long-drawn out and costly action with no assurance of success. Most veterans, under these circumstances, take it on the chin rather than fight it out to the bitter end.

A group of veterans in the Boston, Brooklyn, and Norfolk Navy Yards, however, chose to fight it out with appeal cases when socked by the Navy in the demotion program. Represented by veteran spokesmen from the navy yards, civil-service officers of the major veteran organizations, including V. F. W.'s hard hitting George MacElroy, the appeals were carried from local to regional to central board of appeals and finally dumped in the lap of the three members of the Civil Service Commission itself.

After long and almost continuous conferences between veteran spokesmen, Civil Service officials, Navy brass, and the House Civil Service Committee, the Civil Service Commission handed down a decision which was a smacking victory for the veteran appellants and a set-back for the Navy as well as all other agencies guilty of this policy. The Commission found that the Navy, in its demotion program, had not followed the procedure required in the Veterans Preference Act and ordered it to:

1. Restore to duty, in their former positions, all veterans who had been wrongfully demoted or separated.

2. Require written notice, 30 days in advance of demotion or separation, giving full and complete reasons for such action, explaining and justifying in detail why the veterans were selected for demotion or termination and how it would promote the efficiency of the service. Each veteran affected shall be given such notice and explanation.

3. Permit the veteran to file an appeal, giving him access to all information pertaining to the nonveterans who are to be retained, and present evidence showing that it would not necessarily promote the efficiency of the service to demote him while retaining a nonveteran.

In a conference, following the Commission decision, the Navy Department promised to follow the order and explained how they proposed to carry out the procedure. All veterans would be restored to duty, if available and desiring restoration, and all jobs would be resurveyed with the view of again instituting demotion in accordance with Commission requirements.

When questioned as to how they could satisfactorily explain and justify the demotion of a veteran supervisor, satisfactorily performing his duties, in order to retain a nonveteran dropping down from a higher level, Navy spokesmen were frank to state that if it could not be justified it would not be tried and that the new procedure would probably result in many veterans being retained while nonveteran supervisors might be forced to drop through all the various levels and out through the gate.

Regardless of the temporary victory and the more reasonable attitude of the Navy Department, veteran organizations are on the alert and prepared to handle appeal cases where the veteran has been selected for demotion or termination. A lively battle is predicted on appeal cases where it is contended the veteran was demoted and his place was filled by a better qualified nonveteran to "promote the efficiency of the service."

As a result of continuous study of veteran preference problems developing in the reduction-in-force program; the change-over from war service to permanent status; and almost daily conferences with representatives of the Civil Service Commission, agency supervisors and Members of Congress, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, through its national employment service and national legislative committee, is advocating the following points:

1. No permanent status veteran civil-service employee, satisfactorily performing his duty, shall be demoted and displaced by a permanent status nonveteran employee who is being demoted from a high level.

2. No war-service veteran employee, satisfactorily performing his duty, shall be demoted and displaced by a war-service nonveteran employee who is being demoted from a higher level.

3. No permanent-status veteran employee, satisfactorily performing his duties, shall be demoted or terminated as long as there are war-service nonveterans occupying positions on the same or higher level for which the veteran may qualify.

4. Permanent-status veterans, with reemployment rights, shall be given an opportunity to qualify for higher level jobs occupied by war-service nonveteran employees.

5. Veterans who have been wrongfully or illegally separated from their jobs, or have been unduly delayed in being restored to employment under reemployment rights, shall, upon reinstatement or reemployment, be compensated for the period of waiting.

6. The decision of the Civil Service Commission recommending that a veteran be restored to employment, following appeal, shall be mandatory and binding on the agency involved.

7. That the language in section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act, "shall not be demoted * * * except for cause to promote the efficiency of the service" shall not be interpreted to mean that unless the veteran is better qualified than the nonveteran, the efficiency of the service would be promoted to retain the nonveteran and demote or terminate the veteran.

In order to strengthen and justify veteran preference, and to eliminate discrimination and inequalities between veterans competing for civil-service jobs, the VFW national legislative committee recommends the following changes in the Veterans' Preference Act:

1. Require the veteran applicant for a civil-service job to meet the minimum requirements and make an earned passing grade before adding his preference points.

2. Require that a veteran applicant for a civil-service job establish a compensable degree of service-connected disability (10 percent or more) before being eligible for the special 10-point disability preference which automatically "floats" the disabled veteran to the top of the register.

Airplane Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the country was shocked over the past week end by the two tragic airplane accidents. It seems almost unbelievable that anyone would try to take advantage of such tragedy to accomplish their own selfish purposes.

Secretary of Commerce Harriman was quoted in Monday's Washington newspapers as warning that air accidents would increase if the Senate concurred in House-approved appropriations cutting $70,000,000 from CAA funds.

This statement could only have been issued to make people believe that in some way these recent crashes were due to lack of safety equipment on our air lines. All the money the Congress could appropriate for ILS or any other known safety device could not have prevented either the New York or the Maryland accidents. Nor will the cut of $70,000,000 from the CAA appropriation for next year increase one iota the hazards of air travel in the United States.

Secretary Harriman was further quoted as saying that air travel is eight times more hazardous than railroad or bus travel. As a matter of fact, figures released from Secretary Harriman's own Department showed that there were 2.4 fatalities for every hundred million passenger miles traveled on the railroads in 1945 and 2.5 fatalities on our regularly scheduled commercial air lines. In a 3-year period, from 1943 to 1945, there were 2.5 fatalities for the railroads and only 2.4 for the air lines.

We all want our air lines made as safe as possible, but the spending of unnecessary millions of tax dollars will not in itself add to safety. The record is quite clear that the investigation of air-line crashes started last January by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee stirred up more activity in the CAA and the CAB than has been apparent for many months.

The Secretary of Commerce's attempt to blame an economy-minded Congress for airplane accidents will not fool the American taxpayer.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on Memorial Day at Norwalk, Conn.:

My fellow citizens and friends, 79 years ago Americans first celebrated Memorial Day in homage to the gallant men who fell in the war to preserve the Union. Today we honor also the memory of those who since that day have given their lives not only to preserve the Union but to preserve inviolate and vigorous for future generations the flame of liberty. We Americans have always loved peace. But we have always also preferred to fight rather than accept a peace based on human bondage. Americans have preferred death in battle to a peace imposed by tyrants. We have been true to our traditions by choosing the exhaustion, the despair, the suffering, and the death of war instead of the abject surrender of a dishonorable peace. We have understood the grim challenge of war and we have shown, for all the world to see, that we possess the manly virtues necessary to pursue to a victorious end a war based on justice and carrying in its relentless onward sweep the high hopes of mankind for a more abundant life.

Now we are faced with the challenge of peace. We must also understand this challenge if we are to salvage from the desolation of the recent war some of the things for which the war was fought. We must meet this challenge if we are to vindicate the sacrifices of the brave men whom we honor today; if we are to provide a resounding demonstration to a desperate world that these men and women did not die in vain.

In order to do this, we must realize that there is no sharp dividing line between war and peace. Wars are but extensions of peacetime conflicts, the final confession of man's inability to solve his problems by peaceful means. Accordingly we must learn to be as militant in peace as we have to be in order to win a war. If we do not learn that lesson, we shall inevitably reap another war. We must keep our noble purpose undiminished while we learn to face the grim realities of the modern world. We are not loathe to deal with realities in time of war. When the perils of war surround us, when nations are engaged in mortal combat and men fight to kill, the challenge is clear and the issue clear-cut and overpowering. We must win the war. So much is certain, and that much is sufficient to call forth the realism and summon the courage of an entire people. In the hot flush of battle, under the impact of lethal weapons, men find the steady purpose and calm resolve to face the facts of war and to devise ways and means to defeat the enemy. This is never accomplished by wishful thinking but by the ascertaining of facts and the concoction of means to meet existing conditions.

But when the heat of battle is over there arises an unwillingness to face the facts, and with this unwillingness a desire to accomplish overnight at a peace table what has not been accomplished in all recorded history. The strain of war has been such that it seems there is no strength left to cope with the problems of peace, which, if the truth were known, are equally grim and urgent. Then, if we are not vigilant, heroism gives way to apathy, self-sacrifice to self-indulgence, national dignity and pride to national depravity and indolence. And at that very moment, amid the ruins of the war itself, the germ of the next war is born.

We are at this very moment in the midst of a great moral crisis. The solution to this crisis will not be found in procedural remedies, organizational devices, or governmental hand-outs. It will be found only in the manner in which the individual discharges his or her individual responsibilities, for the challenge of peace is a moral challenge. Moral forces are intangible and difficult to assess, and yet the only sure way to help the peace is to be forever mindful of the moral forces surrounding us, for it is because of our failure to meet the challenge of peace that we must inevitably accept the challenge of war or succumb.

Now, the challenge of peace runs the whole gamut of the challenge of life itself. Just as individuals are judged by their ability to meet the emergencies of life, so it is with nations. Accordingly, in order to preserve peace, we must not only give our attention to the political, diplomatic, military, and economic implications of our world commitments but we must also look with a large and steady eye at ourselves and attempt to improve our own society, casting, so to speak, the beam from our own eye. This is by no means an easy task, and we shall make it no easier by our refusal to face the facts.

We must, of course, be stanch in our opposition to such subversive and barbaric forces as communism. But we should not blame communism, just as we once blamed nazism, for all the troubles with which we are beset. We must realize that these forces will make headway only as we fail to meet the moral challenge—only as we do not grasp the rich opportunities which our free system brings to every American. The struggle is not over. This is no time to grow tired.

In these days of tension and uncertainty we shall do well to to remember the challenge as we met it in the early part of the war when Britain was reeling, when the Germans were at Stalingrad, and when the Japanese were at Manila. We shall be wise not to forget the pain and the suffering, the cries of the wounded and the shrieks of the dying, the devastation and misery, the famine and degradation, the cruelty and horror which characterized World War II. We shall be well advised to recall that while the Japanese were attacking Pearl Harbor we were training with broomsticks, that while the French were overpowered we were protected by two merciful oceans, and then, if we are not only wise but humble, we shall say, "There but for the grace of God go I." We must learn from these tragic mistakes of the recent past.

Now gathered as we are on this Memorial Day in the blessed freedom of our beloved America, amid the beauty and comfort of a New England spring, let us solemnly recognize that the men and women who died in the cause of freedom gave their lives in order that we might have the opportunity to meet the challenge of peace. Daniel Webster said, "God grants peace only to those who love it and are always ready to safeguard and defend it." Are we determined to be free and fearless? Are we prepared to dedicate our lives and our wealth toward the protection of freedom at home and the spreading of freedom abroad, or shall we look the other way while the frontiers of freedom shrink? Shall we conduct an unworthy retreat from life until at the last the forces of freedom are ignominiously routed and overwhelmed within our own borders?

We cannot be oblivious to the desolation and woe of a ravished world. Robert E. Lee said, "Human virtue should be equal to human calamity." This is a task which we must undertake not only as a matter of humanity but particularly as a matter of national self-interest and in the cause of peace. We know that chaos and human misery breed communism. We know, when we look around us, that the concept of human liberty for which we fought in 1776 is still the great revolutionary force for which we must continue to struggle. It remains the essential discovery of our time, but it will perish unless it is constantly nourished with the dynamic faith of the American people.

Let us, then, as we mourn the passing of those who gave their lives for their country, regard this day as more than a ceremonial

lip service to the innumerable caravans of death. Let it instead provide us with a mighty compulsion to accept the great responsibilities which constitute the price of liberty. Our dead gave their lives for freedom. Let us now live for this transcendent truth. We know that we must discharge our responsibilities to other men and renew our faith in freedom in order for freedom to survive. Freedom and responsibility are inseparable.

This ceremony is, therefore, not only one of commemoration but also, and above all, one of rededication to the unfinished task for which these departed soldiers and sailors gave "the last true measure of devotion."

Post Office Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Geo. E. Sokolsky from the Washington Times-Herald of June 4, 1947:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The most usual contact that most Americans have with their Government is with the post office and the postman. The post office does a huge business at a deficiency. Postmen are poorly paid in comparison even with other Government employees. Post offices are usually dirty, ill-kept places, except in those colossal, ornate marble and granite buildings erected wastefully and beyond practical needs.

Of course, there are plenty of exceptions and this is not intended as a reflection on the men down the line, but on the incompetence of the politicians who operate this business enterprise.

The real trouble is that the politician appointed to run the post office is usually either chairman of the Republican or the Democratic national committee and therefore has no time to operate the business for which the taxpayer pays him a salary.

The present Postmaster General, for one reason or another, is not around too much to manage this business. Its policies are made by the permanent subordinates who, at any rate, know that a stamp is not something exclusively for philatelists.

Each year the post office comes to Congress to make up a deficit. Nobody investigates why the post office has a deficit. Nobody tries to find out why it cannot be run efficiently. The problem is to make up the deficit.

The Democrats for 15 years wangled this problem without too much trouble, because they did not care how much they spent. The Republicans, who should shake out the waste in Government, take the post office's word for it that there is a deficit and decide that one way to make it up is to add $8,200,000 by a new tax on the users of second-class mail.

And they justify the discrimination by the New Deal doctrine that the more competent and successful should be penalized in the interest of the smaller units. It was generally thought that that doctrine died with Harry Hopkins.

The post office asks for an appropriation of $1,500,000,000, which is more than they are spending this year and is twice as much as during the prewar years.

The types of publications selected for soaking are metropolitan newspapers, farm journals, and national magazines. All other publications will be exempt from the new provisions. Small newspapers are exempt; labor, religious, fraternal, and veteran publications are exempt.

The large magazines will really carry the full load, which is what the Post Office plans should be the case. The 15 large, national-circulation magazines are the ones that are to be soaked. These magazines generally pay their way completely; that is, they paid $6,579,080 in postal receipts against $6,570,332 in ascertained postal costs for the fiscal year June 30, 1945.

Now, generally speaking, very few care about the other fellow being soaked, so those who are exempt will be well pleased that the load has been passed to the other fellow. If, however, these 15 discover some way of getting out from under, by rearranging their publishing or some other means, the deficit will be there again next year and somebody now exempt will have to be soaked. So passing the buck does not solve the problem.

The way to solve this problem is to discover who says there is a deficit and why. The administration ought to hire one of the great business engineering firms of this country to study the Post Office as a business enterprise, with the object of reorganizing it so that it functions right.

Cutting air mail for spotlight politics and then searching around for some place to tack on the deficit is not a business operation. Nor is it a business operation to promote one kind of mail against another—air mail against ordinary mail—and then to send air mail by train, without a rebate to the sender, as was done for many years.

All these shenanigans represent nothing realistic. Soaking the 15 big magazines will probably bring no additional revenue, but it looks like good politics to soak the successful. Good politics for whom? For the Postmaster General or for the country?

Fight Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt of an address by Tom C. Clark, Attorney General, before the national convention dinner of B'nai B'rith, May 12, 1947:

But, my friends, all of the armament, legal or otherwise, in the world cannot prevail against ideals. It was an ideal—the flaming zeal to make democracy a living fact—which carried our ancestors safely through the trying times of the War for Independence. But there is another type, the insidious infiltration of propaganda by the Communist Party, by bigoted Fascist-minded groups like the Ku Klux Klan and the Columbians, and by other nefarious organizations which would destroy our unity and with it our way of life. I am very proud that your organization is in the forefront fighting against communism in this country, as so forcefully stated in a recent issue of the National Jewish Monthly:

"We are opposed to communism in the United States. We are opposed to it because it would substitute for our present social freedoms the dictatorship that would mean the end of free speech, free press, free religious assemblage. There is nothing wrong with democracy that more democracy won't cure."

Oh, how true; let me repeat, "There is nothing wrong with democracy that more democracy won't cure."

Agricultural Research in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a communication from Mr. W. Carroll Hunter, Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, respecting the authority of the Congress to modify an act of the Territorial Legislature of Alaska appropriating funds to the University of Alaska by altering the control and supervision of their expenditure. The opinion of the Solicitor follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1947.

To: The Solicitor.
From: Associate Solicitor on Litigation.
Subject: Authority of Congress to modify appropriation act of the Territory of Alaska and to make Territorial and Federal funds for the Alaskan Experiment Station subject to control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Congressman DIRKSEN has requested our views concerning the authority of Congress to restrict the expenditure of funds heretofore appropriated by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska and the funds to be appropriated by Congress for experimental and research activities in Alaska under the Hatch, Adams, and Purnell Acts. The latter acts authorize appropriations for grants to the States and Territories for expenditure by the agricultural experiment stations that are attached to the land-grant colleges. The purpose of the grants is to enable the experiment stations to carry on experimental and research activities in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

I understand that the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska has appropriated for the University of Alaska certain funds to be expended on experimental and research work in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture pursuant to these acts. The legislature has completed its work and has adjourned. The money so appropriated by the Territorial legislature and the money that Congress customarily appropriates for such work is normally subject to the control of the governing body of the University of Alaska.

I am informed that it is desired to alter this arrangement by providing that the sum already appropriated by the Territorial legislature, together with the funds to be appropriated by Congress, shall be used for the conduct of such work under the direction and control of the Secretary of Agriculture. The legal question presented is whether Congress may modify the act of the Territorial legislature appropriating funds to the University of Alaska by altering the control and supervision of their expenditure.

Article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the Constitution authorizes Congress "to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." It is well settled that under this provision Congress has plenary authority

to legislate with respect to the territories of the United States. This power may be exercised directly, or it may be exercised indirectly through local legislatures established in the Territories. In the case of Alaska Congress has followed both procedures. Prior to 1912 Alaska had a judicial and an executive system, but it had no legislature. (Organic Act for Alaska, May 17, 1884, 23 Stat. 24). During that period Congress legislated directly for the Territory, imposed local taxes (e. g., act of June 26, 1906, 34 Stat. 478, 48 U. S. C. 230), and provided for the use of local taxes to support the local government (48 U. S. C. 41). Its authority to do so was affirmed by the Supreme Court (*Binns* v. *United States*, 194 U. S. 486). Since 1912 Alaska has had a legislature with general legislative power subject to limitations specifically imposed by Congress (act of August 24, 1912, 37 Stat. 512, 48 U. S. C. 67–90). Although the creation of local legislature presumably relieved Congress to some extent of the necessity of acting in that capacity, Congress has nevertheless enacted a substantial amount of local legislation since that time. (See Pocket Supplement to 48 U. S. C. A. for laws enacted since December 7, 1925.)

The Supreme Court has held that in the exercise of its plenary power over the Territory of the United States the Congress may annul or modify any act of a Territorial legislature. (*First National Bank* v. *Yankton* (101 U. S. 129); *Church of Jesus Christ of L. D. S.* v. *United States* (136 U. S. 1); *Cincinnati Soap Co.* v. *United States* (301 U. S. 308); *Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co.* v. *Hawaii* (304 U. S. 306); *Downes* v. *Bidwell* (182 U. S. 244); Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, vol. 1, p. 78, footnote 1.)

In *First National Bank* v. *Yankton*, Congress had disapproved an act of the legislature of the Territory of Dakota and then reenacted it for limited purposes. In affirming the authority of Congress to do so, the Supreme Court said:

"In the organic act of Dakota there was not an express reservation of power in Congress to amend the acts of the Territorial legislature, nor was it necessary. Such a power is an incident of sovereignty, and continues until granted away. Congress may not only abrogate laws of the Territorial legislatures, but it may itself legislate directly for the local government. It may make a void act of the Territorial legislature valid, and a valid act void. In other words, it has full and complete legislative authority over the people of the Territories and all the departments of the Territorial governments. It may do for the Territories what the people, under the Constitution of the United States, may do for the States."

In *Church of Jesus Christ of L. D. S.* v. *United States*, Congress had disapproved an act of the legislature of the Territory of Utah incorporating the Mormon Church. In affirming the authority of Congress to do so, the Supreme Court said:

"But it is too plain for argument that this charter, or enactment, was subject to revocation and repeal by Congress whenever it should see fit to exercise its power for that purpose. Like any other act of the Territorial legislature, it was subject to this condition. Not only so, but the power of Congress could be exercised in modifying or limiting the powers and privileges granted by such charter for if it could repeal, it could modify; the greater includes the less. Hence there can be no question that the act of July 1, 1862, already recited, was a valid exercise of congressional power. Whatever may be the effect or true construction of this act, we have no doubt of its validity."

This case was referred to and quoted with approval by the Supreme Court in the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. case, which involved an act of the legislature of Hawaii.

In view of the unbroken line of precedents sustaining the power of the Congress to make all laws necessary for the government of its Territories, it is clear that Congress may modify the appropriation act of the Legislature of Alaska and provide for the expenditure of the sums appropriated to the University of Alaska to carry on agricultural research in a manner prescribed by Congress. Mr. DIRKSEN'S objective would be accomplished by inserting in the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, at the end of the paragraph entitled "Office of Experiment Stations, Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico," the following language:

"*Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the laws of the Territory of Alaska, the funds herein appropriated for payment to Alaska and the funds heretofore appropriated by the legislature of the Territory of Alaska for experimental and research work under said acts shall be disbursed under the direction and control of the Secretary of Agriculture in such manner and for such experimental and research activities within the scope of said acts as may be designated by him; and the facilities of the University of Alaska shall be made available for such activities upon request of the Secretary."

Approved, April 9, 1947.

W. CARROLL HUNTER, *Solicitor.*

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolutions:

MASSACHUSETTS ALLIED VETERANS' HOUSING COUNCIL BUDDIES CLUB,
Boston, Mass., May 20, 1947.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: This is merely to thank you cordially for having taken the trouble to appear at the Faneuil Hall housing rally and also to express our warm approval for your strong unequivocal support of the vital Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

We would further like you to know that we are writing strong letters to the other Massachusetts Representatives expressing our feelings about their attitudes toward this measure.

For your convenience we are enclosing a list of the most common allegations made by the opposition although we realize you are all too familiar with them by now. We are also enclosing the latest statistical position on housing in Massachusetts.

EDWARD PRATT,
Department Commander, American Veterans Committee of Massachusetts.
WILLARD IDE SHATTUCK, Jr.,
Department Commander, American Veterans of World War II.
PHILIP V. LORY,
Department Commander, Disabled American Veterans.
DAVID LASKER,
Department Commander, Jewish War Veterans of the United States.
BERNARD J. CURTIN, Jr.,
Department Commander, Marine Corps League.
JAS. P. REYNOLDS,
Department Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

At a regular meeting of George Dilboy Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held at its headquarters, No. 371 Summer Street, Somerville, Mass., on May 19, 1947, a quorum of the membership present and voting, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the dire need of housing accommodations for our returned servicemen is a known-well fact; and

"Whereas this need has not been met by any remedial action by local, State, or Federal agencies; and

"Whereas Federal regulations and curbs hamper the possible chance of low-cost housing; and

"Whereas the cost of new building is an outrage to the average workingman in his economic set-up after return to peacetime pursuits; and

"Whereas family relations have become strained by the lack of proper individual family homes and in too many cases are ending in the divorce courts: Be it

"*Resolved*, That George Dilboy Post, No. 529, VFW, on behalf of its membership urges the adoption and passage of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to the end that some measure of relief will be granted, and that the Members of Congress representing this district be so advised."

JOHN A. MANSSELL, *Commander.*

A true copy.

Attest:

ERNEST P. RILEY, *Adjutant.*

Resolution adopted at the annual meeting of Massachusetts State Council, Knights of Columbus, held at Worcester, Mass., May 12, 1947:

"Whereas all the forces of our Nation were utilized to bring to a successful conclusion World War II; and

"Whereas we have a duty to our returned war veterans to see to it that they can reorient themselves to a peacetime economy; and

"Whereas the family is the basic unit of society: Be it hereby

"*Resolved*, That we urge the Massachusetts representatives in the Congress of the United States to take favorable action on the pending Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill which in effect would relieve the present housing shortage."

Development of Modern Amphibious Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, several marines have requested the following article from the Washington Post of June 1, 1947, be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This article gives the history of the development of modern amphibious warfare:

AMPHIBIOUS OPERATIONS

In your May 28 editorial, Integrating Our Armed Services, I note your statement to the effect that there is dispute as to whether or not the Marine Corps pioneered the development of modern amphibious operations.

It has been said that facts speak for themselves. Let me present the following facts in chronological sequence:

1. 1921: The East and West Coast Expeditionary Forces, United States Marine Corps, were formed as offensive landing forces for

service with the United States Fleet. That was exactly 20 years prior to the training of any major Army unit for amphibious operations.

2. 1929: The Marine Corps schools at Quantico issued the first doctrinal studies on the conduct of modern assault landing operations ever to be promulgated within the armed forces.

3. 1933: The East and West Coast Expeditionary Forces were reorganized and increased in strength under new designation as the Fleet Marine Force, incorporated as an integral part of the United States Fleet for conduct of amphibious operations in the seizure and defense of advanced bases. The Marine Corps Equipment Board, the first professional body in the United States to devote its major efforts to development of military matériel for use in amphibious operations, was likewise organized.

4. 1935: Fleet landing exercise 1, the first modern amphibious maneuver in the history of the United States, was conducted by the Fleet Marine Force at Culebra, P. R. No Army troops participated. Marine Corps schools also issued a Tentative Landing Operations Manual, the first complete manual in the military history of the United States to be devoted to the technique and doctrines of amphibious operations.

5. 1935–41: The Fleet Marine Force, in conjunction with the United States Fleet, conducted annual large-scale amphibious maneuvers in the Caribbean or Pacific. Army participation in these amphibious assault maneuvers was limited to one instance (1937), when a hastily organized provisional force numbering less than 2,000 received amphibious training under direction of the Fleet Marine Force at San Clemente Island, Calif.

6. 1938: The Marine Corps schools' Tentative Landing Operations Manual was adopted intact by the United States Navy under title of FTP-167, Landing Operations Doctrine, United States Navy.

7. 1941: The United States Army issued Field Manual 31–5, the first Army publication ever devoted to modern landing operations. The preface of FM 31–5 stated (over General Marshall's signature) as follows:

"This manual is based to a large extent on Landing Operations Doctrine, United States Navy, 1938. The arrangement of subject matter is similar to the Navy publication and many of the illustrations are taken from it."

In other words the Army admitted in June 1941, that its initial publication dealing with landing operations was directly based upon the 1935 Tentative Landing Operations Manual of Marine Corps schools.

8. 1941–42: The First, Third, and Ninth Infantry Divisions, which composed the entire assault infantry component in the north African landings, received their amphibious training under direction of Fleet Marine Force commanders and their staffs, and with the assistance and support of the Fleet Marine Force. These were the first major Army units to be trained for amphibious assault (exactly 20 years after formation of the East and West Coast Expeditionary Forces of the Marine Corps).

9. 1942–44: Marine Corps training agencies completed the amphibious training of the Seventh, Eighty-first, Ninety-sixth, and Ninety-seventh Army Infantry Divisions, as well as ATF-9 Thirteenth Canadian Brigade, Seventh Infantry Division, Fifty-third and One Hundred Eighty-fourth Army Regimental Combat teams), a provisional corps organized for amphibious operations in the Aleutians.

In summary, therefore, you will note that the Marine Corps organized major forces for the conduct of landing operations well prior to the Army; the basic landing operations doctrines of both the Army and the Navy were originated at Marine Corps schools; the Marine Corps, without Army participation, conducted the first modern amphibious landing maneuvers in the history of the United States, and the Marine Corps trained the first three Army divisions to be indoctrinated in amphibious operations (followed by several more).

In light of all this, can you still say that there is dispute as to whether the Marine Corps pioneered the development of modern amphibious operations?

R. D. HEINL, Jr.,
Lieutenant Colonel, USMC.

WASHINGTON.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—We, of course, intended no disrespect for the Marine Corps in our editorial. Actually we called for more protection for the Marines in the merger bill. What we said was: "Admiral Zacharias is on disputatious ground when he gives the Marines sole credit for developing the technique of amphibious operations." Granted that the Marines had the primary role in pioneering this technique, surely our correspondent would not deny that the Army added to the development through the lessons it learned and applied from such landings as that at Anzio.)

Congressional Voting Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from New Orleans States of May 28, 1947:

THROW LIGHT ON VOTING RECORDS

In the House of Representatives is a bill by Representative BOGGS, of Louisiana's Second Congressional District, which we believe should become law—if it ever gets out of committee.

It is a very short bill. It provides that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting records of the Congressmen to any 10 citizens who write for such a record, or any publication which desires such a record.

A voter today cannot get such information from the Congress without authorization of the Member whose voting record is sought.

As an indication of the manner in which the Library of Congress is conducted, on taxpayers' money, for the benefit of the Members we reproduce herewith part of a letter in reply to a request for the voting record of a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT,
SERIALS DIVISION,
May 29, 1936.

It is the policy of the Library of Congress not to furnish information about a Member's voting record except at the request of the Member himself. However, this information appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a file of which will be found in your public library.

For the Librarian of Congress.
Very truly yours,
H. A. PARSONS,
Chief, Serials Division.

Of course, it can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Every roll call is printed there. And if you haven't time to read it every day, and you haven't time to keep a file, or you haven't time to dig back over months and years, you just will not get it.

The Library of Congress won't give it to you.

But if the Boggs bill becomes law the taxpayers can get this information.

This bill has been in the Committee on House Administration since it was introduced on March 21, 1947. It has received widespread editorial support, and should receive the support of all persons interested in the voting record of the men in Washington who represent them in the House and in the Senate.

What is holding this bill up? Why hasn't it come to the floor for a vote?

The only Members of Congress who, in our opinion, would be against such a bill are those who don't want their records known. The Congress should cut this red tape and allow the citizens they represent to have immediate and full access to their records.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

CAMBRIDGE COMMITTEE FOR
A LIVING WAGE,
Cambridge, Mass., May 20, 1947.

Hon. JOHN KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KENNEDY: The following statement, signed by the 57 prominent Cambridge citizens listed below, has been issued to the press by the Cambridge Committee for a Living Wage. We are sending it to you for your earnest consideration.

"America is now moving toward a serious economic crisis at home. Prices and profits have soared, while wages have lagged far behind. The purchasing power of the people is falling off rapidly, which means inevitable hardship for the whole community—labor, professional, and small business groups alike. A powerful group in Congress is trying to silence the American people through political intimidation and by emasculating their united labor strength.

"The Hartley, Taft, and Ball antilabor bills are designed to abrogate our most fundamental rights and freedoms. They take away, for all practical purposes, the rights of working people to strike or to form effective union organization to protect and advance their living standards and working conditions. They openly flout traditional civil liberties.

"We emphasize that there is no such thing as a labor monopoly as has been charged in the Congress. Collective bargaining through strong unions gives workingmen only an equal voice with management in determining the price of labor. We agree with CIO President Philip Murray who said, 'the enactment of this contemplated legislation is the first real step toward the development of fascism in the United States of America.'

"In this hour of crisis facing America, we are reminded of the unequivocal statement made by Abraham Lincoln: 'All that harms labor is treason to America. No line can be drawn between these two. If any man tells you he loves America, yet he hates labor, he is a liar. If any man tells you he trusts America, yet fears labor, he is a fool. There is no America without labor.'

"We citizens of Cambridge, Mass., call upon the President, the Congress, and the people

to defeat all antilabor bills, and to work with renewed faith and vigor for the advancement of the political, economic, and social well-being of the American people."

Statement signed by Rhoda Truax Aldrich, 46 Shepard Street; Adele P. Bragar, 20 Ware Street; Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Cauman, 27 Shepard Street; Julia Newbold Clark, 8 Plympton Street; Noyes and Olga Collinson, 12 Concord Avenue; Mr. and Mrs. Richard L. Edsall, 15 Walker Street; Mary Eubanks, 13 Field Street; Kathleen Forbes, 62 Coolidge Avenue; Mr. and Mrs. William Gilbert, 94 Foster Street; M. K. Grossman, 146 Oxford Street; Mary T. Henderson, 70 Francis Avenue; L. J. Holmes, 119 Fayerweather Street; Rev. Kenneth and Mrs. Constance Hughes, 64 Gorham Street; Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Korb, 36 Highland Avenue; Florence H. Luscomb, 29 Bowdoin Street; Rabbi Hugo Mantel, 74 Highland Avenue; Judith Matlock, 139 Oxford Street; Jeanne and Frieda Pearlson, 52 Lee Street; Ashton Sanborn, 147 Brattle Street; Margaret E. Smith, 121 Brattle Street; Edna H. Sobel, M. D., 1675 Massachusetts Avenue; Somers H. Sturgis, M. D., 47 Raymond Street; Rebecca Wasserman, 355 Massachusetts Avenue; Dr. Mary C. Wright, 181 Windsor Street; Dr. and Mrs. Isadore Amdur, 24 Sacramento Street; Edward S. Castle, 42 Walker Street; Mrs. Alfred S. Clark, 205 Mount Auburn Street; Dorothy Colby, 46 Avon Hill Street; Rachel and William Crooks, 520 Franklin Street; Philip Eliopoulos, 20 Andrew Street; Dr. Melvin Field, 27 Irving Terrace; Louis A. Frye, 11 Whitcomb Street; Priscilla B. Grace, 3 Chestnut Street (Boston); Harvard Liberal Union, 21 Little Hall (by Frederic D. Houghteling, vice president); Mr. and Mrs. Wallace E. Howell, 34 Shepard Street; Dr. Leo M. Hurvich, 15 Everett Street; Francis and Eugenia Jones, 12 Upton Street; Marjorie Lansing, 147 Lexington Avenue, executive secretary, Massachusetts PCA; Prof. Kirtley F. Mather, Harvard University; Elizabeth J. McCune, 29 Maple Avenue; Rev. Prentiss L. Pemberton, 335 Harvard Street; Esther L. Smith, 48 Buckingham Street; Rev. F. Hastings Smyth, S. C. C., 21 Washington Avenue; Eric A. Starbuck, 86 Ellery Street; L. C. Wallach, M. D., 1426 Cambridge Street; Prof. Payson S. Wild, 9 Kenway Street, assistant dean graduate school, Harvard University.

Very truly yours,

WALLACE E. HOWELL,
Chairman, Cambridge Committee for a Living Wage.

The Responsibilities of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me, I consider it a privilege to insert in the RECORD a copy of a speech recently made by our well-informed and distinguished colleague, Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts, entitled "The Responsibilities of Power." This speech was delivered before a distinguished group of citizens who are interested in the School of Advanced International Studies, located here in Washington.

Mr. HERTER is the chairman of the board of trustees of this institution and was very active in its formation. He was able to secure the interest and support of prominent citizens in business, as well as the political field, and its success was assured from the start. The school has just finished its third year and its future is pregnant with possibilities.

The object of the School of Advanced International Studies is to educate thoroughly trained specialists in the international field and recently courses have been inaugurated to train people in the business methods and procedures of different countries of the world. Intensive courses on American business in Latin America and the Middle East have been held and the interest shown in these courses indicates that they will be expanded in the future.

What an institution of this character means to the United States with its great international responsibilities and contacts cannot be overestimated. Its value to the economic development of our country in equipping men trained in foreign affairs will undoubtedly increase as the days go by, and we are greatly indebted to the foresightedness and ability of Mr. HERTER in his founding of this institution. His address about our Nation's responsibilities well depicts his statesmanship and his vision of the future. It follows:

Members of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, distinguished guests, and students of the School of Advanced International Studies, this occasion which marks the third meeting of a distinguished group participating in and interested in the School of Advanced International Studies is being held at a time when the very purposes to which the members of the student body have been addressing themselves are of the utmost importance. Our first graduating exercises concluded with an address by the then Acting Secretary of State, the Honorable Joseph C. Grew, during which he discussed the responsibility of power. In the second year the Honorable Warren R. Austin, the American representative on the Security Council of the United Nations, but then still a Senator of the United States, carried on where Mr. Grew had left off with an address on the same theme. While I realize that it may be an impertinence for me to follow the same path laid out by these two very distinguished individuals, I nevertheless feel that that subject; namely, The Responsibility of Power, still remains the most important one to which anyone could address himself, and so I shall try to carry on where they left off.

During the course of his address Mr. Austin made the following statement:

"During the 12 months since we listened to that really great commencement oration by Acting Secretary of State Grew, entitled 'The Responsibility of Power,' we have observed the disintegration of our military power in the occupation of the enemy territory.

"When Mr. Grew addressed us a year ago this Nation possessed the most exalted leadership that any nation in all history had attained. The magnificence of its power gave its voice wings that swept around the world, uplifting the aspirations and hopes of mankind.

"But, by our ineptitude and our surrender to fatigue, we have, in 12 short months, fallen from these heights, apparently unmindful that the victory is not attained, and that it cannot be attained in any such state of lassitude and weakness."

I am using that quotation because I fully agree with its implications. However, I feel that the words "ineptitude, surrender to fatigue," and "a state of lassitude and weakness," which Mr. Austin used, might well be replaced at this moment by the words "uncertainty and confusion."

It is no easy task for any responsible individual to state publicly that our assumption of the responsibility which goes with power is conditioned by uncertainty and confusion, yet in my opinion this is true. I believe this to be true primarily because, as a nation, we have been unable to grasp the implications of our newly found position and consequently have not as a nation seen fit to implement those implications.

In the history of many nations the impact of near neighbors and of foreign relations with those near neighbors has in considerable measure determined domestic policies. As a nation we have seldom permitted our foreign policy to dictate our domestic policies except under leadership which could clearly reconcile the two policies in a manner satisfactory to our law-making bodies, or when we were actually at war. With our inflexible system of government whereby responsibility is divided between the administrative and the representative branches, with the judiciary acting only secondarily in the determination of policy, the conduct of our foreign affairs and the determination of policies has had to be resolved through a considerable measure of agreement between these two branches.

Last November, the people of the United States caused a political turnover in the legislative branch of the Government. In most parliamentary systems this would have carried with it a change in the executive branch of the Government and presumably would have given to a new administration the support of the majority of Congress. Our turnover was, in my opinion, determined almost entirely by domestic policies. At the time of the election a virtual truce had been declared with respect to making international policies a partisan matter. Nevertheless, there were current many evidences of dissatisfaction with this bipartisan policy. They are now becoming more apparent.

Contrary to the expectation and hope of all of us who had anticipated a considerable measure of recovery in war-torn countries and a considerable measure of progress toward the achievement of international cooperation through the medium of the United Nations, there has occurred a comparative retrogression in both of these fields. The economic recovery of Europe, if the word "recovery" is even the correct word, has been tantalizingly slow. The progress of concerted international action toward giving the world a feeling of hopefulness with respect to a lasting peace has been equally slow. While the action of nature in denying certain areas of the world normal crops has, in part, been responsible for the lack of progress in economic recovery in sections of Europe, nonetheless the major factor has been political dissension. In fact, the major factor with respect to lack of progress in both the directions I have mentioned has been political dissension, brought about in large part by the inability of the spokesmen for two conflicting ideologies to reconcile what appear to be totally divergent policies.

While I know that it is a common practice to blame all of our troubles on the inability of the United States and Russia to find a solid basis for international cooperation, nevertheless, the record must speak for itself. It is such an unhappy record that large sections of the world have come to the conclusion that the differences are irreconcilable and cannot be solved except through the medium of armed conflict. This thinking has dominated and is still dominating the areas in which policies are made, but unhappily it has not led to the development of any clear-cut course within the United States itself.

We are all familiar with the fact that misery breeds communism. We also have almost unanimous faith in this country that misery can be remedied only by hard work performed under the benign cloak of an orderly and stable government based on the social and political freedoms which we describe in terms of "the American way of life." We wish to see society in other nations develop along the lines which we know to have been successful in this country. The leaders of the Soviet Union have a very different conception. The so-called capitalistic doctrine to which we adhere is to them completely antipathetic to their own social systems. They cannot recognize that we believe so fervently that the will to work, the will to achieve economic and political stability, and the will to be peaceful can flourish best under our free capitalistic system. In fact they are using every effort to oppose this belief and to create the very miseries in which their political philosophies have the best chance of flourishing.

Assuming for a moment that there is general acceptance, which I believe there is, of the underlying situation which I have just described, one might have reason to believe that the domestic and foreign policies of this Nation would be keyed together and would be so directed as to allow us to put out our maximum effort in combatting communistic philisophy and communistic influence. Clear-cut policies to achieve an end at this point become the primary responsibility of power. Uncertainty and confusion undermine that power.

Perhaps I can best illustrate what I mean by uncertainty and confusion, even though there be unanimity with respect to a desirable end, by citing some recent examples.

When the administration decided that because of the economic weakness of the British Empire, it would be obligated to assume some of the responsibilities which were no longer tenable for the Empire, it evolved what has come to be known, unhappily, I think, as the Truman doctrine. That doctrine is predicated upon the belief that the Soviet Union must not be allowed to increase its orbit of satellite states, either by the threat of force or by the infiltration of propagandists. It further has as its base an assumption that by raising the standards of living of many of the nations in which misery is prevalent, the Communist forces within the country will gradually give way to more moderate forces which still cling to the concepts of political and economic freedom. I do not think that anyone can quarrel seriously with either of these two premises. However, it is in the implementation that the trouble begins.

I can, of course, be accused of prejudice because I am a member of the opposite political party from the President and am likewise a member of the legislative body. However, I am deeply distressed by the fact that no clear-cut pattern for implementing the Truman policy has been presented to the country.

Legislation for Greek and Turkish aid, which became law in the last 10 days, is a case in point.

Of the $400,000,000 which was asked of the Congress, roughly $100,000,000 was to be spent on economic rehabilitation in Greece. The uses to which this $100,000,000 was to be put have been fairly clearly defined in a number of documents. On the other hand, even Senator VANDENBERG was unable to tell in the Senate how the money presumably earmarked for military purposes was to be used. When an amendment was offered on the floor of the House to limit to 200 the number of military persons to go to Greece and Turkey, this was bitterly opposed on the grounds that the Secretaries of War and Navy had changed their minds with respect to the public testimony which they had previously given to the effect that not more than 30 or 40 would be required and had privately told some individuals that they did not wish any limitations placed in the legislation. It is only natural that with this insistence on a free hand with respect to military personnel, the American people and the Congress should be confused and worried as to what military assistance actually means. Are Greece and Turkey just the beginning of a policy which is likely to extend very much further? We do not know, and yet every day commentators and editorial writers are indicating that the Truman policy will launch us on a program calling for vast expenditures estimated at from 5 to 20 billion dollars for a period of years, some of it to be expended for what might be called purely economic recovery measures and other parts for continuing military assistance.

If this policy is to be implemented as a part of the responsibility of power in such vast amounts, obviously the American people must be taken in as a partner, and the sooner the better. The American people know that economic collapse or even a serious depression in the United States would immediately negative any possibility of assuming the responsibilty of power. They remember that our collapse in the early thirties was one of the most powerful factors in giving Hitler his opportunity of rising to the top in Germany. They know that nothing would contribute more substantially to the world-wide spread of communism than economic failure in the strongest of the capitalistic nations. They are, therefore, determined that the maintenance of our own domestic stability should be the first consideration of government. They question how far and for how long this Nation can ship to foreign shores its capital and a considerable percentage of its production. They would like to be able to grasp the situation as a whole. They would like to feel that if they are going to be called on to make economic sacrifices, those sacrifices will not be in vain. They would like to throw out the life line, but they want to be certain that in so doing they themselves can remain strong enough to effect a rescue and not be themselves engulfed.

Again only recently, failure to make clear and have adequate support for a policy which presumably is a part of the Truman doctrine was made very apparent.

The wool growers of the West were determined to secure a support price for their wool which would insure them a protective return on wool for the next 2 years. Legislation to that effect had been passed by the Senate and was awaiting action in the House. The Senate, owing to its constitutional inability to initiate revenue measures, had recommended in sending its bill over to the House that the House include a provision placing an import fee (in other words, increasing the tariff) on wool so that the program of supporting the price of domestic wool would not be an excessive burden on the Treasury and the taxpayers of the United States. A provision to accomplish this was put in by the House Committee on Agriculture and the matter was then brought up for debate in the House.

Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton, representing our Government at Geneva, was forced to return to the United States to take a hand in opposing any possible increases in the tariff on wool because in order to secure even preliminary discussions for the creation of the International Trade Organization and for the negotiation of reciprocal-trade agreements in Geneva, he had been required by the British Empire group, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, to agree to discuss reductions in wool tariffs. Obviously, he could not do this in the face of possible domestic legislation which might have the effect of increasing the tariff. He wrote a letter which was read on the floor of the House, making his views very clear, and the result of the letter, instead of strengthening the hand of those who opposed this wool legislation, actually weakened it. The reason for this was very simple. The Members of the Congress bitterly resented the idea of having an individual determine domestic agricultural policies and insisted that this was the prerogative which belonged as much, if not more, to the Congress as to the administrative side of the Government.

I mention this particular incident only to stress the element of uncertainty and confusion to which I have referred. Obviously no administration can make economic commitments in the foreign field unless it is certain of support at home. It must give warning to the American people as to its intent. It must allow of the freest kind of debate and must have at hand some actual indication of support before it dares make a commitment which might be overruled.

I personally doubt whether the Greek-Turkish aid bill would ever have been enacted into law had it not been for the fact that to have rejected the bill would have served notice on the world and on the Soviet Government that the American people were not agreed as to the necessity of checking Soviet expansion. Approval to that bill was given not because of any enthusiasm or any certainty as to the utility of the policy to be pursued but only because of the fear that refusal would have led to serious loss of face.

In using the two illustrations which I have used, I am conscious that they can only serve to emphasize what you may have gathered is an underlying spirit of discouragement on my part. I plead guilty of this, but even though I am really discouraged as to whether or not we shall see our way clear to accepting the responsibility of power, I am at the same time not despairing.

Perhaps the new Secretary of State, George Marshall, will be the individual who can best dispel some of the uncertainties and confusions. Perhaps we shall have to wait until we have had a Nation-wide election. The election in itself cannot solve the problem unless during the course of the election issues which are clearly definable can be put before the people. That means that the leadership of both political parties will have to clarify their own thinking as to the course that we should pursue. I do not believe that we can be effective without achieving a much greater unanimity of conviction as to our course, and we obviously cannot assume responsibility with a muddled mind.

There is one further factor that adds to my discouragement which I feel that I should mention. I am convinced that as a Nation we want to be helpful both from the humane side and from the side of our own best interests in reestablishing the economies of many other nations. I am convinced that we are willing to go to some lengths to accomplish this end. However, there is a real doubt whether or not monetary help alone can accomplish the purposes we all desire without what might be considered a very real measure of interference in the internal affairs of other nations—a kind of interference which, unless exercised with extraordinary skill, might well be so objectionable politically to proud peoples that it would defeat the very purposes we have in mind. Already those doubts have arisen with respect to our proposed mission to Greece, and those doubts are focused largely on the fear that there do not exist in this country sufficiently skilled and well-trained people familiar with the intricacies of foreign customs and foreign psychologies to be able to make their counsel really effective.

I share those fears. If 20 or 30 years ago it had been possible for some training institution similar to the one of which you are members to have put into the bloodstream of this Nation a nucleus of individuals with your interest, your background, and your training, I should be feeling many fewer

qualms. However, I am confident that it will not be long before you can make your influence felt in far greater degree than your numbers signify, and I envy you the opportunity that lies ahead.

I hope that in starting out in your various appointed tasks you will attribute my apparently discouraging words to the fact that at times I am too close to moving events to be able to get an adequate prospective.

However, I assure you that I have stressed the discouraging note only to emphasize the complexity and enormity of the task that must be met. That you, with the freshness and vigor of youth will meet your careers and grapple with that task in the spirit of optimism which alone can lead to great achievement, I do not doubt. Godspeed you.

Why the Taft-Hartley Conference Report Should Be Adopted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as one of the three Republicans in the House who voted against the Hartley bill when it was before us in April, I quite naturally have had more than the usual interest in the conference report on the Taft-Hartley bill.

The report itself has not been available to us until today. I have therefore had to content myself with the May 30 committee print of the bill which was delivered yesterday noon. Prior to that I had the benefit only of the various newspaper accounts that appeared as the House-Senate conference was in progress.

I have not been able to go into all the legal ramifications of each item of the bill. But a reasonably careful study has convinced me the conference bill is a worthy improvement over the original Hartley version in the House. On the whole the conferees, in my judgment, have done a good job, producing a bill in which the sound features outweigh those that to my mind are questionable or downright wrong.

The Hartley bill to me was a backhanded attempt to deunionize American industry. It smothered its good features in a rampage of one-sided restrictions. To be very explicit, it endeavored to give employers and employees the right to be free of effective unions. It specifically upheld individual rights but at the expense of that same worker's organizational rights.

I could not conscientiously support the Hartley bill. At the same time I am as aware as anyone of the need for effective propublic labor-management legislation. Furthermore I have been at this business long enough to know no one can write his own bill. I know any bill must be a compromise of ideas, in which all of us must yield some of our convictions. But I expect it to be a workable bill and when I know in my own mind that it is not workable—as the Hartley bill was not—I intend to say so.

I recognize that in general the obligations of a National Labor Relations Act should be genuinely and scrupulously two-sided; should aim as far as humanly possible to equalize the bargaining power of labor and management in the public interest, since that is the sole basis of satisfactory industrial relations. The main objective of management-labor legislation should be to settle disputes, not strikes—so disputes do not become strikes.

In that regard the Hartley bill was a tragic mistake. It would have turned collective bargaining into an unworkably rigid and legalistic procedure.

I want to be very specific by calling attention to eight major improvements in the conference bill as compared to the Hartley bill.

First. The Hartley bill's serious and in fact vicious encroachments on the Norris-LaGuardia Act have been rejected in the conference bill. The Hartley bill provision permitting injunctions by individual employers has been removed.

Second. The Hartley bill's outlandish formula for handling Nation-wide or industry-wide strike emergencies has been brought down to earth.

Third. The vitual ban on the union shop that was contained in the Hartley bill has been removed in the conference bill.

Fourth. The so-called workers' bill of rights section of the Hartley bill, which was as fancy an array of double-talk and hypocrisy as one could ever want to see, has been eliminated from the conference bill.

Fifth. The Hartley bill ban on industry-wide bargaining has been dropped in the conference bill.

Sixth. The provision to keep communists out of leadership of unions, which was merely a catch-all club in the Hartley bill, appears in the conference bill to have been made workable.

Seventh. A logical and commendable division in judicial and prosecuting functions of the National Labor Relations Board has been incorporated in the conference bill, including an independent conciliation and mediation service.

Eighth. The Senate bill's commendable provision, absent from the Hartley bill, to set up a joint committee to study and report on the basic problems of labor-management relations has been incorporated in the conference bill.

I repeat again that I by no means endorse every provision of the conference bill. I am frankly fearful of some of its provisions. There are loop-holes that can too easily be used unscrupulously. There are provisions in the conference bill that may put a premium on tricky methods. But it is evident that these are not the over-all tone of the conference bill. I am convinced furthermore that the loop-holes in the conference bill, if serious abuses develop, can and must be promptly corrected.

Many persons have exerted a somewhat overanxious effort to make the conference bill inseparable from the Hartley bill. They would make it appear that the former is only a more subtle version of the latter. It is apparent from the above analysis that this is not true. Honesty calls for plain speaking on that, since such a point has been made of it.

That which is constructive in the conference bill sufficiently outweighs its weaknesses so that the bill should be approved. For these reasons I shall support the conference report.

I want, in full frankness, to add one other thought. I do not share the view of those who feel that the passage of this or any similar bill will more or less automatically end all our labor-management difficulties. I have no great confidence in that regard. In the conference bill, as in its far less satisfactory preceding versions, we are setting up a vast Federal referee and patrol system over both management and labor. No one knows how large an organization will have to be developed if the patrol job is to be done with any proper degre of efficiency. But we do know that satisfactory labor relations can never be legislated.

If the conference bill becomes law, it will work only if individual unions and individual employers get down to a basis of reasonable collective bargaining in good faith on their own. Henry Ford II, when he recently addressed the National Press Club in Washington, said he looked with apprehension on the "evident attempt" to settle disputes by Government interference and intervention. That was at the time the Hartley bill itself was before the House. One of the things Mr. Ford meant, I suspect, was that such intervention, if indulged too frequently and relied on too continuously, can in itself be disastrous. It is no simple cure-all by any means.

There is one other point on which we should not delude ourselves. The conference bill, if enacted, will prove itself effective only if we continue to have increasing productivity and reasonable prosperity in this country. That is the real key to the whole program.

Antilabor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution on antilabor legislation adopted by the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, on May 24, 1947, in Boston:

ANTILABOR LEGISLATION

Whereas legislation which would destroy the free trade-unions of the United States, undermine the industrial democracy that is so vital to the well-being of our Nation, and move toward a totalitarian control of our economy is now in a conference committee of the Congress; and

Whereas the conference committee has shown no disposition to report out a final measure which would remove the major labor-destroying provisions of measures already passed by the House and the Senate, so that unions might retain essential freedom and collective bargaining could be given free play; and

Whereas the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, representing 400,000 textile workers in more than 1,700 mills in 34 States,

and the overwhelming majority of employers with whom it negotiates have proved throughout the years that the ordinary processes of collective bargaining can solve the preponderant majority of all labor-management disputes; and

Whereas experience has taught us that congressional fiat is now and never will be a substitute for good faith and understanding at the collective bargaining table: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference, representing 80,000 members of TWUA-CIO who work in New England cotton mills, hereby call upon the President of the United States to veto the Taft-Hartley bill when it comes to him from the Congress; and then be it further

Resolved, That we call upon all local unions, joint boards, and Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, members represented here to communicate this position to the President of the United States.

Fish Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have repeatedly urged that a permanent Federal policy should be established by the Congress to insure adequate protection for fish whenever a dam is constructed by the Government. I have repeatedly emphasized the fact that salmon periodically enter nearly all of the American rivers and streams which flow into the Pacific Ocean in order to spawn in the headwaters of those streams. In the past many of these rivers and streams have been dammed by agencies of the Federal Government without proper facilities to enable these fish to proceed upstream. The result has been that thousands of salmon have perished in a futile effort to reach their spawning beds, and a vitally important source of food supply for the American people is being dangerously impaired.

In this connection I desire to direct the attention of the Members of the House to the following article which appeared in the May 21 issue of the San Francisco Call-Bulletin entitled "Low Waters Doom San Joaquin Salmon," and signed by the fishing editor of that newspaper, "Uncle Joe" Dearing:

A pitiful, repulsive sight may be seen along the San Joaquin River these days—a run of doomed salmon vainly struggling to reach spawning beds that have been left high and dry by a man-made dam.

With only 84 second-feet of water flowing from the Friant Dam, the splashing and threshing of these great fish as they battle over bars in the shallow water can be heard hundreds of feet away. So reports Game Warden Hilton Bergstrom, of Los Banos.

That these fish are at the mercy of law breakers makes little difference. Most of them will perish before spawning, so why shouldn't they be used for food?

The United States Reclamation Bureau, which controls Friant Dam, evidently disregards its duty and pledge to protect all natural resources.

The California Division of Fish and Game now has a maintenance crew on the river to open channels through dry bars and assist the fish in reaching spawning grounds. We understand it didn't have until the deplorable situation was pointed out in green ire by one of our contemporaries.

Unification of Armed Services Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 22, 1947

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training has called our attention to the fact that our military forces are only a hollow shell. This warning has gone unheeded by many in times past, but it will not be overlooked by our potential enemies or those who are looking to us for leadership. With our ground forces reduced to two or three effective combat divisions and our Air Forces unable to muster a large striking force, our military leaders are certainly confronted with a dismal situation.

The President's Commission of Educators and Businessmen unanimously confirmed the opinions of our wartime leaders that because of our wealth and position of leadership, the United States is the logical first target for aggression. No longer can we depend on the ocean distances for our security nor is it likely that we will again have a long breathing spell to prepare and organize. We must train and equip a large reserve which could be ordered up in an emergency.

Universal military training is necessary and we must take action soon to provide this trained reserve to supplement our regular forces. However, immediate unification of the armed forces is of utmost importance if we are to prepare and plan security forces to operate effectively, such as modern warfare requires.

There have been newspaper reports that the Republican leaders of Congress do not consider unification of the armed services as "must" legislation for this session. I sincerely believe that we must provide unification now.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following letter received from Mr. Travis B. Bryan, president of the First National Bank of Bryan, Tex., regarding unification of the services:

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF BRYAN,
Bryan, Tex., May 28, 1947.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR OLIN: In view of the world situation at the present, the state of the military services at the present, the almost total disintegration thereof, the fact that everyone recognizes that in all likelihood next time we won't be granted a year or two for this country to get ready, it would seem to me that the most important thing that the Congress could possibly find to do would be to immediately bring up, decide, and settle the question of the unification of the services.

Then the Army, Navy, and Air Forces could present their plans to Congress, get an allocation of men and money, go ahead and begin to put our military house in order. Until then they will still remain in a state of disintegration.

Surely everyone in the United States has come to know by this time that the cheapest insurance that this country and its people can possibly have is a first-class army, navy, and air force. We can't get it until this unification matter is settled is conceded.

May I urge you with every resource I could command and present to you that you take an immediate stand for it immediately being brought up and settled.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

TRAVIS B. BRYAN,
President.

"Barefaced Grab" of Hungary Shows How the Reds Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of June 3, 1947:

"BAREFACED GRAB" OF HUNGARY SHOWS HOW THE REDS WORK

A concrete example of just what former Under Secretary of State Acheson meant some months ago when he referred to Soviet diplomacy as aggressive and expansionist, to the great indignation of Moscow, is provided by the fate of Hungary. The swift developments of a dramatic week end have placed Hungary, whose resistance to Soviet influence had been steadfast, securely within Russia's sphere of direct control.

This is a coup which illustrates anew the determination of Moscow to dominate Europe and which brings forcefully to the attention of the American people the necessity of either sustaining whatever democratic strongholds may exist in Europe or else becoming reconciled to the ultimate capture of the Continent by communism.

In Hungary the Communist Party numbers about 650,000 members and in the most recent election polled 720,000 votes, only 18 percent of the total. However, it managed to control key positions in the government and in consequence exercised an influence out of proportion to its numerical strength. This is a familiar technique. Through it, aggressive and resourceful Communists are enabled to dominate not only governments but also labor unions and political organizations in which they may hold but a meager representation.

In the case of Hungary, it seems, the Communists were helped through the treachery or the lack of courage of the Premier, Ferenc Nagy, who was vacationing in Switzerland during the crisis and who seems to have been preoccupied with personal interests, including the safe departure of his son from Hungary and a pension for himself.

Through what was distinctly an easy operation, Communists, although a minority of the people of Hungary, are in complete control of the government. The tie that binds them to Russia is indicated by the events that have occurred and also by the news that the Hungarian Army will be trained and equipped by Russia. Actually, Hungary is now something more than a Soviet satellite. It is a Russian province, as completely under

the will of Moscow as if it were one of the Soviet states.

Unofficially, the change in control of the Hungarian Government is described in Washington as a "barefaced grab" by Moscow. Furthermore, pending clarification of developments, suspension of the unused half of a $30,000,000 Hungarian credit for buying American surplus property was announced by Secretary of State Marshall. This was a sensible step.

Communist domination of Hungary is an accomplished fact and Russia has demonstrated once again that it does not intend to be restrained from advancing its purpose of continental dominion by the agreement of Postdam, which provides that nations shall be free to establish governments of their own choosing.

This bold and successful stroke in Hungary gives urgency to a disturbing question. How long will Italy and France and other countries of Europe where Communist voting strength is far greater than in Hungary be able to resist the aggressive and expansionist diplomacy of Moscow?

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article which appeared in the New York Times of June 3, 1947, entitled "One Million Homes—Maybe":

ONE MILLION HOMES—MAYBE

Federal Housing Administrator Creedon's prediction that a million dwelling units will be completed this year if Federal controls are continued for a few more months might make careless readers believe our housing crisis is subsiding. It really is not. Of the million, 610,000 are permanent dwellings now under construction. Another 150,000 represent a reasonable assumption that this many new permanent units will be started and finished before the year is out. The remainder are conversions, trailers and temporary units, which furnish temporary relief for the shelterless but do not solve the problem. And Mr. Creedon does not predict even this much if Congress approves a House proposal to take the lid off nonresidential building, for which he estimates there is now a $2,000,000,000 pent-up demand. If this demand is released, he fears, the resulting scramble for materials would leave the little fellow trying to build a home out in the cold both literally and figuratively. Presumably new moderately priced rental housing could not compete, either.

However much most of us would like to see an unhampered building industry, the truth remains that there must be some governmental interference if millions of people with low or moderate incomes, including a large percentage of the veterans, are not to suffer. Housing is not merely a business—it is a social service. Rent control, which the Senate yesterday reconsidered and voted to extend, is a palliative. What we need are more houses. The least Congress can do is not to make the veterans' situation worse. The best it might do is to pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, favorably reported last April by a 7-to-6 vote of the Senate Banking Committee. This bill is aimed at the goal of 1,500,000 new homes a year for 10 years, a total of 15,000,000, of which 500,000 would be subsidized. Private enterprise, with various governmental aids and encouragements, would do the rest. Senator TAFT thinks he can get this measure through the Senate at this session. But it will take concerted pressure from those who realize the evils of the present shortage of homes to get it through the House.

Tax Reduction and Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Monday, June 2, quoting and commenting on a recent speech by my colleague, Hon. NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire, on the subject of tax reduction and economy.

It is really remarkable that the statement of a new Member of Congress should merit such justifiable national recognition, and as a neighboring Representative from New England I take pride in inserting this editorial in the RECORD for I agree with its content as well as with the speech to which it refers:

HOW TO CUT SPENDING

NORRIS COTTON, a Republican Congressman from New Hampshire, went home recently to report to some of his constituents. While this is his first term in Congress, Mr. COTTON is a veteran of legislative and congressional affairs. He was once secretary to Senator Moses, and later speaker of his State house of representatives.

He dwelt at some length on the desperate lobbying and propaganda campaigns by the Government departments to escape the economy ax. He noted that while his mail continued to demand economy, these campaigns were beginning to bear fruit. Four months in Congress, Mr. COTTON confessed, have forced him to abandon the theory he held on fiscal policy when he went to Washington.

"I had a beautiful theory about the budget and tax reduction," he said. "I believed that we should reduce Government expenditures first, balance the budget, make a start toward retiring the national debt, and then—and not until then—consider tax reduction.

"I still maintain that this is logical and sound. The only trouble with it is that it won't work.

"The Government will spend all the money it can get. The only way to reduce the cost of Government is to reduce the revenue of Government. * * * After watching the vain efforts of earnest and honest men in Congress to reduce expenses to balance the budget, I concluded that we must first cut taxes."

This, it happens, is the program that the Tribune has recommended since the Republican victory last fall. It is the program that Congress is coming to accept, haltingly and incompletely, by its acceptance of the income-tax reduction. We welcome Mr. COTTON'S conversion to the cause. It is a conversion based upon close contact with the problem of Government spending.

The Government, any government, will always spend every penny it can lay hands on. The only way to cut spending is to withhold the means of spending by cutting taxes.

Completely Free Press Not Yet Established in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I wish to include in my remarks the following article by Mr. Ralph J. Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

COMPLETELY FREE PRESS NOT YET ESTABLISHED IN JAPAN
(Article 10)

If the seeds of democracy are to thrive in Japan, there must be a free press which will be the impartial purveyor of news and the fearless champion of freedom and human rights. This objective of the occupation, however, has not yet been achieved. By American standards, the press in Japan is not free.

In the first place, Japanese newspapers are restricted by censorship; in the second place, they are dominated by labor unions. A free press cannot thrive under either of these conditions.

When the occupation authorities arrived in Japan there was a feverish activity in the newspaper shops to organize labor unions. Part of this was due to the natural exuberance of being released from the despotic Japanese Government controls; part, no doubt, was due to the natural desire of the Japanese to please the Americans, who, they were led to believe, wanted them to organize.

But instead of organizing one union of printers, one of pressmen, one of stereotypers, one of editorial workers, and so on, they formed vertical unions which covered all employees of each newspaper. Then, in some cases, they proceeded to seize the plants, throw out the management and operate them under "production control." In other cases the owners were put in jail as war criminals for inciting Japanese aggression.

Each newspaper then became a battleground between the rightists and the leftists. Editorial policies were determined by the group which predominated. There were numerous instances of the compositors refusing to set in type editorials and news stories with which they did not agree. The Communists, of course, moved in wherever they could.

In one newspaper, Yomiuri Shimbun, which has a circulation of approximately 1,700,000, the Communists were ousted, after an internal fight which is described as follows by the publication's present managers:

"In 1945, as a result of internal reform, wartime leaders of the paper, including the president, vice president, managing editor, and several others retired en bloc. Later another major personnel shake-up has occurred. With the support of a majority of the present employees, Mr. Baba (the new president) carried out this major shake-up among the staff occupying key positions in the editorial department.

RADICALS ARE SQUELCHED

"The reason for this change was that the key men in the editorial department were changing the editorial policy into one that was extremely radical, with actual incidents of violations of General MacArthur's press code taking place.

"At the time many workers in the plant opposed such actions and resorted to strike

with the result that the paper was forced to suspend publication for 4 days. However, this incident was cleared up as the strike proved futile due to the fact that the strikers were in the minority."

A similar story of internal strife would apply to virtually every newspaper in Japan, except that Communists and leftists are still in control of many of them.

Even Yomiuri does not dare to fire unnecessary employees, since the labor unions will not permit any reductions in the staffs of newspapers. Yomiuri is restricted to four pages, due to the paper shortage, yet it has 900 editorial employees. (That figure is 600, not 90.)

Asahi Shimbun, which publishes three newspapers in different parts of Japan, claims to have 2,581 staff members in its Tokyo offices alone, yet it publishes only one edition consisting of one sheet, or two pages. On special occasions it gets out a four-page paper.

The editorial offices of these newspapers resemble a New York subway train during rush hours.

We did not inquire about the financial condition of Asahi, but Yomiuri, in spite of its overloaded staff, is making money. It has an income of 9,500,000 yen a month from subscriptions and 3,500,000 from advertising. Its operating costs are 12,000,000. Profits are impounded, however, due to occupation restrictions. The company would like to be able to spend 20,000,000 yen to replace two buildings that were burned out during the war.

It is obvious that, under the chaotic labor conditions, the policy of each newspaper depends on which union is in control. There seems to be no doubt but that the labor policies of the occupation authorities are largely responsible for this condition. They encouraged vertical unionism, according to the CIO pattern in the United States, with the result that there has been labor dictation of editorial policies, through intimidation, threats, and actual violence.

Under such circumstances, it is impossible to have an objective free press to further the aims of democracy in Japan.

Resolution on National Health Insurance by Textile Workers Union of America, CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution adopted by the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, on Sunday, May 24, 1947, at the Bradford Hotel, Boston:

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

Whereas the inadequacy of medical and dental care for millions of American citizens has been increasingly apparent through the years and is now assuming the proportions of a national disgrace; and

Whereas the Nation's need for more adequate care is most strikingly emphasized by the fact that 4 out of every 10 men called up for military service in World War II were rejected for physical reasons; and

Whereas experience and research have shown that the most effective and realistic way of raising the national health standards is through a broad national health-insurance plan; and

Whereas the President of the United States has urged that the Congress pass a long-range, comprehensive national-health bill which would include expanded maternal and child-health care, more medical and dental research and education, more hospitals and more doctors, and hospital and sickness insurance; and

Whereas although the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, has been able to negotiate health protections for well over 200,000 of its members, voluntary plans such as this still lend themselves to improvements. Moreover, millions of our fellow citizens have no protection whatever: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference, representing 90,000 workers in northern cotton mills, wholeheartedly endorse President Truman's national-health program and call upon Congress to desist from making this issue a political football and enact the plan forthwith.

Evacuation Claims Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a copy of a letter which I have addressed to Hon. JOHN W. GWYNNE, the chairman of the subcommittee which has under consideration H. R. 2768. I was familiar with the condition that this bill is intended to correct before I ever came to Congress. I have been very much interested in it. I urge that all Members of Congress examine this bill, and I am sure that they will recognize the real merits of it. I am quite sure that when this bill reaches the floor of the House of Representatives it will pass by a large majority.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1947.

Hon. JOHN W. GWYNNE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Now that the hearings on H. R. 2768, a bill to create an Evacuation Claims Commission under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, and to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes, have been completed, I urge that this bill be reported out of the House Committee on the Judiciary as early as possible. It is my sincere hope that this bill will reach the floor of the House of Representatives during this session. I am sure that the majority of Members of Congress would welcome an opportunity to vote favorably on this bill.

As I have indicated to you in my several conversations on the subject, it is my feeling that the loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry merit the economic adjustments contemplated by H. R. 2768. The Japanese-Americans surprised everyone by their unusual heroism during the war, not alone in Italy and other European theaters of war, but in the Pacific. It has been demonstrated that the evacuation of these people was unnecessary, as there has been no evidence of any sabotage or subversive action. A mistake appears to have been made, and I am sure that the people of the United States would like to provide proper reasonable compensation.

Trusting you and the other members of the committee will give H. R. 2768 precedence over less important legislation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. TWYMAN.

Filipino Veterans' Rights—Comment of Vicente Villamin on a Statement of the Veterans' Administration, Making Suggestions in a Friendly Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the Filipino war veterans, I include a statement of Mr. Vicente Villamin, distinguished Filipino lawyer and economist, commenting in a friendly fashion on a press release, dated June 4 by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Filipino veterans' question, which is really an American question, is not yet settled to the satisfaction of the Filipinos. I, for one, desire to know fully what the question is—its different aspects and ramifications. I can well imagine that it is quite involved and complicated. I am glad that Mr. Villamin, with his analytical mind and his power of effective expression, is tackling the subject matter. Congress wants to be informed and Filipinos should inform Congress, for it is Congress that could provide the remedial measures. Our friends, the Filipinos, should speak up and speak up clearly and soon.

I know that the American people would like to see that full justice is meted out to the Filipinos who so bravely and loyally fought the Japanese enemy under our flag and leadership. But they and their Representatives in Congress must know what the specific complaints are of the Filipino veterans. The question involves enormous amounts of money and we cannot go by generalities or silence on the part of the Filipinos. I am confident that Mr. Villamin and his Filipino associates will give us the necessary information and develop general interest in the Filipino veterans' question. His statement that I am including in these remarks is illuminating in content and temperate in tone, and as such it is a valuable contribution.

Mr. Villamin's statement follows:

In a statement released on June 4, the Veterans' Administration gives plain information for Filipinos who served with the American Army in the last war. That constitutes its policy under the law. Anyone who has a different interpretation of the law is at liberty to state it and work for its adoption. In my contacts with officials of that Administration, I have found them courteous and willing to hear suggestions as well as being broadly sympathetic to Filipino

veterans. As long as that situation prevails the Filipino veterans will have not only a square deal but also an intelligent treatment.

The statement relates to pensions for disability or death. This is one of the two rights—the other is insurance—left to Filipino veterans after the First Rescission Act of 1946 deprived them of the other veterans' rights by declaring that they were not in the active service of the United States armed forces.

The Veterans' Administration statement begins with the assurance that "Filipinos who served in recognized guerrilla forces in the Philippines during the Japanese occupation of the Islands are potentially eligible for benefits under the United States compensation and pension laws for veterans."

The next sentence will aid Congress in formulating possible new laws, for it gives the approximate number of potential beneficiaries. It reads: "Although more than 1,000,000 persons already have claimed service with guerrilla units in the Philippines, the War Department has estimated that only about 338,000 will be recognized officially. Only a small percentage of this number can be expected to qualify for compensation and pension benefits."

In this connection, it should be stated that it is the right of any person to prove that he was a guerrilla, but he must not be disappointed if the Army authorities should disapprove his claim on the basis of the evidence. Those whose claims are not clear should be slow in taking the time of the screening authorities for the sake of the claimants with more valid cases, otherwise delay and confusion will ensue to the injury of all. Here is where plenty of good will and good faith are needed, and Filipinos have them.

The statement says next: "Those who qualify may be entitled to compensation for disabilities due to injuries or disease suffered while serving with guerrilla units. In the event of death incurred in such service, their dependents may be entitled to pension rights. Awards will be based on the regular rates applicable to other veterans of the United States armed forces generally, except that payment will be made at the rate of one Philippine peso for each dollar awarded."

At present one Philippine peso is 50 American cents, but in the future it might be more or less than that, for under section 342 of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 "the value of Philippine currency in relation to the United States dollar" may be changed "by agreement with the President of the United States." Hence, if the intention is to pay Filipino beneficiaries at the rate of one half of that of the American, the law should be rendered more specific, otherwise a peso could cost the Veterans' Administration either $1 or 25 cents, most probably the latter figure, which would be disadvantageous to the Filipino beneficiaries.

The statement proceeds as follows:

"To be eligible for benefits, the person must have served with the United States armed forces, and his service must either be a matter of record or be certified by the United States forces. If he served in an irregular guerrilla force, his service must have been under the command of a commissioned officer of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or of the Commonwealth Army recognized by and cooperating with the United States forces."

In enforcing this rule, the authorities are compelled to depend on incomplete or nonexistent records. Even when trying to be liberal and helpful to rightful claimants, their difficulties in arriving at just decisions could be imagined. A person who claims that he was a guerrilla should at least know his officer and, even more important, his officer should know him as a part of his command. A person who threw a stone at the head of a passing Japanese soldier, or stabbed him while ransacking his house, or gave food or shelter to a guerrilla, or tipped a guerrilla off on Japanese movements—that person is a hero, but not a guerrilla entitled to veterans' benefits. It is hoped, however, that the authorities will be most liberal in dealing with claims and sparing in the application of technicalities adverse to the claimant.

The next paragraph of the statement reads: "Unless the record shows that he received a physical examination at the time of entrance upon duty with the United States forces, he is not entitled to presumption of soundness accorded by statute to veterans who were in the active service of the United States Army or Navy in establishing that a disability is service-connected. In all cases, it must be shown that the disabling injury or disease, or the veterans' death, occurred while he was serving in recognized service as defined in the foregoing paragraphs."

If this rule is to be applied literally, few, if any, guerrillas could qualify for disability benefits, for the guerillas simply joined the armed forces or organized themselves into groups without regard to the state of their health and, in fact, there was neither time nor facilities to determine it. If the law is as stated in the paragraph quoted, it seems it should be modified by Congress, taking into consideration the special conditions and circumstances surrounding the organization and operation of the guerrilla forces.

Pertinent to this point is the statement made by Representative JOHN RANKIN on the floor of the House on August 2, 1946, on the administration bills (H. R. 6508; S. 2235) which he sponsored, but did not become a law. He said: "The existing law is more liberal, by far (to Filipino veterans) than S. 2235 as to benefits for service-connected disability or death in that the former authorizes the application of liberal presumptions both as to sound condition at the time of entry into service and service connection of chronic diseases such as tuberculosis. Eligibility requirements under the bill are made more restrictive, first by requiring a screening through new certificates by the War Department and, second, by requiring that disability must have resulted from disease or injury or aggravation thereof directly resulting from the performance of active service. Under existing law and the bill S. 2235 the same general group of persons is involved. However, due to the screening process employed the load of potential eligibles would be considerably reduced under the bill."

It must be clearly borne in mind then that Filipino veterans are now under the existing law, the bill sponsored by Mr. RANKIN having failed to pass. According to him, repeating for emphasis, the existing law "authorizes the application of liberal presumptions both as to sound condition at the time of entry into service and service connection of chronic diseases such as tuberculosis" from which many Filipino guerrillas suffered.

The Veterans' Administration statement ends with this sentence: "Persons taken prisoner and later paroled by the Japanese are not considered as having been in the active service of the United States during such period of parole." This involves a separate matter for possible new relief legislation by Congress. It is under the War Department. It concerns section 1288 of the Revised Statutes and the War Department Circular No. 400, issued on December 10, 1942. It belongs in the domain of American generosity and reasonableness.

We Filipinos would respectfully and earnestly ask the United States Congress for a redefinition of the rights and benefits to which the Filipino veterans are justly entitled as formerly part of the personnel of the American forces by military order of the President of the United States acting by virtue of an act of Congress. What already has been given is deeply appreciated. The American Government could give more. We ask it to do so.

The Trouble Truman Foreign Policy—a Report From Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 23, 1947

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, a few days after President Truman made his speech to the House asking for intervention in Greece and Turkey, I took the floor to point out how his proposal seemed to play right into Stalin's hands.

Many developments since that date have tended to confirm that appraisal. In this connection, an on-the-spot report by Sefton Delmer in the London Daily Express of May 12 is enlightening. Pertinent excerpts from Delmer's analysis follow:

AMERICA'S LOAN IS BUILDING THE TURKS A VERY FINE TOMB

ANKARA.—If I remove the mosquito netting from my bedroom window I can step out onto the terrace outside.

From there I can gaze at the long, green serpent of bare treeless hills that lies coiled possessively round the fresh white shells of this squawking, hooting and hammering new-old city of Ankara.

They're a fine sight, those hills. But there is one ridge in particular which I like to contemplate. I call it Trouble Truman.

It first caught my eye because I noticed they were building on it what seemed to be an extensive fortification. Or perhaps, I thought, it was a kind of anti-atomic air-raid shelter.

When I took a taxi and drove out to look at it, I found it was neither. The building on the ridge is a super-luxury mausoleum which is being erected as a memorial to Kemal Ataturk, founder and first dictator of modern Turkey.

Half a million pounds have already been spent on it. And, the young, German-trained Turkish engineer in charge of its construction informed me proudly, it will cost well over £2,000,000 before it is finished in 3 years' time.

I call it Trouble Truman because I cannot help thinking that before long the President is going to have bother with this memorial and regime.

The regime, as a consequence of a 23-year absence of parliamentary opposition and criticism, has permitted unrealistic expenditure of this kind to become typical of its budget policy.

Two million pounds, after all, is a handsome slice of the £25,000,000 loan to Turkey (some say it will end by being a gift) which, as the cornerstone of his resist-Communist-imperialism policy, the President is now piloting through Congress.

There is another £7,500,000 being spent on Ankara's supersuper Parliament building and a further £5,000,000 on an Ankara 16-story hospital skyscraper.

Only £1,000,000 a year is at present being spent by the Government on roads and bridges. Transport-starved Turkey needs these more urgently than all else if she is to reduce her uneconomically high costs of production and living and become, as the Americans wish, a sounder proposition militarily and strategically.

Turkey today has a total of only 26,875 miles of roads, and of these only 8,125 are all-weather roads. It is easy to see that Truman's £25,000,000 loan is only a tiny down payment on what looks like becoming a heavyish commitment, especially if any more heroes require mausolea.

Yes; it's Trouble Truman, all right, this ridge, and all it stands for in Turkey. And conversely, it's Comfort Molotov.

I am pretty sure that behind Molotov's policy of delay and procrastinating obstruction, brilliantly carried out at Moscow, there is the shrewd expectation of dividends from the effect on United States taxpayers of such little things as this £2,000,000 mausoleum. All this apart from the general over-all aim of aiding Communist world revolution by refusing to allow the capitalist world to settle down to peace and security.

"Truman," I can almost hear Molotov saying, "has led off his campaign on a very high note. He cannot go much higher without going to war. Soon he will have to sing lower. A revulsion of public opinion will set in which we shall be able to exploit."

NO COMMUNISTS IN TURKEY YET, REPORTS DELMER

I appreciate the difficulties of the Turkish Government's position under the constant barrage of hostile agitation from Soviet Russia.

But it is no use blinking the fact that the suppression of opposition newspapers—and the fact that the Turkish Government refused to guarantee that any complaints made by opposition observers of the poll shall be investigated—may prove embarrassing to Turkey's new American sponsors.

Even more dangerous, however, is this policy to Turkey's internal safety. It is only natural that, after 23 years of one-party rule, there is a great deal of criticism of the government among the people.

There are no Communists to speak of in Turkey today. But if public opinion is not allowed to assert itself in free elections, it is not impossible that Turkey's Communist neighbor will exert some attraction on the oppositionists.

Ataturk's mausoleum would then become the mausoleum of modern Turkey and of Truman's hopes of checking Soviet expansion into the eastern Mediterranean and the oil wells of Iraq.

Brooklyn Neglected in Federal Building Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of June 3, 1947:

BROOKLYN NEGLECTED IN FEDERAL BUILDING PROGRAM

The lawyers are pointing out that Brooklyn is being neglected in the Federal Government's building program, while the eight States which together contain less than Brooklyn and Long Island—Arizona, Nevada, Wyoming, Delaware, Vermont, New Hampshire, Idaho, and Utah—are doing handsomely by themselves in public works, probably because they rate, under the Constitution, two Senators.

Brooklyn is not complaining about the two Senators. But we have a complaint about what we pay in income tax—and don't get back. None of the States above tops our payment. So it is with no surprise that we learn the Federal Bar Association is on the move to demand an amelioration of this grievance.

Too few people seem to realize that our port makes it possible for farmers in Nebraska to have radios and electric ice boxes. Or ranchers in Wyoming or poultry raisers in Delaware to doll their women up in what we have every day on our advertising pages. Or, for that matter, Texans who like to think they run the country. High time it is for us to speak up, as the Washington largess goes elsewhere.

A new Federal courthouse is a drop in the bucket. Long Island and Staten Island are also pitching in with their taxes and deserve consideration for some more of the same. We are not suggesting that improvement expenses should be prorated. We are, however, insisting that the heavily taxed should be getting back a little more than the town, say, of Crow Creek, Ark., or Grass Valley, Mont., in proportion. We are glad that the lawyers have had their say. We think they are right in this matter of a new courthouse and other Federal improvements we are paying for, elsewhere.

Wind in the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, apropos of Memorial Day services just past, I include in my remarks an editorial appearing in the Portland Oregonian which is published in my congressional district, in its issue of May 30, 1947, which is worthy of consideration by all of us. It is a beautiful tribute to the services of the men and women of our Nation who have answered the call of their country in times of great emergency, to bear arms for its protection.

The editorial follows:

THE WIND IN THE FLAG

Then do not think of them as being yonder in alien earth with little white crosses above. They are not there. For these were boys who loved the homeland—her fields and forests, lakes and streams, her villages and cities. These were the boys who went to school here—and would they stay away when they were mustered out? These were the boys who fished our creeks and climbed our mountains; the boys who plowed our fields and harvested our wheat; who manned our factories and each enterprise of peace. It is not right to think of them as being where they seem to be. It isn't fair. Often they used to talk of going home, and surely—when death set them free—surely they came. Now we who knew them well must know they are not there who are forever here, inseparable from the land for which they died. No troopship brought them home, for they came home the quicker and the shorter way. Is it the wind that stirs the flag?

Nor should we think of them as being beneath the sea, where the plane plunged or the wounded ship went down, fathom upon green fathom. They are not there. For these were boys whose laughter scarcely hid from us the consecration which they felt, and when they said that they would soon get it over and come home, they meant it, every word. She called them from their classes and the ball grounds, she called them from the desk and lathe, and from the homes that meant as much to them as to any that ever loved his home with the full mesure of devotion.

They never thought to see the world, at least until they might be middle aged, but soon they saw it, island after island, port after foreign port, and many an island was fenced round with flame, and there was one port that they did not fetch. They died too soon to reach it and to hear the bands and speeches. But we who knew them, surely we must know that they were here before that, for they had said they would come home the moment that they could. And so they aren't there, but here. The ship came back without them, if it came at all, but they were here, not there. Is it the wind that stirs the flag again?

And where they kept the bargain, they who died for land and liberty, it matters not at all, nor where they seem to rest—under the little white crosses or under the sea, or namelessly in the deep jungle. For they were boys who would not stay away when they were done with service, since often they had told themselves the first thing they should do would be to hasten home. And home they must have come. Where the trout rises or the grouse leaps into flight, or at the ball park, or along the seashore, these were the places that they loved—these that forever are our country, and to which they, by their passing, have confirmed our title. They are here surely enough, and shall be for so long as liberty and America are one, and the flag means still what they knew it meant—though they didn't say much about it. That was something they left to the orators and the politicians, and the editors. Do not think of them as being elsewhere. For they are not there—who are here. Look. The light wind stirs the flag as though it caressed it, fold after fold. Look.

Iowa Farmers Against Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks past the House Committee on Agriculture has been conducting hearings on the matter of long-time farm policy. Numerous witnesses have been heard and many suggestions and ideas have been advanced. The committee is, of course, interested not only in having the views of experts and leaders in the field of agriculture, but in getting the viewpoint of men and women on the farms.

Recently the Iowa Farm and Home Register, which conducts the Iowa farm poll, submitted to a representative cross-section of Iowa farmers a number of practical questions covering some of the issues which have been discussed in the committee hearings.

I have received from Mr. Henry J. Kroeger, the director of this poll, a report on the poll which was carried in the June 1 issue of the Iowa Farm and Home Register. I am sure that the results of this poll will be of great interest to Members of Congress and I include the same herewith as a part of my remarks:

IOWA FARMERS AGAINST CONTROLS

Most Iowa farmers prefer abundant production rather than a return to prewar farm production controls, according to findings of the Iowa poll.

The poll also discloses that most Iowa farmers strongly favor keeping a program of farm price supports and guaranties.

These conclusions are indicated by answers from a representative cross section of Iowa farmers.

A majority of those farmers who expressed any opinion on parity prices think parity on basic crops should be brought up to date.

(Parity prices are those which will give crops the same purchasing power as they had just before World War I. Most Government support prices are now set at 90 percent of parity.)

A 68-percent majority of the farmers questioned agreed that the farmer has had to deal with too many Government agencies, and that many agencies overlap.

At the same time, 62 percent of Iowa's farmers believe they would get better service if all national farm programs were handled through the extension service.

Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau federation, testified recently before the House Agriculture Committee that Congress should wipe out duplication and overlapping in the Government farm program.

O'Neal said farmers are confused by the numerous Government farm agencies. He contended that a more efficient farm program would result if all Government farm activities were channeled through the extension service.

Field reporters for the Iowa poll asked a representative cross section of Iowa farmers the following question:

"So far as you can tell now, which would you rather see, a farm program based on loans, production and acreage controls, something like the prewar AAA, or a farm program based on unlimited farm production coupled up with some plan of expanding markets to keep farm surpluses from driving prices too low?"

	Percent
Prewar production controls	34
Abundant production	56
No opinion	10

Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson recently proposed a long-range farm program based on an organized, sustained, and realistic abundance rather than a return to the prewar production controls of the Roosevelt administration.

Present farm price supports are guaranteed through 1948. Through the following question, Iowa farmers show their sentiments for continuing some such program:

"In general, do you favor continuing and keeping a program of price supports and guaranties?"

	Percent
Yes	80
No	11
No opinion	9

Rank and file opinion on the present parity plan was measured through the following:

"Laws we have now will base corn loans and other price supports of basic crops on relation to parity—the price level where farm products will buy as much as before the First World War. What should Congress do about this parity plan? Leave it as it is? Bring parity up to date? Use some other plan?"

	Percent
Leave it as it is	18
Bring parity up to date	38
Use some other plan	9
Undecided	35

Among the 9 percent who want another plan, the majority is indefinite on the type of plan they wanted. However, a few name lower parity, supply and demand, less production control.

The Iowa poll's next question read:

"It has been said that the farmer has to deal with too many Government agencies, that these agencies double up and overlap. Out of your own experience, do you agree or disagree?"

	Percent
Agree	68
Disagree	18
No opinion	14

The farmers speculated on whether these agencies would render better service to the farmer channeled through the extension service in answering this question:

"Do you think farmers would get better service from these Government agencies if all national farm programs were handled through the extension service?"

	Percent
Yes	62
No	15
No opinion	23

Something To Watch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald on Tuesday, April 15, 1947:

SOMETHING TO WATCH

Now that the military have vacated the Common and we've had our fill of buzzing war planes, martial music, and the grim presence of war machines, it may be well to ponder one of the more subtle threats to our liberties. It is the threat of the "military mind," and no small threat it is in a world in which the greatest exterior menace to our Nation is a totalitarian regime, whose war plans are made secretly, and whose attacks in an age of atom bombs and bacteriological warfare would surely maximize the element of surprise. In such an age of excessive jitteriness we are all in awe of the military who must protect us. Therein lies the danger to which we have reference here. It is the possibility that we may forget our traditional subordination of the military to the civil authority.

We must not let our fear of the Communist menace blind us to the danger of military domination. For the thing that could most surely end civil liberty in America would be for the Army General Staff to gain such control over the Nation's civil government as to make us all vassals of the "military mind." One has only to recall the history of the German General Staff to know how true this is.

The principal techniques through which the German general staff managed to dominate the German people were the relentless pursuit of power; the development of a highly efficient propaganda medium; universal military training; and centralization of all of the nation's fighting forces under the army general staff.

First, with regard to universal training. A purpose of the Army-week program was to expedite voluntary recruitment in an effort to make unnecessary universal training or continued reliance upon the draft. We wish the War Department well in this endeavor, but we also hope that if and when universal service should become essential to national security, it be set up in such a way as to keep it largely under the control of our civil government.

As for propaganda, there can be no doubt that the War Department maintains one of the most expensive and effective machines for this purpose of any Federal agency. Moreover, with an ex-Army President, we can be sure that what the General Staff whispers to the White House rings a responsive note. The War Department is also still represented on some wartime interdepartmental committees so that it continues to have a strong voice in the making of foreign policy. General Marshall, the Secretary of State, is himself a lifelong soldier.

And, it hardly need be added, even freedom of speech and of the press might find in the military mind its greatest enemy if an unrestrained General Staff deemed that public discussion of foreign policies threatened our security by tipping off the enemy.

Finally, as to unification, the Herald believes that command unity of the armed forces is essential to efficient conduct of our military establishment in battle. But it seems important, despite the essentiality of unity of command at the top, that the identity of the respective services should be ruggedly maintained. For example, the Marine Corps, thus far a largely autonomous service, although under Navy command, should be clearly perpetuated as a separate fighting force in any service-unification law that may be passed. The Army and the Navy should hardly be insulted by the statement that the Marine Corps is our elite fighting service, always on the alert, and not unknown to have done some of the bitterest fighting to ease the ultimate victories of our combined fighting forces. Organizational autonomy also should be preserved for the Army Air Forces and the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics with the hope that efficiency and economy can be enhanced by mutually agreeable coordination at the top.

The greatest need is, of course, for greater emphasis on military research, and for whatever civilian pressure may be necessary to shake admirals and generals out of traditional habits of mind which tend, unconsciously, of course, to sabotage our effective defense in an atomic age. And, by all means, great pains should be taken to protect the secrecy of military research and its products. We want no repetition of the Canadian atom scandal here.

This is not to say that there is any pat solution to the dilemma of a people striving to maintain civil liberties and democratic processes in an era of devastating weapons and totalitarian government. There just isn't. Therefore, it behooves us to be more on guard than ever lest our combination of fear and zeal for powerful defenses should cause us, unwittingly, to mirror the thing we profess to detest.

The Die Is Cast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the foreign relief bill, the Greek-Turkish loan, and similar measures have occupied a large part of the time and attention of Congress during the last few weeks. Despite the fact that the recommendations of our State Department have been approved by overwhelming majorities in each instance thus far, a surprisingly large number of those Members who voted in favor of the so-called bipartisan foreign program have been extremely frank in their expressions of uncertainty and doubt about the ultimate results and effects of these measures.

These doubts and uncertainties are due to the fact that the American Nation is

embarking upon a new and unprecedented course in world affairs. We have abandoned, finally and irretrievably, our traditional policy of isolationism. We have shouldered a major share of responsibility for maintaining the future peace of the world. In this tremendous undertaking we have no past experience to serve as a practical guide, no precedents of our own upon which to rely. But the tragic lessons of recent history have made this epochal change in our foreign policy inevitable and inescapable.

Twice in the last 3 decades the soil of Europe has been drenched with American blood. After the First World War, despite the decisive part our armed forces had played in the defeat of Germany, the Congress of the United States refused to join the League of Nations which had been created by President Wilson. At that time a majority of the American people, including the present speaker, supported our congressional leaders in adhering to the policy of George Washington and declining to participate in "entangling foreign alliances."

The abstention of America rendered the League of Nations internationally impotent. The League degenerated into a mere debating society whose futile efforts to preserve world peace soon became the object of open scorn by the military dictators who sprang into power in the bankrupt areas of Europe.

A famous American Senator, now dead, told me of a conversation he had with Mussolini soon after the Fascist leader seized control of Italy.

"What do you think of the League of Nation?" the Senator inquired.

Mussolini's reply was a roar of laughter.

Emboldened by their belief that America would never interfere with their ambitions, the German and Italian dictators proceeded with their program of world conquest. They enlisted the support of Japan. Great Britain attempted a policy of appeasement. The result was World War II and finally Pearl Harbor.

Then the die was cast with respect to our foreign policy in the future. The American people determined, with invincible unanimity, that never again would this Nation refuse responsibility for maintaining the peace of the world. We invaded Africa, Europe, and the islands of the Pacific. Italy collapsed. Germany was completely crushed. Japan surrendered.

But for the intervention of our armed forces the outcome of the war would have been totally different. Russia would inevitably have been subjugated by the Axis attack. England could not long have survived. All of continental Europe would have remained under Nazi domination. Japan would have completed her conquest of Asia, Australia, and the islands of the Pacific, including the Philippines. And today this country and the entire western hemisphere would be in imminent danger of attack by the mad enemies of democracy if, indeed, the attack were not already under way.

Members of Congress realize that America, having twice been compelled to conquer the greatest threats in all history to the democratic way of life, is now irrevocably committed to the maintenance of peace throughout the world, by whatever means are necessary. Failure in this commitment is unthinkable. It would be a betrayal of our countless hero dead who gave up their lives on battlefields in all parts of the earth in the sacred belief that they were making peace possible for future generations of mankind everywhere.

The reason why such a great majority of the Members of Congress have thus far supported all measures of foreign policy which have been presented to them since the war is that they know that the peace of the world depends upon strong leadership by the United States of America, and that the only way our leadership can be made strong is to back it up with all of the vast resources of this Nation. They are determined that no present-day dictators abroad shall be permitted to scoff, as Mussolini did, at America's interest in world peace.

It is well that our heroic dead cannot envision the situation which exists around the so-called peace tables of today. America has tried to keep faith with them by organizing the United Nations, and has pledged its tremendous financial, economic, and military resources in an effort to make that organization an effective instrument of peace. America has not sought to acquire any conquered lands for commercial or political exploitation. On the contrary America has restored the Philippines to complete independence. Our only territorial acquisitions when the final peace treaties are signed will be minor islands in the Pacific which are virtually valueless except for our future national defense.

But American efforts to establish a permanent and stable peace have been constantly obstructed by certain of our allies in the late war who, but for our military aid and financial and economic support, would now be enslaved by the Nazi tyrants. Despite the fact that we rescued them from certain national destruction, these erstwhile allies have maintained an attitude of hostility toward us in all of the peace negotiations. They have openly resented our assumption of any responsibility for the reconstruction of Europe—a responsibility which we cannot and will not relinquish. Their policy appears to be basically anti-American. They have striven deliberately to make it impossible for us to cooperate with them, except on their own terms—terms which, in many instances, the American conscience cannot accept.

They ignore the fact that while the war was in progress they eagerly subscribed to our declaration that we were all engaged in a common fight to make the world safe for democracy. Now that the war is over—won for them by our arms and our blood and our aid—they repudiate our democracy and set themselves up as the sole arbiters of real democratic government.

I assert that no government is a real democracy which denies civil liberties and suppresses individual freedom by a sovereign dictatorship. I have been deeply concerned many times by utterances on the floor of Congress which sought to restrict civil liberties in America, but those were merely the utterances of individuals with a warped conception of the American way of life. The Constitution is the supreme law of our land, and the Bill of Rights in that Constitution is the greatest charter of democracy which the world has ever known.

Patrick Henry dramatized and immortalized the American concept of democracy in a single phrase: "Give me liberty, or give me death."

Other nations are attempting to substitute mass social security for individual liberty. Modern American liberals are demanding social security with liberty.

Many Members of Congress frankly confess that there are various aspects of our present foreign policy which they regard with deep misgivings. The United Nations represents the first great attempt in all history—an American attempt—to establish a peaceful world. We must be ever mindful of the fact that not all of the nations which are embraced in this new organization are themselves democratic, and we must endeavor in every proper way to treat their opinions on world problems with deference and respect. We have a right to expect them to treat our opinions in the same manner.

Many Members of Congress regret that our leaders of state did not see fit at first to submit the question of aid to Greece and Turkey to the United Nations. Their explanation is twofold, that the United Nations is not yet able to finance such an undertaking, and that the proposal would be foredoomed to a veto because its frank purpose is to check Communist aggression in the Middle East.

It seems to me that the paramount problem in the United Nations and in the whole scheme of foreign affairs today is to establish a practical working relationship between the United States and Russia. We should employ every honorable means to achieve this objective. Our diplomatic representatives say this cannot be accomplished by a policy of supine appeasement on our part, and in this position they are supported by the tragic lessons of recent history and by the overwhelming preponderance of American public opinion. But I hope that the United Nations will be preserved and strengthened by American leadership in a mutual effort on the part of all the member states to understand and respect each other's aims and aspirations.

All nations in this postwar world are interdependent economically, therefore there must be a world economic plan. Peace is essential, or civilization will be destroyed. To achieve these two all-important objectives America must assume a spiritual leadership which will prove to the world that there can be good will among men, even when they hold different political and economic opinions.

Liberals in Congress who voted for the Greek-Turkish aid bill—and most of them did so—have been bitterly assailed by the extreme leftist who profess to be the only exponents of real liberalism in

this country. The burden of this attack has been that these Congressmen have divorced themselves from the liberal cause, that by this single vote they have betrayed their late leader, Franklin Roosevelt, and have been false to his foreign policies. It is historically interesting to remember that most of these radical leftists, who now profess to have inherited the political mantle of Roosevelt, were bitterly opposed to his policies prior to the time when Germany attacked Russia. The validity of claims by any persons that they, and they alone, are carrying on President Roosevelt's foreign policy today was recently discussed by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. On May 16, in her syndicated column "My Day," Mrs. Roosevelt said that none of her late husband's followers or associates could be sure what his policies would actually be today:

When people talk about his policies in connection with the future or with situations which have occurred since April 12, 1945, they are guessing, pure and simple. Anyone who knew my husband knew that, while he had definite objectives always in mind, he met each situation as it arose and he took into consideration the immediate factors involved.

In view of this statement by Mrs. Roosevelt, it would not be surprising if the militant leftists should proceed solemnly to expel the President's widow from the ranks of the only true followers of Roosevelt in this country today.

Taft-Hartley Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is a waste of time for me to speak out against this NAM sponsored antilabor proposal. It is folly to appeal to reason when all reason has been discarded and only the hysteria of the lunch mob prevails. Let there be no doubt in our minds on this score.

My deep feelings on this issue compel me to speak out today, even though I know that a majority of the House have already made up their minds in favor of taking this blind and fatal step whereby the basic rights of millions of Americans will be trampled underfoot. In the name of basic human rights, I must protest against this vicious measure which strikes at the fundamental rights of labor.

During the course of debate on the Hartley bill, I heard many of my colleagues make the claim that they were not really against labor, but were friends of the workingman, and then proceed to give their support to H. R. 3020 which is one of the worst antilabor bills ever to reach the floor of Congress. These same people argued that they were supporting the Hartley bill to protect the worker from labor racketeers. These suggested that if the truth were only known most workers were for the bill.

WILL BREAK UNIONS

Such claims seemed naive to me at the time, and in a speech before the House I stated that the Hartley bill was aimed at destroying the American labor movement by taking away from the worker his only protection against ruthless employers, namely his union and his American right to organize, bargain collectively, and strike. At the same time, I also stated that the Hartley bill would fail to give America industrial peace, and would only increase industrial strikes and labor unrest.

Since the House passed the unwise and antilabor Hartley bill, there has been a storm of protest from all sections of the working population. Aroused citizens all over America have taken time off from their work to protest the tide of antilabor legislation which has been running high in Congress.

In Cadillac Square, in industrial Detroit, some 250,000 people gathered to express their protest against the break-labor bills now being passed. This was, I understand, the greatest outpouring of people in the history of Detroit.

LABOR PROTESTS

In agricultural Iowa, men and women workers all over the State declared a defend-labor holiday. Over 40,000 of them assembled in the State capitol. When Republican Governor Blue of that State told them that the Iowa Legislature was not unfriendly to labor, their reaction was a cry of derision.

In Chicago, packing-house workers at one rally, and workers from other industries throughout the State at another, made their voices heard. In New York City 75,000 workers marched to Madison Square Park, carrying banners urging the defeat of the Hartley-Taft bills.

Every labor organization in America—the American Federation of Labor, the railroad brotherhoods, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations—has condemned this antilabor measure. These three great labor organizations represent 14,000,000 workers. Every labor local in my district has passed resolutions against this bill which we are considering today.

I might add that opposition to this effort on the part of Congress to "butcher" labor is not confined to labor itself. Businessmen, farm groups, church organizations, citizens and veteran groups, and men and women of good will throughout America have decried this effort to place labor in a strait-jacket whereby labor is regulated and controlled in the interest of the employer.

There is a tendency, not only among the spokesmen of industry but in Congress itself, to discount these symptoms of unrest. Unfortunately, these signs of mass protest cannot be dismissed so lightly. When citizens are willing to leave their jobs in a body, and prepared to give up a day or a half-day's pay to let the Nation know that they will not allow themselves to be pushed around and robbed of their rights, we cannot just ignore it.

BIAS DEMONSTRATED

Some people have said, "Oh, that's just labor raising its voice." They try to give the impression that labor is just a malignant growth on the body politic, and is something separate and apart from the general public. This is an untenable position.

It is time for the Congress to stop thinking of labor as an irritation or a disease which must be stamped out. It is high time the proponents of this antilabor measure forget their promanagement bias and start considering labor as a group of honest, loyal, and patriotic citizens who have the same rights, hopes, and fears as any other section of the population. Labor is the most numerous section of our population. Labor, together with the farmer and small businessman, make up some 95 percent of the American people. As such they most certainly deserve equal consideration to the corporate interests and industrial giants in America.

The majority in the House has consistently favored corporate interests at the expense of the worker and the farmer. This unwise Hartley bill is nothing more than a codification of the legislative recommendations of the National Association of Manufacturers. At the same time the small businessman who is being crushed by the chain stores and monopolies is ignored, as legislation designed to strengthen the present antitrust laws remains in committee. Legislation designed to help the people of America—a large number of whom can be classified as labor—also remains buried. If we in Congress would show the same urgency and consideration for social legislation, the problem of housing, the high cost of living, as we do for legislation which is favorable to that segment of our population which we call industry, labor unrest would rapidly decrease.

STRIKES MEAN LOSS

Workers do not strike because they like to do so; every strike means a loss in wages to the laborer. The men of labor strike because it is the only device available for gaining and maintaining a decent standard of living for themselves and their families.

The recent country-wide demonstrations against the present antilabor legislation should give pause to every thinking Member of Congress. We must realize that such demonstrations were made by individuals and not by some extraneous force known as "labor."

It is said that the Hartley bill was aimed at doing away with industrial strife. The recent demonstrations should make the record clear that it will do just the opposite. Legislation which is designed to destroy the labor movement and to force the worker into a condition of serfdom, will not eliminate labor unrest. Forcing the laborer to submit to every whim of his employer or of an unsympathetic Government is not the way to industrial peace. This is the road to serious industrial strife.

Mr. Speaker, this slave-labor bill violates every principle of Americanism—it violates the rights of the people under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It is designed to take away the fundamental rights of labor to organize, to bargain collectively and to strike. It is

an instrument of industrial slavery. It is designed to destory the American labor movement and sacrifice the living standards of the people on the altar of corporate profits. It will not make for industrial peace, but will precipitate conflict between labor and management.

In closing my address, I want to condemn this measure as an effort to impose the hand of tyranny upon a free people. As such I must vote against it.

Resolution Adopted by Delegates of Textile Workers Union of America in Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution on minimum wage adopted on May 24, 1947, at the Bradford Hotel, Boston, by the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO:

MINIMUM WAGE RESOLUTION

Whereas the Republican Party is now in undisputed control of the Congress of the United States, and many New England Representatives and Senators are among the most influential Republicans in Congress, including Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Speaker of the House of Representatives; Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., of Massachusetts; Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of Maine, majority floor leader of the Senate; Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine; Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and others; and

Whereas the Republican-controlled Congress has seen fit to pass legislation placing severe restriction upon the activities of labor unions, thus effectively restricting the improvement of the living standards of workers and the organization of the unorganized, particularly in the predominantly unorganized South; and

Whereas New England Members of Congress will easily recall the postwar years of World War I, when cut-throat competition brought about by low wages in the Southern textile industry closed scores of New England textile mills, made ghost towns of many Northern textile centers and ravaged the economy of whole communities; and

Whereas New England textile manufacturers and Members of Congress, no less than New England textile workers, must look with grave apprehension upon the least possibility of a return to such conditions; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission, with the approval of the Supreme Court of the United States, recently approved an equalization of freight rates as between the North and South, a ruling that will cancel a substantial cost advantage hitherto enjoyed by Northern manufacturers; and

Whereas an increase in the legal minimum wage from the present 40 cents an hour to 65 cents an hour immediately and 75 cents an hour within 2 years is the least action that Congress can now take to prevent a return to the chaos and insecurity to which the Northern textile industry was subjected in the 1920's and the early 1930's; and

Whereas enlightened self-interest must impress the logic of this position upon Northern textile manufacturers and Republican Members of Congress, entirely aside from the vast social benefits that would derive from an immediate increase in the legal minimum wage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference, representing 90,000 New England cotton textile workers who are members of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, call upon every United States Senator and Representative from New England immediately and forthrightly to endorse the 65-cent to 75-cent minimum-wage bill, work for its speedy enactment, and vote for its passage; and be it further

Resolved, That this conference call upon all other divisions of the union, in every industrial field, to make similar demands upon their own Representatives and Senators; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to every New England Member of Congress.

Health Hazards of Workers in the Foundry Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, we often hear of so-called labor abuses. Under this carefully planned misrepresentation the most repressing kind of legislation is now being pushed through Congress. The abuses by industry are not very often mentioned these days. It is only when such dramatic events as the mine explosion occurs or a chemical plant blows up, that we think of the risks under which men and women work. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in Congress will weigh carefully the speech by R. J. Thomas, vice president of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, which I am inserting in the RECORD together with a resolution passed by the foundry workers organized in the UAW, as follows:

SPEECH OF R. J. THOMAS, VICE PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR, COMPETITIVE SHOP DEPARTMENT, READ AT THE NATIONAL FOUNDRY COUNCIL AT CLEVELAND, OHIO, APRIL 25–27, 1947

I regret very much that the pressure of business at the international executive board meeting in Detroit might make it impossible for me to attend this First National UAW-CIO Wage and Hour Foundry Council meeting. Though I may not be able to attend this council meeting, you may be sure that I will not neglect to carry out the express desires of the delegates to this foundry council.

I should like at this time, to report to you concerning the resolutions adopted by the international executive board as they relate to the foundry workers. In accordance with the mandate of the Milwaukee foundry conference for the establishment of a permanent wage and hour council, I introduced a resolution at the New York meeting of the international executive board calling upon them to approve the establishment of an industry-wide foundry council. I am pleased to announce to you that in compliance with your resolution and in accordance with my suggestion, the international executive board has authorized the establishment of a permanent national foundry council together with geographical subcouncils.

Only yesterday, the international executive board acted favorably on all resolutions referred to it by the Milwaukee foundry conference There will be a more detailed report on this later. I wish only to say at this time that the executive board has acted favorably upon your recommendation for the calling of a national CIO foundry conference to be composed of delegates from foundry locals within the UAW-CIO, the United Steelworkers, the United Electrical Workers, and the mine, mill, and smelter workers.

Other matters which had been discussed at the Milwaukee conference have been taken up directly with the various departments and regional directors of the UAW-CIO. Your resolutions concerning fair employment practices and discrimination in the foundry industry were called to the attention of the UAW-CIO fair practices department some time ago, with the request that that department undertake a special campaign to eliminate racial, national and sex discrimination in that section of our industry in which discrimination is so viciously apparent. Every regional director of the UAW-CIO has been called upon to make a special survey of foundries in his region—particularly nonferrous foundries—for the purpose of conducting an intensified organizing drive.

At your last conference in Milwaukee, you will recall that I urged the delegates to pay particular attention to the problems of health and safety in the foundry industry. The events of the past few weeks have served to emphasize the importance of health and safety conditions in industry and the need for the complete mobilization of organized labor to fight the wholesale butchery of workers by the monopoly employers of industry.

The American people were shocked by the revelations of the committee that investigated the Centralia mine disaster, in which 111 of our brothers in the United Mine Workers Union lost their lives. That investigation proved conclusively that the Centralia mine had for months been declared unsafe, but that the mine operators refused to install safety equipment because they did not want to spend the few thousand dollars involved. And this flagrant violation of the law was winked at by State mine inspectors because the owners of the Centralia mine were heavy contributors to the Republican Party campaign chest.

In the recent explosion in Texas City, Tex., hundreds upon hundreds of our brothers and sisters—some of them members of the National Maritime Union; others, workers at the Monsanto Chemical Co.—lost their lives because the hazardous safety conditions—which had been called to the attention of the employers by the workers—were never corrected. There can be no question but that the captains of American industry do not intend to show to their workers even the same care and consideration they show to their machine.

In 1946, American industry received $3,000,000,000 in tax rebates from the United States Treasury. In 1946, American industry made a fantastic total of $15,000,000,000 in profits. But American industry could not afford a cent to save the lives and preserve the health of the workers from whose labor those profits were made.

I most earnestly urge that the delegates to this council draw up suggestions for a proposed Federal health and safety code for the foundry industry. The monopoly employers of industry have no intention whatever of taking any action to safeguard the health and safety of the workers. We must—and will—take that action ourselves. I recommend upon adoption of a suggested Federal health and safety code for the foundry industry—together with provisions for regularly monthly inspections of all foundries—that a committee representing the foundry workers of the UAW-CIO go to Washington to meet with the United States Bureau of Labor Standards and Members of the United States Congress to demand enactment of the required legislation.

There can be no question but that conditions in the foundry industry are as hazardous as they are in any industry in the country. An explosion in a coal mine is spectacular, and the miners die swiftly. In the foundry industry, the workers die the slow and lingering death of some form of silicosis. In both cases, disease or death is the inevitable lot of the workers; and in both cases, responsibility for the existence of the hazards that lead to disease or death rests directly on the shoulders of industry.

These conditions must be—and they will be—wiped out. But their elimination will require the unity of all of organized labor and its militant determination to fight the employers and their reactionary agents in Congress and the Administration until the battle has been won.

You have my best wishes for a constructive and a successful meeting. I am sure that the foundry workers can be counted on now—as they have always been counted on in the past—to meet the problems that face the labor movement with fighting courage and militance.

RESOLUTION 2 OF FOUNDRY WORKERS ON HEALTH AND SAFETY

Whereas current hazards in the Nation's foundries are annually exacting a tremendous toll in deaths, disabilities, and occupational diseases; and

Whereas in the main this dastardly condition stems from the haphazard controls loosely exerted by the various States; and

Whereas the aforementioned condition closely parallels that existing in the mining industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference go on record in petitioning Congress and the proper officials in the Dominion of Canada to establish a bureau of foundries, with the express direction that said agencies establish a minimum of working conditions with a policing force to guarantee its observance; and be it further

Resolved, That a committee representing the foundry workers of the UAW-CIO go to Washington to meet with the United States Bureau of Labor Standards and members of the United States Congress, as well as the equivalent authorities in Canada, to demand enactment of the required legislation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all UAW-CIO locals, the Department of Labor, the Senate Labor Committee, the House Labor Committee, and/or the equivalent authorities in Canada, and the international union.

Labor Bill Conference Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. HOWES MEADE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am casting my vote for the conference report for the reason that I am a friend of the laboring man.

I voted against the Hartley bill H. R. 3020 when it passed this House 308 to 107 with a majority of the membership of both the Democratic and Republican Parties voting for the bill. This bill in my opinion was vicious. The reason for such a lopsided vote of 308 to 107 was that the public was demanding labor legislation. In my opinion, the public was influenced by unfair labor practices such as jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. These instances received wide publicity and influenced public opinion.

This bill as reported by the conference is in no way related to the original Hartley bill. This bill will, in my opinion, cure the cases that cause the bad publicity and therefore help the great labor movement. This bill will not in any way hurt any of our hard working laboring men. It will help them by weeding out radicals and wrongdoers who create unnecessary disorders. It will strengthen all legitimate labor unions.

I am interested in the coal miners in this country. Their life is a hard one. In too many cases their life is a short one because of the lack of proper enforcement of the safety laws. This bill will have only one effect on them: If, when a strike is called in the coal industry, the President deems that the strike will endanger the Nation's health and safety, he can order the Attorney General to seek an injunction for a period of 80 days. At the end of the period of the 80 days the men, by secret ballot, vote whether or not the last offer of the coal industry should or should not be accepted. If a majority of the mines vote against acceptance the strike goes on. If the majority vote for it the terms of the offer will be accepted.

A fund of $150,000 is provided for the study of labor-management relations. If there is anything in this bill that should react in a way to hurt rather than help our labor movement I will be the first to demand its repeal.

Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 16, passed by the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois:

Senate Joint Resolution 16

Whereas there was imposed by the Revenue Act of 1932, enacted by the Seventy-second Congress, a tax of 1 cent upon every gallon of gasoline sold in the United States; and

Whereas this excise, although originally imposed upon the people of the United States as a measure to endure only for the period of the depression, has not only been continued until the present day but was actually increased by 50 percent in 1941; and

Whereas both the economic depression which was cited as justification for the original levy, and the war emergency under pressure of which the tax was increased, have for all practical purposes ceased to exist; and

Whereas it is an accepted principle of political economy that funds obtained from taxation of gasoline and lubricating oils are to be used only for improvement of roads and motoring conditions; and

Whereas the receipts from this tax are not allocated to a special fund, appropriation from which is restricted to the purposes mentioned above; and

Whereas by its action the Federal Government has tapped a source of revenue which has always been regarded as a State prerogative and has usurped powers which the Constitution reserves to the States and the people: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we hereby petition and memorialize the Eightieth Congress of the United States to repeal immediately those provisions of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended, which impose a tax upon the production and distribution of gasoline; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared by the secretary of state and forwarded to every Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the senate March 12, 1947.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives, May 22, 1947.

HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] prepared an address on the subject that is now before the Senate, which was delivered on his behalf at an American Federation of Labor rally at Madison Square Garden last night, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, on numerous occasions it has been my privilege to speak from this same platform, in behalf of great causes, in the interest of justice, in defense of fair play. Frequently, I have had the honor of addressing you, the members and friends of organized labor, for you have been most steadfast and loyal in defense of all the freedoms that add up to America.

The fact that labor is under attack is nothing new. It has been going on since working men and women of this country first undertook to organize in defense of their inalienable rights.

The labor act which is about to be passed by Congress tries to do to labor what all the enemies of labor have tried so hard to accomplish during the last century and, more particularly, during the last decade.

"Oh, no," cry those who are urging the passage of this act. "We are your friends, we want to help you, we want to free you from the strange hold of your leaders, we want to equalize things. After all, you don't want to have an unfair advantage over your employer."

My friends, imagine saying this to the workers when real wages have been on the decrease since the end of the war while prices have skyrocketed.

Imagine saying that labor has too much power, when labor and its friends couldn't even succeed in persuading this reactionary Congress to maintain price control, or increase the minimum wage, or pass a health and educational aid program, or legislate more effective control and regulation of monopoly, or enact an equitable tax program, all of which would be of great benefit not only to labor, but to the whole American people.

Such hyprocisy should come as no surprise. It was shown up by George Meany, one of your ablest leaders, a few days ago. He referred to the Republican platform of 1944, which stated: "The Republican Party accepts the purpose of the National Labor Relations Act, the Wage and Hour Act, and the Social Security Act, and all other Federal statutes designed to promote and protect the welfare of American working men and women and we promise a fair and just administration of these laws." Mr. Meany quoted the promise of the 1944 Republican Presidential candidate to continue the National Labor Relations Act a "good and necessary law".

My friend and your friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his famous speech before the International Brotherhood of Teamsters in Washington in 1944, summed up this hypocracy when he said: "I cannot talk out of both sides of my mouth at the same time."

Today, my friends, the enemies of labor have done a little streamlining. Once upon a time, people who were against labor unions and the rights of labor admitted it. They publicly denounced unionism. But that failed.

The new approach is simple. No longer do the enemies of labor confess to what they are. They now call themselves "moderates". They now say that they are really the friends of labor, striving desperately to prevent the opposition from "going too far".

Let me warn you again these self-styled "moderates"—these men who want to walk in the middle of the road so that they can curry support from both sides at once. They are all the more dangerous because of their devious ways.

They are the ones who say that it would be going too far to chop off the heads of labor unions. They want to be more gentle and kill labor unions by degrees.

They are the ones who say that it would be going too far to shackle labor hand and foot. They only want to tie the workingman's hands behind his back, put a blindfold around his eyes, and leave his feet free so that he will have a chance to run for his life. This is what they consider fair.

Beware of these soft-spoken gentlemen, who are trying to persuade labor that, if not for their efforts, things would be worse. They are just trying to use the stiletto instead of the blackjack. But these double-talking politicians sometimes give themselves away in an unguarded moment—as, for example, when one of them said recently that the labor bill was now just perfect, and that he and Senator Taft saw eye to eye to it. I do not need to name names—you know what is going on, and nobody is going to pull the wool over your eyes twice in a row. Once was enough.

Now what does this foul labor legislation before Congress today actually do? It substantially removes the safeguards of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, by allowing injunctions in a variety of situations. It imposes hundreds of restrictions upon the administration of the National Labor Relations Act. It allows company unions to reappear on election ballots. Under the pretense of giving the employer the right of free speech, it prohibits the use of anything an employer says as evidence against him.

It outlaws secondary boycotts aimed at defeating sweatshop conditions. It makes the Government the sole arbiter of jurisdictional disputes. It forbids or removes collective bargaining on such vital issues as the closed shop, the union shop, the check-off and health and welfare funds. It requires unions, as a condition of seeking legal redress, to file reports so detailed and burdensome as to paralyze effective action. It makes it illegal for a union to expel from membership a labor spy or one who has stolen the union funds, or one who has led wildcat strikes. It eliminates the power of a union to remain internally strong and united.

It strengthens the power of communism within the trade union movement by visiting the penalty for having a Communist officer upon all the members of the union—Communist, non-Communist, and anti-Communist alike. It weakens the Department of Labor by breaking it up. In 73 pages of text our labor policy is warped and distorted to make the Government a strike-breaking, union-busting instrument.

This foul bill makes sure that you, who believe in rewarding your friends and punishing your enemies, can't penalize those who vote for this outrageous law. It would prevent any expenditure by a labor group for any political purpose whatsoever that had to do with the election of a Federal officeholder.

My friends, the National Labor Relations Act, which the current labor bill will so emasculate, is engraved in the hearts of our people. It is more than print in a statute book. When I wrote the law, I explained it in eight words. I said, "This is a law to make men free." Under the National Labor Relations Act, millions of men and women have breathed that freedom into their daily lives. Let those who would now destroy it learn first to legislate blood out of men's hearts. I make no plea for the National Labor Relations Act just because my name is on it. Its wisdom has been attested to by the highest judges in this land. I merely venture to warn, out of no despair but in full confidence in our people, that the course the present Congress is about to pursue is an attempt to root out industrial self-government—and this miserable effort will fail.

My friends, I stand before you today to predict that if the legislation now before Congress should become the law of the land, that day, too, "will live in infamy." Such confusion and chaos and such clashes between employer and employee, and ultimately, yes, between class and class, may come to pass that American industrial life and democracy as we know it, and as my dear, departed friend and our greatest President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, envisioned it, may well be destroyed—perhaps never to be resurrected.

It is up to you, the American working men and women, to stop it.

You have a stanch friend in the White House—in Harry Truman. I do not believe that he will ever sign this monstrous bill. But you must marshal all your forces to make sure that the reactionary Congress does not ride roughshod over the wishes of President Truman and all other decent men.

I call upon you to rise up in your just indignation and smite down your oppressors and betrayers.

Disarmament Must Come Eventually

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by Mr. Norman Thomas, which appeared in the June 2, issue of the Progressive. It is timely, it is challenging, and Mr. Thomas' approach to the problem is very realistic. I commend it to all Members of the House.

THE PRICE OF PEACE

(By Norman Thomas)

It is a desperately hungry world. Before the war it was commonly said that at least half of the world was ill-fed, by any proper standards of nutrition. Today the United States, Canada, and a few small countries are the only nations that can be said to be well fed, and in the United States we have by no means ended the reproach that "one-third of our people are ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed."

Yet Hanson Baldwin in his sensational survey (published in the New York Times, May 12, 1947) tells us that almost 19,000,000 men are in the armies of the world; that the total cost of getting ready for the next war is at least $27,400,000; and that the nations after "total victory" over the "war-loving"—but now disarmed—Germans and Japanese "are spending perhaps $10,000,000,000 more on armament than they did on the eve of war in 1938." Of the Big Five, Russia and the United States spend most. The tremendous Chinese armies are caught in civil war, and poverty-stricken France in the midst of her own internal crisis sends 1-year conscripts "to replace casualties" in her infamous colonial war in Indochina.

It is fantastic nonsense to talk economic rehabilitation, international cooperation, or lasting peace under these conditions. Already our only hope of peace seems to rest upon mutual fear of rival armaments. This is a situation out of which ambitious rulers of the nations will almost certainly blunder into the kind of war which may literally be the end of the human race.

The final price of peace is something more in our quarreling world than universal disarmament. But universal disarmament under effective international control is the absolute and initial condition for solving the problems of hunger and of war.

The readers of the Progressive are aware that ever since the war's end I have been a man with a specific cause, and that cause, disarmament. I am increasingly puzzled and frightened at the lack of response to a proposal whose benefits would be so tremendous and so obvious. Many men in more or less high position have spoken more or less clearly in favor of disarmament. But very few have tried to make it an immediate and pressing issue.

Take Henry Wallace, for example, the self-appointed champion of peace. He has said some vague good words for disarmament, but he had made no major issue of it. Instead, he seems to put his trust in a negative opposition to the Truman doctrine of military aid to Greece and Turkey—an opposition which I share for rather different reasons; an uncritical and much too optimistic faith in the United Nations as it is now organized, and an exhortation to the United States to devote billions of dollars to world rehabilitation. He has also favored some sort of international control over the world's supply of petroleum.

Can he not see that these economic proposals, good in principle, are fantastically utopian so long as all nations, big and little, devote a very large part of their revenue and their attention to competitive armament?

Let us put it bluntly. There might be a sound case for a large American loan to Russia, despite the difference between us, if both nations were disarmed and prosecuting what conflicts may arise between them on a nonmilitary plane. But so long as the Soviet Union devotes a high percentage of its entire national income to armies and armaments at

tragic cost in poverty to her people; so long as she uses her own armies and those of her satellite nations for the kind of imperialism she practices in eastern and central Europe, it is unthinkable that the United States will or should lend her vast sums for economic rehabilitation and industrial progress that would release Russian resources for more and better armaments.

It is equally absurd to assume that nations which have not agreed on the international control of atomic energy will agree on any sort of pool of petroleum resources under the auspices of the United Nations or any other international body. There may be some pious talk about this sort of thing; there will be no effective action until at least there is agreement on the elementary proposition that a hungry world cannot afford the present race in the manufacture of weapons for its own probable destruction. Disarmament is the preliminary condition for every other approach to true internationalism or lasting peace. But somehow that elementary fact has not captured the popular imagination as it ought.

On this matter I speak with authority born of much experience. I have spoken on the subject across the continent, over the radio, and on the platform. I have written articles about it—one of them in the Progressive; the Postwar World Council has circulated my pamphlet on this theme, and Henry Holt has published my book, Appeal to the Nations.

In forum discussions, letters, and reviews of my book, my plea for effective disarmament has met with comparatively little direct opposition. Skepticism is perhaps the one word which best describes the attitude toward it. Usually that skepticism is born of fatalistic acceptance of atomic war, appalling to contemplate. Rarely do the skeptics offer any alternatives to my proposals for universal—not unilateral—disarmament under effective international control, which necessarily involves the rapid liquidation of all forms of imperialism. Nor do they try to answer in any detail my argument that disarmament is the essential next step.

The exceptions to this statement are the enthusiastic advocates of world government as an immediate possibility and necessity. These critics are at one and the same time too optimistic about the possibility of genuine and full-fledged world government now, and too pessimistic about the values of disarmament, not only as an immense beginning in the establishment of lasting peace, but as containing in the controls it would require the seeds of a desirable growth of world government.

I, too, believe that the right sort of world government is the ultimate guaranty of lasting peace, but no one can look realistically at the attitude of men and nations and believe that it can be achieved in any near future except as it conceivably be imposed by ruthless force. Conceivably, Communist and non-Communist nations or blocs of nations may live in one world without war. However sharply rivalry and ambitions for power may divide them, they do have a common interest in the continued existence of the human race.

The degree of international control necessary to supervise and enforce disarmament and to police a quota system would still leave each nation free to carry on its own way of life. Gradually, through functional cooperation and the growth of world citizenship, true world government might be established. But I cannot imagine being willing to risk the destiny of America or the cause of world peace and human progress in any conceivable federation in which the preponderant voting power would be Russian and Chinese. Nor can I imagine Stalin or even Chiang Kai-shek taking a risk on coming under the rule of a world assembly organized on the pattern of any of the schemes of weighted representation which American advocates of immediate world government have proposed.

Meanwhile, it may sound hard-boiled and realistic to say, "If you can't get world government, you can't get disarmament." It is probably true you can't keep disarmament without growing toward fuller world government, but logically it is absurd to say that all the difficulties in the way of world government apply equally to world disarmament under the limited controls that it would require.

By no means do the main obstacles to disarmament arise from a few extreme advocates of world government now. Usually, they arise from men and women who say, "Stalin won't agree." The specific formula which the American Government employs runs something like this: Agreement on international policing of atomic energy and of general security must precede universal disarmament. Since it is clearly the Soviet dictatorship which holds up such agreement, it is useless to discuss disarmament.

That is a negative approach, far from persuasive. A better psychological approach would be an American plea for the positive advantages of disarmament which would in turn require international supervision and control. Disarmament, we ought to proclaim, is our goal. It is vital to peace. It requires certain agreements for controlling atomic energy and protecting international security. They must be worked out as an essential part of the process of disarming, even if certain changes are necessary in the San Francisco Charter. The failure of the piecemeal approach we have tried with regard to atomic energy and a workable international police force is in itself an argument for this different emphasis and approach.

Maybe Stalin won't agree to a properly organized plan. His very failure would show us where we stand and on whom and what we have to count.

In any case I am becoming more and more persuaded that consciously or unconsciously a great many Americans say "Stalin won't agree," when they mean, "We don't want real disarmament."

I don't think that as yet America is either a militarist or an imperialist nation, but there are strong militarist and imperialist forces among us. When the President's budget would set aside 30 cents out of every taxpayer's dollar for armed forces and armaments, it means that getting ready for war is big business.

It is, I still insist, possible that the Soviet dictatorship in the interest of its own people might agree to that disarmament to which Molotov and Gromyko have already given lip service, even although it would require an effective form of international control to which heretofore they have objected. No people would gain more than the Russians were they free to use their manpower and resources for the business of building up their vast territories and relieving their desperate poverty of consumer goods.

If Stalin should reject effective controls of disarmament, it would be for various reasons. Whatever Communist propagandists tell the Russian people, the rulers probably count on the fact that there is enough decency in the United States to make impossible a preventive war while we still have the monopoly of atomic bombs. Stalin also in his mind believes that we are heading, as indeed we are, for a depression—a depression of such magnitude that we shall be preoccupied with our own domestic troubles.

More than all this, every ruthless dictatorship needs to be able to threaten its people with a foreign enemy to justify its own grim tyranny. Only so, the dictators say, can you have security. (One of the chief objections to military aid to Turkey is that in the minds of most Russian people aid to their ancient enemy, right across the mountains from their oil fields, will seem to justify their rulers who cry out against the danger of Russian "encirclement" by "Anglo-American imperialism.")

In view of these considerations I do not plead for an American appeal for universal disarmament because of an easy assurance of Soviet agreement. I plead for it more than ever in the light of the Truman doctrine, because if America should make this appeal she would light a fire of hope and determination in the peoples of the world which no dictatorship could crush out. She would clear the air and line up the nations on a basic principle. She would do more to check Communist aggression than by any other means.

Make no mistake about it. Europe and much of the world regard us with a degree of suspicion, justified perhaps by the history of imperialism, even if it is not altogether fair to our own American record and present intentions. You can't blame the European peoples for a desperate concern for peace and a steadfast determination not to be drawn into war against their mighty Soviet neighbor.

Henry Wallace's reception in Europe is only one bit of evidence that the Truman doctrine is regarded with suspicion as a more likely breeder of war than a guarantor of peace. Still less can you blame the colored races for a deep-seated mistrust of Anglo-American imperialism and racial arrogance. They know full well what Jim Crowism has meant in America and how much worse is white supremacy in South Africa.

There is one way and only one way to break down this mistrust and to prevent clever and unscrupulous Communist propaganda from exploiting it to achieve a steadily growing moral isolation of the United States. That one way is for America, temporarily the strongest of nations, to propose universal disarmament (with which must go the liquidation of imperialism) under entirely practicable forms of international control.

Such disarmament—I repeat it again and again—must include far more than the international control of atomic energy. It will require the universal abolition of peacetime military conscription; the demilitarization of narrow waterways and island bases; the reduction of armed forces and armaments on land and sea and in the air to a police level for maintaining internal order, and the liquidation of all forms of imperialism which in the last analysis rest on armed might.

Comparatively simple reforms in the United Nations would permit it to set up satisfactory systems of inspection and control. (These reforms I have discussed at some length in my book Appeal To The Nations. Ely Culbertson has discussed them from a somewhat different angle and at greater length in his Must We Fight Russia?)

This sort of disarmament would automatically settle questions like the problem of the Dardanelles. It would enormously reduce the tension over strategic boundaries and the ownership of oil wells. It would greatly simplify the difficult problems of rehabilitation and world trade. It is the only alternative to the mad effort to get peace by one or the other opposite follies of appeasement or preventive war. It is, in short, the essential next step for peace, a step for which there is no substitute and without which other proposals, desirable in themselves, will either fail altogether or do little to still the fears, the hates, and suspicions which sweep us toward the doom of atomic war.

President Truman, if only he had made universal disarmament his doctrine, would have won a place in the affection of mankind that he cannot win by American military intervention, allegedly to stop Communist aggression. It is not yet too late if only the

people of America—yes, of the world—will demand immediately of their rulers this guarantee of life for their children. Let America lead in this appeal to the nations, and no Soviet dictatorship can forever keep its people from following that lead.

The Closed Shop—Analysis of Section 8 of H. R. 3020

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an analysis of section 8 of the bill now pending before the Senate, House bill 3020.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF SECTION 8 OF H. R. 3020 AS PASSED BY THE SENATE OUTLAWING THE SO-CALLED CLOSED SHOP

The 7,500,000 members of the American Federation of Labor are divided up into approximately 40,000 local unions affiliated with the national and international unions or directly affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Four million members of these 40,000 local unions are now working under union-shop contracts. In a number of instances union-shop contracts are entered into between the employers' associations and the national or international unions covering the affiliated local unions on an industry, regional, or local basis.

Most of the local unions have business representatives and maintain offices, which is the focal point for their membership. Day-rooms are maintained where unemployed members can congregate daily for the purpose of finding employment. The business representative acts as the counselor and employment agent.

The practices referred to herein would be wiped out completely by H. R. 3020 as passed by the Senate. Employers would be prohibited from making agreements that would permit this practice to continue. In its stead, provisions are made for union-shop contracts where anyone may be hired with a provision that he join the union in 30 days and where a majority of workers affected vote for same, under the supervision of a National Labor Relations Board. This, in itself, is a highly impractical feature, one that cannot possibly be carried out and one which, if attempted, would bring a tremendous financial burden to bear upon the taxpayer. Where today a union may enter into a union-shop agreement with a large number of employers through the employers' association, under the terms of H. R. 3020 passed by the Senate, labor elections would be necessary in each shop.

It is inconceivable that a bureaucracy could be created that would adequately supervise the elections of the literally tens of thousands of contracts to be entered into. All of existing contracts would have to thus be supervised, and elections, in connection therewith, held.

The bill further provides that the union under a union-shop contract is compelled to take into its membership anyone the employer places to work on the same terms as the other members of the union were admitted to membership. This precludes the possibility of the union maintaining discipline by placing fines upon its membership for infractions of union rules, such as strike-breaking or lesser infractions. It opens the way for the strikebreaker, the undercover spy, and the Communists to infiltrate into labor unions to which they would otherwise be ineligible. One glaring inconsistency is that it provides that unions must take into membership Communists who are hired by employers who can in time aspire to office in the union, under the democratic procedure of the unions in the American Federation of Labor, and once in the position of an officer of the union such union's rights as a bargaining unit are nullified under the terms of this bill.

Radio Broadcast on Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include herein a radio address which I delivered over Station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Thursday, June 5, 1947:

HOMES FOR THE DISPLACED PERSONS OF THE U. S. A.

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, the present housing shortage is not only a critical problem for millions of Americans but is also a national disgrace. The most powerful nation in the world, with a wealth of material and construction skill, is making very little progress toward the solution of this No. 1 need.

People can do without certain articles of clothing and can sacrifice some items of food which are beyond their reach, but they cannot endure lack of decent shelter.

Outside the normal increase in population, other factors have worsened the situation. These include demobilization of large numbers of veterans, less intensive use of housing accommodations, the trend away from construction of rental units, and the change from tenant to owner occupancy.

In 1945 over 6,000,000 veterans were returned to civilian life. Through 1946, the number was increased by 5,600,000. Up to the end of February, this year, 200,000 more were demobilized. The delayed impact of 12,000,000 veterans coming back to a housing shortage that was already severe gives some idea of the size of this peacetime emergency. When you add to this the fact that more than half the veterans are married and want to establish homes of their own, you can readily see that the veterans who saved the Nation have become its displaced persons. While our hearts and our purse strings have been opened on a bountiful scale to the peoples of other lands, we have not succeeded in providing for the shelter needs of our own big family here in the United States.

At the beginning of this year there were 2,200,000 married couples in nonfarm areas who were doubled up in homes with other families, and about 300,000 married couples were living in hotels, rooming houses, tourist camps, shacks, garages, and chicken coops. The net number of new families which will be formed during 1947 will come to 500,000. Even allowing for the most optimistic figures as to the number of dwellings which will be completed this year, it is plain that by next winter more than 2,000,000 families will still be without homes of their own.

Real-estate boards blame the uncertain price situation, which has already gone far beyond the reach of many people who want to build their own homes, for the lag in building. They also claim that a continuance of rent control is holding some available space out of the market. On the other hand, a few real-estate operators wish to see rent control continued because they fear that without controls there will be a speculative boom and bust which will be disastrous to tenants and owners alike.

Be that as it may, we know that there is a great imbalance in the use of such housing as is available. During the war years many families enjoyed large increases in income. One result of this was a less intensive use of housing accommodations. The Bureau of the Census estimates that in the year 1945 over 29,000,000 dwelling units were occupied by four or less persons per unit. This was nearly 4,000,000 more units than were so occupied in 1940. To put it in another ratio, 54.9 percent of all occupied dwelling units in the United States had three persons or less in 1940, while in 1945, 60.2 percent contained three persons or less. Some people were using more housing space than formerly, and would not make room for returning veterans.

As a result, veterans have been forced to double up with other families or in-laws with consequent loss of privacy, which leads to friction. Oftentimes young husbands and wives are forced to live apart in order to get any kind of accommodations. In either case the social dangers are serious. The young veteran and his wife and his children have no chance to set up a normal home life, which is the very foundation of individual and national security. He fought to preserve this for all of us, but he finds that the door to decent housing is closed to him. Small wonder that many have become bitter and more disillusioned by the Nation's failure to solve this domestic problem.

Last year exhaustive hearings were held on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. Testimony pro and con on this and related measures has continued through the present session of Congress. With adjournment coming closer every day, it is unlikely that the Congress will enact this remedial legislation unless a vigorous expression of public opinion demands action. The housing shortage is critical. It will be worse next year unless the Congress adopts a comprehensive national housing policy. You, the people, must write to your Senators and Representatives, insisting that this be done before the national legislature goes into recess. The character of family life, the conditions under which our children grow up, and the attitude of the people toward our system of Government are influenced by the environment in which they live.

The over-all shortage of decent accommodations has been with us a long time. Only recently has it become desperate. Millions of American families are compelled, for reasons beyond their control, to live in substandard housing and in slums and blighted areas. For many, many years, the volume of house construction has not kept up with replacement needs. Apart from the need for more housing, it is estimated that a minimum of 6,000,000 houses are firetraps or disease breeding, so dark and crowded and unsanitary that they promote delinquency and crime. These must be torn down and replaced by decent structures.

In the light of this, the housing problem becomes a twofold challenge. The current shortage must be overcome, and new construction must accommodate the annual net increase in the number of new families. At the same time we must try to eliminate slums and run-down areas, replacing them with decent housing for the people who live in such places and at prices they can afford to pay.

To do all this, we must build at a rate of 1,500,000 houses a year over a sustained period. The size of the job is emphasized by the fact that the highest previous peak

of construction was reached in 1925, when 937,000 dwellings were started. To meet present and increasing needs and at the same time replace the backlog of bad housing, we must produce a yearly goal which is 50 percent greater than the building totals reached by the all-time high established in 1925.

An over-all attack on this problem is imperative.

Spokesmen for public housing and for private industry have admitted that neither one alone can measure up to the task. It is impossible to build a new house or a new apartment for the lowest-income group without subsidies, and that applies to the Government as well as to private industry.

The two must work together as a team.

It is important for Government on the local level to revise antiquated building codes. It is advisable for the building industry to abandon restrictive practices which have held back the production of homes. It is necessary for both to give every aid and encouragement to the technical improvement of home-building methods. Housing stands almost alone as an industry in which we hang on to handicraft techniques little changed from the past. The United States is able to produce more quality goods at lower prices than any other country in the world because it conceived and developed the mass-production method. There is no reason whatever why housing should not be produced by the same modern industrial means as clothing, household appliances, automobiles and most of the other things that we buy. Factory production of houses, to be assembled on the site, will not mean the end of conventional home building. It will simply reach lower in the income scale than present building methods do. Mass-production means lower prices and volume output. Houses which are being produced today, along conventional lines, are priced beyond the reach of the veterans and workers upon whom our national economy depends. Tailor-made houses alone will not solve the problem. We need to take bold and imaginative steps to modernize the home-building industry, to bring it up to the production levels of other industries. The A. F. of L. and the CIO have both endorsed the move for mass-produced houses for it would stimulate employment in the production of houses at the factories and in their erection on the building sites.

To meet the present emergency, we need the grass-roots enterprise of the people of Meriden, Conn. It is the same community spirit as that evidenced by the people of another New England city—Newburyport—in their approach to a different problem. In Meriden, Conn., however, the people are dealing with a commodity—houses—which they have had for a few years and will have for more years to come. Their immediate problem was how to utilize and expand what they had.

This community organized and planned. A survey was made to get figures on the housing needs. This was followed by a share-the-home campaign. Taking advantage of the State's offer to give a dollar for every dollar raised by the community for emergency veterans' housing, Meriden bought 40 quonset huts.

Then came the job of converting unused space into living units. Any owner who allowed the city to take over an attic, garage, empty wing, etc., and convert it into an apartment could lease this space to the city for 5 years without cost or profit. At the end of 5 years this renovated space would revert to the owner. For the 5-year wait he would get $4,000 to $5,000 worth of improvements scot free. Rentals over the 5-year period would return to the city its half of the investment. The State contributed the other half.

Here we have a perfect example of how one community helped to solve a good part of its emergency housing problem. Hand-in-hand with this, we must start on the basic long-range solution.

As a Representative in Congress from an industrial district, I am aware that the problem is most acute in the cities. The urgent demand is for rental housing on a multiple scale which private builders will not undertake. In the blighted wholesale and warehouse areas there are many unused and presently unfit buildings. Here and there you will find empty lots where dilapidated structures have been torn down to save taxes.

With this in mind, I am introducing a bill to encourage private builders in replacing slum areas with modern low-rent housing. Where the need is established by local authorities, I propose that the cities seize these run-down areas by eminent domain, paying proper values for what they take. The sites will be cleared, utilities put in, and the locations resold to private interests for immediate rental developments. The margin of loss suffered by a city in such exchange would be made up by Federal contributions to the amount of two-thirds. The cities would give lenient tax appraisals to stimulate the building of such private housing projects. All initiative and control would be on the local level.

Housing is a neighborhood crisis. The resources of the Federal Government should be used, in part, to underwrite the risks which must be taken. However, democratic enterprise and cooperation, teaming up local governments, civic-minded groups, and individuals, must be the prime movers.

The Congress of the United States wants to assist your community efforts. But it requires local leadership, expressing your city's needs and plans. Home-town get-up and go is necessary to solve home-town problems. And housing is the first of these.

Occupation Troops In Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely and informative report on the status of our occupation troops in Germany, prepared by my friend Col. Julius Klein, of Chicago.

Colonel Klein is a cool reasoned man with highly developed powers of analysis. He is a veteran journalist, editor, and military man who served in both World Wars.

As a correspondent and soldier he has won the admiration of his superiors and commanders. He is a graduate of the School of Military Government of the University of Virginia. He commanded troops in the South Pacific and in the Philippines.

He holds the Oak Leaf Cluster to the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, the Soldiers Medal for Heroism, and the Philippine Distinguished Service Star. Recently he has been notified that the Government of the French Republic has honored him with the rank of Chevalier of the Legion of Honor. He was also assistant to the Secretary of War and the author of the first combat public-relations plan for the War Department, and is thoroughly familiar with the German problem, especially as related to subversive activities, as he conducted the first subversive activities investigation in the Middle West in 1933 and 1934. That investigation produced the first dossier of subversive elements in this country. Colonel Klein was at the time of this investigation a member of the Illinois National Guard, during which period Secretary of State George Marshall, then Colonel Marshall, was instructor for the Illinois Guard. I have great faith in the authenticity of his facts and the authority of his comments on this very vital subject.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCCUPATION TROOPS IN GERMANY

A recent public opinion survey,[1] conducted by the American Military Government in Germany, indicated that 19 percent of Germans are nationalists, 39 percent are anti-Semitic and 22 percent are racists. Previous surveys, polls and intelligence reports yielded equal, if not more sinister, evidence in regard to the postwar status of the German mind.

It is not my objective to raise the question as to how these figures could be reconciled with the educational program of the United States Military Government in Germany, a program of significance not only for the Germans but for all the world. It is beyond me to say whether such extremely slow progress in the reeducation of the Germans was to be expected. I am, however, occupied with questions of lesser magnitude but of immediate grave concern to the American people: How do our soldiers, officers, and civilians fare amidst an atmosphere of such dangerous prospects? Have they been oriented for a democratic mission in a demoralized, totalitarian-minded country? Do they export democracy or are they likely to import divisive matter of un-American nature?

Most of our troops in Germany are callow recruits of an average age of 19, living comfortable lives, exposed not only to the dangers of venereal disease and involvement in black-market activities, but above all, to the danger of being victimized by the Germans on every intellectual front.

In daily and cordial contact with Germans, many of our men are totally incapable of the conception that the people they "occupy" seek pity for profitable advantages. While many Germans are only too willing to make concessions to the vanity of their juvenile masters, they feel no compunction in disseminating sly propaganda, in discrediting other occupation forces, in summarily stigmatizing DP's as immoral and thievish, and in representing the Jews in a degrading light. Reveling in conflicts and clashes among the allied nations, the Germans merchandise invectives against our former allies and overlook no opportunity to deepen religious and racial divergencies of our troops.

At times with rare subtleties hardly perceptible to our soldiers and at other times with audacious frankness, the Germans blend fact and fancy in regard to their own guilt. Steadily bickering for benefits in their contact with our troops, the Germans generate disunity and suspicion with practiced skill.

The most dangerous bearers of confusion are German girls. Four to seven years old when Hitler took over, they never cut themselves adrift from ideologies which had been part and parcel of their childhood. Their influence on our soldiers is alarmingly great and becomes greater every day as long as

[1] Chicago Sun, May 4, 1947.

they remain ensconced in important positions in military installations and administrations. I do not strive to examine the value or the curse inherent in the fact that our troops associate widely with German females. Neither would it be within the scope of this brief to superimpose the 1946 figure of 21,000 German women afflicted with venereal disease in the United States zone upon the unknown but certainly remarkable figure of sex relationships between United States soldiers and German women. Yet, if we add those facts to others—to the fact, for instance, that nearly 3,000 men in Germany have applied for marriage licenses; or to the fact that some United States soldiers were willing to throw away their United States citizenship in order to be able to wed the fraulein of their choice—then the question as to how this fraulein-rule affects our young occupation troops emerges with frightening emphasis.

The answer, in a nutshell, is given by one of our foreign correspondents[2] and underlines squarely the findings and impressions of many other competent observers:

"Many GI's with whom I spoke thought that Hitler had not been far wrong in his destruction of civil rights and his persecution of the Jews. Some of their officers are openly pro-German. 'We fought the wrong people' is a comment frequently heard."

Let me say once more that I fully appreciate the endless difficulties encountered by our education missions in Germany in their task of dusting, rearranging, and removing some of the mental furniture of the Germans. Yet, while affirmative attitudes toward German recovery are understood and approved, it would be tragic indeed should we permit our young men's mental health to succumb while we are so unsuccessfully trying to educate the demoralized people of an unregenerate Reich.

The outcome of inquiries of many on-the-spot observers, my own investigations, and dispassionate corroborations such as undertaken by the veterans' relations department of the Antidefamation League—all point toward just such a disastrous possibility. If we consider that in the course of a 10-year occupation about 1,000,000 young Americans will come in contact with the Germans and their cleverly cloaked resurgence of lethal ideologies, we can assume with safety that a considerable percentage of our men will become indoctrinated with perverse ideas which we had to fight at such a heavy price.

If we plan for the future safety and health of America, we cannot afford to reckon with a yearly return to this country of veterans poisoned with racial and religious hate fermented in Germany. We cannot afford to have these veterans picked out, victimized, and proselytized by our home-made subversive demagogues. We cannot afford such a sibility, and particularly during the coming years, which more emphatically than ever before in our history call for unity.

Whatever changes in our occupation policy may be contemplated in the future, whether the status quo will be upheld or whether control of the United States zone will be transferred from military to civil authorities, the War or the State Department will have to carry the responsibility for the mental health of our young men in Germany.

This responsibility is one of the highest importance. At present this obligation is being shouldered by the War Department special staff, Information and Education Division. So far, considering the terrible odds with which those hard-working and conscientious men are faced, their accomplishments have been admirable. Realistic and hard-hitting education programs have been worked out utilizing round tables, radio discussion groups, Army talks. Distinguished civilians have contributed educational material of highest quality. In fact, the entire I. & E. output is better now than it has ever been before.

Yet, the men heading I. & E. realize full well that no matter how many courses, radio transcriptions, and films are developed, nor how excellent they may be, the program is doomed to failure as long as it is not thoroughly applied to grass-root levels in Germany itself. What the soldier at grass-root level receives today is little more than the same staid, conventional lectures, chockful of cliches, devoid of inspiration, boring, and certainly not potent enough to prevent any dangerous warping of youthful minds.

Where, then, is the bottleneck? The answer, well known to I. & E. is this: There is a severe shortage of officers willing and qualified to implement the splendid output of higher levels into low and lowest grass-root spheres. Furthermore, the number of personnel authorized to engage in orientation work is inexcusably small in consideration of the great and indispensable task. The number of orientation personnel serving overseas is hardly sufficient to service one single battalion. And, finally: I. & E. assets have been reduced to bare bones.

Difficult as these obstacles appear, they should never be permitted to become the excuses for educational failure. The big issue, let me repeat, is not a brilliant improvement of existing educational subject matter. The big issue is the lack of efficient officers capable of implementing the program in lower echelons in Germany.

In an attempt to alleviate this need, one should consider that many possibilities remain inexhausted. Red Cross and USO have never been approached to join wholeheartedly in the Army's educational drives abroad. The columns of troop unit papers and the Stars and Stripes were in the past but sporadically used as educational auxiliary forces. Civilian lecture tours in Germany—and there were some very effective ones—were likewise marked by the same regrettable irregularity. And the manpower, initiative, and ingenuity of the Chaplain's Corps were hardly tapped in connection with educational projects.

The need for an effective innoculation of hundreds of thousands of our young and inexperienced men against the onslaught of hitherto undefeated ideologies is a pressing one. To assure success of this work, every facility must be placed at the disposal of the men entrusted with this weighty assignment.

[2] Winter of Discontent, by Arthur L. Mayer, March 10, 1947.

Lagging Federal Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAMILTON C. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charlotte Observer of May 31, 1947:

LAGGING FEDERAL AID BILL

With several bills for Federal aid to education lagging in committees, it might be well to remind the Members of Congress that in the present conflict for survival between communism and democracy, which may well continue throughout the present century, an educated American citizenship will be no less important in swinging the balance in our favor than the rehabilitation of non-Communist countries.

The children now in kindergarten will wage the final contest of ideas and wits to determine whether our western civilization is to emerge victorious over the eastern civilization that is bent upon destroying it.

Russia has realized the importance of this battle of ideas and is spending 8 percent of its national income on education. We in America apparently have not realized it, because we are spending only 3.5 percent of our income for the same purpose. On that basis the next generation of Russians stands a chance of having what may be a determining advantage over the Americans pledged to preserve our western system.

Whether the intellectual preparation of our future citizens for that struggle is the business of the States or of the Federal Government, or both, should be decided by the answers to these questions:

Is not the citizen of North Carolina and of Alabama also a citizen of the United States on an equal footing with the resident of New Jersey or California?

As such, is he not entitled to the same training in citizenship as his fellow-American of New Jersey or California?

Both of these questions, we submit, must be answered in the affirmative. Since the North Carolina or the Alabama child will, on coming of age, hold a dual citizenship, State and Federal, it is the business of both the State and Federal Governments to see that he is properly trained in the responsibilities that will devolve upon him in both categories.

If, however, the whole responsibility for this training is left to the States, the child fortunate enough to be born in New Jersey or California will have almost twice the training for citizenship as the child born in North Carolina or Alabama.

That discrepancy is no stigma on the States that spend the smallest amount in actual money on education, for those very States are the ones that work hardest at educating their children. Income payments to individuals in New Jersey in 1945 averaged $1,373; in North Carolina, the average was $732. In California in 1945 the average income of individuals was $1,480; in Alabama, $700.

Hence, North Carolina and Alabama were spending a larger percentage of their income on education, making greater sacrifices to provide their children with schools, than were New Jersey and California, though they spend in actual money less than half as much as the two richer States.

The American citizen living in North Carolina has the same responsibilities to his country as the American citizen living in New Jersey; he should have the same training to meet them. If the State is not rich enough to give him the same training, it seems obvious that the Federal Government should make up the difference, just as the State makes up the difference between its richer and poorer counties.

Federal aid to education is nothing new or revolutionary. Since 1787, more than 150 bills for Federal aid to education, in one form or another, have been passed by Congress—one for nearly every year of the country's life—and they do not include the large sums spent by PWA on buildings and equipment, by NYA, and through the GI bill of rights.

Under the bill introduced by Senators TAFT, HILL, and others (S. 472), States' rights would be adequately safeguarded, because this bill prohibits Federal intervention in the local administration of the schools.

We have seen, therefore, that our system of dual citizenship entails dual responsibilities on the part of both citizen and government. The citizen has his responsibilities to both the State and the Federal Governments, and they in turn have the joint obligation to train the citizen in the discharge of his duties.

The cost of Federal aid under S. 472 would reach a maximum of $250,000,000 annually by 1950, a little more than half of what we have just voted to stop the penetration of

communism into Greece and Turkey. But, as a weapon against communism, an educated American citizenship will be worth 10 times as much as any grants we may make to foreign countries.

We cannot, however, win this battle of ideas as long as the average American 20 years of age never gets beyond the ninth grade in school.

The Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, much has been said pro and con about the Taft-Hartley labor-management bill. Its backers claim it is a bill of rights for labor. Its opponents call it a slave labor bill. The truth is it is a labor bill that seeks to place labor and management on a par as to their bargaining powers; to bring peace to the troubled field of labor relations; to eliminate many unlawful labor practices that have developed under the National Labor Relations Act; and to make paramount the interest of the general public over that of any minority group, whether employers or employees. The Taft-Hartley labor-management bill attempts to do just that and nothing more.

Representative CHARLES HALLECK, the majority leader of the House, an active, well-known champion of the rights of organized labor during his 13 years in Congress, in the House debate on the Taft-Hartley labor bill said:

It is sane, fair, decent, reasonable—yes, courageous—legislation dealing with the problems of labor-management relations. * * * It preserves the guarantee of the Wagner Act giving labor the right to organize and to bargain collectively. * * * It provides remedies for activities and practices by labor and by management that almost everyone condemns. It forbids boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, violence in strikes, strikes in violation of contracts, strikes to compel employers to break the law, coercion of employees by unions. It imposes upon unionism restrictions far less stringent than those in the Railway Labor Act, under which the railroad brotherhoods have flourished for years. It preserves the constitutional guaranty of free speech. It provides for separating the function of the Labor Board, requires the Board to decide cases before it according to the facts, and gives to the courts real power to review the Board's decisions. And it puts the public interest in maintaining output so essential to our national well-being above the selfish interests of employers or of employees.

Now these are not provisions that destroy unions. Those who say they will destroy unions say, in effect, that unions, in order to exist, must be free to coerce workers, to engage in violence, to break their contracts, and to break the law, even the very law that protects them. I say this is not true. The great trade-union movement, which protects so many of our people and which has contributed so greatly to raising their standard of living, can and will thrive under the bill now before us. That is my conviction.

Mr. Speaker, because I agree with Congressman HALLECK'S analysis of the bill, I voted for its passage.

Under unanimous consent heretofore given I include in my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, June 5, 1947, which gives an excellent analysis of the Taft-Hartley labor-management relations bill:

THE LABOR BILL

The overwhelming vote of 320 to 79 by which the House yesterday placed its stamp of approval on the Senate-House conference labor-relations bill adds fresh, if redundant, testimony to establishing one point beyond cavil. In the light of that vote, climaxing as it does a series of others only slightly less decisive, it can hardly be longer doubted that the Eightieth Congress considers itself under a clear mandate from the people who elected it last November to enact legislation for the general reform and modernization of the Nation's labor-relations machinery.

This vote in the House did something else, moreover, that is important from the standpoint of the current controversy regarding the character and merits of the pending legislation. It disarmed the more extreme and unreasoning of its critics (who, needless to say, are also the noisiest) of the weapon which up to this point has been their chief reliance. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that it revealed that weapon for what it really is—a mere stage prop. These critics, whose favorite term of denunciation of the legislation is "slave labor," have depended up to now on a peculiarly insidious form of misrepresentation. For the most part, they have built their attack on sweeping generalizations, but when pressed to cite specific examples of the antilabor character of the legislation they have invariably extracted one or two of the more extreme provisions from the original House bill, and, after garnishing them generously with exaggeration, offered them as typical of the spirit of the legislation that was going to be sent to the President for his signature. They were able to do this by grouping the House bill and the Senate bill under the hyphenated title, the Taft-Hartley bill, and by deliberately refraining from pointing out that the vicious features to which they always alluded had no counterpart in the Senate (Taft) bill, the pattern of which has been accepted almost without a change by the conference committee, and which everyone at all familiar with the progress of the legislation has known from the outset would have to be accepted.

Now that the House-Senate conference has agreed on a single amalgamated measure, and now that this measure has received the blessings of the House (the one Chamber where it might conceivably be expected to run into serious criticism), we have for the first time a bill that can be referred to as the "Taft-Hartley bill." It will no longer be possible for critics of the legislation to invoke the ghost of the original House (Hartley) bill, for now not even the ghost of that measure remains. It was buried in conference committee, and yesterday the House chanted over its grave an impressive benediction.

As to the bill which has finally emerged as a result of the more than 4 months of painstaking work dating from last January 23, when committee hearings began in the Senate, what basis does it provide for the loudly trumpeted charges that it is slave labor legislation, that it constitutes a blow at the labor union movement, and that it marks a return to government by injunction? In the first place, this measure is not simply an anti measure. True, it seeks to curb the more obvious abuses of labor's new-found power by imposing upon the unions responsibilities commensurate with that power—responsibilities which many unions have steadfastly refused to impose upon themselves. But it provides, as well, new protection for union minorities and individual workers and for a general overhauling of the administration of the labor laws proposed.

In looking for a basis for charges that the pending bill would deprive labor of its established rights one would seek it naturally in those provisions dealing with the right to organize through its own unions, to bargain collectively and to strike in the case of grievances against management, or for the attainment of its demands, when such issues could not be received at the conference table. It was the avowed purpose of the Wagner Act, which the proposed law would supplant, to achieve and preserve these basic privileges for labor.

Does the proposed Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 forbid labor to organize through its own unions? Not at all. It does prohibit the closed shop, the essence of which is that no one will be admitted to employment in a given unionized shop unless he is already a member of that particular union. It prohibits it on the ground that it is too great a barrier to free employment to be longer tolerated. But to say that this is a return to the open shop, where one might elect to join the union or not, as he saw fit, is a complete distortion of the facts. If a simple majority of the workers in a plant wanted a unionized shop, and so voted, every nonunion employee would have to join the union within a stated period. This is not a blow at the labor movement; it is a blow against monopolistic union control of work opportunities for the individual.

What about collective bargaining? Is labor deprived of that right under the pending legislation? Not at all. On the contrary, one of the principal purposes of the proposed law is to see that labor not merely retains the right to bargain collectively, but assumes a duty to do so. In other words, it places on labor in this respect the responsibility placed unilaterally upon management under the Wagner Act. It says that unions, as well as management, are under an obligation to bargain in good faith and not merely to go through the motions of doing so. It provides, moreover, that having arrived at an agreement with management through bargaining (whether supplemented by a strike or not) a labor union is expected to live up to the terms of its contract—that failure to do so makes it liable to action for damages by management. Such suits, however, may be enforced only against the assets of the union, as such, and not against its individual members. The Wagner Act listed a number of practices on the part of management as unfair, and prohibited them. The proposed law would place labor unions under an obligation to avoid certain unfair practices on their part, such as jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, and these decisions would be enforceable, where necessary, by the Labor Relations Board through the injunctive process.

As to the right to strike, it is forbidden in one case only—that of Government employees. As a logical corollary to the encouragement of collective bargaining, however, it is discouraged in the case of others, except as a last resort. The new measure would provide that either party wishing to open up or terminate an existing contract must give 60 days' notice of his intention to do so, offering to meet for negotiations. If no agreement has been reached at the end of 30 days, the Federal Mediation Service would be notified. During this period or until the contract expires both sides would be committed to refrain from use of the strike or the lock-out. In the case of strikes which threaten the public health or welfare the President might order the Attorney General to postpone strike action by injunction, but this would be limited in its effects to 80 days.

In short, the invasion of labor's rights under the Taft-Hartley bill is not an invasion

at all. It is an attempt rather to see to it that organized labor, in the exercise of its rights, does not trespass, as it has been doing so flagrantly in recent years, upon the rights of management, the individual worker, and the general public.

Friends of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD I desire to include a notable address delivered by Mr. W. Ed. Jameson, of Fulton, Mo., before a farm meeting sponsored by the Fulton Rotary Club.

Mr. Jameson is one of the outstanding agricultural authorities in Missouri. He is not only an extensive landowner and has financed an exceptionally large number of farmers in the acquisition of farms, but he has contributed more effectively than any other private citizen I know to the conservation of the soil and the practical development of scientific farming.

In the course of his address before a representative group of Callaway County farmers he said:

As chairman of the agriculture committee of the Fulton Rotary Club it gives me real pleasure to welcome the men of the Hatton community to this banquet.

I want to talk to you a while on the most vital subject that has to do with our people today. Not only the farmer who tills the land but the merchant, doctor, preacher, and the mechanic all depend on the land for existence—the city man even more than the farmer. The farmer can always have something to eat and it is the surplus he raises that furnishes the food that the city man has to eat. I want to tell you in a few words what is happening to our precious soil and the most effective way I can bring it to your attentio is to tell you what I have observed from the airplane.

A few months ago I made a 1,200-mile trip together with the other members of the executive committee of an organization known as Friends of the Land which exists solely to bring to your attention what is happening to our country.

Twelve of us flew in a private plane from central Texas to Chicago. We flew low enough to see just what is happening to the country and it is both tragic and disheartening to see how terribly eroded the land is in a large part of the country. Many thousands of acres are ruined beyond repair.

To bring this home to all of you I chartered an airplane and spent one afternoon up in the sky. I covered the county backward and forward from east to west, north to south. You can't conceive without seeing it yourself the injuries that have already been done to hundreds of our farms. It will pay any man, who has a good-sized farm, to spend $5 flying over his own land. It would only take an hour of your time and cost no more than $5 to bring home to you what is happening.

It is said that the top soil from 40 acres of land is being washed away every minute down the Missouri, Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers to the Gulf of Mexico.

To begin with, we only had about 450,000,000 acres of arable land in the United States. Already approximately 50,000,000 acres of this land has been totally ruined, and another 50,000,000 acres is well on the way to ruination, and another 100,000,000 acres need attention right now to save it from eventual depreciation. That means that there is no more than 3 acres of arable land for each individual in the United States, and while the land is deteriorating the population is growing. To make you visualize what might happen to us, think what did happen to civilization after civilization that went totally out of existence because they did not preserve the land. That is why you hear of buried cities back in Mesopotamia. Even a large part of the Sahara Desert was fertile at one time and supported a large population. This all presents a dark picture. Within my own memory, back 50 or 60 years, I know of 10 or 12 families living on contiguous farms and making, at that time, what was thought to be a good living. Eventually all these farms were worn out and abandoned, and no families lived on any of them. I will tell you later what has happened to these farms.

Fortunately there is something we can do about it. The Government has been unusually kind to our county. It established the McCredie demonstration area, one of only four in the State. Everybody living in that area will testify to the good that has been accomplished. Then again the Government located the experimental farm under the Soil Conservation Department of the United States Department of Agriculture in this county on Highway 40, about 2 miles east of Kingdom City, this being operated in conjunction with the agriculture department of the State university. Then the Government acquired 13,000 acres in the west part of the county known as Cedar Creek Forestry and Pasturage Projects. It is in this project that the farms mentioned above are located, and you can't imagine unless you see it how successfully the Government is reclaiming this land and is furnishing good pasturage for thousands of head of cattle. This is a pattern that can be followed by any good farmer, and I am glad to say hundreds of our farmers are becoming conscious of the fact that they can save their land if they will only try. This is done by pulling in ditches, terracing and contouring, liming, building ponds, and other good farming practices.

On my trip yesterday afternoon I could see the contrast where one farm had been terraced and saved and another had been totally ruined by erosion. Another evidence that our farmers are awaking to the seriousness of this matter is the result of our election in organizing our county into the soil-conservation district when the vote was 860 to 1.

It is said that it takes 400 or 500 years to create one single inch of topsoil. Our average soil over this part of the county was from 6 inches to 7 inches deep in its virgin state, so when an inch is washed away it is gone forever so far as our generation is concerned.

Now to come back to the one outstanding organization that is attempting to do something about this matter I want to call your attention to the organization known as Friends of the Land. This is a national organization and I am a member of its board of directors and am on its executive committee. We meet twice a year in different parts of the United States. We pay our own expenses with the hope that we can awaken our people to the necessity of doing something right now about the matter.

There are four classes of membership in this organization. The annual dues for class 1 is $2,500 a year and you would be surprised to know that we have a good membership in this class. Class 2 is $500 a year and we also have a lot of members in this class. Class 3 is $100 a year. We have more members in this class but class 4 is only $5 a year which makes up the great bulk of membership.

We hope to have several hundred members in this county. We already have a good many members and I am proud to say I have never asked one single person to join the Friends of the Land who declined to do so and it is my purpose some time in the near future to organize a Callaway Chapter. I know it can be done because any county that can maintain a cattle feeders association for 25 years without missing a month—where from 75 to 100 of us sit down together and discuss our problems and where the Kingdom of Callaway Supper can be maintained for more than 40 years without missing a year, even during the war—can maintain a good chapter of the Friends of the Land. People who will volunteer to join will save me the trouble of coming to see you. I don't believe there is a more progressive set of people anywhere in the United States than right here and we can do anything we try if we have the will to do it.

It is a pleasure to be back up home with you good people and I assure you that the Rotary Club will enjoy every minute of our time with you.

Mary Must Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes:

MARY MUST WAIT
(By Thomas L. Stokes)

On the same day some years ago, the United States Supreme Court handed down one decision killing the anti-child-labor law and another which did something right handsome by the railroads.

This provoked the late Oscar Ameringer, the battling Oklahoma editor, to sit down and pour out his indignation, beginning something like this:

"It's a pity little Mary isn't a railroad."

This incident is recalled in a recent piece by McAlister Coleman in discussing a similar ironic situation today, not in the Supreme Court, but in Congress. This finds Congress passing the Taft-Hartley bill to restrict labor's rights and then preparing to put through the Bulwinkle-Reed bill to exempt railroads from the antitrust laws. Thus would be removed a measure of protection to the public as consumers and shippers and at the same time further entrench the industrial-financial monopoly that controls the railroads.

It would be interesting to know what happened to Mary, who was involved in the child-labor-law test case. We may imagine her, though, as a grown woman with a husband and family, one of the millions of housewives who pinch their pennies as they try to provide for the family in this era of inflated prices.

It's a pity Mary and Bill, her husband, are not a railroad, or a private power company, or a big taxpayer. For the Republican leadership in Congress, with some help from conservative Democrats, is taking good care of these interests and people. The railroads, by the Bulwinkle-Reed bill; private power companies, by curbing expansion of public power which has given the Marys and Bills cheaper electric rates; the big taxpayer, through the tax bill that would give him quite substantial cash relief and give Mary and Bill—if theirs is a large family of low income paying

$100 a year now in income taxes—a saving of $15 a year.

It does seem slightly ironical that the Senate, just as Congress sends the labor and tax bills down to President Truman, prepares to take up the railroad bill. Instead, for example, of pushing ahead on its calendar such measures to improve the lot of labor, such as housing, health, and education bills and to raise the minimum wage—all of which President Truman has coupled with labor-regulatory legislation in his recommendations. Or instead of using the machinery of the Employment Act, to do something about prices and inflation.

Railroad lobbyists claim the votes to put through their bill. They undoubtedly are right. It is a powerful lobby operating here. It knows its way around and is skillful in the technique recently revealed in this column, of enlisting the support of important constituents back home to bring pressure on members here.

A back-to-the-wall stand against the bill will be made in the Senate by Senator TOBEY (Republican, New Hampshire) and a small group of western Republicans and western and southern Democrats. In the last Congress, after the House had passed the bill, they prevented a vote in the Senate by threatening a filibuster in the crowded closing days of the session. Time was on their side then. The situation is less favorable now.

It looks as if Mary and Bill might as well fold their hands and sit back, as patiently as they can, until the railroads and the other interests ride by in review and get theirs from a generous Congress.

Our City and the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 4, 1947:

OUR CITY AND THE ATOM

It is a measure of the fearsome nature of our age that we must give serious thought to the possibility of Washington's overnight annihilation. The latest American to discuss this danger is Lt. Col. David B. Parker, an Army expert on atomic weapons. Writing in the Coast Artillery Journal, he reminds all of us again that our great and beautiful Capital City would be a top-priority target in another war and that it could be erased within a matter of minutes by A-bombs, radioactive gases, germ sprays, or a doomsday combination of the three.

This is a fact that rests on the testimony of many others besides Colonel Parker. His views are not new. They represent merely a local footnote to broader and more comprehensive security studies, like the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training—a report making grimly clear how vulnerable is the whole of urban America. Looking at the problem solely from the standpoint of Washington, Colonel Parker says that virtually every building in the city would have to be rebuilt to give reasonably complete protection, and he suggests that perhaps we ought to abandon the Capital and disperse the Government over a wide area.

Reconstruction, however, would be only a palliating safeguard at best, and its cost would be prohibitive almost to the point of impossibility. As for dispersing the Government, that, too, falls apart for practical reasons: No modern nation, with all the problems of the modern age to handle, can govern itself effectively from dozens of different places; it must have a central seat. Colonel Parker is on more realistic ground when he limits himself to such suggestions as that we should start "right now" to build underground facilities for our most vital Federal units. A limited program of a similar kind—aimed at protecting our key industries—has been advocated by the United States Strategic Bombing Survey and the Commission on Universal Training.

Every protective measure within reason must be taken. Here in the capital, for instance, besides the setting up of special safeguards for important Federal operations, it may be advisable for Congress to consider legislation designed to cope with what would happen if this city—including most Government officials from the President on down—were really wiped out one day. Throughout the Nation at large industrial dispersion and underground construction should be carried out to the greatest extent feasible. Above all, there must be preparedness of a kind that will make any potential enemy think long and hard before attacking us. Still, even as we undertake these and similar measures, we ought not to delude ourselves. We could spend hundreds of billions of dollars decentralizing our urban civilization, but even then our vulnerability would remain great, and the desolation among us would be unimaginably terrible should there be a war with A-weapons.

In short, without the kind of international control and peace that will insure men against the horrors of their own genius, we can have only palliatives. This is the towering fact of our time. It has a life-or-death meaning not merely for our own city, but for all the cities of America and all the cities of the world.

The Transfer of the United States Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to include a letter with reference to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 to place the United States Employment Service permanently in the Labor Department. Mr. Loysen is a career man who has served under both Democratic and Republican Governors of New York and whose experience and familiarity with unemployment problems has been of inestimable value in framing both National and State legislation in the field of unemployment and of unemployment insurance. His letter follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
New York, N. Y., June 3, 1947.

Hon. WALTER A. LYNCH,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am very much afraid that the proposal contained in the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 to locate the United States Employment Service permanently in the Labor Department will make permanent the administrative handicaps under which we are now working.

The close and logical link between the employment service and unemployment insurance programs was recognized when the unemployment insurance program was first undertaken; at that time Federal responsibility for both was vested in the Social Security Board.

Each program naturally supplements the other. The requirement that unemployment insurance claimants register for employment with the Employment Service brought into the public placement offices for the first time a true cross-section of job seekers; the overnight creation of this pool of available labor also brought to the Employment Service for the first time a true cross-section of employer orders for personnel. As a result, the Employment Service was equipped, because of the volume of its business, to administer the unemployment insurance work test in a realistic and satisfactory manner; and the employment offices were able for the first time to operate as bona fide community employment exchanges through which workers could be sure of prompt access to employment opportunities, and through which employers could be sure of access to the best personnel available. These results have been of real dollars-and-cents value to every community in the Nation.

During the period of federalization of the State employment services, first under the jurisdiction of the War Manpower Commission and, subsequently, of the United States Department of Labor, unemployment was negligible. The undesirable results of the separation of unemployment insurance and employment service administrations were therefore not generally apparent. Nevertheless, there was a perceptible growing apart in understanding and cooperation that is essential to the success of both programs.

Since last November 16, when the Federal Government relinquished its control of the State employment services, the employment service and unemployment insurance operations in each State have been consolidated, as coequal programs, under a single administration. The natural and mutually helpful relationships that prevailed before the war have been resumed.

We are handicapped, however, by continued separation on the Federal level. In administering the New York State Division of Placement and Unemployment Insurance we must carry on budgetary negotiations with three separate agencies: The Bureau of Employment Security of the Federal Security Agency for unemployment insurance purposes, the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor for employment service purposes, and Veterans' Administration for servicemen's readjustment allowance purposes. The readjustment allowance program is of necessity a separate undertaking, since we act only as agent for Veterans' Administration. However, separate relationships with respect to the other two phases of our program are unnecessary and have resulted in costly duplication of headquarters and regional office services, demand an unreasonable amount of time which should be devoted to solving administrative problems and improving the system in the States, and handicap us seriously in planning.

The compelling reasons for integration of the two operations were presented by President Roosevelt in his message to the Seventy-sixth Congress on April 25, 1939:

"The Social Security Board is placed under the Federal Security Agency, and at the same time the United States Employment Service is transferred from the Department of Labor and consolidated with the unemployment compensation functions of the Social Security Board in order that their

similar and related functions of social and economic security may be placed under a single head and their internal operations simplified and integrated.

"The unemployment compensation functions of the Social Security Board and the employment service of the Department of Labor are concerned with the same problem, that of the employment, or the unemployment of the individual worker.

"Therefore, they deal necessarily with the same individual. These particular services to the particular individual also are bound up with the public-assistance activities of the Social Security Board. Not only will these similar functions be more efficiently and economically administered at the Federal level by such grouping and consolidation, but this transfer and merger also will be to the advantage of the administration of State social security programs and result in considerable saving of money in the administrative costs of the governments of the 48 States as well as those of the United States. In addition to this saving of money there will be a considerable saving of time and energy not only on the part of administrative officials concerned with this program in both Federal and State Governments, but also on the part of employers and workers, permitting through the simplification of procedures a reduction in the number of reports required and the elimination of unnecessary duplication in contacts with workers and employers."

The reasons advanced by the President at that time are equally sound today. I believe, however, that consideration of return of the Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency should be the occasion for reexamination of the status, in the FSA, of the combined employment service—unemployment insurance operation.

As you know, the principal operating divisions of the Federal Security Agency are the Social Security Administration, the Office of Education, and the Public Health Services. Direct responsibility for the unemployment insurance program is vested in the Bureau of Employment Security which is only one of four bureaus of the Social Security Administration, the others being the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, the Bureau of Public Assistance, and the Children's Bureau. Thus, by far the largest program of the entire Federal Security Agency, affecting a very large percentage of the population of the country on a continuing day-to-day basis, is two steps removed from the administrator of the agency and is allied, by its position in the hierarchy, with the concepts of welfare and relief.

The time seems to me to be opportune to recognize that no relationship exists between the employment-unemployment insurance program and the welfare operations of the Social Security Administration; and that the size and importance of the employment-unemployment insurance operation call for commensurate status for the responsible administrators who must represent the States and present their fiscal requirements to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress.

It seems entirely appropriate that the employment-unemployment insurance program be removed from the Social Security Administration; that a new office or administration be established within the Federal Security Agency to be responsible solely for unemployment compensation and employment service functions; and that this new office be established on a level with the other operating arms of the FSA—the Social Security Administration, the Public Health Service, and the Office of Education.

Sincerely,

MILTON O. LOYSEN,
Executive Director.

Merchant Marine Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which follows, from the Long Beach Press-Telegram of Long Beach, Calif., of May 22, 1947, sets forth the current difficulties of our intercoastal shipping so well that I believe it worthy of insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The American public must act to bring about a change in the attitude of the administration—the President and the Bureau of the Budget—if we are to avoid disaster in our merchant marine on the high seas. The Interstate Commerce Commission must act if we are to continue intercoastal service without the payment of heavy subsidies.

MERCHANT MARINE CRISIS

World Trade Week was picked this year by a well-known maritime publication as the occasion to tell shipowners, in effect, that they might as well open the sea cocks and take to the boats.

With some allowance for the fact that conditions have put too much of a strain on the maritime editor's nerves for him to weigh his language carefully, the quoted statement is timely warning that the American shipping industry is in a bad way and, unless there is prompt action by Congress, it soon will be worse.

History is repeating itself with tragic accuracy as the United States, following World War II, stumbles along the way it took after World War I, sacrificing the great merchant marine it built with magnificent energy and skill and at prodigious cost. It is losing the maritime supremacy it gained, while other nations steadily develop their merchant marines.

Shipowners whose vessels are in coastal and intercoastal trade are in worse plight than those whose ships are in foreign trade. A dozen lines engaged in offshore traffic are subsidized by the United States Government, and they are secure. There is no subsidy for the domestic merchant marine.

The American domestic merchant marine has been permitted since the war ended to drift toward disaster, and it is so near the rocks now that the men operating it can hear the pounding of the surf.

To avoid disaster by providing enough time to work out a plan of successful operation for the domestic merchant marine, Congress is urged to extend Government operation of the ships beyond its present dead line of June 30.

The situation is easy to state briefly and understandably: Under present economic circumstances and with the volume of freight now available, not less than $40,000 is lost with each 90-day coast-to-coast trip by a ship.

The Government, under a wartime arrangement, is operating the intercoastal ships now, with the shipping lines as agents. The Government pays the deficit. The shipowners cannot, and would not if they could, continue to run the ships at a loss of $40,000 a trip.

Between the present time and June 30, all concerned must make up their minds what is going to be done to meet the shipping emergency. The problem is so complicated and difficult that a permanent and constructive policy probably cannot be evolved in the intervening weeks. More time is needed, which can be provided by congressional action to extend for a reasonable period the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate the domestic merchant marine with the shipping lines as agents.

Unless the United States is going to weaken itself by surrendering the economic advantage of a domestic merchant marine, and the military advantage of having one ready at outbreak of war, it will have to make operation of the ships profitable either by adjustment of rates or by Government subsidy.

Freight rates will be considered by the Interstate Commerce Commission at a hearing in San Francisco May 26. Adjustment of rail and sea rates is an essential part of the problem. It is apparent, however, that the Commission will not get far with the problem before June 30, when, as the law now stands, coastal and intercoastal ships will be turned back to their owners. More time is necessary to save the merchant marine, and Congress alone has the power to grant the time.

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the press release of our late colleague, the Honorable Fred Bradley, which he prepared in April, immediately upon his return from the Panama Canal:

Eleven Members of Congress returned to New York today after a brief inspection of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone. The purpose of this visit was to learn and study at first hand suggested plans for the expansion of the Canal which will require hundreds of millions—possibly several billions—of dollars to complete. In addition, the congressional group investigated problems concerning the administration of the Canal Zone and living and employment conditions there.

Members of the congressional party were: Fred Bradley, Republican, of Michigan, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; David Potts, Republican, of New York, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal; Raymond Burke, Republican, of Ohio; Frank Maloney, Republican, of Pennsylvania; John Brophy, Republican, of Wisconsin; Willis Bradley, Republican, of California; Herbert Bonner, Democrat, of North Carolina; James Domengeaux, Democrat, of Louisiana; Emory Price, Democrat, of Florida; John Fogarty, Democrat, of Rhode Island; and Henry Larcade, Democrat, of Louisiana. Accompanying the party were Marvin Coles, counsel for the committee, and Guy LaBounty, the committee's investigator.

During this visit to the Canal Zone, the committee inspected the Canal from the land, water, and air, and discussed all phases of Canal operations with its administrative, engineering, and labor personnel. Models of proposed changes and improvements in the Canal were seen, and engineering plans were discussed with the engineering group now examining proposed expansion plans as provided by an act passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress authorizing such study and appropriating money therefor. Plans for the expansion of the Canal include as possibilities: (a) improvement in the present locks, (b) removal of the Pedro Miguel lock, (c) construction of a third set of locks, or (d) conversion of the present canal to a sea-level route.

Security problems and the defense of the Canal were discussed with Army and Navy officials, and an inspection of existing defense installations was made. In addition, housing conditions, employment problems, relations with the Panamanian Government, and questions of outlying defense bases were all studied and discussed.

Upon his arrival in New York, Congressman Fred Bradley, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which has jurisdiction over all legislation affecting the Panama Canal, made the following statement: "This visit to the Canal Zone has been most educational and helpful. The complexity of Canal operations makes it impossible to understand them unless they are seen at first hand. For in the Canal Zone, our Government is running not only a waterway for world commerce, but has established a small paternalistic state for the thousands of Canal Zone employees and their families who live there, supplying not only employment but housing, food, and even clothing. My own impression is that, as a result of this visit, our committee will be in a position to save the taxpayers of this Nation millions upon millions of dollars, as we have already learned enough of Canal operations and needs to insure our being able to insist upon considerable cuts in expenditures and still maintain essential operations. For instance, in the course of our visit we discovered that the Canal is now employing almost 75 percent more personnel than it did in 1939, despite the fact that actual traffic is substantially no greater. Governor Mehaffey has been making efforts to reduce this force, but progress has been too slow. I believe that our committee will insist that further reductions be made promptly and in substantial number.

"One thing which must be immediately corrected is the inadequacy of fire protection in the present structures. For example, one large schoolhouse has recently been constructed of wood without a single outside fire escape being provided. Such construction would not be tolerated in any State, county, or city in the United States. Many of the Canal Zone communities, built originally as temporary construction camps, but long since carried on as permanent, are veritable tinder boxes of the worst type. Fire-fighting equipment is, I am informed, not adequate, with no ladders available to reach the top floor of the two-story houses. I am also informed that the Panama Canal fire-fighting units, the Army's fire department, and the Navy's fire fighting force are not even connected on a single alarm system and do not use the same size or thread of hose connections. Only by the high and constant humidity, a highly efficient and well-trained fire department, and by the greatest of good luck have we heretofore avoided a truly calamitous major fire. But the menace is ever present.

"Before making any decision on legislation authorizing further expansion of the Canal, I believe that our commitee must wait upon the reports of the engineering group now engaged in this study. There is a serious questio in my mind as to the feasibility of making any large-scale expenditures for improvements because of defense problems which have arisen. In view of the reluctance of the Panamanian Government to grant us defense bases which are needed for the protection of this vital waterway, I do not at present feel that I could in good conscience cast my vote to authorize the expenditure of a single penny for Canal improvements. I wouldn't put money in a bank unless I was sure that the means to protect it were present; and I could not recommend putting the taxpayers' money into a canal until we first have the basis necessary to protect our investment."

David Potts, of New York, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, made the following statement:

"Like Mr. Bradley, I believe that this trip was of great value and will be of inestimable help in our future consideration of legislation concerning the Panama Canal. Most of us had little knowledge of the problems there involved prior to our trip. Now, however, we have a sufficient background to be able to study requests for expansion and the authorization for new developments against the background of our first-hand knowledge of existing conditions. As a result of the trip, we are now infinitely better qualified to consider the proposed authorizations to expend hundreds of millions, if not billions, of the taxpayers' money on this waterway and its administration.

"During our visit we discovered certain conditions existing in the Canal Zone which require correction. Much improvement in housing conditions is necessary, but rents charged Canal Zone employees are so low that they will probably require some upward adjustment in order to amortize future Government investments in better and more permanent buildings. In addition, costs of construction are so high that some method must be arrived at by the Canal Administration to provide better buildings at a lesser cost.

"Additional study must also be made by our committee concerning the employment of aliens on the Canal. While I believe the Panamanians should be employed, I do not feel that they should be permitted to displace American citizens in the vital jobs on this waterway. Moreover, when Panamanians are employed, I feel that the wage differential granted to American employees as an incentive to work in the unattractive climatic conditions, should not similarly be extended to the natives of this area.

"Canal problems are closely allied with military and naval needs. The importance of the Canal is not only to serve the commerce of the world but to furnish an essential link in our Nation's defenses. Our consultations with the Army and Navy, both in Panama and in Washington, were most helpful and gave us a close view of the problems involved, the changes which have already occurred because of developments in modern warfare, and the problems relating to the future defense of this waterway against new weapons.

"Because of the many problems covering the Panama Canal which will be before our committee and subcommittee during the coming months, I feel this visit to the Canal Zone was imperative and timely. This is particularly true because of certain differences in ideas which have arisen as to the best means of expanding the Canal capacity and its defense. Now that we have seen the workings of the Canal and its organization, I feel that we can face these problems in such manner as will best insure both the military interests and the protection of the American taxpayer."

Double Negative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial which appeared on June 3 last, in the Home News, a progressive and forthright newspaper published in Bronx County, New York City, where I reside. It is well worth the reading. The editorial follows:

DOUBLE NEGATIVE

We have been urging a positive and constructive policy upon the administration. But this week we hope the President recalls that a double negative makes an affirmative.

We refer to the necessity for exercising the veto power over the tax bill and the anti-labor bill.

Of the two, the tax bill is in many respects the more vicious.

If it becomes law our present and future are both seriously imperiled.

It possesses none of the virtues claimed for it, and all of the defects charged against it.

Its effect would be to reduce our operating revenues by several billion dollars annually, without even having the virtue of materially lightening the tax burdens of a vast majority of wage earners and voters.

It is a gift to those corporations and individuals aptly dubbed economic royalists by the late President Roosevelt; but it is a gift at the expense of vitally needed expenditures to maintain our own economy and revive that of the world with which we trade.

Even the armed forces, traditional favorites of the conservatives, have been so woefully crippled they cannot discharge their minimum functions with respect to our security. The Congress has wholly disregarded reality in its political hypocrisy, and has insisted on snatching at pennies today which will cost us dollars and probably lives tomorrow.

The bill should be returned to its makers, with a sharp reminder that our obligations as Americans transcend the dubious political values of false economy.

The antilabor bill contains several features which, though severe, may be upheld as justifiable and even necessary to curb the arrogance of a few labor dictators who, like John L. Lewis, have set themselves up as a power above the people, and against the common good.

Other provisions, however, notably the effort to prescribe the political beliefs essential to union officership, are so unwise and so dangerous as to make veto highly desirable.

The Home News has been vigorous in its appeal to unions to rid themselves of the stranglehold obtained by Communists over the executive and administrative branches of many locals and a few national organizations. But it is a matter for union membership action, and not for special legislation which could set a precedent for outlawing all minorities.

There is a vital difference between the right—and the duty—of the Government to reject public employment of Communists—or Fascists—and the right of Congress to limit the prerogatives of unions, without placing the same limitation on all privately organized and supported bodies.

If we mean to withdraw the privileges of citizenship from all Communists, by all means let us do so, boldly and forthrightly.

Meanwhile, the Presidential veto should save us from the farce of creating a greater danger by approving this ill-advised method of combatting a lesser one.

This Is the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following is the law of the land and shows the source:

No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express

authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessay for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both. (July 11, 1919, ch. 6, sec. 6, 41 Stat. 68; 18 U. S. C., 1940 ed., sec. 201.)

Mr. Speaker, if this is the law why in time is it constantly violated by people holding high office in the administrative branch of our Government? Does this law apply only to the individuals in the lower brackets, while the men in high places are immune?

Additional Wool Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since only 20,000,000 of the 140,000,000 Americans live on farms, a fair set-up for the American farmer is difficult to attain and to maintain. The suggested wool bill submitted to the House by the Secretary of Agriculture was evidently a needless proposal. Day after day was spent on hearings, and when the legislation reaches the stage it now finds itself in it becomes more apparent that the introduction of the bill was not necessary except from a political standpoint.

The wool program was set up by the present administration, and after they find themselves all balled up with a 412,000,000-pound stock pile, and after they find themselves in a mess, they evidently desire to pass a hot potato over to the present Congress to straighten out, even though the administration has the authority and power to straighten it out without any further legislation whatsoever. Though much political capital is being made out of the present bill, and though many metropolitan newspapers have been offered an opportunity to express themselves on the tariff issue, the fact still remains that the proposed legislation was unnecessary. I again repeat that the only conceivable reason for suggesting the legislation was that the present administration either did not wish to face the issue or solve the problem or else they proposed the bill for political reasons.

Why do I say that the proposed wool legislation was unneeded and uncalled for?

First. Because, under section 336 of title III of the Tariff Act of 1930, President Roosevelt, on August 22, 1941, increased the duty on "crab meat prepared or preserved in any manner, including crab paste and crab sauce packed in airtight containers, from 15 percent ad valorem to 22½ percent ad valorem, the rate found to be shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such difference in costs of production." This report is No. 147 of the United States Tariff Commission. President Roosevelt's proclamation can be found on page 55 of this report.

After all the bad statements made by New Dealers about the Tariff Act of 1930, or the Smoot-Hawley Act, is it not surprising to know that the New Deal was willing to use the legislation?

Since the duty on the crab products was actually increased by 50 percent, the limit of increase provided by the Smoot-Hawley Act, just exactly how can anyone on either side of the aisle make much of a case out of the wool bill? The wool bill in fact gives the President the authority and power he already has at his command in regard to duties. Did you ever wonder where the State Department was and what it was doing when this crab meat 50-percent increase in duty was put into effect?

First. Did you ever ask where the State Department was when the embargo on wheat was put in operation? Did you ever hear of any vocal or written protest on the part of the State Department? Was the President wrong when he increased the duty on crab products by 50 percent? If President Roosevelt was right then what would be so wrong to give President Truman powers that he already has and that President Roosevelt used? How many sides of the street can you expect to continue to work? And how long? The Smoot-Hawley duty of 42 cents per bushel was implemented by an embargo on imports without protest from the groups now so critical of the wool bill.

Second. Why no protest from the State Department when two embargoes were placed on cotton imports? One of these embargoes was recently put in effect too. Why have not some of our metropolitan papers ever protested this action?

Third. Why no protest when the tobacco-seed embargo was put in operation? Why no protest when tobacco export subsidies were paid? Where were the State Department and the metropolitan press when this took place?

Fourth. Why no protest when the duty on crab meat and crab products was raised 50 percent? Where was the State Department then?

There are more wool producers than there are crab packers, and why, I ask, do we have all this noise about the wool bill?

Are not the wool growers entitled to the same treatment as the crab packers, especially if it has been shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such difference in costs of production?

First. The wool facts to date then are: The wool bill does not give the President any more authority or power than he already has under section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930—a provision of law which had already been used by President Roosevelt.

Second. Whose bill is the wool bill? It was sent to Congress by Mr. Clinton Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture. Since the President had the power and authority to correct the problem, why was the bill submitted?

Third. The administration made a "mountain out of a mole hill" with its propaganda about this wool bill which was sent to the Congress by a member of the President's own Cabinet in the first place.

Fourth. If the administrative branch of the Government is to dictate legislation, then the representatives of the people are not living up to their obligations. This may be Democrats in action but not democracy in action.

Fifth. Since the world wool monopoly, known as JO, controls 85 percent of the world's wool, does not dare set up shop within the confines of the United States because of the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act, Mr. Clayton should not be allowed to be conniving with it some place outside the United States of America.

Sixth. The American producer is up against something he never faced before. He is not now competing with producers of other lands. He must compete with world monopolies and dictator nations. He should not be compelled to compete with world monopolies any more than he should be subjected to the machinations of domestic monopolies.

Russia Grabs Our Inventions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. VAIL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS from the American magazine for June 1947:

RUSSIA GRABS OUR INVENTIONS

(By Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities)

(We have been letting Soviet agents walk away with hundreds of thousands of our vital industrial and military patents. What is Moscow up to?)

Before World War II Hitler hypnotized the German people with a philosophy which, even to those highly scientific people, seemed logical. We soon learned, however, that he did not mean what he said. He was merely using his platform, Mein Kampf, as an implement of war.

Today Russia, through its international Communist front (which still exists in spite of the Soviet Union's pretense of having dissolved the Comintern, its global revolutionary organization), is teaching another utopian philosophy to the world—a philosophy so logical to the inexperienced mind and so rich

in promises of peace and abundance, that even many fairly well-informed Americans fall for it. It is particularly popular with those who have never met the realities of the world head-on.

But anyone who falls for the Marxist philosophy, as promulgated by the Kremlin, would do well to be more aware of the actions than of the words of the Soviet Union. Like Germany and Japan before they were brought to their knees, Russia appears to want the world. Like Hitler, Stalin is using a utopian philosophy as an implement of war, a method of recruiting.

While the Russian leaders accuse us of greed, aggression, and imperialism, their agents creep about through our Nation today, peering and listening like enemy spies, for our every secret. Meanwhile they pretend to be our friends.

Recently it came to my notice and that of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House, of which I am chairman, that the Soviet Union since 1943, acting through her agencies in the United States, has succeeded in obtaining practically every industrial, chemical, and military patent from our Patent Office—hundreds of thousands of them—dealing with every phase of our technological development. They have ordered as many as 60,000 in one request. And what have we received in return? Nothing. Since 1927 Russia has refused to give us a single patent, yet we have obligingly handed to them in this one-way "exchange" our industrial and military know-how.

The procedure was legitimate, as far as I know, because our laws permit the Patent Office to sell, for 25 cents each, descriptions of all patents filed for protection. The suspicious element in the Russian procedure lies in the fact that Russia has used dummies and stooges to obtain the patents, when, at the height of her popularity during the World War, she could have obtained them by a forthright request from her Embassy in Washington.

Russia obtained these patents, for example, by having one of their front agencies in the United States flood the Patent Office with orders for patents. One order from a dummy agency dated January 2, 1945, called for all patents for the year 1942 and part of 1943—60,000 patents in all—and the order was accompanied by a check for $6,000. This agency—known as the Four Continent Book Corporation, of 253 Fifth Avenue, New York—is described on its letterhead as being importers from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of new, old, and rare books. This corporation was registered before the war as an agent for a foreign power—namely, Russia. Its director is a known Communist, and probably will be called upon to testify before our committee before we complete our investigation.

Other patents were obtained by having the Amtorg Trading Corp. of New York, official trading agency of the Soviet Union in the United States, place orders for thousands of patents in every field.

The Soviet Purchasing Commission of New York also filed huge orders for patents, and other orders were made by the Russian Embassy in Washington and the Soviet Legation in Ottawa, Canada. I have many of these orders in my possession. How many orders were placed by other Soviet agencies I have not yet ascertained, because such information can be had only by checking every call made upon the Patent Office since 1943.

Here are some of the things upon which patents were requested by the Soviet Union fronts and delivered by our Patent Office: airplane, parachute and parachute pack, deicing device for airplane propellers and wings, portable emplacement for machine guns, military rank, bullet-resisting glazing unit, gunfire control apparatus, bomb-dropping device, float for aircraft, bullet-resisting armor, method of making explosives, mine sweeper, ship torpedo protector, projectile, gyro-drift control. Other orders requested such patents as bomb sights and range finders.

One request from a Soviet organization asked for a list of all patents applied for by the General Cable Corp. Such corporations made parts of the atomic bomb in its earlier stages of manufacture. Perhaps to lend a little comic relief to their sacking of our inventive genius, one request was made for many of the distilling processes and packing processes of the Schenley Distillery Corp.

Why has Soviet Russia through so many years of industrial development failed to ask for these patents before? Why her sudden and frantic interest? To my mind, it is no coincidence that her sudden interest in all of our patents on industrial development was simultaneous with our atomic research and development. Through our coddling policy of giving Russia our patented knowledge, she may well be on her way to the discovery of many—if, indeed, not all—of those thousands of industrial processes and secrets which constitute the great secret of the atomic bomb. How many of these pieces of the jigsaw puzzle she now possesses I do not know, since we have not yet asked qualified scientists to examine the patents she has already received. However, it is most significant that one of the patents she has obtained concerns the recovery of vanadium from ores of compounds. In the Smythe report it is significant that this statement is made: "Uranium (beryllium) is always found with radium, although in much larger quantities. Both are often found with vanadium ores."

It is obvious that this requested patent would be of incalculable value in enabling Russia to recover uranium from ore compounds, because uranium is the very basis of the atomic bomb. You may see from this how sly and oblique is Russia's approach to our great secret.

All inventions dealing with atomic energy now, under our laws, are referred for safekeeping to one Army officer. In his care some 12,613 patents were placed on a secret status, but all but 1,165 have been released. They are now considered not vital. Alone, they may not be vital, but, coupled with the inferences and clues which the Russians may find in the great volume of patents they have already taken from us, they may enable the Soviet Union not only to manufacture the atomic bomb, but to beat us to the more important goal of atomic energy for purposes of peace.

Under our present laws an invention pertaining to our national defense may be withheld from the general public, upon being patented, only by removal of the patent from sale and from the bound volumes of the Patent Office. Even if this is done a description of the patent remains in the Patent Digest, which has a large subscription. This Digest may be obtained at the New York Public Library and at other libraries throughout the country. During the war the War Department requested the withholding from public inspection of six patents—the Northrop "Batwing" airplane, a radio-locating and following system, a cathode ray deflection apparatus, a method of manufacturing primary carbon, a process of making a carbon-black product, and an instrument suspension system. These patents were withdrawn from sale but were not withdrawn from the bound volumes of the Patent Digest displayed in the Patent Office and the public libraries. It is safe to assume that the Russians have these secrets.

It is now public knowledge that the Russians, through their legal espionage system, have obtained from our Patent Office all of the industrial and chemical secrets we took from Germany as part reparations. Our committee gave this information to General Marshall, Secretary of State, before his recent departure for Moscow, and he was thus enabled to outpoint Foreign Minister Molotov on the question of reparations.

More amazing to me than a presumably friendly nation's clumsy attempt to wrest from us the world's vital secret, is the carelessness or stupidity of those Americans who, for years now, have assisted Russia in plundering the Patent Office without even informing the investigative officials of the Nation that the thing was going on. If Joe Doaks, of Grand Rapids, Mich., had requested all the patents filed in 1942 and the first 21,533 filed in 1943, as the Soviet Union did, he no doubt would have been investigated before his order was filled.

The filling of such an order must have swamped the limited staff at the Patent Office. The physical work of removing thousands of patents from the files, alone, must have been tremendous and have required extra employees or double shifts. But if the bizarre requests elicited any wonderment from anybody connected with the Patent Office, nobody heard of it.

It may be said, however, that when the mass requests were made, the average Government worker in Washington might have taken them for granted, considering the fact that Russia at that time was being coddled by the administration. It is high time the coddling ceased. Before we finish our investigation of Russia's flagrant and greedy raid on our national storehouse of ideas, we shall subpena at least one former high Government official, who, on good authority, once wrote to the Patent Office urging it to expedite the filling of the Russian requests.

It is not only through our patent laws that we are making suckers of ourselves. The Russian Government now has in this country under legal protection 3,867 agents, including 700 engineers. In Russia we have 220 American citizens, including 2 engineers. Why this disparity in the exchange of personnel? The principal reason is that Russia does not want Americans in Russia. She intends to keep her own secrets and take ours.

One of her newest plans to utilize our genius without obligation is to enlist in one of her Communist-front organizations some of our best-informed scientists. Recently, the following letter was received by a scientist at the National Bureau of Standards, of the Department of Commerce, who is entirely cognizant of the processes of manufacturing the atomic bomb:

"It has been suggested by Dr. Condon (Dr. Condon is Director of the Government Bureau of Standards), who is a member of our executive committee, that you might be interested in the activities of our society and membership in same."

This letter was sent by a representative of the American-Soviet Science Society, affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. This latter organization is one of the best-known and strongest Communist fronts in America today. Dr. Condon, by the way, heads the list of the board of directors of the Soviet Science Society. The National Bureau of Standards, which he heads, has worked hand in glove with the men who developed the atomic bomb. One of the functions of the Bureau of Standards is to test our patents applied for, and it was deeply involved in the testing of the atomic bomb.

It would appear that the Russians, through their Science Society and other organizations, are attempting to make "Brother Elks" of our scientists who know the secrets they want. There is no law against this procedure, any more than there is against buying a description of a patent. But we would be unforgivable fools to fall for it.

Before we finish our investigation, we shall subpena Dr. Condon to explain to our committee his connection with the solicitation of members for the society.

The travesty of legal espionage and propaganda does not end here. We have in our

possession a book, compiled by the Russian Government while we were losing men and ships to defend her, which might well be described as "a manual for bombing and sabotaging the United States." This book, called by the Russians, American Construction, was published in 1946 by the Amtorg Trading Corp., an official agency of the Russian Government. It is illustrated with photographs of all of the important bomb targets in the United States.

Understand, the Russians do not call them bomb targets; no doubt they submit them as models for Russian builders and industrialists. The book, written in Russian, is divided into five parts: First, the industrial construction and transportation system of the United States; second, housing and public construction; third, sanitation; fourth, mechanization and organization of our major buildings; fifth, output of the building supplies made here in the United States. The book contains airplane views of some of our great power dams and factories, as well as pictures of all the great bridges in the United States, including the Golden Gate Bridge in California and the George Washington Bridge in New York. The whole TVA project is mapped and described.

Japan, for years before she made war on us, mapped our industries and public utilities and studied our production methods. We permitted it, and almost paid the penalty of losing a major war. Now another nation is boldly doing the same thing, and we are doing nothing about it. As a matter of fact, this "bomb-target" book was paid for by American businessmen who profited through purchases made by Amtorg or lend-lease supplies sent to Russia, or who hoped to profit from future transactions with Russia. They bought 175 pages of advertising, at $230 a page.

It logically follows, if we are going to permit Russian visitors officially to inspect our plants, to photograph and publish and analyze the defense plants of this country, to map and pin point our basic economic structures, what kind of reciprocity do we have? How much authority do we have to go around Russia and visit her plants, to collect pictures of them, etc.? These are logical questions which occur to realistic men.

What are we going to do about it? It is futile, of course, to exhort Americans to everlasting vigilance in times of peace. We are not by nature a suspicious people. We cannot surround our bridges, industries, and waterworks with police, as the Japanese did their own. We cannot do it except at vast expense and incessant international conflict. Every Boy Scout with a camera cannot be tossed in jail for taking a water-front scene, nor can we draw an iron curtain upon the Patent Office. In denying Russia our patents we would be denying our own students, scientists, and industrialists. To keep our patents in secrecy would discourage inventive genius. Sales would be fewer and invaluable time would be wasted upon duplicate or overlapping researches. It is right that every student of physics in America should know of and understand atomic energy. If one generation of children is denied such information, the ultimate liberation of mankind from back-breaking toil may be deferred perhaps for centuries. The very man who may successfully apply atomic energy to industry may be a schoolboy in one of our cities today.

But what other course may we pursue when imperialistic conspirators persist upon this earth? It would be immoral of us to deliver into the hands of paranoid politicians secrets which, if used against mankind, might annihilate the earth. I see no other course than to impound all patents pertaining, even remotely, to the atomic bomb until the world is completely stabilized, and if we play ball with Russia we've got to see to it that Russia plays ball with us.

The Preservation of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABE McGREGOR GOFF
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday, June 2, I attended the annual commencement exercises of the University of Idaho, of which I am a graduate. The commencement address was delivered by the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, and his speech so impressed all who heard it that I feel it is worthy of being brought to the attention of every thoughtful American. General Royall's speech was as follows:

For American citizens as a whole, and particularly for our young men and women, the prevention of war should, and I believe does, rank today as our first national objective.

We have freshly and graphically in our minds the costs, the devastation, and the grief of the greatest of world-wide conflicts. It is impossible to estimate how much in dollars World War II cost the world—in dollars actually spent, dollars to repair destruction, not to mention other dollars which cannot buy back the human effort which has been irretrievably lost.

We in America do know this war cost our Nation alone nearly $350,000,000,000 in actual expenditures, and before this cost can be fully paid a half century may elapse, and the aftermath expenses and the interest may double that figure or more.

Many of you here have seen the scars of war in Europe and Asia—the ruined cities and towns and ports, the shattered railroads and ships, the scorched lands—all of them examples of what could come to America in any future war in which we happened to be involved and unsuccessful. No one who has seen this desolation across the seas can fail to realize that normal life as we know it—business and home and comfort and pleasure—cannot exist under the ravages of war, or for many years thereafter.

But more saddening still is the destruction of human life—young human life. The military and civilian dead of all nations in the last war totaled more than 22,000,000. Our United States fought only half the war and then kept the battle from our shores. We were victorious on all fronts. And yet we ourselves lost in battle more than 300,000 of our best young men, with another million wounded.

These are the lessons of the past. They are enough in themselves to make us hate war—to cherish peace. But there is another and perhaps an even more impelling motive—the hopes and dreams for a safe and progressive future in which we can enjoy tranquillity and reap the full benefits of our great land of opportunity—a future in which you young men and women can pursue your chosen occupations without fear that your plans will be shattered and your lives interrupted by the terrible blight of war.

I have sometimes heard the remark that an occasional war is necessary for maintaining the courage and virility of a nation. I do not subscribe to that view. Despite the ease of American life, despite the oft-repeated cry that American youth was becoming soft and spineless and decadent, our young men in World War I, and again in World War II, successfully passed the final examination of manliness by furnishing—on ground, sea, and air—as courageous a group of combat soldiers as this or any other nation ever furnished.

No; we do not need war; we do not want war. The question then—the only question—is how best to achieve the permanent peace that all Americans so earnestly and desperately desire. This is the same goal that has challenged the wisdom and political skill of men and nations through the ages. After each new outbreak of armed conflict generations of decent men have embarked on a fresh and determined quest for peace. They have always failed.

But we must try again—try diligently and intelligently. We must use every means at our disposal. The mere wish for peace—an apathetic faith—has always failed. Action is needed—affirmative and constructive action—and realism. We must face the facts of international life.

Let us, then, look at the world as it is today. Let us consider, first, one aspect of history over the past century. A hundred years ago the power and politics of the world were almost entirely matters of European balance of power—with England, France, Russia, and the German and Italian states largely controlling the activities of the world. Our Nation was rapidly coming to the front, but it had not quite arrived. The Far East was still disorganiz d and exercising only provincial influence.

Two generations later—with the first decade of the twentieth century—the United States had risen to a position of military and diplomatic power, but there were numerous others who shared this position with us—England, Russia, Germany, Japan, Italy, France.

How different is the situation in 1947. Italy and Japan are defeated and subdued countries, deprived of colonies and of the controlled territory upon which they depended for strength and growth—and even for food. Germany is devastated and conquered—and to date still dismembered. France is no real factor from a power standpoint, and there is small chance she will became such a factor within a generation or more.

China is moving toward a united government, toward a realization of its great potential—but it is moving slowly and haltingly. India is still further from real strength. The smaller countries of the world are years away from military or political importance.

Unfortunately, England, our stanch and sure ally of the past and present and future, cannot approach her military strength of World Wars I and II. She is no longer mistress of the seas. The federation of her empire is loose, and even if it were strong, this empire does not have the military or industrial or economic power that it once possessed.

So we come squarely up against the rather obvious fact that today there are in the world two—and only two—great military and political powers, the United States and Russia. There are unlikely to be more for decades to come.

The influence which these two countries can wield—for peace or war—is immeasurably greater and wider in scope than was the case with ancient Persia or Greece or Rome or Carthage or any combination of them. This influence is not now confined to any continent or continents, and there is no sector of the globe so unexplored or inaccessible as to remain unaffected by the actions and attitudes of our Republic and the Soviet. Such is the history—the current historical fact—which leaves a new and unprecedented situation in world affairs.

But it is not this history alone which makes our age unique and distinctive. Geography plays its part—geography coupled with the advances of science and invention. Old geographical facts have taken on new meanings. Until recently the polar regions, including those in the north, were almost

mythological. Their cold veil had been pierced by occasional daring adventurers, but the ice cap of the world bore no real relation to our private or national or international lives.

For practical purposes we thought of the world as a cylinder more than a sphere. Our maps were flat projections, which ridiculously magnified Greenland and northern Canada and the Arctic distances—magnified them far beyond their true proportions. On these maps it was hard even to visualize the great circle measurements which we had learned about in high school.

But today when we think of world geography we think of a real globe, a globe on which we see that every major country in the Northern Hemisphere, including Russia, is within 5,000 air miles of almost every large city of the United States, and that by the same token almost every leading center of that Northern Hemisphere is less than 5,000 miles from our own northern borders.

In terms of modern aircraft this means that today a plane can travel without stopping from here to there or from there to here and back again, travel at speeds of 250 miles an hour. Soon newer and bigger planes will be able to travel farther at still faster speeds carrying heavier loads.

With the world thus brought closer together, how easy of attainment could be the peace, attainment by nations who in point of time are neighbors whether they want to be or not, closer neighbors in hours than were Washington and New York a century and a half ago. All that is needed is for these neighbors to deal with each other as neighbors, to be frank and fair, to carry out honestly their agreements and commitments, to covet no territory, to embark on no program of aggression, to impose their wills on no other independent nations.

We must do our full part to bring these two countries and other nations closer together in spirit as well as time, to encourage and promote international good will and free relationship, and to build up the standards of life throughout the world and eliminate as much as possible of existing discontent and discord.

As Woodrow Wilson once said: "The world can be at peace only if its life is stable, and there can be no stability where the will is in rebellion, where there is not tranquillity of spirit in the sense of justice, of freedom, and of right." We must strive to make the universal will for peace and prosperity outmatch in efficiency and resourcefulness the world's progress toward its own self-destruction in war.

The first and most important approach is through the United Nations. In spite of much discouragement, we will continue to utilize this organization—in the hope that under the beneficient influence of America and other peace-loving countries—and as a result of mutual contacts and better understandings—the United Nations will grow in influence and power until the peace is assured.

Another—and an important—way of attaining world concord is through freely-moving international commerce and trade. Nations that buy and sell from each other become to a degree mutually dependent, each on the other, for prosperity and progress. Personal ties develop between representative citizens of the various countries, and frequent visits back and forth promote reciprocal knowledge and understanding.

I believe that, if we could get behind the iron curtain of Russia—not with arms or hostility, but with free interchange of commerce and of ideas, with an unrestricted press and with mutual knowledge by each nation of the other's problems—if their people could learn our way and our people could learn theirs—if these things could be done with Russia and with others, I believe that much of the tension and animosity and danger in the world would disappear.

Today our Nation is working in the Geneva Conference on Reciprocal Trade Agreements and on the International Trade Organization of the United Nations. The work is a work for peace—not only in promoting contacts and understanding but also in raising the over-all standard of living of the world.

During the war—and since—we have recognized that hunger and need and discontent often supply the sparks which set off or intensify a war conflagration. We have sought and we are seeking to meet this situation—to meet it by temporary expedients. These expedients have been and are necessary. But we want a permanent remedy, and nothing can supply it as readily as increased production throughout the world and a free interchange of the resulting products.

These are the peaceful means of defense against war—the United Nations, international trade, efforts at mutual understanding. They are strengthened by the knowledge of all peoples that we Americans sincerely want peace, that we covet no territory, that we have no purpose of aggression or aggrandizement.

I wish that those means and our wish for peace were enough to guarantee peace. I wish that our fair conduct in the United Nations and the other councils of the world would enable us to rely solely upon our sincerity of purpose and action and upon our earnest desire and efforts for world concord.

Unfortunately this is not the case today. In the United Nations we have been met by the arbitrary action of the other most powerful country. We strike a barrier when we seek free contact with the people of that nation. We find plain and increasing evidence of ambitious political forces seeking to impose their power upon small independent nations, and seeking to infiltrate even into our own Government. We see—if we are not blind, we see—that military power and potential military power goes, and must go, to the bargaining table; that the strength of a nation often speaks louder than the void of its negotiator.

How then must we deal with this situation? Must we seek to iron out our differences? Yes. Must we be fair and understanding in our approaches and conferences? Yes. But must we surrender our principles? No. Resort to appeasement, acquiesce in a creeping encroachment of smaller nations friendly to us, sit by and see a military potential built up at the expense of other countries, disarm ourselves without fully protective guaranties? The answer is clear. If it were not otherwise so, the history—recent history—has made it crystal clear.

I cannot dismiss from my mind the mistakes we made after World War I. They are well exemplified by the statement of a leading Cabinet member in 1927. He said: "An earnest desire has been expressed by some of our strategists that we should strongly fortify the Philippines and Guam. Yet it is plain that the adequate fortification of these islands, and the maintenance of naval armament absolutely securing them would of necessity be provocative as constituting a menace of Japan."

This is the same Guam and the same Philippines which lay on the flanks of Japan's march to the south in 1942 and which fell to the enemy in the early days of the war—the same islands whose overwhelming strategic value required their recapture as a condition of our victory. May I ask you to consider how many dollars and how many young American lives we sacrificed in this recapture—dollars and lives that a firm foreign policy could have saved?

And so I recommend to you a final—and I believe the most important—method of preserving peace today, the maintenance of an adequate military establishment—one strong enough to let the world know—know with assurance—that we can protect our Nation against any force that can be launched against it, that we can fulfill our military commitments to the United Nations, that we can stop aggression whether it be sudden or creeping.

Had we worked toward the twin goals of peace and security after World War I, it is entirely possible that our militarily strong and vigilant Nation could have entirely avoided involvement in World War II. In fact, we have persuasive proof from the captured documents of our enemies that if we had had a sufficiently powerful Army in 1939 there would have been no World War II.

Until conditions in the world have progressed further along the paths of understanding and concord, we must maintain such an Army today—an Army, Navy, and Air Forces, a balanced force equipped with the best and most modern weapons.

To protect our hemisphere—we must aid the smaller nations of America—along the lines of the program which the President has just proposed to Congress. This program is one of military collaboration and the standardization of arms, equipment, organization and training of the armed forces of the Western Hemisphere. It is predicated on the sound doctrine that in the event of a future war, there must be prompt and unified action against an aggressor by all of North and South America.

This is another string to the bow of national defense. It is another aid to peace—another recognition of the history-proven fact that military-pacifism of strong nations or continents produces war, that their strength prevents war.

Despite the lessons of the past, there is danger again today—danger that with America's desire to forget a recent and a more terrible conflict—that a pendulum philosophy will once more swing us into a state of apathy and inaction—danger that we will again take the easy and misleading road of unpreparedness.

In conclusion, may I remind you that all these steps for the protection of peace and the avoidance of war require the broad-minded and intelligent support of the leaders of our Nation, especially the young leaders who will be recruited from new graduates like yourselves.

The United Nations cannot succeed if America, the leader of the world, draws into a shell of isolationism. Free world commerce is largely dependent upon mutual unselfishness by all countries involved. It will not succeed, if particular businessmen of the world's principal nation see no further than the ends of their noses—if they erect selfish tariff or other commercial barriers against nations whose commerce and friendship we seek.

And a strong national defense cannot be provided by a penny-pinching attitude—or a return to apathy and complacent normalcy—or by a false sense of military security.

In none of these fields can our Government authorities—our Congress, or our President, or the executive departments—rise above the will of our people, the expressed will. There will always be some men and women of limited vision, and others who are too visionary and blindly hopeful. The salvation of America's peace—the world's peace—lies in the greater influence and the more compelling voice of thoughtful and patriotic citizens who seek the actual facts and are prepared to meet them. I bespeak for each of you such vision, such influence, and a forceful expression of your views.

Some Suggestions To Relieve the Boxcar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is predicted that the shortage of boxcars will be most severe this summer, especially at the time when a very large wheat crop is being harvested. Inability to move the grain because of the lack of cars works a great hardship on the farmers and everyone connected with the handling and processing of this grain. To have this grain dumped on the ground to deteriorate, at least in a measure, not only brings a loss to the farmers but it is unsound when there are so many people in the world to be fed.

The Nebraska delegation in Congress has, for many months, been giving special attention to this problem.

At a meeting of the representatives of the State authorities of Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas, held in Kansas City on May 27, some very good suggestions were made. I wish to extend my remarks by including those resolutions, which are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT A CONFERENCE HELD IN KANSAS CITY, MO., ON MAY 27, 1947

Whereas representatives of the State authorities of Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas, and representatives of the grain and milling trades of said States in conference assembled have considered the transportation problem presented by the harvesting of a record crop of winter wheat in said States and have determined that the probable supply of boxcars will be inadequate to move the crop by reason of the fact that western and southwestern lines have available fewer cars than they own and that an unduly large proportion of such cars are not suitable for transporting grain and flour: Now, therefore, be it

1. *Resolved*, That by reason of the extraordinary requirements for transporting winter wheat this year efforts should be made to secure an increased movement of empty boxcars to the western and southwestern grain lines to effect a supply equivalent to 115 percent of each road's ownership by June 20, when the crop is expected to commence moving in volume, with a supply to be maintained not less than 100 percent of ownership from August 1 to the end of the harvest movement.

2. *Resolved*, That a greater effort should be made to return, to western roads, home cars to home roads; or, in the alternative, to assure the return of an adequate proportion of cars suitable for transporting grain and grain products.

3. *Resolved*, That to provide an incentive for the proper return of boxcars the national per diem charge should be increased to $6.15, to be maintained so long as the present penalty demurrage charges are maintained.

4. *Resolved*, That the western and southwestern lines be encouraged to put into service as many special-type cars as possible and that shuttle service use of such cars be provided where conditions make such service suitable.

5. *Resolved*, That Governor Carlson be requested to appoint a committee to be composed of a representative of the railway commission of each Southwestern grain State together with a shipper from each State for the purpose of providing a continuing body designed to protect the interests of southwestern shippers in securing adequate transportation facilities; and further

6. *Resolved*, That said committee shall be duly authorized and requested to carry out the recommendations made herein.

7. *Resolved*, That in the event any permit be established it shall be made applicable to Government agencies as well as to private shippers.

8. *Resolved*, That Commodity Credit Corporation should be urged to provide a satisfactory buying or accumulating program during the harvest movement so as to stockpile sufficient wheat to utilize empty terminal elevator storage space in which wheat can be preserved without the tremendous losses that result from piling wheat on the ground and storing in unsatisfactory bins where quality cannot be preserved. Such program will result in the accumulation and storage of the wheat at the points nearest production and thereby save car days.

Republicans Have Had Bad Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bedford (Ind.) Daily Times-Mail:

REPUBLICANS HAVE HAD BAD PUBLIC RELATIONS

Recent public-opinion polls have indicated a rising popularity of President Truman. Actually, what the polls indicate is a decline in popularity of the Congress, which now has a Republican majority in both Houses. Republican leaders are concerned about this trend, and are baffled.

From the viewpoint of redeeming campaign pledges, few Congresses in the history of the Nation have had as good a record as the present Eightieth Congress. Fair-minded writers, even those with New Deal tendencies like Thomas Stokes or old-line Democrats like David Lawrence, have given Congress credit for its accomplishments.

The Republican platform last fall had four objectives: To streamline Congress, to cut Federal expenses, to reduce taxes, and to do something about labor. To date, the party has made good on all four pledges. Naturally, this program is not popular with all voters, but it does represent an honest effort on the part of Republicans to make good on their campaign promises. They should be honored, rather than scorned, for their success.

Republicans in Congress complain that Washington newspapermen have not been giving the country a fair record of the party's accomplishments—and there is considerable truth to this statement. Most of the Washington newsmen belong to the American Newspaper Guild, an association of reporters affiliated with the CIO. Unhappily, there is a very strong left-wing element in the guild, and this group has dominated the organization for the past 10 years. During the years of the New Deal, when the CIO was given just about everything it asked for, the guild members came to assume more privileges than were really due them.

It is no secret that most CIO and Guild members are strong New Dealers. The present Congress was elected to correct the abuses of the New Deal. Naturally, the Republican Members are not popular with the men who report their actions to the country. A reporter is a human being, he does try to think objectively, he does seek facts, but also he reports those facts as he sees them. If 10 people see an accident there will be 10 different stories of what happened, all very similar, to be sure, but yet all unlike in some detail.

Reduction of Federal expenses means a reduction in the number of Federal jobs. That hurts in Washington. Clerks begin to worry about being released. A great many of these clerks are women—girl friends or family associates of newsmen. Naturally, they are not pleased with the Congressmen and Senators who would take them off the pay roll. They tell their friends, the newsmen, and some of this resentment is bound to show up in the record of Washington doings. On top of that, Washington businessmen don't relish the idea of pay-roll reductions any more than any city enjoys seeing its pay rolls cut. Those men, especially merchants, have put plenty of pressure on Congress not to reduce pay rolls. Washington business lives on taxes, they are the only source of income the city has. It doesn't like tax reductions, and a good share of the propaganda against tax cuts has come out of the various Government bureaus and business organizations in Washington.

Washington is a peculiar city. It is quite detached from the rest of the Nation. It has no industry, no sales problems, and rarely does it have an employment problem. Someone has said, "The last place to go to find out what the American people are thinking about is Washington." There is considerable truth in those statements. Pay rolls go on in Washington, whether business is good or bad in the rest of the country, whether there are "help wanted" ads or WPA. The popularity of a Congressman depends on how much he will do for the Federal pay rollers. For 14 years the Congress added personnel, increased salaries, made the clerks very happy. Now the situation is changed, and Congressmen are not popular in Washington.

What happens "back home" is not of great concern in Washington, whose inhabitants live in a little world of their own, but what happens in Washington is of vital importance to the folks "back home," the folks who foot the bill for all the hundreds of offices and millions of employees. Our own Congressman, EARL WILSON, is about the most unpopular of all the Republican Congressmen, because he has been the most outspoken in demanding a day's work from Federal employees. A Government clerk told us last month that "it is none of Mr. WILSON'S business what we do." That statement is definitely open to argument. Mr. WILSON represents this district. His business is to see that his taxpayers get full value for their money.

Evidently the people wanted the Republican program. Party majorities surpassed the most optimistic expectations. Voters should not be misled by propaganda. Accomplishments count, and the Republican Congress can "point with pride" to its record, despite any reports to the contrary.

The Soviet Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cecil B. Dickson, chief of bureau, Gannett News Service, Washington, a distin-

guished reporter and world traveler, was selected as a member of the press delegation to the big power conference at Moscow. He has recently returned after visiting Stalingrad, Leningrad, Kalinin, and nearby areas.

So many of my colleagues, particularly those hailing from communities served so ably by the Gannett newspapers, have expressed a desire to hear a factual account of his trip and his impressions of conditions in Russia that I feel it would be of interest and value to include here, under leave to extend my remarks, an address entitled "The Soviet Scene," which he recently delivered at the annual spring meeting of publishers, editors, advertising managers and general managers of the 21 Gannett newspapers.

It is my sincere hope that Mr. Dickson's conclusions are unduly grim as to the aims and objectives of the Soviet Union. Time alone will tell. In any event, we cannot afford to play the ostrich with our heads in the sand. Admittedly the views of this experienced observer deserve our careful scrutiny and serious consideration. To that end his address is set forth in full:

Ladies and gentleman, thank you for honoring me here.

Only recently you witnessed the failure of the four-power conference in Moscow. Its failure was foreordained. The Soviets planned it that way. They used the conference as a forum to spread Soviet propaganda. Molotov and Vishinsky concentrated their appeals on passion and prejudice and unreality. In contrast, the American, British and French foreign ministers sought to resolve the problems of Germany and Austria with reasoning and understanding. They know that the economy of Europe will continue to deteriorate as long as Germany's economy remains chaotic.

Undoubtedly the Soviets know that without an economically strong Germany, the economy of Europe will continue unable to meet the demands of the people and the need for reconstruction. I was convinced that this is a vital point of their strategy. That is, they deliberately refused to permit progress toward any fundamental agreements.

This links with the warning Generalissimo Stalin issued to Secretary of State Marshall at their private conference in the Kremlin. The warning, which to me holds grave implications, was that a compromise will be forced through exhaustion. This means, bluntly, that the Soviets intend to try to wear us down. The Soviets know we want to withdraw our forces and costly relief aid as soon as possible. They believe that we will revert to isolationism, particularly if we have difficult times economically in this country. You recall, of course, what Stalin asked Mr. Harold Stassen in the widely publicized interview at the Kremlin. It was whether the United States was going into a depression. Stalin knows if depression comes again to America, the taxpayers will cry for return of our occupation troops and for an end of Federal outlays for food for our former enemies.

Should this occur, it is my belief, that the Soviets would seize the opportunity to sweep to the English Channel and the Straits of Gibraltar. There would be little to hinder them from taking over all Europe. There would be less to impede them on a sweep through the Middle East to the Suez.

For some time we in America have been aware of the Soviet's activities in China, Indonesia and India. There are 2,000,000,000 people in the world, and three-fourths of them live in Europe and Asia. From what I saw in Russia, I was convinced that they plan to take this huge mass of population into the communistic fold. It is the ambition of those who rule Russia and 12 Russian satellite countries to control, not only the Eastern but the Western Hemisphere. In South America last year I found extensive communistic activities, as I did 2 years ago when I swung around the world for the Gannett newspapers as a war correspondent.

When I returned from that world tour I wrote and said that every country bordering Russia and every country that bordered a country bordering Russia, was fearful of the greed and ambition of the Soviets. Now that the Russians have an even dozen countries under Soviet control, the Soviets' plans are easily recognizable.

In Russia I learned of the many missions the Soviets are sending to most parts of the world. Those missions are to gain economic information and military intelligence as well as to spread and strengthen the communistic organizations.

Only Russians on official missions can leave the country. Private individuals cannot leave for personal reasons. Only recently the Soviet Supreme Council issued an edict barring Russians from marrying foreigners.

This was done to prevent Russian soldiers on occupation duty from bringing brides from countries where living conditions and governments, at one time, had been better than they are in Russia. This is a part of the Russian insulation from outside influences, popularly known as the Iron Curtain. Another part of the Iron Curtain is to hide weaknesses, brutality and other parts of the despotic government of which the Soviet leaders are ashamed.

You have read and heard from the pens and mouths of Communists that the government in Russia constitutes a democracy. It is nothing of the sort. Actually there has been little fundamental change in Russia or the Russians since the rule of Ivan the Terrible. Ivan the Terrible, incidentally, now is being hailed as a national hero by the Soviets in their new campaign to build up Russian nationalism.

Individuals in Russia are slaves to the state. They have no actual voice in the conduct of national or international affairs. Some say, however, that the Soviet State capitalistic system—which really is the system there—is no worse than those of Czarist days. Those in the privileged Communistic Party jobs in government, industry, science, education, and the arts, contend it is better. There is a third group rising, an intelligent group that has begun to question the system, its strict regimentation of thinking and living.

It is true that the Soviets have increased the literacy of the people, the number of schools, physicians, scientists, and those in the arts in their 30 years of reign. In the same period this country and many others also have accomplished equally as much and even more. But they have done little to improve living conditions, compared with our standards. And most of their material improvements, such as irrigation, hydroelectric and housing projects have been accomplished through forced labor.

It has been estimated and left undenied that some 15,000,000 political and other prisoners are in forced labor gangs. In my brief time and trips to Leningrad, once known as the Venice of the North, and to Stalingrad, hailed as the Soviet Detroit, I saw hundreds of groups of men and women slaving at the point of a Red soldier's bayonet.

Some 3,000,000 German prisoners of war and probably a quarter of a million Japanese are contributing labor to the rebuilding of Russia's war-devastated areas. In addition, there is the workhorse of Russia—the woman. What coolies are to India and China, the woman is to Russia. Miserable creatures they are mostly, miserably treated by men. They do the lowliest and hardest manual labor. I've seen them in steel plants, on railroad construction jobs in the bitterest sub-zero weather, as street cleaners and snow shovelers, ditch diggers and sewer washers. I saw them in harness pulling huge wheeled carts and in every other conceivable job performed by man. They work even in the coal mines.

You have read and heard Soviet propaganda that the nurseries and kindergartens of Russia represent great social advances. These government institutions are, as are many others, an economic necessity. For under the so-called Russian incentive plan, few men can support a family on the average wage of 700 rubles a month. The wife must work. Kindergarters and nurseries free her for her labor.

Stalin announced Russia lost 7,000,000 men in the war. Russians say 20,000,000 men, women, and children were lost. It is said 15,000,000 women of marriageable age will never get husbands. Divorce laws have been tightened. The Soviets found that free love was an economic loss to the state. Still the divorce as well as the crime rate is high.

The Communists once said that religion was an opium for the people of the western world. They must have found that the opium of communism was not sufficient to drug the Russians. For, under pressure of war, they reopened some churches, but under government ownership, control, and direction.

What the Russians have now is not democracy but despotism. A small hierarchy of some 600,000 rule nearly 200,000,000. These people in the Politburo, government positions, top military and naval officers, and those high in science, medicine, the arts, are the privileged groups. They have automobiles, summer homes, good apartments, ample food. But the common people live under conditions in cities and on collective farms much as did the pioneers in America. But they do not have the freedom our pioneers had. They work or they do not eat. They are in five major categories. Those classed as A, B, and C do very well, what few they are, but the D's have little, and the E's hardly eat. Employers issue ration cards, which are withdrawn when a worker fails to work. Foods other than in the basic rations, largely bread, potatoes and cabbage, are so expensive few workingmen can afford to buy them.

And that is another thing the privileged classes enjoy over the common worker. Those high in the privileged classes can purchase food in stores operated especially for them and at lower prices than prices in so-called commercial stores. In commercial stores I found eggs selling for $1.50 each. I bought a lemon for $1. In barter markets I saw potatoes sell for $2.40 a pound. Clothing was excessively high. Most of the people were shabbily dressed, many wearing old felt boots. Outside of the cities I saw men and women with wrappings around legs and feet, with thongs—the same as the ancients wore.

In Moscow I visited one old prerevolutionary mansion where eight families were living in four basement rooms and a hallway, all using the same kitchen, the toilet separated from the stove by a thin partition. One of their so-called modern apartment buildings, built in 1938 before Russia began to prepare for war, was equally jammed with families. Dirty, badly in need of repair, it looked like an East Side tenement, with wiring tacked onto the ceiling and the top-floor rooms flooded by leaks in the snow-covered roof.

'Tis said in Moscow that only the roof on the Kremlin does not leak. The attitude of the people is, "Why take care of property that belongs to the government?" As a result Moscow is shabby, buildings other than those occupied by high military and government and party officials need repair.

There is one thing the Russians know nothing about—it is maintenance either of

homes, plants, or factory equipment. Makeshifts predominate in almost everything. Yet the Russians are pretty good at putting on a fake facade to make buildings look strong when they are not.

It is characteristic of the Russian people. They have suffered from ages of inferiority complex. Through their history, possessing but a modicum of inventiveness and know-how, they have had to borrow, buy, and steal brains from Europe, Asia, and America. So, they pride themselves on their acquisition of imported knowledge, brag about any improvement they might have made. Some of their scientists and artists have made contributions to the world. But Russia has been a backward nation and is very sensitive about it. Thus, when it happens to produce an exception it propagandizes the world that the exception is typical.

The Soviets claim all progress made during the last 30 years they have been in power is due to communism. The United States and other countries made advances in the same period without the aid of communism. Even Russia under a regime of a czar would have made some progress.

The economy of Russia was badly damaged during the war. Try as hard as the Russians could to reconvert, they admitted that reconversion was delayed 20 months after VE-day. They are far from having restored many plants and power projects destroyed by the Germans and Russians themselves in their scorched-earth policy. I traveled to Leningrad on the Red Arrow, crack Soviet train, at the terrific speed of 30 miles an hour. The International Car, the best but not the latest on the train, still had old brass oil lamps in place, although electricity had been added. Each car has its own brass heater in the front end and a man to fire it.

If you have a weak heart, don't travel on a Russian plane. I flew to Stalingrad, one of the bloodiest battlefields in history, in a battered old lend-lease DC-3. When we crossed the flooded Don, we were so low, spray struck our windows. We could see spots on goats at our 150-foot elevation. We landed on a battle-marked dirt field with only a windsock and a shack at the so-called airport.

Called the Detroit of the Soviet Republic and once with half a million population, narrow Stalingrad stretches 40 miles along the Volga. Its three main sections were destroyed 98, 97, and 85 percent. Today, 4 years after Marshal Paulus surrendered 90,000 Germans remaining out of 330,000, Stalingrad is less than 5 percent restored.

A visit to the famous tractor plant, still badly wrecked, showed the Russians producing 35 tractors a day, 3 shifts, 8 hours each, 6 days a week, with the aid of German, Rumanian, and Hungarian prisoners, and Russian speed-up boys called Strakonovites. Cincinnati-made lathes, with big War Production Board priority signs abounded, women working most of them.

In the Red October steel plant, production of 500,000 tons a year, half of prewar level daylight seeped through the bomb- and shell-punctured roof. Within the plant stood rusting German tanks, exactly where they were stopped. Most of the other plants lay crumbled and rusting and idle, great brown ghosts of prewar production power. Industries on the outskirts of Leningrad were in about the same condition, although the huge electric equipment plant was operating at about 70 percent of prewar capacity despite severe damage. Many other plants there and in Kalinin were rusting, burned-out hulks.

Tremendous efforts are being made by Russians to restore their coal mines and industrial plants, especially throughout the Donbas and other eastern parts overrun by the Germans. One electric unit of the Dneiper Dam has been restored to operation. But there is a tremendous shortage of steel, brick, cement, etc., while war wreckage covers thousands of acres, and burned-out passenger trains and boxcars strew the railroad lines. The current 5-year plan sets a 22,000,000-ton steel goal for 1950.

The Ukraine last year suffered the worst drought in many years. Starvation stalked the war areas. Stalin was forced to send hardboiled trouble-shooters there to keep the situation controlled. The Government is concentrating on building up the food supply. Two years of good crops are needed to relieve Russia from rationing of basic foods.

So desperate did the situation become last year that in October an edict was issued reducing basic rations for the common people. Since employers issue ration tickets, this forced millions to work two jobs a day—16 hours—to get enough basic rations for their families. This is part of the Soviet incentive system. It's called increasing the norm. The Soviets claim there is no poverty problem for them. What they mean by that is that those who can't produce don't count. There are millions of poor, underfed. Tuberculosis is common because of lack of proper and adequate food and crowded living conditions. Beggars ply their trade on trains and subways and on streets. In the open barter markets I watched dirty, hungry, cold old men and women, children, and crippled soldiers trying to trade broken cups, worn rubber, ragged clothing, and junk for something to eat.

Inflation is so severe that while the legal rate of exchange was 5 rubles to the dollar, the black-market rate was 70. The diplomatic exchange rate is 12 to the dollar. Actually the ruble should be about 50 to the dollar.

Every store is Government owned and operated. Therefore, the cost of production does not figure in the sale price. At commercial stores, where goods are unrationed, the prices are beyond conception. Prices are set to drain off individuals' wartime savings made possible when there were no consumer goods. In these stores there is loot from Germany, everything from Dresden china to old upright pianos. There are more German than Russian automobiles on the streets of Moscow.

A prominent Communist in Moscow told me Russian Communists have little respect for American and other foreign Communists; that the Russians look upon them as dupes and tools to be used. He said:

"Yes, we are Communists, but you must remember we are Russians first. If we should ever take over your country, do you think we would trust the American Communists and parlor pinks, as you call them?

"We would not. We Russians trust no traitors to their countries. We would have to eliminate them first, for if a man is a traitor to one country, he could be a traitor to another country."

I was amused when Stalin recently was quoted as saying, "Let us not criticize mutually our systems. Everyone has the right to follow the system he wants to maintain."

At another time Stalin said, "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately, one or the other must conquer."

And again, he said, "Words have no relation to action; otherwise, what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron."

I wish I had time to tell you of the philosophy of deceit, as followed by the Russians since the time of Ivan the Terrible in international matters. But it took Lenin really to put it into practical form, the form in which you see it practiced by the Communists the world over. They say one thing, do another.

The Russian rulers trust no one, not even each other, and their words are untrustworthy. They take pride in being able to deceive and consider fair play a weakness to be exploited.

If the Russian rulers were confident of their despotic government, why should they have a police system that puts a spy in every family, and a secret police force that is larger than any army in the world today, except the Soviet Army?

How any American, except a frustrated crackpot, can go to Russia and see that despotic government, cruel in conception and brutal and ruthless in execution, and then support it, is beyond my comprehension. The Soviet government portrays itself as possessing the greatest ideals and plans for the common man. Yet it drains so much from the slaving public, it leaves little for that common man.

The economic condition of the Russian people is terrible from an industrial and food standpoint. Russia is in no position now to conduct a successful aggressive war. Yet, under the Soviet economy, with 3,500,000 men and women in the army, 2,000,000 secret police, 15,000,000 in forced-labor camps, 3,000,000 German prisoners, it does have the ability to concentrate the nation's entire resources—men and materials—on one objective, such as war.

One can sense this power in Russia, feel its impact. The Communists there think they have the system for the world. They are planning to impose on the people of the earth by trickery or by force. I don't believe they can succeed in their avowed world conquest, but I'm fearful that Communism is to stay in Russia and many satellite countries for a long, long time. Under their police system, control of communications and transportation, as bad as they are, a despotism like that of the Soviets can extend itself indefinitely. It rewards those who serve it, not with lands and monopolies, as did the czars, but with automobiles, better houses, more food and rubles and more clothing.

Russia now is busy building up nationalism, against Lenin's internationalism, and is pressing for a greater war potential through science, industry and food. It is forcing wartime office workers to community farms to increase the food supply, especially Red army reserves.

Later, if not sooner, we in America are going to have to face the issue. Russia is conducting a global war of subversiveness against us; yes, even in our own country. The Communists are clever, unprincipled, ruthless, and ungodly.

It is my unqualified conviction that the greedy and sinister rulers of the Soviet government are determined to destroy our capitalistic system and saddle upon the world's people the deceptive cloak of communism.

I have but one appeal. It is: If we believe in our system, we should not lack confidence in it or the courage to fight for it and all its benefits that have made this Nation the richest and its people the least fettered of all the world.

We need a new conception of duty and loyalty, a deeper faith and love of our form of Government. If we continue to work, produce, and stay united against our social, economic, and potential war enemies, we can resist all enemies within and without.

Certainly, we should have confidence in ourselves and our Government equal to the respect and envy all other peoples and nations have for us.

Argentina Gets Truman Nod as Good Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, President Truman yesterday gave the signal for return of Argentina to good-neighbor standing and at the same time cleared the way for an early mutual security pact of all Western Hemisphere nations. To me, this is one of the most encouraging signs of the past few years. Argentina, unfortunately, has been the victim of a most unscrupulous smear campaign by the Communist press and by the Communist fellow travelers in America. I am happy to see that the Communists are no longer determining the policy of the United States of America toward Argentina.

Argentina has always been a good neighbor; perhaps more so than any other country in the Western Hemisphere. Argentina has never been guilty of an act of aggression against her neighbors. Argentina has always played the role of the mediator and peacemaker in the Western Hemisphere.

With this very healthy advent in our policy in dealing with our Latin-American neighbors, I think it is well to review Argentina's contribution to unity and strength in the Western Hemisphere.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point the address delivered by the Chargé d'Affaires of Argentina, Martin Luis Drago, at the Foreign Policy Association of Philadelphia on April 19, 1947. This speech tells the true history of Argentina and its contribution to Western Hemisphere solidarity, unity, and friendship. I am sure that the Members of Congress will want to become acquainted with the past history of Argentina in accordance with the recent decision on the part of our Government.

The address follows:

Gentlemen, it is indeed a great honor for me to be a guest speaker at the Foreign Policy Association. I cannot, however, accept it as a personal distinction, because of my lack of merits, but I can accept it as a homage to the country I have the great honor to represent. Therefore, I express my hearty thanks to you all.

We are celebrating Pan-American Week. We have, indeed, much to celebrate, because we have tangible proofs that the solidarity and friendship among the American nations is growing steadily every day.

I feel very proud to be a citizen of a country which has always supported the ideal of cooperation and brotherhood with the American nations since the early days of its history.

San Martin, our great national hero, did not confine his aspirations to the emancipation of our country. He led his gallant army across the highest peaks of the American Continent to achieve the independence of two sister nations, Chile and Peru. His army was a democratic army, which fought only for freedom, not for conquest. The pattern set by San Martin has been our light and our inspiration. We have always been ready to help our sister nations of America in their difficulties, and, most important, we have never committed an act of aggression against any country.

On the contrary, Argentina has always taken an active part in the settlement of all differences among the American nations.

In 1854 Argentina acted as mediator in a conflict between the United States and Paraguay. This conflict, which was a grave threat to the peace of the American nations, was solved through the ceaseless efforts of an Argentine President, Justo José de Urquiza.

It is worth while to recall that an American President, James Buchanan, wrote on August 10, 1859, a message to Urquiza, thanking him for his successful intervention, and adding that "his services will be always remembered by the American people."

President Buchanan said also in his message of congratulation the following words, which I want to quote, because, although they were written in 1859, they reflect the present spirit of the United States toward Latin America. As you will appreciate, those words could have been uttered in 1947.

Said President Buchanan:

"I might confess that since the emancipation of the Republics of this hemisphere from the mother country I have never ceased to look at them with the deepest feeling and the most profound interest. I have always wished they could enjoy their liberty with the only restrictions of law, and that God bless them with peace, prosperity, and culture. There never can be a valid reason for a difference or a suspicion between them and us. Reciprocal friendship and peace will be our best link."

In 1865 at the time of a conflict between Spain and Peru which was originated by the occupation of the Chinchas Islands by Spain, the Argentine Government acted also as a mediator. A great President of Argentina, Bartolome Mitre, said at this time that Spain should try to prevent any conflict with the American Republics, because "we would be then in the case of fulfilling a painful but inescapable duty." It was also President Mitre who said in Congress the following words:

"Though essentially Argentine, this Government will never cease to be an American Government and a good neighbor."

It is significant that the expression "good neighbor" was first used by an Argentine President in those early days.

The idea of good neighborliness of Mitre was also shared by many illustrious Argentines.

Juan Bautista Alberdi, one of the outstanding men of the past, was much in favor of convoking regular meetings at which representatives of all the American nations would be invited. The work of Alberdi in that sense has not been forgotten. It is gratifying to recall that on the 18th day of May 1945, an American Representative, Congressman Daniel J. Flood, paid a tribute "to one of the first prophets of inter-American solidarity, that great Argentine patriot and philosopher of the democratic ideal, Juan Bautista Alberdi." He added that more than 50 years ago Alberdi foresaw a great political American system in which the various parts would depend upon the whole and the whole would depend upon the parts.

"Today," continued Congressman Flood, "the hopes of that early prophet have become powerful and productive realities; powerful because they insured the common action in wartime; productive because they insured not only the most ample mobilization of the full resources of all the American countries for the successful prosecution of the war, but because they have created a permanent and lasting cohesion and interdependence among the Americas. Now that the war is over, a permanent peace and security are the blessings we expect and for which we humbly pray."

In 1902 Argentina and Chile signed a treaty of naval disarmament. It was the first of that kind in the world, a fact which was recognized by former Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson, in an address he made at the Pan American Union in Washington in 1922, on the occasion of the signing of a treaty of disarmament entered into by the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan.

After paying a warm tribute to Argentina and Chile for having presented to the world the first example of a naval limitation, Mr. Stimson added:

"Since I took an interest in naval limitations, I found out that two nations of the Western Hemisphere, better said, two of our sister nations of America, offered to the world the first great example of naval reductions."

If I had not attended the Naval Conference I would perhaps have been unaware of this important fact. In the course of my work in London, I learned that Argentina and Chile showed to the world the importance of the tremendous success that could be achieved through a treaty of naval limitations. And they did it in 1902, that is 20 years before the signing of the Washington Treaty, which is considered the pioneer of naval limitations.

It would be impossible for me to enumerate or to even mention all the instances in which Argentina acted as mediator in disputes or conflicts among the American nations. I will only say that in 1935 the indefatigable work of Argentina, Chile, Brazil, and the United States put an end to a bloody war between Bolivia and Paraguay, which was endangering the peace of the American Continent.

More recently, in 1941 Argentina acted again as one of the mediators in the settlement of the armed conflict between Peru and Ecuador.

This brilliant record of Argentina is in keeping with her noble international conduct.

We have solved all our boundary disputes by arbitration and have never resorted to force against smaller or weaker nations. We are proud of the fact that our armies were never defeated, but we are still prouder of the fact that the Argentine Army has never crossed a border to dominate or to exploit any country. On the contrary, as I said before, the gallant soldiers of San Martin who wrote a saga of epics and courage went to Chile and Peru to liberate those countries and they retired once their mission was fulfilled.

I have talked about the role Argentina played in the past, in what relates to the peaceful settlement of all disputes, conflicts, or wars that arose in the American Continent. I want now to say a few words about our peaceful tradition in our relations with the neighboring countries.

Our territorial dispute with Paraguay was submitted to the arbitration of an American President, Rutherford Hayes, who in 1878 settled the boundary line between the two countries. The award of President Hayes has been ever since scrupulously respected by both parties.

The question of our boundary line with Bolivia was the subject of a very long and arduous negotiation between the two countries, until a permanent treaty was signed on July 9, 1925.

Our limits with Brazil were also settled by the arbitration of another American President, Grover Cleveland, on February 5, 1895.

Our boundary controversy with Chile was submitted to the decision of the King of England, Edward VII, who pronounced his award on November 1902.

We have, as you can see, settled all our controversies by arbitration, and we have always fulfilled the letter and the spirit of those arbitrations.

It could not be otherwise. Argentina is a democratic and peace-loving country, and she resorts only to democratic methods in her international dealings.

I am going now to talk about our contributions in the last war.

The cooperation of Argentina to the nations at war with the Axis took various forms. Some of these measures were in accordance with resolutions of the Rio conference. Resolution III, for instance, provides for appropriate exports to other American countries. Argentina had, prior to the conference, signed an agreement with the United States, by which she undertook the obligation of selling exclusively to this country all her exportable tungsten.

A very important form of aid to the United States was the supplying of food and strategical materials to the United States, Great Britain, and the other American Republics.

In 1940, at a time when the German Army was sweeping all over Europe and the prospects of victory for Great Britain looked very slim indeed, Argentina was giving foodstuffs to England, under a special agreement, which practically was tantamount to lend-lease. We continued our exportations to England throughout the war, so much in fact, that at the end of hostilities, England owed us over £120,000,000 sterling, which was the value of the goods sent to her.

Incidentally, some part of the Argentine meat sent to England was the meat used to feed the American troops stationed there.

It was Napoleon who said the famous sentence, "An army marches on its stomach." Since Napoleonic days, warfare has changed entirely its methods. There were no tanks, planes, submarines, or rockets in his time, but there is something that has not changed and never will. He who fights must eat. No escape from this biological fact is possible. No soldier can keep on fighting without food, so the contribution of Argentina was as vital as if it had consisted of planes or tanks.

On December 9, 1941, within 48 hours after Pearl Harbor, Argentina announced that the United States would not be treated as a belligerent. This step was important, since it meant that American warships could enter Argentine ports for an indefinite period and that American planes could use Argentine airfields. Under international law, a belligerent ship is allowed a maximum of 48 hours in a neutral country, even if its condition demands repairs. When Brazil entered the war, Argentina promptly declared the status of that country to be the same as that of the United States.

All Argentine vessels were mobilized to carry materials of interest to the United States. No Argentine ships went to Europe during the war, and there was not any trade by means of Argentine boats with any other part of the world, except North and South America.

We have complied with all the commitments we entered into at the Conference of Chapultepec. A very well known American authority in international affairs pointed out in a very recent article that the Argentine Government has already complied with its obligations with respect to former Axis schools, institutions, and property.

"With the promulgation of a decree of expulsion against 52 former Axis agents, 13 of whom have already been deported and the remainder of which are being actively prosecuted or sought," added this noted authority, "the Argentine Government has carried out fully its obligations."

The present Argentine Government—that is, the constitutional government which was put into power by the free vote of the people in an election considered by the consensus of the opinion as the freest and fairest ever held in Argentina—has expressly announced its intention to cooperate with its sister nations of America.

In his message to the Congress on the occasion of assuming the Presidency, President Perón said:

"Once an engagement is accepted, it must be legally fulfilled. In this respect Argentina stands as an example, and I will certainly not be the one to break this tradition, but, on the contrary, will spare no effort to reaffirm it."

And on another opportunity President Perón said that "Argentina will be always on the side of the American Nations any time she is needed," reaffirming thus the words he said at the Inter-American Economic Institute of Buenos Aires on April 20, 1945, when he was not even a candidate for the Presidency. He said in that opportunity, referring to the Act of Chapultepec, the following words, which are of special significance:

"The recent declaration of Mexico establishes the legal equality and the economical collaboration as essential premises of the collective prosperity of the American countries. But the prosperity of nations cannot be an abstract theory, wherefore it adds that the American nations consider necessary a just coordination to create an economy of abundance in which the natural resources and human labor are used for the purposes of raising the standard of living of all the peoples of the continent."

As you may appreciate, President Perón spoke about economic collaboration. We have always been in favor and we are supporting now the greatest possible economic cooperation with our sister of the Americas. This fact is proven by the recent agreements that Argentina has concluded with Chile, Bolivia, and Uruguay.

The spirit of cooperation of the present Argentine Government in economic matters will be better understood and appreciated by quoting a few excerpts from a statement made to the press by the President of Chile, His Excellency Gabriel Gonzalez Videla, with reference to the signing of the Argentine-Chilean Treaty.

Said the President of Chile:

"The customs Union signed yesterday between Chile and Argentina constitutes an exceptional and unusual event in America. I don't hesitate to say that it is a step of tremendous importance for the life of our nation and even the American continent. It has been sufficient that two governments eminently popular should understand and interpret the feelings of their people. On behalf of the people of Chile I express my gratitude to the American spirit shown by General Perón, to the Vice President of Argentina Dr. Quijano, and to the Government of the Argentine Republic."

In the speech at the Inter-American Institute of Buenos Aires, which I have quoted before, President Perón made reference to an "economy of abundance" for the American nations. Economy of abundance is the system that prevails in this country, where the common effort tends to improve the condition, both material and moral, of all people. It also proves that the Argentine Government is following the policy of raising the standard of living of the poor classes of the country, which is a truly Argentine policy and conforms to the practices set by this country in the past. Therefore it is not only an Argentine policy. It is also an American policy.

What can we do to promote a closer relationship among the American nations? First, we have to know more about each other. We have to encourage the visit of students, the exchange of professors, and the facilitation of travel.

We have to increase the teaching of English in Central and South America and Spanish and Portuguese in the United States.

When I was the Consular Representative of my country in San Francisco, a club was formed by the name "Club del Buen Vecino." The membership was composed for the most part of American citizens who had a sincere desire to learn Spanish, but who also wanted to learn more about Latin-American customs and culture. The official language of the club was Spanish, according to a very rigid rule, which provided for a fine of 10 cents a word to be levied against any member who spoke English within the club's premises. This was considered the best way to compel the members to learn Spanish.

I wish that a great deal more of these clubs were functioning in this country, and I also would like to see established, throughout Latin America, many similar clubs which would be named "the good neighbor," where the official language would be English, and where a fine would be applied to any member who spoke Spanish or Portuguese.

I am proud that the Argentine Embassy in Washington has inaugurated recently an American-Argentine cultural institute where Spanish is taught without charge to Americans. We have already many students, a great deal more than our space would permit, and the classes are functioning properly. In this modest way our Embassy is helping the cause of pan-Americanism.

Gentlemen, I have presented you with a true picture of Argentina, a nation which has a brilliant record in her dealings with its sister nations of America, and in fact with all the nations of the world, a nation which is always willing to lend its assistance and cooperation in the common task of building a better American continent for all of us.

Enlightened patriotism has understood at last that in a continent blessed with immense wealth, where there is a vast reservoir of untapped resources, power and richness are not to be looked for in conquest or aggression, but in collaboration and solidarity which will improve the standard of living throughout this hemisphere, which will give work to all, which will mobilize the unexploited resources of the continent in an effort to improve the condition of the people. People in the Americas understand moreover that this continent, because of the various nationalities of which it is composed and because of its devotion to the principles of democracy, will be a shining example of what good neighborliness and spiritual collaboration can achieve.

In finishing, let me repeat again the words of President Perón: "Argentina will be always on the side of the American nations any time she is needed." I am confident that every day will see an increase of the cordiality, friendship, and mutual esteem among the American nations.

I thank you.

The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio ad-

dress made by me over Station WMAL, Washington, D. C., on June 5, 1947:

The newspapers and the air waves have been filled with statements concerning the labor bills of the House and the Senate. Considerable feeling has been stirred up.

When the Eightieth Congress convened in January, it had been apparent for some time that conditions in the field of labor-management relations were not satisfactory; that strife was occurring too frequently, which, by affecting vitally needed production, was disturbing the economic life of all the people.

In such an atmosphere the Labor Committees of both Houses began their hearings, and after many weeks brought out bills designed to correct some of the trouble. The House and Senate both passed their own bills by large majorities, and they were then sent to the conference committee to iron out the differences. Yesterday, the House passed the conference committee bill. Tomorrow the Senate votes on it, and if passed, as anticipated, it will then go to the President.

The bill is known as the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. It amends the Wagner Act of 1935, and adds some new features. My time will permit me to describe only some of the main parts of this 73-page bill.

The National Labor Relations Board is continued, except that it shall consist of five instead of three members. In addition there shall be a general counsel of the Board, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall investigate charges, issue complaints, and prosecute such complaints before the Board, which will hear the cases, and act in a judicial capacity. The purpose of these provisions is to divide the functions of the Board, which, in the past, acted as investigator, prosecutor, and judge.

Employees continue to have the right to organize or assist labor organizations, and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

Unfair labor practices are designated as follows:

"It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—

"(1) To interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of their rights mentioned previously.

"(2) To dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization, or contribute financial or other support to it; except that subject to regulations of the Board, an employer may permit employees to confer with him during working hours, without loss of time or pay.

"(3) By discrimination in regard to hire, or tenure of employment, or any term or condition of employment, to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization. This section bans the closed-shop agreement, but a provision permits an employer to make a union-shop agreement provided a majority of employees eligible to vote in such an election authorize a labor organization to make such an agreement.

"(4) To discharge or discriminate against an employee because he has filed charges or given testimony under the act.

"(5) To refuse to bargain collectively with the representative of his employees."

A new section states that it shall be an unfair-labor practice for a labor organization or its agents—

"(1) To restrain or coerce employees in the exercise of their rights mentioned previously, provided that a labor organization shall have the right to prescribe its own rules with respect to acquisition or retention of membership therein.

"(2) To cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of the section dealing with an open shop, or union shop, whichever prevails; or to discriminate against an employee whose membership in a labor organization has been denied or terminated on some ground other than failure to pay dues or initiation fees.

"(3) To refuse to bargain collectively with an employer provided it is the representative of his employees.

"(4) To engage in, or induce, or encourage, the employees of any employer to engage in a strike or concerted refusal to use, manufacture, process, transport, handle, or work on any goods where the object is—

"A. Forcing an employer or self-employed person to join a labor or employer organization; or any employer to cease using, selling, or handling the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person.

"B. Forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees, unless such organization is the certified representative of such employees.

"C. Forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees, if another labor organization has been so certified.

"D. Forcing or requiring any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization, or in a particular trade, craft, or class, rather than to employees in another labor organization, trade, craft, or class, unless such employer is failing to conform to an order or certification of the Board.

"Nothing in this section shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer, if employees of such employer are engaged in a strike approved by a representative of such employees.

"(5) To require of employees covered by a union-shop agreement the payment of a fee which the Board finds excessive or discriminatory under all circumstances.

"(6) To cause or attempt to cause an employer to pay or deliver money or other thing of value for services which are not performed or not to be performed."

The bill states that collective bargaining is the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees, to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement. Where a contract is in effect, the duty to bargain collectively shall also mean that the party proposing to modify or terminate it shall:

1. Serve written notice upon the other party 60 days prior to the expiration date, or, if no date exists, then 60 days prior to the date of the proposed change;

2. Offer to meet and confer with the other party for the purpose of negotiating a new contract or modifying the existing one;

3. Notify the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, within 30 days after such notice, of the existence of a dispute, provided no agreement has been reached by that time; and

4. Continue in effect, without resorting to strike or lock-out, all terms and conditions of the existing contract for a period of 60 days after the original notice is given, or until the expiration date of the contract, whichever occurs later.

In order to be eligible for certification as the representative of any employees, a labor organization is required to file annually with the Secretary of Labor detailed reports showing:

1. The name and address of such labor organization.

2. The names, titles, and compensation and allowances of its three principal officers and its other officers or agents whose total compensation and allowances exceeded $5,000 for the preceding year.

3. The manner in which those officers and agents were elected, appointed, or otherwise selected.

4. The initiation fee or fees which new members are required to pay.

5. The regular dues or fees which members are required to pay.

6. A detailed statement showing procedure followed with respect to membership qualifications, assessments, fines, and other union matters.

7. A report showing all receipts and the sources of such receipts; its total assets and liabilities, as of the end of its last fiscal year; disbursements made by it during that fiscal year, including purposes for which made.

8. All members of such labor organization to be furnished copies of the financial report.

The bill creates an independent agency to be known as the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. It shall be under the direction of a Director appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Service may proffer its services in any labor dispute affecting commerce, either upon its own motion or upon the request of one or more of the parties to a dispute. If the Director is not able to bring the parties to agreement by conciliation within a reasonable time, he shall endeavor to induce the parties voluntarily to seek other means of settling the dispute without resort to strike, lock-out, or other coercion, including submission to the employees in the bargaining unit, of the employer's last offer of settlement for approval or rejection in a secret ballot. Neither party is under compulsion to act on these suggestions.

The strikes that give the greatest concern to the public are the so-called national emergency strikes. Whenever, in the opinion of the President, a threatened or actual strike or lock-out affecting interstate commerce will imperil the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to investigate the issues involved and make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe. The report shall include a statement of facts, but shall not contain any recommendations. The President shall make its contents available to the public.

The President, after receiving the report, may then direct the Attorney General to petition any United States district court having jurisdiction of the parties, to enjoin such strike or lock-out. If the court finds the national health or safety is or will be imperiled, it shall have jurisdiction to enjoin such strike or lock-out. The order or orders of the court shall be subject to review, by the appropriate Court of Appeals and by the Supreme Court.

Whenever the district court issues such enjoining order, it shall be the duty of the parties to the labor dispute to make every effort to adjust and settle their differences, with the assistance of the Mediation and Conciliation Service.

Upon the issuance of such order, the President shall reconvene the original board of inquiry. At the end of a 60-day period, if the dispute has not been settled, the board shall report to the President the current position of the parties, and the efforts which have been made for settlement, including a statement of each party of its position, and a statement of the employer's last offer of settlement. The President shall make such report available to the public. The National Labor Relations Board, within the succeeding 15 days, shall take a secret ballot of the employees of each employer involved in the dispute on the question of whether they wish to accept the final offer of settlement made

by their employer. The results shall be certified to the Attorney General within 5 days thereafter.

Upon the certification of the ballot results, or upon a settlement, the Attorney General shall move the court to discharge the injunction. The President shall then submit to Congress a full report, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make for consideration and action.

Suits for violation of contracts between an employer and a labor organization, or between labor organizations, may be brought in any United States district court having jurisdiction of the parties. A labor organization and an employer shall be bound by the acts of its agents. Any such labor organization may sue or be sued as an entity, and in behalf of the employees whom it represents, in the courts of the United States. Any money judgments against a labor organization shall be enforceable only against the organization as an entity and against its assets, and shall not be enforceable against any individual member or his assets.

Boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and strikes to force recognition of another labor organization, after a labor organization has been certified as the bargaining agent, are declared to be unlawful and whoever shall be injured in his business or property by such actions may sue therefor in any United States district court.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 is amended to prohibit political contributions by labor organizations just as it prohibits contributions by any national bank or corporation.

I recognize the fact that we are dealing primarily with human relationships. Laws alone will not solve many of our labor-relations problems. In the final analysis, the solution rests upon individual action. Furthermore, I realize the fact that if our currency continues to weaken and lose its purchasing power, all the laws in the world will not prevent unrest and friction within the ranks of labor. An employee is a human being, and he fundamentally is working for material rewards. Therefore, I believe it is most essential that we stabilize our currency and do everything possible to reduce the unnecessary expenses of the Government so that the cost of living can be reduced for all the people.

Record of the Eighteth Congress to Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address by me which is being broadcast today over Station WIND in Chicago. The subject of the address is the outstanding record of the Eightieth Congress to date.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS' INSPIRING RECORD

I am grateful to this station for the opportunity to address you briefly on the subject of the bright and inspiring record of the Eightieth Congress.

This is a matter which you, as a citizen, are vitally interested in. You know that Congress has an obligation to the American people to handle adequately the problems of America in this atomic age. I believe it is fulfilling its obligation. It has over 5,000 bills pending before it, and it is doing a splendid job in evaluating them.

UNFAIR CRITICISM OF CONGRESS

During the first months of the Congress there was, however, a considerable amount of unfair and New Deal inspired criticism of the Congress' accomplishments.

Let us look at the record and let it speak for itself on just what your 435 Representatives and 96 Senators have been doing since they opened up shop on January 3, 1947. Let us seek the truth, which, as we are told in the Book of Books, sets men free—free from unjust criticism, free from doubt.

Let us first bear two facts, however, in mind.

POLITICAL REORGANIZATION

(A) Let us recognize that the Eightieth Congress had to completely reorganize itself politically before it could even begin to get down to its big work. For the first time in 14 years the Republicans were the majority party. This meant that they had to assume responsibility for committee machinery, for numerous congressional officers, and for other matters. It meant that the Republicans had to make various selections among their own ranks and that those men selected to handle the various legislative duties had to become accustomed to their tasks. I think that this job of political reorganization has been done well, as attested by the record of accomplishments on other fronts.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION

(B) Secondly, let us bear in mind that the Eightieth Congress, before it could do a single day's work on legislation, had to completely reorganize its legislative machinery, its committees, its procedures, in accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act. You will remember that act was passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It instituted the most complete overhaul of the congressional apparatus in 150 years. This reorganization, too, was a tremendous job, but the Eightieth Congress performed it smoothly and efficiently.

With these two reorganization efforts completed, Congress was then able to sail into the larger problems that confronted us. Let us look at what those problems are and how Congress has handled them:

FULL-TIME JOB

We in Congress have not been working on any 40-hour week. I, personally, like most of my colleagues, work around 80 hours a week and I'm proud and happy to do so in the service of our people. I take work home with me almost every night as do my associates. That is the only way we can get our job done.

Now, let us look at some of the fruits of our toil.

PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY

First, one of the most urgent congressional problems was the matter of elimination of the fantastic portal-to-portal mess. You will remember that this involved some $6,000,000,000 of suits filed by certain union organizations against American business for alleged portal-to-portal time. Had these suits been sustained by the courts, American industry would have been crippled and mass unemployment would have resulted.

But within the elapsed time of 4 months, the United States Senate and House held complete and exhaustive hearings on this matter, shaped a bill to eliminate these claims, passed this bill and sent it to the President. Our Chief Executive accepted the only reasonable choice open to him and signed this measure into law. Thus American industry was freed from the spectre of these disastrous suits. Accomplishment No. 1 of the Eightieth Congress.

LIMITATION ON PRESIDENTIAL TENURE

Now, second, we note that Congress has passed a constitutional amendment to limit Presidential tenure to two terms. This amendment has been submitted to the States for ratification and has already been approved by over a third of the final number necessary to enact the amendment.

It was not passed by the Congress or these State legislatures in a spirit of vindictiveness or partisanship. It was passed in a spirit of liberty as a move against too-long one-man control and one-party control which make for dictatorship. You and I know, that power, even when it is in the hands of angels, corrupts.

So, accomplishment No. 2 of the Eightieth Congress was the amendment limiting Presidential tenure.

BUDGET REDUCTION

We turn now to a third front of congressional action—budget reduction. You and I know that the President submitted a padded and bloated $37,500,000,000 budget. This budget gave many agencies even more money than they had lavishly spent during the war. Congress resolved to reduce the budget.

In doing so, it knew it would be fulfilling the people's will. For years the people have been clamoring for economy in Uncle Sam's handling of his business. They have wanted Government to start cutting corners in order to save the taxpayers' money. This meant that Congress would have to go over all of the executive departments' requests for funds with a fine-tooth comb in order to save money wherever possible. This, the Congress has done.

The House and Senate have effected economies in the various appropriations bills approximating one-third of all the money which the agencies requested. Of course, many of these budget cuts hurt some citizens and groups. It isn't easy to cut out Government functions which have been performed for a long time without causing some need for readjustment somewhere. Nevertheless, Congress is seeking to do an honest and efficient job in applying these economy cuts where the agencies can best stand them, by wiping out unnecessary functions and personnel. This is a job that is still continuing in the various appropriations bills before the Congress. Eventually it is hoped that a substantial reduction will be able to be made in the President's $37,500,000,000 budget. Accomplishment No. 3 of the Eightieth Congress.

TAX REDUCTION

Tax reduction goes hand in hand with budget reduction. That is why Congress is submitting a 10-, 20-, 30-percent tax-reduction bill to the President, in fulfillment of its promises of last November.

In the postwar era, it is absolutely essential that private enterprise be encouraged to full production rather than punished through burdensome taxes. Following exhaustive hearings in the Senate and House on this subject, legislation for a 10–20–30 percent tax cut has been prepared. But this is only the beginning.

Hearings are under way in the House of Representatives for a complete overhaul of our entire tax set-up. Congress wants to modernize and streamline and reevaluate all our taxes—inheritance, gift, excise, social security, income, and every other breed of taxes. That is what the people want, too

Tax reduction and the beginning of tax revision, accomplishment No. 4 of the Eightieth Congress.

LABOR REFORM

Another of the real challenges to the Eightieth Congress was meeting the labor situation head-on by enacting long overdue reforms in the public interest. Again after exhaustive hearings, the Senate and the House have fashioned legislation designed to curb racketeering abuses in the ranks of labor. This legislation is not designed to be antilabor nor promanagement. It is only designed to be propublic, to protect the welfare of all of us.

Time does not permit me to examine at length all of the various provisions of the labor bill, with which I am sure you are familiar. You know that the bill seeks to eliminate secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, coercion in labor disputes, control of unions by crooks or Communists, abuses of welfare funds, excessive initiation fees in unions, the closed shop (but not the open shop). It seeks to prevent strikes against the public safety through Federal injunction and to make for better mediation of disputes.

Ring up accomplishment No. 5 of the Eightieth Congress if we can get this labor bill enacted into law.

FOREIGN AID

But my friends, we have seen Congress' accomplishments only on the domestic front so far. Let us recognize now that Congress has been adequate to its responsibilities on the international front, too. With speed and adequacy, Congress made its historic decision to render $400,000,000 of aid to Greece and Turkey in order to halt Russian aggression against those countries. This was a decision by the Congress for peace. It was a decision for liberty. It was a decision for our enlightened self-interest.

But Congress made another decision—to extend humanitarian aid to stricken peoples abroad. It enacted the bill for $350,000,000 of aid to Greece, China, and other war-ravaged countries.

The men and women of the Congress want America to play the role of the Good Samaritan, helping other peoples to help themselves. We don't want to squander America's resources abroad. We don't want to waste the taxpayers' hard-earned money, but we do want to help other peoples back on their feet so that they can help themselves.

Foreign aid, accomplishment No. 6 of the Eightieth Congress.

OTHER BILLS

Time prevents me, my friends, from reviewing the other important legislation already considered by the Congress. Suffice it to say, however, that several score public laws have already been passed—laws which the public wants and laws which the Congress enacted with speed and accuracy.

COMMITTEE WORK

The reasons for Congress' fine record thus far can be found in the excellent work of its committees. As you know, there are some 50 committees in the Senate and House with some 150 subcommittees who do the spade work, who hold the hearings, dig out the facts, prepare the reports.

I would like to tell you a bit about the work of one committee—the Senate Judiciary Committee of which I am honored to be chairman. This committee has received more bills than any other committee in the United States Senate. If you were to pick up what is called its calendar you would find a document 256 pages long listing over 550 bills received, a considerable proportion of them already acted upon. You would find that this committee has held hearings on almost a score of matters. Taken up among those hearings were the portal-to-portal bill which it studied intensively. Another job performed by the Senate Judiciary Committee was the constitutional amendment to limit Presidential tenure, about which I have also already spoken. Still other work has been performed on the matter of eliminating wartime controls. A dozen or so of the nominations by the President for judgeships have also been considered.

PROBLEMS AHEAD

But my fellow Americans, I don't mean for you to assume that all of the legislative problems of the American people have already been handled to date. You and I know that would be impossible. We know that the abnormal wartime conditions have left us a difficult heritage which will take time to resolve. The housing shortage is still with us, but legislation alone cannot solve that problem. We still have high prices brought about by underproduction. We have the problem of the proposed merging of armed forces confronting us. We have the problem of the proposed enactment of the great St. Lawrence waterway, on which I have been holding hearings in a Foreign Relations Subcommittee. We have problems of foreign affairs and domestic affairs.

These, the Congress will take up, I am sure with the same speed and adequacy it has evidenced to date, but may I repeat that legislation will not provide the solution without work and production.

CONCLUSION

My fellow Americans, we have reviewed six specific phases of congressional actions: Its portal-to-portal law, its Presidential limitation, budget reduction, tax reduction, labor reform, and foreign aid. We have seen the work of congressional committees and looked briefly at the problems still up ahead.

I have shown you that on the basis of the record, the American people are justified in their faith in the Eightieth Congress. Your Congress and mine is handling first things first and doing a good job at it, with the welfare of the American people at heart. May the example of this hard-working Congress inspire all of us to do the job which is before us.

In Defense of Juries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, recently there were many critics of the jury's verdict in South Carolina, and many articles appeared in various newspapers throughout the country, both pro and con.

One of the best editorials I have read on the subject appeared in the News and Courier, of Charleston, S. C. It states what I believe to be true that most of the critics did not follow or study the trial.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF JURIES

Many persons have severely criticized the jury that acquitted the 28 men who were indicted for the murder of the Negro, Willie Earle, in Greenville County. The critics did not hear the law charged by the presiding judge and the sworn testimony of the witnesses. The critics have not been sworn as jurymen. The News and Courier cannot say what would have been its verdict had it been a member of the jury.

Do the critics wish the jury system abolished? What would they substitute for it? Would they have indicted persons tried by judges, by kings, by commissars, by political bosses, by newspapers?

Are they contending for the passage of a law that would transfer trials of criminals in South Carolina to Federal courts? If that they advocate, why do they not so say?

The News and Courier is a believer in the right of the State to try criminals. It would not have South Carolina converted into a province governed by proconsuls appointed by authority in Washington or in Moscow.

Juries are composed of men. Men are fallible. An act of Congress sustained by the courts that murderers and other felons be tried in the Federal courts would intensify "race prejudice" in South Carolina. It would incense ruffians, incite them to do murder. Ignorant Negro ruffians would, of course, think that Uncle Sam would protect them no matter how beastly their deeds might be. The Federal Government could apply force to halt them. It could send to South Carolina an army of occupation. That would not be new to South Carolina.

One can think of a jury as ignorant or corrupt, or both. It is not for the News and Courier to describe any jury as of that character or want of character. The News and Courier is a believer in the jury system and a defender of it. It is a believer in the right of the State of South Carolina to try accused persons. It is a defender of that right. Therefore it refuses to join in denunciations of the Greenville jury, and leaves it to persons who think of themselves as specialists in that duty.

Communist Influences in the Motion-Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a report of a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities investigating Communist influences in the motion-picture industry, which report was filed with the full committee on May 28, 1947:

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

On the 22d day of April the chairman appointed a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of the following members: Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman, Hon. JOHN MCDOWELL, and Hon. JOHN S. WOOD, to proceed to California for the purpose of making an investigation and taking executive testimony relative to the Hans Eisler case and the alleged Communist influences and infiltration in the motion-picture industry. The subcommittee arrived in Los Angeles on May 5, accompanied by the chief investigator, Robert E. Stripling, and Investigator Louis J. Russell.

The subcommittee was met by the press and the chairman issued a statement in which he stated that the subcommittee had a twofold purpose of being there. One was to complete certain phases of the so-called

Hans Eisler case, which the committee has been working on for the past 4 months; that there would be no public hearings by the subcommittee in California on the case, but that it was expected that the case would be presented to the full committee in Washington in the early part of June.

The chairman stated that the subcommittee was in California to initiate an extensive and all-inclusive investigation of possible Communist activities and influences in the motion-picture industry. The chairman explained to the press that the committee had been beseiged with demands and requests to investigate the situation. He emphasized, however, that the investigation would require a minimum of 4 months and the services of a trained and competent staff, and that all the committee wanted were the facts and that there would likewise be no public hearings in California on this subject; that the subcommittee was there for the purpose of securing the cooperation of the parties involved, in order that the best job possible would be done.

HANS EISLER

On May 9, agents of the committee served two subpenaes on Han Eisler at his residence, 108 Malibou Beach, Pacific Palisades, Calif. One subpena called for his appearance before the subcommittee at its chambers in the Baltimore Hotel on Monday, May 12, at 11 a. m. The other subpena called for Eisler's appearance before the full committee in Washington on June 16, 1947, at 10 a. m.

On May 12, at 11 a. m., Hans Eisler, accompanied by his attorney, Ben Margolis, appeared in the committee's chambers. The committee was sitting in executive session and Mr. Eisler was sworn and permitted to read a brief statement to the committee, which appears in the official transcript.

The chief investigator explained to Eisler why he was before the subcommittee and proceed to ask him questions relative to the committee's inquiry. The witness' answers were evasive and in many cases contrary to documentary evidence which was in the possession of the subcommittee. He was repeatedly counseled by his attorney, Mr. Margolis, to "answer the questions in any way you see fit." The committee thereupon concluded that due to the witness' noncooperative attitude and evasion, no good purpose could be served in further questioning him in executive session. He was therefore instructed to appear in Washington on June 16 before the full committee in open session, and to refresh his memory on certain vital questions which had been propounded to him. He informed the subcommittee he would be present on June 16. The subcommittee's investigation of Eisler's activities in California, however, disclosed very important information which will be revealed at the hearing on June 16.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCES IN THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

On May 8 and 9, members of the subcommittee and the committee's staff conferred with a number of individuals concerning the situation in Hollywood. Following these conferences, the members of the subcommittee decided to bring before them a number of witnesses from the motion-picture industry who would represent a cross-section of the industry and to question them under oath concerning the allegations with reference to the Communist influences in Hollywood. Accordingly, the following individuals were invited to appear before the committee:

Roy E. Brewer, international representative of the International Alliance of Theater and Stage Employees. He was accompanied by Mr. B. C. DuVal, business representative of Local No. 44 of the IATSE in Hollywood, and Mr. Harry Schiffman, business representative of Local No. 787 of the IATSE.

James K. McGuiness, executive of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios; active in Hollywood for the past 20 years as a screen writer, producer and executive.

John Charles Moffitt, motion-picture critic and reviewer for Esquire magazine; member of the Screen Writers Guild and professional screen writer.

Robert Taylor, actor.

Richard Arlen, actor.

Leia E. Rogers, active in Hollywood since 1915 as a writer, actress and producer, and manager of her daughter, actress Ginger Rogers.

Henry Ginsberg, executive producer and general manager of Paramount Picture Studios; active in Hollywood for the past 16 years.

Adolphe Menjou, actor.

Jack Warner, studio executive at Warner Bros.

Leo McCarey, director and producer.

Rupert Hughes, writer.

Howard Emmet Rogers, screen writer.

All of the above-named witnesses appeared before the subcommittee and were sworn and testified in executive session. They were frank and cooperative. They revealed a very serious situation and manifested deep concern over the inroads that the Communists had made in this important and powerful medium of propaganda and education.

These witnesses gave the subcommittee the names of writers, actors, directors, and producers from the moving-picture industry whom they considered to be Communists. One prominent actor who has been in Hollywood 27 years described Hollywood to the committee as "the hub of Red propaganda in the United States." Another testified that the Communists have infiltrated many talent agencies, so that their hiring will favor party liners who can kick back funds to party causes.

The subcommittee has decided not to analyze the testimony of each witness in this report to the full committee, but recommends that each member read the entire transcript which is contained in 4 volumes, and which will be available to each member. However, the subcommittee would like to give the full committee the benefit of some of the important disclosures which were made before the subcommittee and which we feel deserves the immediate attention of the full committee.

Based upon the testimony and evidence submitted to the subcommittee it was disclosed:

(1) That scores of screen writers who are Communists have infiltrated into the various studios and it has been through this medium that most of the Communist propaganda has been injected into the movies. These writers belong to the Screen Writers Guild, which has a membership of some 1,300, and which, according to the testimony of competent witnesses, is under the complete domination of the Communist Party. These writers receive anywhere from $500 to $5,000 per week.

(2) That some of the most flagrant Communist propaganda films were produced as a result of White House pressure.

(3) That Communist screen writers, directors, and producers have employed subtle techniques in pictures, in glorifying the Communist system and degrading our own system of Government and institutions. (The subcommittee was furnished with a complete list of all the pictures which have been produced in Hollywood in the past 8 years which contain Communist propaganda.) The committee was fortunate in having before it a prominent and experienced screen writer and critic who analyzed these pictures from the standpoint of Communist propaganda and degradation of American institutions.

(4) That the National Labor Relations Board has given great aid to the Communists in their efforts to infiltrate and control the motion-picture industry.

(5) That up until recently, there has been no concerted effort on the part of studio heads to remove the Communists from the industry, but that in fact they have been permitted to gain influence and power which has been reflected in the propaganda which they have been successful in injecting in numerous pictures which have been produced in the last 8 years.

(6) At the present time there is a rebellion within the industry on the part of a number of top actors, directors, and producers who are refusing to play, direct, or produce pictures that contain Communist lines, or which were written by a well-known Communist, or in which well-known Communist actors have been given a role.

(7) That the Communists have succeeded in preventing certain good American pictures, which sought to glorify America and the American system, from being produced.

CONCLUSIONS

Since 1938, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Standing Committee on Un-American Activities has succeeded in amassing voluminous information concerning Communist elements within the motion-picture industry. Unfortunately, however, up until the present time, there has been no inclination on the part of the industry itself to cooperate with the committee in ferreting out these influences. Today the responsible people in the industry seem to be aware that they have been misled and misused by the Communists, and are anxious to rectify this situation. The cooperation which the subcommittee received was evidence of the indignation which responsible people in Hollywood now feel toward Communists and the injury they are doing to this great entertainment agency. In the opinion of the subcommittee, there is no question as to the serious inroads that the Communists have made in the motion-picture industry, and it presents a problem which can only be corrected by complete exposure on the part of the Committee on Un-American Activities and prompt action by the studio heads. Therefore the subcommittee makes the following recommendations:

(1) That the full Committee on Un-American Activities intensify its investigation of Communist influences in the motion-picture industry with the view of holding a public hearing in Washington before the full committee at the earliest possible date, and bring before it all the necessary witnesses to give the American people the full facts and information on this dangerous situation.

(2) That the committee subpena to Washington Communist actors, writers, directors, and producers, and confront them in public session with the testimony and evidence against them.

(3) That an investigation be instituted to determine the responsibility and extent of the influence and interference on the part of Government agencies or officials in the production of flagrant Communist propaganda films.

Death of White Youth in Effort To Rescue Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a story from

the Raleigh News and Observer giving an account of a very heroic act on the part of a young white youth, Chic Shaheen, who lost his life in an attempt to rescue and save the life of a young Negro boy who was drowning in a lake near Raleigh.

In this day, when there is so much publicity about lynchings and other racial disturbances, and especially if these happen to occur anywhere in the South, it seems to me that it is worth while for the other side of the picture to be presented, and that due publicity should be given to the act of this young man in sacrificing his life in an effort to save the life of his Negro companion. Of course, this story would not gain headlines in the sensational press, because so often this type of journalism is interested only in fanning race prejudice and in flaunting what it describes as race discrimination in a great section of our country. This act of heroism on the part of this southern white boy in undertaking to save the life of this Negro youth, should make wholesome reading for the entire country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE YOUTH DIES IN TRYING RESCUE—PANIC-STRICKEN NEGRO YOUTH PULLS WOULD-BE RESCUER UNDER IN LAKE TRAGEDY

A Raleigh white youth, disregarding his own safety, went to the rescue of a drowning Negro boy here yesterday and lost his life in the attempt to save him. The Negro, too, was drowned.

Victims of the tragedy, which occurred at Carolina Pines Lake, a mile south of the city on the Fayetteville Highway, were Chic Shaheen, 17, a Hugh Morson High School student, of 214 Lafayette Road, and Thomas Upchurch, Negro, also 17, of 715 Branch Street.

A third boy in the fishing party, Bobby Albright, 16, of 401 South McDowell Street, swam safely to shore when the boat in which all three were riding filled with water.

Coroner I. M. Cheek ruled the drownings accidental and said no inquest would be held. They were the first drownings to occur in Wake County in 1947.

Young Albright, who caddies at a nearby golf course, said he was in a boat when Shaheen and Upchurch happened by and asked to be taken out to fish.

Albright said he was doing the rowing while the other two boys fished. In some unexplained manner, Upchurch fell overboard and came up calling for help.

Without hesitation, Shaheen, fully dressed, dived in and swam to the struggling Negro youth. As he approached, Upchurch reached out and grasped him around the neck, Albright said, and both youths went down. Albright said he kept looking for the two to come up again, but they didn't.

Meanwhile, the partially capsized boat was filling with water, and Albright jumped into the water and swam to shore. There were a number of persons nearby at the time, and Raleigh firemen were summoned. The Red Cross, too, answered a call, with Louis Gray, swim program director, supervising work of several divers.

Shaheen's body was located and brought to shore within about 30 minutes, and efforts at resuscitation at first gave hopes of being successful, but after some some 2 hours' work with a pulmotor, hope was abandoned.

Considerable difficulty was experienced in locating the body of Upchurch, and it was over 2 hours before it finally was brought up. A. L. Murray of Raleigh, Route 3, and city firemen, directed by Chief W. R. Butts and Assistant Chief A. B. Lloyd, recovered the body. Efforts to revive him also were to no avail.

Shaheen was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Leo Shaheen, of Lafayette Road. His mother is the former Miss Idell Cannon, of Raleigh. Besides his parents, he is survived by one brother, Leo, Jr., and three grandparents.

Funeral rites will be held tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock at Sacred Heart Catholic Cathedral and the pastor, Monsignor J. Lennox Federal will be in charge. Interment will be in Montlawn.

Upchurch's parents are Mr. and Mrs. Jonah Upchurch, of Raleigh. Funeral arrangements for him were incomplete last night.

All Things to All People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Washington Daily News printed a consolidation of the reports from all quarters of the globe to the United Press regarding activities of Communists in foreign countries.

Without question there appears to be only a concerted effort for one thing alone by the Communist Party organizations in all countries—support of the Russian foreign policies looking toward the eventual domination of the world by the Soviet International.

It is significant, too, to note that in none of the countries surveyed have the Communist Party leaders advocated collectivism of farms as in Russia. The only really significant land-reform measure has been the breaking up of large German estates into farms owned and operated by the farmer himself.

This indicates a clever strategy on the part of Communist leaders. They do not want to arouse the people into open revolt or even mild antagonism to their program along other lines. That can come later when all of the other pallatives have been accepted into the thinking of the people for then the shock of such so-called reforms would not be so great. Then would come the collectivism of farms and other communistic methods of Government controls. Enslavement of farms would be a step by step process.

The average American farmer, proud of his land ownership and the freedom and independence that go with it, is almost as unsuspecting of the import of these changes in Europe as those behind the iron curtain already under the heel of the Communist dictatorship. The American farmer knows instinctively that something is wrong with the Communist system but he has not yet transposed that knowledge into how the system might possibly affect his position in life if the Communist form of government were established in the United States.

Analysis of the following consolidated report by Mr. Harrison Salisbury, United Press foreign news editor, will indicate clearly the propaganda methods being used by the Communists in Asia and Europe today. At this stage it has outgrown the propaganda stage of early ideological invasion and is penetrating the very fiber of the governments of those countries as clearly shown by the operations of the Tito government in Yugoslavia. Mr. Salisbury's report is as follows:

CAGEY COMMUNISTS RECONVERT "AIMS"

(By Harrison Salisbury)

Communist Party tactics run the gamut from outright revolutionary activity, guerrilla warfare and underground sabotage to mild parliamentary reformism—all apparently depending upon local conditions in the particular country concerned.

Communist Party programs reveal an equal profusion of variants, ranging from full socialization of industry to introduction of elementary democratic rights such as free speech and a free press.

NOT BACKING COLLECTIVISM

In none of the 46 Communist Party government countries of which the United Press made a survey was the party supporting the collectivization of agriculture such as has been effected in the Soviet Union.

The most revolutionary Communist Party program disclosed in the survey was that in Greece, where the party is backing the guerrilla faction in the semi-civil war in progress in that country.

The Greek Communist Party is half underground and has taken the leading role in the open guerrilla warfare against the Greek Government. But Communist leaders there told United Press Correspondent Robert Vermillion they did not expect to achieve the overthrow of the government by this means, at least as long as the United States supports the Athens regime.

A small campaign of violent action by Communists was reported from Spain. But the number of active Communists appeared to be extremely small. In Spain they carry out occasional sabotage, blowing up of bridges, and setting off small bombs in public squares or in front of important buildings.

In the Middle East the Communist Party's announced objective is revolution. But Communist leaders in Egypt, for instance, said the goal was at least 20 years distant.

The initial stated goal in most Middle Eastern and Asiatic countries is elimination of colonial powers, usually Britain, and establishment of what the Communists call bourgeois democracy.

In Iran the Communist and Russian-backed Tudeh Party last year apparently aspired to win control of the Government by revolutionary means, but the movement was reported largely to have petered out both in Iran proper and Azerbaijan.

EVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM

Most of the European Communist Parties feature the nationalization of basic industries and land reform at the top of their program. In some of the countries, for example in Norway, the party has abandoned revolution as a means for achieving its ends, and in its propaganda calls for achievement of socialism without revolution. The line in Czechoslovakia is described as evolutionary socialism rather than revolutionary socialism.

While calling for land reforms in most countries the Communist Parties are anti-collectivization. In Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary the party stands for ownership of land by the farmer who works it.

In France, the Netherlands, and Belgium the party calls for higher wages and lower living costs. The French party wants to end tax support of Catholic schools. But in Italy the party supported the establishment of catholicism as the state religion. In the Netherlands Catholic authorities announced Communist supporters would be denied the holy sacrament.

In the Balkans, where many Communist Parties are in power, they have generally moved to nationalize mines, large industrial enterprises, public utilities, and so on, but have adopted a hands-off policy toward small business, trades, and professions.

In former enemy countries and occupied countries the Communists continue to press for strict punishment of wartime collaborators and Fascists.

On foreign policy the parties universally favor friendship and good relations with Russia and generally support the Soviet on foreign policy issues. But national disputes, such as that between Italy and Yugoslavia over Trieste, find the parties taking more nationalist lines although usually trying to soft-pedal the issue.

The party program in Germany emphasizes a unified Reich, a fair peace, elimination of Nazis, land reform and nationalization of industry. Land reform has been introduced in the Soviet zone with the splitting up of large estates, and the nationalization of mines and industry has been started.

DIFFERENT AIMS IN ASIA

In Asia and the Far East the Communist Party programs have objectives which differ widely from those in Europe.

The party program in India stresses freedom of speech, assembly, press, religion, trade-union rights, the 8-hour day, union recognition, a month's paid holiday, old-age pensions, maternity benefits, free education, better homes, and better hospitals.

Nationalization of industry is also an Indian objective but is far down the list.

In Siam the party stands for lowered living costs, universal suffrage, free speech, free press, freedom to strike, freedom of religion, better pay, lower taxes, and universal education. In Malaya the program is the same with the addition of a plan advocating equal rights for both sexes.

"BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY"

The Japanese Communist Party sets as its objective the achievement of a "bourgeois democracy." It wants consolidation of labor unions, abolition of special rights for the emperor and large land owners, abolition of the bureaucracy, nationalization of farms and land, nationalization of banks and self-government.

In China where the Chinese Communist Party controls areas of China with an estimated 100,000,000 population the party program is based on agrarian reform, establishment of cooperatives both in agriculture and industry, introduction of education, health measures, and similar rudimentary reforms.

Think Before Wiring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD A. COFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the June issue of the Farm Journal:

THINK BEFORE WIRING

You may be asked, any day now, to "write or wire your Congressman."

The agricultural appropriation bills are before committees, and will shortly be on the House floor. Everybody has a pet appropriation or so. Farm organizations and other groups will be asking their members and friends to tell Congress not to cut their favored items. They are for economy, but not that much.

We have a pet appropriation or so of our own—new crops research, for one. But we are sending no wires.

More important than any single appropriation or any single activity of the Department of Agriculture—more important than the Department of Agriculture, we might say—are these; that the Government of the United States and the American dollar keep their strength; that the mammoth debt be reduced; that taxes be lowered so that men have incentive to produce.

These things can't be accomplished unless Federal expenses are sharply lowered. Expenses can't be lowered except by cutting appropriations, and cutting them hard.

Before any citizen sends his wire to protect some favored activity, let him ask himself whether the reduction of expenses and taxes will not serve him and his country better.

American agriculture managed fairly well for a good many years while the funds of the Department of Agriculture were only one-fifth as much, or even less, than now. Crops will still be harvested, and little pigs will still make pork, whether the Department has two billions or two millions to spend. We believe in the usefulness of the Department of Agriculture, but right now we shall demand no more services from it than a financially bent Nation can afford.

Here is one place where farmers can take the lead to reduce Federal expenses. If we must write or wire the Congressman, why not tell him to keep on whittling the figures down?

Settlement of Telephone Dispute in Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. STANLEY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a communication addressed to his excellency, Hon. William M. Tuck, Governor of Virginia, by the members of the State Corporation Commission of the Commonwealth of Virginia:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION,
Richmond.

Hon. WILLIAM M. TUCK,
Governor of Virginia,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR GOVERNOR TUCK: Under date of April 16, 1947, Your Excellency issued a proclamation reciting certain events, which had transpired in connection with a labor dispute between the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia and certain employees of the company and culminated in the filing of a strike notice to be effective May 17, 1947. Another proclamation of similar character was issued under date of April 18, 1947, with regard to the dispute between the company and certain of its employees in the city of Alexandria, the county of Arlington, and the town of Falls Church which caused the filing of a strike notice to be effective May 14, 1947. A third proclamation on April 21, 1947, cited the strike notice, to be effective May 20, 1947, filed by certain employees in the territory served by the company in Accomack and Northampton Counties. The proclamations and executive orders entered in each instance signified your intention to take possession of and to operate the company, or so much thereof as might be necessary to render adequate telephone service to the areas affected by the three strike notices. The executive orders designated the State corporation commission as your agent to perform the duties required of the Governor as set forth in chapter 9, acts of the General Assembly of Virginia, extra session, 1947.

The commission made a careful study of the aforesaid act and ordered that the act be printed in sufficient quantity to permit us to send a copy (sample is attached—exhibit A) to each employee of the telephone company.

In accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the aforesaid act, the first duty of the commission was to ascertain from each individual employee whether or not he or she would accept employment by the State in the event the State would actually take over and operate the telephone company on the dates designated. We prepared a form letter (a copy of which is attached—exhibit B) to assist us in securing this information.

We requested and received from the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia a complete list of all management and nonmanagement employees, both active and nonactive, because of sickness, leave of absence, etc. This list contained 7,038 names. The list received did not identify union-member personnel, but simply separated the telephone company employees into four classifications; i. e., traffic, commercial, plant, and accounting and executive. The particular duties of each employee and the location or telephone agency where he or she worked was also shown.

In order to comply with the provisions of the afore-mentioned statute, the commission called in 40 of its personnel from the several divisions of the commission and had them meet on Saturday, April 19, 1947, to receive instructions as to the placing of a copy of the law on the subject and the questionnaire hereinbefore mentioned and attached in the hands of the employees of the telephone company. All questionnaires were serially numbered and a record was kept of their distribution in order that all replies could be properly identified. It was found that it would be impracticable to send a representative of the commission to every telephone office in the State; consequently, we mailed the questionnaire, a stamped self-addressed envelope, and a copy of chapter 9, acts of the General Assembly of Virginia, extra session, 1947, marked in very heavy black type, "Important—read carefully," to the home of each employee, with the exception of those employees living in 16 cities. The employees of the company in the 16 cities received the questionnaires, a copy of the law, and a return stamped envelope directly from the representatives of the commission or by mail, if they were not at their posts. The commission felt that every employee of the telephone company had a right to be thoroughly acquainted with the provisions of this law before signifying his or her intention to work for the State in the event of State operation of the company's facilities.

A portion of section 8 of chapter 9 of the act reads as follows:

"In the event that any person or persons then employed by the utility in any such necessary positions shall fail to indicate an intention to work for the State in operating the utility, when inquiry is made of such person, the Governor shall immediately institute measures to employ another person or other persons to perform the required duties of anyone not indicating such intention."

The commission felt that in all fairness to the employees of the telephone company, this provision should be made quite clear to those employees that had not answered our inquiry. Consequently, we prepared and had distributed widely a statement to the effect that if an employee failed to answer our inquiry his or her silence would be construed to mean that he or she did not desire to accept employment by the State,

and that it would be necessary for the commission to make arrangements to see that his or her duties would be performed in the event of, and during the period of, State operation. The letter described above apparently clarified the situation to some extent because the answers began to come in steadily and the percentage of those answering that they would work for the State never decreased from the first day; but, in fact, steadily increased. As the replies were received, all who answered in the affirmative were sent the attached notice, which is self-explanatory—Exhibit C.

The final report on the answers from the employees was as follows:

Total questionnaires sent out and delivered	7,038
Total questionnaires returned	5,771
Percentage of questionnaires returned	82
Number of employees who indicated willingness to work for the State	5,072
Percentage of employees who indicated willingness to work for the State	87.9
Number of employees who indicated unwillingness to work for the State	699
Percentage of employees who indicated unwillingness to work for the State	12.1

Prior to the completion of the canvass of the company's employees the commission felt that it should take every precaution possible to see that adequate personnel would be on hand in the event of a strike. Consequently, we trained a number of State personnel who agreed to work as telephone operators in the event the State took over and operated the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. Finally, our plan of operation contemplated the following:

Employees necessary to operate telephone system for an extended work week, where needed, not to exceed 48 hours	4,548
Employees available:	
Regular company employees willing to work	5,072
Former company operators	500
Total	5,572

Therefore, it will be observed that there were available to work for the State 1,024 more employees than would have been necessary to render uninterrupted telephone service to the customers of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., without taking into consideration any State personnel who had been trained to work during an emergency.

The State actually took over and operated the company's facilities in the territory of Accomack and Northampton Counties on May 20, 1947, at 6 a. m. and released operations to the company on May 23, 1947, at 6 p. m. This action was entirely without incident of any character.

The following bill, amounting to $6,806.12, is being forwarded to the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia for expenses incurred by the State in connection with its duties hereinbefore recited:

Postage	$440.85
Stationery	50.64
Printing	221.59
To State corporation commission:	
Salaries of employees	4,622.68
Expenses of employees	860.34
	5,483.02
To other State departments:	
Salaries of employees	575.01
Expenses of employees	35.01
	610.02
Total	6,806.12

In addition to the above figure, the company will be billed for the amount of $62.76, which represents 15 percent of the net profits on the company's operations in the counties of Accomack and Northampton during the period May 20–23, 1947, when the State was operating its facilities.

This was a somewhat arduous task, but our labors were made less difficult because of the very close cooperation given us by Your Excellency and the management and employees of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia. The State was in a position at all times to operate successfully, without diminution of service, the facilities of the company. We are happy to be able to report that events have so ordered themselves that in Virginia telephone employees have lost none of their regular compensation and that, on the basis of an offer made by the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia an agreement has been reached whereby the employees will receive an increase in wages in an amount acceptable to a majority of the members of the unions; and, further, that the public has suffered no inconvenience whatever.

Respectfully submitted.

H. LESTER HOOKER,
Chairman.
HARVEY B. APPERSON,
Commissioner.
L. MCCARTHY DOWNS,
Commissioner.

Consumer-Credit Controls Doing Irreparable Damage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 23 I appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency to protest against the continuance of consumer credit regulations. I have had letters presenting irrefutable evidence that these regulations are discriminating against the veterans and the laboring man. In addition, it is creating a doubt in the minds of manufacturers as to whether or not they will be able to find a ready cash market for their increased production. These doubts have a tendency to stall the plans for industrial production.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will take the necessary steps to eliminate these unnecessary consumer credit regulations.

Following are my remarks before the committee:

I have introduced in the House of Representatives H. R. 2542, a bill which has been referred to your committee. This bill has been drawn so existing consumer credit regulations—the so-called regulation W—as prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, shall not apply to future consumer credit transactions.

Regulation W is an emergency, wartime regulation. It derives its authority from the Trading with the Enemy Act and the Second War Powers Act. It was intended to restrain inflation and assist in the rationing of goods in short supply during the war. I think all good Americans supported it then.

Now, 2 years after the war ended, we find this war regulation, this specialized, planned-economy regulation still in existence. Under the fiction that we are still at war, the Federal Reserve Board is setting the terms on all installment purchases of 12 classes of durable goods all the way across the Nation. Radios, automobiles, washing machines, furniture, rugs, and such items can be sold by law-abiding merchants only on terms which have been consciously set by the Federal Reserve Board System, in the wisdom of the experts over there, to depress demand and make it hard for the low-income purchaser to buy these products that have become standard parts of the American home.

To interfere with and manage the way Americans spend their money and how American businessmen run their businesses on no basis of law except an emergency regulation put over in wartime and on authority granted by Congress solely for war purposes is bad government, and in my mind detrimental to the economy of our country.

I am glad to find that Mr. Marriner S. Eccles sometimes agrees with me on this point. He has been an outstanding proponent of regulation W during the many months when the Federal Reserve Board's retention of the regulation has been under fire from business, banking, labor and other quarters. However, in reply to an official inquiry from me the other day, he wrote me as follows on May 12th:

"So far as I am concerned, there is no change in my position, which is based on the feeling that regulation of this sort should rest on legislation in peacetime and not on an executive order issued under emergency or war powers. Accordingly, I felt that if the Congress adjourned without enacting the legislation necessary to carry on the regulation, we should recommend that the Executive order be vacated. I cannot, of course, speak for or commit the President."

This is a truly interesting statement. Here a man who has kept a war regulation alive for many many months after the shooting stopped and most war controls were progressively abandoned in the interests of getting back to a peacetime economy now making it clear that the regulation should be abandoned. I wish that he could have come to this conclusion a year ago, as well as today.

I think that, if I understand the feelings and temper of the present Congress correctly, we will never vote the Federal Reserve Board any authority to get permanent power to regulate consumer credit. This Congress wants fewer—not more—controls over the normal life of our people.

Therefore, I have introduced legislation to strip from the Board this wartime power they have retained for themselves in peacetime. In spite of some statements I have no confidence that they will surrender their authority voluntarily because that agency has never operated to seek less power over our credit system but always more. I have no confidence that a request to the White House for the lifting of the Executive order on which the regulation rests will accomplish anything. In fact, the Board does not need to do this; and that puzzles me. The Executive order is permissive, a grant of authority to regulate within the discretion of the Board. If the Board desires, it can certainly lift the regulation tomorrow and end this nonsense forthwith, for it surely must know that Congress will not perpetuate its authority.

Many other Members of Congress agree with me. Your distinguished chairman has made his position clear in opposition to the regulation. Representatives DAVIS, of Georgia, and SCHWABE, of Oklahoma, have introduced bills similar to mine and these are

before your committee. Representatives EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania; SADOWSKI, of Michigan; HOOK, of Michigan; PRIEST, of Tennessee; and MORRISON, of Louisiana, have spoken out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD against this regulation.

I have here clippings from three newspapers on this subject. The New York Times criticizes the control of consumer credit by the Board because:

"The Reserve Board's record in recent years has been such as to create more than a suspicion that it was interested in acquiring power for its own sake.

"The Board has not given convincing evidence that it was prepared at all times to use what power it had fearlessly and without regard to political considerations. And—

"There has been no consistent pattern in the matter of credit policy so far as the administration in Washington is concerned."

Then I have here two labor newspapers, one from the huge Central Labor Union group of A. F. of L. unions in western Pennsylvania, the other the Commercial Telegraphers Journal. Both of these assail regulation W for the manner in which it discriminates against the workingmen in the lower income groups who have always relied on installment buying to equip their homes and get the major items for good living which they need. "Millions of workers should not be barred from the market for durable goods because they must use credit," this labor editor writes.

I could cite many other articles opposing this regulation but it is not necessary, even if time permitted.

I find the American Bankers Association, the Chamber or Commerce of the United States, the American Finance Congress, the National Electrical Wholesalers Association, the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, the Retail Credit Institute, the National Automobile Dealers Association, the National Used Car Dealers Association, the Consumer Bankers Association, the National Association of Credit Jewelers, National Consumer Finance Association, Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, and many local bankers group as well as others whom I have failed to note—all of these important groups of legitimate businessmen, the life-blood of our real American economy, oppose this harmful trouble-making regulation. Furthermore, many labor and veteran groups have adopted resolutions asking that regulation W be terminated.

At this hearing you may hear many technical and seemingly important arguments against regulation W. I am not in a position to cover these as well as some of the businessmen or their representatives who will become witnesses before your committee later.

In closing I want only to read a statement to which I subscribe most heartily from an expert in these matters whose sound judgment and broad thinking I completely respect. I refer again to your chairman, who was quoted as follows some time ago in early opposition to all that regulation W stands for:

"Credit is the lifeblood of the American economy. Reasonably easy credit terms result in mass buying, and therefore mass production, which lowers prices. We are now running into a situation where we are going to have enormous production with a possible cut in domestic markets as a result of the Government controls on consumer credit. There is no point in mass production unless these things can be put into the hands of the people, and it is simply impossible to have mass purchases when the law requires stiff down payments with quick payment of the balance."

I wish your committee the utmost success in the present public-spirited, most important inquiry which you are undertaking.

Striking Similarities of Nazism, Fascism, and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I hereby include the following study of the striking similarity between nazism, fascism, and communism:

STRIKING SIMILARITES OF NAZISM, FASCISM, AND COMMUNISM

(By Hon. FRED E. BUSBEY)

It is important for the American people to note the striking similarity between nazism, fascism, and communism in the following respects:

1. The wiping out of all independent trade unionism with the result that those trade-unions which are permitted exist only under the tolerance of the totalitarian state, to serve as its servile adjuncts.

2. The elimination of political parties except the ruling Nazi, Fascist, or Communist Party.

3. The subordination of all economic and social life to the strict control of the ruling, single party bureaucracy.

4. The suppression of individual initiative, the liquidation of the system of free enterprise, and the nationalization of private property.

5. The abolition of the right to freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religious worship.

6. The reduction of wages and living standards to subminimum levels.

7. The use of slave labor on a vast scale, through the establishment of huge concentration camps.

8. The abolition of the right to trial by jury, habeas corpus, the right to independent defense counsel and the innocence of the defendant until proven guilty.

9 The glorification of a single leader or fuehrer or duce, who is all-powerful and subject neither to criticism or removal through the ballot.

10. The utilization of a special form of social demagogy for the elimination of all opposition and for the concentration of power into the hands of the ruling dictatorship, as for example incitement of race against race, religion against religon, and class against class.

11. The subordination of all economic and social life and the everyday needs of the population to the requirements of an expanding military machine seeking world conquest.

12. The establishment of a system of Nation-wide espionage to which the entire population is subject.

13. The severance of social, cultural, and economic contact between the people of the totalitarian state and those of other countries, through a rigorous press and radio censorship, travel restrictions, etc.

14. Open disregard for the rights of small nations and the sanctity of treaties.

15. The maintenance and encouragement of fifth columns abroad among nations with whom the totalitarian state has treaty relations.

16. The reduction of parliamentary bodies to a rubber-stamp status automatically approving all decisions of the one-party dictatorship and the omnipotent leader.

A Word for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the Pontiac (Mich.) Daily Press, of June 2, 1947, an outstanding newspaper of my State, which reveals what I consider to be a common-sense view of the duties and difficulties of Congress. It is for that reason that I want the opinions expressed therein made known to the entire country.

The editorial follows:

A WORD FOR CONGRESS

When things are not going right or the country seems to be stumbling along, it is all too characteristic of Americans to shift the blame to Congress. In fact, the Congress has been a whipping boy in recent years, because the New Deal found that often it refused to go along with its favorite reforms. As a result, the people are inclined to be critical of Congress even though since last November's election it has changed its party complexion.

Congress is not infallible.

It is a human institution.

How human was illustrated just recently when Congressman Fred Bradley, of Rogers City, Mich., complained that a Congressman was handicapped in doing his job because of the constant strain of invitations he couldn't ignore to dinners and cocktail parties and social events. Less than a week after Congressman Bradley made his complaint, he was dead of overstrain from his congressional duties.

A Congressman works hard.

His job is by no means easy.

Yet all too often people who have no conception of what a Congressman does from day to day complain that all their troubles are caused by a do-nothing Congress. Some public servants may loaf on the job, but just to keep in office a Congressman has to do a tremendous amount of work that the people back home do not always realize. Once in a while a Member of Congress rises up, as Congressman Bradley did, to point out some of the difficulties of his job.

Congress makes many blunders.

But it works harder than we think.

In a little-noted speech in Texas recently Speaker JOE MARTIN took occasion to defend Congress and point out some of the unthinking criticisms that are often made against it. People who do not want the American system, and who are plugging for some form of Fascist or communistic dictatorship, he explained, always find their first target in Congress.

They say our American system is slow.

They want quick action.

"They insist," said Speaker MARTIN, "we must have some form of statism or dictatorship of the proletariat. That kind of propaganda actually fools some of the people. Propagandists chant about the failure of Congress to do something." Actually, Congress has done a lot. In fact, it is pretty clear that the main critics of Congress today are the "lame duck" New Deal columnists in Washington whose real complaint is that Congress is doing too much.

This Congress is ahead of schedule.

Actually, it has achieved a record.

"So long as the people maintain their faith in Congress and send men of high character

to it," Speaker MARTIN told his Texas audience, "just so long will the Congress maintain its power and authority to legislate the people's will into law and action. Just so long as the checks and balances are maintained, just so long will we successfully resist all attempts to destroy our American system and reduce us to serfdom under some alien despot."

We should keep in mind the record of the present Congress, and the pressures brought forcibly to attention by Congressman Bradley, before we criticize Congress too harshly for its shortcomings. It is, after all, part and parcel of our American system.

Reduction of Government Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Clyde M. Reed, Jr., of the Parsons (Kans.) Sun. It is entitled "A Train Slows Down" and is so replete with clear thinking as to the need for restoring the Nation's economy to a sound financial basis and so clarifying as to the part Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public must play in bringing this about that it comes under the heading of "must" reading. The editorial is as follows:

A TRAIN SLOWS DOWN

WASHINGTON.—The Eightieth Congress has thrown a yellow block against the Federal gravy train.

It hasn't halted the spending special by any means, but it is slowing down the train and for the taxpayers that constitutes news of first importance.

Every year since the great depression, civilian spending of the Government has increased. War years are not excluded. Economy long since has been a word erased from the Federal dictionary.

The next fiscal year will be a turning point in that phase of government. The upturn in spending has been halted. A decrease is in sight.

This achievement will be one of the Eightieth Congress' chief claims to fame. It will not be accomplished without a struggle. But when the smoke of battle clears, it will be the spending advocates who will be carried off the battlefield—not the proponents of economy and common sense, as has been the case all too often in the past decade and a half.

Washington, or more specifically that part of it which is not connected with Capitol Hill, is slightly jittery over the slashing of Federal expenditures.

Washington, it need not be emphasized, lives off of the Government. It has experienced its greatest growth in population and wealth since 1933. Every new bureau created, every department expanded meant more tenants for Washington apartment and rooming houses, more mouths to feed for the Capital's restaurateurs, and so on down the line. All at the expense of the remainder of the country.

The Capital City is measuring the current economy drive by the number of Federal workers which will be left when Congress adjourns, not how many dollars in Federal expenses will be saved. And it can afford such a luxury of thought. It has paid high taxes, along with the rest of the country, but has gotten them back the next day and in succeeding days—with compounded interest. That feat, of course, was accomplished through the retail cash register.

So the present edition of Congress is not the most popular of legislative bodies which have deliberated under the Capitol dome, as far as Washington is concerned. It will be glad when late July rolls around and Congress goes home for a spell. Economy talk is wearing on Washington's mercantile nerves.

The most crucial test on economy will not come in Washington, however. It will be in each of the 48 States and all of the counties and cities therein.

The Federal bureaus spend a lot of money on operation, but as compared to the entire Federal budget, that is more or less chicken feed. The greatest part of the budget, on the civilian side, goes for Federal-aid projects of all descriptions from airports to waterways.

These projects originate "back home," or at least the pressure for them originates there. It was the original New Deal, back in the depression days, which brought to the Nation on a wholesale scale the idea of pouring Federal funds into State and community works.

The Federal Government, too, has been generous with the farmer. Subsidies of various kinds have been paid. These also have a hard-times background. The farm income rocked along for many years out of kilter with the rest of the Nation's economic endeavor. The aim of Federal help was to eliminate that disparity, or at least minimize it.

The farmer today, as a class, ranks among the Nation's most prosperous citizens. Several years running of good crops, plus an unlimited demand, has raised the economic status of agriculture to where it belongs.

The result will be a tightening of Federal purse strings as regards agriculture. The House appropriations committee has made sizeable reductions in next year's Federal farm outlay. Some of the cuts may be restored, but the emphasis definitely will be on economy in the farm side of Government as elsewhere.

It will be these matters that will be Government saving's most severe trial. Congress can reduce expenditures only as long as it has the support of the country as a whole.

If there are demands for continued spending along the line of "I'm for economy, but don't cut out my project," then there will be no budget balancing or permanently lower taxes. Saving in Government costs can be made only on a total basis, not by sparing favorite projects here and there. The latter course, known as logrolling, can only add up to a prolongation of the spending jag.

That will be something to watch. The headlines currently may be on the bureaus and agencies. The struggle will be won or lost on flood control, farm benefits, waterways, airports, school lunches, hospitals, highways, and a hundred more assorted items.

It will be a test of self-denial. The Nation has become accustomed to looking to Washington for benefits of every sort because "they won't cost us anything." Communities the country over, under the economy plans which are gathering speed, must foot more of the bill themselves or else be content to go without.

That, or a continuation of high wartime taxes. Today's spending can't be paid for on a pre-war-tax level, nor can the $5,000,000,000 annual carrying charge on the Federal debt—not to mention a reduction of the principal—be met each year with wishful thinking.

At least, a start has been made in the direction of Federal economy. It will be up to the country to say how far it shall go and how much of the presently heavy burden of Federal taxation, in turn, can be lifted from its shoulders.

C. M. R., Jr.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell in the Washington Times-Herald of Friday, June 6, 1947:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

When the tax bill, passed overwhelmingly by the present Congress, reaches the White House desk for approval or veto, Harry S. Truman as President of the United States and Democratic candidate for '48 will find himself battling with Harry S. Truman, Senator from Missouri in 1944.

In February of 1944, Senator Truman followed the banner of revolt which Democratic Leader ALBEN BARKLEY, of Kentucky, waved in the face of the war-dictator President Franklin Roosevelt.

Roosevelt, for the first time in the history of the Republic, vetoed a tax bill passed by the Congress and thereby took another slash at the supposedly coequal powers of Capitol Hill and the White House. F. D. R. lost.

Since the days of the founding fathers, the powers of the purse had been gripped firmly in the hands of Congress. Then came Roosevelt. Then, for the first time, a major tax measure was vetoed by a President. Then Senator, now President, Harry Truman, rose in revolt against this White House grab for power. With his vote he backed up BARKLEY when the White House Senate spokesman denounced the White House by saying that Roosevelt's veto of a congressional tax bill was "a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress."

Senator Truman then joined with 38 other Democratic Senators to beat Roosevelt over the head by triumphantly overriding his veto. The boys on the Hill were in an ugly mood. Democrats controlled both Houses. The President was at the peak of his wartime prestige and popular acclaim. In the face of this, 39 of the Democrats in the Senate and all but 1 Republican united to override Roosevelt's veto of a tax measure backed by a majority of the Congress.

As both Republican and Democratic leaders expressed it, this unprecedented White House veto of a tax bill was even more important in its far-reaching implications than any surface display of wartime unity and one-man leadership by Roosevelt.

In this instance, the President simply overreached himself. House and Senate administered a public and humiliating rebuff to the White House.

And to all of this congressional nose-thumbing in the direction of the White House, Senator Truman gave his rousing assent.

Now of course, the shoe is on the other foot. Congress has passed a tax bill that former Senator Harry Truman, now President Harry Truman, doesn't like.

Chief reason for Truman's distaste is that he would rather distribute such tax largess to the grateful peasantry next year when the Presidential campaign is getting under way and when thankful voters will remember that such relief came on the recommendation and through the wisdom of Democratic Presidential candidate Harry S. Truman.

If the bill goes through now, the voters will suspect that it was the idea of the Republican majority in Congress. Harry S.

Truman as Senator from Missouri, on the congressional record, agrees that the President has no right to veto a tax bill. But Harry Truman as President and Presidential candidate for 1948 is a horse of a different color. The great minds in the White House are still deliberating.

A Dangerous Move for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the United States is known to the people in every country in the world. It is so favorably known that downtrodden persons of every race, and of every color, everywhere, would like to become citizens of this country to enjoy its freedoms and its opportunities. God forbid that the Voice of America as distributed by those promoting this type of international propaganda should disillusion those who in distant lands now have faith in our form of government.

I say that such a propaganda agency as is proposed in H. R. 3342 should be defeated. Is it not known that the State Department is an island of refuge for Communists? Why let this group become the Voice of America? Why not trust a free press which by and large has served the United States in every crisis with fidelity and patriotism?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Evening Star, May 27, 1947:

WORLD NEWS EXCHANGE, NOT PROPAGANDA, IS KEY TO PEACE, COOPER SAYS

CHICAGO, May 27.—International amity can best be attained by international news exchange through the press and its news agencies, instead of through the discredited methods of Government propaganda, Kent Cooper said last night.

Mr. Cooper, who described propaganda as a tool of dictators, was a guest of the twenty-fifth anniversary celebration of the Medill School of Journalism of Northwestern University. He explained he was speaking solely as an individual and not as the executive director of the Associated Press.

He criticized vigorously a State Department plan, now before Congress, for an agency to distribute news abroad, saying it embraced an Old World practice that has been discredited and proved dangerous.

GOVERNMENT WARNED

"I hope our Government will remember that its propaganda can act as an abrasive that can do more harm than good; that it is a maelstrom of international self-seeking where wars are brewed."

He said there could be no successful method of establishing international friendship "that does not provide for complete news exchange between all countries free from the taint of Government handling. The news of one country should not go to the world in the form of propaganda to create prejudice, or to gain converts, but only to inform.

"If they are not hampered, the American news agencies can do far more to bring credit upon America through honesty in news than any Government effort can ever hope to do," Mr. Cooper declared.

The American news agencies' reports, he said, typify what a free press has done for the United States. There existed a practical possibility of making the conception worldwide, he added, "if Government meddling in news dissemination is not too destructive."

WORLD WANTS NEWS

"It is the American conception of forthright honesty in news from the American press that the rest of the world has proved it really wants from us—not seductive propaganda. * * *

"I would risk my country's future upon what its own ideals have developed—like its free press, for example, and truthful, international news exchange through its press, rather than upon the Old World methods of news contamination by governments. America has always been at its best when in its youthful vigor it gives the world a new idea which may benefit mankind. On the other hand, it has never done well when it has adopted Old World practices."

If communism is to be thwarted, he said, "not propaganda but the adhorrent method of military force alone could accomplish it—as in Japan * * * But even if all the vast hordes of underprivileged in all of eastern Europe had radios and thus could hear the Voice of America, I am afraid they would spurn communism and rejoice only if the voice of America were something more than a voice"—military power, food, clothing, land homes, and freedom to enjoy them.

PROPAGANDA DENOUNCED

"If Russian hatred turns against us and leads to solidifying the hold communism has upon them, our propaganda will have had the same effect as the best kind of Communist propaganda.

"If the Government were in the news agency business here at home, its propaganda could at least be under constant observation by the American people who could call it to account. Respecting propaganda sent abroad they are helpless. For they are unaware and have no means of knowing what one single propaganda group in one Government department is broadcasting to foreign lands that may lead us all to catastrophe. A strange phenomenon has been created indeed; the 'Voice of America' (the State Department's name for its foreign broadcasts) is speaking without America itself knowing what it is saying."

Mr. Cooper said the American press was "unanimously sponsoring world-wide news exchange" through its own news agencies and that such exchange offered the best promise of mutual confidence among all peoples.

Appropriation for the Federal Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star for June 5, 1947:

HANDICAPPING JUSTICE

Congress will be doing the cause of justice a grave disservice if it fails to restore to the pending appropriation bill for the Federal courts the funds required to provide essential secretarial and court reporter service. House action in eliminating a $1,800,000 item for judges' secretaries and stenographers and in reducing by $65,000 an $800,000 appropriation for court reporters threatens to handicap the courts at a time when the workload is increasing alarmingly in most districts

A point of order led to dropping of the secretarial item by the House. The contention was made that there is no basic authority in the law for secretaries in the Federal court establishment. This is technically true. But the fact is that Congress for nearly half a century has recognized the need for secretarial and stenographic aid to judges and, in effect, sanctioned these services by appropriating for them, year after year. No question ever was raised over these essential employees until 1945, when the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges prepared a bill to provide legal authority for employment of secretaries and stenographers in the courts. This bill passed both Houses unanimously, after minor changes, and failed of enactment only because the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned before acting on the conference report. Similar bills are pending in this Congress. Certainly it is not the fault of the courts that no basic authority for secretaries has been written into the law. And, as a matter of fact, Congress already has given implicit recognition to them in the Administrative Office Act, which specifically includes "secretaries and stenographers to the judges" among personnel under jurisdiction of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

As for court reporters, officials declare that even a reduction of $65,000, as proposed by the House, would have serious repercussions. This sum is needed to hire additional reporters necessitated by appointment of additional judges, to correct inequities in pay, and to hire temporary reporters in emergency cases. The work of the courts would be badly impaired if the bill as passed by the House is permitted to become law. The Senate will be averting a real crisis in the Federal judiciary if it restores the items omitted by the House and insists on final appropriation of the secretarial and reportorial funds requested by the administrative office of the courts.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

SLAVE LABOR

In their desperate struggle to remain free of all restraints labor union chieftains are trying to whip up a storm of protest against what they call the slave-labor bill. But not a line can be found in it anywhere to support this extravagant ranting. If the rank and file of citizens, union men included, will study the document carefully, they can scarcely fail to be impressed by its general fairness and moderation. In many instances it will have the effect of emancipating individual workers from tyrannies imposed upon them by some of the very men who are now crying, "Slave labor bill." For those who believe in law and order and fairness for all groups in our society the absurd propaganda which is being loosed against the bill will discredit only those who disseminate it. This applies with particular force to the antilabor bill tirade launched in New York Wednesday by the demagogic Mayor O'Dwyer.

Truman Gibes Benton for His "Art" Exhibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. (EDWARD) A. MITCHELL
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which was published in the Chicago Daily Tribune on June 4, 1947:

TRUMAN GIBES BENTON FOR HIS "ART" EXHIBITION—RIDICULES "MODERNISM" AS DEPICTED BY REDS

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

WASHINGTON, June 3.—Disclosure that President Truman rebuked, albeit gently, Assistant State Secretary Benton for his peripatetic exhibition of so-called modern American art gave a new turn to the scandal of Communist influenced State Department propaganda.

Presidential disapproval was evoked by the examples of "modern art" which Benton purchased with $50,000 of Department funds and sent on a tour to acquaint other countries with the state of culture in the United States. Representative BUSBEY, Republican, of Illinois, charged that the exhibition was Communist-inspired propaganda and identified 24 of the 45 artists as persons with Communist-front affiliations. Mr. Truman, in a letter to Benton, called the so-called modern art "the vaporings of half-baked, lazy people."

On the eve of House action this week on the Mundt bill to continue the State Department's propaganda broadcasting and other cultural activities the White House repudiation stirred speculation that Benton may not be in charge of the reorganized set-up.

BENTON WON'T TALK

Benton declined today, to discuss the President's letter. An assistant felt sure Benton will not resign as a result of the Presidential rebuke.

Center of the furor over the Benton art exhibit was a painting called "Circus Girl Resting," by Yasuo Kuniyoshi, a native of Japan, who came to this country in 1906 and became connected with Communist-front organizations. Representative BUSBEY told the House this picture had "shocked the American people" and with the other paintings had "done our country harm abroad."

President Truman agreed with BUSBEY. When Benton, on March 28, wrote the President defending the art exhibit and other features of his cultural program, Mr. Truman replied under date of April 2:

"I appreciated very much your letter of the 28th in regard to the American art exhibit, which is going the rounds of various countries.

"I don't pretend to be an artist or a judge of art, but I am of the opinion that so-called modern art is merely the vaporings of half-baked lazy people. An artistic production is one which shows infinite ability for taking pains and if any of these so-called modern paintings show any such infinite ability, I am very much mistaken.

MODERN "NO ART AT ALL"

"There are a great many American artists who still believe that the ability to make things look as they are is the first requisite of a great artist—they do not belong to the so-called modern school. There is no art at all in connection with the modernists, in my opinion."

"Without exception," said BUSBEY in his House speech, "the paintings in the State Department group that portray a person make him or her unnatural. The skin is not reproduced as it would be naturally, but as a sullen ashen gray. Features of the face are always depressed and melancholy.

"That is what the Communists and other extremists want to portray. They want to tell the foreigners that the American people are despondent, broken down, or of hideous shape—thoroughly dissatisfied with their lot and eager for a change of government.

"When the taxpayers' money is used to buy pictures painted by Communist artists we not only distribute their propaganda, we also put money in their pockets and thereby enable them to influence efforts to make America Red Communists."

SOUGHT TO PROVE "CULTURE"

Testifying before the House appropriations committee, Benton said the art collection had not been properly handled but the theory of it was to counteract impressions abroad that Americans are a "materialistic, money mad race, without interest in art and without appreciation of artists or music." Many think, he added, that "modern art, so-called, is a better illustration of our current artistic interests than the more orthodox or traditional forms of art."

BUSBEY said he favors an office of information and cultural affairs "but it should be free of communistic, fascistic and other alien influences." Representative TABER (Republican of New York), chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, which cut off the propaganda funds, and other Republican leaders picture Benton as a gullible, big advertising executive who was played for a sucker by the Communists and other left wingers who have dominated the Department broadcasts to Russia and other activities.

Mixed with the news beamed to Russia by Benton's broadcasters, it is asserted, is a vast amount of New Deal and left-wing propaganda disparaging the capitalist system, American business enterprise, conservative viewpoints and Republican leaders, and supporting Russian views of the American press and other institutions. All this is interlarded with silly, childish, so-called news features and other piffle calculated to bring the United States into contempt abroad.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks on House bill No. 2953, by Mr. MCCOWEN, and on all the other bills which provide Federal aid to education and which are before the House Committee on Education and Labor, May 14, 1947, by Merwin K. Hart, president of the National Economic Council, Inc., New York, N. Y.:

I oppose all these bills calling for Federal aid to education because:

(1) They would, I believe, result in Federal control over education;

(2) They would add just so much to bureaucratic burdens already borne by the people;

(3) Their cost would be high at the beginning and would tend to increase almost indefinitely; and, lastly, because

(4) American education is not nearly so good as it ought to be, considering the amount of money we spend on it. Hence the Congress, rather than subsidize education, should thoroughly investigate the kind of education now being given our youth throughout the land.

The passage of any of these bills would weaken the cause of individual enterprise and of the capitalist system which are known quantities on which our whole economy is based, and would tend by just so much to involve us in the morass of collectivism which is the world's greatest threat today.

I shall take up these points seriatim.

I. These bills would result in Federal control over education.

Even though all of them have provisions which assert that the passage of the act shall not result in Federal control of education, yet nevertheless Federal control would result. Federal control is, indeed, an inescapable part of any Federal aid bill this Congress would seriously consider.

Thus in the McCowen bill, section 7 lists certain provisions a State must fulfill "in order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this act." This is control.

Every State is required to report to Congress before November 1 each year a detailed statement of the amount received from the Federal Government, and of its disbursements. This is control.

An audit is required from the State covering expenditure of funds received and apportioned to local school jurisdictions; and there must be a system of reports from local school jurisdictions. This is control.

Every State must "make reports to the Commissioner with respect to the progress of education, on forms to be provided by the Commissioner." This, of course, is control.

Every State must send to the United States Commissioner of Education "certified copies of legislative enactments and the official regulations that may be issued by the State authority in connection with such funds." This is control.

Furthermore, it is provided, in substance, that Federal funds shall be allotted only to those States that in any given year spend at least as much, both in total amount and per pupil in average daily attendance, as they have spent in the fiscal year 1947. This is certainly control. And how unwise, because today's school costs may, if the depression so many people are warning us about materializes, be far higher than it will be possible for the country to meet when and if the depression comes.

Of course, the McCowen bill provides that the Commissioner may recommend to Congress revisions of this act "with particular reference to recommendations arising from changing conditions in our national economy." But that means the States have got to keep running down here to Congress for permission to change the method of spending their own money. For, after all, this money comes from the taxpayers back home.

All these provisions spell control. For it is true in politics as in all else in life that "Whose bread I eat, his song I sing." And the Federal bureau in control of education would think of Federal aid as Federal bread.

There is excellent reason to believe that Federal control is the very purpose of those at whose instance these bills have been introduced.

There is a history of at least 10 years of activity behind these bills. Different reasons have been brought forward in different years why the current bill should be passed. At first, the reason asserted was the alleged impoverished financial conditions prevailing among certain States and local governments. Then, during the war when the Federal Government was piling up its huge debt which now stands at $280,000,000,000, practically all of the States which, it had been claimed, were impoverished, were accumulating surpluses and were reducing or even paying off their debts.

Several Senators, in a statement of their minority views on October 14, 1943, said that as of June 1943, after making allowances for the annual surpluses and sinking funds of the States, the debts of all the States amounted to only a little over $1,000,000,000, as compared with the then national debt of $146,000,000,000.

Then the proponents of Federal aid switched to the defense argument; and later on to the plea of the war emergency.

None of the early bills contained provisions against Federal control. As time went on, these, however, were introduced. Yet practically no provision that could be inserted can prevent the exercise by the Commissioner of Education of discretion. And with discretion will come control.

Now of course the proponents of the bill support vehemently the provisions of section 2 and deny that there will be any Federal control. But if they were right, would it be a sound bill from the standpoint of the Congress? Does the Congress think it should approve a large appropriation over which it has no control? Would the Appropriations Committee of this House feel it was doing its duty to taxpayers if it approved expenditures over which Congress or the Administration had no control? Would the voters, who so emphatically last fall registered their objection to socialistic schemes, generally favor such a bill?

The passage of any of these bills would be a step toward national socialism. Under such a system we would "put the culture of a whole nation on an equal footing. This new culture is uniform, unified and welded into a coherent whole." This, Mr. Chairman, is a quotation from Hitler's Minister of Culture in his official Teachers' Manual for German Education. It happens also to be startlingly similar in essence to the expressed intention of this bill more nearly to equalize "school opportunities among and within the States."

Incidentally, this same Nazi manual says that no individual is to think of himself as having a more brilliant mind than his neighbor. Each mind is to be of equal importance; each mind is to be blended into the great state conscience As reported by Dr. Ziemer in his well-known book, Education for Death, the Nazis considered that "the chief purpose of the school is to train human beings to realize that the state is more important than the individual."

I feel certain that under any such law as this, that would come to be the purpose of American schools.

Something very like this happened under the third Republic of France. All powers were centralized in Paris, including the power over education. France was a true democracy in that there was absolutely no appeal to any court from the dictatorial decision of the central government. It was the boast of a French department of education in the 1870's or 1880's that at every hour, in every school in France, every child in a given grade was being taught identically the same lesson. And, under this free play of democracy that always results in totalitarianism, France, as we all know, went down in overwhelming defeat in 1940.

When Pastor Martin Niemöller, distinguished German Minister of the Gospel who defied Hitler and spent 8 years in a concentration camp, was in this country recently, I took pains to get from him first-hand information about the part that public education had played in Germany in recent years. He told me that throughout the history of both the German Empire and the Weimar Republic, that is down to 1933, education had remained solely under the control of the several German states and that the central government had nothing to do with it. But, he told me, when Hitler took over in 1933, he centralized the control of education in Berlin exactly as these bills would centralize the control of education right here in Washington. And thus education became one of Hitler's chief weapons in the regimentation and subjugation to himself of the German people.

I am utterly opposed to Federal aid to education because it would mean Federal control of education. And Federal control of education would be the greatest single gain that the collectivists could possibly make in the United States. From then on Washington bureaucracy would dictate to American education.

II. The passage of any of these bills would add by just so much to the bureaucratic burdens already borne by the people.

You are all doubtless familiar with a resolution that has been passed by the Legislature of the State of Indiana and, I am told, by certain other States, the purport of which is that the people of Indiana have been "fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taken out of our pockets and sent to Washington will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight on its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted."

Unlike the French people, the American people do not like bureaucratic government. They want just as little as possible. Before we got into World War II there were about 1,000,000 Federal employees. Now, almost exactly 2 years after the defeat of Hitler, there are still 2,300,000.

I am convinced that the majority of the Members of this Congress do not like bureaucrats much better than the people back home, and I know that many of you are trying to devise ways and means of getting rid of many of the bureaucrats we have.

Why, then, lay the foundation for a great new lot of bureaucracy by passing any of these bills?

You will collect the money by taxes out of incomes and savings of the people in 48 States and you will bring it to Washington. Then these bureaucrats will solemnly proceed to split this money up and send it back to the very States from which it came. Naturally, this will cost money. They will take their toll. And it will be an added burden on the people. There will be more rules and regulations, more forms to be filled out. Life will be just so much more complicated for the States and the Federal Government, as well as for the people.

In the very nature of things, most bureaucrats are quite securely fixed in their positions—and they know it. They are under none of the pressures and they have few of the worries that the men and women of the country in various private occupations have to meet every day in their task of making a living. They can, and often do, keep private citizens waiting endlessly for results that any private individual or corporation would attend to in a fraction of the time .They are a drag on the average citizen.

In a certain sense, they are barnacles attached to the hull of progress. They cannot be hurried, and they exercise a tremendous control over those working people who have to earn the money necessary to support not only themselves but the bureaucrats.

Daniel Webster once said:

"There are men in all ages who mean to exercise power usefully, but who mean to exercise it. They mean to govern well, but they mean to govern. They promise to be kind masters, but they mean to be masters."

III. I oppose all of these bills because, whether their annual costs start at one hundred million, or two hundred million, or three hundred million a year, they will be bound to soar.

You gentlemen know that one of the hardest things in the world is to get appropriations down once they are up, and it is characteristic of bureau appropriations that they seem constantly to grow.

Anything urged in the name of education has always appealed strongly to the American people. They want their children to have education, and oftentimes they mistake for education what is merely schooling—the mere going through certain forms and rituals.

Way back in 1932 Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, in his budget message of that year said that the fact that per-pupil cost of education had more than doubled in 10 years was startling. Equally startling is the growing amount of educational machinery. So complicated is the State educational law of New York, for instance, that few people understand it. Few are able to understand the intricate relationship between State and local educational authorities. This is bad enough as it is.

It is responsible in part for the fact that so large a proportion of all the money spent by all the cities and all the States of the United States is spent on education.

But these bills would create additional machinery. If possible, the educational machinery of the country is to be gummed up still further. The increase would not be arithmetical but geometrical. You would have three different sets of educational authorities. The State would continue to dictate to the locality (largely through State aid). And then, through Federal aid, the national educational authority would dictate to both the State and locality.

On May 3 the New York Times quoted Dr. George F. Zook, president of the American Council on Education, as saying here in Washington that the Federal Government should provide a minimum of $1,000,000,000 to the schools.

The States and localities are now spending about $3,000,000,000 a year on education. On March 2 of this year a planning committee of 10 school superintendents, headed by Willard E. Goslyn, of Minnesota, submitted to the Nation-wide Association of School Administrators a plan for a Federal school subsidy of $4,250,000,000 a year. Comparable demands have been made by other educators.

One educator said not long ago that we should not hesitate to spend from four to six billions.

I will leave this phase of the matter by merely observing, in the first place, that any of these bills will be merely the entering wedge for the yearly spending of far greater amounts and, secondly, that the more money that is spent the more the control of education will have passed out of the hands of the locality, out, indeed, of the hands of the several States, and will be centered in a bureau in Washington—a bureau that, by reason of its power of propaganda, will probably be the most important bureau in Washington. And I think it extremely likely that this bureau will be in the hands of radicals committed to the elimination of all vestiges of the Republic of the United States and to the spreading of that "democracy" which was so roundly condemned in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and was discarded by them when they set up the Republic.

IV. Lastly, I am opposed to all of these bills because, due in part to excessive bureaucracy in the States, American education is not what it ought to be. In many respects it has been deteriorating steadily for years. It has already become, under many of the States, a propaganda machine under the influence of which the real education of the youth has largely been overlooked.

There is one very useful service that Congress could perform—namely, to investigate for itself the quality of education now being administered in the States. It should investigate the philosophy that is being taught and it will find that the general trend is critical of all heretofore accepted American institutions. It will find it is a godless education; that it teaches that the pupil should be prepared, first of all, for change—that John Dewey doctrine which is admirably suited to prepare the way for totalitarianism.

It will find that in many, many cases American schools are falling down in teaching the very elementals of education.

I think this Congress ought, in the interest of the Republic, to find out what philosophy, what ideas, what tenets, are being instilled in our youth.

There is a wealth of evidence in support of these contentions.

My own organization, the economic council, back in 1935, had an educational advisory committee consisting of five outstanding educators. These were: Dean H. W. Holmes, of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard; Dr. William S. Lerner, of the Carnegie Foundation; Mr. Charles R. Mann, of the American Council on Education; Dr. Albert P. Meredith, of New York University, and Dr. Frank E. Spalding, of Yale University. This committee investigated the schools of what they took to be a typical American city, namely, Niagara Falls, N. Y. They published their results in a 52-page pamphlet. In this pamphlet they set up what they called "an operating balance sheet of a typically modern school system." They listed the following among other "items of weakness:"

"1. Too much 'teaching'; too little learning!

"2. Too much class attendance; too little studying!

"3. Too many things attempted; too few things perfected!

"4. Too much value attached to trivialities of immediate interest; too little to knowledge and habits of permanent worth!

"5. Schooling undervalues and frequently retards the development of reading ability.

"6. Instead of promoting, schooling tends to stifle the growth of independence in learning and thinking.

"7. Too much effort to teach many pupils things beyond their understanding; too little insistence that all pupils master as many permanently valuable things as are within their capacity.

"8. Too much emphasis on 'time spent' and ground 'covered'—on the mechanics and the certificates of schooling; too little concern for the essential processes and results of genuine education."

It has been known for some time that even in many of our largest cities the schools have not been adequately teaching the pupils to read. At a conference on education held by the National Economic Council in February 1940 in Albany, N. Y., Dr. John Tildsley, former associate superintendent of schools of New York City, pointed out that about 20 percent of all pupils admitted to one high school in that city a few weeks before were found unable to read well enough to use the textbooks in high school courses and he believed that proportion would hold throughout the city. This, if you please, in a city with probably the highest per-pupil cost of education of any city in the world. He said that to meet the situation WPA workers were brought in and trained to teach these pupils to read.

In fact, at the present time two reading clinics have been set up by New York University in New York City, for both youth and adults, because the schools have done such a wretched job in the teaching of reading. One of these clinics is located on the ground floor at 31 West Twelfth Street, Manhattan.

Not many years ago the parents of a majority of the pupils in the three schools of a large village on Long Island petitioned the school board, asking if they would kindly teach their children to read.

About 2 years ago a survey conducted by the New York Times found that in many schools throughout the country the teaching of American history was being largely neglected.

In the New York Times of April 16, 1947, reference was made to criticisms recently made by the Transcription Supervisory Associates that the city schools were failing to give pupils sufficient knowledge of simple English grammar.

Some years ago a committee of citizens at Binghamton, N. Y., sent out a questionnaire to some 10,000 employers in New York and Pennsylvania asking several questions, the purport of which was whether the product of the schools, as this product came to work for the employers, seemed to them to justify the cost. About 5,000 answers were received, and the overwhelming burden of their reply was that the cost was not justified. Those employers said that they had found that hardly any of the pupils had learned to do anything well.

Nor is this superficiality of education anything very new. In the New York Sun of March 13, 1934, Principal Raynor, of the Alexander Hamilton High School of Brooklyn, is quoted as saying publicly that high schools are "producing criminals, loafers, and social discontents." He said all children are not competent to receive high-school education, and that many of those not competent rebel, become truants, and "eventually drop into the rapidly swelling ranks of crime."

He said that of 413 pupils admitted to his high school last February, only 169 passed the regents' test in elementary arithmetic and only 48 the elementary English test. He said that if this ratio held throughout the city, then 60 percent of the 61,000 entering New York City high schools the previous winter were unfit for high school.

He said further: "Promotion is by the calendar rather than by honest examination" and results in "lumping into the high schools tens of thousands destined to dismal failure and to add to the tax burden."

And John B. Opdycke, then principal of Haaren High School, New York City, was quoted in the New York Herald Tribune of September 24, 1933, as saying:

"Today the average cosmopolitan high school offers from 75 to 100 subjects or R's, and offers them under the highly complex and elaborate elective system. As a result what have we? Well, we have a bewildered student body and a confused and harassed teaching force. We have graduating groups, as the terms go by, who are masters of nothing and not even Jacks of all they have attempted to study. We have let down in student morale and stamina and in teacher health that has meant something very closely approaching an educational crisis throughout the country. And we have wordy warfare among educators themselves about 'what must be done,' and between educators and lay taxpayers about waste and extravagance in educational administration."

Dr. Frank Spalding, the chairman in 1934–35 of the Educational Advisory Committee of the Economic Council, used to say, after a lifetime of experience as a teacher, that for many youth a good job was the best possible education. Yet according to many educators today and for some time past, all youth should be obliged to go through high school—they should be obliged to go through the motions, even if they learn very little.

The four Senators who made a minority report back in 1943 (Messrs. TAFT, WALSH, BALL, and WHERRY, with Messrs. HAWKES and BRIDGES concurring) said, in part:

"It hardly seems that the States are in position to demand relief from the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, they are not demanding relief. No State has come before us confirming its inability to deal with the educational problem. No legislature has passed any resolution requesting assistance. The entire proposal is placed before us by representatives of the teachers and other educational interests who may or may not have exhausted their remedies within the States."

From a fairly considerable reading and a fairly wide observation, I agree completely with the statement that the proposals for Federal aid come largely, if not entirely, from representatives of the teachers and other educational interests. Except I would add to this that the various left-wing organizations are also in the forefront in making the demand.

Much is made by the proponents of these measures of the alleged 7 percent of the Russian national income used for education. But assuming the Russian 7 percent to be accurate (and there is at least some doubt as to its accuracy and reliability) this figure merely represents the high cost of propagandizing an enormous population under a ruthless dictatorship. It is easily possible the Russians are being taught to read, write, and cipher better than the American youth of recent years; but they are certainly being kept in abysmal ignorance of anything happening on this side of the Russian iron curtain.

Though I am opposed to Federal aid for education, yet, of course, I strongly sympathize with those teachers who are underpaid. But they and their friends should address themselves to the States and municipalities—not to the Federal Government. This running down to Washington as a short cut to put something over which would be more difficult to put over through the States and cities should stop. The Federal Government ought to stop trying to play nursemaid to 48 sovereign States and to the thousands of municipalities involved. Otherwise, we'll reach the point France reached, and perhaps go down as she did.

I realize that it will be a more laborious proceeding to sell the idea of more education and even higher salaries for teachers in a number of different States than to sell it at one fell swoop here in Washington. It is relatively easy for the National Education Association and other educational organizations, not to speak of the various other groups—many of them left-wing, all of them more or less collectivistic, to maintain a tremendous lobby here in Washington. There is no great lobby in Washington against these measures. But the proposal is so unwise that the Congress itself, receiving some aid perhaps from a handful of individuals who have opposed the proposals these last 10 years, has thus far been able to stop it.

This year the propaganda for the proposal has been stepped up enormously. A very great and coordinated effort is being made to put it across.

The citizens of all the States having low-cost education are free to do what they think should be done. There, as in the older, supposedly richer States, sound arguments in favor of better education should bring results—even though slowly. If the poorer States are unwilling to go as fast and as far as the proponents of these bills would have them go, nevertheless I am unalterably opposed to the Federal Government forcing them. Perhaps the people of those poorer States do not think the education Washington would jam down their throats is so good after all.

Doubtless many of this committee have read Human Destiny by a great scientist now living in California, Lecompt du Noüy. He draws a contrast between education and instruction, or what might be called schooling. He says:

"It is possible that in certain periods of the past, education was superior to what it is today. It was evidently less general, but the problem is not so much of quantity as of quality. A bad education, or an education based on false principles and widely extended leads to disastrous results. * * * To give children an intellectual tincture, a smattering of 'instruction' without previously constructing on firm, moral foundation the base which must support it is to build on sand; and the higher the monument the more complete will be its collapse."

The illustrations of poor education, which I have quoted above, suggest that something

is wrong with the moral foundation of our education. I repeat the request that the Congress make an investigation of the quality of education in the country today. A great service could be rendered the country and its children by an investigation of this nature, provided it were conducted by people who without bias could test the value of the education our children have been getting.

Such an investigation would find, fortunately, that we still have a great aggregate amount of good sound education at the hands of those teachers imbued with the value of the old American educational traditions and ideals. But it would also disclose a substantial and growing amount of superficial education of the kind I have described above.

Having made this investigation the results could be referred back to the States for their consideration.

I hope this committee will refrain from approving any Federal-aid bill of any nature.

Statement by Hon. Lister Hill, of Alabama, on the National Soil Fertility Policy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on the national soil fertility policy bill, Monday, May 26, 1947.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The soil of a nation is its most precious material resource, for the fundamental strength of any civilization is the fertility of the soil that supports it.

Here in America the abundance of fertile soil—the rich bottomlands of the South, the vast fertile prairies of the Midwest, and the fruitful soil of the Pacific coast—has led our people for generations into extravagance with their land. We looked upon it as a never-ending resource. As the land became worn out, we moved on to new acres.

In recent years we have come up against the stark fact that we cannot go on endlessly exploiting the land, draining its fertility without ever replacing it. We finally turned to conservation practices and research into soil nutrients. But war and world reconstruction have interrupted these programs and hastened the depletion of the soil.

To supply the tremendous demands for food and agricultural products, during the war and the reconversion, the Nation's farmers postponed soil-conservation practices. They put off rotating their crops. They placed emphasis on the use of fertilizers that stimulate crop growth rather than rebuild the soil. They mined their soil.

Today we are removing about twice as much plant food from our soil through cropping, erosion, and leaching as we are returning through fertilizers and soil-building crops. Even the richest man will soon face bankruptcy if he draws out of the bank twice as much each year as he puts in. That is what is happening to our basic natural resource—the soil. We are facing soil bankruptcy.

The purpose of the bill before us today is to halt this trend, this soil bankruptcy.

Present fertilizer production and present fertilizer practices are about as out of date as a 1925 automobile. As we know, much of the fertilizer purchased today is filled with sand, sulphates, chlorides, fillers, and other elements which the farmer does not need and which is of no value to the farmer or to his soil. In short, if the farmer bought his groceries in the same way that he is forced to buy much of his fertilizer, a loaf of bread would be mostly sawdust, such as Mussolini used to provide for the people of Italy.

There is not enough fertilizer of any kind—nitrates, phosphates or potash—to meet present demands and there will not be in the years ahead, unless action is taken at once to enlarge production facilities, modernize fertilizer formulas, reduce fertilizer costs and make use of improved farming methods.

The bill before this committee lays out such a course of action. The bill would establish a national policy with the goal of restoring and maintaining the Nation's depleted soil resources. To make this policy become a reality, the bill provides for encouraging and stimulating production of plentiful high-grade fertilizers at prices the farmer can afford to pay. It provides for Nation-wide demonstration of the value and practicability of using these concentrated fertilizers in conjunction with improved soil-building practices.

The bill provides, and I deem this most important, that this program shall be carried out to the greatest possible extent by the farm people themselves, working with their State and local farm agencies, their land-grant colleges, the extension service, the experiment stations, and through their own farm associations. The role of the Federal Government in the program would be confined to broad national planning, financial aid where necessary, and technical aid and advice.

I shall not go into a detailed explanation of the measure here, except to point out its other main provisions:

1. It provides for setting up a National Soil Fertility Policy Committee, made up of 12 representative farmers, an executive secretary, and the chairmen of the Extension Service and experiment station committees of the National Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, who would be ex officio members. State and county advisory committees to carry the program right to the grass roots are also provided for.

2. Provision is made for expanding research and experiment station work, so that every farmer may have the soundest technical advice on fertilizing.

3. With this provision is coupled an expanded demonstration program along the lines of the present TVA test demonstration operations. Not to exceed 2 percent of the total farms in a State would be selected as test-demonstration farms to give a practical showing of the best fertilizing practices as a means of educating all farmers. The program would be carried out under the direction of the land-grant colleges through the Extension Service and experiment stations.

4. The program would encourage the production and distribution of nitrates and nitrogenous fertilizers.

5. The program would encourage the development of phosphate and potash deposits in the South and West through both private and public agencies.

6. To develop modern methods of production of concentrated phosphates an experimental plant would be built by the Government at Mobile, Ala. The plant would be operated as an experimental plant for 5 years, then sold for private operation.

7. Financial aid would be made available to private industry and to farmer cooperatives for construction or expanding production facilities.

The provisions of the bill are clear and reasonable.

Its goal is to enable the farmer to get plentiful fertilizers of the kind his soil needs. The bill would modernize the formulas for farm fertilizers. It would eliminate the wasteful processing of inert matter and the costly transportation charges the farmer must pay on this useless material. The farmer would be saved the fruitless labor involved in spreading fertilizers of low plant-food content. And by getting more plant food in each sack of fertilizer his costs would be materially reduced.

The program should double the use of fertilizers within 5 years. Farmers who saw the benefits of concentrated fertilizers in the demonstration program would buy more fertilizers for use on their own farms. The increased production would mean more business and bigger profits for the fertilizer industry. The bill would definitely benefit the fertilizer industry.

We know that the industry already has benefited from the TVA demonstration program. In the Tennessee Valley the demand for phosphatic fertilizers from commercial sources—from the fertilizer industry—has increased about 5 times as much as the increase for the country as a whole, as a result of the demonstration work done by TVA.

We know that the test-demonstration farm program is sound. I have seen it at first hand in my own State of Alabama. In 13 north Alabama counties in the Tennessee River watershed, there are 5,502 test demonstration farms. Other farmers in the valley have watched the improved-farming practices demonstrated on these farms. Largely as a result of these demonstrations, farmers in the 13 counties between 1936 and 1946 increased their improved pasture land from 10,000 to 100,000 acres; their planting of perennial legumes from 2,000 to 60,000 acres; their winter-legume acreage from 76,000 to 300,000 acres; their small grains from 20,000 to 170,000 acres, and their harvested legume seed planting from 500,000 to 1,500,000 pounds.

The bill would make available to the whole Nation the knowledge and experience gained through such programs—programs which have been wisely authorized by Congress and have been carried on by experiment stations, the Extension Service, and the TVA.

The bill means that Congress is willing to give all the farmers of the country the benefit of programs that up to now have been limited.

The bill has bi-partisan support in Congress from Republicans and Democrats. Both major political parties recognize that protection of the soil is a national responsibility—a national necessity.

The bill is sponsored by the American Farm Bureau Federation and is the key to a soil program based on scientific facts and proven experience.

A special committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities reported in October 1943, after an extensive survey, that "an adequate supply of phosphatic fertilizer is fundamental to the national welfare." The committee added: "A very great expansion of phosphatic fertilizer production is needed if soil fertility is to be maintained in this country."

The inadequacy of fertilizer productive facilities was emphasized again in 1944 when the War Production Board reported that the fertilizer industry would not be able to meet the minimum production requirements for phosphatic fertilizers and the War Food Administration declared that the industry's output would not even replenish plant foods removed from the soil each crop year, much less

provide the vast additional amount required for soil building.

And a spokesman for the fertilizer industry has said: "The need for more phosphorus on our croplands and grazing lands has been convincingly demonstrated by experience and research."

We all know the compelling need for increased production of nitrates and nitrogenous fertilizers.

The program provided in the bill is vital to the American farmer who must preserve the productivity of his soil even while he uses it. The program is vital to the American people and their standard of living. Food from soil rich in minerals would benefit every man, woman, and child by giving them increased nutrition in the bread they eat or the milk they drink.

The bill constitutes a broad move by the people, acting through their Government, to protect the Nation's security and health by protecting the basis of its strength—the soil.

We must not forget the part that food will play in building world peace. The importance of food to the peace was graphically described by Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson when he said a few days ago:

"The devastation of war has brought us back to elementals—to the point where we see clearly how short is the distance from food and fuel either to peace or to anarchy."

Through lack of food production, America cannot afford to let other nations take the short step to anarchy rather than to peace.

The Congress can no longer delay action to conserve and rebuild the Nation's soil. Today we are all talking about the atomic bomb and we are frightened by its existence. We know that our Nation could be destroyed by it. I tell you that our Nation will just as surely perish, albeit a bit more slowly, if we do not replenish and rebuild our soil.

The investment called for by the bill is small compared to the stake: Conservation of a fertile soil upon which the very life and strength of our Nation depends; the health of a people nourished by a fruitful land; good income and decent living for the farmer and his family; and, finally, the opportunity for lasting peace by helping to relieve the hunger and suffering of the war-stricken peoples of the world.

A Program That Counts Everybody In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is my duty to call attention of the Members of Congress to an editorial in the Country Gentleman for the month of June, this year. The editorial is entitled "A Program That Counts Everybody In." My good friend, Don Berry, editor, of Indianola, Iowa, has done much to straighten out our thinking on economic problems.

Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst for the Raw Materials National Council, of Sioux City, Iowa, who has for some time pointed out that each $1 of gross farm income would generate $7 of national income. I know of the skepticism that he has had to meet from economists and the general public, which includes some of the Members of Congress. I am frank to admit that when he first called the relationship to my attention, I didn't know whether to believe it or not.

I know, however, that the Country Gentleman in 1944 checked his research material very carefully and then pointed out his results in an article entitled "Key to Prosperity." At that time they sent a copy to all Members of Congress. I will quote from the editorial which proves to me that they have completely accepted the accuracy of the relationship which Mr. Wilken has pointed out.

The editorial states as follows:

Protection against ruinously low prices for farm products is, of course, a "must" in any farm program. The wage- and salary-earning public ought to be better informed of its own vital interest in this necessity. Every depression this country has suffered has been preceded by a collapse in farm prices. For a quarter of a century the national income has averaged just about seven times the total farm income. Plainly there is a public interest involved in sustaining farm buying power.

To me this seven times turn of the total farm income is the key to prosperity. If we need $180,000,000,000 of national income for full employment and a balanced national budget then our total farm income must first create one-seventh of that amount. This relationship to me is the answer that we have been looking for, the something that would lead the way to a new era of prosperity and peace.

As I have stated, Mr. Wilken has had to face skepticism on every hand but he has not let that deter him from plugging away at the rather thankless job of educating a reluctant public. A few weeks ago Mr. Wilken delivered a prepared statement before the House Committee on Agriculture. It was printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2244, in the extension of remarks by my colleague from Iowa, CHARLES B. HOEVEN, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

I have read and studied this statement and to me it is the simplest, the most concrete, and the most complete analysis of our national economy that has ever been presented before that committee.

In my opinion every committee of Congress, both in the House and the Senate, could benefit from such an analysis. A few days ago Mr. Wilken informed me that in a few weeks he will bring out in book form, entitled "Prosperity Unlimited—The American Way," a complete analysis of the relationship of all the major segments of our economy. He will point out the ratio of retail sales, employment, mineral production, construction, transportation, and so forth, in the same positive manner that he sets out the ratio of $1 of gross farm income and $7 of national income.

For example, in January 1946, in an address before the National Livestock Convention in Denver, Colo., Mr. Wilken pointed out that retail sales would approximate 60 percent of the national income regardless of the national income in the postwar period. We had just finished the year 1945 with approximately $60,000,000,000 of retail sales, the highest in the history of the Nation at that time.

Mr. Wilken at the meeting told his audience that we would have over $90,000,000,000 of retail sales in 1946. This seemed fantastic in light of the past record. But after 1946 had passed away, the Nation according to his prediction enjoyed more than that amount in retail sales.

Last January Mr. Wilken, accompanied by his associate, Mr. Charles B. Ray, of Chicago, met with the Iowa delegation in Congress. At that time the newspapers were full of dire predictions of a depression. In spite of this Mr. Wilken and Mr. Ray projected a minimum of $180,000,000,000 of national income for 1947. A few days ago the United States Department of Commerce released a statement showing that our national income was running at the rate of $180,000,000,000.

At that meeting Mr. Wilken told us that retail sales would maintain their ratio of approximately 60 percent. Therefore I wasn't greatly surprised when I picked up the United States News of May 16 and found that retail sales the first quarter of 1947 had been on a level of $107.4, or roughly 60 percent of the national income of $180,000,000,000.

Knowing these facts and realizing the confusion that exists in an economic way, I would like to express the hope that this Congress in some way or other, through an existing committee, or a committee set up especially for that purpose, make a study of the various factors revealed by the research work of the Raw Materials National Council. I feel that they have done a job of research work that this Nation needs to lead us out of the confusion in which we find ourselves.

I will file the complete editorial from the Country Gentleman as part of my remarks. I hope that you can all take the time to read it along with Mr. Wilken's statement in regard to permanent farm legislation.

To me his analysis means that supporting the price of farm products at proper levels is not special legislation for agriculture. A floor under the price of farm products means a floor under the national income of the United States. It means a floor under our American industry, our factory pay rolls, the value of manufactures, the volume of retail sales, and so forth. It means that we can have a sound economic foundation for our American system and economy supported by agricultural resources which surpass that of any nation.

[From the Country Gentleman]

A PROGRAM THAT COUNTS EVERYBODY IN

Any successful farm program must be one that can be sold to the public as fair and in the interest of all. This is the counsel of a wise country editor, Don L. Berry, of Indianola, Iowa, who has been in the forefront of many of the struggles for farm betterment. He adds: "With the farm population now down to 20 percent of the American people, no farm program can succeed permanently that will not stand up to the test of being in the general interest."

This is advice worth noting by the House Committee on Agriculture, now holding hearings preparatory to drawing up a new farm program. It applies equally to those who appear before the committee with ideas they want included.

Fortunately, the hearings are bringing out proposals that can be welded into a program that would serve both the farm and the public interests. Such a program would

have these three main aims: Protecting farmers from disastrously low prices for their products; providing the American people with a steadily better diet; and insuring the Nation's future food supply.

These aims are not inconsistent. In fact, they can be teamed together.

Protection against ruinously low prices for farm products is, of course, a "must" in any farm program. The wage- and salary-earning public ought to be better informed of its own vital interest in this necessity. Every depression this country has suffered has been preceded by a collapse in farm prices. For a quarter of a century the national income has averaged just about seven times the total farm income. Plainly, there is a public interest involved in sustaining farm buying power.

If this fact is properly made known, the public could hardly object to price floors under farm products that will prevent disastrous slumps. These should not be rigid price supports that would perpetuate surpluses and cost large sums of Treasury money. Instead they should be flexible floors that will cushion price declines and enable farmers to make their own adjustments in production. Such a system should be accompanied by the best possible forward estimates of needs for various farm products. It would also require the continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make purchases or loans when necessary to meet temporary surplus conditions.

If the American people consumed the foods that make the most healthful diet there would be no danger of farm surpluses. Also, if we used all of our farm land in a way to maintain its productivity, no surplus production would be possible. Here are two important facts that involve the public interest to a high degree, both now and for the future. They should certainly represent two major aims of a long-range farm program.

To quote one of the best-known leaders of farm thought, H. E. Babcock: "Our farming must be aimed at producing the most palatable and nutritious food supply possible, and the American people must be sold on the public and personal advantages of the best possible diet for all. That way both will benefit." Such a diet would mean more meat and dairy and poultry products and fruit and vegetables. By increasing the demand for meat and dairy and poultry products, more grain would be marketed through them and more land would be needed in pasture, both lessening the danger of surpluses. The trend in food consumption is already running in that direction. People are eating around 25 pounds more meat a year per person than before the war, using nearly 100 more eggs and drinking 40 quarts more milk. Both public and farm policy should be aimed at encouraging this trend.

One way it can be done in the farm program is by revising the present parity formula to give livestock, dairy and poultry products a fairer price ratio in comparison with grain and other feeds. The changes in food habits and costs of production since 1914 should be recognized.

A good food policy would be furthered by a good land policy. This latter is becoming a national necessity, as clearly demonstrated by a recent Nation-wide survey of land conditions by the Soil Conservation Service. It showed that, out of the 425,000,000 acres now in use as cropland, around 107,000,000 acres are deteriorating rapidly. Unless something is done to protect this land, within a few years the damage will be beyond repair. Another 113,000,000 acres of cropland were found to be in a serious, if less advanced, stage of loss. Included in these millions of acres affected by erosion and other soil damage is some of our best producing farm land.

The public interest is very definitely at stake here, for land is a basic and irreplaceable source of national security. Its productivity must be maintained to insure the Nation's future food supply. A national land policy, with this long-range aim, should be a keystone of the farm program. Other parts of the farm program could very well be made dependent upon it.

Such a land policy would inevitably shift more land into grass and other crops that hold the soil and restore its organic materials. This would reduce the danger of surpluses and encourage the production of the very kinds of food that are most needed for a high level diet.

A program based on these principles would have a threefold public interest. And it would do about as much as can be done to develop a stable and permanent agriculture in this country.

Jim Dan Hill Warns of the Importance of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Nation today is facing the most troublous times in its history. In these troublous times the security and the defense of our Nation should be of paramount interest to every loyal American. To me, there is no problem before the Congress more important than that of security and defense of our Nation. In my judgment, every other problem is of secondary importance to the problem of defense and security.

The Wisconsin National Guard Review for the month of June has in it an article written by Jim Dan Hill, major general, Thirty-second Division, Wisconsin National Guard. I am proud of this distinguished constituent. He is also president of the Superior State Teachers College at Superior, Wis.

This article sets forth the need for some form of universal military training. This article, in my judgment, is one of the most splendid and effective presentations that I ever read in my career as a Congressman as to why universal military training is imperative. As this article concludes, "To refuse it is inviting disaster."

Mr. Speaker, so that every Member of Congress might get the benefit of this article, I include it in the RECORD at this point to permit every Member of Congress and the Senate to read it and study it:

Japanese aggression in five short months swept outward from North China to Alaska, to the doorstep of Hawaii, to the coasts of Australia. It engulfed the Philippines. It rolled over the East Indies and southeast Asia to the Indian Ocean.

A tiny American garrison joined native troops in a Thermopylaen stand at Bataan. All the while, that force received morale building broadcasts offering hope of aid that every schoolboy in the American homeland knew could never be sent. The War Department communiques inferred no aid was possible. Ten days after Pearl Harbor the press said as much in the headlines. MacArthur, with a heroic phrase, abandoned his men to their fate pursuant to a War Department order. The same order, in effect, was America's abandonment of those men.

America has never known such dismay. And in all the mass hue and cry of hurt surprise, bitterness, accusation, and denunciation, none was so loud, vociferous, and articulate as were the very groups whose example, precepts, teachings, and philosophies were most responsible for America's defenseless condition.

These groups were not the realistic students of foreign affairs who recognized Japan's aims and her capabilities. They were not the preparedness minded statesmen, citizens, reservists, National Guardsmen, and soldiers who knew the extent of our unpreparedness. Indeed, these groups said little. They were not so greatly astounded. Some of them had long warned of such a possibility.

Turn back to the newspaper files of early 1942, or just cudgel your own memory. You will find the loudly dismayed, how-can-these-things-happen, hue and cry crowds conspicuously included the unrealistic, pacifistic factions of befogged "idealists." There were also blindly "idealistic" educators who shared the views of the above mentioned pacifists, who joined in the bitter questions.

An idealistic college professor, a charming fellow and a friend of mine who, during the thirties, was much in demand as a speaker to pacifist groups, is illustrative. He used to pooh-pooh the need of an American army. He nearly always got a good hand on: "The combined police and fire departments between Washington, D. C., and Boston run into hundreds of thousands of men. They are more than adequate to defend the Atlantic seaboard against any invader." I once sought to refute his sour logic in one discussion from the floor. Reference was at once made to my National Guard commission, and I was all but booed as a vulgar, saber-clanking militarist. Our paths crossed during the dark days of Bataan. His emotions were as high as ever, but in the other direction. "Those heroes on Bataan must be rescued. Where are our forces?" he all but shrieked. Of course, the obvious answer was that the New York police force was busy directing traffic, and the San Francisco police had not been issued amphibious squad cars. The same professor now speaks against universal military training because the atomic bomb makes all armies obsolete. It is not a poor speech either. His ability at stretching his impressionistic ignorance of both armies and atomics through 45 minutes of forensic plausibility excites my envy. The art of substituting plausibility for facts is an enviable, if dangerous, skill.

Also crying to high heaven, along with the temporarily disillusioned campus idealists, were the erstwhile, rabid, impractical isolationists. Columnists and commentators of the weather-vane type, like Dorothy Thompson, who had always shifted with every popular breeze in the ever eager search for reader-listener popularity, were a small but shrilly articulate and critical group.

And last but not least, was the smug, doting parent, often an influential citizen, who had always thought military training and preparedness might be desirable, but not desirable enough to disrupt his summer plans for vacationing with his own, often spoiled and always precious, contribution to American masculinity. He invariably wanted to know what was wrong with our defenses in this hour of trial.

These are the people who yelled the loudest when America got kicked. These are the emotionalists who in 1942 shouted America had been betrayed. These are the pacifists who in 1936 had protested an afternoon flag lowering ceremony in CCC camps because it smacked of military training. These are the sentimentalists who under the impulse of national charity cried for more and more wastage in fruitless WPA boondoggling, but who protested every dime that created equivalent work in defense projects.

These are also the frightened people who in 1942 wrung their hands and proclaimed to the world it would never happen again. Henceforth they would espouse the most powerful peacetime forces in the world. If America would but pull together so that freedom might be preserved on this earth, they would even endorse adequate universal military training in peacetime.

But now that Japan is in ashes of defeat and nazi-fascism grovels under the heels of three conquerors, the old feeling of smug security has returned. Some of these same people are today the most articulate opponents of military training. They have forgotten their short-lived fears. They have forgotten the war lasted 2 years longer than it should have, granted there would have been a Pearl Harbor had we been prepared. The thousands who have died are dismissed with noble-sounding platitudes. The wounded and disabled are paid off with pensions and hospitals.

These forgetful, idealistic emotionalists of yesteryear, these tearful hand wringers of 1942, have today too often returned to their effervescent, sedative cups of blind idealism, and are openly fighting every form of adequate preparedness. They even oppose forces sufficient to sustain commitments for implementing the very idealistic type of peace which they say they hope to achieve.

Fortunately these false prophets are not so influential today as they were in 1938. Grim experience has greatly reduced their ranks and a not so forgetful public has been giving them less heed. But as time dims memories their numbers increase and the public becomes more receptive of their fallacious ideas.

But meanwhile the selfish, fond parent is again cloaking his true sentiments under the maunderings of the emotionalists described above. He is making common cause with them. All the while he is thanking his stars the war came and went while his son was under age. At the same time he is so unappreciative of what the sons of other parents have done for their country that he beguiles himself into seeing no need for his son to spend a mere summer or two in peacetime military training. He is often sure the Army and the war made a man of his neighbor's son, but making a man of his son is exclusively his job—and exclusively his doting, summer pleasure.

These doting, parental sentimentalists and their mouthpieces, the false prophets of emotional, international idealism, are not today strong enough to defeat universal military training by merely rechanting their old catch phrases of post World War I. But they are hurting America's future.

These groups of recrudescent evildoers, masquerading under mantles of impractical sentiment and idealism, would normally merit only the undisguised disdain of all right-minded Americans; but unfortunately they have been fortuitously reinforced by a postwar, third group. From this new group the old obstructionists are drawing new catch phrases with a scientific twang. Mixed with the choicer gems of their old prewar cants, these articulate neopacifists have been able to compose new lyrics for their old disarmament melody.

This third, or postwar, group of preparedness obstructionists deserve a more sympathetic analysis than do the pseudo idealists and the selfish parents. Their motives are unselfish and honestly challenging. This group is largely composed of real scientists, quasi scientists, pseudo scientists, and conversational scientists who have become so appalled by the devastating effects of the atomic bomb that it has completely vaporized and befogged their thinking on all matters other than actual, fixed mathematical and chemical formulas. And of these mentioned above only the real scientists ever knew any genuinely scientific formulas. And their formulas do not yield answers to diplomatic, social, and military problems. The pseudo scientists are 100-percent speculative. Moreover, the false-prophet pacifists and the pompous parent groups are using the newly found scientific jargon to cloak their motives and emotions.

The first contributions these speculative, pseudo-scientific gentry made to the military and social thought of mankind were: "Future wars are impossible." "With the A-bomb in existence, armies can no longer stay in the field." "All World War II weapons, except the A-bomb, are out." "The next war will be a push-button war." "Armies are obsolete." These are their pet catch phrases which have been eagerly seized by the neopacifists and the other discredited messiahs of yesteryear in their postwar campaign of preparedness obstructionism.

If Vegetius, the great expert on Roman arms, equipment, training, and techniques during the golden glow of Rome's afternoon, had been given a week for examining the arms and equipment that were stored in America's Harper's Ferry Arsenal in 1860, he would have thrown up his hands in horror as to the future of warfare.

He would have fled back to Rome in his time machine, and told the other experts that by 1860 warfare would be impossible. He would have told them that a future generation of mankind was about to blow up the world with a battle flash fire they would call gunpowder. He would have told them that a weapon was possible whereby a leaden pellet could be made to leap from a tube at an invisible speed to a distance of a thousand yards. It would do so with such force that it would penetrate any shield or buckler light enough for the noble Roman infantryman to carry on his left arm. He could have groaned and said, "Gentlemen, the wars of the future are going to be push-button wars." And Vegetius would have been right, for the rifle trigger is the original button for releasing concentrated power.

Vegetius would have further said there was no defense against this powerful weapon to be known as the muzzle-loading, percussion-cap rifle, and Vegetius would have been right. There is no defense against the rifle bullet—if your mental processes are so paralyzed by fear you let the hostile rifleman coolly and calmly fix you in his sights. Certainly there was no defense against a bullet within the concept of Vegetius, for in his day the techniques of concealment, camouflage, cover, and dispersion were unrecognized, if not unknown.

Vegetius would have been justified in saying all these things because gunpowder did destroy warfare as Vegetius knew it. Vegetius would have been wrong in saying warfare was impossible, and that mankind was about to destroy itself with the new flash fire of the battlefield. He would have been wrong in saying man as a soldier was obsolete.

On a battlefield at Waterloo, Napoleon and the Duke of Wellington maneuvered, charged, and countercharged armies the combined strength of which totaled 150,000 men. The battle front from flank to flank was about 5 miles. As quarterbacks of their respective teams, Wellington and Napoleon were often within modern machine-gun range of one another. Across the open, gently rolling plain their mounted command parties were often within view of each other.

Deployed as they were pursuant to the techniques of that era, a modern infantry regiment without bombs or air support, but reinforced by one company of tanks and normal artillery, would have cleared that battlefield of both armies, though they had fought in temporary coalition against the modern intruder.

This is how much warfare has changed since Napoleon's day.

If Napoleon on St. Helena had been given a glimpse of our modern machine guns, tanks, artillery, bombs, and airplanes as they existed prior to Hiroshima, the ex-Emperor would have thrown up his hands in horror and said, "Gentlemen, warfare: it will be impossible. Agencies of destruction within the next 125 years are going to be invented that will wreck civilization." Napoleon would have also said twentieth-century wars, if they occurred, would be "push-button wars." That is what a 50-caliber machine gunner pushes when he launches a burst. Napoleon might have gone a step further and predicted a twentieth century of universal peace because all mankind would be in mortal fear of the dreadful character of the ghastly new weapons.

One wishes Napoleon could have seen these things, could have made such predictions, and could have been right. But we know in the light of history that he would have been wrong. The only factor in which Napoleon would have been right is that warfare as he knew it was impossible. History since his day has shown that warfare with such weapons and of magnitude that would have staggered his imagination have been fought. Citizen soldiers for these wars have been in greater demand than ever before within recorded history.

A common characteristic of all victorious armies, whether in the days of Vegetius, Napoleon, Pershing, or Eisenhower, has been a mass of manpower, well trained, well disciplined, and capable of being coordinated immediately toward a common cause and a common objective.

If warfare is to be more and more a push-button affair, we will always need well-trained and well-disciplined push-buttoneers—soldiers. It may be that the battalion, the regiment, and the division, as we have known them, are obsolete as units of combat manpower. A Civil War major general would never recognize a modern division. But with well-trained men organized into appropriate command units to function, the means of combat can never become obsolete. To argue that it will become obsolete is as silly as arguing that man himself can become obsolete in this modern, man-made civilization.

In time of peace, the only procedure known, in the past or the present, for guaranteeing a supply of such manpower has been military training for a great mass of citizenry. Thus far, no one has found a substitute for some form of compulsory military training. Patriotic societies have offered programs whereby practically all of the universal military training can be acquired in summers. It is less expensive in terms of dollars and time for the young men so trained than any plan that has ever been submitted to any nation.

If the laws of war have proven anything, they have also proven the need for calling into active duty such manpower the moment that danger seems imminent. Without such universal military training, this manpower cannot be invoked in less than a year. The fate of a continent can be settled in half a year.

It is also an irrefutable rule of history that a new war starts with all the weapons and equipment with which the preceding war ended. After that, the new war is a race of scientific and industrial ingenuity combined with rapid creation of additional, disciplined manpower necessary for the clock-like coordination toward the vital objective—victory.

It is thus apparent that notwithstanding the maudlin caterwauling of the revived idealistic, false prophets of yesteryear; notwithstanding the selfishness of doting parents of young men who escaped this war because of victory earned by neighbors' sons, and notwithstanding the dire prophecies of the laboratory scientists, the quasi-scientists, and the pseudoscientists, the American public is better advised when it subscribes to

some form of universal military training. Thanks to the high level of mass education of our young people, the period can be shorter in America than any other nation in the world—but some form of universal military training is imperative. To refuse it is inviting disaster.

Buried Alive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, today I listened to many leaders on both sides of the aisle in the House of Representatives tell how necessary it is that the rest of the world be told of the advantages of living in the United States, our high standard of living, and our great individual benefits. It is all true, and yet there is one field of endeavor in the United States which is not receiving proper attention from our National Government. I hope that legislation improving Federal security for the aged people of the United States will be brought before the House for discussion and action by the Eightieth Congress. As we vote help for victims of the war all over the world, let us give due consideration to our aged people at home. They also need our help. If you do not believe it, read the following article entitled "Buried Alive" from the Woman's Home Companion for June 1947:

BURIED ALIVE—HERE IS SHOCKING EVIDENCE OF NATION-WIDE NEGLECT, BRUTALITY, AND PURE IGNORANCE IN THE CARE OF OUR AGED—PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS ARE EQUALLY GUILTY

(By Edith M. Stern)

Unlike some primitive tribes, we do not kill off our aged and infirm. We bury them alive in institutions. To save our face, we call the institutions homes—a travesty on the word. I have seen dozens of such homes in the last 6 months—desolate places peopled with blank-faced men and women, one home so like another that each visit seemed a recurrent nightmare.

But in the heartbreaking monotonous picture some individual figures stand out—the men in cages in the county home in Ohio for example.

The superintendent and his wife the matron didn't want to take me through the little annex a stone's throw from the main building, built before the Civil War and modernized in 1892. But I insisted.

"All right, then," the superintendent said resignedly, "but you're likely to see anything there."

"It's just impossible to keep those men clean," the matron added.

The first room was not unlike the dormitories in the main building. There were the same grimy unadorned walls, the same curtainless windows with cracked torn shades and the same chipped enamel beds with lumpy straw mattresses on which old men in ragged stained clothing lay sprawled. Then my guides unlocked a door and turned a corner.

The stench of that corridor is still in my nostrils. Along each side were narrow cages of cross-barred metal, each just big enough to hold a cot, a chair, a stained toilet or open commode, and an old man quiet as the furniture.

In one cage a fragile 92-year-old, breathing heavily in sleep, lay diagonally across the cot. For bedding there was only a mattress, a rubber sheet, and a dirty brown blanket. And I was startled to see a large vigorous-looking man sitting on the foot of the cot.

I asked what he was doing there. It was Tony's cell, too, the superintendent said. "With that single cot?" I asked. "Yes," the superintendent answered. Of course, that wasn't right, but he had no other place to put Tony. He and the old man got along fine and they both wet and soiled themselves so that didn't bother either of them.

Aside from Tony's incontinence, I couldn't make out why he was locked up; the matron mumbled something about his stealing and breaking things, and there were her husband and herself with two helpers to do all the work and look after 87 people, a dozen of them bedridden. She was more definite about why the old man had to be "taken care of" like that. He had a way of wandering off the grounds, might get run over. She did not add that he was primarily imprisoned for the crime of being old and poor.

I also remember a certain old lady with agonizing clarity, although she could not have been poor. The private room she occupied in an eastern city nursing home staffed with graduate nurses cost $55 a week and extra for medicines, salves, radio connection, and laundry. The room was sizable but wretchedly furnished. The old lady, her hair mussed, her stockings hanging down, sat in a chair, and as the nurse and I passed her door she moaned and beckoned. I paused but the nurse said sourly, "She doesn't want anything," and went on to show me the next room, no more attractive, but with bath, at $65. (I had invented a 78-year-old aunt for whom I was seeking accommodations.)

Down and across the hall was a three-bed room at $45. The sheets and covers of one of the beds were in a heap in the corner and the patient lay with her legs bare almost up to the thigh. There was a bathroom on the floor, but even where patients were out of bed, many rooms contained commodes and the whole place had a permeating odor.

I asked the nurse whether the patients had bells and she said no. How then, I inquired, could they indicate when they needed something? "Oh," she answered, "there's always a nurse passing." But when we went by the old lady's room on our way back, she again moaned and beckoned, and again the nurse disregarded her, and there was no other nurse on the floor.

That old lady has become for me the symbol of all the old folks who ask for help they do not get. And I—and most of us—are as guilty as that nurse. With few exceptions we provide either wretched facilities for our aged or none at all.

Doubtless it will surprise many women, as it did me, to learn that philanthropically supported homes for the aged can care for only a trickle of the torrent of men and women desperately seeking shelter and some measure of protection. The entire capacity of such homes is about 83,000. Nearly a third of them are in 3 States—Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and New York. Some have empty beds because admission requirements are unusually restricted—such as "residence in Georgetown," as Georgetown was defined in 1805. Those with no empty beds have long waiting lists. In fact many will no longer even list new names, believing it a cruel kindness to raise hopes almost certainly doomed to disappointment.

Public institutions are also swamped. In New York City's home for dependents, porches are being used as dormitories; chairs lined up in long, depressing rows touch one another; and in a dining room built for 200, 600 must eat in three shifts. In Cleveland the infirmary had a waiting list of 200 when I last inquired. Even in a small rural-county nursing home I saw a bed in a corridor, and new admissions were closed. In most big-city wards an extra row of beds down the middle is the rule, not the exception. In commercial nursing homes the story is similar.

Last January, 900 patients could have been discharged from hospitals in New York City alone if there had been any place where they could go to get care. In April 1946, St. Paul, Minn., was short more than 600 beds for chronic care. Everywhere I traveled, families and social workers alike were frantic trying to find nursing-home accommodations.

I asked Margaret Wagner, director of the Benjamin Rose Institute, in Cleveland, what on earth happened to the helpless old people who cannot get into any kind of home. With a terrible stark brevity she replied: "They die alone."

But even if they do get into a home—well, come with me to an institution I visited in a midwestern city, a home so typical it might be in any city.

The hard-faced proprietor who opened the door of the decayed Victorian mansion looked much too unrumpled, at 10:30 a. m., for someone who had 22 patients to tend and only one assistant for the housework. But I told her I was calling on behalf of an aged father-in-law. She showed me a men's ward, at $100 a month.

The ward was mussy and cluttered, beds standing every which way. There was no flicker of interest on any of the drawn faces when we went in. I winced when she said loudly, "These are all stroke cases," as if the eight gray-faced humans lying there could neither hear nor feel.

Upstairs, in a hall as drab as the ward, sat the patients able to walk. Downstairs there were two large rooms lush with bright plush overstuffed furniture; but these, the proprietor said, were not for the patients' use.

Visiting time was restricted to 4 hours, 3 days a week. I asked why, since none of these patients was acutely ill. She said, "They like to rest." Whatever else, I felt like saying, was there for them to do?

In other ways too the proprietor indicated her greater interest in sparing herself than in caring for her patients. I asked the rate for a private room; it was occupied now but she'd gladly oust the patient, who was undesirable because he soiled himself. I murmured sympathy, adding, "Maybe he can't help it."

"Oh, yes he can," she said harshly. She also informed me that she did not take cancer patients. In other words, I thought, no one who is any trouble.

Another nursing home proprietor said outright she preferred patients who are no bother. She thought some organization should provide recreation, though she wouldn't pay for it herself because the patients get quarrelsome and gossipy. A third proprietor would not let patients go to the bathroom at night because the noise woke her up.

Sometimes, however, nursing-home abuses result more from good-natured yielding to pressure for beds than from callous selfishness. There was the woman who did a good job of nursing a few patients in her own home. Urged to expand, she added patient after patient in the carriage house of an old mansion until there were a hundred and twenty. Incapable of running so sizable an institution, she fell farther and farther behind financially. Just before she went bankrupt the patients' main meal was weak soup and a cup of tea. The woman was not mean; she was broke.

Bedsores, for which there is little excuse with proper nursing, are a common nursing-home plague. So is malnutrition. And the lack of standard everyday equipment can be shocking.

The higher-priced nursing homes have better equipment than most, but high rates do not guarantee good care. In a $150-a-week

nursing home in New York an old woman was left on the bedpan for 2 hours. When her daughter reported it, the proprietor said she couldn't understand any complaints about that nurse, although she'd had them about another, who was an alcoholic.

A friend of mine placed her semiparalyzed mother in a Washington, D. C., nursing home, recommended by one of the city's leading physicians. But she did not let her stay there long. The room, at $250 a month, was cleaned only twice a week. A part-time cook departed daily at 5 o'clock; so supper, served at 4:30 p. m., consisted of only cake and fruit. There was no nurse or other attendant on duty during the night. But my friend was most appalled to see a nurse who was bathing an emaciated paralyzed patient just leave her, all uncovered, and walk out to attend to some other business.

The invalided aged often get better care in the public homes. But by and large these institutions are still far from anything we associate with the word "home."

The New York City home for dependents has an excellent program and valiantly attempts to make guests feel like individuals. But it cannot overcome the depressing effect of its physical set-up. The gray, thick-walled buildings, erected in 1846 on Welfare Island, look more like a prison than a refuge.

"When I first saw this place, I sat down and cried," the superintendent told me.

During their last years most men and women at the New York home have only a bed and bedstand that is all theirs. Though there is no rule against personal knickknacks, sharing a room with 50 others is likely to kill all individuality. I saw only one pitifully clutching at personalization; a bedstand decorated with pink ribbon and some holy pictures.

Some of the dormitories are nothing more than enlarged corridors, with a single window at one end and an enclosed porch at the other. The enormous dayroom is also the auditorium; it is lighted and partially ventilated by a skylight which lets in birds. Their droppings fall upon the seats—wooden pews discarded by some church. The kitchen, a city block away from where the food is served, has a cracked, uneven floor, heroically being mopped with steaming water when I saw it, but still dirty-looking. Ironically, the only dining room at all attractive is for blind women; it has red chintz curtains. Other ambulant guests eat in great barren halls at big tables without cloths or napkins, the men from battered tin, the women from thick, chipped, and cracked white china.

True, money was recently appropriated for a new institution. But for over a century the great and wealthy city of New York has relegated its needy aged to buildings only slightly less moldy than the grave.

New York City is not alone in its shame. "If you had brought me here blindfolded," said an official from another city, "I would have sworn I was back in my own institution." And I, seeing a hundred-bed barewalled dormitory at Oak Forest, Chicago, had that queer sensation of reliving something. The miles I had covered one-third across the country were annihilated and I seemed to be back on Welfare Island.

Country folk who know their neighbors might be expected to be more sensitive to the fate of their needy aged than city folk. But rural indifference is as brutal as urban—and funds are even smaller. The average county farm or almshouse—though its name today may be nice-Nellied to home—is an obsolete horror.

I tried to avoid seeing the worst county homes. I did not want to report to American women what was exceptional, but what was typical. So I bypassed impoverished backwoods areas, went to prosperous literate regions with a tradition of social welfare. What the suffering of the aged must be in the poorest county homes I do not even want to imagine.

Dilapidation, ragged clothing, thin cotton blankets (for the ever-chilly old), cheerless basement dining-room, backless benches in dayrooms were bad enough. An unventilated unlighted closet-size punishment cell was worse. Worst were the locked cells; some in a building built only 10 years ago; some in a dank centuries-old structure. Nearly always the contemptuously called "undesirables" were in charge of another inmate almost as senile as they.

There are county almshouses without dining-rooms; residents get their food from the kitchen and eat it in their rooms. I did not happen to see any with no bathtubs, no living-room facilities, nor any over 200 years old. I could not see the no toothbrushes, no hot-water bottles, no first-aid supplies, no dental care, no change of clothing, two meals a day. But I have read these things in official reports.

The general run of superintendents are primarily selected for their ability to farm; their wives are the matrons. "Once you get on to the cleaning and cooking, there's not much else to learn," said a matron solely responsible for the health and happiness of about 60 infirm old people. Few have any professional advice to make them understand that institutional care of people differs from barnyard care of animals.

One matron had a mean tight-lipped face and a cold disregard of her wards, but the couple who had the 92-year-old man locked up were well-meaning people, with kind faces. "Mister and I haven't been off this place for 3 years," the matron told me, almost with tears in her eyes. "If I weren't a good Christian I couldn't go on with the work." She, and others like her, are not hardhearted—just ignorant.

Several States—Illinois was the first—are converting county almshouses into nursing homes, open to people who wish to pay their own way, as well as to those who need public assistance. This is excellent, so far as it utilizes badly needed buildings, removes the stigma of the poorhouse and, through painting and remodeling, brightens former rookeries. But a coat of paint and some chintz do not necessarily create a good place for taking care of sick people. Except in its decoration, installations and superficially improved care of the bedridden, one of these converted homes I visited still bore a horrid basic resemblance to its unconverted fellows. Couples were separated; husbands did not even eat with their wives. There were the same blank-faced men and women just sitting, the same lack of any real occupational program.

Another redecorated almshouse, now ostensibly a nursing home, certainly cannot have any real accent on nursing. The minimum personal care required by a bedridden patient is 1 hour a day. Yet here the 1 hour and 20 minutes a day each employee gives a patient includes not only nursing but all the farming, office work, cooking, and cleaning besides. Nursing standards are so much neglected that even diabetics do not get a special diet. "Because," the farmer-superintendent explained, "you can't make old people eat what they don't want to."

Under good management a public home need not be inadequate and dreary. Residents can still live happy lives within its walls. At the magnificent well-run county home in Los Angeles, single residents have private rooms, couples double, decorated as they please. Everyone who wants it gets his own radio with a headset. There are special well-stocked rooms for reading and games. Some residents run canteens, keeping the profits; all who are able enjoy gardening, handicrafts, shows, a band or academic and commercial classes.

A smaller home in Westchester County, New York, is also a heartening place. Dayrooms cheerful with plants are cut up into units not much larger than family living rooms. Each has a piano. In an attractive room equipped especially for the purpose, women guests hold tea parties and may invite friends from the men's section when they wish.

The superintendent knows his more than 700 charges by name, introduces them as Mr. and Mrs. In the sewing-room coffee is served at 10 a. m. "They have breakfast so early," the woman in charge explained sympathetically.

A nursing home does not need to be a place of the living dead, either. One that I visited hummed with life, though it had several patients over ninety, some with terminal cancer. Ambulatory and wheel chair patients had the run of the whole cheerful place and were talking to one another, something I had not seen in any of the dreary places where silence is chronic. The nurse proprietor radiated wholesome sweetness and faces lighted at her approach. But my heart warmed completely when she turned to an 88-year-old semiparalyzed doctor, once prominent in the community, to ask his opinion about cough drops for his roommate.

Such attention cannot be brought about by licensing nursing homes—but licensing, and sufficient personnel to enforce it, are essential to prevent the most flagrant abuses, insanitary conditions and fire hazards. In 28 States, however, the sick aged have less legal protection than patrons of saloons.

It is high time we gave some thought to our old people. Although they are increasing among us, there is no national organization devoted to solving their problems. Even the Townsendites, a most powerful lobby of the aged, have formulated no plans for meeting the most important need—a good home with good care.

Old age in itself is not a tragedy, but a time of life with its own solaces and pleasures, like every other time of life. Only by our neglect and abuse of the aged do we make it a tragedy.

Communism—What It Will Take To Defeat It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the test of our ability to resist the march of communism is the economic stability of this great country. Grants of money scattered over the world for armaments or propaganda are but idle gestures. We must soon understand that fact. For this reason I include as part of my remarks the following editorial which appeared in the Chicago Journal of Commerce on June 5:

HOLDING THE LINE

That tenuous line dividing the Soviet and Western Worlds has begun to emerge, hard and clear. On the left side of it (facing south) lies Hungary, which we have just rebuffed. To the right of it is Italy, recipient of our official blessing.

The rebuff occurred when, following the Communist putsch against Premier Ferenc Nagy of the popularly elected Smallholders Party, the United States cut off the remaining half of a $30,000,000 loan to the Magyar country. Hungary, uneasily lying under the shadow of the hammer and sickle, is deprived at one swoop of her premier and of $15,000,000.

The official blessing was accorded by Secretary of State Marshall, who wished every success to the new government of the perennial Italian Premier, Alcide de Gasperi. His latest venture omits both Socialists and Communists from the cabinet.

"We shall be happy to give aid to the Italian people, who have demonstrated their sincere and abiding faith in democratic processes," General Marshall declared. (Whether Socialist Britain relishes the democratic tag on Italy's Socialist-excluding government is a moot question.)

Iran, too, the oil-laden country which has resisted Soviet incursion, is soon to receive an American reward—a $30,000,000 credit for United States surplus property. Iran's neighbor, Turkey, and Greece have already been voted $400,000,000 by Congress.

Whether the line becomes a battle line is the trillion-dollar question. At present it is a diplomatic frontier between the Communist-dominated part of the map and those under Anglo-American hegemony.

Our negative approach makes more sense than our positive one here. But withholding credits from a regime which has muscled its way into power by force of Russian bayonets is simple logic. Giving aid to a potential enemy, whose present rulers are fanatically opposed to the American way of life, would be an imbecile gesture.

On the other hand, paying a wildly extravagant price to build up a Fascist-minded and antidemocratic autocracy as a rotten bulwark against communism is equally witless.

The breakwaters against communism will not be found in the mountains of Macedonia or the waters of the Dardanelles; on the Iranian plateau or along the Morgan line of Venezia Giulia. They will be found in the ledgers of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks, in a financially sound, economically strong United States. They will be found in a flourishing home economy which gives no hope to domestic Reds. Five billion dollars a year—the golden global shower forecast by our Washington weather experts—would sow the wind of inflation and instability at home. If it does, we shall reap the whirlwind of economic and political disaster.

Address by Hon. Douglas W. McGregor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM CONNALLY
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Hon. Douglas W. McGregor, the Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, at Houston, Tex., on Maritime Day, May 22, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mayor Holcombe, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is good to be back in Houston, and I am grateful to Mr. Gough, the president of the Propeller Club of the port of this city, for affording me the honor of coming here this evening and participating with you in the celebration of Maritime Day. Having lived in Houston as long as I have, having served as the United States attorney for the southern district of Texas, having had the privilege of representing the United States in the approval of the titles for the easements acquired in the construction of the intracoastal canal, and having had over 21 years of admiralty-law experience, I am somewhat familiar with the significance of Maritime Day to this growing and progressive city of ours. To you, Mr. Mayor, I am most grateful for your kind words of introduction. In all sincere humility, I deem myself hardly worthy of all the praises you have given me. You, yourself, have done so much for the maritime interests of our city. It is no exaggeration to assert that your energy, determination, and efforts have constituted one of the greatest factors in building up this port to the eminent position that it now has. None can dispute that you have contributed more than anyone to the building up of the splendid municipal docks, the magnificent highways leading to them, and the superior installations there. You are all familiar with the slogan of Houston, "Where 17 railroads meet the sea." You, Mr. Mayor, and all these men gathered here this evening have done much to make that meeting of the railroads and the sea efficient, convenient, and economical.

As you are all aware, National Maritime Day, by act of the Seventy-third Congress in 1933, has since been celebrated annually over the Nation. The date of May 22 is significant because of the historical fact that on May 22, 1819, the *Savannah* set sail from Savannah, Ga., on the first successful transoceanic voyage under steam propulsion. That event marked the beginning of an epoch in the world's history. Much has happened since that date. When the *Savannah*, often referred to as the steam coffin, made its hazardous crossing from this country to Liverpool, the ship was about one-thirtieth of the size of a modern Liberty ship. It boasted a 72-horsepower engine, about as powerful as the one in your car. It weighed 340 tons. It was fitted with paddle wheels as well as sails. As a matter of fact, it used steam for only 3½ days of its 29-day-and-11-hour journey and sailed the rest of the time. It was reported that she smoked so furiously approaching the English coast that watchers on the Liverpool shore put out in small boats to help extricate it from the fire. Compare that picture with the modern ship.

The world situation today is in marked contrast to that of 1819. Over 2 years ago we achieved a victory in a great war, a victory which we hoped would guarantee to all people the right to life without fear. Instead, most of the peoples of the earth today are still assailed by hunger and starvation, and all people by doubts and fears. Men once more talk of violence and war, and only the dead are sure of peace. It had been hoped that, with victory over the Axis enemies, man would be able to play the game of life unmolested. At no time since the beginning of history have people been confronted with such complex and vexing problems as they are today. There is despair, frustration, hopelessness. All are seeking a solution to the problem—how to build a new and satisfactory way of life on the historical foundations which have become dear to us throughout the ages. The world is crying for peace, bread, and freedom.

It is not idle exaggeration to state that one of the most important elements in securing the future peace of the world is bound up with the future of the merchant marine of our country. As I see it, world peace will depend on the following two factors: First, the maintenance of a strong and powerful United States to counterbalance aggression by other peoples of the world; and, second, the maintenance of a sound economic stability the world over. An efficient, sound, and adequate merchant marine will guarantee both factors.

As President Truman has so aptly stated in his proclamation of April 11, 1947, calling upon the people of the United States to observe this National Maritime Day:

"Whereas the welfare of the American merchant marine is of the utmost importance to our national economy and national defense and our free intercourse with free nations"—

An adequate merchant marine is therefore as necessary to our country in assuring future peace as it was in achieving victory in war.

From what history has taught us, one need have little to say to convince any intelligent person of the necessity of maintaining a powerful United States from a military and naval aspect. A well-prepared, modern, up-to-date, efficient Army and Navy will not only counterbalance aggression by other peoples of the world but will serve as a preventive of war in the future. That the possession of a strong, well-equipped, capably manned merchant marine is an essential constituent element of a powerful Army and Navy, and a modern defense set-up, needs no proof. The contribution that the merchant marine made in the conduct of the recent war is sufficient proof of this assertion on my part.

From Greenland's rocky shores to India's coral sands, from the burning littoral of Africa to the blinding storm-whipped crags of the Arctic, men braved the sea to keep our forces supplied and girded with weapons to enable our country to achieve the victory we did. The men and ships of the American merchant marine were the muscles behind the fist that delivered the blow.

That merchant fleet is now practically intact. The great problem presented is what to do with it.

The first thing we must do is to make sure that we do not repeat the mistake we made after World War I. We must continue to be the greatest maritime Nation on earth. Most of our shipping after World War I was wretchedly inefficient because a great part of it consisted of wooden vessels. This time we were more fortunate. Our shipping in World War II was the best ever built. Germany has lost all of her merchant marine. So has Japan; while Great Britain, the Scandinavian Nations, and Holland have, at the most, only half of their prewar tonnage. To maintain a fleet for defense purposes, the retention of our leadership is absolutely indispensable. But there is another reason why it is necessary to maintain our unrivaled leadership as a martime power in world affairs. There is the second factor I have spoken of—the economic factor.

The United States has now achieved a position of unrivaled leadership in all world affairs. The economy of the United States will reflect the economy of the world. On the economic well-being of our Nation depends the economic well-being of the world; and the economic well-being of our Nation, it may be unequivocally stated, depends upon the character and quantum of the Merchant Marine we maintain. The importance of a merchant marine fleet of our own to our country's sound economy was recognized very early in our Nation's history. George Washington, urging a systematic encouragement of shipbuilding, stated that to do this "is to establish shipyards; is to form magazines; to multiply useful hands; to produce artisans and workmen of every kind who may be found at once for the peaceful speculations of commerce and for the terrible wants of war." This is true because we can only have a sound domestic economy if we develop an increased global trade. The merchant marine is important for our prosperity, and thus resultingly in the maintenance of the peace of the world. It is incumbent upon us to maintain an equilibrium of international trade, and this can only be done by the retention of our leadership as a maritime power. We want an unvacillating, a permanent policy which will supplement the spirit of free enterprise with Government cooperation. As has been so aptly stated, "A country that has turned its back upon isolationism must turn its face toward the sea." For it is an indubitable fact to which all thinkers will give accord that the future economic prosperity of this country is dependent upon the development of foreign trade.

Due to almost miraculous scientific progress made during the past 25 years, the productive powers of man have been greatly increased. It is manifest that all the goods that can be produced in this country cannot possibly be used by the domestic consumers. To live we shall have to export. Experts have estimated that if we carry only 50 percent of our foreign trade on our own ships, we will be able to keep in the sea lanes a full size American fleet, and in this way make it possible to foster the interflow of goods and ideas which makes for stable international relations. Only a full-scale American fleet, carrying goods back and forth over the oceans, will bring the national economy which will promote prosperity and insure millions of workers pay envelopes. At this moment, the United States is the source of goods and materials upon which most of the rest of the world is dependent. Every nation is seeking to recover from the war. The United States was the least scathed, and the United States is the only spot on earth where the material and equipment necessary for the rehabilitation of all people on earth can now be provided.

Also, we should not forget that there are many commodities and materials which we have to import, such, for example, as tin, coffee, and rubber. These imports, as well as our exports, should and must be carried in our own ships. The Department of Commerce has estimated that the United States will furnish about $16,000,000,000 in goods and services to other nations this coming year. Other nations, in return, will provide us with about $9,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. We must resolve that most of it shall be carried in our own ships. American genius for management and organization in labor, as well as industry, can be utilized to that end. British shipyards are already operating at top capacity to turn out ships that will be superior to ours. We must not permit the continuance of this. We must not permit another absorption of our foreign trade by other merchant marine flags. The motto that foreign trade is the keystone to our prosperity should be blazoned to our citizens.

An aggressive world trade policy will be good for the wheat farmer, for the factory and office worker, for the businessman, and the industrialist. It is imperative that countries exchange their products if world trade is to serve as a vehicle of international good will. The Lord has endowed us with many resources. Let us make use of it by the further achievement of American productive genius and give the world the benefit thereof. We cannot permit inaction, indifference, and trust all to the Lord.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that we have always been, during our most prosperous periods, an internationally trade-minded people, and that the foundation of this country's vast economic wealth was built on a merchant marine. We have always been a seafaring nation. During the first year after the migration of the Puritans to New England, shipwrights were busy on the shore of the Mystic River completing the construction of the seagoing vessel, *The Blessing of the Bay*. At that time, the General Court of Massachusetts, which is the official name of the Massachusetts Legislature to this very day, solemnly enacted that shipbuilding was a business of great importance and provided for inspectors to examine every ship to make sure that it was sound and seaworthy. From 1790 to 1855, with the exception of the 10-year period during the War of 1812, we enjoyed what has always been called the golden age of shipping. The whalers that set out from Nantucket to every corner of the globe, searching for precious oil, and the New England clippers which made record voyages to the Orient in search of fine silks and tea, were the foundations of many a fortune built in this country. The Civil War ended this.

We later permitted that shipping supremacy to wane, but in 1936 when we were fourth among the six leading maritime nations in tonnage, sixth in vessels 10 years of age or less, and fifth in vessels with speeds of 12 knots or over, and when dry cargo shipping was at a standstill and most other ships were rapidly reaching the state of obsolescence, President Roosevelt was successful in rallying the friends of the merchant marine in Congress and elsewhere to enact what has been called "the frankest, most expert, and most realistic approach to the problem of supplying the Nation with adequate cargo and passenger facilities yet made." This act, which created the Maritime Commission, has been called the Magna Carta of our maritime policy. It was a great forward step after 50 years of a period when our merchant shipping dwindled to insignificance. It provided for the first time a stable policy in the matter of the merchant marine. It provided a sound approach to the rehabilitation of our then decadent shipping. It can serve now as a guiding post for our future merchant marine policy, for the determination of that policy is one of the most important and difficult problems facing us today. The committees of Congress on the merchant marine are giving this serious matter exhaustive and intensive consideration, and you know, of course, that the President of the United States has appointed an advisory committee to study and report on the problem.

It is not merely the retention of ships which is important. We must have ships, but they must be modern and up-to-date and must possess the most advanced technological and mechanical improvements. We are fortunate in having a fine personnel. The all-out war brought many new faces to our merchant marine and the necessities of the emergency have resulted in a development of instruments and skill second to none. Let us make use of all that.

Moreover, Government help and cooperation is absolutely essential. Private shipping cannot compete with foreign cheap labor and low cost of raw materials. The Government must also help in the development of ports and in aiding in the equipment of such ports with the latest machinery.

Thinking men are saying that if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relations, the ability of all people of all types to live and work together in the same world at peace. Our merchant ship personnel can help channelize a proper course in this direction. We can have in these men the ambassadors of good will. Let us show the world the true meaning of a free America, the real truth of American enterprise, the beauty of our way of life. Let us not permit the world to think of us Americans in the terms of a Yankee trader who once said, "Father would never tell a lie, but sometimes in horse trading he was mighty economical of the truth." We have built up much good will for our country during the war. Let us continue to retain that reputation. As an instrument of international relations, the merchant marine can do a lot and can truthfully translate the symbolism of our flag—namely, that this Nation is a union of States standing together for a world striving to find peace and security.

That is why the work of the National Propeller Club is so significant, and that is why meetings of this sort are so meaningful and important to the welfare of our country. Your organization has grown immensely since that little group of men interested in every phase of the merchant marine met at a luncheon on January 24, 1923, in New York and laid the keel of the national organization, in the form of the Propeller Club of the Port of New York, and then on November 9, 1927, with only four of your ports, met at the old Waldorf Astoria in the same city to plant the seed which has now grown into the vast National Propeller Club. You have clubs in the United States, in Europe, South America, in the West Indies, and one even in Hawaii. From that group of four you have grown into about 100 today. You have provided a means by which maritime interests may band together for mutual advancement.

But the greatest benefit that you have conferred upon the people of our country has been in focusing the attention of the average man and woman to the importance of the merchant marine. You have made the public merchant marine conscious. Unless the people are fully informed concerning the essential object of the merchant marine, it is unreasonable to expect now, or in the future, that American citizens will demand that an adequate merchant marine fleet be maintained. You have crystallized the attention of our American citizens on the importance to the Nation, both in time of peace and national emergency, of the American merchant marine, and you have stimulated interest in shipping. You have made the rallying cry of our people, "Ship American, travel American, and support progressive maritime legislation," meaningful and potent.

Particularly notable is your contribution in stressing the importance on the coming generation of its possible influence upon American shipping. You have done this by the formation of the propeller clubs, student ports, in numerous colleges and universities. I am proud that we have one at the University of Texas. By developing amongst the youth a patriotic and common-sense appreciation of an adequate merchant marine as a factor in our national well-being, you have provided a guarantee and an insurance for the future welfare of our country.

You members of the Propeller Club of Houston have done much to carry out the noble purposes of your national organization. Houston, known as the third port in tonnage in the United States, has benefited greatly from your effort. Our city, 50 miles from the Gulf of Mexico, depends for its economic life on the canal that leads to the ocean. Our municipally owned docks, bordering the channel, are as good as any built.

Let us remember that never again can our Republic, rich and powerful as it is, closely interwoven as it is with the political, commercial, and cultural life of other nations, neglect what is still the primary instrument for promoting world trade among the nations. As has been stated, "Properly used, a strong merchant marine can help enrich the people it connects, can promote a true cosmopolitanism of the mind, and can strengthen the fabric of international peace."

Let us also not forget the sacrifices of the men who died while in the service of the merchant marine. Let us resolve that by their death they must have contributed to years of lasting peace and that by the maintenance of a strong merchant marine, we can be free from the perils of another war. We are now living in the Atomic Age. Few of us actually realize the true import of this statement. A new world is upon us. We must meet this new world boldly with courage and vision, and we must do it quickly. The world is moving at a pace so that even a slight delay may be fatal. But with God's help it can be done. As Webster said, "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and we are always ready to guard and defend it." We all love liberty. We have given our blood to maintain that liberty. We must always be ready to guard it and defend it. But we must have vision and courage and determination. Let us always heed the words of the Bible "that where there is no vision, the people perish." In commemorating "Maritime Day" one day a year and in carrying out the messages delivered during the other days of the year, we will not and cannot perish. Let us effectuate the fitting slogan of this day, "For trade, travel, defense—the American merchant marine."

Montana Farmers Union Condemns GOP Slashes in Agriculture Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Montana Farmers Union at a meeting at Fort Assinniboine:

MONTANA FARMERS UNION CONDEMNS GOP SLASHES IN AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION

HAVRE, June 2.—Directors of the Montana Farmers Union, meeting at Fort Assinniboine, today issued a statement condemning the action of the House of Representatives in cutting Department of Agriculture appropriations. The statement said:

"We consider the present action of Congress, cutting the appropriations of the school lunch, REA, Farmers Home Administration, crop insurance, and triple-A conservation programs, a repudiation of previous congressional promises to the American farmer.

"Such action, done in the name of 'economy,' is destructive of the basic foundations of our national well-being. We feel that this is a grave breach of faith with the American farmer, and that it will result in a loss of confidence and trust among farmers in democratic action programs.

"In view of wartime damage to our soil and the fact that our present annual losses amount to 500,000 acres, a reduction from the promised $300,000,000 to $165,000,000 in conservation funds for 1947, with no funds for 1948, is bound to result in a tremendous increase in loss of soil through erosion, a loss our Nation can ill afford.

"We deplore the attempt to wreck the greatest asset and the best feature of the triple A—its farmer control—by means of drastic cuts in administrative funds allowed State and county committees. Reductions announced for Montana would cut county committees from $399,000 to $217,000 and the State from $110,000 to $32,000. Obviously, it will be impossible for the committees to function properly unless these funds are restored.

"We also fail to see the economy or consistency in reducing the school lunch program from $75,000,000 to $45,000,000. In the face of the impending surpluses and the deficient nutritional standards still prevalent in much of our own country we believe it extremely unwise for Congress to deprive our children of this extra margin of health and at the same time provide 'loans' for military aid to foreign countries.

"We believe opposition to the full appropriation for REA will needlessly postpone the day for many of our farmers to receive benefits of electricity. If the opponents of REA succeed, the resulting delays in construction and expansion could easily seriously set back the whole rural electrification program.

"With reference to the cuts on funds for farm home demonstration, we wonder what has become of the promises to our veterans. This will be the death blow to their hopes of becoming farm owners.

"We are opposed to the contemplated curtailment of the crop insurance program on an 'experimental basis.' It is our considered opinion that, as far as Montana is concerned, crop insurance has worked and should be retained and further extended and improved.

"We call on farmers and friends of agriculture to join with us in our effort to prevent the scuttling of these programs, which we believe beneficial not only to agriculture but to the Nation. While we do not consider present programs the final solutions to national agricultural problems, we do believe such progress as has been made should not be thrown out until improved and better legislation may be enacted."

Proceedings on the Occasion of Unveiling Statue of William E. Borah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcript of the proceedings in connection with the unveiling of the statue of the late Senator William E. Borah in the rotunda of the Capitol this afternoon.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXERCISES ATTENDING THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF THE LATE SENATOR WILLIAM E. BORAH, OF IDAHO, IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE NATIONAL CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D. C., FRIDAY AFTERNOON, JUNE 6, 1947, AT 2 O'CLOCK

Hon. Ray McKaig, of Boise, Idaho, vice chairman of the Borah Memorial Statue Commission, acted as chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Ladies and gentlemen, we are about to pay tribute to the memory of one of the great statesmen of America. If we lived in Germany, Italy, or Russia, perhaps we would appreciate even better than we do the words "Sweet land of liberty" in the inspiring anthem, America. Those words mean much to those who live in many of the countries of Europe. I ask you to sing one verse of America the way the Canadian sings his national song. Sing it as though you meant it—"Sweet land of liberty." When you say those words, think of the oppression in the Old World. The band will play America, and after it has played the song through we will sing one verse, and then you will please remain standing while the Chaplain of the United States Senate, Dr. Peter Marshall, delivers the invocation.

(The audience stood and sang one verse of America.)

Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., Chaplain of the United States Senate, delivered the following invocation:

"Our Father, we give Thee thanks for the men and women of yesteryear who have, by their vision, their faith, their courage, and their lives made our Nation great and bequeathed to us our glorious heritage.

"As we honor the memory, the inspiration, and the example of William E. Borah, we know that he being dead, yet speaketh.

"We thank Thee for his qualities of mind and heart that earned for him the respect of his colleagues and the confidence of his people.

"We dare to pray that Thou wilt raise up among us men like him, men of conviction and courage, men of independent mind, not bending to every varying wind, but standing stalwart as oaks for what they know to be right.

"Wilt Thou bless this Nation, which he loved so much and served so well.

"Wilt Thou bless the gracious lady who walked with him through the years, and sustain her in the faith that looks to that resumption of love and fellowship that shall have no end.

"Wilt Thou bless his friends gathered here to honor him, and grant that when they, too, shall have made their contribution of service to our Nation, it shall be remembered and honored as gratefully as that of Thy servant, William E. Borah.

"We ask these things in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman is pleased now to introduce the artist who created this statue of Senator Borah. The members of the memorial commission, under whose direction the plan for a memorial to Idaho's great Senator has been executed, feel that the artist has done a marvelous work. He has been cooperative and he has been true. I have the pleasure of introducing the man who will make the formal presentation of the statue to the State of Idaho, the sculptor, Mr. Bryant Baker, of New York City. [Applause.]

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, Governor Robins, Mrs. Borah, and ladies and gentlemen, it has been a distinct trust and gratifying privilege to execute for the State of Idaho the statue of their foremost citizen, the late Senator William E. Borah.

To work on a subject whose fine character, integrity, and patriotism have raised him to such a prominent position in this great Nation is indeed an honor, but when combined with all this a sculptor has a subject of such outstanding personality and ruggedness, then indeed he is fortunate and so I say to you I am fortunate.

I would like to extend my thanks to Mrs. Borah and to all the members of the commission for their help—they have at all times been very considerate.

I have tried to depict for future generations the forceful and courageous Borah and I hope you will approve and like my work. I now formally deliver to you, Mr. Governor, representing the State of Idaho, this statue which I believe to be well and truly made. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. I take great pleasure in introducing the Governor of our State, Gov. C. A. Robins, who will accept the statue on behalf of the State of Idaho.

Governor ROBINS. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends, it is for me, a particular privilege and high honor to accept from you, Mr. Baker, on behalf of the State of Idaho this statue, to the completion of which you have contributed so fully of your time and your artistry. On behalf of the Borah Memorial Statue Commission, may I express thus formally our personal appreciation of your effort and your wonderful cooperation?

Placed thus by virtue of the will of the people of Idaho expressed through their legislature, this statue stands and shall stand through years unnumbered, preserving to posterity the physical characteristics of him who for 33 years so faithfully represented Idaho in the United States Senate.

William E. Borah belonged not alone to his beloved Gem State, he was a citizen of the world at whose passing somewhat more than 7 years ago that entire world paused in reverent tribute to acknowledge greatness such as it has too seldom seen.

It seems to me there is a particular fitness surrounding this entire occasion exemplifying as it does the catholicity of this Government of ours. Here, preserved for the ages, in the Halls of the Nation's Capitol, is placed the figure of a man not from a center of population, not the child of affluence, not even in the strictest sense a partisan, and yet a zealot in his continuous and magnificent efforts to defend and preserve the Constitution of the United States of America. Humbly born, successful in his chosen profession by virtue of a fine intellect, effective study, and dogged determination, he came here representing one of the smallest States in population, yet arose by sheer ability to an eminence attained by few, to have his name become the

world around a watchword significant of freedom, and justice, and humanity. A fellow governor, the governor of his native State, expressed it well in saying, "His life was a living sermon that government is the people's servant and that theirs is the right of freedom and opportunity upon which no agency dares encroach."

Freedom he loved as the basis of human happiness and once decided upon a course of action he stood as immovable as the massive peak in the mountains of Idaho which bears his name.

Once determined that the ends of justice were not served, his labors in her behalf were as ceaseless and vigorous as the force of the tumbling torrents of the streams of his adopted State.

And were there suffering and grief, there came an outpouring of sympathetic understanding, known best to those who knew him intimately, as wonderful as the dawn of a lovely spring morning in the valley of his choice.

Weak words of mine can no more express today the loss which we sustained than they could on that evening in January 1940, when, in San Francisco, my senses were chilled by the cry of the newsboy.

To most of us it is not given to serve in such outstanding fashion, but in our several spheres we have an example of firmness, constancy, zeal, and understanding such as this to emulate.

Prophet, he was, in whose utterances of nearly three decades ago were displayed with remarkable clarity the course of some of the circumstances and events of our more immediate past and of the present. Disagree with him, as we might, we were by the very logic of his argument and by the innate sincerity of the man, forced to respect his position.

Borah is remembered. And while thus preserved in the hearts of his countrymen, we accept this wonderful representation of the physical man; and as Idaho gave William E. Borah to the Nation, so we pridefully give to the Nation this enduring monument to our best contribution, matchless champion, eloquent advocate, and friend. A friend of his youth as well as his later years wrote: "An honest man who dedicated his talents to his country's good, as selfless as ever a man had been in American public life. If that is greatness, he is entitled to don his memorial bronze and live among the immortals of his generation."

So be it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Ladies and gentlemen, it is with much pleasure and a great deal of pride that I introduce to you at this time Mrs. William E. Borah—"Little Borah," beloved by all of us. [Great applause; the audience rising.]

In further token of the respect we bear for you, Mrs. Borah, please accept these flowers in the name of the people of the State of Idaho. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, I now introduce to you a nephew of the late Senator Borah, Judge Wayne Z. Borah, of New Orleans, a judge of the Federal court.

Will you please stand, Judge Borah, and let us see you?

(Judge Borah rose, as the audience applauded.)

Seated by the judge is the future Senator from Louisiana, William Edgar Borah, a son of Judge Borah. [Applause.]

At this time we will have the Idaho State song, which I believe is the most beautiful State song that has ever been written.

(The Marine Band rendered the Idaho State song.)

Thank you, Mr. Orchestra Leader. That was splendid.

Ladies and gentlemen, frequently when I went over the State escorting Senator Borah when speaking at our Grange meetings, he would refer to some of his associates in Congress. Again and again the name of a gentleman from Michigan was given me as one of his dear, close friends. So, at this moment, I know that the Senator would be very happy to have this gentleman address this audience on "Borah—the Statesman." I take great pleasure in introducing to you our friend and a distinguished statesman, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan. [Great applause, the audience rising.]

Senator VANDENBERG. Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Borah, Governor Robins, ladies and gentlemen, it is a very precious privilege to join in welcoming the return of William Edgar Borah to this Capitol, which within recent memory he dominated with his devoted statesmanship and with his rugged personality and character. We who labored with him here in the thrilling inspiration of his living presence have never forgotten his genius, his integrity, and his flaming patriotism during these 7 years and 4 months and 18 days since he was gathered to his fathers. Nor has his country which he loved and served so faithfully and well. But to have him in this Hall of Fame more intimately restores him to our old associations and to his rightful place in American history. He belongs beneath this dome forever. We are grateful to Idaho for bringing us this eternal memorial of her great son. Thus he joins the rare company of great Americans who have been nominated by their grateful countrymen for this supreme acknowledgment. I fancy the others are proud to receive him in their honored midst. None worthier has ever been added to their roll.

Mortal words can add nothing to the stature of such a man. His life surpassed in eloquence anything that might be said of him. He loved America with deeds and dedications. He proved it with relentless fidelity to liberty under law. He sought the truth and there he stood, even though he stood alone. He "walked with kings, nor lost the common touch." His client was the Constitution of his country. His constituent was the common citizen of the Republic.

There was something in him of the strength of the mighty mountains of the West from whence he came. There was something in him of the spirit of the lonely pioneer who dares against all odds for the faith of his objectives. There was something in him of the divine genius with which God occasionally touches one among us and bids him lead. There was honor—against which no shadow of a syllable was ever lisped. There was power—the like of which has not often swayed "the greatest deliberative body in the world." There was profound scholarship. There was utter simplicity—the badge of a great soul. There was transparent sincerity, and there was the gentle, kindly friendliness which made him as beloved as he was respected and revered. Upon this latter score I hope I may be forgiven for saying that I was one of its countless beneficiaries. He was my greatest friend in public life. He was one of the greatest men I ever personally knew.

He was one of those few statesmen—I can think of but two or three others in our history—who was greater than any President under whom he served, and for whom the Presidency could have added nothing to his stature or his laurels. He was an institution within himself. He has become a part of our glorious American inheritance.

This is not the first time I have used those last few words, my friends. This is infinitely more than a passing, ceremonial salute, so far as I am concerned. Indeed, nothing could satisfy me more than to repeat this afternoon what I said by radio to a hushed and stricken nation on the night following the day he died. I said:

"My fellow countrymen, the darkness of a deep sorrow rests upon the Capitol tonight. It reaches out to millions of American family hearthstones, where the name and the honor and the rugged patriotism of United States Senator William E. Borah have become part of the American inheritance. Idaho mourns the loss of a brilliant son. The Nation mourns the loss of one who was literally one of its greatest institutions. * * * One of the Republic's pillars has fallen. * * * The Constitution's most stalwart and effective friend since Daniel Webster has been gathered to his Fathers. * * * A great heart is stilled. * * * We shall not soon look upon the like of him again. * * * Thirty-three years ago he came out of the West with his first senatorial commission. He gave it back last night—without a spot or blemish on it.

"He grew in stature each succeeding year. He grew in influence which leaped the boundaries of his native land and spanned the earth. He grew in the talents which made him the greatest advocate and orator of his time. He became the Senate's dean—not alone in years of service, but equally in the personal prestige of a unique and mighty character which was worthy of the Senate in its richest tradition since this Government was born.

"He loved America and America loved him. * * * He believed in America with a passion that was the touchstone of his life. America—whether it always agreed with him or not—believed in him. It knew his courage. It knew his shining probity. It knew his soul-deep sympathy with human needs. It knew his deathless dedication to representative democracy. It knew his devotion to the commonweal."

I said that night: "We shall bring the wreaths of our affection to his tomb. They will stay green as long as memory survives. Farewell, great patriot, great friend."

Mr. Chairman, that was more than 7 years ago. Time has not changed the estimate. It only serves to etch the image of the man a little deeper. It becomes increasingly the true measure of his worth. Being human, he was not infallible. But he never hedged; he never was in doubt. He never sought the easiest way. Historians will quarrel for years about some of his judgments. But they can never deny that he wrote the honest verdict of his conscience upon every major issue that arose for nearly half a century, and that in every instance it had its powerful impact upon the affairs of men.

I have been asked to speak particularly of his statesmanship. It must suffice, in this swift survey, to linger briefly only upon three ever-present passions in his dynamic career.

1. He, like millions of us who followed him in those dubious prewar days, resisted every trend which he feared would needlessly transgress the warnings in Washington's Farewell Address and unnecessarily involve us in other people's destinies and other people's wars. He never knew about Pearl Harbor. He did not live to hear its crack of doom. Yet, even in those earlier times, he had a great longing for world peace and made himself the prime champion of the Kellogg-Briand Pact to outlaw war. He hated war. But he hated injustice even more. He never compromised with aggression in his life. Since his passing, events have written new and startling history with a rushing pen. We have no right to speculate on how he would have met these epochal events. But of this we may be sure—he would have met them with forthright courage and strength and fidelity, and with the infinite patriotism which was the habit of his life. We can only ask of Providence that these qualities may be bequeathed to us and to our children.

2. He was the implacable defender of the Constitution of the United States. He was the constant sentinel upon its watchtowers. His guard was never down. He never compromised his vigilance. It was the breath of life to him. He believed with all his being in the literal preservation of constitutional

democracy. He fought every assault, however trivial or expedient, upon the charter of our ordered liberties and upon its checks and balances. In the hour of greatest test, when the independence of the judiciary was the stake, he led the successful forces of constitutional defense in the battle of the century. If fate had cast him in the role of Chief Justice of the United States, John Marshall would have found a worthy and a comparable successor.

3. He hated monopoly and special privilege. He was the people's advocate in the finest sense of the phrase. His zeals defied political convention. He sought always to serve the total welfare of our total citizenship. There was something of Lincoln in him. He was the humanitarian who practiced what he preached. His sympathies were ever with the struggling throng. He trusted the people, and the people trusted him. They knew that he was one of them. His philosophy, in his own words, was this: "As long as I can distinguish between right and wrong, I shall do what I believe to be right—whatever the consequences." No better epitaph could speak for him upon his monument. No better rule could challenge his colleagues who come after.

Mr. Chairman, upon this memorable occasion, when sadness mingles with triumphant glory, I again thank Idaho for bringing William Edgar Borah back to us; and I thank God for having given his living genius to our blessed land. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. It is with profound regret I have to announce that Senator Burton K. Wheeler was called away to South America on business, and could not return in time for these exercises. We had hoped he would speak on the program, because in a way he was one of the closest friends Senator Borah had in the opposing party. Senator Borah was not a partisan in any strict sense of the word. I have heard him speak often of his great regard for a Senator from Georgia of years ago, Senator Bacon, and tell about the friendship he had with that wonderful character.

At this moment I wish to introduce a gentleman who will read a 15-line poem dedicated to Senator Borah. This gentleman was five times a Representative from Kentucky, he lives here in your own community, and he was a close friend of Senator Borah. I will ask Mr. M. H. Thatcher to come forward and read the poem he has written in tribute to Senator Borah, and which we admired so much that we printed it on the program.

Mr. M. H. Thatcher thereupon read the following poem, composed by him:

"WHEN BORAH DIED

"When Borah died, a giant fell;
A trumpet stilled. Death may dispel
The mortal senses and the frame,
But not the glory of a name.
The praise of which death helped to swell.

"In him Isaiah's gift did dwell;
In him the graces did excel.
Alas! Our land seemed not the same—
When Borah died!

"His final place Time's score will tell;
But those who lived within the spell
Of that great voice, are sure his fame
Will burn with primal, quenchless flame:
But oh! the grief, as tolled the bell—
When Borah died!"

The CHAIRMAN. Before the unveiling, two gentlemen will lay wreaths on the statue. First I will call upon Mr. Persio C. Franco, former charge d'affaires of the Dominican Republic, in Washington, who has prepared a little tribute to Senator Borah. I will ask Mr. Franco to come forward and present his token of love from the Dominican Republic because of the fight Senator Borah waged in the Senate for the liberty of that little nation.

Mr. Persio C. Franco thereupon approached the statue and deposited a wreath.

(The tribute prepared by Mr. Franco is as follows:)

"Senator Borah's statements in the Senate and in an historic meeting at Carnegie Hall, in New York City, during the American military occupation of my country, the Dominican Republic, gained for him the eternal gratitude of the Dominican people. True greatness is achieved only through kindness and justice. Mr. Borah was a truly great man."

The CHAIRMAN. It is very fine to think that a small nation such as the Dominican Republic should remember the Senator at this moment.

I now wish to introduce ABE MCGREGOR GOFF, Representative in Congress from the northern part of Idaho, who, on behalf of the Beta Theta Pi fraternity alumni of the city of Washington, will lay a wreath on the statue of Senator Borah.

Mr. GOFF thereupon came forward and deposited a wreath.

Mr. GOFF. It is a great privilege thus to honor a great person. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. We have with us today the successor of Senator Borah, whom the people of Idaho have loved since he was a Member of the House of Representatives, where he served them faithfully 8 years, just before his election to the United States Senate. I introduce Senator DWORSHAK, who, on behalf of the Federal Government, will accept the statue of Senator Borah.

Senator DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Borah, Governor Robins, ladies and gentlemen: It is a rare privilege for me to accept, on behalf of the American Congress, the American Government, and the American people, this magnificent statue of Senator Borah. Idaho sent this statesman to the National Capital, and now she sends this token of her enduring love and respect.

In these halls Senator Borah for 33 years exemplified the highest traditions of American public service. His mute presence here will inspire us to follow in his footsteps. Future generations will cherish his memory, because few men have contributed so freely to the preservation of constitutional government.

Senator Borah achieved everlasting renown as an illustrious servant of Idaho and the Nation. He now joins his peers in the Valhalla of our great Republic. The Nation today salutes an American patriot whose fame is eternal. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. It is altogether fitting that the lady who unveils the statue should be here with us today, because she is the daughter of the late Senator John Thomas, who served in the Senate for many years, and who was the closest and dearest friend Senator Borah ever had in Idaho. She is also the wife of the junior Senator from Illinois, the State in which Senator Borah was born many years ago.

I take great pleasure at this moment in introducing Mrs. C. Wayland Brooks, who will unveil the statue. After she has unveiled the statue, eight midshipmen from Annapolis, all from Idaho, will approach the statue snd salute, while the band plays The Star-Spangled Banner. That will conclude the program. [Applause.]

(Mrs. Wayland Brooks thereupon unveiled the statue, while the United States Marine Band played the Idaho State song, Here We Have Idaho.)

(Following the unveiling of the statue, eight Naval Academy midshipmen, all from the State of Idaho, approached the statue and saluted, while the United States Marine Band played The Star-Spangled Banner.)

Our Foreign and Domestic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very excellent address entitled "Our Foreign and Domestic Policy," delivered by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] before the Economic Club of Detroit, at Detroit, Mich., on June 2, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, I am glad to have this opportunity to talk with you about national policies and programs as we see them in Washington.

Having won the election in 1946, and with eyes on 1948, Republicans are in much the same position as the faithful employee of a Scotch employer who was called in at the end of the year. After a New Year's greeting, the employer said:

"Here is a check for a New Year's gift. We have done well this year. If we do as well next year, bring the check around and I will sign it."

Republicans are hoping to have their 1946 checks signed in 1948.

Meanwhile, Congress faces a rather paradoxical situation. Many good people who loudly demanded less government from Washington in the summer and fall of 1946 are impatient because they are not getting quicker results by way of more Federal laws.

As I scan the Nation's newspapers and talk with people in all walks of life, I gather two distinct impressions about the temper of the country.

First, there is widespread uncertainty about the present and fear of what may happen in the future. This feeling pervades the whole range of foreign and domestic policy. People know there is starvation, distress, and spiritual downcast in Europe today. They see there is no peace throughout the world. They fear we are drifting toward war with Russia. And they are bewildered by the gigantic sums of money we are spending on foreign policies, which make little sense because they have not been well-grounded, consistent, nor clear.

The same feeling of uncertainty and fear marks conditions in our domestic affairs. Recently we had the pleasure of having Henry Ford talk to us in Washington. What he said was exceedingly well-received because he talked with sincerity and simplicity about a subject with which he is familiar—the making of motorcars. He told us about high hopes for his organization and described some of the difficulties they are having with materials, supplies, and production.

With simple directness he deplored the fact that production is only 65 percent of capacity, explaining that "It is simply a case of not being able to get enough of what it takes—steel, pig iron, tin, and hundreds of other things." He rejoiced in the fact that at long last unauthorized work stoppages had fallen off considerably and the number of grievances filed in the last year dropped from 27,504 to 12,196.

Here, we may observe, are two of the basic uncertainties besetting our national economy—failure in the quantity, quality, and flow of materials, and labor problems. To-

gether they keep a huge industry at 65 percent of capacity. This kind of uncertainty, with its dismal result, can be found over and over again in plant after plant, industry upon industry, throughout the Nation. It is supplemented by fears over prices, resentment over continued wartime taxes, and uncertainties over the form and extent of Government interference in the lives and business enterprise of our people. Some commentators in our national affairs are not sufficiently satisfied with all the current uncertainties surrounding them; they have to reach out to the 1950's and 1960's for a major depression which they glibly promise will lay this country low.

I will return to this again because it has a direct bearing upon the state of our foreign and domestic policy. Let me continue here with my second observation on what seems to be the prevailing temper of the country.

The present Congress had scarcely commenced its work when we began to be bombarded with criticism. People expected laws to come faster out of the legislative mill, and they were impatient when we did not drench them with a flood of new Federal laws. They expected Congress to work miracles with production, labor relations, reduction in cost of Government, taxation, and a score of other major problems. They expected Congress to correct all the errors in 14 weeks that had accumulated in 14 years. They charged Congress with playing politics every time a fundamental and honest point of difference was made. They charged us with shunning vital issues because we do not immediately pass legislation to aid schools, teachers, librarians, scientists, veterans, the aged, the sick, and the maimed. They are impatient with us because in the flick of an eyelash we do not pass laws to merge the Army and Navy, to establish universal military training, to commence the St. Lawrence seaway, to set up a gigantic housing program, to cut prices in half tomorrow at dawn, or abolish by law future booms and busts.

Irresponsible and immature as this kind of criticism certainly is, there is no question in my mind but that it is one of the prevailing features in the present temper of the country. Combined with the uncertainties and fears about the future, it marks the paradox of how the Nation could march so magnificently up the hill to war and yet descend so dismally to the valley of peace after thoroughly whipping the enemy.

Uncertainty and fear, criticism and impatience, are apparently the prevailing temper of the country. Whether we talk foreign or domestic affairs, we see the same moods at work. We see it in the press; we hear it in the clubs; it blares forth from the radio; and from a hundred different channels it reaches down to the man at the workbench and the woman in the home.

Now, I submit there is nothing at all unusual about this state of affairs. To make these conditions the basis of our national thinking is absurd, and as perspective gradually reasserts itself (as it most certainly will), these dismal moods will pass. In this mood we must not sacrifice our fundamental principles for immediate expediency.

The reason we have survived as a Republic for over 150 years when all other such attempts have failed is because through our bill of rights we guarantee the security of the individual against government tyranny.

An experience which we had while at Marseilles, France, on a war-investigating trip illustrates this difference in fundamental psychology in government, and is one of the reasons it is difficult to find a common denominator in our thinking with some other countries. The commanding general told of getting complaints from the French farmers about the conduct of displaced persons in a Russian displaced-persons camp near there. The farmers were missing cattle, chickens, and personal property. The Russian colonel in charge was called to the American general's office and asked to investigate. He departed, and returned in about the time required to reach the camp and return. He clicked his heels, saluted, and reported that everything had been taken care of; and when asked "How?" he said "We shot 1 and incarcerated 20." No investigation. Quick government action; but not justice as we know it.

Uncertainty, disillusionment, and fear follow inevitably on the heels of every major war. In the last war almost all of Europe was laid waste. Millions of people were scattered, imprisoned, or killed. Settled boundaries were wiped out, and the governmental stability of Europe was disorganized. Farms and orchards were overrun and impaired. Factories and cities were leveled. Highways and communication lines were blocked or destroyed. Trade and industry sank to low ebb. Food stores were rapidly depleted or confiscated. The rubble of war stretched from Normandy to the Urals.

Surely here are reasons enough for the starvation, suffering, and despair of a great civilization. They explain the desperate plight of the people. They account for much of the civil strife and hatreds which have swept over Europe and parts of Asia in the grim wake of war. They indicate the great magnitude of the task of peacemaking and reconstruction which still lie before us. And they give the lie to those facile critics in our midst who seem to think we can restore immediately the health of a torn and bleeding civilization with a few international organizations, and the mere loan of American dollars.

We did not experience the devastation of war in our own country, but we did not escape the impact upon our lives. Few families have escaped the loss or maiming of one dear to them. Our national debt rose to the fantastic sum of $271,000,000,000. This, and the inflationary effect of more than $23,000,000,000 of money in circulation exerted a tremendous upward pressure upon our price system. The life of every able-bodied person was held at the disposal of the war effort. Factories were practically commandeered when Government controlled materials and production. Wages in some instances rose to fantastic heights because war demands production at any cost, and Government became the prime purchaser. Through unprecedented powers freely granted the President and all agencies of government, the whole of American life was regimented by priorities, controls, and rationing. Annual expenditures of the Federal Government rose from a mere $9,000,000,000 in 1939 to over $100,000,000,000 at the peak of the war effort in 1945. In the same period the number of taxpayers making Federal returns increased from 7,633,000 to 47,111,000. Government bureaus multiplied in droves, while the number of people in Federal employ rose from 920,310 to more than 3,700,000.

No one can begin to describe what the late war cost us in terms of lost lives, swollen Government, disorganization of our economy, and disruption in the lives and affairs of our people. It would be rash indeed to contend that we can return to the arts and customs of peace with the simplicity and suddenness with which a light switch may be flicked on and off. Critics are irresponsible who believe we can pick up where we left off, uninfluenced by the forces heated in the intense flames of a 4-year global war. And those who think we can re-enter our domestic household, give health, security, and abundance to our people, and feed and rebuild the world in the two bewildering years since VE-day, are either colossally naive or downright stupid in their grasp of practical affairs. They do not realize how, after every catastrophe, there must be a clearing away of the rubble and a period of painful readjustment before the healing processes of reconstruction can begin. No amount of fine-spun dreams can gloss over these stubborn realities.

FOREIGN POLICY

We fought the war to stop the march of dictatorial government toward world domination. We fought to preserve liberty and freedom abroad as a necessary step in safeguarding freedom and security here at home. We determined that the practices of aggression must henceforth cease and that nations are to be politically free in the framework of world organizations capable of guaranteeing orderly development, justice and peace. We expressed these ideals in the Atlantic Charter and in the collateral organizations designed for what we hoped would be a different and better world. For these ideals we altered our past foreign policy and our world outlook. We made great sacrifices in war, and we have contributed liberally to alleviate the suffering and devastation caused by war. We asked nothing in loot or territory for ourselves.

During the war, and so long as each was threatened, our allies led us to believe their war aims were the same as ours. They either joined with us in our hopes for future peace, security, and a free world, or accepted our military and economic aid without questioning our expressed assumptions that they were as one with us in desiring a better world.

We followed this policy through all the dark days of war. When the dawn of victory came, when it became apparent that our enemies in the West and in the East could not hold out against us much longer, and when by the same token the fears of our allies began to recede, the ideals for which we fought were thrust against the hard realities of the national interests of those who fought with us in common cause. As Europe sank into chaos in the closing days of the war, we found many of our ideals compromised either in concessions or violations of agreements reached at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

While we strive valiantly to feed the starving, heal the sick, and restore the enterprise of war-torn people everywhere, we find one of our allies draining their substance, drafting their manpower, quartering her armies on their land, removing plants and machinery and raw materials, and generating chaos wherever she cannot otherwise command and control. International organizations are blocked in what should be their normal functions. Just treaties cannot be written to start the world toward peace. The desperate need for restoration cannot proceed because it seems that chaos best meets the aims of our former ally and friend.

The central fact of the moment is that the destruction of our Nazi and Japanese enemies left a vacuum in the political life of Europe and Asia which Russia seems determined to fill. It makes no difference that Russia fought to prevent similar expansion by the Nazis in Europe. It make no difference that we all joined cause to insure peace, freedom, and justice. It makes no difference that we have done everything possible to guarantee security to Russia and to satisfy her with political concessions, vast quantities of goods, and other material aids. Neither our earnest pleas nor our protests seem to temper the Russian drive to dominate Europe and Asia by her own forces or through agents and instruments under her control.

These were the circumstances which led to a dramatic turn in American foreign policy embodied in the Greek and Turkish loan proposals. Congress sees the essence of this policy to be that at long-last the United States has given notice to the world that we did not rise in our might to crush

one despotism only to make it easy for another despotism to shackle the people of the world.

I supported the Greek-Turkish loan on that basis. I believe the principle is sound: It signifies a return to the ideals for which we went to war. We now in our press set forth in no mistakable terms the simple fact that we are done with the barter of principles and that trifling with the freedom and rights of independent nations is at an end so far as our weight and determination can turn the scales.

It is impossible for me to say I am in equal agreement with the means we have chosen to emphasize the present turn of policy. To me the loan is a stop-gap. We cannot stop communism by cash. The loan is only a symbol of our determination to stand against aggression, to do our part in restoring the economy of the world and in keeping the peoples of the world free. We need to implement this by a foreign policy consistent as a whole, founded on right principle, and clearly defined in its geography, economics, political, and social aspects.

We do not have such a policy today. We take steps as they are forced upon us by circumstances. We often speak and act in contradictory terms. In our international dealings we support measures which we know do violence to every principle we cherish.

Much has been said about "bipartisan foreign policy," as if the great political parties were in singular harmony on all phases of our international affairs. This is not so, and it does great injustice to Republican leaders to have to work under such a popular misconception.

Foreign policy is a combination of the attitude we take toward other countries, of the objectives we seek in furthering our national interests abroad and of the means we use to implement our attitude and objectives. Foreign and domestic policy is and must be closely related. If this policy is to be truly bipartisan, the leaders of the party out of power must be taken into complete confidence of the Administration which conducts our foreign relations. They must be in on every aspect of policy, the attitude we take, the objectives we seek, and the means we employ. So far as I know, we have never had such a bipartisan policy.

We have had a form of very worth while, but extremely limited collaboration between a few Republican leaders and the administration. Speaking with that clarity and candor which has earned for him the great admiration of our people, Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, my colleague made this explanation of bipartisan foreign policy. He said:

"What the policy of the State Department is, I am unable to testify. There is considerable amount of misunderstanding about the so-called bipartisan foreign policy in this country. I have tried to make that plain on several occasions. It is very narrowly channeled within very specific things; namely, the minor peace treaties in Europe and the activities of the United Nations.

"I have never been consulted about the Chinese policy or the pan-American policy, or many other policies. * * *"

I feel sure he was not consulted in advance about the so-called Truman doctrine, and I know of no other Republican leaders who have been so consulted. Yet, in true stature as a statesman, Senator VANDENBERG gave of his wisdom to correct the first mistakes of that policy and to make it workable. In this he had the strong support of his party.

Simple common sense should warn us that we cannot play a proper part in world affairs merely by lavish loans or by blaring out words on Voice of America programs. The outpouring of dollars through the Export-Import Bank, the International Fund Bank, relief loans and gifts at the rate of billions of dollars each year can only lead to the draining of American resources and to the return of wartime rationing under some new version of the OPA. Here is where foreign and domestic policy overlap. While these loans and gifts are stated in terms of dollars, they mean nothing unless translated into American goods. This means American food products, industrial raw materials, and finished machinery and manufactured products. It means the products of our farms, our forests, our mines. It means that millions of American workmen are laboring for people in foreign countries. An exchange by which we send $15,000,000,000 abroad in goods and services, and receive only $4,000,000,000 in return, is not a healthy exchange. If continued indiscriminately, it will delude Europe, delay its recovery while our own country grows progressively poorer.

The impact of such loans can be seen in the present difficulties of our home economy. Thousands of producers speak of shortages of materials and rising price of supplies. Housing lags for want of building materials. Farmers need tractors and cannot get them. Over-all is the strong pressure foreign loans exert upon domestic prices.

Take the simple question of wheat prices. We made certain loans to France, England and other countries. Wheat was $1.50 a bushel. By virtue of these loans, each foreign country came into the American market with dollars to purchase wheat. The price rose sharply and is now from $2.64 to $2.73 a bushel. The same thing is true of other foods, raw materials, and manufactured goods. The whole process leads inevitably to a vicious cycle. High wheat prices encourage further production and bring in the marginal producer. When these uncompensated foreign loans dwindle and cease, as they most certainly will some day, we shall be in danger of high cost overproduction, rapidly falling prices, followed by business failures, bankruptcies, and unemployment.

Lavish and indiscriminate loans, as we have made in the past, do Europe little permanent good, and ill-serve American home economy. Political loans that are frittered away in supporting military operations in musical comedy brigades are worse than useless. Food for immediate relief, loans to restore the self-sufficiency of Europe, followed by trade policies carefully planned to result in a balanced exchange of goods and services, and a firm insistence directly to Russia and through the United Nations that we shall not stand idly by while she pours Europe down the Communist drain, are policies Americans might well support. But the administration, while giving the appearance of following such policies, constantly belies them in practice. Congress is rarely consulted in advance. As a consequence, we are time and again faced with the extremely distasteful duty of upholding the administration and accepting the lesser evils flowing from stupidity and mistakes in foreign policy, like the father making good the overdrafts of a wayward son. Don't misunderstand me. I am for genuine bipartisan foreign policy. To call such transactions bipartisan foreign policy is a gross misconception, and the people ought to know that Republicans support no such makeshifts.

When we turn from foreign to domestic affairs, we see a rather curious spectacle. Congress is being violently criticized for carrying out the exact program promised by the winning party in the elections last November.

In my judgment that party campaigned on six basic issues on which they pledged action if given control of Congress. These issues are:

1. Progressive elimination of controls.
2. Reduction in the number of Federal bureaus and employees, especially Communists and fellow travelers.
3. Decrease in Government spending, a balanced budget, and debt reduction.
4. Tax relief.
5. Legislation to redress the balance between labor and management.
6. Return to government by law as against arbitrary use of Executive powers.
7. Maximum preservation of home rule as against centralization in Washington.

The program was intended to stop the undesirable trends and practices of the last 14 years. It was intended to speed our reconversion to full peacetime economy by giving the utmost encouragement and freedom to enterprise consistent with the national interest. It was a program to clear the ground of wartime operations as the first step to future peacetime prosperity.

It was not intended to be a program of social experimentation, lavish spending, huge public works, or a guaranty against all national ills.

I submit that the program undertaken by this Congress is exactly the one pledged, and that it is moving courageously and efficiently toward its consummation. We are doing this in the face of many obstacles thrown in our path by those who resist fair labor laws, tax relief, reduction in government spending, and a decrease in the size of government bureaus and employees.

Let us see what has been accomplished on these six basic issues:

First. Progressive elimination of controls.

All rationing has been removed except rent control. A new rent-control bill will pass this week, placing control in the hands of local boards recommended by the governors. In other words, it returns it to the respective States.

Sugar controls have been modified and will terminate in October this year.

The war powers have been limited and now extend to a few items only, such as foreign trade.

There has been a reduction in the number of Federal bureaus and employees, especially Communists and fellow travelers.

There will be a decrease in government spending, a balanced budget, and debt reduction.

The President and his agencies have submitted 12 appropriations bills for the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1947. He has placed the minimum cost of Government for that year at $37,500,000,000. This would cost the taxpayer more in taxes than it costs them to eat and drink.

In prior Congresses laws were prepared in the bureaus and agencies, and even the White House, and sent to Congress as must legislation to be passed as drafted. This included appropriations.

Things are different now.

For the first time open hearings are being held in the Senate on all appropriation bills.

After days of hearings, wherever possible appropriations are being cut and the cost of government reduced.

Have you ever tried to prune a bureaucracy? Let me give you one example of the pressure that is brought against such pruning, which I shall read from the Washington News. This is a report from a Mrs. Johnston, customs collector at Minneapolis, to her chief, the Custom Commissioner, W. R. Johnson, in Washington. I quote:

"I have written to the importers, to civic organizations such as the chamber of commerce, to the mayors, and to the foreign departments of banks which handle foreign credit.

"The Customs Service Association (employees' organization) wired our two Senators and the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire.

"The entire customs personnel, members of their families, and friends, are sending letters and post cards to the Senators involved."

So, you see that every time that we try to cut a Government department that department and others go into action and generate all kinds of resistance to these reductions so that it is a very difficult job for us to get the unbiased facts, and to save the taxpayers' money from being lavishly expended.

Similar pressure is applied through practically every agency. Let me give you an example of the way in which appropriations bills were handled formerly: On June 27, 1945, an appropriation bill reached the Senate. A special meeting of the Appropriations Committee was called for 2 p. m. that day. The committee was told that this bill, which appropriated better than $80,000,000,000, had to be passed and signed by June 30—within 3 days—or our Army would be without funds.

TAX RELIEF

Now, what are the facts on personal income-tax relief?

Both Houses of Congress have passed a bill reducing personal income taxes from 10½ percent to 30 percent. A conference of both Houses has agreed on the bill. The House will pass it today, the Senate by Wednesday, and it will be on the President's desk this week for his signature.

Now, what have we done on labor legislation?

Both Houses of Congress have passed a labor relations bill. A conference of both Houses has agreed on this bill. Both Houses will pass the conference bill this week, and it will be on the President's desk before the end of the week for his signature.

The majority party in Congress last fall insisted there were Communists and fellow travelers in government and that they should be thrown out.

This was laughed at by those in the executive branch. In the last month we are told that before we can start the process of getting them out we must appropriate $24,000,000. That is millions, fellow citizens. Then we are told that the top of the agency can use his discretion (after they use this money) as to whether or not they will be ousted from his department.

J. Edgar Hoover has elaborate files and evidence, collected by the aid of your tax dollars, covering these very same "Commies and fellow travelers," and I can tell you a quicker and less expensive way for the Administrator to get ride of them in the policy-making branch of his agency. It is by having him use the phone and ask Mr. Hoover for his evidence.

All this eyewash as to the cost, fair trial, and terrific job it will be to find these subversives in our Government will get us nowhere when the administration of an agency has the sole discretion in the discharge of them.

The investigative function of Congress is another important function of government. The white light of publicity has a very cleansing effect on public officials. It cannot be used by a totalitarian government, and is too seldom used by the party in power in a democracy.

Last week the Senate Judiciary Committee appointed a subcommittee to investigate the Attorney General and the Justice Department as to its investigation of the primary election of a Congressman in Kansas City, Mo., last fall. We only started when we learned that much of the evidence had been stolen or destroyed by safecrackers or others last Wednesday night. So far the evidence shows that the FBI had instructions to make only a preliminary examination, and it was limited to six witnesses to be questioned. On January 6, 1947, the FBI investigation was closed by orders of the Attorney General. You will learn more about this when we hear from the Attorney General and J. Edgar Hoover, whom I have called to testify on Thursday of this week.

It is not the number of laws which are passed by Congress which will determine whether or not Congress performs its services to the Nation as a whole. It is the kind of laws which are passed. It must always be remembered by the people that, as a rule, the passing of laws creates additional bureaus and agencies, and therefore the tax burden of the people back home is increased. It must also be remembered that in the passing of laws, as a rule, the rights and liberties of people are restricted. Therefore it is only when the general welfare of the people demands the passage of legislation that Congress should act.

It is by working together, by making democracy and our society function effectively, that we can best create the conditions which will make America strong internally and respected internationally. Much of the world is still looking desperately to America for leadership. If we put our own affairs in order and demonstrate to other nations that our system is still capable of providing the most good for the greatest number, then we will by that fact alone, enlist their support, we will strengthen democratic tendencies within those countries, and go forward reducing the possibilities that continuing chaos and disintegration in those areas will bring on another world conflict.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 28, Members of the House were limited to 15 minutes to discuss one of the most important items in the 1948 Agriculture Department appropriation bill—an REA amendment. This drastic limitation was on the motion of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and was imposed over my objection.

The gentleman from Illinois exercised his prerogative to close debate on my amendment for adequate funds for rural electrification.

In his usual manner, he lectured us and gave us "light instead of heat," to use his own words. He told us that I was "greatly mistaken" and adjured us that "we might just as well be honest about it."

Now the gentleman from Illinois has no monopoly on either honesty or knowledge, especially on rural electrification. I have led the fight for REA for the last 15 years, and have seldom, if ever, had the cooperation of the gentleman from Illinois.

When I spoke in support of my amendment to give REA $300,000,000 in loan funds, I specifically stated that while I should like to see the co-ops get the $361,000,000 they say they need, I was only asking for the $300,000,000 the head of the REA asked for.

I was denied the opportunity to defend myself from the unwarranted and meaningless inuendoes thrown at me by the gentleman from Illinois, who refused to yield to me and then proceeded to present as misleading a statement in opposition to my amendment as I have heard on the floor of this House.

Now the facts were more readily available to the gentleman from Illinois, in his capacity as chairman of the subcommittee, than they were to any other Member of the House. Some of those facts, including the truth with respect to this matter on which I was challenged, appear in the printed hearings.

I challenge each and every one of the gentleman's statements made in his closing remarks as they appear on page 6027 of the RECORD.

The printed hearings will show that the aggregate of the cooperatives' questionnaires, filed with the committee, was not $361,000,000, as stated by the gentleman. Mr. Ellis, executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and a former Member of this House, testified before the subcommittee as to these questionnaires. He stated that 620 systems had reported that they would need $290,404,317 before June 30, 1948. By extending the average to the 900 systems, he arrived at a total of $422,000,000, from which he subtracted the $60,000,000 which he estimated was available to REA for allocations from 1947 funds, leaving a balance of $362,000,000. This appears in detail on pages 1933 and 1934 of the hearings.

Let me say in all seriousness that REA never had a better friend than Clyde Ellis was during his services in this House, and has been ever since he left this body.

I made no mistake in my references to these figures. The record was there and I read it correctly. But this is only a minor example of the inability or unwillingness of the gentleman from Illinois to report correctly facts to which he had complete and ready access. He reported to the House that, "we"—meaning the committee, I suppose—"went to the trouble of analyzing" the questionnaires sent in by the co-ops. And then he told us what was in them by selecting 2 of the more than 600 questionnaires. I have taken the trouble to examine these questionnaires, and I tell you that their contents were not correctly represented to this House.

First, with respect to the Tennessee case, the gentleman referred to it as "a request for a line to cost $6,000 a mile." This reference was completely misleading. The questionnaire of the Forked Deer Electric Cooperative of Halls, Tenn., dated April 2, 1947, was the only questionnaire in the Tennessee group which could have been interpreted as showing such a cost. But the gentleman from Illinois neglected to disclose what the questionnaire actually showed.

This cooperative reported that its needs until June 30, 1948, amounted to $150 000 including $50,000 covered by an application already made to REA for "member service extensions along existing lines." The report did not specify the number of miles of line included in the application which had already been made. But it did indicate clearly and specifically that the $150,000 was required to serve 750 consumers, and that 25 miles of line would be built for this

purpose. The significant fact in this report was not the number of miles of line, but the number of consumers who would be reached by member service extensions for which the money would be needed. The average cost of these extensions, as disclosed by the report, was $200 per consumer, a modest and reasonable figure, as was apparent to anyone who cared to ascertain the truth.

As to the second request presented by the gentleman from Illinois, which he described only as including 115 miles of line to serve 62 consumers, investigation shows that this request was made by the Hot Springs County Rural Electric Association of Thermopolis, Wyo., which serves a very thinly settled area. The request indicated that many of the cooperative's consumers were large users of electric energy. A further check disclosed that this cooperative was already operating 133 miles of line to serve only 122 consumers, some of whom used tremendous amounts of electricity.

None of these pertinent facts were disclosed by the gentleman from Illinois. These two isolated requests were deliberately selected to create as bad an impression as possible, an impression of waste and extravagance when, as a matter of fact, they each represent a perfectly proper estimate of funds to meet legitimate needs in their respective areas.

At page 1502 of the hearings, the gentleman from Illinois, referring specifically to the Tennessee case, said, "This must be an abnormal condition." Well, it was not an abnormal condition, as the gentleman could have ascertained very quickly if he had placed all of the facts in the record that were contained in the questionnaire. If that had been done, it would have been apparent to the members of the REA staff present, and to every other member of the committee that this was not an abnormal condition. The handling of this matter in the committee and his presentation of this case to the House as a sample of the committee's analysis was grossly misleading, to say the least of it. It was calculated to mislead the members in their consideration of the REA appropriation.

The committee had all of these questionnaires available for several weeks. They certainly had the time and the staff to analyze them. If they did make an honest and careful analysis, it was not presented to the House.

It will suffice to show how distorted a picture the gentleman from Illinois presented on the floor of the House if we merely consider all of the replies received from Tennessee and Wyoming in response to the questionnaires sent to the cooperatives in these States. At my request, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has tabulated these replies, with the following results:

Nine Tennessee cooperatives replied to the questionnaire. Of these, eight showed needs until June 30, 1948, for $7,533,000 to build 5,249 miles of line to serve 21,430 consumers. The average cost of construction per mile, arrived at by simple division, is $1,458. In addition, one of the eight showed need for $135,027 for system improvement, consisting of rephasing some lines. The ninth system reporting was the Forked Deer Electric Cooperative, one of the two selected by the gentleman from Illinois for presentation, which requested, as I have already stated, $150,000 for service extensions to 750 consumers. Of course the 25 miles to which he referred did not cover all these extensions.

Six Wyoming cooperatives replied to the questionnaire. Of these, 5, including Hot Springs Country Rural Electric Association—the second case selected by the gentleman from Illinois—requested $369,500 to build 295.5 miles of line to serve 369 consumers. The sixth indicated need for approximately $50,000 for initial construction work to serve veterans who would settle 83 farm units being opened up in the Heart Mountain division of the Shoshone reclamation project.

A complete disclosure of all these facts by the gentleman from Illinois and a presentation of a similar analysis of all of the questionnaires which were available to his committee, would have given the Members a much more fair and honest basis upon which to determine their vote on the vital issue before the House.

Ordinary standards of fairness and honesty should also have induced the gentleman to make reference, at least, to the responses he received to his questioning of REA witnesses concerning line-construction costs. The gentleman, as chairman of the subcommittee, sought and received specific answers from the REA Administrator and his associates who appeared before the subcommittee. Those answers which appear on pages 1502 to 1504, an 1537 to 1538 of the printed hearings, definitely indicate that the average cost per mile of line financed by REA were actually lower than the average costs reported by the Federal Power Commission. And anyone familiar with the Federal Power Commission's method of estimating costs, knows that their estimates relate to actual construction costs only, and do not include engineering, right-of-way, clearing, and general overhead costs, which are included in the REA average-cost figures.

The gentleman from Illinois seemed to exhibit something less than the candor that was to be expected when he compared the isolated Tennessee case with the Power Commission's estimate. All of us who are interested in rural electrification know that REA cut rural electric line construction costs by more than half and thereby made the tremendous expansion of farm electrification possible. But the gentleman from Illinois seemed to deliberately close his eyes to this well-established fact when he reached into thin air for something that might be considered damaging in order to defeat my attempt to give the farmers of America the means with which to obtain the electric services they so vitally need, and to which they are entitled.

The gentleman from Illinois was most reckless in his presentation of other so-called facts. I have no quarrel with the committee's action in substituting the Treasury for RFC as REA's banker. Although I disagree vigorously with the 10-percent cut made in the Budget estimate for REA's loan funds, I have already sufficiently stated my very valid objection to this action. I do not intend to take time now to go into this further.

I trust that the Senate will rectify this situation. But I do want to make it crystal clear that I was not at all taken in by the misleading arguments the gentleman from Illinois employed in presenting the $25,000,000 cut as an economy or a saving. During general debate on the bill on Tuesday, May 27, the gentleman on three occasions made the claim that the change in the banking arrangement, brought about by the legislative proviso, made possible a saving or an economy of $25,000,000 in cash. That claim is just so much tommyrot. The Budget provided for a $25,000,000 appropriation as part of the total $250,000,000 to be made available for self-liquidating rural electrification loans. The separate provision was a technicality to permit REA to comply with the provisions of the basic law which limited RFC advances to 85 percent of the collateral put by REA.

Cutting off this $25,000,000 was no more an economy or a saving than the cutting off of any part of the $225,000,000 Treasury loan recommended by the committee would have been. This was no saving or economy. Actually and truthfully, it was a denial to 50,000 farm families of an opportunity to obtain electric service through REA financing. It was a body blow to the hopes and dreams of these thousands of farm people, many of whom are ex-servicemen who had hoped they would in 1948 have an opportunity to participate in the Federal investment in the great national rural-electrification program.

No, the gentleman from Illinois did not pull the wool over my eyes with his unsubstantiated claims of economy. Nor did he fool the people out on kerosene-lamp-lighted farms. If there was anybody mistaken, if there was anybody who was not squarely facing the facts, it was the gentleman from Illinois and not the gentleman from Mississippi.

The 15-minute gag limit on debate, maneuvered by the gentleman from Illinois, may have suppressed the truth on that day. But the truth will out. It is fortunate indeed that there is still time to rectify the mistake the gentleman from Illinois has induced the House to make.

I, for one, will do everything in my power to that end; and I believe when the facts are known to the Members of the other body every dollar I asked for in my amendment will be provided.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to go to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for either advice or information on the subject of rural electrification. I have carried on this battle for the last 15 years to try to get this service extended in every farm home in every State in the Union.

When I began this fight practically every other civilized country was ahead

of the United States in rural electrification. We had 10.9 percent of our farms electrified in 1934 while Japan had 90 percent, Germany had 90 percent, France and Italy had 94 percent, and even New Zealand, a new and sparsely settled country, had 65 percent of her farms electrified.

The marvelous progress we have made in this drive toward an electrified rural America is clearly shown by the following table:

Rural Electrification Administration: Number and percent of farms receiving central-station electric service, by States, 1934, 1940, 1945, and 1946

State, division, and territory	Farms receiving central-station electric service, Dec. 31, 1934 [1]		Farms receiving central-station electric service, Apr. 1, 1940 [3]		Farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1945 [5]		Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1945	Farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1946 [5]		Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1946	Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1946	Farms receiving central-station electric service, Dec. 31, 1946 [5]		Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to Dec. 31, 1946
	Number	Percent [2]	Number	Percent [4]	Number	Percent [6]	Percent	Number	Percent [6]	Percent	Number	Number	Percent [6]	Percent
Maine	13,959	33.3	20,221	51.9	27,087	64.2	94.0	29,072	68.9	108.3	15,113	30,165	71.5	116.1
New Hampshire	9,495	53.7	10,845	65.5	15,298	81.4	61.1	16,054	85.5	69.1	6,559	16,605	88.4	74.9
Vermont	7,945	29.4	12,213	51.8	18,916	71.4	138.1	21,857	82.5	175.1	13,912	23,708	89.5	198.4
Massachusetts	14,494	41.3	26,220	82.2	33,287	89.9	129.7	34,071	92.1	135.1	19,577	34,647	93.6	139.0
Rhode Island	1,975	45.6	2,457	81.5	3,148	87.4	59.4	3,248	90.1	64.5	1,273	3,308	91.8	67.5
Connecticut	10,133	31.5	16,995	80.3	20,155	90.6	98.8	21,133	95.0	108.5	10,995	21,251	95.5	109.6
New England	58,006	36.7	88,951	65.8	117,891	78.4	103.2	125,435	83.5	116.2	67,429	129,684	86.3	123.6
New York	57,825	32.7	102,283	66.7	125,433	83.9	116.9	134,237	89.8	132.1	76,412	137,986	92.3	138.6
New Jersey	15,162	51.6	21,298	82.4	23,697	90.4	56.3	24,656	94.0	62.6	9,494	24,851	94.7	63.9
Pennsylvania	45,182	23.6	94,081	55.7	125,612	73.1	178.0	136,388	79.4	201.9	91,206	141,544	82.4	213.3
Middle Atlantic	118,169	29.7	217,662	62.5	274,742	79.1	132.5	295,281	85.0	149.9	177,112	304,381	87.6	157.6
Ohio	48,048	18.8	137,680	58.9	165,387	75.0	244.2	182,424	82.7	279.7	134,376	191,190	86.7	297.9
Indiana	23,476	11.7	91,127	49.4	125,931	71.6	436.4	137,369	78.1	485.1	113,893	142,857	81.2	508.5
Illinois	28,379	12.3	80,627	37.5	121,771	59.6	329.1	134,890	66.0	375.3	106,511	141,929	69.5	400.1
Michigan	42,152	21.4	131,126	69.9	146,325	83.5	247.1	153,725	87.7	264.7	111,573	158,109	90.2	275.1
Wisconsin	39,206	19.6	87,556	46.9	123,096	69.2	213.7	137,751	77.5	251.4	98,545	144,365	81.2	268.2
East North Central	181,261	16.7	527,516	52.4	682,420	71.5	276.5	746,159	78.2	311.6	564,898	778,450	81.6	329.5
Minnesota	13,783	6.8	50,075	25.4	93,208	49.3	576.3	106,284	56.2	671.1	92,501	110,800	58.6	703.9
Iowa	32,047	14.4	73,308	34.4	133,113	63.7	315.4	155,506	74.4	385.2	123,459	163,278	78.1	409.5
Missouri	17,893	6.4	39,204	15.3	77,852	32.0	335.1	97,942	40.3	447.4	80,049	108,786	44.8	508.0
North Dakota	1,968	2.3	3,218	4.4	7,498	10.8	281.0	8,601	12.4	337.0	6,633	9,451	13.6	380.2
South Dakota	2,939	3.5	3,981	5.5	8,964	13.0	205.0	10,143	14.8	245.1	7,204	10,866	15.8	269.7
Nebraska	9,544	7.1	22,832	18.9	39,120	35.0	310.0	40,689	36.4	326.3	31,145	40,378	36.1	323.1
Kansas	13,224	7.6	27,960	17.9	46,056	32.6	248.3	51,273	36.3	287.7	38,049	54,231	38.4	310.0
West North Central	91,398	7.7	220,578	20.2	405,811	39.3	344.0	470,438	45.6	414.7	379,040	497,790	48.2	444.6
Delaware	1,791	17.3	3,545	39.4	5,650	60.8	215.5	6,357	68.4	254.9	4,566	6,452	69.4	260.2
Maryland	6,791	15.3	17,170	40.7	24,124	58.4	255.2	26,990	65.3	297.4	20,199	30,036	72.7	342.3
Virginia	14,954	7.6	42,144	24.1	65,035	37.6	334.9	77,786	44.9	420.2	62,832	84,854	49.0	467.4
West Virginia	3,647	3.5	25,199	25.4	39,148	40.1	973.4	44,137	45.2	1,110.2	40,490	48,331	49.5	1,225.2
North Carolina	9,672	3.2	67,627	24.3	113,574	39.5	1,074.3	131,378	43.7	1,258.3	121,706	141,237	49.1	1,360.2
South Carolina	3,796	2.3	27,568	20.0	55,114	37.3	1,351.9	63,227	42.8	1,565.6	59,431	68,147	46.1	1,695.2
Georgia	6,956	2.8	42,409	19.6	82,248	36.4	1,082.4	95,727	42.4	1,276.2	88,771	103,531	45.8	1,388.3
Florida	5,700	7.8	15,476	24.9	24,750	40.5	334.2	30,792	50.3	440.2	25,092	32,389	53.0	468.2
South Atlantic	53,307	4.6	241,138	23.7	409,643	39.3	668.5	476,394	45.7	793.6	423,087	514,977	49.4	866.1
Kentucky	8,480	3.0	38,607	15.3	72,602	30.4	756.2	87,791	36.8	935.3	79,311	94,571	39.7	1,015.2
Tennessee	9,727	3.6	38,884	15.7	71,458	30.5	634.6	83,381	35.6	757.2	73,654	87,487	37.3	799.4
Alabama	11,053	4.0	33,907	14.6	73,129	32.7	561.6	86,564	38.8	683.2	75,511	94,133	42.1	751.7
Mississippi	2,802	.9	26,078	9.0	52,816	20.0	1,784.9	64,435	24.5	2,199.6	61,633	75,047	28.5	2,578.3
East South Central	32,062	2.8	137,476	13.4	270,005	28.1	742.1	322,171	33.6	904.8	290,109	351,238	36.6	995.5
Arkansas	2,943	1.2	21,303	9.8	46,149	23.2	1,468.1	63,102	31.8	2,044.1	60,159	68,558	34.5	2,229.5
Louisiana	2,826	1.7	16,058	10.7	36,778	28.4	1,201.4	49,239	38.1	1,642.4	46,413	54,933	42.5	1,843.8
Oklahoma	5,648	2.6	20,149	11.2	49,473	30.0	775.9	64,548	39.2	1,042.8	58,900	70,134	42.6	1,141.7
Texas	11,466	2.3	79,127	18.9	162,290	42.2	1,315.4	196,910	51.1	1,617.3	185,444	212,508	55.2	1,753.4
West South Central	22,883	2.0	136,637	14.2	294,690	33.6	1,187.8	373,799	42.6	1,533.5	350,916	406,133	46.3	1,674.8
Montana	2,768	5.5	7,947	19.0	11,401	30.2	311.9	13,497	35.8	387.6	10,729	14,299	37.9	416.6
Idaho	13,433	29.8	25,439	58.3	32,139	77.4	139.3	34,733	83.7	158.6	21,300	35,644	85.9	165.3
Wyoming	527	3.0	3,474	23.1	5,632	43.1	968.7	6,283	48.0	1,092.2	5,756	6,485	49.6	1,130.6
Colorado	7,145	11.2	14,823	28.8	24,637	51.7	244.8	28,133	59.1	293.7	20,988	29,986	63.0	319.7
New Mexico	1,350	3.3	4,479	13.1	7,645	25.7	466.3	10,250	34.5	659.3	8,900	10,618	35.8	686.5
Arizona	5,577	29.6	5,607	30.4	9,280	70.6	66.4	9,594	73.0	72.0	4,017	10,703	81.4	91.9
Utah	16,130	52.5	17,411	68.5	20,019	76.1	24.1	20,762	78.9	28.7	4,632	20,872	79.3	29.4
Nevada	946	25.6	1,555	43.5	1,639	47.8	73.3	1,713	50.0	81.1	767	1,538	53.6	94.3
Mountain	47,876	17.6	80,735	34.6	112,392	52.9	134.8	124,965	58.8	161.0	77,089	130,445	61.4	172.5
Washington	40,060	47.5	58,283	71.4	68,194	85.4	70.2	72,388	90.6	80.7	32,328	74,670	93.5	86.4
Oregon	17,839	27.5	36,369	58.8	48,635	77.0	172.6	51,857	82.1	190.7	34,018	52,802	83.6	196.0
California	81,093	53.9	107,904	81.3	121,873	87.7	50.3	123,246	88.7	52.0	42,153	124,036	89.3	53.0
Pacific	138,992	46.4	202,556	73.3	238,702	84.7	71.7	247,491	87.8	78.1	108,499	251,508	89.2	81.0
United States	743,954	10.9	1,853,249	30.4	2,806,296	47.9	277.2	3,182,133	54.3	327.7	2,438,179	3,364,606	57.4	352.3

[1] Edison Electric Institute.
[2] Percent of all farms in State as shown by 1935 United States census of agriculture.
[3] 1940 United States census.
[4] Percent of all farms in State as shown by 1940 United States census.
[5] REA estimates, revised 1947, based on final United States census of agriculture, 1945.
[6] Percent of all farms in State as shown by 1945 United States census of agriculture.

Thus it will be seen that in 13 years the number of electrified homes in this country has increased from 10.9 percent to 57.4 percent; and those of us who are really interested in this cause are determined to move forward toward the electrification of every farm home in America.

Excise Tax on Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, certain members of the Ways and Means Committee have informed me that they intend to take up the subject of taxation with the object in view of rewriting the entire revenue act. In my opinion this action is long overdue and our entire revenue producing and social-security program needs a complete over-hauling.

The following exposé by officials of the Chillicothe, Ohio, telephone company, offers one glowing example of the need for tax-revision legislation.

I sincerely trust that members of the Ways and Means Committee will soon get busy on their noble objective and that the following may be given serious and corrective consideration:

The Internal Revenue Code as presently constituted provides for the imposition of excise taxes on communication services at the following rates:

	Percent
Telephone toll messages of 25 cents and over	25
Local telephone service and toll messages of 24 cents and under	15
Domestic telegraph, cable, and radio messages	25
International telegraph, cable, and radio messages	10
Leased wire services	25
Wire and equipment service	8

The excise taxes imposed on the services enumerated above are collected by the communications companies from the subscribers to the services. The companies are, therefore, acting in the capacity of tax collector for the United States Government, remitting collections monthly to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The tax is not a tax on the companies; in this case it is the subscribers to the services who are the taxpayers. In presenting this statement the Chillicothe Telephone Co. is therefore not seeking any tax relief for the telephone company, nor is it asking for any consideration for such company other than that the elimination of the taxes on the services mentioned would relieve the company of the expense and burden of collecting the tax from the subscribers and remitting it to the United States Government. This statement is, in effect, presented in behalf of the telephone-using public and is a reflection of widespread reaction to excise taxes on communication facilities from customers of telephone companies, and the operating companies as well, all over the United States.

Excise taxes are a deterrent to the use of telephone service. That excise taxes are, in fact, a deterrent to the use of telephone service and, therefore, to the fullest widespread use of communications within the country was recognized by the Government during the war, when it took the position that, if taxes on toll service were increased, they would act as a deterrent and therefore cause less use of equipment and lessen the need for the building of additional toll facilities, and therefore save critical materials.

A study of the history of excise taxes on communications services shows that this form of taxation has been used only in cases of emergency and has been repealed when the emergency has passed.

While it is understandable that high rates of tax were necessary to finance the war which recently ended, it is nevertheless difficult to understand why a social and business necessity should continue to be taxed as a luxury, or why it has been taxed at rates higher than those applied to luxury items—such as furs, jewelry, and toilet preparations, and amusements, theaters, night clubs, etc. These items are taxed at 20 percent, yet toll telephone messages are presently taxed at 25 percent.

Taxes on communications services are not properly classifiable as luxury taxes. Such taxes, as well as the luxury taxes, are selective sales taxes which fall with equal severity on rich and poor alike. They are not distributed equitably nor are they based on the fundamental principle of taxation—namely, ability to pay. They may be easy to administer, but ease of administration should not be a basis for imposition of a tax. There may be jutification for continuing true luxury taxes in times of peace, but there is no such justification for the taxation of necessities, and communications services are undeniably a necessary part of business and social life.

There has been, since the war ended, a great revival, on the part of telephone companies, of the country-wide program for providing and extending rural telephone service. Attention is called to the burden of this tax upon the rural telephone user.

The independent telephone industry, therefore, believes Congress should completely repeal the tax on communications services which are so vital to the business and social economy of the United States. Luxury taxes should not be imposed on necessities. Such a burden of taxation falls heavily upon the people of moderate means as well as upon the poorest classes of the community.

One Would Be Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on Monday, June 2, 1947, concerning Mr. Henry Wallace. I commend the reading of this short editorial to everyone as a very correct analysis of Mr. Wallace's recent efforts.

I think the editorial is interesting, too, in view of the fact that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt is reported by the newspapers to have said the other day that Mr. Wallace's speeches on the west coast had created a great deal of confusion among the people there.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE WOULD BE WORSE

Henry Wallace is gallivanting around over the country shuddering and shouting over the fearful things that will happen if the world is divided into two armed camps. No one in his right mind wants that to come to pass, but two camps with only one of them armed and able to defend itself might be far worse. It is invariably difficult to tell what Mr. Wallace means, even after the third or fourth explanation of what he says he meant to say the first time. It is not difficult, however, to suspect that Mr. Wallace is recommending a course of action that would result in the part of the world that would be free at the mercy of those who would have it otherwise.

Federal Trial Examiners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered here in Washington last Friday before the Federal Trial Examiners Conference. The address pertains to the several hundred hearing examiners who will be appointed under the Administrative Procedures Act.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL TRIAL EXAMINERS UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

It is very gratifying to be permitted to address this fine group, and I appreciate the opportunity. I am gratified also to see that the examiners present here tonight, as a group, are apparently keenly conscious of our collective responsibility—particularly since the enactment of Public Law 404, which provides for a new administrative procedure.

VALUE OF CONFERENCE

The organization of this examiners' conference is evidence of an understanding of the challenges inherent in the Administrative Procedure Act and is evidence likewise of a determination to assist in every manner in making the act workable.

At the outset of this discussion, permit me to make it clear that I am not attempting to pose as an expert or authority on the Administrative Procedure Act. I have had the benefit of some of the hearings which have been conducted on this subject in the past, and I have had the benefit of discussion with leaders of the American bar who participated in the original discussion of the act. I do not, however, feel competent to express more than a few limited conclusions with respect to section 11 of the act which, as you know, relates to examiners.

Let me make it clear also at the outset that my comments are solely my own with respect to selection of examiners. They are intended to be constructive, with the public interest in mind. It is not my intention to spearhead any kind of witch hunting.

OUR MUTUAL INTEREST IN ACT

We are all engaged in the same enterprise—making government a better servant of the people. You in the administrative branch of government, and we in the legislative branch, and those who are in the judicial branch, all have a common interest in securing the most effective use of the tech-

niques and standards established in the Administrative Procedure Act.

Our job is to work together and not for any one of us to invade the province of the other. Rather, we must build together a nation of laws which will result in greater justice and liberty for all concerned. Neither you nor I can do the job alone.

Our problem tonight is obviously not to go over the past history of this question, but rather to see what we can accomplish with the help of the Administrative Procedure Act.

NATURE OF EXAMINERS

The examiners are extremely important cogs in the machinery of this act. We know that the administrative process has been defended on the ground that it operated upon judicially tested patterns. We know that the examiners have been considered to be, in fact, the administrative master in chancery.

Nevertheless, we also know that the actual status of the examiners has been surprisingly undefined in an administrative twilight zone.

In recent years, there has been a tendency to batter down the functions of the examiner to an advisory level.

I am told that in the last decades there have been departmental hijacking attempts by some agencies to find substitutes for examiners, or at least to find substitutes for portions of their functions.

Many students of government have, however, felt that the status and the importance and the jurisdiction of the examiner must be maintained at a high level. I am told that in 1941 the Attorney General's committee deplored both the use of anonymous reviewers and also the practice of some agencies of making a marionette show of a hearing with the examiner serving as a sort of puppet.

The Administrative Procedure Act presumably removes the examiner from agency domination in selection and places him in a prominent position in statutory hearing cases, where the examiner is to be carefully chosen and is subject to disqualification upon the filing in good faith of a timely and sufficient affidavit of personal bias.

ACT'S HEARINGS POWERS

The act also establishes certain hearing powers for officers presiding at hearings. They can:

(1) Administer oaths and affirmations.

(2) Issue subpenas authorized by law.

(3) Rule upon offers of proof and receive relevant evidence.

(4) Take or cause depositions to be taken whenever the ends of justice would be served thereby.

(5) Regulate the course of the hearing.

(6) Hold conferences for the settlement or simplification of the issues by consent of the parties.

(7) Dispose of procedural requests or similar matters.

(8) Make decisions or recommend decisions in conformity with section 8.

(9) Take any other action authorized by agency rule consistent with this act.

Earlier in the act, in section 5 (c) we find that in the adjudication function, the examiner is apparently to participate in both the hearing and deciding function, and in section 8 (a) of the bill, it is apparent he could even be authorized to make the final decision.

It is quite apparent that the examiner will, however, function within the entire framework of the whole statute. It is equally apparent that the act endeavors to lay down fundamental requirements for the protection of private rights and the due administration of justice, which means that the function of the examiner in contested cases is extremely important.

SELECTION OF EXAMINERS

This brings us to the question of examiner personnel. The selection of examiner personnel is an extremely vital matter. It has been said that the qualifications to be written are those for administrative judges.

Congress has, of course, delegated the active function of writing these qualifications to the United States Civil Service Commission. The Commission in turn has to write its qualifications not in the shifting sands of administrative expediency, but on the enduring background of the statute and with reference to the objectives which Congress had in mind and still has in mind.

We may assume, of course, that the Commission will require such obviously indispensable qualifications as experience and education, integrity, a judicial approach, and personal efficiency. It is very easy to enumerate these more obvious requirements, but it is a much more difficult job to establish specific objective yardsticks.

We can and must establish objective standards, but in the last analysis it will be the attitude and the spirit which examiners bring to their jobs which will determine their success in this new role. You will remember that Dooley told us that common sense is man's best tool but that "it's the most uncommon sense of all."

We can outline the paper requirements for the examiners, but the issue will still be whether or not we can translate those paper requirements into living, working realities, when they are applied to candidates for positions so tremendously important and so consequential to both the Government and its citizens.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION'S ROLE

We all know, of course, that the act provides for a certification of eligible examiners by the Civil Service Commission, and we know further that the agencies can appoint the examiners from the eligible list.

The Administrative Procedure Act actually gives the Civil Service Commission an opportunity it has not had before. It gives the Commission an opportunity to demonstrate whether it can make its machinery function satisfactorily in this new field—where the public interest is such a dominant consideration and where Congress has been so intent on writing an administrative Magna Carta.

Section 11 of the act gives some very wide powers to the Commission, and Congress is looking to the Commission to exercise these powers wisely and carefully in the public interest.

MAJOR QUESTIONS BEFORE US

All of this brings us to the question of whether or not existing examiners should be reappointed and, secondly, how the new appointments to examiner positions should be made. The first problem is a very immediate one, since many examiners must be appointed in the immediate future, and the second problem is equally important because it can conceivably set an administrative pattern for decades to come.

At the outset we must realize that both the new category of examiner and the new technique of administrative process are going to be tested and under fire as a method of government. The results of that test depend to a large extent on the caliber of the examiners.

The general public has a tremendous stake in the new administrative process and in the selection of examiners. The agencies themselves likewise have a tremendous stake in the selection of examiners because once these appointments are made, eliminations are going to be difficult. If the system fails by reason of incompenent examiners or for any other reason, it is undoubtedly true that Congress would demand a new system.

ELIGIBILITY OF CURRENT EXAMINERS

The basic qualifications—the paper qualifications—must, of course, be adequate. With reference to existing hearing officers, it seems reasonable to conclude that they should be eligible to their positions but only when clearly qualified by experience, and particular fitness to perform the functions which are required under the terms of the new act.

In other words, the Civil Service Commission will probably want to investigate each case—both for present examiners and potential examiners—thoroughly and adequately. It is possible, incidentally, that in connection with these examinations and investigations the Commission may want to utilize its authority to set up advisory committees to secure outside views with reference to particular appointees. The importance of such committees would of necessity depend upon the over-all system which might be established to handle the selection of examiners.

VALUE OF COMPETITION

I do not want to be misinterpreted as even implying that existing examiners should not have proper and adequate consideration given to their experience. In fact, it is for that very reason that so many students of the Administrative Procedure Act have contended that existing examiners should compete with outsiders for these appointments. The existing examiners will, it is true, have an advantage, or presumably in most instances they will be able to produce definite measurable records of extremely pertinent experience.

On the basis of this experience, it would appear that the examining authorities will be able to certify to their qualifications with somewhat more certainty than they would be able to certify to the qualifications of a complete outsider. I believe that honest and conscientious examiners will welcome competition, because it will give them the opportunity to demonstrate that there is no self-perpetuating inner palace guard. It will give them an opportunity to demonstrate also that there is no perpetuation of any one dynasty of political ideology.

It would appear that this kind of competition would be fairer from a national standpoint, sounder from a public standpoint, and infinitely more desirable from an agency standpoint.

NUMBER OF EXAMINERS

I understand that about 200 examiners will be appointed, and I understand that about 150 of the present incumbents will probably meet the so-called paper qualifications, which would mean that if the 150 are found adequate about 50 positions will have to be filled from the ranks of outsiders.

My interest in this matter stems from the fact that the Judiciary Committee originally considered the Administrative Procedure Act, and, consequently, when this question of examiner appointments first came up my committee instructed me to make an inquiry with the Commissioner of the United States Civil Service Commission.

I did make such an inquiry.

MY LETTER TO MR. FLEMMING

In addition, I took the opportunity to communicate some personal sentiments to Commissioner Arthur Flemming on this matter. I would like to quote in part from my letter of April 5, 1947, because I know that you gentlemen are interested in getting a candid reaction on this subject. Some of you may have already noted the contents of my letter, because the American Bar Association Journal in its May issue was kind enough to reprint the letter in full. I quote:

"DEAR MR. FLEMMING: According to advice to me from some of the highest and most unimpeachable sources in the legal profession, it is feared that these hearings examiners will be appointed on a narrow partisan and ideological basis, with the selection largely limited to present examiners and agency staffs, with all members of other parties largely excluded irrespective of their possibly superior qualifications.

"I am determined that this condition which is feared shall not come about; that

the men who fill these administrative examiner posts shall not, as has been well said by the American Bar Association Journal, be 'men of bias, of ideological preconceptions, of partisan fealty, of subservience to pressure groups, of habits of unfairness, of disregard of the true values and weight of evidence.' It seems to me that the burden of proof is on the United States Civil Service Commission that these hearings examiners will not be men of leftist thinking, men who don't have complete loyalty to our constitutional system of checks and balances, men who are not devoted to our system of private enterprise, but rather men of outstanding judicial temperament, who are unalterably dedicated to the preservation of the American way.

"The President has recently issued his loyalty order for the removal from Government pay rolls of persons whose loyalty is open to question. It seems to me that 'we ought in this case to lock the barn door before horses of red stripe can get in, rather than attempt to shoo them out once they get in.'

"Mere generalities that the Commission is going to take ample safeguard against Communists filling these posts is not enough. I am anxious not only that these appointees not be Communists, but that they not be appointees who will offer only shallow resistance to Communistic influences upon them. There are too many who, although they are not Communists, nevertheless lack the moral values with which to combat Communistic infiltration and pressure which is brought to bear upon them.

"I shall be looking for substantial proof that the Civil Service Commission is going to fill these quasi-judicial posts with men of the highest, unimpeachable caliber of the legal profession available, rather than with men who simply have occupied similar positions in the Federal Government today, who largely are of one party, and who may lack the approach of private enterprise in their work.

"Looking forward to hearing from you on this matter at your earliest convenience, I am

"Respectfully yours,

"ALEXANDER WILEY."

MR. FLEMMING'S STATEMENT AS TO PROCEDURE

Within the past few weeks I received a letter from Mr. Flemming on the appointment procedure. In it he said that "in order to provide us with an opportunity to explore in a careful manner the issues which are involved in this matter, the Commission has decided to promulgate a temporary regulation which would have the effect of making it possible for all present hearing examiners to continue to perform their functions after June 11, pending the promulgation of final regulations by the Commission, these regulations to become effective on August 1."

Commissioner Flemming also advises me that in the interval he intends to transmit to all interested parties a tentative draft of the proposed regulations, and he further states that hearings will be held so that various approaches to this problem may be carefully studied. This appears to be a fair procedure.

In the last analysis, I suppose that the greatest problem with reference to examiner appointments will occur in the future, after the initial selection of examiners has been made. These future appointments will provide a testing ground to determine whether attempts will be made to sabotage the statute by evading its intent and policy.

The appointment problems should, however, be temporary in character and I have every confidence that they will be correctly solved. Once they have been solved, it is gratifying to know that the statute gives these examiners security of tenure. We must be equally vigilant in seeing that this security is implemented with adequate regulations to insure its effectiveness in actual practice.

I have of necessity in the course of this rather brief discussion confined my comments to a large degree to those provisions of the act which I felt related most directly to this group.

NEED FOR UNDERSTANDING OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

I would not like to leave this group, however, without adding that, in my judgment, the effectiveness of the act will be determined largely by the spirit with which it is administered. I don't want to make any statement which could be construed as partisan, but I thing it is undeniable that on the basis of the most objective studies which could be made many agencies in government have unfortunately demonstrated a deplorable lack of appreciation for the problems of private industry and the private citizen.

Granted that the agencies have frequently had to administer difficult laws, it is still difficult to explain why in the administration there has frequently been an unwarranted degree of bureaucratic arrogance used to sandbag the average taxpayer into submission.

I don't desire to dwell on the past history, but I do know that if agencies are to survive unscathed by further congressional surgery, it will be necessary for them to become keenly and acutely conscious of the responsibility and the challenges which confront them.

I have every confidence that those of us who are assembled here tonight, for example, are aware of these challenges which confront government today.

THE CHALLENGES OF OUR TIMES

We are today engaged in shrinking government from the high tide of necessary wartime regulations to the minimum level necessary for the orderly conduct of business in a peacetime period.

We are today engaged in fighting our way back from a situation in which all too frequently business and private initiative were condemned before they were given a hearing.

We are today fighting our way back from a condition in which all too frequently a single agency of government was both prosecutor and judge.

We are today fighting our way toward an era in which our kind of economy will be tested to a degree yet undreamed of.

We are today fighting our way toward a government of law rather than of men.

INTERRELATIONSHIP OF THREE BRANCHES

Justice Holmes said that the courts are concerned only with the power to enact statutes, not with their wisdom. It is up to Congress to adequately meet its responsibility and its challenge in providing that wisdom, and it is up to the executive branch of government to demonstrate a rare understanding in the administration of statutes which are enacted and not to seek to override congressional policy.

CONCLUSIONS

Gentlemen, you are to an amazing degree an intermediary between government and the people. You hold high and consequential positions of tremendous importance and in the conduct of your offices, there will be engendered either the gratitude or the resentment of the American people. Yours is a tremendous responsibility and yours is a stimulating task.

I trust and believe that all of the hearings examiners under the Administrative Procedure Act will be more than adequate to meet the challenges of the future. I believe that they will be more than adequate to conduct their offices with sympathetic understanding, with the courage and the vision and the impartial fairness which will insure the survival of that which is good in government and will insure the discard of that which is bad.

The Soil Fertility Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely and well-expressed editorial entitled "The Soil Fertility Bill." This editorial appeared in the Tennessee Farm Bureau News, a monthly paper published by the Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation at Columbia, Tenn., on Thursday, June 5, 1947.

This editorial expresses approval of the National Soil Fertility bill, S. 1251, which was introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and points out that all Tennesseans have a vital interest therein because the object and purpose of the bill is to bring about the feeding into the soil of Tennessee and the Nation the needed mineral elements which are necessary to revitalize depleted soils and compensate for other losses of plant food.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOIL FERTILITY BILL

The national soil fertility bill introduced in the Senate May 8 by Senators HICKENLOOPER, WHERRY, HILL, CAPPER, THYE, STEWART, AIKEN, BUSHFIELD, YOUNG, and WILSON, and its companion bill in the House by Congressman FLANNAGAN, promises to be one of the most controversial measures on the agricultural legislative front of the Eightieth Congress.

On one side of the controversy will be the American Farm Bureau Federation, and a number of other influential groups who favor the measure, and on the other side will be the giant fertilizer industry, most of which will vigorously oppose it. Congress will be in the middle.

The object of the measure is to get the needed mineral elements applied to the land, particularly phosphate and potash, to revitalize the depleted soils and to compensate for crop removal and other losses of plant food.

Studies reveal that we have in the past, and are at present taking out more than we are putting back. Studies also reveal that food grown on mineral-deficient soils are not only expensive, but such foods fall short of mineral content needed to meet body requirements of food consumers. It is also pointed out by those conversant with problems of soil and farm management that mineral-deficient soils have a narrow range of uses resulting in continuous cropping of commodities in which apparent surpluses occur.

Both consumers and producers have an interest in finding some solution to the problem which has a deeper implication than one might appreciate on first thought.

The controversy will in the main be centered around the procedure for obtaining desired results.

It is to be regretted, but we might as well expect the injection of issues which will have for their principal purpose to confuse the minds of the public, and to create prejudice and suspicion. Would that all could discuss the real issues objectively.

Tennesseans have a vital interest in the national soil-fertility bill. The State is very fortunate in having phosphate deposits in the central basin. These deposits are being mined most heavily. The other known deposits are in Florida and the far West. The Florida deposits have been estimated as 10 times greater than the Tennessee deposits. The western deposits, which are by far greater than the Tennessee and Florida deposits, are not being mined extensively.

The demand for phosphate is growing by leaps and bounds in the Midwest and other agricultural sections. War demands and foreign shipments are putting additional pressure on reserves in Tennessee and Florida.

The question is how long can farmers in Tennessee and the South enjoy the proximity of phosphate deposits? Would it not be in the long-time interest of all to start exploratory work in processing of the western deposits to safeguard the source of supply for the areas that have traditionally and must continue to use fertilizer? One of the purposes of the Mobile plant, proposed in the bill, is to develop processing technique applicable to the needs for utilization of the western deposits.

It appears to be poor public policy indeed to permit the removal of reserves in Tennessee and then in time force Tennessee farmers to pay transportation cost from the far West on fertilizer requirements. The same is true of the South. It would appear far better policy to equalize the withdrawal of these reserves and at the same time meet demands of all sections for phosphate materials. Certainly, from a national defense point of view, to which phosphate is most important, we do not need all our eggs in one basket.

Lilienthal: "No Bomb Back-Down"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lilienthal: 'No Bomb Back-Down,'" from the Washington Times-Herald of June 7, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LILIENTHAL: "NO BOMB BACK-DOWN"

At Lake Success, Long Island, recently, David E. Lilienthal made his first public, detailed statement as Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. The Senate confirmed his nomination to that post a few weeks ago, after a long and bitter debate.

The Lilienthal performance, we think, was most reassuring.

It was staged before the Control Committee of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission (which shouldn't be confused with Lilienthal's atom group), reporters asking questions afterward.

The gist of the American atom chief's remarks was that we are not going to back down on our previously stated position regarding the atom bomb, no matter how much we are baited and berated about it by the Russian Government in Moscow and its fifth columnists in the United States, or by anybody else.

Instead, Lilienthal says his Commission is determined that this country shall keep the atomic lead it already has, and shall do its darnedest to increase that lead.

This means, we infer and hope, that we will go on stock-piling atom bombs and make more efficient bombs as the good Lord unveils additional atomic knowledge to us.

BARUCH PLAN—RUSSIAN PLAN

As to the United States previously stated position on the atom bomb, it is entirely clear.

It was set forth months ago in the plan worked out by Bernard M. Baruch and several associates. The Baruch scheme calls for eventual giving up to an international organization of all United States atom bomb secrets—but only after certain conditions have been met.

The most important of those conditions is that there must be a world-wide, workable, foolproof, and cheatproof system of inspection of all nations' nuclear energy activities from uranium or thorium mine to end products.

Next in importance is the proviso that, when it comes to punitive action by the UN against any nation found to be readying an atomic war, none of the big five countries shall have any veto power.

And, of course, the United States will not even enter into such an agreement as this without the consent of two-thirds of the Senate, as in the case of any treaty.

The Russians have been opposed to the Baruch plan all along, for obvious reasons. They have offered, and go on offering, a plan of their own. This one calls for keeping the veto power; for a pious international agreement outlawing the atom bomb; and for the destruction within 90 days thereafter of all existing atom bombs—meaning, of course, ours.

Mr. Baruch has blackballed this Russian plan from the word go. We're more than glad to see Lilienthal, firmly and without double talk, second that black ball. In the present state of the world, the United States would be crazy to lay the atom pistol down with the Baruch guaranties of safety.

Causing the Desert to Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 6, 1947

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, have you ever ridden by rail or airplane over vast portions of the far West, especially over the Pacific Southwest, that corner of our country from the panhandle of Texas and the panhandle of Oklahoma westward to the Pacific Ocean, including the States of New Mexico, Arizona, and the southern half of California? If you have traversed the far expanses of that region, you saw unfold before you interminable miles of scenery, of strange vegetation, of mountains and deserts, which seem to support mighty little of human or animal life. Perhaps you thought, what was this country intended for; of what was the Almighty thinking when he produced so much apparent wastelands? If you did have such thoughts, you certainly are not the first to think them, for the early American writer, Washington Irving, who crossed the Great Plains to the Pacific coast to where rolls the Oregon declared that the land would be fit only for the Indians, being incapable of supporting civilized life.

About that same time one of the leading American explorers, Becknell, in his travels west of the Missouri River called the vast region constituting more than half of the present United States, The Great American Desert. Now, more than 100 years ago such a view seemed quite logical, but what a libel on our western geography this label implies. Even in the school geographies which our grandfathers used, the maps of the United States had all that vast western half of the United States lying beyond the Great Bend of the Missouri River labeled, The Great American Desert. That name continued to be thus applied in school books even down to our own childhood days.

However, it was found that although nature is cruel in a vast portion of the West, yet nature nevertheless does furnish food for animals, which in turn furnish food for man. This great American desert has been shrinking and is far less forbidding and frightful than we were taught at first to believe. Before the coming of the white man this vast expanse supported countless thousands of buffalo, that great lumbering hump-back creature on which the red man depended for food, clothing and all of his necessities. Yes, those vast areas which supported the countless thousands of buffalo were well suited to support an equal or even greater number of their domestic kind—the white man's cattle. However, it is a slander on the buffalo to call the Texas longhorns his domestic kind, so, not to ruffle the buffalo's feelings, we may speak of the Texas longhorn as the successor of the buffalo. Why do I speak of the longhorn? Because most of our western geography was first occupied by white men who brought in cattle, the first kind being the long-horned creatures from Texas. Of course, longhorns have been displaced by better stock.

The point I wish to make is that the millions of buffalo were supplanted by more millions of cattle, so that about half of the States in the Union were carved out of the great West with the livestock industry as their economic base. It was the grass which grew on the plains, and some on the desert, which supported a greater population of domestic animals than the Indians had known of the wild animals. We have an expression which signifies value, or lack of it, when we use the expression "hay." But "hay" is not hay, when it is harvested by grazing herds, or otherwise, as it is the very basis of animal and human life over a region a thousand miles in any given direction. Such was the West in its heyday. In places the grass grew luxuriously. In other areas where the rainfall was slight, it grew sparsely, but all over the West it grew and it made human life and civilization possible wherever it grew.

We are told that the era of cattle, and especially the period of the trail driving out of Texas through the West, was the period from 1865 to the end of the century. However, the cattle business

reached its height about 1890, and there was a larger cattle population then in all the Western States than at any time prior or most of the time since that date. The greater portion of the land lying west of the one hundredth meridian, lacking sufficient moisture for cultivation of the soil, was utilized thus for grazing, and since much of it has not been homesteaded by settlers, it remained public domain to be had for the using, and the livestock owners used it. Naturally, they overused it and in many cases overgrazed it, so that the carrying capacity of the ranges decreased. Public-spirited citizens saw what was happening, and called a halt.

Such men as President Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot took the lead in the saving work of conservation. Much good has been accomplished, but some of the areas worst overgrazed present an impossible task for Mother Nature to replace the vegetation cover. Nature has great recuperative power in restoring grass on even those areas grazed by sheep, which are worse than those grazed by cattle, and some lands have been entirely denuded. Nature will restore some of the native grasses if given half a chance. But that has not been the experience of the West, and many portions entirely overgrazed have too frequently been covered with snake grass and poisonous weeds and other growth not nutritious nor beneficial to livestock. Also some lands overgrazed have become badly eroded. There are today in Federal ownership hundreds of millions of acres of land west of the one hundredth meridian which has been so abused that it will take years for nature to restore it, if nature unaided ever can restore it. What is the hope for such lands?

I think that a wise policy of controlled grazing, coupled with the proper reseeding program, promises restoration of even these worst areas. What is the best process other than controlled grazing thus far discovered for aiding nature to restore those grasslands? I think the best method is by airplane reseeding, using pelletized seed of suitable grasses for each given area. I think the distribution of the seed will have to be by airplanes, and I think the seed will have to be pelletized for the sowing, and I also think the fullest possible knowledge is needed of suitable seed—grass seed adapted to the soil, the altitude, the climate, and the rainfall of each region to get maximum results. Such a method is now being used on 50,000 acres of land in Arizona on Indian reservations. Dr. Lytle Adams has devised this process and has made this beginning, which seems to me so full of promise that I have continuously urged it upon my colleagues in Congress. Let me explain the essentials of this program.

Much of the area that we would like to reseed is rough terrain and cannot be driven over with any implement to work the soil. Neither a team of horses or a tractor with a disc harrow or any other farming implement can scratch the land surface because it is so rough. A great deal of the territory is like that. Therefore, the airplane method of distributing the seed is the only practical method of dropping it over a large area quickly from the air. The seed must be pelletized for several reasons. When the seed is distributed from the plane it must fall in a desired pattern and not be carried by the wind and piled up where it is not wanted. That would be a waste of seed and also ineffective. Accordingly, the seed must be given sufficient weight so that it will stay where it falls and at the same time be given protection and a proper aid in germination.

This is another function of the pelletizing, for the pellets are made of suitable soil and contain the right number of seed, and also in each pellet is a fertilizer element, an insect and rodent repellent, and all the conditions are such that the seed will germinate with only a little moisture, for only a little moisture is required to dissolve the pellets. Even though some pellets fall upon a stony land, the soil in the pellet is sufficient to germinate the seed. An amazingly large percentage of the pellets dissolve on good ground and a remarkable percentage of germination actually occurs.

If this experimentation of reseeding proves successful it is hoped that other governmental agencies will make use of the process on public lands other than Indian reservations, and it is also hoped that private holdings of cattlemen and sheepmen, at their expense, may be treated in the same way. It is known that livestock men are watching this experiment with great interest.

Why have I insisted on this experimental work of 50,000 acres on an Indian reservation in Arizona? Naturally, being Congressman from Arizona, I wanted this done in my State, though I am anxious to get it spread to other States as well. Certainly Arizona Indian reservations need this sort of treatment. Some of our greatest Indian reservations are in the State of Arizona, the largest being the Navajo Indian Reservation, which is as large as the entire State of West Virginia. The Navajo Indians are nomadic. They are essentially stockmen and they live principally on sheep. Sixty thousand Navajos, mostly in northeastern Arizona, but also in the adjoining States, are living on that area the size of the State of West Virginia, where 5,000 white men could not long exist. This is a high plateau area and it has been terribly overgrazed. Perhaps the overgrazing has been more pronounced and the consequent erosion has been greater on the Navajo Indian Reservation than on any other part of the United States. Nothing comparable to it can be found outside China. Therefore, I have earnestly endeavored to get as much of the area of the Navajo Reservation restored to its original grazing possibilities and also to minimize as much as possible the loss of its soil through erosion.

There is a dollar-and-cent value in both of these results, and the least of these values is stabilizing the sheep and wool industry and the economy of these Indian people. I say that animal production is the least of the value, for it is from the Navajo Indian Reservation that most of the silt comes into the Colorado River which is now filling up Lake Mead at an alarming rate. Nearly a billion dollars have been invested in developments on the lower Colorado River, part of it Government funds, part of it California's great investment, and some of it the investments of Arizona and Nevada. But the total of this vast river improvement program is jeopardized by the filling up of Lake Mead with silt faster than it was originally expected. This must be stopped or minimized.

In addition to Indian reservations and Taylor grazing districts, there is a vast acreage in our national forests which might well be reseeded for grass and even reseeded for forest growth. The devices and methods used by Dr. Adams can be equally well applied for spreading of tree seed, and he can also plant tree seed in straight rows or lines if such is desired in a shelter belt program. It is known that the shelter-belt tree planting in the Great Plains States, such as Nebraska, has been very worthwhile, and the planting of the tree seed instead of the small trees would be far less expensive by using the new method.

There is a desert vegetation of great commercial value—barring cost of harvesting—growing on the southwestern deserts which might be harvested profitably as a commercial business if it grew more compactly and was not so thinly and widely scattered. I have particular reference now to yucca, or Spanish bayonet, of which there are several types. This remarkable plant grows at certain altitudes with a very limited supply of water. If the growth and yield of foliage per acre could be naturally increased, such increase probably would mean the difference between a questionable and a certain financial success. I believe that with airplane seeding with pelletized seed, the natural desert areas, where yucca now grows, can be made to produce many times its present natural production.

We started out by saying that vast areas at first seemed unfit for human habitation. I am now contending that the developments of science in regard to the utility of desert vegetation plus the full development of the technique which is now being used to reseed Indian lands in Arizona will before long make comparatively valueless desert areas industrially productive. In such a case those lands which once seemed so ill-favored may become highly valued and a Biblical saying come true: "The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner." Another saying may be made a literal fulfillment in our West of the prophesy in Isaiah: "The Lord will make her wilderness like Eden and her desert like the garden of the Lord."

Use Made of the Committee on Un-American Activities by Members of Congress and Various Government Departments, January 22–May 27, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include a breakdown of the use made of the Committee on Un-American Activities by Members of Congress and various Government departments in the period of January 22, 1947, to May 27, 1947:

USE MADE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND VARIOUS GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS, JANUARY 22, 1947–MAY 27, 1947

During the period, January 22, 1947, to May 27, 1947, inclusive, a total of 512 visits were made to the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities by persons who made their own check through records and publications of the committee. The total number of names on which they checked was 8,529. These callers were employees of congressional committees or individual Members of Congress or employees of various agencies in the executive branch of the Government, namely: the Departments of Commerce, Interior, Justice, Labor, Navy, State, Treasury, and War, the United States Civil Service Commission, and the Veterans' Administration.

A break-down of the total number of visits made and the total number of names checked by visitors for each month of the present year shows:

Month	Number of callers	Number of names checked
Jan. 22-31, 1947	48	975
Feb. 1-28, 1947	92	1,462
Mar. 1-31, 1947	128	2,128
Apr. 1-30, 1947	132	2,450
May 1-27, 1947	112	1,514
Total	512	8,529

In addition, the committee staff assisted these callers in cases where they were unable to find information which was known to be available or in cases where they needed to consult source material contained in the files. Sixty-six requests of this kind were filed by members of the committee staff covering information on 47 individual names and 65 organizations.

During the same period of time, Members of Congress made 313 separate requests for information from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities. In answering these requests, committee employees made a search of files, records, and publications of the committee and furnished Members of Congress with written reports on the 602 individual names and 236 organizations listed in these requests. In many cases it was necessary to check the names of the officers and sponsors of an organization through all sources in order to make a report on the organization, and no record has been kept of the number of names checked in such cases.

The following figures will show the monthly totals for this year of the number of requests received from Members of Congress, and the number of individual names of persons or organizations involved:

Month	Requests from Members of Congress	Individual names listed in requests	Organizations listed in requests
Jan 22-31, 1947	13	18	7
Feb. 1-28, 1947	53	118	21
Mar. 1-13, 1947	71	167	66
Apr. 1-30, 1947	104	140	46
May 1-28, 1947	72	159	96
Total	313	602	236

Weekly Message to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following message to my constituents:

WEEKLY MESSAGE FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, HOMER A. RAMEY

Fellow citizens of the Ninth District of Ohio, Members of Congress returned to their desks this week refreshed and inspired by the Memorial Day services over the holiday. Most of us feel, I believe, that we are entering the last lap of the present session. As you know, under the terms of the Reorganization Act, we are due to complete this first legislative session of the Eightieth Congress by July 31.

This does not mean, of course, that every piece of legislation introduced in the House or the Senate will have been acted upon. It does mean that the most urgent and pressing matters of concern to the voters in the last congressional election have been thoroughly studied. Laws have been passed to provide the machinery, the money, and the men to work out the solution for these major national problems.

The two most important measures sent to the President this week were the labor bill and the bill reducing taxes. As I see it, the many expressions of diverse opinions on these two pieces of legislation furnished an unmistakable indication that our system of government has come out of the war in healthier condition than it was 6 years ago. The two-party system, which has served us well in the past, is coming into its own once more.

Now there may be some of you listening in right now who are shaking your heads and saying: "That's just Homer playing Pollyanna again!" To you doubting Thomases I say, the time to worry about government is the day when you hear nothing but agreement in Washington. When all we hear is "yes, yes" coming out of the congressional halls and the Federal buildings, we have cause to be concerned about the well-being of our great Republic.

Today, in all reverence, I thank God for the healthy signs of disagreement in Washington. I thank God that whether President Truman signs a bill or doesn't sign it, he has a right to try to check the Congress of the United States if he sincerely disagrees with its legislative decisions. I am equally thankful for the comforting promixity of the Supreme Court. Every day as I walk to and from my office, I pass the impressive white edifice which houses our highest judicial authority. Many of you have visited it, I know. Do you ever wonder where this country would be today, with totalitarian governments apparently thriving in many lands, were it not for the ingenious system of checks and balances our forefathers painstakingly built into the framework of our representative government?

Because of our system of checks and balances, the citizens, sources of all the Government's authority, know they will get a square deal. If they think they aren't getting fair treatment, either from the Executive or from the Legislature, they can, as the saying goes, "throw the rascals out." And as long as we have good healthy arguments, a strong opposition, the people can always find, shall we say, "other rascals" to give them what they want in the way of legislation and Government administration.

Seriously, I had planned to discuss some of the advantages we have as citizens of the United States, living today under our free Government. I see that a noted journalist has written along that line in the New York Times magazine published last Sunday. I don't know whether additional copies of that article are to be printed—they should be. Every man and woman, every high school boy and girl in the United States should have a chance to see what Brooks Atkinson wrote. The piece was called America and Russia, Dangers and Hopes. The part about Russia is good, but what impressed me most was his accent on the assets of this country, and his positive approach to our problems of world leadership.

For example, I would gather Mr. Atkinson agrees with the report out this week recommending universal military training. But, he says, "We must be certain that we do not fail at home." He goes on to say: "The peace of the world depends less on the truculence and force of the Soviet Government than on our ability here to fulfill the promises of democracy—which are freedom for individuals, individual opportunity, and a progressively higher standard of living."

This is a newspaperman's way of saying what I meant when, just a month ago, I expressed my belief that "Today we have no choice but to work together to put the American formula for prosperity into effect by finding the means to get more goods for more people at lower prices." I said then, and I repeat, this is the only way to maintain our high standards and use our great natural resources fairly and efficiently.

Most of us have a tendency to fall into one of two ways of thinking (or not thinking) about our country and our Government, and what it means to us. Either we take the great bounty of American life for granted, because we have never known anything else, in which case we fail to appreciate it, or, on the other hand, we say, with Eric Johnson, "The United States of America is the wealthiest, healthiest, freest, best-educated country in all history." If we let it go at that, we fall into a rut of complacency and fail to see all the improvements which must be made if we are to use our God-given land to the greatest benefit of all.

How often do we stop to think that with less than 7 percent of the world's population we are equipped to produce one-fifth of all the world's goods? Are we aware that we have 35 percent of the world's railroads, 70 percent of its automobiles, 45 percent of its radios, and the greatest store of industrial know-how in the world?

We all realize the miracles of production wrought during the recent war by the men and women who worked in our factories. Do we constantly insist that these wartime methods and practices be carried over and devoted to peacetime production? Is it possible that a nation which produced the materials of war, as we did, is unable to build enough houses and apartment buildings to provide decent homes at reasonable prices for all our citizens?

I want to congratulate the Housing Committee of the Toledo Chamber of Commerce on its determined efforts to ease the housing shortage. Next week marks the beginning of their program to promote the remodeling of large houses into duplexes to provide homes for veterans. The chamber of commerce will furnish free-cost estimates made by experts to those of you who have large houses which might be remodeled to give some veteran a warm, comfortable place to live. This is just a part of the complete program, but it indicates the spirit of initiative and resourcefulness which has built up the United States in the past. It is an example of cooperative action to solve local problems, rather than waiting for directions from some Washington headquarters before acting.

Recognizing the many improvements yet to be made in our way of living, we can still take pride in the accomplishments of these United States. We have succeeded in spreading our production over an ever-widening area, so that the average American has more of the comforts and conveniences of life than the citizen of any other nation in the world. We have done this while maintaining the liberty, dignity, and self-respect of the individual. Our job today is to strengthen and improve this tried and true Government of ours. Let those who seek to change its fundamental character come out into the open and show us where any other system of government devised by man has come near to equaling our record. If we are humbly aware of our own accomplishments, sincerely determined to right existing wrongs as fast as possible, we need not spend sleepless nights worrying about the enemy within our gates.

Justice to the Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Oliver La Farge at the annual meeting of the Association of American Indian Affairs:

I regret to have to report that we are in serious danger of seeing all the gains of the last 20 years in Indian Affairs wiped out. We are threatened with reversion to conditions just as bad in their way and just as cruel to our Indians as those which obtained when this Association began its fight for justice to the Indians in the early nineteen twenties.

This may sound overdramatic and alarmist. Unhappily it is the case. If all of the legislation now before Congress should pass we shall have a crippled Indian Service, schools shut down, hospitals out of operation, the whole program not only of advancing our Indians into equality but of merely enabling them to exist broken down. We shall have a return to the old days of plunder and to the system by which, in the 50 years before 1930, over a hundred millions acres of land and millions of dollars in capital assets passed into the possession of rapacious white men.

We well know that the largest surviving tribe of Indians, the more than 50,000 Navajos, are at present deprived of even minimal education, health services, even of the means of earning a livelihood, and that this great tribe stands literally on the brink of famine. Yet we see no signs of an intention on the part of the American people to lift a finger to help them.

Up to the beginning of the war, the condition of our Indians generally was steadily improving. There were mistakes and setbacks, there were areas in which our policy was ineffectual or even wrong. But on the whole we were advancing steadily toward the time when Indians would no longer need the special safeguards, privileges, services, and restrictions upon which their present survival depends, we could see coming the time when all of them could fully participate in our American life as competent equals of all other citizens. During the war, naturally, activities decreased. Much of the best personnel of the Indian Service was drawn off into war services. Everything was curtailed. So, also, this association inevitably became less active. We did not see any great danger in this. Rather, we looked toward the postwar period with great hope.

Our hope sprang from two sources. We felt that the conscience of this country was awakened as never before to its duty to apply its democratic beliefs to all peoples within its borders. We also saw, with joy and wonder, how unanimously our Indians rallied to their country's service. We saw their amazing record in the armed services, their devotion in the war industries, the lavishness with which out of their poverty they gave money and goods and effort in the country's need. We knew that one of the men who raised the flag on Mount Suribachi was an Indian, and that shortly after that flag was raised, another Indian died to keep it there. We who served in the war knew that these were truly brothers in arms, men to be proud of, great defenders of their country, thousands of them. We cherished the delusion that in return, their country would pay attention to the Indians' needs as it never had before, and that it would be easy to interest the people of the United States and to persuade the Congress to give them a full opportunity to share in the good things of our way of life.

This was, it seems, mere delusion. Instead of an era of help, hope, and opportunity, the Indians today face a desperate crisis.

Let us begin with the vital matter of appropriations. To understand what is impending, it is helpful to review the manner in which the estimates, the requests for appropriations, are prepared. First, the Indian Office prepares its estimate of its needs. This estimate is reviewed and pared down by the Department of the Interior. Then it is reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget, which makes further cuts. This twice-reduced estimate comes before Congress. This year the request, in its final form, was $54,000,000. At present, unless the Senate subcommittee will give heed to the Indians' plight, in the general reduction of the Department of the Interior's budget, the Indian Service is due to get only about $36,000,000.

That cut means a crippled Indian Service. When the appropriation for such an organization as the Bureau of Reclamation is made, it means simply that certain projects will not be undertaken. The effect is negative. The organization as such is not destroyed. But a drastic cut in the Indian appropriation has a positive, destructive effect, for it means the termination of going activities. It will mean the laying off of personnel when the service is already grossly undermanned. It means that schools can handle even fewer pupils, that hospitals may have to close, and that areas already empty of medical services will remain so deprived. The cry of the Indians for more doctors and more schools, the twin essentials of hope, will go unheeded. Our Indian population, nearly four hundred thousand loyal citizens, will step back toward the old days of ignorance and disease, the wretchedness from which they were so hopefully emerging. All the manifold, essential enterprise such as agricultural extension work, development of resources, the various forms of training, advancement, and establishment of economic strength will be curtailed. We must hope that before the pending appropriation bill is enacted into law, the Congress will see the cruel error of including a service responsible for the living of hundreds of thousands of citizens in a blind, across-the-board economy cut.

We also have pending certain bills, introduced with the best possible intentions, which allegedly are for the "emancipation" of the Indians. Note that word "emancipation." It typifies the erroneous thinking that underlies them, with its totally false implication that Indians are in some manner enslaved.

The essence of these bills is to provide an easy means for the wholesale lifting of restrictions on Indian lands and property. We believe that certain Indians have reached a point in education and knowledge of the world at which they need neither the protection of those restrictions, nor any other special aids or services not enjoyed by the American community as a whole. But we know very well that as a whole Indians are not yet ready to face our competitive and often greedy world without protections. We know from years of bitter experience that if these bills become law, we shall have a new era of the alienation of Indian property, a new crop of Indians despoiled of their only means of livelihood, dumped back in the end, as so many thousands were in the past, as pensioners and paupers to be kept alive by governmental charity.

The goal in Indian affairs is clear enough. It is to give our Indians that education—I do not mean merely schooling, but education in its broadest sense—which will enable them to do without special treatment, so that in the end the Federal Indian Service and associations such as ours will become unnecessary. The goal is competence in its truest sense. The goal is freedom in the only real meaning of the word, the freedom of being fully equipped to take care of one's self and to have an equal status in the pursuit of happiness. You cannot achieve that goal by closing schools, cutting down public-health services, selling property, reducing communities to rural slums. You cannot even effect true economies by such means, for the more helpless, diseased, and ignorant these communities become, the more expensive, in the long run, they will be to the Nation The true, great economy is the one to be made by elevating these people, who are innately intelligent and able, to the level at which they will no longer need special appropriations any more than you or I. Today's orgy of penny-pinching only postpones, perhaps for generations, the achievement of that economy.

The folly and evil of our present policy is illustrated to the point of caricature by the situation of the Navajos. That great tribe, famous for its vigor, its arts, its native literature, and the great charm of its members, has increased to over fifty thousand and is still increasing. Its numbers have grown far beyond what its land can possibly provide with food and clothing. In this it exemplifies, in extreme form, the situation of our Indians generally. Its only hope, its only future, is an ever-increasing proportion of the tribe to be so educated and trained that they can leave the reservation and compete for jobs with the general population. The tribe is well aware of this. I attended the last meeting of its tribal council, and I can testify that the essence of the council's debate was one great cry for schools, schools, schools. Secondarily they asked for doctors and hospitals, and also for the development of irrigation which would enable them to keep on eating while they are being educated, but above all, more even than farming land or money, they asked for schools, schools, schools.

By treaty, too, we are solemnly bound to provide schools with a teacher for every thirty children. We know that we can solve the Navajo problem, perhaps in as short a space as 10 years. We know that by a large but very reasonable investment we can develop enough irrigated land to turn the balance from starvation to a reasonably sound economic life for the present tribe while the process of education goes on.

What are we doing? For lack of funds, old schools have had to be closed because they had become unusable, while no new ones go up. Less than half of the Navajos have ever had any schooling at all, less than half speak any English, few are at home in the language. Thirteen thousand Navajo chil-

dren today have no chance to go to school. Those who do get into a classroom, generally do not get beyond the fifth grade. Hardly 50 can hope to go through high school.

The Navajos are a famous tribe. We think of them romantically. Three thousand of their young men distinguished themselves mightily in the war. Take a look at them. The veterans sit idle and helpless, for there is no land for them to farm, and they lack the education to seek work outside. The people are hungry. Many are already living on the charity of the fortunate ones who have access to enough land to survive on. Before another year is out we shall be making out the relief rolls. If we do not fulfill our treaty obligations, if we do not wake up and move energetically to the rescue, in a few years this tribe will be forced to disintegrate. Illiterate, ignorant, its members will drift across the country as migratory workers, Okies, gypsies, hoboes, sunk to the bottom of the social scale, with all their great tradition and potential contribution as well-equipped citizens gone, destroyed.

We want the Indians free. Technically they are free. They are citizens, they can go where they like, enter into any enterprise, and they can die for their country as readily as the next man. In fact they are not free, nor can they be until they are liberated from ignorance and set upon their feet economically. For 20 years we have advanced toward that freedom, now we are faced with a crisis which may result in a complete setback, and we are literally faced with a flat desperation in regard to our greatest tribe, comprising nearly a fifth of the entire Indian population. Now is the test of this association; what you, all of us, are able to do in this next year will be the proof that we can and will defend the Indians or that we are futile. I believe in the fundamental goodness of the American people. I cannot believe that they cannot be moved, and I have faith in this association's ability to awaken them and to forestall a shameful disaster.

The Taft-Wagner-Ellender Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the Los Angeles County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars:

Whereas the housing problem is the most critical domestic issue facing this country, particularly as it affects veterans; and

Whereas the Bureau of Census survey indicates that among veterans who desire to own their own homes only 15 percent can pay more than $60 per month, while 14 percent can pay less than $30 per month, and 68 percent can pay from $40 to $60 per month; among every 10 veterans desiring to rent only 1 is able to go higher than $60 per month, while 2 cannot afford even to pay $30 per month, and 7 cannot go over $50 per month; and

Whereas the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill—S. 866 and H. R. 2523—presents the means of reducing the cost of housing, whether for sale or rent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Harry T. McLane Post 1387, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, Bellflower, Calif., go on record in support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill;

Harry T. McLane Post 1387, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, urges immediate hearings by the House Committee on Banking and Currency on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and prompt enactment of the bill by Congress; and

This resolution be sent to the Los Angeles County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, for approval and transmission to the Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and that copies be sent to Congressman WILLIS W. BRADLEY and United States Senators SHERIDAN DOWNEY and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

HARRY A. HENDRICKSON,
Commander.
AVERY T. REEVES,
Adjutant.

Congress Represents the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sylvania (Ohio) Sentinel of June 5, 1947:

CONGRESS REPRESENTS THE PEOPLE

Recently the governors of most of the far Western States met and jointly denounced the action of the House in heavily reducing appropriations for the Reclamation Bureau which would have largely been used for the construction of tax-exempt Government electric generating plants and related facilities. The governors announced that they would make a concerted demand on Congress to restore the funds of their original figure, on the grounds that the future welfare and industrial development of the West is at stake.

Here is a perfect example of why economy in Government has become so difficult a goal to achieve. The plain and ominous fact is that we have come to look on the Federal Treasury as a bottomless pit which may be raided at will for any region's pet projects. All of us are strongly in favor of a reduced budget—so long as budget reductions don't affect us. Governors, Senators, Representatives, mayors and a host of minor officials shriek to high heaven whenever a nickel is sliced from an appropriation for their States and towns.

Another plain and ominous fact is that we have lost local independence and local self-reliance. We want the Federal Government to spend billions for purposes which are clearly within the provinces of local government or of private business enterprise. And thus, we are surely and swiftly building a supergovernment with all the threats to freedom and independence that supergovernment inevitably implies.

It is senseless to blame Congress for waste and prodigality when the people at home who cast the votes demand a continuation of unnecessary spending. Congress simply represents a distillation of the voice of the people. In the long run, the people are given what they ask for—and it is the people who must choose between supergovernment, whose end is always some form of dictatorship, or our constitutional government of limited powers with its firm guaranties of maximum freedom for all.

Canada and the Pan American Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this week the President visits Canada, our neighbor on the north, with whom we enjoy relations of unparalleled cooperation and cordiality.

In these critical times we cannot overemphasize the mutual benefits which flow from the powerful bond of good will which unites our two countries.

On May 7 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 48, declaring it to be the sense of the Congress that the Dominion of Canada should be extended an invitation by the Pan American Union to join such union and take full part in its activities. It is my sincere hope that this measure will have an early hearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and a favorable response from both the committee and the House.

In this connection, pursuant to leave granted, I include a timely editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle:

GOOD-NEIGHBOR FENCE

Plans for the visit by President Truman in Ottawa this month are directing attention once more to the increasingly close relations between the Dominion and the United States of America. The border is ceasing to be a division line between two great countries and is being recognized more clearly as a bond of fraternal union between two proud and independent peoples.

Within the last decade; the people of the United States have come to realize more keenly than ever before their need of cooperation with other nations. Not only have the industries of America developed enormous capacities for the utilization of natural products and raw materials outside the United States, but it has become evident in recent months that Pan-American solidarity is essential, if the United States is to achieve at home that security which is necessary if America is to take a leading part in the larger arena of the United Nations.

But of even more immediate importance to the United States is the preservation and development of that close bond of friendly understanding which has prevailed for more than a century and a quarter between the Dominion of Canada and this Republic.

President Truman's visit to Ottawa at this time is an event of far more significance than appears on the surface. It serves to accent the unity of the two great English speaking nations of North America and to remind all the world that peaceful cooperation without a show of force is not only a possibility, but an actuality.

The President and the Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include the following editorial from the Courier-Journal:

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD APPROVE THE LABOR BILL

It may safely be assumed that both Senate and House will accept the conference report on the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. Before the week is out, the adjusted bill probably will be on the President's desk, for approval or veto. This newspaper believes that Mr. Truman should approve it.

Our conclusion is reached after long and diligent study of the measure. The study has been applied not only to provisions of the bill as it has been adjusted, but also to the context of events, experiences, and attitudes out of which it emerged.

One of the most earnest efforts in this connection has been the search for a definite point of attack upon the bill by spokesmen for organized labor. What is wrong with the bill in their eyes? What title, section, paragraph, or line holds a specific danger to democratic freedom? We have become impressed by the lack of any bill of particulars from labor leadership.

We have heard only the impassioned generality that the whole bill was wrong, in spirit, in hostile sponsorship, and in detail. We have heard charges of fascism and epithets, unflattering personal allusions to Messrs. TAFT, BALL, HARTLEY, and others, and particularly the National Association of Manufacturers. It is said the bill would shackle labor in un-American slavery, that it would set social progress back half a century, that it would destroy labor and labor's rights and gains.

We cannot see where it would do anything of the sort. Unions may still strike for the legitimate purposes of better wages, hours, and working conditions. After an 80-day injunction, to hold while fact finding goes on, they may even strike, as before, to bring about a Nation-wide tie-up. The right of collective bargaining and selection of representatives by majority vote remains unimpaired.

The only new stipulation on this point is that labor now must bargain, where previously only management was obliged to bargain. Not one single obligation which previous labor laws placed upon employers has been removed. But to the existing body of laws is added one important particular, and this is the sum and substance of the revisions, as we see them. It is the intention of making unions equally responsible for their actions with management.

Nor are we impressed by the outcry that the Magna Carta of organized labor is being ripped to pieces. What we see in this legislation is a new Magna Carta. It is that of the individual member of the union.

No longer may he be exiled from a union, deprived of his right to work, for questioning the acts of remote officers, or demanding accountings, or speaking his mind or anything other than nonpayment of dues or initiation fees. No longer may a man be denied a union card if he is qualified and applies for membership. No longer may he be barred by unreasonable fees. The law says he cannot be coerced or intimidated to join a union, or pushed around, as many a rebel in Lewis' mine workers has been, once he gets in.

All this means that arbitrary power has been questioned. Simply stated, the bill would put an end to the practice of holding the ranks with rough stuff or threats of expulsion. It provides inducement for teaching the benefits of trade unionism and solidarity. It would put an end to capricious strikes, to strikes in violation of contract, to jurisdictional strikes, and strikes to enforce "featherbedding" practices; that is, to force an employer to pay men for doing nothing except standing by. It would forbid strikes like the paralyzing walkout of seamen last year to force employers to violate NLRB orders.

On this page is printed a summary of the bill's provisions, which tells more completely than can be done in this space, of the legislation's complete effect. We daresay that no impartial reader can fail to see the general point of seeking a better balance of rights and responsibility. We believe most readers will agree with us that the bill should strengthen the process of collective bargaining. It makes this the important thing by forcing both sides to keep at it rather than permitting one side, labor, to walk away from the table any time it pleases and to call out its men.

The bill is not perfect. But we have been impressed by the obvious efforts of House-Senate conferees to make it as nearly so as possible. The suspicion that supporters of the original bills were playing politics, that they wanted to force a veto, has been removed. They obviously want a bill that will work and that approaches the desires of what we believe to be the majority of people of the United States. Some details remain which strike us as possible of technical evasion, like the prohibition against political activity, or as requiring court interpretation, like the ban on Communists. There are vagueness and possible danger in spots. One may foresee a protracted round of suits. But it must not be overlooked that Congress plainly does not regard this as the final word in labor laws. There is provision for a continuing study of its operations and of the need of improvement or revisions.

And this is the big point. We hold it to be unfortunate that circumstances and abuses ever forced the writing of many details in the bill. We feel that this necessity may justly be laid at the door of labor leadership and its refusal to live up to the obligations of power which it acquired. The cooperation and consideration which the leadership refused, both to lawmakers and the public, should now be forthcoming, as an earnest of good intentions. We believe the bill will lead to more effective and intelligent labor-management relations all around. A kind of science in this field may develop, with the prospect of peace through reason. Up to now there have been only rigid, one-sided law and hair-trigger strikes, or compulsion by ever-present threat of strike.

The Budget-Cut Howl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest pleasure that I insert in the RECORD an article from the Labor News, of Long Beach, Calif., one of the outstanding labor papers of the western United States. It must be indeed gratifying to Members of this Congress to realize that our efforts to achieve some reasonable economy in the expenses of government meet with such wholehearted approval on the part of labor in one of the great industrial areas of the Nation. This article appeared on the first page of the Labor News issue of May 30, 1947, and is as follows:

THE BUDGET CUT HOWL

It's getting pretty tiresome to hear the weeping and wailing that attend virtually every cut Congress makes in the budget. We are told (usually by the bureau being cut) that "dire consequences" will result.

In a few cases the pruning was too severe, but where this was clearly pointed out Congress usually restored the funds needed. In most instances, however, the cuts, made after careful study, are justified and long overdue.

When the 11-percent slash in Navy funds was made by the House some Congressmen claimed our sea force would have to be cut by 80,000 men. Reliable Washington reports said that this claim simply wasn't true. But it illustrates the fear psychology used in the effort to block economy.

No one wants to weaken our military forces or any other essential branch of Government. They should get the money they need. But it's time to halt the waste and extravagance that have cost taxpayers billions.

Congress is trying hard to do just that and should have the support of every fair-minded citizen.

Investigation of Election in Kansas City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S DODGE

At various times after the vote frauds were revealed in Kansas City and before the evidence was stolen, Attorney General Clark wrote protesting Senators that he had made a "thorough" investigation of the matter.

Another time he used the phrase "full investigation." After being prodded a little more, he turned himself loose and described it as a "lengthy and detailed investigation."

But before the Senate probers yesterday he admitted that nothing had been done beyond preliminary interviews by the FBI, a pro forma business limited to talks with a few reporters and the members of the election board.

The conclusion is inescapable that Attorney General Clark was deliberately trying to cover up, to palm off as a genuine investigation something which he knew was no more than a pretext for not doing what the situation called for.

J. Edgar Hoover knew what was happening and he was careful to see that the FBI was not involved in the whitewash. At Hoover's instance, the FBI specifically stated that "this report does not reflect the results of an investigation by the special agents of the FBI."

Clark failed to do his duty and he misrepresented the facts to cover up his failure. Both he and Sam Wear, district attorney at Kansas City, have shown themselves unfit to be trusted with prosecution of the vote frauds and the ballot theft in the President's home county.

President Truman yesterday was forced into saying that the vote fraud and vote theft prosecutions must be followed to their logical conclusion. The logical conclusion is the conviction of the guilty. If the President expects to achieve this, he can do no less than divest Clark and Wear of all connection with the case and appoint a special prosecutor.

Debt Retirement Versus Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Debt Retirement Versus Tax Reduction," by Roy A. Foulke, vice president of Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., which appeared in a recent issue of Dun's Review, a publication issued monthly by Dun & Bradstreet.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBT RETIREMENT VERSUS TAX REDUCTION

(By Roy A. Foulke, vice president, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.)

On January 20, 1795, Alexander Hamilton sent his last report to Congress closing his official career as the first Secretary of the Treasury. That report on public credit contains Hamilton's philosophy of the Federal debt which Members of every new Congress would do well to review and study. "To extinguish a debt which exists," Hamilton succinctly summarized after his meticulous and exhaustive report to the Senate on the state of the national finances, "and to avoid contracting more, are ideas always favored by public feeling and opinion; but to pay taxes for the one or the other purpose, which are the only means of avoiding evil, is always, more or less, unpopular."

Our own history contains too many examples of legislators who have professed sincere desires to see the public debt reduced rapidly, but whose actions indicated high degree of disingeniousness or the lack of will power to lay taxes for that specific purpose. "These contradictions are in human nature," continued Hamilton, "and happy, indeed, would be the lot of a country that should ever want men ready to turn them to the account of their own popularity, or to some other sinister account."

Six years after Hamilton's last message to Congress, on November 16, 1801, Albert Gallatin, the native of Switzerland who had become the fourth Secretary of the Treasury, wrote a letter to Thomas Jefferson in which he discussed an annuity formula for retiring the outstanding debt. In that letter he touched on this same problem of the urgent necessity of retiring the existing obligations of the Federal Government.

"If we cannot with the probable amount of impost and sale of lands pay the debt at the rate proposed and support the establishments on the proposed plans," he advised the President, "one of three things must be done; either to continue the internal taxes, or to reduce the expenditures still more, or to discharge the debt with less rapidity. The last recourse, to me, is the most objectionable * * * I am firmly of the opinion that, if the present administration and Congress do not take the most effective measures for that object, the debt will be entailed on us and the ensuing generations, together with all the systems which support it, and which it supports * * *" Here is a forecast which could well be made with greater earnestness today with our national debt of $258,000,000,000, than 146 years ago when our debt was only $83,000,000.

These two statesmen were violently opposed to each other in their political life. Both were Americans by adoption. Hamilton was the strong Federalist, the practical analyst, who had made the greatest contributions toward solving the intricate financial problems arising out of the creation of the Federal Union from bankruptcy under the Articles of Confederation. Gallatin was an anti-Federalist, and exerted his influence in every way against strengthening the power of the Federal Government. To Gallatin any national debt was anathema. But notwithstanding their violent differences, the two greatest Secretaries of the Treasury had one fundamental idea in common, plans should always be carefully made and carried out to retire any public debt as rapidly as possible.

GO AHEAD AND DO IT

In the years prior to January 1, 1879, when greenbacks were legal currency and not convertible into specie, Horace Greeley was forever writing that the way "to resume was to resume." Others would discuss the risks, the difficulties, necessities, needs, inflation, deflation, and consider the political implications in the resumption of gold payment. Greeley's formula was simple; go ahead and do it. The old proverb read, "Actions speak louder than words."

And so it is when we come to the reduction in the Federal debt, Hamilton and Gallatin implemented their basic belief and their unquestioned sincerity with action. Hamilton would incur no debt without simultaneously setting up the instruments for its complete retirement. While Gallatin was Secretary of the Treasury, he reduced the Federal debt from $83,000,000 in 1801 to $45,000,000 in 1812, a reduction of 46 percent, and also paid $15,000,000 to France for the Louisiana Purchase. Here also was action, the kind that emphasized results.

In his budget message made to Congress last January, President Truman estimated the Federal revenue at $39,100,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, and expenditures at $37,500,000,000, allowing a surplus at $1,600,000,000.

In February, the House of Representatives, after a review of this budget, set a ceiling of $31,500,000,000 on spending, $6,000,000,000 less than the President's estimate for the next fiscal year. The Senate voted a $4,500,000,000 saving. To date, the two Chambers have come to no mutual agreement. One must keep in mind that ceilings such as those voted by the House and the Senate are only an expression of intent. The real job of budget cutting takes place in the specific actions on appropriation bills.

On March 27, the House of Representatives approved by a vote of 273 to 137 a plan to reduce, retroactive to last January 1, (a) 30 percent of the taxable personal incomes (after exemptions and deductions) of $1,000, or less; (b) 20 percent on personal incomes up to $302,000; and (c) 10½ percent on higher levels. These reductions, it was estimated, would cut personal income taxes to the Federal Government by $3,800,000,000 during the calendar year of 1947, one-half of which would apply to the current fiscal year ending next June 30.

Total receipts would be reduced substantially with no clear idea at this stage as to what our foreign commitments and domestic expenditures would be during the fiscal year 1947-48. This bizarre program has not lacked plenty of advocates, but what business executive would apply similar reasoning to his own business? If there were some doubt as to levels of income and expenses of a business enterprise, especially after deficits of 16 years, every possible effort would be made to protect a margin when black ink finally might be used instead of red.

In the original budget for 1946-47 a deficit of $3,600,000,000 was forecast. By January 1947 the estimated deficit had been reduced to $2,300,000,000. Recent Treasury statements indicate a surplus over receipts running around $3,000,000,000. It seems to be the opinion of experts that the current fiscal year will end on June 30 with a surplus, but certain extraordinary expenses to be incurred in this fourth quarter raise some question as to the final result. Any excess of income over expenditures will provide the first surplus in 17 long years, since 1930 when Herbert Hoover was in the White House. From 1930 to 1947, the debt has increased sixteenfold, from $16,100,000,000 to $258,000,000,000, no mean feat without the use of magic.

BALANCE BUDGET, REDUCE DEBT

After 17 years there seems to be a growing realization that a balanced budget and public debt reduction are of some importance before material personal income tax reduction. Fortunately for our own national good, we've lost that sophism of the New Deal. "We owe it to ourselves." Somehow or other that adage seemed to lose its potency as an economic easement for tax increases during the war years. The steady increase in personal income tax rates was a greater reality to the individual than the misty idea that the increases made no difference.

Hamilton forecast the difficulty of raising funds by taxation to reduce the debt, but there seems to be a growing conviction among our legislators and taxpayers that relatively heavy taxation until the immediate future is more clearly seen is less onerous than continued inflation in living costs which originally stemmed partly from deficit financing and the inflation of bank credit by forcing $97,000,000,000 of Federal securities into the banking system. A program of positive debt reduction on a large scale, as the most important feature of Federal taxation and monetary policy, would lend hope and confidence to all classes of the population.

Roswell Magill, of Columbia University, and John W. Hanes, both former Under Secretaries of the Treasury, have supported an across-the-board personal income tax cut of 20 percent on the basis that such a program was necessary to preserve free enterprise and high productivity in industry. The theory behind this view rests on the idea that reduced tax rates for wealthy individuals would remove the barriers to incentives for investments by those who really have the funds to invest. There is cogency to this reasoning. The other side of the picture, however, is stressed by the fact (a) that wealthy individuals now are taxed a maximum of 25 percent on capital gains and not as progressive personal income tax rates, and (b) if funds are used largely to reduce the Federal debt, those funds then get into the pockets of securities holders, individual or corporate, and would at least partly be used for reinvestment purposes.

TAX LEGISLATION OBJECTIVES

There are plenty of reasons why taxes should be reduced and little or no reduction made in the Federal debt at this time. Hamilton forecast them in his many state papers over and over again. There were plenty of reasons why we should not have resumed the payment of gold in 1879. There were sound reasons in 1789 why plans should be made to reduce the Federal debt and there were sound reasons in 1879 to resume payment in specie. It took the will to do it. It took action which cut through the red tape of continued debate and pressure politics.

In the light of the variety of conflicting opinions, the following four basic objectives, listed in the order of their importance, would seem to be the elements of sound business policy for consideration in determining taxation legislation at this time:

1. That Federal personal-income-tax legislation be made to apply from June 30 to June 30 to coincide with the fiscal year of

the Federal Government, and accordingly that no legislation whatsoever be enacted at this time, retroactive to last January 1.

2. That every possible cent be saved in the operations of the manifold departments, divisions, bureaus, agencies, and corporations of the Federal Government. Here is the place for heroic but calmly considered decisions of statesmanlike proportions in both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

3. That the Federal debt be reduced at the rate of at least $5,000,000,000 yearly.

4. That the over-all average reductions in personal-income-tax rates for the fiscal year 1947–48 range between 5 and 10 percent, and that the reduction in 1948–49 be based on the size of the surplus in 1947–48 with an anticipated surplus of $5,000,000,000 for continued debt reduction. In any such legislation, consideration should be given to the equalization of taxes to be paid by individuals with the same exemptions and the same incomes throughout the country by enacting provisions which would be uniform with those of the existing nine community-property States.

DEFICIT SPENDING

During the past 15 years, millions of words have been written about deficit spending. The foremost advocates Lord Keynes in Britain, Alvin Hansen, and Stuart Chase in the United States for the economist and the popular reader, soften their case by emphasizing the fact that at the top of the cycle, when business is good, the national debt would be reduced substantially. In a depression the debt would increase, but over the years, good and poor, there would probably be a fairly even balance provided there was sufficient understanding to raise adequate revenue in times of full employment and high business activity.

If we are not in the top segment of a business cycle today, we never shall be. Now is the time to make hay while the sun shines. Sound reasoning and keen business judgment would dictate the desirability of making the greatest inroad on that tremendous Federal debt in the next few years that we have ever made. That objective should be not a yearly token reduction of $1,000,000,000 or $2,000,000,000, but $5,000,000,000 every 12 months, beginning with July 1, next, $25,000,000,000 in the next 5 years.

Visiting Members of Korean Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished group of Korean jurists and members of the bar is now visiting this country to survey our method of training lawyers and the manner in which the American judicial system functions. We welcome our legal brethren from this country which is so close to our hearts and in whose future development we have a profound concern and an extensive stake.

My personal interest in this delegation and their mission is enhanced by the fact that their contact with our Department of State has been through a distinguished son of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, Mr. William Roy Vallance, assistant to the Legal Adviser to the State Department and chairman of the Committee on International Law of the New York State Bar Association. Mr. Vallance is a graduate of the University of Rochester, in the class of 1910, practiced law in the city of Rochester with one of the outstanding firms, then known as Hubbell, Taylor, Goodwin, and Moser, predecessor to the illustrious firm of Nixon, Hargrave, Middleton, and Devans, and in 1918 entered the service of his country in the State Department, where he has for nearly 30 years, with conspicuous devotion, occupied positions of great responsibility.

At a luncheon arranged on May 27 in honor of the Korean delegation, a welcome was extended by Mr. George Maurice Morris, formerly president of the American Bar Association and now Speaker of the House of Deputies of the newly organized International Bar Association, to which response was made by Mr. Justice S. K. Lee of the Korean Supreme Court and by Dr. K. H. Chyun, Secretary of the Korean Legislature.

Under leave granted, I include their remarks on this auspicious occasion:

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF DEPUTIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL BAR ASSOCIATION

All persons interested in the advance of civilization in the path of justice and freedom under law have been concerned about the people of Korea. The sympathy of men of good will for the Koreans in their efforts to achieve self-government has been particularly keen among the members of the legal profession. The familiarity of the members of the bar with the history of governments gives them a realization of the enormous tasks involved in agreeing upon the principles to be incorporated in a system of courts and in the administration of the law. Lawyers know, also, how difficult it is even after principles are agreed upon to see that those principles are put into effect and administered with efficient and even justice for all persons in a community.

We lawyers who are interested in promoting international cooperation among the lawyers of the world are particularly happy in the circumstance that the people of Korea have had the assistance of the lawyers of another country in setting up the judicial and administrative system for the new Korea. Those of us who are practicing law in the District of Columbia are especially delighted that our colleagues, Col. Emery Woodall and Dean Charles Pergler, have played such important parts in this example of how the lawyers of one country may bring aid to the people, the bench, and the bar of another country.

In welcoming our distinguished brethren of the Korean bar here today, we hope that they will henceforth be able to join and continue with the other lawyers of the world in promoting the administration of justice under law among all peoples. The organized lawyers of Korea are sure to be welcomed as members of the International Bar Association. Because of that prospect, we are very happy to have with us Mr. Justice J. K. Lee of the Supreme Court of Korea. We shall be very happy to hear from him, and hope that he will tell us something of the success he and his four colleagues are enjoying in their mission to survey the methods of the training of lawyers in this country and the functioning of the American judicial system.

ADDRESS BY MR. JUSTICE J. K. LEE, OF THE KOREAN SUPREME COURT

Gentlemen, I deeply appreciate your kind invitation today. I am very happy to be here in your beautiful country and to have the opportunity of studying the American judicial system, based upon democratic principles.

We are all grateful to you for the spiritual and economic assistance which the United States has given to our country and our people, and I hope you will continue it in the future. We will do our best so that your favorable assistance will not be in vain.

I have much to say, but I am sorry I cannot express myself fully. Thank you.

ADDRESS BY DR. K. H. CHYUN, SECRETARY OF THE KOREAN LEGISLATURE, ON BEHALF OF THE KOREAN JUDICIAL MISSION TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Chairman and officers of the International Bar Association, speaking for the Korean Judicial Mission, I wish to express our appreciation for this opportunity to meet with you. Before describing briefly some of the development of the administration of justice in Korea by officials and judges since Japanese officials in Korea were removed, I want to answer a question which I know everyone will ask: What will happen in Korea? I will answer that question frankly. We do not know. Perhaps only history will reveal. Now, having answered that question, I cannot resist telling you that the administration of justice in Korea is exclusively in Korean hands. Shortly after American occupation began in Korea, all Japanese judges and officials were removed and the courts, prisons, and the Department of Justice were staffed with Koreans. The courts of Korea were completely delivered into Korean hands when Japanese were ousted. Such action by Maj. Gen. A. V. Arnold, then Military Governor of Korea, represented a great deal of confidence in Korean judges. We believe that we have fulfilled that confidence fairly well. The courts have won the confidence of the people and there has never been any serious criticism of the Korean courts since Korean judges assumed office in November 1945.

The Korean people are very grateful to American Military Government for fulfilling General MacArthur's promise in the first proclamation to the Korean people that freedom of speech and freedom of the press would be given to the Korean people in South Korea, where American forces were in control. During the first few days of American occupation, an ordinance was promulgated repealing all of the political thought-control laws under which Koreans had been arrested and tortured for 40 years. Under these oppressive laws the chief prosecutor of our Supreme Court, Mr. Lee Inn, was tortured and, as a result, is badly crippled today. May I add that the freedom of speech and freedom of the press is being fully enjoyed and used by all Korean politicians today.

One of the fine developments of our administration of justice in Korea was the establishment by Military Government during the first few months of the occupation of the national law library of Korea, to which was assigned a very fine building in the courts center of our national capital. The legal library which the Japanese had provided is wholly inadequate. Because no international exchange has been established for Korean currency, it is not possible for us to use our money to buy the necessary foreign law books. We must for the moment trust that our legal brethren in America and other countries will come to our aid with some law books.

The National Bar Association of Korea would be highly honored to have the opportunity to become affiliated with the International Bar Association. In behalf of all the lawyers of Korea, we again express our thanks for this opportunity of meeting with you.

Lowering the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 5, 1947:

LOWERING THE PRESIDENCY

Harry S. Truman has at last broken his silence on the degradation of democracy in his home county. He doesn't even say that he is against sin.

What the man who occupies the high office of President of the United States does say is that the vote-fraud investigation should be carried through to its logical conclusion—that no one wants to condone a vote fraud.

Could anyone possibly have said less and said anything at all?

Note the circumstances under which Mr. Truman speaks this weak generality. He does not volunteer a statement. He does not come before his press conference ready to take the initiative. He waits until he is questioned. Then he contents himself to say the very least he can.

What a performance for the presidency!

The St. Louis correspondents, as any good reporters would have done, persisted in their attempt to get Mr. Truman on record as to certain vital facts.

Does this "logical conclusion" include a Federal grand jury investigation? The President of the United States cannot answer that. He says he does not know the law, and that if the reporter wants to know, he will have to look it up.

This is a contemptuous remark—contemptuous of the American people who pay Harry Truman to administer the Federal statutes. While it clearly is not beneath him, it is far below the office of the Chief Executive of this great country.

Has the President discussed the compounded theft at Kansas City with his Attorney General, Tom Clark?

Accepting at face value Mr. Truman's answer that he has not, the statement is as amazing true as it would be if it were untrue. Why has he not discussed the case with his chief legal adviser? What sort of thing does he ever discuss with his Attorney General if he does not talk about an outrageous invasion of the free ballot, now made an even greater crime by the theft of the evidence by safe blowers in the dark of night?

Almost at the same time the President of the United States was lowering his great office, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee was hearing from J. Edgar Hoover that the FBI investigation conducted in Kansas City was limited by imposed instructions.

Why was the investigation limited? On whose order was it limited? We know now that the report the hand-picked district attorney, Sam M. Wear, put before the Federal judges in Kansas City was a whitewash. Why should the FBI be associated with any such political cover up?

This makes it plainer than ever that Attorney General Clark is no man to have anything to do with the Federal prosecution. He should have taken the case to the President if the President did not call him in. The record shows now that the Department of Justice is far less than its name.

But let no one think that ground is not being gained. A week ago the President's press secretary said that Mr. Truman had "no comment," and "there is nothing the President could say."

Now the President recognizes the fact of the vote frauds to the extent that he will vaguely, platitudinously, and contemptuously answer questions about them.

He can be sure that he will be confronted with further questions about a genuine Federal prosecution by a fearless, determined special prosecutor and about a Federal elections law.

Meantime, the country is learning about Harry Truman. It is beginning to see what Missouri saw when as a Senator he handled appointments on a personal friendship-machine basis.

It is beginning to feel what Missouri felt when he handed down, on a certain celebrated occasion, the ukase: "It is Hannegan or nobody."

Socialism by Indirection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of June 4, 1947:

SOCIALISM BY INDIRECTION

To say that the Federal Government has a housing program is to speak inexactly.

During a decade and a half 13 housing agencies have been created at Washington which, in President Truman's language, were scattered around in seven departments and independent agencies.

The accumulation of activities is an illustration of the pattern of paternalism in government.

It is also a typical example of the bewildering growth of bureaucracy, which accounts in part for the huge Federal pay rolls and explains in part the difficulty of balancing the Federal budget or of procuring in Congress the enactment of any just or adequate tax reduction legislation.

Recognizing the fact that this is a politically fostered problem that cannot be ignored, President Truman has informed Congress that he intends to do something about it.

Unless Congress instructs him otherwise, he is going to make a change.

The trouble with the President's announcement, however, is that it proposes to dispose of the problem by retaining and perpetuating the whole incongruous variety of housing services, instead of arranging for their reduction and, eventually, their total elimination.

As an emergency measure, under the First War Powers Act, the Federal housing agencies have been loosely and temporarily consolidated in a National Housing Agency.

With the forthcoming lapse of this Agency, the separate functions will revert to their former locations in the Government.

To avert such an outcome, the President tells Congress that he intends to create a Housing and Home Finance Agency, which will supplant the wartime expedient and become a lasting fixture of the national establishment.

If Congress accedes, a huge bureaucratic bloc will be inseparably cemented into the sprawling Federal structure.

It will include what Mr. Truman vaguely referred to as remaining emergency housing activities pending the completion of their liquidation.

The reference would indicate a future reduction of Federal housing agencies.

But it is most unlikely that any important retrenchment will occur.

It is in the nature of bureaucracy to insure its own continuance and aggrandizement: Cessation of one activity usually involves merely a transfer of pay-roll personnel to another one.

Moreover, the actual prospect before the country is an enormous increase—in fact, a multiplication—of Federal housing schemes and expenditures.

The socialistic Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill is still unfinished business in Congress.

The bill would ensconce a virtual Federal dictatorship over housing.

It would commit the Government to a 45-year program of promoting and paying the operating deficits of innumerable local public housing authorities.

It would imply incomputable Federal expenditures estimated by housing specialists at more than $6,000,000,000 a year.

President Truman plainly contemplated the passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, for in his message to Congress he said:

"Whatever may be the permanent housing functions of the Government, whether they be confined to the existing programs or supplemented as Congress may determine, they are inevitably correlated."

In other words, the extravagant Wagner-Ellender-Taft scheme would become a component of the New Deal's organization, adding untold billons of dollars to the Government's liabilities and commitments.

Nowhere in sight is there a curtailment of bureaucracy or any official purpose of getting the Government out of business in competition with private enterprise.

And there has been nothing in Federal housing to justify its destructive socialism.

Public housing has not prevented nor even relieved a so-called housing shortage.

At the same time, bureaucratic restrictions and interference with the whole housing industry—including rent controls—are preventing free enterprise from providing what the Government obviously cannot provide, at whatever cost.

Congress can deal with this ominous situation—and further estop the furtive socialization of America—by three simple, commonsense procedures.

First. There should be no more Federal housing programs. The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill should be rejected.

Second. President Truman's latest proposal is issued under the Reorganization Act of 1946.

That means it will become law by an Executive ukase, unless both Houses of Congress vote to disapprove it within 60 days.

Both Houses should do so.

Third. Congress itself should institute action to liquidate all Federal housing agencies and to get the Government out of a field of business where no government is competent to operate.

Cash for Terminal Leave Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herewith the following editorial from the

Tampa Morning Tribune, Tampa, Fla., on June 8, 1947, and written by Mr. E. D. Lambright, one of the outstanding newspapermen of Florida and of the South:

CASH FOR GI BONDS

Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of the Sixth Florida District, is making earnest effort to enable GI veterans to obtain cash on their terminal leave bonds. His proposed legislation to this end is receiving Nationwide commendation.

Mr. ROGERS first introduced a bill providing that these terminal leave bonds could be redeemed in cash, upon application of the bondholder. This bill met with objection by the Treasury Department, which feared that cashing the bonds might disturb the cash status of the Treasury and possibly prevent balancing the budget.

To avoid these objections, Mr. ROGERS has presented another bill, which provides that these bonds, although not redeemable by the Government on demand, be made negotiable, so that the veterans may sell their bonds, for not less than face value, plus the accrued interest. Under the present law these bonds are not negotiable, may not be cashed until 5 years after discharge, and bear 2½ percent interest. This law is unfair to the holders of the bonds, because some of the enlisted men were paid in cash on furlough and the officers received their accrued leave pay at separation centers, while the other group of enlisted men were forced to wait for their money.

The plan of Mr. ROGERS will permit these veterans to convert their bonds into immediate cash, if they wish to do so, and those who buy them will make a sound investment.

Adoption of the Rogers plan should not encourage veterans to cash their gilt-edged securities for unwise and extravagant expenditures, but it will give them the privilege, if and when they need money, to get it and use it to their best advantage.

We are sure that the holders of these terminal leave bonds heartily approve the bill of the able Florida Representative. It should be promptly passed.

National Heart Disease Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of the bill to provide for research relating to diseases of the heart and circulation and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, and so forth, referred to in my address today, and which is endorsed by the American Heart Association, the leading private agency in this field:

H. R. 3762

A bill to provide for research relating to diseases of the heart and circulation and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such diseases, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Heart Disease Act."

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. For the purpose of improving the health of the people of the United States through the conduct of researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of diseases of the heart and circulation (hereafter in this act referred to as "heart diseases"); assisting and fostering such researches and activities by public and private agencies, and promoting the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results; training personnel in matters relating to heart diseases; and developing, and assisting States in the use of, the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of heart diseases; there is hereby established in the Public Health Service (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Service"), a division of the National Institute of Health to be known as the National Heart Disease Institute (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Institute").

SEC. 3. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Surgeon General of the Service (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Surgeon General") is authorized, through the Institute, to—

(a) conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of heart diseases;

(b) promote the coordination of researches conducted by the institute, and similar researches conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

(c) make available research facilities of the Service to appropriate public authorities, and to health officials and scientists engaged in special studies related to the purposes of this Act;

(d) make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private institutions, and to individuals for such research projects as are recommended by the National Heart Disease Council (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Council"), including grants to such institutions for the construction, acquisition, leasing, and equipment of hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities necessary for such research;

(e) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, information as to, and the practical application of, research and other activities carried on pursuant to this act;

(f) secure from time to time, and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of persons from the United States or abroad who are experts in the field of heart diseases;

(g) establish and maintain, from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose, fellowships in the Institute with such stipends and allowances, including travel and subsistence expenses) as he may deem necessary to procure the assistance of the most brilliant and promising research fellows from the United States and abroad;

(h) (1) provide training and instruction in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of heart diseases to persons found by him to have proper qualifications, and fix and pay to any of such persons as he may designate a per diem allowance during such training and instruction of not to exceed $10, the number of such persons receiving such training and instruction to be fixed by the Council; and (2) provide such training and instruction, and demonstrations, through grants, upon recommendation of the Council, to public and other nonprofit institutions, including grants to such institutions for the construction, acquisition, leasing, and equipment of hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities necessary for such training and instruction;

(i) for purposes of study, admit and treat at the Institute voluntary patients suffering from heart diseases, whether or not otherwise eligible for such treatment by the Service;

(j) adopt, upon recommendation of the Council, such additional means as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

NATIONAL HEART DISEASE COUNCIL

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby created a National Heart Disease Council, to consist of the Surgeon General or his representative, the chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Army or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Navy or his representative, and 12 members appointed without regard to the civil-service laws by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Administrator"). The 12 appointed members shall be outstanding persons who have had wide experience and have demonstrated competence in scientific matters, and 6 of such 12 shall be selected from leading medical or scientific authorities who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of heart diseases.

(b) Each appointed member of the Council shall hold office for a term of 6 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that, of the members first appointed, four shall hold office for a term of 4 years and four for a term of 2 years, as designated by the Surgeon General. None of such 12 members shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term. Every 2 years the Council shall elect one member to act as Chairman for the succeeding 2-year period.

(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters related to the work of the Service for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine to be necessary.

(d) Each appointed member of the Council, while attending conferences or meetings of the Council or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Administrator, but not exceeding $50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from his place of residence.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL

SEC. 5. The Council is authorized to—

(a) review research projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it relating to the study of the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases, and recommend to the Surgeon General, for prosecution under this act, any such projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases;

(b) review applications from any university, hospital, laboratory, or other institution or agency, whether public or private, or from individuals, for grants-in-aid for research and demonstration projects relating to heart diseases, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of grants-in-aid in the cases of such projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart disease;

(c) review applications from any public or other nonprofit institution for grants-in-aid for training and instruction in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of heart diseases, and certify to the Surgeon General its approval of such applications for grants-in-aid as it determines will best carry out the purposes of this act;

(d) collect information as to studies which are being carried on in the United States or any other country as to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases, by correspondence or by

personal investigation of such studies, and with the approval of the Surgeon General make available such information through appropriate publications for the benefit of health and welfare agencies and organization (public or private), physicians, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public;

(e) recommend to the Surgeon General for acceptance conditional gifts pursuant to section 501 of the Public Health Service Act for carrying out the purposes of this act; and

(f) advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to carrying out the provisions of this act.

GIFTS

SEC. 6. The Surgeon General shall recommend to the Administrator acceptance of conditional gifts, pursuant to section 501 of the Public Health Service Act, for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases, or for the acquisition of grounds or for the erection, equipment, or maintenance of premises, buildings, or equipment of the Institute. Donations of $50,000 or over for carrying out the purposes of this act may be acknowledged by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

GRANTS TO STATES

SEC. 7. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to make grants-in-aid, as provided in this section, to States, counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the States for the establishment and maintenance of programs of prevention, treatment, and control of heart diseases, including the provision of appropriate facilities for care and treatment and including the training of personnel for State and local health work.

(b) For each fiscal year, the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, shall determine the total sum from the appropriation under section 8 (a) which shall be available for allotment among the several States under this section. He shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Administrator, from time to time make allotments from such sum to the several States on the basis of (1) the population (2) the extent of the heart-disease problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States. Upon making such allotments, the Surgeon General shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts thereof.

(c) The Surgeon General shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts to be paid to each State from the allotments to such State, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by the amount by which he finds that estimates of required expenditures with respect to any prior period were greater or less than the actual expenditures for such period. Upon receipt of such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in accordance with such certification.

(d) The money so paid to any State shall be expended solely in carrying out the purposes for which the grant is made and in accordance with plans presented by the health authority of such State and approved by the Surgeon General. The Surgeon General shall not approve any such plan unless it provides for expenditure thereunder, from funds of the State or from funds of the State and its political subdivisions, of such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator.

(e) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the health authority of the State, finds that there is a failure to comply substantially with either—

(1) the provisions of this section;

(2) the plan submitted under subsection (d); or

(3) the regulations prescribed with respect to grants under this section;

the Surgeon General shall notify such State health authority either that further payments will not be made to the State under this section (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State under this section for activities in which there is such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Surgeon General shall make no further certification for payment to such State under this section, or shall limit payments to activities in which there is no such failure.

(f) All regulations and amendments thereto with respect to grants to States under this section shall be made after consultation with a conference of the State health authorities. Insofar as practicable, the Surgeon General shall obtain the agreement of the State health authorities prior to the issuance of any such regulations or amendments.

APPROPRIATIONS AND BUILDINGS

SEC. 8. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) There is also authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $2,000,000 for the erection and equipment, for the use of the Institute in carrying out the provisions of this act, of suitable and adequate laboratory and clinical research buildings and facilities, including necessary living quarters for personnel. The Federal Works Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a suitable and adequate site or sites, selected on the advice of the Surgeon General, in or near the District of Columbia for such buildings and facilities, and to erect thereon, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities when funds are made available. The amount authorized to be appropriated in this subsection shall include the cost of preparation of drawings and specifications, supervision of construction, and other administrative expenses incident to the work: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Agency shall prepare the plans and specifications, make all necessary contracts, and supervise construction.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) So much of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 8 (a) for a fiscal year as are allocated by the Surgeon General during such year for grants-in-aid under section 3 for research and training (including construction in connection therewith) shall remain available for such purposes until the end of the fifth fiscal year following such year.

(b) This act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting (1) the functions, under any other act, of the Surgeon General or the Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to the study of the causes, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of heart diseases; or (2) the expenditure of money therefor.

(c) The Surgeon General shall perform his functions under this act under the supervision and direction of the Administrator. The Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(d) As used in this act, the term "State" means a State or the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alsaka, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

(e) The Surgeon General shall include in the report for submission to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session a full report of the administration of the act, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements.

Reading the Signs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1947

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Upton Close from the New York Journal-American:

READING THE SIGNS

(By Upton Close)

How President Truman expects to fight communism in Greece with an initial $250,000,000 "take" from American taxpayers became somewhat clearer when word leaked out that his State Department had demanded that Greece release political prisoners, apparently as a condition for getting the money.

The political prisoners in question are highly revolutionary Communist leaders. To think that they would become law-abiding citizens within the measurable future is absurd.

These prisoners were among the Greek resistance groups whom we supplied surreptitiously with arms during the Nazi occupation there. Our own Army Intelligence knew that these revolutionaries whom we glorified under the name of Partisans, held their best fighting units and arms in hiding, instead of throwing them against the Nazis.

As Hitler's forces withdrew, the Partisans rose up and sacked Athens, burned and blasted trains, and anti-Communist Greek cities and police barricades.

As soon as the Red army, swinging across the Balkans, reached the Greek border, it began supplying the now-imprisoned Red revolutionaries with arms and in some instances with men.

For the United States to insist that Greece release these enemies of the state, while that country is in a condition requiring American military equipment and advisers, is indeed a queer way to fight communism.

What confidence, that we are really going to aid threatened anti-Communist governments, will remain in Greece and the other border countries?

How long will the American people put up with an administration which talks one way but acts another, which makes a big show of fighting communism to get money from Congress, then spends the funds furthering the cause of communism?

The State Department said it must have power to withhold exports and other aid arbitrarily from any country. The Department spokesman gave the impression that the purpose of the new policy would be to deny aid to Communist countries, while throwing our weight to the anti-Communists.

But 3 days later the Department said Spain would be the first target. Spain, being strongly anti-Marxist, conventionally Catholic, is the object of the most intense hatred on the part of Communists—including many an employee in our State Department.

This is the same Department which even yet is pressuring Chiang to make his Chinese Government democratic by taking in the revolutionary Communists, and permitting the Communist wing of the proposed government to maintain its own Red army.

And, though Brazil virtually outlaws its Communist Party and Mexico's President declares against the Reds, our State Department resents efforts to force the firing of our Latin-American diplomatic fixer, Spruille Braden, ardent pro-Soviet.

George C. Marshall himself comes in for a rap, as John Foster Dulles, who accompanied him to the Moscow conferences, reveals that the hardened, former soldier talked too softly to the Muscovites.

What is back of all this double talk about fighting communism?

The answer is American New Deal Marxism. And you may translate that word "communism" without shaving it much.

New Deal Marxism has so thoroughly colored the thinking of the administration for so many years that we need expect little as long as this administration remains in the White House.

The Antilabor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include as a part of my remarks a reprint from the Chicago Times which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for April 24, 1947. It follows:

A NEW LABOR BILL, BUT—

(Republicans are playing politics with labor bill, editorial charges; says President would have to veto any extreme legislation; this would be unfortunate because it would prevent badly needed labor reforms; warns Congress against return to an era of union-busting strife.)

(From the Chicago Times)

The House of Representatives has passed what the United Press news service terms "the most rigid union control bill in American labor history." The measure now goes to the Senate, whose labor committee has approved a much "milder" labor reform bill.

Washington observers have little doubt that President Truman will be forced to veto whatever measure the two Houses finally agree upon.

The reason: Republicans who control Congress are playing politics. They are wrapping good and bad labor legislation in one package and presenting it to President Truman on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. In order to get reasonable legislation the Nation needs the President would have to approve other measures he considers harmful. Thus the Republicans want to put President Truman on a spot. When he vetoes the bill, they'll scream he is sidetracking needed labor reforms.

FAIR CHANGES ARE NEEDED

It is unfortunate that the Republican leadership has decided to play politics with labor legislation. It is unfortunate because the country needs some labor reforms. But it needs changes—like the Securities and Exchange Commission law passed to keep Wall Street on the straight and narrow—which are designed to restrain certain questionable practices of some unions and are not rigged to strengthen employers at the expense of all unions.

How a measure works out often depends on its interpretation in the courts. The Wagner Act, for example, was supposed to bring industrial peace. But Congress didn't cover all the possible situations which arose under it. The Supreme Court was forced to make decisions which seemed to exempt unions even from laws prohibiting monopolistic, trade-restraining, and even criminal practices.

Some unions have used their power to force employers to agree to "featherbed" practices. These practices—paying for labor not performed, forbidding use of new materials and processes, etc.—increase the cost of merchandise and services to the public. They have greatly retarded the housing program, for one example.

Former Federal trust-buster Thurman Arnold recently advised Congress that legislation ought to be passed outlawing these union practices:

1. Economic restraints or coercion to prevent use of cheaper material, improved equipment, or more efficient methods.

2. Any sort of coercion designed to compel hiring of useless and unnecessary labor.

3. Any sort of coercion to fix prices for any commodity or service except wages.

BAN ON FEATHER-BEDDING

These are among the clarifications of the Wagner Act enlightened businessmen and fair-minded union leaders want to see Congress enact. The House bill includes a ban on featherbedding. But President Truman couldn't O. K. it without also approving legislation which the Supreme Court might be forced to interpret as a virtual repeal of the Wagner Act. Such a repeal probably would bring a return to the dog-eat-dog, labor spy, bloody bust-the-unions era. Such a period of chaos would be an invitation to Communists to reap a harvest.

Unions have demonstrated ability to lead the way on many occasions. A recent criticism of the present Federal law calling for a 30-day cooling-off period is in point. The Illinois State Federation of Labor pointed out that under the Smith-Connally Act, "upon failure to settle within 30 days, the question of a possible strike must be immediately put to an official vote. That's crazy, of course."

As we have said before, the State federation's opposition to considering strikes as one of the first items of business instead of as a last resource shows a maturity of thinking manifested all too little by congressional reformers who are rushing in with bills to save the workers from the big, bad unions.

Some of the Congressmen might better study the steel agreement as evidence that a big union and a big industry can get together when there's a real will to reach agreement.

A Plea for the Small Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by J. K. Lasser, well-known tax expert, which appeared in the New York Times magazine:

Ever since the first lawmakers solemnly gathered together to think up the first tax, a basic canon has been "The tax shall be proportionate to the ability to pay." Every time the American Congress squares away to draw up a new tax schedule this old maxim is waved in the oratorical winds.

Sometimes it is interpreted as a mandate to "soak the rich"—because their ability to pay is highly visible. More generally, the principle is one of taking a little from those who have a little, a lot from those who have a lot.

That is why our income-tax forms are a phantasmagoria of exemptions, deductions, graduated surtax brackets, computations of capital gains and losses, percentages piled on nets and all those other minutiae which are designed to make sure the tax burden is equitable.

The only trouble with it all is that it isn't equitable. The well-intended hair-splittings leave important factors in the tax burden unfairly imposed. And, contrary to general belief, most of these inequities fall upon the lower-bracket taxpayers.

EXCUSE FOR TAX INJUSTICE

The excuse generally given is that in dealing with 40,000,000 or so taxpayers arbitrary lines must be drawn somewhere. But it is a grave question whether simplicity in statute and alleged difficulties in administration are reason enough for the shortcomings in the law. I think not.

Let us examine some of the more obvious tax discriminations.

Uniforms and the cost of maintaining them ought to be a tax deduction when they are part of the requirements of a job. A couple of court decisions have said that, too. Contrast these costs with those of the fortunate group who wear their street clothes to work. But tax collectors are niggardly. They still refuse to allow the few dollars for even a nurse's uniform.

Similarly, the cost of transportation is often a very heavy item in family budgets. Yet the Treasury persists in refusing to allow it as a deduction on the income-tax return. That is tax injustice at its worst.

A businessman may wine and dine prospects to build up future years' income and get a tax deduction for it. It seems fantastic that the salaried worker cannot take off the measly cost necessary to get to and from his work.

UNFAIR TO THE HOUSEWIFE

The high cost of living has forced many a housewife from her domestic duties. Yet, when a skilled housewife makes best economic and social use of her talent she is severely punished by our tax laws. The cost of a household substitute to do her domestic work cannot be deducted on her tax return.

A real inequity exists in the denial of educational costs. Expenses of a doctor in taking post-graduate courses—however necessary to keep posted in his work—cannot be deducted on his return. By some strange logic, the Treasury considers these expenses to be personal expenses. Yet these expenses produce the very income of these people that are taxed.

Strange are the workings of the medical and health deductions. Medical expenses, up to the first 5 percent of one's income, must be borne as a personal expense. What is equally bad is that there is a maximum limit to the deduction. Many a man who has accumulated his ills over years of labor finds that his medical expenses pile up at the wrong time—near the end of his journey.

The Government certainly subscribes to Emerson's dictum that a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds; only the taxpayer must be consistent—but the Government, never.

Take a cash-basis taxpayer, for example, who has received a promissory note as compensation. Does he have to report the value of the note as income, even though he has not yet received the cash? "Why, certainly," says the Government.

THE GOVERNMENT SAYS "NO"

But suppose the same taxpayer, because of lack of immediate cash, has paid one of his own suppliers with a promissory note. "No," says the Government. "You must pay the note first before you can take the deduction."

What happens to this taxpayer as a result of the Government blowing hot and cold through both sides of its face at once? He pays a much higher income tax precisely at the time when he is short of cash. Only wealthier taxpayers can avoid the burden. They can pay debts in cash.

Smith gives his widowed daughter a monthly allowance. She supports herself and three minor children. Smith can get merely one dependency credit, that is, an exemption of $500.

Yet if he directly supported each child he would get four exemptions aggregating $2,000. To do so he would have to really interfere with the paternal domestic management of the mother of the children.

It would be much better if Smith gave his daughter the money to manage her household as her reason dictated. The Treasury should not concern itself with legislative distinctions.

Hawaii Deserving of Statehood, Says Milwaukee Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of Milwaukee, Wis., as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The request of the Hawaiians for inclusion in the United States is one matter before Congress that should call for no extended deliberation. Opinion seems almost unanimous that our Pacific stronghold is deserving of statehood.

The residents of the islands have voted for statehood. A congressional committee has voiced its approval after an investigation. President Truman favors statehood. His views were reiterated recently when Secretary of the Interior Krug told the Hawaiian Legislature that the administration is pledged to do everything it can to make Hawaii the forty-ninth State.

Secretary Krug reviewed all the arguments for statehood. He said it was a basic concept of the American system that people should have the right to take an active part in making the laws by which they are governed. He said there is no place in a democratic set-up for "dependent peoples" or "three-quarters citizens." Pointing out that Hawaii pays more taxes to the Federal Government than many States, he added that our war for independence was fought against the idea of taxation without representation.

Hawaii is qualified in every way for statehood, Mr. Krug declared. It has greater population, greater economic strength, and a more stable government than many States had at the time of their admission to the Union, he argued.

As to objections that Hawaii is not contiguous, Krug argued that no such objection was raised to California's admission in 1850, although "we couldn't travel to it overnight or talk to it on the telephone." And to the complaint that Hawaii's population is too heterogeneous, he pointed out that these diverse groups have lived and worked together amicably and democratically for years, and their record of patriotism during the recent war was second to none.

In conclusion, the Secretary made a point that is often overlooked—that the United States has much to gain from Hawaii's statehood, perhaps even more than Hawaii. Such statehood, he said, will add "an informed and experienced element" to our national deliberations on Pacific affairs. Because of our increased interest in the entire Pacific area, we must place a stronger national reliance upon the people of Hawaii. Statehood will encourage Hawaiian loyalties to American interests, and will strengthen our cause in the vast region that is so important to our national welfare.

"I can think of no reason for denying statehood to Hawaii," Krug told the legislators in historic Iolani palace. Truly, there seems no good reason. Here is a matter that all factions in Congress should be able to dispose of in a hurry.

Reds in Our Atom-Bomb Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Reds in Our Atom-Bomb Plants" by the Honorable J. PARNELL THOMAS, of New Jersey, which appeared in the June 21 issue of Liberty magazine:

REDS IN OUR ATOM-BOMB PLANTS

(By Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, as told to Stacy V. Jones)

The Atomic Energy Commission must come to grips shortly with pro-Soviet infiltration of its own organization. Fellow travelers, if not actual members of the Communist Party, have, for instance, ensconced themselves in the great plants at Oak Ridge, Tenn., where U-235 is separated for use in the atomic bomb.

On a recent visit to Oak Ridge, I was startled to find how many Communist suspects were on duty there—in the electromagnetic plant, the gaseous diffusion plant, or the Clinton Laboratories where general nuclear research is conducted. The laboratories are the most heavily infested.

A Communist policy enforces concealment of party membership on persons holding responsible Government jobs, and there can be no doubt that, in addition to the known adherents, many others are on the pay roll. I examined Army Intelligence reports on a number of men holding strategic positions. Several of these dossiers showed, in my opinion, very serious cases.

A natural question is why the known followers of the party line haven't been fired. The commanding officer assured me that the matter was very delicate, for if certain of the suspected physicists were discharged scores of other scientists had threatened to walk out. This inability to throw out persons of doubtful loyalty is a serious matter.

Communist penetration has apparently been more successful at Oak Ridge than at Hanford, Los Alamos, or the other atomic-energy installations. The morale of the whole organization has, however, suffered from the confusion marking transfer of control from Army to civilian hands. On my unannounced call at Oak Ridge I noticed, for one thing, the absence of elementary security precautions.

The Oak Ridge area of 59,000 acres is surrounded by a fence, which during the war was patrolled by soldiers. This perimeter guard had been withdrawn at the time of my visit, and indeed very few MP's were on duty anywhere at Oak Ridge. Guards, of course, question any stranger at the gates, and they also patrol connecting roads. But there is nothing to stop anyone climbing the fence, even in daylight, and approaching within perhaps 75 yards of one of the three widely separated plants. Each of these is fenced, and patroled by civilian guards. If anyone were bent on sabotage it would be possible to do considerable damage at 75 yards, even with hand weapons.

On my return to Washington the deputy general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, who also was its acting director of security, called on me. It later developed that he has a brother who is a member of the Communist Party. I am not so much disturbed by this fact—because he himself has a record of loyal service and the two are estranged—as by the fact that he seemed to be unfamiliar with security conditions at Oak Ridge. He thought, for instance, that there was still a perimeter guard of military police.

Besides the danger from sabotage or the physical penetration by actual Soviet agents, there is another danger which lies in the susceptibility of gullible American scientists employed by the Atomic Energy Commission, or the contractors who operate its plants and laboratories. Our scientists, it seems, are well schooled in their specialties but not in the history of Communist tactics and designs. They have a weakness for attending meetings, signing petitions, sponsoring committees, and joining organizations labeled "liberal" or "progressive" but which are actually often Communist fronts.

Thus the dossiers that I examined at Oak Ridge showed memberships in many organizations which have been classified by various investigating bodies as Communist fronts. One is called the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. This is an innocent enough title. What harm in joining it? Only that it has been initiated and manipulated by the Communist Party behind a facade of loosely organized southern liberals. Earl Browder testified that it was a "transmission belt" of his party.

Among the politically naive, one front leads to another, and finally to action. Communism is not a disease of the poor but an affliction of the academic and professional classes. Dr. X, for instance, has a wife who is an active party member. This, say his friends, makes no difference in his loyalty. But the party's 1938 constitution provides that "no party member shall have personal or political relationship with known enemies of the party and the working class." Under Communist usage, a pro-Communist wife could not properly live with an anti-Communist husband.

There are a number of cases paralleling that of Dr. and Mrs. X. One couple, both on the suspect list and both employed daytimes in one of the plants, give the security officers uneasy moments by staying there evenings.

Relatives of staff members come and go at Oak Ridge. It is a town of some 40,000 and in a year the turn-over may be several times that figure. Only strict security regulation under expert military personnel could control the contracts with American Communist relatives and even espionage agents.

There are minor signs of Soviet sympathies, including distribution of the Communist Daily Worker. The wife of one Oak Ridge employee was found to be employed at the Soviet Embassy in Washington. There is no active Communist cell at Knoxville, 26 miles from Oak Ridge. More alarming is the case of Professor Y, on the staff of one of the Oak Ridge plants, who spent most of one summer vacation in Canada visiting his friend, Dr. Alan Nunn May, since committed to 10 years' penal servitude for betraying British Government secrets.

Among the scientific societies at Oak Ridge there is much advocacy of free interchange of scientific information. This sounds plau-

sible enough until it involves national safety. In his curious confession, Dr. May wrote: "I gave and had given very careful consideration to correctness of making sure that develpoment of atomic energy was not confined to United States of America, I took the very painful decision that it was necessary to convey general information on atomic energy and make sure it was taken seriously." So he gave away secrets to a Russian agent, influenced no doubt by ideology but accepting $700 and two bottles of whisky.

That Americans can be equally generous is shown by the case of Z, a scientist working on the bomb project at Chicago in 1943. The FBI saw him hand a package to a Russian agent. The package proved to contain valuable information. The American was speedily inducted and sent to the Pacific, but his wife used their home in Brooklyn as a mail drop for the Russian agent. The latter's movements were followed by the FBI.

Each of hundreds of scientists has knowledge that could shorten an enemy's time in perfecting the bomb. If five key men could be subverted, years could be saved. It is fortunate that the wartime operations were compartmentalized, so that dupes can give away bits and pieces but not the whole story.

One high Government scientist—let us call him Dr. V—was preparing to fly to a Moscow congress of scientists, and the Army was jittery about what he might say overseas. The Russian plane which was to take him to Moscow was serviced by American Army mechanics at New York. First it had engine trouble and then a military truck accidentally backed into it. But after word came that the scientist's passport had been canceled, the mechanics speedily had it ready for the take-off.

In their efforts to pry loose information, Communists make every effort to use the cluster of associations set up by the atomic scientists themselves. The Federation of American Scientists (formerly the Federation of Atomic Scientists) ostensibly includes most of those who worked on the atom-bomb project in our many plants and laboratories. With it are affiliated the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists, Inc., the big-name money-raising group, and the educational or propaganda branch, the National Committee on Atomic Information.

From its office on Nassau Street in Princeton the Emergency Committee sent out solicitation for a $1,000,000 educational fund over the signature of Dr. Albert Einstein as chairman. The letterhead carried the names of half a dozen other top-flight scientists on various college factulties. I do not characterize the committee as a Communist front, nor Dr. Einstein as a Communist, but it is notable that Communist fronts energetically cultivate him. They welcome him as a sponsor, and he has lent his name to a score of organizations classified as fronts by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Committee on Atomic Information, which, like the Federation, has offices in Washington, grew out of atomic scientists' efforts to shape atomic legislation. Robert K. Lamb of the CIO United Steelworkers has always been active in the committee. He was chairman of a meeting of the National Student League at Harvard in 1934 after a disturbance had been started at the Charlestown Navy Yard by students and members of the Young Communist League. The National Student League has been cited in four Government reports as a Communist front. Lamb was a contributor to the Communist New Masses in 1938.

From February to July of last year Mrs. Edith Marzani, employed through Lamb, worked in the committee's offices. She is the wife of Carl A. Marzani, a card-carrying Communist Party member who was for years in positions of confidence with the Office of Strategic Services and later with the State Department. He is now under multiple indictments in Federal court.

A former director of the National Committee on Atomic Information was discharged after various complaints, including the allegation that he had been meticulously following the party line. On the NCAI stationery have appeared the names of various persons with long records of Communist-front affiliations, and they have made effective use of their NCAI connection. I do not charge that the committee is a Communist front, but merely point to the danger.

The Communists' usual method of infiltrating a society is to hide their party affiliation, volunteer for the hard detail work that others are likely to shirk, and eventually make themselves indispensable. Finally there are a Communist executive secretary and several Communist executive committee members, controlling funds and directing policies.

The American-Soviet Science Society recently solicited memberships among the staff of the National Bureau of Standards, citing the membership on its executive committee of Dr. Edward U. Condon, director of the Bureau. The letterhead showed affiliation with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., a known Communist front. Dr. Condon's is indeed a name to conjure with, as he was made scientific adviser to the special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy in the last Congress about the time Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace appointed him to his post in the Bureau of Standards. He has also been a sponsor of the Washington committee of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

Science groups inside our bomb fences, including Oak Ridge Engineers and Scientists and the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists, were extraordinarily active last summer in opposing military control of the atomic project. The House at that time was considering amendments to the bill creating the Atomic Energy Commission which would have assured membership on the Commission to at least one man from the armed forces. Those of us on the Military Affairs Committee were flooded with letters, telegrams, and telephone calls from all parts of the country urging adoption of the original Senate bill with its all-civilian commission. These were in such volume as obviously to have been planted by professional lobbyists. In addition to the honest protests, many bore the Communist stamp.

One wire from inside the fence was signed by the executive committee of the Association of Los Alamos Scientists. Referring to the proposed amendments, it said, "We particularly deprecate the increased emphasis on secrecy and the inclusion of military personnel on the Commission, since both are contrary to the spirit and interest of any sound solution of the problem of international control of atomic energy." This came, mind you, from the very center of our bomb manufacture.

This is reminiscent of the satirical complaint of the New Leader, an American Socialist (and anti-Communist) paper, that by our indecision and criminal weakness we have forced the Soviet Union to steal the atomic bomb before we could give it to them.

Revelations of the Canadian scandal came while the bill was before Congress, and were dismissed by advocates of civilian control as "hysteria" over a spy scare. The sober report of the Royal Commission, with its 700 pages of evidence, is anything but hysterical, and gains strength from its understatement.

In Canada, the Soviet military spy ring got control of the Canadian Association of Scientific Workers. The corresponding society in this country, the American Assocation of Scientific Workers, has been lauded by the Daily Worker, in which nothing appears without design.

Chapter 25 of the International Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians, CIO, conducted a special membership campaign in the atomic-research laboratories of the University of California at Berkeley. A State legislative committee, after investigation, concluded that the FAECT and its west-coast chapters were Communist organized. Minutes of 1943 meetings of chapter 25's executive committee disclosed a surreptitious plan to obtain lists of the laboratory personnel, to infiltrate the entire project, and to propagandize and organize the scientists there, meanwhile avoiding detection by the FBI. Scientists engaged in atomic research at Berkeley were at the same time lecturing on scientific matters at the Communist California Labor School in San Francisco.

One of the unions at Oak Ridge recognized by the Atomic Energy Commission is the Atomic Workers Organizing Council of the United Gas, Coke and Chemical Workers, CIO. The union is known to have been deeply penetrated by Communists.

Russia, for obvious reasons, welcomes international meetings and societies of scientific workers. The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, copies of which are distributed by the national committee on atomic information, has described the organization in England last summer of a world-wide federation of national associations of scientific workers. Two scientists attended as observers for the Federation of American Scientists, Prof. Frederic Joliot-Curie, a French Communist, was elected president of the provisional executive council. Norman Veall was made regional representative for the British Commonwealth. Veall has been examined by the Royal Commission in Canada, which concluded from the evidence that Veall did not communicate information with respect to atomic work for the reason that the Russians designedly did not ask him.

The international federation was of "trade-union-type organizations of academic and industrial scientists, teachers, and related professional workers," according to the account in the Bulletin. Among those in attendance was listed a representative of the Engineers and Architects Association, Pasadena.

One American also attended as representative of the Federation of American Scientists, an international conference of atomic scientists held a few days later at Oxford. This was called by the (British) Atomic Scientists Asssociation, a limited group of highly qualified scientists.

Naturally Professor Joliot-Curie is all for getting whatever information he can out of the United States. The Sunday magazine published by the New York Daily Worker recently carried an article signed by him as director of the French Government Atomic Energy Commission. "I consider as very dangerous," says the article, "the position taken up by the United States during recent talks regarding the maintenance of secrecy over atomic research, because keeping the secrets of the atomic bomb appears as a means of pressure."

The science lobby which operated on Congress last year had two goals: to get the military out of Oak Ridge and other reservations, and to get David E. Lilienthal in as chairman. It is obvious why fellow travelers wanted the military out. They apparently wanted Lilienthal in, although he is not a Communist, because he lacked experience on security measures and because he was a known liberal. He was, indeed, a sponsor of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

Atomic production and research should remain for the present entirely a military province. We cannot afford to lower our guard for a moment. The Soviet Union has large and active espionage organizations here—military, secret police, and party—whose chief purpose is to get atomic information. Our committee itself has unmasked several espionage agents and passport forgers.

Our Atomic Energy Act of 1946, finally passed in the Senate form, recognizes that

the development of atomic energy is subject at all times to the paramount objective of assuring the common defense and security.

It is, however, unrealistic in that it places this vital weapon in the inexperienced hands of civilians. True enough, under the commission is a division of military application, headed by a military man, and there is a military liaison committee representing the Army and Navy which has a right of appeal to the President. But this is far from military control.

A further flaw lies in the security provisions, which authorize the FBI to investigate the personnel but give it no authority to bar undesirables. The FBI is merely to report the facts to the civilian commission.

I fought the bill because I feared that security would be slighted, and so far my fears have been well grounded. I believe that in the present chaotic world situation our only solution is to repeal the act and return Manhattan district to the Army, which can best administer security.

We have an immediate educational problem with the scientists who insist on having academic freedom with military secrets, who want one world but are indifferent as to whether it is to be a Communist world. Compulsory reading of the report of the Canadian Royal Commission would go far toward convincing the politically naive that Communist orders come from Moscow via Paris, and that all of the party members, whether registered or not, are potential traitors, saboteurs, and espionage agents.

In these times, atomic bomb production and research belong under War Department control. When and if the United Nations becomes a going concern, and international security is offered through some agency such as the Atomic Development Authority proposed in the Acheson-Lilienthal report of last year, Congress can review the problem.

Socialization of the Fertilizer Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the June 1 issue of the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal on socialization of the fertilizer industry:

SOCIALIZATION OF FERTILIZER INDUSTRY, AS CONTEMPLATED BY BILL IN CONGRESS, IS THREAT TO ALL PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Speeches made by TVA Chairman Gordon Clapp in various parts of the country since his confirmation would suggest to his hearers, or to those who read reports of his remarks, that the Federal agency for which he speaks is a strong supporter of the principle of private enterprise.

The regularity with which these pleasant references to private enterprise are worked into Mr. Clapp's addresses lead one to the conclusion that news has been kept from the chairman of the hearings now under way in Washington on a bill purposed to place the TVA in position to completely dominate the fertilizer industry of the Nation.

The bill in question does not appear, under quick reading, to be a very large matter one way or another. It provides for an initial appropriation for expenditure by TVA of $3,000,000 to construct a fertilizer plant at Mobile, Ala., and to acquire phosphate lands in Florida. Its broad objective is set forth in the caption as being a piece of legislation for the encouragement of the use of fertilizer by the farmers of the country. Such encouragement is to be given, under provisions of the bill, through test demonstrations, the same kind of demonstrations the Authority has been conducting over a 10-year period.

It is in this test demonstration feature of the bill that the joker is located. The country's fertilizer industry would have nothing to fear if any Federal agency were simply setting up in business to sell a product. But when the bill lays out a program of test demonstrations, it is talking not about selling but giving away.

Competent authorities in the fertilizer industry are on record to the effect that this exclusive feature of the TVA program—giving fertilizer away instead of selling it—is actually one of two features the private enterpriser has not been able to equal.

The other exclusive feature is that the private enterpriser has not been able to get his manufacturing cost as high as the Authority's. The industry cites as an example a fertilizer known as triple superphosphate, which, according to TVA's 1946 report, cost $85 per ton to manufacture. This fertilizer was given away. At the same time the standard selling price for this same fertilizer in the industry was about $65 and this included everybody's profit.

Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, who is of course an administration man, expressed opposition to the bill this past week on the grounds that the scale of tests—remember this means the scale of giving away fertilizer at public expense—provided for was, to quote his words, "larger than necessary." Analysis of the provisions of the bill by experts would make the Secretary's words one of the notable understatements of all time.

To suggest the proportions of the program, for which this initial appropriation of three millions is only a starter, it provides that 2 percent of the farms in the United States shall be eligible for "demonstrations," which means that each of the farms selected would receive, to meet TVA test requirements, about 30 tons of fertilizer.

In 1945, there were listed 5,859,169 farms in the United States, 2 percent of which would be 117,182. So that after the program got going under full blast the bill under consideration by Congress would provide for giving away 3,515,460 tons of fertilizer annually.

But that is not all. The bill also provides that not over half of the production of the Government fertilizer plants is to be given away. In order to carry out its demonstration program in full the TVA would have to build up a total annual business of more than seven million tons, and the little $3,000,000 initial investment would have to grow to an estimated half billion.

To realize the vast proportions of this camel whose snout is just now being eased under the tent of the fertilizer industry, compare the contemplated production figures above with the actual production figures for the Nation's fertilizer industry in private hands. In 1946 private industry produced and sold 13,000,000 tons of fertilizer. The bill contemplates, then, the ultimate preempting by Government of well over half the production of private industry in one of its biggest years.

Thus one is driven to the conclusion that while Chairman Clapp makes speeches remarkable for pleasantries about private enterprise, the Authority's emissaries in Congress are getting ready to drive to a final conclusion one of the most socialistic of the Authority's undertakings.

Our conviction is that if Congress intends to nationalize the fertilizer business at the expense of the general taxpayer, it will act with a great deal more candor, and sense, too, by purchase of existing fertilizer plants rather than undertaking to put private industry out of business by a long and painful process. Both Joe Stalin and the British Socialists have followed the method we have suggested. They do not beat around the bush with a bill such as the one under discussion, or cloud their purposes with ambiguous verbiage. They simply say they're going to nationalize this industry or that, and that's all there is to it. Our own Congress should be equally frank with our people.

It would seem unnecessary to point out that this is a matter which is not of concern or interest to the fertilizer people alone. The fight to maintain our traditional form of free economy must be waged on every battle front where it is challenged. If the fertilizer industry is nationalized, that simply brings nearer the day when the next field of private industry or business will feel the hot breath of Government upon its neck. Private enterprise must all stand or fall as one fabric, and no citizen should refuse to recognize the fact, even though for the moment he is not endangered.

It might be appropriate to point out that the farmer himself, in whose name the present bill is sponsored, could well take a look at this time at the situation of his fellow farmer in Britain where the same kind of socialization proposed in this bill has actually been made effective. If the British farmer doesn't till his acres to suit the government bureaucrat, he is simply put off his land. Of what value would free fertilizer be under those conditions?

Tensas Cocodrie Sector, Red River Backwater Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement before the Subcommittee on Civil Appropriations for the War Department of the Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. ENGEL. The committee will come to order. Gentlemen, we have with us this morning our colleague, Mr. PASSMAN, from Louisiana.

What project are you interested in, Mr. PASSMAN?

Mr. PASSMAN. It is the Tensas Cocodrie sector of the Red River backwater area that we are interested in, Mr. Chairman, and I have with me Mr. Fred Hudson from the Fifth Congressional District whom I would like to have you hear this morning.

Mr. ENGEL. All right, Mr. Hudson.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, this is Mr. Fred Hudson of Monroe, La., who wishes to be heard on the subject of flood control, especially the Tensas Cocodrie sector of the Red River backwater area project.

Mr. ENGEL. You are appearing on what project, Mr. Hudson?

Mr. HUDSON. On the Tensas Cocodrie sector of the Red River backwater area.

Mr. ENGEL. On the Mississippi River?

Mr. HUDSON. On the lower Mississippi; yes, sir.

Gentlemen, my time is very limited, but I do want to take enough of it to express my gratitude to you for hearing me at all on a particular project.

I should like also to say not only on behalf of myself, but I am sure my people, that the objective of economy and reduction of taxes meets with our most hearty approval.

However, there are some functions of Federal Government that we feel should not be curtailed in the interest of the Federal function itself, and among them are certain measures of flood control within the entire program. Certainly I would not assume or presume to indicate to you what could or should be done from the over-all point of view.

I see you have General Wheeler and his very competent and informed and able staff here, and I should like to say from many years of experience with them in a humble and minor capacity on the general subject of the lower end of the Mississippi River that the Corps of Engineers know the story, and they know what it is all about, and they know what to do about it, and they are most competent and most reliable.

I understand also you will be addressed later by one representative of the whole State, Mr. Dewitt Pyburn, our respected and highly regarded and competent Director of Public Works in Louisiana.

However, there is one particular project to which I would like to direct your attention and would appreciate your listening to me on for just a few moments, and that is what is known as the Tensas Cocodrie sector of the Red River backwater area.

I am sure that you are familiar with where the Red River empties into the Mississippi, and this particular sector is north of the mouth of the Red River.

NOT A LOCAL PROJECT

This is not a project that some local organization has created, propagandized and worked up.

On the contrary it is a project that has existed for many years about which the Corps of Engineers in its prudence and discretion did not feel that anything could be done, which I am sure you realize, and which General Wheeler I am sure will tell you is an integral part of a continuing process of protection. It was not until in 1941 the development of the entire project for the protection of the lower Mississippi Valley reached a point where the Corps of Engineers itself brought up and recommended the protection of several backwater areas.

In its report of March 7, 1941, the Mississippi River Commission has this to say, which the Corps of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers approved:

"The confinement of floods between levee lines on both banks of the Mississippi River, each line having gaps therein permitting the outflow of tributary streams, has caused what are locally known as backwaters. Each backwater, in time of flood, extends around the end of the main-line levee, upstream behind that levee and up into the tributory basin. The area flooded in each case depends upon the height of the flood confined by the main-line levees and the volume of discharge of the tributory. The principal backwaters are the St. Francis, the White-Arkansas, and the Red on the west bank, and the Yazoo on the east bank.

"The backwater areas have had an unhappy history. Originally their status was comparable with that of lands elsewhere in the basins. Floods spread with equal freedom over both banks of the river, inundating the higher lands to comparatively shallow depths for comparatively short periods of time. But as the main river levees were made stronger and extended further and further downstream, the lands upstream from what have become known as the backwater areas were overflowed not at all, while the lands in the backwater areas were submerged to greater depths. The main-line levees have protected the backwater areas from Mississippi River floodwaters coming down overbank from upstream but these same main-line levees, by confining greater floods, have increased the areas of the backwaters and the depths of their flooding. The lands in the backwaters, in many cases, were taxed and continue to be taxed for the construction and upkeep of the very levees which have caused their greater flooding. Under early conditions low, private levees gave sufficient protection to some of the higher backwater lands to permit the profitable operation of large plantations. Now, due to greater flooding, many are no longer profitable and have been allowed to grow up in timber.

"It cannot be claimed that the Government is under obligation to afford equal protection to all alluvial valley lands. That is a physical impossibility. No great engineering project is ever carried through to completion without the destruction of some existing or prospective property values for the greater good of the general community. This project is no exception to the general rule; and it is evident that the backwater areas have suffered some consequential damages and have lost, to a large extent, such future prospects as otherwise they might have had in agriculture while retaining unimpaired their future as timberlands.

"Experience shows that areas of the alluvial valley which have been given a reasonable degree of protection have been largely devoted to cultivation and support a relatively dense population for agricultural lands.

"The Department has consistently opposed the exclusion of great floods from the large backwater areas, since the elimination of the storage capacities in the backwaters would materially increase flood heights. There is no objection, however, to the partial protection of the better portions of such areas provided they are restored to normal function of storing floodwaters when floods attain menacing proportions.

"The principles just stated were recognized as both equitable and sound by the Congress in the act approved June 15, 1936, authorizing the protection of a portion of the White River backwater area from all but the larger floods by an extension of the front-line levee system up the White River, and thence to a connection with the main line Mississippi River levee near Old Town Lake. The extension of the levee system for the protection of this backwater area, as authorized, is being constructed in two operations. The levee extension was built first to an interim grade to obtain substantial protection with dispatch. Work is now in progress to bring the work up to the final approved grade.

"Of course, the backwater areas are not all of equal potential value nor are they in an equal state of development. Their shape, topography drainage, and position with respect to the main-line levees differ widely. Two backwater areas, both contiguous to main-line Mississippi River levees, are so closely related thereto as to merit consideration at this time in any revision of main-line levee grades or modification of the adopted project. These are the Yazoo backwater and the Tensas-Cocodrie area of the Red River backwater."

I shall not go into further detail, as I am sure the Army engineers themselves will tell you more about it.

My point is that this area has been made by the protection which has been afforded to other sections of the country.

In this particular area, gentlemen, it has been overflowed every year for the past 4 or 5 years, and there has been an overflow to such an extent that the people have been run out of their homes and their crops and farms ruined, and they cannot stand it much longer.

As I say, the Army engineers recognized it, and in 1941 Congress passed in the Flood Control Act authority for the protection of this area, authorizing as much as a maximum expenditure of $15,000,000 for that purpose.

In doing that the Secretary of War attested to the House in his letter of August 14, 1941, that it would be in the future of interest to the Federal Government, and that it was engineeringly sound and adequate, that it was economically justified—that is, weighing benefits versus cost—and that it was practical, advisable, and feasible, and that it was fundamental in the development of the over-all project.

Mr. KERR. How much appropriation has been made for this project?

Mr. HUDSON. The entire work was deferred by the war and the inability to get material, manpower, and equipment. It was immediately after the war taken up in the deficiency appropriation bill of 1945 or 1946, I am not quite certain which, and there was $2,500,000 appropriated.

Contracts were let, and the work has actually been begun; but it has just been begun, and my plea is that it would be a calamity to have it interfered with and stopped now.

Mr. KERR. How much is recommended for it now?

Mr. HUDSON. The total authority is $15,000,000, but the actual appropriation that was frozen by the President's order of last August was $2,500,000.

I want to say that these people are perfectly reasonable and we desire to be cooperative. We are in favor of the economy move, and we are in favor of lower taxes and we have nothing but respect for the objective, and if it is necessary to cut our appropriation 20 or 30 percent, whatever is done to others, we would have no objection to that.

We feel that we have no right to any priority, but we do feel that the appropriation that is actually made should be ear-marked for this particular project in such amount as you in your worthy discretion decide to appropriate.

As I understand it, and General Wheeler and his assistants can correct me if I am wrong, the entire budget for the Lower Mississippi project was $24,000,000, was it not, General? Of course, I understand from General Crawford, with whom I have discussed the matter that approximately $7,000,000 and, perhaps, as much as $12,000,000 will be required for essential maintenance, which makes the spreading of the balance rather thin.

Had it not been for the freeze order of the President, which some say was, perhaps without his legal authority but, nevertheless, like the nigger in jail it was done, and that is that, we would have had $68,000,000 for this work including $2,500,000 for the project on which I appear, but the essential dredging and the maintenance and the essential revetment should be done, as to which, I believe, it was General Crawford who said that any curtailment of that, even for economy reasons, would be unthinkable.

We respectfully submit that this Tensas Cocodrie backwater project is a very worthy project. It is an essential project if those people are going to continue to live there and exist because no farmers and small-town residents can continue to exist in a place that is overflowed every year, and that is what has been going on. It is not nature that did it. It is the unavoidable result of what has been done in the general over-all flood-control project.

BENEFITS OF PROJECT

This project would conserve some 233,000 acres of as rich land as there is in the world.

It would set aside and leave available for a sump area for storage, which is essential and we recognize it, some 133,000 acres, but it is the 233,000 acres that we are interested in and that the people want to cultivate and produce on and wish to have protected.

I could talk to you for hours on this, gentlemen, but I have probably already exceeded the time allotted to me.

I know I have not said anything that is not true, that is not provable by the record, and I do not believe I have said anything that General Wheeler, General Crawford, General Tyler, or any of the highly efficient and well informed Army officers who are familiar with it would not back up as true.

I should like only to add my utmost sincerity and my great earnestness in assuring you of the extreme gratitude that those people would feel if you should see fit to allow them their $2,500,000 in the next budget which would continue to be used as the work progressed. It is not necessary to appropriate the entire amount authorized at one time, and if you have to cut it 20 or 25 percent they will have no objection to that because they are in favor of the general system of efficient economy; and even though they are southern Democrats they are in favor of what you are undertaking.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Mr. PASSMAN. I wish to thank you very sincerely, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee for hearing Mr. Hudson. I do hope that the committee will see fit to provide adequate funds for the continuation of this worthy project because in my opinion the matter is worthy of your very best consideration.

Terminal-Leave Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LIBERTY POST, NO. 67, INC.,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Liberty, S. C., June 5, 1947.

Hon. BRYAN DORN,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DORN: An increasing number of queries are coming from merchants and businessmen regarding the posting of terminal-leave bonds as security for the purchase of machinery, tools, livestock, farm implements, and other materials needed in various lines of work. Of course, it is necessary that we explain that the posting of these bonds as security is illegal.

It is difficult for veterans to understand why they must borrow money at a higher rate of interest than is paid on their terminal-leave bond to make purchases when they could purchase many items at a great saving from the War Assets Administration. By the time these bonds mature the War Assets Administration will have sold practically every item needed in various lines of work.

This post has voted 100 percent in favor of arrangements being made whereby veterans may cash their bonds and have the use of the money due them. We appreciate your fine speech on the floor of the House and hope you will continue supporting this proposition so that the bonds might at least be posted as security for loans or other items needed.

Thanking you, and with all good wishes, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

E. W. TAYLOR,
Post Commander.

Veterans' Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Post of June 5, 1947:

VA INSURANCE IS SCORED

Representative EDITH N. ROGERS of Massachusetts is chairman of the House Veterans' Committee. Since World War I she has been most active in veteran affairs, and when out of what seemed to be a clear sky she denounces the operation of the Veterans' Administration in regard to insurance, it really is news. She can generally be relied upon to have the facts.

She told the House this week that the time has come to "stop rendering lip service" to the "mythical 'fine job' allegedly being done for the veteran" and face the cold fact that "the service is inefficient and unsatisfactory." Outside of a few bookkeeping delays, or temporary difficulties due to the large volume of business being handled, it had been generally considered that the VA work in insurance was being admirably conducted.

Mrs. ROGERS, however, points out that there is an appalling drop in service insurance held by veterans every month. This she declares justifies an investigation, to find out why the most liberal and the cheapest insurance in existence should be losing ground.

Her statistics show that after World War I there were 5,000,000 policies in force. Of that number, only 400,000 are left. When World War II ended 13,000,000 men and women held service policies. That figure has dwindled to about 5,000,000.

Why? asks Representative ROGERS. She avers that the average veteran would prefer to pay more for insurance with an independent, commercial company because of the better service he receives.

Referring to this better service, her statistics show that the Veterans' Administration has approximately a million and a quarter unapplied remittances "floating around the country" which they are unable to credit properly because they cannot locate the records of the men. As a matter of fact, it is known that 2 or 3 months are required to get a reply from the VA on insurance matters, even when the records are available.

Thousands of applications for conversion of term insurance are lying dormant; death and benefit claims often require a year or more for settlement. These are some of the service problems of which Representative ROGERS complains.

Further, she claims the VA has "far more people per policy in force than is required by any commercial company," yet the VA alleges that it needs more help to handle the unprecedented rate of discharge of military personnel. VA has a surplus of from thirty to sixty million dollars, but is vague as to the exact amount. Representative ROGERS would have the Comptroller General find out, for the benefit of all the taxpayers, whose money this actually is.

This is, indeed, an unpleasant report, coming at a time when veteran organizations, newspaper and magazine editors, commercial insurance executives, and scores of other interested persons have been fairly begging the World War II veterans to rush to the nearest VA office to reinstate their lapsed policies.

OIC Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

As the House prepared to open debate on Representative KARL MUNDT's bill to preserve the State Department's foreign information program, the Federation of American Scientists strongly urged congressional support of the bill. The federation's position was stated in a letter from Dr. Robert E. Marshak, chairman of the federation, to the bill's sponsor, Representative MUNDT (Republican, South Dakota) and to Senator VANDENBERG and Representative EATON (Republican, New Jersey), chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Relations. Dr. Marshak's letter stressed the importance of informing foreign peoples of the dangers of atomic war, and of America's proposals for averting this catastrophe. "We believe," he said, "that a most effective means of propagating this information is the continuation and expansion of the OIC program. Informed men are peaceful men."

Dr. Marshak, who last month became head of the Federation of American Scientists, formerly served at the Los Alamos bomb laboratory and is now professor of physics at the University of Rochester. The federation includes a majority of the scientists who developed the atomic bomb, and has as its primary purpose the achievement of effective international control over atomic energy.

The full text of the letter follows:

"As scientists, we have a special awareness of what another great war would mean. As scientists, also, we are members of a professional world community. We know first-hand how much a working knowledge of each other's interests and activities can do to insure mutual understanding and confidence, even among people who are separated by political and cultural barriers. We therefore attach great importance to the program of the State Department's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, the purpose of which is to bring directly to other peoples a knowledge of our traditions, our ideals, and our everyday lives.

"The Federation of American Scientists was organized to work especially for control of atomic weapons, as a vital step toward establishing the confidence and community of interest among nations which alone can avert disaster. We have been gratified and encouraged by the widespread support in this country of the principles of world control which the United States has advocated in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. It therefore seems especially important now that people in other lands be informed directly and in detail of the terms of our proposals and our purposes in offering them.

"Fear, intensified by international rivalry in atomic weapons, can lead swiftly into an arms race which may well end in the destruction of our civilization. It is essential for world peace that all peoples, everywhere, should recognize this inescapable fact. We believe that a most effective means for propagating this information is the continuation and expansion of the OIC program. Informed men are peaceful men.

"The Federation of American Scientists therefore urges the enactment of legislation

specifially authorizing the OIC program, so as to permit full restoration of the appropriation requested for it by the Department of State. At a time when this Nation is spending billions of dollars on its Military Establishment, we cannot afford to eliminate an inexpensive program which may contribute vitally toward preventing catastrophe.

"ROBERT E. MARSHAK,
"Chairman, Administrative Committee, Federation of American Scientists."

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bedford (Ind.) Daily Times-Mail of June 2, 1947:

A NEW SITUATION—PUBLIC OPPOSITION TO TAX REDUCTION

Legislators are facing a brand new situation, which is baffling. For the first time in our Nation, there is opposition to tax reductions. Ordinarily, one of the best ways to get votes is to promise tax reduction; and an even better method of getting votes is to actually reduce taxes.

Republicans campaigned last fall on the platform that income taxes should be reduced at least 20 percent. Their opponents scoffed at the idea, but the majority of the Republicans elected to Congress were sincere in their statements. The very first bill introduced into the present Congress was to cut taxes 20 percent. (It is known as House bill 1.) Now that bill has emerged from a joint Senate and House committee in such a manner as to entirely justify the confidence of the voters who believed the Republican candidates last autumn.

It is a good tax bill. Certainly, it is an equitable bill. Every person in the land making $500 or more a year will benefit. Roughly this is how the bill will operate: Net incomes of $1,000 or less, 30 percent cut; incomes of $1,000 to $1,398.83, reductions of 20 percent to 30 percent; incomes from $1,398.83 to $136,720, reductions of 20 percent; incomes up to $302,396, reductions of 15 percent; and above that figure, 10½ percent.

Because so few people make very large incomes, there is little thought given to the small amount of money which is really left to the taxpayer after taxes. A man who has a gross income of $100,000 pays out $67,320 plus 89 percent of any money earned beyond $100,000. A man making $200,000 pays $156,820 plus 91 percent of any money earned beyond $200,000. The Treasury Department has not been very fair to the handful of people in the very high income tax brackets. There is publicity about the gross salaries of some corporation officials, movie stars, etc., but no mention of the fact that Uncle Sam bites off $91,000 out of each $100,000 in the very top brackets. For years there has been a cry of "soak the rich." They can't be soaked much more than they have been. Leaving a man only 9 cents out of each $1 earned is certainly not an incentive to building a larger business.

There has been a marked indifference to business expansion, especially by small, closely-owned companies. What is the use? The owners take all the risk, and the Government takes almost all the profits, but fails to share in any losses which might come in years of poor business. Within the past 3 months, three examples of curtailment of business expansion have come to our attention. In each case, the attitude of the owner was the same, "I would rather have a smaller income than to stick my neck out, work like the dickens, and then see the Government come along and gobble up the profits. I would rather be a small outfit; have less money, but fewer troubles and worries. I'll live slower, but I'll live longer." That is a logical attitude, but it does mean the opportunity of jobs is decreased—and that is unfortunate.

It is not a pleasant truth—but it is a truth just the same—that the poor cannot get rich unless the rich get richer. Unless a business expands, it will not create employment. The history of most large fortunes is the same—some capable man had an idea in which he believed, he saved a little money, borrowed some more money, and went into business, prospered or went broke. Some of those who prospered bring to mind such names as Ford, Carnegie, Rockefeller, Wright, Chrysler, to name a few of the outstanding.

It is becoming more and more apparent that the manifold Government agencies, even the Army and Navy, can function very successfully on smaller appropriations than they received during the New Deal days when the philosophy was to "spend and spend, elect and elect." Most of the opposition to tax reduction comes from the unnecessary Government employees who will be chopped off the Federal pay roll, which is paid by our withholding taxes. They represent a very vocal group.

The Nation will function well with a much smaller staff. Provisions have been made to reduce the national debt ($23,000,000,000 will have been paid by June 30), and all of us will have more money to spend on our homes and families. Why anyone objects to tax reduction as long as essential services are unimpaired is a mystery. It is exactly the same as objecting to an increase in wages or salary. Tax reduction means more take-home pay. As for us, we like it.

Increased Widow's Pension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave already granted me, I include as part of these remarks a statement I have just issued in support of the bill I introduced today to raise the limit on the amount of annual income from other sources which may be received by the widow or child of a veteran without disqualifying them for a pension for non-service-connected death of the veteran.

I have today introduced a bill to raise the limit on the amount of annual income from other sources which may be received by a widow or child of a veteran of World War I or World War II without disqualifying such widow or child for a pension for the non-service-connected death of a veteran.

Under existing law if a widow or a child has other income in excess of $1,000, or a widow with a child has income in excess of $2,500, such widow is not entitled to a pension unless the veteran died of a service-connected disability.

Under the provisions of my bill a widow without children would be eligible for such pension provided her income did not exceed $1,500 annually, and a widow with a child or children would be eligible to the pension provided her income did not exceed $3,500 per annum.

This increase is only fair in my estimation when we consider that the cost of living has risen at least 50 percent since existing law was enacted.

United States Information Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

ROME, May 7.—Regardless of their varied political beliefs, Italians here are dismayed and bewildered by the possibility that the United States Information Service might be abandoned following this week's vote of the American House Appropriations Committee.

The Roman newspapers carried the reports of the House committee's decision to withhold funds from the State Department's division of information because it considered that USIS was undesirable propaganda. Nothing could be farther from the minds of thousands of Italians who have been using this service here in the last 2 years.

This correspondent, who has lived in Rome for more than a year, has never heard a single complaint from any Italian, whether pro- or anti-American, that USIS was attempting to disseminate political propaganda in Italy. It is recognized here as simply an agency—far more modest and objective than similar British, French, and Russian organizations in this country—which distributes invaluable cultural, technical, professional, and civic information which is unavailable elsewhere.

Russian, French, and British books, for example, are available in the city at reasonable prices in lire. United States books, for which there is an enormous demand, can be bought only with very expensive American dollars. Therefore the USIS library and reading room in Rome alone has a steady attendance of at least a hundred Italians daily. Proportionate attendance has been reported in eight other USIS libraries and reading rooms spread through the country.

In addition, the USIS daily press bulletin, which is carefully nonpolitical, has been irreplaceable to Italian newspaper editors seeking the full text of speeches and press conferences of President Truman and highly placed United States political leaders.

Technical bulletins covering medicine, agriculture, engineering, education, industry and labor are considered so competent that they are used as texts in the Italian technical institutes. It was through these bulletins that the Italians got their first precise information on penicillin, streptomycin, atomic energy, and radar.

The Voice of America radio programs, carried over by the USIS from the Psychological Warfare Bureau, have reached such heights of popularity on a broad cultural and scientific basis that in 1 week the

USIS officials received more than 2,500 letters from all parts of Italy requesting the monthly bulletins of its programs.

The mobile USIS film units covering health, civics, and subjects of interest to women, go out every week end to the most remote provinces of Italy, drawing an average of 200,000 Italians a month. USIS exhibits on similar subjects also attract many customers each month.

Disbanding the USIS, in Italian eyes, would not be considered a weighty political step, in one direction or another. But it would be felt as a serious loss in their struggle to overcome the actute problems of literacy, hygiene, and knowledge of the outside world and their desire to develop cultural ties with the United States that would transcend political aspirations. Those Americans here who are interested in this aspect of Italian life could wish that Congress would think in terms not of less but of more money for the USIS program.

Kansas City Vote Fraud Case a National Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, no word from the President can remove the stigma of downright fraud from the Kansas City primary election contest last year. The President, of course, had nothing to do with this situation except that his candidate was the beneficiary of the actual fraud. Yesterday the New York Herald Tribune had a timely editorial on this subject and under leave to extend my remarks I am including it herein:

LOGICAL CONCLUSIONS

President Truman's remark that the Kansas City vote-fraud case should be "carried through to its logical conclusion" was just about the mildest and most innocuous observation he could make on a crime that has shocked the Nation.

When politically inspired thugs broke open a steel vault in the Jackson County Courthouse at Kansas City 10 days ago and carried away incriminating ballots, records, poll books, and tally sheets of the August 1946 Democratic primary, President Truman was staying at the Hotel Muehlebach, only a few blocks away. The implications could scarcely have escaped his notice. The stolen primary records contained evidence that Representative Roger C. Slaughter had been defeated by gross fraud. The primary contest had attracted Nation-wide attention as a Presidential purge.

An exhaustive investigation by the Kansas City Star and other local agencies disclosed that in executing the President's expressed desire the revitalized Pendergast machine had resorted to widespread and outrageous fraud. Subsequently the crime of stealing an election was compounded by the brazen theft of the incriminating records.

Perhaps the "logical conclusion" President Truman had in mind was a further investigation of the case by "duly constituted authorities," the indictment of the underlings who were so negligent as to allow the courthouse vault to be robbed and the minor election officials guilty of the primary frauds.

But there is another "logical conclusion" to this Kansas City case which may outdistance the local law enforcement the President has in mind, a "logical conclusion" in which an aroused citizenry finally smashes the corrupt Pendergast machine and which provides the Republicans with another clear issue in the Presidential election of 1948.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Mark Sullivan which appeared in this morning's New York Herald Tribune. Mr. Sullivan brings to the attention of his readers the same reasoning I brought to my constituents a few days ago. The Hartley-Taft bill is the result of long and intensive study. It was not put through in haste and anger or with any desire to punish anyone. I believe the legislation is an expression by the Congress to put through the wishes of the people. If the President's statement made after the election last fall, that he would cooperate with the Congress, was anything more than a political gesture, now is the time for him to prove it.

The editorial follows:

ANY VETO OF LABOR BILL REGARDED AS EXTREME USE OF POWER—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS PRESIDENT SHOULD CONSIDER LARGE MAJORITIES WHICH MEASURE RECEIVED IN CONGRESS, LEGISLATORS' SPIRIT OF COOPERATION

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, June 8.—Public interest in whether President Truman vetoes the labor bill includes interest in the considerations that bear upon him as he arrives at decision. Granting that Mr. Truman is conscientious, that he has a mind of his own and arrives ultimately at his own decisions, it remains inevitable that he must to some extent depend upon others.

This is true of any measure coming before any President, and especially true of the labor bill, containing some 20,000 words and including many intricate provisions, expressed with minute care and definition. During the some 2 weeks in which the labor bill was being put in final form by conferees of the House and Senate many other problems of extreme public importance weighed upon the President, and he was obliged by official engagement and his mother's illness to pass many days away from Washington. Under modern conditions no President can be expected to give meticulous word-by-word study to every word of every legislative measure or other document that goes before him. As a substitute there is in the executive department a system which lays before the President accurate and adequate digests of measures and accompanying data.

SEES METICULOUS CARE

Considering the handicap under which any President as an individual necessarily is, there is some weight in the fact that the committees and groups in Congress who draft measures and who propose and argue for amendments have given the subjects a minuteness of care impossible for the Executive to achieve. The pending labor bill was written with meticulous word-by-word care by the labor committees of the House and Senate. Within the Senate committee there was prolonged face-to-face argument, conducted in a spirit of mutual respect, by Senators holding such opposed views on some provisions as JOSEPH H. BALL, of Minnesota, and IRVING M. IVES, of New York. Again, in the conference of committees of the House and Senate, to adjust differences between the versions originally passed by the two, there was prolonged concentration upon provisions to be put in the bill. The care and discussion that went into the writing of the labor bill is itself a consideration that should weigh upon the President's decision on it.

In yet another respect the labor bill deserves a special consideration from the President. To a degree not often equaled this bill represents the will of the legislative branch of Government. As it lies on the President's desk it was passed by the House with a majority of more than 4 to 1, literally 320 to 79. In the Senate a majority of the President's own party supported the bill. In the House 103 Democrats voted for it, only 66 against. In the Senate 17 Democrats supported the bill, 15 opposed.

CITES LABOR'S OPPOSITION

From his official family the President receives information and advice. From other sources he receives pleas and pressures. Among these the most strenuous come from the labor leaders. These are hardly in a position to receive the consideration they demand. Throughout the weeks in which the labor legislation was being written the labor leaders maintained a single position, no legislation at all. To Congress they offered no alternative and they now offer none to the President. The tens of thousands of letters and telegrams which labor leaders have incited to be sent to the White House each and all come down to four words, "veto the labor bill."

Veto of the labor bill by President Truman would be an extreme use of the veto power, an extreme assertion of the constitutional power of the Executive to frustrate the legislative branch. Not only has the legislative branch expressed itself by a more than 4 to 1 vote in the House and a more than 3 to 1 vote in the Senate for the bill as it now lies before the President but, further than that, Congress has already paid deference and consideration to the President. In the final form of the bill arrived at by conference committees of the House and Senate provisions were dropped which Congress wanted and which had been written into the original versions passed by the Senate and House. They were dropped for the deliberate purpose of making the bill more acceptable to the President. That reflected a spirit of cooperation on the part of Congress. Veto now by the President would fairly be regarded by Congress as a refusal of cooperation.

Our Tariff Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 11, 1947, showing that a recent poll reveals that 57 percent of those polled favor low tariffs:

OPINION ON THE TARIFF

The tariff has been a hot political issue since the early days of the Republic. At the present time, the formulation of a sound

tariff policy is as important to the national welfare as it has ever been. It is therefore with considerable interest that we note the findings of Mr. Elmo Roper, who commented in this newspaper recently on the results of his Fortune polls on the subject. Mr. Roper discovered a significant shift in American opinion since 1939, when nearly 60 percent of those questioned said they believed in a high tariff. He now finds 57 percent in favor of low tariffs, and if one excludes those who gave qualified answers or expressed no opinion, the ratio is 3 to 1 against high tariffs.

It must be admitted that these figures give only a very rough measure of the opinions of the voters. Those polled were not tariff experts. A considerable proportion admitted frankly that they did not believe they had enough facts to give a valid opinion. None of them had an opportunity to say how high or how low they thought tariffs should be. It is likely that many Americans favor lower tariffs except in specific instances where their own interests would be directly affected. However, on the basis of these polls, we believe it would be fair to say that a majority of Americans have been impressed by the argument that lower tariffs will mean higher living standards through increased trade. The minority presumably feel that such advantages as lower prices to consumers would be outweighed by disadvantages like the loss of markets for certain American industries and unemployment in those industries.

Significantly, Mr. Roper finds that the shift in opinion on the tariff question coincides with an increase in the number of those favoring international cooperation as opposed to isolationism. He concludes that "not only do majorities say they want international cooperation, but they say they want the kind of tariff arrangement needed to implement that cooperation." It would seem, then, that the majority of those polled believe tariff reduction is necessary, not merely because it would produce such immediate and direct benefits as lower prices but also because they consider that America's prosperity and prosperity of the international community are interdependent. That, at any rate, is a sound conclusion.

Reduction of Agricultural Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

REACTION FROM AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I regretted to see the appropriations recommended by the budget for the agricultural agencies cut. I feel that it was a mistake, and, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the following letters that I have received from my district protesting those cuts:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Fayetteville, Ark., June 3, 1947.

Hon. J. W. TRIMBLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Farmers of Washington County are upset about the reduction in agricultural appropriations, as voted by the House of Representatives.

We appreciate the good fight you are making for the farm program and ask you to continue to do everything in your power to restore this drastic cut in appropriations.

We wish to call your attention particularly to the $300,000,000 AAA conservation payments and section 32 funds. We farmers feel we have been working under a definite promise from the Government and feel it would be impossible to make payments on a fair basis if this reduction in funds goes through.

We also ask your support in insuring a 1948 program to meet conservation needs.

Yours very truly,
WALTER D. RAMEY,
LINCOLN N. MAUPIN,
RAE D. STOKENBURY,
Washington County ACA Committee.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Harrison, Ark., May 31, 1947.

Mr. J. W. TRIMBLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TRIMBLE: We as a farmer committee elected by the farmers of the Third Congressional District are "smelling the patching" from the results of the House of Representative action in cutting the agricultural appropriation.

The farmers are very much upset and are bringing much pressure to bear on committeemen of your district. Farmers do not feel that they have been fairly treated according to the action and information that were furnished the Department of Agriculture in setting up the 1947 agriculture program by both Houses and major parties in 1946.

All the farmers are looking to you for your continued support in getting triple-A funds and section 32 funds restored in the Senate and the necessary action to insure a 1948 program according to conservation needs.

Very truly yours,
W. D. RAMEY,
Fayetteville, Ark.
JESS W. PARRISH,
Harrison, Ark.
JIM PARKER,
Huntsville, Ark.
H. E. MCMORRIS,
Green Forest, Ark.
RALPH HUDSPETH,
St. Joe, Ark.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Huntsville, Ark., May 20, 1947.

Hon. JIM TRIMBLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRIMBLE: We are enclosing with this letter a summary of conservation (triple A) practices carried out in Madison County in 1946, for which the Government paid a part of the cost (usually about 50 percent). We are also enclosing a clipping from the Madison County Record written by Mr. Dewey Harris, a farmer living near Huntsville, Ark.

We realize that we do not have to sell you on the idea of soil conservation, but we trust that you can use the enclosed information to an advantage in helping to sell the program to someone else.

We, the PMA Committee of Madison County do believe that much and lasting good has been done in our county and State through the agricultural program, and that a lot more can be done if we can be provided with the proper assistance, that is, cash payments to farmers and funds for personnel service. We believe that every dollar spent in carrying out practices will be repaid several times to this and future generations.

You will note from Mr. Harris' letter that he has used $788.35 worth of material and services that netted him $14,505.20 over a 5-year period. Mr. Harris further states that the increase in production on his farm is directly due to benefits received through the triple-A.

If you desire any further information in regard to the work in this county, please call on us at your convenience.

Yours very truly,
D. W. ALDERSON,
JAS. M. PARKER,
OREN PUERRY,
Madison County PMA Committee.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WNBF on July 7, 1947:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, this kind invitation of my good friend, Merlin Castarlin, to speak with Capt. Bob Townsend at Ross Park on Sunday, June 15, has been duly received and accepted. I look forward to greeting my stanch friends on the eleventh annual Townsend Day. This occasion has become as popular in Binghamton as Old Home Day. It gives folks a chance to get together in true American fashion.

Naturally I am anxious to see as many of you at the park as can possibly get there. We have a rendezvous with patriotism, you and I, and I have a most interesting and important message for you. See you, then, at Ross Park, Sunday, June 15, at 2 o'clock.

Just after I spoke on the courthouse square in Binghamton on Memorial Day, a member of city council accosted me and asked what progress is being made in Congress on the question of paying veterans cash for their terminal-leave bonds. Several members of Legion and VFW posts asked me the same question. I had to tell them no action had yet been taken.

These gentlemen pointed out that many veterans need the cash and I quite agree. If I am not mistaken, the enlisted men with low pay were the ones who had to take the bonds, while the officers received terminal leave pay in cash.

I can't see anything fair about stalling off the great majority of ex-servicemen any longer. The issue has to be met sooner or later, why not now? This cash will certainly come in handy, and if my letters are any indication of how veterans feel and I think they are, most of them could use the money.

Many veterans are building or buying homes, or automobiles, or starting to raise families. Perhaps they are in the hole and want to get caught up. Yes, there are thousands of ways they can spend the money to good advantage. As it is now, they can only look at the bonds.

To you veterans interested in this issue of converting terminal leave bonds into cash, drop me a line and express yourselves. Don't let a few, who are lucky to be well-off and comfortable, try to drown out your desires or ridicule your sentiments.

Let me know how you stand. Your letters approving my stand in wanting you to get the cash will be strengthening to me against a tide of opposition which always comes from those who don't need the cash.

I'm for the veteran, first, last and always, whether he fought in World War I or II or any other American engagement.

I recently made the following speech on the floor of the House of Representatives which I would like to read to you at this time.

"Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring parts of our Constitution is contained in the preamble which guarantees to all citizens the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet, when men and women, 9 out of 10 of them in this country reach the age of 60, they are unable to pursue that happiness because of limited means or the lack of wherewithal.

"Therefore, I am advocating immediate consideration and passage of a universal old-age pension plan such as the one outlined by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] in his bill, H. R. 16. This is popularly known as the Townsend Plan. Our hope is that not just one group or a few will be included in our social-security system, but all groups regardless of race, religion, or color, and regardless of occupation. All citizens of the land should have the opportunity to enjoy the fruits of a well-earned retirement and the results of all their productive years so that they can live happily in their old age.

"We can successfully fight off communism by making our American system work. The most natural desire of everyone is to have security in his declining years. Reasonable retirement for all is the answer, especially when such retirement is actuarily sound.

"The millions of Americans who have reached 60 or who are approaching this ripe age deserve consideration. They have the right to anticipate their brightest days to come.

"With security guaranteed, they can emulate the experience of Rabbi Ben Ezra who in his wisdom said in Browning's poem:

> "'Grow old along with me!
> The best is yet to be,
> The last of life, for which
> The first was made.'"

Thank you.

The Hartley-Taft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the May 3, 1947, issue of America, a Catholic review of the week:

CONGRESS AND LABOR

When even columnists critical of organized labor, like Arthur Krock of the New York Times, concede that the Republican majority in Congress is playing politics with labor legislation, it seems useless to devote time and space to a serious discussion of the issues. The bill which the House passed on April 17 by a thunderous vote of 308 to 107 indicates that the Republicans have their eye not on industrial peace, but on the 1948 elections. They want to present Mr. Truman with a bill that he will be constrained to veto. They want to be able to go to the country next year and say: "We know you good people are exasperated with certain abuses of organized labor. You are sick and tired of strikes. When you went to the polls in 1946, you elected a Congress to do something about the situation. Well, we tried our best. We passed a bill which prescribed fair and equitable rules of conduct for labor and management, which aimed to protect individual workers and to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes. That's what the preamble to H. R. 3020 said. But what happened? We passed the bill, but a Democratic President refused to permit it to become law. He vetoed it, just like Gromyko. Blame him, folks, and vote for us."

What removes the last vestige of doubt about the intentions of the Republican majority, and their Democratic allies from the South, is their insistence on wrapping labor legislation in one big package. In this way they insidiously combine constructive suggestions with out-and-out antilabor proposals, so that a fair-minded President has no choice: he is obliged to veto the whole bundle.

The Republicans are well aware that Mr. Truman would sign a bill outlawing jurisdictional strikes and certain types of secondary boycotts, or a bill protecting the rights of the rank-and-file union man, or a bill providing a fair and workable formula for dealing with industrial disputes which threaten the general welfare. But that is not what they want. They do not wish the White House to share with them the credit for a piece of constructive legislation, if, which is doubtful, they want constructive legislation at all. They desire political profit from the transaction. As the saying goes, they want to put the President on the spot. They want him to be damned if he does and damned if he don't. And so they wrap up the good with the bad and dream pleasant dreams of 1948.

Not all Republicans, it should be noted, approve this strategy. The bill reported out by the Senate Committee on Labor and Education is a notable improvement on H. R. 3020, and credit for this goes to three Republicans on the committee—Senators IVES, AIKEN, and MORSE—who joined with the Democrats to outvote the committee chairman, Senator TAFT, on several important points. But this bill is also a one-package job; hence subject to the same general criticism as H. R. 3020. The emphasis is too political.

The present prospect is, then, that no new labor law will be written by the Eightieth Congress. While the House has the votes, the Senate cannot muster the two-thirds majority required to override a Presidential veto. And Mr. Truman will almost certainly veto whatever omnibus bill eventually emerges from the joint conference that will have to iron out the differences between the Senate and House bills. Regardless, therefore, of the intentions of the men who planned it this way, labor and management now have a breathing spell to put their respective houses in order; a chance to get together and make collective bargaining work. It may be the last chance they will ever have.

The Fatalistic Psychology of Boom and Bust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Leon Henderson, from the New Leader of June 7, 1947:

THE FATALISTIC PSYCHOLOGY OF BOOM AND BUST

(By Leon Henderson, former Director of OPA)

A boom-and-bust psychology seems to be dominating America today. It carries with it a spreading fatalism for many persons in responsible positions—a fatalism which paralyzes tested actions which might be taken to forestall, mitigate, or insure against potential disasters.

In early 1946, it was possible to take the position that transition from war to peace could be achieved without alarming dislocations. Economic factors favored this possibility. Peacetime full employment was in sight after years of strain and almost despair. Peacetime production was never higher and it was rising. A balanced budget was in sight. The price level, despite assassination threats, was manageable. Business spending, financed by generous tax treatment, was surprisingly vigorous. The inventory pipe lines were hungrily crying to be filled. A war-devastated world was seeking our goods. There were bright prospects that, by keeping sacred promises to veterans, a steadily climbing housing activity would fill gaps left when consumer goods demands had been met.

Above all, by passing the Full Employment Act, the Government seemed to be guaranteeing that its immense resources would be available if depression ever threatened again.

Reviewing this rosy outlook, how is it possible that the prophets of boom and bust have commanded attention? They smell bankruptcy ahead; for the first time in years the rate of business failure is turning upward. Here and there mills are closing down and retail sales are declining.

In the meantime an irresponsible Congress destroyed sane controls over prices, profits, scarce materials, and consumer credit, and gave us insane inflation.

An irresponsible industry group, pressing on a short-sighted Government, mutilated the veterans' housing program. Today we still have scarcity of housing instead of plenty. This year less than half of last year's housing results may be expected.

In the short space of a year the glorious possibility of matching purchasing power with high production of goods has disappeared. Only by drawing on savings, by increasing consumer debt, by special financing for foreign trade, has the dangerous gap been partly bridged.

A reactionary majority of Republicans and southern Democrats has done a major injury to responsible capitalism, because a responsible capitalism cannot countenance inflation, scarcity, and unconscionable profits.

Given the possibility of approaching business decline and unemployment, what does the majority in Congress propose to do?

It proposes to lay in President Truman's lap a flock of antiliberal, deflationary measures and then go home. It proposes to leave the welfare of this country to a discredited policy of laissez faire.

Faced with a month-to-month decline in construction activity, they sidetrack the mild Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and offer to let landlords raise their rents.

Faced with a demonstrated disastrous decline in workers' real wages, the reactionary Congress proposes an antiliberal bill to coerce labor from exercising their economic bargaining power.

Every evidence points to the need of additional purchasing power. Mr. KNUTSON and his gang propose to lower taxes for the well-to-do, thus reviving the outworn Hoover trickle-down theory.

Do the Republicans have a formula for inflated prices? Hardly. They have a Dun & Bradstreet questionnaire which they will file in the back room when they go home in July.

Every major measure they propose can be demonstrated to be deflationary. Had a group deliberately set out to choose a program for deflation, it could scarcely have selected a better calculated set of ideas.

We of the liberal faith cannot accept the fatalistic boom-and-bust thesis. Every sinew of our faith tells us that by intelligent choices, by democratic planning, a responsi-

ble government can defend its people against depression.

The Americans for Democratic Action have a program.

ADA suggests that a determined government, utilizing a Price Adjustment Board, help American business to reduce the level of prices by 10 percent, and the cost of construction by 20 percent.

ADA proposes that rent control be continued, that adequate funds for enforcement be supplied.

ADA suggests that the Government keep its wartime commitments for support of farm prices, that the school-lunch program be expanded, and that the Aiken food allotment bill be passed. It recommends a planned procurement of food for foreign relief and wise use of surpluses.

As to taxes—the ADA strongly urges that, when taxes can be cut, they be reduced where the greatest amount of vigorous purchasing power will result. Raising the individual exemption from $500 to $700, and repeal of the burdensome excise taxes, will leave money at home in the right homes.

Industry and labor, by collective bargaining in key industries, have established a new workable "wage package" of 15 cents an hour. ADA suggests that this is a useful standard for rapid adoption. We suggest, too, that the minimum wage floor be raised to 65 cents an hour, and coverage expanded to the limit of Federal power. There are 14,000,000 workers not now covered by unemployment compensation. We suggest that these be brought in, that the scale and duration of payments be increased.

ADA believes that the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank should be increased by $5,000,000,000, so that useful tasks in world reconstruction may be promptly begun.

ADA regards the potential of housing construction as most vital to high employment, as well as the keeping of commitments to veterans. We urge the Federal Government to underwrite 1,500,000 housing units a year, that the program for factory-built houses be revived, and that public housing be authorized to provide 500,000 rental units a year at modest rents.

This is a positive program for progressives; it's a workable, feasible program for America. It involves no new adventures; the administrative machinery for most of it stands ready at hand, eager to do battle against the false philosophy of fatalistic "boom and bust."

The Situation in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I received from Mr. William Dumas, an American citizen, who recently visited Greece, the land of his birth:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *May 10, 1947.*

Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: Since the American people through their Government have made the decision to step in and help Greece solve her many problems, I want to make a humble suggestion to you regarding the funds which our Congress has voted for that country.

First, I wish to express my appreciation for the contribution you have made concerning the solving of the problems of Greece. Also, that I am a Greek-American myself and have also served in the United States of America Army in the First World War. I had not visited my native land for nearly 39 years. Last summer, however, I went to Greece by plane and stayed there for 3 months. I devoted much of my time there to the study of the general conditions of that country. Many of the statements to follow are the result of what I saw and felt during my stay in Greece:

A. The American Government should not entrust those millions of dollars to the hands of the present Greek Government. If the American Government should do so it would commit a great and irreparable mistake.

1. The present Greek Government is not representative of the Greek people.

2. The present Greek Government is not trustworthy. It is a government, rather a gang, which would spend the American dollars in the interests of the monarchial system in Greece.

3. With a slight exception, the present Greek Government is not made up of capable and honest men. It is made up of German collaborators and traitors who enriched themselves at the expense of the common people during the occupation.

4. The present Greek Government, under the dominant power of the unwanted king, his corrupt court, and his dishonest politicians and generals would, without any doubt, use the American dollars to entrench a Fascist and dictatorial system in Greece as is unknown to the history of mankind. Fascism breeds Communists and revolutions, and communism breeds dictatorship and oppression.

5. The corrupt Greek politician who is the brain trust of the present Greek Government and the king would move heaven and earth to actually steal the money through devilish political maneuvers, unknown to and unsuspected by the American people, and enrich himself at the expense of the American taxpayer and the misery of the common people of Greece.

B. The American Government should employ American experts in Greece to administer the economics of that country and direct and supervise the spending of the American taxpayer's savings.

1. In their work, the American experts should enlist the knowledge and assistance of capable and honest Greek Americans through the Greek War Relief headed by Skouras brothers and William Helis and other capable and honest American Greeks.

C. The American Government should see that the American dollars are spent for public works. This would benefit the common people in Greece and the nation at large. This would employ the mind of the workingman and would therefore stop it harkening to the idolatrous and deceptive trumpet of the communistic Kremlin whose efforts are to communize the world.

Should the American Government work in Greece systematically and with a foresight and should it see that the money is spent in the interests of the country at large, and not in the interests of the undesirable king and the corrupt Greek military men and aristocracy, it could make Greece a veritable paradise. The Greek people love America and admire the American people more than any other people in the world. They love democracy and they hate communism. They will work hard to build and rebuild their country on a sound and honest foundation, provided the American Government restores them their freedom which they now have lost in the hands of the king.

The American Government should avoid the mistakes and blunders of the British who went into Greece and then went out of Greece with bowed faces stained with ignoble acts and shameful policies.

My dear Congressman, they say that a sin concealed is like a hidden fire. It eats into the very life and consumes it with the horrible flame of destruction. The British have committed too many sins in Greece—too many crimes. If the American Government is not careful at this moment and if it has not the will to watch and expose and correct the British sins, America will suffer the humiliation in Greece that Britian did. The whole world will be watching America in Greece now, let alone the Greek people. Let not America lose her prestige which is more precious than money or anything else.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM DUMAS.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, this House passed an appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture wherein the budget for the Soil Conservation Service was drastically reduced. I opposed a reduction in this the most basic of all our farm programs. I opposed this cut on the premise that its effect will be a drastic and lasting reduction in farm prosperity.

As evidence of the beneficial effect that the Soil Conservation Service's program has had on the American farmer, and further as proof that the curtailment of this Service will adversely affect farm income, I include herewith an article taken from the Lebanon (Ill.) Advertiser dealing with soil conservation in St. Clair County, Ill.

From the conclusive evidence contained in this article, I again reiterate that the recent cuts in funds for the Soil Conservation Service were a serious mistake.

The article follows:

CONSERVATION FARMERS HAVE HIGHER INCOME

By adopting soil-conservation methods 105 farmers of Illinois have each added $1,487 annually to their farm income. This fact was shown in a new comparative study of farm incomes, the result of which has just been announced locally by Otto F. Baumann, of the United States Soil Conservation Service. "This study should be of personal interest to every farmer living in the Shiloh-O'Fallon soil conservation district," Baumann declared.

"Your local district already has 478 cooperators," he explained, "but some of them are just starting to use soil-conservation methods. These men will be interested in finding out what they can expect to realize in the future from their new farming program. The new study will give them the answer."

In making the study, farm economists selected 210 farms which were comparable in size, type of land, and which were located in the same parts of the State. Of this group, 105 are being operated under well-developed, complete farm conservation plans. On the remainder little or no soil conservation is being practiced.

The information was obtained directly from the farmers themselves. It covers crop acreage, yields, and the amount of crop and livestock products sold by the farmers during the 1945 crop year. Actual 1945 market

prices were used in computing income for both groups.

The 105 conservation farmers had an average income that year of $8,930, which was $1,487 higher than the nonconservation farm average. They earned $39.93 per acre, which was $6.91 an acre more than the nonconservation farmers received that year. Farms in both groups averaged approximately 215 acres.

As contrasted with the second group, the conservation farmers had these increases in crop yields: Corn and soybeans, 6.8 bushels per acre; wheat, 2.7 bushels per acre; and oats, 2.2 bushels per acre.

In addition, the conservation farmers averaged 4,302 pounds more pork than the second group; 4,204 pounds more beef; 108 pounds more poultry; 175 dozen more eggs; and 1,300 pounds more milk per farm.

The income figures revealed by the study, Mr. Baumann explained, represent total farm income above the cost of lime, fertilizer, and additional feed purchased.

These studies were carried on by the United States Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with the State agricultural colleges as a means of scientifically checking the benefits which soil-conservation methods are adding to the income from farms located in representative parts of the United States.

Some of the 210 farms studied are located in the Madison County and Shiloh-O'Fallon soil-conservation districts. Other farms in the Madison County and Shiloh-O'Fallon soil-conservation districts can do equally as well.

The GAR Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article from the Minneapolis Tribune for June 4, 1947, describing the surrender of their charter by the surviving members of the Minnesota Department of the Grand Army of the Republic, and my remarks with respect to this historical occasion:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN GEORGE MACKINNON ON THE OCCASION OF THE SURRENDER OF THE CHARTER OF THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

Minnesota's Grand Army of the Republic has made its last march, but it did not march in vain. It was they who contributed so valiantly to the preservation of the Union. Their conquests brought about freedom from human bondage.

"Nor shall their story be forgot,
While fame her record keeps,
Or honor points the hallowed spot
Where valor proudly sleeps."
—*Bivouac of the Dead,*
by Theodore O'Hara.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune]

STATE GAR, DOWN TO THREE MEMBERS, GIVES UP CHARTER

(By Janet Russell)

In a final flash of glory Wednesday, the Grand Army of the Republic passed out of existence in Minnesota.

The three aged, surviving members of the once-powerful GAR held their final encampment together in the Minnesota Soldiers' Home and disbanded the State department as they voted to surrender the charter.

The three men who witnessed their organization pass into the realm of memory, history and legend are Albert Woolson, 100, Duluth, the final department commander; Anson B. Baker, 97, Minnesota Soldiers' Home hospital, and Nathan Colburn, 101, Champlin.

THREE OTHER COMRADES

Sharing the honors in the day of recognition to the "boys in blue" were three other surviving Union veterans in Minnesota who did not belong to the Minnesota department of the GAR. They are Elias Fenstermacher, 97, Brainerd; Orris S. Pierce, 99, 3149 Lyndale avenue S.; and Charles L. Hooker, 109, Virginia.

Although the GAR ranks have dwindled to three, veterans of the three wars which have followed the Civil War joined forces to give the occasion something of the splendor the GAR once had.

Organizations made up of Spanish-American War veterans and veterans of World Wars I and II planned a parade through the streets of St. Paul—a parade with younger veterans marching where the thousands of GAR comrades once marched, and with marching songs of the four wars within the memories of the three men who held places of honor last night.

FLAG IS FRAGILE

The American flag belonging to the Minnesota GAR, now a brittle relic which contains an embroidered banner, "Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Minnesota," was too delicate to stand the rigors of a parade and was stationed on the platform in the St. Paul auditorium.

The program at the auditorium, which marked the climax of the state-wide recognition of "Grand Army of the Republic Farewell" day, included an address by Judge Harold N. Rogers of Minneapolis municipal court, introduction of the three GAR men, and a ceremony of turning over the charter to Marion Jewell, secretary of the department.

Mrs. Jewell will take the charter to the national office with a request that it be returned to the Minnesota Historical Society.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include herewith in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois. As will be noted, the Illinois Legislature has gone on record as favoring a year's training period for all young men to occur some time between the eighteenth and twentieth birthdays.

The resolution follows:

House Joint Resolution 34

Whereas this Nation now stands at the crossroads of what will surely be the most fateful period in its history; and

Whereas, despite the magnitude of the victory in World War II, the time has not yet come when peace-loving nations may neglect their defenses or lay aside their arms; and

Whereas a plan of universal military training, embodied in Senate bill 651 and House bill 1988, has been introduced in Congress, at the suggestion of the American Legion, which plan provides for 1 year's training composed of 4 months of basic training and 8 months of advanced study in military schools, colleges, ROTC courses, or in the armed forces, the Organized Reserve, or the National Guard, with a choice of Army, Navy, or Air Force as a field of training; and

Whereas this year of training for every young man coming some time between his eighteenth and twentieth birthdays would be valuable not only to the young men individually, but of immeasurable benefit to the Nation in providing a continuing reserve of trained and capable manpower skilled in the technique of modern scientific warfare: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That we endorse the plan embodied in the bills now before Congress as a vital step in the preservation of our strength and freedom; that a copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Illinois Member of Congress at Washington.

Adopted by the house, May 21, 1947.
HUGH GREEN,
Speaker of the House.
FRED W. RUEGG,
Clerk of the House.

Concurred in by the senate, June 4, 1947.
HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Polish-American Congress Sunday, June 8, 1947, Manhattan Center, New York City:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege to address this great meeting. The atmosphere fairly crackles with enthusiasm for the cause you promote this afternoon, "Justice for Poland." This signifies your determination to battle for the principles of liberty and freedom which the people of Poland have exemplified for centuries. As a liberty-loving people you have the responsibility of fighting for those principles because it has been a precious heritage from your forefathers. In addition you fight to reestablish those rights once more in Poland and in that struggle bring courage and cheer to those who remain in the Mother Country. You realize, I am sure, that it is going to take money, and effort, but above all it will take courage and a spirit within to insure that ultimately there will be "Justice for Poland." This is not a fight for the weak-kneed, the weak-hearted, the selfish or the lazy individual, but it is a battle for the generous, the strong-hearted, and the loyal patriot.

You are not alone in this struggle. Millions of Americans are at your side. They realize that there can be no peace in the world until order through justice is established for every nation.

Ladies and gentlemen, you may well ask, "Yes, that sounds very good, but where have you been, Mr. Smith, while the principles of justice are being ignored?" Yes, you should know what I have done about it.

I am proud of my record in this matter. On the second day of March 1945, which was

only a few weeks after the Yalta agreement was announced, I spoke on the floor of the House of Representatives and used as my subject, Yalta—A Moral Retreat—Poland and Small Nations Crucified. A few days before that, your friend and mine, Congressman ALVIN O'KONSKI, had likewise given a speech in which he described the Yalta Conference as the crime of the ages. He blistered the State Department in its efforts to justify the action taken at Yalta. He also said that the efforts by the Department sounded more like Moscow than Washington. After we had made those speeches we were the targets for all kinds of attacks. It was charged that we were isolationists, that we were disloyal, and the old Communist charge that we were Fascists. But time has been on our side and history will record that we were absolutely right. Time will likewise prove that you are right. You must not fail.

With due humility, I want to call your attention to parts of my Yalta speech as I believe them to be pertinent to the subject of this meeting and so you may know of my position right after the Yalta Conference. I said then:

"The determination to settle the boundary lines of Poland before the question was submitted to the people of Poland constitutes a retreat from the high moral ground that we have steadily maintained throughout the war. To say now that free elections are to be held and that Poland will receive a long shore line carved out of Germany is to rob Peter to pay Paul and is a feeble effort to fool the people."

Further: "I feel it my duty to speak, for I am firmly convinced that a great mistake was made at Yalta; yes, a mistake which, if not rectified, will lead to World War No. 3."

Further, I said: "The results at Yalta must be tested by their effect upon the inalienable rights of millions of people of the small European countries, who apparently had no spokesman at Yalta."

You will recall that Government officials assured the people of this country that the people of Poland were guaranteed the right of free elections, hence, they could choose the kind of government they wanted. And that the elections would be free and unfettered and wholly within the spirit and meaning of the Atlantic Charter. Are we not ashamed of ourselves?

We can hear again the voice of Woodrow Wilson after World War I, when he said, "The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone forever; so also is the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world." Franklin Roosevelt was a disciple of the great Wilson, but at Yalta he certainly forgot about the lofty idealism of his teacher; in fact Wilson was betrayed at Yalta. There Russia, Britain, and the United States partitioned Poland for the fifth time and all of it was done in secret. Woodrow Wilson must have turned over in his grave.

It was difficult for me, ladies and gentlemen, to reconcile the position of my Government at Yalta to the position it took in 1940, when the rights of Latvia, Lithuania, and Esthonia were under consideration. Then the State Department issued a statement, part of which was:

"The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by threat of force or use of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention, on the part of the state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak."

Now get this, from the same statement by the State Department:

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization—cannot be preserved."

I charged in the House that our 1940 position and our position at Yalta were wholly inconsistent and said that unless it was reversed it would lead to another war, more deadly, more devastating, more cruel, and more costly than this one.

And what a tragedy when we think back to the days of 1917–18 and remember what a gallant fight Woodrow Wilson made for Polish independence. In a speech to the United States Senate, in January 1917, he said:

"No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand people about as if they were property."

We know that Woodrow Wilson was right because his statement is based upon an eternal truth—that right will ultimately prevail—a truth that is geared to the ages and to which the American people fully subscribe.

Mr. David Lawrence, an outstanding journalist, said after Yalta: "American idealism was defeated at Yalta. American constitutionalism was scorned at Yalta, and the pledges given in the Atlantic Charter that no nation—neither Russia, nor Britain, nor any other country—will seek territorial aggrandizement were flagrantly violated at Yalta."

Many more national authorities could be marshaled in support of our position that Poland has suffered ignominious treatment at the hands of the victorious Allies. As one great Polish patriot has so well said: "Poland has suffered defeat in victory." It is, indeed, a strange situation.

To the liberty-loving people of Poland and the United States, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam are nightmares. We do not have the time this afternoon to review events since those conferences; we only know that those who remain in the homeland and bear the burdens of the Soviet dictatorship still refuse to yield to foreign aggression. They are supported in spirit and in prayer by you here who carry the torch of liberty in this free land.

I shall never forget the late President Roosevelt after he returned from the Yalta Conference. He appeared before the Congress in joint session. On that occasion he was wheeled onto the floor of the House and spoke to us while seated. He appeared to be a sick and tired man, but he was cheerful and said: "I have had an interesting trip and I feel fine." That was early in March, and on April 12 he was dead. When he spoke he assured us that the rights of all peoples had been fully protected and he said: "There have been no secret agreements." We know now that that statement was false. The surrender at Yalta to Russia was total and absolute. It was rank appeasement and the historians will so record it.

I have often wondered how the former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes feels about his part in the betrayal of Poland—and that's what it was. You will recall that on July 5, 1945, he addressed a note to the Polish Ambassador in Washington, which said in part:

"It is with great satisfaction that I announce that effective today as of 7 p. m. eastern war time the Government of the United States has established diplomatic relations with the newly formed Polish Provisional Government of National Unity now established in Warsaw. The establishment of this Government is an important and positive step in fulfilling the decisions regarding Poland reached at Yalta and signed on February 11, 1945."

Here was the height of appeasement; here was the sell-out of Poland; this was the final act. And to think that Byrnes started his note by saying, "It is with great satisfaction." What a travesty against justice! As citizens of the United States we should set aside February 11 every year as a day of penitence; we should spend the day on our knees asking forgiveness for the crime we have committed not only against Poland but against the people of other small nations who are the victims of Russian aggression.

I have spent this time reviewing events because it is well for us to refresh our memories and to recognize injustice. But now let us look to the future.

If we are to insure justice for Poland some time in the future, we must eradicate bolshevism and communism as a form of government. It is a mass revolutionary movement and not a political movement. Now this is a task that will require the efforts of courageous men and women inspired by the idea that they are fighting on the side of God against a godless revolution.

The Bolshevik doctrine, as advanced by Lenin, is a struggle against religion and capitalism. This conception, which views spiritual life as secondary in comparison with material and external manifestations, formulates the well-known thesis that conscience is determined by existence and by social relations, as well as, in a particular way, by the economic factor of these relations—this latter being the most important.

From this principle Lenin says that the struggle against religions should tend, in the first instance, to break up the social-economic system upon which the roots of religion rest. The social-economic system, upon which religion grows, is the capitalistic system. Hence the struggle against religion should have for its principal objective the destruction of the capitalistic system. In this way the disappearance of religion will become merely a natural consequence with the defeat of capitalism.

"Fear has created the gods," writes Lenin, and he adds: "Fear inspired by the blind force of capitalism—blind because the voice of the masses cannot penetrate through it. At every moment of the life of the proletarian and of the small proprietor this blind force threatens to bring upon them a sudden, unexpected, and casual destruction, an annihilation, a transformation into nothing; it threatens to make them paupers and prostitutes and to reduce them to death by starvation. Here we have the marrow of contemporary religion, which the materialist should always keep in mind, unless he wishes to remain a materialist of an elementary order. No book of instruction is in a position to root up religion from the masses, who are imprisoned by the capitalists and dominated by the blind and destructive forces of capitalism, until the masses have learned to struggle in common, in an organized, systematic, and conscientious way, against that root of religion—against the domination of capitalism in all its manifestations."

Alert American patriots are the last remaining hope of civilization. There is a great need for vigorous leadership by honest men and women who are devoted to the principles of liberty and justice; political and economic men and women who believe in the sanctity of the individual and the holiness of God. This is the basis for our own free government.

One writer has well said that communism imposes systematic serfdom as a substitute for God-given inalienable individual liberty. He also said that communism is not a philosophy of life for human beings any more than a rat trap is a philosophy of life for rats. Communism uses organized subterfuge, supplemented by outrageous violence.

Yet when we look at the world today we must admit that our own Government has unwittingly advanced the cause of commu-

nism all over the world—yes, even including our own United States. It is idle to think that $400,000,000 in Greece and Turkey is going to stop the march of communism there. Only an aroused public opinion throughout the world can stop it.

But what about justice for Poland now, you ask? I can only suggest a course for the future. We must speak to the people of Poland and to other nations who are in the same boat through the Congress of the United States. We are your representatives and symbolize free institutions. The voice of freedom and of liberty can speak out in the Halls of Congress. It can reflect the will of the people if that will is expressed, if it is alert and forceful. We realize now, I am sure, that a strong Executive took matters in his own hands at Teheran and Yalta. There was collaboration behind closed doors and the public did not know what was going on. That must never happen again. We who had condemned appeasement suddenly found ourselves committed to such a program. The damage has been done.

Justice for Poland may come within a very few years. It may take longer than we expect. But freedom and justice will come just as sure as I stand here today.

I am convinced that we can assure justice for Poland by making absolutely sure that we do not lose our own liberty and freedom. The one citadel of freedom in the whole world is the Congress of the United States. Yet we know that there are certain subversive elements in this country who would sabotage and destroy that Congress. At the present time certain newspapers and radio commentators are engaged in a campaign to destroy our public institutions by ridiculing and offering disparaging remarks about elected public officials. Great emphasis has been laid upon the infallibility of the bureaucrats and the planners. Some people believe that our Government should be run by a few smart men. Do you not recognize that this is the start of communism? A few smart fellows are running Russia, too. There are no real elections in that country. But in this country you do elect people to serve you, and when you want a change you do it with ballots—not bullets. I have had a feeling for a long time that too many people take democracy for granted. The time has come for us to recognize that the world struggle today is between our way of life and the Soviet way. Freedom, liberty, and justice are best protected by making sure that your elected public officials are responsible to you in that they protect your inalienable rights. This can be insured by making the Congress of the United States the real strong arm of Government. That kind of Congress will fight for the liberty-loving people of Poland.

In conclusion, I want to leave with you a thought around which you can all rally in the trying days ahead. I quote two sentences from that remarkable book by that outstanding Polish Ambassador to Washington, Jan Ciechanowski, when he replied to our own Secretary of State on July 5. He said to the Secretary:

"For the second time in history the Polish Nation is deprived of its independence, though this time not as a result of events which took place in Europe alone, but as a result of a war which the United Nations waged in the name of law and justice. Notwithstanding the recognition of this state of things by other states, the Polish Nation will never give up its right to an independent state, and for this right it will struggle unwaveringly."

Ultimately, Poland will be free; ultimately its boundaries will be restored. The task is not an easy one, but strong and courageous men and women, with the help of God, will win. Let us dedicate, let us consecrate, ourselves to that end through our free institutions. The United States must reverse itself and it will when your voices are heard in official Washington.

Greenbelt: The Boondoggle That Made Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gerald G. Gross from yesterday's Washington Post:

GREENBELT: THE BOONDOGGLE THAT MADE GOOD—FEDERAL TOWN OF 8,000 NEARS HAPPY TENTH BIRTHDAY

(By Gerald G. Gross)

Approaching its tenth anniversary is Greenbelt, one of the most interesting experiments of the early New Deal.

Greenbelt—or Tugwelltown, as it was called for a while—home of 1,900 families, the Federal Government's best example of communal life, started out as a boondoggle but flourished and prospered in a manner to confound its critics.

Situated in Prince Georges County, Md., 14 miles from the heart of Washington, Greenbelt has long since disproved the implication of impermanency which the nickname "Tugwelltown" carried. Today it is a going concern, with a long waiting list of prospective tenants. Its troubles are mainly little ones—youngsters who daub statuary with green paint, fall out of trees, and play in the roadways.

Population of Greenbelt is now about 8,000. The town directory, beginning with Abramowitz and ending with Zuccaro, reveals the diversified descents of the burghers. In between are such family names as Ehrhardt, Murphy, Comploler, MacGregor, Tchikoff, Van Deusen, and (1 each) Cohen and Kelly.

Theirs is a community without a jail, where there has been only one traffic fatality in the decade of its existence; where one-half the population are children; heads of three families out of four are on Uncle Sam's pay roll, and the same percentage displayed blue-star service flags in World War II.

On Memorial Day Greenbelt dedicated a granite memorial to its war dead, and a few hours later opened the swimming pool for the season. The Greenbelt Health Association, a prepayment plan for medical care, is reported to be in a ticklish situation. Interest is mounting steadily in the biennial municipal election which will be held September 16. Folks have their baby-sitter problems, a bigger food market is needed, benefit parties are being given to raise money to equip the rescue-squad ambulance.

TEST-TUBE TOWN

That's Greenbelt, so much like the average small town in Indiana or Vermont and yet so different in many ways. The nature of its conception—to provide work for thousands of jobless in depression days—and the extraordinary character of its operation, due to the fact that it is in Federal ownership, make Greenbelt different in spite of itself.

Add to that the fact that Greenbelt was—and still is—an experimental laboratory in large-scale, moderate-rental public housing and that all of its inhabitants are guinea pigs for the testing of schemes in education, recreation, merchandising, medical care, and whatnot—well, it is evident that here is something which, for all its typicalness, is still a thing apart.

Greenbelt has been the subject of innumerable themes and theses by high school and college students. Laboriously the authors delved into the socio-economic aspects of the project, the political ramifications of a council-manager type of government, and all that heavy stuff. Some of them, recognizing the importance of giving their papers a human touch, engaged James T. Gobbel in conversation on his favorite topic.

Gobbel is Greenbelt's town manager.

"But don't get me too wound up on Greenbelt," says the thirtyish administrator with a broad grin. "If you do, I'll never stop."

A GOBBEL DECADE

His enthusiasm dates back to the time when he was in the Resettlement Administration and his boss, Rexford Guy Tugwell, sold President Roosevelt on the idea of a model housing project near Washington that would give work to a lot of men and, at the same time, provide good dwellings for families of moderate means. Also, it would put a theory or two to the test.

The Government acquired 3,300 acres adjacent to Berwyn Heights, Md., and the first spadeful of earth was turned on October 12, 1935. Actually the ground breaking was done not with a spade but a pick ax, swung by the ubiquitous George E. Allen in his capacity as Works Progress Administrator for the District.

Just 3 days later what had been advance-billed as a "mass protest" against the project was made to the Prince Georges County commissioners. When all were inside and the doors closed, one solitary dissenter faced the officials. He was LANSDALE G. SASSCER, then president of the State senate.

Today SASSCER, a Member of Congress whose district includes Prince Georges, is one of Greenbelt's most stalwart supporters, would like to forget that he once opposed the venture.

Another critic of the unborn Greenbelt was Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. His blasts were directed at the project's cost, but they stemmed largely from a personal feud with Henry A. Wallace, then Secretary of Agriculture.

Getting back to Gobbel, he was in on the Greenbelt plan from its blueprint stage. In October 1943 he took over the dual job of Federal manager and town manager. In the one capacity he was landlord, in behalf of the Federal Public Housing Authority; in the other, he was the town's top administrator, appointed by the popularly elected five-man council.

Just a year ago the dual job was split, and Gobbel stayed on as town manager, a $6,500 position, relinquishing his duties as Federal manager to Charles M. Cormack. Last month, in the climax to an intracouncil dispute, Gobbel submitted his resignation. It is effective September 30.

THE PERSONAL TOUCH

The new town council which will be elected September 16 may reappoint Gobbel. Or it may pick someone else. Come what may, he was, is, and will continue to be Greenbelt's No. 1 horn tooter.

As he walks through the town square, there is scarcely a person he meets whom he does not know by name. Proudly he takes you to the firehouse to display the rescue-squad ambulance which four tenants, former GI's, bought with funds they raised and pooled.

Why did Greenbelt have so many poliomyelitis cases last year, Mr. Gobbel?

"Yes, we did have 13 of them," he says. "But who knows why the disease strikes harder in some places than others? Besides, only a very few of our cases got a paralysis."

Juvenile delinquency, how about that?

"No problem there," according to the town manager. "I can think of only one serious case since I've been here. That was a teen-age boy who stole some things. He reformed so thoroughly that a certain youth organization"—Gobbel did not wish to identify the lad too closely—"has honored him by electing him president."

He is proud of the community church—"Do you realize that its members represent 23 denominations?"—and the work being

done by its pastor, who was a Navy chaplain in the South Pacific. He gets a kick out of the Greenbelt band, composed chiefly of teen-age boys and girls, and its "feeder" band of "tikes"—most of them just valve-high to a tuba—who graduate eventually into the big band.

NOT HALF DEVELOPED

For a change of pace, get Gobbel to talking statistics.

The original Greenbelt consisted of 885 houses and apartments. Then there were five farm-type dwellings that were on the reservation when the Government took over. You get an even 900 by adding the 10 privately built and owned houses that were erected on land leased from FPHA. On top of that, you have the 1,000 defense homes that were built here in 1941 and 1942 to relieve the housing shortage.

That is a total of 1,900 units, far below Greenbelt's capacity. They occupy only 200 of the tract's 3,300 acres. Federal Public Housing Authority officials say that 4,000 dwellings could be comfortably accommodated.

The 885 units erected in the thirties, ranging from bachelor apartments and honeymoon bungalows to four-bedroom houses, were supposed to be the first installment toward a goal of 3,000. But lifting of the depression and changes in the political picture arrested further construction.

A few years ago some Greenbelters formed an association whose purpose is to buy their homes from the Government. FPHA officials say that eventual transfer of the property to private ownership is desirable but that it simply is not salable at present.

It would not be feasible, they point out, for the Government to sell the dwellings piecemeal. And no investor has been found who was willing to buy the whole works and, besides paying the price, provide assurance that the tenants' interests and the community's character would be protected.

NINETEEN-MILLION-DOLLAR JOB

Oliver C. Winston, director of the FPHA general field office and titular landlord of Greenbelt's residents, estimates that the original 890 units (exclusive of the 10 non-Federally owned) cost $14,000,000, plus $570,000 for land. Uncle Sam put out $4,500,000 for the 1,000 defense homes—hastily built dwellings of asbestos siding which lack the architectural finesse and charming landscaping of the character houses.

Greenbelt's warmest supporters confess that it is uneconomic; its sewage disposal plant and police and fire establishments should be serving 3,000 to 4,000 families and not 1,900. But construction costs today are prohibitive. It probably will be sometime before you hear of any large-scale building at Greenbelt.

Rents are graded according to the tenant's income, and there have been two increases since the first dwellings were occupied on September 30, 1937. Sixty-five dollars is the top. Only veterans may join the waiting list, and they are told that they cannot possibly be accommodated in less than 1 year.

"Yes, and it might be closer to 2 years," volunteers Mrs. Mary Jane Kinzer, who has charge of family selection.

There isn't much turnover, she explains. Greenbelt still has 313 families who were original inhabitants—202 of them living in the same houses and apartments which they rented in the beginning.

PROPHETS WERE WRONG

Mrs. Kinzer's sense of humor is still intact, though it takes a daily beating from people who think Greenbelt is awful for barring dogs and other pets, who think the community rules are too strict and who think they ought to have a three-bedroom apartment even though they do not have the required number of children.

A decade ago the view-with-alarmers were predicting that this newfangled project would bring in undesirable elements and eventually become a big slum. Some said Greenbelt would become an oasis for long-haired New Dealers. As recently as 1940 it was charged that the community was bolshevistic.

Well, Greenbelt today is a pretty nice place, with a community spirit that gets things done.

The town's cooperative stores are in the black. So are the cooperative busses which, about once a month, give free rides as dividends. At meetings of the citizens' association, American Legion post, sewing circles, etc., there is plenty of outspoken griping—a sure sign of a healthy, democratic community.

As Town Manager Gobbel says, inhaling a chestful of that good old Greenbelt air: "There's nothing like it."

The Confederacy's Warrior Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, Judge Walter B. Jones, of Montgomery, Ala., delivered an excellent and inspiring address at Arlington National Cemetery, his subject being the Confederacy's Warrior Dead.

Judge Jones is an outstanding jurist and author. He is an active leader in the civic, fraternal, and religious life of Montgomery. He is past national archon of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity. His father was an outstanding soldier of the Confederacy and was later Governor of the State of Alabama and Federal judge.

The text of Judge Jones' address is as follows:

THE CONFEDERACY'S WARRIOR DEAD

Obedient to the summons of a sad, sweet duty, we gather at Arlington this Sabbath afternoon, on this funeral field of fame, in the glory of this historic place, and we come here, where the dead warriors of the North and South have slept through the long years, to pay tribute to the memory of the sons of Dixie, who in the sixties followed the star-crossed banner, furled long years ago, and now living only in song and story. We come with music and song and tender words, to recall with love and tears those who poured out upon the altars of the South their holy oblations of heroism and sacrifice.

With noble memories welling in our hearts, we come to honor our gallant dead by strewing the first flowers of spring over the graves of those who, not for fame or reward, nor for place or rank, not lured by ambition or goaded by necessity, but in simple obedience to duty * * * suffered all, sacrificed all, dared all—and died in defense of those ideals for which their fathers fought, and dying, delegated to their hands.

DAY CONSECRATED TO CONFEDERATE SOLDIER

This day belongs to the soldiers and sailors of the Southern Confederacy, and this sweet and solemn hour is consecrated to the memory of their sacrifices. Over this great Nation, at this same hour, those who are worthy of the priceless legacy bequeathed to them by their sires, and those who love to honor the brave, are making with grateful and reverent hearts their pilgrimages of love to the mounds where pavilioned 'round with sleep the Southern dead await the voice of Him who brought again from the dead the great Shepherd of the Sheep.

James Ryder Randall, one of the South's greatest war poets, in his touching lines, at Arlington, pays tribute to the soldier dead who sleep here, and we recall today his unforgettable lines:

"In that vast sepulcher repose
The thousands reaped from every fray;
The men in blue who once uprose
In battle-front to smite their foes—
The Spartan bands who wore the gray;
The combat o'er, the death hub done,
In summer blaze or winter snows
They keep the truce at Arlington."

THE SOLDIER DEAD AT ARLINGTON

And so today this great multitude of Americans, mindful of the divine command—"Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee"—has turned its footsteps to this hallowed spot where defeated valor lies, by mourning beauty crowned. With music and song and flowers, we have come to pay tribute to the noble dead whose battle flags were forever furled on that historic April Sunday in sixty-five. Here they lie on the gentle slope of the hillside, peacefully awaiting the last great day when the earth and the sea shall give up their dead and they shall be raised incorruptible.

MEMORIES OF THOSE WHO SLEEP HERE

Over there sleeps a lad who stood by the side of the "Gallant" Pelham at Kelly's Ford, and saw the great cannoneer write his name in letters of gold on history's scroll.

Yonder, just on the brow of the hill, in his humble grave, rests one who charged with Kelly o'er Franklin's crimson-sheeted field; and close by his side, in his faded jacket of gray, sleeps one who drank the wine of victory at Fredericksburg and helped Lee roll back the mighty armies of Burnside.

In the shadow of yonder mournful cedar lies one who marched out steadily, as if on dress parade, across a mile of open plain, in the face of thundering guns and thousands of rifles at Cemetery Ridge, and made the phrase "as valiant as Pickett's charge" the "supreme martial metaphor."

In the shade of yonder solemn elm rests a sailor lad who steamed out into Hampton Roads on the iron monster, the *Virginia*, saw her ram and sink the mighty *Cumberland*, force the gallant *Congress* to strike her colors, and show the world that the day of wooden war vessels was past, and that in the future all navies must be ships of steel.

In the shadow of yon tearful willow is the last bivouac of a boy soldier who was with Longstreet at Second Manassas and joined in the pursuit of the fleeing Pope.

Guarded by yonder modest stone sleeps one who helped Lee repulse Grant at Spottsylvania Court House; and close by his side sleeps a lad who was with Albert Sidney Johnston at Shiloh, saw the great Confederate chieftain, mounted on Fire-eater, lead the charge against the enemy, shouting: "Men, they are stubborn; we must use the bayonet."

Not far from here lie the ashes of one who was with Stonewall Jackson at Cross Keys and Port Republic, in the First Valley Campaign, and saw the skilled leader drive Fremont and Shields from the valley.

Over there, beneath the emerald grasses, forever rests a young Confederate cavalryman who cheered as Turner Ashby rode his milk white steed at the head of Jackson's cavalry; and nearby rests one who was with Ewell at Culp's Hill, and saw the great Confederate general drive Meade's right back in confusion.

Yonder, beneath the grass-covered sod, resting in the serenity of death, is one who

saw Lee's flag of truce go forth through the morning mists at Appomattox, and shortly after surrendered his last cartridge and his bullet-torn flag, and, with the consciousness of duty faithfully performed, turned his weary footsteps homeward to fight in the battles of peace as he had fought in the battles of war, like a man.

THE CONFEDERATE MONUMENT AT ARLINGTON

Within a stone's throw of this beautiful and hallowed spot stands the handsome memorial to the Confederate dead designed by Sir Moses J. Ezekiel, who as a youth fought with the Confederate cadets in the battle of New Market, 1864. And at the foot of this monument, among his fellow soldiers of the Confederacy, rests the body of the talented sculptor.

This monument, a gift of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, was dedicated by President Woodrow Wilson in 1914.

The south side of the monument bears the following inscription:

"To our dead heroes, by the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Victrix causa diis placuit sed victa Catoni."

How appropriate is the selection of this Latin phrase from Lucullus, and translating the inscription we learn, "victorious cause pleases the gods, but a vanquished cause pleases Cato."

This great Roman statesman, Cato the Elder, was regarded by all in his day and time as the ideal model of high morals, and to say "a vanquished cause pleases Cato" is a noble tribute to those who bore its banners in battle.

And so here at Arlington:

"The victims of a grand despair
In long, long ranks of death await
The last loud trump, the judgment sun
Which comes for all, and, soon or late,
Will come for those at Arlington."

THE SOUTH DID NOT REBEL

What a flood of deep, indefinable emotions, what throngs of stern and tender memories stir our hearts and fill our souls and minds as we reverently stand before the graves of our heroic dead, and recall again those days and deeds of long ago, when Lee and Jackson, Gordon and Johnston, Stuart and Ashby, Longstreet and Pickett, walked among the children of men.

We see the southerner of the sixties anxiously guarding the rights of his State, standing steadfast for those ancient principles of local self-government and State sovereignty, the very rocks upon which the Union had been builded, and in the establishment of which his fathers—Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, James Madison, and John Marshall—had taken such signal and honored parts.

The southerner and his military leaders had been taught, yea taught in the very textbooks used at the United States Military Academy, that the secession of a State from the Union depended upon the will of the people of such State, and, until 1860, no one had ever doubted the right of a State to withdraw from the Union. It was not South Carolina that led in the thought and intention of disunion, for in 1796, in 1803, again in 1807 and 1811, even as late as 1844, New England took the lead and, first upon one ground and then upon another, advocated and threatened secession. These are the undeniable facts of history; and they were the indisputable facts more than half a century before South Carolina passed her ordinance of secession.

SOUTHERNER GUIDED BY INSTINCTS OF SELF-PRESERVATION

The sons of the southland did not rebel, nor did they create any new doctrine; they only asserted the time-honored rights of their States. The motives and sacrifices of the southerner were not the mad folly of misguided fathers who waved hostile battle flags against the genius of liberty in the New World. He did not give his land to ruin and his sons to slaughter because of his devotion to the institution of African slavery. Nay. Realizing that he could no longer live in peace under the Union of the fathers, the southerner, in obedience to the instincts of self-preservation and the teachings of a lofty courage, declared that he would depart in peace, and, that denied him, would stake all upon his sword. That was denied him, and then came the guns at Sumter, and then the Confederate soldier.

THE CONFEDERATE SOLDIER

And what a noble soldier he was. What imperishable renown did he win for his country. And what a glorious page did he write for himself and his children in history's grandest volume.

As we stand here today, in the presence of our honored dead, memory carries us back to that day when the long arguments of statemen ceased, the troops assembled, and the flower of southern manhood, "the knightliest of the knightly race," went forth to battle.

"No warrior of the golden past, of glorious antique days,
Crowned with the victor wreath of Greece, of Rome's immortal bays,
No knight who laid his lance in rest with mighty Charlemagne,
Or bore the brave Crusader's cross in great St. Louis' train,
No soldier of the Lion-Heart, who thundered at the gate
Of Acre, when proud Saladin held there his royal state,
No Cavalier of England, who rode in daring pride
With Rupert of the Bloody Sword, or with him fought and died.
But the heir of all these heroes of the great days of old,
Last of the long and gallant line of knightly hearts of gold.
One who has written with his sword his name upon the page
Of glory's deathless muster-roll, gathered from every age."

These are the warriors, the heroes of the rights of sovereign States we honor today.

GRANT'S SOLDIERS

As we dwell upon the life and character of the Confederate soldier, let us not forget his antagonist who bravely fought in the armies of Grant, Hooker, Meade, and McClellan. And, on this occasion, may I not picture this soldier of the armies of the United States to you in the words of one who fought him at Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, Monocacy, and Cedar Creek—words uttered nearly three-quarters of a century ago in the Cradle of the Confederacy, by one who carried Lee's flag of truce at Appomattox, and who today sleeps in the soil of Alabama among his comrades of the sixties. In speaking of the northern dead, he said:

"And while we ponder thus, the mind carries us northward, where tombs, not of our dead, are whiter than the sands of the sea and more numerous than the stars in the heavens. In them lie men of the same race as ourselves, who spoke the same language and worshipped the same God. Fond mothers sent them to battle, and tender tears and agonizing prayers watched their pathway. Not Pickett's charge at Gettysburg, nor Cleburne's at Franklin, outshone in vain but glorious valor the luster of his assault at Marye's Heights, and his mad charges at Spottsylvania and Cold Harbor. He had grander courage yet—he did not mock us at Appomattox. He followed a flag that was as dear to him as was to us the star-crossed banner that has long since taken its flight to greet the warrior's soul, and he that worthily speaks for the dead, or the living, must say that no feeling of hate to the northern dead pervades this Memorial Day. One touch of pity makes the whole world kin. From scenes like this, where the warring sections mourn their dead, let the statesman draw inspiration to guide the living."

NO VACANT CHAIRS IN THE FIRESIDE OF THE HEART

And now, my friends, the glow is fading from the western sky; the shadows are lengthening and the hour has come when we must quit this sacred ground and leave our noble dead in the keeping of the God of Peace. And as we go to our homes, let us remember that the Confederate soldier did not fight and die in vain, for out of his struggles have come freer and nobler States, and, because of this, a more enduring Union. Let us here dedicate ourselves anew to the great principles for which he battled, and resolves to emulate his glorious life and character.

Let us remember, too, that there are no vacant chairs in the fireside of the heart, and that on this sacred Memorial Day, as on all days, the spirit of the Confederate soldier hovers near, bidding us, in the service of a reunited Nation and people, "to think the highest that is in us to think; to do the best that is in us to do; and to be the noblest that is in us to be."

Price of Iowa Farm Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEAR MR. DOLLIVER: Regarding conference called by President Truman for June 9, 1947, concerning placing of ceilings on price of farm lands.

The members of the Iowa chapter of the National Institute of Farm Brokers have given considerable thought to this conference, and we feel very strongly that the price of farm land in Iowa, at the present time, is not excessive, and that it would be very detrimental to both buyers and sellers of farm land, to attempt to control the price, in any way at this time.

According to the figures of the United States Department of Agriculture, farm land in Iowa today, based on an index of 100 for the 1909 to 1914 average, is selling at 134, which is exactly the same as in 1917. The average production of farms in Iowa in the 5 years prior to 1947 is 46½ percent greater than it was in the 5 years prior to 1917, due to the use of hybrid seeds, fertilizers, better farm practice, and better farm equipment. A farm in 1917, had no graveled roads, electricity, or other modern conveniences, nor were any paved roads available in the State. In other words, today's farm selling at the same price as it did in 1917 is a better equipped unit, and one that will produce 46½ percent more than the same unit selling at the same price in 1917.

The mortgage indebtedness on farms in Iowa, is at an all-time low and what financing is being done, is on a long-term basis, and at the lowest interest rate in the history of the Midwest. We fear that any tampering with the prices of farms will only result in two things: (1) Farm sales will be made privately between buyers and owners with a good share of the price hidden as a side consideration; (2) That the whole control program, when abandoned, will result in an immediate upswing in price that will inaugurate the very thing it was trying to prevent. Farms are now being sold in a very

orderly fashion, and three-quarters of them for cash.

We would greatly appreciate any assistance that you might be able to give in bringing these facts before the committee and seeing that no tampering is done with the prices of farms in this State.

Yours very truly,

OTTO KNUDSON,
President, National Institute of Farm Brokers, Chapter No. 2, of Iowa.

Jewish National Homeland in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas we believe that the peace and security of the world and freedom from fear of all peoples can be accomplished only by the nations of the world, powerful, and weak, honoring their pledges and commitments; and

Whereas we believe that a just and honorable solution of the Palestine issue currently before the United Nations and its Investigation Commission is vital to the interests of all freedom-loving, democratic people; and

Whereas for the past 30 years, beginning with the Balfour Declaration, each President of the United States of America, both Houses of Congress, and both the Democratic and Republican Parties have repeatedly declared it the policy of the American people and of their Government to support the establishment in Palestine of a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth; and

Whereas, pursuant to this traditional American policy, the United States Government is formally, legally, publicly, and morally committed to a policy helping to establish a Jewish national homeland in Palestine: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the City Council of Clairton, Pa., respectfully call upon the Government of the United States to take the initiative during the meetings before the Investigation Commission and before the United Nations in vigorously championing the program for Palestine it has repeatedly reaffirmed; and be it further

Resolved, That pending final settlement of this issue by the United Nations, the great weight of the United States Government be brought to bear on Great Britain, the mandatory government, to set into motion at once an interim policy providing for immediate large-scale Jewish immigration into Palestine and the removal forthwith of the discriminatory land restrictions in the Jewish national homeland; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States forthwith publicly declare its traditional policy on Palestine and assume the leadership to which its prestige, power, and humanitarian traditions entitle it, in saving displaced homeless persons now languishing in European, Cyprean, and other concentration camps so that they may, at long last, begin life anew in a home of their own choice; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution go forward to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the American delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, to the Pennsylvania United States Senators, and to the Congressmen of Allegheny County.

Trained To Raise Hell in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I desire to insert in the RECORD a reprint from Nation's Business for April 1947 entitled "Trained To Raise Hell in America," which I hope every Member of the House will read. The article follows:

TRAINED TO RAISE HELL IN AMERICA
(By Junius B. Wood)

Attention, ambitious young men and women! A well-established and liberally endowed university offers you free courses in factory sabotage, bomb making, kidnaping, train wrecking, bank robbery, fomenting armed mutiny, and other techniques of violence and treason.

Scholarships cover all expenses, including recreation and annual vacations at summer resorts.

This university is the West Point of world revolution.

That it exists is surprising. That it is sanctioned and supported, according to its graduates, by a recognized government, is more amazing.

Other state-supported schools educate their youth to become better citizens. This university teaches youth of other lands to go back home and wreck their countries.

Over the years it has trained and returned to the United States an estimated 800 disloyal Americans. They are the leaven of some 50,000 Communists and 10,000 pinkos in our land; they are the high officers of a secret army now being drilled to overthrow our Government and social order.

Most startling of all, from an American point of view, is the diplomatic amiability which bolsters and bows to a government that is diligently working to wreck our institutions.

This university is the International Lenin School in Moscow. Conspiracy and secrecy are the essence of all it teaches. Outside of top levels in the Communist Party and in the Soviet Government, few even in Moscow know of its existence.

It is behind a stucco-covered brick wall, high enough to baffle prying eyes. It is on the left side of Vorovskaya Ulitza (street), a few blocks beyond Arbat Ploschad (square of the telegas). Oldtimers, before adopting names of Communist heroes became the vogue, knew the thoroughfare as Povarskaya Ulitza (Cook Street). Even earlier, in 1613, Arbat Ploschad was where a Russian volunteer army under Prince Pozharsky and a Nishni Novogorod (now Gorki) tradesman broke through the defenses of the White city and drove the Polish invaders from the Kremlin.

In olden days this was the genteel neighborhood of court attendants. Later, the aristocracy found it convenient for extramarital ventures. Now it is dotted with diplomatic offices and homes. Students can look across the street from dormitory windows at the former British mission building, now a consulate, at the onetime German Embassy and the official abodes of other capitalist countries.

The present site of higher education in bank robbery—rechristened "revolutionary self-help"—and kindred arts was once the quiet love nest of a Russian prince. His lady friend's little palace in the spacious grounds has been remodeled into the students' auditorium, classrooms and dormitories. It faces a plain, unnumbered gate in the wall, guarded 24 hours a day by a Red sentry so none may enter without a Communist identification card.

More buildings were needed for the growing school. Overlooking the wall is a structure in modern Soviet architecture with classrooms on the lower floors and sleeping quarters on the others. Back of the modest palace is a building for political police and secret paraphernalia, to which even students do not have free entrance. In the rear of the school building is a larger one with halls for demonstrations in street fighting and other activities. A smaller administration building is near the center of the campus, still leaving ample space for outdoor exercises away from inquisitive eyes.

SIBERIA AWAITS THE CURIOUS

Native Russians have learned that the reward for curiosity may be an extended visit to Siberia or an appearance before a firing squad. Patrons of the school admit that the Japanese did photograph the establishment and from within the compound. This was considered an act of treachery (the two countries being friends at the time) which was not discovered until a Soviet spy fraternally stole a copy from Japan's secret files.

When a stranger ask any Muscovite in the know about the Lenin school, the prearranged reply always is:

"It's up Tverskaya Ulitza, off the square with the Moscow Soviet Building," meaning the city hall. This college with so similar a name is the Lenin Institute. Its field is scholarly and theoretical, shouldering the big task of compiling biographies of Marx and Lenin which will account for their acts during every day and hour of their lives.

The International Lenin School started with Nikolai Bucharin, party doctrinarian, as its first director. Lenin passed into posthumous fame and Bucharin did not survive the Stalin purges, but the school grew. War temporarily interrupted plans for expansion as well as the flow of students from other countries.

The school has a permanent faculty, mostly from the Academy of Red Professors, and a director, at one time a woman. High lights of the Soviet hierarchy, past and present—Stalin, Trotzky, Kuusinen, Molotov, Manuilsky, Yaroslavsky, Lazovsky, Budenny, and others—serve as guest lecturers.

Students are immediately inducted into the air of conspiracy in which these veterans have lived. With matriculation, each student takes a revolutionary or party name by which he will be known in the Communist circles and outside activities. Mark Aldanov in The Fifth Seal tells of a party worker who had so many aliases that he forgot his baptismal name.

Even party workers not in the top Holy of Holies speculate over the identity of Josef Broz Tito, belligerent dictator of Yugoslavia. They explain that Tito is a party label from "Third International Terrorist Organization," the initials being the same in Slavic and English. They surmise from his photographs that Tito may be Rudolph Baker, a promising American student of Slav ancestry who was detailed to district organizing after his return to the United States and then mysteriously disappeared.

Dual names as party labels are not limited to students. The oldtimers needed them as revolutionists, and aliases are now a stylish party custom. Among the emissaries sent by Moscow to run party affairs in the United States, the Hungarian Pogany was "John Pepper" and "Schwartz" the late Lussey was "P. Green"; Alpi was "Fred Brown," and the Finn Sirola was plain "Miller."

With his rebirth under a new name, the student gets more instructions in life behavior. He must blindly obey every order. He may associate outside with the unfaithful but not disclose that he is a Communist, must not dress or act conspicuously, be photographed, answer questions, or become talkative from drinking. If positively identi-

fied as a Communist, he shall frankly admit it, but under no circumstances, even if it means imprisonment or death, disclose anything about the party.

WARNED AGAINST UNITED STATES CONTACTS

The first business of any meeting, even casually on the street, is to agree on a fictitious story of what is being discussed to avoid disclosing the truth if interrupted later. Students should not recognize each other off the campus or cultivate fellow countrymen, Americans being warned particularly against American engineers, newspapermen, tourist, and Government employees in Moscow.

The freshman student is already familiar with some tricks of deception. In the United States, he got a passport on the pretext of sightseeing in Europe. If he used a false name, the American party which paid his expenses to Moscow, corroborated his "legent," or fake biography. In the school, the political police can supply a forged identification for any country.

Unless usually naive, the student senses that permission to be off the campus until 11 p. m., is to enable the police to check on his actions and acquaintances. He learns that they watch his political progress or deterioration and control him as they do every Russian. He is now dependent on the Russian party and Soviet Government for existence.

He is instructed to be peaceful and disingenuous with authorities pending the day of revolution. Instead of avoiding military, police or other law-enforcement service in his own country, the graduate must welcome it. These are not only choice fields for spreading Communist doctrine among associates, but the military will supplement the school's instruction in tactics and weapons. A surprising story is told of the recent war:

"Today, I'll start your lessons on dismantling and assembling a machine gun," an American captain told a likely appearing enlisted man. The officer started to take the gun apart.

"Let me try," the soldier suggested. In a few minutes, he had the gun apart and before long the complicated mechanism was back in place and working.

"Where did you ever learn that?" the captain asked, amazed at such dexterity by a raw recruit.

"In the Lenin School in Moscow," the man explained. Instruction in weapons of other countries is one of its courses.

This man was one who had belatedly realized that his first loyalty was to his own country and not to Moscow and the world revolution. Nurserymen figure that 20 percent of seeds will not germinate and the Lenin School figures the same percentage of its alumni may lapse from communism.

PARTY IDEOLOGY FIRST

To keep the percentage down, the first studies in the school's 3-year course are intensive indoctrination in the theories of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. Once well grounded in party ideology, a party member will realize that winning a wage increase or election or disrupting his own country's economy for the benefit of the Soviet Union are only steps toward the final goal.

"Strikes are skirmishes that force the class solidarity of the proletariat, that oppose class against class and train the masses for the final struggle—the destruction of the state apparatus in a capitalist state," is quoted from a lecture by Abraham Branovich, better known as A. D. Lozovosky, lately Secretary of War in the U. S. S. R. and tops in Profintern and Comintern.

"The most glaring weakness of our members is inability to connect particular tasks with party outlook," Beatrice Siskin, alias "Shields," a Lenin school alumna, warns in Party Organizer, the monthly magazine circulated only to trusted American party members. It also fell to name changing and is now Contact.

The Lenin school student who survives volume I of Marx's involved and obtuse capitalism can go on to volumes II and III, to the clearer philosophy of Lenin, the mistakes of Malthus, Ricardo, Smith, and other bourgeois economists and to increasing instruction in practical communism. As volumes II and III were written by Engels from notes left by Marx, faculty members doubt whether Marx himself would understand them.

In addition to its 3-year course, the school has short courses in labor activities, party organization, propaganda, and such, according to the graduates of the school.

The labor movement is next traced from ancient times to the Red Revolution in 1917. In Marxist dogma, the struggle between employers and workers is irreconciliable. Christianity, according to Marx, came from a slave rebellion against the masters. In modern society the struggle is between capital and labor, farmers and distributors. It will be solved only when civilization returns to the collectivism of tribal days and the masses take over the factories and farms. This is the version to be expounded to the masses, but it is made clear to the students that actually a government, as in the Soviet Union, will take over with the Communist Party in control and today's students as the actual rulers.

"Saying there can be unity of interests between employers and employees is treason to the working class," says a textbook by Olgin, followed by instruction that a collective agreement should be broken at the first opportunity.

Stalin, always direct, clarifies this with: "The mightiest ally of Russia is strife, conflicts, and wars in every capitalist nation."

Comrades who recant communism are to be ostracized, slandered, and accused of stealing and swindling, according to the school's instructions. The easiest way to answer charges by outsiders is to denounce them long and loudly as lies until they are doubted.

When the student reaches the courses on Communist Party organization, the haze of theory clears and action starts. He is taught what methods to use, based on party structure and ideology, in any foreseeable circumstance.

In a country where the party is outlawed, it must work entirely underground. In the United States where it is legal but suspect, it should work under cover of other organizations, but the strategy of conspiracy to create internal disorder and to undermine the Government is the same.

TAUGHT BORING FROM WITHIN

The Lenin school student must join tradeunions or liberal societies when he returns to his own country—attend all meetings, pay dues promptly, be eager for work, unite others by party discipline until the organization is blindly following the party line in which he is so well grounded.

"Never in our wildest dreams did we imagine a simple-minded government would permit trade unions and strikes by its employees," a professor in the school commented on the United States. "We have unions but here all workers are government employees and strike is the same as mutiny in the armed forces, punishable by death. Nor did we foresee that a government would facilitate Communist infiltration into independent unions."

Students who can stand it, get the powerful dose from A to Z. They have now reached Z which is insurrection or revolution—how to put propaganda and organization among the masses to a practical test. Red Army officers and technicians, shadowy shapes from the MVD (Ministry of Political Police) and veterans in revolution take over. The course is based on actual experiences, a few successful and many bitter, each teaching something. When the time comes to apply these lessons there will be no turning back, and the penalties for failure are death.

"Too great humanity is a danger as it is interpreted as a sign of weakness," says the textbook of Han Kippenberger, who, under the name of Alfred Langer, writes as a former revolutionary leader in Germany. "That is the great lesson from all revolutionary conflicts. Humanity should be extended only to those who may be won over to the cause. The revolutionary procedure—that is, the terror—should be applied most strictly to all adversaries."

PREPARATION FOR REVOLUTION

Though Moscow does not consider revolution imminent in the United States, American pupils get the course so they will be ready if the occasion arrives. Russia is a shining example of a small well-organized group taking over a country, and the lessons have succeeded in China and the Balkans.

Four "conceptions," using the school's phraseology, for an insurrection are: Preparation, timing, knowledge of tactics, and complete surprise. Though loyal to the Communist world capital and well instructed, the local leaders still will be amateurs—and Moscow prefers to send experienced revolutionaries to take charge and avoid disastrous bungling and overleniency.

Like the party policies and the life of a party member, nothing is left to chance or to personal vagaries, but is planned in advance on party principles and experience.

High points of the plan for the capture of Chicago—when the time comes—sound like an army operation with everything provided for from psychological warfare to dropping paratroopers.

The peaceful preparations are to go on for years through capable party members burrowed into trade-unions, public offices, police force, liberal clubs, and other sources of information. Vital spots, such as power plants, radio stations, and airports must be mapped.

All the working masses and unorganized proletariat may not be aroused to join in the fracas, but the needed knowledge of where to attack to paralyze the city will be at hand. Even recording such a small detail as whether a watchman has a dog is called for in the instructions.

A headquarters, known only to a selected few, will be set up; a courier system organized; telephone talks will be in code, party papers or names memorized and destroyed. Until the zero hour, nonparty friends should be used as blinds and communications written on borrowed typewriters.

Police forces are notoriously unreliable for insurrections. Consequently, the city's riot squad—sure to put up a fight—is studied. If it is on three shifts, the weakest one is picked for attack. Once it is subdued, other police can be mopped up. If there is a suspicion that police officers are alert to what is brewing, the advice is to telephone them on a phony pretext to learn whether they are home or on duty.

The habits and daily routine of the chief of police, also the mayor and leading citizens, must be learned. A blacklist is to be prepared of politically undesirable citizens for summary liquidation or temporary use while their families are held as hostages.

Squads are assigned to capture each objective. Getting arms for them is easy in the United States. The hours and minute when the groups will strike simultaneously will be the final instructions.

To prevent calls for outside help, communications will be interrupted immediately. Railroads are to be wrecked several miles outside the city, either by sending out maverick locomotives or by blowing up incoming trains. Armed men will hold the airports.

Captured radio stations will order a general strike which will be easy if the power plants are seized. The mayor, chief of police, and other officers and leaders are to be captured early. If the mayor refuses to read the

proclamation which must be prepared for him, he can be disposed of on the spot and somebody with a similar voice, already selected, can read it.

According to the time schedule, a city like Chicago should be captured in less than 48 hours. By that time the insurrectionists will have all the weapons and can arm more supporters. They are to proceed to setting up the government from officials picked in advance.

POSTGRADUATE TRAINING

After completing this practical phase of his studies, the graduate of the Lenin school leaves Moscow to begin his career. He may be sent to a colony for a year or more of postgraduate training or to his own country where communism may be outlawed. He has mastered the technique of working under cover. Even in the United States and other countries where the party is permitted, it is actually two parties—one in the open and the other in the shadows.

A party worker or returned student is ostensibly assigned to duty by the proclaimed head of the Communist Party of the United States. Actually his job is picked by the party's American politburo which acts under Moscow's direction. He may be detailed as a state secretary or to other organizational work, for propaganda or writing articles, for special work among Negroes or foreign-language groups or to get a job and build up party influence in a particular union.

The International Lenin School, of special interest because of American students, is only one of several which the Soviet Union operates for this purpose. The Eastern University, formerly the Sun Yat-sen Institute which Chiang Kai-shek's son attended has graduated nearly 10,000. Its efficient work shows in China and Korea, making trouble for young Chiang's father and for us.

Graduates of Western University are active in Balkan and Baltic countries and scattered foreign-language groups from the United States. Tiflis, scene of Stalin's youthful exploits, has a school for Communists from the Near East. Another in Vladivostock is chiefly for Koreans.

The Academy of Red Professors with a 7-year course is scholarly and philosophical. It is for heavy thinkers and high-browed evangels of communism with little appeal for less sedentary Americans.

SCHOOL FOR SECRET POLICE

On an equally high pedestal above the other schools for world revolution is the supersecret Kirov Academy in Leningrad. It is under the MVD, or secret political police. Only candidates who have proved their do-or-die stamina enter its classes. It teaches higher-level underground work and how to organize a police force which can control a nation, even its army, and keep the Communist Party in power. Its alumni are active in both Hungary and Greece.

By fostering so-called liberal schools in American cities, some formerly under party names, selected students can be instructed in revolutionary tactics. Summer camps with intensive courses are even safer from intruders. A goodly portion of some 20,000 graduates of these schools become converts to communism or sympathizers.

With the American schools the International Lenin school in Moscow has become less essential for the program in the United States. It does, however, continue as a goal or finishing school for the hopeful young party member or graduate of the American classes.

The Soviet schools for foreigners are not too alarming when they are stripped of mystery. It would be well to know their eight-hundred-odd American alumni, also their instructors, and what secret plotting is behind the formal handshakes over a conference table or the clink of cocktail glasses at a banquet board. It also will help when they know that we know—an interesting long-range job for our State Department and FBI.

The Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, Plain Talk About a Missouri Valley Authority, by Morris Llewellyn Cooke, appearing in the January 1947 issue of the Iowa Law Review.

This important article is given even greater stature and significance because of its authorship. Morris Cooke is quite generally recognized as one of the Nation's foremost engineers in the field of scientific management. His long record of achievement in the public interest places him, along with Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, among those early conservationists to whom this Nation owes a debt of gratitude for saving our natural resources from exploitation and ruin.

Morris Cooke is a practical engineer. He was director of public works of the city of Philadelphia for many years; chairman, Mississippi Valley Committee; first Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration; chairman of the Technical Mission to Brazil; and United States arbitrator in settlement of the oil dispute with Mexico.

The Mississippi Valley report made under Morris Cooke's chairmanship drew sharply into focus the need for an integrated program of resources development. He has long recognized the dangers of soil erosion, the need for a national forestry program, tied in with flood-control activities on the main stems of our great river systems.

As an early advocate of the TVA, Morris Cooke stood shoulder to shoulder with the great Senator Norris in leading this Nation toward the establishment of that world-recognized achievement. In this article on Plain Talk About a Missouri Valley Authority, Morris Cooke brings to bear on this subject the accumulation of his vast knowledge and wide experience in harnessing natural resources for the common good.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer, which indicates that the article by Mr. Cooke will exceed the two printed pages allowed under the rule without an estimate, and that the cost of printing will be $355.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAIN TALK ABOUT A MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

(By Morris Llewellyn Cooke)

The date 1900 may be said to mark the turning of a most significant page in the progress of the race, essentially because commercial electricity arrived toward the end of a century during which there had been a progressive change in the mental attitude entertained toward man and his environment.

Since the beginning of recorded time countless millions inhabiting the valleys of the world—of the Euphrates, the Ganges, the Nile—have lived lives of utter squalor; squalor emphasized by the splendor surrounding the way of living of the ruling few. Low vitality, ill health, primitive sanitation, inadequate food, unceasing toil have been the grinding lot of mankind. The nineteenth century had witnessed a widening of the democratic process and a growing regard for the individual. There also had occurred a stepping up in the tempo of scientific discovery, which gave new insights into our basic resources—man, land, and water.

In 1882 came current electricity with the growth in its use accelerating in each succeeding decade. By 1900 scientists and engineers had learned to generate it in any desired volume from fuels and falling water. By this date too it could be transmitted great distances to operate large-scale industry, and to serve in many ways in the homes of the people.

In 1933 the Tennessee Valley Authority with its novel concept of local autonomy was launched. During the years of its development it has afforded the world the first demonstration of the political, economic, and social effects which may be expected to flow in increasing measure from the competent application of the wide variety of influences pictured as having culminated about 1900. TVA is admittedly only a beginning—a foretaste of what is to be. But through foresight, highly competent administration, and some lucky breaks such foundations have been laid as will insure further and continuing progress. Enough has been demonstrated in the Tennessee Valley to afford valid promise of establishing throughout the world conditions under which man can reach new heights of living and being.

What is the application of all this to our theme? The Missouri Valley[1] is one of the undeveloped areas of the world. Its rivers are largely uncontrolled and its soils are washing away. Income-producing industrialization is all but absent, obvious natural resources remain undeveloped, average income is low and moving lower, both family and community life are below the American standard, and population is declining. One is tempted to ask, "Watchman, what of the night?" and the answer can confidently be made that most of the influences that now weigh down the Missouri Valley can be removed, others minimized by establishment of an autonomous valley authority comparable to TVA. And it may be asserted just as confidently that practically all the opposition to such an authority is occasioned by the desire to set ahead relatively petty interests—both public and private—which have no legitimate bearing on the proposal to establish within the Valley a general level of well-being in which all citizens, and all legitimate interests, may participate and profit.

In view of so much that is wrong it is not strange that there are to be found people who take the very pessimistic view as to what can be accomplished under the most favorable procedures in improving the current way of life in the Missouri Valley. It is generally and perhaps rightly assumed that the upper valley—the land of low rainfall—would be the more difficult part of the problem. And yet a distinguished group of experts visiting this region during the height of the

[1] The Missouri Valley consists of large parts of Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, Minnesota, Wyoming, all of Nebraska, and a considerable South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, and section of western Iowa. This represents in area nearly 17 percent of the total area of the United States. The population included in the Valley is about 11 percent of the total population of the country.

disastrous drought of 1936 and while the effects of the depression were still widely felt, had this to say:

"The land may bloom again if man once more makes his peace with Nature. Careful planting will give him back the foothill trees; terracing will restore grass for controlled grazing; fewer and larger farms on scientifically selected sites may yield under the plow a comfortable living; dams will hold back the waters from rains and melting snow, giving power and controlling the flow of the life-giving streams; springs may be developed, water pumped by windmills to water cattle, moisture held in the soil by scientific methods of tillage; by such means the life of man on the land may be made happier, more prosperous, more secure. The sun, the wind, the rain, the snow can be friends of man, not enemies. This is no Utopian dream. It is a promise, to be realized if we will." [2]

It is a great mistake to view the situation in the Missouri Valley as a matter with which only the residents of that region need be concerned. The Missouri Valley is an integral part of the United States. The buying power of the valley is an important factor in the trade of the country. The banks of the valley are part of a Nation-wide system. With every decline in the indices of the prosperity of the valley the great trunk-line railways which run through the region are penalized. The health of the valley's people is a matter of general concern, among other reasons, because of its obvious bearing on recruiting for national defense. The decline of the Missouri Valley is all but problem No. 1 on the national doorstep.

NEW ATTITUDES TOWARD BASIC RESOURCES

Now what can be said as to our changing attitude toward basic resources? I first take man—our principal resource. The dignity of the individual and the necessity for recognizing differences between individuals are concepts of relatively recent growth. Given a reasonably responsible government and a favorable environment, we now know that what happens is largely decided by the individual. Indeed under present-day attitudes each of us has become a personality. In my early years the idea was widely and importantly held that labor was a commodity. By contrast, in TVA as a part of the cost of building dams and for the first time in history, villages providing decent living conditions for the workers were laid out and, when practicable, with the thought that they would be more or less permanent. And in the subsequent development of TVA vast research has been devoted to devices for making life more worth while in the home, on the farm, and in the fields. One might continue these new affirmations indefinitely.

When it comes to land and especially to soils, science has opened up vistas for conservation and progress not dreamed of even a few years ago. At the conservation meeting of the governors of States in the White House in 1907 the representative of the Department of Agriculture referred to our soils as "imperishable" and "eternal." But in a short span of 40 years since, we have come to know that over wide areas the land is all but worthless because of soil erosion. That is the negative side. On the other hand, the sciences of land use and of soil conservation have, through a wide variety of new farming practices,[3] given us a new and more constructive attitude toward what just a few years ago seemed almost a hopeless prospect.

[2] The Future of the Great Plains (1936), a report of the Great Plains Committee.

[3] Two practical pamphlets outlining these practices have been published for free distribution: 1. There Goes a Thousand Million Dollars a Year, issued by Ford Peterson Co., and 2. Let's Practice Soil Conservation for a Permanent Agriculture, issued by International Harvester Co., Chicago.

Shaler, Harvard's great geology teacher of a half century ago, raised the portentous question as to whether "human culture can devise and enforce ways of dealing with the earth so that it may support men of the ages to come." We in the United States have a special responsibility in this matter because our soils as a whole are in better shape than those found in the other continents, and we have the needed resources both to carry on the necessary researches and see that the findings are applied. It cannot be too often repeated that in this matter of nailing down our soils we are still slipping, notwithstanding all the progress made in recent years in our understanding of the problem.

World-wide research into the science of soils, in which Union of Soviet Socialist Republics scientists have taken an important if not a leading part, has yielded new understanding. For instance, within recent years a Rutgers College group has isolated hundreds of varieties of micro-organisms to be found in good soils and not heretofore known to exist and speculated profitably as to their roles in soil processes.

In an entirely different field, W. D. Ellison, of the Soil Conservation Service, reports on the mechanical effect of the lowly raindrop on soils. When rains fall slowly, farmers give thanks for "a good soaking rain." When the rains beat hard and fast and fall on exposed seed beds and bare ground, farmers know instinctively their land is being hurt. Row crops—corn, cotton, and tobacco—are especially vulnerable. Flowing water cuts gullies and rills. But sheet erosion—something else—takes place across entire fields, and is usually blamed on the cutting power of water flowing down slope. Ellison has discovered that this is only partially true.

Some rainstorms have large drops; some have small. In some, the drops fall fast; in others they fall slowly. We have drizzles and cloudbursts. But each drop that hits bare soil splashes many small particles of soil into the air and this is what causes sheet erosion. A single raindrop may splash very little soil, but during a heavy rainstorm on a bare field of highly erodible soil, the billion or more raindrops striking each acre may splash more than 100 tons of soil into the air. This splash will reach heights of from 5 inches to more than 2 feet. Since most of the land in the United States slopes, most of the splashed material is moving downhill.

When soil is splashed into the air the very slightest particles are usually carried off downslope, while the heaviest particles may settle out of the surface water almost immediately. This process results in the washing out of light organic matter, humus, clay materials, chemical fertilizers, and seed. Several tons of very fine particles from each acre of bare land may be released in a single shower.

When raindrops beat on the soil, breaking down the clods and crumbs, the resulting small particles tend to reduce the size of the cracks and pores through which water may penetrate the surface. Before long the surface of the land is sealed, and so there results an increase in flash runoff, which tends to aggravate flood situations.

The conservation of readily detachable soils depends on protecting the soil against the beating raindrop by holding it together, while the conservation of readily transportable soils, on the other hand, must depend primarily on stopping surface flow of water. Heavy cover crops and mulches are most effective in preventing the erosion of highly detachable soils, while terracing is an effective measure in dealing with highly transportable soils. After all, the only way to safeguard the land is to use it according to its individual capability and characteristics.

Five years ago the Soil Conservation Service in estimating the total cost of protecting the Nation's 1,300,000,000 acres of erodible lands against further depletion [4] concluded that approximately $3,000,000,000 would be required to be expended over a period of 25 years—say $120,000,000 a year with the allotments increasing toward the end of the period. As this gross was not more than one-tenth of what had been spent in the preceding 25 years on roads and highways—exclusive of what had been spent in cities which amounted to another ten billion—it seemed to be a sum easily within range of accomplishment. Not to spread gloom but only to emphasize the necessity for action, it has been estimated that our annual losses due to soil erosion now total nearly $4,000,000,000. Anyone who has watched the deterioration in Pennsylvania farm lands during the last 50 years can easily believe this.

Recently the Soil Conservation Service has restudied the situation and divided the total work into the portions of this work which should be done in 10-, 20-, and 30-year periods, based on the current rate of depletion. That means first attending to the areas where total loss may be impending. The soil-conservation worl to be done in the Missouri Valley is being divided up similarly and from this it is believed that one will be able to form a guided opinion as to how soil losses are going forward in the valley as compared with the rest of the country.

An important step in ending erosion is water control. During the last 15 years we in the United States have made great progress in our understanding of the origin and behavior of water (see fig. 2 [not printed]) [5] when it strikes and courses through the land. We know now that floods and damage to tillable areas through run-off are largely due to improper water-control practices. Roadside ditches, gullies, and up-and-down furrows on steep hillsides—the product of recent years—largely account for our increasing floods. That this water is allowed to run off rather than seep in accounts for the lessening of our subsurface reserves and the tragic lowering of the water table, which is a threat to agriculture everywhere, and in some States is shaping up as a block to further industrial growth. In Ohio, for instance, Procter & Gamble and Youngstown Sheet & Tube are reported to have found the diminishing water supply the principal obstacle to their growth. The remedy lies largely in "holding the raindrop where it falls," giving it by various devices and practices a chance to sink in and reach the water courses ultimately by underground routes (see fig. 3 [not printed]) [6] thus not only building up the subsurface water reserves but also sparing damage to agricultural lands.

Our everyday experience is proving that most of the problems posed by the necessity for conserving our main natural resources—men, land, and water—are soluble. But unless the people competent to tackle and solve these problems are given a chance to do so, such areas as the Missouri Valley will continue to decline. Every delay adds to the difficulty and expense of solutions.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY EXPERIENCE

Certainly no one was in a better position to know the effectiveness of the TVA administrative mechanism and, as a farmer, to know the difficulties connected with bringing back abused acres than the late President Roosevelt. He never lost an opportunity either to visit the Tennessee Valley or to give favorable testimony as to what was there being

[4] See Conservation of Renewable Resources (1941), a symposium on fundamental aspects of the problem, held in connection with the bicentennial of the University of Pennsylvania.

[5] From Person, Little Waters—Their Use and Relation to the Land (1936).

[6] From Cooke, Multiple Purpose Rivers (April 1944), 237, Journal of the Franklin Institute 256.

accomplished. He was a constant advocate of valley authorities in general throughout the country. In September 1944, at the height of the war, President Roosevelt urged on Congress "careful and early" consideration of an MVA "for the greatest benefit of its citizens, both present and future, and for the greatest benefit of the United States." In signing legislation authorizing certain work to be done on rivers within the Missouri Valley, not long before his death, he stipulated that these projects must not be allowed to stand in the way of the establishment of an MVA.

An eloquent testimony as to his faith in autonomous watershed development is afforded by the following statement as related by Secretary of Labor Perkins:

"President ROOSEVELT. When I get through being President of the United States and this damn war is over, I think Eleanor and I will go to the Near East and see if we can manage to put over an operation like the Tennessee Valley System that will really make something of that country. I would love to do it.

"Secretary PERKINS. There is plenty for you to do here.

"F. D. R. Well, I can't be President forever, and I don't know any people who need someone to help them more than the people in the Near East." [7]

Fortunately 12 years of novel and fruitful experience with the Tennessee Valley Authority would give any new valley authority an advantage which TVA did not enjoy. The list of pick-ups which any new authority could have for the asking would be worth many millions. In spite of all the difficulties which attend the launching of any new enterprise, TVA justifies and has won worldwide recognition. A constant stream of visitors, representing to date over 50 nations, is visiting the Valley in increasing numbers. Scores of books, hundreds of pamphlets, and thousands of newspaper articles, many of them in foreign languages, have been written analyzing its operations. Perhaps the broadest gage and most fundamental item in this long list is TVA—Democracy on the March [8] by David E. Lilienthal, former Chairman of the TVA Board, a book which has been translated into a score of languages including Hebrew and Chinese. Democracy has developed no techniques for adequately rewarding such signal public service as has been rendered by Lilienthal and his colleagues against exasperating odds in making a success of this enterprise.

During the days of its fiery ordeal in getting started, of having its legislation validated by the Supreme Court,[9] and of having its brand-new organization shaken down, TVA was subjected, as might have been expected, to widespread critical comment, much of it originating with the private utility companies. Finally friends and foes united in a thoroughgoing and amply financed congressional investigation with a clean bill of health as the verdict.[10] But the criticisms keep on just as Mencken's imaginary story of the introduction of the bathtub is still published 40 years after the distinguished author widely advertised it as a fake.

Just as "the test of a pudding is in the eating" so what TVA has actually accomplished along many different lines during its relatively short life must be its most dependable justification. One cannot visit the Valley without encountering these benefits at every turn. Fortunately the United States Census [11] has recently issued various comparisons county by county between conditions in the Missouri and Tennessee Valleys—1930 as contrasted with 1945. For instance, in these 15 years: 1. In 1930 the acre value of Missouri Valley was $39.17 or 15 cents more than in the Tennessee Valley. By 1945 the acre value of Tennessee Valley farms had risen to $46.30 and in the Missouri Valley had fallen to $25.28. 2. In the value of farm machinery employed per acre the Missouri Valley figure rose from $7.13 to $9.34 while in Tennessee Valley it rose from $7.05 to $12.72. 3. In the matter of farm homes equipped with electricity the increase in Missouri Valley was twofold while in Tennessee Valley it was sevenfold. 4. In population the Missouri Valley lost slightly as contrasted with a national average increase of about 7 percent and with a 12-percent increase in Tennessee Valley. 5. And farm tenancy in Missouri Valley fell from 40 percent to 35 percent while in Tennessee Valley it dropped from 43 percent to 27 percent. These revealing comparisons might be continued more or less indefinitely.

FATAL FLAW IN PICK-SLOAN PLAN

Congressional announcements, the mimeographed hand-outs of certain Government bureaus, and the propaganda of the private interests, including that of local and national chambers of commerce might easily lead one to believe that the steps already taken or authorized would solve all the problems of the Missouri Valley. These steps consist largely of building dams and other structures in or adjacent to the main stems of rivers—the Missouri and its principal tributaries.

There is an obvious and fatal flaw in these plans, a flaw which neither the Congress nor the people directly interested appear to want to recognize even though hundreds of millions—perhaps over $1,000,000,000—are under these plans to be spent in the Valley. Such expenditures surely ought to do something pretty fine, say the pork-barrel politicians, the contractors who will do the work, and the special and private interests to be favorably affected, each perhaps in a different way.

This vast and all but futile scheme is to be carried out by two agencies of Government—the Army engineers and the Reclamation Service, the latter the Bureau which handles irrigation within the Department of Interior. Formerly these two agencies fought each other tooth and nail, hammer and tongs, for appropriations. But with the appearance of the MVA proposal discretion suggested that these agencies work together both for appropriations and against MVA. So what has been humorously referred to as a shotgun marriage was effected and the Pick-Sloan plan was adopted. The consolidation of the lobbies representing these agencies has been highly successful in making it appear that dam building on a large scale would save the Missouri Valley.

Here is the hitch. Water which at one and the same time is the lifeblood of irrigation and the cause of floods originates almost wholly upon the land. It is what is done on the land that conserves water and makes increasing volumes available for irrigation up river. It is what is done on the land that retards run-off and thereby reduces the volumes of water which have to be handled as floods downstream. Yet neither the Army engineers nor the Reclamation Service has any legal right to carry on operations on the land nor does either attempt to operate on the land. If steps are to be taken on the land to increase flow to provide for irrigation and navigation, and to decrease flow in order to prevent or decrease floods, then it must be done by some agency commissioned to operate on the land and authorized to coordinate the efforts of the score or more of public agencies influencing the conduct of water wherever it is to be found, among them the Army engineers and the Reclamation Service. This is a function for an autonomous watershed or valley authority.

The path to land-wise conservation of water has been cleared by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture in its sponsorship of uniform State legislation authorizing autonomous soil-conservation districts. Three hundred and fifteen such districts have been established in the Missouri Valley covering about 45 percent of the Valley's area. Each of these districts has accomplished much within its own geographical confines; and each through educating groups of farmers to better agricultural practices has made a real contribution to the total national problem of land use and water conservation. But to be truly effective even in their restricted area of operations, these districts need valley-wide leadership such as would be provided by an MVA. This could be done without any appreciable encroachment on their local autonomy. Perhaps a contract between MVA and Soil Conservation Service, similar to those in force between TVA and many governmental agencies—Federal, State, and local—would provide one means to this end. But whatever the final organizational set-up every effort should be made to give as free rein as possible to the farmer's individual initiative. Local interest and resourcefulness as contrasted with bureaucratic control should be promoted. The Department of Agriculture, as well as MVA, should constantly seek to be the farmer's great and good friend, available on demand with advice but without imposing cramping instructions or dictating procedures. Self-reliance of the individual has been and will continue to be our most priceless asset. The mechanical working of the land under modern soil-conservation practices requires a constantly increasing variety of heavy machinery too expensive to be owned by a single farmer or even a single district. Valley-wide organization would permit such equipment to be moved about on loan. In recent years the Congress has made some appropriations to the Forestry Service in the Department of Agriculture to aid land and water salvage work, pond building, and such like, not ordinarily associated with forestry. Such recognition of pressing needs in certain areas and for certain projects simply affords another unanswerable argument for an over-all autonomous regional agency, bringing into effective harmony the vast number of conservation activities which will have to be either energized or initiated if the vitality of the Missouri Valley is to be restored.

Involved in this total task of putting the Missouri Valley on the way to its maximum rehabilitation and development are a myriad of minor matters and adjustments, some confined to narrow areas, others common to the entire region.[12] There are, too, some major problems which in the light of our knowledge of only a few years ago seemed all but insoluble. In the latter class is the treatment of certain tributaries of the Yellowstone—"the Tongue, the Rosebud, especially the Powder River and most especially the Big Horn," [13] which come into the Yellowstone carrying a tremendous load of silt and cause the Yellowstone to load and color the Missouri-Mississippi all the way to the Gulf. This condition was once believed natural and unavoidable; we know now, however, that it results largely from overgrazing,

[7] Perkins, The Roosevelt I Knew (1946) 89.

[8] Published in 1944.

[9] See Swidler and Marquis, TVA in Court: A Study of TVA's Constitutional Litigation, supra, p. 296.

[10] Report of the Joint Congressional Committee investigating the TVA dated April 1, 1939, filed with the 76th Cong., and printed as S. Doc. No. 56 (based on 14 volumes of hearings) with an additional volume, including Appendices A and B.

[11] See St. Louis Post-Dispatch, January 11, 1947.

[12] For illustrations see Headwaters Control and Use (1937), a report of the Upstream Engineering Conference held in Washington, D. C., September 22 and 23, 1946. See also Slattery, Rural America Lights Up, a detailed account of the operation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

[13] Devoto, The West Against Itself (January 1947), 194 Harper's 1, 3.

and that as recently as the time of the Civil War these particular streams ran almost crystal clear.[14]

With the situation in the Missouri Valley as grave as most indices suggest and with the promise of relief through an MVA "just around the corner" one wonders why nothing is done about it. The answer seems at least threefold. First, it has been widely assumed that such radical changes in political administration as called for by an MVA cannot be brought about quickly; no matter how serious the emergency may be, long periods of gestation are assumed to be necessary. Second, there has seldom been concentrated on a single piece of legislation such a volume of fallacious argument and special pleading as has been thrown up against Senator MURRAY'S successive bills for an MVA.[15] And third—and by far the most important—we have not taken on the appropriate postwar type of thinking about desirable changes in our political, social, and economic set-up. The legislative process remains, except on rare occasions when the national safety is involved, pretty much the humdrum, slow tempo process it has always been. It is a process adapted to the relatively small affairs of "horse-and-buggy days." It is based too frequently on what cannot be done. World War II has taught us that it is high time that we quit talking about what cannot be done and visualize what can be done. Especially in a matter such as setting up an MVA, where the need for action is overwhelming and the remedy right at hand, we must lift ourselves out of the world of "small potatoes." We must adopt the type of thinking that called for the "impossible" in airplane production and then more than doubled it, that moved 12,000,000 men equipped for war overseas when it clearly "could not be done," and that gave us long-sought atomic energy and the bomb and the war's end. This type of thinking backed by a few unquavering voices can give us a Missouri Valley Authority.

TIME-WORN ARGUMENTS AGAINST MVA

As is apt to be the case with any sizable project, there are questions in connection with the proposal for an MVA upon which reasonable men may hold differing views. On such matters either viewpoint may be adopted—at least temporarily—without materially lessening the value of the scheme as a whole. It is important that discussions be held and legitimate differences of opinion be expressed. But captious criticisms on minor points, even though made unconsciously, may weaken or defeat the over-all objectives.

There is no arithmetical answer as to whether one administrator or a board of three, or even five, men should head the proposed Authority. Any one of them would probably work. Whether one is better than three would depend in large measure on the character of the appointees under the two set-ups. Because of the marked difference in economics up and down river I personally prefer a board of three, which would give an opportunity to appoint one man closely acquainted with the situation down river, another having familiarity with the low-rainfall upper section, and a third, perhaps the chairman, who would possibly come from outside the valley, and therefore not share what are undoubtedly fairly acute local prejudices. Again, if it be held that irrigation should be reserved for "family-sized farms" as contrasted with corporation farms, there may well be a difference of views as to the formula. One hundred and sixty acres, once a standard, has long since ceased to be wholly dependable. Ten acres of irrigated land, used for highly priced crops, may be a full-size job for one family, while with another type of land use, 1,000 acres may be insufficient for adequate family living. Here again a difference of opinion on a minor matter should not be made the excuse for holding up vitally needed legislation.

Perhaps the most fundamental of such questions is as to whether the Missouri Valley—17 percent of the area of the United States—is too large to be put under a single authority and administration. One reason why the size of the Missouri Valley is used as an argument against a single authority is that people mistakenly assume that the scope of the Authority is wider than it really is. It has nothing to do with the great bulk of the political and quasi political administrative activities of the region, such as the State, county, township, and municipal governments, the school system, and widely ramifying Federal responsibilities, such as those of the Treasury, Commerce, and War Departments.

Some of the most effective opposition to an MVA comes from Federal officeholders—perhaps because they fear that its creation will in some way curtail their own authority. Hugh H. Bennett, the distinguished head of the Soil Conservation Service, who has probably done more for soil conservation than any other single individual, in his appearances before congressional committees and in periodicals with wide circulation, has given diaphanous support to the MVA proposal. Largely through an unfortunate interplay of strong and technically equipped personalities Soil Conservation Service has until recently been practically excluded from the Tennessee Valley area—the Authority having decided, somewhat mistakenly, I believe, to do its own soil-conservation work. There is no reason to believe that the same thing would happen in another area under wholly different conditions and under different administrative direction.

Similarly Harold Ickes, when Secretary of the Interior, took violent exception to the second draft of the MVA bill and dubbed it one "to gut and dismember the Department of the Interior," [16] insisting that if such an agency were created it should be placed under his direction and control. Later Secretary Krug took a more statesmanlike view when he said in connection with the proposal for a Columbia River Authority:

"It is clear to me that a strong regional autonomous organization should be created to execute certain specified Federal functions in this area. The most important thing to keep in mind is the need for such a delegation of these certain specified Federal responsibilities to a single regional organization. It could do the job better and cheaper than many Federal agencies dealing with river development." [17]

COLD- VERSUS WARM-WATER FISHING

There are 57 varieties of private interests in opposition to unified watershed developments. The Izaak Walton League, for instance, opposes virtually all dam building because (1) such structures are apt to intersition effective, the league on occasion teams fere with upstream "cold-water fishing," i. e. for trout and bass, and (2) that the constant shift in water levels above the dams makes the shore lines difficult nesting and feeding grounds for game ducks. To make this oppoup with the private power interests, who always oppose public dam building as leading toward public ownership of the power industry. Every effort should be made, of course, to keep in a state of nature the largest possible number of those priceless beauty spots where game fish are to be caught by the relatively limited number of those possessing the proper paraphernalia, including hip boots. But we must not lose sight of the vast number—children and adults—who enjoy hauling out "sunnies," catfish, and other varieties from reservoirs created by multiple-purpose dams, filled as they are with water disdainfully called "warm" by those who prefer to go to the wilds for their sport and recreation.

We should, of course, deeply resent the spoliation of the physical aspects of our water courses. When I was a boy one did not have to leave the haunts of men to find streams where verdure—ferns and mosses—bordered streams of clear water in which fish lived and thrived. Through the dumping of waste and more frequently through the scouring of floods of the stream bottoms and banks, all this is gone. The present generation does not realize the change and the loss. So if on the upper reaches of our rivers such beauty spots still persist, I am all for saving them, while at the same time we harness other waters to produce energy and incidentally make pools where young and old can pull out warm-water fish.

There has been, it must be admitted, an almost patronizing attitude on the part of most agencies, public and private, toward realizing on the recreational opportunities associated with dam construction. But this can and must be corrected. For instance, it would be relatively easy to create below the dams, where water levels are fairly steady, new areas for game birds quite the equivalent of those destroyed above the dams. All that would be needed would be legislation including in the total cost of the dam the minor expense of some bulldozer work below the dam proper to clear away underbrush and open new fresh-water channels.

Perhaps I feel strongly in this matter because I have lived through comparable aberrations in engineering thinking. I recall the time when educated water engineers divided about 50–50 as between those who believed that rivers were designed by God as conveniently located sewers and those who fought to protect them against defilement of any sort whatever. This attitude has resulted in the present practice of 6,300 communities with a population of over 50,000,000 dumping their disease-laden sewage into our rivers.[18] The first highway engineers I knew drew a straight line between two points and "let her go." Now it has become quite the practice to choose scenic routes, to watch the grades and curves, to avoid the clutter of pole lines and hot-dog stands, and even to seek out vistas. It has become professional to have in mind and safeguard aesthetic considerations.

The most substantial grievance to those of us who believe in a broad recognition of the claims of recreation lies in the fact that whatever is done to further recreation is almost always undertaken after the claims of flood control, navigation, and power have been satisfied, rather than as an integral part of the making of plans and their execution. This usually means "too little and too late."

WASHINGTON LOBBIES IN ACTION

A military commander invariably seeks to find out as much as possible about the opposing forces, the strength of the several services, and how deployed. So those of us who are seeking to promote MVA legislation must recognize the organized groups in opposition, study their methods, and keep a watchful eye on their operations. The cattlemen, lumber and oil interests, railroads, electric power industry, and the contractors, each motivated somewhat differently, are opposing MVA just as they opposed and continue to oppose TVA. What makes this opposition powerful is that they hang together on

[14] Ibid.

[15] The first bill was introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress, the second in the Seventy-ninth, and the last is before the present Eightieth Congress. With appropriate variations all three bills are modeled on the TVA.

[16] So stated in a letter to the author, dated December 24, 1946.

[17] Quoted from a news release issued in Portland, Oreg., in October 1946.

[18] See Harvey, America's Dead and Dying Rivers (October 1945), 47 Reader's Digest 75, based on Harvey, Our Dead and Dying Rivers (September 1945) 60 American City 106.

issues even where their own particular interests may not be affected.[19] The cattle, lumber, and oil men want to graze, cut, and drain without let or hindrance, without regard to the evil effect on the districts in which they operate and even if the long-term interests of their own industries are sure to be injured thereby. The cattle and lumber interests are now engaged in a campaign to have the Federal holdings in range and forest turned back to the States and then if possible to private ownership. Contrariwise, history shows that when State administration gets too effective the cry goes up for Federal control. The railroads oppose the development of river transportation for fear of its effects on rail rates. The power people oppose public power as likely to press down private electricity rates, for it is recognized that cheap electricity is perhaps the most important factor in regionalism. The contractors oppose MVA because TVA adopted the policy of doing its own construction of dams and transmission lines in order to safeguard the comfort and safety of the workers and to distribute the educational advantages that can be made to accompany that kind of work. The foremen were necessarily moved from one dam site to another but as largely as possible labor was recruited locally. In addition to the training afforded, each worker acquired an understanding of TVA and its objectives.

To further consolidate this opposition and make it more effective some 30 organizations,[20] largely but not exclusively confined to the West, have been created for the purpose of holding meetings at strategic times and places and otherwise lining up directed support through the press, chambers of commerce, Izaak Walton league bodies, college teachers, and other amenable agencies of our free enterprise society. A small percentage of these organizations include with their propaganda activities some socially desirable objectives. It must be admitted that this makes their opposition all the more formidable.

These widely distributed, closely articulated, and highly vocal back-country propaganda organizations head up in various Washington lobbies. A lobby may be a single individual or a highly functionalized group of individuals. However set up, the Washington representatives of the private interests referred to above invariably work as a team so that when legislation is to be opposed all hands join in the attack, seemingly quite regardless of whose ox is to be gored or who pays the bills. It has happened more than once that quasi-public lobbies such as those who work on the Congress on behalf of bureaus and departments of the Government have actually teamed up with these private lobbies. That the National Association of Electric Companies takes its lobbying seriously is indicated by the fact that its representative in Washington, who is registered under the La Follette-Monroney Act as a lobbyist, receives a salary of $65,000 per annum on a long-term contract. He seemingly earns his salary for at a recent hearing on REA legislation it is reported that the presidents of 25 private utility companies were in attendance. Such a showing is apt to impress all but the most stout-hearted legislators. A mass of detail as to how these lobbies operate appeared recently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and was later published in a pamphlet for free distribution.[21]

It is increasingly being recognized that the industrialization of an essentially agricultural region such as the Missouri Valley is basic to its real growth.[22] For each such area and for each stage in its development there appears to be an appropriate balance between the number of industrial and agricultural workers with the percentage of the latter declining as income per capita increases. Perhaps the most obvious first step in industrialization is to develop within the region the processing of the maximum volum of the foods, fibers, and timber produced. From there on to the satisfying of local consumer wants by local manufacture and to the development of natural resources lying fallow [23] one covers the whole range of possible future industrialization. These steps have yet to be initiated in the Missouri Valley with its colonial economy producing raw materials for processing and fabrication elsewhere than in the Valley—largely in the industrial East. Out-of-balance rail rates only aggravate this unfortunate situation. As has been demonstrated in TVA experience, an enlightened, aggressive headquarters organization such as would be provided by a Missouri Valley Authority is needed to give to industrialization the required tempo and a wide distribution. Our war-born technical efficiency has the tendency to lessen the country-wide demand for labor. But an industrialized regionism not only multiplies the kinds of jobs but facilitates rapid adjustments in employment for the individual.

The type of agricultural-industrial regional set-up fostered in the Tennessee Valley, and potentially in the Missouri Valley, is the only one which affords the background and means for a culturally enriched and satisfying village and rural community life. In the Missouri Valley and elsewhere throughout the land it is increasingly true that in place of a stabilized and well-content population, we find a large percentage of the people on the move, wanting to get away from a colorless and stultifying subsistence. On to the big city is the cry—with a drab life the result for the great majority.

The local community we seek, according to Baker Brownell [24] has five essential characteristics. It is:

1. A group of neighbors who know each other.

2. A diversified group as to age, sex, skill, function, and mutual service to each other.

3. A cooperative group, in which many of the main activities of life are carried on cooperatively.

4. A group having a sense of "belonging," or group identity.

5. And lastly, a rather small group, such as the family or small town, in which people can know each other as whole persons, not as functional fragments.

When the group under consideration is so large that the people in it do not know each other, in Brownell's view the community in the sense in which he uses the term disappears.

Seemingly such grass roots community groups do not conflict with that broader concept of community living as advocated by Patrick Geddes[25] and by Robert M. McIver in his Community.[26] On the contrary they afford its only sure support. The use of the same term for functions, characteristics, and qualities at the several levels of evolutionary development—differing as they may in intensity—is quite common in science, notably in biology. An amoeba is an organism but so is Albert Einstein.

It has long since become obvious, and with the development of atomic energy it only becomes more so, that we must develop a science of society that will help us keep pace with our great strides in physical science. Society, according to Howard W. Odum,[27] can only be built on man's relation to, and his dependence upon, the great physical backgrounds and natural resources. These together with the people constitute the physical basis of society and therefore become the first and inescapable principles of the science of society. And this is fundamental the world over. Further the proposition of the regional equality of peoples, with better opportunity to have access to the resources in the places where they live, is an essential problem of modern social science. This includes the widening range of occupational opportunity that comes from developed resources and a balanced culture.

VALLEY DEVELOPMENT A WORLD-WIDE MOVEMENT

It is impossible to examine the proposal for a Missouri Valley Authority in its true perspective except it be viewed as part and parcel of a many-sided world-wide movement. While the international publicity which has attended the success of TVA has given valley development a decided impetus and clarification, regionalization has been actively promoted in many parts of the world for many years. Russia, India, China, Spain, and French West Africa [28] are among the countries having going valley projects, while in Palestine, Ontario, Australia, Wales, France, Mexico, Brazil, and elsewhere the matter is very much to the fore. People generally throughout the world are beginning to realize that it will be only through the type of organization which goes with unified watershed development that we can conquer the dreadful poverty which increasingly menaces civilization.

There are businessmen all over the world who are coming to recognize that economic development, especially of backward areas, is the most obvious means of expanding world trade and defeating isolationism. And so in the preliminary draft of the Charter for an International Trade Organization [29] under the United Nations the signatories "recognize that progressive economic development is dependent upon the availability of adequate supplies of capital funds, materials, equipment, advanced technology, trained workers and managerial skill" and pledge themselves "to impose no unreasonable impediments that would prevent other members from obtaining access to facilities required for their economic development." The World Bank was set up to facilitate such developments.

"Investment of 2 percent of the American national income or $4,000,000,000 annually for the next 20 years in the economic development of the less fortunate countries of the world" said Chester Bowles, former Director

[19] For a discussion of the way in which these different groups hang together and fight each other's battles see a series of seven articles by Ralph W. Page published in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin in early October 1946.

[20] A list including most of these organizations can be compiled from a study of the congressional hearings on the MVA bills in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, for one of their important functions is to put in voluminous testimony against valley developments.

[21] The Power Lobby of 1946, addresses delivered by Senators JAMES E. MURRAY, GEORGE D. AIKEN, and LISTER HILL in the United States Senate, June 18, 1946.

[22] Some Observations on World Industrialization, by Morris L. Cooke before the World Engineering Congress, Paris, France, September 16–21, 1946; preprinted in (May 1946) 68 Mechanical Engineering 406; also in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, p. 3567.

[23] An interesting map, dated December 1946, locating Mineral Resources in the lower six States of the Missouri Valley can be obtained from the Gas Service Co., 700 Scarritt Building, Kansas City, Mo.

[24] Professor of philosophy at Northwestern University.

[25] Boardman, Geddes, Maker of the Future (1944).

[26] Published in 1920.

[27] Professor of economics at the University of North Carolina.

[28] Rossin, The Niger Valley: A New Colonial Pattern (January 1945), 34 Survey Graphic 8.

[29] Issued by the Department of State (December 1946).

of Economic Stabilization, recently "might well change the entire tide of world history."

This sum, in addition to private investments abroad, would go a long way toward the building of a modern transportation system throughout the East, in South America, and in Europe, and would help to harness the power of most of the great rivers of the earth, eliminate floods, build great power plants, provide irrigation for the benefit of tens of millions of people. And by raising living standards in Europe, Asia, India, South America, and Africa would enable countless people to become customers for the goods produced in our own factories.[30]

Supplementing these proposals, Charles F. Kettering, vice-president of General Motors, admitted recently that:

"We have the scientific knowledge to provide an adequate diet for every one of the 2,000,000,000 inhabitants of the globe if the information were properly applied. The false barriers erected by man himself prevent a large percentage of the peoples of the world from enjoying the benefits of science." [31]

THE EPIC OF A SWISS VALLEY

In the summer of 1946 I visited the Valley of the Aar in northwest Switzerland, an area which has been wonderfully reconditioned through the introduction of electricity beginning in 1895. In recent years the electricity supply resulting from dams in the river has been increased by the creation of pondage in the nearby mountains. Although the region is highly industrialized it gives the impression today of a well-kept park. Factories, homes, and farms give every appearance of prosperity. And yet, less than 100 years ago the country was quite wild; little land was cultivated, people lived in thatched houses, and wolves and wild boar roamed the hills.

The pressure of poverty was so great at that time that the town of Rothrist cut down trees from the mountainside and sold the lumber in order to buy ship passage to this country for its surplus and very poor population. It was shortly after this that the industrial development of Rothrist and the Valley of the Aar began. And while the 300 voyagers who left the Aar to seek new opportunities in the New World were settling in the industrial slums of America,[32] in many cases to remain there, the Aar Valley was gradually being converted through considered industrial development to an area of social and economic abundance.

With so many solid arguments in favor of an MVA we must concentrate on the techniques by which it can promptly be brought about. Because MVA is the first valley authority proposal since TVA, proponents of MVA must be prepared "to stand the heat," to meet the vehement opposition of those who want to stop this country-wide movement in its tracks. Further, if the idea is to eventuate promptly in legislation, one or more centers comparable to Senator Norris' office between 1918 and 1933 will have to be created. Coincident with the building of the Wilson Dam in World War I, the question arose in the Senator's mind as to what would be done with the electricity when it was no longer necessary to the conduct of the war. From this time on there was a warm welcome awaiting those with pertinent ideas or a willingness to work on the ideas of others. Gradually and collectively there was built up an understanding as to the fundamentals of a widely ramifying public-power project. Much of the assembled statistics found its way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, committee hearings, and gradually and increasingly into the public prints. If a grateful Republic should ever erect a memorial to this piece of wholly disinterested public service it would carry the name of George W. Norris—in letters of gold—together with Paul Y. Anderson, William T. Chantland, Mabel Cory Costigan, Ruth Finney, Hugo L. Black, Frank W. James, Judson King, O. C. Merrill, John Morin, Marguerite Owen, Gifford Pinchot, John P. Robertson, J. D. Ross, Charles G. Ross, Charles A. Russell, Belle Sherwin, Harry Slattery, E. C. Scattergood, and Thomas L. Stokes.[33]

Until just before the TVA bill was introduced in the Congress it had been almost exclusively a public power and fertilizer bill. Senator Norris made a 30-minute call on President Roosevelt early in 1933. Returning to his office he began revamping the bill so as to broaden its scope and make power take its rightful place as one of many forces in a great social experiment reaching every nook and cranny and all the people in the whole Tennessee Valley.

A broad regionalism has been advocated at Chapel Hill, N. C., for years, through the Institute for Research, under Howard W. Odum's leadership. Their constant effort has been to widen the concept of regionalism and to break away from the idea, formerly quite generally held, that planning was applicable only to the city and metropolitan areas.

A regionalism conference was held early in July 1931 at Charlottesville, Va., with Mr. Odum, Ernest P. Goodrich, Lewis Mumford, and Stringfellow Barr among the speakers. Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Governor of New York, took an active part in this conference, making the opening address at the first session. He had become thoroughly familiar and sympathetic with the wider and more recent outlook as to regionalism. In New York he had put the theories of general resource planning to practical test. He had mobilized and integrated the work of State agencies in a unified program. Senator Norris had aroused the public conscience with respect to one resource in the Tennessee Valley. Now all these interests were combined "Hail and farewell" to George W. Norris and Franklin D. Roosevelt. God grant that comparable sponsors may be found for CVA, DVA, AVA, MVA, and all the other major valleys, for the continued well-being of our land and of our people is at stake.

[30] From a speech given at Freedom House, January 17, 1947.

[31] From retiring address as president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Boston, December 27, 1946.

[32] Strangely enough, at least one family settled in the Missouri Valley, where it remains in relative poverty to this day.

[33] It is interesting to note that not one of this group was a resident of the Tennessee Valley—not a realtor among them.

Hungry Horse Dam and Montana Reclamation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Appropriations for Hungry Horse Dam and Bureau of Reclamation Projects," prepared by me for delivery in Montana.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow citizens, the western program of reclamation and power development, including the Hungry Horse Dam and irrigation project in northwestern Montana, is the key to our future growth and prosperity. Appropriations for the construction of these projects are now being considered in Washington. The action of Congress on this matter is vitally important to our people. If successfully carried out, this program of power production and reclamation will constitute the most important move our State has ever taken toward the establishment of a sound and balanced economy, and will in the years to come make Montana the "Treasure State" in fact as well as in name.

Unfortunately, a reactionary Republican group in the House of Representatives at Washington have slashed these appropriations which were recommended by the President and the Interior Department to begin the construction. This action will, if not corrected, undermine the whole program. Indeed, if the arbitrary action of the House of Representatives is not reversed in the Senate the national policy of developing western resources and building up a sound economy for the Western States may not merely be stymied but it may be entirely destroyed.

The people of the West have been aroused by this effort of reactionary eastern Republicans to block this vitally important program. Extensive hearings have been held at which representatives from the interested Western States have appeared and presented convincing proof of the necessity of proceeding with the construction of this program without delay. The future growth and prosperity of our State is involved and every citizen is deeply concerned. While Montana is the third largest State in the Union, possessing almost unlimited natural resources, it is nevertheless recognized as one of the backward States in the Union in point of population and economic development. Its growth and industrial progress have been retarded in the past. It has been denied by those who control its destiny an opportunity to develop its vast water, agricultural, and power resources.

This important program now before the Congress for the development and conservation of western resources is nonpartisan in character. It has the united support of the people of the West and is recognized as an engineeringly sound and financially feasible program. Furthermore, it is wholly repayable and does not in any respect constitute a subsidy or charge against the taxpayers of our State or of the Nation. Self-liquidating projects of this character have been demonstrated to be of tremendous value to the States in which they are located and to the Nation as a whole. They constitute a wise contribution to our national defense and general welfare.

The Hungry Horse Dam is located on the South Fork of the Flathead River near Kalispell. Contiguous to the dam there is a large area of rich, undeveloped agricultural land. This project will bring a hundred thousand acres of this valuable land into a high state of cultivation, greatly adding to the taxable income of the State and the local communities. The preliminary construction program originally recommended by the President and the Interior Department amount to $4,500,000. In the House this appropriation was cut to $1,550,000, which effectively hamstrings the engineering plans and will add to the ultimate costs of construction, if it is ever carried through.

The need for the early construction of the Hungry Horse Dam and the reclamation project I have described is urgent. They constitute an essential and indispensable part of the whole western program and benefit Montana and the entire Columbia basin. The low-cost electric power which will be produced through the construction of this project will make possible substantial development of both large- and small-scale industry in Montana and give our State a more balanced economy. The carrying out of this program means that we are breaking

away from a long-followed do-nothing course which has confined Montana within the narrow limits of a raw-material economy—an economy which utterly failed to provide opportunities for homes and jobs for our young people. The continued expansion and development of all parts of our country, including Montana, is essential if we are to provide for our growing population and continue to enjoy a high measure of employment and national income, and guard against the dangers of another blighting depression.

In Montana the problem of the need for industrial development is particularly urgent. It is becoming more urgent year by year, because we lack the necessary economic balance to provide jobs and opportunities in life for our young people. Montana, though undeveloped, is one of our country's richest States in natural resources. It sustains a wide variety of agriculture. It possesses extensive cattle, wool, beet sugar, and wheat-growing industries. It has an abundance of forest and mineral resources which, properly developed, can bring about a substantial increase of industry and business, and place the region on a basis of continuous prosperity. It has vast undeveloped deposits of phosphates so essential to the maintenance of agricultural fertility. It has rich, productive soils and favorable climatic conditions. It has water resources with magnificent potentialities for irrigation, reclamation, and electric-power development.

Notwithstanding all these recognized advantages, the private power interests in our State oppose this development. They gloss over and minimize facts in an effort to discredit the program. They undertake to make it appear that Montana is just a poor, backward State, and nothing much can be expected of it. They would have us understand that, while it is too bad that Montana is a poor, struggling State, it simply cannot be helped and the people should accept its lowly status without complaint.

Representatives of the power interests appeared at the hearings in Washington, and in the course of their testimony sought to imply that Montana is not a State entitled to industrial development or growth. Let me quote the exact statement of Mr. J. E. Corette and Mr. H. H. Cochrane, representing the Montana Power Co. In their joint statement they said: "Our basic economy in Montana is about what you would expect for that kind of a State." They said, and I quote again: "The prosperity of Montana really comes from agricultural and livestock industries." Later they referred to the mining industry, but indicated that it was of much less importance than the agricultural and livestock industries. Now, my friends, I am sure you will be disappointed to hear Montana condemned to a state of perpetual pauperism. It is just exactly such backward and undeveloped conditions of our State that the people of Montana are trying to get away from.

Montana is a backward, poor, undeveloped State only because it has been held back and confined during its entire existence to a raw-material economy. We are, as everyone knows, sadly lacking in industrial and business development. Our activities are devoted solely to raw-material production and exploitation. As we exhaust our minerals and forests, and deplete our soils and other resources, we become poorer and poorer as the years roll by. Our population dwindles or remains static and our young folks desert us for other fields of activity.

This attitude of holding Montana in the position of a raw-material economy as a colony for the industrial East is creating widespread disappointment in our State. Our citizens are compelled to stand idly by and see our State become gradually impoverished, except in certain favored spots because of special conditions. This situation will continue to exist unless we take steps now to balance our economy by providing low-cost electric power and attract investments for the developing of processing plants and other industrial activities related to our extensive raw-material resources.

It has been pointed out on many occasions in our State that our young people who are educated and grow up in Montana are compelled to leave the State in search of opportunities in life in other parts of the country. Boys and girls of Montana families are scattered all over the Nation. Very few of our returning veterans are able to find opportunities here and are being compelled to hunt elsewhere to establish homes and take on family responsibilities as independent citizens. Dr. Melby, former president of the State university, referred to this situation in our State several years ago. Many prominent businessmen, too, have called attention to these unsatisfactory economic conditions.

Frank J. Gavin, president of the Great Northern Railway Co., in an interview printed in the Great Falls Tribune in May 1944, discussed the need for the development of our resources. Among other things, he said, "Power has a lot to do with development. Montana certainly has the raw materials, and I don't know why Montana can't have manufacturing if it has power, labor, and population."

An editorial in the Cut Bank Pioneer Press of June 2, 1944, commenting on the Gavin statement, pointed out that the Gavin proposal was far more important than many postwar plans getting the headlines. The editorial concluded in the following words: "The views of an important leader who is no visionary ought to revive interest in a matter that should take precedence over all others in planning for the years after the war." The people wish to follow that advice.

This matter of restoring the appropriations so as to proceed with these projects for the development of the Western States, including Montana, is now before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I am hopeful that we will overcome the opposition presented by the biased Representatives in Congress from the industrial East and succeed in having these appropriations restored. We can then go forward with this important program to line Montana up with the other progressive and prosperous States of the West—a program which will definitely increase our national strength and wealth without costing the taxpayers a dollar, because the program is entirely repayable out of the proceeds of the projects.

The New York Times of May 11, 1947, in an editorial commending these western projects and commenting on their self-liquidating character, said:

"It is gratifying to learn that the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system has been a profitable investment. As of June 30, 1946, the Bonneville Power Administration had returned to the United States Treasury some $80,000,000—about one-fourth of the investment so far made, including interest. This financial showing is all the more remarkable because the 36,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours sold since 1938 have averaged 2.55 mills per kilowatt-hour. Those who proclaim the dawn of a new industrial day, now that a uranium pile may be substituted for coal or oil, may well ponder these figures. Atomic power cannot compete with falling water, which costs nothing. Whatever may happen in other parts of the world the Northwest will rely on its rivers and their tributaries. A potential of some 25,000,000 kilowatts remains to be developed. There is more gold in these waters than there is in any of the hills of the far west. Horace Greeley's advice to young men is still good."

This is a sound, intelligent, nonpartisan program which will bring progress and prosperity to Montana. It should have the cooperation and support of all industrial and business interests in our State inasmuch as they will benefit in a very high degree from the expansion and prosperity which will follow.

Unions and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unions and Politics," which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIONS AND POLITICS

Not only is the existing prohibition against political contributions by labor unions inadequate, but all restrictions on use of union funds for political purposes will be lifted when the Smith-Connally Act expires June 30 unless the labor bill which will go to the White House tomorrow becomes law. Under this bill labor organizations would be prohibited from making any contribution or expenditures in connection with national elections or primaries. All the proposed legislation aims at doing is to put labor organizations under restrictions already applicable to corporations and to close loopholes in the existing law that have permitted certain types of political expenditures to escape the ban, such as outlays for political advertisements and pamphlets designed to influence the outcome of elections.

Opponents of the proposal protest that it would muzzle the labor unions and deprive the labor press of the right to express its opinions freely. The same argument, of course, can be applied against the banning of political publications financed by business and industrial corporations. But in neither case can it rightly be claimed that the freedom of the press would be invaded or the rights of an individual to express his opinions curtailed. The members of a labor union would still be perfectly free to make voluntary contributions for the support of a newspaper or other publication designed to further the political fortunes of particular candidates or parties. According to Senator TAFT, a labor union could, indeed, under the proposed law publish a political newspaper provided it was paid for by subscriptions. But no union funds could be used for the purpose.

In our opinion, such restrictions are necessary not only to protect the body politic against the sort of spending abuses that the Corrupt Practices Act was intended to prevent, but also to protect members of labor unions from being forced to make indirect contributions for political purposes. Far from being an invasion of the right of an individual to give free expression to his political views, prohibitions on the political use of union funds are essential to protect those rights. For members of labor unions belong to different parties and their political views often represent the extremes of radicalism and conservatism. They are banded together to further their mutual economic interests—not to advance the fortunes of any political party or candidate for office. Hence, if any part of the contributed dues are used for political purposes, some of the contributors are in effect victims of political coercion, being denied their right as citizens to throw their support wholeheartedly to causes and candidates of their own choice.

Under existing law labor unions become the accredited bargaining representatives of employees. Sometimes those employees

are forced to become members of a union in order to hold their jobs. In any case, they may wish to join the organization that represents them and determines the conditions of their employment. If that organization uses any part of the dues they contribute to support political programs or candidates for political office not acceptable to them, they are placed in a most embarrassing position. Many union members would, therefore, welcome a complete legal divorce between labor organizations and any form of political activity as a means of emancipating them from forced contributions to political causes of which they disapprove.

Imports of Whisky Under Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the foreign whisky ring has won a great battle. Through the operation of the Trade Agreement Act, clothed in the pious habiliments of peace, the foreign whisky ring has achieved a major victory by opening the liquor floodgates, thus deluging our country not only with whisky but with gin, brandy, champagne, sparkling wines, still wines, vermouth, ale, porter, and beer. It requires propaganda of a higher order to convert millions of good Christian Temperance women, especially mothers, and also the women members of the larger congregations of our churches to the wet cause as carried out by the State Department under the Trade Agreement Act. Yet if those persons who have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, each professing to represent large groups of women throughout the Nation as favoring the wet program of the State Department under the Trade Agreement Act are correct in their claim that they do represent the women of the churches on this issue, then there has been an amazing change in the habits and convictions of the good Christian women of our land.

No person or group of persons can support the Trade Agreement Act without accepting full responsibility for what is done by those who administer it.

Prominent women who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee representing their respective women's organizations as being in favor of the liquor program under the Trade Agreements Act are listed below:

Mrs. Harvey Wiley, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C. Statement was submitted for record in lieu of appearance.

Prof. Mildred Northrop, Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace, New York. Professor Northrop is professor of economics at Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Laura Puffer Morgan appeared for the above-named organization.

Mrs. Zelia Ruebhausen, National League of Women Voters, New York City, N. Y.

Mrs. Margaret F. Stone, the National Women's Trade Union League of America, Washington, D. C.

Miss Katharine Lee Marshall, Women's International League, Washington, D. C. Statement filed in lieu of appearance.

Dr. Helen Dwight Reid, American Association of University Women, Washington, D. C.

I am sure that the examination of the Honorable Charles Taft will be of interest to the members of those churches which comprise the Federal Council of Churches. Mr. Taft is an able and persuasive advocate. He presented and represented his group of churches before the Ways and Means Committee hearing held on April 29, 1947. I quote from the public hearings to which I have referred:

Mr. REED. I was rather interested in the statement made with regard to your coming here representing the Federal Council of Churches. Am I correct in that?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, sir. That is in connection with that first statement. I do not include with that statement these detailed answers; they have not responsibility for that.

Mr. REED. Would you mind naming, for my benefit, the denominations represented in that council?

Mr. TAFT. I will try. I am not sure I can give all of them.

Presbyterian, U. S. A.; the Episcopal; the Northern Baptist Convention; the Presbyterian, U. S.; the Congregational; the Congregational Christian—that is separate, I am never quite clear about that; the Disciples; the Evangelical and Reformed; the Evangelical United Brethren, which is just combined in Pennsylvania; African Methodist Episcopal, African Methodist Episcopal Zion, the National Baptist Convention—which are three of the colored denominations; the Methodists; the United Presbyterians; the Dutch Reformed; at least two meetings of the Friends—I think the Philadelphia and the Five Year Meetings; the United Lutherans are members—not the American or the Augustana or the Missouri Synod.

There are some small ones. I cannot remember all of them, I am sorry.

Mr. REED. I understood you to say that the organization represented the aggregate of about 27,000,000?

Mr. TAFT. It is 27,000,000 members of those churches. As I said, though, very firmly, I do not claim to speak for them, obviously.

Mr. REED. What proportion of that membership of 27,000,000 would you say are women, have you any idea?

Mr. TAFT. This would have to be a guess. I think it is slightly larger than the proportion of women in the population, which I think is around 51 percent, but not very much more.

That does not mean that the men attend churches well, Mr. Reed.

Mr. REED. I understand. I know from experience. However, does the Methodist Church have a temperance organization?

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry, I cannot answer for that. I am attorney for the Methodist Publishing House, among other activities, but I cannot speak for their organizations or other organizations, I am sorry.

Mr. REED. Would you say, generally speaking, they are fairly familiar with the provisions of the different agreements?

Mr. TAFT. I would think not; no, sir.

Mr. REED. Therefore, really, in endorsing the trade agreements, they are not altogether too familiar with it?

Mr. TAFT. I would agree with that entirely. They are endorsing a general principle upon which they have been sold and they endorse it with great sincerity and with a very widespread selection of the membership, I have no question.

Mr. REED. I was wondering, because quite a number of the churches that you have named are quite active in temperance activities.

Mr. TAFT. I can say this to you, sir, that they passed a resolution at the Federal Council meeting in Seattle. I do not have it with me, but it was passed after long consideration and discussion, and it is not definitely a prohibition resolution. It is a conference resolution and they have urged various measures such as better relations or regulations of advertising, but the churches today in the Federal Council at least do not stand officially for prohibition.

Mr. REED. However, did they take an interest in the trade agreements with Canada in 1936 and 1939 by which they lowered the duty on liquor—that is, whiskey—from $5 per gallon to $2.50?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think they took any steps—they certainly took none in the Federal Council until 1942, and back of that, as to the denominations, I do not know. I think there was some before that, but the Federal Council did not until 1942, I believe.

Mr. REED. You would not know, then, whether they were interested or took a vote or referendum or anything on the trade agreements particularly in which they lowered the tax from $4 per proof gallon on rum to $2.50 a gallon?

Mr. TAFT. I doubt if they knew anything about it at that time, sir.

Mr. REED. You would not, of course, know about the further one with Cuba, in 1939?

Mr. TAFT. No, sir. I hope you will not tell them, Mr. Reed, that I was the rum czar in the Caribbean in 1934.

Mr. REED. As long as you were not a rum runner, that is all right.

Mr. TAFT. I had to fix the quotas for rum to be admitted to the United States during the whisky drought.

Mr. REED. I wondered if all these good women who were interested in their children favored not only losing the revenue to the taxpayer and reducing the tax of $5 per gallon on gin to $2.50?

Mr. TAFT. I can only say to you, sir, that until the whisky drought in the United States, the prohibition of the use of alcohol for making liquor, that the imports from Cuba and the Caribbean of rum were almost invisible. They were very, very low.

Mr. REED. I can give you some figures on those in a little while.

The CHAIRMAN. They are larger now.

Mr. TAFT. They went up because you could not buy it here. They went up in 1 year, as far as Cuba is concerned, from 2,000,000 gallons to 14,000,000, and the following year they were building capacity for 75,000,000 gallons.

Mr. REED. Are you giving credit to the reciprocal trade agreements?

Mr. TAFT. No, sir; not at all. I am giving it to the fact that the United States was giving every bit of alcohol it could get its hands on to making rubber.

Mr. REED. I was wondering to what extent the women were interested in brandy. They were reducing that from $5 a gallon to $2.50.

Mr. TAFT. Which agreement is that?

Mr. REED. That is the one with France, and with Argentina.

Mr. TAFT. Well, French brandy certainly has not been an important factor in the liquor market at any time, although I hasten to say I do not drink—brandy at least.

Mr. REED. I do not charge you with drinking.

Mr. TAFT. You understand I must protect my record here.

Mr. REED. Well, you are representing the churches here, I know you must be speaking for them here. Of course it is a loss of revenue of nearly, almost $1,000,000,000 as a result of the lowering of these taxes.

A very interesting thing to me is, I know the churches must have had some interest in the fact that they have on the list, over there at Geneva, to lower still further the

tax on whisky, brandy, gin, rum, and other distilled spirits, champagne, vermouth, and other wines, with certain exceptions, beer and ale and other malt products.

Of course, I cannot tell to what extent. Of course, they had no particular referendum, with fine church organizations and the like, on this item.

Mr. TAFT. I believe their experience with prohibition has led them, to a very considerable degree, to the position that the promotion of temperance must be an educational process and it cannot be done by law. That is my own conviction, sir.

Mr. REED. Then they are using this method of letting in more liquor to educate the people not to use it, is that the idea?

Mr. TAFT. No, sir; I would say that the imports of liquor that are involved in that particular case are a relatively small element to us, or to world trade, although they are important as a source of dollars to the British.

Mr. REED. Now, I am quite sure that as long as they are in this campaign of education, to handle the temperance question, while really the trade agreements and the production involved and the dollar value of the flood of liquor that came in here under the trade agreements is of great interest to the church people, I ask permission at this point to include official figures in that regard.

This appearance of the Honorable Charles Taft before our committee representing millions of church members, urging in their name a continuation of the wet program under the Trade Agreements Act, seemed to be in conflict with the temperance principles espoused by some of the churches for which he claimed to speak.

I recall reading in a publication of the Central Methodist Church, of Detroit, Mich., in which was quoted with approval of the church the findings of the General Director of Public Health in Sweden, Dr. Axel Hojer, as follows:

1. Beverage alcohol is the great destroyer of character and personality.

2. Beverage alcohol is the most powerful agent in the disorganization of family life.

3. Beverage alcohol destroys precision in work and lowers both quantity and quality.

4. Beverage alcohol disorganizes traffic and is a major factor in serious accidents.

5. Beverage alcohol is not a remedy for internal use but a poison.

6. If beverage alcohol procures some revenue for the state, it creates a still higher expenditure. It invariably lowers the standard of the economic and cultural life of the people.

The Central Methodist Church publication commenting on the findings of Dr. Axel Hojer said:

These statements are both conservative and incontestable. Only the incorrigibly ignorant or the selfishly interested would attempt to deny them—openly.

I do not believe the majority of the church members and the members of the temperance organizations of my district believe in flooding our country with foreign liquor. I am sure that even the wets would not favor the foreign whisky ring to the extent of letting them profit by the 50-percent tariff reduction on each gallon of whisky and other liquor, such reduction to come out of the pockets of the taxpayers of our own country.

I here insert the table showing the reduction in tariff on foreign liquors entering this country under the trade agreements. The table shows the vast increase in volume of whisky and other intoxicating liquors inundating our country:

Alcoholic beverages: United States imports for consumption, by specified kinds, 1934–46

[In thousands]

Year	Whisky		Brandy		Rum		Gin		Cordials, liqueurs, kirschwasser, and ratafia	
	Proof gallons	Value	Proof gallons	Value	Proof gallons	Value	Proof gallons	Value	Proof gallons	Value
1934	5,624	$27,818	756	$3,544	316	$1,295	153	$450	563	$2,778
1935	5,847	26,498	444	2,695	483	1,889	61	173	217	1,155
1936	13,375	55,928	646	3,887	555	2,226	70	212	278	1,464
1937	14,364	53,970	738	4,176	510	2,271	70	228	301	1,485
1938	10,321	42,786	665	3,236	395	1,564	62	190	270	1,351
1939	9,846	41,593	770	3,439	394	1,510	72	193	301	1,528
1940	9,715	38,694	773	3,109	407	1,479	56	151	261	1,259
1941	10,279	41,452	323	1,072	416	1,489	58	163	113	489
1942	9,899	43,872	271	852	413	1,707	99	289	65	306
1943	9,478	41,144	1,295	4,365	5,387	12,296	7,128	10,979	83	306
1944	7,686	32,724	4,405	16,973	7,450	16,633	1,872	4,723	190	1,060
1945 [1]	8,599	24,345	1,433	7,377	979	3,472	334	934	151	1,124
1946 [1]	10,512	43,695	1,448	10,603	547	2,300	225	658	372	2,697

Year	Still wines (other than vermouth)		Vermouth		Champagne		Malt liquors		Total, all alcoholic beverages	
	Gallons	Value	Gallons	Value	Gallons	Value	Gallons	Value	Gallons	Value
1934	3,463	$10,212	[2]	[2]	395	$2,971	500	$697	11,570	$49,765
1935	1,395	4,374	956	$2,175	277	2,100	1,032	1,035	10,712	42,094
1936	1,977	5,610	1,159	2,304	502	3,444	1,927	1,736	20,489	76,811
1937	1,881	4,938	1,215	2,128	577	3,239	2,568	2,157	22,224	74,592
1938	1,684	4,180	1,152	1,907	483	2,323	2,119	1,730	17,151	59,267
1939	1,861	4,504	1,400	1,922	560	2,526	1,984	1,658	17,188	58,873
1940	1,669	3,867	1,404	2,064	760	2,088	1,099	947	15,844	53,658
1941	893	2,348	622	1,116	106	567	961	891	13,771	49,587
1942	561	1,440	365	625	98	490	2,371	1,697	14,142	51,278
1943	3,574	8,018	529	1,008	84	407	4,655	3,558	31,213	82,081
1944	7,296	17,114	791	1,625	87	464	8,034	8,260	37,811	99,576
1945 [1]	1,966	5,541	590	1,278	149	1,352	9,394	7,788	23,595	63,211
1946 [1]	3,311	11,641	1,159	2,807	546	5,246	11,945	10,538	30,065	90,185

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Included with "still wines" prior to 1935.

NOTE.—Includes special free imports and imports free from the Philippines.
Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Changes in duties on alcoholic beverages, 1930–47

Par. No.	Articles	Rate before change	Rate after change	Effective date and basis of change
802	Spirits manufactured or distilled from grains or other materials, and compounds and preparations of which distilled spirits are the component material of chief value: Whisky of all types and classes, not consisting in any part of distilled spirits which have not been aged in wooden containers at least 4 years prior to the date the whisky is entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption.	$5 per proof gallon	$2.50 per proof gallon	Jan. 1, 1936, Canada (T. D. 48033). Jan. 1, 1939, Canada (T. D. 49752). Jan. 1, 1939, United Kingdom (T. D. 49753).
	Rum, in containers holding each 1 gallon or less:			
	Product of Cuba [2]	$4 per proof gallon	do [1]	Sept. 3, 1934, Cuba (T. D. 47232). June 3, 1935.[3]
		$2.50 per proof gallon	$2 per proof gallon	Dec. 23, 1939, Cuba (T. D. 50050).
	Other than Cuban	$5 per proof gallon	$2.50 per proof gallon	June 3, 1935, Haiti (T. D. 47667). Jan. 1, 1939, United Kingdom (T. D. 49753).
	Gin	do	do	Feb. 1, 1936, Netherlands (T. D. 48075). Jan. 1, 1939, United Kingdom (T. D. 49753).
	Brandy	do	do	June 15, 1936, France (T. D. 48316). Nov. 15, 1941, Argentina (T. D. 50504).
	Other, not specially provided	do	do	Jan. 30, 1943, Mexico (T. D. 50797).
	Cordials, liqueurs, kirschwasser, and ratafia	do	do	June 15, 1936, France (T. D. 48316). Nov. 15, 1941, Argentina (T. D. 50504).
	Bitters of all kinds containing spirits	do	do	Jan. 1, 1939, United Kingdom (T. D. 49753). Nov. 15, 1941, Argentina (T. D. 50504).
803	Champagne and all other sparkling wines	$6 per gallon	$3 per gallon	June 15, 1936, France (T. D. 48316). Nov. 15, 1941, Argentina (T. D. 40405).
804	Still wines produced from grapes (not including vermouth), containing 14 percent or less of absolute alcohol by volume, in containers holding each 1 gallon or less.	$1.25 per gallon	75 cents per gallon	June 15, 1936, France (T. D. 48316). Nov. 15, 1941, Argentina (T. D. 50504).
	Vermouth, in containers holding less each 1 gallon or less	do	62½ cents per gallon	June 15, 1936, France (T. D. 48316). Nov. 15, 1941, Argentina (T. D. 50504).
805	Ale, porter, stout, and beer	$1 per gallon 50 cents per gallon	50 cents per gallon [1] 25 cents per gallon	Feb. 15, 1935, sec. 336 (T. D. 47470). Jan. 30, 1943, Mexico (T. D. 50797).

[1] Superseded.
[2] Limited to rum "in bott'es" from Sept. 3, 1934, to June 3, 1935.
[3] Reduction resulted from change in general rate pursuant to agreement with Haiti (T. D. 47667; T. D. 47232).

Changes in internal revenue rates on alcoholic beverages (1930–47)

Distilled spirits		Malt beverages (imported beverage not subject to this tax)	
Date	Rate per tax gallon	Date	Rate per barrel of 31 gallons
In effect 1930	$6.40	In effect 1930	$6
December 1933	1.10	Mar. 22, 1933	[1]5
Jan. 12, 1934	2.00	Jan. 12, 1934	5
July 1, 1938	[2]2.25	July 1, 1940	6
July 1, 1940	[3]3.00	Nov. 1, 1942	7
Oct. 1, 1941	4.00	Apr. 1, 1944	8
Nov. 1, 1942	6.00		
Apr. 1, 1944	9.00		

Date	Still wines (per wine gallon)		Sparkling wines (per ½ pint unit)		
	Not over 14 percent alcohol	Over 14 and not over 21 percent alcohol	Over 21 and not over 24 percent alcohol	Naturally carbonated	Artificially carbonated
In effect 1930	$0.04	$0.10	$0.25	$0.12	$0.06
Jan. 12, 1934	.10	.20	.40	.05	.02½
June 26, 1936	.05	.10	.20	.02½	[4].01¼
July 1, 1940	.06	.18	.30	.03	.01½
Oct. 1, 1941	.08	.30	.65	.07	.03½
Nov. 1, 1944	.10	.40	1.00	.10	.05
Apr. 1, 1944	.15	.60	2.00	.15	.10

[1] On beer of 3.2 percent alcohol by weight.
[2] Brandy, $2 per tax gallon.
[3] Brandy, $2.75 per tax gallon.
[4] Per pint.
Source: U. S. Tariff Commission, April 1947.

I wish to report that liquors are on the list for a further reduction by our trade-agreement negotiators at Geneva, Switzerland.

Did the propaganda of the State Department which was sent out to the church organizations and women's clubs urging them to support the trade-agreement program explain that the only real barrier to trade to be promptly removed would be the barrier to foreign whisky importation? No. This proposed reduction from $5 a gallon to $2.50 a gallon on imported whisky was not mentioned in the propaganda of the State Department. If this move to deluge this Nation with foreign imported whisky and other liquor had been urged as the main argument for the adoption of the Trade Agreement Act, I doubt if the millions of church members would have been so zealous in supporting this wet program. The figures relating to the volume of imported liquor from the day the tax of $5 a gallon on whisky was reduced to $2.50 a gallon reveal the danger of relying on organized Government propaganda when it is directed to an unworthy end. It places those good citizens who rely on misleading propaganda in a most awkward position and definitely puts them in opposition to their honest intentions and convictions.

Not once in the public hearings on the trade-agreement bill did the State Department officials indicate that the purpose of the proposed legislation was to lower the trade barriers to admit imported whisky.

There will be an ample supply of whisky for our soldiers when and if universal military training is adopted. Is this what the public desires?

The propaganda technique of deception worked, and now it is sought at Geneva, Switzerland, to lower still further the barriers to the imports of foreign liquors.

Steel Requirements for Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a study on Steel Requirements for Full Employment by Dr. Louis H. Bean, economist in the Bureau of the Budget.

I have been greatly disturbed by published reports rejecting decisions of steel companies not to expand production to meet the enormously increased demand for steel in our economy. This is so manifestly the steel age that any such decision has far-reaching effects.

During my chairmanship of the Senate Small Business Committee, we held hearings in which a good cross section of independent manufacturers testified that steel shortages were greatly handicapping their operations. These conditions have continued and, in fact, recent investigations shows that they have become greatly aggravated. Independent business firms are shut down and others are working on part-time because of the lack of steel.

In this situation, I asked Dr. Louis Bean, who had made a very thorough study of steel capacity and needs, to prepare for me a statement on this important subject. It is of such crucial significance to the Congress and to the American people that I seek to make it available through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL REQUIREMENTS FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT

Conclusions with regard to steel requirements and capacity both for 1947 and for the immediate future need obviously to be based on surveys of actual demand by the various users of steel and of actual plans of producers with regard to capacity. For 1947, the results of such a survey are available, but for future steel requirements for full employment we can resort in this statement only to projections of recent and current trends in consumption. Both for full employment conditions in 1947 and for the longer future, we appear to need more steel production than present capacity can provide.

At the beginning of this year, the Civilian Production Administration made a survey of the supply of and demand for steel products. Translating the results of that survey into terms of steel ingots and castings, it showed that the steel industry was expecting to supply about 83,000,000 to 85,000,000 tons, but the total demand for products added up to 92,000,000 tons of ingots, indicating a shortage of 11 percent. Actual supply or production of steel during the first 4 months of 1947 has been at an annual rate of 85,000,000 tons.

According to the American Iron and Steel Institute, the 1947 capacity of the industry is 91,000,000 tons, compared with 95,000,000 in 1945. It is generally understood that for the immediate future the iron and steel industry has no plans for expanding its ingot capacity. In other words, even if the industry operated at 100-percent capacity throughout 1947, it would not be supplying all of the steel that American industry and foreign demand could consume.

The estimated demand for 1947 of 92,000,000 tons may, in fact, be an underestimate. For example, in the case of steel for the automobile industry, requirements are based on 5,000,000 passenger cars and 1,250,000 trucks. The potential demand for automobiles, in view of wartime curtailment in production and in registrations, has been estimated far in excess of 5,000,000 cars per year for several years. Even under normal prosperity conditions similar to those of the 1920's and allowing for the increase in population, production could be expected to exceed 6,000,000 cars.

The present shortage of steel and other raw materials has a limiting effect on the total national production. Total industrial production is high, but not high enough. This is indicated by excerpts, attached hereto, selected from the United States Department of Labor report on Labor Market Information, March 1947, by Areas. It is also indicated by the fact that during the last half of 1946 and the first part of 1947 the total national output of goods and services per man-hour appears to have been at least 15 percent below normal, taking into account the long-time trend in the Nation's productivity. If this shortage in total output of industrial goods and services is to be made up, it would require more steel and other raw materials, and the required steel production would be in excess of present capacity. This is in line with the findings of the Civilian Production Administration.

On the other hand, if the shortages of steel and other raw materials are not soon made up, some unemployment might develop. As indicated by the attached excerpts, there has already been some curtailment in employment as a result of these shortages. And there could be more unemployment as employers sought to increase production per man-hour without a larger supply of raw materials for expanded production.

It may be asked why is there need for more steel production and therefore more capacity, in view of the fact that we have practically full employment? One reason has already been suggested, namely that we are operating the national economy below normal efficiency. Full employment and normal efficiency would bring about a greater consumption of steel if it were available. Another reason may be given in terms of consumer expenditures. A substantially larger proportion of consumer income is being spent for nondurable goods. If this excess were shifted to durable goods, undoubtedly a larger volume of steel would be required than is now being produced. A third factor that needs to be mentioned is the 1,600,000 persons in the armed services and the effect that that may have in reducing the consumption of steel below what it would be if they were engaged in civilian employment. The additional consumption probably would not amount to more than, say, 2,000,000 tons, a relatively small part of the indicated difference between full employment steel requirements and present production.

Estimating the total amount of steel production and capacity that may be required for full employment situations beyond 1947 is not as simple as making surveys of current production and consumption. The obvious approach would be (a) to study the facts as to past and current tendencies; (b) to secure what information may be obtained from the producers and consumers of steel and steel products as to the most likely developments with regard to productivity of existing plants, plans for new investment,

new technological developments, the rate of growth in competition from other products such as light metals and plastics; and (c) to reconcile, if necessary, the indications obtained from the statistical analyses with those obtained from the latest information as to most probable supply and demand developments.

The rest of this memo touches only on indications as to full employment requirements for steel derived from analyses of the over-all record of production and consumption to date. There are, of course, many studies of this subject, but I refer here to only two. One is a byproduct of a recently published study of the United States Department of Labor on "Full Employment Patterns, 1950." The other is a set of statistical analyses of the trends in domestic and foreign production of steel in relation to full employment and to different levels of unemployment.

The Department of Labor study defines full employment in 1950 as requiring 59,000,000 jobs in civilian employment and 1,500,000 in the armed services. In addition, it assumes that there may be about 2,000,000 persons unemployed for brief periods due to shiftings from job to job and from one locality to another, and to normal delays of various sorts in bringing job applicants and job opportunities together. Starting with this labor force and the detailed production and consumption facts of 1939 for the entire economy, the analysis deals with the supply and demand for labor, goods, and services that might prevail in 1950. It concludes that the amount of steel that might be required by 1950 could range from 98 to 122 million tons depending on whether full employment were attained by relatively large consumer expenditures for nondurable goods or by relatively large expenditures on capital goods, the latter requiring the greater amount of steel.

In the past, our full employment or prosperity situations were attained as a result of expansion in both categories of expenditures, consumption, and investment. Consequently, in comparing this range in the Department of Labor's estimates with the record of production in normal prosperity years, an average of this range, namely, 112,000,000, should probably be used This figure of probable steel requirement if full employment prevails in 1950 is approximately 20,000,000 tons in excess of present capacity.

Approximately the same conclusion is indicated by an examination of the long-time record of steel production as contained in the attached four charts. [Charts not printed.] One shows the record of United States steel production from 1900 to date and the trend of production in prosperity years; the second shows the same record of production, but in terms of the amount of steel per person in civilian employment; the third shows total production from 1920 to 1947 related to the different levels of unemployment experienced during the 1920's and 1930's; and the fourth is the record of production of steel in the United States compared with a similar record for the rest of the world, showing the magnitude of the present and prospective shortage aboad in contrast with full employment requirements abroad.

In the record of steel production in the United States from 1900 to date, as shown in chart I, note particularly the years marked as prosperity years and how the trend of production has risen from one prosperity year to the next throughout the period 1900–29. In 1903, a prosperous year, we produced 16,000,000 tons; in 1907, 26,000,000; in 1913, 35,000,000; in 1929, 63,000,000. In 1941 we produced 83,000,000 tons, but in that year we still had 8 percent of the labor force unemployed. Had production in that year equaled the volume suggested by the trend of output in the pre-1930 prosperity years it would have exceeded 90,000,000 tons. That trend of production for full-employment years, if projected to the years 1947–50, indicates a requirement of well over 100,000,000 tons.

This projection does not take into account the changing rate of population growth and the accompanying change in the number of persons to be employed. Therefore, chart II presents the annual totals of steel production on a per capita basis. It shows the production of steel, not per person in the total population, but per person employed in the United States in civilian jobs. Thus, in 1900, for every person with a job, we produced close to one-half ton of steel. By 1913 we produced close to 1.0 ton per job; by 1929, 1.35 tons; and in 1941, 1.6 tons. This rising volume of steel per job opportunity for full employment situations, if projected beyond 1941, indicates a maximum requirement of 1.8 tons per job in 1947–48, and with 58,000,000 jobs constituting full employment, total steel production would need to be about 104,000,000 tons compared with first quarter of 1947 production equivalent to 85,000,000 and a capacity of 91,000,000.

The over-all trends for full-employment conditions, shown in charts I and II, both show that on the basis of past experience we need over 100,000,000 tons of steel to attain full employment. How much unemployment would there be if total production were only 80,000,000 or 60,000,000? Chart III helps to answer this question; it shows the volume of steel production for the years 1920 to date, including for each year from 1920 to 1941 the percentage of the total labor force that was unemployed. Thus, in 1920 and 1929 we had only 3 percent unemployment. In 1923, 1925, 1926, and 1928, 4 percent; in 1924 and 1927, 5 percent; in 1922 and 1941, 8 percent; in 1922 and 1930, 9 and 10 percent, respectively; in 1931 and 1939, 16 percent; and in 1932 and 1933, 25 percent.

Two facts stand out; the level of steel production goes down with increasing unemployment; and for each level of unemployment the underlying trend of production is a rising one. Contrary to the general view, the underlying trend of steel production was a rising one, even in the 1930's.

If these trends of 1920–40 are projected to 1947–50, it becomes clear that for full employment such as we had in 1929, when we produced 63,000,000 tons of steel we would need close to 110,000,000 tons. Similarly, in the years of deepest depression, 1932–33, with 25 percent unemployment, we produced only 16,000,000 to 26,000,000 tons of steel, and if such a deep depression were allowed to develop again in the near future, it would most likely be accompanied by a production of only 60,000,000 to 65,000,000 tons of steel.

In considering whether something like 110,000,000 tons of steel, as indicated by the foregoing analysis, would actually be utilized in full employment situations in 1950 and after, the question of a possible rise in substitution is often raised. Similarly, for such a large volume of consumption, capacity would have to be increased very substantially from the present 91,000,000 tons to something over 110,000,000 tons to allow for a normal operating margin. And in this connection the question is raised as to whether technological developments may not make it possible to produce much more steel with no increase over present capacity.

Such information as is now available for 1947 and 1948 indicates that at most the substitutes for steel; namely, light metals, plastics, and rubber represent a possible displacement of steel of not more than 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 tons. This is a small part of the present as well as the longer time difference between current production and the projected requirements based on past full employment experience. With regard to increased productivity of present plant capacity as a result of new processes, all that needs to be said here is that such new processes as are being discussed in the industry are apparently still in the experimental stages. From the standpoint of consumers of steel products, it is of course immaterial (setting aside the question of price) whether the amount of steel for full employment needs is produced by expansion of present capacity or by increased productivity due to new processes. Both of the questions as to the probable rise in the importance of substitutes and as to the advent of new processes need to be dealt with by competent technicians and industrial engineers familiar with the use properties of steel and competing materials and with production processes.

Leaders in the steel industry apparently consider the present level of demand as temporary. They expect demand to fall off by the end of 1947 sufficiently to bring about a balance between supply and demand for steel at a level that would make present capacity more than ample. As to the longer time outlook, they take the major depression experience of the 1920's and 1930's as a guide to the average volume of their future markets. It is possible that in these expectations the deep depression of the 1930's is given too much importance, for there is no real reason for taking that kind of depression as part of the normal ups and downs in the demand for steel. The record in chart I shows the deep depression of the 1930's is not at all characteristic of the fluctuations in the demand for steel at least since 1900. In fact, if the record is taken back another 25 years to the early days of the steel industry, there is no situation similar to that of the 1930's.

The point is often made that the production of capital goods such as steel cannot be maintained year in and year out at a maximum level. In this connection it should be observed that we did have a 7-year period, 1923–29, with unemployment ranging only between 3 and 5 percent. If we take the entire 10-year period 1920–29, including a major depression in 1921, a moderate depression in 1924 and a minor one in 1927, the average of unemployment amounted to 5 percent; and for this kind of experience the average volume of steel required in 1947–50 approximates 100,000,000 tons, for which a capacity of about 110 would be required.

Another reason for considering past business cycle experience as inapplicable for the future is that certain economic programs, both domestic and foreign, if they materialize, could produce a relatively long period free of major business depressions. For example, the 10-year housing program providing for 1,500,000 units per year now being considered by Congress would contribute greatly toward keeping the demand for steel at a continued high level.

In case of a sag in domestic consumption of steel, foreign demand for American iron and steel products could lend considerable support. Steel production outside the United States is bound to remain below normal for several years, as is suggested by the record in chart IV. The wartime curtailment in foreign steel production amounted to a decline from 97,000,000 tons in 1939 to 52,000,000 tons in 1945, as Russian, German, French, and other European steel plants were destroyed. Normally, foreign production in 1947 would now be up to about 120,000,000 tons. It will probably fall short of that amount this year by at least 50,000,000 tons and the shortage will take years to make up, even if the rate of recovery is as speedy as that after the First World War or as that after 1932. The opportunity for a much larger volume of United States exports of iron and steel products during the next 5 years is potentially greater than ever before; and this ought to be looked upon as support for prosperity levels of United States steel production in case domestic demand begins to sag.

It is extremely important that industrialists do not take a pessimistic view of American industrial prospects. It is likely to bring about a slower rate of capacity expansion in certain key industries like steel, and in other industries directly or indirectly dependent on steel, and thus tend to restrain industrial growth and job opportunities.

A good example of this type of pessimism due to an overemphasis on the record of the 1930's is the following statement contained in the 1946 annual United States Steel Corp. report to its stockholders.

"If the record of the past is any measure of the future, United States Steel has entered a period of peace in which the long-term outlook is for the average use of about two-thirds of its capacity with relatively inadequate provision for future needs having been made during recent periods of maximum production."

The United States Steel Corp. has a capacity of nearly 30,000,000 tons, or about 32 percent of the capacity of the entire steel industry. If its prospects are taken as two-thirds of present capacity, on the average, it would mean only 18,000,000 tons for the United States Steel Corp. and about 60,000,000 tons for the industry as a whole. Judging from the record in chart II, 60,000,000 tons of steel in 1950 would be equivalent to an unemployment situation of about 20 percent. This would mean that in a total labor force of 60,000,000, about 12 million would be unemployed.

We are entering the peace years with a greater appreciation than heretofore on the part of business and Government of the need for maintaining full employment. There is wider recognition of the feasibility of cooperation between producing and consuming interests and public agencies in behalf of maintaining full employment. There is much wider experience in labor-management relations to promote stability. There are extensive plans by international economic and security agencies aimed at raising the world demand for raw materials and for maintaining peaceful conditions to sustain that higher level of demand. Under these circumstances the highly abnormal experience with low production in the 1930's should not color unduly our judgment with regard to the next decade. The experience from 1900 to 1929 would appear to be a more reasonable basis for judging the future than the experience of the 1920's and 1930's. In that 30-year period there were only 2 years, 1908 and 1921, when the operations of the United States Steel Corp. actually fell below 60 percent of capacity. Based on that period, the steel industry's prospect would be for production averaging more nearly 80 to 85 percent of capacity rather than two-thirds.

If an industry like steel, basic to so much of our industrial production, fails to set its goals in line with full employment requirements and instead orients its policies in line with operating its present capacity at only two-thirds on the average, the maintenance of full employment becomes impossible, unless, of course, job opportunities develop in service industries or in production of goods less dependent, directly or indirectly, on steel.

Outworn Censorship Now Plagues Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herewith an article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

OUTWORN CENSORSHIP NOW PLAGUES JAPAN

(Article 11)

Besides labor domination, the Japanese press is plagued by a military censorship which undoubtedly was necessary at the beginning of the occupation, but for which there is no longer any need.

As a matter of fact, censorship today is hampering one of the objectives of the occupation, which is to establish a firm belief in and knowledge of the democratic way of life among the Japanese people.

The press code for Japan, which was promulgated September 19, 1945, was designed primarily to bar publication of troop movements, to forbid destructive criticism of the occupation forces, to outlaw propaganda, and to prevent publication of any news items which might stir up resentment against the occupation.

The press code also contains the stipulation that "there shall be no false or destructive criticism of the Allied Powers." This, of course, includes Russia, which is one of the Allied Powers.

However, there is considerable Communist propaganda in Japan today. Some of it consists of outright attacks on the United States as an imperialist power and denunciations of our occupation policies.

The presumption is that these newspapers, printed in Japanese characters, are prepared outside of Japan and brought in for hand to hand distribution by Japanese Communists.

Conservative Japanese editors say they are not permitted to reply to this propaganda, because any comment would be construed as destructive criticism of one of the Allied Powers. So far the Communist propaganda has been ineffective, but the censorship policy requires the Japanese people to be exposed to it without any remedial comment from their own newspapers.

The Japanese editors also complain that they are not permitted to print any interviews with repatriates from Siberia. When the war ended, Japan's Kwantung army in Manchuria, estimated at 750,000, was swallowed up by the Russians and taken to Siberia.

Recently, the Russians agreed to repatriate these troops at the rate of 50,000 a month. They are coming back to Japan now, and presumably many of them have interesting stories to tell of what happened to them from the time of surrender until their release. But any comments which are in any way critical of the Russians are excluded under the censorship code.

In a conference with the American editors, the Japanese editors and writers said that censorship makes it impossible for them to publish the true story of what is happening in Japan.

They cited a conference between Japanese labor leaders and Brig. Gen. William F. Marquat, chief of the economic and scientific section of SCAP, during which it was made clear that the occupation authorities wanted the general strike, set for February 1, called off.

CENSORS CALLED INEFFICIENT

They contended that if this story had been printed, the strike threat would have diminished. But they were not allowed to print it, and General MacArthur finally had to step in and prohibit the strike.

One editor cited an editorial on coeducation, which has just been made permissible in Japan. The editorial was held up for no apparent reason. Publication of a report on Henry Wallace's Madison Square Garden speech last summer was delayed for a week.

Moreover, they said, due to inefficiency in the censorship offices, many stories and editorials are delayed until they have lost their news value.

It is axiomatic that a free people must be an informed people. But we, who are trying to instill the principles of freedom in the Japanese people, have put arbitrary restrictions on the information they may receive.

Truman-Wallace Defeat in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I include a revealing article by that able political writer, Mr. Gould Lincoln, on the results and the meaning of the Republican victory in the Third Congressional District of the State of Washington.

Because of the Nation-wide interest in the contest, Mr. Lincoln's analysis is especially valuable:

[From the Washington Star of June 10, 1947]

THE POLITICAL MILL—WASHINGTON STATE ELECTION CALLED MAJOR PARTY DEFEAT—SAVAGE BEATEN DESPITE ENDORSEMENT OF BOTH WALLACE AND ADMINISTRATION

(By Gould Lincoln)

Neither President Truman or Henry Wallace can get any joy out of what happened to their candidate, former Representative Savage, in the Third Congressional District of Washington in last Saturday's election—Mr. Savage was defeated by his Republican opponent, a newspaper editor, RUSSELL V. MACK. Mr. Savage was Mr. Wallace's candidate primarily, but after Mr. Savage had defeated Attorney General Smith Troy in the Democratic primary for the nomination for Representative, President Truman, Governor Wallgren, of Washington, and Gael Sullivan, executive director and vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, all stuck their necks out. Mr. Truman at a recent press conference publicly announced his support of Mr. Savage, and Governor Wallgren and Mr. Sullivan had preceded him.

The Democrats, as a matter of fact, were counting heavily on winning this by-election in Washington to fill a vacancy created by the death of the late Representative Norman, Republican. A victory there would have been construed by them, jubilantly, as a sure sign that the tide had turned and that the country was again swinging Democratic. This desire for victory is probably what impelled Mr. Truman, Governor Wallgren, and Mr. Sullivan to get back of Mr. Savage. The President did not have to mix himself up in this congressional district fight. Neither he, nor Governor Wallgren nor Mr. Sullivan wanted Mr. Savage nominated.

It is being argued in some quarters that Henry Wallace's support of Mr. Savage was what did him in at the polls, and that had Mr. Troy been nominated, the Democrat might have defeated the Republican. But that is by no means necessarily so. Mr. Savage won the nomination over Mr. Troy because of heavy CIO and radical support. They went to town for Mr. Savage in the primary and in the general election—and they might have done neither for Mr. Troy, known as a conservative Democrat. The election as well as the primary was held on Saturday—an odd day of the week for an election. As it happened, that is a day when the CIO workers and other organized labor is free—while the farmers, who work 6 days a week, are not.

RADICALS SUPPORTED SAVAGE

The defeat of Mr. Savage was a Democratic defeat—not just a defeat for Henry Wallace. One of the reasons the Democrats lost heavily in Washington in the 1946 elections was because the charge was laid against them that, as a party, they had played along with the radicals, fellow travelers and Communists—for the sake of getting their votes. Mr. Savage, who was then in Congress, was charged with being one of the most radical of its members. He was defeated by nearly 7,000 votes by the late Fred Norman. He was defeated Saturday by a narrower margin, some 1,500 to 2,000 votes. Last November was a general election, with many candidates for other offices. Saturday was a special election with only the Savage-Mack contest. In consequence, the vote Saturday was much lighter—about 64,000 as compared to 88,000 cast in 1946.

There was no slightest doubt that Mr. Savage had in this recent campaign the support of the radicals, including Communists. The willingness, therefore, of the Truman administration to line up for Savage, as well as Henry Wallace, again raised the same old issue—that the Democrats, for political expediency, are willing to go along with the Reds, despite the fact that President Truman in his foreign policy has displayed great firmness in dealing with Soviet Russia.

The Democrats, in this campaign for Mr. Savage, raised the issue that the Republican Party was out to beat down the West—because the Republican House had cut vigorously the appropriations for the Interior Department, reducing the Government money to be expended for reclamation, irrigation, and power projects in that area. They figured it would be effective—and the Republicans were uncertain about it. Still the Republican candidate won.

Mr. Savage, while in Congress, had been an arch foe of legislation opposed by the labor unions. So Republican congressional action on the labor bill now awaiting approval or disapproval by President Truman played its part in the campaign. Organized labor was desperately fighting to put Mr. Savage back in the House. There is a large organized labor group in the district. Still the Republican candidate won.

Only twice in the last 16 years has the Third Washington District elected a Republican to the House—each time it was the late Fred Norman. First in 1942 and again in 1946, Mr. Norman won. Saturday's result, therefore, can give little satisfaction to the Democrats as they look forward to the national election in 1948. If they cannot win in such a district with Mr. Wallace's blessing—they cannot win without him either.

Mayor Frank Hague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent editorial in the Jersey Journal expressing the high regard in which Mayor Hague is held by the people he has been privileged to serve during the past 34 years. His unique position of having been elected eight times for a term of 4 years with tremendous majorities proves that he has, during all these years, held the respect and affection of the people he served so well. While we who appreciate what he has done for Jersey City—my own district—regret that he has resigned as mayor, we feel that he has earned the right to do so, and we are hoping that his great experience and leadership will be continued in the State and in the Nation at this period when good leadership is of the greatest importance.

HAGUE RECORD IS LONG LIST OF BETTERMENTS

Mayor Frank Hague's retirement as mayor, while he is abdicating in no degree his powers as Democratic local and State leader, will be made the occasion for a public demonstration in the Dickinson High School, Tuesday evening, June 17.

It is at that time that the city commissioners in open session on the stage of the high school, with the public filling the auditorium and packing the galleries, will accept Hague's resignation as mayor and commissioner, elect City Clerk Philip McGovern as the new city commissioner, promote Commissioner Frank H. Eggers to the mayoralty, and appoint war veteran Francis Burke as new city clerk.

The city commissioners and the public will have abundant reasons for bestowing praise on Hague and registering a tribute of respect and appreciation for good work done. The public will also have good reason for encouraging the new and younger mayor as he embarks on a course of municipal leadership in a time of unprecedented widespread unrest and complications.

With the history of Hague inextricably interwoven with the modern history of Jersey City, in which he was born and reared, Mayor Hague in his earlier days reorganized the demoralized police department, stamped out commercialized vice, and checked gangsters in Jersey City, even though his administration covered the brawling days of prohibition when gang slayings were commonplace throughout the Nation. There was never a case of protection money paid by any businessman or industrialist even during the days when racketeers in other cities flouted the authorities by exacting tribute under threat of destroying life and property.

Later in his 34 years reign Hague developed the city hospital into the medical center with Federal funds and won for it national praise and renown. He gave Hudson a maternity hospital and it was the first public institution of that kind in the United States devoted entirely to maternity cases. In the development of a united welfare program that won the commendation of the State and Nation, Hague, supported actively by Governor Moore, established a school for crippled children and developed and enlarged it. In the movement to help solve the juvenile delinquency problem Hague has been active and conspicuous. Jersey City's Junior College was the first school of that kind in the State under municipal auspices.

Probably the most outstanding achievement came in the latter days of his mayoralty career. Crowning a record with many notable chapters, Hague rendered the people one of his greatest services when he successfully fought the plot to turn over to the railroads a gift of $80,000,000 in canceled taxes without warrant and excuse. The decision of the courts upholding Hague no doubt will always be the reward giving him the greatest satisfaction.

Mayor Hague after 34 years of municipal battling has a right at the age of 71 to ask for the lightening of official burdens as, with unstinted energy, he plans to devote his time from now on to the work in State and Nation attaching to a powerful political leadership in a chaotic era of the world's history.

Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal of Commerce of today:

TAXES

MAGILL APPOINTMENT UNDERSCORES TREND TOWARD SALES TAXES

WASHINGTON.—Any lingering doubts that Republican legislators plan to shift the center of gravity of the Federal tax system from income taxes are pretty much dispelled by appointment of Roswell Magill as key outsider to help formulate the 1948 tax law revision.

Named by the Ways and Means Committee as chairman of a new advisory group, Mr. Magill favors minimizing income taxes as a source of Federal revenue. Excises and other sales-tax types of levies would be given a greatly expanded role as revenue raiser.

As chairman of the special advisory group, Mr. Magill will play a key role in formulation of new tax law. His general views have followed closely Republican tax and budget programs since the beginning of the year; some in fact suggest that the Republicans got the programs from him. Treasury has disagreed with just about everything Mr. Magill says. The appointment, therefore, does not bode smooth sailing between Capitol Hill and the Treasury.

Others in the group include John W. Hanes, who also backed H. R. 1, effective to January 1, 1946; J. Cheever Cowden, former NAM spokesman who advocated sales taxes before Congress earlier.

Another Bubble Bursts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, much has been said of the importance and value of cheap electric power as an inducement to industry to locate in certain communities. The construction of large multiple-purpose dams has been advocated, and in order to obtain authorizations and appropriations from Congress with which to construct these dams, the New Deal promoters have tried to sell Congress and the public on the idea that cheap power would be an inducement to industry to locate in the vicinity of these multiple-purpose dams or hydroelectric power generators.

It is always refreshing to see whether or not such claims and arguments are supported by the facts. A few figures and a little historical information on the subject is most illuminating. I am, therefore, pleased to quote the following editorial from the Tulsa Daily World of Tulsa, Okla., of May 22, 1947:

ANOTHER BUBBLE BURSTS

Cheap power does not seem to be the chief ingredient of industrial growth, at least in the Tennessee Valley Authority area. The TVA has been pumped by its proponents as a great social experiment designed to raise the standard of living of the people in the section which it serves.

The major emphasis of the TVA experiment has been on the provision of electric energy—that very necessary ingredient to industrial development. Hence, the success of the TVA may best be measured, at least in its prime aspect, by the industrial progress of the territory it serves. The Southern States Industrial Council has made a survey of the gain in the value of manufactured products in 16 States of the South between 1933 and 1945. Mississippi led with a 411-percent increase while Oklahoma was eighth with a 234-percent increase. Tennessee, where the TVA operates, ranked seventh with a 288-percent increase. The Council says, by all reasoning of the New Dealers and by all claims of TVA boosters, the percentage of increase for the State of Tennessee should have been far and away the greatest in the South, if not in the Nation.

Yet, we find the greatest percentage of increase in Mississippi and Alabama, only remotely affected by the TVA. The next four highest, Texas, Florida, Louisiana, and Arkansas, are entirely removed from TVA influence. Clearly, the comparative record of industrial development in the South during these years must be disillusioning to the advocates of the TVA.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave already granted to me, I include as part of my remarks the following resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island that prompt and favorable action be taken on the Taft-Wagner-Ellender housing bill.

That there is a shortage of housing is not disputed by anyone. The question seems to be whether private enterprise can meet the challenge and provide housing of the type required for all our people, including the low-income groups as well as those who are fortunate enough to be financially able to pay the exorbitant prices asked for houses at this time.

It is my opinion that private enterprise either does not want to or cannot provide low-rental housing which is so sorely needed by the veterans as well as other low-income groups, and I sincerely hope that this Congress, before it adjourns, will take favorable action on the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill.

House resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their good offices to secure prompt passage of the Taft-Wagner-Ellender long-rang housin bill

Whereas it is evident that one of the most pressing problems confronting the Nation is the lack of adequate housing to shelter our people; and

Whereas veterans of World War II and millions of other American citizens are finding it virtually impossible to find decent housing for themselves and their families; and

Whereas there exists in this State and Nation many blighted areas which constitute social and economic liabilities and require redevelopment in the interest of the health, safety and welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, the Taft-Wagner-Ellender long-range housing bill to encourage construction of 15,000,000 city and rural dwellings in the next 10 years; and

Whereas the announced goal of the measure is "decent houses and a suitable living environment for every American family;" and

Whereas the target for the first year would be 5,000,000 units, which would provide at least some relief; and

Whereas under the terms of the bill private enterprise in the construction industry would be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total housing need as possible; and

Whereas the bill provides Federal funds to clear slums and provide public low-rent housing to areas whose needs cannot be fully met through reliance on private enterprise, or local and State revenues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Rhode Island House of Representatives, realizing that there is a great need to provide decent and adequate housing for citizens of our State and of the Nation and believing that the proposed Taft-Wagner-Ellender housing bill can do much to alleviate the housing shortage, do hereby respectfully request the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their good offices to secure prompt passage of said Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill, so-called; and the recording clerk of this honorable body is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

Necessary To Watch the Peas and Shells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from a prominent businessman of Oklahoma City, who has always had the best interests of the farmers of our State at heart. He has sent me an editorial which appeared in the Oklahoma City Times, published at Oklahoma City, Okla., under date of May 27, 1947, and bearing the above title.

I think it would be well for each Member of Congress to study well what the author of this editorial has to say with reference to the appropriations which Congress has been making for the Soil Conservation Service and for the AAA. These agencies are frequently confused, one with the other. My friend suggests that we are tremendously interested in saving the soil and we do not believe it would be in the interest of good judgment nor economy to combine the Soil Conservation Service with the AAA or any other organization.

This editorial has added significance and should be of more than usual interest to the Members of Congress at this time in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill recently passed by the House of Representatives, and I commend the following editorial to your most serious consideration. The editorial follows:

NECESSARY TO WATCH THE PEAS AND SHELLS

Not all of the maneuvering for large appropriations for the United States Department of Agriculture is the work of designing politicians and bureaucrats desperately trying to hold on to their jobs, but unquestionably much of it is.

The Government soil-conservation work provides one wide-open method whereby the genuine soil-conservation program and the political type may be so scrambled up together that only the careful observer can tell the difference.

It is evident that some of the Washington press reporters have fallen for the game in which the peas are skillfully shifted, being covered by first one shell and then another. They write in general terms about the soil-conservation program without knowing exactly what they are writing about.

It should be made emphatically clear that the United States soil-conservation service with its annual appropriation of less than $40,000,000, is the service that really matters. It is composed of highly trained technicians, and it is headed by the veteran expert, Dr. H. H. Bennett. Its work during the past decade has been marvelously effective. It shies away from politics and tends to its knitting, as a competent Government department should.

Then there is a wholly different division, which requires no technical knowledge or ability, but nevertheless has received the lion's share of appropriations, running to about 10 times that of the United States Soil Conservation Service.

This division is an outgrowth of the old AAA, and was formed as a desperation move by Secretary Henry Wallace when the processing tax was knocked out by the Supreme Court, and it became the political department of the general conservation movement, its function being to spread the gentle rain of checks to individual farmers.

These checks were ostensibly intended to reimburse farmers for soil-building practices, but the practice quickly took on the aspects of a racket, for payments were made for as many as 40 different practices, including digging a well, making a garden, and other frivolous pretexts. If the payments had been made wholly for terrace building and the use of two or three principal fertilizers, there might have been some sense to it, but the case of a farmer not far from Oklahoma City illustrates what really happened.

"I received a check for $400 from the Government the other day," he said. "What for?" he was asked. "Blessed if I know," he replied.

The record shows that a large part of the money, probably the bulk of it, has been going to well-to-do and wealthy landowners. One of this type recently said:

"This Government hand-out is a farce and a disgrace. I know the value of soil conservation and soil building, and it pays me big dividends to do the work on my own, so why should I be paid for it?"

His statement is amply reinforced by research of the Oklahoma State Bankers Association, which finds by exhaustive reports that the average immediate benefit from soil conservation amounts to 40 percent increase in crops.

As a matter of fact, obviously there would be little realistic and practical use in soil conservation unless it were profitable to those who practice it, so the Government

hand-out is a prima facie case of political "gimme." The chief benefit of Government financing of terracing, pond-building, and fertilization payments up to now is that it has induced the establishment of projects which are examples to the neighbors. However, since this phase of the work has been accomplished, it's about time to inventory and clean up the situation.

If there are any technical experts in the political hand-out division, it is purely coincidental.

Those who are interested in soil conservation should differentiate carefully between the genuine service and the political type and not shed too many tears over the reduction in appropriation for the latter. The conservation movement is so big and important that it ought to be gone over carefully. The political angles ought to be eliminated and all the work should be concentrated on the program of saving the soil, hewing to the line and letting the votes fall where they may.

Address of Mayor William O'Dwyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Mayor William O'Dwyer on radio program sponsored by the American Federation of Labor over Station WJZ on Tuesday, June 3, 1947:

It's been a long time now, but most of us have not forgotten the Republican depression that began in 1929. When we hit bottom in 1932 and President Roosevelt took hold, we needed help from Government. And so began the New Deal—a philosophy of Government based on the simple, democratic principle that we should do the most good for the most people.

As conditions improved, the same old crowd that led us right into the worst depression we have yet had, became vocal once more. In Congress, on the radio, in the newspapers, from the speaking platforms. The New Deal was under attack.

Government, they said, was trying to run business. The New Deal was "planned economy," "Statism," "socialism," and even "communism."

If Washington would only let us alone, they said, we could solve all our problems ourselves. Get rid of the bureaucrats, the rules, the regulations they cried. The New Deal is unconstitutional, un-American, blood brother to the foreign isms.

That's what they said in the days of President Roosevelt.

But this is not all ancient history.

About 1 year ago we were assured by ROBERT TAFT, Republican Senator from Ohio, and his cohorts in Congress, that prices were bound to come down if the Government's OPA ceilings were removed. They scoffed at the estimates of the Administration that living costs would skyrocket.

So the OPA was demolished in deference to those who clamored against Government regulation of business. And what has been the result. You get the answer all too well when you go out to buy food and clothing and other necessities.

But we have to say this for the Republicans. At least they were consistent. They opposed the socially and economically beneficial legislation of the New Deal and they fought against regulatory war emergency legislation.

But now what do we find with the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill by the Republican Congress. The great advocates of free private enterprise have now embarked on the most comprehensive program of regulation by government we have yet to see in this country.

Of course they don't want to regulate everybody. Just the majority of the people—those who work for a living at wages of $30, $40, and $50 a week.

It took the New York Times more than 14 full-length newspaper columns to report the complete text of this bill. Practically no phase of the relations of management and labor are free from its restrictive provisions. Before a union is organized, there are laws governing what the workers can do. After a union is formed, there are rules for their dealings with management. There are restrictions on the kind of agreements that can be made. There are rules of procedure where no agreements are made. There are rules, regulations, restraints, restrictions, and controls.

Those of us who sincerely believe in free private enterprise, also believe in free collective bargaining. Freedom cannot be apportioned on a class basis. If the Republicans want the freedom for capital to own and operates businesses, as I do, they must also recognize the right of the working men and women to own and operate their unions.

Now let me make this perfectly clear. I'm prepared to have it out both ways. I am against any kind of State control—for business or labor. I have an intense loathing and hatred for the Fascist and Communist glorification of the state at the expense of the individual.

Let me also make this clear. Government has a job to do in correcting abuses by industry or labor, and I'm in favor of having corrected the abuses by the extremists on both sides.

But that's a far cry from the Taft-Hartley form of State control of labor unions.

Although the Republicans would deny it, the fact is that this law gives positive aid and comfort to the totalitarians. First of all, it is consistent with their views of Government regulation of everything. Secondly, it's a stab in the back of our free-labor movement—the most powerful force we have to fight communism and fascism.

As I read through the provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill, I kept thinking that its authors must have been trying at least to solve one problem; namely, unemployment among the lawyers. And this bill would really solve that one. Under it, litigation is substituted for collective bargaining—court proceedings for the peaceful adjustment of grievances and disputes.

I kept comparing the operations of this legal monstrosity with the work of the division of labor relations which I set up last October. This division has no power to command. It cannot subpena. It issues no orders, no decisions. It doesn't have any involved rules of procedure. It has merely one simple purpose and objective: to bring about the friendly settlement of labor disputes that seriously affect the people of this city.

What have been the results of the work of this division? Just this: Since it was created, New York City has had only one serious strike, and that lasted for only 1 day.

I said when I established the division that I was confident that management and labor could settle their controversies across the bargaining table. I still think so, and I've had my faith in collective bargaining reaffirmed by the work of our division of labor relations. I am also convinced that we will never achieve labor peace under the system of State regulation of industrial relations set up by the Taft-Hartley bill.

You might be curious, as I am, as to why the Republicans devised the Taft-Hartley bill. After 14 years of solid opposition to any and all forms of regulation, they now come forth with a thoroughgoing system of regulation for labor. Part of the explanation, of course, is that they are being pushed by the NAM and the chamber of commerce, whose representatives admittedly wrote most of the legislation.

But fundamentally, in my opinion, it is that deep down they do not trust, and, in fact, fear, the workingman. They believe that people who work for a living haven't got the emotional and intellectual capacity to be free from Government restraints. They must be guarded; they must be watched.

I have an abiding and deep-rooted faith in the common sense, the intelligence, the emotional stability of the working men and women, as well, for that matter, as the business men and women of America. I do not believe that either group must be placed in shackles. I therefore oppose, with all the vigor I can command, the Taft-Hartley labor-control law.

Arming Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Oregon Statesman by ex-Governor Sprague, of Oregon. The membership of the House would do well to consider carefully the contents of this editorial in view of the important decision on this subject which we must make.

ARMING LATIN AMERICA

Congress should scrutinize very carefully the recommendation of President Truman that the United States supply arms to the nations of Latin American and Canada and train their army, navy, and air personnel in tactics used by this country. His plan also calls for us to maintain and repair their planes, tanks, guns, and ships. The basis for renewing this appeal, first made last year, is that world developments during the year give still greater importance to this legislation.

Suppose we take this apart. What developments are there which make a fresh threat to the Western Hemisphere? The only plausible answer is that our relations with Russia have become strained. Very well, Russia is possible enemy No. 1. If so, how does South America or Central America become involved? Is Uncle Joe going to come up through Antarctica, subdue the Pategonians at Tierra del Fuego and then inch his way up through the Southern Continent to the Panama Canal or by a short hop cross to Miami? Surely, no one has any fear of that.

Russia has no navy so it could not transport armies for any beachhead on South or Central America. It has no fleets of long-range planes. If it builds them they will come over the north top of the world directly toward our centers of industry.

The coordination of defense between this country and Canada which was begun in 1940 seems practicable, especially since Canada is the air crossroads of the world. But the nations of Latin America are in no danger of attack from outside this hemisphere. Surely, we are not shivering over the Communist Parties of Latin America.

If we did arm the southern nations of what value would they be in future warfare? In the last war all but Argentina declared war on the Axis but only Brazil par-

ticipated with troops and that country only with a token force. Its navy did patrol duty but where is the navy to venture into American waters with hostile intent?

Not only is there no evident reason why we should furnish these countries with arms and then keep them in operating condition, but there are good reasons why we shouldn't. The cost will be by no means inconsiderable, even if we ship them surplus material. If we furnish them arms we merely help build up the military caste in those countries and make their governments more than ever the creature of the military command. The only use that probably would be made of all this United States furnished equipment would be either to foment or suppress revolution or to carry on war with a neighboring nation. As far as cementing their friendship is concerned the effect might be the reverse except among the generals and colonels who would get new guns to play with.

This form of bounty is a mistake. It is of no great benefit to the nations receiving it and adds nothing to the practical defense of the United States. We still would have the job to do for both continents, except for the probable help of brave Canada.

There are other ways to assist our neighboring nations and much better ways of providing for the national defense. One of the first is to concentrate rather than scatter our weapons of war. Another is to strengthen the instrumentalities for peace, like the United Nations.

Congress failed to adopt the President's recommendation for hemisphere defense last year. It will be wise if it puts his revived appeal on the shelf. With the War Department "taking over" the Department of State. Congress is under greater need for exercising independent judgment in the area of foreign policy than before.

Soviets Salute D-Day and Breach Widens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by the House, I include the following newspaper article by Robert M. Grannis, published in the Brooklyn Eagle of Sunday, June 8, 1947:

SOVIETS SALUTE D-DAY AND BREACH WIDENS
(By Robert M. Grannis)

I am addressing this to Communists and Russian apologists in this country whose divided allegiance is an affront to all decent Americans. They need to know the true complexion of the Russian way of life they prefer to our own. And we who find their presence and utterances most unwelcome need to know what we can expect if the day ever comes when we have to go to war with the Soviets.

Friday was the third anniversary of D-day, the day when American and British troops achieved the impossible—a landing on the coast of France where the Germans were firmly and confidently entrenched.

Our Russian friends who say they want peace, our Russian friends who cry out against social injustice used Friday to defame the memory of Allied dead. They used it to spread lies among the conquered people of Germany as a means of undermining trust in the United States, as a means of peddling communism.

The Kremlin marked the day with a front-page editorial in the Taeglische Rundschau, which is the official daily paper of the Soviet military administration in Berlin. It was printed in German for the edification of the German public.

SAYS REDS ALONE WON THE WAR

First it repeated the old lie that Russia alone won the war. Then it added two new points:

That our air forces had sought our German cities for bombing and neglected military targets.

That the western allies delayed the second front until they were afraid the Russians would win alone.

As to the actual Allied invasion on June 6, the editorial said: "The invasion troops experienced relatively weak resistance. The Germans' eagerness to fight had disappeared and how the war would end was obvious to everybody."

You Communists who parrot the Russian doctrines in this country—you Communists who swallow the red line and call yourself Americans need to remember the thousands of loyal Americans who rest in cemeteries in Normandy; the American hospitals that are filled with the mentally ill and the maimed.

This Russian hate editorial is a challenge—you can't be on both sides at the same time. The protection of the American flag is not rightly yours—it is yours by sufferance alone. In Russia your actions and utterances would send you to a concentration camp.

OUR DESIRE FOR PEACE HAS LIMITS

We who are not Communists want peace just as earnestly as the next man. But we don't want it at the expense of selling out the whole world to a nation that deals in lies under the guise of social justice.

I believe that the danger of war with Russia is remote. I believe that Russia will bully her way across Europe as long as we permit it and no longer.

I believe we have nothing to fear if we keep ourselves strong and encourage and help others to do likewise. And I predict that one day the Russian balloon will explode when the people discover they are being deluded by men who practice gangsterism in the name of democracy—the same caliber of men who tried to sell the German people the idea that theirs was a super race and born to conquer and rule.

Meanwhile it is well to remember that Russia's strength today is a debt she owes to the United States. I think it is not an exaggeration to say that without our help she might have perished. And again it will be the strong right arm of the United States that will be felt if she threatens the peace of the world.

Consumers Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tulsa (Okla.) World of May 4, 1947:

CO-OP EMPIRE FACES KANSAS COURT BATTLE—ATTORNEY GENERAL SEEKS RECEIVER AFTER WORLD EXPOSES SCHEME

TOPEKA, May 3.—The economic future of the $17,000,000 Consumers Cooperative Association—the second largest in the United States—will be determined here June 6 when the State supreme court hears an application for its dissolution and the appointment of a receiver for its vast properties.

The action was brought and is being prosecuted for the people of Kansas by their attorney general, Edward F. Arn. He charges the CCA with:

1. Violation of its charter provisions.
2. Violation of the State marketing act.
3. Selling $7,120,64[illegible] of unregistered securities in violation of law.
4. Operating as a farm cooperative when in fact it was an industrial empire.

The varied, interlocking and far-flung activities of the 18-year-old cooperative were recently exposed in an exhaustive study made by the Tulsa (Okla.) World which said the Kansas City organization showed net earnings of $1,665,298.82 in 1944–45 and was tax-free. The newspaper pointed out the fact that a taxpaying corporation earning $1,665,298.82 would have surrendered $632,000 in Federal taxes at the present rate of 38 percent.

The CCA was originally chartered in Kansas to deal in, handle, and distribute petroleum and various products and byproducts; also such commodities as are essential to the operation of the business of this association; to purchase, lease, build, construct, maintain, and operate warehouses, filling stations, pumping plants, compounding plants, refineries, and all other appliances and conveniences for use in connection with the manufacture, purchase, and sale of gasoline, petroleum, lubricating oils, and all other petroleum and oil products.

CHARTER AMENDED

In November 1937 the CCA amended its charter to include the buying, selling, processing, manufacturing, warehousing, and transporting of tires, auto accessories, groceries, paint, farm machinery, farm supplies, and other consumers goods.

It thus hoped to participate in the benefits of the State's Cooperative Marketing Act. The purposes of the act, however, are clearly defined and limit it to the promotion and encouragement of intelligent and orderly marketing of agricultural products.

Instead of being an agricultural cooperative, the CCA, according to the attorney general's petition in the Supreme Court, had activities which included:

1. International trade, including shipping of petroleum products overseas to the extent that during 1946 approximately 3,000,000 gallons of motor oil were shipped to 10 different foreign countries.
2. Entering into exchange agreements with all major and independent oil companies in connection wtih the transportation of oil and gasoline.
3. Ownership of huge oil refineries at Coffeyville, Kans., Phillipsburg, Kans., Scottsbluff, Nebr., where it has a total annual production of more than 130,000,000 gallons of refined fuels and can handle approximately 6,000,000 barrels of crude oil per year; this in addition to one-third interest in a large refinery at McPherson, Kans., which itself has a capacity of 6,000,000 barrels of crude oil per year.

VAST EMPIRE

4. Ownership of canning plants, lumber mills, printing plants, paint factories, and other industries.
5. Purchases, owns, and holds extensive oil and gas leases and royalties and oil producing properties.
6. Drilling, operating, and producing approximately 450 oil wells with an annual oil run of nearly 1,750,000 barrels.
7. Ownership and operation of a vast pipeline system.
8. Operation of auditing, management, services, and insurance agencies, as well as many other business and industrial pursuits.

All these activities and pursuits, the petition states, extend far beyond the authority of the State Marketing Act and the CCA has usurped and assumed corporate powers not delegated to it by the State and to which it is not entitled according to Kansas law.

These pursuits were engaged in by the CCA and its subsidiaries, the Cooperative Pipeline Association, the Cooperative Refinery Association, and the Cooperative Oil Production Association

STOCK SALE BARED

By February 28, 1947, the CCA sold $2,707,170 of its capital stock without first registering it with the Kansas corporation commission, as required by law. In addition, the petition states, it sold $4,398,674 in deferred patronage refund certificates and $14,800 in certificates of indebtedness—all unregistered. The total was $7,120,644 in unregistered securities sold in violation of law, Attorney General Arn charged.

When the CCA dealt with nonmembers, as it still does, it is a violation of the Kansas cooperative marketing act.

Instead of being a farmers' cooperative—as it claimed to be—the CCA carried on an expansive industrial pursuit under the guise of marketing agricultural products, the Supreme Court was told.

Settlement and Colonization of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, this year the State of Utah is celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the entry of the pioneers into the Salt Lake Valley. The historic pilgrimage of these people in their trek to the Rocky Mountains is one of the outstanding events of American history, and their colonization of the great American desert has resulted in the great inter-mountain empire of which Utah is the center.

In Washington the Congressional Library has arranged an interesting exhibit, showing an early pictorial history of Utah and its colonization by the Mormon people. On the occasion of the opening of this exhibition last Saturday, exercises were held under the direction of Dr. Luther Evans, Director of the Library. As a part of the program the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is a descendant of Utah pioneers, delivered an interesting address and paid a tribute to the pioneers of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESERET, LAND OF THE HONEYBEE, A UNIQUE EXPERIMENT

At the outset, Dr. Evans, in behalf of the people of Utah, and in my own behalf as a second generation descendant of pioneers who settled that State, I want to thank you for the very gracious gesture in placing before the people of the Nation this historic exhibit. You and your staff have always been courteous and very generous in giving aid and assistance. I desire to particularly acknowledge the fine work of Mr. Sandborn and Dr. Burr, and extend appreciation to all the members of your staff. This is indeed an auspicious occasion and one long to be remembered.

Now to my theme—Deseret, land of the honeybee—a unique experiment.

In the early summer of 1847 a band of pioneers left the Missouri River, bound for the mysterious region then known to most of their countrymen as the great American desert. On and on they went, out the long reaches of the Platte River, past lonely Chimney Rock, sentinel and landmark of thousands destined to follow them, past Fort Bridger, named for the aging trapper familiarly known as "Old Jim." Then, through the last mountain passes and out of Emigration Canyon. At their head moved the son of a veteran of the American Revolution. Brigham Young himself was leading a sort of revolution, when he announced to his followers that the desolate looking valley before them was the place where they should start all over again.

Few in the company, or among the thousands who came after, could have known the fascinating story of how that land had been revealed to the world.

More than 300 years had passed since Antonio de Mendoza, Viceroy of New Spain, had heard rumors of lands and Indian tribes far to the north of any previous Spanish exploration. There was a tradition that the founders of the once mighty empire of the Aztecs had come from the shores of a great salty lake in that northern wilderness. There were rumors of the land of "Quivira" and the "Seven Cities of Cibola." Those stories piqued the curiosity of a Spanish monk, Fray Marcos de Niza, who decided to find out about Cibola. His report, which someone unkindly said was embroidered by fancy, decided the Viceroy to undertake exploration of the north country on an unprecedented scale. The result was the famous expedition led by the Governor of New Galicia, Francisco Fosquez de Coronado.

To him we owe the first knowledge of contact by white men with the land of Utah. The Indians told stories of a red river that ran at the botom of a vast gash in the earth. So Coronado sent a detachment to find it, led by Garcia Lopez de Cardenas. Pressing northwestward, after many days' journey, they came suddenly upon the brilliant and awesome gorge, somewhere near the present southern boundary of Utah. Their emotions were probably those of countless thousands of modern tourists who now get there easily by motor. Crashing pieces of music and reams of diaries do not convey the impression, as well as 20 words by a frail American poet who wanted to see the Canyon before her early death:

"By Zeus! Shout word of this to the eldest dead!
Titians, Gods, Heroes, come who have once more a home!"

—*Adelaide Crapsey.*

The Spaniards found that rock pinnacles, which form the rim looked no bigger than a man, were taller than the tower of Seville Cathedral. The river, a ribbon when seen from above, was a broad, swift torrent, angry and red. Rio de Tizon they called it—"Firebrand River."

The conquest and settlement of New Mexico, and missions to the Pueblo Indians, brought the Spanish to the very verge of the Utah mystery. But the full revelation waited for more than two centuries.

While the English colonies were preparing to declare independence, in June 1776, a Spanish monk was making ready to start on the first great exploration of Utah. Other monks were busy founding missions on the coast of Upper California, and the powers of church and state were anxious to find an overland route from Santa Fe to Monterey, and link the far-flung missions and presidios into one strong cordon from Texas to the Pacific Ocean. History has almost forgotten the name of the expedition's formal leader, Fray Atancio Dominquez. Because the real leader, the man who sold the idea to the authorities, was Fray Silvestre Vilez de Escalante, of the Zuni Indian Mission.

In the summer of 1776 the expedition vanished into the wilds, and the autumn was well advanced when Escalante recorded his return "dead tired" in his now famous journal. He had failed in the main purpose of his journey—to break the overland path to California. But in his heroic trek of over 2,000 miles he had crossed the plateau and canyon country of southeastern Utah, crossed the Green River, seen the snow on the Timpanagos Mountains, observed the Indians of the lake valleys, and forded the Colorado on the return journey. His mapmaker, Bernardo Miera y Pacheco, drew the first map showing the details of Utah's geography with something like an approach to accuracy. After that trip, the Spaniards knew far more about Utah than Anglo-Americans learned until many years later.

What little our countrymen did know, even as late as the 1840's came from inaccurate and sometimes partly imaginary maps, and from the reports of hunters, trappers, and scouts who after 1820 threaded the mountain passes, briefly explored the Great Salt Lake and valley, met the Indians, and suffered in the deserts. The names of some of those trailblazers are now legendary. There was Jed Smith, who made the first trip to California through southern Utah, and the first overland journey eastward across the desert that stretches from Great Salt Lake into Nevada. His journal of the latter feat is one of the heroic narratives of American history. There were the fur traders, Peter Skene Ogden and Etienne Provost, for whom two of Utah's cities were named. And the mulatto scout, James P. Beckwourth, who dictated his autobiography, and Jim Bridger and Joseph Reddeford Walker, and Kit Carson, who guided John C. Fremont, the Pathfinder. Most of those trailblazers were too busy to write much, and some couldn't write at all. The priceless information they gathered in their minds slowly dispelled the cloud of mystery that hung over Utah and guided the official explorers, who with the support of the fur companies and the United States Government, broke new trails, surveyed wagon routes, and felt out the easiest routes for future railroads.

Utah suddenly emerges into broad daylight in the reports, journals, and letters of John C. Fremont, Howard Stansbury, and James Hervey Simpson, and the romance of Washington Irving, founded upon the journal of Capt. Benjamin Bonneville. Those explorers really enjoyed themselves, in spite of hardship and danger. They hunted and camped out, and were companions to the artists whose sketches inspired engravings and water colors in which the scenery of Utah still lives as it came to their eyes with the freshness of a romantic discovery.

Even after all their efforts, much of Utah was still a deep and forbidding mystery, especially the vast plateau and canyon region of the far south, where the Green, the San Juan, and the Colorado Rivers wound down through awesome walls of rock. In 1869 the mystery began to yield a little to the determination of a Civil War veteran who came out of the Battle of Shiloh with his right arm shattered to the elbow. That was Maj. John Wesley Powell. His supreme confidence inspired the band of men who started for high adventure at Green River, Wyo., in May, and

in August completed one of the greatest explorations of all time—900 miles through the canyons of Utah and Arizona. Powell's work, and the later expeditions of Hayden, Dutton, and Dellenbaugh, revealed to Americans the marvelous scenery and resources of Utah. They aroused the public interest and pride that eventually created the national parks and monuments now visited yearly by hordes of awestruck tourists.

But we are running ahead of our main theme. The hunter and the fur trader, the explorers and surveyors, the geologists and map-makers came and went, but the Mormon pioneer, actuated by a deep religious faith, came, planted, built, prospered, and stayed. Even the lure of newly discovered California gold—gold, by the way, discovered by Mormons—did not change or alter his purpose. He came with what he believed was a sacred vision and a divinely revealed history of peoples who had once inhabited the lands of the Americas. That book has been considered, even by those who refused to accept its religious message, as one of the hundred books that have had the greatest influence on American civilization and religious thinking. It inspired the coming into existence of a native American religion, which took its name Mormon from the Sacred Book. It inspired a religious community that planted a new garden in the barren waste, and to that garden gave a name Deseret, the land of the honey bee, whose hive has been the symbol of Utah these 100 years with final recognition as a part of the great seal of the State.

Now, the establishment of States by religious communities was not new in America, and their founders were fond of likening themselves to the Children of Israel. Like them, they found a "promised land," where there were corn, and wild grapes; and in a last resort they could, like the Pilgrim Fathers, "suck the treasures hid in the sand." But the pioneers of Utah found none of those things. There was water in the snowy mountains, and under the sand, and the rocks were veined with minerals. They had to unlock the storehouse by hard labor. While others found a promised land, they had to make it. They were like the bishop who was sent into the wilderness, with orders to create his own diocese.

Inspired by the churches missionaries they streamed to Utah from the older States, and from England, Sweden, Denmark, and other lands. The leaders had little to promise them, except hardship and work—the beehive was not merely a symbol, it was a stark reality. So was the suffering on the way—the swollen feet, the thirst, the rought jolting of wagons, the pull and creak of the hand carts, the dust, the heat, and many times death and lonesome graves to mark the way for later comers. There were all the hardships and dangers we read about so comfortably now, in the narratives copied in recent years by the Historical Records Survey. But there were compensations—companionship, and the hymns by campfires in the wilderness, when someone started to sing and all joined to swell the chorus; and there were the hours of worship and of prayer when heaven drew nearer. For the adventurous, there was buffalo hunting; for the sensitive, the thrill of wild and colorful scenery, and the stars coming out at campfire time. And to those who came later at the journey's end, there was the supreme moment of emerging from Emigration Canyon to see the growing city, and the shining level of the lake, and friends and kinsmen who had gone ahead coming out to greet them, and the greatest thrill of all, there was their Zion, the Zion their prophets had told them in the last days would be established in the tops of the mountains.

Within a few years Deseret was a fact, felt around the world. Its farmers, the first Anglo Saxons to practice irrigation on a large scale, were making the desert bloom. Others introduced the manufacture of iron, and stayed up through the night to feed fuel to the beehive furnaces. Before long, still others began to experiment with the sugar beet. Some tended sheep, sheared them, spun the yarn, dyed it with homemade colors, and wove it into cloth. Men turned the legs and rounds of chairs, and the leader, Brigham Young, set the example by working in his own carpenter shop. Theirs was an economy of necessity which for many years made them self-contained.

The impact of this unique community, founded upon religious devotion, sacrifice, and economic cooperation, was new and strange. Whether friendly or not, most observers admitted the practical genius of these people, as colonists and as founders of what was practically a new civilization in a barren wilderness. The astonishing thing about it was the fact that they were mostly of humble origin, the little and supposedly obscure people of the world, who left all that they might find a place where they could be free to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. They were the people who, at the end of a long grueling day of physical pain and hardship encountered on the great journey—they were the people who, in the face of deep sorrow and anguish of soul at the loss of dear ones whose bodies had been placed in wayside graves—they were the humble people who could, under such tribulations, sing with all the deep feeling and fervor of their souls their great pioneer song:

"Come, come, ye saints, no toil nor labor fear,
But with joy wend your way;
Tho' hard to you this journey may appear,
Grace shall be as your day.
'Tis better far for us to strive
Our useless cares from us to drive;
Do this, and joy your hearts will swell—
All is well! All is well!

"Why should we mourn, or think our lot is hard?
'Tis not so; all is right!
Why should we think to earn a great reward,
If we now shun the fight?
Gird up your loins, fresh courage take,
Our God will nevèr us forsake;
And soon we'll have this truth to tell—
All is well! All is well!

"We'll find the place which God for us prepared,
Far away in the West;
Where none shall come to hurt or make afraid;
There the saints will be blessed.
We'll make the air with music ring—
Shout praises to our God and King;
Above the rest these words we'll tell—
All is well! All is well!

"And should we die before our journey's through,
Happy day! All is well!
We then are free from toil and sorrow too;
With the just we shall dwell.
But if our lives are spared again
To see the saints their rest obtain,
O how we'll make this chorus swell—
All is well! All is well!

—*William Clayton.*

But to go on, the Army officers, surveyors, and map makers, who came in the late 1850's, were astounded to find the oasis of culture those people had made in a land ringed by snow-capped mountains and isolated from the rest of the Nation by vast stretches of Indian and buffalo ranges and infinite levels of appalling desert. Travelers from the States and Europe in the very earliest times saw irrigation ditches, sunny spots of greenery, the foundations of churches, temples, stone and brick houses, iron furnaces, cooperative stores, a theater, a newspaper, elementary schools, and the beginnings of a university, later to become the University of Utah, where Orson Pratt was working out a new alphabet, the Deseret characters. It was all quite astonishing, and many couldn't understand the blend of religious faith and practical good works. It seemed to defy common sense—it was unique and under the circumstances unparalleled, but there it was.

Equally unique was the political sense of what was presumed to be a company of dreamers and fanatics. They had hardly settled and driven the first furrow, when they organized a provisional government—for Deseret. Within 2 years they had drafted a constitution and were knocking on the door of Congress, for admission as a State. Their petitions were received with civility at the freezing point—but that didn't discourage them. And their patience survived many similar snubs during the 46 years (1850–96) when Deseret was a Territory. No other well-settled State has passed through such a long period as a Territory; that, too, is unique.

Meanwhile, the people and their leaders accepted, in a realistic spirit, the fact that the expansive force of American civilization made isolation impossible, and that they were part of the American family. They determined to support the Union of States, and to lead the development of the Rocky Mountain West. Knowing the hardships of the overland trails as few other Americans could, they favored linking the oceans by rail. The ceremony that marked the completion of that project took place in their Deseret May 10, 1869, at Promontory Point. The solders were drawn up, the locomotives of the Central and Union Pacific railroads puffed close to each other, and the golden spike was driven. Then the crowd melted away, the cameras were taken down, and Utah was bound to play its role in American civilization.

It has played the part, evolving from a patriarchal religious society into a modern American State. In 1894 Congress permitted Utah to hold a constitutional convention, and on January 4, 1896, President Grover Cleveland signed the proclamation announcing the admission of Utah to the Union on an equal footing with the other States. It was not the Deseret of 1849, or the territory of 1850, for in the meantime three other States had been carved from it, Nevada, Colorado, and Wyoming.

The treasures hid in the earth, land, water, and minerals, the hard work and industry of her people, the fine spirit of cooperation of the pioneers and later comers of all religious faiths, have brought Utah a long way in these 100 years. In retrospect it is amusing now to read the pronouncement of a geologist that artesian wells would be impractical in the desert. The pure fountains that now gush from thousands of wells in many Utah valleys have helped make farms and gardens. The diversions of mountain streams through networks of irrigation ditches and canals, and the fields and orchards contrasted with the bleakness of the adjoining desert, are typical features of the landscape. Other great irrigation and power projects in contemplation of construction are expected to attract the young people of the State to do more pioneering to spread the cultivated areas, and to encourage the growth of numerous small and large scale industries and the building of many thousands of new homes.

The great new steel mill at Geneva, resultant of the war, suggests what the industrial future of Utah may be and contrasts strangely with the heroic pioneer smelting of iron in Iron County by the pioneers. The early diggings for copper are dwarfed by the vast terraces of the open copper mine at Bingham.

Development of roads has opened the friendly State as a paradise for tourists, and brought the scenic wonders that awed the Spanish explorers within reach of anyone who can drive his own car, or buy a bus

ticket. The route to the national park country lies through an almost continuous belt of settlement and cultivation, which was already begun when the explorers, seeking a route to New Mexico, passed that way years ago.

There is more in Utah than wells, dams, ditches, acres of sugar beets, and vastnesses of pinnacled rock and chromatic canyons. The earliest pioneers were not illiterate and uncultured boors. Their Deseret News, still flourishing, was the first newspaper in the Great Basin region, beginning June 15, 1850. Their University of Deseret and their primary schools have grown into a State free-school system and two public institutions of higher learning. Their arts and crafts are the treasures of the museums maintained by the Church of Latter-Day Saints and the Daughters of the Utah Pioneers. The singing of hymns, around campfires on the trail, was the fountainhead of a brilliant musical history, and of the tabernacle choir that inspires millions today through the radio.

Utah began with a company of devoutly religious people, who withdrew themselves from the world of their time to seek in the wilderness the peace they craved. They thought they had come to make their homes in the great American desert, a land undesirable to all other Americans, and the place where they might remain in seclusion. But that seclusion which they sought was bound, in the very nature of things, to be invaded before long by the westward march of Americans following the war with Mexico and preceding the great Civil War. The gold discovery in California emphasized that rush. The new colonies in Utah were way-stations on one of the main highways to the new El Dorado in the West. Some of these adventurers tarried in the villages and cities, liked the country and decided to make their homes there. Thousands more, impelled by the urge to go West, were attracted to the new and growing territory. They came, they saw, and they remained, thousands of them, to take an important part in the building of Utah, and many of them deservedly share honors as pioneers.

Utah soon became a place of many religions, and it was inevitable that during an adjustment period which followed there should be some friction and recriminations. Happily those times are of the past, and today religious intolerance in Utah is practically unknown. It is a land of homes, schools, churches, farms, mines, and industries, and a land of opportunities where men and women of all faiths live together and work together, with tolerance and understanding. And in the new period just ahead, which will be a period of pioneering only in a different way, the people should build worthily on the foundations laid by the pioneers of 1847.

Today we honor the memories of the men and women of 100 years ago. Utah had its beginning as the result of the migration of a religious group seeking opportunity for the development of its religious ideals. One of the perennially significant facts about such religious groups is that their spiritual energy rarely flows solely in the original channel. It has a way of descending, like water from the mountains, and spreading out in rills to bring life to the plains. It has been so with the history begun by the pioneers of Utah. The mountain of inspiration, where the religious impulse began, is still there. The hard realism and common sense of their progeny has caused its snow-fed streams to water the fields marked out by their practical energy. In a very peculiar way, as Deseret, has become the State of Utah, the history of the experiment in cooperation has shown the intertwining of American democratic political ideals and the devotion of a religious society to make the pattern of modern Utah, an unique contribution to the American way of life.

In Memoriam, Hon. Fred Van Ness Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by Rev. William J. Lichan, of Rogers City, Mich., in memory of our late colleague, Fred Bradley:

Looking through the church records of Westminster Presbyterian Church, I found the first four names as follows: Carl D. Bradley, Emma Bradley, Fred V. N. Bradley, and Marie Bradley.

It was Carl D. Bradley who built Westminster Church and to the end the family have been supporters of it.

On occasions like this, one is called upon to render active service when one's feelings seem to impose silence rather than the call for words. Only 2 days ago, attending the general assembly at Grand Rapids, I heard the newsboys crying: "Bradley died—Read all about it." Yes, laymen and ministers alike came to me and said, "Sorry to hear of the sudden death of Congressman Bradley."

It is in this spirit as Fred's pastor that I approach the duties of this hour. Most of you know Congressman Bradley as your personal friend, others like these distinguished guests from Washington, D. C., knew him as their colleague and coworker; yes, and true friend, but the letters which I have received from Fred in the past few months I shall always treasure. Here is but one paragraph from his last letter to me:

"It will be a pleasure if I can be of assistance in the two cases you mentioned in your letter, and you will hear from me again as soon as I have contacted the proper authorities here in Washington. Please be assured of my cooperation. With kindest regards to you, in which Mrs. Bradley joins me, I remain

"Sincerely yours,

"FRED BRADLEY."

Today we have come here from all walks of life at the call of death. Indeed his passing was a shock to all of us, yet it is one of the common and ever recurring events in human affairs that people die. Those whom we love are taken from us and those whom we have known are with us no more. It is well for us in the midst of these circumstances to pause and think seriously about our affairs and realize that this is not our abiding place. Death strikes in all places and among all classes.

Not so long ago it was Fred who said: "Washington with its rounds of entertainment in addition to the many legislative chores is more than many common Congressmen can take. It's physically and mentally a strain hardly imaginable to the folks back home." I am weary. "Let us get ready and go home," might have well been said by this one man. It was ROY WOODRUFF who said: "In my many years in the House, no Member's service has impressed me more favorably than Mr. Bradley's." Are there words of comfort and hope for you Mrs. Bradley? You who from now on must walk alone in the paths you two have walked so oft together.

"Time brings us change and leaves fretting;
We weep when every comrade goes
Perhaps too much, perhaps forgetting
That over yonder there are those
To whom he comes and whom he knows.

"I would not hold our loss too lightly;
God knows and he, how deep the pain,
But friends, I see still shining brightly
The brightest link in all our chain
That links us to a new domain.

"For this I swear, because believing
Time breaks no circle such as this.
However hurt, however grieving,
However much a friend we miss,
Between the worlds is no abyss.

"For friendship binds the worlds together
World over there, world over here.
From earth to heaven is the tether
That brings the earth and heaven near
And makes them both a bit more dear.

"Not weaker now our chain, but stronger;
In all our loss and all our ill
We now shall look a little longer
At every star above the hill
And think of him, and have him still.

"Whatever vales we yet may wander,
What sorrow, what tempest blow,
We have a friend, a friend out yonder
To greet us when we have to go—
Out yonder someone that we know.

"To all eternity he binds us;
He links his planet with the star;
He rides ahead, the trail he finds us,
And where he is and where we are
Will never seem again so far."

—*Douglas Malloch.*

Let us pray.

Almighty and Eternal God, Father of comfort, who hast brought life and immortality to light through the gospel of Christ, we thank Thee for words of hope and comfort that break upon us and our vision with a light from above. We praise Thee for the assurance that to depart from this earth and to be with Christ is far better, and to be absent from the body is to be at home with Thee. Turn our thoughts not downward to the grave, but heavenward to eternity.

We thank Thee for the boundless blessings that attend our earthly pathway; in a world full of anguish our sheltered lives are brightened with Thy sunlight and beauty. We praise Thee for the inspiration of friendship, especially do we thank Thee for the one whose memory we honor today. For the gentleness of his character, for the breadth of sympathies, for the power of his conviction, for his patience and courage, for his genius for friendship, for his loyalty to his State, his Nation, and his devotion as Congressman to his task and his willingness to aid those who were in need of aid, we give Thee thanks.

Now that for a time he has parted from us, we beseech Thee to bless this family circle that is severed, his companion who is bereaved. Grant that we all may be worthy of our loved ones and true to those who have put their trust in us. Send us back to our tasks with new cheerfulness and hope, gladly to accept whatever Thou dost give us. As we wait for the cloudless day to dawn and the shadows to flee away, give us an unquestionable faith in Thy Holy Will and to Thee shall be the honor and glory forever. Amen.

Presentation of Honorary Degree to Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. CROW

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following address of the Honorable D. Lane Powers in presenting the Honorable JOSEPH WILLIAM MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the president of the board of trustees of Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa., on June 3, 1947, to receive the honorary degree, doctor of laws, together with the address of the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, after receiving the honorary degree, doctor of laws.

ADDRESS OF HON. D. LANE POWERS

JOSEPH WILLIAM MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, was born at North Attleboro, Mass., on November 3, 1884.

The early part of his career was spent in journalism, which field he is still pursuing. At the age of 18 he was a reporter on the staff of the Attleboro Sun. He also served on the Providence Journal. In 1908 he became publisher of the Evening Chronicle, North Attleboro, and he has continued in this capacity to the present time. He is also publisher of the Sentinel, Franklin, Mass.

Four years after he became publisher of the Chronicle he began his career of political service to his State as member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives. He went next to the Massachusetts Senate in 1914, and began active participation in national political life as delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1916. To detail his many specific services, both State and national, would not be particularly enlightening as to the true nature of his contribution to his Nation and his party. Let it suffice to say that he was elected Representative in the Sixty-ninth Congress (1925), and has been an active Member and a growing power through more than two troubled decades. He now stands before us as Speaker of the House of Representatives, a strong force and a steadying influence for everything truly American.

Mr. President, this gentleman has been my close and respected friend and colleague for years. His long and outstanding career of public service is deserving of outstanding recognition. I therefore take as a special honor the privilege of presenting to you for the degree of doctor of laws the Honorable JOSEPH WILLIAM MARTIN, JR.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON RECEIVING THE HONORARY DEGREE

Mr. President, gentlemen of the board of trustees, members of the faculty, alumni, students, and friends of Pennsylvania Military College, it is with a mixture of humility and pride—and a very deep appreciation, I come to you to receive the distinguished honor of this degree you have been pleased to confer upon me.

I have a profound respect for education. It is one of the glories of America that such institutions as Pennsylvania Military College can exist and continue through the years.

In accepting this honor so graciously offered me, I am proud to become a member of the society into which it brings me. This college has conferred its degrees upon a distinguished list of statesmen, Presidents, generals, and judges. No man can be in the company of such illustrious men as Charles E. Hughes, Douglas MacArthur, George C. Marshall, John J. Pershing, Owen J. Roberts, Patrick J. Hurley, Edward Martin, without feeling humble, yet proud to be one of such a distinguished company.

You may well be proud of the more than a century and a quarter of military and civic service behind Pennsylvania Military College. This college has trained youths who have served with distinction in our Nation's wars, during the long span of this institution's existence. I have learned that in the recent great struggle, 918 of your men served with the colors, of whom 37 gave their lives.

There are two ways of getting an education. One is by hard study; the other is by hard knocks. All men must learn—in the classrooms and corridors of the colleges—or in the school of experience.

The college teaches men how to think. I am tempted to say the school of experience teaches men how not to think—or should.

The man who goes to college and learns how to think—then does not follow his teachings—fails of real education. The man who has experience—but fails to heed the lessons—does not profit by experience—and gets nowhere.

The end product of education, to be worth while, is human service. Nothing else is worth while.

One fact of history is outstanding. All great destroyers were arrogant. All great builders have been wise—and very humble. Destroyers seek to rise by putting other men down. Builders rise by trying to help other men to rise.

Twice within the lives of many of us here—three times in the lives of some of us—America has had to go to war to put down the arrogance of destroyers. On those occasions our military men have done a wonderful job of leading our defense on the battlefields. Those who stayed at home have worked just as earnestly providing the machines and materials of war to supply our armed forces for battle.

The American people have always wanted to live at peace with all the world. We have, therefore, never been prepared for war when war came. Twice within 30 years we have performed miracles of preparation under our free American system.

With world conditions as they are we shall have to maintain, for a long time, an invincible national defense. It would be highly dangerous not to do so. That defense must be economical, but it must be kept fully effective to guarantee peaceful progress.

Human progress proceeds along three parallel lines—wise government; productive economy; free society.

America has risen to her greatness because she has followed those three lines. Her constitutional government of laws has always been the abiding place of justice and tolerance. America has become the greatest abode of liberty and progress on this earth. Today she offers the last remaining habitat for liberty. Only good government—wise government—will keep her so.

Since all spiritual development and human progress for any people must follow on the three lines of wise government, a good, productive economy, and a just, tolerant society, government is an exceedingly important part of the life of every individual.

The subversionists—those who would supplant government of laws by government of men—constantly strive to discredit our American Government. But our Government is not something merely to be sneered at, ridiculed, and reviled—as Communists and Fascists declare. Government is to be justly and constructively criticized, constantly improved through better laws—and fewer of them—and by more enlightened administration. But government is always to be supported and cherished, when it is wise. If orderly government under just law is ever destroyed in America, liberty will go off the track, progress will cease, and chaos will come.

The Congress is the people's special instrument of control over their Government. Without the Congress, we could have no representative government by consent of the governed. Therefore, those who would destroy our constitutional government of, by, and for the people, bend their utmost efforts toward destroying your confidence in your Congress.

Right here I want to deliver a message to the young people of America.

Into the hands of your generation, we of the older generation must deliver the destiny of our Government and our Nation. To you is committed a task, upon you rests a responsibility, you are granted a great adventure and a priceless privilege—that of remolding a weary and war-shattered world into a structure of liberty, prosperity, progress, and happiness. No such great adventure ever was possible to the youth of any other age.

Be not dismayed at the enormity of the job. Always remember, if you use right rules, and stick to the right principles, it is no more difficult to add or multiply great sums than little ones—it merely takes longer.

Let me counsel the youth of America—do not be fooled and defrauded by the ridicule and abuse heaped upon your Congress and your Constitution by those who would destroy the structure of your laws. They would enslave you and loot your country under the guise—the gross false pretense—of widening your opportunities.

One theme of derision and bitter criticism constantly harped upon by those who would destroy your Constitutional right to govern yourself is that the Eightieth Congress has been a do-nothing Congress. The reason for those assaults is because the Eightieth Congress has been moving, directly and promptly, to abolish unnecessary controls, reduce useless spending of public funds, and to replace recklessness in our Government, our economy and our society by economy and fair responsibility.

I do not intend to try to tell you in 10 minutes what the Eightieth Congress has done since last January; but from the contentions of the subversionists, you would think they expected the aftermath of war conditions, the cutting of expenditures, the freeing of the Nation from unnecessary controls, should have been cleaned up in about 12 days.

These jeering critics of the Congress would have you believe that if both parties in each House of the Congress do not always agree at every point, popular government will come to a standstill. These would-be wreckers of Americanism would have you believe that if the two Houses of the Congress do not see eye to eye on every phase of every issue, the Congress has failed.

Self-seeking opportunists courting radical support for their political aspirations, would try to convince you government has failed if the Congress does not act as a rubber stamp for the White House.

The truth is disagreements between parties in a bipartisan Congress, and between the two Houses of the Congress, and between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government, are wholesome. They are healthy and necessary under our form of government.

But—and mark these words—when both parties in the two Houses ever agree on all questions, beware. If ever both Houses of the Congress agree on all phases of all issues without dissent and discussion, look to your liberties. If ever both parties in both Houses, and both Houses and the White House, all agree entirely on all phases of all questions, it will be useless for you to look to your liberties; they will be gone.

Young folks, and older folks, we have the finest Government, the finest economic system, the best social system the world has ever seen. Let us continue to protect it. Let us continue to work out the flaws and faults. Let us continue to adapt it to changing conditions so we may help lead the world back to peace and sanity. But let us never give it up; permit it to be destroyed; or allow false pretenders to defraud us out of it, or persuade us to abandon it.

Americanism is today the light of the world. It is the hope of the world. It is the salvation of the world, if we keep it on the high spiritual plane on which it was conceived.

God give us—especially America's youth—the wisdom, the faith, and the courage to guard America; to carry on under our incomparable American system of freedom to help rebuild a shattered world.

Yearning To Quit Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Lester Allen which appeared in the Boston Post, Sunday, June 8, 1947:

YEARNING TO QUIT EUROPE—MILLIONS OF THOROUGHLY DISILLUSIONED AND HOPELESS PEOPLE SEE NO HOPE IN OWN LANDS

(By Lester Allen)

Throughout western Europe an immense number of people dream and talk of getting away from their own countries and going to nations across the seas where they will be safe from war. They are found in the Netherlands, Great Britain, Belgium, France, Portugal, and Italy, and no doubt, if Russian control was not so strict, they would be found in nations east of the Russian occupation line.

They are aware of their failure to fashion a life for themselves, satisfying to their inner selves, and they do not like to contemplate being caught in-between in another war. The London Sunday Times noted recently that tens of thousands of Britons were waiting vainly for an opportunity to get out of England and go to the colonies or to the United States.

Netherlands correspondents noted that students in Dutch agricultural colleges, whose skill is needed by the Netherlands in the colonial possessions, have stated a preference for California, Florida, South America, or Canada.

FRENCH, ALSO

Young Frenchmen, who came of a race which traditionally wouldn't be found dead outside of metropolitan France, are seeking ways of escaping to the Western Hemisphere to settle there for good.

Perhaps the Dutch are more keenly aware of a deficiency in their way of life, and they seek to do something about it. J. H. Boas, an articulate Dutch writer, has summed it up, "Now they are haunted by the fear that they will fall again," he says, "and that they will fail even more because failure in peace is more demnable than failure in war.

"They are bored stiff by the endless repetition of national slogans which are acceptable as quaint and rather useless drawing room ornaments in the uneventful safety of their prewar homes. They are fed up with the glorification of folklore, which may interest the readers of foreign geographic magazines, but to which the natives will never give any credit and which will positively disgust them when in times of stress and distress it is exploited by way of escapism from the serious almost tragic moral problems which confront practically every European nation."

SEE IT AS SPIRIT

"They are sick of the timeworn tenets of patriotic ideals inspired by obsolete and mostly rather ridiculous songs, rather than the strong reality of free and sovereign citizenship. They have acquired a holy respect, bordering on veneration, for the citizen-armies of that unmilitary new world which crossed oceans in order to deliver them, and they are deeply aware that it is not merely the strength of new weapons, but the greater strength of a new spirit which wrought their deliverance."

It is not fear of another war with Germany, or fear of a war between the western democracies and the Soviet Union, which has brought about the profound disillusionment of these people who want to break away from their native lands. They learned 2 years ago that German invincibility was a myth, a foolish legend, which they exposed for themselves during the long and bitter occupation when they lived in close contact with the conquering Germans. They learned that Germans are obsessed by a frantic inferiority, that they bluster and connive and browbeat en masse, but are abject and pitiable as individuals.

These people who seek to escape from Europe have found a profound moral chaos open before them. The petty dishonesty of daily life sickens them. Everyone is made a petty criminal by being compelled to trade in the black market to get the crusts of bread that will keep them alive. Those who do get away from Europe will tell you with childlike wonder what a marvelous feeling of goodness comes over them when they walk into an American grocery store and buy what they want honestly, without breaking a law and without a twinge of conscience.

Things are not going to change, they say, over and over again. Things will not improve. It is this incessant fear and dismay that gets them down. Two years ago they had stout hearts, and were convinced that if they worked and saved and suffered and sacrificed that the old way of life would be rebuilt. Now they are not so sure. They then expected much from what the future would bring. Now they feel that the future will bring only more of the same dreary round of toil and suffering.

ARE PLAIN PEOPLE

These people are not intellectuals, splitting the hairs of an ethical problem. They are plain, common people, small business people, skilled tradesmen, landholders, salaried men. The intellectuals tell them that it is merely a question of making a choice between the Soviet Union as a great, protecting power, or the United States as a great protecting power. The intellectuals reason that there is a breathing spell. War between the two great nations will not come right away; it requires time for a build-up, time for amassing money and manpower.

Most western Europeans have made their choice. They have chosen the New World, and not because of any conviction that democracy and free enterprise are better than collectivism. They choose the New World because they have seen Canadians and Americans and Australians, men bred far from the bickering and strife of Europe, and liked the way they do things, their outlook and their dynamism.

If the instincts of the common people of Europe, as distinct from intellectuals, politicians, and financiers, can be trusted, there is hope of saving Europe. They are aware that the United States is thinking about a plan for an economic union of western European countries and a master plan for financial aid to this economic union.

Europeans know from bitter experience that a Europe united by force is a perilous reef upon which Europe has been broken several times since the Roman legions ventured out of Italy. But, every day it becomes more apparent to them that without some form of economic union Europe is doomed, and they are doomed with it.

MATTER OF SENSE

Any plan to alter the prostrated economy of Europe, to change it over from a ruinous flophouse into a prosperous area, must include a realignment of Europe's productive machinery, a shotgun wedding of the Ruhr with the rest of Europe's economy. Mass migrations are virtually impossible. Europe's people have staggered their last wandering mile. A pooling of resources is barely possible, for such a pool would have to triumph over the rabid nationalism rampant in the areas that would benefit most.

Looking upon Europe from this safe vantage point it appears that a United States of Europe is merely a matter of good common sense. But, actually, Europeans do not think in our dynamic fashion. They have no faith in free suffrage and the power of the individual vote. They are dogmatic and hidebound by tradition.

When the French permitted some Italians and Germans from over-populated areas to enter France to work, it was looked upon as a sign that French nationalism was being tempered by common sense. Actually, it was merely a desperate need for manpower to accomplish the minimum of reconstruction, and there was bitter resentment that even if these men earned their bread they were just so many more mouths to feed.

The people of Europe who want to get away find no clarion call to unified effort in their own countries in such flag-waving appeals as that of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, and his moving references to the glorious past of the great French Nation. They have only a sinking feeling that the past holds nothing for them if it is to become the mold of their future.

The United States cannot avoid contributing to the vast disillusionment of Europeans. Events have alined the Soviet Union against the United States. It is certainly not an incentive to struggle on, squeezed between the threat of a militant communism and obliteration by the atomic bomb.

UNION SET UP

Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg have set up an economic union of sorts, the so-called Benelux union, founded in 1944. It has given promise of fruitfulness over a long period, but time is what Europe can least afford. Whatever plan is adopted to relieve the distress must be one that relieves immediately, not some day in the future.

Watching the citizen armies of Canada and the United States stream across Europe brought home to the people of the western European nations that these armies were made up of their distant relatives who, having left Europe for good, had become a different kind of people, with different viewpoints.

If they had the power, which they haven't the bitter, unfair and deliberate villification of the United States, which comes from intellectuals and politicians of Europe, would be tempered by an outpouring of real gratitude for what we have already done.

The people who want to get out of Europe know that it is impossible for all save a very few who manage to raise the money and get on the quota for admission to another land. Perhaps that is why the utterances of Secretary of State Marshall and the discussions of loans to Europe are followed by Europeans with even more rapt attention than some of the deliberations in their own law-making bodies.

PEACE ELUDES THEM

They have spent 2 years struggling for peace and peace has eluded them. They are as disillusioned, in fact, as we are disillusioned. As one Frenchman paraphrased it, "God helps those who helps themselves" has come to mean, "God help those who try to help themselves."

There is a feeling abroad, however, gaining in strength, that Europe could not be more miserable than it is today, and that, since nothing could be worse, what is coming is bound to be much better. But they still want to get out of Europe, these tens of

thousands of discontented and disillusioned people, who have come to believe that America's worst slum is better than what they now have.

Test Program in Fertilizers by Federal Government Aids, Not Hurts, Private Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1947

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks Members of Congress have been greatly interested in fertilizer legislation. Also, this week, the TVA's fertilizer program will be considered. A very interesting diagnosis of the problem is contained in a feature article in the News-Sentinel of Knoxville, Tenn., dated June 8. It was written by Edward B. Smith, a thorough newspaperman who is well-acquainted with the problem. The article is as follows:

A terrific battle is taking place in Washington these days between two powerful forces over a proposed expansion of fertilizer test demonstrations on America's farms.

Opposing the bill are the American Plant Food Council and the National Fertilizer Association, two propaganda agencies maintained by the fertilizer business.

Supporting the bill are the American Farm Bureau Federation, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, leading agronomists, farm demonstration agents, and county agents everywhere.

It is interesting to note that the bill itself is sponsored by a bipartisan group of Senators—HICKENLOOPER, WHERRY, CAPPER, THYE, AIKEN, BUSHFIELD, YOUNG and WILSON, all Republicans in both liberal and reactionary camps; and two Democrats, HILL of Alabama and STEWART of Tennessee.

A lot of misleading propaganda has been printed about provisions of the bill, which is called the National Soil Fertility Act. Fertilizer people say it puts the Government into the fertilizer business in a big way, that it will drive private business into bankruptcy, that it is State socialism, that it is communism, and so forth.

Briefly, here are provisions of the act:

A test demonstration program is established, involving 2 percent of the Nation's farmers (not 2 percent of the land, as has been said). These farmers would agree to grow specific crops and use specific amounts of test fertilizer. Some of the triple superphosphate would be supplied from a new TVA plant at Mobile, Ala., the only cost to the farmer being the freight charge. He would also buy considerable quantities of commercially produced fertilizer through regular private channels at prevailing prices. Farm management practices as well as fertilizers would be tested.

Key unit in the administrative part of the program would be the extension department in each State. In each State there would be also an advisory committee composed of the State experiment station chief, two farmers, a representative of the private fertilizer business, and a representative of farmers' cooperative organizations.

National policy on administration of the act would be formulated by a committee composed of 12 farmers and three representatives of the land-grant colleges.

TVA would be directed to erect a $3,000,000 superphosphate plant at Mobile, so that phosphate rock from Florida deposits could be economically shipped to it by barge. This plant must be sold within 5 years either to private fertilizer industry or to a farmers' cooperative.

Supplementing the needed plant at Mobile would be phosphate and potash plants near raw material sources in the West. These plants would be built by farmers' cooperatives, using Farm Credit Administration long-term loans. The cooperative plants would not be income tax exempt.

The test-demonstration idea is not new. TVA, in the original act creating it, was directed to conduct such experiments and research, using the idle nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals. For more than 10 years TVA has carried on experiments in new and better ways to produce phosphates in highly concentrated form, using enormous electric furnaces and power from Wilson Dam. Working through university extension departments and county agents, it has established test demonstrations on many farms throughout this area. Land that had been worn out and eroded for years has been put back into high productivity.

The TVA-produced fertilizer has been furnished free. All the farmer pays is the transportation cost. But TVA has not driven the private fertilizer out of business. The result has been exactly the reverse. The private fertilizer industry, thanks to this educational program by TVA, is selling more fertilizer today than it ever has before.

Look at the sales record for Tennessee, as an example. In 1941, TVA distributed 7,702 tons of test fertilizer to Tennessee farmers; in 1942 the tonnage was 8,683, in 1943 it was 10,008, in 1944 it was 11,799, in 1945 it was 7,608, and last year 14,240. Now watch how commercial sales zoomed in Tennessee during the same period: In 1941, total tonnage was 141,461; in 1942 it was 174,298, in 1943 it was 230,218, in 1944 it was 271,545, in 1945 it was 277,090, and last year it was 331,265. These are the industry's own figures, incidentally. In the 6-year period commercial sales in Tennessee have more than doubled.

The story of fertilizer is as dramatic as is the story of electric power. Before TVA, electric power was a luxury, particularly here in the Southeast. Today, all across America, electric rates are lower and consumption is zooming skyward. The private power business, no longer a monopoly, is nevertheless making plenty of money and paying excellent dividends to stockholders.

The fertilizer people ought to get smart, too.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the House to the address of Mr. Frank B. Creedon, Housing Expediter, before the Washington, D. C., Building Congress, delivered on June 9.

The address is as follows:

Addressing a building congress has become a habit with me. I have had the pleasure in New York, more recently in Boston, and here today in Washington. I am grateful for the opportunity and wish to thank you, Mr. Lee, as president of the Washington Building Congress, and you, Mr. Clas, as program chairman, for your kind invitation.

I would like you to know that I was favorably impressed by the statement which the Washington Building Congress sent to the President last month pledging its support of measures to reduce building costs and to stabilize the building industry. I am sure that we all subscribe to the desirability of achieving the first seven objectives. The eighth objective of immediate elimination of controls on construction by the Federal Government, I should like to discuss with you today.

As Housing Expediter, my chief concern is with the problems of housing—but the problem of housing is as broad as the entire construction field. It is, therefore, very appropriate for me as Housing Expediter to discuss this problem with the Building Trades Congress.

In my association with William Jeffers, former Rubber Director, during the war I was struck with the remark once made by him to the effect that he was amazed at the number of synthetic rubber experts engaged on the problem. Gentlemen, in my brief experience as Housing Expediter I have found that there are many more synthetic housing experts.

Having had some experience as an engineer and construction manager I have always found that in order to build a job, the thing to do is measure the size of it, get the necessary tools, equipment, and men, and get on with the job. Then if time and other factors permit, refinements may be sought for and incorporated in the project. We have approached the housing problem in the same manner. We know the tremendous need for housing so we have the measure of the job but unfortunately we are unable to assemble sufficient men and materials to get on with it in a manner comparable to the demands of our measurements. But we are going on with the job using all the men and materials that are available.

There are obviously many refinements which are needed and which are very desirable in reaching a solution of the housing problem, and each refinement contributes to a more satisfactory solution of the housing need. Consistently we have refrained from letting a multiplicity of smaller problems distract us from the main objective, and in line with this premise I have consistently resisted efforts to take on the solutions of problems which I believe to exceed the scope of the Federal Government's powers in that field. Where certain obstacles were encountered which raised problems which I felt to be; and know to be, not in the field of Federal Government, we have attempted to assist those in whose field the problems lie. Revision of building and safety codes, development of new materials and increasing use of modulor design are examples of the kind of thing I mean. These problems are not within the province of the Federal Government. Some are problems in the field of labor and management; others are problems of local government, and still others are a challenge to industry.

The biggest problem affecting housing today is the supply of building materials. Try as you will to find other problems to solve, until this nut is cracked and the materials supply pipe lines are filled so that firm delivery promises and prices can be made and relied upon, the other problems will not be solved.

Now, of course, a Government official is fair game and never out of season. I ought to know; I am always looking down the gun barrel, but it seems to me that the subject of Government controls as a scapegoat for all the ills that beset us should be pretty well exhausted by this time. In the housing field not only have I repeatedly stated my views on the subject, but these statements have been backed up with positive action. Every control that could be removed has been removed and this same policy will be applied to the few remaining controls when they can

be lifted without harm to the housing program or the economy of the country as a whole.

Removal of the few remaining controls at this time will not result in the production of any additional housing but in fact will have the opposite effect. The problem can be simply illustrated by citing the case of pig iron. You all know that it takes pig iron to make cast-iron pipe and cast-iron soil pipe is one of the scarcest building materials today. There just isn't enough cast-iron soil pipe to satisfy the demands for housing and the nonresidential construction which is now permitted to go ahead. By the allocation powers we direct the amount of pig iron which must go to cast-iron pipe manufacturers. Now let's be frank about this. The pig-iron manufacturers don't like to be directed and neither would I in their place, but by the use of premium payments, which are optional with the industry, they have been induced to increase the production of merchant pig-iron and by direction have delivered a part to the cast-iron soil pipe manufacturers.

Without this power of allocation and without the power to pay premiums, what would happen?

Not only would the soil-pipe manufacturers use the pig iron for purposes other than building production but pig-iron suppliers would sell their pig wherever they choose. And this is no criticism of their action. But how in the world can anyone interested in the housing or construction field believe that by permitting this to happen, the housing program would be helped. Well, I just can't follow such reasoning. This would not only make cast-iron soil pipe unavailable to builders of housing, it would make it not available, period!

Last Monday for the first time since becoming Housing Expediter, I made a public statement estimating the number of houses which can be built this year. There are so many factors to be considered that not until then did I have sufficient facts upon which to base an estimate, and I reiterate—this is an estimate and not a prediction.

My statement was that with the few present controls continuing, we could expect to complete slightly over 1,000,000 dwelling units of all types this year, of which more than 750,000 will be new permanent units. This number of completed dwelling units would give us the best year of housing completions since the middle twenties. These results were achieved without undue impact on nonresidential construction because in 1946 when controls were tighter, more private commercial, industrial, and other nonresidential construction was put in place than in any other peacetime year in the Nation's history. Now with this record of more homes being completed than in any year since the middle twenties, and a larger volume of other private construction under way than in any other year of the Nation's history, we should note that this record housing year was accomplished without adversely affecting other parts of the Nation's economy.

But if the few remaining controls are lifted at this time, my estimate of 1,000,000 homes will not be reached. We may lose over 200,000 completions. But let us not be misled into believing that the building materials which will not go into these lost houses will go into needed commercial and industrial types of construction. Based on the number of applications of all types of construction which have been denied there is an estimated pent-up demand of $3,000,000,000 which may hit the market. This includes a large amount of easily deferrable and much less desirable types of projects. But by a curious paradox these less necessary projects can, in the open market, outbid the sponsors of commercial and industrial construction as well as housing for the scarce materials which will then become scarcer. If this happens it certainly will not result in lowered prices but the very opposite will happen and you know and I know where prices are today.

Everyone in the country is more or less familiar with rent control on existing housing. Rent control will eventually be lifted but I do not believe that many people will recommend the lifting of rent control entirely at this time. The time to lift rent control, is, of course, when the supply of housing has come somewhere nearer meeting the demand. This day will certainly not be reached sooner by doing anything to delay or hamper the construction of new housing.

The building materials situation has improved greatly. Many materials short a year ago are now in plentiful supply. Others in short supply at present are becoming more and more plentiful. There are only a very few which are not satisfactory from the production standpoint. So, I say to you builders who have struggled with shortages and restrictions for almost 2 years since VJ-day, be patient just a little longer and I believe I can say that all restrictions on construction can be safely removed this fall. I have tried in this brief talk to give you the picture as I see it, without boring you with many of the details.

You all know what happened when L-41, the order which limited building construction, was lifted shortly after VJ-day. Many builders requested that it be restored and controls on building were reinstituted.

Now, we are all anxious to remove these few remaining controls. It is my judgment that the time for lifting all controls is approaching—but most assuredly, it is not yet here.

GOP Congress Slow To Take Care of Vets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, although this Republican Congress has been in session over 5 months now, not a single piece of legislation for the benefit of our war veterans has yet been enacted. Not one of the promises made to the veteran last fall by the Republican Party has been redeemed. What have you done about increasing subsistence allowances for students and job trainees? What have you done about redeeming the terminal-leave-pay bonds? I am glad to say that I have signed discharge petition No. 4 with regard to the Kearney bill as well as the petition to discharge the Rules Committee concerning the cash payment of terminal-leave-pay bonds. The following article, published in the June 7, 1947, issue of Trainman News, official paper of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, accurately describes the legislative situation:

GOP CONGRESS SLOW TO TAKE CARE OF VETS—ELECTION-TIME TALK FORGOTTEN AS SESSION WINDS UP FIFTH MONTH

WASHINGTON.—The GOP Congress, it seems, is ignoring the veteran like a pay car passes a bum.

The lawmakers have been in session 5 months now and action on measures to benefit World War II warriors adds up to just about zero.

All the election-time gab spouted off last fall when the veterans were practically promised the earth with a fence around it has amounted to what most people thought it would—a lot of hot air. Yet, some favorable legislation was expected since 69 ex-servicemen were elected to Congress and 47 of them belong to the majority party.

Well, here's the record and it's a pitiful one:

The hopper contains several bills for a bonus, but no hearings have been held. And prospects for hearings at this session by the House Ways and Means Committee are remote.

Subsistence allowances for students and job trainees—after 5 months House committee has reported a bill raising monthly allowances for married veterans from $90 to $105, with increased amounts for children, no raise for single veterans. Senate committee still considering the matter. Meanwhile, nearly a million veterans, one-fourth of the total in school or training, have dropped out without finishing their course.

CEILING REPEAL SCUTTLED

Ceilings on job trainee monthly income—outright repeal of the ceilings scuttled. Kearney bill (H. R. 246) which would raise ceilings to $250 for single veteran trainees and $325 for married was passed by House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, buried by Rules Committee. Discharge petition No. 4, which would send the bill to the floor, had 95 signatures at last report, requires 218.

Increased benefits for unemployed veterans—no action. Meanwhile, a quarter million veterans have exhausted their year's unemployment compensation under the GI bill of rights. War veterans make up 28 percent of the Nation's labor force, but 36 percent of the unemployed.

Cash payment for terminal leave pay bonds—none of the bills introduced have been acted upon.

Seamen's bill of rights (H. R. 476), giving limited benefits to wartime merchant seamen—still in House committee.

Congress has passed one bill for the vets but, you might know, that has a hitch to it. The measure allows the ex-doughboys to reinstate national service life insurance without physical examination, but critics assert it permits the Veterans' Administration to declare policies lapsed only 3 months after the previous payment.

New Works Conducted by Hans Kindler With the National Symphony Orchestra Since 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following list of works played for the first time in Washington, D. C., between 1941 and April 1947 by the National Symphony Orchestra:

NATIONAL SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA ASSOCIATION, 1947

An interesting record was made by the National Symphony Orchestra, under Hans Kindler, during the war years from 1941 until the close of the season just past, in the number of works played for the first time in Washington, D. C.

These were 149 in number, and included 15 symphonies. Out of these 15 symphonies 5 were given their concert premieres. In all,

37 works were played for the first time anywhere; 79 of the 149 works, or 53 percent, were written by 48 American composers, of whom 8 are American by naturalization.

This list of 149 does not include any of the orchestra's standard repertoire played before 1941, although, of course, a large number of the works comprising this repertoire were also played during the above-mentioned period. It included symphonies by Johann Christian and Karl Philipp Emanuel Bach; Haydn; Mozart; Beethoven, 7 symphonies (including 3 performances of the Ninth with chorus); Schubert, 5 symphonies; Schumann, 2; Mendelssohn, 2; Tschaikovsky, 4; Sibelius, 2; Brahms, 4; Liszt (Faust Symphony with chorus); Scriabin, Third Symphony (Le Poeme Divin); César Franck; Glazounov; Saint-Saëns; Chausson; Dvorak; and others, as well as works by Richard Strauss (Heidenleben, etc.), Wagner, Moussorgsky, Ravel, Debussy—in short, the standard repertoire from Bach to Stravinsky.

The combined works, old and new, as played under the brilliant leadership of Hans Kindler and our guest conductors resulted in a series of programs and performances of which the association is justly proud.

The list of 149 premieres as analyzed above is, we think, unusual enough to be of interest to the music public in general.

LIST OF WORKS PLAYED FOR THE FIRST TIME IN WASHINGTON, D. C., BETWEEN 1941 AND APRIL 1947 BY THE NATIONAL SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA, HANS KINDLER, CONDUCTOR

Antheil, George: Symphony No. 4.[1]
Antheil, George: Decatur in Algiers.
Antheil, George: Scherzo, The Golden Spike.[1]
Bales, Richard: Music for Strings.[1]
Barber, Samuel: Symphony No. 1 (new version).
Barber, Samuel: Concerto for violin and orchestra.
Barber, Samuel: Commando March.
Bartok, Bela: Concerto for violin and orchestra.
Bartok, Bela: Portrait, for violin and orchestra.[1]
Benjamin, Arthur: Cotillon Suite.
Benjamin, Arthur: Overture, Italian Comedy.
Bennett, Robert Russell: Overture to an Imaginary Drama.
Bernstein, Leonard: Fancy Free (ballet).
Bergsma, William: Music on a Quiet Theme.[1]
Bornschein, Franz: Ode to the Brave.[1]
Bornschein, Franz: Moon Over Taos.
Bortkiewicz, Sergei: Concerto for piano and orchestra.
Britten, Benjamin: Four Sea Interludes.
Bruckner, Anton: Symphony No. 4.
Busoni, Ferruccio: Concerto for violin and orchestra.
Busoni, Ferruccio: Concerto for piano and orchestra.
Calker, Darrell: Penguin Island.[1]
Canteloube, Joseph: Suite of Songs From the Auvergne.
Carpenter, John A.: Dance Suite.[1]
Castro, Juan (Argentine): Arabal (Sinfonia Argentina).
Chavez, Carlos (Mexico): Sinfonia de Baile.
Clements, Otis: Prelude and March.[1]
Cole, Ulric: Divertimento.
Copland, Aaron: A Lincoln Portrait.
Copland, Aaron: Billy the Kid.
Copland, Aaron: Fanfare for the Common Man.
Copland, Aaron: Outdoor Overture.
Copland, Aaron, Rodeo.
Cornelissen, Arnold: Symphony No. 1.[1]
Cornelissen, Arnold: Lilac Bush in Bloom.[1]
Cowell, Henry: Ancient Desert Drone.
Creston, Paul: Chant, 1942.[1]
Creston, Paul: Frontiers.
Crist, Bainbridge: American Epic: 1620.[1]
Crist, Bainbridge: Souvenir de Ballet.

[1] First concert performance anywhere.

Delamarter, Eric: They, Too, Went t'Town (overture).
Delius, Frederic: Concerto for piano and orchestra.
Delius, Frederic: La Calinda (from Koanga).
DeSabata, Victor: Juventus.
Eppert, Carl: Traffic.
Fernandez, Oscar (Brazil): Batuque.
Fuleihan, Anis: Comedy Overture.[1]
Fuleihan, Anis: Etude for winds.
Gilbert, Henry: Overture on Negro Themes.
Gilbert, Henry: Riders to the Sea.
Gnattali, Radame: Concerto for piano and orchestra.[1]
Gould, Morton: American Salute.
Gould, Morton: Concerto for piano and orchestra.
Gould, Morton: Cowboy Rhapsody.
Gould, Morton: Sinfonietta.
Grainger, Percy: Suite in a Nutshell.
Grainger, Percy: Danish Folk Song Suite.
Grainger, Percy: Youthful Suite.
Guarnieri, Camargo (Brazil): Abertura Concertante.
Harris, Roy: Acceleration.[1]
Hart, Weldon: Darling Cory.
Hindemith, Paul, Cupid and Psyche.
Hindemith, Paul: Mathis der Maler.
Holst, Gustav: Suite in E flat Major.
Holst, Gustav: The Planets.
Howe, Mary: Paean.[1]
Howe, Mary: American Piece.
Ibert, Jacques: Divertissement.
d'Indy, Vincent: Symphony on a French Mountain Air.
Jacobi, Frederic: Four Dances.
Jones, Charles: Overture for orchestra.[1]
Kabalevsky, Dmitri: Symphony No. 2.
Kabalevsky, Dmitri: Overture, Colas Breugnon.
Khachaturyan, Aram: Dances from Gayaneh.
Khachaturyan, Aram: Concerto for piano and orchestra.
Khrennikov, Tikhon: Symphony No. 1.
Kindler, Hans: The Seven Provinces.[1]
Kindler, Hans: Scherzo, Hop-Frog.[1]
Kilpatrick, Jack: Three Ozark Dances.
Lee, Dai-Keong: Hawaiian Festival Overture.[1]
Lee, Dai-Keong: Prelude and Hula.
Leng, Alfonso (Chile): Canto de Invierno.
Mahler, Gustav: Das Lied von der Erde.
Mahler, Gustav: Symphony No. 4.
Mahler, Gustav: Lieder Eines Fahrenden Gesellen.
Martinu, Bohuslav: Thunderbolt.[1]
McDonald, Harl: Bataan.[1]
McKay, G. F.: Symphonie Miniature.
Mennin, Peter: Folk Overture.[1]
Menotti, Gian Carlo: The Old Maid and the Thief (opera).
Menotti, Gian Carlo: Concerto for piano and orchestra.
Milhaud, Darius: Concerto for two pianos and orchestra.
Milhaud, Darius: Quatre Chansons de Ronsard.
Milhaud, Darius: Suite Provencale.
Olmstead: Suite for voice and orchestra.
Pescara, Aurelio: Tibet.
Piston, Walter: Symphony No. 2.[1]
Piston, Walter, The Incredible Flutist.
Ponce, Manuel (Mexico): Chapultepec; Concierto del Sur, for guitar and orchestra.
Prokofieff, Serge: Lieutenant Kije.
Prokofieff, Serge: Concerto No. 2 for violin and orchestra.
Prokofieff, Serge: Concerto No. 3 for piano and orchestra.
Prokofieff, Serge: Gala Performance (ballet).
Prokofieff, Serge: Peter and the Wolf.
Read, Gardner: Prelude and Toccata.
Read, Gardner: Night Flight.
Riegger, Wallingford: Canon and Fugue.
Riegger, Wallingford: Passacaglia and Fugue.[1]
Riegger, Wallingford: Funeral March.[1]
Rieti, Vittorio: Night Shadow (ballet).

[1] First concert performance anywhere.

Rieti, Vittorio: Waltz Academy (ballet).
Schuman, William: News Reel.
Schuman, William: Prayer, 1943.
Schuman, William: Side Show.
Shapleigh, Bertram: Mirage.[1]
Shostakovich, Dmitri: Symphony No. 7.
Shostakovich, Dmitri: Symphony No. 9.
Shostakovich, Dmitri: Concerto for piano and orchestra.
Shostakovich, Dmitri: Song of the United Nations.[1]
Shure, R. Deane: The Flax Spinner.[1]
Stravinsky, Igor: Four Norwegian Moods.
Stravinsky, Igor: Comedia Balletica (ballet).
Stravinsky, Igor: Danses Concertantes (ballet).
Stravinsky, Igor: Jeu de Cartes.
Tansman, Alexandre: Polish Rhapsodie.
Tansman, Alexandre: Symphony No. 5.[1]
Tavarez, Hekel (Brazil): Concerto in Brazilian Forms for piano and orchestra.
Tavarez, Hekel (Brazil): Danza de Caboclo.
Taylor, Deems: Marco Takes a Walk.
Tschaikovsky, Peter: Overture, The Voyvode.
Van Vactor, David: Overture to a Comedy No. 2.
Villa Lobos, Heitor (Brazil): Bachiana Brasiliera Nos. 2 and 5.
Villa Lobos, Heitor (Brazil): Impressoes Seresteiras.
Vasquez, José (Mexico): Acuarelas de Viaje
Wagenaar, Bernard: Feuilleton.[1]
Wagenaar, Bernard: Song of Mourning.[1]
Wagner, Joseph: Festival Processions.
Walton, William: Concerto for violin and orchestra.
Ward, Robert: Symphony No. 1.
Warren, Elinor: King Arthur's Farewell.
Weinberger, Jaromir: Czech Rhapsody.[1]
Wilkes, Robert W.: Tolentine Overture.
Wilkes, Robert W.: Twilight Dreams.[1]
Williams, Vaughan: Three English Folk Songs.
Wiren, Dag: Serenade for string orchestra.[1]
Wiren, Dag: Overture Joyeuse.
Wiren, Dag: Scherzo.
Zimbalist, Efrem: American Rhapsody.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Florida Times-Union of May 27, 1947:

ECONOMY, YES, BUT NOT FOOLISH PENNY PINCHING

Taxpaying citizens of the United States are insistent in their demands that costs of government be reduced, that services be improved, and that the tendency toward an aristocracy in the Government service—government at all levels—be checked. They want to see cuts made in the proposed Federal budget, now before Congress and calling for more than $37,000,000,000.

These citizens are not so foolish, however, as to think that economy-minded Members of Congress can pick up the budget of a department of their Government in Washington and arbitrarily chop off any fixed percentage with safety. If there be any who think that can be done without danger to the Nation's future, they should study the Department of Agriculture's budget, which the

Appropriations Committee is now threatening to cut by one-third.

For included in the cut is the fund set up for soil conservation. This fund would be reduced by almost one-half—from $300,000,000 to $165,000,000. Yet the inroads being made upon the Nation's soils have reached alarming proportions—alarming because of their scope, and because there can be no American Nation when there are no soils upon which to raise food crops for humans and feed crops for the animals, and fowl upon which the people depend for life.

Soil conservation is fundamentally important to America. The health, happiness, and future welfare of the people depend on the curtailment of the ravages of erosion much more than any other agricultural problem that is known today. Furthermore, soil-conservation farming is responsible for high yields and quality of products more than any other single benefit. It is, therefore, economically profitable to hasten the application of conservation practices on the farms of the country. Contrariwise, it is economically unsound, even foolhardy, to take any step that retards conservation practices, or, better, that tends to hold such practices on an unprogressive basis.

Infinitely better would it be for Congress to eliminate some of its subsidies, or make its cuts somewhere else in the Federal budget in order to save money, than to reduce the funds for soil conservation. If anything is to be done about that program, it should be given increased funds, and steps taken to get the maximum in results for the expenditures.

No Time To Spare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item of June 7, 1947:

NO TIME TO SPARE

Russia's bold political coup in Hungary has been followed by reports that steps will now be taken to form a Balkan federation of Soviet-dominated countries in eastern Europe. Membership might include Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, and perhaps Poland. That would be a formidable line-up, and the possibility of its extension was grimly underscored by the arrest of a Bulgarian anti-Communist, Nikola Petkov, on charges similar to those used in the Hungarian coup.

What could be a more immediate and impelling argument for a United States of Europe? In its absence, a Balkan Union might well be expanded to include nations where the Communists, while not yet preponderant, have an excellent chance of becoming so. Economic necessity dictates a European federation. Whether it is to be a democratic union or a totalitarian chain is the question.

Yet Secretary of State Marshall, while pledging American encouragement, disavows direct participation. "It would be neither fitting nor efficacious for this Government to undertake to draw up unilaterally a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically," he now says. "This is the business of Europeans. The initiative, I think, must come from Europe."

From where, we would ask, did the initiative for the Hungarian coup come? Or the Bulgarian purge that is now in progress? From whom would the initiative for a Balkan Federation come? The Europeans? Already Metyas Rakosy, Hungary's Communist dictator under the Soviet aegis, has boasted that he outwitted the United States by the swiftness of his seizure of power.

Secretary Marshall and all other Americans know the answer to that. Is it to be a Union of Sovietized European Republics or a United States of Europe? It is in large measure ours to decide, not by "encouragement," but by outright initiative.

The Good Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following world broadcast by Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman from Caux, Switzerland, June 4, 1947, introduced by Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd:

REAR ADM. RICHARD E. BYRD. I consider it a great privilege to be given the opportunity to precede Dr. Frank Buchman on this broadcast. As I see it, Frank Buchman and his many associates are inspired. If you could know exactly what this group is doing, you would see that their lives are completely dedicated to the greatest of all causes—the achievement of peace, harmony and good will in the world. These men and women, their whole families, give themselves unselfishly. They have gone out into the world and have given up their homes and security. They work without pay. Their attitude is akin to that of the disciples of old.

We know that many minorities have organized themselves into strong units for purely selfish purposes, but this group is consecrated to the cause of good. They are implementing in a practical way what Christ taught 2,000 years ago; and make no mistake about it, many nations of the world are beginning to feel its influence.

We know that there is evil in the universe and due to that evil there is much bad will in the world. But it is my conviction that there is far more good will than there is bad will. But the world has suffered immeasurably and is still suffering from selfishness, and that is because the selfish groups have developed a genius for organizing and mobilizing whereas those of good will have seldom demonstrated a talent for organizing. Consequently only too often the bad will dominates the affairs of men with devastating results in the form of cruelty, suffering, despair, starvation, chaos and war, all of which lend more strength and power to the forces of evil.

On the other hand, the MRA not only is mobilizing good will the world over, but is changing men of bad will to the end that the good will eventually predominates, so that the human race will no longer resort to war but will choose rather to settle questions across the godly table of arbitration. We know that this is a materialistic age where man's genius has been largely expended on the development of material science to the neglect of the human spirit and the science of human relationships. The MRA has the answer. How else can man fit himself into this Atomic Age than by the creation of a universal good will that will dominate the world so that it will dissolve man's dangerously selfish desires and ambitions?

People the world over are bewildered and confused. They do not know just what to do about it. Frank Buchman points to the answer. His group is fighting throughout the world to accomplish what you people of good will who are listening to me today are hoping can somehow be accomplished. I want to say with all the emphasis at my command that this movement gives you the chance you have been looking for to go into action to save civilization.

And now I give you Dr. Frank Buchman, who started this great movement more than a quarter of a century ago.

THE GOOD ROAD

(By Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman)

People everywhere are trying to find the good road that will lead them to security. Awesome fear surrounds everyone. It stalks the world. Conference follows conference but peace comes no nearer. Menacing economic problems face both the Old World and the New. The young United Nations sags under the weight of its problems and the lack of the right spirit in which to meet them. People lose faith in their leaders, and statesmen—earnest, able men—toil but see no harvest.

Some people are thinking in terms of another war. I don't believe they are sane if they are thinking of such an answer. But there are men who are willing to submit to all its horrors if that were a way out.

Meanwhile the forces of subversion prey like vultures over man's disillusionment. Even the elements seem to be working with them, giving a red answer to the balance sheet.

On every hand we see disunity. Divisions are the mark of our time. Men oppose other men because they are of another nation, another race, another class, another party, or simply because they hold another point of view.

Everyone longs for peace and order, yet battling for divisive points of view only increases the chaos. What is our greatest need?

Someone in Europe said recently, "We are hungry, hungry not only for food but for ideas—ideas on which to reshape our individual and national life."

The truth is that our problem goes deeper than economics or politics. It is ideological. Divisive ideologies strive for the mastery of men's minds. Thousands follow their banners only because they see no convincing alternative. Not all governments have grasped the paramount importance of ideological preparedness. A nation which is materially strong may be ideologically divided against itself, and therefore in danger. Leaders who ignore this fact will sell us short.

There is a road, a good road among many false ways, a good road mankind must find and follow. It is a God-constructed road. It is the great high road of God-inspired democracy. It is valid for every nation. It is essential for world peace.

Men today are being stretched consciously or unconsciously into new molds of thinking. People everywhere ask, "Have you the answer to communism?"

It is interesting how fanciful and heroic or even pathetic some people are in trying to find the answer. Others begin to see vaguely that there must be a note of change. Everybody knows somebody, some nation which ought to be different. But most people have not come to the point where they see that they themselves need a radical change. Yet these are days of radical action. And human nature can be changed.

"I thought," said a military man recently after meeting Moral Rearmament, "I thought

that I was Major Brown. I found that I was Mr. Anyman facing Major Change."

He had found the good road, the road of a change of heart. As we travel this road miracles happen and renaissance and true security will follow in their train.

A steel worker came to our training center here at Caux. He had been a Communist for 28 years. He had trained his daughter until she became even more radical than he. Yet that daughter was changed and persuaded her father to come to Caux. Before he left us he read a poem that he had written. These are his words:

"I contemplate, and bow in awe
Before God's master plan;
I watch the miracle superb—
The change in selfish man.

"The snows on Dent-du-Midi
Are but the robes of grace;
God has a plan for every man,
And each one has a place."

This steel worker now writes, "I was a new creature in Christ and the experience at Caux sealed forever my allegiance to the Highest. This is the first time in years that I have written anything of a spiritual nature, for, for the last 28 years, my pen and any talents I possessed were given to proclaiming and proclaiming very forcibly my belief in the materialism of the Marxist theory."

People summon new hope whenever you give the voice of faith as a sure and certain answer for even the darkest days. I thank God for the mounting evidence—sometimes in the headlines, more often behind the headlines—that this is true.

I hold in my hand today a report by the noted Associated Press columnist DeWitt Mackenzie, which he calls one of the most remarkable in his experience. He tells of the striking new plans which one of China's foremost soldier-statesmen has been developing for his nation. Concerned over the tragic divisions of his country, General Ho, who as China's Chief of Staff received the surrender of 2,000,000 Japanese in China, and who now represents his country on the United Nations Military Staff Committee, went to a Moral Rearmamant conference in America.

This is the new truth he saw there. He says, "During the past 20 years of my fight against materialism in China, the method I used was force against force, and organization against organization. I have now come to the very firm conclusion that I must fight an idea with an idea."

General Ho now puts first the moral rehabilitation of China. He believes that along with economic reform must come the moral force that will give new standards to the country. In short, says the General, there is no use merely trying to reform the Communists by naked force alone. It would be best to solve the Communist problem by moral force. He stresses the importance of raising the moral standards of society in China as a whole, including Communists and Kuomintang.

To this end he has submitted to his government detailed plans for sending at once selected groups of his countrymen to Switzerland and America for training in Moral Rearmament. He specifies that these men must be unselfish by nature, and ablebodied, that they must be men of faith and that they must return to give at least 1 year's service to the development of this ideology in their country. He concludes with these memorable words, "To put the world in order, we must first put the nation in order; to put the nation in order, we must put the family in order; to put the family in order, we must cultivate our personal life: and to cultivate our personal life, we must first set our hearts right."

Here surely is statesmanlike planning, a new approach to the problems of fratricidal strife which menace so many nations today.

Here at Caux, in the heart of troubled Europe, and at Mackinac Island in America there are centers for ideological training to which the ordinary man and the statesman are coming in growing numbers, and they are finding there new hope and the way out of confusion. One of the statesmen from the Paris Peace Conference last summer said, "At Caux I found the answer to Paris."

India, a center of considerable confusion today, sent a distinguished delegation of leaders. One was the Director of Agriculture for the United Provinces. He said, "Two main ideologies are likely to capture the imagination of the people of India. One is the ideology of Karl Marx. The other is the ideology advocated by Moral Rearmament." Indian newspapers got the point. They said it in headlines—"Caux, the answer to communism."

The son of an Indian peer came to Caux with his parents. He was drifting aimlessly. He was gripped by the new life he saw for himself and his country. He found a love for the millions of India and is a spokesman in the making for that nation.

Coal is one of the chief problems of the economic world. Every major coal field in Britain was represented at Caux. In the most critical year for the British mines these leaders went back to settle disputes and raise production. There was more coal because there was a new spirit. These miners have not only increased production, they have happy homes.

A British Member of Parliament said, "A fresh wind of liberty and good will blows from Caux over the ruined nations." Today he is heading a committee of Parliamentarians who are inviting government leaders from other countries to join them here to plan the moral and spiritual rebirth of nations which will make peace secure. Labor leads in many lands. Labor led by God can unite the world.

Army leaders, too, see a new role for themselves and their forces, to give quickly to their nations the added strength of an inspired ideology.

And thank God there is now at work a world force of people, ideologically equipped, who know how a new moral climate can be produced because of what has happened in their own lives. Workers and soldiers, housewives, and statesmen, farmers and industrialists, young and old, they have no new paper plans to offer. They have experience which cannot be denied. They know that a change of heart is possible. They know that definite, decisive guidance from God is available, today as always.

Two weeks ago I was present in Rome at the ceremonies which proclaimed as saint a statesman of his day, Nikolaus von der Flue, who lived in Switzerland in the fifteenth century. Nikolaus had this gift of Divine direction. As he exercised it, he became the saviour of his country. He was a farmer who tilled his land well, a soldier, a magistrate. At 50, oppressed by the problems of a warring world, he gave up much to follow radically the guidance of God. Soon his inspired good sense, knowledge of men and singleness of heart commanded the respect of his contemporaries, not only in Switzerland but in all Europe. He became the most sought-after arbiter in affairs of state. When the bitter quarrels of the Cantons brought his country to the verge of civil war, it was his God-given answer which set Switzerland on the good road that gave her unity. It is most timely that this statesman of 500 years ago, who listened for God's word and fearlessly passed it on to his generation, should today receive this supreme recognition. Today he is a saint for our times, a model for the United Nations.

A diplomat led by God—a nation united. Is that the answer?

An Arab Foreign Minister said, "The world is at the crossroads. One road leads to revolution and chaos. The other to reaction and despair. Moral Rearmament is the third way—the way of an inspired democracy that will unite the world."

Democracy's inspired ideology is a life to be lived, a road to be followed. A whole new order of statemanship is required. Cabinet ministers to rule well must change people. Ordinarily cabinets do not have that art.

As men change, nations find a new level of living that makes problems melt.

As men listen to God and obey His orders, nations find a pattern that makes plain God's will for government.

Here is the good road. Anyone can travel it. Everyone must travel it—ordinary men and the statesman alike.

As we step out upon it, God becomes real. Fear vanishes and life opens out. There is no need for detours: the good road lies straight ahead.

"When ye turn to the right hand and when ye turn to the left, thine ears shall hear a word behind thee saying, 'This is the way, walk ye in it.'"

"Nations shall run unto thee because of the Lord thy God. And great shall be the peace of thy children."

Soil-Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Lions Club, of Albia, Iowa, urging that appropriations be continued to the Department of Agriculture and other Government units so that the soil-conservation program may be continued:

Whereas the United States Congress is now in session and is considering appropriations for the benefit of the Department of Agriculture which affect the soil-conservation program as now being conducted in Monroe County, Iowa; and

Whereas the conservation program now in existence and planned is of great value to our community and its land and farming population, and it being the desire of the Albia Lions Club that such practices be continued, and for the purpose of expressing such belief: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Albia Lions Club of Albia, Iowa, That it is the belief of said club that the soil-conservation practices now being conducted in Monroe County, Iowa, and the State of Iowa, should be continued, and we therefore urge our representatives in Congress to continue the appropriations to the Department of Agriculture and other Government units so that such programs may continue; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Representatives in Congress from our district and to the Senators from the State of Iowa.

Passed and adopted this 4th day of June 1947,

C. J. MURRAY,
President.

Attest:

L. L. SMITH,
Secretary.

Must We Have Another Depression?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Leon H. Keyserling from the New York Times magazine of June 8, 1947:

MUST WE HAVE ANOTHER DEPRESSION?

(By Leon H. Keyserling)

WASHINGTON.—If a group of economists and other observers of current affairs gathered to appraise America's economic future, opinions would be about as follows: Some of the group would regard a recession as inevitable in less than a year; others would believe that it still might be averted by prompt action. (The average definition of a recession would be a drop in production ranging from 5 to 10 percent and unemployment running up toward five to six million.)

A majority would agree that, if a recession should come, it would be shorter and milder than the one which started in the second year after World War I and that there would then be a few years of high prosperity. Most significantly, a large majority would think this: Unless substantial changes in popular attitudes and economic practices occur, the new prosperity era will be followed within 3 to 10 years by a depression which might be as much larger than the one commencing in 1929 as the second World War was larger than the first.

This concern about a major depression in the fifties does not spring from unwarranted pessimism or from a superstitious belief that history must repeat itself. It has a more solid basis. While all economists do not agree as to all the causes of the last depression, a listing of the causal factors generally agreed upon indicates that many of these factors are again present now or will be present within a few years.

Some of these are the tendency of our productive capacity to outrun our mass buying power, the chronic weakness of such bellwether industries as residential construction, the seeming reluctance of capital investment to expand as dynamically as it once did, the uncertain elements in foreign trade, the enormous disparities in the price-and-wage structure, and huge differentials in the enjoyment of national income whether measured by regions or by individuals. Above all, the country as a whole has not yet adopted and put into action a fully rounded antidepression program.

The majority opinion that this depression threat is several years off rather than imminent rests largely upon the backlog of demand resulting from the war. This pent-up demand is regarded as sufficiently powerful to forestall a depression for some years. But it may not be powerful enough to avert a recession in the shorter run, for the war boom and the postwar restocking boom have resulted in many maladjustments, the most serious being price inflation. Yet even the recession which may be just around the corner can be avoided or reduced to minimum proportions if remedial action is taken in time.

A short-range program to avert this recession was contained in the Economic Report of the President on January 8. This program focused upon maintaining high buying power to match high production. It proposed voluntary price reductions, moderate wage adjustments, maintenance of rent control, expansion of social security and minimum-wage legislation, a Government-aided housing program, a surplus in Government revenues over expenditures, and improved management-labor relations. Suggestions made recently by six distinguished economists in the New York Times magazine and by other competent authorities have been in substantial measure similar.

Whether or not these immediate antirecession efforts receive the cooperation necessary for their complete success, the current situation provides us with a laboratory in which we may learn a lot about preventing the depression which looms a few years off.

America has the power and the time to prevent another 1929 or worse. This preventive effort, however, cannot commence with prescriptions. It must commence with wider popular agreements on general principles, for only on the firm foundation of common consents can we proceed harmoniously and swiftly to the development of specific measures. What broad principles, then, can we now evolve from experience? In what direction should this experience propel us to act?

LESSONS OF 1929

Future historians alone will be able to measure the full costs of the depression which started in 1929. Even they may fail to allow adequately for the happier course world events might have taken if America had remained prosperous throughout the third decade of this century.

But we can make some evaluation even now. Over the 10-year period beginning with 1930 our national income fell far short of what it would have been if prosperity had been maintained; the amount exceeded $300,000,000,000 (adjusted)—about the dollar cost to us of the recent war. This takes no account of the lingering effects of human deprivation and social discontent.

Another major depression could mean a drop of nearly $100,000,000,000 in our annual national income, and unemployment which could easily exceed twenty million. And just as the last depression here impeded world revival and thus paved the way for warmakers, another American economic collapse would undermine world reconstruction and thus blast away the foundations of enduring peace.

But while the record of the last depression alerts us to the danger, it does not provide us with a complete remedy. The most significant lesson we can learn from the past is that we have not yet learned enough. Without underestimating the far-reaching improvements that were initiated during the thirties, we must recognize that the recovery, strictly speaking, was not much greater than that which had followed previous depressions, and by the middle of 1937 we were again on the economic downgrade for a spell.

True, there are some who maintain that the imperfections in the recovery program were mainly quantitative. They say, for example, that the public-works program did not succeed fully because it was too small and too slow and because it was tapered off too sharply after 1936. But it seems far more likely that the insufficiencies in our former approaches have been qualitative as well as quantitative.

The first of these insufficiencies arose from circumstances beyond the control of those making the effort. They were empowered to act only after the depression was upon us in full force. They checked the economic fire, but they did not put it out entirely. Nor did they develop an apparatus which can be used without modification in the future. It is hard to build an adequate fire-prevention system in the middle of a big fire

Another insufficiency in our previous efforts cannot be extenuated so easily. Too much trust was put in the idea that direct Government programs can be used to enlarge employment regardless of their effect upon the whole business system. To illustrate: The employment of 3,000,000 people on public works does not necessarily add three million to the net number of employed. It may add four million if its indirect consequence is to stimulate private employment by one million; or it may add only two million if its indirect consequence is to retard private employment by one million. When such hypodermics are given, the most important thing to watch is their effect upon the whole economy—in the long as well as short run.

The most serious insufficiency in our previous antidepression efforts, however, was that they did not place enough emphasis upon restoring balance within the enterprise system itself. It is easy to illustrate this in terms of the current situation. Of present national income running at an annual rate of about $180,000,000,000, about $117,000,000,000 is in wages and salaries, about $18,000,000,000 in farm income, and about $15,000,000,000 in corporate profits. (The remainder is in entrepreneurial income—interest, rents, etc.) And it is decisions within the enterprise system which mainly determine wages, salaries, prices, and profits.

As the Nation's economic budget shows, in peacetime three-quarters or more of national receipts and expenditures are attributable to consumer business and international transactions, while only about one-quarter or less are attributable to Federal, State, and local governments.

Manifestly, the policies pursued within the enterprise system have more effect upon the Nation's economic health than any programs the Government may undertake, unless the Government should undertake to run the whole economy.

Responsible, vigorous enterprise and responsible, vigorous government are both essential to the maintenance of prosperity within the framework of our democratic freedoms, and neither can do its full share unless there is a precise delineation of the role of each and of the working relationship between the two.

THE ROLE OF ENTERPRISE

We may begin this delineation by stating briefly, at the risk of some oversimplification, the core requirement for maintaining maximum employment, production, and prosperity. As our already fabulous capacity to produce increases, the flow of income to producers must be kept in equilibrium with the flow of income to consumers, and while certain Government devices may help, the major stabilizing or unstabilizing factors are the wage-price-profit relationships of the enterprise system.

Concerning these relationships, there will never be complete agreement between management and labor. Some disagreements will continue to be settled by the relative strength of the parties. But mere tests of strength will no more add up to economic equilibrium than the impersonal competitive forces conjured up by Adam Smith. Both industrial leadership and labor leadership will be tested by their capacity for foresight, forbearance, and appreciation of the national interest, which is also their own.

Their common aim should be to answer this question: What kind of profits, prices, and wages will keep supply and demand in balance at the highest levels which our resources and individual freedoms permit? When management and labor, in conjunction, get a better answer to this question than they have at present they will both be better off than ever before. And so shall we all.

In this context, the recent advice of President Truman that labor remain moderate in its wage demands, and that businessmen undertake voluntarily to reduce prices where profit margins permit, becomes fully understandable. Yet, while many people have agreed with the President's advice on prices,

some have said that moral suasion was sure to fail. But would they regard compulsory regulation of prices and wages in peacetime as consistent with the blend of private and public action best suited to the American tradition and needs?

President Truman's advice on prices has been in accord with the evolution of American experience. But while this experience shows the need for a wise admixture of private and public action, it has not yet forged all of the instrumentalities required for the blend. Only strong action, comprehending the needs of the whole economy and sensitively adjusted to these needs, can stabilize a system as complex and interdependent as ours. The economic system, like nature, abhors a vacuum; and since the price-wage-profit relationship is not to be fixed by Government fiat, this question thrusts itself inescapably forward: What other devices within the enterprise system itself will accomplish workable results? This requires a fresh look at the whole problem of business size and practices.

While we should work steadfastly to keep the doors of opportunity open to small, individualistic enterprise and to prosecute monopolistic misdoing, we cannot re-create the pre-Civil War pattern or achieve economic stability by applying standards of size alone. Today some industries which are organized on a large, integrated basis are administering their prices at lower levels than the traffic will bear.

In contrast, the home-building function, which can hardly be called an industry at all—it is mostly in the hands of very small operators—has been notoriously inefficient, highly resistant to technological change, and is presently pricing its product out of the market. And one reason for the difficulty of the farm price situation is the lack of organization in farming which makes a wise price policy hard to adopt even were it defined.

This suggests that the older and simpler concept of trust busting needs to be modernized by attention to problems such as these: where certain industries have already acquired a degree of concentration which makes monopolistic abuse possible, how can this concentrated power be used to stabilize rather than to exploit the economy? In those industries where competition still exists or is attainable, how can this competition serve as a stimulus to efficiency without preventing the coordination of effort which healthful price policies may require?

Where prices of a particular item should be lowered, and no one businessman can afford to take the first step alone, how can many businessmen similarly situated take the step together? Where the retailer and the wholesaler must synchronize their price policies, how can this be accomplished? Where industrial prices, farm prices and wages are interrelated, how can the businessman, the farmer and the laborer work things out instead of calling each other names?

While both the NRA and the OPA had their defects, and while there is scant desire to resuscitate either, the fact that the country turned to the first to fight deflation and to the second to fight inflation indicates that some coordination becomes essential when economic stability is seriously endangered. The Government should not discourage such stabilizing efforts by enterprise as show fair promise of an adequate and preferable alternative to intensive Government control and regulation. And avoiding the evils of the corporative state does not mean industrial self-regulation free from Government vigilance in the public interest.

Similar considerations are applicable to labor organizations. The true purpose of large-scale labor organization is not to enable ever more powerful labor leaders to fight on equal terms with ever more powerful employers. Large-scale labor organization, at its best, can help to reduce the glaring disparities in the wage structure and standards of living, can aid in the development of a self-disciplined labor movement, can put a powerful shoulder to the wheel of social progress, and can join with industry and Government in the formulation and application of stabilization policies on a scale large enough to be significant.

Sound competition, directed toward increased efficiency, should be encouraged. But there is also need to evolve instrumentalities of expression and action through which industry and labor can work alone and with Government to master rather than succumb to the gigantic problems of twentieth century industrialism. Otherwise economic collapse could lead to supergovernment and not to the preservation of enterprise. The recognized primacy of government should be used not solely to police and prohibit bad practices but also to encourage good practices. Both price making and wage negotiation will require flexible and realistic experimentation with new modes adjusted to new needs.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

While determination of wage-price-profit relationships rests mainly with enterprise, the Government can help in developing some useful economic guides. It can provide Nation-wide facts and analyses beyond the capacity of individual employers, trade associations, workers, or labor unions to ferret out by themselves. The Government may set up some forums for study and exchange of information. It may cooperatively promote understanding and agreement about courses of safety and danger.

All parties concerned are only in the initial stages of this economic fact-finding and analysis. Frequently conclusions are drawn that profits are too high because the return on net worth is greater than in 1929, or that wages are too low because they have increased percentage-wise less than profits since early 1946, or that farm prices are in greatest need of reduction because they have gone up more than industrial prices. These conclusions may be true or false in whole or in part. But at best such facile comparisons with the past are inadequate.

The patterns of the past may have been undesirable; presumably they could not have been entirely desirable in view of the instabilities which ensued.

Moreover, a healthy level of profits or wages cannot be measured solely by national totals. It depends also and even more upon their distribution.

The moral is this: While currently available economic guides have considerable utility when not misused, there is imperative need to refine and classify these guides into more precise categories for practical application.

This entails a better portrayal of production goals and national requirements. In any given industry, it is difficult to appraise appropriate profits until we know more about existing plant capacity, measured against the capacity required for our present and future needs. While the statement is made that farm prices are too high, this needs to be tested by a more discerning look at farm standards of living and a more comprehensive analysis of the farm production necessary for world trade, our own industrial demands at maximum employment, and decent diets for every American family. And shortages of some basic raw materials require immediate attention.

Since the end of the war, there has been an understandable slackening of interest in this whole matter of productive capacity, national requirements and goals. There is need to speed up this vital line of inquiry, not to restore the forced drive of a war economy, but to marshal every acceptable incentive toward an economy of maximum production for peacetime plenty.

These improved economic guides will not only help enterprise; they will also enrich the perspective of the Government in the performance of its own inescapable functions. These functions include a tax program which, until defense expenditures can be reduced greatly, will draw in more than $30,000,000,000 a year in revenue; management of a national debt approximating a quarter of a trillion dollars; manifold money and banking functions; social security, minimum wage, and other protective programs; the established regulatory activities; and necessary public spending for defense and welfare at levels far above the prewar rate.

The range and flexibility of these public undertakings make them enormously powerful weapons for combating deflationary forces. They can furnish production incentives, affect the size of the labor force and redress imbalances in the economy by withdrawing or adding purchasing power at strategic spots. But the specific adjustment of all these governmental programs to a consistent national economic policy and objective should not be ignored until depression appears, and then hastily attempted. As we learned from the last depression, such a course leads to inconsistency and lost motion. It will be far more profitable and less costly if these programs are constantly and temperately coordinated with all other efforts—especially those of enterprise—to maintain continuous prosperity. It is easier to hold fast to prosperity than to recapture it. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

This coordination of all governmental programs does not imply a planned economy or more Government intervention. The people who have complained most frequently about lack of consistency in Government policy have been conservative businessmen and taxpayers. Harmonizing various undertakings pares down rather than increases the total size of the Government structure. It weeds out duplications. It puts the spotlight on what is vital and what is superficial.

THE ROLE OF US ALL

Transcending all these specifics, the campaign for continuous prosperity must be affirmative and aggressive. Defense will not win the war against unemployment. Economic Maginot Line strategy would have ruinous consequences. The people of America need to be electrified by our limitless possibilities, not frightened into action by prophets of disaster.

Our national income (1944 dollars) now is about 64 percent greater than it was in the last year before the war; almost 3 times what it was in the depression year 1932; 72 percent higher than it was in the peak prosperity year 1929. During the war we made enormous strides in producing faster and more cheaply. If we apply these techniques, our national income can mount steadily in the years ahead. Nothing but folly can prevent us from attaining extraordinary and universally enjoyed standards of living and opportunities for self-development. There can be so much for all that the removal of unmerited poverty will remove the threat to merited wealth. This is what Eric Johnston calls "America Unlimited."

Prosperity is ours for the doing. In summary of the foregoing discussion, these five lines of activity, relevant to the current anti-recession effort but aimed mainly against the terrible threat of a major depression some time in the fifties, should be carried forward with relentless vigor and determination:

1. We need to set goals reflecting America's maximum productive capacity, based upon our resources and skills. We need to subdivide these goals into at least a few major classifications, so that production may be

related to the optimum satisfaction of human needs, and so that incentives may be applied where shortcomings become apparent. These goals will provide an affirmative impulse to national effort and a frame of reference for testing the validity of specific economic policies. This is a task primarily for engineers, economists, and students of human needs.

2. We need to gain and apply more knowledge bearing upon the kind of income flow to producers and consumers that will stimulate and sustain this maximum production and the maximum employment that goes with it. This involves the wage-price-profit policies of enterprise. It also involves the fiscal and regulatory policies of government, for every important Government program (e. g., taxation, social security, rate making, tariffs, aid for education, agriculture, health, or housing) affects the flow of income to and from producers and consumers and therefore balances or unbalances the economy depending upon the wisdom of the application. This fitting of separate actions—both private and public—into the whole picture of economic equilibrium might be called the problem of maintaining maximum purchasing power. It requires still further advances in the science or art of economics, and greater acceptance of this tool by businessmen, farmers, workers, and public officials.

3. We need to define more clearly the respective roles of enterprise and government in maintaining maximum production, employment, and purchasing power. In order that enterprise may exert a major stabilizing role, we need to harmonize our thinking about the size and practices of business and labor organizations with the size and complexity of the modern economy. In order that government may reinforce the stabilizing efforts of enterprise, we need ever-increasing cooperation between the two and we need to weld all national economic policies into a consistent program. This calls for public statesmanship and industrial statesmanship.

4. We need to cultivate an ever-growing understanding and cooperation between management and labor because their actions so largely affect the whole economy. This depends upon the leaders of both. It depends upon specific machinery for cooperation, which the Government can encourage, as well as upon public good will.

5. We need, above all, to achieve the popular agreements and consents without which there can be no effective action in a democracy. This is a challenge to all who help to mold public opinion or disseminate information through the written or spoken word. It calls for practical application of the highest gifts of political science.

These five main lines of concentration are virtually a summary of the purposes of the Employment Act of 1946. This act, approved by a majority of both parties, calls for an annual inventory of the nation's economic condition and an annual program to achieve the declared policy of continuous maximum employment, production and purchasing power. Under the act, the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report and the Council of Economic Advisers to the President have been established, and those charged with responsibility are enjoined to consult with industry, agriculture, labor and consumers. This affords an unprecedented opportunity for the President, the Congress, and the people to participate in shaping the kind of future that we want.

The great philosopher of history, Toynbee, has concluded that no great nation ever succumbed to the pressure of competing ideologies or forces unless it first weakened itself by self-inflicted wounds. If we make the most of our own resources and talents, we have nothing to fear in the course of world events. We hold within our hands the capacity to retain leadership in a peaceful world environment through the strength of our matchless native endowments.

Speech of Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the text of a speech of world-wide importance made on June 2, 1947, by Pope Pius XII.

In his analysis of the conditions that exist in the world of today, of the problems, as well as the menace and danger that confronts decent people throughout the world, and his call for unity, and as a result thereof, unified action on the part of all religions and all decent-minded persons, the message of Pope Pius XII is worthy of deep consideration, to be followed by definite, constructive, unified action in preserving and advancing the truths and fundamentals, spiritual and governmental, that we of all creeds in the United States as well as countless millions of persons in other countries believe in, and which are being challenged by atheistic communism.

TEXT OF POPE'S WARNING OF TYRANNY AND WAR IN SPEECH TO CARDINALS

THE YEAR 1947

Once again the recurrence of the feast of our holy predecessor and heavenly patron provides us with the occasion, venerable brethren, of dwelling for a while with you on the great questions of the tremendous happenings of the day, and on the dangers that threaten the whole world.

May the outpouring of our mind and heart, which find an echo in the thoughts and sentiments so happily expressed to us by your venerable dean, be for each of you, our intimate counselors and faithful helpers, and for ourselves, a stimulus to continue with renewed confidence, greater energy, and calm dedication that apostolic work which today more than ever weighs on all the toilers in the Lord's vineyard, all the ministers of the sanctuary.

The year 1947—what judgment shall the future ages pass on it? It has almost reached half of its course and up to now, to the time of speaking, has it brought anything else to the world except the apparently irreconcilable opposition between the mighty onrush of problems in which it is sinking and entangled, and the humiliating lack of solution for them?

The verdict of history will be in accordance with the results coming from the events and discussions of the months which still remain.

Future generations will either bless or curse it; they will bless if it is means for the great human family a starting point toward the reawakening of the sentiment of brotherhood establishing an order of law and peace worthy of men, useful and beneficial for all; they will curse it, on the other hand, if it means a gradual decline into those stagnant marshes of discord and violence from whose murky depths there can arise only sinister and harmful forebodings of new and incalculable calamities.

SECURITY

The wounds caused by the war have not yet been healed; indeed, some of them have rather been deepened and inflamed.

Was there ever before so much talk of universal security which should have been the fruit of victory? But where is it to be found? Have feelings of uncertainty and the fear of war vanished or, at any rate, have they diminished? If things are considered as they really are, it must be admitted that it is not possible, even with the best of good will, to establish immediately that security for which the human race so ardently longs.

Then, in that case, let not those postwar and peace methods be employed which have nothing to do with punishing the criminals of the war but which create bitter disillusionment, especially among those who had no responsibility for the past regimes and during which they themselves were persecuted and oppressed.

How, indeed, does one help in establishing universal security by heaping up in its very foundations mighty ruins—not only material ones but the ruins of living human beings? How can a Europe feel safe whose members are a prey to despair and to discouragement, the dark and dismal forces of disintegration which the revolutionaries of tomorrow will easily exploit, just as those of yesterday did?

We well know, indeed, the extent and gravity of the unspeakable horrors with which the defeated system covered the face of Europe; nor do we wish to lessen the enormity of its guilt. But how is it possible for the victorious nations, in their turn, to adopt or tolerate the methods of hate and violence on which that system lived and thrived, or how can they use the weapons which aroused their righteous indignation when employed in the hands of others? What sensible man would ever seek a guarantee for his own safety and security in the ruin and misery of his neighbor?

Therefore, once again we desire to exhort and warn the nations: security, as far as it may be realized here below, cannot have any other solid foundation than the physical and moral well-being of a nation, based internally on right public order and externally on normal relations with neighboring states. At present, it is still possible to renew such normal relations, even after the second World War. May the rulers of the states not let slip this opportunity; it may be—God forbid—the last opportunity.

PROSPERITY

Much has been said also about a universal prosperity, which should likewise have resulted from the victory. But where is it? There are, indeed, countries where the wheels of industry turn rapidly and work without interruption and at a maximum capacity. Production — overproduction — that is the golden key, the sesame, the secret formula that would wipe out the last traces of the evils of the war and fill up the craters it made.

But the prosperity of nations cannot be safe and secure if all do not share in it. Hence it is not unlikely that idleness and the impossibility of commerce in which some nations find themselves placed will automatically cause in the near future economic crises and unemployment even in other nations as well.

LIBERTY

Likewise, much was said of the state of liberty which was to have been another perfect fruit of victory—liberty triumphing over despotism and over violence. But this cannot flourish except where justice and law command and efficaciously secure the respect for individual and collective dignity.

Meanwhile the world is still waiting and pleading that justice and law create stable conditions for man and society. In the meantime millions of human beings continue to live under oppression and despotic rule. For them nothing is safe—neither home, nor goods, nor liberty, nor honor; thus, the last ray of happiness—the last spark of courage—dies in their hearts.

In our Christmas message of 1944, addressing a world full of enthusiasm for democracy and eager to be its champion and proponent,

we expounded the main moral requirements for a right and healthy democracy. Today not a few fear that the hope placed in that order has diminished, owing to the striking contrast between democracy in words and the concrete reality.

If at this moment we raise our voice, it is not to discourage the many men of good will who have already set to work nor to belittle what has already been attained, but it is only through a desire to contribute, as far as in us lies, to an improvement of present conditions.

It is not yet too late for the peoples of the earth to bring about in a united and loyal effort, these conditions so indispensable for security, for universal prosperity or at least for a tolerable modus vivendi, and for a helpful organization of liberty.

YOUTH

A consideration of the first importance renders necessary this common effort—the good of youth and of the family.

The church, a tender mother, is not alone in fearing for the welfare of youth. In some countries the new generations from their adolescence and even from infancy suffer from weakness, physical and spiritual anemia caused by material poverty with all its attendant miseries, from an insufficient family life or even from its complete absence, from lack of education and instruction or finally, perhaps, from long years of imprisonment or exile.

Among peoples living under better conditions, dangers of another kind often arising from an excess of wealth and pleasure menace the physical and moral health of youth. This state is still sadder. But there is something even more serious, and it makes the cure of the evil still more difficult—the widespread crisis, indefinitely prolonged, with the disorders it provokes and the uncertainty for the future which it necessarily brings, sows in the hearts of coming generations seeds of distrust in their elders, whom they hold responsible for all the evils they suffer and makes them skeptical of all the principles and values that their elders held in high esteem and passed down to them.

There is a serious danger that very many youths poisoned by these corrupting principles will end by falling into pure nihilism. Woe to the nations the day when there is extinguished in the heart of youth the sacred flame of faith, of ideals, of readiness for sacrifice, of the spirit of dedication. Even though such a state of things were to last but for a short while, who can foresee the consequences?

THE FAMILY

In a similar precarious state of incertitude which tends to continue, what can the future hold in store for the family—that natural nursery and school where the man of tomorrow grows up and is formed?

From districts that suffered most come distressing news of the miserable condition of family, youth, woman. Above all, tragic is the state of the families—if those wandering groups may still be called such—whose fidelity to God's law brought the blessing of a rich crown of children, very often after paying more than others their tribute of blood during the war. Today, they are obliged to suffer more acutely the consequences of the general lack of dwellings and provisions.

It is not God, certainly, who is failing to keep His promise, as the sneers of egoists and the pleasure-loving seem to insinuate; but the incomprehension, the harshness and ill-will of others makes the burden of life well-nigh insupportable for the heroes of conjugal duty.

It is only true heroism, sustained by the grace of God, that is capable of keeping in the hearts of young married people the desire and joy of having a large family. What a humiliation for the world to have fallen so low—into a social condition so opposed to nature.

Before God and faced with this sad truth, we call with all our strength for a speedy remedy and trust that our cry of anguish may resound in the ends of the earth and find an echo in the minds of those who are in charge of public affairs and who cannot ignore that, without a healthy and vigorous family life, a people and a nation are lost. Nothing calls more urgently for the peace of the world than the unspeakably wretched state of the family and of woman.

FEAR NOT

What is the true state of affairs? Who would dare affirm that the 2 years since the cessation of hostilities have marked notable advances in the path of restoration and social progress?

In seeing fruitless conferences succeeding one another and the series of interrupted or postponed discussions being prolonged, the peoples, bitterly deluded in their desire for order, peace, and reconstruction, are coming to lose hope and patience.

It is not our intention to make accusations. We have before our eyes a higher purpose than to pass judgment on what has been done. We wish to forestall new and greater evils in the near and distant future.

During periods of deep agitation of minds and of disordered events we place all our trust in God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and Lord of Lords (II Corinthians 1: 3; I Timothy iv: 15), and after God we place our trust in the faithful of the whole world. To them, then, we address the words that the Divine Master repeated to his disciples: "Fear not."

If there is something today that gives cause for fear, it is fear itself. There is no worse counselor, especially in the present conditions. It only bring dizziness and blindness and leads away from the right and secure path of trust and justice.

False prophets unscrupulously propagate with cunning and violence anti-Christian and atheistic concepts of the world and of the state, which are contrary to the natural law, and as such they have been condemned by the church, particularly in the encyclical, Quadragesimo Anno of our great predecessor, Pius XI. Neither the difficulties of the present nor the cross-fire of propaganda should frighten or mislead you.

Fear, which is a shameful thing in itself, excels in its many disguises. At times it puts on the misleading garb of a declared Christian love for the oppressed; as if suffering people could derive advantage from falsehood and injustice, from mob tactics and from promises that can never be fulfilled.

At other times it hides under the appearance of Christian prudence and under this pretext remains silent when duty should require it to utter a fearless non licet to the rich and powerful, and to caution them thus: It is not lawful for you, in following a greed for gain and dominion, to stray from the inflexible lines of Christian principles which are the bases of political and social life which the Church has repeatedly and with great clarity expounded to the men of our times. To you especially the invitation is addressed to collaborate without reserve in forming a public order which will realize in the highest possible degree, a healthy economic life and social justice.

Thus the exploiters of class warfare will be deprived of the possibility of ensnaring the disappointed and the despoiled people of the world, by telling them that the Christian faith and the Catholic Church are not their ally, but their enemy.

By disposition of the divine providence, the Catholic Church has formulated and promulgated its social doctrine. She points the path to be followed; and no fear of losing possessions or of temporal gains, of appearing less in harmony with modern civilization or less national or social, could authorize true Christians to deviate even a hair's breadth from this path.

PEACE

Considering the sad reality of the numerous and disastrous conflicts which so painfully afflict the world of today and bar the path of peace, it would be equally wrong to shut one's eyes so as not to see or to hold one's arms so as not to act, alleging as an excuse that nothing more can be done. Nothing more can be done? At the very moment when Christians can oppose to vacillating and uncertain principles that fearless courage which is not the mere joyous exuberance of a sanguine nature, but a manifest proof of a supernatural force nourished by the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity?

By means of this force a mighty breath of pure air will sweep over the world, dissipating the atmosphere of panic and pessimism which threatens to poison it; eyes sealed till then, will open to the clear vision of truth and justice. Those in good faith and of good will, who had gone astray, will discover a way out of a situation that has become almost intolerable and advance toward a solution of apparently insurmountable problems.

For those who see things in the light of the supernatural, there is no doubt that even in the most serious conflicts of human and national interest there is always room for a peaceful settlement.

Is this not, perhaps, the mission of the Christian, of the Catholic, in the whirlpool of social and political agitation of today? This is preicsely the explanation of the hatred toward the church that all those cherish whose life depends on dissensions and conflicts and whose interest it is to fan them continuously into flame. They feel almost instinctively that the church, established by God as a rock of brotherhood and of peace, cannot come to terms with the idolatrous worshippers of brute force and of the struggles, inside and outside their frontiers for world domination.

This consideration should be enough to fill you, Catholics, with noble pride because the hatred launched against the church heightens in the eyes of men her spiritual and moral grandeur and her work done for the good of mankind. Be alive to such greatness! It means a task, a duty, a responsibility. It is not without a purpose that Divine Providence has disposed that never more deeply, perhaps, than at present, have all the faithful of the church on earth felt conscious of sharing intimate membership in the mystical body of Christ. Even if the powers of darkness, of disunity, discord, and destruction are spreading today over the whole world, so much more effective must be the superior activity of Christians and their force, derived from union, order, and peace.

What true Catholic could think of shirking such a pressing duty? Apply yourselves, all of you, with earnestness to those tasks; among the timorous be fearless, among the doubters be firm in faith, among the discouraged be strong in hope and be full of love among the skeptics who are devoid of love.

LOVE

Your love is ardent and is as vast as the world. We know it from experience and can in some measure gage it from the admirable generosity by which the Catholics in countries still prosperous helped to relieve the needs of people in greater want. They gave incomparably more than figures published in certain quarters would lead one to believe. To a renewed expression of our gratitude toward all the benefactors, we join once again our earnest exhortation: Let not your love grow cold, but let it spread more widely. There are still so many districts from which rise to heaven a cry of distress and a plea for help.

Heaven hears this cry of anguish, but wishes to heed it through means of your charity. The words of Christ, "As long as you did it to one of these my least brethren you did it to me" (Matt. xxv:40), may also be changed by saying: The good that each of you has done to relieve your neighbor in need has been done by Christ; Christ himself, in you and through you, is helping the poor and the derelict.

Therefore, in the happy certitude that Christ lives and works in each of us, we say to all our sons and daughters throughout the universe:

Strong in faith, put up a good fight! The future belongs to believers and not to the skeptics and doubters.

The future belongs to those who love, not to those who hate.

The church's mission in the world, far from being ended or outmoded, goes out to meet new trial and fresh enterprises.

The task confided to you by providence in this crucial hour is not to conclude a weak and timid peace with the world, but to establish for the world a peace really worthy in the sight of God and man.

Humanity, by its own unaided efforts, cannot win this peace. To implore it from the divine mercy for the poor, torn and tortured world is a duty that all, pastors and flocks, should undertake with fervent zeal, especially during this month consecrated to the heart of the Divine Redeemer.

Animated by an unshakable faith in the power of this suppliant prayer, and as a presage of its being heard, we impart with an ever-flowing heart, on you, venerable brethren, and on all our beloved sons and daughters scattered over the face of the earth, our apostolic benediction.

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation of the Governor of the State of Connecticut:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT.

By His Excellency James L. McConaughy, Governor, a proclamation:

June 14 is the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the decision by our Continental Congress to approve the Stars and Stripes as our Nation's flag. In honor thereof, and pursuant to custom and statute, I hereby proclaim Saturday, June 14, 1947, as Flag Day.

Let us display Old Glory on all buildings, schools, and our homes. It has thrilled us at home; it has inspired the valiant warriors who followed it against our Nation's enemies. It has returned battle-scarred and tattered, but always victorious, from brutal and bloody wars to fly from the flagstaffs of peace, symbolic of the pride, the courage, and the spirit of America.

Today the eyes of the world turn toward Old Glory with prayer and with hope. Let us unfurl it proudly as a constant reminder that democracy and freedom live in our Republic. Out of the exciting tumult and strife of our country's infancy came the glorious red, white, and blue design which has grown into a living thing. Let it emblematize our precious heritage as we cherish our continuing freedom, equality, and fraternity, in days of peace, in days of war, in days of plenty, and in days of need.

Given under my hand and seal of the State at the capitol, in Hartford, this 21st day of May, in the year of our Lord 1947 and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and seventy-first.

[SEAL] JAMES L. MCCONAUGHY.

By His Excellency's command:

FRANCES BURKE REDICK,
Secretary.

Permanent Peace Must Rest on Mutual Understanding—There Is No Better Path to Mutual Understanding Than the Exchange of Students, Teachers, Information, and Skills—H. R. 3342 Is a Measure To Wage Peace and Avert War—It Deserves Your Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, there is no better place in all this world to teach democracy and to demonstrate the virtues of freedom than in the United States. H. R. 3342 proposes in part to enable our State Department to encourage the interchange of students and teachers with friendly nations on a reciprocal basis so that others may learn about America and its cherished concepts by observing our way of life and so that American teachers and students can serve as ambassadors of good will abroad through attendance at foreign schools and colleges.

It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the students of rich foreign families have always been able to attend schools and colleges in the United States. Over 17,000 foreign students are now in this country but they have not been selected by our State Department and they are not participants in the type of program which H. R. 3342 envisages.

H. R. 3342 would establish safeguards and protections in the field of student and teacher interchanges and in connection with such students as are now in this country. These safeguards do not now exist but the passage of H. R. 3342 will equip the State Department with authority to make certain that visiting students and teachers are serious minded, able and loyal foreign subjects who are here for the purpose of learning about America and its great economic, social, and political institutions.

For example, upon the passage of H. R. 3342, the State Department would be required to utilize the formula of reciprocity in the interchange of students and teachers. This means that only visitors for this purpose would be admitted from abroad from those countries granting like concessions and privileges to our nationals in their lands. Thus the United States would cease to be the recipient of students and teachers from areas which deny access to visitors from America. As a further new safeguard which would come into operation with the passage of H. R. 3342, this legislation provides specifically for the prompt deportation of any visiting students or teachers who engage in political activities or who prove unwelcome because of security reasons. Thus instead of increasing the dangers which might conceivably come from the admission of foreigners or visitor's visas, H. R. 3342 actually and definitely takes positive and effective steps to reduce such dangers.

Mr. Speaker, America can afford to show itself to foreign students and teachers. We have a system and a way of life of which we can all be proud and which sells itself quickly to visitors who are given the opportunity to study and understand it. I can think of nothing which would contribute more greatly to the stability of China, for example, than for the United States to admit 1,000 able young Chinese students to learn about America in our schools and colleges with the specific understanding that they return to China to help develop and stabilize their own country. What is true of China is equally true of other nations of the earth where the crying need today is for trained and able leadership. Surely we can ill afford to perpetuate chaos and turmoil abroad by failing to provide an opportunity for carefully selected young foreigners to learn about America by studying in our country.

Mr. Speaker, as a very pertinent example of what I have in mind, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a letter received today by Congressman LANDIS, of Indiana. The author of the letter is Prof. William Hugh Jansen, director of the English program for foreign students in Indiana University, located in Bloomington, Ind. The letter tells its own eloquent story:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH,
Bloomington, Ind., June 7, 1947.

The Honorable GERALD LANDIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANDIS: I am sending you a part of an examination written for me today by my foreign students. Though the English and the script are not always of the best, I wish you would take time to read them so that you may see what some of our foreign students are thinking.

I do this because I understand the Mundt bill, section 201, concerning the exchange of students and teachers between the United States and other lands, is under fire—that there is a fear that such an exchange will expose our institutions to communism and will mean the break-down of immigration bars.

I assure you that nothing is further from the truth. The strongest bulwark protecting democracy against communism in foreign lands will be those students who were once "exchanged" to the United States. And indeed one of the strongest props for our native democracy should be the evident admiration for our institutions in the eyes of these exchange visitors. I can see no greater hope for our future position in the world than can be provided by our extending our educational facilities to future foreign leaders. The leaders of the future of democracy will be those educated here. If we deprive them of that opportunity, where will they go? To nondemocratic countries, of course, and then I fear for the direction that their leadership will take.

The nine papers that I enclose are written by one who is already a teacher, by three who will become teachers, by a prince who will become a political leader, by three who hope to aid their countries in medicine and den-

tistry, and by one who is the scion of a democratic family in a rather autocratic country. I have indicated their nationalities on their papers. One of them spoke no English 4 months ago; only one has had more than a year's experience with the language. They live with American students; they love, and are loved by, American students. Can anybody believe honestly that they are forces for communism in this country? Or can anyone suppose that they will be anything but supporters of what we proudly call the American (i. e., the democratic) way when they return to their countries?

Very sincerely yours,

WM. HUGH JANSEN,
Director of English Programs for Foreign Students.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I desire to quote briefly from a few of the examination papers enclosed with Professor Jensen's letter. I think any fair minded American can convince himself from these statements that America gets big dividends through a program of exchanging students and teachers with other countries.

The first examination paper is from a young student from Chile who is now attending Indiana University. Here is what he says:

My training here called my attention to the good friendship that exists among all the Americans; they don't consider too much the differences of religions, or money, social, and political differences. In Latin American countries all these factors are troubles. In spite of that we are growing up as democratic republics. I think that when the individuals grow and build their personalities thinking not only as individuals but as members of a community, they are able to give welfare to the rest of the people.

Mr. Speaker, this young student will return to Chile with new confidence and enthusiasm for our American concepts.

Here is an examination paper from a student from Costa Rica now at Indiana University. He says:

American people open their homes very easily. Their homes are widely open to the strangers. In Costa Rica it is a little different. We would not invite to our homes the first person we meet. Of the two methods, I like and love the American way.

This next examination paper is a young visitor from Greece now at Indiana University. He says:

I could tell an American that his country has developed and preserved the human freedoms better than any other country in the world. It has developed the ways of living well and comfortably and it has grown up more gloriously than any other country in the present century.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that if we could bring 5,000 young Greek students to the United States, train them in our colleges and universities for 1 year, and then return them to Greece we would do more to strengthen freedom and democracy and to help resist communism in Greece than we can with the multi-hundred-million-dollar aid bill which was recently passed by Congress.

Next I call your attention to an examination paper written by a student from Iran who is now attending Indiana University. He says:

The American people should teach millions of people who live like animals in other countries. You have millions of enlightened people in the United States and they teach lessons of democracy to the reactionary people of the Middle East.

Here is the proof of the pudding, Mr. Speaker. Here is testimony from first-hand sources that what H. R. 3342 proposes to encourage and systematize and expand has vast potential possibilities for spreading freedom throughout the world, for stiffening the resistance to communism and other totalitarian techniques, and for cementing friendships with the United States which are literally priceless. No wonder Gen. Ike Eisenhower came before our committee to plead for the passage of H. R. 3342 and the comprehensive program it proposes to establish at the cost mind you—at the very insignificant cost, I repeat—of less than one-fourth the cost of a single battleship.

Let me read you a sentence from the examination paper of a student from Turkey now attending Indiana University. He says:

Before the First World War there wasn't any relation between Turkey and the United States. But the second war changed everything. Now it is easy to see frequent relations in all the fields especially in culture and economics. These relations are going to attract many Americans to Turkey. I hope they will like it.

Let me complete these exhibits by quoting from a paper written by a Brazilian student now attending Indiana University. He writes:

This country is a marvelous one. What makes it marvelous are the little things we see in the streets, the little machines that come to our lands, the gaiety of the people and their friendship and belief in democracy that leads this country to be the first in the world. God bless America.

Mr. Speaker, can we afford to discontinue or cripple a program paying dividends in lasting friendship and respect such as are indicated by the quotations which I have just read? These comments were written in the course of an ordinary examination in English during which each student was invited to write his own thoughts on the subject, What I Could Tell an American About His Country. I have read you passages from the original papers handed in by the students. Their English and handwriting were not always of the best but their enthusiasm and friendship for America leaves nothing further to be desired.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, since so many have asked questions about the safeguards in H. R. 3342 and the congressional controls written into the legislation by our committee, I am inserting at this point a summary of those 20 safeguards which I described in detail on the floor of the House last Friday:

Let me give you the facts from the printed record and I hope you will supplement this information by reading the comprehensive volume of hearings which we held on H. R. 3342 and the committee report which accompanies it. Here, however, by specific, definite reference to page, section, and line are the new safeguards by which Congress will direct the activities of this new program and by which Congress will keep it constantly under its control and supervision.

No. 1. On page 3, section 201, line 15, you will find set forth in unmistakably clear language the doctrine of reciprocity governing our international relations and activities. I have discussed this previously in this address so I shall not elaborate upon it further now.

No. 2. On the same page, page 3, starting on line 21, you will observe that we require the Secretary of State to turn over for deportation any foreign visitor who abuses the privileges he enjoys under his visitor's visa by engaging in activities of a political nature or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States. May I add, Mr. Chairman, that since visitors are now in the United States and will always be here whether we enact H. R. 3342 or not, this is a highly significant new safeguard since it gives the Secretary of State authority and instructions which will not only stop any existing un-American activities on the part of foreign visitors but which will make certain under the exchange program we propose to establish there shall be no abuses of this type. This safeguard is specific, stern, and clear.

No. 3. On page 4, section 203, line 19, we provide that no assistance under this act shall be furnished of any character not in keeping with the free democratic principles and the established foreign policy of the United States. Mr. Chairman, here once again we write into law the clear conviction of Congress that this shall be an American program, projecting American concepts, and conforming with American ideals.

No. 4. Page 9, line 4: Here we make clear that nothing in this act shall authorize the extension of services and advice to foreign countries relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government. You see, Mr. Chairman, throughout this legislation we retain the fundamental purpose of this program. This is a peace bill, sir, and not in any sense a war measure or a military proposition.

No. 5. On page 8, section 403, line 12, we specify that the Secretary of State shall encourage the performance of the services proposed under this legislation by private American individuals and agencies. Only where private enterprise is unable or unwilling to function is it contemplated the information and educational exchange program established under H. R. 3342 shall be handled by the Government itself.

No. 6. Again on page 8, section 403, line 16, we provide that the services abroad rendered by a Government agency shall be advisory, investigative, or instructional in character for purposes of demonstration and not in competition with private enterprise.

No. 7. Still on page 8, section 403, line 20, we make even clearer that such services abroad shall not include the construction of public works or the supervision of such construction. It is our purpose to aid private engineers and private American enterprises to secure business connections and contracts abroad and not in any way to interfere with private enterprise. That we have been successful in doing this is clearly apparent from the fact that the Committee on International Relations of the Engineers Joint Council has enthusiastically recommended passage of this bill. The testimony of their spokesmen is found on page 178 of the printed hearings available to each of you.

No. 8. Page 9, line 8: We specify that services by our Government to foreign countries shall not be undertaken if such services will impair the fulfillment of domestic responsibilities of any Government agency. In other words, we clearly recognize and stipulate that the primary function of an American Government agency is to handle the needs and requirements of Americans first.

No. 9. Page 9, line 12: Here we stipulate clearly that this is to be no great haven of bureaucracy and no starry-eyed adventure by impractical idealists or theorists. Here it is provided that the Department of State shall invite in outstanding leaders—please note the language is mandatory—in the various fields of activity covered by this act to review and extend advice on the policies in each of the various categories concerned.

No. 10. Page 11, section 502, line 7: We have made it crystal clear in the language of this so-called Mundt bill that this program

will not establish competitive Government radio and press agencies to compete with private American enterprise. Note the language of this specific congressional directive:

"The Secretary shall encourage and facilitate by appropriate means the dissemination abroad of information about the United States by private individuals and agencies, shall supplement such private information dissemination where necessary, and shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate."

Mr. Chairman, the Office of Information and Educational Exchange as proposed by H. R. 3342 will become the only Government agency in the United States operating under a congressional mandate to work itself out of a job as soon as possible.

No. 11. Page 11, line 15: Here we stipulate directly that this act shall not be construed in any way to give the Government a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs or a monopoly in any other medium of information. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to observe here that all seven of the short-wave licensees in the United States are in favor of this program and that well over 80 percent of the editorial opinion of this country has also been expressed in support of it.

No. 12. Page 11, line 17: We provide specifically here that the State Department shall—again please note this is a directive and not a suggestion—invite in outstanding private leaders in cultural and informational fields to review and extend advice on the Government's international information activities. We have proposed, sir, to mobilize in this great crusade to win and preserve the peace the best brains and capacities of America both in and out of Government in every field of endeavor and pursuit incorporated in this legislation.

No. 13. Page 11, still in section 502, near the bottom of this page, please, on line 23: To make double certain and completely positive that there shall be no competition by the Government against private enterprise we stipulate that all films, broadcasts, and other materials in the fields of mass media shall be identified as to Government source when they are so projected.

No. 14. Page 14, line 4: Again to make positive that this becomes truly the voice of America we stipulate that the employment of aliens shall be sharply limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available. These will be very few in number but where they are required their services become invaluable.

No. 15. Page 16, section 703, starting on line 21: To prevent this operation from becoming a sprawling bureaucratic office and to safeguard the American taxpayer we specify that the maximum use must be made of existing Government property and facilities where Government property or services are required to be used under this act. Thus where Embassy property abroad can be used, it will be; where existing offices can be used at home, that is required. Small as are the outside expenditures to be made by this operation, we have set up safeguards that they all be used, economically and efficiently.

No. 16. Page 18, section 901, starting on line 14: This is the now famous loyalty check on all personnel to be used in this program. It requires that all people employed or assigned to duties under this act must first be screened and certified as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I have discussed this earlier in this speech so I shall not amplify upon this safeguard further now. It is the complete answer, however, to those who worry, as all of us rightfully should, lest un-American influences creep into this or any other division of the State Department. You can be sure before the FBI certifies as to their loyalty the people in this division will be completely and adequately investigated and examined.

No. 17. Page 19, section 904, line 20: This safeguard provides that nothing in this act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure is prohibited by other law of the United States, such as in the case of atomic developments, for example, or where it is inconsistent with the security of the United States. Since the War Department is to be represented on the Interdepartmental Coordinating Committee advising the Secretary of State on the conduct of this program, this provides a full and effective safeguard concerning our military secrets as well as upon other developments which might better not be disclosed.

No. 18. Page 20, section 906, line 18: Once again to make definite and clear the mandate of Congress we here provide that it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State—need I add, sir, that any Cabinet officer can be impeached for a violation of duty—that insofar as is practicable the services and facilities of private agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise, must be utilized in carrying out the provisions of this act. By bringing in here the element of contractual arrangements we specifically provide the avenue and agency for utilizing a wide field of private agencies in implementing the program set up in H. R. 3342.

No. 19. Page 21, section 908, beginning on line 6: To retain the full control of this program in the hands of Congress—and whom, may I ask, are we to trust if we cannot trust ourselves?—we provide that the authority of this act or any provision of it shall terminate whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. Since such a termination procedure does not require the signature of the President, it means that a simple majority of the Congress can terminate this program in whole or in part at any time it so desires or at any time it finds or feels that the program is neither effective nor efficient. Seldom has legislation been written which carries a more direct and decisive safeguard.

No. 20. Page 21, section 909, which is the final section of the act and which begins on line 11: Here we provide that the Secretary of State must submit to Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under the authority of H. R. 3342. In addition we must appropriate the money specifically for every activity under the act at the beginning of each fiscal year.

From These Beginnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune on its one hundredth anniversary, June 10, 1947:

FROM THESE BEGINNINGS

The Tribune was born into the most dynamic era in history. More changes in the conditions of human life were to take place within a few generations than in all the previous centuries together. It is the moment of all moments to start a newspaper, for change is news and great changes are great news.

So many revolutionary discoveries and inventions in the physical and biological sciences were to be made in the century that men came to expect them. There was to be a great surge of activity in the old arts and the creation of new ones. Civilization was to march across half a continent of virgin wilderness. Plagues were to be conquered and illiteracy largely overcome in the western world. Nations were to rise and fall. Great wars were to be followed by a period of relative peace and then by still greater wars. There were to be profound political and moral crises within a Nation composed then of only 29 States.

If there was a better spot than Chicago from which to view the pageant we can only wonder where it was. At the beginning, in 1847, the frontier had moved beyond Chicago, but not far beyond it. It was a city by statute, but in population hardly more than a village on the edge of largely unbroken prairies and in the shadow of the northern forests. Within three generations it was to become the center of the most productive of all agricultural and industrial areas and to find itself close to the center of population of the leading Nation on earth.

By 1847 there was need of a new journalism, with new methods of collecting and organizing the news. Few editors yet realized that their readers wanted something more than casual items copied from whatever sources came to hand. The failure to meet the needs of the new day goes far to explain why so few of the newspapers then in existence have survived. It was the Tribune's good fortune that its editors were in step with the new times, especially after 1855 when Joseph Medill and his colleagues acquired the paper. By 1881, Medill could look upon his achievement and say:

"As a news-gatherer, the Tribune is already the leading American newspaper. It uses the telegraph more freely and more wisely than any other journal; it has a larger and better staff of correspondents than any other; its news is better edited and more judiciously displayed than that of any of its contemporaries. It does not throw the burden of selection, arrangement, and distribution upon its readers, but gives them all the news in convenient form."

Those who seek an explanation of the Tribune's continuing success can find no small part of the answer in those few lines. Call it a knack, call it an art, a tradition or anything else, the recognition of what is news and the presentation of it in sharp focus are Tribune specialities that put us on top and have kept us there.

Many of the newspapers of a century ago, especially in the older sections of the East and South, addressed themselves to an aristocracy. Here, in the heart of the old Northwest Territory, dedicated as it was to the political equality of men and to universal free education, there was no temptation to cater to rank. The Tribune was to be every one's newspaper in a community where all were assumed to be concerned equally in public matters. The aristocratic press, with few exceptions, did not survive the subsequent competition of the vulgar press. The Tribune did without sinking into vulgarity. It learned early how to win and hold the lead in circulation without crawling into the gutter, and without demogogic appeals to class prejudice.

There was something else in The Tribune's tradition that was even more important. The Tribune in Chicago was strategically situated in its formative years to play a leading part in the political and moral conflict that was impending. Here in Illinois, more sharply perhaps than in any other State, the issue of slavery and its extension was focused. In part, that was because in Illinois, as in Indiana and Ohio, the southern counties were settled in the main by men from the slave States and the northern counties by men from free soil. As late as 1853, 6 years

after the founding of the Tribune, the proslavery forces in Illinois were the stronger. They proved it by enacting a series of laws which forbade any Negro, slave or free, to enter the State and punished violators by ordering them sold at auction for a term of service sufficient to pay their fines. The best that the antislavery forces in the legislature could do was to win approval of a provision requiring a jury trial in such cases.

In a State so divided, it was inevitable that the political leaders of both parties should temper their doctrines in the hope of attracting the support of the middle-of-the-road men. Thus, Lincoln, who hated slavery, insisted over and over again that slavery must be protected in the States in which it existed, but not in the Territories; Douglas was equally insistent that the mere permission to extend slavery into the Territories, which he advocated, need not and probably would not result in its extension.

Here was a distinction with a real difference, but it was a subtle one which could easily have been glossed over. In the circumstances, the Tribune might have chosen to remain neutral in the hope that by avoiding offense to the Douglas following it would win new friends, lose no old ones, and recover its solvency, for at the time the paper was in serious financial difficulties. Something like neutrality was, in fact, the line which Greeley took and because his weekly New York Tribune circulated widely in Illinois, he did heavy injury to Lincoln's cause.

Medill didn't have the kind of mind that could miss the point that a victory for Douglas would be a victory for slavery, and a victory for Lincoln a victory for freedom. That was enough and more than enough to decide his course. The Tribune, taking no account of the risks, was in the fight with everything it had.

"We need not say," Medill could write a few years later, "that the Tribune, whatever its other faults, has not that of timidity." And he could add, with justified pride: "We go our own way, at our own time, in our own manner, in company of our own choosing, knowing as we do that vindication will be sure to follow. We can afford to be honest and fearless, and to wait."

That became the Tribune's tradition. Readers of today do not have to be reminded that it is still operative. The bigger Mr. Roosevelt's popular majorities grew, the harder the Tribune fought the New Deal, just as, against heavy odds, the Tribune had slugged it out with Lorimer, Small, and Thompson. The Tribune in a century has never compromised its convictions to sell more papers or to avoid injury to itself.

The readers seem to like it that way. So do the men and women who together make this newspaper. No doubt that is one reason why we have today, as we have always had, the cream of the crop not only in the editorial departments but in the mechanical and business branches as well.

It's been a great century and in the course of it we have learned a lot and probably forgotten a lot, too. But we haven't forgotten how to get all the news and present it; and we haven't learned how to play safe in great moral and political crises. It will have to be that way in the second century, too.

Your Chances of Getting Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1947

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while I come across some figures which appear to me to clarify the basis of our Republican actions here in the Congress and to give added reasons why the American people must vote for solvency if they are to save themselves.

For more than 15 years the so-called common man has been voting for security, but all the time he has been losing his chances of attaining security. Every time he has voted for more security in the form of bigger Government handouts, he has lowered the value of the dollar and made more difficult the task of all working Americans who want to save enough to care for themselves when they are too old to work.

James H. McGraw, president of McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., has given the figures and the explanations which show these facts far more clearly than I could give them myself.

He points out in the editorial and accompanying statistics that a man now must earn four times as much money to save as much toward retirement as he did in 1914. A typical American, not looking for hand-outs but anxious to prepare his future against starvation and degradation, must make more than twice as many dollars each year as he made in 1929 to save a comparable amount of money for his old age. The return on the money in the form of interest has decreased steadily, as have the value of the dollars, so he must save twice as much as he once did to have only as much security.

In other words, the Government itself has been working to make it virtually impossible for millions of our citizens to do anything but seek a public dole. That is why we are in the shape we are in—with plenty of dollars for exhibition, but not quite enough to buy what we must have. I saw a cartoon of a farmer carrying a bag full of money the other day and the caption on it was, "We used to go to the store with a pocketful of money and get a bagful of groceries. Now we go with a bag of money and get a pocketful of groceries."

That is about what the New Deal has brought us to. Under permission to extend my remarks I include the following editorial and accompanying statistics from the June 2, 1947, issue of Aviation News:

Your Chances of Getting Ahead

For 20 years we have been whittling away the foundations of our economic structure. We have been cutting away the incentives to "get ahead in the world," to increase production, and to improve efficiency. Unless this process is reversed soon, we risk the sort of industrial stagnation that currently afflicts Great Britain so disastrously.

How far the whittling has gone is shown by the statement at the end of this article. It shows that everyone's stake in working harder and getting ahead has been reduced sharply since 1929. In that year anyone who was even moderately successful could look forward to reaping the rewards of his success. If he earned $5,300 annually over a period of 25 years he could retire on a comfortable income of $3,000 per year. Or he could pile up enough capital to go into business for himself. He could fulfill the American dream as phrased by Abraham Lincoln in his first annual message to Congress in 1861:

"The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system, which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress, and improvement of condition to all."

Look at the situation today. To retire on an annual income from investment that will buy as much as $3,000 did in 1929, a young man needs to earn over $13,000 a year for 25 years. That's more than 2½ times the income he would have needed in 1929. The same thing is true of acquiring a stake in a business.

Although the dollar income needed for retirement rose 75 percent between 1914 and 1929, the average person's chances of getting ahead improved. This is because the average man's income was rising; it was double the 1914 level by 1929. So more people were within striking distance of success and security.

WHY TRY TO SUCCEED?

It was a different story after 1929. The income needed for retirement today is 2½ times the 1929 amount. Meanwhile average incomes are up only 80 percent. So the average person's chances of achieving success are actually slimmer now than in a generation.

What is more, fewer people actually do achieve success today. Only 1 percent of all families now have incomes large enough to build up a retirement fund or acquire a stake in a business. In 1929, almost 6 percent of all families attained a comparable degree of success.

Higher taxes are the most important reason why it takes so much more now to build up a competence. They account for one-half the increase in the amount needed. The other half is explained by higher living costs and lower interest rates.

It is, of course, true that few people ever get into the higher income brackets. So the process of cutting away the incentives which play such a key role in our economic system affects comparatively few people immediately. It does, however, have a powerful indirect affect on all of us.

EVERYBODY LOSES

When half to four-fifths of any additional income of successful people goes to Uncle Sam a heavy drag is obviously put on doing the work to get it. Thus, we stand to lose the benefit of full use of the Nation's best brains. By so doing we stifle industrial progress. And the loss in productive efficiency far outweighs the amount of tax revenue the Treasury gains. Carried far enough, the process of stifling economic progress by slashing rewards leads straight to industrial stagnation.

The same process also multiplies the risks of embarking on new capital investment. High taxes rule out all but the most profitable new projects and restrict most expansions to boom times when profits are high. So capital investment follows a boom-and-bust pattern and, by so doing, contributes much to ups and downs in production and employment.

THE SORRY PLIGHT OF BRITAIN

The case of Britain today provides an object lesson of how blighted incentives produce industrial stagnation. Britain's number one economic problem is to get more production. But the tax load there is so heavy it stifles the incentive to produce more.

A coal miner who works an extra shift pays about a third of his added earnings to the tax collector. And, as the London Economist comments, tax rates on business executives are so high that they kill every incentive except that to tax evasion. In short, not only is the incentive to succeed blighted, but so is the incentive to work. A root cause of Britain's trouble is this: The cost of an expensive program of social benefits has been piled on top of the heavy costs

of paying for past wars and trying to prevent future wars. Tax rates are boosted accordingly. What her experience proves is that the attempt to provide excessive social benefits may defeat itself. It raises the tax burden on rich and poor alike and smothers the incentive to work. So the underlying basis of all economic benefits—production—is eaten away.

We in the United States haven't traveled as far down the stagnation road as Britain has. Taxes amount to about 26 percent of national income here as against about 45 percent there. But unless we start soon to build up incentives to do better work, instead of whittling them away as we have been doing, we will catch up with Britain fast.

IT'S LATE BUT NOT TOO LATE

Can anything be done? Decidedly yes, particularly by tax reform and reduction in the cost of living. As far as interest rates are concerned, any large increase would raise excessively the cost of carrying our war-swollen national debt, and hence raise taxes. But some increase in what are now excessively low interest rates may well be both feasible and desirable.

Action on the tax front is the first order of business. Our jerry-built tax structure is the thing that is chiefly responsible for cutting the incentives to work harder. Two things are important: (1) Government spending must be pared on the bone; (2) the tax system must be completely overhauled to remove the shackles on all-out production.

The fifty-sixth editorial in this series, published in March, outlined major steps that need to be taken in remodeling Federal taxes in order to increase incentives to individual and business enterprise. The revenue bill now before Congress is no more than a short step in the right direction. Much more must be done to clear the way for high production and rising living standards.

Lifting the blight which taxes now place on incentives would help cut the high cost of living. It would stimulate greater production and greater efficiency. But a further step is necessary. Part of the benefits of improved efficiency must be passed on to consumers in the form of lower prices.

In the past few years we have been following precisely the opposite course. In many cases wages have been increased all out of proportion to increased productivity. Result—soaring prices and a severe squeeze of the consumer, to which some greedy exploitation of war-created shortages has also contributed.

TO GIVE ABILITY A CHANCE

Our basic and most crucial problem is to get back on the track which leads to higher production and improved living standards all along the line. We got off that track in the thirties. Then, we started scrambling for larger slices of the same pie instead of trying to produce a larger pie. Now the process of getting back on the track is greatly complicated by the tremendous tax burden growing out of the war.

Yet it's not too late to turn back from the road that leads to industrial stagnation. As the statement in the center of the page shows, we could restore the odds of getting ahead to what they were in 1929. Cutting the Federal budget to $25,000,000,000 a year and putting the tax structure in good order are the crucial first steps.

By taking these steps soon, Congress can go far to restore the incentives to hard work and efficiency which have been so largely washed away in the past 20 years. If they are not taken the American dream of getting ahead by hard and effective work will exist only in the history books, and our children will inherit from us an economic order without opportunity, without hope, without individual liberty.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, JR.,
President, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

To see how your chances of getting on in the world have changed during the past few decades, the McGraw-Hill department of economics has calculated how much it now takes to save enough to acquire a retirement income or a comparable stake in a business, as compared to what it took in 1914 and 1929.

The objective set is an income from investment equal to $3,000 a year in 1929 dollars. It is assumed that the savings required to yield this income are made over a period of 25 years. During that period it is also assumed that $4,000 per year (in 1929 dollars) is spent on living expenses. Several other factors were omitted from the calculations because they would not have a decisive effect on the results. Thus, existence of social-security pensions now reduces the income needed; but if State income taxes were added, the income needed would increase.

Here is how the figures work out:

	Yearly income needed
1914	$3,075
1929	5,267
1947	13,221

It now takes more than four times as large an annual income as it did in 1914 to gain a comparable stake. It takes well over twice as much as it did in 1929.

Changes in three factors—Federal income taxes, living costs, and interest rates—explain why the income needed has multiplied so. Here's how these factors line up for the 3 years.

Year	Federal income taxes—married man, 2 dependents		Cost of living (index numbers, 1935–39)	Interest rate high-grade corporate bonds
	$5,000 income	$10,000 income		
				Percent
1914	$10	$60	71.8	5
1929	3	40	122.5	5
1947	589	1,862	155.0	2½

Similar calculations show that if we could reduce Federal expenditures from $35,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 annually, raise interest rates by one-tenth, and lower living costs by 15 percent—all realistic possibilities if we make the effort—then the income needed to build up such a retirement fund would come down to $9,500. The chances of realizing that goal would then be restored to what they were in 1929.

Conditions in the Balkan Area of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very informative letter received by me from Reuben H. Markham, of Boston, Mass., who writes with an experience of 35 years in actual contact with conditions in the Balkan area of Europe:

BOSTON, MASS.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am writing this letter to tell you why I believe you should support President Truman's proposal to stop the advance of Soviet-backed imperial communism at Greece's northern border.

My claim to your consideration is the fact that I have spent most of the last 35 years in the Balkans, first as a missionary teacher in Bulgaria, and for 20 years as the correspondent of one of America's most influential newspapers. During the war I was deputy director of OWI for the Balkans and served overseas in the Middle East area. I returned to the Balkans as a correspondent in 1945 and came back in July 1946, after having been expelled by the Red army.

Imperial communism is engaged in a political and conspiratorial offensive throughout the world and is devoting its chief efforts to the Balkan front. It holds the whole of eastern Europe, except Greece, and is trying to break through Greece into the eastern Mediterranean, the Near East, and Africa.

RUSSIA IMPOSES COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT

The Communist-led governments of the Balkan countries north of Greece were imposed by Russia. Mr. Andrei Y. Vishinsky personally forced the present government upon Rumania March 6, 1945. He had flown from Moscow to Bucharest for the purpose. Backed by the Red army then occupying Rumania, he ousted a pro-Allied government, which had been loyal to America and Britain as well as to Russia, and placed the country in the hands of four Communists, three of whom had recently come from Russia.

The Bulgarian Government was set up in the Soviet Legation in Sofia and was imposed upon the country on September 9, 1944, as the Red Army approached the Bulgarian capital. It replaced a pro-Allied government. It is run by fanatical Bulgarian Communists who came from Russia and have long been in the service of world revolution.

Tito and his six Communist comrades who govern Yugoslavia, all of whom have been trained in Russia, were enabled to seize power in that country through Red Army aid and—with some misdirected Allied help.

The Albanian government is a Soviet creation, mistakenly helped to power by the British.

The Hungarian Communists, with Red Army backing and direction, are violently taking over power in Hungary, replacing the pro-Allied regime. The chief Communist there came from Russia.

In other words, Russia exercises direct control over all of southeast Europe except Greece, and through armed Communists is striving to seize that country.

PHONY COMMUNIST FRONTS

In all cases Soviet Russia works through phony fronts. They are said to represent the oppressed common people, who have risen up and joined hands to throw off feudal yokes. That is false. The fronts are exclusively Communist instruments, devised to deceive the natives and the rest of the world.

These fake Balkan coalitions are said to consist of peasants, workers, and progressive intellectuals, according to the classic Soviet formula. At first they did contain Communists, Socialists, some Peasant Party leaders, and a few feeble bourgeois democrats. But every element not subservient to Russian-directed communism has been forced out. These fronts now contain only compromised remnants of Socialist parties, a few renegade "democrats," and not a single authentic peasant leader. They are Communist tools.

The Greek EAM or National Liberation Front is of the same nature. With the exception of the Communists, it contains no group that before the war was any stronger there than the prohibition party is in the United States. The EAM is a Communist-formed and Communist-directed front, using four especially created or fictitious groups as Communist stooges. It is working for world revolution, as is all the "front governments" in southeast Europe.

THE BALKAN COMMUNISTS ARE TYRANTS

The Russian-imposed, Russian-directed Communist governments in the lands north of Greece maintain totalitarian regimes. They have wiped out a large part of their real or potential political opponents in bloody purges, whose brutality has not been equalled in modern Balkan history.

They maintain large organizations of secret police which keep watch on dwellings, places of business, schools, coffee houses and practically every citizen. This exclusively Communist police works through terror, prisons, concentration camps. It controls jobs, civil-service positions, the distribution of food, clothing and dwellings. It works hand in hand with people's courts that operate as branches of the Communist Party and are in the service of world communism.

The Balkan armies are under Communist control and serve as sections or auxiliaries of the Russian Red Army. Like the "Glorious Red Army" they are above criticism. They are as sacrosanct as kings and emperors used to be.

SLAVE LABOR

The Balkan workers and practically all job holders have been forced into state unions directed by Communist dictators. In Yugoslavia, the Communist labor boss has come direct from Russia. The other Balkan labor bosses were trained in Russia. Slave labor and forced labor are officially and extensively practiced in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania. Men and women are snatched on the streets. Members of the free professions must get licenses from Communist officials.

Most property in Yugoslavia used for productive purposes, such as workshops, stores and factories, has been confiscated by the Communists. In Bulgaria Communists control most factories and much of the trade.

PEASANTS ARE PERSECUTED

The peasants are objects of special persecution in each Communist-dominated Balkan country. Some peasants have been robbed of their land; others have been put into Sovhozi (state farms) and Kolhozi (cooperative farms) and reduced to the status of work gangs. Everything produced by the peasants is subject to confiscation by the state, and much is being confiscated. Not one peasant leader in any Communist-ruled land is allowed freely to carry on his political activity. Most are subject to extreme repression. Not a few have been killed. To receive land or supplies, peasants must join Communist or Communist-led parties.

With property, enterprises, jobs, workers unions and the peasantry under communistic control; with the police, army, and courts serving as departments of the Communist Parties, every family's subsistence is at the mercy of the Communists.

THEY IMPRISON MINDS

The schools, from the kindergartens up, are Communist controlled and serve as institutions for Communist indoctrination. Communist students force the dismissal of non-Communist professors. Communist-led workers demolish student dormitories.

The publication of books and magazines is under Communist direction and control. In Yugoslavia there is no opposition publication or paper; in Bulgaria the last opposition daily has been suspended; in Albania even opposition whispers are stifled.

The radio is exclusively in Communist hands. Sport organizations, women's societies, children's and youth's associations, touring clubs, and every other social institution have been taken over by Communists. Religious activity is restricted, though religious services are permitted.

DRIVE AGAINST GREECE

The purpose of such tyranny is twofold: First to enable a minority to hold power and second to convert the Balkan peoples into shock troops for the advance of imperial communism.

Already Russia is using those troops for further advances. She and her satellites are pushing against Greece with great force in order to establish a solid front of Communist regimes from Moscow to Athens.

Soviet Russia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania give constant and extensive moral support to the Communist-led Greek rebels. Yugoslavia and Bulgaria also give them military aid. Slav Communists in Greece, closely connected with Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, are among the most active fighters against the Athens government. They and their comrades in Belgrade and Sofia want to separate large northern areas from Greece; they want to partition Greece, through the device of a "free Aegean Macedonia."

Naturally, there are other factors in the situation. Greece is a barren, overpopulated land, crowded with destitute refugees. It suffered greatly from the war—from many wars. The nation has long been divided into political factions that have bitterly fought each other. There are armed Fascist conspirators as well as armed Communist conspirators. The Government is not free from graft.

But these matters, though exceedingly regrettable, are only subsidiary. The salient fact, overriding all others, is that armed Communist conspirators forming part of a Balkan Communist front are trying to impose a Tito-like regime on Greece. They have been striving toward that since 1943, working closely with Tito and directly with Soviet missions. For that they created EAM. Sometimes the Communists have been in the Government, as in 1944, sometimes out of the Government, but in all cases they have worked with equal vehemence and treachery to seize exclusive power. Regardless of whether there is a king or president in Athens, whether this government exists or another, the Communists will continue to work for power, with violence and deceit.

The task to which President Truman has called America is not easy. Nor will it be brief. One of the most terrific world forces in history is trying to break through the Greek front as a further step toward setting up a global Soviet system. What is pressing on Greece is not a few mountain rebels, but world communism. America is asked to check that force of darkness and tyranny, not chiefly for the sake of the 7,000,000 Greek people—though that is important—but in order to hold the American front against total enslavement.

Sincerely,

REUBEN H. MARKHAM.

MARCH 27, 1947.

Mr. Ickes Reviews Vote Frauds by Pendergast Machine in Kansas City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1947

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, June 9, 1947:

MAN TO MAN—FIGURES CITED IN REVIEW OF VOTE FRAUDS BY PENDERGAST MACHINE IN KANSAS CITY

(By Harold L. Ickes)

It is hoped that President Truman is hot on the trail of the ballot thieves of Kansas City. In the meantime, it might be helpful to have a little more of the background of that primary campaign in the President's own congressional district where not only the ballots but an election was stolen.

When President Truman made up his mind to purge Representative Slaughter, he turned to Jim Pendergast for support. Mr. Pendergast had already announced that he would be for Mr. Slaughter. Notwithstanding this, the President called Mr. Pendergast to Washington and insisted that he desert Mr. Slaughter and support Mr. Axtell. He did, and on the face of the returns, Mr. Axtell won the nomination. But the returns from the political bad-lands dominated by the Pendergast machine were so grotesque as to arouse suspicion that votes had been stolen for Mr. Axtell.

It appears that in the four wards in President Truman's congressional district, the total vote for Mr. Axtell was 12,104. That for Representative Slaughter was 2,075. Since the Axtell plurality in the entire district was only about 2,000, this means that the additional 10,000 votes for Mr. Axtell in the Pendergast hunting ground nominated him. The next chapter in the story was of indictments by the grand jury involving 71 persons. The theft of the ballots followed as a matter of course.

RETURNS IN SENATE RACE CITED

If the foregoing figures are interesting, the following will not be less so. President Truman wanted to be county collector in 1934. But "Boss" Tom Pendergast made him Senator instead. The returns from the Pendergast strongholds in Kansas City in the primary election held in August of that year were also in the Pendergast pattern.

At that time Harry S. Truman was an obscure county judge, whose duties were really those of a county commissioner. He was nominated after a hard fight with the late John J. Cochran, of St. Louis. In that primary the following votes in Kansas City were significant: ward 1, Truman 17,485, Cochran 49; ward 2, Truman 15,145, Cochran 24; ward 3, Truman 8,182, Cochran 34. The total in these three wards was Truman 40,812, Cochran 107, or a plurality in four Pendergast wards alone of 40,705. Truman carried the State over Cochran by 40,745 votes.

In 1934 there were alleged to be 21,731 registered voters in ward 1, from whom Mr. Truman received 17,845 votes. A later investigation disclosed that there were 8,462 possible voters in the ward in 1944. In ward 2, in 1934 there were 20,097 registered voters of whom 15,145 voted for Mr. Truman. The 1944 investigation disclosed only 9,018 persons eligible to vote. In ward 3, in 1934 there were 13,845 registered voters, of whom 8,142 voted for Mr. Truman, while 10 years later an investigation disclosed only 6,845 eligible voters. This net loss of 31,547 voters from wards 1, 2, and 3 of Kansas City may have been a bona fide loss, but I doubt it. It looks as if the registry had been padded with ghost voters in 1934.

EIGHTY-FIVE THOUSAND GHOSTS FOUND

While the figures quoted relate only to three sample wards, the same situation, in fact, existed in eight wards in Kansas City. Mr. Truman in all eight wards had received a total of 82,989 as against 387 votes for Mr. Cochran. The 1944 investigation disclosed a total of 85,000 ghost voters in 16 wards of Kansas City. It seems that these ghost voters accounted for the Truman plurality. It is significant that Mr. Truman won over Mr. Cochran by only 40,745 votes, which is less than 50 percent of all the number of ghost voters.

In 1940 Senator Truman was again nominated, this time over Governor Stark. His plurality was only about 7,000 votes. Again, the Pendergast machine with its ghosts supported Mr. Truman.

In the 1936 election, the Pendergast machine had again brazenly stolen ballots. The United States district attorney at that time

was Maurice Milligan, the brother of Tuck Milligan who had fought Mr. Truman in 1934 for the Democratic nomination for Senator. As the two Milligan brothers studied the returns coming in on election night from precincts that they were confident Tuck Milligan had carried, Maurice vowed to break the Pendergast machine and send the vote thieves to the penitentiary. As a result of his efforts, 278 election officials were sentenced. In 13 jury trials, 63 were convicted, 36 pleaded guilty, and 160 entered pleas of nolo contendere. The cases that were nolle prossed numbered 19.

After he became President, Mr. Truman proceeded to pardon (not parole) a number of these election officials who had been convicted. When one of them, Mrs. Frances Ryan, who had been a judge of election, was pardoned, Charles G. Ross, publicity secretary for President Truman, tried to satisfy the public curiosity by saying that it was a "routine matter." Perhaps he was thinking of vote-stealing by the Pendergast machine.

Address of Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a commencement address delivered by our colleague, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, on June 5, 1947, to the graduates of Belmont Abbey College and the Preparatory School, at Belmont, N. C.:

Most Reverend Abbot, very reverend and reverend Fathers, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, and ladies and gentlemen, you are about to leave this splendid institution of learning, in which you have spent important years of your life in its formative period, some of you to continue your studies elsewhere, some of you to continue in this institution and some of you to assume the full responsibilities of life. In any event, all of you are about to take another step in the journey of your life. Whatever that journey may be, by reason of the period of time you have spent here, you go forth well equipped to take that journey and to meet with confidence the challenge of the coming years.

Yours has been the privilege of able guidance while a student in this institution of learning. Your teachers have sought to develop in you the intellectual and moral virtues. They have sought to convey to you, and convince you thereby that happiness and perfection are not found in the pursuit of wealth, fame, or power alone, but rather in the unselfish devotion to the higher ideals.

You have been educated and trained to be leaders in Christian and Godlike thought and action, to be future leaders in your communities, leaders in civil life, leaders in business and professional life, some, leaders in public life, some, maybe, leaders in the field of religion. But no matter what your future journey may be in the years to come, leaders in the service of God and country.

That leadership will be a constructive one, a productive one, if you retain and put into practice the fundamental principles and truths you have learned here as students.

Despite the temporary discomfort they may occasion, and the consistency of conduct they may demand, if you fail to adhere to these first principles in your own life, your leadership will have lost its value, and the real happiness of life will be lost to you.

As students here you must have caught something of the spirit of the teachers who have been your guides.

That spirit might well be summed up in one word—truth.

If ever there was a time when the truths we believe in must be lived up to and put into active, energetic, dynamic, and courageous operation, it is today, in this period of the world's history.

It is because of that love which your teachers have for truth that they have waged an uncompromising battle against every form of error, against evil and sin, against hate, to prepare you for the future battle of life, and to bring earthly and eternal happiness to yourself and to others.

The lives of your teachers at Belmont Abbey College must serve as a challenge to you as in the days and years to come you have memories of the eternal truths inculcated in you, to ever drive you on to greater and greater heights, memories of the joy that can be yours when you put to work what you have stored here in your minds and hearts.

The majority of you are about to leave here in one of the most trying periods of the known history of man. You have lived through one World War, and some of you served in that war with honor and distinction. We have seen the youth of our country respond nobly in war to the call of duty, to defend and preserve our institutions of government, and the way of life we believe in.

We have seen the whole of our people respond, the great power of our country developed and utilized in winning that war under the leadership of one who has taken his place among the immortals of all time, our late beloved Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Our part in the recent war was the determining factor in its successful outcome, and by winning it we have seen the triumph of an American ideal of government under God and law" over the titanic forces. In that case, Nazi Germany, which would have subjugated man and make him a slave of the state by the attempted banishment of God.

In that conflict we had to meet and defeat the immediate danger then to the continued existence of our liberty and freedom.

With the ending of the recent war, the hopes of mankind ran high that the days of universal and permanent peace had finally arrived.

Our hopes in this respect, due to the actions of the Soviet Union, are almost shattered.

Across the horizon we see another titanic force which would subjugate man and make him a slave of the state by the attempted banishment of God."

Without minimizing in the least the dangerous world situation that exists, and speaking directly to the point, if the Soviet Union persists in its efforts, and the issue is joined, I approach the coming days with confidence, with optimism of the successful outcome, and not with lack of confidence or with fear.

As the late Franklin D. Roosevelt once well said, and we can make it one of the guides of our life, "The only thing we need to fear is fear itself."

Or as another great world leader of this period, His Holiness Pope Pius XII, well said only a few days ago in his powerful and timely message calling upon Christian creeds to unite in their common cause against the challenge of atheistic communism:

"If there is something today that gives cause for fear, it is fear itself."

The answer to the present challenge of atheistic communism is to meet the false premises upon which this destructive ideology is based with the truths we are possessed of and in which we so strongly believe, and of governments dedicated to those truths which come from God Himself * * * of the dignity of man as contrasted with the power and totalitarianism of the state, to exercise their power to preserve those truths for themselves and for future generations.

The answer will be found in forward-looking, sound, dynamic, affirmative, courageous leadership in all walks of human activity, and particularly in the field of religion—of all religions—and in the field of government.

We must keep in mind in connection with the present world situation that the Soviet Union, while a powerful nation potentially—and one of the two most powerful in the world of today—has its internal weaknesses, particularly from an economic angle.

As we view the world of today, there are three great nations—the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. Of these three, the two most powerful—one actually and the other potentially—are the United States and the Soviet Union, respectively.

One nation, the Soviet Union, with its adherents in every country, is determined to impose its ideology wherever it can, using any and all means to do so.

It is challenging the way of life we believe in. It is taking over, through its Communist Parties and the vicious methods employed, country after country. There is no question but what Communist Parties in the various countries are backed up actively by the Soviet Union. Hungary is the latest example. After a government of a country is taken over, the processes of liquidation are engaged in * * * the first attack being against religion—not one religion but against all organized creeds.

Faced with this world situation, the question an American properly asks is: "Under such conditions, what course of action should our country take? What course of action is for the national interest of our country?"

After all, a nation, whether large or small, must give primary consideration to its own national interest.

There are one or two alternatives: To remain inactive; to follow negative policies and leadership; to go isolationist; to fail to face the realities of the world situation; or to adopt affirmative policies and take affirmative action, using the great power of our country as its national interest demands.

For your consideration and for whatever value my opinion may be worth to you, it seems to me that for our country to take the first course would be taking the road of defeatism and contrary to our own best interests.

We cannot escape the fact that all nations and all peoples are looking either to the east to Moscow, or the west to Washington.

It is known that the great majority of the peoples of countries behind what Winston Churchill properly termed "the iron curtain" are hoping and praying that the day of their deliverance from the hands of the oppressors is not far off. There is powerful discontent behind the iron curtain.

Before the pressure on the unfortunate people behind the iron curtain can be relieved so they can with freedom from fear establish the form of government of their own choice, our country must use its powers to stop an extension of the iron curtain and to assist the decent elements in countries at present outside of Soviet control to resist with success the influences that would destroy them.

There is no question but what a great majority of the people of Poland, Yugoslavia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, as well as other present satellite nations of the Soviet Union, at the first opportunity possible when their will can be expressed without fear, will oust the Communist regimes now in control of their governments.

Such regimes exist where the Russian Army has an occupying force.

Fortunately our country is committed to a policy of active assistance, in accordance with international law, to countries resisting

aggression. Our country has not recognized any of these regimes that have been forced upon a people.

The message of President Truman of a few months ago is a recognition of the present world challenge, and a message to the world that we do not intend to sit idly by and witness country after country taken over by the forces of atheistic communism in violation of international law. By his message, we also inform the world that we do not consider that such happenings are consistent with our own national interest. The address of President Truman is another ringing American message that will take its place among the foremost pages of history.

The Congress of the United States also recognized the gravity of the situation when it followed President Truman's recommendations and passed the Greek-Turkey legislation, to preserve those countries against the forces of aggression. That action was also for our own best interests.

The message of President Truman and the action of the Congress has committed our country to an affirmative approach in meeting the challenge and in acting for our national interest.

It would not be consistent with our national interest for our country to sit idly by and permit country after country to be taken over by the forces of international Communism and to wait, through our neglect, until this vicious wave has reached our own shores. To follow such a course, in my opinion, would be criminal negligence.

We must remember that this situation has been forced upon us; that we have to act now, or it will soon be too late.

If our country failed to act, or fails to do so in the future as conditions require, every country now outside of "the iron curtain," against their will, would have to turn to Moscow to make the best agreements possible, and the first one made will be the beginning of the end for that country.

There is not a country in continental Europe that is free from fear. And as country after country falls to the Soviet control, whether direct or indirect, the countries comprising the Western or the Christian civilization become smaller in number, and are taken out of the spiritual and constructive influences of our civilization.

And with continental Europe under the direct or indirect control of international communism, Asia, already on the defensive, and Africa will in all probabilities quickly follow.

The forces of decency in the world have reached their last line of defense. That last line of defense is in Europe. The line must be held there before we can start rolling back this challenging wave. It would be a world catastrophe of first importance, for example, if either Italy or France become subjected to a Communist government. The forces of decency in those countries, already subjected to powerful pressure, are fighting hard to save their countries from such domination.

It is in our national interest, as well as in the interest of a future decent world, that our country take and maintain affirmative action wherever necessary.

In order for this to be done, public opinion in America must be aroused to a recognition of the situation, and with a determination that our country meet and perform its responsibilities as the first power for good that exists in the world of today. In this respect you and all other American citizens can play an important part. An aroused public opinion plays a most important part in the life of a democracy.

In connection with a consideration of the present world situation, we must keep in mind that the deliberate unwillingness of the Soviet Union to cooperate with understanding with other nations is the primary cause of the present fear and unrest that exists throughout the world.

On an occasion of this kind, matters of import, and what I have discussed is a matter of grave import, should be discussed with all frankness. You are future leaders of our country, that is, you can and will be if you carry with you into your future life the truths you have learned at Belmont Abbey College.

As the Communist is one possessed with fanatical mind, believing in a destructive ideology which he would impose on others, so must those who believe in God and our way of life make ourselves active missionaries advancing the constructive truths that our philosophy of life has given to us.

I have presented to you today a picture of a world in which forces of evil and destruction are attempting to dominate, but on the other side there are powerful forces of good and constructiveness, and the forces of good, when organized, always overcome the forces of evil.

We can thank God that our country has recognized and assumed its proper and necessary leadership in world affairs as they exist in the troubled world of today.

With the assumption and the continuance of that leadership, exercising our great powers diplomatically and economically, with an aroused American public opinion in support of affirmative policies, you and I can go forward and look to the future with confidence. We need have no feeling of fear.

In discussing with you, as I have, the present world condition, I mainly do so for the purpose of conveying to you a message of confidence as you take the next step in your journey of life, and not of fear. Therefore, as you take your next step, let confidence and not fear dominate your thoughts and your actions.

The experience of life should teach us that when men and women become indifferent to the dignity of human beings they soon begin to think that saving their physical existence means saving their dignity.

When individuals or nations become indifferent to God, then spiritual values are no longer the driving force of their lives and their existence, and the life of an individual, and the existence of a nation, becomes a mad scramble to attain the false peak of economic stability.

When people become indifferent to truth they are then the target for the shattering gunfire of propaganda, emotionalism, and of the false prophets.

It is then that the final goal ceases to be the center around which noble hopes and ambitions resolve. It is then when people grow weary of being human beings and pretend to shake off their humanity by wearing false faces.

If some of you feel that the pioneering spirit is no longer needed, you are sadly mistaken. Those who possess noble ideals must still try to eliminate the dark barriers of hatred, intolerance, selfishness, and evil, and the harmful results that flow therefrom which have kept the human family divided.

Who are better able to go forth and penetrate these debasing barriers to the progress of mankind and progress than you who have been educated to a way of life, based on truth, love, and sacrifice—you who possess the truth—you who recognize the individual and respect his God-given rights.

Mellon Foundation Gifts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1947

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newpaper articles:

[From the Pittsburgh Press of June 9, 1947]

OVER $32,000,000 OF MELLON BEQUEST TO BE GIVEN TO PITTSBURGH—ALL REMAINING ASSETS OF FOUNDATION WILL BE SPENT WITHIN 15 YEARS FOR PROJECTS

The Mellon Foundation is about to give over $32,000,000 for projects in the Pittsburgh district.

The vast bequest will enable Pittsburgh institutions to carry on activities expected to prove of national and international value.

All remaining assets in the foundation established by the late Andrew W. Mellon will be distributed in approximately 15 years, and all for use in this district.

Trustees of the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust, in making this announcement today, said that the program for doing so will be made public later. The announcement was made at the same time that the foundation issued a report on its first 15 years of operation.

ESTABLISHED IN 1930

Trustees are Paul Mellon and Mrs. Ailsa Mellon Bruce, children of A. W. Mellon, and Donald Shepard, long associated with him.

Remaining assets in the Mellon trust had a book value of $32,416,459 at the end of 1946. But their present market value is believed to be very considerably higher.

The Mellon trust was established in 1930 for "such religious, charitable, scientific, and educational purposes as are in furtherance of the public welfare."

The trustees decided to concentrate all future grants in the Pittsburgh area because Mr. Mellon's major interests had always been in and around his home city. However, he left no specific directive as to the activities or location of projects to be helped by the foundation.

WILL BE ADJUSTABLE

"The trustees decided to distribute all remaining assets of the trust within the next 15 years because Mr. Mellon during his lifetime questioned the wisdom of leaving substantial foundation funds in perpetuity," the trustees said. "They emphasized, however, that the program will have to remain adjustable both to shorter and longer periods, depending on future developments."

No indication of how the vast sum will be distributed was given in today's report. It simply said that the money will go for "a major project or projects in the Pittsburgh area."

As soon as further policies are decided on, the future program of the trust will be announced. Until that time, it will make no new grants.

The 15-year report issued today showed that Pittsburgh and Washington institutions already have received millions in grants from the fund. Its total distributions through 1946 has been $78,270,280.

Total market value of Mr. Mellon's gifts and bequests to the trust exceeded one hundred millions. This sum was substantially increased by later earnings.

The foundation's biggest gifts were to the National Gallery of Art in Washington. The building cost over sixteen millions and an endowment fund of five millions was established. The art collection which Mr. Mellon gave to the gallery was valued by congressional committees at fifty millions.

Total value of this gift, which was made to the American people in a letter to the President, exceeded seventy-one millions. It was the largest gift ever made by an individual to the Nation. In making it Mr. Mellon stipulated that the gallery must not bear his name.

BIGGEST BENEFICIARY

Chief Pittsburgh beneficiary of the trust has been the Mellon Institute of Industrial Research. This is an endowed nonprofit institution organized in 1913 by Mr. Mellon and his brother, Richard B. Mellon.

It conducts research in the pure and applied natural sciences through the medium of fellowships. Research is done both for public and private organizations. It also trains research workers and distributes scientific data for public use.

The Mellon brothers donated $8,400,000 for the building on a basis of equal shares. The Mellon Trust gave $285,232 to the institute for research projects, including pneumonia studies and investigation of antimalaria compounds. Securities for the endowment were used in 1946 to add $1,154,520 to that fund.

VARIETY OF GIFTS

In addition to the major gifts to the National Gallery of Art and Mellon Institute, the trust announced a wide variety of charitable gifts during the last 15 years. These grants totaled $4,898,872, for the following uses:

Social welfare, $2,036,551.
Education, $1,277,613.
Health, $600,108.
Public and civic enterprises, $133,500.
Religious institutions, $16,100.
World War II relief agencies, $835,000.

Much of this money came to Pittsburgh institutions.

Three-fourths of the $2,036,551 for social welfare went to the Pittsburgh Community Fund. Much of the educational grants were to the University of Pittsburgh for buildings, scholarships, and the University Press. The total given to Pitt was $630,428.

Carnegie Institute of Technology, Shady Side Academy and Pennsylvania College for Women also received grants. The PCW endowment fund received a grant of $500,000 last year.

SYMPHONY AIDED

The Pittsburgh Symphony has received $140,000 from the trust. Pittsburgh Playhouse and other organizations in the field of fine arts have been helped. The Boys' Club in Pittsburgh also received help.

Half a million dollars went to the Red Cross War Fund from 1940 to 1945, with $268,500 for the USO and other war agencies.

The Mellon Trust never actually has carried on projects. It has acted solely as a grant-making agency to established public educational and charitable institutions. It has taken no part in the administration of institutions receiving grants.

* * * * *

The money apparently will go to established Pittsburgh institutions or to such as might be set up to carry projects in behalf of the public.

The 15-year report covered operations of the foundation through December 31, 1945, during which time it made grants of $75,956,305. Gifts in 1946 were $2,313,981.

The National Gallery of Art now houses over 16,000 works of art. Over 2,000,000 visitors from all parts of the world annually visit it.

The Mellon Institute in 35 years has issued thousands of publications and articles. During that time 979 United States patents and 920 foreign patents were taken out as a result of its research.

[From the Pittsburgh Press]

GREAT GIFT OF PITTSBURGH

On top of a great program for public improvements in Pittsburgh—including new highways, traffic control, the Point Park, urban redevelopment, a parking authority, elimination of stream pollution, and smoke control—comes today a surprise announcement of outstanding importance.

The A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust is going to devote all its remaining assets to projects in the Pittsburgh district.

These assets have a book value of more than $32,000,000, but their actual market worth is believed to be considerably greater.

Within a period of 15 years, this vast sum will be used to support projects for the general welfare. So great is the amount thus assured for public, religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational purposes—as provided in the language of the trust—that its expenditure in this one section should produce outstanding results.

The three present trustees—Paul Mellon, Ailsa M. Bruce, and Donald D. Shepard, announce that they hope these results will have national and international value.

The decision to distribute the entire trust for use in the Pittsburgh area again emphasizes the loyalty to and interest of the Mellons in the city where they founded their careers and made their wealth.

"The major interests of the donor had always been in and around his home city," was the simple explanation of the trustees.

These benefactions can mean much for the public welfare, and particularly for the welfare of Pittsburgh.

The city already is a center of scientific and educational research; rich in the arts and eminent as a school, hospital, and laboratory area. It has numerous institutions eminently able to carry on work of the utmost importance for the welfare of mankind.

Now it is assured that vast funds will be made available to further such work and to carry on other projects which may be included in the program.

The Mellon trust will make no further grants until the new program is announced.

Its report indicates that a survey already is under way to determine "the major needs of the Pittsburgh area, including those now existent and those likely to develop in the foreseeable future."

The combination of this vast private charity with the great program of public improvements now getting started can reshape the whole future of the Pittsburgh district.

[From the Washington Post of June 9, 1947]

MELLON FUND GIFTS TOTAL SEVENTY-SIX MILLIONS IN 15 YEARS—REPORT SHOWS BULK OF PHILANTHROPIC TRUST WAS INVESTED IN NATIONAL GALLERY

Nearly $76,000,000 in cash and works of art were contributed to local and national institutions by the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust during its first 15 years.

Most of this amount—$71,000,000—represents the building, endowment, and works of art of the National Gallery of Art here. The gallery was given to the Nation by the late Andrew W. Mellon through the trust. This is the largest gift ever made by an individual to the United States Government.

A report of the trust, to be distributed today, shows that other Washington institutions benefited by gifts of $368,850 during the period from December 30, 1930, when Mr. Mellon created the fund, to December 31, 1945. The largest of such local gifts went to the Community Chest and the Corcoran Gallery.

The trustees, Paul Mellon and Mrs. Ailsa Mellon Bruce, children of the former Secretary of the Treasury, and Donald D. Shepard, of Washington, long-time associate of Mr. Mellon, plan to distribute the entire remainder of the fund within the next 15 years. At the end of 1946, its book value was $32,416,459, but the market value was substantially higher, the report states.

The total of all contributions in the 15-year period covered by the report amounted to $75,956,305, and additional gifts of $2,313,981 were made during 1946.

Mr. Mellon began to give property and securities to the trust in 1930. In 1931 he made his first gift of paintings, and later all the works he had gathered became part of the internationally famous collection of the National Gallery.

The book cost of the Mellon collection was $32,490,155, but at the time of the gift, it was valued by congressional committees at about $50,000,000.

The building housing the Gallery, dedicated in 1941 and accepted by President Roosevelt cost $16,057,433. In 1942, the trust established a $5,000,000 endowment for the Gallery, which as expressly stipulated by the donor, does not bear his name.

Mr. Mellon's hope that other donors would contribute to a great national collection, has been realized, and the Gallery now houses more than 16,000 works of art.

In addition to its major project and to the Mellon Institute of Industrial Research in Pittsburgh, previously generously endowed, the trust has made a wide variety of charitable grants, totaling $4,898,872.

Among these have been the following, made to institutions and agencies here in Washington:

In the field of social welfare: American Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, $52,250; Boys' Club of Washington, $10,000; Boys' Club of Metropolitan Police, $850; Community Chest, Washington, $122,000; Central Union Mission, $3,600; Child Welfare League of America, $100; unemployment relief in District of Columbia, $9,050; Washington Home for Foundlings, $50,000.

In education: American University, $5,000; National Symphony Orchestra, $4,500; Corcoran Gallery of Art, $65,000.

For health: Gallinger Hospital, cancer research, $1,500.

For religion: Washington Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation, $9,000.

For war relief: USO special committee, Washington, $7,500; United War Fund, Washington, $28,500.

Carter Glass

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. PATRICK H. DREWRY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 19, 1947

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. CARTER GLASS, late a Senator from the State of Virginia

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, the life of CARTER GLASS exemplifies the opportunity there is for every American who possesses ambition, courage, determination, and willingness for hard work to succeed in what he attempts to do.

CARTER GLASS was born in Virginia in 1858. His span of life covered the argumentative excitement of a possible disruption of his country, the actual conflict which was the outgrowth of two schools of thought as to the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, the so-called reconstruction period, the building up of the devastated area of the country in which he lived, the patriotic and heart-burning efforts of Virginians to put their State on the road to recovery, and three war periods in which his beloved State was endangered by the events affecting the welfare of his Nation. Such a period required moral, mental, and physical strength of a high order. His efforts resulted in placing him at the top of the statesmen of his time, who successfully

used their genius for the welfare of their country.

His father, an officer in the Confederate Army, was a newspaper publisher, but, like all other Virginians, lost everything during the War Between the States. CARTER GLASS was 7 years old when the war ended, and Virginia, utterly bankrupt, was not in a position to provide complete educational facilities, so he, like other Virginia boys with limited educational opportunities, was forced to educate himself. He read and studied the books to which he had access, mainly in his father's library. The books were not many, but they contained in their pages the philosophy of the sages of the world. With a retentive mind, he never forgot his reading during this formative period of his life, and his writings and his speeches show his acquaintance with the thought of the great philosophers of former times.

Naturally, in his efforts to make a living and get an education, his mind turned to newspaper work, and he became, first, a newspaper carrier at 13, and a year later went to work in the newspaper office as a typesetter. It is possible that his extensive vocabulary was partly obtained from the nature of his work, as unaccustomed words when setting type fixed themselves in his mind.

When he was 18 years of age his family moved from Lynchburg, Va., where he was born, to Petersburg, Va., his father having accepted the editorship of a Petersburg daily. I talked with him frequently about his life in my home town and enjoyed the recital of his experiences as a printer. He soon, however, had an urge to write and became a reporter for a Lynchburg paper, and from this time on, as he worked up finally to the ownership of the paper upon whose staff he had commenced his work, he became known throughout the State for his editorial style and his vigorous, trenchant method of expression. He was at his best probably in his political editorials, and soon began to take a personal interest in the politics of the State. Probably the value of his work as an editorial writer may never be properly evaluated, but as a journalist, he became well known throughout the State before he went into public life. His first public office was as State senator from the senatorial district comprising the city of Lynchburg and Campbell County, and he was a member of the State senate from 1899 to 1903, after which he resigned.

A State convention was called in 1901 to write a new organic law for Virginia, the purpose being to get rid of laws which were obnoxious to the people of the State and had been forced upon them in the reconstruction period. CARTER GLASS was selected as a delegate to that convention. It was an opportunity to do the things that were much to his liking and uppermost in his mind. Due to his work in that convention, he became one of the best known men in the State, and shaped the basic law to an extent that was probably greater than that of any other delegate. While there have been constitutional conventions since that time, that Constitution of Virginia still remains basic, and is largely the foundation of the work of the following constitutional conventions. The work of the convention of 1901–02 still remains, and the work of CARTER GLASS stands out in the framing of it.

In 1902 he was elected to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia, and was seated December 1, 1902, in the Fifty-seventh Congress. He was reelected to all of the succeeding Congresses through the Sixty-sixth, but before the commencement of the Sixty-sixth Congress, he resigned to accept the position of Secretary of the Treasury offered him by President Woodrow Wilson. The President's attention had been called to Senator GLASS' ability in his handling in the House of the Federal Reserve Act, and when Mr. McAdoo resigned, it is reported that he suggested to the President that Mr. GLASS would be the man to take his place. He was the first Secretary of the Treasury from Virginia and the first Cabinet officer from Virginia since John B. Flood was Secretary of War in President Buchanan's administration. In his position as Secretary of the Treasury, he was called upon to clean up the waste and wreckage of war, and there were numerous matters involving the Treasury, both foreign and domestic, which required the closest attention. This is not the place nor the time to do more than point out that at a dangerous time in the financial condition of the country, he served conscientiously and faithfully and with distinction.

Then came his appointment by the Governor of Virginia to the vacancy in the Senate of the United States occasioned by the death of Thomas S. Martin, but he remained as Secretary of the Treasury until the vacancy caused by his resignation of that position could be filled by the President; therefore, he did not take his seat in the Senate until February 2, 1920. He was elected to the Senate for the unexpired term, and then reelected for successive terms until his death May 28, 1946. His service in the Senate stands out before the country to such an extent that it is not necessary to go into details concerning it. An analysis of his personal character indicates his greatest attributes were courage, and independence of thought and action. From a legislative standpoint he was an outstanding and vigorous champion of the Constitution of the United States. In the history of the Senate, as the years passed from the beginning of the Government, and as long as this Government endures, CARTER GLASS will be ranked as one of the great leaders of that body. His position in legislation can be given in his own words in extracts from his speeches, which indicate his independence of mind and his appreciation of the fundamental principles as evidenced in the Constitution:

> It is more than likely, though I do not admit it, that I have been wrong more than I have been right. But whether I have been right or wrong, I have spoken my own mind and voted my own way and did not permit anyone to do it for me. If I have been wrong, I regret it. In all events my purpose always has been to serve Virginia and my country.
>
> The people of my State, I think, understand when they send me to the Senate, they send me to exercise my own best judgment and heed my own conscience. I would rather go out of the Senate and spend the few remaining years of my life where I was born among my people, and without their favor—but possessing still my intellectual integrity—than to surrender my convictions.

Again he expressed the same thought in the following words:

> I prefer to think of a United States Senator as a representative of the sovereignty of his State and subject every moment of his service to the promptings of his conscience and the preservation of his own intellectual integrity.
>
> I refuse to believe that the people of Virginia want me, as their representative, or the people of other States want their representatives, to vote for things unconstitutional and oppressive.

He was noted for his adherence to a strict interpretation of the Constitution. He consistently, fearlessly, and with ability advocated adherence to the Constitution of the United States, and shaped his votes and his work in accordance with his views thereon. In his own inimitable phraseology, he called himself "a relic of constitutional government."

His views of the construction of the Constitution is expressed with such clarity that I am setting out a further extract from his addresses:

> The Constitution belongs to the people. It was written by great representatives of the people, chosen for the purpose, and was ratified by the people as the Supreme Charter of their Government, to be respected and maintained with the help of God. With the consent and by mandate of the people their Constitution provides how it may be amended to meet the requirements of the ages. It has always been so, and no administration in the history of the Republic has attempted to flank the Constitution by a legislative short-cut so vividly denounced by Woodrow Wilson as "an outrage upon constitutional morality."

I cannot end this feeble tribute to a great man without striking a personal note. I came to the House of Representatives a few months after he took his seat in the Senate. I had known him for many years, but had not had an intimate acquaintance with him. My work in the House involved, in my opinion, cooperation with my colleagues, both in the House and Senate. I conferred frequently with Senator Glass and he never failed me. I relied upon his good judgment and his intense patriotism and his love for our State and Nation. My views, to a large extent, coincided with his. He had the great attribute of loyalty, not only to his country but to his friends. I felt that I had learned his friendship—he most assuredly not only had my loyal friendship, but also my deep admiration for him as a man of integrity and ability. His character was beyond reproach. I feel deeply a personal loss, the loss of a strong friendship, and the political scene lacks in depth as well as in picturesquesness since he has been away from it. His death created not only a vacancy in the office which he held, but it also left a vacant place in the line-up of men throughout the years who have given their best patriotic endeavors to the welfare of their Nation.

Address by James A. Farley Before Canadian Exporters' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, among the civilian population of our country there is perhaps no finer exponent of good will and good neighborliness than the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States and now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

Recently at Toronto, Canada, he delivered before the Canadian Exporters' Association an address which in every respect rings true to these traditions.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD TRADE AND WORLD PEACE

An American coming to Canada is proud of both countries. If, as in my case, he has recently traveled in Europe and Asia, he is also humbly grateful for them. Our two countries, beyond most others, know the real content of peace.

Actually, peace depends on what goes on in people's minds. Canada and the United States, like other countries, have a lot of assorted and abutting geography. If we wanted to we could make that geography bitter and venomous, as are the quarrels overseas. In that case, Toronto could be another Trieste. Detroit could be a pistol pointed at the head of somebody. The St. Lawrence River could be another Dardanelles, and Alaska an encircling movement. Thanks to the right-mindedness of our peoples, these things don't happen here and they won't happen here. As an American, I am proud of the achievement, and I am thankful to the gracious spirit of both our countries.

If we could teach the spirit of Canadian-American relations to all the countries in the world, we should have real peace, and sometimes I think that is the only way we ever will get it.

We have not got real peace now. In the past year and a half I have seen most of the Western Hemisphere and a great part of the Eastern Hemisphere. I claim no expertness in foreign affairs, and do not pretend to have all the answers to every country over which I have flown in an airplane. But, as a businessman not wholly unfamiliar with politics I know some things when I see them, and they may be of interest.

Practically everywhere there is social unrest. I cannot, of course, speak about the Soviet Union, where the press is censored and visitors do not go about freely. My guess is that if you got below the surface, you might find unrest there too. If this is not so, I cannot make out why they have to keep millions of Russians in prison camps all the time.

Eleswhere we don't have to guess. We know. There is a general, huge movement, taking different forms in different countries, and differing in intenseness practically everywhere.

The slogans and political catchwords and catch phrases of this unrest differ, depending on the country and depending on political leaders who either exploit the unrest or oppose it. The experts can report on the various local issues. I know from my own political experience, however, that slogans and political catchwords and catch phrases, together with local issues, are only the crest of a wave. They are usually cast up as a result of some deep unhappiness beneath the surface.

The Lord knows that in most parts of the world—our own countries being perhaps among the amazingly few happy exceptions—there is plenty to create unhappiness. In many places there is not enough to eat, and food and other supplies are getting less. Great blocs of people are increasingly hungry; they are apprehensive of being hungrier yet. The mere business of standing endlessly in line, to get less food than you need and of a kind you don't want, makes people bitter and hard.

Also, practically everybody is afraid. Sometimes they know what they fear. More often they are simply afraid of the whole future. This is chiefly true in Europe. Tomorrow is a day not to be hoped for, but dreaded. Life there is not happiness, it is survival.

Against that background I found many fine and splendid men and women with their heads up, trying to meet the soul-trying problems of the time. Some of them were working through their governments. Others were working with Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and other religious bodies. Still others were in business or private occupations. I think the huge majority everywhere pray that they and their colleagues will bring order out of the wreckage and pull things together again. But they want honest leadership and help, and they need both badly.

This is where we come in. North America has that leadership whether we want it or not. Our civilization is in one piece, it is working, and it is successful. You and I know, of course, that we have our own trouble spots and headaches and some failures. Being democracies we talk about them and expose them and in that way get them cleaned up. But by comparison we are so far out ahead that no one else is even in sight. Our poorest are living in luxury by comparison with the middle and lower average across the sea.

In that respect, let me say that the Canadian job has been perhaps the most successful in the entire world. You did it by straight thinking and hard work and great loyalty. You paid half your war expenses currently. You kept your prices in bounds. Your food prices are where ours were a year ago—and I wish ours were back there. While you have been doing this for your own people you have been one of the three greatest contributors of goods and food and money to the stricken Old World. This is a great record brought about not only by wisdom in high places but by loyal action of all Canadians. My hat is off to you, and so is that of everyone who knows your glorious record.

We in the United States also have not done so badly, though we have had our slight dose of postwar inflation which I hope is now petering out.

In combination, our two economies have put us at the business and economic top of the entire world—and the entire world knows it. This is one reason why we have a leadership position which we could not resign if we wished.

Partly because of this, North America, and particularly the United States, has likewise top position in sheer power. Military strength today has its roots in commercial production and its branches in organizing ability. In a hemisphere of great natural resources these elements make us powerful beyond any combination yet known. We did not go out to get this position. It happened automatically when we really stretched and stinted ourselves to make our full contribution to defend civilization in World War II. Nevertheless, you and I have to live with the results and they are going to affect us, both of us, right along from now on.

The war job proved that we could nearly double our national production even though the flower of Canadian and American youth was taken out of industry and put into armies. That would have been amazing in itself, but something else happened, too. Partly because we took naturally to the air and partly because we use machines, our two countries proved that the power of this hemisphere can be laid down practically anywhere in the entire world. Armies crossed the Atlantic and reconquered western Europe. Task forces pushed into the Pacific and dumped an unbeatable barrage on Japan. Equipped with atomic bombs which, I might observe, were jointly developed by Great Britain, Canada, and the United States, the military force we had at the end of World War II, and could have again if needed, gave us unlimited scope for power politics if we were minded in that direction, as I hope we will not be.

As a result, from now on no political or diplomatic combination anywhere can ignore the attitude of North America. Whether we like it or not, we are one of the dominant world forces. That puts some questions on our doorstep. Throughout my travels I had the privilege of talking to most of the representative men in the many countries I visited. Over and over again they asked, in different ways. "Do you know what you want? What is your policy? How do we fit into it? We have world leadership, and now we have to live up to it.

That is a large contract. I spoke a moment ago of the general sense of fear and unrest outside our common countries. Peoples are looking to us to help in bringing about a real peace.

My belief is that in the next 2 or 3 years this leadership will be tested. The test may come soon. Here are some reasons:

The Old World, and particularly Europe, has not reconstructed itself. That is, they are not producing and trading at levels which take care of their people. They have been filling in by securing goods from the Western Hemisphere, chiefly from the United States. They are not producing and exporting enough goods in payment. Instead, they have been getting by with relief funds and using their prewar supply of American dollars and their gold. Just now the United States is exporting monthly goods worth nearly a billion dollars more than the goods she monthly imports. You don't have to be an economist to know that this cannot go on indefinitely. Sooner or later the supply of dollars and gold runs out. Some experts think it will run out this year or early next year. That, of course, would be the end of the export boom in North America; but it would also be the end of even the most modest flow of necessary goods which has kept western Europe afloat during the past 2 years.

This would be bad anyway, but it is made worse by the fact that much of the world, and especially Europe, had a poor food crop last year, and apparently is going to have another bad crop this year. It looks therefore as though European dollar exchange will run out about the same time that her needs for food, as well as for machinery and equipment will be at their peak.

We can see the time coming, then, when the eyes of the world will be on us. They will want to know what we can do about it.

Our governments, well aware of this, have doubtless prepared a plan. May I speak now to ask you, however, and my countrymen in the United States, to think this situation

through and meet it with the best of your brains and the best of your hearts. If we do some proper thinking now, we may save months and years of misery for ourselves and others later on. If things move as now indicated, it may take everything we have got to prevent chaos.

It is no help in this business that there are countries which hope for that chaos and expect to profit by it. I can draw no other conclusion from some of the policies followed by our Soviet friends during the last 2 years. I do not believe their policy will be successful, and I hope and believe they will eventually change it. I have seen a good many attempts at rule or ruin in my life, and I have noticed that the end is always ruin and never rule. But it does add to the problems of the men of good will who want a world of peace and plenty and kindliness.

I have painted a stormy world outlook. But there are some things you can do and do now. Though the Old World is in deep trouble the nations of the Americas, north and south, have a splendid opportunity to help themselves and the world. They are well along the road to close working partnership. They can now close ranks to form a working alliance of peaceful nations, capable of influencing the entire world picture.

Canadians, like Americans, have followed the progress of the Pan American Union and of the inter-American conferences for a long time. In recent years the Canadian Government has sent observers to many Pan-American meetings. I know that Canada's membership in the Pan American Union would be almost unanimously welcomed in the United States and in the other American republics. Because the American Hemisphere has no plan or desire for conquest or aggression anywhere, and because none of us has any wish to weaken Canada's ties with the British Commonwealth, I am clear that it is sound policy and sound common sense to bring together the American nations in a peaceful group thoroughly capable of mutual defense, and also thoroughly able to help our less fortunate neighbors flourish.

The American nations together can do a number of things. They have area enough, land enough, and resources enough to be able to use effectively a considerable number of European immigrants. They can increase still further their own agricultural production. Taken together, they can be almost self-sufficient in time of danger; but they must be buyers as well as sellers in times of peace. The outlines of a great structure have already been drawn. They are already a regional group within the framework of the United Nations. They have guaranteed each other's frontiers. They have outlined a hemispheric general staff for common defense. They have gone farther than any group of countries in maintaining peace.

Traveling through South America, you find everywhere a desire to increase the ties of inter-American unity—to strengthen them through Government action, to ballast them through trade, to widen them through exchange of students, to deepen them through personal friendships. At a time when, in other parts of the world, neighbor suspects neighbor, here there is no fear, and a great desire to get toward common understanding. American nations feel that the interests of all of us ride together. We can bring about the united front of the Americas against the growing fear and misery of the world.

While doing this we can put the united strength of the Americas at the service of the United Nations. We know, of course, that the United Nations is only just beginning. It has its troubles and its problems. It has been taxed up to the limit of its strength. But it is the main hope we have. I know how I would feel, and I think I know how you would feel, if tomorrow's newspapers were to announce that the United Nations had broken up. It would hit every one of us like a stone blow. We should be waiting in fear for the next outbreak of war. And we know that neither the Atlantic nor the Pacific nor the Arctic Oceans would protect us this time from having some of the effects of that war on our northern continent.

Fortunately the countries to the south of us are just as interested in the United Nations as are we. Many of them know the leading part which Canada has played in building the structure. They sent their delegates to Montreal, where the international civil aviation organization has its headquarters. They know that your Under Secretary of External Affairs, Dr. Lester B. Pearson, whom we knew in Washington familiarly as "Mike," is one of the most active and effective servants of the United Nations organization.

Perhaps, being a businessman, I have fewer illusions than some people about the task before us. Both in business and politics you have to deal with hard-boiled realities at all times. People who have quite different ideas have to be brought to agree on a common program. Bills do have to be paid. Interests have to be adjusted. The fellow who wants more than his fair share has to be convinced not only that he cannot get it but that it will be bad for him and the rest of us if he does. We have plenty of that kind in all countries. The job of any politician, national or international, is to take all this welter of ambition and idealism, and self-interest, and productiveness, and hope, and fear, and bring out of it something that works. Politicians are frequently abused. Sometimes they deserve it. But politicians frequently have been the great servants of society.

I can give you one word of hopefulness. From long experience I have noticed that very often people tackle a situation with exactly opposite points of view, and frequently with exactly opposite interests. But I have also noticed that practical men, while they will hang on to their differing ideas, and insist upon their differing interests, nevertheless do agree on a practical plan of action. They will go right on arguing about theories, sticking out for their claims; but they will nevertheless get together to do the practical thing. One result of the free system we have in Canada and in the United States has been to bring up two great peoples who are accustomed to doing just that. This is why a composite federation of provinces has become the Canadian nation, and why a scattered group of colonies came together as the Federal Union of the United States. That same attitude can help world affairs now.

I might add that you will need this kind of experience no matter what changes there are in the social structure of political forms. People are still people, regardless of the political complexion of their government.

Those of us who are assembled here are particularly interested in foreign trade. This is our job, and we get results. We don't call ourselves diplomats. We do the pick-and-shovel work by which peoples get fed, clothed and housed, in spite of international borders. We have to cooperate with each other and with our friends overseas, because if there is no cooperation there is no deal. To the extent that there has been one world, we have had a good large part in making it.

So let me greet you as colleagues, not only in business but also in the work of building a more peaceful world. Our job is expanding and we are moving into a time when our individual work becomes clearly a part of the work of the world. We shall need clear heads and stout hearts. We are not interested in a century of fear. We can, I think, contribute to making a great century. Our work is cut out but I think Canadians and Americans in partnership with the other American nations have shown the way.

Destruction of Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, there has been much discussion on the floor of Congress and throughout the country concerning the destruction of potatoes in this country. I have an article appearing in the May 31, 1947, issue of Business Week, which discusses the problem and points out some of the factors which have not been considered. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOING THE COMMUNISTS' WORK FOR THEM

If we were given the job of promotion manager for the Communist Party in the U. S. A., we doubt if we could possibly dream up a neater piece of business for our side than that portrayed in the center of this page. This particular exhibit was taken from the Detroit Free Press, one of the most staunchly conservative newspapers in the United States. But the same picture was run with much the same caption and text by daily newspapers through the country.

On the very days when the picture, thanks to wire-photo, was being featured in picture sections from coast to coast, the front pages of the same newspapers were reporting the desperate hunger in Europe and the hurried emergency steps to stave it off. The Nation's newspaper readers were thus left with the clear and dramatically underlined impression that, while Europe cries out with hunger, we destroy fine foodstuffs in order to keep up the price. Certainly it would be hard to conjure up a more damning portrayal of hopeless confusion and frustration in our own house.

Well, what of it? Wasn't it the duty of the press of our free land to tell the plain and unadulterated truth, however unpleasant? It is, indeed, the business of the press to tell the complete truth, but in this particular case one key and easily understood fact, which puts an entirely different complexion on the exhibit, was left out. And other facts which reveal the incident portrayed in a much softer light also were ignored by the blunt report that "A glutted market brings more than 50 tons of surplus potatoes to be dumped by the Government * * * kerosene was poured over the potatoes to render them useless."

The key fact which was completely ignored is that potatoes could not be shipped to Europe. This fact first came to light last January, when the potato surplus began to attract attention. UNRRA officials, noting the availability of 20,000,000 bushels of potatoes, said that a thorough study had convinced them of the impracticability of shipping them to needy countries. Potatoes must be shipped in refrigerated vessels or dehydrated. Refrigerator space, even if available, could be better used for more nutritional foods, UNRRA reported. The cost of preparing and shipping dehydrated potatoes would be five times what it would be to send other foods of equal caloric value.

Another neglected fact is that the Government potato surplus is a hangover of a wartime program which commanded almost universal congressional support when enacted.

In 1942, in order to stimulate production of crops urgently needed for the war effort, the principle of Government support of agricultural prices during a period of postwar readjustment was written into the Stabilization Act. Under this act, which remains in force until 2 years after the end of hostilities (until December 31, 1948), the Government is committed to buy farmers' produce if the market price falls below 90 percent of parity.

As we have remarked before in this space, we think the farm price support program now hurts both the public at large and the farmers themselves. It encourages excess production of the wrong things, and retards the adjustment of farm production to the facts of economic life. In our view, the program should be dropped at the first moment it can be done without having the Government break its pledge. But, even so, this wartime measure is not the utterly inane and antisocial program so starkly implied by the exhibit in question.

Our inquiries indicate that this potato picture (and what it does not tell) has had a wide and deep effect. Indeed, while there is no way to measure it, we doubt if the combined efforts of all the editorial page defenders and expounders of the American way of economic life for the next 6 months will offset the devastating impact of the misrepresentation carried by that single picture, particularly in its vivid and immediate association with starvation in Europe.

We expect the Communists and their cohorts to misrepresent the workings of our economic system. But when the press of the country, in its most conservative reaches, does the Communists' stuff for them with tremendous effectiveness, we call that unfair competition.

Our Illusory Labor Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a very interesting article which appeared in the April 1947 issue of American Affairs entitled "Our Illusory Labor Force."

This article is by L. C. Walker, president of Shaw-Walker Co., of Muskegon, Mich. Mr. Walker has been a student of economic questions for many years and has written some splendid articles along this line. The following is one of the most thought-provoking presentations I have read for some time. By reason of Mr. Walker's experience and because of his objective point of view, the article offers a surprisingly fresh slant on the whole problem of our labor force and its relationship to the prosperity of the country as a whole. Anyone who reads it will agree that it is a timely contribution on this all-important subject.

The article follows:

OUR ILLUSORY LABOR FORCE—AS IT IS AND AS WE USE IT, CAN WE REPRODUCE OUR FORMER STANDARD OF LIVING?

(By L. C. Walker)

I am interested in the relation of employment to the standard of living, and I suspect that our thinking about it has become greatly distorted.

First, the Government was in a panic about unemployment after the war. Its economists said there would be 8,000,000 or more out of work shortly after the fighting ceased. The lawmakers had wisely passed a law that employers must give jobs back to every enlisted man. They apparently were thinking there would not be jobs enough. Henry Wallace tried to stir things up with his evangel of 60,000,000 jobs. Short of that, he suggested, industry would have failed to do its job, whereupon the Government must act, etc.

I represent a town that was blown up by the war from 16,000 industrial workers to 35,000. We all worried about what would happen to those extra people when we deflated and got back to our peacetime size. We tried to evolve plans to get our labor "imports" to go home, but before we could get very far with that idea a plant or two talked of moving away unless the chamber of commerce could guarantee more men. Soon there was more help-wanted advertising than at any time during the war.

I thought at first it was local. Now I am thinking it is national. The second city in Michigan, Grand Rapids, had surplus labor all through the war. Today it's as hard put for men as we are. When we want parts or material and push for delivery on orders long overdue, the answer is always the same: "We need more men." Domestic help isn't plentiful. Office workers are scarce everywhere. Men want higher wages, not more hours at time and a half.

A STATISTICAL MIRACLE?

During the five war years we heard much about our high production. Everyone praised industry. The flow of guns and ships and planes to the front was astounding. The President lauded labor on every occasion for its hard work and marvelous productivity. He said industry had been restored to a high place in his esteem (or maybe that's overstated). We all assumed these things to be true, with the gross national product, according to the Government's figures, going from $88,000,000,000 in 1939 to $120,000,000,000 in 1941; $187,000,000 in 1943; $197,000,000,000 in 1945; and $200,000,000,000 for 1946. Everyone seemed contented with such facts and there were certain things to be said for them. OPA was keeping official prices down. The statistical cost of living had risen only from the index figure of 96.7 in 1930 to 114.6 in September 1946 (using 1926 as 100). We believed a miracle had happened in production.

I now am of the opinion that even industry was misled by these magnificent figures. Much adulation may have turned our heads. We don't generally analyze a compliment. We overlooked that war material was bought on a cost-plus basis, or at negotiated prices, with nothing basic to protect the Government's purchasing agents and the suppliers protecting themselves. Possibly we were distracted by the OPA propaganda. We forgot to look at the consumer—at what it cost him to survive.

AS CONSUMERS

Let us look now at some comparative prices:

	Autumn, 1946	In 1936	Up
			Pct.
Wheat	$2.10	$1.11	89
Corn	2.03	.88	130
Cotton, bale	192.50	60.10	220

Three automobile dealers handling popular models gave me these figures:

	Autumn, 1946	In 1939	Up
			Percent
Automobile	$2,200	$1,250	76
Do	1,600	900	77
Do	1,039	680	52

A chain-store manager gave me these figures:

	Autumn, 1946	In 1939	Up
			Pct.
House dresses	$5.95	$1.98	200
House coats	$8.95	$3.89	130
Gloves	$2.59, $3.49	98 cents to $1.00.	164
Curtains	$5.39	$1.95	175
Underwear, rayon	59, 69, 79 cents	25 cents	136
Rayon, No. 1	$1.15	59 cents	95
Towels	66 cents	36 cents	83
Wash cloths	19 cents	10 cents	90

I am suggesting that our high national income is not a measure of our productivity; that, for what it will actually buy, it is below what the United States has been used to, even below what is needed to maintain our old standard of living, and that somebody is hoodwinking the people into believing that they are going to get the goods they got before, plus extra for some or all of their savings, plus rebuilding Europe and Russia and Japan, reequipping English mines and plants, starting a manufacturing economy in South America and a few other countries.

I now test my supposition on a different base. I take the period 1929–30 as a composite year. It was one of the last good years, undisturbed by depression or war—when unemployment was normal (only 3,000,000 total unemployed), when cost of living was an index figure of 97, as compared with 115 now. The gross national product in that year was $88,000,000,000. It was a year of good living; you could buy anything you wanted.

In the year 1929–30 much employment was on a 48-hour-a-week basis. Other things being equal, it will take 120 men now to produce as much as was produced by 100 men in 1929–30, simply because they now work fewer hours. The 40-hour week was made a Federal edict in 1934 under the Blue Eagle, the first of the New Deal's regulations of business. Shorter hours appear in more union negotiations all the while and some industries now are working 35 hours a week. For the past 12 years labor, whether organized or not, has been coming steadily closer to a 40-hour week nationally. The workers of the Nation march en masse to the chant, "Shorter hours for all."

THE LABOR FORCE

If it took 46,000,000 gainfully employed to produce our standard of living in 1929–30 it will probably take 9,000,000 more now to produce the same volume of goods and services, other things being equal. And since there are 139,000,000 people in the United Stats now and there were only 123,000,000 then, it will take 12 percent more produce, or 12 percent more producers, to give to all the same standard of living that 123,000,000 enjoyed in 1929–30. So we now have our 46,000,000 workers increased by 9,000,000, plus 12 percent, making a total of 61,600,000 workers needed at 40 hours a week to give the old 1929–30 standard of living to our present population. But that is not all.

Vacations take their toll of production. The old-fashioned 2 weeks of paid vacation for the office force now is extending to the factory workers. It begins as 1 week, but an avowed union objective is 2 weeks and even 3 for employees long in service. It is doubtful if it will stop short of 2 weeks in a complete coverage. The paid vacation sounds too reasonable to be opposed and seems in fact to have a place in our higher standard of living. Then holidays are being added. The number is now seven. The ultimate 2 weeks' vacation means a loss of 4 percent to production time. In fact, 2 percent would be a conservative figure; it allows for office workers, railroad workers, teachers and those others who are already getting vacations. Thus, to make up the

vacation loss and still maintain our 1929–30 standard of living, we need 1,200,000 more workers—bringing the figure to 62,800,000.

UNPRODUCTIVE DEMANDS

But now we have a few increased demands on the labor force, when compared with 1929–30.

The Federal Government now employs 2,400,000. In 1929–30 the number was 550,000. So the demand on the labor force is increased by 1,850,000.

Then there is the defense establishment. In 1945, there were 11,300,000 in the military services. In May 1946, there were 4,000,000, estimated. In 1947–48 or 1949 there will be, I've heard, some 2,000,000, against some 300,000 in 1929–30. Assuming half of these would enter gainful employment, we may say the increased military demand on the labor force is 850,000.

Our Government is trying to provide for veterans some of the education it took away from them in their 4 years of war, and there are some 500,000 of them in our colleges for 1 to 4 years, off the gainful pay rolls.

Adding all these increased demands to our 62,800,000, we find that the labor force needed to reproduce the 1929–30 standard of living now is 66,000,000.

Next we should recognize the effect of our social progress. Benefits of various kinds are drawing off gainful workers from the labor force. The effects of unemployment compensation, old-age insurance over 65, and the veteran program are estimated for me at three and one-half to four million people, divided as follows: The beneficiaries of the veteran program number 1,600,000; of unemployment compensation, 1,400,000; and of old-age pensions 2,000,000. If we discount the old-age figure by 75 percent, and, to be conservative, admit that all the veterans in college are included in the veteran program, it leaves the total of these three social activities at 3,000,000 workers withdrawn from the labor pool.

It seemed very high to me, but adding these 3,000,000 brings to 69,000,000 the labor force needed to produce now a standard of living equal to that produced in 1929–30 by a labor force of 46,000,000.

There are two counteracting factors to be considered: (a) technological advance, which increases output per man-hour and decreases the number of workers required, and (b) the growing inefficiency of labor for the past 6 years which increases the number required.

Technological improvements hitherto have raised industrial production 2 or 3 percent per year; but for the economy as a whole the average is not more than 1 to 1½ percent a year, or 11 to 16 percent for the years from 1930 to 1940. From 1940 on, there is no gain in production per man per hour.

The inefficiency of labor is no delusion and it is a tangle that's difficult to unravel and evaluate. Less work for more men seems to be labor's objective. It varies in different plants and different industries. One national service recently estimated the efficiency of labor generally at 65 percent to 70 percent of normal. One manufacturer said it took 120 man-hours today to produce the equivalent car that 84 man-hours produced before the war. If these were typical, it would take 50 percent more labor to offset this loss. It seems unbelievable, but it has a powerful effect on production and must be considered in an estimate of this kind. To be conservative, we might estimate that the technological advance of 16 percent since 1930 would be offset by the inefficiency of labor.

HAVE WE GOT IT?

Now, how many workers can be had out of the present population of 139,000,000? If you eliminate children up to 14 years, there are 108,000,000 left.

In 1929–30 the number of those above 14 years of age who accepted gainful employment was 54.5 percent. If we apply this ratio to the present population the result is 58,860,000. That figure, therefore, represents the total potential of gainfully employed, or, as we call it, the labor force. (Under the pressure of war the figure of 54.5 percent may have been exceeded as much as 10 percent, but that is not attainable in peacetimes.)

The conclusion is that we now have a labor force of approximately 59,000,000, whereas we need one of 69,000,000 to assure ourselves of a standard of living equal to that of 1929–30—and we are looking for that 1929–30 standard again, with a large plus sign after it.

This is not a rigid calculation. It is a businessman's approximation, based on some experience, some observation, and some help and advice from others on the percentage effects of new conditions. Certainly, there is a shortage of labor now and there is reason to believe that this will be true for some years to come.

What effect will this have on labor rates? Will labor efficiency rise while there are more jobs than men? And what then of prices? Must we pile upon an unsatisfied, lopsided, domestic demand a lot of foreign orders, and should we encourage them by loans, ostensibly to hold up our prosperity? Would it not be better to work 45 hours a week for a few years than to keep on talking about working less? When we need to recover our own standard of living by repairing and re-equipping plants that have had 6 years of hard wear and tear, shall we re-equip the rest of the world first? If so, do we realize it means sacrifice and self-discipline?

EDITORIAL NOTE

Mr. Walker's case may be stated in another way with the same result. First, owing to (a) the shorter work week, (b) more time out for vacations with pay, and (c) the increase of population, we need now a labor force of 62,800,000 to produce as much per capita as we produced and consumed in 1929–30 with a labor force of 46,000,000—that is to say, we need a labor force greater by 12,800,000 to produce the same standard of living as in 1929–30. Then we look at what we call the labor force, meaning all who are gainfully employed. The rule is that of the total population above the age of 14, 54.5 percent will offer themselves for gainful employment. Thus, in 1929–30 with a total population of 123,000,000, the labor force was 46,000,000. By the same ratio a total population of 139,000,000 in 1947 should yield a labor force of 58,860,000. But if it is production you are thinking of, this is an illusory figure because of the way the labor force now is used, or not used. As compared with 1920–30, many more are counted as gainfully employed who are not actually engaged in production, as, for example, men in the armed forces and people employed by Government; and, furthermore, many who belong to the labor force in a statistical sense are not there, as for example, the veterans who are being educated at public expense. Thus, we arrive at the following calculation:

Theoretical labor force from a total present population of 139,000,000; i. e., 54.5 percent of the total population above the age of 14	58,860,000
Now deduct:	
Increase of Government employees	1,850,000
Increase in military service	850,000
Veterans at school	500,000
Beneficiaries of various social programs	3,000,000
Total deductions	6,200,000
Remainder	52,660,000

This remainder of 52,660,000 is what we now have to compare with what we called the labor force in 1929–30, whereas to produce a standard of living equal to that of 1929–30—that is to say, the same quantity of goods and services per capita—we should need at the present time a labor force of 62,800,000. The apparent shortage is approximately 10,000,000, and it is a startling figure. This is entirely Mr. Walker's idea. Many economists may be expected to dispute it.

Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

For the fiscal year 1948 estimates for administrative expenses for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, after submission to and approval by the Bureau of the Budget, totaled $670,000. The Government corporation control subcommittee of the House has reduced this to $532,000, or a cut of $138,000.

During the fiscal year 1947, Congress authorized the sum of $532,000 for administrative expenses for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. It later approved $18,000 to cover the cost of the pay increase which could not be absorbed. This made the total available for the current fiscal year $550,000. Because of the delay and uncertainties attending the approval of the deficiency request, which occurred on May 26, 1947, the Insurance Corporation had to cut down its operations and effect every possible economy.

The amount which the committee has now recommended for the fiscal year 1948 is the identical amount approved for the fiscal year 1947, but without consideration of the amount allowed for the deficiency. This means, in effect, that the committee expects the Insurance Corporation to continue during the fiscal year 1948 on the same restricted basis that it has had to operate under during 1947, with no opportunity for growth, no opportunity to further extend the protection of insurance of accounts, and no funds with which to meet contingencies which can and may arise.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has grown, both in size and importance, in each year since its creation. Savings against loss up to a maximum of $5,000 in the Insurance Corporation represents a most important segment in the Nation's economy. Insurance of accounts by an agency of the Federal Government is a life line that not only safeguards the small savings of millions of American citizens but provides great sums of money necessary to adequate home financing in the United States through private mutual, cooperative savings institutions.

Relying on the Government's pledge of protection, over 4,500,000 American citizens have invested their savings to the extent of $6,500,000,000 in these insured associations. These are people of small means. They know little or nothing about balance sheets or financial matters and care little, relying wholly upon the knowledge that their Government has provided protection for their savings through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

In preparing the estimates for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation provision was made for the number of employees adequate to carry out the responsibilities imposed upon it by the Congress. Provision was also made for contingencies which can and may arise. This is good common sense. Nothing would be more fatal for the Insurance Corporation's operations than to be confronted with an emergency such as a receivership, impairment, defalcation, or any other cause requiring immediate action, only to find itself unprepared with insufficient personnel and without enough funds to meet the situation.

The action of the committee in reducing the 1948 estimates to the amount made available for the current fiscal year without consideration of the increasing demand upon the Corporation and the need for additional personnel which must be paid for at the increased rates of pay, places the operations of this agency in a very serious and uncertain position.

Address by George Bacopoulos in the Greek Parliament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following address delivered in the Greek Parliament by Mr. George Bacopoulos, deputy for Athens, dedicated to the President of the United States, Harry Truman:

Gentlemen, it is clear from the contents of the communications made by the president of the council, or at least such is the impression given therefrom, that their main point is the one referring to the decision of the people of the United States and their great President, Mr. Truman, to save Greece from the total economic collapse that is now imminent; an event which would have decided of the date of the Greek state and the Greek society; to save Greece from the threat of communism and slavism lurking at its back. And this impression is justified, because this is, indeed, the principal subject of the communications. In the course of the debate on these communications, however, this subject was confined to a secondary place. It is reasonable that the debate should principally devolve around the question of public order and the security of the state. It was proper that the debate should cover this burning question, and previous speakers have reported events of great importance, especially those described for the first time, with such convincing force and national feeling, by Mr. Eliades, the honorable and so hardly tried Florina member. This, however, does not justify the transfer of the principal subject of the government's statements to a secondary degree and its being placed on a plane almost equal to nonexistence.

As though it had itself been subjected to an attack by the parastatal organizations, which were so triumphantly led to this House by the distinguished diplomat and experienced politician from Argolis and Corinthia. And as if frightened by this attack it drew away from sight to avoid the danger. It dived down into the swamp, shall we say, of untimely and purposeless debate on parastatal organizations in order to avoid moral injury.

It would appear that there is still an insufficient apprehension of the moral and material omnipotence of the decision of the people of the United States to put an end to the activities of small or big agitators, the enemies of democratic principles and international justice. All talk about parastatal organizations, which, in fact, do not even exist, at this time and after this important decision, is mere pettishness. Assistance has last year been granted to us by Great Britain, and we are grateful for it, but no decision was taken to put an end to the unsettled conditions and the gradual undermining of Greece, owing to bad neighbors, because the assistance granted was not accompanied by a will to this effect. All sorts of parastatal organizations, EAM, Communist, NOF, SNOF, etc., and everything that goes against the decision of the great American Commonwealth to impose justice and peace on earth, will be swept away like toys by the irresistible current of the creative capacity of the American spirit.

Let us only pray that this spirit will also extend its directive capacity and interest in Greece to all aspects of society and even of the state, and let us ignore the malignant and calculated calumnies that this decision should serve imperialistic aims of the great American democracy. What a blasphemy. But this blasphemy is being uttered by those who in their fight for supremacy have made it a principle to distort even the simplest truth. The great decision of the American Commonwealth, to assist and save Greece, derives from the traditions first created on that historic day of July 4, 1776, and the cause is that small nations are facing the danger of losing their freedom.

In 1776 the heroes of the American Revolution and founders of the present great Commonwealth wrote in that historic document by which they declared the independence of the United States, that all men have equal rights, among which the inalienable right of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. It is from this declaration that the tradition starts, which led to the present great decision. And it is not the first time that Americans take up the defense of the freedom of small peoples. In the course of time this tradition took solid roots in the history of the United States.

In 1822 President Monroe declared that the United States would not be indifferent in case the independence of any people of the Western Hemisphere were to be threatened by any European power. This took place at the time of the Greek Revolution during which many Americans came here and assistance of all sorts was sent to support the Greeks in their fight for liberty; an assistance granted with the knowledge of the American Government but without its pursuing any imperialistic aim whatever.

In 1863 Abraham Lincoln, the greatest of Presidents, manifested again, with his famous Proclamation of Emancipation, the belief of American spirit in liberty and the right of all to be free.

Inspired by this belief, Americans fought in 1898 against Spain for the liberation of Cuba. They defeated Spain and occupied the island. They kept it just as long as was necessary to reconstitute it economically and to organize it as an independent state, and then departed. During the period of their occupation they had not omitted to organize a sanitary service which freed the island from the scourge of yellow fever.

True to the same tradition, Americans have sent their armies to Europe in both world wars to fight for the freedom of peoples and international justice. And we all know the share of their contribution to the victory over the evil sprits of humanity as personified in the Italian Duce, the German Fuehrer, and Boris of Bulgaria, in their attempt to subjugate other nations. In all these cases there is not the slightest sign of an intention to follow an imperialistic policy on the part of the American Commonwealth, but only sacrifices in the interest of the freedom of others. But even if the assistance granted to us and the interest shown by the people of the United States in our country, does have the sense of an imperialistic policy, we accept it with pleasure, because it is incomparably preferable to find ourselves under the political influence of such a people than to come under the yoke of criminal communism and barbaric Slavism [applause]: under the influence of a people whose political leaders are competing as to who will be the first to serve international justice in the case of their beloved Greece. Just a few hours ago the news was given over the radio that one of the leaders of the Republican Party, Senator from the State of Ohio, leader of the Senate majority, son of the late President William Taft, and one of the candidates for the office of President, Mr. ROBERT TAFT, declared that he will insist on a speedy assistance to Greece and will oppose the amendment of the House of Representatives as regards a reduction of the amount and any other amendment attaching any strings to the assistance given.

Besides the said tradition, substantial reasons and immediate causes have called for this decision of the American Commonwealth. And these reasons have been created by those who, with actually imperialistic intentions of domination over other nations, have endangered fundamental principles for which a Second World War, such a destructive one, had to be fought.

One is tempted to think that a malignant fate was jealous of the good luck that was coming to the peoples of the world, victors and vanquished, after the victory of right over injustice, of real civilization against camouflaged barbarism.

The same malignant fate which for centuries keeps appearing at important turns of humanity, at critical moments, to hinder the progress of the peoples toward mutual understanding put forth again on the international scene the malevolent spirit of the times, to protract the drama of war and unsettlement. It presented communism, this satanic organ of Slavism, by which it is threatening the independence and freedom of many peoples, for whom the Americans have fought and sustained large sacrifices.

The danger was immediate and great. We Greeks were running the greatest danger of all. In fact, from what has recently come to light, the conspiracy against our country was of a much larger scale than what we imagined. The Slavs had dangerously armed and organized much of the riffraff in Greece.

The whole world and we ourselves were wondering whether there was any hope of a deus ex machina appearing to save the liberal-minded nations from the gloom of slavery and despair. And there, the sunrise from the West. The message of President Truman appeared on the gloomy international horizon as an enlivening sun. Its historic contents are well known. It will constitute a most important milestone in human history. On one side it will be a breakwater against the waves of the communistic plague, which was threatening to flood over the whole of humanity, and on the other hand it will constitute the starting point for favorable evolutions. It has been an honor for us that this milestone was placed in Greece. The fates have again set Greece as one of the advance sentinels of civilization.

It is up to us to prove ourselves worthy of this honor. It depends on us to take advantage of the good fortune sent us by God through President Truman at the most critical moment.

The Government, which includes men of high ideals and capable of fully grasping the significance of this event, should turn its undivided attention to it and prepare the

premises for its realization, adapting them to American mentality which hates bureaucracy, procrastination, useless red tape and slowness. All of us here must rally around the Government, or any other nationalist government, to contribute all we can so that the great aim of social and economic reconstruction of our country may be attained. And when our fatherland is reconstructed, thanks to the assistance of our great friends and to our own efforts, and when economic despondency and misery, into which we have sunk, on account of the war, is followed by prosperity and a moral order of things, then even the slightest vestige of the multiple organizations and rebellions will have also disappeared in the same manner as mosquitoes disappear after a morass has been drained.

Then, we may be sure that Greece will prosper. Greece will prosper, as she deserves to.

Then, grateful to God and Truman, to Truman and the people of the United States, to the people of the United States and anyone who would have cooperated for the good of Greece, we will build on the highest summit of our Macedonian mountains a replica, an immense replica of the Statue of Liberty, adorning the port of New York, with the torch in her hand to show the light to the people beyond our frontiers and to show to them what liberty and social justice are. With the other hand she will be crowning the statue of Truman, who will in this case symbolize the idealistic greatness of the American spirit. [Long applause.]

Broadcasting of Proceedings of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Let Us Put Congress on the Air," by Jack H. Pollack, published in Pageant magazine of July 1947.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S PUT CONGRESS ON THE AIR

(By Jack H. Pollack)

You sit in your favorite easy chair, flip your radio dial. The announcer says: "We now bring you the United States Senate."

Immediately you are transported to the plush-carpeted upper Chamber. There, stormy debate is taking place on whether your rent should be raised or your income tax lowered, how much sugar should be allowed on your table or what size army your country needs. For as long as debate goes on—or as long as you care to listen—you have a ringside seat at history, your history, being made.

This is no far-fetched idea. A bill has been introduced that would put Congress' entire proceedings on the air. If this measure becomes law, television will bring you an eyeful as well as an earful. You may see half-empty chambers, legislators snoozing over their newspapers, taking a pinch of snuff, utilizing brass spittoons, sometimes even coming to blows.

There is no question that you and every other citizen should know more about what goes on among your elected representatives. One poll shows that only one voter in seven ever writes or wires his Congressman, and that half of us do not even know our Congressman's names. Broadcasting proceedings on Capitol Hill would change that almost overnight. And the behavior of our lawmakers could be expected to improve noticeably.

ALOLPH SABATH, of Illinois, whose 41 years of service make him the dean of the House of Representatives, puts it this way: "Broadcasting Congress would raise the level of debate. Members would restrain themselves from reckless remarks and not go off half-cocked." And Mr. BILBO, of Mississippi, expresses his own feeling: "If people back home heard everything we said in the Senate, I wouldn't get reelected—and neither would some of my high-falutin' colleagues."

Were Congress on the air, you probably would no longer hear Nebraska's KENNETH WHERRY try to slug Oregon's WAYNE MORSE on the Senate floor. Pennsylvania's Representative ROBERT RICH might think twice befor offering his solution for handling the atomic bomb: "Hide it so no one could get it." If Massachusetts housewives were listening to him, Representative CHARLES GIFFORD might pause before charging that women Congressmen are "dangerous."

In a recent exchange on the Senate floor between BREWSTER, of Maine, and TOBEY, of New Hampshire, BREWSTER irritably declined to continue because "it would be like arguing the right of way with a skunk." This unparliamentary remark does not appear in the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because, on reflection, BREWSTER deleted it. Had he been facing a microphone at the time, however, chances are he never would have made it.

Democracy requires regular communication between citizens and their elected representatives. The Pilgrim Fathers came face to face with their public servants in town meetings. President Lincoln put aside time twice a week to talk to workers, farmers, businessmen, housewives. Even professorial Woodrow Wilson once sighed, "I would rather hear what men are talking about on trains and in the shops and by the firesides than hear anything else, because I want guidance and I know I would get it there."

Were Congress broadcast, legislators would be more apt to follow the people's will rather than greedy, vocal pressure groups. Opinion polls show that ordinary folk often are years ahead of Washington in their thinking. Long before Congress adopted such measures, Americans favored war preparedness, price control, pay-as-you-go taxation. Three years before Pearl Harbor, a Gallup poll found that most Americans wanted to stop shipping scrap iron to Japan.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, who introduced the bill to put Congress on the air, aptly points out: "It's the people's business we're transacting, and they have a right to know what is going on. If we fail to broadcast our proceedings and keep in step with the times, our citizens may wonder if we're afraid to let them hear what we're saying. * * * We provide galleries for people to come and hear Congress. Why shouldn't the millions who can't come also be able to listen in?"

The Pepper bill would allow any commercial station or network to send over the air waves all or part of Congress' proceedings either as a live or canned broadcast. Complete transcriptions would be made of all debates, which stations could buy at cost. PEPPER adds: "Press and radio reports about Congress are often fragmentary and strongly biased. Uncensored broadcasts would serve as a check on those newspapers which delete or distort the news."

The press has a defender in Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas. He opposes legislative broadcasts because they "would take away the dignity and solemnity of the Senate." Actually, that dignity and solemnity is perhaps the greatest obstacle to broadcasting Congress. The haughty upper Chamber, where many Senators still walk in the shadow of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, has been far more hostile to the proposal than the often more democratic House. For example, Ohio's Senator BRICKER dismisses the Pepper bill as a silly idea. But Representative GEORGE BENDER, Ohio's largest vote getter, declares: "Broadcasting Congress would give more Americans a chance to participate in democracy."

Strongest Senatorial objection to broadcasting Congress is behind the scenes. Last year members of the Streamlining Congress Committee recommended a weekly broadcast; when the idea was frowned on by Maine's influential WALLACE WHITE (now majority leader), the recommendation was dropped.

Outwardly, Senators offer various arguments against being aired. Some fear their privacy of conversation would be jeopardized (though a simple seat switch could disconnect any individual microphone). North Carolina's CLYDE HOEY says, "Broadcasting us would only increase conversation. We need more action—less talk." Rhode Island's THEODORE GREEN adds, "If the Senate were broadcast, it would never do any work."

There are dissenters, of course. Wisconsin's Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Judiciary Committee chairman, asserts: "Every means to give the American people a closer understanding of their National Legislature is worth trying. I have often recommended that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be modernized and put on sale on American newsstands. This suggestion could go hand in hand with broadcasting limited sessions of Congress."

Kansas' ARTHUR CAPPER, 82-year-old Senate veteran, adds: "I've witnessed a lot of changes in my time and there's no reason why some day people shouldn't be able to hear and see Congress broadcast. Any proposal that will give people more information about their Representatives ought to be encouraged."

Despite this, the United States Senate in many ways still is back in the gaslit era. Lacking even a public-address system, upper-chamber acoustics are so atrocious that it is difficult to hear the near-whispers of aged Senators. Others, too proud to wear hearing aids, also are at a disadvantage. Obviously microphones ought to be placed behind Senators' desks to help them hear what colleagues are saying. Idaho's GLEN TAYLOR concurs: "Broadcasting Congress is an excellent idea, but even before we get around to it, we ought to fix it so that we can hear what's going on ourselves."

The House of Representatives already boasts seven microphones, including one each for the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders and the roll-call clerk. An operator in the gallery controls voice volume. Lacking the Senatorial filibustering privilege, Representatives are jealous of the time allotted them. This prompts CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, to observe, "If we put Congress on the air, we ought to put it all on or not at all. Otherwise, we wouldn't be giving people back home a true picture."

Broadcasting complete proceedings would bring greater recognition to the hard-working Congressman now hiding his light under a bushel. Tennessee's Democrat ESTES KEFAUVER avers, "If we were on the air, public indignation and enthusiasm would be multiplied, a healthy sign in a democracy."

Actually, a few congressional events now do go on the air. Recently Americans heard the first live broadcast of a congressional committee's proceedings when two networks caught Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson testifying on the Greek-Turkish loan. Since last year some radio stations have been recording, editing and then rebroadcasting important Washington happenings. Ex-Secretary Ickes' last press conference from the Interior Department was wire-recorded; so was the Bilbo cross-examination before the Senate War Investigating Committee.

Despite these preliminary successes, radio officials entertain misgivings about airing 96 Senators and 435 Representatives regularly. They fear it would accentuate the ham rather than the statesman, and bore or disillusion the public. One radio man complains, "Congress would be too highbrow for our gum-chewing audience." Another warns, "The blabbermouths would have a field day at the expense of the less articulate." Yet Nathan Straus, president of WMCA in New York, declares, "Radio can perform no greater service than to bring into every American home the deliberations of those who make our laws."

What really disturbs radio most is that Congress on the air would have to be a "sustaining" program. Instead of a lucrative advertiser, the people—who elect the program's participants—would be the sponsor.

Some legislators resent this general attitude rather strongly. Says Oklahoma's Representative MIKE MONRONEY, "I think it is rather pathetic that the United States Congress, in discussing an important issue, must beg for time to reach the people of this country and then be allocated time at 11:15 at night." Adds ex-Representative John Coffee, of Washington, "The airways, after all, are 'public domain'."

Some suggest that Congress run its own broadcasting set-up, with plants on the east and west coasts for short wave. Twelve frequencies would be needed. Engineers estimate it would cost $800,000 annually to operate two congressional stations—one for the Senate and one for the House. Two million dollars would be required to install the equipment.

A government-owned station has been the answer in New Zealand, only country now broadcasting complete legislative sessions. Ever since the Labor Party came to power a dozen years ago, New Zealand has been airing its parliamentary proceedings over a 60,000-watt government station in Wellington. Legislators can be heard from 2:30 to 11 p. m. daily; not allowed to read speeches over the air, they make debate snappy and extemporaneous. During popular listening hours, equal time is given to both parties.

Two years ago Canada's prairie province of Saskatchewan also began broadcasting part of its legislative proceedings from Regina, the capital. Radio time, purchased from a local station, is allotted to parties on the basis of their representation. A government publication reports that "public reaction has been enthusiastic beyond our fondest hopes."

In the United States, Connecticut has experimented in airing its public servants. Thanks to the new radio room in the State Capitol, Nutmeg voters get full reports on legislative debate and hearings from their representatives' own lips. These State-sponsored broadcasts are worked out in cooperation with Connecticut's 15 radio stations.

City-government proceedings have been broadcast in Buffalo and Toledo. But the most successful municipal experiment was in airing the New York City Council between 1938 and 1940. Broadcast by city-owned WNYC, the program won a listening audience of over a million and made the average New Yorker far more civic-minded. Sad to say, ward-heeling Tammanyites finally voted themselves off the air so they could carry on in comparative privacy.

Today Americans are Congress-conscious and information-hungry. Many would applaud the opinion of Dr. George Galloway, staff director of the Reorganizing Congress Committee: "It seems only a question of time before Congress will use radio and television as channels of direct communication with the electorate." The main objections seem to come from Congress itself. In the last analysis, if you want Congress broadcast—and want it hard enough—you'll get it.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

The voluntary reduction in expenses which the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has made year after year speaks for itself.

The estimate for HOLC which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget for 1948 totaled $3,875,000 and called for a total of 910 employees, both home office and field. After these estimates had been submitted to Congress the Corporation found it could close the Dallas Regional Office and save $152,000. The Government Corporation Control Committee was advised of this closing and informed that the estimates for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation could be further reduced from $3,875,000 to $3,723,000. This saving effected also a reduction in personnel of 70 employees. The committee has reduced these estimates to $3,000,000, a cut of $723,000.

The Corporation's records show conclusively that on its own initiative it has effected economies and eliminated personnel at a rate greater than the reductions in the Corporations workload.

As of June 30, 1946, the number of loan and property accounts had been reduced by 57.8 percent from the total number of loans made; whereas, during the fiscal year 1946 the Corporation's administrative expenses had been reduced by 82.5 percent as compared with the fiscal year 1937 which is the first year in which the Corporation's status changed from that of a lending institution to one in liquidation.

The Corporation's personnel has been reduced from a peak of 21,000 to the employment, as of May 30, of 792. Field operations for the entire Nation are now carried on through two regional offices.

As of June 30, 1946, there were 430,307 accounts scattered over the entire Nation. This had been reduced on December 31 last to 387,642 accounts. Of this number, 81,220, or nearly 21 percent had balances of $500 or less. Over 22 percent more, or 87,015 accounts, had balances ranging from $500 to $1,000. Approximately 70 percent of the borrowers, numbering 269,249, owed the Corporation $2,000 or less.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation in extending relief to over a million distressed home owners became the largest mortgage-lending institution of its kind in this or any other country of the world. Even today, with practically all of its properties disposed of and its mortgage-loan portfolio reduced by over one-half of the original number of loans made, it still remains the largest mortgage-lending institution of its kind in the country.

In the original disbursement of billions of dollars, and subsequently in the collection of many millions of dollars, every working day received in the form of cash, money orders, etc., defalcations or embezzlements have been practically nil. This is attributed, in the main, to the Corporation's personnel, both quantitative and qualitative.

From time to time various speculative interests have suggested that they would buy all the loans of the Corporation at par and relieve the Home Owners' Loan Corporation of all responsibility. None of these proponents have been able to demonstrate financial responsibility sufficient to purchase even a small part of the loans.

The reports which have been circulated from time to time that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation loans would soon be sold out have consistently stimulated activties on the part of private lending institutions to persuade borrowers whose names they secured from public records to refinance with them immediately. As a result over 92,000 loans which had been paid down to a point where they no longer represented any risk have been taken over by private lenders. The interest loss to the Corporation on these loans which had been made good at great public expense was over $40,000,000.

In 1943 the executive vice president of the United State Savings and Loan League devised a plan under which the Corporation would prepare lists of all its borrowers, by States and communities, with the facts concerning their accounts, and furnish this information to all who might be interested in bidding for any of the loans. The impracticability of such a plan, however, is apparent to anyone familiar with the home mortgage business. It would cost the Corporation a large sum to prepare such data as that suggested by the United States Savings and Loan League and the Corporation would have no assurance whatever that any part of the loans would be purchased.

If the lists were circulated, there would be many calls at the homes of borrowers with obviously disturbing results. Wherever possible, institutions or brokers having the lists would take over, by direct refinancing, the loans which they regarded as good and leave the Corporation with the small accounts and those which they considered doubtful.

Subsequent to the proposal to invite bids for the HOLC loans by States and communities, the United States Savings and Loan League undertook to organize State committees which would make firm purchase commitments. This effort failed, however, and no dependable commitment of any kind has ever been submitted.

No sooner had the Corporation completed its lending operations in 1936 than proposals were made to turn these loans back to the institutions which only a very short time before were the very ones who were threatening foreclosure. It cost the Corporation over $58,000,000 to place these loans on its books. This amount was not charged against the borrowers but was absorbed as a part of its operating expenses.

It was frequently stated that the Government should get out of the real estate mortgage business. Notwithstanding the fact that only a short time before these mortgage lending institutions were pleading with their Government to come to their rescue.

In July of 1941 the United States Savings and Loan League presented to the Corporation a plan for selling its assets to the 12 Federal Home Loan Banks. It provided for passing the assets of the Corporation to the members of the banks for their ownership and administration. It was proposed that the Corporation be not dissolved and that its bonds be left outstanding since by letting these bonds remain outstanding whatever loss there may be ultimately will fall on the Government without requiring any additional guarantees from the Government. The memorandum outlining this plan frankly stated that:

"The above suggested plan places the losses upon the Government where it justly belongs."

The Government Corporation Control Subcommittee expresses the opinion that it is possible to sell all of the outstanding loans on the books at the present time at not less than face value without recourse. It should be possible to make such sales by areas or States, selling en bloc all the mortgages in a given area. The loans are for the most part paid down to where they are backed by sound mortgage collateral, and should be readily salable in large lots.

If previous proposals, at a time when loan balances were substantially higher than they are today, failed to progress such a plan is far less practical today with loan balances so far reduced and with loans being paid in full at the rate that they are at the present time.

Conservation Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the prize essay written by Miss Muriel Moore, of the New Market High School, of New Market, Va. Her essay, which is entitled "Conservation Farming," was the winning essay of the Lord Fairfax Soil Conservation District of the Valley of Virginia, composed of the counties of Frederick, Clarke, Warren, and Shenandoah. More than 500 pupils in 20 high schools competed in the contest. In my opinion the essay, which I am submitting for the RECORD, is worthy of the consideration that it will receive by being published in the record of our proceedings.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION FARMING

(By Muriel Moore, New Market High School, New Market, Va.)

For years our soil was thought inexhaustible. New land was plentiful. New farms could be carved from the wilderness cheaper than the old could be maintained. Now we are building a new economy based on proper land usage. We know now that our lands can be exhausted. Few virgin soils remain. Our soil is our heritage to be passed on to the next generation better than it came to us. For on our soil depends the progress of America and that progress is in our trust.

America was built by men and women seeking independence and security. Our food, our shelter, our clothing, all come from the soil. As the soil is lost, so is our security and our freedom. Without secure farm homes, adequate and stable incomes for farm people and a continuous supply of farm products, we Americans cannot maintain a high standard of living either on our farms or in our cities.

Already we have great rural poverty where erosion has been particularly serious. More than 50,000,000 acres of once fertile American soil can no longer be used for the production of cultivated crops. From another 50,000,000 acres we have lost more than 50 percent of the topsoil. In fact, erosion has taken at least 25 percent of the topsoil from half of the farm land of the United States. Poor lands mean poor crops and low incomes. As incomes drop, the standard of living falls, taxes go unpaid, trade is reduced, school facilities decline, malnutrition becomes common, and people migrate in search of freedom and security. This has been the history of mankind.

Serious as erosion is in some areas, the situation in most sections is not so critical but that it can be controlled by prompt action. Uncontrolled water moving swiftly down our slopes and hillsides is the greatest destroyer of valuable topsoil and soil nutrients. The Mississippi alone annually dumps at least 730,000,000 tons of soil into the Gulf of Mexico. To this tremendous tonnage must be added the millions of tons of soil washed off fields and dropped along the way.

Farmers use tremendous amounts of commercial fertilizer every year in an effort to maintain and improve the fertility of their soil. This tonnage is puny in comparison with the soil nutrients erosion removes each year. Even the volume of soil nutrients taken from our fields in the form of crops is small compared with losses due to erosion.

Conservation calls for intelligent utilization of our land resources today and their maintenance for profitable future production. It may mean putting the land in good physical condition, changing the rotation, using fertilizer and soil-building crops, contour farming, strip cropping, terracing, and planting trees and grass.

But before any of these, must come a plan, a workable plan that will least disrupt the present productive capacity of the farm, and which will, at the same time, aim at soil conservation. The plan must take into consideration the physical characteristics of the farm—types of soil, fertility, erosion, and the degree of slope. It must show which fields by strip cropping, contour planting, terracing, and other conservation measures can be used for most profitable production of annual crops.

Contour strip cropping, the planting of alternate strips of cultivated and close-growing crops on the contour, holds fertile soil and rainfall and increases crop yields. To be most effective, some of more critical strips should be kept in hay crops of perennial grasses and legumes. A thick matting of grass filters the water, increases absorption and penetration, and slows down the movement of the run-off water. By keeping the soil and more of the water on the hillside crop production is benefited. In Iowa, records show that contouring in 1943 increased corn yields 5.6 bushels per acre. When rows are run on the contour each furrow acts as a miniature dam, holding the water in check so that more of it can soak into the ground and be stored for use of crops during periods of light rainfall. Contour cultivation distributes water over a field, eliminating concentration in low areas where gullies might start. Contour strip cropping makes possible a better balance between soil building and harvested crops on most farms. Less power is required for farming round the hill on the contour. With longer rows there are less turns.

Terracing is usually on larger fields having long, gradual slopes. Terraces are in the nature of long dams. When on the true contour they hold the water or, if made with a slight degree of slope, they conduct the water slowly and safely off the field.

The maintaining of high organic matter content in the soil is very important in the control of erosion. Organic matter increases the absorptive capacity of the soil. This reduces the amount of run-off water, thereby lessening erosion. It is important, therefore, to follow a rotation system that will return large amounts of organic matter to the soil.

Trees and grass hold water on the hillside, storing the surplus in the subsoil. Each blade of grass, each tree, each bit of organic matter serves as a barrier, holding the water where it falls until it can be absorbed. The sponge-like covering of dead leaves, twigs, and other litter releases the water slowly; protects and holds the soil in place. The roots of trees and grasses bind together the soil particles, holding them where they will be a source of plant nutrients.

Uncontrolled gullies not only destroy the fields where they exist, growing even wider, deeper, and longer, but they also may be responsible for a covering of unproductive subsoil over once fertile acres below. Gullies can best be checked with vegetation. Checking old gullies is important, but it is even more important to prevent the formation of new ones.

Soil losses in the United States total more than 5,000,000,000 tons annually along with the enormous loss of rainfall. From farm lands alone the annual loss is about 3,000,000,000 tons, enough to fill a freight train which would encircle the globe 18 times.

It is estimated for an adequate standard of living there ought to be five acres of arable land per capita in the world. Actually there are about two. Nutritionists estimate that at least 2½ acres are necessary for a minimum diet. Some nations have less than one.

Soil conservation is an obligation of every American interested in the preservation of freedom and security for the generations of tomorrow. As Patrick Henry said soon after the Revolution, "He is the greatest patriot who stops the most gullies." Thomas Jefferson, philosopher, statesman, and architect, taught and practiced the art of contour farming.

There Is a Legal Answer to Political Use of Racist or Religious Prejudices, and Chicago Has Found It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there is not a man or woman of responsibility in America who does not deplore race-baiting and religious-baiting in the Nazi pattern, and who has not anxiously canvassed the possibilities of fighting such actions effectively without sacrificing any of our own precious liberties of speech and press.

To my mind, the most intelligent suggestion made is that the political use of racial or religious prejudices should be regarded as against public interest and therefore classified as a crime.

My own great city of Chicago, always progressive and always ahead of the rest of the country in needed legislation, has actually adopted a city ordinance which makes the incitation of a race riot a crime under city law.

I am proud of my city for taking this action.

Under leave granted, I am inserting the full text of the ordinance. I hope that this will be a model for similar laws in every municipality and eventually in every State of this Union; and I do not see why this cannot become a model for a Federal act to help implement the civil rights provisions of the American Constitution.

Be it ordained by the City Council of the city of Chicago:

Section 1. chapter 193, of the municipal code of Chicago is amended by adding thereto the following section:

"193-1.1. Inciting race riots: It shall be unlawful for any person or group of persons, or any corporation, firm, organization, association, league, or other body, to print, publish, post, distribute, circulate, or exhibit, or cause to be printed, published, posted, distributed, circulated, or exhibited, any handbill, dodger, circular, booklet, pamphlet, leaflet, card, sticker, periodical, pictorial print,

picture, painting, or other written or printed matter which exposes any individual or any racial or religious group to such hatred, contempt, ridicule, or hatred, violence, hostility, or discriminatory practices against any person or group of persons because of his or their race, color, religion, or manner of worship as to endanger the public peace.

"Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be fined not less than $25 nor more than $200 or imprisoned for not less than 10 days nor more than 6 months for each offense.

"SEC. 2. This ordinance shall be in force from and after its passage and due publication."

Introduced by Alderman Benjamin M. Becker, fortieth.

Federal Home Loan Bank System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK SYSTEM

The estimates for the Federal Home Loan Bank System for the fiscal year 1948 as presented to the Congress amounted to $1,965,000. The committee has cut this $715,000 to $1,250,000.

Of the total of $1,965,000 requested, $1,398,819, or 71.2 percent would be fully repaid by the institutions examined or served. The amount which the committee recommends for all administrative expenses is $148,819 less than would be collected from private sources alone. If examinations of insured institutions on which the Government has a risk of $7,500,000,000 are to be carried on during 1948 even on a reduced basis there would be no funds left to cover any of the expenses of the office of the Governor of the Bank System, the Supervisor's office, Comptroller's office, Legal Department, and others.

The Federal Home Loan Bank System has grown, both in size and in importance, each year since its creation. The assets of the member institutions have more than doubled since 1939 and are now over $10,000,000,000.

During the fiscal year 1946, the 11 regional banks advanced to member institutions nearly $315,000,000. Repayments during the same year amounted to over $243,000,000 with balances outstanding at the end of the 1946 fiscal year of over $203,000,000.

The sale of the banks' debentures and bonds in the open market, have always been heavily oversubscribed because they represent the joint and several obligations of these banks. The country's greatest financial institutions are among the largest buyers of these debentures and bonds, and their purchases are a reflection of their judgment on the sound management of these banks.

Under the law these banks must be examined at least twice in every year. I am sure that the purchasers of these debentures and bonds know this fact. There would be good reason on the part of these purchasers to be concerned about the value of these bank debentures and bonds if they knew that through lack of funds the examination of these 11 banks would have to be curtailed.

If the amount recommended by the Committee for Administrative Expenses for the fiscal year 1948 should become law, the bank administration would have no choice other than to restrict the number of examinations to be made and narrow the scope of the examinations which could be made. Such a limitation could have serious consequences.

Everyone knows we are now in a period of the most serious inflation in real estate values. It is certainly as serious in its possibilities for trouble as it was when the worst mortgage panic in history took place in this country in the early thirties. The collapse in the real-estate-mortgage market at that time made it necessary for the Government, through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, to take over 1,000,000 defaulted mortgages and to make loans and advances to restore stability to the extent of nearly $3,500,000,000. We cannot shut our eyes to the contribution which is being made by many lending institutions of all kinds to the present state of affairs.

Under its rules and regulations the Bank System is required to examine all insured associations at least annually. At present there are over 2,500 such insured institutions. Because of the shortage of funds during 1947, the Federal Home Loan Bank staff of examiners dropped from 173 to 154. On a basis of the number of insured institutions at the present time and the increased size of the institutions, not less than 195 examiners can meet the need. Overdue examinations have risen from 386 at June 30, 1946, to approximately 500 at the present time.

Never before in the history of the Federal Home Loan Bank System has the necessity for current examinations been so great. This need is the result of the unprecedented demand for homes throughout the Nation together with the active market for existing homes. Supervision of insured institutions is based on the examiners' reports. There can be no intelligent supervision of these insured associations without accurate information which can be produced only by careful and up-to-date examinations.

Work of the Examining Division is not only essential for the protection of the savings of millions of American citizens whose incomes for the most part are not large, but for the protection of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation against losses and for the guidance of supervisors, directors, and officials of the insured associations. If only the amount recommended is approved, there may be serious repercussions on the responsibility and liability of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

During the current fiscal year, Congress authorized for the Bank System, $1,501,000. The deficiency to cover the cost of the pay increase which was approved on May 26, 1947, amounted to $140,000. In other words, during the fiscal year 1947, this Bank System operated on a subnormal basis with a total of $1,641,000. The Bank System estimates for the fiscal year 1948 provided for the recruitment of a staff sufficient to keep current with this work. It certainly stands to reason that if it was impossible to keep pace with the necessary work even under subnormal conditions with a total of $1,641,000, this bank operation cannot hope to come anywhere near doing the job with only $1,250,000.

The recommendation by the House also provides "that the cost of terminal leave of any personnel of the Office of the Administrator shall be paid out of funds available for administrative expenses to the constituent units of the National Housing Agency." This is an indeterminate figure and may be an additional drain on the resources of the Federal Home Loan Bank System which it cannot meet. In addition, if the amount recommended by the committee should become law, employees would have to be terminated at great expense from both the Examining Division and all other divisions and sections of the Bank System. Terminal leave would also have to be a determining factor as to the number of employees which will have to be terminated, since all terminal leave must be paid out of the reduced amount available.

Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the long-deserted estate on a side road just outside of town had been restored to its original beauty and usefulness. The old weather-beaten house had been transformed into a stately dwelling. The rough, weed-choked lawn had been cleaned up, fenced, and beautifully landscaped with shrubs and flowers.

The ramshackle barn had been replaced. The surrounding acreage, including a large woodland off toward the foothills, was under new fences, and was alive with growing crops and herds.

Indeed, the change in the old place was so impressive that the pastor of the local village church, on viewing the place and its transformation, was moved to remark: "My! My! The Lord certainly can work wonders." He was inspired. The host, the new owner of the place, readily accepted the observation, but after a moment's reflection, said: "But my good man, you must recall what this place looked like when God was working at it all by Himself."

The purpose of this story is to bring sharply to our attention the fact that God put a great heritage into our hands when He gave us land. He leaves it to our will, our initiative, and our resourcefulness to preserve that heritage. He furnishes the sunshine and the rain. We must do the work. In other words, the parable of the talents is exemplified in this story. Former owners of the estate had hidden the talent which God had given them. The present owner had increased the talents which God had entrusted to him, and the result was an inspiration to the pastor, the neighbors, and the world, and, above all, pleasing to God.

Nature has been especially generous with us in the Third District of Arkansas. Our forests, our fields, and our streams are bountiful. Our hills, our valleys, our plains are rich in scenic splendor. Our hardwoods, our fertile soil, and our useful minerals are on every hand. Our all-year-round climate is unmatched anywhere in the country. The district is a veritable garden spot. We are up front in the vanguard of progress. Our opportunities for development are unlimited.

Actually, our natural wealth has been so great that, for the most part, we have been disposed to accept nature's gifts as adequate to all our needs. As a result, we have neglected our responsibility to conserve our resources, and, therefore, our opportunity for progress. We have not always recalled that the gifts are exhaustible, and that we are called upon to work with our natural resources in such manner that they might be con-

served and developed to our continued advantage. We have not realized fully that our forests can be cut almost to the point of exhaustion; that our farm lands have been seriously depleted of soil fertility by erosion and our own neglect; that our streams require control and development. Nor have we fully appreciated the natural value of our hills and valleys, our streams, and our forests.

It appears to me that our immediate opportunities for progress continue to depend upon our efforts and successes in, first, soil conservation; second, diversified farming; third, orderly marketing; fourth, rural electrification; fifth, flood control and power development; sixth, improvement of our roads, highways, and common-carrier services.

Since the advent of Government interest and assistance in flood control and rural electrification a few years ago, we have made creditable progress in our district in each of the above directions. However, since we are now at the threshold of full realization of our efforts, it is imperative that we concentrate our interests and pull together so that our district may continue to grow and prosper.

Since I have been a Member of the Congress, I have supported all legislation which I thought would tend to the achievement of the objectives toward which we must strive. Now, let us take up briefly the six different items which I have mentioned.

Since the first immigrants landed on the shores of this country, we have exploited our soil and our other natural resources. Heretofore, when soil became so depleted that it would not sustain the family, there was always a new frontier, and the pioneers lifted their little families and moved westward across the mountains. These are the people who settled our own section. They came from Tennessee, Kentucky, Georgia, and Alabama. They were the salt of the earth. And so it continued until their posterity had moved westward to the Pacific. Now we must pioneer in a new direction, and we have learned that it is necessary to conserve what fertility is yet left in the soil and to reestablish that which we have taken away. I have constantly supported all the measures in the Congress, including the appropriation for soil conservation, which I thought would help the farmer keep and improve his heritage.

Closely allied with soil conservation, and a part of it, is crop diversification. My father was a corn farmer. He reared a family of nine children raising corn. Not until the last of us was nearly grown did he accept the diversification programs and begin to put back into the soil by crop rotation the fertility which the corn had taken away. I think farmers generally in our section now accept that as wise soil and business practice. I have supported this program at every opportunity.

In this connection, I might add that only in recent years has anything approaching security on the farm been developed. Workers in civil-service status have for years been contributing to a retirement fund against that day when they will be retired on account of age, physical disability, or completion of service tenure. The same situation obtains in most of our other industries where the laborer contributes to benefits of unemployment compensation under social security to take care of himself and his family in case of physical disability, lay-off, or retirement. Various enterprises are protected by law in their income. For instance, the utility companies, where rates are so fixed that they have a guaranteed 6-percent income above all expenses, including taxes, salaries, rebates, advertising funds, and public-relations funds. The same situation practically obtains in the insurance field, where the rates are fixed to insure proper protection to the policyholders and at the same time guarantee a profit to the company. But the farmer has no such security. He must fight and scratch for his. All too often he sells in a free and competitive market and must buy his machinery, his fertilizer, and his electricity in a protected market.

In view of these circumstances, it has become necessary for the farmer to watch his sowing and his reaping more than ever. No longer can he meet his competition by proceeding in a haphazard fashion. He has learned that in order to prevent the dumping of his product on a slow market at a loss, he can establish processing and cold-storage plants to hold his product until the demand is better. He also has established various marketing associations and cooperatives to help him in marketing his grain, his poultry, his livestock, and his fruits and berries. By this method he has a larger volume, and therefore can command a better bargain. I have supported legislation to encourage this enterprise upon the part of the farmer, and I think it is one of the essentials to security on the farm.

Rural electrification is really a godsend to the farm home. For years, our rural people hoped and clamored for electricity. It never came—until the Rural Electrification Administration was established and money was lent to the farmers to establish their own organization and bring this much needed commodity to their farms. When electricity came to the farm home, washing machines, refrigerators, stoves, and lights came with it. The farm home became more attractive to our young people, and as a result more of them are staying on the farm to make it their calling. I have supported this program with all my strength. I shall continue to support it, and I shall resist any movement to hamstring it.

Flood-control projects in our district are a definite reality. Already Norfork Dam is completed. Work is moving ahead at Bull Shoals. In the not too distant future, Gilbert Dam, the Lone Rock Dam, the Table Rock Dam, and the Beaver Dam will all be built. They will do three things to our district. First, they will control floods; second, they will develop much needed hydroelectric power, without which small industry will not come to our section; and, third, they will make our district one of the garden spots of the United States from a recreational standpoint. I shall continue to support these projects. I have voted in the past to tie all these dams together. I shall continue to vote the same way, believing that we will have a greater bargaining power when all our property is tied together than we do if we have single and isolated projects to offer the utility companies who are now asking for the power developed at the dams. They want to buy it at each dam separately.

I have supported and shall continue to support Federal aid to public roads, farm-to-market roads, and rural mail routes. They should receive help because progress marches along these roads.

I have also supported and shall continue to support Federal aid for airports. We are in the beginning of the air age. Air transportation is in its youth. Not only will the development of a great Federal and State aid program help us commercially, but it will be one of our strongest lines of defense in case of emergency.

With forces united, let us as farmers, laborers in the industries, and industry itself strive to work together for the future with our chins up and our motives just.

Japan Is Paradise for Government Planners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 14, 1947

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Mr. Ralph Donaldson of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

JAPAN IS PARADISE FOR GOVERNMENT PLANNERS
(Article 12)

Japan under the occupation is a paradise for planners, a happy hunting ground for regulators. There is enough price control, rationing, and allocation of scarce materials to delight the soul of the most avid New Dealer.

It is not surprising that a number of Washington bureaucrats, whose agencies were shot out from under them, so to speak, have found their way to Japan where they can practice the art of regulating a nation's economy to their heart's content.

Every basic commodity in Japan is scarce—fertilizer, food, oils, timber, coal, and steel.

The Japanese themselves ruined some of their production facilities by wasteful methods during the war and the years preceding it when they were preparing for war. Others we smashed with our B–29 bombing raids.

Japan has about 15,000,000 acres of land under cultivation. The Japanese Government has announced plans to put another 3,500,000 acres under cultivation, but American agricultural experts doubt whether this will be possible.

POPULATION TROUBLES GROW

Meanwhile, due to population dispersal as a result of bombings and the repatriation of Japanese from other countries, there has been a recent increase of 300,000 families, plus 2,000,000 individuals in the farm villages.

The production of fish, an important item in the Japanese diet, dropped during the war because many of the fishermen went

into the navy. They returned to find their boats deteriorated and their nets rotted, with little chance of replacement. They are now producing 3,000,000 tons of fish a month, but another 1,000,000 is needed.

Last August, SCAP authorized a Japanese Antarctic whaling expedition, but the authorization probably will not be repeated because all the other whaling countries protested.

Legislation is now being prepared to abolish tenant fishing. In the feudal days each coastal village had certain fishing rights. Most of these rights were mortgaged and the mortgages foreclosed. Thus for years the fishing rights have been controlled by absentee owners, who collected as high as 50 percent of the take.

TIMBER PINCH AGGRAVATED

From 1937 to 1944 the Japanese cut twice as much timber as they were raising. So they now have have a timber shortage, aggravated by the fact that much of their sawmill capacity was destroyed in the war.

The Japanese need lumber to build 4,000,000 homes, including the replacement of 3,000,000 destroyed in the war, 200,000 which depreciated to the extent of needing replacement and 800,000 needed to house repatriates. The industrial requirements probably will equal the amount needed for homes.

Large quantities of lumber are required for housing the Americans and their families. Additional quantities will be needed to crate the machinery shipped out of Japan for reparations.

Japan produced 57,000,000 metric tons of coal in 1940. Last year's production was only 23,000,000. The mining industry needs wood to shore up the tunnels and also to build miners' homes. It also needs steel for tools and machinery. But the steel industry, or what is left of it, needs coal in order to operate. The planners are having a tough time figuring that one out.

Farmers and fishermen are supposed to sell a certain percentage of their production to the Government which, in turn, rations it to consumers at controlled prices. What the producers have left over they may use themselves or sell in the black market.

In the fishing industry the rationing system works this way: only poor quality and slightly spoiled fish reach the legitimate market; the best quality finds its way to the black market. (Just like the OPA.) The government is now trying to figure out a way of overcoming this by allocating oil to run the fishing boats on the basis of the quantity and quality of fish sold through legitimate channels.

The great problem of the planners is to increase production of all kinds. But there is no profit motive in the Japanese economy now. The only incentives toward increased production are patriotism, pride in achievement, and a hope of better times in the future.

A controlled economy has never been successful in peacetime in modern times. But it has a better chance to succeed in Japan than in the United States, for instance, because the Japanese people are accustomed to regimentation.

Rev. Francis M. Juras

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Pilot, Friday, June 6, 1947, by Bill McMorrow on the life of Rev. Father Francis M. Juras, pastor of St. Francis Church, Lawrence, Mass., who will celebrate his "silver jubilee" in the priesthood on June 22, 1947:

MEET YOUR PASTOR

(By Bill McMorrow)

Congratulations. No other word in the dictionary is more adequate as an introduction to the brief story of Rev. Francis M. Juras, pastor of St. Francis Church, Lawrence, for in but two short weeks, on June 22, the beloved leader of this widely known parish will celebrate his silver jubilee in the holy priesthood with a Solemn High Mass at 9 a. m., at which Archbishop Cushing will preside and preach.

Father Juras was born in the village of Bridai, Lithuania, on June 16, 1891, and attended the village schools there, graduating from the academy with highest honors. In 1912 he came to America, and attended St. Charles College, Catonsville, Md., and later St. Vincent de Paul University, Chicago. He matriculated at Kendrick Seminary, St. Louis, and later attended St. John's Seminary in Brighton, being ordained on the feast of Corpus Christi in the cathedral in Boston by Cardinal O'Connell. Immediately following his ordination he was assigned as curate to St. Francis Church, Lawrence, remaining until 1927, when he transferred to St. Joseph's, Lowell, as pastor for a 2-year stay. In 1929 he returned to Lawrence and St. Francis parish, laboring in the service of the people here until the present time.

RELIGIOUS FAMILY

A zealous pastor, under his able direction St. Francis parish has flourished and is an exemplary and well-organized unit of our diocesan family. Aided by his capable curates, Rev. John F. Bernatonis and Rev. Peter A. Shakalis, a newly ordained priest who has replaced Rev. Felix Kenstavicius who transferred to St. Pius parish, Lynn, some 16 active parish groups meet here each month, resounding out a plan of Catholic action that is on par with the finest in the diocese. To attempt to outline them all, space will not permit, but it will suffice to say that in the opinion of Father Juras, each of them rates high, and collectively they are the very backbone of the parish.

In 1945 a large piece of property adjacent to the church was purchased as a proposed site of the new parish hall and recreation center, to be erected as a memorial to the servicemen of the parish. The "Servicemen's Memorial fund" is, of course, an item of interest to all in the parish, and Father Juras looks forward with pleasure to the time when conditions will permit breaking ground for this worth-while project. He was loud in his praise of Peter Jaskal, president of the Building Fund Society for the outstanding job he has done, and pointed out that Mr. Jaskal is also president of Saint Francis Holy Name Society which is currently running on a full-steam-ahead basis.

NOTED WRITER

The literary work of Father Juras hasn't been confined to books and religious themes alone, for he is well-known as a feature writer of several magazines and newspapers. From 1935 till 1945 he was general manager of "Darbininkas" the popular Lithuanian newspaper published in South Boston, and he is an honorary member in the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance of America, and a member of the board of directors of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Federation of America, an affiliate of the NCWC.

The renovation of beautiful St. Francis Church has long been considered one of Father Juras' major accomplishments by his parishioners, and it's a known fact that he delights in the wide variety of parish activity, much of which takes place in the spacious hall in the basement of the church. Here, in addition to regular meetings of societies and sodalities, is held the Sunday-school classes and released-time religious instruction, something near and dear to the pastor's heart; and the church itself is certainly a tribute to his love of God and his people, with a picturesque altar, several devotional shrines, among which is a beautiful reproduction of the Grotto of Our Lady of Lourdes, a life-sized crucifix, and over the tabernacle a delicately carved statue of St. Francis, patron of the parish. Here, it may well be repeated, is a church of which every parishioner may be proud.

CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES

Well known in Lawrence, he was one of the initiators of the project to build a Catholic hospital there, and he currently serves on the board of directors of the Bon Secours Hospital, judged by authorities one of the finest institutions of its kind in New England.

In 1921 he was elected national president of the Knights of Lithuania, and he likewise is affiliated with scores of organizations, too numerous to mention in such a brief recapitulation. It is, however, safe to say that as he approaches June 22 his legion of loyal friends will join in a fervent prayer "that the silver leaves of their devoted pastor's crown of glory will turn to gold in God's sacred priesthood."

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Times of Tuesday, June 10, entitled "An Extreme Measure," and another from the New York Times of Wednesday, June 11, entitled "A Veto—On What Grounds?":

[From the New York Times of June 10, 1947]

AN "EXTREME" MEASURE?

Critics of the labor-management bill, which is now awaiting action by the President, have called it an "extreme" measure. Is this charge justified? Is this legislation "punitive" in the sense that the President used the term in his message of last January on the state of the Union?

Such a question necessarily calls for some basis of comparison. If the bill is "extreme," or if it is unduly restrictive, then it must be "extreme" or unduly restrictive with reference to something else. Admittedly the bill is "extreme" when compared with what the labor leaders themselves have been urging. For they have been urging that nothing be done; and it is elementary that something—anything—is "extreme," or excessive, when "nothing" is taken as the norm.

Aside from those who have made a career of taking orders from the AFL, the CIO, and the PAC, labor has no more staunch friend in Congress than Senator IVES, the liberal Republican of New York. Senator IVES and Senators MORSE and AIKEN were able, because of the strategic positions they occupied, to see to it that a much more temperate bill emerged from the House than would have been produced had the measure been written by a committee representing the cross section of Congressional opinion. Said Mr. IVES, in the closing Republican brief for the measure:

"I, for one, had hoped that no legislation would be required. But the course of the hearings of the Senate Labor Committee in-

dicated that there is abuse, and there is inequity, and that these abuses must be corrected and these inequities eliminated. No one could have listened to the hearings without knowing that something was wrong. But those immediately connected with the labor unions refused to agree to any type of legislation. We received no help whatever from the representatives of organized labor. Even the legislation that I myself proposed, mild as it was, met with vigorous objection. This legislation goes down the middle of the road—it will not 'destroy' trade unionism."

It cannot be stressed too greatly that, left to its own devices, Congress would have liked a stronger measure than the one it turned out. It is not necessary to recite again the numerous points of difference which made the House (Hartley) bill a good deal more extreme than the Taft-Hartley measure as it was worked out in conference, for these have been discussed many times recently. There can be little doubt that the House gave in to the Senate on most major controversial points, not because it favored the Senate version but because it was persuaded that to insist upon its own bill, or a halfway compromise between the terms of that and the Senate measure would have been to court an almost certain Presidential veto.

No discussion of this question would be complete without reference to two pieces of legislation which came before the Seventy-ninth Congress last year. The first of these was the Case bill for the general reform of the labor laws, which was the predecessor of, but in several respects more restrictive than the present Taft-Hartley bill. Although the President vetoed that measure, his action was sustained by the narrow margin of five votes, and this in spite of the fact that his own party at the time had a substantial margin in both Houses of Congress.

But it was another bill of that period that not only merited the term "extreme," but could certainly be called "punitive" if that word has any meaning at all. That measure was aimed at strikes such as that on the railways last May. Employees, under the provisions of this bill, who failed to return to work lost their Wagner Act standing; they and officials of the offending unions might be drafted into the Army by the President, and the latter would be empowered to fix their wages and working conditions, as well as to divert any earnings of the railroads into the United States Treasury. It was not Congress, but President Truman himself, who produced this remarkable legislative proposal, although it took the House only 2 hours to approve it. Ironically, it was the Senate, moving more deliberately and with Mr. TAFT playing a conspicuous part, which struck out the more hysterical and extreme provisions of the bill, such as loss of seniority for workers, the draft clauses, and criminal penalties for offending workers.

In sum, while labor leaders like to declare, without specification, that the Taft-Hartley bill is "punitive," "vindictive," "antilabor" and "extreme," the fact would appear to be that by any valid test it rates none of these terms. For we have seen that it is less harsh than the Hartley bill; that it is less stringent than the kind of bill Congress really wanted to pass; that it has been described as "middle-of-the-road" by a Senator who fought throughout consideration of the legislation to see that labor's rights were safeguarded; that it is milder than the corresponding measure of last year, the Case bill, which narrowly failed of enactment in a Democratic Congress, and, finally, that it does not remotely approach in severity the only positive piece of legislation offered by the President himself.

[From the New York Times of June 11, 1947]

A VETO—ON WHAT GROUNDS?

When Congress has approved an important piece of legislation not only by an enormous vote but actually with the majority support of both parties in both Houses, only the soundest and most persuasive reasons justify a Presidential veto. Mr. Truman's mail, we are told is running strongly in favor of a veto of the new labor bill which now awaits his action. But it is not unusual for the opponents of a measure to be more active in their letter-writing than those who are in favor, and surely a mere count of pros and cons in a mail representing the opinions of a tiny fraction of the country's population will not supply Mr. Truman with an adequate reason to annul with a stroke of his own pen the considered action of both parties in Congress. He must have better reasons than that, if he intends to veto the bill and expects his veto to carry conviction to the public. Where will he find these reasons?

In this space yesterday we examined the argument that the new labor bill is extreme and punitive, and we found, on the basis of comparison, that it is less harsh than the original Hartley bill; that it is less stringent than the kind of bill Congress really wanted to pass; that it has been described as middle-of-the-road by a liberal Senator who fought throughout the debate on the measure to see that labor's rights were safeguarded; that it is milder than the corresponding measure of last year, the Case bill, which narrowly failed of enactment in a Democratic Congress, and, finally, that it does not even remotely approach in severity the President's own proposal of just a year ago to draft strikers into the Army in cases of national emergency.

If a veto will not stand up, in the eyes of the public, on the unconvincing charge that this is a case of "extreme" and "punitive" legislation, then on what other grounds can a veto be based?

Let us examine the possibilities.

1. Can it be argued successfully that this bill is a hasty, slap-dash effort, and that a subject so serious and important as labor-management relations deserves more careful study and consideration?

That argument will not stick. Few bills before Congress have received the thorough consideration, the careful preparation, and the searching debate which this measure has received. The Senate began hearings on it as early as January 23; the House on February 5. Scores of witnesses, representing the whole range of opinion, were heard. The House gave the bill a full-dress discussion. The Senate debate on it lasted literally for weeks. Compare this record—if the test is to be how carefully and how adequately the bill was prepared and discussed—with the less than 2 days' debate that was given in 1935 to the enactment of the Wagner Act.

2. Can it be argued that the new bill is unnecessary, that there is no need for action in this field by Congress, and that the best policy is simply to do nothing and let matters work themselves out by their own accord?

The answer to this argument is the unprecedented and immensely costly record of 113,000,000 man-days of work lost through strikes in 1946. Matters are not working themselves out satisfactorily by their own accord. The Wagner Act, unamended and unaccompanied by other necessary legislation, has fallen short of its own declared purpose to reduce "strikes and other forms of industrial strife and unrest." The need for further action to promote the conditions of responsible, even-handed collective bargaining is evident.

3. Can it be argued that this is a mere partisan measure, and that partisanship should have no place in matters of such grave importance?

The Democratic Senators approved this measure by a vote of 17 to 15. The House Democrats approved it by a vote of 103 to 66.

4. Can it be argued, finally, that Congress had no mandate from the people for legislation in this field?

Is it not fair to assume that the Members of a House of Representatives elected on peacetime issues only 7 months ago have at least as good an understanding of what their constituents expect of them—if there is unfortunately to be a difference of judgment here—as has a President elected under the wartime conditions fo 1944? On the final test, these Members of the House of Representatives voted for this legislation by a majority of 4 to 1.

As for the Senate: 32 of its Members also have a fresh mandate from the people, won by election last November. Of these 32, 17 voted for this legislation; 6 more were paired for it or announced in favor, and only 7—fewer than 1 out of 4—were opposed or paired against.

Address of Hon. John W. Byrnes, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES, of Green Bay, Wis., Member of Congress, Eighth District, Wisconsin, keynoting National Young Republican Federation Convention at Milwaukee, Wis., June 6, 1947:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Republicans, it is a distinct pleasure to appear before this magnificent gathering of Young Republicans. I speak as one of you and I am thrilled, as I am sure each one of you must be, at this concrete manifestation of our strength, our purpose, and our determination.

We Young Republicans have witnessed a tremendous growth in our national federation since last we met. Today, we boast of active and virile State organizations in 46 of our 48 States. In a year's time, we have effected an almost three-fold increase in the number of our affiliated associations. There are today more Young Republican clubs and more young Republicans than ever before in the history of our movement.

This startling growth has not been a haphazard thing.

It is the product of thoughtful planning, careful organization and steady hard work. It is the result, to a large extent, of enthusiastic effort and intelligent direction on the part of our State, regional and national officers. It would not have been possible but for the spirit, faith and boundless enterprise of our national chairman, Ralph Becker.

But, more than this, our growth has been inseparably bound together with a national resurgence of belief in the principles and purposes of the Republican Party. The youth of America, imparting strength and vitality to that resurgence, has found vehicle in the Young Republican movement. The Young Republican movement has lent purpose and direction to that strength and vitality. The combination has created a political force unique in American life.

Today, however, we are not met to mull over our achievements. We would be neither young nor Republican if we were content to dwell in the past. Today, in the manner of youth, we meet to fix our hopes and aspirations firmly upon the future—the future of our movement, our party, our Nation, and our world. It is to that future that we address ourselves today.

We need, first, to look to the future of the young Republican movement.

We are frankly a political organization, and it is only good politics that we frequently take stock, assay our influence, and clarify our objective. We should not only know where we are going but how fast we are getting there.

Our objective, in the words of our national chairman, is "to sell practical politics to the youth of this country as an essential part of the American way of life and to interest that same youth to work within the framework of the Republican Party."

That objective is based upon the sincere belief that youth will find its hopes and ideals best expressed in the program and principles of our party. It is based equally upon the belief that our party, as a growing and dynamic thing, cannot long survive without youth's energy, idealism, and progressive influence.

If we are to realize our objective, it seems clear that we must recognize that our success must necessarily depend upon our appeal as an effective political organization. It is necessary, therefore, that we constantly evaluate our practical effectiveness.

That effectiveness can be measured, first, by our success in influencing party policy; and second, by our success as practical politicians within our own political party.

It is a startling fact that the age group represented by the membership of the Young Republican movement constitutes nearly 50 percent of the Nation's total potential voting population. We may well ask ourselves if our influence in American political life is commensurate with the power we wield at the polling place.

Have we Young Republicans effectively assumed the responsibility that is an essential feature of political activity? This question must be answered in the affirmative if our appeal to the youth of America is to be constant, positive, and self-perpetuating.

While serving as the rallying point for youth and Young Republicans everywhere, we must never forget for a moment that the individual members of the Young Republican Federation are an integral part of the Republican Party. The theory of young republicanism has not been, and never was intended to be, that its members must serve as apprentices before active participation in party and governmental affairs.

Of course, we admit the practical difficulty of youth aspiring to legislative and executive positions of high responsibility. Of course, we recognize that success in political life, as a practical matter is too often dependent upon long and faithful service. However, we are just as quick in asserting that these considerations shall not prevent youth from a dynamic participation in political policy-making and office seeking. Youth has the power at the ballot box; youth has the greatest stake in the future. The combination forms an inexorable political force.

We have the opportunity to demonstrate that this power cannot be denied. It is more than an opportunity; it is a full-fledged challenge. If we fail to prove our effectiveness, we will soon lose our appeal as a political organization. The youth of today is not interested in polite debating societies. He is interested in his future; he is interested in effective political action.

Therefore, we must demonstrate our ability to influence party policy; we must demonstrate our ability to become effective participants in party and governmental affairs. These are not things which shall be given to us; these are things which we must win.

First, we must make ourselves heard in party councils.

Our success as an organization is not alone measured by our total enrollment. It must be measured also by the number of young Republicans who are members of Republican county committees, who are chairmen of these committees, who are members of the Republican State committees, who have become State committeemen or State chairmen. Our influence will be small indeed and our purpose thwarted unless we are working members of the regular organization. We must rid ourselves of the belief that it is more important to aspire to high office in the Young Republican Federation than to become lowly workers in the Republican Party. We are no separate organization; we are an indivisible part of the Republican Party. We have no other reason for being.

Second, we must become active in government.

The success of a practical politician is determined by his ability to get elected to office. If we are to demonstrate our effectiveness as a practical political group, young Republicans must be elected to political office. The place to begin is at the grass roots. Active participation in local politics leads invariably to active participation in State and National politics. Sound Republican—that's spelled with a capital R—government begins at home. Ask yourselves, as representatives of almost half of the potential voting population, how many young Republicans in your area have become city councilmen, county supervisors, or State legislators; how many have held city, county, or State executive positions. The growing voice of youth will not be heard in governmental affairs until youth takes his place in government. While it is true that the Young Republicans have led the way, it is equally self-evident that we still have far to go.

These practical achievements are true measures of our effectiveness as a political organization; if we fail as practical politicians, by what right can we expect to interest the youth of America in practical politics as an essential feature of the American way of life? We will have our greatest appeal to youth when we conclusively demonstrate that we offer a dynamic medium for effective political action. We can interest youth only when we offer him results. Results cannot be achieved by words; they stem from action. Such action cannot be confined to frenzied activities around election time. It must be continuing; it must be useful; it must be measured by our influence in party and governmental affairs.

But, to present the youth of America with an active, influential and effective vehicle for his ambition, energy, strength, and vitality is not enough. Our appeal cannot be based alone upon our effectiveness as a working organization. It must be based equally upon the fundamental soundness of our political principles and our party program. It is not enough to show that our voice will be heard; our voice must be atuned to the wishes, desires, and ambitions of American youth.

It is the impressive responsibility of our federation to give fresh meaning and new scope to the time-tested principles of the Republican Party. We must accept the solemn responsibility of actively influencing a party program that will meet the great challenge of the postwar era. No party can stand still. It is the privilege of youth to provide the driving force and the steady infiltration of new hopes and fresh ideas that militate against stodginess and immobility, the inevitable forerunners of political decay. In short, as Republicans, we pledge allegiance to our party principles, and as young Republicans, we acknowledge our responsibility in the formation of a program that will give new meaning to those principles in these days of decision.

We are facing up to that responsibility in this convention. It is significant that the forums to follow have been given the general title, Problems of Youth. It will early be discovered, I believe, that the problems of youth are the problems of America, and that the problems of America are the problems of the world. By frankly facing the problems of youth we lay open for discussion and recommendation the entire field of political activity. We fulfill our function as catalytic agent for the Republican Party. We take responsibility for the formation of a party program.

Our immediate concern is with the keynote of that program.

I think we need not search far for it. Our program must be based upon a solution to the fundamental problem of youth, of the Nation, and of the world.

That problem is the preservation of peace.

It is the problem of preserving the peace in the world while retaining the American way of life at home. Our program must face squarely the issues involved in the solution of that problem. It is made compellingly urgent by the advent of potential mass destruction through scientific warfare; it is made increasingly difficult by the rise of political doctrines which are based upon the abrogation of the basic rights of men.

The preservation of peace is of special concern to youth. Youth has historically fought the wars of mankind; youth has inevitably picked up the rubble when the guns fell silent. Youth will fight the next, and will live in the wilderness it creates, if youth now fails its duty in the campaign for peace.

We, then, representing the youth of a great political party, have a significant obligation. Ours is the opportunity to enlist the fire, the spirit, and the optimism of youth in the formation of a program for peace. Ours is the solemn duty to insure that our program for peace is based upon the Republican principles of individual freedom and the hopeful promise of the American way of life. We must not fail in this duty, this obligation, this fateful opportunity.

I believe our first task is clear.

It is the development of a national state of mind. What America needs is a sudden and rude awakening to the lateness of the hour. As a Nation, we are capable of great national effort; we are also unfortunately capable of colossal numbness, of a disregard for actualities, of looking fondly back instead of sternly ahead.

This fact must sink into our consciousness, and, in all truth, must become part and parcel of our national state of mind.

We are dangerously close to losing the peace.

We are close to losing it by reason of our very blindness to the urgency of our danger. Half-hearted measures based upon faint-hearted support will not surmount the obstacles to peace. What is needed now is a great new boldness springing from an understanding and a united people. Our great move for peace must emerge clear and strong from the purifying crucible of public opinion. An aroused America, in time of war, has demonstrated her potential for destruction; an aroused America can surpass that effort in building for peace.

In the development of this new mood, we representatives of youth have a significant role. We must channel this new awareness into the creation of positive and constructive action and away from indecision, negation, and wishfulness. We must fully and critically assess the policies and actions of our national leaders. We must constantly be on the alert for obscurity of motive, faulty planning, and maladministration. We must demand complete information; we must beware of secrecy, inconsistencies, and half-truths.

The present administration must stand indicted for its failure to take the people into its confidence and to make clear the issues involved in the battle for peace. It has failed to present a clear and understandable picture of what must be done, what it must cost, and what sacrifices it calls for. It is tragic that, with the world calling for boldness of action, we are presented with piecemeal proposals, each designed to cope with the latest emergency. Such indecision can only drive the American people into an isolationism which they neither feel nor desire.

No American foreign policy can ignore the world's need for America's ingenuity and resources. No American political party, aspiring to national leadership, can ignore these facts:

There must be created in the world an atmosphere in which peace is possible. The peace is lost if the free peoples of the world succumb, in desperation, to the false promise of communism. Unless there can be created in those nations a measure of prosperity and self-sufficiency, their surrender to that ideology is inevitable. Their restoration to productivity is dependent upon the ability and willingness of the United States to contribute her genius and productive capacity to the task. Unless we are willing to watch the rest of the world erupt into chaos and are prepared to fight off the beast that arises from the debris, we cannot escape that responsibility.

These untarnished facts, it seems to me, make certain our acceptance of that responsibility. The cost of doing nothing is too terrible to admit of inaction. Our great need now is the development of a national spirit without which a national effort for peace cannot be sustained.

The great question is: Are we to move willingly to the great task with the full support of an informed and determined people, or are we to accept grudgingly and fitfully an unwanted responsibility, hampered by the suspicion and skepticism of a doubtful America?

We invite failure by the latter course. Our present policy of piecemeal effort, confusion and waste, based upon negative and emergency thinking, is producing doubt and skepticism in the minds of the people. It is inviting failure. The support it gains is based upon fear and timidity instead of courage and boldness. We must act to enlist the full and unqualified support of a determined American people in a clear program for peace.

That support can be won.

First, there must be created, as I have already mentioned, a universal understanding of the urgency of the world situation and of the cost of our failure to act boldly and surely.

Second, there must be presented to the American people a broad outline of the job to be done. They must know what must be done and where, what it will cost, and what sacrifices will be necessary. The program must be geared to the rebuilding of productive facilities. It must lead toward self-sustaining, free nations. The American people cannot long be sold on a program to feed and clothe the world; they will support a program which will help the peoples of the world feed and clothe themselves.

Third, this broad program must be coordinated under a unified administration. Waste and misdirected effort cannot be financed by America. Definitely planned results cannot be achieved by unrelated agencies tossing American dollars and resources hither and yon. The singleness of our purpose demands unity and clarity of action.

These are the basic concepts in a program for peace.

The eventual scope of such a bold program will tax the productive genius of the American system to the utmost. It will kill forever our political isolation from the rest of the world. It involves nothing less than world leadership—toward peace, prosperity, and freedom.

We young Republicans must be in the forefront of the ranks of those who are demanding our assumption of that leadership. The youth of America with its great stake in a peaceful future will find voice and direction within our fold.

We have another great responsibility—a responsibility distinct in itself and yet inseparable from our responsibility to create an enduring peace.

It is the maintenance of a strong, free, and productive America. It is the retention of incentive and competition within our economic system. It is the encouragement of enterprise, individual freedom and individual responsibility. It is the safeguarding of individual rights.

We must have faith in our traditions, our institutions, and our republican form of government. We must have confidence in the American people. For too long a time, our people have been ignored by their Government. The day of glittering promises must give way to the day of honest facts. If our program is based on justice, equity, and right, we need never fear its public acceptance.

We must be a united America. The New Deal game of playing one group of our people against the other for political gain must give way to unselfish unity of purpose and action. Let us recognize that the maintenance of a strong America and a peacefull world will require just as much real courage, noble sacrifice and spirit of high adventure as did the waging of war.

In all honesty and frankness, then, we must be aware of the inherent dangers in our program for peace. The greatest of these is that, in our struggle for peace, we lose those freedoms without which even peace is unendurable. Such dangers are ever present during time of war; a campaign for peace, such as we envisage, is equally rife with threats to basic freedoms. We must be alert to meet that peril.

There will be those who will insist upon greater centralization of our Government, upon greater control over the means of production, upon vast increases in the power of the executive branch and upon further regimentation of our daily lives. There will be others who will seize this opportunity to destroy the very freedom we seek to spread. They will maintain that it is necessary in the name of peace. These are real dangers.

It is basic to Republican principles that only a free America can be strong and productive. We must prove that our freedom is the underlying cause of our strength and productivity. We must champion the cause of freedom by demonstrating its workability. The world looks to a strong and productive America; it must follow a free America.

We must recognize that our system is not perfect and that we must constantly be alert to the changing tempo of human affairs.

Within our system, we must guard against the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few—in government, in labor, and in business. We must adopt and enforce the rules which will prevent the monopoly of power by any segment of our society. When the proper balance is struck, there is no limit to the productive capacity of the American system.

We are a Union of States. We must return to the States those powers of government we have denied them for so long. Our greatest safeguard against the concentration of power in the Federal Government is the creation of strong and progressive State governments. We lose one of the essential ingredients of democracy when we kill civic responsibility by the steady removal of power to Washington.

We must eliminate waste and inefficiency from Government. We destroy the essential confidence of our people in democracy when we make of our Government an unwieldy and burdensome bureaucracy. We must cease Federal hand-outs to pressure groups who draw their sustenance from the sweat of our citizens.

We must remain strong. We cannot allow our hopes for peace to weaken our national security. Our acknowledged superiority on land, sea, and in the air must remain our greatest insurance against the threat of war.

Thus, we can bring life and meaning and hope to our program for peace. With a strong faith in our own traditions and institutions, with an abiding determination to succeed, we will rally to our banner the strength and vitality of American youth in the battle ahead.

We will make of our federation an effective political organization; we will bring new scope and meaning to that effectiveness and to the principles of the Republican Party in this momentous hour. The job is ours; let us move to it with firmness and dispatch.

Naval Service Veterans Opposed to Armed Forces Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Navy Club, United States of America, a service organization chartered by Congress, composed of veterans of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with 147 "ships" from Maine to California, conducted its annual reunion in Milwaukee, Wis., on June 5–7. There the delegates, carrying a mandate from thousands of members, unanimously adopted a resolution opposing merger of the armed forces, including the present proposal now before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The text of this resolution follows:

Whereas Navy Club, U. S. A., is opposed to a merger of the armed forces of the United States because, on the basis of historical evidence, such a merger would inevitably weaken our ability to defend ourselves; and

Whereas Navy Club, U. S. A., recognizes the practical necessity for joint operations in active theaters of war; and

Whereas to achieve joint operations close coordination is required at the highest echelon; and

Whereas responsibility for such coordination is placed in the hands of the President of the United States by the Constitution; and

Whereas the existing proposal to delegate such vast authority in the hands of an appointed official constitutes a violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Navy Club, U. S. A., recommends permanent status for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, expanded to include the commandant, United States Marine Corps, and the commandant, United States Coast Guard, during those periods when the Coast Guard operates under Navy command, as the supreme military operating command; and be it further

Resolved, That Navy Club, U. S. A., recommends the creation of a joint intelligence agency, empowered to coordinate the activities of all existing intelligence agencies, empowered to analyze all intelligence gathered by existing agencies and by its own agents, and further empowered to provide such additional intelligence gathering facilities as are necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That Navy Club, U. S. A., recommends the creation of a national security council, composed of the top civilian heads of all agencies concerned with security; and be it further

Resolved, That Navy Club, U. S. A., recommends the creation of such joint boards as are necessary to achieve unification in the fields of procurement and services where such unification is deemed efficient and economical.

Sensible Recommendation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Manitowoc Herald-Times of May 28, 1947:

A SENSIBLE RECOMMENDATION

It appears that Manitowoc will wait a while for its long-talked-of new post office.

Recently the Public Buildings Administration in Washington announced, with a modesty unusual in a Government bureau, that the present is a poor time for post-office building. It recommended that all such construction be indefinitely postponed.

This would, of course, delay building of a local post office for which the Federal Government has recommended financial aid amounting to several hundred thousand dollars.

Manitowoc needs a new post office, the present structure having been outgrown by the city. Local postal employees are handicapped by lack of adequate space in which to handle a mail-call far exceeding the daily turn-over processed when the Franklin Street building was erected.

Nevertheless we are heartily in accord with the Washington recommendation and compliment the agency director who made the announcement for possessing a fair amount of economic acumen and common sense.

Public building at this time means Government competition with the housing program. True, not many private homes are being built but chances for stepped up construction in this line would be greatly endangered by any extensive public-works program.

At present there is neither the materials nor the labor available to do justice to both programs. Building post offices would drain off some of each and further skyrocket prices and wages in the construction field. Building costs are roughly twice what they were before the war—and very much higher than they ought to be now.

Another, long-range reason for postponing Government building at this time has to do with the economic theory that public works of any kind should not be undertaken during boom times. It is suggested that Government projects, which during the last depression many times were merely job-making projects, should be delayed for less prosperous years when they would create no shortages and would help combat unemployment.

Government construction now would exhaust many job opportunities that might well be held in reserve for leaner times and would cost the Government, meaning you and me, much more than it would some years hence. It also would raise hob with Congress' announced intention of paring all Government expenses to the bone.

Hon. Emmet O'Neal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be among those expressing pleasure over the appointment of our former colleague, Emmet O'Neal, of Louisville, Ky., as our American Ambassador to the Philippines.

As a congressional secretary, some years before I entered the House, I came to know Mr. O'Neal as a friendly gentleman who had time for and thought in terms of "the other fellow." His democratic spirit, his engaging smile, and his attitude of good-will, made him a favorite among Capitol Hill workers.

The new Ambassador was among the first to shake my hand and wish me well when I became a member and I was glad in my third term to be named to the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations on which he was then serving as a majority member. He was a proven legislator and his common sense approach to the problems of our day was reflected in his effective presentations on the floor.

It was a treat to see Emmet O'Neal at play on the House gym floor after a busy day. He could hold his own with the fastest youngsters who today can be counted in his corner because he never violated the rules of the game.

Frank Bilowith, of Passaic, N. J., and other fighting veterans of World War I from my district, who served with Emmet O'Neal in the famed First Division, are happy, too, over the recognition accorded their former comrade.

And most certainly the Philippines Ambassador to our country, Hon. Michael Elizalde, and Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, the new Republic's ambassador to the United Nations, both of whom served as Resident Commissioner in the House with Mr. O'Neal, are rejoicing that their friend is to be in Manila as the representative of the mother republic.

I was in the Philippines in January 1946, and I saw what the brave people of the islands had to go through for freedom's cause. I have a lasting affection for these folks and I feel we are serving them well when we send them Mr. O'Neal.

Our Ailing Building Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert J. Lewis, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 10, 1947, entitled "Our Ailing Building Industry":

OUR AILING BUILDING INDUSTRY—WHEN IT SHOULD BE MAKING FULL SPEED AHEAD THERE ARE DANGEROUS SIGNS OF SLOWING DOWN

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Signs of stagnation in the construction industry constitute a warning to the rest of the economy.

Prices have risen to fantastic heights and are still edging fractionally higher. Under the weight of the cost burden, the housing program has begun to sag unmistakably, and much commercial and industrial building has been postponed or canceled.

The Commerce Department, which earlier predicted a housing construction volume of $6,000,000,000 for this year, now expects a volume of only between $4,250,000,000 and $4,800,000,000.

Housing Expediter Creedon and Housing Administrator Foley both have repeatedly warned that costs must be reduced if homes are not to be priced out of the market.

HALF A BILLION DROP IN PERMITS

Permits for all urban construction in the first 3 months of this year fell to $923,000,000—a drop of $515,000,000 from the total for the same period last year. Construction contracts awarded in the 37 States east of the Rocky Mountains dropped 18 percent in April of this year below the volume for the corresponding month last year.

Despite the continuing housing shortage, fewer new houses have been started throughout the country in the first 4 months of this year than in the same period last year, when material shortages held up production.

Builders in some parts of the Nation complain that completed houses are moving slowly, or not at all. The April quarterly review of the construction situation prepared by the Commerce Department reports the "general atmosphere of the residential construction industry is disturbing." Continuing, it says:

"Builders appear to be increasingly reluctant to start new projects because of expectations that both construction costs and the prices of finished houses are due for a drop.

"Reports are also accumulating concerning the difficulty of selling newly-completed houses, and it is clear that the housing market is far less active at the present time than it was some months ago."

EMPLOYMENT FALLING OFF

The gloomy picture is also beginning to be reflected in employment figures. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, on-site employment in new private residential construction in April this year was 383,000 workers, in comparison to 406,000 in the same month last year—a drop of 23,000 workers.

Government officials employ the word "critical" when they discuss building material prices, and are seeking to bring about widespread voluntary reductions. Reports are heard that building materials are even beginning to pile up in some lines.

For example, lumber—which tripled in price over 1939—threatens to become so plentiful that certain parts of the industry hope for relaxed export controls in order that more of this product may be sold abroad.

Paradoxical as it may seem, in view of last year's concern over material shortages as they affected housing, the Government is now reported to be considering a plan to raise the limitation on non-residential construction so that materials and labor may not be left idle.

Also, a significant result of the present rarefied construction price level is the effect it has on commercial, industrial, and public projects.

A February survey by the Civilian Production Administration, recently released, shows that more than $165,000,000 in nonresidential construction authorized between March and September 1946 has been deferred by the sponsors. Of that amount, 62 percent was put off or canceled because of excessive costs or because contractors were unwilling to set prices.

POSTPONEMENT UNTIL BETTER DAYS

In the District area, many needed projects have had to be postponed owing to high costs, including Federal and District Government construction.

The CPA's limited sampling survey of 89 projects in the Washington area, authorized

between March and September 1946—all of which were to have begun last year—showed that 21 projects to cost $5,245,000 had not yet been started by March, this year, and that the sponsors of 10 projects to cost $3,323,000 had either definitely abandoned the projects or postponed them until after July 1.

The social and economic consequences implicit in the present construction-cost level are admittedly serious. Why is building so expensive? What is chiefly to blame? High-labor rates? Excessive builders' profit? Skyrocketing material prices? Or lowered production on the part of labor?

Emmet O'Neal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with a great deal of pleasure that I learn of the confirmation by the Senate of the Honorable Emmet O'Neal, of Louisville, Ky., as Ambassador to the Philippines.

Our former colleague here in the House and a Member of the Kentucky delegation is eminently qualified for this most important diplomatic post. At a time when friendship and understanding among the nations of the world is imperative, his appointment is a source of inspiration.

His lovable disposition, his sterling character, his devotion to duty, his vast experience in Government, his ability to make friends and hold them, in my humble opinion, make him stand out like the Washington Monument on the diplomatic front.

Kentucky is proud of Emmet O'Neal and I am sure I express the sentiments of all of his former colleagues of this House when I say: May he have a full fruition of his dreams, a happy realization of his endeavors in his new assignment, and may God bless him in every official act.

Statement of Benjamin Spewak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. McGARVEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

TWO AND ONE-HALF YEAR PLAN FOR THE OPENING OF 100 AGENCIES FOR THE SALE OF THE ARTS AND CRAFTS OF THE PUEBLO TRIBES AND OTHER TRIBES, WITHOUT ANY EXPENSE OF OPENING OR COST OF MAINTENANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT IN 100 OF OUR AMERICAN CITIES

(By Benjamin Spewak, former manager of an Indian goods building at Williams, Ariz.)

HOW TO PUT PLAN INTO PERFORMANCE

First. Stockroom in Albuquerque, N. Mex., for assembling, price tagging and shipping of the arts and crafts; Indians on reservations and in Indian schools outside of the State of New Mexico, need not send their arts and crafts to the Indian Field Agency at Albuquerque, but instead send a weekly report of arts and crafts on hand and the Albuquerque Agency will send them official price tags and direct them where to ship.

Second. Each item have Government sticker with sale price in plain figures, and name of tribe.

Third. Price determined at 300 percent profit above actual cost of production to the Indians.

Fourth. Preference be given to modern arts and crafts made today by the Indians in the Pueblo villages and in Indian schools, and that of other Indian tribes.

Fifth. Pamphlets are to be printed for mailing purposes giving a brief history of each Indian tribe with one illustration for each tribe.

Sixth. Only one agency to be opened in each major city in largest department store.

Seventh. Stock signs be prearranged portraying the arts and crafts of each tribe, sent to each agency with shipment of goods, to make the arts and crafts plainly understood by the public.

Eighth. When the agency is opened the management of store is to advertise it in their regular ad once a week, each Thursday; the Arts and Crafts office in Washington, D. C., mail each week 1,000 circular letters with pamphlet enclosed of the arts and crafts, also name of store. The names are to be taken from phone directory, and each name in directory is to get a letter until all names in directory are exhausted; then the Arts and Crafts Board stops mailing and store agency is left on its own.

Ninth. Agencies make remittance to the Arts and Crafts Board monthly less 40 percent of the money taken in.

Tenth. After percentages are paid on arts and crafts sold and other expenses deducted, there should be 100 percent profit.

Eleventh. After all the agencies are in operation they should bring a minimum net profit of $78,000 the first year, basing on $15 profit for each agency each week.

Twelfth. The author of this plan be given appointment by the Arts and Crafts Board to put the agencies into operation for the duration of the 2½ years required to put plan into performance.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times, of June 7, 1947, urging full consideration of a bill to provide Federal support for education. I agree with the editorial that it is neither desirable nor advisable to dispose of so important a measure without full consideration. It follows:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Hearings before the House subcommittee on education have now come to a close and the subcommittee is considering its report. Some 60 witnesses appeared before it to argue the pros and cons of Federal help to the Nation's schools. Previously a Senate education subcommittee had voted to report a similar bill favorably, and is now ironing out the final details of the measure.

Some leaders of the House contend that this is not the time to add new expenditures to the Federal budget. But the House itself ought to have an opportunity to consider this question and to debate the bill openly and on its merits. To keep it "frozen" would be poor strategy; too many people are concerned with the plight of the American public schools. It is neither advisable nor desirable to kill so important a measure in this manner.

Twenty-seven organizations have banded together to see that the House gets an opportunity to vote on the bill. The reason they are centering on the House is that little difficulty is expected to arise in the Senate, where Senator TAFT is sponsoring a Federal-aid measure. It is to be hoped that the House, too, will assure a vote.

President Truman's Address Before the Canadian Parliament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by President Truman at Ottawa, Canada:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENT

Following is the text of President Truman's address before a joint session of the Canadian Parliament yesterday in Ottawa, as recorded by the New York Times:

"Mr. Prime Minister, Honorable Members of the Senate, and Members of the House of Commons of Canada, this is my first visit to Canada as President of the United States, and I am happy that it affords me the opportunity to address this meeting of the Members of both houses of the Canadian Parliament. Here is a body which exemplifies self-government and freedom of the nations of the great British Commonwealth. The history of the Commonwealth proves that it is possible for many nations to work and live in harmony and for the common good.

"I wish to acknowledge the many courtesies extended to me on this visit by the Governor General, Viscount Alexander, who paid me the honor of a visit in Washington a few months ago. His career as a soldier and as a statesman eminently qualifies him to follow his illustrious predecessors.

"For the courtesy of appearing before you, as for other courtesies, I am sure I am largely indebted to my good friend, Prime Minister Mackenzie King.

"I was particularly happy to be present yesterday when we were honored in the rotunda of this Parliament Building. It is a wonderful ceremony and one which, I think, he richly deserves. I also appreciate very highly his political advice, which he gave me this morning.

"I have come to value and cherish his friendship and statesmanship. As our two nations have worked together in solving the difficult problems of the postwar period, I have developed greater and greater respect for his wisdom.

"Americans who come to know Canada informally, such as our tourists, as well as those whose approach is more academic, learn that Canada is a broad land—broad in mind, broad in spirit, and broad in physical expanse. They find that the composition of your population and the evolution of your political institutions hold a lesson for other nations of the earth."

STRENGTH, UNITY GAINED

"Canada has achieved internal unity and material strength, and has grown in stature in the world community, by solving problems that might have hopelessly divided and weakened a less gifted people.

"Canada's eminent position today is a tribute to the patience, tolerance, and strength of character of her people, of both French and British strains. For Canada is enriched by the heritage of France as well as of Britain, and Quebec has imparted the vitality and spirit of France itself to Canada. Canada's notable achievement of national unity and progress through accommodation, moderation, and forbearance can be studied with profit by her sister nations.

"Much the same qualities have been employed, with like success, in your relations with the United States. Perhaps I should say 'your foreign relations with the United States.' But the word 'foreign' seems strangely out of place. Canada and the United States have reached the point where we no longer think of each other as 'foreign' countries. We think of each other as friends, as peaceful and cooperative neighbors on a spacious and fruitful continent.

"We must go back a long way, nearly a century and a half, to find a time when we were not on good terms. In the War of 1812 there was fighting across our frontier. But permanent good came of that brief campaign. It shocked Canadians and Americans into a realization that continued antagonism would be costly and perilous.

"The first result of that realization was the Rush-Bagot Agreement in 1817, which embodied a spirit and an attitude that have permeated our relations to this day. This agreement originally was intended to limit and to regulate the naval vessels of both countries on the Great Lakes. It has become one of the world's most effective disarmament agreements and is the basis for our much-hailed unfortified frontier."

A HAPPY COMPOUND

"I speak of that period of history to make the point that the friendship that has characterized Canadian-American relations for many years did not develop spontaneously. The example of accord provided by our two countries did not come about merely through the happy circumstance of geography. It is compounded of one part proximity and nine parts good will and common sense.

"We have had a number of problems, but they have all been settled by adjustment, by compromise, and by negotiations inspired by a spirit of mutual respect and a desire for justice on both sides.

"This is the peaceful way, the sensible way, and the fair way to settle problems, whether between two nations that are close neighbors or among many nations widely separated.

"This way is open to all. We in Canada and the United States are justifiably proud of our joint record, but we claim no monopoly on the formula.

"Canada and the United States will gladly share the formula, which rejects distrust and suspicion in favor of common sense, mutual respect, and equal justice with their fellow members of the United Nations. One of the most effective contributions which our two countries can make to the cause of the United Nations is the patient and diligent effort to apply on a global scale the principles and practices which we have tested with success on this continent.

"Relations between Canada and the United States have emphasized the spirit of cooperation rather than the letter of protest. The Rush-Bagot Agreement was stated in less than 150 words. From time to time it has been revised by mutual agreement to meet changing conditions. It was amended as recently as last December."

COLLABORATION INTENSIFIED

"The last war brought our countries into even closer collaboration. The Ogdensburg agreement of 1940 provided for the creation of the Permanent Joint Board for Defense. It was followed by the Hyde Park agreement of 1941, which enabled us to coordinate our economic resources with increased efficiency.

"Common interests, particularly after Pearl Harbor, required the creation of several joint agencies to coordinate our efforts in special fields. When victory ended the necessity for these agencies they were quietly disbanded with a minimum disturbance of the national economies of the two countries. It's common sense again.

"The Permanent Joint Board on Defense will continue to function. I wish to emphasize, in addition to the word 'Permanent,' the other two parts of the title. The board is joint, being composed of representatives of each country. Canada and the United States participate on the basis of equality, and the sovereignty of each is carefully respected. This was true during the gravest dangers of the war and it will continue to be true, in keeping with the nature of all our joint undertakings.

"The Board was created, and will continue to exist, for the sole purpose of assuring the most effective defense for North America. The Board, as you know, has no executive powers and can only make recommendations for action. The record of the Board provides another example of the truly cooperative spirit that prevails between our two countries.

"The spirit of common purpose and the impressive strength which we marshalled for action on all fronts are the surest safeguard of continental security in the future."

WAR AND PEACE ALLIANCE

"The people of the United States fully appreciate the magnificent contribution in men and resources that Canada made to the Allied war effort. The United States soldiers, sailors, and airmen in the heat of battle knew their Canadian comrades as valiant and daring warriors. We look back with pride on our association as stanch allies in two wars.

"Today our two Nations are called upon to make great contributions to world rehabilitation. This task requires broad vision and constant effort.

"I am confident that we can overcome the difficulties involved, as we overcame the greater difficulties of the war. The national genius of our peoples finds its most satisfying expression in the creation of new values in peace.

"The record proves that in peaceful commerce of the combined efforts of our countries can produce outstanding results. Our trade with each other is far greater than that of any other two nations on earth.

"Last year the flow of trade in both directions across the border reached the record peacetime total of $2,250,000,000. We imported from Canada more than twice the value of goods we received from the United Kingdom, France, China, and Russia combined. United States purchases from Canada were about six times our purchases from Great Britain, nearly 10 times those from China, and 11 times those from France. We sold to Canada nearly as much as we sold to Britain and France together.

"Gratifying as the volume of our trade now is, it is capable of even further expansion to our mutual benefit. Some of our greatest assets are still to be developed to the maximum. I am thinking of one particularly that holds tremendous possibilities, the magnificent St. Lawrence-Great Lakes system, which we share and which we must develop together.

"The St. Lawrence project stirs the imagination of men long accustomed to majestic distances and epic undertakings. The proposal for taking electric power from the river and bringing ocean shipping 2,400 miles inland, to tap the fertile heart of our continent, is economically sound and strategically important."

TRADE ACCORDS CITED

"When this program is carried out, the waterway that is a part of our boundary will more than ever unite our two countries. It will stimulate our economies to new growth and will spread the flow of trade.

"There have been times when short-sighted tariff policies on both sides threatened to raise almost insurmountable barriers. But the need to exchange goods was so imperative that trade flourished despite artificial obstacles. The reciprocal-trade agreements of 1936 and 1939 made possible a sensible reduction of tariff rates, and paved the way for our present phenomenal trade.

"Something more than commercial agreements, however, is required to explain why Canada and the United States exchange more than $2,000,000,000 worth of goods a year. Ambassador Atherton has aptly given the reason as not free trade but the trade of freemen. That record flow of goods and the high standard of living it indicates, on both sides of the border, provide a practical demonstration of the benefits of the democratic way of life and a free economy.

"The benefits of our democratic governments and free economies operating side by side have spread beyond our countries to the advantage of the whole world. Both nations expanded their productivity enormously during the war and both escaped the physical damage that afflicted other countries. As a result, Canada and the United States emerged from the war as the only major sources of the industrial products and the food upon which much of the world depends for survival.

"Canada has responded as nobly to the challenge of peace as she did to that of the war. Your wheat has fed millions who otherwise would have starved. Your loan has strengthened Britain in her valiant battle for recovery.

"The United States is particularly gratified to find Canada at our side in the effort to develop the International Trade Organization. We attach great importance to this undertaking, because we believe it will provide the key to the welfare and prosperity of the world in the years immediately ahead.

"In sponsoring the International Trade Organization, the United States, with the cooperation of Canada and other countries, is making a determined effort to see that the inevitable adjustments in world trade as a result of the war will result in an expanding volume of business for all nations.

"Our goal is a vast expansion of agriculture and industry throughout the world, with freer access to raw materials and markets for all nations, and a wider distribution of the products of the earth's fields and factories among all peoples. Our hope is to multiply the fruitfulness of the earth and to diffuse its benefits among all mankind."

A CHALLENGE FACED

"At this critical point in history, we of the United States are deeply conscious of our responsibilities to the world. We know that in this trying period, between a war that is over and a peace that is not yet secure, the destitute and the oppressed of the earth look chiefly to us for sustenance and support until they can again face life with self-confidence and self-reliance.

"We are keenly aware that much depends upon the internal strength, the economic stability, and the moral stamina of the United States. We face this challenge with determination and confidence.

"Free men everywhere know that the purpose of the United States is to restore the world to health, to reestablish condi-

tions in which the common people of the earth can work out their salvation by their own efforts.

"We seek a peaceful world, a prosperous world, a free world, a world of good neighbors, living on terms of equality and mutual respect, as Canada and the United States have lived for generations.

"We intend to expend our energies and to invest our substance in promoting world recovery by assisting those who are able and willing to make their maximum contribution to the same cause.

"We intend to support those who are determined to govern themselves in their own way, and who honor the right of others to do likewise.

"We intend to aid those who seek to live at peace with their neighbors, without coercing or being coerced, without intimidating or being intimidated.

"We intend to uphold those who respect the dignity of the individual, who guarantee to him equal treatment under the law, and who allow him the widest possible liberty to work out his own destiny and achieve success to the limit of his capacity.

"We intend to cooperate actively and loyally with all who honestly seek, as we do, to build a better world in which mankind can live in peace and prosperity.

"We count Canada in the forefront of those who share these objectives and ideals.

"With such friends we face the future unafraid."

Little Caesar's Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the late city edition of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Wednesday, June 11:

James Caesar Petrillo's threat to expel Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, a Pennsylvania Republican, from the American Federation of Musicians springs ostensibly from the Congressman's agreement to share the podium at the musical festival to be conducted by Dr. Joseph Maddy at Interlochen on July 4.

Of course, Mr. Petrillo feels about Dr. Maddy as John L. Lewis does about J. A. Krug. But there may be still another reason for Little Caesar's rancor toward Mr. KEARNS. The Congressman was among those who voted for the Taft-Hartley labor bill, the bare mention of which sends the head of the musicians into a running fit.

Mr. KEARNS is a music teacher in Greenville, Pa. If he's booted peremptorily out of the union, he is robbed of a right to earn a living at his profession. But Mr. KEARNS is also a Congressman, earning $15,000 a year to represent the people of his district—and is therefore in a position to do something about the meat upon which "this our Caesar feeds that he is grown so great." Of the two jobs, we should think he would prefer the work in Washington.

If Mr. KEARNS stands up against Mr. Petrillo, as we hope he will, his teaching career may suffer. If he knuckles under to the arrogant little union boss, he may have to answer to his constituents. Faced with these prospects, his choice should be obvious.

Official Fears Death of Filbert Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, as I have several times heretofore stated on the floor of the House, the filbert-nut situation in this country is a very serious one. If imports continue in the future as they have in the past, it seems but a matter of time until this industry will be ruined. Mr. John E. Trunk, who is thoroughly familiar with the entire situation, last week discussed this subject at a meeting at Amity, Oreg. Under leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper report of this speech as taken from the Telephone Register at McMinnville, Oreg., I include it herewith:

OFFICIAL FEARS DEATH OF FILBERT INDUSTRY

Pacific Northwest filbert industry, comprising practically the entire filbert output of the United States, is in danger of complete annihilation because of unrestricted European imports of the product into this country.

This, briefly, sums up the precarious position of some 3,500 Oregon and Washington nut farmers as set forth by John E. Trunk, manager of the Northwest Nut Growers Association of Dundee, at the annual meeting of Amity-Gaston members held at Amity last Monday. "Hundreds of thousands of pounds of filberts are being dumped into this country from Mediterranean bases," declared Trunk who became manager of the Northwest Association June 1. "Unless our Government takes immediate action to curb these imports the domestic filbert industry faces ruin," he said.

* * * * *

Threat to the home market loomed during the past year, Trunk stated. Small shipments of filberts from foreign countries to the United States prior to the war did not make serious inroads into the enterprise here, he said.

"Today, however, we have a very different picture," warned the executive. "From September through March of the past year a total equivalent to 25,000,000 pounds of shelled and in-the-shell filberts was laid down in our ports from abroad.

DOMESTIC SUPPLY ENOUGH

Home growers produced during that period, 18,000,000 pounds of in-the-shell nuts. This amounts to more than sufficient to supply domestic needs. As a matter of fact we have been doing extensive research in this field with a view of developing other than food uses for an ever-increasing filbert production, Trunk revealed.

One-third of last year's domestic filbert crop is being sold at the present time at a loss, Trunk said. This will have a depressing effect on prices paid for the incoming crop, he pointed out.

Italy is our greatest threat in the unshelled filbert market, according to the figures listed by Trunk. Last year Italian growers were compelled by their government to divert part of their crops to oil. This year they have a bumper yield and so will be able to greatly increase exports.

Turkey leads with shelled filberts while Spain contributes somewhat to the top-heavy market. It is estimated that foreign shipments of filberts to this country this year will be more than 30,000,000 pounds.

"Europe is starving. They are in great need of American dollars in spite of our loans to them," declared Trunk. "This, coupled with the advantage of a low tariff, ideal climate conditions for year-around production and cheap labor give our foreign competitors all the advantages," he said.

IMPORTERS UNDERSELLING

Domestic growers have tried to offset the infringing trade by lowering prices only to be met by underselling tactics of importers.

Turkey has met our lowered prices by subsidizing, and other governments are expected to follow suit

Raising tariff would be a help in the opinion of growers but drastic quota restrictions on imports are necessary to divert disaster, states Trunk.

Implications of Invasion of Sinkiang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Choice of Doctrines," from the Washington Daily News of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHOICE OF DOCTRINES

Great wars do not come as bolts from a clear sky. Their causes are cumulative. They result from the loosing of forces which gather momentum until they become as irresistible as the tide.

The shooting in World II began on September 1, 1939, when Hitler invaded Poland, 6 months after he invaded Czechoslovakia, and 1 year after Munich. Britain and France declared war two days later.

Formal hostilities between Japan and China date from the exchange of shots by troops of the two countries near Peking on July 7, 1937. But that too, was the climax of a long series of incidents.

Historians are coming to regard the Jap invasion of Manchuria in 1931 as the actual beginning of World War II, and the Italian attack on Ethiopia in October 1935, as the opening of its European phase.

We thought of these beginnings of the most tragic period in history today when reading the report that Outer Mongolian troops, allegedly supported by Russian planes, had invaded the Chinese province of Sinkiang.

History has a habit of repeating itself.

Outer Mongolia is a Soviet satellite, so this undeclared war is in fact a Russian invasion of China, in the same sense that a Yugoslavian attack on Greece would be accepted as a Soviet attack.

This attack on Sinkiang probably is not the start of an all-out war against China. More likely, it is a feeler, designed to determine how the other great powers, including America, will react. If so, it is in the same pattern as the Soviet coup in Hungary, the demand for a pro-Russian Government in Austria, and the Communist intrigues in Italy and France.

But, taken together, these developments add up to an impressive threat of an all-out war to come.

Hitler, Mussolini, and the Jap war lords pushed their luck too far and found death for themselves and brought civilization to the brink of destruction.

Premier Stalin and his associates in the Kremlin can provoke a repetition of that

catastrophe by pursuing the mad adventure upon which they have embarked. But though it is late, it is not too late for Russia to seek and find an answer to all her legitimate needs by peaceful means.

The solution can be found in President Truman's statement at Ottawa:

"We seek a peaceful world, a prosperous world, a free world, a world of good neighbors, living on terms of equality and mutual respect, as Canada and the United States have lived for generations."

The world of tomorrow must be such a world if civilization is to survive and move on to better things. Canada and the United States have found happiness and security in that kind of world. And, as the President said, "we intend to expand our energies and invest our substance in promoting world recovery by assisting those who are able and willing to make their maximum contribution to the same cause * * * to build a better world in which mankind can live in peace and prosperity."

The choice today is between that doctrine and the doctrine of Hitler and Mussolini, which can end only in chaos and disaster.

Development of Columbia Basin Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dealing with the development of the water resources of the Columbia Basin, addressed to me by Theron D. Weaver, colonel of the Corps of Engineers, and chairman of the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBIA BASIN INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE,
Portland, Oreg., May 29, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Those interested in the development of the water resources of the Columbia Basin have for some time been deeply concerned with the problem presented by competing interests between the Columbia River fisheries and the power and navigation needs of the Northwest.

Commercial and sport fishing are important resources of the region, but the fishing benefits as compared to the magnitude of the actual benefits from other uses of the water resources are relatively small. Opponents of water resource development point to dam construction as the primary destructive agency to fish life, while proponents of multipurpose development believe that such work can be carried out in a manner not inimical to perpetuation of the fishery industry, and that over-fishing, stream pollution, unscreened diversion canals, damage due to logging operations, general industrialization and development of the area account largely for the depletion of the fish runs.

The Department of the Interior has submitted preliminary recommendations by that Department concerning the problem to the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee, which in turn has referred the matter to the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee for consideration and recommendation.

Conclusions of the Department of the Interior may be summarized as follows:

a. The salmon runs, even with full use of fish ladders and all protective devices, are impaired by any mainstream dam on the Columbia below the Okanogan, or on the Snake below the Salmon River.

b. The annual wholesale value of river-caught salmon ranges from $6,000,000 to $10,000,000. Capitalized value of the resource may be said to be $125,000,000.

c. Some five Indian tribes will be dispossessed of fishing sites reserved to them under treaty. An arbitrary capitalized value of fifteen to twenty million dollars might be placed on these rights.

d. An arbitrary capitalized value of $20,000,000 might be assigned to the sport fishing of salmon on the river.

e. The Bonneville Power Administration estimates that it needs peak firm power capacity of 3,875,000 kilowatts by 1955. This requires in addition to existing installations 9 units at Grand Coulee (1,070,000 kilowatts), 1 unit at Detroit (41,000 kilowatts), 3 units at Hungry Horse (142,000 kilowatts), 9 units at Foster Creek (576,000 kilowatts), 12 units at McNary (828,000 kilowatts), and 4 plants in the lower Snake River (364,000 kilowatts). All of these installations are now authorized. Only the latter two are a threat to the salmon.

f. The Corps of Engineers assigns annual navigation benefits of over $7,300,000 to the mid-Columbia and Snake projects.

g. The Department agrees that the Columbia River fisheries should not be allowed indefinitely to block the full development of the other resources of the river. If they were to be preserved at any cost, eight potential projects on the Columbia and five on the Snake would have to be abandoned. The costs would be about 5,000,000 kilowatts of low-cost power capacity (80 percent on the Columbia), the acceptance of only shallow-draft navigation above the Dalles and none on the Snake, and the ultimate sacrifice of about 1,000,000 acres of irrigation. It is difficult precisely to equate these potential benefits against the value of the present Columbia River salmon, but all concerned within the Department are agreed that they are the foundation of the ultimate development of the Pacific Northwest and that they considerably outweigh the resulting cost to the commercial fisheries, the Indians, and the sportsmen.

h. It is, therefore, the conclusion of the Department that the over-all benefits to the Pacific Northwest from a thoroughgoing development of the Snake and Columbia are such that the present salmon run must, if necessary, be sacrified. This means that the Government's efforts should be directed toward ameliorating the impact of this development upon the injured interests and not toward a vain attempt to hold still the hands of the clock.

i. Possibilities of amelioration. There are several substantial opportunities for easing the burden of those injured by the proposed developments. They are:

(a) Downstream salmon development: The Fish and Wildlife Service has outlined a possible program for salmon development in the lower river and coastal streams. That program consists of (1) removal of obstructions, (2) abatement of pollution, (3) screening all diversions and construction of fish ways, (4) transplantation of up-river runs, (5) extension of artificial propagation.

(b) Indian readjustment: The Indian tribes should receive just compensation; some part of any downstream salmon development should be made available for their use; arrangements should be worked out for Indian use of carcasses from the hatcheries; and alternative economic opportunities should be developed for the Indian fishing population.

(c) Rescheduling: The present construction schedule will largely be fixed by the rate of appropriations. Obstruction of the Columbia by McNary might be completed by 1952, and of the lower Snake probably 1 or 2 years later. The Dalles and the other projects on the main streams below the Okanogan and Salmon Rivers have not yet been authorized (nor is there any assurance that they can or will be authorized in time to meet the power needs as determined by the Department of the Interior). McNary has gone too far to stop or to delay. Low-cost power can be found which will, for the immediate future, meet the power capacity represented by those projects without injurious effects upon the salmon. The Dalles and the lower Snake projects have a combined capacity of about 1,900,000 kilowatts. Of this capacity, only 365,000 kilowatts is needed before 1956; it is scheduled to come from the lower Snake. Power needs for the next decade or more might be met by two, or at the most all, of these projects: Hell's Canyon, on the Snake, 495,000 kilowatts; Boundary (or Z Canyon), on the Pend Oreille, 400,000 kilowatts; and Wolf Creek, on the Snake, 425,000 kilowatts. If these projects were scheduled for completion before the Columbia dams (except McNary) below the Okanogan, and the Snake dams below the Salmon River, the Columbia salmon run would probably have an additional life of 15 to 20 years, and could hardly fail to be preserved against this threat for at least 10 years.

j. Recommendations: The following recommendations represent the preliminary views of the Department:

(a) The current plans for further installations at Grand Coulee, Rock Island, and Kerr, and for construction of Hungry Horse, Foster Creek, Detroit, and McNary should be carried forward with all speed.

(b) The Hell's Canyon, Boundary, and Wolf Creek projects, or such other sizable upstream projects as should prove more practicable, should be authorized and scheduled for construction ahead of the Dalles and the lower Snake projects, and ahead of the other planned but unauthorized main-stream projects below the Okanogan and the Salmon Rivers.

(c) The Fish and Wildlife Service should promptly and vigorously prosecute its program for lower-river improvements.

(d) The Office of Indian Affairs should lay detailed plans, in consultation with the other interested agencies, for (1) an agreed or arbitrated valuation of fishery rights, (2) acquisition of downstream rights, and (3) alternative economic opportunities.

The Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee will hold a meeting in the city hall, at Walla Walla, Wash., commencing at 9 a. m., Wednesday, June 25, to hear the views of those affected by this problem. Oral testimony will be heard, but only from those submitting written statements and will be limited to not more than 10 minutes. For the accuracy of the record, all important facts and arguments will be submitted in writing. Written statements may be handed to the Secretary at the hearing, or mailed to him beforehand. Insofar as practicable, briefs reciting factual data will cite the sources of that data. Briefs should be submitted in quadruplicate.

THERON D. WEAVER,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Chairman.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the

Appendix of the RECORD three editorials dealing with Federal aid to education. It is very encouraging to find newspapers in several of the Northern States which formerly have not supported this program now giving their unqualified support to it.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 12, 1947]

SCHOOL AID

Approval by a Senate Public Welfare Subcommittee of the Taft-Thomas-Hill proposal for Federal aid to education is a heartening first link in the long chain that must be welded to bring about a rehabilitation of the country's public-school system. We hope for prompt endorsement by the full Public Welfare Committee to be followed by debate and decision by the Senate as a whole. We hope, also, that the House will not be laggard on the spurious pretext of economy. In view of the fact that the bill, as now drafted, does not call for commencement of Federal grants to the States until the beginning of the fiscal year 1949, it can no longer be argued that it threatens the balance of the 1948 budget. Since it would probably be impossible for the States to begin operating under the program before the opening of the 1948 school year, the delay seems warranted. But the program ought to be enacted into law in the current session of Congress so that the machinery of administration can be established and set in motion.

The Taft-Thomas-Hill bill is strictly a States' rights bill. It provides for a grant-in-aid program to the States and rigidly denies the Federal Government any measure of supervision or control respecting the nature and techniques of the State school systems to which it will contribute financial aid. This being so, we can see no logic in the opposition of Senator DONNELL who cast the lone vote against the program in the subcommittee on the ground that it would leave to State discretion whether aid should be given to nonpublic schools such as parochial institutions.

We think it a bad idea to give public funds to nonpublic schools. Nevertheless, this is a matter in which the States are entitled to exercise their discretion. Senator DONNELL cannot have it both ways. If the States are to be kept fully free from Federal dictation, they must be free to distribute their school funds as they see fit. The overriding interest of the Nation as a whole is in seeing to it that its children everywhere have adequate educational opportunities. Because some States do not now possess the financial resources necessary to provide such opportunities, they must be given help. Federal contributions—without strings attached—are the simple, direct, effective way to lift State standards to a minimum of decency.

[From the New York Times of June 7, 1947]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Hearings before the House subcommittee on education have now come to a close and the subcommittee is considering its report. Some 60 witnesses appeared before it to argue the pros and cons of Federal help to the Nation's schools. Previously a Senate education subcommittee had voted to report a similar bill favorably, and is now ironing out the final details of the measure.

Some leaders of the House contend that this is not the time to add new expenditures to the Federal budget. But the House itself ought to have an opportunity to consider this question and to debate the bill openly and on its merits. To keep it frozen would be poor strategy; too many people are concerned with the plight of the American public schools. It is neither advisable nor desirable to kill so importunate a measure in this manner.

Twenty-seven organizations have banded together to see that the House gets an opportunity to vote on the bill. The reason they are centering on the House is that little difficulty is expected to arise in the Senate, where Senator TAFT is sponsoring a Federal aid measure. It is to be hoped that the House, too, will assure a vote.

THE NEW SCHOOL-AID BILL

A Senate subcommittee has approved a Federal grant of $300,000,000 to the States to raise standards of education, Senator AIKEN, chairman, predicts approval by the full committee and action by the Senate next month. The prospect is encouraging; the need for Federal aid to meet the current emergency in education is now generally accepted. Generally accepted, too, is the principle that Federal aid must involve no Federal control of schools.

Main issues outside that general area of agreement turn on the basis of distribution of Federal aid and on the share, if any, which may go to private, including religious, schools. This paper has favored a straight equalization program, such as the original Taft bill provided. Equalization is the paramount justification of the use of Federal taxing powers in support of education. Although poorer States, such as Mississippi, spend a greater proportion of the State's total income on schools, they are unable to meet the higher standards of States blessed with greater resources. Yet the responsibility to decide the Nation's destiny will fall no less upon the handicapped youth of Mississippi than upon the more fortunate youth of, say, California. But the fact that under a straight equalization program some States would receive no Federal aid is not politically popular.

The subcommittee bill is a compromise. It provides a flat $5 Federal grant a child to all States which qualify—to qualify a State must provide school funds averaging $50 a child in each school district. It would give additional funds to the needier States according to an equalization formula like that in the Taft bill. We still think the Taft bill is better.

The compromise bill includes no reference to the use of Federal money for nonpublic schools, thereby leaving decision to the States. The Taft bill (also sponsored by Senators CHAVEZ, COOPER, ELLENDER, HILL, THOMAS of Utah, SMITH, and TOBEY) would have permitted each State to spend the same proportion of its Federal grant as of its own funds for nonpublic schools. The argument for State determination of the issue is that since Federal aid is to be predicated on the State's independence of control, it would be illogical for the Federal Government to impose any strictures that the States themselves do not impose. Although we feel strongly that public funds should be reserved to public schools, we cannot refute that argument. There is, however, a question as to the wisdom of striking out the Taft bill's provision. Certainly a Federal bill must not give any new leeway for relaxations of the principle of separating church and State. That question the Congress should examine carefully.

American Economic System on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "American Economic System on Trial Against Russian," delivered on April 28, 1947, by George W. Rochester, a member of the Los Angeles bar.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ECONOMIC SYSTEM ON TRIAL AGAINST RUSSIAN

(Address by George W. Rochester, Los Angeles bar, radio station KRKD, April 28, 1947)

With all the uncertainty of life and the age in which we live, there is very little that one can definitely state as a certainty, but I am sure of one thing, that each person has a destiny. By the same token, America has a destiny. What that destiny will be is conditioned by what we do today, and not tomorrow. It is with the destiny of our country that all of us should vitally concern ourselves.

For 16 years millions of people throughout the world have known only depression, want, hunger, and war, and now, as we emerge from that cataclysmic conflict, we feel a common impulse moving the minds of men throughout the world. There is no certain date that we can state this movement of men's minds as taking place, but we can all feel the gradual hope of mankind for a better life.

This is very noticeable by the struggles we now see taking place in China, India, Indonesia, and Eurasia, where the goodly part of 2,000,000,000 people are seething in unrest, trying in their various ways to gain a better life than that which they have experienced during the recent two decades. Each one of them either consciously or subconsciously, is asking questions.

Whether they realize it or not, their inquiries could be crystalized by these two questions: What forces prevent the technology of the modern world from being used for the happiness of the plain man, and if the industrial machine can supply man for war, why can't it supply the comforts of man at peace?

Americans also are asking these same questions because they are motivated by the same impulses for a better life and a better destiny. We veterans know what American industry and technique did during the war. We so utilized the finest intellects to develop a technique of production and distribution by labor and capital, which produced the greatest era of industrial activity the world has ever seen. I well remember how we all marveled before the invasion of Europe at the endless supply of food, clothing, munitions, and ordnance of all kinds that came to us in an unending and increasing stream, until we used to think that if another tank was placed on the little island of England it would surely sink.

And what do we find today? Even in one segment of this great productive machine we see that it has failed miserably and cannot even produce houses for the men who fought to give America the chance to make a decent Nation and a decent world. It seems beyond our comprehension that, with the potential and proven capacity of production that we have in this country, thousands of our comrades are homeless and unable to put a roof over the heads of themselves and their families. And, having seen what we could do with our productive economy, we are unable to understand any sane reason why our economy cannot furnish a job, home, food, and education for all.

Since the industrial revolution in the latter part of the eighteenth century, I think it can safely be stated that the economy of the civilized world has been based on the so-called free enterprise system. That system has had its modifications and its panic and prosperity spheres, but all during this time it has never had a complete competitor with an entirely different system. Now we are confronted with a virile, strong, and

growing competitor, fostered by Russia. Let us accord Russia the conviction that they think their system is the proper way of life, and believe themselves morally right, the same as we feel that our way of life is morally right and for the best interests of the people. We then see in this postwar period two contending systems of economy. On the one hand, our private enterprise system, and on the other the communistic system of Russia. We have a formidable competitor who, in the years with their potential power and wealth, will keep us on our toes and be a tonic for us to prove that our way of life is the better.

There is no question that our industrial capacity to produce far surpasses Russia's present productive industrial capacity, and it is in the potential future with Russia's aggressive desire to assimilate other countries, that causes us to have the fear that we have toward Russia. We should not fear Russia, but we should be more resolved to perfect our own economic system, and in that way prove to the millions of people now in a quandary which system they should choose—that ours is the better and under our way of life they would have more political, as well as industrial, freedom. For fear begets panic, and many are jittery today. Fear begets hatred, and the hatred for Russia is growing in our country, that hatred being fanned on by the apostles of hate and the propaganda we frequently read. Fear begets violence, and there is actual talk of war with Russia, even a this time when blood is still flowing from the last war. My friends, if we permit fear to take its course, we will be committing the age-old disaster that fear brings to pass what it fears. Instead of this, we should make a constructive use of the fear that we have today—not panic, not hatred, not war, but dedicate ourselves to make our democratic economy so effective for all the people that it proves its superior ability to meet most needs.

In order to do that, the ultimate criterion to decide the issue between Russian communism and American democracy must be which of the two systems does the more for the common man—and war will not settle that issue. You have head Aesop's fable where the lion and the goat argued over who should drink first, neither trusting the other, and about the time that they thought they would settle the question by fighting they looked up and saw a vulture leisurely flying over them, waiting for the result of the conflict, and straightway they decided to drink together. If we resort to war, the vultures will get us both.

But there is no disputing the fact that our economic system is on trial before the world and has never experienced such a terrific human force in opposition to it as we are seeing and will see the remainder of our lives and our children's lives. The success or failure of our political and industrial freedom depends upon the moral strength that we have to discipline ourselves and not allow greed, avariciousness, and the grasping instinct of some to upset the equilibrium of our supply and demand. We must accept two cardinal principles by which our body politic must discipline itself if we are to perfect and win in the competitive race now going on. First, we must accept the fact that the primary end of economic production is not profit, but satisfaction of human needs. Profit is necessary, but secondary. And, second, we must realize that what is physically possible is financially possible.

We veterans know this to be a fact, for when we left for war our Nation was in a depression and was insolvent as a government, but withal we produced more food, more ordnance, and more munitions than all the world could put together. If we cannot develop this necessary self-discipline to attain and follow these principles, our industrial freedom, and the world's, will be lost, because the ultimate victor will be which system does the most for the plain people of the world.

With the supreme test of our economy at hand, the spreading of hate will not solve the contest. This reminds me of a dramatic scene in the recent play staged in Los Angeles called "The State of the Nation." Those of you who saw it will remember Mary Mathews as the wife of a Presidential candidate, attending a dinner where her husband's supporters were discussing how to get the most votes. Involved in that inquiry were playing prejudices of the people against each other, taking advantage of the intolerance of classes and racial distinctions, putting to gain the accumulated self-interests of different groups, and holding the threat of war over the heads of voters. Finally, Mary Mathews, in deep and tremulous emotion, arose from the table and said, "All of you are talking about the next war. When will someone talk about the destiny of the next generation?"

Postmaster of Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Dillon Fills the Bill," from the Hartford Times of June 6, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. DILLON FILLS THE BILL

President Truman has sent to the Senate the nomination of Acting Postmaster Edward J. Dillon to be permanent postmaster of Hartford. It could be added to the 775 being held up by the Senate Civil Service Committee. Hartford will trust it will not be, or that if it is a way will be found to persuade the committee that, regarding the desirability of this appointment, at least, there can be no question.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, chairman of the committee, thinks that "many of these nominees are broken-down hacks of the Democratic Party who are trying to beat qualified civil-service candidates to plush jobs." The Democratic retort is that Senator LANGER is trying to sidetrack some Democrats and force the appointment of Republicans.

We are not concerned with that dispute, but only with the need that a suitable permanent postmaster should be appointed to a vacancy which has lasted for many months.

Certainly Mr. Dillon is not a "broken-down hack of the Democratic Party" who is trying to beat qualified civil-service candidates to the job. Mr. Dillon is himself the qualified civil-service candidate for the place. He is not a political aspirant in any sense, Democrat though he be. He is a postal service career man, who has come up through the ranks over a period of 35 years or more to be successively superintendent of mails, assistant postmaster, and finally acting postmaster when death created a vacancy.

The Civil Service Committee is asking for $33,000 to investigate alleged politics in connection with the pending nominations. This investigation will cover political activities in the civil service, chiefly in the postmaster field; whether any postmasters, on threat of losing their positions have been compelled to pay tribute financially or otherwise to anyone or to a group of politicians; third, whether there has been an attempt to compel men and women occupying positions of postmaster to violate the Hatch Clean Politics Act.

These questions can be answered categorically in the case of Mr. Dillon. He has been engaged in no political activity. Hartford at large neither knows nor cares what his party affiliation is. He has not been compelled to pay tribute, financially or otherwise, to anyone. There certainly has been no attempt to compel him to violate the Hatch Act nor any evidence of any disposition on his part to do so. His was the only name certified for the appointment after the civil-service examination and Congressman Kopplemann, then in office, promptly recommended that he be named.

The Hartford post office, unless we are very much mistaken, does the largest business in New England outside of Boston. Its postmastership is a highly important place, regarded by citizens and businessmen as a business and not a political post. What they want is efficient service, not a job for any politician. That is what they get and know they will continue to get from Mr. Dillon. It is why there is no sentiment in Hartford, except on the part of those who would like the job themselves, for the appointment of anybody else.

If the Senate committee wants to approve an appointment which conforms to its own specifications, here is its opportunity.

An Issue Long Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of June 2, 1947:

AN ISSUE LONG DEAD

Objection to the admission of Hawaii, Alaska and Puerto Rico as States has been voiced by Nicholas Murray Butler in a letter to J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior.

President Butler wrote:

"Under no circumstances should Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico or any other outlying island or Territory be admitted as a State in our Federal Union. To do so * * * would mark the beginning of the end of the United States as we have known it. * * * Think of what would happen were the vote of one Senator from Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico to defeat the ratification of an important treaty."

He suggests that these Territories "be set up, by treaty, as independent and self-governing nations, subject to but two limitations:"

(1) Their foreign relations should be subject to the approval of the President and Senate of the United States.

(2) Litigants in any of these countries should have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In answer to Dr. Butler's objections the following may be pertinent:

"The United States as we have known it" was changed when Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico were made Territories of the United States.

Our country is always changing. The recent war and the current Truman doctrine

against communism, as well as the award of the strategic trusteeship of the Pacific islands, have been significant changes.

Our country remains strong by adaptability to change.

Hawaii and Alaska are already Territories of the United States with a large measure of local self-government through legislative bodies.

There is no precedent for either a Territory or a State to be detached from the United States and set up on an independent basis. There is precedent for Territories to become States. That has been the normal procedure. Western Territories when they became States were more detached from Washington than are Hawaii and Alaska now.

The senatorial vote issue raised by Dr. Butler is untenable as a political doctrine. All votes have to be associated for and against a proposition. One vote cannot be considered as deciding the issue.

Dr. Butler's suggestion of setting up these Territories as independent and self-governing nations would change the character of the United States more than their admission as States. Our country is not now a commonwealth of nations. Political, legal, defense, and international relations problems would be difficult to solve.

The dangers Dr. Butler envisions would be as great and more complicated under his suggested system than under our tried and proved federation of States.

When Alaska was ceded and Hawaii was annexed, these areas were incorporated into the United States. Rights were conferred on the residents of these areas by treaty and by act of Congress. The United States should live up to those agreements.

The status of Territory meant then, and has always meant, that the citizens of the Territories could look forward to statehood. That is the American system. That is the United States as we have known it.

Dr. Butler's suggestions mean the adoption of a system of imperialism, not the maintenance of the American system.

Dr. Butler was for many years the eminent president of Columbia University. He is now retired as its president emeritus, 85 years old. When he proposes that Hawaii should be set up as a self-governing nation, substantially severing its natural union with the Federal Government, he is living in the past, and talking the language of an issue long dead.

It died when the Republic of Hawaii, succeeding the monarchy, was established as a prelude to annexation to the United States.

Good Luck, Mr. Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it was with great personal satisfaction that I read of the Senate confirmation of our friend, the Honorable Emmet O'Neal, of Kentucky, as Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines. No finer choice could have been made and none could have brought greater satisfaction to his colleagues in the Congress.

We are fortunate in having such a man as Emmet O'Neal to represent our country in the Philippines. He carries with him a sound knowledge of the islands' problems and needs and the Filipinos will find in him a valued friend and counselor. It is a job of tremendous importance that he undertakes but that he will conduct his responsibilities with dignity, tolerance, and understanding we of the Congress have not the slightest doubt. To our friend, Emmet O'Neal, and to his charming wife and beautiful daughters, we say good luck, Mr. Ambassador, and may God continue to guide you in the future as he always has in the past.

Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

SOCIALISM

Louis V. Sutton, president of the Carolina Power & Light Co., has renewed his opposition to the Buggs Island project on the Roanoke River by filing a brief with a congressional committee. In his brief, the power company official describes the project as "a perfect example of socialism."

Mr. Sutton would turn the clock back a long way. The Buggs Island project merely seeks to develop hydroelectric prower as a by-product of flood control and as a means of paying for flood control which is desperately needed on the Roanoke River. It does not go as far as numerous other projects such as the TVA, which have long ago demonstrated their usefulness and are conceded to be in the public interest by all except a few die-hards like Mr. Sutton, who takes occasion to denounce the TVA in his brief filed on Buggs Island. But, if such projects are a perfect example of socialism, surely any attempt to regulate power companies in any fashion would be an imperfect example of socialism. It is not likely that even Mr. Sutton would go so far as to advocate doing away with any control whatever of power companies. Hydroelectric power is a natural resource and belongs to the public. All power companies have a monopoly which gives the public a particular interest in them.

Government ownership of a dam on the Roanoke River and Government ownership of all productive enterprise, which is what is generally understood to be socialism, are two different things. Surely Mr. Sutton is not afraid that the comparatively small project on the Roanoke River will destroy the large and prosperous Carolina Power & Light Co., which he heads. In fact this company has had its greatest prosperity since the advant of the TVA which is adjacent to the territory of his company. The company has also withstood successfully the competition of the Santee-Cooper project which is in the territory of the company. The truth is that cheaper electricity has not only been a boon to the public, but has been of great benefit to the private power companies, which have greatly increased their sales since they lowered their rates.

Mr. Sutton will not frighten anyone, not even his own stockholders, by the cry of socialism. And, so far as the public is concerned, likening the Buggs Island project to the TVA will be commendation of the project rather than a condemnation of it.

The Role of the United States in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under consent granted me, I am inserting in the RECORD, in two parts, a copy of a speech I made before the National Federation of Catholic Students with the cooperation of the social action department, NCWC, and the Catholic Association for International Peace, at New York City on Monday, June 9, 1947. The second part of this speech will appear in tomorrow's RECORD.

The first part follows:

THE UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA

The idea of the United Nations may be traced indirectly to the Atlantic Charter. In that charter, given to the world on August 14 of 1941, when the late President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill declared that they "deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world," they probably foresaw the future United Nations. Therein may be found the germ of the idea. The next step, definitely a great step forward, was the Declaration of the United Nations, issued jointly by 26 nations on January 1 of 1942, confirming their adherence "to a program of purposes and principles embodied * * * in the Atlantic Charter."

On September 21 of 1943 the House of Representatives took a step which brought this country another step nearer to full membership in a future world organization. On that day the House passed, by a vote of 360 to 29, the Fulbright resolution, which, incidentally, I had a part in drawing up, as "favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with powers adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace * * * and as favoring participation by the United States therein." On November 5 of the same year the Senate of the United States also voted, by 85 to 5, for a similar resolution (Connally resolution) stating "That the United States * * * join with free and sovereign nations in establishment and maintenance of international authority with powers to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." The spirit and the content of these resolutions, and their easy passage by overwhelming margins both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, surely served as proof that at least the elective branch of the United States Government was definitely wedded to the idea of the United Nations.

At about the time when the Connally resolution was being taken up in the Senate the United Nations idea was being echoed at the Foreign Ministers meeting in Moscow. The declaration issued from Moscow on November 1, jointly by Secretary of State Cordell Hull and the Foreign Ministers of China, Russia and the United Kingdom, stated "That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization * * * for the maintenance of international peace and security." The Dumbarton Oaks conversations on international peace and security organization, held among the representatives

of the United States, China, Russia, and the United Kingdom, August 23 to October 7, 1944, registered the intent of the Moscow Declaration of November 1. As the result of these conversations proposals were agreed upon in which it was stated that "there should be established an international organization under the title of the United Nations * * *." Finally at the Crimea Conference of the Big Three, in February of 1945, it was agreed that a conference of United Nations should be called to meet at San Francisco on April 25, 1945, to prepare the charter of such an organization, along the lines proposed at Dumbarton Oaks. Then it was agreed that the governments of the Big Three, as well as those of China and France, jointly sponsor invitations to the conference.

The San Francisco Conference, "a town meeting of the world," opened on April 25 with 46 nations participating. In about 2 months its work was completed and it was concluded on June 26 with an address (in person) by President Truman. On that day the drafted charter was signed by the United States representatives and by the representatives of 49 other nations. Thus the charter of the United Nations was born.

Article 110 of the charter provides that the charter will come into force upon the deposit of ratifications with the Government of the United States by the governments of the Big Five, and by a majority of the signatory states, that is, by 24 states. In his address at the concluding plenary session of the Conference the President had said: "I shall send this charter to the United States Senate at once. I am sure that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of my country and of their representatives in the Senate is in favor of immediate ratification." Subsequent events proved that the President was correct in his judgment and hopeful expectation. On July 2 he personally took the charter to the Senate and in his address to that body he urged prompt ratification. Prompt ratification it received; in less than 4 weeks the Senate gave its advice and consent for the ratification of the charter by a vote of 89 to 2. On August 8 the President signed the formal document by which he ratified the charter * * * (and) the instrument of ratification was deposited in the Archives of the Department of State, and thereby the United States Government became the first to complete action necessary to bring the charter into force."

The charter came into force on October 24 of 1945 when the governments of the big five and 24 other nations had deposited their instruments of ratification with the State Department. "It is now my happy privilege," said then Secretary of State Byrnes, "to sign the protocol which, in accordance with article 110 of the United Nations Charter, will attest to the fact that the charter has come into force." On December 4, 1945, the Senate, by a vote of 65 to 7, passed legislation "to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization." In brief and chronological order such is the story of the birth of the United Nations.

It is also worth noting that long before the official birth of the United Nations the United States had been working with numerous international groups. In nearly all cases we were serving as sponsors and hosts and had a major share in their creation, working and eventual merging with the United Nations. A few of these were:

The International Conference on Food and Agriculture, held at Hot Springs, Va., in May 18–June 3, 1943, proposing "the creation of a Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations."

The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) came into being on November 9, 1943, under the sponsorship of the United Nations. The agreement was signed at the White House on that day by 44 nations. And our financial share in the work of this organization, totaling more than $2,700,000,000, or about 80 percent of its budget, was voted by Congress without any bickering.

At the invitation of the United States Government the representatives of 44 nations met at Bretton Woods, N. H., in July 1–22, 1944, and prepared the final act providing for International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Again at the invitation of the United States the representatives of 52 nations attended, in November 1–December 7 of 1944, the International Civil Aviation Conference "to negotiate proposals for an international civil aviation organization."

THE UNITED STATES AT WORK IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The part played by the United States in the United Nations may be seen, first, through the work of the United Nations Security Council, then by her work in the General Assembly, and lastly, by the leadership which the United States Government has assumed in the work of numerous other organizations of the United Nations. It will be difficult, in a brief survey such as this, to enumerate in detail and to evaluate exactly the part played by the United States. It is safe to say that the United States has played and is still playing a great part, perhaps the leading part, in the United Nations. In this survey, first the work of our representatives in the Security Council will be considered; then our share in the General Assembly; and lastly, the work of our representatives in other organizations, particularly in the Atomic Energy Commission, in the Economic and Social Council, and in a number of other organizations.

The charter confers upon the Security Council "the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security." This responsibility is in general only commensurate to the power each of the Big Five wields, for it is assumed in the charter that power and responsibility go together. In the course of its first meetings in London early in 1946 all important cases taken up by the Security Council dealt with peace and security: the Iranian case, the Indonesian case, the Greek case, and the case of Syria and the Lebanon, all had in them the elements of disturbance in respective areas. In the case of Iran, one of the Big Five was involved. According to a treaty, Allied forces should have withdrawn from Iran 6 months after the termination of hostilities. The United States and the British had abided by the treaty and had withdrawn their forces from Iran long before the stipulated date, but the Russians were slow in their move to withdraw from northwestern Iran. Several protests from Iran to Russia did not settle the matter, and finally Iran appealed to the Security Council. On January 19, 1946, the matter was placed before the Council, Iran's charge being "interference by the Soviet Union in its internal affairs." In this case "the United States position, * * * was that the Council should take no action other than to encourage the continuance of the negotiations in progress between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Iran, but should evidence its continued interest in the case by retaining the matter on its agenda." When the Council was holding its New York meetings in March this matter came up, and "Secretary of State Byrnes, * * * took the position that the matter was properly on the Council's agenda. On the Soviet proposal that the Council should postpone its consideration of the case, he pointed out that the Council could not, under its responsibilities, decide on a postponement until the representative of the country bringing the matter to attention had been heard upon that issue." A month later when information was received from the Soviet Government about the withdrawal of Russian troops, the Council adopted a suggestion of Secretary Byrnes "that the Secretary-General of the United Nations should obtain from both the Soviet and Iranian Governments a report as to the status of the negotiations between them and a report as to whether the withdrawal of troops was conditional upon the conclusion of other agreements between the two governments." Thus it becomes clear that the United States took a decisive stand in this matter and successfully challenged those who opposed the consideration of the case, or the keeping of it on the Council's agenda.

On January 21 of 1946 the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Social Republic protested against the alleged "use of British, and even some Japanese, troops against the Indonesian population" and called upon the Council to carry out an on-the-spot investigation. The United States representative was against such an investigation, stating that "it might prejudice or retard the negotiations then in progress between the Dutch authorities and the Indonesian Nationalists." The majority of the Security Council assented to the views of the United States representative.

On January 21 of 1946 the chairman of the Soviet delegation charged that "the presence of British troops in Greece constituted interference with that country's internal affairs and contributed to tension fraught with grave consequences to the maintenance of international peace." The United States representative took a decided stand against this charge. He did not believe that the situation was likely "to endanger international peace and security within the meaning of the charter; accordingly the * * * Security Council was without charter authority to recommend procedures or methods of adjustment." Then the Council accepted a proposal put forward by the United States representative that the matter "should be closed." In its New York meetings, on August 24 of 1946, the Greek question came up again in another form. On that day the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic complained of internal conditions in Greece and of the Greek-Albanian frontier incidents, "allegedly provoked by Greek armed forces." Then the United States representative moved for the establishment of a commission to investigate, "with authority to call upon Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Yugoslavia for information." The negative vote by the Soviet representative blocked the adoption of this resolution, and the Council took no action at the time.

In December the Greek issue came up to the Council for the third time. This time it was the Greek Government which brought the complaint, contending that her northern neighbors were lending support to the violent guerrilla warfare being waged in northern Greece, and requesting the Council to conduct an "on-the-spot investigation." Then the United States representative proposed the establishment of a commission. On December 19 the Security Council approved this proposal. Under this resolution the commission, consisting of the representatives of all members of the Council, was given authority "to conduct its investigation in northern Greece and * * * in other parts of Greece, in Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. * * *" Since January this commission has been carrying on its on-the-spot investigation. Just now it has repaired to Geneva and is preparing its report to the Security Council.

The question of British and French forces in the Levant was also brought to the Security Council in February of 1946. Then the Lebanese and Syrian delegations to the General Assembly complained of the "continued presence" of these forces in their countries. The United States representative on the Council stated that the withdrawal of these

forces should proceed as quickly as possible. He pointed out that the parties should first seek a solution of their own choice, preferably by direct negotiations. He then proposed a resolution, "expressing confidence that the troops would be withdrawn as soon as practicable and negotiations to that end undertaken without delay." This resolution failed to pass the Security Council "because of the negative vote of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." Both France and the United Kingdom, however, declared their intention to carry out the sense of the resolution, to which Syria and the Lebanon readily agreed.

The few instances cited above in which the United States representative worked in the Security Council amply show the important and the leading part played by the United States in that body. But the work of the Council is not the only mirror in which the United States part in the higher councils of the United Nations is reflected. As has been truly stated, "the Foreign Ministers Conferences are as closely interlocked as the links in chain," and in these meetings also the United States representatives have taken a leading part. Before the end of the Security Council's meetings in London, Secretary Byrnes pressed for and obtained the consent of the Soviet delegation that a peace conference be called at Paris in July. When it was found that the Paris Peace Conference could not accomplish all that was expected of it, then again the Secretary of State stood firm on his contention that the work of drafting peace treaties must proceed without delay. As the result of his persistence peace treaties with Italy and the four Axis satellite countries (Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, and Rumania) were drafted and signed on February 10, 1947. In his address to the General Assembly on December 13 last, Secretary Byrnes declared that "the United States has also persistently urged the conclusion of a treaty recognizing the independence of Austria and providing for the withdrawal of foreign troops." This has not been accomplished yet. At the recent Moscow Conference of the Big Four Foreign Ministers, Secretary Marshall ably and urgently pressed the aims of his predecessor, even though the representatives of the Big Four could not agree and produce the desired treaty.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a plan advanced by Francis S. Murphy, publisher of the Hartford Times, Hartford, Conn., for compulsory military training through State guard units of the country. The article follows:

TRAIN OUR BOYS IN CONNECTICUT

(A plan advanced by Francis S. Murphy, publisher of the Hartford Times, for compulsory military training through State guard units of the country, is being submitted to President Truman by Senator Hart.

(Senator Hart has informed Mr. Murphy that he is studying the plan and also is bringing it to the President's attention.

(Mr. Murphy, national councilor of the National Aeronautics Association for Connecticut, a trustee of the University of Connecticut, and chairman of the aviation advisory committee of the State development commission, calls attention to the large number of airports throughout the country, both constructed and planned, which would supplement the basic training facilities in most of the States.)

(By Francis S. Murphy)

The National Guard has made a splendid record in two great wars and it was available for duty at the start of both conflicts. It seems to me, therefore, that if we are to have a policy of required military training in this country we should seriously consider the advantages of joining such training with our National Guard program.

Each State of which I have information has facilities for the military training of its share of the several hundred thousand youths who reach their eighteenth birthday each year. I suggest that these boys could be given 3 months of intensive training during the summer.

Some 12,500 young men become of age 18 in Connecticut each year, with 10,000 or more fit for military training and I believe that Bradley Field in Windsor Locks could easily accommodate these men. Having a great water supply, a top-notch sewage disposal system, excelled by no other airfield in the country, and ample for a city of 35,000, housing accommodations, fire-protection apparatus, etc., Bradley Field has everything all made to order to undertake such a program and yet can be used for any commercial-aviation use that would develop.

Army pay, $50 a month, probably should be paid these youths while they are in summer training.

Those asking for a full year given over entirely to military training will probably object to a limiting of the program to two summers, and with that one should not quarrel. It can be pointed out, of course, that boys, during this war, have been sent into action after a few months of basic training. Possibly a complete program would require that two summers be given over to the acquiring of military competence and that between those two summers, the youths could be required to drill one night a week on a schedule approximating that of the National Guard in peacetime. In effect, we should be setting up a compulsory National Guard, somewhat at variance with our national ideas, but far less so than the proposal to turn over to the Federal Government, in peacetime, control of every healthy 18-year-old boy in the Nation.

I should not expect that this compulsory military training program would replace the volunteer National Guard as we have known it. As a matter of fact, many young men would wish to continue military experience after their required service and the senior, volunteer branch of the National Guard would probably be much larger than formerly because of the earlier interest aroused. The Army would be able to assign substantial numbers of officers and noncommissioned officers as instructors. In the event of unemployment and the need for a made work program, there is much of a worth while nature that could be done in providing additional facilities for this program. The State would find it necessary to provide more armories. Certainly we should find that to be the case in Connecticut, although I am informed that Connecticut has 27 of them, distributed quite well throughout the State.

This proposal is in harmony with that of many educators who feel that if we must have compulsory military training, much of the program should be conducted at the community and State levels. Dr. Alonzo G. Grace, commissioner of education for Connecticut, a few months ago, asked the War and Navy Departments, in planning for compulsory training, to provide for "the organization and administration of a basic program by the National Guard in the several States." Dr. Grace believes that if the military leaders of the country will seek the full cooperation of the adjutants general and the educational authorities in the States, we can have a thoroughly American program of military training, much of it conducted in the home States.

Connecticut installations are paralleled in most States, exceeded in some. The advantages of using available space at airports for some of the basic training of youth is obvious. We have the fields the war gave us and we shall have municipal and other airports, all of which will be included in any national defense plan likely to be written. Why not use these fields to the limit of their capacity? I suggest the use of Bradley Field on account of its great size (over 2,000 acres) and its complete equipment.

Possibly the National Guard training, compulsory at 18, could be made optional at 17, and many boys would like to meet the requirements while they are in high school. Boys away at college could have the ROTC training to compensate for weekly drill.

It would be my hope that our health resources, our education facilities, and the aviation opportunities of the State would be joined in such a program sufficiently to help Connecticut's boys in preparation for civil life as well as giving them basic training as soldiers.

I am not attempting to write a military preparedness program for the Nation. In fact, it is an idea, rather than a plan, that I should like to advance. Our military leaders are men of good judgment and their advice regarding minimum military strength for the United States should have great weight when we write a national policy.

It is my hope, however, that we shall adopt a training program in keeping with American ideas, rather than European continental policies. While we decry increased centralization of power in Washington, we should try to decentralize, so far as possible, any required training program for youth. If the job can be done at home, or some substantial part of it, we should not turn it over, completely, to the National Government.

All that can be done in the community and State should be done here. The boys should go out of the home State to participate in maneuvers or war games involving armies in the second summer, which would allow for a new group each year for basic training in the home State. It would be well, I think, for the boy to have some military training at home in advance of that experience.

I submit that there are two questions, not one, for the American people to decide. First, do we need a peacetime policy of compulsory military training? Second, if we do, is it possible to give much of this training in or near the home community, coordinated with education and employment and to require a few months, rather than a year, of full time service in the armed forces?

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune for June 9, 1947:

STATEHOOD SEEN AS A BUSINESS SPUR IN HAWAII—TRADE AND INDUSTRY SEEK BENEFITS OF UNITED STATES LAWS, END OF DISCRIMINATION

Statehood for Hawaii—an end toward which 12 bills in Congress are directed—would greatly benefit Hawaiian business firms, and remove inequities they have suffered for years while sharing equally with

mainland firms the costs of running the Federal Government, according to representatives of two prominent island businesses who commented on the proposed legislation yesterday.

Hawaiian businessmen not only feel that the Territory is ready for statehood, culturally and politically, but that its business and industry should receive the benefits of our laws, and be spared the repetition of instances in which they have actually been discriminated against by Federal legislation.

This sums up the contentions of Henry A. White, president of Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd., and C. J. Henderson, executive vice president of Castle & Cooke, Ltd., two concerns representing the island's principle products—pineapples and sugar.

TAX BURDEN CITED

"Hawaii is too important economically to be represented in Congress only by a nonvoting delegate," Mr. White pointed out. "Hawaii pays more in Federal taxes than 14 of the present 48 States. Territorial status for this important part of the country is inequitable for half a million people, and unsound for their businesses."

Furthermore, it should be emphasized that reasons for statehood for Hawaii far transcend mere protection for Hawaiian business. The businessmen of Hawaii, over a long span of years, have made an extraordinary record of achievement, not only in pineapples and sugar, but in shipping, banking, insurance, and many other fields.

Mr. White said the economy of the islands was vitally affected, however, by policy made in Washington, with respect to such matters as labor relations, industrial and agricultural development, transportation, finance, public health, and welfare.

LABOR RELATIONS A PROBLEM

He cited as one matter in which Hawaii particularly desires a say in national policy, and, in turn, the protection afforded by national legislation, the problem of labor relations, which he called "the most troublesome of the island's postwar problems."

"Hawaii's problem in employee-employer relations is part of the general national problem," Mr. White explained. "Union leadership here stems from the mainland; yet the cost of labor strife is more acutely felt here. Shipping tie-ups cut off essentials—even food supplies. Also in our great sugar and pineapple industries, involving the irrevocable loss of crops."

Mr. White added that labor strife could destroy the economy of the islands, resting as it does on sugar and pineapples, and warned also that excessive labor costs in the Hawaiian pineapple business could result in a rise of foreign competition which might wrest world leadership from it.

LAWS HELD DISCRIMINATORY

Commenting further on the need of Hawaii's businesses receiving equal treatment, Mr. Henderson pointed out numerous examples in which the territory had failed to receive benefits granted to the States, and of laws which discriminated against Hawaiian industry.

"When the Federal Road Act, providing funds for the States for road building, was passed by Congress in 1916, it did not include any provision for extending the benefits to Hawaii," Mr. Henderson declared. "This inequity was not corrected until 1924 when Congress passed a special amendment providing for inclusion of Hawaii.

"Hawaii also was omitted in 1917 from provision of the Smith-Hughes Act for aid of vocational education. Correction of this inequity was not accomplished until 7 years later when Congress amended the measure to apply to Hawaii."

POTATO EXPERIENCE TOLD

"Under provisions of the Potato Control Act of 1935, the Agricultural Adjustment Agency placed what amounted to an embargo on shipment of Hawaii-grown new potatoes to the mainland market. This discrimination would have ruined Hawaii's potato industry had not the Supreme Court subsequently declared it unconstitutional.

"The Jones-Costigan Sugar Act of 1934 listed Hawaii along with the nonincorporated areas of Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands and with the foreign country of Cuba, which were not guaranteed minimum quotas for sugar production. This measure, drawing sharp distinction between Hawaiian sugar production and that of the mainland United States, resulted in a substantial and damaging reduction for Hawaii.

"It is sometimes argued that Congress usually if not always has been willing to adjust and correct such inequalities—in time. But the time required for congressional machinery to reverse itself and straighten out these matters usually accumulate to the disadvantage of Hawaii."

Colorful Exhibition of Royal Hawaiian Heirlooms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

COLORFUL EXHIBITION OF ROYAL HAWAIIAN HEIRLOOMS

A rare collection of masterpieces of native Hawaiian handicrafts, comprising heirlooms of the Hawaiian royal family, now has a permanent home in the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. These heirlooms were bequeathed by Princess Abigail W. Kawananakoa, of Honolulu, upon her death April 12, 1945. Her husband, Prince David Kawananakoa, a direct descendant of the Oahu, Kauai and Maui royal families, had been named an heir to the Hawaiian throne by King David Kalakaua and Queen Liliuokalani, the last reigning monarchs of Hawaii. Many of the specimens in the collection had been owned and used by King Kalakaua and his queen. Others had belonged to Hawaiian royalty of earlier times. One beautiful feather cape may have belonged to Kamakahelei, chieftess of Kauai, when Capt. James Cook discovered the Hawaiian Islands in 1778.

The collection includes four colorful ceremonial feather capes worn by members of the Hawaiian royal family. The capes were made of carefully selected feathers of the o-o and iiwi birds, skillfully and painstakingly tied to a foundation of olono (native hemp) fiber. Thousands of tufts of small yellow, black and red feathers were required for the construction of a single cape. The handsome feather capes and cloaks are considered the highest achievement of Hawaiian craftsmanship. The making of these elaborate garments had practically ceased by the middle of the nineteenth century.

Some of the finest examples of Hawaiian woodwork are exemplified by three large bowls in this collection. These bowls, used for serving poi, a popular native Hawaiian food made from a paste of the taro root mixed with water, were hand-carved with stone tools from kou and milo wood. The largest bowl is 84 inches in diameter and stands more than 15 inches high. Its walls were carved to less than one-half inch thickness and were highly burnished. Two of the bowls were used by David Kalakaua, seventh King of Hawaii, who was elected to the throne February 12, 1874, and died in San Francisco, Calif., January 29, 1891. The cover of one of the bowls bears his royal crest.

There is a rare hand-woven mat in the collection which was made by women of Niihau the westernmost inhabited island of the Hawaiian group. The background is woven from the brown leaves of a sedge which grows along the shores and in marshes on the island. The colored figures in the mat are formed from the darker, lower portion of the stem of the same plant. Very few mats of this kind, known to Hawaiians as pawehe niihau, have been made in the last 50 years.

This valuable collection has been placed on special exhibition on the ground floor of the United States National Museum at Tenth Street and Constitution Avenue. Later it will serve as the nucleus of a revised and modernized exhibition on Hawaiian ethnology. Along with these specimens will appear other important examples of Hawaiian handicrafts collected by the historic United States exploring expedition under Capt. Charles Wilkes, which sailed under orders of President Van Buren to explore and survey "the Great Southern Ocean in the important interests of our commerce." Specimens collected by this and by later expeditions have been carefully preserved in the collections of the Smithsonian Institution since its establishment a century ago.

Our Responsibility to the Honored Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address prepared and delivered by me at the Memorial Day exercises in Naugatuck, Conn.:

Fellow citizens, this year, perhaps more than ever, we should realize with great seriousness the responsibilities incumbent upon us, the living, to those who have given their lives for their country. No more mouthing of words, expressions of fine sentiments or firing of salutes will fulfill our duties to those who died on the field of battle. These are precarious times, less than 2 years completion of the most terrible conflict in history, and already there are many who state that another war, more terrible than any of which man has ever dreamed, is confronting us. This Nation nor any other Nation can today even dream of war. Every country in the world is faced with shortages of physical and material power necessary to prosecute a war. This alone, however, is not assurance enough that there will be lasting peace. Only the peoples of the world, acting in concert, can assure such peace.

We, the people of the United States, who for generations treasured self-rule; we, who fought wars to preserve self-rule, deliberately and with aforethought in San Francisco relinquished some measure of our sovereign rights as a nation in order to band together with our allies to make certain that no numeral three would be affixed to the name "World War." This was a great concession for the American people to make, and another is before us as a result of the American development of atomic weapons.

As a corollary to our action in joining the United Nations organization we must aid now in strengthening it through the allotment to it of international control of atomic energy.

This tremendous force, now held as a monopoly by the United States, must be relinquished to an international authority with powers never before granted to any body of individuals. So long as we maintain superiority in this field other nations for self-protection will attempt desperately to exceed our efforts in this field. The world cannot afford an armaments race in atomic weapons as some unscrupulous despot will surely seek greater power through this means.

I believe that the American people are willing to grant to an international atomic development authority the powers which must be inherent in it to control effectively atomic development. Our representatives in the United Nations have stated this as the position of the United States. We must stand firmly behind this proposal to insure the peace of the world.

The chief opponent at this time of such a plan is the Soviet Union, yet they are agreed that some system of control is necessary. Our positions are not so unrelated that we should despair of agreement. In lieu of an agreement in treaty form, signed by all participating nations, and vesting authority in the United Nations, Russia desires international control by treaty only, with punishment for violators meted out by the individual nation. In place of inspection by internationally constituted teams, Russia desires national inspection. Russia desires, as we do, the destruction of all atomic weapons, but they wish it before agreement is reached, and we state that international control must be a reality before we take this step. These are the main differences in our programs. These differences are not insurmountable.

Agreement on international control can and, I believe, will be realized in the immediate future. It must be reached if we are to live in peace with our neighbors. It must never again be said of these valiant dead that they died in vain. America can lead in the search for a better world through a lasting peace if all of us will but remember that our responsibilities to those we honor today are never ending and our debt to them never paid.

Thank you.

Ten "Don'ts" by J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extract from Newsweek of June 9, 1947:

TEN DON'TS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER OF THE FBI

We can successfully defeat the Communist attempt to capture the United States by fighting it with truth and justice, implemented with a few don'ts:

Don't label anyone as a Communist unless you have the facts.

Don't confuse liberals and progressives with Communists.

Don't take the law into your own hands. If Communists violate the law, report such facts to your law-enforcement agency.

Don't be a party to the violation of the civil rights of anyone. When this is done, you are playing directly into the hands of the Communists.

Don't let up on the fight against real Fascists, the KKK, and other dangerous groups.

Don't let Communists in your organization or labor union outwork, outvote, or outnumber you.

Don't be hoodwinked by Communist propaganda that says one thing but means destruction of the American way of life. Expose it with the truth.

Don't give aid and comfort to the Communist cause by joining front organizations, contributing to their campaign chests, or by championing their cause in any way, shape, or form.

Don't let Communists infiltrate into our schools, churches, and molders of public opinion—the press, radio, and screen.

Don't fail to make democracy work with equal opportunity and the fullest enjoyment of every American's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Coosa-Alabama River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following statement made by me before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, with reference to the Coosa-Alabama River project:

Mr. Chairman, Senator SPARKMAN asked me to state for the record that he was here to testify in support of this project, representing himself, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, and Senator HILL, of Alabama. It was not possible for him to remain until this hour, for the reason that he is to follow Senator RUSSELL on the floor of the Senate in a discussion of the Bulwinkle bill. Senator SPARKMAN asked me to state that he and each of the other Senators earnestly request favorable consideration of the committee on the Coosa-Alabama River project.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the Fifth District of Alabama, through which flows the great Coosa River. As you know, the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers are in junction at Montgomery, Ala., and the river to the Gulf of Mexico is known as the Alabama River. Thus, the entire river system is known as the Coosa-Alabama River. First of all, I want to speak a word in support of the project known as the Allatoona Dam near Cartersville, Ga., which is in the district represented by the Honorable HENDERSON LANHAM, of Rome, Ga. This dam, as you know, is already under construction, and I am quite sure is entitled to the funds necessary for its completion. The dam is on the headwater of the Coosa River, and is one of the essential dams to be built in the over-all construction and development of this river system. I, therefore, urge, first of all, that the necessary funds be allocated for the completion of this project.

There is a long legislative history back of the proposed construction on the Coosa-Alabama River. For more than 50 years, the need for this great project has been presented to the Congress by interested citizens, by the people of the States of Alabama and Georgia, and by their elected Representatives in the Congress and in the Senate. Finally, in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the development of this great river system was approved, and the authorization in the rivers and harbors bill of that Congress, provided for the sum of $60,000,000 to begin the work. It is in support of that authorization that I, along with the other Members of the Alabama and Georgia congressional delegations, appear before your committee this afternoon.

It is not necessary, I know, for me to urge the need and feasibility of this project, since that has been heretofore established, both before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and before the Congress itself, by competent witnesses and by the United States Army engineers. The $60,000,000 which was authorized in the Seventy-ninth Congress was to provide for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the basin development of the Coosa-Alabama River, as outlined in House Document 414, Seventy-seventh Congress, as follows:

"Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ala.: Initial and ultimate development of the Alabama-Coosa River and tributaries for navigation, flood control, power development, and other purposes as outlined in House Document No. 414, Seventy-seventh Congress, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the plans being prepared by the Chief of Engineers with such modifications thereof from time to time as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable for the purpose of increasing the development of hydroelectric power; and that for the initiation and accomplishment of the ultimate plan, appropriations are authorized in such amounts as Congress may from time to time determine to be advisable, the total of such appropriations not to exceed the sum of $60,000,000."

The development of this river system by the use of multiple-purpose dams is economically feasible and justifiable, on the basis of (a) flood control, (b) navigation, and (c) hydroelectric power. The plan for ultimate development of the river system provided for a 9-foot navigation channel from Mobile, Ala., to Rome, Ga. It is interesting to note when this river development is complete, it will be the second longest navigable waterway in the world. I call to the attention of the committee that this river system is adjacent to, and would carry the traffic for one of the greatest industrial sections of the South. Engineering reports prove conclusively that sufficient tonnage would be available on the river to justify the development for a navigation standpoint.

Over all the years, the section traversed by this river, from the mountains of north Georgia, to the Gulf of Mexico, has been subjected to great and serious damages by the ravages of constant floods. Floods and soil erosion are greatly endangering the fertility and the productivity of the soil in this great agricultural region of our Nation. The committee, I know, subscribes to the now well-founded principle of conservation, that flood control is one of the essential responsibilities and obligations of the Nation. On the basis of flood control, this project is feasible and sound.

We come now to a brief discussion of the hydroelectric power possibilities of the Coosa-Alabama Rivers. Hydroelectric engineers state that the Coosa-Alabama Rivers, from the mountains of north Georgia to the Gulf of Mexico, present the second greatest power potentiality in the United States—surpassed only by the Columbia River. The Army Engineers' plans set out in House Document 414 provide for the construction of hydroelectric dams which would step up the power generating facilities of this great river to the point where the ever-increasing need for power could be met in this fast-growing industrial section of our country. A report recently released, and known as the Southeastern Power Survey points up conclusively the urgent need for hydroelectric generating facilities of this river. Only yesterday the Alabama Power Co. broke ground for a $12,000,000 steam-generating plant in my home town, Gadsden, Ala., on the banks of the Coosa River. This steam plant is being located at Gadsden because the demand for power is so great in this industrial section of Alabama. We have steel mills, soil-pipe-manufacturing plants, the largest rubber-manufacturing plant in the South, textile mills, paper mills, and many other great industries, which are multiplying over and over again the demand for power in

the section through which flows the Coosa River.

Yes; I know, Mr. Chairman, there are those who maintain that this is no time for the Congress to expand the hydroelectric facilities of this Nation. This position is sought to be maintained under the cry of economy. I submit that the curtailment of funds for much-needed hydroelectric facilities is a short-sighted policy. I will remember, as do the members of this committee, that the same charge of needless appropriations for hydroelectric power was made many times with reference to the great Tennessee Valley Authority. I do not need to recount here for this committee the uncontradicted fact that the TVA hydroelectric facilities were a top-flight factor in our being able to achieve the fabulous quota of 100,000 airplanes a year during the days of the war. I should like to state here, for the benefit of the committee, that my investigation discloses that the TVA's hydroelectric facilities are being stretched to the saturation point. I know that demands for electric energy are being made on TVA by private power companies, which the TVA is not able to meet. We must have new and further development of hydroelectric power facilities, and this very project presents the best potential power pull in America.

I well realize that the President did not include in his budget the appropriation to meet the authorization requested. However, that is not a complete answer, and should not be accepted as such by this committee. The urgent need, the full and complete financial justification, makes it necessary that this work be begun, not 5 years from now, but immediately.

Can it really be said, Mr. Chairman, that the appropriation of funds for the development of a project which has such potentialities for the general good, not only of the people of the section through which the Coosa-Alabama River flows, but for the people of the Nation, should be denied in the name of economy? Is the failure to expend the necessary capital outlay for the development of our long-prized natural resources in this country, economy? I submit, Mr. Chairman, such a course is the practice of hurtful and false economy.

Allow me to express my appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the committee. You have a tremendous job. I sometimes wonder if the people of the Nation know the long hours and diligent endeavor which you, as members of the Appropriations Committee, work, in an effort to solve the problems of the people.

Republican Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 11, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following excerpt from a letter that I recently received:

Let me add one other Republican achievement for the peoples' benefit. This is Memorial Day. My breakfast table this morning provided biscuit, butter, eggs, bacon, jellies, and whatever else I desired could be obtained. Last Memorial Day, 1946, under the Democrats, I recall distinctly that I could not get a loaf of bread, nor could I get a stick of butter, breakfast bacon, nor much of anything, and had to use crackers that day for bread.

Our Soldier-Statesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an address delivered by Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, entitled "Our Soldier-Statesmen."

Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, widely known historical writer and lecturer, delivered on Monday, June 11, 1947, at Shepherd College, Shepherdstown, W. Va., an address of much historic interest. His subject was Our Soldier-Statesmen. Dr. Wilson was introduced by Dr. W. H. S. White, who is retiring as president from Shepherd College, ending a tenure of 27 years. President White has rendered outstanding service as head of Shepherd College and as a citizen of West Virginia. Dr. Wilson spoke, in part, as follows:

Our Nation has always paid high homage to its war heroes. Rightfully or wrongfully, we have favored the sword more often than the pen in choosing our national heroes. Only two of our Presidents had won Nation-wide renown as writers before reaching that high office. Those two were Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, each of whom wrote great books of permanent historical interest. Fourteen of the thirty-two different men who have been President had had some sort of military experience before they became President.

Washington and Monroe were soldiers of the Revolution; William Henry Harrison and Andrew Jackson were soldiers of the War of 1812; Zachary Taylor and Pierce were in the Mexican War; Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Benjamin Harrison, and William McKinley fought in the Civil War. Hayes, Garfield, and Harrison held the rank of brigadier general at the close of that war. McKinley was known always afterward as Major McKinley. Major had been the rank held by Monroe at the close of the Revolution. Theodore Roosevelt became a colonel in the Spanish-American War; and Truman was a captain in World War I. Lincoln had pride in having served for a brief period as a captain in the Indian war known as the Blackhawk War.

Out of the long list of these military men only five of them—Washington, Jackson, William Henry Harrison, Taylor, and Grant—reached the Presidency primarily on account of their fame as soldiers. Suppose we look at the careers of these five great national heroes.

Washington, who was unanimously chosen as our first President, deserved that honor. Without him there would not have been a successful Revolutionary War; without him there would not have been a successful writing and ratification of the Constitution of the United States. He was the most selfless of all our Presidents. He was truly first in war and first in peace, and he will forever be first in the hearts of his countrymen. Like a great mountain peak, towering above its fellows, so will the figure of Washington forever rise in our mountain range of great men.

It is a paradoxical fact that Jackson won the Presidency primarily as the hero of the battle of New Orleans, which was fought after the peace treaty had already been signed in Paris, which treaty had been signed by John Quincy Adams, Jackson's opponent in his second bid for the Presidency. Jackson had lost the Presidency to Adams in the contest decided by Congress in 1825, though Jackson had received more popular and also more electoral votes than Adams. Adams had only carried the States of New England and New York, seven in all, in the campaign of 1824. Jackson, whose fame largely rests on his career as a soldier, was 45 years of age when he began his first military service in the War of 1812. His entire career in the field as a soldier was for a period of less than 3 years. Jackson had gone to Congress from the new State of Tennessee at 29 years of age, and one year later had been promoted to the office of United States Senator from that State. He also served for 6 years on the highest court of Tennessee when only a very young man. Jackson's career as President was a mixture of both success and failure. His administration is known now as an era in history, and it is looked upon as the first great triumph of democracy in American political history. But, his imperial manner and dictatorial rule all but split in twain the political forces of that day. A great depression followed the Jackson administration and his own hand-picked successor, Marin Van Buren could never be reelected after his one term in the White House despite his repeated efforts to gain that high office. All of this made it easy for the Whig Party, made up largely of anti-Jackson forces, in win the Presidency in the campaign of 1840 and again in 1848.

The short-lived Whig Party which existed as a party for only a score of years, won the Presidency both in 1840 and again in 1848 by capitalizing on the personal popularity of two great war heroes, William Henry Harrison and Zachary Taylor. The first of these, Harrison, was 68 years of age and was holding the office of county court clerk at Cincinnati, Ohio, when he was taken up by the Whig Party as its nominee, without any platform of principles, and in a demagogic fashion elevated to the White House. Harrison, as a young man of 26, had represented the great Northwest Territory in Congress and had served for more than a dozen years thereafter as the Governor of the Indiana Territory, composed of the present States of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and part of Minnesota. He had been a chronic seeker after public office and had only won in seven of his nineteen efforts in that direction. In 1836 Harrison ranked next to Van Buren in electoral votes and then 4 years later defeated Van Buren by a still larger vote than that by which he had been defeated in the campaign of 1836. Harrison died 1 month after taking the oath of office as President and was succeeded by Tyler, the first of the seven men who became President on account of the death of a President while they were serving as Vice President.

There is nothing to make the student of history believe that William Henry Harrison would have been a great President had he lived to serve out his term.

Zachary Taylor was the least fitted to serve as President of all the men who have held that high office. He was a professional soldier who had served in the United States Army during the greater portion of his life. He fought with distinction in Florida against the Seminole Indians, who still boast that they have never surrendered, and when the Mexican War came on Taylor led the Army which marched across the Rio Grande in the early days of the Mexican War. Taylor, who had never voted in his life, was taken up by the Whig Party in 1848 while Taylor was living as a cotton planter in Louisiana. He was the last President elected directly from a Southern State to the Presidency, and that was 99 years ago. No one was more surprised than Taylor over his election. He had refused to pay the postage on the letter sent him telling him of his nomination when it first arrived. He was soon lost in the great duties of his high office, and it was fortunate

for his fame that he died before he had been asked to sign the compromise measures of 1850, which he had opposed. As a soldier and as a man, he had won high respect, but he had few, if any, of the qualities of a statesman.

The career of U. S. Grant as a statesman was a tragic one. He had been a practical failure even as a soldier in his early life and had left the Army some years before the Civil War came on. He was not invited back into the Army when the Civil War began, and came back into the service through the State Militia of Illinois, in which State he lived at that time. He was the only President educated at West Point, and his military knowledge was greatly needed in the training of young soldiers at that time. Grant received the highest military distinction, and as a military hero was elevated to the Presidency. There he was surrounded by advisers so vicious and corrupt that his administration is known among historians as the tragic era. He was the only one of the seven Ohio-born Presidents who served 8 years in the White House, and it was well for the country that Grant was denied the return to the White House which he so much desired 4 years after he had left that seat of power. Grant, as an ex-President, was an even greater failure than before his rise as a soldier.

So, in the light of our former experience with military heroes as Presidents, it would be well for the Nation always to solemnly pause before replacing the epaulet of the soldier with the toga of the statesman.

"Dream not that sword and helmet
Are signs of valor true
For peace hath greater victories
Than battle ever knew."

It is of great significance that the only man thus far in our history who has reached the Presidency as a result of fame won in World War I was Herbert Hoover, the Quaker man of peace who won his high distinction, not as the leader of marching men but as the great humanitarian who led our Nation in the feeding and clothing of the distressed people of the world.

In recent months Mr. Hoover has won the increasing affection not only of this Nation but of the entire world by his untiring efforts in aiding in the solving of the great problems which followed in the wake of the recent war.

Mike Mansfield's Statement on the Hungry Horse Dam Before Senate Appropriations Committee, May 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under consent granted me, I am inserting a copy of my remarks before the Senate Finance Committee in behalf of appropriations for the vitally needed Hungry Horse Dam in northwest Montana:

STATEMENT OF HON. MIKE MANSFIELD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA

Senator CORDON. Congressman MANSFIELD is present, and I understand he desires to make a statement in connection with the Hungry Horse Dam appropriation in Montana.

We will be glad to hear from you, Congressman, at this time. You may file your statement with the reporter, and it will be made part of the record in connection with the hearings on that project.

RESTORATION OF FUNDS REQUESTED FOR HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT

Representative MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, sir.

Senator CORDON. Go right ahead, please.

Representative MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is my second appearance before a Senate committee on behalf of the Hungry Horse project in northwest Montana. As you know, the project was authorized on June 5, 1944, and since then, in excess of $3,000,000 has been appropriated for this project.

The need for the Hungry Horse is very apparent when one considers that in 1943 the Army engineers tried to take over the Flathead Lake to use as they saw fit for the purpose of furnishing firm power from downstream dams.

FLATHEAD LAKE AUTHORIZATION

Because of the unanimous protest of the people of the State of Montana, the Army engineers were forced to back down on their demands and to insure that another attempt would not be made to raise Flathead Lake, an authorization bill was passed unanimously by both the House and the Senate and signed by the President on June 5, 1944.

This authorization was intended to give security to the people of western Montana insofar as the raising or the lowering of Flathead Lake was concerned. It was intended also to bring about the economic development of our State and to make use of the forest, minerals, and soil resources which we possess in abundance. It was also going to further add to the power potentialities of Bonneville and Grand Coulee and because of that fact, it was and is the key point in the economic development of the Northwest and as such has been recognized by all the governors of the Northwest States, Republicans and Democrats alike.

I might interpolate here that it is also unanimously backed by the Republicans and Democrats who represent the State of Montana in both Houses, and always has been.

The authorization of the Hungry Horse is the only such measure passed by the Congress since 1939, and I earnestly urge this committee to restore the full amount requested by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Budget so that this project can go ahead and Montana will be given its first opportunity to develop one of its resources for its own benefit.

As you, many of you, gentlemen, know, Montana has been mined and milked of its resources for a number of years. I think it is about time that Montana is developed for the benefit of Montana people and not for outside interests.

OPPOSITION OF POWER COMPANY

I realize that for 3 years now the Montana Power Co., a subsidiary of the Electric Bond & Share, has appeared before this committee in opposition. I cannot understand their position because when we saved Flathead Lake, we saved for this company its dam at Polson. This company has had many years to develop the Kalispell and Whitefish area in which the Hungry Horse is located, but only when the Government goes in do they become interested.

To me, it is another indication of their spite-work tactics which has been amply illustrated in their opposition to the REA program, and I urge this committee to recognize the fact that what the Montana Power Co. is intending to do is in direct contrast to the wishes of the people of the State of Montana. I have no opposition to utilities, like the Montana Power Co., working in their own field, but I do resent their dog-in-the-manger attitude in opposing a project of this kind which they in no way would be able to finance, but which they would stop because it would give the people of my State a chance to participate in the development of the resources which we possess.

POTENTIAL POWER IN MONTANA

I should like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that Montana has approximately one-tenth of the potential hydroelectric power in the United States. That water was put there for a purpose, and that water, so far as we are concerned, is going to waste at the present time.

AMENDMENT REQUESTED

I am not here to advocate a boondoggling project. I am here to ask this committee to raise the amount granted by the House to $4,500,000, so that we can get this project under way; so that cheap power will be given to our farmers; so that cheap power will bring security and comfort in the lives of our people; so that cheap power will bring in industry and help develop our resources; so that flood-control efforts will be strengthened all along the Columbia; and so that the peace and security of the people of the State of Montana will be enhanced as a result. I plead with you for this project, not only from an economic, but also from a humanitarian, point of view.

NATIONAL BENEFITS

We want to borrow sufficient money from the Federal Government to develop a resource which will be to the Nation's benefit as well. We will repay the Federal Government every dime which it invests in this project, and after that payment has been made the revenue accruing from the sale of power will continue to pay to the Federal Government a sizable sum each year. We do not ask for pity or sympathy. We only ask for an opportunity to develop our State for the benefit of our people on fair and equitable terms.

ANSWERS TO STATEMENTS OF POWER COMPANY

Mr. Chairman, I have here an answer to the statements made by the Montana Power Co. in the House, and also an answer to the statements made by the Montana Power representative, Mr. Corette, before this committee last Friday.

I ask consent to insert these with my remarks in the record at this point.

Senator CORDON. Without objection, the data will appear immediately following your remarks.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

"THE TRUE POSITION OF HUNGRY HORSE

"Mr. Corette, of the Montana Power Co., has appeared before the House Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations and made statements to the effect that the Hungry Horse Dam and the Hungry Horse-Kerr Dam transmission line should not be built. I appreciate this opportunity to show that the opposite is true and that these two projects are sound in every respect.

"REGIONAL POWER SUPPLY

"Mr. Corette started out by asserting that there is a surplus of power in Montana and therefore no new facilities are needed. He quotes from a news release of Dr. Raver issued January 17, stating that Montana supplied 72,000 surplus kilowatts to Washington. There is no disagreement that a surplus has existed in eastern Montana; however, this surplus is fixed both as to time and place. Mr. Corette may be willing to repose in the present but I am looking to the future. A year ago there was a surplus at Grand Coulee. Now there is a definite shortage and every generator is being worked to the limit to supply the demand. Three new 108,000 kilowatt units are to be brought into service within the next year and every kilowatt of this electricity has already been spoken for. I am not willing to risk a shortage in Montana because of a surplus in eastern Montana on January 17. Furthermore, the surplus is fixed as to place. There are shortages in

Montana even now. The town of Kalispell has been receiving poor electrical service because of weak transmission lines into the area. It is not enough to have sufficient generation—there must also be a capable transmission system.

"Kerr Dam-Kalispell transmission line

"The power situation at Kalispell can be relieved by the construction of the Kerr Dam-Kalispell line, which is the first step of the Hungry Horse-Kerr Dam line. Contracts have been let for the construction of the project. Initial funds have been already appropriated but $237,000 will be required in 1948 to carry forward the work. Forty-five thousand dollars additional will be needed in 1949 and this will complete the project. The $237,000 item is contained in the 1948 budget now being considered and has been approved by the Appropriations Committee. The power line now connecting Kerr Dam and Kalispell is a 33,000-volt line owned by the Indian Service. All agree that the time has come for this line to be supplemented with additional capacity. This 33,000-volt line traverses the east side of Flathead Lake which during certain seasons of the year creates a freezing, moisture-laden atmosphere. When there is a west wind this moist air sometimes deposits ice on the transmission line to such an extent that the wires break. The ice deposit is so heavy that it is economically infeasible to build the line strong enough to carry the load. When a breakage occurs, power service is interrupted. Such failures are so frequent that relief of some kind is imperative. This is one reason that the Kerr Dam-Kalispell line is being built. In addition to the need for better service to Kalispell, this new line capacity is required for growth in the power load. This latter need is recognized by the Montana Power Co. in the form of its proposal to buy the Indian Service 33,000-volt line and rebuild it at higher voltage and capacity. But it would at the same time stop construction and rescind all appropriations for the Kerr Dam-Kalispell line. Such a proposal does not solve the ice problem, and service would still be interrupted under this scheme. The Kerr Dam-Kalispell line will solve both parts of the problem by providing substantial power capacity and by preventing interruptions to service. This line will follow along the western shore of Flathead Lake and thus will not be affected by the same winds which blow the moist, freezing air to the opposite shore.

"Hungry Horse Dam

"The Montana Power Co. continues to oppose the Hungry Horse Dam, which is looked to as the No. 1 project of Montana by the people. Figures are quoted that power developed at Hungry Horse will cost $340 per killowatt and thus be more expensive than other Columbia River projects. This figure completely ignores the benefits which the storage of water in Hungry Horse Dam will bestow on the power plants lower down the river—Grand Coulee, Bonneville, McNary, Foster Creek. Every acre-foot of water held in Hungry Horse Dam during the wet season and released during the time of greatest power needs will add kilowatts to the prime power outputs of the big downstream dams. The more down river dams there are built, the greater will be the benefits from this Hungry Horse storage. I have obtained a computation of Hungry Horse power costs which shows that the 3,500,000 acre-feet of storage will create 435,000 kilowatts of additional power at Grand Coulee, Foster Creek, McNary, and Bonneville. The over-all cost of power created by Hungry Horse including integrating transmission lines, and incremental costs at downstream power plants will be 1.1 mills per kilowatt-hour at 100 percent load factor. This figure will decrease as more downstream power plants are brought in to benefit from the storage. Lower cost power cannot be found today. Funds for this project have been cut by the Appropriations Committee from $4,500,000 to $1,550,000.

"Reductions in either the dam or the transmission line will only delay the time when power can flow to the homes, businesses, and industries that need it even at this moment. From a purely financial standpoint, it is unwise to delay the projects as the power users of the area will be correspondingly delayed in their ability to return the cost of the projects with interest to the Government. The Appropriation Committee has wisely rejected the request of Montana Power that the appropriation for Hungry Horse-Kerr Dam be rescinded and has instead approved the full budget request for $237,000. I ask that this action of the committee be sustained. I further ask that the cut in the funds for Hungry Horse Dam be restored to the full amount of $4,500,000 as requested in the budget estimate.

"ANSWERS TO STATEMENTS PRESENTED TO SENATE COMMITTEE BY MONTANA POWER CO., IN OPPOSITION TO HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT

"Mr. J. E. Corette, Jr., appeared before the House and Senate committees in his official capacity as vice president of the Montana Power Co. rather than as a representative of the people of Montana. His House statement was not available to me until the House record was printed. In my submission to this committee I have answered all the points raised by Mr. Corette when he appeared before the House committee.

"In a similar manner the copy of his statement before the Senate committee was not available for examination until he completed his presentation. I have gone over his Senate statement and I find that it is more or less repetition of the House statement but in a different form. On page 1 of his Senate committee statement he raised points all of which were previously covered in the House hearings. I have answered the items mentioned on page 1 of his Senate committee presentation by points 1, 7, 10, 11, and 12 in the first part of my statement before this committee. The items covered on page 5 of his Senate committee statement I have answered as point 11 and the items on page 8 have likewise been answered by points 2 and 6. Therefore, in what follows I will only cover such points not previously answered.

"MONTANA POWER CO.'S SENATE COMMITTEE STATEMENT

"There is very little new material included in the Corette Senate committee statement and a great deal that should be covered has been omitted. He failed to cover the real reason for the Hungry Horse project; namely, the protection of the natural advantages of Flathead Lake. He failed also to cover the earlier efforts of his company to manipulate the lake levels and similarly the efforts of the Federal Government to do likewise during the late war. The Hungry Horse project was initiated as a means of regulating the river flow without using Flathead Lake for a regulating reservoir in order that Montana as well as the downstream States could secure the material benefits which would accrue from regulated river flows. The water in the Flathead, Clarks Fork, and the Columbia belong to all the people of the Basin States. In order to make an equitable distribution of these benefits between the several States the regulation of this major stream should be kept in the hands of the duly elected representatives of the people. The control should never be allowed to go into private hands. This can be accomplished without disturbing in any way the vested rights of any enterprise and without the use of any investment-destroying devices by any side. Unless there is an equitable distribution of the benefits accruing from the regulated flow the region will encounter conflicts between States, which the founding fathers and all Congresses to date have sought to avoid. Therefore, the early constitutional provision covering control of interstate waters is one of the wisest concepts of man. The experience for the last 150 years has verified this wisdom.

"A new thesis in Mr. Corette's Senate committee presentation is that the benefits all accrue to the States of Oregon and Washington. He built his case on this point.

"On page 6 of the Corette brief filed with the Senate committee, Mr. Corette presented a table which he captioned 'No justification for Hungry Horse.'

"This table totally ignores the State of Montana and it will be noted that no capacity is allocated to Montana in his justification. All the plants which he cites will serve the purpose of meeting conditions in the States of Oregon and Washington. The reason for this is obvious. His company and the Washington Water Power Co. are building a high-powered transmission line from Kerr Dam to Spokane. The Montana Power Co. will use this line to their advantage by circulating power flow with the Washington Water Power Co. Such use of the projected transmission line will give the Montana Power Co. full use of Columbia power without being in a required position to pass benefits along to the people of Montana. The intent of the table on page 6 of the Corette statement is very obvious when Montana capacity is purposely omitted.

"This is factually incorrect. The principal benefits of Hungry Horse, and that is the reason I have initiated the Hungry Horse legislation, accrue locally to Montana. This is possible without in any way disturbing the benefits which accrue downstream because the same regulated water can be used over and over again for all downstream uses. Mr. Corette's presentation totally ignores the economic position of the people of Montana and fails to point out what the State needs in order to be transferred from a colonial status.

"About one-quarter of Mr. Corette's presentation covers advertisements for the Montana Power Co. The people of Montana know the good points of the power company without further repetition. The people of Montana also look upon Mr. Corette as one of its outstanding citizens and without surrendering one iota of this respect they can honestly and sincerely differ with him on points involving the economic destiny of the State.

"The Montana Power Co. is strictly a hydro generating organization. It has 13 hydro plants in the Columbia and Missouri watersheds. Within the last several days I have had an opportunity to look into the statistics covering the Montana Power Co. which are made a matter of official record under the Water Power Act by the Federal Power Commission. The 13 hydro plants of the power company have a total installed capacity of about 314,000 kilowatts capable of generating in an average year in excess of 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Approximately 9 percent of this capacity was installed prior to December 31, 1909; 50 percent of that total capacity was installed between 1910 and 1919, nearly 10 percent between 1920 and 1929, and 32 percent was installed after 1930. This is exclusive of the new 56,000 unit now going in to the Kerr Dam plant at the foot of Flathead Lake.

"These statistics show that over two-thirds of the hydro capacity of this company was installed in the period before the extensive use of hydro power for electrochemical and electrometallurgical processes became standard. Consequently, the larger part of their installation was made to fit load conditions existing a decade or so ago. These conditions are quite different from load conditions which would result from modern metal processing. As a result, the Montana Power Co. is long on short-peaking capacity but short on energy which is the principal re-

quirement of electro processing. Hungry Horse will remedy this situation without causing any hardship to the Montana Power Co. The modernization of Montana's resource base will accrue to the benefit of the Montana Power Co. as well as all the people of the State of Montana.

"The real reason for Mr. Corette's objection to the Hungry Horse project is cited for the first time on page 2 of his Senate committee presentation wherein he outlines his opposition to the Bonneville agency. This is not a present issue before this committee as a close examination of the Bonneville submissions do not show any request for funds to tie the existing Oregon-Washington grid into Hungry Horse. Naturally this matter cannot become an issue until Hungry Horse approaches the stage of actual completion. It would be decidedly unwise to ask for any money for the interconnection transmission lines at this time for the reason that such expenditures would remain a dead investment until long hour-use power capacity at Hungry Horse becomes surplus to the State of Montana. This is a long way in the future. The Federal Government by no stretch of the imagination can be conceived of going into competition with the Montana Power Co., which is largely a retailing agency. There is no authority in law for any Federal agency to encroach upon State jurisdiction, which is the implication of Mr. Corette's statement.

"On several previous occasions I have fully covered the Army engineers' report which appeared as House Document No. 643. Also, on numerous occasions I have pointed out that this report was only authorized for local flood protection, and omitted any appraisal of storage or power benefits. It is distinctly beside the point to use the Army engineers' report as Mr. Corette has done. I need not repeat at this time the facts on this report which I have fully covered in official presentations and remarks during the past 2 years. The same situation applies to the reclamation component of the Hungry Horse multipurpose project mentioned by Mr. Corette.

"On page 5 of Mr. Corette's Senate presentation he incorrectly used the data accompanying the Federal Power Commission's document No. IT 5955 applying to Bonneville costs. In using this data he included the Bonneville transmission system which is not properly included in the term 'Bonneville project' as defined on page 3 of the Chief Engineer report to the Federal Power Commission.

"In this Federal Power Commission document the Bonneville project is defined as the dam, locks, power plant, and appurtenant works in accordance with the provisions of the Bonneville Act. In the Federal Power Commission's communication, the transmission system is defined as a separate activity. The correct figures for the Bonneville project can be found on page 3 of the cited Federal Power Commission report and these show $58,000,000 as the total amount allotted to power at the Bonneville project out of a total project investment of $84,000,000 in round numbers.

"The statement given on page 7 of Mr. Corette's presentation is factually incorrect, as Hungry Horse by law and by practice has never been conceived as a project 'to supply anticipated power shortage in Oregon and Washington.' The legislation covering Hungry Horse was drafted and passed long before the present load condition in Oregon and Washington was known. The reason for the Hungry Horse legislation was amply set out during the hearings before the House and Senate reclamation committees and during the debates attending the passage of the act.

"The conclusions cited by Mr. Corette on page 8 of this skillful presentation are based entirely on the Montana Power Co.'s viewpoint. They totally ignore the interest of the people of the State of Montana and if accepted would result in a great State being retained in the colonial status. I have fully answered all the points raised to date by Mr. Corette and in so doing I have attempted to show all the respect that his position merits.

"The value of reclamation projects is not generally recognized throughout the United States. These projects are no longer an experiment—they are a proven success and a good Government investment.

"Although Montana was a source of raw materials during the war, it did not have any war projects because of the lack of cheap power. This lack of development within the State has created a serious problem in the aflux of the youth and business interests to other areas. Since the beginning of this project, many thousands of people have returned to Montana and many more thousands will return if the project is completed.

"I have put in much time on this particular project and I am more than willing to put in a lot more. Especially when the future and livelihood of so many people is in doubt. The fear of raising Flathead Lake has kept the people in that area in a state of confusion and uncertainty."

Representative MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if I may say a few more words:

LOCAL BENEFITS TO MONTANA

Montana is one of the few States in the Union which, in the last two decades has lost much in the way of population. It is not because we lack resources, because I believe, taken on a comparative basis with any other State, we have as much as most, and more than many.

My State has been held back because of the fact that it has been controlled by corporations, who have their chief interest outside the State, as a whole. I have mentioned that we have been mined and milked for a good many years. This project, the Hungry Horse project, is the first project which will be of benefit to the people of Montana directly.

Of course, many of you may think of the Fort Peck Dam and the $180,000,000 spent by the Government there. As a matter of fact, at the present time it does not mean a thing to the State of Montana. It is a project primarily for the down-river States in the Missouri Basin. This is a project which will be a benefit to the State of Montana and the fact is that because of it many individuals are coming into our State, hoping to establish businesses there.

We want them to come in. We want to give our children opportunity. We want to give our people security.

And I have been pleading for this particular project because I believe in it with my whole heart and soul, and I know that outside of the Montana Power Co. I speak for all of the people of Montana, Democrats and Republicans alike.

Senator CORDON. Thank you very much, sir.

Representative MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The "Soak-the-Poor" Tax Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] recently stated that the Democratic Party had in the Seventy-ninth Congress passed an income-tax law which reduced corporate tax liability by $6,000,000,000, and pointed out that President Truman had signed that bill into law.

While the gentleman made a factual statement, he was endeavoring to give the Democratic Party undeserved credit for an enactment forced through the Congress and upon the President by a coalition, led by Republicans but unfortunately participated in by some Democrats which crossed party lines.

The credit or shame for prematurely eliminating the excess-profits tax belongs to the Republican Party and its present numerical majority in Congress.

The gentleman also is in error when he assumes that the so-called carry-back provision or the privilege of utilizing previously unused credits from losses applies only to corporations. The same privilege applies to individuals making the individual income tax return. Of course, individuals did not have to pay an excess-profits tax and, therefore, the elimination of those taxes do not accrue to the direct benefit of individual taxpayers. Nevertheless, to the extent that corporations were relieved of tax liability up to as much as 90 percent and the tax saving went immediately into distributed profits, the individual was the beneficiary of this unfair special-privilege law.

Naturally, I do not boast of the part which some members of the Democratic Party took in handing back that $6,000,000,000 gift to big business, but it had, at least, the justification of repealing a specific and special wartime tax.

But now the Republican Party, through its congressional majority and still with the support of a small segment of the Democratic Party which has no responsibility to the people, has made another huge gift of about $4,000,000,000—billions, not millions—to the wealthy. It is another example of the Republican policy of "soaking the poor and coddling the rich."

I am giving here a table which shows how little the present income tax law helps the man with a small income and how much it helps the bloated plutocrat of wealth and unending avarice. You will notice that a married man with two dependents does not save one cent under this bill until you reach the income category of more than $2,000 a year.

A worker getting that munificent salary and trying to support a wife and two children would receive the vast benefits of 56 cents a week in tax saving or $29 a year. That would not pay the milk bill for the two children.

But a millionaire receiving an income of $1,000,000 would save $1,897.59 a week or a total of $98,675 in a year. If his income was $5,000,000 a year he would save almost one-half million dollars a year under this law.

In other words, we add $29 to the spendable income of the little fellow barely able to scrape by on $2,000 a year, but we add $450,000 a year to the spendable income of the man who could live in luxury merely on the interest of his annual income. We give the millionaire back more than four times as much in one week as the little fellow earns in a whole year.

I have tried to reduce this table to a point where even Republican Members of Congress can get the full impact at a glance.

Help-the-rich tax reduction in terms of take-home pay—married person, 2 dependents

Net income before personal exemptions	Take-home pay after Federal income tax—present rate	Increase in take-home pay	
		Yearly	Weekly
$2,000	0	0	0
$2,500	$2,405	$29	$0.56
$3,000	2,810	57	1.09
$4,000	3,620	76	1.46
$5,000	4,411	118	2.27
$6,000	5,202	160	3.07
$7,000	5,955	209	4.02
$8,000	6,708	259	4.97
$9,000	7,423	316	6.07
$10,000	8,138	373	7.13
$15,000	11,362	728	14.00
$20,000	14,110	1,178	22.65
$25,000	16,479	1,704	32.75
$30,000	18,619	2,277	43.78
$40,000	22,558	3,489	67.09
$50,000	25,889	4,823	92.75
$100,000	36,699	13,461	258.86
$250,000	59,525	28,688	570.76
$500,000	93,400	58,175	1,118.76
$1,000,000	166,150	98,675	1,897.59
$2,000,000	296,650	194,675	3,747.59
$5,000,000	725,000	450,000	8,646.15

The lowest tax bracket in the "married, two dependents" group is $2,500.

In the "single person, no dependents" group the lowest bracket is $600 and the take-home increase figures $6 a year, 11½ cents a week, 1 percent.

In the "married, no dependents" group, the lowest bracket is $1,200, the take-home increase $12 a year, 23 cents a week, 1 percent.

Thirty million dollars was slashed by Congress from the school-lunch program, which previously benefited 7,000,000 children.

Thirty million dollars in tax relief was allotted to 577 taxpayers in the $300,000-up brackets.

Keep Exchange of Students in Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that I arranged to be in California on an official trip to participate in an air-power conference and also primarily because a telegram today disclosed the serious and critical illness of my mother, I may not be on hand for a vote on the Mundt bill providing generally for the building up of good will for the United States in foreign countries.

I am heartily in favor of the general purpose and principles of the Mundt bill. While there may be some minor amendments that would make the bill better than it is, irrespective of whether these amendments are passed or not, I intend to vote for the bill.

I approach the matter in the following manner: During the war we were absolutely united in the prosecution of the war. By that unity we won the great victory and brought about a cessation of hostilities. However, the real objective of our effort was not the bare winning of the war, but it was really the winning of the peace which was to follow the war. I have never met a person but what they hoped and many of them expected that with the winning of the war the Allied Nations would forge a peace which would be permanent. We must realize that America came out of the war as a leader of the world and particularly it was the special leader of those who looked forward to and hoped and prayed for a world of peace. Therefore, to me the great mission of the United States of America today and of the Congress should be to lead the way and forge the necessary instruments that will assure the world a lasting peace. We realize that we are having tremendous difficulties. Some of our allies are not cooperating. Some of our allies are, in fact, stirring up misunderstanding by telling untruths or only half-truths about America. They are charging us with imperialism when in fact we turned loose the Philippine Islands after having held them for 46 years. We not only gave them their freedom but we entered into agreements to help them for a prolonged period in order that they might develop into a strong, sturdy, self-reliant, independent nation. We have given untold sums of money, supplies of all kinds, and various other types of help to the unfortunate persons of Europe and Asia.

We must, and it seems everyone should, understand that a misunderstood America is one that cannot be the real leader that we should be. Much as I dislike propaganda, I think we should use that vehicle to develop good will for America. By the radio and other means we should let the world know what America really is, namely, "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

These matters have been brought before the Congress by Members of the committee who have studied and written this bill. I have the utmost confidence in them and am willing to accept their judgment as to what we should do and how we should do it.

There seems to be some objection to the provision providing for the interchange of students. To me this is a highly important provision of the bill. It has been my pleasure to have traveled in many parts of the world on official missions for the Military Affairs Committee of the House. I have met students who were trained in America in France, in Belgium, in England, in Greece, in Egypt, in Palestine, in Japan, in Korea, in China, in the Philippines and in Siam. Every one of these persons was really an American ambassador of good will. In their student days in America they learned to understand something of the spirit of America. They learned to understand how America extols the individual and how it gives him the utmost personal freedom and opportunity. In Japan our committee had a meeting with about thirty members of the Diet, who had been trained in America. This is a small group in a large nation, but they might be the very nuclei that will result in the development of self-government in Japan. These people have seen how it works. They know what obstacles lie in the way of its development and it may be that they can finally help bring their Japanese comrades to the point where they too can successfully have a self-governing system. I have been a firm believer in the interchange of students by knowing something first-hand about the International Club organized at the University of Wisconsin many years ago by the noted Associated Press correspondent, Louis P. Lochner. I, also, came to know about the benefits of having foreign students study in America, through the International House at the University of California, where hundreds and hundreds of students have lived in the atmosphere of that great university and come to really understand America and its institutions and customs. My judgment on this matter is confirmed by President Robert G. Sproul, of the University of California. He wired me that he is most heartily in favor of section 201 of the Mundt bill as it is now written. Testimony from such an individual as President Sproul is highly important. He is the president of the largest university in America. He is noted as a great educator and a marvelous administrator. Spread over seven campuses are over 30,000 students under his jurisdiction. He has been familiar with the results of foreign students living in the International House and taking courses at the University of California. He is recognized as one of America's great educators and besides that is a very public-spirited man. I do certainly hope that the House will not amend or change the provisions of section 201 of the Mundt bill. As I said before, our most pressing and challenging mission for the United States today is to find a way to permanent peace. This bill and the particular section to which I refer is a step in that direction. We cannot turn down our millions of servicemen and the other millions who supported them and who expect Congress to prepare the road which will lead to lasting peace. The Mundt bill is a segment, and a very important one, of that highway. I do wish I could be here to vote for the bill and hope it will pass by an overwhelming majority so that America's leadership for world peace will be strengthened thereby.

Address by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, Record of Vice Adm. C. H. McMorris, and List of Naval Vessels Named for Alabamians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, April 21), 1947

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Monday, Representative PETE JARMAN, Vice Adm. Charles H. McMorris, of the United States Navy, a distinguished Alabamian, and I accompanied Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, Chief of Naval Operations, to Tuscaloosa, Ala., where Admiral Nimitz delivered an address at the graduation exercises of the University of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the

address delivered by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, on that occasion; a brief summary of the naval record of Vice Adm. Charles H. McMorris; and a brief list of the ships in the Navy, named for Alabamians.

There being no objection, the address by Admiral Nimitz, the summary of the naval record of Vice Adm. McMorris, and the list of ships named for Alabamians, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY FLEET ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ, UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, AT UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, TUSCALOOSA, ALA., JUNE 9, 1947

It is gratifying to know that people like yourselves, who live at some distance from our seacoasts, are always ready to extend a cordial welcome to the Navy. I hope this will always be so, for although our ships and planes and submarines are most often seen by the people of our coastal cities, the Navy owes its existence and its strength to all Americans, regardless of where they may live.

Though Alabama has only a small window on the sea, its citizens have maintained strong interest and ties with the Navy. No less than 52 ships have names derived from your State, counties, cities, rivers, and citizens. A battleship, *Alabama*, third of that name; a heavy cruiser, *Tuscaloosa*, named after your fair city; two light cruisers, *Birmingham* and *Mobile*—these ships all have marvelous war records in World War II. Two other ships, the U. S. S. *Howard W. Gilmore*, submarine tender, and U. S. S. *New*, destroyer, were named after Alabama heroes who won Congressional Medals of Honor. I do not believe any other State, not even my native Texas, can boast of such a record.

I welcome this opportunity to express the Navy's appreciation for the very substantial contributions to the war effort of this great State of Alabama. You have given us some of our most capable and distinguished naval officers, and we are counting on you to supply us with more in the future. Men like Raphael Semmes, who first distinguished himself in the Mexican War and then in the War Between the States, don't come along very often. It was Semmes who commanded the famous commerce raider *Alabama*, which paralyzed Union commerce for 2 years. And then there is Rear Adm. Richmond Pierson Hobson, Congressional Medal of Honor winner, who sank his ship, the *Merrimac*, off the entrance to Santiago Bay in order to bottle up the Spanish Fleet. That exploit is an inspiration to all of us and it will live forever in American naval history. That wasn't the least of Admiral Hobson's accomplishments, for as the Representative in Congress of the Sixth District of Alabama he was the most helpful in establishing the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, the position I now hold. So you see, I owe a very personal debt to Admiral Hobson. I don't have to tell you much about one of our most famous marine officers, Gen. Holland M. Smith, who also hails from Alabama. In fact, he received a degree from this very university. You've all read in the newspapers about his exploits in the Pacific during the past war. He commanded the Fifth Amphibious Corps in the Gilbert and Marshall campaigns and also in the seizure of Saipan. Later he became commanding general of the Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, and served as commander of expeditionary force troops at Iwo Jima.

There is another naval officer from Alabama who established a brilliant record in World War II, but I have purposely refrained from mentioning him until this moment because he is here tonight and I want to be sure he receives the full recognition he deserves. I refer to Vice Adm. Charles H. McMorris, of Wetumpka, who, first as my war plans officer, and then my chief of staff, must receive much of the credit for the success of our operations against the enemy in the Pacific. The importance and value of his services in these positions is matched only by his outstanding achievements as commanding officer of the cruiser *San Francisco* during the Battle of Cape Esperance off Guadalcanal, and as commander of a cruiser task force in the Battle of the Komandorski Islands.

Alabama's over-all contribution to the winning of World War II can never be fully assessed, but I do know that the men you sent overseas, and the long hours you labored on the home front to produce all the things they and their comrades required, were instrumental in achieving final victory. In particular, I thank the University of Alabama for participating in the V–12 program, and furnishing the Navy with vitally needed medical officers. Many others who served in the armed forces received their education here at this university, and the splendid performance of duty of those who served in the Navy reflects great credit upon their earlier training. Among those who did not come back are 355 graduates of this university.

Although the shooting war has now been over for nearly 2 years, I find no evidence that the university's contribution to the country's welfare has slackened in any degree. On the contrary, it is currently participating in the naval aviation college program, and has opened its doors to a great many veterans who would otherwise be denied the chance to obtain a higher education. I don't believe further proof is needed of the splendid manner in which this institution is fulfilling its obligations to the Nation.

I have had many opportunities since the end of the war to visit colleges and universities throughout the country. At each of these I have been deeply impressed by the work being done by students who are also veterans. I do not believe the American campus has been subject to such a beneficial influence since the birth of our country. These GI students are bringing to the classroom an awareness of individual responsibility which is also a challenge to our educators. I am sure that faculty members will agree with me when I say that the young veterans are displaying the same qualities of devotion to duty, determination, and willingness to learn that they did in the armed forces. And I predict they will leave their mark upon the campus, in the form of higher standards of study and conduct, for years to come. I am informed that of the approximately 8,000 students on this campus, over half are veterans and that these veterans are upholding the generally fine scholastic records of all GI students.

I pay special tribute also to our educators who are working long hours to accommodate the unprecedented numbers of those desiring a higher education. They are helping to reduce our wartime educational deficit, and this is something of the greatest value to the future of the Nation.

Now, as never before, knowledge is power—power to establish a real and lasting peace, or power to create weapons which can bring about the destruction of a greater part of civilization. We must continually strive for greater educational opportunities for everyone, for the responsibilities we bear in the world today call for the fullest understanding of the forces which make for peace or war. Upon our success or failure rests the hopes of all peace-loving nations. We must not fail our trust.

We hopefully await the conclusion of satisfactory peace treaties, and although progress has been discouragingly slow, there is no reason to believe that satisfactory agreements cannot be reached. If we have the courage and patience to hold onto our ideas strongly enough, eventually right will prevail. Writing treaties is one thing, but writing them with good will is another, and without good will there can be no real peace. I am hopeful that there are enough intelligent men of good will in the world to make a real peace possible.

We are united in the desire to abolish war for all time. Those of us who have seen first hand the death and destruction of modern warfare, and who can visualize the consequences of another war, are the strongest advocates of peace. While the United Nations has not yet accomplished much, it is still our best hope for lasting peace. Here again, we must have patience, for if this international peace agency eventually proves successful, it will reward all our efforts. We should not find it so difficult to be patient, for here in the United States we went through a very similar experience when we first obtained our independence and were struggling to establish a form of government satisfactory to all. It took the Thirteen Original Colonies over a decade to agree to our present Constitution and yet they had the tremendous advantages of common speech, purpose, and effort, and had just concluded a successful war against a common enemy. How much more difficult is the task of the United Nations, as it struggles to achieve its goal in spite of the difficulties caused by language barriers, varying aspirations, and conflicting interests? In the light of our own example, we can hardly expect quick and easy results from the United Nations.

Just as it is important to maintain our faith in the ultimate success of the international peace organization, so is it important that we erect our own safeguards against aggression in the meantime. Before we can safely disarm we must make sure that three prerequisites have been met. First, it is vital that sound and equitable peace treaties be written, in order to eliminate at the beginning much of the cause for a future war. Second, we must have reliable safeguards against the possibility of a would-be aggressor arming for world conquest. These safeguards must include inspection if they are to be effective. And finally, there must be reasonable assurance that the United Nations is a going, workable organization. No nation with a genuine desire for peace can find fault with such a program.

Just as education can do much to banish the misunderstanding and suspicion that leads to war, so can it give us the weapons to prevent war if international controls fail. History has proven too often, and too recently, that it is the weak, and not the strong nation, which invites attack. We must make sure that the means for waging successful war are in the hands of those who hate war. The inventive genius which gave the United States the most effective weapons of World War II must always be capable of giving us more effective weapons than those of possible aggressors. This becomes the responsibility of our educational institutions, and laboratories, for it is there that the technical skills and knowledge so essential to the waging of modern warfare are acquired.

Think of the unlimited possibilities that years of peace can bring us and remember that it is largely within our power to insure the peace. Many war-devastated nations look to us to fulfill our responsibility as a moral leader of the world. No nation has ever had a greater obligation to civilization. Now, more than ever, there is need for courage, foresight, and wisdom. But if we are willing—each of us—to forget personal desire and work to the limit of our ability for the common good, I am confident that we shall emerge a happier, more prosperous, Nation and world.

To those of you who have just completed your educational work at this university, and who are about to start your life's work—congratulations, good luck, and Godspeed.

VICE ADM. CHARLES HORATIO M'MORRIS, UNITED STATES NAVY

Vice Admiral McMorris was born in Wetumpka, Ala., on August 31, 1890. He attended public schools in Wetumpka before entering the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., on June 26, 1908, from the State of Alabama. Graduated and commissioned ensign in June 1912, he was promoted to lieutenant (junior grade) on June 8, 1915; received temporary promotions to lieutenant and lieutenant commander during World War I, and was commissioned in those ranks on June 8, 1918, and June 3, 1922, respectively; and subsequently received promotions as follows: Commander, October 1, 1931; captain, July 1, 1939; rear admiral, November 14, 1942; and vice admiral, September 23, 1944.

Following graduation in 1912, Vice Admiral McMorris had consecutive service aboard the battleships *Delaware, Montana,* and *New Hampshire,* participating in the occupation of Veracruz in the Mexiçan campaign in 1914. In August of that year he returned to the U. S. S. *Montana* for torpedo instruction, after which he joined the U. S. S. *Maryland* on November 18, 1914. While serving in the *Maryland* he assisted in salvaging the U. S. S. *F–4,* which sank off Honolulu in 1915. He received a letter of commendation for assistance in rescuing passengers from a vessel grounded in the Gulf of Lower California during a storm that year.

Assisting to fit out the U. S. S. *Shaw* at the navy yard, Mare Island, Calif., he served in that destroyer from her commissioning, April 9, 1917, when she proceeded to Queenstown, Ireland, to join the destroyer force on June 17, early in World War I. Detached from the *Shaw* on July 30, 1918, he returned to the United States to duty in connection with fitting out the U. S. S. *Meredith* at the Fore River Shipbuilding Corp., Quincy, Mass., and served as her executive officer from her commissioning, January 29, 1919, until June of that year.

Vice Admiral McMorris assumed command of the U. S. S. *Walke* on June 13, 1919, and, detached a month later, reported for 3 months' duty at the Navy recruiting station, Pittsburgh, Pa. During the next 2½ years, he served in the Detail Section, Officer Personnel Division, Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, Washington, D. C. He next became navigator of the U. S. S. *Baltimore* in March 1922, transferring in September of the same year to the U. S. S. *Burns* and serving as her executive officer until detached on December 5, 1924, to report for duty with Mine Squadron Two, Fleet Base Force.

From September 1925 until May 1927 Vice Admiral McMorris had duty in the Department of Seamanship and Flight Tactics at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., where he was also assistant editor of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings. In May 1927 he assumed command of the destroyer *Shirk,* operating off the coast of Nicaragua during the second Nicaraguan campaign, with destroyer squadrons, battle fleet. In February 1930 he was transferred to command the U. S. S. *Elliott.*

Returning to the Naval Academy in July 1930 Vice Admiral McMorris served for 3 years as instructor in the Department of English and History, and for 2 years during that period was editor of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings. After duty from June 1933 until June 1935 as navigator of the U. S. S. *California,* he served the two succeeding years in the Detail Section, Officer Personnel Division, Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department.

In July 1937 Vice Admiral McMorris reported for instruction at the Naval War College, Newport, R. I., and completing the senior course there, he reported as operations officer on the staff of Vice Admiral Adolphus Andrews, United States Navy, now retired, commander, scouting force, United States Fleet. He served in that assignment, which also included duty from October 1939 to January 1941 as operations officer of the Hawaiian detachment, until February 1, 1941, when he became war plans officer on the staff of the commander in chief, Pacific Fleet. For services in this capacity from December 7, 1941, until April 15, 1942, he was awarded the Legion of Merit with the following citation:

"Legion of Merit: For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the Government of the United States as war plans officer on the staff of the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, from December 7, 1941, to April 15, 1942. Serving with distinction in an assignment of vital importance during the early critical days of the Pacific war, Vice Admiral McMorris rendered invaluable service to his command and, by his initiative and judgment, contributed materially to the conduct of our operations against the Japanese Empire. His professional skill and devotion to duty reflect the highest credit upon Vice Admiral McMorris and the United States naval service."

Vice Admiral McMorris commanded the U. S. S. *San Francisco* from May 14 until November 9, 1942. For heroism as commanding officer of the *San Francisco* during the action on October 11–12, 1942, he was awarded the Navy Cross, and is entitled to the ribbon for, and a facsimile of, the Presidential Unit Citation awarded the *San Francisco,* with the following citations:

Navy Cross: "For extraordinary heroism as commanding officer of the U. S. S. *San Francisco* during the night action against an enemy Japanese force of cruisers and destroyers, October 11–12, 1942. In the van of battle during the entire action, Vice Admiral McMorris fought his ship valiantly, maneuvering with the expertness of an able seaman and striking at the enemy with determined and effective gunfire despite the difficulties of night combat. As captain of the flagship, he rendered valuable service to the task force commander and contributed materially to the success of our forces."

Presidential Unit Citation, U. S. S. *San Francisco:* "For outstanding performance in action against enemy Japanese forces off Savo Island, in the Solomon Islands on the night of October 11–12, and again in the early morning of November 13, 1942. In the latter engagement, the *San Francisco* silenced and disabled an enemy battleship at a range of 3,000 yards, sank one enemy destroyer, and damaged two other enemy vessels. Although heavily damaged by 15 major caliber hits, she lived to fight again, her survival a distinctive tribute to the valorous spirit of her officers and men."

In December 1942, Vice Admiral McMorris assumed command of Cruiser Task Force 8, operating in the North Pacific. Referring to the Battle of the Komandorski Islands, Admiral King's first report on the United States Navy at War states: "* * * the enemy, late in March 1943, undertook to support the two garrisons by sending through a small but heavily protected convoy. Early on the morning of March 26, a unit of our North Pacific Force, commanded by Vice Adm. C. H. McMorris, encountered the advancing enemy force, which included heavy and light cruisers, some destroyers and cargo ships, about 65 miles south of the Komandorski Peninsula. Our force, although outnumbered, closed for attack.

"The engagement which followed developed into a running gunfire duel between our cruisers *Salt Lake City* and *Richmond* and enemy cruisers. This was followed by a torpedo attack delivered by our destroyers, upon completion of which the enemy retired in the direction of Paramushiru, 500 miles to the westward. Our damage was small and our casualties were light. While the damage inflicted on the enemy is not definitely known, a superior enemy force, after being engaged for 3½ hours, had been prevented from supporting Japanese garrisons at Kiska and Attu."

For his services during this action, Vice Admiral McMorris was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with the following citation:

Distinguished Service Medal: "For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as commander of a cruiser task group in action against enemy Japanese surface forces in the Aleutian area, March 26, 1943. Daringly intercepting an enemy cruiser and destroyer force, escorting a convoy of two train vessels, Rear Admiral McMorris outmaneuvered the enemy and launched a brilliant attack. Tactically disposing his greatly outnumbered force for maximum striking power, he achieved a complete rout of the enemy, compelling the Japanese to withdraw toward the Kuriles with three badly damaged cruisers while impairment to our forces was comparatively light. By his distinctive ability as a leader and fighter, Rear Admiral McMorris disrupted a vital enemy mission and prevented sorely needed supplies from reaching Japanese-held bases in the Aleutian area."

In June 1943 Vice Admiral McMorris assumed duty as Chief of Staff and Aide to Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas. For his services in this capacity during the final phases of the hostilities of World War II, he was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of a second Distinguished Service Medal, with the following citation:

Gold Star in lieu of second Distinguished Service Medal: "For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as Chief of the Joint Staff and aide to the Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, from July 1943 to September 1945. Charged with the coordination of work by staff members, Vice Admiral McMorris supervised the preparation and execution of strategic and tactical plans for naval operations against the enemy Japanese forces in the Gilberts, Marshalls, Marianas, Western Caroline Islands, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa and, in addition, rendered invaluable assistance in the capture of Hollandia and Morotai, in the support of the Philippines Campaign, in attacks on the home islands of the Japanese Empire and in carrying out the naval phase of the occupation after the enemy's defeat. Throughout the steady advance of our forces in the Pacific area, Vice Admiral McMorris, by his knowledge, judgment, and efforts, contributed materially to the success of our operations against the enemy. His professional ability and devotion to the fulfillment of an important task reflect great credit upon himself and upheld the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

On February 8, 1946, Vice Admiral McMorris was ordered to duty as commander, Fourth Fleet. He was relieved of this command on September 20, 1946, and ordered to duty with the General Board, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

In addition to the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, and the Presidential Unit Citation to the U. S. S. *San Francisco,* Vice Admiral McMorris has the Mexican Service Medal; Victory Medal, Destroyer Clasp; Second Nicaraguan Campaign Medal; and is entitled to the American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp; the Asiatic-Pacific Area Campaign Medal; the Philippine Liberation Medal; and the World War II Victory Medal.

Vice Admiral McMorris' wife, Mrs. Elizabeth M. McMorris, daughter of Colonel David Brainard Case, U. S. A., resides at Marietta, Pa. His son, David Spencer McMorris, Princeton, 1940, was a lieutenant in the Naval Reserve during the war and serving on the U. S. S. *South Dakota* when the surrender ceremonies took place in Tokyo Bay.

Vice Admiral McMorris' official address is Wetumpka, Ala.

No less than 52 ships have names derived from Alabama counties, cities, rivers, and citizens. Battleship *Alabama*, third of that name; a heavy cruiser, *Tuscaloosa*, named after that fair city; two light cruisers, *Birmingham* and *Mobile*.

Among ships named for persons from Alabama are two named for Medal of Honor winners, both deceased. They are: U. S. S. *Howard W. Gilmore* (AS–16), named for Commander Howard W. Gilmore, USN, born in Selma, Ala.; and U. S. S. *New* (DD–818), named for John D. New, Pfc, USMC, born in Mobile, Ala.

Other ships named for Alabama persons are:

U. S. S. *Austin* (DE–15), for John A. Austin, ChCarpenter, Warrior, Ala.

U. S. S. *Charles E. Brannon* (DE–446), for Ensign Charles E. Brannon, Montgomery, Ala.

U. S. S. *Brock* (APD–93), for Ensign John W. Brock, New Brockton, Ala.

U. S. S. *Dortch* (DD–670), for Capt. Isaac F. Dortch, Gadsden, Ala.

U. S. S. *George F. Elliott* (AP–105), for Maj. Gen. George F. Elliott, USMC.

U. S. S. *Henry A. Wiley* (DM–29), for Admiral Henry A. Wiley, Troy, Ala.

U. S. S. *Kalk* (DD–611), for Lt. Stanton F. Kalk.

U. S. S. *King*, for Commander Frank R. King, Albany, Ala.

U. S. S. *Melvin* (DD–680), for Lt. (jg) John T. Melvin, Selma, Ala.

U. S. S. *Neal A. Scott* (DE–769), for Ensign Neal A. Scott, Montgomery, Ala.

U. S. S. *Newell* (DE–322), for Lt. Comdr. Byron B. Newell, Camp Hill, Ala.

U. S. S. *Henry W. Tucker* (DD–875), for Henry W. Tucker, pharmacist mate third class, Birmingham, Ala.

U. S. S. *Hobson* (DMS–26), for Rear Adm. Richmond P. Hobson, Greensboro, Ala.

U. S. S. *John Hood* (DD–655), for Rear Adm. John Hood, Florence, Ala.

U. S. S. *John Q. Roberts* (APD–94), for Ensign John Q. Roberts, Boaz, Ala.

U. S. S. *Osmond Ingram* (APD–35), for Osmond Ingram, gunner's mate, Birmingham, Ala.

U. S. S. *Porterfield* (DD–682), for Rear Adm. Lewis B. Porterfield, Greenville, Ala.

U. S. S. *Rogers* (DD–876), for Charles E. and Jack E. Rogers, both S1c, Birmingham, Ala.

U. S. S. *Slater* (DE–766), for Frank O. Slater, S2c, Marshall County, Ala.

U. S. S. *Tatum* (APD–81), for Lt. Comdr. Laurice A. Tatum, Chambers County, Ala.

U. S. S. *Thornhill* (DE–195), for Lt. (jg) Leonard W. Thornhill, Lamison, Ala.

Navy ships named for counties in Alabama are: *Winston*[1] (AKA 94); *Autauga* (AK 160); *Blount*[1] (AK 163); *Bullock* (AK 165); *Marengo* (AK 194); *Chilton* (APA 38); *Clay*[1] (APA 39); *Elmore*[1] (APA 42); *Fayette*[1] (APA 43); *Lamar*[1] (APA 47); *Sumter*[1] (APA 52); *Cleburne*[1] (APA 73); *Crenshaw* (APA 76); *Cullman* (APA 78); *Geneva* (APA 86); *Shelby*[1] (APA 105); *Colbert* (APA 145); *Lowndes*[1] (APA 154); *Lauderdale*[1] (APA 179); *Pickens*[1] (APA 190); *Talladega* (APA 208).

Navy ships named for rivers in Alabama are: *Cahaba* (AO 82); *Tombigbee*[2] (AOG 11); *Escatawpa*[2] (AOG 27); *Conecuh* (AO 103).

[1] Also named for counties in other States.
[2] Also named for rivers in other States.

The Leaders of the So-Called Arab Higher Committee Should Be on Trial at Nuremberg, Not Accredited to the United Nations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1947

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the decent people of America learned with horror a few weeks ago that the so-called Higher Arab Committee, headed by the notorious collaborator with the Nazis, Haj Amin El-Hussein, the Mufti of Jerusalem, has been accredited to the United Nations Assembly.

I would have thought the Mufti's blood-stained record is known to all. I have in my own files a copy of a carefully documented statement showing his war record of active collaboration with the Axis, which was presented to our State Department more than a year ago.

HIS SINS FORGIVEN

It now appears, however, that not only will the Mufti not face trial for his war crimes in company with his accomplices in international crime and race murder, but that he is to be welcomed back into the family of nations, his sins forgotten and forgiven. The Mufti was one of those who enthusiastically aided and abetted the horrible Hitler plan for killing off all Jewish people.

But, fortunately for world morality, not everyone has forgotten. I have received, and I believe that every Member has received, a copy of a brilliant study of the Arab Higher Committee and of the self-appointed Arab spokesmen, and the Mufti, prepared by the Nation Associates, thoroughly documented, and presented briefly and concisely.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I now insert in the RECORD the first nine pages of this document, and urge Members to look at their own copy and see there the reproduction of photographs of the Mufti with Hitler, with Himmler, with his storm troops, and copies of official Nazi documents proving the Mufti's blood guilt:

THE ARAB HIGHER COMMITTEE OF PALESTINE

The Political Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations decided on May 7, 1947, without a dissenting vote, to invite the Arab Higher Committee to testify before it on the Palestine question.

The invitation was extended after an assurance from the delegation of the United Kingdom that the Arab Higher Committee represents a considerable portion of the Arab population of Palestine. Moreover, a special sitting of the General Assembly was convened, under pressure of the Arab states, in order to issue the invitation in a form which would invest the Arab Higher Committee with the same diplomatic status as the Jewish Agency for Palestine, the internationally recognized representative of the Jewish people.

It is important, in view of the extraordinary emphasis placed on the testimony of the Arab Higher Committee, to examine its origin, its membership, its leadership, and its purpose.

COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY ARAB LEAGUE

The Arab Higher Committee of Palestine is a creature of the Arab League comprising Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Transjordan, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen. The head of the Arab Higher Committee is the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el-Husseini, a full partner of the Axis before and during World War II, and an escaped prisoner of war who has found asylum in the Palace of the King of Egypt.

The Arab Higher Committee, representing the six Arab parties of Palestine, came into existence in 1936. A year later it was established that the Mufti and his associates in the Arab Higher Committee were responsible for the 1936 riots which took a toll of hundreds of British, Jewish, and Arab lives. Accordingly, the Palestine Government in 1937 declared the committee illegal and ordered it disbanded. Some of its members were arrested and sent to Seychelles. Others, including its chairman, the Mufti of Jerusalem, escaped to Syria, whence they continued to direct Arab operations. During his exile in Syria, the Mufti even succeeded in liquidating most of the Arab leaders of Palestine who opposed him and his policies.

Until 1943, the Arab Higher Committee had no formal existence. The Mufti, in the interval, had moved from Syria to Iraq, where he organized the revolt against the British in 1941. When that failed, he fled to Germany and there played his role as Axis ally in the war against the United Nations.

In 1943, a number of prominent Palestinian Arabs made an effort to establish an Arab Higher Committee but were prevented from achieving their purpose by followers of the Mufti who had remained in Palestine during the war and who feared that, in the absence of the Mufti, the new body would oust them from leadership.

In 1944, however, the effort to establish an Arab Higher Committee was given stimulus when the Arab states, under British incentive, began to form what has now become known as the Arab League. In September of that year, political leaders from neighboring Arab countries came to Palestine to urge Palestinian Arabs to agree among themselves on the composition of an Arab Higher Committee. These attempts again met with failure, due in every instance to the opposition of the followers of the Mufti who were hopefully awaiting his return from Germany and his resumption of leadership.

A temporary truce was established in 1944 when Musa el Alami, a mild supporter of the Mufti, was recognized by the Arab League as the sole representative of Palestinian Arabs, pending the formation of a Palestine Arab Higher Committee.

A few months after VE-day, when the Husseini family, to their great astonishment, found that the British were reluctant to try the Mufti as a war criminal, they were emboldened openly to demand the return of the Mufti and his aides to Palestine. In this they were joined by the Arab states and the Arab League.

In November 1945, the Foreign Minister of Syria, Jamil Mardam, headed an Arab delegation to Palestine, the sole purpose of which was to solve the problem of setting up an Arab Higher Committee. The Husseini family finally agreed to the establishment of an Arab Higher Committee on the promise that the Arab League would induce the British to release Jamal Husseini, nephew of the Mufti, from his internment in Rhodesia as a pro-Axis leader. Assurance was also given to them that the chairmanship of the Arab Higher Committee would be held open for the Mufti on his return, and that the vice chairmanship would be assigned to Jamal Husseini. When most of the seats had also been assigned to the Husseini family, the Arab Higher Committee was established.

Leaders of the other Palestine Arab parties attacked the formation of the committee on

the ground that it was unrepresentative. The Arab press demanded the holding of elections. No notice, however, was taken of these objections. Soon after its formation, however, the committee was boycotted even by some of its own members and was again dissolved.

In February 1946, Jamal Husseini was released by the British and permitted to return to Palestine. He immediately reestablished the Arab Higher Committee and enlarged it to include some 29 members. But two-thirds of the membership was assigned to the Mufti's representatives or supporters of his policies. Again this action was opposed by the leaders of the five other Palestine Arab parties. Ten members of the Arab Higher Committee split with it and formed another group known as the Arab Higher Front, leaving the Arab Higher Committee to the exclusive possession of the Husseini family.

In June of 1946, the Mufti escaped from his forced residence in Paris and reached Egypt. The Arab League, meeting then in Bludan, Syria, entered into negotiations with the Mufti and, soon thereafter, took things into its own hands and appointed the present membership of the Arab Higher Committee, establishing the Mufti as chairman; his nephew, Jamal Husseini, as vice chairman; Dr. Hussein Khalidi as secretary general; and Emil Ghouri and Ahmad Hilmi as members.

THE ARAB LEAGUE'S RELATION TO PALESTINE

The Arab League was established in February of 1945 and its principal function to date has been to demand the independence of Palestine and the ending of Jewish immigration, and in general, to prevent the implementation of the Palestine Mandate.

In 1945, the member states of the Arab League adopted the following resolution on Palestine:

"At the end of the last war, Palestine, like the other Arab states detached from the Ottoman Empire, was liberated from Ottoman domination. Having become autonomous, she was no longer dependent on any other state.

"The Treaty of Lausanne proclaimed that her fate would be settled by the interested parties. But if Palestine has not been able to order her own destiny, it is nevertheless true that it is on the basis of the recognition of her independence that the Covenant of the League of Nations in 1919 settled her status.

"Her international existence and independence therefore cannot de jure be questioned any more than can the independence of any other Arab country.

"If, for reasons beyond her will, her independence has failed to materialize, this circumstance cannot constitute an obstacle to the participation of Palestine in the work of the council of the League.

"The State signatories of the present Covenant consider that, under these conditions and by reason of the special circumstances involving Palestine, until that country can exercise all the effective attributes of her independence, it behooves the Council of the League to designate an Arab representative from Palestine who will participate in its work."

The existence of the Arab League was officially registered at the organizing conference of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945. The League was the culmination of more than 4 years of effort which had been encouraged by Anthony Eden, then Foreign Secretary of Great Britain.

THE LEADERS OF THE ARAB LEAGUE

Since the opening of the Extraordinary Session of the United Nations on Palestine, all pretenses have been dropped as to the role of the Mufti of Jerusalem as Chairman of the Arab Higher Committee and the man who gives it orders.

The titular recognition accorded the Mufti is further strengthened by the list of delegates named by the Arab Higher Committee to represent it before the Political Committee of the United Nations. In a message addressed to the Secretary General on May 4, 1947, from Cairo, the headquarters of the Mufti, Hussein Khalidi presented the following names: Emil Ghouri, Rajai Husseini, Henry Katan, Wasef Kamal, Isa Nakhleh, Rasem Khalidi.

Of this list, Emil Ghouri alone is a member of the Arab Higher Committee. Of the five other members, one is a cousin of the Mufti, and two—Wasef Kamal and Rasem Khalidi—are notorious for their long-time association with the Mufti in his Axis activities.

THE DOSSIER OF THE MUFTI AND AIDES

Haj Amin el-Husseini, Mufti of Jerusalem

Haj Amin el-Husseini has a long-time record of complicity with terrorism. Responsible for the Arab riots in Palestine in 1920, he fled to Transjordan to escape a 10-year sentence of imprisonment, returning only after complete amnesty had been granted.

In 1922, he became the Mufti of Jerusalem and later the President of the Supreme Moslem Council, during which period he had at his disposal more than 100,000 pounds a year.

The Shaw Commission, appointed by the British Government to investigate the 1929 riots, attributed to the Mufti a share in the responsibility for these riots, in which 133 Jews were killed and 239 wounded. No action was taken to curb his activities, with the result that in 1936 he again was responsible for new attacks upon the Jews of Palestine. At the same time, he caused the assassination of hundreds of prominent Arabs, including 24 leading Palestine Arabs who refused to accept his leadership.

The captured files of the German High Command in Flansburg at the war's end reveal that the Arab riots of 1936 in Palestine were carried out by the Mufti with funds supplied by the Nazis. The report states: "Only through funds made available by Germany to the Grand Mufti, of Jerusalem, was it possible to carry out the revolt in Palestine."

Following his escape from Palestine to Syria and later to Iraq, he and his henchmen were directly responsible for the anti-Jewish pogrom in which almost 400 Jewish men, women and children were stabbed or brutally clubbed to death in the streets of Bagdad. An investigating committee appointed by the legitimate Iraq Government, following its restoration after the revolt in 1941, declared that the causes of the disturbance, "are, in the opinion of the investigating committee, Nazi propaganda emanating from the following sources: (1) the German League; (2) the Mufti of Jerusalem and his henchmen who followed him to Iraq. This man was accorded enthusiastic reception in Iraq and has turned it to his own use to disseminate many-sided Nazi propaganda. His influence on government and army circles became so strong that he could give orders to his group to set to work to spread anti-Jewish and anti-British propaganda among all classes of the population."

In Iraq the Mufti's first undertaking was to organize the Iraqi revolt with Jemal el Husseini, now vice chairman of the Arab Higher Committee, as his chief of staff.

After the failure of the Iraqi revolt, the Mufti escaped to Tehran and found refuge in the Japanese embassy. From there he escaped to Italy. In October of 1941, he conferred with Mussolini, Ciano, and Dino Alfieri. From Rome he communicated with Balkan Moslems under Italian rule in Yugoslavia and Albania.

In November 1941, he went to Berlin. The Nazis established a special office for him in Berlin entitled, "Buro des Grosmufti," with branches organized later in other parts of Germany and Italy. His activities included propaganda, espionage, organization of Moslem military units in Axis-occupied countries and in north Africa and Russia, establishment of Arab legions, of an Arab brigade and organization of fifth-column activities in the Middle East, including sabotage and parachutist expeditions.

In the course of his propaganda work, the Grand Mufti had at his disposal not only the German-controlled radio, but radio stations in Bari, Rome, Tokyo, and Athens. In addition, he was responsible for sending to the Middle East various propaganda publications in Arabic.

His espionage service extended throughout the Middle East. He had a suboffice in Geneva linking him to Egypt and Turkey, and another in Istanbul, branching out all along the Syrian-Turkish frontier in Mersine, Alexandretta, Antioch, Adana, and Diarbekr. These stations received information directly from the Mufti's agents in Palestine, Syria, and Iraq, and maintained close contact with members of the German Intelligence in Turkey.

In Athens the Mufti established a parachutist and sabotage school for Arabs.

In The Hague, under his direction, Arab students were trained in wireless transmission, high explosives, and demolitions. The Mufti's agents were parachuted into Palestine, Syria, and Iraq. A number of them were caught by the British. On a number of occasions these agents, with the help of local Arabs, cut telephone and pipe lines in Transjordan and Palestine and sabotaged railways and bridges in Iraq.

Another of the Mufti's accomplishments was the organization of Moslem military units. He attempted to recruit for the German military command some 500,000 soldiers from Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria. In Asiatic Russia, he collaborated with Moslem Russian Quislings and White Russian traitors whom he helped to form pro-Axis legions.

In 1942, he started to organize Axis Arab legions from among Arab students in Germany and Arab prisoners of war who followed him to Germany. His legionnaires wore the German uniform with Free Arabia patches on their shoulders.

After the Jewish Brigade had been recognized by Winston Churchill in 1944, the Mufti, on November 2, with the consent of Ribbentrop, called upon all Arabs in Germany hailing from Palestine, Iraq, Egypt, and Syria to join the Arab Brigade.

Accepting a proposal of the Japanese that he broadcast to Moslems in the South Pacific and India, the Mufti recorded numerous broadcasts which were beamed to India, Indonesia, and Java.

On September 3, 1941, Maj. Gen. Erwin Lahousen, one of the top officials of the Abwehr, whose secret diary was among the captured German documents, wrote: "The Grand Mufti, who left Iraq to go to Iran, is currently in connection with the Abwehr II (sabotage division of the Abwehr). According to reports from Tehran he is safe with the Japanese envoy."

A year later, on June 2, 1942, Lahousen wrote in his secret diary: "The Italian national, Captain Simen, took part in discussions with the Grand Mufti concerning the utilization of the connections with the Grand Mufti for the purpose of Abwehr II, in order to demonstrate the solidarity of the Axis Powers."

A month later, on July 13, 1942, Lahousen made the further entry in his secret diary: "A meeting between the chief of the Abwehr" (Admiral Canaris, who was also Hitler's representative in arranging for the Franco revolt against the Spanish Republican Government), and the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem took place in the apartment of the chief. I (Lahousen) took part in the discussion. The Mufti made an offer to the chief that the followers of the Arabian Freedom Movement, which was led by him, as well as the followers of the former Iraq Prime Minister, Kallani (leader of the Iraqi revolt against Britain), were to be used for purposes of sabotage and

sedition in the Near East in accordance with the purposes of Abwehr II."

Wasef Kamal

Wasef Kamal, member of a well-known Nablus family and a teacher by profession, is notorious for his extremist propaganda among his students and for his association with the Istaklil Party during the disturbances in Palestine in and after 1936. He was a member of the National Committee in Nablus and played a role in the organization of the 1936 riots. Arrested in that year, he soon escaped to Transjordan and later to Iraq. An ally of the Mufti, he played an important role in the Iraqi rebellion of 1941 against the British.

From Iraq, he escaped to Turkey. During the first part of the war he remained in Turkey as an agent of the German Secret Service from which he received a salary. In 1943 he went to Italy and Germany where he served as one of the closest collaborators of the Mufti. He returned to Syria in April 1946. He was one of the few Arab leaders excluded from the amnesty of November 1946, because he is regarded as dangerous.

In April 1947, Wasef Kamal was appointed by the Arab Higher Committee as a member of a propaganda delegation to the United States. Having arrived in this country, he is in attendance at the sessions of the United Nations.

Rasem Khalidi

Rasem Khalidi, member of a well-known Jerusalem family and a former Palestine Government official, has been one of the closest collaborators of the Husseini family, and particularly of the Mufti.

In 1936, at the outbreak of the Axis-sponsored Palestinian Arab uprisings, he was a member of the most intimate inner circle of Haj Amin el-Husseini.

In 1937, after the dissolution of the Arab Higher Committee, he was a member of an underground committee which directed Arab terrorism in Palestine. After his arrest in 1938, he fled to Syria and then to Iraq, where he joined the Mufti in organizing the Iraqi rebellion of 1941. After its failure he fled to Ankara and thence to Italy and Germany. In the midst of the war, in 1943, he served as an announcer on the Axis-Arabic radio station in Athens. Since 1944 he has been a member of the Mufti's personal entourage, first in Berlin and later in Paris. In July 1945, he returned to Egypt and in November 1946 was included in the Palestine Government's amnesty. Although permitted to return to Palestine, he preferred to remain in Egypt. Most recently, the United States Consul refused to grant him a visa to the United States because of his activities in Nazi Germany.

Emil Ghouri

Emil Ghouri, a member of the Arab Higher Committee, has long been active in extremist politics in Palestine. After the dissolution of the Arab Higher Committee in 1937, he was exiled and moved to Egypt and Iraq. In Iraq, he worked with the Mufti as a member of his Foreign Relations Committee in charge of propaganda. A report of the British General Service of Intelligence, on December 1, 1941, listed Emil Ghouri as one of a group "who are responsible for propaganda, intrigue, and subversive activities inside and outside Iraq."

Ghouri was permitted to return to Palestine in 1941 on condition that he would not engage in politics. This condition, however, has not been met. He has been a member of each of the three Arab Higher Committees named since 1941, and is the political editor of the Husseini daily, Al Wahda. He is the organizer and political leader of the underground Arab army, and is alleged to be one of those responsible for internal terror against Arab opponents of the Mufti and Arabs who sell land to the Jews. He advocates that all Jews who came to Palestine since 1918 be regarded as foreigners and be deprived of rights in an independent Arab Palestine.

Jamal Husseini

Jamal Husseini, nephew of the Mufti and for many years his right-hand man, has been the head of the Palestine Arab party, the Mufti's party, since 1935. He was the closest assistant of the Mufti in organizing the 1936–39 Arab rebellion. In 1939 he joined the Mufti in Bagdad and organized the pro-Axis fifth column in Iraq which culminated in the Iraqi rebellion.

He fled from Bagdad en route to Tehran, but was captured there by the British before he could make good his escape. He was placed in internment in Rhodesia as a dangerous pro-Axis leader. There he spent 4 years until he was finally released in February 1946 and allowed to return to Palestine owing to the pressure of the Arab League.

Five months ago, in January 1947, at the Mufti's request, three of his aides in the Axis adventure were added to the Arab Higher Committee. These were Izzat Darwaza, Is'haq Darwish, and Muin el Madi. The latter was the head of the Mufti's espionage office in Turkey, while the former two operated in Germany and Athens. Today, unquestionably the center of activity of the Arab Higher Committee is in Cairo, with the Mufti playing a game which he hopes will bring about his recognition by the Arab states as the Palestine Arab government-in-exile.

The extent of the alliance of the Mufti and his aides with the Axis is presented in the following pages in photographs and photostatic copies of documents found among the papers of the Mufti in his villas and offices in Germany at the war's end, and among the official papers of the Nazi government. Most, if not all, of these documents are now in the possession of the State Department of the United States.

The record shows that the chairman of the Arab Higher Committee and his principal representatives were involved in an active partnership with Rome and Tokyo, with the Moslem quislings of the Balkans and the Soviet Union, with Axis representatives in the Middle East, and with Vichyites in the French territories of north Africa.

The documents prove, moreover, that due to the insistence of the Mufti, the extermination program of the Nazis was carried out even in those satellite countries which were willing to permit the rescue of the Jews.

It is to these men, whose acts establish their place among the worst of the Axis war criminals, that the United Nations has accorded the honor of appearing in behalf of the Arabs of Palestine.

Congressional Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Hartford Courant, one of the outstanding newspapers in the Nation. This editorial accurately describes the circumstances which call for the adoption of House Resolution 219, which is now pending before the Committee on Rules.

CONGRESSIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Representative GEORGE MACKINNON, Minnesota Republican, last week introduced in the House a much-needed resolution during one of his rare speeches in that body. He expressed the view that it is about time the House declared its independence from the threats of intimidation that have frequently been made on the floor in connection with passage of the tax and labor bills and lesser legislation. It has become altogether too common for self-appointed spokesmen for the President to bring pressure on Members of the House on the ground that Mr. Truman will veto a measure if such-and-such a provision is included or excluded, whichever it may be.

To eliminate this browbeating of Congressmen, who after all are just as much entitled, indeed obligated, to have their own opinion on legislation as is the President, the Minnesota Republican has introduced the following resolution;

"It shall be a breach of order in debate on any pending bill or resolution to make any reference to the opinion of the President of the United States, or to the nature of any future action the President may take unless such opinion or reference to future action was contained in an official communication or message from the President to the House."

Such a resolution would obviously leave the door open for legitimate communications from the White House with regard to pending legislation, but it would eliminate much of the speculation that masquerades as inside information about the President's views, in order to influence legislation.

Too much attention to the supposed attitude of the President on pending legislation engenders the sort of political tactics that constitute the greatest obstacle to conscientious law making. Measures such as the tax and labor bills should be passed on their merits. It is the duty of Members of Congress to shape the best and fairest legislation they can on these and other matters, regardless of what the President's attitude may be. His duty is to approve or to veto in accordance with his own convictions. Certainly Congress should not shape its course of action with the anticipation of either securing the President's approval or of putting him in an embarrassing dilemma.

Representative MACKINNON'S resolution would help maintain Congress in a position of equality with the executive branch of the Government and enable it, if its members are willing, to decide important questions on their merits instead of on a basis of political maneuvering. It would also, incidentally, protect Mr. Truman from being embarrassed by the articulate Members of Congress who are only to ready to divulge to their colleagues what his views are, or what they think they should be, on any given issue. Unless and until this country adopts the parliamentary system, in which the Cabinet is directly responsible to Congress, we will do well to keep our traditional separation of powers from being vitiated by the actions of irresponsible sycophants who like to proclaim what they think are the President's views.

Use of Canned Fruits and Vegetables in Relief Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the various governmental

agencies charged with the purchase of supplies to fulfill our relief program, as well as those whose duty it is to make purchases of food supplies for the War and Navy Departments and other governmental needs, will give every possible consideration to the use of canned vegetables and fruits.

Modern methods in the industry have enabled canners to retain in their product practically the full nutritive value of a fresh item and, of course, the great merit in canned goods lies in their nonperishable quality.

Under leave granted, I desire to set forth a letter which I have received from Mr. Arthur E. Nash, secretary of the Association of New York State Canners, Inc., to which I invite the careful consideration both of my colleagues and the Government agencies:

ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK
STATE CANNERS, INC.,
Rochester, N. Y., June 6, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEATING: The Association of New York State Canners, Inc., is a trade organization representing canners, freezers, grape juice and specialty packers throughout New York State. Membership of the association is composed of 85 companies with a total of 130 processing plants. The State pack of fruits and vegetables annually exceeds 20,000,000 cases of which approximately 95 percent is packed by association members.

The board of directors of the association in a meeting Monday, May 26, 1947, voted to bring before you the position of canned food stocks in the Nation and to explain the attitude of our industry relative to the advisability of consideration for the purchase of canned foods for relief shipments to foreign countries.

The May 24, 1947, issue of the American Institute of Food Distribution, Inc., very clearly points out an analysis of this canned food picture. The following quotation taken from this issue substantiates the concern of the industry for shipments of high food value stocks to Europe:

"Analysis of May 1 conners' stocks of the major vegetables and tomato juice shows how burdensome inventory position of wholesalers and distributors has backed up on canners. As of that date according to the National Canners Association statistics, packers held a total of 18,916,000 cases, basis No. 2's of corn, peas, snap beans, tomatoes and tomato juice. This compared with a grand total of 5,554,000 cases as of the same date last year or 241 percent more. On March 1, the last time Food Institute made this comparison, canners' stocks were only 90 percent greater than a year earlier."

This situation as presented on the abovementioned items is likewise true on many other vegetables and fruits in the United States. The industry is concerned with this trend and its possible effect on the agricultural situation throughout the country.

It is not the intent of our group to emphasize the relieving of a situation which in essence is our own problem. However, with the world in need, it seems highly logical that a great deal of consideration should be given to shipments of good foods to these needy areas from stocks which are in surplus.

Canned foods are nonperishable and are easily handled for export shipment. This is not the case with some products which might be under consideration by Congress or its committees for the relief of the needy areas.

We realize, of course, that you have many problems to consider in this tremendous program. On the other hand, our industry is in a position to alleviate some of this without affecting the economic situation or without in any way affecting the current inflationary trend.

Detailed statistics substantiating the position of the industry are available through the department of statistics of the National Canners' Association, as well as various bureaus of the Federal Government and trade services. These are readily available to the committees considering this problem.

The association urges that all consideration be given to the purchase of surplus canned foods for shipments abroad.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. NASH,
Secretary.

Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on June 6, 1947, entitled "Right to Work."

The Washington Post has been noted for its general support of administration policies, and its particular support of the rights of the workingman and labor unions, so that this editorial generally favoring the labor bill has exceptional significance.

The difficulty with most criticisms of the labor bill is that they denounce it in general terms but seldom, if ever, make any specific objection. If every labor-union member and every workingman would examine carefully all the provisions of the bill, he would find it to be in his interest. It restores the fundamental rights of the workingman, and it does not interfere with the legitimate conduct of a labor union. It is restrictive only of abuses practiced by some labor leaders who, if not checked, would bring the whole labor movement into discredit.

The editorial follows:

RIGHT TO WORK

In the search for some provision of the Taft-Hartley labor bill to which they can point for definite evidence of a reactionary spirit, opponents of the bill are inclined to single out the ban on the closed shop. But that is usually as far as they go. The President is urged to veto the bill because it would outlaw a device that some unions have long employed to make their power effective. Almost nothing is said, however, as to what the bill actually provides or of the additional safeguards it would throw around the right to work.

It is true that the closed shop, as it has been known in the past, would be outlawed as an instrument of inexcusable monopoly. More significant, however, is the fact that something better would be put in its place. Workers could have a union shop at any time simply by getting 30 percent of their number to sign a petition requesting an election on the subject and then commanding a majority of the votes at the election. Certainly that involves no hardship. On the contrary, it gives the rank and file of workingmen a chance to make their own choice instead of having a union shop thrust upon them.

The union shop thus established would be confined to the legitimate purpose of maintaining the union's strength and dividing its expenses among all workers benefiting from its efforts. Unions would not have to carry the so-called "free riders," for the employer would have to fire men who failed to pay their dues. Unions would also be left free to expel their numbers for any other cause. But they could not, as they now sometimes do, deprive a man of his right to work because of mere dislike or disapproval of something he may have done. In other words, the only offense for which the union could force the discharge of an employee would be failure to pay his dues. Tight little labor monopolies would thus be broken and unions would no longer be in a position to dictate to the employer as to whom he could hire. This is nothing more than a belated triumph of common sense.

To take advantage of the union-shop provision of the act, unions would also have to make an accounting for the spending of their funds and state their method of electing their officers. The union shop could operate successfully, moreover, only so long as the union avoided discrimination among employees and fixed reasonable initiation fees that would not amount to a tax on the right to work. Any sort of monopoly standing without regulation in the public interest is utterly incompatible with twentieth century democracy. As we see it, the substitution of a regulated union shop for the closed shop, as provided in the bill, would not detract one iota from the strength of unions in pursuit of their legitimate objectives. It would, of course, correct numerous abuses and take from a few ruthless labor bosses the power to deprive men of the right to work. But these are changes for which the great majority of citizens will be thankful.

Voice of America Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, Phineas T. Barnum, the great genius who made a million dollars exploiting the gullibility of the American people, said, "There's a sucker born every minute." Since Mr. Barnum's time, Mr. Speaker, our birth rate has increased considerably, and if this so-called Voice of America appropriation is passed it will be concrete proof that that ratio referred to has increased along with it.

It looks to me like we are falling for some pretty fancy propaganda. We have been accused of being imperialistic. Why should we even have to answer such accusations by broadcasting across the seas. Our answer to those accusations is already over there.

Three hundred thousand American boys lie beneath foreign soil today. Those boys died fighting, not only so that their own homes and families could remain free, but so that peoples everywhere could be free. Let that be our answer to our accusers. Mere words can but detract from the glory of our victory.

Our boys did not fight to enslave, but to liberate. People all across the continent of Europe cheered and kissed those Americans who were their liberators. Millions of people were rescued from slavery by those American boys who now rest beneath the soil in foreign lands. Do those people think we are going to enslave them? Of course, they know better.

Why, then, do we not call this so-called Voice of America by its right name? It is propaganda, pure and simple. It is a program that defiles the respect we can claim throughout the world. Should we not be ashamed to broadcast swing music and poetry, and praise of Henry Wallace, abroad under the name "Voice of America." Those people heard the real voice of America when they shouted to American liberation troops. They know that the voice of America does not speak of labor battalions, or concentration camps, or revolution. They know already that the real voice of America speaks of freedom, and equality, and of peace.

There are those who say that these so-called Voice of America broadcasts will keep up the peoples' faith in America. We have seen some of the material that is broadcast, and it is difficult to see how we can expect to keep the peoples' faith when they are allowed to see how we can waste these millions of dollars. These broadcasts, which have been going on, did not give the people of Hungary strength to resist the Communist overthrow of their government. People in Hungary, at this very moment, may be saying that American swing music is the best in the world as they march to the mines or fields under an armed Communist guard. What good is that knowledge to those people?

As for the provision calling for the exchange of students with foreign nations, I find no quarrel with that idea. But how many European countries are ready to send students over here to study, and do we have the money to spend on this? In most of those nations people have not even begun to go to work. There is no war devastated country abroad that is back on its feet economically yet. To me, this program seems a bit premature.

If you are hungry, you do not go to college for 4 years to learn how to get a job and then earn something to eat. You go to work and eat first, then you save up something, and then you may plan your schooling. That is the situation right now with these foreign countries. Under this program, they are a drag on the American taxpayer all the way, and the taxpayers of this country cannot stand that drag much longer. It is not right that they should have to.

This bill, as I see it, has no place in the world as it is constituted today. The broadcasts are of no value, we should not have to answer the propaganda of others when we are accused. Our Nation was founded on the principles of freedom, and the world knows it. We cannot improve on that.

A strong America, an America that is capable of backing up the peace we have won, is what the peoples abroad want to see. When they see that we intend to use our might to enforce world freedom—never fear—they will hear the voice of America.

Airplane Disasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, we have all been shocked by the tragic deaths resulting from the recent air-lines crashes. During the Memorial Day week end alone over 180 people throughout the world lost their lives in these disasters. Almost 100 of these people were Americans flying in American planes.

In spite of this appalling toll of lives, Delta Airlines is operating with only 25 percent of its maintenance personnel and with inadequate inspection of its equipment.

The mechanics of Delta Airlines went on strike on May 8. The company has refused to meet with the mechanics even to discuss the issues of disagreement.

At the time of the strike the regional office of the Civil Aeronautics Authority required that Delta airplanes be inspected every 35 hours of flying time. Shortly after the strike began the regional office gave Delta permission to inspect its planes only every 50 hours.

The Civil Aeronautics Authority in Washington is either ignorant of the situation in Atlanta or is deliberately allowing its regional office to serve as a strikebreaker. It is difficult for me to believe that an agency of the Government would lend assistance of this kind, especially at the possible cost of human lives.

I sincerely hope that the CAA is merely unaware of what its regional office is doing and that the matter will be rectified immediately.

H. R. 3036

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I include as an extension of my remarks, the statement I made before the Public Works Committee of the House on June 10, 1947, on H. R. 3036. This is a bill upon which hearings were begun by the committee on June 4, and which has for its purpose the transfer of the authority for selling electric power generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department from the Interior Department to the Secretary of War and which requires all sales to be made at the generating plants. In my judgment the adoption of this proposal would be a step backward and would again place electric power, so essential to our economy, particularly in the Northwest, in the control of private monopolies.

My statement is as follows:

H. R. 3036

(Statement of HOMER D. ANGELL, Member of Congress, Third District, Oregon, before the Public Works Committee of the House on June 10, 1947)

H. R. 3036, a bill to amend section 5 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong.), was introduced in the House on April 14, 1947, by Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO, chairman of the House Committee on Public Works. The bill would amend said section 5 to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) Electric power generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department, and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects, shall be disposed of by the Secretary of War at the generating plants: *Provided*, That when, in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the Federal Power Commission, interconnecting transmission facilities are necessary to coordinate the operation of two or more federally owned plants with other plants in the area, the Chief of Engineers will construct such transmission lines when specific appropriation has been made therefor: *Provided further*, That when, in the opinion of the Federal Power Commission such action will not prevent full use and development of the power potentialities of a project, preference in the sale of power shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives either directly or through resale by the purchaser. The Federal Power Commission shall determine those costs of projects appropriately chargeable to power. The costs of two or more project in a region may be considered as a unit for the purpose of establishing rates. Rate schedules shall be based upon such costs and will be sufficient to cover annual operating and fixed charges, including interest on and amortization over a reasonable period of years of the capital investment allocated to power. All contracts and rates for the disposal of power shall be subject to the approval of the Federal Power Commission before becoming effective. Contracts shall be effective for such periods as the Secretary of War may determine, subject to the approval of the Federal Power Commission, but such periods shall not exceed 20 years from the date of the contract, and all contracts shall provide for cancellation upon not to exceed 5 years' written notice. All moneys received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"(b) All transmission facilities, property, and records under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior used or intended for use in transmitting electric power from reservoir projects under control of the Secretary of War, including transmission facilities under construction shall be transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of War upon the effective date of this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall change the provisions of the Bonneville Act. The Secretary of the Interior shall transfer to the Secretary of War the unexpended balances of all funds appropriated for construction or acquisition of transmission facilities used or intended for use in transmitting electric power from reservoir projects under control of the Secretary of War.

"(c) Nothing in this act shall affect or invalidate any existing contract heretofore made by the Department of the Interior or extension or renewal thereof for the sale of electric power from reservoir projects under the control of the Secretary of War and all such contracts shall be binding and obligatory on the Secretary of War who shall succeed to all the rights, duties, and obligations of the Secretary of the Interior in the matters transferred.

"(d) The provisions of this act shall become effective upon enactment."

The bill, if enacted, would make fundamental changes in Federal power policy which would have material effect on the sale and marketing of electric power from the projects owned and maintained by the Federal Government. First of all, I call attention to the fact that under subsection (b) of the bill, a reservation is made in the following language: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall change the provisions of the Bonneville Act." I understand that it was intended by this reservation to exclude the marketing of power through the Bonneville agency from the operation of the act. However, that is only partially true by reason of the fact that Foster Creek and Willamette Basin projects, power from which should be marketed through the Bonneville agency, are subject to subsection 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, and would be controlled by this bill, if enacted into law. Furthermore, other contemplated, but as yet unauthorized, navigation and flood-control projects on the main stem of the Columbia River, such as The Dalles, John Day, and Arlington projects, which, in all likelihood, would be constructed by the Army engineers and for which Bonneville would logically be the marketing agent, would likewise be controlled by this legislation. These projects are in the very heart of the area served by the Bonneville transmission system, and the power generated by them should be marketed over that system.

It would be a grievous mistake, from the standpoint of management, as well as economy, for the Federal Government to market power from these projects or attempt to do so through an independent system while, at the same time, it owned and maintained the Bonneville network of transmission facilities covering the entire area that would be served by these new projects.

On the other hand, the Hungry Horse and Upper Snake River projects, which are on the Columbia and Snake Rivers in the Columbia River Basin, are reclamation projects and would not be directly affected by this bill. Neither would the bill be applicable to the McNary and Lower Snake River projects, I am advised. Since the bill is an amendment to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, it would affect only projects subject to that section. McNary and Lower Snake River projects were authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1944, which specifically provided that the surplus power from both projects should be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior for disposition in accordance with existing laws relating to the disposition of power at Bonneville Dam. Neither project is subject to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, and as I have said, neither, for that reason, would be subject to the provisions of H. R. 3036.

Speaking from the standpoint of the development of hydroelectric power in the Columbia River Basin, the transferring to the Secretary of War of the function of marketing power from the projects constructed and operated by the Corps of Engineers, would be a step in the wrong direction. It would undo the recent efforts of the Congress to improve administration in this field. All of the power developed by the Federal Government in the Columbia River Basin from projects located on the main stem of the Columbia River, as well as on its tributaries, feeds into a pool of power marketed through one coordinated grid system with transmission facilities reaching into the entire area in the Northwest serviced by this system. It is the most economical and most efficient system that could be devised for bringing the power of these federally owned and operated projects to the various areas of the district needing hydro power. By feeding all of the energy generated into one pool, deficiencies are overcome which are occasioned by breakdowns, lack of firm power, or other deficiencies in development of any plant in the entire system.

Bonneville Power Administration now markets the power from the Bonneville and Columbia Basin projects. It has been designated as the marketing agent for the power from the Hungry Horse, McNary, Foster Creek, and lower Snake River projects and various dams in the Willamette Basin project, including, Detroit, Lookout Point, and Quartz Creek, all of which are now authorized. It has also been requested by the Secretary of the Interior to plan to undertake the function of marketing power from reclamation projects in the upper Snake River Basin. Power from the existing main stream projects is marketed over a transmission system constructed and operated by Bonneville. This transmission system now totals over 3,000 circuit miles, and it constitutes the largest high-voltage system in the world. There is nothing like it anywhere. Bonneville supplies more than 40 percent of the energy requirements of the Pacific Northwest and is marketing power at a rate of approximately 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year. On the basis of energy produced and sold, Bonneville is the third largest power supplier, public or private, in the United States. The transmission system is loaded to capacity to meet the existing demands for power and must be expanded to market the tremendous quantities of additional power which are necessary to meet demands and which will become available as the authorized projects for which Bonneville has been designated the marketing agent are constructed.

The history of the development of Federal power marketing administration will show an unmistakable trend toward consolidation of the power marketing function into a single department rather than a division of that responsibility among varying departments and agencies. Power generated at reclamation projects has been marketed for many years by the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation. Lesser quantities of power are generated at projects under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, both of which are agencies within the Department of the Interior.

Until a few years ago there was no general provision for designating a marketing agent for power generated at flood control and river and harbor projects. Bonneville was one of the first large projects within this category. A separate act was enacted for that one project, which provided for the marketing of power by the Bonneville Power Administrator under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. In 1940, the act was amended to clarify the status of the Bonneville Power Administration and specifically to place it within the Department of the Interior. The Fort Peck project was completed shortly after Bonneville, and the same pattern of a separate act designating an agency in the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, as market agent, again was followed.

In the early part of the war, the Denison and Norfork projects began generating power, and in the absence of any statute creating administrative machinery, the President, under authority contained in the First War Powers Act, placed the function of marketing power from these dams in the Secretary of the Interior. The latter established the Southwestern Power Administration to carry out this duty. The Flood Control Act of 1944, for the first time, established a general policy and designated the Secretary of the Interior as marketing agent for reservoir projects under the jurisdiction of the War Department. Under this act the Secretary of the Interior can provide staffs to do the actual marketing work, as and where needed. Thus, provision has been made for all Federal power, with the exception of that generated by the Tennessee Valley Authority, to be marketed by the Secretary of the Interior through agencies under his jurisdiction.

As far as the Columbia River Basin hydroprojects are concerned, the enactment of H. R. 3036 would abandon this pattern of fixing responsibility for marketing Federal power in a single Cabinet official and scatter it out again. It would divide the responsibility. Such a division inevitably would mean duplications of staff and perhaps of facilities, and would invite competition and divergent power marketing policies. It would prevent intelligent planning and timing of new generating projects and new transmission facilities. It would be wasteful and inefficient.

As I have said, all projects in the same region and marketing area should be operated as a unit. More firm power can be obtained by the coordinated operation of such units than from their separate and independent operation. Hundreds of thousands of kilowatts of additional firm power are being generated and will be generated in the Columbia River system by coordinated operation. That means more power for the people and industries of the region. It means more dollars to repay to the Treasury and to make the existing and future projects feasible. I am aware that H. R. 3036 contains some provision for coordinating projects, but it is exceedingly vague and ambiguous, particularly in its application to projects which are not under the jurisdiction of the War Department. In the event of the coordination of projects not subject to the provisions of the bill with those which are governed thereby, which agency is to operate the system, sell the power, and account for the proceeds?

The advantage of a single marketing agent is particularly applicable to a region. Separate marketing agencies within the same region mean double staffs and facilities. Poorer service and waste of Government funds are likely to result. For example, Bonneville Power Administration cannot plan a transmission system for reclamation, Bonneville, McNary, and the lower Snake River projects without knowing when power will be available from Foster Creek, Detroit, The Dalles, and other projects in the Columbia Basin. Neither can it plan such a transmission system without knowledge as to the load centers which will be served by power from these additional projects and the location, size, and electrical characteristics of the transmission system necessary to carry their power to points where it will be used.

The Department of the Interior has adopted the policy of a single agency to market power from all projects subject to the Department's jurisdiction within a single region. In the Missouri Basin, power is to be marketed by the Bureau of Reclamation regardless of whether the power is generated at reclamation, river and harbor, or flood control projects. Similarly, in the Southwest, all power is marketed through the Southwestern Power Administration. In the Columbia Basin, Bonneville Power Administration is

now designated marketing agent for all power projects, reclamation and War Department, with the exception of those in the upper Snake Basin. In the Columbia River Basin report of the Department of the Interior, which is now being reviewed by the affected States and will shortly be presented to Congress, there is an express recommendation which would direct the Secretary to designate, as early as practicable, a single agency to carry out the power marketing functions in the entire Columbia River Basin. The Department has adopted this pattern because experience has disclosed it to be the best form of administration and management, both for the region involved and for the Federal Government. Two power marketing agencies in the same region simply makes no sense.

For the reasons I have named, if this bill should be reported favorably, it should be amended to exclude the entire Columbia River Basin rather than just those few projects now subject to the Bonneville Act. The Bonneville Power Administration is a going, experienced, well-staffed, power marketing agency. I know of no reason why it should not market all power developed at Federal projects in the Columbia Basin.

The bill would direct the Secretary of War to dispose of power from projects under his control at the generating plants. In other words, the Secretary would be compelled to sell the power at the bus bar. In this respect, the bill would effect more than a step backward in Federal power policy; it would be a long leap. We need examine only the Government's experience with the Muscle Shoals plant following the First World War, in order to appraise the effects of that policy. The power from that plant was sold at the bus bar to a single company, a private utility, at a low price. The company, in turn, resold it to the consumers at a price many times more than that which it paid for the power. Only the private utility benefited from the project. It was not until the project was transferred to the TVA and its power could be marketed over the TVA transmission system that the project was able to escape the stifling blanket of domination by a single purchaser and could fulfill its proper role in the development of the Tennessee Valley.

The past and the present policy of the Federal Government is to dispose of power in such a manner as to encourage its widespread use and to prevent its monopoly. That policy was specifically adopted in numerous laws enacted by the Congress, including the TVA Act of 1933, the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the Bonneville Act of 1937, the Fort Peck Act of 1938, and the Flood Control Act of 1944. The sale of power at the bus bar is utterly inconsistent with the policy announced in those acts of Congress. Limited use and monopoly are inherent in bus-bar sales. Only the largest privately owned utilities and industrial customers can afford to make the heavy investment in transmission lines and facilities which will permit them to connect their systems and plants with the dams.

These Federal projects and the power generated therefrom belong to all the people. If the people as a whole are to benefit from their power, the Government must bring them the power at the points where they can use it. In a meeting in Tacoma, Wash., on January 22 of this year, all the major utilities in Oregon and Washington, both public and private, agreed in the following language that power from the Government dams should be carried by Government transmission lines to the region's load centers:

"Inasmuch as these Federal generating plants are located a considerable distance from the region's load centers, and inasmuch as present transmission facilities of the Bonneville Power Administration are already approaching conditions of full load, it is agreed as essential that appropriations for backbone transmission facilities be made available to the Bonneville Power Administration on an annual and continuing basis adequate to provide a means for the delivery of power to load centers."

True, power could be sold at the bus bar at less cost than if transmission lines are constructed to area-load centers. Bus-bar sales, however, would soon eliminate all purchasers but a few of the major privately owned utilities and industrial customers. The result would be that the revenue which the Government received would be sharply curtailed The Government would have no opportunity to sell the power elsewhere, and the few monopolists who were able to take delivery of power at the bus bar would dictate the price which they would pay for power. The strangulation of the Muscle Shoals project would be repeated many times elsewhere.

A policy of bus-bar sales for some Federal projects and transmission-system sales for other Federal projects, which have transmission lines now, in the same marketing area would produce an unfortunate and perhaps chaotic result. Rates would differ and projects would in effect be in competition with each other. It is obvious that Federal projects in the same marketing area should not compete with each other. Competition can be avoided only by means of uniform rates, and such rates are not feasible where power from some projects is sold from a transmission system and power from other projects is sold at the bus bar. Under this bill the Columbia Basin, Bonneville, Hungry Horse, McNary, Lower Snake River, and reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest would be competing for power markets with the Foster Creek, Detroit, The Dalles, and other contemplated War Department projects. That condition could mean only a loss to the people of the Pacific Northwest, as well as to the Federal Government.

With respect to still another policy, H. R. 3036 would take a backward step. For more than 40 years—ever since the initial authorization in 1906 for the sale of power from reclamation projects—the Federal Government has granted preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives. I do not know of a single act providing for the disposition of federally generated power which does not embody that preference in one form or another. While H. R. 3036 provides a preference and priority for public bodies and cooperatives, the preference is so limited and tied in with other factors that, for all practical purposes, it is nullified. The preference itself is granted only if it will not prevent the full use and development of the power potentialities of the project, an obvious invitation to the private utilities to take economic action nullifying the preference. That provision extends an open request to the private utilities to demand the entire output of a plant, to the exclusion of public bodies and cooperatives.

In the second place, the policy of the bill in favor of bus-bar sales defeats the preference. Public bodies and cooperatives are unable to finance the erection of the necessary transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities necessary to connect their systems with the generating plants. Only major, privately owned utilities and large industrial customers can do so. Moreover, because of their heavier loads and higher load factors, they can install such facilities at a lower cost per unit of capacity than can the public bodies and cooperatives. For these reasons, a bus-bar-sale policy not only would nullify a 40-year policy granting preference and priority to the small, nonprofit distributor, but in fact it would reverse that policy. Practical economics would give preference to the privately owned utilities and industrial customers.

Under H. R. 3036, the Federal Power Commission would make cost allocations for power and would confirm rates. However, the bill would also require Federal Power Commission approval of every power contract before it could become effective. In my opinion, this would result in an unnecessary and unworkable restriction on the authority of the marketing agent. This kind of a requirement is directly contrary to principles of good business management. I fail to see what is expected to be gained by it. Certainly, it has no counterpart in ordinary utility regulation. Delays in making power contracts effective would be inevitable. If experience during the war years is any criterion, they would often become interminable. During the war, the Federal Power Commission was required to approve power contracts entered into by certain Government establishments and their prime contractors. FPC approval of contracts between Bonneville and such agencies, or their contractors, was often delayed for weeks, months, and in some instances, years. The Federal Power Commission's authority to allocate costs to power and to confirm power rates constitutes an adequate check on the power-marketing agent. The power contract details should be left to the latter. He must have the flexibility in his operations to take advantage of requests for immediate delivery of power, to meet varying situations and, in general, to run his business.

In summary, H. R 3036 proposes drastic changes in Federal power policies—policies that have been in effect 40 years or more and have been reiterated time and time again by the Congress. The changes are backward steps and would be neither good government, good administration, nor good business. It also proposes changes in administration and management which would be more harmful than helpful. The Federal Government is often accused—and not always without justification—that it is too unwieldy. Changes in policies and management should be in the direction of a better and more efficient administration. They should not slide backward and become more unworkable than they are now.

Address to Graduating Class, Immaculata Seminary, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on June 5 I had the privilege and honor of addressing the 1947 graduating class of Immaculata Seminary here in Washington, D. C., from which my daughter Lucille received her diploma. Immaculata Seminary is under the supervision of the Sisters of Providence and enjoys the honor of being classified as one of the highest rated educational institutions of its kind in the Nation. Here the students are taught the highest principles of fundamental Americanism together

with sound Christianity. The exemplary and self-sacrificing character of the Sisters of Providence as their teachers and molders of their characters is before them daily. I am proud and happy that my daughter had the opportunity to graduate from this fine institution. Here is the speech I made to the graduating class:

Youth is ever the hope and promise of a nation. As it is trained so does a nation grow as the ideals of a nation are imbedded in its youth. The history of civilization reveals that teachers, religious, and political leaders, reformers, social workers, dictators have focused the promulgation of their theories and ideals upon youth. The greatest teacher of all time taught us "that a little child shall lead them."

We hear a lot today about youth. Youth is bewildered, confused, saturated with all kinds of new theories, doctrines in educational, political, social, economic, and even spiritual fields. New ideas are thrust upon him as hard and fast as the rains fall upon the ground—in hope that these ideas will find fertile soil. Rarely do we hear about American ideals, but a great deal about the glories of communism, world government, regimentation, and progressive education. There are those who cry "peace," but have not the slighest idea of peace based on justice—but rather a revolutionary peace, stirring up class against class and setting up ideals for a new system of government in these United States, based on materialism rather than sipiritual ideals. Many of our youth are disgruntled and discouraged, questioning whether World War II was fought to preserve freedom. Over the air waves, from the public platform, through the written word, from every available source written or verbal—24 hours a day, a contsant stream of camouflaged ideas to confuse, to belittle existing customs and tradition, to change, to forsake representative democracy for some new form of government is literally being thrust at our people, especially youth.

The dictators, who recently built up a generation of youth imbued with their ideals, realized that youth demands a cause to champion. Dictatorship, the enemy of democracy, translates itself into impressive armies, powerful guns, and force—tangible evidence that plastic and eager youth can see and be thrilled. Is it any wonder that young America is more and more inclined to listen to the claim that dictatorships are modern and efficient, while democracies are slow, clumsy, inefficient, and have outlived their usefulness?

It seems that never in all history has youth been the object of so much demagogic solicitation and destructive influence as it is today. There is plenty of subversive propaganda going on in our cities, spread by advocates of foreign or pseudo-Americanisms. Soap-box orators find their audiences are increasing. New cults gain supporters rapidly. They aim to interest the young boys and girls in their doctrines so that the future of their movements is assured and will not perish. Many of our young people, groping for a new dawn of opportunity, justice, and freedom, desire an active change in our Government because they have no conception of what our heritage for free men truly is. They have not received training in fundamental principles either in the home, school, or church.

Youth demands a cause to champion. Talking in abstract terms about democracy and freedom, suppressing agitators, warning youth against subversive influences and crime, and trying to control youth are not enough. These are negative methods. The situation demands something positive be done. Youth must have a cause to champion. A cause that will stir his very soul, that will fire his ambition and stimulate his mind. Make America a living, vital reality. Sell America, with all its eternal principles, so that he, in turn, will champion the cause with all of his enthusiasm, vitality, strength, and faith. Knowledge must be his armor and truth his guide. This must be done, from the cradle all through the years of adolescence, if our ideals are to be carried forward.

Give youth a cause to champion. Instill him with all those fine qualities of manhood and womanhood which will enable him to revive the strength of the home, where character is built.

Let us see every student who leaves the schools of America go out into the highways and byways feeling a divine ordination to build a greater America. Let them understand what it means to be an American. Let the young people understand the history of their country and be willing to save the philosophy which gave it birth.

We have seen the failure of nazism, fascism, and communism in lifting up men's souls, in giving them a chance to "reach the stars." The question faces youth today whether we still have the pioneer spirit we once had, and upon its answer will be determined the faith to preserve the spirit of America.

If we are sure our way of life is right, we must prove it to others, who are in doubt. Not by talk, but by actually living the doctrines which we preach. We must prove that our heritage of freedom is a better form of living than any other.

The answer for today, the hope for tomorrow, is quality of our people adhering to fundamental principles. We need a revival of those spiritual realities which will impart wisdom and justice, unity and peace; wide horizons of thought and deep sympathy, deep rooting in truth, integrity, moderation, courage, and faith to go forward and character to endure. We need to take off the fetters of regimentation, employ the methods of free men and go forward in the American way—which alone will bring a moral, economic, and spiritual advance.

Lack of religious training is one of the chief causes of youthful confusion, and unless there is a sound guidance program by parents, teachers, and clergy there can be no effective training in either morals or manners. There must be training in moral law and adequate basic guidance in discipline and knowledge of those old-fashioned virtues. A trained disciplined healthy youngster of 18 is an asset worth a great deal more to the Nation than his living and training has cost.

You have not been exposed to these unstable theories and false ideals. Here at Immaculata Seminary you have had before you daily and hourly by precept and example the exemplary lives of the Sisters of Providence who have dedicated themselves to educating you in the sound and fundamental virtues of life, to instilling in you an appreciation for the better things in life, to preparing you for your future career, and in molding your character and developing your talents.

Millions of children in Europe and Asia are still out of school. Few of the thousands of destroyed schools, universities, libraries, and museums have been rebuilt. Even the simplest educational supplies are totally lacking in some communities.

You are fortunate indeed to have had this fine training here at Immaculata Seminary. You must now assume some responsibility for carrying on—responsibility to your school, to your parents, to your Nation, and to yourselves.

Responsibilities to your school:

To uphold the traditions and good name of your school.

To remember that you carry the name of your school wherever you go.

To obtain the highest records possible in your future studies.

To remember the time, patience, and sincere interest bestowed upon you by your instructors to further your well-being and educational advantages.

To be prudent and moderate in all of your actions so as to reflect credit upon the good Sisters of Mary of Providence whose self-sacrifice and whose whole lives are dedicated to your future welfare.

Responsibilities to your parents:

For the years of hope and love your parents have spent on your behalf.

For the time, patience, and money spent to give you the best of everything.

For the good name and background your parents have maintained in order to give you your present position in life.

Your duty to make good and to so conduct yourself so that they may feel proud and happy over our success.

To always keep in mind that your parents love you and will always be ready and willing to help you, but that you should never take undue advantage of their love and consideration, but that you should make their consideration of you a pleasure and not a burden.

Responsibilities as an American:

To always remember that you are fortunate citizens of the greatest Nation on earth.

That it is your duty to equip yourself mentally and physically so as to be an asset to your country.

To uphold the high traditions of this great Nation and to oppose any attempt to undermine its fundamentals or its institutions.

To be alert and informed on the issues of the day.

To be proud you are an American.

Responsibilities to yourself:

To do your best at all times.

To preserve your self-respect.

To develop your talents.

To prepare yourself for the future both for your own happiness and well-being as well as for your community in whatever pursuit you may follow.

Alternate Canal Routes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID M. POTTS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include a letter, with respect to the Panama Canal, from Mr. William G. B. Thompson to the editor of the Wall Street Journal, which appeared in that publication's issue of Wednesday, June 4, 1947.

Mr. Thompson is a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers and a former associate of Gen. George W. Goethals, the builder of the Panama Canal.

ALTERNATIVE CANAL ROUTES

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

S. H. Scheibla's Washington story in May 27 issue brings into the open the matter of a sea-level versus a lock canal at Panama. Its vital import to the American people deserves the fullest publicity, respecting the is-

sues at stake, regardless of the comparative estimates of cost or the estimated duration of construction operations for each type.

Argument for a sea-level canal, with one or two exceptions, long antedates the association of any of its present proponents with the project. The present Army predilection for a sea-level canal is ostensibly based on an apprehension that future development of atomic bombing will render the lock structures of the existing canal peculiarly susceptible to destruction. If any double flight of existing locks were destroyed by bombing, the canal would become inoperable. Damage to the Gatun or Pedro Miguel locks could drain Gatun Lake. Damage to Miraflores locks or dam could drain Miraflores Lake. In either case the canal would be unusable.

Quoting from your article:

"The Army favors a sea-level canal because it would be the easiest kind to defend; there would be no mechanical gadgets which could be put out of operation by single bomb explosion."

This statement, if made by the Army, is an oversimplification. No sea-level canal can ever properly function without tide control gates, due to the difference in tidal fluctuation between Colon and Balboa, this difference at times approaching 20 feet. No large vessel entering the Canal at Balboa at the beginning of flood tide there could safely navigate the sharp turns, inevitable in the proposed sea-level canal, because of currents induced by a rise and surge of current incident to 20 or more feet rise in 6 hours. The tidal locks necessary to enable a sea-level canal to properly function would be susceptible, not only to atomic bombing, but to any well placed TNT bomb. For the Army to deny this latter would be tantamount to admitting that the elaborately expensive precautions for guarding the locks against bombing, 1941–1945, were unnecessary. Why, then, should potential future atomic bombing be the pretext for the questionable accomplishment of questionable safety of a sea-level canal?

Ignoring the Army's alleged claim that a canal minus mechanical gadgets would not be susceptible to enemy destruction, diversion of the Chagres and other rivers cannot be ignored or dismissed, respecting its difficulty, ultimately unreliability, and susceptibility to atomic energy destruction.

Much of this proposed diversion would be in deep cuts through hills, in itself subject to jeopardy by earth slides in rainy season. Much of it would be through deep swamps with uncertain and unstable bottom. Here are involved massive dikes, similar to the Gatun Dam. To be ultimately feasible, these dikes must be built of carefully classified material. During relocation of the Panama Railroad, deep fills near Gatun sank out of sight over night. Dikes built to confine the rainy season flow of the Chargres and other streams would be peculiarly susceptible to destruction by any modern bombs, ignoring entirely atomic bombing. Breaches of almost any sections of the swamp dikes would empty enormous volumes of high velocity water flow into the canal ship channel, precluding any kind of navigation during rainy seasons.

If, in fact, future capacity and safety of the Canal demand profound changes in existing conditions, Capt. Miles P. Duval's reiteration of much earlier recommendations for a single lake level at elevation plus 85, from Miraflores to Gatun, which would in fact utilize most of the work already done on the third locks project, deserves a serious consideration which no hysterical demand of any other group for a sea-level canal deserves.

The future economic and military safety needs of this Nation will be ill served by consuming 20 years of its human and physical resources in a venture the essence of which lies in its uncertainty and boldness, as compared with the practical and infinitely less costly alternative recommended by Captain Duval and sponsored by the Navy.

My justification for the above derives from having spent the years 1905 to 1916 working on every phase of the Canal construction in the engineering and construction activities, and 42 years' study of and solicitude for the general integrity of that waterway.

WM. G. B. THOMPSON.

HAMDEN, CONN.

World Federation of Trade Unions' Mission to Japan and Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an article appearing in the Times-Herald of June 8 regarding the WFTU's mission to Japan and Korea.

I exposed the World Federation of Trade Unions in more than one address before the House of Representatives as an organization definitely hostile to the United States. Its recent mission to Japan and Korea, to which General MacArthur objected, is further proof of that hostility. Its attitude reflects the communistic influence and domination of this organization as well set forth in the article by George E. Sokolsky, which I include in these remarks:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The delegates of the World Federation of Trade Unions traveled to Japan as the guests of the American Government, the host being the War Department. General MacArthur had no wish for them to come but he was overruled by Secretary of War Patterson. The delegation consisted of Louis Saillant, general secretary of the federation; Ernest Bell, international secretary of the British Trade Union Congress; Willard Townsend, executive board member of CIO, United States of America; Michael Tarazov, secretary of the central council of the Soviet Trade Union; Patrick Waldberg, secretary of the delegation.

Their Information Bulletin recounts of a visit to a Korean textile mill accompanied by three members of the board of the All-Korean Trade Union Congress—a left-wing organization. Apparently the management of the textile mill did not regard this delegation as of very much importance. So, Mr. Saillant expressed his surprise to the director at not having been received as he left his car as it is traditional and customary on all similar missions.

So apparently they got into a fight, that is, the Korean trade union members and the local people. The management—I quote the WFTU report—"then informed us that he refused to grant permission to visit the establishment in the company of the people we had chosen." The fight was apparently a bad one—

"The members of the delegation were later informed that during the course of the morning the Korean police had arrested many members of the All-Korean Congress of Trade Unions who had been distributing the text of the message of welcome in honor of the members of the WFTU delegation." Then the delegation passed the following resolution:

"1. That all the persons arrested shall be released immediately.

"2. That the delegation be given the opportunity of seeing before the departure at 8:30 this evening the two Korean trade unionists who were brutally beaten at the factory.

"3. That a medical report be given to the delegation on the extent of physical damages which those 2 men have suffered.

"4. That the delegation be given a guaranty that the security and the lives of those men and of the other members of the group who were accompanying us will be safeguarded.

"5. That action be taken against the perpetrators of these brutalities and the manager of the factory.

"6. That the director of the plant, Mr. Lee, and his manager, Mr. Kim, who have allowed these incidents to take place and have tacitly approved of them, be discharged from their positions and that they be subjected to the full rigors of the Korean laws which are applicable to such circumstances.

"7. That steps be taken to ensure that the people be guaranteed the right to organize in trade-unions of their own choice on the basis of complete democracy without interference by the state or the police and that this guaranty shall be incorporated in a law.

"8. That this committee through its chairman, Mr. Saillant, be advised as to the disposition of this case and that the Korean people be advised of the results."

The probability is that nobody paid much attention to these world-shaking resolutions. But the point is that it was the War Department of the United States that insisted upon this troublesome delegation going to Japan and Korea where nobody wanted them. It is true that the American delegate, Willard Townsend, is not a Communist and was not in accord with the anti-Americanism of his communistic conferees. Here is a troublesome crowd of left-wing unionists who will, in the future, make their headquarters in the United States, at the United Nations building in New York.

The United Nations is a parliament of governments, but by resolution certain private organizations have been accorded special rights, particularly the right to maintain headquarters on their premises. The WFTU, the international left-wing labor organization, is one of those. This body will in the future have the advantage of a New York address. The cover-up is that the AFL and the International Chamber of Commerce will have offices there, too. But the WFTU is already acting as though it were an accredited international body. Actually, it is a menace.

Secretary of State Marshall Appeals for Continuation of State Department's Information Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks, I am inserting an editorial from the New York Times of June 12, 1947, covering Secretary Marshall's appeal to the Senate for a restoration of the funds to carry on his Department's informational program. I hope the House will heed the sound advice contained in this editorial and give its wholehearted approval to the Mundt measure authorizing the continuation of this vital and much-needed program of making America known—truthfully—to the rest of the world.

APPEAL FROM MARSHALL

Even in his days as Chief of Staff, Secretary Marshall probably never made a more earnest or imperative plea for a program than he did before the Senate Appropriations Committee in asking that at least $55,000,000 be restored of the $60,000,000 which the House has deleted from his budget. Of this sum, $34,000,000 is for the State Department's cultural and informational program. Without it, the Department's staffs will have to be reduced in many places, intelligence activities on which policies are to be based will have to be curtailed, and we shall lose our last direct contact with the people of Soviet Russia and various other countries. The Voice of America is the only voice many Russians hear, except the strident voice of the Soviet Government's propaganda bureau.

The American voice in China, in India, and in southeast Asia also would be silenced. The doors of 70 libraries in 41 countries would be slammed in the faces of thousands of persons who throng them every day, eager to learn about the strongest country in the world and denied any other means. Scholars who look to an opportunity to study in the United States would be denied the opportunity that the State Department now gives them to come to this country.

As Secretary Marshall has tacitly admitted, the cultural informational program has not always been what it should be. But it has been infinitely better than no program at all, and the Secretary promises that in the future, if the money is provided, the program will be "very carefully administered." By thus taking personal responsibility for it, he guarantees all that Congress need ask.

Any American who has traveled recently outside the borders of his own country knows with what hope and eagerness most of the rest of the world looks to the United States for leadership in these anxious days. What good is the best program if it is not explained to other people, and explained to them by those who make it and know what it is intended to accomplish?

The Labor-Management Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, no one can contemplate what the Pesident will do with the recently enacted labor-management bill, which has passed both Houses of Congress, but that is his responsibility which he must assume. If the President should veto that measure, then the question will resolve itself into the question as to whether this measure, as it is now written, shall be passed over the veto. There has been much discussion upon the question as to what the President will do on this subject. But, if he should veto this measure, and the Congress should fail to pass it over the veto, which requires a two-thirds majority vote, and if John L. Lewis should promote another strike in the coal mines in July which would, without doubt, cause many people in our country to have little or no coal for fuel this coming winter—then we wonder upon whom this deplorable reality would fall. Of course, the President would be the sole and only person upon whom that censure should fall—because he had the last word, and he had the opportunity to prevent such a disaster in our country.

The measure which is now upon the President's desk is a fair and equitable measure, which deals with both labor and management alike; it deals with both fairly; this measure will, if enacted into law, prove to be very helpful to labor over a long-range program; it will be helpful to our people who are attempting to secure jobs in our factories and in our plants, and it will be most helpful to our returned soldiers from the recent war; and, it has been predicted by many whose sympathies have ever been on the side of labor, that this measure is the fairest proposal for both labor and management that has been presented throughout the years.

We must remember that both capital and labor are required in our Nation in order to develop our security and to promote our progress. These groups must work with and for one another. It is manifestly necessary that both be treated fairly in their dealings one with the other. The general sentiment expressed, with respect to the pending measure, is that it is entirely fair to all parties—and that the measure should be enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, a very illuminating editorial appeared recently in the Indianapolis Times, of Indianapolis, Ind., upon this very subject—which I ask to be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD with my own remarks—which editorial is as follows:

FIFTEEN YEARS AGO—AND NOW

Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, speaking in New York, said:

"The temptation to put on labor all the blame for industrial difficulties and high prices is as unjust as it is to saddle all business with that blame. * * * Bitterness against all labor and all labor leaders as a group is just as dangerous, just as unfair, as the tendency 15 years ago to smear all business and management."

That is true. But if, as some of his hearers inferred, Mr. Forrestal was hinting at a line of argument he thinks President Truman might use in vetoing the Taft-Hartley labor bill which is before him, there is other truth that should be stated.

Fifteen years ago there were business abuses that cried for correction. Powerful men, who professed to speak for business, tried to deny these abuses and bitterly resisted the efforts of Government to correct them, by such laws as the Stock Exchange Control Act and truth-in-securities measure. They assailed the advocates of corrective legislation as enemies of business. They set themselves against the unmistakable will of the American people. In many cases they fought unfairly and laid themselves open to smearing tactics which were extended to all business, obvious as it was that all business was not at fault—that most of business was decent and honest.

Much of the legislation these men opposed was enacted in spite of them, and has been accepted. It has hurt business far less—if it was hurt at all—than business was hurt by the methods they used in opposing it.

Today there are labor-union abuses that cry for correction. Powerful men, who profess to speak for labor as a group, are trying to deny these abuses. For years they have resisted bitterly—and, with help from an indulgent administration, successfully—proposals to correct them by law. They are now resisting corrective legislation, passed by overwhelming majorities in Congress in response to the unmistakable will of the American people. They are assailing all advocates of this legislation as enemies of labor. They are fighting as unwisely, unfairly, and stupidly as the professed spokesmen for business did in the 1930's.

Of course, all labor and all labor leaders should not be indicted for the sins of a few. Of course, the vast majority of union members and union officers are honest, good citizens. It is not smearing them to say that the abuses of unionism must be corrected. The legislation now before President Truman will not destroy unions and enslave workers, as the professed spokesmen for labor say.

The measure should be signed.

Tulsa Chamber of Commerce Urges Civil Aeronautics Board Be Continued as Sole Authority for Granting New Air Routes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a resolution adopted unanimously by the board of directors of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce of Tulsa, Okla. I quote the resolution adopted June 3, 1947:

Whereas we have been informed that there are now pending in the House of Representatives certain resolutions relating to the entry of surface and water carriers into the field of air transportation; and

Whereas embodied in these various House resolutions is the principle that Federal agencies other than the Civil Aeronautics Board be given the right of granting authority for the operation of new air routes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce do hereby express their conviction that authority for the granting of all new air routes should continue to be vested in the Civil Aeronautics Board, under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 as amended; be it further

Resolved, That our Congressman be urged to work and vote for the continuation of this principle by opposing such portions of the above-mentioned House resolutions which would give authority to any other Federal body for the granting of new air routes.

Approved and adopted this 3d day of June 1947, by the board of directors of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, in regular session.

G. H. WESTBY, *President.*

Attest:

O. A. BORDER, *Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, there are several bills pending in Congress which seek to give authority to others than the Civil Aeronautics Board in the matter of granting new air routes. It is the belief of these constituents of mine, leading business and professional men of the city of Tulsa, through the board of directors of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, that other Federal agencies should not be given the right of granting authority for the operation of new air routes. I have quoted the above resolution in order that my colleagues and the public may know the strong conviction my constituents hold on this subject.

Loyalty Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the House in recent days have asserted that the State Department is doing nothing to clean out its own personnel. There is a story in today's Washington News which states that the State Department is completing 700 loyalty investigations a month, and that 225 persons, against whom there was unfavorable information, have left the Department.

The text of the article follows:

SEVEN HUNDRED STATE EMPLOYEES PROBED A MONTH

(By Frederick Oechsner)

An average of 700 loyalty and security investigations of employees, transfers, and new applicants is being conducted by the State Department each month, it was learned today.

Following President Truman's Executive order calling for a loyalty check of all Government employees, Secretary of State George Marshall wrote Attorney General Tom Clark requesting the FBI give priority to investigating State Department personnel.

MARZANI SPURRED IT

This resulted from frequent criticism of the Department in Congress and elsewhere for employing left-wingers. The recent conviction of Carl A. Marzani, former State Department employee, on charges of perjury in connection with Communist affiliations, spotlighted the issue.

Two or three investigations each week are initiated as the result of requests from individual Congressmen or from congressional committees.

The Mundt bill, to continue Office of Information and Cultural Affairs, calls for a loyalty check of the agency's personnel; the Greek-Turkish aid calls for similar checks on the members of the field missions.

MONTH EACH

The State Department's own investigations are conducted by a large staff working in the field (principally in the United States) and within the Department itself, in conjunction with the FBI, the military intelligence agencies, credit agencies, and other sources of information. Each investigation takes about 1 month to complete.

Charges of questionable loyalty or reliability by private persons are frequent. In the last 2 years, however, only 50 cases are said to have involved actual security considerations.

VERY SECRET

Certain important cases are referred to a special State Department committee of investigation, the character and membership of which are not disclosed even in the Department itself. Practically all other cases are dealt with by Assistant Secretaries.

Efforts to have the FBI "certify" the loyalty of persons whom they have investigated (generally applicants for employment) have been unavailing. The FBI merely will report its findings and the administrative decision is up to State.

Of 4,500 persons transferred to the State Department from other agencies at the end of the war, all have been investigated. In 342 cases, questionable factors arose; 225 of these left the Department, or were let out, on various grounds; 2 were dismissed; 70 were cleared; the remaining 45 are still under consideration.

Charges against State Department employees, or "soft spots" found in their records, vary greatly.

One involved a young woman who, as a resident of New York's Greenwich Village, fresh from a rural community, had been personally in favor of the candidacy of Communist Earl Browder for office.

The fact was brought to light, and her record investigated. She was cleared and kept her job.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of June 12, 1947:

SPEND AND SPEND, ELECT AND ELECT

The policy described so well by the late Harry Hopkins of "spend and spend and elect and elect," abetted by World War II, cost this country forty-two and one-half billions during the fiscal year which ends this month. The Cleveland Trust Co. performs a public service by reducing the figure to everyday sums. If every man, woman, and child paid his or her share of that sum, says the bank, it would require $300 apiece.

United States Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, devotes practically all of his time to dissecting Government spending. BYRD is a Democrat and because of this activity he has earned the hatred of the Democratic bosses.

Omitting the war expenditures politics is responsible for much of the rest. Take the Federal pay roll. In 1939, the last normal prewar year, the number of Government employees was 919,776. This was during the second Roosevelt administration when "spend and spend and elect and elect" was the order of the day. On June 30, 1945, this number had increased to 3,737,896 and in January of this year it was 2,261,459, well over twice as large as it was in 1939.

Notable among those showing increases were the office of Secretary of Labor, First Assistant Postmaster General, Public Buildings Administration, Public Roads Administration, and Veterans' Administration. The report of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures submitted to the United States Senate by Senator BYRD shows that the Washington metropolitan area led with 221,288 employees; California ran second with 212,912; New York third with 192,596. Vermont was last with 3,159. Federal employees outside the country totaled nearly 300,000.

The same joint committee also made a report on the assets of wholly owned Government corporations. A summary of the assets, largely in terms of book value, follows:

Cash on hand, in banks, and on deposit	$1,250,935,984
Accounts receivable	499,792,291
Loans receivable	3,719,370,798
Deferred charges	39,266,137
Real property	3,095,267,469
Plant and operating equipment	5,206,769,133
Furniture and fixtures	81,172
Inventories of goods and commodities on hand	1,378,209,602
Investments	486,673,013
Miscellaneous assets	21,724,108
Total assets	15,698,089,707
Estimated liabilities	14,161,000,000

If every man, woman, and child in the country paid the $300 yearly which it takes to run the Government it would be spent as follows: $104 would go for defense; $54 for veterans aid; $45 for international finance (foreign loans and such); $35 for interest; $15 for refunds; $11 for general Government expense, and $36 for all other expenses such as housing, highways, merchant marine, and agricultural programs.

We are dealing now with astronomical figures. President Truman wants to continue spending because he thinks spending means votes. But we think it is high time something were done for the taxpayers. The bill which Congress has passed by overwhelming majorities would cut taxes 30 percent on all low-wage earners, 20 percent on all middle incomes, and 10 percent on those in the top brackets.

If President Truman vetoes the tax reduction it will be purely politics. The economic ills now besetting this country simply cannot stand much more of this political pressure.

Secretary of State Marshall Issues Important Statement Supporting Student Exchange Program of H. R. 3342

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the House have said they

would vote for the Voice of America because General Marshall had recommended the broadcasting, but that General Marshall was not supporting the exchange of students and teachers, and other parts of H. R. 3342.

General Marshall issued a statement to the press this morning very forcefully endorsing the exchange of students and other activities authorized by the Mundt bill. In fact, General Marshall said that the exchange of students in the long run may be far more important than broadcasting. The text of General Marshall's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY MARSHALL ON IMPORTANCE OF STUDENT EXCHANGE

THE MUNDT BILL

At his press conference today, Secretary Marshall made the following statement:

"The Mundt bill authorizes the Secretary of State to conduct an international information and educational exchange program. A number of Members of Congress have stated they would support the Voice of America broadcasts because I had urged the continuation of this broadcasting, but they could not support the exchange of students and professors, or assistance to American libraries and schools abroad, or the assignment of American technicians as advisers to other governments.

"I have supported the continuation of broadcasting because it is the most important single method for correcting false ideas about the United States in those areas where the people are isolated from the rest of the world. I have spoken in support of broadcasting on several occasions because I felt this was the most controversial element in a program for the exchange of information.

"I am unreservedly in favor of the exchange of students, professors, and books. These methods in the long run may be far more important for the interchange of information than broadcasting. I believe that private institutions and organizations must continue, as they have in the past, to bear the principal responsibility for the exchange of students and professors. Assistance from the Government would supplement these private activities. I have seen some of the work of the American-founded schools in China. They are largely financed by private fund raising. During the war the State Department provided these schools with some books and laboratory equipment. The Department also gave to the American colleges in the Near East some scholarship funds for bringing students from the Arab states to study under American teachers in Syria and Turkey. I should like to see that authority continued, and wherever it is necessary in our national interest to supplement the work of private agencies I believe the Department should be in a position to do so.

"The assignment of public officials as advisers to other governments will be increasingly important to the United States in its foreign-relief program and will enable those governments to achieve maximum self-help. This bill contains provision that the Secretary of State can require other governments to pay for the services of these advisers.

"I do not believe that a bill limited to broadcasting would give this Government the opportunities it must have to explain itself to the rest of the world."